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I found every single reader’s comment of the ‘BLACK IS OK! or the presumption of innocence in the game of chess’ essay precious, one way or another. As you soon will see some even composed their own essay. It is a fact that I deeply believe in my thesis, that is ‘my truth’. But for me to find out ‘THE TRUTH’ in chess was always more important. I think, chessfriends, we had a fine, sometimes sharp dispute. Yet no one gets hurt! And, as usually happens, by teaching you learn a lot too. So thanks to you all for the free lessons!

Definitions of Symbols

+ check
++ double check
± slight advantage for White
≈ slight advantage for Black
+ clear advantage for White
≈ clear advantage for Black
+ decisive advantage for White
++ decisive advantage for Black
= equal game
! good move
!! excellent move
!? move deserving attention
?! dubious move
? weak move
?? blunder
∞ with compensation
∆ with the idea of ...
◇ better is ...
◆ with counterplay
N new move
□ only move
↑ with initiative
EPPUR SI MUOVE (Galileo)

(which means roughly ‘BLACK IS OK! forever’...)

(Warning: this page contains heretical thoughts. So do all the others!)

It is unknown when it all started, hundreds or maybe thousands of years ago, but everybody knows by now that having White is an advantage in chess.

Well, they’ve got it wrong!
BLACK IS OK!

Simply because White has the right (and duty) to play first, some people leapt to the conclusion that the ‘first player’ also gains the initiative immediately, and BLACK must be happy if he manages to clinch half a point by stubborn defence.

BLACK can only win if White overdoes his winning efforts, this kind of logic goes.

I formulated the slogan BLACK IS OK! for the first time eighteen years ago. I have been working consciously on the rehabilitation of the ‘second (to none!) player’ since 1985. However, I also have scraps of memory dating back much further: e.g. I used the expressions ‘colour superstition’ and ‘colour superstitious’ as early as 1980, when I was preparing for the World Champion Candidates’ match with Hübner. Over the years, I published BLACK IS OK! articles in a total of 57(!) journals of almost all chess-playing countries, in various periodicals offered my writings and game analyses to their readers for a longer time, in some countries (e.g. Argentina, Spain, Germany) they came out for several years. In 1988, timed for the Saloniki Chess Olympiad, Batsford published an updated and revised ‘best of’ volume, completed with some fresh work of mine. I don’t know whether it sold well, but it definitely ignited strong emotions and shock in the chess world. It provoked people to think. Something not everybody likes to do.

The tale of White’s advantage is a delusion, belief in it is based on mass psychosis. Both before and after the book came out, I could easily neutralise or even flatly refute all strictly CHESS-BASED arguments ever offered to support it. There were also ‘arguments’ I saved for the chessboard! I even gave some of them to others. Kasparov (we co-operated between 1979-86) and Peter Leko (’96-99) could tell you more. So could my opponents! The novelties, games and analyses in the book speak for themselves.

What you now begin to read is not the updated edition of BLACK IS OK!. Yes, the subject and the publisher are the same. Still, it is a completely different book written in the same spirit. The title is: BLACK IS STILL OK!

András Adorján
Introduction
I say: BLACK is OK!

Yes, I really mean it. BLACK is a nice colour, one of the best in chess. At least, I’ve always liked to play as BLACK, and have usually made a fine score with it.

But in that case you might ask why on earth almost every tournament cross-table shows such an overwhelming plus for White. And why the leading players – or at least a lot of them – simply hate to play with BLACK, and are apparently satisfied with a draw even against relatively weak opponents.

Yes, at present these are the undeniable facts. But why is it so? Is this just the natural state of things? I say that isn’t. The basic reason why people win more rarely as BLACK is that they simply don’t try! Everybody is crazy about White, players and theoreticians alike. ‘Win with White, draw with BLACK’ – that is the so-called ‘professional’ approach to tournament chess. I would sooner call it a miserable approach. After all, chess is supposed to be some kind of art, too.

Of course playing with BLACK involves a certain handicap. But how big is this handicap, and what is its nature? In my opinion, the only obvious advantage for White is that if he or she plays for a draw, and does so well, then BLACK can hardly avoid this without taking sizeable risks. But nowadays, when most players just want to survive when they have BLACK, you can expect them to make some sort of effort as White.

I think that playing BLACK can be a real pleasure. You only have to be well prepared and to have some original ideas.

Words, words. I don’t expect anybody to believe just words. Fortunately, I am in a position to show you some of the evidence...

(From the BLACK IS OK!
1988 Batsford book)
The Way It All Started
(The Story of ‘BLACK Is OK’)

1985 was a very BLACK year, and not ‘OK’ at all. My mother died. Those who have already had a trauma like this know more or less what I went through; for others I should say something about this kind of experience. It’s completely different to hear about an earthquake or a flood killing 10,000 people. This is all the same just a number, a momentary heartache, maybe with some feeling of relief – we are ashamed of it, but it’s true – saying “Thank God it did not happen here, with them reading about it over there.” There is a classic epitaph from a Hungarian cemetery in Transylvania (now part of Rumania): “Now you are reading; / ‘May he rest in peace’. / I wish I could be reading / that You rest in peace.” So when death gathers its crops on a large scale, but at a safe distance, it is – what a regretful fact! – not such a big deal for us. We are all like Tolstoy’s Ivan Ilyich: we can accept death in general; it’s more difficult to accept the death of someone close to us, let alone ourselves: we can’t even imagine passing away! The loss of a relative or friend, or just someone of the same generation, or someone very young, shakes us deeply. And it’s not only that we cry for the deceased, as we know from Hemingway that, hearing the bell toll, you should never ask for whom it tolls. It tolls for you. It’s preceded by the statement that it’s me who loses something with every death. That’s why you should never ask for whom the bell tolls.

We mourn for our loved ones. We mourn with pity, guilt, sorrow, and, feeling sorry for the deceased, we feel sorry for ourselves as well. We mourn over our own mortality, our momentary loneliness, and, first of all – at least in such moments – we think of what our existence is all about.

Every cloud has a silver lining, or so we are told. But can there be anything good in losing someone you loved? Isn’t it a morbid thought? Well, let me tell you just one thing before trying to answer this painful and eternal question. I was far from being as good a son as my poor mother liked to think. I was lucky to have the chance to soothe her suffering in her last hours a little bit, doing some penance while she was still alive. (During one of my travels abroad, I saw the question looking at me from wallposters: “When did you last call your mother?” And you, dear Reader? Do it while you still can!). I managed to tell my mother on her deathbed: “Don’t you be afraid, you of all people. You’ve done a lot of good to others in your life, and you are doing good to us even at the moment of your death. You’re reminding us to keep together, and
to leave as little debt as possible.” She, poor soul, was still teaching in a primary school a couple of months before her death (at the age of 70), in rather bad health. She was happy at the school, surrounded by children, more than anywhere else.

So what did this blow of fortune bring me? A good lesson. Experiencing that human life is ephemeral, I was forced to ponder the meaning of us being here. That is, what are we supposed to do? When I finally felt that I am able to come up with an answer, I figured we should do something in return for the oxygen we breathe in and transform into carbon-dioxide during our presence on earth... We must leave something lasting, something that lives on when we die.

That was the time when I started to think of building up a ‘life-work’, and seemed to have found writing as the right course of activity to follow. I had done a lot of writing before that anyway, from my teens on: chess articles, analyses, reports, prose and poetry, lyrics, occasionally even music. I am extremely extroverted, as a psychologist would put it – blessed (or cursed) with an enormous desire for self-expression. So I didn’t have to force myself to take pen in hand, and grasp it even stronger than before.

What I wanted to write was something original, novel and daring: some sort of a series of articles that have something in common, some kind of ‘meaningful harmony’, but still, each piece can be taken for a whole, with an essence of its own. I didn’t get too far for a while. Then I took to jotting down the theoretical subjects in which I’d ever had an original idea (most of them had already been successfully tried in practice, I even had followers in some cases, including top players) on slips of paper. When I had a list of 18-20 variations, I started to look for what is unmistakably common in them. And then came the moment when I suddenly realised that they all support BLACK’s case, with maybe two or three exceptions. Then I recalled that I liked playing with BLACK (or at least I wasn’t afraid of the ‘dark days’) already at the age of twenty (or maybe even much earlier; being a middle-aged man of 42, I rather watch my next step than recall memories with no particular reason(?), and what a great number of tournaments I had where I held most of my victories with BLACK, and so on. Today – being perhaps not only older but wiser as well – I can’t help thinking that it was not me seeking and finally finding my task – no, it happened just the other way round. I was probably predestined to do it, it was my calling, all I had to do was listen to the message. ‘It took me a little long, oh long, but the voice of my master was strong!’ – as the poet would say.

So I got down to work, and I started (as mentioned already in the preface to the book BLACK IS OK!, first published in English in 1988) with the Keres Attack, followed by the others in quick succession. The articles written with the help of my friends were published in the chess magazines of practically every country in the world. The reception was encouraging, not bad for a start (and not only for a start!). Then I decided to pursue the ‘BLACK IS OK’
mission, and this way committed myself to something much more than just a well-sounding witticism. It was (and is) something I did and do believe in, and my belief is getting deeper and deeper, if it's possible at all. In the beginning, however, even my best friends looked at this thesis with - how to say it - condescending cheerfulness, considering it a strange hobbyhorse. Not that anybody told me anything nasty - but it was in the air, and I could smell it. Well, after all, they didn't disturb me playing, and I kept 'building my sandcastle', with persistence and dedication. And, as time went on, the army of sceptics lessened, seeing my things published in various chess magazines from India to Singapore, from the USA to the (passed-away) USSR, all the countries of Europe, Australia, not to mention... yes, let's not mention them! What really matters is not what makes me pleased. It is that the people (judging by the reception of the articles) appreciated and enjoyed the results of the cruelly concrete analyses, created by myself and my 'brothers-in-arms' in a humble effort to 'straighten out' a little part of the world that had 'gone aslant'. It is not by chance that Don Quixote became the 'logo' of our struggle, as in the early days our efforts - to make people rethink things day by day instead of following dogmas - seemed just as futile as fighting windmills.

However, while at the beginning the whole idea sounded as heretic as - maybe the comparison is a bit pretentious - Martin Luther's theses nailed to the gate, nowadays there are probably very few people who completely reject the idea that it is quite tolerable to play with BLACK. I even received two letters whose writers went even further, one of them saying that there is a limited number of 'good moves' for each player in the starting position, and if someone runs out of these, he can only make things worse with every further move, and the 'right' to move actually becomes a nuisance. Now, as White starts the game, he will have to make the first 'bad move'. Therefore, with both players making the best moves possible, BLACK must win. Well...

My other penfriend challenged the view that it is White who determines the character of the game. I think he is right in saying that BLACK can also choose from a great variety of answers, influencing the position at least as strongly as White. The information that the disadvantage of starting is not unfamiliar in some board games, e.g. in nine-men's morris, also comes from him. What I am saying is, though, not more than 'BLACK is OK'. I will probably repeat it on my deathbed, unlike Goethe, who wanted - on the contrary - more light. Or another 'fellow-heretic', who claimed that "The Earth is moving just the same".

To cut a long story short, I don't think I could deny it in the torture chamber, unless... someone convinced me it isn't true! So my 'mission' is actually a scientific experiment to find out how each idea works in practice. It is all very nice that in my own practice playing with BLACK was rather a bliss than a burden, and that my results seem to support my thesis. But it is still rather like someone vaccinating himself with black pox, then with the serum he has invented, and
surviving. It doesn’t prove that the vaccine can be used expansively, only that this particular guy didn’t die. In clinical practice it takes 5-10 years to legalise a drug, to prove it isn’t toxic, to rule out all harmful side effects etc. Now we can similarly get thousands of games by organising theme tournaments, and see how my ideas stand the test of serious tournament practice. The statistics of these tournaments concerning wins and losses with BLACK and White is also interesting. Hopefully, it will not be as sad for BLACK as the overall tournament statistics of our times.

Finally, let me tell you that the ultimate goal of the experiment is not to confirm my thesis, and definitely not ‘by all means’. It is to discover the truth. Summing up the results after 5-10 years, we might realise that BLACK is not OK at all, or just a little bit OK. Well, it will be a disappointment for me personally that my hypothesis is wrong, and in fact it’s just myself and a couple of ‘kindred spirits’ who are able to use this ‘left-handed’ approach.

But my personal disappointment – which would come quite unexpected to me! – would also do great service to chess science, as a failed hypothesis takes us closer to truth, too. So the strongest motivation of this work is curiosity. Curiosity that keeps asking somewhere inside “What’s going to become of all this?” Will it prove to be a revolutionary theory, a fresh spring breeze sweeping out the ‘junk’ of all times, or will everything remain the same, allowing White to get a devastating 8-1 record at a match for the world championship in 1986? Well, if you think this is normal, and will be the same till the end of time, just think of the fall of ‘invincible’ empires!

I must tell you an anecdote: a woman went to see a psychiatrist and said: “Doctor, my husband is getting so funny.” “Why, tell me about it, perhaps I can help you.” “The poor fellow thinks he is a hen.” “A hen? Well, this is a serious case” – the doctor wrinkled his forehead. “And how long has he had it?” “For four or five years.” “Four or five years? And you are coming here only now? I could have probably helped you more easily at an early stage.” “Well, you know, Doctor, we are not really well-off. To tell you the truth, the money for the eggs came in handy.”

So my thesis might be totally refuted in the future, waiting in a dusty school equipment store for the teacher who can tell the amused students about what nonsense people took into their heads – a couple of millennia ago. But I sometimes daydream about another possible turn of events. It’s kind of a vision, and not entirely funny: some centuries from today triangle-headed, intelligent creatures with wooden legs and green bodies from outer space appear on Earth. These creatures, who are a whole lot cleverer than our proud human race, and also still alive, get down to studying the records of the history of our culture. Among other things, they come across my book called ‘BLACK IS OK’, and, as they can play chess (it would be a funny part of a galaxy with intelligent beings who can’t play chess, right?), they have a look at it. A little bit later they say with a heavy sigh: “What a pity! This poor devil was the only one who knew it. It’s a shame he
wasn’t important enough to be listened to!...

Well, dear Reader, only time can decide which of these possibilities will come true. As for me, I will keep ‘laying eggs’ like the hero of our anecdote. If you don’t mind, I will win quite a few games as BLACK, whether on firm scientific ground or just by the power of faith. In return, I promise that I am not going to push anyone to take my side. I will use only concrete facts, data of experiments, statistics, that is, objective factors to recruit new ‘converts’. It’s usually said about artists that they’re tolerated by the rest of mankind and saved from Hell for their works only. If my BLACK IS OK mission is successful, perhaps I can also hope for a place in Purgatory...

**Your BLACK IS OK! Talisman...**

To win in 40 moves is commonplace. But to win three games in a total of 40 moves with BLACK is something unusual. Let me present you with a modest bunch of three miniatures of mine. You can copy them from the book if you like and carry them with you all the time as a talisman. (According to the rumours already the ancient Romans wore talismans, but none of them could come to this. Poor Romans! They lived too early) Derive strength and courage from them when storms are raging in your games*. Remember: BLACK IS OK! forever.

*If the worst comes to the worst offer the guy a draw.

**My Shortest Ever**

Yes, the following game is my shortest ever – at least among the decisive games I’ve played!

*Lj. Spassov – Adorján
Sochi 1977*

1 d4 ef6 2 c4 c5 3 d5 d6 4 ef3
g6 5 g3 eg7 6 eg2

White could avoid the complications by 6 ec3 0-0 7 eg2
e6!? (7...ea6??) 8 dx6 (8 0-0 edx5
9 cxd5 is a Benoni) 8...exe6 9 eg5
exf4 10 ebx7 eb7∞.

6...b5!? 7 cxb5

7...a6

Seems we transpose to the Benko Gambit. The deviation by 7....
wa5+!? could have independent significance.

A) 8 ed2 wxb5 9 ec3 wb7 10
e4 0-0=;

B) 8 ec3 de4 (8...a6) 9 ed2
dx3 (9...edx2?? 10 wxd2 a6) 10
dx3 dx3+ 11 bxc3 wxc3+ 12
d2 a6!=;

C) 8 df2 wxb5 9 ec3 wa6=.

8 bxa6 wa5+!?

This is not supposed to be any better than the usual continuations if
White were to play $9 \text{\text{Q}}\text{fd2}$, but not worse either. And gives an opportunity for the opponent to go wrong. $8...\text{\text{Q}}\text{xa6}\text{\text{Q}}\text{z}; 8...\text{\text{Q}}\text{xa6!}\text{\text{Q}}\text{z}$.

$9 \text{\text{Q}}\text{c3}$?

Here it is. I couldn’t have expected such a blunder from a strong player, but if it happens then I go for the full point.

$9 \text{\text{Q}}\text{d2} \text{\text{Q}}\text{xa6}\text{\text{Q}}\text{z};$

$9 \text{\text{Q}}\text{fd2}$!.

$9...\text{\text{Q}}\text{e4} 10 \text{\text{Q}}\text{d2} \text{\text{Q}}\text{xc3} 11 \text{\text{Q}}\text{c2}$??

White was relying on this pin. The c3 knight seems condemned to death but it is ready for one more act of service.

$11 \text{\text{B}}\text{xc3} \text{\text{Q}}\text{xc3} 12 0-0 \text{\text{Q}}\text{xd2} 13 \text{\text{Q}}\text{xd2} \text{\text{Q}}\text{xa6} 14 \text{\text{Q}}\text{c2} 0-0$?? (14...

$\text{\text{Q}}\text{xe2} 15 \text{\text{Q}}\text{fe1} \text{\text{Q}}\text{a6} 16 \text{\text{Q}}\text{b2}$).

$11...\text{\text{Q}}\text{a4}$!

White resigns. If $12 \text{\text{B}}\text{b3}$ then follows $12...\text{\text{Q}}\text{e4}$.

$0-1$

**Heavy Traffic on the Chessboard**

The following game is full of bustle. The battle lasts only twelve moves, but it’s all action. Of course, rush hour traffic is perilous and dangerous to life, and one can never be cautious enough.

**Pal Petran – A. Adorján**

Sziráek 1985

1 $d4 \text{\text{Q}}\text{f6} 2 \text{c4} \text{e6} 3 \text{\text{Q}}\text{f3} \text{b6} 4 \text{\text{Q}}\text{a6} 5 \text{\text{B}}\text{b3}$

A move I never played before this game and don’t remember repeating it afterwards. I had known my opponent for decades and his habit of forgetting about time. Normally I played 5...\text{\text{Q}}\text{b4+} or 5...\text{\text{B}}\text{b5}!! - there is a chapter in my BLACK IS OK! 1988 book on the second subject.

6 $\text{\text{Q}}\text{g2} \text{\text{Q}}\text{xc4} 7 \text{\text{Q}}\text{e5} \text{\text{Q}}\text{b4+} 8 \text{\text{Q}}\text{d2}$?!

The effect of the surprise already shows. I think 8 $\text{\text{Q}}\text{f1}$ gives a slight edge in all variations.

8...$\text{\text{Q}}\text{d6}$ (8...$\text{\text{Q}}\text{fd7}?! 9 \text{\text{Q}}\text{xf7!} \text{xf7}

$10 \text{\text{Q}}\text{xa8} \text{c6} 11 \text{\text{Q}}\text{a3} \text{\text{Q}}\text{xa3} 12 \text{\text{Q}}\text{xa3}

$\text{b5} 13 \text{\text{B}}\text{xc4} \text{b4} 14 \text{\text{Q}}\text{c2} \text{\text{Q}}\text{b6} 15 \text{\text{Q}}\text{xb4} \text{\text{Q}}\text{xa8} 16 \text{\text{Q}}\text{xa6} \text{\text{Q}}\text{xa6} 17$

$\text{c3±}) 9 \text{\text{Q}}\text{xc4}$?!

8...\text{\text{B}}\text{xb3}!

9 $\text{\text{Q}}\text{c6}$??
9 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{x}}b4 b2 10 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{c}}c3 bxa1=\textbf{w}} 11 \textbf{\textbf{w}}xa1 \textbf{\textbf{w}}xd4++;}
9 axb3 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{x}}xd2+}
A) 10 \textbf{\textbf{w}}xd2 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{d}}d5 11 0-0 0-0}
A1) 12 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{c}}c1 \textbf{\textbf{b}}b7 13 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{c}}c3 (13 e4 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{e}}e7 14 \textbf{\textbf{w}}e3 \textbf{\textbf{b}}bc6 15 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{f}}f3 \textbf{\textbf{w}}d7∀) 13...a5∀;}}
A2) 12 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{c}}c3;}
B) 10 \textbf{\textbf{c}}xd2 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{d}}d5 11 \textbf{\textbf{w}}c2 (11 0-0 0-0 12 \textbf{\textbf{d}}dc4 \textbf{\textbf{x}}b7∀) 11...\textbf{\textbf{b}}b7∀.}

9...b2!-+ 10 \textbf{\textbf{x}}xb4
10 \textbf{\textbf{c}}xd8 bxa1=\textbf{w} 11 \textbf{\textbf{x}}xb4 \textbf{\textbf{d}}d5--.
10...bxa1=\textbf{w} 11 \textbf{\textbf{c}}c3 \textbf{\textbf{w}}xc3+ 12 \textbf{\textbf{d}}xc3 c6 0-1

The storm has blown over. White now apparently realised that in the confusion he had lost a rook. Therefore he resigned: 13 \textbf{\textbf{x}}xa6 (13 \textbf{\textbf{d}}xc6 \textbf{\textbf{w}}c7 14 \textbf{\textbf{w}}a4 \textbf{\textbf{d}}fd7) 13...
\textbf{\textbf{x}}xa6 14 \textbf{\textbf{x}}xc6+ \textbf{\textbf{e}}e7.

Patzer-looking but a good preventive move.
8...\textbf{\textbf{d}}d7 9 \textbf{\textbf{g}}g5 \textbf{\textbf{e}}e7 (9...\textbf{\textbf{f}}f6? 10 \textbf{\textbf{c}}c4!±) 10 \textbf{\textbf{x}}xe7 \textbf{\textbf{xe}}e7\textbf{∞}.

9 b4

Some months later, in the decisive match Soviet Union v Hungary in the Chess Olympiad at Dubai, Vaganian played 9 e3 against me. After 9...\textbf{\textbf{e}}e7 10 \textbf{\textbf{b}}b5+ c6 11 \textbf{\textbf{e}}e2 0-0 12 0-0 \textbf{\textbf{d}}d7 13 \textbf{\textbf{d}}d1 \textbf{\textbf{d}}d8 14 b4 c5! 15 bxc5 bxc5 16 \textbf{\textbf{b}}b2 \textbf{\textbf{f}}f6 BLACK was OK. The game did not last long till the peace treaty...
9 \textbf{\textbf{f}}f4 \textbf{\textbf{d}}d6.

9...\textbf{\textbf{e}}e7 10 \textbf{\textbf{b}}b2 0-0 11 e3 \textbf{\textbf{d}}d7!

An improvement on 11...a6 which proved just a loss of tempo in the stem game Polugaevsky-Sax, Biel 1985.

\textbf{\textbf{\linebreak Those Tricky Knights}}

\textbf{P.Hardicsay – A.Alordján}
Hungarian Team Championship 1986

1 \textbf{\textbf{d}}d4 \textbf{\textbf{f}}f6 2 c4 e6 3 \textbf{\textbf{f}}f3 b6 4 a3 \textbf{\textbf{b}}b7 5 \textbf{\textbf{c}}c3 d5 6 cxd5 \textbf{\textbf{e}}xd5 7 \textbf{\textbf{w}}c2 \textbf{\textbf{x}}xc3 8 \textbf{\textbf{w}}xc3 h6!

12 \textbf{\textbf{d}}d1
A normal move but with a wrong intention. My opponent tries to follow a plan of Lputian but mixes up things.

12 .attack b5 c6

\( \square e5 \) 19...\( \mathbb{w}7 \) 20 0-0 \( \sqsubset c5 \) 21 \( \mathbb{c}1 \) \( \mathbb{f}d8= \).

14 .attack a4 loses the right to castle and this element of the position proves to be fatal.

14...\( \mathbb{f}a6= \)

A) 13 .attack c6? \( \mathbb{c}8 \) 14 b5  attack c6 15 bxc6  attack b8 16 \( \mathbb{e}5 \) \( \mathbb{d}5 \) 17 c7? (17 0-0! \( \mathbb{c}x\mathbb{c}6= \) \( \mathbb{w}xg2! \) 18 cxb8=\( \mathbb{w} \) \( \mathbb{x}x3 \) 19 \( \mathbb{w}xa7 \) \( \mathbb{c}2 \) 20 \( \mathbb{f}f1 \) \( \mathbb{h}4=+; \)

B) 13 .attack a4 This is the idea: by this strange move White tries to eliminate or at least postpone the possibility of the freeing c6-c5. As usual it worked for the first time. But when the surprise value disappeared it became clear that with accurate play BLACK can still execute his plan, and getting even better: the bishop on a4 is misplaced. 13...\( \mathbb{c}8 \) 14 0-0 c5 15 bxc5 (15 dxc5 \( \mathbb{f} f6 \) 16 \( \mathbb{w}d2 \) \( \mathbb{xf}3 \) 17 \( \mathbb{gxf}3 \) \( \mathbb{x}x3 \) 18 \( \mathbb{d}d5 \) \( \mathbb{c}7\)) 15...\( \mathbb{x}x3 \) 16 \( \mathbb{gxf}3 \) bxc5 17 \( \mathbb{d}d1 \) \( \mathbb{f}6 \) 18 \( \mathbb{w}d3 \) cxd4 19 \( \mathbb{xd}4 \) \( \mathbb{xd}4 \) 20 \( \mathbb{w}x\mathbb{d}4 \) \( \mathbb{b}6= \);

12 b5 a6= It’s now in time. 13 a4?! axb5 14 axb5 \( \mathbb{d}d1 \) 15 \( \mathbb{g}x8 \) \( \mathbb{e}2 \) \( \mathbb{b}4 \) 17 \( \mathbb{w}x4 \) \( \mathbb{x}x1 \) 18\( \mathbb{d}d1 \) \( \mathbb{x}x3 \) 19 \( \mathbb{g}f3 \) e5=\( \mathbb{f}3 \).

12...\( \mathbb{c}8 \) 13 \( \mathbb{b}5 \) c6 14 \( \mathbb{a}4 \)?

14 \( \mathbb{e}2 \) \( \mathbb{f}6 \) 15 \( \mathbb{w}d2 \) c5 would transpose to the Vaganian game. Then 16 dxc5 \( \mathbb{x}x2 \) 17 \( \mathbb{x}x2 \) \( \mathbb{x}f3 \) 18 \( \mathbb{x}f3 \) bxc5 19 bxc5 (19 \( \mathbb{w}d2 \)

15 e4

The c6 pawn was poisoned. The ‘repentant’ move 15 \( \mathbb{e}2 \) is not something you gladly make, admitting the mistake. Still it was maybe the lesser evil: 15...\( \mathbb{f} f6 \) 16 \( \mathbb{d}d3 \) \( \mathbb{d}d5 \) 17 \( \mathbb{w}d2 \) \( \mathbb{x}d3 \) 18 \( \mathbb{x}d3 \) b5 (a5! 19 bxa5 b5) 19 0-0 a5 with a clear advantage to BLACK.

15 \( \mathbb{x}c6 \) \( \mathbb{f}6 \)! 16 a4 (16 \( \mathbb{w}b3 \) \( \mathbb{x}c6 \) 17 b5 \( \mathbb{x}b5 \) 18 \( \mathbb{x}b5 \) \( \mathbb{c}7 \) 19 0-0 \( \mathbb{c}8 \) 16...\( \mathbb{d}b8 \) 17 b5 \( \mathbb{x}c6 \) 18 bxc6 \( \mathbb{d}d5 \) 19 \( \mathbb{c}d1 \) \( \mathbb{c}7 \);

15 \( \mathbb{e}2 \) \( \mathbb{f}6 \) 16 \( \mathbb{d}d3 \) \( \mathbb{d}d5 \) 17 \( \mathbb{w}d2 \) \( \mathbb{x}d3 \) 18 \( \mathbb{x}d3 \) a5 19 bxa5 b5=!
16 Qd2?!

Doesn't look that bad. But as Chris Rea's song says: 'It's a road to Hell'. I will not lie to you saying I had already set up the deadly trap. But the inventing of castling some 500 years ago was not incidental. I suspect before that people had to face unpleasant threats against their king far more often.

16 We3 Wc7 17 Ac1 Wb7 18 Qe5 Ab5

A) 19 Ab3? c5 20 dxc5 bxc5 21 Ag6 (21 bxc5 Wxe4) 21...cxb4! (21...fxg6 22 Axc6+ Wh7 23 Axc8 Axc8+†) 22 Bxf8 bxa3 23 Axc8 Wxc8 24 Axf6 Axf6 25 Axe6 a2! 26 Axa2 Wc2 27 e5 Ac7+;  

B) 19 Axb5 cxb5 20 f3 Axc1+ 21 Axc1 Axc8†.

16...Wc7

In the frying pan on e1, White makes a desperate attempt to make a more comfortable place for his king. But as happens pretty often, it's the 'freeing', 'safe' move that is becoming suicidal.

17 f3??

Good Heavens! The feeling reminded me of one Christmas when my little daughter sat down on the floor by the tree among all the presents. 'What are you doing, Marta?' I asked. 'I am also a present!' she said. And indeed, she was. Our table was surrounded in a minute by the players of both teams (smelling blood) and when my unforgettable trainer Béla Papp approached the board, I felt that I had to make the decisive move immediately (although I couldn't believe my eyes and didn't really check it) otherwise Uncle Béla would think all the work and love he put into me was wasted...

17 Ac2 Ad8 (17...c5 18 dxc5 bxc5 19 bxc5 Ac5 20 Af3 e5†) 18 Ab3 Wf4 19 Ag3 Wxg3 20 hxg3 Ab5†; 17 Ag3 Ad8 18 Axc7 Ac7 19 f3 (a19 Ac1) 19...Ah5 20 g3 Af4†.

17...Qd5!!

White resigns.

After 18 exd5 Ah4+ 19 g3 Wxg3+! 20 hxg3 Axg3 is mate. I only gave the variation, you all saw, to warn readers: never keep your queen if you can give it away!

0-1
BLANK IS OK — or the Presumption of Innocence in the Game of Chess

In criminal law, the suspect is entitled to the presumption of innocence until it is proved beyond reasonable doubt that he is guilty. It might help me a lot if I was well-versed in law, but perhaps it would also make my argumentation bloody boring. So what am I getting at is that we should try to take an unbiased approach, and think of the starting position of the chess game. BLACK does NOT have to equalise, as it is not BLACK who has to prove anything in the first place! I presume — in the spirit of the presumption of innocence — that the position is equal. It is **White who has to prove** that he can get an advantage. And, as he has the right to move first, he sees to it immediately. Naturally, starting the game should not be mistaken for taking the initiative!

The significance of the right to start varies from game to game. In tennis, for one, the server has an enormous advantage if he serves well. The opponent may not even be able to touch the ball, or may return it so feebly that the server ‘smashes’ it at once. Or take handball. While the **attacking team has the ball**, the opponent can not do anything but line up in front of the penalty area, with perhaps one of them running about trying to intercept passes — and pray for dear life. All they can hope for is that the other team makes a mistake, or runs out of attacking time — but what they have is play at one goal! Football is different: the referee tosses a coin at the beginning, and the team whose captain got heads or tails right has a choice to make. And what do they usually choose? **Always** the half of the pitch! It depends on where the sun shines from, or which way the wind blows. The point is that this advantage belongs to them till halftime. Kick-off and the right to launch the first attack are not as important as this. It would be interesting to know exactly how many attacks and counterattacks there are in an average football game. There are a lot in any case, and there are very few goals compared to this number. Therefore both the players and the fans know very well that it is not extremely important which side kicks off.

In chess, however, the right to move first still sounds like an achievement. Not too bad, is it: White can move any of his pieces, and some of the possible moves are even good. A whole lot of them, on the other hand, are definitely foolish. Some first moves have been in rivalry since the ‘heroic age’ of chess for the title of the best first move. They are $e4$ and $d4$, and that is basically it, as $c4$ and $\mathit{d}f3$ often have no individual significance. Sometimes the players just develop their forces quietly, and the stronger one beats his weaker opponent. Which first move is best is an open question, and it is highly
debatable whether we will ever answer it. On the other hand, we can tell for sure which moves are out of competition. Such moves are, for example, h4, a4, g4 and b4. There are quite a few first moves after which BLACK can stop worrying and lay back.

The right to move first, however, is an obligation at the same time. We can all remember cases – even from our own practice – when this right became a sad necessity, or zugzwang. Take a simple pawn ending: opposition, and the person to move loses the game, regardless of colours. You can not say ‘No bid!’ in chess, and those who argue that White has the initiative and can decide what course the game takes, and which way it can not go, only partly right. On the other hand – as pointed out by Árpád Földesák in his article – this involves a certain responsibility, which is not to everyone’s liking.

And this takes us to the point when we can ask anyone, from highly-qualified chess professionals to devoted chess fans or people having nothing to do with chess whatsoever, how they think a hypothetical ‘perfect game’ would end? We may get all kinds of answers, especially from those not involved in chess, but qualified players will mostly come up with the same reply as a great number of world champions or chess thinkers since Lasker: the logical outcome of the game is a draw. This view is usually shared even by fierce attacking players who love playing with the White pieces.

Nobody has ever won a chess game without his opponent making some kind of mistake. Whether it is blundering a rook or just some minor inaccuracy, the refutation of which takes deep strategic insight and flawless technique, is naturally important from an aesthetic or professional point of view, but makes no difference concerning the general point. If one of the players wins the game, his opponent has certainly made some mistake. All games ever played in the history of chess serve as evidence of this statement, whether they took place on benches of public squares or on the stages of world championship matches. The ‘correct’ result of a chess game is draw. Why is it so surprising, then, that BLACK IS OK? If the game is drawn with both players making the best moves from the starting position, then BLACK can not possibly have any problems if he plays well.

Opening variations in theory books and game annotations usually end with BLACK equalising all of a sudden. I can not remember any analysis starting from move 1 where White suddenly makes a good move, which is awarded an exclamation mark by the author, who then decides that the position is equal. That is, in a ‘correct’ game – in the traditional sense of the word – BLACK equalises with good play, and then, so to speak, ‘holds’ this equal position, and the game is drawn. Well, that’s where the trouble starts, as it never occurs to me that any party should ‘equalise’ from the starting position. The starting position is equal, at least if you ask me!

As far as I am concerned, the whole of opening theory – even the works of high standard – is based on a fallacy, because they assume that White – within certain limits of course – can do almost anything.
However, if you take an opening book, and start to analyse positions labelled as ‘equal’, then what you will see is seven (or rather eight) cases out of ten (a moderate estimate) is that they are not equal (BLACK is better)! But this cannot be put on paper, this is taboo for some reason, BLACK simply cannot stand better, merely because the aggregate results of chess games show White’s upper hand.

In the real world, people do win games as BLACK quite often, of course. Hungarian chess historian Árpád Földéák even wrote an article in the Hungarian chess monthly Sakkélet in 1995, pointing out that a Hastings tournament at the end of the 19th century saw quite a few top players of that time fare better as BLACK than with the White pieces. Naturally, this is just a curiosity, and neither Földéák nor myself consider it to be typical.

Naturally, a lot depends on how one lays the foundation of the game. Lajos Portisch said something to the effect that he had tried almost all openings and defences during his long chess career, and found that about two-thirds of these were disadvantageous for BLACK. So there is the remaining one-third, and all BLACK has to do is play these openings and defences, and then he has nothing to fear! Of course he did not give out which ones he considered weak and which he thought were good, you can not expect a tournament player (he laid out his views years ago) to do so. Moreover, instead of asking a chess player questions, one should look into his games and see which openings he plays and which ones he avoids. I personally think that, although Lajos is a great player and he is right in most cases, the element of subjectivity is present with him as well as any of us. I saw him, for example, experiment with the Grunfeld, and he could not make head or tail of it. Somehow it was not his cup of tea. On the other hand, I have also seen him play strategies I considered much more difficult with devastating effect.

Personally, I do prefer playing as BLACK, but this is naturally the other extreme. I have invested so much time and energy into the rehabilitation of the BLACK side and the improvement of my BLACK repertoire that this way of seeing has simply permeated me. My repertoire is more ambitious, I play openings which suit my style better, and so on. BLACK IS OK means that everything is all right with BLACK, no more, no less and nothing else!

It would be worth surveying whether there is any difference between the statistics of games played by top-level, mediocre and very weak players. I have the impression that White has the better score everywhere. Why? How is it possible that White won 8 games at the World Championship match between Kasparov and Karpov in 1986. while BLACK only 1?? In addition their next fight (1990) favoured White again. This time all 7 (seven) decisive games brought White’s victory!! That makes altogether 15-1!! How should I interpret this? To say they played with White like geniuses? Or maybe (rather) they both played with BLACK like Patzers? Why does White have a sweeping score at great tournaments, as well as in lower-level chess (at least that’s how I feel)? I simply can’t believe
there has to be such a big difference! OK, it could be something like 55:45 in 100 games (not if I'm playing BLACK), but it is not like that. This is said to be a fact, a kind of ultimate, unquestionable piece of evidence.

A considerable part of my life, however, has been devoted to efforts to change this, because it is not a necessity! I have never been into denying or manipulating facts, but let me remind you that heavy objects had been moved about long before the wheel was invented. However, this was not a sufficient reason for not inventing the wheel! Furthermore, objects had been falling downwards long before Newton published anything on gravity, and everybody had been aware of this circumstance, they just didn't know the reason. So Newton did not discover anything new; he gave an original and correct interpretation of a well-known phenomenon.

The overwhelming majority of chess players try to build up a serious repertoire as White, and aim for safety as BLACK. They do not really want to win with the BLACK pieces, or can not imagine how it is possible. The opponent might, of course, overdo the attack and lose, but this is accidental, people do not expect this to happen. This is understandable, as it is extremely difficult nowadays to have ambitious, versatile and up-to-date repertoires with both colours. As I pointed out as early as 1988, people do not win too often with the BLACK pieces because they do not even want to, and that's why White has a psychological advantage, although it could be turned around. I managed to do so in my better days. Regretfully, I was so successful in it that I 'forgot' how to play with the White pieces. Still, BLACK has a lot of psychological plusses, which can be turned into a chess advantage, as people usually play for a win as White.

I personally think that Anatoly Karpov can be 'blamed' for this one-sided approach to a certain extent. In the best 15-20 years of his career, he had a 'shamelessly' good score in his White games, and therefore he was not forced to play for a win as BLACK. E.g. a considerable amount of his games ran like this: NN-Karpov 1 e4 e5 2 \( \Box f3 \) \( \Delta c6 \) 3 \( \Box b5 \) a6 4 \( \Box a4 \) \( \Box f6 \) 5 0-0 \( \Delta e7 \) 6 \( \Xi e1 \) b5 7 \( \Box b3 \) d6 8 c3 0-0 9 h3 \( \Box b7 \) 10 d4 \( \Xi e8 \) 11 \( \Xi g5 \) \( \Xi f8 \) 12 \( \Box f3 \) \( \Xi e8 \) 13 \( \Xi g5 \) draw. (Of course, he could win BLACK games as well, if he was 'rushed into it', but he usually wasn't.) And it is typical of most people to mimic the 'top guns' instead of searching for their own path. They easily succeed in copying surface elements like behaviour, choice of openings or even clothes, but not strength of character, talent, or skill.

Anyway, chess is an ancient game, and it is still played, so it is simply impossible to claim that BLACK stands no chance whatsoever. If this was the case, the game of chess as such would be 'over', as the lines leading to White's advantage would have been elaborated ages ago. But, as we are all aware, this is not the case. Those speaking about the death of chess, and computers, and the information boom, and all that jazz, are parroting half-truths. As long as it is still possible to come up with novelties of at least equal value as early as move 6, 5 or even 3 (cf. the
'Adorján-gambit' 1 d4 ♙f6 2 c4 g6 3 f3 e5?!; which 'went off' in Kramnik-Léko, Tilburg, 1998.,) this whole line of argumentation is simply rubbish! Another point, mentioned by Mr Földéák as well, is that counter-attack has a certain advantage over attack. It is a well-known fact that you can not launch an attack without exposing some weaknesses in your own position. When a boxer lifts his arm for a punch, he necessarily leaves some part of his body unprotected, and if the opponent reacts quickly, the outcome of his 'initiative' may be two or three blows that he will remember for the rest of his life. Moreover, it is common knowledge in the art of war that your troops must outnumber the enemy several times if you want to occupy some enemy position, territory or high ground. Most chess sacrifices are aimed at gaining superiority at a certain part of the board (most often in the vicinity of the king).

But let us go on! Another common argument is that White starts the game, and thus he determines the course of the battle and the character of the position. All BLACK can do is adapt to it. (Father! Forgive them for they know not what they are talking about! Hear me Lord!) To what extent is it true? White plays, say, 1 e4. This is a very good move indeed, as it deprives BLACK of the possibility of playing any Indian defence... There are a lot of things BLACK can not play indeed, except for rare move order shifts. So can we say that White has won the opening battle already? No way! If BLACK plays 1...c5, White can say farewell to the Spanish Opening, and there will be no Pirc, Modern, French, Caro-Kann, Alekhine or Nimzowitsch, either. And BLACK has quite a number of alternatives after 2 ♙f3, too: 2...c6, d6 or e6 are considered the best options. Now it is White's turn again to make a decision. The main line is 3 d4 cxd4 4 ♙xd4, and here BLACK can decide which variation to go for: Najdorf, Paulsen, Sveshnikov, Dragon, Rauzer or Sozin. All in all, the 'bidding' takes a while. For how long? It may be six, eight, even more moves. By that point, things will have more or less settled down, with the character of the play having been more or less established. If both players have developed their forces in a normal and healthy way, the position remains equal, at least in terms of opportunities, and it does not, and can not, have any significance whatsoever who is White and who is BLACK!

It is such a simple truth for me that I really wonder why it still seems to be some kind of 'black magic' for some people. In chess, the 'extra tempo' can have some significance only if the position acquires a symmetric character. Even in those positions, it is not always the case! In a sharp position, however, where both players fight hard for the initiative, attack, or counterattack, colours are of no importance. White's only advantage is that he can avoid sharp play in any opening, exchange the pieces off, and if he does it well, he will have his draw all right. Or he may even win if BLACK risks too much. On the other hand, I think there are three things that can, and do have significance. First, who the stronger player is. Second, who is in better 'shape', or in a frame of mind more favourable for chess,
that very day. And, last but not least, it is also important whose knowledge of that specific variation is deeper, that is, who is more familiar with the spirit of the position. This can make up for several categories of playing strength!

So far so good, but if both players make good moves, they will inevitably reach an equal position. This is the point when 'old salts', call it a day and agree a draw — if they can. It is not always possible, as they have team-mates, team managers, spectators etc., who all expect them to play for a win as White, saying that it is an advantage! This is where BLACK's chance lies. If White does not realise that he has reached the point when he has to play carefully to keep the game balanced, the process of the 'disappearance' of his 'advantage' may become irreversible in a couple of moves. A chess game is never in perfect equilibrium, except for obviously drawn positions. It is more like a seesaw in continuous motion. Perhaps this is what they call dynamic equilibrium, and this may well be the basis of the popular wisdom that once BLACK has equalised, he is already better! This means that, although the game is still balanced, the pendulum swings in the direction White has pushed it in. If White fails to stop the pendulum, BLACK obviously takes over the initiative, which may not mean too much in the strict sense of the word (that is, on the board), but it has important psychological implications. (This is the difference between human beings and computers.) Let's suppose you play a game, and have a good position in the beginning (or so you believe), and then you realise that the position is not so good any longer, or simply believe that you are actually worse. In this situation, chances are you will play badly from that point on, because you are disappointed, afraid of losing the game, worrying about what people will say etc. All these psychological factors may play an important role on BLACK's side.

There is another thing I have been 'prophesying' for a long time. It might be just my personal hobbyhorse, but I do believe in it: playing BLACK puts you in a morally superior position, as BLACK exercises the ancient right of the assaulted party: self-defence. And if he does it in a courageous and active way, e.g. sacrificing material, he will definitely make the audience sympathise with him, and — what is perhaps even more important in chess — his opponent will be astonished. 'This guy is playing as BLACK, and fears nothing!' — he may think to himself.

People play for a win with the White pieces, because they believe in it. They have been taught and expected to do so. (Except for those sad tournament situations when a draw is sufficient for White. He can surely have his draw if he does not set about it in a passive and cowardly way. In this sense we can say that it is better to play as White, but such situations are rare.) The beginning of mass psychosis — in my opinion — is when children are taught a lot of useful things like how the pieces move etc., and then the next lesson is that it is better to play as White(?!). Those who play this game at a high level (including
my humble self) know very well that there are some basic principles of the game, e.g. the bishop is stronger in an open position than the knight, and all that. Some of them, however, turned out to be nonsense as such, while some others must be thought over in all specific positions! The thesis that White has an advantage due to the right to make the first move belongs to the latter group. The whole thing is just so naive. In the last century, and even at the beginning of this one, people who declined sacrifices were dismissed from the club. It has been only for a mere (perhaps) fifty years that chess is played on a scientific basis, instead of just hoping for some \( \texttt{\textbackslash \&xf7} \) check, or some romantic mating attack without preparations.

A Russian chess journalist gave a very witty and sharp answer when I asked him how big White's advantage was: 'At least 50 years!' This is the point! It may well be even more, as it – most naturally – has its psychological reasons. What we call 'opening theory' has somehow always looked at things from White's point of view. Game analyses were based on the presupposition that White is better. What happened to me is the opposite of this: I could learn how to play with BLACK because I put a lot of work in it. Unfortunately, I did not have the healthy, down-to-earth approach that helps to avoid exaggerations, so I overdid it and fell for the other extreme.

Nowadays there are attempts at some tournaments to make people fight and avoid quick draws; nevertheless, most people play chess with the White pieces, and try to get their draw as BLACK! Although once the organiser is so ambitious, and wants to have 'eternal' games in his tournament, it would be so much more fun if people set their eyes on the full point with both colours! This is simply the way it works!

I am really concerned by the possibility that once the BLACK IS OK repertoire comes out in, say, five volumes, it will be believed the only possible way. But what about the people who do not like playing the openings recommended by me? I can't claim omnipotence, and tell people to play this or that, can I? Let us not forget that Grandmaster Portisch said 'two-thirds – one-third', and the repertoire I recommend is only a small part of this one-third! There are a lot of things I have never played as BLACK, but if I had to face them as White, I would have had no idea what to do! I am absolutely sure that the 'duo' of the Slav and the Caro-Kann is perfectly capable of solving BLACK's problems (in good hands, of course). If I live long enough maybe I write another repertoire book. In case I don't, I tell you the title: 1...c6! =

When I published the BLACK IS OK thesis in practically all chess periodicals of the world, as well as some books, people thought I was crazy. Still, since the moment when I made this discovery, I have been trying to prove and spread this idea in various forms, including 'philosophical' writings like this one, as well as analyses, articles and books. Just give it a thought:

'If White to play and win' was all chess had to offer, the game would have been exhausted and buried in oblivion for a long time, wouldn't it?
Dear Readers!

Let the real debate start now! Readers can come up with very clever and interesting things, and it is not laid down in the ‘rules of the house’ that everything has to be thought up by me.

So could you please answer the following questions (lazy people may only care to give the number of the question and a short answer, although it looks a whole lot better with an explanation!)

1. Which colour do you prefer?
   1. White
   2. BLACK
   3. Makes no difference

2. What is the logical outcome of a game if both sides play perfectly?
   1. White wins
   2. Draw
   3. BLACK wins

3. Is there any difference between the statistics of top-level games and games played by mediocre or very weak players?
   1. The higher the level of the players, the bigger White’s advantage becomes
   2. No difference

3. BLACK might even get a ‘plus’ at lower levels

4. How does the type of the tournament (correspondence, rapid, junior, senior, open, round-robin) influence the balance? If you have data of this kind (or perhaps ‘merely’ a few decades of personal experience), please share it with us!

We expect your reply at fax (36-1) 318-6259,
postal address H-1053 Budapest, Kálvin tér 2. II. 4,
or e-mail aa_ok@elender.hu

Most interesting, however would be your personal views and experiences – reading those reflections you’ll agree with the old truth: everybody is a whole universe. And everybody can reveal a part of the truth of chess, just like anybody is able to find a good move (even by chance...).

***

Up till now I’ve had 29 replies. After the list of the correspondents you can read what they all have to say, together with my reflections.

***
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<td>c/o <a href="mailto:info@chess.co.uk">info@chess.co.uk</a></td>
<td>Godoll, Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan H. Brewer</td>
<td>c/o <a href="mailto:info@chess.co.uk">info@chess.co.uk</a></td>
<td>Oudegem, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sandham</td>
<td>c/o <a href="mailto:info@chess.co.uk">info@chess.co.uk</a></td>
<td>Ukrainian Chess News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attila Schneider IM ☞</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Török Sándor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vleeschauwer Raoul (unknown)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Anne Caz

Having just browsed your website I decided to reply, I’ve only recently begun devoting a lot of my time to chess and decided two weeks ago to almost exclusively study BLACK openings and defensive games and since then I’ve won far more games than I have lost. I think the reason is that when you are playing White, **BLACK is usually happy to accept a draw.** The other reason I can think of is that most players don’t expect BLACK to go on the attack so they overlook attacking variations in favour of defensive ones, this has the effect of disconcerting them when they can’t find an answer and they lose the initiative even when in a better position. I’m not a particularly strong player but I definitely prefer playing BLACK to White.

1. I prefer playing BLACK

2. **The logical outcome of a ‘perfect’ game: draw.**

3. **Is there any difference between the statistics of games by the level of players?**

   Objectively I don’t think so, I just think that BLACK players hope at the maximum for a draw and will accept one too easily.

Modest and clever. It is true that many people have a ‘target’ for each game, say, a draw (even with White against a strong opponent). If they get the desired result, they are satisfied even if the position promises more. There is another well-known phenomenon similar to this: after a long defence in an inferior position, people often don’t realise that the tables have turned, and accept the draw.

* * *

From: Ian Ash

Hi there,

First off to answer the questions that you pose:

1. **Which colour do you prefer?** White.

2. **What is the logical outcome of a game if both sides play well?** Draw.

3. **Is there any difference between the statistics of top-level games and games played by mediocre or very weak players?**

   No difference. I would suggest, though, that at low levels White probably does have an advantage due to the limited knowledge of openings – increasing the likelihood of BLACK finding himself facing an opening that he knows little about. Obviously this does not comment on BLACK’s chances, just a reality I suspect of weaker players.

4. **How does the type of the tournament influence the balance?**

   I’m too new to chess to comment on this. I think I should place my comments in perspective. I’m 23, and have only been playing chess ‘seriously’ for around a year. And that, along with studying and working. Most of my experience is internet chess, and blitz at that. Having placed the ‘weak player’ caveat in place (smile), I’d like to share some thoughts.

   I tend to agree with you that BLACK is equal to White at the
beginning of a game, though I don’t know that this can be said to be definitive. I suspect that a lot of the advantage White holds is psychological at various levels, as you suggest. Somehow the game is always viewed in terms of White’s moves, rather than BLACK’s. Typically, working through a game one tends to sit looking at the board from White’s side. After all, White moves first and so it seems easier like that – but perhaps that results in a subtle shift of thought whereby subconsciously one views the game as an action by White and a reaction by BLACK. Our instincts tell us that to be reacting is bad – one must have initiative in order to survive. The mediaeval king whose castle is surrounded is lost in the long run, unless he can get soldiers out of the castle to counter attack. The sports team that only reacts to their opponent’s moves will ultimately be left flat footed. Of course, there is an interesting twist to this whole idea that ‘the early bird catches the worm’ after all, it is the early worm that gets eaten!

I’m suggesting that assuming White and BLACK both play well the result will be a draw. Consequently, the first person to make a mistake should lose (and of course, they should be the last person to make a mistake as well!). In that instance it seems to me that White is always one step closer to making a mistake than BLACK is; the fact that BLACK can achieve the quickest mate seems fair testimony in this regard. I must admit though that given the forced nature of chess (whereby each side must move in turn), this idea is fairly weak as BLACK soon enough gets his own chance to make a mistake.

Perhaps then the issue is not one of who gets to play first, and/or the associated psychological implications, so much as it is the cost of a mistake. Is a less than ideal move made by one or other side more detrimental to White or to BLACK? This is not an easy question for me to answer, perhaps a more experienced person could pass a better judgement. If one could solve chess completely, then it stands to reason that there would be a finite number of moves by one side in reaction to any one correct move by the other side. Of these, a certain number would lead to a draw, and a certain number would lead to a loss. If one could establish the percentage of draws versus the percentage of losses from every position for both BLACK and White, perhaps one could then make a judgement that one colour or the other is more likely to win. Of course, a forced win for either side in all variations would be decisive in the discussion, and would also sound the death knell of chess. (?? – AA see later) I feel like my ideas are fairly superficial, and probably for the most part echo thoughts already formed by more experienced chess players. Nevertheless, they’re new to me, and I hope at least of some interest to you.

Kind regards
Ian Ash

Dear Ian,

I was very glad to receive your quick response, and feel a little guilty to reply with a slight delay. I think your way of reasoning is
excellent. And a model of a fairly original and sound opinion. Talking about ‘White is acting, BLACK is reacting’ I suddenly remembered something remarkable, that is every single diagram in (almost) any book, publication is from White’s side! In my books I do the opposite, not to upset people at any price, but to demonstrate my devotion to BLACK’s case. It’s logical too since I try to give weapons to people for BLACK! White has been served very well in the past couple of centuries... Lajos Portisch liked this idea very much (other people call my diagrams ‘reversed’) saying: if I play with BLACK in the afternoon, I’m not a fool to analyse from White’s side! It’s clear to my mind: your full heart is needed to go into the fight, but it may (and must) be combined with objectivity. As to action-reaction, and the advantage of ‘plus’ tempo, it may only have importance in symmetric (or alike) positions. At least that’s how I thought till I had a game with White against GM Forintos: 1 Qf3 Qf6 2 d4 d5 3 c4 c5 (Open Hun.Ch. ’99) and was not able to gain any kind of advantage. The post-mortem didn’t show much either (except I found an improvement on one line – but of course for BLACK). There are other symmetrical lines which are totally harmless for BLACK: Slav exchange, 1 c4 c5 2 g3 g6 etc. Finally the Petroff may never have been as popular as it is today...

So, dear Ian, while I’m already circulating your letter as (good) food for thought, please do continue your contribution! Not necessarily only about BLACK IS OK, but with any territory of philosophy or psychology of chess.

And from now on, you may quietly leave modesty to those who need it much more than you do... Bravo!

András

*****

From: Alex Baburin

Dear András,

As for my personal experience with the topic, as most pros, I do better with White than BLACK. However, I don’t feel that playing BLACK is certainly a disadvantage – often my opponents pressed too hard simply because they were White.

I also worked with Morozevich who had amazing results with BLACK. For two reasons: he worked on his BLACK openings a lot more than on White. His opponents often over-pressed in the opening since they felt obliged to get an edge.

Best regards,
Alex

This is GM Baburin’s opinion, who is the owner and chief editor of the Chess Today fine electronic daily(!) Magazine*. It’s a small world: a reader of CHESS also mentioned Morozevich as somebody who plays excellently with BLACK. The ‘secret’ was revealed by Alex: it’s work. Not very surprising! The other thing that is very common: BLACK can win by taking advantage of the high expectations toward the White player.
*I am receiving this mag regularly and I do really enjoy the games and using the information it provides. I only wonder if there is any other daily service in the chessworld apart from the known websites? – AA

****

From: David Christian

Dear András,

In response to your request:
1. I prefer White.
2. The logical outcome of a ‘perfect’ game: A draw (maybe).
3. I think the higher the level of play, the more likely it is that White will win. At club level, the colour does not seem to influence results very much.
4. No comment.

It may be of interest that I have formed the view that one reason White has an advantage is due to the accepted printing standard for chess diagrams which are ALWAYS published from White’s side of the board. I think this causes many players to develop a much better ‘FEEL’ for White positions, as that is all they will ever see in books and magazines. When I am looking at a specific defence to use as BLACK, I find it extremely helpful to print out a few positional diagrams from BLACK’s side of the board to augment the notes I am making.

Regards,
David Christian

Believe me, we are not in cahoots! I have also noticed and reflected on the fact observed by David. Yes, we live in a ‘world of right-handers’! I hadn’t given it much thought until I saw a film on the subject: lots and lots of everyday objects are designed in a way that makes them difficult, even impossible, to use for left-handed people. During my entire life, I have so far encountered only one book, or rather booklet (DM 9), where the diagrams looked different. The anonymous author of the Closed Sicilian brochure proceeded in a witty and logical way: if he wanted to illustrate a typical motif from White’s point of view, he used ‘traditional’ diagrams, whereas if he had something to say for BLACK, he turned them around. This technique must have some educational benefit as well.

****

From: Eric Schiller

I am much better with BLACK, and prefer it to White. With White I am under pressure not to let the advantage slip and constantly over-play. I even use BLACK in many simuls!

Personally, I have always been reluctant to throw the first punch, I am a counter-puncher, and I much prefer playing BLACK. It is in man’s nature to defend his territory, not to conquer others! Or at least it should be.

Eric Schiller, USA
As regards simul s, I have only played BLACK IS OK! ones since 1986. When you are a ‘one-man band’ you must take every opportunity to show you really mean what you say. I don’t care too much about the result of an exhibition as long as it’s good enough (unlike Garry K. who wants to kill everybody in a simul and I have indeed seen him do this many times as well). What happened, however, was surprising: my score became better than before! I think the explanation is that when you have White against all guys they ‘dig themselves in’, while having the ‘advantage’ of playing White they become active, for the ‘better colour’ makes them brave. A fine counter-blow at the right moment sobered them up. On top of everything, they even think of me as a wizard. Funny, isn’t it?

I appreciate it when somebody doesn’t feel ashamed to say: ‘I don’t know’. (Only idiots believe or pretend to be able to answer whatever question they’ve been asked.) This is a phrase I use as well: I’m not going to make a fool of myself claiming that I’m an expert of everything. Hell no! Not even in chess!

As far as ‘Patzership’ is concerned, we’re all Patzers only in different sizes...

*****

From: John Henderson

(One more reflection on the ‘BLACK IS OK! or the presumption of innocence in the Game of Chess’ published in CHESS June 2002)

With regard to the latest debate raging within the magazine about players finding it easier to play with BLACK rather than White, dare I suggest that in reality this has nothing to do with the ‘Ol’ BLACK Magic’, as some would call it, but more to do with the fact that you tend to learn and therefore know your defences much better, and as BLACK you find it much, much easier reacting to your opponent’s advances?

It’s no secret that as a player I have far better results with BLACK than with White – particularly after 1 e4. When I started playing chess during the height of the Fischer-Spassky match of 1972, the one game that fascinated me as a beginner was Fischer’s handling of the Alekhine Defence from game 13. From that moment the one...
defence I studied more than any other was the Alekhine – for nearly 30 years now it has practically been my only response to 1 e4. One season playing on top board for my home team of Kirkintilloch in the Glasgow League, we adopted a policy of choosing BLACK on top board on winning the coin toss (and of course our opponents opting for White when they won). It was a strategy that took us to the verge of promotion to the dizzy heights of Division 2 in season 1975-76. But alas our strategy backfired in the final game of the season – needing to win – when our opponents won the toss and they opted for BLACK! It was the only game of the season where not only I lost but also our board two, who by this time was so used to playing White! Doing a rough ChessBase calculation of my games, I find I have a ridiculously high percentage of wins playing BLACK, mainly in the Alekhine. I’m sure if I could get an Alekhine each game my ELO rating would be increased by some 300 points! Of course, I have tried dabbling with ways of getting an Alekhine Reversed – and it’s not easy. I suppose this is the problem most players find themselves in when they have a reliable defence with a good score: why not play the defence reversed as White? Of course it’s not as easy as that – on the whole the extra move can be a hindrance. I’ve tried several times in my career to get a ‘true’ Alekhine Reversed, but it’s well-nigh impossible. If I play 1 g3 hoping for 1...e5 2 Qf3, there’s many lines of the Alekhine when fianchettoing the bishop can be so wrong. I’ve also tried 1 a3 and 1 Qc3 – each time the extra move gets in the way. Over the years I’ve faced just about every conceivable White way of playing against the Alekhine – one in particular almost catching me out. I was playing against Edinburgh a few years ago in the Scottish National League and had to play the redoubtable Geoff Chandler. Now Geoff’s a tricky bugger at the best of times, but he stumped me by playing 1 e4 Qf6 2 f3?! – as far as I was concerned this was a stupid move, but how do you take advantage of it? I thought for just over ten minutes on how best to reply to this obviously foolish move and, probably like 9/10 players out there, I’d come to the conclusion that what was called for was 2...e5 to take advantage of the weakness on the c5-g1 diagonal. I almost touched the e-pawn when the penny finally dropped: Geoff is one of the foremost Latvian Gambit theoreticians in Scotland – in reply he was going to play 3 f4! with a true Latvian Reversed! As it was I feebly opted for a Pirc with 2...d6 I somehow managed to win a rather complicated game – but not before getting into serious time trouble, and all brought on by the 10-12 minute think on move two!

Didn’t I say (some) readers write better and more enjoyable than celebrated authors? – AA. (P.S.: In the case of John I’ve found out later that he’s a chess journalist! – Likely one of the few who can read too... But for this story of his I think the real Readers will forgive him! We even thank you for your [free] contribution.)

****
From: Peter Hertel

Dear Mr Adorján,

In answer to your article in Rochade ‘BLACK is still OK’...

1. I prefer White.
3. The higher the players’ level, the bigger White’s advantage becomes. BLACK can be more successful at lower levels because one can prepare special openings more easily with BLACK against weaker opposition than with White.
4. I have data from my results in correspondence and face-to-face chess:

   In my correspondence games, the result is 59%-41% in White’s favour. In my White correspondence games, I scored 85%. With BLACK, I scored 67%.

   In my regular chess games with classical thinking time, the result is 52%-48% in White’s favour. I scored 66% as White, and 61% with the black pieces.

   The level of my correspondence games is by far higher than the level of my face-to-face games. I am an FM in classical chess, whereas in correspondence chess I am an (ICCF) GM in the TOP 20 (Elo 2653). I have been playing chess seriously for a good 30 years, correspondence chess for 26 years.

   I think the statistics show clearly that people score more points with the White pieces at higher levels than at lower levels. By the way, I am strongly convinced that the level of top correspondence chess (partly due to the use of computers) is clearly higher than in top face-to-face chess. However, I still think that perfect play leads to a draw. For this, one has to play the right opening, as Portisch has already said. So the Najdorf, for example, is completely OK for BLACK in my opinion. In principle, I share your standpoint, if I understand it correctly. Theoretically, BLACK is all right. In practice, White has the upper hand, as shown by the statistics, because it is more difficult for BLACK to find the right moves.

   By the way, I think we can not exclude the possibility that chess will be solved by computers in the future (perhaps in some decades, or even centuries).

   With kind greetings,

   Peter Hertel

Dear Chessfriend, Mr Hertel,

Excuse me for my somewhat late reply, and that I’m writing in English. The thing is my German is simply not good enough, therefore I had to find a friend to translate your letter. Something tells me your English is much-much better than my German...

As for your answers I thought the same about number 3 until a chessfriend and programmer compiled detailed statistics of the 1,370,000 games on his own database. In certain categories there are differences but not significant, always around 45+ 55% in White’s favour. In my opinion this is one of many pieces of evidence of the only real advantage playing White: psychology. Very strangely
this balance applies to correspondence games too, in which I perfectly agree with you: it should not! My guess is that this attitude is at least a few hundred years old, but maybe even the 'beginning of time'.

I don't quite understand your point of saying it's more difficult to find the right moves for BLACK. I think in a position when it's your move it's not the colour that matters, but your skill. If you pardon me this is the typical 'White man's way of thinking' on the chessboard.

Anyway, I thank you very much for your reflections, many other people (even from Nicaragua) have sent their opinions, comments. The benefit is not only the concrete figures, numbers, answers of yes or no. It sure helps to learn more about people's personal experiences and thoughts. Just like yours. If you feel like writing to me at any time be sure of my reply!

All the very best,
András ADORJÁN

From: Peter Hertel

In reply to your article in Rochade 'BLACK is still OK'.

A friend of mine is translating your English and my German, because my English is rather bad. That is far too much trouble in the long run, so we should exchange only a few Emails and concentrate on the main subjects.

Maybe there is a little misunderstanding between us. I meant that White's practical advantage in correspondence games should be higher and noted in statistics due to the higher level of correspondence chess. Actually this is not the case. Only in the case of correspondence players rated above ELO 2500 does the success rate rise to 57:43 in favour of White. In my opinion this is maybe a sign for a practical White advantage, because relatively stronger players are more able to use this advantage than relatively weaker ones. Psychology plays no or only a very small part. (?? – AA)

Another misunderstanding: I don't mean that it is more difficult for BLACK to find the correct moves because BLACK is another colour than White. I meant that BLACK is at a disadvantage (an advantage/disadvantage relationship not existing in your opinion) because of White's right to start the game. Of course it is totally indifferent whether you have BLACK or White in any position. It is the position itself that is decisive. In my opinion the positions are rather more difficult to master on the BLACK side of the board.

With best regards
Peter Hertel

Dear Mr. Hertel,

Many thanks to you and your friend for your quick response.

Talking about advantages and disadvantages, the fact that White scores higher in any category or age, correspondence or rapid has been known for a long time, I can only think of weaker players having a somewhat balanced result for the simple reason: they make many
mistakes (even more than us) so the ever changing picture of their games may show anything at the end. The thing is not the fact. The thing that I claim is that White shouldn’t have ANY advantage on the basis of clear chess reasons.

When you say from the very beginning BLACK has to fight for equality, because it is White who begins the game, if you will pardon me — it is total nonsense. It could only be true if the position were symmetrical or alike and even then it is not at all certain. Somebody wrote to me saying that White is better in the starting position for several reasons. I will tell you just the first of these. He says: every symmetrical position favours the one who is on the move except Zugzwang. Since White has no Zugzwang, but the right to move, he’s better. To which I answered: OK, make your move, if it’s 1 e4 I will play c5 and I guarantee that no longer is there going to be any symmetry (maybe by chance). Somebody else wrote: many people have the wrong impression of the chess game like action-reaction. Hell no! It is all mass psychosis for centuries resulting in the fact that (1) you are confident when White (2) you are better prepared too, because ‘this is the colour that wins’ (3) yes, you win more, because of these combined reasons, and so do all the players who grew up on the same education. You see the statistics, you take any chess material where the diagrams are always shown from White’s side. You go to studies and they all demand: White to play and win. But why am I talking instead of saying: I am a person who is not only thinking and talking about BLACK IS OK! — that sounds fine — but I have also prepared myself seriously with BLACK, believing that it’s not only OK, but you can play for counterattack, countless novelties, and I have won hundreds of games with BLACK, at least 60-70 % of them not only gaining a point but also contributing serious chess value. I cannot foresee any noticeable change of the ‘Theory’ and the players’ attitude. This is something I know. If I were to have the chance to conduct a BLACK IS OK! school, or if my name were different — say it was Kasparow saying the same thing — people would listen. I have been a GM for 30 years and studied hard the BLACK IS OK! subject for 18 years. For about 3 years (’96-99) I’ve been the trainer of Péter Lékó whose BLACK repertoire is still based on my ideas and variations. Not forgetting about the games he won with my weapons against players like Kramnik (’97 Tilburg), Topalov (’96 Vienna), Van Wely (’95 Groningen — at that time I gave him a Grünfeld novelty) and many others. I’m not talking rubbish! I don’t want to sell anything to anyone! But the whole of tournament chess suffers from psychosis, the so called theory is one-sided and many times simply false. When the opportunities presented themselves, I produced evidence of all kinds, much more than you would expect of somebody who was at first even ridiculed — but then those wins, articles and books silenced the cynics. I consider my thesis sound and very simple, I’m wondering for what purpose chessplayers use their brains. I’m wondering how is it possible that —
at least to my knowledge – no other of the great chess players, thinkers or trainers has ever got this idea. To avoid extra misunderstanding, I’m not proud about it. The way that I see even very intelligent, skilful, success-hungry people (by the millions) are simply prisoners of their habits. Pity for them. And pity for chess, because serious studies of BLACK IS OK! would surely bring benefit to BOTH colours.

I wish you every success in your correspondence games (once I organised a Memorial tournament for my late trainer Béla Papp), and I really find it a shame that there are such low-low prizes in this kind of chess. I suspect that people who play correspondence must be as devoted as myself and perhaps a little crazy too (as myself). You are fighting for only symbolic prizes. Scandal! At the time I organised the Memorial I mentioned that the first prize of the 1987 Hungarian Correspondence Championship was 8000 Hungarian forints. Now it’s tough to convert that into DM or Euro, but I can tell you it was peanuts. By way of comparison when I won my third Championship in ’93 I received 300,000 forints. I’ve never played correspondence, but a friend of mine for 35 years Sándor Dobsa (who is a pianist and the leader of the Hungarian Radio’s Orchestra Studio 11) has done so since long before we met. One aspect that I really admire of him and all of you is your ‘poor’ love of chess. On the other hand it’s time that you send letter bombs (to be stylish) to those who are responsible for your oppression.

Best regards,
András Adorján

From: Henrique Henriques

Hi,

I came across your article published in http://chess-sector.odessa.ua and it is simply the best ‘philosophical’ paper about chess I have ever read. I also like the commas around ‘philosophical’: it’s not philosophy at all, it’s simply sensible, intelligent talk (come to think of it, that’s perhaps just what philosophy is/should be).

I agree with your statement that no game of chess is won without a mistake. This should be obvious, but is obscured by the so-called ‘genius theory’. I won’t go into details now, suffice it to say that if mistakes were not around, the game, as you say, would be over: it would be a problem, and under the initial position we could read ‘White to play and win’ ... or ‘White is in zugzwang’.

Still, the presumption of equality is just that: a presumption, i.e., it is impossible to prove mathematically anything at present. So, the presumption that in the initial position ‘White is better, or slightly better’, is just the same, a presumption. You complain against this presumption, and show that action on these premises (marvellous analysis from Karpov’s style) tends to non-ambitious play for BLACK.

Now if the ‘position is equal’ or if ‘White is better’ are both presumptions, which should we take? Clearly, the second! And I suspect you know it. Your arguments (White can get his draw alright: White tends to over-stretch his attacking possibilities, etc.) show that, after all, the presumption
that White is better is not so wrong. But you have cleverly managed to take, from the BLACK side point of view, the best of it.

Still, you could argue that BLACK is OK all the time. But then you would have to claim that evaluations such as 'clearly better'; 'slightly better', 'endgame with good winning chances' are all rubbish. There would be, to defend your point, only two evaluations: equality and decisive advantage. That is to say, there would be no evaluations at all but only outcomes! Victory, defeat and draw. And, from the point of view of the final result, 'good winning chances' is in fact a non-description.

I hope you appreciate my opinions just as I enjoyed your article. Now I turn to your questions.

