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The Queen's Indian Defence (arising after 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e6 3 f3 b6) is one of the most popular openings at both club and international level. The reason for this is obvious – ever since its introduction at the beginning of the century, the Queen's Indian has proved to be the most dependable defence for Black against 1 d4, together with its companion, the Nimzo-Indian (3 c3 b4). Additionally, most players like to create some kind of imbalance and avoid structures of a symmetrical nature, such as those found in the Queen's Gambit Declined and the Slav, although these openings also have their followers.

When I was originally asked to write a book about the Queen's Indian I asked if I could write a two volume work in order to delve deep into the different positional aspects of the opening. My publisher judged that most people would be more interested in a single volume, standard work, which is what I have ultimately agreed to. In order to achieve this I had to make some decisions concerning the structure of the book because it was evident that certain things which, in an ideal world, merited space, would have to be omitted. First, it was impossible to provide a deep positional study in a naturally restricted book form, as I did with the Dutch Stonewall. In this case I counted 19 different pawn structures that would have to be discussed, and the only way this could be done would be via a multitude of arrows and short, abstract words – something other writers have done before, but for which I have found little use for myself and, consequently, believe is the same for others. Therefore, other than brief discussions about the isolated pawn structures, below, this book is more a traditional work on the Queen's Indian. Moreover, when it came to the lines to include I had to make numerous decisions, minimising the material as much as possible. In ECO there are about 120 pages devoted to the QID and the positions that can result via transpositions which, in a book like this, would be around 300 pages. Meanwhile, ECO includes only those games that were previously published in Informant, so they actually exclude quite a lot of important games! I decided to include games from the very highest level—more or less all the games in this book, as well as all the sidelines, originate from Grandmaster competition. But this only got me down to 20,000 games! Then I made the obvious decision: only critical lines should be represented. But merely eliminating mistake after a mistake was far from enough. I also had to decide that some moves were not critical in any way and that, therefore, they had no role in the book because nobody would try to memorise the continuation, while looking it up afterwards also appears to me to...
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be rather indifferent. Finally, in 'normal' positions, those 'normal' moves that give Black several ways to equalise have been omitted.

The result is a traditional work of theory, aimed at the tournament player and thus designed for practical use. I feel that I have been good at finding the critical lines in modern play, and picking out the most important games. I hope you will find this a useful and enjoyable book.

Jacob Aagaard
Copenhagen
July 2002
Theoretical Overview
Here, briefly, is an overview of the status of the various lines found in the following chapters.

Chapter 1
4 ¼f4 is by no means an attempt to create an opening advantage. I have a feeling that the bishop is not very well placed in this variation as Black can still play ...d7-d6 in order to limit its scope. In fact Black can equalise in more than one way.

4 ¼g5 should normally lead to transpositions because the best move for White on the next move is 5 ëc3. Ideas with 5 ëbd2 appear to be nothing other than a means of avoiding opening theory and promise White nothing.

Chapter 2
4 a3 is, generally, an interesting system. As there is no line that guarantees an advantage against the Queen’s Indian White should select his approach based on style and taste, although I do feel that 4 a3 is not the most annoying move order for Black. 4 ëc3, with the idea of meeting 4...¼b7 with 5 a3!, appears to avoid some of Black’s most popular, fashionable lines.

Anyway, after 4 a3 Black has the following possibilities.

4...d5!? leads to standard positions after 5 cxd5 exd5; these are normally very slightly better for White, but are ultimately a matter of taste. Such positions are discussed throughout the book and are examined in some detail in Chapter 1.

4...c6?! has been played only once at the top level and will rarely be repeated. White should secure a small plus in a symmetrical position, which is always unpleasant for the second player.

4...c5!? leads to a sort of Benoni set-up with the bishop on a6 after 5 d5 ëa6 where, for the time being, theory promises Black a good game (yet nothing more). I have a feeling that White will eventually find a way to prove a small plus here, although this has yet to happen. This line has gained significantly in popularity thanks to Kasparov’s convincing victory against Gelfand.

4...¼a6 is the most popular system these days, leading to a variety of different positions, both hedgehog and the more flexible systems with ...c5 and cxd4. This should lead to equality and pleasant play for Black if he is sufficiently prepared, but it is a system that is still open for improvements and new ideas.

4...¼b7 is the other main line (besides 4...¼a6), and a solid reply. White has tried a
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number of different ways to gain an advantage but it still seems that Kasparov's idea from the 80's with 5 \( \text{c3} \text{d5} 6 \text{cxd5} \text{exd5} 7 \text{wc2!} \) is the only real chance of giving Black a headache. I believe that these positions are, perhaps, equal after correct play, but it should be borne in mind that this correct play could often prove difficult to produce.

Chapter 3

4 \( \text{c3} \text{b7} 5 \text{wc2} \) is harmless and Black equalises easily, but the chapter is also mainly about 5 \( \text{g5} \). If Black has played 4 ... \( \text{b4} \), then 5 \( \text{a3!} \) is the best way to fight for an advantage, and the move order I consider the most dangerous for Black (what White should play after 4 ... \( \text{b4} \) is another question – see below). This particular move order gives Black the chance to equalise with 5 ... \( \text{h6} 6 \text{b4} \text{e7} \), after which there are no problems for the second player.

4 ... \( \text{b4} \) is a logical response, often played to avoid the 5 \( \text{a3} \) transposition after 4 ... \( \text{b7} \). These positions can arise after 1 \( \text{d4} \text{f6} 2 \text{c4} \text{e6} 3 \text{c3} \text{b4} 4 \text{f3} \), where both 4 ... \( \text{c5} \) and 4 ... \( \text{b6} \) are main lines, the latter obviously transposing to the QID.

5 \( \text{g5} \) and now Black has two ways to equalise. The first is 5 ... \( \text{h6} 6 \text{h4} \text{b7} 7 \text{e3} \) (the move that has been proven to give Black most problems, unlike 7 \( \text{wc2} \), for example, which does not impress) 7 ... \( \text{xc3} 8 \text{bxc3} \text{d6} \) when a Nimzo-Indian structure has emerged, with Black being quite comfortable. The other comes after 7 ... \( \text{g5} 8 \text{g3} \text{e4} \). Although this has been played many times and the 'opening' theory can continue to 30 moves or more, I still feel that there is room for improvement and that Black should not trust the verdict of equality completely. It should be noted that White must play 9 \( \text{wc2} \) and that the gambit with 9 \( \text{d2} \) seems rather dubious.

Chapter 4

4 \( \text{c3} \text{b4} 5 \text{wb3!} \) – I have given this move an exclamation mark simply because it is the most unpleasant mark for Black to meet. This hitherto offbeat line became a main line with the match Timman-Seirawan, Hilversum 1990, where Seirawan employed it in all his White games with convincing results. Since then it has been played by some of the other world's elite, with varying degrees of success. Black has three main options.

5 ... \( \text{a5} \) does equalise but the resulting positions seem to be a little passive for Black because he will often have to play on against the two bishops.

5 ... \( \text{e7} \) is also sufficient for equality. However, one should always remember that if Black first has to fight to solve various problems before equalising, then this only means that both players have equal chances in the position itself, the assessment excluding other factors such as familiarity with the position, time used on the clock and playing strength. Consequently, in the reality of competition, it is not necessarily always 'happiness' when one equalises.

5 ... \( \text{c5} \) is the main move and, it seems, also the best. After 6 \( \text{a3} \text{a5} \) (the point) Black is allowed to keep the two bishops for the time being, and he will exchange only if doing so leads to a clear gain of some sort. Then comes 7 \( \text{g5} \text{b7} \), as played several times in the match between Seirawan and Adams in Bermuda 1999. Black should be able to keep the game level, but this line is still in its early childhood, and new discoveries will most certainly emerge with time. It should be noted that this line is full of all kinds of tactical tricks and options, which is a major reason why I recommend it. Better preparation will pay off.

Chapter 5

4 \( \text{e3} \). This chapter provides some easy to use ways for Black to equalise against this (from a theoretical point of view) harmless system. This might be a good place for a little warning: If you (as Black) do not know what
you are doing against this system, you can quickly find yourself in terrible trouble. See, for example, Yusupov-Beliavsky (Game 33), where top players produce moves about which a deeper theoretical knowledge would have made them think twice.

Chapter 6

4 g3 sees the beginning of the great saga of White’s most popular. I have always played 4 g3 when facing the QID, but I have never mistaken the great taste I had for the positions with an advantage, and neither, I am sure, have the majority of the players who employ the fianchetto. Black has a considerable variety of choices, but I would recommend playing something along the main lines with 4...a6 while, for White, I would seriously ask you to consider 4 c3. Of course, perhaps you play these lines to avoid fun, just like I do on a bad day.

4...b4+: The lines with ...b4+ generally benefit from the inclusion of the preparatory 4...a6. The only exception is 4...b4+ 5 d2 d2+ 6 c2 a6!, which transposes to 4...a6 5 b3 b4+ after 7 b3, which is the best move. Generally these lines seem to be me to be slightly worse for Black, but never anything less than that. They are not very exciting and the second player rarely has any reason to hope for a full point.

4...a6 is probably a better move than 4...b7, and certainly more modern. The reason why this appears to be so clever is that almost no matter which way White protects the c4-pawn, Black can always play 5...c6 and claim that the white pieces are no better placed than they were the previous move. The idea certainly appeals to many players. Black should equalise in all the main lines; perhaps there is a theoretical plus in the main line, but that is only something for players to worry about if they cannot draw drawn endgames... We will come to this but, first, let us look at White’s options to be presented in this chapter.

5 c2 is completely harmless. Black probably has several ways to equalise, but the simplest is 5...d5!, when there is no doubt about the evaluation of the position.

5 b3 might look stupid and, after 5...c6! (best) Black is able to exploit the misplacement of the queen immediately to further his own development. However, White’s move should not be mistaken for being bad since Black only equalises—with nothing more.

5 cd2 is my own choice, although it should not give Black any problems. Black has some different and interesting choices here. 5...b4! is very interesting and leads to an unbalanced situation in which, while White might be slightly better, the stronger player will be in the driving seat. All the lines with a quick ...c7-c5 seem a bit dangerous to me, but (of course) I might be mistaken. It all comes down to an evaluation of Game 39 and the lines featured therein. Finally 5...d5 should equalise without too much effort, and that is the main reason why this is not a main line.

5 a4 is popular but simply lacks punch. 5...c6 is rather dubious, but after 5...c5! Black has several ways to generate a good game. Actually I am normally pleased when I see this move from Black as I simply cannot see how White can play for a win in the resulting positions—there is no pressure.

Chapter 7

5 b3 is the main line. And actually the only argument I see for playing the system with 4 g3 is to prove that this move is an advantage for White rather than a weakening of the dark squares. Having investigated the relevant variations I must say that I still cannot see this as anything other than a weakness, and it is for this reason that I recommend that everyone dump 4...b7 and choose a line from below.

5...d5!? is not in itself poor but the idea is to answer 6 g2 with 6...dxc4, which is
unsound. 6...\(\texttt{\textup{b4+}}\) might still be theoretically okay, but I do not know many people who like to play such positions.

5...c5 also looks slightly fragile, although it might work as a surprise. But if you are looking for good positions, look elsewhere.

5...b5!? is Adorjan’s move, about which a positional verdict is quite simple. If Black finds success in ...a5-a4xb3 he can look forward to a good position. But why should White allow this? Against a logical treatment Black should be suffering from his inferior pawn structure and be slightly worse. However, 5...b5 is not a poor move and it does offer Black chances to steer the game away from more theoretical lines.

5...\(\texttt{\textup{b7}}\) 6 \(\texttt{\textup{g2 b4+}}\) is an interesting option which promises something close to equality after both 7 \(\texttt{\textup{d2 a5}}\) (Adams’ choice) and 7...c5 (Korchnoi’s choice). The struggle often hinges on deep strategic understanding, and I would not recommend that you undertake the responsibilities of Black if this book is the only material you will look at. But if you work through the games and find them interesting, then I will certainly not discourage you from seeking further knowledge and subsequently including these lines in your repertoire. In fact most players with White are unaware of what is best after 5...\(\texttt{\textup{b7}}\) and can thus find themselves on unfamiliar territory when Black refrains from entering the long main lines.

The main lines after 1 d4 \(\texttt{\textup{f6}}\) 2 c4 e6 3 \(\texttt{\textup{f3 b6}}\) 4 g3 \(\texttt{\textup{a6}}\) 5 b3 \(\texttt{\textup{b4+}}\) 6 \(\texttt{\textup{d2 e7}}\) 7 \(\texttt{\textup{g2 c6}}\) have been debated endlessly for the last decade, and the verdict is – not surprisingly – that it is very difficult for White to gain an advantage; and if he succeeds it is only of ‘scientific’ value – that is if Black is well prepared! I have looked at 8 0-0 d5 9 \(\texttt{\textup{wc2}}\), which is the new idea at the top level, but it seems to be harmless, and if anybody takes any risks in the games played, it has mainly been Black. 8 \(\texttt{\textup{c3 d5}}\) 9 \(\texttt{\textup{e5}}\) is the main line and has been treated as something which is highly respected yet no longer has any place among the living. The story of the main line is a funeral – I know that this is an easy thing to say for a believer, so let us keep it blurred for now, and see if the evaluation should ever change.

Chapter 8

4...\(\texttt{\textup{b7}}\) is still popular with some top grandmasters. Only the absolute elite such as Kramnik, Anand and Karpov stick to 4...\(\texttt{\textup{a6}}\), while Tiviakov, Timman and Korchnoi still have some affection for this old main move. Personally I have no doubt about the correctness of 4...\(\texttt{\textup{b7}}\), but I do feel that the play after 4...\(\texttt{\textup{a6}}\) is more flowing and should suit most players – at least those who I know – better. But there are some players with a very relaxed attitude to chess, and these do best with the calm and strategic 4...\(\texttt{\textup{b7}}\). Anyway, let us turn to the lines arising after 5 \(\texttt{\textup{g2}}\):

5...c5 is simply positionally suspect and Black has nothing to show for it but a very modest – and very temporary – initiative. Stay away from this move.

5...\(\texttt{\textup{e7}}\) is the main move (5...\(\texttt{\textup{b4+}}\) belongs to the comments given above for 4...\(\texttt{\textup{b4+}}\)). Now White has two paths. First, after 6 0-0 0-0, there are some minor side-lines.

7 b3 is harmless. Actually, I play this occasionally in order to reach an equal endgame (you know – hot summer days when you would like to be at the beach...). Nonetheless, do take a quick look at the easiest equalising methods.

7 d5!? was once wildly popular. First Polugaevsky used it, then Kasparov. Now – it’s a joke. Black has several ways to equalise and can probably also play for a win without any great risks – if he is well prepared.

7 \(\texttt{\textup{e1}}\) was modern a few years ago. The problem seems to have been solved with 7...\(\texttt{\textup{a6!}}\), after which the new try is 8 a3. Come on guys! Call that an advantage?
7 \( \text{c3} \) raises numerous issues. First White has 6 \( \text{c3} \) with some different ideas, and this is the most popular line at the moment. In the event of 7 \( \text{c3} \) I would go for the highly exciting 7...\( \text{d6!} \) – which is quite complicated – rather than the somewhat drawish 7...\( \text{e4} \). Anyway, after 6 \( \text{c3} \) Black usually replies 6...\( \text{e4} \). Then 7 \( \text{w2} \) is harmless. Instead after 7 \( \text{d2} \) it seems to me that only 7...\( \text{f6!} \) guarantees Black a good game. Of course this is tested again and again at the top level, but it seems to me that those lines that are given as leading to an advantage for White (8 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xd2} \) 9 \( \text{xd2} \) is an example) are often the lines I would fear least, while those given as harmless might conceal a trick or two. There are some tricks involving delaying castling but after 7...\( \text{f6} \) these do not pay off (as they do against all the other lines).

That's all folks. Enjoy your games, no matter what faith or choice or line you might take.

**The isolated d5-pawn**

The QID is characteristic for its many different lines and prototypical positions. It can be compared to the Sicilian, where the structures after the opening vary from, for example, the wildly different Sveshnikov, Dragon and Hedgehog variations. In the QID I have found 19 different prototypical variations which, of course, might themselves contain numerous variations. Only one pawn structure (along with its distinct variations) is transcendental universal and appears, in some form, in all lines. I am referring to a situation such as the following example:

![Chessboard with moves 1 d4 \( \text{f6} \) 2 c4 e6 3 \( \text{f3} \) b6 4 g3 \( \text{a6} \) 5 \( \text{wa4} \) \( \text{b7} \) 6 \( \text{g2} \) c5 7 dxc5 \( \text{xc5} \) 8 0-0 \( \text{ae7} \) 9 \( \text{c3} \) 0-0 10 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{a6} \) 11 \( \text{fd1} \) \( \text{c5} \) 12 \( \text{wc2} \) \( \text{wc8} \) 13 \( \text{xd4} \) d5 14 cxd5 exd5 15 \( \text{dd1} \)]

This is it! Black has accepted an isolated pawn on d5. As is usually the case this gives Black considerable free play for his pieces, but he will have to keep them active or use them appropriately before White's permanent advantage of a superior pawn structure begins to tell. Normally exchanges tend to favour White, as the removal of pieces serves to enhance the significance of the static aspects of a given position. This does not necessarily mean that endgames are bad for Black. Typically White might have weakened his queenside with b2-b3 at some point, when Black will be able to gain counterplay with a knight placed on e4, heading for c3. Gelfand-Karpov, Game 31 is an example of how activity can last long into the endgame.

In this game Black creates compensation for the isolated d-pawn by advancing his g-pawn, creating some potential threats on the light squares around White's king. Gelfand then decides to eliminate the g-pawn and, in return, takes a weak pawn on e3 (which is just as weak as d5).

15...\( \text{ce4} \) 16 \( \text{ac1} \) \( \text{c5} \) 17 e3 \( \text{xc3} \) 18 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{e4} \) 19 \( \text{wd3} \) \( \text{wd6} \) 20 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 21 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 22 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{xc1} \) 23 \( \text{xc1} \) \( \text{c8} \) 24 \( \text{wd1} \) \( \text{d6} \) 25 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{f5} \) 26 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{xc1} \) 27 \( \text{xc1} \) f6 28 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f7} \) 29 \( \text{wc2} \) g5 30 \( \text{we2} \) h5 31 \( \text{dd2} \) g4 32 f3 \( \text{gxf3+} \) 33 \( \text{xf3} \) \%-%

In the following game Black places all his...
pieces in a more or less ideal way. I recommend you play through this game carefully and note how Black's pieces generate pressure.

**Queen's Indian Defence**


This is Kramnik's way of playing the 7.e1 variation. The threat of 8.e4 often makes Black respond with 7...d5, but 7...c5, along the lines of the hedgehog set-up, is a sensible move.

7...d5 8.cxd5 exd5 9.d4 a6!

This is where the knight belongs. Black has no reason to fight for d4 in these positions because it is a fight he will only very rarely win. Rather he focuses on bringing the knight to an active post, the ideal spots being c5 and, primarily, e6.


Here a draw was agreed.

If we look at the final position we see that all Black's pieces have a function. The knight on e6 monitors both d4 and f4 and can, potentially, jump to c5, from where an invasion might be possible. The knight on e4 keeps a good eye on f2 and also prevents White from putting his pieces completely at ease. The bishop on c5 exerts pressure on d4 and e3 and will, in the long run, prevent White from playing f2-f3, or at least serve to remind White that e3 would then become a weakness. The bishop on b7 looks bad but can often come into play with ...Nc6 or, perhaps, even the pawn sacrifice ...d5-d4 on some occasions. Only the heavy pieces are not easy to place. Usually the rooks should be at d8 and e8 if Black is playing for ...d5-d4, and at c8 and e8 if he (like here) has more or less ignored the fight for the d4-square.

White, on the other hand, tends to have problems in finding a good square for the dark-squared bishop. Principally it is best placed on b2, but that, of course, cannot happen without White weakening his queenside with b2-b3 at some point. As I mentioned above, this will give the knight, which is usually placed on e4, a future. Additionally, the bishop on g2 can often find that it is nicely placed, but with the knight on e4 it tends to be looking at a piece that cannot realistically be removed (the exchange would be far from ideal anyway) for fear of the resulting weaknesses on the light squares.

Let us take a look at another variation of the structures after ...d7-d5 and cxd5 exd5, where White is in no hurry to exchange on c5.

**Karpov-Spassky**

Riga 1975

1.d4 Nf6 2.c4 e6 3.d3 b6 4.g3 b7 5.d3 e7 6.c3 0-0 7.Qc2 d5 8.cxd5 Nxd5 9.a0-0 d7 10.Qxd5 exd5 11.h3 Nf6

Where should White place his pieces here? I could use this as an exercise for my pupils because the answer is not so obvious if you are unfamiliar with the position. Well, the queen is fine (f5 or d2 look appropriate for later), the queen's rook goes to c1, the other
rook is already perfectly placed, the queen’s bishop has no obvious post and the other bishop is good. But what about White’s knight? As Black will not fight for d4 the knight is not required on f3, but where would we prefer it to be? The correct answer is f4, from where it exerts considerable pressure on d5. The following manoeuvre is standard and will not have come as a surprise for Spassky.

12 \text{\textit{d}}e5 c5 13 dxc5 \textit{x}xc5 14 \textit{d}d3 \textit{d}d6 15 \textit{f}4!

This bishop has no ideal square so seeking to remove it is quite logical.

15...\textit{e}e8 16 e3 \textit{e}e4 17 \textit{x}xd6 \textit{w}xd6 18 \textit{f}4

White has an advantage. The d4-square is a good outpost for the heavy pieces and both the knight and the bishop are well placed. But most importantly – all the play will revolve around White’s pressure on the d5-pawn, so Black will not be able to generate sufficient active play to compensate for the weakness.

18...\textit{a}c8 19 \textit{w}a4 \textit{w}e7 20 \textit{wx}a7 \textit{e}xf2 21 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 22 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xd}1 23 \textit{e}c1 \textit{b}b8 24 \textit{w}b4 \textit{xe}2 25 \textit{xe}2 \textit{e}e3+ 26 \textit{g}1 \textit{e}e6 27 \textit{w}f1 \textit{d}d8 28 \textit{wd}4 \textit{h}d8 29 \textit{wd}7 \textit{g}4 30 \textit{h}c8 \textit{f}6 31 \textit{xe}x8+ \textit{xe}8 32 \textit{wb}7 \textit{e}6 33 \textit{wb}8+ \textit{e}e8 34 a4 g6 35 b4 \textit{g}7 36 \textit{wb}7 h5 37 h3 \textit{h}f6 38 \textit{g}2 \textit{d}d6 39 a5 \textit{bxa}5 40 \textit{bxa}5 \textit{e}6 41 a6 \textit{c}7 42 a7 \textit{e}7 43 \textit{wc}6+ \textit{e}e5 44 \textit{f}3 1-0

The same manoeuvre is also possible even if the pair of knights has yet to be exchanged. The following example illustrates how White handles the possibility of ...c5xd4.

\textbf{Beliavsky-Chuchelov}

\textit{Ohrid 2001}

1 d4 \textit{f}6 2 c4 e6 3 \textit{f}3 b6 4 g3 \textit{a}6 5 b3 d5 6 cxd5 exd5 7 \textit{g}g2 \textit{b}4+ 8 \textit{d}2 \textit{e}7 9 0-0 0-0 10 \textit{c}c3 \textit{b}7 11 \textit{c}c1 \textit{d}6 12 \textit{b}b2 \textit{e}e8 13 \textit{c}c1 \textit{f}8 14 \textit{e}5 c5 15 \textit{d}d3 cxd4

Black’s trade in the centre is probably not the best. Clearly Black was familiar with the following manoeuvre, but it still seems to be a particularly unnecessary concession to give up the d4-square when having to face a well placed knight on f4.

16 \textit{b}b5!

The main idea. In this position the knight transfer is rather straightforward, but some players have a tendency to forget about this if White has the option of recapturing on d4 with the queen. Now White has an edge.

16...\textit{w}d7 17 \textit{xd}4 \textit{e}e4 18 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}e8 19 \textit{h}3 \textit{w}e8 20 a3 \textit{g}5 21 \textit{g}2 \textit{e}c5 22 b4 \textit{a}4 23 \textit{a}a1 \textit{e}e4 24 \textit{d}c7 \textit{h}ab8 25 \textit{f}5 d4 26 \textit{w}c2 \textit{h}cb8 27 \textit{xd}4 a5 28 b5 \textit{xe}c7 29 \textit{x}xc7 \textit{wd}7 30 \textit{wc}2 \textit{ac}5 31 \textit{d}d3 \textit{e}c8 32 \textit{ac}6 \textit{xd}3 33 \textit{xe}4 \textit{e}c5 34 \textit{x}h7+ \textit{w}h8 35 \textit{f}5 \textit{e}6 36 \textit{d}d1 \textit{we}8 37 \textit{we}4 1-0
CHAPTER ONE

Opting for Nothing: 4 \( \text{f}4 \) and 4 \( \text{g}5 \)

There are some players, no matter what their rating, who always try to avoid main line theory. This can be for different reasons, of course – one is simply a surrender to the modern reality of the enormous amount of games in a standard database, while another is the need for an independent and original way of playing, based more on psychology than actual playing style.

Both 4 \( \text{g}5 \) and 4 \( \text{f}4 \) are ways to stay clear of all established theory in the Queen’s Indian. Neither is dangerous for Black, but if you are content to get your pieces out and then play a game on practically alien soil, then 4 \( \text{f}4 \) in particular makes good sense, as can be seen from Miles’ and Bareev’s relative success with this approach.

4 ... \( \text{b}7 \) 5 e3 \( \text{b}4 \+)

This is an interesting choice. The simpler 5 ... \( \text{c}7 \) is presented in Game 3.

6 \( \text{fd}2 \)

The key reasoning behind this retreat is as follows:
1) The queen’s knight belongs on c3 and not d2, and
2) White does not want doubled pawns.

There are two alternatives, each contradicting these points. Somewhat similar to the Nimzo-Indian and the lines in this book fea-
turing 4 \( \text{Qf3} \) and 5 \( \text{g5} \) are the positions arising after 6 \( \text{Qc3} \ \text{axc3}+7 \text{bxc3} \ d6 \), when there are two set-ups for Black to choose between:

a) 8 \( \text{Qd3} \ \text{bd7} 9 \) \( 0-0 \) \( \text{We7} \) 10 \( \text{Qd2} \ e5 \) 11 \( \text{Qg3} \) 0-0 12 \( \text{He1} \) c5 sees Black trying to dominate White’s centre and bishops. In fact this seems to be rock solid, and Black had a good game in Ostenstad-Hjartarson, Gausdal 1985.

b) 8 h3 \( \text{Qbd7} \) 9 \( \text{he2} \) \( \text{We7} \) 10 \( \text{Qb1} \) 0-0 11 \( \text{Qe2} \ Qe4 \) 12 \( \text{Qb3} \) f5 brings about another traditional set-up from the Nimzo-Indian. It is not clear that \( \text{Qh2} \) is, after all, such a great piece, but it is easy for Black to find good squares for his minor pieces, e.g. 13 0-0 e5! (limiting the scope of White’s bishop, although it was also possible to ignore it) 14 c5 \( \text{Qc6} \) and Black is fine, Agdestein-Yrjola, Gausdal 1985.

Meanwhile 6 \( \text{Qbd2} \) 0-0 7 \( \text{Qd3} \) d5 8 0-0 \( \text{Qbd7} \) 9 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 10 \( \text{Qe5} \ Qe4 \) 11 \( cxd5 \) \( \text{Qxd7} \) 12 \( \text{Qxd7} \) \( \text{Wxd7} \) gave Black full equality in Matera-Dzindzichashvili, New York 1980.

6...0-0 7 a3 \( \text{Qe7} \) 8 \( \text{Qc3} \) d5

9 \( cxd5 \) \( \text{Qxd5}! \)

This is the safe path to equality. Recapturing with the pawn would be ungrateful to the bishop on b7, although it has been tried. After 9...\( \text{Qxd5} \) 10 \( \text{Qd3} \) c5 11 0-0 \( \text{Qc6} \) 12 \( \text{Qf3} \) White probably has a slight edge. In Meduna-Vilela, Leipzig 1980, play continued 12...a6 13 \( \text{Qe5} \) cxd4 14 \( \text{Qxc6} \ \text{Qxc6} \) 15 exd4 \( \text{He8} \) 16 \( \text{He1} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 17 \( \text{Wf3} \) with a slightly worse position for Black.

10 \( \text{Qxd5} \ \text{Qxd5} \) 11 \( \text{Wc2} \)

Here White has a serious alternative in 11 \( \text{Qc1} \). Then 11...\( \text{Qd6}?! \) 12 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{cxd6} \) looks solid, while Miles-Hübner, England-West Germany 1979, continued 11...c5 12 \( \text{Qxc5} \) 13 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qb7}!! \) 14 0-0 \( \text{Qd6} \) with approximate equality. Instead 13...\( \text{Qxc4} \) 14 \( \text{Qxc4} \) \( \text{Wxd1}+ \) 15 \( \text{Qxd1} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 16 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 17 \( \text{Qd6} \) led to a lasting ending advantage for White in Miles-Ligterink, Amsterdam 1978, while 13...\( \text{Qc6} \) 14 b4 \( \text{Qe7} \) 15 \( \text{Qb5}! \) favours White as both \( \text{Qc6} \) and e3-e4 are threatened.

11...c5

Equally good looks 11...\( \text{Qd6} \) 12 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{cxd6} \) 13 \( \text{Qd3} \) g6 14 0-0 \( \text{Qd7} \) 15 \( \text{Qac1} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 16 \( \text{Wf4} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) with equality in Meduna-Unzicker, Moscow 1982. Here 14 e4 \( \text{Qb7} \) 15 0-0 \( \text{Qc6} \) 16 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Wf6} \) also seems to fail to give Black problems in finding good squares for his pieces.

12 \( \text{Qxc5} \) \( \text{Qxc5} \) 13 \( \text{Qe4} \)

13 \( \text{Qd3} \) h6 14 0-0 \( \text{Qd7} \) 15 \( \text{Qfd1} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) looked fine for Black in Meduna-Brynell, Leon 2001.

13...\( \text{Qd7} \)!

Black chooses to complete his development. This is more important than the two bishops. Now, thanks to the activity of the knight and the possibility of exchanging dark-squared bishops, Black can equalise.
14 \textit{d}d1 \text{wc}8 15 \textit{d}d3 \textit{xe}4 16 \textit{xe}4 \textit{df}6 17 \textit{d}d3

The trick was, of course, 17 \textit{xa}8\textit{b}4+!, and Black wins.

17...\textit{e}7 18 \textit{we}2 \text{wc}5 19 \textit{h}3 \textit{d}d5 20 \textit{g}3 \textit{ad}8 21 0-0 \textit{d}d6 22 \textit{c}c1 \textit{wa}5 23 \textit{x}d6 \textit{xd}6 24 \textit{fx}d1 \textit{fd}8 25 \textit{b}b5 \textit{fe}7 26 \textit{xe}d6 \textit{xe}d6 27 \textit{c}c3 \textit{d}d5 28 \textit{a}4 \textit{wb}4 29 \textit{c}c7 a5 30 \textit{g}3 g6 31 \textit{g}2 \textit{wd}6 32 \textit{xd}7 \textit{wc}5 33 \textit{a}a7 \textit{ad}8 34 \textit{wf}3 \textit{df}5 35 e4 ½-½

After ...\textit{d}6 Black has nothing to fear.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 2}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Bareev-Karpov}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textit{Moscow} (blitz) 1993
\end{center}

1 \textit{d}4 \textit{gf}6 2 \textit{c}c4 \textit{e}6 3 \textit{f}f3 \textit{b}6 4 \textit{f}f4 \textit{b}7 5 \textit{e}3 \textit{g}7

This move is more natural than 5...\textit{b}4+ and should lead to a good game without too much trouble.

6 \textit{c}c3 \textit{h}5!

\begin{center}
If White fails to address the well-being of the bishop then Black should, of course, attack it. Now White will anyway have to lose a tempo...
7 \textit{g}3 0-0

Karpov’s strategy is logical and simple. The key idea is to develop, eliminating the bishop only when he is somehow forced to do so. Another possibility is to delay castling by exchanging the bishop immediately, e.g.

7...\textit{g}3?! 8 \textit{hx}g3 \textit{f}f6 9 \textit{wc}2 \textit{g}6 10 0-0-0 \textit{we}7 11 \textit{d}d3 \textit{ec}6 12 \textit{e}4 0-0-0, leading to an original position where both players had good chances in Rodriguez-Fedorowicz, New York 1987.

8 \textit{wc}2

In this game Bareev elects, quite logically, to bury the bishop on b7 by advancing d4-d5. If he had not done so he might have played along the following lines: 8 \textit{e}2 \textit{g}6! (a standard reaction; now the knight won’t be hanging after surprises like \textit{lb}f3-e5) 9 0-0 \textit{d}6 10 \textit{c}c1 \textit{d}7 11 \textit{d}d2 \textit{ex}g3 12 \textit{hx}g3 \textit{a}6 13 \textit{b}b3 \textit{c}6 14 \textit{g}4 \textit{wb}8 15 \textit{a}4 \textit{d}5 16 \textit{cxd}5 \textit{cxd}5 17 \textit{e}2 \textit{wd}6 with equality in Agdestein-Adorjan, Oslo 1984.

8...\textit{d}6 9 \textit{d}5

Essentially the same position as in the game, with the same players, arose after 9 \textit{e}2 \textit{g}6 10 0-0-0 \textit{d}7 11 \textit{d}5 \textit{e}5 12 \textit{d}d2 in Bareev-Karpov, Paris 1992. Now Black did not play the best move, 12...\textit{g}7!, which he must have realised later (which brings us to the present game). Instead 12...\textit{df}6 13 \textit{wb}1 \textit{a}6 14 \textit{f}3 \textit{g}3 15 \textit{hx}g3 \textit{h}5 16 \textit{e}4 \textit{c}8 17 \textit{fl} \textit{e}8 18 \textit{ce}3 \textit{f}8 19 \textit{wd}3 \textit{we}7 20 \textit{h}2 \textit{d}7 21 \textit{dd}1 \textit{g}7 22 \textit{d}2 \textit{h}6 23 \textit{h}4 \textit{ec}8 24 \textit{dc}6 \textit{we}8 25 \textit{g}4 saw White being allowed to create a strong attack that was enough to win the game...

9...\textit{e}5 10 \textit{de}2 \textit{g}6 11 \textit{d}d2

11...\textit{g}7!

The correct decision. The g3-bishop is not
impressive and White would benefit tremendously from the opening of the h-file, as can be seen in the following game: 11...\texttt{Qxg3?!} 12 h\texttt{xg3 Qd7} 13 0-0-0 \texttt{Qg7} 14 g4 a6 15 g3 c6 16 \texttt{Qf3 Qc8} 17 dxc6 \texttt{Qxc6} 18 \texttt{Qxc6 Qxc6} 19 \texttt{Qxe4} with a clear advantage to White in Bareev-Karpov, Paris 1992. It should be noted that all these games were in 'active' chess of some form, and not played with the usual, longer time control.

\texttt{12 e4 Qd7 13 0-0}

This looks very suspicious.

\texttt{13...Qg5!}

Compare the bishops on g5 and g3. Black has at least equalised.

\texttt{14 b4 h5 15 h3 Qf6 16 Qf3 Qf4!}

Exchanging the bishop to win the e5-square and making way for the g-pawn.

\texttt{17 Qxf4}

17...g5, with an attack, was a serious threat.

\texttt{17...exf4 18 Qd2 g5} 19 e5!?

White is worse and he knows it, so he decides to sacrifice a pawn in a bid to change the nature of the position and win some squares for his pieces.

\texttt{19...Qxe5} 20 \texttt{Qxe5 Qxe5} 21 \texttt{Qae1 Qf6} 22 h4 gxh4 23 \texttt{Qe4 Qf5} 24 Qwd4 f6 25 Qd2 h3!

Black uses his additional material to ruin White's king position. Black is winning.

\texttt{26 Qxh3 Qxh3} 27 Qxf4 \texttt{Qae8} 28 Qg3 Qxg3+ 29 fxg3 \texttt{Qe5} 30 Qf3 \texttt{Qe3} 31 Qd1 Qf8 32 Qf2 Qxe1 33 Qxe1 b5

\texttt{34 cxb5 Qxd5} 35 a4 Qe4 36 Qf3 \texttt{Qe5} 37 Qd3 Qf5 38 Qf4 Qc4 39 Qe1 Qf7 0-1

\textbf{Game 3}

\textbf{Nikolic-Lautier}

\textit{Moscow (Fide knockout) 2001}

\texttt{1 d4 Qf6} 2 \texttt{Qf3 e6} 3 c4 b6 4 \texttt{Qf4 Qb7} 5 \texttt{e3 Qe7} 6 h3

Preserving the bishop, but this costs time, so Black decides to act at once in the centre.

\texttt{6...c5!}

This is the easiest way to equalise. White's dark-squared bishop has left the queenside (g1-a7 and everything on the queenside as a result of e2-e3) so Black then operates on the dark squares there. This is perfectly logical.

The old way to play this was 6...0-0 7 Qc3
Queen's Indian Defence

do but this might result in a modest advantage for White in some cases. After 8 cxd5 Qxd5 9 Qxd5 Qxd5 10 a3 c5 11 dxc5 Qxc5 12 Qe2 Qd8 13 Qb1 Qa6 14 Qxa6 Qa5+ 15 Qe1 Qxa6+ 16 Qh1 Qd7 17 Qh2, as in Meduna-Lerner, Lvov 1981, White's minor pieces are well placed, although Black should be okay. Perhaps if White plays something slower in the opening Black will have to face some problems.

7 d5?

This is completely suicidal. It is difficult to imagine a top GM playing something like this. There are two essentially different set-ups here.

a) 7 dxc5 bxc5 8 Qe2 0-0 9 Qe2 Qe6 10 Qb6 d6 11 Qe2 Qe6 12 Qb6 13 Qc3 14 Qd1 Qd8 15 Qd8. Lputian-Mikhalkishin, Frunze 1979 continued 12 Qd1 Qe8 13 Qa4 Qb6 14 Qd6 Qc7 15 Qd6 Qd8. Langeweg-Timman, Leeuwarden 1980 continued 12..Qd8=

b) 7 Qc3 cxd4 and now a possibility is 8 exd4, leading to a position similar to the Panov/Nimzo-Indian after 8...0-0 9 Qd3 d5 10 0-0 Qxc4 11 Qe1 Qc6 12 Qd1 Qd8 13 Qd5 Qd5, Rivas Pastor-Hubner, Linares 1985. Here the moves h2-h3 and Qf4 were clearly not very aggressive. Black has equalised. This leaves us with 8 Qxd4 and a further branch:

b1) 8...Qa7 9 Qe2 0-0 and now 10 Qf3 is logical, dealing with Black's bishop, which has considerable influence on the centre. Gretarsson-Stefansson, Stockholm 1998 continued 10...Qa7 11 Qe4 Qxf3 12 Qxf3 d6 13 0-0 Qc8 14 Qfd1 Qd8 15 Qd2 Qc7 16 Qd1 with an equal position, while Gretarsson-Hansen, Gentofte 1999 went 10 0-0 d6 11 Qb3 Qc7 12 Qe1 Qbd7 with equality, although Black's game is probably the easier to conduct.

b2) 8...0-0!? is provocative but if White cannot exploit it then it is by far the most logical response. Miles-Kupreichik, Reykjavik 1980 continued 9 Qxd5 Qe8 10 Qd2!? (this move is obviously just losing time; better was 10 Qd6 with an unclear position) 10...Qa6 11 Qd6 Qxd6 12 Qxd6 Qxd6 13 Qxd6 b5+ 14 a3 bxc4 15 Qd1 Qc6 16 Qxc4 Qg5 and Black has a useful lead in development.

7...exd5 8 Qc3 Qxc4!!

Black is testing the pawn sacrifice. Or he is just taking the pawn. You decide.

9 Qb5

It is too late to play for compensation with 9 Qxc4 because 9...d5 10 Qb5+ Qc6 gives White very little.

9...0-0!

Simple chess. White should not really take the exchange so Black simply makes the move from which he most benefits.

10 Qc7?

The strategically decisive mistake. The only move here is 10 Qc7! Qc8 11 Qd6, with Qxc4 to come, trying for some kind of compensation.

10...d5 11 Qxa8 Qxa8

Black has two big central pawns and an enormous lead in development. The advantage is not in doubt.
Opting for Nothing: 4 \( \text{f4} \) and 4 \( \text{g5} \)

12 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{c6} \) 13 0-0 \( \text{b5} \) 14 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{b4} \) 15 \( \text{xc4} \)

Who cares about pieces here? The pawns are doing the job!

18...\( \text{ed2} \) 19 \( \text{ic2} \) \text{dxc4} \( \text{o-1} \)

4 ... \( \text{b4}+ \)

This is just as natural as 4 ... \( \text{b7} \), although Black now loses the option of 5 ... \( \text{e7} \) instead of ... \( \text{b4} \). Of course if Black is not interested in 5 ... \( \text{e7} \) the text is quite a funny move, threatening to engineer a win, as happens in this game.

4 ... \( \text{b7} \) 5 \( \text{bd2}?! \) fails to impress. After 5 ... \( \text{te7} \) 6 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{h6} \) 7 \( \text{h4} \) 0-0 8 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 9 0-0 \text{cxd4} 10 \text{exd4} \( \text{d5} \), as in Wuts-Matthias, Germany 1996, Black has at least equalised. The long-term potentials in the position are in Black's favour and the knight on \( \text{d2} \) is not well placed in terms of the fight for the \( \text{d5} \)-square. Now Black will be able to take control over this quite easily and thus develop more freely than is usual in such positions.

5 \( \text{bd2} \)

This move gives the line independent value, but it is not good. 5 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b7} \) leads us back to Chapter 3.

5 ... \( \text{h6} \) 6 \( \text{h4} \)

6 \( \text{a3}?! \) is a possibility. If you are an occasional Bogo-Indian fan you can play 6 ... \( \text{xd2+} \) 7 \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{b7} \) with a good version? Otherwise the simple 6 ... \( \text{e7} \) should equalise directly.

6 ... \( \text{g5} \) 7 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{g4} \) 8 \( \text{e5}?! \)

Losing. The only move is 8 a3!, with good prospects for Black after 8 ... \( \text{e7} \) 9 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{d6} \) 10 \( \text{a4}+ \) \( \text{c6} \) 11 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d7}! \) followed by ... \( \text{b7} \) and ...\text{c6-c5}.

8 ... \( \text{e4} \) 9 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 10 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xd4}! \)
Capturing the pawn without releasing the pressure.

11 e3

What a blunder! After 11...\texttt{xd2+!} 12 \texttt{xd2} \texttt{xd2} 13 \texttt{exd4} \texttt{xf1} 14 \texttt{xf1} \texttt{b7} Black is clearly better. White has some compensation on the dark squares but I, for one, would take the risk!

12 exd4

Now we have a perpetual.

12...\texttt{f3+} 13 \texttt{e2} \texttt{xd4+} 14 \texttt{e3} \texttt{f5+} 15 \texttt{e2}

15 \texttt{e4} \texttt{b7+} 16 \texttt{e5} \texttt{d6+} 17 \texttt{f6} \texttt{d7} mate(!) is a sour way to end your days.

15...\texttt{d4+} 16 \texttt{e3} \texttt{f5+} 17 \texttt{e2} \texttt{d4+}

$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$
Summary
4 \( \texttt{f4} \) is a rather harmless move and after 4...\( \texttt{b7} \) 5 e3 both 5...\( \texttt{b4} \)+ and 5...\( \texttt{e7} \) lead to safe equality. Still it is a good idea to check out the most important ideas here, or White might be able to pose Black some problems. 4 \( \texttt{g5} \) should not gain any independent significance, but simply transpose to Chapter 3. After 5 \( \texttt{bd2} \) Black is always going to be fine.

1 d4 \( \texttt{f6} \) 2 c4 \( \texttt{e6} \) 3 \( \texttt{f3} \) b6 4 \( \texttt{f4} \) (D)
   4 \( \texttt{g5} \) (D) \( \texttt{b4} \)+
   5 \( \texttt{c3} \) \( \texttt{b7} \) – Chapter 3
   5 \( \texttt{bd2} \) – Game 4
4...\( \texttt{b7} \) 5 e3 \( \texttt{e7} \) (D)
   5...\( \texttt{b4} \)+ 6 \( \texttt{fd2} \) – Game 1
6 \( \texttt{c3} \) – Game 2
   6 h3 – Game 3
CHAPTER TWO

The Petrosian System:
4 a3

The Petrosian System had its heyday in modern times during the 1980's, when Kasparov – still a boy – blew away the world's strongest GMs. Today the variation does not enjoy the same status and is regarded as one of several options, not necessarily offering White an advantage, but leading to positions where many players feel comfortable. And, of course, new ideas are constantly produced.

In Game 5 we see what happens when Black pushes with ...d7-d5 and recaptures with the e-pawn. White might have a slightly more comfortable game but Black should do okay with decent play. Game 6 features an idea, 4...c6, tried once and not again (for good reasons), while Game 7 introduces a very interesting, dynamic system, namely 4...c5?, a line that resembles the Benoni, which seems to be totally playable at the moment. In Game 8 we just glance at what happens if White is unambitious against 4...c5 – and not surprisingly, nothing happens.

Game 9 includes the minor lines against 4...a6, which is one of Black's main replies, while we discuss the direct assault 5 2c2 a6 7...c5 leads to Game 7) 6 c3 c5 7 d5?! in Game 10. Game 11 features one of the main lines, 7 e4 cxd4 8 a4 a5, and Game 12 investigates 8...c6 9 x6c6 e6 10 f4 h5, which currently looks like the most promising system for Black in the 4...a6 line. In Game 13 it is time for 10...c5, which seems to give White an edge.

Game 5
Portisch-Nikolic
Ljubljana 1985

1 d4 f6 2 c4 e6 3 f3 b6 4 a3

4...d5?!

This move is not the standard theoretical recommendation, but such great players as Petrosian, Larsen, Karpov and Bronstein, have given it a strong vote of confidence, simply by employing it against fellow players from the world's elite. Besides this, 4...a6
and 4...a6 are the standard moves. 4...c6 and 4...c5 are treated in the following games, while 4...Qe4 5 Qfd2! d5 6 e3 Qb7 7 cxd5! exd5 8 Qxe4 dxe4 9 Qc3 Qd6 10 Qb5+ Qf8 (10...c6 11 Qa4! and e4 is in trouble, unless Black accepts something along the lines of 11...f5 12 Qb3!, and the king is caught in the middle) 11 Wc2 Wg5 12 g3 a6 13 Qf1 f5 14 Qg2 gave White the advantage in Glek-Rozentalis, Lvov 1985.

4...Qe7 5 Qc3 0-0 is a strange and alternative way to play. After the logical 6 d5!? (taking control over the light squares in the centre, hoping to bury the bishop on c8) 6...Qe8! (directed against 7 e4) 7 g3 Qa6 8 Qg2! Qxc4 (8...d6 9 dxe6 fx6 10 Qd4 seems risky) 9 Qe5 Qxd5 10 Qxd5 exd5 11 Qxd5 Qxd5 12 Wxd5 c6 13 Wxf7+ Wh8 14 Wh5 Wc8 15 Qf4 d5 16 Qc1 Qf8 Black might have been okay in Gofshtein-Vitolinsh, Beltsy 1979, but the general impression of the game is that Black had to take risks without ever having a genuine opportunity to obtain more than an equal position.

White decides not to give his opponent the chance to return to the main lines with 5 Qc3 Qb7, although most players would probably stick with their choice and play 5...Qe7, with a transposition. However, after the usual 6 cxd5 Black can remain within the lines here with 6...exd5, but there are some things with Qa4+. All these nuances are treated under 7 Qa4+ in Game 15.

5...cxd5

5...Qxd5 6 e4 is not relevant.

6 Qc3 Qe7 7 Qf4

This is one of the two standard ways to place the pieces. 7 Qg5 is also possible, of course, with a position from the Queen’s Gambit Declined rather than the QID. The real alternative, and simply a matter of taste, is 7 g3 0-0 8 Qg2 c5 9 Qb7 10 Qf4, but White cannot count on a significant advantage after 10...a6 11 Qe5 (11 dxc5 bxc5 12 Wb3 Wb6 13 Qd2 Wxb3 14 Qxb3 Qd8 15 Qa5 Qa8 was equal in Lputian-Nikolic, Sarajevo 1998, but 11 Qc1! seems to be the most logical move) 11...Qc7. Note that here 11...Qe4? meets with 12 Qxe4 dxe4 13 dxc5 Qxc5 14 Wc2 Qc8 15 Qd1 Wb6 16 Qh3 Qc6 17 Wb3, which put Black under great pressure in Vaganian-Gulko, Lvov 1978. As we shall see it is a characteristic of these positions that ...Qe4 tends to be a clear positional error, and Black should be well aware of when it is playable and when it is not! Returning to 11...Qc7, with 12 dxc5 White chooses a forced continuation which ends with a completely level position, but ...cxd4 was a real threat now that the knight has control over b5. After 12...bxc5 13 Qc4 Bb8 14 Qxc7 Wxc7 15 Qxd5 Qxd5 16 Qxd5 Qd8! (the most active, although 16...Qbd8 is also good enough) 17 e4 Qxe4 we have the following:

a) 18 Wb5?! g6 19 Qxf7+ is given by Parma as leading to an advantage, but 19...Qg7 20 Wc2 Qd2! 21 Qe1 (21 Qxd2?! Wxb2 22 Qad1 Qxf7 and here the bishop and the passed pawn must give Black a favourable position) 21...Qf6 22 Qe6 Qxc4 23 Wxc4, Qxb2 followed by ...Qd4 might even favour Black.

b) 18 Wc2 Qxd5 19 Wxe4 Wd7 20 Qe1 Qf6 21 Qac1 h5 22 h4 Qd4 23 Qc2 a5 24 Qce2 Qf5 with equality and a draw in Browne-Ljubojevic, Brasilia 1981.

7...0-0 8 e3
Queen’s Indian Defence

8...c5

The most active, but Black has more than one reasonable move here.

a) 8...d5 seems perfectly logical because the exchange has already been performed on d5 and, consequently, b7 is no longer a good square for the bishop. Still, the move does abandon the light squares on the queenside. Van der Sterren-Short, Baku 1983, continued 9 e2 (9 d3 also looks okay) 9...e4 10 b3 c6 11 0-0 d6 12 dxe6 wxe6 13 a1 c7 with approximate equality.

b) 8...b7. This way of holding back the c-pawn makes sense. All the pieces can develop freely, so why not? Timman-Sunye Neto, Las Palmas 1982, went 9 e2 (9 c1?, forcing Black to make a decision, is interesting) 9...d5 10 e5 (10 0-0 must be more testing) 10...dxe4 11 dxe4 dxe4 12 c1 c5 e5 13 dxe5 dxe5 14 cxd6 cxd6 15 a4 (this move does not impress; 15 0-0 must be better) 15...a6 16 0-0 d5 17 c3 b5 18 c2 b6 and Black looks more than fine. Bacrot-Röder, Spain 2001, saw positionally unsound play from Black: 9...a5 10 b4 b6 11 e3 c6 12 b3 c7 13 0-0 dxe3 14 xg8 wxe6 15 fc1 fe8 16 b5 c6 17 bxc6 xc6 18 w4 and Black had weaknesses in his pawn structure, while his bishop had no prospects.

c) 8...e6 seems illogical. The bishop is less well placed here than on f5 and b7. 9 h3 c5 10 d3 c6 11 0-0 a6 12 c1 c4 13 b1 b5 14 e5 w6 15 g5 fe8 16 f4 earned White an advantage in Wilder-Larsen, New York 1984.

d) 8...c6!? offers White some chances of a slight advantage if he plays 9 d3. But after 9 e5 f5 10 g4! e6 11 d3 f7 12 w2, as in A.Petrosian-Short, Yerevan 1984, the situation is more difficult to evaluate, although White looks good here, too.

9 e5

It may sound strange but this is the most flexible move available to White. Note that it is the only move that White is sure he will make, whereas the decision to put the bishop on e2 or d3, for example, can be made later. However, many games have been played using these moves directly:

a) 9 e2 is the most serious alternative. After 9...d5 10 e5 (10 0-0 c6 or 10...a6, or 10...b7 11 e5 transposes) Black must make a choice - two options are interesting, the third less good.

a1) 10...a6? is natural. It has not been properly tested in practice, only in this one game, Bacrot-Kurajica, Yerevan 1996, where White achieved nothing by playing 11 w4 c7 12 c6 c6 13 xc6 with the two bishops, being behind in development and already fielding threats – after 13...d6 14 e5 cxd4 15 xd4 (15 exd4? is the testing move) 15...c8 16 b5 cxd4 17 exd4 e4 18 xd5 c5 19 dxc5 xc5 20 w4 xd5 was equal. Instead 19 d1 w5 20 dxc5
\[ \text{The Petrosian System: 4 a3} \]

\[ \text{\textbf{wxc5 21 wxc5 axc5 22 0-0 e8 23 f6e1 gives White a tiny lead with bishop against knight in the endgame, although this will, in 99.9% of all cases, not influence the result.} \]

\[ \text{a2) 10...b7 seems to do less well with ...c7-c5 than the other knight moves. After 11 0-0 c8 12 dxc5 dxc5? (12...bxc5? should keep the balance) 13 b5! a6 14 d4 White had the advantage in Ribli-Gligoric, Lucerne 1982. 11...dxe5? is almost always bad when White's bishop is on e2: 12 dxe5 bxe5 13 b4 a6 14 ffd1 e8 16 e5 b5 17 e6 with advantage to White, Lputian-Zagrebelny, Lucerne 1993. The e4-square will always be weak in the endgame.} \]

\[ \text{a3) 10...c6 11 0-0 cxd4 12 exd4 f6 is always bad when White's bishop is on e2 Black ends up in trouble after 12...dxe5?! 13 dxe5 dxe4 14 a4 a6 16 d1 e8 17 b3, as in Timman-Larsen, Tilburg 1982) 13 cxc6 bxc6 14 e1 d7 15 a6 ad8 16 d3 d6 and now Farago-Matanovic, Vienna 1986 continued 17 e2?! xf4 18 xf4 e8, when Black appeared to have survived the opening. With 17 e2?! White completely lacked a plan; better was 17 xd6 xd6 18 c2! to use the c-file in the near future!} \]

\[ \text{b) 9 d3 was played in Plaskett-Stefansson, Reykjavik 1992. There followed 9...c6 10 c1 (10 e5 transposes to the main line) 10...b7 11 0-0 h6 12 e5 dxe5 13 dxe5 (13 xe5, with equality, is most likely superior) 13...e4 14 h5 e8!, preparing ...f7-f5 in the case of a sacrifice. After 15 e4 dxe4 16 c4 b5 17 a2 c4 Black was better.} \]

\[ \text{c) 9 h3 c6 10 d3 should not be dangerous for Black, but after 10...cxd4 (a premature decision; 10...b7 offers good chances of equality) 11 exd4 d6 12 xd6 xd6 13 0-0 e8 14 b5! d7 15 xc6 xc6 16 e5 White had an edge in Schandorff-Larsen, Denmark 1989.} \]

\[ \text{d) Interesting is 9 c1 c6 10 c2 c4 (10...b7 is more natural). Now White can choose a very interesting plan in 11 b4?, with the idea that c3 will be a fine blockading square, and later e3-e4 will undermine Black's centre. Ostojic-Abramovic, Banja Vrucica 1991 was unclear after 11...a6 12 0-0 b5 13 e5 b7 14 f3.} \]

\[ \text{9...b7} \]

Once the pawn has arrived on c5 this is the appropriate square for the bishop. After 9...e6 the c6-square is left weakened, something well illustrated in the following game: 10 d3 e8 11 0-0 c4 12 c2 b7 13 a4 a6 14 c6 e8 15 xe7+ xe7 16 f3 b5 17 c2 c6 18 d2 and the two bishops gave White good chances for an advantage in Bisguier-Villarroel, Caracas 1970.

\[ \text{10 d3 e6} \]

10...b7 is quite passive—as I mentioned earlier, ...c7-c5 and ...b7 do not combine well. 11 f3 e8 12 0-0 a6 13 h3 created promising attacking chances for White in Tal-Bronstein, Tbilisi 1982.

\[ \text{11 0-0} \]

\[ \text{11...cxd4} \]

This is the main line in ECO and other places, but I recommend 11...xe5! 12 dxe5 (12 xe5, with equality, might be the best move) 12...d4!, the difference between this and other situations being that the bishop is now on d3. Browne-Frias, Santiago 1981 continued 13 c2 xc3! 14 bxc3 (14 xh7+ h8 15 bxc3 g6 16 xg6 fxg6 17 xg6 e8 and, as Black has control over all the light}
Queen's Indian Defence

squares, there will be no attack, only three scattered pawns for the piece), and now not 14...g6?! 15 \h6 \e8 16 \h5, when White was winning, but 14...\h6, with an unclear position that Black should not fear. The alternative 12...\e8?! was tried in Ligterink-Nikolic, Wijk aan Zee 1984, when 13 \g4 \g6 14 \ad1 \h5 15 \f3 \c7 16 \h6 was slightly better for White.

12 \c6 \c6 13 exd4 \d6?!

After this move Black will always face some problems. The exchange is illogical as it highlights the difference between the bishops on d3 and c6. An improvement is 13...\d7?! 14 \f3 \ae8! (the argument for using this rook lies in the following line: 14...\fe8 15 \fe1 \d6 16 \g5! \de4 17 \dxe4 \dxe4 18 \dxe4 \dxe4? 19 \dxe4 \wb7 20 \ae1, where ...\f7-f5 has no protection — with the rook on f8 this is not the case) 15 \fe1 \d6 16 \e5 (16 \g5? \de4! 17 \dxe4? \dxe4 18 \dxe4 \dxe4? 19 \dxe4 \wb7 and Black wins) 16...\dxe5 17 \dxe5 \d4 18 \de4 was Petursson-Larsen, Næstved 1988, and now Larsen writes that Black can keep the balance with 18...\dxe4 19 \dxe4 \dxe4 20 \dxe4 \e6!, which looks correct as far as I can see. 21 \ad1 \d8 22 \f4 \d3 23 \f5 \e8! is an important line, when the e-pawn is getting as weak as the d-pawn, at least. Black should avoid 23...\c6?? 24 \e6 \fxe6 25 \fxe6 \e8 26 \e7 \adc8 27 \wdx3 and White wins.

14 \g5

14 \f3\? is also natural, preparing a future \e5!

14...\h6 15 \h4 \e8 16 \c2 \e7 17 \e1 \de4

This is the only move that, in the long run, frees Black from having to push with ...\g7-\g5.

18 \dxe7 \dxe7 19 \we2! \d7?!

Very passive. Now White gets time to strengthen his position without any worries. 19...\e6 20 \dxe4 \dxe4 21 \d5 \xd5 22 \ad1 \d6 23 \wd2 \h4 24 \dxd5 \ad8 25 \g3 \wg4 26 \de7+ \f8 27 \wdx6 \xd6 28 \xd6 \xe7 29 \xd3 might give White a small advantage

in the endgame, but only if he manages to penetrate to the 7th rank will he be able to win.

20 \wd3 \g6 21 \b3 \g7 22 \aad1 \c8 23 f3 \d6 24 \we3 \dc4?!

Forcing this exchange only benefits White. After a more careful move Black should be only slightly worse.

25 \xc4 \dxc4 26 \cd1 \wg5!!

Introducing a tactical endgame in which Black is on the receiving end.

27 \wxf5 \hxf5 28 \d5 \b7 29 \e5 \c5?

Here 29...\f6 is the appropriate move, after which White maintains some pressure.

30 \wxf5 \f5 31 \h4 \f6 32 \d6 \e5 33 \f2 \e6 34 \dxe2 \xd6 35 \f4 \xd1 36 \xg6+ \f7 37 \xe6 \d4

38 \h6 \xf4 39 \g3 \d4 40 \h7+ \g6 41 \xb7 \d2 42 \xa7 \xb2 43 \c7 \b5 44 \c6+ \g7 45 \c5 \g6 46 \c6+
\[ \text{Game 6} \]

Dreev-Seirawan

Wijk aan Zee 1995

1 d4 \( \text{d}6 \) 2 \( \text{d}f3 \) e6 3 c4 b6 4 a3 c6?!

One of those ideas that is tried once for the sake of originality, and never tried again for the sake of results...

5 \( \text{d}e3 \) d5

6 cxd5!

Letting Black choose at once.

6...exd5

This was the reasoning behind 4...c6, of course. Otherwise the move would have contributed nothing to Black's cause. 6...exd5 meets with 7 \( \text{g}5 \), when White has the freedom to play as he likes in the centre.

7...a6 8 \( \text{c}1 \) a7

8...\( \text{c}7 \) is very bad in view of 9 \( \text{a}4!!! \), when Black is forced into 9...\( \text{d}7 \) 10 \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{xc}4 \) 11 \( \text{xa}4+ \) \( \text{d}7 \) 12 \( \text{b}3 \) b5 13 \( \text{e}5 \) with a significant advantage to White. After e2-e3 comes a3-a4.

9 e3 \( \text{c}6 \)!

Failing to appreciate the immediate danger on the c-file. With this in mind 9...\( \text{bd}7 \) followed by ...\( \text{c}8 \) is absolutely necessary. Now White springs a wonderful combination.

10 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{c}8 \)

10...axb5 11 \( \text{xb}5 \) \( \text{xc}8 \) 12 \( \text{e}5 \) sees White win the piece back with interest.

11 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \)

11...\( \text{h}5 \) 12 \( \text{c}7+! \) \( \text{xc}7 \) 13 \( \text{xc}7 \) \( \text{xc}7 \) 14 \( \text{xa}6 \) \( \text{xa}6 \) 15 \( \text{xc}6 \) and White wins.

12 \( \text{c}7+ \) \( \text{xc}7 \) 13 \( \text{xa}6 \)!

Precisely played. After 13 \( \text{xc}7? \) \( \text{xc}7 \) 14...
Queen’s Indian Defence

\[ \text{\textit{xa6 \textit{db8 15 \textit{xb7 \textit{wb7 Black is ready with \ldots b6-b5, breaking the pin. And after 16 \textit{wb5 \textit{d6! Black prevents \textit{e5.}}}}}

13...\textit{xa6}

There is no alternative. 13...\textit{db8 14 \textit{xb7 \textit{xb7 15 \textit{xb8 b5 16 \textit{wa6 and White regains his piece, or 13...e5 14 \textit{xb7 \textit{xb7 15 \textit{xc6 and White wins.}}}}}}

14 \textit{xc7 \textit{wc7 15 \textit{xc6 \textit{wb7 16 \textit{e5 \textit{e7 17 b4! f6}}}}}

17...\textit{c4 would lead to serious trouble after 18 \textit{xb6!, but not 18 \textit{xc4 dxc4 19 b5 as indicated by Dreev. Then 19...\textit{b8! 20 \textit{xc4 \textit{wxg2! by no means looks bad for Black!}}}}

18 b5?

