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PREFACE

The final volume consists of five parts.

In the first part we analyse some seldom played moves for Black. The second part of the book is devoted to the Dutch Defence. In the third part we deal with the different defences for Black after 1.d4 \( \text{\#f6} \) 2.c4, besides 2...c5 and 2...e6. In the fourth part we analyse the Benoni Defence and the Volga Gambit. Finally, in the fifth part of the book, we deal with Black’s most reliable opening – the Nimzo-Indian Defence.

In this volume, just like in the previous two, we have emphasized on reliability and rationality in our choice of systems for White. For example, against the Dutch Defence we have preferred the move 2.\( \text{\#c3} \), with which White reduces Black’s possibilities considerably. Against the Nimzo-Indian Defence we analyse the Rubinstein System – 4.e3, followed by \( \text{\#ge2} \), in which White’s first task is to avoid compromising of his pawn-structure.

The author wishes to express his deepest gratitude to Margarita Schepetkova for her invaluable help in the creation of this book.

Alexei Kornev
Part 1

Black tries seldom played moves after 1.d4

In the first part we will discuss some rarely played lines for Black on move one.

In the first chapter, we will have a look at 1...e5?!, 1...c6, followed by b7-b5 and 1...c6.

In chapter two, we will analyse the systems connected with the fianchetto of Black's lightsquared bishop; these are 1...a6, followed by b7-b5, 1...b5 and 1...b6.

The third chapter will be devoted to the move 1...c5.

In Chapters 4 and 5, we will deal with the move 1...e6, meanwhile Chapter 4 will be devoted to the somewhat dubious move 2...b6 (after 2.c4). In Chapter 5, we will analyse the more solid move 2...b4.

The power of Black's alternatives in the first part follows the path of increasing popularity. If the move 1...e5 seems to be quite dubious and he is immediately on the verge of disaster, then the line in Chapter 5 – 1.d4 e6 2.c4 b4+ creates serious problems for White and it is not easy for him to obtain an advantage in the opening at all.
Chapter 1

1.d4 e5
1.d4 c6
1.d4 \( \triangle c6 \)

In the first chapter of our final volume we will analyse three of the not so popular replies for Black against White's first move with his queen's pawn: A) 1... e5?!; B) 1... c6 with the idea b5 and C) 1... \( \triangle c6 \).

A) 1... e5?!

This move has been tried in more than 2000 games and even A. Alekhine has tested it several times; nevertheless, it is quite dubious. Later, Black will have to continue either a pawn down, or lose plenty of time to regain it falling back considerably in development.

2.dxe5

This is White's simplest and best response.

2...\( \triangle c6 \)

Black conceals his further plans for the moment.

2...\( e7 \) 3.f3 \( \triangle c6 \) 4.f4, or 2...f6 3.e4 \( \triangle c6 \) 4.f3 – see. 2... \( \triangle c6 \).

After 2...d6 3.exd6 \( \triangle x d6 \) 4.\( f3 \), Black's compensation for the sacrificed pawn is insufficient, for example: 4...\( \triangle c6 \) 5.c3 \( f6 \) 6.\( b5 \). This is an important move. White wishes to trade his opponent's powerful bishop and to compromise his pawn-structure, so that he can maintain a positional advantage besides the extra
pawns. Later, in the game Elliott–Lampon, IECC 2009, there followed 6...0–0 7.♘xd6 cxd6 8.e3 ♜e8 9.♗e2 ♘g4 10.0–0± Black has no compensation for the pawn whatsoever, because he cannot organize an attack against the enemy king. After White completes the development of his queenside, his advantage will become decisive.

3.♘f3

3...♗e7

This is the main line for Black after which he at least regains the sacrificed material.

Following 3...d6, contrary to 2...d6, White can develop his bishop with tempo. 4.♗g5!? ♜d7 5.exd6 ♛xd6 6.♘c3± and once again Black has no compensation for the sacrificed material at all, Kopylov–Faika, Hamburg 2012.

Following 3...♗c5 4.♘c3 f6 5. exf6 ♛xf6 6.♗g5 d6 7.e3 h6, Dorner–Schmidt, Email 1997, White maintains a clear advantage after 8.♗xf6 ♛xf6 9.♗d5 ♛f7 10.♗c4±

It may be interesting for Black to try 3...♗e7 – he wishes to regain his pawn after 4...♗g6, but contrary to 3...♗e7, his queen will not be attacked by White’s pieces. 4.♘c3 ♘g6 (The attempt to prevent the move 5.♗g5 with 4...h6, would lead to an even greater lag
of development for Black. 5.e4 \(\square_g6\) 6.e2 \(\square_cxe5\) 7.\(\square_xe5\) \(\square_xe5\), Metzenroth – Frank, Mittelfranken 2008, 8.0–0± – Almost all White’s pieces are perfectly mobilised while only Black’s knight has been developed.) 5.\(\square_g5\) \(\square_e7\) 6.\(\square_xe7\) \(\square_xe7\) 7.\(\square_d5\) \(\square_d8\) 8.\(\square_d2\) – His position is very difficult, Kachar – Gansvind, Moscow 2000. Black’s attempt to regain the pawn 8...\(\square_gxe5\)? 9.\(\square_xe5\) \(\square_xe5\) can be refuted by White with the simple resource 10.\(\square_c3\)–

4.\(\square_f4\)

He protects his pawn. Now, if Black wishes to regain the sacrificed material, he must begin a rather risky queen-sortie inside the enemy camp.

4...\(\square_b4\) plus

Following 4...f6 5.\(\square_xf6\) \(\square_xf6\) 6.\(\square_c1\)±, Black will have to defend a position with a pawn down, Solozhenkin – Bocchichio, Montecatini Terme 1999.

5.\(\square_d2\) \(\square_xb2\)

After this energetic move, Black’s lag in development will be hurting him.

But not 6.\(\square_c3??\), since White loses after 6...\(\square_b4\) 7.\(\square_d2\) \(\squarexc3\) 8.\(\squarexc3\) \(\squarec1\)#! This checkmate is the dream of the players who try this variation for Black. Still, only participants in children’s’ tournaments fall in traps like this.

6...\(\square_b4\)

It is not preferable for Black to opt here for 6...a6 7.\(\square_b1\) \(\squarea3\) 8.\(\square_d5\) \(\square_d8\) 9.e4 \(\squarege7\) 10.\(\square_c4\) – he is horribly behind in development and his king, stranded in the centre, will come soon under the attack of White’s combined forces, Blatt – Cherner, Email 2003.

6...\(\squareb4\) 7.\(\square d4\) c6 (7...c5 8.\(\square_b1\) \(\square a3\) 9.\(\square db5\) \(\square a5\) 10.a3 \(\square a6\) 11.\(\square e4\) – with a decisive penetration to the d6-square, Florea – Seidel, Klinge 1993) 8.\(\square b1\) \(\square a3\) 9.\(\square b3\) \(\square a5\) 10.a3 \(\square d5\) 11.\(\square cb5\) \(\square d8\) 12.e4 \(\square c7\) 13.\(\square g5\)+– and Black suffers huge material losses, Maruejols – Bakkes, Guernsey 2011.

In the variation 7...\(\square xc3\) 8.\(\square xb2\) \(\square xb2\), O.Pavlov – Zalesskij, Krasnoyarsk 2011, 9.\(\square b1\), Black’s compensation for the queen is insufficient, for example: 9...\(\square xe5\) 10.\(\square xe5\) \(\square xe5\) 11.\(\square c3\) f6 12.\(\square xe5\) fxe5 13.\(\square b5\) \(\square f6\) 14.\(\square e5\)+ \(\square d8\) 15.\(\square g5\)+–
Chapter 1

8.\(\text{d}5\)

After this move, Black will have great problems with the protection of his c7-pawn.

![Diagram 1](image1.png)

8...\(\text{a}5\)

8...\(\text{x}d2+\) 9.\(\text{xa}2\) \(\text{xa}2\) 10.\(\text{d}8\) 11.e4 \(\text{ge}7\) 12.e2 h6 13.0-0+-, Black lags catastrophically in development and his king is terribly misplaced in the centre, so he is incapable of parrying the threat \(\text{x}f4\), followed by e5-e6, Guthrie – Kaspar, Dunedin 1999.

9.\(\text{b}5\) \(\text{x}d2+\) 10.\(\text{xd}2\) \(\text{d}8\)

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

12.f4

White not only protects his e5-pawn, but also prepares the f2-square for his king. Later, in the game Cottegnie – Nicholls, Email 2011, there followed: 12...\(\text{xa}2\) 13.e3 \(\text{a}1+\) 14.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{g}4+\) 15.\(\text{g}1\) \(\text{h}6\) 16.h3 \(\text{a}6\) 17.\(\text{c}5\) \(\text{a}3\) 18.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{a}5\) 19.e4 \(\text{a}7\) 20.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{e}8\) 21.\(\text{h}2\) \(\text{g}8\) 22.\(\text{c}5\) \(\text{b}5\) 23.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{d}8\) 24.\(\text{d}4+-\) This is a picturesque position! Almost all Black’s pieces are deployed on the last ranks, while White’s pieces and pawns have occupied the centre completely. Black resigned in a few moves. This game is a very instructive examples for the beginners about the dangers of gobbling pawns early in the game, ignoring the development of the pieces.

B) 1...\(\text{c}6\)

![Diagram 2](image2.png)

This move does not determine Black’s plans yet. For example, he can still change his mind and transpose after 2...d5, or 2...\(\text{f}6\) 3.\(\text{c}3\) d5, to standard theoretical lines.
Here, we will only analyse the extravagant undermining of the enemy c4-pawn with the move 2...b5.

2.c4 b5
This line cannot provide Black with equality, but still White must be well prepared against it.

3.c5!? 

This interesting move is not so often played by White. He simply occupies space and waits what Black plans to do.

3...d6

Following 3...f6, Bogdanovski – Jacimovic, Star Dojran 1996, the best for White is to continue with 4...c2 d6 5.cxd6 exd6 6.f3 e7 7.e4±, followed by a2-a4, d3 and 0–0. In this variation, you can see the basic defect of Black’s second move – the weakening of his queenside pawn-structure.

4.cxd6 exd6 5.e4 f6

After 5...a6 6.a4! b7 7.f3 d7 8.d3 g6 9.0–0 e7 10. e1±, White has a powerful pawn-centre, while Black’s b5-pawn is weak and he can hardly activate his bishop on b7 (with c6-c5) because of that, Arnaudov – Panajotov, Plovdiv 2011.

6.d3 e7

Black’s situation becomes even worse after 6...b6 7.f3 g4 8.e3 d5, Moskalenko – Laketic, Belgorod 1990, 9.e5±. If his pawn had still been on the b7-square, White’s advantage would not have been so great. Now, the vulnerability of the c6-pawn is hurting Black.

7.f3!? 

This development of the knight is more natural than 7. e2, although even then after 7...0–0 8.0–0± Korobov – Fier, Beijing 2008, White would maintain better prospects. He dominates in the centre, while Black’s queenside pawn-structure is somewhat compromised.

7...0–0 8.0–0 g4 9.a4 b4
Chapter 1

10.h3 g5 11.e1 bd7 12. bd2± In the forthcoming middle game White can prepare a breakthrough in the centre with e4–e5, after the preliminary d1-c2, or choose the more reliable idea d2-f1-g3. His position would be preferable in both cases.

C) 1...e6

This move is only seldom played in the contemporary tournament practice; nevertheless, it has been tried by grandmasters like C.Bauer, A.Miles, N.Short etc. As a rule, after it there arise positions similar to the Alekhine Defence (naturally on the other side of the board...). White chases the enemy knight, while Black waits for the moment to exploit his opponent’s far-advanced pawns in order to organise counterplay.

2.d5 e5 3.f4 g6 4.e4 (diagram)

4...e5

About 4...e6 5.dxe6 – see 4...e5.

Black’s position is very passive following 4...d6, since contrary to the variations which we will analyse later his bishop cannot occupy the c5-square. 5.f3 e5 6.dxe6 fxe6 7.d3 f6, Skodvin – Wrangell, Norway 1991 (7...e5 8.f5 h4 9.0–0 xf3+ 10.xf3± White not only leads in development but has also space advantage on the kingside.) 8.e2!?± His game is much easier now. White can either advance immediately e4–e5, or after preliminary development of his queenside pieces and castling. He can do that, depending on circumstances, on the kingside, or on the queenside.

5.dxe6
Now, Black is faced with a choice. He may preserve the queens C1) $5...\text{fxe}6$, or enter a slightly inferior endgame with C2) $5...\text{dxe}6$.

**C1) $5...\text{fxe}6$**

One of the drawbacks of this move is that now, the slightly weakened shelter of Black's king may prove to be an important factor.

6. $\text{d}f3 \text{c}5$

He develops his bishop to an active position.

About 6...$\text{d}6$ 7.$\text{d}3$ — see 4...$\text{d}6$.

7. $\text{c}3$

![Chess Diagram]

7...$\text{h}6$

Here, Black's knight will be misplaced.

7...$\text{f}6$. This more natural development of Black's knight would not equalise either. 8.$\text{e}5$ $\text{g}4$ 9.$\text{e}4$ $\text{e}7$ (9...$\text{e}3$ 10.$\text{xe}3$ $\text{xe}3$ 11.$\text{g}3$ $\text{e}7$ 12.$\text{a}3$ 0–0 13. $\text{d}3\text{±}$ Sutkovic – Kalajzic, Omis 2006. White's pawns on e5 and f4 restrict considerably the movement of Black's knight on g6. Later, White can begin an attack on the kingside with h4–h5.) 10.$\text{g}3$ $\text{e}3$ 11.$\text{d}3$ $\text{b}6$, Kozak – Cernik, Czech Republic 2012, 12.$\text{fd}2$! $\text{h}6$ 13.$\text{f}3$ $\text{xd}2\text{+}$ 14.$\text{xd}2\text{±}$ — His minor pieces are much more active than their black counterparts.

It is possible that Black's most reliable line here is: 7...$\text{d}6$, although even then White maintains a slight edge. 8.$\text{a}4$ $\text{b}6$ (It is not so reliable for Black to follow here with 8...$\text{b}4\text{+}$ 9.$\text{d}2$ $\text{xd}2\text{+}$ 10.$\text{h}2$ $\text{e}7$ 11.$\text{g}3$ $\text{b}6$ 12. $\text{c}3$ 0–0 13.$\text{h}4\text{±}$ — he will have great problems parrying White's kingside attack, Cheng – Teichmann, Canterbury 2010.) 9.$\text{xb}6$ $\text{xb}6$, Ruban – Ermenkov, Miskolc 1990, 10.$\text{d}3$ $\text{e}5$ 11.$\text{f}5$ $\text{e}7$ 12.$\text{g}5$ $\text{h}6$ 13.$\text{h}4\text{±}$ — but despite White's two-bishop advantage and a slight lead in development, Black might still resist for long.

8.$\text{f}5$!

This is the point! After this move Black's position crumbles. 8...$\text{exf}5$

He loses immediately following 8...$\text{h}4$? Kagan – Teichmann, Melbourne 2002, due to 9.$\text{g}5$! $\text{exf}5$ 10.$\text{h}5\text{+}$ $\text{g}6$ 11.$\text{xf}5$ $\text{xf}5$ 12.$\text{d}3$ $\text{d}5$ 13.$\text{d}1\text{+}$ — and Black is helpless against $\text{h}7$.

9.$\text{g}5$
The position remains very difficult for him after 9...\textit{e}7 10. \textit{x}h6 \textit{gxh}6 11.\textit{exf}5 \textit{\textbf{h}4} 12.\textit{\textbf{x}h}4 \textit{\textbf{x}h}4+ 13.g3 \textit{\textbf{e}7+}, Obukhov – Davidovich, Warren 2004, 14. \textit{\textbf{e}2}! Naturally, White should better avoid the trade of the queens, since he is better developed. 14... \textit{f}6 15.\textit{\textbf{d}5} \textit{\textbf{e}5} 16.\textit{\textbf{x}f}6+ \textit{\textbf{x}f}6 17.\textit{\textbf{d}3}± Black’s king is terribly misplaced and his kingside pawn-structure has been compromised.

\textbf{10.\textit{x}h}6

Now, his king will hardly find a safe shelter.

\textit{10...\textit{gxh}6 11.\textit{\textbf{w}d}2 \textit{\textbf{b}4} 12. \textit{\textbf{w}d}4 \textit{\textbf{x}c}3+ 13.\textit{\textbf{w}xc}3 \textit{\textbf{f}8} 14. \textit{\textbf{x}f}5±} – Later, White managed to win the game, exploiting the unsafe placement of Black’s king, Grammatica – Kokorin, Email 2011.

\begin{center}
\textbf{C2) 5...dxe6}
\end{center}

This move seems to be more reliable than 5...fxe6, but it does not promise Black equality either, since White has occupied much more space. In addition, Black’s knight is misplaced on the g6-square. White only needs to watch carefully about his f4-pawn.

\textbf{6.\textit{\textbf{w}xd}8+ \textit{\textbf{xd}8} 7.\textit{\textbf{f}3}}

\textbf{7...\textit{\textbf{c}5}}

This is Black’s most natural and often played move. His bishop is developed to an active position.

About 7...\textit{\textbf{f}6} 8.\textit{\textbf{d}3} \textit{\textbf{c}5} 9. \textit{\textbf{c}3} – see 7...\textit{\textbf{c}5}.

\textbf{7...\textit{\textbf{d}7}}

This move leads to a cramped position for Black. 8.\textit{\textbf{d}3} \textit{f}6 (8...\textit{\textbf{d}6} 9.g3 \textit{\textbf{e}7}, Magerramov – Eid, Dubai 2003, 10.\textit{\textbf{e}3}! f6 11.0–0 \textit{h}5 12.\textit{\textbf{b}d}2 \textit{h}4 13.\textit{\textbf{c}4}± followed by an exchange on d6. After this, White will have not only the two-bishop advantage but also a superior pawn-structure.) 9.\textit{\textbf{e}3} \textit{h}6 10.h3 \textit{\textbf{f}7} 11.g3 \textit{e}5 12.f5 \textit{\textbf{e}7} 13.g4 \textit{c}6 14.\textit{\textbf{b}d}2 \textit{\textbf{c}7}, Grebionkin – Bezgodov, Ishevsk 2005, 15.0–0–0 \textit{\textbf{c}8} 16. \textit{h}4 \textit{\textbf{c}d}6 17.g5 with powerful initiative for White on Black’s kingside.
After 7...\textit{b}4+ 8.c3 \textit{e}5, Karpov – Berlandier, Cannes 1998, White can deploy advantageously his knight in the centre of the board. 9.\textit{b}d2 \textit{f}6 (Black loses a piece following 9...\textit{x}f4?? 10.\textit{b}3 \textit{d}6 11.e5+-) 10.e5 \textit{g}4 11.\textit{e}4 \textit{b}6 12.\textit{d}3– White has much more space and his pieces are considerably more active.

8.\textit{c}3 \textit{d}7

About 8...\textit{f}6 9.\textit{d}3 \textit{d}7 10.e5 – see 8...\textit{d}7.

9.\textit{d}3

9...\textit{f}6

After 9...\textit{e}7 10.\textit{e}2 a6 11.g3 \textit{c}6, Liedl – Vitouch, Vienna 2010, 12.\textit{e}3 \textit{x}e3 13.\textit{xe}3 \textit{e}7 14.h4±, White has a space advantage, while Black’s knight on g6 is misplaced.

9...\textit{h}6 10.e5 \textit{c}6 (He only weakens his pawn-structure after 10...f5 11.exf5 \textit{g}xf5 12.\textit{e}4 \textit{e}7 13.\textit{d}2 \textit{f}7 14.0–0–0± White is obviously much better prepared for the opening of the position, Yevseev – Vlasenko, St Petersburg 2011.) 11.\textit{e}4 \textit{e}7, Yevseev – Barhudarian, St Petersburg 2011 (11...\textit{x}e4 12.\textit{xe}4 \textit{e}7, Russev – Trevelyan, Plovdiv 2003, 13.\textit{e}3± and White’s position is much freer.) 12.\textit{e}2 \textit{e}8 13.\textit{d}1± Black’s minor pieces do not have enough space for manoeuvring.

10.e5 \textit{g}4

Following 10...\textit{d}5 11.\textit{x}d5 exd5 12.\textit{d}2 c6 13.0–0–0± Black has serious problems parrying the threats c2-c4, f4-f5 or \textit{f}3-g5, Vlasenko – Jorayeva, St Petersburg 2012.

11.\textit{e}4

White’s knight occupies a dominating position in the centre of the board.

11...\textit{e}3

It is possibly more reliable for Black to choose here 11...\textit{b}6, but even then after 12.\textit{e}2±, White’s advantage is doubtless.
Chapter 1

12.g3
12.h3!?! hxg4 13.f6 h6
14.g3 e7 15.f2 h8 16.eg5

Black does not have sufficient space and his knights are misplaced, moreover that he must take care permanently about the protection of his h7-pawn.

12...e7 13.h3 xc1 14.hxg4 xc1+ 15.e2 b6 16.h5 f8 17.lh1 Khenkin - Mate Adan, Don Benito 2012. White's rooks exert powerful pressure on the h-file. Black's defence is not easy at all, because his pieces are discoordinated.

Conclusion

Among all the schemes we have analysed in this chapter, Black's most dubious is – 1.e5. In this line, as a rule, White obtains an overwhelming, practically decisive advantage.

His achievements are not so great after 1..c6, but even then he can rely on a stable edge, because Black's queenside pawn-structure has been weakened by the move b7-b5.

White has greater problems maintaining an edge after 1..c6, if Black enters an endgame with the move 5...dxe6. White must follow with several precise moves in order to emphasize Black's difficulties connected with the lack of space. On the other hand, after 5...fxe6, White has good attacking chances, exploiting the unfavourable placement of Black's king in the centre of the board.
In this chapter we will analyse systems in which Black fianchettoes early his light-squared bishop. All these systems are not dangerous for White at all and he obtains an advantage effortlessly (it is accepted that you should fight actively for the centre in the opening...), but he should be well prepared against them. Black plays often like this particularly in tournaments with a shorter time-control. He can develop his bishop to b7 in three different ways: A) 1...a6 followed by b7-b5, B) 1...b5 and C) 1...b6.

A) 1...a6

Black is preparing an enlarged fianchetto. On the one hand the placement of his pawn on the b5-square has the advantage that later he can attack White's knight on c3, but on the other hand the defects of the placement of his pawn on b5 can be seen even by a naked eye. Black loses one more tempo (in comparison to 1...b6), in order to develop his bishop on b7 and what is most important – the placement of Black's pawn on b5 provides White with a target on the queenside to organise active actions there (after a2-a4). Despite all that, the move 1...a6 is encountered even at top level. For example, it is often played by the French grandmaster C. Bauer.

2.e4

White makes use of the main drawback of his opponent's first move and occupies the centre.
2...b5

After 2...c5 3.d5±, there arise positions from Chapter 3 in which the move a7-a6 is not the most useful for Black.

Following 2...d6, the simplest reaction for White would be 3.c4!, after which the best for Black would be to transpose to the King's Indian Defence with 3...g6 (after 3...e5 4.d5  ♘f6 5.♘c3 ♘e7 6.♗d3 ♕bd7 7.♗ge2 h5 8.h3 ♕h7 9.0-0± White maintains a stable advantage thanks to his extra space and superior development, Romanov – Dmitriev, Voronezh 2009) 4.♘c3 ♗g7 5.♘e2 ♕f6 6.♗g5 – see volume 2.

After 2...e6, White has an edge following 3.c4,

![Diagram](image)

It seems too risky for him to sacrifice a pawn with 3...b5. 4. cxb5 axb5 5.♗xb5 ♕b7 6.♘c3 ♕b4 7.♗e2 f5. Black is trying to organise counterplay exploiting the defencelessness of his opponent's pawn on g2, but falls behind considerably in development. 8.♖h3. White sacrifices a pawn and seiz-
es completely the initiative. 8... fxe4 9.♗h5+ ♕f8 10.♗g5 ♕h6 11.0-0+– Chandler – Basman, England 1985.

3...d5. This is the best for Black. 4.exd5 exd5 5.♘c3 ♕f6 (5... ♕b4, Meier – Bauer, Biel 2012. Here, after 6.cxd5!? ♘xd5 7.♗f3 ♕f6 8.♗d3 0-0 9.0-0 ♘xc3 10.bxc3± White maintains a slight but stable edge thanks to his bishop-pair.) 6.♗g5 dxc4 7.♘xc4 ♕e7 8.♗f3± Raetsky – Bauer, Biel 2008. The arising type of positions was analysed by us in our first volume (the variation 1.d4 d5 2.c4 dxc4 3.e3 e5 4.♘xc4 exd4 5.exd4), but here, Black has lost a tempo for the not so useful move a7-a6.

3.♗f3 ♕b7

About 3...e6 4.♗d3 ♕b7 5.0-0 – see 3...♗b7.

4.♗d3

White not only protects his central pawn, but prepares to castle.

![Diagram](image)

4...e6
The position is difficult for Black after 4...\( \text{d}f6 \). Following 5.e5 \( \text{d}d5 \)

White should better choose 6.0–0!? (The consequences are not so clear after the active attempt 6.\( \text{g}5 \) e6 7.\( \text{f}3 \) f5 8.exf6 \( \text{xf6} \) 9.\( \text{xh7} \) \( \text{xf3} \) 10.\( \text{g}6+ \) \( \text{d}8 \) 11.\( \text{xf3} \), Dearing – Tiller, England 2010, 11...\( \text{e}7 \) 12.\( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{xf3} \) 13.\( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{c}8 \) 14.\( \text{d}3 \) and although White has succeeded in winning a pawn, but he will have great problems realising it in the endgame, because he has numerous pawn-weaknesses.). 6...e6 7. a4. He wishes to exploit immediately the advanced position of Black’s b5-pawn. 7...b4 8.\( \text{bd2} \). White’s knight is headed for the c4-square. We will see this manoeuvre many more times. 8...\( \text{c}6 \) 9.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 10.c4 bxc3 11.bxc3 \( \text{b}8 \) 12.\( \text{b}1 \)± Tomba – De Filippis, Email 2009. After castling kingside, Black’s king may come under attack, because White’s e5-pawn deprives Black’s knight of the f6-square. So, his pieces will have problems helping in the defence of his king. Black’s early queenside activity has only led to the appearance of a weak a-pawn there.

5.0–0

5...c5

Black attacks immediately his opponent’s centre.

About 5...\( \text{f}6 \) 6.e5 (6.\( \text{e}1 \)?) 6...\( \text{d}5 \) 7.a4 – see 4...\( \text{f}6 \).

He cannot equalise with 5...d6 6.\( \text{e}2 \) (White has an interesting move here which has not been tested in practice yet – 6.d5?!†, beginning immediately active operations in the centre. Black’s defence will be difficult, because he lags in development.) 6...\( \text{d}7 \) 7. a4 b4 (7...c6 8.\( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 9.h3 \( \text{e}7 \) 10.\( \text{bd2} \)± White dominates in the centre and his pieces have occupied more active positions, Matsuura – Lucena, Brasilia 2005) 8.c3!? With this move, he not only wishes to gain access to the c3-square for his knight, but starts active actions on the queenside. 8...bxc3 9.\( \text{x}c3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 10.d5 e5. Black lags in development and
cannot afford to open the game in the centre. Now however, his bishop will be restricted by White’s pawn on d5. 11...\texttt{d}d2. He is preparing the transfer of his knight to the a5-square. 11...\texttt{e}7 12.b4 0–0 13.\texttt{c}c4 \texttt{c}6 14.\texttt{d}xc6 \texttt{xc}6 15.\texttt{a}a5\texttt{±} White has seized the initiative on the queenside and Black’s defence there will be very difficult, since his a6-pawn is vulnerable, Kahl – Boehnke, Email 2010.

\begin{itemize}
\item [6.c3]
\end{itemize}
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6...\texttt{f}6

It is bad for Black to play here 6...\texttt{c}6, because his knight will come under attack with tempo. 7.d5! \texttt{a}a5 8.\texttt{e}e1 \texttt{c}7 (8...\texttt{e}7, Hoffmann – Lopatina, Bad Wiessee 2008, 9.d6!? \texttt{g}6 10.e5\texttt{±} White’s pawns on d6 and e5 cramp considerably Black’s position). 9.b3 \texttt{g}6, Kuljasevic – Fernandez, Rethymno 2012. Here, White refrained from the move 10.c4!, but in vain, because after 10...\texttt{g}7, he would have the resource 11.e5 \texttt{d}5 12.\texttt{x}d5 \texttt{x}d5 13.\texttt{x}g6\texttt{±} – regaining the pawn and preserving all the advantages of his position.

6...d6 7.a4 c4. This is an attempt by Black to keep the position closed (7...b4 8.\texttt{c}xb4 \texttt{c}xb4, Van Wely – Zapolskis, Liepaya 2004, 9.\texttt{e}e1!?\texttt{±} – His b4-pawn is very weak and his kingside is absolutely undeveloped.). 8.\texttt{c}c2 \texttt{f}6 9.\texttt{e}e1 \texttt{e}7 10.axb5 axb5 11.\texttt{x}a8 \texttt{x}a8 12.\texttt{a}a3 \texttt{c}6 13.d5! White opens advantageously the position. 13...\texttt{d}5 14.\texttt{x}d5 \texttt{x}d5 15.\texttt{x}b5 0–0, Bartell – Gelashvili, Philadelphia 2012. Now, he could have maintained a great advantage with the move 16.\texttt{d}d4!\texttt{±} and Black would have great problems with the protection of his c4-pawn. He can hardly parry White’s threats: \texttt{a}a3, \texttt{a}a4-b5 and \texttt{e}e2.

\begin{itemize}
\item [7.\texttt{e}e1]
\end{itemize}

![](image)

7...\texttt{e}7

In the blitz game Kasparov – Short, Leuven 2011, Black tried
7...\(\text{c7}\) and after 8.a4 \(\text{c4}\) 9.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{d5}\) 10.e5± there arose a favourable type of position for White from the French Defence. His pieces are better developed and he has a space advantage.

Following 7...\(\text{d5}\) 8.e5, the position remains closed and the pawn-structure resembles the French Defence.

8...\(\text{f}d7\) 9.\(\text{g5}\) ! After this energetic move, Black's defence is difficult. 9...\(\text{g6}\) (9...\(\text{h6}\)?? 10.\(\text{xe6}\)! \(\text{xe6}\) 11.\(\text{h5}\)+ \(\text{e7}\) 12.\(\text{h4}\)+ g5 13.\(\text{xg5}\)+ \(\text{hxg5}\) 14.\(\text{xg5}\)+ \(\text{f6}\) 15.\(\text{xf6}\)+ \(\text{d7}\) 16.\(\text{xf6}\)+) 10.\(\text{g4}\).

White continues to increase the pressure. 10...\(\text{e7}\) 11.\(\text{xe7}\) 12.\(\text{xh7}\), Niebergall - Jovanovic, Munich 2006, 11.\(\text{exh7}\) 12.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{exe5}\) 13.\(\text{dxe5}\) \(\text{d7}\) 14.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{c6}\) 15.\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{g7}\) 16.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{h5}\) 17.\(\text{h4}\)+ Black's king can hardly find a safe haven in this position.

8...\(\text{e4}\) 9.\(\text{bd2}\) \(\text{xd2}\) 10.\(\text{xd2}\) \(\text{c6}\) 11.\(\text{xc5}\) \(\text{xc5}\) 12.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{c7}\) 13.\(\text{h5}\) \(\text{g6}\) 14.\(\text{h3}\). Now, it has become impossible for Black to castle kingside and after 14...0-0-0, White begins an attack on the queenside: 15.b4 \(\text{b6}\) 16.\(\text{f3}\)+ - later he will follow with a2-a4 and once again you can see the consequences of the move b7-b5, Delchev – Chetverik, Cannes 2005.

8.e5
White occupies space and frees the e4-square for his knight.

8...\(\text{d5}\) 9.\(\text{xc5}\) \(\text{xc5}\) 10.\(\text{bd2}\)

10...\(\text{f5}\)
Naturally, Black is reluctant to let the enemy knight to occupy the e4-square.

Following 10...\(\text{e7}\), Riemersma – Singh, Amsterdam 2010, White ousts the enemy knight from the centre: 11.a4! \(\text{b4}\) 12.c4 \(\text{f4}\). Now, his task is to penetrate to the d6-square. 13.\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{xe4}\) 14.\(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{g6}\) 15.\(\text{g5}\)+ – After the trade of the dark-squared bishops, White's knight will go unavoidably to the d6-square.

10...\(\text{c6}\) 11.\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{e7}\) 12.a4 \(\text{bxa4}\) 13.\(\text{xa4}\)+ L.Torre – Leisner,
Email 2003. Later, White can exert pressure against the enemy a6-pawn, or prepare an attack on the kingside with \( \text{c2, d3} \). In all the variations Black will be faced with a difficult defence.

After this move there arise positions, similar to variation A, except that Black is not obliged immediately to play the move a7-a6. In this way he gains time to create pressure against the enemy e4-pawn. This move has been tested several times by the World Champion number 10 B.Spassky.

2.\( e4 \text{ b7} \) 3.\( d3 \)

Naturally, White should not exchange his central pawn for the enemy flank pawn.

3...\( \text{f6} \)

About 3...a6 4.\( \text{f3} \) – see 1...a6.

4.\( \text{d2} \)

White defends his e4-pawn. In general, the knight on d2 is not so well placed as on c3, but here, this is not so important because later, he will play e4-e5 and will deploy this knight on the e4-square.

4...\( e6 \) 5.\( \text{gf3} \) \( a6 \)

About 5...c5 6.dxc5 \( \text{x}c5 \) 7.0–0 a6 – see 5...a6.

6.0–0

B) 1...\( b5 \)

6...c5

This is Black’s most energetic response. He undermines White’s centre.
6...\(\text{e7}\). After this indifferent move, Black’s position becomes difficult. 7.e5 \(\text{\text{d}}\text{d}\text{5}\) 8.a4 b4 9.\(\text{e}\text{e}\text{4}\) a5 10.c4 bxc3 11.bxc3 \(\text{a}\text{a}\text{6}\), Oll – Bogaerts, Groningen 1984. Now, White could have provoked a favourable weakening of the d6-square with the line: 12.\(\text{b}\text{b}\text{5}\)!? c6 13.\(\text{d}\text{d}\text{3}\) ± followed by \(\text{a3}\) and penetration to the d6-square.

6...d5. This move leads to closed positions, more typical for the French Defence. 7.e5 \(\text{f}\text{f}\text{d}\text{7}\) 8.\(\text{b}\text{b}\text{3}\) c5 9.dxc5 \(\text{x}\text{c}\text{5}\) 10.\(\text{x}\text{c}\text{5}\) \(\text{x}\text{c}\text{5}\) 11.c3 \(\text{c}\text{6}\), Flear – Rossi, Asti 1997. Here, White should have begun active operations on the queenside: 12.b4 \(\text{e}\text{7}\) 13.a4± Black has difficulties with the protection of his pawns on a6 and b5 and White has much more space.

7.dxc5 He forces the enemy bishop to come under attack with tempo after the move \(\text{e}\text{4}\).

7...\(\text{x}\text{c}\text{5}\) 8.e5 \(\text{d}\text{d}\text{5}\) 9.\(\text{e}\text{4}\) \(\text{e}\text{7}\) 10.a4

Before the start of the active actions in the centre and on the kingside, it is useful for White to compromise his opponent’s position on the other side of the board.

10...b4

It may be interesting, but still insufficient for Black to equalise, to try 10...\(\text{b}\text{4}\) 11.\(\text{g}\text{5}\), Swinkels – Serdijn, Vlissingen 2006. The trade of the dark-squared bishops is in favour of White, because after that the vulnerability of the d6-square in Black’s camp will be hurting him. 11...0–0 12.\(\text{xe}\text{7}\) \(\text{xe}\text{7}\) 13.c3 \(\text{xd}\text{3}\) 14.\(\text{xd}\text{3}\) \(\text{xe}\text{4}\) 15.\(\text{xe}\text{4}\) \(\text{c}\text{6}\) 16.\(\text{f}\text{d}1\)± White has a very easy game against Black’s weak pawns on b5 and d7.

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

White has a very good alternative here – 11.\(\text{f}\text{d}2\)!?, preparing the transfer of his knight to the c4-square and eventually to d6. 11...0–0 12.\(\text{c}\text{4}\)± and due to the vulnerability of the d6-square Black must start defending, Hasangatin – Kutuzov, Pardubice 2004.
11...0–0

Black loses immediately after 11...f6?. Following 12.exf6 ∆xf6 13.∆xf6 gxf6, White inflicts a decisive tactical strike: 14.∆e5! fxe5 15.♗h5+ ♔f8 16.f4 1-0 Colsaet – Fedorko, Email 2000.

12.♗d2 ∆xg5 13.∆exg5 h6 14.∆e4 ∆c6 15.♗ae1 White has good prospects in the forthcoming middle game to exploit the vulnerability of the dark squares in Black's camp.

C) 1...b6

This is the most reliable move among all we have been analysing in this chapter. Black wishes to develop his bishop on b7 as quickly as possible, without losing tempi for b5, which as a rule leads only to the weakening of his queenside. It has been tried by World Champions like Em. Lasker and B. Spassky. Nowadays, C. Bauer plays often like this and sometimes E. Bakro, H. Nakamura – and some other grandmasters.

Still the move 1...b6 is considerably less popular not only than the standard variations, but even than its “twin-brother” – the move 1...g6. This is not surprising, because with the move 1...g6, Black not only develops his bishop, but prepares castling kingside, while after 1...b6, he often dooms his king to remain in the centre for long. Naturally, you should not forget that all the lines, analysed in this chapter, have one general defect. Black does not prevent his opponent from occupying the centre with his pawns.

2.e4 ♔b7 3.♗d3

White is not in a hurry to play ♔c3, keeping the possibility to follow in some variations with c2-c4.

3...♗f6

After 3...f5?, Black fails to exploit the vulnerability of the g2-square, because of 4.exf5 ∆xg2 5.♔h5+ g6 6.fxg6, for example: 6...♗g7 (6...♗f6?? 7.gxh7+ ♔xh5 8.♗g6#) 7.gxh7+ ♔f8 8.♕f3 ♔f6
(8...$\text{axh1} \? 9.\text{c5} \text{e8} 10.\text{hxg8}+ \text{hxg8} 11.\text{f5}+ \text{f6} 12.\text{h6}+) 9.\text{g6} \text{xf3} (\text{White's rook is un-touchable, just like before: } 9... \text{xh1} \? 10.\text{h6}! \text{hxh7} 11.\text{g5}+) 10.\text{g1} \text{exh7} 11.\text{g3}. \text{Now}, both \text{Black's bishop and rook are under attack.} 11...\text{e4} 12.\text{exe4} \text{exe4} 13.\text{f3}+ \text{g8} 14.\text{xex4}+, \text{White has regained the sacrificed material and now, his advantage is not so much due to his extra pawn, but Black's king is terribly weak, deprived of its pawn-shelter}, \text{Thierry – Van den Braak, Email 2009.}

3...g6. \text{Black plans a double fianchetto.} 4.\text{f3} \text{g7} 5.0-0 \text{d6} (5...e6 6.\text{g5} \text{e7} 7.\text{d2} \text{h6} 8.\text{e3} \text{d6} 9.c4 c5 10.\text{c3} \text{White is better developed and has occupied more space, while Black has problems with his castling due to the placement of his pawn on h6}, \text{Dreev – McShane, playchess.com 2006}) 6.c4. \text{Now}, there arise positions more typical for the King's Indian Defence and as it is well known the b7-square is not the best for Black's bishop in this opening, since it does not control from there the important h3-c8 diagonal. 6...\text{d7} 7.\text{c3} e6 (7...e5 8.d5 \text{gf6} 9.\text{b1} 0-0 10.b4+ \text{White is considerably ahead of his opponent in actions on different sides of the board}, \text{Djurhuus – Ong, Sweden 2009}) 8.\text{g5} \text{e7} 9.\text{d2} \text{h6} 10.\text{e3} g5. \text{This move is forced; otherwise, it is inconceivable how Black can castle.} 11.d5 \text{g6} 12.\text{d4} \text{e7} 13.\text{cb5} \text{c5} 14.\text{c2} a5 15.b3 0-0 16.a3 (followed by b3-b4) \text{White's queenside actions are running effortlessly, Oll – Spassky, Tallinn 1998.}

After 3...e6, as a rule, Black plays later \text{f6} and the game transposes to 3...\text{f6}, but there are some exceptions as well. 4.\text{c3}

\begin{center}
\text{4...g6 5.f4 g7 6.f3 e7 7.0-0 d6 8.f5+ \text{White's attack is very powerful, Panarin – Laznicka, playchess.com 2006.}}

\text{Following 4...d6 5.f4 \text{f6} 6.\text{f3} c5, Tocchioni – Meijers, Assisi 2008, White can begin immediately active actions in the centre.} 7.d5! \text{exd5} 8.\text{b5+ c6} 9.\text{xc6+ ecx6} 10.exd5 \text{a5} 11.0-0 \text{Black lags in development, moreover that after the trade of the bishops the light squares in his camp are very weak.}

4...\text{b4 5.ge2}. \text{White prevents the doubling of his pawns.}
\end{center}

\begin{center}(diagram)
\end{center}

\text{About 5.\text{f6} 6.a3 – see 3...\text{f6}.}

\text{After 5...c5 6.d5 \text{f6} 7.0-0 0-0 8.\text{g5}+ the pin of the knight is very unpleasant for Black, Delchev – Savenkov, Varna 2012.}
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5...\(\text{e7}\) 6.0–0 0–0 7.a3 \(\text{xc3}\) 8.\(\text{e4}\), White has the two-bishop advantage and a much easier game. After the impulsive move 8...f5?! , Matta – Singh, Mumbai 2009, he could have increased his advantage with 9.d5!±

5...d5 6.0–0 dxe4 7.\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{e4}\) 8.\(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{e7}\), Jansa – Ljubisavljevic, Smederevska Palanka 1978, 9.\(\text{c3!}\)± Black has great problems defending against White’s threats d4-d5 and \(\text{f3}\).

4.\(\text{c3}\) e6 5.\(\text{ge2!}\)?

This move has brought to White excellent results both in practical games as well as in correspondence chess.

With a white knight on e2, the move 5...\(\text{b4}\) is senseless, because after 6.a3! Black is forced to retreat his bishop back to his camp. 6...\(\text{e7}\) (following 6...\(\text{xc3}\) 7.\(\text{xc3}\)± and then \(\text{g5}\), the pin of the knight on f6 is very unpleasant for Black, Dragun – Pietrocha, Warsaw 2012) 7.e5 \(\text{d5}\) 8.\(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{xd5}\) Tomcik – Bucek, Slovakia 2012. Here, White maintains a great advantage by transferring his queen to the g4-square: 9.\(\text{c3!}\) \(\text{b7}\) 10.\(\text{g4!}\)

It seems too passive for Black to choose 5...d6 6.0–0 \(\text{e7}\) 7.f4 0–0 8.e5 \(\text{fd7}\), Preussner – Buhmann, Email 2009, 9.\(\text{e4!}±\) and thanks to his pawn on e5 and the powerful placement of his knight on the centre, White has excellent attacking prospects.

5...d5. This attempt by Black to keep the position closed cannot help him. 6.e5

Following 6...\(\text{e4}\) 7.\(\text{xe4}\) dxe4 8.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{d7}\), Greet – Steffens, Penarth 2013, 9.0–0± Black has problems with the protection of his e4-pawn.
6...\( \text{g}8 \) 7.\( \text{f}4 \) c5 8.0–0 \( \text{c}6 \)
9.dxc5 bxc5 10.\( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{ge}7 \), Lalic – Gawehns, Germany 2002. Black has lost too much time on manoeuvres with his knight and White can begin active operations. 11.\( \text{b}5!? \) \( \text{g}6 \) 12.\( \text{xd}5! \) \( \text{exd}5 \) 13.\( \text{wh}5 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 14.\( \text{g}5 \) and despite the extra piece, Black can hardly parry his opponent's numerous threats against his king.
14...\( \text{a}6 \) 15.a\( \text{d}6\) 16.a\( \text{f}5\) c7 17.\( \text{xf}7 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 18.\( \text{uh}7+-\), Black's kingside is in ruins.

6...\( \text{fd}7 \) 7.\( \text{f}4 \). White is preparing \( \text{g}4 \). 7...\( \text{e}7 \) 8.\( \text{g}4 \) g6 9.\( \text{h}4 \). Before sacrificing on e6, he plans to transfer his rook to f3.
9...\( \text{c}6 \) 10.\( \text{xe}6 \)! “If in the first act you have hung a pistol on the wall, then in the following one it should be fired.” (A.P. Chekhov).
10...\( \text{fxe}6 \) 11.\( \text{xg}6+ \text{hxg}6 \) 12.\( \text{g}6+ \text{f}8 \) 13.\( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 14.\( \text{h}6+ \text{xh}6 \) 15.\( \text{xh}6+ \text{f}7 \) 16.\( \text{h}7+ \text{e}8 \) 17.\( \text{h}5+ \text{f}8 \) 18.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 19.\( \text{h}7 \text{e}8 \)
20.0–0 0.\( \text{g}3 \) Fass – Lloyd, Email 2009.

6.d5!
This is the right move. White sacrifices a pawn and seizes completely the initiative.

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

The position remains very difficult for Black even if he refrains from accepting the pawn-sacrifice: 6...a6 7.0–0 \( \text{c}7 \) 8.\( \text{g}3\) White is better developed and his pawn on d5 cramps considerably Black's bishop on b7 and hampers the development of his knight on b8, Kubicki – Taras, Email 2009.

7.\( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 8.\( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 9.0–0

White has more than sufficient compensation for the pawn, because Black lags in development.

9...\( \text{c}6 \)

Following 9...\( \text{b}7 \) 10.\( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 11.\( \text{f}4 \), Black cannot play 11...0–0, since he will be immediately checkmated after 12.\( \text{wh}5 \) g6 13.\( \text{xg}6 \) \( \text{fxg}6 \) 14.\( \text{xg}6 \) hxg6 15.\( \text{xg}6+ \text{h}8 \) 16.\( \text{e}5+−\)

10.\( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \)
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the game Smikovski – Osipov, Omsk 2001. Here, White could have maintained a slight edge with 11.\( \text{dx}e6! \text{dxe6} \) 12.\( \text{f}4 \) – In this position his bishops are very powerful. Black's defence is very difficult. 12...\( \text{e}7 \) 13.\( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{xd}1 \) 14.\( \text{fxd1} \) \( \text{c}8 \) 15.\( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 16.\( \text{xd}8+ \) \( \text{xd}8 \) 17.\( \text{b}5+ \) \( \text{f}8 \) 18.\( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 19.\( \text{b}8\pm \) White regains his pawn preserving all the advantages of his position.

Conclusion

We have just finished the analysis of the systems, connected with the early fianchetto of Black's light-squared bishop. White obtains effortlessly an advantage in the opening exploiting the main drawback of Black's plan. He falls behind in development and his king remains in the centre for too long. If his pawn is on \( b5 \), then he has even another problem – to protect his queenside after White plays \( a2-a4 \). We must also mention that he often sacrifices material, so White needs to know concrete opening variations and this book should be very helpful to the readers because of that.
We will devote this chapter to the analysis of the move 1...c5. It has been played back in the middle of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century has been often used by S. Tartakover. The World Champions A. Alekhine and M. Tal have tried it as well. Nowadays, V. Malakhov, Sh. Mamedyarov and some other grandmasters play it.

Now, contrary to the classical Benoni Defence, which has been analysed in Part 4, we will analyse variations without 1...\(\texttt{f6}\) 2.c4. The main feature of these positions is that White’s pawn is still on c2. This may turn out to be in his favour, because his light-squared bishop may go b5 after which White may exchange favourably the light-squared bishops. What is even more important is that the c4-square has not been occupied by a white pawn and he can transfer his knight there along the route f3-d2-c4. It will exert pressure from that square against the enemy pawns on d6 and e5 and this may prove to be very important after White advances f2-f4.

2.d5

We will analyse as basic responses for Black the moves A) 2...e5 and B) 2...d6.

About 2...\(\texttt{f6}\) 3.c4, or 2...e6 3.c4 – see Part 4.
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2...f5 – see the Dutch Defence.
Following 2...g6 3.c4, there arise positions from the Modern Defence, which has been analysed in our volume 2.

It seems anti-positional for Black to choose 2...b5?! because he fails to maintain the control over the c4-square later and only creates additional weaknesses on his queenside. 3.e4

3...wb6 4.a4. This is a key-move. Now, White wins the battle for the c4-square. 4...bxa4, Loncar – Radulovic, Sibenik 2008 (or 4...b4 5.\(\texttt{d}2\)± followed by \(\texttt{c}4\) and White’s knight comes with tempo to a very favourable position) 5.\(\texttt{f}3\)!? d6 6.e5 g6 7.exd6 exd6 8.\(\texttt{d}3\) \(\texttt{g}7\) 9.0–0 \(\texttt{e}7\) 10.\(\texttt{e}1\)± Black has lost tempo for premature operations on the queenside and lags in development, moreover that the pin on the e-file is very unpleasant for him.

3...a6 4.a4 b4 5.\(\texttt{d}2\) \(\texttt{f}6\) 6.\(\texttt{d}3\) d6 7.\(\texttt{g}3\) e5 8.a5 \(\texttt{e}7\) 9.h3 0–0 10.\(\texttt{c}4\)± Khenkin – Alias Ginel, Santa Cruz de la Palma 2005. Black has no counterplay whatsoever. White can prepare an offensive on the kingside with f2-f4, as well as on the queenside with the undermining move c2-c3.

A) 2...e5
After this move the centre is blocked and the active operations will be on the flanks.
3.e4

There arises a transposition to the main line after 3...\(\texttt{f}6\) 4.\(\texttt{c}3\) d6 5.\(\texttt{b}5\)+ \(\texttt{d}7\) (5...\(\texttt{d}7\) 6.a4 \(\texttt{e}7\) 7.\(\texttt{f}3\) – see variation A1) 6.a4 \(\texttt{e}7\) 7.\(\texttt{f}3\) – see variation A2a.

Following 3...g6, White can begin immediately the fight for the e5-square. 4.f4 \(\texttt{g}7\) 5.\(\texttt{f}3\) exf4 6.\(\texttt{x}f4\) \(\texttt{x}b2\) 7.\(\texttt{b}d2\) \(\texttt{x}a1\) 8.\(\texttt{x}a1\) f6 9.\(\texttt{c}4\) h6, Holzgrewe – Tutschka, Germany 1999. Here, it seems very good for White to play 10.\(\texttt{h}4\)! and Black cannot play 10...g5 due to 11.\(\texttt{g}6\) \(\texttt{h}7\) 12.\(\texttt{d}6\)#

It seems very bad for him to opt for 3...a6, since following 4.
f4!? the move a7-a6 is not useful for Black at all. 4...exf4 (4...d6 5."f3 exf4 6."xf4 – see 4...exf4) 5.f3 d6 6."xf4 e7 7.bd2 g6 8.g3 e7 9.a4 0–0 10.d3 d7 11.c4 White's knight on c4 exerts powerful pressure against the enemy d6-pawn, Ratolistka – Milotai, Brno 1957.

4."b5+

This rather unpleasant check is not so often played in the tournament practice, but creates great problems for Black.

Now, he must choose how to interpose against it: with the bishop **A1)** 4...d7, which may lead later to a favourable for White exchange of the light-squared bishops, or with the knight **A2)** 4...d7, which would lead to the fact that the bishop on c8 may fail to enter the actions for a long time.

**A1)** 4...d7 5.a4

Naturally, White does not exchange on d7, since this would only help Black's development. Now, if he trades the bishops on b5, this would lead to a favourable for White opening of the a-file.

**5...e7**

Black develops his kingside pieces and is threatening to exchange advantageously the bishops with the move g5.

It seems rather dubious for Black to choose 5...a6?! in view of 6.xd7+ xd7 7.a5. Now, the pawn-advance b7-b5 will be connected with a serious weakening of Black's queenside pawn-structure. 7...e7 (7...g6 8.d2+ followed by c4) 8.f3 g6 9.c3 b5 10.axb6 xb6 11.d2 0–0 12.c4 White has much more space, while Black's pawns on a6 and d6 are very weak, Muehlebach – Kaeding, Bad Ragaz 1992. White has accomplished the standard plan for similar positions – the transfer of his knight to the c4-square. Later, it may remain there, or continue its journey inside the enemy camp (c4-a5-c6).
After 5...g6, White can open advantageously the position in the centre with 6.f4. Although this move is a typical resource for him in this variation, White should be very careful about this pawn-advance, since Black’s pieces gain access to the important e5-square.

Now, it would not work for Black to continue with 6...exf4 7.gxf4 Wf6, due to 8.\textit{e}c2!? (White maintains a slight but stable edge in the endgame after 8.\textit{c}c1 \textit{h}6 9.\textit{x}h6 \textit{h}4+ 10.g3, \textit{x}h6, \textit{Kortylev – Malakhov, Moscow 1995, 11.\textit{x}h6 \textit{d}h6 12.\textit{d}d2=} 8...\textit{h}6 (It would be too risky for Black to try 8...\textit{x}b2?, since his queen will be seriously endangered after that and he falls behind considerably in development. 9.\textit{b}c3 \textit{g}7 10.\textit{e}5 \textit{b}4 11.\textit{b}1 \textit{a}5 12.0-0 dxe5 13.\textit{g}5 \textit{h}6 14.\textit{d}d2 \textit{f}5 15.\textit{g}4 \textit{d}d6 16.\textit{x}d7+ \textit{d}d7 17.\textit{b}5 \textit{b}6 18.a5 \textit{xb}5 19.\textit{x}b5 \textit{xb}5 20.d6 0-0 21.\textit{d}d5+-) 9.0-0 \textit{xf}4 10.\textit{xf}4 \textit{e}7 11.\textit{d}d2 \textit{xb}5 12.axb5 \textit{d}d7 13.\textit{c}4= (followed by doubling of the rooks on the f-file) White’s pieces exert rather unpleasant pressure against Black’s position.)

Following 6...\textit{g}7, White has a very promising exchange-sacrifice at his disposal: 7.\textit{f}3 a6 8.\textit{d}3 exf4 9.\textit{xf}4 \textit{xb}2 10.\textit{bd}2!? (It is also good for White to opt here for 10.\textit{a}2= followed by \textit{d}2-c4 and his compensation for the sacrificed pawn is more than sufficient, \textit{Gundavaa – Bayarmandah, Arvaikheer 2012.}) 10...\textit{xa}1 11.\textit{xa}1 \textit{f}6 11...\textit{f}6 12.\textit{c}4+- 12.0-0 \textit{xa}1 13.\textit{xa}1 \textit{e}7 14.\textit{xd}6 \textit{b}6 15.\textit{a}5= Black has an extra exchange but his defence is very difficult. He lags in development, his pieces have occupied passive positions and his pawns on \textit{c}5 and \textit{a}6 are very weak.

\textbf{6.\textit{f}3}

Naturally, White should prevent \textit{g}5.

\textbf{6...\textit{f}6 7.\textit{c}3 0–0 8.\textit{d}2}

His knight is headed immediately to the c4-outpost.

\textbf{8...\textit{e}8 9.\textit{c}4 \textit{g}6?!}

It is possible that Black’s best move here is 9...\textit{f}5, but even then
after 10...xd7 wxd7 11.0–0± White’s prospects are preferable, since the light squares in Black’s camp are very weak.

10.0–0 f5 11.f4
White has managed to advance this at the right time!

11...h6!? ±f7 12.f4±

11...a6 12.xd7 £xd7

This position was reached in the game Shtyrenkov – Khudyakov, Alushta 2003. Here, White’s simplest move would be 13.a5±, occupying additional space on the queenside. Sooner or later Black will have to play fxe4 or exf4. Opening of the game will be in favour of White, because he has more space and his pieces are much more active.

A2) 4...£d7
This move seems stronger for Black than 4...£d7, because he avoids the trade of the light-squared bishops. Still, he is too far from equalising.

5.a4

Now, after a7-a6, White does not plan to capture on d7 but will retreat his bishop, having prevented b7-b5. Once again Black will be faced with a choice – where to develop his bishop: on e7 – A2a) 5...e7, or to g7 – A2b) 5...g6.

About 5...£gf6 6.c3 £e7 – see 5...£e7; 6...g6 – see 5...g6.

5...£e7 This is an original move but still insufficient for equality. 6.f3 g6 (It is possibly more reliable for Black to continue here with 6...£g6, although even then after 7.a5 a6 8.£d3 £e7 9.0–0 0–0 10.£bd2± followed by £c4, there arises a typical position for this variation with an advantage for White.) 7.£bd2 £c7 8.£c4± – He has much more space and his knight on c4 exerts powerful pressure against the enemy d6-pawn, Gulko – Zimmermann, Lugano 1988.

5...a6. As a rule, this move
does not lead to original positions. In the game Goldin – Blatny, Oak Bridge 2000, Black played too extravagantly in the opening after 6...e2. Here, White's bishop is more actively placed than on d3. 6...b6 7.a3 g6 8.h4 h5 9.d3 h6 10.d2 d6f6 11.c4 xc1 12.xc1 h6 13.g5 a7. Black could have ended up in a very difficult position following 14.f4± because White's pieces are much better prepared for the opening of the position in the centre.

A2a) 5...e7 6.f3
Once again White does not allow.

6...g6
About 6...a6 7.e2 g6 8.c3 – see 6...g6.

7.c3

7...0–0
Black can hardly continue the game without castling.

7...a6 8.e2 f8 (8...0–0 9.0–0 – see 7...0–0) 9.d2 g6 10.c4 b6 11.h4 h6 12.h5 f8, Nestorovic – Peovic, Novi Sad 2013. Now, White could have made use of the circumstance that Black's g7-pawn is not protected by the king. 13.d3! d7 14.g3± His defence will be very difficult, because Black lags in development and after the move f2-f4 his position is about to crumble.

8.0–0

8...e8
He is preparing f7-f5 and refrains from making pawn-moves on the queenside for the time being.

8...a6. This move forces the retreat of White's bishop. 9.e2 e8 (After 9...b6, he can begin his standard plan with the transfer of his knight to the c4-square. 10.d2 e8 11.c4 g5 12.xg5 xg5, Silva – Godoy Bugueno, Chile 1971. Here, White can exploit the vulnerability of the enemy b6-pawn with the line: 13.a3!? d8 14.d2 b8 15.b3± Black's pieces are squeezed with
10...g6. Black is preparing f7-f5. (He only weakens his queenside with 10...b5 11.axb6AXB6 12.\texttt{A}d2 A\texttt{c}7 13.Ab3. White’s knight is headed for the a5-square. 13...A\texttt{d}7 14.A\texttt{x}c5!! This is a small combination in the style of J.R.Capablanca. 14...\texttt{A}xc5 15.d6 A\texttt{b}5 16.dxe7 A\texttt{x}e7 17.A\texttt{d}5 A\texttt{a}d5 18.exd5\texttt{A}+ White has a superior pawn-structure and the two-bishop advantage, Arab – Oussedik, Plzen 2011.) 11.A\texttt{d}2 A\texttt{g}7 (Naturally, the exchange of the dark-squared bishops does not facilitate Black’s defence here, because following 11...Gg5 12.Ag4 A\texttt{x}c1 13.\texttt{W}xc1 f5 14.exf5 gxf5 15.f4 e4 16.\texttt{A}a4 A\texttt{f}6 17.Aa3\texttt{A} the vulnerability of his king is an important factor and his queenside pieces will hardly enter the actions any time soon, because his knight on d7 must defend the b6-square against the penetration of White’s knight, Przezdziecka – Kaniak, Leba 2004.) 12.Ac4 f5 13.f4\texttt{A}+ White is better prepared for the opening of the game in the centre mostly because of the powerful placement of his knight on the c4-outpost, Jaworski – Mammadov, Ustron 2003.

9.A\texttt{d}2

9...Gg5

Black is planning to trade the dark-squared bishops.

His position will be very difficult after the ambitious attempt 9...g6 – we have already seen that after f7-f5, White always counters with f2-f4. 10.Ac4 f5 (10...Gg5 11.a5 f5, Gutov – Sazonova, Khanty-Mansiysk 2010, 12.A\texttt{x}g5! A\texttt{x}g5 13.exf5 gxf5 14.f4\texttt{A} – The position is opened and Black’s lag in the development of his queenside pieces becomes the decisive factor. He would weaken the b6-square after 10...a6 11.A\texttt{x}d7, Nestorovic – Manic, Belgrade 1991, 12.a5\texttt{A}+) 11.Ah6 Ag7 12.f4\texttt{A} Black’s defence is problematic. 12...A\texttt{f}6 13.Axe5 Ag4, Battey – Rzayev, Budapest 2011, 14.A\texttt{f}4! g5 15.exd6 A\texttt{f}6 16.
e5+–, White’s pawns are so powerful that Black’s defence crumbles in front of them.

10.\textit{c4} \textit{xc1} 11.\textit{xc1}

Naturally, White should capture with his queen, because his rook is better placed on the a-file, since it supports from there the pawn-advance a4-a5.

11...\textit{a6}

After White has played \textit{c4}, his bishop cannot retreat and he will have to exchange on d7.

The position is difficult for Black following 11...\textit{e7}, Sosnicki – Markowski, Ksiaz 1998, 12.a5!? \textit{c7} 13.f4±

12.\textit{xd7} \textit{xd7} 13.a5 \textit{b5} 14.\textit{xb5} \textit{axb5} 15.\textit{b6} \textit{a6}, Aranha Filho – Schutt, Santos 2011, 16.\textit{b4} \textit{c4} 17.f4± Black has facilitated a bit his defence by exchanging pieces; nevertheless, White has seized completely the initiative. Black must still lose several tempi in order to free his rook from the exile on the a6-square (\textit{c7-a8} or \textit{f6-d7}).

A2b) 5...\textit{g6} 6.\textit{c3}

About 6...\textit{a6} 7.\textit{e2} \textit{g7} 8.\textit{f3} \textit{g6} 9.0–0 0–0 10.\textit{d2} – see 6...\textit{g7}.

Black cannot equalise if he tries to trade the dark-squared bishops. 6...h5 7.\textit{f3} \textit{h6} 8.\textit{d2} a6 9.\textit{e2} b6 10.\textit{c4} \textit{e7} 11.0–0 \textit{f8}, Ikonnikov – Kr. Georgiev, Toulon 2001. Here, White could have emphasized the vulnerability of his enemy b6-pawn with the line: 12.\textit{a3}!? \textit{g7} 13.\textit{xe6+} \textit{xe6} 14.\textit{b3} \textit{b8} 15.\textit{d2}± Black’s pieces are squeezed with the protection of the b6-pawn and White can prepare patiently a breakthrough on the opposite side of the board with f2-f4.

Or immediately 6...\textit{h6} 7.\textit{xe6} \textit{exe6} 8.\textit{d2} \textit{g8} 9.f4 exf4, Khenkin – Rogers, Baden 1998, 10.\textit{f3} \textit{g6} 11.\textit{xf4} \textit{e7} 12.0–0± Black has failed to establish firm control over the e5-square with \textit{g4-e5} and is doomed to a pas-
sive defence.

7. \( \text{d}f3 \)

About 7...a6 8.\( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 9.\( h4 \) – see 7...\( \text{e}7 \); 8...\( \text{g}6 \) 9.0-0 0-0 10.\( \text{d}2 \) – see 7...\( \text{g}6 \).

Following 7...\( \text{e}7 \), White obtains an advantage with the energetic move 8.h4!? Now, Black is faced with a rather unpleasant choice. He must either allow h4-h5, or play h7-h5 himself, which would lead to the weakening of the g5-square. 8...a6 9.\( \text{e}2 \) h5 10.a5 0-0 11.\( \text{d}2 \) f5 12.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \), Mirzoeva – Kotanjian, Dubai 2011 and here, White’s simplest decision would be 13.f3± followed by \( \text{g}5 \) and the preparation of castling queenside.

8.0-0 0-0 9.\( \text{d}2 \) a6

9...\( \text{h}5 \) 10.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 11.a5 a6, Rodshtein – Andreikin, playchess.com 2006, 12.\( \text{a}4 \)± Black’s b6-square is terribly weak and he can hardly organise counterplay on the kingside.

After 9...\( \text{e}8 \), Chilov – Managadze, Athens 1999, the simplest response for White would be 10.a5, ensuring a square for the retreat of the bishop on b5. 10...\( \text{c}7 \) 11.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 12.\( \text{a}4 \)±

10.\( \text{e}2 \) b6
Black prevents a4-a5.

Following 10...\( \text{e}8 \) 11.a5 b5 12.axb6 \( \text{xb}6 \) 13.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 14.\( \text{x}c4 \)± White has an easy game against Black’s weak a6-pawn.

11.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \)

This position was reached in the game Lalic – Orenda, Pula 1997. Here, White could have maintained a great advantage with a manoeuvre which has been encountered numerous times in this chapter. 12.\( \text{a}3 \)±? \( \text{b}8 \) 13.\( \text{b}3 \)± Black will have great problems organising counterplay because his pieces are forced to protect the b6-pawn.
B) 2...d6

This move leads to more open positions than 2...e5. Later, Black will either undermine White’s centre with the move e7-e6, or will fianchetto his bishop after g7-g6.

3.e4

White occupies the centre will his pawns preserving the possibility to follow later with c2-c4, or c3.

After 3.c4 e5 4.e4, Black can play 4...e7!? followed by g5, exchanging his “bad” bishop.

3...c6

3...e5 4.b5 – see 2...e5.

About 3...g6 4.c4 g7 5.c3 – see volume 2, Chapter 12, variation B2.

About 3...e6 4.c4 f6 5.c3 or 4...exd5 5.cxd5 – see Chapter 17.

Now, Black has a choice between: B1) 4...e6 and B2) 4...g6.

About 4...e5 5.b5+ bd7 6.a4 e7 7.f3 or 5...d7 6.a4 e7 7.f3 – see 2...e5.

It seems rather dubious for Black to opt for 4...bd7, since after 5.f4 g6 6.f3 g7 7.e5 dx5 8.fx5 g4 9.e6 fxe6 10.dxe6 de5, Wornath – Lebermann, Frankfurt 2000, 11.xd8+ xd8 12.f4 xe6 13.0-0-0+ bd7 14. e4 c8 15.b5 a6 16.xd7+ xd7 17.xc5 c6 18.e6+ White’s knight on e6 has occupied a dominating position, while Black can hardly coordinate his pieces.

He cannot equalise with the line: 4...a6 5.f3 c7 6.c4 g4 (6...a6 7.a4 b6 8.0-0 g6 9.e5!+ – the game is opened and almost all Black’s pieces are on their initial positions, Garcia Palermo – Velasquez Ojeda, Santiago de Chile 1981) 7.h3 xf3 8.xf3 g6 9.f3 g7 10.0-0 0-0, S. Savchenko – M. Ivanov, Bad Zwesten 2004,
11.\texttt{g}5\texttt{\pm} White has more space and two powerful bishops.

\textbf{B1) 4...e6 5.\texttt{b}5+}

\texttt{5...\texttt{d}7}

It is not preferable for Black to choose here 5...\texttt{bd}7 6.dxe6 fxe6 7.\texttt{f}3 a6 8.\texttt{c}4?! (The position is rather unclear after 8.\texttt{xd}7+ \texttt{xd}7\texttt{\infty}, because Black’s bishop-pair provides him with good counterplay, Romanishin – Zherebukh, Dresden 2007.) 8...d5 9.exd5 \texttt{b}6 10.\texttt{d}3 exd5 11.0–0 \texttt{e}7 12.a4\texttt{\pm} He lags in development and can hardly neutralise the activity of White’s pieces. 12...d4 13.a5 dxc3 14.axb6 \texttt{xb}6 15.\texttt{bxc}3 0–0 16.\texttt{f}4\texttt{\pm} Despite the doubled pawn, White’s position is clearly better. His pieces are very active and has an easy plan to improve further his position with: \texttt{e}1, \texttt{b}1, \texttt{c}4 and \texttt{e}5.