1. I prefer WHITE.

2. The logical outcome of a 'perfect' game: DRAW.

3. BLACK might even get a 'plus' at lower levels.

4. How does the type of tournament influence the balance?

I don't know, but I suspect it doesn't have any kind of influence, apart that stated in question 3.

Best Wishes,
Henrique Henriques
Lisbon, Portugal

To: Henrique Henriques

Dear Chessfriend,

It's me typing with all my 2 fingers... I'd rather not. But for the time being please find attached somewhat more to make you understand the background of my quest. (It was 'The Way It All Started') Since BLACK IS OK! is not something I want to sell as some curiosity in which even I don't believe. Just the opposite! Thanks to my own experiences (working for years with Kasparov, being the trainer of Péter Lékó for 3 years, the results, the contents of the games, the important novelties that were almost always successful) my belief has been permanently growing since 1985. I'll be back to you!

András Adorján

Dear Grandmaster,

Thank you for sending me your (more private) thoughts about the BLACK side of life. In chess, at least.

Two funny things:

1) I wasn't aware, before I talked to some chess fans here in Lisbon, that BLACK is OK is actually the title of a book of yours. Can't wait to buy it. Liar! I must write my thesis first, and the deadline is May, the 2nd. So then I will start hunting for your book. It isn't easy though, here in Portugal, to find a library with a wide choice available. Except for Keene’s books, but then, there are so many of them...

2) You mentioned your work with Kasparov and Leko. Actually, in my first reply, I was wondering about writing sentences like 'if you considered the standard Sveshnikov Sicilian position with Leko as BLACK, you could even state that BLACK has a decisive advantage'. Well, that was before the last round of the Budapest Tournament. But
then I must confess I am a weak tournament player, and I can’t trust my own analysis. Was Leko outplayed? Or did he simply over-stretch (as BLACK!) because he wanted to improve his final position in the tournament?

I’m looking forward to your complete answer. ‘Complete’ being a somewhat vague concept in these debates.

Thank you very much for your kind reply.

Hope to read from you soon.

Best wishes,
Henrique Henriques

Poor Henrique is still waiting, but soon or later I’ll contact him. I like thinkers. There are a few things I don’t understand in his first letter. He claims judgements should be clear, not like ‘slightly better’ and the rest. Personally I don’t like the ∞ (unclear) sign. When you see it many times in an ‘analysis’, you can be sure it took the guy about half an hour, and he simply didn’t even try to analyse positions he found ‘too complicated’. And still I’m using it occasionally, because in some cases it’s really too hard to give a decent, reliable evaluation in a limited time. And how about a rook ending with three pawns against two on the same side? In a normal position the weaker side can make a draw if he plays well. It is sometimes not even difficult. But when I annotate a game, I cannot call the position ‘=’ because the one who has material advantage is better. Still, we know it’s gonna be a draw. I created some symbols in addition to the ones everybody uses. If you take a look at the Chess Informant, you find some 3 pages full of symbols with explanations. But most of them are not used by anybody. As for symbols like ‘opposite colours’, it’s obviously because they find them needless. What I thought was: in the world of ‘wordless analyses’ let’s make some more, really important symbols. The first one was of course ‘OK!’ which meant BLACK IS OK! (White cannot be…) and that meant it’s not better, and it’s not quite clear, but from BLACK’s point of view it is OK. Then came: ‘ty’=typical. This is very important while analysing an opening. The following one is: ‘n’=normal, natural. (You can believe that I created this one for the rest of Mankind, not for myself.) Again something useful after a move that complicates matters with no good reason. Or: ‘L’=logical, ‘N?’=only the Devil knows whether it’s a novelty, ‘RN’=renewal that is for moves/ideas that were forgotten or considered weak by ‘Theory’, ‘O’=original, ‘F’=flexible, ‘TT’=mutual time trouble, ‘A’=active, ‘P’=passive, ‘Z’=zugzwang, ‘C’=compensation. I don’t think it’s complete, anybody may come up with some more useful signs, although I hardly believe ‘OK!’ or ‘ty’ can be beaten. Seriously: I tried to find words that are similar in quite a few languages and give important additional information. In some of my previous books I indeed used my own stuff (I’ve changed other Informant symbols as well, e.g. ‘greater board room for …’) is demonstrated by a square in which White or BLACK – whichever is ahead – owns x of the space). The trouble was that I forgot to use them too many times, and unfortunately not too many of the Readers were good at ESP...
Returning to the presumptions' question: Henrique, this (otherwise) nice fellow accuses me of doing the same thing that I protest against when others do it. After confirming that nothing can be proved mathematically, he says BLACK IS OK! is just another presumption. He sticks to the old one. Another violation of the presumption of innocence! The difference between 'White is better' and 'BLACK is OK!' is that while science is still hesitant, the first slogan is aggressive. Mine, on the other hand, only targets justice.

* * * *

From: Kenneth Bachman

As a first-time visitor to this website containing your article, here is a response to your survey. I have several of your BLACK is OK repertoire books (probably most or all that are available in English), but have never found time to read or study them (like most of my chess books). I am a self-taught amateur player (never had a coach or lessons). Rating is USCF 1892 (Class A). Played mostly local and area tournaments from 1993-1998 (club player, never in a high level competition), inactive since 1998 due to lack of time and preparation.

I seem to prefer White, but this makes little sense because results show I actually do much better with BLACK. For purely psychological reasons, I always seem to wish for White and am disappointed when getting BLACK, especially in a final tournament game on which the first place result hinges. The reality is that my results are much better with BLACK, especially in those critical games where I had hoped for White.

(I can't help thinking of the phrase: 'God knows what is good for us better than we ourselves'... – AA)

Perhaps it is that I feel I must try harder and don’t relax as much, or because of the reasons extrapolated at the addendum to question 4 below (which somewhat strays from the question asked)

The logical outcome of a 'perfect' game: Draw.

I believe if either White or BLACK had a forced win, it would have been found by now.

Is there any difference between the statistics of top-level games and games played by mediocre or very weak players?

1. The higher the level of the players, the bigger White's advantage becomes.
2. No difference.
3. BLACK might even get a 'plus' at lower levels.

I probably agree to an extent with both 1 and 3.

I do not believe White's advantage is larger at higher levels, but believe that higher-rated players are better able to exploit an advantage such as the minimal advantage of having an 'extra' tempo at the start of the game, by virtue of having the first move. Therefore, I believe the advantage of the first move declines at the lower levels and it is easier for BLACK to maintain equality or even to get a plus (IF he is the better player!). Since getting a plus
basically depends on at least slight inaccuracies on the part of the opposing player, it stands to reason that this will be more difficult to do as the skill level increases. With inferior players, the first move has less significance, as neither party is as skilled at keeping an initiative and driving home an advantage. With equal players at lower levels, play takes on more of a random character and the colour (advantage of first move) has less significance.

(I object, Your Honour, the right – and duty – of the first move is not necessarily an advantage! – AA)

How does the type of the tournament influence the balance?

I have played only informal blitz, some rapid or quick (G/30) and slower tournament play. I do not believe colour to be as important as comfort and experience in the openings chosen (His words, not mine! – AA) I believe it is more important to have a tactically-oriented opening at the faster time controls where cheap shots are more likely to be overlooked and win a game, and to play a more positionally oriented and complex game at the slower time controls. I do not consider colour to be more or less of a factor or influence on the type of tournament.

Personally, I have done much better with BLACK than with White, especially against higher rated opponents. Probably because I believe it is much easier to prepare a higher level repertoire as BLACK than it is for White. For example, to play 1 e4 as White, you would have to be familiar with many dozens of BLACK defences and have lines prepared against all contingencies such as the many lines of the French, Sicilian (a lifetime of study in itself unless opting out of the main lines with a copout such as the c3 Sicilian, f4 Sicilian, closed, etc, which probably make it easier to equalize against BLACK but probably also gives less chance of securing the advantage), Caro-Kan, Pirc, Modern, Scandinavian, etc., as well as needing to know intimately whatever opening you intend to play if BLACK cooperates classically and replies 1...e5. Yes, I think BLACK may even have the advantage in many lines such as the Sicilian, where White must be prepared for many main lines, but BLACK need only know what he will play. If White cops out with one of the Anti-Sicilians, then it is easier for BLACK (or should I be saying White?) to equalise, but then BLACK (and probably White) also finds it more difficult to win. I think the choice of one of these more equalising lines by White in the Sicilian is basically an admission that BLACK has the advantage. White tries to regain the advantage by steering for a branch that BLACK may not be as thoroughly acquainted with. This highlights the difference between having a theoretical advantage and a practical advantage. White may be theoretically better in most of the main lines of the Sicilian, but the practical reality is that such a vast amount of theoretical knowledge in so many branches of the Sicilian is difficult to acquire and keep up with. If White plays a main line, unless it is the same main line he also plays with BLACK, then BLACK is much more likely to be more knowledgeable about the
specific branch of the Sicilian played. He would have much more experience in it than White if he specialises in it and White only meets it occasionally. So there is a difference between a theoretical advantage and a practical advantage. This difference is important, because if it were easy to acquire perfect theoretical knowledge, then there would be no errors, no one would ever win or lose, and chess would quickly die out as a game.

Similar problems with the White repertoire are encountered in opening 1 d4 or others. There is simply too much theoretical knowledge to be prepared for in facing numerous defences, such as the Indian defences and various other alternatives. For this reason, having limited time to play and study, I have chosen basically simple double d-pawn openings for White such as the Colle, Stonewall Attack, Torre Attack, etc. With these openings, I find it much easier to play against higher rated opponents who have a large advantage in theoretical knowledge, but the down side is that it is much more difficult to gain an advantage except against weak players or those unfamiliar with the openings because they seldom play them. Therefore, I have a high level of draws as White. With BLACK, it is much easier to direct the opening into a line you are familiar with, and I have chosen a riskier, more aggressive repertoire. I tend to win a high proportion of my games with BLACK (defeating 2 of 3 masters I have played) when White opens 1 e4 and I respond with the Sicilian, but have a higher proportion of draws when responding to 1 d4, since I usually play defences supposedly leading to easy equality for White. When facing a master or highly rated opponent, I am much more likely to get to play my opening since they are more likely to play a main line open Sicilian than to deviate before move 3. Lower rated players usually opt for an Anti-Sicilian where a draw is more likely. A master would shudder at drawing with a much lower rated player, so is more likely to take me on in a main line and to take more risks. Therefore, paradoxically, I am probably more likely to have the advantage against a master in such a line than to even be able to get into such an opening against a lower rated opponent. However, this advantage does not usually exist in the opening – it is a hard-fought advantage usually attained in the middle game or ending, since such players believe they know the opening thoroughly (and usually do) or they wouldn’t be playing it. My tournament wins (when successful) have usually shown every game won with BLACK, but often a draw or occasional loss on the White side. I believe it would probably be much more difficult to maintain this type of BLACK advantage at higher levels.

Upon reflection, it seems probable that I have done better with BLACK simply because I have worked harder on my BLACK openings. Psychologically, I have probably felt that I did not need to work as hard with White, because the first move is generally considered to give an advantage, so I expected my White wins to come naturally, simply by virtue of having the first move and therefore the ‘advantage’. I expect my wins to come as White almost as a birthright. Since BLACK is
considered to be at a disadvantage, I have worked much more industriously at my BLACK repertoire. So my BLACK repertoire is basically at a much higher level in general than my White repertoire, which basically consists of 'beginner' openings that I expect to carry me through without really trying or having to work as hard at it. Since there isn't sufficient time for everything, I choose to concentrate on the 'weak' spots, which, since BLACK is supposed to be at a disadvantage, happens to be the BLACK repertoire.

To sum up, I believe the specific openings chosen (and becoming proficient in complicated openings) have much more to do with having the advantage and winning, than whether playing with the White or BLACK pieces.

At the higher levels, my perception is that many players are content to draw with BLACK and conserve their concentration and energy for their games with White. I believe it is probably more the perception of disadvantage with BLACK than any actual disadvantage in some openings, though with many openings it is necessary for BLACK to defend patiently for many moves just to hope for a draw. The problem may lie in the openings and lines chosen, rather than any innate disadvantage as BLACK. It may be simply that BLACK is at a disadvantage in many lines, but not all lines. This is the reason many openings are no longer played much today, such as the Steinitz Defence to the Ruy Lopez, where BLACK must suffer for many moves and only hope to equalize with perfect play, without much chance for ever attaining the advantage. It may be that 50 to 100 or more years of BLACK suffering from openings giving inferior chances to the 2nd player has contributed to the fallacy that BLACK is at a disadvantage. I believe you mentioned this point, or a similar statement, in the essay. The openings have changed radically in the last 50 – 100 years, but prejudices and beliefs are much slower to change.

(Sorry, this has ended up being more of an essay of my own, than the quick survey response I originally intended.)

Kenneth Bachman
Florida

I can't help repeating that readers (at least many of them) can write better than many so-called experts. And they are not as expensive! My dream is to publish a BLACK IS OK! book written entirely by readers. I'm sure it would be a runaway success. And I would run away with all the money! And start a new life! If it is going to happen (that is my desperate hope), Mr Bachman has already a seat.

Whenever you teach, you learn as well. When I wrote the essay I knew that if it reached the right people (those who not only think, but also write to me) I shall be getting a few surprises. And I may learn or re-discover forgotten truths. In the case of the letter above it is just that: opposite to the commonplace view that White begins and directs the game, the truth is – as Mr Bachman wrote – it is even easier to build up a repertoire for BLACK, because when you play 1 e4 you have to be reasonably well prepared.
against every ‘proper’ variation. And there are a hell of a lot of them! When playing BLACK, you pick not one, but two different main lines and learn them very well (including on the way the sub-variations) with much less energy. The same applies to 1 d4 and 1 c4. Strange as it may seem, it is the TRUTH! Thank you for reminding us, friend from Florida!

***

From: Kevin Bonham

Dear GM Adorján,

I saw your article advocating BLACK as an equal force in Australian Chess Forum and your survey questions. These are my answers (I am merely a ‘strong club player’ rated in the 1700s ACF, probably about 1900 USCF equivalent).

1. With best play the game is a draw. There are so few symmetrical positions where the right to move is a winning advantage and even fewer where it is a losing disadvantage that it is not plausible that the start position is a forced win – especially as most of these exceptional positions have far less pieces on the board.

I still think White has a ‘very slight’ edge in practical chances, and not just because people feel inferior with BLACK. Because the extra move can be used to make a threat before the opponent can make one, I expect that this increases the risk of a failed defence to that threat through bad play. This may be simply a prejudice on my part. (I agree – AA) If you play well enough, it doesn’t matter.

2. It makes little difference to me whether I am BLACK or White. My score with White is only 2% better whereas most players are supposedly 10% or more better. Against weak players I like BLACK because I play the French and weak players usually lose a pawn against it inside a dozen moves. It all depends on the opponent. Strangely enough I feel that I have more margin for error with BLACK. I can mess up a French or Slav very badly and still draw because the position is so solid. With White I am sometimes tempted into too-loose positions and find that playing reverse defences can give BLACK too much choice.

3. I don’t think the level of play makes much difference. I tested this in a local and very weak under-12s event over about 250 games recently and White scored about 58%. When I asked the children most said they preferred White. The stronger ones who had moved beyond 1 e4 e5 often liked BLACK though and scored more evenly by colour. I think you can train a strong junior to do very well with BLACK (especially if you steer them away from symmetrical defences) and maybe this is a key to getting less colour bias in our perceptions.

4. I’m not sure if the type of event matters. I have seen no data on this.

Kevin Bonham
Hobart, Tasmania.
Do you know, where Tasmania is?
It’s a part of Australia. They are not
a big chess society, but they still
have their own chess magazine.
Only 500 copies. Years ago I used
to send them my BLACK IS OK!
articles. I wonder if Mr Bonham
read them?

I like it when somebody has a
style and my faraway chessfriend
certainly does have.

There are two things I’d like to
mention.

1. I’m struggling against expres-
sions like ‘extra tempo’, ‘plus
tempo’. There are no such things in
chess. If they were it would mean
that the one who has the ‘extra
tempo’ can make one EXTRA
MOVE! Is it so? No, it isn’t! Also to
call White the ‘first player’ while
BLACK only qualifies for ‘second’
is an obvious manipulation. It
makes BLACK secondary and thus
also the people when they are
playing BLACK.

2. It’s so funny that whenever
people talk about initiative, attack
they always suppose that the
‘target’s’ only choice is defence.
For God’s sake! Never heard of
counter-attack? Which in many
cases can be more effective than the
attack? Come on!

* * * *

From: Dr. Altanoch Gendengin

Dear András,

I’m from Mongolia and have the
FM title. I’m trying to answer your
questions.

1. Which colour do you prefer?
Makes no difference.

2. The logical outcome of a

3. BLACK might even get a
‘plus’ at lower levels.

4. How does the type of the
tournament influence the balance?
correspondence – equal
rapid – more White
junior – equal
senior – equal
open – equal
round-robin – more White

Dr. Altanoch Gendengin
Mongolia

I don’t remember the exact date
when we sent ‘BLACK IS OK, or the
Presumption of Innocence in the
Royal Game’ essay to all FIDE
Federations. Should be sometime
late Spring on a Sunday. And – to
our great surprise – we had the first
‘swallow’ from Mongolia in 2
hours! I did thank him immediately
and encouraged the Doctor to write
more freely about his personal
experiences. It’s a pity, but he
didn’t. Still, compared to all other
FIDE Federations the Mongolian is
the most active. Although every
single one got the same material I
think in three waves, none of them
bothered to reply at least with
‘please don’t bother’. No
comment...
From: Ramón Rafael Barrios

1. I prefer BLACK. A psychological handicap is always felt by the White player, who has an 'obligation' to win.

2. The logical outcome of a 'perfect' game: Draw. The harmony and the equilibrium must be maintained.

3. There is no difference between the statistics of top-level games and games played by mediocre or very weak players.

4. According to our personal experience, when the tournament is round robin or swiss system, BLACK easily can get at least a draw. The opposite is the case when it is a match competition.

FIDE Master Ramón Rafael Barrios
Managua, Nicaragua

Dear Ramon,

My questions had neither expectations nor guidance towards the 'right' answers. Still, I confess I liked your reply a lot. People usually do nothing apart from memorising WINNING variations. Even so we all know they don't exist. Write more of your thoughts if you have time! Thanks!

Greetings András

The picture is controversial, but it is natural in the case of such a complex subject. And I feel lucky that in most cases I'm able to enclose an address/phone/fax/e-mail to the letters. Otherwise some could have the suspicion that all of them were written by me (sometimes when I get lonely I seriously consider this option...) as practising my style! Specially in case of R.R.Barrios, whose message could really be written by myself...

* * * *

From: Dirceu Viana

Hi again,

I think I read your thesis in a chess site 'Chess Siberian', I think so ... good argument but statistics so far prove the opposite ... anyway, maybe you are right because you really believe BLACK is OK!

I have one copy, sometimes I study some variations because I don't know how to play against 1 d4! ... well, I love chess as you, so its not a big problem because I'm not a professional...

As a trainer you should think in terms of constructing a restricted subscription website (blackis.ok.com!) ... you have a brand! Adorján ... US$30 a year and the student could build his own repertoire based on your suggestions and ideas and analysis ... every member could share some information ... 3 or 4 variations against 1 e4 and 3 or 4 against 1 d4 ... a complete repertoire! Why not?...much better than opening books (they get old!) ... some English masters are trying to do that but they don't have a brand!
I have some very close friends here in Rio you probably know ... Toth family (Peter and Christian)

Now some answers...

1. I prefer White ... to play like young Spassky!!

2. The logical outcome of a ‘perfect’ game: You are right... Draw!

3. The higher the level of the players, the bigger White’s advantage becomes ... but you have a point here, some players are proving the opposite is true!

4. How does the type of the tournament influence the balance?

I can’t help here! But I thing it doesn’t matter ... but if you play e4, I prefer to have BLACK!

Best wishes
Dirceu Viana

***

From: Friedrich Wolfenter

Dear Mr Adorján,

I read your article ‘BLACK is still OK’ in Rochade Europa (6/2003) with great interest.

First the answers to your 4 questions:

1. I prefer White.


3. The higher the level of the players, the bigger White’s advantage becomes.

4. In my experience, the advantage of making the first move doesn’t play such a significant role in correspondence chess as it does in face-to-face chess.

I have been playing correspondence chess for more than 30 years, my current ELO is 2491. At the moment I am playing in an ICCF Master Norm Tournament.

My last 50 correspondence games brought the following results:

As White: 14 wins, 9 draws, 1 loss.

As BLACK: 12 wins, 8 draws, 6 losses.

In my opinion, the DRAWING RANGE plays a significant role. As you know very well yourself, this range is relatively broad, which is proved by the fact that BLACK may be able to hold a draw when he is one, or, in exceptional cases, even two pawns down. This supports your thesis that with equally good, i.e. correct play from both sides, a game ends (has to end) with a draw. However, I make the restriction that it is somewhat more difficult for BLACK than for White to stay within the drawing range. In certain opening variations, the extra tempo does count. It follows from this that White suffers fewer losses than BLACK, whereas the wins of the two sides are roughly equal.

In other words: the right to play first does NOT guarantee an automatic win, but it is indirectly responsible for BLACK’s slightly higher loss ratio.

I suggest that statistical assessments should be made
primarily in master-level correspondence games. These games are usually analysed more conscientiously than face-to-face games. The reasons for this are:

a) unlimited thinking time

b) the lack of psychological or physical factors, which have an important influence on the outcome of the game.

I hope my little contribution to your subject is helpful to you.

Best regards,
Friedrich Wolfenter

Dear Chessfriend, Mr Wolfenter,

Excuse me please for answering a little late and in English. The trouble is my German is simply not good enough, and I had to find somebody to help correctly understand your letter.

I'm thinking hard, but still I can't recall anybody else but you, who thought/thinks (including myself) that a perfect game would bring BLACK the victory (2/3). Or is it a misunderstanding? (It WAS a misunderstanding)

As to number 3) I thought the same as you (1) until a friend of mine compiled tremendous statistics from many points of view and measuring the categories of his database that has 1,370,000 games. The result briefly is: White is up by 55 (or lower) to 45 (or upper) in every single field. Including correspondence chess as well, to my surprise, because I supposed, like you the expert, that impersonality and the lack of time trouble (if I know it well, correspondence players only got into time trouble if they take part too many tournaments at the same time) reduces the psychological pressure BLACK usually suffers. Your reasoning is rather witty, and I really regret that a symposium of people like yourself and unorthodox thinking people remains a dream. Yet when you are talking about the difficulties of BLACK and the advantage of White – especially in certain opening variations – let me be primitive. The thing is, yes, there are at least suspect defences. Just like openings! THIS IS WHAT YOU HAVE TO AVOID. IT IS AS SIMPLE AS THAT. Most people don't believe in BLACK and therefore go into variations that are from the very beginning slightly worse. They suffer the whole bloody game through in the grave hope of survival and then there comes tomorrow in which they will have ALL THE WHITE PIECES. The thing is, Mr Wolfenter, anybody at his/her level, without any personal help and just by using GOOD books, a database and mostly the head everybody has above the neck, could radically improve not only his/her personal score, but also their understanding of the whole Royal Game. You know it's not easy, but it's simple. If you believe you can learn skiing, and you're stubborn enough, you will. Unless you are missing a leg! That is of course bad luck. But let not be this line the last one. Some 40-50 years ago a Hungarian man, Károly Takács won the Olympic Gold in 'sport pistol shooting' (surely this is not the right expression, but you understand). Some time after this he lost his right hand. And you guessed
what happened. He has learned to shoot with his left hand, and won the Olympiad again. With this I say so long (not good-bye) to you, and I repeat that I've enjoyed very much your objectivity. If you ever happen to say some more about the psychological and philosophical questions of our beloved game DO NOT HESITATE! YOU SHALL HAVE AN ANSWER.

Very best regards,

András ADORJÁN

* * * *

From: György Négyesi

Dear András,

My answers to your questions are as follows:

1. I prefer White.

2. The logical outcome of a game if both parties play well: White wins.

3. There is no difference between the statistics of games of top-level, mediocre and very low-level players.

4. The type of the tournament (correspondence, normal, rapid/blitz, junior, senior, open or round robin) does not influence the score.

Let me explain my standpoint in more detail. First, I quote a sentence from you: In a sharp position, however, where both players fight hard for the initiative, attack, or counterattack, colours are of no importance. White's only advantage is that he can avoid sharp play in any opening, exchange the pieces off, and if he does it well, he will have his draw all right. Or he may even win if BLACK takes too many risks.

I think this is the point: in a sharp position, where both players attack, White has an extra tempo! That is, he mates first. This statement can be challenged, of course, and discussed for days on end. As you must know very well yourself, we have played only a tiny portion of all possible chess games so far. It doesn't prove anything that White has had the better score in the past 300-400 years. If BLACK had scored better, it wouldn't prove anything, either. What you say about the psychological side is completely true. If everyone sat down to the game saying 'it's all the same which colour I have', it would definitely have an influence on the game. On the other hand, it might not influence the statistics. In fact, we could get closer to the truth this way. If we could condition everyone to believe that colour doesn't matter, and look at the statistics when another 3 or 4 centuries have passed. We wouldn't even need that much time, as tournament chess has been played by a large crowd only recently, with a huge number of games played after 1950. Therefore it is possible that the statistics of 50 years would already indicate something.

To sum it up: it's not because of the statistics that I don't believe in BLACK's case. As a chemical engineer, I take a mathematical view of the world, saying that if I am the one who starts the attack, I arrive first, and the defence is necessarily late by one tempo.
Mr. Négyesi used to play tournament chess about 3 decades or so ago, now his chess activities are mostly restricted to chess history. This is no judgement, of course, only information for the readers (I know only the Hungarian letter writers). His standpoint and argumentation, shared with us in his remarkable piece of writing, is a classic example of how deeply the things learnt in childhood and youth are imprinted in our minds. They mix with our own thoughts, and it gets more and more difficult with time to tell them apart. The interpretation of my quoted sentence (and the choice of the quotation itself) is typically naive. It presupposes that approaching the enemy king is like a running race, with the participants proceeding along parallel lanes and in the same style. Somewhere else, Négyesi’s ‘recipe’ starts with opposite-side castling, which fits into his line of argumentation. However, it should not be taken for granted, as both players castle kingside in two-thirds, or rather three-quarters of all chess games (my estimate), plus they both castle queenside in a few variations. But even if our cherished wish comes true, and the two players castle on different sides (e.g. in the Sicilian Dragon, Rauzer, Sozin etc. or in the King’s Indian Samisch), their weapons and methods are not identical. If, for example, White launches a pawn storm in almost any Sicilian line, he has to reckon with BLACK’s piece play or centre break. So-called destructive sacs are also frequent: let me just remind you of the exchange sacrifice on c3 in the Dragon. All in all, the course of attack and counterattack is not like the sprinter’s 100-meter race, where one of the runners may even get a decisive leeway if he starts well.

Let’s not get stuck with openings, and take a pawn ending: if the two sides have passed pawns beyond the reach of their kings, a ‘cockroach race’ starts, as the Russians say. E.g. 1 h4 a5 2 h5 and White wins, as he queens on h8 first, and simultaneously prevents al=♕-t.

You see! That ‘extra tempo’ proved to be decisive all the same! Well, guess again: the case just described is an exception! If BLACK has a b, c, d, e, f or even g pawn (in the latter case it only can be 1 h6 g3 etc.), the new white queen doesn’t control BLACK’s queen-ing square. Hair-splitters may argue that White can start checking, but checking is usually fruitful only if White already has a material or positional advantage (e.g. restricted position of the BLACK king). Négyesi, who is always in for a little hair-splitting, surprisingly agrees that if chess players sat down to their BLACK games with no psychological inhibitions, it would influence their play. If he thinks so, why does he doubt that it would influence the statistics as well? Isn’t it only logical that ANYONE can perform better on any occasion (school tests, exams, chess games, driving etc.) if he gets rid of any unnecessary anxiety?

One final thing: I don’t believe in BLACK’s ‘truth’, and I don’t get paid for campaigning in support of it. There is only one objective truth in chess or anywhere else. This truth, of course, is put together from countless factors, or little truths if you like...
From: Zoltán Blázsík

1. I prefer having BLACK. The reason is that I like to deal counterblows at the attacker. I am a peaceful person in life as well. I usually find it difficult to exploit the ‘theoretical’ extra tempo with White because I prefer defence to attack. Accordingly, my personal statistics are much better in my BLACK games! At my last tournament, I scored half a point out of 4 White games and 3½/4 with the BLACK pieces. And don’t forget that such a result produces a similar tendency in my opponents’ statistics as well. In team matches, I definitely like it when the two excellent attacking players on my two sides have White!

2. Nobody knows for a moment what the ‘logical’ outcome of a game is. I can’t answer this question as a mathematician, and I think others stand even less chance than me. This is a problem of game theory, not chess. There are games played by two where one of the following three statements is true: (a) the first player wins (b) draw (c) the second player wins. These are mathematically proven facts for certain games! Naturally, the question always means IF BOTH PARTIES PLAY PERFECTLY! For most games, however, this question can not be decided. If a game has a simple drawing or winning strategy, it’s a mathematical game, and it’s not worth playing any more. If the strategy is very complicated, or the proof does not provide us with a strategy to be followed, the game can still be played, it is not influenced by the theoretical decision. As for chess, nobody has been able to say anything so far, so nobody has been able to say BLACK is NOT OK!!! As far as we can tell, even BLACK may have a WINNING strategy!

The following game is well-known among students of mathematics, and it is easy to understand for anyone else as well:

Two players take turns in putting down identical round coins on a round table. The coins must not overlap of course, only their edges can touch each other. No coin already placed can be moved later. As the area of a table is finite, sooner or later we get to the point when no more coins can be placed on the table this way. The player who managed to place the last coin wins. Well, who wins if both sides play perfectly: the first player or the second?

Compared to chess, the game is not too interesting, but it illustrates a mathematical principle very well. At first, one would think that the answer must depend on the relative size of the table and the coins. However, even if the two sizes are given, it is not so easy to solve the problem, except if the table happens to be actually smaller than the coin. If the table can hold only one coin, the first player evidently wins. So we can’t say that ‘BLACK’ is always OK in this game! He can never win at a small table. Our second thought could be that at a big table, the situation is extremely complicated, requiring a hopelessly great number of geometrical calculations. We suddenly feel that the game is as complex as chess. However, there is a brilliant idea that helps: symmetry! The concept of symmetry often helps to prove
things in mathematics and other branches of the natural sciences.

So what can we do with symmetry in this case? If the second player could imitate the first player using one of the two symmetries of the table (axial or central), he could win. This does not work, however, as the two coins may overlap. It is actually the first player who can use the ‘aping’ strategy! He puts down the first coin in a way that its centre is identical with the centre of the table. This move can be made on any ‘board’, no matter how small it is. Then ‘BLACK’ puts down a coin somewhere if he can. And now the first player places his second coin using central symmetry. He can do that! Then it’s ‘BLACK’s’ turn again, and ‘White’ can follow his simple strategy. He can always do so, as the coins are always placed in a centraiy symmetrical way after his moves. As long as BLACK still has a move, White has one too. Only White can win with this strategy, as the moment comes sooner or later when BLACK runs out of space!

If we could find a similar line of argumentation in chess as well, we could justify White’s superiority. However, no one has ever had such an idea!

Now let’s take a game which is closer to chess. Let’s call it ‘double chess’.

It’s played with the rules of chess, with a few necessary adjustments. The only significant difference is that both players have two moves when it is their turn.

Let’s not delve into this game very deeply. All we should try to do is answer the question whether BLACK can have a winning strategy? In other words, is it possible that White is helpless against BLACK’s optimal play? Do you think it’s an exaggeration? Why, in our next example, it will be the second player who has the upper hand! In double chess, however, there can be no winning strategy for BLACK! But how can we say this about a game as complex as chess? Let’s suppose BLACK has a winning strategy. In this case, White has to do the following: play 1 Qf3 and Qg1, two moves that do not change the position. Now it’s BLACK to move. White simply passed on the right to start the game. He can play as if he had ‘BLACK’, unless the second player does the same (1...Qf6 and Qg8), and the game ends with a draw before it has even started! So in this game, if BLACK has a winning strategy, White can simply ‘steal’ it. The presupposition that BLACK can have a winning strategy in double chess has been refuted! This does not mean, of course, that BLACK can not be ‘OK’!

Finally, let me ‘help you imagine’ a game where the second player wins. We know one already, of course: if there is a coin-sized hole in the middle of the table, which is a forbidden area, the first player loses!

Another one: the two players take the chess pieces from the box in the following way: White can take one, two or three, then BLACK takes one, two or three as well. They take turns as long as there are pieces in the box. The winner is the one who takes the last (32nd) piece. My statement is that I always win with BLACK.
Let's imagine there are only four pieces left, and it's White to move. If he takes one, I take three, if he takes two, I also take two, and if he takes three, I take the last one. So I win whatever he does. As 32 = 8x4, I can do it eight times in a row. White is helpless, I have the appropriate answer to all his 'moves'. In this simple game, which can be played before a game of chess, the second player wins easily. BLACK is completely OK!

Zoltán Blázsik

Zoltán Blázsik is a mathematician by profession and a chess-lover. He lives in Szeged (the home town of Péter Lékó, whom he has known since Pete was a child). You can read much more of his thoughts in some other parts of this book. The only thing I'd like to say about his answers is that it is amazing for how long they have tried to scare us, chessplayers, that chess is going to be 'solved'. Which would mean the end of the Royal Game. We have been hearing it for at least two decades. And I was never afraid of it, saying that people will still compete even if this happens. But! It was just very recently, when I actually started to think of how a practical execution could happen. And you shall see somewhere later in this book my vision. The solution begins 1 d4! (1 e4!?= all variations till the end plus all other reasonable White moves to begin analysed to the convincing final conclusion) So far it is – to my estimate – two thick books. And then there comes 1...d5! (analyses of all others as above). In short: even if the solution is going to be a win for White – or BLACK! –, nobody will be able to learn it. So we can play on! And then when I was happily through this tough thinking, and a little proud of myself, there comes the e-mail of Zoltán with the sentence you can read beginning: 'If the strategy...' It seems after all, that I'm not so silly, or if yes, I'm in good company.

****

From: Mikhail Golubev

I like your basic concept: I don't think it can be proved mathematically that BLACK is 'worse'.

Sincerely yours,
GM Mikhail Golubev
Odessa, Ukraine

This is how much I could squeeze out of Mikhail. But he took care of a replacement! (see end of chapter)

****

From: Gene Venable

Hello! I am Gene Venable (Chess Watch) a chess journalist!

If you can make any use from the my modest comment on BLACK is OK (and to correct my English!), here it is:

I like the BLACK is OK concept of GM András Adorján, which I
understand (almost for sure primitively and incorrectly), in the following way. From the mathematical nature of chess we all can learn that there are three types of chess positions: (1) objectively won for White, (2) objectively won for BLACK, and (3) objectively drawish. Of course we could only precisely understand what is the case with the same concrete position if we were able to find in that position all the ultimately best possible moves for both sides. Positions with many pieces on the board are incalculable even for the computers and we can’t find out the ultimate truth. Nevertheless the majority of top players tend to think that the most important chess position, the starting position, is objectively drawish. If so, what exactly is White’s ‘advantage’ in the initial position is? Psychological advantage, myth or maybe an illusion. And András Adorján discusses all these things. So, his theory, in my view, is very much about the humans who plays chess.

In the end I would like to defend the White side a bit: I hope that the starting position is not an ‘mutual zugzwang’ (when White loses!) – so, if we are OK and still able to play chess, then we can be OK with BLACK and with White too.

Jonathan Speelman, who disguised himself for decades as a peaceful creature turned out to be a BLACK IS WINNING extremist! He was quoted on saying ‘The initial position is a mutual Zugzwang’. Maybe I’m mistaken, but if I remember well – and according to a reader – the one in mutual Zugzwang who has to move first loses. And if the rules are the same as they were during the 39 years I was a tournament player, the right to start the game belongs to White. This is, I know, a sad story but it’s not my fault. Now it’s up to Jonathan to write a paper revealing HIS thesis... – AA

* * * *

From: Igor Lyashkevych

Dear Mr Adorján,

I read your article in Rochade Europa No.6 (2003) a little late, but I would like to answer your questions anyway.

I am 45 years old, I have been living in Germany since 1997. I come from the Ukraine. Unfortunately, I have hardly any time for chess, and my rating is quite low, about 2120.

Now the answers:

1. I prefer BLACK. It suits my character better.

2. If both sides play perfectly, the logical result is a draw, as the starting position is equal.

3. BLACK can certainly have a plus at lower levels, but at high

I agree it is necessary to have White as well. And let’s play till the end of time. Let’s rehabilitate BLACK and restore the right balance. For the sake of quality, fighting, fair play and the people’s entertainment. There are however dangers.
level the advantage belongs to White.

4. Based on my long experience, I would say that White has a better score in junior tournaments and in rapid and blitz, or when people play fast in time trouble in classical games. In ‘normal’ chess, however, White has no advantage. Only in the players’ heads.

With friendly greetings,

I. Lyashkevych
Magdeburg, Germany

This is man’s talk! Telling the truth, based on many previous tries of collecting opinions of different subjects, I had no idea how many of you will react, but I feared just a few as always. In few things I like to be wrong. This is one case of those. Thanks! – AA

***

From: Tom Cooper

I’m a 1400 rated approximately ICU (Ireland) chess player, I found your article interesting and thought I’d answer your questions for you with my opinions.

1. I prefer White, I’ve put more effort into learning White openings and since I almost always start e4, I’ve gained experience with how to deal with most responses at my level of play. It is only now, that I’m really looking at BLACK openings, perhaps you’re right, BLACK is OK, but as yet with the learning I’ve done and games I’ve played, White has won more games for me.

2. The logical outcome of a ‘perfect’ game: White wins, I was always led to believe that this was so, statistics reported on different openings almost always show White with higher winning percentages by large amounts.

3. I think the percentage of wins with White will be higher at higher standards of play but not necessarily because they use White so much better but instead because players at lower levels tend to make more errors, games of GMs inserted into a Fritz analysis and plotted on a graph are normally level for most of the game with slight increases and decreases whereas games of much lower rated players tend to have spikes going both ways throughout the game.

After a certain stage, it does not matter who is White or BLACK then.

4. How does the type of the tournament influence the balance?

I’ve no statistics on this or anything.

Regards

Tom Cooper
BLACK IS OK

Our readers reply (CHESS – August 2002)

In June CHESS Grandmaster András Adorján urged readers to play the BLACK pieces without any feeling of inferiority – and play to win!

This is what some of our readers think...

From: Martin Cobham
Derby & Mickleover Chess Club

My replies to Grandmaster Adorján’s questions (CHESS June 2002, page 20)

Which colour do you prefer?

BLACK. There is very little difference between my results with White & BLACK over 40 years (present grade 139 and falling). However, given a choice – i.e when I am captain and win the toss, I will aim for BLACK. The reasons are that I normally enjoy the games more and some of my best wins have been with BLACK. I like counter-attack and ‘the reduced pressure’ from team-mates expecting a win. It is also easier to be in ‘control’ early on. I play slightly obscure defences – KP Nimzovitch and either the Chigorin of Dutch Leningrad to d4. It is therefore common for my opponents to be out of book early on. Conversely, if I have White, obscure openings such as Blackmar, Birds, Colle, Stonewall or Trompowsky Attack do not seem to work.

What is the logical outcome of a game if both sides play well?

2. Draw. Although, in practice I only draw if my opponent plays solid boring chess with no intent to win. Due to the unsound pawn structures I aim for, I almost invariably win or lose by move 30/35. Endgame knowledge – who needs it?

Is there any difference between the statistics of top-level games and games played by mediocre or very weak players.

1 & 3! I think at the top level with the positional nature of the games, the extra move does give White an advantage well into the game. At my level BLACK is definitely OK and could be better.

How does the type of the tournament (correspondence, rapid, junior, senior, open, all-play-all) influence the balance?

You would have thought correspondence chess would favour White, but I do not think so. I only play two postal games each year now but in this year’s match I won easily with BLACK but my opponent had several opportunities to win when he had BLACK but fortunately missed them all and eventually resigned in a position which was probably drawn!

Conversely, rapidplay possibly does favour White – wins in 10 moves or less are more common at this speed and are much more likely to be a White win due to the move advantage. Having said that my quickest win was with BLACK in 10 moves.
It is all in the mind. One of the players in our team loses nearly every game with BLACK, even when he is facing an opponent 30 or 40 points weaker. With White he nearly always obtains a sound winning position against equal or worse. Another player hates playing White – he just loves to soak up the pressure, as BLACK, for 25 moves with his Modern Defence played against anything. Although of roughly equal strength I know I have no chance winning with White against him.

From: Allan Jackson
Australia

I read the article by GM András Adorján entitled BLACK is OK with interest if not agreement.

Adorján is a fine player and chess writer but I cannot agree that White’s advantage is some form of collective hallucination. I do not think chess players ‘presume’ White is better. This is inferred from having the privilege of moving first and confirmed by the statistics from actual play.

There are, of course, individuals who play better with BLACK. Adorján himself or Alexander Morozevich can serve as examples. I think this is due to individual style and variation in abilities, as happens between competitors in any sport.

A large part of Morozevich’s being so dangerous with BLACK can be explained simply by the fact that he has studied the Slav Defence so thoroughly that he knows far more about it than most, or all, of his contemporaries. I sometimes think that a game involving this remarkable player could be annotated:

NN – Morozevich:
1 d4? d5! 2 c4? c6!

But does this mean anything more than hard work can bring results? I think not.

There may be a lesson for the club player here. If you work at your chosen openings, not only learning the theory but playing through as many published games with them as you can and gaining a lot of experience with the opening and the resulting positions, you should be able to gain a reputation as the ‘Morozevich’ of your club. Indeed, this may be more feasible for the club player than the professional. Professionals all work seriously and methodically at their game, while club players generally do not.

From: Jonathan H. Brewer
St Columb, Cornwall

Which colour do you prefer?

Well, I know I certainly prefer playing with the White pieces. I have an inkling this is not only because it gives me, if only temporarily(!), an advantage in being able to choose more or less the opening, but also because like the majority of chess players today I own a chess computer and inevitably play with the White pieces, (also playing against the computer has, alas, given me one or two other bad habits such as pressing the ‘Take Back’ key or more often – usually only after a few moves – pressing the ‘New Game’ key!)
Or is the real reason I prefer playing with the White pieces simply because I wish to be like Alice who stepped through a looking-glass becoming a living White pawn in a living game of chess?

Curiouser and curiouser!

*What is the logical outcome of a game if both sides play well?*

This seems to be, if anything a philosophical question! I guess all things are relative and comparative and hence a move that is at first regarded as ‘good’ can later be regarded as ‘bad’ – depending on both White’s and BLACK’s later moves and of course the outcome of the game. The same can equally be applied to ‘well’. And can ‘logic’ really be applied to chess? Chess is played by humans, and ‘to be human is to err’ and so games are always going to be LOST. The question can not be applied.

*Is there any difference between the statistics of top-level games and games played by mediocre or very weak players?*

Presumably there are more draws at the top-level.

*How does the type of of the tournament (correspondence, rapid, junior, senior, open, all-play-all) influence the balance?*

All I say to this is that I would like very much to see the more powerful chess computers play correspondence chess with the machine ‘thinking’ on, say, 48 hours per move. What a game! Maybe even resulting in the strongest chess ever played.

From: **David Sandham**

I admired Grandmaster András Adorján’s philosophical article on the alleged advantage held by White at the start of the game (CHESS, June 2002).

In my opinion, it is clear that White enjoys some advantage in the Start Position. But the more interesting question is, How much of an advantage? It may very well be, as Adorján persuasively argues, that most players overestimate the advantage White holds at move one, and that this is an important insight.

First let me show you that White does indeed have an advantage in the Start Position. We cannot conclusively prove that: the Start Position is simply too complicated for proof by analysis. The argument is one from analogy. We know that in many symmetrical positions, the player to move first has an advantage. There are exceptions to this (Zugzwang), but the Start Position does not have the character of these exceptions.

I add a second argument to show that White has an advantage at move one. Consider a change in the rules of chess, such that, as in some card games, each player had the option of saying ‘pass’ on his turn instead of making a move. Would anyone suggest it would be to White’s advantage to say ‘pass’ on move one? No. Therefore, the Start Position is more advantageous to the player who has the move.

I add a third argument. What are both players best advised to do in the very early stages of the game? To develop their pieces and to control the centre. White, with his extra move, can do this faster. It is
not that BLACK is not prevented from pursuing this correct strategy; it is just that White is able to do it slightly more quickly.

If we are all agreed that White does have an advantage at move one, the interesting question is then 'How much of an advantage?' It may well be that the strategy with the BLACK pieces of playing very solidly and seeking to erode gradually the White advantage is mistaken and based on an over-estimation of that advantage. If true, this could have important consequences for opening theory. It could show that BLACK should be playing the Indian defences and not the Orthodox Variation of the Queens Gambit Declined, or that after 1 e4, 1...c5 is a much better move than 1...e5. However, I doubt we will prove those hypotheses anytime this century. The Start Position is far too complicated for proofs. Also, for practical play, it may not matter as much as one might think. Most games (even those between the world’s best) are decided by mistakes made after the opening. We tend to tear our hair out over how best to play the Opening because the Start Position is the one position we are guaranteed to find ourselves in, every game. But such is the complexity of chess that we are also guaranteed that, after not many moves, we will find ourselves in a position we could not have predicted. It is players who play best in those unforeseen positions who triumph. As Tarrasch did not quite say, 'After the Opening the Gods have placed the Middlegame'.

Many thanks for Adorján’s great article.

Dear Chessfriends,

I was very pleased to see so many readers’ reflections on my essay published in the June issue of CHESS, under the title 'BLACK is OK, or the presumption of innocence in the game of chess'. Many people refrain from expressing their opinions on issues like this out of modesty, timidity or sheer laziness. Beyond all that, there is also the danger of being ridiculed by the Author, who takes criticism as an insult.

Everybody likes to be right, but – as in a post-mortem analysis – objectivity may lead to something much more important: a part of chess truth. Yes, I’d like to see my BLACK IS OK! thesis accepted and gaining more and more ground in tournament chess – but not at any price! Since 1985, I’ve been relentlessly studying the subject, and publishing analyses and articles in the chess magazines of virtually all chess-playing countries. It makes me really proud that even CIA showed remarkable interest in my work! (Don’t worry, CIA = Chess In Australia) In ’88 my first BLACK IS OK! book was published by Batsford. And now I have signed a contract with the same publishing house for another (master)piece, titled ‘BLACK IS still OK!’.

Now! Once you, dear readers, have honoured me by several letters, I’ll try to reflect on all the important details.

I’m afraid my question ‘What is the logical outcome of a game if both sides play well?’ was not clear enough. Maybe I should have said a ‘perfect game’, an imaginary one,
played by computers, not human beings. White always plays the best move and BLACK replies the same way. So it is a purely hypothetical question, having nothing to do with actual tournament practice. In other words: suppose there is a 'solution' to chess, what is the result of the line?

Mr Jonathan H. Brewer therefore drew the conclusion that the question is inapplicable. Before that he said that there'll always be mistakes, since chess is played by people and 'to err is human'. Very true. And as we all know, nobody has ever won a game without a mistake by the opponent.

Mr David Sandham is sure that in the Start Position White has an advantage. He brings up some arguments to prove this. First he says that in symmetrical positions the one who has the right to move has the advantage as well. (He also mentions Zugzwang as the one exception.) On the other hand, if White plays 1 e4 and BLACK answers 1...c5, 1) there is no longer any symmetry, and 2) if the principle of 'central pawns is more valuable than others' is true, BLACK will soon have the upper hand: 2 Qf3 Qc6 3 d4 cxd4! If you think it's a joke, it's fine by me! But Evgeny Sveshnikov really means it, that's why he has been playing 2 c3 throughout his entire career in order not to 'sacrifice' his d-pawn for BLACK's feeble c-pawn.

Once again, I'm deadly earnest! There are some other board games where the right to play first is an advantage. In some of them it's all the same, and - believe me or not - in quite a few board games 'BLACK', that is, the second player, has the better chances. Thanks to his/her minus tempo!

There comes another argument that says: at the beginning of the game one has to develop his forces and take care of the safety of his king. According to Mr Sandham, the extra tempo guarantees that White shall complete this task earlier. Again, it supposes some kind of symmetry, but I, for one, have been playing the Grünfeld for at least 35 years. Let's take just one of its variations: 1 d4 Qf6 2 c4 g6 3 Qc3 d5 4 cxd5 Qxd5 5 e4 Qxc3 6 bxc3. We have reached the key position of the exchange variation (the Hungarian term 'centre-building variation' is actually more accurate!). At the same time we can see two different types of strategies: central strategy versus flank strategy. Who's to tell which one is sounder: to occupy the centre, or undermine it with the help of the g7 bishop (in this particular case)? I have not the slightest idea of how many times I had this position as BLACK in my life. I don't have to be ashamed about the results I made against even the top players of the world. On the other hand: many-many chess players go for this line as White. Are they all crazy? If so, they - or at least some of them - do extremely well. Dogmas lead us nowhere.

Mr Alan Jackson (Australia - CIA?) 'pretends' not to agree that 'White's advantage is some form of collective hallucination'. But the closer we get to the end of his witty message, the stronger he supports my views. He says 'there are of course individuals who can play
better with BLACK. Adorján or Morozevich. And then we learn that Morozevich is dangerous with the BLACK pieces simply because 'he has studied the Slav Defence so thoroughly that he knows far more about it than most, or all, of his contemporaries'. That's it! You see, Mr Jackson, if Morozevich or I were to have psychological complexes playing BLACK, we would never spend so much time studying all those complicated variations and defences for BLACK. If we thought BLACK is worse all the same, we would build up a strong repertoire only with White, and play the Bogo-Indian and things like that in our BLACK games, hoping to survive somehow! You 'only' need conviction and hard work. Find the dynamic, flexible, active lines, and whoever does it, he or she will probably soon feel the difference.

The difference lies in more points, pleasure and quality in your BLACK games (as well).

Mr Martin Cobham once again confirms that this false mass-psychosis results in a lot of pressure on those who happen to be the 'lucky ones' to play White in a team match. They are expected to win. Take the Olympiads or any other event. It's just idiotic. I have always been much more of a player than a team-captain, but in the latter case I've never said anything like this. When a member of my team was offered a draw, colour never mattered. My — maybe rather primitive — instructions just went: 'Try to win the good positions and save the bad ones, if you can.'

Finally: opinions varied concerning how much the balance is influenced by the playing level and age of the players, or by the tournament type. To be frank, I have no idea or record. I will try to get some. My suspicion is that in low(er) level tournaments, where mistakes are plentiful, colours don't matter too much, or at all.

And one more thing I'd like to point out very frankly: There are no good or bad answers by which the performance of you, dear reader, is marked. We're all searching for truth in the darkness (to use a rather appropriate phrase...). Everybody may have bright ideas, and his or her own experience is certainly something nobody else in the world knows.

So! Once again, let me thank those who took the trouble and took up their pens (or rather keyboards(?)). I do hope our discussion will continue, and we will all benefit from it. As you probably know, at the moment there are only two colours in chess. So what we are talking about is not less than 50% of the game!

Very best wishes,
András Adorján

***

From: Attila Schneider

1. Which colour do you prefer? White
2. What is the logical outcome of a game if both sides play perfectly? Draw
3. Is there any difference between the statistics of top-level games and games played by mediocre or very
weak players? **BLACK** might even get a 'plus' at lower levels

**IM Attila Schneider** twice, Champion of Hungary, author of many books and renowned theoretician, passed away in the summer of 2003 at the age of 48. What can one say? Within a month GM Péter Székely (48) died of a heart attack. Both so early. Let them rest in peace. – AA

* * * *

From: **Török Sándor Miklós**

Dear Mr. Török,

Thank you for your reply. I agree with some of your answers, with some others I disagree, and there are a few where I can't risk a definite answer for lack of sufficient data. One thing I regretfully forgot to include in this 'mini-questionnaire': I am quite interested in anyone's personal (over-the-board, correspondence or other) experience, with no restrictions as regards the content. This is no entrance exam where you can choose between right and wrong answers: all of us are more or less groping about in the dark (where else...). So here are my replies to your replies (mind you, replies, not assessment!):

Dear Mr. Adorján,

My answers to your questions are as follows:

1. I prefer White for two reasons:
   - in most openings it is White who determines the character of middlegame

   This statement can be refuted, as I did in the original article. Both sides have a lot of choice.
   - it is more difficult for my opponent to play for a draw

   I completely agree with you here. I already wrote some 15 years ago that White's only tangible advantage is that if he plays for a draw, and does it well, BLACK has to take too much risk if he wants to avoid the draw.

2. Probably a draw

   That was the standpoint of a lot of great chess thinkers, from Lasker to Portisch. An indirect proof: the mistake or mistakes leading to defeat can be pointed out in all lost games.

3. The higher the level, the bigger White’s advantage.

   If we look at tournament statistics, maybe. However, if the players put in the same amount of energy to work out their **BLACK** repertoires as they do with White, I don’t believe there would be any (significant) difference between the performance of the two sides. White’s statistical dominance is a result of the mass psychosis that makes most people believe that it is easier to win with the White pieces. Therefore they have more faith in White and spend more time sharpening their opening weapons, whereas in their **BLACK** games they choose the Queen’s Gambit Declined, or some other unambitious but stable system, and hope to survive.
The opening doesn’t matter so much at lower levels.

I agree, but we may both be wrong. Logically we are right because there are much more errors in the games of lower-level players (even if they are a rook down, it’s not necessarily that much of a problem, they may still win). Therefore an opening advantage may not be so important. Except for the cases, of course, when someone’s opening knowledge is so much above his playing strength that he gets an easily winning position right from the opening, and simply has no chance to give it away.

4. I can’t give a definite answer. I don’t think the type of tournament significantly influences the balance.

Neither can I. The point in asking these questions is that I might come across some people who can provide credible statistical data for their own level (or tournament type, or age group).

Yours sincerely,
Sándor Török

Thank you for your letter. I do hope people will realise some day that the dispute is not over some obscure philosophical issue: it’s OBVIOUSLY over one of the cardinal issues of the game of chess. After all, we play chess with a total of two colours, and we have BLACK every other day...

With friendly greetings,
András Adorján

***

From: De Vleeschauwer Raoul

Dear Grandmaster,

I read your article ‘BLACK is O.K. – or the Presumption of Innocence in Chess’ with great interest. My answers are as follows:

Question 2: Draw (3), Question 3: No difference (2). As regards Question 4, I don’t want to take a stand.

I left Question 1 to the end, because I think I can say something here which is of interest to you: I prefer BLACK, and I have worked out a system that enables me to play ‘BLACK’ with the White pieces as well. Moreover, most of the time I can steer the game into opening systems that are certainly perfectly suitable for solving BLACK’s problems, namely into the Caro-Kann and the Slav.

Now what does this system look like? 1 d3 e5 2 c3 d5 3 d4 (Caro-Kann); 1 d3 e5 2 c3 f6 3 d4 (Caro-Kann); 1 d3 e5 2 c3 f6 3 d4 (Caro-Kann); 1 d3 e5 2 c3 e5 3 d4 (Caro-Kann); 1 d3 e5 2 c3 d6 3 d4 (Caro-Kann); 1 d3 d5 2 d4 (=1 d4 d5); 1 d3 d6 2 d4 (=1. d3 f6 d5); 1 d3 c5 2 c3 e5 3 d4 (Caro-Kann); 1 d3 c5 2 c3 d5 3 d4 (Slav); 1 d3 c5 2 c3 f6 3 d4 (Reti); 1 d3 c5 2 c3 g6 3 d4 (= 1 g3 d5 2 c4 c6); 1 d3 c5 2 c3 f6 3 d4 (=1 c4 c6 2. d3 d5); 1 d3 g6 2 d4 (= 1 g3 d5); 1 d3 f5 2 d4 (Birkl); 1 d3 b5 2 d4 (Sokolsky); 1 d3 b6 2 d4 (Larsen).

As an alternative, you can play 1 d3 d5 2 c3 with the idea of 3 d4.

Likewise, instead of 1 d3 f6 2 d4, 2 c3 followed by 3 d4 is also possible.
What is the advantage of my system?

(a) Those who prefer BLACK can play BLACK openings with the White pieces as well, and quite healthy systems at that.

(b) You surprise your opponent, and force him to think on his own from the very beginning.

(c) There is a fair chance that your opponent will be forced to play an opening he doesn’t know very well. Let’s suppose for example that the opponent always plays 1 d4 with White. When he replies 1...e5 to 1 d3 (this is quite possible), he is already in a Caro-Kann, i.e. in a 1 e4-opening!

(d) Finally, let me remark that after 1 d3 e5 you can also play 2 d4 (Scandinavian).

What do you think of this system? I look forward to your answer.

De Vleeschauwer Raoul
Oudegem, Belgium

This was the last reaction to the essay published in Rochade, when I did not expect anything more to come. It’s good to be wrong sometimes, take my word on it!

The subject our friend from Belgium deals with is one of the evergreens, but he had a switch on! So many people would like to gain of the (this time rightly called) ‘extra’ tempo that can be added to systems which work fine with BLACK, while playing the ‘improved’ version with White. Seems it wishful thinking. But Raoul’s method could get fair play award. He doesn’t want to get a move as a plus while playing his favourite BLACK systems with White as well, he only wants to make it sure that the game goes according to his taste/mentality!! It may of course become a target of cheap jokes among ‘professionals’ (not necessarily by strength, but by status). I suppose he is a player of (likely) a club category. Yet! Not somebody who just sits down and makes a move whenever it is his turn. Trying to plan his games probably not in order to score all the time. But he would like to enjoy chess. He wants to play BLACK even if the cruel Fate gives him the wrong pieces. A man who is original. Individuals and not sheep(s) make this Earth a bearable place to stay.

And if you promise not to call the ambulance – OK? Shall I go on? – I confess something dark. Do you think, I’m so dumb (silly) not to think about this earlier too? Don’t you think there were many who – sometimes jokingly – proposed that I should play BLACK while having White? Nothing came out of it! Even if the position got sometimes nice I felt there was something wrong. No, I did not feel pity for BLACK (or for the guy who did not deserve the honour to play with it). But in my ‘normal’ BLACK from White positions I had a strong feeling that I was not playing with the right colour, and it seems I am different from everybody else except moving the pieces properly. A stranger in the Globe. I LOVE BLACK! And I can’t help it anymore. Even if you, traitors call the ambulance...

* * *
GM Golubev, Editor of the Ukrainian Chess News sent me a short e-mail sometime in June 2003, saying: 'There is not so much news, but it's a good one.'

Should I say I was moved? (AA)

BLACK IS OK!

I don’t know how long this essay has been posted on the Ukrainian Chess Online site, but Adorján’s opinionated piece, ‘BLACK is OK, or the Presumption of Innocence in the Game of Chess’ on the virtues of playing BLACK, is a classic.

* * * *

This is the end of the chapter but surely only the beginning of more and more serious disputes. Let me thank again all of those whose voice could be heard here. Since I reflected upon almost everyone on the pages an opinion was expressed, I think there is no need for any further ‘wisdom’ of mine.

My present (the third penultimate) wife, however, who is a statistician by profession and a very tidy person (in paperwork!!) did a little ‘Informant’ for all you readers to tell you who said what – and what is the actual ‘standing’. It is unofficial, a guide that can spare you all quite a bit of time. (Another method of saving time and money is not to buy books.)

BUT! No good-byes! As long as I breathe I will be always be interested in ANY opinion, criticism, games won in style with BLACK, disguised love letters but no letter bomb, please. It might be another person who opens it first!

Address: ADORJÁN András, H-1053 Budapest, Kávin tér 2. HUNGARY

E-mail: aa_ok@hu.inter.net

Phone/fax: (36-1) 318-6259, 267-5992
Summary

Which Colour do you prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>Makes no difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ian Ash</td>
<td>Anne Caz</td>
<td>Kevin Bonham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Christian</td>
<td>Eric Schiller</td>
<td>(‘It all depends on the opponent.’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Hertel</td>
<td>George Stern</td>
<td>Dr. Altanoch Gendengin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrique Henriques</td>
<td>John Henderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Bachman</td>
<td>Ramón Rafael Barrios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dircu Viana</td>
<td>Zoltán Blázsik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Wolfenter</td>
<td>Igor Lyashkevych</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>György Négyesi</td>
<td>Martin Cobham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Cooper</td>
<td>De Vleeschauwer Raoul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan H. Brewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attila Schneider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sándor Török</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For White:

‘One reason White has an advantage is due to the accepted printing standard for chess diagrams which are ALWAYS published from White’s side of the board. I think this causes many players to develop a much better “FEEL” for White positions, as that is all they will ever see in books and magazines.’ (David Christian)

‘Theoretically, BLACK is all right. In practice, White has the upper hand, as shown by the statistics, because it is more difficult for BLACK to find the right moves. ... BLACK is at a disadvantage (an advantage/disadvantage relationship not existing in your opinion) because he has to fight against the White right to start the game.’ (Peter Hertel)

‘For purely psychological reasons, I always seem to wish for White and am disappointed when getting BLACK... The reality is that my results are much better with BLACK, especially in those critical games where I had hoped for White. Perhaps it is that I feel I must try harder and don’t relax as much. ... Psychologically, I have probably felt that I did not need to work as hard with White, because the first move is generally considered to give an advantage, so I expected my White wins to come naturally, simply by virtue of having the first move and therefore the “advantage”. I expect my wins to come as White almost as a birthright.’ (Kenneth Bachman)

‘...I feel that I have more margin for error with BLACK.’ (Kevin Bonham)
‘... to play like young Spassky!’
(Dirceu Viana)

‘The right to play first does NOT guarantee an automatic win, but it is indirectly responsible for BLACK’s slightly higher loss ratio.’ (Friedrich Wolfenter)

‘... in a sharp position, where both players attack, White has an extra tempo!’ (György Négyes)

‘I’ve put more effort into learning White openings ... I’ve gained experience with how to deal with most responses at my level of play. ... with the learning I’ve done and games I’ve played, White has won more games for me.’ (Tom Cooper)

‘... it gives me, if only temporarily(!), an advantage in being able to choose more or less the opening ... I own a chess computer and inevitably play with the White pieces ... I wish to be like Alice who stepped through a looking-glass becoming a living White pawn in a living game of chess?’ (Johathan H. Brewer)

‘I prefer White for two reasons:

in most openings it is White who determines the character of middlegame

it is more difficult for my opponent to play for a draw’ (Sándor Török).

For BLACK:

‘With White I am under pressure not to let the advantage slip and constantly over-play. I have always been reluctant to throw the first punch, I am a counter-puncher. It is in man’s nature to defend his territory, not to conquer others! Or at least it should be.’ (Eric Schiller)

‘So I can bamboozle my opponent with the Hippopotamus or 1... a6.’ (George Stern)

‘... finding it easier to play with BLACK rather than White ... has nothing to do with the ‘Ol’ BLACK Magic’, ... but more to do with the fact that you tend to learn and therefore know your defences much better, and as BLACK you find it much, much easier reacting to your opponent’s advances’ (John Henderson)

‘I believe it is much easier to prepare a higher level repertoire as BLACK than it is for White. With BLACK, it is much easier to direct the opening into a line you are familiar with ... it seems probable that I have done better with BLACK simply because I have worked harder on my BLACK openings.’ (Kenneth Bachman)

‘With White I am sometimes tempted into too-loose positions and find that playing reverse defences can give BLACK too much choice.’ (Kevin Bonham)

‘Psychological handicap is always felt by the White player, who “is obligated” to win.’ (Ramón Rafael Barrios)

‘I like to deal counterblows at the attacker. I am a peaceful person in life as well. I usually find it difficult to exploit the “theoretical” extra tempo with White because I prefer defence to attack.’ (Zoltán Blázsik)

‘It fits my character better.’ (Igor Lyashkevych)

‘I normally enjoy the games more and some of my best wins have been with BLACK. I like counter-attack and ‘the reduced pressure’ from team-mates
expecting a win. It is also easier to be in 'control' early on.' *(Martin Cobham)*

'I have worked out a system that enables me to play 'BLACK' with the White pieces as well. Moreover, most of the time I can steer the game into openings systems that are certainly perfectly suitable for solving BLACK’s problems, namely into the Caro-Kann and the Slav.' *(De Vleeschauwer Raoul)*

'I do better with White than BLACK. However, I don’t feel that playing BLACK is certainly a disadvantage—often my opponents pressed too hard simply because they were White.' *(Alex Baburin)*

**What is the logical outcome of a game if both sides play perfectly?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White wins</th>
<th>Draw</th>
<th>Nobody knows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>György Négyesi</td>
<td>Anne Caz</td>
<td>Zoltán Blázsik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Cooper</td>
<td>Ian Ash</td>
<td>Gene Venable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Christian (maybe)</td>
<td>Jonathan H. Brewer ('The question can not be applied.')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Stern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Hertel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henrique Henriques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenneth Bachman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Bonham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Altanoch Gendengin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramón Rafael Barrios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dirceu Viana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friedrich Wolfenter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Igor Lyashkevych</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Cobham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attila Schneider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sándor Török (probably)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De Vleeschauwer Raoul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For ‘White wins’:**

'If I am the one who starts the attack, I arrive first, and the defence is necessarily late by one tempo.' *(György Négyesi)*

'White wins, I was always led to believe that this was so, statistics reported on different openings almost always show White with higher winning percentages by large amounts.' *(Tom Cooper)*

**For a draw:**

'I believe if either White or BLACK had a forced win, it would have been found by now.' *(Kenneth Bachman)*

'There are so few symmetrical positions where the right to move is a winning advantage and even fewer where it is a losing disadvantage that it is not plausible that the start position is a forced win—especially as most of these exceptional
positions have far less pieces on the board.’ (Kevin Bonham)

‘The harmony and the equilibrium must be maintained.’ (Ramón Rafael Barrios)

‘...the starting position is equal.’ (Igor Lyashkevych)

For ‘Nobody knows’:

‘This is a problem of game theory, not chess. There are games played by two where one of the following three statements is true: a) the first player wins b) draw c) the second player wins. These are mathematically proven facts for certain games! Naturally, the question always means IF BOTH PARTIES PLAY PERFECTLY! For most games, however, this question can not be decided.’ (Zoltán Blázsek)

From the mathematical nature of chess we all can learn that there are three types of the chess positions 1) objectively won for White, 2) objectively won for BLACK, and 3) objectively drawish. ... Positions with many pieces on the board are incalculable even for the computers and we can’t find out the ultimate truth.’ (Gene Venable)

‘...all things are relative and comparative... Chess is played by humans, and ‘to err is to be human’ and so games are always going to be LOST.’ (Jonathan H. Brewer)

Is there any difference between the statistics of top-level games and games played by mediocre or very weak players?

Summary: One ‘extra’ answer: ‘Presumably there are more draws at the top-level.’ (Jonathan H. Brewer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. The higher the level of the players, the bigger White's advantage becomes</th>
<th>2. No difference</th>
<th>3. BLACK might even get a 'plus' at lower levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Christian</td>
<td>Anne Caz</td>
<td>Henrique Henriques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Hertel</td>
<td>Ian Ash</td>
<td>Kenneth Bachman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Bachman</td>
<td>Kevin Bonham</td>
<td>dr. Altanoch Gendengin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirceu Viana</td>
<td>Ramón Rafael Barrios</td>
<td>Igor Lyashkevych</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich Wolfenter</td>
<td>György Négyesi</td>
<td>Martin Cobham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor Lyashkevych</td>
<td>De Vleeschauwer Raoul</td>
<td>Attila Schneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Cooper (but not necessarily)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For 1 and 3:
‘At club level, the colour does not seem to influence results very much.’ (David Christian)

‘BLACK can be more successful at lower levels because one can prepare special openings more easily with BLACK against weaker opposition than with White.’ (Peter Hertel)

‘...higher-rated players are better able to exploit an advantage such as the minimal advantage of having an ‘extra’ tempo at the start of the game, by virtue of having the first move. Since getting a plus basically depends on at least slight inaccuracies on the part of the opposing player ... this will be more difficult to do as the skill level increases. With equal players at lower levels, play takes on more of a random character and the colour (advantage of first move) has less significance.’ (Kenneth Bachman)

‘...but you have a point here, some players are proving the opposite is true!’ (Dirceu Viana)

‘...at higher standards of play ... they use White so much better but instead because players at lower levels tend to make more errors, games of GMs inserted into a Fritz analysis and plotted on a graph are normally level for most of the game with slight increases and decreases, whereas games of much lower rated players tend to have spikes going both ways throughout the game. After a certain stage, it does not matter who is White or BLACK then. (Tom Cooper)

‘The opening doesn’t matter so much at lower levels.’ (Sándor Török)

‘I think at the top level with the positional nature of the games, the extra move does give White an advantage well into the game. At my level BLACK is definitely OK and could be better.’ (Martin Cobham)

For 2:
‘Objectively ... I just think that BLACK players hope for at the maximum a draw and will accept one too easily’ (Anne Caz)

‘... at low levels White probably does have an advantage due to the limited knowledge of openings — increasing the likelihood of BLACK finding himself facing an opening that he knows little about. Obviously this does not comment on the chances of BLACK, just a reality I suspect of weaker players.’ (Ian Ash)

‘I think you can train a strong junior to do very well with BLACK (especially if you steer them away from symmetrical defences) and maybe this is a key to getting less colour bias in our perceptions.’ (Kevin Bonham)

And now let’s see the statistics! Here are the results of only those games, where both players’ ELO fell into the same category. In my database ‘Mega2003’ the number of such games was 320,301 from the total of more than 2.3 million (including a lot of ones before the ‘ELO-era’). The figures give the right to answer 1.:}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELO</th>
<th>The number of games with the result of</th>
<th>The rate of White wins within the decisive games</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-0</td>
<td>½-½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2099</td>
<td>12700</td>
<td>11015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100-99</td>
<td>9039</td>
<td>8547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200-99</td>
<td>22351</td>
<td>22708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300-99</td>
<td>21447</td>
<td>28217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400-99</td>
<td>23407</td>
<td>40339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500-99</td>
<td>11023</td>
<td>23975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600-99</td>
<td>2776</td>
<td>5829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700&lt;</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103185</strong></td>
<td><strong>141604</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Black’s results by ELO**

![Bar chart showing Black's results by ELO rating](image-url)
Evgeny Sveshnikov disagrees

I have been acquainted with grandmaster András Adorján, the author of this book, for more than a quarter of a century. I recall playing him in a match between the national teams of Hungary and Russia in 1967. Much water has flown under the bridge since then, we both have become grandmasters, András was even a world champion candidate once. He also worked as a second of the would-be world champion, Garry Kasparov. At the same time I worked with my countryman A.Karpov, but first of all I taught chess to children all over Russia, and this makes me think about the essence of chess.

The Hungarian grandmaster’s ‘world-view’ in chess is very attractive to me, especially the perseverance and inexhaustible energy with which he insists on the ‘equal rights’ of the BLACK pieces. And I still do not agree with him in everything, as there have been other hypotheses which claimed exactly the opposite of what he says.