This is simply a mistake. After 18 \textit{xb6! \textit{wb6 19 \textit{xd7+ \textit{f8 20 \textit{xc6 \textit{wb7 21 \textit{xe6 \textit{wc7 22 \textit{d2! \textit{wd6 23 \textit{xe7+ \textit{xe7 24 \textit{xe7 \textit{xe7 25 a4 White has very good chances in the endgame.}}}}}}}}}}}}}

18...\textit{xb5 19 \textit{wb5 fxe5 20 0-0}

20 \textit{xe6 exd4 21 0-0 \textit{f7 22 \textit{c6 \textit{f6 is okay for Black.}}}}

20...\textit{exd4?}

The decisive mistake. Dreev must have not seen that Black is absolutely fine after 20...0-0 21 \textit{fc1! \textit{d8 22 \textit{xe6 e4, instead giving 21 \textit{xe6 as a simple explanation, but after 21...\textit{xa3 22 \textit{a1 \textit{c8! all Black’s pieces are playing.}}}}}}

21 \textit{fc1! \textit{d8?}}

Another grave error. After 21...\textit{d8 22 \textit{xe6+ \textit{f7 23 \textit{cc6 \textit{f6 24 e4! \textit{wd7 25 exd5 \textit{e7 Black is starting to unravel.}}}}}}}

22 exd4 \textit{f8 23 a4!}

Now Black can do nothing to stop the a-pawn.

23...\textit{g5 24 \textit{fc2 \textit{f4 25 a5 \textit{exd4 26 g3 \textit{d1+ 27 \textit{g2 \textit{a1 28 axb6 \textit{d8}}}}}}}

28...\textit{a6 29 \textit{xa6 \textit{xa6 30 b7 \textit{xc6 31 \textit{xc6 \textit{f6 32 \textit{d6 and White wins.}}}}}}}

29 \textit{d6+ 1-0}

\[ \text{Game 7}

\text{Gelfand-Kasparov}

\text{Novgorod 1997}

1 d4 \textit{f6 2 c4 e6 3 \textit{f3 b6 4 a3 c5!}}?

The alternative continuation 4...\textit{a6 5 \textit{wc2 c5 6 d5 is seen just as often.}}

5 d5

5 e3 is considered in Game 8.

5...\textit{a6 6 \textit{c2}}
6 b3 has been played a few times but the pawn structure is not really suited for a bishop on b2 as d6 is the weak spot in Black's camp.

6...exd5

Black can try to prevent e3-e4 with 6...We7?! but experience shows that this move, which hinders development, is rather risky if White reacts with determination. Miles-Kudrin, London 1982, went 7 g5 exd5 8 c3! cx4 (8...b7 9 exd5 h6 10 xf6 xf6 11 e4 was a shade better for White in Vyzmanavin-Rozentalis, Lvov 1987) 9 e4! (Kasparov's contribution) 9...h6 10 xf6 xf6 12 xf1 d6 13 e1+ c7 14 a4+ f8 15 g4 and Black was under a lot of pressure. Returning to the position after 9 e4!, Black has a couple of alternatives to 9...h6. 9...e6 10 xc4 dxc4 11 0-0-0 c6 12 e5 h5 13 d5 e8 14 xc4 e7 15 g4 was terrible for Black in Hernandez-Ortega, Cuba 1982, but 9...dx4! 10 0-0 c6 11 xc4 d8 12 c4 c7 13 xf6 xf6 14 d6+ f8 15 d5 xd5 16 xxd5 gives White compensation for the material rather than an enormous advantage.

7 cxd5 g6

This only serious move. The bishop never belongs on e7 in a Benoni set-up and winning a pawn with 7...b7? 8 e4 We7 9 c3 xdx5 looks unhealthy. After 10 0-0 c7 11 g5! f6 12 f4 d6 13 c3 d7 14 b4! Black was under pressure in Sakaev-Ruban, Elista 1995. And 7...xd5 8 e4+ c7 9 xa8 xe6 10 c5 c7 11 f4 xex5 12 c4 simply wins for White, as in Einarsson-Thorhallsson, Reykjavik 1996.

8 c3

There is an alternative set-up both here and on the following move, designed to take immediate advantage of the weaknesses of the d6-square and the a4-e8 diagonal. Luckily for Black, he also has his resources. 8 f4?! d6 9 c3 c7 10 a4+ d7! 11 xd6 xa4 12 d4 xd5 13 0-0-0 c7! is very important, for if the knight goes to f6 it blocks the bishop and does not possess any mobility. About 6-7 serious games have been played with 11 xd6, and in all of them where the knight went to f6 (mainly after 13 e4) Black did badly, while in the rest, where the knight went to e7, Black equalised. Browne-Timman, Las Palmas 1982 continued 14 e4 xf1 15 xf1 bc6 16 c3 xc3! 17 bxc3 db8 18 c7 d7 19 xc4 f6 with an equal ending which Black went on to win. Less ambitious is 11 xxd7+ xd7, when Black should be doing fine. In Garcia Trobat-Rodriguez, Malaga 1991 White even got into trouble after 12 g3 e7 13 g2 bd7 14 0-0 he8 15 h3 h5 16 c3 f8! etc. Finding a good move for White here is by no means easy.

8...c7 9 g3

White can also give up the right to castle in order to gain immediate control over the centre with 9 e4 xf1 10 xf1, but this neglects the fact that in Benoni positions Black is normally thrilled to exchange the lightsquared bishop for any piece. Consequently, without any weak light squares, this makes little sense from a positional point of view. Of course this is my way of thinking. A number of the world's top players think differently, and the variation has been tried by better players than I. Arencibia-Almasi, Elista 1998, for example, continued 10...d6 11 f4 0-0 12 h3 e8 13 g4 b5! 14 xb5 xc4 15 e1 a6 16 c3 xc3 17 xe8+ xe8 18
bxc3 ∇d7 19 ∇g2 (White should avoid 19 ∇xd6 c4 20 ∇g3 ∇f6 21 d6 ∇e4, where the importance of the inactive rook is too evident) 19...c4 20 ∇e1 ∇d8 21 ∇xd6 ∇f6 22 ∇e5 ∇xd6 23 ∇f2 =.d2 2 ½-½. Cebalo-Tukmakov, Pula 1994 saw Black enjoy a pleasant position after 14 ∇g2 ∇b6, with all his pieces being able to find good squares. Who knows – Black might even be a little bit better here.

9...0-0 10 ∇g2

The automatic square for the bishop, and also the best. However GM Neverov has experimented with 10 ∇h3 b5!, but now Black does not rush with ...d7-d6 as there is no pressure on the g2-a8 diagonal. Play might continue 11 0-0 ∇e8 (Also good looks 11...b4 12 axb4 cxb4 13 ∇d1 ∇xd5 14 ∇g5 ∇c7 15 ∇xd2 ∇b7 16 ∇c1 ∇a5 17 ∇e3 ∇xe3 18 ∇xe3 ∇xf3 19 exf3 ∇c6 with a very complex position, which ended with a draw in Neverov-Onischuk, Donetsk 1998) 12 b4!? (the e2-pawn needs protection, and ruling out ...b5-b4 safeguards the d5-pawn) 12...d6 13 ∇f4 ∇h5 14 ∇g5 ∇c7 15 ∇xd2 ∇b7 16 ∇c1 ∇a5 17 ∇e3 ∇xe3 18 ∇xe3 ∇xf3 19 exf3 ∇c6 with a complex position, which ended with a draw in Neverov-Onischuk, Donetsk 1998, 17...∇b7!? looks best, with at least equality for Black.

10...d6

Benoni set-ups is that Black has not yet played ...a7-a6 or ...c5. Now the knight comes to b4 in a second, and White experiences problems with the a6-f1 diagonal (d3) and the d5-pawn. 11...∇b7! 12 ∇d2 ∇a6 13 0-0 ∇b4 14 ∇b3 ∇e7 15 ∇d1 ∇a6 gave Black a clear advantage in Marjanovic-Timman, Bled 1979.

11...∇e8

This is the exact developing move. It is a question of timing and the deeper details in the position. After both possible knight moves Black comes under pressure. 11...∇bd7?! 12 ∇a4! ∇b7 (12...∇c8? 13 ∇h3! and Black is under irritating pressure, with ∇f4! coming soon) 13 ∇h4! and Black has some problems, as has been demonstrated in many games, one such being Grooten-Riemersma, Holland 1993. 13...∇xd5? loses at once to 14 ∇xd5 ∇xd5 15 ∇g5!, for example.

Nor does 11...∇g4?! 12 ∇e1 improve Black's situation because after the natural 12...∇d7?? White might consider 13 ∇a4, when Black resigned in Korotylev-Kiselev, Moscow 1996. Sometimes it is nice to see 2545 players blunder like we might do in 1-minute games on the Internet Chess Club! It makes me feel that the game is still alive for humanity...

12 ∇e1

Clearly the most natural move, and by far the most popular. Others:

a) 12 ∇f4 ∇h5 13 ∇g5 ∇c8 14 ∇e1 ∇d7 15 g4?! ∇hf6 16 ∇f4 (16 h3 h5! is also bad for White) 16...∇xg4 17 ∇e4 ∇xe4! 18 ∇xe4 ∇xb2 and Black was better in Zhu Chen-Ehlvest, Beijing 1998. Look at the prospects for the queenside pawns!

b) 12 b4!? was original and not unsuccessful in the following game but, as we shall see, Black had some promising improvements: 12...∇bd7 (12...∇xd5 13 ∇g5!, or 12...∇e4 13 ∇xe4 ∇xa1 14 ∇g5 f6 15 ∇xal fxg5 16 ∇fxg5, followed by ∇e6 or ∇c3, with good compensation) 13 ∇b2 ∇c4 14 ∇fd1 cxb4

11 0-0

An understandable mistake would be 11 a4?. The problem here compared to normal
(14...b5!? 15 axb4 \(c_8\) (15...a5, gaining c5 for the knight) 16 \(Wd_2\) (16 e4 \(Qxe4\) 17 \(Qxe4\) \(Qxb2\) 18 \(Qxd6\) with a mess) 16..\(a5\)? (16..\(Qxd5\)! wins a pawn!) 17 \(Qxe2\) \(Qe4\) 18 \(Wd_3\) \(Qxb2\) 19 \(Qxa7\) and the position was rather unclear in Krasenkow-Emms, Hastings 1990.

c) 12 \(Bb1\) \(Qbd7\) 13 \(Be1\) b5 14 b4 \(Qc8\) 15 \(Wd_3\) \(Qg_4\) 16 \(Qe4\) \(Wc_7\) saw White already experiencing problems in Zhu Chen-Alterman, Beijing 1997.

12...\(Qbd7\)

This is the standard move. There are some transpositions with 12...b5, but they are not so relevant. Yet one idea does look interesting: 12...\(h6\)?, playing against the c1-bishop. 13 e4 \(Qb_7\) 14 \(Qf_4\) \(Qh_5\) 15 \(Qc3\) \(Qc6\) 16 \(Qad1\) \(Wd_7\) led to an interesting position in Touzane-Bauer, France 1996. However, I have a feeling the bishop's value on b7 has declined here.

13 \(h3!\)

By far the most logical option. White wants to play e2-e4 without allowing ...\(Qg4\)-e5-d3. Others:

a) 13 \(Qf_4\) \(Wc_7\), and now:

a1) 14 e4 \(Qg_4!\) 15 \(Qg_5\) f6 16 \(Qf_4\) \(Qg_5\) 17 \(Qxe5\) \(Qxe5\) 18 \(Qad1\) \(Wd_7\) and Black has the better prospects, Kramnik-Timman, Linares 1993. White's pieces are nicely placed, but they are not really doing anything.

a2) 14 \(Wd_4\) \(Qb_7\) 15 \(Qb_5\) \(Qxd5\) 16 \(Qd_6\) (16 \(Qxd6\) \(Qxb2\) 17 \(Qxb7\) \(Qxa1\) 18 \(Qxa1\) \(Qc3\) looked better for Black in Riazantsev-Mitenkov, Moscow 1998) 16..\(Wf_6\) 17 \(Qad1\) \(Qc6\) and White's pieces are all tangled up, Szymczak-Panczyk, Poland 1982.

a3) 14 \(Qad1\) \(Qe4!\) 15 \(Wd_4\) (15 \(Qxe4\) \(Wxe4\) 16 \(Wd_2\) \(Wc_7\) with equality) 15...\(Qxc3!\) 16 bxc3 \(Qb_7\) 17 \(Qd_3\) \(Qf_5\) and Black is by no means worse, Jusupov-Timman, Tilburg 1986.

b) 13 e4 \(Qg_4\) 14 \(Qg_5\) \(Wc_7\) 15 \(Qf_4\) \(Qd_5\) 16 \(Qad1\) b5 gave Black excellent prospects in Popov-Kastanieda, St. Petersburg 1998.

c) 13 \(Wd_4?!\) \(Qb_7\) 14 \(Wd_4\) does not work now as the rook is no longer on f8! After 14...\(Qxd5!\) 15 \(Qxd5\) \(Qxd5\) 16 \(Qg_5\) \(Qxg2\) 17 \(Wxh7+\) \(Qf_8\) 18 \(Qxg2\) \(Qf_6\) 19 \(Wd_4\) d5 Black has the advantage (...d5-d4 and ...\(Wd_5\) are coming, with total domination).

13...b5

Clearly the best move. After 13...\(Qe5?!\) 14 \(Qxe5\) \(Qxe5\) 15 e4 \(Qe8\) 16 \(Qd_3\) \(Qd_7\) 17 f4 Black's forces had problems finding squares in Yusupov-Timman, Tilburg 1986.

14 e4

This was supposed to be the move for White until the present game was played. Now nobody really knows. Just as frequently played has been 14 \(Qf_4\), but Black should be fine if he continues 14...\(Wb_6\) 15 e4 \(Qac8\) 16 \(Qc3\) \(Qb_7\)?, remembering to push with ...a7-a5 and then ...\(Qa6\) in order to fight for control of the c4-square. Yevseev-Ionov, St. Petersburg 2000, went 17 \(Qd_2\) a6 18 a4 b4 19 \(Qc_4\) (19 a5 \(Qc_7\) 20 \(Qcb1\) c4 and Black is okay) 19...\(Wc_7\) 20 \(Qb_1\) a5! 21 \(Qbd2\) \(Qa6\) 22 \(Qf_4\) \(Qf_8\) 23 \(Qad1\) \(Qh_5\) with a sound position for Black. In Moreno-Emms, Mondariz 2000, 16...\(Wb_7\) 17 \(Qf_1\) \(Qb_8!\) also proved to be fine, e.g. 18 \(Qf_4?!\) b4 19 \(Qd_1\) b3 20 \(Wb_1\) \(Qxf1\) 21 \(Qxf1\) \(Wd_6+\) 22 \(Qg_2\) \(Qbd7\) 23 \(Qc_3\) c4 and Black was better.

14...\(Wc_8!!\)

I have used this position as an exercise in my positional training program on the Internet. The key idea is that the bishop should be supported so that Black can play ...b5-b4 as
soon as possible. Kasparov’s move is the only one that does this. The automatic 14...\textit{c}8 15 \textit{c}e3 \textit{w}e7 (15...b4 16 axb4 cxb4 17 \textit{x}xa6 bxc3 18 \textit{d}d4! followed by \textit{c}c6 has long been known to give White a good position) 16 \textit{f}f1 \textit{w}b7 17 \textit{f}f4 gave White a good position in Van Wely-Kamsky, Amsterdam Donner 1996. 14...\textit{w}b6 15 \textit{c}e3! also slows down the ...b5-b4 idea.

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

15 \textit{f}f4

The aggressive approach, but after this it is White who must try to keep the balance. However, other games suggest that Black is absolutely fine. 15 \textit{f}f1? b4 16 \textit{b}b5 \textit{x}xb5? 17 \textit{x}xb5 \textit{b}b8 18 \textit{c}c6 b3 19 \textit{w}d3 \textit{e}e5 20 \textit{x}xe5 \textit{e}xe5 21 \textit{g}g2 \textit{c}c7 led to an interesting position (which Black went on to win) in Markos-Nisipeanu, Cappelle la Grande. The question is what is the most important here—the bishop on c6 or the weaknesses of the b2-pawn? The debate is most likely not over. 15 \textit{d}d2? b4 16 \textit{d}d1 b3 17 \textit{w}b1 c4 was plainly good for Black in Tunik-Ionov, St. Petersburg 2001.

15...b4 16 \textit{c}a4

16 \textit{d}d1 b3 17 \textit{w}b1 \textit{w}c7 18 \textit{c}c3 \textit{e}ab8 did not look impressive in Zhu Chen-Zatonskikh, Istanbul 2000.

16...b3!

This is the idea—now White loses control over e4.

17 \textit{w}xb3

I am one of those people who does not need to see variations to see that 17 \textit{w}b1? is bad. Just look at the white pieces!

17...\textit{d}xe4 18 \textit{w}c2

18 \textit{c}c3? \textit{h}b8 19 \textit{w}c2 \textit{e}xb2! pockets a pawn for Black.

18...\textit{d}f6

Here White needs to do something to challenge the power of the e4-knight. The way he does it is terrible, as it serves only to weaken his king.

19 \textit{g}4?!

19 \textit{g}5! was the only move.

19...\textit{w}d7 20 \textit{g}5?!

Still 20 \textit{g}5? is necessary.

20...\textit{h}5 21 \textit{h}2

21 \textit{x}e4 \textit{x}e4 22 \textit{x}e4 \textit{e}8 23 \textit{d}xc5 \textit{x}e4 24 \textit{x}d7 \textit{x}f4? leads to a very clear advantage for Black. White’s pieces could hardly be worse.

21...\textit{f}5!
With complete domination.

22 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{bxb8} \) 23 \( \text{ab1} \) \( \text{xc3}! \)

Securing the difference between Black’s majestic knight and the bishop on h2.

24 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{xb1} \) 25 \( \text{xb1} \) \( \text{c4} \) 26 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xd2} \) 27 \( \text{wx}6d2 \) f4! 28 \( \text{xe1} \) \( \text{e5}!\)

\section*{Game 8}
Silman-Gheorghiu
Palo Alto 1981

1 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 2 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 3 \( \text{d}f3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 4 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{c5} \) 5 \( \text{e}3 \)

This move is less ambitious than 5 d5, and Black has no problems equalizing.

5... \( \text{b}b7 \)

5... \( \text{g6}!\) 6 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 7 \( \text{e}2 \) 0-0 8 0-0 \( \text{b}7 \) 9 \( \text{b}4 \) (9 d5?! \( \text{exd5} \) 10 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{xe8} \) gives Black a good version of the Benoni – where does White’s queen’s bishop belong and how is the other bishop contributing?) 9... \( \text{cxd4} \) 10 \( \text{dxe4} \) (10 \( \text{exd4} \) d5 11 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{bxc5} \) \( \text{c}4 \) should not certainly not be worse for Black)

10... \( \text{c6} \) 11 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 12 \( \text{b}2 \) d5 13 \( \text{wb3} \) (13 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) with at least equality, Browne-Timman, London 1980) 13... \( \text{xc4} \) 14 \( \text{xe7} \) 15 \( \text{adl} \) \( \text{f6d8} \) with an equal position (but also somewhat boring, with chances only for a draw) in Panno-Andersson, Bue-

7os Aires 1980.

6 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{exd4} \) 7 \( \text{exd4} \) d5 8 \( \text{cxd5} \)

There has been an attempt to finish Black off immediately by weakening his light squares with 8 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e7} \) 9 \( \text{xf6}!\) \( \text{xf6} \) 10 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 11 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 12 \( \text{a}4+ \) \( \text{e}7 \) 13 \( \text{c}1 \), but time has shown that this is not possible.

Christiansen-Gurevich, Parsippany 1996 went 13... \( \text{d}8 \) 14 \( \text{d}3?! \) \( \text{a}6! \) 15 0-0 \( \text{a}7 \) 16 \( \text{xe1} \) \( \text{xf6}! \) 17 \( \text{xf7} \) \( \text{b}5 \) 18 \( \text{xb}5 \) \( \text{b}x \) 19 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xd}4 \), when Black was better placed for the endgame, while 14 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 15 \( \text{c}7+ \) \( \text{f}6 \) 16 \( \text{c}8 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 17 \( \text{xd}8 \) \( \text{xd}8 \) 18 0-0 \( \text{c}6 \) results in equality according to Gurevich.

8... \( \text{cxd5} \)

This is clearly the most flexible move, and as White has no way of troubling Black straight away there is no need to resort to 8... \( \text{exd5}?! \) 9 \( \text{b}5+ \) \( \text{bd}7 \) 10 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 11 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{xc}6 \) 12 \( \text{xc}6 \), when White stood better in the game Eingorn-Lauber, Bad Wörishofen 1997.

9 \( \text{b}5+ \) \( \text{c}6 \) 10 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}7! \)

The bishop appears to be exposed on c6 but White has no way to exploit it, so Black maintains the balance.

11 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 12 \( \text{d}2?! \)

This clearly shows that White lacks sufficient understanding of the positions arising with the isolated pawn. 12 \( \text{e}2 \) is an improvement.

12...0-0 13 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{xc3} \) 14 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{b}7 \) 15
This looks just like a bad endgame, and guess what it is...?

19...\textit{W}xc1 20 ~x\textit{xc}1 \textit{Q}d5 21 \textit{Q}e4 \textit{f}6 22 \textit{Q}g3 \textit{Q}c8 23 \textit{Q}xc8+ \textit{Q}xc8 24 \textit{Q}b8 a6 25 \textit{Q}xd5 exd5 26 \textit{Q}c7 b5 27 b4 \textit{Q}f5

Here the bishop is better than the knight. Black has good practical chances, although White might have been able to hold it with best play.

28 \textit{Q}e1 \textit{Q}f7 29 \textit{Q}f1 h5 30 \textit{Q}e2 \textit{Q}e6 31 \textit{Q}f4 g5 32 \textit{Q}c1 \textit{Q}d6 33 h3 g4 34 h4 g3 35 f3 \textit{Q}b1 36 \textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}f5 37 \textit{Q}c5 \textit{Q}a2 38 \textit{Q}xa6 \textit{Q}c4+ 39 \textit{Q}e1 \textit{Q}f4 40 \textit{Q}xf4 \textit{Q}xf4 41 \textit{Q}c5 \textit{Q}e3 42 a4 \textit{Q}xa4 43 \textit{Q}xa4 \textit{Q}xd4 44 \textit{Q}c5 \textit{Q}c3 0-1

The queen is quite obviously less well placed here than on c2. Other moves have also been tried.

a) 5 e3 is really harmless, and often transposes to the 4 e3 line after 5...d5, where White has the extra move a2-a3, which hardly does him any good (Black can also play 5...c5 6 \textit{Q}c3 \textit{Q}e7 7 \textit{Q}e2 cxd4 8 \textit{Q}xd4 \textit{Q}b7 9 \textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}c6 with total equality, as in Hort-Ljubojevic, OHRA 1988). And now:

a1) 6 b3 \textit{Q}c7 7 \textit{Q}d3 0-0 8 0-0 c5 9 \textit{Q}b2 dxc4 10 bxc4 \textit{Q}c6 11 \textit{Q}e5 \textit{Q}a5 12 \textit{Q}d2 \textit{Q}c8 13 \textit{Q}c1 \textit{Q}d7 and White's queenside weaknesses began to tell in Smolej-Siegel, Germany 1985.

a2) 6 \textit{Q}c3 \textit{Q}e7 7 \textit{Q}e5 (7 \textit{Q}a4+ c6 8 cxd5 \textit{Q}xf1 9 \textit{Q}xf1 cxd5, Flesh-Romanishin, Lvov 1981, is simply better for Black – look at White’s bishop) 7...0-0 8 \textit{Q}e2 c6 9 0-0 \textit{Q}xf7! and Black has solved all his opening problems, Browne-Benjamin, USA 1984.

a3) 6 \textit{Q}bd2 is the only move for people who want to play. Kholmov-Naumkin, Voskresensk 1990 went 6...\textit{Q}d6 7 b3 0-0 8 \textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}b7 9 \textit{Q}c2 \textit{Q}bd7 10 \textit{Q}b2 c5 11 0-0 \textit{Q}c8 12 \textit{Q}fe1 b5 13 dxc5 \textit{Q}xc5 14 \textit{W}b1 with a draw, although I must say that as Black I would have considered playing on here.

b) After 5 \textit{Q}bd2 Black plays 5...\textit{Q}b7! as the new arrival on d2 is poorly placed. Rohde-Miles, USA 1989 continued 6 \textit{Q}c2 d5 7 cxd5 exd5 8 g3 \textit{Q}d6! (controlling e5 and...
better than the old 8...\(\text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}}}}\text{\texttt{c}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{g}}\text{\texttt{2}}\text{\texttt{g}}\text{\texttt{2}}\text{\texttt{d}}\text{\texttt{b}}\text{\texttt{d}}\text{\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{1}}\text{\texttt{0}}\text{\texttt{0}}\text{\texttt{0}}\text{\texttt{0}}\) 11 \(\text{\texttt{h}}\text{\texttt{h}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{?}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{8}}\text{\texttt{8}}\text{\texttt{1}}\text{\texttt{2}}\text{\texttt{d}}\text{\texttt{c}}\text{\texttt{c}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{?}}\text{\texttt{!}}\text{\texttt{!}}\text{\texttt{(not good;}}\text{\texttt{12}}\text{\texttt{d}}\text{\texttt{f}}\text{\texttt{3}}\text{\texttt{gives both players chances)}\text{\texttt{12}}\text{\texttt{f}}\text{\texttt{f}}\text{\texttt{8}}\text{\texttt{8}}\text{\texttt{1}}\text{\texttt{3}}\text{\texttt{f}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{?}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{!}}\text{\texttt{!}}\text{\texttt{and Black was much better}}\text{\texttt{due to the threat of...}}\text{\texttt{g}}\text{\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{-}}\text{\texttt{g}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{.)}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{...g}}\text{\texttt{6}}\text{\texttt{!}}\text{\texttt{6}}\text{\texttt{c}}\text{\texttt{c}}\text{\texttt{3}}\text{\texttt{g}}\text{\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{0}}\text{\texttt{0}}\text{\texttt{0}}\text{\texttt{0}}\text{\texttt{8}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{2}}\text{\texttt{c}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{9}}\text{\texttt{d}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{d}}\text{\texttt{6}}\text{\texttt{.}}\text{\texttt{9}}\text{\texttt{exd}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{would be too soon. After 10 exd}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{8}}\text{\texttt{1}}\text{\texttt{1}}\text{\texttt{w}}\text{\texttt{c}}\text{\texttt{2}}\text{\texttt{White might be better as the}}\text{\texttt{bishop is misplaced on a6.}}\text{\texttt{10}}\text{\texttt{0}}\text{\texttt{0}}\text{\texttt{o}}\text{\texttt{bd}}\text{\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{Black is just developing and, as White has}}\text{\texttt{no active plans, the position is equal. Now}}\text{\texttt{White goes over the edge}}\text{\texttt{in}}\text{\texttt{an attempt to do}}\text{\texttt{something.}}\text{\texttt{11 dxed}}\text{\texttt{6?! fxed}}\text{\texttt{12 e}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{dxe}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{13 g}}\text{\texttt{g}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{w}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{14 f}}\text{\texttt{f}}\text{\texttt{3}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{!}}\text{\texttt{Black will not allow White to occupy e4 with a knight without first opening up for his bishop on the long diagonal.}}\text{\texttt{15 dxed}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{?}}\text{\texttt{This seems to be bad, but 15 g}}\text{\texttt{xe}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{dxe}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{16 xex}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{17 b}}\text{\texttt{b}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{axad}}\text{\texttt{8}}\text{\texttt{would also benefit Black.}}\text{\texttt{15...xe}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{16 xxf}}\text{\texttt{6+}}\text{\texttt{xxf}}\text{\texttt{6}}\text{\texttt{17 axa}}\text{\texttt{8}}\text{\texttt{xex}}\text{\texttt{c}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{18 w}}\text{\texttt{g}}\text{\texttt{3}}\text{\texttt{xex}}\text{\texttt{1}}\text{\texttt{9 e}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{d}}\text{\texttt{3}}\text{\texttt{!}}\text{\texttt{A very important simplification. Now}}\text{\texttt{White's hopes of an attack against the weakened king disappear together with the minor pieces.}}\text{\texttt{20 xexd}}\text{\texttt{3 xexd}}\text{\texttt{21 w}}\text{\texttt{xd}}\text{\texttt{3}}\text{\texttt{The last finesse is that 21 xexh7 wxxh7! 22}}\text{\texttt{wxd}}\text{\texttt{3 d}}\text{\texttt{8}}\text{\texttt{!}}\text{\texttt{23 w}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{2}}\text{\texttt{w}}\text{\texttt{h}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{gives White a terri}}\text{\texttt{ble problem on the first rank and on b2.}}\text{\texttt{21...xexg5 22 xexg5 wxxg5 23 ed1 we5}}\text{\texttt{Black has a pawn and very good winning chances, which proved enough...}}\text{\texttt{24 b3 w}}\text{\texttt{g}}\text{\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{25 a4 w}}\text{\texttt{f}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{26 wd}}\text{\texttt{d}}\text{\texttt{7+}}\text{\texttt{ed}}\text{\texttt{7}}\text{\texttt{27}}\text{\texttt{wd2 wd6}}\text{\texttt{28 h}}\text{\texttt{3}}\text{\texttt{e}}\text{\texttt{5}}\text{\texttt{29 fe1 wf4 30 we2 e}}\text{\texttt{4}}\text{\texttt{31 wb2+ wh6 32 wc2 we7 33 wc4 we5 34 wg8 we5 35 wd8 wf7 36 wd2+ wg7 37 we3 wd5 38 wg3 wd4 39 wh4 xe5 40 wg3 ef5 41 wh4 xe5 42 wg3}}\text{\texttt{a6 43 wh2 we7 44 wh4 we5+ 45 wg1}}\text{\texttt{b5 46 axb5 axb5 47 wg4 c4 48 bc4 bc4 49 we2 c3 50 wc2 ed7 51 xex4 ed1+}}\text{\texttt{52 wxd1 xex4 53 wd7+ wh6 54 wc8}}\text{\texttt{c2 55 wf8+ xg5 56 h4+ wh5 57 wc5+ xhx4 58 wh2 g5 0-1}}\text{\texttt{Game 10}}\text{\texttt{Dzhandzhava-Chernin}}\text{\texttt{Lvov, 1987}}\text{\texttt{1 d4 ef6 2 c4 e6 3 ef3 b6 4 a3 xa6 5}}\text{\texttt{wc2 eb7 6 ec3 c5 7 d5?}}\text{\texttt{This should not be considered as a serious alternative to 7 e4, and nor should 7 dxc5 bxc5, e.g. 8 ef4 dh5 9 xg5 ec7 10 xex7}}\text{\texttt{xex7 11 e3 0-0 12 ec2 ef6 13 0-0 d6 14}}\text{\texttt{fd1 ed8 15 ed2 bd7 16 ed1 and White realised that he had no advantage at all in}}\text{\texttt{Gavrikov-Yemelin, Tallinn 2000. Another game went 8 xg5 ec7 9 e3 d6 10 ed1 0-0}}\text{\texttt{11 xec2 bd7 12 0-0 wb6 13 ed2 ad8 14}}
Queen's Indian Defence

\(\text{Be}1 \text{f}e8 15 \text{h}3 \text{f}8!\) with the idea of...
\(\text{g}6\) and...h7-h6, winning the two bishops.
After 16 \text{f}4 \text{g}6 17 \text{h}2 \text{d}7 18 \text{b}1 \text{e}d8 Black was no worse in Portisch-Timman, Reykjavik 1988.

7...\text{exd}5 8 \text{cxd}5 \text{e}d5 9 \text{g}5
9 \text{e}4+ \text{e}7 10 \text{xd}5 is a silly blitz line.
Black just takes the money and runs.
9...\text{e}7 10 \text{b}5 0-0 11 \text{d}6

White must get going. The alternatives are hopeless. After 14 \text{f}4 \text{e}7 15 \text{f}5 \text{g}6 there is no compensation for the sacrificed material, while 14 \text{e}4 \text{e}7 15 \text{xa}8 \text{e}3+ 16 \text{c}2 \text{c}6 17 \text{b}7 \text{d}2+ 18 \text{f}1 \text{xd}6 19 \text{d}1 \text{d}4 is very close to winning for Black. The domination of the dark squares and the misplacement of White's king will decide the game.

14...\text{c}6?! 
Here Black could have buried 7 d5 once and for all by simply playing 14...\text{e}7!, e.g. 15 \text{e}4 \text{xd}6 16 \text{xa}8 \text{c}6 17 \text{b}7 \text{xe}3, or 15 \text{f}5 \text{e}5 16 \text{e}4 \text{g}6, when Black has a pawn plus an overwhelming positional advantage.

15 \text{f}4?
Here White could have fought back a little bit with 15 h4! \text{f}3 16 \text{x}7 \text{f}x7 17 \text{f}x7+ \text{f}h8 18 \text{d}5, and Black has no clear way to conduct the attack, although he has good chances. Now the struggle is effectively over...

15...\text{xf}4! 16 \text{xf}7

16 \text{xf}4 \text{e}7+ 17 \text{e}4 \text{d}4 18 \text{d}3 \text{ae}8 19 \text{d}5 \text{h}4+ 20 \text{f}1 (20 \text{g}3 \text{h}5 21 \text{b}7 \text{d}5) 20...\text{f}4+ 21 \text{g}1 \text{f}5 22 \text{b}7 \text{d}5 23 \text{f}2 \text{e}5 24 \text{g}3 \text{c}4 25 \text{d}1 \text{f}5 and the attack wins by itself.

16...\text{h}4+ 17 \text{g}3
No alternatives: 17 \text{e}2 \text{h}5+ 18 \text{g}4 (18 \text{e}1 \text{d}5) 18...\text{xg}4+ 19 \text{d}2 \text{e}3+! 20 \text{xe}3 \text{d}4+ 21 \text{e}2 \text{ae}8+ 22 \text{f}1 \text{d}5 and
17 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{\textbf{d}1}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}e}3!}} 18 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{h}6+ \textbf{\textbf{h}8}}} 19 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{f}7+ \textbf{\textbf{xf}7}}} 20 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{xf}7 \textbf{\textbf{d}4}}} 21 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{w}d}3 \textbf{\textbf{g}4+} 22 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{e}1 \textbf{\textbf{xf}g2}}}} both win for Black.

17...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}g3+} 18 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}2}}} Black would also win after 18 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e}2 \textbf{\textbf{wh}5+} 19 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}2 \textbf{\textbf{f}2!}}} (funnily enough Chemin makes the mistake of mentioning 19...d5 as winning, but 20 hxg3! is worth a try!!) 20 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{a}f1 \textbf{\textbf{xe}3+}}}! 21 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{xe}3 \textbf{d}5 and Black wins in the attack.}}

18...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{f}2}} 19 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{d}1}}} Black would also win after 18 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}2 \textbf{\textbf{f}2}} 19 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{d}1}}} \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{xf}7 20 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{xf}7+ \textbf{\textbf{f}7}}} 21 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{xd}7+ \textbf{\textbf{e}7}} 22 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{a}f1 \textbf{\textbf{f}8}}} and Black wins.}}

19...d5 0-1

8...\texttt{\textbf{\textbf{c}5!}}? Here the main line is 8...\texttt{\textbf{\textbf{c}6}}, but the text move and 8...d6!? have gained in popularity. After 9 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{e}2 \textbf{\textbf{c}7}} White has played:

a) 10 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{c}3 \textbf{a}6 11 \textbf{\textbf{g}4?!}} has been tried occasionally but it seems to be too dangerous for White in view of the weakening of his queenside with a2-a3. Dreev-Lerner, Vienna 1996 continued 11...\texttt{\textbf{\textbf{d}fd7} 12 0-0-0 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{c}6 13 \textbf{\textbf{xc}6}}} \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{xc}6} 14 \texttt{\textbf{f}4 \textbf{\textbf{wb}8} 15 \texttt{\textbf{g}5 0-0} 16 \texttt{\textbf{h}4 \textbf{\textbf{b}5} 17 \texttt{\textbf{h}5 \textbf{b}4} 18 \texttt{\textbf{f}4 \textbf{\textbf{bx}b}4} 19 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{g}6 \textbf{f}6} 20 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{c}6 \textbf{\textbf{g}7}}}+) 20 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{g}x}h7+ \textbf{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{h}8} 21 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{d}4 \textbf{\textbf{xd}4}}} 22 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{xd}4 \textbf{\textbf{c}5}}} would also give Black a serious attack) 20...\texttt{\textbf{\textbf{c}xf7} 21 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{d}3 \textbf{\textbf{xc}3}}} 22 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{c}xc3} (22 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{b}xc3}}} 

b) 10-0-0 0-0 11 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{e}3 \textbf{a}6 12 \texttt{\textbf{f}d1 \textbf{\textbf{c}7} 13 \texttt{\textbf{ac1 \textbf{\textbf{d}bd7} 14 \texttt{\textbf{f}3 \textbf{\textbf{f}c8!}}} 15 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{f}f1 \textbf{\textbf{d}8} 16 \texttt{\textbf{f}2 \texttt{\textbf{ab}8} 17 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{h}1}} \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{a}8} 18 \texttt{\textbf{g}3 \textbf{\textbf{c}c7} 19 \texttt{\textbf{b}4 \textbf{\textbf{we}8!}}} with equality in Ljubojevic-Piket, Monaco. In these hedgehog positions a2-a3 tends to have pros and cons. It provides White with the opportunity to advance with a3-a4-a5 later to generate an attack against a6, but it also weakens the defence of a2-c4, and any pawns that might be placed on that diagonal.

9 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{b}3 \textbf{\textbf{c}6} 10 \textbf{\textbf{g}5}}} This game illustrates quite clearly that this line is okay for Black. Here are the alternatives:

a) 10 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{d}3 0-0 11 \textbf{\textbf{h}6?}}} 12 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{c}xc5 \textbf{\textbf{b}xc5}}} 13 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{e}3 \textbf{d}6 14 \texttt{\textbf{f}3! \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{h}b}8} 15 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{f}d1 \textbf{\textbf{f}e}7} 16 \texttt{\textbf{f}f1 \texttt{\textbf{fd}8} 17 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{b}1 \textbf{\textbf{a}8} 18 \texttt{\textbf{g}3 \textbf{\textbf{c}c7} 19 \texttt{\textbf{b}4 \textbf{\textbf{we}8!}} with a very small advantage to White in Sakaev-Milos, Sao Paolo 1991. In Lputian-Adams, Wijk aan Zee 2000, 11 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{f}4 \textbf{e}5 12 \textbf{\textbf{g}5 \textbf{h}6 13 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{h}4 \textbf{\textbf{c}e}7} 14 0-0 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{h}5}} 15 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{xe}7 \textbf{\textbf{xe}7} 16 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{a}d}1 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{f}4}}} 17 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{d}5 \textbf{\textbf{g}3} 18 \texttt{\textbf{xf}4 \textbf{\textbf{exf}4}}} left Black slightly better.}}

b) 10 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{c}xc5 \textbf{\textbf{b}xc5} 11 \textbf{\textbf{d}3 \textbf{d}6 12 0-0 0-0} 13 \texttt{\textbf{h}3 \texttt{\textbf{e}5 14 \texttt{\textbf{d}1 \textbf{\textbf{h}6} 15 \texttt{\textbf{b}1 \textbf{\textbf{a}5} 16 \texttt{\textbf{f}4 \texttt{\textbf{extf}4} 17 \texttt{\textbf{xf}4 \textbf{\textbf{e}5} and Black seems to be fine, Khalifman-Salov, Amsterdam 1995.}}

c) 10 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{f}4!} is the real test of 8...\texttt{\textbf{\textbf{c}5}, when wild and gruesome is 10...0-0 11 \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{c}xc5 \textbf{\textbf{b}xc5}}}}
Queen’s Indian Defence

12  ﾀd6  ﾀd4  13  ﾑd3  e5  14  ﾁxc5! (the exchange does not appear to be so interesting when all the remaining pieces are good for Black) 14...�e8  15  ﾃxd4  exd4  16  ﾑxd4  ﾃxe4  17  0-0-0 and White had the advantage in Piket-Salov, Wijk aan Zee 1997. In Kramnik-Psakhis, Debrecen 1992, 10...�e7  11  ﾁc2  d6  12  ﾁd1  ﾁb8 was too slow, and White had 13  c5  e5  14  cxd6  exf4  15  dxe7  ﾁxe7  16  ﾁb5+  ﾁf8  17  0-0 with a small advantage. This leaves 10...e5  11  ﾁg5  h6  12  ﾁh4, and now Black has the following options at his disposal.

c1) 12...0-0  13  ﾁe7  14  ﾁf2 with advantage to White according to Dautov. And trust me, he is right, although Black should hurry with 14...a5!, with the idea of ...a5-a4 and ...�d4 and, perhaps, ...d7-d5 to use his lead in development to blow the centre apart. 13  ﾁxc5?!  bxc5  14  ﾁd3  ﾁd4  15  ﾑd1  a5  16  0-0  g5  17  ﾁg3  d6  18  ﾁe1  ﾁc6 was better for Black in Christiansen-Seiravan, USA 1984.

c2) 12...�e7  13  0-0-0?  0-0  14  ﾁf3 was better for White in Notkin-Kiselev, Cappelle la Grande.

c3) 12...�d6  13  0-0-0  a6  (13...0-0  14  ﾁf3  a5  15  ﾑd3! gave White a serious advantage in Akopian-Salov, Wijk aan Zee 1993) 14  ﾁc8  15  ﾁb1  ﾁa5, Gruenenwald-Bischoff, Bundesliga 1988, and here White should have played 16  ﾁxc5!  bxc5  17  ﾁd5 with an advantage.

10...�d4!

11  ﾁxd4  ﾁxd4  12  ﾁb5

This is the test, but as we shall see it seems to be in Black’s favour. 12  ﾁd3  ﾑb8 and the control over the dark squares guarantees Black equality.

12...�c5!

12...�c5  13  f4, with unclear play, was the main line before this game. But the bishop is better placed on c5.

13  e5  h6  14  exf6

Also fine for Black is 14 �e3  a6  15  exf6  axb5  16  fxe7  �g8, e.g. 17  ﾁh7  ﾁe7  18  ﾁxh6  ﾁe3  19  ﾁxe3  bxc4 and Black appears to be better as g2 is weak. 17  ﾁxc5  bxc5  18  ﾁh7  ﾁe7  19  ﾁxe6  a5+ looks good for Black. White is severely behind in development and the potential pressure against g2 is strong.

14...�xg5  15  fxe7  �g8  16  ﾁh7  ﾁe7  17  b4  a6  18  bxc5  axb5  19  ﾁh6  f6

White has attacked with his lone queen and now his king is stuck in the centre. Black now wins almost by force from here.

20  ﾁd3  ﾁxg2  21  ﾁg1  ﾁc7!  22  cxb5

22  ﾁxg2  ﾁe5+ is easy.

22...�xc5  23  ﾁh7  ﾁf3  24  ﾁb1  ﾁxa3  0-1

Game 12

Bareev-Eingorn

Kiev 1986

1  d4  ﾁf6  2  c4  e6  3  ﾁf3  b6  4  a3  ﾁa6  5  ﾁc2  ﾁb7  6  ﾁc3  c5  7  e4  cxd4  8  ﾁxd4
\( \text{c6} 9 \text{xc6} \)

In practice this is the only move played by the top players; there are no serious alternatives. After 9 \( \text{e3} \text{g4}! \) Black gains the two bishops without any concessions.

9...\( \text{xc6} \)

10 \( \text{f4} \)

This is the main move, but not the only serious one.

a) 10 \( \text{e2} \) does nothing about the important dark squares. In fact White should now be careful if he is to maintain the balance:

a1) After 10...\( \text{b8} \) we have 11 0-0?! \( \text{c5}! \)
12 \( \text{h1} \) (12 b4 \( \text{d4} \) 13 \( \text{b2} \) h5 and the attack continues) 12...h5 13 \( \text{d3} \text{g4} \), when Black was already much better in Fedorowicz-Miles, USA 1989, while 11 \( \text{e3} \) was equal in Christiansen-Miles, Linares 1985.

a2) 10...\( \text{c5}! \) looks best. Then 11 0-0?! is too dangerous. Now Black attacks on the dark squares (but what should White do?):
11...\( \text{c7} \) 12 \( \text{h1} \) h5! 13 f3 h4 14 b4 \( \text{d4} \) 15 \( \text{d2} \text{h5}! \) with a decisive attack in prospect, Farago-Grooten, Sas van Gent 1988.

b) 10 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{b8} \) 11 \( \text{e2}! \) (no castling here!) 11...\( \text{d6} \) 12 \( \text{d2} \) 0-0 13 h3 \( \text{f4} \) 14 \( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 15 0-0 d6, as in Sakaev-Poluljahov, Vrnjacka Banja 1996, should be equal.

c) 10 \( \text{g5}?! \) might give White something. It all comes down what happens after 10...\( \text{b8} \). While 11 g3?! is not very good, the refutation is not 11...\( \text{xe4}?! \), as played in Lputian-Psakhis, Sochi 1987, but 11...\( \text{e7}! \)
12 \( \text{g2} \text{xe4}!! \) 13 \( \text{xe7} \text{xc3} \) 14 \( \text{xc6} \)
\( \text{xe5}!! \) 15 \( \text{f1} \text{dxc6} \) 16 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d4} \) 17 \( \text{h4} \) h6!!
18 g4 (18 \( \text{xc3} \text{xc3} \) 19 bxc3 g5 20 \( \text{e4} \text{d8}!! \) and Black will have a better endgame)
18...\( \text{xe4} \) 19 \( \text{g3} \text{xc4}+ \) 20 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{d8} \) 21 \( \text{xc3} \text{xc3} \) 22 bxc3 \( \text{d3} \) 23 \( \text{e3} \text{xe3} \) 24 \( \text{exe3} \text{e7} \), and the three pawns look stronger than the bishop. Instead 11 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{e7} \) 12 \( \text{e2} \) h6 13 \( \text{d2} \), Klimov-Yemelin, St. Petersburg 2000, looks like a tiny edge for White.

10...\( \text{h5} \)

Whether this is the best move or not is very difficult to tell. The alternative, 10...\( \text{c5} \), is treated in Game 13.

11 \( \text{e3} \)
Queen's Indian Defence

...f8-d6 coming. Black should equalise:

a) 12 g3 f5! 13 0-0-0 (13 h4 g5 14 dxe4 dxe4 15 hxg5 fxe4 16 f4 e5 17 g5 0-0 with equality in San Segundo-Langeweg, Zaragoza 1995) 13...d5 14 dxe4 fxe4 15 dxe4 17 fxe4! (17 fxe4?! hinders the bishop on d3; after 17...d6 Black was better in Lutz-Karpov, Dortmund 1993) 17...exf5 18 fxg5 0-0-0 with an unclear game according to Karpov.

b) 12 h4 d5 13 exd5 cxd5 14 g3 0-0 15 f4 d6 16 g4 fxe4 17 dxe4 dxe4 18 fxe4 dxe4 19 dxe4 dxe4 20 fxe4 f5 21 gxf5 with equality.

c) 12...c5! 13 bxc5 bxc5 14 g3 0-0 15 f4 d6 16 g4 fxe4 17 dxe4 dxe4 18 fxe4 dxe4 19 fxe4 dxe4 20 fxe4 dxe4 21 fxe4 f5 22 gxf5 gxf5 23 d4 with equality.

c3) 12...d5! is probably the only good move here. Then 13 f4 dxe4 14 dxe4 dxe4 15 dxe4 f5 16 g4 e5 17 dxe5 fxe5 18 gxf5 dxe5 19 fxe5 dxe5 20 fxe5 dxe5 21 gxf5 with equality.

12...dxc5 13 g3 0-0

13...f5 14 0-0-0 f4 worked out well after 15 g4? in Dreev-Supatashvili, Moscow 2001, but White could have used his lead in development more aggressively with 15 e2! d5 16 gxf4 e5 17 e1! (or 16...f5 17 e2! d5 18 f4 e5 19 g5 h6 20 e4 f5 21 d4 fxe4 22 dxe4 fxe4 23 e5 f6 24 gxf5 gxf5 25 e6 dxe6 26 fxe6 fxe6 27 e7 f7 28 g5 e8 29 e6 f6 30 d5 1-0

Game 13

Lautier-Timman

Amsterdam 1996

1 d4 d5 2 e4 e5 3 c3 c6 4 b4 a6 5 b5...
The best move. White does not want to allow 11 0-0-0 0h5!, when he has no advantage after 12 d6 xd6 13 xd6 0-0 14 g3 f5 15 g2 (15 f4?! fx4 16 exf4 exf4 17 wxf4 c8 is even more dangerous for White) 15...f4 16 h8 d1 w5 17 d2 e5, as in Greenfeld-Kindermann, Pardubice 1994.

11...0-0 12 0-0-0

This is by far the most promising continuation. After 12 d1 a5 Black appears to be doing all right. Play might develop as follows: 13 g5!? (13 g3!? w7? 14 e5 e7 15 d6 f5 16 exf6 dxf6 17 d3 dxe4 18 xex4 dxe4 19 wxe4 and Black cannot be that much worse, if at all, Gurievich-Chuchelov, Germany 1995) 13...h6 14 h4 e5? (Black is okay after 14 w7 15 xf6 gxf6 16 d3 h7 15 0-0 w7 16 h1 g5 17 g3 h8 18 f3 e4 19 d2 d5 20 c3 d4 21 f1 g4 and now instead of 22 e2, as in Dreev-Adams, London (rapid) 1995, White could have won with 22 d5!!! dxd5 23 exd5 e5 (23...xf3 24 xd4 and Black is on the wrong side of a strong attack) 24 wxf3 xf3 25 wxf6 fxg2+ 26 wg2 wxc4 27 xd4 wxd4 28 xe5 wg4+ 29 w1 w7 30 wgl etc. (Vaiisser).

12 e5 meets with 12...h5! 13 xh5 w4 14 xf7+ xf7 15 g3 wxc4, while in the vent of 12 0-0 Black has 12...d4? with the wild idea of 13 d6 xc3 14 xf8 dxe4 15 b4 e5 16 f5, with strong compensation. For more cautious players I recommend 13.e8! 14 e5 (14 d3 e5 looks even better for Black) 14...xc3 15 wxc3 e4 with equality.

12...e8

Also possible are one decent alternative and two mistakes:

a) 12...c8 13 b1 a5 (13...e8 14 g3? f6 15 b4 e7 16 g4! d7 17 b5 a8 18 d3 xa3 19 wxd7 wxd7 20 wxd7 f7 21 d1 with a clear advantage for White) 14 g3 e8 15 he1 w7 16 d3 f6 17 f4 w8 18 f2 should supposedly give White a small advantage, as in Greenfeld-Yu, Beijing 1996, but it does not appear to be that clear, does it?

b) 12...e5? 13 xe5 g4 14 xg4 w5+ 15 b1 w4 16 d5 xd5 17 cxd5 ac8 18 f3 wg6 19 c3 left White with an extra pawn in Krasenkov-Hellsten, Malmo 1995.

c) 12...xf2?! 13 d6 e8 14 e5 xg2 15 h1 xg1 16 xg1 b7 17 d3 c8 18 g3 g6 19 w4, with a very dangerous position for Black (Piket).

13 g3

This appears to be the strongest. The alternative 13 b1? is probably not best met with 13...f6 14 g3 e5 15 f4 d4 16 b5! xb5 17 cxb5 e8 18 w4 c7 19 c1, with an advantage to White in Greenfeld-Tunk, Beersheva 1996. Instead Black has 13...e5 14 xe5 xf2 15 d3 f6!? 16 f4
Queen's Indian Defence

\[ \text{d4} 17 \text{h}1 \text{f1} \text{with close to equality, or even}
13...\text{xf2!} 14 \text{d3 c5} 15 e5 f5 and the pawn sacrifice gives White compensation, but not too much.

13...e5

Here you can also take the direct route to the insane asylum with 13...f5!? 14 exf5 exf5 15 f3 g5+ 16 b1 f4 17 d3 fxg3 18 \text{h7}+ f7 19 f4 f6 20 h3 d6 21 g4 e7, and who can tell what the hell is going on here without scanning all the other games in the database and spending two weeks with this position?! Piket-Timman, The Hague 1995 ended in a draw.

14 b1

14 xe5 g5+ 15 f4 e3+ 16 b1 xf4 17 d4 e5? with equality according to Tiviakov.

14...d4 15 b5 xb5 16 cxb5 We7

Here I prefer 16...c8 17 a4, when Black has a couple of options. 17...d6 18 h4 h6 (18...d5 19 f4 c5 was played in Watson-Browne, USA 1996, and now White could probably have gained an advantage by bringing his last piece into play with 20 h1f1!) 19 f4 g5 was Van Wely-Adams, Wijk aan Zee 1998, and now White would have the advantage after 20 g3! xe4 (20...gx6 21 f4 xe4 22 xe5 xe5 23 xe4 appears even more dangerous) 21 fxe5 xe3 22 hxe3 xe3 23 d6. Alternatively 17...e7 18 c1 d6 19 d3 h5 20 h4 led to equality in Van Wely-Timman, Breda 1998.

17 xd4? exd4 18 d1 d5?

Black is trying to complicate the position. 18...c5 19 b4 xc2+ 20 xc2 c8+ 21 b2 d6 22 xd4 fe8 23 d3 gives White a small advantage in the endgame due to the two bishops.

19 exd5 d6

19...d6 20 d6 d7 21 xd4 is just very good for White.

20 d3! h6?

A grave error. After 20...xc8! 21 e2 (21 a4 c5!) 21...xe2 22 xe2 the chances are even (Lautier).

21 wa4 wf6?!

Black continues to hesitate about seizing the open file, and soon it is too late. After 21...c8 22 xd4 fe8 23 f4 ed8 24 h4 c5 25 a4 White is slightly better.

22 c1! d5?

Still not doing too well.

23 c7! h4? 24 f4! xg2 25 e5 Wh4 25...d8 26 xd4 f6 27 e4 wins for White immediately.

26 xd4 e1

26...f6 27 e4 fxe5 28 Wh7+ f7 29 c7+ e8 30 g6+ and White mates.

27 g1!

27 xg7?! meets with 27...b3!, when matters are less clear.

27...f6 28 xe1?!

Here Lautier later felt his queen was better placed and that 28 xe1 fxe5 29 fxe5 would
have won easier as both the pawns march forward and the idea of \( \text{e}1-\text{e}2 \) followed by \( \text{g}1-\text{g}6-\text{h}7 \) seems to have deadly powers.

28 ... \( \text{xf}e1 \) 29 \( \text{xe}1 \) \( \text{fxe}5 \) 30 \( \text{fxe}5 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 31 \( \text{h}4! \) \( \text{g}5 \)

31 ... \( \text{c}8 \) 32 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 33 \( \text{c}4+ \) \( \text{d}7 \) 34 \( \text{c}6+ \) \( \text{x}d6 \) 35 \( \text{e}7 \) and White wins.

32 \( \text{hxg}5 \) \( \text{hxg}5 \) 33 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{ad}8 \)

33 ... \( \text{h}8 \) followed by the e-pawn's march forward wins for White.

34 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 35 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{h}8 \)

35 ... \( \text{f}4 \) 36 \( \text{e}6 \) \( \text{x}g4 \) 37 \( \text{e}4 \) and the king marches to the centre to assist the pawns forward.

38 \( \text{x}g4 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 39 \( \text{x}g5 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 40 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{h}8 \)

41 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{h}1 \) 42 \( \text{g}8 \) 1-0

**Game 14**

**Gershon-Anastasian**

**Saint Vincent 2000**

1 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 2 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 3 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 4 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 5 \( \text{c}3 \)

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

This is the most serious alternative to 5 ... \( \text{d}5 \), although Black hardly ever equals. The other option worth mentioning is 5 ... \( \text{c}4?! \), a variation I have tried without any pleasure. Black has no real chance to fight for equality. A good, solid way for White to gain an advantage is 6 \( \text{c}xe4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 7 e3 \( \text{e}7 \) 8 \( \text{d}3 \), e.g. 8 ... \( \text{d}5?! \) (8 ... \( \text{xd}3 \) 9 \( \text{xd}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 10 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 11 \( \text{e}0-0 \) 0-0 12 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \) gave White a safe plus in Browne-Trois, Buenos Aires 1979) 9 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{dx}e4 \) 10 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 11 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}6?! \) 11 ... \( \text{c}5?! \) 12 \( \text{fxe}4 \) \( \text{cxd}4 \) 13 \( \text{d}4+ \) \( \text{f}7 \) 14 \( \text{f}3 \) favours White, as does 11 ... \( \text{e}5 \) 12 \( \text{fxe}4 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 13 \( \text{e}5 \) 0-0 14 \( \text{e}4 \) 12 ... \( \text{d}7?! \) 13 \( \text{fxe}4 \) \( \text{h}4+ \) 14 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{g}4+ \) 15 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 16 \( \text{f}1 \) also gives White a grip on the light squares, but still it was a fighting chance – now White is just much better) 13 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 0-0 15 \( \text{c}5! \) \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 16 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 17 \( \text{dx}c5 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 18 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 19 \( \text{c}2 \) with a clear advantage for White in Kramnik-Vaganian, Horgen 1995.

6 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{x}f3 \)

This is the only move that makes sense. After 6 ... \( \text{g}7? \) 7 \( \text{e}4 \) The bishop is not very good on \( \text{b}7 \). 7 ... \( \text{d}5 \) (7 ... \( \text{g}7 \) 8 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 10 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{bd}7 \) 11 \( \text{e}2 \) was very good for White in Dreev-Sorokin, St.Petersburg 1993) 8 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 9 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 10 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) (White also had a solid advantage after 10 ... \( \text{xc}3 \) 11 \( \text{bxc}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 0-0 12 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 13 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 14 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 15 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{xc}6 \) 16 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 17 \( \text{h}6 \) in Farago-Podlesnik, Bled 1996) 11 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 12 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 13 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 14 0-0 \( \text{e}8 \) 15 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 16 \( \text{b}5 \) and Black is in trouble, Christiansen-Schroll, Vienna 1991.

7 \( \text{e}5 \)

Also good is 7 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 8 \( \text{d}1 \) ?! \( \text{g}7 \) 9 \( \text{g}5 \) 0-0 10 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 11 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 12 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 13 \( \text{b}4 \), when White had the advantage in Garcia Ilundain-Epishin, Manresa 1995. Romero Holmes writes that White is better in view of the superior bishop and the weakness of \( \text{c}6 \). 7 ... \( \text{g}7 \)

This move has to be played, so just get it out. After 7 ... \( \text{c}6 \) 8 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 9 \( \text{g}5 \) 0-0 10 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 11 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 12 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 13 \( \text{b}4 \), when White had the advantage in Garcia Ilundain-Epishin, Manresa 1995. Ro-
Queen's Indian Defence


8  

This is the most normal move. The alternatives just seem to be too premature. 8 g4 0-0 9  

10 g5  

d5 11 cxd5 exd5 12 f4  

c6 13 e2 e7 14 g3 c5 15 dx5 d4 gave Black good counterplay in Kozul-Romanishin, Yerevan 1996, while 8 d5 0-0 9  

e2 exd5 10 cxd5 c6 11 dxc6  

e6 12  

a4 13 0-0 b5 14  

h4 15  

g5  

f6 was certainly not worse for Black in Lalic-Romanishin, Germany 1996.

8...0-0 9 h4

Here it is actually most natural to castle first. In the following game Black chooses a good set-up compared to the main game: 9  

0-0 d5 10 g4 dxc4 11  

e4  

c6 12 h4  

d5 13 e4 d7 14 h5  

e7 15 hxg6 hxg6 16  

dxc5  

exd5 17  

c3  

d6 with a good game for Black, Huzman-Van der Wiel, Pula 1997. 10 cxd5  

cxd5 11  

xc4  

cia 12  

d6 13 d5 e5 would be the critical position. I prefer White due to the control over the light squares.

9...c6

Here Black has 9...d5!? 10 cxd5  

xd5 11  

xc4  

wd6, with a slight edge for White.

10 0-0-0 d5

Black is trying to defend. Active counterplay with 13...c5 14 hxg6 hxg6 15 dx5  

f6 invites 16 g5, undermining the defence of the centre.

14 hxg6 hxg6

14...fxg6 15 g5  

h5 16 f4 and White has the advantage due to the weak light squares in the centre.

15  

d3

15  

e2? makes more sense in some ways because it monitors the h5-square. But from  

d3 the bishop might be sacrificed on g6 later!

15...c6

Before he can think of any counterplay Black has to protect the d5-pawn.

16  

h3!

16  

h6?  

xh6+ 17  

xh6  

xg4! gives Black some interesting opportunities. For this there is no reason.

16...c4 17  

g5  

d6

18  

xg6!

This sacrifice does present Black with more problems than most players can solve at the board. But it does seem that as White does not have anything directly winning that it is not the objectively best continuation. 18  

h1  

c7 19  

c2 followed by  

f4 is also very dangerous for Black.

18...fxg6 19  

xg6  

f8

Better is 19...d7! 20  

f7+  

f7 21  

h6  

e6 22  

f5+  

f6 23  

g6+  

f8 24  

h1  

e8 25  

h8+  

g8 26  

f5+  

f6 27  

xf6  

xf6 28  

h5, when White has some advan-
The Petrosian System: 4 a3

With a mating attack. Black resigned.

Game 15
Neverov-Stefanova
Reykjavik 2002

1 c4 e6 2 d4 Qf6 3 Qf3 b6 4 a3 Qb7 5 Qc3 d5

Addressing the Qc4 problem and therefore winning the game.