\textbf{6.\texttt{xd}7+?!}

This is the simplest move for White. After this White will have a slight but stable advantage, because his bishop is much more active than its counterpart. In addition, Black will end up with a weak pawn on d6 in numerous variations.

\textbf{6...\texttt{xd}7 7.\texttt{f}3 exd5}

He fails to equalise even if he tries to keep the position closed. 7...\texttt{e}7 8.0–0 0–0 9.\texttt{e}1 e5 10.a4 \texttt{a}6 11.d2 g6 12.\texttt{c}4\texttt{\pm} White has accomplished a set-up, which we already know from the variation with 2...e5 and Black obviously lacks space, Richter – Hendriks, Germany 2007.

\textbf{8.\texttt{xd}5}

White’s plan is aimed at exploiting the vulnerability of the enemy d6-pawn.

\textbf{8...\texttt{e}7}

Black cannot equalise with 8...\texttt{xe}4, because after 9.0–0 \texttt{c}6 10.\texttt{e}1 f5 11.\texttt{g}5\texttt{\pm} White regains the sacrificed pawn and maintains an edge thanks to the powerful position of his knight on d5.

\textbf{9.0–0 0–0}
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This position was reached in the game Hamilton – Noritsyn, Guelph 2011. Here, White had simply to increase the pressure against the enemy d6-pawn with 10.\( \text{Af4!} \) \( \text{Axd5} \) 11.\( \text{Axd5} \) \( \text{Ac6} \) 12.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{gfe8} \) 13.\( \text{ad1\&} \) and Black would be doomed to a long and passive defence.

B2) 4...\( \text{g6} \) 5.\( \text{f4} \)

This is the most principled move for White. Now, he will be permanently threatening to play e4-e5, attacking the enemy knight.

5...\( \text{g7} \)

About 5...\( \text{bd7} \) 6.\( \text{f3} \) – see 4...\( \text{bd7} \).

Following 5...a6, White can begin immediately active actions in the centre, 6.e5 \( \text{fd7} \) (6...dxe5? 7.fxe5 \( \text{g4} \) 8.\( \text{f3\&} \) Chepukaitis – Korchnoi, St Petersburg 2001) 7.\( \text{e2\&} \) White’s powerful central pawns provide him with a clear advantage, Minero Pineda – Garcia, Bogota 1992.

5...\( \text{fd7} \). This move seems to be a bit awkward. 6.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 7.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{a6} \) 8.0–0 0–0 9.f5\& There arises a position from the main line (5...\( \text{g7} \)), but with an extra tempo for White, since his bishop has come to the d3-square in one move and not in two.

6.\( \text{b5\&} \)?

This check provokes disharmony in Black’s position.

6...\( \text{fd7} \)

This move is forced, because after 6...\( \text{bd7} \), White has the powerful resource 7.e5\&

Following 6...\( \text{d7} \) 7.e5 \( \text{g8} \) 8.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{h6} \) 9.0–0\& White obtains an edge, since Black will have to lose plenty of time on manoeuvres with his knight on f6, Grosser – Roosen, Bruchkoebel 2002.

7.\( \text{d3} \)

This is a timely retreat. Now, if Black plays a7-a6, then White will prevent the move b7-b5 with a2-a4.
He does not wish to play a2-a4 before Black has played a7-a6, because then, Black’s knight will follow the route b8-a6-b4.

7...0-0
About 7...a6 8.a3 f3 c7 9.0-0 0-0 – see 7...0-0.

Following 8...e6, White may enter almost by force a superior endgame: 9.dxe6 fxe6, Borges – Bjazevic, corr. 1983, 10.e2! ? f6 11.e5 dxe5 12.xd8 xd8 13.fxe5 g4 14.g5 f8 15.e7 f5 16.xc5 xe5 17.xe5 xe5 18.e3± and Black’s e6-pawn is very weak.

After 8...f6 9.0-0, Black will have problems to fight against his opponent’s powerful centre. For example: 9...bd7 10.h1 b6 11.a4 g4 12.a5 bd7 13.h3 xf3 14.xf3± White has two powerful bishops, while Black can hardly find good squares for his pieces, Skokov – Nevorotov, Omsk 2009.

9.b4 10.e2. He must preserve the powerful light-squared bishop. 10...b6 11.a3 a6 12.e3!? (The consequences of the pawn-sacrifice are rather unclear after: 12.f5 gxf5 13.exf5 xf5, Hodgson – Plaskett, Eastbourne 1990, 14.h4 g6 15.f5± No doubt, White has compensation for the sacrificed pawn, but it is unclear whether he can rely on more.) 12...c7 13.a4± (preparing a4-a5) and Black’s pieces evidently do not have sufficient space for manoeuvring.

10.f5!
This is the beginning of an attack.
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It is obviously bad for Black to choose 10...\textit{\$}b8, Sebestyen – Palkovi, Zalakaros 2003, because after 11.\textit{\$}e1! b5 12.\textit{\$}h4→ (followed by \textit{\$}h6 and \textit{\$}g5) White's attack is developing effortlessly.

Black should better refrain from 10...\textit{\$}f6 due to 11.\textit{\$}e1!? White is preparing the already familiar transfer of his queen to the h4-square. (It would not be so precise for him to opt for 11.fxg6 fxg6 12.\textit{\$}e1 \textit{\$}g4± Gallagher – Forster, Luzern 1994 and after the exchange of the knight on f3, Black reduces considerably his opponent's attacking potential.) 11...gxf5 (11...b5 12.fxg6 hxg6 13.\textit{\$}h4 c4 14.\textit{\$}g5 \textit{\$}e8 15.\textit{\$}e2± White has a powerful attack and Black must be permanently on the alert about the possible sacrifice on f6, as well as about the manoeuvre \textit{\$}c3-d1-e3-g4, Meszaros – Schneider, Hungary 2002.) 12.exf5 \textit{\$}cxd5 13.\textit{\$}xd5 \textit{\$}xd5 14.\textit{\$}g3. Black has won a pawn, but White's attack against the enemy king is very powerful. 14...\textit{\$}h8 15.\textit{\$}h4 \textit{\$}f6 16.\textit{\$}g5 h6 17.\textit{\$}f3 \textit{\$}g8 18.\textit{\$}h5 \textit{\$}e8 19.\textit{\$}c4+- and Black suffers material losses.

The line: 10...\textit{\$}e5 11.\textit{\$}xe5 dxe5, has been tested in the game Haila – Tuominen, Finland 1994. Black has fortified his position in the centre, but the weaknesses of his pawn-structure may become a telling factor in the future. 12.\textit{\$}e3 b6 13.\textit{\$}f3 \textit{\$}e8 14.a4± – He is faced with a very difficult defence.

11.fxg6 hxg6

This position was reached in the game Emms – Minasian, Leningrad 1990. 12.\textit{\$}e1!? White should not lose time in order to win the enemy b5-pawn. His plan should be to attack the enemy king. 12...b4 13.\textit{\$}d1 e6 14.\textit{\$}g5 f6 15.\textit{\$}f3 exd5 16.exd5 f5 17.\textit{\$}g3→ Black can hardly parry his opponent's dangerous threats.

Conclusion

We have just completed the analysis of the variations after 1.d4 c5. Now, White obtains an advantage in the opening relatively easily, because contrary to the variations, which we will analyse in Part 4, White's pawn is on c2 and not on the c4-square. So, he has a very dangerous plan to deploy his knight on c4 and to follow that with f2-f4. White should not forget about the possibility \textit{\$}b5+, after which he provokes disharmony in the set-up of Black's pieces.
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1.d4 e6

This chapter, as well as the next one, will be devoted to the move 1...e6 for Black. It was played even by H. Staunton in the middle of the 19th century. Well, in response to 2.c4, he usually transposed to Queen's Gambit set-ups with 2...d5. At the beginning of the 20th century A. Alekhine and S. Tartakover played like this and some time later M. Botvinnik. Among the contemporary grandmasters M. Carlsen, V. Ivanchuk, A. Morozevich, N. Vitiugov and many others try this move sometimes. This system is very flexible. Having played 1...e6, Black does not determine his future plans yet.

2.c4

It is possible that White's strongest move here may be 2.e4, transposing to the French Defence, but we will not analyse it, because we think that it is not necessary to study the French Defence in order to obtain an advantage after 1.d4 e6.

2...b6

This move is considered to be not so reliable in the theory of the openings. Indeed, Black does not prevent his opponent from occupying the centre after e2-e4. Still, there has been amassed plenty of theory after it, so we devote a separate chapter to this move. It has been often played by British players like A. Miles, J. Speelman and
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N. Short. Accordingly, this variation has been named the English Defence in the theory of the openings.

The more reliable line for Black 2...\textit{b}4+ will be analysed in the next chapter.

He often plays 1...e6 in order to transpose to the Dutch Defence: 2...f5, which will be analysed in Chapter 7.

2...c5 3.d5 – see Chapters 17-18.

2...\textit{f}6 3.\textit{c}3 – see Chapters 20-25.

2...d5 3.\textit{c}3 – see volume 1.

3.e4

White occupies the centre with his pawns. Later, he will have to watch carefully about the e4-square, because Black plans to exert pressure against it with the moves \textit{b}7, \textit{f}6 or f7-f5.

3...\textit{b}7

The move 3...\textit{b}4+, leads as a rule to transposition of moves: 4. \textit{d}2 \textit{x}d2+ 5.\textit{x}d2 \textit{b}7 6.\textit{d}3, or 5...\textit{h}6 6.\textit{c}3 0–0 7.\textit{f}3 \textit{b}7 8.\textit{d}3, or 5...\textit{e}7 6.\textit{c}3 0–0 7.\textit{f}3 \textit{b}7 8.\textit{d}3 – see variation A.

4.\textit{d}3

This is an important fine point. White is not in a hurry to play \textit{c}3, because then Black will reply with \textit{b}4 and White will hardly manage to avoid the doubling of his pawns after \textit{xc}3.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Diagram}
\end{center}

Now, we will analyse in details: A) 4...\textit{b}4, B) 4...f5 and C) 4...\textit{c}6.

About 4...g6 5.\textit{c}3 \textit{g}7 6.\textit{f}3 d6 7.0–0 \textit{d}7 8.\textit{g}5 – see Chapter 2, variation C, 3...g6.

4...d6. This move leads to a solid but passive position for Black. 5.\textit{c}3 \textit{d}7 6.\textit{ge}2 \textit{e}7 7.0–0 \textit{g}6 8.\textit{e}3 \textit{g}7, Aubry – Meijers, Rennes 2013, 9.\textit{c}2. It is essential for White to control reliably the d4-square. 9...0–0 10.\textit{d}2± Black’s position has no weaknesses but White’s extra space guarantees him superior prospects in the middle game.

After 4...\textit{f}6, White can already play 5.\textit{c}3.

(diagram)

Now, following 5...\textit{b}4 6.\textit{c}2, there arises a position from Part 3 (1.\textit{d}4 \textit{f}6 2.c4 \textit{b}6).
It is again very passive for Black to opt for 5...d6 6.Qf3 Qbd7 7.0-0 Qe7 8.Qe2 0-0 9.Qc2± and he can hardly organise any active actions, because after c7-c5, White always has the resource d4-d5 and Black’s bishop on b7 will be severely restricted, Karpatchev – Pierrad, Calvi 2006.

5...d5. This strike against White’s centre is not dangerous. 6.exd5 exd5 7.e5 Qe4 8.Qge2 Qe7 (8...c5?! 9.0-0 cxd4 10.Qxd4 Qe7, Savina – Charochkina, Voronezh 2009, 11.Qb5+!? Qf8 12.Qf3+-) 9.0-0 0-0, Boehm – Szabados, Trieste 1923, 10.Qf4 Qxc3 11. bxc3± White has good attacking prospects against the enemy king.

The position is very difficult for Black after 5...Qc6 6.Qf3 d6 7.Qc2 Qe7 8.d5 exd5 9.exd5 Qb8 10.0-0± White leads in development, while Black’s bishop on b7 is restricted by his own pawn on d5, Sax – Vukic, Novi Sad 1976.

A) 4...Qb4+

Black has less space and wishes to facilitate his defence by exchanging a couple of minor pieces.
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Naturally, he cannot play 8 . . .
�xb2?? because of 9.a3 ! +-, Black's
queen will perish on the b2-square.
The complications end up in
favour of White after 6 .. .f5 7.exf5
.bg2 8 .!'1g1 .b:d2 + 9.lt:\xd2 i.b7
10 .fxe6±, because his pieces are
much better mobilised.
6 . . . .txd2+ 7.�xd2 4Jh6. With
this original flank development of
the knight, Black keeps the possi­
bility to advance f7-f5. 8 .4Jbc3
0-0 9.0-0 d6 (9 .. .f5, Balazs Bokros, Balatonlelle 2009, 10.
exfS 4Jxf5 11.d5. This is an impor­
tant move restricting the mobility
of Black's bishop on b7. 11 . . . 4Ja6
12.:B:ael;!; White's pieces are much
better coordinated, while Black
can hardly find good squares · for
his bishop on b7 and the knight
on a6.) 10.f4 4Jd7 11.d5 eS 12.f5 f6
13.b4;!; White has much more
space and can organise an offen­
sive both on the queenside as well
as on the kingside, Avrukh Speelman, Elista 1998.

queen and not with the knight, in
order to be able later to play 4Jc3.

6 . . . f5
Black is trying to organise
counterplay against the e4square.
If he tries something else,
White manages to complete his
devel o pment and to maintain a
slight edge thanks to his extra
space.
6 . . . 4Je7 7.4Jc3 0-0 8.4Jf3 d6 9.
0-0 4Jd7 10.i.c2 4Jg6 ll.:B:fe1 �e7
12.:B:adl;!; Maiorov - Epishin, Pfalz
2009.
6 ... 4Jh6 7.4Jf3 0-0 8 .4Jc3

6.�xd2 ! ?

He captures on d2 with the
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8 . . . d6 9.0-0 4Jd7 10.i.c2 Vlfe7
ll.:B:fe1 :B:fd8 12 .:B:adU I.Sokolov ­
8 ... 4Jc6 9.0-0;!; (White does
not need to complicate the game
with 9.0-0-0oo Vyzmanavin Miles, Ostend 1991).
8 . . .f5 9.0-0 4Jc6 10.:B:ad1 4Je7
11.d5! 'it>h8 12 .dxe6 dxe6 13.4Jg5
�c8 14.exf5 exfS 15.:B:fel± White's
pieces are deployed much more
harmoniously, Metge - Miles,


7. \( \text{\texttt{Cc3}} \)

![Diagram](image)

Following 7...fxe4 8. \( \text{\texttt{Cf3}} \) 0–0 9.0–0\( \pm \) Metge – Miles, Auckland 1992.

8. \( \text{\texttt{Cc6}} \)

8...\( \text{\texttt{Ff6}} \)

It seems worse for Black to develop his knight to the edge of the board 7...\( \text{\texttt{Ch6}} \) 8.\( \text{\texttt{Ff3}} \) 0–0 9.0–0\( \pm \) Metge – Miles, Auckland 1992.

9. \( \text{\texttt{Exf5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{Dxd4}} \) 10. \( \text{\texttt{We3}} \)

9...\( \text{\texttt{Df6}} \)

White protects reliably the e4-square.

8...\( \text{\texttt{Cc6}} \)

10...\( \text{\texttt{Cc5}} \) 11.\( \text{\texttt{Ge2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{Dxe2}} \) 12. \( \text{\texttt{Fxe2}} \) 0–0 13.\( \text{\texttt{Fxe6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{Be8}} \) 14.0–0–0 \( \text{\texttt{Dxe6}} \) 15.\( \text{\texttt{Dd2}} \)

Rijeka 2010. Now, he must restrict Black's bishop on b7 with the move 11.d5!, for example: 11...exd5 12.cxd5 d6 13.0–0\( \pm \) and Black will have to be permanently on the alert about White's threat \( \text{\texttt{Ff3-g5-e6}} \).

15...\( \text{\texttt{Cc6}} \)
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Following 15...b8 16.c2 c6 17.b1 c7 18.d5 xd5 19.cxd5 d6 20.c3 c4 21.g4, White begins an attack on the kingside. The position is quite open and his long-range bishop is obviously stronger than Black's knight. 21...xd5 22.xd5 xd5 23.e4 f4 24.e4 f8 25.xh7+ f7 26.h4± Black's king is vulnerable, Standard – Girard, Email 2011.

16.hf1 e8 17.e4 d6 18.d5 xd5 19.xd5 White has very powerful pressure on the d-file, Dosi – Girard, Email 2010.

B) 4...f5

This move leads to very sharp positions. In the majority of the variations Black has temporarily an extra rook. This was the reason that in the pre-computer era, many players were afraid to choose 3.e4. Presently, the situation is different and thanks to the computer analysis we can say definitely that White maintains a considerable advantage in all the variations.

5.exf5

Now, Black has a choice. He can capture on g2 B1) 5...xg2, or play the more modest line: B2) 5...b4.

B1) 5...xg2

Accepting the rook-sacrifice is considered to be very risky for Black. White only needs to memorise several long theoretical variations in order to obtain a great advantage. Well, we have to emphasize that there is plenty of theory to remember and that is not so simple at all.

6.h5+ g6 7.fxg6 g7

The alternatives for Black lose very quickly, for example: 7...f6 8.g7+ xh5 9.gxh8 f6 10.e2 xh1 11.xg5+–

8.gxh7+ f8 9.e2

White's knight is in a hurry to go to the f4-square, from where it can go both to g6 as well as to the h5-square.

9...f6
As a rule, there arises transposition following 9...d6. In the game Utnasunov – Gusev, Elista 2006, Black decided to follow a very original path with the move 10...e5, but after White’s precise reaction 11.h4! c6 12.f4 wxe8 13.hxg8+ xg8 14.xe8+ xxe8 15.xf6+ Black ended up in a hopeless position.

10.wh4 xh1 11.g5

After this move there arises the basic position of the entire variation with 5...xg2. Black has temporarily an extra rook but White’s threats are tremendously dangerous. He is threatening with the manoeuvre c2-f4-g6(h5), or simply to complete his development (c2d2 and 0-0-0), bringing his last reserves into the battle.

11...c6

Besides this developing move, Black has many other possibilities, but unfortunately for him almost all of them lead to hopeless positions for him.

11...d6? Now, on top of all the troubles for Black, his e6-square becomes terribly weak. 12.f4 f7, Wise – Ivanchik, Canada 1994, 13.wh3 c8 14.d5 exd5 15.g6+ e7 16.e3+ d8 17.e6+ d7 18.xg7 f8 19.e6+ c6 20.xf6+– White has regained the sacrificed material, maintaining his powerful pawn on h7 as well as a strong attack.

11...d5? This move, just like 11...d6, leads to the horrible weakening of the e6-square. 12.f4 f7 13.d2 dxc4 14.xc4 xd4 15.wh5+ c7 16.g6 f8, Pamatmat – Tan, Ledyard 2009, 17. g2+–

11...c5 12.f4 c6 13.d2 xd4? (Black should better play here 13.exd4 14.f3+) 14.0-0-0 c6 (14...f5 15.e6+ e8 16.xf5 xh7 17.g3+++) 15.h5 f5 16.xf5 exf5 17.xf6+– Akobian – Kiewra, Wheeling 2010.

The retreat of the bishop back to Black’s camp would not save him: 11...b7, Lacrosse – Guetas Sanchez, Cullera 2006, after 12. f4 c6 13.d2 b4 14.g6 e7 15.h5 f8 16.d5 exd5 17.0-0-0+, Black is helpless against e1, followed by xg7 and xf6.

The other retreats of the bishop are not any better 11...f3. 12.f4 c6 13.d2 g4 14.xf6 xf6 15.xg4 xd4, Lower – Marshall,
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Email 1999, 16...d1!  ∆f6 17.∆f3 ∆xb2 18.∆g6+ ∆f7 19.∆e4+-- All White’s pieces participate in the attack against the enemy king. Black cannot prevent the threats ∆xh8 and ∆xd7.

He cannot save the day even if he brings his queen into the defence. 11...∆e7 12.∆f4 ∆f7 13. ∆g6+ ∆e8 14.∆e5 ∆f8 15.∆c3 d6 16.0–0–0 dxe5 17.dxe5 ∆bd7 (17...∆e7 18.∆xh1 ∆bd7 19.∆e1 ∆xe5 20.∆xe5 ∆d7, Browne – Miles, Reno 1999, 21.c5!--; White wins too with 18.exf6 ∆xf6 19.∆xh1+--) 18.∆g6+ ∆e7 19.∆f4 ∆c6 20.∆e4 ∆xe4 21.exf6+ ∆xf6 22.∆xf6+ ∆xf6 23.∆xd7+ ∆xd7 24.∆xf6 ∆xg6 25.∆xg6+– Gerbich – Kazantsev, IE mail 2009.

12.∆d2
He is preparing castling queenside.

12...∆f7
This is Black’s most resilient defence. His alternatives lose:


12...∆b4? 13.∆g6 ∆b7 14.∆f4 ∆c6 15.0–0–0 ∆xd4, Popovics – Babujian, Chalkidiki 2003, 16. ∆h5+–

Black’s attempt to deflect his opponent from his kingside actions with the move 12...b5 would not work, because White can simply ignore it: 13.∆f4, threatening to win immediately with the move 14.∆h5. 13...∆xd4 (13...bxc4 14. ∆xc4 ∆b4 15.∆b1 ∆bd5 16.∆g6+ ∆e8 17.∆xh8 ∆xh8, Schneider – Utasi, Budapest 1984, 18.∆g6+ ∆e7 19.∆e2 ∆g2 20.∆g1++, Black loses his bishop and White ends up with two extra pawns and an attack) 14.∆g6+ ∆f7 15.∆e5+ ∆e8 16.∆xd4+-, The extra exchange is small consolation for Black, since his king is stranded in the centre and is an excellent target for White’s pieces, Boor – Kraai, Lindsborg 2004.

The counter strike in the centre is not good for Black 12...e5, because White is better developed and the opening of the position is in his favour. 13.0–0–0 e4 14. ∆xe4 ∆xe4 15.∆xe4 ∆xh7 16.∆f4 ∆e7 (16...∆f7, Magerramov – Psakhis, Riga 1980, 17.∆d3 ∆e7 18.∆e3+–) 17.∆xf6 ∆f7 18.∆g5 ∆xc4+ 19.∆c3 ∆h6 20.∆xg7+ ∆xg7 21.∆g4 ∆h8 22.∆f5+– Van Seben – Heesen, Email 2009.
13.0-0-0 $\textbf{\text{b}4}$

This is the only chance for Black of saving his bishop on h1.

14.$\textbf{\text{b}1}$ $\textbf{\text{b}7}$

Black develops his bishop with tempo. This move is much more reliable than the hazardous capturing of the g2-pawn.

6.$\textbf{\text{f}1}$

This move is forced. White loses his castling rights but protects his pawn on g2. His plan is connected later with exploiting the unfavourable placement of Black’s bishop on b4, which White will try to trap with c4-c5 and a2-a3.

This position was reached in the game Taffijn – Dehaye, Email 2009. Here, White could have obtained a decisive advantage with 15.$\textbf{\text{g}1}$!, for example:

15...$\textbf{\text{c}6}$ (15...$\textbf{x}a2$ 16.$\textbf{d}1+-$)

16.$\textbf{\text{g}6}$ $\textbf{\text{f}8}$ 17.$\textbf{\text{e}4+}$-- Black has an extra rook indeed, but his position is absolutely hopeless. His pieces are not developed, while on the contrary, White’s entire army takes part into the decisive attack.

6...$\textbf{\text{f}6}$

This is an energetic move with which Black develops quickly his pieces.

6...$\textbf{h}4$ 7.$\textbf{f}3$ $\textbf{h}5$, Estremera Panos – Rausis, Seville 2003, 8. c5!± Black will have great problems with his bishop on b4.

Following 6...exf5 7.c5 bxc5 8. a3, Black will have to give back the pawn in order to bring his bishop back into his camp. 8...c4 (8...$\textbf{a}5$ 9.dxc5 $\textbf{f}6$, Tabernig – Burger, Linz 1999, 10.$\textbf{d}2$?! (It seems also good for White to
choose the more ambitious line:
10.\textit{h}5 \textit{f}8 11.\textit{g}5 \textit{e}5 12.\textit{d}8+ \textit{f}7 13.\textit{f}3 \textit{x}f3 14.gxf3 \textit{xc}5 15.\textit{d}2±) 10...\textit{x}d2 11.\textit{x}d2 \textit{e}7 12.\textit{h}5+! After this move White transfers into a better endgame. 12...\textit{f}7 13.\textit{xf}7+ \textit{x}f7 14.\textit{f}3 \textit{xf}3 15.gxf3 d5 16.cxd6 cxd6 17.\textit{g}1± and in the arising endgame both sides have pawn-weaknesses, but White's bishops are obviously much more active than Black's cavalry.) 9.\textit{xc}4 \textit{d}6 (9...\textit{a}5? 10.\textit{b}3+ \textit{a}6 11.\textit{xa}6 \textit{xa}6 12.\textit{b}5) 10.\textit{c}3 \textit{f}6 11.\textit{f}3 \textit{w}e7 12.\textit{g}5. White has lost his castling rights, but this has not worsened his situation, because his minor pieces are very active, while Black's king is stranded in the centre. 12...\textit{d}8, Seirawan – Schussler, Malmo 1979, 13.\textit{d}5 \textit{xd}5 14.\textit{xd}5 \textit{c}6 15.\textit{b}3! \textit{c}7 16.\textit{e}1 \textit{f}8 17.\textit{c}4± White has two powerful bishops, while Black will hardly manage to bring his knight on b8 into the actions any time soon.

7.c5

White cuts off the retreat of his opponent's bishop, just like in the previous variations.

7...\textit{b}xc5 8.a3 c4 9.\textit{xc}4

\begin{center}
\textbf{Diagram 9}
\end{center}

9...\textit{a}5

Black wishes to deploy his bishop on an active position on b6 from where it will exert pressure against the enemy d4-pawn and eventually against the f2-square as well.

9...\textit{e}7. This move seems to be too passive. 10.fxe6 0–0 11.\textit{c}3. White is not after material gains and wishes to compete the development of his pieces. 11...\textit{d}xe6 (The move 11...\textit{d}5 restricts considerably the prospects of the bishop on b7. 12.\textit{d}3 \textit{c}5 13.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 14.\textit{xc}5 \textit{xc}5 15.\textit{g}5± White's king is not well placed on f1, but this cannot compensate Black's two missing pawns, Bulski – Strzemiecki, Lazy 2012.) 12.\textit{f}3 \textit{d}6 13.\textit{e}2 \textit{d}5 14.g3 \textit{c}6 15.\textit{xd}5 exd5 16.\textit{a}2 \textit{ae}8 17.\textit{g}2 \textit{d}7 18.\textit{d}3± White has succeed-
10...0-0

10...exf5 11.g5 d5 12.b5+ c6 13.e2+ e7 14.xf6 gxf6 15.d3 xe2+ 16.xe2± Black has numerous pawn-weaknesses in his position.

10...c6, Popovics – Wojtaszek, Hungary 2003, 11.fxe6± – His compensation for the two sacrificed pawns is evidently insufficient.

11.fxe6 dxe6 12.c3 h8

After 12...c6, Herraiz – Del Rio de Angelis, Madrid 2005, White must bring his rook on h1 into the actions via the h3-square. 13.h4!? d6 14.g1 (It is also possible for White to play here immediately 14.b3±) 14...b6 15.e3 ad8 16.h3± Black has no compensation for the pawn, because White’s weakness on d4 is balanced by Black’s weakness on e6.

13.g5

Now, there arise tactical complications on the board.

13...d6, Graf – Bunzmann, Germany 2000, 14.d3 bd7 15.b4 b6 16.xe6 g4 17.a2! White brings cold-bloodedly his rook into the protection of his f2-square. After this, Black’s attack loses its momentum and there arises a favourable endgame for White following the exchange of pieces. 17...de5 18.xe5 xf2+ 19.xf2 xd3+ 20.xd3 xf2 21.c4 xh1 22.a4! White’s knight is headed for the c5-square in order to cover the a7-g1 diagonal for his opponent’s bishop. Black’s knight will nor run away from the h1-square. 22...h6 23.ac5 ac6 24.g1 a5 25.b5 xc5+ 26.xh1 b8 27.xc5 xb5 28.d5 f8 29.f3± and in the arising endgame, White managed to prove quickly that his two minor pieces are stronger than Black’s rook.
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C) 4...\(\textit{\text{c}}\text{c}6\)

This is Black's most reliable move, because after 5...\(\textit{\text{b}}\text{b}4\) he exchanges on d3. After this he not only facilitates his defence by trading a piece in this somewhat cramped position, but also obtains the two-bishop advantage. All this is not sufficient for him to equalise however (his lack of space is an essential factor and also the fact that Black has lost too much time on moves with his knight), but still his position is quite solid (at least in comparison to the move 4...f5).

5.\(\textit{\text{d}}\text{e}2\)

This is White's most popular move. Now, contrary to 5.\(\textit{\text{f}}\text{f}3\), he will manage to advance later f2-f4 occupying even more space in the centre.

5...\(\textit{\text{b}}\text{b}4\)

This is a logical move. The alternatives for Black seem weaker.

5...e5. This move cramped his position even more. 6.d5 \(\textit{\text{c}}\text{c}3\) 7.\(\textit{\text{d}}\text{d}3\) 8.\(\textit{\text{f}}\text{f}6\) (8...\(\textit{\text{f}}\text{f}7\) 9.h4 h5 10.g5± White has an easy game, moreover that Black lags considerably in development, Iskusnyh – Lahiri, Chennai 2004) 9.\(\textit{\text{f}}\text{f}4\) \(\textit{\text{c}}\text{c}5\), Marcos Nozar – Andersen, Email 2012. It is useful for White to provoke a weakening on Black's kingside with the line: 10.\(\textit{\text{g}}\text{g}3!\) g6 11.\(\textit{\text{g}}\text{ge}2\) (with the idea 12.\(\textit{\text{h}}\text{h}6\) \(\textit{\text{g}}\text{g}4\) 13.\(\textit{\text{g}}\text{g}3!\); the immediate move 11.\(\textit{\text{h}}\text{h}6\), does not bring White anything real after 11...\(\textit{\text{g}}\text{g}4\) 11...0–0 12.\(\textit{\text{g}}\text{g}5\) e7 13.\(\textit{\text{f}}\text{f}4\)± Blacks defence is very difficult, because his pieces are rather cramped in their movements.

6...\(\textit{\text{b}}\text{b}4\) + 6.\(\textit{\text{d}}\text{d}2\)

6...\(\textit{\text{d}}\text{d}2\) + 7.\(\textit{\text{d}}\text{d}2\) \(\textit{\text{g}}\text{ge}7\) (7...\(\textit{\text{f}}\text{f}6\) 8.\(\textit{\text{c}}\text{c}2\) \(\textit{\text{h}}\text{h}6\) 9.\(\textit{\text{f}}\text{f}4\) \(\textit{\text{h}}\text{h}4\) + 10.\(\textit{\text{g}}\text{g}3\) \(\textit{\text{h}}\text{h}5\) 11.\(\textit{\text{d}}\text{d}5\) \(\textit{\text{c}}\text{c}7\) 12.\(\textit{\text{b}}\text{b}3\) \(\textit{\text{c}}\text{c}6\) 13.0–0–0± Black has wasted too many tempi on moves with his queen and his position is very difficult, Avrukh – Bischoff, Zuerich 2009.) 8.0–0 0–0 9.\(\textit{\text{b}}\text{b}3\) e5 10.\(\textit{\text{d}}\text{d}5\) \(\textit{\text{b}}\text{b}4\) 11.\(\textit{\text{b}}\text{b}1\) a5, Grefe – Kraai, San Francisco 1999, 12.d6!? \(\textit{\text{g}}\text{g}6\) 13.\(\textit{\text{d}}\text{xc}7\) \(\textit{\text{c}}\text{c}7\) 14.b3± White has an easy game against Black's weak d7-pawn.

6...\(\textit{\text{f}}\text{f}6\) 7.d5!? White occupies even more space. 7...\(\textit{\text{d}}\text{d}2\) + 8.
1.d4 e6 2.c4 b6 3.e4 \( \text{\textit{\textit{d}}}_7 \) 4.d3 f5 5.e5

\textit{\textit{d}}xd2  \textit{\textit{d}}e5 9.\textit{\textit{e}}bc3  \textit{\textit{h}}h6 10.0-0 0-0 11.f4  \textit{\textit{d}}xd3 12.\textit{\textit{w}}xd3\# Black does not have pawn-weaknesses in his camp, but lacks space and his minor pieces are misplaced, so his defence will be long and difficult, Jelen – Lovric, Kastav 1999.

After 5...g6, it will be ineffective for Black to exert pressure with his fianchettoed bishop against White’s centre, because his pieces cover quite reliably the e4 and d4-squares. 6.\textit{\textit{e}}bc3  \textit{\textit{g}}7 7.e3 \textit{\textit{e}}ge7 (7...d6 8.\textit{\textit{w}}d2 \textit{\textit{e}}7 9.\textit{\textit{h}}3  \textit{\textit{f}}6 10.0-0  e5 11.d5  \textit{\textit{b}}4 12.\textit{\textit{b}}1  \textit{\textit{h}}5 13.a3  \textit{\textit{a}}6 14.b4± Hauchard – Zvjaginsev, Belfort 1999. 7...\textit{\textit{h}}6?! 8.\textit{\textit{w}}d2  \textit{\textit{g}}4 9.\textit{\textit{g}}5  \textit{\textit{f}}6 10.\textit{\textit{h}}4  \textit{\textit{h}}6 11.0-0\# followed by f2-f4, Chatibalashev – Efimov, Cutro 1999) 8.\textit{\textit{w}}d2  d5 9.cxd5 exd5 10.e5 \textit{\textit{d}}7 (10...0-0?! 11.0-0  \textit{\textit{b}}4 12.\textit{\textit{b}}1  c5 13.f4 cxd4 14.\textit{\textit{\textit{d}}}_xd4\# Almost all Black’s pieces are restricted by his own isolated d5-pawn, Bareev – Bauer, Ajaccio 2007.) 11.\textit{\textit{h}}6  \textit{\textit{x}}h6 12.\textit{\textit{w}}xh6 0-0 0-0 13.0-0\# Plischki – Gonda, Pardubice 2012. White has a clear-cut plan for actions in the arising position: f2-f4-f5. Black can hardly activate his bishop on b7 and the vulnerability of the dark squares on his kingside may become a telling factor.

6.\textit{\textit{e}}bc3  \textit{\textit{d}}xd3+

6...d5. This is an interesting move, but still insufficient for equality. 7.cxd5 exd5 8.e5  \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}}_xd3+

9.\textit{\textit{w}}xd3  \textit{\textit{w}}d7 10.0-0  \textit{\textit{e}}7, Czakon – Starostits, Gijon 2007, 11.\textit{\textit{\textit{d}}}_g5  \textit{\textit{h}}6 12.\textit{\textit{\textit{d}}}_xe7?!  \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}}_xe7 13.f4\# – The position is closed and Black’s bishops are not sufficiently active. Meanwhile, White has an easy and simple plan for further operations: f4-f5, followed by the preparation of the pawn-advances f5-f6 or e5-e6.

7.\textit{\textit{w}}xd3

7...\textit{\textit{e}}7

7...\textit{\textit{b}}4 8.0-0  \textit{\textit{e}}7 (After 8... \textit{\textit{\textit{d}}}_c3, Black loses his only trump – his two-bishop advantage. 9.\textit{\textit{\textit{d}}}_c3  \textit{\textit{e}}7 10.d5 0-0 11.\textit{\textit{d}}d2  \textit{\textit{g}}6 12.f4 d6 13.\textit{\textit{g}}3\# – White not only has more space, but his bishop on d2 is obviously much more active than its counterpart on b7. This is very important in positions with bishops of opposite colour particularly if White begins an attack against the enemy king on the dark squares, Gasanov – Chernyshov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2008.) 9.\textit{\textit{a}}4?! Now, Black’s bishop on b4 will be permanently endangered.
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9...g6 10.c5 a6 11.d5 f5 12.exf5 h4 13.f3 xf5 14.a3 b5 15.axb4 bxa4 16.d5 xd5 17.xa4. White maintains a slight edge, since his pawn-structure is better. Later, in the game Kosulin – Heesen, Email 2008, there followed: 17...c6 18.ea5 a6 19.f4 b5 20.e1 0–0 21.d2 d6 22.c3 e5 23.g5 e8 24.cxd6 xd6 25.d5+ h8 26.e1±. Black's pawns on a6, c7 and e5 are excellent targets for the attack of White's pieces.

After 7...g6, White can begin active actions on the kingside with 8.h4 f6. Black prevents h4–h5. (It is worse for him to follow with 8...h6 9.h5 g5 10.f4†, because the pawn on g5 is an excellent target for White's attack, Predojevic – Popchev, Zupanja 2009. The move 8...h5 weakens considerably the g5-square: 9.g5 e7 10.e3 d6 11.0–0 0–0 12.b1± Gonda – Czebe, Balatonlelle 2009.) 9.e5 h5 10.d5 d6, Smirnov – Bocharov, Novosibirsk 2012, 11.g5!?± followed by 0–0–0. White's pieces are better developed, but breaking Black's position may prove to be a rather difficult task.

It will not be easy for White to obtain an advantage after the solid line for Black: 7...d6 8.0–0 f6 (About 8...e7 9.d5 – see 7...e7; 8...e7 9.d5 f6 10.d4 – see 8...f6. Following 8...g6, White can begin an immediate advance of his kingside pawns cramping the enemy position even more. 9.f4 f6 10.d5 e7 11.d4 d7 12.d2 c5 13.f3 a6 14.a4±. Black's bishops are very passive and he must be permanently on the alert about White's threat e4–e5, Toth – Van Oosterom, Email 2009.) 9.d5.

White restricts the enemy bishop on b7 and frees the d4-square for his knight. 9...e7 (9...d7 10.d4 e5 11.f5 g6 12.h6± – Now, Black cannot castle kingside and his monarch would be endangered on the queenside, Pacheco Asmat – Belli Pino, Peru 1997.) 10.d4 d7 11.a4 0–0 (after 11...c5, Kramnik – Ivanchuk, Monaco 2002, White can play simply 12.f3!?±, preserving better prospects thanks to his space advantage) 12.a5. He begins active actions on the queenside. 12...c5 13.f3 exd5 14.exd5 a6 15.e1 e8 16.h3 h6 17.f4± – It would be difficult for Black to activate his light-squared bishop since it is restricted by his own pawns on d5 and c4, Rodshtein – Czebe, Biel 2012.

8.0–0
8...d6
It seems anti-positional for Black to opt for 8...f5 9.f3 g6 10.\texttt{hg}5 h6 11.\texttt{f6} \texttt{g}8 12.d5± and his kingside ends up horribly weakened, Kachiani-Gersinska – Muse, Berlin 1999.

It is also bad for him to continue with 8...d5, since the opening of the position is in favour of White because of his superior development. 9.exd5 exd5 10.e1!? dxc4 11.xc4 \texttt{d}7 12.\texttt{f}4 0–0–0 13.\texttt{xf}7± Ludgate – Gonzalez Freixas, Email 2007.

After 8...\texttt{c6}, Kaufman – Mack, Toronto 2011, the simplest for White would be to play 9.\texttt{g}3?!± and Black will have great problems to bring his bishop on f8 into the actions.

Following 8...g6, White can deprive immediately his opponent of the two-bishop advantage. 9.h3 \texttt{g}7 10.h6 0–0 11.xg7 \texttt{xg}7, Kohlweyer – Gulko, Geneva 1997 and here, he could obtain an edge restricting Black's bishop on b7 with the line: 12.d5! \texttt{a}6 13.b3±

9.d5 \texttt{d}7 10.f4 g6
10...\texttt{g}6 11.b3 \texttt{e}7 12.b2 \texttt{f}6 13.g3 e5 14.\texttt{ce}2 h5 15.\texttt{f}5 h4 16.h3 a5 17.\texttt{f}3± Black's position is cramped, while White's knight on f5 has occupied a very powerful position, Claridge – Bendig, Email 2008.

11.\texttt{d}4 \texttt{g}7
After 11...0–0–0, in the game Osbahr – Benedetto, Email 2003, White began an immediate attack against the enemy king. 12.a4 c5 13.dxc6 \texttt{xc}6 14.\texttt{e}3±

12.\texttt{e}3 0–0–0
Black's monarch cannot be safe on the kingside either. 12...0–0 13.f5 exf5 14.exf5 \texttt{xf}5 15.\texttt{xf}5 gxf5 16.\texttt{xf}5± S.Savchenko – Koenig, Bad Woerishofen 2003.

13.a4 exd5 14.exd5 a5
Black is trying to prevent the opening of files.

15.\texttt{cb}5 \texttt{b}8 16.\texttt{ab}1
White is preparing the pawn-advance b2-b4.

16...\texttt{he}8 17.\texttt{wd}2 \texttt{xd}4 18.\texttt{xd}4 \texttt{f}5 19.b4 axb4 20.\texttt{xb}4→ Gerbich – Gaujens, Email 2011.

Conclusion

White obtains an advantage easily in the English Defence and this is not surprising because Black ignores one of the most important principles of playing in the opening and this is the fight for the centre.

He should comply with the fact that his position is inferior and begin a tough defence, because the attempt to provoke tactical complications with the move 4...f5 may lead immediately to a hopeless position for Black. Naturally, in this case White needs to know thoroughly numerous forced theoretical variations. This chapter should be very helpful in this aspect.
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1.d4 e6 2.c4 b4+

This move is much more reliable than 2...b6, which was analysed in the previous chapter. You can consider its strength having in mind that it has been played several times by the present World Champion M. Carlsen, as well as by D. Andreikin, A. Grischuk, V. Ivanchuk, N. Vitiugov as well as by many other grandmasters.

There arises on the board the Bogoljubow Defence “deferred” (without the inclusion of the moves f3 – f6). Black is trying to complete the development of his kingside pieces as quickly as possible and to castle. One of the drawbacks of the move 2...b4 is the fact that in some variations the bishop on c8 may become “bad” and if Black tries to improve its position by rearranging his pawns on dark squares (with d7-d6 and e6-e5), then he might lose too much time while doing this.

3.d2

This is the simplest move. White does not mind the trade of the bishops.

Now, Black is faced with a choice: A) 3...e7, B) 3...a5, C) 3...xd2.

He plays only seldom 3...c5, because White can occupy immediately the centre with his pawns 4.xb4 cxb4 5.e4

5...d5 6.d2 c6 7.gf3 dxe4 8.xe4 gf6 9.wd3 0–0 10.e2 b6 11.0–0± White’s superior pawn-
structure (Black’s doubled pawns on the b-file are a serious defect of his position.) provides him with a stable edge and if he succeeds in advancing d4-d5 (after the preliminary move $\text{c}ad1$), then his advantage may increase considerably.

5...$\text{c}e7$ 6.$\text{df}3$ d5 7.$\text{dd}b2$ $\text{db}c6$ 8.$\text{de}2$ 0-0 9.0-0 dxe4 10.$\text{de}4$ $\text{df}5$. Black’s pressure against the d4-pawn is not dangerous for White, because he can continue with 11.d5! exd5 12.exd5 $\text{ce}7$ 13. d6 $\text{dg}6$ 14.$\text{cc}4\pm$ and his far-advanced passed d-pawn is tremendously powerful, Leitao – Rodriguez Vila, Argentina 2005.

A) 3...$\text{we}7$ 4.e4

Black has not played yet the move $\text{df}6$, so White exploits this occupying immediately the centre.

\[\text{Diagram} 1\]

4...d5

With this strike in the centre (Black exploits the juxtaposition of his queen and White’s king on the e-file.) Black creates counterplay.

Besides this move, he has many other possibilities. Still, in all the variations White maintains a slight but stable advantage.

4...e5. This move has the drawback that after the exchange on e5 Black’s queen comes to the centre of the board too early and White gains tempi by attacking it. 5.dxe5 $\text{xd}2+$. 6.$\text{xd}2$ $\text{xe}5$ (Black’s situation is even worse following 6...f6?! 7.$\text{cc}3$ fxe5 8.$\text{dd}5$ $\text{dd}8$ 9. ef c6 10.$\text{de}3$ $\text{df}6$ 11.$\text{cc}4$ 0-0 12. $\text{dd}6\pm$ White’s knight on d6 dominates over the board and he is threatening $\text{cc}4$ too, so Black’s position is nearly hopeless, Karasev – Kalinitschew, Novosibirsk 1989) 7.$\text{cc}3$ d6, Gadalsinski – Ciejkia, Sopot 1946, 8.$\text{ff}3\pm$

4...$\text{dc}6$ 5.$\text{ff}3$ $\text{ff}6$ (After the strike in the centre 5...d5, Rowson – Kovacevic, Bled 1998, White should better react calmly: 6. $\text{dd}3!?$ dxc4 7.$\text{xc}4$ $\text{xd}2+$. 8.$\text{bx}d2\pm$ – He is better developed and his pawns have occupied the centre.) 6.e5. White occupies additional space. 6...$\text{ce}4$ 7.a3 $\text{xd}2$ 8.$\text{bx}d2$ $\text{xd}2+$. 9.$\text{xd}2$ d6. Black begins the fight against his opponent’s centre. (9...b6 10.$\text{dd}3$ f6 11.exf6 $\text{xf}6$ 12.$\text{ee}4$ $\text{bb}7$ 13.0-0 $\text{a}5$ 14.$\text{xb}7$ $\text{xb}7$, Kahn – Sebstyen, Hungary 2008, 15.$\text{ac}1$ $\text{db}6!$ 16.c5++; 15...0-0 16.$\text{fe}1\pm$ White has a much freer game, while Black has a serious problem with the “fianchettoed” knight on b7.) 10.$\text{dd}3$ dxe5 11.dxe5 a5 12.
0–0 a4 13. \( c2 \) 0–0 14. \( f1 \) f5 15. exf6 gxf6 16. \( e4 \)± Black’s kingside pawn-structure has been compromised and he will have problems parrying his opponent’s attacking threats, Burmakin – Ovetchkin, Russia 1998.

4...\( f6 \) 5. \( d3 \) \( xd2+ \) (5...d5 6.e5 \( e4 \), Andreev – Klimov, St Petersburg 2002, 7.\( xe4 \) \( xe4 \) 8.\( g4 \)±) 6.\( xd2 \) d6. Black accomplishes the typical pawn set-up for this variation – d6-e5, which we will see still numerous more times in this chapter. 7.\( c3 \) e5 8. \( ge2 \) \( c6 \) 9.\( c2 \). White refrains from d4-d5, maintaining the tension in the centre in anticipation of the moment when Black will capture on d4. 9...0–0 10.0–0 \( xd4 \) 11.\( xd4 \) exd4 12.\( xd4 \) \( e5 \), Epishin – Ivkov, Vancouver 2000, 13.\( ad1 \)± and thanks to the possession of extra space, White’s play is much easier both in the middle game as well as in the endgame. Black’s position has no weaknesses, but he has problems to organise counterplay, because the only possible object for his attack (White’s pawn on e4) is reliably protected.

5.e5
Now, Black will have difficulties to develop his knight on g8.
(diagram)

5...\( c6 \)

5...\( xd2+ \) 6.\( xd2 \) c5. Opening of the game in the centre is advantageous for White because his forces enter the actions easily. 7. cxd5 exd5 8.\( c3 \) cxd4, Széberenyi – Portisch, Hungary 2000. Here, he can transfer by force to a better endgame: 9.\( xd5 ? \) \( xe5+ \) 10. \( e2 \) \( xe2+ \) 11.\( xe2 \) \( a6 \) 12.\( xd4 \) \( e7 \) 13.\( b5+ \) \( f8 \) 14.\( c3 \)± and Black can hardly coordinate his forces.

After 5...dxc4 6.\( xc4 \), there arises a position similar to the Queen’s Gambit Accepted 1.d4 d5 2.c4 dxc4 3.e4 \( f6 \) 4.e5 \( d5 \) 5. \( c4 \), but contrary to that variation, Black’s knight on g8 can hardly take part in the fight for the key d5-square.

Following 6...\( xd2+ \) 7.\( xd2 \) \( d7 \), Richardson – Eingorn, Graz
1999, White can simply continue with the development of his pieces: 8.\( \text{c3} \)!? \( \text{b6} \) 9.\( \text{g}2 \pm 
6...\( \text{d7} \). This transfer of the knight to the b6-square seems to take too much time. 7.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b6} \) 8.\( \text{b3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 9.\( \text{g}4 \). Black can hardly avoid compromising his kingside pawn-structure. 9...f5 10.\( \text{f}3 \) a5 11.a3 \( \text{xc3} \) 12.bxc3. Now, White's pawn on d4 is reliably protected. 12...\( \text{b5} \) 13.\( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{c4} \) 14.\( \text{c1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 15.\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{f7} \) 16.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 17.\( \text{h4} \) \( \text{c6} \) 18.0-0± – It would be quite sufficient to compare the positions of the kings in order to evaluate correctly the position, Gretarsson – Movsesian, Czech Republic 1999.

6...\( \text{c6} \), Koltanowski – Lazar, Paris 1929, 7.a3!? \( \text{xd2} + \) 8.\( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{h6} \) 9.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 10.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{h4} \) 11.\( \text{e7} \) \( \text{h4} \) 12.\( \text{d1} \) 0-0 13.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h3} \) 14.\( \text{f1} ! \) White transfers his bishop to g2, from where it will exert pressure against Black's queenside. 14...\( \text{h5} \) 15.\( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{d8} \) 16.\( \text{e3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 17.0-0± – He has no counterplay at all, while White has a clear-cut plan for the improvement of his position: f2-f4 followed by d4-d5 or \( \text{e4-c5} \).

(diagram)

6...\( \text{xd2} + \)

After 6...\( \text{dxc4} \), it seems very good for White to play 7.\( \text{c3} !? \), after which Black cannot simplify the position by exchanging the bishops. The trade of his bishop for White's knight looks rather dubious 7...\( \text{xc3} !? \) after 8.bxc3 b5 9.a4 \( \text{a6} \) 10.axb5 \( \text{xb5} \), Ezat – Amin, Tanta 2002. Black has an extra pawn indeed, but his position is very difficult, since he lags in development and his pawns on a7, c7 and c4 are vulnerable. White can develop his initiative in many different ways, but possibly the most energetic among them is 11.\( \text{g}5 \)± followed by \( \text{h5} \).

6...\( \text{h6} \) This attempt by Black to exert pressure against the enemy d4-pawn does not work. 7.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 8.a3 \( \text{xc3} \), Vescovi – Rodriguez Vila, Sao Paulo 2006, 9.\( \text{xc3} \)± White has much more space and two powerful bishops, while his d4-pawn is reliably protected.

7.\( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{dxc4} \) 8.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{a5} \)

Black lags so much in development that his attempt to hold on to his c4-pawn looks very risky.

Meanwhile, the move 8...\( \text{h6} \) is not any better either. 9.\( \text{xc4} \) 0-0 10.\( \text{d8} \) 11.\( \text{e1} \) b6 12.\( \text{f4} \)
13.0–0 ②a5 14.④a2± I.Sokolov – Fernandez Romero, Lanzarote 2003. Black’s knights, isolated at the edge of the board, are a sorry sight. Later, White advanced d4-d5 and scored a quick victory.

9.d5
This is the beginning of a decisive offensive in the centre. 9...b6 10.d6 cxd6 11.exd6 ⑦d8 12.②b5 ⑦f8 13.④c7 ⑦b8 14.④d1 ⑦f6, Solari – Yui Pineda, Email 2007, 15.④e5! ⑦d7 16.⑧xc4 ⑧xc4 17.⑧xc4± White has regained the sacrificed pawn and thanks to his powerful passed pawn on d6 and the fact that Black’s king has been deprived of its castling rights, White’s advantage is doubtless.

B) 3...a5
Now, contrary to variation A, Black protects his bishop with the pawn and not with the queen.

4.②c3
Here, it does not seem so good for White to play 4.e4, because after 4...d5 Black’s queen on d8 joins immediately in the fight for the d4 and d5-squares.

9.d5
Following 4...②c6, the simplest reaction for White is 5.e3!? and after 5...⑦f6 6.②d3 d6 7.④ge2 e5 8.0–0 0–0, there arises transposition to the variation with 4...d6.

4...b6. This move seems very passive, because White advances e2–e4 and Black has no resources to organise counterplay against the pawn on e4. 5.e4 ②b7 6.④c2!? (This move is more reliable than 6.②d3 f5 7.d5 fxe4 8.④xe4 ②f6± and White’s centre crumbles, Timoschenko – Graf, Tashkent 1987.) 6...⑦f6 7.②d3 d6 8.④f3. Now and later, after White plays ④f3, there arises by transposition the Bogoljubow Defence. Still, this should not worry the readers, since White has managed to avoid the main variations of this open-
ing. 8...\(\text{bd}7\) 9.a3. Now, White will have the two-bishop advantage in the forthcoming middle game. 9...\(\text{xc}3\) 10...c5 (It seems rather awkward for Black to transfer his queen to a8, as it was tried in the game Mecking – Suba, Bazna 2007: 10...\(\text{xa}7\) 11.\(\text{f}3\) 0-0 \(\text{b}8\) 12.\(\text{d}2\) c5 13.d5\(\pm\) – His pressure on the long diagonal has been neutralised and Black’s rook on a7 is a sorry sight.) 11.d5 e5 12.g3 \(\text{g}8\) 13.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{e}7\) 14.0-0-0 Sarrau – Dgebuadze, Lommel 2012.

If Black tries to follow schemes resembling the Dutch Defence, White can counter that with a breakthrough in the centre. 4...f5 5.e4!? \(\text{xc}3\) (after 5...\(\text{f}xe4\) 6.\(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{f}6\), Certic – Mihic, Belgrade 2003, White obtains good attacking prospects after 7.\(\text{c}3\)!? 0-0 8.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{xc}3\) 9 \(\text{e}4\) 10.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{xc}3\) 11.\(\text{bxc}3\) b6 12.\(\text{c}2\) g6 13.h4→ followed by h4-h5) 6.\(\text{xc}3\) fxe4 7.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{f}6\) 8.\(\text{x}g7\) \(\text{g}8\) 9.\(\text{h}6\) Black’s entire kingside has been weakened as well as his dark squares, Werle – De Jong, Leeuwarden 2009.

4...d5. This move leads to interesting developments advantageous for White. 5.a3 \(\text{xc}3\) 6.\(\text{bxc}3\). He should not be afraid of the doubling of his pawns, since he can always exchange on d5. Capturing with the bishop is weaker, because on the c3-square it will be restricted by the pawn on d4 and cannot go to the g5-square if necessary. 6.\(\text{e}7\) (6.\(\text{f}6\) 7.\(\text{g}5\) h6 8.\(\text{h}4\) 0-0 9.e3 c6 10.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{bd}7\) 11.\(\text{xd}5\) cxd5 12.c4\(\pm\) White has two powerful bishops, Milov – Landenberge, Neuchatel 1995) 7.\(\text{xd}5\) exd5 8.e3 b6 9.\(\text{f}3\) 0-0 10.c4 \(\text{a}6\) 11.\(\text{c}2\) c5 12.\(\text{dx}c5\) bxc5, Ki.Georgiev – Istratescu, Porto Carras 2011, 13.\(\text{d}1\)!? \(\text{d}7\) 14.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{b}7\) 15.\(\text{e}2\)\(\pm\) and in this open position White’s bishops may be rather unpleasant for Black. Meanwhile, he must be on the alert about the protection of his pawns on d5 and c5.

After 4...\(\text{f}6\), White can again try to advance 5.e4.

Black cannot win a pawn, since following 5...\(\text{xc}3\) 6.\(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{xe}4\), White will play 7.\(\text{g}4\) d5 (7...\(\text{xc}3\) 8.\(\text{x}g7\) \(\text{e}7\) 9.\(\text{bxc}3\)\(\pm\) and in the middle game Black’s unsafe king is much more important than White’s doubled pawns, I.Sokolov – Gofshtein, Villarrobledo 2007) 8.\(\text{x}g7\) \(\text{f}6\) 9.\(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{xf}6\), L’Ami – Meshcheriakova, Benidorm 2010, 10.\(\text{e}2\)\(\pm\) White has a superior pawn-structure and the two-bishop advantage.
Following 5...d6, White is not obliged to wait for e6-e5, but can play 6.e5 himself, for example: 6...dxe5 7.dxe5 a6c3 (7...a6f7 8.\(\textit{W}\)c4 g6 9.a\(\textit{f}\)f3± and he has a space advantage, while Black’s kingside has been weakened, Ippolito – Ibragimov, Ledyard 2008) 8.a\(\textit{xc}\)3 \(\textit{W}\)xd1+ 9.\(\textit{W}\)xd1 a6f4 10.a\(\textit{d}\)d4 a6c6 (10...a6c6 11.a\(\textit{f}\)f3 a6c5 12.a\(\textit{e}\)e2 a6d7 13.a\(\textit{c}\)c3± Narciso Dublan – Schlawin, Dresden 2007) 11.a6d3 a6c4 12.a6e4 a6f5 13.a\(\textit{f}\)f3± and Black will have to fight long and hard for a draw in this endgame, because his bishop on c8 is very passive in comparison to its counterpart on e4, Sarkar – Izoria, Chicago 2006.

5...d5. This is Black’s best move in this position. 6.e5 a6d4 (6...a6c3?! 7.b\(\textit{xc}\)3 a6f4 8.a\(\textit{f}\)f3± – His knight is endangered, because White is threatening 9.a\(\textit{f}\)f3 a6g5 10.\(\textit{W}\)c1 a4 12.a\(\textit{c}\)c3 a6xd4 13.a\(\textit{xe}\)d4 a6e5 14.a6xd4 a6xd4 15.a6xd4 a6c6= – the position has been considerably simplified.). 7.a6xd2 8.a6xd2 a6xd5 9.a3 a6xc3 10.a6xc3 0-0 11.\(\textit{W}\)e1 a6c6 12.a6f3 a6f5 13.a\(\textit{e}\)e2 a4 14.0-0± – The pressure on the semi-open c-file provides White with a slight but stable advantage.

5.e3!?

White gives up the idea of advancing e2-e4 and covers reliably the d4-square. Now, Black will have problems creating counterplay.

5...e5

About 5...a6f6 6.a6d3 e5 7.a\(\textit{f}\)e2 – see 5...e5.

Following 5...f5, White maintains an edge accomplishing a set-up which we will encounter numerous times in the next part of our book, devoted to the Dutch Defence: a6d3, \(\textit{W}\)c2, a6ge2, f3 followed by e3-e4. 6.a6d3 a6f6 7.a6c2 0-0 8.a\(\textit{ge}\)2 a6c6 9.a3 a6xc3 10.a6xc3 a6e7 (Black’s alternatives would not change the evaluation of the position: 10...a6d7, Ikonnikov – De Jong, Vlissingen 2011, 11.0-0 a4 12.a6ad1±; 10...a4 11.0-0 a6e8 12.a6ad1 a6e7, Shabtai – Soffer, Tel Aviv 1990, 13.a6f3±; 10...a6e7, Poplavsky – Galakhov, Odessa 2000, 11.0-0?! a4 12.a6ad1±) 11.a6f3 a4 12.0-0± and White has the two-bishop advantage and more space, while Black can hardly find good squares for his
1.d4 e6 2.c4 \(\square_b4+\) 3.\(\square_d2\)


6.\(\square_d3\) \(\square_f6\)

About 6...\(\square_c6\) 7.a3!? \(\square_xc3\) 8.\(\square_xc3\) \(\square_f6\) 9.\(\square_e2\) 0–0 10.0–0 – see 6...\(\square_f6\).

7.\(\square_ge2\) 0–0

7...\(\square_c6\) 8.0–0 0–0 – see 7...0–0.

8.0–0

8...\(\square_c6\)

8...\(\square_e8\) 9.a3 \(\square_xc3\) 10.\(\square_xc3\) \(\square_c6\) 11.d5 – see 8...\(\square_c6\).

Black’s position is rather passive after 8...exd4 9.exd4 h6 10.a3 \(\square_xc3\) 11.\(\square_xc3\) \(\square_c6\), Feller – Edouard, Nimes 2009, 12.\(\square_b5!??\) – he will have to defend long and hard an inferior position without chances of creating active counterplay.

9.a3 \(\square_xc3\) 10.\(\square_xc3\) \(\square_e8\) 11.\(\square_d5\) \(\square_e7\)

Black’s position is even worse if he retreats his knight to its initial position: 11...\(\square_b8\) 12.\(\square_g3\) c6 13.dxc6 bxc6 14.\(\square_e4\) \(\square_xe4\) 15.\(\square_xe4\)± and in comparison to the main line, Black’s knight’s position is worse than on the g6-square, Arencibia Rodriguez – Gulko, Merida 2002.

12.\(\square_g3\) \(\square_g6\) 13.\(\square_c2\) c6 14.\(\square_xc6\) bxc6 15.\(\square_e4\) \(\square_xe4\) 16.\(\square_xe4\)± The position is opened and White’s bishop-pair is tremendously powerful, Chernin – Bosman, Ohrid 2009.

C) 3...\(\square_xd2\)+

This is the most reliable move for Black. He does not waste time to protect his bishop and is trying to develop quickly his pieces.

4.\(\square_xd2\)

(diagram)

4...\(\square_f6\)

About 4...b6 5.e4 – see Chapter 4.
The move 4...f5 will be analysed in the part devoted to the Dutch Defence.

It is bad for Black to develop his knight to the edge of the board 4...h6. Later, in the game Komljenovic – Carlier, Benidorm 1992, there followed 5.g3 0-0 6.g2 d6 7.f3 d7 8.0-0 e5 9.c3 c6 10.ad1± and the knight on h6 is obviously placed worse than on its usual position – on f6.

Following 4...d6 5.c3 e7 (5...f6 6.e4, or 5..e7 6.e4 f6 7.f4, or 5..d7 6.e4 e5 7.f3 g6 8.d1 – see 4..f6) 6.g3 d7 7.g2 b8 8.f3 a6 9.0-0± and White’s game is much freer, Osnos – Gurgenidze, Kutansi 1978.

The move 4...d5, after 5.c3 f6 6.c3, transposes to the line with 4..f6. Black’s attempt to steer the game into original positions with 5..c6 6.e3 g7 7..f3 0-0 8.e2 b6, did not solve the problems for him in the game Shishkin – Malaniuk, Lazy 2009. 9.0–0 a6 10.cxd5 xe2 11.xe2 exd5 12.xc1± with a rather unpleasant pressure for White on the c-file. Later, the weakening of Black’s position after the move b7-b6 may become a telling factor.

5.c3

5...d5

After this move, there arise positions more typical for the Queen’s Gambit and Black will have to work hard in order to solve the problem with his “bad” bishop on c8.

Black has also tried in practice 5...d6 6.e4 bd7 (6...0–0 – see 5...0–0; 6..e7, Botvinnik – Budo, Leningrad 1932, 7.f4± and the threat e4-e5 is very unpleasant for Black) 7..f3 e5, Gruenwald – Schauwecker, Switzerland 1994, 8.d1!? (it is also good for White to play here 8..d3?!) 8... exd4 9.xd4 0–0 10.e2 c5 11.f3 a5 12.0–0± White has protected reliably his e4-pawn and his prospects in the forthcoming
middle game are preferable thanks to his space advantage.

5...0–0 6.\(\diamond f3\)

About 6...d5 7.\(\ast f4\) – see 5...d5. Black’s position is rather cramped after 6...\(\ast e7\) 7.e4\(\pm\), as well as following 6...b6 7.e4 \(\ast b7\) 8.\(\ast d3\) Drozdova – Chernova, Kazan 2003.

After 6...d6, White can enter a slightly better endgame with 7.e4 e5 (7...\(\ast c6\) 8.\(\ast d1\) – see 6...\(\ast c6\)) 8.dxe5 \(\ast x e5\), Van der Stricht – Van den Doel, Belgium 2012, 9.\(\ast x d8\) \(\ast x d8\) 10.\(\ast x e5\) \(\ast e8\) 11.f4 \(\ast x e4\) 12.\(\ast x e4\) f6 13.g4! fxe5 14.\(f5\) White’s knight is very powerful in the centre of the board, while Black’s bishop on c8 is restricted by his pawn on f5. It is worth remembering that his pawn on e5 is isolated and its weakness might become a telling factor later.

6...\(\ast c6\). Now, it is difficult for White to maintain an edge. 7.e4 d6 8.\(\ast d1\) \(\ast e7\) 9.\(\ast e 5\) 10.dxe5 dxe5. He should play here 11.h3!? , preventing \(g4\) (White would not achieve much with 11.\(\ast d5\), due to 11...\(\ast d8\)=) 11...\(\ast c5\) 12.0–0 \(\ast e 6\)

13.\(\ast a 4\) \(\ast e 7\) 14.\(\ast e 3\) White has managed to oust the enemy queen from its active position and has covered the d4-square against possible penetration. Later, he can develop his initiative with the help of the manoeuvres \(\ast a 4\)-c5, or \(\ast a 4\)-c3-d5.

6.\(\ast f3\)

6...0–0

Black’s possibilities are somewhat reduced after the move 6...c6, because later, the pawn-advance c6-c5 will be connected with a loss of a tempo. 7.e3 \(\ast b7\) 8.\(\ast d3\) dxc4 9.\(\ast x c4\) \(\ast e 7\) 10.e4 \(\ast e 5\), Andreikin – Stupak, Chotowa 2010, 11.0–0!? 0–0 (White should not be afraid of 11...b5 12.\(\ast b3\) \(b4\)! 13.\(\ast e 2\) \(\ast x e 4\) 14.\(\ast c2\) – he will regain his pawn, while Black’s queenside has been seriously weakened.) 12.\(\ast f e 1\) exd4 13.\(\ast x d4\) followed by e4-e5. White’s pawn-majority in the centre and on the kingside is much more important than Black’s pawn-majority on the other side of the board.
This is a modern idea, which has been tested in games played in the years 2012-2013. White is in a hurry to deploy his queen to an active position.

About 7...⪗bd7 8.e3 a6 9.⪗d1 – see 7...a6.

Following 7...c5, Akshat – Swayams, Bhopal 2013, the simplest reaction for White would be 8.dxc5!? and after 8...⪗a5 9.⪗c1 ⪗xc5 10.e3 ⪗c6 11.cxd5 ⪗xd5 12.⪗c4 ⪗xc4 13.⪗xc4 ⪗xc3 14.⪗xc3 ⪗d7 15.⪗e2± there arises an endgame which is in his favour.

Or 7...a6 8.e3 ⪗bd7 9.⪗d1 c6 (9...c5 10.cxd5 exd5 11.⪗d3 c4, Vitiugov – Rakhmanov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2013 and here, after 12.⪗c2± there arises a quite familiar type of position in which Black’s possible queenside counterplay would not compensate his weakness on d5.) 10.⪗d3 dxc4 11.⪗xc4 ⪗d5 12.⪗e4 ⪗f6 13.⪗c2 b5 14.⪗e2 ⪗b7, Miljkovic – Kosic, Sarajevo 2013. Black’s bishop on b7 is misplaced and White only needs to prevent c6-c5. The simplest way for him to do that is 15.⪗d2!? ⪗e7 16.⪗ce4±, followed by ⪗c5.

8.e3 a6

8...⪗d8 9.⪗c1 dxc4 10.⪗xc4 c5 11.dxc5 ⪗c6 12.0–0 ⪗xc5, Krysa – Pineiro, Buenos Aires, 13.⪗fd1± White’s rooks have occupied the key files for similar positions – c and d, while Black has not solved yet the problem with his bishop on c8.