For example, the renowned Soviet theoretician V.Rauzer claimed in the 30s: ‘I e2-e4! – and White wins!’ and he managed to prove it quite often.

András Adorján tries to persuade us that it is good to play with BLACK! My standpoint in this question is less moderate, although I do strive for an exact (radical) answer. I put the question like this: ‘What is the extent of White’s advantage in the starting position?’ if measured on a ten-point scale (after Bondarevsky). I would very much like to discover the answer to this fundamental theoretical question by the end of my life. I considered chess first of all as a kind of sport and a kind of art in the first 30 years of my career, but recently I have grown more and more interested in the scientific essence of the game.

How can we answer the question about the extent of White’s initial advantage then? As we need a mathematical solution, we must use statistics. The statistics of beginners’ games shows that the result after 10 games is on average 5:5. However, if the players are stronger, White has the lead. (cf. W.Steinitz: ‘The realization of advantage shows a growing tendency if the players are stronger.’)

Even if the score is 7:3 to White, it means that BLACK is OK! – that is, he can draw. But BLACK players cannot afford to make even the slightest mistake, and therefore they must work on the opening a lot, and as precisely and zealously as the author of this book elaborated his variations. A.Adorján easily draws in worse positions, and even wins quite often, but I will talk about this in more detail later on.

If White’s advantage in the starting position is 7.5:2.5, it means neither a win nor a draw. We can draw a parallel between this case and the endgame king + rook +
bishop vs king + rook. How to evaluate this position? A computer, programmed specially to solve this puzzle, came up with the following answer: ‘40% of all possible positions are won by the stronger side, the method of defence has not been found.’ That is, if the evaluation of the starting position is 7.5:2.5, I can but raise my hat to the inventor of chess.

And now I attempt to explain why BLACK usually scores more than 2½ points out of 10 games. There are several reasons:

1) First, we do not always make ideal moves, we often make mistakes, therefore the advantage of the starting position evaporates.

2) The psychological factor can be no less important. The human being seems to be ‘programmed’ to think of his own safety first of all, and start aggressive action only after that.

When, for instance, I made it to the Premier League of the Soviet championship in 1973 as a young boy, and I had to prepare for hard battles against the leading players of that time (there were 4 world champions and 3 candidates in the field), I worked mostly on my repertoire with BLACK, and allotted only the time left to my White games. The overwhelming majority of leading players follows the same model, although the elaboration of a good repertoire for White is more time-consuming, as one is forced to prepare for a wide range of openings, whereas for BLACK it is satisfactory to have one or two openings ‘on stock’.

In addition to that, when people play with White they often try to prove that White is better, and they often go beyond the limit of reasonable risk. Then BLACK can take over the initiative, and he is stronger because he is prepared better!

And I still hold that, from a theoretical point of view, the tasks of White and BLACK in chess are different:

White has to strive for a win, BLACK – for a draw!

May 12, 1994
‘Let all flowers bloom’
— reflections on Grandmaster Sveshnikov’s arguments

All people faithful to their convictions deserve respect (except for those, obviously, who have left the grounds of humanism), even if my ideals and opinions are different from theirs. Who would dare to declare, after all, that he or she is a repository of the one and only truth?

Evgeny Sveshnikov has strict principles, as you may have read in his contribution. As regards BLACK IS OK!, his opinions could not be any more different from mine, although we are friends, and will remain so as two kindred spirits, two inquisitive minds. We met first in 1967 indeed, and, as Evgeny tactfully concealed the fact that I received a good beating from him on that occasion, let me also keep the result of our game in Sarajevo ’83 a secret... He wrote the above treatise at my request in 1994, when we both played in a category 14 tournament in Alushta. And this is what he wrote, despite the fact that I proved BLACK IS OK! in practice: I beat Dreev with BLACK, whereas I lost to Morozevich and Golubev as White... That makes no less than +3 with the BLACK pieces!

It is not fair to comment on someone’s writing without the possibility of a reply, even less so if we do it in a manipulative way. This is not my style. However, I must make some remarks, trying to keep the rules of fair play.

The comparison of my thesis to Rauzer’s ‘1 e2-e4 and White wins’ is unfortunate. The fact that Rauzer, a great attacking player, won a lot of games with 1 e4, is no proof. I bet he would have won a lot with 1 d4 as well. We have no idea which first move is better: Rauzer’s choice or 1 d4. Quite a few World Champions and top players could be listed on both sides. They all played only one move or the other, and were equally great players. Maths is not one of my strengths, but I am still probably not the only one who hasn’t got a clue where Evgeny took White’s 7:3 ‘advantage’ in the starting position from. Why does he think White has any advantage at all, and if he can explain that, why exactly 7:3? It sounds quite ‘out of the blue’, to put it mildly. Then he generously goes on to say that BLACK is OK nevertheless, it’s only that the slightest mistake can be fatal for him. Chess is a democratic game, no matter how royal it is. Therefore White has every right to make mistakes as well, and a lot of people have already exercised this right. So Evgeny’s standpoint is just another attempt to establish the supremacy of the ‘white man’ on the board, a
sort of ‘chess apartheid’ saying BLACK had better watch out! And lie low, or else...!

Still, Sveshnikov is not completely lacking goodwill. He admits that BLACK usually scores more than the 25 or maximum 30 percent he grants the second player in the starting position. Let me add that it’s significantly more, about 42-45%. For the moment it’s only me who finds it a scandalously poor result. The time will come, however, when the empty myth of White’s ‘advantage’ evaporates!

The statement that people think primarily of safety, with aggression and prey pushed into the background, is interesting. It may even be true in general, but the chess world is full of attacking players who march forward almost from move 1, especially if they have the White pieces. I believe Evgeny that he spent much more time on his BLACK repertoire when he was young. He probably still does the same, judging from the fact that the father of the Sveshnikov Variation plays very well with BLACK, and scores much more than the 25-30 percent ‘permitted’ by himself. However, his assumption that an ‘overwhelming majority’ of chess players does the same can be easily refuted in two ways: (1) by a representative survey among strong grandmasters (or at any level of playing strength), (2) by selecting 100 games at random, and pondering the striking difference between White and BLACK players’ play both during and after the opening – and the no less striking difference in the two sides’ results, of course. If BLACK’s lousy play and score is something beyond repair, not to be changed to the better in spite of the passionate and diligent preparations of the ‘overwhelming majority’, I am ready to withdraw my teachings and do public penance. However, I am afraid that if I ever do public penance, it will be for my numerous other sins. The ‘BLACK IS OK!’ theory will rather be a sort of mitigating circumstance...

My old friend Evgeny Sveshnikov deals his blows with BLACK, and proclaims between two wins that ‘White has to strive for a win, BLACK – for a draw’.

What a hypocrite!
A Rapid Theme Tournament

Gyula Fehér – Endre Végh:

Was BLACK OK?

WARNING! This is the part of our magazine (I planned to produce a periodical with the title you can guess. I thought of a kind of magazine with two thirds of its contents written by ourselves, while the rest was to be created by our potential partners all over the world, so they could add the specialties of their respective regions. Naturally, all from BLACK’s point of view. My plans failed, so only the complimentary issue (‘No. Zero’) was made and distributed free of charge first at the Manila Chess Olympiad. Without bothering you with the details, I must confess that THE ABILITY TO CREATE FAILURES AND TORSOS ranks high among my skills. – AA) which requires a certain degree of chess skills and preferably a chess set at hand...

The 10th Budapest Spring Cultural and Art Festival was organised this year, too. The chess tournament known as the 8th Budapest Spring Festival, which has by now also become traditional, took place within the framework of this event. It showed the usual picture: a large field battling in the spacious training hall of the Budapest Sports Hall. The strongest foreign players came mostly from the republics of the late Soviet Union. The first prize was won by the totally unknown Vladimir Poley from Minsk in the end (7½ points out of 9). But the main objective of our article is not to give a detailed report of this tournament, as there was a completely new initiative connected to the main event, ending on a Sunday afternoon (March 22). Just a couple of hours later the so-called ‘Is BLACK OK?’ rapid theme tournament began.

What does it mean? The idea comes from grandmaster András Adorján, whose ‘chess creed’ is that playing with the BLACK pieces doesn’t mean any kind of handicap – to say the least!...

You can read about its origins in ‘The Way It All Started’.

A new question arose later on: is it worth trying out the new thoughts in theme tournaments? This way they could undergo a serious test of practice, prove that they are ‘fit for life’, and, in addition to that, the statistics of these tournaments (compared to that of ‘normal’ ones which show White’s overwhelming, or at least 60:40 victory) could serve as basis for a scientific experiment. So the answer to the question if it’s worth trying was definitely: yes.

The most suitable form of realisation seems to be rapid (or
‘active’) chess with its thinking time of 30 minutes for each player. It’s hardly questionable that with this time control – if the players are well prepared – games of a very high level can be ‘produced’, which can enrich chess theory as well (in the future we will attempt not only to let the players know the subjects in advance like now, but also to enclose a ‘guide’, that is, a bunch of ideas to inspire inquisitive minds). The fact that this genre involves more time troubles than a traditional tournament (with all its natural consequences) influences only the sporting value of the event, as ideas of theoretical interest are usually introduced in the first 15-20 moves.

Nowadays, with financial considerations playing a more important role, even ‘normal’ round robins are played with one day-off – if there is a day-off at all – which is a strong challenge to the competitors’ physical and mental endurance.

A rapid tournament, however, takes only two days, with a maximum of 7 hours of playing time for 7 rounds. At a ‘normal’ tournament, however, one single adjourned game of, say, 75 moves can be longer than that!

After this short digression, let’s get back to the real point of our article, to the theme tournament ‘Is BLACK OK?’.

The organising and sponsor of the event, as well as one of the players, was András Adorján.

The themes had been given well in advance in a brochure, so the competitors had a chance to prepare for the games if they liked. There were obviously quite a few who did so, while others fell back on improvisation. This is quite natural since our event immediately followed the main tournament.

The bigger part of the field consisted of the participants of the main tournament, with some of the players concentrating only on this event. They had to start the game from a given position, different in each round. They couldn’t agree on a draw before the 30th move (except for perpetual check etc.). There were half-hour breaks between the rounds. (But – bloody Hell – it’s not enough that most of the players were from the main tournament, and obviously tired, but since the prizegiving took forever, we could only manage 1 round in the evening and 6 more on the following day, instead of the planned 2/5. The quality of the games DID SUFFER FROM THE HARSH SCHEDULE. – AA)

The sharpest variation was appropriately left to the finish. Owing to this, the games of the last round were characterised by a most uncompromising fight, even more so than those of the previous rounds.

* * * *

So much for introduction, and now let’s see the first round of the 7-round contest. The World Champion in the White corner and his unknown Challenger, a ‘dark (black) horse’ in the BLACK. Just think of good old Rocky Balboa (for this particular bout we changed the usual colours with the subsequent approval of our highly honoured audience). We have the referees to register the score after each round. So... ready? Box!
ROUND 1
Nimzo-Indian defence

1 d4 \( \text{dxf6} \) 2 c4 e6 3 \( \text{cxd5} \) a6 4 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{w}}c2} \) 0-0 5 a3 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{x}}cxd5} \) 6 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{w}}xc3} \) b5?!

\[ 
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
\text{W} & 15; = 1; \text{B} 16 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

BLACK’s point is to speed up his development, even if it costs him a pawn, and to take advantage of the weakened white squares and the white queen’s shaky position on the c-file.

A. 7 cxb5 c6!

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

It is true that it was the Latvian Vitolins, (renowned for his originality) who played 6...b5 first, but he continued with 7...a6 most of the time. This doesn’t belong to the subject of our present article, and the followers of 7...c6 were in a majority at the tournament, too. Maybe it’s not an exaggeration to say that the latter is an improvement on the original idea as it takes advantage of the weaknesses of the white squares and the shaky situation of the \( \text{\textbf{\textit{w}}c3} \). The premiere of this idea was in Nemeth – Adorján, Biel 1983, and it was successful...

Let’s see the branches of this variation!

You know, it’s so funny I have played this gambit quite a few times and with a good result against strong players. But after a while I started to have doubts concerning its correctness. And (1) since I never gambled (2) because the board is full of good moves and as long as you can find at least one at a time why should you play something suspect? So I quit. And now after 20 years of birth I got a big bunch of games. Great players – such as Adams for one – regularly play it. A crowd of people of any strength, sex, age play it. And win with it! Even if many of them might not know who is the ‘forefather’ I’m amused and in some strange way grateful for this most precious recognition. – AA

A1. 8 e3

A quiet, not too demanding continuation causing no problem for BLACK. We have chosen three games to support our point.

Game 1: Czeripp-Tolnai

8...\( \text{cxb5} \) 9 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{d}}d3} \) \( \text{\textbf{\textit{d}}b7} \) 10 \( \text{f3?} \) \( \text{\textbf{\textit{c}}c6} \) 11 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{e}}e2} \)
White's plan is too slow to work.
11...c8 12 e4 d5 13 g5 dxe4 14 fxe4 e5 15 d2 dxd3+ 16
xd3 xe4 17 xb5 h6 18 h4
19 xd5 20 0-0 c2 21
f2 xb2
with an easy win for BLACK.

Game 2: A. Kovács-Zapolskis
8...cxb5 9 xxb5 e4 10 d3
d6

11 d2??
White overlooks the double attack. But BLACK's position is
more favourable after 11 a4 a6 12 c4 g5 13 f1 xxc4 14 xc4
a5 15 f3 f5 16 g1 a6 17
c5 xc5 (17...d3!?) 18 dxc5
b8, too, as White is rather
vulnerable on the queenside.
11...g5! 12 b4 xb5 13
xb5 xxb5 14 xf8 xf8
The realisation of BLACK's
obvious advantage is just a technical
exercise:
15 f3 b7 16 d2 c6 17 b4
d6 18 hcl a5
and BLACK won on move 46

Game 3: Kharlov-Almási
8...b7 9 f3 cxb5 10 xb5
e4 11 b4

11...a5?
11...g5 was necessary here or
on the next move, e.g. 12 e2
d5!! 13 0-0 c6 14 d6 e4 15
f4 g5 16 g4 f5 17 h5 b8 or 14 d2 xf3+ 15 xf3 xf3 16
gxf3 h4 with promising
counterplay for BLACK in both
cases (AA).
12 wa4 a6? 13 0-0 g5
It's too late now.
14 xg5 xg5 15 f3
and BLACK had no counterplay
for the pawn.

A2. 8 bxc6

This move, as well as the
following one (B3) was, strangely
enough, never played at the
tournament. A more thorough
examination of the variations is not possible in this article, so let us just sketch their main lines:

8...\(\text{dxc6}\) 9 \(\text{dxf3}\)

9 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{dxa6!}\) 10 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{h6}\) 11 \(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 12 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{ac8}\) 13 \(\text{b2}\) \(\text{c7}\) 14 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{xf1}\) 15 \(\text{xf1}\) \(\text{xc8}\)!! still offered sufficient compensation, in Polugnau - Dzindzihashvili, Reykjavik 1990. But however logical and natural this last move is, there is an even stronger continuation. (In chess, you have to be quite specific - A.A.) 15...\(\text{wxf5}\)! 16 \(\text{xc1}\) \(\text{xc8}\) 17 \(\text{e2}\) \(\text{xb4}\) or 16 b5 \(\text{dxd4}\)! and our deepest sympathy goes to White.

9...\(\text{b7}\) 10 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{c8}\) 11 \(\text{d2}\)

11 \(\text{wd3}\) \(\text{wb6}\) 12 \(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{gxf6}\) 13 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{xb2}\) 14 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{wa2}\) 15 \(\text{d2}\)? (15 \(\text{b3}\)) 15...\(\text{d5}\)! 16 \(\text{w5}\) \(\text{xa3}\) 17 \(\text{d3}\) a6! --, Forintos-Dizdar, London, 1983.

11...\(\text{h6}\) 12 \(\text{h4}\)? \(\text{hxg5}\) 13 \(\text{hxg5}\) \(\text{g4}\) 14 \(\text{e4}\) \(\text{f5}\)

Even stronger is 14...\(\text{wc7}\) --, since 15 \(\text{wh3}\) is met by ...\(\text{f5}\) (16 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{h6}\)).

15 \(\text{gxf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 16 \(\text{d6}\) \(\text{wc7}\) 17 \(\text{xc8}\) \(\text{xc8}\) 18 \(\text{h4}\) \(\text{wb6}\) 19 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{a5}\) with an edge for BLACK, Nemet-Adorján, Biel 1983.

A3. 8 \(\text{f3}\)!!?

Not a harmless move at all, therefore it requires some examination.

8...\(\text{d5}\)!

After 8...\(\text{xc6}\) 9 e4 a6 10 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{c6}\) 11 \(\text{e2}\) White’s position is better.

I. 9 \(\text{wd2}\)?! \(\text{f5}\) 10 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{xb5}\) 11 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{c6}\) 12 \(\text{xb5}\) \(\text{a5}\) 13 \(\text{wd3}\) \(\text{b8}\) 14 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{xb5}\)!! 15 \(\text{bxa5}\)?

15 \(\text{xb5}\) \(\text{b3}\) 16 \(\text{b1}\) \(\text{h4}\)!! 17 \(\text{f2}\) \(\text{xc1}\) 18 \(\text{xc1}\) \(\text{xc3}\) with compensation for the exchange - Christiansen.

15...\(\text{a6}\) and BLACK won in 77 moves, Mohr-Christian sen, Germany 1989.

II. 9 \(\text{wd3}\)(!) This move can give BLACK a headache. A warning example:

9...\(\text{f5}\) 10 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{xb5}\) 11 \(\text{e4}\) \(\text{fxe4}\) 12 \(\text{fxe4}\) \(\text{d6}\) 13 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{d5}\) 14 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{f5}\)

15 \(\text{h4}\) \(\text{g6}\) 16 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{h6}\) 17 \(\text{h7}\) \(\text{xh7}\) 18 \(\text{h5}\) \(\text{g8}\) 19 \(\text{hxg6}\) \(\text{e8}\) 20 \(\text{h8+}\) \(\text{g7}\) 21 \(\text{h6+}\)!! 1-0, Oltean-Dumitrache, Rumania 1989.

A4. 8 \(\text{g5}\)!
The main line. One good way of handling all gambits is to give back the material gained at the right time and in the right way. That's what happens here, too!

8...cxb5 9 e3 b7 10 d3

a) 10...a6
- Kuntz-Vaulin -
11 e2
An insipid move.
11...d6 12 c1 bd7 13 c7 c8
and here White took everyone by surprise when he - resigned!

Even BLACK's edge is not at all clear if he 'punishes' White's 'blunder': e.g. 14 xd8 xc1+ 15 d2 xd8 16 xc1 e4+ 17 e1 xe5 18 xe5 xe5?! 19 f3 or 15...xh1 16 c7 e4+ 17 d3 f2+ and there seems to be nothing much better than perpetual check. What can the explanation be? Sometimes we do and say things we cannot explain even to ourselves. This was probably a kind of hallucination. Still, after the cold-blooded recapture of the queen BLACK can get a little positional advantage: 14...fxd8 15 0-0 b6 and he has the initiative on the queenside, the threat is a4.

11 d3! c6 12 0-0 c8 13 d2 d6
13...a5? 14 xf6 gxf6 15 e4 b3 16 h6+-
14 ad1 c7 15 b1 e5 16 d3!
A fine manoeuvre, forcing the weakening of the BLACK king's position.
16...g6 17 d2 b8 18 e4 bd7 19 e3 e6?
As the Hungarian saying goes, he jumps out of the way of the bicycle and finds himself under the wheels of a car. Slightly better 19...c7 but by 20 d5 and d2 White preserves his edge.
20 d5 g4?
The remorseful withdrawal with 20...we8 was better.
21 h3 wh5 22 h2!
Seeing the inevitable threat g4, BLACK sacrificed a piece with
22...xe4,
and resigned after a couple of moves. Adorján-A.Mészáros.

11 d3! d6 12 0-0 h6 13 h4 bd7 14 g3 d5 15 wb3 b6 16 d2!
16...f5 (?)  
16...\textit{\$e7 17 e4 \textit{\$f6 18 \textit{\$h4 with an edge.  
17 \textit{\$a1 \textit{\$h8 18 \textit{\$e1! \textit{\$g5 19 \textit{\$f3 \textit{\$e7 20 \textit{\$h4  
The weakness of the squares around the king is becoming apparent.  
20...\textit{\$f6 21 \textit{\$d1 \textit{\$e8  
21...g5 fails to 22 \textit{\$xd6!.  
22 \textit{\$h5 \textit{\$xc1 23 \textit{\$xc1 \textit{\$d8  
23...\textit{\$c8 is punished by the unbearable 24 \textit{\$e8+ \textit{\$h7 25 \textit{\$d7, whereas after the tricky 23...\textit{\$h7 24 \textit{\$xd6 g6 the only (but satisfactory) riposte is the striking 25 \textit{\$e5!.  
24 \textit{\$g6+ \textit{\$h7 25 \textit{\$h4 \textit{\$xg6 26 \textit{\$xg6+ \textit{\$xg6 27 \textit{\$xd8  
and White won both the exchange and the game.  

b) 10...h6 11 \textit{\$h4  
11 \textit{\$xf6 \textit{\$xf6 12 \textit{\$c1 \textit{\$a6 13 \textit{\$xb5 \textit{\$ac8 14 \textit{\$d2 \textit{\$g6 15 \textit{\$e2 \textit{\$xc1 16 \textit{\$xc1 \textit{\$c8 17 \textit{\$d1 \textit{\$xg2 and BLACK has a good game, H.Olafsson-Seirawan, Reykjavik, 1990.  
11...a6 12 \textit{\$d3 \textit{\$c6 13 0-0  

13...\textit{\$c8  
13...\textit{\$a5 14 \textit{\$xf6 gxf6 15 e4 \textit{\$g7 16 \textit{\$ae1 \textit{\$g8 17 \textit{\$c1 \textit{\$c8 18 \textit{\$f4 \textit{\$c7 19 \textit{\$h4 \textit{\$c4 20 \textit{\$e2 \textit{\$d8 21 \textit{\$f4 \textit{\$c7 22 \textit{\$h4 \textit{\$d8 23 \textit{\$f4 \textit{\$c7 Thorsteins-Adorján, Akureyri, 1988. Draw.  
14 \textit{\$d2 \textit{\$e7!?  
14...\textit{\$a5 15 \textit{\$xf6 gxf6 16 e4! \textit{\$g7 17 \textit{\$f4 with an edge for White.  
15 \textit{\$xf6 gxf6 16 e4 \textit{\$g7 17 \textit{\$c1 \textit{\$g6 18 \textit{\$xc8  
After 18 d5 \textit{\$xc1 19 \textit{\$xc1 \textit{\$b8 20 g3 \textit{\$c8 BLACK’s position is satisfactory.  
18...\textit{\$xc8 19 \textit{\$c1 \textit{\$b8 20 g3  
20 d5 doesn’t work because of the strong \textit{\$f4.  
20...f5! 21 d5?  
21 \textit{\$e3 was obligatory. After the text move White suddenly gets into a losing position.  
21...\textit{\$xe4 22 \textit{\$xe4 f5 23 dxe6  
Throwing the helve after the hatchet.  
23...\textit{\$xe4 24 \textit{\$xd7+ \textit{\$f6 25 \textit{\$c7 \textit{\$xf3}
26 h4
26 e7 \( \text{Ce8} \); 26 \( \text{Wg7+ Qg5} \)

26...\( \text{We8} \) 27 \( \text{Wg7+ Qxe6} \) and White’s army, reduced to a handful in numbers, could do no harm to the BLACK king in the middle of the board, and had to capitulate soon. A. Forgács-Berkovich.

A naive attempt to demolish the idea, but BLACK teaches his opponent a good lesson.

7...\( \text{Qc6!} \) 8 \( \text{cxb5 Qxd4} \) 9 \( \text{Wxa8} \)

9 \( \text{Wd3} \) was the lesser evil, but BLACK has excellent play after 9...c5!; e.g.

a) 10 bxc6 e.p. \( \text{Qxc6} \) and BLACK’s threat is a5 followed by \( \text{a6} \);

b) 10 e3 \( \text{f5} \) 11 \( \text{f3} \) a6! 12 \( \text{c2} \) d5! and White is already in trouble.

9...\( \text{c2+} \) 10 \( \text{d1 Qxa1} \) 11 \( \text{g5} \)

h6 12 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{We7} \) 13 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 14
\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{xf2} \) 15 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{We3+} \) 16 \( \text{b1} \)
\( \text{a6} \) 17 \( \text{xf8+} \) \( \text{xf8} \) 18 \( \text{bxa6} \) \( \text{b3} \)

White’s agony is becoming pitiful.

20...\( \text{We2} \)

and BLACK won in a couple of moves, Castello-Pulyakhov.

A real surprise! The challenger, considered a ‘BLACK horse’, started better. Hard slaps caught White on his body. A fight without compromise (one draw!) proves the real chances of the unknown challenger. The score of the first round: 51.6 – 48.4 for BLACK!

### ROUND 2

**Danube-gambit**

1 d4 \( \text{f6} \) 2 c4 g6 3 d5 b5

\( \text{W} \) 10; = 6; B 13

The ‘godfathers’ of the opening are the editors of the IBM tournament bulletin (1978), who gave this name to the opening,
hinting at its similarity to the Volga Gambit as well as to the differences. Both are big rivers, but their waters flow at different places — and in different ways... Do you know how old this gambit of mine is? It was suggested in my theoretical review of the Hungarian Championship of 1967!! But it took Ribli 7 years to throw it in against Spassov (Cienfuegos '74) and win. As for myself, I had to wait another 4 years until Dzindzihashvili came my way (IBM 1978). There is no justice for Hungary: I let him slip away... As to similarities and differences: in both gambits b is the letter for the gambit pawn. But as to the rest: the Volga (we rather call it Benko) has a closed centre with BLACK trying to get counterplay using the half open a and b lines. In my ‘Danube’ BLACK tries to take over the centre and attack in the middle, while White’s a and b pawns are passed. — AA

This energetic counterattack prevents the manoeuvre $\text{Qc3-e4}$ which would press BLACK down. (4 $\text{Qc3 b4! 5 Qb1a4 c6} \text{f3}$) Here it’s similar to the Benko-Volga Gambit, but the developing character of the position is different. In the Volga Gambit BLACK presses White on the a and b files, whereas here he counterbalances White’s majority in numbers with active piece play, sacrificing his pawns on the queenside.

We must also say here that this subject has something in common with the fifth one, regardless of all their differences: White’s play is based on the idea of avoiding the Grunfeld Defence.

4 cxb5

White can’t have the upper hand if he declines the gambit, e.g. 4 $\text{f3!} \text{bxc4 5 e4 c6 6 Qxc4 cxd5 7 exd5 Qg7 8 Qc3, M.Makláry-Pallagi, Béla Papp memorial correspondence theme tournament, 1989-90.}$ Instead of 8...$\text{w47}!! 9 Qb3 0-0, as played in that game, it is more serviceable to direct BLACK’s forces against the d5 pawn immediately.

4...a6

White can choose between two continuations here: 5 e3 and 5 bxa6.

A. 5 e3

The ‘counter-gambit’ led to an extra pawn for BLACK with no compensation for White: 5 $\text{Qc3 axb5 6 e4?! b4 7 e5 bxc3 8 exf6 cxb2 9 Qxb2 exf6 10 Qd4 Qe7 11 Qe2 Qg7 12 Qf3 0-0 13 Qf1 c5 14 Qc3 d6 15 h4 Qg4 16 Rae1 Qb7, I.Lipták-I.Rago, Béla Papp Memorial, correspondence, 1989-90.

5...Qg7 6 Qc3 0-0 7 Qf3 Qb7 8 Qe2

Now if 8 bxa6 then 8...$\text{Qxa6 9 Qc4 c6 10 0-0 (or 10 d6 Qc5 11 0-0 Qf6c4) 10...Qxd5 11 Qxd5 Qxd5 12 Qxd5 Qc7 with satisfactory activity for the pawn.}$

8...axb5 9 Qxb5
Played in the spirit of the gambit! 5...c5 is also possible, but then White can choose the Volga Gambit as well, although not the best variation.

6 dxc6 dxc6 7 e3 g7

Recapturing the pawn isn’t very urgent.

8 f3 0-0 9 e2

Or 9 c3 a5 10 d2 xa6 and the knight hasn’t got an effective move, e.g. 11 b5?! b6 12 a4 e4! with an edge for BLACK.

9...x a6 10 x a6 a5+!

A surprising ‘zwischengang’, easy to overlook.

11 c3 e4 12 0-0 x c3 13 bxc3 xa6 14 d2 f a8 15 c2 d5 16 f d1 a2 17 c4

B. 5 bxa6

17...a5!

This tactical blow helped BLACK get a better endgame (18 xa2 xa2 19 xa2 xa2), but later White managed to hold him to a draw, Dzindziashvili-Adorjan, Amsterdam, 1978. See The Anti-Grunfeld System chapter of the book Winning with the Grunfeld (Batsford, 1987).

1-6 moves as above.

7 c3 x a6
White’s pieces are hopelessly held up on the base line, and his king is also lingering in the middle.

16 \( \text{d2} \) e5 17 \( \text{g5} \) f6 18 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f8!} \) 19 a3 \( \text{b8} \) 20 b4 c5 21 b5 \( \text{xb5!} \) 22 \( \text{d2} \)

22 a4 \( \text{xa4!} \) 23 \( \text{xb8} \) \( \text{d1} \) checkmate!

22...\( \text{d8} \) 23 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{a4} \) 24 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{b3} \) 25 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{xa3!} \)

26 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{b8} \) 27 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{b2} \) 28 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{a2} \) 0-1, F.Pallagi-L.Rago, Béla Papp Memorial, correspondence, 1989-90.

1-7 moves as above.

8 g3 \( \text{b6!?} \)

9...0-0

The queen exchange is totally harmless, but 9...\( \text{b6} \) is interesting: 10 \( \text{f3} \) 0-0 11 0-0 d5!? (Or 11...\( \text{fd8}?! \) and then d7-d5.) 12 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 13 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xe2} \) 14 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{a5} \) 15 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{xf3} \) 16 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{d4} \) 17 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d8} \) 18 \( \text{ed1} \) \( \text{f5} \) 19 \( \text{h1!} \) (19 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xb2} \) 20 \( \text{e4} \) was more persistent.) 19...\( \text{xf2} \) 20 a4 \( \text{e6} \) 21 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xb2} \) 22 \( \text{db1} \) \( \text{xd3} \) and White resigned, T.Szabó-I.Lipták, Béla Papp Memorial. correspondence, 1989-90.

10 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{dxc6} \) 11 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{xd1}+ \) 12 \( \text{xd1} \) \( \text{d5} \) 13 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{fd8} \) 14 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 15 \( \text{ab1} \) \( \text{ad8} \)

9 \( \text{g2} \)

9 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g4} \) 10 e3 \( \text{xf1} \) 11 \( \text{xf1} \) \( \text{g7} \) and the white squares are ‘full of holes’.

9...\( \text{g4} \) 10 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 11 0-0 \( \text{a7} \)

12 \( \text{f4} \) 0-0 13 \( \text{e1} \) h6 14 \( \text{c1} \) g5

15 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{ab8} \) 16 b3 \( \text{ce5} \) 17 \( \text{d5} \) e6 18 \( \text{e3} \)

18 \( \text{e3} \) f5! with paralysing pressure.

18...\( \text{xe3} \) 19 \( \text{xe3} \) f5 20 \( \text{d2} \)
20...f4 21 gx{f4} gxf4 22 {c4} {c4}
{xe4} 23 bxc4 {b2}
23...f3 24 exf3 {xf3}+ 25 {xf3} {xf3} 26 {e3} {xe3} 27 {xe3} {xa2}
was simpler.
24 {c2} {xc4} 25 {d1}

II. 8 e3

In the following two games White gives up the idea of castling, therefore he loses a lot of time finding a safe place for his king.
8...{xf1} 9 {xf1} {g7} 10 g3 0-0
11 {g2} d5 12 {ge2} e5 13 f3 d4
with an immediate breakthrough, leading to a draw in the end, S. Faragó – G. Kállai. BLACK should have prepared d5 playing first 13...{a5}!, followed by {a8} and {d8}

III. 8 e4 {xf1} 9 {xf1} {g7} 10 g3
0-0 11 {g2}

25...d5??
A bad fumble, 25...{xc2} 26 {xc2} d5 would have led to a preferable position for BLACK.
26 {xd5}! exd5 27 {xd5}+ {f7}
28 {xf7}+ {xf7} 29 {xc4} f3 30 exf3
{xf3} 31 {g2} {a3} 32 {c8}+ {h7} 33
{c7}

and White triumphed, T.Tolnai – O.Boritchev.

11...d5
This is the most consistent move, but 11...{a5}!? 12 {f3} d5 13 exd5
{xd5} 14 {xd5} {xd5} was also worth considering.
12 exd5 ♗d4 13 d6 ♙xd6 14 ♙xd6 exd6 15 ♗f4 ♙fd8 16 ♙ge2 ♙fd5 17 ♙hd1 ♙xf4+ 18 ♙xf4 ♙xc3 19 bxc3 ♙c2 20 ♙ab1 ♙xa2

Material balance is restored, the position is equal. The game ended with a draw.

21 ♙d5 ♙g7 22 ♙f3 ♙e8 23 ♙d2 ♙e5 24 ♙bd1 ♙e1+ 25 ♙g4 h5+ 26 ♙h3 ♙xd2 27 ♙xd2 28 ♙d1 ♙e2 29 ♙g2 ♙e5 30 ♙f4 ♙c2 31 ♙xd6 ♙xc3 32 ♙d2 ½−½
A.Barshov – Z.Nemeth.

B2. 5...♗xa6!?

An original move making its first appearance at this tournament. (Every book has its own destiny, as they say. The blushing author must confess here that this treatment of the gambit didn’t even cross his mind and he focussed automatically on ♙xa6 a regular in the other gambit. Well, that’s what makes the world go round: people influencing each other, learning from each other. Now this particular ‘guest idea’ has been partly understood, and there is obviously still a lot to discover. – AA)

There were two other games with the same idea carried out in a different order of moves: 5...♗g7

a) 6 g3 ♙xa6 7 ♙g2 ♙b7 8 ♙c3 ♙d4 9 ♙b3 c5 10 dxc6 ♙xc6 11 ♙f3 ♙b8 12 ♙d1 0–0 13 0–0 ♙bd5 14 ♙xd5 ♙xd5 15 ♙g5 ♙c6 16 b3 ♙wa5 17 ♙d2 ♙h5 18 ♙e1, P.Lékó – M.Makarov. Here the right plan is 18...♗b7?! intending 19...♗a8 with increasing pressure on the queenside.

b) 6 e3 0–0 7 0–0 ♙c3 ♙xa6 8 ♙c4 e6 9 ♙ge2 ♙b7 10 0–0 ♙e7 11 e4 ♙b4 12 ♙b3 ♙xb3 13 axb3 exd5 14 exd5 ♙b4 15 ♙xa8 ♙xa8 16 ♙f4 g5, J.Demina – I.Ibragimov.

6 ♙c3 ♙g7 7 e4 0–0 8 ♙c4 e6 9 ♙xe6?!

It was better not to open the f file.

9...fxe6 10 ♙ge2 ♙g4 11 0–0 ♙h4 12 h3 ♙e5

BLACK would have walked into a trap playing 12...♕xf2?? 13 ♙el1.

13 ♙b3 ♙c5 14 ♙c2 ♙a6 15 ♙e3 ♙ed3 16 ♙xd3 ♙xd3 17 ♙d2 ♙h5 18 ♙ac1 c5 19 ♙g5 h6 20 ♙e3 ♙ab8

21 ♙f4??

Frightened of the threatening d7–d5, White makes a fatal mistake.

21...♕xf4 22 ♙xf4 ♕xf1 23 ♙xf1

White is ready to yield the exchange, as 23 ♙xb8 ♙xg2 24 ♙xg2 ♙f3+ 25 ♙g1 ♙xb8 is also hopeless.
23...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b4}}} 24 f3 d5.... 0-1, V. Loginov – Y. Klovan.

BLACK continues at his best. The second round also showed an advantage for the him. He doesn’t seem to be paralysed by fear at all. White might feel surprised, as he didn’t expect as tough resistance as this. The judges registered the punches as follows: 55.2 – 44.8 The fight stands at 53.3 – 46.7 to BLACK.

ROUND 3
Sicilian Defence,
Scheveningen-variations

1 e4 c5 2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}f3}} e6 3 d4 exd4 4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}xd4 \textex}f6} 5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}c3}} d6 6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}e2 \textex}e7} 7 0-0 0-0 8 f4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}b6}}

\textbf{W 18; = 4; B 8}

White can eliminate the pin of his knight in two ways: A. 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}h1}} or B. 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}c3}}(!).

A. 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}h1}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}c6}}

A1. 10 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}b3}}

10...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}c7}}!

Seemingly losing a tempo, but actually wins it! What do we mean? Let’s recall what happened in the 24\textsuperscript{th} game of the Karpov-Kasparov match (Moscow-Leningrad, 1985): 1 e4 c5 2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}f3}} d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}xd4 \textex}f6} 5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}c3}} a6 6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}e2 \textex}e6} 7 0-0 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}e7}} 8 f4 0-0 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}h1}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}c7}} 10 a4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}c6}} 11 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}e3 \textex}e8} 12 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}f3 \textex}b8} 13 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}d2 \textex}d7} 14 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}b3 b6}} 15 g4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}c8}} So the ‘wavering’ bishop (d7-c8-b7) lost TWO tempi in the ‘regular’ variation, whereas here it is waiting for the proper moment to occupy the long diagonal after 10...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}c7}}, at the cost of just ONE tempo (\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}b6-c7}}). 10...a6! 11 a4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}c7}} 12 a5 b5 13 axb6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}xb6}} 14 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}f3 \textex}b7}! 15 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}e2}} with mutual chances is also interesting. But here BLACK missed the promising 14...a5!

11 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textex}f3}}

Another benefit of BLACK’s 10\textsuperscript{th} move is that in case of 11 a4 he doesn’t have to move the a-pawn and he can simply play 11...b6!.

11...a6 12 a4 b6
13 \( \text{Qd4?} \)

This return is a significant waste of time. It’s more advisable to play 13 g4 \( \text{Qb8} \) with a roughly level game. The following variation illustrates the perils lurking for White: 13 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qb7} \) 14 g4? (Rather 14 \( \text{We2} \).) 14...d5! (There is nothing new under the sun: action in the centre is an effective riposte against a flank attack.) 15 exd5 (After 15 e5 \( \text{Qxg4!} \) 16 \( \text{Qxg4} \) d4 BLACK gets his pawn back with a favourable position.) 15...\( \text{Qb4!} \) 16 dxe6 \( \text{Qxg4} \) 17 exf7+ \( \text{Qxf7} \) 18 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 19 h3 \( \text{Qxf4} \) 20 \( \text{Qxb7} \) (20 hgx4 \( \text{Qxc1} \) 21 \( \text{Qxc1} \) \( \text{Qxf3} \) 22 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 23 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qg3} \) and BLACK wins.) 20...\( \text{Qxb7} \) 21 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qe3} \)!! 22 \( \text{Qxb7} \) \( \text{Qxf1+} \) 23 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qg1+} \) 24 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qf8+} \) 25 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qf4} \) or 25 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qf2} \) checkmate.

This very economical and picturesque dual deserves two diagrams! (see page 125)

13...\( \text{Qb7} \) 14 \( \text{Qxc6} \) \( \text{Qxc6} \) 15 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Wb7} \) 16 e5

16 g4?! d5! 17 e5? \( \text{Qxg4} \) with a decisive edge.

16...\( \text{Qd7} \) 17 exd6 \( \text{Qxd6} \)

White’s centre has fallen apart. BLACK definitely has the upper hand, and he won the game later, Beran – Adorján, Paris Open, 1990.

1-9 moves as above.

10 \( \text{Qb3} \) d5!?

11 exd5 (?)

The touchstone was 11 e5. Now the hazardous 11...\( \text{Qe4} \) results in strong counterplay for the pawn after 12 \( \text{Qxe4} \) dxe4 13 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 14 \( \text{We1} \) \( \text{Qb4} \) 15 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 16 \( \text{We4} \) \( \text{Qd7} \), but 13 c3! (planning \( \text{Qc2} \)) undermines the lonesome e4-pawn. The evaluation of the variation depends on the consequences of 11...\( \text{Qd7} \), e.g. 12 \( \text{Qd3} \) a5?! 13 a4 \( \text{Qb4} \).

11...\( \text{Qd8} \) 12 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qb4} \) 13 dxe6 \( \text{Qxe6} \) 14 f5 \( \text{Qc4} \) 15 \( \text{Qf3} \)

15...\( \text{Qa6} \)?

BLACK misses the advantageous 15...\( \text{Qg4} \)!! 16 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Qxd3} \) 17 cxd3 \( \text{Qxd3} \) 18 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 19 \( \text{Qg1} \) \( \text{Qde5} \) or \( \text{Qd2} \).
16 \( \&g5 \&xd3 17 \text{cxd3} \&xd3 18 \&we2 \&xf3 19 \&xf3 \&wc6 20 \&we2 \&e8 21 \&d4 - \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}, \text{S.Zagrebely - A.Barshov.}

A2. 10 \&e3 \&xb2

Otherwise 8...\&b6 would be meaningless.

11 \&d2 \&a3 12 \&ab1

12...\&h8!?

An important preparatory move by A.A. After 12...\&a5 13 \&xc6 bxc6 14 \&d5 \&b8 15 \&xe7+ \&xe7 16 e5 dxe5 17 fxe5 \&d5 18 \&g5 f6 19 exf6 \&xf6 20 \&xf6 gxf6 21 \&b3 White has an attack for the pawn, K.Klundt-E.Végth, Augsburg, 1987.

(\text{It is all very nice and indeed I'm smart! But sometimes it is even better to be reasonable. What I mean is that after both 11 \&d2 and 12 \&ab1, \&xd4 followed by \&b4/\&a5 led to a position with a pawn up. Sometimes you simply can't see the wood for the trees... – AA})

13 \&b5!?

White would walk into a pitfall by 13 \&cb5? \&xe4!! 14 \&xa3 \&xd2 and the point of \text{BLACK}'s 12th move becomes obvious: the e7-bishop can't be taken with a check after 15 \&xc6 \&xb1 or its 'dual', 15...\&xf1. \text{I confess this pretty variation captured my heart. The other knight jump was by far the best: 13 \&db5 \&a5 14 \&xd6 \&xd6 15 \text{xd6} \&d8 16 \&c5 \&xc5 17 \&xc5 b6 18 \&e3 \&b7 19 e5 \&e8 seems to bring a slight White plus.}

13...e5 14 \&b3 a6 15 \&b6 exf4

16 \&xf4 \&d7 17 \&e1! \&f6

If 17...\&xb6 then 18 \&c1 \&b4 19 a3 trapping the queen. It's not a tragedy though, since after 18...\&xc1 19 \&xc1 \&e6 the position is unclear.

18 \&c1 \&xc3 19 \&xc3 \&a4 20 \&b2 f6 21 e5!

21...dxe5

White's intention was probably 21...\&xb6 22 exf6 'winning the game'. It's rather a draw after 22...\&e5 23 fxg7+ \&xg7 24 \&g3+ \&g4 25 \&xe5 dxe5 26 \&xe5+ \&g8 27 \&g5+ and perpetual check. But there is an improvement by 22...\&g8 23 f7+ \&xf7 24 \&xf7 \&e5 25 \&f1 \&e6 and \text{BLACK is better.}

22 \&c5 \&d4!?

22...\&xc5 23 \&xc5 \&d8 24 a3 \&b8 is tremendous.

23 \&xd7 \&xc3 24 \&xc3 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}, although \text{BLACK}'s position is slightly better, D.Lawson-J.Horváth, European Team Championship, Haifa 1989.
B. 9 \( \text{\textbf{e}}3(!!) \)

23...f6?

He feels that he can take advantage of the pin, but he chooses the wrong way. 23...\( \text{\textbf{f}}6! \) 24 \( \text{\textbf{x}}\text{f}5 \) \( \text{\textbf{w}}d2! \) would have put an end to White’s illusions — and to the game!

24 \( \text{\textbf{x}}\text{h}7! \) \( \text{\textbf{f}}xe5 \) 25 \( \text{\textbf{x}}\text{xe5} \) \( \text{\textbf{w}}d6 \) 26 \( \text{\textbf{h}}8+ \) \( \text{\textbf{f}}7 \)

26...\( \text{\textbf{g}}7 \) isn’t any better: 27 \( \text{\textbf{w}}h7+ \) \( \text{\textbf{f}}6 \) 28 \( \text{\textbf{x}}\text{f}5+ \) \( \text{\textbf{gx}}f5 \) 29 \( \text{\textbf{w}}x5+ \) \( \text{\textbf{g}}7 \) 30 \( \text{\textbf{h}}7+ \) \( \text{\textbf{g}}8 \) 31 \( \text{\textbf{g}}4+ \) leads to checkmate.

27 \( \text{\textbf{x}}\text{f}5+ \) \( \text{\textbf{gx}}f5 \) 28 \( \text{\textbf{w}}f5+ \) \( \text{\textbf{w}}f6 \) 29 \( \text{\textbf{h}}7+ \) \( \text{\textbf{g}}8 \) 30 \( \text{\textbf{w}}4+ \) 1-0, A.Adorján – G.Tunik.

1-8 moves as above.

9 \( \text{\textbf{e}}3 \) \( \text{\textbf{w}}x\text{b}2 \)

A critical moment. The question is if White can take advantage of the ‘rambling’ of the opponent’s queen.
B1. 10 \( \text{Q} \text{c}b5 \)?

Very inviting indeed, but also a move that loses. Which happens.

10...\( \text{W} \text{b}4 \)!

An oversight that miraculously occurred in two games as well (see 'The Philosopher's Stone'), but it was over in the long run: BLACK was just a pawn up. – AA.

11...\( \text{W} \text{c}3 \)!

– over!

This double attack virtually puts an end to the battle, there's just a little cat-and-mouse play left.

12 \( \text{Q} \text{x}a8 \) \( \text{W} \text{x}e3+ \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{h}1 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}e4 \)
14 \( \text{W} \text{d}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{f}2+ \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{x}f2 \) \( \text{W} \text{x}f2 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{f}1 \) \( \text{W} \text{h}4 \) – +

The game Maeder-Adorján, Biel Open, 1990 and Zude – Adorján, Bundesliga, 1990, went on exactly like this up to this point. You will find them a few pages later.

16 \( \text{W} \text{c}6 \)!

Bravo!

16...\( \text{b}x\text{c}6 \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{b}6 \) \( \text{W} \text{b}6+ \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{x}b6 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 19 \( \text{Q} \text{f}3 \)

As a result of the combination, White has a preferable endgame.

19...\( \text{a}7 \) 20 \( \text{c}c6 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 21 e5 \( \text{e}8 \)
22 \( \text{e}6 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 23 \( \text{d}d1 \) \( \text{x}d1+ \) 24 \( \text{x}d1 \) \( \text{a}8 \) 25 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 26 \( \text{d}3 \)
27 g3 \( \text{h}6 \) 28 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 29 \( \text{f}3 \)
30 a3 \( \text{b}6 \) 31 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 32 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 33 \( \text{d}4 \) a5 34 \( \text{x}b6 \)
35 \( \text{a}4+ \) \( \text{f}7 \) 36 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
37 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{x}b5 \) 38 \( \text{x}b5 \) g5 39 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{h}5 \)
40 h4 \( \text{g}xh4 \) 41 \( \text{g}xh4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 42 h5 \( \text{f}x5 \) 43 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{d}6+ \) 44 \( \text{x}a5 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 45 \( \text{h}7 \)
46 \( \text{c}3 \) – 1-0, Sjoberg – Onischuk.

B3. 10 \( \text{W} \text{d}3 \) \( \text{W} \text{b}4 \) 11 \( \text{a}b1 \) \( \text{a}5 \)
12 \( \text{h}5 \)

B2. 10 \( \text{Q} \text{d}b5 \) \( \text{W} \text{b}4 \) 11 \( \text{W} \text{d}2 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
12 \( \text{a}b1 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 13 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{a}6 \)?

A mistake. 13...\( \text{d}5 \)! was 'OK'.

14 \( \text{Q} \text{x}d6 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x}d6 \) 15 \( \text{W} \text{x}d6 \) \( \text{d}8 \)
Over to the kingside!

12...\(\text{Wc7}\) 13 \(\text{Ec5}\) \(\text{Dbd7}\) 14 \(\text{Ddb5}\) \(\text{Wb8}\) 15 \(\text{Ee1}\) \(\text{Ee8}\) 16 \(\text{Ec3}\) a6 17 \(\text{Ed4}\) \(\text{Ec5}\) 18 \(\text{Wd2}\) \(\text{Df6}\) 19 \(\text{Ef3}\) \(\text{Ed8}\) 19...d5!? 20 exd5 \(\text{Ed8}\) was more ambitious.

20 f5 e5 21 \(\text{Ah6}\) g6 22 \(\text{Db3}\)

22...d5

22...\(\text{Wc7}\)! 23 \(\text{Dd5}\) \(\text{Dxd5}\) 24 \(\text{Wxd5}\) \(\text{Ah4}\) 25 fxg6 \(\text{Axg3}\) 26 \(\text{Axc5}\) \(\text{Ah4}\) 27 gxh7+ \(\text{Wxh7}\) 28 \(\text{Wxf7}\) \(\text{Wxf7}\) 29 \(\text{Da4}\) \(\text{He6}\)! and BLACK seems to be winning.

23 \(\text{Dxc5}\) \(\text{Wa7}\) 24 \(\text{Ah1}\) \(\text{Wxc5}\) 25 fxg6 hxg6 26 \(\text{Dxd5}\) \(\text{Dxd5}\) 27 exd5 \(\text{Df5}\) 28 \(\text{Wc2}\) \(\text{Ah6}\)

28...\(\text{Ah7}\)! 29 \(\text{Ac1}\) \(\text{Wxc2}\) 30 \(\text{Wxe5}\) \(\text{Ah4}\) still gave an edge for BLACK.

29 \(\text{Ee4}\) \(\text{Axh4}\) 30 \(\text{Wxe4}\) \(\text{Wc7}\) 31 d6 \(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\)

Drawn because after 31...\(\text{Dxd6}\) 32 \(\text{Dxd6}\) \(\text{Dxd6}\) 33 \(\text{Axg6}\) fxg6 34 \(\text{Wxg6}\) \(\text{Eh8}\) 35 \(\text{Axg7}\) \(\text{Dg8}\) White is forced to give perpetual check due to the weakness of his base line. Klován – Vaulin.

B4. 10 \(\text{Wd2}\)

The most problematic continuation from BLACK’s point of view.

10...\(\text{Wb4}\) 11 \(\text{Hab1}\) \(\text{Wa5}\) 12 \(\text{Dd5}\) \(\text{Wd8}\)

12...\(\text{Dd8}\)? loses to 13 \(\text{Dxe7}+\)!

13 \(\text{Dxe7}\) \(\text{Wxe7}\) 14 \(\text{Wf3}\) d5 15 e5 \(\text{Dxe}\) \(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\) Unzicker-Adorján, Bundesliga 1989.

BLACK offered a draw in a pretty shaky position, as 16 \(\text{Wd3}\) can follow, and after any move of the b8-knight there comes 17 c4! with fearful threats, e.g. 16...\(\text{Dxa6}\) 17 c4 \(\text{Dxc5}\) 18 \(\text{Wxa3}\) dxc4 19, \(\text{He1}\) totally paralysing BLACK’s forces. BLACK’s improvement may be 14...\(\text{Cc6}\)? or 14...e5?*

We have much more to say about this subject than we could squeeze into this article, so we’re going to return to it with a more detailed analysis in one of our following issues.*

White is now recovering from the shock of the first two rounds and fights back with all his might. It seems that BLACK’s over-confidence after the first signs of success made him forget the advice of his coach! After a heavy punch he was even down for the count! Score of this round: B: 33.3 – W: 66.7 (1:2!). And the overall score: B: 46.7 – W: 53.3
*Most unfortunately there were no following issues. This article was a chapter of the 'BLACK IS OK!' periodical’s sample copy. We gave away thousands of it first in Manila ’92 Olympiad. For some reasons this copy (has) remained the one and only issue. Such things happen, nevertheless right after this review follows 'The Philosopher's Stone'!

ROUND 4
Grunfeld Defence

1 d4 Qf6 2 c4 g6 3 Qc3 d5 4 Qf3 Qg7 5 Qb3 dxc4 6 Qxc4 0-0 7 e4 a6

This is the 'Hungarian way' of the Russian variation. It is called Hungarian because from 1970 myself, Ribli, Sax played it quite regularly and successfully, with Bárczay and Vadász following suit later. The 'inner enemy' was led by none other than Lajos Portisch. The 'case' became international soon. There are, however, two relatively unknown facts. (1) It was IM Dr Liptay in '69 who showed me a game Kozlov-Lukin from 'Shakhmatny Bulletin', won by BLACK in style. We thought this was the stem game... (2)...until I found a somewhat earlier game when working on 'Winning with the Grunfeld'. It was played in the World Championship match Euwe-Alekhine (1935), and went 8 Qf4 b5! 9 Qxc7 Qe8? (9...Qxc7 10 Qxc7 Qb7 and BLACK IS OK!) 10 Qd5! with an easy win for White. Let me say again: you never know whose novelty you have just worked out... — AA

W 9; = 6; B 16

The starting position of the theme allowed the players a relatively free choice of continuations.

A. 8 e5 Qfd7

8...b5 9 Qb3 leads to the main variation with a reversed order of moves.

9 e6 fxe6 10 Qxe6+ Qh8 11 Qg5 Qc6 12 Qe3

12 Qf7+ Qxf7 13 Qxf7 Qxd4 ++.

12...Qe8

12...Qc5 was played in a game Georgadze-Yermolinsky, Simferopol, 1988, and after 13 Qf7+ Qxf7 14 Qxf7 Qxd4 15 Qxd4 Qxd4 16 Qe2 e5 17 0-0 Qe6 18 Qf3 Qe7 BLACK had a satisfactory position, although he lost the game in the end. 12...Qf6 is also worth considering, e.g. 13 Qf7+ Qxf7 14
\( \text{xf7 } \text{xd4} \ 15 \text{xd4} \) (15 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e6!} \)) 15...\( \text{wd4} \) with active play for BLACK against the 'underdeveloped' White army. And, last but not least, 12...\( \text{de5} \) is also on a par with the moves mentioned so far: 13 \( \text{wd5} \) \( \text{g4!?} \) 14 \( \text{f7} \) \( \text{xf7} \) 15 \( \text{xf7} \) \( \text{f5} \) 16 0-0-0 \( \text{xd4} \) 17 \( \text{wc4} \) e5 with abundant compensation for the exchange.

13 0-0-0 \( \text{f6} \) 14 \( \text{b3} \) e5! 15 dxe5

15 d5 \( \text{d4} \) is decisively strong.

This is the critical point of the game.

15...\( \text{exe5} \)?

This move looks good, but in fact it's a mistake. BLACK should have played 15...\( \text{g4!} \) 16 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{h6} \)! 17 h4 \( \text{xf2} \) with excellent play (Adorján).

16 \( \text{e2} \)

After this quiet continuation it's difficult to give White any useful advice.

16...\( \text{f5} \)?

A suicidal resolution.

17 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{e8} \) 18 \( \text{f3} \)

Maybe he overlooked this move?

18...\( \text{e5} \) 19 \( \text{xa8} \) \( \text{xa8} \) 20 \( \text{xa8} \), Polulyahov-Kharlov. White won on move 28.

B. 8 \( \text{b3} \) b5 9 e5

B1. 9...\( \text{fd7} \) 10 e6

10 h4 c5 11 e6 is more dangerous for BLACK.

10...\( \text{fxe6} \) 11 \( \text{xe6}+ \) \( \text{h8} \) 12 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e5} \) 13 \( \text{wd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 14 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{e6} \) 15 \( \text{xe7} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 16 \( \text{xa8} \) \( \text{xc2}+ \) 17 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{xa1} \) 18 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{f5} \) 19 f3 \( \text{c2}+? \)!

Seems to be unnecessary. Instead, BLACK could have practically 'nailed down' his opponent playing 19...h6! 20 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 21 fxe4 \( \text{c6} \) 22 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{f2} \)!

20 \( \text{e1} \) e6 21 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{d4}+ \) 22 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xb2} \) 23 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{e8} \) 24 \( \text{d4} \) g5

with a complicated endgame, leading to a draw in 38 moves in Barlov-Sjoberg.

B2. 9...\( \text{g4}(!) \)

Eleven years is a long time in the life of the frequently played variations. The exclamation mark is not valid anymore, as a bad guy from White's side came up with the idea of 10 h3 \( \text{h6} \) 11 \( \text{d3} \) (or 11 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{xh6} \) 12 \( \text{d3} \)) followed by \( \text{e4} \) and White is simply better. It may be not such a big deal, but makes the play one-sided and dull. The good news is that 9...\( \text{fd7} \) is alive and kicking. – AA
BLACK’s idea is not a ‘new-born’ baby at all. It was played in a game Portisch-Adorján, Budapest, 1970 (cf. Hungarian variation). At this point there are some important lines:

I. 10...f4 c5 11 dxc5
   11 h3 cxd4 12 d1 w5 13 xd4 h6 14 w5 a7 15 b4 w7 16 w3 d6 17 c1 e6 18 c5 w8 19 g5 xd5 20 xd5 xe5 21 xe5 xe5 22 c3, Marinetti-Fogarasi, Mitropa Cup, 1991. Here BLACK could have won in a couple of moves by playing 22...f6!
   11...d6 12 d1 w5 13 w3

It’s usually not for fun that people make strange moves like this...

   13...wxa3 14 bxa3 e6 15 a4 bxa4

15...b4!? was worth considering. An interesting variation: 16 d5 ad8 17 c4 d7 18 h3 gxe5 19 xe5 (19 xe5 xe5+ 19...xe5 20 b6 xd1+ 21 xd1 d8+ 22 e2 xc4+ 23 xc4 d5 24 cxe5 xe5 25 e1 d3 26 c4 xc5 27 xb4 e5! with a slight advantage for BLACK.

   16 xa4 gxe5 17 xe5 xe5 18 b6 a7 19 a4 d7 20 e3 c3+ 21 e2 c7 22 d5 xd5 23 xd5 e6 24 d6 xe5 and BLACK has a slight advantage (†), Ftacnik-Wolff, New York 1991.

II. 10 h3 h6 11 f4

An interesting game with 11 g5:
   11...c5 12 dxc5 c6 13 e2 e6 14 c2 c7 15 e4 ad8 16 0-0 b4 17 a4 d5 18 f4 f5 19 c1 cd4 20 xd4 xd4 21 d1 e8 and BLACK must have been a little bit discouraged, as he offered a draw in a more favourable position, and his offer wasn’t turned down. (J.Horváth-Hoffmann, Budapest, 1992.) The two writers of the article couldn’t figure out even with the editor’s help what was wrong with
   11 f5 12 d1 c6 with an edge, and 12 d5 fails to 12...c5! 13 d6 e6.

   11...c5 12 d1 c6!
Adorján's move which was first tried out in '91 at a blitz tournament (!). In the game Cs.Horváth-Atalik the 'Turkish Capa', AA's protégée forgot where he was and 'gave away' the novelty. White — obviously taken by surprise — didn't show much resistance: 13 d5 惱d4! 14 淘xd4 exd4 15 淘xd4 深f5 16 淘d1 深c7 17 d6 exd6 18 exd6 深a5 19 深e2 深e6 20 深c2 b4 21 深a4?? 深xc3+ 0-1. In any case, White learned the lesson, as we're going to see.

The same position was on the board in the game Vaulin-Adorján. The exact order of moves was:

10 深f4 c5 11 深d1 深c6 12 h3 深h6

Then followed:

13 d5 惱d4! 14 淘xd4 exd4 15 淘xd4 深f5

16 深e4

BLACK has a superb position after 16 深d2 as well, as our analysis with grandmaster Adorján has proved: 16...深c7

a) 17 d6 exd6 18 exd6 深a5 19 d7 深b7 with a clear edge;

b) 17 深e2 深xe5 18 深xe5 深xe5 19 0-0 深e3! 20 f4 (only move) 深c7 21 深f3 深c4 and BLACK has the upper hand.

16...e6! 17 d6

17 dxе6 深xe6 isn’t even worth mentioning, whereas after 17 深e2 exd5 White can hardly make a ‘regular’ move.

17...深b7 18 深d3 深e4

19 深xe4?
Followed by a forced loss.

19...深a5+ 20 深d2 深b6
Here White is struggling with too many problems.

21 深f4 深d4 22 深c3 深d5 23 b4 23 深b3 深xe5! with a ‘snappy ending’.

23...深c8
Almost any other move would have also won, the simplest way was perhaps 23...深xd6.

24 深c5 深h4 25 深g3 深xg2+ 26 深e2 深f4+ 27 深xf4 深xh1
and BLACK realised his advantage. 0-1

And now let’s get back to move 19:

19 深xe4
Better than 19 深xe4, but not enough.

19...深e8 20 深xf5 gxf5 21 0-0 深c4 22 深e2
This position was on the board in a game Cs.Horváth-Lékó, GM tournament, Budapest, 1992 (Just some days later than the previous game.) BLACK chose the unfortunate 22...f6? and lost the game in an instructive way: 23 \text{\textit{W}}g3 \text{\textit{Q}}h8 24 \text{\textit{Md}}1 \text{\textit{Wd}}7 25 \text{\textit{Qd}}4 \text{\textit{Rg}}8 26 \text{\textit{We}}3 fxe5 27 \text{\textit{Qxe}}5 \text{\textit{Qxe}}5 28 \text{\textit{Wxe}}5+ (Total blockade.) \text{\textit{Wg}}7 29 f4 \text{\textit{Wxe}}5 30 fxe5 \text{\textit{Kc}}5 31 \text{\textit{Ke}}1 \text{\textit{Kg}}6 32 \text{\textit{Qxf}}5! \text{\textit{Kg}}5 33 d7 \text{\textit{Kg}}8 34 \text{\textit{Qd}}6 and BLACK surrendered – 1-0

Let’s get back to the position after White’s 22th move:

Let’s try to realise the noble intention of breaking the phalanx in another way:

a) 22...\text{\textit{Mxf}}4 23 \text{\textit{Qxf}}4 \text{\textit{Qxe}}5 fails to 24 \text{\textit{Wg}}3+ \text{\textit{Qh}}8 25 \text{\textit{Qg}}6+ hxg6 27 \text{\textit{Wxe}}5+ \text{\textit{Qg}}8 28 \text{\textit{Kc}}1 and BLACK is not OK.

b) 22...\text{\textit{Wh}}4! seems to be, on the other hand, very strong, e.g. 23 \text{\textit{Qg}}3 \text{\textit{We}}4 24 \text{\textit{Qc}}3 \text{\textit{Wd}}4 25 \text{\textit{Kd}}1 \text{\textit{We}}5++; 23 \text{\textit{Kh}}2 f4++; 23 \text{\textit{Wf}}3 \text{\textit{Kc}}2++

C. 8 \text{\textit{Ke}}2

8...h5 9 \text{\textit{Wb}}3 c5 10 dxc5 \text{\textit{Qbd}}7

11 c6

Let’s see an example of 11 e5, too: 11...\text{\textit{Qg}}4 (!) 12 0-0 \text{\textit{Qx}}5 13 \text{\textit{Qxe}}5 \text{\textit{Qxe}}5 14 \text{\textit{Kd}}1 \text{\textit{Wc}}7 15 \text{\textit{Qd}}5 \text{\textit{Wb}}7 16 \text{\textit{Ke}}3 \text{\textit{Kf}}6 17 f4? \text{\textit{Kad}}8 18 fxe5 \text{\textit{Qxd}}5 19 \text{\textit{Qxd}}5 \text{\textit{Kxd}}5 and BLACK won, Sosonko-Kasparov, SWIFT (blitz!), 1987.

11...\text{\textit{Qc}}5 12 \text{\textit{Wc}}2 b4 13 \text{\textit{Qd}}5?!

13 \text{\textit{Qa}}4 \text{\textit{Qxa}}4 (after 13...\text{\textit{Qxe}}4 14 c7 is strong) 14 \text{\textit{Qxa}}4 \text{\textit{Qxe}}4 15 0-0 (15 \text{\textit{Wxb}}4 \text{\textit{Qf}}5 16 0-0 \text{\textit{Kb}}8 with good counterplay for the pawn.) 15...\text{\textit{Wc}}7 16 a3 \text{\textit{Kxa}}3 17 \text{\textit{Qxa}}3 \text{\textit{Qd}}6 18 \text{\textit{Qd}}2 \text{\textit{Qxb}}2 draw, Vladimirov-Gulko, Moscow, 1990)

13...\text{\textit{Qxe}}4 14 \text{\textit{Qc}}4 \text{\textit{Qf}}5 15 \text{\textit{We}}2 e6 16 c7 \text{\textit{Wd}}6 17 \text{\textit{Qf}}4

17...\text{\textit{Exd}}5! 18 \text{\textit{Qxd}}6 \text{\textit{Qxd}}6 19 0-0

\text{\textit{Wd}}4 20 \text{\textit{We}}7 \text{\textit{Qce}}4
The three pieces bought for a ridiculously low price (a queen) are the pledge of BLACK’s victory.

21 \textit{wh}4 \textit{ac}8 22 \textit{ad}1 \textit{xc}7 23 \textit{g}g5 \textit{xg}5 24 \textit{wxg}5 \textit{xd}3 25 \textit{fe}1 \textit{xb}2 26 \textit{wa}5

White is struggling powerlessly.

26...\textit{db}5 27 \textit{xa}6 \textit{bb}8 28 h4 \textit{af}5 29 h5 \textit{d}7 30 h6 \textit{a}7

and BLACK realised his advantage, Czobe-Malyutin.

White lost his power in the previous round! BLACK proved that even a great champion can lose his balance under the punches of a well-prepared nameless fighter. Dear readers, don’t go to bed yet, more unexpected excitement is waiting for you! BLACK returned the heavy blow in this round:

B: 66.7 – W: 33.3 (2:1!). He is the leader after 4 rounds, by B: 50.4 – W: 49.6

A. 3 \textit{gf}3 \textit{g}7 4 d4 \textit{exd}4 5 \textit{xd}4 \textit{f}6!

The competitors were obliged to get to this point. The last move is Adorján’s idea, which he played in his game with Adamski for the first time in 1970 (\textit{I’ll have to check out the two matches between Steinitz and Chigorin, just to make sure... – A4}). Until then 5...\textit{bc}6 followed by 6...\textit{e}7 was the usual continuation.

6 \textit{c}3 0-0 7 \textit{e}2 \textit{e}8 8 f3 c6!

That’s it! Unfortunately, few players ventured the immediate explosion of the centre made possible by this order of moves, as opposed to the King’s Indian, e.g. 1 d4 \textit{f}6 2 c4 g6 3 \textit{c}3 \textit{g}7 4 e4 d6 5 \textit{f}3 0-0 6 \textit{e}2 e5 7 0-0 \textit{exd}4 8
\( \text{\#xd4 } \text{\#e8} 9 \text{ f3 c6 etc. (If the story goes as usual, BLACK is a clear tempo up compared to the original variation.)} \)

To prevent BLACK's intention, A1. 9 \text{ \#c2} or A2. 9 \text{ \#g5} are worth considering, but White can also ignore this plan: A3. 9 0-0.

A1. 9 \text{ \#c2} d5!

\begin{center}
\text{Diagram 1}
\end{center}

It's an interesting paradox occurring quite often that our plans are the most forceful exactly when the opponent makes the greatest effort to prevent them.

10 cxd5

White would simply have a worse position if he declined the pawn sacrifice.

10...cxd5 11 \text{ \#xd5} \text{ \#xd5} 12 \text{ \#xd5} \text{ \#xd5}!

12...\text{\#h4+} 13 g3 \text{ \#f6} 14 \text{\#b1} \text{\#c6} was played in the above-mentioned adventurous Adamski-Adorján game (Polanica Zdroj, 1970) and BLACK won in the end.

13 exd5 \text{\#a6} 14 \text{\#f2} \text{\#f5} 15 \text{\#e3} \text{\#d4}!

BLACK has the upper hand owing to the White king's ragged position.

A2. 9 \text{\#g5}

Pinning the knight doesn't solve White's problems, either.

9...h6 10 \text{\#h4} d5!

\begin{center}
\text{Diagram 2}
\end{center}

Faithful to the spirit of the variation.

11 exd5

11 cxd5 cxd5 12 exd5 g5 13 \text{\#f2} \text{\#xd5} 14 \text{\#db5} \text{\#e6} 15 0-0 \text{\#c6} 16 \text{\#xd5} \text{\#xd5} 17 \text{\#c3} \text{\#e6} is weaker as all of BLACK's pieces - especially his bishops - are much more active than White's, and he has a strong pressure on the queenside and the d4 square as well. These advantages were enough for BLACK to win the game David-Adorján, Zalaegerszeg, 1991

11...cxd5 12 0-0

12 \text{\#xf6} is no longer promising, either, e.g. 12...\text{\#xf6}! 13 \text{\#xd5} \text{\#xd4} 14 \text{\#xd4} \text{\#xd4} 15 \text{\#c7} \text{\#d7} 16 \text{\#xa8} \text{\#c8} 17 \text{\#d1} \text{\#c6} with an advantage for BLACK.

12...\text{\#c6} 13 \text{\#xc6 bxc6} 14 \text{\#f2}

After 14 cxd5 comes 14...\text{\#b6+!} and \text{\#xb2}.

14...\text{\#e6}
15 \text{\texttt{a}4}

15 \texttt{c5} \texttt{b}8 16 \texttt{b}1 \texttt{h}5 or 15 \texttt{c}1 \texttt{b}8! 16 cxd5 \texttt{d}x5 17 \texttt{x}d5 \texttt{x}d5 18 b3 \texttt{b}4 19 \texttt{c}4 \texttt{ad}8 20 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{xc}4 21 \texttt{xc}4 \texttt{xc}4 22 \texttt{xc}4 \texttt{e}2! is favourable for BLACK.

15...\texttt{h}5! 16 cxd5 \texttt{d}x5 17 \texttt{e}1 \texttt{g}5 18 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{f}4 19 \texttt{f}1 \texttt{c}4! 20 \texttt{xe}8+ \texttt{xe}8 21 \texttt{c}3 \texttt{x}f1 22 \texttt{xf}1

Ostrich policy doesn't help, either!

9...d5! 10 exd5 cxd5 11 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{c}6 12 \texttt{xc}6 bxc6 13 cxd5 \texttt{d}x5 14 \texttt{d}x5 cxd5 15 \texttt{b}1 \texttt{a}5 16 a3 \texttt{a}6 17 \texttt{d}3

White is condemned to passivity, his only hope is to blockade the d-pawn.

17...\texttt{b}5 18 b4 \texttt{a}6 19 \texttt{xb}5 \texttt{xb}5

Annihilating the blockade, BLACK got a better game, and later he won, Lékó – Vaulin.