38...dxe4 39 Qxe6+ Qg7 40 Qxc4 exf3
41 Qe8 Qxf2 42 Qg8+ Qh7 43 Qh8+ Qg7 44 Qg8+ Qf6 45 Qh6+ 1-0
found sufficient defences after $8\ \text{Wxd7+} \ A\text{bxd7} \ A\text{b5 A\text{d8!}}$ (the most logical, and also the height of fashion), e.g. $10\ \text{cx} d5 \ A\text{f4? dxc4} \ A\text{xc7} + \ A\text{xc7} \ A\text{xc7} \ 0\-0\ 13 \ A\text{c1 Ac8} \ 14 \ A\text{f4 b5} \text{ and Black is better. The control over the centre and the queenside majority is far more important than the dark squares, Van Wely-Gelfand, Monaco 2001) 10...\text{Axd5} \ A\text{e4} \ A\text{f6} \ A\text{d5} \ A\text{xd5} \ A\text{c1+} \ 15 \ A\text{xc1 leads to the win of a pawn for White, but Bacrot-Gelfand, Leon 2001 continued 12...\text{Axe4}! \ 13 \ A\text{xc7} + \ A\text{xc7} \ 14 \ A\text{xc7 A\text{c1+} 15 \ A\text{xc1 leads to the win of a pawn for White.}}$

This leaves 12 a4 c6 13 axb5 cxb5 14 \text{We4} 0-0 15 \text{f4! (White is playing for structure; after 15 A\text{a5 b4} 16 \text{Aa4 A\text{d8!} 17 \text{Axc5 Wd5} 18 \text{Aa4 A\text{c6} 19 A\text{g2} A\text{b6} 20 f4 \text{fd8 Black is ideally placed according to Gelfand), and now time has validated 15...A\text{c8! (15...A\text{c6, as in Gelfand-Lautier, Biel 1997, has also been played). Now White has more than one possibility:}}}$

a) 16 \text{Wxa8 A\text{c6} 17 Wxc8+ Wxc8 18 A\text{g2 a6} 19 0-0 g6 and the primary factor in the position is Black's future on the queenside.}

b) 16 A\text{g2 A\text{c6} 17 0-0 (17 A\text{xb5? A\text{b4} 18 Wb7 Wd8 and White is not well coordinated, nor fully developed) 17...A\text{ab8 18 A\text{h3 shows that White can earn no advantage from 16 A\text{g2. Bacrot-Gershon, Bermuda 1999 continued 18...b4 19 A\text{a4 A\text{d8} 20 A\text{c5 Wd5} 21 A\text{g2 A\text{xd4} 22 exd4 A\text{xd4 23 A\text{a4 \text{1/2-1/2.}}}}}$

c) 16 A\text{h3!? attacks on the light squares, where White is better. All other moves are harmless. Piket-Khalifman, Wijk aan Zee 2002, went 16...A\text{c6 17 A\text{xb5 A\text{ab8} 18 A\text{c3 A\text{xb2} 19 0-0 A\text{b3 with a very promising position for Black, but best seems 19...A\text{xd4! with the idea of 20 exd4 Wxd4 21 Wxd4 A\text{xd4 22 A\text{a1? (otherwise three pawns and the better structure should be important, too) 22...A\text{b3 and Black wins. 17 d5 A\text{d8} 18 0-0 is a suggestion – without an evaluation – of Gelfand. Black should be fine if he chooses to play 18...b4 19 A\text{a4 exd5 20 A\text{xd7 dxe4 21 A\text{xc8 A\text{xc8, when the passed pawns are of paramount importance, and White is}}}$

White in Gelfand-Karpov, Dortmund 1997, when Black was still far from finishing his development. Here 11 0-0-0! meets with 11...\text{Axd4} 12 A\text{xd4 A\text{c8} 13 A\text{h4 h6 etc. Instead 9...A\text{xf3! 10 gxf3 b5 and the queen does not escape) 14...A\text{xf8 15 A\text{xb5 Wd5 sees Black win the f3-pawn, with dangerous threats on the dark squares.}}}$

This leaves 12 a4 c6 13 axb5 cxb5 14 Wxe4 0-0 15 f4! (White is playing for structure; after 15 A\text{a5 b4} 16 A\text{a4 A\text{d8!} 17 A\text{c5 Wd5 18 A\text{a4 A\text{c6} 19 A\text{g2} A\text{b6} 20 f4 \text{fd8 Black is ideally placed according to Gelfand), and now time has validated 15...A\text{c8! (15...A\text{c6, as in Gelfand-Lautier, Biel 1997, has also been played). Now White has more than one possibility:}}}$

a) 16 Wxa8 A\text{c6} 17 Wxc8+ Wxc8 18 A\text{g2 a6} 19 0-0 g6 and the primary factor in the position is Black's future on the queenside.}

b) 16 A\text{g2 A\text{c6} 17 0-0 (17 A\text{xb5? A\text{b4} 18 Wb7 Wd8 and White is not well coordinated, nor fully developed) 17...A\text{ab8 18 A\text{h3 shows that White can earn no advantage from 16 A\text{g2. Bacrot-Gershon, Bermuda 1999 continued 18...b4 19 A\text{a4 A\text{d8} 20 A\text{c5 Wd5} 21 A\text{g2 A\text{xd4} 22 exd4 A\text{xd4 23 A\text{a4 \text{1/2-1/2.}}}}}$

c) 16 A\text{h3!? attacks on the light squares, where White is better. All other moves are harmless. Piket-Khalifman, Wijk aan Zee 2002, went 16...A\text{c6 17 A\text{xb5 A\text{ab8} 18 A\text{c3 A\text{xb2} 19 0-0 A\text{b3 with a very promising position for Black, but best seems 19...A\text{xd4! with the idea of 20 exd4 Wxd4 21 Wxd4 A\text{xd4 22 A\text{a1? (otherwise three pawns and the better structure should be important, too) 22...A\text{b3 and Black wins. 17 d5 A\text{d8} 18 0-0 is a suggestion – without an evaluation – of Gelfand. Black should be fine if he chooses to play 18...b4 19 A\text{a4 exd5 20 A\text{xd7 dxe4 21 A\text{xc8 A\text{xc8, when the passed pawns are of paramount importance, and White is}}}$

White in Gelfand-Karpov, Dortmund 1997, when Black was still far from finishing hi
struggling for survival.
9...b5 10 d1 a6 11 e2 h6 12 h4

\[ \begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
13 & 0-0 0-0 14 e5 \\
\hline
\end{array} \]

14...c5?

Here Black loses the chance to gain a clear opening advantage. After 14...c6 White has no better move than the exchange of knights, as d4 is hanging. After the trade Black needs slightly less space in which to manoeuvre, and the pawn grows in stature.

15 d5! exd5 16 exd5 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qd7?}}} \)!

16...exd5P 17 g3 xc3 18 xd8 xe2+ 19 xe2 xd8 with a situation that is very difficult to assess. Black is, in theory, better placed, with the large majority on the queenside, but there will be considerable problems completing development.

17 xe7 xe7 18 g4

\[ \begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
\end{array} \]

Here White finally has a very interesting position. For the pawn he has a strong passed pawn on d5, while Black’s development difficulties remain.

18...f5 19 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qe3 f4}}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qf5 Wg5}}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qd6 Qe5}}} \) 22 f3 a7 23 a4 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qw8}}} \) 24 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qce4 Qb6}}} \) 25 g3 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qed7}}} \) 26 Qh1 Qf6 27 Qxf4 Qbd7 28 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qf5 Qxd5?!}}} \)

28...d5 looks better, with a complex struggle ahead. Now White slowly takes over.

29 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qxd5 Qxd5}}} \) 30 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qe7+ Qh8}}} \) 31 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qxd5 We6}}} \) 32 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qd1 Qf5}}} \) 33 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qdc3 b4}}} \) 34 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qd6 Wf7}}} \) 35 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qd5 c3}}} \) 36 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qc4 Wh5}}} \) 37 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Qg2 Qf8}}} \) 38 bxc3 Qe5 39 We2 Qxc4 40 Wxc4 bxc4 41 Wxc3 Qb7 42 Qg3 Wh4 43 Qe6 Qd7 44 We5 Qd8 45 Qxh6+

45...Qg8 46 We6+ Qf7 47 Qh5 Qd6 48 Wh3 Qh6 49 Qh6 gxh6 50 We6 Wf8 51 f5 c4 52 f6 Qh7 53 We4+ Qh8 54 Qxc4 Wb8 55 We4 a5 56 Wg6 Qb7 57 Qe7 Qb2+ 58 Qh3 Wf8 59 Qg6 1-0

\[ \begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
\end{array} \]

\textbf{Game 16}

\textbf{Piket-Anand}

\textit{Monte Carlo (blindfold) 1997}

1 d4 Qf6 2 c4 e6 3 Qf3 b6 4 Qc3 Qb7 5 a3 d5 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{Wc2?!}}} \)

This move has been known ever since 1950, but it was only when Gelfand used it against Kasparov in 1992 that it became fashionable. As with the 6 Qg5 line its span in the great circulation of modern theory was short, as Black quickly found the right way to respond. In this game we shall see two such
Queen's Indian Defence

examples.

6...dxc4

This is the current trend, but I prefer 6...c5, although it is a matter of taste. However, not good for Black is 6...Qbd7?! 7 cxd5 Qxd5 8 Qxd5. Then 8...exd5 9 Qg5 gives White a small edge, but 8...Qxd5? 9 e4 Qb7 10 Qb5! c6 (otherwise Qc6 with a great advantage) 11 Qxc6 Qc8 12 d5 Qc7 is a different story. Now instead of 13 Qd4? as in Gelfand-Karpov, Moscow 1992, White should play 13 Qc3! Qxc6 14 Qc1 exd5 (14...Qb8 15 dxс6! Qxc6 16 0-0 e5 17 b4 and Black is still struggling to complete his development) 15 exd5 Qb8 16 dxс6! Qxc6 17 Qb1 Qd8 18 Qa4+! with a lasting initiative.

Returning to 6...c5!, this is the tactician’s preference. After 7 cxd5 cxd5 8 Qa4+ Qbd7 White has three logical options (of different value):

a) 9 Qxd4?! Qc5 10 Qa4 exd5! 11 Qg5 0-0 12 e3 Qe7! and White needs to develop quickly, but chose not to in Gofshtein-Altman, Israel 1997.

b) 9 dxс6 dxс3 10 edx7+ Qxd7 11 Qxd7+ Qxd7 12 bxc3 Qe7 13 Qc3! Qc8 14 Qd4 0-0 15 e3 Qc5 16 Qd2 (16 Qe2? Qb3 17 Qb1 [17 Qa2? Qd5 and Black is getting some action] 17...Qxd4 18 cxd4 Qxa3 and Black is better due to the pawns and bishops) 16...Qa4! 17 c4 Qc5 with good compensation for the pawn, Lputian-Dautov, Budapest 1996.

c) 9 Qxd4 has become the critical move, although Black has nothing to fear after 9...Qxd5 10 Qxd5 Qxd5 11 e4 Qb7, e.g. 12 Qe3 a6 13 f3 b5 14 Qd1 Qe7 15 Qe2 0-0 16 Qc8 17 Qe1 Qg5 18 Qf2 Qe5 19 Qd1 Qe7 and Black had equalised so effortlessly that he became too ambitious in Dreev-Karpov, Cap d’Agde 2000. Cramling-Xu Jun, Yerevan 1996 went 12 Qa6 Qxa6 13 Qxa6 Qc5 14 Qe3 0-0 15 0-0 Qf6 16 Qad1 Qc8! with equality.

6...Qe7 is dealt with in the next game.

7 e4 c5 8 d5

8 dxс5 seems to be rather harmless. After 8...Qxc5 9 Qxc4 Qbd7 10 0-0 Qc7 11 Qd3 a6 12 Qg5 Qe5! Black already has a pleasant position. In fact in Sokolov-Polugayevsky, Holland 1994 the sequence 13 Qxe5 Qxe5 14 Qh4 Qh5! 15 Qa4+! Qf8 16 Qd7 g5! gave him a great position.

8...exd5 9 exd5 a6!

This is the way they are doing it these days. After the passive 9...Qd6 10 Qg5 0-0 11 0-0-0 Qbd7 12 Qxc4 Qb8 13 Qb1 a6 14 Qe4 Qxe4 15 Qxe4 Qe8 16 Qg4 Qf8 17 Qd3 Qc8 18 Qh5 Qc7 19 Qc1 White had a little pressure in Lautier-Karpov, Monte Carlo 1996.

10 Qg5?!

The beginning of a wild stream of complications that ends with an equal position.

10 Qxc4 b5 11 Qa2 Qd6 12 Qg5 0-0 13 0-0 Qbd7 14 Qad1 Qc7 15 Qb1 Qe8 and
Black was in no way worse in Avrukh-Anand, Haifa 2000. Instead 11...e7?? is poor since the bishop belongs in front of the d-pawn. Sakaev- Veingold, Moscow 1994 went 12 0-0 0-0 13 g5 Bd7 14 a6 w6 15 h4 with an advantage to White in view of 15...g6? 16 hxg6 hxg6 17 d6 exd6 18 wXg6+, when White wins.

10...b5 11 0-0-0 d6 12 e4 e7 13 xc4?! This attack seems incorrect. 13 x6f6 xf6 14 xxc5 0-0 (14...c8 15 e4+ with an attack) 15 xxb7 wC7 16 g4? was a try for an advantage.

13...bxc4 14 h6 0-0 15 d6 xe4 16 xxe4 xxd6 17 e5 bd7? 17...c3! would have disturbed White considerably. Now we are heading for a draw.

18 xxd6 e4

19 xxd8 xxd6 20 xxd7 xfd8 21 xdb6 xab8 22 xxc4 xxc4 ½-½

Game 17
Cramling-Almasi
Horgen 1995

1 d4 f6 2 c4 e6 3 f3 b6 4 a3 b7 5 xC3 d5 6 wc2

Another way to lead to the positions in the game (in fact the most common) is the following: 6 cxd5 xc5 7 d2 (7 wc2 xe7 8 xd2 has been seen, but the most popular replies to 7 wc2 are 7...c5 and 7...xc3, while White often prefers 8 e4, transposing to 7...xc3 7...d7 8 wc2. Now 8...c5 seems safe enough, albeit a little boring. Akopian-Gurevich, Haifa 1995 continued 9 e4 xc3 10 xxc3 xxd4 11 xxd4 a6 12 g3 wc7 13 g2 e7!? 14 0-0 0-0 15 xac1 xac8 16 wc2 ffd8! (the x-ray finds no practical use, so Black ignores it) 17 xdb3 xg5 18 xbd7 xe7 xxe7 with equality. Instead 8...e7 9 e4 xc3 10 xc3 0-0 would be a very natural transposition to our main game, which seems more interesting and equally sound.

6...e7 7 cxd5 xc5

7...exd5 leads to positions similar to the 4...d5 lines. There is no need for exact theoretical knowledge there.

8 xd2 0-0 9 e4 xc3 10 xc3 d7 11 0-0-0

11...c6!

11...wc8 12 h4 xd8 13 xh3 h6!? 14 d5 15 g5! (threatening e4-e5) 15...hxg5 16 hxg5 g4 (16...xe8! 17 f4 gives White a very strong attack as the black pieces are not playing) 17 f4 xc5! 18 xg7? xc7 19 wc3+ and White had a very interesting attack in Akopian-Granda Zuniga, Groningen 1993. Best for Black here is 19...w8! 20 xh7 x7, bringing the king to safety, when 21 xe2 exd5 22 f5 is messy indeed.

12 h4 b5 13 xxb1

More direct is 13 xh3!? a5 14 d5 cxd5 15 xb5, as in Kamsky-Anand, Sanghi Nagar.
1994. Black defended well by taking the central squares with 15...\(\text{Qf6}\) 16 \(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{Wb6}\) 17 exd5 \(\text{Ac8}\)! 18 \(\text{Ad7}\) \(\text{xd5}\)! 19 \(\text{Ac8}\) \(\text{xc8}\) 20 \(\text{xd5}\) (the bishop seems to be stronger than the rook, so this exchange is quite natural) 20...exd5 21 \(\text{Wf5}\) \(\text{Wa6}\), and now instead of the adventurous 22 \(\text{Qd2}\)? White should have settled for the repetition after 22 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{Wf1+}\) 23 \(\text{a2}\) \(\text{c4+}\).

13...a5 14 \(\text{Qe1}\)?

This move hurts my eyes. I cannot see how the bishop will ever be a useful piece on e1.

Better, in my opinion, is 14 \(\text{Qd2}\) b4 15 a4 c5 16 d5?! (this pawn sac seems wrong; 16 \(\text{Qg5}\)! is obviously superior, getting all the pieces into action) 16...exd5 17 exd5 \(\text{Ad5}\) 18 \(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{Qf6}\), Mikhailchishin-Petrosian, Lvov 1994, when Black has the initiative and a pawn and, therefore, the better prospects (his pieces are only temporarily awkwardly placed in the centre).

14 d5 exd5 15 \(\text{Qg5}\) (15 \(\text{Qxb5}\) \(\text{Mc8}\) 16 exd5 \(\text{Ad5}\) 17 \(\text{Ad3}\) \(\text{Wb6}\)! looks good for Black) 15...dxe4 16 \(\text{Qxb5}\) \(\text{Qd5}\) 17 \(\text{Qxe4}\) \(\text{Wc7}\) was good enough for Black in Tregubov-Akesson, Cap d’Agde 1994, although White has quite a bit of compensation for the pawn.

14...b4 15 a4 \(\text{Mc8}\) 16 \(\text{Qg5}\) c5 17 d5 \(\text{Qxg5}\)!

17...e5? fails to 18 \(\text{De6}\)! fxe6 19 dxe6, when White is better.

18 h\(\text{hxg5}\)

No improvement is 18 dxe6 fxe6 19 \(\text{ac5}\) (19 h\(\text{hxg5}\) \(\text{We7}\) and Black’s position is comfortably superior, with, among others, ...\(\text{Qb6}\) and ...c5-c4 coming) 19...\(\text{ac6}\)! 20 \(\text{Qxc6}\) \(\text{xc6}\) 21 h\(\text{hxg5}\) \(\text{We7}\) and White is very weak on the highly important light squares.

18...exd5 19 exd5 g6 20 \(\text{Qb5}\)

20 \(\text{Wb3}\) \(\text{Wxg5}\) 21 \(\text{Wh3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) and Black is close to winning. 20 f4 is met by 20...\(\text{Qb6}\).

20...\(\text{Qxb6}\)

Black is clearly better according to Almasi.

21 d6 c4?

21...\(\text{Qxg2}\)! 22 \(\text{Qh2}\) \(\text{Qf3}\) and White is finished.

22 f3! c3! 23 b3

 Forced. 23 d7 b3! wins on the spot for Black.

23...\(\text{Qd5}\) 24 \(\text{Qf2}\)!

More tricks: 24 d7 \(\text{Qe3}\)! and Black wins.

24...\(\text{Wxg5}\) 25 d7 \(\text{Qb8}\) 26 \(\text{Qh4}\)!

Here White had the chance to gain good counterplay with 26 \(\text{Qd4}\)! \(\text{Qe3}\) 27 \(\text{Qxe3}\) \(\text{Wxe3}\) 28 \(\text{Qe1}\) \(\text{Wg5}\) 29 \(\text{Qe8}\), although Black’s chances are preferable after 29...\(\text{Qd8}\)! etc.

26...\(\text{Qf4}\) 27 \(\text{Qe1}\)?

White is on the way, not to sacrifice an exchange, but to win a piece. The only problem is that a bishop on d5 together with the strong c3-pawn combine to provide Black with decisive compensation. 27 \(\text{Qf2}\) was better according to Almasi.

27...\(\text{Qe3}\) 28 \(\text{Qxe3}\) \(\text{Wxe3}\) 29 \(\text{Qe1}\) \(\text{Wb6}\) 30
White has a piece but, as promised, Black is very close to winning.

34 \( \texttt{a}g3 \) \( \texttt{w}d2 \) 35 \( \texttt{a}b1 \) \( \texttt{w}e3! \) 36 \( \texttt{a}b5 \) \( \texttt{a}x\texttt{b}3! \) 37 \( \texttt{w}x\texttt{b}3 \) \( \texttt{w}g1+ \) 38 \( \texttt{a}a2 \) \( \texttt{w}x\texttt{g}2+ \) 39 \( \texttt{a}a1 \) \( \texttt{w}x\texttt{g}3 \) 40 \( \texttt{w}d1 \) \( \texttt{w}f2 \) 41 \( \texttt{a}e2 \) \( \texttt{b}3! \) 42 \( \texttt{w}x\texttt{b}3 \) \( \texttt{w}x\texttt{e}2 \) 43 \( \texttt{w}x\texttt{c}3 \) \( \texttt{w}d1+ \) 44 \( \texttt{a}b2 \) \( \texttt{w}d8 \) 0-1

White has had enough.

**Game 18**

*Timman-Polgar*

*Bali 2000*

1 \( \texttt{d}f3 \) \( \texttt{f}f6 \) 2 c4 b6 3 d4 e6 4 a3 \( \texttt{b}7 \) 5 \( \texttt{c}3 \) d5 6 cxd5 \( \texttt{c}xd5 \) 7 \( \texttt{w}c2! \)

This is the most popular move in this position with GMs today, and for good reason. As we shall see Black has no clear-cut path to development and, in fact, this is the main reason why I cannot fully recommend the system with 4...\( \texttt{b}7 \) followed by 6...\( \texttt{d}5 \). I just do not feel comfortable about the resulting positions.

7...\( \texttt{d}xc3 \)

7...c5 is dealt with in the following game.

8 \( \texttt{b}xc3 \)

This has become the only serious move. In the late 1980's 8 \( \texttt{w}x\texttt{c}3? \) was also played quite a lot, but several methods to equalise were quickly found. The simplest is 8...\( \texttt{e}d7 \) 9 \( \texttt{g}5 \) (9 \( \texttt{f}4 \) \( \texttt{d}6 \) is no problem at all for Black) 9...\( \texttt{e}7 \) 10 \( \texttt{w}xe7 \) \( \texttt{d}xe7 \) (the king is not exposed, so this yields no problems) 11 \( \texttt{e}8 \) \( \texttt{c}8 \) 12 \( \texttt{e}2 \) c5 13 dxc5? (this starts a kamikaze journey for the queen which leads only to problems; 13 0-0 is better) 13...\( \texttt{a}c5! \) 14 \( \texttt{w}x\texttt{g}7 \) \( \texttt{g}8 \) 15 \( \texttt{w}x\texttt{h}7 \) \( \texttt{x}x\texttt{g}2 \) (the white king is more awkward in the centre as Black is well developed) 16 \( \texttt{h}4+ \) \( \texttt{f}6 \) 17 \( \texttt{d}1 \) \( \texttt{w}c7 \) 18 \( \texttt{d}4 \) a5! and Black is clearly better according to Petursson. Portisch-Karpov, Biel 1996 saw White blunder with 19 \( \texttt{d}5? \) (19 \( \texttt{h}3? \) 19...\( \texttt{b}5 \)!) 20 \( \texttt{a}x\texttt{b}5 \) \( \texttt{g}4 \) 0-1.

8...\( \texttt{e}7 \) 9 e4 0-0 10 \( \texttt{d}3 \) c5 11 0-0

Here there is a very interesting alternative. Of course this can also be played at move 13, but it is for some reason seen more often here - namely 11 \( \texttt{b}2 \), when Piket-Rau, Rotterdam 1988 continued 11...\( \texttt{e}8 \) 12 \( \texttt{e}2 \) \( \texttt{a}6 \) 13 0-0 \( \texttt{x}d3 \) 14 \( \texttt{x}d3 \) \( \texttt{a}6 \) (14...\( \texttt{c}d4 \) 15 \( \texttt{c}d4 \) \( \texttt{a}6 \) 16 \( \texttt{w}c3 \) \( \texttt{d}7 \) 17 \( \texttt{d}5 \) gives White the initiative, while 14...\( \texttt{c}6 \) 15 \( \texttt{a}5 \) \( \texttt{c}4 \) is overwhelmingly better for White) 15 c4! \( \texttt{c}d4 \) 16 \( \texttt{c}d4 \) \( \texttt{b}7 \) (16...\( \texttt{e}8 \)!) 17 \( \texttt{b}5 \) \( \texttt{c}6 \) 18 \( \texttt{g}3 \) e5 19 f4! was very promising for White in Piket-Polugaevsky, Aruba 1994) 17 \( \texttt{g}3 \) (17 \( \texttt{b}5? \) also looks good) 17...\( \texttt{a}6 \) 18 \( \texttt{e}5 \) \( \texttt{e}7 \) 19 \( \texttt{d}1 \) \( \texttt{d}8 \) 20 \( \texttt{b}5 \) \( \texttt{x}d1 \) 21 \( \texttt{x}d1 \) \( \texttt{a}6 \) with an unclear game. I think that this is more unclear for White than for Black, if you get my drift. White has some strong plans involving the advance of the h-pawn. Note that 15 c4! is far stronger than 15 \( \texttt{c}3 \) \( \texttt{d}7 \) 16 \( \texttt{d}1 \) \( \texttt{c}8 \) 17 \( \texttt{d}2 \) b5, where the
bishops is poor on b2. Black has at least equalised, and won quite soon in Flear-Hjartarson, Szirak 1987. Nor does 15 \( \text{xaxa6} \) \( \text{dxa6} \) 16 \( \text{ehe5} \) \( \text{xc8} \) 17 \( \text{f1d4} \) \( \text{cx4} \) 18 \( \text{cx4} \) \( \text{c2} \) present Black with anything but prospects, as in Malaniuk-Ehlvest, USSR 1987.

11...\( \text{wc8} \) 12 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{a6} \)

13 \( \text{xd1} \)

Others:

a) 13 a4 \( \text{xd3} \) 14 \( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{d8} \) 15 \( \text{xf4} \) (15 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{bxa5} \) 16 \( \text{xa5} \) \( \text{c6} \) 17 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{cx4} \) 18 \( \text{cx4} \) \( \text{d7} \) with equality – Dautov) 15...\( \text{b7} \) 16 a5 \( \text{c6} \) (16...\( \text{cx4} \)? 17 \( \text{cx4} \) \( \text{bxa5} \) 18 \( \text{xa5} \) \( \text{c6} \) would probably be fine) 17 \( \text{axb6} \) \( \text{cx4} \) 18 \( \text{cx4} \) \( \text{axb6} \) 19 \( \text{xa8} \) \( \text{a8} \) 20 \( \text{xd1} \) \( \text{d8} \) with equality, Azmaiparashvili-Epishin, Reggio Emilia 1995/96. Dautov has suggested the following alternatives: 14...\( \text{wa6} \) 15 \( \text{wb5} \) \( \text{wb7} \) 16 \( \text{e1} \) a6 17 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{d8} \) 18 d5 with good prospects for White, and 14...\( \text{cx4} \)? 15 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{c6} \), which possibly equalises. I am not completely sure on this one, although it looks natural.

b) 13 \( \text{f4} \) gives White the advantage according to ECO, but I will remain sceptical on that one, too. Black should be fine after 13...\( \text{xd3} \) 14 \( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{d8} \) (more careful is 14...\( \text{d7} \) 15 a4 \( \text{d8} \) 16 \( \text{fe1} \) \( \text{cx4} \) 17 \( \text{cx4} \) \( \text{b7} \) 18 \( \text{ab1} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 19 a5, when White might have a slight positional edge but it will be very difficult to prove, and he was nowhere even close in Piket-Polugaevsky, Aruba 1994) 15 \( \text{we3} \) (White has no advantage after 15 d5? \( \text{c4} \) 16 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{cx5} \) 17 \( \text{cx5} \) \( \text{f6} \) 18 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{f5} \) 19 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 20 \( \text{xc4} \), when a draw was agreed in Piket-Van der Wiel, Holland 1996) 15...\( \text{c6} \) 16 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{a5} \), Arbakov-Levin, Berlin 1994. Now White had sufficient compensation for the pawn after 17 h4 \( \text{c4} \) 18 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 19 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xc2} \) 20 \( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{c3} \) 21 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 22 \( \text{g3} \), but nothing has been decided. Personally I would not like to be Black here, but I think it is more a question of style than anything else...

13 \( \text{xb2} \) leads to the note to White’s 11th move.

13...\( \text{cx4} \) 14 \( \text{cx4} \) \( \text{xd3} \) 15 \( \text{xd3} \)

White has no chance for an advantage here, it seems. The alternative looks a little clumsy and Black equalises easily: 15 \( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 16 \( \text{b2} \) (16 \( \text{g5} \)? \( \text{xc5} \) 17 \( \text{xc5} \) h6 18 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{we4} \), as in Peshina-Gurevich, Eger 1987, is already better for Black; White’s forces are misplaced) 16...\( \text{wa6} \) 17 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{f8} \) 18 \( \text{we3} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 19 d5 \( \text{cx5} \) 20 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{f8} \) 21 h4 \( \text{wa4} \) 22 \( \text{e1} \) and a draw was agreed in Bareev-Rodriguez, Sochi 1988.

15...\( \text{wa6} \) 16 \( \text{b2} \)

16 d5 \( \text{xd3} \)! 17 \( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{exd5} \) 18 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{d6} \) 19 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{c8} \) 20 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d7} \) is equal according to Knaak. 16 \( \text{we3} \)? \( \text{d7} \) 17 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{ac8} \) is more adventurous, but Black should be able to gain sufficient counterplay on the c-file.

16...\( \text{xd3} \) 17 \( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 18 \( \text{e1} \)

White gains the c-file but Black has the possibility of a distant passed pawn and of creating a good square for the knight on c4. Also equal is 18 d5 \( \text{c5} \) 19 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{fxd8} \) 20 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{ac8} \).

18...\( \text{fe8} \) 19 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 20 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 21 \( \text{d2} \)

21 e5? \( \text{d5} \) helps only Black.

21...b5!

Black would never allow 22 a4, where the pawn is less weak and when he would not have c4 waiting for the knight.

22 \( \text{c6} \)

22 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{f8} \) 23 \( \text{b7} \) a6 has been assessed as unclear. I think White should be very care-
ful here that ...\texttt{c8} does not suddenly win something. All in all it seems that improving the king should be a priority.

\texttt{22...\texttt{d8} 23 \texttt{f3} \texttt{e8} 24 \texttt{b3}}

24 \texttt{f2} \texttt{d7} shows that White somehow gained nothing by 22 \texttt{c6}, only to have to waste time keeping it there.

\texttt{24...\texttt{d7}}

24...\texttt{d7} 25 \texttt{c1} \texttt{c8} 26 \texttt{c5+} and White maintains the balance.

\texttt{25 \texttt{f1}?}

Creating problems later. Actually it is difficult to why 25 \texttt{f2!} was not played.

\texttt{25...\texttt{b6} 26 \texttt{c5?}}

White is drifting. The knight does less here than it seems to while the knight on c4 is really annoying. 26 \texttt{a5} \texttt{d7} 27 \texttt{c2} \texttt{c8} 28 \texttt{x}c8 \texttt{dx}c8 29 \texttt{e2} results in an endgame where Black has very slightly better chances due to the prospects of creating a passed pawn and the weakness of the a3-pawn. However, this should be a drawable option for White.

\texttt{26...\texttt{c4!} 27 \texttt{c1} \texttt{d8}}

Now White just loses something. If the king had been on f2 the game continuation would have worked better because there would be no check on d1.

\texttt{28 \texttt{a4}}

28 d5 \texttt{e5} 29 \texttt{c7} \texttt{d6} and Black should win.

\texttt{28...\texttt{x}d4! 29 \texttt{b3} \texttt{d3} 30 \texttt{x}b5 \texttt{e5} 31 \texttt{c8+} \texttt{d7} 32 \texttt{a8} \texttt{x}b3 33 \texttt{x}a7+ \texttt{e8}}

0-1

\textbf{Game 19}

\textit{Kasparov-van der Wiel}

\textit{Amsterdam 1988}

1 d4 \texttt{f6} 2 c4 e6 3 \texttt{f3} b6 4 a3 \texttt{b7} 5 \texttt{c3} d5 6 \texttt{c2} c5 7 cxd5 \texttt{dx}d5

8 \texttt{dxc5!}

This is the only move that is dangerous for Black. The alternatives both promise Black equality.

a) 8 e4 \texttt{xc3} 9 bxc3 and now:

a1) After 9...\texttt{d7} White reaches another crossroads.

a11) In reply to 10 \texttt{d3} the best move is 10...\texttt{c7!} according to Kasparov, a draw being agreed in Kasparov-Sosonko, Lucerne 1982 after 11 \texttt{d2} g6 12 0-0 \texttt{g7}. Kasparov was, in fact, so uncomfortable with his position here that he claimed in Chess Informant that Black already has a slight advantage. Whether or not this is too strong an assessment I shall not say, but the fact that Black is not unhappy with the outcome of the opening is quite clear to me. Black is also fine after the alternatives, e.g. 11 \texttt{b1} g6 12 0-0 \texttt{g7} 13 \texttt{a2} 0-0 14 \texttt{e1} a6 15 a4 \texttt{fc8} 16 h3 \texttt{c6} 17 \texttt{e3} c4 18 \texttt{c2} b5 with equality, as in Ostermeyer-Sosonko, Hannover 1983.

Meanwhile 11 \texttt{b2} cxd4 12 cxd4 \texttt{xc}2 13 \texttt{xc}2 \texttt{a6} led to a carefree endgame for Black in Yusupov-Miles, Linares 1983, and
Queen's Indian Defence

11 0-0 cxd4 12 cxd4 \texttt{Wxc2} 13 \texttt{Bxc2 Bc8} even gave Black some initiative in Franco Ocampes-Van der Sterren, Wijk aan Zee 1983.

a12) 10 \texttt{Bf4}. This bishop needs to be developed immediately. 10...\texttt{cx}d4 11 \texttt{cx}d4 \texttt{Bxc2} 12 \texttt{Bxc2 Bc8} even gave Black some initiative in Franco Ocampes-Van der Sterren, Wijk aan Zee 1983.

a2) Black can also try 9...\texttt{Be7} 10 \texttt{Bb5+! Bc6} 11 \texttt{Bd3} and the bishop is badly placed on c6. No need for further variations...

a3) Or 9...\texttt{Bc6}, which also puts Black in trouble after 10 \texttt{Bb2}, e.g. 10...\texttt{Be7} 11 d5! exd5 12 \texttt{Bd1} 0-0 (worse is 12...\texttt{Bf6} 13 exd5

\texttt{Dc5} 14 \texttt{Dxe5 Dxe5} 15 \texttt{Bb5+ Wf8} 16 0-0 \texttt{Dd6} 17 f4 \texttt{Df6} 18 c4 a6 19 \texttt{Be5} and White is already winning, Tukmakov-Oll, Kujbyshev 1986 continuing 19...\texttt{Dxe5} 20 \texttt{fxe5 Dxe5} 21 \texttt{Df2} f6 22 \texttt{Bf1 Wh5} 23 \texttt{Dd7 Df7} 24 \texttt{Dc6 Dc7} 25 d6 \texttt{Dd8} 26 \texttt{Dh3 Dc6} 27 \texttt{Dh7} 1-0) 13 exd5 \texttt{Qa5} 14 \texttt{Bd3 Df6} 15 \texttt{Bxh7+?!} (15 0-0! gives White the advantage due to 15...g6 16 c4) 15...\texttt{Bh8} 16 \texttt{Be4} (16 0-0 g6 17 \texttt{hxg6 fxg6} 18 \texttt{Dxg6 Wc7} and White's queen is alone in attack) 16...\texttt{Dd6} 17 \texttt{Bd3 Dc8}+ 18 \texttt{Bf1 Dc4} 19 \texttt{Bxc4 Dxc4+} 20 \texttt{Dg1 Bxe2} and Black had enough for the pawn (to put it mildly) in Portisch-Sosonko, Tilburg 1982, while 10...\texttt{Dc8}! 11 d5?! exd5 12 exd5 \texttt{Dd7+} 13 \texttt{Bb2} \texttt{Dxe5} 15 \texttt{Dd4+ Dd7} 16 0-0 0-0 17 \texttt{Bd1} left White better developed in Petrov-Sosonko, Tilburg 1982, while 10...\texttt{Dc8}! 11 d5?! exd5 12 exd5 \texttt{Dxd5} 13 \texttt{Bd3 Dc5} 14 0-0-0 was just a killer in Agdestein-Lau, Dortmund 1987. I would say that Black's king is not completely safe...

b) 8 \texttt{Bg5} is also not so dangerous. After 8...\texttt{Dc5} 9 \texttt{Dxe7} \texttt{Dxe7} 10 \texttt{Dxd5 exd5} 11 e4 0-0 12 \texttt{Bd3} g6 (taking control over the kingside light squares) 13 dxc5 bxc5 14 0-0 \texttt{Dd7}, as in Seirawan-Timman, Amsterdam 1992, Black secured equality. Vilela-Rodriguez, Cienfuegos 1985 seemed okay for Black after 11 g3 0-0 12 \texttt{Bg2 Dd7} 13 0-0 \texttt{Bac8}.

8...\texttt{Dc5} 9 \texttt{Bg5}!
The most energetic. There are two differences between this and 8 \text{\textit{c5}} – Black no longer has a c-pawn, so the d4-square is available to White, and Black has already moved his bishop. Now there are three different paths to choose from. I would recommend 9...f6, although none of them promises equality.

9...c8

Others:

a) 9...f6 10 d2 0-0 (Black should not hesitate over this logical move – after 10...\text{\textit{d7}} 11 e4 \text{\textit{xc3}} 12 \text{\textit{xc3}} c8 13 0-0 0-0 14 b4 c7 15 b3 f7 16 c4 d8 17 d4 White had strong pressure [his king will be fine on b1] in Plaskett-Short, Plovdiv 1984) and now White should play 11 e3! (intending to use the b1-h7 diagonal), e.g. 11...\text{\textit{h8}}? 12 c4! c7 (12...\text{\textit{xc3}}?! 13 \text{\textit{xc3}} \text{\textit{h4}}! with the idea of h4-h5 with a very dangerous attack) 13 d1!? and White has the better prospects (Piket). An improvement is 11...a5! – there is no need to go to the h-file before being forced to do so. Gelfand-Lautier, Manila 1990 continued 12 d3 \text{\textit{h8}}! 13 d1 (13 h4?! c8 14 c5 f5 15 e4 f6 16 0-0-0 d6 offers Black counterplay according to Gelfand, while 13 xh7? f5 14 g6 f6 15 h5 h6 benefits only Black) 13...d7 14 0-0 c7 15 c4! xxc3 16 xc3 (16 xb7? xd1 17 axa8 xxe3 and Black wins) 16...a7 17 d4?! (17 d2!? and White is perhaps a little bit better – Gelfand) 17...xd4 18 exd4 \text{\textit{d8}}! 19 fxe1 xxe4 20 xe4 \text{\textit{d8}} 21 d5 \text{\textit{d6}}! with equality. Note that after 11 e4 there is no good place for the light-squared bishop, e.g. 11...xxc3 12 xxc3 a5 13 d1 c8 14 d3 d6 15 0-0 \text{\textit{h8}} 16 f7 e5 with equality in Vyzmanavin-Lautier, Sochi 1989, or 13 c4 c8 14 e2 a6 15 xa6 xxa6 16 xa6 xxa6 17 c2 e5 18 d1 d8 with a good position for Black in Benigni-Korchnoi, Jerusalem 1986.

b) 9...c7 is slightly passive. After 10 xxe7 xxe7 11 exd5 exd5 12 e3 0-0 13 d3 c8 14 e2 \text{\textit{d7}} 15 0-0 d5 16 d4 xd3 17 \text{\textit{xd3}} \text{\textit{c5}} Black had the c-file to compensate for his structural deficiencies in Ehvest-Korchnoi, Zagreb 1987. In Gurevich-Ionescu, Moscow 1987 White played 13 c5! to be ready to remove Black’s knight. Play continued 13...d4 14 xd4 xg2 15 xg1 c4 16 f5! xf5 (16...c5 17 \text{\textit{f6}}! \text{\textit{h8}} 18 xf7+! and White wins) 17 xf5 a6 18 d3 g6 19 w5 with a clear advantage to White. Black’s 13th move seems a bit too optimistic. White is just better developed for this kind of stuff. Best was 13...c8, when Black is still fighting to equalise.

10 \text{\textit{d1}}

10 e3 0-0 11 cxd5 cxd5 12 d3 h6 13 d4 d7 14 0-0 a5 15 \text{\textit{ac1}} a4 was harmless in Farago-Horvath, Hungary 1995.

10...h5 11 d4

The only serious move – the bishop must remain active. For example after 11 d3 the bishop looks stupid on d2, e.g. 12 e3 0-0 13 c2 b7 14 0-0 c8 15 b4 c7 16 d4 c8 17 b5 a5 18 f3 axb4 19 axb4 d6 and Black was clearly better in Chekhover-Timoshchenko, Berlin 1986, or 12 b4 c7 13 c5 c6 14 w4 a5 15 bxa5 0-0 with unclear play in Petursson-Asamon, Reykjavik 1985. Meanwhile 11 cxd5?! hxg5 12 b4 g4! 13 c5 c5 favoured Black in Petursson-C.Hansen, Borgames 1985, and Ligterink-Beliavsky, Wijk aan Zee 1985; or 11...c6 12 c3 c6 13 d4 g4 14 c4 a5 15 c5 c5 c6 16 b4 f5 17 g3 b6 18 d5 d5 19 g4 c4 20 g4 xg4 and White resigned.

11...a5

Perhaps the alternatives are better:

a) 11...c6 12 cxd5 exd5 13 e3 c5 14 d3 a5 15 0-0 d4 16 e4 c8 17 f3 with a slight advantage to White in Ftacnik-Hjartarson, Esbjerg 1985.

b) 11...0-0 12 cxd5 exd5 13 e3 d7 14 c2 d6 15 w1 w8 16 0-0 c5 17 d4
Queen's Indian Defence

\[ \text{1. } \text{e4} \text{ } \text{c5} \text{ } \text{2. } \text{e5} \]

12 \text{ d4}!

The only serious option. 12 \text{ c4} \text{ d5} 13 \text{ cxd5} \text{ cxd5} 14 \text{ h4} \text{ h5} 15 \text{ g4} \text{ g6}!\text{ dxe5} 16 \text{ fxe5} \text{ fxg4} 17 \text{ h5} \text{ f5}! with a large lead.

13 e4 0-0 14 \text{ c4} \text{ c4} 15 \text{ cxd5} \text{ cxd5} 16 \text{ f4} \text{ dxe5} 17 \text{ fxe5} \text{ f6} 18 \text{ g5} \text{ g5} 19 \text{ f4} \text{ f6} 20 \text{ g4} \text{ g4} 21 \text{ h4}!

With a clear advantage for White.

21 ... \text{ d8}

22 \text{ d5} \text{ d6} 23 \text{ d8} 24 \text{ d6} \text{ d6}

On 24 ... \text{ d8} Kasparov gives the following winning line: 25 \text{ d6} \text{ h7} 26 \text{ f7} 27 \text{ xg8} \text{ xg8} 28 \text{ c7} \text{ d7} \text{ xg8} 29 \text{ g6} \text{ g6} 30 \text{ f5} \text{ f5} 31 \text{ e6} \text{ e6} 32 \text{ d7} \text{ d7} 33 \text{ f4} \text{ f4} and White wins.

24 ... \text{ e5} 25 \text{ dxe5} \text{ dxe5} 26 \text{ fxe5} \text{ fxe5} 27 \text{ g5} \text{ g5} 28 \text{ h4} \text{ h4} 29 \text{ f5} \text{ f5} 30 \text{ c4} \text{ c4} 31 \text{ d5} \text{ d5} 32 \text{ f4} \text{ f4} and White wins.

22 ... \text{ d5} 23 \text{ d5} \text{ d6} 24 \text{ d8} \text{ d8}

On 24 ... \text{ d8} Kasparov gives the following winning line: 25 \text{ d6} \text{ h7} 26 \text{ f7} 27 \text{ xg8} \text{ xg8} 28 \text{ c7} \text{ d7} \text{ xg8} 29 \text{ g6} \text{ g6} 30 \text{ f5} \text{ f5} 31 \text{ e6} \text{ e6} 32 \text{ d7} \text{ d7} 33 \text{ f4} \text{ f4} and White wins.

27 ... \text{ e5} 28 \text{ d6} \text{ d6} 29 \text{ e5} 30 \text{ c4} \text{ c4} 31 \text{ c5} \text{ c5} 32 \text{ d5} \text{ d5} 33 \text{ f4} \text{ f4} and White wins.

28 ... \text{ d5} 29 \text{ d5} \text{ d5} 30 \text{ c4} \text{ c4} 31 \text{ d5} \text{ d5} 32 \text{ f4} \text{ f4} and White wins.

31 ... \text{ e5}? 32 \text{ f4} \text{ f4} 33 \text{ c4} \text{ c4} 34 \text{ d5} \text{ d5} 35 \text{ e5} \text{ e5} 36 \text{ f4} \text{ f4} and White wins.
36 e5 \( \text{Q}h7 \) 37 \( \text{Q}f4+ \) \( g7 \) 38 \( f1 \) and Black has nothing left to do but resign.
36...\( g7 \) 37 \( g5 \) \( b6 \) 38 \( w3 \)?!
Again 38 \( w4 \) was simpler.
38...\( g8 \)?!
38...\( wxe4! \) 39 \( h6+ \) \( h7! \) 40 \( f8+ \) \( g8 \)
41 \( xc5 \) gives White a pawn but at least puts up some resistance.
39 \( c8+ \) \( g7 \) 40 \( c7+ \) \( d7 \) 41

**Game 20**

**Khalifman-Short**

Paernu 1996

1 d4 \( \text{f6} \) 2 c4 e6 3 \( \text{f3} \) b6 4 \( c3 \) \( b7 \)
5 a3 d5 6 cxd5 \( \text{xd5} \) 7 e3

This is the main move in ECO, but in recent times it has been less popular among those who know. This is due to 7...g6, and for this reason I will not consider other moves here, or give 7 e3 serious attention. Anyway, White plays the text with the idea of e3-e4. It does not seem to be so dangerous.

7...g6

8 \( \text{b5}+ \)

Here there are other possibilities:

a) 8 h4 \( \text{g7} \) 9 h5 \( d7 \) 10 \( e3 \) 0-0 11 e4 (this is just not very good!) 11...\( xc3 \) 12 \( bxc3 \) \( c5! \) 13 hxg6 hxg6 14 dxc5 (losing, but Black is already doing very well) 14...\( xc5+ \) 15 \( e2 \) \( xa1 \) 16 \( g1 \) \( d7 \) 17 \( h2 \) \( fd8 \) 18

\( \text{wh7+} \) \( \text{f8} \) 19 \( \text{h6+} \) \( e8 \) and the attack never went further in Vokac-Sax, Lazne Bohdanec 1995. 10...\( xc3 \) 11 bxc3 \( c8 \) appears to be equally good, when White should start thinking of castling. After 12 e4?! \( c5! \)
13 hxg6 \( xd3+ \) 14 \( xd3 \) hxg6 15 \( xh8+ \) \( xh8 \) 16 \( f4 \) \( g7 \) 17 \( d2 \) c5 Black was better in Maksimovic-Groszpeter, Berlin 1988. 9...0-0 is also okay, although it seems natural to wait. Here after 10 hxg6 hxg6 11 \( xd5 \) exd5 12 \( d2 \) \( d7 \) 13 \( d3 \) \( e8 \) 14 \( c3 \) a5 15 \( c2 \) \( a6 \) 16 \( xa6 \) Black has no problems, Razuvaev-Rodriguez, Moscow 1985 already coming to a peaceful conclusion.

b) 8 \( xd5 \) exd5 9 b4 is supposed to give White an advantage. But due to the plan illustrated in this game (...c7-c6 and ...a7-a5) nobody adopts this approach any more. Black is just fine. Shirov-Karpov, Monte Carlo 1995 went 9...\( g7 \) 10 \( b2 \) c6 11 \( e2 \) 0-0 12 0-0 \( d7 \) 13 \( b3 \) \( e8 \) 14 \( fc1 \) a5 15 \( bx a5 \) \( xa5 \) 16 a4 c5 with equality.

8...c6 9 \( d3 \) \( g7 \) 10 \( a4?! \)

Short wrote that this move was an invention of Lobron and his long-term companion Jack Daniels. Surely Mr. Daniels is an innovative guy. After 10 e4 \( xc3 \) 11 bxc3 c5! 12 \( g5 \) \( d6 \) 13 e5 \( d7 \) Black seems to do well as White's centre appears rather fragile. And after 14 \( dxc5?! \) 0-0 15 \( cxb6 \) \( axb6 \) Black was even better in Kasparov-Korchnoi, London 1983. White has three weak pawns and is lacking in co-ordination and development.

10...\( d7 \) 11 e4 \( e7 \) 12 0-0

Here (and on the next move) White has a serious alternative in 12 \( f4 \) 0-0 13 0-0. Then Black needs to accept a weak pawn and he will be okay: 13...c5! 14 dxc5 \( xc5 \) 15 \( xc5 \) bxc5 16 \( e2 \) (16 \( c2 \) \( d6 \) and Black is fine, while 16 \( c1 \) c4! also equals because after 17 \( xc4? \) \( a6 \) 18 \( c7 \) \( d7 \) 19 \( e5 \) \( xe5 \) 20 \( xe5 \) \( xc4 \) 21 \( xc4 \) \( xd1 \) 22 \( xd1 \) \( fd8 \) Black has all the chances) 16...\( c6 \) 17 \( a1 \) \( d4 \) 18 \( xd4 \) \( xd4 \) with equality in Yermolinsky-Ivanov, Parsippany
Queen's Indian Defence

1996.

12...0-0 13 ♖g5
13 ♖f4 — see the previous note...
13...h6!

Here White could have kept the balance with 25 ♕d6! ♖f4 26 ♕xf4 ♕xg2 27 ♕xg2 ♕xf4 28 ♕xe7 ♕g4+ with a perpetual.
25...a6 26 ♕e2 ♖d7 27 ♕e1 ♕e6 28 ♕f3 ♕xf3 29 ♕xf3 ♕f8 30 ♕f2?!
30 ♕h4! is forced. Now Black will be able to play ...g6-g5 and prove a clear advantage.
30...♕e7 31 c4 ♕ad8 32 ♕fc3 g5!

13...♕e8?! (Khalifman) 14 ♗c1 ♕b8 15 ♕h4! (going to the h2-b8 diagonal) 15...h6 16 b4 b5 17 ♗c5 ♗xc5 18 ♗xc5 with a strong positional advantage for White in Khalifman-Sivokho, St Petersburg 1996.
14 ♗e3 ♕h7 15 ♗c1 f5!
Black has equalised (Short).
16 ♖xf5 ♖xf5
16...♕xf5 17 ♗e4 is just wrong.
17 ♗f4 ♗d5 18 ♗d6?!
18 ♗g3 improves.
18...♕e8 19 ♗c3 ♖f6 20 ♕g3 ♗xc3 21 ♖xc3 e5
Here Black could have rewarded himself for his strong opening play with 21...f4! 22 ♕h4 ♖f7, when all White's pieces are unprepared for ...c6-c5.
22 ♕b5 ♕e7 23 ♕e5 ♘xe5 24 dxe5 ♖f7 25 f4?!

The e-pawn is now in trouble. From here Short's fantastic technique took over.
33 ♖e3 ♕xf4 34 ♕xf4 ♕d4 35 ♕f1 ♕g5 36 ♕xg5 hxg5 37 ♕e2 ♕g6! 38 ♗e3 ♗d2 39 ♖f3 g4 40 ♖f1 ♘d4 41 g3 h5 42 ♖e2 ♖xe2 43 ♕xe2 ♖e4 44 ♕d2 ♕xe5 45 ♖f2 ♖d4 46 ♖e2 ♖xe2+ 47 ♖xe2 f4! 48 gxf4 ♕f5 49 ♖b1 ♖d6 50 ♖f1 ♖h6 51 ♕f2 ♕h3 52 ♖f1 ♖b3! 53 ♖g2 a5 54 ♖a2 a4 55 ♖e5+ ♖xf4 56 ♖e6 ♖xa3 57 ♕f6+ ♕e5 58 ♖xb6 ♖b3 59 ♖a6 a3 60 ♖a5 ♕f4 0-1
Summary
The Petrosian system still holds great dangers for Black as it did 15 years ago when Kasparov was championing it. The move order with 4 a3 gives Black some extra lines to choose from, most notably 4...a6, therefore it can be a good idea for White players to play 4 d.c3 with the idea of 4...b7 5 a3 with transposition to the 4 a3 b7 lines. After 4 a3 then 4...d5 gives a typical d-pawn position, as discussed in the introduction. After 4...c6!? we get some interesting and unusual positions. Black has so far been able to keep the game level, but perhaps White can make his better structure count for something in the future. 4...c6 is just not very good, while 4...a6 leads to a whole series of variations which are basically okay for Black although precise play is needed. 4...b7 is still the main line, and after 5 d.c3 Black only has one good plan: 5...d5 cxd5 d.xd5 and now 7 w.c2! is perhaps very slightly better for White.

1 d4 f6 2 c4 e6 3 d.f3 b6 4 a3 (D) b7

4...d5 5 cxd5 exd5 6 d.c3 e7 – Game 5; 4...c6 – Game 6
4...c5
5 e3 – Game 8; 5 d5 a6 6 w.c2 – Game 7
4...a6
5 w.b3 – Game 9
5 w.c2
5...c5 6 d5 – 4...c5
5...b7 6 d.c3 c5
7 d5 – Game 10
7 e4 cxd4 8 d.xd4
8...c5 – Game 11; 8 d.c6 9 d.xc6 b.c6 10 f4 (D)
10...d.h5 – Game 12; 10...c5 – Game 13

5 d.c3 d5
5...g6 – Game 14

6 cxd5
6 a.g5 – Game 15; 6 w.c2: 6...dxc4 – Game 16; 6...e7 – Game 17
6...d.xd5 (D) 7 w.c2
7 e3 – Game 20

7...d.c3 – Game 18
8 dxc5 – Game 19
In this chapter you will see White try to put Black under pressure and fight for the control of the e4-square – and you will see him fail. These lines do not offer White an advantage from the opening, yet they can nevertheless be difficult to play for Black, and if they suit you, as they used to suit Kamsky, there is a definite possibility that a level opening might later lead to a superior middlegame and, ultimately, a full point.

Game 21
Tolnai-Adorjan
Hungary 1992

1 d4 d6f 2 c4 e6 3 d3 b6 4 c3 b7 5 d4 e6 5 d37 e4, is the best way to play with this structure. After the not so clever 10...d5 11 0-0 d7 (11...dxc4 12 d1 c8 13 e4 gave White an initiative in Razuaev-Kruszynski, Polanica Zdroj 1979) 12 d1 c8 13 ac1 White had an edge in Sokolov-Stohl, Burgas 1992.

11 0-0 d5 12 d1 d4 13 e7 13 g3 dxc3 14 dxc3 d4 favours Black thanks to the two bishops.

13...dxc3 14 dxc3 d4 15 d1 16...d5 17 cxd5 fce8 is nice for Black.

16...d8 17 h3
17 b4!?  @a6 18 a3 @ac8 19 @b3 dxc4 20 @xc4 @xf3 21 gxf3 @c7 is a shade preferable for Black.
17...dxc4! 18 @xb7 @xb7 19 @xc4 @ac8 20 @a3 @xa3 21 @xa3 @c5 22 @b5 a6

White could have equalised with 23 @d6 @c6 24 @c4 @d3 25 @e5 @cd6 26 @c4, with a repetition.
23...@d3 24 @d2 @e5 25 @xd8+
25 @ad1 @xd2 26 @xd2 @f8 is only slightly better for Black. Now Adorjan’s fantastic will to win comes into play
25...@xd8 26 @d1 @c8 27 @d4 @f8 28 @f1 @e7 29 @e2 @c4 30 @d1 b5 31 @d3 b4 32 @f4?
32 @b3 was forced.
32...a5 33 a3?

This variation is known to be quite harmless but, as this game clearly illustrates, it is a genuine struggle so long as the pieces remain on the board. The most normal move here must be 5 a3, transposing to the Petrosian System. Actually, this is the way I would play with White, as the lines with 4...@b7 seem to be the most fragile for Black in the Petrosian.
5...@h6 6 @h4 @e7
Now Black has this possibility, and therefore equalises easily.
7 e3

Standard. 7 @c2 has also been tried, when 7...c5! is another standard reaction, White having neglected the dark squares. Sokolov-Salov, Wijk aan Zee 1997 went 8 dxc5 bxc5 9
Queen's Indian Defence

e3 d6 10 筈c2 筈bd7 11 筈d1 0-0 12 0-0 a6 13 
筈d2 筈c7 14 筈fd1 筈fd8 15 h3 筈f8 16 筈h2 
筈d7 17 筈g3 筈ad8 18 筈f3 筈g6 19 筈xb7 
筈xb7 20 筈f3 d5 and, if anyone is better, it is 
Black.

7...筈e4

This is a good way to equalise. Also possible 
is 7...0-0, and now:

a) 8 筈d3 c5 9 0-0 cxd4 (9...d6 10 a3 筈bd7 
11 b4 d5 12 cxd5 筈xd5 13 筈xe7 筈xe7 14 
筈xd5 筈xd5 15 e4 and a draw was agreed in 
Onischuk-Dautov, Germany 2000) 10 exd4 
d5 (also possible is 10...筈xf3! 11 筈xf3 筈c6 
12 筈e2 d5 13 筈ad1 筈b4 14 筈xf6 筈xf6 15 
cxd5 筈xd5 16 筈e4 with a draw in Seirawan­ 
Schussler, New York 1985) and now the 
most testing is 11 筈xf6!, unlike the harmless 
11 cxd5 筈xd5 12 筈g3 筈xc3 13 bxc3 筈c6 
14 筈e1 筈f6 15 筈c1 筈c8 16 筈e2 筈a5 17 
筈e5 筈d5 18 f4 筈xe5 19 fxe5 筈c7 with 
complete equality in Spassky-Hjartarson, 
Reykjavik 1988. In Sokolov-Rivas Pastor, 
Leon 1995 the position after (11 筈xf6) 
11...筈xf6 12 cxd5 exd5 was reminiscent of 
the Tartakower where the bishop on b7 is 
somewhat silly, and where there might be a 
weakness on c6 occasionally. But the ex­ 
change of the dark-squared bishop does also 
influence White's position. After 13 筈e1 
筈c6 14 筈c2 筈wd6 15 筈d3 g6 16 a3 筈f8 17 
h3 筈g7 the game was equal, Black having 
the manoeuvre...筈a5-c4.

b) 8 筈e2 c5 9 0-0 d6 (9...cxd4 10 exd4 d5 
is, of course, also possible) 10 dxc5 bxc5 11 
筈c2 筈bd7 12 筈fd1 筈wb6 13 筈d2 筈fd8 with 
equality in Karpov-Polugaevsky, Bugojno 
1980. 10 筈c1 筈bd7 11 a3 筈c8 12 筈g3 a6 13 
b3 cxd4 14 筈xd4 筈c7, Groszpeter-Tal, So­ 
chi 1984, was at least equal for Black. The 
move a2-a3 does not improve White's posi­ 
tion.

8 筈xe4?! 

This should not be dangerous for Black at 
all, but neither is 8 筈g3 筈b4! 9 筈c2 d6 10 
筈d3 筈xc3+ 11 bxc3 f5 (11...筈xf3! is too 
éarly: after 12 hxg3 筈d7 13 e4 筈e7 14 0-0 
0-0 15 筈h4! White had a space advantage in 
Korchnoi-Ligterink, Wijk aan Zee 1984) 12 
h4 筈d7 13 筈h2 筈e7 14 0-0-0 0-0-0 15 筈df1 
g5 with dynamic equality in Mikhailevski­ 
Yudasin, Tel Aviv 1994.

8...筈xh4?!

This is risky. A safe path to equality is 
8...筈xe4 9 筈g3 0-0, e.g. 10 筈d2 筈b7 11 
筈d3 c5! (standard when White weakens the 
dark squares) 12 dxc5 bxc5 13 0-0 d5 14 
cxd5 exd5 15 e4 dxe4 16 筈xe4 筈xe4 17 
筈xe4 筈c6 18 筈a4 筈d4 with complete 
equality in Uhlmann-Padevsky, Havana 1964, 
or 10 筈d3 筈xd3 11 筈xd3 d6 12 0-0 筈d7 13 
b4 a5 14 b5 f5 15 筈b3 a4 16 筈c2 筈e8 17 
筈e1 e5, Uhlmann-Antoshin, Leipzig 1965, 
also equal.

9 筈d3 筈e7 10 筈b3!

White has a territorial advantage to add to 
his superior development, which he uses to 
generate an attack.

10...d6 11 h4?! 筈d7 12 0-0-0 c6?!

Slightly passive. After 12...c5!? 13 dxc5 
c5x d3 14 筈c3 White has a small edge (Kam­ 
sky).

13 g4 筈c7 14 筈b1 a6 15 g5 c5 16 
筈c3?! 筈g8 17 筈hg1 hxg5?!

Now the g5-square becomes available for 
White, with attacking possibilities on e6 and 
f7. Better is 17...0-0-0 with a messy position 
where anything could happen.

18 筈exg5!

18 筈fxg5?! allows 18...d5! etc.
18...cxd4!? 19 exd4 f6 20 wb3!
Shooting at e6 and f7 while taking control of the light squares on the queenside.

20...xf3?
From here on Black is defenceless on the light squares. A lesser evil is 20...f8 21 e4!? 0-0-0 with a poor – but not losing – position.

21 xf3 h8 22 g4!
A strong, active post.

22...d7 23 e1 b5!? 24 cxb5 axb5 25 g5! xg5 26 hxg5 g6
White was considering g5-g6 himself.

27 fxe4 dh8 28 d5 e4 29 xe4 h5 30 xe4! xe4 31 c2 wb6
32 e3 d6 34 c6 1-0
Black resigned due to 34 c6 wa7 35 c8+ we7 36 xd7 etc.

Game 23
Portisch-Popovic
Ljubljana 1985

1 d3 d6 2 c4 e6 3 d4 b4 4 d4 b6
5 g5 b7
5...h6 6 h4 b7 and now 7 c2, along with 7 d2, is aimed at gaining control of e4. Both moves weaken the d4-square and should therefore be countered by ...c7-c5.

6 c2
6 d2 h6 7 h4 c5! 8 a3 cxd4 9 axb4 dxc3 10 bxc3 0-0 11 f3 d5 12 e3 a5 13 bxa5 bxa5 14 e2 dbd7 15 cxd5 exd5 16 0-0

This is the simple way to equalise against this system. White now has no path to an advantage.

9 e3
White can also go for complications, but Black is okay after 9 e5 f6 10 d5 exd5 11 cxd5 xc3+ 12 xc3 xd5 13 0-0-0 xc3 14 xc3 f7! 15 h4 g4 16 xe5 h5 17 wc2 fxe5 18 wc5 wc7 19 wxh5+ xd8 with dynamic equality in Portisch-Timman, Hilversum 1984.

9...xc3+ 10 bxc3 d6
A natural move. Black can also choose to exchange the bishop immediately, which should lead to the same type of positions:
10...\texttt{d}x\texttt{g}3 11 hxg3 \texttt{c}6!? (Black decides that c4-c5 is the only White way to make sense of the position, so he avoids creating a ‘hook’ with d6–11...d6 12 c5 \texttt{d}7 13 cxd6 cxd6 14 a4 \texttt{b}8 15 \texttt{e}3 \texttt{c}8 16 a5 bxa5 17 e4 \texttt{g}7 18 0-0 ended peacefully in Ehlvest-Adams, Pula 1997) 12 \texttt{b}1 (in Langeweg-Karpov, Amsterdam 1981, the following manoeuvre did not favour White: 12 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{e}7 13 \texttt{b}2 g4 14 \texttt{b}3 \texttt{g}5 15 c5 \texttt{b}8 16 \texttt{a}3 h5 17 \texttt{h}4 \texttt{a}8 18 \texttt{e}2 f5 and Black is already better) 12...\texttt{d}7 13 c5 h5 14 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{a}5 15 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{x}g2 16 \texttt{x}h5 0-0 17 cxb6 axb6 18 \texttt{x}h8 \texttt{x}h8 19 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{f}5 20 \texttt{x}f3 \texttt{f}6 favoured Black in Gheorghiu-Miles, London 1980.

11 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{x}g3 12 fxg3!?

This decision is quite common in these positions. White wants to build up his artillery with the rooks on f1 and f2, aiming at f7. Black should be able to meet this plan without fear, but some attention is required, of course.

12...\texttt{d}7 13 0-0 \texttt{e}7 14 \texttt{e}4

Other, equally good, options are:

a) 14 \texttt{d}2 0-0 15 \texttt{g}4!? seems rather exotic, and Black gets a good position after 15...\texttt{f}6 16 h3 h5 17 \texttt{x}h5 \texttt{b}5 18 \texttt{g}4 \texttt{g}3 19 \texttt{f}5 20 \texttt{h}2 \texttt{e}4!, the pawn sacrifice providing enough compensation to draw, but not more. Van Wely-Anand, Tilburg 1998 continued 21 \texttt{x}e4 \texttt{x}e4 22 \texttt{x}f3+ \texttt{x}f3 23 \texttt{f}+ 25 \texttt{g}1 \texttt{f}7 26 \texttt{e}1 \texttt{g}7 27 a4 ½-½. And Black cannot use his activity for anything, as the rook must stay on f2 (otherwise White has \texttt{f}f1), while White cannot try to win as Black is too active to make a single pawn important.

b) 14 \texttt{f}2 is the most natural. This does not mean that White immediately wants to play \texttt{f}f1, but that he can do so whenever he pleases, without spending time in preparation. Quite simply, his position becomes more flexible. We are following Zvjaginsev-Timman, Biel 1995, which continued 14...0-0-0 15 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{f}8!? 16 \texttt{e}1 (intending to meet 16...f5 with \texttt{x}b7 and e3-e4 with a good game) 16...\texttt{x}e4 17 \texttt{x}e4 \texttt{b}8 18 \texttt{h}7 \texttt{h}8 19 \texttt{c}2 h5 with unclear play. Now Black slightly misplayed his position with 20 \texttt{e}4 h4 21 \texttt{x}h4 \texttt{g}xh4 (21...\texttt{g}4 22 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{x}h4 23 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{w}h6 is better, with chances for both sides) 22 \texttt{c}5 with a modest lead for White. 16 a4!? was suggested by Timman as a possible improvement. It is hard to say anything about that...