9.a3 ⪗e8 10.⪗c1 ⪗c6

This position was reached in the game Mamedyarov – Vitiugov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2013. Here, after 11.cxd5!? exd5 White could have obtained a very favourable version of the Queen’s Gambit, because in positions with Carlsbad pawn-structure, the c6-square is not the best for Black’s knight and his attempt to ad-
advance c7-c5 would lead to the appearance of an isolated pawn in his position. For example: 12.\textit{h}3 \textit{d}a5 13.\textit{d}d3 \textit{c}5 14.\textit{d}xc5 \textit{b}3 15.\textit{d}d1 \textit{dxc}5 16.\textit{c}2 \textit{e}6 17.0-0± Black will have to defend long and hard a typical position with an isolated queen's pawn.

**Conclusion**

Among all the lines, we have analysed in the first part of the book, 1...\textit{e}6, 2...\textit{b}4 is the most reliable system of development for Black. It is not easy for White to obtain an advantage, because Black does not have any noticeable weaknesses in his camp.

Still, White has better prospects, because if Black advances d7-d5, then he will have problems with his bishop on c8 (since most of his pawns are on the same colour as the bishop).

Black's plan, connected with the pawn-advance e6-e5, leads to a great lag in development for him. We have to remember that White should not be in a hurry to push d4-d5, but should maintain the tension in the centre, waiting for the exchange on d4. He must be also on the alert about Black's possible counterplay on the semi-open e-file.
Part 2

The Dutch Defence
1.d4 f5 or 1.d4 e6 2.c4 f5

Dutch set-ups
1.d4 e6 2.c4 b4+ 3.d2 xxd2 4.xd2 f5
1.d4 g6 2.c4 f5
1.d4 c5 2.d5 f5
1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.d3 c3 f5
1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.d3 c6 4.e3 f5

As a main weapon for White against the classical Dutch Defence (1.d4 f5) I have chosen the most practical move 2.c3,

which, contrary to the systems connected with the fianchetto of White's light-squared bishop, reduces Black's possibilities considerably. In this way, studying of the opening for White is facilitated. We deal with this in our Chapter 6.

In Chapter 7, we analyse Black's attempts to play the Dutch Defence via the move order 1.d4 e6 2.c4 f5, as well as the variation 1.d4 e6 2.c4 b4 3.d2 xd2 4.xd2 f5.

Chapters 8-9 will be devoted to Dutch set-ups reached via some other openings. In Chapter 8 we will analyse the rather dubious lines: 1.d4 g6 2.c4 f5 and 1.d5 c5 2.d5 f5. In Chapter 9, we will deal with the variations 1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.d3 c6 4.f3 f5 and 1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.d3 c5.

White maintains the advantage in the Dutch Defence, but there arise very complicated positions, since there remain many pieces on the board in the majority of the variations. This book will help you to understand and learn the intricacies of this opening.
After this move there arises the Dutch Defence on the board. This opening has long history. It was named like this after the theoretical analysis of the Dutch player E. Stein back in the year 1789. It was played regularly in the tournament practice during the first half of the 19th century. At the beginning of the 20th century M. Botvinnik made a great contribution to the development of the theory of this opening. Among the contemporary grandmasters, we have to mention M. Gurevich and V. Malaniuk as its ardent adherents. At the very top level this opening is only seldom encountered, but H. Nakamura plays like this sometimes and even the present World Champion M. Carlsen has tried it several times.

The main strategical idea of this defence is to prevent White from occupying the centre. The same idea is typical for the Sicilian Defence as well. Why then the Sicilian Defence is one of the most popular openings nowadays, while the Dutch Defence is not? The answer to this question is quite obvious. The move 1...f7-f5 weakens Black's king considerably.

2.\( \text{dxc3} \)

This is not the most popular move for White, but it is the most practical. Indeed, after 2.c4, fol-
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One of the benefits of 3.g3 is that Black has three approximately equally strong systems of development. They are the Leningrad Variation, the Ilyin-Zhenevsky’s System and the Stonewall System.

With the move 2.\textit{c}3, White reduces considerably Black’s possibilities. The only drawback of this move is that White places his knight in front of his pawn, but as a rule, later he succeeds in advancing c2-c4, removing his knight to b5 or to e2. His second possible plan includes the idea to prepare e2-e4. In this case White’s pawn is even better placed on c2, since it protects reliably his king after he castles queenside.

About the strength of the move 2.\textit{c}3 you can judge by the fact that it has been played by B. Gel- fand, A. Grischuk, G. Kasparov, R. Ponomariov, I. Sokolov and many other grandmasters.

Following 2.\textit{c}3, Black has three basic alternatives: A) 2...\textit{g}6, B) 2...\textit{d}5 and C) 2...\textit{f}6.

If he tries something else, White advances e2-e4 and obtains a great advantage. For example: 2...\textit{c}6 3.e4 \textit{fxe}4 4.\textit{xe}4 \textit{xf}6 5.\textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 6.\textit{d}3 \textit{c}6, Huss – Kulak-sizoglou, Bern 1998, 7.\textit{f}3 \textit{g}7 8.0–0 0–0 9.\textit{h}4 \textit{d}5 10.\textit{h}5± and Black has great difficulties with the protection of the g6-square, while if he plays f6-f5, then the all-important e5-square is completely in White’s hands.

2...c5. The combination of the moves f5 and c5 seems a bit strange. 3.\textit{d}xc5 \textit{f}6 4.\textit{g}5 \textit{e}6 5.e4 \textit{h}6, Wells – Slavin, England 2012, 6.\textit{e}3!? \textit{fxe}4 7.\textit{ge}2 \textit{e}7 8.\textit{f}4 0–0 0 9.\textit{g}6 \textit{f}7 10.\textit{xe}7+ \textit{x}e7 11.\textit{b}5 \textit{c}6 12.\textit{d}6± and White’s knight on d6 paralyses Black’s position completely.

Black’s situation is only slightly better after 2...\textit{d}6 3.e4, for example 3...\textit{f}6 (3...\textit{fxe}4 4.\textit{xe}4 \textit{xf}6 5.\textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 6.\textit{d}3 \textit{c}6 7.\textit{c}3 \textit{e}7 8.\textit{e}2 \textit{d}7 9.0–0 0–0 10.\textit{b}4± Collas – Iwanesko, Caen 2011, followed by a2-a4-\textit{a}5, b4-b5.) 4.\textit{xf}5 \textit{xf}5 5.\textit{d}3 \textit{d}7 6.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 7.0–0 \textit{e}5, Feoktistov – Buecker, playchess.com 2006, 8.\textit{b}5± and the pin of the knight is very unpleasant for Black.

2...\textit{e}6 3.e4 \textit{fxe}4 (3...\textit{b}4 4.\textit{xf}5 \textit{exf}5 5.\textit{d}3 \textit{d}6 6.\textit{h}5+ \textit{g}6 7.\textit{w}3 \textit{f}6 8.\textit{ge}2 \textit{d}5 9.\textit{g}5 \textit{c}6, Dmitrenko – S. Ivanova, Serpukhov 2004, 10.\textit{w}3+!? \textit{f}7 11.0–0 \textit{e}8 12.\textit{h}3 \textit{bd}7 13.\textit{ae}1± Black’s king is very weak, moreover that he has not completed the development of his pieces.) 4.\textit{xe}4 \textit{f}6 5.\textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 6.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 (It is worse for Black to play 6...\textit{e}7?!, because after 7.\textit{g}5 \textit{w}5 8.\textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}7 9.\textit{d}3± he loses his castling rights, Korchnoi – Midjord, Siegen 1970.) 7.\textit{g}5 \textit{w}7 8.\textit{d}3 \textit{e}7, Annageldyev – Afifi, Manila 1992, 9.\textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}7 10.0–0 \textit{w}5 11.\textit{e}1± Black lags in development and White’s king will be much more
reliably protected in the forthcoming middle game covered by three pawns, while Black's king will be covered by only two pawns after castling kingside.

A) 2...g6
This is not the best move for Black, since it enables White to begin an immediate offensive on the kingside.

3.h4!

Now, Black will hardly manage to parry the threat h4-h5.

3...\(\text{g7}\\)

After 3...\(\text{f6}\\), White has the energetic possibility – 4.h5!

Following the exchange-sacrifice 4...\(\text{xe}5\\) 5.\(\text{xe}5\\), Black's position is on the verge of collapsing. 5...\(\text{gx}5\\) 6.e4 \(\text{g7}\\) (6...d6 7.\(\text{wx}5+\text{d7}\\) 8.\(\text{xf}5+\text{e6}\\) 9.\(\text{h}3\\) c6, Koelsch – Rulofs, Kiel 2003, 10.\(\text{xf}3\\) \(\text{c7}\\) 11.\(\text{d}3\\) ± White has a pawn for the exchange, while Black lags in development and he can hardly ensure a safe haven for his king.) 7.\(\text{wh}5+\text{f8}\\) 8.\(\text{xf}5+\text{g8}\\) 9.\(\text{f}3\\) ± White has overwhelming positional compensation for his minimal material deficit, Weiss – Wojdyla, Germany 2008.

The refusal to accept the sacrifice is not preferable for Black either: 4...\(\text{g8}\\) 5.\(\text{hx}g6\text{hxg6}\\) 6.\(\text{b}5\\) d5 7.e3 \(\text{c6}\\) 8.\(\text{b}5\\) \(\text{e}4\\) 9.\(\text{xe}4\\) \(\text{xe}4\) 10.\(\text{d}2\\) \(\text{f}5\\) , Zakaria – Zhang, Kuala Lumpur 2007 and here 11.c4! \(\text{d}7\\) 12.\(\text{c}1\\) ± Black has succeeded in protecting reliably his kingside, but parrying the opponent's threats on the other side of the board may prove to be a very difficult task for him.

4...\(\text{g}7\\) 5.\(\text{hx}g6\text{hxg6}\\) 6.\(\text{hx}8+\text{f8}\\) \(\text{xh}8\\) 7.\(\text{d}2\\) \(\text{g}7\\) 8.\(\text{g}5\\) \(\text{f}7\\) 9.\(\text{f}3\\) \(\text{h}7\\) 10.\(\text{h}4\\) \(\text{g}8\\) 11.e4+– followed by \(\text{c}4\\), \(\text{h}6\\), 0–0–0 and \(\text{h}1\\), Pribyl – Minich, Trnava 1990. The material is equal indeed, but White's attack is victorious.

4.h5 \(\text{c}6\\)

After 4...c5 5.d5 d6, Eliet – Miralles, Belfort 2004, White could have exploited the vulnerability of
the e6-square in the enemy camp. In order to do that, he should transfer one of his knights to the g5-square and the other knight to f4, for example: 6.e4!? fxe4 7. \( \Box e4 \Box f6 8.h6 \Box f8 9.\Box g5 \Box a6 10. \Box e2 \pm \) (followed by \( \Box f4 \)) and the penetration of White's knight to e6 is unavoidable.

5.\( \Box f3 \) \( d6 \)

After 5...d5, there appears another weakness in Black's camp – the e5-square. 6.\( \Box f4 \) a6 7.e3 \( \Box h6 \), Debarnot – Larsen, Las Palmas 1976 and here, it seems very good for White to transfer his queen to the h2-b8 diagonal. 8.\( \Box g5! \) e6 9.\( \Box f3 \Box d7 10.\Box g3 \pm \)

6.e4 fxe4 7.\( \Box xe4 \Box f5 8. \Box g3 \Box d7 \)

This position was reached in the game Fuente – Cenal Gutierrez, Spain 1997. Here, White had simply to obtain the two-bishop advantage with: 9.\( \Box xf5 \) gxf5 10.d5 \( \Box d8 11.\Box h6 \Box f6 12.\Box g5 \Box xg5 13.\Box xg5\pm \) and his bishops would be obviously much stronger than Black's cavalry, moreover that his pawns on f5 and e7 would be very weak.

B) 2...d5

With this move Black prevents radically the pawn-advance e2-e4. Still, his last move has an obvious drawback – the weakening of the e5-square, which is exploited by White immediately.

3.\( \Box f4 \)

3...\( \Box f6 \)

Black can hardly continue the game without this natural developing move.

About 3...e6 4.e3 \( \Box f6 5.\Box b5 \) – see variation B1.

About 3...a6 4.e3 \( \Box f6 5.\Box d3 \) – see variation B2.

In the game Zeller – Movsziszian, Dudweiler 1996, Black played a bit too originally. 3...\( \Box e6 4.e3 \Box f6 5.\Box f3 \) g6 6.\( \Box b5! \) You have to pay special attention to
this move for White. He opens with tempo the way forward of his c2-pawn. You will encounter this resource numerous more times. 6...a6 7.c4 c6 8.exd5 exd5 9. e5 g8 10.c3± Black has many weaknesses in his position and his pieces are not well deployed.

Following 3...c6 4.e3,

Black played in the majority of the games the move 4...d6 and after 5.f3 there arose transposition to variation B3.

Black's attempt to postpone the development of his king's knight would not end well for him. For example: 4...b6 5.b1 d7 6.f3 g6, Rojo Huerta – Garcia Ilundain, Ponferrada 1997, 7. e2?! g7 8.0–0± and White has a clear-cut plan for his further actions. This is the preparation of the pawn-advance c2-c4 after a4. Meanwhile, Black must be constantly on the alert about the possibility g5-e6.

or 4...g6 5.h4!? The threat h4-h5 is very unpleasant for Black. 5...e6 (5...f6 6.h5 gxh5 7.e2± Zdebskaja – Dybtseva, Evpatoria 2001) 6.h5 g7 7.f3 d7 8.g5± – The misplacement of Black's bishop on e6 becomes a telling factor, Stefanova – Cmilyte, Beijing 2011.

It seems more reliable for him to choose 4...d7 5.d3 e6 6.f3 e7 7.0–0 g6 8.h3 – see variation B3b2.

Now, Black has a choice between three basic lines: B1) 4...e6, B2) 4...a6, B3) 4...c6.

It is too dubious for him to choose 4...g6 5.h4 g7 6.h5, for example: 6...hx5 7.exh5 gxh5 8.xh5+ f8 9.f3 c6 10.g5 e8 11.xh7+ h7 12.xh7+ Sautto – Welz, Arco 2010.

About 4...e6 5.f3 g6 (5...c6 6.d3 – see 4...c6) 6.b5 – see 3...e6.

B1) 4...e6 5.b5 a6
It is well known that the edge of the board is not the best place for the knights in chess.
Chapter 6

The alternatives for Black present White with the two-bishop advantage. 5...d6 6.exd6+ cxd6 7.f3 c6 (7...e4 8.h3 c6 9.c3 0-0 10.e2 a5 11.0-0 a4 12.c1 e7 13.d2 b6 14.xe4 fxe4, Bellatalla – Tudor, Email 2006, White should try to open the game with his two powerful bishops: 15.c4±) 8.e2 0-0 9.0-0 a6, Milov – Kindermann, Biel 1995 (The character of the fight remains more or less the same after 9...e7 10.c4 d7 11.c1± Nyzhnyk – Danilenko, Odessa 2007.) 10.c1 e7 11.c4± – The position is opened and White’s two bishops will be soon powerful force.

6.c4

Following 6...b4+ 7.c3 c5, White should continue with 8. a3!? (after 8.f3 e4 9.c1 a5 10.b3, Black can obtain a very good position with the energetic line: 10...b5!? 11.cxb5 c4 12.c2 c7± Rozum – Bulanov, Peterhof 2010) 8...xc3+ 9.bxc3± – White has two powerful bishops and excellent prospects on the dark squares.

Black’s position is very difficult after 6...dxc4 7.xc4 d5 8.e2 c6 9.bc3 ac7 10.e5± – he is behind in development and his pawn-structure has been compromised, Wu Wenjin – Zhao Xue, Suzhou 2001.

It seems more reliable for Black to play 6...e7 7.f3 0-0 8.a3 e4 9.c1 c6 10.c3± There often arise similar positions after 1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.c3 f5 and we will analyse them thoroughly in Chapter 9.

7.c3

7...e7

About 7...b8 8.f3 – see Chapter 9, variation A1.

Black weakens his dark squares with 7...d6 8.xd6 wxd6 9.f3 0-0 10.c5 c7 11.xa6 bxa6
12.\textit{\texttt{c}e2} – his bishop is “bad” and his queenside pawn-structure has been compromised, Hillarp Persson – Tozer, Copenhagen 2000.

8.\textit{\texttt{f}3} 0–0 9.a3

White does not let the enemy knight to the b4-square and in case of the exchange on c4 prevents the pawn-march b7-b5-b4. 9...\textit{\texttt{c}c7} 10.\textit{\texttt{e}e2} \textit{\texttt{ce}8} 11.0–0 \textit{\texttt{d}d7} 12.\textit{\texttt{w}b3} b6 – Black’s c6-pawn is very weak, Berg – Boe Olsen, Nyborg 2001, and White could have emphasized this with the move 13.\textit{\texttt{e}e5}$\pm$

Black defends reliably against the threat \textit{\texttt{b}b5}, but later this move may turn out to be a loss of time.

5.\textit{\texttt{d}d3}

White is in a hurry to complete the development of his kingside and to castle there. Later, he will begin the preparation of the pawn-advance c2-c4 (after \textit{\texttt{c}c3–e2}).

5...e6

About 5...c5 6.dxc5 e6 7.\textit{\texttt{f}3} – see 5.\textit{\texttt{d}d3}.

6.\textit{\texttt{f}3} c5

If Black decides not to advance c7-c5, his situation would not be easy at all. 6...\textit{\texttt{d}d6} 7.\textit{\texttt{e}e2} 0–0 8.\textit{\texttt{c}c4} b6 9.\textit{\texttt{c}c1} \textit{\texttt{e}e4} 10.\textit{\texttt{w}b3} \textit{\texttt{h}h8} 11.0–0$\pm$ White has obtained a stable advantage, Komarov – Panbukchian, Varna 2010.

7.dxc5 \textit{\texttt{x}c5} 8.0–0

B2) 4...a6

8...0–0

Black can hardly continue the
game without castling.

8...c6 9.e2

About 9...0-0 10.c4 or 9...e7 10.ed4 0-0 11.c4 – see 8...0-0.

Following 9...d6, Alonso Rosell – Llanes Hurtado, Spain 2012, White can follow with the thematic pawn-advance c2-c4 without being afraid of e6-e5. 10. c4!? e5 11.cxd5 cxd5 (Black’s attempt to gobble material may lead to a very quick demise for him after 11...exf4 12.dxc6 fxe3 13.eb3 bxc6 14.ed4± exf2+? 15.exf2+ – and White has a crushing attack against the enemy king stranded in the centre) 12.g5 e7 13.cxe7 e7 14.e4 cd4 15.b1 0-0 16. a3 c8 17.c1 fxe4 18.cxe4± White has a slight edge thanks to the weakness of the isolated enemy e5-pawn.

9.e2 c6

About 9...e7 10.c4 c6 11. ed4 – see 9...c6.

10.c4

The character of the fight resembles the Queen’s Gambit. If Black’s pawn had been on f7 and not on f5, then the position would be evaluated as equal. Here, the vulnerability of the a2-g8 diagonal makes his defence very difficult.

10...e7

10.d4 11.exd4 xd4 12.ed4 xd4 13.e2± – The weakness of Black’s e6-pawn guarantees White’s advantage. Later, in the game Svetushkin – Zygouris, Nikea 2011, Black played carelessly 13...xb2?! 14.ad1 h5 15.e3 f6 16.g5 c3 and here, White could have exploited the unfavourable position of Black’s bishop on b2 with the line: 17.b1! a3 18.b3 a5 19.d2 a4 20. g5 f6 21.cxe6 e8 22.xf5± White has an extra pawn and much more actively deployed pieces.

It also seems good for Black to choose here 10...b4 11.a3 xd3 12.wxd3 d7 13.ed4 c8 14. cxd5 xd5 15.e5±, although even then his weakened pawn-
structure (the consequence of the pawn-move f7-f5) is a more important factor in the evaluation of the position than Black’s two-bishop advantage.

11.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d4 \texttt{\textbackslash d4}}}

11...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslashxd4}} 12.exd4 dxc4 13.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslashxc4}} White has two powerful bishops while Black’s e6-pawn is very weak, Komarov – Kontic, Niksic 2000.

12.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c1 \texttt{\textbackslashxd4}}}

After 12...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d6}} 13.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslashxd6 \texttt{\textbackslashxd6}}} 14.cxd5 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslashxd5}}, Savon – Olenin, Orel 1999, 15.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslashc4}} White’s pawn-structure is preferable.

In the game Zatonskih – Forsaa, Caleta 2010, Black played 12...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslashac8}}, but after 13.cxd5 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslashxd5}} 14.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslashxf5 exf5}} 15.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslashc4}} his compensation for the sacrificed pawn was insufficient.

13.exd4

Here, Black has a choice where to develop his dark-squared bishop: B3a) 5...g6 or B3b) 5...e6.

He should fianchettto his bishop immediately, because after the preliminary move 5...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslashe6}} 6.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslashd3 g6}}, White can begin immediate active actions with the move 7.h4! and Black has no satisfactory defence against the threat h4-h5.
7...h5, Yevseev – A. Potapov, Alushta 2002. Here, it seems very strong for White to transfer his queen to the h2-b8 diagonal with 8.g5 g8 9.f3 bd7 10.g3 b6 11.0-0-0 ±

7...g7 8.h5 bd7 (If Black accepts the exchange-sacrifice, his position crumbles: 8...xh5 9. xh5 gxh5 10.g5±) 9.g5 g8 10.h6 f8, Sakaev – Kobalia, St Petersburg 1994. Here, it is also very good for White to transfer his queen to the g3-square: 11.f3!? e6 12.0-0-0 e7 13.g3±

7...h6. This move leads to the weakening of the g6-pawn. 8.e5 g8 9.f3 bd7, Bareev – Onischuk, Elista 1998 and now, after the simple line: 10.xd7!? xd7 11.d2± followed by 0-0-0, Black will be doomed to a passive defence, because his pieces can hardly show any activity.

B3a) 5...g6 6.d3 g7 7.0-0 (diagram)

7...0-0

In the game Gelfand – Nakamura, Moscow 2013, Black treated this position rather originally, refraining from castling kingside, but this did not bring him any dividends. 7...bd7 8.e2 h5 9.c4 e6. Here, White should have avoided the exchange of the bishop with tempo 10.g5!?± and the vulnerability of the dark squares in Black’s camp would be a telling factor.

7...e6 8.e2 bd7 (8...0-0 9.g5 – see 7...0-0) 9.c1. White advances c2-c4, maintaining the advantage, because Black has no compensation for the weakened e5-square. 9...0-0 (9...e4 10. c4±) 10.g5 f7 11.c4± – he is doomed to a passive defence, Yakovich – V. Pogosian, Petersburg 2009.

8.e2 e4

Black’s attempt to prevent the move c2-c4 would not work – 8... e6, because after 9.g5 f7, Kosic – Bui Vinh, Budapest 2007, White can still play 10.c4! without being afraid of 10...dxc4 11.xf7±

The move 8...h6, Kosic – Ho-
1. d4 f5 2. c3 d5 3. Nf3 Nf6 4. e3 c6 5. d3

ang, Hungary 2012, weakens the g6-square and White can exploit this immediately with 9. Bxb8!? axb8 10. f4 e8 11. e5 ±

9. c4 h8

This position was reached in the game Khalifman – Topalov, Las Palmas 1993. White’s further play is a very good example of what to do in similar positions.

10. e5

The exchange of the dark-squared bishops is in favour of White since the majority of Black’s pawns are deployed on light squares and the bishop on d3 is more powerful than Black’s bishop on c8. In addition, his king is weakened.

10... e6 11. b4 d6 12. Bxg7+ h7 13. h3 d7 14. a4 f6 15. cxd5 exd5 16. b5

White has obtained an excellent version of a typical position with the pawn-minority attack. 16... e4 17. a1 d6 18. c2 f6 19. f1 a6 20. f4 ± Black’s defence is very difficult, because he has no active counterplay on the kingside (he cannot play 20... g5 21. h5+-). Later, Black blundered and lost quickly: 20... h6 21. b2! h7 22. e5 ec5?? 23. ecx5! 1-0

B3b) 5...e6 6. d3

Once again Black has a choice where to develop his bishop: B3b1) 6... d6 or B3b2) 6... e7.

B3b1) 6... d6

Here Black’s bishop is more actively placed than on the e7-square, but its possible exchange would reduce considerably his attacking potential. In addition, Black’s bishop on c8, which remains on the board, is obviously “bad”, since all his central pawns are placed on squares of the same colour as the bishop.

7. 0-0 0-0

Black’s attempt to advance e6-e5 would not promise him any
good prospects, because White is much better prepared for the opening of the position. 7...\texttt{wc7} 8.\texttt{de2} \texttt{bd7} 9.\texttt{c4} e5 10.\texttt{dxe5} \texttt{de5} 11.\texttt{exe5} \texttt{exe5} 12.\texttt{wb3} \texttt{xf4} 13.\texttt{xf4} d4, Neverov - Grunberg, Port Erin 2002, 14.g3! dxe3 15.\texttt{fe1} 0-0 16.\texttt{xe3} (followed by \texttt{ae1} and c4-c5) and once again Black will have reasons to regret that his pawn is on f5 and not on f7.

\textbf{8.\texttt{de2}}

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

\textbf{8...\texttt{we7}}

8...b6 9.\texttt{c4} \texttt{de4} 10.\texttt{wb3}\pm White has an easy plan to double his rooks on the c-file, Bhat – Karlsson, Collado Villalba 2010.

Black’s attempt to create active counterplay would not be effective after 8...\texttt{de4} 9.\texttt{c4} (diagram)

9...g5. This move is very risky, because it is very difficult for Black to organise an attack against White’s king, while the weakening of the position of Black’s king may become a telling factor later. 10.\texttt{xd6} \texttt{xd6} 11.\texttt{wc2} \texttt{dd7} 12.b4 dxc4 13.\texttt{b6} (13...\texttt{we7} 14.\texttt{b3}\pm) 14.\texttt{d3} \texttt{d5} 15.a3 a5 16.\texttt{bxa5} \texttt{xa5} 17.\texttt{de5} \texttt{we7} 18.\texttt{d2} \texttt{a7} 19.a4 \texttt{d7} 20.a5 \texttt{fa8} 21.f3\pm (followed by e3-e4) White has seized completely the initiative in the centre and on the kingside, David – Vezzosi, Fermo 2010.

The more prudent move 9...\texttt{we7} was tested in the game Maletin – Mesropov, Moscow 2012: 10.\texttt{wc2} \texttt{dd7} 11.\texttt{ab1} g5 12.\texttt{xd6} \texttt{xd6} 13.\texttt{fcl} \texttt{b8}. Here after 14.\texttt{cxd5}?! White could have obtained a very good version of the typical position with a Carlsbad pawn-structure. 14...\texttt{exd5} 15.b4 g4 16.\texttt{d2}\pm (followed by \texttt{f4}, a4, b5) Black’s counterplay, connected with \texttt{f6-h6} and \texttt{h4}, is not dangerous for White, because he can protect reliably the h2-square with the move \texttt{f1}.

\textbf{9.\texttt{c4} \texttt{bd7}}

It is possibly better for Black here to continue with 9...\texttt{de4}, transposing to the variation with 8...\texttt{de4}.

\textbf{10.\texttt{cxd5}}
1.d4 f5 2.\( \text{\textcopyright C3} \) d5 3.e4 f4 \( \text{\textcopyright f6} \) 4.e3 c6 5.\( \text{\textcopyright f3} \)

This is a timely exchange. White exploits the fact that Black cannot play 10...exd5, because of the loss of his f5-pawn, while after 10...cxd5 White will occupy quickly the c-file, so Black is forced to capture with his knight.

10...\( \text{\textcopyright x} \)xd5 11.\( \text{\textcopyright x} \)xd6 \( \text{\textcopyright x} \)xd6, Gligoric – Maric, Titograd 1965, 12.\( \text{\textcopyright g} \)3!? b6 13.e4 fxe4 14.\( \text{\textcopyright x} \)xe4\( \pm \) – The vulnerability of the pawns on c6 and e6 dooms Black to a long and difficult defence.

**B3b2) 6...\( \text{\textcopyright e} \)7 7.h3**

White should not be afraid of 7...\( \text{\textcopyright b} \)6 8.a3 0–0 9.0–0 \( \text{\textcopyright d} \)7 10.\( \text{\textcopyright a} \)4 \( \text{\textcopyright a} \)5, Arencibia Rodriguez – Otero Acosta, Santa Clara 2005. Now, he has a very promising pawn-sacrifice: 11.\( \text{\textcopyright c} \)5!? \( \text{\textcopyright x} \)c5 12.\( \text{\textcopyright b} \)4 \( \text{\textcopyright x} \)xb4 13.axb4 \( \text{\textcopyright d} \)8 (Black’s position is just horrible after 13...\( \text{\textcopyright b} \)6 14.\( \text{\textcopyright b} \)1 \( \text{\textcopyright e} \)7 15.\( \text{\textcopyright x} \)b7\( \pm \) followed by \( \text{\textcopyright b} \)1 and his knight on b8 may perish without having made a single move.) 14.\( \text{\textcopyright d} \)6 \( \text{\textcopyright e} \)8 15.\( \text{\textcopyright b} \)1 a6 16.c4\( \pm \) White has more than sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn, since he is totally dominant on the dark squares.

**8.0–0**

8...\( \text{\textcopyright e} \)4

and Black will be incapable of exchanging it with his knight after \( \text{\textcopyright h} \)5.

**7...0–0**

About 7...\( \text{\textcopyright e} \)4 8.0–0 \( \text{\textcopyright d} \)7 9.\( \text{\textcopyright e} \)2 0–0, or 7...\( \text{\textcopyright b} \)d7 8.0–0 \( \text{\textcopyright e} \)4 9.\( \text{\textcopyright e} \)2 0–0 – see 7...0–0.
Black cannot equalise with the standard transfer in the Dutch Defence of his light-squared bishop to the h5-square. 8...\textit{d}d7 9. \textit{e}e2 \textit{e}e8 10.\textit{h}h2 \textit{h}h5 11.\textit{f}f4 \textit{x}xf3 12.\text{xf}3 \textit{d}d7 13.\textit{c}4 \textit{e}e4 14.\textit{d}d1± White has the two-bishop advantage, while Black's knight will not remain in the centre for long, because White will soon out it from there with the move f2-f3, Gel-fand – Beinoras, Kallithea 2008.

8...\textit{bd}7 9.\textit{e}e2 \textit{h}6 (9...\textit{e}e4 10.\textit{c}4 – see 8...\textit{e}e4) 10.\textit{h}h2 g5 11.\textit{c}4 \textit{e}e4 12.\textit{c}c1 \textit{f}f7 13.\textit{e}e5 \textit{xe}5 14.\textit{xe}5± Black has no resources to attack on the kingside and after White advances f2-f3 and e3-e4, his attack against the enemy king, deprived of any pawn-shelter, will be very powerful, Kosic – S. Schmidt, Munich 2013.

9.\textit{xe}2 \textit{d}d7 10.\textit{c}4

10...\textit{b}6

Besides this move, preparing the development of the bishop to the b7-square, Black has tried some other moves in practice. Neither of then equalises, though...

10...a5 11.\textit{h}h2 g5 12.\textit{e}e5 \textit{xe}5 13.\textit{xe}5 \textit{d}d6 14.\textit{xd}6 \textit{xd}6 15. \textit{c}c2 \textit{d}d7 16.\textit{c}5 \textit{e}e7 17.\textit{f}3 \textit{f}6 18.\textit{ae}1± White has extra space and his bishop is more active than its counterpart, Dizdar – Kobalia, Dresden 2007.

10...\textit{e}e8 11.\textit{c}c1 \textit{h}5 12.\textit{e}e5 \textit{xe}5 13.\textit{xe}5 \textit{d}d7, Neverov – A.Potapov, Cappelle la Grande 2002, 14.\textit{f}3± – Black's knight is forced to retreat from the centre of the board. Here, you can see once again the basic strategical defect of this variation for Black. He cannot have pawn-control over the e5-square, while White can always out the enemy knight from the e4-square with the move f2-f3.

10...\textit{f}f6 11.\textit{h}h2 \textit{e}e7 12.\textit{c}c2 g5 13.\textit{ac}1 \textit{h}8 14.\textit{e}e5 \textit{xe}5, Mala-khatko – Y.Kuzubov, St Petersburg 2011, 15.\textit{dx}e5!? \textit{g}g7 16.\textit{cx}d5 \textit{cx}d5 (16...\textit{ex}d5 17.\textit{f}3 \textit{ec}5 18.\textit{xf}5+-) 17.\textit{c}7± and the c-file is completely in White's hands.

10...g5 11.\textit{h}h2 \textit{d}d6 12 \textit{xd}6, Pap – Grunberg, Hungary 2009, 13.\textit{c}c1!± White has no pawn-weaknesses in his camp and this promises him better prospects. Black's attempt to organise an attack on the h-file only leads to the appearance of additional weaknesses in his camp:
13...g4 14.hxg4 fxg4 15.d2 h4 16.f4 f6 17.g3 g5 18.b3 h6 19.exd5 exd5 20.e4 – His attack has reached its dead end and his weaknesses have remained on the board. In addition, Black lags considerably in development.

11.c1 b7 12.cxd5 exd5 13.a4!

Black’s knight occupies a powerful position in the centre of the board, but this cannot compensate the vulnerability of his pawn on c6 and the passive position of his bishop on b7. After the careless move 13...a6?! Sargissian – A.Muzychuk, Antwerp 2009, White can inflict a simple tactical strike with 14.xc6!, increasing his advantage. 14...b5 15.c2 xc6 16.xc6 h8 17.xd5 – White’s bishop and his two central pawns are more powerful than Black’s rook.

C) 2...f6

Now, just like in variation B, Black prevents the move e2-e4, but does not weaken the e5-square.

3.g5

White develops his bishop to an active position.

3...d5

This is the most popular move for Black. After White’s bishop has been developed to g5, the weakening of the e5-square is not so important for Black.

It seems rather dubious for him to play 3...e4, because with this move Black exchanges his only active piece. 4.xe4 fxe4 5.e3 c5, Shengelia – Chetverik, Werther 2007 (following 5...d5 6.c4 c6, Swathi – Alka, Visakhapatnam 2006, White can transfer his knight to c3, following this with b3 and Black will hardly manage to hold on to the d5-square, because his lag in development is considerable: 7.e2) 6.d2 b6 7.0–0–0 d6 8.f3 – The position in the centre is opened and Black’s lag is development is essential.
It seems too slow for Black to opt for 3...c6 4.d5 e5 5.f3 d5 6.exf6 exf6. He has obtained the two-bishop advantage indeed, but has lost too much time on manoeuvres with his queen's knight. 7.e3 c5 8.d3 g6, Gagunashvili – Saleh, Dubai 2011. Here, White should have played energetically: 9.h4!? a6 10.a4 d6 (After 10...h5, Black's g6-pawn is weakened considerably. 11.0–0 d6 12.e2± followed by e2-f4.) 11.h5; – It would be very difficult for Black to parry his opponent's kingside activity due to his lag in development. In addition, the e6-square is very weak in Black's position. White's knight may go there along the route c3-e2-f4-e6 and if Black plays g6-g5, then he would weaken the f5-pawn.

3...c6. He is preparing the development of his queen to the b6-square. 4.f3. White's main strategic idea in this variation is to advance e2-e4. 4...b6 (4...d5 5.d3 – see 3...d5) 5.d2 h6, Arakelov – Morozov, Russia 1991 (It would be too risky for Black to accept the pawn-sacrifice: 5...xb2 6.b1 a3 7.e4=} 6.xf6 exf6 7.0–0–0 d5 8.e4 fxe4 9. fxe4± White has advanced the thematic move e2-e4, while the only developed piece in Black's position is his queen.

After 3...g6 4.f3 g7 (it is possibly more reliable for Black to play here 4...d5 – see 3...d5) 5.e4 fxe4 (5...d6, Halay – Bao, Kuala Lumpur 2006, 6.exf5 xf5 7.c4 c6 8.ge2 d7 9.0–0 0–0–0 10.d5 e5 11.b3± followed by e2-f4 and the vulnerability of the e6-square is hurting Black) 6.fxe4 d5 7.e5 e5 8.xe4 dxe4 9.c4 c5 10.c3 c6 11.e2± and due to the vulnerability of the a2-g8 diagonal, Black will hardly manage to castle. In addition, the weakness of the e4-pawn may become a telling factor for Black, Borbjerggaard – Trabolt, Aarhus 1993.

3...e6. After this move Black's knight is pinned and White can play immediately e2-e4. 4.e4 fxe4 5.xe4. The arising position resembles the Rubinstein Variation in the French Defence, but with the difference that Black has a pawn on d7 and not on f7. This is no doubt in favour of White, since Black will have problems to complete the development of his queenside pieces. 5..e7 6.xf6 xf6 7.h5+!? This is a rather unpleasant check, because after 7...g6 8.h6, Black's king may remain stranded in the centre for long.
It is bad for Black to opt for 8...\texttt{\textit{b6}}, due to 9.0–0–0 \texttt{\textit{xf6}} 10.h4 \texttt{\textit{e7}} 11.\texttt{\textit{xf6}}+ \texttt{\textit{xf6}} 12.h5 \texttt{\textit{e8}}, Velasco – Encarnacao, Dos Hermanas 2003, since after 13.\texttt{\textit{d3}}± he falls behind in development considerably.

8...b6 9.\texttt{\textit{f3}} \texttt{\textit{b7}} 10.\texttt{\textit{d3}} \texttt{\textit{a6}} (Black's situation is even worse after 10...\texttt{\textit{c6}} 11.c3, for example: 11...\texttt{\textit{e7}} 12.\texttt{\textit{f4}}± or 11...d5 12.\texttt{\textit{xf6}}+ \texttt{\textit{xf6}} 13.0–0 0–0–0 14.\texttt{\textit{ae1}}± and his pawn on e6 is weak and his bishop is "bad", Zhao – Zierk, Saint Louis 2010.) 11.c3 \texttt{\textit{e7}}, Vera Gonzalez – B.Gonzalez, Yucatan 1999, 12.0–0!± followed by a2-a4-a5, emphasizing the unfavourable placement of Black's knight at the edge of the board.

After 8...\texttt{\textit{c6}} 9.\texttt{\textit{f3}}, it is too dangerous for Black to accept the pawn-sacrifice 9...\texttt{\textit{xd4}} (9...\texttt{\textit{e7}} 10.\texttt{\textit{xf6}} \texttt{\textit{xf6}} 11.0–0–0 – see 8...\texttt{\textit{e7}}) 10.\texttt{\textit{xd4}} \texttt{\textit{xd4}} 11.0–0–0 \texttt{\textit{f6}} 12.h4 \texttt{\textit{e7}} 13.\texttt{\textit{xf6}}+ \texttt{\textit{xf6}} 14.\texttt{\textit{h5 e8}} 15.\texttt{\textit{d3 g7}}, Knaak – Ftacnik, Trnava 1980. White has a great lead in development as compensation for the sacrificed pawn. Naturally, he should be reluctant to trade queens in similar situations: 16.\texttt{\textit{e3}}±

It seems strategically risky for Black to play 8...d5, because after 9.\texttt{\textit{xf6}}+ \texttt{\textit{xf6}} 10.\texttt{\textit{f3}} \texttt{\textit{c6}} 11.\texttt{\textit{b5}} \texttt{\textit{d7}} 12.\texttt{\textit{xc6}} \texttt{\textit{xc6}}, White's knight has access to the wonderful e5-outpost and is much stronger than Black's bishop. 13.0–0–0 0–0–0 14.\texttt{\textit{he1 d6}} 15.\texttt{\textit{e3 d7}} 16.\texttt{\textit{e5}}± Vera Gonzalez – Conejero, Valencia 2002.

8...\texttt{\textit{e7}} 9.\texttt{\textit{xf6}}+ \texttt{\textit{xf6}} 10.0–0–0 \texttt{\textit{c6}} 11.\texttt{\textit{f3}} d6 12.\texttt{\textit{e3}}!? White must strive to open the position as quickly as possible in order to exploit his lead in development. Therefore, he is preparing d4-d5. 12...\texttt{\textit{d7}} 13.d5 \texttt{\textit{e7}} 14.\texttt{\textit{xe6 wxe6}}, Karr – Ragonese, Porto San Giorgio 2002, 15.\texttt{\textit{d4!}} \texttt{\textit{f8}} 16.\texttt{\textit{c4 w6}} 17.\texttt{\textit{e3 w4}} 18.\texttt{\textit{he1}}± and the pin on the e-file is very unpleasant for Black.

\textbf{4.\texttt{f3}!!}

This is not the most popular move for White.

He plays much more often 4.\texttt{\textit{xf6}} exf6. His further plan for actions is well illustrated by the game Grischuk – Svidler, Riga 2013: 5.e3 c6 6.\texttt{\textit{d3 e6}} 7.\texttt{\textit{f3}} g6 8.\texttt{\textit{ge2 d7}} 9.0–0–0 \texttt{\textit{w7}} 10.h3 0–0–0 11.g4 fxg4 12.hxg4 \texttt{\textit{e7}} 13.\texttt{\textit{f4 f7}} 14.\texttt{\textit{h6}}± followed by \texttt{\textit{dh1}} and eventually e3-e4. White maintains a stable advantage, since Black can hardly neutralise the pressure of the enemy major
pieces on the h-file. Still, things are far from simple. After the move 4...\textit{xf6}, White presents the opponent with the two-bishop advantage and this may become an important factor in the future. Therefore, the move 4.f3 is more reliable for White.

4...\textit{c6}

Black exerts pressure against the d4-pawn and thus, he defends indirectly against the threat e2-e4.

4...\textit{e6} 5.\textit{d}d3 \textit{c6} 6.0-0-0 or 5...\textit{h6} 6.\textit{h}4 \textit{c6} 7.0-0-0 – see 4...\textit{c6}.

Following 4...\textit{g6}, White should continue with 5.\textit{d}d2 preparing \textit{h}6. 5...\textit{g}7 6.\textit{h}3 \textit{e}6 7.0-0-0 \textit{bd}7 8.\textit{h}6 0-0 9.\textit{xg}7 \textit{xd}7 10.\textit{f}4 \textit{f}7 11.\textit{h}4 c5 12.e3 \textit{a}5 13.h5± White is clearly ahead of his opponent in a position with attacks on both sides of the board, Kempiński – Krasenkow, Warsaw 1997.

Black tries only seldom in practice 4...\textit{c6} 5.\textit{d}d3 \textit{a}5 6.a3 (He obtains good counterplay after White’s hasty reply 6.0-0-0 \textit{b}5=) 6...\textit{e}6, Raessle – Faber, Email 2004, 7.\textit{d}d2 \textit{b}6 8.0-0-0 \textit{e}7 9.e4 0-0 10.\textit{h}3± Black must consider now both e4-e5 and \textit{g}5, as well as the exchange on e5 followed by active actions on the e-file.

After 4...\textit{bd}7, White attacks the enemy f5-pawn with the move 5.\textit{d}d3 and wins a tempo for the preparation of e2-e4. 5...\textit{g}6 (5...\textit{e}6 6.e4±) 6.e4 \textit{xe}4 7.\textit{f}xe4 \textit{g}7, Lisanti – Rechel, Kassel 1993, 9.0-0-0 0-0 10.\textit{f}3± – The weakness of the e7-pawn dooms Black to a long and difficult defence.

After 4...\textit{e}6 5.e4, there arises the classical variation of the French Defence, but with the inclusion of the moves f3 and f5. This is no doubt in favour of White, because the weakening of the e5-square may prove to be very costly for Black. 5...\textit{e}7 6.\textit{xf}5 \textit{g}x5 7.\textit{d}d2 0-0 8.\textit{h}3 \textit{c}6 9.0-0-0 \textit{a}6 10.\textit{b}1 \textit{c}7 11.\textit{d}3± followed by \textit{g}5-f4-e5, \textit{h}3-f4, \textit{e}1, Dizdar – Sedlak, Murska Sobota 2008.

It is interesting for him to try 4...c5. About the power of this move you can judge by the fact that it has been played by such an eminent expert of the Dutch Defence as V.Malaniuk. 5.e4
5...cxd4 6.\texttt{\texttt{f}}xd4 \texttt{d}c6 (6...dxe4 7.\texttt{f}xd8+ \texttt{g}xd8 8.0–0–0+ \texttt{d}d7 9.fxe4 fxe4 10.\texttt{f}xe2 \texttt{d}c6 11.\texttt{f}g3 h6 12.\texttt{f}e3 \texttt{c}7 13.\texttt{f}xe4± White’s pawn-structure is preferable) 7.\texttt{b}5 dxe4 8.\texttt{f}xd8+ \texttt{g}xd8 9.fxe4 fxe4 10.0–0–0+ \texttt{d}c7 11.\texttt{f}ge2 a6 12.\texttt{f}xc6 bxc6 13.\texttt{f}f4+ \texttt{b}7, Matjushin – Olenin, Mariupol 2003. Now, after the accurate response 14.\texttt{f}e1 (White is not in a hurry to play 14.\texttt{f}g3, because Black can counter that with 14...\texttt{g}g4±) 14...\texttt{f}g8 15.\texttt{f}g3 \texttt{g}g4 16.\texttt{f}d2± White regains his e4-pawn and his prospects seem preferable in view of Black’s numerous pawn-weaknesses.

After 5...\texttt{d}c6, White would not achieve much with 6.\texttt{b}5 due to 6...fxe4, for example: 7.dxc5 d4 8.\texttt{f}xc6+ bxc6 9.\texttt{f}xe4 \texttt{d}d5 10.\texttt{f}xf6 gxf6 11.\texttt{f}e2 f5 12.\texttt{f}f2 e5∞ and Black’s bishops are very powerful force, Galanov – Pirs, ICCF 2012. Therefore, in order for White to fight for the opening advantage, he must sacrifice a pawn with 6.\texttt{f}ge2!? (this idea belongs to S.Soloviov) 6...dxe4 7.d5 exf3 8.gxf3 \texttt{e}e5 9.\texttt{f}f4. White’s knight is headed for the e6-square.

Black lags considerably in development, so White’s compensation for the pawn is more than sufficient.

9...\texttt{b}6 10.\texttt{e}e2. Now, it seems too risky for Black to win the exchange with: 10...\texttt{b}b2 11.\texttt{f}xe5 \texttt{x}xa+ 12.\texttt{h}d2 and it becomes inconceivable how he can complete his development. 12...\texttt{d}d7 13.\texttt{f}c7 \texttt{f}b2 14.\texttt{f}b5 \texttt{x}xb5 15.\texttt{f}b1 \texttt{x}xb1 16.\texttt{f}xb1 \texttt{d}d7 17.\texttt{f}xb7 \texttt{x}d8 18.\texttt{f}c1 \texttt{g}6 19.\texttt{d}d6± Black has more than sufficient material equivalent for the queen, but his pieces are not developed yet and are discoordinated. Therefore, his defence will be very difficult.

9...a6 10.\texttt{e}e2 \texttt{d}d6 11.\texttt{e}e3 \texttt{f}f7 12.h4 h6 13.\texttt{x}xf6 gxf6 14.h5 \texttt{e}e5 15.\texttt{x}xe5 \texttt{x}xe5 16.\texttt{a}4 \texttt{f}f3+ 17.\texttt{f}f2 \texttt{e}e5 18.\texttt{g}g6 \texttt{g}g8 (18...\texttt{x}xe6 19.\texttt{x}xg6 \texttt{h}5 20.\texttt{b}b6 \texttt{h}b8 21.\texttt{h}3 \texttt{h}6 22.\texttt{a}d1±) 19.\texttt{b}6 \texttt{b}b8 20.\texttt{h}3± and despite the two extra pawns, Black’s defence will be problematic, since his bishop on f8 is restricted by the pawns on e7, f6, h6 and bringing it into the actions may prove to be a very difficult task.
5. \( \mathcal{W}d2 \)
White is preparing to castle queenside.

5...e6

5...g6. This move has a very serious drawback. After the trade of the dark-squared bishops, Black's light-squared bishop, which will remain on the board, will be very "bad" since most of his pawns are deployed on squares with the same colour. 6.0–0–0 \( \mathcal{G}g7 \) 7.\( \mathcal{H}h6 \) 0–0 8.\( \mathcal{D}h3 \) e6 (It would be too slow for Black to opt for 8...a6 9.\( \mathcal{A}xg7 \) \( \mathcal{D}xg7 \) 10.\( \mathcal{A}f4 \) \( \mathcal{W}d6 \) 11.e3 e6, I.Sokolov – Illescas Cordoba, Wijk aan Zee 1997 and here, White could have developed very powerful initiative, exploiting the exposed position of the enemy f5-pawn: 12.h3! \( \mathcal{F}f7 \) 13.g4±) 9.\( \mathcal{A}xg7 \) \( \mathcal{D}xg7 \) 10.\( \mathcal{A}f4 \) \( \mathcal{F}f7 \), Romanchuk – A.Onischuk, Alushta 2008. Now, after the simple response 11.h4± (followed by e2-e3), White places his pawns quite correctly on squares with a different colour as his bishop and later, he can exploit the advantage of a "good" bishop against a "bad" enemy bishop.

5...\( \mathcal{E}e6 \) 6.0–0–0 h6 (After 6...\( \mathcal{W}d7 \), S.Volkov – Hoenick, Germany 2000, White obtains a very good position with 7.e3!?± followed by \( \mathcal{B}b5 \), \( \mathcal{G}ge2 \), \( \mathcal{G}f4 \) and eventually \( \mathcal{G}f4-d3-e5(c5) \)) 7.\( \mathcal{A}h4 \) \( \mathcal{W}d7 \) (The move 7...g5 weakens Black's kingside: 8.\( \mathcal{G}g3! \) f4 9.\( \mathcal{G}f2 \) \( \mathcal{W}d7 \) 10.e4± followed by h2–h4) 8.\( \mathcal{E}e3 \) \( \mathcal{F}f7 \) 9.\( \mathcal{B}b5 \) a6 10.\( \mathcal{W}xc6 \) \( \mathcal{W}xc6 \) 11.\( \mathcal{G}ge2 \). White's knight is headed for the d3-square. 11...0–0–0 12.\( \mathcal{B}b1 \) e6 13.\( \mathcal{C}c1 \) \( \mathcal{A}d6 \) 14.\( \mathcal{D}d3 \) \( \mathcal{W}e8 \) 15.\( \mathcal{G}g3± \) and White maintains a slight but stable edge thanks to the vulnerability of the e5-square in his opponent's camp, Neuman – Garbisu de Goni, Brno 2005.

5...h6. Black obtains the two-bishop advantage after this move indeed, but his lag in development and the vulnerability of the g6-square preclude him from obtaining an acceptable game. 6.\( \mathcal{X}xf6 \) exf6 7.\( \mathcal{H}h3 \)

After 7...\( \mathcal{E}e6 \), White advances effortlessly e2-e4. 8.0–0–0 \( \mathcal{F}f7 \) 9.e4 fxe4 10.fxe4 dxe4 11.d5 0.e5
12.\textit{dxe}4 \textit{xe}7 13.\textit{f}4+ followed by g2-g3, \textit{h}3 and \textit{e}6(or \textit{e}6) and White’s pieces occupy the e6-square.

After 7...g5, Black does not let the enemy knight to the f4-square, but weakens his kingside even more. 8.0-0-0 \textit{e}6 9.e4 fxe4 10.fxe4 \textit{b}4, Heise – Pirs, Email 2010, 11.\textit{e}2!?± Now, Black can hardly parry the threat \textit{h}5+, after which he will lose his castling rights.

7...\textit{b}4 8.\textit{f}4 \textit{e}7 9.h4 c6 10.\textit{h}5. Now, Black cannot protect his f5-pawn with the move g7-g6. 10...\textit{d}6 11.e3 \textit{e}6 12.\textit{f}2 \textit{f}7 13.a3 \textit{a}5. The position is closed and Black’s two bishops are not so dangerous. White has a clear-cut plan for actions against the weak enemy f5-pawn. In addition, he can inflict a tactical strike. 14. \textit{b}5! \textit{d}8 15.\textit{d}6+ \textit{xd}6 16. \textit{xa}5. Black has no counterplay at all. 16...0-0 17.\textit{d}3 b6 18.\textit{d}2 c5 19.e3 c4 20.\textit{c}2 b5. After Black has castled, White can leave aside the plan with exerting piece-pressure against the enemy f5-pawn and try to open the g-file. 21. \textit{ag}1± (followed by g2-g4) and Black can hardly parry the direct attack, S.Volkov – Malaniuk, Smolensk 2000.

(diagram)

6.a3!?  
This move is played only very seldom. White prevents the development of the enemy bishop to the b4-square. Now, the play is of a manoeuvring type.
structure in order to create counterplay in the centre, but this proves to be insufficient for equality.

13.\textbf{\textit{xf4}} 14.\textit{xf4} c5 15.\textbf{\textit{dxc5}} b6 16.\textit{c6}!? White gives back his central pawn just in time.

16...\textbf{\textit{xc6}} 17.\textbf{\textit{e2}} 18.g4 \textbf{\textit{fxg4}} 19.\textbf{\textit{fxg4}} 20.\textbf{\textit{g1}} 21.\textbf{\textit{h8}} 20-0-0-0 \pm – Black's king is vulnerable and White's further actions on the kingside (h4-h5, g4-g5) created great problems for Black in the game Papenin – Kuijper, Email 2010.

\textbf{Conclusion}

After 1.d4 f5 2.\textit{c3}, it is very difficult for Black to create active counterplay. If he does not play 2...d5 or 2...\textbf{f6}, then White advances easily e2-e4 and obtains a considerable advantage.

Following 2...d5, the weakening of the e5-square enables White to obtain an advantage with very simple moves. As a rule he places his pieces in the following way: \textbf{\textit{f4}}, e2-e3, \textbf{\textit{d3}}, 0–0 followed by \textbf{\textit{e2}}(b5) and c2-c4.

After 2...\textbf{f6}, White should castle queenside: \textbf{\textit{g5}}, \textbf{\textit{d2}}, 0–0–0. If Black prevents the immediate pawn-advance e2-e4, then White obtains an edge with the manoeuvre \textbf{\textit{g1}}-h3(e2)–f4 and eventually \textbf{\textit{d3}}. Once again the vulnerability of the e5-square forces Black to adhere to a passive defence.
This chapter is devoted to variations arising when Black enters the Dutch Defence beginning with the move 1...e6. Naturally, now White does not have the possibility 2...c3, which was analysed in Chapter 2. Still, Black has played 1...e6 and thus has reduced his choice of systems of development in the Dutch set-ups. We will analyse his main line 2...f5 in variation B. Before that, we will deal with A) 2...b4+, a variation in which Black exchanges the dark-squared bishops before advancing f7-f5.

A) 2...b4+ 3.d2 xd2+ 4.xd2 f5

This variation was played for the first time in the year 1925 by A.Ilyin-Zhenevsky and G.Levenfish. It has not become popular, because the trade of the dark-squared bishops reduces considerably Black’s active possibilities; nevertheless, it is encountered once in a while in the contemporary tournament practice. GM I. Glek plays like this sometimes and even the present World Champion M. Carlsen has tried it in two of his games.

5.c3 f6 6.g3
Chapter 7

is quite simple. He should complete the development of his kingside pieces (\texttt{g2, f3, 0-0}) and prepare e2-e4 with \texttt{e1}. If Black plays d7-d5, then the dark squares in his camp will be very weak, since almost all of his pawns are placed on light squares, so his bishop, remaining on the board, would be “bad”.

6...0-0

About 6...d6 7\texttt{g2} 0-0 8\texttt{f3} – see 6...0-0.

7\texttt{g2}

Black has problems with the development of his bishop on c8.

10...\texttt{e8} 11.e3 \texttt{h5} 12.\texttt{e2} g5, Flohr - Menchik, Margate 1936. Here, White could have exploited the insufficient protection of the enemy f5-pawn with 13.cxd5! cxd5 14.\texttt{ac1} and the c-file is completely in his hands.

After 10...\texttt{e7}, White should play the solid move 11.e3! (Winning the pawn with 11.cxd5 exd5 12.\texttt{xf5} \texttt{e4} 13.\texttt{h5} \texttt{d6} 14.\texttt{e5} \texttt{b4} 15.\texttt{xex4} \texttt{xex4} would lead to a position in which White must either comply with a repetition of moves – Black is threatening with the move \texttt{f5} chasing permanently the enemy queen, or must give up his b2-pawn, Swapnil – Chakravarthy, Kolkata 2012).

After 10...\texttt{e4} 11.\texttt{ac1}, there arises a position in which White’s play is much easier. In the game Lavis – Slavin, Lechenicher SchachServer 2010, Black failed to solve the problem with his light-squared bishop. 11...\texttt{df6} 12.\texttt{e5} \texttt{e8} 13.\texttt{xex4} \texttt{xex4} 14. \texttt{xe4!} fxe4 15.f3 exf3 16.\texttt{xf3} \texttt{xf3} 17.\texttt{exf3}+

Black plays only seldom 7...d5 8.\texttt{f3} c6 9.0-0 \texttt{bd7} 10.\texttt{c2}. White removes prudently his queen from the possible enemy attack with \texttt{e4}.

7...d6

Black is preparing e6-e5 after the preliminary moves \texttt{e7} and \texttt{c6}.

About 7...\texttt{c6} 8.\texttt{f3} d6 9.\texttt{d1} or 7...\texttt{e7} 8.\texttt{f3} d6 9.0-0 – see 7...d6.

Black plays only seldom 7...d5 8.\texttt{f3} c6 9.0-0 \texttt{bd7} 10.\texttt{c2}. White removes prudently his queen from the possible enemy attack with \texttt{e4}.
2...\texttt{b}b4+ 3.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{xd}2+ 4.\texttt{xf}d2f5 5.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{f}f6 6.g3 0-0 7.\texttt{g}g2 d6 8.\texttt{f}f3

8.\texttt{d}d3

We will analyse now: A1) 8...\texttt{e}e4, A2) 8...\texttt{c}c6 and A3) 8...\texttt{e}e7.

A1) 8...\texttt{e}e4

Black wishes to simplify his defence by exchanging a couple of knights.

9.\texttt{c}c2 \texttt{xc}3 10.\texttt{xc}c3

White has better development and his game is much easier.

10...\texttt{d}d7

Here, Black's knight will not be attacked after b2-b4-b5 and can later take part in the fight for the e4-square with \texttt{d}d7-f6-e4.

10...\texttt{e}e7 11.0-0 \texttt{c}c6 (11...\texttt{d}d7 12.\texttt{f}f1 -- see 10...\texttt{f}f7) 12.b4 e5 (12...\texttt{d}d8 13.\texttt{ac}1=) 13.b5 \texttt{xd}4 14.\texttt{xd}4 exd4 15.\texttt{xd}4= Kopylov – Berelowitsch, Internet 2005. Black will have problems to complete the development of his queenside pieces. Naturally, he loses immediately after 15...\texttt{xe}2?? because of 16.\texttt{ae}1 \texttt{g}4 17.\texttt{d}d5+ \texttt{h}8 18.\texttt{f}f7!+-

The line: 10...\texttt{f}f6 11.0-0 \texttt{c}c6 leads to a difficult position for Black. 12.b4. This is a very unpleasant plan, because now, Black must be constantly on the alert about the possibility b4-b5. 12...e5 13.dxe5 \texttt{xe}5. This move is forced. (After 13...dxe5 14.b5 \texttt{d}d4 15.\texttt{xd}4 exd4, D.Gurevich – Karlins, Philadelphia 1998, White could have maintained a great advantage by transferring his queen to the c5-square. 16.\texttt{a}a3!? \texttt{d}d8 17.\texttt{fd}1 c6 18.\texttt{c}c5= and his queen exerts pressure simultaneously against three black pawns – a7, c6 and b4. Black will hardly manage to complete his development without material losses.) 14.\texttt{ac}1 a5, Akobian – Altounian, Los Angeles 2001. Here, White had the simple move 15.b5!? and Black would not succeed in parrying the threat c4-c5, since after 15...\texttt{d}d7, White would have the resource 16.\texttt{xf}6 \texttt{xf}6 17.\texttt{g}g5!± followed by \texttt{d}d5.

11.0-0 \texttt{e}e7
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11...\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{f}6\) 12.\(\text{\textit{d}}\text{d}2\). White is better prepared for the fight for the key e4-square. Opening of the game in the centre 12...e5 is also in his favour, because he is better developed. 13.dxe5 dxe5 14.e4 f4 15.\(\text{\textit{c}}\text{f}3\) fxg3 16.hxg3 \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{xe}4\) 17.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{xe}5\) \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{d}6\), Polugaevsky – Makarichev, Reykjavik 1990. Here, White could have maintained a great advantage with the energetic line: 18.c5! \(\text{\textit{\textit{f}}}\text{f}7\) 19.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{c}3\) c6 20.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{ad}1\) \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{f}6\) 21.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{xf}6\) gxf6 22.\(\text{\textit{e}}\text{fe}1\) \(\text{\textit{g}}\text{g}4\) 23.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{d}4\) \(\text{\textit{\textit{w}}xf3}\) 24.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{xf3}\) – His pawn-structure is superior and he has a stable space advantage, moreover that in actions on both sides of the board, White’s bishop is likely to be more powerful than Black’s knight.

12.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{fe}1\)

12...\(\text{\textit{\textit{d}}}\text{f}6\)

This move impedes White’s pawn-advance e2-e4.

Following 12...e5 13.dxe5 \(\text{\textit{d}}\text{xe}5\), Garcia Gonzales – Cio-caltea, Bochum 1981, White maintains a stable edge with 14.c5!?± and Black’s defence will be very difficult. For example after 14...\(\text{\textit{\textit{\textit{d}}}}\text{x}f3+?! White has the powerful resource 15.exf3! \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{f}6\) 16.\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{b}3+\) \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{f}7\) 17.cxd6 cxd6 18.f4 \(\text{\textit{w}}\text{xb}3\) 19.axb3± and the arising endgame will be very difficult for Black, since he will have problems to bring his bishop into the actions and his pawns on a7, b7 and d6 will need permanent protection.

13.\(\text{\textit{\textit{d}}}\text{d}2\)

White is threatening again e2-e4.

13...\(\text{\textit{w}}\text{b}8\)

Now, after 13...e5, L.Popov – Commons, Plovdiv 1982, White will follow with 14.e4!±

It seems more reliable for Black to choose here 13...d5, Botvinnik – Nenarokov, Odessa 1929, but even then after 14.\(\text{\textit{\textit{\textit{d}}}}\text{f}3!± followed by \(\text{\textit{\textit{d}}}\text{e}5\), White will have a slight but stable edge.

14.e4 fxe4 15.\(\text{\textit{\textit{d}}}\text{xe}4\)
15...b5 16.c5 b4 17.c2
\( \text{dxe4} \) 18.xe4± Black’s queenside has been compromised and in the middle game the rather unsafe shelter of his king may be a telling factor as well, Pierzak – Tamburro, Email 2010.

A2) 8..c6 9.d1
White prevents the move e6-e5.

9..e7
Now, after Black advances e6-e5, White will have the possibility c3-d5 and after the trade of the knights, he will have a plan connected with exerting pressure against Black’s backward c7-pawn.

It seems too slow for Black to transfer his knight to the g6-square, because White can advance e2-e4 effortlessly. 9..e7 10.0-0 g6 11.fxe1 d7 12.e4 fxe4 13.xe4 dxe4 14.xe4. He will have an easy game against Black’s weak e6-pawn in the oncoming fight. 14..d5, Estremera Panos – Naumkin, Cutro 2003 (14..f6, Pelletier – Gerber, Switzerland 1997, 15.g5!± followed by h3 and gde1). White’s overwhelming positional advantage is doubtless. 15.e2! c6 16.g5 ef6 17.d1 g8 18.e3 h6 19.f3 e8 20.e5± Black has problems with his weak c6-pawn and with the development of his bishop on e8.

10.0-0 e5

11.d5! \( \text{xd5} \) 12. \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 13.d4 exd4 14.e1 f4 15.xd4 g4 16.e1 f7, Collett – Svenn, Sweden 1996. Now, White can simply capture a pawn 17.gxf4± and Black would not have sufficient compensation for the material deficit.

A3) 8..e7 9.0-0
(diagram)

9..c6
This is the most popular move for Black.

It looks rather dubious for him to develop his knight to the edge
move 10...e5, because after 11. \( \text{d}d5 \text{d}d8 12.\text{dxe}5 \text{dxe}5 13.\text{f}d1 \text{e}4 14.\text{g}f5 \text{d}6, \) Lehmann – Kotainy, Senden 2010, 15.\text{c}3!± the juxtaposition of the queen and the rook is tremendously unpleasant for Black.

10...\( \text{d}7 11.\text{d}5 \text{d}8 12.\text{dxe}6 \text{dxe}6, \) Dautov – Ruban, Minsk 1988, 13.\text{d}4± White’s bishop exerts powerful pressure on the long diagonal.

10.\text{f}e1

9...e5. The endgame is worse for Black after this move. 10.\text{dxe}5 \text{dxe}5 11.\text{d}d5 \text{d}d6 12.\text{xf}6+ \text{xf}6 13.\text{xd}6 \text{cxd}6 14.\text{f}d1± and the vulnerability of the d6-pawn dooms Black to a long and difficult defence, Magerramov – Laketic, Cheliabinsk 1991.

9...\text{c}6 10.\text{ac}1

Following 10...\text{d}8, White advances e2-e4 and obtains a stable advantage. 11. \text{fe}1 \text{f}7 12.e4 \text{xe}4 13.\text{xe}4 \text{fxe}4 14.\text{xe}4\pm Stahlberg – Spielmann, Stockholm 1933.

Black fails to equalise with the
2...\texttt{b}4+ 3.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{xd}2+ 4.\texttt{w}xd2\texttt{f}5 5.\texttt{c}3 \texttt{f}6 6.\texttt{g}3 0-0 7.\texttt{g}2 \texttt{d}6 8.\texttt{f}3

After 10...\texttt{e}4 11.\texttt{c}2 \texttt{d}5, there arise positions similar to the variation with 7...\texttt{d}5. Once again, the absence of Black's dark-squared bishop dooms him to a passive defence. 12.e3 \texttt{d}7 (12...\texttt{d}7 13.\texttt{e}2 \texttt{h}8, Anelli – Giardelli, Buenos Aires 1978. Here, White maintains a stable advantage with the move 14.\texttt{f}4\texttt{f}4 followed by \texttt{f}4-d3, \texttt{f}3-e5, \texttt{f}2-f3.) 13.\texttt{e}2 \texttt{e}8 14.\texttt{f}4 \texttt{d}7 15.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{df}6 16.\texttt{fe}5\texttt{f}5 A.Kharitonov – Ovetchkin, Moscow 1998. Later in the game, White continued quite successfully with a plan to attack on the queenside: \texttt{b}2-\texttt{b}4, \texttt{ec}1, \texttt{a}2-\texttt{a}4, \texttt{ab}1, \texttt{wb}2, \texttt{c}5 and crowned his positional advantage with a full point.

\textbf{11.e3 \texttt{bd}7 12.b3}

\textbf{12...\texttt{b}6}

This reliable move was played by M. Carlsen. Black is preparing the development of his bishop on \texttt{b}7, followed by \texttt{c}6-c5.

\textbf{13.\texttt{e}2}

White transfers his knight to the active \texttt{f}4-square.

\textbf{13...\texttt{b}7 14.\texttt{f}4 \texttt{dxc}4 15.\texttt{bxc}4 \texttt{c}5}

It may look like Black is close to equality, because he has solved his main problem, connected with the development of his bishop on c8. This would have been true if his pawn had been on f7 and not on f5. Now however, White can exploit the vulnerability of the a2-g8 diagonal.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Diagram}
\end{center}

\textbf{16.\texttt{wb}2}

This is the best move for White.