B. 3 \texttt{d}4 \texttt{f}6

22...\texttt{d}5? was played in the game Bobotsov-Adorján, Vrnjacka Banja, 1972. Here White could have reached a level game by 23 \texttt{xa}7! \texttt{a}8 24 \texttt{g}1!, but, missing this chance, he was defeated.

The correct 22...a5! 23 \texttt{e}1 \texttt{xe}1 24 \texttt{xe}1 \texttt{f}5! 25 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{d}5 26 g3 \texttt{d}3 27 \texttt{c}3 \texttt{e}5 (27...\texttt{xb}2? 28 \texttt{f}6#!). 28 a3 f5 29 \texttt{d}2 \texttt{d}3 would have led to a preferable position for BLACK.

Here two continuations were particularly popular with the participants:
B1. 4  \( \square c3?! \) and B2. 4  \( \square f3 \).
4 dxe5  \( \square x e4 \) was to nobody’s liking in the tournament.

**B1. 4  \( \square c3?! \) exd4 5  \( \square x d4 \)  \( \square c6 \)**

This way BLACK gains time to develop his pieces.
6  \( \square d2 \)

6...  \( \square b4! \)

In chess you have to be very specific! This statement is supported by BLACK, who apparently doesn’t give a damn about the common-sense wisdom that the bishop’s ‘place’ is on g7.

7  \( f3 \)

7 a3? loses to 7...  \( \square x e4 \) 8  \( \square e3 \)  \( \square x c3 \) 9  \( b x c3 \) 0-0.

7...a5 8  \( \square h3 \) 0-0 9  \( \square e2 \) d6 10  \( \square f2 \) a4 11 a3  \( \square c5 \) 12  \( \square d1 \)  \( \square h5! \)
13  \( \square x a4? \)

This ‘round trip’ for a miserable pawn is slightly naive. Castling was advisable.

13...  \( \square d4 \) 14  \( \square c3 \)  \( \square h4 \) 15  \( g3 \)

Why not 15 0-0? Because BLACK’s attack would break through without any sacrifice by playing simply 15...  \( \square e5 \) 16 h3  \( \square g3 \).

15...  \( \square x g3! \) 16 hxg3  \( \square x g3 \) 17  \( \square f1 \)  \( \square h3 \) 18  \( \square c2 \)  \( \square x f1 \) 19  \( \square x f1 \)  \( \square e5 \)

with a winning position and 0-1, Kharlov-Zagrebely.

1-5 moves as above.
6  \( \square d3 \)  \( \square c5 \) 7  \( \square f3?! \)

Do you remember, who was the great chessplayer of the old times, who said: ‘Handy moves are wrong (or bad)?’?

7...  \( \square g4! \) 8  \( \square d1 \) d6 9  \( \square e2 \)  \( \square g e 5 \)
10  \( \square x e5 \) dxe5 11  \( \square x d8+ \)  \( \square x d8 \) 12  \( \square e 3 \) c6

BLACK’s strategic success is complete. He controls all the important squares, whereas there is an ugly hole in White’s position on d4.

13  \( \square d2 \) a5 14  \( \square c3 \) f6 15 h4  \( \square e 7 \)
The more careful 15...h5! wouldn’t have given White any chance.

16 h5 f7 17 0-0-0
17 hxg6 hxg6 18 xh8 xh8 19 0-0-0 was more precise.

17...e6 18 hxg6 hxg6 19 xh8

g5?! 11 xg5 xc2 12 e6! led to White’s advantage.

5 e5 b4+ 6 d2 e7 7 xb4 xb4+ 8 d2 xd2+ 9 xd2

9...g8 10 xd4 f6 (suggested by Malich) is rather suspect because of the simple 11 f4.

10 xd4 f6

A new move. 10...c6 11 xxc6 dxc6 would result in a pawn structure similar to that of the Berlin variation of the Spanish Game, but White has already moved his c-pawn, leaving weak points behind it. If 12 0-0-0, then 12...f5! 13 f3 g7 with mutual chances; later BLACK won the game, owing a great deal to 14 g4?, Polugaeovsky-Timman, Bugojno, 1980.

11 exf6?!

No really serious puzzle for BLACK. The dangerous continuation was 11 g4!, with 11...fxe5? losing to 12 b5 11...f4 12 exf6 d6 (12...f7?! 13 g5 h6 14 c5! with a perilous attack for White.) 13 g1 0-0 14 g5 e8+ 15 d1 d7 seems to be BLACK’s logical play, but it’s questionable if he has enough compensation for the pawn. (I seem to have become dogmatic as regards dynamic play: I loved the initiative so much that no sacrifice
made their moves taking turns!
Score of this round: B: 38.7 – W: 61.3 Total score: B: 48 – W: 52, White took the lead again.

ROUND 6
Queen’s Indian

1 d4 Qf6 2 c4 e6 3 Qf3 b6 4 g3 Qa6 5 b3 b4+ 6 Qd2 Qe7 7 Qc3 0-0 8 e4 Qb7

W 12; = 9; B 10

In the eighties 7 Qc3 was popular and (almost) everybody thought c6 8 e4 d5 was the only way to equality. It’s not that I wanted to differ from others at any cost. But I realised that my plan may also lead to a position that some people go for anyway. Even to a position resembling normal ones, only with the White pawn on g3 and the bishop developed to d3. Somehow I felt the X-ray effect on the long diagonal may be activated some time, and if so, it is a deadly force. – No doc, I don’t need anything! But thanks for seeing me. – Pardon me, friends, since I said aloud BLACK IS OK! for the first time, some nice people have been trying to take good care of me... And yes! I played my variation, scoring roughly 50%
against strong GMs, but the real highlight point was discovered not by me. It came in this tournament! – AA

Here White could choose between three alternatives: A. 9 e5 B. 9 ∆d3 d5 C. 9 d5?!

A. 9 e5 ∆e4 10 ∆xe4 ∆xe4 11 ∆xe2

The ‘premier’ of this quiet line was peaceful: 11 ∆g2 d5 12 exd6 cxd6 13 0-0 ∆d7 14 ∆e1 and the two parties agreed on a draw, Smyslov-Adorjan, New York Open, 1987.

11...∆b7 12 ∆g2 d5 13 exd6 e.p. cxd6 14 0-0 ∆d7 15 ∆fd1 ∆f6 16 ∆ac1 ∆c8

White has greater board room, but it’s totally insignificant because BLACK’s position is solid, with no weak points, and by no means worse owing to its flexibility.

17 ∆e3

A negligent move. 17 b4!? is more ambitious.

17...∆c7 18 ∆e1 ∆a8

For the better 18...d5 cf. the following game.

19 ∆xb7 ∆xb7 20 ∆f3 ∆xf3 21 ∆xf3 ∆fc8 22 ∆f1 h6 23 h3 d5 24 ∆f4 ∆d7 25 ∆e5 ∆dd8 26 ∆e3 dxc4 27 bxc4 ∆d6 28 ∆d3 ∆c7 29 c5 ∆e7 30 exb6 ∆xc1 31 ∆xc1 axb6 32 ∆c7 ∆d5 33 ∆a7 ∆d6 34 ∆e2 ∆c8 35 ∆e5 ∆xe5 36 dxe5 ∆c2+ 37 ∆d3 ∆b4+ 38 ∆e4 ∆xa2 39 ∆xb6 ∆b4 ½-½, Vaulin – Z.Almasi.

1-16 moves as above.

17 ∆c3

See note to the previous game.

17...∆e8 18 ∆b2 ∆c7 19 ∆e1?!

d5! 20 ∆f3 dxc4 21 bxc4

And we have the so-called ‘hanging’ pawns, which can easily get weak.

21...∆a8

22 ∆e1?

White can’t find a plan, his pieces are just aimlessly rambling about the board.

22...∆ec8 23 h4 h6 24 ∆d3 ∆e4! 25 ∆b3 ∆xg2

25...∆b7 followed by ∆a6-a5-f5.

26 ∆xg2 ∆e4 27 ∆e1 ∆g4 28 ∆e3 ∆h3

and BLACK has a slight advantage, but in the end he produced stalemate instead of mate
with an extra queen and bishop (!)  
Tolnai-Adorján ½-½

B. 9 \( \text{d3} \) d5 10 \( \text{w} \)e2(?!)
Not the best novelty of our age.
10...c5 11 e5

11...cxd4! 12 exf6 \( \text{x} \)xf6!
An excellent sac, opening the centre in time. It’s pretty much forced, too, as several tricky pitfalls were lurking at BLACK after 12...dxc3, e.g. 13 \( \text{x} \)h7+! \( \text{x} \)h7 14 \( \text{g} \)g5+ \( \text{g} \)g6 15 \( \text{w} \)d3+ \( \text{x} \)xf6 16 \( \text{h} \)h7+ \( \text{e} \)e5 17 \( \text{f} \)f4 mating!

13 \( \text{b} \)b5 e5 14 \( \text{b} \)b4 e4 15 \( \text{x} \)xf8 \( \text{w} \)xf8 16 0-0
16 \( \text{c} \)c7 fails to 16...exd3 17 \( \text{w} \)e8 \( \text{x} \)xe8 18 \( \text{x} \)xe8 dxc4.
16...exd3 17 \( \text{w} \)xd3 dxc4 18 bxc4 \( \text{a} \)a6

The hand-to-hand fighting is over, BLACK has excellent play and a passed pawn for the material.

19 \( \text{a} \)ae1?
It was better to play 19 \( \text{b} \)xd4 \( \text{c} \)c5 20 \( \text{f} \)f5 \( \text{x} \)xf3 21 \( \text{x} \)xf3 \( \text{x} \)xa1 22 \( \text{x} \)xa1 \( \text{d} \)d8, although White’s weak pawns still remain on the queenside.

19...\( \text{c} \)c5 20 \( \text{w} \)f5 \( \text{w} \)d8 21 \( \text{e} \)e5 a6
22 \( \text{a} \)a3 g6 23 \( \text{w} \)f4 \( \text{e} \)e6 24 \( \text{w} \)e1 d3 25 \( \text{w} \)d2 \( \text{d} \)d4

25...\( \text{w} \)d6 also won, but with 26 c5! White can still go on fighting.

26 \( \text{f} \)f4 \( \text{x} \)xe5
Wasting his advantage on trifles. 26...\( \text{e} \)e7! planning 28...\( \text{c} \)c5 would have won immediately.

27 \( \text{x} \)xe5 \( \text{f} \)f3+ 28 \( \text{x} \)xf3 \( \text{x} \)xf3 29 \( \text{e} \)e3 \( \text{e} \)e2 30 \( \text{b} \)b1 \( \text{w} \)d4 31 \( \text{c} \)c3 \( \text{x} \)xc4 32 \( \text{x} \)xe2 dxe2 33 \( \text{x} \)xe2 \( \text{c} \)c8 34 \( \text{g} \)g2 \( \text{w} \)e6+ 35 \( \text{h} \)h3 \( \text{w} \)f3 36 a4 \( \text{w} \)f1+ 37 \( \text{g} \)g2 \( \text{w} \)f5+ 38 g4 \( \text{x} \)xe5 39 \( \text{e} \)e2 \( \text{w} \)c3+ 40 \( \text{x} \)xc3 \( \text{w} \)xc3+ 41 \( \text{g} \)g2 \( \text{c} \)c4 42 \( \text{b} \)b2 0-1, S.Faragó-Makarov.

1-9 moves as above.
10 cxd5 exd5 11 e5 \( \text{e} \)e4 12 0-0 c5

10...cxd5 11 e5 \( \text{e} \)e4 12 0-0 c5

The traditional continuation.
13 \( \text{We}2 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{ } d2 \) 14 \( \text{Wxd}2 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{ } c6 \) 15 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}2 \)

15 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{fd}1 \text{ } \text{cxd}4 \) 16 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}2 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{b}4 \) 17 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}5 \text{ } d3 \) 18 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{ed}4 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{a}6? \) 19 \( \text{Wxd}3 \) with an edge for White, Portisch-Adorján, Hungarian Championship, 1985. But BLACK can improve by 16...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}5 \) 17 a3 a5 and be OK?

15...\( \text{Wd}7 \) 16 \( \text{Wf}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 17 \( \text{Wh}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \)

18 \( \text{Wh}6 \) \( \text{fxe}5 \) 19 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}6 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}6 \) 20 \( \text{dxe}5 \)

18...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xe}5 \) 22 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{h}7+ \) \( \text{Wh}7 \) 23 \( \text{We}6+ \) \( \text{fx}7 \) 24 \( \text{Wxe}5 \) \( \text{He}7 \) 25 \( \text{Wg}5+ \) \( \text{Wg}7 \) 26 \( \text{Wd}2 \) d4

with a complicated, asymmetrical position, Boritchev-Groszpéter.

1-11 moves like above.

12 0-0 f5!

This is the highlight I was talking about. White faces a difficult choice. Either he tolerates the e4 knight virtually forever, which paralyses his forces and helps to prepare BLACK’s attack. Quite a nuisance. But if he takes the other road, he has to face different kinds of difficulties. – AA

13 exf6 e.p.

It seems to be logical to hinder the above-mentioned plan.

13...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xf}6 \) 14 \( \text{Wc}2 \)

14 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}1? \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xd}2? \) 15 \( \text{Wxd}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 16 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{e}5 \text{ cxd}4 \) and later White won the game, Zsirka-Ibragimov. But BLACK passed right by his good luck, as 14...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xf}2! \) 15 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xf}2 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xd}4+ \) 16 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}2 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xc}3 \) 17 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xc}3 \) d4 led to the win of a pawn (A.A.).

14...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xd}2 \) 15 \( \text{Wxd}2 \)

The ‘zwischenzug’ 15 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{h}7+ \) backfires: 15...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{h}8 \) 16 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xd}2 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xd}4 \) 17 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}3 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{f}6 \) 18 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{a}1 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}6 \) 19 \( \text{Wd}1 \) 19 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}1 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{b}4 \) 20 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{b}1 \text{ } \text{Wh}6+) \) 19...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xf}2+ \) 20 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{g}2 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{b}4 \) 21 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{h}5+ \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{h}6-+ \) (Ferenczy-Berecz, Bela Papp Memorial, correspondence, 1989/90)

15...\( \text{c}5 \) 16 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{a}d1 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{h}8! \)

An important move preparing the development of the knight. The immediate 16...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}6? \) fails to 17 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xd}5! \)

17 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{b}1 \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{c}6 \) 18 \( \text{dxc}5 \)

A shocking novelty! BLACK wants to support the e4 outpost to go on joining forces ‘in its shadow’.

18...\( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xc}5! \) 19 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{a}4 \)

The tactical support of BLACK’s 18th move: 19 \( \text{\textit{\&}} \text{xd}5? \text{ } \text{\textit{\&}} \text{d}4! \) and material loss is inevitable.
19...\textit{e}7 20 \textit{w}d3 g6 21 \textit{c}d2
21 \textit{c}c1 \textit{b}4 22 \textit{w}e3 d4 23 \textit{w}e5+ \textit{f}6 24 \textit{w}xc5 \textit{xf}3 25 \textit{w}xb4 \textit{w}d7 and there is no defence against 26...\textit{w}h3.

21...\textit{c}8 22 \textit{f}e1 \textit{d}4 23 f4 \textit{f}6 24 \textit{f}3 c4! 25 \textit{w}f1 \textit{xf}3+ 26 \textit{w}xf3 c3 27 \textit{c}c1 \textit{w}c7 28 \textit{d}ed1?

28 \textit{d}3 was more persistent, although BLACK doubtless has the upper hand.

28...\textit{f}e8 29 \textit{e}1 \textit{xe}1+ 30 \textit{xe}1 c2 31 \textit{xc}2 \textit{wc}2 32 h4 \textit{a}8 33 \textit{w}f1 d4 34 \textit{e}2 \textit{wc}6 35 \textit{wh}2 d3 36 \textit{d}2 \textit{we}4 37 \textit{d}d1 \textit{xc}2+ 38 \textit{h}3 \textit{wg}2+ 0-1, Onishchuk – Z. Varga.

And finally just to be tidy:

C. 9 d5?! exd5 10 exd5 c6 and the position opens up clearly to BLACK’s favour: 11 dxc6 \textit{xc}6 12 \textit{g}2 d5! with a strong initiative.

The closest round so far, the air is sparkling with tension, both fighters are very active, White’s slight advantage seems to stabilise. Score of this round: B: 46.8 – W: 53.2

This system was elaborated by the Hungarian International Master Béla Perényi, an excellent tactician and a fanatical fighter. He created his own way of playing (the ‘Perényi-school’) in several openings, like the Dragon in the Sicilian, or the Benoni. Béla beat almost every leading Hungarian GM, and quite a few high-rated foreigners. He died in a car accident at a heartbreakingly young age, having won the open championship of Hungary in the same year (1988). He was only 35.

BLACK can choose between two lines: A. 7...e5 8 \textit{f}5 \textit{c}6!? or B. 7...h5.

A. 7...e5 8 \textit{f}5 \textit{c}6!?

This occurred only in one or two games, but the players didn’t ‘shake the world’ even in those.
Therefore we turn our attention to the 'world premiere'.

9 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{g2}}

Playing 9 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{wf3}} g6 10 g5 gxf5 11 exf5 he would walk into BLACK's trap, as he has no compensation for the piece after 11...\textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{d4}}! On the other hand, 9 h3! is very strong (9...h5 10 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{g1}}).

9...g6

10 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{we2}}

The seemingly decisive 10 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{d5}} gxf5 11 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{b6}} is met by an effective riposte: 11...\textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{xd5}}! 12 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{xd8}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{f4}} 13 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{f6}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{xg2}}+ (13...\textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{g8}} is also worth considering.) 14 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{f1}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{g8}} 15 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{xg2}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{xg4}}+ 16 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{f1}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{g6}} 17 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{h4}} fx4 18 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{g3}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{h3}}+ 19 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{e1}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{d4}} 20 c3 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{f3}} 21 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{e2}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{d4}}+! with perpetual check, as it is self-destructive to evade: 22 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{e3}}?! \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{g4}}! and when the queen goes away, 23...\textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{f3}} threatening with \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{h6}} checkmate. (Analysis by the late IM Tamás Utasi who died by his own hand at a young age. We lost Perényi and him within 2 years. A heavy loss, especially for a tiny nation like Hungary.)

10...gxf5 11 exf5 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{g8}} 12 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{g1}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{d4}}?! 13 a3 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{wa5}} 14 0-0-0 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{xg4}} 15 f4 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{xf5}} 16 axb4 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{wa1}}+ 17 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{b1}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{c8}} 18 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{d2}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{e6}} 19 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{wd3}}

The game Perényi-Adorján, Team Championship of Hungary, 1986 went like this. Here BLACK could have won easily: 19...e4! 20 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{xe4}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{c4}}! 21 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{wd4}} \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{a2}} 22 c3 \textit{\textforeignlanguage{en}{c4}} He got the same result following a somewhat more thorny path (0-1).

B. 7...h5!

The 'magician' of BLACK Is OK improvised this 'refutation' at the board! White committed himself to develop his BLACK bishop rather early, BLACK can capitalise on this.

Attention! This is the 'magician' speaking! Yes, I found that move during the game that follows. But when I looked in my database recently, I found quite a few earlier examples. You can't stop other people using their heads, too.
Fortunately, Ever since my childhood I imagined the world of chess as a great co-operation in order to find the TRUTH in chess.
— AA

The two main lines are: B1. 8 gxh5 and B2. 8 g5.

B1. 8 gxh5 \( \triangle \) xh5

It's not urgent to get the pawn back.

9 \( \text{Wd2} \) \( \text{d7} \) 10 0-0-0 \( \triangle \) c6 11 \( \text{\triangle b1} \) \( \text{c7} \)?!

Short castling is out of the question, therefore this move is superfluous. He should have launched his counterplay by 11...b5 at once.

12 \( \triangle g2 \) \( \text{wc7} \) 13 f4 0-0-0 14 \( \triangle \text{b3} \)

b5 15 \( \text{wf2!} \) \( \text{wb8} \)

16 \( \triangle d5! \) \( \triangle f6 \)

16...exd5 17 exd5 \( \triangle \text{b4} \) 18 a3 wins back the piece with a better position.

17 \( \triangle \text{e7+} \) \( \triangle \text{e7} \) 18 \( \text{a7} \) \( \text{wa8} \) 19 e5 \( \text{e4} \) 20 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 21 \( \text{hhe1} \)

\( \text{wa8} \) 22 \( \text{b6} \) d5 23 \( \text{xd8} \) \( \text{xd8} \) 24 \( \text{wc5+} \) \( \text{c6} \) 25 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{wa7} \) 26 \( \text{xa7} \)

\( \text{xa7} \) 27 f5 exf5 28 e6 fxe6 29 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{g8} \) 30 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{c6} \) 31 \( \text{c5} \)

\( \text{e8} \) 32 \( \text{xf5} \) a5 33 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{d4} \) 34 \( \text{\triangle d5} \)

1-7 moves as above.

8 gxh5 b5!

Starting the counterplay. I think this is mine, others couldn't make b5 \( \triangle b7 \) for taking back the pawn that is not running away. — AA

9 \( \triangle g2 \)

9 \( \text{g5} \) is a waste of time, as 9...\( \text{b7} \) 10 \( \triangle \text{g2} \) \( \text{c7} \) 11 h6?! gxh6

12 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 13 \( \text{wd2} \) \( \text{e5} \) gives BLACK a mighty pair of bishops, Zagrebely-Adorján.

Just to be fair I managed to lose this later on. — AA

9...\( \text{b7} \) 10 a3

10 \( \text{we2?!} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 11 0-0-0 \( \text{wc7} \)

(11...b4 12 \( \text{cd5?!} \) exd5 13 exd5 \( \text{e7} \) 14 \( \text{df5} \) with a dangerous attack.) 12 f4 \( \text{hh5} \) 13 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{h3} \) 14

\( \text{g2} \) \( \text{hh5} \) 15 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{c5} \)?! (Too hazardous, 15...\( \text{h3} \) leads to a draw.) 16 f5! e5 17 \( \text{e6} \) fxe6 18

fxe6 \( \text{xc3} \) 19 exd7+ \( \text{xd7} \) 20 bxc3

\( \text{wc3} \) 21 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{a1} + 22 \) \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xa2} \)

23 \( \text{wg2} \) \( \text{wa5+} \) 24 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{c7} \) 25 \( \text{d2} \)

b4 26 \( \text{b3} \) d5 27 exd5 \( \text{xd5} \) with double-edged play, Polulyakhov-Tolnai.

10...\( \text{bd7} \) 11 \( \text{we2} \)
11...\textit{c8}!

Strengthening the pressure on the e4-pawn. ‘Routine’ moves land BLACK in a mess: 11...\textit{e7} 12 0-0-0 \textit{w}c7 13 f4 \textit{d}xh5 14 \textit{f}3 g6 15 f5! e5 16 fxg6! exd4 17 gxf7+ \textit{d}8 18 \textit{d}xd4 \textit{h}f6 19 e5 dxe5 20 \textit{x}xe5 \textit{x}xe5 (A sign of despair, but he had no defence, e.g.: 20...\textit{b}6 21 \textit{d}d4 \textit{w}c7 22 \textit{h}el1 with indefensible threats.) 21 \textit{x}xe5 \textit{x}f3 22 \textit{h}el1 \textit{d}xd1 23 \textit{x}xe7+ \textit{c}7 24 \textit{x}xd1 – 1-0, Z.Varga – L.Zsinka.

12 \textit{d}2

Preventing the threatened exchange sacrifice.

12...\textit{e}5

12...\textit{w}b6 is also worth considering.

13 0-0-0 \textit{w}b6 14 f4 \textit{d}c4 15 e5?!
\textit{x}g2 16 \textit{x}g2 dxe5 17 fxe5

17...\textit{d}xh5

17...\textit{w}xd4?! 18 exf6 gxf6 19 \textit{w}b7 \textit{w}d7 20 \textit{w}a6 \textit{d}x2 21 \textit{c}4 \textit{c}6 22 \textit{x}c6+ \textit{h}xc6 23 \textit{x}d2 f5 was also strong, giving BLACK a better endgame.

18 \textit{b}3 \textit{e}7

Or 18...a5!? with operations on the queenside.

19 \textit{h}el1 \textit{w}c6 20 \textit{w}c6+ \textit{x}c6 21 \textit{d}d4 \textit{c}7 22 \textit{f}3 \textit{x}d2 23 \textit{x}d2 \textit{f}4 24 \textit{e}4 \textit{g}6 25 \textit{e}2 \textit{h}3 26 \textit{f}g1 \textit{h}5 27 \textit{e}d1 \textit{c}5 28 c4 bxc4 29 \textit{c}3 \textit{h}5 30 \textit{x}e4 \textit{x}e5 31 \textit{x}e5 \textit{h}xe5 32 \textit{d}d1 \textit{x}ed5 33 \textit{x}d5 exd5 34 \textit{x}e8+ \textit{d}7 35 \textit{a}8 \textit{f}6+ 36 \textit{d}3 \textit{h}b3+ 37 \textit{f}2 \textit{x}b2+ 38 \textit{w}f1 \textit{x}h2 39 \textit{x}xa6 \textit{d}d4 40 \textit{d}3 \textit{f}2+ 0-1, Istvándi – Adorján, Hungarian Team Championship, 1991.

B2. 8 g5(!) \textit{g}4 9 \textit{c}1

White hopes to restart his attack after this temporary withdrawal, chasing away the impertinent knight.

A. 9...\textit{w}b6?!(?)

Assists White’s plan.

10 h3 \textit{e}5 11 \textit{b}3
11 \(\text{Ne}2\) \(\text{Nb}c6\) 12 \(\text{Nb}3\) also led to a superior position: 12...\(\text{g}6\) 13 \(\text{Ne}3\) \(\text{Wc}7\) 14 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{Qd}7\) 15 \(\text{Wd}2\) \(\text{b}5\) 16 0-0-0 \(\text{b}4\) 17 \(\text{Qc}4\) \(\text{Bb}7\) 18 \(\text{He}1\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 19 \(\text{Bb}1\), Kharlov-A. Mészáros.

11...\(\text{Qc}7\) 12 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{Qc}6\) 13 \(\text{We}2\) \(\text{Qd}7\) 14 \(\text{Ne}3\) \(\text{Wc}7\) 15 0-0-0 \(\text{b}5\) 16 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Qb}7\) 17 \(\text{Qb}1\) 0-0-0 18 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{g}6\) 19 \(\text{Qh}3\) \(\text{He}8\) 20 \(\text{Qh}1\) \(\text{Qf}8\) 21 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{Qe}5\) 22 \(\text{fxe}6\) \(\text{fxe}6\) 23 \(\text{Qd}4\) \(\text{Qc}5\) 24 \(\text{Qd}5\) \(\text{Wg}7\) 25 \(\text{Qf}4\) \(\text{Wg}8\)

The trouble with this originally praised move is that it loses! To make it even worse, the refutation is quite primitive: 10 \(\text{Qxc}6\) bxc6 11 \(f4\) threatening \(h3\) and 11...\(\text{Wb}6\) doesn’t help because of 12 \(\text{Wf}3\) and White wins. This is sad news to some, but let’s however accept God’s will. But the story goes on, and 9...\(\text{Wb}6\) is still being played even in high places such as Tilburg. With surprisingly good results. – AA

10 \(\text{Qxc}6\)

After 10 \(\text{Qb}3\) \(\text{b}5\)! 11 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{Qge}5\) 12 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{Qc}4\) 13 \(\text{Qxc}4\)?! bxc4 14 \(\text{Qd}2\) \(d5\), whereas after 10 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{Qge}5\) 11 \(f4\)? \(\text{Qxd}4\) proves the correctness of White’s conception. The ‘proof of the pudding’ is 10 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Wb}6\) 11 \(\text{Qxg}4\) \(\text{Qxd}4!\) 12 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{hxg}4\) 14 \(\text{Qxd}4\) \(\text{W}a5\) or 12 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{Qc}6!\).

10...\(\text{bxc}6\) 11 \(\text{h}3\)

11 \(\text{Qe}2\) would be met again by 11...\(\text{Wb}6!\)!

11...\(\text{Qe}5\) 12 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{Qg}6\) 13 \(\text{Qe}2\)

B. 9...\(\text{Qc}6!(??)\)

13...\(\text{e}5!\)

Crushing White’s attacking pawn structure.

14 \(\text{Qxh}5\)

14 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{Qf}4\).

14...\(\text{Qxf}4\) 15 \(\text{Qxf}4\) \(\text{exf}4\) 16 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{g}6\) 17 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{Qg}7\) 18 \(\text{Wd}2\) \(\text{Qe}5\) 19 \(\text{Qe}2\)
\[ \text{\textit{b}6 20 \textit{c}3 \textit{b}8 21 \textit{b}3 \textit{a}5 22 \textit{\textcyr{d}xf}4 \textit{\textcyr{a}6} 23 \textit{h}5 \textit{g}xh5 24 \textit{g}6 \textit{\textcyr{w}c}5 25 \textit{gxf7+ \textcyr{xf}7} 26 \textit{\textcyr{e}1 \textcyr{mb}g}8 27 \textit{\textcyr{d}1} 27 \textit{\textcyr{xh}5+ \textcyr{e}7} \text{and there is no way to parry 28...\textit{\textcyr{xf}4}.} \\
27...h4 28 \textit{\textcyr{a}h}5+ \textit{\textcyr{xh}5}!?? 29 \textit{\textcyr{xh}5 \textcyr{g}1+} \]

30 \textit{\textcyr{xg}1}

He has been doing quite well in defence so far, but here he ran out of patience (and time). Playing 30 \textit{\textcyr{c}2}! he could have held out: 30...\textit{\textcyr{xg}2}!? 31 \textit{\textcyr{xg}2} \textit{\textcyr{xc}3+} 32 \textit{\textcyr{d}1} (32 \textit{\textcyr{xb}1 \textcyr{d}3+} 33 \textit{\textcyr{c}2 \textcyr{wa}1} checkmate.) 32...\textit{\textcyr{wd}3+} 33 \textit{\textcyr{e}1} (33 \textit{\textcyr{wd}2 \textcyr{f}3+} 34 \textit{\textcyr{c}2 \textcyr{xc}4+} 35 \textit{\textcyr{d}1 \textcyr{xh}1+} 36 \textit{\textcyr{c}2 \textcyr{e}4+} 37 \textit{\textcyr{d}1 \textcyr{g}4+} 38 \textit{\textcyr{c}2 \textcyr{f}5+} 39 \textit{\textcyr{d}1 \textcyr{xh}5+} loses.) 33...\textit{\textcyr{we}3+} 34 \textit{\textcyr{d}1} and BLACK is forced to take perpetual check.

30...\textit{\textcyr{xg}1}+ 31 \textit{\textcyr{c}2} \textit{\textcyr{g}4} 32 \textit{\textcyr{f}2+ \textcyr{e}6} – 0-1, Surányi – Onischchuk.

The final ranking (in alphabetical order) was:

1 Zagrebelny, S. 6
2 Kállai, G. 5.5
3 Makarov, M. 5.5
4 Malyutin, E. 5.5
5 Polulyakhov, A. 5.5
6 Tönni, T. 5.5
7 Adorján, A. 5
8 Kharlov, A. 5
9 Vaulin, A. 5

Special prizes:

For most wins with BLACK:
J.Demina, A.Groszpéter, A.Mészáros, J.Votava, N.Schlosnik (3-3 wins).

Best players of last 3 rounds:
G.Hetényi, T.Molnár, Z.Varga, 3-3 points

Best Hungarian junior among women:
M.Grábics, 3 pts.

Best Hungarian junior among men:
Z.Almási, P.Léko, 4.5-4.5

Prizes (total): DM 2550

The goal of our article was to entertain you as well as to bring the BLACK pieces a bit closer to your heart. We truly hope, dear ‘believers’ and ‘infidels’, that all of you have found something to your tastes and interests. If not, let us know! We will comment on your advice or criticism in our very next issue – especially if you are right!
What was it I wanted to say?

It may not all come to my mind right now. But I do know what I didn't want to say, suggest or assert didactically like some big-headed Mr. Clever. Everyone could see the games my co-workers selected, as well as the figures of this 7-round theme tournament at the beginning and end of each round. Theme tournaments have a long history, and I think the theory of the offered variations can improve greatly if the players have a chance to prepare. I wanted to provide the participants with a little booklet of the games played and published before, including some tips on untried ideas. Unfortunately, I couldn't do that, but I am not sure anyway whether it would have changed the results and the statistics significantly. In any case, the players would certainly have had more information, as the ideas behind the themes of all 7 rounds came from me (with or without a predecessor), and may not be as widely-known as the fashionable ‘mainstream’ variations. I didn't, and couldn't have the intention of ‘proving that I’m right’, as even if BLACK comes out on top, one tournament is just one tournament. But, as the Chinese saying goes, a ten-thousand-mile journey also starts out right below our soles. The starting positions of the lines given by me are:

1. only a couple of moves from the initial starting position. As a result, neither of the parties is likely to have committed an error that undermines the balance of powers present in the initial position.

2. based on my ideas which are completely new or rarely played, and admittedly aim at supporting BLACK’s case.

Normally, a theme tournament is organised in order to gather information for the assessment of the variation(s) in question. In this respect, my tournament differed from the others only because of my personal involvement. I wondered to what extent people are able to free themselves from White-BLACK prejudices if they start the game from a position rich in opportunities, but different from the usual starting position. And naturally, I was also eager to see how strong the field would be. As regards the latter, I had no reason to complain, as you will find quite a few well-known names. It is true that Lékó and Almási were children back then, but they showed some good ‘swordsmanship’ already.

As you can see, the tide changed several times in the process of the tournament, with lots of decisive games, but White emerged victorious in the end, albeit with a lesser margin than usual. As my colleagues have also said, it is quite conspicuous that BLACK suffered his losses in themes that the players who happened to have BLACK were not really familiar with. This holds for the Scheveningen with $8...\text{\textsf{b6}}$ especially, where they didn’t have a clue about the idea behind the move. It’s all the more regrettable as we are talking about the ‘philosophers’ stone’, at least this is what the article on this subject is titled. No, I don’t want to imply that ‘it could have been all different’. This would be mere speculation. What happened was an experiment, which I would repeat
every month if I owned, say, General Motors. Now do you take bad news relatively well? Only those who are firm enough should read on! Well, speaking between us, you must be aware that I do not own General Motors. And that is not all! The really bad news is that they seem to be reluctant to give it to me! They insist on keeping it for some reason. I tell you, this materialistic attitude will ruin mankind!

As a result, I haven't been able to organise another BLACK IS OK! theme tournament ever since.

(But! The games identified with 'Papp Béla Memorial.' were played at my earlier correspondence theme tournament, held in memory of the greatest chess pedagogue of all times. That one brought some theoretical fruit as well, and was not devoted to the kinds of openings I sometimes see offered: Falkbeer, Orang-Utan and so on. Correspondence chess has great potential. Why doesn't chess science use it for an appropriate fee?)

It's a mere accident, of course, that my co-authors played a team game I wanted for the book...

E. Vegh - G. Feher
Hungarian Team Championship, 1996

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 g6 3 ♗c3 d5 4 ♘f3 ♗g7 5 ♘f4 0-0 6 ♗c1 dxc4 7 e4 b5!? AA
7...♗g4 is the usual continuation.
8 ♘xb5 ♘xe4 9 ♘xc7??

After the world premiere (Van Wely-Lékó, Groningen 1995) Portisch discovered the idea behind this move.

9 ♘xc4 c6 10 ♘c3 ♘d6 11 ♘e2 ♘f5 12 ♘e5 ♘h6??

9...♕d7 10 ♘xc4 a6 11 ♘a3 ♘c6 12 0-0 ♘b7!

12...♕xc7? 13 ♘d5± Portisch-Tukmakov, Biel 1996.

13 ♘e5?!

0-13 ♘b6! Fairly odd at first sight. What is the bishop doing there? I won't go into details, but one thing I can tell: I/we haven't been able to prove for seven years that BLACK IS (still) OK in this position! The winner's annotations were made right after the game. Since then, we have realised quite a few dangers. 14 ♘b3 is one,
activating the knight. Those readers who help us out by sending their analyses will be rewarded with another problem to solve!!

13...\text{ab8} \Delta \text{a8}

A) 14 \text{He1 a8} 15 \text{d5} (15 \text{xe4 exb6} 16 \text{d5} \text{a4} 17 \text{xb3 axd5} 18 \text{c4 \text{bb8}1\text{f}1} 15...\text{xb6} 16 \text{dxc6}
\text{wxd1} 17 \text{cxd1 xb2} 18 \text{xh7+ \text{xf7} 19 \text{c4 xc6} 20 \text{xe4 cc5}1\text{f};

B) 14 \text{b3 h6} 15 \text{cc2} (15 \text{e5 de5} 16 \text{dxe5 dd2} 17 \text{e1 ff5} \Delta \text{g2f1} 15...\text{b4} 16 \text{e5 ff51\text{f}}

13...\text{h6!} 14 \text{b1}

14 \text{c2 aad8} (14...\text{b4} 15 \text{e2 dd6} 16 \text{xd6 wxd6} 17 \text{b31\text{f}1} 15
\text{wxc1} (15 \text{b3 cg5} 16 \text{xg5 axe5}
17 \text{e5 xg5} 18 \text{dxe5 ff51\text{f}} 15...\text{xe5} 16 \text{dxe5} e61\text{f}

14...\text{aad8} 15 \text{we2?}

15 \text{e1 axe5} 16 \text{dxe5 wc6} 17
\text{e2 dd2} 18 \text{bd1 sec 15 \text{e2}; 15 }
\text{wb3 da5} 16 \text{wb4 xc4 17 \text{xc4 e6} 18 \text{b6 wc6} \Delta \text{dd2} 19 \text{dc4}
\text{wb5?} (19...\text{wd7=}) 20 \text{xb5 axb5}
21 \text{e3} (21 \text{b6 f6} 22 \text{c7 de8}
23 \text{fe1 ce71\text{f}} 21...f6 22 \text{c7 d7}
23 \text{fc1 dd61\text{f}}

15...\text{xe5} 16 \text{dxe5 wc6}!

This may be called BLACK humour for White.

17 \text{ff1}

17 \text{bd1 dd2} 18 \text{fe1 dd4!}
(18...\text{xf3}+ 19 \text{xf3 xf3} 20 \text{xf3}
\text{xf3} 21 \text{xd8 xd8} 22 \text{xa6 dd4}
23 \text{e2! gg4+ 24 \text{ff1 gg2+ 25}
\text{g1 ff3}\Delta 19 \text{b3 ee4!} 20 \text{wd3}
\text{gg4+}.

17...\text{d2} 18 \text{bc1 wb6}

18...\text{xf3} 19 \text{xf7+ \text{xf7} 20}
\text{xc6 cc6} 21 \text{e6 \text{f6} 22 \text{wa6 was}
the original variation, but let's make
just one more move: 22...\text{d4}+

19 \text{xd2 xd2} 20 \text{we1 \text{d4}!}

\Delta \text{eg4.} 20...\text{wb2} 21 \text{b1} (21
\text{db1 dd4} 22 \text{cc3 dd2+-}) 21...
\text{yg2+ 22 \text{yg2 wxa3} 23 \text{e6 f51\text{f}}

21 \text{f3}

21...\text{d8} 22 \text{bb3}

22...\text{xb2}

Team competitions often make
you play it safe (and see ghosts).
There was a cute finish that Gy
Feher saw, but..

22...\text{yg2! 23 \text{yg2} (23 \text{cc7}
\text{xb2} 24 \text{cc2 dd2+-}) 23...\text{xc1}
24 \text{xc1 \text{g4}+ 25 \text{ff2} (25 \text{h1}
\text{xf3+ 26 \text{xf3 \text{xf3}+ 27 \text{g1}
\text{d4+-}) 25...\text{xf3+ 26 \text{ee1 \text{e4}+
27 \text{ff2 dd3 \Delta \text{ff3} 28 \text{dd1 (28}
\text{xf7+ \text{g7+-}) 28...\text{h3+}

23 \text{cc7 dd5} 24 \text{cc4}
24  
25  
26  
27... 
28  
28... 
(3)  
29  
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
29... 
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29... 
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Hungarian). He is also very good at finding missions that are hard, but to say the least pay little... He is the publisher and editor of ‘MOST’ (of Hungary). It’s a 16-times-a-year magazine with Hungarian games (among others Hungarian Teams’ League I and II) you don’t find in any other source, and makes – I believe – only symbolic sums of money. To express my appreciation I write an article for every number. It’s a good feeling to say: chessplayers who are usually ‘cheap’ do it as well occasionally also free. Last but not least: Gyula was for quite some time the trainer of Péter Lékó. After me, the two of us together, finally simultaneously with Yusupov and A.Rodriguez. The kind of person I like: a lunatic (like myself) for some months he is a technical editor of the monthly Magyar Sakkvilág (Hungarian Chess World) besides his own. He has probably discovered the secret of a short life...
The Philosopher’s Stone...

Oh friends, that’s what everybody has been searching for since the beginning of time! Still it hasn’t been found. Except by me, naturally, back in 1987. When you look at 8...\( \text{W}b6 \) at least some of you will certainly think it is a joke. True, \( \text{W}b6 \) is not unusual in the Sicilian, but it mostly tries to prevent White from castling. In some other lines, like in the Najdorf or the Keres Attack, BLACK doesn’t care about losing a tempo by returning to c7 because the d4 knight retreats to b3, where it is less active. But ‘my’ \( \text{W}b6 \) seems to be just a loss of tempo for nothing. (Missing the threat 9... e5 is something very few pub — or should I say club — players will do.) White finishes his development in the usual way, and after \( \text{A}e3 \) the queen must go to c7. My wife bears witness that I am unusually sober when saying: BLACK has gained a tempo, rather than lost it! And here is the explanation: in the regular Scheveningen there comes a moment when BLACK (whose queen went to c7 in one move) plays bishop d7. Then White plays g4, followed by the obligatory \( \text{A}c8 \). Now if you would be kind enough to tot up the tempi lost and won, we shall understand each other perfectly. The Scheveningen is good enough, but with an extra tempo, it’s like a dream!

We seem to have a deal. Or don’t we? White to play and BLACK to win? Is it the winning path, and is the Philosopher’s Stone in our hands indeed? Not quite. There is one (and only) move to question the soundness of the idea. Namely, a pawn sacrifice by 9 \( \text{A}e3 \) \( \text{X}xb2 \) 10 \( \text{W}d2 \) \( \text{W}b4 \) 11 \( \text{A}ab1 \) \( \text{A}a5 \) 12 \( \text{X}d5 \) \( \text{W}d8 \) 13 \( \text{X}xe7+ \) \( \text{X}xe7 \) 14 \( \text{A}f3 \). This is the most critical line, in which there is still a lot to discover. Frankly speaking, I used to be sceptical about it — probably because I prefer initiative versus material — but Péter Lékó was keen to analyse, and it so happened that IM Gyula Fehér and I wrote something serious about it. It is here, it is your potential weapon. Have a lot of success with it! And let me know about it!

Finally: I’m not a great one for statistics. But a score of +8 = 8 -0! is encouraging.

There was a whole round dedicated to this subject in the Budapest Spring ’92 BLACK IS OK! Theme Tournament. Compare its section in the review with this!!

F.Bellia – A.Adorján
Pinerolo Open 1987

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{A}f3 \) e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \( \text{A}xd4 \) \( \text{A}f6 \) 5 \( \text{A}c3 \) d6 6 \( \text{A}e2 \) \( \text{A}e7 \) 7 0-0 0-0 8 \( \text{W}b4 \)?
An idea born in 21 February 1987. Whether it is so good as BLACK’s result with it (+8–8–0!) is still to be found out...

9 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{c6} \) 10 \( \text{b3} \) a6(?)

these two games are similar to each other.

More exact is 10...\( \text{c7} \). 11 a4 b6 excluding 12 a5.

11 a4 \( \text{c7} \) 12 a5! b5 13 axb6 \( \text{xb6} \) 14 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{b7} \)

14...\( \text{b8} \)? 15 \( \text{e2} \)

A) 15...\( \text{b4} \) 16 \( \text{e3} \) (16 e5 dxe5 17 fxe5 \( \text{d7} \)) 16...\( \text{c7} \) 17 \( \text{fd1} \) \( \text{b7} \);

B) 15...\( \text{c7} \).

15 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{ac8} \)

15...\( \text{ab8} \)!

16 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{c7} \) 17 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{fe8} \)

17...\( \text{b8} \)? 18 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{cd8} \)

(18...\( \text{xc2} \)?)

18 \( \text{fc1} \) \( \text{b8} \) 19 c4 \( \text{d7} \) 20 \( \text{wd2} \)

\( \text{a8} \) 21 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{c7} \) 22 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 23 c5

23 \( \text{c3} \).

23...\( \text{dxe5} \) 24 \( \text{xc5} \)

Losing a pawn.

24 \( \text{xc5} \).

24...\( \text{xc5} \) 25 \( \text{xc5} \)

25...\( \text{xe4} \)

26 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{xc1} \) 27 \( \text{xc1} \) \( \text{a8} \) 28 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 29 h3 \( \text{h6} \)

29...\( \text{f6} \)

30 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{d3} \) 31 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 32 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{b8} \)

32...\( \text{b6} \)!
33 \( \text{Wxd7 Ac8} \)
33...e5!? 34 fxe5 Wxe5\( \text{#} \).

34 b3 g6 35 Wa4 Wb6 36 Wd7 Ab8 37 Ad3 h5 38 We7 Ac8
38...Wb5 39 Wd6 h4! 40 Ac3 Wb7\( \text{#} \).

39 \( \text{h2} \) Wc5?
39...Wb5! 40 Ad8+ (40 Ad7 Wf5 41 Wb4 e5 42 Aa7 exf4 43 Axa6 f3\(+\)) 40...Axh8 41 Wxd8+ \( \text{h7} \) 42 Wc7 Wf5 43 g4 (43 g3 Wg7 44 b4 g5\( \text{#} \)) 43...Wf6\( \text{#} \).

40 Wxc5 Axc5

41 Ad6?!?

Now and the next move h4 could hold the game. Perhaps, but not quite sure!

41 h4! Wf8 (41...Ab5 42 Ad6 a5 43 Ab6 Wg7 44 Aa7 Wf6 45 g3) 42 Ad6 a5 43 Ab6 Wc7 44 g3\( \text{#} \) (44 b4? Ac4! 45 bxa5 Wxf4 46 \( \text{h3} \) Aa4 47 a6 Aa3+ 48 g3 Wf6\( \text{#} \)) 44...Wf6 45 b4 (45 Ab7 Wf5\(+\)) 45...axb4 46 Axb4 Wf5 47 Wf3 f6 48 Ab8 e5 49 fxe5 fxe5 50 Wf8+ \( \text{e6} \) 51 Wg8 Wf7 52 Ab8 Ac3 53 Ab6 Ac2! 54 g4?! Ac3+ 55 Ac2 h5xg4 56 Ab4 g3 57 Ab4 Ae3\(+\).

41...a5 42 Ad4?!

42 h4 Ab5 43 Ad3 Acg7 44 Ac3 Wf6 45 Ac3 Ac5 46 Ae3 f6\(+\).

42...Ab5 43 Ac4

43 Ad8+ Ac7 44 Aa8 h4! 45 Aa6 Ab3 46 Aa5 Ab4\(+\).

43...h4\(+\)

That makes all the difference. Now it's effectively over

44 Ac1 Ac7 45 Ac2 Acf6 46 Ac3 Acf5 47 Acf3 Acf6 48 Ac3 Ac5 49 Acf3 Acd5 50 Ac3 Ab5 51 Acf3 Ac5! 52 Acxg5 Acxg5 53 Ae3 Acf5 54 Ac3 Acf4 55 Ae2 e5 56 Ac2 e4 57 Ac4 Ac5 58 b4 e3 59 Ac1 Axb4 60 Axb4 Acg3 61 Acf1 Acf4 62 Ab8 Aa1 63 Ac2 Ac2 64 Acf1 Acf2 0-1

Now this has been the appetiser. Let's get to the more serious (shall I say crucial) matters. After that – if you behave like a gentle whoever – there will be some sweets.

W. Unzicker – A. Adorján
Bundesliga, 1989

1 e4 c5 2 Acf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Acxd4 Acf6 5 Ac3 d6 6 Ac2 Ae7 7 0-0 0-0 8 Acf4 Wb6 9 Ac3 Wxb2 10 Acd2

10 Wd3 Wb4 11 Acb1 Wa5 12 Ac2 Wc7 13 Wh1 (13 Ac3 Wb5 14 Aa6 Ad6, a6) 13...Acbd7 14 Wg3 Ac5 15 Aa6 Ac6\(+\).

10...Wb4 11 Acb1 Wa5 12 Acd5 Wd8
12...d8?? 13 De7+++

13 Dxe7+ Wxe7 14 f3

Without doubt this is the key position of my variation beginning with 8... Wb6.

14...d5

14...e5 15 Db5 Dc6

A) 16 Wxd6 Wxd6 17 Dxd6 b6 18 Dfd1 Aa6 19 c4 (19 f5 Dfd8 A Dd7; A ad8; 19 A b31) 19...Dfd8 (19...exf4 20 Axf4±) 20 g3 Dd7 21 c5 Aad8 22 Df2±;

B) 16 Dxd6

B1) 16...Dd8 17 Dfd1 b6 18 c4 Ag4 (18...Ag4);

B2) 16...b6 17 c4 Ag4 18 c5 exf4 (18...Dfd8!?=) 19 Axf4 Axf3 20 gxf3 bxc5 21 Db7 Wd8 22 Dc1 Dd4 23 Ag2 Ah5 24 Ae5 f6 25 Axd4 Wxd6 26 Aa3 Wd2+ 27 Aa2 Dfb8=;

C) 16 f5!? A c4 ± 16...Dd8 17 g4 (17 c4 b6 18 Dfd1 DA5 19 Ag5 Aa6 20 Axf6 gxf6 21 Ae2 Dac8 22 Ac3 Ag7 23 Ad5 Wf8=) 17...b6 18 g5 De8 19 c4 (19 f6) 19...Ab7 20 Ac3 Da5 21 Ad5 Dd7 (21...Axd5 22 Wxd5 Dac8=) 22 Dc1 Acd8 23 Ae2 Dc7= 24 f6 Axd5 25 cxd5 (25 exd5? Dxc4!) 25...Wa4.

15 e5 De4

After 16 Wd3 the thing that worried me was 17 c4! (I was ready to give back the pawn by leaving the knight on e4 at any time.) After so many years it seems that I was far too frightened.

A) 16...Dd8 17 c4 Dc5 18 Wa3 Dxc4 19 Dfc1 Db7 20 Dxc4±;

B) 16...Dc5 17 Wa3 b6 18 c4 Ab7 19 cxd5 Axd5 20 Axd5 exd5 21 Dxb6 axb6 22 Wa8±;

C) 16...Dd7 Even this is playable! 17 c4 Ddc5 (17...Ddc5 18 Wa3 Dxc4 19 Dfc1±) 18 Wa3 Ae8 19 Dfc1 Da6 20 Wxe7 Axe7 21 Ab5 b6 22 Dd6 Ab7 23 Db7 Dxb7 24 cxd5 exd5 25 Ab5 Ac7 26 Ab4 f5 27 exf6 Dxf6 28 Dd4±;

D) 16...b6! If this line doesn’t work, the ‘Philosopher’s Stone’ has NOT been found. But it seems to be OK! HURRAH! 17 c4 (17 Axe4 dxe4 18 Wxe4 Ab7 19 Wa3 Dd8 20 f5 Dc6=) 17...Aa6! (17...Dc5 18 Wa3 Ab7 19 cxd5 Axd5 20 Axd5 exd5 21 Dxb6 axb6 22 Wa8±) 18 Ab5 Ab7 19 cxd5 exd5 20 Dfc1 Dc6 21 Dd4 (21 Aexe4! dxe4 22 Wb3±) 21...Dac5=.

½-½
It is possible that a natural developing move like this loses by force! See later!

15...d5!!

This patient move seems to be very strong.

15...d5
15...exd4 16 xd4

A) 16...b6?! 17 e5! (17 wb4 ab7 18 e5 ed5=) 17 wxd6 wxd6 18 exd6 eb7 17...dxe5 18 fxe5 ed5

19 ef2 eb8 20 c4 ec7 21 wd6 ed8 22 ec6+; 16...d5 17 e5 ed7 18 wa4! Nasty (18 c4!? ed6 19 exd5 exd5 20 exd5 ed8 21 we4 exd5 22 exd5 edx5 23 edx5 e5 18...ed5 19 wa3 b6 20 c4 (20 xb6 axb6 21 wxa8 wc7 22 wa3 ab6=) 20...eb7 21 ec5 ecx5 22 edx5 ecx5 23 edx5 edx5 24 edx5 edx5 25 ebx5 (25 ecx5 ec8= Δ ec2) 25...edx8 Δ ef5, edx2 26 ec7 ef5 27 ef1 hx5 28 edx7 edx7 29 wxa7 edx2 with compensation that does not seem to be great, but look what might happen! 30 wa7+ eh7 31 a3 ed4 32 g3 ed2 33 ec1 (33 wf3 ed3)
33...edx2 34 a4 wxh3 35 wh1 edx4 36 edx5 edx5 37 wb3 edx4=.

16 e5?! 16 edc6! bxc6 17 wa5! transposes to the refutational line.

16...ed7 17 c4 ed6! 18 edc6

18 edx5 edx5 (18...exd5=) 19 edxc6 bxc6 20 ecx1 wd7 21 ec4 eda6 22 wc2 edx3? (22...hx6=) 23 edx7+ eh8 24 edx7 edxc2 25 edxc2 edxc4 26 edx6+

18...bxc6 19 edx6 edx6 20 edx6 edx6 edxc4 22 edx4 edxc4 23 edx8 edxa8 24 wd4 wc7 25 edx1 edx8 26 h3 (26 edx edx5 27 a3 edx5) 26...edx2

But ½-½ at the end

And here is the forced variation that seems to refute 14... edx6(!):

15 edxc6! bxc6 16 edx6

A) 16...b6?! 17 e5! (17 wb4 ab7 18 e5 ed5=) 17 wxd6 wxd6 18 edx6 eb7 17...dxe5 18 fxe5 ed5


\[ \text{16...d5} \]

[Diagram]

\[ 17 \text{a5!} \]

[Diagram]

17 \text{c3} dx\text{e}4 18 \text{c}5 \text{we}8 19 \text{e}2 \text{d}5 20 \text{g}3 f5 21 \text{xf}8 \text{xf}8=.

17...\text{d}8 18 \text{a}4

Even more direct is 18 \text{b}6! axb6 19 \text{xa}8 \text{d}6 20 \text{e}5 \text{c}5+ 21 \text{h}1 \text{d}7 22 \text{c}4 \text{e}3 (22...\text{xc}4 23 \text{bc}1 \text{wa}6 24 \text{xa}6 \text{xa}6 25 \text{xc}6 \text{d}8 26 \text{d}6+) 23 \text{xc}6 \text{xf}4 24 \text{ex}5 \text{xe}5 25 \text{d}6=.

18...\text{c}7 19 \text{e}5 \text{d}7 20 \text{c}4 \text{b}7 21 \text{ex}5 \text{ex}5 22 \text{xd}5! \text{xe}5

A desperate try but with no luck. If 22...\text{b}6 23 \text{e}2 \text{xd}5 24 \text{xd}5; 22...\text{ex}5 23 \text{d}c1=.

23 \text{fxe}5 \text{ex}5 24 \text{d}c1 \text{wb}8=

Only move, but not good enough

24...\text{xe}5 25 \text{f}4=.

25 \text{d}4 \text{c}8 26 \text{b}5 \text{xc}1+ 27 \text{xc}1 \text{a}6 28 \text{d}7=+

A.Cela – A.Andorján
Novi Sad Olympiad 1990

1 \text{e}4 \text{c}5 2 \text{f}3 \text{e}6 3 \text{d}4 \text{cxd}4 4 \text{d}4 \text{f}6 5 \text{c}3 \text{d}6 6 \text{e}2 \text{e}7 7 0-0 0-0 8 \text{f}4

8 \text{e}3 \text{a}6 9 \text{f}4 \text{c}7 10 \text{h}1 (10 \text{a}4!) 10...\text{b}5 11 \text{f}3 \text{b}7 12 \text{e}5 \text{xe}5 13 \text{fxe}5 \text{fd}7=.

8...\text{b}6 9 \text{e}3?!

9 \text{h}1 \text{c}6 10 \text{b}3 \text{c}7 11 \text{e}3 \text{a}6 12 \text{a}4 \text{b}6=.

9...\text{xb}2 10 \text{d}2 \text{b}4 11 \text{ab}1 \text{wa}5 12 \text{d}5 \text{d}8

13 \text{xf}6=!

An interesting option. 13 \text{xe}7+ \text{xe}7 14 \text{f}3=.

13...\text{xf}6 14 \text{b}5 \text{d}5 15 \text{e}5

15 \text{exd}5 \text{exd}5 16 \text{xa}7 \text{e}7! 17 \text{d}4 \text{xd}4+ 18 \text{xd}4 \text{xa}2=.

15...\text{e}7 16 \text{xa}7 \text{c}6 17 \text{xc}6?

Co-operative. There were two ways to keep the balance:

17 \text{xc}8 \text{xc}8 18 \text{c}3 \text{xa}5=; \text{c}17 \text{b}6 \text{e}8 18 \text{xc}8 (18 \text{xc}6 \text{xc}6 19 \text{c}3 \text{d}7=) 18...\text{xc}8 19 \text{c}4 \text{xc}4 20 \text{fc}1 \text{a}5! 21 \text{xa}5 \text{c}5+ 22 \text{h}1 \text{xa}5 23 \text{wa}5 \text{wa}5 24 \text{xc}4 (24 \text{xb}7 \text{xa}2 25 \text{xc}4 \text{c}8 26 \text{h}3 \text{f}8 27 \text{xa}2 \text{xc}1+ 28 \text{h}2 \text{g}5=) 24...\text{a}8=.

17...\text{xc}6 18 \text{c}4 \text{wa}5=.

An ambitious move, gaining the upper hand based on the super-solid pawn structure vs a2.

18...\text{a}6 19 \text{fc}1 \text{xc}4=. 
19 \textit{Wxa5} \\
BLACK is better anyway.

19 \textit{b2 a5!} 20 \textit{xc5} (20 \textit{f3 wd2} 21 \textit{xd2 axc+} 22 \textit{e3 a4} 23 \textit{c3 a6f}) 20...\textit{Wxc5}+ 21 \textit{h1 a6f}.

19...\textit{a5} 20 \textit{b2 a6} 21 \textit{fb1} \\
21 \textit{c1? a3;} 21 cxd5 cxd5 22 \textit{xa6 axa6} 23 \textit{fb1 a3f} 24 \textit{f2} (24 \textit{f2} f6 25 \textit{d4 fxe5} 26 \textit{exe5 f6}) 24...h5; 21 \textit{c2 b8f}.

21...\textit{dxc4}! \\
It's a passed pawn plus!

22 \textit{c2 a4} 23 \textit{b6} \\
23 \textit{bc1 a3}.

23...\textit{e8} 24 \textit{f3 b5f} 25 \textit{b7 e8} 26 \textit{a7 xa7} 27 \textit{xa7 a8} 28 \textit{d4 g6} 29 \textit{f2}

9 \textit{h1 c6} 10 \textit{b3 c7!} 11 \textit{f3} 11 a4 b6.

11...a6 12 a4 b6 13 \textit{d4} \\
13 \textit{e3 b7} That's what I was talking about. BLACK is somewhat better or at least more comfortable. And if the 'first' player still feels aggressive he will regret it: 14 g4? (\textit{c14 c2=})
14...d5! this counterblow is typical. What comes later is not:

A) 15 e5 \( \text{Q}xg4! \) 16 \( \text{Q}xg4 \) d4 17 \( \text{Q}f3 \) (17 \( \text{Q}d5 \text{Q}xe5+; \) 17 \( \text{Q}xd4 \text{Q}xd4+ 18 \text{Q}g1 \text{W}c6+\) ) 17...dxe3 18 \( \text{W}e2 \)

A1) 18...g5!? 19 \( \text{Q}e4 \) (19 \( \text{W}g2 \text{W}h8 20 \text{fxg5} \text{W}ab8+)\) 19...\( \text{Q}b4 \) 20 \( \text{Q}xb7 \text{W}xb7+ 21 \text{Q}g1 \text{gxf4} 22 \text{Wxf4} \text{W}h8+; \)

A2) Simpler is: 18...f6 19 exf6 (19 \( \text{W}c4 \) \( \text{W}c8 20 \text{exf6} \text{Q}xf6 21 \text{Mae1} \text{Q}d4 22 \text{Wxc8} \text{Wxf3+} 23 \text{Wxf3} \text{Mae8+})\) 19...\( \text{W}xf6 20 \text{Wxe3} \text{Maf8+;} \)

B) 15 exd5 \( \text{Q}b4! \) 16 dxe6 \( \text{Q}xg4 \) 17 exf7+ \( \text{W}xf7 \)

For just a pawn BLACK got everything he wanted to and a little more. Accurate handling is needed, but the result reached through all the beautiful variations is worth it.

B1) 18 \( \text{Q}d2 \text{Q}d8 \triangle \text{Q}e3 \) 19 \( \text{W}e2 \text{Q}xc2 \) 20 \( \text{W}ac1 \)

B1a) 21 \text{Q}xd2 \text{Q}d4

B1a1) 22 \( \text{W}g2 \text{Q}xf3 \) 23 \( \text{Q}d5 \text{W}d7 24 \text{Q}xe7+ \text{Q}xe7 25 \text{Wxf3} \text{Wxf4} 26 \text{Wc8+} \text{Wxc8} 27 \text{Wxf4} \text{Q}b7 28 \text{Q}f3 \) (28 \( \text{Q}e4 \text{Q}xe4 \) 29 \( \text{W}xe4 \text{W}xe4+)\) 28...\( \text{Q}e5 29 \text{W}e2 \text{W}g5! 30 \text{W}e4 \text{W}h5+; \)

B1a2) 22 \( \text{Q}d5 \text{W}xc1 \) 23 \( \text{W}xc1 \) (23 \( \text{Q}xe7+ \text{W}xe7 24 \text{W}xe7 \text{W}xf3+ 25 \text{g1} \text{Q}e2+ 26 \text{W}xe2 \text{W}c5++)\) 23...\( \text{Q}xe2 \) 24 \( \text{W}d7 \text{Q}xd5 \) 25 \( \text{Q}xd5 \text{Q}f2+ 26 \text{Q}g2 \text{Q}xf4++; \)

B1b) 21 \text{W}xd2 \text{Q}ge3

B1b1) 22 \( \text{Q}d5 \text{Q}xf1 \) 23 \( \text{W}xc2 \) (23 \( \text{W}xf1 \text{W}c4; \) 23 \( \text{W}xc2 \text{W}d8 24 \text{W}g2 \text{Q}xd5 25 \text{Q}xd5 \text{Q}e3 26 \text{W}xf7+ \text{W}xf7 27 \text{Md2} \text{Q}xg2 28 \text{W}xd8 \text{Q}xd8 29 \text{Q}xg2 \text{Q}f6+)\) 23...\( \text{W}xc2 \) 24 \( \text{W}xc2 \text{Q}e3++) 25 \text{Md2} \text{Q}xd5++; \)}
B1b2) 22 Qf2

B1b21) 22...Qh4

B1b211) 23 Qxb7 Qxb7+ 24 Qg2

B1b212) 23 Qd5 Qxf2! 24 Qxf2 Qxd5++;

B1b22) 22...Qxf4 23 Qxc2 Qxf3

B1b23) 22 Qxc2

B1b31) 22...Qxf1 23 Qd3 (23 Qd5 Qd6 24 Qd3 Qe3++;) 23...Qd6! 24 Qd5 Qe3++;

B1b32) 22...Qxf4 23 Qd5 Qxd5++;

B1b4) 22 Qxb7 Qxb7+ 23 Qg1 Qxf1 24 Qxf1 (24 Qxc2 Qxf4 25 We2 Qd2!) 24...Qb4++;

B2) 18 Qc1 Qd6

B2a) 19 Qd5 Qxc2;

B2b) 19 Qxb7 Qxb7+ 20 Qg1 Qf6 21 Qf3 (21 h3 Qe3) 21...Qxf3 22 Qxf3 Qxe2++;

B2c) 19 h3 Qxf4!

B2c1) 20 hxg4 Qxc1 21 Qxc1 Qxf3 22 Qxf3 Qf8 23 Qd2 Qf4 24 Qg2 Qxg4+ 25 Qf2 Wh4+

B2c11) 26 Qe2 Wh2+ 27 Qe3 Qd8 28 We1 (28 Qf2 Wh3+ 29 Qf3
13 g4 \text{\textit{b8}=}}.
13...\text{\textit{b7} 14 \text{\textit{xc6 } \text{\textit{xc6}} 15 \text{\textit{we2}} \text{\textit{wb7}} 16 e5}
16 g4?! d5! 17 e5? \text{\textit{dxg4}!}.
16...\text{\textit{d7}} 17 \text{\textit{exd6}} \text{\textit{edx6}} 18 \text{\textit{e4}} \text{\textit{ec7}} 19 b3 \text{\textit{df6}}
19...b5?!
A) 20 \text{\textit{b2}} bx4 (20...\text{\textit{fc8}}?) 21 \text{\textit{xa4}};
B) 20 \text{\textit{e1}} \text{\textit{wc7}} 21 axb5 axb5 22 \text{\textit{xa8}} \text{\textit{xa8}} 23 c3 \text{\textit{c8}} 24 \text{\textit{d2}}
\text{\textit{b6}}.

20 \text{\textit{xf6+?!}}
20 \text{\textit{a3?!}} \text{\textit{d5?!}} (20...\text{\textit{xe4}} 21 \text{\textit{xe7}}=; 20...\text{\textit{xe4}}! 21 \text{\textit{xe4}} \text{\textit{we4}}
22 \text{\textit{we4}} \text{\textit{xe4}} 23 \text{\textit{xe7}} \text{\textit{fc8}} 24 \text{\textit{a2}} \text{\textit{a7}} 25 \text{\textit{b4}} \text{\textit{d7}}) 21 \text{\textit{xe7}} \text{\textit{we7}} 22 g3 \text{\textit{fd8}}.
20...\text{\textit{xf6}} 21 \text{\textit{a2}}
21 \text{\textit{b1}} b5 22 axb5 axb5 23 \text{\textit{b2}} \text{\textit{xb2}} 24 \text{\textit{xb2}} b4.
21...b5 22 axb5 axb5 23 \text{\textit{xa8}} \text{\textit{xa8}} 24 \text{\textit{e3}} \text{\textit{a2}} 25 \text{\textit{wd3}} \text{\textit{xf3}} 26 \text{\textit{xf3}}

26 gxf3 Ugly but not worse than the nice one: since that loses on the spot: 26...b4 (26...g6 27 c4 bxc4 28 bxc4 \text{\textit{b2}}?) 27 f5 \text{\textit{wd5}} 28 fxe6 \text{\textit{wd3}} 29 \text{\textit{xf7+}} \text{\textit{xf7}} 30 \text{\textit{cxd3}} \text{\textit{b2}}.
34 fxe5  
34 \( \text{fxf4} \)

A) 35 \( \text{\textit{g5}} \) \( \text{\textit{b2}} \) 36 \( \text{\textit{e7}} \) (36 \( \text{\textit{xf4}} \) \( \text{\textit{xb4}} \) 37 \( \text{\textit{a8+}} \) \( \text{\textit{g7}} \)) 36...\text{fxg3} 37 \( \text{\textit{g7}} \) 38 \( \text{\textit{c5}} \) \( \text{\textit{xc5}} \) 39 \( \text{\textit{bxc5}} \) \( \text{\textit{e6+}} \)

B) 35 \( \text{\textit{xd4}} \).

34...\text{fxe5} 35 \( \text{\textit{g5}} \)

35 \( \text{\textit{a5}} \) e4 36 \( \text{\textit{xb5}} \) e3 37 \( \text{\textit{g5}} \) h6! 38 \( \text{\textit{xe3}} \) \( \text{\textit{xe3+}} \)

35...\text{gb2}

0-1

So far this is the only game in which ladies took up this weapon. And Vasilijevich could not be disappointed with it except the result but she missed quite some chances of victory.

N.Bojkovic – T.Vasilijevich  
Women’s tournament,  
Belgrade, 1998

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{\textit{f3}} \) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \( \text{\textit{xd4}} \) \( \text{\textit{f6}} \) 5 \( \text{\textit{c3}} \) e6 6 \( \text{\textit{e2}} \) \( \text{\textit{e7}} \) 7 0-0 0-0 8 f4 \( \text{\textit{wb6}} \) 9 \( \text{\textit{h1}} \) \( \text{\textit{c6}} \) 10 \( \text{\textit{b3}} \) \( \text{\textit{wc7}} \) 11 \( \text{\textit{e3}} \) a6 12 a4 b6 13 \( \text{\textit{f3}} \) \( \text{\textit{b7}} \)

[Diagram]

14 \( \text{\textit{we2}} \)

14 g4?! d5 15 e5? \( \text{\textit{xe4}} \)!

14...\text{\textit{fe8}} 15 \( \text{\textit{ad1}} \) \( \text{\textit{b4}} \) 16 \( \text{\textit{f2}} \)!

\( \text{\textit{d7}} \) 17 g4? d5! 18 e5 \( \text{\textit{ce5}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{d4}} \)

\( \text{\textit{e4}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{we2}} \)

20 \( \text{\textit{xe4}} \) \( \text{\textit{dxe4}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{xb6}} \) \( \text{\textit{wc2}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{wc2}} \) \( \text{\textit{xc2}} \) 23 \( \text{\textit{e2}} \) \( \text{\textit{d5+}} \)

20...\text{\textit{ac8}} 21 \( \text{\textit{g2}} \) \( \text{\textit{c6+}} \)

Instead 21...\text{\textit{xc3}}! 22 \( \text{\textit{xc3}} \) \( \text{\textit{a2}} \)

23 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) a5 24 \( \text{\textit{a1}} \) \( \text{\textit{xc3}} \) 25 \( \text{\textit{xc3}} \) \( \text{\textit{b8}} \) gave an advantage.

22 \( \text{\textit{f3}} \) \( \text{\textit{f8}} \) 23 \( \text{\textit{h3}} \) g6 24 \( \text{\textit{f1}} \)

\( \text{\textit{g7}} \) 25 \( \text{\textit{g1}} \) \( \text{\textit{wb8}} \) 26 \( \text{\textit{c1}} \) \( \text{\textit{wb7}} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{f1}} \) \( \text{\textit{c7}} \) 28 \( \text{\textit{c1}} \) \( \text{\textit{wb7}} \) 29 \( \text{\textit{we1}} \) a5

30 \( \text{\textit{wh4}} \) h6 31 \( \text{\textit{we1}} \) \( \text{\textit{a6}} \) 32 \( \text{\textit{xe4}} \) \( \text{\textit{dxe4}} \) 33 \( \text{\textit{xe3}} \) \( \text{\textit{b4}} \) 34 \( \text{\textit{f2}} \)

34 \( \text{\textit{f2}} \) \( \text{\textit{xa4}} \) 35 \( \text{\textit{exe4}} \) \( \text{\textit{c6+}} \)

\( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)

One game tries:

O.Roese – L.Vogt  
Bundesliga, 1992

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{\textit{f3}} \) e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \( \text{\textit{xd4}} \) \( \text{\textit{f6}} \) 5 \( \text{\textit{c3}} \) d6 6 \( \text{\textit{e2}} \) \( \text{\textit{e7}} \) 7 0-0 0-0 8 f4 \( \text{\textit{wb6}} \) 9 \( \text{\textit{e3}} \) \( \text{\textit{xb2}} \) 10 \( \text{\textit{we1}} \)!