14...\texttt{x}e4 15 \texttt{x}e4 0-0 16 \texttt{d}2 c5 17 \texttt{g}4 \texttt{c}8 18 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{g}7 19 \texttt{f}1 \texttt{c}8

The position is more or less equal. Now the longest arms won the fight.

20 \texttt{b}7 \texttt{b}8 21 \texttt{f}3 f5 22 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{d}7 23 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{x}g4 24 \texttt{x}g4 \texttt{x}f2 25 \texttt{x}f2 \texttt{f}8 26 \texttt{x}f8 \texttt{x}f8 27 \texttt{g}1 \texttt{f}6 28 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{g}7 29 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{c}4 30 \texttt{c}d4 \texttt{e}5 31 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{e}d4 32 \texttt{x}d4 \texttt{f}7 33 \texttt{f}1 \texttt{e}6 34 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{w}4+ 35 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{w}xg2 36 \texttt{e}5 \texttt{w}h3+ 37 \texttt{c}2
5 c2 and 5 g5

\[ \text{\textbf{5 \text{c2} and 5 \text{g5}}} \]

\[ \text{\textbf{Game 24}} \]

\begin{center}
\textbf{Belozerov-Nikolenko}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Moscow 1999}
\end{center}

1 d4 e6 2 \text{\text{\text{c3}}} f6 3 \text{c4} b6 4 \text{c3} b4 5 \text{g5} \text{b7} 6 e3 h6 7 \text{h4} \text{x}\text{c3}+ 8 \text{bxc3} d6 9 \text{d3}

This move is less good than the theory's favourite, 9 \text{c2}, for obvious reasons. After the bishop is developed White is forced to hurry with kingside castling as the knight cannot move, and White cannot build his usual impressive centre.

9...\text{\text{e7}}

\[ \begin{array}{c}
10 0-0 \\
\end{array} \]

Practically the only alternative is 10 \text{c2}, which does not pose Black problems after 10...g5 11 \text{g3} h5 12 h3 (now this is forced because 12 \text{\text{xf4}} e5, while 12 h4 g4 13 \text{d2} \text{\text{xf4}} drops a pawn) 12...h4 13 \text{h2} \text{g8} 14 e4 \text{c6} 15 \text{d2} e5 16 d5 and the bishop is now buried on h2, and White will have to do some manoeuvring to get it out. First the other bishop needs to get outside the pawn chain: 16...\text{\text{d8}} 17 \text{e2} \text{\text{b7}} 18 \text{g4} \text{\text{xf4}} 19 \text{hgx4} \text{c5} 20 \text{f3} \text{c8} and a draw was agreed in Beliavsky-Gulko, Munich 1990.

10...\text{\text{d7}} 11 \text{d2} g5 12 \text{g3} h5 13 h4!

This is absolutely forced, otherwise White has no control over the dark squares on the queenside and is overrun completely. 13 \text{f3?}

13...\text{\text{d8}} 14 \text{\text{f2}} 0-0-0 15 \text{h3} \text{\text{d8}} 16 \text{e2} \text{\text{h5}} 17 \text{a4} \text{b8} 18 c5 \text{x}\text{c5} 19 \text{a6} \text{a8} 20 \text{b3} c4! 21 \text{\text{xc4}} f5 22 \text{e2} g4! (the final breakthrough; it is clear now that Black is the quicker) 23 \text{\text{fxg4}} \text{\text{fxg4}} 24 \text{\text{xf4}} \text{\text{xf6}} 25 \text{c5} \text{\text{xf5}} 26 \text{dxc5} \text{\text{xf4}} 27 \text{hxg4} \text{\text{xc5}} 28 \text{f1}h3 29 e4 h2+ and White resigned in Borik-Speelman, Dortmund 1981. The alternatives are no better, e.g. 15 a4 a5 16 \text{b1} g4 17 \text{fxg4} h3 18 g3 \text{\text{hg8}} 19 \text{e2} \text{e4} 20 \text{f3} \text{\text{xd}}2 21 \text{\text{xb7}}+ \text{\text{xb7}} 22 \text{\text{xd2}} \text{\text{xf4}} 23 \text{\text{e2}} f5 with a clear advantage for Black in Rohde-Bejamin, USA 1986, or 15 e4 \text{\text{d8}} (15... \text{\text{h5}}! 16 c5! dxc5 17 \text{\text{w4}} \text{\text{f4}}! 18 \text{\text{b8}} \text{\text{\text{b8}}}! gave Black a good position in Hjartarson-Stoica, Taffelag-Politehnica 1987) 16 h3 \text{\text{h5}} 17 \text{\text{e1}} \text{\text{f4}} 18 \text{c2} c5 19 \text{\text{f1}} f5 20 \text{\text{exf5}} g4! 21 \text{\text{fxg4}} \text{\text{\text{xf4}}} with an overwhelming attack in Neashev-Tiviakov, Groningen 1997.

13...\text{\text{g8}}

13...\text{g4} has also been tried, but it seems that White gets better control of the kingside after 14 \text{\text{f3}} gxf4 15 \text{\text{h4}} 0-0-0 16 e4 (Beckmann-Steil, Germany 1990) than he normally does.

14 f3 0-0-0 15 \text{\text{hxg5}} \text{\text{\text{xf4}}} 16 \text{h4} \text{g7}

17 \text{f2}

The alternative is very sharp, but perhaps the best way for White to place his pieces might be 17 \text{\text{e4}}. If not Black has the following active continuation: 17...\text{\text{d8}} 18 \text{f2}
Queen's Indian Defence

\( \text{Qxe4!} \) (Black will have to do something about the pin eventually, and this is a good way – a spectacular queen sacrifice) 19 \( \text{\underline{\text{e}}7} \) 19 \( \text{\underline{x}}f2 \) 20 \( \text{\underline{x}}xf2 \) 20 \( \text{\underline{x}}xg2+ \) 21 \( \text{\underline{e}}1 \) h2 22 \( \text{\underline{f}}1 \) g1 23 e4 (White has nothing better since f3 must be protected; after 23 \( \text{h}c1 \) h4! 24 \( \text{h}c2 \) \( \text{\underline{x}}xf1+ \) 25 \( \text{\underline{x}}f1 \) h1+ 26 \( \text{\underline{e}}2 \) \( \text{\underline{x}}f3+ \) Black should win). Now Black should choose between three moves:

a) 23...f5? 24 exf5 exf5 25 \( \text{\underline{c}}1! \) (addressing the unwelcome rook on g1) 25...\( \text{\underline{a}}6 \) 26 \( \text{\underline{e}}3 \) \( \text{\underline{x}}f1+ \) (26...\( \text{\underline{h}}g2 \) 27 \( \text{\underline{e}}6 \) and Black cannot improve his position easily) 27 \( \text{\underline{x}}f1 \) h1+ 28 \( \text{\underline{f}}2 \) \( \text{\underline{x}}a1 \) 29 \( \text{\underline{e}}6 \) and White is winning. Black severely lacks co-ordination.

b) 23...d5!? seems to be the safest policy. After 24 exd5 (24 \( \text{\underline{d}}3 \) \( \text{\underline{a}}6 \) 25 exd5 exd5 26 \( \text{\underline{e}}3 \) \( \text{\underline{g}}h1 \) and Black wins) 24...exd5 25 \( \text{\underline{a}}4 \) dxc4 26 \( \text{\underline{c}}1 \) b5! 27 \( \text{\underline{x}}b5 \) \( \text{\underline{x}}f3 \) 28 \( \text{\underline{e}}x4 \) \( \text{\underline{g}}4 \) 29 \( \text{\underline{a}}6+ \) \( \text{\underline{b}}8 \) 30 \( \text{\underline{d}}3 \) \( \text{\underline{g}}1+ \) 31 \( \text{\underline{f}}1 \) \( \text{\underline{g}}4 \) a draw results.

c) 23...h4 24 \( \text{\underline{x}}h4 \) \( \text{\underline{x}}h4 \) 25 \( \text{\underline{f}}2 \) \( \text{\underline{g}}5 \) with a complicated position in Barsov-Schoenthier, Germany 1996. I am a little sceptical about Black's position as I cannot find a good square for the knight, but perhaps most GMs would see great options in ...f7-f5 and ...\( \text{\underline{f}}6 \).

17...\( \text{\underline{d}}g8 \) 18 \( \text{\underline{a}}4 \)

18...\( \text{\underline{e}}b8 \)

This seems more healthy than 18...e5, allowing 19 \( \text{\underline{f}}5 \) \( \text{\underline{b}}8 \) 20 e4 when White looks good. After 20...\( \text{\underline{f}}8 \)? 21 \( \text{\underline{x}}f6 \) he had already won(!) in Sideif Sade-Guedon, Cappelle 1995.

19 \( \text{\underline{e}}1! \)

I have most faith in closing the long diagonal with 19 e4. Then Farago-Rechlis, Beersheba 1987 continued 19...\( \text{\underline{e}}8 \) 20 c5 dxc5 21 \( \text{\underline{b}}5 \) \( \text{\underline{c}}8 \) 22 e5 \( \text{\underline{a}}6 \) 23 exf6 axb5 24 \( \text{\underline{x}}b5 \) \( \text{\underline{g}}6 \) 25 a4 e5 26 a5 exd4 27 axb6? \( \text{\underline{x}}xb6 \) (now Black has a clear advantage) 28 \( \text{\underline{h}}2 \) dxc3 29 \( \text{\underline{f}}1 \) \( \text{\underline{f}}5 \) 30 g3 \( \text{\underline{g}}4 \) 31 \( \text{\underline{e}}2 \) \( \text{\underline{b}}4 \) 32 \( \text{\underline{e}}3 \) \( \text{\underline{e}}5 \) 33 f4 \( \text{\underline{e}}4 \) 34 \( \text{\underline{d}}2 \) \( \text{\underline{b}}2 \) 35 \( \text{\underline{e}}1 \) \( \text{\underline{xe}}2 \) and White resigned. Instead 27 a6! \( \text{\underline{d}}5 \) (27...\( \text{\underline{a}}8 \) 28 a7+ \( \text{\underline{b}}7 \) 29 \( \text{\underline{e}}4 \) gives White a winning attack) 28 cxd4 would have kept the struggle unclear.

19...\( \text{\underline{e}}8 \) 20 \( \text{\underline{c}}2 \) \( \text{\underline{g}}4 \!\!\! \)

A cute tactic that allows Black to break through to g2, albeit at a price.

21 \( \text{\underline{f}}e2 \)

21 fxe4 \( \text{\underline{x}}xg4 \) 22 \( \text{\underline{f}}4 \) \( \text{\underline{x}}xg2+ \) 23 \( \text{\underline{f}}1 \) e5 is inferior for White since Black's attack is even stronger and White's forces more exposed.

21...\( \text{\underline{e}}xe3! \) 22 \( \text{\underline{x}}e3 \) \( \text{\underline{x}}xg2+ \) 23 \( \text{\underline{f}}1 \? \)

Losing by force. It is understandable that White did not want to go on to the long diagonal with 23 \( \text{\underline{h}}1 \), but at least this brings with it the possibility of putting something on e4. It is much harder to do something about g1. Anyway, Black is probably still better here, and it is not easy to recommend since the corner is no place to be during a raging attack. White does avoid having to worry about a rampaging h-pawn, though, and has slightly better piece co-ordination here than in the game. 23...\( \text{\underline{g}}4 \) 24 \( \text{\underline{f}}2 \) \( \text{\underline{c}}7 \) 25 \( \text{\underline{e}}4 \) \( \text{\underline{g}}4 \) 26 \( \text{\underline{f}}1 \) h4 looks good, with the two pawns plus good co-ordination.

23...\( \text{\underline{h}}2 \) 24 \( \text{\underline{f}}2 \) \( \text{\underline{e}}7 \) 25 \( \text{\underline{e}}4 \) \( \text{\underline{g}}2 \) 26 \( \text{\underline{e}}2 \) \( \text{\underline{g}}4 \)

18 \( \text{\underline{e}}4 \) transposes to the previous note.

18...\( \text{\underline{b}}8 \)

Removing a defensive piece for one not taking part in the attack on White's second rank. Pure logic.

27 \( \text{\underline{e}}xe4 \)

There is nothing left to do. 27 fxe4 \( \text{\underline{g}}5 \) 28 \( \text{\underline{g}}3 \) (28 \( \text{\underline{d}}2 \) \( \text{\underline{h}}1+ \) 29 \( \text{\underline{e}}2 \) \( \text{\underline{x}}f2+ \) 30 \( \text{\underline{x}}f2 \) \( \text{\underline{g}}1+ \) 31 \( \text{\underline{f}}3 \) \( \text{\underline{h}}3+ \) 32 \( \text{\underline{f}}4 \) \( \text{\underline{e}}3 \)
mate) 28...\textit{bxe}2 29 \textit{dxe}2 \textit{h}1+ 30 \textit{gf}2 \textit{h}4 and Black wins.

27...\textit{w}g5

...\textit{h}1 is now a deadly threat.

28 \textit{d}h4

The battle is over. 28 \textit{d}d2 \textit{h}1+ 29 \textit{we}2 \textit{xf}2+ 30 \textit{xf}2 \textit{w}g1+ 31 \textit{e}2 \textit{we}1 mate or 28 \textit{g}3 \textit{x}g3 29 \textit{hg}2 \textit{h}1+ and wins.

28...\textit{xf}2+ 29 \textit{xf}2 \textit{xh}4 30 \textit{g}2 \textit{we}3 31 \textit{g}8+ \textit{b}7 32 \textit{g}2 \textit{xf}6 33 \textit{g}7 \textit{wh}6 34 \textit{g}3 \textit{f}4 35 c5 \textit{h}4 36 \textit{a}6+! \textit{b}8 37 \textit{g}8+ \textit{xg}8 38 \textit{wa}4 \textit{w}g5+ 39 \textit{h}1 \textit{xf}6 40 \textit{wc}6 0-1

White resigned before Black could play 40...\textit{wd}5.

8...\textit{bd}7 9 \textit{f}3 \textit{h}6 10 \textit{d}h4 \textit{we}7 11 \textit{ad}3

There is no difference between this and 11 \textit{e}4 in practice. After 11...\textit{e}5 there are two alternatives to 12 \textit{ad}3, which transposes to the game:

a) 12 \textit{c}2 \textit{d}f8! (this is the right way to hit the bishop) with a further branch:

a1) 13 \textit{fl} \textit{g}6 14 \textit{f}2 \textit{f}4 15 \textit{d}3 and now in Khalifman-Hulak, Bled, 1991 the natural 15...0-0 was, for some reason, new at the time. There followed 16 \textit{fl}??! (planning \textit{g}2-\textit{g}3 to chase away the knight, but this gives Black a chance to generate a substantial lead in development) 16...\textit{fe}8 17 \textit{g}3 (17 \textit{d}5?? was probably becoming necessary) 17...\textit{xe}4!!

This is the move I would recommend for Black. With sensible play from Black equality is possible.

8 \textit{d}d2

This is the serious move here. After \textit{f}2-\textit{f}3 and \textit{e}3-\textit{e}4 White has a powerful centre.

18 \textit{f}xe4 (18 \textit{gx}f4 \textit{ex}f4 19 \textit{f}xe4 \textit{fxe}3 20 \textit{g}3 \textit{d}xe4 gives Black a completely winning attack; the \textit{e}3-pawn is worth a piece) 18...\textit{ex}d4! (18...\textit{d}xe4 19 \textit{d}5! keeps the position closed) 19 \textit{wd}x\textit{d}4 (19 \textit{cx}d4 \textit{d}xe4 20 \textit{g}1 \textit{d}5! with a powerful attack) 19...\textit{c}5 20 \textit{wd}2 \textit{d}xe4 21 \textit{wc}2 \textit{w}f6!! (a brilliant quiet move) 22 \textit{g}1 (22 \textit{gx}f4 \textit{d}xf4 and White loses) 22...\textit{xc}3 23 \textit{gx}f4 \textit{d}5! with a decisive attack. According to Khalifman 16 0-0, with equality, is an improvement. After seeing the game one tends to agree.

a2) 13 \textit{a}4+ \textit{d}7 14 \textit{wb}3 does not seem too smart. Now Black has 14...\textit{h}5! 15 \textit{c}5 \textit{g}6 16 \textit{f}2 \textit{xc}5 17 \textit{dx}c5 \textit{hf}4 18 \textit{fl} 0-0 and White was on the way to trouble in Campos Moreno-Polugaevsky, Oviedo 1991.

a3) 13 \textit{f}2?? seems more to the point, but
after 13...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{Q}} \text{g6} 14 \text{g3} 0-0-0 15 \text{f1 c6!}, with the idea of ...,d6-d5, Black is able to use his lead in development constructively. In Dokhoian-Djuric, Philadelphia 1989, 16 \text{d5 \textit{\texttt{A}} ac8 17 \text{d2 b5!} 18 \text{dxc6 \textit{\texttt{A}} xc6 19 \text{e3! bx}c4 20 0-0 \text{w}d7? ! 21 \text{a}xc4 \text{b}5! saw Black completely equalise.}

Note that here 12...g5?! 13 \text{f2 h5! 14 g3! seems to guarantee White an opening advantage, e.g. 14...\( \text{g7} 15 0-0 0-0-0 (15...h5 16 \text{c5 \textit{\texttt{A}} e5 17 h5 18 \text{f1 h5} (18...f5 19 \text{i}xf5 \text{xf5 20 \text{d}1 h5! 21 \text{f4!} and White had a structural advantage in Epishin-Shneider, USSR 1990. When White’s knight comes to d5 Black cannot really take it but, unfortunately, nor can he leave it!

b) 12 \text{w4} is not really dangerous. The only thing White has in this position is the pin from h4-e7, and Black can unravel without allowing \( \text{d}2-f1-e3-f5, which at times is very annoying. Fear-Salov, Szirak 1987 continued 12...0-0 13 \text{e2 \textit{\texttt{A}} e8! 14 \text{bl \textit{\texttt{A}} h5 with equality. After 15 0-0 \text{f4} 16 \text{e1 f5 17 f1 \textit{\texttt{A}} h8 Black’s position looks like it is more pleasant to play.}

11...e5 12 e4 g5(?!)

I am a little suspicious about this move. The hole on f5 is big enough to consume all the pieces I have blundered during the years. The alternatives are:

a) 12...0-0-0! is quite a normal move that has been suggested in numerous places but never tried.

b) 12...\( \text{f8} begins a logical manoeuvre. Piket-Ljubojevic, Monaco 1994 continued 13 \text{f1 \textit{\texttt{A}} g6 14 \text{e2} (I think this is the best move because it keeps the option of g2-g3 open; in van der Wiel-Ljubojevic, Amsterdam 1986 Black was never really worse: 14 \text{g3 h5 15 \text{e3 \textit{\texttt{A}} g6 16 \textit{\texttt{A}} a4+ \textit{\texttt{f8}} 17 \text{a1 \textit{\texttt{A}} xg3 18 \text{h}xg3 \textit{\texttt{A}} e6 19 \text{e2 g6 20 \textit{\texttt{f2}} g7 21 \text{w}e3 \textit{\texttt{A}} g5 22 \textit{\texttt{w}e}1 \textit{\texttt{A}} ad8 23 \textit{\texttt{w}e}2 24 \text{d}5 \textit{\texttt{A}} \textit{\texttt{x}d2 25 \textit{\texttt{x}d2 f6 26 \textit{\texttt{e}3 \textit{\texttt{f}7 27 \textit{\texttt{d}1 c5) 14...\( \text{xf4 15 \text{e3 \textit{\texttt{A}} \textit{\texttt{x}d3+? (directed against \textit{\texttt{A} c2 and g2-g3) 16 \textit{\texttt{w}d3 \textit{\texttt{h}5! (not 16...\( \text{w}d7 17 \text{d1 \textit{\texttt{A}} a4 18 0-0 0-0 19 \text{g3 \textit{\texttt{f}e}8 20 \textit{\texttt{f}2 h5! 21 \textit{\texttt{h}b2, when White had an enduring advantage in Sokolov-Govedarica, Belgrade 1987; 16...g6? runs into 17 \textit{\texttt{h}4! 17 0-0-0 g6 18 \textit{\texttt{w}e}2 0-0-0 19 \textit{\texttt{e}2 f6 and the position is unclear, with chances for both sides.}

13 \text{f2 h5 14 \textit{\texttt{f1 exd4?}}

Handing White a large advantage, but nothing leads to equality.

a) 14...\( \text{f4 15 \text{e3 \textit{\texttt{f}4 16 \textit{\texttt{f}5 \textit{\texttt{w}f6 17 g4 has been assessed as unclear, but I find that silly. With the knight on f5 and a strong structure in the centre White appears to be better.

b) 14...\( \text{f4 does not work here. After 15 \text{e3 g4 16 0-0! White already has an enormous advantage: 16...\( \text{gxf3 17 \textit{\texttt{w}f3! exd4 (17...\( \textit{\texttt{x}d3 18 \textit{\texttt{f}5! \textit{\texttt{g}5 19 \textit{\texttt{h}4 leads to a substantial plus due to 19...\( \textit{\texttt{f}4?! 20 \textit{\texttt{g}7+ \textit{\texttt{f}8 21 \textit{\texttt{e}6+! \textit{\texttt{x}e}6 22 \textit{\texttt{w}d3, when White wins) 18 \textit{\texttt{d}5! \textit{\texttt{x}d5 (18...\( \textit{\texttt{x}d5 19 \textit{\texttt{w}f4 \textit{\texttt{d}5 20 \textit{\texttt{e}5 \textit{\texttt{d}3 21 \textit{\texttt{w}d4 \textit{\texttt{e}5 22 \textit{\texttt{h}4 also wins for White) 19 \textit{\texttt{e}5 d}2 and Black did not make it to move 30 in Khalifman-Yemelin, Russia 1996. The dark squares are simply too weak.

15 \textit{\texttt{x}d4 f5 16 \textit{\texttt{e}3! fxe4

17 \textit{\texttt{f5!}

An important trick to remember.

17...\( \text{f7 18 \textit{\texttt{x}e}4

White has a very strong position. Now
\( \text{Wxh5 is a threat.} \)

18...\( \text{Qf4} \) 19 0-0 \( \text{Qxg2?!} \)

Black is trying to create counterplay as the 'normal' 19...\( \text{Qxd3} \) 20 \( \text{Wxd3} \) 0-0-0 21 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Wh7} \) looks very dangerous for Black. Here White can try 22 \( \text{Qxd6!?} \) \( \text{Qxd6} \) 23 \( \text{Qxd6+} \) \( \text{Qb8} \) 24 \( \text{Wg3} \) \( \text{Qa8} \) 25 \( \text{Qf7} \) \( \text{Wg6} \) 26 \( \text{Qa1} \) with a strong attack against the king (Piket).

20 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qf4} \) 21 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{Qxf4} \) 22 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{Wg6+} \) 23 \( \text{Qg4} \) \( \text{Wf6} \) 24 \( \text{Qg7+} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 25 \( \text{Qh1} \)?

This is unnecessary. Preferable is the logical 25 \( \text{Qc2} \) with an advantage after 25...h5 26 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 27 \( \text{Qhx5} \) \( \text{Qxg2+} \) 28 \( \text{Qxg2} \) \( \text{Qg5+} \) 29 \( \text{Qg3} \), when Black has nothing concrete for the pawn.

25...\( \text{Qc8} \) 26 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qa6}? \)

A terrible mistake, simply overlooking the reply. Better are 26...c5! and 26...\( \text{Qf8}? \), both with counterplay.

27 \( \text{Qa4}! \)

Eying c6. This is much more important than the c-pawn.

27...\( \text{Qb7} \) 28 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qc5} \)

9 \( \text{Qd2} \) is dealt with in the following game.

9...\( \text{Qxc3+} \) 10 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 11 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{f5} \)

11...\( \text{Qxg3} \) 12 \( \text{fxg3} \) leads to Game 23 by transposition. This variation is a good option for Black.

12 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{Qc5} \)

This is the old move, and probably good enough for soms kind of equality, but the new 12...\( \text{Qd7}?! \) is certainly more logical. Then 13 \( \text{Qxe4}?! \) gives away all the light squares without any concessions. After 13...\( \text{fxe4} \) 14 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Wf6} \) 15 0-0 0-0-0 Black seems to have a good position despite the pawn deficit. 16 \( \text{Wxe6} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 17 \( \text{dxe6} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 18 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qde8} \) saw Black enjoy a good ending in a few games, among them Hort-Bellon, Hastings 1975. The score so far is two wins for Black and one draw. Instead White should play 13 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qdc5} \) 14 \( \text{dxe6} \) and now:

a) 14...\( \text{Qf8} \) 15 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{g4}?! \) 16 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{Qxg3} \) 17

33...\( \text{Qxa4} \) 34 \( \text{Qxe8+} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 35 \( \text{Qxa8} \) \( \text{Qxa8} \) 36 d5 1-0

---

**Game 26**

**Miles-Timman**

**Tilburg 1986**

1 d4 \( \text{Qf6} \) 2 c4 e6 3 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qb4} \) 4 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{b6} \)

5 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{b7} \) 6 e3 h6 7 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{g5}?! \)

This used to be the main line, championed by Timman, but these days it is seen less and less.

8 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qe4} \) 9 \( \text{Qc2}! \)

---

29 \( \text{Qf1}! \) \( \text{Qxe4} \)

29...\( \text{Qxg7} \) 30 \( \text{Qh3}! \).

30 \( \text{Qxf6} \) \( \text{Qf2+} \) 31 \( \text{Qg1} \) \( \text{Qxd3} \) 32 \( \text{Qe6} \)

\( \text{Qb2}? \)

Losing immediately, but after 32...\( \text{Qb8} \) 33 \( \text{Qg7} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 34 \( \text{Qf7} \) \( \text{Qb2} \) 35 \( \text{Qb3} \) a5 36 \( \text{Qxc7} \)

White also has a winning position.

33 \( \text{Qxh6}! \)

No squares left for the pilgrim!
Queen's Indian Defence

hxg3 \w_g5 18 0-0-0! 0-0-0 19 \d_d3 \gxf3 20 \gxf3 \dxe6 21 \dxe5 \mx_f5 22 \wxf5 \wxf5 23 \dxf5 \dxf3 24 \hx_h6 \ex_d1 25 \ex_d1 \eg_5 26 g4 \e_b3? (26...\e_b7? with compensation was better according to Tisdall, but it still feels as if Black is fighting for equality here) 27 \c_e2 with an advantage to White in Zvajginev-Hübner, Elista 1998.

b) 14...\f_f6 appears to be the most natural move. After 15 \f_f3 \f_f4! 16 \dxe4! (forced - 16 exf4? \dxd3+ 17 \wxd3 \c_c5 18 \we_2 gxf4 was very dangerous for White in Komarov-Mantovani, Reggio Emilia 1996) 16...\dxe4 17 fxe4 \fx_d6 0-0-0 the situation is unclear, although I feel a bit more comfortable about White's position. The pawns might look ugly, but they control many invasion squares.

13 \h_h4 \g_g4 14 \d_d4 \f_f6 15 0-0 \b_ba_6

This is the only move these days since 15...\dxd3 16 \wxd3 e5 17 \dxf5 \c_c8

16...\dxe6 17 \dxe5 \g_g7 18 \d_g6+ \d_d7 19 f3 \a_a8!

Preparing a possible getaway to the queenside for the king.

20 \fx_g4 \w_e7 21 e4 \c_c8

Also possible is 21...\a_a5? 22 \w_e2 \a_a8 23 e5 \a_a6 24 e6 \c_c6 25 \h_xh8+ \h_xh8 26 \f_f1+ 27 \w_f1 \e_d8 28 \w_f4 \h_h7 29 \w_xh6 \e_e5 30 \h_xd6 \w_xd6 31 \h_h8+ \c_c7 32 \w_xg7+ \d_d8 33 \h_h8+, with a perpetual in Ivanchuk-Anand, Monaco 1993.

22 \d_d2

16...\dxe6?!

This sacrifice is the only way for White to prevent his centre from collapsing. After 16 dxe6 Black's bishop would be a truly powerful piece and Black would rock n' roll on the light squares.

16...\a_a6 17 \dxe5 \g_g7 18 \d_g6+ \d_d7 19 f3 \a_a8!

Preparing a possible getaway to the queenside for the king.

20 \fx_g4 \w_e7 21 e4 \c_c8

Also possible is 21...\a_a5? 22 \w_e2 \a_a8 23 e5 \a_a6 24 e6 \c_c6 25 \h_xh8+ \h_xh8 26 \f_f1+ 27 \w_f1 \e_d8 28 \w_f4 \h_h7 29 \w_xh6 \e_e5 30 \h_xd6 \w_xd6 31 \h_h8+ \c_c7 32 \w_xg7+ \d_d8 33 \h_h8+, with a perpetual in Ivanchuk-Anand, Monaco 1993.

22 \d_d2

22...\a_a5?!

This game was a sad episode for Black and, later, play was improved with 22...\b_b8!, e.g. 23 \h_xh6+ \h_xh6 24 \w_xh6 \h_c8 (this is the idea behind ...\b_b8 - the bishop is badly needed on the kingside to stop the pawns) 25 \d_e1 \d_xg4 26 c5 \w_f6 27 \e_xd6 \h_h5 28 e5 \w_xg6 29 \w_g6 \e_xg6 30 e6 \d_c5 31 d7 \dxd7 32 \e_xd7 \h_h8 33 \d_e6 \h_h5 34 \a_e5 \h_xd7 35 \h_h6 \h_f7 36 \a_xg7 \a_xd5 37 \e_e5 \e_a2 \h_f5 1/2-1/2, Kasparov-Timman, Hilversum 1985; or 23 \d_d4 \d_e8 24 \h_f7 \h_f7 25 \w_xh8 \h_f8 26 \w_xh6 \d_c5 27 \h_h5 \d_d7 28 \h_f5 \a_c8 29 \f_f1 \d_e5, which left Black okay in Salov-Timman, Saint John 1988.

23 \h_xh8+ \h_xh8 24 \w_xh6 \w_f6 25 \a_f5+ \a_xf5 26 \w_xf6 \h_xf6 27 \e_xf5 \d_a6 28 \a_f2 \e_xe4 29 \d_d4 \h_f7 30 f6 \h_h7 31 \a_c5 \dxc5 32 \d_d1!

Keeping the bishop out of the game.

32...\d_b5

was met with 18 f4!! in Miles-Beliavsky, Tilburg 1986, practically winning on the spot. There followed 18...\wxf5 19 e4 \w_h5 20 fxe5 dxe5 21 c5 \d_d8 22 d6 \w_e8 23 dxc7+ \e_c7 24 \w_d5 \e_c6 25 \h_f7+ \e_d7 26 \a_a1 \d_d8 27 \e_1f6 \c_c8 28 cxb6 axb6 29 \w_b5 1-0.

16...\a_xe6?

This sacrifice is the only way for White to prevent his centre from collapsing. After 16 dxe6 Black's bishop would be a truly powerful piece and Black would rock n' roll on the light squares.
Take the money and run.

10 bxc3 \(a5\) 11 e1 a5

This appears to be the safest path here. It is doubtful that White has gained much for his pawn. But other moves have also brought good results.

a) 11....\(\text{xd}2+\) 12 \(\text{xd}2\) d6 13 c5 (13 f5? is too slow: 13...\(\text{d}7\) 14 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}7\) 15 0-0 f5 16 c5 dxc5 17 \(\text{xc}7\) 0-0 18 dxc5 \(\text{xc}5\) 19 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{ad}8\) and White resigned in Priehoda-Rozentalis, Trnava 1988) 13...\(\text{xc}5\) 14 \(\text{b}2\)? (harmless is 14 dxc5 \(\text{xd}2+\) 15 \(\text{xd}2\) \(\text{a}6\) 16 \(\text{xc}7\) \(\text{xf}1\) 17 \(\text{hx}f1\) \(\text{a}6\) 18 \(\text{d}6\) \(\text{xc}5\) 19 \(\text{xc}5\) bxc5 20 \(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{d}8\)+ 21 \(\text{e}2\) and a draw was agreed in Smirin-Rozentalis, New York 1997) 14...0-0 15 h4 g4 16 dxc5 \(\text{d}5\) 17 \(\text{c}2\) and now Black was too careful with 17...\(\text{c}6\)? in Stoeck-Cvek, Plzen 1997, after which the positional aspects of the position begin to count over material. Correct was 17...\(\text{xd}2+\) 18 \(\text{h}2\) \(\text{d}5\) to ruin White's set-up. After 19 \(\text{f}6\) \(\text{d}7\) 20 \(\text{h}6\) \(\text{xc}5\) 21 \(\text{g}5+\) \(\text{xd}5\) 22 h\(x\)g5 we have a big mess.

b) 11....\(\text{b}4\) 12 h4 and now the piece sacrifice 12...\(\text{c}6\)? should be the reason to play this system. 12...\(\text{gh}4\)? is still the main line given in ECO, but after 13 \(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{d}6\) 14 \(\text{g}4\) \(\text{e}7\) 15 \(\text{xc}6\) c\(x\)d6 16 \(\text{g}3!\) they suggest to improve on 16...f5 with 16...d5!? About 10 years ago I told Steffen Pedersen the refutation and he put it in his book 1 d4! 17 c\(x\)d5 d\(x\)d5 (what else? 17...\(\text{a}6\) is just plain bad) 18 \(\text{c}7\) \(\text{a}6\) 19 \(\text{a}a7\) and White wins. But even stronger is 19 \(\text{c}4!\), winning everything after 19...d\(x\)c4 (19...\(\text{a}3\) 20 \(\text{xa}6\) \(\text{xa}6\) 21 \(\text{e}5+\) \(\text{d}8\) 22 \(\text{c}2\) and White wins material or mates) 20 \(\text{xa}7!\) \(\text{xa}7\) 21 \(\text{xb}8+\) with a mate in 8 according to Junior. After 16...f5 White has 17 c5 d5 18 \(\text{e}5!\) with a strong initiative, as in Agdestein-Hellers, Gausdal 1987. Returning to 13 d5, Schussler-Armason, Reykjavik 1986 went 13...\(\text{e}7\)? 14 d\(x\)c6 d\(x\)c6 15 \(\text{e}5\) 0-0-0 16 \(\text{c}3\) (16 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{xd}2\) 17 \(\text{xd}2\) \(\text{d}8\) and Black wins) 16...\(\text{xc}3\) 17 \(\text{xc}3\) c5 18 h\(x\)g5 h\(x\)g5 19 \(\text{h}8\) \(\text{h}8\) 20 e4 f5 21 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{d}8\) 22 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{f}8\) 23

---

32...\(\text{xe}4\) 33 f7 \(\text{e}8\) 34 g5 and White wins.

33 g5 \(\text{xe}8\) 34 \(\text{e}1!\)

And now the king.

34...\(\text{d}7\) 35 g3 b5 36 \(\text{g}2\) a5 37 h3 b4 38 c\(x\)b4 a\(x\)b4 39 g4 \(\text{h}8\) 40 h5 \(\text{d}6\)

41 \(\text{xe}8!\) 1-0

---

Game 27

Crouch-Harikrishna

London 2001

1 d4 e6 2 c4 \(\text{d}f6\) 3 \(\text{f}3\) b6 4 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{b}7\) 5 \(\text{g}5\) h6 6 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{b}4\) 7 e3 g5 8 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{e}4\) 9 \(\text{d}2?!\)

This is a gambit that might have been playable back in the days when people were afraid of taking the pawns and defending an awkward position. But these days – no.

9...\(\text{xe}3!\)
Queen's Indian Defence

\text{c2} \text{f7} and Black actually won this position. Here I will just say that White has no easy way to co-ordinate his pieces, and Black's bishop does look terribly strong. Still, my choice would be 11...\text{a5}.

12 h4 \text{g8} 13 \text{c2} \text{e7}!

Black lives with the knowledge that \text{c7} falls. So what? White is still trapped in a terrible pin and \text{g2} is still exposed. All in all it looks as if White does not have any chances to gain an advantage in this line, as he does not have the fluent development you usually get when you sacrifice a pawn.

14 hxg5 hxg5 15 \text{xc7} \text{a6} 16 \text{e5} \text{a3} 17 \text{d1} \text{b4} 18 \text{b3} \text{xa2} 19 \text{xa2} \text{xa2} 20 \text{f3} \text{b4} 21 \text{a1} \text{c3} 22 \text{f2} \text{a5} 23 \text{f6} \text{g4} 24 \text{d3} \text{g3} + 25 \text{e1} \text{b5} 26 \text{h7} \text{f8} 27 \text{g7} \text{bxc4} 28 \text{xf8} \text{xf8} 29 \text{xc4} \text{f5} 30 \text{g6} \text{g7} 31 \text{e5} \text{e4} + 32 \text{f1} \text{a6} + 33 \text{g1} \text{g5} 34 \text{f4} 34...\text{d2}!

The winning move. Once the e3-square caves in the game is up.

35 \text{h4} \text{xe3} + 36 \text{h1} \text{xd4} 37 \text{d1} \text{xe5} 38 \text{h5} \text{xf4} 39 \text{xd7} + \text{f6} 40 \text{xf4} \text{h8} 41 \text{h4} \text{e2} 42 \text{a7} \text{hxh5} 43 \text{hxh5} \text{hxh5} 44 \text{xa5} \text{f4} 45 \text{g1} \text{e2} 46 \text{a8} \text{f3} 47 \text{gf3} \text{xf3} 0-1
5 \textit{c2} and 5 \textit{g5}

Summary

5 \textit{c2} is not ambitious and Black equalises without trouble. 4 \textit{c3} \textit{b4} 5 \textit{g5} \textit{b7} 6 e3 h6 7 \textit{h4} \textit{xc3} 8 bxc3 d6 is a good reliable system for Black. Now 9 \textit{d2} is the only good move, but 9 \textit{d3}, which has led to disaster for many White players, is still seen occasionally. 7...g5 8 \textit{g3} \textit{e4} is also seen at the top level, and after 9 \textit{c2} the game seems to be more or less equal, even though this is a complex line. The gambit after 9 \textit{d2} is simply not to be recommended.

1 d4 \textit{f6} 2 c4 e6 3 \textit{f3} b6 4 \textit{c3} (D) \textit{b4}

4...\textit{b7}

5 \textit{c2} – Game 21; 5 \textit{g5} – Game 22

5 \textit{g5}

5 \textit{b3} – Chapter 4

5...\textit{b7} 6 e3

6 \textit{c2} – Game 23

6...\textit{h6} 7 \textit{h4} \textit{xc3} +

7...g5 8 \textit{g3} \textit{e4} (D)

9 \textit{c2} – Game 26; 9 \textit{d2} – Game 27

8 bxc3 d6 (D)

9 \textit{d3} – Game 24; 9 \textit{d2} – Game 25
In this chapter we will investigate Seirawan's pet line which, in my opinion, is one of the most difficult for Black to face. Look out particularly for Alterman's nice strategic idea in the first main game, and that of Miles in one of the sub-variations.

```
1 d4 \(\text{f6}\) 2 c4 e6 3 \(\text{f3}\) b6 4 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{b4}\)
5 \(\text{b3}\)
```

I give this move an exclamation mark not because it is better than 5 e3, leading to the Nimzo-Indian, or 5 \(\text{g5}\), but because this is what I would play myself with White in this position, as it is clearly the most problematic line for Black to face.

```
5...a5
```

This is one of three ways to protect the bishop. 5...\(\text{e7}\) is considered in the following game and 5...\(\text{c5}\) in Game 30.

```
6 \(\text{g5}\)
```

The main line. Black has no problems after the alternatives:

a) In reply to 6 g3, 6...\(\text{b7}\) 7 \(\text{g2}\) 0-0 8 0-0 \(\text{xc3}\) 9 \(\text{xc3}\) d6 10 b3 \(\text{bd7}\) 11 \(\text{b2}\) leads us to a standard position where White seems to have a tiny edge thanks to the potential pressure on the long diagonal, as in Dreev-Kiselev, Podolsk 1992. Instead 6...\(\text{c6}\)! is the aggressive approach, e.g. 7 \(\text{g2}\) a4! (now this is possible) 8 \(\text{c2}\) \(\text{a6}\) 9 a3 (9 0-0 \(\text{xc4}\) 10 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 11 dxe5 \(\text{d5}\) 12 \(\text{xa4}\) b5 13 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{xc3}\) 14 bxc3 \(\text{a4}\) was fine for Black in Labunsky-Tsesarsky, USSR 1986) 9...\(\text{xc3+}\) 10 \(\text{xc3}\) \(\text{a5}\) 11 \(\text{e5}\)! (11 \(\text{d2}\) d5 12 cxd5 \(\text{xd5}\) 13 \(\text{c2}\) is unclear according to Giplis) 11...d5! 12 cxd5 \(\text{xd5}\) and it is already clear that Black has considerable power in his pieces. That he used it to win a superb game in Polugaevsky-Ljubojevic, Linares 1985, is no surprise: 13 \(\text{c2}\) \(\text{b3}\) 14 \(\text{c6+}\) \(\text{f8}\) 15 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{e8}\) 16
\( \text{\texttt{Qd7+ Qg8 17 e4 Qxd4 18 Wxa4 c5 19 exd5 Qb5 20 Wd1 Qxd7 21 Qe3 Qe2 22 dxe6 Wxe6 23 Wxe2 Qxe2 24 Qxa8 Qc4 25 Qd1 Qd4 26 Qxd4 cxd4 27 Qe4 g6 28 Qd3 Wa2 29 Qb1 Wb3 30 Qd2 Qg7 and Black went on to win.}} \)

b) 6 a3 \( \text{Qxc3+ (6...a4 7 Qc2 Qxc3+ 8 bxc3! reminds me of the main game. 8 bxc3 has never been played before) 7 Wxc3 Qb7 8 g3 0-0 9 Qg2 a4! and Black had at least equalised in Ahner-Bischoff, Germany 1997 (c4 is a potential problem for White and the queen's bishop has no good squares).} \)

6...h6

White is developing. 7 a3 \( \text{Qxc3+ 8 Wxf6 Qxd6 9 e3 Qbd7 10 Qd2 Wc7 11 Qb5 e5 12 a2 exd4 13 Qxd4 a4 was good enough for equality in Zaja-Baklan, New Delhi 2000.} \)

7...h6

There is only one really independent way to play this position, namely 7...Wc7 8 Qc2 a4? 9 a3 \( \text{Qxc3+, and now 10 Wxc3 Qe4! 11 Qxe7 Qxc3 12 Qh4 Qe4 seems to give Black equality due to the weakness of c4. Instead 10 bxc3! is best, the idea being that Black will have some commitment to the a4-pawn and that White will benefit from a strong centre, as is the case in the 5 Qg5 lines. Miles-Arkhipov, Münster 1993 continued 10...Qc4 (it is not easy to decide where this bishop belongs, as we will certainly play f2-f3 and e3-e4 soon) 11 Wb2 h6 12 Qh4 0-0 13 Qd2 Qh7 14 f3 e5 15 e4 Qc6 16 Qe2 (planning to re-route the knight to d5) 16...d6 17 Qf1 g5 18 Qf2 Qh5 19 Qe3 Qd4 20 Qd5! Wd8 21 g4! and White had a very promising position.} \)

8 Qh4

The only serious move. After 8 Qxf6 Wxf6 9 Qe2 0-0 10 0-0 Qxc3 11 Wxc3 d6 12 Qd2 Qd7 the position was even in Ivanov-Farago, Philadelphia 1984.

8...d6

Black should develop smoothly. After 8...g5 9 Qg3 Qe4 10 Qd3 d6 11 Qxe4! Qxe4 12 0-0-0 Qxc3 (12...Qb7 13 d5! gives White the advantage due to his influence in the centre) 13 Wxc3 Qd7 14 Qe1 Qc7 15 c5 White seemed to have some initiative in Miles-Budnikov, Beijing 1991, although Black might be fine.

9 a3?!

This builds on a very interesting concept, similar to the one Miles used in the note to Black’s 7th move. Others:

a) 9 Qe2?! – it is not easy to see what the bishop is doing here. Black is doing well after 9...g5 10 Qg3 Qe4, e.g. 11 0-0-0 Qxc3 12 bxc3 Qd7 13 Qe1 h5 14 h4 g4 15 Qd3 Qxg3 16 fxg3 Qxg2 17 Qh2 Qe4, and White did not have enough compensation for the pawn in Conquest-Onischuk, Germany 1997, or 11 d5 Qd7 12 Qd4 Qd5 13 Wc2 Qxc3+ 14 bxc3 e5, and Black was satisfied in Stohl-Polak, Olomouc 1998.

b) 9 Qd3 is the main line here. After 9...Qbd7 10 0-0-0 Qxc3 11 Wxc3 Black has a variety of valid options:

b1) 11...a4?! 12 Wc2 Qa5 13 Qd2 g5 14 Qg3 Qxg2 15 Qg1 Qb7 16 f3 Qa8 17 Qd1 Qe7 18 Qe1 c5 19 Qe4 Qa7 20 Qc3 Qa6 21 f4, Miles-Bischoff, Havana 1998, and White had compensation for the pawn but it was still a battle.

b2) 11...Wc8?! 12 Wc2! c5 13 d5 e5 14 Qd2 g5 15 Qg3 Wc7 16 f4 and Black experienced serious problems on the light squares in Khalifman-Tunik, Maikop 1998.

b3) 11...Wd7 12 Qe1 e5?! 13 Qf5 0-0-0 14
Queen's Indian Defence

c5! put Black under fire in Miles-Singh, Calcutta 1994. After 14...exd4 15 cxd6 \( \text{wx}d6 \) 16 \( \text{cx}d4 \text{\texttt{Q}}d5 \) 17 \( \text{w}c2 \text{c}5 \) 18 \( \text{Q}d3 \text{c}6 \) 19 \( \text{Q}g3 \text{w}f6 \) 20 \( \text{Q}e5 \text{cx}d4 \) 21 \( \text{Q}xc6 \) he was ready to resign.

b4) 11...g5 12 \( \text{Q}g3 \text{c}e4 \) 13 \( \text{w}c2 \text{d}f6 \) 14 \( \text{h}e1 \text{w}e7 \) with an even position in Khalifman-Granda Zuniga, Ulcinj 1998.

9...a4

9...\( \text{Q}xc3+! \), with the idea of 10 \( \text{w}xc3 \) a4! with equality, is probably a better line. Now White gets something.

10 \( \text{w}c2 \text{xc}3+! \) 11 bxc3!

I would like to quote Alterman on this position because he says it all: 'This was my idea. It looks as if Black gets a tempo with ...a5-a4 but, as I understand it, the pawn on a4 only presents problems for Black because it requires constant protection.'

11...\( \text{bd}7 \) 12 \( \text{dd}2 \text{w}e7 \) 13 f3 e5 14 e4 0-0 15 \( \text{ae}2 \)

Here Black should find a way to organise his pieces so that he gets out of the pin and activates his forces. I have a feeling that Liss does not find the appropriate route.

15...\( \text{we}6?! \)

15...\( \text{we}8! \) improves, with indirect protection of a4 and the manoeuvre ...\( \text{Q}h5-f4 \) coming up, perhaps even ...c7-c6 and ...d6-d5 in some situations. Liss leaves the e8-square free for a rook, which seems sensible enough, but the queen appears to be slightly awkward on e6 and he still has problems with the a4-pawn.

16 0-0 \( \text{Qh}5 \) 17 \( \text{Qfe}1 \text{f}4 \) 18 \( \text{Qf}1 \text{w}g6 \)
19 \( \text{Ad}1 \text{f}5 \) 20 exf5 \( \text{Ax}f5 \) 21 \( \text{Q}g3! \)

All White's pieces are well organised here and Black has managed to do nothing other than open up the position for them. White is clearly better.

21...\( \text{Wf}7 \) 22 \( \text{Qe}4! \text{h}8 \) 23 \( \text{Qf}2 \text{Qf}8! \)

Leaving the pawn to its own devices seems a rational thing to do. The pieces need to play before everything goes wrong.

24 \( \text{Wxa}4 \text{Qf}6 \) 25 \( \text{Qxf}4 \text{Qxf}4 \) 26 dxe5 dxe5 27 \( \text{Qd}3 \text{e}5 \) 28 \( \text{Xe}5 \text{Qh}5 \)

Here Black has only one minute left with which to reach the 40th move, but White completely overlooks his threat, and the game takes a sudden turn.

29 \( \text{Qd}1?? \) \( \text{xf}3! \)

This rook is obviously taboo.

30 \( \text{Wd}1 \text{Wg}6 \) 31 \( \text{Wd}2?! \)
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31 \textit{We}2! is better according to Alterman. 

I like this move quite a lot. The next note demonstrates the main reason why (\textit{De}4).

6 \textit{a}3!

The most challenging set-up. At least it earns the bishop pair. Others:

a) After 6 \textit{g}5 \textit{b}7 7 \textit{e}3 a5 8 a3 \textit{xc}3+ 9 \textit{xc}3 \textit{De}4! Black steers the game to an ending where \textit{c}4 is a slight weakness. Seirewan-Sokolov, Candidates 1985, went 10 \textit{xa}7 \textit{xc}3 11 \textit{h}4 \textit{De}4 12 \textit{xd}2 \textit{xd}2 13 \textit{xd}2 \textit{a}4! 14 \textit{b}6 \textit{c}6 15 \textit{d}3 \textit{a}5 16 \textit{xc}3 \textit{a}6 17 \textit{e}4 0-0 18 \textit{c}2 \textit{xc}4 19 \textit{xa}4 c6 20 \textit{b}3 \textit{d}5 21 \textit{xc}4 \textit{xc}4 22 \textit{b}3 with complete equality.

b) 6 \textit{g}3 \textit{b}7 7 \textit{g}2 \textit{c}5 8 a3 \textit{xc}3+ 9 \textit{xc}3 \textit{xd}4 10 \textit{xd}4 \textit{c}6 11 \textit{h}4 \textit{a}5 12 \textit{g}5 \textit{h}6 13 0-0 0-0 14 \textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 15 \textit{xf}6 \textit{gx}f6 16 \textit{d}2 \textit{fc}8 and Black was completely fine in Dreev-Karpov, Dortmund 1994. However, I think White might be slightly better after 7...0-0 0-0 \textit{xc}3 9 \textit{xc}3 \textit{d}6 10 \textit{b}3 \textit{bd}7 11 \textit{b}2 \textit{e}4 12 \textit{fe}1. At least Black was in trouble after 12...\textit{c}5 13 \textit{ad}1 \textit{fd}8 14 d5! \textit{ex}d5 15 cxd5 b5 16 \textit{h}4! \textit{xa}4 17 \textit{h}3 \textit{g}2 b4 18 \textit{b}6 g6 19 e4 in Van Wely-Psakhis, Internet 1995, the bishop making its presence felt.

c) 6 \textit{f}4. The bishop is nice here, but not very useful. 6...\textit{d}5 7 \textit{e}3 0-0 8 a3 \textit{xc}3+ 9 \textit{xc}3 \textit{a}6! 10 \textit{g}5 \textit{c}8 11 \textit{cx}5 \textit{xf}1 12 \textit{xf}1 \textit{ex}d5 13 \textit{xc}1 \textit{we}6 left Black no worse in Alterman-Hracek, Bad Homburg 1997.

6...\textit{xc}3+ 7 \textit{xc}3 \textit{b}7 8 \textit{e}3

Here I prefer 8 g3 0-0 9 \textit{g}2 as it puts less restraint on the queen's bishop. Now 9...\textit{d}6 10 0-0 \textit{bd}7 11 \textit{b}4 is perhaps a touch better for White, but this is difficult to prove, e.g. 11...a5 12 \textit{b}2 \textit{a}xb4 13 \textit{ab}4 \textit{fc}8 14 \textit{fd}1, Gurevich-Karpov, Reggio Emilia 1991, when 14...\textit{fl}8!, with the intention of ...\textit{xa}1 and ...\textit{a}8, puts Black as close to equality as he can possibly come in positions like this (without a mistake from White). Indeed he should not fear such positions. Gurevich calls it equal, but this is because White's advantage is so minor that, at his level, it is insignificant. 11...\textit{De}4 12 \textit{c}2 \textit{f}5 is
less good for Black. Smyslov-Chandler, Hastings 1988, went 13 \( \texttt{b2 c6} \) 14 \( \texttt{a4 a5} \) 15 \( \texttt{b5 a6} \) 16 \( \texttt{d1 c6} \) 17 \( \texttt{bxc6 bxc6} \) 18 \( \texttt{f3 d5} \) 19 \( \texttt{d3} \), and White was better. Look at all the weak pawns on the dark squares!

8 \( \texttt{g5 e4} \) sees Black equalise immediately.

8...0-0

8...d6 9 \( \texttt{e2 e4} \) 10 \( \texttt{wc2 d7} \) 11 0-0 0-0 12 \( \texttt{d2 f5} \) 13 \( \texttt{f3 d5} \) 14 \( \texttt{e2 e5} \) 15 \( \texttt{f1 exd4} \) 16 \( \texttt{exd4} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 17 \( \texttt{g5} \) 18 \( \texttt{g3} \) 19 \( \texttt{h4} \) 20 \( \texttt{f4} \)!

9 \( \texttt{e2 d6} \)

I think this is the most natural way to play the position, but also possible is 9...c5?! 10 0-0 \( \texttt{c8} \) 11 \( \texttt{dx5 wc5} \) (11...\( \texttt{bc5} \) 12 \( \texttt{b3} \) followed by 13 \( \texttt{b2} \) is slightly better for White) 12 \( \texttt{b4 wc7} \) 13 \( \texttt{b2 d5} \) 14 \( \texttt{wd4 dx4} \) 15 \( \texttt{xc4 a5} \)! (15...\( \texttt{c6} \)?! 16 \( \texttt{wh4} \) and Black needs to be careful) 16 \( \texttt{d3 c6} \) 17 \( \texttt{c6 xc6} \) 18 \( \texttt{bxa5} \) (18 \( \texttt{b5 xd6} \) 19 \( \texttt{wh4 e5} \) 20 \( \texttt{a4 xd2} \) 21 \( \texttt{a3 wd8} \) 22 \( \texttt{wd3 xd5} \) is no worse for Black at all) 18...\( \texttt{e5!} \) 19 \( \texttt{wh4 xxa5?!} \) was Sokolov-Karpov, Groningen 1995. Better in any way.

10 0-0 \( \texttt{bd7} \) 11 \( \texttt{b4 c5} \)!

Black should seek counterplay, and the only way to do so is to put pressure on a weakness on the light squares, namely the c4-pawn. 11...\( \texttt{e4} \) 12 \( \texttt{wd3} \) \( \texttt{f5} \) tries to put pressure on g2, but Black is not in position to justify this: 13 \( \texttt{d2 wh4} \) 14 \( \texttt{f3 d5} \) 15 \( \texttt{d5} \) gave White a slight advantage in Van Wely-Lobron, London 1995. The point is, of course, 15...\( \texttt{c5} \) 16 \( \texttt{f4} \)!, with a fight for a giant bishop on b2.

12 \( \texttt{b2 a5} \)

Here Black has a great range of alternatives.

a) 12...\( \texttt{ac8} \) 13 \( \texttt{dx5 dx5} \) 14 \( \texttt{b5 fd8} \) 15 \( \texttt{a4} \), Becker-Pitzchak, Bad Liebenwerda 1934. This kind of position is typical for the line. White has a very minor plus due to the bishop's superiority over the knight.

b) 12...\( \texttt{e4} \) 13 \( \texttt{c2} \) and now 13...\( \texttt{f5} \)?! does not sit well with ...\( \texttt{c7-c5} \). Now White's dark-squared bishop assumes great influence that could otherwise be neutralised later with ...\( \texttt{f7-f6} \) if necessary. Moreover Black's second rank is slightly more exposed, and this is felt on g7. In Shankovich-Kholmov, Baku 1972, 14 \( \texttt{dx5 bxc5} \) 15 \( \texttt{b5 fd6} \) 16 \( \texttt{d2 ad8} \) 17 \( \texttt{f3 d5} \) 18 \( \texttt{f1} \) gave White the advantage. Better is 13...\( \texttt{ac8} \), e.g. 14 \( \texttt{dx5 dx5} \) 15 \( \texttt{b5 h6} \) 16 \( \texttt{fd1 fd8} \) 17 \( \texttt{a4 d5} \) 18 \( \texttt{wc3 dx3+} \) 19 \( \texttt{xf3 fd6} \) 20 \( \texttt{xb7 wb7} \) with an edge for White in Cebalo-Hohler, Saint Vincent 1998. Often Black should not fear such positions as White's bishop tends to have difficulties causing any harm all by itself.

c) 12...\( \texttt{fd8} \) 13 \( \texttt{fd1 ac8} \) 14 \( \texttt{wb3 e4} \) 15 \( \texttt{d2 a8} \) 16 \( \texttt{dx5 dx5} \) 17 \( \texttt{b5 e4} \) 18 \( \texttt{b4 xe4 xe4} \) 19 \( \texttt{a4 f6} \) 20 \( \texttt{a5 df8} \) 21 \( \texttt{f3 g6} \) and, because Black's bishop looks so good and the a1-h8 diagonal is limited, Black had equalised in Gurevich-Rozentalis, Belfort 1997.

d) 12...\( \texttt{fe8} \) 13 \( \texttt{d2 ac8} \) 14 \( \texttt{dx5 dx5} \) 15 \( \texttt{b5 e5} \) 16 \( \texttt{f3 df8} \) 17 \( \texttt{a4} \) was slightly better for White in Burmakin-Zayac, St Petersburg 1998. White's set-up here is probably the most promising.

13 \( \texttt{fd1} \)

13 \( \texttt{dx5 dx5} \) 14 \( \texttt{b5 fe8} \) 15 \( \texttt{fd1 ad8} \)
16 \(\text{Qd2}\) e5 equalises. Perhaps 16 \(\text{Qe5}\)? Perhaps offer some kind of an advantage.

13...\(\text{axb4}\) 14 \(\text{axb4}\) f8b8!

Clearing space for the queen in order to trade major pieces on the a-file.

15 \(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Wd8}\) 16 f3 \(\text{Qxa1}\) 17 \(\text{Qxa1}\) \(\text{Qa8}\)

18 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Wc7}\) 19 \(\text{Qc2}\) \(\text{Qc8}\)!

A slight positional mistake. After 19...e5! Black has neutralised the pressure on the long diagonal and thus limited the scope of the bishop. Now White has a chance to establish a small edge.

20 dxc5 dxc5 21 b5!

The pawn structure is now clearly favourable for White. His bishops enjoy open diagonals, but Black's knights have no good squares.

21...\(\text{Qe8}\)

21...e5 22 \(\text{Qf5}\) is uncomfortable for White. Thanks to the misplacement of Black's pieces, e3-e4 followed by \(\text{Qf1-e3}\) will soon be a relevant option.

22 \(\text{Qe4}\) f6 23 \(\text{Wd3}\) \(\text{Qxe4}\)

This move is based on the following tactics: 23...\(\text{Qf8}\) 24 \(\text{Qd6}\)! \(\text{Qxd6}\) (24...\(\text{Qxe8}\) 25 \(\text{Qxe8}\) \(\text{Qxe8}\) 26 \(\text{Wd6}\) gives White a great advantage; b6 falls) 25 \(\text{Wxd6}\) (with the threat of \(\text{Wxc7}\) and \(\text{Qd6}\)) 25...\(\text{Wxd6}\) 26 \(\text{Qxd6}\) \(\text{Qa8}\) 27 \(\text{Qc3}\) \(\text{Ba2}\) 28 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qc8}\) 29 \(\text{Qf1}\) \(\text{Qa3}\) 30 \(\text{Qe1}\) and White wins b6 for e3, which gives him a passed pawn on the queenside and establishes c5 as a weakness.

24 \(\text{Wxe4}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 25 \(\text{Wd3}\) \(\text{Qf7}\) 26 \(\text{Qc3}\) \(\text{Qe7}\)

White is trying to open the position.

31...f5

31...\(\text{Qe7}\) 32 \(\text{Qh5}\) + \(\text{Qg6}\) 33 exf6 gxf6 34 \(\text{Qf1}\)! and White is ready to launch a direct assault on f6 with f4-f5.

32 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 33 h3 \(\text{Qg8}\) 34 \(\text{Qh2}\)!

Improving the king before the attack.

34...\(\text{Qg6}\) 35 g3 \(\text{f7}\) 36 h4! \(\text{Qg8}\) 37 h5 \(\text{Qh8}\)

37...\(\text{Qf8}\) 38 g4! – now this is possible as Black cannot organise counterplay against f4.

38 g4 \(\text{Qf8}\)

38...\(\text{f6}\)g4 39 \(\text{Qxg4}\) \(\text{Qxg4}\) 40 \(\text{Qa7}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 41 h6 with a winning attack.

39 \(\text{Qxf5}\) \(\text{Qxf5}\)

39...\(\text{exf5}\) 40 e6 and the bishop comes to life.

40 \(\text{Qxf5}\) \(\text{Qxf5}\) 41 \(\text{Qa8}\)+ \(\text{Qf8}\) 42 \(\text{Qxf8}\)+ \(\text{Qxf8}\) 43 \(\text{Qa8}\)+ \(\text{Qf7}\) 44 \(\text{Wxh8}\) \(\text{Wb7}\) 45 \(\text{h6}\)! 1-0

---

**Game 30**

**Seirawan-Timman**

**Hilversum Match (5th game) 1990**

1 d4 \(\text{Qf6}\) 2 \(\text{Qf3}\) e6 3 c4 b6 4 \(\text{Qc3}\) \(\text{b4}\)
Queen's Indian Defence

5 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{c5} \)

This is the main line. Actually it was this match between Timman and Seirawan that put the 5 \( \text{b3} \) line on the map as a serious main line, instead of a decent sub-variation. Seirawan used it in all three of his games with White—all of which he won.