It is not so good for him to play the straightforward move 16.\texttt{g}5, as it was done in the game Giri – Carlsen, Monte Carlo 2011. 16...\texttt{xe}2 17.\texttt{xe}2 \texttt{e}5 18.\texttt{fe}6 \texttt{e}4 19.\texttt{xe}4 \texttt{xe}6= White's play against the weakness on e6 was not successful and Black equalised completely.

\textbf{16...\texttt{e}4 17.a4 \texttt{d}6 18.\texttt{ed}1!}

White creates the threat d4-d5, after which Black will have to consider permanently the possi-
bility of the penetration of his opponent’s knight to the e6-square.

18...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Exe}}8}

White’s pawn is untouchable, because after 18...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Exc}}4?} there will follow 19.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Wa}}2\#} and Black loses after 19...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Aa}}6?} due to 20.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Gg}}5!} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{Xg}}5} 21.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Xe}}6} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{Ff}}6} 22.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Xf}}8} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{Exf}}8} 23.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Dd}}5+-}

19.d5 exd5 20.cxd5 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{Ff}}6}
21.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Cc}}2} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{Fe}}8} 22.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Hh}}4\#}

There has arisen a very complicated position. Both sides have their pluses. Still, White’s positional achievements seem to be much more real, because Black can hardly advance his queenside pawns. White can exert powerful pressure against Black’s kingside (\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Gf3}}-g5-e6}) and if he plays h7-h6, then White will follow with h4-h5 and \texttt{\textbf{\textit{Gf3}}-h4-g6}. Then his knight will be in the vicinity of Black’s monarch endangering it.

\textbf{B)} 2...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Ff5}}}

This order of moves is preferred by competitors who play both the Dutch Defence and the French Defence. These are for example grandmasters E. Gleizerov, A. Moskalenko, M. Ulibin...

Now, Black enters the Dutch Defence, avoiding numerous dangerous variations (the Staunton Gambit, the scheme with 2.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Gg}}5}, the scheme with 2.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Cc3}}}).

3.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Cc3}}}

This is one of the oldest moves in the Dutch Defence. It was popular in the middle of the 19th century. For example, it was used numerous times by D. Harwitz in his match against P. Morphy (Paris 1858). The move was also played
by A. Alekhine, J.R.Capablanca, D. Janowski, F. Marshall, H. Pillsbury, A. Rubinstein, W. Steinitz—that was practically the entire chess elite of those times. Presently, this move is played by A. Dreev, H. Nakamura, A. Karlov, Sh. Mamedyarov. The move 3.g3 has reduced considerably the popularity of 3...c3, but Black has great problems here as well.

I believe that many readers might like to ask the following question—whether White can avoid studying the previous chapter and after 1.d4 f5, to follow with 2.c4 e6 3.c3, hoping after 3...e6 to reach the positions from this variation. Unfortunately, this is not possible, because Black has the move 3...g6 and the set-up for White, analysed in this chapter, is not so effective for him against the Leningrad Variation.

After 3...c6, White advances 4.e4 maintaining the advantage. 4...fxe4 5.xe4± Sjoberg – Grebennikov, Kecskemé 1991.

Following 3...b6, it would be best for White to play immediately 4.e4 fxe4 5.xe4± with a very comfortable game, Shimanov – Chernyshov, Pardubice 2013.

After 3...b4, White’s most reliable move is 4.c2! (in the variation 4.e3 xc3+!? 5.bxc3 f6 there arise positions with doubled pawns, which are not to everybody’s liking, Benitah – Bricard, Besancon 1999) 4...c5 (4...f6 5.e3 – see variation B3; 4...b6 5.e3 f6 6.d3 – see variation B3b) 5.e3 b6 6.a3 xc3+ 7.c3 xc3 f6 – see variation B3a.

4.e3

One of the advantages of this variation for White is the fact that he has a clear-cut plan for further actions—this is d3, c2, ge2, f2-f3, taking under reliable control the key e4-square for the Dutch Defence.
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Black’s main lines in this position are: B1) 4...b6, B2) 4...\(\text{b7}\), B3) 4...\(\text{b4}\).

About 4...c6 5.\(\text{d}3\) d5 6.\(\text{e}2\) – see Chapter 9, variation B.

4...d5 5.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}6\) (5...c6 6.\(\text{e}2\) – see Chapter 9, variation B; 5...e7 6.\(\text{c}2\) c6 7.\(\text{ge}2\) 0–0 8.f3 – see Chapter 9, variation B) 6.\(\text{ge}2\) 0–0 7.\(\text{c}2\). In the game Cheparinov – Agdestein, Amsterdam 2008, Black was reluctant to lose time for the move c7-c6 (7...c6 8.f3 – see Chapter 9, variation B), but after 7...\(\text{h}8\) 8.cxd5, he was forced to recapture on d5 with his knight: 8...\(\text{xd}5\) 9.a3\(\pm\)

Black tries that only seldom in practice, although it is not so bad for him to opt for 4...g6 5.g3!? \(\text{g}7\) 6.\(\text{g}2\) 0–0 7.\(\text{ge}2\) d6 8.0–0 e5 (after 8...c6, Najdorf – Munoz Izcua, Montevideo 1954, White can begin an immediate offensive on the queenside with the move 9.b4!\(\pm\) followed by a2-a4, \(\text{b}3\), b4-b5, \(\text{a}3\) and eventually a4-a5-a6) 9.dxe5 dxe5 10.\(\text{x}8\) \(\text{x}8\) 11.e4 c6 12.b3 \(\text{e}6\) 13.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{bd}7\), Epishin – Ulibin, Port Erin 2005. White can rely on a slight advantage in the endgame after 14. exf5!? gxf5 (14...\(\text{x}f5\) 15.h3 h5 16.\(\text{f}3\)\(\pm\) followed by g3-g4, winning the fight for the e4-square) 15.h3 \(\text{e}8\) 16.f4\(\pm\)

White obtains a better position if Black tries to prepare immediately e6-e5. 4...d6 5.\(\text{d}3\) e5 (5...c6 6.\(\text{ge}2\) \(\text{e}7\) 7.0–0 0–0 8.f3 e5 9.a3 a5, Herrera Hidalgo – Gely Alonso, Spain 1992, 10.\(\text{c}2\) g6 11.\(\text{d}2\)\(\pm\) White has a much freer game) 6.\(\text{ge}2\) \(\text{e}7\) (It would be too slow for Black to choose 6...a5 7.0–0 g6, McPhillips – Jones, Galway 2006. He is behind in development and White could have exploited that with the line: 8.e4! f4 9.c5!\(\pm\) 7.0–0 0–0, Veresov – I. Zaitsev, Moscow 1965, 8.f3 c6 9.\(\text{c}2\) g6 10.\(\text{d}2\)\(\pm\) White’s game is much easier.

B1) 4...b6 5.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{b}7\)

About 5...\(\text{b}4\) 6.\(\text{c}2\) – see variation B3b.

6.f3

In this line, White’s f3-pawn restricts considerably the scope of action of Black’s bishop on b7.

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

His bishop is attacking now White’s h2-pawn. Later, Black plans to organize kingside operations with \(\text{f}6\)–h5 and \(\text{h}4\). Besides that, he has numerous other possibilities.
About 6...\( \text{b}4 \) 7.\( \text{c}2 \) – see variation B3b.

6...\( \text{c}6 \). Black’s knight is not so well placed here, because it impedes the pawn-advance c7-c5.

7.\( \text{ge}2 \) \( \text{g}6 \) (7...\( \text{d}6 \) 8.0–0 – see 6...\( \text{d}6 \)) 8.0–0 \( \text{g}7 \) 9.e4 0–0 10.\( \text{g}5 \) h6 11.\( \text{e}3 \) fxe4 12.\( \text{x}e4 \)± White has extra space, while Black must worry about the vulnerability of his g6-pawn, Salwe – Tartakower, Vienna 1908.

There arises a complicated position, but still in favour of White after 6...c5 7.d5!? exd5 8.exd5 \( \text{c}6 \) 9.\( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 10.\( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{f}7 \), Rubinstein – Levenfish, Vilnius 1912, 11.\( \text{d}2 \)±? White is preparing \( \text{c}3 \). It is essential for him not to let the enemy bishop to the long diagonal. 11...\( \text{g}5 \) 12.\( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 13.\( \text{e}2 \) 0–0–0 14.0–0± Black’s king is not so reliably placed on the queenside.

Following 6...\( \text{h}5 \) 7.\( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{h}4 \)± (After 7...\( \text{d}6 \) 8.0–0 \( \text{c}6 \), Pedersen – Williams, Oslo 2004, White could have obtained an advantage with the move 9.\( \text{b}5 \)!, ousting the enemy bishop from its active position. 9...\( \text{e}7 \) 10.d5± Black’s kingside counterplay has reached its dead end and he lags behind considerably in development.) 8.\( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 9.a3 \( \text{g}6 \), Yakovich – Shtyrenkov, Salekhard 2007. Now, after 10.\( \text{d}2 \) (it would be premature for White to choose here 10.0–0 \( \text{g}5 \)?) 10...\( \text{g}7 \) 11.0–0± there arises a very complicated position in which White can rely on having the advantage. He has extra space and Black can hardly organise effective counterplay on the kingside.

It seems too passive for him to opt for 6...\( \text{e}7 \), because after 7.\( \text{ge}2 \) 0–0 8.0–0 c5 (8...\( \text{h}8 \) 9.\( \text{c}2 \)±) 9.d5! exd5 10.exd5 \( \text{e}8 \) 11.\( \text{g}3 \) g6 12.e4± White’s pieces are obviously more active and Black needs plenty of time to develop his queenside pieces, Rubinstein – Spielmann, Ostend 1907.

6...g6 7.\( \text{ge}2 \)

The move 7...d5 leads to the weakening of the e6-pawn after 8.0–0 \( \text{g}7 \), Gilardi – Sala, Bergamo 2008, 9.\( \text{f}4 \)±

Following 7...c5 8.0–0 \( \text{g}7 \) 9.d5 exd5 10.exd5 \( \text{c}6 \), Salwe – Fritz, Dusseldorf 1908, White could have organised a powerful attack with the line: 11.\( \text{b}5 \)! \( \text{c}6 \) (11...\( \text{e}5 \) 12.e4±) 12.\( \text{d}6 \)± \( \text{e}7 \) 13.e4 \( \text{d}6 \) 14.exd5 \( \text{xd}5 \) 15.\( \text{f}4 \)± \( \text{c}6 \) 16.\( \text{b}5 \)± \( \text{xb}5 \) 17.\( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 18.\( \text{d}3 \)± c4 19.a4± \( \text{a}6 \) 20.\( \text{xc}4 \)+
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\( \boxplus b7 \) 21.\( \boxminus f d 1 \)± and despite the fact that Black has parried the first wave of his opponent’s attack, the position of his king on the queenside is not reliable at all. White will soon begin a new dangerous offensive.

Black’s position is rather cramped after 7...\( \boxplus g 7 \) 8.0–0 0–0 9.e4 fxe4 (9...\( \boxplus c 6 \) 10.\( \boxplus g 5 \) – see 6...\( \boxplus c 6 \)) 10.fxe4 e5 11.d5 \( \boxplus e 7 \) 12.h3 c5 13.\( \boxplus g 5 \) h6 14.\( \boxplus h 4 \) d6 15.\( \boxplus d 2 \) \( \boxplus f 7 \) 16.\( \boxplus f 3 \) g5 17.\( \boxplus f 2 \)± and despite the fact that Black has avoided the unpleasant pin of his knight, but he has paid a too dear price for that. He has a gaping weakness in his camp on the f5-square and White’s knights will be headed there along the routes \( \boxplus e 2 \)-g3-f5 or \( \boxplus d 1 \)-e3-f5, Avrukh – Vaisser, Jerusalem 2013.

7.\( \boxplus g e 2 \)

After 7...\( \boxplus g 7 \) 8.0–0 0–0 9.e4 fxe4 (9...\( \boxplus c 6 \) 10.\( \boxplus g 5 \) – see 6...\( \boxplus c 6 \)) 10.fxe4 e5 11.d5 \( \boxplus e 7 \) 12.h3 c5 13.\( \boxplus g 5 \) h6 14.\( \boxplus h 4 \) d6 15.\( \boxplus d 2 \) \( \boxplus f 7 \) 16.\( \boxplus f 3 \) g5 17.\( \boxplus f 2 \)± and despite the fact that Black has avoided the unpleasant pin of his knight, but he has paid a too dear price for that. He has a gaping weakness in his camp on the f5-square and White’s knights will be headed there along the routes \( \boxplus e 2 \)-g3-f5 or \( \boxplus d 1 \)-e3-f5, Avrukh – Vaisser, Jerusalem 2013.

7...0–0

After 7...\( \boxplus h 5 \), White should continue with 8.\( \boxplus b 5 \)! (8.0–0 \( \boxplus h 4 \) 9.f4 \( \boxplus f 6 \)∞) Black has forced the move f3-f4 and his bishop on b7 exerts powerful pressure against the position of White’s king, Alonso Rosell – Gleizerov, San Sebastian 2010) 8...\( \boxplus h 4 \)± 9.\( \boxplus f 1 \) \( \boxplus a 6 \) 10.\( \boxplus x d 6 + \) cxd6 11.\( \boxplus d 2 \) 0–0 12.\( \boxplus e 1 \)± Dreev – Gorovets, Eilat 2012. White has lost his castling rights; nevertheless, his position is preferable. He has two powerful bishops and a superior pawn-structure, while Black’s knight on a6 is isolated from the actions.

He fails to equalise after 7...\( \boxplus c 6 \) 8.0–0 0–0 9.a3 \( \boxplus e 7 \), Sarkar – Shabalov, Arlington 2011 (9...\( \boxplus h 5 \), Djurkovic – Gliksman, Slovenia 1991, 10.\( \boxplus b 5 \)!±) 10.\( \boxplus b 5 \)± and once again White obtains an advantage with this move.

8.0–0 c5

About 8...\( \boxplus c 6 \) 9.a3 – see 7...\( \boxplus c 6 \).

8...\( \boxplus e 8 \). This move leads to a difficult position for Black. 9.\( \boxplus b 5 \) \( \boxplus a 6 \) 10.\( \boxplus x d 6 \) cxd6 11.\( \boxplus d 2 \)± Cohn – Caro, Berlin (m/5) 1906.

After 8...a6 9.a3± (followed by b2-b4) White seizes the initiative on the queenside, Cohn – Caro, Berlin (m/7) 1906.

9.d5±

(diagram)

This position was reached in the game Janowski – Von Popiel,
Monte Carlo 1902. White was quite consistent in implementing the plan connected with the restriction of the activity of Black's bishop on b7 and after the careless move 9...\textit{e}8? White could have simply won a pawn with 10.\textit{b}5 \textit{e}7 11.\textit{dxe}6 \textit{dxe}6 12.\textit{xd}6 \textit{xd}6 13.\textit{xf}5±

\textbf{B2) 4...\textit{e}7}
Black's bishop is not so active here as on b4.
5.\textit{d}3

\textbf{5...0–0}
5...d6 6.\textit{ge}2 0–0 7.\textit{c}2 – see 5...0–0.

1.d4 e6 2.c4 f5 3.\textit{c}3 \textit{d}f6 4.e3

5...d5 6.\textit{c}2 – see variation \textbf{B}, 4...d5.

5...b6 6.\textit{ge}2 \textit{b}7 7.f3 – see variation \textbf{B1}.

\textbf{6.\textit{ge}2 d6}

6...d5 7.\textit{c}2 c6 8.f3 – see Chapter 9, variation \textbf{B}.

7.\textit{c}2
White arranges his pieces according to the already familiar set-up.

\textbf{7...\textit{c}6}
Black develops his knight to an active position, creating in the process the threat \textit{b}4.

About 7...\textit{d}7 8.a3!? \textit{c}6 9.\textit{d}2 – see 7...\textit{c}6.

After 7...c5 8.d5! \textit{a}6 9.a3 exd5 10.cxd5± there arises a weakness on the e6-square in Black's position, Khodos – Bondarevsky, Rostov on Don 1961.

7...g6 8.0–0 e5 9.f3 \textit{e}6, Bla-
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gojevic – Tchernyi, Golden Sands 2013, 10.e4! f4 11.%d5± White has more space and his queenside initiative develops faster than Black’s counterplay on the other side of the board.

8.a3

8...%d7

8...%d7 9.f3 e5 10.%d2± Inkiov – Yedidia, Paris 1996. White should not be afraid of the threat e5-e4. Depending on circumstances, later he will castle either on the kingside, or on the queenside, while Black will hardly find a reasonable plan for his further actions.

8...%e8 9.0-0 %d7, Stephan – Rabineau, Avoine 2009 (The seemingly active move for Black 9...%h5, after 10.f3 %d7, Pinot – Capitaine, Bretagne 2006, can be countered by White with 11.d5!± and Black’s queen on h5 is misplaced, because it will be attacked with tempo after %e2-f4.) 10.e4± Black has failed to prevent e3-e4

...%d7 9...%e8 10.0-0 %d7, Stephan – Rabineau, Avoine 2009 (The seemingly active move for Black 9...%h5, after 10.f3 %d7, Pinot – Capitaine, Bretagne 2006, can be countered by White with 11.d5!± and Black’s queen on h5 is misplaced, because it will be attacked with tempo after %e2-f4.) 10.e4± Black has failed to prevent e3-e4

8...%e8 9.0-0 %d7, Stephan – Rabineau, Avoine 2009 (The seemingly active move for Black 9...%h5, after 10.f3 %d7, Pinot – Capitaine, Bretagne 2006, can be countered by White with 11.d5!± and Black’s queen on h5 is misplaced, because it will be attacked with tempo after %e2-f4.) 10.e4± Black has failed to prevent e3-e4

The character of the fight remains more or less the same after 8...%g6 9.f3± A.Lein – Kyhle, Gmunden 2007.

9.%d2 %c8 Black is preparing e6-e5.

10.f3 e5

11.0–0!?

This move seems more reliable than 11.0–0–0 a6 12.h3 b5!? Black sacrifices a pawn and organises counterplay on the a and b-files. 13.cxb5 axb5 14 Seirawan – Short, Tilburg 1990, 14...%b7± (followed by %fb8) and despite the extra pawn, White will have problems neutralising Black’s pressure.

11...%a5 12.%ac1 %g6 13.%d5± Black can hardly find an active
plan for his further actions and must adhere to waiting tactics. Meanwhile, White can improve patiently his position.

**B3) 4...\texttt{b}4**

This is an active move after which there arises on the board an interesting hybrid between the Nimzo-Indian Defence and the Dutch Defence. Black controls reliably the e4-square, because now, contrary to the Nimzo-Indian Defence, his f-pawn participates in the fight for it.

5.\texttt{c}2

White should not allow the doubling of his pawns.

Now, as main lines for Black, we will analyse **B3a) 5...c5, B3b) 5...b6, B3c) 5...0–0.**

5...d6 6.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{d}7. Here, after e6-e5, Black's f5-pawn will be protected. 7.\texttt{ge}2 e5 8.f3 \texttt{xc}3+ 9.\texttt{xc}3 \texttt{c}6 10.0–0± (followed by b2-b4-b5, \texttt{c}1-b2) and thanks to the two-bishop advantage White's prospects are preferable, Matros – Lalic, Southend 2002.

**B3a) 5...c5 6.a3**

After this move, White will have two bishops. He lags a bit in development, but this should not worry him since the position is closed.

6...\texttt{xc}3+ 7.\texttt{xc}3 \texttt{b}6

7...d6 8.b4 \texttt{c}6 9.\texttt{f}3 0–0 10.\texttt{e}2 \texttt{e}4 11.\texttt{b}2 \texttt{b}6 12.0–0± White has the two-bishop advantage and can exchange the powerful enemy knight with \texttt{f}3-d2 the moment he pleases, Antoshin – Uusi, Vilnius 1960.

8.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{b}7 9.\texttt{f}3

White not only restricts the enemy bishop on b7, but also takes the e4-square under control. Now, Black's pieces have no access to it.

9...0–0

9...d6 10.\texttt{h}3 \texttt{e}7 11.0–0 \texttt{bd}7 12.b4 0–0 13.\texttt{b}3 \texttt{g}6 14.\texttt{bxc}5 \texttt{dxc}5 15.\texttt{b}2± – The dark squares are obviously weak in
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Black’s camp (this is the consequence of the moves f5 and g6), Cheparinov – Szabo, Albena 2011.

After 9...\( \text{Nh5} \), White can parry the threat of a check on h4 with 10.\( \text{Nh3} \) \( \text{Wh4+} \) 11.\( \text{Qf2} \) 0-0 (11...d6 12.0-0\( \pm \)) 12.0-0 \text{cxd4} 13.\text{exd4 \( \text{Nh6} \), Yakovich – Moskalenko, Terrassa 1999} and here, he had to play 14.\( \text{Be3} \\), protecting his d4-pawn.

10.\( \text{Qe2} \)

10...\( \text{Qc6} \)

Following 10...a5, Romanko – Stepovaia, Suzdal 2010, White must continue with 11.b3\( \pm \), preventing a5-a4.

10...\( \text{We7} \) 11.b4 d6 12.\text{bxc5 dxc5} 13.0-0 \text{bd7} 14.a4 \( \text{Qae8} \) 15.a5\( \pm \) White has seized completely the initiative on the queenside, Sorin – Ginzburg, Villa Gesell 1998

10...d6 11.0-0 \( \text{bd7} \) 12.b3 \( \text{Nh5} \) 13.\( \text{b2} \\)\( \pm \) Black can hardly neutralise his opponent’s pressure on the a1-h8 diagonal, Malakhatko – Williams, Marseille 2006.

11.\( \text{b4} \)

White begins a pawn-offensive on the queenside.

Now, Black must consider the following plan for his opponent: dxc5 followed by b4-b5, a3-a4-a5.

11...\( \text{cxd4} \)

Black is trying to create counterplay on the c-file, exploiting the juxtaposition of the rook and the queen.

Black has an interesting pawn-sacrifice here, but it is insufficient for equality 11...\( \text{cxb4} \) 12.\text{axb4} b5. White has the following powerful argument against it: 13.d5! \( \text{Qe7} \) 14.\text{dxe6 dxe6}, Chiburdanidze – Lalic, Pula 1997 and here simply 15.\text{cxb5}\( \pm \) and Black’s compensation is not good enough.

After 11...\( \text{We7} \), White realises successfully the above mentioned plan: 12.dxc5! \text{bxc5} 13.b5 \( \text{Qd8} \) 14.0-0 \( \text{Qf7} \) 15.\( \text{b2} \) d6 16.a4\( \pm \) Shu-

12.exd4 \(\text{xc}8\)

13.\(\text{qb}2\)?

This is the most precise move. White not only removes his queen from the X-ray with Black’s rook, but also preserves his control over the e5-square.

After the careless move 13. \(\text{qd}2\), Yakovich – Iljushin, Samara 2000, Black could have created counterplay by sacrificing two pawns – 13...e5!? 14 e4\(=\) and despite the material advantage White will have problems neutralising his opponent’s initiative.

13...d6 14.0–0\(\pm\) White has two bishops and a much freer game.

B3b) 5...b6

Black is planning to develop his bishop to the long diagonal.

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

6...\(\text{qb}7\)

About 6...0–0 7.\(\text{qe}2\) \(\text{b}7\) 8.f3 – see 6...\(\text{b}7\).

The line: 6...\(\text{xc}3+\) 7.\(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{b}7\) cannot equalise for Black, because after 8.f3 0–0 9.\(\text{ge}2\) c5 10.0–0 \(\text{we}7\) 11.b3 \(\text{d}6\) 12.\(\text{b}2\)\(\pm\) there arises a standard position for this variation, with the difference that White has not lost a tempo for the move a2–a3, Ryskin – Gleizerov, Wisla 1992.

7.f3
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7...\(\text{c6} \ 8.\text{ge2} \ 0-0\) (8...\(\text{e7}\) 9.0-0 \(\text{xc3}\) 10.\(\text{xc3}\) \(\text{Slipak – Claverie, Buenos Aires 2002}\) 9.0-0 \(\text{d6}\) (it is too passive for Black to opt for 9...\(\text{xc3}\) 10.\(\text{xc3}\)±) 10.a3 \(e5\) 11.\(\text{f5}\) \(\text{e7}\) 12.b3 \(\text{a5}\) 13.\(\text{bc3}\) \(\text{c8}\) 14.\(\text{d2}\)± and Black’s pieces are not harmoniously deployed, Lautier – Vaisser, Marseille 2001.

As a rule, the move 7...c5 leads to positions which we have already analysed. 8.a3 \(\text{a5}\). There arise original positions after this move (8...\(\text{xc3}\)+ 9.\(\text{xc3}\) – see variation B3a). 9.\(\text{ge2}\) \(\text{c6}\) 10.0-0 0-0 11.\(\text{b1}\) \(\text{e7}\) 12.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{ac8}\) 13.\(\text{fd1}\) \(g6\), Herzog – Ortiz, Lechenicher SchachServer 2011 and here, the best way for White to emphasize the vulnerability of the dark squares in his opponent’s camp is the move 14.\(\text{e1}\)!± followed by \(\text{h4}\).

It is not good for Black to trade voluntarily his bishop with 7...\(\text{xc3}\)+ 8.\(\text{xc3}\) \(\text{e7}\) (8...0-0 9.\(\text{e2}\) – see 6...\(\text{xc3}\)) 9.\(\text{e2}\)± and White managed to save a tempo for the move a2-a3, Jaracz – Neiksans, Pardubice 2003.

White should not be afraid of 7...\(\text{h5}\) 8.\(\text{ge2}\) \(\text{h4}\)+ 9.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{e7}\) (Following 9...\(\text{xc3}\), Khurtsidze – Matveeva, Ulcinj 1997, White can play 10.\(\text{xc3}\)!±, since it would not work for Black to follow with 10...\(\text{g3}\)! due to 11.\(\text{f2}\) \(f4\) 12.\(\text{g1}\)! \(\text{f5}\) 13.\(\text{xf5}\) \(\text{xf2}\)+ 14.\(\text{xf2}\) \(\text{xf5}\) 15.\(\text{g7}\)± White has succeeded in exchanging all the active pieces of his opponent and Black lags considerably in development in this endgame.) 10.0-0 \(\text{xc3}\), Sargissian – Iljushin, Antalya 2004. Now, White could have played here simply 11.\(\text{xc3}\)±, preserving the elasticity of his pawn-structure.

8.\(\text{ge2}\)

About 8...\(\text{c6}\) 9.0-0 – see 7...\(\text{c6}\).

Following 8...d6 9.0-0 \(\text{bd7}\), Weber – Kluglich, Wingst 2003, White could have exploited the insufficient protection of the enemy f5-pawn with the move 10.\(\text{d5}\)!±

It does not look logical for Black to play 8...\(\text{d6}\), because his bishop could have occupied that square in one move. 9.\(\text{d2}\) 10.\(\text{d5}\) \(\text{a6}\) 11.\(\text{a3}\) \(\text{c7}\) 12.\(\text{dxe6}\) \(\text{dxe6}\) 13.0-0-0 \(\text{e8}\) 14.\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{fxe4}\) 15.\(\text{xe4}\)
\( \text{xe4 16. } \text{xe4 } \text{dxe4 17. } \text{xe4+ and Black's e6-pawn is very weak, M. Socko – Hoang Thanh Trang, Dresden 2008.} \)

8...e7 9.0–0 xxc3 10.xxc3 d6 11.d2 c5 12.d5 a6 13.a3± (followed by e3-e4) White has more space, while Black's knight is misplaced at the edge of the board, Malakhatko – Frey, Deizisau 2009.

9.a3 cxd4

About 9...xxc3+ 10.xxc3 – see variation B3a.

10.axb4 dxc3 11.xxc3 a5 12.bxa5 xxa5 13.xxa5 bxa5 14.0–0±

The position has been opened and White's bishops have become very powerful, moreover that Black's a5-pawn is very weak, Malakhatko – Cavaletto, Zuerich 2010.

B3c) 5...0–0 6.d3

6...d6

About 6...b6 7.ge2 b7 8.f3 – see variation B3b.

It does not seem consistent for Black to choose 6...d5 7.ge2 c6 8.f3 a6 (or 8...d6) 9.d2 d6 and there has arisen a position which will be analysed in Chapter 9, but with an extra tempo for White, since Black has lost time on manoeuvres with his bishop.

It does not seem good for him to opt for 6...xc3 – Black presents voluntarily his opponent with the two-bishop advantage. 7.xxc3 d4 (7...d6 8.e2 e7 9.0–0 c5, Rodriguez – Rubini, Argentina 1989, 10.b4±, White begins active actions on the queenside) 8.c2 c6 9.a3 e5 10.d5 e7 11.xe4 fxe4, Shalimov – Sitnikov, Alushta 2008, 12.xe4± and Black does not have sufficient compensation for the pawn.

6...c5 7.a3 xxc3+ 8.xxc3 d6 9.e2 e5 10.dxe5 dxe5 11.0–0 a5 12.b3 c6 13.b2 e7 14.g3
\( \mathcal{g}4 \) 15.h3 \( \mathcal{h}6 \) 16.f4± Black has failed to parry the activity of White's bishops, Taimanov – Kopylov, Leningrad 1955.

7.\( \mathcal{d}ge2 \)

This position was tested in two games by M. Botvinnik. Both of them ended in a draw, but White had the advantage after the opening in both of them.

7...c5

Before developing his knight to the c6-square, Black advances his pawn.

He has also tried the immediate move 7...\( \mathcal{c}c6 \) 8.0–0 \( \mathcal{x}c3 \) 9.\( \mathcal{w}xc3 \) a5 (9...e5 10.b4±) 10.b3 e5 11.\( \mathcal{a}a3 \) (11.\( \mathcal{b}b2!?) \) 11...\( \mathcal{e}e8 \) 12.d5 \( \mathcal{d}e7 \) 13.f4!± and White clears the long diagonal for the actions of his dark-squared bishop, Yakovich – Gleizerov, Stockholm 2001.

7...\( \mathcal{w}d7 \) 8.\( \mathcal{d}d2 \) e5 9.f3± – Now, the move e5-e4 has been prevented for a long time and in order to free his queen from the protection of the f5-pawn, Black will have to play g7-g6, which will weaken the position of his king, Wiedenkeller – Karlsson, Stockholm 1993.

8.a3

In the game Taimanov – Botvinnik, Moscow 1952, there followed 8...\( \mathcal{a}a5 \) 9.d5 exd5 10.cxd5 \( \mathcal{g}4 \) 11.\( \mathcal{f}f4 \) \( \mathcal{e}e5 \) 12.\( \mathcal{d}e2 \) \( \mathcal{w}e7 \) 13.0–0± and Black had to be constantly on the alert about the possible penetration of the enemy knight to the e6-square.

9.\( \mathcal{x}c3 \) \( \mathcal{c}c6 \) 10.dxc5 dxc5 11.b3 \( \mathcal{d}d7 \) 12.\( \mathcal{b}b2 \) \( \mathcal{e}e5 \) 13.\( \mathcal{e}e2 \) \( \mathcal{c}c6 \), Bronstein – Botvinnik, Moscow 1951.
White has the two-bishop advantage and his dark-squared bishop is particularly powerful since it has no opponent. The only thing White must do is to neutralise the pressure of the enemy bishop on c6 against the g2-square. The simplest way to do that is 14.\textit{d1} \textit{e7} 15.0-0 \textit{g6} 16.f3±

Conclusion

In the variation 1.d4 e6 2.c4 \textit{b4} 3.d2 \textit{xd2} 4.\textit{xd2} f5, White maintains a slight but stable advantage by fianchettoing his bishop (g2-g3, \textit{f1}-g2) followed by \textit{c3}, \textit{f3}, 0–0, \textit{f1e1}, after which Black must either comply with the enemy pawn-advance e2-e4, which would lead to the opening of the e-file and pressure of White’s pieces against the e6-square, or Black will have to play d5, which would lead to the weakening of the dark squares in his camp.

In the variation 1.d4 e6 2.c4 f5, White deploys his pieces according to the following scheme: e2-e3, \textit{d3}, \textit{ge2}, \textit{c2} and f2-f3, taking under reliable control the key e4-square for the Dutch Defence. If Black develops his bishop on b7, then it will be restricted considerably by White’s pawn on f3. If Black plays \textit{b4}, then he will have to exchange sooner or later this bishop for the enemy knight on c3, which will present White with the two-bishop advantage.
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1.d4 g6 2.c4 f5
1.d4 c5 2.d5 f5

This chapter will be devoted to Black’s two not so successful attempts to enter Dutch set-ups. These are the variations A) 1.d4 g6 2.c4 f5 and B) 1.d4 c5 2.d5 f5.

A) 1.d4 g6 2.c4 f5

Black began the game as in the Modern Defence and then tries to transpose to the Leningrad Variation of the Dutch Defence, having avoided the variation 1.d5 f5 2.\texttt{c}c3, which has been analysed in Chapter 6.

This line has been tested in almost 2000 games and has been played by grandmasters like J. Elvest and V. Tseshkovsky; nevertheless, it has a very serious drawback.

3.h4!

This is the point! Now, Black will have great problems to defend his kingside, because he cannot parry the threat h4-h5 without considerable positional concessions.

3...h6

He has a choice between two possibilities: A1) 3...\texttt{g}7 and A2) 3...\texttt{f}6.

About 3...c5 4.h5 \texttt{g}7 5.d5 – see 3...\texttt{g}7.

After 3...h6, White can play immediately 4.e4!, for example 4...d6 (but not 4...fxe4?, because
after 5...\textit{g}4 d6 6.\textit{g}xg6+ \textit{d}d7 7.\textit{c}c3 \textit{e}8 8.\textit{x}e4+– White remains with an extra pawn and an overwhelming positional advantage) 5.\textit{d}d3 \textit{f}6 6.\textit{c}c3± The vulnerability of Black’s g6-pawn is an important factor in this position, Toth – Rigo, Eger 2002.

\textbf{A1) 3...\textit{g}7 4.h5}

Now, Black must be permanently on the alert about the move hxg6, opening the h-file, as well as about the possibility h5-h6.

\textbf{4...c5}

Black is trying to create active counterplay on the long diagonal.

About 4...\textit{c}c6 5.\textit{f}3 d6 6.\textit{c}c3 – see 4...d6.

White obtains a great advantage after 4...\textit{f}6 5.h6 \textit{f}8 6.\textit{c}c3± Black has lost two tempi on manoeuvres with his bishop and his position is very bad, V.Popov – Ditiatev, Novaya Ladoga 2002.

Following 4...d6 5.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 6.\textit{c}c3 e5 7.\textit{g}5 \textit{d}7 8.d5 \textit{d}8 9.e4 \textit{f}7, Lipinsky – Danner, Budapest 1997, White has, at his disposal a very promising pawn-sacrifice – 10.c5!, opening the diagonal for his light-squared bishop. 10...\textit{d}xc5 11.\textit{b}5 c6 12.\textit{d}xc6 \textit{bxc6} 13.\textit{c}4 \textit{xd}1+ 14.\textit{x}d1± Black has problems defending this endgame, since he lags in development and his doubled c-pawns are very weak, while White’s pieces are tremendously active.

\textbf{5.d5}

![Chess Diagram](image)

It is also possible for Black to play immediately 5...\textit{b}6, but even then his counterplay is not dangerous for White. 6.\textit{c}c3 g5 (Black weakens considerably his dark squares with the line: 6...\textit{xc}3+ 7.bxc3 \textit{f}6 8.\textit{f}3, Paehitz – Danner, Budapest 1991 and here, after capturing of the pawn 8...\textit{xc}3+ and 9.\textit{d}2 \textit{g}7 10.g3 \textit{f}6 11.\textit{c}3 d6 12.h6 \textit{f}8 13.\textit{g}5± leads to a very difficult position for Black. He can hardly neutralise the pressure of the enemy dark-squared bishop as well as the threat of the penetration to the e6-square.) 7.\textit{c}2 \textit{f}6, Conquest – Berg, Saint Vincent 2000. White can maintain the advantage in many different ways, but the simplest is the plan with castling queenside as quickly as possible: 8.\textit{d}2 \textit{a}6 9.a3 d6 10.0–0± followed by the preparation of the pawn-advance e2–e4.

\textbf{6.\textit{d}2 \textit{b}6 7.\textit{c}3!?}
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After this pawn-sacrifice, Black has great problems.

7...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}c3+}} 8.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}c3} }\texttt{\textit{\textbf{xb2}}}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image1.png}
\end{center}

9.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{h3}!}}
This is a very precise move after which Black’s problems become even more difficult.

9...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{b6}} 10.d6 }\texttt{\textit{\textbf{gxh5} 11.e4±}}
and Black’s position crumbles, Dymek – Kostanjsek, Email 2009.

A2) 3...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{f6}}}
Black wishes to prevent h4-h5.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image2.png}
\end{center}

4.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{h5}!}}
White plays this move despite of everything! He sacrifices a pawn and if necessary the exchange as well and breaks his opponent’s defence on the kingside.

4...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{hxh5}}}
This is at least a principled move. Black gobbles material.

4...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{g7}} 5.h6} – see 3...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{g7}}.}

If he plays something else, he will have to defend a position with material equality. 4...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{g8}} 5.hxg6 hxg6 6.\texttt{c3 b6} 7.\texttt{f3 \textit{\textbf{b7}} 8.e4±}}
Black will have difficulties to complete his development and to evacuate his king away from the centre, Bisguier – Monickaraj, New York 2004.

After 4...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{gxh5}}}, White will regain his pawn after a while and Black will have no compensation for his kingside pawn-weaknesses. 5.\texttt{c3 \textit{\textbf{g7}} 6.e5 0–0} (6...d6, Knaak – Wessel, Germany 1990, 7.\texttt{xf6 \textit{\textbf{xf6}} 8.e3 h4 9.\texttt{h5+ \textit{\textbf{f8}}}}
10.0–0–0 e6 11.\texttt{f3± followed by \textit{\textbf{h4}} and Black’s king is endangered) 7.e3 d6 8.\texttt{h3 \textit{\textbf{c6}} 9.e4±}}
(followed by \textit{\textbf{h5}), Dao Thien Hai – Petran, Hungary 1995.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image3.png}
\end{center}
5.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{xh5}}}!
This move is energetic and strong.
5...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{gxh5}}} 6.\texttt{\textit{e4}}

6...\texttt{\textit{d6}}
Black is preparing the evacuation of his king to the queenside.

It will be even more vulnerable on the kingside: 6...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{g7}}} 7.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{wxh5+ f8}}} 8.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{xf5+ d8}}} 9.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{f3 c6}}} 10.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{h5 d6}}} (10...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{xd4??}}} 11.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{xd4 d5+}}} 11.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{c3 d7}}} 12.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{e3 e8}}} 13.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{h4}}} 12...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{e8}}} 13.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{h4}}} 14.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{h4}}} – the position is opened and Black’s problems become even greater.

B) 1.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textit{d4}}} \texttt{\textit{c5}} 2.\texttt{\textit{d5 f5}}

After this move there arises on the board a strange hybrid between the Modern Benoni De-
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fence and the Dutch Defence. This line is seldom played in the contemporary tournament practice and is usually aimed at surprising the opponent and reaching rather original positions. This scheme has been tried by J. Elvest, Sh. Mamedyarov, K. Sakaev, A. Shabalov, V. Tukmakov and some other grandmasters. It has a serious positional defect however.

3.e4!

This is an energetic pawn-break in the centre. Here, contrary to the Staunton Gambit, White will regain easily his pawn since Black does not have the possibility d7-d5.

3...fxe4 4.Qc3 Qf6

After 4...g6 5.Qxe4 Qg7, Mishuchkov – Beznosikov, Odintsovo 2011, 6.Qf3± there arise positions analogous to the main line with the difference that White does not need to lose tempi in order to regain his e4-pawn (Qg1-e2-g3xe4).

5.Qge2!?

This is the simplest move. White wishes to play Qg3 and Qgxe4.

The move 5.g4 became popular after the game Seirawan – Mamedyarov, Ningbo 2011: 5...h6 6.h3 d6 7.Qge2 e5 8.Qg3 Qe7 9.Qg2 Qa6 10.Qxc4± and having established complete control over the e4-square, White scored a convincing victory. Still, the move 5.g4 seems to be too risky, because it weakens considerably White’s kingside pawn-structure.

5...g6

Black prepares the development of his bishop on g7.

Following 5...Qb6 6.Qg3 g6, before capturing on e4, it is better for White to castle. 7.Qe2!? (After the hasty move 7.Qgxe4 Qxe4 8.Qxe4 Qb4+ 9.Qc3 Qg7± Black obtained good counterplay in the game F.Portisch – Okhotnik, Zakararos 2003.). 7...Qg7 8.0–0 d6 9.Qgxe4± – The weakness of the e6-square and the backward e7-pawn are serious defects of Black’s position.
5...d6 6.\( \triangle g3 \) \( \triangle bd7 \) 7.\( \triangle gxe4 \) \( \triangle xe4 \) 8.\( \triangle xe4 \) \( \triangle b6 \), Farago – Danner, Budapest 1998, 9.c3!? This is the most precise move for White. He not only neutralizes his opponent's tactical threat (\( \triangle b4+ \)), but also covers the long diagonal in case Black fianchettoes his dark-squared bishop. 9...\( \triangle e5 \) 10.a4 a6 11.f4 0-0 12.\( \triangle d3 \) g6 13.h4± – He can hardly defend against the threat h4-h5.

After the move 5...e5, as it was played in the game Danner – Tu Hoang Thong, Elista 1998, White could have reacted resolutely with the move 6.d6!? There might follow: 6...\( \triangle b6 \) 7.\( \triangle g5 \) \( \triangle xd6 \) (7...\( \triangle xd6 \) 8.\( \triangle xf6 \) gxf6 9.\( \triangle d5+ \)) 8.\( \triangle xd6 \) \( \triangle xd6 \) 9.\( \triangle b5 \) \( \triangle e7 \) (9...\( \triangle e7 \) 10.\( \triangle g3+ \))- 10.\( \triangle c7+ \) \( \triangle d8 \) 11.\( \triangle xa8 \) b6 12.\( \triangle c3 \) \( \triangle b7 \) 13.\( \triangle xb6 \) axb6 14.\( \triangle c4± \) and after this accurate move (White prevents d7-d5), Black's compensation for the exchange is insufficient.

5...\( \triangle a5 \) 6.\( \triangle d2 \) \( \triangle b6 \). Black's counterplay against the b2-pawn is doomed to failure. 7.\( \triangle g3 \) g6 (7...\( \triangle xb2? \) 8.\( \triangle b1 \) \( \triangle a3 \) 9.\( \triangle b5+ \))- 8.a4 \( \triangle g7 \) 9.a5 \( \triangle c7 \) 10.\( \triangle b5 \) \( \triangle d8 \) 11.d6! \( \triangle a6 \) 12.\( \triangle c4 \) e6, Ornstein – Backelin, Bolrange 1995 and here after 13.0-0 0-0 14.\( \triangle e2± \) White regains his pawn. Black's position is cramped, his knight on a6 is misplaced and he must lose plenty of time to bring his bishop on c8 into the actions.

6.\( \triangle g3 \) d6
Black can hardly continue the game without this move.

The move 6...\( \triangle g7 \) as a rule leads to transposition 7.\( \triangle gxe4 \) \( \triangle xe4 \) 8.\( \triangle xe4 \) 0-0 (8...d6 9.h4 – see 6...d6) 9.h4 d6 10.h5 – see 6...d6.

7.\( \triangle gxe4 \) \( \triangle xe4 \) 8.\( \triangle xe4 \) 0-0 9.h4

Black is incapable of playing actively in the centre, so White can begin immediate active actions on the kingside.

9...0-0

9...\( \triangle f5 \) 10.\( \triangle g3 \) 0-0 11.\( \triangle xf5 \) \( \triangle xf5 \) 12.\( \triangle d3 \) \( \triangle e5+ \), Dinenis – Makepeace, Swansea 2006 and here, the cold-blooded move 13.\( \triangle f1!± \) emphasizes best the defects of Black's position. He must not only defend against h4-h5, but also be on the alert not to lose his rook.

10.h5 \( \triangle f5 \) 11.\( \triangle g3 \) \( \triangle d7 \)
12.c3!??

After 12.hxg6, Naumkin – Andreoli, Castel di Sangro 2010, 12...\textit{\&}xg6= White’s edge would not be so great, because he cannot obtain the two-bishop advantage.

12...\textit{\&}a6 13.\textit{\&}e3 \textit{\&}c7 14.\textit{\&}xf5 gxf5

Black’s compensation for the exchange is insufficient after 14...\textit{\&}xf5 15.\textit{\&}d3 \textit{\&}xd5 16.\textit{\&}c4 \textit{\&}f5 17.\textit{\&}xd5+ \textit{\&}xd5 18.\textit{\&}b3±

It also seems good for White to play here 15.h6!? \textit{\&}e5 16.\textit{\&}h5±

15...f4 16.\textit{\&}d2±

Black’s position would not be so bad if his knight had the possibility to come to the e5-square. Now, White has a great advantage, because he has two powerful bishops while Black’s king is vulnerable.

\textbf{Conclusion}

We have just analysed Black’s attempts to reach a position of the Dutch type out of the Modern Defence 1.d4 g6 2.c4 f5 or out of the Modern Benoni Defence – 1.d4 c5 2.d5 f5. These lines are not considered quite correct, since they lead to difficult positions for Black.

In the first variation White has the powerful idea h2-h4-h5, after which Black can hardly defend his kingside. This is due to the negative consequences of the moves f5 and g6, which have led to the weakening of the h5-e8 diagonal.

In the second line, White has a powerful temporary pawn-sacrifice 3.e2-e4. He will soon regain this pawn with \textit{\&}e2-g3xe4 and Black will be left with a backward pawn on e7. If he castles kingside, then the position of his king will be weakened by the absence of the pawn on f7. This will enable White to begin active actions on the kingside with the pawn-march h2-h4.
In the final chapter of our book, devoted to the Dutch schemes, we will analyse variations in which Black advances f7-f5 in Queen’s set-ups.

At first we will deal with the rather dubious move A) 3...f5, which enables White to develop his bishop to the f4-square and later we will analyse the elastic move B) 3...c6, after which Black waits at first for his opponent to play 4.e3 and only then advances f7-f5.

A) 3...f5?!

This move was played at the end of the 19th century, but it never became popular in the grandmaster practice. Among the contemporary grandmasters only A. Minasian plays like this once in a while. Presently, if somebody wishes to build a Stonewall, he begins as a rule with the moves f5, e6, d6, postponing the move d7-d5.

The point is that now White has the possibility to play:

4. f4!

White develops his bishop to an active position and creates serious problems for Black. Now, no matter where he will develop his dark-squared bishop, he will have difficulties in the opening. If Black develops the bishop to d6, then sooner or later there will be an advantageous trade for White of the bishops and he will remain
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with a “good” bishop against a “bad” bishop for Black, since the majority of his pawns are placed on light squares. If Black develops his bishop to e7, then he can hardly fight for the e5-square.

4...\(\text{\textit{\textdollar f6}}\)

Black is not likely to continue the game without this move.

About 4...c6 5.e3 \(\text{\textit{\textdollar f6}}\) (5...d6 6.f3 – see 4...d6) 6.f3 – see 4...f6.

Black has tried in practice to continue without \(\text{\textit{\textdollar f6}}, \) for example 4...d6 5.e3 c6 (5...f6 6.f3 – see 4...f6) 6.f3 e7 (6...f6 7.d3 or 6 xf4 7 xf4 f6 8.d3 0–0 9.0–0 – see variation A1) 7.d3 g6 (7...0–0 8.0–0 g6 9.xd6 xd6 10.wc2 – see 7...g6) 8.xd6 xd6 9.0–0 0–0 10.wc2 a6 11.xc1 Babula – Blatny, Prague 2007. There arises an advantageous position for White, because he has a clear-cut plan for queenside actions: ab1, b2-b4, a2-a4, and b4-b5. Black has no counterplay, because his knight on g6 is misplaced and his attempt to begin active operations with the move f5-f4 will be countered by White with e3-e4.

5.e3

(diagram)

Now, Black must choose where to develop his bishop on f8. He may place it on e7 – A2) 5...e7 or to d6, usually after the preliminary move A1) 5...c6.

As a rule, there arises transposition after 5...d6 6.f3 0–0 (6...c6 7.d3 – see 5...c6. In the game Sakaev – Radulski, Vrnjacka Banja 1996, Black chose 6 xf4 7 xf4 0–0 8.e2 b6 9.0–0 b7 10. xc1±, but in the forthcoming middle game White’s chances seemed preferable, because Black’s e6-pawn was very weak.) 7.d3 c6. There arise very original positions after this move (7...c6 8.0–0 – see variation A1). 8.0–0 d7, Vyzmanavin – Padlevsky, Gelsenkirchen 1991, 9.cxd5! exd5 10. wb3 a5 11.wc2 xf4 12.xf4 g6 13.xe1± – followed by f3-e5. White’s knight on e5 will dominate the board, while after e4, White will always manage to oust the enemy knight away from the centre with the move f2-f3.

A1) 5...c6 6.f3

(diagram)

6...d6

About 6...e7 7.d3 – see variation A2.
After 6...\( \text{c}4 \), White has at his disposal the energetic resource 7. \( \text{c}5 \)? and in order to parry the threat \( \text{wh}5 \), Black must place another pawn on a light square. 7...g6 8.\( \text{e}4 \) dxe4 9.c5! White creates the rather unpleasant threats \( \text{d}5-c4 \) and \( \text{d}6 \) or \( \text{d}6 \). 9...\( \text{wa}5+ \) 10.\( \text{wd}2 \) \( \text{xd}2+ \) 11.\( \text{xd}2 \) White controls the d6 and e5-squares, Kukov – Scholvin, Latschach 2011.

It is useless for Black to play 6...\( \text{b}4 \), because he can reap no dividends out of the pin of the enemy knight. 7.\( \text{d}3 \) 0–0 (It would be rather dubious for Black to give up the centre 7...dxc4 8.\( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 9.\( \text{wb}3 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 10.0–0 \( \text{d}7 \) 11. \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 12.\( \text{xe}5 \)± Slugin – Perekhodkin, Dago mys 2010. Black has no compensation for the weak e5-square on which White’s bishop is perfectly placed. Naturally, Black’s attempt to win a pawn with 12...\( \text{xc}3 \) 13.bxc3 \( \text{xc}3 \)?? after 14.\( \text{xd}5 \)– would lead to the loss of a piece.) 8.0–0 \( \text{e}4 \) 9.\( \text{wb}3 \) a5 10.\( \text{ac}1 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 11.c5 \( \text{xc}3 \) 12.\( \text{xc}3 \)± followed by \( \text{f}3-e5 \), f2-f3 and c3-c4, Shulman – Muhammad, Philadelphia 2004.

6...\( \text{bd}7 \) 7.\( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 8.\( \text{wc}2 \) \( \text{df}6 \). It may be possible that Black’s best decision here is 8...\( \text{e}7 \), transposing to variation A2. (Black played too riskily in the game Shishkin – Sopur, Police 2007: 8...\( \text{b}4 \) 9.0–0 g5? 10.\( \text{xe}4 \) gxf4 11.\( \text{d}3 \) fxe3 12.\( \text{ae}1 \) 0–0 13. \( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 14.\( \text{e}5 \) White managed to neutralise his opponent’s initiative with rather simple moves. Now, Black has no compensation for the compromised shelter of his king and his backward e-pawn.) 9.0–0 \( \text{e}7 \) 10.h3 0–0 11.\( \text{e}5 \). This is one of the main ideas for White in this variation and we will see it again numerous times. He not only occupies the central square with his knight but prepares f2-f3 too. 11...g5. This attack on the flank is absolutely harmless for White. 12. \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{e}8 \), Sideif Sade – S. Guliev, Baku 1997, 13.cxd5 exd5 14.f3 \( \text{xc}3 \) 15.bxc3 \( \text{d}6 \) 16.\( \text{ab}1 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 17.\( \text{h}1 \)– Later, White will prepare c3-c4 or e3-e4. After the opening of the game, he will try to organise an attack against the enemy king, because its shelter is somewhat weakened by the pawn-advance g7-g5.

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

White is developing his bishop and is preparing to castle kingside.
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7...0–0

About 7...dxe4 8.0–0 0–0 9. dxe6, or 7...xf4 8.exf4 0–0 9. 0–0, or 7...c7 8.dxe6 cxd6 9. 0–0 0–0 10.c2 – see 7...0–0.

8.0–0

8...dxe4

This is Black’s main line. He occupies a central square with his knight.

8...c7 9.xd6 cxd6 – see 8...c7.

Black plays only seldom 8...xf4 9.exf4, after which White has an easy game against his opponent’s backward e6-pawn.

9...dxc4 10.xc4 d5 11.g3 d7 12.e1+ Black has a weakness on e6 as well as a “bad” bishop, Svetushkin – Krapivin, Moscow 2007.

It is not preferable for him to opt for 9...dxe4 10.e1 d7 11.c1 h8 12.g3 d6 13.e5 b6 14. xe4 xe4 15.c2 c8 16.f3± and once again White’s knight on e5 is obviously more powerful than the bishop on c8, Shishkin – Ruszczynski, Koszalin 2008.

The evaluation of the position remains the same after 9...d7 10.e1 e4 11.e5 e8 12.f3 xc3 13.bxc3± Korobov – Karjakin, Kramatorsk 2001.

After 8...c7

White’s simplest reaction would be 9.xd6 cxd6 10.c2 e4 11. ab1 a5 12.a3 d7, Potkin – Akbaev, Khanty-Maniysk 2013 and here 13.c5!? c7 14.a4 e8 15. b6 a7 16.xe4 xe4 17.e5± and on top of all Black’s troubles, his rook on a7 is a sorry sight.

It is also good for White to opt here for 9.g3!? Schlechter – John, Barmen 1905 and despite the fact
that more than 100 years have passed since that game was played, the ideas of Carl Schlechter seem to be quite applicable nowadays as well. 9...\(\text{e}4\) 10.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{h}8\) 11.\(\text{ac}1\) \(\text{xf}4\) 12.\(\text{exf}4\) \(\text{f}7\) 13.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{e}7\) 14.\(\text{exe}4\) \(\text{fxe}4\) 15.\(f3\) \(\text{ex}f3\) 16.\(\text{ce}1\) \(\text{c}7\) 17.\(\text{a}3\) \(\text{g}8\) 18.\(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{a}6\) 19.\(b3\)± Later, Black failed to cope with the problems of his position. 19...\(\text{d}8\) 20.\(\text{c}5\) \(\text{c}7\) 21.\(\text{b}2\) \(\text{d}7\) 22.\(\text{c}2\) \(\text{e}7\) 23.\(\text{ef}1\) \(\text{ae}8\) 24.\(g4\) \(\text{c}8\) 25.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 26.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{f}6\) 27.\(\text{h}f3\) \(\text{e}7\) 28.\(a4\) \(\text{a}6\) 29.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{g}7\) 30.\(\text{ce}3\) \(\text{e}7\) 31.g5. It is worth noticing how skilfully Schlechter fixed all his opponent’s pawns on light squares. After that, Black’s bishop resembled a big pawn.

31...\(\text{d}7\) 32.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{e}8\) 33.\(\text{h}6+\) \(\text{h}8\) 34.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{d}8\) 35.\(\text{eg}4\) \(\text{d}7\) 36.\(\text{we}5\) \(\text{e}8\) 37.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{c}7\) 38.\(\text{f}6\) \(\text{exe}5\) 39.\(\text{fxe}5\) \(\text{e}7\) 40.\(\text{hf}3\) \(\text{xf}6\) 41.\(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{xf}6\) 42.\(\text{exf}6\) \(\text{e}8\) 43.\(\text{f}7+\) \(\text{g}8\) 44.\(\text{e}5\)± White’s advantage has become decisive. 44...\(\text{xd}8\) 45.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{f}8\) 46.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{e}8\) 47.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{f}7\) 48.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{e}8\) 49.\(\text{b}1\) \(\text{f}8\) 50.\(\text{b}5\) 1-0

9.\(\text{xd}6\) \(\text{xd}6\)

The character of the fight remains the same after 9...\(\text{xd}6\), Kekki – Moskalenko, Helsinki 1992, 10.\(\text{b}3!\)±

10.\(\text{b}3\)

White connects his rooks and creates in the process tactical threats on the a2-g8 diagonal.

10...\(\text{h}8\)

In the game Ryzhov – Anzhirev, Smolensk 2001, the careless move 10...\(\text{d}7?\) cost a pawn for Black following 11.cxd5 exd5 (11...\(\text{xf}4\) 12.\(\text{b}5\) \(\text{e}7\) 13.\(\text{ac}1\)±) 12.\(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{fxe}4\) 13.\(\text{xe}4\)±

11.\(\text{e}2\)

White is preparing the transfer of his knight to the f4-square.

11...\(\text{d}7\) 12.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{df}6\) 13.\(\text{c}5\) \(\text{e}7\) 14.\(\text{e}5\)

He is completely dominant on the dark squares.

14...\(\text{g}8\) 15.\(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{fxe}4\) 16.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}7\) 17.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{d}7\) 18.\(\text{af}1\) \(\text{xf}3\)

19.\(\text{gxf}3\)! White is preparing active actions on the semi-open g-file and Black’s knight has been
deprived of the e4-square after White’s last move. 19...\texttt{Eae8} 20.\texttt{Eg2}\# Black has no counterplay at all and later he failed to solve the problem with his “bad” bishop on d7, Carolei – Llagaria Vidal, Email 2010.

A2) 5...\texttt{Ee7}
This move leads to a sharper game, because with it Black avoids the trade of the bishops.
6.\texttt{Ef3} c6
About 6...0–0 7.\texttt{Ed3} c6 – see 6...c6.

7.\texttt{Ed3}

Now, Black has a choice. He may castle A2b) 7...0–0, or may leave his king in the centre by playing A2a) 7...\texttt{Ee4}.

It is worse for Black to choose 8...cxd5 9.\texttt{Cb5} 0–0 10.\texttt{Dg5}\# White’s cavalry will create great problems for Black, Zagorsks – S.Guliev, Frunze 1989.) 9.\texttt{Xxd5} cxd5 10.0–0 \texttt{Db6} 11.\texttt{Cc2} 0–0 12.\texttt{Yfc1}\# White has complete control over the only open file, Podolchenko – A.Potapov, Minsk 2007.

A2a) 7...\texttt{Ee4} 8.\texttt{Wc2}
White is not in a hurry to castle kingside.
8...\texttt{Ed7}
8...0–0 9.g4 – see 7...0–0.

9.g4!? This is White’s main idea in this variation. He exploits the exposed position of Black’s f5-pawn in order to open the g-file.

9...\texttt{Exc3}

It is bad for Black to play 9...fxg4, because after 10.\texttt{Xxe4} gxf3 11.\texttt{Xh7}\# his king will be seriously endangered, Meyer – Borngaesser, Germany 1990.
It is not preferable for him to opt for the solid line: 9...g6 10. cxd5 exd5 11.gxf5 gxf5 12.g1 df6 13.e5± Black’s king is stranded in the centre, while White has almost completed the development of his pieces, has occupied the g-file and his knight is very powerful in the centre of the board, Lazarev – Malyshev, Budapest 1990.

Black’s counterplay, connected with the pin of the knight, is not dangerous for White, because Black’s queenside pieces are not developed yet. 9...a5 10.gxf5 exf5 11.cxd5 cxd5 (11...xc3 12. bxc3 xd5 13.e2! df6 14.e5± – and due to the lag in development, Black is incapable of exploiting the placement of White’s king in the centre of the board, Cuenca Jimenez – Santos, La Roda 2010) 12.0-0 a6 13. fc1 df6 14.e2 d7 15.c7 a4 16. e5 xc2 17.xc2± White has occupied the c-file, while Black has a pawn on d5 and his knight on e4 will be soon ousted from the centre after the move f2-f3, Khenkin – Stoliar, Stockholm 1998.

10.bxc3
Now, Black can hardly neutralise the enemy pressure against his f5-pawn.

10...dxc4
He gives up the centre, but deflects the enemy bishop from the attack against the f5-pawn.

Black loses immediately after 10...fxg4 11.xh7 xh7 (11...gxf3 12.g6+ f8 13.g1 f6 14. d6+– and in order not to be checkmated, Black will have to part with his queen.) 12.g6+ f8 13.xh7 gxf3 14.g1 f6 15. h8+ f7 16.xg7+– and Black suffers huge material losses, Ovetchkin – Bochkarev, Samara 2012.

11.xc4 fxg4 12.d2 d6

13.h3. White opens files for an attack. 13...gxh3, Shulman – Sevillano, Las Vegas 2008, 14. e5! Before capturing the h3-pawn, White must deprive his opponent of the tactical possibility e6-e5. 14...d7 15.xh3 c5 16. xc5 a5 17.e4± White’s pieces are much more active in the arising complicated position. In addition, Black has great problems to find a safe haven for his king.
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A2b) 7...0–0 8.\textit{c2}

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

8...\textit{e4}

8...\textit{h8} 9.\textit{h3} \textit{e4} 10.0–0 \textit{d7} (following 10...\textit{f6}, Javakhishvili – Mamedjarova, Khanty-Mansiysk 2010, White can begin immediately active actions on the queenside: 11.\textit{b4±}) 11.\textit{e5±} followed by \textit{f2–f3}, removing Black’s knight away from the centre, Averkin – Rakhimov, Krasnodar 1997.

Black fails to get rid of his “bad” bishop after 8...\textit{b6} 9.0–0 \textit{a6}, Moradiabadi – Moreto, Spain 2006, because White can counter this with 10.\textit{cxd5! \textit{xd3} 11.\textit{xd3} \textit{cxd5} 12.\textit{b5 \textit{e8} 13. \textit{ac1±} following this with doubling of his major pieces on the c-file.

8...\textit{a6}. This development of the knight to the edge of the board leads to difficult positions for Black. 9.a3 \textit{dxc4}. He is trying to organise active counterplay, but this only leads to the appearance of new pawn-weaknesses in his camp (Meanwhile, it is not preferable for Black to opt for 9...\textit{c7} 10.0–0 \textit{d7} 11.\textit{ac1±}, because his knight is misplaced on the c7-square, Gorelov – Bronstein, Moscow 1981.). 10.\textit{xc4} b5 11.\textit{e2} b4 12.\textit{axb4 \textit{xb4} 13.\textit{b3 \textit{fd5} (13...\textit{bd5} 14.\textit{e5±) 14.\textit{e5} a5 15. 0–0 \textit{a6} 16.\textit{xa6 \textit{xa6} 17.\textit{a4±}} Black’s pawns on a5, c6 and e6 are an excellent target for White’s pieces, Lytchak – Malakhov, Tallinn 1997

Black cannot equalise with the standard transfer for the Dutch set-ups of his bishop to the e8-square. 8...\textit{d7} 9.\textit{e5 \textit{e8} (9... \textit{a6} 10.a3 \textit{c7}, Sherbakov – Grabarczyk, Koszalin 1997, 11.\textit{h3!?± – depriving Black of the possibility to exchange the powerful bishop with the move \textit{h5}. It would be sufficient to evaluate the position in favour of White if you compare the placement of the knights on e5 and c7.) 10.g4 \textit{fxg4 (10...\textit{dxe4} 11.\textit{xc4±; 10...\textit{e4} 11. \textit{gxf5 \textit{exf5} 12.\textit{cx} 13.\textit{bxc3+– Raetsky – Shumiakina, Pardubice 1992) 11.h3! White opens files and his attack becomes tremendously powerful, Iljin – Gevorgyan, Alushta 2010.

9.g4!? We are already familiar with this resource for White.

(diaagram)

9...\textit{a5} Black has a great choice of
possibilities here, but neither of them promises him an easy game.

After 9...fxg4 10.\texttt{xe4 dx}e4 11.\texttt{d}e5 \texttt{d}7 12.0-0-0 \texttt{dxe}5 13.\texttt{x}e5 \texttt{d}7 14.\texttt{xd}g1 \texttt{f}6 15.\texttt{x}g4 \texttt{x}e5 16.dxe5± Black loses his e4-pawn, Sequera Paolini – Psakhis, Elista 1998.

9...\texttt{d}6 10.cxd5 cxd5, Korotkjevich – T. Fischer, Germany 2011, 11.0–0–0!\texttt{c}e6 12.a3± (followed by gxf5) and White's play on the g-file is much more dangerous than Black's queenside counterplay.

After 9...\texttt{d}6, White's simplest response would be 10.\texttt{g}3!? Now, the exchange on g3 would lead to the opening of the h-file, which would be in favour of White. 10...\texttt{b}4 (but not 10...fxg4 11.\texttt{x}e4 dx}e4 12.\texttt{xd}x6 \texttt{xd}x6 13.\texttt{d}x}e5± White regains his pawn and Black will have great problems with the protection of his g4-pawn and the development of the bishop on c8, Gustafsson – Sanduleac, Mallorca 2004) 11.gxf5 exf5 12.\texttt{b}3 \texttt{a}5 13.

0–0 \texttt{x}c}3 14.bxc3 dxc4 15.\texttt{xc}4+ \texttt{h}8 16.a4± White has two powerful bishops and after the exchange on g3, he may develop a powerful attack on the h-file (\texttt{g}2, \texttt{h}1), Daus – Contreras Poblete, Lechenicher SchachServer 2009.

Black loses a pawn after 9...\texttt{d}7 10.gxf5 exf5 (following 10...\texttt{d}f6 11.fxe6 \texttt{x}e6, Lingnau – Belelowitsch, Berkel 2003, 12.h4!?± Black's compensation for his material deficit is insufficient) 11.cxd5 \texttt{x}c}3 12.bxc3 cxd5 13.\texttt{x}f5± Wirig – Piankov, La Fere 2009.

It is not good for Black to opt for 9...\texttt{b}4 10.gxf5 exf5, Narciso Dublan – Simon Padros, Barcelona 2005. Now, White can enter almost by force a better endgame with the line: 11.\texttt{b}3!? \texttt{a}5 12.0–0! \texttt{x}c}3 13.bxc3 \texttt{x}c}3 14.\texttt{x}e4 \texttt{xb}3 15.\texttt{xd}x5+ cxd5 16.axb3 dxc4 17.bxc4± (followed by d4-d5, \texttt{f}3-d4, \texttt{b}1) Black will have great problems neutralising the pressure of White's pieces.

After 9...\texttt{x}c}3 10.bxc3 \texttt{d}6 (10...dxc4 11.\texttt{x}c}4 b5 12.\texttt{b}3 \texttt{h}8, Levin – Sotsky, St Petersburg 2013, 13.gxf5 exf5 14.\texttt{d}e}5±) 11.\texttt{g}3 g6 12.\texttt{e}5 \texttt{xe}5 13.\texttt{xe}5± – the dark squares in Black's camp are catastrophically weak, Sharma – Kalyan Kumar, Mumbai 2003.

After the prophylactic move 9...\texttt{h}8, White should not be in a
hurry to open the g-file, but can play instead 10.\texttt{g}g1.

Following 10...b6 11.gxf5 exf5 12.cxd5 cxd5 13.\texttt{e}e5+ Black can hardly neutralise the pressure of White's pieces on the g-file, Lauber - Izrailev, Germany 2007.

It is not preferable for Black to opt for 10...\texttt{f}6 11.g5 \texttt{e}7 12.g6+ Tan – Hoang Thi Bao, Philippines 2010.