Innocent looking but not without poison!

10...\text{\textit{wb6}}
10...\(\text{\#d7?!}\) 11 \(\text{\#d5!}\).

11 e5 \(\text{\#e8}\)
11...dxe5 12 fxe5 \(\text{\#fd7}\).

12 \(\text{\#f5}\) \(\text{\#d8}\) 13 \(\text{\#xe7+}\) \(\text{\#xe7}\) 14
\(\text{\#d1}\) \(\text{\#d7}\) 15 \(\text{\#b5}\) dxe5 16 \(\text{\#e4}\)
\(\text{\#ef6?!}\)

16...exf4!\(\text{\#f}\).

17 \(\text{\#xf6+}\) \(\text{\#xf6}\) 18 fxe5 \(\text{\#d5}\) 19
\(\text{\#d4}\) b6 20 \(\text{\#d3?!}\) \(\text{\#b4}\)
20...\(\text{\#d7}\).

21 c4 \(\text{\#xe1}\) 22 \(\text{\#xe1}\) \(\text{\#b4}\) 23
\(\text{\#d2}\) \(\text{\#d8}\) 24 \(\text{\#c3}\) \(\text{\#xd2}\) 25 \(\text{\#xd2}\)
\(\text{\#c2}\) 26 \(\text{\#d1}\) \(\text{\#b7}\)

27 \(\text{\#c3?!}\)
White outplayed himself, and now
blunders (in a worse position).

27 \(\text{\#f4}\) \(\text{\#e4}\).

27...\(\text{\#xg2!}\) 28 \(\text{\#xg2}\) \(\text{\#e3+}\) 29
\(\text{\#f3}\) \(\text{\#xd1}\) 30 \(\text{\#d4}\) \(\text{\#d8}\) 31 \(\text{\#e4}\)
f5+ 32 \(\text{\#xf6}\) \(\text{\#xf6}\) 33 \(\text{\#xf6}\) \(\text{\#f2+}\) 0-1

M.Kaminski – U.Boenschi
Bad Worishofen Open 1992

1 e4 c5 2 \(\text{\#f3}\) d6 3 d4 exd4 4
\(\text{\#xd4}\) \(\text{\#f6}\) 5 \(\text{\#c3}\) e6 6 \(\text{\#e2}\) \(\text{\#e7}\)
0-0 0-0 8 f4 \(\text{\#b6}\) 9 \(\text{\#e3}\) \(\text{\#xb2}\) 10
\(\text{\#d2}\) \(\text{\#b4}\) 11 f5?!?

17 e5! dxe5 18 \(\text{\#a5}\) \(\text{\#d7?!}\)
The worst choice, looking for
trouble.

18...\(\text{\#e4?!}\) 19 \(\text{\#c5}\) \(\text{\#d8}\) 20 \(\text{\#a4}\)
\(\text{\#f7}\) 21 \(\text{\#xc6}\) \(\text{\#d5}\) 22 \(\text{\#d6}!;\)
18...\(\text{\#d8?!}\) 19 \(\text{\#xe5}\) \(\text{\#d6}!\).

19 \(\text{\#xe5}\)
19 \(\text{\#c5}\) \(\text{\#d8}\).
19...\(\text{d}5\) 20 \(\text{xf}8+\) \(\text{xf}8\) 21 \(\text{xa}7\) \(\text{c}8\) 22 \(\text{d}4\) c5 23 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{f}5\) 24 \(\text{wb}8?!\)

24 \(\text{wg}3\) ?

24...\(\text{c}3!!=\) 25 \(\text{w}c8+\) \(\text{f}8\) 26 \(\text{wc}5\) \(\text{xe}2+\) 27 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{wc}5\) 28 \(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{c}8\) 29 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{c}3\) 30 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{xa}2\) 31 \(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{xc}2\) 32 \(h3\) \(1/2-1/2\)

\(\text{xb}6\) \(\text{xb}6\) 30 \(\text{gb}1\) \(\text{f}7\) 31 \(\text{g}2\) h6

31...\(c4\) is more consequent.

32 \(\text{f}3\) g5 33 h3 \(\text{e}6\) 34 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{ba}6\) 35 \(\text{ac}1\) \(\text{g}8\) 36 \(\text{a}1\) \(\text{d}5\) 37 \(\text{ad}1\) \text{AXB3} 38 \text{AXB3} \(\text{a}2\) 39 \(\text{c}1\)

I. Gazik – I. Stohl
Budapest Zonal B 1993

1 \(\text{e}4\) c5 2 \(\text{f}3\) d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{f}6\) 5 \(\text{c}3\) e6 6 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{e}7\) 7 0-0 0-0 8 f4 \(\text{w}b6\) 9 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{c}6\) 10 \(\text{xc}6?!\)

Rather harmless, what is more...

10...\(\text{bx}c6\) 11 \(\text{wd}3\) d5 12 e5 \(\text{d}7\) 13 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{c}7\)

...BLACK’s position is already more pleasant.

13...\(\text{wa}5?!\) 14 b3 c5\(\uparrow\).

14 b3 \(\text{b}6\) 15 \(\text{b}2\) f6 16 \(\text{wg}3\) a5 17 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{a}6\) 18 \(\text{h}3\) f5 19 \(\text{d}2\) a4 20 g4 c5 21 gxf5 exf5 22 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{b}7\)

23 \(\text{f}3\) d4 24 \(\text{b}2\)

39...\(\text{wb}2\)

Slow. He had a fine choice instead:

39...d3! 40 \(\text{c}4+\) \(\text{e}6\) 41 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{b}8\) 42 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{a}3\)\(\mp\); 39...\(c4!\) 40 \(\text{bxc}4+\) \(\text{xc}4\) 41 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{a}3\)\(\mp\).

40 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{e}6\) 41 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{d}5\) 42 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{a}8\) 43 fxg5 hxg5 44 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{g}5\) 45 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{a}3\) 46 \(\text{xf}5\) c4+ 47 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{axb}3\) 48 \(\text{e}6+\) \(\text{e}4\) 49 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{d}3+\)

50 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{e}3+\) 51 \(\text{e}2??\)

51 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{d}5\) 52 \(\text{a}1\)\(\mp\).

51...d3?

Missing an easy win by 51...\(\text{f}3!\)

52 \(\text{xe}3+\) \(\text{dxe}3\) 53 e7 \(\text{b}8++\).
52 cxd3+ cxd3 53 ♢xe3+??

The good Dr. Nunn used to say: 'If your opponent makes a mistake, it's likely he will make another soon.'

53 ♢c4+ ♡f3 54 ♢xe3+ ♡xe3 55 ♡d1 ♢h2 56 ♢e4+! saved the game, 56...♢xe4 57 e7 ♢h1+ 58 ♢d2 ♢h2=.

53...♢xe3 54 ♡f1 ♡f2+ 55 ♡g1 d2 56 ♢a1 ♡f6 57 e7 ♢g6+ 58 ♡f1 ♡f6+ 59 ♡g2 ♢e6 60 ♡f1 ♢xe7 0-1

25 ♢d4+–.

25...♗b7 26 ♢xa7 ♞xc2 27 ♞d2 ♞xd2 28 ♢xd2 ♢e8 29 h3 ♢d5 30 ♢f5 ♢a8 31 fxe6 ♢xe6 32 ♢c5 ♢xa2 ½–½

Again: there is more in the BLACK IS OK! '92 tournament report!

M. Stoinev – J. Howell
Capelle la Grande 1991

1 e4 c5 2 ♡f3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ♢xd4 ♡f6 5 ♢c3 d6 6 ♢e2 ♢e7 7 0-0 0-0 8 ♢f4 ♢b6 9 ♢h1 ♢c6 10 ♢e3 ♢xb2 11 ♢d2

11...♢b4?!?

Simple and good was 11...♢xd4! 12 ♢xd4 ♢b4=.

12 ♢ab1 ♢a5 13 ♢xc6 bxc6 14 ♢d5 ♢d8 15 ♢xe7+ ♢xe7 16 e5 ♢e4?

This should be losing. 16...dxe5 17 fxe5 ♢d5 18 ♢g5 ♢f6=.

17 ♢b4 f5 18 ♢f3 ♢d8 19 ♢xe4 fxe4 20 ♢fd1 c5 21 exd6 ♢xd6 22 ♢xc5 ♢xd1+ 23 ♢xd1 ♢c7 24 ♢xe4 ♢b8 25 ♢d4?±

This is winning in the long run: White has no compensation whatsoever for the missing pawn. It's hard to find a good man. Some even doubt whether there are too many in the whole world. But I was lucky to meet this and another one, who both entered this position, and did not make me sweat in converting my advantage into win...

10...♢xe4?? 11 ♢b1 ♢xa2 12 ♢f3 a6 13 ♢a1–+.

11 ♢c7? ♢c3+ (!) 12 ♢xa8 ♢xe3+ 13 ♢h1 ♢xe4 14 ♢d3
14 ♢c7 ♢f6 15 ♢cb5 a6=+. 
14...\(\texttt{Qf}2+\) 15 \(\texttt{Hxf2}\) \(\texttt{Wxf2}\) 16 \(\texttt{Hf1}\)
\(\texttt{Wh4}\)

17 \(\texttt{Wa3}\)
Since there is nothing to lose, White hangs on and tries to complicate matters. The other ‘customer’ (an old friend from our younger years) ceased resistance sooner. 17 \(g3\) \(\texttt{Wf6}\) 18 \(\texttt{Qf3}\) \(\texttt{Qa6}\) 19 \(\texttt{Qb5}\) \(\texttt{Qd7}\) 20 \(\texttt{Qac7}\) \(\texttt{Qc5}\) 21 \(\texttt{Wd2}\) \(\texttt{Ec8}\) 0-1 Maeder-Adorján Biel 1990.

17...\(e5\) 18 \(\texttt{Qb5}\)
18 \(\texttt{Wxa7}\) \(\texttt{exd4}\) 19 \(\texttt{Wxb8}\) \(\texttt{Qg4}\+)
18...\(\texttt{Cc6}\) 19 \(\texttt{Qxa7}\) \(\texttt{Qg4}\!\)

The rest is more or less forced and doesn’t need any verbal comment.
20 \(\texttt{Qxe6}\)

20 \(\texttt{Qxg4?}\) \(\texttt{Qxa8}\).
20...\(\texttt{Qxe2}\) 21 \(\texttt{Qxe7+}\) \(\texttt{Wxe7}\) 22 \(\texttt{Me1}\)
22 \(\texttt{Hf2}\) \(\texttt{exf4}\) 23 \(\texttt{Hxf4}\) \(\texttt{a6}\+)
22...\(\texttt{exf4}\)

23 \(\texttt{Qg1}\)
23 \(\texttt{Qb6}\) \(\texttt{He8}\) 24 \(\texttt{Qd5}\) (24 \(\texttt{Qg1}\) \(f3\+-) 24...\(\texttt{Wh4}\)! 25 \(\texttt{Qxe2}\) \(\texttt{We1}\+!! +\)

23 \(\texttt{Cc7}\) \(\texttt{We5}\+)
23...\(\texttt{He8}\)! 24 \(\texttt{Cc7}\)
24 \(\texttt{Qb6}\) \(f3\+-)
24...\(\texttt{Wxc7}\) 25 \(\texttt{Qxe2}\) \(\texttt{Wb6}\+ 26 \texttt{f1}\)
\(\texttt{Wb5}\) 0-1

These twins were your cakes. Did you like them?
Garry The Greatest
Kasparov: Revolutionary and Tsar

One of the commonplace questions in chess circles is ‘who do you consider to be the best player of all time?’. Listening to my heart, I would name two, but it’s not allowed. Unfortunately, Bobby Fischer returned to chess only for his ‘revenge’ match with Spassky. As he left the chess scene after his victorious world championship match in 1972, and I became a grandmaster only in 1973, we could not meet at the board. We still know each other a little, as in summer 1993 I tried to persuade him to move from the late Yugoslavia to peaceful Hungary. After some previous telephone conversations, I travelled to the town where he was staying. However, things got confused: instead of convincing him to leave the war-ridden country for Hungary (although he did so later), I was deported from Yugoslavia after two and a half days. The reason? Anti-war interviews given to the news agency Tanjug and some newspapers, and a public declaration of solidarity to opposition leader Vuk Draskovic and his wife, who had both been nearly beaten to death. The Serbian authorities were right from their own point of view. It was a miracle that I was able to leave the country with a whole skin.

It was also Yugoslavia where my lucky star, which also brought me a lot of hardships over the years, led me to my first meeting with Garry Kasparov. The field of the 1979 Banja Luka tournament included 14 grandmasters, 1 local master and a boy who would later become the 13th chess world champion. This was his debut on the international scene. It was successful enough, as the shock-headed youth with the piercing look, who turned sixteen during the tournament (on April 13), came first with a margin of 2 full points! (2. T. Petrosian, 3. Andersson, 4. Smejkal, 5. Adorján). I had never seen anything like that before, and haven’t seen anything like that ever since. I don’t remember when and how our conversations began, but I do remember that we became friends and decided to work together. By now I have hopefully become capable of objective self-assessment, but I still don’t understand what he saw in me. A lot of people were ‘buzzing around’ this God-blessed genius already, and he chose me of all the available foreign grandmasters. It’s true, though, that I am a sort of ‘undersized’ genius myself, who is much less fit for competitive sport.

Our co-operation started out as a ‘correspondence game’, and remained one for quite some time. We had a rather peculiar technique: he wrote to me in Russian, and I
replied in English. We understood each other perfectly, as most of the letters (6-8 pages sometimes) were filled with opening variations anyway.

It may be hard to believe, but it's true that our next personal encounter in the SOVIEUT UNION took place only right before the first Karpov-match in 1984. Although Hungary was a neighbouring province of the communist empire, Soviet people could visit our country only in organised tourist groups, or with strictly controlled individual invitations. Incoming traffic was not exactly 'free-flowing' in the USSR, either. On top of that, both of us had tournaments, and my two daughters were born in '79 and '80. It was also in 1979 that I qualified to be a World Championship Candidate from the Riga interzonal. This success was more than surprising for myself as well as others, as I was seeded 11th-12th by ELO among the 18 participants. Garry helped me a lot professionally and even more psychologically. During the tournament he even sent me a weapon for use against Miles in the last round. I won that game with my own Hedgehog, and my young friend wasn't even surprised that his prediction had come true. (It was his 'idea fixée' that I had a chance to qualify, and he repeated this several times in his letters.) When I was preparing for the Hübner-match, he also sent me detailed suggestions with both colours. It was really not his fault that I 'stalemated' my opponent in game 9 when I could have won the game and equalised the score easily.

So we could only 'steal' a few hours (with the rules of conspiracy strictly followed) in various team competitions (European Championship, Skara (Sweden), 1980; Olympiad, Malta, 1980; Soviet Union - Rest of the World, London, 1984(?)). I travelled to the last two events at my own expense as a tourist. This short time was obviously enough only for exchanging notes and 'sketching' some interesting thoughts on the board. Then in 1984 I signed up for a two-week individual tourist programme in Baku (much to my surprise, I was given the 'green light' in time). However, I only spent one night at my 'destination', as Litvinov (Kasparov's man at that time) literally smuggled me out of the city, and I flew to a place called Siki, about 500 kms from Baku. In the training camp set up there, I was introduced to Klara Saganova ('Mama') and the crew: Nikitin, Sakharov, Timoshenko, Vladimirov. I was a little afraid of the mutual jealousies that are 'in the air' in such situations, and I was also worried about how I could fit into a team having worked together for years on end. But I received a friendly welcome. They would have given me even their shirts and pants, as the Hungarian saying goes — and they actually did, as the suitcase containing all my clothes was lost in Moscow (no matter which part of the Empire you flew to, you could only get there via the capital). As it turned out, the suitcase was gone forever. Thank God, we still had the contents of the other suitcase, plus the information stored in my mind, including the counterblow to the Keres Attack in the Scheveningen
(in my 1988 book BLACK IS OK!, this variation was allotted a full chapter, and so were the double fianchetto and 5 a3 d5 6 cxd5 Qxd5 7 e3 g6 in the Queen’s Indian, which I had in my remaining suitcase as well). We had only 10 days because I had to return to Baku in time as a disciplined tourist. So it was an intensive course with 9-10 hours of analysis every day, with Nikitin and Sakarov taking shorthand in turns. Then they wrote down their notes neatly, and we checked them out later. Convincing him that BLACK can even have winning chances against the Keres (it took some concrete ideas and variations analysed 70-80%) was highly gratifying for the chess player and a great success for the educator. I am saying this because there had been a recurrent statement in several of his earlier letters: ‘The Keres Attack should not be allowed.’ You, dear reader, may not grasp the gravely sinister character of this statement, so let me put it in a context. It was something like the famous warning to Caesar: ‘Beware the Ides of March!’ You know the rest.

Garry became so enthusiastic that he allowed the Keres in the VERY FIRST GAME of the ‘chess marathon’ that was interrupted later. Karpov, perhaps listening to his legendary sense of danger, played 9 gxh5 instead of 9 g5, considered advantageous at that time. BLACK had no problems in the game, but the ‘wonder weapon’ could not fire.

During the Kasparov-Karpov match, I was the (Budapest-based...) correspondent of a Hungarian daily Magyar Hirlap. After Game 12, I received a letter from GM Peter Dely. I rang him up, only to find out that the ‘novelty of the century’ was exactly 20 years old! Let me tell the shortened version of his story. Preparing for his game, Peter didn’t really like any of the lines he considered. When he took the tram in the afternoon, his motto was ‘we’ll see what happens’. But he apparently took the right tram, as a daring idea occurred to him as it rattled along. He could do only some ‘blind’ analysis of course. So it was two ‘fresh minds’ that moved the pieces. The game ended with the least probable result so that both players could consider themselves lucky...

A. Karpov – G. Kasparov

Game One, World Championship, Moscow 1984

1 e4 c5 2 Qf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Qxd4 Qf6 5 Qc3 d6 6 g4 h6 7 h4 Qc6 8 Qg1 h5 9 gxh5(!) Qxh5 10 Qg5 Qf6 11 Wd2 Wb6 12 Qb3 Qd7 13 0-0-0 a6 14 Qg3 Wc7 15 Qg2 Qe7 16 f4

16...0-0-0
16...Qc8!?±
17 Wf2 Qb8 18 f5 Qe5 19 Qh3 Qc4 20 Qd2 Qxd2 21 Qxd2 Qc8= 22 fxe6 Qxe6 23 Qxe6 fxe6 24
Very few people thought that Kasparov would dare to throw in his gambit nearly two weeks later, as matches of this level have long been contests between the two teams as well as the two players. On the ‘first night’ of the show, Karpov proceeded as he would on such occasions: he shirked the fight, left no loose threads, and made his draw. Next time, he thought! Well, here is ‘next time’ for you!

The fact that a long drawn game played back in 1965 didn’t catch anybody’s attention (it was only published in the Hungarian Championship bulletin) is only natural. However, when the gambit was already all the rage in the chess world, another predecessor came to light. It was played later than the ‘very first forerunner’ but it would have been definitely easier to dig up. It has a serious drawback, though: the gambit player was beaten quite easily, as he erred as early as on move 11. Let’s see this monument of chess history, a sad memento of the ‘heroic age’ of the variation. Well, it fired twice at the Dortmund GM tournament that started at the same time as the match, and brought me two points.

A. Sznapik – A. Adorján
Dortmund 1984

1 e4 c5 2 ẞf3 e6 3 d4 exd4 4 ẞxd4 ẞf6 5 ẞc3 d6 6 g4 h6 7 h4
ẞc6 8 ßg1 h5 9 g5 ßg4 10 ße2

10...d5!N

The solution. Earlier I had tried to strengthen on the ‘old line’ by the same move, only 3 moves later. It worked quite well, but. Nunn’s improvement 16 ßg2!± against Andersson brought White back into the game.

10...ßb6 11 ßxc6 hxc6 12 ßxc6 ßg4 12 ßxc6 bxc6 13 ßxg4 d5?! N 14 g6 f6 15 h5 ßc5 16 ßf3 (16 ßg2!±)
16...ßa6 17 h6 0-0-0 18 ßd2 ßxb2 19 ßb1 ßxc2 20 ßd1 (20 ßc1 ßxd2+ 21 ßxd2 dxe4++)
20...ßd3 0-1 A. Rodriguez-A. Adorján, Toluca Interzonal 1982.

11 ßxc6

11 ßb5 ßc5! 12 ßxc6 bxc6 13 ßxc6+ ßd7 14 ßxa8 ßxf2+ 15 ße2 ßxg1 16 ßxg1 ßxa8 17 exd5 0-0;
11 exd5 exd5 12 ßb5
A) 12...\text{c}d7

A1) 13 f3 \text{g}ge5 14 \text{g}g3 (14 f4 \text{c}c5) 14...\text{c}c5 15 \text{e}e3 \text{w}e7 16 \text{x}xd5 \text{w}d6 17 \text{e}e2 0-0-0 18 \text{w}d2 (18 \text{d}dc3 \text{w}xd1+ 19 \text{e}xd1 \text{g}b4 20 \text{f}f1 \text{x}xb5 21 \text{x}xc5 \text{xc}2+=; 18 f4 \text{g}4) 18...\text{xe}3 19 \text{xe}3 \text{x}xf3+! 20 \text{x}f3 \text{w}xd2+ 21 \text{x}xd2 \text{g}4++;

A2) 13 \text{g}xd5 \text{c}c5 14 c3 0-0 15 \text{e}e3 \text{x}xd4 16 cxd4 \text{xb}5 17 dxc5 \text{e}e8 18 \text{g}g3 \text{c}4 19 \text{f}f4 \text{a}5+ 20 \text{w}d2 \text{w}xc5 21 \text{e}h5 \text{w}c6+;

A more aggressive try is:

B) 12...\text{w}e7+!? 13 \text{e}e3 (13 \text{d}e2 \text{w}c5; 13 \text{f}f1 \text{w}c5 14 \text{g}g2 \text{c}6 15 \text{a}4 \text{w}d6 16 f3 \text{g}ge5 17 \text{f}f4 f6=) 13...\text{xe}3 14 \text{xc}6 \text{bxc}6 15 \text{xc}6+ \text{d}7 16 \text{xd}7+ \text{xd}7 17 \text{fxe}3 \text{w}xe3+ 18 \text{d}e2 (18 \text{f}f1 \text{d}4+) 18...\text{w}e4 19 \text{w}d4 \text{w}xd4 20 \text{x}xd4 \text{e}e8+=;

11 \text{c}xg4 \text{hxg}4 12 g6 (12 exd5 exd5 13 \text{e}e3 \text{b}4)

A2a) 15 \text{w}xe7+ \text{xe}7

A2a1) 16 \text{d}db5 \text{b}4 17 \text{d}d1 \text{f}5 18 \text{c}c7+ \text{d}7 19 \text{xa}8 \text{xc}2 20 \text{b}b1 \text{b}4 21 \text{a}1 \text{d}4! (21...\text{c}2=) 22 \text{b}5 \text{c}2 23 \text{b}1 \text{xa}8+;

A2a2) 16 \text{e}e3

A2a21) 16...\text{b}4 17 0-0-0 \text{xc}3 18 bxc3 \text{xd}4 19 \text{xd}4 \text{e}6 20 \text{c}4 dxc4 21 \text{e}4 \text{e}7 22 \text{e}1 (22 \text{c}5+ \text{d}7 23 \text{d}1+ \text{c}6=) 22...\text{e}8 23 \text{h}6 \text{d}7 24 \text{c}xg7 \text{h}g8 25 \text{xf}6 \text{g}6=;

A2a22) 16...\text{x}h4 goes for more:
17 \text{d}db5 d4! 18 \text{c}7+ \text{f}8 19 \text{xa}8 dxc3 20 bxc3 \text{f}5=;

A2b) 15 \text{e}3 \text{xd}4 16 \text{xd}4 \text{w}e2+ 17 \text{exe}2 \text{d}6=;

B) 12...\text{x}h4 Compared to 12...f6 it seems to make the BLACK king's position more draughty. But let's go on: 13 gxf7+ \text{xf}7 14 \text{e}3 \text{b}4 15 \text{d}2 \text{a}5=;

11...bxc6 12 \text{x}g4 \text{hxg}4 13 \text{w}g4 d4 14 \text{e}2
14...e5!

This is fine, I only deviated in my game because I felt like trying the other tempting move, just to surprise the opponent. Objectively, this 'revised novelty' looks suspicious. But it won!

14...b8!?N 15 h5 a6 16 d2? (<16 g6!) 16...xb2 17 g6 f5 18 exf5 exf5 19 xf5 e7 20 f7+ xf7 21 gxf7+ xf7 22 d4 xh5 23 c3 b8 24 g3? (24 0-0-0 a3+ 25 d2 d5=) 24...e8+ 25 e3 (25 d2 c5 26 c6 e2=) 25...xe3+ 26 xe3 b4+! + Schmiedel-Adorján Dortmund 1984. 0-1(43).

15 g3 d6 16 f4 a6 17 fxe5

A) 18 c3 dxc3 19 xc3 xe5 20 f4 xc3+ 21 bxc3 (21 xc3 xc3+ 22 bxc3 xh4=) 21...a4?;

B) 18 d2 xe5 19 xe5+ xe5 20 h1 b8! 21 c1 (21 b3 xe2 22 xe2 d3+ 23 cxd3 xa1 24 xal xh4=) 21...d3 22 cxd3 (22 c3 xc3+ 23 bxc3 dxe2 24 d2 b1 25 a3 xa1 26 xa1 xal xh4=) 22...xd3 23 c3 xc3+ 24 bxc3 xe4 25 h2 0-0=.

18 d2

A) 19...xh4? 20 d2 (20 g6 dxc2+ 21 xe2 g4=) 20...dxc2+ 21 xe2 d4 22 ad1 xe4 23 xe4 (23 g6! 0-0-0 24 c1+) 23...xe4+ 24 c1 e2 25 de1 xd2+ 26 xd2 0-0+ 27 c1 d4 28 wh3+ b8 29 g3=;

B) 19...xc3! 20 bxc3 wa5 21 g6 0-0 22 cxd3 (22 d2 ad8) 22...xd3=!

18 c3! dxc3 (18...d3 19 cxb4 dxe2 20 e3=) 19 bxc3 c5 20 h1 d7=.

18...xd2+ 19 xd2 wa5+ 20 d1 0-0?!

20...b5! 21 d3 b6 (21...xd3+ 22 cxd3 xd3 23 xd4 xh4 24 f5 h2=) 22 b3 xe2+ 23 xe2 xh4=.

17...b4+?!

Now this is a bit silly. Consequent and good was:

17...wa5+!
21 \( \Box c1! \)

A) 21...\( \Box b6 \) 22 \( \Box d3 \) \( \Box xd3 \) 23 cxd3 \( \Box xb2 \) 24 \( \Box c1 \) \( \Box xa2 \) 25 \( \Box xc6+ \) \( \Box b7 \) 26 \( \Box c2 \) \( \Box b3 \) 27 \( \Box d2 \) \( \Box c8 \) 28 \( \Box gc1 \) \( \Box xc2+ \) 29 \( \Box xc2 \) \( \Box c8 \) 30 \( \Box xc8 \) \( \Box xe8 \) \( \Box f3 \) 31 \( \Box f3 \) (31 h5 \( \Box b2+ \) 32 \( \Box d1 \) \( \Box b1=\)) 31...a5 32 g6 fxg6 33 \( \Box f8+ \) \( \Box b7 \) 34 \( \Box e7+ \) \( \Box a6 \) 35 \( \Box d6+ \) \( \Box b6 \) 36 \( \Box c2+\);

B) 21...c5! 22 g6 c4 23 gxf7 d3=\( \Box d3 \) 24 cxd3 \( \Box a4+ \) 25 b3 \( \Box xb3 \) 26 \( \Box g4+ \) \( \Box b8 \) 27 \( \Box xb3 \) \( \Box xd3+ \) 28 \( \Box c2 \) \( \Box c4+ \) 29 \( \Box b2 \) \( \Box c3+ \) 30 \( \Box a3 \) \( \Box a5=\); Those who like to get a little chilly can try 21 g6 d3 22 \( \Box c3 \) \( \Box b6 \) 23 \( \Box c1! \) and after \( \Box d2+ \) both 24 \( \Box d1 \) and \( \Box b1 \) seem to give White an advantage... (23 b3? \( \Box d4 \) 24 \( \Box e1 \) \( \Box xh4 \) 25 gxf7 dxc2+ 26 \( \Box c1 \) \( \Box xe4+\))

21...\( \Box xe5 \) 22 \( \Box g4+ \) \( \Box b8 \)

23 a4?

Desperation in a heavy time scramble. On the other hand BLACK was (again...) clearly better anyhow.

\( \Box 23 \) \( \Box d3 \) \( \Box h2 \) 24 \( \Box g2 \) \( \Box xh4+? \) (24...\( \Box xg2 \) 25 \( \Box xg2 \) \( \Box xh4 \) 26 \( \Box d2=\) )

23...d3! 24 c3

24 \( \Box xd3 \) \( \Box xb2 \) 25 \( \Box c1 \) c5=\.

24...d2! 25 g6

25 \( \Box h3 \) \( \Box c8 \) 26 \( \Box g3 \) \( \Box xg3 \) 27 \( \Box xg3 \) \( \Box xh4+\).

25...\( \Box c4+ \) 26 \( \Box g2 \) f5! 27 \( \Box f4 \) \( \Box xf4 \) 28 \( \Box xf4 \) \( \Box xh4 \) 29 \( \Box g2 \) \( \Box b3+ \) 30 \( \Box e2 \) \( \Box xe4+ \) 0-1

Garry, however, used one of his own Paulsen-ideas (a suspect one, to say the least) in Game 3 (why on Earth did he deviate?), and lost. Then he lost two more games soon.

Back in the training camp, I argued fiercely against Garry playing the so-called Tarrasch Defence in the Queen’s Gambit. I have never seen anyone play it regularly and avoid ugly defeats ever since Spassky used it several times in the match with Petrosian. Again, it’s not only about the variation being ‘good’ or ‘bad’. It’s simply masochism of a dangerous kind to go for such a line against Karpov of all people, where he can have a slight but permanent positional plus. And that silly Nikitin brought up all kinds of statistics, saying that Garry had never lost even a training game with the Tarrasch. I asked: ‘Please tell me, Alexander Nikolayevich, did he train with Karpov as well?’ But my objections were to no avail, and young Garry proceeded to chalk up a loss at once. Then another one, in my presence already. Please don’t misunderstand me: it’s not that I was so bloody clever. It was they who were bloody fools, lacking common sense! Yes, I went to Moscow as ‘a correspondent for the Hungarian Radio’. Not that they paid anything, not even for my reports, but it was the only way for me to get accredited for the match. So I once more brought up the idea to throw in the Grünfeld, all the
more so as we had another Grünfeld-specialist in the team (Dorfman). And so the three of us started the ‘fast-track course’. As you may have guessed, Kasparov has a rather keen and quick mind, plus the spirit of the Grünfeld (active and dynamic play with counterattack) suits him down to the ground. We accomplished all that could be accomplished at such short notice. I would not have been worried about Garry even if the next game had been the first Grünfeld in his life. So what happened? Well, Karpov used exclusively 1 \( \text{Qf3} \) in the rest of the extra-long duel! He didn’t give the Grünfeld a chance. That time. But it occurred 9 times at their next match, and Kasparov used it on numerous further occasions, mostly with success.

I stayed in Hotel Rossija for a month, just a few floors away from the Kasparov-team, but the ‘tovarishchi’ and their champion (as Krogius said, quoted in Kasparov’s book: ‘We have a world champion already, we don’t need another one’) pleasantly surprised us by realising only at the end of the third week that I was an ‘undercover agent’. Once they realised it, though, they snapped into action immediately: Tamaz Georgadze told me about Karpov’s disapproval in person. Soviet Chess Federation ‘big-wig’ Baturinsky, a former tribunal judge who delivered a great number of death sentences, dialled Sandor Szenyő’s (President of the Hungarian Chess Federation for 29 years, as well as one of the eight founding members of the Hungarian Communist Party) home number(!). What kind of retaliation he suggested for my sinful and deceptive doings, I don’t know, and

I don’t want to guess. The shot in the back of the head had lost most of its popularity in Hungary by then. Anyway, my crime was no more than assisting Kasparov’s agony as a friend. He suffered his fourth loss at the week of my arrival, and we were all really suffering like hell, being utterly helpless, and unable to help. And now the surprising turnabout: Szenyő said he could not see anything wrong with my activities, and the Hungarian federation would not investigate the matter, especially not before the Olympiad! It may seem that I lived dangerously. And so I did. However, it was not my own decision, let alone ‘heroism’. We simply lived in a world where it took COURAGE to behave in a reasonable, constructive and ethical way. A real nightmare! (But, as the rebellious son of a small nation that has struggled for its physical survival so often over the centuries – let me just mention the Tartar, Turkish, German and Russian invasions – I do not consider ‘mere’ honesty and humanism a special merit.) I did and do admire Garry Kasparov, the perfectionist, the versatile and brilliant player. As a human being, I loved him for a long time as if I had been a peculiar mixture of his father, (who passed away early) and the elder brother he never had (the age difference between us is 13 years). As there was no legal way for me to help him, I took some risks. I was richly rewarded. In my book Quo vadis, Garry?, published in 1990 in Hungarian, German and Norwegian(!), I put it as follows: ‘It felt grand to stand on the side of Good, even if my side was losing.’ Yes, it was great! But it was horrible! Still it was a noble struggle!
I was his second three more times at various matches. In the summer of '85, we took on Andersson in Belgrade. The result: 4-2. Garry also beat Hübner in Hamburg in a similar training match. He could not set the goal to catch up with Karpov’s match experience, what he could do was to get some more experience for himself — and in 1985, the chess world had a new world champion: Garry Kasparov.

I was NOT present at the match (held in the Soviet Union), but we were in almost daily telephone contact. It cherished our national pride when it turned out that the gambit he threw in twice, winning a truly fantastic game at the second attempt (the ‘novelty of the century’ as it was called), was actually (and naturally) a Hungarian invention! The games and analyses in this chapter start out with Honfi-Dely (Hungarian Championship, 1965). But! As so many times before, it is all put together only in this book. In real life, several people may discover the same thing, ignorant of each other. Kasparov worked out his gambit a few months before the match. He didn’t know the stem game either from me (as many people thought) or from his database, which was naturally all in ‘paperback’ then.

K. Honfi – P. Dely
Hungarian Championship
1965

1 e4 c5 2 d4 f3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4
\( \square \) xd4 \( \square \) c6 5 \( \square \) b5 d6 6 c4 \( \square \) f6 7
\( \square \) c3 a6 8 \( \square \) a3 d5 9 cxd5 exd5 10
exd5 \( \square \) b4 11 \( \square \) a4+!? \( \square \) d7 12 \( \square \) b3

12...\( \square \) e7

Dely thinks that it’s no good. However, his recommendation 12...\( \square \) c5 is also far from perfect. What we have are the moves of the d7 bishop:

12...\( \square \) f5!?;
12...\( \square \) g4! ?;
12...\( \square \) c5?! 13 \( \square \) e3 \( \square \) e7 14 \( \square \) e2
\( \square \) x3 15 fxe3 0-0 16 \( \square \) d1! a5 17
\( \square \) c4 \( \square \) c5 (17...a4 18 d6 axb3 19
dxe7 \( \square \) fe8 20 \( \square \) b6++) 18 a3 \( \square \) bxd5
19 \( \square \) xd5 \( \square \) xd5 20 e4 \( \square \) f6 21 e5
\( \square \) e4 22 \( \square \) b6 \( \square \) c6 23 0-0±.

13 \( \square \) f4
13 \( \square \) a2!±.
13...\( \square \) g4! 14 f3
14 h3 \( \square \) h5 15 g4 \( \square \) g6 16 \( \square \) d1
\( \square \) d6= (16...\( \square \) c5?!).

14...\( \square \) fxd5
The ‘founding father’, on the other hand, criticised the move in the game. As for myself, my contemporary analysis, published in numerous periodicals, was overly emotional and exhilarated. 18 years have passed, and I do hope that all the old mistakes have been corrected, and this book will contain only brand-new ones!

14...\(\text{Q}bxd5?\)

A) 15 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{Q}e6\) 16 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}b4!\) 17 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{W}e7\) 18 \(\text{Q}xd5\) \(\text{Q}xd5+\) 19 \(\text{Q}f2\) \(\text{Q}c5+\) 20 \(\text{Q}e3=\);

B) 15 \(\text{fxg4}\) \(\text{Q}xf4\) 16 \(\text{W}a4+\) b5 17 \(\text{W}xf4\) (17 \(\text{Q}xb5\) 0-0 18 \(\text{W}xf4\) axb5 19 \(\text{Q}xb5\) \(\text{W}b6\) ) 17...b4 18 g5! (18 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{W}b8\) 19 \(\text{Q}xb8+\) \(\text{Q}xb8=\)) 18...\(\text{Q}h5\) 19 \(\text{W}e4\) bxc3 20 \(\text{Q}d1\) (20 \(\text{W}c6+\) \(\text{Q}f8\) 21 \(\text{W}xc3\) \(\text{Q}xg5\)) 20...\(\text{W}b8\) 21 bxc3 0-0=;

C) 15 0-0-0 \(\text{Q}e6\) 16 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}c8!\)

C1) 17 \(\text{Q}xd5\) \(\text{Q}xd5\) 18 \(\text{Q}xd5\) \(\text{Q}xa3\) 19 \(\text{W}xa3\) (19 \(\text{Q}e5\) \(\text{Q}e7=\)) 19...\(\text{Q}xd5\) 20 \(\text{Q}e1+\) \(\text{Q}e6\) 21 \(\text{Q}b1\) \(\text{W}c6\) 22 \(\text{Q}e4\) \(\text{W}d5\) 23 \(\text{Q}g5\) f6 24 \(\text{Q}xf6\) \(\text{Q}xa2+=\);

C2) 17 \(\text{Q}xd5!\) Now there’s the rub! 17...\(\text{Q}xd5\) 18 \(\text{Q}xd5\) \(\text{Q}xa3\) 20 \(\text{W}e5+\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 21 \(\text{W}xg7\) \(\text{Q}f8\) 22 \(\text{Q}e1+=.

15 \(\text{Q}xd5\)

15 \(\text{Q}d1\) Dely was afraid of this, although even the final position of the line in brackets is roughly equal. 15...\(\text{Q}h4+1N\) (15...\(\text{Q}e6\) 16 \(\text{Q}e4\) \(\text{Q}xf4\) 17 \(\text{Q}xd8+\) \(\text{Q}xd8\) 18 \(\text{Q}xe6\) \(\text{Q}xe6\) 19 0-0 0-0=) 16 \(\text{Q}g3\) \(\text{Q}xg3+\) 17 \(\text{hxg3}\) \(\text{Q}e6\) 18 \(\text{Q}xd5\) \(\text{Q}xd5\) 19 \(\text{W}xb7\) \(\text{W}a5+\) 20 \(\text{Q}d2\) 0-0 21 \(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{W}c5\).

15...\(\text{Q}xd5\) 16 \(\text{fxg4}\) \(\text{Q}xf4\) 17 \(\text{W}a4+\) b5 18 \(\text{W}xf4\) 0-0

19 \(\text{W}d2?\)

Well, this is a losing move. The critical line starts with 19 \(\text{Q}d1\).

19 \(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{Q}g5\) 20 \(\text{W}b4\) \(\text{Q}e8\) 21 \(\text{Q}f1!\) (21 \(\text{Q}f1\) \(\text{Q}xe2+!\)) 22 \(\text{Q}xe2\) \(\text{W}e8+\) 23 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{Q}d8++\); 21 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{W}f6\) 22 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}ac8\) 23 \(\text{Q}c2\) \(\text{Q}xe2+\) 24 \(\text{Q}xe2\) \(\text{Q}e8+\) 25 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{Q}d8++\) 26 \(\text{Q}e1\) \(\text{Q}h4+\) 27 \(g3\) \(\text{Q}f3++\) 21...\(\text{Q}d2\) 22 \(\text{W}b3\) \(\text{Q}e3\) 23 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{W}f6+\) 24 \(\text{Q}f3\) \(\text{Q}e1+\) 25 \(\text{Q}xe1\) \(\text{Q}xe1\) 26 \(\text{Q}e1\) \(\text{Q}c8\) 27 \(\text{Q}c2\) \(\text{W}xb2\) 28 \(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{W}xa2\) 29 \(\text{Q}b7\) \(\text{Q}d8\) 30 \(\text{Q}f2\) \(\text{Q}a5\);

19 \(\text{Q}d1!\) \(\text{W}a5+\) 20 \(\text{Q}f2\) \(\text{W}b6+\) 21 \(\text{Q}g3\) \(\text{Q}d8\) 22 \(\text{Q}e2\) (22 \(\text{Q}d8\) \(\text{Q}d8\) 23 \(\text{Q}h3\) g5! 24 \(\text{W}f5\) \(\text{Q}d6++\) 22...\(\text{Q}d6\) 23 \(\text{Q}d6\) \(\text{Q}d6\) 24 \(\text{Q}f3\) \(\text{Q}e8\) 25 \(h4\) \(\text{Q}d4\) 26 \(\text{Q}c1\) \(\text{Q}d6+\) 27 \(\text{Q}h3\) h5 28 gxh5 (28 \(\text{Q}e1\)) 28...\(\text{W}e6+\) 29 \(\text{Q}g3\) (29 g4 \(\text{Q}d3\) 30 \(\text{Q}f1\) f5!) 29...\(\text{W}d6+\).

19...\(\text{Q}e8!!\) 20 \(\text{Q}d1\)
20 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}xd8 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}x\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{X}}}}d8 21 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}xb5 (21 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}e2 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}b4+ 22 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{W}}}f1 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{M}}}}d2 23 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{W}}}f3 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}c5+}) 21...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}xb5 22 0-0 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}c5+ 23 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{W}}}h1} b4 24 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d4} (24 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c2 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{M}}}}d2 25 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}ac1 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}e2 26 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}e3 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}e3} 27 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}xc5 \\
f6 28 a4 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}xb2+) 24...
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}d4 25 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}ac1 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}xg4 26 a4 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{B}}}}xa3 27 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}x}a3 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}}f8\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{P}}}.
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20...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}g5}?! !

A strong move with a pretty intention and a nice punchline, leading to an endgame with winning chances. The sad thing (for BLACK) is that two other moves were winning, too! One of them is simple but a little lengthy, whereas the other is even more beautiful than the combination played in the game. Moreover, it is quick!

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}20...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xa}3 21 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{B}}}xa}3 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{F}}}f6} 22 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{C}}}c1 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}d}8 23 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}d3 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{X}}}d3} 24 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xd}3 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}d}8\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{P}}}.

\item 20...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}b}6! 21 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}d}3 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}d}8 22 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{C}}}c1 \\
(22 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c}2 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{X}}}d}3 23 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xd}3 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}d}8\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{P}}}.

\item 22...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}b}4!! (22...
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xd}3) 22 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xb}4 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{X}}}d}3+ 24 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}c}2 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{W}}}g}6\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{P}}}.

\item 21 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xd}8 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}ax}d8+ 22 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{C}}}c}2 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{M}}}d}2+ \\
23 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}c}3 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}c}8+ 24 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{B}}}b}3 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{F}}}f6} 25 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}b}1 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}c}1!!
\end{itemize}

You don’t see something like this every day, do you? White is lucky to escape into an endgame with one pawn down..
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26 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xb}5\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{P}}}.

26 g5 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{E}}}e}5 27 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xb}5 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{X}}}h}1 28 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{X}}}h}1 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xb}2+ 29 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{C}}}c}4 axb5+ 30 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xb}5 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{X}}}g}2\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{P}}}.

26...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}x}h1 27 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}x}h1 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xb}2+ 28 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{C}}}c}4 axb5+ 29 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xb}5 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{X}}}g}2 30 h3 \\
30 a4? \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{X}}}xg}4+ 31 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{B}}}b}3 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{E}}}e}7!\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{P}}}.

30...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xa}2 31 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{E}}}e}1 h5!

31...h6.

32 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{G}}}x}h5

32 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}d}6 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}a}4+ 33 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{D}}}d}5 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{X}}}g}4 34 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{X}}}g}4 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xg}4 35 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{E}}}e}8+ \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{H}}}h}7 36 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}xf}7 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{D}}}d}4+ 37 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{C}}}c}6 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{D}}}d}1\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{P}}} and BLACK’s advantage can probably be turned into a win.

32...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}a}4+ 33 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{D}}}d}5 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{H}}}h}4 34 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{E}}}e}3 \\
\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}x}h5+ 35 \textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{C}}}c}6

35...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{A}}}h}4?!

A mutual time scramble must have been in full rage at this point.
If BLACK had centralised his bishop instead of this hasty move, he could have won in spite of the reduced material, as the white king is hopelessly cut off from its camp.

35...<b><i>x</i></b>xe5!--.

36 <b><i>x</i></b>d6 f5 37 <b><i>x</i></b>f3 g6 38 <b><i>x</i></b>d7 <b><i>x</i></b>h7+ 39 <b><i>x</i></b>e6 <b><i>x</i></b>e7+ 40 <b><i>x</i></b>d5

40...<b><i>x</i></b>h8??

Oh, those fortieth moves! Now Honfi is a long and tedious lesson in rook versus rook and bishop. But this is nothing compared to what happened to him so far! Besides, he became quite well-versed in this kind of endgame. When I played him years later in the Hungarian Team Championship, I also had an extra bishop with a rook each. Before the adjournment, I asked him: ‘Charlie, you know how to play with your rook, don’t you?’ ‘Why of course’ – he laughed, and we agreed a draw. How could I doubt a gentleman’s word?

40...<b><i>x</i></b>f6.

41 <b><i>x</i></b>f5 <b><i>x</i></b>f5 42 <b><i>x</i></b>f5 <b><i>x</i></b>g7 43 <b><i>x</i></b>f3 <b><i>x</i></b>g6 44 <b><i>x</i></b>d4 <b><i>x</i></b>g4 45 <b><i>x</i></b>d3 <b><i>e</i></b>e1 46 <b><i>x</i></b>d2 <b><i>x</i></b>g1 47 <b><i>x</i></b>e2 <b><i>x</i></b>g3 48 <b><i>x</i></b>h8 <b><i>x</i></b>e1+ 49 <b><i>x</i></b>d2 <b><i>x</i></b>h1 50 <b><i>x</i></b>e3 <b><i>x</i></b>xh3 51 <b><i>x</i></b>h4 <b><i>x</i></b>h7 52 <b><i>x</i></b>g8+ <b><i>x</i></b>h4 53 <b><i>x</i></b>f3 <b><i>x</i></b>h7+ 54 <b><i>x</i></b>e4 <b><i>x</i></b>h3 55 <b><i>x</i></b>d5 <b><i>x</i></b>f6 56 <b><i>x</i></b>e4 <b><i>x</i></b>g2 57 <b><i>x</i></b>a8 <b><i>x</i></b>f4+ 58 <b><i>x</i></b>d5 <b><i>x</i></b>f3 59 <b><i>x</i></b>a3+ <b><i>x</i></b>g4 60 <b><i>x</i></b>a8 <b><i>x</i></b>f5+ 61 <b><i>x</i></b>e4 <b><i>x</i></b>e5+ 62 <b><i>x</i></b>d4 <b><i>x</i></b>f4 63 <b><i>x</i></b>g8+ <b><i>x</i></b>f3 64 <b><i>x</i></b>a8 <b><i>x</i></b>e6 65 <b><i>x</i></b>a3+ <b><i>x</i></b>g4 66 <b><i>x</i></b>a8 <b><i>x</i></b>e1 67 <b><i>x</i></b>d5 <b><i>x</i></b>h6 68 <b><i>x</i></b>a7 <b><i>x</i></b>f5 69 <b><i>x</i></b>f7+ <b><i>x</i></b>g6 70 <b><i>x</i></b>f2 <b><i>x</i></b>g7 71 <b><i>x</i></b>g2+ <b><i>x</i></b>f7 72 <b><i>x</i></b>f4 <b><i>x</i></b>e5+ 73 <b><i>x</i></b>c4 <b><i>x</i></b>f6 74 <b><i>x</i></b>d3 <b><i>x</i></b>a5 75 <b><i>x</i></b>e4 <b><i>x</i></b>e5 76 <b><i>x</i></b>b4 <b><i>x</i></b>e6 77 <b><i>x</i></b>e4 <b><i>x</i></b>d6 78 <b><i>x</i></b>c4 <b><i>x</i></b>c5 79 <b><i>x</i></b>f4 <b><i>x</i></b>d5 80 <b><i>x</i></b>e4 <b><i>x</i></b>d6+ 81 <b><i>x</i></b>f5 <b><i>x</i></b>a3 82 <b><i>x</i></b>e2 <b><i>x</i></b>f3+ 83 <b><i>x</i></b>g4 <b><i>x</i></b>f4+ 84 <b><i>x</i></b>g5 <b><i>x</i></b>f8 85 <b><i>x</i></b>g4 <b><i>x</i></b>f4 86 <b><i>x</i></b>e1 <b><i>x</i></b>d4 87 <b><i>x</i></b>e2 <b><i>x</i></b>e3 88 <b><i>x</i></b>a2 <b><i>x</i></b>e4 89 <b><i>x</i></b>a4+ <b><i>x</i></b>d4 90 <b><i>x</i></b>b4 <b><i>x</i></b>g8+ 91 <b><i>x</i></b>h4 <b><i>x</i></b>e5 92 <b><i>x</i></b>h3 <b><i>x</i></b>e4 93 <b><i>x</i></b>h4 ½-½

Karpov – Kasparov
World Championship Match 1985

1 e4 c5 2 <b><i>x</i></b>f3 e6 3 d4 exd4 4 <b><i>x</i></b>xd4 <b><i>x</i></b>c6 5 <b><i>x</i></b>b5 d6 6 c4 <b><i>x</i></b>f6 7 <b><i>x</i></b>hc3 a6 8 <b><i>x</i></b>a3 d5!!?

Shocking! In similar positions, BLACK plays b6–<b><i>x</i></b>b7, completes his development, waits for the appropriate moment with patient manoeuvring, and plays d6–d5 when this moment comes. Kasparov makes the key move a good 20 moves earlier, albeit at the cost of a pawn.

9 exd5 exd5 10 cxd5

Deviations are simply self-destructive, as shown by the lines below.
144 Garry the Greatest

10 \( \text{Q}x\text{d}5?! \text{Q}x\text{d}5 \) 11 \text{cxd}5 (11 \text{W}x\text{d}5? \text{b}4+ 12 \text{d}2 \text{W}e7+ 13 \text{e}2 \text{g}4+-) \\
\text{A)} 11...\text{W}a5+ 12 \text{d}2 (12 \text{e}2 \text{x}a3 13 \text{b}xa3 \text{e}7 14 \text{d}4 \text{W}x\text{d}5 15 \text{W}x\text{g}7 \text{g}8 16 \text{c}3 \text{h}3!) 12...\text{W}x\text{d}5\text{=}; \\
\text{B)} 11...\text{b}4+ \\
\text{B1)} 12 \text{e}2? 0-0 (12...\text{W}e7+ 13 \text{e}3 \text{e}5\text{=} 13 \text{d}xc6? (13 \text{c}xe2 \text{W}e7+ 14 \text{e}3 \text{d}8\text{=} 13...\text{e}e8+ 14 \text{e}3 \text{x}e3\text{=} 15 \text{x}e3 \text{e}7++; \\
\text{B2)} 12 \text{d}2 \text{W}x\text{d}5 13 \text{xb}4 \text{xb}4 14 \text{W}x\text{d}5 \text{a}x\text{d}5\text{=}.

10...\text{b}4

\( \text{e}4?! \text{xe}4 17 \text{fxe}4 \text{bxc}4 18 \text{xf}6 \text{gx}f6 19 \text{xc}4 \text{a}5 20 \text{a}3 \text{a}6 21 \text{g}4+\text{=} 16...\text{d}3 17 \text{e}4

\text{A1)} My original analysis went 17...\text{xe}4 18 \text{fx}e4 \text{f}2+! 19 \text{h}2 \text{xe}4 20 \text{xe}2 \text{x}g5 21 \text{e}1 \text{e}8 fails to 22 \text{h}4 \text{e}6 23 \text{e}4 \text{d}4 24 \text{xc}5+- but not 24 \text{xd}4?? \text{xd}4 25 \text{xc}8 \text{wh}4 mate; \\
\text{A2)} 17...\text{xb}2 Sometimes you are forced to score points in simple ways. 18 \text{d}2 \text{xa}3 19 \text{d}4 \text{xe}4 20 \text{fxe}4 \text{c}7 21 \text{x}f6 \text{gxf}6 22 \text{xf}6 \text{c}4+-;

B) 12 \text{d}4 \text{b}5

11 \text{e}2

So this is the brainchild of the Karpov-team. Have a look at the ‘warm-up’ game: 11 \text{c}4 \text{g}4

\text{B1)} 13 \text{b}3 \text{c}5! 14 \text{e}5+ \text{f}8\text{=} \\
\text{B1a)} 15 \text{c}2 \text{d}7 16 0-0 \text{e}8 17 \text{g}3 \text{x}c2 18 \text{xc}2 \text{b}4 19 \text{d}1 \text{e}2! 20 \text{e}1 \text{e}4 21 \text{b}3 \text{x}d1 22 \text{xd}1 \text{xf}2+ (22...\text{xf}2!!) 23 \text{f}1 \text{d}3+ 24 \text{h}1 \text{b}5\text{=} 23 \text{h}1 (23 \text{f}1) 23...\text{h}5 (23...\text{g}4 24 \text{f}3 \text{b}6 25 \text{e}3=) 24 \text{xb}4? \text{h}4 25 \text{h}3 \text{w}d6 26 \text{d}3 \text{g}8??! (26...g5+- threatening 27...g4 is brutal) 27 \text{f}4 \text{w}f6 (27...\text{xd}5\text{=} 28 \text{g}4? (28 \text{d}7 \text{e}8 29 \text{g}4 \text{g}3+ 30 \text{h}xg3 \text{h}xg3 31 \text{h}3 \text{h}4 32 \text{e}2 \text{e}4\text{=} 28...\text{g}3+ 29 \text{h}xg3 \text{h}xg3 30 \text{h}3 \text{h}4 All of a sudden, White is dead! 31 \text{d}7 (31 \text{f}2 \text{x}g4 32 \text{xe}4 \text{xb}2++) 31...\text{d}8 32 \text{xd}8+ \text{w}xd8 33 \text{d}6 \text{h}3+! 34 \text{g}xh3 0-1

Guliev-Zaitsev Ch Moscow 1966;

A) 12 \text{f}3 \text{f}5 13 0-0 \text{c}5+ 14 \text{h}1 0-0 15 \text{g}5 \text{b}5 16 \text{b}3 (16
B1b) 15 0-0? Qd3 16 Kg3 Qxc1 17 Bxc1 Qd6 18 Wh4 b4++;

B2) 13 Qxb5?! One of the inevitable attempts at refutation, recommended by Velickovic during the match. (It doesn’t cost a ‘kibitzer’ anything, as it was put by an adage of Hungarian card and chess players.) Then people analysed hell out of it, but I was lucky enough to see the ‘redouble’ with my own eyes in Cannes ’86 where I played in the GM tournament myself. In a way it’s forced too because: 13...axb5 14
Qxb5+ Qd7 15 d6 Qc2+! 16 Qxc2
Wa5+ 17 Qd2 Qxb5 18 0-0-0 Qxa2! 19 He1+ Qe6 20 Qb4 Qc6! 21 Qb1 Qa8 22 f4 Qd7 23 Ke5 Qa2+ 24 Qc1 Qd5 25 Qd3 (25 Qxd5? Qa1+) 25...Qxd6 26 Qxd6
Hc8! 27 Qe7+ Qd8 28 Ac3 Qxd6 29 Qxf7 Qxc3 30 bxc3 Qe8++ Santo Roman-Kouatly, Cannes 1986 (0-1/39) The knight sac may have other refutations, but this one will suffice for us.

C) 12 Qe2 Not a move for the wildly ambitious, but the two other possible moves may turn out to be dangerous. 12...Qxe2 13 Qxe2+ Qe7 14 Qe3 Qbxd5

C1a) 16...Qxe3 17 Qf1 Qxg2 18 Qxg2 (18 Qf1 Qxe1 19 Qxe1 Qd8?) 18...Qxe2 19 Qxe2+ Qd7 20 Qd1±;

C1b) 16...Qe6! 17 Qf1 Qxa3 18 Qxa3 (18 Qd3 Qxb2! 19 Qd4 Qxa1 20 Qxe6+ fx6 21 Qxal 0-0?) 18...0-0-0;

C2) 15 Qc2 Qxe3 16 Qxe3 Qe6 17 0-0 Qc5 18 Qf1 0-0 Karpov-Kasparov Game 12, World Championship 1985.

11...Qc5

A logical move, you might even say obvious. However, as a wise chess philosopher said, obvious moves are bad! With time, BLACK’s followers moved on to 11...Qf3, to be covered later.

12 0-0

12 Qe3! The refutation of Qc5 came late. To make the story complete, van der Wiel somehow survived the torture. 12...Qxe3 13 Qa4+ Qd7 14 Qxb4 Qc5 15 Qe4+ Qf8 16 0-0 b5 17 Qc2 Qf6 18 Qd3
g6 19 Qf3± Karpov-van der Wiel Swift, Brussels 1986 (Qd4!).

12...0-0 13 Qf3 Qf5 14 Qg5

14 Qc4 Qc2 (14...Qc2 15 Qe3!) 15 Qd2 Qd3 16 Qe2 Qxe2 17
Qxe2 Qbxd5 18 Qxd5 Qxd5 19
Qd1 Qxe8 20 Qe3 Qe6++; 14 Qe3
Qxe3 15 fxe3 Qb6 16 Qd2 Qd3 17
Qf1 Qe8±.

14...Qe8 15 Qd2

15 Qe1?? Qxf2+ 16 Qxf2
Qd3++.

15...b5 16 Qd1

16 Qf4 Qg6 17 Qxf6 Qxf6 18
Qxf6 gxf6±.

16 Qd3
17 \( \text{Qa} \text{ab1?} \)

The question mark is not for the move itself, it’s for the whole approach. Yes, an extra pawn feels good, especially in the centre. But, if Karpov had sensed danger, he would have returned it sooner or later, just to recover his breath. Kasparov’s creative imagination in positions where he has the initiative, combined with the overwhelming will to win radiating from his personality, is irresistible.

17 d6 \( \text{b} \text{b8} \) 18 \( \text{Qe} \text{e2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf2} \) 19 \( \text{Q} \text{xf2} \) b4 20 \( \text{Q} \text{f4=} \);

17 \( \text{Qe} \text{e2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf2} \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{xf2} \) b4\( \text{f} \).

17...h6 18 \( \text{Q} \text{h4} \) b4 19 \( \text{Q} \text{a4} \)

A knight on the edge is a disgrace, let alone two! (b1 is on the edge, too!)

19 \( \text{Qe} \text{e4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xe4} \) 20 \( \text{Q} \text{xe4} \) (20 \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf6} \) 21 \( \text{Q} \text{xe4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf2} \)) 20...\( \text{Q} \text{xe4=} \).

19...\( \text{Qd} \text{d6} \) 20 \( \text{Q} \text{g3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{c8} \) 21 b3

21 \( \text{Q} \text{xd6} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xd6} \) 22 \( \text{Q} \text{e2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{f4} \) 23 \( \text{Q} \text{f3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{e4} \) 24 \( \text{Q} \text{d4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{g5=} \).

21...\( \text{Q} \text{g5}! \)

It is always impressive to launch a pawn storm in front of your own king. Moreover, it is an intimidating display of power.

22 \( \text{Q} \text{xd6} \)

22 h4 \( \text{Q} \text{f4} \) 23 \( \text{Q} \text{xf4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf4} \) 24 \( \text{Q} \text{xb4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{d6} \) 25 \( \text{Q} \text{b6} \) g4\( \text{f} \).

22...\( \text{Q} \text{xd6} \) 23 g3

23 \( \text{Q} \text{e2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{f4} \) 24 \( \text{Q} \text{c4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{g4} \) 25 g3 \( \text{Q} \text{xc4} \) 26 bxc4 \( \text{Q} \text{e2} \) 27 \( \text{Q} \text{d4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{e4=} \).

23...\( \text{Q} \text{d7} \! \)

24 \( \text{Q} \text{g2} \)

24 \( \text{Q} \text{b2} \)

A) 24...\( \text{Q} \text{7e5}!? \) – AA. 25 \( \text{Q} \text{g2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xb2} \) 26 \( \text{Q} \text{xb2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{d3} \) 27 \( \text{Q} \text{f1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{f6} \) 28 \( \text{Q} \text{h1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{f5} \) 29 \( \text{Q} \text{d2} \) (29 \( \text{Q} \text{e3} \) \( \text{c2} \) 30 \( \text{Q} \text{d4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf2} \) 31 \( \text{Q} \text{g1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{f1} \) 32 \( \text{Q} \text{e4} \) \( \text{f5=} \) 29 d6! The saving move. 29...\( \text{Q} \text{g4}! \) 30 \( \text{Q} \text{g1=} \) 29...\( \text{Q} \text{c2} \) 30 \( \text{Q} \text{c1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{d3} \) 31 \( \text{Q} \text{xe8+} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xe8} \) 32 \( \text{Q} \text{xc2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{e1}+3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{xe1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf2}+\).

B) 24...\( \text{Q} \text{f6} \)!! Kasparov’s move, in case White tries to activate at least the knight a4. I was enchanted by this game myself, but the line recommended by me falls short because of a well-timed pawn sac.

25 \( \text{Q} \text{c4} \) (25 \( \text{Q} \text{xd3} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xd3} \) 26 \( \text{Q} \text{g4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{e5} \) 27 \( \text{Q} \text{xb4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{xf1} \) 28 \( \text{Q} \text{xf1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{g4} \) 29 \( \text{Q} \text{g4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{c2=} \)) 25...\( \text{Q} \text{7e5} \) 26
\( \text{Qxe5 (26 Qe2 Qxc4! 27 bxc4 Qxc4 28 wc2 Qdb2 29 Qd3 Qxd3 30 Qxd3 Qxd3 31 wc4 Qf5 32 d6 Qe1 33 wc2 Qd5+ 26...Qxe5 27 Qe2 Qd3! 28 f4 Qc2 29 fxe5 (29 Qxb4 Qc6!! 30 Qxc6 Qxe2 31 Qd2 Qxc6 32 Qf2 Qxd2 33 Qxd2 Qe1+ and mate) 29...Qb6+++.}

24...Qf6 25 a3 a5 26 axb4 axb4 27 wa2 Qg6 28 d6

Now he is ready to return it, but it’s too late.

28...g4! 29 wd2 Qg7 30 f3

The army of White’s paralysed pieces was a funny spectacle anyway, but this move makes BLACK’s job easier.

30...Qxd6!

Everything in its own time...

31 fxg4 Qd4+ 32 Qh1

32...Qf6!

The finish is Kasparov’s well-deserved reward. All I can say is that, as illustrated by this game (and many more), Garry’s chess is not only more successful than the play of Karpov and the present-day heroes: it’s simply superior.

33 Qf4 Qe4+ 34 Qxd3 Qf2+ 35 Qxf2 Qxd3 36 Qfd2 Qe3 37 Qxd3 Qc1! 38 Qb2 Qf2! 39 Qd2 Qxd1+ 39...Qe2!

40 Qxd1 Qe1+ 0-1

J.Boudy – G.Lebredo
Capablanca Memorial-B,
Camaguey 1974

1 e4 c5 2 Qf3 e6 3 d4 Qxd4 4 Qxd4 Qc6 5 Qb5 d6 6 c4 Qf6 7 Qc3 a6 8 Qa3 d5 9 Qxd5 exd5 10 Qxd5 Qb4 11 Qc4 b5?

11...Qg4.

12 0-0! bxc4 13 Qe1+
13 wa4+ Qd7 14 Qe1+ Qd8.

13...Qe7

13...Qd7 14 Qf4...and checkmate in (n-1) moves...

14 d6 Qe6 15 Qxc4 Qc8
15...Qxc4 16 wa4++.

16 wa4+ Qd7 17 Qxb4 Qxc4 18 Qxc4 Qxc4 19 Qxe7+ Qxe7 20 dxe7 Qxe7 21 b3+ Qe6 22 Qa3+ Qd7 23 Qa4 Qc6 24 Qd1 Qd7 25 f3 Qb7 26 Qf2 Qc8 27 Qc1 Qxc1

28 Qxc1 Qc6 29 Qb2 g6 30 Qd4 Qb5 31 Qc3+ Qb4 32 Qb1 Qf5 33 Qc3+ Qc5 34 Qd2 Qd5 35 Qe3 Qc2 36 Qb2 Qc5 37 Qa3 Qd7 38 Qe4 f5?? 39 Qc3+ followed by Qd2 catching the bishop...

1-0
A. Galkin – S. Beshukov
Russia Cup, Moscow 1998

1 e4 c5 2 d3 c6 3 d4 exd4 4 
\(\text{Nxd4}\) e6 5 b5 d6 6 c4 f6 7 
1c3 a6 8 a3 d5 9 exd5 exd5 10 
\(\text{Nxd5 Bb4}\) 11 e2

11...\(\text{Nfxd5}\)!

This is where BLACK landed, after excluding all the alternatives. This is not bad news, however, and I still consider the variation playable, despite the fact that BLACK lost both the stem game (Almási-J. Horváth, Hungarian Champ 1993) and this one. As for the reasons, the difference between the opponents’ playing strengths is conspicuous. In this game, it amounts to 160 ELO-points! The other reason is that the culture and technique of defence and counterattack still lags far behind that of the attack. On top of that, it is not easy for a gambit player to find himself in a defensive position.

11...\(\text{Be5}\)?! 12 \(\text{Be3!}\) \(\text{We7}\) 13 \(\text{Cc4}\) 
\(\text{Bf5}\) 14 \(\text{Bxc5}\) \(\text{Wxc5}\) 15 \(\text{Be3}\) \(\text{Bg6}\) 
16 a3 \(\text{Nbd5}\) 17 \(\text{Nxd5}\) \(\text{Ad8}\) 18 
\(\text{Bxf6+}\) gxf6 19 \(\text{Wa4+}\) 1-0 Pulyer-
Leek, Correspondence, Holland 1988 – one more argument against 11...\(\text{Be5}\).

12 0-0 \(\text{Le6}\)

12...\(\text{Be7}\) 13 \(\text{Nxd5}\) \(\text{We5}\) 14 
\(\text{Cc4±}\).

13 \(\text{Ba4+?}\)

This is the novelty introduced by Almási at the Hungarian Championship (Gyula 1993). We can call the move and the whole idea brave, but, as shown by numerous earlier events, White can pursue happiness only in radical ways. Almási himself was held to an easy draw by J. Horváth earlier that year.

13 \(\text{Nxd5}\) \(\text{We5}\) 14 \(\text{Bf3}\) (14 \(\text{Cc4}\) 
\(\text{Wxd1}\) 15 \(\text{Nxd1}\) \(\text{Cc5}\)!!? 16 \(\text{Bxe6}\) 
\(\text{fxe6}\) 17 \(\text{Cc4}\) \(\text{Cc2}\) 18 \(\text{Bb1}\) 0-0 19 
\(\text{Be3=}\) Korneev-Jo Horvath, Velden 1993.) 14...\(\text{Wxd1}\) 15 \(\text{Nxd1}\) \(\text{Be7}\) 16 
\(\text{Nxb7}\) = T. Ernst-M. Brodsky, Helsinki 1992.

13...\(\text{b5}\)
A forcing move, which was believed to be forced as well, although the line starting with 13...\textit{Wd7} seems to ‘gently’ neutralise White’s aggressive approach.

13...\textit{Wd7}!?  
A) 14 \textit{Ab5} \textit{Qc6} 15 \textit{Ad1} (15 \textit{Qxd5} \textit{Qxd5} 16 \textit{Be1}+ \textit{Qe7} 17 \textit{Qg5} \textit{f6} 18 \textit{Qe3} \textit{Qd8} 19 \textit{Qe2} \textit{Qb4=}) 15...\textit{Qxc3} (15...\textit{Qd8=} 16 \textit{bxc3} \textit{Qc8=};  
B) 14 \textit{Wxd7+} \textit{Qxd7} 15 \textit{Ad1} \textit{Qd8} 16 \textit{Qf4} \textit{Qd6=}.  
14 \textit{Qaxb5} \textit{axb5} 15 \textit{Qxb5+} \textit{Qe7} 16 \textit{Qxd5+} \textit{Qxd5} 17 \textit{Qe4=+} \textit{f5=}  
The only move, but it’s good too! There is no position where one good move is not enough!  
18 \textit{Bf3} \textit{Bf7} 19 \textit{Ad1}  

19...\textit{Qc8}  
This is what J.Horváth also played, but this is the first place where a serious improvement can be made: 19...\textit{Qa5=} After all, it’s all about the attack and defence of the d5 knight/square. So why lose time?