6 \( \text{a3} \)

This is the most serious move. Alternatives:

a) 6 \( \text{f4} \) 0-0 and here White has two ways he can go:

a1) 7 a3 \( \text{a5} \) 8 \( \text{d1} \) (8 \( \text{dxc5} \) \( \text{d4} \) 9 \( \text{cb6} \) \( \text{axb6} \) 10 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 11 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{xc3}+ \) 12 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{a6} \) 13 0-0 \( \text{d5} \) 14 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 15 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{b3} \) 16 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 17 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{d5} \) was nice for Black in Dreev-Timman, Moscow 1993, until he blundered a few moves later...) 8...\( \text{a6}! \) and the bishop is much better placed here than on b7. In Garcia Palermo-Eingorn, Cienfuegos 1986 Black organised a quick attack on White's centre: 9 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{cxxd4} \) 10 \( \text{cxxd4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 11 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 12 \( \text{cx4} \) \( \text{dxc4} \) 13 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{w5} \) and Black had equalised, if not more...

a2) 7 \( \text{e3} \). This must be the way to play with \( \text{f4} \) but it fails to earn White an advantage. Dreev-Ivanchuk, Linares 1995 continued 7...\( \text{d5} \) 8 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 9 \( \text{cxxd5} \) (9 \( \text{dxc5} \) \( \text{bxc5} \) 10 \( \text{d3} \), with an unclear position, is better, while 9 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{e8} \) 10 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{a6} \) seems dangerous for White — what is the bishop really doing on d6?) 9...\( \text{cxxd5} \) 10 \( \text{g5} \) (10 \( \text{d6?} \) \( \text{c4}! \) might have been what Dreev overlooked) 10...\( \text{c7} \) 11 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 12 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xc3}+ \) 13 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{exd5} \) 14 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{a6} \) and Black had the advantage.

b) 6 \( \text{g5} \) with a further branch:

b1) Now after 6...\( \text{c6} \) there has been much debate as to whether 7 \( \text{d5} \) gives White an advantage. But the basic fact that the knight looks misplaced is possibly best illustrated by the less ambitious, but smooth 7 \( \text{e3?} \) \( \text{h6} \) 8 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{g5} \) 9 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e4} \) 10 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xc3}+ \) 11 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 12 \( \text{xg3} \) d6 13 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 14 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{dxc6} \) 15 \( \text{d5} \), when White had an advantage in Condie-Cullip, Edinburgh 1989.

b2) 6...\( \text{b7} \)

b21) 7 0-0-0 \( \text{xc3}! \) 8 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{e4} \) 9 \( \text{xd8} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 10 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{xd8} \) 11 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{e7} \) gives Black an even endgame.

b22) 7 \( \text{e3} \) 0-0 (7...\( \text{xf3} \) 8 \( \text{gx} \) \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 9 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{d5} \) 10 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{e5} \) 11 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e3} \) 12 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{fxg5} \) 13 \( \text{fxg5} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 14 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 15 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{e7} \) 16 \( \text{xe7}+ \) \( \text{xe7} \) 17 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{d6} \) 18 \( \text{f3} \) gave White a strategically won position in Van Wely-Miles, London (rapid) 1995) 8 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{d4} \) 9 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{c6} \) 10 0-0 \( \text{xc3} \) 11 0-0 \( \text{xf6} \) 12 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 13 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{e7} \) 14 \( \text{ac1} \) \( \text{g6} \) 15 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{d4} \) and Black was doing fine in Timoschenko-Pelletier, Leon 2001. Actually it might be White who should be careful here.

b23) 7 \( \text{d1?} \) 0-0 0 8 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{cxd4} \) 9 \( \text{exd4} \) and now 9...\( \text{d3} \) is a strong theoretical novelty of Boris Gelfand which gives Black equality. 10 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{c7} \) 11 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 12 \( \text{gxf3} \) \( \text{gxf3} \) 13 \( \text{gxf3} \) \( \text{d4} \) 14 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{h4} \) + led to a draw in Alterman-Gelfand, Tel Aviv 1999. This ending is equal.

c) 6 \( \text{e3?} \) \( \text{a6} \) (6...\( \text{c6?} \) looks so natural here that one wonders why it has not been played — when there is no \( \text{g5} \), then \( \text{d4-d5} \) also becomes less of a real threat) 7 a3 \( \text{a5} \) 8 \( \text{d2} \) 0-0 and now:

\[ c1 \] 9 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{cxd4} \) 10 \( \text{cxd4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 11 \( \text{db5} \) \( \text{b7} \) 12 \( \text{cxd5} \) a6! 13 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 14 \( \text{xd5} \)
\[ \text{15} \text{Wxd5} \text{Axd2}+ \text{16} \text{Axd2} \text{Axd5} \text{17} f3 \text{Aa7!} \text{18} e4 \text{Aa8!} \text{ was even in Seirawan-Browne, USA 1987. A decent alternative is 9...d5!?} \text{ with the following idea: 10 dxc5 bxc5 11 cxd5 exd5 12 Axa6 Axa6 13 0-0 Ab8 14 Wa2 c4! and Black has good play on the light squares.}

\[ \text{c2) 9 0-0-0 and now after 9...Wc7 10 d5 exd5 11 Axd5 Axd5 12 cxd5 Axf1 13 Axb6 axb6 13 cxd5 Axf1 14 Axb6 Axc3 15 Aa2 Axc3 Axd5 and Black is a pawn down but certainly has the advantage!}

\[ \text{6...Aa5!?}

\[ \text{Also possible is 6...Axc3+ 7 Wxc3 0-0, when 8 dxc5 is the best try for an advantage, e.g. 8...bxc5 9 Ag5 Axc6 10 e3 h6 11 Ah4 g5 12 Ag3 Ae4 13 Wc2 f5 14 0-0-0 Wf6 15 Aa4 Axc3 16 hxg3 Ab7, and now in Seirawan-Arnason, Manila 1992, White played 17 Aa2?. Instead 17 g4! gives White a powerful attack. When the kings are castled on opposite flanks and there are lots of open files, time is an important aspect of the game. The alternatives are 8 Aa5 Ab7 9 e3 d6 10 dxc5 bxc5 11 Aa1 Wc7 12 Ae3 Axd7 13 0-0 Afd8, which appeared to secure Black equality in Malaniuk-Lerner, Donetsk 1998, 8 e3 Ab7 9 b4 d6 10 Ab2 Ae4 11 Wc2 f5 12 Aa1 Afd7 13 Aa2 a5 14 bxc5 bxc5 15 0-0 Ab7 16 Aa1 Ab6 17 dxc5 Axc5 18 Aed4 Wg5 19 Aa3 Axf3 20 Axf3 with equality in Seirawan-Arnason, Reyjkavik 1986 (although this set-up might be more dangerous than it appeared here) and, finally, 8 g3? cxd4! 9 Wxd4 Ac6 10 Wh4 Ab7 11 Aa2 Axc8 12 Aa2 Axc3+ 13 Axa5 bxa5, when Black had a lead in development and very active pieces in Gurevich-Kasparov, Linares 1991.}

\[ 7 Ag5

\[ \text{The aggressive move. After 7 e3 0-0 8 Ae2 Wc4! 9 d5 Axh3+ 10 bxc3 Aa6!? 11 Ab2 We7 12 Ad1 Aa8! 13 Aa3 (13 0-0? exd5 14 Axd5 Ac6 with ...Aa5 to follow) 13...Ad6? Black was doing very well in Seirawan-Timman, Hilversum 1990. 7 Aa4 Aa7 8 Ad1 0-0 9 e3 cxd4 10 Axd4 Ae4 11 Wc2 Axh3 Bxc3+ 12 bxc3 was fine for Black in Portisch-Polugaevsky, Linares 1985. It seems that the bishop is rather harmlessly placed on f4 in these lines, as the attack on d6 and c7 is not supported by other pieces.}

\[ 7...Ac6?

\[ \text{This move is refuted in the meanest possible way. Others:}

- a) 7...ah6! 8 Ah4 g5 (8...Ac6? 9 0-0-0 Ad3 10 Ac6 cxd4 11 Ac6 d5! and Black is clearly not developed to meet this) 11 Axd4 Ad4 12 Wh3! and White won a quick victory in Seirawan-Timman, Hilversum (3) 1990, while 8...Ab7 is, of course, best here, but because the bishop is now on h4 Black will have less effect with the ...Axh3 and ...Ad4 trick than without ...Ah7-h6). After 8...g5 9 Ag3 Black has played:

- a1) 9...Ac6 10 0-0-0 Axh3 11 d5! exd5 12 Axd5 Ac6 13 Ac6 Ad7 14 h4 and White had a powerful initiative in Nielsen-Hracek, Germany 2000.

- a2) 9...Ad4 10 e3 Ac6 11 Ad3 Axg3 (11...Axh3+ 12 bxc3 Axe3 13 fxg3! gives White some prospects on the f-file) 12 hxg3 g4 13 d5! gxh3 14 dxc6 fxg2 15 Ag1 with a powerful initiative for White in Psakhis-}
Queen's Indian Defence


a3) ...g4 10 d2 cxd4 11 b5 xd2+ 12 xd2 e4+ 13 e1 with a clear advantage for White in Malaniuk-Lendwai, Kesckemét 1991.

b) 7...b7! and now White has a flood of different opportunities:

b1) 8 0-0-0? xc3! 9 xc3 e4 10 xd8 xc3 11 bxc3 xd8 12 d5 e7 13 e4 d6 14 d3 d7 15 e1 a6 with a level ending in Gretarsson-Hjartarson, Leeuwarden 1995.

b2) There is no time for 8 dxc5!. Black now develops a lot of threats quickly:

b21) 8 0-0-0? xc3! 9 bc3 e4 10 xc3 bd7 11 e4 d6 12 b4 axb4 13 axb4 a5 gave Black an equal ending in Campos Moreno-Adams, Cala Galdana 2001-who cares about two bishops when the rook is still on h1 with no immediate prospects?) 9 d5 10 c2 e4 11 d1 xc3+ 12 bxc3 xa1+ 14 b6 a6 15 b2 c5 gave Black a development advantage in Campos Moreno-Adams, Cala Galdana 2001-who cares about two bishops when the rook is still on h1 with no immediate prospects?) 9 d5 10 c2 e4 11 d1 xc3+ 12 bxc3 b6 and Black has a strong initiative, Van Wely-Seirawan, Wijk an Zee 1995.

b23) 8 ... h6?! 9 h4 g5 (9 ... 0-0 10 d1 cxd4 11 xd4 f3 12 gxf3 c6 13 d2 e5 14 c2 g6 15 g3 e8 16 c2 f3 c5 17 c3 d5 looked fine for Black in Sokolov-Adams, Dortmund 1999.

b24) 8 e3 and now:

b241) 8 ... 0-0 is the most normal. 9 c1 d5 (again the most logical, but also possible is 9 ... xc3+ 10 bxc3 e7 11 e2 d6 12 0-0 bd7 13 d2 f8 14 f3 h5 15 h4 with a complicated struggle ahead in Seirawan-Adams, Bermuda 1999) 10 e2 bd7 11 0-0 cxd4 12 b5? (although neither of the players could have foreseen it, this move practically leads to a forced draw; anyway, Black appears to be doing well) 12 ... h6 13 h4 c5 14 e2 d3! 15 xd3 xd3 16 xd3 a6 17 cxd5 axb5 18 dxe6 e8 19 fxe6 fxe6 20 c5 e4 21 d7! (21 b4?? xe3 22 gxf3 g6+ 21 ... xc2 (21 ... xd7 22 xe4 gives White powerful compensation for the exchange as his minor pieces are very strongly placed in the centre) 22 c7+ h8 and a draw was agreed in Bareev-Adams, Wijk aan Zee 2002. Note that ...cxd4? quickly leads to trouble: 10 xd4! c6 11 f4! e7 12 xf6! and White had an initiative in Seirawan-Adams, Bermuda 1999.

b242) 8 ... cxd4? 9 cxd4 0-0 10 c2 xc3+ 11 xd3 d5 looked fine for Black in Sokolov-Adams, Dortmund 1999.

b243) 8 ... h6?! 9 c4 d5 (9 ... 0-0 10 d1 cxd4 11 xd4 f3 12 gxf3 c6 13 d2 e5 14 c2 g6 15 g3 e8 16 c2 f3 c5 17 c3 d5 left White in a strong attacking position in Sokolov-Janssen, Netherlands 1999) 10 g3 e4 11 d3 xc3+ 12 bxc3 g6 13 hxg6 d6 14 c2 c7 and a draw was soon agreed in Nielsen-C.Hansen, Aars 1995, but the position does not feel completely safe for Black.

b244) 8 ... f3? 9 gxf3 cxd4 10 exd4 c6 11 0-0-0 xc3 12 xc3 e8 13 b1 gave White a storming advantage in Korchnoi-Polugaevsky, Reykjavik 1987.

b245) 8 ... e7 9 c1 d6 10 dxc5 dxc5 11 0-0-0 b7?! (11 ... xc3 12 xc3 is a little better for White due to 12 ... e4 13 g7 with advantage) 12 b5 0-0 13 d6 c6 14 e4 was critical for Black in Shabalov-Yemelin, Moscow 2002.

8 0-0-0 xc3
available to White because the lead in development over-rides a possible loss of a pawn.

9...exd5?

Opening up the position when behind in development tends to be a poor idea. 9...\(\text{e}5\)! 10 dxc6 \(\text{c}7\)! is the correct defence (weaker is 10...\(\text{wc}7\)?, e.g. 11 g3! \(\text{d}6\) 12 \(\text{g}2\) dxc6 13 \(\text{xd}6\)! \(\text{xd}6\) 14 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{c}7\) 15 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{b}7\) 16 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{d}7\) 17 \(\text{xd}7\)! \(\text{xd}7\) 18 \(\text{xc}6\), which led to a swift victory in Seirawan-Zarnicki, Buenos Aires 1993). Then with 11 e3! White maintains a lead in development for as long as possible in order to create the greatest possible disharmony in the opponent’s camp. Soppe-Debarnot, Buenos Aires 1991 continued 11...h6 12 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{c}7\) 13 \(\text{wa}4\) d6 14 \(\text{d}3\) (14 \(\text{e}2\)? appears logical) 14...g5 15 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{h}5\) 16 \(\text{e}2\) f5 17 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{f}6\) 18 h4 g4 19 f3 h5 20 \(\text{b}1\) a6 21 \(\text{c}3\) 0-0 22 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{b}8\) 23 \(\text{h}6\) \(\text{f}7\) 24 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{f}8\) 25 e4 with excellent prospects for White. Note that the bishop is yet to be of use on c8 and, therefore, the c6-pawn remains a constant source of discomfort for Black.

10 cxd5 \(\text{e}5\) 11 dxc6 \(\text{e}7\)

12 cxd7+?

This move wins the game but, as a pupil of mine illustrated when given this game as an exercise, 12 \(\text{xf}6\)! is more straightforward: 12...\(\text{xf}6\) (12...\(\text{xf}6\) 13 cxd7+ \(\text{xe}6\) 14 \(\text{d}5\) 0-0 14 cxd7 \(\text{a}6\) 15 e4 and White wins.

12...\(\text{xd}7\) 13 e3!

With the idea of \(\text{xd}7\) and \(\text{b}5\). Note that Black cannot get the king into safety as he will lose instantly.

13...\(\text{d}8\)

13...0-0? 14 \(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{xe}5\) 15 \(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{xf}6\) 16 \(\text{xd}7\) and White wins a piece, or 13...0-0-0 14 \(\text{a}6+\) \(\text{b}8\) 15 \(\text{xe}5\) and Black can only resign.

14 \(\text{xd}7\)! \(\text{xd}7\)

14...\(\text{xd}7\) 15 \(\text{wa}4+\) \(\text{e}6\) 16 \(\text{c}4+\) \(\text{f}5\) 17 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{f}6\) 18 h4 g4 19 f3 h5 20 \(\text{b}1\) a6 21 \(\text{c}3\) 0-0 22 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{b}8\) 23 \(\text{h}6\) \(\text{f}7\) 24 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{f}8\) 25 e4 with excellent prospects for White. And Black has no defence.

18...c4

18...\(\text{e}4\) 19 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{a}4\) 20 \(\text{xd}6\) \(\text{d}8\) 21 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{xd}6\) 22 \(\text{c}4\) and White wins a piece.

19 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{e}8\) 20 \(\text{g}5\)! \(f5\) 21 \(\text{xc}4+\) \(\text{h}8\) 22 \(\text{xd}6\) \(\text{xd}6\) 23 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{d}8\) 24 \(\text{e}6\)! \(\text{c}8+\) 25 \(\text{b}1\) \(\text{d}7\) 26 \(\text{xd}6\) 1-0
Queen's Indian Defence

Summary
The positions after 5 \( \text{wb}3 \) are less well known than other lines in the QID, and that is already a good reason for playing it. Furthermore it can give White some good pressure. After 5...a5 and 5...\( \text{we}7 \) Black is probably always going to be very slightly worse, while after the more active 5...c5 – with the idea of 6 a3 \( \text{a}5 \) keeping the bishop – Black should be able to find a path to equality. This latter line is particularly worthy of experimentation.

1 d4 \( \text{gf}6 \) 2 c4 e6 3 \( \text{gf}3 \) b6 4 \( \text{dc}3 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 5 \( \text{wb}3 \) \( \text{(D)} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
5...a5 & \quad \text{- Game 28} \\
5...\text{we}7 & \quad \text{- Game 29}
\end{align*}
\]

5...c5 \( \text{(D)} \) 6 a3 \( \text{a}5 \) 7 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{(D)} \) – Game 30

\[
\begin{align*}
5 \text{wb}3 & \\
5...c5 & \\
7 \text{g}5
\end{align*}
\]
The 4 e3 line is often favoured by players who do not like to study a lot of theory. Not because knowledge of the line is limited but because it has a tendency not to change. Consequently in the books (as in this one) Black is completely equal and the lines are rather harmless, but some older GMs (who might prefer playing with their kids) choose this line over others that they feel will demand more study. A large number of draws should be anticipated.

In fact the e3-line is rather harmless for Black and I simply cannot recommend it for White, despite strong players such as Yusupov and Gelfand having found it useful for their purposes occasionally. The system simply does not put Black under any pressure and therefore he should be able to equalise without too great an effort. Of course, that is if he is prepared. I just think that playing a more aggressive system will benefit your game generally, no matter who you are.

---

**Game 31**

**Gelfand-Karpov**

*Sanghi Nagar (7) 1995*

1 c4 e6 2 d4 e6 3 f3 b6 4 e3 b7 5 c3 d5

Black should play this for safety. After 5...c7! 6 d5! White is playing against the bishop on b7. Nevertheless this is still playable for Black; only the main line is safer.

6 cxd5 exd5 7 b5+

Played in order to limit Black’s influence on e4.

7...c6 8 d3 e7?

8...d6 appears equally but we are following the path of the great masters here.

9 0–0 0–0 10 b3

White is taking it slowly. 10 e4 dxe4 11 dxe4 b7 12 e1 c8 13 c5 14 c4 dxe4 15 cxb4 was fine for Black in Kurajica-Dizdar, Zagreb 1993.

10...d7

This is where the knight belongs. After
10...\( \text{Da6} \) 11 \( \text{Db2} \) c5 12 \( \text{Bc1} \) Bc7 13 dxc5 bxc5 14 \( \text{Da4} \) De4 (14...De6 15 \( \text{Bxf6} \) would be uncomfortable for Black), 15 \( \text{Bxe4} \) was played in Langeweg-Schneider, Plovdiv 1983, but 15 \( \text{Bc5} \) is stronger, securing White an advantage. The main threat is f2-f3, but \( \text{Bxe4} \) followed by \( \text{Bd7} \) is also in the air.

11 \( \text{Bb2} \)

11...\( \text{d6} \)

This move order is actually not so exact. As we shall see \( \text{Bf3-f5} \) is a relevant manoeuvre, and therefore Black should start with 11...\( \text{Be8} \), securing equality and ensuring that dropping back to \( f8 \) with the bishop no longer wastes time.

12 \( \text{Bc1} \)

Others:

a) 12 \( \text{Wc2} \) Be8 13 \( \text{He1} \) c8 14 e4 (14 \( \text{Ac1} \) c5 15 \( \text{We2} \) De4 16 \( \text{Ba6} \) Axa6 17 \( \text{Wxa6} \) \( \text{Bd6} \) 18 dxc5 \( \text{Bxc5} \) 19 h3 \( \text{Wd7} \) 20 \( \text{Bd3} \) \( \text{Be8} \) was equal in Portisch-Hübner, Manila 1990) 14...\( \text{dxe4} \) 15 \( \text{Bxe4} \) \( \text{Bxe4} \) 16 \( \text{Bxe4} \) \( \text{Bd6} \) 17 \( \text{Bf5} \) \( \text{Cc7} \) 18 \( \text{Bxe8+} \) \( \text{Bxe8} \) 19 \( \text{De5} \) c5 20 \( \text{Bd3} \) \( \text{Bd7} \) with equality, Polugaevsky-Karpov, Roquebrune 1992.

b) 12 \( \text{Dh4} \) \( \text{Be8} \) 13 \( \text{Bf5} \) \( \text{Bf8} \) 14 \( \text{Bc1} \) was a little better for White in Petrosian-Taimanov, Zurich 1953.

12...\( \text{Be8} \) 13 \( \text{De2} \) \( \text{We7} \) 14 \( \text{Gg3} \) g6 15 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Bxa3} \)!

Apparently exchanging the ‘good’ bishop, but in reality preventing any problems on the long diagonal after ...c6-c5, and creating a possible weak square on c3.

16 \( \text{He1} \) \( \text{Wd6} \)

Black has equalised.

17 \( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{xb2} \)

17...a5?! is also possible.

18 \( \text{Wxb2} \) c5 19 \( \text{He1} \) \( \text{Bac8} \) 20 \( \text{Bb2} \) \( \text{Bb8} \)

20...a6 21 \( \text{Bc2} \) cxd4 22 \( \text{Dexd4} \) gave White a little something in Gelfand-Karpov, Sanghi Nagar 1995.

21 \( \text{Bc2} \) cxd4 22 \( \text{Dexd4} \) \( \text{Bc2} \) 23 \( \text{Bc2} \) \( \text{Cc8} \) 24 \( \text{Bc1} \) \( \text{Cf6} \) 25 \( \text{Cd3} \) \( \text{Bc1+} \) 26 \( \text{Wxc1} \) \( \text{Cc5} \) 27 \( \text{Wd1} \) b5 28 \( \text{Cbe2} \) b4 29 \( \text{Ca1} \) \( \text{Wd6} \) 30 \( \text{Wd4} \) \( \text{Cc5} \) 31 \( \text{Ca1} \) \( \text{Wd6} \) 32 h3 \( \text{Dcd5} \) 33 \( \text{Cc2} \) \( \text{Wf6} \) 34 \( \text{Wb5} \) \( \text{Bxe5} \) 35 \( \text{Fxe5} \) 36 \( \text{Ff3} \) \( \text{Cc6} \) 37 \( \text{Cfe1} \) \( \text{Bf7} \) 38 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{Bc5} \) 39 g4 a5 40 \( \text{Cf2} \) \( \text{Ba6} \) 41 h4 h6 42 g5 gxh5 43 ghx5 \( \text{Bf7} \) 44 \( \text{Gg3} \) \( \text{Gg7} \) 45 \( \text{Gg6} \) \( \text{Cg6} \) 46 \( \text{Gg2} \) \( \text{Bxb5} \) 47 \( \text{Cc2} \) \( \text{Cce6} \) 48 f4

White has played well and Black is still defending. Now Karpov’s superior technique pays dividends.

48...\( \text{Bf7} \) 49 \( \text{Gf2} \) \( \text{Cc7} \) 50 \( \text{Dc4} \) \( \text{Db5} \) 51 \( \text{Bxb5+} \) ?! \( \text{Bxb5} \) 52 \( \text{Cce1} \) \( \text{Cd7} \) 53 \( \text{Cd3} \) \( \text{Gg4} \) 54 \( \text{Cf2} \) \( \text{f5} \)!

Suddenly White has a difficult bishop endgame on his hands.

55 \( \text{Bxf5} \)

55 \( \text{Dxf4} \) \( \text{Dxg3} \) 56 \( \text{Bf3} \) \( \text{Bf5} \) and White has problems.

55...\( \text{Bxf5} \) 56 \( \text{Cd2} \) \( \text{Cc5} \) 57 \( \text{Cd3} \) \( \text{Cd7} \) 58 \( \text{Cc2} \) \( \text{Bc8} \) 59 \( \text{Gg6} \) \( \text{Bc6} \) 60 \( \text{Cc2} \) \( \text{Cd7} \) 61
65...\texttt{axa4 66 \texttt{xe2 \texttt{c6 67 \texttt{f3}}}
67 \texttt{\texttt{ad3 d4 68 e4 \texttt{xe8 69 \texttt{ad2 f7 and Black wins.}}}
67...\texttt{\texttt{e8 68 \texttt{ad1 d4 69 \texttt{ad3 \texttt{b5+ 70}}}}}
68 \texttt{\texttt{ad2 dxe3+ 71 \texttt{xe3 e8 72 \texttt{ae4 \texttt{d6}}}}}
67...\texttt{e5}
73 \texttt{\texttt{f5}}
73 \texttt{\texttt{d4 f7 74 \texttt{b3 xh5 75 \texttt{c4 \texttt{f7+ and the pawn ending is winning for Black.}}}}}
73...\texttt{e7 74 \texttt{e2 f7 75 \texttt{d1 xa2 76}}}
76 \texttt{\texttt{d6 b3 77 \texttt{\texttt{hxh6 b2 78 \texttt{c2 f7!}}}}}
Prevents all counterplay. After 78...\texttt{b1\texttt{w}}
79 \texttt{\texttt{xb1 \texttt{80 \texttt{g7 the position is drawn.}}}}
79 \texttt{\texttt{g6+ f8! 80 \texttt{d3 b1w 81 \texttt{xb1 \texttt{ge1 82 f5 f7 0-1}}}}}

\textbf{Game 32}
\textbf{Danner-Yu Shaoteng}
\textbf{Gyula 2000}

1 \texttt{d4 \texttt{f6 2 c4 e6 3 \texttt{d3 b6 4 e3 \texttt{\texttt{b7 5 ad3 d5 6 0-0 \texttt{e7 7 b3}}}}}
As this game shows Black has no problems in this line.
7...0-0 8 \texttt{c3 c5 9 ab2 cxd4 10 exd4 \texttt{c6}}

11 \texttt{e1}
The main line. The alternatives are:

\textbf{a) 11 \texttt{we2?!}} is not so good because the rook now gets stuck on a1 – 11...\texttt{\texttt{ab4!}}
12 \texttt{\texttt{b1 dxc4 13 bxc4 \texttt{xf3 14 \texttt{gxf3 xd4 15}}}}
16 \texttt{\texttt{e4 \texttt{d8 16 \texttt{d1 \texttt{c7 17 \texttt{xf6+ \texttt{xf6 18}}}}}}}
19 \texttt{\texttt{xf6 gxf6 19 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xf7+ \texttt{g7! (19...\texttt{xe7 20}}}}}}}
\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f4 is not something Black allows}}}}
20 \texttt{\texttt{c4 \texttt{h8 21 \texttt{g4+ \texttt{f8 22 \texttt{b2 \texttt{xe7 23 \texttt{xb4+ \texttt{c5 and Black had a positional advantage in}}}}}}}}
Grigorian-Karpov, Moscow 1976.

\textbf{b) 11 \texttt{e1?! \texttt{dxc4}} (this does not look quite right; after 11...\texttt{c8! White has nothing better than 12 \texttt{c1, transposing to the main line)}
12 \texttt{bxc4 \texttt{c8 13 \texttt{c1 e8 14 d5! (suddenly this is possible)} 14...\texttt{b4 15 \texttt{\texttt{b1 exd5 16 a3 d4}}}}
17 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xd4 \texttt{c6 18 \texttt{\texttt{f5 xd1 19 \texttt{\texttt{xd1 \texttt{f8}}}}}}}}}
20 \texttt{\texttt{d5 \texttt{d7 21 h3 \texttt{xe1+ 22 \texttt{xe1 \texttt{c8 and Black kept his stuff together in Portisch-Hjartarson, Szirak 1987, although the line looks shaky.}}}}}
11...\texttt{c8}
This is the most natural move. Black is improving his position before taking action.
11...\texttt{c3 12 \texttt{b1 \texttt{c8 13 \texttt{d5 \texttt{c6 14}}}}}
\texttt{\texttt{c6 \texttt{e8 15 \texttt{e2 \texttt{e8 16 \texttt{d1 \texttt{f8 17 \texttt{e3 was agreed drawn in Gelfand-Kramnik, Novgorod, 1997. It seems to me that White has more freedom to manoeuvre than is usual in this line.}}}}}
11...\texttt{d6?!, as in Portisch-Adorjan, Szirak 1987, is probably best met with 12 \texttt{cxd5! exd5 13 \texttt{e1 \texttt{\texttt{f8 14 \texttt{b5 \texttt{f4 15 \texttt{g3 \texttt{wb8 16 \texttt{c5 and White has the advantage.}}}}}}}}}
12 \texttt{e1!}
The rook belongs here. After 12 \texttt{e2 \texttt{c8 13 \texttt{f1 \texttt{f8}}}
14 \texttt{h3 g6 15 \texttt{b1 h6! 16 \texttt{\texttt{d2 dxc4 17 bxc4 xd5 18 \texttt{e1 e5 Black was much better in Polgar-Hansen, Aabenraa 1989.}}}}
12...\texttt{b4!}
With this move Black takes control of the centre. Others seem to be inferior.

\textbf{a) Now 12...\texttt{f8!? comes out okay here, but I do not trust it completely: 13 \texttt{\texttt{xd5 14 xd5 xd5 (14...\texttt{xd5 15 \texttt{b5 \texttt{c7}}}}}
16 \texttt{e2 gave White an edge in Yusupov-Renet, Kaubeuren 1993) 15 \texttt{e4 \texttt{wh5 (15...\texttt{d7? 16 \texttt{xc6! \texttt{xc6 17 \texttt{e5 \texttt{wb7 18}}}}}}}}
Queen's Indian Defence

\[ \text{xh7+!} \text{ was winning in Portisch-de Firmian, Reggio Emilia 1989; while 15...}\text{wd6} 16 \text{d5! led to White assuming the initiative in Yusupov-Rodriguez, Novi Sad 1990. Then 16 } \text{e5} \text{ (certainly not forced...)} 16...\text{xd1} 17 \text{exd1} \text{xc5} 18 \text{xb7} \text{xc1} 19 \text{xc1} \text{d8} 20 \text{f1} \text{d7} 21 \text{c8} \text{d8} 22 \text{b7} \text{d7} 23 \text{c8} \text{d8} 24 \text{b7} \text{was agreed drawn in Petrosian-Peters, Lone Pine 1978.}

b) 12...\text{b4} 13 \text{a3} \text{xc3} 14 \text{xc3} \text{c7} 15 \text{e5} \text{looked better for White in Ambarchjan-Shabalov, Seattle 2002, but I am sure that Shabalov only wanted to depart from the normal paths and somehow unbalance the situation.}

13 \text{f1} \text{c4}

Clearly the most active move. Also possible is 13...\text{e8} 14 \text{a3} \text{c6} 15 \text{cx5} \text{ex5} with equality in Nogueiras-Farago, Aosta 1990.

14 \text{a3} \text{xc3} 15 \text{xc3} \text{c6} 16 \text{wd2}?! \text{White wants to prepare d4-d5, but this is too slow and Black is excellently placed to meet it. Better was 16 \text{cx5} \text{wd5} 17 \text{c4} (17 \text{d3?} \text{xd4} 18 \text{sb7} \text{sb7} 19 \text{xd4} \text{xd4} 20 \text{xf6} 21 \text{d3} \text{f8} \text{was better for Black in Van der Werf-Van den Doel, Holland 1994) and now 17...}\text{wd6?!} 18 \text{d5} \text{c5} (18...\text{exd5} 19 \text{d3} \text{gives White the initiative}) 19 \text{d3} 20 \text{c4} \text{d8} 21 \text{d2}? (21 \text{e5}! \text{wd7} [21...\text{e5}! 22 \text{d6! with an advantage to White] 22 \text{wxd7??} \text{wxd7} 23 \text{e5 and White has a winning attack on the way]}

21...\text{exd5} (now Black holds the lead) 22 \text{cx5} \text{xd5} 23 \text{d1} \text{f8} 24 \text{e3} \text{c5} 25 \text{d2} \text{d6} 26 \text{d1} \text{d6} 27 \text{g3} \text{e4} 28 \text{f4} \text{w3} 29 \text{f3} \text{xd3} 30 \text{xd3} \text{d5} \text{and White resigned in Lukacs-Atalik, Budapest 1991.}

17...\text{w5} \text{heads for the safe spot.} 18 \text{d} 18 \text{d5} \text{xd5} 19 \text{wx6} \text{xd5} 20 \text{dxd5} \text{f6} 21 \text{h2} \text{h8} 22 \text{xf6} \text{fxd5} 23 \text{b2} \text{cd8} \text{was equal in Shariyazdanov-Chernyshov, Djakovo 1994.}

16...\text{f6} 17 \text{d1} \text{w6} 18 \text{cxd5} 18 \text{e3} \text{xc4} 19 \text{bxc4} \text{a7}! \text{and Black's pieces are much the better placed.}

18...\text{wxd5} 19 \text{c4} \text{w5} 20 \text{d} 21 \text{a5} \text{Black sacrifices a pawn for the two bishops and to open up the position in order to exploit White's uncoordinated pieces.}

21 \text{dxe6} \text{xe4}

21...\text{xc3}? 22 \text{wxc3} \text{g6} 23 \text{exf7+} \text{h8} 24 \text{d6} \text{is given by Gershon as winning. After 24...\text{xc4} 25 \text{bx4} \text{f7} it is, presumably, not bad at all, but still – why should Black want this position in the first place if he does not win the exchange?}

22 \text{exf7+} \text{xf7} 23 \text{xc4} \text{xc4} 24 \text{bx4} \text{xb2} 25 \text{wb2} \text{xf3} 26 \text{gxf3}

The number of weaknesses in White's camp spells the end.

27 \text{d4} \text{h6}

Creating an escape square for the king so the rook can be activated.

28 \text{a4} \text{h6} 29 \text{w2} \text{a6} 30 \text{wd2} \text{g6+} 31 \text{h1} \text{g2+} 32 \text{e2} \text{e6}+ 33 \text{d1} \text{w1+} 34 \text{c2} \text{e2} 35 \text{d8+} \text{h7} 0-1

Yusupov-Beliavsky

Austria 1998

This game is an illustration of one line that Black should try to avoid, and into which White players have occasionally had luck in tripping their opponents.

1 \text{d4} \text{e6} 2 \text{w3} \text{e5} 3 \text{e3} \text{c6} 4 \text{xd3} \text{b7} 5 0-0 \text{c5}

Already the problems begin. After 5...d5! Black can play 6 \text{bd2} c5! and return to
these solid positions against the Colle or, in the event of 6 c4 \( \text{Le7} \), employ a transposition to the previous game.

**6 c4 \( \text{Le7} \) 7 \( \text{Da}3 \) cxd4?!**

7...d5! is still good enough for Black. 7...h6?! has also been tried (to avoid \( \text{Axe7}+ \) and thereby d4-d5, as in the following example) and now 7...0-0?! 8 d5! exd5 9 cxd5 d6 10 e4 \( \text{Da6} \) 11 \( \text{De1} \) \( \text{Da}7 \) 12 \( \text{Db}1 \) \( \text{De8} \) 13 a3 \( \text{Dd}7 \) 14 \( \text{Af4} \) \( \text{Ac8} \) 15 \( \text{Wd}2 \) gave White an enormous advantage in Bukic-Ljubojevic, Bugojno 1978. The bishop is not well on b7.

**8 exd4 d5**

Seems forced. After 8...d6 9 d5! White has a better version of: 8...0-0 9 d5! \( \text{Da6} \) 10 \( \text{Af4} \) d6 11 dx6 fx6 12 \( \text{Ag3} \), which gave White an edge in Malaniuk-Tiviakov, Moscow 1992.

**9 cxd5 \( \text{Dxd5} \) 10 \( \text{De5} \) 0-0 11 \( \text{Wg4} \)**

Also possible is 11 \( \text{Wf5} \) g6?! (11...f5?! 12 \( \text{Ac4} \) secures White a strong position) 12 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Dxc}3 \) 13 \( \text{Bxc3} \) \( \text{Dc6} \) 14 \( \text{Dg4} \) with menacing play.

**11...\( \text{Df6} \)**

Perhaps it was better to play 11...\( \text{Dxc3} \) 12 \( \text{Bxc3} \) \( \text{Dd7} \) 13 \( \text{Ag6} \) \( \text{Af6} \) 14 \( \text{Dad1} \), although White retains the initiative.

**12 \( \text{Wh4} \)?**

This move gives Black a chance to fight. After 12 \( \text{Wg3}! \) \( \text{Dh8} \) (12...\( \text{Wxd4} \) 13 \( \text{De3} \) \( \text{Wb4} \) 14 a3! is clearly favourable to White according to L. Hansen) 13 \( \text{Ag5} \) h6 14 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Dg8} \) 15 \( \text{Wh5} \) Black was in serious trouble in Dizdar-Hansen, West Berlin 1988.

**12...\( \text{Dbd7} \)?**

Necessary is 12... \( \text{De4}! \) 13 \( \text{Wf5} \) \( \text{Df6} \) 14 \( \text{Wh4} \) \( \text{De4} \) 15 \( \text{Wh5} \) \( \text{Df6} \) 16 \( \text{Wh4} \) \( \text{De4} \) 17 \( \text{Wh5} \) \( \text{Df6} \) 18 \( \text{Wh4} \) \( \text{De4} \) 19 \( \text{Wh3} \)? \( \text{Wxd4} \) 20 \( \text{Df4} \) \( \text{Df6} \) 21 \( \text{De2} \) \( \text{Wf4} \) 22 \( \text{Fc1} \) \( \text{Aa6} \) 23 \( \text{Cc2} \) \( \text{We8} \) and Black held out in Kishnevs-Schlosser, Budapest 1991.

**12...\( \text{Dc6} \)? 13 \( \text{Dg5} \) \( \text{g6} \) (13...h6 14 \( \text{Axf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 15 \( \text{We4} \) \( \text{g6} \) 16 \( \text{Dxc6} \) \( \text{c7} \) 17 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Dg7} \) 18 \( \text{Dc4} \) \( \text{f5} \) 19 \( \text{De}+ \) and wins) 14 \( \text{Aa6} \) and White was winning in Plaskett-Arkell, London 1991.

**13 \( \text{Ad1} \) \( \text{De4} \)?**

After this it seems that Black is in dire straits. Imperative is 13...\( \text{De8} \) 14 \( \text{Ab5} \) a6 15 \( \text{Dc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 16 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{a7} \) 17 \( \text{f3} \), where White is simply better (Yudasin).

**14 \( \text{Dh3} \) \( \text{Df6} \)**

**15 d5!!**

Opening the d-file and thereby undermining e4 as a strongpoint.

15...\( \text{Dxc3} \) 16 \( \text{bx} \) 3 \( \text{Dxd5} \) 17 \( \text{Dg5} \) \( \text{h6} \)

17...\( \text{g6} \) 18 \( \text{Wh4}! \) \( \text{h6} \) demonstrates how bad things are. In Polgar-Christiansen, San Francisco 1991, White was in the driving seat after 19 \( \text{Axg6} \) \( \text{fxg6} \) 20 \( \text{Wxh6} \) \( \text{Dh7} \) 21 \( \text{Wxg6+} \) \( \text{Dh8} \) 22 \( \text{Dxe7} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 23 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{Wh4} \) 24 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{xf2+} \) 25 \( \text{Df1} \) \( \text{Df6} \) 26 \( \text{Wxe4} \) \( \text{exd5} \) 27 \( \text{Dxd5} \) \( \text{Dg8} \) 28 \( \text{h3} \) etc.

18 \( \text{Axh6} \) \( \text{gxh6} \) 19 \( \text{Wxh6} \) \( \text{Dc7} \) 20 \( \text{Dg5+} \) \( \text{Dh8} \) 21 \( \text{Wh4+} \) 1-0

![Diagram](image-url)
Queen’s Indian Defence

Summary
The variation with e2-e3 is not really theoretical, but it can still be a minefield for Black. The right way to meet it has been presented in this chapter. If you play like Black in Danner – Yu Shaoteng, or the sidelines, you should not end up in any trouble. The most important lesson is not to play like Beliavsky against Yusupov. Many grandmasters have suffered in this line.

1 d4 ef6 2 c4 e6 3 ef3 b6 4 e3 eb7 (D) 5 d3
5...d5

5...c5 6 0-0 eb7 7 ef3 cxd4 8 exd4 d5 – Game 33
6 0-0 eb7 7 b3 0-0 8 ef3 c5 (D) – Game 32

4...eb7 7 ef5+ 8...c5
CHAPTER SIX

4 g3 \(\text{\Delta} b4+\) and
4...\(\text{\Delta} a6\) without 5 b3

1 d4 \(\text{\Delta} f6\) 2 c4 e6 3 \(\text{\Delta} f3\) b6 4 g3 \(\text{\Delta} b4+\)

In this chapter we are considering the lines arising after 4...\(\text{\Delta} b4+\) and also those that occur after 4...\(\text{\Delta} a6\) when White tries any move other than 5 b3. 4...\(\text{\Delta} a6\) is the modern way of playing these Queen's Indian positions, and usually generates more lively play than 4...\(\text{\Delta} b7\), which will be considered in Chapter 8. After 4...\(\text{\Delta} a6\), White has several replies besides 5 b3. They include 5 \(\text{\Delta} c2\) and 5 \(\text{\Delta} b3\), which are not really dangerous for Black. Korchnoi has tried to come up with some ideas after 5 \(\text{\Delta} c2\), but I find it hard to believe in them. 5 \(\text{\Delta} a4\) has been played for a long time now. It was originally made popular by Michael Rohde in the 1980's, and has ever since been a serious alternative. 5 \(\text{\Delta} bd2\) is also a popular alternative, but as this chapter illustrates, Black can always find a safe path for equality in these lines.

**Game 34**

*Magerramov-Makaričev*

*Moscow 1991*

1 d4 \(\text{\Delta} f6\) 2 c4 e6 3 \(\text{\Delta} f3\) b6 4 g3 \(\text{\Delta} b4+\)!

This is rather off-beat but does offer a chance for transposition to standard lines.

5 \(\text{\Delta} d2\) a5

The alternative is 5...\(\text{\Delta} x d2+\) 6 \(\text{\Delta} x d2\) \(\text{\Delta} a6\) 7 \(\text{\Delta} a3!?\) (the knight is not so impressive out here; 7 b3 transposes to 5 b3 \(\text{\Delta} b4+\) 6 \(\text{\Delta} d2\) \(\text{\Delta} x d2\) 7 \(\text{\Delta} x d2\) and Game 47) 7...0-0 8 \(\text{\Delta} g2\) \(\text{\Delta} b7\) 9 0-0 d6 10 \(\text{\Delta} x d1\) \(\text{\Delta} d7\) 11 \(\text{\Delta} c1\) \(\text{\Delta} b7\) 12 \(\text{\Delta} b5\) a6 13 \(\text{\Delta} c3\) \(\text{\Delta} e4\) 14 \(\text{\Delta} d3\) f5 15 \(\text{\Delta} e1\) \(\text{\Delta} d6\) 16 d5 \(\text{\Delta} a8\) 17 e3 b5 18 b3 \(\text{\Delta} c5\) 19 \(\text{\Delta} c2\) b4 20 \(\text{\Delta} e2\) e5 with an unclear game in Beliavsky-Miles, Tilburg 1986. Garcia Palermo-Groszpeter, Zenica 1987 went 10 \(\text{\Delta} h4\) \(\text{\Delta} x g2\) 11 \(\text{\Delta} x g2\) c5 12 d5 exd5 13 cxd5 \(\text{\Delta} e8\) 14 f3 a6 15 \(\text{\Delta} c4\) b5 16 \(\text{\Delta} c3\) \(\text{\Delta} x b5\) with equality, while 10 \(\text{\Delta} b5\) \(\text{\Delta} x b5\) 11 \(\text{\Delta} x d1\) a6 12 \(\text{\Delta} c3\) \(\text{\Delta} e4\) 13 \(\text{\Delta} x e4\) \(\text{\Delta} x e4\) 14 \(\text{\Delta} c1\) \(\text{\Delta} f6\) 15 \(\text{\Delta} e3\) \(\text{\Delta} b8\) 16 \(\text{\Delta} e1\) \(\text{\Delta} x g2\) 17 \(\text{\Delta} x g2\) \(\text{\Delta} b7\) was equal in Yusupov-Kuzmin, Minsk 1982. White's space advantage is not so important because so many pieces have been exchanged.

6 \(\text{\Delta} g2\) 0-0

Here White has a very slight advantage after 6...\(\text{\Delta} a6\) 7 \(\text{\Delta} x b4\) axb4 8 \(\text{\Delta} e5\) \(\text{\Delta} a7\) 9 a3 \(\text{\Delta} c8\) 10 \(\text{\Delta} x d3\) \(\text{\Delta} x a3\) 11 \(\text{\Delta} x a3\) \(\text{\Delta} x a3\) 12 \(\text{\Delta} x a3\) 0-0 13 0-0, as in Browne-Spassky, Manila 1976.

7 0-0 \(\text{\Delta} a6\)

7...\(\text{\Delta} b7\) 8 \(\text{\Delta} g5\) (8 \(\text{\Delta} c2\) h6 9 \(\text{\Delta} f4\) \(\text{\Delta} e4\) 10 \(\text{\Delta} d1\) \(\text{\Delta} c6\) 11 a3 \(\text{\Delta} d6\) 12 \(\text{\Delta} x d6\) cxd6 13 \(\text{\Delta} x c3\) d5 14 cxd5 exd5 15 c3 \(\text{\Delta} e7\) 16 \(\text{\Delta} x e5\) \(\text{\Delta} x g2\) 17 \(\text{\Delta} x g2\) d6 18 \(\text{\Delta} d3\) was also better for White
in Ivanchuk - Speelman, Roquebrune 1992)
8...d5
This is the main move here, but there are some important alternatives:

a) 8...a7 9 f4 a4 (9...d5?! 10 c5 e4 11 a3 c3 12 cxb6 cxb6 13 a2 b5 14 g5! d5 15 xxc4 b4 16 axb4 axb4 17 b5 d7 18 c1 with an edge for White) 10 c2 d5 11 d1 c8 12 e5 c5 13 dxc5 xc5 14 c3 and now, instead of 14...b5?, which was played in Avrukh-Mikhalevski, Beersheba 1997, Black should play 14...AXB3 15 axb3 dxc4, although White is better after 16 dxc4.

b) 8...c6 9 c2 d5 10 xxb4 axb4 11 a3 b7 12 bd2 bxa3 13 b4 a6 14 b3 dxc4 15 dxc4 d5 16 a3 a3 dxb4 17 b5 c7 18 b1 gave White excellent compensation for the pawn in Zimmerman-Letreguilly, Budapest 1994.

c) 8...b7 transposes to Games 48-50 with 4...a6 5 b3 b7 6 g2 b4+ 7 d2 a5 8 0-0 0-0.

9 cxd5 cxd5
9...exd5 10 e5 is a structural advantage for White.

10 e1 c5 11 e4 d6 12 a3! xd2 13 bd2 bd7 14 e5 d5 15 e4
White has won the opening battle. The d6-square secures him a slight pull.

15 wb8!
15...e7! (Magarramov) 16 d6 ad8! 17 c1 xd4 18 exd4 exd5 19 c4! dxc4 20 bx5 df6 21 fc6 wc7 22 xf8 xd8 with just about enough compensation, although it is still White who is trying for a win.

16 d6 cxd4!
Now White gets the chance to start an attack. Necessary was 16...h6.

17 xd4 c5
17...d8? 18 xf7! xf7 19 g5+ e7 20 xe6! would eliminate Black completely.

18 g5! d8
18...h6? 19 xf7! xf7 20 xd5 exd5 21 xf7 xf7 22 e6! xe6 23 xd5 c8 24 ac1 and White wins.

19 wg4 a7
Black is trying very hard to defend. 19...h6? 20 xf7 xf7 21 b4! and White wins.

20 b4 d3 21 e4! g6 22 xe6 xe5
Black is running out of defensive resources. After 22...d7? White wins with 23 xd5 xe1 24 xe1 c8 25 h3! xe6 26 dxc8 exd5 27 axa7.

23 xd8 xg4

24 xg7!
A nice combination that in practice wins the game.

24...df6 25 c2 axf7 26 b3! dh6
27 xf7 xf7 28 e6 wg7 29 xb6 c8 30 bx5 dg5 31 f4 dh3+ 32 dg2
This idea is not particularly popular. The main reason is probably 5...d5, which appears to be a very easy route to equality.

5...c5

ECO suggests this move but does not include 6 e4 in its world view.

a) After 5...d5! we have:

a1) 6 b3 \( \text{b}4+7 \text{d}2 \text{xd}2+8 \text{bd}2 0-0 9 \text{g}2 \text{c}5 promises Black equality, and 10 e3 \( \text{c}6 11 \text{dx}c5 \text{dx}c4 12 \text{bxc}4 \text{b}4 13 \text{wb}1 \text{d}3+ much more than that in Vacek-Hausner, Brno 1969.

a2) 6 \( \text{bd}2 \text{e}7 7 \text{g}2 0-0 8 0-0 \text{c}5 9 \text{dx}c5 (9 \text{d}1 \text{xc}6 10 \text{wa}4 \text{wc}8 11 \text{dx}c5 \text{dx}c4 12 \text{xe}5 \text{exe}5 13 \text{xe}8 \text{b}5 14 \text{wa}5 \text{d}8 15 \text{g}2 \text{xc}5 was crushing in Udovcic-Rakic, Sombor 1957) 9...\text{xc}5 10 a3 \text{bd}7 11 \text{wa}4 \text{b}7 12 \text{cxd}5 \text{exd}5 13 \text{b}4 \text{d}6 14 \text{b}2 a5 15 b5 \text{e}8 16 e3 \text{d}4 and Black had sufficient counterplay in Blom-Johannessen, Marianske Lazne 1961.

a2) 6 \text{cxd}5 is the most logical move: 6...\text{exd}5 7 \text{g}2 \text{b}4+ 8 \text{c}3 0-0 9 0-0 \text{xe}8! and Black is ready to give up the dark-squared bishop to concentrate on the light squares. To be successful in this strategy he needs to keep the bishop outside the pawn chain, meaning on the b1-h7 diagonal. Lilient-Gereben, San Benedetto 1957 continued 10 \( \text{e}1 \text{c}5 11 a3 \text{xc}3 12 \text{bxc}3 \text{bd}7 13 e3 \text{wc}7 14 \text{wa}4?! (doing nothing about solving the most important problem—where does the queen’s bishop belong?) 14...\text{d}3 15 \text{a}2 (hardly a dream spot for the bishop) 15...b5 16 \text{d}1 \text{e}4 17 \text{f}1 c4 18 \text{xd}2 \text{g}6 19 \text{g}2 \text{b}6 20 f3 \text{a}4 and Black was better.

b) 5...\text{d}6?! tries to exploit White’s lack of development. I am not sure Black equalises with this line, but it does result in an interesting position, e.g. 6 a3?! (6 \text{g}2! must be the right move—after 6...\text{b}4 7 \text{wb}3 d5 8 \text{e}5 [8 \text{cxd}5 \text{wd}5 is already equal] 8...\text{dxc}4 9 \text{wd}1! [9 \text{xc}4 \text{xd}4 10 \text{a}8 \text{xc}4 11 \text{wd}1 \text{xd}1+ 12 \text{xd}1 \text{c}5 is terrible for White] 9...b5 10 a4 c6 11 axb5 \text{xb}5 12 \text{c}3 \text{bd}5 13 e4 \text{xc}4 14 bxc4 and White has a strong centre to compensate for his pawn deficit). Returning to 6 a3, play might continue 6...\text{b}7 7 \text{wd}3 e5! 8 dxe5 \text{exe}5 9 \text{exe}5 \text{xc}1 10 f3 \text{d}6 11 \text{wc}3 \text{we}7 12 \text{g}4 \text{xd}4 13 \text{wd}7 0-0-0 14 \text{wd}4 h5 15 \text{wd}5 \text{xd}8 16 \text{f}4 \text{xf}4 17 \text{xf}4 \text{h}4 18 g4 f5 19 gxf5 \text{g}2 20 f6 \text{w}6 21 \text{we}4 c6 22 f7 \text{g}8 23 \text{g}2 \text{xd}2 24 g4 h3 25 \text{f}1 \text{xf}7 26 \text{c}2 \text{we}5 27 \text{a}3 \text{g}7 28 \text{g}4+ 29 \text{d}1 \text{w}3 30 \text{e}2 \text{g}2 31 \text{wd}3, and Black had great winning chances in Korchnoi-Kachiani Gersinska, Willingen 1999.

6 \text{g}2

After this move Black can equalise. I am less sure about 6 e4!, although it has been played only once—6...\text{cxd}4 7 \text{xd}4 \text{b}7 8 \text{g}2 a6 9 0-0 \text{wc}7 10 \text{e}1 \text{c}6 11 \text{xc}6 \text{wc}6 12 b3 \text{e}7 13 \text{d}2 \text{d}6 14 \text{a}2 0-0 15 \text{wc}3 appears to be very slightly better for White. After 15...\text{c}8 16 g4 \text{e}8 17 \text{g}3 \text{f}6 18 \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 19 g5 \text{d}7 20 \text{ad}1 \text{c}5 21 \text{f}1 White is better, and in Korchnoi-Lau, Hessen 1999, Korchnoi more or less outplayed his opponent by advancing the h-
Queen's Indian Defence

6...\(\text{dxc6}\) 7 dxc5 \(\text{e}x\text{c}5\) 8 0-0 0-0 9 \(\text{g}5!?)\n
\(\text{Cc}8\) 10 \(\text{wa}4\) \(\text{b}7\) 11 \(\text{Cc}3\) \(\text{h}6\) 12 \(\text{f}4!\)

\(\text{We}7\) 13 e3 a5?

13...\(\text{d}6\) would have kept the position more or less equal. Now Black has problems.

14 \(\text{Ea}1\) \(\text{Ed}8\) 15 \(\text{Ge}5\)

The b-file is a terrible source of weakness for Black.

15...\(\text{a}8\) 16 \(\text{d}3!\)

Game 36
Barlov-Beliavsky
Yugoslavia 1992

1 d4 \(\text{df}6\) 2 c4 \(\text{e}6\) 3 \(\text{df}3\) b6 4 g3 \(\text{a}6\) 5 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{b}3\)

This line can at best be described as completely harmless. After...

5...\(\text{c}6!\)

White has a clear advantage.

16...\(\text{h}5\) 17 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{d}4\)

17...\(\text{d}4\) 18 \(\text{xa}8\) \(\text{xa}8\) 19 \(\text{e}3!)\? \(\text{f}5\) 20 \(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{xc}5\) 21 \(\text{e}4\), with the idea g3-g4 is given by Dautov. White is close to winning.

18 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{f}6\) 19 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{e}8\) 20 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{f}6\)

21 \(\text{d}1\) d5 22 \(\text{c}x\text{d}5\) \(\text{ex}d5\) 23 \(\text{a}2\) \(\text{a}7\)

24 \(\text{a}7\) \(\text{wa}7\) 25 \(\text{d}c1\) \(\text{xc}2\) 26 \(\text{xc}2\)

\(\text{We}7\) 27 \(\text{wb}5\) \(\text{we}6\) 28 h4 g5!? 29 \(\text{hxg}5\)

hxg5 30 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{b}8\) 31 \(\text{e}1!)\ \(\text{d}6\) 32 \(\text{d}3\)

\(\text{e}4\) 33 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}5\) 34 \(\text{wa}1\) \(\text{f}5\) 35 \(\text{a}3\)

\(\text{d}6\) 36 \(\text{d}2\)

Entering some complicated tactics. 36 \(\text{xc}5?)\ \(\text{xa}4\) 37 e4 \(\text{xc}2\) 38 \(\text{xc}2\) \(\text{xe}4\) would turn the tables, but 36 \(\text{b}3?)\, as suggested by Dautov, might improve.

36...\(\text{a}4\) 37 \(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xf}3\) 38 \(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{xd}1\)

39 \(\text{xd}1\) \(\text{xb}2\) 40 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{xa}3\) 41 \(\text{f}6!\)

Now White also has an attack on the kingside to make him happy.

41...\(\text{e}6?)!\ 42 \(\text{d}7\) \(\text{f}8\) 43 \(\text{a}7\) \(\text{h}7\)

44 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{d}8\) 45 \(\text{h}5\) f6 46 \(\text{f}7+)\ \(\text{h}8\)

47 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{c}8\) 48 \(\text{a}2\) \(\text{a}1\) 49 \(\text{e}6\) \(\text{d}8\) 50

...White is forced to protect e4 an additional time.

6 \(\text{bd}2\) d5!

Black's forces are quickly finding a way into the game.

7 \(\text{wa}4\)

Perhaps it is better to simply play 7 \(\text{cxd}5\)

\(\text{cxd}5\) (7...\(\text{xd}5?)\? must also equalise) 8 \(\text{wa}4\)

\(\text{b}7\) 9 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{d}6\) 10 0-0 0-0, e.g. 11 \(\text{db}1\)

\(\text{e}4\) 12 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{e}8\) 13 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{xf}4\) 14 gxf4 \(\text{e}7\)

15 \(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{f}5\) and Black had equalised in Gelfand-Leko, Monaco 2002.

7...\(\text{b}7\) 8 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{d}6\) 9 0-0

9 \(\text{e}5\) looks good, but after 9...0-0! 10 \(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{d}7\) Black retains his piece with no minuses whatsoever, and complete equality.

Chekhov-Bareev, Germany 1992 continued
11 0-0 \(\text{xe}8\) 12 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{xc}6\) 13 \(\text{b}3\) (13 \(\text{d}1\)

\(\text{ad}8\) with equality, as in Grivas-Delchev, Varna 1994, is probably better) 13...\(\text{c}5!\) 14 \(\text{b}2\) dxc4 15 \(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{xc}6\) 16 \(\text{xc}4\) \(\text{b}7\) 17
4 g3 \( \text{b4} + \) and 4...\( \text{a6} \) without 5 b3

\( \text{g4} + \)!! (17 dxe5 \( \text{axe5} \) 18 \( \text{axe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) is active and quite pleasant for Black) 17...b5! 18 \( \text{wc2} \) exd4 19 \( \text{zf3} \) c5 20 b4 \( \text{xb4} \) 21 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{de4} \) 22 \( \text{zd1} \) a5 23 \( \text{zh4} \) \( \text{f8} \) 24 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c3} \) 25 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{bxc3} \) 26 e4 b4 27 \( \text{zd5} \) \( \text{ed8} \) 28 \( \text{cd1} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 29 exd5 \( \text{zd8} \) 30 \( \text{wd3} \) \( \text{xd5} \) and White resigned.

9...0-0 10 a3 a5!? 11 \( \text{wc2} \) a4 12 \( \text{xe1} \) \( \text{xe7} \?)

This move makes very little sense at all. Correct is 12...e5 13 dxe5 \( \text{exe5} \) 14 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 15 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 16 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{c5} \) 17 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{e8} \) with an unclear game. White is not very well co-ordinated to exploit the well placed knight.

13 e3 \( \text{wd7} \) 14 cxd5 exd5 15 \( \text{b1} \)!

The knight belongs on c3.

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

An interesting pawn sacrifice.

16 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{we8} \) 17 \( \text{wxc7} \) \( \text{d8} \) 18 \( \text{wc2} \) \( \text{db3} \) 19 \( \text{xa2} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 20 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c4} \) 21 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f6} \)

More accurate is 21...f5!, with the idea of 22 \( \text{d1} \) g5 followed by ...f5-f4 etc.

22 \( \text{d1} \) h5 23 \( \text{d2} \)!

White has the advantage.

23...\( \text{g5} \) 24 \( \text{e1} \) h4 25 \( \text{aa1} \)!

As the a4-pawn also falls, this makes good sense.

25...\( \text{xa1} \) 26 \( \text{xa1} \) \( \text{we6} \) 27 \( \text{wd1} \) \( \text{fe8} \) 28 \( \text{xa4} \) \( \text{wh6} \) 29 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{cd8} \) 30 f4!

Black is strategically lost. His rooks have no play.

30...\( \text{f6} \) 31 \( \text{exe4} \) dxe4 32 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{wg6} \) 33 \( \text{g4} \)!!

33 g4! is simpler.

33...\( \text{wh7} \) 34 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{c8} \) 35 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{hg3} \) 36 \( \text{hg3} \) \( \text{wg6} \) 37 g4?

Allowing a strong combination. After 37 \( \text{c6} \), planning g3-g4, Black is busted.

37...\( \text{xd4} \) 38 exd4?

38 \( \text{xc8} \) \( \text{xc8} \) 39 exd4 retains the better chances. Now Black takes over.

38...e3 39 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 40 \( \text{wc2} \) \( \text{f5} \) 41 \( \text{wc6} \) \( \text{xd3} \) 42 \( \text{wxg6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 43 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 44 \( \text{wh2} \) \( \text{f5} \) 45 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{e6} \) 46 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 47 \( \text{wh2} \) \( \text{g4} \) 48 d5 \( \text{xf4} \) 49 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{g4} \) 50 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 51 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{e4} \) 52 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{eh1} \) 53 \( \text{eh1} \) f5 54 \( \text{b4} \) \( \text{g2} \) 55 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xb2} \) 56 d6 e2 57 \( \text{e1} \) f4 58 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{xb4} \) 0-1

**Game 37**

**Barbero-Cebalo**

**Caorle 1987**

1 d4 \( \text{df6} \) 2 c4 e6 3 \( \text{df3} \) b6 4 g3 \( \text{a6} \) 5 \( \text{bd2} \)

This is one of the main systems and should offer White a modest chance for an advantage.

5...\( \text{b4} \)!! 6 \( \text{wb3} \)

6 \( \text{wc2} \) \( \text{b7} \) 7 \( \text{g2} \) a5 8 0-0 d5 9 \( \text{e5} \) 0-0 10 cxd5 exd5 11 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d4} \) 12 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{e8} \) led to equality in Portisch-Bronstein, Las Palmas 1972, as did 6 \( \text{wa4} \) c5 7 a3 \( \text{xd2} \) 8 \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{cxd4} \) 9 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{b7} \) 10 0-0 \( \text{c6} \) 11 \( \text{wd1} \) \( \text{f3} \) 12 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 13 \( \text{d4} \) 0-0 14 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{e8} \) 15 \( \text{xc6} \) dxc6 16 \( \text{xd4} \) c5 17 \( \text{ff4} \) \( \text{h5} \) 18 \( \text{we5} \) f6 19 \( \text{wh5} \) \( \text{xd6} \), Dizdar-Palac, Medulin 1997.

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

Best. 6...\( \text{xc6} \) 7 d5 \( \text{xd2} \) 8 \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{e7} \) (8...\( \text{a5} \) 9 \( \text{wa4} \) \( \text{d4} \) 10 \( \text{xa5} \) bxa5 11 dxe6 fxe6 12 \( \text{g2} \) 0-0 13 0-0 gave White a clear advantage in Vaganian-Nogueiras, Montpellier 1985) 9 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 10 \( \text{d2} \) favours White.

Kasparov-Speelman, La Valetta 1980 continued 10...\( \text{d6} \) 11 \( \text{f3} \) 0-0 12 e4 and White was now clearly better. After 12...exd5 13
Queen’s Indian Defence

cxd5 ♘xf1 14 ♘xf1 a5 15 e5 a4 16 ♗c2 ♗e8 17 ♘f2 ♛xd5 18 ♗d3 ♗e6 19 exd6 the lead had grown to being technically winning. An improvement is 10...♗e7 11 0-0 exd5 12 cxd5 ♗e4 13 ♗xe4 ♗xe4 14 ♗f3 ♗e3+ 15 ♘d2 ♘xb3 16 axb3 ♘d4 17 b4 with a plus for White (Kasparov).

6...♗e7 7 ♗g2 ♘b7 8 0-0 ♘xd2 9 ♘xd2 0-0 10 ♘ad1 gave White a slight edge in Alexandria-Chiburdanidze, Tbilisi 1981.

7 ♘g2!

7 a3 ♘xd2+ 8 ♘xd2 ♘c6 9 d5 (9 ♘g2 cxd4 10 ♗a4 ♗c8 11 0-0 ♗b7 12 b4 ♗e4 was a pawn in Nesis-Sanakoev, corr. 1986, while 9 dxc5 bxc5 10 ♗c2 looks best, but White has no chance of an advantage) 9...♗a5 10 ♘xa5 bx5 11 dxe6 fxe6 12 ♗c2 ♘b8 13 ♘h3 ♗b6 and Black has the better prospects, Fedorowicz-Seirawan, South Bend 1981.

7...♗c6

7...♗b7 8 dxc5 ♘xc5 9 0-0 0-0 10 ♗c2 ♗e7 11 b3 d6 12 ♘b2 ♘bd7 was equal in Oll-Andersson, Tallinn 1998. But the simple 8 0-0 looks enough for an edge.

8 dxc5

8 a3 transposes to the note to White’s 7th move.

8...bxc5?!