10...\texttt{a}a5 11.\texttt{e}e2. This is the best square for White's king. 11...\texttt{d}d7 12.gxf5 exf5 13.cxd5 cxd5 (if 13...\texttt{xc}3+, then 14.\texttt{xc}3 \texttt{b}4 15.\texttt{b}b3 cxd5 16.\texttt{ac}1 followed by \texttt{c}c7, Surjadnji – Ustianovich, Kharkov 2000) 14.\texttt{b}5 \texttt{df}6 15.\texttt{c}c7 \texttt{b}b8 16.\texttt{a}a6 \texttt{a}a8 17.\texttt{c}c7 \texttt{xc}7 18.\texttt{xc}7 \texttt{b}b8 19.\texttt{xd}5+– Matlakov – Melnikov, St Petersburg 2012.

9...\texttt{a}a6. This flank development of the knight is encountered often in practice. 10.a3

(diagram)

White prevents the move \texttt{b}4. Black has a very difficult position after 10...\texttt{d}d6 11.c5 \texttt{e}4 12.gxf5 exf5 13.\texttt{xa}6 \texttt{xa}6 14.0–0–0 \texttt{a}5 15.\texttt{dg}1+ White has a superior pawn-structure and a powerful attack on the g-file, Malakhatko – Firman, Warsaw 2006.

It is not preferable for Black to continue with 10...\texttt{c}7, because after 11.gxf5 dxc4 (11...\texttt{ex}f5 12.\texttt{xc}7 \texttt{xc}7 13.cxd5+ Cuenca Jimenez – Ruiz Sanchez, Jaen 2011) 12.\texttt{xe}4 \texttt{ex}f5 13.\texttt{xc}6 bxc6 14.\texttt{e}5+ Black's two-bishops and the weakening of White's kingside are not sufficient to compensate Black's sacrificed pawn.

White is noticeably better after 10...\texttt{xc}3 11.bxc3 \texttt{d}6 (11...\texttt{dc}4 12.\texttt{dc}4 \texttt{b}5 13.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{d}5 14.e4+ Lagowski – Bleis, Warsaw 2005) 12.\texttt{xd}6 \texttt{xd}6 13.\texttt{g}1+ Black can hardly parry his opponent's attack, since his minor pieces are misplaced, Raetsky – A.Potapov, Miass 2007.

It is possible that Black's best reply here may be 10...\texttt{a}a5 11.\texttt{e}2 with a transfer to the main line.

(diagram)

10...\texttt{a}a6

About 10...\texttt{h}8 11.\texttt{hg}1 – see 9...\texttt{h}8.
The endgame is worse for Black after 10...\texttt{d}d7 11.gxf5 \texttt{xc}3+ 12.\texttt{xc}3 \texttt{xc}3 13.bxc3 exf5 14.\texttt{c}xd5 \texttt{c}xd5 15.c4\texttt{±} Yermolinsky – Privman, Ledyard 2009.

White should not be afraid of the tactical sortie 10...\texttt{a}3, as it was played in the game Shariyazhadanov – Radjabov, Biel 2000. 11. gxf5! \texttt{xb}2 12.\texttt{xe}4 dxe4 13. \texttt{xe}4 \texttt{xa}1 14.f6! \texttt{h}5 (Black is checkmated by force after 14... \texttt{c}3 15.\texttt{h}7+ \texttt{h}8 16.\texttt{g}7+ \texttt{g}7 17.\texttt{g}6+ \texttt{h}8 18.\texttt{e}5+-) 15.\texttt{g}7 \texttt{f}7 16.\texttt{g}1\texttt{±} and despite the fact that Black has an extra rook, his position is almost hopeless since all White’s pieces participate in the attack, while Black’s bishop will perish on the c1-square.

11.a3 \texttt{xc}3+

Following 11...\texttt{d}7 12.\texttt{hg}1 \texttt{e}8 13.gxf5 exf5 14.\texttt{c}xd5 \texttt{c}xd5, Sher – Speck, Switzerland 1992, White can maintain a great advantage with the simple move 15. \texttt{b}3!\texttt{±}

12.bxc3 \texttt{c}7

12...dxc4 13.\texttt{xc}4 b5 (12... \texttt{xc}3+ 13.bxc3 – see 11...\texttt{c}3) 13. \texttt{b}4 \texttt{b}6 14.\texttt{b}3 \texttt{xc}3+ 15.\texttt{xc}3 \texttt{f}xg4 16.\texttt{e}5 \texttt{c}7, Poluljahov – Chigvintsev, Smolensk 2000, 17. \texttt{h}3!\texttt{±} – Files will be opened on the kingside and White’s attack is likely to be victorious.

13.c5!

The position is closed and Black fails to create counterplay in the centre and on the queenside. White’s hands are free to organise an attack on the g-file.

13...\texttt{e}8 14.\texttt{e}5 \texttt{f}6, Granados Gomez – Pablo Marin, Cala Galdana 2001. Here after 15. \texttt{hg}1 Black has no counterplay whatsoever, while White’s attack
on the g-file is running effortlessly.

**B) 3...c6!?**

This order of moves is very popular lately. This is a very flexible system of development for Black. He chooses it in two cases – either as a transfer to the Meran Variation of the Slav Defence (he plays in that case 4...\(\text{Qf6}\)), avoiding the exchange variation in the process (1.d4 d5 2.c4 c6 3.cxd5) as well as the variation 1.d4 d5 2.c4 c6 3.\(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qf6}\) 4.e3, or tries to obtain a hybrid of Slav and Dutch set-ups after f7-f5. It is understandable that we will be only interested in the possible transfer to the Dutch set-ups, since the Meran Variation has been analysed already in volume 1.

**4.e3 f5**

This move was played by Z. Tarrasch back in the year 1895. Among the contemporary grandmasters it is preferred by E. Bareev, A. Grischuk, V. Ivanchuk, M. Krasenkow, V. Malakhov, P. Tregubov...

Now, contrary to variation A, White's dark-squared bishop will be placed more passively and he will need to play very precisely in order to obtain even a slight edge.

About 4...\(\text{Qf6}\) – see volume 1.

Sometimes Black may begin with 4...\(\text{Qd7}\) and White should counter that with the accurate move 5.\(\text{Qd3}\) (It is not so good for him to play 5.\(\text{Qf3}\) f5 and now, White cannot follow the set-up \(\text{Qd3+Qge2}\), since his knight has gone to the f3-square too early. Later, in the game Aronian – Morozevich, Moscow 2012, there followed 6.\(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qh6}\) 7.b3 \(\text{Qd6}\) 8.\(\text{b2}\) 0–0 9.0–0 \(\text{Qf6}\) 10.\(\text{Qc2}\) \(\text{Qf7}\) 5...\(\text{f5}\) (5...\(\text{Qgf6}\) 6.\(\text{Qf3}\) – see volume 1. 5...dxc4 6.\(\text{Qxc4}\) b5 7.\(\text{Qd3}\) a6 8.\(\text{Qf3}\) c5, Peralta – Giri, Istanbul 2012. Now, after 9.a4 b4 10.\(\text{Qe4}\) \(\text{b7}\) 11.0–0 \(\text{Qgf6}\), there arises transposition to the Meran Variation, analysed by us in volume 1.) 6.\(\text{Qc2}\) \(\text{Qgf6}\) 7.\(\text{Qge2}\) \(\text{±}\) Oms Pallisse – Hurtado Rueda, Seville 2000. This is a position from the main line, but in a bad version for Black, because he has played too early \(\text{Qd7}\) and must watch permanently about White's possible threat – cxd5 cxd5, \(\text{Qb5}\).

Black begins sometimes with the move 4...\(\text{Qd6}\), against which it would be best again for White to play 5.\(\text{Qd3!}\) f5 – see 4...f5 (after
5...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{d}}\textsf{d}}\textsf{7}} 6.e4± there arises a very favourable version for him of the Slav Defence).

![Chess Diagram](image)

5.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{d}}\textsf{d}}\textsf{3}}

This is the beginning of a plan, connected with the fight for the e4-square. White wishes to play \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{g}}\textsf{e}}\textsf{2}}, f2-f3, \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{c}}\textsf{2}}}, and eventually e3-e4.

This set-up is very unpleasant for Black, because he is deprived of the typical plan for the Dutch Defence including the move \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{f}}\textsf{6}}-e4 followed by a preparation of a kingside attack.

5.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{f}}\textsf{6}}

This is a natural developing move, but Black places sometimes this knight at the edge of the board too.

5...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{d}}\textsf{6}}} 6.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{g}}\textsf{e}}\textsf{2}} \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{h}}\textsf{6}}} (6...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{f}}\textsf{6}}}, 7.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{f}}\textsf{3}} – see 5...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{f}}\textsf{6}}}, 7.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{f}}\textsf{3}} 0-0 8.0-0 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{d}}\textsf{7}}}, 9.h3!! – With this accurate move White emphasizes the misplacement of his opponent's knight on h6. Now Black can hardly prevent e3-e4 (in the game Mamedyarov – Riveiro, San Sebastian 2011, White played hastily 9.e4?! and after 9...fxe4 10.fxe4, Black made a draw by a perpetual check with a simple combination: 10...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{x}}\textsf{h}}\textsf{2+}}, 11.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{x}}\textsf{h}}\textsf{2}}, \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{h}}\textsf{4+}}}, 12.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{g}}\textsf{1}}}, \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{g}}\textsf{4}}}, 13.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{x}}\textsf{f}}\textsf{8+}}, \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{x}}\textsf{f}}\textsf{8}}, 14.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{f}}\textsf{4}}}, \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{f}}\textsf{2+}}}, 15.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{h}}\textsf{1}}}, \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{h}}\textsf{4+}}}).

6.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{g}}\textsf{e}}\textsf{2}} \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{d}}\textsf{6}}}

This is the best square for Black's bishop from which it controls the e5-square and can support the attack of his pieces on the kingside.

It is not so active for him to choose 6...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{e}}\textsf{7}}}, 7.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{f}}\textsf{3}} 0-0 8.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{c}}\textsf{2}}}, b6 (8...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{h}}\textsf{8}}}, 9.0-0±), 9.0-0, c5 10. cxd5 \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{x}}\textsf{d}}\textsf{5}}, 11.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{d}}\textsf{5}}}, \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{d}}\textsf{5}}}, 12.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{d}}\textsf{c5}}, \textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{x}}\textsf{c}}\textsf{5}}, 13.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{f}}\textsf{4}}}, ± White maintains a stable advantage thanks to Black's weak isolated d5-pawn, Mohr – Lutz, Berlin West 1989.

7.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{f}}\textsf{3}} 0-0 8.\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{c}}\textsf{2}}}

In this position Black has a great choice of possibilities.

8...\textcolor{red}{\text{\textsf{\textit{a}}\textsf{6}}}

Before exchanging on c4, Black wishes to provoke a2-a3, in
order later to exploit this move as a target for his future queenside counterplay.

Following 8...\textit{\texttt{c7}} 9.cxd5 \textit{\texttt{\text{\texttt{d5}}}}, Korchnoi – Nikolic, Sarajevo 1998, the simplest move for White would be 10.a3!? \pm, preventing the threat \textit{\texttt{b4}}. Black will have problems countering White’s plan to advance e3-e4.

He should not be afraid of Black’s knight-sortie to the edge of the board. 8...\textit{\texttt{h5}} 9.0–0 \textit{\texttt{f6}}, Ree – Bachofner, Amsterdam 2001, 10.g3!? \pm followed by e3-e4.

8...\textit{\texttt{e7}}. Black plays sometimes this waiting move. 9.0–0

After 9...\textit{\texttt{h8}}, White can occupy space on the queenside with 10.c5 \textit{\texttt{c7}} 11.b4 \textit{\texttt{h5}} 12.\textit{\texttt{b1}} e5 13.\textit{\texttt{dxe5}} \textit{\texttt{xe5}} 14.f4 \textit{\texttt{c7}} 15.\textit{\texttt{d4}} \pm – He has extra space and his knight is very powerful in the centre of the board, while Black lags in development and is incapable of exploiting the weakness of the pawn on e3, Romanko – Hoang Thanh Trang, Tbilisi 2011.

His attempt to create active counterplay on the queenside with 9...\textit{\texttt{dxc4}} 10.\textit{\texttt{xc4}} b5 11.\textit{\texttt{b3}} b4 12.\textit{\texttt{a4}} \textit{\texttt{a6}}, Gavrilov – Gleizerov, St Petersburg 1993, would lead to a difficult position for Black after 13.\textit{\texttt{e1}}!\pm (followed by \textit{\texttt{c5}} or \textit{\texttt{f4}}) and his pawns on c6 and e6 are vulnerable.

9...\textit{\texttt{d7}} 10.\textit{\texttt{d2}} \textit{\texttt{e8}} 11.e4. It is quite obvious that White is much better prepared for the opening of the game in the centre. 11...\textit{\texttt{fxe4}} 12.\textit{\texttt{fxe4}} dxc4. This is the only possibility for Black to obtain an acceptable position (He loses immediately after 12...e5? S. Atalik – Sanduleac, Mallorca 2004, following 13.c5! \textit{\texttt{c7}} 14.exd5 cxd5 15.\textit{\texttt{g5}} – Black is incapable of parrying simultaneously the threats \textit{\texttt{h7}} and \textit{\texttt{d5.}}) 13.\textit{\texttt{xc4}} \pm White has a stable advantage thanks to the weakness of Black’s pawn on e6, Wassin – Gunajew, Goa 2006.

In the variation 8...\textit{\texttt{d7}} 9.0–0 \textit{\texttt{e8}} 10.\textit{\texttt{d2}} \textit{\texttt{h5}} 11.\textit{\texttt{f4}} \textit{\texttt{h6}} 12.\textit{\texttt{ce2}} g5 13.\textit{\texttt{h3}} \pm Colom Andres – Vives Font, Barcelona 2001, White can counter g5–g4 with \textit{\texttt{h3}}–f4. Black’s attempt to organise an attack has only led to the weakening of his kingside pawn-structure.

8...\textit{\texttt{bd7}} 9.0–0 g6 10.\textit{\texttt{d2}} b6, Mohota – Sriram, Raipur 2002 (It seems premature for Black to opt for 10...\textit{\texttt{dxc4}} 11.\textit{\texttt{xc4}} \textit{\texttt{b6}} 12.\textit{\texttt{b3}} \textit{\texttt{g7}} 13.e4!± Obukhov – Kiroski, Skopje 1993.). Now, White can
accomplish a favourable pawn-break in the centre with 11.cxd5!? exd5 12.f4 e7 13.e4!±

After 8...a6, White can occupy immediately additional space on the queenside. 9.c5 c7 10.d2. This is an important moment. He is not in a hurry to castle. Later, depending on circumstances, White’s king may go to the queenside, or to the kingside. 10...bd7 (It is not so precise for Black to play here 10...e7 11.0–0–0 e5 12.dxe5 cxe5 13.a4 e6 14. d4± Bukavshin – Geller, Moscow 2011. He has great problems. Black cannot exchange on d4, because then his dark squares would be catastrophically weak. Without this exchange however, he cannot parry simultaneously White’s two threats xf5 and a4-b6, after which Black will have to play a7 and this rook will be isolated from the actions for long.) 11.0–0 e8 (Black weakens his c6-pawn with the line: 11...b6 12.cxb6 axb6, Zmarzy – Warchol, Murzasichle 2011, 13.ac1± followed by c3-a4-e2 or c2-f4, c3-e2.) 12.h3 e7 13.e4 (It is also good for White to play here at first 13. b4!?±) 13...e5. The juxtaposition of the pawns in the centre is in favour of White, since all his pieces have been developed. 14.exf5 exd4 15.a4 e5 16.ae1! This is an accurate move after which Black will be doomed to defend passively (It is weaker for White to opt for 16.xd4? x3 17.

xd3 e5 18.f4 e4∞ and the dominance over the e4-square provides Black with good compensation for the sacrificed pawn, Koneru – Girya, Eilat 2012.). 16.

cxd3 17.xd3 e5 18.xf4 xf5 19.xf5 xf5 20.xc7 xc7 21.

cd4 d3 22.db6 d8 23.d2± White can make his opponent suffer for long in this endgame playing against his “bad” bishop.

It would be premature for Black to try counterplay in the spirit of the Meran Variation of the Slav Defence – 8...dxc4 9.

cxc4 b5 (about 9...h8 10.0–0 – see 8...h8) 10.b3 h8 11.e4

After 11...fxe4 12.xe4± the weakness of the d4-pawn is not so important as the vulnerability of Black’s pawns on c6 and e6, Bhat – Rombaldoni, Reykjavik 2009.

It may be interesting for Black to try the recommendation of R. Scherbakov – 11...e5!? It is insufficient for equality because White has the energetic resource 12. g5± and his chances are preferable in the oncoming sharp fight, since Black will have problems with the development of his
queenside pieces. 12...exd4 13. 0-0-0! dxc4 14.e5 cxb2+ 15. b1± White will regain his piece and Black can hardly neutralise the activity of his opponent’s pieces.

11...b4 12.e5!? This is the simplest move. After this White obtains a slight but stable edge. 12...bxc3 13.bxc3 (White has not tested in practice yet a very promising pawn-sacrifice – 13.exd6!? cxb2 14.xb2 xd6 15.f4± and he has two powerful bishops for the minimal material deficit, while Black’s pawns are very weak.) 13...c7 14. exf6 xf6 15.0-0t This position was reached in the game Lobron – Sveshnikov, Budapest 1996. White has a clear cut plan to improve his position with e3, c2–c4, ad1, f1. Black’s c6-pawn is weak and his pawn on f5 would have been much better placed on f7...

It seems more reliable for Black to choose 8...h8 – before capturing on c4 he removes prudently his king away from the a2-g8 diagonal. 9.0–0 dxc4 (Following 9...a6 10.c5, White obtains a considerable advantage with active actions on the queenside. 10...c7 11.d2 bd7 12.b4 b6 13. a4 bc5 14.bxc5± Kramnik – Tregubov, France 2002. Black has weakened his b6-square with the move a7-a6 and later White can exploit this by penetrating to this square after the preliminary move a1b.) 10.xc4

10...b5 11.ad3 a6 12.a3 b4 13.a4 wc7 14.g3± White has a superb pawn-structure, Jankowski – Maitre, Email 2011.

10..e7 11.d2 bd7 12.b3 b5, Melkumyan – S.Zhigalko, Konya 2011. The position is of a Meran type, but once against his pawn on f5 would have been better placed on f7. White can maintain an advantage in different ways, but possibly his most reliable line is 13.a3! b8 14.f4 b6 15.d3± and the knight on d3 impedes Black’s freeing pawn-breaks e6-e5 or c6-c5.

10...e5 11.dxe5 xe5, Lugovoi – Yudin, St Petersburg 2005. Now, White obtains a stable advantage with 12.d2 bd7 13. f4 d6 14.a3 we7 15.d4 b6 16.a2 g6 17.e1± Black’s castling position has been considerably weakened by the move g7-g6, so he can hardly parry his opponent’s break in the centre e3-e4 and he must also watch for the possible transfer of White’s bishop to the a1-h8 diagonal.

Black has an interesting plan beginning with the move 8...b6.
Now, contrary to the variation with 8...a6, White does not have the possibility c4-c5. This plan is analysed as the main line for Black in a book which was published in the year 2012 by R. Scherbakov – “The Triangle System”. Still, even then White can rely on obtaining an opening edge after the prophylactic line: 9.0-0 a6 10...h1!? (It would not be so convincing for him to choose 10.\textit{d}2 \textit{c}7 11.h3 c5!\textit{∞} Bauer – Grischuk, Enghien les Bains 2001. Black managed to advance c6-c5 and outplayed his opponent in the subsequent fight.) 10...\textit{c}7 11.e4. This is a very promising pawn-sacrifice after which White’s pieces become tremendously active. 11...dxe4 12.fxe4 \textit{x}h2. Now, the idea behind White’s move 10 becomes evident. Black captures on h2 without a check and White manages to play exf5. 13.exf5 \textit{g}4 14.f6! This pawn-sacrifice is rather non-obvious and is of a purely computer type! 14...gxf6 (White has powerful initiative after 14...\textit{f}6?! 15.e4 \textit{d}6 16.xf6+ gxf6 17.h6 \textit{f}7 18.f4\textit{±} 15.d1. It is essential for him to get rid of the actively placed black knight on g4. 15...f5 16.e3 There may follow 16...h5 17.d5 cxd5 18.cxd5 \textit{x}c2 19.xc2 \textit{e}5 20.b3 \textit{e}8 21.\textit{c}4\textit{±}. The queens have been exchanged but Black has great problems neutralising his opponent’s initiative, because his queenside pieces are still on their initial squares.

9.a3

9...dxc4

It seems rather inconsistent for Black to try 9...h8 10.c5 \textit{c}7 11.0-0\textit{±}, since his knight on a6 is evidently misplaced, Shytrenkov – Gevorgyan, Alushta 2010, as well as 9...\textit{c}7 10.c5 \textit{e}7 11.b4 \textit{d}7, Hermann – Maierhofer, Austria 1997, 12.0-0\textit{±} White has much more space and later can prepare b4-b5 (after a2-a4), as well as e3-e4.

10.xc4 b5 11.a2 h8

This prophylactic was necessary, because the pawn on f5 was hanging.

In the game Savina – Manakova, Moscow 2009, there followed 11...d5 12.e4 xc3 13.bxc3 \textit{h}8 14.0-0 e5 and here, White could have obtained a stable advantage with the move 15.e3\textit{±}. He has a stable pawn-centre, while Black’s knight is terribly misplaced at the edge of the board.
12.0–0 b4
This is a logical continuation of Black’s opening strategy.

It also seems good for him to try 12...\$e7 13.b4 \$c7, Pushin – S.Volkov, Moscow 2011. He is threatening to play a7-a5 creating counterplay on the queenside. Still, White obtains an advantage in the opening with the line: 14. e4!? fxe4 15.\$xe4 \$xe4 16.\$xe4± followed by \$d2, \$ae1 and eventually – \$b1, provoking weaknesses in his opponent’s castling position.

13.\$a4 \$c7 14.g3

It is also interesting for White to play here 14.h3!?± and contrary to 14 g3, he does not need to consider later the consequences of the bishop-sacrifice on g3.

14...\$b8 15.\$d2 \$e7 16.\$c4 bxa3 17.bxa3 c5

This position was reached in the game David – Feller, Paris 2010. White has a slight edge mostly due to the unfavourable placement of Black’s knight on a6.

18.\$ab1! cxd4 19.\$xd4 \$xb1 20.\$xb1 \$xa3 21.\$d3 \$c7 22.\$b3 \$d6 23.\$c6 \$d7 24.\$xa7 \$cd5 25.\$xc8 \$xc8 26.\$c3 \$xc3 27.\$xc3± The position has been simplified considerably but thanks to his powerful bishop-pair and the weakness on e6 White can still play for a win for a long time, while Black is doomed to a passive defence.

Conclusion
In the variation 1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.\$c3 f5, White has no problems to maintain an opening advantage, because he can develop his dark-squared bishop to an active position. Later, he often implements a plan connected with undermining Black’s f5-pawn with the move g2-g4, followed by \$g1 and an attack on the g-file. In principle, his king remains in the centre of the board (\$e2).

In the variation 1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.\$c3 c6 4.e3 f5, White’s achievements are not so great. Still, he can again obtain a slight but stable edge following this set-up: \$d3, \$ge2, f2-f3. Later, he can prepare either a break in the centre (e3-e4), or an attack on the queenside with (c4-c5, b2-b4, a2-a4 and b4-b5).
Part 3

Black tries seldom played moves after
1.d4 \textsf{\textit{\textsf{f}}6} 2.c4

In the third part of our book, we will analyse some rarely played moves for Black on his second move.

Chapter 10 will be devoted to 2...a6 and 2...b6. In Chapter 11 we will deal with the so-called Knight’s Tango – 2...\textsf{\textit{\textsf{c}}6}.

In Chapters 12-13, we will analyse some variations of the Old Indian Defence (1.d4 \textsf{\textit{\textsf{f}}6} 2.c4 d6). In Chapters 14-15 we will deal with the Budapest Gambit – (1.d4 \textsf{\textit{\textsf{f}}6} 2.c4 e5 3.dxe5). Chapter 14 will be devoted to the rarely played move 3...\textsf{\textit{\textsf{e}}4} (the Fajrowicz Variation), while in Chapter 15, we will deal with Black’s main line – 3...\textsf{\textit{\textsf{g}}4}.

Among the variations, analysed in Part 3, the most dangerous for White may be 1.d4 \textsf{\textit{\textsf{f}}6} 2.c4 d6, because against that, he must not only obtain an advantage in the opening, but also not to allow Black to enter the King’s Indian Defence, having avoided the Averbakh System (for example 3.\textsf{\textit{\textsf{f}}3} g6).

Against the other possibilities for Black, White has no problems to maintain an advantage in the opening, because the moves 2...a6, 2...b6 and 2...\textsf{\textit{\textsf{c}}6} have a serious drawback – Black presents his opponent with the possibility to occupy the centre with his pawns. In the Budapest Gambit Black regains the sacrificed pawn indeed, but his position is without good prospects since White has a much freer game and very often the two-bishop advantage as well.
In this chapter we will analyse two very rarely played moves for Black: A) 2...a6 and B) 2...b6.

A) 2...a6

This move is not tested so often in the tournament practice; nevertheless, we will devote to it several pages, since White must play very precisely in order to obtain an advantage. It has been tried numerous times by D. Gurevich and sometimes it has been tested also by B. Gurgenidze, H. Nakamura, V. Malakhov... Black's main idea is to play c7-c5, followed by b7-b5 and to try to seize the initiative by a pawn-sacrifice.

3.Δc3
White simply develops his pieces ignoring Black’s possible diversion on the flank.

3...c5
This is the logical continuation of Black’s idea.

He has an original move here, but still insufficient for equality – 3...b5. White should better avoid accepting the sacrifice. 4.e4 b4 5.Δd5 Δxe4 (5...Δxd5 6.cxd5±) 6.Δf3 (We can recommend a promising pawn-sacrifice to the fans of sharp complicated positions: 6.Δf4!? d6 7.Δd3 Δf6 8.Δxf6+ exf6 9.Δf3 Δa7 10.Δe2± – White is clearly ahead in development and later, he can exploit the weakening of Black's queenside pawn-structure with the move a2-a3.) 6...c6 7.Δxe4 cxd5 8.Δxd5. White has regained his pawn and preserved a better position. 8...Δc6 9.Δe4 d5 10.cxd5 f5 11.Δe3 Δxd5 12.Δf3 g6 13.b3 Δg7 14.Δb2 Δb7 15.Δc4 Δe4, Vaganian - Gurgenidze, Ordzhonikidze 1978, 16. 0-0 Δxe3 17.fxe3± and Black’s compromised pawn-
structure will be a very important factor in this endgame (you can see the consequences of the moves b7-b5-b4 and f7-f5).

It seems just bad for Black to opt for 3...e6, because there arises the Nimzo-Indian Defence after that, except that instead of the move b4, he has played the not so useful move a7-a6. 4.e4 d5 (It is bad for Black to choose here 4...c5 5.d5 exd5 6.cxd5 d6 and there arises a bad version for him of the Modern Benoni.) 5.e5 dxe4 6.cxd5 exd5 7.d3 f5 8.ge2± Black lags considerably in development and White can oust the enemy knight away from the centre at any moment with the move f2-f3, Stohl – Cicak, Czech Republic 2001. bkw

4.d5

This position arises often after another move-order 1.d4 e6 2.c4 c5 3.d5 a6 4.c3 and among the grandmasters we have mentioned above, we will add V. Milov who usually reaches this position after this particular move-order.

4...b5

This is a pawn-sacrifice in the spirit of the Volga Gambit, which will be analysed in the next part of the book.

5.e4

White does not accept the gambit pawn and is ready to sacrifice material himself in order to seize the initiative.

5...b4 6.a4

6...dxe4

This is a principled move for Black, but a bit too risky.

After 6...wc7 7.d3 d6, Farago – M. Ivanov, Deizisau 2002, 8. f4!? g6 9.d3± Black can hardly parry the threat e4-e5.

It seems more reliable for him to continue with 6...d6!? and naturally, White’s lead in development is obvious, but you should not forget that his knight on a4 is misplaced. 7.d3 e5. Black is trying to close the position. Naturally, White would not like this. 8.f4 g4 (8...exf4 9.gxf4 d7 10.f3 e7 11.0–0 g4 12.a3 bxa3 13. 143
Chapter 10

\(\text{exa3}^+\) – He has played the undermining move a2-a3, weakening Black’s queenside pawn-structure and so, White’s prospects in the forthcoming complicated fight are preferable, Albrecht – Bjarnehag, Berlin 2012) 9.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{d7}\) 10.\(\text{f3}\)

Following 10...\(\text{exe4}\), White can continue with a very promising positional piece-sacrifice: 11. \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 12.\(\text{xc5!}\) dxc5 13.\(\text{xe5}\), for example: 13...\(\text{g8}\) 14.0-0 \(\text{e7}\) 15.\(\text{e1}\) g6 16.\(\text{f2}\) (It is also very strong for him to play here 16. \(\text{g3}\) with the idea \(\text{g5}\).) 16...f5 17.\(\text{e1}\)– This is a picturesque situation! White has only a pawn for the piece, but his positional advantage is so great that the computer evaluates his position as winning. We have to mention the unfortunate placement of Black’s knights, which have no moves, as well as White’s powerful pawn-tandem e5 and d5, which can advance at any moment crushing completely Black’s resistance.

10...\(\text{wa5}\), Belozerov – Lopez Martinez, Moscow 2005, 11.\(\text{fxe5}\). White begins active actions in the centre. 11...\(\text{xa4}\) 12.\(\text{b3}\) dxe5 (It would be too risky for Black to opt for 12...\(\text{xb3}\) 13.\(\text{xb3}\) dxe5 14. \(\text{xe5}\) and his lag in development becomes an important factor. In addition, Black has no pawns in the centre, which is also bad for him.) 13.\(\text{bxa4}\) \(\text{bd7}\) 14.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{e7}\) 15.0-0 0-0 16.\(\text{h4}\) g6 17.\(\text{h6}\) White has more space and can prepare an offensive on the kingside and the semi open f-file will be helpful. Black is incapable of exploiting the weakened queenside pawn-structure of his opponent, because White can easily protect his weakness on a4 with his bishop from d1.

7.\(\text{d3}\)

This is the main idea of this variation. Now, White’s knight not only will capture the enemy c5-pawn, but will leave the edge of the board being centralised.

7...\(\text{f6}\) 8.\(\text{xc5}\)

8...\(\text{e6}\)

The alternatives for Black are not any better:
8...g6?! 9.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)\texttt{e}3 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{g}}}}\)7 10.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{a}}}}\)4± (followed by \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{a}}}}\)a4-b6), Levitt – Teske, Polanica Zdroj 1988.

8...a5, Neunhoeffer – Budde, Germany 1983, 9.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)4! \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)xe4 10.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}}}}\)xe4. Black has problems to complete the development of his kingside pieces, since it is bad for him to opt for 10...g6 due to 11.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}\)d4±

8...e5, Hausner – Berchtenbreiter, Austria 2012, 9.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)4 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)xe4 10.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}}}}\)xe4 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}\)c5 (10...d6? 11.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{a}}}}\)a4+ \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}\)d7 12.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}\)xb4+-) 11.d6. White should not allow his opponent to play d7-d6, because after that Black’s position would be quite acceptable. Now, he will hardly manage to coordinate his pieces. 11.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}\)c6 12.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}}}}\)f3 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}\)b7 13.0-0 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}\)b8 14.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e1 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}}}}\)xd6 (14...\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}\)xd6 15.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}\)xd6 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}}}}\)xd6 16.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}}}}\)xe5 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)xe5 17.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}\)xc6 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}\)xc6 18.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)xe5+ \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}\)d8 19.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e3± Black will have difficulties with the protection of his d4-pawn.) 15.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}\)c3 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e7 16.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}\)b6 f6 17.c5± He has an extra pawn, but his position is problematic. White’s pieces are obviously more active and if Black castles kingside, White will begin an immediate attack there with \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{h}}}}\)h4 and \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}\)h5.

9.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e4 exd5 10.cxd5
(diagram)

10...\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}\)b7

Black loses immediately with 10...\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}}}}\)xd5? 11.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e2 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e7 12.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}\)c4 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}}}}\)6 13.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}\)d6+-, while following 10...d6 11.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{a}}}}\)a4+ \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}\)bd7, Volodin – Berchtenbreiter, Pardubice 2012, White should not be in a hurry to capture on b4 and should develop his pieces at first: 12.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}}}}\)xf6+ \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}\)xf6 13.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}}}}\)f3 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e7 14.0-0 h6 15.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e1 0-0 16.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{w}}}}\)xb4± Black has no compensation for the pawn.

11.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{g}}}}\)g5 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}}}}\)xd5 12.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e2

White has long lasting initiative for the sacrificed pawn.

12...\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e6 13.f4 d5 14.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{x}}}}\)xf6+

Now, almost all Black’s pawns will be weak.

14...gxf6 15.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{h}}}}\)h4 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e7 16.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}}}}\)f3 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{h}}}}\)h6 17.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{e}}}}\)e3 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}\)c6 18.0-0 0-0 19.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{a}}}}\)ae1 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{f}}}}\)fc8 20.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}\)d2!

White’s knight has been restricted by the enemy f6-pawn, so he is transferring it to a more active position.

20...\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{d}}}}\)d8 21.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{b}}}}\)b3 \(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{g}}}}\)g7 22.\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\textbf{c}}}}\)c5±

White’s pieces are very active. Black can hardly protect his numerous pawn-weaknesses.
B) 2...b6

This is in a way Queen's Indian Defence “deferred” without the inclusion of the moves \( \text{f3 - e6} \) and it was very popular during the 20ies of the 20th century. It was often played by A. Alekhine, E. Gruenfeld, R. Reti and other leading players of those times. Nowadays, it has been used by Valljeho Pons, I. Sokolov and many other grandmasters.

Still, this line is not played so often, because White has found reliable ways to obtain an advantage. He wins the fight for the key-squares in similar positions – e4 and d5.

3.\( \text{c3} \)

White develops his knight and takes control over the e4 and d5-squares. Now, Black’s main move here is – B2) 3...\( \text{b7} \), but before that we will have a look at the less popular move B1) 3...\( \text{e6} \).

B1) 3...\( \text{e6} \)

The defect of this move is quite obvious even to the naked eye. Black enables his opponent to occupy the centre.

4.\( \text{e4} \)

The more prudent move 4...d6 leads to a very difficult position for Black. 5.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 6.\( \text{ge2} \). This is the best square for White’s knight, since it does not impede the pawn-advance \( \text{f2-f4} \). 6...c5 (6...\( \text{bd7} \) 7.0–0 \( \text{e7} \) 8.h3 0–0 9.\( \text{g3} \) \( \text{c8} \) 10.f4 c5 11.d5 e5 12.f5\( \text{+} \) White’s knight on f5 is very powerful and Black’s pieces evidently lack space, Garcia Palermo – Epitacio, Sao Paulo 1997.) 7.d5 exd5 8.cxd5 \( \text{e7} \) 9.\( \text{g3} \) 0–0 10. 0–0 \( \text{e8} \) 11.f4\( \text{±} \) Bagirov – Glisic, Novi Sad 1988 (11.\( \text{f5}?!\text{±} \)). There has arisen a position with a pawn-structure typical for the Modern Benoni, but in a very bad version for Black. His dark-squared bishop would be better placed on g7 and not on e7 and he has lost too many tempi in vain on fianchettoing of his light-squared bishop.

After 4...\( \text{b4} \), White has an almost forced variation leading to
his advantage. 5.e5! 2e4 6.8g4 
6xc3 7.a3 8.f8 8.g5! This is the point. Now, Black is forced to part with his g7-pawn. 8...e7 (8...f6?? 
9.exf6 gxf6 10.8h5+ 8e7 11. 
8xf6+-) 9.8xe7 8xe7 (Black will 
not save the day with 9...8xe7 ei-
ther, since White can counter that 
with 10.8g5+ 8e8 11.8xg7± and 
Black loses a pawn anyway, but 
even in a worse version for him, 
Henrichs – Rebber, Senden 
2000) 10.8xg7 8f8 11.8xf8+ 
8xf8 12.bxc3 8b7 13.f4 f6 14.8f3 
8xf3 (14...fxe5?! 15.fxе5 8e7 16. 
8d3 8f7 17.0–0± and Black has no 
compensation for the pawn, De 
lос Santos Serrano – Heidtmann, 
Email 2002) 15.gxf3 c5 16.8e2. 
This is a quiet move. (Besides 
this, White has at his disposal a 
sharp pawn-sacrifice: 16.d5! fxe5 
17.fxе5 8f5 18.8g1! 8xe5+ 19. 
8f2± and he obtains an over-
whelming position for the sacri-
ficed pawn. It is an endgame, but 
Black’s defence is very difficult, 
because his pieces are not de-
veloped.) 16...8c6 17.8e3± White 
has numerous pawn-weakenesses 
in his camp and this complicates 
considerably the realisation of his 
extra pawn, but the evaluation of 
the position is doubtless. Black 
will have to fight long and hard 
for a draw, Konstantinov – Buj-
dak, Internet 2009.

5.8c2
This is the best square for 
White’s queen. From here, it not 
only protects the e4-pawn, but 
also prevents in some variations 
the doubling of his pawns if Black 
plays 8b4 and 8xc3.

5...8b4

5...c5 6.d5 d6 7.8e2 8e7 8.8f3 
0–0 9.0–0 a6, Arlt – Vasiljev, 
Leverkusen 2005 and here, White 
can increase his advantage with 
10.dxe6! fxe6 11.8g5 8c8 12.e5 
dxe5 13.8d1 8c7 14.8g4± Black 
loses his e6-pawn and White will 
have the edge thanks to his supe-
rior pawn-structure.

5...d6 6.8f3 8bd7 (6...8e7 
7.8e2 0–0 8.0–0 a6 9.a3 8fd7 10. 
8d1 8e8 11.b4± Black’s pieces 
are deployed on the last three ranks 
and are a sorry sight, S.Atalik – 
Urban, Bad Wiessee 2003.) 7.8e2 
g6. Now, the position resembles 
the King’s Indian Defence. 8.0–0 
8g7 9.8e3 0–0 10.8d1 h6 11.d5! 
White restricts the enemy bishop 
on b7. 11...exd5 12.exd5 8e8 
13.8d4 8c5 14.8f3± – He has 
much more space, Alonso Rosell 
– Camacho Collados, La Massana 
2013.
Chapter 10

6.\textit{d}3

6...\textit{c}5

The move 6...\textit{e}7 has not been analysed thoroughly, but it looks like after 7.\textit{c}ge2 \textit{xc}3+ 8.bxc3 d6 9.0-0 \textit{bd}7 10.f4± White's two-bishop advantage and his powerful pawn-centre compensate completely the weakening of his queenside pawn-structure, Litvinenko – Jung, Email 2012.

Black only compromises his position after the active line: 6...d5 7.cxd5 exd5 8.e5, for example: 8...\textit{d}e4 9.\textit{dc}ge2 c5 10.0-0 \textit{xc}3 11.bxc3 h6 12.\textit{a}a3± Black is forced to part with his powerful dark-squared bishop and also he lags considerably in development, Csi- bor – Liptak, Hungary 1996.

White should not be afraid of 6...\textit{c}6, since Black cannot organize counterplay against the d4-pawn. 7.\textit{f}3

(diagram)

It seems rather dubious for Black to sacrifice a pawn here 7...

e5 8.dxe5 \textit{g}4 9.\textit{g}5 \textit{d}4 10.\textit{x}d8 \textit{xc}2+ 11.\textit{xc}2 \textit{xd}8 12.h3 \textit{h}6 13.\textit{d}4 0–0 14.0–0–0 \textit{xc}3 15.\textit{b}xc3± and despite the fact that White's pawn-structure has certain weaknesses, Black has no compensation for the sacrificed material, Salvermoser – Schmidt-diel, Austria 2004.

7.d5 8.cxd5 exd5 9.e5 \textit{e}4 10.0–0 \textit{xc}3 11.bxc3 \textit{a}a5 12.\textit{e}1 0–0 13.c4± – The position is opened and this is in favour of White, because he has two powerful bishops, Vettel – Cordes, Germany 1999.

7.d6 8.0–0 \textit{xc}3 9.\textit{wc}3± White has avoided the doubling of his pawns and Black is incapable of countering his opponent's powerful centre, Kotanjian – Ayyad, Al Ain 2012.

It seems quite purposeful for Black to play 6...\textit{xc}3+, at least because he doubles his opponent's pawns. 7.bxc3 d6 (It seems more reliable for him to opt for 7...c5, although even then after 8.\textit{f}3 d6 9.0–0 \textit{bd}7 10.a4 \textit{c}7 11.\textit{e}1 h6 12.a5± White's two bishops, his dominance over the cen-
tre and the active possibilities on the queenside compensate fully his doubled pawns on the c-file, Dao Thien Hai – Granda Zuniga, Moscow 1994.) There has arisen on the board a favourable version for White of the classical variation of the Nimzo-Indian Defence. 8.f4. He is planning \( \text{Qf3} \) and \( e5 \). (It is also good for White to try here 8.\( \text{Qe2} \). One of the games of M. Euwe is considered to be a perfect example of how to play this position with White. 8... \( \text{Qbd7} \) 9.0-0 0-0 10.f4 h6 11.e5 \( \text{Qe8} \) 12.\( \text{Qg3} \). He has accomplished the standard set-up of his pieces for this variation and begins active operations. 12... \( \text{c5} \) 13.\( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Wh4} \) 14.f5 cxd4 15.\( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 16. cxd4 dxe5 17.dxe5 \( \text{Qc7} \) 18.\( \text{Qg4} \). This joining of White's rook into the attack is decisive. 18...\( \text{Qe7} \) 19.\( \text{Qxg7+} \) 1-0 Euwe – Colle, Amsterdam 1928)

Following 8... \( \text{Qbd7} \) 9.\( \text{Qf3} \), the simplest reply for Black would be 9...\( e5 \) and there arises transposition to the variation with 8...\( e5 \) (It seems too dubious for Black to opt for 9...\( \text{Qe7} \) 10.e5\( \text{Q} \) White occupies even more space, while Black must lose even more time for the retreat of his knight, Kahn – Bors, Budapest 1996).

8...\( e5 \) 9.\( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \) 10.0-0 \( \text{Qe7} \) 11.\( \text{Qh4} \) 0-0-0 12.\( \text{Qf5} \) White is dominant in the centre and his pieces are more active, Bryzgalin – Koganov, ICC 2009.

8... \( \text{Qc6} \) 9.\( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) (9...\( \text{Qe7} \) 10.0-0 0-0-0, Neuman – Babula, Czech Republic 1999, 11.e5?! \( \text{Qd7} \) 12.\( \text{Qa3} \) 10.0-0 \( \text{Qe7} \), Korchnoi – Chernyshov, Warsaw 2002, 11. e5?!\( \text{Q} \) followed by \( \text{Qa3} \), after which the vulnerability of the a3-f8 diagonal will be hurting Black. His pieces have been obviously deprived of space for manoeuvres.

7.d5

White restricts considerably his opponent's bishop on b7. Now, he must only complete his development keeping the enemy pieces in isolation.

7...d6

About 7...\( \text{Qxd5} \) 8.\( \text{Qxd5} \) 0-0 9.\( \text{Qge2} \) b5 10.b3 – see 7...b5.
Chapter 10

It is also possible for Black to play 7...\&e7 8.\&ge2 \&xc3+ (8...d6 9.0-0 \&xc3 10.\&xc3 e5 11.f4± and his pieces are cramped, Hellegaard – B.Pedersen, Gistrup 2009) 9.\&xc3 d6 10.0-0 \&bd7 11.\&g3 0-0 0-0 12.h3 h5 13.a3 h4 14.\&e2 \&dg8 15.b4 g5 16.f3± – Now, Black's kingside activity has reached its dead end, because the move g5-g4 is impossible, De Carlos Arregui – Davidov, Email 2007.

It is also bad for Black to choose here 7...exd5 8.exd5 \&xc3+ (8...b5 9.b3 – see 7...b5) 9.\&xc3 0-0 10.\&e2 d6 11.0-0 \&bd7 12.b3 \&e8 13.\&g3± followed by \&b2 and \&f5, Rodriguez – Maubres, Email 2005. White has much more space and his battery queen+bishop on the long diagonal is likely to create great problems for his opponent.

White should better counter 7...b5 with the solid move 8.b3, keeping the enemy bishop in its cage on the b7-square.

Black will not facilitate his defence with the line: 8...d6 9.\&f3 exd5 10.exd5 bxc4 11.bxc4 \&e7+ 12.\&f1 0-0, Wiley – Alienkin, Belgium 2008, 13.g3± followed by \&g2.

8...0-0 9.\&ge2 bxc4 10.bxc4 \&g4 11.0-0 \&e5 12.f4 \&xc3 13.\&xc3 \&xd3 14.\&xd3 \&a6 15.a3± Black's bishop has been severely restricted by White's pawns on d5 and c4 and Black's pawns is horribly misplaced at the edge of the board, Lehikoinen – Molander, Helsinki 2002.

The character of the fight remains the same after 8...exd5, since following 9.exd5 0-0 10.\&ge2 d6 11.0-0 \&bd7, Rubinstein – Janowski, Marienbad 1925, 13.\&g5± White's minor pieces are deployed considerably more actively.

8...bxc4 9.bxc4 exd5 10.exd5 0-0 11.\&ge2 d6 12.\&f4 h6 13.0-0± and once again, White's minor pieces are much more active, S.Ivanov – Novikov, St Petersburg 2003.

8.\&ge2

Now, Black cannot double the enemy pawns after \&xc3.

8...\&bd7 9.a3 \&xc3+ 10.\&xc3
10...\textit{\textbf{e}}e5

It is not preferable for him to opt for 10...0–0 11.0–0 \textit{\textbf{e}}e8 12.f4 exd5 13.exd5 \textit{\textbf{f}}f8 14.d2± Schlosser – Hagarova, Pardubice 2001.

Following 10...\textit{\textbf{e}}e7 11.0–0 0–0 12.d2 e5 13.ae1 \textit{\textbf{h}}h5 14.g3 \textit{\textbf{f}}fe8 15.a1 \textit{\textbf{c}}8 16.f4± White begins immediate active operations on the kingside, Jacimovic – Walsh, Heraklio 1997.

It is possible that Black’s best defence here may be 10...e5 11.0–0 0–0, Silman – Formanek, Philadelphia 1989, 12.b4± and White’s bishops are not so dangerous in this closed position.

11.a2 \textit{\textbf{g}}6 12.f4 0–0

\begin{center}
\begin{position}
1.d4 \textit{\textbf{f}}6 2.c4 b6 3.\textit{\textbf{c}}3
\end{position}
\end{center}

13.e8 14.h5 \textit{\textbf{f}}f8 15.h6 g6 16.0–0± Black has no space for manoeuvres and the dark squares on his kingside have been weakened, I.Sokolov – Slobodjan, Germany 2003.

B2) 3...\textit{\textbf{b}}7 4.\textit{\textbf{c}}2

4.d5

Now, White will play actively. He will occupy the centre, while Black will exert piece-pressure against it.

About 4...e6 5.e4 – see variation B1.

It is obviously bad for Black to opt for 4...c5 5.d5 and it becomes unclear why he has lost time to fianchetto his bishop. 5...e5 (about 5...e6 6.e4 – see variation B1, 5...c5) 6.e4 d6 7.g3 \textit{\textbf{e}}e7 8.g2 \textit{\textbf{c}}8 9.f4 a6 10.f3± Smyslov – Matanovic, Biel 1976. Black has lost too much time on manoeuvres with his bishop. White has extra space and better developed pieces.

151
4...d6. After this move Black obtains a solid but rather passive position. 5.e4 e5 (5...\d6 6.f3 e5 7.d5 – see 5...e5) 6.d5 \b7 7.f3 e7 8.e2 0–0 9.0–0 c5, Monin – Kengis, Pinsk 1986 (Following 9...\e8, Black can hardly obtain counterplay on the kingside. 10.b1 g6 11.h6 \g7 12.d2 a5 13.e1 f5 14.exf5 gxf5 15.f4 \c5 16.fxe5 dxe5. Black’s pawns on e5 and f5 are excellent targets for attack of White’s pieces. 17.\d3 \xd3 18.\xd3 \d7, Van der Stricht – Cekro, Aalst 2005, 19.\h1!? \f6 20.g4± with powerful initiative on the kingside.) Here, White had to continue with 10.a3± followed by b2-b4, beginning active actions on the queenside.

5.cxd5 \xd5 6.e4 \xc3 7.\xc3

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

7...e5

Black sacrifices a pawn, but White should better not accept this gift.

It may be also interesting for Black to try 7...g6, after which the position begins the resemble the Gruenfeld Defence. 8.f3 \g7 9.\b5+. This is a very useful check. Its idea is to provoke disharmony in Black’s set-up. 9...\d7. Now, his knight cannot be developed to c6 (it is possible for Black to play here 9...c6 10.e2 0–0 11.0–0 c5 12.d5±). 10.0–0 0–0 11.f4 a6 12.d3± and in the arising typical Gruenfeld middle game, White has the advantage, because Black can hardly attack his opponent’s pawn centre, Quinteros – Plani\- nec, Yugoslavia 1973.

Following 7...e6 8.f3, there arises on the board a position resembling the Petrosian System in the Queen’s Indian Defence (1.d4 \f6 2.c4 e6 3.f3 b6 4.a3 \b7 5.\c3 d5 6.cxd5 \xd5 7.\c2 \c3 8.bxc3 \e7 9.e4).

Black can try to enter that position after the moves 8...\e7 9. a3. White however, has a stronger move than a2-a3 and this is – 9. \b5+. It is useful for him to provoke c7-c6. 9...c6 10.d3

(diagram)

About 10...0–0 11.0–0 c5 – see 10...c5.
10...\textit{\texttt{d7}} 11.0–0 \textit{\texttt{c7}} (11...0–0 12.c4\texttt{e4}±) 12.c4 \textit{\texttt{d8}} 13.b2 0–0 14.\textit{\texttt{e5}} g6 15.\textit{\texttt{e4}}± Black’s position is cramped and he cannot advance the freeing move \textit{\texttt{c6}}–\textit{c5}, since White will counter that with \textit{\texttt{d4}}–\textit{d5}, Verlinsky – Freiman, Odessa 1929.

After 10...\textit{\texttt{a6}} 11.\textit{\texttt{xa6}} \textit{\texttt{xa6}} 12.0–0 0–0, Biriukov – Abergel, St Petersburg 2009, 13.\textit{\texttt{e2}} \textit{\texttt{c8}} 14.\textit{\texttt{f4}}± Black’s pieces remain very passive, therefore he will have great problems fighting against White’s pawn-centre.

10...\textit{\texttt{c5}} 11.0–0

After the careless move 11...0–0, White can begin immediate active actions with the already familiar motive 12.d5!, for example: 12...\textit{\texttt{exd5}} 13.exd5 h6 (13...\textit{\texttt{xd5}} 14.\textit{\texttt{exh7+}} \textit{\texttt{h8}}, Bozinovic – Stipic, Zadar 1999, 15.\textit{\texttt{e1}} \textit{\texttt{h5}} 16.\textit{\texttt{e4}}± Black can hardly complete his development without material losses.) 14.c4 \textit{\texttt{f6}} 15.\textit{\texttt{b1}}± and White’s protected passed pawn in the centre provides him with better chances, Kruppa – Simonian, Kiev 2007.

Therefore, Black should better exchange at first 11...\textit{\texttt{cxd4}}, although even then after 12.cxd4 0–0 13.\textit{\texttt{b2}} \textit{\texttt{c6}} 14.\textit{\texttt{e2}} \textit{\texttt{c8}} (14.\textit{\texttt{b4}} 15.\textit{\texttt{b5}} \textit{\texttt{c8}} 16.\textit{\texttt{fcl}} \textit{\texttt{xc1+}} 17.\textit{\texttt{xc1}} \textit{\texttt{xa2}} 18.\textit{\texttt{a1}} \textit{\texttt{b4}} 19.\textit{\texttt{xa7}} \textit{\texttt{b8}}, Johansson – Mira, Beijing 2008, 20.\textit{\texttt{a4}}± – his pawn on \textit{\texttt{b6}} will remain very weak) 15.\textit{\texttt{fd1}} \textit{\texttt{b4}} 16.\textit{\texttt{b1}} \textit{\texttt{a6}} 17.\textit{\texttt{d2}} \textit{\texttt{c6}} 18.\textit{\texttt{d5}}± he will hardly manage to neutralise the activity of White’s pieces in the centre and on the kingside, Roghani – Vakhidov, Dubai 2004.

Let’s go back to 7...\textit{\texttt{e6}} 8.\textit{\texttt{f3}}.

It seems premature for Black to choose here 8...\textit{\texttt{c5}}, because after 9.\textit{\texttt{b5+}} \textit{\texttt{c6}}, Kasparov – Wei der, Cagnes sur Mer 1977, White obtains a great advantage with the simple line: 10.\textit{\texttt{xc6+}} \textit{\texttt{xc6}} 11.0–0 \textit{\texttt{cxd4}} 12.\textit{\texttt{cxd4}} \textit{\texttt{e8}} 13.\textit{\texttt{b2}}
\( \text{\&e7 14.d5}\) – exploiting Black's delay of his castling.

His position remains very difficult after 8...\( \text{\&d7}\), since Black's knight is passive on this square. 9.\( \text{\&d3 e7}\) (After 9...c5, White has a powerful resource at his disposal – 10.d5! exd5 11.exd5 \( \text{\&xd5}\) 12.0-0 \( \text{\&e7}\) 13.\( \text{\&d1}\) Black has an extra pawn indeed, but his defence is difficult due to the pin on the d-file, for example: 13...\( \text{\&xf3}\)?! 14.gxf3 a6 15.\( \text{\&f4} \text{\e7}\) 16.\( \text{\&a4}\) 0-0 17.\( \text{\&b5}\) – and he loses material.) 10.0-0 0-0 (10...c5 11.d5\( \pm\)) 11.\( \text{\&f4}\) c5 12.d5! This pawn-break is already familiar to us. 12...exd5 13.exd5 \( \text{\&xd5}\) 14.\( \text{\&xh7}\) \( \text{\&h8}\) 15.\( \text{\&f5}\) \( \text{\&xf3}\) 16.gxf3 \( \text{\&g5}\) 17.\( \text{\&d6}\) e7 18.\( \text{\&g3}\) \( \text{\&f6}\) 19.\( \text{\&e1}\) \( \text{\&g8}\) 20.\( \text{\&ad1}\) – The material is equal indeed, but Black's position is very difficult. His king is vulnerable, while White's pieces control the entire board, Rohde – Comp Socrates Exp, Boston 1993.

After 8.dxe5 \( \text{\&d7}\) 9.\( \text{\&f3}\) \( \text{\&e7}\) 10.\( \text{\&b5}\) 0-0-0\( \infty\) there arises a very complicated position in which White's extra pawn is absolutely immaterial, Bacrot – Edward, Villandry 2012.

**8...exd4 9.\( \text{\&c4}\)**

This bishop will be perfectly placed on this diagonal, exerting pressure against the f7-square. White is ready to sacrifice a pawn.

8.\( \text{\&f3}\)

This is the right move for White! He must strive to develop his pieces as quickly as possible.

9...\( \text{\&c6}\)

9...d3. It is possible that this may be Black's best decision. He gives back immediately his extra pawn, but deflects the enemy bishop from the attack against the f7-square. 10.\( \text{\&xd3}\) \( \text{\&e7}\) (10...\( \text{\&d7}\) 11.0-0 \( \text{\&c5}\), Iskusnhy – Sowray, Dresden 2007, 12.\( \text{\&f4}\) 0-0 13.\( \text{\&ad1}\) \( \text{\&e7}\) 14.\( \text{\&e1}\) \( \text{\&f6}\) 15.\( \text{\&d4}\) – White's piece-activity more than compensates the defects of his pawn-structure.) 11.0-0 0-0 12.e5 h6 13.\( \text{\&d1}\)\( ?\) The juxtaposition of the rook and the queen on the
d-file is very unpleasant for Black (White maintains a slight edge after 13.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{xe}4\) 14.\(\text{w}x\text{e}4\) \(\text{d}a6\) 15.\(\text{d}4\)± I. Sokolov – Van Kerkhof, Vienna 2013).

Following 9...\(\text{e}7\), Gladyshev – Erwich, Witley 2001, White should not be in a hurry to regain his pawn. 10.0–0! \(\text{c}6\) (10...\(\text{dxc}3\). Black should better avoid gobbling pawns. 11.\(\text{d}1\). White’s pieces are tremendously active. 11...\(\text{w}c8\) 12.\(\text{w}x\text{c}3\) 0–0 13.\(\text{b}2\) \(\text{f}6\) 14.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{e}7\) 15.\(\text{e}6\) \(\text{f}6\) 16.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{g}6\) 17.\(\text{d}7\)– and Black’s position is defenceless.) 11.\(\text{d}1\) 0–0 12.\(\text{c}xd4\)± White’s powerful pawn-centre provides him with a stable advantage.

10.0–0

Now, Black should again refrain from 10...\(\text{dxc}3\), in view of 11.\(\text{g}5\) f6 12.\(\text{d}ad1\) \(\text{w}e7\) 13.\(\text{w}x\text{c}3\) and after 13...\(\text{fxg}5\)? White wins with the simple tactical strike – 14.\(\text{a}6\)!±

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

11.\(\text{xd}3\) \(\text{c}5\) 12.\(\text{e}5\)

The pressure on the b1-h7 diagonal is very unpleasant for Black.

12...\(\text{h}6\)

Following 12...\(\text{e}7\), Graf – Johansson, Email 2009, White maintains an edge with 13.\(\text{b}5\)±?! \(\text{c}6\) 14.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{c}7\) 15.\(\text{d}3\)± and in order to evaluate the position correctly, it would be sufficient at least to compare the power of the bishops on d3 and b7.

13.\(\text{e}6\)!

White sacrifices a pawn and deprives the enemy king of its castling rights.

13...\(\text{fxe}6\) 14.\(\text{g}6\)+ \(\text{f}8\) 15.\(\text{f}4\)±

Black’s defence is very difficult, because his rook on h8 is likely to remain isolated from the actions for long.

15...\(\text{d}6\) 16.\(\text{d}ad1\) \(\text{w}e7\) 17.\(\text{g}3\) \(\text{xd}3\) 18.\(\text{fxg}3\)! White opens the f-file for attack. 18...\(\text{g}8\), Giannetto – Fernandez, Email 2007, 19.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 20.\(\text{d}e1\) \(\text{xd}6\) 21.\(\text{x}e6\) \(\text{d}7\) 22.\(\text{w}xg6\)
\[ \text{Conclusion} \]

The move 2...a6 is not a frequent guest in the contemporary tournament practice and quite deservedly so. White can obtain a considerable advantage. In the main line he exchanges his central e4-pawn for his opponent's c5-pawn and obtains powerful initiative, because Black lags considerably in development.

In the variation with 2...b6, White's achievements are not so great. This move was often played by the World Champion number four – A. Alekhine. Still, White's edge after 4.\texttt{wc2}, followed by e2-e4, is doubtless. He occupies the centre with his pawns and although Black exerts some piece-pressure against it, this is insufficient for him to maintain equality.
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1. d4 d6 2. c4 c6

This chapter will be devoted to an opening named "Knight's Tango". In it, contrary to the majority of the other openings, he is not fighting for the centre, but at first develops his cavalry. This opening shares the similar ideas with the Alekhine Defence. Black provokes his opponent to chase his knights with his pawns and plans later to exploit the exposed position of White's pawns. Still, the move 2... c6 has a serious positional defect. The role of the centre in the game of chess is very important and ignoring that, particularly when you play with Black, is very risky.

This opening is not so frequently used in the contemporary tournament practice. Among the grandmasters playing it, we can mention C. Bauer, V. Bologan, A. Ermolinsky, H. Nakamura.

3. e3

This move is simple and strong. White is not provoked to punish his opponent immediately by attacking his knight with the move d4-d5 and is not worried by the possibility e7-e5.

Now, Black has at his disposal two basic possibilities. The most popular and logical move here is B) 3... e5, but before we start its analysis, we will deal with the less ambitious move A) 3... e6.

About 3... d6 4. d5 – see Chapter 12.
3... d5 4. cxd5 – see volume 1, Chapter 3, variation C.

A) 3... e6 4. e4

White continues to occupy the centre with his pawns.

(diagram)

4... b4

Black exerts pressure against his opponent's centre.
After 4...e5, White should better open the position with the line: 5.dxe5!? dxe5 6.f4 c6 7.e5 g8 8.f3 d6 9.e2± and he is clearly ahead of his opponent in development, Amini - Afzalnia, Bojnord 2012.

It seems very bad for Black to opt here for 4...d6 5.f3 e7 6.e2 0-0 7.0-0 f5± His position is horribly cramped and White is completely dominant in the centre, P.Smirnov - Mikhailchenko, Tomsk 2013.

4...d5. This move looks rather inconsistent for Black. 5.e5. Later, this pawn will cramp Black’s position considerably. 5...e4 6.cxd5 exd5 7.b5 b4 8.ge2 0-0 (It is not preferable for him to choose 8...f5, Stirb - Manolache, Timisoara 2006, 9.0-0 0-0 10.e4 xe4 xe4 11.g3± and after the retreat of Black’s light-squared bishop, White will begin an offensive on the kingside with f2-f4-f5.) 9.0-0 xc3 10.bxc3 e7 11. c2 f6 12.exf6 xf6 13.d3 g6, Ju – T.Kosintseva, Sochi 2009.

Black’s king is vulnerable (This is because of the absence of the pawn on f7.) and later, White can prepare an attack on the kingside (f2-f4-f5), or choose the more reliable move 14.e1!? ± followed by f4-e6.

5.e5 e4 6.c2 d5

6...xc3 7.bxc3 e7 (7...xd4?? 8.d3+−; 7.a5 8.f3 e7 9.d3 d6 10.0-0 d7 11.a3± – The pressure on the a3-f8 diagonal is very unpleasant for Black, Zinovjev – Iljin, Alushta 2010.) 8.d3 h6, Gygli – Heilimo, Munich 1936, 9.e2!± followed by g4 and powerful pressure against the g7-square.

7.f3

White has occupied plenty of space. He is not afraid of the doubling of his pawns on the c-file, because he can always get rid of his doubled pawns by simply exchanging on d5.

7...f6
Black wishes to get rid of the pawn on e5 which cramps his position considerably.

About 7...f5 8.exf6 – see 7...f6.

Following 7...\textit{xc}3, Black will be forced to waste some more time for the retreat of his bishop and this is detrimental to his chances. 8.bxc3 \textit{e}7 9.d3 \textit{h}6 (9...dxe4 10.\textit{xc}4 0–0 11.0–0 \textit{a}5 12.d3 \textit{h}6, V.Terentjev – Yaksin, Izhevsk 2010, 13.\textit{e}2+– followed by \textit{e}4. Here, you can see the defects of the weakened shelter of his king after the move h7-h6. If Black defends against the checkmate with the move g7-g6, then he will lose his h6-pawn.) 10.0–0 0–0 11.\textit{e}2 \textit{a}5 12.cxd5 exd5 13.\textit{c}2± and Black will have great problems to parry the threat \textit{d}3, again because of the move h7-h6, which has weakened his king, Shvedchikov – Petrov, Moscow 1995.

After 7...\textit{a}5, Gossell – Fernandez, Lindsborg 2004, White can simply ignore that move and continue calmly with his development: 8.e2!? \textit{b}4 9.\textit{b}3± – It has become unclear what Black has achieved with the manoeuvres \textit{b}4-a5 and \textit{c}6-b4.

8.exf6 \textit{xf}6 9.a3
White is forced to lose a tempo in order to force the exchange on c3, but this does not compromise his position.

9...\textit{xc}3+ 10.bxc3
White’s pawn on d4 is reliably protected now.

10...0–0
Black’s position is very difficult after 10...h6 11.d3 \textit{d}6 12.c5 \textit{f}7 13.0–0 e5 14.dxe5 \textit{fxe}5 15.\textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 16.\textit{b}5+! \textit{c}6 17.f4 \textit{g}4 18.d3 \textit{e}7 19.\textit{g}6± and his king has lost its castling rights and may come under attack later, Kuosmanen – Pesonen, Email 2011, as well as following 10...\textit{d}6 11.g5 \textit{f}7 12.d3 dxc4 13.xh7 \textit{f}5 14.xf5 exf5 15.0–0 \textit{e}6 16.\textit{f}1± and later \textit{f}4 and \textit{g}5 and Black’s monarch will have problems to find reliable shelter on the kingside, Quesada Perez – Olivera Medrano, Camaguey 1999.

11.d3
White eyes Black’s most active piece.

11...\textit{a}5
After 11...b6 12.0–0 \textit{b}7, F. Gonzalez – Ogaard, Oslo 2012,
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13.a4!? h6 14.\textit{a}3 \textit{fe8} 15.\textit{fe}1±
White remains with two powerful
bishops, while Black's e6-pawn is
very weak.

\textbf{12.0–0 b6 13.\textit{e}5 \textit{h}4}

\textbf{14.cxd5!?}

This move is stronger than
14.a4 \textit{a}6± Ivanchuk – Aronian,
Warsaw 2003, although White
maintains the edge even then, but
the possible exchange of the light-
squared bishops is in favour of
Black.

\textbf{14...exd5 15.\textit{a}4±} followed by
\textit{a}3 and \textit{ae}1 and the powerful
position of his knight on e5, com-
bined with his two-bishop advan-
tage, provide White with a clear
edge.

\textbf{B) 3...e5}

This is the strongest move for
Black. He provokes the move d4-
d5 and later, would try to develop
his bishop to c5, or to b4, with the
idea to organize counterplay on
the dark squares.

\textbf{4.d5}

\textbf{4...\textit{e}7}

This is Black's most popular
response.

4...\textit{a}5. This retreat of the
knight to the edge of the board
seems very bad. 5.e4 \textit{b}4 6.\textit{c}2
b6 7.d3 0–0 8.a3 \textit{xc}3+ 9.\textit{xc}3±
White has more space and the
two-bishop advantage, Pacher –

4...\textit{d}4. This knight will not
remain in the centre for long. 5.e3
\textit{f}5 6.\textit{f}3 d6 7.e4 \textit{e}7. Black has
lost too much time on manoeu-
vres with his knight. 8.c5! \textit{g}6 9.
\textit{b}5± White accomplishes the fa-
vourable trade of the light-squared
bishops for similar positions, Yu-
nusov – Frink, Istanbul 2012.

4...\textit{b}8. Strangely enough,
this retreat of the knight to its ini-
tial square is not so bad. 5.\textit{f}3! It
is good for White to provoke the
move d7-d6, so that Black's bish-
op should remain closed inside
his own camp. 5...d6 6.e4
6...\textit{e}7 7.h3 0–0 8.\textit{e}3 a5 9.\textit{d}3 \textit{a}6 10.a3 \textit{b}6 11.b4 axb4 12.axb4 \textit{d}7 13.\textit{b}1 \textit{h}6 14.0–0± 
White exploits the tempi, presented by Black, and begins an offensive on the queenside, while Black's counterplay on the opposite side of the board is obviously too slow, Pracejus – Ohtake, Email 2000.

After 6...\textit{bd}7 7.\textit{e}2 \textit{e}7 8.0–0 0–0 9.a3 a5 10.\textit{c}2 \textit{c}5 11.\textit{e}3 \textit{a}6 12.h3 \textit{d}7 13.\textit{ab}1± followed by b2-b4 and c4-c5, White seizes completely the initiative on the queenside, Macchiagodena – Aminta, Email 2006.

6...g6 7.\textit{d}3 \textit{g}7 8.\textit{e}3 a5 9.0–0 \textit{a}6 10.a3 0–0 11.\textit{c}2 \textit{h}6 12.h3 \textit{h}5 13.\textit{d}2± Mjasoedov – Gubanov, Simferopol 2004. The arising position resembles the King's Indian Defence, except that Black has lost several tempi. After \textit{ab}1, followed by b2-b4, White's prospects seem preferable.