20 \textit{Aa4} \textit{Wa5}  
\textit{O} 20...\textit{Qe7!} 21 \textit{Ab3} \textit{Ac5} 22 \textit{Qe3=} \textit{Qa5} You see? 23 \textit{Qd2=}? (23 \textit{Qd3} \textit{Wa8=}) 23...\textit{Qb5} (23...\textit{Qa7=}) 24 \textit{a4} \textit{Qb7} 25 \textit{Qb4} \textit{Qd7} 26 \textit{Qxe7} \textit{Qxe7} 27 \textit{a5} \textit{Qa8} 28 \textit{a6} \textit{Qhd8=};  

20...\textit{Wh4=}? 21 \textit{Qb3} \textit{Qf6} 22 \textit{Qxe6=} \textit{Qxe6} 23 \textit{Qe1}+ \textit{Qe4} 24 \textit{g3=--}  

A) 24...\textit{Qd8} 25 \textit{Qxe4}+ \textit{fxe4} 26 \textit{Qxe4+} \textit{Qf7} (26...\textit{Qf6} 27 \textit{Qf3}+ \textit{Qe6} 28 \textit{Qf4}) 27 \textit{Qf5+} \textit{Qf8} (27...\textit{Qf6} 28 \textit{Qxc8=} 27...\textit{Qg8} 28 \textit{Qe6} mate) 28 \textit{Qg5=} 29 \textit{Qe7} 29...\textit{Qxe7} 30 \textit{Qxd7+} \textit{Qxd7} 31 \textit{Qb4=}  
B) 24...\textit{Qf6!} 25 \textit{Qb3}+ \textit{Qd7} 26 \textit{Qf4} \textit{Qc5} 27 \textit{Qb7}+ \textit{Qe6} 28 \textit{Qb3=};  
C) 24...\textit{Wh3}  
C1) 25 \textit{Qg5} \textit{Qc5} 26 \textit{Qb3}+ \textit{Qe5} 27 \textit{Qad1} \textit{Qxf2}+ 28 \textit{Qh1=+};  
C2) 25 \textit{Qe3}? \textit{Qb4=+?} (25...\textit{Qf6=}) 26 \textit{Qd4=} \textit{Qxe1} 27 \textit{Qb3}+ \textit{Qe7} 28 \textit{Qxe1} \textit{Qhd8} 29 \textit{Qb7}+ \textit{Qe6}? (29...\textit{Qe8} 30 \textit{Qxg7} \textit{Qc6} 31 \textit{Qf6} \textit{Qxf6} 32 \textit{Qxf6} \textit{Qd7} 33 \textit{Qe6}+ \textit{Qe7} 34 \textit{Qc6+} \textit{Qf7} 35 \textit{f3} \textit{Qg5} 36 \textit{Qd5}+ \textit{Qf6} 37 \textit{Qd4+} \textit{Qf7} 38 \textit{Qxe7}+ \textit{Qxe7} 39 \textit{Qg7}+ \textit{Qf7} 40 \textit{a4=} 30 \textit{Qf3=} Almásy-J.Horváth Hungarian Championship 1993 saw all of these horrible things one after the other. Ouch!;  
C3) 25 \textit{Qb3}+ \textit{Qf6} 26 \textit{Qb6}+ \textit{Qf7} (26...\textit{Qd6} 27 \textit{Qf4} \textit{Qhd8} 28 \textit{Qad1} \textit{Qb8} 29 \textit{Qxd6+} \textit{Qxd6} 30 \textit{Qd4}+ \textit{Qg6} 31 \textit{Qe6}+ \textit{Qf7} 32 \textit{Qxd6} \textit{Qxd6} 33 \textit{Qxd6} \textit{Qe8} 34 \textit{Qe3=} 27 \textit{Qb7}+ \textit{Qe7} 28 \textit{f3+}.  
21 \textit{Qb3} \textit{Qd8}
21...\textit{c}c5!? This is also good, with the same intention: to keep the d5 knight stable as long as possible. Still, I prefer the above-mentioned \textit{a}a5-\textit{w}a8 setup.

22 \textit{d}d2

\textit{w}b6?

22...\textit{w}a8! was still playable. Also 22...\textit{w}b5 23 a4 (23 \textit{c}c3 \textit{c}e7!) 23...\textit{w}b7 24 \textit{g}5 \textit{e}7 25 \textit{x}e7 \textit{x}e7 26 a5 \textit{f}6+.

23 \textit{c}c3 \textit{f}6

23...\textit{w}b5 24 \textit{d}d2 \textit{e}7 25 \textit{e}1+ seems to be winning soon 25...\textit{f}6 26 \textit{d}e2 \textit{c}8 27 \textit{h}5+ g6 28 \textit{h}6+.

24 \textit{x}d8 \textit{x}d8 25 \textit{x}f6!

And BLACK has got himself in trouble! In a whole lot of trouble!

25...\textit{x}f6

25...\textit{w}xf6 26 \textit{e}1 \textit{xb}3 27 \textit{xb}3+ \textit{g}6 28 \textit{e}6+.

26 \textit{c}3+ \textit{f}7 27 \textit{e}1+

The game goes on for some time, but it's virtually over.

27...\textit{xb}3

27...\textit{d}5 28 \textit{d}1+.

28 \textit{xb}3+ \textit{g}6

28...\textit{f}6 29 \textit{e}6+ \textit{g}5 (29...\textit{f}7 30 \textit{d}6++) 30 f4+ \textit{xf}4 31 \textit{g}3 mate.

29 \textit{e}6+ \textit{h}5 30 \textit{f}3+ \textit{g}5 31 \textit{h}4+

31 \textit{e}3++.

31...\textit{x}h4 32 g3+ \textit{g}5 33 \textit{f}4+ \textit{h}5 34 \textit{xf}5+

34 \textit{xf}5+ \textit{g}5 35 \textit{h}3++.

1-0

This was the history of the Dely-Garry Gambit as I knew it. Needless to say, it boosted my national pride tremendously. Using the materials and knowledge available to me at that time, I wrote the only BLACK IS OK! article which is NOT about an idea of my own. It was published by a lot of chess periodicals, including British Chess Magazine. It is nice for me to see nearly four decades later that the gambit is still a dangerous weapon if wielded by hands worthy of it. It’s no secret that I was (and still am) very happy with this gambit, as it proves a thesis accepted by very few people, although proved on countless occasions by my humble self (who has never been a permanent member of the world elite!). The thesis is the following: there are plenty of unexplored opportunities at the early stages of the game, around moves 6-7!! For BLACK! As well as for White! But don’t forget: ‘There is no forced wins from the initial position. Not even for BLACK’ (Graffiti) Naturally, research made into these opportunities does not serve purely theoretical purposes. Tournament practice rewards those who follow their own paths with big fat points.

Shortly after the ‘change of guard’, we went to Hilversum to answer Timman’s challenge.
Regrettably, Garry went crazy, and wrote a book of the World Championship Match at an English publisher’s request instead of having a rest and preparing for the friendly match. You can easily guess what great shape he was in when he arrived in the Netherlands. (He looked much better, though, than Karpov at the end of the unfinished match) I was on friendly enough terms with him to call him a fool (he did it to me himself on other occasions – and not once!) for risking losing a match like this as a fresh world champion. Well, he didn’t lose it. He won 4-2. But he got the 2-point margin only in the last game. Bloody hell!

Time went on, and in May ’86 Garry played a match in Basel against two-time Tilburg winner Tony Miles. (I heard some horrible news just yesterday: a friend of mine who was not ill – as a matter of fact, a doctor – and who took a reasonable degree of exercise, and watched what he ate and drank, died of a heart attack. He was just two years older than me. I still have a photo taken in 1997 at the Maróczy Memorial in Szeged. Tony Miles is playing Lembt Oll. Now both of them are dead! Poor Lembt took his own life (’99), whereas Tony Miles was found dead at home (2001) due to diabetic-related causes. Looking back, the 17-year-old boy I met in Birmingham in 1973 grew into a great player and an original chess thinker. He was much too young to go. When he beat me at the Maróczy Memorial, I sought some comfort in telling him: ‘Now you have equalised: 5-5.’ Then he, with his usual affable cheek: ‘How could I lose so many games to you?’ Me: ‘Give me a minute, I will recall them one by one!’ Miles: ‘I am not insisting, thank you’.

Back to Basel. At the matches where I was his sole second, Kasparov used to ask me jokingly what score I expected from him. And he usually obeyed me: his results against both Andersson and Timman were ‘at my order’. This time I stipulated 5-1, adding that even me, the second, have a 5-4 lead against Miles (it had been even 5-2). Garry surpassed my expectations, although he had the luck that is always on the side of the stronger player. Plus one more thing: if someone knows he stands no chance of winning a match, he can choose two kinds of strategies. One is to try to lose by a relatively narrow margin, making a fair amount of draws, and the other (followed by Tony) is to try to win at least one or two games, even if you lose the rest. Miles had one good chance to get his win, but he lost that game somehow. So Kasparov produced the almost ‘Fischerian’ score of 5½-½.

I had sent the manuscript of my book written with co-author Jenő Dőry to Batsford shortly before the match. I gave Kasparov a copy, so he was the only one to have one until the book was actually published, which took half a year.

The story is slowly coming to an end. Not a happy ending at all, although somewhat trivial. A great many people have gone through the same: a sudden change after reaching the top at a tender age. The change was not for the better. Dubious figures started to show up in his company, people who can be called parasites, to say the least. Some of them had already ‘tapped’
at least one previous ‘king’. Some of them want only money, others go for ‘social status’ and influence. For some reason, this ‘rat race’ was even more disgusting in Basel than usual, or perhaps it was just that my disgust, growing stronger and stronger over the years, reached ‘boiling point’. I told Garry several times: ‘Don’t you know these people? They are the prostitutes of the chess world!’ He just winked at me: ‘I am using them, that’s all!’ Me: ‘It’s them who use you, crazy, and it’s a shame for you to be seen with characters like these.’ I didn’t push him any more, it wasn’t worth the effort. My personal disappointment and change of status (I became ‘a nice old fixture: where is it I know him from?’) was certainly painful. But the most painful thing was that the young revolutionary had become the Tsar himself, father of all his subjects. His demeanour and external behaviour still differed from those of his much-cursed (and rightly cursed) rival Karpov, but he was much the same at the core.

None of his retinue bothered to see me off. No problem, I found the railway station by myself.

I never charged Karpov a fee, or accepted any money from him, despite the fact that I deserved it – he offered it and he could naturally afford it. He was my friend, and a genius whom I was simply happy to help. Once he was pushing me in a friendly way for the umpteenth time: ‘Ya zhe ne bednyj chelovek, batenka’ (‘You know, I’m not a poor man, batenka’). ‘Batenka’ used to be one of the favourite words of V. I. Lenin, as the Kasparovs told me. My answer was: ‘Znaesh, Garrynka, ya dazhe bogatyj’ (‘Listen, Garrynka, I’m even a rich guy’). And really, I have almost never been in financial need in my life. I had many (not money) problems for sure, but they were of a different nature. Worse!

During his third match against Karpov in ’86 where he suffered three consecutive losses after having a confident lead, Garry publicly accused Vladimirov of treason. He had no evidence, just his stupid and unjustified suspicion. He was misled by people who lied to him. I even know who they were: some bastards driven by their momentary interest. Timoshenko, who is a professional soldier, and took part in some military exercise at the time of the match, told me later: ‘András, if I had been there, perhaps I would have been done for by the same people.’ So I know everything, even a little bit more. Over the years, I had a chance to talk spontaneously to all the characters in this story, but I KNEW immediately anyway that the charges against Vladimirov were nonsense. By the way, Kasparov not only defended the title, he also won the match in the end. And then!

Before the next WC match (Sevilla ’87), his book called ‘Child of Change’ came out in 7 languages(!!) at the same time. In this self-flattering and abusive book of very low standard, he repeated the same accusation concerning Vladimirov in a rather ridiculous way. Even sentences like ‘I can’t prove that Vladimirov betrayed me, but I am sure he did’ found their way into this primitive excuse for a book. Now what do you make of this? Admitting that he can’t prove anything, he still feels entitled to slander worldwide another person?? In the West, a lawyer might have
won millions of dollars as lawful compensation for Vladimirov. Why didn’t he hire a lawyer then? I think he was too ‘squeamish’ for a noisy scandal like that. His consolation was that the chess world got to know his name at once, though and sympathised with him in unison! Tim Krabbé, the excellent Dutch (chess) writer said in his book review in *New in Chess*: ‘Kasparov managed to do at once what Karpov couldn’t manage for all his life: he made me like him. I mean, Karpov!’ Otherwise Garry is a great lecturer, writer and analyst. This crap was a joint effort with some celebrated Western journalist. The result: total rejection and a terrible loss of face. This cost him much more than the bloody money they have earned.

One can be excused, or at least understood, for trying to blame three consecutive losses on external factors in desperation. It’s only human to find other reasons, even false ones, to conceal the fact that the opponent played better. However, there is no excuse for repeating baseless accusations a year later, throwing muck on a faithful companion and the whole chess world! I don’t know for how much money?

The Hungarian publisher Medicina had contacted me half a year before. *Would I write a book* on Kasparov and us? I didn’t want to. Some people could probably go on beginning the introduction like: ‘This wonderful chess player and perfect human being, our only hope to change the course of history for the better, chose me, and I am very happy to have my modest contribution to his mission. I hope I will pocket a lot of dough from him and through him.’ Oops! They don’t include this last sentence! They just think it to themselves!

I said thanks, no. But after ‘Child of Change’ I’ve changed my mind too, although I still live in grave hope that maybe Garry King somehow sobers up. But I had to see, there was no way back.

So, no boot-licking. I wrote a lot on the matter, though, and wrote honestly at that. Parts of the story were published in various chess magazines, including the Russian 64. Although I was sharply criticising Karpov and Baturinsky in these articles, editor-in-chief Karpov thought it worthwhile to publish the thing word by word, as the beloved Garry featured mainly in the ‘opus’ called ‘Idiocy’ (Idiots). That’s what he called his seconds because they – as well as himself – misanalysed an adjourned game which was a draw but he lost it. And our beloved Garry took it badly. He spat fire, to be more precise, and called me all kinds of bad names, BUT never in public! There is no way for me to know whether brave Garry feared that I would do what Vladimirov couldn’t bring himself to do, or it was just a human gesture against all odds. We had a past.

I’ve just realised that I could simply have quoted Murphy’s Law instead of all this word-twisting: ‘If something can go wrong, it does.’

That sums it all up. The rest is just ‘coals to Newcastle’
Statistics on the World Champions’ Games

1. World Champion Matches

Our database contains 755 games of 34 World Champion Matches, of which

- 234 (31 %) ended in victory for White,
- BLACK won 124 (16.4 %, only a bit more than half of White wins!)

This balance is of course a scandal. One can understand, if not accept, that as in the Steinitz-Zukertort match there were four games in a row won by the person who played White. Those were romantic times when many people already excelled in the attack and very few knew about defence or counterattack. Anyway, there can be a difference in favour of one side. But nothing like this. The trick in making such results acceptable is adding the draws. Every single draw improves the total percentage. At the end, for those who consider the White plus normal, it is OK. But how can you possibly call ‘normal’ the result of Kasparov-Karpov ’86 and ’90? White won altogether 15-1! Between the two greatest players at that time!

- The other 397 (52.6 %) were drawn. (Can you see?)

The Number of World Champion Match Games by results, 1886-1990
Looking at it in time, you can see that
- the growth in the number of draws is significant.
- BLACK won more games than White only twice (in 1934: Alekhine-Bogoljubow /7-4/ and 1951: Botvinnik-Bronstein /6-4/),
- the distribution of decisive games was equal four times (in 1890/91, 1907, 1921 and 1972) while
- there were two matches, when all the wins were produced by White (in 1910: Lasker-Schlechter /2/ and 1990: Kasparov-Karpov /7!!/ – in 1986 they also produced very poor performance with BLACK: the result of decisive games was 8-1 for White!).

2. The World Champions’ total (?) games

The number of the World Champions’ total games in our database from Steinitz to Kasparov is 23,362, of which 1,148 were played in matches. (The number of the games is by no means complete. These are the games we had. Still their quantity is large enough to draw some conclusions.)

Let’s see first the results of them by colours:

- in World Championship matches:
  - White wins 15%
  - Black losses 14%
  - White draws 20%
  - Black draws 28%
  - White losses 6%
- in the total (in our database) of the World Champions’ games:
  - White wins 29%
  - Black losses 7%
  - White draws 20%
  - Black draws 21%
  - White losses 6%
  - Black wins 17%

Naturally the rate of wins in the total number of all the games is almost twice as high as in the case of match games (with both colours), as the opponents’ average strength was lower.

More interesting, that the share of the Champions’ lost White games is the same (true, low: 6%) both in the matches and in total.

I was a little surprised, that the database contains more White than BLACK games by the Champs in total.
The total number of the World Champions' games in the database by colours

By person the highest share of BLACK games is 50.2% (Bronstein), but in the case of Capablanca and Alekhine this rate is below 35%!

Because of this I abandoned my first plan to analyse the share of BLACK within wins, draws, losses and rather calculated the distribution of results by colours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of BLACK games</th>
<th>Share of White games of which (%) of which (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinitz</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasker</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capablanca</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alekhine</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euwe</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botvinnik</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronstein</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyslov</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrovian</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpov</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see,
- the rate of wins everywhere is higher in White games than BLACK
- in the case of draws the situation is the opposite
- the share of losses varies: the database contains more White than BLACK losses of Lasker, Capablanca, Alekhine and Fischer.
Views of a Chess-lover
Mathematician, Zoltán Blázsik

BLACK view in Hungarian Championships

It has to be admitted that people win more games in chess tournaments with the White pieces. This is especially true for elite round robins. Instead of looking for the reasons now, let’s have a glance at some examples of the opposite. As we know, the exception proves the rule.

Why does a statistical rule have exceptions? It follows from the nature of statistics itself. If something is overwhelmingly true, it doesn’t mean it is always true. Obviously, there is no point in making statistics for one player. His or her score with White or BLACK is just a figure characteristic of himself/herself. It’s also obvious that you get opponents with White and BLACK in a more or less haphazard way (or a completely haphazard way if we think of the drawing of lots) during your chess career. Thus the strength of your opponents if insignificant, you will have strong opponents with both colours.

Similarly, the ‘BLACK is OK’ statistics of a specific tournament can not be ‘blamed’ on the numbers drawn. It’s true that as a rule, all players think to themselves after the drawing of lots that they would have preferred to have White or BLACK against this or that particular opponent. This may be caused by the different styles of different players, and also by earlier memories, pleasant or unpleasant. However, numbers drawn can not influence the ratio of games won by BLACK.

I examined the games of 35 Hungarian Championships, and found three where BLACK had a plus.

In 1953, BLACK won 39 games, whereas White won one game less. For example, Peter Dely, a strong master (now honorary grandmaster) well-known all over the world for the Dely Gambit, scored four times when he had BLACK, and remained ‘silent’ with the White pieces.

In 1972, BLACK defeated White by 34 wins to 26. András Adorján and Istvan Csom both won four BLACK and two White games, and their would-be teammates in the ‘Golden Team’ (Buenos Aires, 1978) improved BLACK’s score, too (Zoltan Ribli: 3 White and 4 BLACK wins, Gyula Sax: 1 and 5(!)).

BLACK was OK in this year’s championship as well! Although Zoltan Almasi, the champion, won four times as White and once as BLACK, only three more contenders managed to win one game each with the more
‘fashionable’ White pieces. Nobody except Almasi won more with White than with BLACK!

There have been certainly not too many tournaments in chess history where only one of the participants was more successful with White! Has there ever been a single round-robin where nobody won more with the White pieces?

Lajos Portisch tied for 2nd-3rd, winning three of his BLACK games. Gyula Sax of the next generation also proved the truth of BLACK IS OK, winning the first two games as BLACK. He drew number 6 which many people consider to be the worst of all, but it didn’t bother him at all. If it brings two victories with BLACK in the first two rounds, then it is definitely the best. The former World Champion Candidate is known by everyone as an imaginative attacking player. That makes it especially surprising that he triumphed with the BLACK pieces in both 1972 and 2003!

The two promising youngsters, Junior World Champion Peter Acs and his teammate U-18 World Champion Ferenc Berkes also won one game more as the second player. All in all, BLACK was OK in 2003, the overall score is 7-11. (Unfortunately, a lot of games were drawn, and BLACK players have an equal share of responsibility for this...)

Matches for the Title of World Champion

In a match, at least the opponent is always the same! We would think this situation must bring out White’s advantage – if there is any. However, it’s very interesting to think it over whether we can really draw decisive conclusions from the statistics.

If someone wins a game – with any colour – he can ‘sit on his laurels’. He will win if he keeps his lead. Most people agree that with the White pieces it is much easier to play for a draw, as it is easier to do nothing with an extra tempo, exchanging pieces and avoiding unnecessary risk. So the player who is behind in a match can not really play for a win as BLACK, therefore he tries to equalise in his White games. However, as he is behind, it might mean that he is a little weaker. This enhances the winning chances of the BLACK player who is stronger (or is simply in better form). If he wins, the same logic holds for the rest of the match as well: BLACK can win even more games.

The above argumentation has a certain logic to it, but we shouldn’t ignore the facts, either. If we look at the statistics of the World Championship matches played between 1886 and 1986 we can draw some interesting conclusions. White won 214 games, whereas BLACK scored only 118 times. 322 games were drawn. The fact that decisive games outnumber the draws by ten is primarily courtesy of the matadors of old times. So we can say that at the very highest level roughly half of the encounters ended in draws, one-third was won by the first player, and the second player could win only one-sixth of all games.

Let’s see another ‘logical’ line of argumentation, which is also
supported by facts. If someone has
the lead in a match – say, by two
points at least – he can play more
courageously, as no dramatic
turnabout can take place in a single
game, only his margin will be
narrower. On the other hand, his
lead can turn into a decisive gap in
case of a win. In a tournament we
always have a lot of rivals, and one
or two of them may overtake us if
we lose a game, therefore it’s
advisable to play with caution. In a
match, however, the contender who
is in better shape anyway can be
more undertaking, therefore he
plays more ambitiously with the
White pieces. Less so in the
BLACK games, because the
opponent can parry over-committed
assaults more easily with White. As
a result, the player with the
advantage can win more games – as
White. The opponent is forced to
accept the inevitable...

Any statistics can be explained in
some way. However, we may never
get to know the real reasons, as
there is no such thing as a ‘real’
reason. All matches are different.

Let’s imagine that one of the
players prefers White, and the other
prefers BLACK. In this case, half of
the games will be drawn, and half of
them will be nice fighting games.
The result doesn’t depend on
colours, it depends on playing
strength and momentary form.

BLACK has won in two World
Championship matches so far.

Alekhine – Bogoljubow (1934)
4-7 in BLACK’s favour (15 draws).

Botvinnik – Bronstein (1951) 4-6
in BLACK’s favour (14 draws).

In four of the remaining 29
matches, BLACK won as many
games as White, but White had the
upper hand 25 times.
Struggle with a dear, little
‘Yellow Peril’

Xie Jun – A. Adorján
Budapest, 1992

The first time I exchanged a few words with Xie Jun was in 1991 in
Manila. We played in a large Open
in the company of at least 130
people, and she suffered an
‘accident’ in Round 1, poor thing. I
was, on the contrary, lucky enough
to see my local opponent fall into a
well-known trap. So far so good,
and I also noticed one of my ‘distant
friends’, so I got my stuff and
headed for the exit. But alas, the
sorrowful young girl was still sitting
at her board in solitude. I stopped
by, trying to comfort her somehow.
Such things happen, I said, don’t
worry, and she gave a smile of
gratitude. As I learnt later, the
Chinese Chess Federation had
decided two days before that she
should play in Manila, the very city
where she was scheduled to play the
World Championship match against
Chiburdanidze a few months later.
Most people didn’t think she stood
a chance, but she kept repeating a
modest ‘I’ll do my best’. She must
have done a little bit more than that,
as she conquered the title at a very
tender age! As you know, some
people do not really benefit from
early success, wealth, or power.
Hardly anybody does, in fact. So I
was curious about how it affects
her. I was also optimistic. We met
again at the Manila Olympics. And I

was right: the modest challenger did
not become a conceited champion.
This girl did not change at all!
Encouraged by this, I invited her to
Budapest with her trainer to a
mini-match tournament with six
players. The game below was
played in this tournament. Modesty
and friendship aside, she attacked
me so fiercely that it could not be
misunderstood...

1 e4 c5 2 ∆f3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4
∆xd4 ∆f6 5 ∆c3 d6 6 ∆e2 ∆e7 7
0-0 0-0 8 f4 a6
8...∆b6!?.
9 ∆e3
9 ∆h1 is alternative.
9...∆c7 10 g4 ∆e8 11 g5 ∆fd7 12
∆h5 g6 13 ∆g4 ∆f8 14 f5 ∆e5 15
fxe6 fx6 16 ∆f6 ∆xg4 17 ∆xg4
∆d7!

This is a novelty I found over the
board. Earlier they played 17....
∆c6. The position is very
complicated indeed. I checked the fresh analyses and some extra lines, 'I did my best' as Tsu-Tsu would say (that was her nickname), but I can only hope there are no serious mistakes in it. If you go through all the 'I take – she takes' variations, you'll understand me better.

18 ♖a1f

18 ♖xe6!? ♗e5 19 ♖xe8 ♕xg4 (19...♕xg4 20 ♖xa8++) 20 ♕f1 ♖f7! (20...♕f5 21 ♖xa8 ♗xe3 22 ♕xf8++! ♖g7 23 ♖1xf5++) 21 ♖xf7 ♖xf7 22 ♕xf8+ ♖xf8 23 ♖f4 ♗e5 24 ♖d5 ♗d7 (24...♖h3 25 ♖f2 ♖e8 26 ♗g3 ♗d7=) 25 ♖f6 (25 ♖f2 ♖c6 26 b3)? 25...♖g7 26 ♖xe5 (26 ♖xd7 ♖xd7 27 ♖e6+ ♖f7 28 ♖c7 ♖c8 29 ♖xd6 ♕c5 30 e5 ♗e6 31 ♗xe6 ♖xe6 32 c3 ♕c4++) 26...dxe5 27 ♗f3 ♖c6! 28 ♖d2 ♗xe5? (28...♖xe4?) 28...h6 29 h4 hxg5 30 hxg5 ♖f8 31 ♖e3 ♖xf6 32 gxf6+ ♖xf6?.

18...♗e5

Doing fine and staying relaxed, unlike the suicidal taking of the exchange. 18...♕xf6? 19 gxf6 e5 20 ♘h4 ♖f7 21 ♗f3 h6 22 ♗d5 ♗c6 (22...g5 23 ♗xg5 ♕g6 24 ♖7+!!) 23 ♘xh6 ♗xd5 24 ♗g5++. 19 ♘h3 ♗g7 20 ♗xe6

Simple and good. Somehow (by mistake?) I started to analyse 20...♕c4 and couldn't stop it. I should have, though, no doubt. Once you find a continuation that leads safely to an advantage you are better off analysing anything else at home! 20...♗c4!? 21 ♗d5 ♕d8?

21...♗d7 (21...♕xe4?? 22 ♗f8+! ♕xf8 23 ♖xf8+ ♖xf8 24 ♖f6++)

21...♕xa2 22 ♗e7+ ♕h8 23 ♖xc8 ♖xf6 24 ♗b6 ♖xe6 25 ♖xe6 26 ♖xa8 ♕g7 27 ♖c7 ♕c7 28 ♖d5 ♕e8=) 22 ♖f1 ♗f2! (22...♖xc2?? 23 ♖f8++ ♖f8 24 ♗e7+ ♕h8 25 ♖h7+! ♕xh7 26 ♖h4+ ♖h6 27 ♖hx6 mate)

A) 23 ♗b6 ♕xe6 24 ♖xe6 ♕d1+ 25 ♕f1 ♕g4+ 26 ♖xg4 ♕xg4 27 ♖xd6 ♚x3 28 ♕xa8 ♕xf1 29 ♕c7 ♕f8 30 ♕e6 ♕e5+;

B) 23 ♕d4 ♖d1+ 24 ♕f1 ♕xf1+ 25 ♕xf1 ♕d4 26 ♕e2 ♕xf6 27 gx6 ♕f7 28 ♕c7 ♕ac8 29 ♕xe8 ♕xe8 30 ♕f3 (30 ♕f3 h6 31 h4 ♕xf6 32 ♕d3 ♕c6 33 ♕d2 ♕e6?) 30...♕xh2+ (30...♕xf6=);

C) 23 ♕ec7 ♕xe6 (23...♖xc2!)

C1) 24 ♕xe6 ♕xf6 25 gx6 ♕f7 26 ♕c7 ♕xc2 (26...♕d1+ 27 ♕f1 ♕xc2 28 ♕c1 ♕xe4 29 ♖xa8) 27 ♕xa8 ♕xa8 28 ♕e6 ♕xb2+;

C2) 24 ♕xe6 ♕xe6 25 ♕xe6+ (25 ♕xa8 ♕e8 26 ♕c7 ♕f8 27 ♕xf8+
chances... 25...\textit{c}8! 26 \textit{e}xe6 \textit{xb}2
27 \textit{g}2 \textit{e}8 28 \textit{c}7 \textit{xe}4\texttt{=} 29 \textit{f}3
(29 \textit{f}3? \textit{x}f4\texttt{=}+ 30 \textit{xf}4 \textit{xe}5\texttt{=+};
29 \textit{d}5 \textit{e}5 30 \textit{f}3 \textit{b}5\texttt{=} 29...\textit{e}5\texttt{=}
.

26 \textit{xa}8 \textit{d}4+ 27 \textit{f}2 \textit{xb}2 28
\textit{xd}6
28 c3? \textit{a}7 29 \textit{xd}6 \textit{d}1 30
\textit{g}3 \textit{xc}3\texttt{=+}
28...\textit{d}1 29 \textit{g}3 \textit{c}3.
\textit{e}2-g3+-
29...\textit{e}3 30 \textit{c}7 \textit{xf}2 31 \textit{xf}2
\textit{xe}5 32 \textit{d}4 \textit{g}4 33 \textit{d}5 \textit{f}7\texttt{=}
30 \textit{h}1 \textit{xf}2 31 \textit{xf}2 \textit{xe}4

Well, this is something I thought
must be winning. Naturally, I'm still
not sure. Having a domination, with
at least 3 targets among the 4 white
pawns, it wouldn't be a big surprise.
On the other hand, it's fairly
surprising how much the
opposite-colored bishops increase
the chances of escape. The late
Grandmaster Gedeon Barcza gave
me a useful piece of advice for such
cases: 'Think that his bishop is
against your knight and vice
versa...' You think it's a joke.
You're wrong. Think it over!
31...\textit{xa}2 32 \textit{d}4 \textit{b}4 (32...\textit{c}1
33 \textit{b}6 \textit{e}2 34 \textit{b}2 \textit{f}7 35 \textit{c}4
\textit{e}7 36 \textit{c}5\texttt{=}) 33 \textit{c}3 (33 \textit{c}4 \textit{fl}
34 \textit{c}5 \textit{f}7 35 \textit{b}6 \textit{d}3 36 \textit{e}5 \textit{c}6 37
\textit{c}3 \textit{e}6\texttt{=}) 33...\textit{d}3 (33...\textit{c}6 34

25...\textit{h}3?!

You know, I have two daughters.
When they were little, I used to
teach them like this: 'Maybe you're
proud of what you've done now, but
I'm afraid you'll be ashamed of the
same thing later on. Good line, isn't
it? But unfortunately the father, full
of wisdom, erred sometimes
himself. Here, for example, I was
stupid enough to be proud of this
move, while the alternative was
winning almost instantly. The only
consolation was that I could enjoy a
gorgeous sight (you know, I
somehow still prefer women) much
longer, and still with the better
36...\( \text{Qd6} \)

36...\( \text{Qc3} \)! Playing by my original plan I did not pay enough attention to this logical jump.

A) 37 \( \text{Qxe6 Qxe6} \) 38 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{(38 Qd2? Qb5+ Qd4)} \) 38...\( \text{Qb1} \) 39 \( \text{Qb2 Qd2+?} \)

B) 37 \( \text{Qd4 Qb1} \) 38 \( \text{Qxe6 Qxe6} \)

B1) 39 \( \text{Qc5 Qd2+} \) 40 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{(40 Qe3 Qf1++; 40 Qe2 Qc4 41 Qd3 Qd5 42 Qe7 Qe5++)} \) 40...\( \text{Qd5} \) 41 \( \text{Qe7 Qc4} \) 42 \( \text{h4 Qe5} \) 43 \( \text{Qe3 Qc4} \) 44 \( \text{Qd6 Qc6} \) 45 \( \text{Qe4 b5+} \)

B2) 39 \( \text{Qb2 Qd2+} \) 40 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qc4} \) 41 \( \text{Qc1 Qd5} \) 42 \( \text{Qd3 Qe5+} \) 43 \( \text{Qc3} \)

\( \text{(43 Qe3 Qc4 44 Qe4 Qc6++)} \) 43...\( \text{Qf3} \) 44 \( \text{Qf4 Qe4+} \).

37 \( \text{Qxe6?} \)

How happy my old teacher would be to see the 'Barcza-thesis' in practice! Believe it or not, 37 \( \text{Qa8!} \) still kept drawing chances... 37 \( \text{Qa8! Qf5} \) (37...\( \text{b5} \) 38 \( \text{Qb6+} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 39 \( \text{Qf4 Qf5} \) 40 \( \text{c3 Qe4} \) 41 \( \text{Qc8!} \) \( \text{d7} \) 42 \( \text{Qb6+} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 43 \( \text{c4=} \) 38 \( \text{Qb6+} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 39 \( \text{c4 Qd3} \) 40 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 41 \( \text{Qe5 Qd3?} \).

37...\( \text{Qxe6} \) 38 \( \text{Qe5 Qf7} \) 39 \( \text{Qf4} \)

\( \text{d5} \) 40 \( \text{Qe7 b5} \) 41 \( \text{Qh4 Qe5} \) 42 \( \text{Qe3} \)

\( \text{Qc6} \) 43 \( \text{Qf6} \)

Everything is nice and tidy, it's time to blow it all! Instead of the easy wins, there comes the third best move. There are not so many positions allowing you to make them!

43...\( \text{a5?} \)

43...\( \text{Qc4!} \) 44 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{(44 Qd2 Qd4+)} \) 44...\( \text{a5} \) 45 \( \text{Qa1} \) \( \text{(45 c3 a4±)} \) 45...\( \text{a4} \) 46 \( \text{b2 b4} \) 47 \( \text{AXB4} \) \( \text{xb4} \) 48 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qxc2} \) 49 \( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{Qc3} \) 50 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{(50 Qg7 Qf5+ 51 Qxh7 Qxh4+)} \) 50...\( \text{Qxh5} \) 51 \( \text{Qg7} \) \( \text{h4} \) 52 \( \text{Qxh7} \) \( \text{h3} \) 53 \( \text{Qc5} \) \( \text{a3} \) 54 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{Qf5+; 43...Qa5?} \).

44 \( \text{Qd3 Qe5+} \) 45 \( \text{Qc3} \)

45...\( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 46 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{(46 Qe3} \) \( \text{Qf5} \) 47 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{b4} \) 48 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) 49 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 50 \( \text{Qd3 Qc5} \) 51 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{b3} \) 52 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{b2} \) 53 \( \text{Qxb2} \) \( \text{Qxc4+; 46 a4 bx4a4 47} \).
49 d8?

Tiredness tells. So far the fair lady has defended herself very well. (I would have gone astray long before her!) But now she forgets the importance of the long diagonal (no d4), and her game is lost. Quite commonplace, but true: the player who is forced into (passive) defence errs more easily.

49 b4? xc2+ 50 xb5 xa3+ 51 xa4 e4 52 b5 e3 53 c6 f5 54 d7 xh4 55 e6 f3 56 e7 f5 57 g7 xg5 58 h6 f7+ 59 g7 e5+;

49 g7!

A) 49...d5+ 50 d2= f4 (50...f4 51 d3 g4 52 d4 b6 53 c5 c4 54 b4 xh4 55 f6 g4 56 e7 e3 57 xb5 xc2 58 xa4 h5 59 b3 xxa3 60 xa3 h6=); B) 49 f3 50 f8! g4 51 b4 xc2+ 52 xb5 xh4 53 e7 xxa3+ 54 xax3 xg5 55 xa4 B1) 55 f4 56 b3 f3 57 e7 h6 58 c2 g5 59 d2 g4 60 c1 g2 61 c2 g3 (61...h5 62 f6 g3 63 h4=) 62 d6 h5 63 xg3 xg3 64 f1=;

B2) 55 h5 56 d6 g4 57 b3 g5 58 c2 f3 59 d1 f2 60 c5+ g2 61 e7 g4 62 e2=;

C) 49 f5 50 f6 d5 51 b4 c6 52 c4=.

49 d5+ 50 d2 d4!+ 51 f6+ e4 52 e5 e7 52...b4! 53 axb4 xxb4 54 c1 d5 55 b2 (55 d2 e7 56 g3 f5 57 f2 d4+!) 55...e3+ 56 g3 a3+ 57 xxa3 xc2+ 58 a4 d4 59 a5 f5.

53 g3 f5 54 e1 e7 55 g3 c6

56 d6?

56 f2 b4 (56...d4? 57 xd4 xd4 58 c3=) 57 axb4 xxb4 58 c1 a3 59 g3 da2+ 60 d2 (60 b1 c3+ 61 a1 e2 62 e5 d4=) 60...c3 61 e5 d5 62 c1 e3 63 f6 d5 64 g7 a2
65 \( \text{a1 (65 \text{b2 a1=\text{\text{\text{\text{b}}}}+-+}) 65...} \text{c4++;}

56...\text{d4 57 \text{g3 b4! 58 axb4 a3}}

Once again, I’m wrestling with myself whether I was lucky or deserved the point. Probably both. This is the chess of our time: games between players of similar strength seldom go without mistakes on both sides, as a result of increased tension. But — you are free to think what you please — my heart was aching. I recalled Leo Tolstoy’s words: ‘Chess is wonderful. The trouble is, you can only win at a price of someone else’s defeat.’

0–1
Spraggett – no regrets

My plane landed at Montreal Airport on 27th December 1987. Kevin Spraggett, with whom I had been on friendly terms for a few years already, was waiting for me. Yet it was not a holiday trip, or at least we had no way of knowing if it would be. On the following day we travelled to Saint John, where the World Chess Festival was to take place in less than three weeks’ time. The Candidates’ Matches were ‘served’ as the main course (of course!), but the ‘side dishes’ also included the World Blitz Championship plus two FIDE Opens! Since Canada was the host nation, they got a ‘wild card’ in the Candidates’ field. The place was filled by Kevin. He faced none other than Andrei Sokolov, who had played a Candidates’ Final Match against Karpov in the previous cycle. Yes, he lost it, but he was neither the first nor the last great player to do so. Sokolov was no doubt the heavy(?) favourite. Honestly, I didn’t expect miracles. I don’t know how much hope K. Spraggett himself had in the case. It was perhaps fortunate that we had only those three weeks to work together, so we did not have time for worries. (By the way, the ELO-difference between the two was only 15 points, and I respected ‘Sprag’ as a strong GM as well as a tough fighter. In such duels, the latter is sometimes even more important.) I got only scared when the ‘Canadian Bastard’ (nickname given by me. He took it well, pointing out the lack of support for him in his motherland. That’s why I took this assignment free of charge, just for my expenses covered. Even that I never received completely...) showed me the opening variations he had prepared. On the White side it was mainly okay, but in most of the ‘BLACK cases’ I exercised my right of veto. I had already advised him by phone to play the Caro-Kann. Not because it’s the best defence. There is no such thing. There are, however, attacking players who are ready to sacrifice half of the set, but they need to see the target clearly in order to do so. For this, they need rather open positions. At that time I had just had five Caro games against Sax as BLACK in a few years’ time.

Sax – Adorján
Hungarian Team Championship 1987

This game was played on November 1, 1987, not long before my Saint John mission. As I mentioned, it was at least the fifth Caro within, say, a period two years against the same opponent. The result was the ‘usual’ upperhand draw. By that time I had already mentioned the Caro-Kann on the phone to the CB as a very good option. Watch this!

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 Qd2 dxe4 4 Qxe4 Qd7 5 c4 Qgf6 6 Qg5 e6 7 We2 Qb6 8 Qb3
Surprise, but one of the more pleasant kind. It’s not by chance that this move never became as popular as 8 d3.

8...h6 9 d5f3

9...a5!?

Playable, but unnecessary. After all these years I may sound somewhat silly, but I must confess I don’t understand the point of it. 9...c5, as I (and others) played many times, is more than good enough. Maybe I wanted to return the surprise.

9...c5 10 f4

A) 10...d5 Interesting is the Speelman-Adorján gambit that I played against W. Watson and J. Arnason – both ended up a draw but in the second one I had the upper hand. 11 e5 c4!? 12 xc4 b4+! AA (The original idea of Jonathan was 12...xc4 13 xc4 a5+ against Chandler somewhat earlier, and did OK. But it was suspicious. A bit. My improvement brought me peace 2x, but the variation lacks enough practical test!

A1) 13 c3? xc3;

A2) 13 d2 xd2+ 14 xd2 g5+ 15 e1 xg2 (15...xc4 16 a3!) 16 xd5 xd5 17 f3 f6=;

A3) 13 f1 13..xc4 14 xc4 0-0;

B) 10...bd5 11 e5 a5+ 12 d2 b5 13 dxc5 (13 c4?! bxc4 14 xc4 e7! N AA 15 b5+ d7 16 xd7+ xd7 17 xg7 g8 18 xh6 b8!?) 13..xc5 14 gf3 0-0 15 0-0 b7 16 xd5 xd5 17 b3 b6 18 xc5 xc5=.

10 a3

10 c3 is probably better.

10...a4 11 a2 c5 12 c3 e7 13 e3 0-0 14 e5 b5 15 gf3 c7 16 0-0 b5!

17 f1 e3 18 fxe3 a6=.

1/2-1/2

This could have been the key to punish White for his ‘drowsy’ play. Don’t ask me why I offered a draw myself in an obviously better position... Think of something silly that you have done once. (Or several times?) Try to be more understanding!

No wonder I carried on the Caro-business against Sax, who always varied, but never broke through. One interesting fight of these:
G. Sax – A. Adorján
Hungarian Team Championship 1990

Chess is fun. And funny things often happen. The gambit my opponent tries after our numerous Caro games was my favourite line (for White) as a teenager. I beat strong players such as P. Szilagyi and L. Vadász with this ‘wonder weapon’. Time has been flying since then, but maybe not in vain: I’ve learned quite a few things about the nature of counterattacks. And I discovered 3... e5!?. Or at least I didn’t know that it had already been played. Several times! To cut a long story short, it occurred back in 1950 (when I was born...) between J. Balogh and Köberl. That is one of the reasons I’ve created a symbol N??. Many people could play original chess already hundreds of years ago, when there were actually rather few players around. We (not me!) don’t pay the deserved tribute to them. Shame on us.

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 f3?! e5!?

A brave move, which is also a logical reaction to the weakening of the a7-g1 diagonal, and (last but not least!) it is MY brainchild. Still, it’s probably not the best. Lékó played the modest-looking g6 against Adams (Tilburg ’96), and got a (slight) advantage soon and almost for free.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{A}\text{3...}\text{g6 4}\text{ }\text{c3}\text{ }\text{g7 5}\text{ }\text{e3}\text{ }\text{wb6}
\text{6}\text{ exd5 (6}\text{ }\text{xb1}\text{ }\text{dxe4 7}\text{ }\text{fxe4}\text{ }\text{e5 8}\text{ }\text{tf3}
\text{d7 9}\text{ }\text{c4}\text{ }\text{exd4 10}\text{ }\text{xd4}\text{ }\text{w7 11}
\text{0-0}\text{ }\text{gf6 12}\text{ }\text{f3 0-0 13}\text{ }\text{d4}\text{ }\text{g4}
\text{14}\text{ }\text{xg7}\text{ }\text{xg7 15}\text{ }\text{wd4+}\text{ }\text{de5 16}
\text{h3}\text{ }\text{wb6+} 6...\text{wb2 7}\text{ }\text{ge2}\text{ }\text{xf6 8}
\text{xb1}\text{ }\text{wa3 9}\text{ }\text{dxc6 bxec6=} 9...\text{xc61?}\text{?}.
\end{align*} \]

4 dxec5

A must. Now it’s up to BLACK to prove that he has enough initiative for the pawn.

4 exd5? \text{wh4+! (4...}\text{xd5 5}\text{ }\text{e2}
\text{exd4 6}\text{ }\text{xd4}\text{ }\text{c5 7}\text{ }\text{e3}\text{ }\text{f6 8}
\text{c3}\text{ }\text{e5 9}\text{ }\text{d2 0-0 10}\text{ }\text{0-0-0}\text{ }\text{d8}
\text{11 h3} 5\text{ g3}\text{ }\text{xd4 6}\text{ }\text{xd4 exd4 7}
\text{e2}\text{ }\text{f6! 8}\text{ }\text{xd4 (8}\text{ }\text{dxe6}\text{ }\text{xc6=) 8...}\text{xd5 9}\text{ }\text{c4}\text{ }\text{c5 10}\text{ }\text{e2 (10}
\text{xb5 a6! 11}\text{ }\text{xd5 axb5=} 10...\text{xb4}
\text{11}\text{ }\text{xb4}\text{ }\text{xb4=} 12\text{ }\text{f2}\text{ }\text{a6 13}
\text{e3}\text{ }\text{e6 14}\text{ }\text{d2}\text{ }\text{c5=}.
\end{align*} \]

4...\text{xc5}

5 \text{c3}

This is normal. (But, strangely enough, 5 \text{d3} may be even better.) It takes a madman to test in a tournament game what happens after taking the second pawn.
5 exd5 \textit{W}b6 6 \textit{Q}h3 \textit{Q}xh3 7 gxh3 \textit{W}b4+! (7...\textit{Q}f2+ 8 \textit{Q}e2 \textit{Q}d4 9 \textit{Q}d2\texttt{±}) 8 \textit{W}d2 (8 c3 \textit{W}h4+ 9 \textit{Q}d2 \textit{Q}e7\texttt{+}) 8...\textit{W}h4+ 9 \textit{Q}d1

A) 9...\textit{Q}e7 10 d6 \textit{Q}d5 11 \textit{Q}g5 (11 \textit{W}g2 \textit{Q}d7 12 \textit{Q}d3 0-0-0 13 \textit{Q}e1 \textit{Q}he8 14 \textit{W}xg7 \textit{Q}d4 15 \textit{Q}g5 \textit{W}f2 16 \textit{Q}xd8 \textit{W}xe5 17 \textit{W}xe5 \textit{W}xe5 18 \textit{Q}b6 \textit{Q}xf3+ 19 \textit{Q}e2 \textit{Q}e3+ 20 \textit{Q}xe3 \textit{W}d5\texttt{±}) 11...\textit{W}xg5 12 \textit{Q}xg5 \textit{Q}d4 13 \textit{Q}c1 \textit{Q}xe5\texttt{±};

B) 9...\textit{Q}d7 10 f4 \textit{Q}e7 11 d6 \textit{Q}d5 12 \textit{W}e1 \textit{Q}e3+ 13 \textit{Q}xe3 \textit{W}xe1+ 14 \textit{Q}xe1 \textit{Q}xe3 15 \textit{Q}c4 \textit{Q}xf4 16 \textit{Q}f1 g5 17 \textit{Q}c3 \textit{Q}xe5 18 \textit{Q}b3 0-0-0 19 \textit{Q}d1 \textit{Q}he8 20 \textit{Q}e2 f5 21 \textit{Q}f2 \textit{Q}g6 22 \textit{Q}xf4 \textit{Q}xf4 23 h4 g4 24 \textit{Q}g3 \textit{Q}h5\texttt{±} 25 \textit{Q}f2 \textit{Q}e5 26 \textit{Q}f1 \textit{Q}e1 27 \textit{Q}xe1 \textit{Q}d7\texttt{±};

\textit{Q}d5 \textit{Q}d3!.

5...\textit{Q}e7 6 exd5

6 \textit{Q}a4 \textit{W}a5+ 7 c3 \textit{W}xg1 8 \textit{W}xg1 dxe4 9 \textit{W}d4 exf3 10 gxf3 \textit{Q}d7 11 f4 \textit{Q}f5 12 \textit{W}e4 \textit{Q}b6 13 \textit{Q}xb6 \textit{W}xb6 14 \textit{Q}g5 g6 15 \textit{Q}c4 \textit{Q}e6 16 \textit{Q}xe6 fx6 17 \textit{W}c4 \textit{W}f7\texttt{±}.

6...\textit{Q}xd5 7 \textit{Q}e4

7 \textit{Q}ge2 \textit{W}b6 (7...0-0? 8 \textit{Q}e4 \textit{Q}e3 9 \textit{W}xd8 \textit{Q}xd8 10 \textit{Q}xe3 \textit{Q}xe3 11 \textit{Q}d6\texttt{±}) 8 \textit{Q}e4 0-0 9 \textit{Q}xc5 \textit{W}xc5\texttt{=};

7 \textit{Q}xd5 exd5 8 \textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}c6 9 f4 0-0\texttt{=}.

7...0-0!

BLACK cannot afford to slow down. The time gained evaporates much faster than it takes to get the sacrificed material back.

8 \textit{Q}xe5

8...\textit{W}a5+ 9 c3 \textit{W}xc5

10 \textit{W}d4

Not the only choice, but certainly the safest way to sail in quiet waters. Reasonable too, as my opponent – believe me or not – was already approaching mild time trouble!

10 \textit{Q}d3?! \textit{Q}xc3 11 \textit{Q}xh7+ \textit{Q}xh7 12 \textit{W}c2+ \textit{Q}g8 13 \textit{W}xc3 \textit{W}xc3+ 14 bxc3 \textit{Q}e8\texttt{=};

10 f4 \textit{Q}f5 (10...f6 11 \textit{W}d4 \textit{W}xd4 12 cxd4 \textit{Q}e6 13 \textit{Q}d2 fxe5 14 fxe5 \textit{Q}d7 15 \textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}ae8 16 b4\texttt{±}) 11 \textit{Q}e2 \textit{Q}d7 12 \textit{Q}f3 f6 13 \textit{W}d4 \textit{Q}ae8 14 \textit{W}xc5 \textit{Q}xc5 15 0-0 \textit{Q}d3 (15...\textit{Q}d7 16 \textit{Q}d4 fxe5 17 fxe5 \textit{Q}xe5 18 \textit{Q}c4 \textit{Q}e6\texttt{±}) 16 \textit{Q}e1 \textit{Q}xe2 17 \textit{Q}xe2 \textit{Q}d3 18 \textit{Q}e4 fxe5 19 fxe5 \textit{Q}f5 20 \textit{Q}d2 \textit{Q}xe5 21 \textit{Q}d4 \textit{Q}f6 22 \textit{Q}e2 \textit{Q}h5 23 \textit{Q}ae1 \textit{Q}f7=.

10...\textit{W}xd4 11 cxd4 \textit{Q}b4 12 \textit{Q}f2!

12 \textit{Q}d2 \textit{Q}f5 13 g4 \textit{Q}g6 14 a3 \textit{Q}c2 15 \textit{Q}a2 \textit{Q}xd4 16 \textit{Q}c3 \textit{Q}b5+ 17 \textit{Q}xb5 cxb5\texttt{=};

12 \textit{Q}d1 \textit{Q}f5 13 \textit{Q}g5 \textit{Q}c2 14 \textit{Q}c1 \textit{Q}xd4 15 \textit{Q}c2 \textit{Q}xe2 16 \textit{Q}xe2 \textit{Q}d7
17 f4 f6 18 \(\text{c}4+\) \(\text{h}8\) 19 exf6 \(\text{xf}6\).

18 f4 f6 19 exf6 \(\text{xf}6\) 20 \(\text{he}1=\) \(\text{c}4+\) 21 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{c}3\) 22 \(\text{b}2\) a5.

12...\(\text{c}e2\)

I still don't know whether I could have got more out of the game by playing the alternative. Believe me, I've analysed it quite a lot. But sooner or later – you must reconcile yourself to the fact that that life is pretty short...

12...\(\text{e}6!?\) 13 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}e2\) 14 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{xe}3\) 15 \(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{xa}2\) 16 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{a}6!\) (16...\(\text{d}7\) 17 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 18 f4 f6 19 \(\text{d}3\) fxe5 20 dxe5 \(\text{ad}8\) 21 \(\text{hd}1\) g5 22 g3 \(\text{b}6\) 23 \(\text{a}1\) gxf4+ 24 gxf4 a6 25 \(\text{g}1+\) \(\text{h}8\) 26 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{c}4\) 27 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{g}8\) 28 b3 \(\text{e}8\) 17 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{b}4\) 18 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 19 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{fd}8\) 20 \(\text{d}6\) \(\text{xd}6\) 21 exd6 \(\text{d}8\).

13 \(\text{b}1\) \(\text{e}6\) 14 b3 \(\text{xd}4\) 15 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{e}8\)

15...\(\text{xd}8\) 16 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{d}7\) 17 f4 (17 \(\text{e}2!\)) 17...a5 18 \(\text{d}6\) \(\text{f}5\) 19 \(\text{c}4\) (19 \(\text{f}3\)? a4 20 \(\text{c}4\) axb3 21 \(\text{xb}8\) bx2 22 \(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{xd}1\) 23 \(\text{xd}1\) fxe6++) 19...\(\text{a}6\) 20 \(\text{xa}6\) \(\text{xa}6\) 21 \(\text{e}2\) a4 22 \(\text{b}4\) \(\text{xd}1\) 23 \(\text{xd}1\) h5=.

16 \(\text{e}2\)

16 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{b}5\) 17 \(\text{xb}5\) cxb5 18 \(\text{d}6\) \(\text{c}6\) 19 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{ac}8\).

16...\(\text{xe}2\) 17 \(\text{xe}2\) \(\text{d}7\) 18 \(\text{d}6\)!

18...\(\text{d}5\)

Missing a big chance. It's not that White wouldn't have enough compensation for the pawn. But considering the fact that Gyula had some two minutes for the remaining moves (till 40) I could have tested his nerves by complicating matters and setting traps. Unlike him, I had a large amount of precious time.

18...\(\text{f}5!?\) 19 \(\text{bd}1\) \(\text{xe}5\) 20 g4 \(\text{c}2\) 21 \(\text{d}4\).

19 f4 f6 20 \(\text{g}4\) fxe5! 21 \(\text{xd}7\) \(\text{ed}8\) 22 \(\text{xe}5\)

22 fxe5 \(\text{xd}7\) 23 \(\text{h}1\) a5.

22...\(\text{xd}7\) 23 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{ad}8\)

And I accepted the draw. Time doesn't play a part anymore: in such a position, you can make 50 moves in his two minutes.

23...a5!? 24 \(\text{d}2\) a4 25 \(\text{bd}1=\)

\(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\)

I didn't lose a single game, but missed some promising chances. And I saw definite similarities in the styles of Sax and Sokolov! Kevin gave in, and we used this short time for serious study from my files(?) and some other sources. We
naturally paid more attention to the variations in fashion, but did not forget that Sokolov had played 2 c4 as well.

The match started with a relatively quiet draw. The second game Spraggett lost with ‘my’ Caro-Kann! Being a good-natured guy, he did not excuse himself and blame the variation, as many would have done. There was no basis to do this, for, as you’ll see soon, he was better!

A.Sokolov – K.Spraggett
Candidates, Saint John 1988

1 e4 c6 2 c4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4
exd5 d6 5 c3 dxe5 6 f3 c6
7 d4 g4 8 b3 xf3 9 gxf3 e6 10
xb7 xd4 11 b5+ xb5 12
xb6+ e7 13 xb5 d7 14
xd5+ xd5 15 xd5 exd5

The key position of this system, which is misunderstood by many if not most of the players. At first you can see the ‘isolani’ on d5 and White’s pawn majority on the queenside. Judgement: White is better. The picture is incomplete, the evaluation is wrong. Important extra elements are: (1) White’s doubled pawns and his kingside in

16 e3 e6 17 0-0-0 b4 18
b1 b8d8 19 d3 a6!?N

Virgin hands! Till this game – as far as I know – people only played 19...d7. This move is however very logical and at least as good as the usual stuff.

20 b3 a8b8 21 a7 b5 22
d4 f6 23 h3 d6 24 xxb5 axb5
25 c1 f5 26 c6
26...b4

Instead both moves below gave BLACK an advantage too. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, it is possible to have the better of it with BLACK much earlier than this too—and without the opponent making an obvious mistake.

26...e5?! 27 xe5 fxe5 28 c7 d6 29 xg7 h6 30 g3 h4 31 b3 h5 32 c2 f4 33 g8 xf3 34 f8+ e4 35 xf3 xf3 36 a4 bxa4 37 bxa4 e2 38 a5 d4 39 a6 d3+ 40 b2 d2 41 a7 d1= 42 a8= 42 xf2=+

On the other hand 26...f4?? loses the same way as on the next move! Life and death are close in chess...

27 c2 h5
27...g5?;

27...f4?? 28 b6 d7 29 xd6 d6 60 c7 e5 31 f4+ e6 32 f5+ e7 33 xd6+ xd6 34 d3 c5 35 a4=.

28 e3

28...g5

Still not bad, but with a wrong intention. Again there was a chance to gain the upper hand.

28...e5! 29 b6 d4 30 d2 d3+ 31 b1 (31 d1 a8 32 xb4

38 b4??

Strangely enough the game is not over even after 38 b3, e.g. 38 a8 a4 40 c3 d4+ (40...xf2
41 xf4+ e3 42 h4 c8+ 43
\( b4\ d4 =)\ 41\ \boxtimes d4\ \boxtimes b3\ 42\ a5\ \boxtimes a3\ 43\ \boxtimes a4+\ 44\ \boxtimes c5\ \boxtimes a2\ (44...\boxtimes xf2?\ 45\ \boxtimes b5+)\ 45\ \boxtimes b6\ \boxtimes b2+\ 46\ \boxtimes c6\ \boxtimes xf2\ 47\ a7\ \boxtimes a2\ 48\ \boxtimes b7\ \boxtimes xa7+\ 49\ \boxtimes xa7\ \boxtimes e3\ 50\ \boxtimes e6+\ \boxtimes d4=.

38...\boxtimes c1??

Instead of a draw in one by 38...\boxtimes a8= this is unfortunately the last mistake – not the penultimate one of the game, by committing which you can still win, as they say...

39\ a4\ \boxtimes c4

39...\boxtimes d1+\ 40\ \boxtimes c3\ \boxtimes c1+\ 41\ \boxtimes b2\ \boxtimes c4\ 42\ \boxtimes b3\ \boxtimes xf2\ 43\ b5\ f3\ 44\ b6\ \boxtimes c1\ 45\ a5\ \boxtimes a1\ 46\ a6\ \boxtimes xa6\ 47\ b7\ \boxtimes xf6\ 48\ b8=\boxtimes\ \boxtimes e6\ 49\ \boxtimes c3+.

40\ \boxtimes b6\ \boxtimes xf2\ 41\ a5\ f3\ 42\ a6\ \boxtimes c1\ 43\ b5\ \boxtimes d1+\ 44\ \boxtimes c3\ d4+

44...\boxtimes a1\ 45\ \boxtimes d4\ \boxtimes f1\ 46\ \boxtimes xd5\ f2\ 47\ \boxtimes f6\ \boxtimes e2\ 48\ \boxtimes c6\ f1=\boxtimes\ 49\ \boxtimes xf1\ \boxtimes xf1\ 50\ a7+.

45\ \boxtimes b2\ \boxtimes d2+\ 46\ \boxtimes b3\ \boxtimes d1\ 47\ a7\ 1-0

A disaster. But before we go on with the story let me add some more material to this type of ‘Opening’:

Take a hair of the dog
that bit you!

Brunner – Adorján
Bundesliga 1990

1\ e4\ c6\ 2\ d4\ d5\ 3\ exd5\ cxd5\ 4\ c4\ \boxtimes f6\ 5\ \boxtimes c3\ \boxtimes c6\ 6\ \boxtimes f3\ \boxtimes g4\ 7\ cxd5\ \boxtimes x d5\ 8\ \boxtimes b3\ \boxtimes x f3\ 9\ gxf3\ e6\ 10\ \boxtimes x b7\ \boxtimes x d4\ 11\ \x x b5+\ \boxtimes x b5\ 12\ \x x c6+\ \x x e 7\ 13\ \boxtimes x b5\ \boxtimes d7\ 14\ \box x d 5+\ \box x d 5\ 15\ \x x d 5\ ex d 5

16\ \boxtimes e3

So my opponent doesn’t wish to repeat the line we played in the 1989 World Team Championship in Luzern, although I was kind enough to present him with a full point there! I don’t usually look for excuses, but if you play through the game below, you must agree that I was performing like a patzer! I gave it a lot of thought before discovering the following formula: Nobody can really play chess. Some people can play chess better than others, a few may play better than all others of their time, but the Royal Game is much too difficult to learn for everyone to claim ‘I know how to play chess’.

16...0-0\ \boxtimes e6\ 17\ \boxtimes e 1+\ \boxtimes f 5\ 18\ \boxtimes d 1\ \boxtimes d 8\ 19\ \boxtimes e 3\ \boxtimes d 7\ 20\ \y a c 1\ \x e 7\ 21\ \x d 4\ g5!? (This is still all right, actually a winning attempt based on the advance of the passed [not isolated!] d-pawn. BLACK already had an easy draw. by 21...\boxtimes f 6\ 22\ \y a f 4+\ \y g 6\ 23\ \y g 4+\ \y f 5\ 24\ \y f 4+\ \y g 6=\ 25\ \x h 1?\ h 6\boxtimes)\ 22\ \y a c 6\ \y h d 8\ 23\ \y f 1\ \y f 6\ 24\ \y b 4\ d 4\ (24...\x e 5\boxtimes)\ 25\ \y b 5+\ \x e 5? A bit silly, but not very much... Parrying the check with the rook gave BLACK an advantage. (25...\x d 5!\ 26\ \y c c 5\ \x e 6\ 27\ \x c 6+\ \y d 6\boxtimes)\ 26\ \x x g 5

174 Spraggett – no regrets
A) 26...\text{d}5 27 \text{e}cc5 \text{x}c5 28 \text{x}c5 \text{x}g5 29 \text{x}e5+ \text{f}4 30 \text{e}7 \text{f}5 31 \text{a}a7 \text{d}3 32 \text{e}1 \text{e}8+ 33 \text{d}2 \text{e}2+ 34 \text{x}d3 \text{xb}2 35 a4 h5 36 \text{h}7 \text{x}f3 37 \text{hx}5 \text{f}4 38 a5 \text{x}f2 39 \text{c}3 (39 a6 \text{a}2 40 \text{h}6 \text{f}3 41 \text{g}6 \text{e}1=) 39...\text{a}2 40 h4 \text{g}3=; 

B) 26...\text{x}g5?? But this is a stupid mistake. There was still a way to save half a point as follows: 27 \text{x}e5+ \text{f}4 (27...f5 28 \text{c}c5 \text{f}7 29 \text{c}d5=) 28 \text{c}c5 \text{xf}3 29 \text{f}5+ \text{e}4 (29...\text{g}4 30 \text{f}3+) 30 \text{e}2 and White wins after a few more moves.

16...\text{e}6 17 0-0-0

A1) 20 \text{g}e1 \text{d}6 21 \text{d}3

A1a) 21...\text{h}d8? 22 \text{g}5! \text{d}7 (22...f6 23 \text{a}xf6 \text{e}8 24 \text{e}d1 \text{e}6 25 \text{d}4+) 23 \text{f}4+ \text{c}6 24 \text{c}1 \text{b}7 25 \text{d}c3+; 

A1b) 21...\text{x}e3! 22 \text{fx}e3 (22 \text{h}dxe3? \text{c}7+) 22...\text{c}5 23 e4 \text{e}8 24 \text{h}ed1 \text{e}5 25 b4 \text{b}5 26 \text{e}2 \text{e}6= (26...a5!? 27 a4 \text{xb}4 28 \text{xd}5+ \text{e}6 29 \text{d}6+ \text{e}7 30 \text{d}7+ \text{f}6 31 \text{b}7 \text{h}5 32 \text{d}6+ \text{g}5 33 \text{d}5+ f5 34 \text{xa}5 \text{x}h2+ 35 \text{c}3 \text{bb}2 36 \text{xx}h7 \text{bc}2+ 37 \text{d}3 \text{cd}2\pm; 

A2) 20 \text{g}4 20...\text{h}d8 21 \text{a}4 \text{b}6! (Gdanski-Adorjan, Polanica Zdroj 1991) 22 \text{xb}6 \text{ax}b6 23 \text{a}7 \text{d}4 24 \text{e}1+ \text{f}6 25 \text{c}1 (25 \text{ee}7 \text{d}3 26 \text{xf}7+ \text{g}5+) 25...\text{b}5 26 \text{ac}7 (26 \text{b}7 \text{xc}1+ 27 \text{xc}1 \text{d}5) 26...\text{xc}7 27 \text{xc}7 \text{e}8 (27...\text{d}5! 28 \text{c}2 \text{f}5+) 28 \text{c}1

17...\text{b}4!?

Believe it or not, this move is a winning try again. The other line below is fairly good for equality.

17...\text{c}8+ 18 \text{b}1 \text{c}5

A) 19 \text{h}g1!? g6
A2a) 28...\(\mathcal{E}e2\) 29 \(\mathcal{E}c2\) \(\mathcal{E}e1+\) 30 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) \(\mathcal{H}h1\) 31 \(\mathcal{W}d3\) \(\mathcal{E}xh2\) 32 \(\mathcal{W}xd4\) \(\mathcal{E}h4+\) 33 \(\mathcal{W}e3\) \(\mathcal{H}h5\) (33...\(\mathcal{H}h5\) 34 \(\mathcal{F}f4\)) 34 b3 \(\mathcal{E}e5+\) 35 \(\mathcal{W}d3\) h5 36 f4 \(\mathcal{E}e7\) 37 a4 bxa4 38 bxa4 \(\mathcal{W}f5\) 39 a5 h4 (39...\(\mathcal{W}xf4\) 40 a6 \(\mathcal{W}f3\) 41 \(\mathcal{E}a2\) \(\mathcal{E}a7\) 42 \(\mathcal{C}c4\) h4 43 \(\mathcal{B}b5\) h3 44 \(\mathcal{A}a3\) 40 \(\mathcal{E}a2\) h3 41 a6 \(\mathcal{A}a7\) 42 \(\mathcal{C}c4\) \(\mathcal{W}xf4\) 43 \(\mathcal{B}b5\) h2 44 \(\mathcal{A}a1\) \(\mathcal{W}f3+\);

A2b) 28...\(\mathcal{E}e1+\) 29 \(\mathcal{W}d2\) \(\mathcal{B}b1\) 30 \(\mathcal{C}c6+\) \(\mathcal{W}e7\) 31 \(\mathcal{C}c2\) \(\mathcal{W}d6\) 32 \(\mathcal{W}d3\) \(\mathcal{W}d5\) 33 a3 \(\mathcal{F}f5\) 34 \(\mathcal{W}e2\) \(\mathcal{B}a1\) 35 h4 h6 36 b4 \(\mathcal{W}e5\) 37 \(\mathcal{C}c5\) \(\mathcal{W}f4\) 38 \(\mathcal{B}xb5\) \(\mathcal{A}xa3\) 39 \(\mathcal{B}b6\) \(\mathcal{W}xf3\) 40 \(\mathcal{W}xg6\) \(\mathcal{B}b3\) 41 \(\mathcal{A}xh6\) \(\mathcal{W}xb4\) 42 h5 \(\mathcal{B}b2+\) 43 \(\mathcal{W}d3\) \(\mathcal{W}xf1\) 44 \(\mathcal{B}b6\) \(\mathcal{H}h2\) 45 h6 \(\mathcal{B}b3\) 46 \(\mathcal{B}b4\);

B) 19 \(\mathcal{A}he1\) \(\mathcal{W}d6\) 20 \(\mathcal{B}b3\) \(\mathcal{A}hd8\) 21 \(\mathcal{W}f4+\) \(\mathcal{W}c6\) 22 \(\mathcal{C}c1\) \(\mathcal{B}b7\) 23 \(\mathcal{E}cd1\) \(\mathcal{W}c6=\).

18 \(\mathcal{W}b1\) \(\mathcal{H}hd8\) 19 \(\mathcal{B}d3\)

19...\(\mathcal{D}d7\)

This is the old stuff. As you’ve seen before, Spraggett’s move 19...\(\mathcal{A}a6\) is just as good, maybe even better.

Then 20 \(\mathcal{F}b3\) \(\mathcal{A}ab8\) 21 \(\mathcal{A}a7\) \(\mathcal{B}b5\) 22 \(\mathcal{D}d4\) f6 23 h3 \(\mathcal{D}d6\) 24 \(\mathcal{B}xb5\) \(\mathcal{A}xb5\) 25 \(\mathcal{C}c1\), A.Sokolov-Spraggett, Saint John 1987, 25...\(\mathcal{A}e5\)!±.

20 \(\mathcal{C}c1\) \(\mathcal{B}b8\) 21 \(\mathcal{C}c6+\) \(\mathcal{F}f5\) 22 \(\mathcal{A}a6\)

Not a big deal, but the other option was even dangerous. Belt up!

22 \(\mathcal{B}b3\)

22...d4! (22...\(\mathcal{A}db7\) 23 \(\mathcal{A}a6\) \(\mathcal{A}e7\) 24 \(\mathcal{W}xb7\) \(\mathcal{X}xb7\) 25 \(\mathcal{X}xa7\) \(\mathcal{E}xa7\) 26 \(\mathcal{X}xa7\) \(\mathcal{A}d6\) 27 h3 \(\mathcal{A}f4\) 28 a4±; 22...\(\mathcal{A}bb7\)? 23 \(\mathcal{X}xa7\) \(\mathcal{E}xa7\) 24 \(\mathcal{B}xb4\) d4 25 a4 \(\mathcal{F}f4\) 26 \(\mathcal{C}c3\) \(\mathcal{A}e5\) 27 \(\mathcal{B}d3\) f5 28 \(\mathcal{C}c2\) 29 \(\mathcal{A}xh2\) 23 \(\mathcal{A}d2\) \(\mathcal{A}xd2\)! Oh yes! (23...\(\mathcal{A}db7\) 24 \(\mathcal{X}xb4\) \(\mathcal{A}xb4\) 25 \(\mathcal{X}xb4\) \(\mathcal{A}xb4\) 26 \(\mathcal{C}c7\) \(\mathcal{A}e6\) 27 \(\mathcal{A}xa7\) d3 28 \(\mathcal{A}a3\) \(\mathcal{D}d4\) 29 \(\mathcal{C}c1\) \(\mathcal{H}h4\) 30 \(\mathcal{A}xd3\) \(\mathcal{X}xh2\) 31 a4 \(\mathcal{W}xf2\) 32 a5 \(\mathcal{F}f1+\) 33 \(\mathcal{F}f2\) \(\mathcal{A}a1\) 34 b4 g5) 24 \(\mathcal{A}xb8\) d3 25 \(\mathcal{C}c4\) (25 \(\mathcal{F}b5+\) \(\mathcal{F}f4\) 26 \(\mathcal{C}c5\) \(\mathcal{W}xf3\) 27 \(\mathcal{B}d5\) \(\mathcal{X}xd5\) 28 \(\mathcal{A}xd5\) \(\mathcal{F}e2\) 29 \(\mathcal{D}d7\) f5 30 \(\mathcal{X}xa7\) f4 31 a4 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) 32 \(\mathcal{D}d7\) f3 33 a5 \(\mathcal{A}xf2\) 34 a6 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) 35 a7 f2 36 a8=\(\mathcal{W}\) 37 \(\mathcal{F}f1=\mathcal{W}\) 38 \(\mathcal{A}xg7\) d2 39 \(\mathcal{G}g2+\) \(\mathcal{A}e1\) 40 \(\mathcal{E}e4\) d1=\(\mathcal{W}\) 41 \(\mathcal{G}g1\) \(\mathcal{A}e2\) 42 \(\mathcal{B}xd1\) \(\mathcal{A}xd1\)+; 25 \(\mathcal{A}c1\) \(\mathcal{A}xc1\) 26 \(\mathcal{B}xc1\) \(\mathcal{F}f4+\) Analysing games in depth, giving all the long variations instead of using the popular ∞, involves a double risk. First, readers who are used to the symbol instead of hard but enjoyable work fall asleep. And this is not all! There might also be an angry ‘customer’ visiting me in the middle of the night, blaming me for being responsible for his loss with my silly line. Unsure of surviving such a visit, I hereby inform you that it is a joint effort. From the moment you are ready to use something in a game, it is
entirely your responsibility to check it out. Another thing before I go: I certainly have made mistakes in my analyses. Recommended something that turned out to be wrong. But never, NEVER in my life have I advised anybody, in oral or written form, to play a line I wasn’t ready to play myself the following day against anybody. To err is human.) 25...\text{h}6 26 \text{b}5+ \text{g}6 27 \text{c}1 \text{d}2 28 \text{g}1+ \text{f}6 29 \text{d}1 \text{c}7++.  
22...\text{b}b7 23 \text{a}3 \text{e}7

34 \text{c}2

34 \text{c}3 \text{xd}4 35 \text{xd}4 \text{h}7 (35...\text{h}4 36 \text{d}3 \text{xf}3+ 37 \text{e}4 \text{c}3 38 \text{d}2) 36 \text{xf}6 \text{gx}f6 37 \text{b}5 \text{g}6 38 \text{d}7 \text{xf}3+ 39 \text{b}4 \text{h}4 40 \text{xa}7 \text{h}3 41 \text{a}8 \text{f}4+ 42 \text{a}5 \text{h}4 43 \text{g}8+ \text{f}5 44 \text{g}1 \text{e}6 45 \text{b}6 \text{h}2 46 \text{h}1 \text{d}7 47 \text{b}5 (47 \text{a}6 \text{c}8) 47...\text{c}8 48 \text{c}6 \text{f}5 49 \text{a}4 \text{f}4 50 \text{a}5 \text{h}6+ 51 \text{b}5 \text{f}3 52 \text{a}6 \text{f}2 53 \text{c}1+ \text{d}7++ \Delta 54 \text{a}7 \text{h}1=\text{w} 55 \text{xh}1 \text{hxh}1 56 \text{a}8=\text{w} \text{f}1=\text{w}+; 
34 \text{c}4? \text{c}2+ 35 \text{b}3 \text{c}8 36 \text{d}2 \text{h}7 37 \text{e}3 \text{c}3+++.  
34...\text{xd}3+ 35 \text{c}4 \text{xf}3 36 \text{xa}7 \text{h}4 37 \text{b}5 \text{h}3 38 \text{h}8 \text{f}2 39 \text{d}6\text{c}2++ 40 \text{b}4 \text{c}8 41 \text{b}6 
41 \text{a}7 \text{h}2 42 \text{d}1 \text{h}8 43 \text{h}1 \text{e}7++.  
41...\text{f}5 42 \text{b}7

34 \text{xf}6 \text{gx}f6++.  
33...\text{d}7!
42...\textit{\textbf{\textsc{H}}h8}

What a shame! I swear I saw 42...\textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xb8, but for some reason I decided to play the ‘normal’ text move. It was a team match, you know.