8...♗xc5 9 0-0 0-0 seems to equalise, e.g. 10 a3 ♗e7 11 ♗a4 ♘b7 12 e4 ♗c7 13 ♗c2 ♘e5! 14 b3 ♘xb3+ 15 ♘xb3 ♘d6 16 ♘g2 ♘ac8 17 ♘b2 ♘e5 with equality, Tibensky-Hracek, Slovakia 2000, or 10 ♗a4 ♘b7 11 ♘b3 ♘c7 12 ♘d1 ♗c8 13 ♘f4 ♘b4 14 ♘e5 ♘xg2 15 ♘xg2 ♗b7+ 16 ♘g1 d5, Redzepagic-Popovic, Novi Sad 1985.

9 0-0

9...♗b8?

The rook is misplaced here due to a future ♘f4. Both alternatives are better.

a) 9...♗c8 10 ♗c2 0-0 is interesting. We don’t know much about it because 11 ♘b3 ♘d4 12 ♘bd4 cxd4 13 b5 d5 14 ♘xd4 e5 15 a3 ♘c5 16 ♘f5 dxc4 17 bxc4 ♘xc4 was a display of poor opening play that left Black in front in Dlugy-Ehlvest, Mazatlan 1988. But this looks like the route that Black should pursue.

b) 9...0-0 10 a3 ♘xd2 11 ♘xd2 d5 12 cxd5 exd5 13 ♘f1 was, potentially, slightly better for White in Kempinski-Hansen, Hamburg 1999.

10 ♗c2 0-0 11 ♘b3! ♗e7! 11...♗a5 12 ♘f4! d6 13 ♘fd2 gives White the advantage but is nonetheless preferable.

12 ♘f4

12 a3! ♘a5 13 ♘xa5 ♘xa5 14 ♗a4 ♘b3 15 ♘xa6 ♘xa6 16 ♘f4 ♘b6 17 ♘xa7 ♘xb2 18 ♘xa1 has been suggested as giving White an advantage.

12...♗e5

Forced. After 12...d6? 13 ♘fd1 ♘fd8 14 a3 ♘a5 15 ♘g5 White wins a piece.

13 ♘g5 ♘f8?!

Imperative is 13...♘d4 14 ♘bd4 cxd4 15...
\[ g3 \, b4+ \text{ and } 4...a6 \text{ without } 5\, b3 \]

\[ w4\, b6 \, 16\, a3 \, d6 \, 17\, d2! \, b8 \, 18\, b4 \, d6 \, 19\, b5 \, c8 \, 20\, c6! \text{, when White has some positional pluses. Now he is winning.} \]

14\, a3\, a5\, 15\, exa5\, exa5\, 16\, wa4!\, xc4\, 17\, wxa5\, xe2\, 18\, fe1\, xf3\, 19\, xf3\, h6\, 20\, xf6\, wxf6\, 21\, wc3\, d6\, 22\, d5\, c4\, 23\, e3\, h3\, 24\, wd2\, xe3\, 25\, fxe3\, wg5\, 26\, xc1\, wg4\, 27\, wf2\, h8\, 28\, wxf7\, we2\, 29\, wf2\, w3\, 30\, e4\, a5\, 31\, xc4\, xc4\, 32\, w8f+\, h7\, 33\, g8+\, 1-0

**Game 38**

Salov-Karpov

Wijk aan Zee 1998

1\, d4\, df6\, 2\, c4\, e6\, 3\, df3\, b6\, 4\, g3\, a6\, 5\, bbd2\, b7

5...c5\, 6\, g2\, b7\, is just a transposition, but 6...c6! is much stronger, as can be seen in the next game.

6\, g2\, c5

6...c7\, 7\, 0-0\, 0-0\, 8\, b3 normally leads to transposition after 8...d5.

7\, e4!

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
& & \\
\hline
& & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Time has given this move the stamp of approval. 7\, d5?!\, exd5\, 8\, dh4\, g6!\, 9\, cxd5\, g7\, 10\, dc4\, 0-0\, 11\, d6\, (11\, 0-0\, d6\, 12\, f4\, a6!\, 13\, c1\, xc4\, 14\, xc4\, b5 is fine for Black)\, 11...a6\, 12\, a4\, w8\, 13\, e4\, d6\, 14\, 0-0\, dd7\, 15\, b1\, d6! led to equality in van Wely-Psakhis, Leeuwarden 1993.

7...xd4

Black cannot exploit the e-pawn's momentarily weakness: 7...exd4?!\, 8\, e5!\, d5\, (8...c3?\, 9\, w5\, g6\, 10\, w3)\, 9\, wa4+\, dd7\, 10\, cxd5\, edx2\, 11\, edx2\, edx5\, 12\, edx5\, exd5\, 13\, 0-0\, f6\, 14\, fe1\, fxe5\, 15\, xe5+\, e7\, 16\, g5?!\, b5! with a quick draw in Goldin-Smirin, Moscow (GMA) 1989, but Avrukh recommends 16\, e7!\, (with the threat of g5), when 16...f7 17\, edx5! appears to be decisive.

After 7...d6\, 8\, d5\, edx5\, 9\, cxd5\, a6\, 10\, d1\, w8\, 11\, wa4+\, d7\, 12\, d6\, d6\, 13\, w6\, axa6\, 14\, w6\, c6\, axa6\, 14\, 0-0\, db4\, 15\, c4\, f5\, 16\, exf5\, df6\, 17\, g5\, dbxd5\, 18\, d6\, White was clearly better in Sosonko-Miles, Wijk aan Zee 1981.

8\, 0-0!

The modern treatment – Black cannot cling on to the pawn. Other options promise nothing:

- a)\, 8\, e5\, de4!\, 9\, 0-0\, edx2\, 10\, edx2\, f3\, 11\, wxf3\, c6\, 12\, w6\, dxc6\, 13\, a4+\, d7\, 14\, edx7+\, edx7 was completely equal in Salov-Karpov, Wijk aan Zee 1993.

- b)\, 8\, edx4\, c5! and now:
  - b1)\, 9\, db3\, e7\, 10\, 0-0\, w8\, 11\, d1\, d6\, 12\, dd4\, 0-0\, 13\, b3\, a6\, 14\, db2\, d7 was equal in Piket-Salov, Wijk An Zee 1992.
  - b2)\, 9\, e2\, w7\, 10\, 0-0\, e7 and now in Agdestein-Hjartarson, Belgrade 1989, White should have maintained the balance with 11 b3. Instead 11\, c5?! was too optimistic. After 11...exf2\, 12\, exf6\, xf4\, 13\, fxe7\, f7\, 14\, w3\, xc2\, 15\, wa8\, e7\, 16\, b3\, d7\, 17\, a3+\, e7\, 18\, w3\, e5!\, 19\, c1\, g6 Black had a clear lead.
  - b3)\, 9\, db5\, a6\, 10\, cc3\, w7\, 11\, ee2\, e7 with complete equality in Welin-Chemin, Lugano 1989.

8...d6

The alternatives favour White:

- a)\, 8...exd4?! has never been played but has been analysed by Cifuentes, among others. After 9\, d5\, 10\, exd5\, edx5\, 11\, wa4+\, d7\, 12\, edx4!\, dxe4\, 13\, db3\, b5\, (13...c8\, 14\, wc6\, db8\, 15\, dxe7!\, w6\, 16\, wc6\, e8\, 17\, g5 and White wins)\, 14\, eb5\, c8\, 15\, wc6\, db8\, 16\, edx7! White wins. Black's best op-
Queen’s Indian Defence

tion seems to be $9...\text{d6}$ 10 $\text{xf7} \text{xf7}$ 11 $\text{xe4} \text{xe4}$ 12 $\text{xe4} \text{d6}$ 13 $\text{f3}+ \text{g8}$ 14 $\text{xc6} \text{dxc6}$ 15 $\text{xc6} \text{c8}$ 16 $\text{e4}$, although White still has a pleasant structural advantage, while $9...\text{d6}$ 10 $\text{xb7} \text{xb7}$ 11 $\text{f3}$ does not work out well...

b) $8...\text{c6}$? $9 \text{e5} \text{g4}$ 10 h3 $\text{h6}$ 11 $\text{d4}$ gives White a clear advantage.

c) $8...\text{c5}$?! $9 \text{e5} \text{g4}$ 10 $\text{g5}$ $\text{c3}$ 11 $\text{xc3} \text{g2}$ 12 $\text{g2} \text{g5}$ 13 $\text{f3}$ is given as clearly better for White by Ftacnik. In fact 13 $\text{cx4}$! looks even stronger...

$9 \text{xd4} \text{a6}$?

Here there are a number of alternatives but it would seem to be an enormous waste of energy trying to memorise them all. White has a simple plan in $\text{a2-a4-a5}$ followed by a knight transfer to $\text{a5}$. That is really all you need to know, and that $...\text{bd7}$ often runs into $e4-e5$ after $\text{e1}$, as we shall see.

$9...\text{d7}$ 10 $\text{e1}$ (10 $a4$ $\text{c5}$ is premature) 10...$\text{c8}$ 11 a4! a6 12 a5 e5 13 $\text{f5} \text{g6}$ 14 $\text{c3} \text{e7}$ 15 $\text{xb6}$ 0-0 16 b4 was poor for Black in Oll-Kengis, Riga 1995. 12 $\text{b8}$ has been suggested as an improvement, but to me it still looks as if White is a whole lot better. 10...$\text{c7}$?! has also been investigated, 11 e5 $\text{g2}$ 12 $\text{xf6} \text{xf6}$ 13 $\text{xe6} \text{f6}$ 14 $\text{g2} \text{c5}$ 15 $\text{c4}$ giving White a clear advantage according to Avrukh. Browne-Bradford, Dallas 1996 continued 10...$\text{c7}$?! 11 $\text{b5} \text{b8}$ 12 c5! (freeing the c4-square for the knight) 12...$\text{xc5}$ 13 $\text{e4}$ e5 14 f4 $\text{c6}$ 15 $\text{c3}$! b5 16 $\text{fxe5}$ and White had a powerful initiative. Finally 10...e5?! 11 $\text{b5}$ a6 12 $\text{c3} \text{e7}$ 13 $\text{f1} \text{c8}$ 14 $\text{c3}$ 0-0 15 $\text{a4}$ was slightly worse for Black in Cramling-Chiburdanidze, Groningen 1997, although Black’s position remains solid.

$10 \text{e1} \text{wc7}$

10...$\text{bd7}$ 11 e5! $\text{xc7}$ 12 $\text{xf6} \text{b7}$ (12...$\text{xf6}$ 13 $\text{xe6} \text{f6}$ 14 $\text{xg2} \text{c5}$ 15 $\text{c4} \text{c4}$ 16 $\text{xe4}$ was clearly better for White in Browne-Burger, Philadelphia 1990) 13 $\text{f7} \text{f7}$ 14 $\text{f4}$ 0-0? (14...$\text{xe4}$ 15 $\text{xe4}$ 0-0 16 $\text{g4}$ gives White an edge) 15 $\text{xd6} \text{c5}$ 16 $\text{xb7} \text{xd4}$ 17 $\text{xd4} \text{b8}$ 18 $\text{f1} \text{d4}$ 19 $\text{d1} \text{a8}$ 20 $\text{d6} \text{fd8}$ 21 $\text{d4}$ f5 22 $\text{c6}$ and White was winning in Tregubov-Grooten, Amsterdam 2001.

$11 \text{a4}$!

The reason why this is possible here and not in other hedgehog positions is the knight on d2 and the excellent support it adds to the c-pawn. White is also more flexibly placed to push with b2-b4.

$11...\text{c6}$

11...$\text{bd7}$ 12 a5 $\text{e7}$ 13 $\text{d2} \text{d8}$ 14 $\text{xb6} \text{xb6}$ 15 $\text{a5}$ was better for White in Bönsch-Chuchelov, Berlin 1996.

$12 \text{xc6} \text{xc6}$ 13 a5 $\text{b8}$?!

This is probably because Karpov overlooked White’s 15th move. Now Black is in trouble. 13...$\text{c7}$, developing, is necessary.

$14 \text{axb6} \text{wb6}$

14...$\text{xb6}$ leaves the rook awkwardly
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placed without solving the problem of the a6-pawn. After 15 b3, with the idea b2-d4, Black has problems and is still not developed.

15...\texttt{He3!} \texttt{Qd7}

Now Black is in trouble as developing is not possible. Note that 15...\texttt{Qc7}? 16 \texttt{Qb3} \texttt{Wc7} 17 \texttt{Qxb8+} \texttt{Wxb8} 18 e5 \texttt{Qxg2} 19 exf6 wins for White.

16 \texttt{Qb3} \texttt{Wa7}

Or 16...\texttt{Wc7} 17 \texttt{Qxa6} \texttt{Qxb3} 18 \texttt{Qxb3} \texttt{Wb7} 19 \texttt{Qa1} \texttt{Qxe4} 20 \texttt{Qa5} \texttt{Wb8} 21 \texttt{Qxe4} \texttt{Qxe4} 22 \texttt{Qf4} and the lead in development is again a key factor.

17 \texttt{Qba3}

White exerts maximum pressure on the primary weakness.

17...\texttt{Qb7}

17...\texttt{Qc5} 18 \texttt{Qb3!} \texttt{Qxb3} 19 \texttt{Qxb3} \texttt{Qxb3} 20 \texttt{Wxb3} \texttt{Qc7} 21 \texttt{Wxa2} and the a-pawn is difficult to protect without allowing \texttt{Wa4+}.

18 b4 \texttt{Wb6}?! 

Black is wasting time. 18...\texttt{Qc7} has to be tried, although White has many strong opportunities.

19 \texttt{Wa4}! \texttt{Qe7} 20 \texttt{Qb2} \texttt{Qf6}?

The lesser evil 20...e5 is tantamount to positional resignation.

21 e5!!

Fully exploiting the lead in development.

21...\texttt{Qxe5}

21...dxe5 22 \texttt{Qd3}! and Black will never escape as c4-c5 is coming.

22 c5 \texttt{Wc7}

22...\texttt{Wb5} 23 \texttt{Wxb5} axb5 24 \texttt{Qxe5} and White wins.

23 \texttt{Qxe5} dxe5 24 \texttt{Qxb7} \texttt{Qxb7} 25 c6 \texttt{Qb6} 26 \texttt{Wxa6} \texttt{Wxc6} 27 \texttt{Qc4}!

Winning a piece and the game. The threat is \texttt{Qa5}.

27...\texttt{Qb8} 28 \texttt{Qxb6} 0-0

28...\texttt{Wxb6} 29 \texttt{Wa8+} and White wins a rook.

29 \texttt{Qc4} \texttt{We4} 30 \texttt{Qe3} \texttt{Wd5} 31 \texttt{Qxe5} \texttt{Qf8} 32 \texttt{Wd3} 1-0

---

\textbf{Game 39}

Tregubov-Shaposhnikov

Samara 2000

1 d4 \texttt{Qf6} 2 c4 e6 3 \texttt{Qf3} b6 4 g3 \texttt{Qa6} 5 \texttt{Qbd2} c5

In my opinion this line is unnecessarily
Queen's Indian Defence

The only serious option. 6 \textit{g2} \textit{c6} 7 \textit{e5}!? (White can also play safe, but he will gain no advantage) 7...\textit{cxd4} 8 \textit{e3} \textit{f5} 9 \textit{a4} \textit{c8} 10 \textit{dxa8} \textit{wa8} 11 \textit{a1} \textit{c8} 12 \textit{b3} \textit{e4} 13 \textit{b2} \textit{d2} 14 \textit{xd2} \textit{e7} 15 \textit{ad1} \textit{f6} 16 \textit{d3} \textit{b7} gave Black the better chances in Timman-Dautov, Forchheim 2000.

6...\textit{cxd4} 7 \textit{e5}!

White needs to act now to gain an advantage. 7 \textit{g2}?! is a waste of time. Remember that White has sacrificed the d4-pawn! von Herman-Hübner, Altenkirchen 1999 went 7...\textit{c6} 8 \textit{e5} \textit{g4} 9 0-0 \textit{b8} 10 \textit{e1} \textit{c5} 11 \textit{h3} \textit{e3}, and White resigned.

7...\textit{g4} 8 \textit{hl6}

Now the knight is worse off and White can take time to develop.

9 \textit{g2} \textit{c6} 10 0-0 \textit{f5}

10...\textit{e7} 11 \textit{a3} 0-0 12 \textit{b4} \textit{b7} 13 \textit{e4} \textit{xb4}? (13...\textit{f5}?! is better, but White appears to be well placed) 14 \textit{h6}! \textit{xf6} 15 \textit{exf6} \textit{c6} 16 \textit{g5} \textit{c7} 17 \textit{hxh6} \textit{gxh6} 18 \textit{w2} \textit{h8} 19 \textit{w6} \textit{g8} 20 \textit{g5}! \textit{g5} 21 \textit{e4} \textit{g3}+ 22 \textit{fxg3} \textit{w3}+ 23 \textit{h1} and Black resigned in Hellsten-Aström, Ronneby 1998.

11 \textit{a3}!

Menacing. 11 \textit{a4} has also been played (Hellsten-Shipov, Gistrup 1997 being one example) but never with much success. White has to realised that he is well placed and that the pawn on d4 is very difficult for Black to hang on to, so he should just play around it.

11...\textit{e7}

This move has been given a ?! by one commentator but no improvement has been suggested. The following lines demonstrate the problems faced by Black:

a) 11...\textit{c8}?! 12 \textit{e1} \textit{e7} 13 \textit{b4} \textit{b7} 14 \textit{e4}! and Black is in trouble as he cannot develop freely. After 14...0-0 comes 15 \textit{g4}! \textit{h4} 16 \textit{hxh4} \textit{hxh4} 17 \textit{d6} \textit{c7} 18 \textit{xb7} \textit{xb7} 19 \textit{b5} \textit{a5} 20 \textit{xb7} \textit{xb7} 21 \textit{wxd4} f6 22 \textit{e2} and the compensation for the exchange is not apparent.

b) 11...\textit{c7} 12 \textit{b4} \textit{b7} 13 \textit{e4} \textit{h5} 14 \textit{f4} \textit{a5} 15 \textit{b5} \textit{d8} 16 \textit{xd4} \textit{xc4} 17 \textit{xf5} \textit{xf5} 18 \textit{c1} \textit{e6} 19 \textit{g5} gave White a clear advantage in Sherbakov-Galliamova, Chelyabinsk 1989.

c) 11...\textit{b5} 12 \textit{g4} \textit{h4} 13 \textit{hxh4} \textit{w4} 14 \textit{f3} \textit{d8} 15 \textit{xd4} \textit{xd4} 16 \textit{wxd4} looks good for White (Gershon).

12 \textit{b4} \textit{b7} 13 \textit{e4}!

This is the most logical move. Before White takes any action he improves his pieces to the maximum. 13 \textit{g4} has proved to be less dangerous.

13...\textit{d5}

Here Black has a serious alternative in 13...0-0?! 14 \textit{g4} \textit{d5} (only move) 15 \textit{xd5}! exd5 16 \textit{ded2} (16 \textit{eg5} \textit{h4}! is only in Black's interest; the knight is misplaced on g5) 16...\textit{h4} 17 \textit{b5} \textit{a5} 18 \textit{hxh4} \textit{hxh4} 19 \textit{f3} \textit{f7} 20 \textit{xd4} and White has an appealing position, but Black has some good things going for him, too. The c4-square is a strongpoint for the knight and the c-file will also come in handy. However, I believe that the potential storm on the kingside is very serious, and White should be optimistic.

14 \textit{xd5} \textit{xd5}

After this White gets time to irritate Black. Preferable is 14...\textit{exd5} 15 \textit{ded2} a6! (directed against b4-b5) 16 \textit{bd3} \textit{c8}!, and now 17 \textit{g4}?! \textit{h4} 18 \textit{hxh4} \textit{hxh4} 19 \textit{xd4} \textit{xd4} 20
$\text{W}xd4 \text{Cc}4$ gives Black a strong initiative. Instead after 17 $\text{B}b2$ 17...0-0 18 $g4 \text{D}h4$ 19 $\text{D}xh4 \text{x}h4$ White has only a slight edge.

15 $\text{R}e1$ d3?!

Black is in trouble and now self-destructs. After 15...0-0 16 $g4$ $\text{D}h3$ (16...$\text{D}xh6$ 17 $\text{x}h6$ $\text{gxh6}$ 18 $\text{W}d2$ looks very dangerous for Black) 17 $\text{fxe3}$ $\text{W}xe4$ 18 exd4 $\text{W}d5$ 19 $\text{L}e3$ White is slightly better.

16 $\text{B}b2$ 0-0-0?

This seems completely ridiculous.

17 $g4$ $\text{D}h6$ 18 $\text{Kg}2d2$ $\text{W}b5$??

Losing. After the necessary 18...$\text{W}d7$ 19 $\text{Cc}4$ $\text{D}b8$ 20 $\text{Q}ed6$ Black is still in trouble.

19 $\text{Cc}3$! 1-0

White wins material.

---

### Game 40

**Lautier-Karpov**

**Monte Carlo (rapid) 2000**

1 $d4$ $\text{Kf}6$ 2 $c4$ $e6$ 3 $\text{Kf}3$ $b6$ 4 $g3$ $\text{La}6$ 5 $\text{Kbd}2$ $d5$

This is the main reason why 5 $\text{Kbd}2$ is not such a popular choice.

6 $\text{Kg}2$ $\text{K}e7$ 7 0-0 0-0 8 $\text{De}5$

Here White could transpose with 8 exd5! exd5 9 $\text{De}5$. Other options causes no problems for Black. With the move order in the game Black has some additional options.

In Aagaard-Gavrikov, Gothenburg 1998 I discovered that the queen is not well placed after 8 $\text{W}c2$: 8...$\text{b}b7$ 9 $b3$ $a5$ 10 $\text{B}b2$ $\text{La}6$ 11 $\text{Kac}1$ $a4$ and Black was already doing fine.

8 $b3$ $c5$ 9 $\text{Dxc}5$ $\text{Kx}c5$ 10 $\text{B}b2$ $\text{Kbd}7$ 11 $\text{Cc}1$ $\text{Kb}7$ 12 $\text{D}d4$ $\text{K}e8$ 13 $\text{Db}5$ $\text{W}e7$ led to equality in Piket-Karpov, Wijk aan Zee 1998.

8...$\text{Kb}7$!

This move, followed by ...$a7-a5$ and ...$\text{D}a6$, is the main option for a good reason. With the knight on $d2$ White has to play $b2-b3$ and $\text{Kb}2$ to develop his dark-squared bishop, but cannot meet ...$a5-a4$ very well. However, there is another way to go, namely 8...c5?, e.g. 9 cxd5 exd5 10 $b3$ $\text{Ke}8$ (10...$\text{Kb}7$! followed by ...$\text{D}a6$ is the right path; Black does not play the opening altogether well here) 11 $\text{B}b2$ cxd4?! 12 $\text{D}d3$! (standard in these lines) 12...$c5$ 13 $a3$ $\text{D}bd7$ 14 $\text{D}d3$! and White has a very clear advantage, Polugaevsky-Rodriguez, Sochi 1988. 10 dxc5!? is interesting. Black should probably not play 10...$\text{bb}5$, when White was better in Romanishin-Psakhis, Moscow 1983 after 11 $b3$ $\text{B}b7$ 12 $\text{B}b2$ $a5$ 13 $e4$! $d4$ 14 $\text{D}ec4$ $\text{D}fd7$ 15 $\text{Ke}1$ $\text{Db}6$ 16 $\text{Dxb6}$ $\text{W}xb6$ 17 $\text{D}c4$. Instead 10...$\text{xc}5$! 11 $\text{D}d3$ (heading for f4) 11...$\text{D}e8$ 12 $\text{D}b3$ $\text{D}c6$ secures equality. Earlier 9 $\text{D}b3$ is possible, e.g. 9...$\text{b}b7$ 10 dxc5 $\text{bc}5$ 11 cxd5 $\text{xc}5$ 12 $\text{f}4$ $\text{Fb}6$ 13 $\text{C}c2$ $\text{D}g2$ 14 $\text{D}xg2$ $\text{D}c6$ 15 $\text{D}xg6$ $\text{D}xc6+$ 16 $\text{D}g1$ $\text{D}d5$, which was perhaps slightly preferable for White in Jusupov-Polugaevsky, Toluca 1982.

9 cxd5!
Queen's Indian Defence

a) 9 \( \textit{wa}4 \). What the queen is supposed to do out here is not altogether clear. Kempinski-Nisipeanu, Krynica 1998 continued 9...\( \textit{ad}6 \) 10 \( \textit{cx}5 \) \( \textit{xd}5 \) 11 e4 \( \textit{bb}7 \) 12 \( \textit{de}c4 \) \( \textit{ce}7 \) with a good opening for Black, although it was about to get even better: 13 e5?! \( \textit{axg}2 \) 14 \( \textit{exf}6 \) \( \textit{xf}6 \) 15 \( \textit{axg}2 \) \( \textit{d}5+ \) 16 \( \textit{df}3 \) b5 and Black had a clear advantage.

b) 9 \( \textit{b}3 \) c5! 10 \( \textit{dxc}5 \) bxc5 11 \( \textit{bb}2 \) \( \textit{bd}7 \) 12 \( \textit{dxd}7 \) \( \textit{xd}7 \) with equality, Oll-Khalifman, Parnu 1996. After 10 \( \textit{bb}2 \) \( \textit{cxd}5 \) exd5 has been played is that White cannot delay the recapture – 11 \( \textit{xd}4 \) \( \textit{d}6 \) was equal in Uhlmann-Stahlberg, Prague 1954. Note that 10 cxd5 does not transpose to the main lines because after 10...\( \textit{xd}5 \)! Black has already equalised.

c) 9 \( \textit{c}2 \) c5 10 \( \textit{dxc}5 \) exd5 11 dxc5 \( \textit{xc}5 \) 12 \( \textit{df}3 \) \( \textit{bd}7 \) 13 \( \textit{f}4 \) \( \textit{e}8 \) was also level in Sutter-Kindermann, Bern 1995.

9...exd5

The interesting 9...\( \textit{xd}5? \) 10 e4 \( \textit{bb}7 \) 11 \( \textit{wc}2 \) (11 \( \textit{wa}4 \) \( \textit{e}8 \) 12 \( \textit{wc}2 \) \( \textit{dc}6! \), with an even game, is better) 11...\( \textit{da}6 \) 12 \( \textit{dd}1 \) \( \textit{we}8 \) was seen in Dizdar-Granda Zuniga, New York 1997. After 12...\( \textit{xd}4! \) 13 \( \textit{dc}4 \) \( \textit{wc}5 \) 14 \( \textit{c}3 \) \( \textit{wb}5 \) it is clear that White has genuine compensation for the pawn. A GM once told me that the most important thing he had learned from Fritz was that you should take pawns when it seems dangerous but you cannot actually see any real danger. If you look through Tal's old games you will find that he bluffed half his way to the World Championship title.

10 \( \textit{b}3 \) a5

Here Black can also try 10...c5 11 \( \textit{b}2 \) \( \textit{dc}6! \)? 12 \( \textit{dc}6 \) \( \textit{xc}6 \) 13 \( \textit{cc}1 \) \( \textit{bb}7 \) with counterplay according to Dolmatov. Instead 11...\( \textit{bd}7 \) 12 \( \textit{dxd}7 \) \( \textit{xd}7 \) 13 dxc5 bxc5 14 e4 seemed slightly better for White in Topalov-Gelfand, Monte Carlo 1999, while 11...\( \textit{da}6 \) 12 \( \textit{cc}1 \) \( \textit{dc}7 \) 13 dxc5 \( \textit{xc}5 \) 14 \( \textit{dd}3 \) \( \textit{dd}6 \) 15 \( \textit{df}3 \) \( \textit{de}4 \) 16 \( \textit{dc}4 \) was a good deal better for White in Goldin-Ulibin, Kazan 1995.

11 \( \textit{wc}2 \)

Again I do not like this move at all. White should concentrate on developing his minor soldiers first before sending the queen into battle. 11 \( \textit{bb}2 \) \( \textit{da}6 \) 12 \( \textit{cc}1 \) c5 13 \( \textit{xd}3 \) (another standard manoeuvre in such positions) 13...\( \textit{ee}8 \) 14 \( \textit{df}4 \) was played in Khalifman-Leko, New Delhi 2000. Such situations are what the main lines of the Queen's Indian Defence are all about. White might have a small plus and can manoeuvre around, trying to create something more, while Black will try to equalise or use any chance that might be given him to get some kind of an initiative.

11...\( \textit{da}6 \) 12 \( \textit{bb}2 \) c5 13 dxc5 bxc5 14 \( \textit{ad}1 \)!

This move is rather careless. The only black piece that is not really well placed is the queen's knight, and now Black is allowed to bring it back into the game. 14 a3 \( \textit{wb}6 \) 15 \( \textit{ad}1 \) a4 16 bxa4 \( \textit{xc}8 \) 17 \( \textit{bb}1 \) \( \textit{wa}7 \) results in a kind of dynamic equilibrium.

14...a4!

Black is activating all his pieces this way. 15 bxa4 \( \textit{bb}4 \) 16 \( \textit{wb}1 \) \( \textit{wc}7 \) 17 e4

Black is about to advance his c-pawn and White uses the moment to claim squares for his knights. 17 a3 \( \textit{cc}6 \) 18 \( \textit{xc}6 \) \( \textit{xc}6 \) also gives Black the advantage.

17...d4 18 a3 \( \textit{cc}6 \) 19 \( \textit{dc}4 \) \( \textit{xa}4 \) 20 \( \textit{xe}4 \)!

Inviting Black to exploit his more active
pieces. It was better to try to disturb Black with 20 \( \text{wc2} \) \( \text{xfa8} \) 21 \( \text{f4} \)?, when White’s forces are not easily kept out.

20...\( \text{dxa5} \)!

Now this is possible. After this the defence of a3 is more difficult for White.

21 \( \text{dxa5} \)

21 \( \text{wc2} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 22 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{xfa8} \), followed by \( ... \) \( \text{d7-b6} \) with advantage.

21...\( \text{xa5} \)

White has no counterplay and Black has the c-pawn as a strong force and the a-pawn to put pressure on.

22 \( \text{wc2} \) \( \text{wc6} \) 23 \( \text{ec4} \) \( \text{ea7} \) 24 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 25 \( \text{wd2} \) \( \text{b6} \) 26 \( \text{lc1} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 27 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{ed8} \) 28 \( \text{ec1} \) \( \text{wb6} \) 29 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{a6} \) 30 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{wb3} \) 31 \( \text{xc5} \) 32 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{b7} \) 33 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{wa4} \) 34 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{b4} \) 0-1

This line is somewhat dubious. The superior \( 5...\text{c5} \) is considered in the following games.

6 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b5} \)!

The point. Passive play with \( 6...\text{e7} \) 7 \( \text{g2} \) 0-0 8 0-0 \( \text{d5} \) 9 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{c8} \) 10 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 11 \( \text{f4} \) favoured White in Hübner-Bauer, Leon 2001.

7 \( \text{xb5} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 8 \( \text{xb5} \) \( \text{b6} \) 9 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b4} \)

Black also fails to equalise after 9...\( \text{c6} \) 10 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{b4} \), e.g. 11 0-0 \( \text{xc3} \) 12 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{xe2} \) 13 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{wa6} \) 14 \( \text{xa6} \) \( \text{xa6} \) 15 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{c8} \) 16 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{dxc6} \) 17 \( \text{a3} \), when White had a lasting advantage in Nikolic-Ljubojevic, Monte Carlo 1995.

10 \( \text{g2} \) 0-0 11 \( \text{wd1} \)!

This is the dangerous move for Black. After 11 0-0 \( \text{xc3} \) 12 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{xe2} \) 13 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{b5} \)!? 14 \( \text{wb3} \) \( \text{d5} \) (Black must prevent c3-c4: White stood better in Skembris-Timman, Corfu 1993 after 14...\( \text{xc6} \)!! 15 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{xa6} \) 16 \( \text{f4} \)? 15 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{c8} \) 16 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 17 \( \text{wb4} \) \( \text{g8} \) 18 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{a6} \) 19 \( \text{xb6} \) \( \text{axb6} \) with equality in Vukic-Bronstein, Sarajevo 1971. Meanwhile in Tukmakov-Gulko, Leningrad 1977, 11 \( \text{wc2} \) \( \text{e6} \) 12 0-0 \( \text{xc8} \) 13 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 14 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{ed5} \) 15 \( \text{dd1} \) \( \text{ce7} \) 16 \( \text{a2} \) \( \text{ab8} \) 17 \( \text{ab1} \) \( \text{wb3} \) gave Black enormous compensation for the pawn.

11...\( \text{xc8} \)

11...\( \text{xc3}+ \) 12 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{c8} \) 13 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{d5} \) 14 0-0 \( \text{e4} \) 15 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 16 \( \text{e1} \)!
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White is taking his time to untangle. After
16 \textit{Qd2} \textit{Bxc3} 17 \textit{Bxc3} \textit{Mc7} Black will exert
pressure on c3, and 18 c4 \textit{Wxd4} 19 cxd5
\textit{Mcx1} 20 \textit{Wxc1} \textit{Mc8}! 21 \textit{Wd1} exd5 is level.

16...\textit{Mab8}

16...\textit{Mc7} 17 \textit{Wa4}! and Black will find it
hard to improve his situation due to the
threat of \textit{Ma5}.

17 \textit{Wa4} \textit{Mb5} 18 \textit{Wa3} \textit{Mb7} 19 \textit{Ma5}! \textit{Mxc1}
20 \textit{Mxc1}

White has more or less untangled.

20...\textit{Mc8}

After 20...\textit{Mxc2} 21 \textit{Mc7}! \textit{Mb5} 22 \textit{Mb3}!!
\textit{Wxb3} 23 axb3 \textit{Mf8} 24 b4 a6 25 \textit{Me5} White
loses his pawn but, suddenly, his pieces to­
tally dominate Black and he can hope for a
successful result.

21 \textit{Mxc8}+ \textit{Wxc8} 22 \textit{Mf1} \textit{Mc1} 23 \textit{Mg2}
\textit{Wd1} 24 \textit{Mb3} \textit{Mxe2} 25 \textit{Mc1} \textit{Wxd1}

Again Black has won back his pawn, but
at a price. White has the two bishops and an
extra pawn on the queenside, so the ending
is, in fact, dreadful for Black.

26 \textit{Mb5} \textit{Mb6} 27 b3 \textit{Mc2} 28 \textit{Me5} \textit{Md6} 29
\textit{Ma6} \textit{Ma1} 30 \textit{Mc6} \textit{Mxa2} 31 \textit{Mxa7} \textit{Md7}
32 b4 e5 33 \textit{Mc7} \textit{Mf4} 34 \textit{Mc6} \textit{exd4} 35
\textit{Mxd4} \textit{Mb1} 36 \textit{Mb7} \textit{Mdb6} 37 \textit{Mc6} \textit{Mf8}
38 f3 \textit{Md3} 39 \textit{Mf2} \textit{Me7} 40 \textit{Mb5} \textit{Md7} 41
\textit{Mc6} \textit{Mc6} 42 \textit{Mc3} \textit{Mb1} 43 \textit{Mb5} \textit{Ma2} 44
\textit{Mdb} \textit{Mc6} 45 \textit{Mc3} \textit{Mb3} 46 \textit{Ma2} g5 47
\textit{Mdc} \textit{Mc4} 48 \textit{Mc4}+ \textit{Me7} 49 b5 \textit{Ma4}+ 50
\textit{Mb4} \textit{Mc5} 51 \textit{Ma5}+ \textit{Mb6} 52 \textit{Mdc4}+ \textit{Me7}
53 \textit{Ma5} f6 54 \textit{Mc5}+ \textit{Mb6} 55 \textit{Mc4}+ \textit{Me7}

This is practically the only line played
these days. After 7 0-0 \textit{exd4} 8 \textit{Mxd4} \textit{Mc8} 9
\textit{Mc3} \textit{Mxb2} 10 \textit{Wxb2}+ \textit{Wb7}+ Black has an
improved version of the hedgehog system, as
with little space each exchange is normally an
advantage. Nikolic-Karpov, Monte Carlo
2000 continued 11 f3 \textit{Mc7} 12 \textit{Mg1} a6 13
\textit{Ma5} b6 14 \textit{Mh6} \textit{Mf6} 15 \textit{Mc4} \textit{Mc7} 16 \textit{Mb3}
\textit{Mc7} 17 \textit{Mc6}! 0-0 18 \textit{Me4} 19 \textit{Mc3} \textit{Mb8} 20
\textit{Ma3} \textit{Mb8} 21 g4 d5 and Black was okay.

7...\textit{Mxc5}!?

More usual is 7...\textit{Mc5}, as can be seen in
the two following games. After the text Black
is rock solid but has few chances of an ad­
advantage.

8 0-0 \textit{Mc7} 9 \textit{Ma3} 0-0 10 \textit{Mf4} \textit{Mb6} 11
\textit{Mfd1} \textit{Md8}

After 11...d6 12 \textit{Md2} Black has an extra
option in 12...\textit{Mf6}? 13 \textit{Mxd6} \textit{Mxd6} 14 \textit{Mxd6}
\textit{Wxb2} 15 \textit{Mb1} \textit{Wxc3} 16 \textit{Mb7} \textit{Mxd4} 17 \textit{Wd1},
as in Karpov-Polugaevsky, Biel 1990. Now
17...\textit{Ma8}! would have kept the balance. No­
tice it is important to use the appropriate
rook, as 17...£fd8 gives White the additional option of 18 £xa7?!, with the main point being 18...£xc4?? 19 £e5! etc. What worries me most here is 12 £b3! £d8 with transposition to the main game.

12 £b3!

12 £d2 d5 13 exd5 exd5 14 £c2 £a6 15 a3 h6 16 £e5 d4 17 £a4 £b5 18 b4? £xb4 19 £xd4 £xd4! and Black was winning in Olafsson-Bareev, Hastings 1990. Instead 14 £e5 £a6 15 £ad1 £e6 16 £c4 £b4 17 a3 £c6 18 £a5 d4 19 axb4 £xg2 20 £xg2 £xb4 was equal in Tukmakov-Dautov, Istanbul 2000, but 14 £td2! improves, with a chance to gradually develop an initiative.

12...£d6

12...£xb3 is to premature in view of 13 axb3 £d6 14 £b5!, forcing concessions.

13 £d2

White is improving his position. 13 £xb6 axb6 14 £b5 £e8 15 £g5 £xg2 16 £xg2 £c6 gave White nothing in Mirzoev-Dautov, Istanbul 2000, but 14 £d2! improves, with a chance to gradually develop an initiative.

13...£a6

13...£xb3 14 axb3 £c6 15 £ad1 £e8, as in Olafsson-Lautier, Antwerp 1998, is possibly enough for equality. But one tends to ask what the rook is really doing on d1 besides attacking the d6-pawn.

14 £xb6 axb6 15 £ad1 £e8 16 h4 h6 17 £h2 £xg2 18 £xg2 £c7 19 e4 £f8 20 b3 £db8

Seems too optimistic; perhaps Black failed to appreciate the implications of his opponent’s reply.

21 £e5! d5 22 cxd5 exd5 23 £xd5 £xd5 24 £xd5 £xa2 25 £d7!

Now the white pieces are active, which cannot be said of Black’s. In fact Black is in trouble.

25...£aa8 26 £g4 £d8 27 £e3 £ac8 28 £f5 £xd7 29 £xd7 £d8 30 £h7 £c7 31 £h5 £d8 32 £e3 £d3 33 £e6 £xe6 34 £xc7 £d7 35 £xb6 £xc7 36 £xe6 £b7 37 £e5 £xb3 38 £c5 £ef6 39 g4 £a3 40 £c8+ £f7 41 £c4 £a7 42 £f3 £e6 43 £c5 £d5 44 £e6+ £f7 45 £e5 £f4+ 46 £g3 £a4 47 £c2 £f6 48 £d7+ £e7 49 £c5 £d4 50 £a2 £f7 51 £a7+ £f8 52 £e4 £e6 53 £a6 £e7 54 £f2 £c4 55 £e3 £c1 56 £e7+ £c5 57 £a4 £b7 58 £a3 £c7 59 £g3 £f6 60 £e4+ £f7 61 £c3 £d7 62 £f4 £c5 63 £e2 £f1 64 £d4 £e6 65 £f3 £b7 66 £e5+ £f6 67 £d3 £e7 68 £e4 £d7 69 £f5 £d6 70 £a7+ £f8 71 £e5 £d4+ 72 £e4 £e6 73 £g6+ £g8 74 £e5 £b6 75 £e7 1-0

Game 43

Borges Mateos-Spraggett

Cienfuegos 1997

1 d4 £f6 2 c4 e6 3 £f3 b6 4 g3 £a6 5 £e4 £b7 6 £g2 c5 7 dxc5 £xc5 8 0-0 0-0 9 £c3 £e7!

The bishop is not well placed on c5, a square that is more suited for the knight.

10 £d1 £e6?!

This has become fashionable over the last couple of years. Black is trying to establish a hedgehog position. 10...£a6 – the main line – is considered in the following game.

11 £f4 d6 12 £d2

With this move White is trying to put d6 under pressure but, as we shall see, Black can easily protect it. The alternative is 12 £ac1 £c7:

a) 13 £c2 £d8! (13...£bd7 14 £d2 £e8
is a standard Hedgehog but Black wants the rook on the other side of the knight) 14 \textit{d}d2 \textit{d}e8 15 \textit{g}5 \textit{x}g5 16 \textit{x}g5 \textit{d}d7 17 b3 \textit{a}c8 18 \textit{w}c3 \textit{c}e6 with equality, Jakobsen-Hansen, Greve 2002.

b) 13 \textit{w}b4 (more dangerous than 13 \textit{w}c2) 13...\textit{d}e8 14 \textit{g}5 (14 \textit{d}a4 \textit{d}d7 15 \textit{w}d2 \textit{d}c5 16 \textit{d}c3 \textit{d}e4 17 \textit{d}xe4 \textit{d}xe4 was fine for Black in Hansen-Onischuk, Bundesliga 1995) 14...\textit{f}6 15 \textit{h}x6 \textit{g}x6 16 \textit{d}d5?! (forcing a draw, but it seems that White has no advantage anyway) 16...\textit{e}xd5 17 \textit{c}xd5 \textit{d}8 18 \textit{d}d4 \textit{h}8 19 \textit{c}c6 \textit{w}c7 20 \textit{w}d4 \textit{d}d8 21 \textit{d}c6 \textit{w}c7 22 \textit{d}d4 and a draw was agreed in Ivanchuk-Lautier, Moscow 2001.

12...\textit{w}c7 13 \textit{d}d1 \textit{d}8 14 \textit{g}5

Others:

a) 14 \textit{d}e1 \textit{x}g2 15 \textit{x}g2 \textit{d}c6 16 \textit{g}5 \textit{d}a5 17 \textit{d}e3 \textit{h}6 18 \textit{x}f6 \textit{x}f6 19 \textit{d}e4 \textit{e}7 20 \textit{e}c2 \textit{w}b7 with equality in Bönsch-Stempin, Polanica Zdroj 1987.

b) 14 \textit{w}c2 h6. Black addresses the possibility of \textit{g}5-e4 and \textit{g}5. This is not strictly necessary, but quite a common move when White has no chances of a kingside pawn storm. Grivas-Ionescu, Dubai 1986 continued 15 e4 \textit{h}5 16 \textit{e}c3 \textit{d}7 17 \textit{b}3 \textit{e}ac8 18 \textit{a}4 \textit{h}5 19 \textit{f}4 \textit{e}5 20 \textit{x}xe5 \textit{d}xe5 21 \textit{d}xe4 \textit{d}xe4 22 \textit{d}e3 \textit{e}7 23 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}d7 and Black was okay. Normally Black should be careful when allowing White a majority on the queenside, but because the pawn is on a4 there is no problem here.

c) 14 \textit{w}b3 \textit{d}e8 15 e4 \textit{d}d7 16 e5 \textit{d}xe5 17 \textit{d}xe5 \textit{d}xe5 18 \textit{d}xd8 \textit{d}xd8 19 \textit{d}xe5 \textit{d}xe5 20 \textit{d}xb7 a5 with equality, Meister-Wegner, Germany 1987.

14...\textit{x}g2 15 \textit{x}g2 \textit{d}c6 16 \textit{d}ge4 \textit{e}8!

Black should be careful and remember this lesson. White has a knight on c3 and cannot find any good use for it, so an exchange on e4 would be silly. Indeed 16...\textit{d}xe4?! 17 \textit{d}xe4 e5 leaves the d5-square susceptible to future attention.

17 \textit{g}5

More sensible than 17 g4!? which, in

Zaltsman-Amason, New York 1986, met with 17...\textit{d}a5!, a brilliant manoeuvre, albeit quite simple. There followed 18 b3 \textit{d}b7 19 \textit{f}3 \textit{x}f8! (guarding the minor pieces and addressing the king's own security), and now White should have played 20 \textit{a}3 with a sensible position. Instead after 20 \textit{g}3?! \textit{w}c8! Black assumed the initiative: 21 \textit{f}2 b5 22 \textit{c}xb5 \textit{x}b5 23 \textit{w}xb5 \textit{d}5 24 \textit{d}a4 \textit{a}5 25 \textit{w}b6 \textit{x}d4 26 \textit{x}d4 \textit{x}f3+ 27 \textit{x}f3 \textit{x}d8 28 \textit{x}d8 \textit{x}d8 29 \textit{w}b7 \textit{d}5 and Black had a clear advantage.

17...\textit{f}6!

This is not really necessary. Also possible is 17...\textit{x}g5?! 18 \textit{x}g5 h6 19 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}a5 20 \textit{d}d4 (20 b3? b5! is in Black's interest) 20...\textit{d}c8 with sufficient counterplay.

18 \textit{f}3!

Forced. The bishop is misplaced after 18 \textit{f}4? \textit{d}a5! 19 b3 \textit{f}5 20 \textit{g}5 b5! 21 \textit{a}3 \textit{x}g5 22 \textit{x}g5 \textit{d}b8, when Black has a powerful initiative.

18...\textit{d}e5 19 \textit{d}d4 \textit{d}c8 20 \textit{d}d2 \textit{f}5 21 \textit{f}3 \textit{f}6

Black is more than comfortable here.

22 \textit{f}2 \textit{d}6 23 \textit{d}d3 \textit{d}a5 24 \textit{e}4 \textit{g}6 25 \textit{d}d4 \textit{x}d4 26 \textit{d}xe4 \textit{d}c6 27 \textit{d}d3 \textit{d}e5 28 \textit{d}d4 \textit{d}f6 29 \textit{w}a3 \textit{d}d8 30 \textit{x}f5 \textit{g}xf5 31 \textit{d}e2 \textit{d}c6 32 \textit{h}4 \textit{d}e5 33 \textit{w}e3 \textit{d}e8 34 \textit{h}6?

What the rook is supposed to be doing up here is not clear. After 34 \textit{w}g5+ \textit{w}g7 35 \textit{w}xg7+ \textit{w}xg7 36 \textit{d}d4 the endgame is level.
4 g3 b4+ and 4...a6 without 5 b3

34...\(\text{W}g7!\) 35 \(\text{H}h4\) b5 36 b3 \(\text{H}ad8\) 37 \(\text{Qf4}\) \(\text{Qg6}\) 38 \(\text{Qxg6}\) \(\text{hxg6}\) 39 \(\text{Hd4}\)

39 \(\text{W}d3\) g5 40 \(\text{Hd4}\) d5! is also clearly better for Black because 41 cxd5? e5! is decisive.

39...e5 40 \(\text{H}d3\) \(\text{W}b7\)?

The traditional 40th move blunder... Black can win with 40...d5! 41 cxd5 e4! 42 fxe4 fxe4 and White will suffer material losses.

41 \(\text{f}g1\) \(\text{f}7\) 42 \(\text{He}1\) d5 43 cxd5 \(\text{Hxd5}\) 44 \(\text{W}c5\) \(\text{f}6\) 45 \(\text{Hxd8}\) \(\text{Hxd8}\) 46 \(\text{W}e3\) \(\text{W}d5\) 47 \(\text{He}2\) \(\text{W}d4\) 48 \(\text{W}xd4\) \(\text{Hxd4}\) 49 \(\text{f}f1\) \(\text{He}6\) 50 \(\text{Hc}2\) \(\text{d}7\) 51 \(\text{f}f2\) \(\text{d}5\) 52 \(\text{Hd}2\) \(\text{Hxd2+}\) 52...\(\text{H}xg3\) 53 \(\text{Hc}2\) \(\text{d}3\) 54 \(\text{He}3\) \(\text{Hd}6\) maintains the pressure, but now we have a draw.

53 \(\text{Hxd2}\) \(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\)

Game 44
Piket-Chuchelov
Netherlands 2000

1 \(d4\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 2 \(c4\) e6 3 \(\text{Qf3}\) b6 4 \(g3\) \(\text{a6}\) 5 \(\text{W}e4\) \(\text{b}7\) 6 \(\text{g}2\) c5 7 dxc5 \(\text{Qxc5}\) 8 0-0 0-0 9 \(\text{Qc3}\) \(\text{He}7\) 10 \(\text{Hd1}\) \(\text{d}6\) 11 \(\text{Hf4}\)

The most normal move, but dangerous is 11 \(\text{Hc}3\)!, with the idea of putting the bishop on d4. This has led to problems for Black but seems to have been solved by 11...\(\text{W}b8\)!, with the idea of overprotecting the d6-square. Georgiev-Ivanchuk, Tilburg 1993 continued 12 \(\text{Hac1}\) \(\text{d}c5\) 13 \(\text{Wc2}\) \(\text{Hxe4}\) 14 \(\text{Hf4}\), transposing to the main game, but 14...\(\text{Wc8}\) 15 \(\text{Hxe4}\) \(\text{dxe4}\) 16 \(\text{Wc4}\) \(\text{Wb7}\)! (the obvious move) 17 \(\text{f}f1\) \(\text{He}8\) 18 \(\text{d}e1\) a6 was level. Here 14 \(\text{Qd}4\) \(\text{Qc}5\) looks fine for Black.

11...\(\text{Wc8}\) 12 \(\text{Hac1}\) \(\text{d}c5\) 13 \(\text{Wc2}\) \(\text{Hxe4}\) 14 \(\text{Hd4}\)

14 \(\text{Hxe4}\) \(\text{d}xe4\) 15 \(\text{W}a4\) (both 15 \(\text{W}d2\) \(\text{Wb}7\) 16 \(\text{d}d6\) \(\text{Hxd6}\) 17 \(\text{d}xd6\) \(\text{Qac8}\), Dautov-Smirin, Daugavpils 1989, and 15 \(\text{W}b3\) \(\text{Wb}7\) 16 \(\text{Qd6}\) \(\text{Qxd6}\) 17 \(\text{Hxd6}\) \(\text{Qc8}\), Dlugy-Adorjan, New York 1984, give Black a good game) 15...\(\text{Wb}7!\) 16 \(\text{d}e6\)? (this exchange favours Black; 16 \(\text{Qf1}\) is seen in the note above) 16...\(\text{d}xd6\) 17 \(\text{Hxd6}\) \(\text{Qc8}\)! and Black was better in Blees-Gershon, Tel Aviv 1999. Already the threat is ...\(\text{b}6-\text{b}5\).

In Bareev-Karpov, Tilburg 1991, 14 \(\text{h}3\)?! \(\text{Qd}8\) 15 \(\text{g}4\)? \(\text{d}6!\) left Black in the lead as White had achieved nothing but weakening his kingside. Karpov offers 15 \(\text{Qd}4\) with equality.

14...\(\text{Qxc3}\) 15 \(\text{Wxc3}\) a6 16 \(\text{Wb}3\) \(\text{Qxg2}\) 17 \(\text{Qxg2}\) \(\text{Wb}7+\) 18 \(\text{Wf}3\) \(\text{Qa}7\)!

Stronger than 18...\(\text{Wxf3+}\) 19 \(\text{Wxf3}\) \(\text{Qac8}\)
20 \(\text{e}4\), when White has more freedom to manœuvre thanks to his space advantage.

19 \(\text{Wxb7}\) \(\text{Qxb7}\) 20 f3 \(\text{Qc8}\)

20...\(\text{Hh}5?!\) 21 \(\text{Hc}3\) \(\text{f}5?!\) was an interesting alternative.

21 e4 \(\text{d}6\)

21...\(\text{Qe}8\) 22 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{h}5!\) 23 a4 \(\text{Hc}6\) 24 \(\text{Hc}3\) was slightly better for White in Piket-Karpov, Monaco 1999. However, as in the main game, White failed to make anything of the modest lead, so perhaps Black should not fear it so much. Nevertheless I feel that 10...\(\text{d}6\) is the safest option for Black.

22 \(\text{Hxe2}\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 23 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{h}5!?\) 24 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{g}6\) 25 \(\text{Hd}2\) \(\text{Hbc7}\) 26 \(\text{Hd}3\) \(\text{Qc}5\) 27 a4 \(\text{Hc}6\) 28 \(\text{Hcd1}\) \(\text{Hbc2}\) 29 \(\text{Hf}1\) \(\text{Hf}8\) 30 \(\text{Qc3}\) \(\text{Hb}8\) 31 \(\text{Qd}1\) \(\text{Qb}7\) 32 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 33 \(\text{Hd}1\) \(\text{Hf}8\) 34 \(\text{Qc}2\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 35 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Hbc7}\) 36 \(\text{Hc}2\) \(\text{Hb}7\) 37 \(\text{Qe}6+\) \(\text{Qg}8\) 38 \(\text{Hc}3\) \(\text{Hf}6\) 39 \(\text{Hf}4\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 40 \(\text{Qc}3\) \(\text{Hf}6!\) 41 \(\text{Hd}2\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 42 \(\text{Hc}2\) \(\text{b}6\) 43 \(\text{Qc}6\) \(\text{Hf}6\) 44 \(\text{Qd}1\) \(\text{b}5!\) 45 axb6 axb6 46 \(\text{Qa}3\) \(\text{bx}4\) 47 \(\text{Hxc4}\) \(\text{Hxe7}\) 48 \(\text{Hxc7}\) \(\text{Qxc7}\) 49 \(\text{Qc}4\) \(\text{Qc}6\) 50 \(\text{Qc}2\) \(\text{f}5\) 51 \(\text{Qc}3\) \(\text{f}xe4\) 52 \(\text{f}xe4\) \(\text{Qf}6\) 53 \(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Qxc3+}\) 54 \(\text{Qxc3}\) \(\text{Qf}7\) 55 \(\text{Qd}3\) \(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\)
Summary
The 4...\textbf{b}4+ line invariably leads to a small advantage for White. 4...\textbf{a}6 is more modern and more dynamic. After moves like 5 \textbf{c}2, 5 \textbf{bd}2, 5 \textbf{b}3 and 5 \textbf{a}4 Black can easily achieve equality. The real test (if that is what you want to call it) is found in the following chapter. It is a notable feature of these lines that, after the bishop returns to b7 at a later date, it seems that White has used his extra move to his own disadvantage. The only real dangerous move considered here is 5 \textbf{bd}2, but the idea of ...d7-d5 and ...\textbf{b}7 followed by ...a7-a5 and ...\textbf{a}6 should give Black a good game.

\begin{center}
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1 d4 \textbf{f}6 2 c4 e6 3 \textbf{f}3 b6 4 g3 (D) \textbf{a}6
4...\textbf{b}4+ 5 \textbf{d}2 a5 6 \textbf{g}2 0-0 7 0-0 \textbf{a}6 8 b3
8...\textbf{b}7 - Chapter 7; 8...d5 - Game 34
5 \textbf{a}4
5 b3 - Chapter 7
5 \textbf{c}2 - Game 35
5 \textbf{b}3 - Game 36
5 \textbf{bd}2 (D)
5...\textbf{b}4 - Game 37
5...\textbf{b}7 6 \textbf{g}2 c5 - Game 38
5...c5 6 e4 - Game 39
5...d5 6 \textbf{g}2 \textbf{c}7 7 0-0 0-0 - Game 40

5...\textbf{b}7
5...c6 - Game 41
6 \textbf{g}2 c5 7 dxc5 \textbf{xc}5
7...\textbf{xc}5 - Game 42
8 0-0 0-0 9 \textbf{c}3 \textbf{e}7 10 \textbf{d}1 (D)
10...a6 - Game 43; 10...\textbf{a}6 - Game 44
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CHAPTER SEVEN

4...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{a6}}}: \)
Main Line with 5 \( \texttt{b3} \)

1 \texttt{d4 \textit{f6} 2 \texttt{c4 e6 3 \textit{f3 b6 4 \texttt{g3 a6}} 5 \texttt{b3} }

This is where the main theoretical battleground for the Queen’s Indian and maybe even for 1 \texttt{d4} is taking place. Black has a multitude of variations to choose from. Some of them are more experimental and lead to an unbalancing of the position, while others aim for long forced lines hoping to equalise. The balance of play currently favours Black in the sense that White apparently cannot engineer an advantage in the main lines towards the end of the chapter. But if you, like me, not only desire to play perfect chess, but also want to win some games now and again, then you might find more fun in some of the sidelines presented in this chapter, as all top players have done from time to time.

\textbf{Game 45}

\textbf{Kasparov-Gelfand}
Novgorod 1997

1 \texttt{d4 \textit{f6} 2 \texttt{c4 e6 3 \textit{f3 b6 4 \texttt{g3 a6}} 5 \texttt{b3 d5?}

This move has been played more than it deserves, or at least it has been played with an idea neither I nor practice can fully approve of. Another dubious alternative that some might consider worth a try is 5...\texttt{c5}, e.g. \texttt{6 \textit{g2} and now:

a) \texttt{6...d5} seems to be the only serious option. Bach-Schilow, 1997 continued 7 \texttt{0-0 \textit{c6} 8 \texttt{exd5 exd5 9 \textit{b2 \textit{c8} 10 \textit{e1}} with (probably) an edge for White in one of those ‘better player wins’ situations. 7...\textit{e7} 8 \texttt{exd5 \textit{cxd5} 9 \textit{b2 0-0 10 \texttt{bd2 \textit{d7} 11 \textit{c4 \textit{c8}} 12 \texttt{e4 \textit{g6} 13 \texttt{d5 exd5} 14 \texttt{exd5} was better for White in Neverov-Sazonov, Yalta 1996.

b) \texttt{6...\textit{c6} 7 \texttt{d5! exd5 8 \texttt{exd5 \textit{e7}?! (8...\textit{b4} 9 \textit{c3 \textit{b7} 10 \texttt{e4 \textit{a6} 11 \textit{xf1 \textit{xf1} 12 \textit{xf1}, with some advantage to White, is a lesser evil) 9 \textit{c3 \textit{c6? (9...\texttt{d6} 10 \texttt{0-0 \texttt{d6} 11 \textit{b2 \textit{g7} merely points to the weird knight on e7) 10 \textit{g5 \textit{g7} 11 \texttt{d6 \textit{d6} 12 \texttt{d5 with a clear advantage in Popov-Zvjaginsev, St. Petersburg 1998.

c) \texttt{6...\textit{b7} 7 \texttt{d5 exd5 8 \textit{h4 g6 9 \textit{b2 \textit{g7} 10 \texttt{exd5 d6 11 0-0 \texttt{b5} 12 \textit{a4 b4 13 \texttt{d2} was better for White in Tratar-Slak, Slovenia 1994.

6 \textit{g2 dxc4?}

After this move White has a large advantage. But 6...\texttt{b4}! 7 \texttt{d2 \textit{xd2=H! is interesting (rather than 7...\texttt{d6} 8 \textit{c3 \texttt{bd7} 9 \texttt{e4! c5 10 \texttt{exd5 exd5 11 \textit{e2=H, as in Nestorovic-Rajkovic, Belgrade 1988). Then 8 \texttt{bxd2 0-0 (8...\texttt{c5 9 dxc5 bxc5 10 0-0 0-0 11 \textit{e1 \textit{c6 12 \texttt{xd5 exd5} 13 \textit{c1 \textit{b6} 14 \textit{c2
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Queen's Indian Defence

\( \square b4 15 \square x c5 \square x a2 16 \square x b6 a x b 6 17 \square c 6 \) was better for White in Nikolic-Yudasin, Tilburg 1993) 9 0-0 \( \square b d 7 \) 10 \( \square c 1 \) c 5 11 c x d 5 (11 \( \square e 1 \) \( \square b 7 \) 12 c x d 5 e x d 5 13 \( \square c 2 \) \( \square e 8 \) 14 \( \square b 2 \) \( \square e 7 \) 15 e 3 a 5 with equality in Tischer-Eismont, Biel 1994) 11...e x d 5 12 \( \square e 1 \) \( \square e 8 \) 13 e 3 \( \square c 8 \) 14 \( \square h 3 \) \( \square c 7 \) 15 \( \square f 1 \) ended peacefully in Alteman-Yudasin, Haifa 1995, although I have a feeling that White might be slightly better here. Instead 8 \( \square d x d 2 \) 0-0 9 0-0 \( \square e 7 \) 10 c x d 5 e x d 5 11 \( \square c 3 \) \( \square b 7 \) 12 \( \square a c 1 \) \( \square a 6 \) 13 \( \square f d 1 \) \( \square f d 8 \) 14 \( \square b 2 \) c 5 15 e 3 was a prototypical position in Chernin-Razuvaev, Tilburg 1994.

7 \( \square l e 5 \) \( \square b 4 + \) 8 \( \square f 1 \) \( \square d 6 \)

Here 8...\( \square b d 7 ?? \) 9 \( \square l c 6 \) is embarrassing. The other alternatives are:

a) 8...\( \square f d 7 \) 9 \( \square x c 4 \) c 6 10 \( \square b 2 \) 0-0 (after 10...b 5 11 \( \square e 3 \) ! Black appears to have nothing better than 11...0-0, transposing) 11 \( \square b d 2 \) b 5 12 \( \square e 3 \) \( \square b 7 \) 13 \( \square c 2 \) \( \square b 6 \) 14 \( \square f 3 \) \( \square d 6 \) 15 \( \square e 5 \) \( \square e 7 \) 16 \( \square g 4 ? ! \) was Karpov-Timman, Kuala Lumpur (8) 1990. Karpov himself indicates that 16 \( \square c 1 \) ! followed by \( \square f 3 \) and \( \square g 2 \) was better, securing an advantage.

b) 8...c 6 9 \( \square x c 4 \) 0-0 10 \( \square b 2 \) \( \square d 6 \) 11 \( \square d 2 \) \( \square c 7 \) 12 \( \square c 2 \) secured White a small plus in Bykhovsky-Gofshtein, Tel Aviv 1995.

9 \( \square x c 4 \) \( \square d 5 \) 10 e 4 \( \square e 7 \)

11 \( \square b 2 \)

11 \( \square f 3 ? ! \) \( \square b c 6 \) 12 \( \square g 2 \) \( \square x c 4 \) 13 b x c 4 e 5 14 d 5 \( \square d 4 \) 15 \( \square e 3 \) c 5 is fine for Black, Jas-

White is firmly in the driving seat.

22...\( \square e 3 ? \)

22...\( \square d 3 \).

23 \( \square x c 3 \) b x c 3 24 \( \square d 4 \)

Now it is over.
24...exd5 25 exd5 \( \text{\textit{wc7}} \) 26 \( \text{\textit{wd1}} \) \( \text{\textit{ac8}} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{ae4}} \) \( \text{\textit{wb6}} \) 28 \( \text{\textit{hf4}} \) \( \text{\textit{ab7}} \) 29 \( \text{\textit{ec1}} \) \( \text{\textit{wa5}} \) 30 \( \text{\textit{xc2}} \) \( \text{\textit{wh8}} \) 31 \( \text{\textit{ag2}} \) \( \text{\textit{ae6}} \) 32 \( \text{\textit{ma4}} \) \( \text{\textit{wb6}} \) 33 \( \text{\textit{dc4}}! \) \( \text{\textit{xc4}} \) 34 \( \text{\textit{bc4}} \) \( \text{\textit{df5}} \) 35 \( \text{\textit{xc3}} \) \( \text{\textit{dd4}}? \) 36 c5 \( \text{\textit{xc5}} \) 37 \( \text{\textit{wxd4}} \) 1-0

Game 46
Tkachiev-Nisipeanu
Naujac-sur-Mer 2000

1 d4 \( \text{\textit{cf6}} \) 2 c4 e6 3 \( \text{\textit{ff3}} \) b6 4 g3 \( \text{\textit{a6}} \) 5 b3 b5!? 6 cxb5 \( \text{\textit{xb5}} \) 7 \( \text{\textit{g2}} \) \( \text{\textit{b4}}+ \)

Korchnoi 1998.