5.h4!? 
This move is not played so often, but still, it is very unpleasant for Black. Now, he must either refrain from transferring his knight to the g6-square, or weaken his position with the move h7-h5.

5...\textit{h}5

Black can play the move 5...\textit{eg}8, which seems rather original, but still insufficient to maintain the equality. This is in fact the only position in the chess theory in which after five moves Black will have his queen's knight on g8 and not the king's knight. 6.e3. In this variation, White often refrains from the move e2-e4 in favour of the more modest move e2-e3, because from there his pawn controls the d4 and f4-squares, impeding Black's counterplay on the dark squares. 6...h5. This is a very important decision, leading to the weakening of the g5-square (It is possible that Black should better choose here 6...d6!? 7.\textit{f}3 \textit{e}7 8.\textit{e}2±, preserving a cramped but still quite defensible position.). 7.\textit{f}3 \textit{g}4 8.\textit{g}5 \textit{e}7 9.f3 \textit{h}4 10.\textit{c}2 \textit{xg}5 11.hxg5 \textit{xg}5 12.\textit{b}5± Black has an extra pawn, but his position remains very difficult. 12...
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\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{d8} 13. \text{d6} \text{c6} 14. \text{c7} \text{b8} 15. \text{e4} \\
\text{g3} + 16. \text{f2} \text{xf2} + 17. \text{xf2} \text{g6}, Turov – Arnaudov, Dieren 2011, 18. \text{c5} \text{b6} 19. \text{e3} \text{bxc5} 20. \text{b3} + -,
\end{array} \]

Black’s pieces are practically completely stalemated.

After 5...d6 6.e4 g6 (It is bad for Black to play 6...\text{g6}, Bareev – Riff, Ajaccio 2007, because of 7.h5± and he cannot follow with 7...\text{f4}?. 8.g3 and he will be forced to give up his two knights for White’s rook and a pawn.) 7.\text{e2}. There has arisen a very favourable version for White of the King’s Indian Defence. 7...h5. This move leads to the weakening of the g5-square (It is not preferable for Black to opt for 7...\text{g7} 8.h5± followed by g2-g4.). 8.\text{f3} \text{g7} 9. \text{g5} 0–0 (9...c5 10.f3 a6 11.\text{e3} \text{d7} 12.a3 0–0 13.\text{d2} \text{b8} 14.b4 b6 15.0–0± and due to the weakness on g5, Black can hardly organize counterplay on the kingside, Estremera Panos – Todorcevic, Zaragoza 1995.) 10.f3 c6 11. \text{e3} a6 12.\text{d2}± White exploits his space advantage and can prepare active actions on the queenside, Hoffman – Todorcevic, Ponnerrada 1992.

Black plays sometimes 5...\text{f5} and White’s best reaction against that would be 6.\text{d3}, for example: 6...g6 7.\text{f3} \text{g4} (7...d6 8.h5±) 8.h5 \text{c5} 9.e3 d6, Goldin – Vlassov, St Petersburg 1994, 10.\text{d2} 0–0 11.\text{e4} \text{b6} 12.\text{hxg6} \text{fxg6} 13.\text{fg5}± and the powerful position of the knight on e4 provides White with a stable advantage.

6.\text{g5} \text{g6}

Following 6...d6 7.e4 \text{d7}, Degtiiarev – Ernst, Groningen 2006, 8.\text{e2} g6 9.\text{f3}± Black lags in development due to the lost tempi in the beginning of the game on manoeuvres with his knights.

7.\text{e3}

\[ \begin{array}{c}
7...\text{e7}
\end{array} \]

It is not preferable for Black to play 7...\text{b4} 8.\text{ge2} \text{f8} 9. \text{g3} \text{h7} 10.\text{hxg5} \text{xg5} 11.\text{hxg5} \text{xh5} 12.\text{xh5} \text{xc3}+ 13.\text{bxc3} \text{hxg5} 14.\text{hx5}± and in the game Girya – I.Vasilevich, Tyumen 2012, White managed to realise his extra pawn.

8.\text{d3} d6

Following 8...\text{f8}, White has the resource 9.\text{a4}?!± and Black will hardly succeed in advancing d7-d6.
9.\(\text{d}f3\) \(\text{d}f8\)

He cannot equalise with 9... \(\text{d}g4\) 10.\(\text{c}c2\) \(\text{d}f8\), Richter – Vidit, Paris 2010, 11 \(\text{w}xe7\) 12.\(\text{g}5\)± White has much more space and can play later f2-f3, ousting his opponent’s knight from its active position.

10.\(\text{d}d2\) \(\text{g}4\) 11.\(\text{x}xe7\) \(\text{w}xe7\) 12.\(\text{w}e2\) \(f5\) 13.\(f3\) \(\text{d}f6\) 14.0–0–0± (diagram)

Black’s position is cramped and he lags in development too. 14...c6?! (It seems more reliable for him to continue with 14...a6?!), but even then after 15.\(\text{b}b1\)± White’s prospects seem preferable in the forthcoming complicated middle game.) 15.e4 \(f4\). White opens advantageously the game with a temporary pawn-sacrifice. 16.c5 dxc5 17.\(\text{c}c4\) \(\text{g}6\) 18. dxc6 bxc6 19.\(\text{a}a5\) \(\text{w}c7\) 20.\(\text{b}b3\) 0–0 21.\(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{h}7\) 22.\(\text{c}c4\)± White has regained the sacrificed material and has better prospects thanks to the powerful position of his knight on c5 and the vulnerability of Black’s pawn on c6, Ivanchuk – Bauer, Cap d’Agde 2012.

**Conclusion**

As can be expected, such early “dancing” of Black’s knights cannot bring him equality. White occupies space with simple moves and obtains the advantage. Black’s main problems are caused by his knight on c6, since he can hardly find a good place for it. The best square for this knight is no doubt the g6-square, but White plays h2-h4 forcing his opponent to weaken the g5-square. Its vulnerability will hurt Black deep into the middle game. Still, we should not forget that White often refrains from the move e2-e4 and plays the more modest move e2-e3, taking the d4 and f4-squares under control, impeding Black’s counterplay on the dark squares.
After this move there arises the Indian Defence on the board (naturally, if Black does not transpose later to the King’s Indian Defence with g7-g6). This move was very popular during the 50ies of the past century. At that period, the players who liked the King’s Indian Defence used that tricky order of moves in order to avoid the Saemisch System. The same thing applies to the Averbakh System as well. White cannot prevent the pawn-advance e7-e5 with the move 3.\( \text{c3} \), because after that Black may play 3...g6. The move 2...d6 is not so popular, but still, it has been encountered in the grandmaster practice as well. S. Movsesian plays often like this (indeed, mostly in games with a shorter time-control). It has been tested also by E. Bacrot, L. Fressinet, B. Jobava, P. Svidler and many other grandmasters.

3.\( \text{c3} \)

This is a good move. White develops his pieces and prepares e2-e4 ignoring his opponent’s possible counterplay, connected with e7-e5.

Now, Black’s most logical move is B) 3...e5, or the preliminary move 3...\( \text{bd7} \) followed by e7-e5 (We will devote to this move the next chapter .). Before that however, we will deal with A) 3...

After 3...\( \text{c6} \), White should play immediately 4.d5!??, without waiting for e7-e5. 4...\( \text{e5} \) 5.e4 g6, This is the best for Black. (It seems weaker for him to try 5...e6 6.f4 \( \text{g6} \) 7.dxe6 fx6 8.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e7} \) 9.\( \text{d3} \) 0-0 10.0-0± Albrecht – Holler, Wuerttemberg 1992, as well as 5...c6 6.f4 \( \text{g6} \) 7.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{b6} \) 8.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g4} \) 9.h3 \( \text{xf3} \) 10.\( \text{xf3} \)± Ivanisevic – Masic, Belgrade
2006 and in both variations White’s game is noticeably freer.
Here, White’s simplest decision would be 6.\e2 \g7 and there arises a favourable version of the King’s Indian Defence – see volume 2, Chapter 6.

3...c6 4.e4 e5 (About 4...\bd7 5.\e3 – see Chapter 13, while following 4...g6 5.\e2 \g7 6.\g5, there arises transposition to the King’s Indian Defence – see volume 2, Chapter 6.) 5.d5. White occupies space. 5...\e7 6.f3 0-0 (6...\bd7 7.\e3 0-0 – see Chapter 13, variation C) 7.\e3 a6 8.\wd2 b5. Black begins active actions on the queenside, but as it is well known – pawns do not go back in chess (8...\xd5 9.\xd5 b5 10.\d3 \bd7 11.\ge2 – see Chapter 13, variation C). 9.\d1 b4, Sakaev – Svidler, Tivat 1995 (following 9...\xc4 10.\xc4 c5 11.\ge2 \bd7 12.\g3 White maintains an edge, since he has more space, moreover that the vulnerability of Black’s pawn on a6 may tell in the future, Sakaev – Jansa, Pardubice 1997). Now, White has a slight but stable advantage after 10.\a4!? c5 11.\xc5 dxc5 12.d6+, regaining his piece. Black’s c5-pawn is weak.

A) 3...\f5
This is not the best move for Black, since he fails to prevent the move e2-e4, so he will have to lose a tempo later for the retreat of his bishop.

4.g3!
This is White’s most precise move. White prepares the flank development of his bishop and from where it will control the key e4-square for this variation.

Unfortunately for him, the other possibility to prepare the pawn-advance e2-e4 would not work for White, because after 4.f3, Black has a tactical possibility, which provides him with a very good game – 4...e5 5.d5 and here 5...e4!, after which White is obliged to play 6.\d4 In the forthcoming complicated fight the chances are mutual, since White will have difficulties with the development of his pieces (\g1), moreover that his queen has been developed a bit too early.

After 6.g4, Black has an exquisite combination which leads to a perpetual check – 6...\xg4! 7.fxg4 \h4+ 8.\d2 e3+! Now, White’s king cannot be evacuated to the queenside. 9.\xe3 \g5+ 10.\f2, draw, Malakhov – Svidler, St Petersburg 2005.
4...e5

This is the most natural move for Black. He advances e7-e5, increasing the pressure against the d4-square.

About 4...c6 5.\texttt{g2} \texttt{bd7} (5...e5 6.\texttt{f3} – see 4...e5; 5...g6 6.e4 – see 4...g6) 6.\texttt{f3} e5 7.0-0 – see 4...e5.

Unfortunately for Black, he cannot provoke the favourable for him exchange of the knights after 4...\texttt{e4}, since White can counter that with the powerful resource 5.\texttt{d3}! This is the point. Now White exchanges his knight on c3 for the enemy bishop on f5 after which his two powerful bishops guarantee his advantage in all the variations. 5...d5 6.\texttt{xd5} \texttt{xc3} 7.\texttt{xf5} \texttt{xd5} 8.a3 e6 (8...\texttt{c6} 9.\texttt{f3} g6 10.\texttt{d3} \texttt{g7} 11.\texttt{g2} \texttt{b6} 12.0-0 0-0 13.\texttt{d1} Khenkin – Scal­cione, Saint Vincent 2002. White has protected reliably his d4-pawn against the attacks of the enemy pieces. In the forthcoming fight White’s light-squared bish­
op will play a decisive role exert­
ing powerful pressure on the long diagonal. You should not forget that he dominates in the centre too.) 9.\texttt{c2} \texttt{d7} 10.\texttt{g2} \texttt{e7} 11.\texttt{f3} 0-0 12.0-0 c5 13.\texttt{xc5} \texttt{xc5} 14.\texttt{d1}± Tratar – Sutkovic, Zupan­ja 2008. The position in the cen­
tre has been opened. This is no doubt in favour of White, since the power of his two bishops in­
creases in open positions as it is well known.

Naturally, Black cannot equal­ise with 4...g6, because after 5.\texttt{g2} he cannot prevent e2-e4.
White can attack it with his bishop from e3 or a3. Black has no pawn weaknesses in his position; nevertheless, White's advantage is doubtless.

It is obviously bad for Black to play 5...c6, because after that White wins tempi attacking not only the bishop on f5, but the enemy knight as well. 6.d5 b8 7.e4± After the retreat of the bishop, there arises a position with the development of the bishop to g2 in the King's Indian Defence, but with the loss of two tempi for Black (two on knight moves b8-c6-b8 and one for the retreat of the bishop from the f5-square.).

After 5...c6 6.e4 e6 7.wh2, Black is incapable of exerting pressure against White's powerful pawn-centre. 7...b6 8.d3 g7 9.0–0 0–0 10.h3 h6. In the game Gaprindashvili – Hickl, Biel 1988, White opened advantageously the game in the centre with: 11.d5 d7 12.e5 dxe5 13.dxe5 cxd5 14.cxd5± and in the arising standard position with an isolated pawn, he had the advantage thanks to his better developed pieces.

5.g2

White exploits the defencelessness of the b7-pawn and develops his bishop with tempo to an active position.

(diagram)

5...c6

Black restricts the pressure of White's bishop, but now his knight cannot go to c6 to exert pressure against the d4-square.

It seems more ambitious for Black to play here 5...c6, but even then after the simple move 6.d3!? White maintains the opening advantage.

6.g6 7.g5 g7 8.dxe5 dxe5 9.wxd8+ (It is also good for White to choose here 9.wb3!?±, preserving a slight edge in the middle game.) 9...xd8, Perun – Dolzhikova, Kiev 2004, 10.xf6 xf6 11.d5± and thanks to the double attack, White wins a pawn, but his edge will be minimal, since Black's bishops are very powerful.

6...wd7 7.0–0 e7 (Black is behind in development anyway, so he has no time for prophylac-
tics. 7...h6, Lugovoi – Jusic, Neum 2002. Here, White could have obtained a great advantage with the line: 8.dxe5! dxe5 9.\textit{\textit{W}a}4± followed by \textit{\textit{D}d}1 and Black can hardly neutralise White’s piece-pressure due to his considerable lag in development.) 8.d5. White attacks the enemy knight and wins tempi in order to organise his offensive on the queenside. 8...\textit{\textit{B}b}4 9.\textit{\textit{D}h}4. The two-bishop advantage is always useful. 9...a5 10.a3 \textit{\textit{B}a}6 11.\textit{\textit{D}x}f5 \textit{\textit{W}x}f5 12.\textit{\textit{W}}a4+ \textit{\textit{D}d}7 13.e4 \textit{\textit{W}}h5 14.b4± White has seized completely the initiative on the queenside, while Black’s knights are horribly misplaced. One of them is at the edge of the board and the defencelessness of the other does not allow him to castle, Zhao – V.Smirnov, Tuggeranong 2007.

It would not work for Black to play 5...exd4, because in that case White can calmly collect the exchange with 6.\textit{\textit{D}x}b7! dxc3 7 c2. (It is understandable that Black’s pawn on c2 is not supported by the rest of Black’s forces and cannot create any serious problems for White, but even after 7...c6, Mozetic – Kovacevic, Tivat 1995, White can obtain an advantage by sending his queen to help the isolated bishop. 8.\textit{\textit{W}}a4± Black’s compensation for the exchange is insufficient.) 8.\textit{\textit{W}}d4 c6, Grinev – Kislinsky, Kiev 2007. Here, White had to play 9.\textit{\textit{W}}xa7±, after which his material advantage would be considerable. He only needs to make two moves in order to evacuate his king away from the centre: \textit{\textit{D}f}3 and 0–0.

The character of the fight is not changed after 6...\textit{\textit{W}}c7, because White can obtain a comfortable position playing like in the main line: 7.0–0 h6 8.\textit{\textit{D}h}4 \textit{\textit{W}}h7 9.e4 \textit{\textit{D}e}7 10.\textit{\textit{D}f}5± Black cannot put up with the knight on f5 for long, so after \textit{\textit{D}x}f5 White will obtain the two-bishop advantage.

7.0–0

![Diagram](image)

7...\textit{\textit{h}6}

This is necessary prophylactic on order to prevent the exchange of the bishop.

Following 7...\textit{\textit{D}e}7, White can provoke an advantageous trade of his knight for the enemy bishop with the move 8.\textit{\textit{D}h}4!

(diagram)

Now, Black ends up in a difficult position after 8...\textit{\textit{g}4} 9.h3
h5 (His defence would not be facilitated after an opening of the game in the centre with 9...exd4, because White’s pieces are better developed. 10.hxg4 dxc3 11.g5 \textit{h}5 12.\textit{f}5 \textit{e}5, Christiansen – Shirazi, New York 1989. Here, after energetic centralization of his queen 13.\textit{d}4!+– White could have obtained a decisive advantage, because Black’s knight on \textit{h}5 would be horribly misplaced at the edge of the board. He has no satisfactory defence against g3-g4.)

10.\textit{d}5 c5 11.\textit{b}3 b6 12.\textit{f}5± Black has succeeded in avoiding the exchange of his light-squared bishop; nevertheless, his position is very difficult. White’s knight is very powerful on \textit{f}5 and he is perfectly prepared to develop his initiative in the centre and on the kingside with e2-e4, f2-f4 and eventually g2-g4.

It is possible that Black’s best chance may be 8...\textit{g}6, although even then after 9.d5 \textit{c}8, Koneru – Krasenkov, Wijk aan Zee 2008, White would maintain an edge following 10.\textit{a}4!? d\textit{c}5 11.\textit{a}3 a5 12.\textit{e}3± and his pieces would exert powerful pressure against Black’s queenside.

8.\textit{h}4

White is preparing to occupy the centre with e2-e4.

8...\textit{h}7 9.e4 \textit{e}7

Black would not facilitate his defence if he gives up the centre with 9...exd4, because after 10.\textit{xd}4 \textit{e}7 11.\textit{f}5 \textit{xf}5 12.exf5 0–0 13.\textit{f}4± White would have not only the two bishop advantage, but would attack the weak enemy d6-pawn, Ulibin – Bielczyk, Berlin 1994.

10.\textit{e}3 0–0 11.\textit{f}5


11...\textit{xf}5 12.exf5

(diagram)

12...exd4

This exchange is not bad at all, despite the fact that White has the two-bishop advantage and the opening of the position is in his favour. The point is that Black ob-
tains control over two important squares for his knights – c5 and e5.

Black’s defence would not be any easier after the super-solid move 12...\texttt{e}8, Espig – Vorotnikov, Germany 1998. Following 13.d5 c5 14.\texttt{We}2 \texttt{wc}7 15.\texttt{d}2 a6 16.a4 \texttt{ch}7 17.h4= Black will hardly manage to parry White’s kingside offensive, since his pieces lack space.

13.\texttt{xd}4 \texttt{wa}5 14.\texttt{wc}2 \texttt{fe}8

It is obviously bad for Black to play 14...d5?! , because after 15.\texttt{cx}d5 \texttt{dx}d5 16.\texttt{xd}5 \texttt{cx}d5 17.\texttt{wb}3± White’s bishops are very active, while Black’s d5-pawn is very weak, Ionescu – Nisipeanu, Bucharest 1994.

15.\texttt{ab}1 \texttt{ad}8 16.b4= White has begun a pawn-offensive on the queenside with his last move and despite the weakening of his pawn-structure (the doubled pawns on the f-file), his prospects seem preferable in the forthcoming fight, Ligterink – Miles, London 1981.

B) 3...e5
This is Black’s most logical move. He advances immediately e7–e5, after which White cannot enter positions of the King’s Indian type.

4.dxe5!?
This seemingly unpretentious exchange is full of venom. White is not trying to obtain a great advantage in the middle game, but prefers to maintain a slight but stable edge in the endgame. It is often used by a strong positional player like V. Epishin and before that it was tried by D. Bronstein, V. Smyslov, B. Spassky...

It is worth mentioning that after an exchange like this, White can rely on obtaining an advantage only with a pawn on e2. If his pawn had been on the e4-square, only Black might think about having an edge due to the permanent weakness of the d4-square.
4...dxe5 5.\texttt{\textsc{xd}}d8+ \texttt{\textsc{xd}}d8 6. \texttt{\textsc{f}}d3

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

It is understandable that White’s basic hopes are based on his lead in development, moreover that the placement of Black’s king on d8, despite the exchange of queens, may prove to be very bad for him, since there are still too many pieces left on the board.

Now, Black must choose how to protect his e5-pawn: B1) 6... \texttt{\textsc{fd}}d7 or B2) 6... \texttt{\textsc{bd}}d7.

6...\texttt{\textsc{d}}d6 7.\texttt{\textsc{xe}}3 c6 8.0–0–0 \texttt{\textsc{e}}7 9.\texttt{\textsc{g}}5 \texttt{\textsc{e}}6 10.\texttt{\textsc{xe}}6 \texttt{\textsc{xe}}6 11.\texttt{\textsc{g}}3 \texttt{\textsc{a}}6 12.\texttt{\textsc{h}}3+ \texttt{\textsc{e}}7, Skembris – Attard, Budva 1981. Here, White could have isolated the enemy knight on a6 from the actions with 13.a3!? There might follow: 13...\texttt{\textsc{c}}5 14.\texttt{\textsc{g}}5 \texttt{\textsc{hd}}8 15.\texttt{\textsc{e}}4 \texttt{\textsc{b}}6 16.b4± and White has not only the two-bishop advantage, but also actively placed pieces.

Following 6...\texttt{\textsc{c}}6 7.\texttt{\textsc{g}}5 \texttt{\textsc{e}}7 (7...\texttt{\textsc{e}}6 8.\texttt{\textsc{d}}5 \texttt{\textsc{b}}4+, Popovics – Mozes, Hungary 2008, 9.\texttt{\textsc{d}}d2 \texttt{\textsc{xd}}5 10.\texttt{\textsc{xf}}6+ \texttt{\textsc{g}}f6 11.\texttt{\textsc{c}}xd5 \texttt{\textsc{e}}7 12.0–0–0± White’s pawn-structure is preferable.) 8.0–0–0+ \texttt{\textsc{e}}8 9.e3 \texttt{\textsc{e}}6 (9...\texttt{\textsc{g}}4?! 10.\texttt{\textsc{e}}2 \texttt{\textsc{d}}d7 11.\texttt{\textsc{xe}}7 \texttt{\textsc{xe}}7 12.\texttt{\textsc{d}}5+ \texttt{\textsc{d}}8 13.\texttt{\textsc{d}}2± followed by \texttt{\textsc{he}}1, Legky – Okhotnik, Douai 1993. Black can hardly coordinate his pieces, because his king is horribly misplaced in the centre of the board, despite its being an endgame.)

10.\texttt{\textsc{e}}2 \texttt{\textsc{g}}4 11.\texttt{\textsc{xe}}7 \texttt{\textsc{xe}}7, Villega – Ravina, Spain 2011, 12.\texttt{\textsc{hf}}1 \texttt{\textsc{hd}}8 13.\texttt{\textsc{g}}5 f5 14.\texttt{\textsc{xe}}6 \texttt{\textsc{xd}}1+ 15.\texttt{\textsc{xd}}1 \texttt{\textsc{xe}}6 16.\texttt{\textsc{e}}4± Black has great difficulties to neutralise the activity of White’s pieces.

\textbf{B1) 6...\texttt{\textsc{fd}}d7}

This move looks a bit ugly since Black’s knight retreats, just like a crab. Still, the move is connected with a quite reasonable idea – to protect the pawn on e5 with the move f7–f6, which will restrict noticeably White’s knight on f3 (Black takes the g5-square under control.). In spite of all, White obtains effortlessly an advantage thanks to Black’s lag in development.

7.g4?*

This is a very original move.
Black will have to play f7–f6 sooner or later, so White prepares an attack against the pawn on f6 with the move g4–g5. After the exchange on f6, his rook will be very active on the open g-file and his bishop will be developed on h3.
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7...c6

This move is no doubt much more flexible than 7...f6.

The straightforward attempt 7...f6 after 8.g5! leads to a position in which White has a slight edge and a clear-cut plan for his further actions.

Following 8...f5, White's best reaction would be 9.d2 d6 10.0-0-0 – Black will have difficulties to complete the development of his queenside pieces, because his central pawn on e5 needs permanent protection.

8...c6 9.gxf6 gxf6 10.g1 a6 11.e3. White not only develops his bishop to an active position, taking the c5-square under control, but also prepares castling queenside. 11...e8 (Black cannot equalise with 11...b6, because after 12.b3± White's c4-pawn is reliably protected and Black's knight on b6 is very passive.) 12.h3 dc5 13.xc8. The exchange of the light-squared bishops is in favour of White, because the pawns on e5 and f6 are placed on dark-squares and Black's dark-squared bishop may turn out to be "bad" in the endgame. 13...xc8 14.a3! White is preparing b2-b4, after which Black's pieces will be deprived of the important c5-square. 14...b6 15.b4 e6 16.e4 f7 17.0–0–0! This is the most precise move for White. (He preserves a slight edge even after 17.d1: 17...d8 18.xd8 xd8 19.h4 b8 20.f4 d7 21.fxe5 fxe5 22.g5 b7 23.f1+ e8 24.f5 a5 25.b5 cxb5 26.cxb5± White's pieces are more actively deployed, but Black preserves some chances of saving the game, because there are just a few pawns left on the board, Ugge – David, ICCF 1999.) 17...b8 (Black loses immediately after 17...d8? in view of 18.xd8 xd8 19.d1 and he cannot prevent the penetration of the enemy rook to the d7-square, because after 19...e7 White has the resource 20.xe5+-) 18.h4 c7 19.b2. This is the main idea behind White's castling queenside. Now, after a7-a5, he will manage to protect his queenside pawns with the move b3. 19.d7 20.f5 xd1 21.xd1± White has a considera-
ble positional advantage in this endgame. His knights on f5 and e4 are very powerful and most of Black's pawns are placed on the same colour of squares as his bishop.

8. g5
White plays this move in spite of all!

8... b4
This is an active move. Black is threatening now to double his opponent’s pawns, so White should not play e3 and must occupy the more modest position on d2 with his bishop.

Following 8... c7, White obtains a slight advantage after 9. d2, for example: 9... c5 10. e4 e8 11. xc5!? This is the simplest. Now, White will have at least the two-bishop advantage. (It is not so clear after 11.0–0–0, because of 11... f8, Black avoids prudently the trade of his bishop. 12. c3, Solinski – Gemein, Germany 1995. Here, he could have created counterplay with 12... f5 13.gxf6 xf6+) 11... xc5 12. e3 ba6 13. g1. White should not let the enemy bishop to occupy the g4-square. 13... d7 14.0–0–0 ad8 15.b3 b6 16.h4 White has the two-bishop advantage, while Black's knight on a6 is misplaced.

9. d2 e8
This is a solid move after which obtaining an advantage with White is not a simple task.

9... a5. This move does not equalise for Black, because White manages to play a3 and b4. 10.a3 d6 11. e4 c7 12. c3 e7 13. g1!? (13.h4, Christiansen – Murshed, New York 1989, 13... h6?!) 13... a6 14.b4 d8 15. h3 axb4 16.axb4 White's pieces are very active, while Black's knight is misplaced on the a6-square.

10. d1
White should not waste a tempo for the move 10.a3, because in this variation Black's bishop often goes to the f8-square anyway. 10... f8= Zuev – S.Salov, Brno 1994.
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10...a5 11.h4
This is the beginning of a very original plan.
11...c7 12.h5 a6

13.h6!?
This is the idea of the advance of this flank pawn. White fixes the enemy pawn on h7 and now, Black must control permanently the f6-square; otherwise, White's knight will be headed along the route e4-f6-h7.
13...g6 14.a3 f8 15.h3
dc5 16.e3 b6 17.xc8
xc8 18.d2 cd8 19.e4
dxe4 20.xb6+ xb6 21.
xе4 xd1+ 22.xd1 d8+
23.c2 e7 24.e3± White maintains a slight edge despite the numerous exchanges, because his centralised knight is obviously stronger than Black's bishop.

B2) 6...bd7
After this natural move White must play very energetically, because if Black succeeds in completing his development, White's slight edge may evaporate.

7.g1!?
White wishes to implement the plan with the advance of his g-pawn, analogously to the previous variation, despite the placement of Black's knight on the f6-square.

7...h6
Besides this move, he has many other possibilities.

7...h5. One of the drawbacks of this move is that Black weakens the g5-square and White's knight is immediately headed there. 8.g5 e8 9.b5 d6, Jussupow – Bronstein, Moscow 1981, 10.g3!? He plans to develop his bishop on the long diagonal. 10.h4 11.g2 e7 12.d2 hxg3 13.hxg3 a6 14.
xd6 cxd6. White has a superior pawn-structure and two powerful bishops. He only needs to open maximally the position. 15.f4!± and Black has great problems in this endgame.

After 7...b6 8.g4 b7, the best move for White is 9.g2!?, impeding the exchange of the
1.d4 2.c4 d6 3.d3 c5 4.d4 e5 5.exd8 6 xd8 7.f3

knights for Black (It seems too hasty for White to play 9.g5, because of 9...\( \text{\textit{d}} \text{e}4 \) 10.\( \text{\textit{e}} \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{\textit{xe}4} \) = and having simplified the position by trading the knights, Black has nothing to be afraid of in the future, Eljanov – Prokopchuk, Moscow 1999). 9...\( \text{\textit{b}} \text{b}8 \). He must lose time in order to protect his bishop (Black loses immediately after 9...\( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e}4? \) 10.\( \text{\textit{g}} \text{g}5+- , as well as following 9...\( \text{\textit{x}} \text{g}4? \) 10.\( \text{\textit{g}} \text{g}5+- ) 10.g5. Now is the right time for White to oust the enemy knight to a passive position. 10...\( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e}8 \) 11.b3 \( \text{\textit{c}} \text{c}5 \) 12.\( \text{\textit{b}} \text{b}2 \) \( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}6 \) 13.\( \text{\textit{a}} \text{a}4 \) \( \text{\textit{b}} \text{b}4+ \) 14.\( \text{\textit{f}} \text{f}1 \) f6 15.gxf6 gxf6 16.\( \text{\textit{h}} \text{h}3 \)+ and in the arising complicated endgame, White has the initiative, because Black will have great problems to defend against the penetration of the enemy rook to the penultimate rank.

White should not be afraid of the pin of the knight: 7...\( \text{\textit{b}} \text{b}4 \) 8.\( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}2 \) \( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e}8 \), Glavas – Dizdarevic, Sarajevo 1998, 9.\( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}1 \) c6 10.g4 h6 11.g5 hxg5 12.\( \text{\textit{x}} \text{g}5 \) \( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e}7 \) 13.a3 \( \text{\textit{x}} \text{xc}3 \) 14.\( \text{\textit{x}} \text{xc}3 \)+ Despite some weakening of White’s pawn-structure (his h2-pawn), the position should be evaluated in his favour. He has the two-bishop advantage (his dark-squared bishop is particularly strong, since it has no opponent) and Black still needs time to complete his development.

7...c6. This is a reliable move. Black takes the d5-square under control and frees the c7-square for his king. Still, White has sufficient resources to maintain his opening advantage. 8.g4 h6 9.h4

9...e4. This is Black’s best move. 10.\( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}4 \) \( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e}5 \) 11.g5 hxg5 12.\( \text{\textit{x}} \text{g}5 \) \( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e}8 \), Karasev – Dvoretzky, Minsk 1976, 13.b3± The queens have been exchanged; nevertheless, Black’s king is not safe on d8. White must only develop his dark-squared bishop and castle queenside after which Black will have great problems with the safety of his king.

It is not so good for him to play 9...\( \text{\textit{b}} \text{b}4 \), because the defencelessness of this bishop may be an important factor in the oncoming battle. 10.\( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}2 \) \( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e}8 \) 11.\( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}1 \) \( \text{\textit{c}} \text{c}7 \), Kachiani_Gersinska – Remmler, Badenweiler 1990. Here, White could have begun decisive actions: 12.\( \text{\textit{b}} \text{b}5+! \) cxb5 13.\( \text{\textit{x}} \text{xb}4 \) bxc4 14.g5 \( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e}4 \) (14...hxg5? 15.\( \text{\textit{x}} \text{g}5+- ) 15.gxh6 gxh6 16.\( \text{\textit{g}} \text{g}7 \)+ Black’s extra pawn is absolutely immaterial. White’s pieces are tremendously active, while Black will have great problems to complete the development of his kingside and to avoid the material losses.
8.g4 e4
After this move, there arise complications which are in favour of White.
8...c6 9.h4 – see 7...c6.

9.g5
This is the beginning of active actions.

It is also good for White to play here simply 9.d4!?, for example: 9...b4, Epishin – Romanishin, Bratto 2002 (White obtains more than sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn after 9...e5 10.g5 hxg5 11.xg5 xc4 12.0–0–0 Black lags considerably in development) 10.d2 b6 11.xe4 xe4 12.xb4 c5. Unfortunately for him this move does not win a piece, since White has the resource 13.g2± and in the oncoming fight his prospects are preferable due to his considerable lead in development.

9...exf3 10.gxf6 xf6
This is the best move for Black.
It is obviously weaker for him to choose 10...gxf6, which would lead to hopeless compromising of his kingside pawn-structure. 11.f4! White does not lose a tempo for regaining of his pawn and tries instead to develop his pieces as quickly as possible. 11...c6 12.0–0–0 e8 13.e4 e7 14.d6+ xd6 15.xd6 e5 16.exf3 e6, Rowson – Turner, Sunningdale 2008, 17.c5 xf3 18.g3 e5 19.f4 d7 20.b3± Black has an extra doubled pawn, but it is completely useless, while White’s powerful bishops control the entire board. It is also worth remembering that Black’s king has lost its castling rights and its placement in the centre of the board does not beautify his position either.

11.exf3 c6
After 11...e6 12.f4!? c8 13.0–0–0 h5 14.e3±, despite the weakening of White’s kingside pawn-structure, his chances are preferable since Black can hardly coordinate his pieces.

12.e3 e6 13.0–0–0+ c7 14.f4+ c8 15.e4±
After this move, Black is forced to exchange on e4 in order to neutralise the activity of his opponent's pieces and this will correct the defects of White's pawn-structure.

15...\texttt{\textblacksquare}xe4 16.fxe4 g6 17.\texttt{\textblacksquare}e5 \texttt{\textblacksquare}g8 18.f4 \texttt{\textblacksquare}c5 19.\texttt{\textblacksquare}g3 \texttt{\textblacksquare}e8 20.\texttt{\textblacksquare}h3

20...\texttt{\textblacksquare}xh3

It is possibly more precise for Black to play here 20...\texttt{\textblacksquare}b6, but even then White maintains a slight edge since his pieces are more active.

21.\texttt{\textblacksquare}xh3 \texttt{\textblacksquare}d8

Black must sacrifice his h6-pawn now, because after 21...h5 22.\texttt{\textblacksquare}hd3 White will penetrate decisively with his rook to the d7-square.

22.\texttt{\textblacksquare}xh6 \texttt{\textblacksquare}xd1+ 23.\texttt{\textblacksquare}xd1±

\textbf{Conclusion}

We have just finished the analysis of the variations in the Indian Defence connected with 3...\texttt{\textblacksquare}f5 and 3...e5. After 3...\texttt{\textblacksquare}f5 4.g3, White obtains easily an advantage in the opening, because he establishes effortlessly control over the key e4-square and practically renders Black's third move senseless. Later, White often obtains the two-bishop advantage after \texttt{\textblacksquare}g1-f3-h4 (followed by \texttt{\textblacksquare}f5 or \texttt{\textblacksquare}xg6) and thanks to the more active placement of his pieces, his prospects in the forthcoming middle game are preferable.

White's task is more complicated after 3...e5, but even then he can rely on having an edge in the arising endgame thanks to his lead in development. The most important feature of White's plan is the pawn-advance g2-g4-g5, as a rule, with the support of his rook on g1. Later, his light-squared bishop is developed to h3 (or g2), his knight occupies an excellent position on the e4-square and White castles queenside after the preliminary moves \texttt{\textblacksquare}e3 or \texttt{\textblacksquare}d2.
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1. d4  \( \text{\textregistered} f6 \) 2. c4  d6 3. \( \text{\textregistered} c3 \)  \( \text{\textregistered} bd7 \)

Now, contrary to 3...e5, after 3...\( \text{\textregistered} bd7 \) there arise more complicated positions, because White cannot transfer to a slightly better endgame with 4.dxe5.

Therefore, he will have to enter a complex middle game, which resembles the King’s Indian Defence, because of the pawn-structure, except that Black can develop his dark-squared bishop both to g7 as well as to e7.

The remarkable Russian player Mikhail Chigorin used to play like this at the beginning of the last century and sometimes even Capablanca tried this variation.

Presently, as a rule, this order of moves is used by players whose opening repertoire includes the King’s Indian Defence, for example grandmasters V. Akopian, V. Bologan, S. Movsesian...

4.e4

White occupies the centre with his pawns just like in the King’s Indian Defence.

4...e5

Black accomplishes this thematic pawn-advance for this variation.

About 4...g6 5.\( \text{\textregistered} e2 \)  \( \text{\textregistered} g7 \) 6.\( \text{\textregistered} g5 \) – see volume 2, Chapter 6.

4...c6 5.\( \text{\textregistered} e3 \) e5 6.d5  \( \text{\textregistered} e7 \) 7.f3 – see variation C.

4...c5 5.d5 g6 (5...e5 6.\( \text{\textregistered} e2 \) \( \text{\textregistered} g7 \) 7.\( \text{\textregistered} g5 \) 0–0 8.\( \text{\textregistered} d2 \) – there arises transposition to a favourable for White variation of the King’s Indian Defence (see volume 2, Chapter 11).

5.d5

White is occupying space.
Now, the actions are focused on the flanks and Black must make up his mind where he will develop his dark-squared bishop. In this position we will analyse A) 5...g6, B) 5...c5 and C) 5...e7.

There do not arise original positions after 5...a5 6.e3 e7 (6...c5 7.f3 – see 5...c5) 7.f3 or 5...c6 6.e3 e7 7.f3 – see 5...e7.

A) 5...g6
After this move, there arises a position from the King’s Indian Defence, but not from the Averbakh System, which we have analysed in our previous volume, but from the Saemisch System. White does not need to regret this, since at first, these two systems are very similar from the point of view of strategy and secondly, in the Saemisch system the plan with e7-e5 is only seldom played in the last twenty years (Black prefers to undermine his opponent’s centre from the other side with c7-c5.), or even if he plays e7-e5, then after d4-d5, Black opens the c-file with c7-c6, which with a knight on d7 will be hardly possible due to the vulnerability of the d6-pawn.

6.e3
White is preparing to castle queenside.

6...g7 7.f3
Before playing Wd2, White takes the g4-square under control, depriving his opponent of the possibility to attack his bishop and protecting his e4-pawn once again. This is useful, since Black can always attack it again with the move c5.

7...0-0
He can hardly continue the game without castling, for example: 7...h5 8.Wd2 f5 9.0-0 0-0 9...c5 7.f3 or 5...c6 6.e3 e7 7.f3 – see 5...e7.

8.Wd2

8...h5
Black must advance f7-f5 sooner or later, so he must retreat his knight. This is an active move,
because from this square the knight may go later to f4.

8...\(\text{\texttt{d}}\text{e8}\). This move seems more passive. 9.\(\text{\texttt{d}}\text{d3}\). White develops his bishop to an active position before deploying his knight on e2.

9...\(\text{\texttt{d}}\text{c5}\) 10.\(\text{\texttt{c}}\text{c2}\) \(\text{\texttt{f}}\text{5}\) (about 10...a5 11.\(\text{\texttt{d}}\text{ge2}\) \(\text{\texttt{f}}\text{5}\) 12.\(\text{\texttt{e}}\text{xf5}\) gxf5 13.0-0-0 – see 9...f5) 11.\(\text{\texttt{e}}\text{xf5}\) \(\text{\texttt{xf5}}\). Black is trying to play actively, but just like in the many variations of the King’s Indian Defence the trade of the light-squared bishops will be obviously in favour of White. 12.0-0-0 a6 13.\(\text{\texttt{d}}\text{ge2}\) \(\text{\texttt{c}}\text{5}\) 14.b4. This is a typical move for the Saemisch System. In it White often organises a pawn-offensive on the queenside without being afraid of weakening his king, since he has more pieces on this side of the board than his opponent (Black can hardly bring to the queenside his bishop on g7 and the knight on e8.). 14...\(\text{\texttt{a}}\text{a4}\) 15.\(\text{\texttt{d}}\text{xa4}\) bxa4 16.\(\text{\texttt{d}}\text{xa4}\) \(\text{\texttt{\pm}}\). Black does not have sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn, Vyzmanavin – Cazorla Alvesa, Zaragoza 1993.

9...f5. This is a thematic pawn-advance. 10.\(\text{\texttt{e}}\text{xf5}\). This is a standard exchange for this variation. 10...gxf5

Now, Black cannot play f5-f4, because this will weaken the b1-h7 diagonal and particularly the e4-square. He must only wait and see how White will undermine his pawns, with g2-g4 or with f3-f4. 11.\(\text{\texttt{d}}\text{ge2}\) \(\text{\texttt{c}}\text{5}\) 12.\(\text{\texttt{c}}\text{c2}\) a5 13.0-0-0. White is preparing a kingside offensive. (It is also good for him to continue with 13.0-0!? followed by a pawn-onslaught on the queenside, for example: 13...\(\text{\texttt{f}}\text{6}\) 14.b3 \(\text{\texttt{we7}}\) 15.\(\text{\texttt{e}}\text{ae1}\) \(\text{\texttt{wf7}}\) 16.a3\(\pm\) followed by b3-b4 and c4-c5, Christiansen – Lopez Michelone, Yucatan 1999. White’s queenside initiative seems more effective than Black’s counterplay on the opposite side of the board.) 13...\(\text{\texttt{d}}\text{7}\) 14.h4! (This move is more accurate than 14.\(\text{\texttt{g}}\text{3}\), because after 14...\(\text{\texttt{h}}\text{4}\) \(\text{\texttt{\pm}}\) Black’s queen on h4 impedes considerably the development of White’s kingside initiative, Kahe – Lau, Blankenburg 2009.) 14...\(\text{\texttt{h}}\text{8}\) (After 14...a4 15.\(\text{\texttt{h}}\text{5}\) a3 16.b3 b5 17.h6 \(\text{\texttt{h}}\text{8}\) 18.exb5\(\pm\) Black is a pawn down and his king
is very weak, Botvinnik – Diez del Corral, Palma de Mallorca 1967.)

15.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{g}3 }\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{e}7} (15...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{f}4} 16.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{x}c5} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{d}xc5} 17.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{d}3±} – The light squares in Black’s camp are vulnerable and he is incapable of organising counterplay, because his bishop is restricted by his own pawn on e5.) 16.h5±. White’s kingside offensive is developing effortlessly. His king is completely safe on the queenside, because Black cannot create any counterplay there. White’s knight on c3 and the pawn on c4 prevent reliably the pawn-break b7-b5.

\textbf{9.0–0–0}

\textbf{10.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{d}3}}

Before developing his knight on e2, White develops his bishop on the b1-h7 diagonal.

\textbf{10...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{c}5}}

This is the main move for Black, which leads to a complicated fight. He ousts the enemy bishop to c2 in order to weaken his control over the b5-square.

It seems rather dubious for Black to play 10...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{a}6}, since White can open the g-file after this. 11.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{e}xf5} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{g}xf5} 12.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{x}f5}!\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{e}5} 13.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{g}3} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{f}7} 14.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{x}h5} \texttt{\textcolor{brown}{h}4} 15.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{h}6} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{f}8} 16.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{h}3}! White sacrifices a piece and begins a decisive attack. 16...\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{x}h3} 17.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{d}g1+} \texttt{\textcolor{brown}{h}8} 18.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{g}3} \texttt{\textcolor{brown}{h}5} 19.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{h}g1} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{f}6} 20.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{g}2}+– Nizky – Mostowik, Email 2011.

Following 10...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{f}4} 11.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{f}2} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{a}6} 12.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{g}e2} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{f}6} 13.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{b}1} \texttt{\textcolor{brown}{h}4} 14.\texttt{\textcolor{brown}{g}1} \texttt{\textcolor{brown}{e}7}
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15.\(\mathcal{c}c1\) there arises a very favourable position for White, Mastrovasilis – Banikas, Thessaloniki 1996. He has more space and Black can hardly prevent the opening of the queenside after b2-b4, \(\mathcal{c}c1\)-b3 and c4-c5.

It does not seem good for Black to try 10...fxe4, because after 11.\(\mathcal{d}xe4\), White establishes a piece-control over the e4-square and this is a great achievement for him in the King's Indian Defence. In order to understand this, it would be enough to compare the power of the knight on e4 and the bishop on g7, restricted by Black's own pawn on e5. 11...\(\mathcal{f}f4\) 12.\(\mathcal{f}f1\)!? This is the simplest move. 12...\(\mathcal{f}f6\) 13.\(\mathcal{c}c3\). The retreat of White's pieces is only temporary. Black's knight on f4 will be soon ousted from there and White's cavalry will have a complete control over the e4-square. 13...a5 (13...a6 14.\(\mathcal{g}3\) \(\mathcal{d}4h5\) 15.\(\mathcal{b}b1\) \(\mathcal{w}e8\) 16.\(\mathcal{d}h3\) \(\mathcal{b}8\) 17.\(\mathcal{c}c5\) \(\mathcal{d}7\) 18.\(\text{cxd6}\) \(\text{cxd6}\), Tataev – Pohl Kuemmell, Wuerzburg 1991, 19.\(\mathcal{g}5\)!? \(\mathcal{w}e7\) 20.\(\mathcal{e}e6\) \(\mathcal{xf3}\) 21.\(\mathcal{e}e2\) \(\mathcal{xf7}\) 22.\(\mathcal{e}e4\) – Winning a pawn is just a small consolation for Black, since White's knights on e4 and e6 paralyse completely the enemy forces.) 14.\(\mathcal{g}3\) \(\mathcal{d}4h5\) 15.\(\mathcal{h}h3\) \(\mathcal{h}h8\) 16.\(\mathcal{g}4\) \(\mathcal{g}7\) 17.\(\mathcal{g}5\) \(\mathcal{w}e7\) 18.\(\text{h}4\) Soza de la Carrera – T.Carlsen, corr. 2003. Black's position is almost hopeless. White's pawns on d5, f3 and g4 have deprived Black's knights of nearly all squares. White only needs to advance h4-h5 at an opportune moment in order to organise a crushing attack against Black's king.

The move 10...\(\mathcal{d}df6\) does not look aesthetic, because Black's knights only hamper each other's movements. 11.exf5! This resource is already familiar to us.

It seems like a positional concession for Black to play 11...\(\mathcal{xf}5\), because the exchange of the light-squared bishops is in favour of White. 12.\(\mathcal{ge}2\) (It is also good for him to play 12.\(\mathcal{xf}5\)!) 12...\(\mathcal{xf}5\) 13.\(\mathcal{h}3\)\(!\) followed by \(\mathcal{g}5\)-e6.) 12...\(\mathcal{xd}3\) 13.\(\mathcal{w}xd3\) – The vulnerability of the light squares in Black's camp is quite obvious, moreover that White's bishop on e3 is much stronger than its opponent.

11...\(\mathcal{g}xf5\) 12.\(\mathcal{h}h3\). This knight is headed for the e6-square. 12...\(\mathcal{d}d7\) (Black's defence is not any easier after 12...c6, because White can counter this with 13.\(\mathcal{c}c2\)! and in order not to lose his d6-pawn, Black is forced to play 13...c5 14.\(\mathcal{g}5\)\(!\) followed by \(\mathcal{e}6\) and after the exchange on e6, the pawn on d6, as well as the f5-pawn will be
1.d4 ćf6 2.c4 d6 3.ćc3 ćbd7 4.e4 e5 5.d5

hopelessly weak in Black’s camp, Hernandez Onna – De la Roche, Medellin 1972.) 13.ćg5 će7 14. ćb1 c5 15.ćhg1! White is preparing the decisive opening of the kingside with the move g2-g4. 15...a6 16.g4 fxg4 17.fxg4 ćxg4 18.ćxh7 and here, White has a strong attack in a position with material equality. 18...ćf3 19.ćg5 ćf7 20.ćdf1 ćf2 21.ćf6+ ćxf6 22.ćxf2 e4 23.ćxf3 exf3 24.ćf4± Black’s defence is very difficult, because almost all White’s pieces are taking part in the attack and Black’s king has almost no pawn-shelter at all, Trumpf – Hansen, Email 2010.

11.ćc2

11...a5. This move leads to a solid but passive position for Black. 12.ćge2 ćd7 (12...b6 13. exf5 ćxf5 14.ćg3 ćxc2 15.ćxc2 ćh4 16.ćge4 ćxe4 17.ćxe4 ćxe4 18.ćxe4± – There has arisen a classical endgame with a “good” bishop on e3 against a “bad” bishop on g7, because practically all Black’s pawns are placed against the rules – that is on the same colour of squares as his bishop, Hrovath – Haak, Vlissingen 1997.) 13.exf5 gxf5 14.h3! White is preparing the pawn-advance g2-g4.

11...a6

Black wishes to play b7-b5. His main task is to organise an attack against the enemy king even at the price of sacrificing a pawn.

The move 11...fxe4 enables White to establish immediately a complete control over the key e4-square. 12.ćxc5 dxc5 13.ćxe4±

Black’s defence will not be easier at all if he allows g2-g4. 14...ća6 15.g4 f4 16.ćf2 ćg3 17. ćhg1 ćxe2+ 18.ćxe2 ćb4 19.će4 a4 20.a3 ća6 21.h4 ćh8 22.ćf5 23.h5 ćxe4 24.ćxe4± White’s knight has occupied a dominant position in the centre of the board, while Black’s pieces are very passive, so White’s kingside attack should lead to a very quick checkmate, Starostits – Prevenios, Email 2006.

14...f4. This move leads to the weakening of the b1-h7 diagonal. 15.ćxc5 dxe5 16.će4 b6 17.ćc3± White maintains a great advan-
tage thanks to his control over the e4-square, Seifert – Zovko, Budva 2003.

12.\(\text{\&}b1\)

This prophylactic move (White protects his a2-pawn) seems more reliable than 12.\(\text{\&}ge2\), as it was played in the famous game Timman – Kasparov, Linares 1992: 12...b5 13.b4 \(\text{\&}d7\) 14.cxb5 axb5 and in the subsequent fight, Black managed to score a quick victory.

12...b5

Still, Black advances b7-b5, despite the loss of a pawn, since he has no other active plan.

13.cxb5 axb5 14.\(\text{\&}xb5\) \(\text{\&}a6\)

Black has counterplay on the a and b-files against the enemy king on the queenside. White’s king will not be safe there, but Black will hardly be able to bring his dark-squared bishop into the attack.

15.\(\text{\&}c3\)

15...\(\text{\&}b8\) 16.\(\text{\&}ge2\) \(\text{\&}b4\) 17.\(\text{\&}xc5\) dxc5 18.a3 \(\text{\&}a5\)

19.\(\text{\&}g3!\)

This move is obviously stronger than 19.\(\text{\&}c1\), because after 19...\(\text{\&}c4\) 20.\(\text{\&}b3\) \(\text{\&}xb3\) 21.\(\text{\&}xb3\) \(\text{\&}b6\) 22.\(\text{\&}c2\) \(\text{\&}fb8\) 23.\(\text{\&}a2\) \(\text{\&}f4\) 24.\(\text{\&}c1\) c4\(\uparrow\) there arose a position in which the activity of Black’s pieces compensated with an interest his minimal material deficit, Wang Yue – Cheparinov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2007.

19...\(\text{\&}xg3\)

After 19...\(\text{\&}f4\), White should continue with 20.\(\text{\&}a4!\) and in order to avoid the exchange of the queens Black must play 20...d3 21.\(\text{\&}xd3\) \(\text{\&}xa4\) 22.\(\text{\&}c1\) \(\text{\&}fb8\) 23.\(\text{\&}c3\). White has succeeded in trading a couple of minor pieces and has decreased his opponent’s pressure. His prospects seem preferable in the incoming fight, because Black is a pawn down and has weaknesses on the c-file. His pawn on f5 would have been much better on the f7-square too.

20.hxg3 \(\text{\&}c4\) 21.d6 cxd6 22.\(\text{\&}d5\) \(\text{\&}xd2\) 23.\(\text{\&}xd2\) \(\text{\&}xd5\)
24.\textit{\textbd{axd5 fxe4 25.\textbd{axe4\pm}}}

White has given back some material in order to simplify the position and has a considerable advantage in this endgame, because his bishop is much stronger than its counterpart, moreover that Black’s d6-pawn is very weak.

B) 5...\textit{\textbd{c5}}

Black develops immediately his knight to an active position and White cannot develop his bishop on d3.

6.\textit{\textbd{f3}}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{chess_board.png}
\end{center}

6...\textit{\textbd{a5}}

Black will have to play this move sooner or later, because White will be permanently threatening b2-b4.

For example: 6...\textit{\textbd{e7 7.e3}}

0–0 8.\textit{\textbd{d2 \textbd{e8 9.b4 \textbd{a6 10.a3 f5}}}}

11.\textit{\textbd{exf5 \textbd{xf5 12.\textbd{ge2 \textbd{b8 13.g3}}}}}

\textbd{g6 14.d3 \textbd{xd3 15 xd3 g5}}

16.\textit{\textbd{f2 \textbd{d7 17.ge4\pm}}} Black has lost too many tempi on manoeuvres of his knight and White has managed in the meantime to occupy the e4-square, Demianjuk – Dedyukhin, Moscow 2013.

7.\textit{\textbd{e3 e7}}

Now, contrary to the previous variation, Black develops his knight to the e7-square. He has the idea to trade the bishops from the g5-square in the forthcoming fight. After this, he may exploit the vulnerability of the dark squares in his opponent’s camp. Therefore, White must watch permanently about this positional threat and possibly to prevent it.

About 7...\textit{\textbd{fd7 8.d2 e7}}

9.0–0–0 – see 7...\textit{\textbd{e7}}.

8.\textit{\textbd{d2}}

White prepares castling queenside and increases his control over the g5-square.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{chess_board2.png}
\end{center}

8...0–0

After 8...\textit{\textbd{fd7 9.0–0–0 c6}}

10.\textit{\textbd{b1 a4 11.ge2 a5, Moor – Vogt, Switzerland 2012, White maintains a stable advantage with}}

12.g4!\pm followed by \textit{\textbd{g3–f5}}.
Black would not equalise with 8...\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{h}h5}}\) 9.0–0–0 h6 10.g3 a4 11.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{h}h3}}\) White gets rid of his “bad” bishop, Elsness – Shulman, Stockholm 1998. Black cannot play \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{e}e7-g5}}\), since White will counter this simply with f3-f4.

8...c6 9.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{g}ge2}}\) a4 (9...\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{f}fd7}}\) 10.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{d}d3}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{f}fd7}}\) 12.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{e}e2}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{a}a5}}\) 13.0–0 \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xd3}}}\) 14.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{x}xd3}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{c}c5}}\) 15.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{c}c2+}}\) White’s space advantage guarantees his better prospects, Straka – M. Ivanov, Teplice 2010.

Black has also tried in practice the move 8...h6, because he wishes to trade the dark-squared bishops as quickly as possible without losing time to castle. 9.0–0–0

9...\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{h}h7}}\). This knight will not be so active here, as on the d7-square. 10.g3. White not only prevents the exchange of the dark-squared bishops, but prepares the development of his bishop to h3. 10...a4 11.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{h}h3}}\). Naturally, this exchange is in favour of White, because all his pawns are placed on the same squares as this bishop. There followed 11...b6 12.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{x}xc8}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{w}xc8}}\) 13.h4 0–0 14.g4 \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{a}a6}}\) 15.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{b}b5}}\) a3 16.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{x}xa3}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{f}fc8}}\) 17.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{e}e2+}}\) and Black had no compensation for the pawn in the game Postny – Kozul, Sibenik 2009.

9...\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{f}fd7}}\) 10.g3. This is a standard resource in similar positions. White wishes to counter the move \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{g}g5}}\) with f4, avoiding the trade of the bishops. 10...a4 (10...0–0 11.h4. Now, Black will not have the possibility \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{g}g5}}\). 11...\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{b}b6}}\) 12.f4. After Black has reduced his control over the e5-square (his knight has abandoned the d7-square) this move is much stronger. 12...\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{e}exf4}}\) 13.gxf4 \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{g}g4}}\) 14.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{e}e2}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xe2}}\) 15.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{w}wxe2}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{d}d7}}\) 16.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{f}f3}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{b}ba4}}\) 17.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{a}a4}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{x}xa4}}\) 18.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xc5}}!}\) This is White’s simplest move. He exchanges the active enemy knight and now, Black is helpless against White’s powerful pawn-centre. 18...\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{d}xc5}}\) 19.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{b}b1}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{f}fe8}}\) 20.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{h}hg1}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{a}a6}}\) 21.e5 \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{f}f8}}\) 22.f5+ and White’s pawn-avalanche will crush everything on its way forward, Petursson – Knaak, Thessaloniki 1988.) 11.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{b}b1}}\) 0–0 12.h4. He not only prevents \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{g}g5}}\), but begins active kingside operations. 12...c6. Black prepares a queen-sortie to the a5-square after which White must be on the alert about his opponent’s possible counterplay on the dark squares. 13.g4 \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{a}a5}}\) 14.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{g}ge2}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{b}b6}}\) 15.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{g}g3}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{cxd5}}\) 16.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{d}xd5}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{x}xd5}}\) 17.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{cxd5}}\) \(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{w}xd2}}\) 18.\(\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xd2+}}\) and White has much more space in this endgame, Moiseenko – Kozul, Warsaw 2005.
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It is obviously bad for Black to advance his rook pawn 9...a4, because after 10.\textit{\textbf{N}}ge2 a3 11.b3 \textit{\textbf{N}}d7 12.\textit{\textbf{N}}b1 \textit{\textbf{W}}e8 13.g4 c6 14.\textit{\textbf{N}}g3 cxd5 15.cxd5\textpm his pawn-advances on the queenside have only led to the formation of additional weaknesses, Iskusnyh – Kovalev, Vladivostok 1995.

The move 9...h6 seems quite logical. Black prepares the exchange of the dark-squared bishops. 10.\textit{\textbf{N}}b1 \textit{\textbf{N}}h7 11.g4

White is forced to weaken his dark squares, since he cannot play 11.g3 in view of 11...f5 and Black seizes the initiative on the kingside.

It seems a bit too slow for Black to play 11...\textit{\textbf{W}}e8, with the idea to send the knight along the route h7-f8-g6. 12.h4. This is an energetic move. 12...\textit{\textbf{W}}f8 (12...\textit{\textbf{N}}xh4? 13.\textit{\textbf{N}}xh6\textpm) 13.g5 h5 14.\textit{\textbf{N}}h3 \textit{\textbf{N}}fd7 15.\textit{\textbf{N}}ge2\textpm Petursson – Malaniuk, Moscow 1987. White has avoided the trade of the knights and has advanced his kingside pawns. Black’s position is solid indeed, but White’s prospects are still preferable.

11...\textit{\textbf{N}}g5. This is a purposeful move. Now, White cannot prevent the trade of the dark-squared bishops. 12.h4! This is the right move! He must use every possibility to deploy a pawn on a dark square; otherwise, the vulnerability of the dark squares may become a telling factor. 12...\textit{\textbf{N}}xe3 13.\textit{\textbf{W}}xe3 \textit{\textbf{N}}d7 14.\textit{\textbf{N}}ge2 \textit{\textbf{Q}}a4 15.\textit{\textbf{N}}xa4 \textit{\textbf{N}}xa4 16.\textit{\textbf{N}}d2\textpm White has much more space and can begin active actions on the kingside (preparing g4-g5), as well as on the queenside (c4-c5). After Black’s imprecise move 16...\textit{\textbf{W}}b8?! White seized immediately the initiative on the kingside: 17.g5! h5 18.f4! exf4 19.\textit{\textbf{N}}xf4\textpm Petursson – Westerinen, Espoo 1989.

10.g4

He is preventing f7-f5.

10.g3!? f5 11.exf5 \textit{\textbf{N}}xf5 12.h4 a4 (The move 12...h6 only creates
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a target for White’s attack on the kingside. 13.g4 h7 14.g5 – his offensive has become quite real, Sakaev – Chernov, Krynica 1997) 13.g4 d7, Postny – Casper, Germany 2010, 14.\(b1\) White has more space, but despite the fact that his position is preferable, he must be very careful, since he lags in development a bit and has a backward pawn on f3.

10...\(h4\)
Black should not allow h2–h4.

10...a4 11.h4 d7 12.g5 a3 13.b3 f6 14.h3 xh3 15.xh3 fxg5 16.xg5± Dimitrov – Gavrijiski, Email 2009. White has much more space and has excellent prospects to organise an attack on the g-file. The e6-square is very weak in Black’s position too.

11.ge2 g6 12.g3 g7

13.g1
White prevents his opponent’s pawn-advance f7-f5 with all his forces.

13...f6 14.b1 g5

14...d7 15.d3 xd3 16.xd3 f7 17.c5± Zhu Chen – Hort, Copenhagen 1997. White has seized completely the initiative. Black’s bishop-pair is irrelevant, since the position is closed.

15.d3!

15.e2 d7 16.\(e1\) xe3 17.\(xe3\) f5± – He has managed to advance f7-f5 and can be optimistic about the future, Miton – Provotorov, Briansk 1995.

15...a4 16.\(e2\) a3 17.b3±
White’s prospects are preferable despite his weakened dark squares. If Black plays f6-f5, White will have an attack on the opened g-file. Therefore, he may prepare patiently a breakthrough on the queenside with b2-b4, followed by c4-c5.

C) 5...e7
Here, just like in variation B, Black develops his bishop on the d8-h4 diagonal, but without the preliminary move \(c5\).

6.e3
6...0–0

About 6...c6 7.f3 0–0 8.\( \textbullet \text{d2} \) – see 6...0–0.

About 6...\( \text{c5} \) 7.f3 a5 8.\( \text{d2} \) – see 5...\( \text{c5} \).

6...a5 7.f3 h6 (7...0–0 8.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c5} \) 9.0–0–0 – see variation B; following 7...\( \text{h5} \), White can defend against the move \( \text{g5} \) with 8.\( \text{h3}!?) \) 8.\( \text{ge2} \) \( \text{h7} \) 9.\( \text{f2} \) \( \text{c5} \), Zaltsman – Zapata, New York 1989. Now, White should continue with 10.\( \text{g3} \), impeding the pawn-advance f7-f5.

Black cannot equalise by transferring his knight to the g6-square: 6...\( \text{f8} \) 7.f3 \( \text{g6} \) 8.\( \text{d2} \) 0–0 9.0–0–0 c6 10.\( \text{ge2} \) \( \text{d7} \) 11.\( \text{b1} \) \( \text{b6} \) 12.\( \text{g3} \) and he can hardly create any meaningful counterplay, Balogh – Meister, Slovakia 1994.

7.f3 \( \text{h5} \)

About 7...a5 8.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c5} \) 9.0–0–0 – see variation B.

Black obtains a very passive position after 7...c5 8.\( \text{e8} \) 9.\( \text{d3} \) g6 10.\( \text{ge2} \) \( \text{g7} \) 11.\( \text{g4} \) \( \text{h+} \) 12.\( \text{d1} \) f6 13.\( \text{c2} \) \( \text{g5} \) 14.\( \text{h4} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 15.\( \text{xe3} \) a6 16.\( \text{g3} \) \( \text{f7} \) 17.a3 \( \text{f8} \) 18.h5 g5 19.b4 b6 20.\( \text{h1} \) followed by a doubling of the rooks on the b-file, Miles – Rubinetti, Buenos Aires 1979. Black will have to defend long and hard this difficult position without any chances of creating counterplay.

7...\( \text{e8} \). This move is solid but somewhat passive. 8.\( \text{d2} \)

Black cannot equalise with the plan of advancing f7-f5. After 8...g6 9.0–0–0 f5 10.\( \text{xf5} \) gxf5 11.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 12.\( \text{ge2} \), there arises a position similar to variation A, except that Black’s bishop is not so well placed on e7 as on g7, Petursson – Kouksov, New York 1992.

8...h6 9.\( \text{h3} \). White is transferring his knight to f2, so that it does not stand in the way of the development of the bishop on f1. 9...\( \text{c5} \) 10.\( \text{f2} \) \( \text{g5} \), Rahmani – Franzen, Sousse 1996. Black has succeeded in exchanging the dark-squared bishop indeed, but White’s prospects are still preferable in the forthcoming endgame. 11.\( \text{xg5} \) \( \text{xg5} \) 12.\( \text{xg5} \) hxg5 13.\( \text{h4}! \) gxh4 14.\( \text{xh4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 15.\( \text{d2} \) a5 16.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xd3} \) 17.\( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 18.\( \text{c2} \)! This is an important manoeuvre. White wishes to get rid of his “bad” bishop-op. 18...g6 19.\( \text{a4} \) \( \text{xa4} \) 20.\( \text{xa4} \) – He has much more space, while Black is deprived of counterplay and doomed to a passive defence.
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It is also possible for Black to opt here for 7...c6, preparing counterplay on the queenside. 8.\textsubscript{W}d2

About 8...cxd5 9.cxd5 a6 10.\textsubscript{A}d3 – see 8...a6.

8...\textsubscript{W}c7 9.\textsubscript{A}d3  \textsubscript{D}c5 10.\textsubscript{A}c2 a5 11.\textsubscript{A}ge2. Black’s position is solid indeed, but is very passive, since he can hardly obtain any counterplay. 11...\textsubscript{D}d7 12.0-0 cxd5 13.exd5  \textsubscript{D}fc8 14.\textsubscript{D}h1. White is preparing f4 (He obtains an advantage too with 14.\textsubscript{A}g3!? or 14.a4!?). 14...g6 15.f4 exf4 16.\textsubscript{A}xf4  \textsubscript{A}f8, Riazantsev – Vorobiov, Moscow 2006, 17.h3!? He takes the g4-square under control. 17...\textsubscript{D}h5 18.\textsubscript{D}h2 f5 19.\textsubscript{D}d4± White has a clear-cut plan against the weak enemy d6-pawn, moreover that Black’s castling position has been weakened by the move f7-f5 and his king is unsafe.

8...a6 9.\textsubscript{A}d3 (It is also good for White to play here 9.\textsubscript{D}h3!?, transferring the knight to the f2-square. 9...cxd5 10.cxd5 b5 11.\textsubscript{A}f2  \textsubscript{A}b6 12.b3  \textsubscript{D}d7 13.\textsubscript{A}e2  \textsubscript{A}e8 14.a3 f5 15.exf5  \textsubscript{A}xf5 16.0-0  \textsubscript{A}f6 17. \textsubscript{D}fe4  \textsubscript{B}b8 18.\textsubscript{E}ac1± White dominates over the e4-square, while Black’s knight on b6 is misplaced, restricted by White’s pawn on b3, Razuvaev – Cherniaev, Gausdal 1993.) 9...cxd5 10.cxd5 b5. This is an active move, but is a bit risky, since pawns do not go back, as it is well known. 11.\textsubscript{D}ge2  \textsubscript{D}b6 (11... \textsubscript{D}b7 12.0-0  \textsubscript{W}b8 13.b4 \textsubscript{D}d8 14.a4 bxa4 15.\textsubscript{A}xa4  \textsubscript{A}c8 16.\textsubscript{W}fb1  \textsubscript{A}b6, Bielicki – Jozefijan, Germany 2000, 17.\textsubscript{A}c5!± followed by \textsubscript{A}c5-b3-a5-c6. This is where you can see the drawbacks of Black’s tenth move.) 12.0-0 \textsubscript{D}d7 13.b3!? White restricts the enemy knight and prepares a4. 13...\textsubscript{W}b8 14.\textsubscript{E}fc1  \textsubscript{W}b7 15.a4 b4 16.\textsubscript{D}d1 a5 17.\textsubscript{A}g3± followed by \textsubscript{W}e2 and \textsubscript{A}b5. After the trade of the light-squared bishops, White’s advantage will become quite real.