42...\textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xb8! 43 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xb8 g5 44 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c8 g4++.

43 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{h}}}h2 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e5! 44 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xf7+ \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e6 45 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xe5!

45 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f2 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xh2 46 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xh2 g5.

\begin{center}
\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textsc{W}}}xb7 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{Q}}}xd4 11 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{b}}}b5+ \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xb5 12 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c6+ \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e7 13 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xb5 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d7 14 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xd5+ \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xd5 15 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{w}}}xd5 exd5 16 0-0 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e6 17 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d1+ \textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f5 18 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d1+ \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d8 19 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e3 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d7 20 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{a}}}ac1 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e7}
\end{center}

45...\textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}xe5!

But this is a beauty! It’s hard to believe – I hope I have checked it enough times – but the greedy 45...\textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xf7 would still leave some chances to blow it all. Take a look!

45...\textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xf7?! 46 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{h}}}h2 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e8? (But of course 46...\textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c8! gathers the harvest.

47 b6 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{b}}}b6 48 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{b}}}b3 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c6+)) 47 b6 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e2 48 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c3 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e7 49 a4 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{b}}}b7 50 a5 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e6 51 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c4 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d7 52 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c5 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c8 53 a6 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f7 54 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c6 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f6+ 55 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c5=.

46 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f1 g5 0-1

\begin{center}
\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textsc{M}}}M.\textit{\textbf{\textsc{W}}}ahls – \textit{\textbf{\textsc{A}}}Adorj\'an}

\textbf{Bundesliga 1990}
\end{center}

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4
\textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f6 5 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c3 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c6 6 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f3 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{g}}}g4 7 cxd5
\textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xd5 8 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{w}}}b3 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xf3 9 gxf3 e6 10

21 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e4!?

Looks better than the other rook move, since the d5 pawn remains under pressure. But still, the position is easier to handle with BLACK. I know it’s hard to believe, but the more the reader studies this whole variation, the more strange truths will come to light.

21 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d4.

21...\textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f6

21...g5!? 22 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{a}}}a4 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{b}}}b8 23 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}a7 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{a}}}a7 24 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{a}}}xa7 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xb2 25 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xd5+ \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e6 26 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{a}}}a5 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f5+ 27 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d4 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{b}}}b1+ 28 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{g}}}g2 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d6.

22 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c5 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{h}}}hd8 23 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{b}}}b3 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e5

23...a6!? 24 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{a}}}a5 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d6 25 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c5 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e6 26 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{a}}}a3 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e6 27 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{e}}}e1+ \textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f5 28 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d1=.

24 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{a}}}a5 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{c}}}c3!?

A good move, but perhaps it was even better to push the ‘isolated’ d-pawn with the following continuation:

24...d4! 25 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f4 (25 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d2 g5 26 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{g}}}g5 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xg5 27 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xe5+ \textit{\textbf{\textsc{f}}}f4\textit{\textsc{+}}) 25...dxe3 26 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{x}}}xd7 \textit{\textbf{\textsc{d}}}d7 27 fxe3
(27 \text{\textit{Exe}} 5+ \textit{Qxf}} 4 28 \textit{Exe} 3 \textit{f5} = 27...\text{f6} 28 \text{fxe} 5 \text{fxe} 5 29 \textit{Qf} 2 \textit{g5} =
25 \textit{Ec} 5

Grabbing the pawn would be more dangerous:
25 \textit{Eaxa} 7? \textit{d} 4 26 \textit{Exd} 7 \textit{Exd} 7 27 \textit{Ed} 2 \textit{Exd} 2 28 \textit{Exd} 2 \textit{d} 3
A) 29 \textit{Qf} 1 \textit{Qf} 4 30 \textit{Qg} 2 (30 \textit{b} 4 \textit{Qxf} 3 =) 30...\textit{Ee} 5;
B) 29 \textit{Qg} 2 29...\textit{Ee} 5 =
25...\textit{Ee} 5 26 \textit{Ed} 4

26...\textit{Eb} 8

It cannot be called bad, as \textit{BLACK}'s advantage doesn't disappear till the end of the game. Still, if you are ever able to play \textit{f7-f6} in this type of position, never miss it! It never hurts, but if our \textit{f}-pawn ever recaptures on \textit{e5}, \textit{White} is a dead man.
26...\textit{f6}! 27 \textit{Ea} 5 \textit{Exd} 4 28 \textit{Exd} 4 \textit{Ee} 6 =
27 \textit{Ea} 5 \textit{Ebb} 7
27...\textit{Exd} 4 28 \textit{Exd} 4 \textit{Ee} 6 =.
28 \textit{h} 3 \textit{f6} 29 \textit{Qf} 1 \textit{Ee} 6 30 \textit{Ea} 6+ \textit{Qf} 5 31 \textit{Ea} 5 \textit{Ee} 6 ?!
31...\textit{Exd} 4! 32 \textit{Exd} 4 \textit{Ee} 6 33 \textit{f} 4 \textit{Ec} 7 34 \textit{Qg} 2 =
32 \textit{Ea} 6+ \textit{Qf} 5 33 \textit{Ea} 5 \textit{Ee} 6 ?

Timid with no reason. \textit{BLACK} could, and really should, have tried to play for a win without risking anything.
\(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\)

Kevin kept on playing the Caro till the very end, as a good boy! Between two \textit{BLACK} games, I always added something to our analyses. Once he got angry and shouted at me: 'Oh yes, all you want is me not only to win the match but on top of everything to do it with \textit{BLACK}!' 'What else could I wish, handsome?;' I laughed. But I took it quite easy when he equalised as \textit{White} in the 5\textsuperscript{th} (penultimate) game! The sixth was a draw, and he even had a slight advantage. The basic match has ended 3-3. Then came the drama: two more draws with normal time control, two with one hour each, and then fifteen minutes each 'sudden death' fights. To my great pleasure, the Can. Bast. (who used to call me Big Mouth for some reason) not only won, he did so with the right colour, as instructed... And I was very happy for him.

\textbf{A.Sokolov – K.Spraggett}
Candidates (15 minutes rapid), Saint John 1988

1 \textit{e} 4 \textit{c} 6 2 \textit{d} 4 \textit{d} 5 3 \textit{Qd} 2 \textit{dxe} 4 4 \textit{Qxe} 4 \textit{Qd} 7 5 \textit{g} 5 \textit{Qg} f 6 6 \textit{Qd} 3 \textit{e} 6
7 \textit{Qf} 3 \textit{e} 7 8 \textit{We} 2 \textit{h} 6 9 \textit{Qe} 4 \textit{Qxe} 4
10 \textit{Wxe} 4 \textit{c} 5 11 0-0 \textit{cxd} 4 12 \textit{Exd} 4 \textit{Qc} 5 13 \textit{ab} 5+ \textit{Ed} 7 14 \textit{We} 2 \textit{a} 6
14...0-0! =
15 \textit{Exd} 7+ \textit{Wxd} 7 16 \textit{Ed} 1 \textit{Wc} 7 17 \textit{g} 3 ??
17 \textit{Wg} 4 \textit{Qf} 6 18 \textit{Ee} 3 0-0-0 19 \textit{c} 3 \textit{Ed} 7 (19...\textit{Ed} 5!?).
17...\textit{d}8 18 \textit{f}4 \textit{b}6 19 c3 0-0
20 b4? \textit{d}7 21 a4 \textit{f}6 22 a5 \textit{a}7
23 \textit{c}7 \textit{c}8 24 \textit{b}6 \textit{b}8

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

25 \textit{f}5??
25 \textit{e}c1 \textit{e}e8.
25...\textit{e}xe7 26 \textit{w}xe7 \textit{c}c3?
26...\textit{e}f8 27 \textit{d}6 \textit{e}e1+!+-.
27 \textit{d}6 \textit{w}c8 28 \textit{d}d4 \textit{w}c6 29 \textit{w}f4
\textit{w}e8 30 \textit{h}c1 \textit{d}e4 31 \textit{h}c6 \textit{w}x6
31...\textit{w}x6c6 32 \textit{w}f3 (32 \textit{w}xf5 \textit{d}g5)
32...\textit{w}a4 33 \textit{e}3 g6+.
32 f3?
32 \textit{w}c1 \textit{w}e6+.
32...\textit{d}g5 33 \textit{h}3?? \textit{d}h3+ 0-1

SPRAGGETT qualifies!

Time was flying. As I hadn’t heard anything from Canada for a long time, I wrote a letter to find out what plans the ‘Pride of Canada’ (this is what he became after his deserved win against Sokolov) had for his match against Yusupov. I did so despite the fact that we had had some rows during the match. I did not think they were more serious than the quarrels two people would have in any similarly tense situation. I had been a second before, and I had had seconds before and would have them afterwards myself. To the best of my memory, most of the problems that seemed so serious disappeared by themselves after the battle. Especially after a victorious one!

The answer came slowly, and didn’t make me very glad. It said something like: ‘I have been busy up to now taking care of some important things. I have a sponsor now, and there will be a team of three Grandmasters helping me during the preparation phase and the match. I’m sure it doesn’t come to you as a surprise that you will not be a member of this team. Among other things, I was not satisfied with your professional support in Saint John...’

This nonsense made the whole case easier to take. Let me repeat: Kevin Spraggett was/is(?) a strong GM and an extremely good fighter. But as far as his chess education is concerned, well... the first opening files the poor devil saw in his life were mine. If he had played the things he prepared against Sokolov with BLACK, they probably wouldn’t have needed all six games. It also actually happened to others, for example Sax lost to Short 1½-3½. (And shame on Kasparov, who failed to notice my lack of professionalism through seven long years! Instead, he employed some of my ideas, and was ready for much more.)

The issue was (and is) closed, but one naturally follows the games of the Candidates’ Matches. And what do I see in Yusupov-Spraggett, Game 7? My learned Canadian friend is using my idea, neutralising Artur’s winning attempts!
A.Yusupov – K.Spraggett
Candidates, Quebec 1989

1 d4 ćf6 2 c4 e6 3 ćf3 b6 4 g3 ća6 5 ćbd2 ćb7 6 ćg2 će7 7 0-0 0-0 8 ćc2 ća6!? N

This is my novelty, an active, provocative one. Before that, people used to play c5 or d5. Checking games past and present, I only found one with a similar plan, and it was my countryman Lukács playing ća6 after 8...d5. He won, too. The opponent? Yusupov himself! See later.

9 a3
9 e4

A) 9...ćb4!? was the original intention with quite sharp play in some variations, but now I think 9...d5 is just as good as the first idea. 10 ćb1 d5

A1) 11 cxd5 ća6! 12 će5

A1a) 12...ćxf1 13 ćxf1 exd5 14 a3 ća6 15 exd5

A1a1) 15...ćd6?! 16 ćg5= ćb8 17 ćf5 ćbd7 18 ćh3 h6 19 ćh4 g5? (19...ćb8 20 će3±) 20 ćxg5 hxg5 21 ćxg5= ćh8 22 ćxd7 ćxd7 23 ćh5+= ćg8 24 ćg4++;

A1a2) 15...ćc5!;

A1b) 12...ćg4!

A1b1) 13 ćdf3 ćxe5 14 ćxe5 f6 (14...ćxf1 15 ćxf1 f6 16 ćd3 exd5 17 ćf4 ćd6 18 a3 ćc6 19 ćxd5 ćxd4 20 ćf4 ćf3+ 21 ćg2 će5 22 ćc2 c5 23 ćd1 ćfd8=) 15 ćd1 fxe5 16 a3 ćd3 17 ćxd3 ćxd3 18 ćxd3 exd4 19 dx6 c5 20 e5 ćc8 21 b3=;

A1b2) 13 ćec4 exd5 14 exd5 ćxd5 15 će1 c6 16 ćc2 ćb5 17 h3 ćgf6=;

A2) 11 a3? ćxe4 12 ćg5 ćc6;

A3) 11 exd5 exd5 12 će5 c5 13 dxc5 ćc7 14 će1 ćxc5 15 a3 ćc6 16 ćd3 ćd4 17 exd5 ćxd5; (17...ćc2!? 18 ćd6 ćxd6 19 ćxb7 ćxe1 20 ćxa8 ćxd3 21 ćg2 ćxc1 22 ćxc1=) 18 ćxc5 ćxg2 19 ćxg2 bxc5=;

B) 9...d5 10 cxd5 exd5 11 e5 će4 12 ćxe4 (12 ćd1 c5 13 dxc5 ćxc5=) 12...ćxe4 13 ćd2 ćxd4 14 ćxe4 ćc5! (14...ćxe5 15 ćg5 ćxg5 16 ćxb7 ćd4 17 ćc4 ćxc1 18 ćxc1 ćab8 19 ćg2 a5 20 a3 b5 21 ćxc7 ćd3 22 ćxe5 ćxe5=) 15 ćxe5 ćxg2

B1) 16 ćxg2 ćxc5 17 ćf4 ćd5+ 18 f3 (18 ćg1 ćfd8 19 ćf1 ćf6?) 18...ćfd8=;

B2) 16 ćd1 ćxc5 17 ćxc5 ćxc5 18 ćxg2 ćf8 19 ćf4 g5 (19...h6 20 h4 g5 21 hxg5 hxg5 22 ćxg5 ćxe5 23 ćf4 ćc2 24 ćd2 ćae8= 25 ćad1 ćxf2 26 ćf3 ćxd2 27 ćxd2
\[c5\ 28\ \text{\#xc7}\] 20 \[\text{\#xg5 \text{\#xe5}}\] 21 h4 \[\text{\#e2} 22 \text{\#d2 \text{\#ae8=;}}\]

9 b3 c5 10 \[\text{\#b2 d5=}.

9...c5 10 b3

10 e4 d5 11 e5 \[\text{\#e4} 12 \text{\#d1 \text{\#xd2}}\]

13 \[\text{\#x2c2 \text{\#xd4}} 14 \text{\#xd4 \text{\#c8}} 15 b3 \text{\#c7=} 16 \#b5 \text{\#b8} 17 \text{\#f4 dxc4} 18 \text{\#xb7 \text{\#xb7}} 19 bxc4 \text{\#c5=}

10...d5

14...\[\text{\#c7} 15 \text{\#c2 \text{\#b5!= (see diagram)}}\]

15 \[\text{\#e2 h6?!}\

15...\[\text{\#xd4} 16 \#d4 \text{\#xg2} 17 \text{\#xg2 \text{\#c8=}}.\

16 dxc5 \[\text{\#xc5} 17 \text{\#e5 \text{\#d6}}\

17...\[\text{\#c8} 18 b4±.\

18 \text{\#xf6 gxf6} 19 b4 \[\text{\#d7} 20 \#d4 \text{\#e5}

Artur's careful 9 a3 immediately deprived him of the possibility to fight for an opening advantage. Now it's dead even. Needless to say, I prefer BLACK...

11 \[\text{\#b2 dxc4}\

There was no rush about this. More in the spirit of the position was \[\text{\#c8},\] now or on the next move.

11...\[\text{\#c8} 12 \#fd1 dxc4 13 \#xc4\]

\[cxd4 14 \#xd4 \#xd4 15 \#d4 \text{\#g2} 16 \#g2 \text{\#c5} 17 \#ac1 \#fd8=.

12 \[\#xc4 \#c8?!

12...\[\#c8 13 \#ac1 cxd4 14 \#xd4 \#xc1 15 \#xc1 \#a8 16 b4 \#d8.

13 \[\#d3\

13 \[\#ac1 \#d5.

13...\[\#d8

13...\[cxd4 14 b4 \#c7 15 \#xd4 \#d8 16 \#ac1±.

14 \#fc1 \#b8

21 e3?!

As a consequence of the couple of inaccurate moves made by BLACK, White could gain some advantage by 21 \[\#xb7 \#xb7 22 f4! \#g4 (22...\#g6 23 \#xe6 \#h4 24 \#xh4 \#xe6 25 \#e3±) 23 \#c3 \#ac8 24 \#f3 \#xf3 25 \#xf3±.

21...\[\#c8 22 \#b3 \#xg2 23 \#xg2 \#b7+ 24 e4

24 \#g1 \#xc1+ 25 \#xc1 \#c8 26 \#xc8+ \#xc8.
24...\textit{f}8 25 \textit{w}e3 \textit{d}8 26 \textit{c}2f3 \textit{xf}3 27 \textit{x}f3=.

White is perhaps somewhat better, but it's rather symbolic.

$\frac{1}{2}$-$\frac{1}{2}$

Now let's see the above mentioned game in which a Hungarian (who else?) kills the Russian Bear:

\begin{verbatim}
A.Yusupov – P.Lukacs
EU Cup, Budapest 1982

1 d4 \textit{f}6 2 c4 e6 3 \textit{f}3 b6 4 g3 \textit{a}6 5 \textit{bd}2 \textit{b}7 6 \textit{g}2 \textit{e}7 7 0-0 0-0 8 \textit{w}c2 d5 9 b3 \textit{a}6! 10 \textit{b}2 c5 11 \textit{e}c1 dxc4
11...\textit{b}4 12 \textit{w}b1 dxc4 13 dxc5 cxb3 14 a3 \textit{c}6 15 \textit{xb}3=.

12 dxc5?
12 \textit{wc}4=.

12...cxb3 13 \textit{xb}3

13...\textit{b}4! 14 \textit{wc}4 a5! 15 a3 \textit{d}5 16 \textit{wb}5 \textit{a}2! 17 cxb6?
17 \textit{c}2 a4=.

17...\textit{xc}1=+
17...\textit{b}8=.

18 \textit{xc}1 \textit{b}8 19 \textit{d}4 \textit{d}7 20 \textit{xa}5 \textit{xb}6 21 \textit{c}6 \textit{xc}6 22 \textit{xc}6 \textit{d}5 23 \textit{wd}3 \textit{a}8 24 \textit{b}2 \textit{f}6 25 \textit{d}4 \textit{a}4=+

25...\textit{b}8! 26 \textit{wc}2 \textit{f}4 27 \textit{gxf}4 \textit{xd}4=+.

26 e3 \textit{e}7 27 \textit{c}1 \textit{f}5 28 \textit{wb}3 \textit{xd}4 29 \textit{xc}4 \textit{a}5 30 \textit{c}5

30 \textit{xf}6 gxf6 31 \textit{wc}3 \textit{xc}3 32 \textit{xc}3 \textit{b}8=.

30...\textit{e}8 31 \textit{b}7 \textit{e}7 32 \textit{b}4?? \textit{xb}4?? 33 axb4 \textit{wa}1?? 34 \textit{g}2 \textit{xb}7

0-1

Has the Canadian Bastard K.Spr. and his squad of fully professional Grandmasters run out of all their excellent ideas and variations? What a pity! It is sad anyhow, but when it happens at once with four people, one gets lost for words of surprise. (My name was not mentioned, of course, as the author of the idea. Nor do I know the names of the three GM replacements.) Later Yusupov still managed to win the match. – Naturally, that could have happened with me by Kevin’s side as well. – What else should I say? Apart from my disappointment in a fine man, I still have no regrets. I know I did my best to help someone I appreciated to achieve the respect he deserved in the chess world, and even in his motherland. He must have had a lot of devoted friends if he could afford losing me...
IM Dr Ervin Nagy:

Our Psyche in Chess

Introduction

Surely, in a philosophical mood, each of us has already thought about what chess actually is. It has been called a game, a kind of entertainment, a kind of sport, fight, struggle, science, art etc, and everybody can choose a category to his or her liking. Let us not delve into the exact meanings of these concepts now, as an awful lot has been written on them anyway. They are all true from a certain aspect.

Writings on the psychology of chess and chess-players usually aim at discovering a way to victory. The main endeavour of these studies is to model the competitors’ thinking, and (to a lesser extent) they also cover the utilisation of the opponent’s psychological weaknesses.

This ‘gamesmanship’ is all very nice, true and useful – but the picture is still far from being complete, as only one end is considered, namely, that the game must be won. However, it may well be the case that the invincible psychological force is not the urge to win the game, but some inner voice saying ‘You must play chess.’

Plenty of other questions arise here. First of all – why ‘must’ you play chess? (Or ‘To play Chess necesse est’ – as the ancient Vikings said... AA)

As far as I am concerned, I feel that chess involves a certain essential experience shared by all of us. We are all ‘possessed’ by this experience for life, and people become professional players or stay ‘on the sidelines’ as kibitzers due to differences in talent, other fields of interest, or by mere chance.

‘Gens una sumus!’ also carries the meaning that we have made an alliance to unveil a mystery (although we are not even sure about its existence). We are driven by the desire to experience ‘déjà vu’, to face something that makes us exclaim: ‘This is just what I meant, it could have just as well been discovered by me!’

We have this kind of experience after every move. ‘Why did he play this?’ – ‘Oh yes, that’s why!’ Of course we do not think it over like this, and this is the good part of it. We simply see the opponent’s move, and find an answer to it. If everything turns out well, the result is a coherent combination, strategic
plan, or manoeuvre. The psychological benefit (the above-mentioned experience) lies exactly in this ‘short-circuit’ state of mind between two moves.

Sounds pretty complicated, doesn’t it? It will perhaps become more understandable if we ponder (in Sigmund Freud’s footsteps) the reasons why we appreciate a good joke. It is because we ‘get the idea’, that is, we realise the connection between the introductory story and the punchline in no time. We do not need an explicit interpretation. Chess moves hit us like the punchlines of jokes. Those who need a lengthy explanation also learn what it is about in the end, but it spoils the fun – these people do not belong to our gens.

My assessment of Ervin’s work is by no means influenced by the fact that we are age-old friends, and used to play for the same youth club. If something is good, it’s good, whoever wrote it! It gains extra value because books on chess psychology are incredibly rare, despite the fact that we all have strong and organic contact with our own feeble and fallible self during the long hours of chess games. With this frail self, we attempt to defeat another human being (yes, a human being, not White or BLACK!). Emanuel Lasker should be quoted again and again (he was World Champion for 27 years after all): “A game of chess is played by living human beings, not by lifeless pieces.”

Budapest, February 22, 1992

András Adorján

BLACK or White?

‘Do you have White or BLACK tomorrow?’

‘Unfortunately, BLACK again!’

‘Why is it a problem?’

‘Can you play chess?’

‘I am a club player.’

‘Then it will be difficult for you to understand.’

‘Have a try! Maybe you can explain.’

‘It won’t be easy, because you, as an amateur, can’t appreciate what a big difference it makes at a higher level.’

‘Maybe, but I know one thing: you have a certain psychological advantage in most situations, which are difficult for you.’
‘Well, that makes me curious. What do you mean?’

‘I would like to hear your arguments for White first.’

‘OK, here is a list:

- White starts the game, he has an extra tempo, he determines the character of the position;

- White can choose an opening he is familiar with, and avoid the ones I usually play. For example, he can choose between e4 or d4 (or some other closed opening) at the very beginning;

- White can kill the tension of the game, if he wants, and it leads to an inevitable draw;

- if he wants to win, he can play aggressively, and, having an extra tempo, he always ‘gets there first’ in case of a mutual attack;

- and I could tell you a lot more – but I am sure you also know the statistics: White wins more games than BLACK.’

‘This is all very nice, but the game does not take place only on the 64 squares, 16 pieces to each ‘matador’. It is your mind making up plans, and the wooden armies only follow their commanders’ order!’

‘Oh yes, it’s Lasker. But it was easier to play chess in his time.’

‘I’m not so sure, but nevertheless there are numerous other factors supporting BLACK’s case.’

‘Tell me a few!’

‘There are the above-mentioned statistics, for one. They say that BLACK can also win, if not as often as White.’

‘You are speaking for me now.’

‘I did not say it was a serious argument; I just mentioned it as a well-known fact.’

‘OK, what else is there?’

‘Maybe White has an advantage on the board, but I dare say that all the other factors are in BLACK’s favour.’

‘BLACK is OK, huh?’

‘Something like that – but I really mean it.’

‘Then I would like to hear some sensible arguments!’

‘All right. Here is the disadvantage of the statistics, for one.’

‘What kind of disadvantage?’

‘Well, it’s the pressure coming from the expectations. If White is theoretically supposed to win, it is a failure for him not to win.’

‘You can’t be serious now!’

‘You bet, I am!’

‘But you are the only one to say this, Doc.’

‘I am not! I have already heard it from you that it is declared at team meetings at the Olympics and the European Championships. The slogan is: win your White games, draw with BLACK! – But it can be the same at individual tournaments, too. If someone plans in advance when to play for a win and when to be happy with a draw, he will most probably try to win against the relatively weak and with the White pieces.’

‘You have a point there. But he is not influenced by this during the game.’

‘That is not at all sure. The two players have to shoulder different amounts of responsibility.’
'If White doesn’t want to win, I can’t do anything as BLACK.’

‘But he usually does want to win! When is someone supposed to win, if not when he has White?’

‘And what if he still does not want to?’

‘Then it will be a draw in the worst case. But if there is no great difference between the skills of the two players – it is quite likely that White’s escalatory behaviour...’

‘Hey! What on earth does that mean?’

‘Sorry. We speak about escalatory behaviour in psychology (and elsewhere) if the elements of a behavioural chain seem to follow from each other, but the intention is not the same at the beginning and the end of the line.’

‘It’s not quite clear.’

‘OK, let me try to bring up some examples. Have you ever had a real row with someone?’

‘Of course I have! I’m married!’

‘Did you offend each other badly?’

‘Well, that happened, too.’

‘Did you hurt the other one’s feelings?’

‘Most probably I did.’

‘Deliberately?’

‘No.’

‘How did it happen then?’

‘We just kept speaking out our opinions, and finally it came out quite differently from what we wanted to say.’

‘That’s what I am talking about! In a fierce debate, everybody gets closer to an extremist point of view! The utterances of the debate follow from each other, but they are far from reflecting the original intention. The ultimate goal will be to win the debate, not to convince the opponent. In politics it can lead to, say, the bombing of civilian targets, like in Vietnam. It is the ‘He hit me first’ syndrome.’

‘But we are talking about chess now.’

‘That is also a sort of battle.’

‘Yes, so what?’

‘Escalatory behaviour is a kind of self-justification. In our case it appears in the following way: the intention behind our moves is still there, but it gets carried away from our original ideas, as well as from the inner nature of the position.’

‘I can’t really follow you.’

‘For example, I do not realise that the tide has turned’;

WHITE:

- the opponent has beaten off my attack, but I am still playing for a win, just because I have made attacking moves so far. I have sort of committed myself to attack, although I should already be defending myself (or best get off the game), rather than create further weaknesses in my position, relying on the ‘extra tempo’;

BLACK:

- I have been on the defensive so far, but now the opponent’s initiative is over, maybe I stand even better, but – under the influence of the period of pressure – I do not think of winning the game, and if he offers I will agree for a draw;

- in short, I forget that my original goal was to get the best result possible. The influence of the
previous moves has proved to be stronger than the objective consideration of the present position.'

'You mean that you can beat yourself like this?'

'This is putting it too simple! Losing your objectivity has certainly got something to do with it. Just think of the simple fact that makes a great big difference when exactly you offer a draw. You can save a game if you sense when 'the tide turns'. You make your offer when the opponent is to get an edge soon, but he is still influenced by the previous (worse) position, and he accepts the offer because he has not been able to 'switch over' to the new situation psychologically. It follows from the tension of the game that a certain part of the events can be in his 'blind spot'. Besides that, there is another factor.'

'Namely?'

'Sense of guilt!'

'Now this is just too much! You psychiatrists always come up with this kind of nonsense! First that 'escalatory behaviour', and now this 'sense of guilt'! I have not killed anyone, taken anyone's purse, or stepped on anyone's foot, I have not even wished anyone anything bad (well, maybe sometimes). Why should I have 'sense of guilt', just because I have White?'

'It is not because of that.'

'I have also read Freud! This must be something neurotic. You are not saying all chess-players are ill?!

'Not by any means! But we can approach a phenomenon of life using psychological concepts, even if it has nothing to do with being ill.'

'What do you mean?'

'Of course I am not saying that chess-players are ill in any way, all the more so as I consider myself to be one of them. What about declaring that neurosis is not an illness but a way of life? This may make the statistics about the high percentage of neurotic people understandable.'

'OK, why not.'

'I will go on if you listen to me. Let us use the concept of 'sense of guilt' in a little broader sense. It can not only mean that I have committed some 'crime', but also that I am not like I am supposed to be. In other words, I fail to fulfil the expectations.'

'What kinds of expectations do you exactly mean?'

'I mean it in the broadest sense possible. In our case the expectation to be satisfied is "you must win your White games", because White has so many(?) advantages on the board.'

'Whose expectation is it?'

'The expectation of the 'public'. Everyone knows about White's advantageous position, therefore everyone believes in it, too. White's psychological handicap lies in the following: he feels that 'people' know he has the upper hand at the moment when they take their seats. Therefore, it is his moral obligation to win the game, or he does not satisfy the expectations - that's what brings about his 'sense of guilt'.

'So White's handicap is that he is expected to win.'

'Not exactly. Probably nobody on earth cares about him, but he has that feeling.'
‘What makes him think like that?’
‘Most people think they are in the centre of attention, and everybody is concerned about them. Of course people in the limelight get more attention than others, but not as much more as they think.’

‘If the others don’t really care – of which I am not totally convinced –, where is the conflict?’

‘It’s inside. I mean inside the White player’s soul. For him everything he presupposes about the public mind is reality, and he wants to fulfil the expectations. If he fails to do so, he experiences ‘sense of guilt’. So you can trust him that he will venture to win the game.’

‘Why is it good for me?’
‘Because of his inner struggle! He wants to achieve something, fearing failure at the same time. It is like running in a sack.’

‘You are exaggerating.’
‘Of course I am. I just wanted to give you an idea of White’s tortures.’

‘There is something in what you are saying, but it is not completely true. Besides that, not everybody is ‘neurotic’.’

‘I meant all this just as remarks ‘aside’. But I have one more argument. Let me remind you what an enormous psychological burden it is when this imaginary expectation is openly declared, say, at the Olympics: draw in the BLACK games, win the White games!’

‘That’s true. I have already had enough of it... But tomorrow I am BLACK again, and my opponent is quite strong... A draw is all I want!’

‘You have not learnt a thing from what I said.’
‘Speculation is one thing, and sitting down to the chessboard is another business.’

‘You are right. These two are really different. And the more professional a player is, the less important the other factors are. However, these factors apply to even the greatest players to some extent. I don’t want to bring up examples here, you could probably tell me more.’

‘Well, a word of praise at last! Now I know why it is bad for White – but why is it good for me?’
‘You are Fortune’s darling.’
‘Come on! Don’t be silly!’
‘I am serious – well, almost serious. You will have an opponent who is under the pressure of an enormous responsibility, whereas you...’

‘What about me?’
‘For you it will be easy, at least with the off-board factors.’

‘In what sense?’
‘No burden will rest on your shoulders. Your opponent has all the responsibility! Everybody will know how hard it is for you, and they will sympathise with you.’

‘At least those who sympathise with me anyway.’
‘Great people have great enemies. You know – aquila non captat muscas! (Eagles do not catch flies.)’

‘Stop it, will you!’
‘OK Bill, let us stick to the technical part. All those malevolent people claim to know that it is more difficult to play with BLACK; it is only you who already knows it isn’t.'
Therefore they will be indulgent to you, and have nothing against you making a draw. Everybody is worried about his professional reputation, and in this case they represent the ‘public’.

‘So everybody will take the draw as an acceptable result.’

‘Sure, but maybe there is something more in it. Maybe he wants to beat you.’

‘And? That’s what I am afraid of.’

‘But your advantage lies exactly in this. You can play for a win without moral responsibility – and unobserved!’

‘What do you mean “unobserved”? ’

‘One must take risks in order to win, and that’s what your opponent will do. The psychological situation will be the following: you are a peaceful person, and the opponent wants to beat you. You are the attacked party, the one in an unfavourable position, and the people’s sympathy is yours. There is always something heroic about your struggle, even if you get carried away and do something you regret later. So you are the only one who can profit from this business. If you happen to lose the game...so what? It could be foretold by all odds. Any other result is unfavourable for your opponent.’

‘Yes, it sounds convincing, I really feel like ‘facing my destiny’.’

‘Now all you have to do is make it a bit more conscious, so that the opponent did not even realise that you intend to win.’

‘How?’

‘You must know it better than me, it is a purely professional task. For example, you can prepare for your opponent’s favourite ‘winning’ openings, and find something new in them. Let him believe that he is the one to play for a win, and let him ignore the fact that he has one more opponent.’

‘Who is that?’

‘The one I have talked about so far. He! Himself!’

Budapest, April 3, 1992

**IM Dr Ervin NAGY (1945) became a psychiatrist in 1979 and somewhat later a neurologist. He is working as a psychiatrist and as a justiciary mental specialist. His wife, WF Sarolta Nyárasdy is also an amateur chessplayer (by status!) and however hard to believe, all three of us met 40 years ago being members of the Great Béla Papp’s Chess School and Team. The Team (ASI), composed completely of teenagers, made the first league in 6(!!) years and kept the class. Ervin as most of us chose a ‘decent’ profession, but never left chess: he takes part usually in one or two serious tournament(s) a year even if he has to sacrifice his own holiday. And he plays in the Teams’ Championship. Here comes a fine game from the time when we were a bit younger – his opponent G.Sax became a GM the following year, proving that his scalp was a precious one.**

---

**G.Sax – E.Nagy**
Hungarian Championship, semifinal, 1973

1 e4 d6 2 d4 ∆f6 3 ∆c3 g6 4 ∆e2 ∆g7 5 h4
5...h5
5...c6 6 le3 (6 h5 xh5 7 xhx5 gxh5 8 xge2 h4!) 6...e5 7 d5 xbd4! 8 xexd4 exd4 9 wxd4 0-0-

6 f3 c6 7 xe3 wb6 8 wc1 xfd7 9 e5 wa5 10 exd6 exd6 11 wxd2 0-0 12 0-0-0 xfd6 13 xec4?
13 xf4.

13...b5 14 xbd3 xbd7 15 xbd7 xfc5! 17 a4
17 xexd6 c4 18 xf8 xf8+.
17...c4 18 xa2 b4 19 xb5

19...c3! 20 bxc3 wxa4 21 c4 d5 22 xbd3 wa5 23 xbd6 dxc4 24 xc4
24 xexb7 wb6+.
24...wa6 25 xe2 xb6 26 wd3 xfd5 27 g4? xfd8
27...hxg4++.
28 xd2 xac8
28...hxg4.

29 xexb6 wxd3 30 cxd3 xbd6 31 gxh5 xf3 32 xf7+! wh8 33 wh2 gxh5 34 xh1 xg4 35 xexb4

35...xd5
35...a4! 36 xd2 xbd8+ 37 xc1 xdc8+ 38 xc4 xbd2+. 36 xa5?!
36 xexd5 xbd8! (36...xexd5 37 xc5 xdc7++) 37 xc4 xexd8+ 38 xc2 a5+.
36...xb8+ 37 xa2 xd7 38 xexd5 xexd5 39 xc3 xd6+ 40 xb2 xa6+
41 xb1 xab6 42 xc3 xexd4 43 xc1 xf5 44 xd2 xexd3+! 45 xa1 xa6+ 46 xa2

46...xexb2+ 47 xc8+ wh7 48 xc7+ wh6 49 xexb2 xh7 50 xc8 xe5 51 xe8 xf6 52 xf8 xg7 53 xc8

There follows 53...xa4 54 xc7 xg8.
0-1
My Thesis in Practice

L. Vadasz – A. Adorján
Hungary 1978

1 ąf3 g6 2 e4 ąg7 3 d4 d6 4 c4 ąg4 5 ęe2 ęc6 6 ąbd2!?  
Not a very frequently seen move, but absolutely logical.  
6 ąc3 e5 7 d5 ąxf3 8 ąxf3 ęd4 9 ąa4+ (9 ąc3 ęe7 10 0-0 0-0 11 ęb5 c5 12 dxc6 ęexc6) 9...węd7 10 węxd7+ ąxd7 11 ąd1 f5±.

6...e5?!  
This is, however, too conventional. Once we have ‘shuffled the cards’ so hard, it is more advisable to go for the complications of 6...ąf6, e.g. 7 ęb3 (7 d5 ąb8 8 ęb3 ąbd7 9 ęxb7 ąc5 10 ęb4 ąfxe4 11 ąxe4 ąxe4) 7...ąb8 8 d5 ąa5 9 ęe3 c5 10 0-0 0-0 11 h3 ąxf3 12 ąfx3 ąd7 13 ąb1 a6 14 ąd2 b5 15 cxb5 axb5 16 b4 ąc4 17 ąxc4 bxc4±.  

7 d5 ące7  
7...ąxf3 8 ąxf3 ąd4 9 ąxd4 exd4 10 0-0 ąe7 11 ąb1 0-0 12 b4±.

8 węb3!  
8...b6  
A brilliant oversight! I was afraid of 8...węc8 9 c5, and I noticed the following tactical blow only after making my move. Luckily, I had a quarter of an hour to recover from the shock (while Vadasz was thinking), so I managed to work out how to sell it as a ‘sacrifice’ by the time the decisive-looking blow was actually dealt.

8...węc8 9 c5! dxc5 10 ąc4 ąxf3 11 ąxf3 a6 12 ęc3 b5 13 ąe3 c4 14 b3 cxb3 15 axb3±.  
9 ąxe5! ąxe2 10 ęa4+ b5  
10...ęf8 11 ąd7+ ęe8 12 ąxb6+ ęf8 13 ąxa8++.  
11 ęxb5+ ęf8 12 ąd7+ ęe8 13 ęf6+ ęf8 14 ąxg8  
People of a more advanced age, or with a slightly weaker nervous system, would probably have called it a day with a repetition, but Vadasz is made of tougher material. However, my next two moves were a big surprise for him.
14...\(\texttt{Qf5!}\)

No, it’s not a misprint! Indeed, it is a white knight on g8, while the f5 colleague just jumped there as a sacrifice-offer! If you see a bishop on e2 that’s BLACK, your eyes are working just fine.

15 \(\texttt{exf5}\) \(\texttt{Qb8}\)

16 \(\texttt{Wxb8}\)?

This move, made after half an hour’s thinking, is an obvious sign that he was losing the thread. Although White has rook + knight + two pawns for the queen, he will be unable to harmonise the working of his pieces. The crucial variation is 16 \(\texttt{Wa4}\) \(\texttt{Qd3}\) 17 \(\texttt{f6}\) \(\texttt{Qxg8}\) 18 \(\texttt{fxg7}\) \(\texttt{Qe7+}\) 19 \(\texttt{Qe4}\) \(\texttt{Qxe4+}\) 20 \(\texttt{Qe3}\) \(\texttt{Qxg7}\) 21 0-0-0 \(\texttt{Qxb2}\) 22 \(\texttt{Qxb2}\) \(\texttt{Wxe5+}\) 23 \(\texttt{Qa3}\) \(\texttt{Qb8}\) 24 \(\texttt{Wb3}\) \(\texttt{Qxb3+}\) 25 axb3 \(\texttt{Wc3}\) 26 \(\texttt{Qhe1}\) c5 27 \(\texttt{Qd2}\) (27 \(\texttt{dxc6}\) \(\texttt{Wa5+}\) 28 \(\texttt{Qb2}\) \(\texttt{Wc5}\) 28...\(\texttt{Wc2}\) 28 \(\texttt{Qa5}\) \(\texttt{Qxc4}\) 29 \(\texttt{bxc4}\) \(\texttt{Qxc4}\) 30 \(\texttt{Qc1}\) \(\texttt{Wxd5}\) 31 \(\texttt{Qc3+}\) \(\texttt{Qh6}\)\(\texttt{=}\)

If all this is true, the conventional sign may be true as well. It is obvious in any case that only White can play for a win here.

16...\(\texttt{Wxb8}\) 17 \(\texttt{Qxe2}\) \(\texttt{Qxg8}\) 18 \(\texttt{Qe1}\) \(\texttt{Qe7}\) 19 \(\texttt{fxg6}\) \(\texttt{hxg6}\) 20 \(\texttt{Qf1+}\) \(\texttt{Qd7}\) 21 \(\texttt{Qe4}\)

21 \(\texttt{Qb1}\) \(\texttt{Qe8}\) 22 \(\texttt{Qxe8}\) \(\texttt{Qxe8}\) 23 \(\texttt{b4}\) \(\texttt{Qe5}\) 24 \(\texttt{Qb2}\) \(\texttt{Wf4}\) 25 \(\texttt{Qxg7}\) \(\texttt{Wxd2}\) 26 \(\texttt{Qe1}\) \(\texttt{Wxb4+}\); 21 \(\texttt{Qe3}\) \(\texttt{Wb6}\)\(\texttt{+}\).

21...\(\texttt{Qe8}\)?

21...\(\texttt{Wb4}\)\(\texttt{+}\).

22 c5!?

No better and no worse than any ‘normal’ move. Since his queen sac, White has been lost. On top of that, he is also in time trouble, which I was able to ‘enjoy’ myself, although it wasn’t as bad as his. In an objectively lost position, playing for tricks and setting traps is really the only chance.

22 \(\texttt{Qb1}\) \(\texttt{Qf5}\)\(\texttt{+}\).

22...\(\texttt{Wb5+}\) 23 \(\texttt{Qg1}\) \(\texttt{dxc5}\)

23...\(\texttt{f5}\) 24 \(\texttt{c6+}\)\(\texttt{!}\).

24 \(\texttt{Qh6}\)? \(\texttt{Qd4+}\)

24...\(\texttt{Qxb2}\) 25 \(\texttt{Qab1}\) \(\texttt{f5}\) 26 \(\texttt{Qxc5+}\) \(\texttt{Qxc5}\) 27 \(\texttt{Qxe8}\) \(\texttt{Qxe8}\) 28 \(\texttt{Qxb2}\) \(\texttt{Wxd5}\) 29 \(\texttt{h3}\) c5\(\texttt{=}\); 24...\(\texttt{Qxb6}\)? 25 \(\texttt{Qf6}\)\(\texttt{+}\).
25 $\text{\textit{Ad1}}$ $\text{\textit{Wxb2}}$
25...f5? 26 $\text{\textit{Ad4!}}$.

26 $\text{\textit{Cc1}}$
26 $\text{\textit{Ad2? xe4!+}}$.

26...$\text{\textit{Wb6}}$ 27 d6!

He's got some tricks up his sleeve, hasn't he? But even this witty attempt to save the game doesn't work now.

27...$\text{\textit{Ce6}}$
27...cxd6?! 28 $\text{\textit{Ad4!}}$ $\text{\textit{xd4}}$ 29 $\text{\textit{f6+}}$ $\text{\textit{Cc6}}$ 30 $\text{\textit{xe8}}$ $\text{\textit{Wa5}}$ 31 $\text{\textit{f1}}$ $\text{\textit{Wb5+}}$! (31...d3!) 32 $\text{\textit{g1}}$ $\text{\textit{Wa5}}$;
27...f5? 28 $\text{\textit{f6+}}$! $\text{\textit{xh6}}$ 29 $\text{\textit{xc7+}}$ $\text{\textit{Cc7}}$ 30 $\text{\textit{xe8+}}$.

28 $\text{\textit{dxc7}}$ $\text{\textit{xe7}}$ 29 $\text{\textit{f4+}}$ $\text{\textit{Cc6}}$ 30 $\text{\textit{b2}}$ 31 $\text{\textit{g3}}$
31 $\text{\textit{dd2 xe4}}$.
31...$\text{\textit{Wxa2}}$
31...f5 32 $\text{\textit{h2}}$ a5 33 f3 a4 34 $\text{\textit{dx}}$ a2 $\text{\textit{Wb3}}$
35 $\text{\textit{Cc1 xe3}}$ 36 $\text{\textit{xc5}}$ $\text{\textit{xc5}}$

His flag fell in a lost position.

0-1

It's the last round of the Interzonal. I must win to have a chance to qualify for Candidates. But if Ribli holds Romanishin I'm still out!

A. Miles – A. Adorján
Riga Interzonal 1979

1 $\text{\textit{f3}}$ $\text{\textit{f6}}$ 2 c4 c5 3 g3
Surprise, surprise! Miles had always played 3 $\text{\textit{Cc3}}$ e6 4 c3 before. However, we also thought that he might throw in some new 'wonder weapon'. Both ourselves and the 'Hedgehog' were much younger in those days, and there were several tries to refute it as it is. Then people realised there was no such thing as a refutation! I and my second IM János Tompa thought that if his 'bomb' was defused, he would have to play a position he was only superficially familiar with.

3...b6 4 $\text{\textit{g2}}$ $\text{\textit{b7}}$ 5 0-0 e6 6 $\text{\textit{Cc3}}$
$\text{\textit{e7}}$ 7 d4 $\text{\textit{xd4}}$ 8 $\text{\textit{Wxd4}}$ d6 9 b3 0-0 10 $\text{\textit{a3}}$

Here we go! However, Tompa knew this try as well, and the following reply is his recommendation. Naturally, blows were exchanged between the two sides for several years after this. Then, as usual, they found some other bone to pick.

10...$\text{\textit{xa6}}$! 11 $\text{\textit{xd1}}$ $\text{\textit{Cc5}}$ 12 $\text{\textit{ac1}}$?

The first sign of indecision. The rook has nothing to do here. On top of that, he may have problems with
the a2 pawn in case of a typical a6-b5. People tried all kinds of things later: b4 immediately, or after \( \mathcal{d}b5 \). The ‘remorseful’ 12 \( \mathcal{d}b2 \) was not bad, either. However, it’s difficult to admit that you were wrong...

12...a6 13 b4 \( \mathcal{d}c7 \)

13...\( \mathcal{d}c4 \) 14 \( \mathcal{d}x e4 \) \( \mathcal{d}x e4 \) 15 \( \mathcal{w}e3 \) \( \mathcal{c}8 \) 16 \( \mathcal{b}2 \) \( \mathcal{b}7 \) 17 a3 \( \mathcal{c}7 \).

14 \( \mathcal{b}2 \) \( \mathcal{b}8 \)!

That’s the way! Once White has committed himself, there is no need to waste time on the usual lengthy manoeuvres (\( \mathcal{c}8 \), \( \mathcal{c}7 \), \( \mathcal{a}c(d)8 \), \( \mathcal{w}b8 \)). It’s time to take action!

15 \( \mathcal{d}d2 \)

15 \( \mathcal{d}e1 \) \( \mathcal{c}8 \) (15...\( \mathcal{x}g2 \) 16 \( \mathcal{x}g2 \) \( \mathcal{c}8 \) 17 \( \mathcal{d}e3 \) b5 18 cxb5 axb5 19 \( \mathcal{w}d3 \) \( \mathcal{d}e5 \) 20 \( \mathcal{w}x b5 \) \( \mathcal{w}a7 \) 21 \( \mathcal{w}a5 \) \( \mathcal{x}a5 \) 22 bxax5 \( \mathcal{c}b8 \) 23 \( \mathcal{d}a3 \) \( \mathcal{e}8 \) 24 \( \mathcal{d}d3 \) \( \mathcal{a}c7 \) 25 \( \mathcal{d}d4 \) \( \mathcal{d}d8 \) 26 \( \mathcal{a}h1 \) \( \mathcal{d}c7 \).

16 \( \mathcal{d}e4 \) \( \mathcal{d}e8 \) 17 \( \mathcal{w}e3 \) \( \mathcal{c}6 \).

15...\( \mathcal{x}g2 \) 16 \( \mathcal{x}g2 \) \( \mathcal{c}8 \)

17 \( \mathcal{f}3 \)!

Of course, it is quite bothersome that your king is exposed to intermediate checks. However, this move weakens the king’s position, and this factor will prove to be decisive later. It reminds me of my game against Korchnoi (Cannes 1986) in the same opening. In that encounter, the breakthrough on the queenside shook the kingside as well, after the exchange of the light-squared bishops and the moves f3-e4. This is a rather complex version of the ‘spread of weaknesses’, one of Grandmaster Barcza’s favourite theorems.

17 \( \mathcal{d}d4 \) \( \mathcal{w}b7 \) 18 \( \mathcal{g}1 \) \( \mathcal{e}5 \) 19 \( \mathcal{d}x f6+ \) \( \mathcal{x}f6 \) 20 \( \mathcal{w}e4 \) \( \mathcal{c}7 \).

17 \( \mathcal{d}d4 \) \( \mathcal{a}7 \) (17...b5!? 18 c5 dx5 19 bxc5 \( \mathcal{w}a7 \) 20 c6 \( \mathcal{d}b6 \) 21 \( \mathcal{w}e5 \) \( \mathcal{c}7 \) 22 \( \mathcal{d}d4 \) \( \mathcal{d}d8 \) 18 a4 \( \mathcal{d}e8 \) 19 \( \mathcal{w}e3 \) \( \mathcal{a}c7 \).

17...b5! 18 cxb5

18 a3 \( \mathcal{d}e5 \) 19 cxb5 axb5 20 e4 \( \mathcal{d}d8 \) 21 \( \mathcal{w}e3 \) \( \mathcal{b}6 \) 22 \( \mathcal{w}e2 \) \( \mathcal{d}d4 \) 23 \( \mathcal{d}d5 \) exd5 24 \( \mathcal{w}c8+ \) \( \mathcal{x}c8 \) 25 \( \mathcal{x}d4 \) \( \mathcal{c}2 \) 26 \( \mathcal{h}1 \) h6 27 exd5 \( \mathcal{x}a3 \).

18...axb5 19 \( \mathcal{w}d3 \) \( \mathcal{d}e5 \) 20 \( \mathcal{w}x b5 \)

20...\( \mathcal{w}a7 \)!

I was playing this game in a sort of ‘trance’. I felt as if the pieces were heading for the right squares by themselves, and I was just helping them physically. To get the pawn back, with an endgame advantage? Yes, it was possible, but it didn’t even cross my mind. Let’s see what a a cool-headed analysis and Fritz 7 has to say about it a little while later (24 years to be precise)? Maybe 20...\( \mathcal{d}d5 \), recommended by ‘him’ and analysed in a joint effort, was the ‘real thing’.
20...Qd5! 21 Wxb8 (21 Qh3 Qe3) 21...Qe3+ 22 Wh3 (22 Qf2 Qxd1+ 23 Qxd1 Wxb8=) 22...Waxb8 23 a3 (23 Qg1 Wxb4 24 Qa3 Qbb8=) 23...f5! (23...Qxd1 24 Qxd1 f5=) 24 Qe1 Qg5! 25 Qd1 Qxd1 26 Qexd1 Qf2+ 27 Qg2 Qxd1 28 Qxd1 Qc2+;

20...Wxb5 21 Qxb5 Qcb8 22 Qxe5 dxe5 23 Qc3 Qxb4 24 Qdb1 Qc5 25 Qe4 Qxe4 26 fxe4 Qd4 27 Qc2 g6=.

21 e4

21 Wa5 We3 22 Qf1 Wg5 23 Qb1 We8=.

---

21...We3!!!

I thought it was over. The vicinity of his king is blackened by storm-clouds, and I felt that my next move, devised long before, would be decisive. It was only at the final checkup of game, analysed frequently by lots of different people, that Fritz 7 ‘spat out’ a move which holds the position. Had I known this, I would have certainly collected the b4 pawn and taken my time to collect the point as well. I am still satisfied with the result, and let me quote the late Misha Tal, a loveable man as well as a genius: ‘My sacrifices are usually refuted. Perhaps in 2 years, or in 2 months, sometimes even in 2 days. But I win the game!’

22 Wf1

22 Qc2 Wd3 (22...g5!??) 23 Wxd3 Qxd3 24 Qdb1 Qxb4 25 Qcd2 d5.

22...g5!?
A1) 26...\(\text{d}8\) 27 \(\text{c}b3\) \(\text{w}a7\) 28 \(\text{a}a1\) \(\text{b}4\) 29 \(\text{f}xg4\) \(\text{x}g4\) 30 \(\text{w}e2\) \(\text{e}3+\) 31 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{x}d2\) 32 \(\text{c}xg4\) \(\text{d}4\) 33 \(\text{e}e1\) \(\text{x}d2\) 34 \(\text{x}e3\) \(\text{w}e3\) 35 \(\text{b}a2\) \(\text{c}b3\) 36 \(\text{e}2\) 37 \(\text{x}e3\) \(\text{x}e3\) 38 \(\text{e}2\) 39 \(\text{b}a4\) 40 \(\text{g}4\);  
A2) 26...\(\text{a}b4\) 27 \(\text{d}c4\) \(\text{w}c3\) 28 \(\text{f}xg4\) \(\text{w}c2\) 29 \(\text{w}e2\) \(\text{x}a2\) 30 \(\text{f}f1\) 31 \(\text{w}d3\) \(\text{c}e2\) 32 \(\text{w}c3\) \(\text{b}c3\) 33 \(\text{d}e3\) \(\text{b}c5\) 34 \(\text{d}d3\) \(\text{e}x3\) 35 \(\text{x}g4\) 36 \(\text{w}d2\) \(\text{b}3\) 37 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{h}6\) 38 \(\text{f}e3\) \(\text{b}5\) 39 \(\text{x}e3\) 40 \(\text{x}e3\) 41 \(\text{w}e1\) 42 \(\text{d}d4\) 43 \(\text{x}e5\) 44 \(\text{h}3\) 45 \(\text{e}3\) 46 \(\text{d}6=\); 23 \(\text{h}5!\) 24 \(\text{e}2\) 25 \(\text{d}xe5\) 26 \(\text{x}e4\) \(\text{g}x3\) 27 \(\text{w}x3\) \(\text{x}e4\) 28 \(\text{w}x4\) \(\text{x}e4\) 29 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{g}5\) 30 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{d}d2!\) 31 \(\text{d}c7\) 32 \(\text{d}c4\) \(\text{c}7=\) 33 \(\text{x}d2\) \(\text{x}d2\) 34 \(\text{d}d3\) \(\text{c}2\) 35 \(\text{f}2\) 36 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{f}3\) 37 \(\text{d}5\);  
B) 23...\(\text{g}4\) 24 \(\text{x}e5\) \(\text{d}xe5\)

\[
\text{24...\text{x}c2! 25 \text{c}c3 \text{c}xb2 26 \text{w}e2 \text{g}4! 27 \text{f}4}
\]

27 \(\text{x}g4\) \(\text{x}f4\) 28 \(\text{x}g4\) \(\text{g}5+\).

27...\(\text{x}e4\) 28 \(\text{d}f1\) \(\text{d}d2!??\)

\(\text{c}3!\) would have won the whole board, but the move in the game also checkmates in a few moves.

29 \(\text{x}d2\) \(\text{x}d2\) 30 \(\text{f}3\) 31 \(\text{f}6\)

and White surrendered, congratulating me standing up from his chair! Yes, it is possible to lose a game in a dignified way like this. In addition Romanishin crushed Ribli. A tie! A dramatic match, victorious in three weeks...

0-1
Z.Ribli – A. Adorján
Budapest playoff 1979

In the Riga Interzonal (1979) I shared 3rd-4th place with my opponent. We then had to play a 6-game qualification match for a place among the World Championship Candidates. For such a short encounter, we produced a real drama, which started off for me as a tragedy. At halftime, he led 2½-½, and it seemed that only some miracle can help me (in case of a draw, my better Berger-Sonneborn of Riga would decide, but at that time nobody thought it had any importance anymore). Then, in this seemingly hopeless situation, I beat him in 22 moves in game 4. Then followed the one below (game 5). Now, watch this!

1 c4 g6 2 d4 ♜f6 3 ♜f3 ♗g7 4 g3 0-0 5 ♘g2 d6 6 0-0 ♜c6 7 ♘c3 a6
Ribli, Sax and myself analysed and played this variation a lot, and so did Vadász, who joined us later.

8 b3 ♜b8 9 ♜b2 b5 10 cxb5 axb5 11 ♘c1 b4 12 ♜b1
12 ♜a4 ♜a7.

12...♛a7!

This was a new move back then (not mine). The BLACK knight stands much better here than on a5.

12...♛b7 13 ♜f2d ♦d7 14 ♦c2 d5 15 a4 ♦xa3 16 ♦xa3 ♦fc8++. 13 ♜bd2?!

Yes, I gave this move the conventional symbol of disapproval (?!). The truth is, however, that I don’t know where White made a serious error after this. What happened up to this point, on the other hand, is called ‘Theory’.

13 ♜e1 c6! 14 ♦d2 (14 ♦xc6 ♦xc6 15 ♦xc6 ♦a5++) 14...♗b6 15 ♜d3 ♘a6 (15...♗f5) 16 ♦fd1 ♦fc8++. 13...c6 14 ♜e1
14 e4 ♦d7 15 ♦c2 ♘b5++. 14...♗d5! 15 ♜c4
15 e4 ♘c3 16 ♘xc3 bxc3 17 ♘df3 ♘a6 18 ♘xc3 ♘xf1 19 ♘xf1 c5++. 15...♗b5 16 ♦d2 ♘dc3+++ 17 e3
17 ♘c2 c5 18 dxc5 dxc5 19 ♦e3 ♘b7++. 17...♕xa2 18 ♘a1 ♘bc3 19 ♘xc3 ♘xc3 20 ♘a5

White hoped to get some relief by this move, but at this point I wanted
to win, and win in style! That’s why I was considering even the queen sac, and didn’t hesitate to actually sacrifice the exchange.

20...c5!

20...a6?! 21 axc6 axa1 22 axd8 a2 23 c2 axd8 24 a1 b2 25 f1 e6 26 c1 xb3 27 axb4 c8 28 d3 e2+ 29 xe2 xc1+ 30 xc1=

20...d7. Perhaps you believe me that I also saw this move, and was aware of the fact that it yields BLACK an edge. However, I usually left moves like that to ‘chess pros’. I have always been enthralled by the artistic side of chess, and wanted to win brilliantly instead of just collecting the point, even if it seemed irrational. Well others have nasty habits as well, don’t they? Some people smoke, for one! 21 axc6 (21 axc6 h3 22 g2 axg2 23 xg2 c7=) 21...xc6 22 axc6 d5! 23 d3 b6

A) 24 xb4 e4 25 we1 wd6 26 a4 (26 xd5 f6) 26...xc6=;

B) 24 a4 24...wd6=.

21 c6 w7 22 xb8 wb8 23 a8 wb6 24 c2 e6 25 xf8+ xf8 26 a1 f6 27 dxc5?

A co-operative move. As if White wasn’t in quite enough trouble anyway...

27 d5 d7 28 e4 g7 29 we3 e6=;

27 e4 g7=.

27...dxc5 28 e4

28 a8+ g7 29 a1 wd6 30 wc2 f5 31 c4 g4+=.

28...g7 29 xe1 wd6= 30 we3

30 wxe6 exd6 31 a1 d5 32 f1 c3 33 d1 d4= 34 c4 g4.

30...xb3 31 e5 xe5 32 a1 d4 33 we7

33...we7=

It nearly broke my heart that I rejected a spectacular finish here (quite a schizoid decision, actually)! I know it sounds rather funny, but I feared that he might escape in the endgame somehow!

33...xf2+! 34 xf2 d1+ 35 xd1 (35 g1 wd4+) 35...we7 36 xb3 c4=.

34 xe7 e6 35 c2 b3 36 a3

36 xd4 cxd4 37 b7 d3=.

36...d1 37 f1 xf2 38 e2 g4 39 b7 xh2 40 d3 g4 41 b5 e5

And White surrendered. It’s really not too much fun to be the exchange ‘up’ against five pawns...

0-1

My opponent took both of his days off before the last, 6th game. Someone like him who used to lose two games a year understandably collapsed after doing it in two days. Strange as it may sound, I needed a rest too. I had to cope with the situation, even if it had changed radically in my favour. It agitated me nonetheless, and in a short time I had to work out completely
different tactics for the finish. It is not necessarily easier to make a
draw than to win: if you are timid,
or search for the drawing moves
instead of the best ones, you can
easily go astray. So I did something
sober for a change: I played
actively, and when all he had was
two minutes on the clock plus a lost
position, I accepted his draw offer
and qualified.

Improving on Fischer!

The following game, played at the
‘Young Masters’ International
Tournament’, is one of those I’m
proud of: although it did not
become very well-known, it still
enriched opening theory. 12 \textit{We}1
became ‘invisible’ in tournament
practice pretty soon after this game.

H.Schelchel – A.Adorján
Hungary 1971

1 d4 \textit{f}6 2 c4 g6 3 \textit{c}3 d5 4
cxd5 \textit{c}xd5 5 e4 \textit{c}xe3 6 bxc3 \textit{g}7
7 \textit{c}4 c5 8 \textit{e}2 \textit{c}6 9 \textit{e}3 0-0 10
0-0 \textit{c}7 11 \textit{c}1 \textit{d}8 12 \textit{e}1 e6 13
f4 \textit{a}5 14 \textit{d}3 f5 15 h3 b6 16 g4
\textit{b}7!N

That’s it! Attacking players often
forget the fact that there are TWO
kings on the board. White’s
‘bayonet’ pawn storm has created
fine targets for BLACK’s counter-
attack.

16...fxe 17 \textit{x}e 4 \textit{b}7 18 \textit{g}3
\textit{c}4 19 \textit{x}b7 \textit{x}b7 didn’t look
bad, but Bobby lost later on. The
defender is always in a more
difficult situation. Spassky-Fischer,
Siegen Olympiad 1970.

17 \textit{g}3

White quite rightly tries to keep
his position together somehow. If he
allows the long diagonal to open up,
the attacker will himself be hunted.
OK, it’s a bit more complicated than
that. See all those longish variations,
but as the principles of chess are on
BLACK’s side, the concrete
variations, however difficult, are
there to be found.

17 ex f 5 ex f 5 18 gxf 5

A) 18...gxf 5

A1) 19 \textit{g}3 \textit{c}6 20 \textit{f}2 \textit{d}5
(20...\textit{e}8!?) 21 \textit{f}e 1 \textit{x}e 3 22 \textit{x}e 3
cxd 4 23 \textit{e}7 dxc 3 24 \textit{h}2 \textit{d}4 25
\textit{e}2 \textit{d}6 26 \textit{f}1+ ) 21 \textit{e}2 (21
\textit{h}2 \textit{e}8 22 \textit{g}1±) 21...\textit{e}8 22
\textit{f}3 \textit{c}4 23 \textit{c}e 1 \textit{x}e 3 24 \textit{xe} 3
\textit{xe} 3 25 \textit{xe} 3 cxd 4 26 cxd 4 (26
\textit{d}3 dxc 3 27 \textit{x}d 5+ \textit{x}d 5 28
\textit{x}d 5+ \textit{x}d 5 29 \textit{x}f 5 \textit{f} 6 30 a 3
\[ \text{e6 31 } \text{h6+ g7 32 } \text{g4 d4+ 33 g2 c2=} 26...\text{xd4 27 } \text{xd4} \\
\text{xd4 28 } \text{xc6 xc6 29 } \text{xf5 e4=} \]

\[ \text{A2) } 19 \text{g3 f7 (19...e4 20 } \text{xe4 fxe4 21 } \text{dxe5 xc4 22 } \text{d4} \\
\text{xc5 23 } \text{g7 } \text{e6+ f6 25 } \text{xc5 bx5 26 } \text{xc5 d3=} 19...\text{e8=}?) 20 \text{h2 c4;} \]

\[ \text{B) } 18...\text{e8=}! 19 \text{g3 (19 } \text{g3} \\
\text{cxd4 20 } \text{xd4 d7 21 } \text{d} 22 \text{f2 } \text{d4 23 e2 e3 24 } \text{e3} \\
\text{c6=} 19...\text{xf5 } 20 \text{ce1 e7=} \]

\[ 17...\text{d7 18 } \text{d1=}! \]

But this backfires. The outcome of 18 gxf5 is fairly ugly, but still the lesser evil.

\[ 18 \text{gxf5 exf5 19 e5 } \text{e6 20 } \text{f2} \\
\text{ac8=} \]

\[ 18...\text{cxd4 19 } \text{b1} \]

\[ 19 \text{cxd4 fxg4 20 hgx4 } \text{d4=} \]

\[ 19...\text{c4=} \]

Funny! For 32 years I was so satisfied with this jump — that certainly does the job — that I never searched for anything else. Still, here is the alternative (see below)! Maybe it is even better. But the move I made wins. And nobody gives you more than one point just because you crushed your opponent even more cruelly.

\[ \text{ 19... } \text{a6! 20 } \text{f3 (20 } \text{d3} \\
\text{dxe3 21 } \text{xa6 } \text{xd1 22 } \text{xd1} \\
\text{xd1 23 } \text{xd1 e5) 20 } \text{c4 21} \\
\text{d4 fxg4 22 hxg4 e5 23 fxe5} \\
\text{f4=+} \]

\[ 20 \text{xd4} \]

\[ 20 \text{f2 } \text{a3=} (20...\text{fg4 } 21 \text{hg4} \\
\text{e5) } 20...\text{e5! } 21 \text{fxe5} \\
\text{21 } \text{xe5 } \text{xd1 } 22 \text{xd1 } \text{d1 23} \\
\text{xd1 } \text{dxe5 } 24 \text{fxe5 } \text{xe5=} \]

\[ 21...\text{fxg4 } 22 \text{e2 } \text{c7 23 } \text{e5} \]

Look at that! The centre, which was the pride of White’s army just a few moves ago, is in ruins. In addition, the surviving white pawns are scattered and weak. The rest takes only a little accuracy.

\[ 24 \text{g5 h6 25 } \text{e3 } \text{f8 26 } \text{g2} \\
\text{a6 27 } \text{f8+ } \text{f8 28 } \text{e5=}? \]

\[ \text{wxe5 } 29 \text{c2 } \text{c4=} 30 \text{b3 } \text{xb3} \\
\text{31 axb3 } \text{xc3 } 32 \text{xc3 } \text{c3 } 33 \\
\text{xd7 f7} \]

\[ 0-1 \]

Now a game from the 3rd Hungarian Super Championship, where I came in second. This result brought me the title ‘Player of the Year 1991’. I got this title for the first time in my life.
I. Farago – A. Adorján
Hungarian Super Championship 1991

1 d4 $f6$ 2 c4 g6 3 $c3$ d5 4 $cxd5$

Surprise! Ivan almost always plays one of the $f4$ lines against the Grunfeld. To cut a long story short, he likes to see his queen’s bishop on $f4$. There were even wicked rumours that some hazardous guy played 1 d4 g5 once upon a time, and Farago replied 2 $f4$ without looking up. (I can’t guarantee that the story is true, but I must confess that I used to blunder mate in one myself now and then when I was a child…)

4…$\text{cxd5}$ 5 e4 $\text{xc3}$ 6 $\text{bxc3} \text{ g7}$
7 $\text{c4} \text{ c5}$ 8 $\text{e2} \text{ c6}$ 9 $\text{e3} 0-0 10$
0-0 $\text{c7} 11 \text{c1} \text{d8} 12 \text{d2} \text{a6}$

13 a4? N

Not a very fortunate move. He tries to hinder BLACK’s queenside play, but the effect is exactly the opposite.

13 f4 $\text{a5}$ 14 $\text{d3} \text{ f5}$ 15 exf5
$\text{xf5} 16 \text{xf5} \text{gxh5} 17 \text{c2} \text{e6} 18$
$\text{dxc5} \text{ f8} 19 \text{d4} \text{ xe5}=$;

13 $\text{h6} \text{ h8} (13...b5) 14 \text{e3} \text{ b5}$
15 $\text{b3} \text{ b7} 16 \text{f4} \text{ a5}$. That’s where we agreed a draw with Lukács at the ‘Chinese-Hungarian’

double-round GM tournament in Budapest, 1992. Objectively speaking, the decision was justified.
But the late grandmaster Barcza would have been also right to ask: ‘How could you bring yourself to?’
To call it a day so soon, that is. 17 $\text{f5} \text{xb3} 18 \text{xb3} \text{d4} 19 \text{d4}$
$\text{b6} 20 \text{d5} (20 \text{fxg6} \text{xg6} 21 \text{e7} \text{d7} 22 \text{f2} \text{e6} 23 \text{e5})$.

13...$\text{a7} 14 \text{a2} \text{e8}$

15 $\text{a3}$?

This is a serious mistake. The whole game can be blamed on it, although there is still some excitement left until the logical outcome. The variation recommended instead would have been quite difficult to calculate: 15 $\text{fd1} \text{ b5} 16$
$\text{b3} \text{ c4} 17 \text{c2} \text{ e5} 18 \text{d5} \text{ a5} 19$
$\text{a1} \text{ b3} 20 \text{xb3} \text{ cxb3} 21 \text{xb3} \text{bx4}$.