9...0-0 10 a3 \( \text{\textit{ae7}} \)

If Black exchanges the bishops on \( d2 \) he will experience permanent problems on the \( c5 \)-square: Korchnoi’s 10...\( \text{\textit{xd2}} \) 11 \( \text{\textit{wd2}} \) \( \text{\textit{xc6}} \) 12 \( \text{\textit{dc3}} \) d5 13 \( \text{\textit{de5}} \) \( \text{\textit{b7}} \) 14 \( \text{\textit{fc1}} \), with a pleasant position for White, illustrates this well.

11 \( \text{\textit{dc3}} \) \( \text{\textit{ac6}} \)

11...\( \text{\textit{a6}} \) 12 \( \text{\textit{wc2}} \) d5 13 \( \text{\textit{fc1}} \) \( \text{\textit{bd7}} \) 14 e4 gave White the advantage in Karpov-Christiansen, Wijk aan Zee 1993.

12 \( \text{\textit{wc2}} \) d5

12...\( \text{\textit{b7}}? \), with the idea 13 e4 d5 14 e5 \( \text{\textit{de4}} \) with counterplay has been suggested by Gershon, but I think that White has the advantage after the simple 15 \( \text{\textit{xc1}} \).

13 \( \text{\textit{de5}} \) \( \text{\textit{b7}} \) 14 \( \text{\textit{fa4}} \) \( \text{\textit{fd7}} \) 15 \( \text{\textit{dd3}} \)

White has the advantage.

15...\( \text{\textit{ac6}} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{ac5}} \) \( \text{\textit{xc5}} \) 17 \( \text{\textit{xc5}} \) \( \text{\textit{ea7}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{fc1}} \) \( \text{\textit{b5}} \) 19 e3 \( \text{\textit{dd7}}? \)

Losing.

20 a4! \( \text{\textit{ae2}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{xa5}}! \) \( \text{\textit{xc5}} \) 22 dxc5 \( \text{\textit{xa5}} \) 23 b4 \( \text{\textit{af6}} \) 24 \( \text{\textit{ma3}} \) \( \text{\textit{ac4}} \) 25 bxa5 \( \text{\textit{wb8}} \) 26 \( \text{\textit{mb1}} \) \( \text{\textit{wa7}} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{f1}}! \) \( \text{\textit{wc5}} \) 28 \( \text{\textit{aab3}} \) 1-0

Game 47
Bogdanovski-Cabrilo
Bijeljina Dvorovi 2002

1 d4 \( \text{\textit{cf6}} \) 2 c4 e6 3 \( \text{\textit{ff3}} \) b6 4 g3 \( \text{\textit{a6}} \) 5 b3 \( \text{\textit{b4}}+ \) 6 \( \text{\textit{xd2}} \) \( \text{\textit{xd2}}+! ? \)
This sideline is not as popular as one might imagine when we look at the evaluation after the opening. I think this is because the position is rather dull and Black does have a slight structural disadvantage in having a c-pawn compared to the e-pawn (both pawns are in half-open files). One difference is that f2 is a better protector for the e-pawn than b6 for the c-pawn. It is also significant that White’s king can assist the e-pawn better than the Black can assist the c-pawn. These are, of course, relatively minor issues but, structurally, White does possess a slight advantage. It should not matter theoretically, but in practice such things often do.

7...\textit{xd2}

The only serious move. 7 \textit{xbxd2} \textit{b7} 8 \textit{g2} c5 9 0-0 0-0 10 \textit{c2} \textit{c6} 11 \textit{b2} \textit{xd4} 12 \textit{xd4} \textit{xe2} 13 \textit{xe2} cxd4 14 \textit{xd4} d5 was completely equal in Andersson-Short, Næstved 1985.

7...d5 8 \textit{xd5}

Also interesting is 8 \textit{g2} and now:

a) 8...0-0 9 0-0 c5 10 \textit{c3} \textit{c6} 11 \textit{fd1} \textit{e8} 12 \textit{xd5} exd5 13 dxc5 bxc5 14 \textit{xd5} \textit{xd5} 15 \textit{xd5} \textit{xe2} 16 \textit{xd8} \textit{fxd8} 17 \textit{xd8}+ \textit{xd8} 18 \textit{e1} \textit{d1} 19 \textit{xd1} \textit{xd1} 20 \textit{d2} \textit{b4} 21 a4?! was Gligoric-Szabo, Moscow 1956. Chekov suggests 21 a3! \textit{c2} 22 a4 \textit{d4} 23 \textit{d5} \textit{f8} 24 \textit{f4} f6 25 \textit{g2} \textit{e7} 26 \textit{c3}, with a slight advantage, as being more prudent. After 9...c6 10 \textit{c2} \textit{bd7} 11 \textit{d1} \textit{e8} 12 \textit{e5}?! (12 \textit{bd2} c5 13 dxc5 is a shade better for White) 12...c5 13 \textit{d7} \textit{xd7} 14 cxd5 cxd4 15 \textit{b2} e5 Black emerged ahead in Zhu Chen-Christiansen, Seattle 2001.

b) 8...c5 9 cxd5 exd5 10 \textit{e3}+ \textit{e7} 11 \textit{xe7}+ \textit{xe7} 12 \textit{c3} \textit{c6} 13 dxc5 bxc5 14 \textit{d4} \textit{d4} 15 0-0-0 \textit{hd8} 16 \textit{he1} \textit{b7} 17 \textit{b2} g6 18 e4, Ruzele-Balashov, Boeblingen 1998, and White looked slightly better, although it is very very slight.

8...\textit{exd5} 9 \textit{e3}+

9 \textit{c3} 0-0 10 \textit{g2} \textit{e8} 11 \textit{e5}! (White must be careful here: 11 0-0?! \textit{e4}! 12 \textit{xe4} dxe4 13 \textit{g5} \textit{d6}! 14 \textit{fd1} \textit{xd4} 15 \textit{xf7} \textit{xe2}+ 16 \textit{xe2} \textit{xe2} 17 \textit{xd8} \textit{xd8} 18 \textit{xd8} \textit{xd8} 19 \textit{xe4} c5 left White struggling for equality in Eingorn-Gelfand, Moscow 1990) 11...\textit{b7} 12 0-0 c5 13 \textit{e3} \textit{e7} 14 \textit{xc2} \textit{ac1} \textit{dc7} 16 \textit{f6} \textit{f6} with equal play in Hansen-Epishin, Tilburg 1993. In Georgiev-Christiansen, Las Palmas 1993 Black chose the less accurate 10...\textit{e4}?, the game continuing 11 \textit{xe4} dxe4 12 \textit{g5} \textit{c6} 13 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 14 \textit{xf7}+ \textit{h8} 15 \textit{d3} \textit{xd4} 16 \textit{xd4} \textit{f5} 17 \textit{xd4} \textit{g6} 18 \textit{e5} \textit{c4} (Dautov's 19 0-0-0?! c5 20 \textit{wd5} \textit{bd4} 21 \textit{b2} looks even stronger) 19...\textit{xc4} 20 \textit{bxc4} \textit{e5}!, and now Dautov gives 21 \textit{e2}! \textit{e5} 22 \textit{ac1} \textit{h8} 23 \textit{h4} \textit{g4} 24 \textit{h1} \textit{c6} 25 \textit{c6} \textit{f5} \textit{c2}, retaining a clear advantage.

9...\textit{e7} 10 \textit{xe7}+ \textit{e7} 11 \textit{d3} \textit{e8}

11...\textit{bd7} 12 \textit{h3} \textit{e8} 13 0-0-0 \textit{f8} 14 \textit{fc1} c6 was equal in Hjartarson-Agdestein, Gausdal 1987.

12 \textit{c1} \textit{c6} 13 \textit{g2} \textit{bd7} 14 0-0 \textit{f8} 15 \textit{f6} \textit{b7} 16 \textit{h3} \textit{ad8} 17 \textit{e3} \textit{h6}

Black has an equal position. However, this endgame is far from decided and White just plays on and on, his longer arms deciding the game...

18 b4 g5 19 \textit{f5} \textit{e4} 20 h4 \textit{g4} 21 \textit{d6} 22 \textit{d3} \textit{f6} 23 \textit{a4} \textit{e7} 24 \textit{a5} \textit{b5} 25 \textit{f5} \textit{xf5} 26 \textit{xf5} \textit{e8} 27 \textit{e2} \textit{c8} 28 \textit{d3} \textit{d7} 29 \textit{g2} \textit{c7} 30 \textit{h1} \textit{e6} 31 \textit{f5} \textit{ad6} 32 \textit{bd7} \textit{xd7}
The main line, $9 \text{d}c3$, is considered in the next two games.

Another option is $9 \text{w}e2$, when Black can equalise with $9...\text{c}5!$, e.g. $10 \text{d}d1 \text{cxd}4 11 \text{cxd}4 \text{c}xg2 12 \text{c}xg2 \text{w}c7 13 \text{g}5 \text{we}5 14 \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 15 \text{dc}3 \text{dc}6 16 \text{db}5 \text{fd}8 17 \text{ac}1 \text{we}7 18 \text{we}4 \text{f}5 19 \text{wb}3 \text{ac}5 20 \text{da}4 \text{de}5 21 \text{wc}3 \text{dg}4 22 \text{xc}5 \text{wc}5 23 \text{wd}4 \text{fd}6$ with a draw in Brenninkmeijer-Hübner, Wijk aan Zee 1992. Black should avoid $9...\text{h}6 10 \text{a}3$, when $10...\text{c}7 11 \text{dc}3 \text{d}5 12 \text{fd}1! \text{wc}8?! \text{(12...\text{da}6 improves)} 13 \text{cxd}5 \text{cxd}5 14 \text{f}4 \text{d}8! (14...\text{h}5) 15 \text{hb}4! left White in charge in Karpov-Lobron, Baden-Baden 1992, while $10...\text{cxd}2 11 \text{b}xd2 \text{d}5 12 \text{cxd}5 \text{cxd}5 13 \text{ac}1 \text{d}6 14 \text{e}3 \text{c}5 15 \text{fd}1$ followed by $\text{eb}1-c3$ gives White a slight advantage according to Dautov.

$9...\text{a}4! 10 \text{bx}a4$

$10 \text{a}3?! \text{axb}3! does not benefit White.

$10...\text{h}6 11 \text{a}3 \text{a}5! 12 \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6$

Black has at least equalised.

$13 \text{e}3$

$13 \text{wd}3$ is probably better.

$13...\text{c}5!$

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 48}

\textbf{Petursson-Polugaevsky}

\textit{Reykjavik 1987}
\end{center}

$1 \text{d}4 \text{df}6 2 \text{c}4 \text{e}6 3 \text{df}3 \text{b}6 4 \text{g}3 \text{a}6 5 \text{b}3 \text{b}7 6 \text{g}2 \text{b}4+ 7 \text{d}2 \text{a}5!?$

This is the choice of the ambitious player. The typical positions in this line might be marginally better for White, as all positions in the QID tend to be, but results are almost always decided by who is the better player on the day.

$8 0-0 0-0 9 \text{g}5$

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{game48.png}
\end{figure}

Another Polugaevsky game goes $14 \text{db}2 \text{xd}2 15 \text{xd}2 \text{xc}2 16 \text{xc}2 \text{cxd}4 17 \text{d}4 \text{xd}4 18 \text{b}1 \text{e}6 19 \text{e}1 \text{c}8 20 \text{e}3 \text{c}6 21 \text{bb}3 \text{ce}5 22 \text{e}4 \text{wd}6 23 \text{we}2 \text{wc}6 24 \text{g}1 \text{d}6 25 \text{we}3 \text{c}5 26 \text{ha}4 \text{xe}3 27 \text{xe}3 and Black won the ending in Epishin-Polugaevsky, New York 1989.
Queen's Indian Defence

14...a7 15 Qe5?!
15 dxc5 bxc5 16 Qbd2 with approximate equality.
15...cxd4! 16 Qxd4 d6! 17 f3
17 Qg4!? Qxd4 18 exd4 Qc8! 19 Qe3 Qd7 also gives Black something. The bishop on a5 is potentially very strong.
17...e5 18 Qd1

15 dxc5 bxc5 16 Qbd2 with approximate equality.
15...cxd4! 16 Qxd4 d6! 17 f3
17 Qg4!? Qxd4 18 exd4 Qc8! 19 Qe3 Qd7 also gives Black something. The bishop on a5 is potentially very strong.
17...e5 18 Qd1

18...Qd7
Preferable is 18...Qe6! 19 Qfd2 Qxg2 20 Qxg2 d5 21 Qb3 d4! with a definite advantage for Black.
19 Qfd2 Qxg2 20 Qxg2 Qe6 21 Qb2! Qc5 22 Qb5 Qfa8 23 Qb3 Qxb3 24 Qxb3 Qc8! 25 Qd5?
25 Qd1 Qxc4 26 Qxd6 Qxd6 27 Qxc4 Qc7 keeps White's disadvantage to a minimum.
25...Qac7 26 Qfd1 Qxc4 27 Qxd6 Qf5 28 Qd8+ Qh7 29 Qxc8 Qxc8 30 Qd2 e4! 31 Qg1?
31 Qf1 Qc3 32 Qb1 Qd3 might be terrible but it is White's only chance of survival.
31...Qxd2! 32 Qxd2 Qc1+ 33 Qg2
33 Qd1 Qe6! picks up a rook.
33...Qf3+ 34 Qh3 Qg1 0-1

Game 49
Karpov-Salov
Linares 1992

1 d4 Qf6 2 c4 e6 3 Qf3 b6 4 g3 Qa6 5 b3 Qb7 6 Qg2 Qb4+ 7 Qd2 a5 8 0-0

9...d5
The more flexible 9...d6 is considered in the next game. The main reason for not playing this move is an attempt to push ...d7-d5 in one go, investing the extra tempo somewhere else. After the alternative 9...Be8 10 Qc2 h6 11 Qe1 Qxc3 12 Qxc3 Qe4 13 Qb2 d5 14 Qf1 Black has tried:
a) 14...Qxf3?! 15 exf3 Qbd7 16 Qd3 a4 17 Qad1 was Polugaevsky-Anand, Roquebrune 1992, and 17 f4! would have secured White an edge.
b) 14...Qbd7 15 Qd2 Qe7 16 Qacl c6 17 e3 was slightly better for White in Pintegarcia Trobat, Spain 1993.
c) 14...c6 15 Qd2 Qg6 16 a3 gave White a tiny advantage in Alterman-Korchnoi, Beer-Sheva 1992.
10 Qc2 Qa6 11 Qad1! h6
11...Qc8 12 cxd5 exd5 13 Qh3 favours White.
12 Qe5 Qc8 13 Qh3!? Qe8 14 cxd5 exd5
14...Qxd5 15 Qxd5 Qxd5 16 e4 Qb7 17 Qf4 is not to be recommended for Black.
15 Qf4 Qd8 16 Qc1! Qc8
16...Qe4 17 Qxe4 dx4 18 Qc4 is only a little better for White.
17 Qg2 Qb7 18 a3 Qd6 19 Qc4!
The knight seeks fresher pastures. Black is in a bad situation.
19...Qxf4 20 Qxf4 Qc8 21 Qe3 Qe6 22
4...\textit{\textit{a}6: Main Line with 5 b3

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
f5 & xf5 & 23 & xf5 & e6 & 24 & wd3 & b8 & 25 \\
b4 & axb4 & 26 & axb4 & c6 & 27 & b5 & d5 & 28 \\
fe1 & fe8 & 29 & c1 & wd6 & 30 & ec2 & e7 & 31 \\
e3 & g6 & 32 & ec1 & wg7 & 33 & de2 & e8 & 34 & df4 \\
ba7 & 35 & e2d7 & 36 & wa3! & wxa3 & 37 & xe3 & \\
w8 & 38 & d3 & we8 & 39 & db4 & h5 & 40 & ac3 \\
\hline
e8 & 41 & ec6! & de4 & 42 & h3 & d6 & 43 & xdx6+ & xd6 & 44 & d1! & de4 & 45 & edx5 \\
ab3 & 46 & ec2 & g5 & 47 & d2e2! & a1+ & 48 & g2 \\
dc1 & 49 & d6 & 50 & f1g4 & 51 & fxg4 & hxg4 & 52 & d6 & a2 & 53 & d2f2! & xf2+ & 54 & dxf2 \\
ac2 & 55 & e4 & dc3 & 56 & de3 & dxca5 & 57 & d5! & \\
c5 & 58 & dxc6 & da7 & 59 & e5 & dxc8 & 60 & c7! & \\
xxc7 & 61 & xc4 & cc6 & 62 & xgc4 & 1-0 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textbf{Game 50}  
\textit{Topalov-Adams}  
\textit{Fujitsu Siemens Masters Frankfurt 2000}

1 d4 \textit{\textit{f}6 2 c4 e6 3 \textit{\textit{f}f}3 b6 4 g3 \textit{\textit{a}6 5 \\
b3 \textit{\textit{b}7 6 \textit{\textit{g}2 \textit{\textit{b}4+ 7 d2 a5 8 0-0 \\
o} o 0 9 wc2 d6 10 dc3 \textit{\textit{b}d7 11 fe1 \\

This is the most difficult for Black to meet. Others: 

a) 11 \textit{\textit{d}a1 \textit{\textit{xc}3 12 \textit{\textit{xc}3 \textit{\textit{e}4 13 wc1 \\
a4 14 \textit{\textit{h}3 b5 15 \textit{\textit{d}2 axb3 16 axb3 bxc4 17 \\
\textit{\textit{d}xc4 eda2 led to full equality in Morovic Fernandez-Adams, Istanbul 2000. The position is about equal, perhaps a bit better for Black. 

b) 11 \textit{\textit{d}e1 wc8 12 ec1 \textit{\textit{e}8 13 db5 \\
xg2 14 xg2 wb8 15 a3 \textit{\textit{axd2 16 wxd2 \\
c6 17 \textit{\textit{c}3 d5 with equality in Korchnoi-Adams, Wijk aan Zee 2000. 

11...\textit{\textit{xc}3 12 \textit{\textit{xc}3 \textit{\textit{e}4 13 wb2 \\

The great expert of the QID-g3, GM Dautov, plays the more flexible 13 \textit{\textit{wc}1?}, when the queen is yet to commit to a flank. Dautov-Romanishin, Essen 2001 continued 13...h6 14 \textit{\textit{h}3 \textit{\textit{h}7 15 \textit{\textit{d}2 \textit{\textit{e}4 16 \textit{\textit{xe}4 \\
\textit{\textit{xe}4 17 f3 \textit{\textit{h}7 18 e4 a4 19 wb2 with a pull, while 13... \textit{\textit{b}8 14 \textit{\textit{h}3 c6 15 \textit{\textit{d}4 h6 \\
16 f3 \textit{\textit{h}7 17 e4 b5 18 wb2 gave White similar prospects in Dautov-Zeller, Boeblingen 1996. 

13...a4 

Just one of several possibilities. 

a) 13...c6!? 14 \textit{\textit{f}1 b5 15 \textit{\textit{g}5 \textit{\textit{g}6 16 \\
c2 d5 17 c5?! h6 18 f3 \textit{\textit{e}4 led to equality in Pinter-Almasi, Budapest 1997. Avrukh suggests 17 f3 as an improvement. Sjöberg-Almasi, Malmö 1994 went 15 d5?! and now the strongest seems to be 15...exd5! 16 cxb5 c5 17 \textit{\textit{f}x6 \textit{\textit{f}6 18 \textit{\textit{d}2 \textit{\textit{g}6 and Black has a pleasant grip on the centre. 

b) 13...d5 14 \textit{\textit{h}3? \textit{\textit{f}5 (14...dxc4 15 \\
bxc4 c5 16 d5! exd5 17 cxd5 \textit{\textit{xd}5?! 18 \\
\textit{\textit{d}ad1 gives White a dangerous initiative according to Chernin) 15 \textit{\textit{f}5 exf5 16 \textit{\textit{h}4 \\
\textit{\textit{e}4? 17 f3 \textit{\textit{xc}3 18 \textit{\textit{wc}3 f4 19 \textit{\textit{ac}1 with a slight edge for White in Chernin-Romanishin, Taastorp 1992. 

c) 13... \textit{\textit{b}8 14 \textit{\textit{f}1 (in Petursson-Lerner, 
Moscow 1987 White tried 14 \textit{\textit{h}3 b5 15 d5 \\
e5 16 \textit{\textit{d}2 \textit{\textit{g}6 17 cxb5 \textit{\textit{xb}5 18 e4 \textit{\textit{c}5 19 \\
\textit{\textit{d}f1 \textit{\textit{b}6 and was already struggling) 14...c5 \\
ead1 \textit{\textit{d}8 16 \textit{\textit{h}3! a4! 17 \textit{\textit{d}2 axb3 18 \\
axb3 e7 19 d5 with compensation for the pawn, should Black decide to take it, in van Wely-Karpov, Tilburg 1996. 14... \textit{\textit{f}3 15 \\
\textit{\textit{f}5 edc1 c6 was Hulak-Polugaevsky, 
Zagreb 1987. Now 17 f4 should give White some advantage. 

14 \textit{\textit{f}1 c5 

14... \textit{\textit{b}8?! 15 \textit{\textit{d}2 b5 16 \textit{\textit{f}3 \textit{\textit{c}6 17 b4 \\
bxc4 18 \textit{\textit{xc}4 d5 19 \textit{\textit{a}3 \textit{\textit{e}8 gave Black a good game in van der Sterren-Timman, 
Gouda 1997. But we should still question whether White could have played better. 

14... \textit{\textit{b}7 15 \textit{\textit{d}2 \textit{\textit{e}4 16 \textit{\textit{g}2 \textit{\textit{d}f6 17 
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Queen's Indian Defence

\[ \text{\textasciitilde x e 4 \texttt{e 4} 18 d 5 \texttt{c x c 3} 19 \texttt{w c 3} e 5 20 b 4 f 5 offered Black sufficient counterplay in}\]

Pinter-Romanishin, Balatonbereny 1995, but it seems that White was not out to test his opponent in this game.

15 \texttt{d d 2} \texttt{b 7} 16 \texttt{b 4}

16 \texttt{h 3} \texttt{w c 7} 17 \texttt{a d 1} \texttt{a 6} 18 d 5 e 5 19 f 4 f a 8 was the course of Kragelj-Romanishin, Pula 1994, with a good game for Black.

16...a 3 17 \texttt{w b 3} c x d 4 18 d x d 4 e 5 19 a 3 \texttt{w c 7} 20 \texttt{c a c 1} \texttt{w c 6} 21 f 3 \texttt{w a 4} 22 \texttt{w b 1}

22...d 5!

It is obvious that Black has outplayed his opponent in the opening and now has a better game.

23 \texttt{a 1} e 4 24 d 4 \texttt{d f 8} 25 c x d 5 \texttt{x d 5} 26 f 4 e 3 27 c c 4 f 4 28 \texttt{w a 1} \texttt{w b 4} 29 c x e 3 b 5 30 \texttt{h 3} d a 8 31 d a 1 \texttt{a 8} 32 \texttt{b 1} \texttt{w a 4} 33 \texttt{w c 3} f f 8 34 \texttt{e 5} \texttt{x d 1} 35 \texttt{x d 1} \texttt{d 5} 36 \texttt{x d 5} \texttt{x d 5} 37 \texttt{x g 7} c x e 3 38 \texttt{w e 3} \texttt{d 1}+ 39 \texttt{f 2} g x g 7 40 w e 5+ 41 g 6 w e 7+ 42 g 7 42 \texttt{w x a 3} \texttt{w d 4} 43 \texttt{w e 3} \texttt{w c 3}+ 44 \texttt{h 3} \texttt{x a 2}

As you can see it is not only club players who play on in embarrassing positions. This probably has something to do with a fighter's attitude...

45 \texttt{d d 4} a 4 46 e 3 d e 6+ 47 c c 3 \texttt{d c 5} 48 f 5 h 6 49 h 4 a 6 50 c 2 a 6 51 a 3 b 4+ 52 d 4 c 7 53 e 4 b 3 54 c c 3 g 8 55 a 2 c 7 56 g 4 g 6 57 g 5 h x g 5 58 f x g 5 f x g 5 59 h x g 5 c c 5 60 b b 2 b b 4

\[ \text{61} \texttt{g 6} \texttt{d b 5} 62 \texttt{g 7} \texttt{d c 3} 63 \texttt{g 4} \texttt{d a 4}+ 64 \texttt{b 1} \texttt{g 8} 65 e 5 h 7+ 0-1 \]

**Game 51**

**Ehlvest-Chandler**

**Lucerne 1989**

1 d 4 \texttt{d f 6} 2 c 4 e 6 3 d f 3 b 6 4 g 3 \texttt{d a 6} 5 b 3 \texttt{d b 7} 6 g 2 b b 4+ 7 d 2 c 5 !?

Initially this seems quite strange but, when you think about it, Black is trying to gain some control over the dark squares on the queenside, as well as opening the c-file. If you compare it with 7...a 5, then 7...c 5 better meets 9 \texttt{d c 3}.

8 0-0

Harmless is 8 d x c 5 \texttt{d x c 5} 9 \texttt{d c 3} \texttt{d e 4} 10 \texttt{d x e 4} \texttt{d x e 4} 11 \texttt{c c 3} 0-0 12 0-0 \texttt{d c 6} 13 \texttt{w d 2} d 5 14 c x d 5 \texttt{w d 5} with complete equality, Hjartarson-Korchnoi, Barcelona 1989.

8...0-0 9 \texttt{c c 3}

9 d x c 5 transposes to 8 d x c 5. 9 \texttt{d c 3} c x d 4 10 \texttt{c x d 4} \texttt{x g 2} 11 \texttt{x g 2} d 5 results in immediate equality, a draw being agreed in Olafsson-Petursson, Reykjavik 1989, for example.

9...d 5 10 c x d 5

Or 10 \texttt{d e 5} \texttt{d c 6}! 11 \texttt{d x c 6} (11 \texttt{x b 4} \texttt{x b 4}! does not trouble Black) 11...d x c 6 12 \texttt{x b 4} (12 e 3, as in Goldin-Douven, Palma de Mallorca 1989, leads to equality after 12...a x c 3 13 \texttt{x c 3} \texttt{x c 8} 14 d x c 5 d x c 4)! 12...c x b 4 13 \texttt{d d 3}? d x c 4 14 b x c 4 \texttt{x g 2} 15
\( \text{\(1\text{d4} \text{e6} \text{c4} \text{f3} \text{b6} \text{g3} \text{a6} 5 \text{b3} \text{a5} 14 \text{b4} \text{xb6} 15 \text{c3} \text{xc3} 16 \text{xe3} \text{xb4} 17 \text{axb4} \text{xb4} 18 \text{xb4} \text{wxb4} 19 \text{e1} \text{w7} 20 \text{a4}! \text{w7}! \text{etc.} \)}\)

\(12...\text{a5} 13 \text{f2} f5! ?\)

Black has had a successful opening. The situation is unclear.

\(14 \text{xe4 fxe4} 15 \text{c3 a6}!\)

\(15...\text{c6}! 16 \text{dxc5 xc3} 17 \text{xc3} \text{bxc5} 18 \text{b4} \text{is very good for White.}\)

\(16 \text{c1 h8} 17 \text{e3 xc3} 18 \text{xc3 \text{w}g5} 19 \text{b2 \text{ad8} f4!} \text{exe3} 21 \text{xf3 \text{e}7} 22 \text{wd2 \text{xf3} 23 \text{xf3 \text{e}8} 24 \text{e1 \text{e}7} 25 \text{g2 \text{e}6 26 \text{f1 g5} 27 \text{e5 h6} 28 \text{e5 \text{w}7 29 \text{xe8+ \text{w}xe8} 30 \text{w}f2?} \text{Allowing the creation of a passed pawn. Instead 30 \text{dxc5! bxc5} 31 \text{b4 is unclear.}\)\)

\(30...\text{c4!} 31 \text{bxc4 dxc4} 32 \text{d5 \text{xc5} 33 \text{h4 d4 e4} 34 \text{w}f4\)\)

This loses on the spot. There is still some resistance left in 35 \text{a1 c2} 36 \text{b2 f6!} 37 \text{d5 \text{xe3+} 38 \text{h2 c1w} 39 \text{xc1 \text{w}c1, with an extra pawn for Black.}\)\)

\(35...\text{f6!} 36 \text{wd4 cxb2} 37 \text{wb2 \text{xe3+} 38 \text{f2 \text{xa3} 39 \text{f4 \text{wc5+} 40 \text{h1 b5} 41 \text{wd2 \text{wc}7 0-1} \)}\)

\(\text{Game 52}
\text{Dokhoian-Romanishin}
\text{Yerevan 1989}\)

\(1 \text{d4 \text{f6} 2 \text{c4 e6} 3 \text{f3 b6} 4 \text{g3 a6} 5 \text{b3 a7 6 g2 a4+ 7 d2 c5 8 0-0 0-0 9 a4 bxa4} \)}\)

\(10 \text{wd3!} \)

The most serious move.
a) After 10 \( \text{Qbd2} \) d6 11 \( \text{wc2} \) it is obvious that the queen is less well placed on \( e2 \). Shariyazdanov-Baklan, Neum 2000 continued 11...\( \text{Qc6} \) 12 e4 e5 13 d5 \( \text{Qb8} \) 14 a3 bxa3 (14...\( \text{Qa6} \), a suggested of Rabinovich, seems to be more natural) 15 b4 a5 16 c5!? (this double pawn sacrifice was, of course, planned, and is rather complex) 16...\( \text{Qa6} \) 17 \( \text{Qxb4} \) 18 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) and Black had good counterplay in this very double edged position.

b) 10 a3 and now Black has:

b1) 10...bxa3 11 \( \text{Qxa3} \) a5 12 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qxg2} \) a short draw in Bauer-Baklan, Germany 1999. It seems that Black should be equal. There is also 12 \( \text{Qb5} \) to consider, fighting for e4. This seems more dangerous, although I believe Black is fine.

b2) 10...\( \text{Qa6} \) 11 e3 \( \text{Qe7} \) 12 a4? \( \text{Qe4} \) 13 a5 b5! 14 \( \text{Qfd2} \) \( \text{Qc3} \) 15 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qxg2} \) 16 \( \text{Qxg2} \) \( \text{Qxb1} \) 17 \( \text{Qxb1} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) with sufficient counterplay for Black in Epishin-Petursson, Bern 1991. 11 axb4 \( \text{Qxb4} \) 12 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qe4} \) 13 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Qxc3} \) 14 \( \text{Qxc3} \) a5 15 \( \text{Qe5} \) was a draw in Yusupov-Benjamin, San John 1988, while 11 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qxg2} \) 12 \( \text{Qxg2} \) \( \text{Qb8} \) 13 \( \text{Qd3} \) bxa3 14 \( \text{Qxa3} \) \( \text{Qb7} \) 15 \( \text{Qg1} \) d5 16 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qb8} \) 17 e3 \( \text{Qc6} \) was yet another draw in Hracek-Dorfman, Hamburg 2001.

10...\( \text{Qe4} \)?

Serving only to create problems for Black. Both alternatives are superior:

a) 10...d5 and now:

a1) 11 \( \text{Qbd2} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \) 12 \( \text{Qfc1} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 13 \( \text{Qe3} \) (13 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qfc8} \) 14 f4 \( \text{Qe8} \) 15 e4 \( \text{Qdf6} \) was more or less equal in Psakhis-Lutz, Baden-Baden 1992) 13...\( \text{Qac8} \) 14 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 15 dxe5 \( \text{Qd7} \) 16 cxd5 \( \text{Qxd5} \) 17 \( \text{Qxd5} \) exd5 18 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 19 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) with equality (or something very close) in Nikolic-Amason, Moscow 1990.

a2) 11 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \) 12 \( \text{Qxd7} \) \( \text{Qxd7} \) 13 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qfd8} \) 14 \( \text{Qfd1} \) dxc4 15 \( \text{Qxc4} \) with equality in Gavrikov-Korchnoi, Swiss League 1995.

b) 10...d6 11 \( \text{Qbd2} \) a5 (11...\( \text{Qbd7} \) 12 a3 bxa3 13 \( \text{Qxa3} \) e5 14 \( \text{Qh4} \) \( \text{Qxg2} \) 15 \( \text{Qxg2} \) d5? 16 \( \text{Qd3} \) dxc4 17 \( \text{Qdx4} \) gave White an advantage in Ftacnik-Romanishin, Maribor 1995) 12 \( \text{Qad1} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 13 e4 e5 14 \( \text{Qh4} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) was equal in Grinenberg-Hjartarson, Novi Sad 1990. 13 e3!? stays flexible in the centre and seems to be stronger. After e3-e4 ...e6-e5 Black is always equal.

11 \( \text{We3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 12 \( \text{Qbd2} \) d5 13 \( \text{Qxe4} \)?

Later this variation was refuted with 13 \( \text{cxd5} \) exd5 (13...\( \text{Qxd5} \) 14 \( \text{Qd3} \) gives White the advantage as e2-e4 is coming) 14 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qxg2} \) 15 \( \text{Qxc6} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 16 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qh3} \) 17 \( \text{Qfc1} \) with a clear advantage for White in Dautov-Romanishin, Kecskemet 1989.

13...\( \text{Qxe4} \) 14 \( \text{Qd2} \)

Preferable is 14 a3 bxa3 15 \( \text{Qxa3} \) \( \text{Qb4} \) 16 \( \text{Qc1} \) a5, with equality in Lerner-Romanishin, Nikolaev 1995.

14...\( \text{Qe3} \)

Now the threat of...\( \text{Qxd4} \) dictates White’s moves, and Black already have an advantage.

15 \( \text{Qb1} \)

15 \( \text{Qf3} \) seems to be more natural.

15...\( \text{Qxd4}! \) 16 \( \text{Qxc3} \) \( \text{Qc2} \) 17 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Qxa1} \)

18 \( \text{Qb5} \) a6 19 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 20 \( \text{Qxb3} \) \( \text{Qc8} \)

21 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 22 e4 \( \text{Qfd8} \) 23 \( \text{Qb1} \) dxc4? 24...\( \text{Qxe4}! \) 24 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qxd1}+ \) 25 \( \text{Qxd1} \) \( \text{Qd8} \)

26 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qb2}! \) secures Black a clear advantage.

24 \( \text{Qc6} \) \( \text{Qxd1}+ \) 25 \( \text{Qxd1} \) e5 26 \( \text{Qxb4} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 27 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 28 \( \text{Qxb3} \) \( \text{Qc1}+ \) 29 \( \text{Qf1} \) b5 30 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 31 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 32

120
1 d4 Qf6 2 c4 e6 3 Qf3

An important point here is that this can lead to transposition to the Catalan with 3 g3 b4+ 4 g2 e7 5 g2 d5 6 f3 0-0 7 0-0 c6 8 Qc2 b6 9 b3 a6 10 d1 Qbd7, and you have the move after 10...0-0. Of course Black can also delay castling in this line but, as we shall see, this has no positive sides.

3...b6 4 g3 a6 5 b3 b4+ 6 d2 e7

This is the main line everywhere, although, as we have seen, not Black's only reasonable line.

7 g2

White also has 7 Qc3 0-0 8 e4 as an interesting possibility, but time has shown that after 8...d5 9 cxd5 Qxe1 10 Qxe1 exd5 11 e5 Qe4 12 g2 Qd7 13 e2 Qxc3 14 Qxc3 Qc6 15 Qhe1 Qd8 16 Qg1 Qe6 17 f4 g6 18 Qf3 Qg7, as in Tukmakov-Vaganian, Odessa 1989, Black is fine, although, of course, there is a lot of play in the position. The main line is marked by there being very little place for individual performance or any other kind of competition between the two players, so such lines do attract a lot of players who see chess as 'going to the office'. There are many

GM between 2450 and 2550 who view chess as a random profession, playing a sort of accountant's chess. These people often play such technical lines, which are equal but not dead, and then they make their 75% score without any real risks. Here the position is just equal.

7...c6

Black has two major alternatives:

a) 7...b7 8 Qc3 0-0 9 0-0 d5 (best – 9...Qa6 10 e3 d5 11 Qe2 c5 12 Qfd1 Qe7 13 Qe5 Qd6 14 Qe1 Qe7 15 f4 Qd8 16 g4 was better for White in Van der Sterren-Sokolov, Amsterdam 1994, while 9...c5 10 d5! Qxd5 11 Qe1 Qa6 12 cxd5 d6 13 Qd3 Qc7 14 e4 Qd7 15 f4 was quite pleasant for White in Timman-Franco Ocampo, Mar del Plata 1982) 10 cxd5 exd5 11 Qc1! Qa6 12 b2 c6 13 Qe5 Qd6 14 Qd3 Qe8 15 Qc1 Qc7 16 Qe1 Qc6 17 e4 with a slight advantage for White in a typical position, Karpov-Kurajica, Tilburg 1994.

b) 7...d5 has a reputation for achieving equality, but a poor record when it comes to practical results. The position arising after 8 cxd5 Qxd5 9 Qc3 Qd7 10 Qxd5 exd5 11 0-0 0-0 12 Qc1 Qe8 13 Qe1 c5 14 Qe3 Qb7 15 Qh3 Qxd4 16 Qxd4 Qf6, as in Karpov-Sokolov, Linares 1987, might be equal, but I would not like to have such a position with Black, where White has a simple blockade of the isolated pawn. All in all it might be equal from an objective point of view, but Black will find it hard in practice.

8 0-0 d5 9 Qc2!?

This variation was previously thought to be harmless, but after 8 Qc3 d5 9 Qe5 had been drained of new ideas, White tried to go elsewhere to find an advantage. I do not thing that this is the way, but nor can I suggest another path. Other moves have been tried here, but none so serious that it deserves a mention in a book like this.

9...Qbd7 10 Qd1

The most precise approach. The alternatives were:
Queen’s Indian Defence

a) 10 a4 0-0 11 a5 dxe4 12 axb6 axb6 13 a4 b5 14 bxc5 dxc5 15 dxe5 bxc4 16 bxc4 with equality Gurieli-Sokolov, Basle 2001.

b) 10 f4 c8 11 b2 (11 d1 is, of course, still the main line) 11...c5 12 dxc5 dxc5 13 dxc5 14 f4 b5 15 exd5 dxc5 16 e5 f6 17 d4 b4 with a better position for Black in Babu-Prasad, Kuala Lumpur 1992. But White did not play the best possible lines. Meanwhile 12...dxc5 13 bxc6 bxc6 14 f4 dxc5 15 bxc4 0-0 16 a3 d7 was equal in Tjiam-Van der Wiel, Holland 1993.

10...c8

Unless some improvement is found over the main game here, Black will have to go back to casting and slow play: 10...0-0 11 f4 c8 12 c3 and now:

a) 12...d5 13 c1 h6 14 e4 dxc4 15 f3 c3 16 bxc5 bxc5 17 dxc5 a4 18 c2 d5 19 a3 h6 20 b2 b4 21 b5 1 bxc3 22 b3 a4 23 d2 b5 24 d5 25 e4 26 b5 27 exd5 a5 18 d5 exd5 19 f2 d6 20 d6 resulted in a complex struggle in Georgiev-Mitkov, Skopje 2002, where the best player won.

b) 12...b5 13 c4 b5 14 a4 h5 15 b5 c3 16 d3 c4 17 bxc4 a5 is extremely complex, Hansen-Emms, Esbjerg 2000. Perhaps Black is equal, but it is a considerably difficult position to handle.

c) 12...dxc4!? seems to be the strongest, although both the alternatives are fine. Kramnik-Leko, Hungary 2001 continued 13 d2 c5 14 d5 bxc5 15 d4 dxe4 16 dxe4 cxb3 17 b2 bxa2 18 b4 c4 19 a7 d5 20 c5 bxc5 21 e4 c6 22 d6 c8 23 b3 a7 24 b4 c8 25 b1 b6 26 b5 27 f3 b5 28 b6 29 c5 c6 30 b6 with a draw. White obviously had compensation, but hardly an advantage.

Earlier White has also tried 11 a4 c5 12 c3 dxc4 13 bxc4 dxc4 14 d5 d5 15 dxe5 dxe5 with a complex but even position in Gelfand-Lautier, Biel 2001. White will expand with f2-f4 and e2-e4 and send his knight to d6, while Black maintains his extra pawn.

11 f4! c5?!

11...0-0 still transposes to the 10th move.

12 dxc5 dxc5 13 c3!

This remarkable piece of home preparation should have refuted Black’s set-up and will, in the future, make Black return to 10...0-0. The latest try at the top level looked like this: 13 b2 0-0 14 c3 c4 15 d5 b5 16 a3 c3 17 c3 c4 and Black had the advantage in Van Wely-Polgar, Hoogeveen 2001.

13...0-0 14 e4!

The notes that follow are based on Peter Heine Nielsen’s annotations in the splendid Swedish magazine Schacknytt.

14...d4 14...dxc4 15 e5 d4 16 d6 g6 17 d4 would also give White the advantage.

15 exd5

15 f2? is a more careful alternative according to Nielsen, but after 15...e5 it seems to be just as complicated – only now I prefer Black.

15...xf2 16 xf1 d4

16...h3+ 17 h1 c4 18 c4 c4 19 d5 d6 20 c5 g6 21 c1 gives White a winning attack. The plan is c3-h3, with numerous threats.

17 c1 e4 18 c4 e3!
In their preparation Peter’s team had focused on 18...\( \text{W}f6 \) 19 \( \text{b}b2 \) \( \text{Q}d1+ \) 20 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{Q}e3 \) 21 \( \text{W}e2 \) \( \text{Q}x1 \) 22 \( \text{a}x1 \) \( \text{W}d8 \) 23 \( \text{Q}e4 \), and White has overwhelming compensation.

19 \( \text{Q}a4 \) \( \text{Q}d4 \)

19...\( \text{h}3+ \) 20 \( \text{X}xh3 \) e2+ 21 \( \text{Q}xh3 \) \( \text{Q}x1 \) 22 \( \text{a}x1 \) \( \text{Q}c5 \) 23 \( \text{b}2 \) is not as promising as earlier exchange sacrifices but still leads to a clear advantage for White. One line is 23...b5 24 \( \text{Q}f5 \) bxc4 25 \( \text{f}xg7 \), and White’s attack decides.

20 \( \text{b}2 \)

20 \( \text{b}1?! \) \( \text{h}3+ \) 21 \( \text{X}xh3 \) e2+ 22 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{Q}x1 \) \( \text{Q}f6 \), followed by ...b6-b5, gives Black reasonable chances.

20...\( \text{X}x2 \) 21 \( \text{W}x2 \)?

A blunder. 21 \( \text{Q}x2 \) g6 is necessary according to Anand. 22 \( \text{W}c3! \) \( \text{e}8 \) 23 \( \text{ae}1 \) leads to a clear advantage to White according to Curt Hansen.

21...b5 22 \( \text{Q}f5 \) \( \text{W}g5 \)

The move White had missed.

23 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{b}x4 \) 24 \( \text{Q}x8 \) \( \text{Q}x8 \) 25 \( \text{W}d4 \) \( \text{Q}f6 \) 26 \( \text{ae}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 27 \( \text{h}3+ \) 28 \( \text{a}x3 \) \( \text{X}x3 \) 29 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 30 \( \text{X}e3 \) \( \text{X}e3 \) 31 \( \text{X}e3 \) \( \text{a}x3 \) 32 d7 \( \text{X}d7 \) 33 axb3 \( \text{h}3 \)

0-1

**Game 54**

Kamsky-Karpov

Elista 1996

1 d4 \( \text{Q}f6 \) 2 c4 \( \text{e}6 \) 3 \( \text{Q}f3 \) b6 4 g3 \( \text{a}6 \) 5

b3 \( \text{b}4+ \) 6 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 7 \( \text{g}2 \) c6 8 \( \text{c}3 \) d5 9 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{f}d7 \! \)

9...0-0 10 \( \text{Q}d2 \) \( \text{Q}d7 \) 11 \( \text{Q}d3 \) has been known to be an unnecessary extra possibility for White since Lputian-Portisch, Manila 1990. White is slightly better.

10 \( \text{Q}x7 \) \( \text{Q}x7 \) 11 \( \text{Q}d2 \) 0-0 12 0-0 \( \text{a}8 \)

This has been the main line almost forever, but the Portisch line with 12...\( \text{d}f6 \) 13 \( \text{e}4 \) b5 has brought Black good results. Kar- pov-Timman, Hoogeveen 1999 continued 14 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 15 \( \text{W}c2 \) \( \text{a}8 \) 16 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{Q}d5 \) 17 \( \text{X}e4 \) (17 \( \text{cxd5} \) cxd5 18 a3 \( \text{X}a3 \) gives Black good compensation for the pieces, while Black also had excellent compensation after 17 \( \text{f}2 \) f5 18 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{b}1 \) b4 20 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 21 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{f}6 \) in Karpov-Polgar, Buenos Aires 2000) 17...\( \text{X}c3 \) 18 \( \text{W}c8 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 19 \( \text{W}c2 \) g6 20 \( \text{Q}f3 \) bxc4 21 bxc4 \( \text{W}a5 \) 22 c5 \( \text{b}5 \) with a level game.

12...b5?! 13 \( \text{e}1 \) bxc4 14 bxc4 \( \text{e}6 \) 15 c5 \( \text{c}4 \) 16 e4 led to a plus for White in Novikov-Hellers, Copenhagen 1991.

13 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{c}5 \)
Queen's Indian Defence

Queen's Indian Defence

1 d4 9g5 2 9f6 3 9f3 9e6 4 9e2 9a6 5 9d3 9b4+ 6 9d2 9e7 7 9g2 9c6 8 9d3 9e5 9d7 10 9xd7 9xd7 11 9d2 0-0 12 0-0 9c8 13 9e4 9c5 14 exd5 9xf5 15 9xc5 9xc4 16 9c6 9xb3 17 9e1 2b2

14 exd5 exd5 15 dxc5 dxc4 16 c6 cxb3 17 9e1 9b5?

17...b2! was once thought to be refuted and thus replaced with the text move, but current trends go in the opposite direction. 17...b2 is considered in the next game.

18 axb3 9xc6 19 9xc6 9xc6 20 9xa7 9f6

20...9xc3? 21 9b1! and White has a clear advantage, e.g. 21...9g7 22 9xc7 9xc7 23 9xe7 9d8 24 9d5 9c1+ 25 9g2 9h8 26 9xd7 9xb1 27 9d6 and Black has a horrible ending to face which, in practice, is drawn very rarely.

21 9c4! 9xc3

21...9xc4? 22 9xc4 9xc3 23 9e3 and White wins material. The best chance lies in 21...9c5! 22 9xd8 9xd8 23 9xf6 9xf6 (23...9xf6 24 b4 9e6 25 9xb6 gave White a clear advantage in Karpov-Beliavsky, Linares 1993) 24 9e3!, an improvement over a previous game. Van Wely-Karpov, Cap d’Agde 1996, went 24...9xb3 25 9f5 9c1 26 9xc1 9xc1 27 9b7 9b5 28 9g2 9h5 29 9xb5, with a promising ending for White.

22 9xd7 9f6

22...9c8 23 9e3 9f6 24 9d5 b5 25 9a3 b4 26 9c4 h6 27 9g2 9c7? 28 9b6! and White was clearly better in Khalifman-Van der Wiel, Ter Apel 1993. Instead 27...9c5 28 9b7 9xb7+ 29 9xb7 9c3, with an endgame with no other prospects than a fight for a draw, was the only chance.

23 9e4 9f5?

Karpov and his seconds prepared this position before the game and none of them saw the coming combination. The most amazing thing about this oversight is that a similar combination had already been played in the following game: 23...9e6 24 9f4 9g6? (24...9xf4 25 9xf4 9e1+ 26 9xe1 9xe1 27 9xb6 is the only chance, but of course Black cannot hope for anything other than a draw) 25 9xf7! 9xf7 26 9xf7 9xf7 27 9d8+ 9f8 28 9d5 and White won, Chernin-Veingold, Seville 1993.

24 9f4 9e6

25 9xf7!

Picking up a pawn.

25...9e8

The sacrifice could never be accepted: 25...9xf7 26 9d8+ and 25...9xf7 26 9xf7 9xf7 27 9d8+ 9f8 28 9d5+ are both straightforward winning lines.

26 9f3 9f6 27 9b7 h6 28 9g2 9h8 29 9h4 9g8 30 9h2 9h8 31 9h5 9d8 32 9f7 9d4 33 9f8+ 9xf8 34 9xf8+ 9h7 35 9f3 9c5 36 9f5 9c8 37 9h5 9d8 38 9e5 9d7 39 9e4+ 9h8 40 9g2 9f8 41 9f4 9d8 42 9f3 9d4 43 9e2 b5 44 9d2 9b6 45 9e4 9d1? 46 9f2 9b1 47 9g4 9f5 48 9e5 9g8? 49 9c6 1-0

Game 55

Gheorghiu-Cserna

Berlin 1986

1 d4 9f6 2 9f3 e6 3 9c4 b6 4 9g3 9a6 5 b3 9b4+ 6 9d2 9e7 7 9g2 9c6 8 9d3 9e5 9d7 10 9xd7 9xd7 11 9d2 0-0 12 0-0 9c8 13 9e4 9c5 14 exd5 9xd5 15 9xc5 9xc4 16 c6 9xb3 17 9e1 2b2!

Once refuted, now the drawing line, killing all life in the position.
18 \textbf{\textit{x}b}2 \textbf{\textit{c}c}5

18...\textbf{\textit{d}d}6 19 \textbf{\textit{b}b}3 \textbf{\textit{b}b}4 20 \textbf{\textit{e}e}3 \textbf{\textit{w}x}d1+ 21 \textbf{\textit{a}a}1 \textbf{\textit{e}e}d8 22 \textbf{\textit{d}d}4! gives White a clear advantage due to the pawn on c6.

19 \textbf{\textit{a}a}3

This was the refutation of the ...b2 line, but improvements have been found. Others:

a) 19 \textbf{\textit{b}b}3?! \textbf{\textit{d}d}3 20 \textbf{\textit{e}e}2 \textbf{\textit{b}b}4! 21 \textbf{\textit{a}a}4 \textbf{\textit{a}a}5! was a draw in Gelfand-Anand, China 2000. The reason is 22 \textbf{\textit{x}c}5 (22 \textbf{\textit{c}c}3? \textbf{\textit{f}f}4! 23 \textbf{\textit{x}d}2 \textbf{\textit{e}e}2+ 24 \textbf{\textit{h}h}1 \textbf{\textit{e}e}7! 25 \textbf{\textit{b}b}2 \textbf{\textit{x}f}2 is enormous for Black) 22...\textbf{\textit{b}b}5 23 \textbf{\textit{f}f}3 \textbf{\textit{g}g}4! 24 \textbf{\textit{w}w}e3 \textbf{\textit{c}c}4 25 \textbf{\textit{w}w}g4 \textbf{\textit{g}g}6 26 \textbf{\textit{a}a}4 \textbf{\textit{a}a}6 27 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x4 \textbf{\textit{x}x}g2 28 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x3 with equality. Here 21...\textbf{\textit{a}a}5? 22 \textbf{\textit{e}e}2! \textbf{\textit{d}d}3 23 \textbf{\textit{x}x}c5! \textbf{\textit{x}x}c5 24 \textbf{\textit{w}w}g4 gave White a strong position in Dautov-Sax, Germany 1998.

b) 19 \textbf{\textit{b}b}3?! \textbf{\textit{g}g}4 20 \textbf{\textit{a}a}6! \textbf{\textit{x}x}f6 gave White nothing but problems in Timoschenko-Bagaturov, Enakievo 1997.

c) 19 \textbf{\textit{d}d}4 (White is better after both 19...\textbf{\textit{d}d}3 20 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x7! \textbf{\textit{x}x}c4 21 \textbf{\textit{h}h}7! \textbf{\textit{w}w}xg2 22 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x8 \textbf{\textit{x}x}d1 23 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x1, and 19...\textbf{\textit{f}f}6? 20 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x8 \textbf{\textit{h}h}4 21 \textbf{\textit{a}a}x6! \textbf{\textit{x}x}f6 22 \textbf{\textit{e}e}3) 20 \textbf{\textit{w}w}g4 \textbf{\textit{g}g}5! 21 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x4 \textbf{\textit{d}d}3 with a further branch:

c1) 22 \textbf{\textit{c}c}3 \textbf{\textit{x}x}e1 23 \textbf{\textit{e}e}1 \textbf{\textit{w}w}e8 24 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x8+ (24 \textbf{\textit{b}b}1 \textbf{\textit{e}e}6 25 \textbf{\textit{h}h}4 \textbf{\textit{f}f}6 26 \textbf{\textit{a}a}6! \textbf{\textit{w}w}d4 Barus-Shneider, Jakarta 1997 and Black has a clear advantage according to Khalifman) 24...\textbf{\textit{w}w}x8 25 \textbf{\textit{w}w}g4 \textbf{\textit{g}g}6, planning to return the exchange, gives Black a better game according to Khalifman.

c2) 22 \textbf{\textit{e}e}2? \textbf{\textit{a}a}x2b2 23 \textbf{\textit{x}b}2 \textbf{\textit{f}f}6 wins for Black.

c3) 22 \textbf{\textit{e}e}5! \textbf{\textit{x}x}e1 23 \textbf{\textit{f}f}xe1 \textbf{\textit{x}x}f6l 24 \textbf{\textit{x}x}f6 (Komarov gives 24 \textbf{\textit{h}h}3? \textbf{\textit{w}w}d2 25 \textbf{\textit{f}f}1 \textbf{\textit{e}e}8) 24...\textbf{\textit{w}w}f6 25 \textbf{\textit{c}c}7 and a draw was soon agreed in Georgiev-Komarov, Yugoslavia 1997.

19...\textbf{\textit{a}a}6?

19...\textbf{\textit{b}b}5?! 20 \textbf{\textit{b}b}3 \textbf{\textit{f}f}6 21 \textbf{\textit{x}x}c5 \textbf{\textit{b}b}c5 was Gheorghiu’s recommendation, but after 22 \textbf{\textit{c}c}1! \textbf{\textit{w}w}d1 23 \textbf{\textit{x}x}d1 \textbf{\textit{a}a}6 24 \textbf{\textit{c}c}5 White seems to have some chances. The a-pawn is probably falling.

19...\textbf{\textit{f}f}6! 20 \textbf{\textit{c}c}1 \textbf{\textit{g}g}5 21 \textbf{\textit{c}c}2 \textbf{\textit{b}b}5 22 \textbf{\textit{x}x}d1 \textbf{\textit{w}w}d1 23 \textbf{\textit{c}c}5 \textbf{\textit{x}x}c5 24 \textbf{\textit{a}a}xg2 \textbf{\textit{e}e}7 25 \textbf{\textit{w}w}e3 \textbf{\textit{g}g}6 26 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x4 \textbf{\textit{a}a}6 27 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x5 \textbf{\textit{h}h}4 28 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x5 \textbf{\textit{f}f}5 30 \textbf{\textit{w}w}x5 \textbf{\textit{g}g}6 31 \textbf{\textit{w}w}e7 \textbf{\textit{g}g}5 32 \textbf{\textit{a}a}x7 \textbf{\textit{h}h}5 33 \textbf{\textit{f}f}3 \textbf{\textit{g}g}2 34 \textbf{\textit{h}h}4 \textbf{\textit{g}g}7 35 \textbf{\textit{a}a}6 was the course of Dautov-Alterman, Germany 1998. This endgame is a theoretical draw. Black can even lose a tempo once the a-pawn starts rolling and still make the draw. However, many players find it difficult to draw such endings in practice. One example is Georgiev, who lost it to Akopian in Las Vegas 1999. That game can be found in my book \textit{Excelling at Chess}, page 104. Alterman also lost this endgame, but those intending to play this line should look this ending up and then they would find that there is nothing to fear. 20 \textbf{\textit{x}x}c5 \textbf{\textit{b}b}x5 21 \textbf{\textit{c}c}1 \textbf{\textit{b}b}5 22 \textbf{\textit{x}x}c5 was agreed drawn in Shneider-Anand, Bastia 2000. Taking the difference of strength of the two players into account, one might suspect that Black was not altogether confident about his position, but I think that if Anand really wanted to win against Shneider, he would have chosen a less forcing system.

20 \textbf{\textit{b}b}3 \textbf{\textit{d}d}3

20...\textbf{\textit{x}x}b3 21 \textbf{\textit{a}a}x6 \textbf{\textit{x}x}a1 22 \textbf{\textit{x}x}f8 and White can hope for a considerable advantage.

21 \textbf{\textit{x}x}d6 \textbf{\textit{a}a}d6 22 \textbf{\textit{c}c}1! \textbf{\textit{h}h}8 23 \textbf{\textit{x}x}d3 \textbf{\textit{x}x}d3 24 \textbf{\textit{w}w}a4 \textbf{\textit{a}a}5 25 \textbf{\textit{a}a}d1 \textbf{\textit{w}w}c7 26 \textbf{\textit{h}h}3 \textbf{\textit{b}b}5 27 \textbf{\textit{w}w}f4 1-0
Summary
After 5 b3 d5 6 g2, game 45 shows that 6...dxc4?! is past its sell-by date. White has found the right path to a small but very clear advantage. After 5...b5? White will always be a little better, as his pawn structure is slightly superior. Still this line has brought many players good practical results, and is good for winning attempts, as the position easily becomes unbalanced. Also interesting is 5...b4!? with the idea to exchange on d2. As far as I can see this line is theoretically okay, even though the practically results indicate that it is easier to play the White side. Both 7...a5! and 7...c5!? are probably very slightly worse for Black, but again they give positions where there remains much play, and where the better player most often succeed. The long lines with 5...b4+ and 6...e7 seems to be the main reason for Black to play 4...a6. There are good reasons for this: If White plays the tough lines, Black can liquidate the game to a draw, and if not, Black is probably fine all the same.

1 d4 f6 2 c4 e6 3 f3 b6 4 g3 a6 5 b3 (D) b4 +
   5...d5 6 g2 dxc4 – Game 45
   5...b5 – Game 46
   5...b7 6 g2 b4+ 7 d2 (D)
     7...a5 8 0-0 0-0
       9 g5 – Game 48
       9 c3
       9...d5 – Game 49; 9...d6 – Game 50
     7...c5 8 0-0 0-0
       9 c3 – Game 51; 9 xb4 cxb4 10 d3 – Game 52

6 d2 e7
   6...xd2+ – Game 47

7 g2 c6 8 c3
   8 0-0 d5 9 c2 – Game 53

8...d5 9 e5 d7 10 xd7 xd7 11 d2 0-0 12 0-0 c8 13 e4 c5 14 exd5 exd5
15 dxc5 dxc4 16 c6 cxb3 17 e1 (D)
   17...b5 – Game 54; 17...b2 – Game 55

126
4 g3 b7

1 d4 f6 2 c4 e6 3 f3 b6 4 g3 b7

4...b7 is the old classical move, which was much played in the days when few people believed in such modern moves as 4...a6. In this chapter we will consider all the classical lines as well as some of the sidelines. As you will find out, if you choose to play anything other than 5 g2 e7 6 c3 then there is really no way to play for an advantage, or even create an interesting game. All these d5, b3 and e1 lines are not dangerous for Black, once they have been looked at under the microscope.

So the real battleground is in the main lines and here it is a matter of taste. All lines should lead to an even game. But what kind of even game suits you best? Take a look and then decide.

Game 56
Karpov-Gavrikov
USSR 1988

1 f3 f6 2 c4 b6 3 d4 e6 4 g3 b7 5 g2 c5

This move is more or less refuted (this game). Other alternatives are:

a) 5...b4+. The difference with the Bogo-Indian is hard to find after this. After 6 d2 Black has four possibilities:

a1) 6...c5 7 b4 cxb4 8 0-0 0-0 9 bd2 d6 10 e1 c7 11 e4 e5 is very similar to Game 52, except that White has not played b2-b3. This is an advantage that secures White the better prospects in this position. 12 b3 a5 13 e3 c6 and now, instead of 14 d5, which was seen in Gavrilov-Šefterjan, Rjazan 1993, Gavrilov recommends 14 h3 f8 15 d5 b8 16 h4 c8 17 h2 a6 18 f4 c5 19 e2 with a slight pull.

a2) 6...a5 7 0-0 0-0 8 f4 e7 9 c3 e4 10 c2 c3 11 bxc3 a7 12 e4 d6 13 f1 d7 14 d1 e8 with a modest advantage to White in Piket-Korchnoi, Nijmegen 1993, after 15 a4.

a3) 6...c7 7 c3 0-0 (7...c6 8 e4 d5 9 cxd5 cxd5 10 e5 d4 11 0-0 0-0 12 e1 c2 13 xd2 a6 14 f1 favoured White in Savchenko-Hulak, Portoroz 1996) 8 0-0 d6 9 c1 e8 10 e1 d5 11 cxd5 exd5 12 f4 c5 13 a4 c4 14 f1 d1 with another edge in Filippov-Kalinin, Moscow 2002.

a4) 6...c7 7 0-0 d2 8 xd2 0-0 0-0 c3 d5 10 e5 a6 11 d1, Ilincic-Damljanovic, Niksic 1997, and we have yet another of these typical positions where White is only very slightly better.

b) 5...g6?! 6 0-0 b7 7 c2 0-0 8 c3 d6 9 e4 b7 10 b3 e5 11 b2 exd4 12 xd4 e8 13 f1 simply led to a clear plus for...
White in Milev-Simagin, Russia 1959. The weakening of the light squares on the queenside does not work well within such a King’s Indian structure.

6 d5!

White assumes control of the centre. Either Black will have to live with an undesirable structure or fight for d5. As this game shows, White is ‘fitter’ for this fight.

6...exd5 7 c4 b5 8 0-0!

8 cxd5 merely justifies Black’s play this far. 8...bxc4 9 c3 e7 10 d5!

10 e5?! is inferior. Now White clearly has the advantage.

10...0-0 11 dxe7+! wxe7 12 g5 h6

12...d6?! 13 dxd5 a5 14 dxd5 ab8 15 xc4 secures White a very clear advantage. The knight is badly placed on a6.

13 dxf6 wxf6 14 dxd5 a5 15 wxd5 c6 16 xc4 xb2 17 e3

White will soon regain the pawn, after which the superiority of both his bishop and his pawn structure will guarantee an advantage.

17...ab8 18 wxc5 ab6?!

18...b5 is better. This slow play presents White with an opportunity to complete development without any concerns.

19 ad1 ab8 20 d5!

Now the game is more or less decided. The rest, as they say, is a matter of technique...

20...wb5 21 wc7 wa6 22 xc1 wa5 23 wd1 b5 24 wc6 wb6 25 we7 wg6 26 xe4 we6 27 xh7+ xh7 28 wxf8 xa2 29 wd6 a6 30 wd3+ f5 31 b1 we6 32 xb5 axb5 33 wb5 xc6 34 d5 wg6 35 wc5 we4 36 wd6+ xh7 37 wd5 wb1+ 38 wd1 we4 39 wd3 wg4 40 d5 1-0

**Game 57**

**Polugaevsky-Wojtkiewicz**

**Haninge 1990**

1 d4 d6 2 d3 e6 3 c4 b6 4 g3 a6 5 d5 c6 6 d3 0-0 7 b3 d5

8 cxd5 exd5

Black has an easier way to equalise in 8...dxd5! 9 b2 d7 (9...c5 is a good alternative: 10 c3 cxd4 11 dxd5 xd5 12 dxd4 xg2 13 xg2 f6 14 e3 d4 15 cxd4 gave White some advantage in Aa-
gaard-Christensen, Copenhagen 1999, but simply 14...\textit{W}d5+! would have kept the game drawish) 10 $\text{Q}bd2?!$ c5 11 $\text{Q}c1 $\text{N}c8 12 $\text{Q}c4 $\text{Q}d5f6 with equality in Dautov-van der Sterren, Ter Apel 1994.