8.\textsubscript{W}d2

8...g6

8...a6 9.\textsubscript{A}d3!? (Black can counter 9.0-0-0 with 9...c5!? 10.\textsubscript{D}b1 b5! 11.exb5  \textsubscript{W}a5) 9...\textsubscript{D}f4 10.\textsubscript{A}c2  \textsubscript{B}b6 11.b3 h6 12.g3  \textsubscript{D}g6 13.h4± White has managed to
1.d4 \( \Box f6 \) 2.c4 \( d6 \) 3.\( \Box c3 \) \( \Box bd7 \) 4.e4 \( e5 \) 5.d5

squeeze considerably his opponent's pieces, Bojchev – Lazarov, Albena 2010.

Black fails to trade the bishops after 8...h6 9.\( \Box h3 \) \( \Box c5 \) 10.g3!\( \pm \) (It seems too extravagant for White to play 10.g4, because after 10...\( \Box h4+ \) 11.\( \Box d1 \) \( \Box f6 \) the position is with mutual chances, Vaisser – Apicella, Besancon 1999).

9.0–0–0 \( \Box g7 \)

Black's attempt to block the queenside fails. After 9...a6 10.\( \Box b1 \) \( c5 \) 11.\( \Box h6 \) \( \Box g7 \) 12.g4\( \pm \) White seizes completely the initiative. Later, in the game Razuvaev – Saltaev, Tiraspol 1994, Black switched to a completely passive defence with 12...f6?!, but after 13.h4 \( \Box f7 \) 14.\( \Box ge2 \) \( \Box b8 \) 15.\( \Box c1 \) \( \Box f8 \) 16.\( \Box e3 \) \( \Box e8 \) 17.h5\( \pm \) White managed to convert his great positional advantage into a full point.

10.g4 \( f5 \)

11.gxf5!?

The position is not so clear after 11.exf5 \( \Box f6 \) 12.\( \Box ge2 \) \( \Box b6 \) since Black creates counterplay, Rustemov – Zhelnin, Moscow 1998.

11...gxf5 12.\( \Box b1 \) \( \Box f6 \) 13.\( \Box ge2 \) \( \Box g6 \) 14.\( \Box g1 \) \( f4 \) 15.\( \Box f2 \) \( \Box c5 \) 16.\( \Box c1 \) \( g5 \) 17.\( \Box xg1 \) White has more space and an easy plan for queenside actions (b2-b4 and c4–c5). Black's counterplay on the kingside is useless, because White's king is on the other side of the board.

Conclusion

In the variation with 3...\( \Box bd7 \) White has much more space, therefore he obtains an advantage in the opening no matter whether Black develops his bishop on g7, or on e7. If Black deploys it on g7, White must watch carefully about his opponent's plan, connected with \( \Box c5 \), a6, b5, because Black obtains initiative for the sacrificed pawn. White must play very carefully and should strive to simplify the position and enter a better endgame without holding on to extra material.

If Black develops his bishop on e7, White should try to prevent if possible the exchange of the dark squared bishops (g3 and f4), but even if Black succeeds in trading the bishops, White will still be better thanks to his extra space.
This chapter and the next one will be devoted to the Budapest Gambit. This opening was played for the first time in the game M. Adler – G. Maroczy in the year 1896 in Budapest (this was how the opening was named...). This move was played often by R. Reti, as well as by World Champion number four A. Alekhine, but it was not popular for a long time in the tournament practice, since White found reliable ways of obtaining a stable advantage. Well, there is not a direct refutation of this opening, but Black obtains too passive positions and the idea of playing a gambit in order to defend during the rest of the game cannot be attractive at all. Still, this opening is encountered sometimes in the contemporary tournament practice too. It is used by N. Short and Sh. Mamedyarov, but only in games with a shorter time-control.

3. dxe5 $\triangle e4$

The next chapter will be devoted to Black's basic move here – 3... $\triangle g4$. Now, we will analyse a seldom played possibility, which is classified in the chess theory as the Fayarovich Variation.

This move is rather dubious, because Black will have great problems to regain the sacrificed pawn and all his hopes will be connected with tactical tricks like $\mathbf{wh4}$ and $\mathbf{b4}$, which can be parried easily by White. In addition, the position of Black's knight on e4 may prove to be unstable, because the placement of White's pawn on e5 does not allow Black to defend his knight with moves like f7-f5 or d7-d5.

4. a3

This is White's simplest move.
He defends against $\mathbf{b4}$ and de-
spite the fact that Black has a great choice of possibilities in this position, they all lead to very bad or even hopeless positions for him.

As main lines for Black, we will analyse here: A) 4...\texttt{c6}, B) 4...\texttt{h4}, C) 4...\texttt{d6} and D) 4...\texttt{b6}.

Black has tried sometimes 4...\texttt{c5} as well, but after 5.e3 \texttt{f5} 6.\texttt{d2} White exchanges Black's only active piece - his knight on e4 and he has no compensation for the pawn whatsoever, Che - Maidana Guerra, Email 2001.

It does not seem good for Black to opt for 4...a5 - he is a pawn down and must play more actively in order to create some problems for his opponent. 5.\texttt{c2} \texttt{c5} (5...d5 6.exd6 \texttt{f5} 7.\texttt{c3} \texttt{xd6} 8.e4\texttt{f} Stewart - Will, Oban 1995) 5.f3 \texttt{c6} 7.\texttt{c3} \texttt{d6} 8.\texttt{g5} \texttt{f6} 9.exf6 gxf6, Hermesmann - Roes, Dortmund 1987. Here, the most precise retreat of White's bishop would be 10.\texttt{e3}± and Black would remain a pawn down with a compromised pawn-structure on his kingside.

A) 4...\texttt{c6}

This is his most natural move. He develops his knight and attacks White’s e5-pawn.

5.\texttt{f3} \texttt{d6}

Black wishes to open the position.

5...a5 6.\texttt{c2} \texttt{d5} (6...\texttt{c5} 7.\texttt{c3} \texttt{e7} 8.\texttt{e3} 0–0, Hermesmann - Schulz, Hamburg 1999, 9.\texttt{d1} \texttt{b6} 10.g3 \texttt{b7} 11.d5 \texttt{e6} 12.h4 h6 13.h3± White not only has an extra pawn, but also a very powerful knight on d5. Black's position is nearly hopeless.) 7.e3 \texttt{e6} 8.\texttt{c3} \texttt{xc3} 9.\texttt{xc3} dxc4 10.\texttt{xc4} \texttt{xc4} 11.\texttt{xc4} \texttt{e7} 12.\texttt{d2}± (followed by \texttt{c3}) White has protected reliably his e5-pawn and after 0–0 can begin the realisation of his material advantage, Geisler - Debertshaeuser, Germany 1988.

6.\texttt{c2}
This is the point! White ousts the enemy knight away from the centre.

6...d5
This move does not seem logical, but the alternatives are not any better for Black.

6...c5 7.b4 e6 8.exd6 cxd6 9.b2 0–0 10.b2 b6 11.e3 b7 12.d3 h6 13.0–0± White has completed his development and has an extra pawn and a very good position, Raijmaekers – Alberts, Email 2009.

White should not be afraid of the threat of Black's knight going somewhere after 6...f5, because he can counter that calmly with the move 7.c3.

7....c3 8.xf5 a4 9.f4± White has an extra pawn and the two-bishop advantage.

7...xf2 8.xf5 xh1 9.g3 c8 10.xc8+ xc8 11.h3 d8 12.d5 e7 13.e6+ and despite the fact that White is an exchange down at the moment, but Black's position is very difficult, since his knight will hardly go away from the h1-square, Di Marino – Garcia Cortes, Email 2007.

7...g3 8.e4 xh1 (8...xe4 9.xe4 xh1 10.g5 e7 11.xe7 xe7 12.exd6 cxd6 13.0–0 0–0 14.d3± Black loses his knight on h1 and in the middle game White's two minor pieces will be stronger than Black's rook and pawns, Van Bommel – Boisgard, Email 2001) 9.exf5 c5 (after 9...dxe5 10.e3 d4 11.e4 xf3+ 12.gxf3 c6 13.f4 f6 14.fxe5 fxe5 15.e2+– Black loses again his knight on h1 and White's two minor pieces will be obviously more powerful than Black's rook, V.Georgiev – Olgag, Izmir 2006) 10.e4 c6 11.e3 e7 12.xe5 dxe5 13.g3+– Simchen – Beutel, corr. 1987.

7.e3

7...g4

7...e6 8.bd2 xd2 9.xd2 dxc4 10.xc4 xc4 11.e4 e7 12.c3+–, Black is a pawn down and has problems with the mobilization of his forces, Fokin – Beltugov, Orsk 2000.
8. cxd5 wxd5 9. a4 w a5+
10. b4
White can obtain an advantage in numerous ways in this position, but this is the most concrete and accurate.

10... axb4+

Black loses too after 10... axb4

11. axb4 wxa1

This position was reached in the game Flear – Leygue, Saint Affrique 2002. Here, White could have obtained a decisive advantage. 12. b2! axb4 13. wxf7+! Now, Black’s king loses its casting rights and will come under the attack of White’s pieces. 13... w f8 14. wxe4 wxb2 15. 0–0 wxf7 16. w xg4 h6 17. w c4+ w g6 18. w e4+ w f7 19. w e6+ w g8 20. e7 w e8 21. w d2. Here, Black should better give up his knight (21... w f6), which, of course, also leads to a lost position, but still keeps his chances of offering some resistance. The move 21... w c6 enables White to finish the game off with a direct attack against the enemy king. 22. w e6+ w h7 23. w e4 w g8 24. w f5+ w h8 25. w g6+–

B) 4... w h4
There is just one positive side of this move for Black – he creates the threat of a checkmate in one...

5. g3 w h5

Black has failed to checkmate his opponent and now, he will be trying at least to regain his sacrificed pawn on e5.
This illustrates the in-correctness of his opening strategy, because he could have played 3... w g4 and regained his pawn in a much better version.

6. w g2 w xe5
The pawn has been regained, but Black has lost too much time on manoeuvres with his queen.

7. w f3
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7...\textit{W}e7

We will have a look at some other possible retreats of Black’s queen.

7...\textit{W}a5+ 8.\textit{f}d2! White is not in a hurry to develop his knight on b1, because it will be better placed on c3. 8...\textit{f}6 9.\textit{c}3 \textit{e}7·10.0–0 \textit{d}6 11.\textit{d}e4± He is clearly ahead of his opponent in development and the roaming of Black’s queen is not over yet. After b2–b4, he will lose even more time on useless moves with his queen all over the board.

7...\textit{c}5. The attack against the pawn on c4 cannot provide Black with an acceptable position because he lags considerably in development. 8.\textit{d}4 \textit{f}6 (8...\textit{d}6 9.\textit{d}5! \textit{xc}4 10.\textit{b}3 \textit{b}5 11.\textit{c}3 \textit{a}6 12.\textit{d}4 \textit{d}6 13.\textit{e}5+ \textit{e}7 14.\textit{x}g7+-- and Black’s position crumbles like a pile of cards) 9. \textit{c}3. With this great lead in development White does not need to worry about the fate of his c4-pawn. 9...c6 (9...\textit{xc}4 10.\textit{f}4 c6 11.\textit{c}1 -- see 9...c6) 10.\textit{f}4 \textit{xc}4 (10...\textit{h}5 11.\textit{e}4 \textit{xc}4 12.\textit{d}6+ \textit{xd}6 13.\textit{xd}6+-) 11.\textit{c}1 \textit{a}6 12. \textit{cb}5+-- with the decisive penetration of the knight to the c7-square.

7...\textit{f}6 8.\textit{c}e5 \textit{c}5 9.\textit{c}3 \textit{e}6 10.0–0 \textit{c}6 11.\textit{d}5 \textit{d}8 12.\textit{b}4± White’s knight is very powerful in the centre of the board, while Black lags considerably in development, Yrjola – Fossan, Gausdal 1988.

7...\textit{h}5 8.\textit{d}4 \textit{f}6 9.\textit{f}4 \textit{a}6 10.\textit{c}3 \textit{e}7 11.\textit{h}4 c6 12.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}5 13.\textit{a}4 \textit{a}5+ 14.\textit{b}4, Gil – Gonzaga Grego, Chessfriend.com 2005, 14...\textit{d}8 15.\textit{f}5+-- and once again Black’s position is hopeless due to the numerous moves of his queen early in the opening.

8.0–0 \textit{d}6 9.\textit{d}4 \textit{c}6

This position was reached in the game Kutirov – Kurajica, Strumica 1995. White has a great lead in development and he only needs to find an object for attack in Black’s position. In this partic-
ular case this should be the pawn on d6. 10...c2! d6 11.d1 g6 12.d4 Black must play very carefully in order to complete his development and to hold on to his d6-pawn.

C) 4...d6
Black continues to play in a gambit style.
5.c2!?

Now, just like in the variation with the inclusion of the moves c6 - d3, White's main idea is to exploit the unstable position of the enemy knight on e4.

5...d5
5...d5 6.e3 d3 (about 6...d6 7.d3 - see variation A). Here, White can play simply 7.c3 and Black does not have a good move with his knight. 7.g3 8.e4! dxe4 (8...xh1 9.exf5 White will capture sooner or later the enemy knight on h1.) 9.d3 c5 10.dxe4 dxe4 11.dxe4± and Black has no compensation for the pawn.

6.c3
This is the most principled move for White.

6...g3
Now, once again Black's knight-sortie for the enemy rook is doomed to fail. 6...xf2 7.xf5 xh1 8.f3 w7, Bluebaum – Lukeck, Dortmund 2005, 9.exd6 cxd6 10.g3+-

Black loses after 6...h4 7.g3 g4 8.f3 xc3, Abbott – Alberts, Email 2009. Here, after the exquisite move – 9.e4! White could have obtained a decisive material advantage: 9...xe4 10.xc3+-
6...d5 7.cxd5 ¤xc3 8.ñxf5 ñxd5 9.e6 f6 10.e4+–, White has an extra pawn and an overwhelming positional advantage, Roeder – Stefanova, Groningen 1996.

7.e4 ñxh1 8.exf5 dxe5 9.ñe3 c6, Schriewer – Medger, Germany 2009. Naturally, White can maintain an advantage in many different ways, but the most precise is 10.ñf3! ñe7 11.ñd3 ñd7 12.0–0–0+

D) 4...b6
Black wishes to defend his knight on e4 with his bishop.

5.ñf3!
This is the simplest move for White.

He has an excellent position and does not need to enter the tactical complications after 5.ñd5 ñb7! 6.ñxb7 ñc6 7.ñc3 ñc5 8.ñg5 f6 9.exf6 gxf6 10.ñxf6 ñxf6 11.ñxa8+ ñf7∞ Young – Morin, Email 2005.

5...ñb7 6.g3!
This is White’s strongest move, although it is not encountered so often in practice. He is not in a hurry to exchange the knight and wishes to develop his kingside pieces as quickly as possible.

6...ñc5
Following 6...ñe7 7.ñg2± Black has no compensation for the pawn at all, Fodor – Morselli, Arco 2010.

7.e3 a5 8.ñg2 ñe7 9.0–0 ñc6

10.ñfd2
White should occupy this square with this particular knight. The knight on b1 will go to the d5-square via c3.

10...ñxd2 11.ñxd2 0–0 12.ñc3 ñxe5 13.ñd5±
Black has regained his pawn indeed, but his position is very difficult, since his pieces are dis-coordinated, while White’s knight
is dominating in the centre of the board.

13... transporter8

13... $\text{e}6$ 14.f4 $\text{e}5$ 15.e4 $\text{e}6$
16.$\text{c}3$ $\text{a}6$ 17.$\text{e}5$ $\text{c}5$+ 18.$\text{h}1$
$\text{xc}4$ 19.f5!+- Laghetti – Jong, Email 2011.

14.$\text{c}3$ $\text{f}5$ 15.$\text{e}1$ $\text{d}8$ 16.$\text{e}4$ $\text{g}5$ 17.$\text{e}5$± Teeriaho – Destruels Moreno, Email 2012. Tarrasch said once – “If one of your pieces is “bad”, your entire position is bad...”. Now, almost all of Black’s pieces are misplaced. His only active piece – the bishop on c5 will be soon ousted from there with the pawn-advance b2-b4.

**Conclusion**

In the Fayarovitch Variation White obtains effortlessly a great opening advantage, since Black either fails to regain his sacrificed pawn, or its recapturing leads to a fatal lag in development for him. Naturally, White should know well some concrete variations, because he might have problems to find the right way in the numerous tactical possibilities over the board.
We begin our analysis of Black’s main line in the Budapest Gambit. Now, contrary to the already analysed 3...\textit{e}4, his last move is more reliable. Black’s knight on g4 is not only threatening the f2-square, but he wishes at first to regain his sacrificed pawn. Therefore, as a rule, Black restores quickly the material balance. Still, this does not mean that he equalises.

4.\textit{f}4!

This is White’s most reliable move. Now, Black can hardly obtain meaningful counterplay.

White’s other popular move 4.\textit{f}3 leads to more complicated positions. With the move 4...\textit{c}5, Black provokes 5.e3, after which White’s bishop cannot come to the f4-square. 5...\textit{c}6 6.\textit{e}2 0–0 7.\textit{c}3 \textit{e}8 8.0–0 \textit{g}xe5 9.\textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 10.b3 a5 11.\textit{b}2 \textit{a}6± and in the arising complicated position White’s prospects are preferable but his task is not easy at all. After the transfer of Black’s rook to the kingside (\textit{h}6), his threats should not be underestimated, R.Mamedov – Mamedyarov, Moscow 2011.

Following 4.\textit{f}4, Black must choose his further course of actions. He may weaken a bit his kingside pawn-structure with B) 4...g5 complicating the position, or play the calmer move C) 4...
\( \textit{\&c6}, \) but before that, we will pay attention to the variation A) 4... \( \textit{\&b4}. \)

About 4...f6 5.\( \textit{\&f3} \) \( \textit{\&c6} \) 6.exf6 – see 4...\( \textit{\&c6}. \)

It is bad for Black to opt for 4... \( \textit{\&c5} \) because of 5.e3 and he has an immediate problem due to the defencelessness of his knight on g4. 5...d6. This move is forced (I was really amazed when I found in the chess base numerous games in which after 5...\( \textit{\&c6} \)?? 6.\( \textit{\&xg4+} \)– Black lost his knight.). 6.exd6 cxd6 7.\( \textit{\&c3} \) 0–0 8.\( \textit{\&e2} \) \( \textit{\&f6} \) 9.\( \textit{\&f3} \) \( \textit{\&e8} \) 10.0–0± White has not only an extra pawn, but also a superior pawn-structure, Van Wely – Miezis, Kuppenheim 2005.

A) 4...\( \textit{\&b4} \) 5.\( \textit{\&d2} \)

5...d6
This is a very dubious pawn-sacrifice.

After Black's alternatives, there usually arises transposition to variation C: 5...\( \textit{\&c6} \) 6.\( \textit{\&gf3}, \) or 5...\( \textit{\&e7} \) 6.\( \textit{\&gf3} \) \( \textit{\&c6} \) 7.e3, or 5...f6?! 6.\( \textit{\&gf3} \) \( \textit{\&c6} \) 7.exf6 – see 4...\( \textit{\&c6}. \)

6.exd6 \( \textit{\&f6} \)
This is the essence of Black's idea. Now, White's bishop and his b2-pawn are simultaneously under attack.

7.\( \textit{\&h3} \)
It is not recommended to develop the knight at the edge of the board in the opening, but here this move has concrete justification. From the h3-square, White's knight not only protects the bishop but also the f2-square.

7...\( \textit{\&xf2} \)
Black inflicts this strike in spite of all and the game becomes sharp and tactical.

Following 7...\( \textit{\&xb2} \) 8.\( \textit{\&b1} \) \( \textit{\&a3} \) 9.\( \textit{\&b3} \) \( \textit{\&a5} \) 10.dxc7 \( \textit{\&c6} \), Gleizerov – Rytova, Berlin 1996, 11.g3± White only needs to complete his development with \( \textit{\&g2} \) and 0–0. Black has no compensation for the sacrificed material.
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8. \( \text{f}x2 \text{f}xh3 \) 9.g3

In the arising position, Black can hardly parry the threat dxc7, because his bishop on h3 is hanging.

![Diagram]

9...\( \text{c}5+ \)

He wishes to improve his position with this intermediate check.

9...\( \text{xf}1 \) 10.dxc7 \( \text{a}6 \) (10...\( \text{c}6 \) 11.\( \text{xf}1 \) 0–0 12.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{xb}2 \) 13.\( \text{wd}5 \) White has an extra pawn and his passed c7-pawn is very powerful force, Paessler – Rawlings, Email 2002.) 11.\( \text{xf}1 \) 0–0 12.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{b}6+ \) 13.\( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{xc}7 \) 14.\( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 15.\( \text{xb}6 \) \( \text{xb}6 \) 16.a3 \( \text{e}7 \) 17.\( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 18.\( \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 19.\( \text{fd}1 \) White has all the chances of realising his extra pawn, Williams – Jong, Email 2008.

9...\( \text{xf}5 \) 10.e4 \( \text{d}7 \), Sage – Fister, Email 2006 (It is possibly stronger for Black to play here 10...g5 11.\( \text{xf}5 \) gxf4, although even then after 12.dxc7!? \( \text{c}6 \) 13.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{xb}2+ \) 14.\( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 15.\( \text{f}3 \) 0–0 16.\( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{xc}7 \) 17.\( \text{c}1\pm \) his king is vulnerable and Black is doomed to a difficult defence.). Now, White obtains a clear advantage after the energetic move 11.e5?!, for example: 11...\( \text{c}5+ \) 12.\( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 13.h4 \( \text{xd}6 \) 14.\( \text{xd}6 \) 0–0 15.\( \text{bd}3 \) \( \text{c}6+ \) 16.\( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{xh}1 \) 17.\( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 18.\( \text{hxh}1 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 19.d7\pm – his d7-pawn is very powerful and Black must fight long and hard for a draw.

10.e3

Following 10...g5 11.\( \text{xf}3 \) gxf4 12.\( \text{g}2 \) fxe3, Shumilov – Malienko, Kiev 2006, White could have obtained a decisive advantage with the line: 13.\( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{xd}6 \) 14.\( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{d}2+ \) 15.\( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 16.ad1 \( \text{c}2 \) 17.\( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{xe}4+ \) 18.\( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 19.\( \text{xe}7+ \) \( \text{xe}7 \) 20.\( \text{xb}7+ \)

10...\( \text{xf}1 \) 11.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{xb}2+ \) 12.\( \text{xf}1 \) \( \text{cxd}6 \) 13.\( \text{x}d6 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 14.\( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 15.\( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{xa}2 \) 16.\( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 17.\( \text{xb}7\pm \) White’s bishop on d6 and his rook on b7 are so powerful that Black's position is very difficult to defend, moreover that his king is strand-
ed in the centre for long, Matisson – Fister, Email 2006.

11.dxc7 2d7 12.h4 2xb2 
13.g1 2b6 14.b3±

Black’s compensation for the pawn is insufficient. 
14...b4 15.c5! White exploits the lack of coordination of the enemy pieces and manages to capture the g7-pawn.

15...xc5 16.b2 xd2 17. 
18.d1 e4 19.e5+ 
20.b5+ e7 21.h2 c3 
22.c4 g6 23.h5 f6 24.g4 
a6 25.xb7 1-0 Sage – Fister, Email 2005.

B) 4...g5!? 

Black prepares to fianchetto his dark-squared bishop with this move. After that there will arise positions similar to the King’s Indian Defence, but the exposed position of his pawn on g5 will be a telling factor in the future.

5.g3

It is not so clear for White to play 5.d2 with the idea to place the bishop on c3 and to parry the pressure of the enemy bishop on the long diagonal. One of the drawbacks of this plan is that it is too slow. 5...gxe5 6.c3 bc6 7. e3 d6 8.f3 g7 9.e5 xe5 
10.ee2 0–0 11.0–0 e7∞ Eljanov – Mamedyarov, Moscow 2008.

5...g7 6.f3 c6 7.c3 
gxe5 8.xe5 xe5 9.e3

9.d6

It seems not so precise for Black to play 9...0–0, since following 10.h4 he must weaken his pawn-structure even more. 10...d6 (He loses a pawn after 10...g4
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11...\texttt{xe}5 \texttt{xe}5 12.\texttt{w}xg4+ \texttt{h}h8 13.\texttt{d}d3\pm Vladimirov – Sazhino, Novokuznetsk 2007.) 11.hxg5 \texttt{w}xg5 12.\texttt{f}f4 \texttt{g}g4 13.\texttt{d}d5\pm Gorshkov – Sokolovsky, Voronezh 2009.

9...h5 10.h4 g4 11.\texttt{c}2. White prepares to castle queenside so that he can exploit in the forthcoming battle Black’s weaknesses on the kingside with f2-f3 or f2-f4). 11...d6 12.0-0-0 12...b6. This move is too slow.

13.f4! gxf3 14.gxf3 \texttt{b}7 15.\texttt{g}2 \texttt{g}8 (15...a6 16.\texttt{xe}5 \texttt{xe}5 17.\texttt{e}4\pm) 16.\texttt{d}5 c6 17.\texttt{f}4\pm Black has postponed castling for too long, his king is unsafe in the centre of the board and his pawns on d6 and h5 are weak, Evans – Salvador Marques, Email 2010.

12...\texttt{e}6 13.c5 0–0 14.f4! White seizes completely the initiative. 14...\texttt{c}4 15.\texttt{xc}4 \texttt{xc}4 16.e4 b5 17.\texttt{he}1 \texttt{e}8 18.e5\pm – He exerts powerful pressure against the d6-square and Black’s two-bishop advantage is immaterial in this position, because his bishop on g7 is severely restricted by White’s pawn on e5, Rodriguez Rey – Fels, Email 2006.

10.c5!? White creates another pawn-weakness for his opponent.

10...0–0

10...dxc5. This exchange of queens is not good for Black. 11.\texttt{x}d8+ \texttt{x}d8 12.0–0–0+ \texttt{d}7 13.\texttt{e}2. He has an extra pawn in this endgame indeed, but his defence will be very difficult, because his king in the centre on d8 impedes him to connect his rooks. 13...\texttt{e}8 (13...\texttt{e}8 14.\texttt{d}5 \texttt{g}6 15.\texttt{xc}5\pm White has regained his pawn and Black’s c7 and g5-pawns are under attack, Suvarajit – Kahn, Budapest 1998.) 14.h4 g4, Cordes – Bartsch, Germany 1996. Now, the simplest reaction for White would be to double his rooks on the d-file: 15.\texttt{d}2! \texttt{c}8 16.\texttt{ed}1 \texttt{e}6 17.\texttt{e}4 and his pieces are very active.

17...c4 18.\texttt{g}5 h5 19.\texttt{xe}6 \texttt{fxe}6 20.\texttt{xe}5 \texttt{xe}5 21.\texttt{d}7 b5 22.f3 gxf3 23.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{b}8 24.\texttt{x}h5\pm White has regained the sacrificed pawn and is clearly better thanks to his more active rooks and his powerful passed h-pawn.
It does not seem too reliable for Black to choose 10...\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{e} \texttt{6} \), because after 11.cxd6 cxd6 12.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{b} \texttt{5} + \texttt{f} \texttt{8} \), his king would remain stranded in the centre, Steadman – Bennett, Auckland 2008, 13.f4 \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{g} \texttt{4} \) 14.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{d} \texttt{2} \) \( \texttt{g} \texttt{x} \texttt{f} \texttt{4} \) 15.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{x} \texttt{f} \texttt{4} \) \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{e} \texttt{5} \) 16.0-0\( \pm \) and his king needs permanent protection.

11.cxd6 cxd6 12.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{e} \texttt{2} \) \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{e} \texttt{6} \)

13.h4

Black has two pawn-weaknesses (d6 and g5), but White must play very energetically, since Black’s pieces have occupied active positions.

If White plays too academically, he may lose his opening advantage altogether. 13.0-0 \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{c} \texttt{8} \) 14.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{c} \texttt{1} \) \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{b} \texttt{6} \) 15.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{d} \texttt{2} \) \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{a} \texttt{5} \) 16.e4 \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{c} \texttt{4} \) 17.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{x} \texttt{c} \texttt{4} \) \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{e} \texttt{c} \texttt{4} \) 18.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{f} \texttt{d} \texttt{1} \) \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{f} \texttt{c} \texttt{8} \) Chrestani – Ohtake, Email 2007.

13...\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{b} \texttt{6} \)

The character of the fight remains more or less the same after 13...g4 14.0-0\( \pm \)

14.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{d} \texttt{2} \) g4 15.0-0 \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{f} \texttt{d} \texttt{8} \)

This position was reached in the game Prohaszka – Rosenthal, Winterthur 2008. White could have tried here a very promising pawn-sacrifice: 16.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{d} \texttt{5} \) ! 17.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{x} \texttt{d} \texttt{5} \) \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{x} \texttt{b} \texttt{2} \) 18.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{f} \texttt{e} \texttt{1} \) \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{b} \texttt{6} \) 19.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{a} \texttt{b} \texttt{1} \) \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{c} \texttt{6} \) 20.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{b} \texttt{3} \) b6 21.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{e} \texttt{c} \texttt{1} \) \( \texttt{\&} \texttt{d} \texttt{7} \) 22.\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{a} \texttt{6} \)\( \pm \) After this important move, Black cannot facilitate his defence by exchanging the rooks on the c-file. White has more than sufficient compensation for the sacrificed material. His bishops are more active, while Black will have to defend passively, since not only his pawns on d6 and g4 are weak, but his castling position has been compromised.

C) 4...\( \texttt{\&} \texttt{c} \texttt{6} \)

This is the best move for Black.
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He not only develops a piece, but also attacks the enemy e5-pawn.

5.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{d}}f3} \)

5...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{b}}4} + \)

Before playing \( \text{\texttt{we}}7 \), Black develops his bishop.

The other possible development of the bishop seems worse 5...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{c}}5} \), because after 6.e3 \( \text{\texttt{we}}7 \) 7.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{c}}3} \) he cannot play 7...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{g}}xe5} \)?? due to 8.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{xe}}5} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{xe}}5} \) 9.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{d}}5} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{b}}4} + \) 10.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e}}2} + - \) Wimmer - Bau, Email 2010.

It looks rather dubious for Black to opt here for 5...f6, because after 6.exf6 \( \text{\texttt{wxf6}} \) 7.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{d}}2} \), his temporary initiative does not compensate the sacrificed pawn. 7...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{b}}4} \) 8.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{c}}3} \) d6 (after 8...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{xc}}3} \) 9.bxc3 d6 10.e5 0–0 11.e3 dxc5 12.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{xc}}7} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{e}}6} \) 13.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e}}2} \) \( \text{\texttt{ac}}8 \) 14.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{g}}3} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{f}}7} \) 15.0–0\( \text{\textit{\texttt{f}}2} \)± White has an extra pawn and the two-bishop advantage) 9.e3 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{e}}6} \) 10.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{e}}2} \)!! This is the simplest. White is trying to develop his pieces as quickly as possible. 10...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{ge}}5} \) 11.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{xe}}5} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{xe}}5} \) 12.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{xe}}5} \) \( \text{\texttt{wxe5}} \), Tseng - Seia, Email 2008. Black’s two bishops are powerful, but still his compensation for the pawn is absent. White should only be careful not to allow his pawns to be doubled on the c-file. 13.\( \text{\texttt{c}}1 \)±

6.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{bd}}2} \)

We will analyse now C1) 6...f6 and C2) 6...\( \text{\texttt{we}}7 \).

Black does not obtain sufficient compensation after 6...d6 7.exd6 \( \text{\texttt{wxf6}} \) (7 8.\( \text{\textit{\texttt{xd}}6} \) \( \text{\texttt{wxd6}} \) 9.e3\( \text{\texttt{e}}3 \)±) 8.e3 \( \text{\texttt{xb}}2 \) 9.dxc7± Braun - Feistenerauer, Goetzis 1996.

C1) 6...f6

This move was popular at the beginning of the development of the popularity of the theory of the Budapest Gambit during the 20ies of the past century. Black gives up the idea to regain his e5-pawn and relies on an active piece-play. Contemporary theory however considers this line as unsatisfactory for Black, since White obtains an advantage effortlessly in the opening.
7.exf6 \(\mathcal{W}\)xf6 8.e3

This is the simplest. White is not keeping the extra material, but is trying to develop his kingside pieces as quickly as possible and castle.

8...\(\mathcal{W}\)xb2 9.a3!?

He obtains a stable advantage after this move. Its main idea is to reduce the pressure of Black's pieces against the knight on d2.

9...\(\mathcal{A}\)c3 10.\(\mathcal{B}\)b1 \(\mathcal{W}\)xa3 11.\(\mathcal{A}\)xc7

White has accomplished a very favourable exchange of his a3-pawn for the enemy c7-pawn. He has a considerable positional advantage thanks to his superior pawn-structure (two pawn islands against three for his opponent), as well as a safer king. After White castles kingside, his king will be protected by four pawns, while Black's monarch will be defended by only two pawns.

11...0–0

Or 11...\(\mathcal{W}\)e7 12.\(\mathcal{W}\)c2 \(\mathcal{B}\)b4 13.\(\mathcal{A}\)g3 \(\mathcal{D}\)f6 14.\(\mathcal{D}\)d3\(=\) followed by 0–0 and \(\mathcal{D}\)e4.

12.\(\mathcal{A}\)e2 \(\mathcal{W}\)e7 13.\(\mathcal{A}\)g3 d6

After 13...a5, White has an interesting pawn-sacrifice at his disposal – 14.c5!\(=\) Cabrera – Schenning, Email 2008. 14...\(\mathcal{W}\)xc5 15.\(\mathcal{B}\)b5 \(\mathcal{W}\)a3 16.0–0 \(\mathcal{A}\)xd2 17.\(\mathcal{X}\)xd2 \(\mathcal{W}\)e8 18.\(\mathcal{A}\)g5 \(\mathcal{D}\)f6 19.\(\mathcal{A}\)c4\(=\) and due to his great lag in development, Black's pieces are incapable in assisting in the defence of his king.

This position was reached in the game Kilgus – Chulis, Vienna 2003. Here, it seems very strong for White to continue with 14.c5!, creating the threat \(\mathcal{W}\)b3. 14...\(\mathcal{E}\)e5 15.\(\mathcal{A}\)xe5 \(\mathcal{G}\)xe5 16.cxd6 \(\mathcal{W}\)xd6 17.0–0\(=\) White's bishops are very powerful in the arising open position. Black's passed pawns on the queenside are much rather a liability than an asset, since they are an excellent target for attack of White's pieces.

C2) 6...\(\mathcal{W}\)e7 7.e3

Besides this move, White plays here sometimes 7.a3, but I do not like this move so much, because
at first, he loses a tempo attacking the enemy bishop and after 7.e3, followed by $\text{\texttt{xe2}}$ and $0-0$, Black often exchanges voluntarily on d2 and secondly, some not strong players also read books, so White might get checkmated after 7... $\text{\texttt{gxe5}}$ 8.axb4?? $\text{\texttt{d3}}$

![Chess Diagram]

7...$\text{\texttt{gxe5}}$

About 7...0-0 8.$\text{\texttt{e2}}$ $\text{\texttt{gxe5}}$ 9.$\text{\texttt{xe5}}$ $\text{\texttt{xe5}}$ 10.0-0 – see variation C2e.

8.$\text{\texttt{xe5}}$ $\text{\texttt{xe5}}$ 9.$\text{\texttt{e2}}$

We have reached the basic position of the variation with 4.$\text{\texttt{f4}}$ in the Budapest Gambit. It is much easier to play with White, because he has a very easy plan. After 0-0, Black’s bishop will be misplaced on b4 and is likely to be exchanged on d2. Then, White’s two bishops will be more powerful than Black’s minor pieces on the board. White’s main task would be to open the game on the queenside (c4-c5 either immediately, or after the preliminary moves a2-a3 and b2-b4).

Still, we have to notice that in a practical game White’s advantage cannot be converted so easily into a full point, because Black has no pawn weaknesses in his position.

Now, we will analyse as main lines for him: C2a) 9...$\text{\texttt{xd2}}$, C2b) 9...$\text{\texttt{a5}}$, C2c) 9...$\text{\texttt{b6}}$, C2d) 9...$\text{\texttt{d6}}$ and C2e) 9...0-0.

Black has often repeated in practice the mistake – 9...$\text{\texttt{g6}}$?, which after 10.$\text{\texttt{xc7}}$ d6 11.$\text{\texttt{a4+ d7}}$ 12.$\text{\texttt{xb4 xc7}}$ 13.$\text{\texttt{e4+-}}$ leads to a decisive material advantage for White, Collado Barbas – Rosa Ramirez, Mostoles 2012.

It is very bad for Black to play here 9...g5, which only leads to an additional weakening of his kingside. 10.$\text{\texttt{g3}}$ h5 (10...b6 11.0-0 $\text{\texttt{xd2}}$ 12.$\text{\texttt{xd2 b7}}$, Lorscheid – Lapshun, Budapest 2007, 13.$\text{\texttt{c3 d6}}$ 14.f4± – and the position will be opened, which will be no doubt in favour of White, because he has the two-bishop advantage and
some lead in development too)
11.h4 g4 12.0–0± Zakaria – Her­
andez, SchachServer 2011.

C2a) 9...xd2+
This move is often played in
the tournament practice, but it
cannot be recommended to Black.
He loses after it the possibility to
organise counterplay and will be
forced to defend passively. The
players who study for the first
time the Budapest Gambit for
White should pay great atten­
tion to this variation, since in it White’s
plan to advance c4-c5 will be il­
lustrated perfectly.

10.xd2 d6

10...0–0 11.0–0 d6 12.b4 – see
10...d6.

11.0–0

Following 11...d7, it seems
very strong for White to sacrifice
a pawn with: 12.c5! dxc5 13.xd5
c6 14.fc1± – he regains his
pawn and obtains a great advan­
tage thanks to his powerful bish­
op-pair.

White will continue in
the same way after 11...e6 12.c5!±

11...g6. It is not logical for
Black to remove his knight volun­
tarily from the centre. 12.g3 0–0
(The character of the fight re­
mains the same after the inclu­
sion of the moves 12...h5 13.h3) 13.b4 e6 14.fd1 fd8 15.c3
c8, Babu – Chatterjee, Kolkata
1994. White has deployed perfect­
ly his pieces and now, he can be­
gin active operations on the
queenside with 16.c5±

12.b4

Now, White is perfectly pre­
pared to advance c4-c5.

There arises an analogous po­
sition, but with the inclusion of
the moves a7-a5 – a2-a3, in vari­
tion C2e.
12...b6
Black is trying to prevent the opening of the game on the queenside.

After the alternatives, White advances effortlessly c4-c5.

12...f6 13...c3 a6 (13...e6 14.c5! dxc5 15.bxc5 f7 16.a4 d8 17.fd1 b6 18.h3± Lednev – Nepustil, Email 2008) 14.g3 d8 15.ac1 a6 16.a3 f7 17.c5± Mikhailovski – Miezis, Dieren 1997.

12...e6 13.c5! d8 14.cxd6 d6 15.b2 f6 16.xe5 fxe5 17.xe5± and Black has no compensation for the pawn, Taylor – Dunn, Email 2011.

12...d8 13.c3 f6 14.fd1 f5 15.g6 16.ad1 f7 17.a3 e6 18.c5± Bluvshtein – Miezis, Mallorca 2004.

12...e8 13.fd1 g6 14.g3 f5 (14...a5?! 15.c5 dxc5 16.bxc5 f5 17.g3± Stohl – Manolov, Elenite 1992) 15.c3 f8 16.ac1± followed by c4-c5.

In all these variations, Black is doomed to a long and laborious defence.

13.c5!
In spite of all White accomplishes this thematic pawn-break, since Black cannot play 13...dxc5 14.g4 15.f3± and he suffers material losses.

13...b7 14.cxd6 cxd6 15. d1 d8 16.a4 c8 17.a5± Black’s d6-pawn is weak as well as his queenside pawns, Ovsejevitsch – Faulhaber, Gau Algesheim 2011.

C2b) 9...a5?!

This is a very interesting move. Black wishes to impede the development of White’s queenside initiative. If he plays a2-a3, then Black will simply exchange on d2 and follow this with a5-a4. White will not be able to play b2-b4, because of the capturing en passant.

10.0–0 d6
About 10...0–0 11.a3 – see variation C2e1.

11.e4!? This is one of the few moves after which White can rely on obtaining an advantage in the opening.

It seems very interesting for
him to try a pawn-sacrifice here – 11.a3 \textit{xd}2 12.\textit{x}xd2 a4 and now 13.c5!? The computer programmes evaluate this possibility as very promising, but things are far from simple. 13...dxc5 14.\textit{wd}5 \textit{g}6 15.b5+ \textit{f}8 16.g3 c6 17.\textit{wd}2 \textit{g}8 18.d6 \textit{d}8 19.c4 b5 20.\textit{e}2 c4 21.\textit{fd}1 h6 22.\textit{c}3 \textit{h}7 23.f3 \textit{a}6 24.e5 \textit{f}8 25.d6 \textit{d}8, draw, Hrubaru – Pavlikov, Email 2010. No doubt, White has sufficient compensation for the pawn, but only future tournament practice will show whether he can rely on something real after 13.c5. Maybe his play can be improved after 17.\textit{wd}1, followed by \textit{xa}4. Now, White at least restores the material balance and can fight for the advantage thanks to his two powerful bishops.

\textbf{11...\textit{g}6 12.\textit{c}2!?}

Now, contrary to the majority of the positions in this variation, Black will have the two-bishop advantage and not White.

\textbf{12...0–0}

It is worse for Black to play now 12...f5. With this move he not only weakens his king, but enables his opponent to transfer his knight to the d5-outpost. 13.c3 0–0 14.\textit{d}5±

\textbf{13.a3 \textit{xf}4}

Black should better capture the enemy bishop, because after 13...c5 White can avoid its exchange with the move 14.g3 and there might follow: 14...a7 15.\textit{c}3 c6 16.\textit{ad}1 \textit{e}5 17.\textit{d}2 \textit{e}6 18.\textit{fd}1 \textit{fd}8 19.a4± and he will have an easy game attacking Black’s d6-pawn.

\textbf{14.\textit{xf}4 \textit{c}5 15.\textit{fe}1±}

There has arisen the key position of this variation. Black has a bishop-pair, but White’s prospects are preferable thanks to his superior development and the powerful position of his knight on e4.

\textbf{15.\textit{f}5 16.d3 \textit{fe}8 17.g3 \textit{b}6 18.g5 \textit{x}e1+ 19.\textit{x}e1 \textit{xe}1+ 20.\textit{g}2 \textit{g}6}
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Following 20...\(\text{a}x\text{d}3\) 21.\(\text{w}x\text{d}3\) g6 22.\(\text{c}e4\) Black will have great problems to protect his king against the attacking tandem of White's pieces. As it is well known – queen and knight combine their actions perfectly.

21.\(\text{w}c3\)

Now, Black is almost helpless against the threat f4-f5.

21...\(\text{e}7\) 22.\(\text{f}5\) f6 23.\(\text{f}x\text{g}6\) \(\text{f}x\text{g}5\) 24.\(\text{g}x\text{h}7+\) \(\text{h}8\) 25.\(\text{f}x\text{g}5\) White's queen seems stronger than the enemy rooks, because Black's king is vulnerable and his bishop is severely restricted by the pawn on c5, Svartbo - Rodrigues, Email 2007.

C2c) 9...\(\text{b}6\)

Black prepares the fianchettto of his light-squared bishop, but his last move has obvious drawbacks. White obtains targets for attack on the queenside.

10.0–0

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

10...\(\text{a}b7\). In this variation it is not easy at all for White to maintain an advantage. 11.\(\text{c}b3\) (The point is that he obtains a slight edge following 11.\(\text{c}f3\) \(\text{c}x\text{f}3+\) 12.\(\text{f}x\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}x\text{f}3\) 13.\(\text{w}x\text{f}3\) 0–0 14.\(\text{w}b7\), but it is insufficient to win the game. 14...\(\text{f}c8\) 15.\(\text{f}d1\) \(\text{c}5\) 16.a3 a5 17.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{a}b8\) 18.\(\text{d}5\) \(\text{a}b4\) 19.\(\text{a}xb4\) \(\text{a}b4\) 20.\(\text{x}d7\) \(\text{x}d7\) 21.\(\text{x}d7\) \(\text{e}8\) 22.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{c}5\) 23.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{f}8\) 24.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{e}8\) 25.\(\text{d}3\) h6 26.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}6\). Black has equalised completely after an accurate play and the opponents agreed to a draw here, Novak – Soentges, Email 1998.)

11...\(\text{a}5\) 12.\(\text{a}3\) \(\text{c}5\) 13.\(\text{c}x\text{c}5\) \(\text{b}x\text{c}5\) 14.\(\text{b}4\) f6 15.\(\text{b}x\text{c}5\) \(\text{w}x\text{c}5\) 16.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{e}7\) 17.\(\text{a}b1\) \(\text{c}6\) 18.\(\text{c}5\) White's queenside initiative has become quite real, Solozhenkin – Plesec, Paris 1993.

It seems too passive for Black to choose 11...a6 12.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{d}6\), Varga – Kahn, Hungary 2000 and here, White could have continued with the thematic move 13.c5! \(\text{b}x\text{c}5\) 14.\(\text{c}2\) followed by \(\text{c}5\), \(\text{f}d1\) and Black's pawns on a6, c7 and d7 are excellent targets for White's pieces.

11...0–0 12.\(\text{a}3\) \(\text{d}6\) (After 12...
1.d4 ʿf6 2.c4 e5 3.de ʿg4 4.ʿf4 ʿc6 5.ʿf3 ʿb4+ 6.ʿbd2

1.c5 13.ʿxc5 bxc5 14.b4 ʿab8 15.ʿxc5 ʿxc5 16.ʿd4 ʿc6 17.f3 ʿg6

11.ʿxd2 ʿb7

Following 11...d6, White can implement his standard plan with the support of his two powerful bishops, advancing b2-b4 and c4-c5, or he can try to exploit the temporary weakness of the h1-a8 diagonal and play 12.ʿxe5?!, for example: 12...dxe5 (12...ʿxe5 13.ʿf3 ʿb8 14.ʿc6+ ʿd7 15.ʿxd7+ ʿxd7 16.ʿfd1± and in this endgame with major pieces Black’s king, in the centre of the board, does not beautify his position at all) 13.ʿf3 ʿb8 14.ʿc6+ ʿd7 15.ʿd5 ʿxc6 16.ʿxc6+ ʿd7 17.ʿe4 ʿe7 18.ʿad1 0–0 19.ʿd5 ʿfe8 20.ʿfd1 ʿbd8 21.g3± White maintains a stable advantage dominating on the only open file.

(diagram)

12.c5!

After this standard breakthrough, Black will have great problems to parry the pressure of his opponent’s pieces.

12...ʿxc5

It is possible that his most reliable possibility may be 12...0–0, although even then after 13.ʿc3 ʿfe8 (13...d6 14.cxd6 cxd6 15.ʿac1± and Black’s d6-pawn is weak, Ilgner – Sahlender, Osterröndorf 1996) 14.ʿfd1 ʿc6 15.b4± White maintains the advantage with his standard queenside play.

13.ʿa5 ʿg6 14.ʿg3 ʿd6 15.ʿb4 cxb4 16.ʿfd1 0–0 17.ʿac1

Now, Black cannot hold on to his c7-pawn, because after 17...ʿac8? White has the resource 18.ʿg4+– and Black will have to part with the exchange.
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C2d) 9...d6

Black often connects this move with 0-0 and this transposes to variation C2e. Now, we will analyse only the possibilities which may lead to original positions.

10.0-0

White wishes to clarify immediately the future of the bishop on b4.

11...\(\text{x}d2\)

Following 11...\(\text{c}5\), White maintains an advantage by transferring his knight to d5. 12.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{b}6\) 13.\(\text{c}3\) c6, Kratz – Miehke, Email 1999, 14.\(\text{e}4\) \(\pm\) Black has managed to cover the d5-square, but his d6 is vulnerable now.

12.\(\text{x}d2\)

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

10...\(\text{x}d2\) 11.\(\text{x}d2\) – see variation C2a.

10...\(\text{a}5\) 11.\(\text{e}4\) – see variation C2b.

10...0-0 11.\(\text{b}3\) – see variation C2e.

It is just bad for Black to play 10...\(\text{e}6\), due to 11.\(\text{a}4+\) \(\text{c}6\) 12.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{x}d2\) 13.\(\text{xc}6+\) \(\text{d}7\) 14.\(\text{xd}7+\) \(\text{xd}7\) 15.\(\text{c}2!\) \(\text{a}5\), Krizsany – Mueller, Basel 1999, 16.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{b}6\) (16...\(\text{x}b4?\) 17.\(\text{e}4+\) \(\text{e}7\) 18.\(\text{xb}7+-\) 17.\(\text{c}3\) \(\pm\) and he cannot defend simultaneously against \(\text{g}7\) and c4-c5.

11.\(\text{a}3\)
1.d4 d6 2.c4 e5 3.dxe5 Nxe5 4.f4 g6 5.Nf3 Nf6 6.Nc3

tions. He wishes to double his
rooks on the a-file and prepare
the penetration to the a7-square
after the preliminary exchange on
b6, Amezqueta – Tauber, Email
2011.

12...g6 13.g3 h5 14.h3 g5
(14...h4 15.h2 c6 16.b4 g5
17.f3± and Black’s activity has
reached its dead end, Mareco –
Rodi, Sao Paulo 2009) 15.f3 c6
16.exd6+ bxd6 17.c3 h4 18.h2
g8 19.c5± Black can hardly pro-
tect his pawn-weaknesses on the
queenside due to his lag in devel-
opment, Zakhartsov – Ilandzis,
Prague 2010.

13.b4

13...Ed8

13...0–0–0 14.a4± White’s
prospects seems preferable in a
position with attacks on the dif-
ferent flanks of the board.

After 13...h5, White can open
immediately the c-file: 14.c5!?
dxc5 15.Ec1 0–0–0 16.Exc5 Eb5
Ec1± and Black’s monarch is
rather unsafe, contrary to its
counterpart.

14. Eh5+ Ef7 15.c5 Eb5 16.
Ed1 d5 17.e4!
White is opening the game in
the centre.

17...Ea4

This position was reached in
the game Ivanchuk – Epishin,
Terrassa 1991. Now, White has a
very pleasant choice. He may cap-
ture on d5, obtaining more than
sufficient compensation for the
exchange, or play the simpler and
more reliable line: 18.Ee1!?
dxe4 19.EXe4 Exe4 20.Ee1
Exd2 21.EXe4+ Eb8 22.EXd2±
and in the arising endgame White
can play for a win for a long time
without any risk thanks to his
two-bishop advantage.

C2e) 9...0–0
This is Black’s best try. He
makes a natural move (he will
have to castle sooner or later...)
and conceals his future plans for the time being.

10.0–0

Now, Black has numerous alternatives. We will analyse his basic moves C2e1) 10...a5 and C2e2) 10...g6, but before that, we will pay attention to some other possibilities for him.

About 10...xd2 11.xd2 – see variation C2a.

10...e8 11.f3!? d6 12.a3 c5 (Black loses a piece after 12...a5?? 13.xe5 dxe5 14.b4+– Vandervorst – Meghridge, Bethune 1998.) 13.b4 xf3+ 14.xf3 b6 15.c1 a5, Ovod – Anokhin, Moscow 1996, 16.c2 axb4 17.axb4± White’s bishops are pointed at the enemy’s queenside and after c4–c5, Black defence will be very difficult.

After 10...d6, White should play 11.b3, cutting off the possible retreat of the enemy bishop on b4.

11..e8 12.a3 c5 13.xc5 dxc5 14.b3 b6, C.Horvath – Chatalbashev, Elista 1998, 15.fd1 b7 16.g3± Black’s position is solid but White has in fact an extra pawn on the kingside. He can realise it without any risk at all.

11...b6 12.a3 c5 13.xc5 bxc5 14.b4 d7 (14...xb4 15.axb4 b7 16.c2± White has a superior pawn-structure and a powerful bishop-pair, Vallepín – Lallemand, Elancourt 2004) 15.g4 e8 (15...a5 16.xd7 xd7 17.bxc5± Black has some chances of saving the draw due to the presence of bishops of opposite colours on the board, but he is still a pawn down, Karapov – Short, Linares 1992) 16.c1± and once again White has two bishops and a better pawn-structure, Ivanchuk – Short, Monte Carlo 1993.

C2e1) 10...a5

With this move, Black is trying to impede White’s queenside pawn-offensive (b2–b4). His hopes are not going to be realised, though...
11.a3

11...\texttt{\texttt{x}}d2

This move is forced, because after 11...\texttt{\texttt{c}}5, White will play 12. \texttt{\texttt{b}}4! seizing the initiative with this pawn-sacrifice. 12...\texttt{\texttt{x}}b4 (12...\texttt{\texttt{a}}7 13.c5± Black’s bishop is misplaced on a7.) 13.axb4 \texttt{\texttt{x}}a1 14. \texttt{\texttt{w}}xa1 \texttt{\texttt{g}}6 15.\texttt{\texttt{h}}6! This is the point! Black’s pawn-structure will be in ruins after this move. 15...g\texttt{\texttt{x}}h6 16.bxc5 \texttt{\texttt{w}}xc5 17.\texttt{\texttt{d}}e4 \texttt{\texttt{w}}e5 18.\texttt{\texttt{w}}xe5 \texttt{\texttt{d}}xe5 19.f4 f5 20.\texttt{\texttt{c}}3 \texttt{\texttt{g}}6 21.\texttt{\texttt{b}}5 d5 22.\texttt{\texttt{d}}xc7 dxc4 23.\texttt{\texttt{d}}xc4± White has regained the sacrificed pawn and has good winning chances in this endgame, because of Black’s numerous pawn-weaknesses, Saule - Hamilton, Email 2007.

12.\texttt{\texttt{w}}xd2 d6

12...a4. Black’s attempt to prevent b2-b4 would not work because of 13.c5!± and he cannot play 13...\texttt{\texttt{w}}xc5?, since after 14. \texttt{\texttt{a}}ac1 \texttt{\texttt{a}}5 15.\texttt{\texttt{x}}a5 \texttt{\texttt{x}}a5 16.\texttt{\texttt{b}}xc7+ White regains his pawn maintain-

13.b4

13...f6

Black can hardly neutralise White’s activity on the queenside even if he tries something else. White advances c4-c5 in almost all the variations preserving an advantage.

13...\texttt{\texttt{g}}6 14.\texttt{\texttt{g}}3 axb4 15.axb4 \texttt{\texttt{d}}7, Stohl – Forintos, Hungary 2001, 16.b5!? \texttt{\texttt{d}}e5 17.c5!±

13...\texttt{\texttt{e}}8 14.\texttt{\texttt{f}}c1 axb4 15.axb4 \texttt{\texttt{x}}a1 16.\texttt{\texttt{x}}a1± Vitiugov – Lanin, St Petersburg 2006.

13...\texttt{\texttt{d}}8 14.\texttt{\texttt{c}}3 b6 (14...f6 15.c5±) 15.c5± Horvath – Salmen-suu, Budapest 1999.

The character of the fight remains the same after 13...axb4 14.axb4 \texttt{\texttt{x}}a1 15.\texttt{\texttt{x}}a1± followed by c4-c5, Gyimesi – Nevednichy, Nagykanizsa 2003.

Black cannot prevent c4-c5,
because after 13...b6, White will play 14.c5 anyway, for example: 14...bxc5 15.bxc5 a6 16.axa6 axa6 17.cxd6 exd6 18.fc1 h6 19.eb1± and his superior pawn-structure will guarantee his stable advantage, Schandorff – Schneider, Germany 2006.


White has an extra pawn, despite its being doubled. His pressure on the b-file creates difficulties for Black to develop his bishop on c8 and he will hardly manage to regain the pawn on a5, since White can protect it with his bishop (after e3-e4 and f4-d2).

C2e2) 10...g6

This is an interesting move. Black removes his knight from the centre in order to play d6 and to trade the bishops.

11.g3

About 11...xd2 12.xd2 – see variation C2a.

It would be too risky for Black to play 11...f5, Kasimdzhanov – Zhang Pengxiang, Yerevan 1999, 12.ecl! f4 13.exf4 xf4 14.f3± and the lag of development of his queenside pieces will be a cause of permanent worries.

12.xd6 xd6

Now, White will find it hard to maintain an edge, since Black has no weaknesses in his position. Still, White leads in development and has extra space, so he can cre-
ate numerous problems for Black.

13. \textcolor{red}{$\text{\textit{d}e4}$}

We are already familiar with this transfer of the knight to the $d5$-square.

13... \textcolor{red}{$\text{\textit{w}e7}$}

There arises almost the same position after the move 13... $\text{\textit{w}e5}$, but Black’s beautifully placed queen in the centre of the board may come under attack after $f2$-$f4$. 14. \textcolor{red}{$\text{\textit{c}c3}$}

Now, White can counter 14... $b6$ with 15. $\text{\textit{w}d5}$ $\text{\textit{e}b8}$ (following 15... $\text{\textit{a}a6}$, Stohl – Blatny, Prague 1996, he can simply capture the pawn 16. $\text{\textit{w}xd7}$\textcolor{red}{$+\text{\textit{w}}$} and Black does not have sufficient compensation for it) 16. $\text{\textit{w}xe5}$ $\text{\textit{d}xe5}$ 17. $f4$ $\text{\textit{g}g6}$ 18. $\text{\textit{b}b5}$ $\text{\textit{b}b7}$ 19. $\text{\textit{f}fd1}$\textcolor{red}{$+\text{\textit{w}}$} Black can hardly defend his queenside without serious positional concessions, Shneider – Porper, Berlin 1994.

It seems more reliable for him to choose 14... $d6$, but even then after 15. $\text{\textit{d}d2}$ $\text{\textit{d}d7}$ 16. $\text{\textit{d}d5}$\textcolor{red}{$+\text{\textit{w}}$} (followed by $f2$-$f4$, $\text{\textit{d}d3}$, $e2$-$e4$) White seizes completely the initiative, Maiorov – Kutyec, Pardubice 2007.

13... $\text{\textit{w}xd1}$ 14. $\text{\textit{f}fxd1}$ $\text{\textit{e}e8}$ 15. $\text{\textit{c}c3}$\textcolor{red}{$+\text{\textit{w}}$} Galyas – Pg, Budapest 2003. The position has been simplified; nevertheless, Black has great difficulties to parry White’s threat $\text{\textit{d}d5}$ (or $\text{\textit{b}b5}$). Naturally, Black can play $c7$-$c6$, but then he will have a backward $d7$- pawn and also great difficulties with the development of his bishop on $c8$.

14. $\text{\textit{c}c3}$ $d6$ 15. $\text{\textit{d}d5}$ $\text{\textit{w}d8}$ 16. $\text{\textit{w}d4}$

16... $\text{\textit{e}e6}$

After 16... $\text{\textit{e}e8}$ 17. $\text{\textit{a}ad1}$, White
is better thanks to his wonderfully placed knight.

One of the peculiarities of this position is that it is not good for Black to play 16...c6?! because after 17.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{e7} \) 18.\( \text{ad1+} \) White has a clear-cut plan to exploit the vulnerability of his opponent’s d6-pawn, Gustafsson – Lamprecht, Hamburg 1997.

17.\( \text{ac1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 18.\( \text{f4} \)

(diagram)

He is occupying space on the kingside. 18...\( \text{c5} \) 19.\( \text{wd2} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 20.\( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{fe8} \) 21.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{e7} \) 22.\( \text{wd2} \) \( \text{ad8} \) 23.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 24.\( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e7} \) 25.\( \text{d5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 26.\( \text{d3} \)

Black’s defence will be difficult. His d6-pawn is weak, while White’s bishop has occupied comfortably the weakened d5-square and his e3-pawn covers the d4-square against the penetration of Black’s knight, Ingersoll – Belanoff, SchachServer 2010.

**Conclusion**

After Black’s best line in the Budapest Gambit – 3...\( \text{g4} \), he has many different possibilities, but White obtains an advantage in the opening against all of them. As a rule, if Black tries to play actively, White’s advantage increases, like for example in the variation \textbf{A)} 4...\( \text{b4} \) followed by 5...d6. White only needs to know some concrete variations. The same can be said about the line with \textbf{B)} 4...g5, although here, White’s achievements are not so great, but Black’s pawn-weaknesses make White’s task in the middle game rather simple.

The best line for Black is \textbf{C)} 4...\( \text{c6} \), in which he regains the sacrificed pawn and follows passive tactics. White does not need to worry, because he has a clear-cut plan for queenside actions (b2-b4 and c4-c5). In addition, in the majority of the variations, he has the two-bishop advantage.
In this part of the book we will analyse how to obtain an edge with White after 1.d4 \( \textit{\&f6} \) 2.c4 \( c5 \) 3.d5, when there arise very complicated positions with a space advantage for him. Meanwhile, Black will try to organise active counterplay.

His most radical response — the Volga Gambit, in which he sacrifices a pawn on his next move — 3...\( b5 \), will be dealt with in Chapter 19.

Chapters 16-18 will be devoted to the Benoni Defence.

At first, we will analyse the so-called Czech Benoni (3...\( e5 \) — Chapter 16), in which Black obtains a solid but rather passive position without many chances of obtaining active counterplay.

Later, we will deal with a more contemporary line for Black — the Modern Benoni System in which he creates active counterplay by undermining White’s centre with the move 3...\( e6 \).

In Chapter 17, we will see the possibilities for Black to avoid the main theoretical variations, and this is the line in which he postpones the development of his knight on \( f6 \) (1.d4 \( c5 \) 2.d5 \( e6 \) 3.c4 exd5 4.cxd5 \( d6 \) 5.\( \textit{\&c3} \) \( g6 \) 6.e4 \( \textit{\&g7} \)), as well as the extravagant variation: 1.d4 \( \textit{\&f6} \) 2.c4 \( c5 \) 3.d5 \( e6 \) 4.\( \textit{\&c3} \) exd5 5.cxd5 \( \textit{\&d6} \).

In Chapter 18, we will analyse the main position of the Modern Benoni System (1.d4 \( \textit{\&f6} \) 2.c4 \( c5 \) 3.d5 \( e6 \) 4.\( \textit{\&c3} \) exd5 5.cxd5 \( d6 \) 6.e4 \( g6 \)). As a main weapon for White I have chosen his most principled and aggressive possibility — the Pawn Storm Variation (7.f4 followed by \( \textit{\&b5+} \)). This variation is very unpleasant for Black, because he must be permanently on the alert about the threat e4-e5, since the centre is in White’s hands.
Whenever Black plays like this, he is doomed as a rule to a passive defence, because he is incapable of undermining his opponent's centre (he does not have the possibility e7-e6). White has a space advantage and thanks to it can either prepare a queenside offensive (b2-b4), or an attack on the kingside (f2-f4). Still, it is not easy for him in practice to break Black's position easily, because it has no pawn weaknesses. White must play very carefully not to overstep the possible risk while storming his opponent's fortress.

This opening, contrary to many other opening systems, was not named after the family name of some player, or after the city where it was played for the first time. It received its name because of the book which appeared out of print back in the year 1825 in Frankfurt am Mein by A. Reinganum "Ben-Oni, or the Pawn-Sacrifice Defense in Chess".

The move 3...e5 is only seldom played in the tournament practice. Among the contemporary grandmasters it is played regularly only by L. Nisipeanu and sometimes L. Aronian and mostly in games with a shorter time-control. Before we begin the analysis of the main lines of the Benoni Defence, we will deal in short with some other possibilities for Black.

About 3...a6 4.\( \text{c3} \) – see Chapter 10, variation A.

If Black fianchettoes his dark-squared bishop, then there arises transposition to the Averbakh System of the King's Indian Defence, which was analysed by us in our volume 2. 3...g6 4.\( \text{c3} \) \&g7 (4...d6 5.e4 – see 3...d6) 5.e4 d6
(5...0-0 6.\texttt{\textbf{e}2} – see volume 2, Chapter 5) 6.\texttt{\textbf{e}2} – see volume 2, Chapter 6, variation B.

3...d6 4.\texttt{\textbf{c}3} g6 (4...e6 5.e4 – see Chapter 17, variation B; 4...e5 5.e4 – see 3...e5) 5.e4 \texttt{\textbf{g}7} (5...e5 6.\texttt{\textbf{e}2} – see variation B; 5...e6 – see Chapter 17, variation B. After 5...b5 6.exb5, there arises a very favourable version of the Volga Gambit for White) 6.\texttt{\textbf{e}2} – see volume 2, Chapter 6, variation B.

We will also pay attention to the rather dubious move for Black 3...\texttt{\textbf{e}4}. It has been played in more than 600 games, also at grandmaster level, but is quite suspicious. Black fails to create threats on the a5-e1 diagonal and later, this knight will be forced to retreat which would lead to a considerable lag of development for Black. 4.\texttt{\textbf{c}2} \texttt{\textbf{a}5}+ 5.\texttt{\textbf{d}2}

It is bad for him to opt for 5...f5, because of 6.g4!? d6 7.f3± and Black loses a pawn, Kluss – Thurner, Wuerzburg 1991.

5...\texttt{\textbf{f}6}. White’s knight is not so well placed on d2 as on c3, but this cannot compensate Black’s loss of two tempi on manoeuvres with his knight. 6.e4 d6 7.\texttt{\textbf{e}2} g6 8.\texttt{\textbf{c}3} \texttt{\textbf{g}7} 9.\texttt{\textbf{e}2} 0-0 10.0-0 e6 11.a3 \texttt{\textbf{a}6} 12.\texttt{\textbf{b}3} \texttt{\textbf{b}6} 13.\texttt{\textbf{c}5} \texttt{\textbf{c}7} 14.\texttt{\textbf{ad}1} exd5 15.cxd5± (followed by \texttt{\textbf{d}2-c4) and Black’s d6-pawn is weak and his queen is misplaced on b6, Shipov – Todorov, Cappelle la Grande 1994.

5...\texttt{\textbf{d}6} 6.b3. This is the most precise move for White. Now, Black cannot develop his bishop on g7. 6...f5 (6...b5 7.\texttt{\textbf{b}2} bxc4 8.bxc4 \texttt{\textbf{a}6} 9.a3± followed by e2-e4, \texttt{\textbf{d}3}, \texttt{\textbf{e}2}, 0-0, f2-f4, e4-e5, Yakimenko – Popchev, Sunny Beach 2013) 7.\texttt{\textbf{b}2} e6 8.\texttt{\textbf{gf}3} exd5 9.cxd5 \texttt{\textbf{a}6}, Ishee – Pickard, Dallas 1996. Here, White could have obtained a decisive advantage with the move 10.a3!, preventing \texttt{\textbf{b}4}. 10...b5 11.\texttt{\textbf{h}4}+ and Black loses his f5-pawn.

4.\texttt{\textbf{c}3}

White is developing his pieces preparing the pawn-advance e2–e4.

4...d6
Chapter 16

4...d6. The only plus of this move is that it was tried once by M. Carlsen. 5.b5 c7 6.xc7+ wxc7 7.f3 d6 8.e4 0–0, Radjabov – Carlsen, Monte Carlo 2007. White has the two-bishop advantage and a lead in development. After the precise move 9.e2!± (followed by c3 and d3) Black will hardly manage to prepare the pawn-breaks b7-b5 or f7-f5 and will be forced to defend passively.

5.e4

After this move, there arises on the board the main position of this variation.

We will analyse now A) 5...bd7, B) 5...g6 and C) 5...e7.

The inclusion of the moves 5...a6 6.a4, either now, or on the next move, would not change the character of the fight.