15...b5! 16 $\text{a2} \text{ b4} 17 \text{cxb4}$

17 $\text{b3} \text{ bxc3} 18 \text{xc3} (18 \text{ d5}$
$\text{d4}++) 18...\text{xd4} 19 \text{xd4} (19$
$\text{xd4} \text{d6}++) 19...\text{xd4} 20 \text{xd4}$
$\text{d6} 21 \text{xf7}+! \text{h8}! (21...\text{xf7}+$
$22 \text{c4}+ \text{e6}$) 22 $\text{xe8} (22$
e5?? \text{xd4} 23 \text{exd6} \text{e2}+ 24 \text{h1}$
$\text{xc3} 25 \text{xe8} \text{xe8} 26 \text{fe1} \text{f6}$
27 a5 $\text{g7} 28 \text{dxe7} \text{f7}$;

22...$\text{xd4} \text{ e8}$;

17...$\text{xd4} 18 \text{d2} \text{ d6} 19 \text{c5}$
19 $\text{f4} \text{ h6}! 20 \text{g3} \text{e5}++;
19...a5!!

White is done for! He has been outplayed both in the centre and on the queenside. From this moment on, BLACK can be choosy as he will have several good continuations all the time. Not that it always makes things easier! Contrary to popular belief, 'only' moves are not so difficult to find, as the only alternative is ... reaching out your hand!

20 A d5

20 bxa5 d3 21 g4 A d4++
(21...A d4 22 f1 A c2++).

20...Axb4

20...Axb4 21 Axa5 A d5 22 w6 exd6 23 Axa8 Axa8 24 exd5 A a4++.

21 w1 A a6 22 A f4

22 A e5 23 g5 A b8 24 c4 A a5

24...A a4!! 25 d5 (25 b5 b1+-) 25...w7 26 A b5 A a3 27 c5 A a5! (27...c3?! 28 Axc3 bx3++) 28 Axc6 w b7++.

25 b5 A a7 26 A d4!! w xd4

26...Axb5 27 Axb5 w8++
(27...Axb5? 28 axb5 Axb5 29 Axb5 A xb5 30 A d1 A c5 31 A d8+ w b8 32 Axc5 Axc5 33 A h6+-).

27 A e3

27...Axb5!!

This is very nice indeed! Even good. It's not really a sac, actually, as three pieces and a pawn are worth more than a queen in this position.

27...wxc5 28 A e8 A c5 29 wxc5 A c5 30 wxa7 A a8 (30...b3? 31 w6 w3 32 A a5 A a8 33 A a6 wxa6 34 w b3++) 31 w d7 b3++.

28 A x d4 A x d4 29 w c4

29 Axa5 A e2++.

29 A a4?!

BLACK can afford even this annoying mistake, giving away the proud passed pawn by taking its doomed white counterpart too hastily.

29 A a8! 30 A b1 b3 31 A a5 A b5 32 A d5 A xa5++.
30 \( \text{Kc8} \text{Kaa8} \) 31 \( \text{Kxb8} \text{Kxb8} \) 32 \( \text{wc7} \text{Ka8} \)

32...\( \text{Qc6} \) 33 \( \text{C1} \) \( \text{Ka8} \) (33...\( \text{Kd8} \) 34 \( \text{Cf1} \) \( \text{b3} \) 35 \( \text{Kxc6} \) \( \text{b2} \) 36 \( \text{Kb6} \) \( \text{Kd1+} \) 37 \( \text{Ke2} \) \( \text{b1=wc} \) 38 \( \text{Kxb1} \) \( \text{Kxb1} \) 39 \( \text{wc8} \) \( \text{Kf8} \) 40 \( \text{wc5=} \) 34 \( \text{wb7} \) \( \text{Kd8} \) 35 \( \text{Cf1} \) \( \text{Kd6} \) 36 \( \text{wc8} \) \( \text{Kf8} \) 37 \( \text{wc7} \) \( \text{Kc6} \) 38 \( \text{Kb1} \) \( \text{Kf6} \) 39 \( \text{Kb2} \) \( \text{Kc7}+) 

33 \( \text{wb7} \) \( \text{Kc6} \) 34 \( \text{wb4} \) \( \text{Kxe4} \) 35 \( \text{wc4} \) \( \text{h5} \) 36 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{Kf5} \) 37 \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{Kxe5} \) 38 \( \text{wd5} \) \( \text{Kc8} \) 39 \( \text{Ke1} \)

39...\( \text{Qc6}! \)

I'm not sure if BLACK can win after 39...\( \text{Kh2}+ \). This pretty knight move, however, makes the rest of the game a mere formality.

39...\( \text{Kh2}+ \) 40 \( \text{Kxh2} \) \( \text{Kxe1} \) 41 \( \text{Wxd4} \) \( \text{Ke2} \) 42 \( \text{Kd1} \) (42 \( \text{Kg3} ? \) \( \text{Ke4} \) 43 \( \text{Kf4} \) \( \text{Kxg2} \) 44 \( \text{Kg5} \) \( \text{Ke7} \) 45 \( \text{Kf6} \) \( \text{Ke4} \) 46 \( \text{Kd2} \) \( \text{Kb3} \) 47 \( \text{Kxf7} \) \( \text{Ke5} \) 48 \( \text{Wh2} \) \( \text{Kf5}++) \) 42...\( \text{Kc2} \) 43 \( \text{Kd5} \) \( \text{Ke6} \) 44 \( \text{Kd8}+ \) \( \text{Kh7} \) 45 \( \text{Kg3}+ \).

40 \( \text{Kh1} \)

40 \( \text{Wxc6} \) \( \text{Kd4}+ \) 41 \( \text{Kf1} \) \( \text{Kd3}++ \).

40...\( \text{Ke6}+ \) 41 \( \text{Kd7} \) \( \text{Kg7} \) 42 \( \text{Kd5} \) \( \text{Kb4} \) 43 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Kc2} \) 44 \( \text{Kf1} \) \( \text{Kf6} \) 45 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{Ke4} \) 46 \( \text{Wf4} \) \( \text{Ke3}+ \) 47 \( \text{Kf2} \) \( \text{Ke6} \) 48 \( \text{Wc7} \)

48 \( \text{Kg1} \) \( \text{Kf5} \) 49 \( \text{Kd2} \) \( \text{Ke1+} \) 50 \( \text{Kf2} \) \( \text{Ke4} \) 51 \( \text{Wc7} \) \( \text{Kh4}++ \).

48...\( \text{Kxg2} \) 49 \( \text{Kxg2} \) \( \text{Ke1+} \) 50 \( \text{Kh2} \) \( \text{Ke5}+ \)

And White resigned. 0-1

You can win
by a ‘losing’ variation

There are not too many bad openings or defences really, except for the obviously silly ‘Killer Grob’ (1 \( g4 \), after which White is immediately much worse) and the like. A player’s choice from normal, healthy beginnings depends very much on his or her style and taste. There are always novelties, improvements, even ‘refutations’, but since chess is played from two sides, both do their homework. So you can win by a ‘losing’ variation. This is what happened in the following game, in which my opponent (and a very good friend) followed a line in which I had lost a game a year before...

L.Győrkös – A.Adorján
Hungarian Team Championship
1992

1 \( d4 \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 2 \( c4 \) \( g6 \) 3 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( d5 \) 4 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 5 \( e4 \) \( \text{Qxc3} \) 6 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 7 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( e5 \) 8 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 9 \( \text{Qe3} \) 0-0 10 0-0 \( \text{Qc7} \) 11 \( \text{Kb1} \)

A little unusual. 11 \( \text{Kc1} \) is much more common, but this move also has its point. Now and on the next
move BLACK could play a simplifying combination, but without reaching an equal position. So there is going to be a fight with all the pieces!

11...a6!!

11...cxd4 12 cxd4 Qxd4 13 Qxf7+ Qxf7 14 Qxd4 Qe5 15 h3±.

12 Wc1
2 dxc5? Qe5 A Qg4+;
12 a4

A) 12...Axd7?! 13 Af4 e6 14 d5 Qe5 15 dxe6 Qxe4 16 Qd5 Qxe3 17 fxe3+;

B) 12...cxd4 13 cxd4 Qxd4 (13...Qg4 14 h3 a6x2 15 a6x2±) 14 Qxf7+ Qxf7 15 Qxd4 Qc4 16 Qc1 (16 f4 Qd7 17 Qxb7 Qxa4 18 Wd2 Qxd4 19 Qxd4 Qc6 20 Qb4 a5±) 16...Wb4 17 Qb1 Wc4= 18 a5± Wb2 19 Qa1 Wb2 20 Wd3 Wb4 21 Qfd1±;

C) 12...Qd8! 13 Wb3 e6 14 Wf4 Wc7 15 dxc5 Wxc5 16 Qfd1 Qd7 17 Qe3 Wc7 18 Qxb7 Qa5 19 Wc7 Qxc4 20 Wxc4 Wc8!±.

12...b5 13 A d3 A d8

In Lautier-Adorján, Polanica Zdroj 1991, White played 14 a4 bxa4 15 Qd1. Since 14...Qe5 was also possible with a messy position, Gyölkös chose this move order.

14 Qd1
14 a4
A) 14...Qe5!?  
A1a) 15 dxe5 Axd3  
A1b) 16 Qd4 Qd8 17 Qd5 Wxe5 18 Qxc5 Qb7 19 c4 e6 20 f4 Wxe4 21 Qe1 Qd4+ 22 Wh1 Qxd5 23 Wxe4 Qxe4 24 Qxd4 Qxd4 25 Qa1 Qxc4 26 We3 bxa4+;

A2) 15 Qc2 Qg4!? 16 Qf4 e5 17 dxe5 (17 Qg5 exd4; 17 Qg3 cxd4 18 cxd4 Qc4+?) 17...Qxe5?;

B) 14...bxa4 15 Qd1 Qb8! (15...Qd7 16 Qf4 Wh5! – 14 Qd1) 16 Qxb8 Qxb8 17 d5 Qe5 18 Qxc5 Qxd3 19 Qxd3 Qb5 20 Qe3 Qh6 21 f4 e5 22 Qf3 Qf5; 14 f4? Qg4 15 d5 c4 (15...e6 16 Qxc5 Qe5 17 fxe5 Qxc5+ 18 Wh1 exd5±) 16 Qxc4 bxc4 17 Qa6 Qd6 18 We3 Qxe2 19 Wxe2 Qa5+;

14...Qd7 15 a4 bxa4 16 Qf4
16 Wc3 cxd4 17 cxd4 Wd6!

A) 18 Wxd6 exd6 19 Qb7 Qab8 20 Qdb1 Qxb7 21 Qxb7 a3 22 Qb3 (22 Qb1 Qb4) 22...a2 23 Qa3 Qb4 24 Qc1 Qe6+;

B) 18 Wd4

B1) 18...Qg4!? 19 f3 Qe6 20 Qc2 Qc4 21 e5 We7
B1a) 22 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qxe5!} \) 23 \( \text{dxe5} \) \( \text{Wxe5} \) 24 \( \text{xe4} \) (24 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{xe2}! \)-++) 24...\( \text{b3}!! \) 25 \( \text{dc1} \) f5=+;

B1b) 22 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qxe5!} \) 23 \( \text{dxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 24 \( \text{Qxd8+} \) \( \text{Qxd8} \) 25 \( \text{Wxa4} \) \( \text{Cc8} \) 26 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qb5}!! \);

B1c) 22 \( \text{Qc3}!! \) \( \text{Qb5} \) 23 \( \text{Qxa4} \) \( \text{Qxa4} \) 24 \( \text{Wxa4} \) \( \text{Wd7=} \);

B2) 18...\( \text{Qb4}!! \)

B2a) 19 \( \text{Qf4} \) e5 20 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 21 \( \text{dxe5} \) \( \text{Wc7} \) 22 \( \text{Qf4} \)

B2a1) 22...\( \text{Qc6} \) 23 \( \text{Qc4} \) (23 \( \text{Wa3} \) \( \text{Wxe5} \) 24 \( \text{Qxg6} \) hxg6 25 \( \text{Wxb4} \) \( \text{Qd4} \) 26 \( \text{Wxe1} \) \( \text{Qad8}!! \)) 23...\( \text{Qc2} \) 24 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qa3} \) 25 e6!=+

B2a2) 22...\( \text{Qg4} \) 23 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{Qxf3}!! \) 24 gxf3 \( \text{Qg5}+ \) 25 \( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Qh4}+ \) 26 \( \text{Qg2} \) (26 \( \text{Qe3}?? \) \( \text{Qxd3}+= \)) 26...\( \text{Qg5}±

B2b) 19 e5 \( \text{Wb6} \) 20 d5 \( \text{Wb8} \) 21 f4 (21 \( \text{Qd4} \) a5 22 e6 \( \text{Qxd4} \) 23 \( \text{Qxd4} \) fxe6 24 dxe6 \( \text{Qxe8}!! \)) 21...a5

B2b1) 22 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 23 \( \text{Qd2} \) (23 \( \text{Qc6} \) \( \text{Wc7} \) 24 \( \text{Qxd8} \) \( \text{Qxd1} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \)

B2b11) 24 \( \text{Wxa4} \) \( \text{Qxe5!} \) 25 \( \text{Qe4} \) (25 fxe5 \( \text{Wxe5}=- \)) 25...\( \text{xf4} \) 26 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 27 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5}+- \);

B2b12) 24 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qxe5}!! \)

25 fxe5 (25 \( \text{Qxa8} \) \( \text{Qxe3} \); 25 \( \text{Qc6} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 25...\( \text{Wxe5} \) 26 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qxa1} \) 27 \( \text{Qxe7}+ \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 28 \( \text{Qxg6}+ \) hxg6 29 \( \text{Qxa1} \) \( \text{Qe8}-- \);

B2b2) 22 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 23 \( \text{Qd2} \) f5! 24 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qc7} \);

B2b3) 22 \( \text{Qc3} \) 22...\( \text{Qg4} \) 23 \( \text{Qd2} \) f6 24 e6 (24 h3 fxe5 25 hxg4 exf4 26 \( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Wc8}-- \)) 24...f5 25 \( \text{Qa3} \)

B2b31) 25...\( \text{Qd4}?! \) 26 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qf4} \) 27 \( \text{Qxb4} \) (27 \( \text{Qe4} \) fx e4 28 \( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Qxf2}+ \) 29 \( \text{Qxf2} \) exd3) 27...axb4 28 \( \text{Qxb4} \) \( \text{Qab8} \) (28...\( \text{Qxd2} \) 29 \( \text{Qxe7} \) 29 \( \text{Qc5} \) \( \text{Qbc8} \) 30 g3 \( \text{Qxd2} \) (30...\( \text{Qxc5} \) 31 gxf4--) 31 \( \text{Qxe7}+- \);

B2b32) 25...\( \text{Qxc3} \) 26 \( \text{Qxc3} \) \( \text{Qc8}± \).
16...\(\text{wa5}\) N
A very strong improvement compared to the earlier game. The strange thing is that this queen move catches the eye much more easily than the artificial 16...\(\text{c8}?)\ And even then I felt that I must have a fine position, but I managed to spoil it. ‘The one who never sinned among you throw the first stone to me...’(?)

16...\(\text{c8}\?) 17 \(\text{d5 wa5}\) 18 \(\text{f4}\) was Lautier-Adorján Polanica Zdroj 1991.

17 \(\text{d5}\)

17 \(\text{d5 e5}\) 18 \(\text{e2 ddc8}\); 17 \(\text{c4 e5}\) 18 \(\text{dxe5 dxex5}\) 19 \(\text{d5 a8}\) 20 \(\text{wa3 f8}\); 17 \(\text{wa3 e5}\) 18 \(\text{dxe5 dxex5}\) 19 \(\text{xe5 b5}\) 20 \(\text{d4 xd3}\) 21 \(\text{xd3 xd4}\) 22 \(\text{cxd4 xd4}\).

17...\(\text{cxd4}\) 18 \(\text{cxd4 db8}\)

This is the difference – White is in big trouble. By the way: do play through the sub-variations, please! It’s not that they are extraordinary. Just the opposite: each one shows a little finesse characteristic of the Grunfeld – BLACK IS OK! spirit. And one more thing: did you know that the Grunfeld Defence is about 80 years old? And it’s still alive and very well!

19 \(\text{f4}\)

19 \(\text{wa3 e6}\) 20 \(\text{d6 d8}\) 21 \(\text{xb8 db8}\) 22 \(\text{c7 db4}\) 23 \(\text{e2 a3=}\).

19...\(\text{xb1}\) 20 \(\text{xb1 a3}\!\). 20...\(\text{xd4}\).

21 \(\text{c4}\)

21 \(\text{wb7 wb8}\) 22 \(\text{c7 we8=}\); 21 \(\text{c7 wa4}\) 22 \(\text{b6 a2}\) 23 \(\text{c1 (23 \text{wa1} wa3 24 e5 a7) 23...wd4}\) 24 \(\text{xa8 a4}\) 25 \(\text{el xd3}\) 26 \(\text{wc6 b1=}\).

21...\(\text{xd4}\) 22 \(\text{wb7 d8}\) 23 \(\text{c7 wa4}\).

24 \(\text{e3=}\)

24 \(\text{c3 wc4}\) 25 \(\text{xd8 cc8}\) (25...\(\text{g4}\)!) 26 \(\text{xe7 wc3=}\) 27 \(\text{we8+ cf8}\) 28 \(\text{e6}\) 29 \(\text{xa3 xd8}\) 30 \(\text{wc8 wa4=}\); 24 \(\text{xe7+ cf8}\) 25 \(\text{el hf8}\) 26 \(\text{a2 de2=}\) 27 \(\text{h1 c3}\) 28 \(\text{b3 wb5=}\).

24...\(\text{c6=}\) 25 \(\text{b1 cc8}\) 26 \(\text{e5}\) 26 \(\text{b6 de2=}\!\)

26...\(\text{b5}\) 27 \(\text{wc1}\)!

A blunder of course, but he no longer had any good moves.

27...\(\text{xc7}\) 28 \(\text{d4 de6}\) 29 \(\text{xe6 wd4}\) 30 \(\text{xc8 a2}\) 31 \(\text{c2 wc3}\) 32 \(\text{wd1 xe5}\) 33 \(\text{xa6 xc2}\) 34 \(\text{xc2 a1=wc+}\) 35 \(\text{f1 db5 0-1}\)
Daddy’s knight is different...

Ljubo and me had been old buddies since those teenage years when the Yugoslav and Hungarian juniors used to have annual matches. The game below is from an Interzonal neither of us cherishes happy memories about. As for myself, I lost on time in the first round, then doubled the loss. From that moment on, the whole tournament (17 rounds!) was pure suffering. My only consolation was that my younger daughter Ann (6) came to visit me for two days and stayed for two weeks till the end. Ljubo didn’t have a great tournament, either. By the time we met at the board, I had already come back from ‘clinical death’, and after we finished I jokingly said... (continued below)

L.Ljubojevic – A.Adoorján
Szirak Interzonal 1987

1 c4 c5 2 g3 g6 3 d4!?

A pleasant surprise. We are always talking about an ‘extra tempo’ on White’s side — by the way, the phrase is total nonsense because it would mean that White has MORE tempi, and consequently more moves, at his disposal. Wishful thinking and a joke of the subconscious. — If moves like this were what White gains BY MOVING FIRST (there is no ‘extra’!), the camp of BLACK's followers would grow quickly and spontaneously.

3...cxd4 4 w xd4 d f6 5 e c3 g7 6 g2 e c6 7 w d2 0-0 8 h3?

While 3 d4 was only suspicious, this one is really provoking misfortunes.

8 b3

A) 8...b8?! 9 b2 a6 10 h3 b5 11 c5=;

B) 8...b6?! 9 b2 b7 10 d5 x d5 11 x g7 x g7 12 cxd5 e e 5 13 f4 (13 w d4 f6) 13...g4 14 e e 4 d6 15 e2=;

C) 8...d6 9 b2 d7 10 h3 a6 11 0-0 b8 A b5=.

8...a5!

‘Hey, friend, don’t you know what even my little girl knows: a knight on the edge of the board is a shame?’ ‘OK — shouted Ljubo (that’s when he is quiet) — and what did she say about your knight on a5?’ ‘Come on: she knows — Daddy’s knight is different...’

9 w f4!!
Continuing to play with fire. The difference between the two knights will be apparent soon. 9 \( \text{Bd}3 \) still kept the balance. The other variations illustrate the (perhaps underestimated) dangers lurking for White very well.

9 b3 d5! 10 cxd5 \( \text{Exh}3 \) 11 \( \text{Exh}3 \) \( \text{Exd}5+; \)

9 c5 \( \text{Cc}4! \) 10 \( \text{Wd}3 \) d5

A) 11 \( \text{Exd}5?! \) \( \text{Exh}3 \) 12 \( \text{Exf}6+ \) \( \text{Exf}6 \) 13 \( \text{Exh}3 \) (13 \( \text{Wxd}8? \) \( \text{Exg}2! \)
14 \( \text{Wd}3 \) \( \text{De}5++; \) 13...\( \text{Wa}5+! \)
(13...\( \text{Exb}2 \) 14 \( \text{Exb}2 \) \( \text{Exb}2 \) 15 \( \text{Wxd}8 \) \( \text{Exd}8 \) 16 \( \text{Bb}1 \) \( \text{Aa}3 \) 17 \( \text{Bb}7 \)
\( \text{Exc}5+? \) 14 \( \text{Exd}2 \) \( \text{Wxc}5 \) 15 \( \text{Ec}1 \) \( \text{Wc}6 \)
16 0-0 \( \text{Wd}8++; \)

B) 11 cxd6 \( \text{Qxd}6++; \)

9 \( \text{Wd}3 \) d6 10 \( \text{Af}4 \) \( \text{Ad}7 \) 11 b3 \( \text{Cc}6 \)
12 0-0 \( \text{Xg}2 \) 13 \( \text{Xg}2 \) \( \text{Cc}6 \) 14 \( \text{Ab}2 \)
\( \text{Wd}5 \)

9...\( \text{Cd}6 \) 10 0-0

10 \( \text{Cd}5 \) \( \text{Cg}4! \) 11 f3 \( \text{De}5 \) 12 \( \text{Wh}4 \)
\( \text{De}8++; \)

10 \( \text{Cd}2? \) \( \text{Eh}5 \) 11 \( \text{Wh}4 \) \( \text{Af}6 \) 12
\( \text{Xg}5 \) \( \text{Xh}3 \) 13 \( \text{Xh}3 \) \( \text{Xg}5 \) 14
\( \text{Wxg}5 \) \( \text{Exc}4++; \)

10 \( \text{Wh}4 \) \( \text{Xh}3 \) 11 \( \text{Xh}3 \) \( \text{Wb}6 \) 12
0-0 \( \text{Wb}4++; \)

10...\( \text{Cg}4! \)

This is killing, but not in the way I tried. Quite an ordinary story: one has a plan that's good (or not bad), and he executes it without checking it out once again at the critical moments. In two moves I could have quite simply won a pawn for nothing, but I was blinded by my original 'great big idea'. It is so much more romantic to give up a pawn than to take one. Anyone else could do that...

11 b3 d5!

\( \text{Dh}1...\text{Exe}2! \) 12 \( \text{Wc}1 \) (12 \( \text{Exe}2 \)
\( \text{Oh}5 \) 12...\( \text{Cg}4++; \)

12 cxd5

12 \( \text{Cxd}1 \) \( \text{Wc}8 \).

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

Stubborn as a mule. The two alternatives offered really good winning chances.

12...\( \text{Xh}3 \) 13 \( \text{Xh}3 \) \( \text{Xd}5 \) 14
\( \text{Xd}5 \) \( \text{Xa}1 \) 15 \( \text{Cd}1 \) \( \text{Cc}6 \) (15...e6
16 \( \text{Aa}3! \) 16 \( \text{Af}6+ \) \( \text{Xf}6 \) 17 \( \text{Xd}8 \)
\( \text{Exd}8++; \)

12...\( \text{Cc}8 \) 13 \( \text{Aa}2 \) \( \text{Xh}3 \) 14 \( \text{Xh}3 \)
\( \text{Xc}3 \) 15 \( \text{Xc}3 \) \( \text{Xd}5 \) 16 \( \text{Xa}5 \)
\( \text{Xf}4 \) 17 \( \text{Xd}8 \) \( \text{Xh}3+ \) 18 \( \text{Xg}2 \)
\( \text{Xa}1 \) 19 \( \text{Xe}7 \) \( \text{Cc}8 \) 20 \( \text{Xa}1 \) \( \text{Xe}7 \)
21 \( \text{Xh}3 \) \( \text{Xe}2++; \)

13 \( \text{Wb}4 \) \( \text{Xh}3 \) 14 \( \text{Xa}5 \) \( \text{b}6 \)
14...\( \text{Xg}2 \) 15 \( \text{Xg}2 \) \( \text{De}4 \) 16
\( \text{Xe}4 \) \( \text{Xa}1 \) 17 \( \text{Gg}5! \) \( \text{Wc}2 \) 18 \( \text{f}3; \)

15 \( \text{Wb}4 \) \( \text{Xg}2 \) 16 \( \text{Xg}2 \) \( \text{a}5 \)
16...\( \text{Xd}5? \) 17 \( \text{Xd}5 \) \( \text{Wb}7 \) 18
\( \text{We}4++; \)

17 \( \text{Wc}4 \)
17...b5!
That is my style and I can’t help it. I don’t want to change it anyway. Maybe some simplicity would add to my personal charm, but I don’t want to be perfect and be hated for it.

17...\textnormal{\textit{\textbf{W}}}xc4 18 bxc4 \textit{\textbf{A}}ac8 19 \textit{\textbf{B}}b1 \textit{\textbf{W}}xc4 20 \textit{\textbf{A}}d2 \textit{\textbf{R}}c8 21 \textit{\textbf{R}}f1 \textit{\textbf{A}}d7 22 \textit{\textbf{A}}b5 (22 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a4? b5) 22...\textit{\textbf{R}}c2 23 d6 exd6! (23...\textit{\textbf{R}}f6 24 a3 \textit{\textbf{A}}8c5 25 \textit{\textbf{W}}xc2 \textit{\textbf{A}}xc2 26 dxe7 \textit{\textbf{A}}xe7 27 \textit{\textbf{Q}}d1 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c5 28 \textit{\textbf{A}}f1 h5=) 24 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xd6 \textit{\textbf{R}}8c6\text{\textit{\textbf{+-}}}.

18 \textit{\textbf{W}}d3?
A mistake. With 18 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xb5 etc. he could hold it.

18 \textit{\textbf{W}}xc8 \textit{\textbf{R}}xc8 19 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xb5 (19 \textit{\textbf{Q}}b2 b4 20 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a4 \textit{\textbf{A}}c2\text{\textit{\textbf{+-}}} 19...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xd5
20 \textit{\textbf{A}}b1 \textit{\textbf{R}}c2 21 e4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f6 22 \textit{\textbf{A}}b2 \textit{\textbf{A}}ac8 23 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xc2 \textit{\textbf{A}}xc2 24 \textit{\textbf{E}}e1 \textit{\textbf{A}}xa2\text{\textit{\textbf{+-}}}.
18 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xb5 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xd5 19 \textit{\textbf{A}}b1 \textit{\textbf{W}}b7!

A) 20 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g1 \textit{\textbf{A}}fc8 21 \textit{\textbf{A}}a4 \textit{\textbf{A}}c8 22 e4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}b4 23 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f4 (23 a3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a2\text{\textit{\textbf{-+}}} 23...e5+-;
B) 20 e4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}b4 21 \textit{\textbf{W}}e2 (21 a4 \textit{\textbf{A}}ac8 22 \textit{\textbf{W}}e2 f5\text{\textit{\textbf{=}}} 21 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xa2 22 \textit{\textbf{A}}b2 \textit{\textbf{A}}xb2 23 \textit{\textbf{A}}xb2 \textit{\textbf{Q}}b4\text{\textit{\textbf{=}}} 21...\textit{\textbf{Q}}xa2! (21...f5 22 a3) 22 \textit{\textbf{A}}b2=.

18...\textit{\textbf{R}}d8 19 \textit{\textbf{A}}b2
19 e4? b4 20 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xd5 21 exd5 \textit{\textbf{A}}xa1 22 \textit{\textbf{Q}}b6 \textit{\textbf{A}}a6\text{\textit{\textbf{+-}}}.

19...b4 20 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xd5 21 \textit{\textbf{W}}f3 \textit{\textbf{A}}xb2 22 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xb2 \textit{\textbf{A}}a6\text{\textit{\textbf{+-}}}.

By mobilising all of his forces BLACK has achieved a dream position.

23 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a4
Is it really another knight on the edge?

23 \textit{\textbf{Q}}d3 \textit{\textbf{G}}f6 24 \textit{\textbf{W}}e4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}c3 25 \textit{\textbf{W}}xe7 \textit{\textbf{G}}c6\textit{\textbf{+}} 26 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g1? (26 f3 \textit{\textbf{E}}e8 27 \textit{\textbf{W}}c5 \textit{\textbf{G}}xe2\textit{\textbf{+}} 28 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g1\textit{\textbf{=}}) 26...\textit{\textbf{E}}e8 27 \textit{\textbf{W}}a7 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xe2 mate.

23...\textit{\textbf{G}}f6 24 \textit{\textbf{W}}e4

24...\textit{\textbf{E}}e6?!
You, dear readers, have probably noticed a few times yourselves how difficult a game we are trying to play. Here is one of its numerous mysteries. If our weaknesses would manifest themselves by mistakes made in certain kinds of positions, at least we would know what’s the matter. But I did find many-many moves that were harder than 24...\textit{\textbf{W}}c6. Here I missed it twice.

24...\textit{\textbf{W}}c6! 25 \textit{\textbf{Q}}h1 (25 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g1 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f4) 25...\textit{\textbf{E}}e6 26 \textit{\textbf{W}}c4 (26 \textit{\textbf{W}}f3 \textit{\textbf{E}}xe2) 26...\textit{\textbf{Q}}c3+ 27 \textit{\textbf{W}}xc6 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xc6\textit{\textbf{+-}}.

25 \textit{\textbf{W}}f3 \textit{\textbf{W}}c2? 25...\textit{\textbf{G}}f6\textit{\textbf{+-}}.

26 \textit{\textbf{A}}f1 \textit{\textbf{G}}f6 27 \textit{\textbf{E}}e1
27 \textit{\textbf{W}}g4 \textit{\textbf{W}}c6 (27...h5 28 \textit{\textbf{W}}c4 \textit{\textbf{W}}f5 29 \textit{\textbf{W}}c5 h4\textit{\textbf{=}}) 28 \textit{\textbf{Q}}g1 \textit{\textbf{Q}}fd6\textit{\textbf{=}}.

27...\textit{\textbf{W}}d2 28 \textit{\textbf{A}}d1
28 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}g4 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{R}}}e6}}} 29 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{F}}}f1 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{D}}}f6}}} 30 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{F}}}f3 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{Q}}}e4}}}.

28...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}g5}} 29 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{W}}}e4 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{R}}}e6}}} 30 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{F}}}f3}

\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{R}}}xe2!

This I can do.

31 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{W}}}xe2 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{Q}}}f4+}}} 32 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{F}}}f1 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{C}}}xe2}}} 33 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{K}}}xd8+ \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{G}}}g7}}} 34 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{R}}}e1}}

34 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{Q}}}xe2 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{W}}}e5+}}.}

34...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{C}}}c1}} 35 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{H}}}h4 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}b5+}}} 36 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{G}}}g2

36...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}c6+?!}}

There might have been some mild time trouble, I don’t remember. Anyway, to sum up, it was harder to draw this game than to collect the point, but I was able to solve the more difficult task. No standing ovation, please!

36...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}b7+}} 37 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{G}}}g1 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{Q}}}xa2+}.}}

37 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{G}}}g1}}

37...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}c2?}}

37...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{E}}}e6}}! 38 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{I}}}d2 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{E}}}e5}}} 39 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{R}}}e1}} (39 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{R}}}xe5 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{Q}}}xb3!+-}}) 39...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{E}}}e4}} 40 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{I}}}d6 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{Q}}}e2+}}} 41 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{F}}}f1 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{I}}}b5}}} 42 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{I}}}d6}} (42 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{Q}}}g2 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{I}}}h5}}} 42...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{C}}}xg3+}} 43 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{G}}}g2}} (43 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{G}}}g1 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{Q}}}b8+}}) 43...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}e2}} 44 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{Q}}}xg3 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{G}}}f3+}}} 45 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{H}}}h2 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}xf2+}}} 46 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{H}}}h3}}

38 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{R}}}xe7 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{Q}}}d3}}}

38...\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}xa2?}} 39 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{I}}}d7 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{W}}}xb3}}} 40 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{C}}}c5 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}c4}}} 41 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{D}}}e6+ \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{Q}}}f6}}} 42 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{G}}}g5+}}


A.Onischuk – A.Adorján
Alushta 1994

I prepared reasonably well before this game. After all a Category 14 tournament is no joke. The trouble was I played somebody else instead of the player I was ready for! Sometime in the middle of the game I complained to Dreev. Come on – he said – it happened to me only yesterday...

1 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{C}}}c4 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{G}}}g6}}} 2 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{C}}}c3 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{C}}}c5}}} 3 \textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{D}}}d4}}
Somehow people – even very strong players – don’t seem to realise that with moves like this they’re playing with fire. I don’t want to get into long explanations (why should I show and analyse the game then?), but one thing is obvious: to get the queen into play without a good reason is at least unnecessary if not dangerous.

3...cxd4 4 wdx4 df6 5 b3?! N

5 g3 could transpose to the game with Ljubo (‘87); 5 e4 was the move that happened in the Hernandez-Adorján game, Las Palmas 1977.

5...dg7 6 db2 0-0 7 df3 be6 8 wd2

8...d5!

But this is not half of a joke! (Certainly not a result of successful preparation...) It will take at least half a century till people understand that they can’t do anything just because they’re White. There was a quieter way of trying to take advantage of White’s somewhat naive play:

8...wa5?

A) 9 ed5? wdx2+ 10 edx2 (10 edx2?? de4++) 10...edx5 11 xg7 xg7 12 cxd5 db4+;

B) 9 db1

B1) It doesn’t always work! True it’s OK twice from three, but the trouble is that the mean opponent usually chooses No.3... 9...d5?! 10 cxd5 (10 edx5 wxa2+) 10...ef5 11 ec1 (11 dxc6 ebx1 12 edx1 wxa2 13 ec3 wxb3 14 edx4 wb6 15 da4 wc7 16 cxb7 wxb7 17 e3 cb8++; 11 e4) 11...edx5 12 edx5 wxd2+ 13 edx2 ebx2;=

B2) 9...d6 10 e4 dg4 11 ae2 wc8=;

C) 9 de1 de4 10 dxe4 ebx2++;

D) 9 e3 9...de4! 10 dxe4 wxd2+ 11 edx2 ebx2 12 db1 g7++;

9 edx5

A must. 9 edx5 is a Road to Hell...

9 edx5 de4 10 wc1 wa5+ 11 ed2 edx2 12 xg7 df3+ 13 d1 xg7 14 ef3 d8 15 ec2 e6+.

9...edx5 10 edx5
10 ec1 eb4+.

10...ebx2
11 $\text{\textit{Qxe7+}}$

If you must suffer, do it at least having some extra material – is the wisdom of old.

11 $\text{\textit{Wxb2 Wxd5}}$

A) 12 $\text{\textit{Ad1 Wa5+ 13 Wd2 (13 Qd2 Qb4+!) 13...Qb4?}}$

B) 12 e3 $\text{\textit{Ad8 13 Qc4 (13 a3 Qh3! 14 Qc4 Wh5 15 0-0 Qxg2++)}}$
13...$\text{\textit{Wa5+ 14 Qe2 (14 Qd2 Qg5)}}$
14...$\text{\textit{Qg4 15 h3 (15 Qhd1 Wh5+) 15...Qxf3+ 16 gxf3 Wh5! 17 h4 Qe5 18 Qh3 Qac8+.)}}$

11...$\text{\textit{Wxe7 12 Wxb2}}$

21...$\text{\textit{Qc5?}}$

This was probably THE moment when BLACK could convert his initiative to something real.

21...$\text{\textit{Qe6! 22 He1 (22 Qh2! Qfc8 23 Ha2 Wh5 24 b4 Qc3) 22...Qfc8 23 We2 We4 (23...Qd5?! 24 Qd1 We6 25 Qg2 Qc3 26 b4 Qxa3) 24 Qg4 Qc2 25 Qg2 We7 26 Qh2 Qxc3+.}}$

22 b4 $\text{\textit{Qd5 23 He1 Qfd8 24 We2 We4 25 Qg4! Qd3}}$

25...$\text{\textit{Qd2?! 26 Qg2 (26 f5!) 26...Qe7 27 Qh2 Qd3 28 Ha1 Xxc3 29 fxe3 Xxe3 30 Qhfl.}}$

26 $\text{\textit{Qg2 We7 27 Ha1 Qd2 28 Qh2 Wh4 29 Qhfl Qd3 30 Wf3 We7 31 Qg1}}$

31 $\text{\textit{Qg3!}}$

31...$\text{\textit{Wd7 32 Qfc1 Qb3}}$
33 $\text{Nd1}$?
A blunder, sure. But for quite some time the position was even anyhow. There was mutual time trouble too.

33 $\text{Ncb1 Nc3}$ 34 $\text{Nc1 Nb3}$=

33...$\text{Nxa3}$! 34 $\text{Nc2 Nxa1}$ 35 $\text{Nxa1 a6}$ 36 $\text{Nc1 Nxd5}$ 37 $\text{Nc7 Nxf3+}$ 38 $\text{Nxf3 b5}$ 39 $\text{Nxa7 Nxa2}$ 40 $\text{e4 Na4}$ 41 $\text{e5 Nxb4}$ ½−½

I still remember having lunch with my team-mates in Kirchheim before a Bundesliga match. I was told about my future opponent’s playing habits, and of the Queen’s Pawn. I had no idea what I was to do, but I got an unusual idea during a little nap. The game itself doesn’t qualify among my best ones, but I still like it, because when you face an uncomfortable task, and solve it OK, it is what you were supposed to do, but couldn’t take success for granted.

L. Keitlinghaus – A. Adorján
West Germany 1988

1 $\text{d4 Nf6}$ 2 $\text{c3 d6}$?! 3 $\text{Nf3 g5}$ $\text{Nbd7}$
4 $\text{d2 e5}$ 5 $\text{e3 Nf6}$ 6 $\text{Nbd3}$

6...d5!!
Flexibility above all!
7 $\text{Nf3 e5}$ 8 $\text{e4 Nf6}$
8...e6 9 $\text{Qg3}$?!
The first sign of uncertainty. In addition, the move is objectively bad.

9 $\text{c4 exd4}$ (9...h6?! 10 $\text{Nxf6}$
$\text{Nxf6}$) 10 $\text{Nxd4 Ne5}=$.

9...h6 10 $\text{Nxf6 Nxf6}$ 11 f4?
And this is awful.

11...e4! 12 $\text{Nxe2}$ g6! 13 $\text{c4 Nge7}$ 14 $\text{cxd5}$ $\text{cxd5}$ 15 $\text{Nbd3}$ $\text{Qe6}$ 16 $\text{Nc1}$ $\text{Nbd7}$ 17 $\text{Nf3}$
$\triangleleft$18 $\text{Nbc1}$.

18...h5 19 $\text{Nh1}$
By the following move BLACK gets really offensive, and remains so till the very end. I never said it's a great game — that takes both partners — but it does feature a few nice trifles, and reminds you: always try to cross your opponent's intentions. Surprise is (almost) everything.

19 f5? $\text{h6.}$

19...b5! $\Rightarrow$ 20 $\text{a6}$

20 $\text{a6}$ $\text{b6}$ 21 $\text{a6}$ $\text{b6}$ $\text{a8}$ 22

$\text{c6}$ (22 $\text{wa4}$ $\text{ag4}$ 23 $\text{c6}$ $\text{wa8}$ 24 $\text{c3}$ $\text{b6}$ 25 $\text{e6}$ $\text{c3}$+$+)

22...$\text{xc6}$ 23 $\text{xc6}$ $\text{xb3}$ 24 $\text{xb3}$

$\text{g4}$ 25 $\text{e1}$ $\text{xe3}!$ 26 $\text{xe3}$ $\text{xd4}$

27 $\text{f2}$ $\text{c8}$ 28 $\text{b5}$ $\text{c2}$ 29 $\text{e2}$

$\text{xe3}+30$ $\text{xe3}$ d4$++$;

20 $\text{xb5}$ $\text{b6}$ 21 $\text{wa4}$ $\text{xb5}$ 22

$\text{b6}$+$.

20...$\text{b8}$ 21 a3 a5 22 $\text{a6}$ b4 23

a4 $\text{wa7}$! 24 $\text{a1}$ $\text{wa8}$ 25 $\text{b1}$ $\text{a7}$

25...$\text{c8}$+$.

26 $\text{d1}$ $\text{f8}$ 27 $\text{wa2}$ b3

28 $\text{xb3}?$

28 $\text{b5}$ $\text{c7}$+$ A$ 29 $\text{xd5}$

$\text{xd5}$ 30 $\text{xd5}$ $\text{xb2}$ 31 $\text{xe4}$ $\text{g7}$

32 $\text{d3}$ $\text{xg2}+!$ 33 $\text{xg2}$ $\text{c6}+.$

28...$\text{ab7}$ 29 $\text{hb1}$ $\text{b4}+30$ $\text{c1}$

30 $\text{c5}$ $\text{xc5}$ 31 $\text{xc5}$ d4$++$.

30...$\text{xa4}$ 31 b3 $\text{b5}$ 32 $\text{e2}$

$\text{wc6}!$

32...a4 33 $\text{xa4}$! $\text{xa4}$ (33...$\text{ac4}$? 34 $\text{xc4}$ $\text{xb1}$ 35 $\text{b3}$+$)$ 34 $\text{xb5}$

$\text{xb5}$+$ (34...$\text{xa2}$ 35 $\text{xe8}$ $\text{xb1}$ 36 $\text{xf7}+$).

33 $\text{xb5}$

33 $\text{xa5}$? $\text{xe2}$ 34 $\text{xe2}$ $\text{ha8}$ 35

$\text{bc1}$ $\text{wc1}$ 36 $\text{xa8}$ $\text{we3}$+=.

33...$\text{a4}$

34...a4! 35 $\text{e2}$

35 $\text{xa4}$? $\text{a8}+$;

35 $\text{d1}$ $\text{xb3}$ 36 $\text{xb3}$ $\text{wc4}+$.

G. Forintos – A. Adorján
Wijk aan Zee II, 1971

Two Hungarians playing in the same tournament abroad. Wouldn't it be all too appropriate to make a 'patriotic' draw? Thank God Forintos was White, and did not have the heart to do so. While quite a few fine games are born instead of friendly draws, I also can't help thinking of the number of beautiful games aborted by the kind of deal we didn't strike.

1 $\text{d4}$ $\text{f6}$ 2 $\text{c4}$ g6 3 $\text{c3}$ d5 4

$\text{wb3}$ $\text{xc4}$ 5 $\text{wc4}$ $\text{e6}$ 6 $\text{wb5}$+$

$\text{d7}$
7 \( \text{Wb3} \)

The early \( \text{Wb3} \) was never as popular as \( \text{Wb3} \) on move 5. And it had a good reason: taking the pawn was risky. The theoretical \( \text{Ac6} \) (Boleslavsky) looked good enough, but I had got another idea and I was ready to try it. Have a look at what remained behind the scenes!

7 \( \text{Wxb7} \)

A) 7...\( \text{Ac6} \) 8 \( \text{Wb3} \) \( \text{Wxd4} \) 9 \( \text{Df3} \) (9 \( \text{Le3} \) \( \text{Wg4} \) 10 \( \text{Df3} \) \( \text{Dbd7} \) 9...\( \text{Wb6} \)) 10 \( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{Ag7} \) 11 \( \text{Af4} \) 0-0 12 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{Dbd7} \) 13 \( \text{Le2} \) \( \text{Wb7} \) 14 0-0 \( \text{De4} \);

B) 7...\( \text{Ac6}! ? \)

B1) 8 e3? \( \text{Db8} \) 9 \( \text{Wa6} \) \( \text{Db4} \) 10 \( \text{We2} \) c5! 11 \( \text{Df3} \) \( \text{Ag7} \) 12 a3 \( \text{Ac6} \) 13 d5 \( \text{Da5} \) 14 \( \text{Dd2} \) 0-0 15 g3 \( \text{Ag4} \) 16 \( \text{Wd3} \) (16 f3 \( \text{Wxd5} \) 17 \( \text{Wxd5} \) \( \text{Wxd5} \) 18 e4 \( \text{Wd6} \) 19 fxg4 \( \text{Wxb2} \) 20 \( \text{Wxb2} \) \( \text{Wxb2} \) 21 \( \text{We3} \) \( \text{Db8} \) 22 \( \text{Dc4} \) \( \text{Dxc4} \) 23 \( \text{Dxc4} \) \( \text{Wd4} ! \) 16...c4! 17 \( \text{Wd4} \) (17 \( \text{Dxc4} \) \( \text{Db3} \) 18 \( \text{Bb1} \) \( \text{Af5} \) 19 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{Cc5}++) \) 17...\( \text{Dxd5} \) 18 \( \text{Wxg4} \) (18 \( \text{Wxd5} \) \( \text{Dxc3} \) 19 \( \text{Wxd8} \) \( \text{Dfxd8} \) 20 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{Db3} \) 21 h3 \( \text{Dxa1} \) 22 hxe4 \( \text{Db3} \) 23 \( \text{Dxb3} \) cxb3 24 \( \text{Db6} \) 25 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{Dbd6} \) 26 \( \text{Dxe2} \) \( \text{Dd2} \) 27 \( \text{Dd4} \) \( \text{Cc2} \) 28 \( \text{Df3} \) \( \text{Cc1}+ \) 29 \( \text{De2} \) b2++) 18...\( \text{Dxc3} \)

B2) 8 \( \text{Df4} \) \( \text{Db8} \) (8...\( \text{Dxd4} \) 9 0-0-0 \( \text{De6} \) 10 \( \text{Le5} \) \( \text{Dg7} \) 11 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{Cc8} \) 9 \( \text{Wxc7} \) \( \text{Wxc7} \) 10 \( \text{Dxc7} \) \( \text{Db2} \) 11 \( \text{e3} \) e5 12 d5 (12 dxe5 \( \text{Db4} \) 13 0-0-0 \( \text{Dxc3} \) 14 exf6 \( \text{Dxb4}+ \); 12 \( \text{Db1} \) \( \text{Db4} \) 13 \( \text{Db2} \) \( \text{Dxc3}+ \) 14 \( \text{Dd2} \) \( \text{De4} \) 15 \( \text{Df3} \) \( \text{exd4} \)) 12...\( \text{Db4} \) (12...\( \text{Db4} \) 13 0-0-0 \( \text{Dxc3} \) 14 dxc6 \( \text{Df5} \) 15 \( \text{Dd3} \) \( \text{e4} \) 16 \( \text{Dc4} \) \( \text{Dg4} \) 17 \( \text{De2} \) \( \text{Df6} \) 18 \( \text{Hf1++} \) 13 \( \text{Dxe5} \) \( \text{Cc2}+ \) 14 \( \text{Dd1} \) \( \text{Dxa1} \) 15 \( \text{Dxf6} \) \( \text{Db8} \) 16 \( \text{Dge2} \) \( \text{Db4} \) 17 e4 g5 18 \( \text{Dd4} \) \( \text{Dg6} \)

A kind of position you can only see in good old coffee-houses. I think BLACK is better, but the silly computer shows symbols of opposite opinion. I would be ashamed of being outplayed by either a program or a human being in a sharp position like this. Let's carry on: 19 \( \text{Dxa7} \) \( \text{Db6} \) 20 \( \text{Dd4} \) \( \text{Cc2} \) 21 \( \text{Dg7} \) \( \text{Da3} \) 22 \( \text{Dc1} \) \( \text{Cc2}+ \) 23 \( \text{Dd1} \) \( \text{Da4} \) 24 \( \text{Dxa4} \) \( \text{Db4} ? \)

7...\( \text{Cc6} ! ? \)

Objectively speaking, better and more in the Grünfeld spirit was 7...c5! 8 dxc5 (8 d5 \( \text{Da6} \) 9 e4 \( \text{Dg7} \) 10 \( \text{Df3} \) 0-0) 8...\( \text{Da6} ? \).
10 h3

A preventive measure. If White hadn’t played it, a strange position could have arisen, where BLACK must be OK: in any case the white king is unsafe.

10...\textit{\textbf{Bb8}} 11 \textit{\textbf{Ae3}}

11 \textit{\textbf{Ad3}} e5! 12 dx\textit{\textbf{e5}} \textit{\textbf{Ae6}} 13 \textit{\textbf{Wd1}} \textit{\textbf{Dd7}} (13...\textit{\textbf{Db4}} 14 \textit{\textbf{Ab1}} \textit{\textbf{Wxd1+}} 15 \textit{\textbf{Dxdl}} \textit{\textbf{Dd7+}}) 14 \textit{\textbf{Ag5}} \textit{\textbf{We8}}?

11 a4 e5! (11...\textit{\textbf{Dc5}}?! 12 \textit{\textbf{Wb4}} c5?! 13 dxc5 \textit{\textbf{Dc6}} 14 \textit{\textbf{Wa3}} \textit{\textbf{Wb5}} 15 \textit{\textbf{Dd2}} \textit{\textbf{Db4}} 16 \textit{\textbf{Mc1}} \textit{\textbf{Wxc5}} 17 e5 \textit{\textbf{Dd8}}) 12 dx\textit{\textbf{e5}} (12 d5 \textit{\textbf{Dd4}} 13 \textit{\textbf{Wd1}} \textit{\textbf{Mc8}}) 12...\textit{\textbf{Ac6}} 13 \textit{\textbf{Wc2}} \textit{\textbf{Dd7}} 14 \textit{\textbf{Ag5}} \textit{\textbf{We8}} (14...\textit{\textbf{Dd4}}?)

11...b5!?

12 \textit{\textbf{Wc2}}?

Co-operative. The principal line was 12 e5 \textit{\textbf{We6}} 13 exf6 and the question is what is worth more: the queen or the three light pieces. Considering the fact that I used to give up the queen for only two pieces and still won most of the time, like in my games against Bednarsky (Varna 1972) and Cardoso (Lanzarote 1975) (see in the ‘ORIGINAL’ BLACK is OK (Batsford, 1988), I’m morally always on the side of the party that is ready to make the biggest sacrifice.

12 d5 b4 13 \textit{\textbf{Db5}} \textit{\textbf{Aa5}} 14 \textit{\textbf{Wxb4}} \textit{\textbf{Ax5}} 15 \textit{\textbf{Ax5}} (15 \textit{\textbf{Wxa5}} \textit{\textbf{Wxf1}} 16 \textit{\textbf{Wxf1}} \textit{\textbf{Dxe4}}) 15...c6 16 dxc6 a6 17 a4 axb5 18 axb5 \textit{\textbf{Dxc6}} 19 \textit{\textbf{Wa4}} \textit{\textbf{Wd3}} 20 bxc6 \textit{\textbf{Bxb2}} 21 \textit{\textbf{Wd1}} \textit{\textbf{Wxe4}}

12 e5 \textit{\textbf{We6}} 13 exf6 \textit{\textbf{Ax5}} 14 \textit{\textbf{Fxg7}} \textit{\textbf{Xg7}} 15 axb3.

12...b4 13 \textit{\textbf{Dd1}} b3!

That’s it! From now on the play becomes a fairy tale (at least for me). Come and see all of the beauties!

14 axb3 \textit{\textbf{Dd4}} 15 \textit{\textbf{Wc1}}

15 \textit{\textbf{Wb1}} \textit{\textbf{Dxe4}}! 16 \textit{\textbf{Ax5}} (16 \textit{\textbf{Wxe4}} \textit{\textbf{Af5}}) 16...\textit{\textbf{Dc5}}! 17 \textit{\textbf{Dc3}} (17 g4 \textit{\textbf{Ax5}} 18 \textit{\textbf{Dc3}} \textit{\textbf{Dc6}}) 17...\textit{\textbf{Df5}}!+

15...\textit{\textbf{Dxe4}} 16 \textit{\textbf{Dxa7}}

16 \textit{\textbf{Cc4}} a6?

16...c5!

Hurrah!

17 dxc5 \textit{\textbf{Ac6}} 18 \textit{\textbf{Dxa3}}

18 c6 \textit{\textbf{Cc8}} 19 c7 \textit{\textbf{Dd3+}} 20 \textit{\textbf{Dxd3}} \textit{\textbf{Wxd3}} 21 \textit{\textbf{Dd2}} \textit{\textbf{Dxd2}} 22 \textit{\textbf{Wxd2}} \textit{\textbf{Wb5}}+ 23 \textit{\textbf{Dd4}}? \textit{\textbf{Wxd5}} 24 \textit{\textbf{Dxg7}} \textit{\textbf{Wxg2}} 25 \textit{\textbf{Wxf8}} \textit{\textbf{Wxh1+}} 26 \textit{\textbf{Dc2}} \textit{\textbf{Wxf8}}.
18...\textit{Wd3}!!

The game is over. But not the fireworks!

19 \textit{Ax}d3
19 \textit{Le}2 \textit{Wc}2!+ (19...\textit{Xb}3$\text{X}$).

19...\textit{Ax}d3+ 20 \textit{Le}2 \textit{Ax}c1+ 21 \textit{Ax}c1 \textit{Xe}5 22 \textit{Lf}4 \textit{Hb}4! 23 \textit{A}d2 \textit{He}4+ 24 \textit{A}e3
24 \textit{A}e3 \textit{Xb}2 25 \textit{Ma}2 \textit{Af}6.
24...\textit{Ax}b3 25 \textit{Gg}5
25 \textit{Ac}3 \textit{Hb}4+.
25...\textit{Lc}4+ 26 \textit{Gf}3 \textit{Hc}5+ 27 \textit{Ac}3 \textit{f}6!+ 28 \textit{Ge}4 \textit{f}5 29 \textit{Ad}2

29...\textit{Lxe}3+!

This I saw from afar, and it is more than enough. Still, it is somewhat funny that I did not even consider the alternative, which was not ugly, either, and led to the same outcome.

29...\textit{Lxe}3+
30 \textit{Dxc}4 \textit{fxe}3+ 31 \textit{Gg}4 \textit{h}5+ 32 \textit{Gh}4 \textit{e}xf2 33 \textit{Dxe}5 \textit{Af}6+!
34 \textit{Gg}3 \textit{Lxe}5+ 35 \textit{Gh}4 \textit{Lf}6+ 36 \textit{Gg}3 \textit{Lxc}3 37 \textit{bxc}3 \textit{Ad}2+.

30 \textit{fxe}3

30 \textit{Dxe}3 \textit{f}4+ 31 \textit{Gb}3 (31 \textit{Ge}4 \textit{Dxd}2 mate) 31...\textit{Dxd}2+ 32 \textit{Gg}4 \textit{Le}6+ 33 \textit{Gg}5 \textit{Hf}5+ 34 \textit{Gg}4 \textit{h}5+ 35 \textit{Gh}4 \textit{Gf}6 mate.

30...\textit{Dxd}2+ 31 \textit{Gf}2 \textit{Mb}8 32 \textit{Ac}1 \textit{Xb}2 33 \textit{Dd}1 \textit{Ge}4+ 34 \textit{Gg}1 \textit{Md}2 35 \textit{Gg}4 \textit{Le}2 36 \textit{Df}2 \textit{Dxf}2 37 \textit{Dxf}2 \textit{Dxg}4+ 38 \textit{Gg}1 \textit{Gg}2+ 39 \textit{Df}1 \textit{Gh}5 40 \textit{Gg}1 \textit{Hh}2 41 \textit{Gg}1 \textit{Gh}3 42 \textit{Gg}2 \textit{Gh}4 0-1

My opponent hung on for a little too long, on the other hand he prolonged my pleasure.

\textbf{G.Giorgadze – A.Adorján}

\textit{Debrecen 1992}

1 \textit{d}4 \textit{Df}6 2 \textit{c}4 \textit{g}6 3 \textit{Ac}3 \textit{d}5 4 \textit{exd}5

Come on! It's not today's lesson!

4...\textit{Dxd}5 5 \textit{e}4 \textit{Dxc}3 6 \textit{bxc}3 \textit{Gg}7 7 \textit{Gb}5?!?

The revival of a line, considered harmless earlier. I faced it four more times in the following months (fashion will be fashion) and had a
positive score. (BLACK IS OK!, as we all know)

7...c6 8 a4 b5 9 b3 b4 10 e3

10 b2 bxc3 11 xc3 a6 12 e2 0-0 13 0-0 d7 14 c1

A) 14...e5? 15 b4! (15 d5? c5! 16 b4 d3 17 xf8 xc1
18 xc1 xf8 19 e1=) 15...e8
16 xf7+!++;

B) 14...e8! Not the hasty counterblow, which surprisingly loses on the spot. Rather this cool rook move, ready for active counterplay. 15 c2 (15 f4 e6 16 a4 c8 17 a1 c5 18 dxc5 a1
19 xa1 e7 20 c6 a5 21 xd8+ xd8 22 fd1 c8 23 c3 a4
24 a5+ d6=; 15 e5 e6) 15...e5
16 fd1 f4+2.

10...bxc3 11 c1 d7 12 e2

12 a6 13 e5

13 xc3 c5 (13...b8 14 e5) 14 dxc5 a5 15 xf7+! (15 d4
e5+) 15...f8 16 xd7 xc3+
17 xc3 xc3+ 18 d1 b8 19
b3 c4 20 c6 b4=;

13 xc3 c5 14 c4 a5;
13 f4!.
13...a5! N

This is the way you play in the Grünfeld spirit! 13...e6?!

14 c2

The touchstone of the whole thing is – naturally – 14 e6 with crazy complications, where either party can get lost easily. Let’s see just a little sample! Unfortunately, it was the most beautiful line that got refuted. It took White four years, though. ‘Little’ Dao Thien Hai unleashed a great novelty, against none other than my ‘accomplice’ IM Endre Végh. In Variation B, after 14 e6 fxe6 15 xxe6 (15 f4
e5 16 c6 f6+) 15...b8 16 0-0 b2 the Vietnamese youngster prevented the ‘wonder line’ 17 e1? d2!! by 17 xc3! fxf1 18 f3!!.

13...a5! N

Poor Endre got so confused that Dao took his rook ‘for free’ after
18...\text{d8} 19 \text{wx}c6 \text{wc}7 20 \text{wx}c7+ \text{xc}7 21 \text{a}4+.

Moreover, other defences also seemed to promise only torture.

So again, after 15...\text{b}8

A) 16 \text{xc}3? \text{b}2 17 \text{xd}7+ (17 \text{c}2? \text{c}5! 18 \text{xb}2 \text{xc}3++)
17...\text{xd}7 18 \text{c}2 \text{hb}8=;

B) 16 0-0! \text{b}2

B1) 17 \text{e}1? \text{d}2!! 18 \text{b}3 \text{xe}2 19 \text{xe}2 \text{xe}2 20 \text{b}7 \text{d}8 21
\text{xc}6 \text{d}3 22 \text{xc}3 (22 \text{g}4 \text{c}2)
22...\text{f}5+ 23 \text{a}6 \text{xe}6 24 \text{c}8 \text{f}7.

B2) 17 \text{xc}3! \text{xf}1 18 \text{f}3 \text{d}3
(18...\text{b}5 19 \text{f}7+ \text{d}8 20 \text{xc}7 \text{e}8 21 \text{xc}7 \text{d}8 22 \text{g}8 \text{xe}6
23 \text{xe}6=) 19 \text{f}7+ \text{d}8 20 \text{xc}7 \text{e}8 21 \text{d}5 \text{xd}5 22 \text{xd}7 \text{xd}7 23
\text{d}4 \text{c}4 24 \text{xd}5 \text{xd}5 25 \text{xb}2=;

But, as the two sides make moves in turns, BLACK can throw in 15...\text{d}8! in his turn (AA-Lékó, 1997). After this, there are no more fireworks, just the logical outcome of a chess game: 16 \text{b}3 \text{f}8! 17
\text{xc}3 \text{b}5 18 \text{c}4 \text{xc}4 19 \text{xc}4 \text{xc}4 20 \text{xc}4 c5! 21 0-0 (21 \text{dxc}5?
\text{e}5) 21...\text{xd}4 22 \text{xd}4 \text{b}6 with a peaceful end.

Finally, 14 \text{f}4 \text{b}6 15 \text{xc}3 \text{c}4?; 14 \text{xc}3 \text{d}8 15 \text{f}3 0-0 16
\text{xc}6 \text{xe}5 17 \text{a}4 \text{c}7=.

14...\text{e}5

15 \text{e}4?

A little naive, don’t you think? Yes, you have to be very specific and sharp in the royal game, but those with a healthy way of thinking are guided quite reliably by their so-called ‘feeling for chess’. So let’s repeat the lesson: there are 2 (two) kings on the board. And one more important slice of popular wisdom: You can never checkmate the enemy king without attacking pieces!

15...\text{xf}7! A bolt from the blue! Really shocking at first sight, but in the end justice will be served. True, on the way White could make his draw. 15...\text{xf}7 16 \text{e}6+!

A) 16...\text{xe}6? 17 \text{e}4+ \text{d}6
(17...\text{f}7 18 \text{d}5+ \text{e}6 19 \text{xd}7+}
\[ \text{f8} 20 \text{f4} \text{e8} 21 \text{xe6}+ \text{xe6} \\
22 \text{wx} 6 \text{cxd} 4 23 \text{f} 4 \text{c} 2+ 24 \text{d} 2 \\
\text{we} 5+ 25 \text{we} 5 \text{xe} 5 26 \text{xe} 2+ \text{e} 5 27 \text{xe} 5 28 \text{g} 3++; \]

**B)** 16...\text{g} 8 17 \text{ex} d 7 \text{cxd} 4 18 \\
\text{w} 3+ (18 \text{xd} 4 \text{d} 5 19 \text{we} 3 \text{d} 8 \\
20 \text{a} 3 \text{xe} 4 21 \text{xa} 6 \text{xe} 3 22 \\
\text{fxe} 3 \text{xd} 7=) 18...\text{f} 8 19 \text{xd} 4 \text{c} 2+ \\
20 \text{d} 2 \text{we} 5+ 21 \text{we} 3 (21 \text{e} 3 \\
\text{a} 5=) 21...\text{xd} 4! (21...\text{we} 3+ 22 \\
\text{xe} 3 \text{f} 7 23 \text{xc} 2 \text{hd} 8=) 22 \\
\text{f} 3+ \text{f} 6 23 \text{xa} 8+ \text{g} 7 24 \text{f} 3 \\
\text{d} 3 25 \text{h} 4 \text{xd} 7 26 \text{h} 5 \text{we} 6+ 27 \\
\text{e} 3 \text{we} 3+ 28 \text{xe} 3 \text{c} 3+ 29 \\
\text{d} 2 \text{b} 2 30 \text{hx} 6 \text{gx} 6 31 \text{h} 6+ \\
\text{g} 7 32 \text{c} 6 \text{xc} 1 33 \text{xc} 1 \text{d} 8 34 \\
\text{c} 7 \text{f} 5 35 \text{d} 2 \text{a} 6\text{f}.

15...0-0 16 \text{xf} 7+

16 \text{e} 6 \text{cxd} 4! 17 \text{ex} f 7+ \text{h} 8 18 \\
\text{xd} 4 \text{c} 2+ 19 \text{f} 1 (19 \text{c} 3 \\
\text{xc} 3+!) 19...\text{wd} 2+.

(23 \text{xc} 3 \text{xd} 7 24 \text{xg} 7 \text{wa} 3+ \\
23...\text{h} 6+ -+;)

**B)** 17 \text{wd} 5+ \text{e} 6 18 \text{xd} 7+ \text{g} 8 \\
19 \text{xe} 6+ \text{h} 8 20 \text{f} 4 \text{ab} 8\text{f}.

17 \text{f} 4

So that’s what it was all about! Threatening \text{xc} 6+ and \text{we} 4+ \\
mating. You don’t want to get too 

optimistic about it, though, as 17... 

g5 would have been insufficient for 

parrying danger, even if the 

variations are somewhat more 

complicated: 17 \text{f} 4 \text{ab} 8

A) 18 \text{e} 6 \text{b} 2 19 \text{xc} 3 \text{cxd} 4 20 \\
\text{wd} 4 (20 \text{xd} 4 \text{c} 5++) 20... \\
\text{xc} 5++;

B) 18 \text{b} 3 \text{c} 4 19 \text{c} 2 \text{b} 7\text{f}; 17 \\
\text{d} 5 \text{cxd} 4 18 \text{xd} 4 \text{ac} 8\text{f}.

17...\text{xf} 7!

The time has come. White pays 
dearly for forgetting the number of 

kings on the board... 17...g5? 18 \\
\text{g} 6+? (18 \text{we} 6? \text{cxd} 4 19 \text{xf} 8 \\
\text{xf} 8++; 18 \text{gh} 3 \text{cxd} 4 19 \text{g} 5 \\
c2+! 20 \text{d} 2 \text{xe} 5+ BUT; 18 \\
\text{h} 3\text{!} \text{cxd} 4 19 \text{c} 2 \text{d} 3 20 \text{xd} 3 \\
\text{e} 8 21 \text{c} 5 \text{f} 8 22 \text{xa} 6 \text{wa} 6 \\
23 \text{g} 5+!) 18...\text{hx} 6 19 \text{h} 4 (19 \\
\text{wa} 6 \text{xf} 7++; 19 \text{g} 5 \text{xf} 7++) \\
19...\text{xf} 7 20 \text{hx} 5+ (20 \text{e} 6 \text{f} 8 21 \\
\text{hx} 5+ \text{g} 8 22 \text{wa} 6 \text{f} 6++) \\
20...\text{g} 8 21 \text{xa} 8+ \text{f} 8 22 \text{we} 4 \\
cxd 4 23 \text{wd} 4 \text{xa} 2 24 \text{wd} 1 \\
\text{xe} 5++.

16...\text{h} 8!?

The other road probably led to 

Rome as well. But by this road, we 

also have a band playing. **ENJOY 

THE MUSIC!** 16...\text{xf} 7

A) 17 \text{e} 6+ \text{g} 8 18 \text{ex} d 7 \text{xe} 2 19 \\
\text{xe} 2 \text{cxd} 4 20 \text{xd} 4 \text{wa} 2+ 21 \\
\text{d} 3 \text{d} 8! 22 \text{c} 2 (22 \text{g} 7 \text{wd} 2+ \\
23 \text{c} 4 \text{f} 4++) 22...\text{wa} 6+ 23 \text{e} 3
18 \( \text{Wh}a8 + \text{Af}8 \) 19 \( \text{Wd}5 \)
19 \( \text{Wh}a7 \text{cx}d4 \) 20 \( \text{Wxd7 c}2 + ! \) 21
\( \text{Ad}2 \text{Wxe}5 + \) 22 \( \text{ Ae}3 \text{dx}e3 - + ; \) 19
\( \text{Wc}6 \text{cx}d4 \) 20 \( \text{Axd}4 \text{Wxf}4 \) 21 \( \text{Wxc}3 \text{Wh}5 + ; \) 19 \( \text{We}4 \text{cx}d4 \) 20 \( \text{Wxd}4 \text{Axe}5 - + . \)

20 \( \text{a}4 \text{Wb}2 \) 21 \( \text{Wxd}7 \text{Af}4 . \)
20...\( \text{cx}d4 \) 21 \( \text{Wxb}5 \text{Axb}5 \) 22 \( \text{Fe}6 \)
22 \( \text{Axd}4 \text{Wxf}4 \) 23 \( \text{Axc}3 \text{Ac}5 + . \)
22...\( \text{dx}e3 \) 23 \( \text{Axf}8 \text{Axe}5 ! ! . \)

A picturesque final position! This game was awarded the Brilliance Prize at the European Team Championship 1992. If Black now continues 24 \( \text{Wd}6 \) (24 \( \text{Wxc}3 \text{Af}3 + ! ; \) 24 \( \text{fx}e3 \text{Ac}3 + \) 25 \( \text{Ad}1 \text{Axc}1 \) 26
\( \text{Wxc}1 \text{Af}8 ) \) then 24...\( \text{Ac}3 + \) 25
\( \text{Ad}1 \) (25 \( \text{Ac}2 \text{Axc}1 + \) 26 \( \text{Wxe}3 \text{Axa}2 ) \) 25...\( \text{Axc}1 \) 26 \( \text{fx}e3 \text{Axa}2 \) 27
\( \text{Ac}2 \text{Aa}4 + \) 28 \( \text{Ab}1 \text{Ab}3 . \)

0-1
OK Lord, You win again...
(A little revolt)

Listen Lord, you can't complain, I was doing fine
Maybe not always but most of the time
I do respect your law and order
But I fear I'm just getting nowhere

I was born as I was told, wasn't I?
And step by step I'm growing old, it's all right
I've learned my lessons well
I saw too little heaven, too much hell

Am I being (You think) unfair? It may be the case
Did I ever say I was the pride of the human race?
Go ahead, admit You made me damn feeble
And let me tempted by a lot of evil

Master, can't you see I really need a rest
So give me a break, and please no more tests
I hit the floor far too often, let's put the record straight
It's getting harder and harder to stand up again before eight

Didn't I serve You faithfully, humbly?
Didn't I go through enough for a man made of clay?
So where is my reward, Father Almighty?
Or at least your great mercy, would You mind to say?
Don't get official, not again, skip that line this time
No eternity stuff, I want now what's mine
Do you know at all what is hunger, what's thirst?
Do you know for God's sake what is bad, and what's worse?

Don't call me beloved child, unless you're pulling my leg
Babble less, give more, Your Highness, don't let me beg
Sometimes I can't tell a night from a day
And you still think I shall endlessly obey?

Goddamn it Holy Dad, pardon me, I quit
The clown leaves the stage, thanks, no more shit
Where is my fair share, kindly keep your promised land
In just half a wink I want a gentle hand

- sobering SILENCE -

Okay Lord, You win again, there was never a chance I stood
If you must be hard on me, it is just understood
I'm back to work, cheerful as ever Boss
Let me quickly find and carry further my cross

Show me please the rainbow of Hope, let it shine
For just a moment or two—thanks! everything’s fine
Let it be by your wish, I shall accept Your will
Bless me with the task of struggling uphill...

13.10. '91. Istanbul
When András Adorján’s first book *Black is OK!* was published in 1988 it became an immediate bestseller and a cult classic, reaching out to the hearts and minds of club chessplayers. In this new book his message remains just as emphatic: too many chessplayers adopt an unnecessarily defensive approach with the Black pieces, when they should be more ambitious and strive immediately for double-edged positions with winning chances. Moreover, not only does Adorján offer concrete opening variations and illustrative games to support his claim but also a philosophy to generate a positive state of mind when entering a battle. The new examples given in this book effectively continue Adorján’s crusade, started in the revolutionary 1960s, and encourage players not only to win more games with Black but to enjoy themselves in the process!

Grandmaster András Adorján has represented Hungary in numerous Olympiads and is a former World Championship candidate. He has served as trainer to Garry Kasparov and Peter Leko, who was a world title challenger in 2003.
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