9 $\text{a}2b2$

9 $\text{Q}c3 $\text{a}6 10 $\text{b}2 $\text{c}8 11 $\text{Q}c1 $\text{d}8 12 $\text{a}3 $\text{c}5 13 dxc5 $\text{b}xc5 14 b4 $\text{W}d7 15 bxc5 $\text{Q}xc5 16 $\text{Q}e5 $\text{W}e6 17 $\text{Q}a4 $\text{Q}e4 18 $\text{Q}xc5 $\text{Q}xc5 19 $\text{W}a4 $\text{b}6 20 $\text{Q}f3 $\text{Q}c8 led to equality in Nikolic-Khalifman, Manila 1990.

9...$\text{a}8$ 10 $\text{Q}c3 $\text{a}6$

10...$\text{W}c8$, with equality, is mentioned above.

11 $\text{Q}e5$ c5 12 $\text{Q}c1 $\text{f}8$

12...cxd4 13 $\text{Q}b5!$ favours White.

13 e3 $\text{Q}c7$ 14 $\text{a}4$!?

---

9...$\text{e}8$ 10 $\text{Q}c3$ $\text{a}6$

9...$\text{e}8$, with equality, is mentioned above.

11 $\text{Q}e5$ c5 12 $\text{Q}c1$ $\text{f}8$

12...cxd4 13 $\text{Q}b5!$ favours White.

13 e3 $\text{Q}c7$ 14 $\text{a}4$!?

White has emerged from the opening with a small plus.

14...$\text{e}6$ 15 dxc5 $\text{b}xc5$ 16 $\text{Q}g4!$ $\text{e}4$?!

16...$\text{Q}xg4$! 17 $\text{W}xg4$ $\text{e}7$ 18 $\text{Q}d1$ $\text{ed}8$ was better according to Polugaevsky.

17 f3 $\text{Q}d6$ 18 f4! $\text{e}4$

18...d4!? was apparently necessary.

19 $\text{Q}f2$ $\text{Q}f6$ 20 $f5$ $\text{Q}g5$ 21 dxc5 $\text{Q}xc5$

22 $\text{Q}xc5$ $\text{Q}e4$ 23 $\text{Q}xe4$ $\text{Q}xe4$ 24 $\text{W}d4$

f6 25 $\text{Q}c2$ $\text{Q}d6$ 26 $\text{Q}f1$ $\text{e}7$ 27 $\text{Q}a4$

$\text{W}d8$ 28 $\text{Q}a3$ $\text{f}7$ 29 $\text{Q}d1$ $\text{W}b6$ 30 $\text{W}d4$

$\text{W}a5$ 31 $\text{Q}b4$ $\text{W}b5$ 32 $\text{a}4$ $\text{Q}xe4!$ $\text{dx}e4$ 33

$\text{Q}c7!!$ $\text{Q}xh7$ 34 $\text{Q}d8+$ $\text{Q}e8$ 35 $\text{Q}xh7$ $\text{Q}c6$

36 $\text{Q}d6$ $\text{Q}b5$ 37 a4 $\text{Q}c8$ 38 $\text{W}a5$ $\text{Q}d3$ 39

$\text{W}d5+$ $\text{Q}h8$ 40 $\text{Q}d7$ h6 41 $g4!$ $\text{W}e5$ 42

$\text{W}xe5$ $\text{fxe}5$ 43 $\text{Q}d6$ $\text{Q}c1+$ 44 $\text{Q}g2!$ $\text{Q}d1$

This pawn sacrifice had its heyday in the 1980's. These days it is not considered to be very dangerous but it must be remembered that it is more messy than the main lines.

7...$\text{ex}d5$

Also possible is 7...$\text{Q}a6$?!, as tried in Haus-rath-Tiviakov, Zwolle 2000. I suppose this was employed as a means to steer the lower rated opponent out of his 'book' ... 8 $\text{Q}c3$

$\text{b}4$! 9 $\text{Q}d4$ $\text{xc}3$ 10 $\text{bxc}3$ $\text{Q}c5$ 11 $\text{Q}a3$ $\text{W}e7$

12 $\text{Q}d3$ d6 13 $\text{Q}xc5$ $\text{dxc}5$ 14 e5 15 $\text{Q}e1$

$\text{Q}e8$ 16 $\text{Q}f1$ $\text{Q}d6$ and Black was doing well.

8 $\text{Qh}4$!

This was Polugaevsky's discovery after the following game: 8 $\text{Q}d4!$ $\text{Q}c6$! 9 cxd5 $\text{Q}xd5$

10 $\text{Q}xd5$ $\text{Q}d5$ 11 e4 $\text{Q}b4$ 12 $\text{Q}c3$ $\text{f}6$ 13

$\text{Q}f5$ $\text{Q}e8$ 14 f4 $\text{d}6$ 15 $\text{W}g4$ $\text{Q}c6$ 16 e5 $\text{Q}x}5$

17 $\text{Q}e4$ $\text{Q}x}4$ 18 $\text{Q}h6+$ $\text{Q}f8$ 19 $\text{Q}x}6$ $\text{Q}x}6$

20 $\text{Q}x}4$ $\text{Q}e}+2$ 21 $\text{g}2$ $\text{Q}e}5$ 22 $\text{Q}x}6$ $\text{Q}x}4$

23 $\text{Q}x}7+$ $\text{Q}e}8$ 24 $\text{Q}x}7$ $\text{Q}x}6$ 25 $a3$ $\text{Q}a}8$

26 axb4 $\text{Q}a}7$ 27 $\text{Q}x}7$ $\text{Q}x}7$ and the endgame is a disaster for White, as was seen in the game Polugaevsky-Korchnoi, Buenos Aires 1980.

45 $\text{Q}x}7$ $\text{f}1+ 46 $\text{Q}f}2$ $\text{Q}x}6d6 47 $\text{Q}x}1$

$\text{Q}b}6 48 a5 $\text{Q}x}b3 49 a6 1-0

\textbf{Game 58}

\textbf{Freitag-Oral}

\textbf{Graz 1998}

1 d4 $\text{Q}f}6$ 2 c4 e6 3 $\text{Q}f}3$ b6 4 g3 $\text{Q}b}7$ 5

$\text{g}2$ $\text{Q}e}7$ 6 0-0 0-0 7 $d5$!?
Queen's Indian Defence

8...c6!

The only good move. After 8...\texttt{De}4 9 cxd5 \texttt{Ax}h4 10 \texttt{Axe}4 \texttt{Af}6 11 \texttt{Wc}2 White was slightly better in Gheorghiu-Unzicker, Wijk aan Zee 1981. 8...\texttt{Dd}8 9 \texttt{Df}5 \texttt{Dd}6 10 \texttt{Dxe}7+ \texttt{Wxe}7 11 cxd5 c5 12 \texttt{Dc}3 \texttt{Da}6 13 \texttt{Af}4 favoured White in Barlov-Ivanovic, Yugoslavia 1984.

9 cxd5 \texttt{Dxd}5

Also good is 9...cxd5!? 10 \texttt{Dc}3 \texttt{Da}6 11 \texttt{Df}5 \texttt{Dc}7 12 \texttt{Af}4 \texttt{Me}8 13 \texttt{Ad}6 \texttt{Ff}8 14 \texttt{Wb}3 \texttt{Lc}6 15 \texttt{Af}8 \texttt{Wxf}8 16 \texttt{Fad}1 \texttt{Me}8 17 \texttt{Ff}1 \texttt{Lt}e5, with equality in Romanishin-Razuvaev, Jurmala 1987. In fact I think this is probably the safest line for Black. On the other hand, it does not offer much in the way of winning chances.

10 \texttt{Df}5 \texttt{Dc}7

Or 10...\texttt{Wf}6!? 11 e4 \texttt{De}7 12 \texttt{Dd}6 \texttt{La}6 13 \texttt{Me}1 \texttt{Lt}e5 14 f4 \texttt{Axd}6 15 \texttt{Wxd}6 c5 16 b4 cxb4 17 \texttt{Wxb}4 \texttt{Dc}6 18 \texttt{Wa}4 \texttt{Wc}8 with unclear play in Milos-Sunye Neto, Sao Paulo 2000. Actually I would prefer to be Black in this line, and in the game, too, but I know that a creative player will also be able to get something out of White's position.

11 \texttt{Dc}3

One of the two main lines. 11 e4 d5 12 \texttt{Me}1! is Barlov's variation, which appears to lead to an unclear but equal game: 12...dxe4 13 \texttt{Dc}3!? \texttt{Ac}8 14 \texttt{Dxe}7+ \texttt{Wxe}7 15 \texttt{Axe}4 \texttt{Lt}e6 16 \texttt{Ff}4 \texttt{Hd}8 17 \texttt{Wht}5 h6 18 \texttt{Me}3 was Piket-Van der Wiel, Rotterdam 1997, with compensation for the pawn, but Black has his chances too and did okay.

White had previously played 13 \texttt{Wg}4 \texttt{Af}6 14 \texttt{Dc}3 \texttt{Ec}8 15 \texttt{Axe}4, but after 15...\texttt{Fxf}5 (15...\texttt{Dd}5? 16 \texttt{Fh}6 g6 17 \texttt{Df}8 \texttt{Fxf}8 18 \texttt{Dxe}5 \texttt{Dxe}5 19 \texttt{Dc}4 \texttt{Dc}7 20 \texttt{Db}3 cxd5 21 \texttt{Dxd}5 \texttt{Lt}e6 and Black resigned in Barlov-Abramovic, Yugoslavia 1994 — simply 22 \texttt{Dxe}6 \texttt{Fxe}6 23 \texttt{Wf}3+ followed by \texttt{Dxe}7 wins) 16 \texttt{Wxf}5 g6 17 \texttt{Df}3 \texttt{Ec}6 18 \texttt{Fh}6 \texttt{Dd}4 19 \texttt{Dg}2 \texttt{Me}8 20 \texttt{Dc}3 a6 21 \texttt{Dc}2 \texttt{Me}7 22 \texttt{Dxd}4 \texttt{Dxd}4 23 \texttt{Dxd}4 \texttt{Dxd}4 24 \texttt{Dxe}6 \texttt{Dxe}1+ 25 \texttt{Dxe}1 \texttt{Dxc}6 26 \texttt{Wxc}6 \texttt{Wg}7 27 b3 there was little life left in the position in Piguos-Tiviakov, Beijing 1997. Of course a man like Piguos is well known for his love for exchanges. Like my first trainer, who said that the sacrifice of a pawn would only make you try to win it back, so therefore it was a waste of time...

11...\texttt{Dd}5

11...\texttt{Dc}8 12 \texttt{Ff}4 \texttt{Da}6 13 \texttt{Dd}2 d5 14 e4 \texttt{Dac}7 15 \texttt{Fad}1 \texttt{Ff}6 16 exd5 \texttt{Dxd}5 17 \texttt{Dxd}5 cxd5 18 \texttt{Dc}3 \texttt{Dc}7 19 \texttt{Dxc}7 \texttt{Wxc}7 was already drawn in Timman-Karpov, Tilburg 1983.

12 e4 \texttt{Me}8!?

The new move. Previously known was 12...\texttt{Ff}6 13 \texttt{Me}1 \texttt{Mc}8 14 \texttt{Wf}3 \texttt{Me}6 15 g4 \texttt{Dd}7 16 \texttt{Wg}3 \texttt{Dxe}4 17 \texttt{Dxe}4 with compensation but no more, Romanishin-Epishin, Belgrade 1988.

13 \texttt{Ff}4 \texttt{Dd}6 14 \texttt{Wg}4 \texttt{Dd}7
This looks like a positional error, and now Black does not have to worry about his centre.

15 ... g6 16 h5+ g7 17 h8+ g5 18 h6+ f8 19 e1 g5 20 h4 x4+ 21 xf4 f5 22 exf6 x6 23 f3 c8 24 a5 g7 25 aae1 xh6 26 f5 gxf5 27 exf5 g7 28 e3 a5 29 g3+ h8 30 e5 g7 0–1

Game 59
Van Wely-Korchnoi
Hoogeveen 2001

1 d4 f6 2 c4 e6 3 f3 b6 4 g3 b7 5 g2 e7 6 0–0 0–0 7 e1

This line was very popular in the mid-1990’s, when Kramnik championed it. It is now known to be harmless in view of...

7...a6!

It is this move that has more or less done away with any modern interest in 7 e1. Instead 7...d5 8 cxd5 exd5 9 d4 might give Black a little plus.

8 e5

Other attempts at an advantage are:

a) 8 d5 9 dxe5 dxe5 10 h4 c7 11 c3 d4 12 xb7 b8 13 g2 dxc3 14 bxc3 leaves all the white pieces well placed) 9 cxd5 exd5 10 e3 c5 11 f4 c7 12 e1 e6 13 e5 g4 was seen in Wojtkiewicz-Zagrebely, Dhaka 1999. In many ways this fits in with White’s plan to increase pressure on the d5-pawn. White was willing to surrender the bishop for the knight and now it is Black who expends energy to arrange this. 13...d7 is a sensible alternative, preparing to put more weight on the d-file. After (13...g4) 14 d5 bxc5 15 h3 xe5 16 xe5 e6! 17 g4 xc3 18 bx3! White had a slight but distinct advantage, but the improvement 16...c8, keeping the two bishops, would have given Black a fine game.

12 xc7 xc7 13 e1 c7 14 e5 c6 15 d3 c4 16 e5 ab8 17 dxe4 dxe4 18 xe4 xe4 19 xe4xe4 20 dxe4 d5 21 e2 f5 22 e3 b5 was the course of Ibragi-

jahov-Tiviakov, St. Petersburg 1998. White has not been able to establish the powerful centre that secures him play in Benoni structures. Necessary here was 13 e3 wb7+! 14 d5? cxd4 15 xd4 with complete equality. 10 e5 has also been played, Bator-Stefansson, Marienhann 1997, continuing 10 e5 xg2 11 xg2 c8! 12 e4 wb7 (already equal) 13 xxd7 xfd8 14 e5 f6 15 f4 xe5 16 xe5 f6 17 f4 e5 18 d2 xd4 and Black had improved his prospects. 10 d5? is another try. Then the safe 10...exd5? 11 cxd5 c5 12 dxc6 dxc6 13 e5 xg2 14 xg2 c8 leads to approximate equality, while the ambitious 10...f6 11 d4 xg2 12 xg2 leaves Black with a modest lead in development, meaning he must act quickly in order to avoid e2-e4-e5. Delchev-Marin, Istanbul 2000 went 12...e5 13 b5 exd5 14 wxd5 d4 15 d1 a6 16 d6 b7 17 e4 bxc4 18 e5 d3! 19 exf6 xfx6 20 f5 g5 21 g4 xf4+ 22 xf4 xd6 23 xg5+ wg6 with a draw.

b) 8 a3! is an interesting try. White is aiming for the standard position and invests a tempo to do so. 8...d5 (8...c5 9 d5 exd5 10 h4 c7 11 c3 d4 12 xb7 b8 13 g2 dxc3 14 bxc3 leaves all the white pieces well placed) 9 cxd5 exd5 10 e3 c5 11 f4 c7 12 e1 e6 13 e5 g4 was seen in Wojtkiewicz-Zagrebely, Dhaka 1999. In many ways this fits in with White’s plan to increase pressure on the d5-pawn. White was willing to surrender the bishop for the knight and now it is Black who expends energy to arrange this. 13...d7? is a sensible alternative, preparing to put more weight on the d-file. After (13...g4) 14 d5 bxc5 15 h3 xe5 16 xe5 e6! 17 g4 xc3 18 bx3! White had a slight but distinct advantage, but the improvement 16...c8, keeping the two bishops, would have given Black a fine game.

12 xc7 xc7 13 e1 c7 14 e5 c6 15 d3 c4 16 e5 ab8 17 e4 dxe4 18 xe4 xe4 19 xe4 xe4 20 dxe4 d5 21 e2 f5 22 e3 b5 was the course of Ibragi-
mov-Pushkov, Elista 2001, with a level game. This shows that the idea is just to get a position and then play, rather than attempt to refute Black's plans.

8...d5!

The improvement over 8...exg2. The difference with 7...d5 is that White's knight is not very well placed on e5 so early, so Black has no problems in equalising.

9 cxd5 exd5 10 0-0 c5 11 a4 e4 12 dxe4 dxe4 13 dxc5 dxc5 14 w2 c8

Black has equalised. The f5-square is a brilliant outpost for the queen, as is e6.

15 ed1 g6 16 e3 We6 17 c4 ac8
18 b3 h6 19 d4 d5 20 b2 ad8 21 ac1 b5 22 wc3 f6 23 e3

An interesting sideline. This illustrates how good this is against 7 e1. When it is good here, it must be brilliant there! 7...d5 8 e5 d6 9 f4 transposes to 8 f4 in the note to White's 8th move.

8 a3

Others:

a) 8 b3 w8 9 b2 d5 10 dxe5 c5 11 e3 wc7 12 cxd5 exd5 13 b5 wc8 14 a3 c7 led to a balanced game in Zaremba-Ibragimov, Chicago 2002.

b) 8 f4 d6! (8...d5 9 d5 c5 10 cxd5 exd5 11 c1 d4 12 dxe4 dxe4 13 c5 dxc5 14 d4 d6 15 d5 f6 16 d6 xfd6 17 xd6 gave White a little something in Paunovic-Tiviakov, Cacak 1996) 9 a3 c5 10 d5 c7 11 e4 a6 12 b4 exd5 13 exd5 cxb4 14 axb4 b5 with a complicated game with chances for both sides in Ribli-Markowski, Moscow 1994.

c) 8 a4 wc8! (protecting the knight on a6 just once more) 9 d1 e4 10 dxe4 xxe4 11 f4 d6 12 ac1 b7 13 c1 xg2 14 xg2 c5 with equality in Tatai-Tiviakov, Arco 1998.
d) 8 \( \text{h5} \text{c5} 9 \text{d5} \text{exd5} 10 \text{cx} \text{d5} \text{d6} \text{11} \text{\text{h}4 \text{w}d7} 12 \text{\text{w}d2} \text{b5} 13 \text{e4} \text{b4} 14 \text{\text{d}1} \text{\text{d}8} \), Shneider-Tiviakov, Moscow 1992, was very messy.

8...\( \text{\text{e}4} \text{9} \text{\text{d}2} \text{f5} 10 \text{b4} \text{f6} 11 \text{\text{h}1} \text{d1} \text{i}d7 12 \text{\text{d}2} \text{b5} 13 \text{e4} \text{b4} 14 \text{\text{b}d1} \text{i}d8\), Shneider-Tiviakov, Moscow 1992, was very messy.

8 ... \( \text{\text{e}4} \text{9} \text{\text{d}2} \text{f5} 10 \text{b4} \text{f6} 11 \text{\text{h}1} \text{d1} \text{i}d7 12 \text{\text{d}2} \text{b5} 13 \text{e4} \text{b4} 14 \text{\text{b}d1} \text{i}d8\), Shneider-Tiviakov, Moscow 1992, was very messy.

11 ... \( \text{\text{x}c3} \)

11 ... \( \text{\text{x}c3} \text{12} \text{bxc5} \text{\text{b}bxc5} 13 \text{dxc5} \text{\text{b}bxc3} 14 \text{\text{x}c3} \text{\text{x}c3} \text{15} \text{\text{w}d6} \text{\text{w}c6} \text{is another route to equality.} \)

12 \text{\text{h}xc3} \text{\text{e}4} 13 \text{\text{b}b3}

13...c6!

Part of a magnificent but not too complex plan. Black wants to establish a giant knight on d5.

14 \text{\text{b}2}

14 b5?! cxb5 15 cxb5 \text{\text{c}7} favours Black.

14 ... \( \text{\text{c}7} 15 \text{\text{h}3} \)

15 a4 b5 16 axb5 cxb5 17 c5 \text{\text{d}5} 18 e3 a5! and Black has a positional plus.

15 ...b5! 16 \text{\text{d}2} \text{bxc4} 17 \text{\text{x}c4} \text{\text{x}d5} 18 \text{\text{w}d3} \text{\text{w}b8} 19 \text{\text{g}2}

19 f3? \text{\text{w}b5} 20 \text{\text{b}c1} \text{\text{f}b8} 21 e4 \text{\text{x}c4} 22 \text{\text{w}xc4} \text{\text{f}xe4} 23 \text{\text{f}xe4} a5! leads to equality.

19 ... \text{\text{w}b5} 20 \text{\text{b}c1} \text{\text{f}b8} 21 f3 a5!

Black has the initiative. White was not able to counter quickly enough.

22 e4 \text{\text{x}c4} 23 \text{\text{x}c4} d5! 24 \text{\text{x}d5} \text{\text{x}d5} 25 \text{\text{c}5} \text{\text{w}xd3} 26 \text{\text{x}d3} \text{\text{a}x} 24 27 \text{\text{x}c6} \text{\text{b}a3} 28 \text{\text{a}x} 29 \text{\text{a}x} + 29 \text{\text{b}c1} \text{\text{b}5}

Black's pieces are literally springing to life with powerful effect.

30 \text{\text{x}d4}+ 31 \text{\text{f}1} \text{\text{a}a1} 32 \text{\text{a}d5}+ \text{\text{w}f8} 33 \text{\text{d}1} \text{\text{c}3} 34 \text{\text{w}e} 35 \text{\text{w}c1} \text{\text{c}1} 36 \text{\text{d}3} \text{\text{b}2} 37 \text{\text{b}6} \text{\text{d}1}+ 38 \text{\text{w}c4} \text{\text{a}3}+ 0-1

\text{Game 61}

\text{Andersson-Karpov}

\text{Tilburg 1983}

1 \text{\text{f}3} \text{\text{f}6} 2 \text{c4} \text{b6} 3 \text{g3} \text{\text{g}7} 4 \text{\text{g}2} \text{e6}

5 0-0 \text{\text{e}7} 6 \text{\text{d}4} 0-0 7 \text{\text{c}3} \text{\text{e}4} 8 \text{\text{w}c} 2

This line is so classical that many players still play it with some odd kind of respect for the old masters. The newer and more dangerous 8 \text{\text{h}2} is treated in the following games.

8 \text{\text{d}xe4} \text{\text{x}e4} 9 \text{\text{h}4} is the ultimate drawing line. After 9 ... \text{\text{x}g2} 10 \text{\text{x}g2} \text{d5} 11 \text{\text{a}4} \text{\text{d}4} 12 \text{\text{w}c} 4 \text{\text{c}5} 13 \text{\text{d}e} 3 \text{\text{c}d} 4 4.14 \text{\text{w}d} 4 \text{\text{d}8} the position is completely equal. Apart from a blunder once deciding a game between Polugaevsky and Andersson (White), I cannot recall this line being dangerous for anything other than one's interest in chess. Yet this characteristic is precisely the reason why some people play it. By somehow reaching a technical position where they cannot create any winning chances they leave the floor free, as it were, for their opponents to create losing chances. Andersson-Karpov, Reggio Emilia 1991 continued 15 \text{\text{f}c1} \text{\text{w}c} 4 16 \text{\text{d}c} 4 \text{\text{a}6} 17 \text{\text{f}4} \text{\text{f}d} 8 18 \text{\text{d}e} 3 \\text{d} 7 19 \text{\text{d}3} \text{f} 6 20 \text{\text{a}c} 1 \text{\text{a}d} 8 21 \text{\text{g}2} \text{\text{f}7} with equality.

8 ... \text{\text{d}xe4} 9 \text{\text{w}c} 4 \text{c} 5

This is the most drawish line here. Equally good is 9 ... \text{\text{f}6} 5, e.g. 10 \text{\text{d}5} \text{\text{f}6} 11 \text{\text{w}c} 2 \text{\text{a}6} 12 \text{\text{d}1} \text{\text{e}7} 13 \text{\text{d}4} \text{\text{c}5} 14 \text{\text{e}3} \text{\text{d}4} 15 \text{\text{d}4} \text{d} 6 16 \text{\text{b}4} \text{\text{d}7} 17 \text{a} 5 18 \text{\text{b}a} 5 \text{\text{a}5} with equality in Krogius-Kholmov, Kiev 1964. Meanwhile Andersson-Akesson, Skelleftea 1999 went 10 \text{\text{b}3} \text{\text{f}6} 11 \text{\text{b}2} \text{d} 6 12 \text{\text{a}d} 1 \text{\text{a}5} 13 \text{\text{e}1} \text{\text{x}g} 2 14 \text{\text{x}g} 2 \text{\text{c}6} 15 \text{\text{w}d} 2 \text{\text{w}d} 7 16 \text{\text{d}5} \text{\text{d}8} 17 \text{\text{f}x} 6 \text{\text{f}6} 18 \text{\text{d}e} 6 \text{\text{d}e} 6 19 \text{\text{d}4} \text{\text{a}f} 4 20 \text{\text{w}f} 4 \text{\text{e}8}, again with complete equality. It should be said such
positions can be seen a million or so times in GM games, and some players, like Andersson, continue to play them because they know them so well.

10 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d1}} \)

Black also has nothing to fear after the line 10 b3 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}f6}} \) 11 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}b2}} \) cxd4 12 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}xd4}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}xg2}} \) 13 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}xg2}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}c6}} \) 14 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}e3}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}e8}} \) 15 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}fd1}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d8}} \), as in the encounter Beliavsky-Adams, Belgrade 1995.

10...d6 11 b3 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}f6}} \) 12 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}b2}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d7}} \)

This is the most flexible choice, but another route to equality is well known, namely 12...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}c7}} \) 13 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}d2}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}d8}} \) 14 dxc5 dxc5 15 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}f4}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{a}a6}} \) 16 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}xc7}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}xc7}} \) 17 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}e5}} \) (17 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}xf6}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{g}xg6}} \) 18 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}e1}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}xd2}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}f5}} \) 20 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}e3}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d3}} \) 21 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{z}zd3}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}e7}} \) 22 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d1}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}e8}} \) 23 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{g}g4}} \) was equal in Hort-Karpov, Buenos Aires 1980).

12...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}f6}} \) 13 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d2}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d7}} \) 14 dxc5 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}b2}} \) 15 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}b2}} \) dxc5 16 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{z}zd3}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d8}} \) 17 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{a}a1}} \)

17...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}b8}} \) 18 h4 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}xd3}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{z}zd3}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d8}} \) 20 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}d2}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}d3}} \) 21 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}xd3}} \) ½−½

7...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}f6}} \)

I believe this is the best way to deal with these lines. 7...0-0 8 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}xd5}} \) is considered in the next game. Note that if 7...0-0 8 0-0 then it is interesting to play 8...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}xd5}} \), for if you want to play such positions this is certainly the right place to push to \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}5}} \). Actually these lines are considered to give White a slight plus in ECO, but I guess that is primarily because there was originally a guy who tried a line and secured a modest advantage and then he has been quoted for it ever since. Perhaps White is a little better, but then he always is in these situations. Korchnoi-Polugaevsky, Moscow 1972 continued 9 cxd5 exd5 10 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{a}a1}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d7}} \) 11 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}f4}} \) c5 12 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}xe4}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}xe4}} \) 13 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d2}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}f5}} \) 14 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{a}a3}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d5}} \) 15 dxc5 with a draw.

8...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}f5}} \) 9 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}xd2}} \) 10 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}xd2}} \) c5 11 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}f4}} \) exf4 12 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{g}g4}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d7}} \) 13 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}f6}} \) 14 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d4}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}e8}} \) 15 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{g}g4}} \) gave White a substantial advantage in Vaganian-Furman, USSR 1971.

8...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}f5}} \) is considered in the last game.

8 0-0

8 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}c2}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}xd2}} \) 9 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}xd2}} \) looks like a loss of time, and I suspect that that is what it is. After 9...0-0 10 0-0 d6 11 e4 (11 d5 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{z}xc3}} \) 12 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}xc3}} \) exd5 13 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}bh4}} \) d4! 14 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}xd4}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}xg2}} \) is equal, as pointed out by Makarchiev) 11...\( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d7}} \) 12 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{a}a1}} \) g6 13 h4 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}d7}} \) 14 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}e7}} \) 15 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}fe1}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}f8}} \) 16 hxg6 hxg6 17 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{h}h3}} \) c5 18 d5 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}e5}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}xd5}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}e5}} \) Black had no problems whatsoever in Tukmakov-Nielsen, Copenhagen 1996.
8...xh4! 9...xh4 xh4 10...g5...d5 11...e2 0-0 12...f3...e6 13...h6...d8 14...f6...xh6 15.b4...e6 16.b5...xh6 17.bxa6...c5 18...e3...e4 with sufficient counterplay in Karpov-Salov, Rotterdam 1989, a game Black went on to win after a fierce struggle.

8...0-0 9...e5

9...d5 is a tempo too late. After 10 cxd5 exd5 11...f4...a6 12...c6 13...f6...f6 14.e3...c5 15...e5...e7 16...e1...d4 White should not play 17...d3?! (Korchnoi-Salov, Belgrade 1987) but 17...a4!?...xc3 18...xc3, with the idea of 18...c4 19...xc4 b5 20...xc4 bxa4 21...exf6...exf6 22...e1 with a small advantage to White according to Korchnoi.

10 d5 exd5 11 cxd5...d2

Also possible is 11...xc3?! 12...xc3 d6 13...f2...e4 14...e7? 15.g4 b5 with a messy game in Rogers-Speelman, Oropesa del Mar 1996.

12...d2

12...xd2...e8 13.h4 d6 14...g5...a6 15...e4...e5 16...f1...e7 17...h1...e7 18...e3...xc3 20...xc3 b5 21...g3! f5! and Black was slightly better in the game Yusupov-Almasi, Germany 1994. It should be noted that the line itself does not give Black the advantage – White should be able to improve on this, but the positive trend seems to be with Black, nonetheless.

14...d2

14...xd2...d4+ 15...h1...a6 16...f3...e8 (16...e7 is even better according to Almasi) 17.g4...e7 18.g5...d7 19.e3...xc3 20...xc3 b5 21...g3! f5! and Black was slightly better in the game Yusupov-Almasi, Germany 1994. It should be noted that the line itself does not give Black the advantage – White should be able to improve on this, but the positive trend seems to be with Black, nonetheless.

14...e6 15...h1

15...f1...g6 16.f4...d4+ 17.e3...g7 18.a3?...e7 19.b4...d7 20.g4! h6 21.g5? was unclear in Brenninkmeijer-van der Weil, Holland 1991.

15...e7 16.f4...d4 17...f1

The most natural. After 17...f3...d7 18.e3...xc5 19...xc5 b5 20...f1...ab8 Black had good counterplay in Horvath-Zagrebelny, Budapest 1993, while 17.b4...g6 18.b5...c8 19.e3 introduced an early draw in Yermolinsky-De Firmian, Seattle 2000.

17...h6 18.g6...g7 19.g4

19.a3...d7 20.b4...cxb4 21.axb4...c4 22...e2...f8 23...g5...xe2 24...xe2 a5 gave Black a better game in Van der Sterren-Yemelin, Hamburg 1997.

19...h6 20.g5...h5 21...xg5

This is the only dangerous move. White should remember how strong the bishop is on f6. After 13...d4...a6 14...b3...xc4 15...xc4...d7 16.e3...e6 17.a4...e7 18...e2...fb8 19...a1...e8 only Black had realistic prospects of pushing for a win in Vyzmanavin-Khalifman, USSR 1990.

13...e5!

13...e7?! had been played quite often before 13...e5 took over. Actually, I wonder why? The bishop does not look better than the knight once it gets to e7. (I would suspect that even 13...d6 is better than this). White earned himself a clear advantage in Karpov-Salov, Linares 1993: 14.f4...d7 15.g4! a6 16...e8 17.g5...h8 18...h1! etc. Schneider-Beliavsky, USSR 1990, went 16.g5 b5 17...g3...e8 18.h4...f8 19.h5 with the better game for White. Let us compare the bishop with the knight now – why run away from the exchange like that?

14...d2

14...xd2...d4+ 15...h1...a6 16...f3...e8 (16...e7 is even better according to Almasi) 17.g4...e7 18.g5...d7 19.e3...xc3 20...xc3 b5 21...g3! f5! and Black was slightly better in the game Yusupov-Almasi, Germany 1994. It should be noted that the line itself does not give Black the advantage – White should be able to improve on this, but the positive trend seems to be with Black, nonetheless.

14...a6 15...h1

15...f1...g6 16.f4...d4+ 17.e3...g7 18.a3?...e7 19.b4...d7 20.g4! h6 21.g5? was unclear in Brenninkmeijer-van der Weil, Holland 1991.

15...e7 16.f4...d4 17...f1

The most natural. After 17...f3...d7 18.e3...xc5 19...xc5 b5 20...f1...ab8 Black had good counterplay in Horvath-Zagrebelny, Budapest 1993, while 17.b4...g6 18.b5...c8 19.e3 introduced an early draw in Yermolinsky-De Firmian, Seattle 2000.

17...h6 18.g6...g7 19.g4

19.a3...d7 20.b4...cxb4 21.axb4...c4 22...e2...f8 23...g5...xe2 24...xe2 a5 gave Black a better game in Van der Sterren-Yemelin, Hamburg 1997.
Queen's Indian Defence

The game is rather unclear.

21...\( \text{d}7 \) 22 \( \text{w}f2 \) \( \text{h}6! \)

22.\( \text{f}6 \) 23 \( \text{w}h4 \) followed by \( e3\)-\( e4\)-\( e5 \) would be very dangerous for Black.

23.\( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{x}g5 \) 24 \( \text{x}g5 \) \( f6! \) 25 \( \text{gx}f6 \) \( \text{w}h7+ \)

26 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{x}f6 \) 27 \( \text{w}g3 \) \( \text{e}ae8 \) 28 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{g}7 \)

29 \( \text{c}d1 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 30 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{w}h4 \) 31 \( \text{w}xh4 \)

32.\( a4! \) \( f6! \) 33 \( \text{fx}g5 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 34 \( \text{w}d2 \) \( \text{f}d7 \) 35 \( \text{e}3 \)

36 \( \text{c}xg5 \) \( \text{h}7 \) 37 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{d}xe8 \) 38 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h}4 \) 39 \( \text{g}3 \)

40.\( \text{g}d2 \) \( \text{x}g5 \) 41 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 42 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 43 \( \text{e}4 \)

44.\( \text{c}d3 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 45 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 46 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 47 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{h}8 \)

48.\( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 49 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 50 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 51 \( \text{g}4 \)

52 \( \text{e}6 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 0-1

Game 63
Romanishin-Korchnoi
Lvov 2000

1 d4 \( \text{f}6 \) 2 \( \text{f}3 \) e6 3 g3 b6 4 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{b}7 \)

5 c4 \( \text{e}7 \) 6 \( \text{c}3 \) 0-0

This move makes a lot of sense. Black wants to see if White's move order holds any real threats to his wellbeing.

7 d5!

7 \( \text{w}c2 \) is, as always, answered with 7...c5! and Black equalises with 8 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 9 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{c}a6 \) 10 \( \text{c}x \) \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 11 \( \text{w}b2 \) \( \text{x}d5 \) 12 \( \text{x}d5 \)

\( \text{x}g5 \) 13 \( \text{w}xg5 \) \( \text{w}xg5 \) 14 \( \text{c}x \) \( \text{x}g5 \) \( \text{x}d5 \) 15 \( \text{x}d5 \) \( \text{x}d5 \) 16 0-0-0 \( \text{d}4 \) 17 a3 \( \text{c}6 \)

18 \( \text{w}d7 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 19 \( \text{c}1 \) f6 20 \( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{a}d8 \), as in Bogdanovski-Marin, Yerevan 1996.

7...\( \text{b}4 \)

7...\( \text{c}a6 \) 8 0-0 \( \text{c}5 \) 9 \( \text{c}e5 \) a5 10 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 11 \( \text{c}x \) \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{c}a6 \) 12 \( \text{w}c2 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \) gave White the advantage in Atalik-Stoica, Herculane 1996.

8 0-0?!

This line allows the exchange on c3, after which Black is okay. The critical lines arise after 8 \( \text{d}2 \) and now:

a) 8...\( \text{x}c3 \) 9 \( \text{x}c3 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 10 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{e}4 \)

(10...c6 11 \( \text{f}5 \) dxc4 12 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 13 \( \text{x}g7 \)

\( \text{x}g7 \) 14 \( \text{x}f4 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 15 \( \text{g}4 \) gave White a promising attack in Halasz-Lendwai, Miskolc 1990)

11 \( \text{c}x \) \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{x}c3 \) 12 \( \text{bxc}3 \) d6 13 0-0 \( \text{d}7 \) 14 \( \text{e}4 \)

\( \text{c}5 \) 15 \( \text{w}d4 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 16 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 17 \( \text{f}4 \) with a slight advantage to White in Karpow-Ivanchuk, Linares 1993.

b) 8...c6 9 0-0 \( \text{x}c3 \) 10 \( \text{x}c3 \) \( \text{bxc}3 \) 10 \( \text{d}x \) \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{d}x \) \( \text{c}6 \) 11 \( \text{d}c2 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 12 \( \text{w}c2 \) also looks better for White and the two bishops)

10...\( \text{d}5 \) 11 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{h}4 \) 12 \( \text{c}x \) \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{c}x \) \( \text{c}3 \) 13 \( \text{bxc}3 \) \( \text{w}c7 \) 14

\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 15 \( \text{a}1 \) with an advantage according to Ribli.

c) 8...\( \text{d}a6 \) 9 0-0 \( \text{d}5 \) and now 10 \( \text{c}e1 \)

\( \text{e}8 \) 11 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{c}3 \) 12 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 13 \( \text{c}d5 \)

\( \text{d}4 \) 14 \( \text{c}4 \) 15 \( \text{x}c3 \) \( \text{bxc}3 \) 16 \( \text{f}3 \)

d6 17 \( \text{x}d4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 18 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{w}7 \) 19 \( \text{a}f1 \) \( \text{c}5 \)
gave Black brilliant play for the exchange in Razuvaev-Tiviakov, Rostov 1993. It is hard to find any use for the rooks as all the files are closed or semi-closed. An improvement for White is 10 \( \text{d}4 \) !, e.g. 10...\( \text{e}8 \) 11 \( \text{e}1 \)

a5 12 a3! (12 \( \text{e}1 \) d6! was good for Black in
Van Wely-Tiviakov, Gausdal 1992)

12...\textit{xc3} 13 \textit{xc3} exd5 14 cxd5 \textit{a6}! 15 \textit{e}e1 with a modest plus for White thanks to the strong and uncontested dark-squared bishop. 14...\textit{c}e4 has been analysed by Barlov. After 15 \textit{d}d5 \textit{xc3} 16 bxc3 \textit{a6} 17 d6! White has the initiative. Note 17...\textit{xe}2 18 \textit{xc}7! \textit{e}8 19 \textit{d}d6, and White wins in a million ways. White is on top after 15...\textit{xd}5? 16 \textit{a}xg7 \textit{g}5 17 g4 etc.

8...\textit{xc3}

There are alternatives, but this is the move.

9 bxc3 \textit{a}6 10 \textit{d}h4 \textit{b}8!

Time has shown this to be the strongest option. 10...e5 11 e4 d6 12 f4 efx4 13 \textit{f}5 \textit{c}8 14 \textit{x}g7?! \textit{g}7 15 \textit{d}4 \textit{g}8 16 gxf4 \textit{e}c5 17 e5 \textit{d}4 was good for Black in Filipov-Tiviakov, Elista 1995, but simply 14 \textit{xf}4 would have kept White slightly better.

10...\textit{xc}5 11 \textit{a}4 \textit{b}8 12 \textit{xc}5 bxc5 13 \textit{xb}1 exd5 14 cxd5 \textit{a}6 15 \textit{e}1 d6 16 \textit{xb}8 \textit{xb}8 17 \textit{d}2 \textit{e}8 18 e4 gave White some pressure in Shneider-Brynell, Aars 1995.

11 e4 d6 12 \textit{e}3

12 f4 \textit{d}7 13 \textit{f}3 e5 14 fxe5 (14 \textit{e}3 \textit{ac}5 15 \textit{d}d2 \textit{a}6 is equal) 14...\textit{xe}5 15 \textit{xe}5 dxe5 16 \textit{a}3 \textit{c}5 17 bxc5 bxc5 18 \textit{a}4 \textit{d}6! with a good game for Black in Filipov-Savon, St. Petersburg 1996.

12...\textit{e}8 13 \textit{e}1 \textit{d}7 14 f4

After 14 \textit{f}3 \textit{ac}5 15 \textit{c}2 \textit{f}6 16 \textit{d}4 \textit{w}6 17 h3 \textit{a}6 18 \textit{f}1 exd5 19 exd5 \textit{w}g6 Black had nothing to fear in Romanishin-Markovsky, Biel 1995.

14...\textit{ac}5 15 \textit{f}2 \textit{a}6 16 \textit{f}3

White decides to forget about the c4-pawn and generate his own chances on the kingside.

16...e5!

16...\textit{xc}4 17 \textit{d}d4 \textit{d}3 18 \textit{f}1 \textit{xf}2 19 \textit{xf}2 \textit{xf}1 20 \textit{c}6 gives White something to bite on. Now the d4-squares is protected.

17 f5!?}

White refuses to compromise.

17...\textit{xc}4 18 \textit{e}3! b5 19 g4 f6 20 h4 \textit{c}8 21 \textit{e}1 c6 22 dxc6 \textit{xc}6 23 \textit{c}2 \textit{c}7 24 \textit{g}3 \textit{b}6 25 g5 fxg5?

I qualify this move as a suicide attempt! Actually, Black built up his position in order to be able to push ...d6-d5, and he had to do it now! Then White would be at a crossroads: 25...d5 26 \textit{xc}5! \textit{xc}5 27 \textit{h}5 \textit{h}8 28 \textit{e}3 \textit{e}7 29 \textit{d}1 d4 30 cxd4 exd4 31 \textit{xd}4 \textit{d}7 with equality is a suggested improvement from Korchnoi.

26 hxg5 d5 27 \textit{xc}5! \textit{xc}5 28 \textit{h}5 \textit{d}7 29 f6?

29 \textit{e}3!!

29...\textit{d}4 30 \textit{fx}7 \textit{f}7 31 \textit{h}3 \textit{xc}3 32 \textit{xc}3 \textit{d}xc3 33 \textit{w}xc3 \textit{w}g5 34 \textit{e}3 \textit{f}6 35 \textit{f}1 \textit{xe}4 36 \textit{wa}3 \textit{g}3 37 \textit{f}2 \textit{w}g7 38 \textit{w}xa7 \textit{h}8 39 \textit{wb}6 \textit{g}5 40 \textit{wa}7 \textit{e}6 41 \textit{d}5! \textit{xf}2 42 \textit{w}xf2 \textit{h}5 43 \textit{wb}8+ \textit{g}7 44 \textit{w}xb5 \textit{f}6 45 \textit{w}b7+ \textit{h}6 46 \textit{xf}6? \textit{w}xf6+ 47 \textit{w}f3 \textit{wxf}3+ 48 \textit{wxf}3
Queen's Indian Defence

\[ \text{d5+ 49 ~g3 i.xa2 50 ~e4 i.f7 51 ~g4 ~g6 52 ~b7 ~g7 53 ~g5 h6+ 54 ~g4 ~f6 55 ~c8 ~f5+ 0-1} \]

Game 64
Yermolinsky-Gulko
Seattle 2000

1 d4 ~f6 2 c4 e6 3 ~f3 b6 4 g3 ~b7 5 ~g2 ~e7 6 ~c3 ~e4 7 ~d2 0-0 8 d5!!

9 0-0 transposes to the main lines.

9...\text{d6}

It is also possible for Black to play for equality with 9...exd5 10 ~xd5 \text{c6} 11 0-0 a5 12 \text{ad1} \text{f6} 13 \text{e3} \text{g6} 14 \text{xf6} \text{xf6} 15 \text{g5} \text{b4} 16 \text{b1} \text{we8} 17 a3 \text{a6}, as in Horvath-Atalik, 1991, which ended in a draw after 26 moves.

10 \text{f4}

A possibly better shot for an opening advantage is 10 b3 \text{f6} 11 \text{d1} \text{c7} 12 0-0 \text{a6} 13 \text{e1} c6 14 dxc6 dxc6 15 e4 \text{b4} 16 \text{b1} c5 17 \text{f4} \text{f7} 18 \text{b5} e5 19 \text{c1} \text{ad8} with a complex struggle in Van der Sterren-Salov, Wijk aan Zee 1998, where White might get to occupy d5 at the right moment if he plays his cards right.

10...\text{d6}

10...\text{xc4} 11 \text{b5} \text{b4+} 12 \text{f1} \text{xd5} 13 \text{xc7} \text{c6} 14 \text{xd5} exd5 15 \text{g5} gives White some initiative, while 10...\text{f6} 11 0-0 \text{c7} 12 \text{xd6} cxd6 13 \text{a1} (13 \text{fd1} g6 14 \text{d4} e5 15 \text{db5} \text{c8} 16 e4 was a little better for White in Ivanchuk-Salov, Linares 1993, although Black can improve) 13...\text{a6} 14 dx6 dx6 15 \text{f6} \text{c8} 16 \text{a4} \text{xd8} was completely equal in Epishin-Korobov, Ohrd 2001.

11 0-0 \text{xc4} 12 dx6 \text{b4}

12...dx6 13 \text{b3} \text{d5} 14 \text{xd5} exd5 15 \text{d4} \text{d7} 16 \text{b5} \text{b5} 17 \text{xb5} \text{d8} 18 b3 gives White a small plus.

13 \text{c1}

13 \text{b3}? \text{a5}! 14 \text{a4} dx6 is better for Black.

13...\text{d5}

Black cannot enter 13...dx6 14 \text{d1}! \text{d5} 15 \text{d4} \text{c8} 16 \text{xb6} \text{xf4} 17 \text{xf4} as he clearly has severe problems.

14 b3 \text{a5}

14...\text{d6} 15 a3 \text{a6} 16 \text{e5} looks good for White.

15 \text{e5} \text{f6}?! 16...\text{c5}! 16 \text{d1} \text{f6} and Black should be able to keep the balance. Now he has to play some precise moves in order to equalise.

16 \text{d1}!
This is just bad. Necessary was 21...\(\text{Q}d6!\) 22 exd4 cxd4 23 \(\text{Q}b5\) when White’s prospects are slightly preferable.

22 exd4 cxd4 23 \(\text{Qxd}4\) \(\text{Q}c2\) 24 \(\text{Q}c6\)

24...\(\text{Wf}8\) 25 \(\text{Qxe}7+\) \(\text{Wxe}7\) 26 \(\text{Q}d5\) \(\text{Wf}7\) 27 \(\text{Qxf}6+\) \(\text{Wxf}6\) 28 \(\text{Qxd}6\) \(\text{Wxa}1+\) 29 \(\text{Qd}1\) \(\text{Wf}6\) 30 \(\text{Wd}7\) \(\text{Qf}8\) 31 \(\text{Wd}3\) \(\text{Qc}8\)?? 32 \(\text{Wd}5+\) \(\text{Wh}8\) 33 \(\text{Qe}5\) \(\text{Wg}6\) 34 \(\text{Wd}8+\) \(\text{We}8\) 35 \(\text{Wd}71-0\)

**Game 65**

**Khalifman-Korchnoi**

*St Petersburg 1997*

1 d4 \(\text{Qf}6\) 2 c4 e6 3 \(\text{Qf}3\) b6 4 g3 \(\text{Qb}7\) 5 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 6 \(\text{Qc}3\) \(\text{Qe}4\) 7 \(\text{Qd}2\) f5 8 d5 \(\text{Qf}6\)

I am not too fond of this line. 8...0-0 transposes to Game 64.

9 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{We}7\)

9...\(\text{Qd}6\) gave White a better game after 10 \(\text{Qf}4\) \(\text{We}7\) 11 \(\text{Qxd}6\) cxd6 12 0-0 0-0 13 \(\text{Qfd}1\) g6 14 \(\text{Qd}4\) e5 15 \(\text{Qdb}5\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 16 e4 in Ivanchuk-Salov, Linares 1993.

10 \(\text{Qd}1\)

White is concentrating his play on the d5-pawn. Both alternatives are worse. 10 0-0 \(\text{Qxc}3\) 11 \(\text{Qxc}3\) exd5 12 cxd5 \(\text{Qxd}5\) looks acceptable for Black, Hulak-Naumkin, Palma 1989, while Tyomkin gives 10 \(\text{Qxe}4?\) fxe4 11 \(\text{Wxe}4\) exd5 12 \(\text{Wf}4\) \(\text{Qa}6!\) 13 \(\text{Qd}4\) 0-0 14 \(\text{Qe}5\) \(\text{Wc}5\) as being better for Black. Clever guy.

10...exd5

Khalifman writes in his notes: ‘...the text move was played before and brought Black good practical results. I think it’s strategically dubious...’

The alternative is 10...\(\text{Qa}6\) 11 0-0 \(\text{Qd}6\) (11...\(\text{Qac}5\) 12 \(\text{Qb}5\) 0-0 13 \(\text{Qxc}7\) \(\text{Qac}8\) 14 \(\text{Qb}5\) exd5 15 cxd5 \(\text{Qxd}5\) 16 \(\text{Wb}1\) gave White a plus in Naumkin-Marinelli, Formia 1995) 12 \(\text{Qb}5\) (12 dxe6? dxe6 13 \(\text{W}a4+\) \(\text{Qf}7\) 14 \(\text{Qe}3\) favoured White in Petursson-Rozentalis, Malmö 1993) 12...\(\text{Qxb}5\) 13 cxb5 \(\text{Qc}5\) 14 dxe6 dxe6 15 \(\text{Qb}4\) \(\text{Qe}4\) 16 \(\text{Wc}1\) and White was slightly better, Olafsson-Rozentalis, Lyon 1994. Rozentalis generally plays a lot of these typical QID positions without too much hesitation, as he knows them very well.

11 cxd5

11 \(\text{Qxd}5\)?? \(\text{Qxd}5\) 12 cxd5 \(\text{Wc}5!\) 13 \(\text{Wxc}5\) bxc5 14 \(\text{Qc}1\) \(\text{Qa}6\) and Black is better (Olafsson-Arnason, Kopavogur 1994).

11...\(\text{Qc}5\)??

This move finds a refutation in this game. Better is 11...0-0 12 0-0 \(\text{Qa}6\) (probably the best—White has only a slight advantage now) 13 \(\text{Qf}4\) \(\text{Qxc}3\) 14 bxc3 \(\text{Qa}8\) 15 \(\text{Qd}4\) \(\text{Wc}5\) 16 \(\text{Wb}3\) \(\text{Wh}8\) 17 \(\text{Qe}3\) with an for White according to Khalifman.

12 dxc6! dxc6
White is close to winning the ending.

18...c6! 19 ∆xb7 ∆xb7 20 ∆c3 ∆c6 21 ∆g1 ∆e8 22 ∆g5 ∆e4 23 h5 ∆be7 24 e3 ∆d4 25 f1 h6 26 ∆d5 ∆b5 27 ∆e1 ∆f7? 28 ∆d8+ ∆h7 29 ∆xd7! ∆f5 30 ∆d5 ∆f6 31 ∆b8! ∆d6 32 ∆f5 ∆f6 33 ∆xf6 gxf6 34 ∆d8 c4? 35 a4 c3 36 axb5 cxb2 37 ∆d1 ∆c4 38 ∆d2! ∆c5 39 ∆b1 ∆xb5 40 ∆c3 ∆c5 41 ∆xb2 ∆b5 42 ∆e2 a5 43 ∆d3 a4 44 ∆e2 ∆c5+ 45 ∆c3 b5 46 ∆d3 ∆xh5 47 ∆xf6 1-0

Game 66

Ivanchuk-Timman

Wijk aan Zee 2001

1 ∆f3 ∆f6 2 c4 b6 3 g3 ∆b7 4 d4 e6 5 ∆g2 ∆e7 6 ∆c3 0-0 7 0-0 ∆e4 8 ∆d2 f5

Because of the trouble I feel Black faces in this line I highly recommend 8...∆f6.

9 ∆c2!

This quieter variation is an attempt to increase the tension. After 9 d5 ∆f6 10 ∆c1 ∆a6 Black normally equalises completely. The theory goes as follows: 11 a3 c6! 12 dx6 dx6 13 ∆c2 c5 14 ∆fd1 ∆e7 15 ∆e1 (15 ∆xe4 ∆xe4 16 ∆a4 ∆b8 17 b4 ∆c6 18 b5 ∆d8 19 ∆c3 ∆xc3 20 ∆xc3 ∆f7 was equal in Beliavsky-Brodsky, Koszalin 1998) 15...∆xd2 16 ∆xd2 ∆xb7 17 ∆a4 18 ∆d2 19 ∆d8 20 ∆c5 ∆f6 was then equal in Hansen-Korchnoi, Malmö 1996. Or 11 ∆e1 c5! (the new way to play) 12 dx6 dx6 13 ∆b3 ∆ac5 14 ∆c2 ∆e7 15 b4 ∆xc3 16 ∆xc3 ∆xc3 17 ∆xc3 ∆e4 18 ∆b2 c5 with complete equality, Beliavsky-Stefansson, Istanbul 2000.

9...∆f6

9...∆xc3 10 ∆xc3 ∆e4 11 ∆a4 d6 12 ∆ac1 ∆d7 13 ∆d1 c5 14 ∆d2 ∆c6 15 ∆fd1 and White had a little something in Skembris-Huzman, Beersheba 1993.

9...∆xd2 10 ∆xd2 ∆b4 11 ∆ac1 ∆e4 12 a3 ∆xc3 13 ∆xc3 ∆f6 14 ∆e1 ∆xg2 15 ∆xg2 ∆c6 was very slightly better for White in Stahlberg-Castaldi, Hamburg 1955.

10...∆a6

This is certainly not the main move, and in this game Black is nowhere near equality. The alternatives are:

a) 10...∆xc3 is the critical line given in Chess Informant, and also the most natural. But I think Black needs to come up with a new concept somewhere to play like this. 11 ∆xc3 ∆e4 11...∆e7 allows 12 d5! ∆xc3 12 ∆xc3 ∆a6 14 ∆d4 ∆c5 15 b4 ∆e4 16 ∆xe4 fxe4 17 dx6 dx6 18 b5, when White is just a whole lot better, Ovsejevitcs-Rehm, Berlin 1997) 12 ∆c1!, Azmaiparashvili-Gulko, Elenite 1995. The queen is much better placed here than on d2 because it leaves the way clear for the traditional plan with ∆h3 followed by f2, driving the bishop away from e4 and seizing control of the centre. Now 12...∆e8, to prevent ∆d2, is answered with 13 ∆c1 with the idea of f1. However, it could be argued that the inclusion of these points benefits Black as well as White. Instead the game continued (12 ∆c1!) 12...d6 13 ∆h3! ∆e8 (Gulko does not like this move and improves it with 13...∆d7! 14 ∆xd7! 14...∆b7 15 e4 c5! with counterplay – he is probably correct, although it is far from clear that Black has a potentially equal position, and 16 d5 seems good for White to me) 14 ∆g5 ∆h5 15 ∆xe6! and now White found the strong combinatorial continuation 15...∆xh3 16 f3 ∆b7 17 ∆xc7 and Black
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was in trouble, although he went on to win.

Earlier 12 \textit{W}d2 leads to a more or less equal position after 12...d6 13 \textit{Q}e1 \textit{Q}xg2 14 \textit{Q}xg2 \textit{W}e7!, when the idea behind developing the queen first is seen after 15 \textit{W}c2, when Black has the deep reply 15...\textit{W}f7! intending 16 e4 \textit{fxe4} 17 \textit{W}xa4 d5! followed by 18...\textit{Q}c6 and Black has good and natural counterplay. Karpov -Polugaevsky, Amsterdam 1981 went 15 \textit{W}f4 \textit{Q}d7 16 d5 \textit{Q}g5 17 dxe6 \textit{W}xf4 18 \textit{W}xf4 \textit{W}xe6 19 \textit{Q}xe1 \textit{Q}c5 and Black fine.

b) 10...\textit{W}c8 11 d5! \textit{Q}d6 12 b3 \textit{Q}a6 13 \textit{Q}f4 favoured White in Lundin-Skold, Sweden 1967.

c) 10...d6 11 d5 \textit{Q}xc3 12 \textit{Q}xc3 \textit{Q}xc3 13 \textit{W}xc3 e5 14 b4 saw White assume an advantage on the queenside in Larsen-Levitt, London 1990.

d) 10...c5 11 d5 \textit{Q}xc3 12 \textit{Q}xc3 exd5 13 cxd5 d6 14 \textit{Q}h4 \textit{Q}xc3 15 bxc3 \textit{W}f6 16 f4 \textit{Q}a6 17 \textit{Q}h3 g6 18 e4 was also better for White in Navrotescu-Marin, Bucharest 2001.

11 \textit{Q}e5!
11 a3 c5 12 d5 \textit{Q}xc3 13 \textit{Q}xc3 exd5 14 cxd5 d6 15 \textit{Q}h4 \textit{Q}xc3 16 bxc3 achieved nothing in Gritsak-Brodsky, Ordzhonikidze 2000.

11...\textit{Q}xc3 12 \textit{Q}xc3 \textit{Q}xg2 13 \textit{Q}xg2 \textit{W}c8 14 \textit{Q}xe1 \textit{W}b7+ 15 \textit{Q}g1 \textit{Q}xe5

This is a tough decision, after which the pressure down the d-file and the potentially very strong bishop gives White an advantage. Interesting was 15...c5!? 16 dxc5 \textit{Q}xc5 17 b4 d6, which Fritz came up with, although it looks like White is better after 18 \textit{Q}xd6 (18 bxc5 dxe5! gives Black a good game) 18...\textit{W}e4 19 \textit{W}d2 \textit{Q}e5 20 \textit{Q}xe5 \textit{W}xe5 21 f4! (21 bxc5 \textit{Q}xc5 and Black is fine) 21...\textit{W}e4 22 bxc5 bxc5 23 \textit{W}d3! etc.

16 dxe5 \textit{Q}f7
Summary
4...\(\text{b7}\) still seems to be playable according to theory. The older attempts to get an advantage with 7 d5 and 7 b3 do not trouble Black and neither does 7 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{e6}\)!. The most dangerous tries are the logical developing moves with 6 \(\text{c3}\) and 7 \(\text{d2}\) in reply to 6...\(\text{e4}\). Black should have a good grasp of the theory to play these lines, but if he does, then he can also count on equality. My investigations have clearly indicated that ...\(\text{f6}\) is a better defence than ...f5, but who knows what time will show.

1 d4 \(\text{f6}\) 2 c4 e6 3 \(\text{f3}\) b6 4 g3 \(\text{b7}\) 5 \(\text{g2}\) (D) \(\text{e7}\)
5...c5 – Game 56

6 \(\text{c3}\)

6 0-0 0-0 (D)
7 b3 – Game 57
7 d5 exd5 8 \(\text{h4}\) – Game 58
7 \(\text{e1}\) – Game 59
7 \(\text{c3}\)

7...\(\text{a6}\) – Game 60
7...\(\text{e4}\)

8 \(\text{d2}\) – 6 \(\text{c3}\)
8 \(\text{c2}\) – Game 61

6...\(\text{e4}\)

6...0-0 7 d5 \(\text{b4}\) – Game 63

7 \(\text{d2}\) (D) 0-0
7...\(\text{f6}\) – Game 62; 7...f5 8 d5 \(\text{f6}\) – Game 65

8 0-0
8 d5 f5 9 \(\text{c2}\) – Game 64

8...f5
8...\(\text{f6}\) – 7...\(\text{f6}\)

9 \(\text{c2}\) – Game 66
# INDEX OF COMPLETE GAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Game</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alterman-Liss</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasian-Brodsky</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersson-Karpov</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Tilburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacrot-Adams</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Cannes (rapid)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbero-Cebalo</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Caorle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bareev-Eingorn</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bareev-Karpov</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Moscow (blitz)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barlov-Beliavsky</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barlov-Sakaev</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Budva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belozerov-Nikolenko</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogdanovski-Cabriolo</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Bijeljina Dvorovi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borges Mateos-Spraggett</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Cienfuegos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramling-Almasi</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Horgen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crouch-Harikrishna</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danner-Yu Shaoteng</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Gyula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dokhoian-Romanishin</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Yerevan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreev-Seirawan</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Wijk aan Zee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzhandzhava-Chernin</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Lvov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehlvest-Chandler</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Lucerne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fominyh-Chernyshov</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Smolensk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freitag-Oral</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Graz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelfand-Karpov</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Sanghi Nagar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelfand-Kasparov</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Novgorod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gershon-Anastasian</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Saint Vincent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gheorghiu-Cserna</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanchuk-Timman</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Wijk aan Zee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamsky-Karpov</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Elista</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamsky-Yudasin</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Biel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Game</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karpov-Gavrikov, USSR 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpov-Polgar, Buenos Aires 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpov-Salov, Linares 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov-Gelfand, Novgorod 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov-van der Wiel, Amsterdam 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalifman-Korchnoi, St Petersburg 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalifman-Short, Paernu 1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lautier-Karpov, Monte Carlo (rapid) 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lautier-Timman, Amsterdam 1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magerramov-Makarichev, Moscow 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles-Timman, Tilburg 1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles-Unzicker, Johannesburg 1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neverov-Stefanova, Reykjavik 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolic-Lautier, Moscow (Fide knockout) 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petursson-Polugaevsky, Reykjavik 1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piket-Anand, Monte Carlo (blindfold) 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piket-Chuchelov, Netherlands 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piket-Tiviakov, Wijk aan Zee 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinter-Tompa, Hungary 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polugaevsky-Wojtkiewicz, Haninge 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portisch-Nikolic, Ljubljana 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portisch-Popovic, Ljubljana 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanishin-Korchnoi, Lvov 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakaev-Berzinsh, Duisburg 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salov-Karpov, Wijk aan Zee 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seirawan-Timman, Hilversum Match (5th game) 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silman-Gheorghiu, Palo Alto 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teske-Paechtz, East Germany 1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timman-Karpov, Hoogeveen 1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timman-Polgar, Bali 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tkachiev-Nisipeanu, Nanjac-sur-Mer 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolin-Adorjan, Hungary 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topalov-Adams, Fujitsu Siemens Masters Frankfurt 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tregubov-Shaposhnikov, Samara 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Wely-Korchnoi, Hoogeveen 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yermolinsky-Gulko, Seattle 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusupov-Beliavsky, Austria 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
queen’s Indian defence

The Queen’s Indian Defence is one of Black’s toughest and most respectable choices against queen’s pawn openings and is a favourite of world class players such as Vladimir Kramnik, Vishy Anand, Michael Adams and Judit Polgar. From the outset Black employs the dynamic principle of controlling the centre with pieces rather than pawns, and this can lead to rich and complex chess. The Queen’s Indian is a multi-dimensional opening which appeals to aggressive and positional players alike. In this treatise, openings expert Jacob Aagaard delves into the many strategic and tactical ideas available to both sides. Using illustrative games, Aagaard guides the reader through both the fashionable main lines as well as the tricky offbeat variations.

- Up-to-date coverage of one of Black’s most reliable defences
- Strategies and tactics explained for both sides
- Written by a renowned openings theoretician

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 manuals, such as Dutch Stonewall and Easy Guide to the Panov-Botvinnik Attack, have been widely admired for the clarity of their approach.