A) 5...bd7

With this move Black does not determine yet the placement of his dark-squared bishop.

6.e2

White postpones the development of his knight on g1, preserving the possibility to continue with active actions on the kingside with h2-h4 or f2-f4.

6...e7

About 6...g6 7.g5 – see variation B.

7.h4!?

This is a very good move, although it is not the most popular for White. Black's position is cramped in the centre and White wishes to occupy even more space on the kingside, by a pawn-offensive, in order to deprive Black's pieces of the possibility to manoeuvre freely.

7...h5

Black prevents the further occupation of space by his opponent, but weakens the g5-square.

After 7...g6, Erdos – McShane, Germany 2010, it seems very strong for White to play 8.h5!± Now, Black must be permanently
on the alert about the positional threat h5xg6. He cannot capture on h5 himself, because this would lead to a catastrophic weakening of his kingside pawn-structure.

Following 7...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)f8, Vanek – M. Ivanov, Teplice 2007, White has the powerful resource 8.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)d3!? and the threat \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)d3 is very unpleasant for Black. After 8...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)f6, White will reply with 9.h5 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)f4 10.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)xf4 exf4 11.g3! (This is stronger than 11.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)h3, because after 11...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)d7 12.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)xf4 0–0\(\text{\textdagger}\), White's game is not easy at all, despite the extra pawn, since his dark squares have been weakened.) 11...fxg3 12.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)xg3. It is essential for White to capture with his queen in order to have a pawn on the f-file. Later, he will have the possibility to play f2-f4, depriving Black’s pieces of the important e5-square. 12...0–0 13.f4 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)e8 14.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)f8 15.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)d2 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)e7 16.0–0–0\(\text{\textdagger}\) Black’s pieces do not have sufficient space, while White has excellent attacking prospects on the g-file.

8.g3 a6 9.a4 a5

Black closes the queenside and dooms himself to a long defence without any good prospects. Now, the problem is whether White will manage to break his opponent’s position on the kingside.

10.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)h3 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)f8 11.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)d2 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)g4 12.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)c2 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)g6 13.0–0–0 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)f6 14.f3 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)h6 15.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)f2 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)g7 16.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)b1 b6 17.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)b5\(\text{\textdagger}\) and later, White succeeded in opening the position on the kingside with the move f3-f4 winning the game, Epishin – Re­tera, Tilburg 2007.

B) 5...g6
Black plans to fianchettto his bishop.

6.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)e2
White develops his pieces just like in the Averbakh System in the King’s Indian Defence.

6...a6
Black is not in a hurry to play \(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)g7.

About 6...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)g7 7.\(\text{\textit{\textbf{\textdagger}}}\)e3 – see vol­ume 2, Chapter 6, variation B.

Black’s attempt to trade the dark-squared bishops with the
move 6...h5 leads to a very difficult position for him since he lags considerably in development. 7. \( \text{f3} \) \( h6 \) (7...\( g4 \) 8.\( g5 \)± White provokes the favourable exchange of the light-squared bishops.) 8.\( xh6 \) \( xh6 \) 9.\( d2 \) \( h8 \) 10.0-0 \( h7 \) (10...\( g4 \) 11.\( g5 \) \( xe2 \) 12.\( xe2 \) \( h7 \) 13.\( xh7 \) \( xh7 \) 14.\( f4 \) \( d7 \) 15.\( b5 \) \( b8 \) 16.\( xe5 \) \( xe5 \) 17.\( f6 \) \( e7 \) 18.\( af1 \)+- Shulman – Andrianov, Los Angeles 2002) 11.\( e1 \). He is freeing the way forward of his f-pawn. 11...\( d7 \) 12.\( b5 \) (12.\( f4 \)!?±) 12...\( e7 \) 13.\( d3 \) a6 14.\( c3 \) \( f8 \), Taboas – Gonzalez Rodriguez, Pontevedra 2004, 15.\( f4 \)± followed by the doubling of the rooks on the f-file. Black is faced with a very difficult defence.

6...\( bd7 \) 7.\( g5 \)

The character of the fight remains the same after the inclusion of the moves 7...a6 8.a4 \( e7 \) 9.\( e3 \) – see 7...\( e7 \).

After 7...\( g7 \), White's simplest reaction would be 8.h3 \( h6 \) 9.\( e3 \) – see 7...h6.

7...\( h6 \) 8.\( e3 \) \( e7 \) 9.\( d2 \) h5 10.h3 \( h4 \), Petkov – Rodriguez Cordon, La Roda 2007, 11.\( f3 \)± and Black's pawn on h4 is too far away from the rest of his forces and may turn into a target for attack.

7...\( e7 \) 8.\( e3 \). White is defending against the threat \( xd5 \). 8...a6 9.a4 \( b8 \), Speelman – Zilberman, London 1991. Now, he obtains a great advantage after 10.\( f3 \) (It would be premature for White to play 10.\( g4 \)± due to 10...\( h5 \)±.) 10...0-0 11.\( h6 \)! This powerful manoeuvre has been recommended by B.Avrukh. Its idea is to provoke Black's rook to occupy the e8-square and to deprive him later of the possibility – \( e8 \) and \( g5 \) (after the retreat of White's knight – \( f3 \)-d2) forcing the favourable exchange for Black of the dark-squared bishops. 11...\( e8 \) 12.\( d2 \) \( f8 \) 13.\( e3 \) \( g7 \) 14\( g4 \) h6 15.h4 \( h7 \) 16.\( c2 \)± White has succeeded in avoiding the exchange of pieces and advancing h2-h4 and g2-g4. Black's position is very difficult, because he cannot find good squares for his pieces due to the lack of space.

7.\( g5 \) \( h6 \) 8.\( e3 \)
8...\textit{\textit{\textit{\textbf{g7}}}}

The move 8...h5 leads to the serious weakening of the g5-square. 9.\textsc{gf}3 h4?! 10.\textsc{g5}. In the game Kramnik – Piket, Zuerich 2001, Black decided to give up his h4-pawn in order to complicate the position, but failed to obtain sufficient compensation for it. 10...\textsc{e7} 11.\textsc{xe}4 \textsc{g4} 12.\textsc{xf}6 \textsc{xf}6 13.\textsc{d}2 \textsc{c}8 14.\textsc{g}4±

9.h3
White takes the g4-square under control and prepares \textsc{d}2.

9...\textsc{bd}7 10.\textsc{d}2 \textsc{b}8 11.a4

This move prevents Black’s counterplay on the queenside.

11...\textsc{a}5 12.\textsc{a}3 h5
In the game Trusis – Casden, USA 1997, Black played 12...\textsc{b}4 and White could have countered that simply with 13.\textsc{f}3+ without being afraid of 13...\textsc{b}6? 14.a5 \textsc{xc}4 15.\textsc{xc}4 \textsc{xc}4 16.\textsc{c}2. Now, in order not to lose his queen,
Chapter 16

This is Black’s main line and it is typical for the classical Benoni. Now, contrary to the move g7-g6, Black develops his dark-squared bishop in one move and not in two. During the 40ies of the past century it was often played by the theoretician V. Panov (the same master after which the Panov attack in the Caro-Kann Defence has been named). For some time this variation used to be named the Panov Defence, but this did not last for long. Presently, you can see it sometimes as the Czech Benoni since the Czech players have contributed greatly to the development of its theory.

6.g3!?

This move is simple and strong. White not only prepares the fianchetto of his bishop, but also plans later f2-f4, after which the exchange e5xf4 will not be good for Black because White will simply recapture g3xf4, with a firm control over the key e5-square.

6...0-0

It looks like Black cannot continue the game without this move, but he has tried in practice to postpone castling, or even not to castle at all in this position. We will pay attention to some of his alternatives:

There do not arise original positions after the inclusion of the moves 6...a6 7.a4 and only then 7...0-0 8.g2 – there arises transposition to 6...0-0.

6...b5?! This pawn-sacrifice in the spirit of the Volga Gambit does not seem good here, because Black’s bishop on e7 is not so active as on g7. 7.cxb5 a6 8.d3 0-0 9.bxa6 e8 10.d2 xax6 11.c4 f5, Vranesic – Jansa, Siegen 1970, 12.g2!? f6 13.0-0 fxe4 14. xxe4 f5 15.e2 b4 16.xf6+ xxf6 17.e4 xe4 18.xe4 xax2 19.d2± Black has managed to regain his pawn, but his position is very bad from the point of view of positional play. His d6-pawn is weak as well as his light squares and he has problems defending against White’s manoeuvre e4-g4-e6.

The seemingly active move 6...h5 weakens the g5-square and White can emphasize that with the move 7.h4.

(diagram)

Now, Black must choose a route for his knight.

After 7...bd7 8.h3 g6 9.f3, he can hardly organize any counterplay. 9...a6 (9...h7 10.e3 a6 11.d2 df6 12.e2± White has
much more space. Later he prepared and advanced f3-f4-f5 and won the game, Browne – Finegold, Las Vegas 1994) 10.a3. White is preparing active actions on the queenside. 10...b6 11.e3 \(f8\) 12.b4 \(g7\) 13.d3 \(b8\) 14. \(d2\) \(c7\) 15.c1 and once again Black obviously lacks space, Chatalbashev – Petrov, Sunny Beach 2013.

He cannot obtain an acceptable position after 7...\(a6\) either. 8.a3 \(c7\) 9.b4 \(b6\) 10.bxc5 bxc5 11.b1 0–0 12.e2 \(ce8\) 13.\(f3\) \(Delchev – Ramiro Ovejero, Tarragona 2007. White has a clear-cut plan for actions on the queenside and can prepare penetration of his pieces into his opponent’s camp (\(d1-a4-c6\) or \(e2-d3-c2-a4-c6\)). Black’s chances of organizing counterplay on the kingside are just minimal.

He has tried the transfer of his knight to c7 – 6...\(a6\) 7.g2 \(c7\), but this has the drawback that the control over the e5-square is weakened. White can exploit this circumstance with the energetic move 8.f4, for example: 8...\(xf4\) 9.xf4 0–0 (Black’s attempt to

oust the enemy bishop from its active position seems rather dubious 9...\(d7\) 10.\(f3\) g5, Nikolic – Braga, Thessaloniki 1988. Here, White had the possibility to continue with a promising piece-sacrifice for two pawns: 11.xg5! xg5 12.xd6 and Black will have great problems to evacuate his king away from the centre.) 10.\(f3\) b5. In the game Moskalenko – Damaso, Andorra 2006, White did not accept the pawn-sacrifice and in vain, because after 11.cxb5 a6 12.a4 \(\text{Black’s compensation for it would be insufficient.}\)

6...\(bd7\) 7.g2

Now, the best move for Black is 7...0–0, transposing to the main lines. His attempts to play originally would not end well for him.

7...h5 8.\(f3\) a6 (following 8...\(f8\), White can prevent the appearance of the knight on g6 with 9.\(h4\) g6, Moskalenko – Hristodorescu, Benidorm 2007, 10. 0–0+ 9.a4 \(f8\) 10.a5 \(b8\) 11.0–0 b5 12.axb6 \(xb6\) 13.\(a4\) \(b4\), Riazantsev – I. Sokolov, Rijeka 2010.
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Here, White has at his disposal a very promising piece-sacrifice:

$$14.\text{dx}c5!\text{ dxc}5\ 15.\text{dx}e5\text{ }b6\ 16.\text{c}6\pm$$

Black's king is terribly misplaced in the centre. White has for the piece two central pawns and if he succeeds in advancing them Black will be in a great trouble.

After $$7...\text{g}f8\ 8.\text{f}3\text{ }g6$$, White can maintain the advantage in many different ways, for example:

$$9.\text{d}2!?,\text{ preparing the transfer of his knight to the e3-square. Black is deprived of any counterplay. In addition, he lags considerably in development. } 9...\text{h}5\ 10.\text{f}1\text{ }\text{f}8\ 11.\text{e}3\text{ g}6\ 12.\text{f}4\text{ }\text{d}6\text{d}7\ 13.0-0\pm$$


7.\text{g}2

Now, Black must choose between three basic possibilities:

**C1)** $$7...\text{a}6$$

Black transfers his knight to c7 and plans later to create counterplay with the pawn-advance b7–b5.

8.\text{ge}2 \text{c}7 9.0–0

**C2)** $$7...\text{e}8$$

**C3)** $$7...\text{bd}7$$

There do not arise original positions after the inclusion of the moves 7...a6 8.a4, because it all transposes to the variations we analyse below.

9...\text{b}8

9...a6 10.a4 \text{b}6 11.f4 \text{d}7 12.\text{d}3 \text{b}8 13.b3\pm White is well prepared to counter b6–b5 and has the advantage thanks to his lead in development and extra space. Still, Black's position is very solid. In the game Kunin – Mishin, Moscow 2008, after the impulsive move 13...f5? 14.exf5 exf4 15.\text{xf}4 \text{e}5 16.\text{xe}5 \text{dxe}5 17.g4+– White had not only an extra pawn, but a winning position too.

10.a4 \text{b}6

He should not be afraid of the transfer of Black’s knight to the b4-square. 10...\text{a}6 11.f4 \text{d}7 12.\text{e}3 \text{b}4 13.\text{d}2 \text{f}6 14.f5 a6 15.\text{b}3 \text{b}6, Sonntag – Braga, Cadiz 1991, 16.h4\pm Black's queenside
counterplay has reached its dead end and now he is forced to defend passively.

After 10...a6 11.a5 b5 12.axb6 \(\text{AXB6} \ 13.\text{B4A4} \ \text{B7} \ 14.\text{D2D7} \ \text{D7} \ 15.\text{C3F8} \ 16.F4±\) Black has a weakness on a6 and later, White can play on the kingside, or prepare the pawn-advance b2-b4, Gulko – Mar, San Mateo 1989.

11.\text{D2A6}

This position was reached in the game Grabarczyk – Gasik, Polesczyk 2000. Following 12.\text{B3B5} 13.\text{D2B2}\) the best for Black would be to close the queenside with 13...\text{B4}, because only White can break there. 14.\text{D1A5} 15.\text{C1F8} 16.\text{D3±}\) Black is forced to defend passively. The problem is whether White will manage to break on the kingside.

\text{C2)} 7...\text{E8}

With this move Black prepares f7-f5, as well as \text{E7-G5}.

8.\text{G5G5}

This move seems a bit dubious, since Black fails to accomplish the advantageous exchange of the dark-squared bishops.

About 8...\text{D7} 9.0-0 or 8...\text{G6} 9.\text{H6 G7} 10.\text{D2D7} 11.0-0 – see 7...\text{BBD7}.

It is strategically risky for him to opt for 8...\text{F5} 9.0-0 fxe4 10.\text{XEX4} Now, the important e4-square is completely in White's hands. 10...\text{F5} 11.\text{C2C3 D7} 12.F4 \text{H6} 13.\text{F2E2 EXF4} 14.XXF4± – His pieces are much more actively deployed, while Black's d6-pawn is very weak, Prohaszka – Volosin, Hungary 2010.

8...\text{C7}. Black often refrains from active operations on the kingside and tries in this way to advance b7-b5. 9.0-0 \text{D7} 10.A4. White prevents his opponent's plans. 10...\text{BBA6}. Now, Black is transferring his knight to the b4-square. (It does not seem logical for him to play 10...\text{F5}, because his knight is already on the queen-
side. 11.f4 £f6, Hillarp Persson – Shchekachev, Salou 2005, 12. exf5!? £xf5 13.£e4± followed by £xf6 – the position is opened and White’s two bishops will be tremendously effective.) 11.£e3 £b4 12.£d2 b6 (12...a6 13.b3 £b8 14.f4 £f6 15.f5± Black has no counterplay at all, Medvegy – Bezdol, Austria 2007) 13.f4 £f6 14.f5 a6 15.b3 £e7 16.a5 b5 17.h4± – Once again Black’s queenside play has reached its dead end and he is forced to begin a long and difficult defence of a cramped position, Drozdovskij – I. Sokolov, Rijeka 2010.

Black has tried to place on c7 his other knight with 8...£a6, but even then he can only dream about organizing an active play. 9.0–0 £ac7 10.£e3 £d7 11.a4 £a6 12.f4 £f6 13.£d2 £b4 14.f5 a6 15.h4 b5 16.b3 bxc4 17.bxc4 £b8 18.£h2 £e7 19.£h3 f6 20.g4 g6 21.£g3± White’s kingside offensive is very dangerous, Gyimesi – Skembris, Bolzano 2000.

9.f4

He should not exchange the dark-squared bishops because he has extra space and the trade of pieces is in favour of Black, moreover that his bishop on g5 is “bad”.

9...exf4 10.gxf4 £h4+

Black runs away with his bishop with tempo under the attack.

Following 10...£f6 11.0–0 £g4 12.£d3 £d7 13.£g3± White maintains a stable advantage thanks to his extra space, moreover that the exchange of Black’s central e-pawn for White’s flank g-pawn is obviously in favour of White, Kaspi – Axelrod, Israel 2008.

11.£g3

11...f5

After 11...£d7 12.0–0 g6 13.£e3± White’s pawn-majority in the centre guarantees his advantage, Hoang Thanh Trang – Csom, Budapest 1997.

12.0–0 fxe4

Following 12...£f6, Hoang Thanh Trang – Csom, Budapest 1997, 13.£xf5 £xf5 14.exf5 £xc3 15.bxc3± White’s bishops are much stronger than his opponent’s cavalry.

13.£cxe4

Black lags in development and his e6-square is weak. White’s knight can go there at any mo-
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ment along the route e4-g5-e6, so Black is faced with a difficult defence. It is understandable that the vulnerability of the pawn on f4 is not important at all.

13...g6

After 13...��d7, Renet – Partos, France 1993, White can play simply 14.��g5! and following 14...��xg5 15.fxg5± he obtains the two-bishop advantage getting rid in the process of his isolated f4-pawn.

14.b3

White prepares the development of his bishop to the long diagonal.

14...��d7 15.��b2

He is not in a hurry to begin active actions before the completion of his development.

It was good for White however to play immediately 15.f5!?±

15...��df6

After this move Black can still resist for long.

Following 15...h6? Zakharevich – Gubajdullin, Belgorod 2008, White wins immediately with the line: 16.f5! ��xg3 17.��xg3 ��e5 18.fxg6 ��xf1+ 19.��xf1 ��xg6 20.��d3 ��g5 21.��f1 ��g7 22.��f3 ��e7 23.��f6 ��xf6 24.��xf6 ��f8 25.��xd6+-

16.��g5 ��g7 17.��d3± (followed by ��ae1 and the penetration of White's knight to e6 or ��c3) and Black can hardly parry the attack on the long diagonal.

C3) 7...��bd7

After this move, Black as a rule is preparing active actions on the kingside: ��e8, g7-g6, ��g7 and f7-f5.

8.��ge2

8...a6

8...��e8 9.0-0 g6 10.��h6. White develops his bishop with tempo. 10...��g7 11.��d2 ��f6. This is a standard manoeuvre for similar positions. White's bishop on h6 is too active and Black wishes
to oust it from there with $\triangle h8$ and $\triangle g8$ (following 11...f5 12.f4± White is better prepared for the opening of the game in the centre). 12.h3. He is defending against $\triangle g4$. 12...$\triangle h8$ 13.$\text{a}ae1$. White is bringing his last reserves. 13...$\triangle g8$ 14.$\text{a}e3$ f5 15.f4. Black’s defence is very difficult, because White has extra space and can manoeuvre very easily. 15...$\text{a}xe6$ (15...exf4, Zakhartsov – Srbs, Split 2013, 16.$\triangle xf4$+) 16.fxe5 $\triangle xe5$ 17.$\text{xf4}$ $\triangle xf4$ 18.$\text{xf4}$ fxe5 19.$\text{a}g4$. White restricts the enemy knight on $g7$. 19...e3 20.$\text{xe3}$ $\text{a}d7$ 21.$\text{xe4}$+ - Sasikiran – Satyapragyan, Kolkata 2009. The material is equal indeed, but Black’s position is hopeless, since he is incapable of countering the activity of White’s pieces. There followed later: 21...$\text{c}7$ 22.$\text{ef3}$ $\text{fe8}$ 23. $\triangle g5$ $\text{e}7$ 24.$\text{f7}$+ $\text{xf7}$ 25.$\text{xg6}$+ hxg6 26.$\text{xf7}$ 1-0

9.$\text{a}4$ $\triangle e8$

About 9...b6 10.0–0 $\triangle e8$ 11.h3 – see 9...$\triangle e8$.

10.0–0

10...$\text{g6}$

10...$\triangle h8$ 11.f4 exf4 12.$\text{gxf4}$ g6 13.b3 f5, Lysyj – Ehlvest, Moscow 2007. Here, White maintains a stable advantage with the line: 14.$\text{exf5}$? $\text{xf5}$ 15.$\text{e}4$ $\text{f8}$ 16. $\text{g}2$ $\text{g7}$ 17.$\text{b}2$ $\text{f6}$ 18.$\text{xf6}$. He exchanges the important enemy bishop. 18...$\text{xf6}$ 19.$\text{w}d2$±

10...$\text{b}8$ 11.$\text{d}2$ b6 (11...$\text{g}6$ 12.$\text{a}5$ $\text{g}7$ 13.$\text{a}4$ h5 14.$\text{b}4$± White has succeeded in breaking on the queenside, Avrukh – Paethz, Bonnevoie 1998) 12.$\text{c}1$ $\text{c}7$ 13. $\text{e}2$ $\text{f}6$, Korchnoi – Udovcic, Leningrad 1957, 14.$\text{d}3$± – He has extra space and can prepare an offensive on the queenside (b2-b4), as well as on the kingside (f2-f4).

After 10...b6, White should better play the waiting move 11. h3!? g6 12.$\text{h}6$ $\text{g}7$ 13.$\text{w}d2$ $\text{a}7$ 14.$\text{h}2$ $\text{h}8$ 15.$\text{ae1}$±, maintaining a stable advantage, Kornev – Sergienko, Voronezh 2012.

11.$\text{h}6$ $\text{g}7$ 12.$\text{w}d2$
12...\texttt{\texttt{5f6}}

The character of the fight remains the same after $12...\texttt{\texttt{5b8}}$ 13. $\texttt{\texttt{h3}}$ $\texttt{\texttt{5f6}}$ 14.$\texttt{b3}$ $\texttt{\texttt{5fe8}}$ 15.$\texttt{f4}\pm$ Zakharevich – Melkonyan, Kaluga 2003.

The immediate move $12...\texttt{\texttt{f5}}$ also leads to a difficult position for Black. $13.\texttt{f4}$ $\texttt{\texttt{5f6}}$ (It is not preferable for him to opt for $13...\texttt{exf4}$ $14.\texttt{\texttt{xf4}}$ $\texttt{\texttt{5e5}}$, Iotov – Chatalbashyev, Sofia 2004, due to $15.\texttt{\texttt{d6}}$ $\texttt{\texttt{exf6}}$ $16.\texttt{\texttt{dxe6}}\pm$ followed by $\texttt{\texttt{d5}}$ and Black’s position begins to crumble.) $14.\texttt{\texttt{ae1}}$ $\texttt{\texttt{a5}}$ 15.$\texttt{\texttt{c2}}$ $\texttt{\texttt{b8}}$, Trikaliotis – Dimitrijevic, Kallithea 1976. He has great problems defending, while White can either increase his pressure against Black’s position even more with the move $16.\texttt{\texttt{h3}}!\pm$, or begin immediate active operations with $16.\texttt{exf5}$ $\texttt{\texttt{gxf5}}$ $17.\texttt{g4}\pm$

13.$\texttt{h3}$ $\texttt{\texttt{h8}}$ 14.$\texttt{\texttt{e3}}$

14...$\texttt{\texttt{g8}}$

This is a thematic move, but Black has also tried in practice $15.\texttt{\texttt{f4}}$ $\texttt{\texttt{f6}}$

Black cannot facilitate his defence with $15...\texttt{exf4}$ 16.$\texttt{\texttt{xf4}}$ $\texttt{a5}$, Steckner – Fernandez Aguado, Germany 2005, $17.\texttt{\texttt{f2}}\pm$, as well as with $15...\texttt{f6}$, Umansky – Kostic, Bayern 2006, $16.a5!\pm$ – He has no counterplay, while White can play actively on the kingside ($\texttt{\texttt{f2}}, \texttt{\texttt{af1}}$), or on the queenside ($\texttt{\texttt{c3}}$-$\texttt{a4}$-$\texttt{b6}$, $\texttt{b2}$-$\texttt{b4}$).

16.$\texttt{\texttt{f2}}$

White is preparing the dou-
bling of his rooks.

16...b6 17.ae1 a7 18.b3 ee7 19.f5
He is occupying even more space.

19...eb7 20.g4 ah4
(diagram)
This position was reached in the game Kornev – Uryupin, Gagarin 2009. Here, White could have continued with a simple combination: 21.f6! xf6+ (21... de6 22.xf6 xf6 23.xf6±) 22.xf6 xf6 23.xf6± and White’s two minor pieces are stronger than his opponent’s rook and pawns, because there are no open files on the board and Black’s rooks have no scope of action.

Conclusion
Black obtains as a rule a solid but cramped position in the classical Benoni.
If he develops his bishop to g7, then White deploys his pieces analogously to the Averbakh System of the King’s Indian Defence (ae2, ag5 and eventually h2-h4 and g2-g4 cramping Black’s position even more).
If he develops his bishop to the e7-square, then White should deploy his pieces according to the following scheme: g2-g3, ag2, ag3, 0-0, h2-h3, ae3, ad2, f2-f4, ae1 seizing firmly the initiative.
This chapter will be devoted to some not so popular variations in the Benoni Defence. At first we will analyse the variation A) 1... c5 2.d5 e6 3.c4, in which Black, just like in the Modern Benoni, undermines the enemy centre with the move e7-e6, but does not develop his knight to an active position on the f6-square, but prefers the more modest development – d7. Then, we will analyse the line: B) 1... f6 2.c4 c5 3.d5 e6 4.c3 exd5 5.cxd5, in which Black chooses instead of the main line 5...d6, the extravagant development of the bishop – 5...d6. A) 1...c5 2.d5 e6 3.c4

3...exd5
Now and on the next move 3... f6 leads either to variation B, or to the main lines of the Modern Benoni, which will be analysed in the next chapter.

The variation 3...b5 4.cxb5 f6 5.c3 will be dealt with in the chapter devoted to the Volga Gambit.

There do not arise original positions after 3...d6 4.c3 g6 (4... exd5 5.cxd5 g6 6.e4 g7 7.f4 – see 3...exd5; 4...f6 5.e4 – see variation B; 4...e7 5.e4 exd5 6.cxd5 – see 3...exd5) 5.e4 g7 6.e2 – see volume 2, Chapter 12, variation B.

4.cxd5 d6
Black’s position is cramped indeed, but he has good chances of creating counterplay. In order to do that he usually develops his bishop to the long diagonal. After 0–0 and e8 his rook will exert pressure on the e-file.

About 4...d6 5.c3 f6 6.e4 – see variation B.
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4...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f}}}}6 5.\texttt{\texttt{c}}c3 \texttt{\texttt{d}}6 (5...\texttt{\texttt{d}}6 6.e4 – see variation B; 5...a6 6.e4 d6 7.f4 – see Chapter 18) 6.e4 – see Chapter 18.

It seems rather dubious for Black to opt for 4...f5 5.\texttt{\texttt{c}}c3 \texttt{\texttt{f}}6 6.g3 g6 7.\texttt{\texttt{g}}2 \texttt{\texttt{d}}6 8.\texttt{h}3! White’s knight is headed for the weakened e6-square. 8...\texttt{\texttt{a}}6 9.0-0 \texttt{\texttt{g}}7 10.\texttt{f}4 \texttt{\texttt{c}}7, Kock – Hresc, Latschach 2001. Black transfers his knight to c7 and covers the weakness on e6. Now, White maintains a clear advantage with the line: 11.\texttt{a}4+?! \texttt{d}7 12.\texttt{b}3 \texttt{c}8 13.e4 \texttt{x}e4 14.\texttt{g}5 0-0 15.\texttt{x}e4± Black will have great problems with his weak pawn on d6.

In the game Dreev – Volokitin, Moscow 2004, Black decided to postpone the move: 4...g6 5.e4 \texttt{\texttt{g}}7 (5...d6 6.\texttt{c}c3 – see 4...d6) 6.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{\texttt{a}}6 (It was preferable for Black to play 6...d6 transposing to the usual variations.), but after 7.d6± he would have been sorry about this, since he would hardly parry the threat \texttt{x}a6, \texttt{c}3-d5-c7.

5.e4

White occupies the centre. (diagram)

5...g6

This is the most natural move for Black.
In similar positions he cannot find a better place for his bishop than the g7-square.

6...\texttt{\texttt{f}}6 6.\texttt{\texttt{c}}3 or 5...a6 6.f4 \texttt{\texttt{f}}6 7.\texttt{\texttt{c}}3 – see Chapter 18.

5...\texttt{\texttt{e}}7 6.\texttt{\texttt{c}}3

6...a6 7.a4 \texttt{\texttt{f}}6 8.\texttt{d}3. White protects reliably the key e4-pawn. 8...\texttt{e}7 9.\texttt{ge}2. This knight is headed for the g3-square. 9...\texttt{g}6 10.\texttt{\texttt{g}}3 0-0 11.0-0 \texttt{\texttt{d}}7 12.\texttt{e}3 \texttt{b}8 (12...\texttt{e}8 13.f4 \texttt{\texttt{b}}6 14.\texttt{d}2± Ersahin – Tissir, Izmir 2011) 13.f4 \texttt{c}7 14.\texttt{c}1± White has a considerable space advantage, while Black’s pieces are cramped. His knight on g6 is not so active as on f6, because it does not control the central e4 and d5-squares, Dreev – Bozinovic, Sibenik 2009.

Black can also play immediately 6...\texttt{\texttt{f}}6 7.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{\texttt{e}}7 8.\texttt{ge}2 0-0 9.0-0 \texttt{\texttt{g}}6 10.\texttt{\texttt{g}}3 \texttt{\texttt{e}}8 11.f4±
White has a powerful pawn-centre and Black can hardly exert any pressure against it, Bertrand – Efimov, France 2008.

Following 5...\( \text{c6} \) 6.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g6} \), White should better take care prudently about his e4-pawn. 7. \( \text{ge2}! ? \) \( \text{c7} \) 8.\( \text{g3} \)

It would be premature for Black to choose 8...\( \text{g5} \), due to 9. \( \text{b5}+ \) \( \text{f8} \) (9...\( \text{d7} \) 10.\( \text{f5} \)±) 10. 0–0± Burmakin – Kolar, Bled 1995.

8...0–0 9.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{h4} \) (9...a6 10. \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 11.0–0 – see 5...\( \text{c7} \)) 10. 0–0 \( \text{xg3} \) 11.hxg3 \( \text{d7} \), Pavlidis – Zelcic, Rijeka 2010. White has two powerful bishops and he only needs to restrict the active possibilities of Black’s cavalry. The simplest way to do that is: 12.\( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 13.\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{e8} \) 14.f3 a6 15.a4 \( \text{d7} \) 16.g4± and Black’s position is solid indeed, but very passive.

Following 8...a6 9.a4 \( \text{g5} \) 10. \( \text{e2} \) 0–0 11.0–0 \( \text{f4} \), Alonso Rosell – Narciso Dublan, El Sauzal 2010, White maintains a slight but stable edge with 12.\( \text{h5}! ? \) \( \text{xc1} \) 13.\( \text{xc1} \)± – he has much more space and later may continue with active actions on the queenside (\( \text{b1} \), b2-b4), as well as on the kingside (f2-f4).

6.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g7} \)

After 6...a6 7.f4!? \( \text{g7} \), there arises the variation 6...\( \text{g7} \) (It would not work for Black to play 7...b5 8.e5 dxe5 9.fxe5 b4 10.\( \text{e4} \) \( \text{h4} \)+, since White has the resource 11.\( \text{f2} \)±)

7.f4

White deploys his pieces analogously to the main line, which we will analyse in the next chapter.

7...\( \text{e7} \)

7...\( \text{f6} \) 8.\( \text{b5} \) – see Chapter 18.

It is not good for Black to develop his knight to the edge of the board: 7...\( \text{h6} \) 8.\( \text{f3} \) 0–0 9.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{g4} \) 10.0–0± the knight on h6 is misplaced, since it does not exert pressure against White’s centre.
Chapter 17

It looks too dubious for Black to opt for 7...\( \text{Wh}h4+ \) 8.g3 \( \text{We7} \) 9.e5! dxe5 10.d6 \( \text{We6} \) 11.\( \text{Wh}3 \) f5 12.\( \text{Wf} \)3 exf4+ 13.\( \text{Wf} \)2 fxg3+ 14.hxg3± and despite his two extra pawns Black’s position is almost hopeless, because he lags considerably in development, his king is stranded in the centre and he can hardly defend against White’s threats \( \text{We}1 \) or \( \text{Wc}3-b5-c7 \). Peralta – Reinaldo Castineira, Barcelona 2008.

After 7...a6, White should play 8.\( \text{We} \)f3 (following 8.a4 \( \text{Wf} \)6! the inclusion of the moves a6 and a4 prevents White from the possibility to play \( \text{Wb}5+ \), like in the main line of the Modern Benoni). 8...\( \text{We} \)g4 (8...\( \text{We} \)e7 9.a4 0–0 10.\( \text{We} \)e2 \( \text{We} \)g4 11.0–0 – see 7...\( \text{We} \)e7; it seems too risky for Black to choose 8.b5 9.e5! \( \text{We} \)e7 10.a4 b4 11.\( \text{We} \)e4 dxe5 12.fx e5 0–0 13.\( \text{We} \)c4± and White’s powerful pawn-centre is ready to crush Black’s position, Inkiov – Palleja, Saint Affrique 2008) 9.\( \text{We} \)e2 \( \text{Wxf} \)3 (9...\( \text{Wd} \)7 10.0–0 \( \text{We} \)e7 11.a4 0–0 12.\( \text{Wh} \)h1 – see 7...\( \text{We} \)e7) 10.\( \text{Wxf} \)3 \( \text{We} \)e7 11.0–0 0–0 12.\( \text{Wh} \)h1 \( \text{Wd} \)7 13.a4± – The misplaced knight on e7 impedes Black’s active actions against the enemy e4-pawn, Krutti – Lengyel, Salgotarjan 1998.

About 8...\( \text{Wg} \)4 9.\( \text{We} \)e2 \( \text{Wd} \)7 10.0–0 0–0 11.\( \text{Wh} \)h1 a6 12.a4 – see 8...0–0.

9.\( \text{We} \)e2

Following 9...a6 10.a4 \( \text{Wd} \)7 (10...\( \text{Wg} \)4 11.0–0 – see 9...\( \text{Wg} \)4) 11.0–0 f5 (11...\( \text{Wc} \)7 12.\( \text{We} \)3±) White can accomplish a pawn-break in the centre: 12.e5 dxe5 13.\( \text{Wg} \)5 \( \text{Wb} \)6 14.a5 h6, Manolache – Sloviananu, Sovata 2000, 15.d6!± Black’s defence will be very difficult because both his knights are hanging and White is threatening the rather unpleasant check from the b3-square.

After 9...\( \text{Wd} \)7, White’s most precise move is 10.a4!?± Lanchava – Slingerland, Rotterdam 2000 and here, it would not work for Black to choose 10...f5 11.e5! dxe5 12.\( \text{Wg} \)5±, since he cannot play \( \text{Wb} \)6, because White will counter that with a4-a5.

10.0–0 a6

About 10...\( \text{Wd} \)7 11.\( \text{Wh} \)h1 a6 12.a4 – see 10...a6.
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11.a4
Naturally, White should not allow his opponent to play b7-b5.

11...\(\text{Nd7}\) 12.\(\text{Nh1}\)
This is a very useful move. White should remove his king from the possible checks in the future on the a7-g1 diagonal.

12...\(\text{c7}\)

About 12...\(\text{xf3}\) 13.\(\text{xf3}\) – see 7...a6.

After 12...\(\text{e8}\) 13.a5 h6 14.h3 \(\text{xf3}\) 15.\(\text{xf3}\), there arises a standard position for this variation with a slight but stable advantage for White, Peev – M. Petrov, Plovdiv 2006.

13.a5!?
White occupies space on the queenside.

In the game Bouaziz – Larsen, Sousse 1967 he played less accurately 13.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{ae8}\) 14.h3 \(\text{xf3}\) 15.\(\text{xf3}\) and exploiting the defencelessness of the bishop on e3, Black transferred his knight to the centre of the board – 15...\(\text{f5}\)! 16.\(\text{f2}\) \(\text{d4}\) 15.

13...\(\text{fe8}\) 14.\(\text{h3}\) \(\text{xf3}\) 15.\(\text{xf3}\) and once again the position is quite typical for the entire variation. White dominates in the centre, he has more space and two bishops, while Black has problems with his knight on e7.

B) 1...\(\text{f6}\) 2.\(\text{c4}\) c5 3.\(\text{d5}\) e6 4.\(\text{c3}\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{4...exd5}
\end{array}
\]

4...d6 5.e4 \(\text{e7}\) (5...exd5 6. cxd5 – see Chapter 18) 6.f4 exd5 7.cxd5 – see Chapter 18.

4...g6 5.e4 \(\text{g7}\) (5...exd5 6. cxd5 d6 7.f4 – see Chapter 18; 5...d6 6.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{g7}\) 7.\(\text{g5}\) 0–0 8.\(\text{f2}\) – see volume 2, Chapter 11, variation D) 6.e5 \(\text{g8}\) 7.\(\text{f3}\)  Black’s knight has been ousted and White has a great advantage, Kaliberda – Guzenko, Peterhof 2009.
Chapter 17

5. cxd5  \( \text{xd}6 \)

This move has not been played so often as 5...d6, but still, it has been tested by V. Gashimov, V. Epishin, S. Karjak in, N. Miesis...

The basic advantage of this move, in comparison to 5...d6, is that it has not been analysed thoroughly, so if White is reluctant to enter theoretical disputes, then Black can equalise easily. You must treat this move quite seriously if you do not wish to be surprised by it. There often arise quite irrational positions after it and White often wins material but falls behind considerably in development.

6. e4!

This is the most principled move, because White wishes to exploit with it the basic defect of Black’s move 5. White will play f2-f4 on the next move creating the threat e4-e5.

6... 0-0

This is Black’s most popular response. He wishes to place his rook on the e-file as quickly as possible and to try to exploit the unfavourable placement of White’s king in the centre of the board.

It is bad for Black to play 6...  \( \text{c}7 \)?! due to 7.d6! and he can hardly avoid material losses. 7...  \( \text{a}5 \) 8.e5  \( \text{e}4 \) (8...  \( \text{g}8 \) 9.\( \text{c}4 \)+- followed by  \( \text{d}5 \)) 9.\( \text{g}4 \) 0–0 (9...  \( \text{x}c3 \) 10.\( \text{x}g7 \)  \( \text{e}4+ \) 11.\( \text{d}1+ \)–) 10.\( \text{x}e4 \)  \( \text{c}6 \) 11.\( \text{f}3+ \)– Cheng – Akshat, North Geelong 2011.

6...  \( \text{e}7 \) 7.  \( \text{d}3 \)

7... 0–0. This move is too slow. 8.\( \text{f}3 \)  \( \text{c}7 \) (8...  \( \text{c}4 \) 9.\( \text{xc}4 \)  \( \text{xe}4 \) 10.0–0  \( \text{x}c3 \) 11.\( \text{bxc}3 \)± Sivic – Miezis, Nova Gorica 2010. The position is opened and Black’s lag in development becomes a telling factor. Now, you can see the basic defect of the move 5...  \( \text{d}6 \) – Black’s bishop has been placed in front of the d7-pawn and this impedes the development of his queenside pieces.) 9.0–0  \( \text{d}6 \), Gryciuk – Stark, Dos Hermanas 2004, 10.\( \text{b}5! \) a6 11.\( \text{xc}7 \)  \( \text{xc}7 \) 12.h3± White has extra space and the two-bishop advantage.

It seems stronger for Black to play 7...  \( \text{c}4 \)!, but even then White
maintains the advantage, although Black preserves chances of creating counterplay. 8.\textit{c}2 \textit{c}5 9.\textit{f}3 d6 10.h3 0–0 11.0–0± Mochalov – S. Savchenko, Kiev 1995.

Following 6...\textit{e}5, White has a very promising pawn-sacrifice (eventually even two pawns) – 7.\textit{f}3! \textit{xc}3+ 8.\textit{b}xc3 \textit{xe}4 9.\textit{d}3 \textit{f}6, Hodysh – Schwab, Vienna 2003 (9...\textit{xc}3 10.\textit{b}3++) 10.\textit{e}2+ \textit{f}7 11.\textit{xe}7+ \textit{xe}7 12.0–0. White’s lead in development and his two powerful bishops provide him with more than sufficient compensation for the sacrificed material. Now, it would be too dangerous for Black to accept the sacrifice of the second pawn. 12...\textit{xd}5 (It is preferable for him to play 12...d6 13.\textit{e}1+ \textit{d}7 14.\textit{c}4 h6 15.\textit{b}2, although even then Black’s defence will be very difficult.) 13.\textit{e}1+ \textit{f}8 14.\textit{g}5 h6 15.\textit{xf}7 \textit{xf}7 16.\textit{c}4 d6 17.\textit{xd}5+ \textit{f}6 18.\textit{c}4. White’s second bishop joins in the attack against the enemy king. 18...\textit{c}6 19.\textit{b}2+ \textit{d}4 20.\textit{ad}1 \textit{f}8 21.\textit{xd}4 \textit{xd}4 22.\textit{xd}4+ \textit{g}6 23.\textit{e}7± and despite the extra exchange Black’s position is very difficult, because White’s pieces totally dominate the board.

7.\textit{f}4

Now, there arise sharp complications.

7...\textit{xe}4

Black is forced to sacrifice a piece, because he cannot afford to let the opponent to play e4–e5.

8.\textit{xe}4 \textit{e}8

White has a piece for a pawn, but his game is very difficult, because the pin on the e-file is very unpleasant for him.

9.\textit{e}2

9...\textit{f}8

Black removes his bishop from the e-file and creates the threat f7–f5.

The immediate move 9...\textit{f}5 is worse, because after 10.\textit{xd}6 \textit{xe}2+ 11.\textit{xe}2 \textit{f}8 12.\textit{xc}8 \textit{xc}8 13.\textit{f}3± White’s rook and two minor pieces are obviously stronger than Black’s queen, Gagunashvili – Sutherland, Sydney 2008.

Following 9...\textit{c}7, White should better begin the immediate evacuation of his pieces away from the e-file. 10.\textit{d}1 d6 (10...\textit{f}5 11.d6 \textit{xe}4 12.\textit{xc}7 \textit{xc}7 13.\textit{f}2± – His minor piece is stronger than Black’s two pawns, but White must play accurately in order to
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avoid the attack against his king.) 11.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{f3}}}± Saidashev – Hempel, Email 2007.

It may be interesting for Black to try the not so well analysed line: 9...\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{a6}}} 10.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{d2}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{e7}}} (It is weaker for him to opt for 10...f5 11.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xd6}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xe2+}}} 12.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xe2}}}± and White’s rook and two minor pieces are obviously stronger than Black’s queen and pawns, moreover that his queenside pieces are not developed, Ovsejevitsch – Wagner, Ditzingen 2009.) 11.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xd6}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{h4+}}} 12.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{g3}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xe2+}}} 13.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xe2}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{f6}}} 14.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{b5}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xb2}}} 15.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{c3}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{c2}}} 16.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{f3}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{c7}}} 17.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xc7}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xc3+}}} 18.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{f2}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{b8}}} 19.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{he1}}}± Black has managed to win the b2-pawn, but White has completed his development in the meantime and evacuated his king away from the centre. His prospects seem preferable in the arising endgame with a rather non-standard material ratio.

10.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{g4}}}
White prevents f7-f5.

10...f5? 11.gxf5 d6 12.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{h3}}}+– Hillarp Persson – Almeida Quintana, Banyoles 2006.

After 10...\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{a6}}}, White’s best response would be 11.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{d2}}}±, preventing \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{b4}}}.

He should not be afraid of 10...b6, since he can simply give back his d5-pawn, completing his development and removing his king from the centre. 11.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{h3}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{b7}}} 12.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{g2}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xd5}}} 13.0–0 \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xe4}}} (13...\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{c6}}}, Hamad – Stupak, Beirut 2011, 14.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{hg5}}}! h6 15.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{d3}}}+–, As a result of the tactical fine point, White has got rid of the pin and Black’s two pawns will be obviously insufficient to compensate the missing piece.) 14.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xe4}}} d5, Fajs – Beltins, Email 2006. Now, White in his turn sacrifices a piece and begins a decisive onslaught: 15.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xh7+}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xh7}}} 16.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{d3+}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{g8}}} 17.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{g5}}} g6 18.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{wh3}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{g7}}} 19.f5 gxf5 20.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{h7+}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{f8}}} 21.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xf5}}} 1-0

11.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{h3}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xa4}}} 12.\\texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xg4}}} \texttt{\textsf{\ldseries{xe4+}}}

10...d6

This position was reached in
the game Nielsen – Karjakin, Beijing 2011. Here, White’s simplest decision would be 13.\textit{f}f2\textpm{} and Black does not have sufficient material compensation for the sacrificed piece. He cannot exploit the vulnerability of White’s king, because he has difficulties to bring into the actions his rook on a8 and his minor pieces.

\textbf{Conclusion}

We have just completed the analysis of variations in the Benoni Defence in which Black develops his knight on e7, or plays 5...\textit{d}d6.

In the first case, White obtains a stable advantage mostly because Black cannot exert pressure on the e-file, since contrary to its usual position on f6, Black’s knight on e7 not only does not exert any pressure against the enemy e4-pawn, but closes the scope of action of his rook on e8.

In the second case White must play very energetically in order to exploit the defects of the move 5...\textit{d}d6 – he must advance immediately f2-f4 and e2-e4, creating the threat e4-e5, after which Black is practically forced to sacrifice his knight 7...\textit{x}xe4. After that, there arise very complicated positions on the board, but still White’s material advantage guarantees his better chances.
We begin the analysis of the main line for Black in the Modern Benoni. It was suggested by F. Marshall in the year 1927 and since then became the main variation of this opening. Now, contrary to the classical Benoni, Black is trying to play actively starting from the first moves. This is easily understandable because there are strategical defects in his position – his weak d6-pawn and White's pawn majority in the centre. Black connects his plan with pressure on the semi-open e-file, the activity of his dark-squared bishop on the long diagonal and the advance of his pawn-majority on the queenside. Still, all this proves to be insufficient to maintain equality. It would be fair to say however that the fans of Modern Benoni do not strive to equalise, but wish instead to obtain a double-edged position even if it is worse. Black wishes to confuse and to outplay his opponent in tactical complications. This opening has been a part of the opening repertoire of such masters of combinational play like G. Kasparov, M. Tal, V. Topalov...

6.e4
White occupies the centre with his pawns.

6...g6
This is Black's main line, because he cannot find a better square for his bishop than g7.
1.d4 ♜f6 2.c4 c5 3.d5 e6 4.♕c3 ed 5.cd d6 6.e4 g6 7.f4

Still, he has tried in practice the less active move 6...♗e7. Here, Black’s bishop is placed obviously worse, because it impedes the possible pressure of his rook against the enemy e4-pawn. 7.f4 0-0 8.♗e2 ♕e8 9.♕f3 ♘f8 10.♗c2 ♘bd7 11.0-0 a6 12.a4 ♗g6. Black thus accepts that his move 6 was a mistake. 13.♗d2 ♘g7 14.♗ae1 ♗b8 15.♕h1+ Mroczek – Grochowski, Email 2010. Black has lost two tempi for manoeuvres of his bishop and has enabled his opponent to complete his development. Now, Black can hardly exert any pressure against his opponent’s centre. In addition, he must be constantly on the alert about the possible pawn-break e4-e5.

It is also bad for Black to choose 6...a6 7.f4! Now, there arises a position similar to the main variation, except that he has played the not so useful move a7-a6.

Following 7...♕g4, White has a very unpleasant check 8.♕a4+ ♘d7 9.g3± Black’s defence is very difficult and after the careless move 9...♕e7? 10.h3 ♘h5 11.g4+ he lost his bishop and the game, Mecking – Rodriguez Vila, Campinas 2011.

7...♗e7 8.♕f3 ♘g4 9.♕e2 ♘bd7 10.0-0, Flear – Giffard, Paris 1988. Black can hardly fight effectively against his opponent’s centre, because he lags considerably in development. After 10...♖xe4 11.♕e1! 0-0 0-0 12.h3 ♘xf3 13.♕xf3 ♖f5 14.♖xe4 fxe4 15.♕xe4 ♕f7 16.♕d2± White’s bishops became tremendously powerful. Black must be constantly on the alert about the possibilities ♖d2-a5 and ♖f3-g4-e6.

7...♗c7 8.♕f3 ♘g4 9.♕e2 ♘xf3 10.♕xf3 g6 11.0-0 ♘fd7 12.♕e1 ♖f6 13.♕g4± with an overwhelming advantage for White, E. L’Ami – Saligo, Maastricht 2007.

7.f4!?  

Black should better avoid 7...b5, because after 8.e5± he cannot play 8...b4? due to the loss of a piece. 9.exf6 ♖xc3 10.♕e2+ ♖d7 11.fgx7 1-0 Lalic – Laurent, Metz 2007.

This is the most unpleasant plan for Black. He must watch
now at any moment about the possible pawn-break in the centre e4-e5. About the strength of the system with 7.f4 you can judge by the fact that many fans of the Benoni Defence prefer to enter this opening via the following move-order: 1.d4 ♘f6 2.c4 e6 and only after 3.♘f3 or 3.g3 – 3...c5, avoiding this variation.

7...♘g7

This is the best move for Black.

After 7...a6 8.e5±, White attacks immediately his opponent’s knight in the centre.

It is bad for Black to opt for 7...♗bd7, because after 8.♗f3, he is incapable of preventing e4-e5. 8...♖g7 9.e5 dxe5 10.fxe5 ♗g4 11.e6± Geller – Kondratiev, Leningrad 1959.

After 7...♗fd7 8.♗f3 a6 9.a4 ♘g7 10.♖d3 0–0 11.0–0± there arises a position from the main variation, but with an extra tempo for White, because his bishop has come to the d3-square in one move and not in two.

It is also bad for Black to choose 7...♗g4 8.♗b3 ♕e7, Nemet – Komljenovic, Zuerich 1989. Here, White could have accomplished a pawn-break in the centre with: 9.e5! dxe5 10.d6 ♕d7 11.♕b5 ♖c6 12.fxe5± and his powerful pawns e5+d6 guarantee his overwhelming positional advantage.

8.♗b5+

White provokes disharmony in his opponent’s camp with this check. If Black interposes with his bishop A) 8...♗d7 or plays B) 8...♗bd7, then he will deprive his knight on f6 of a square for retreat and will enable White to break in the centre e4-e5. Therefore, it is considered most reliable for Black to continue with C) 8...♗fd7, but with this move his knight retreats from its active position.

The move 8.♗b5 was the main weapon of G. Kasparov and this was a definite proof of quality. It
has also been used by E. Bareev, L. van Wely, N. Vitiugov, D. Yako­venko and many other grandmas­ters.

A) 8...∥d7
This is not the best move for Black.

9.e5
Now, he has problems with his knight on f6.

9...dxe5
Black can also retreat immediately with his knight to the edge of the board. 9...∥h5 10.∥f3 0–0 (10...dxe5 11.fxe5 – see 9...dxe5) 11.∥xd7 ∥xd7 12.0–0 ∥a6 13.∥e4 dxe5 14.fxe5 ∥ae8 15.∥e1! Mar­ques – Del Bosco, Sao Paulo 1997. He can hardly counter now the powerful centralization of White’s pieces. Maybe Black should better give up the exchange immediately 15.∥xe5 16.∥xe5 ∥xe5 17.∥f6+ ∥xf6 18.∥xe5+, but even then, due to the open character of the position, White’s rook will be ob­viously stronger than Black’s knight and pawns.

Following 9...∥e7, Black has great problems to obtain a defens­ible position. 10.∥e2 dxe5 (His situation becomes even worse af­ter 10...∥xb5 11.∥xb5 ∥xd5 12.∥xd6+– followed by ∥e4, Koma­rov – Levers, Bethune 1993.) 11. d6 ∥e6 12.∥c4 ∥g4 13.fxe5 ∥xe5+, Stupica – Paoli, Reggio Emilia 1958, 14.∥xe2! ∥g4 15.∥d5 0–0 16.e6 ∥xe6 17.∥c7 ∥c6 18.∥xe6 fxe6 19.∥xg4± and Black does not have sufficient compensation for the piece.

10.fxe5 ∥h5
10...∥e7 11.∥f3 0–0 12.∥g5 ∥e8 13.∥xf6 ∥xf6 14.∥e2 ∥g7 15.0–0 a6 16.∥xd7 ∥xd7 17.e6 fxe6 18.dxe6± and thanks to his powerful passed pawn on e6, White has excellent prospects, Cortijo – Alfageme, Valladolid 1992.

11.∥f3 0–0
11...∥xb5 12.∥xb5±

12.∥xd7 ∥xd7
Black’s defence does not be­come easier after 12...∥xd7 13. 0–0 ∥a6 14.∥a4! ∥xa4 15.∥xa4 f5, Skembris – Alexakis, Greece 1981, 16.d6± and although he has succeeded in avoiding the loss of a piece, Black is practically helpless against White’s two connected passed pawns.

13.g4
Chapter 18

9.e5 dxe5 10.fxe5 ♞h5 11.e6 ♞h4+

Black loses his knight, but obtains counterplay.

It is obviously weaker for him to opt for 11...fxe6 12.dxe6 0-0 13.♕f3! White defends against ♞h4. 13...♕d4 (13...♕xf3 14.♕xf3+) 14.exd7 ♞xd7 15.♖g5 ♞e8+ 16.♗e2+- Simoncini – Caruso, corr. 1989.

Black’s unfortunate knight perishes at the edge of the board.

13...♕xe5 14.gxh5 ♞xf3+ 15.♕xf3 ♞e8+ 16.♗d1 ♞e5 17.♖h6± – He does not have sufficient compensation for the piece, but White still needs to play accurately because his king is in the centre of the board, Dobosz – Iglesias, France 2010.

B) 8...♗bd7

This move does not equalise for Black, but it leads to very complicated positions in which White must demonstrate excellent knowledge of forced variations.

12.g3!

Now, there arises by force an endgame which is better for White and it is with a non-standard material ratio.

White does not need to enter the complications after 12. ♖d2, because after that Black’s threats become very dangerous. For example: 12...fxe6 13.dxe6 0–0 14. exd7 ♖xd7 15.♖xd7 ♖f2+! 16.♖ge2 ♖d8 17.♖b3+ c4! 18.♖b5 ♖h8+ and White’s king is under the attack of the enemy pieces in the centre of the board, J. Ivanov – Cheparinov, Seville 2004.
\[ d4 \, f5 \, c4 \, c5 \, d5 \, e6 \, c3 \, e5 \, cd \, d6 \, e4 \, g6 \, f4 \, g7 \, b5 \]

12...\textit{dxg3} 13.hxg3 \textit{wxh1}
14.e3

White defends his knight on e1 and is preparing to castle queenside.

14...\textit{exg3}+

This is Black’s most resilient defence.

It is worse for him to opt for 14... \textit{g2} due to 15.exd7+ \textit{xd7} 16. \textit{xd7}+ \textit{xd7} 17.\textit{a4}+! White removes his queen with tempo. 17... \textit{d8} (17... \textit{c8} 18.0-0-00+ Hentze – Manuel, Email 2006) 18.0-0-0. He has ensured the safety of his monarch and now begins a decisive attack against the enemy king. 18.\textit{xc3} 19.bxc3 \textit{xc3} 20. \textit{d3} \textit{d6} 21.\textit{f3}. White brings his last reserves into the battle. 21...f6 22.d2 b6 23.e4 \textit{d7} (23... \textit{e5} 24.d6+--) 24.a6 \textit{e7} 25.xf6 \textit{xf6} 26.b1 1-0 Soucha – Hlavac, ICCF 2005. Black had an extra exchange and two pawns, but had to resign, because he was incapable of coordinating his pieces and offering resistance against White’s forces, which were not so numerous but perfectly coordinated.

It seems too risky for Black to play 14...0-0, since he sacrifices too much material with that. 15. exd7 \textit{xd7} 16.\textit{xd7} \textit{e8} 17.\textit{xe8} 18.\textit{we2}! This is the most precise move for White. 18...\textit{d4} (Black’s most resilient defence here is 18... \textit{h6}, but even then after 19.f1 \textit{xc3} 20.\textit{g2} \textit{xc2}+ 21.xc2 \textit{g7} 22.d1+ he has no compensation for the sacrificed material.) 19.0-0-0 \textit{ec3} 20.\textit{d2} \textit{h5} 21.\textit{g2}+– Draba – Zorzopoulos, Email 2000.

15.bxc3 a6

This is the most accurate move for Black.

It is not so good for him to continue with 15... \textit{e4} because of 16.exd7+! \textit{xd7} 17.\textit{d3} \textit{xd3} 18. \textit{xd3}. There has arisen a similar endgame like in the main variation (White has two pieces for a rook and two pawns.), but White has succeeded in preserving both his bishops, which are perfectly coordinated. 18.b6 19.\textit{g5} 0-0 (19...f6. Black sacrifices a pawn, but fails to activate his rook anyway. 20.\textit{xf6} 0-0 21.\textit{e7} \textit{fe8} 22.d6± Gazi – Nichols, Email 2010.) 20.f6 \textit{e8}+ 21.f2 b5 22.f3 \textit{ab8} 23.e5 \textit{h3} 24. \textit{c6}+ White’s minor pieces are very active and his passed pawn is close to the square of promotion, Sage – Simeonov, Email 2011.
16. exd7+  
17. \textit{xd7}+ \textit{xd7} 

18. \textit{g4}+ 
It is advantageous for White to provoke f7-f5, because in many variations he will manage to occupy the weakened e5-square with his knight.

18...f5 19. \textit{f3} \textit{xf3} 20. \textit{xf3} 
There has arisen a transition to an endgame and although there are numerous situations in which a rook and two pawns (and sometimes even with one...) fight quite successfully with two minor pieces, but here Black will need to fight long and hard for a draw. White’s pieces are perfectly coordinated. He must avoid the exchange of the rooks in the oncoming fight, since after that the activity of his pieces would not be so effective.

20...\textit{he8} 

20...\textit{ae8}?! 21. \textit{d2} \textit{e4} 22. \textit{f4} \textit{he8} 23. \textit{g5} \textit{e2+} 24. \textit{d3} h5 25.a4 \textit{e1} 26.\textit{a2}!? \textit{f1} 27.\textit{e6} \textit{c8} 28.\textit{xc5} \textit{f3+} 29.\textit{d4±} Rain – Flude, Email 2011. It is worth noticing the perfect coordination of White’s king, his two minor pieces and his passed pawn.

21. \textit{f2} 
Here, contrary to \textit{ae8}, the move 21.\textit{d2} is not so effective, because Black can play 21...c4, followed by \textit{ad8}, organizing certain counterplay.

21...\textit{e4} 

22. \textit{xc5} 

22...\textit{c8} 
Black ousts the enemy bishop, since it impeded his king to come closer to the d5-pawn.

After 22...\textit{ae8}, the activity of Black’s rooks is harmless for White. 23. \textit{g5} \textit{e2+} 24. \textit{f3} \textit{c2} (24...\textit{d2} 25.\textit{h7}! Now, White’s
1.d4 2.c5 e6 3.d5 4.c3 ed 5.cd d6 6.e4 g6 7.f4 g7 8.b5

Knight comes to f6 or to f8 capturing the enemy pawn in the process. 25...d3+ 26.f2± Houseaux – Vuilleumier, France 2009 25.b4 h6 26.h7 e2 27.f8+ d8 28.xg6 b6 29.f4 f2+ 30.e3 a5 31.f8 e2 32.e1! We have already mentioned that White should better avoid the trade of the rooks. 32...a4 33.d4 a3 34.c4 f3 35.b4 xg3 36.e6± Once again White has succeeded in coordinating his pieces and despite the fact that Black also had a passed pawn in the game Summerscale – Snape, Coulsdon 2010, White managed to promote his passed d-pawn faster.

23.d4 d6 24.d1 xd5 25.g5 e8 26.xh7± White has succeeded in regaining one of his pawns and in the subsequent fight proved that his knight and bishop are stronger than Black’s rook and pawns, Schoen – Blokh, corr. 1995.

C) 8...fd7
This is Black’s main line. Now, it will not be so easy for White to provoke an immediate conflict with the move e4-e5.
9.f3!?
This is an interesting move, which is not the most popular. It has been tried by A. Dreev, V. Milov, N. Vitiugov...

Now, contrary to the main line 9.a4, White does not weaken the b4-square, where Black may send his knight along the route b8-a6-b4 and prevents Wh4, which would lead to a situation in which after g2-g3 and 0–0, White’s king will not be so well protected by his pawns. Well, now Black has at his disposal a plan with an immediate pawn-advance on the queenside with a7-a6 and b7-b5.

We will analyse it in the variation with C2) 9...a6, but before that we will deal with C1) 9...0–0.

About 9...a6 10.0–0 c7 11. d3 0–0 12.h1 – see variation C1b.

C1) 9...0–0
This is not Black’s most energetic move, but it is very good. He refrains from occupying additional space on the queenside.
10.0–0

Now, Black must choose between C1a) 10...a6 or C1b) 10...d4.
Chapter 18

It is bad for him to play 10... \( \text{Qf6} \)?! because of 11.e5\( ^\pm \).

It is quite dubious for Black to opt for 10...f5?! because that leads to the weakening of the e6-square. 11.exf5 \( \text{Qxf5} \) 12.\( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 13.\( \text{Qg5} \)\( ^\pm \).

The attempt to capture a pawn 10...\( \text{WBa5} \) would not end well for Black at all. 11.a4?! \( \text{hxc3} \) 12.\( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{Wxc3} \) 13.\( \text{Qb1} \) (followed by \( \text{Qb2} \)) – he will pay very dearly for the weakening of the dark squares.

Black should better avoid 10...\( \text{Qb6} \), Georgescu – Ardelean, Mamaia 2013, 11.a4?! \( \text{g4} \) 12.h3 \( \text{Qxf3} \) 13.\( \text{Wxf3} \) a6 14.\( \text{Qd3} \)\( ^\pm \) – his knight is misplaced on the b6-square. Now, White can advance a4-a5 with tempo.

After 10...\( \text{We8} \), White’s most precise reaction would be 11.\( \text{Qh1} \) and following 11...a6 12.\( \text{Qd3} \) b5 13.a3, there arise positions from the variation with 9...a6.

\textbf{C1a) 10...a6}

Now, we will analyse variations in which Black plays early a7-a6, but refrains from the immediate move b7-b5.

\textbf{11.\( \text{Qd3} \) (diagram)}

Here, White’s bishop is placed more reliably and protects the e4-pawn. Black’s counterplay, connected with c5-c4 is not dangerous. Now, he has a choice again between: \textbf{C1a1) 11...\( \text{Qf6} \) or C1a2) 11...\( \text{Wc7} \).

About 11...b5 12.\( \text{Qh1} \) or 11...\( \text{We8} \) 12.\( \text{Qh1} \)?? b5 13.a3 – see variation C2.

\textbf{C1a1) 11...Qf6}

It is easy to see that with this move Black loses in fact a tempo. White’s bishop has come to d3 in two moves, while Black’s knight has come to f6 in three moves. Still, it is not easy at all for White to obtain a considerable advantage.

\textbf{12.a4}

This is the simplest move for
White, because he is dominant in the centre and has much more space and can squeeze Black even more on the queenside with the move a4-a5.

**12...\textit{g4}**

Black lacks space and the exchange of a couple of minor pieces would be in his favour. In addition, after the disappearance of the knight on f3, it will be much more difficult for White to advance e4-e5.

It is not so accurate for Black to play 12...\textit{e8}, because after 13.h3!? the move \textit{g4} will be already impossible and later, Black’s pieces will obviously lack space. 13...\textit{bd7} (13...c4 14.c2 \textit{bd7} 15.e3 \textit{c7} 16.d4 \textit{c5} 17.e1 \textit{d7} 18.d2± White is perfectly prepared for e4-e5, Shereshevski – Sarbay, Minsk 1980) 14.e1 \textit{c7} 15.c4. We will encounter this resource numerous more times. White prevents c5-c4 and is threatening at an opportune moment to play e4-e5 and after dxe5 – d5-d6, breaking through in the centre. 15...\textit{f8} (15...b5 16.axb5 \textit{b6} 17.f1± Black does not have compensation for the sacrificed pawn, Kurpiewski – Brewczynski, Mazowsze 2010) 16.b3 b6 17.a2. White is preparing the transfer of his rook to the e2-square. 17...\textit{b7} 18.\textit{ae2±} Black has no counterplay at all and must only wait for the moment White will break through in the centre at the best possible moment, Stone – Findlay, Toronto 1985.

**13.h3 \textit{xf3} 14.\textit{xf3} \textit{bd7} 15.a5**

Now, Black’s attempts to organize counterplay on the queenside with the move b7-b5 would lead after axb6 to the appearance of a weakness on a6.

**15...b5**

Still, Black must play this move!.

Slowing down of the active actions on the queenside will not end well for Black. For example: 15...\textit{e8} 16.e3 \textit{c8} 17.c2 h6 18.\textit{fd1} \textit{c7} 19.f2 \textit{b8} 20.a2 \textit{h7} and here, White obtains a great positional advantage with the transfer of his knight to the c4-square. 21.b1 \textit{g8} 22.d2± Malaysh – Leshchyshak, Email 2011.

15...\textit{c7} 16.a4. White prevents c5-c4. 16...h6 (16...\textit{f8} 17.\textit{h2!±}) 17.d2 \textit{f8}, Edelsvard – Malmdin, Sweden 1969, 18.
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He removes prudently his king away from the g1-a7 diagonal. In the arising complicated middle game, White’s prospects seem preferable due to his advantage in the centre and the two powerful bishops. Black has reliable control over the e5-square and it will not be easy for White to break his opponent’s defence.

16.axb6 \textit{\textbullet}xb6 17.\textit{\textbullet}h2 \textit{\textbullet}e8

This position was reached in the game Gibney – Dubuc, Email 2005. Black’s pawns on a6 and d6 are weak, but he still has good counterplay thanks to the active position of the bishop on g7 and White’s weak b2-pawn. With his last move, Black has created the threat to transfer his knight to the b5-square (\textit{\textbullet}e8-c7-b5) and eventually to d4. Now, White should continue with 18.\textit{\textbullet}c4 \textit{\textbullet}c7 19.\textit{\textbullet}d3\pm and he has prevents Black’s possibility \textit{\textbullet}b5. Later, White will play \textit{\textbullet}a2 and b2-b3, with which he will neutralise the pressure of Black’s bishop on the long diagonal.

\textbf{C1a2) 11...\textit{\textbullet}c7}  
He is preparing the pawn-advance c5-c4.

\textbf{12.a4}

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

12...c4

This is the logical continuation of Black’s plan.

It is not so good for him to play 12...\textit{\textbullet}f6, Turova – Zimina, St Petersburg 2000, because of the already well familiar motive 13.\textit{\textbullet}c4!, for example, 13...\textit{\textbullet}g4 14.e5\pm White has accomplished a breakthrough in the centre. Black’s attempt to win a pawn would not work after 14...\textit{\textbullet}xf3?! 15.\textit{\textbullet}xf3! dxe5 16.d6+-

After 12...b6 it is again very strong for White to play 13.\textit{\textbullet}c4!±

Following 12...\textit{\textbullet}e8, it seems very good for White to play the prophylactic move 13.\textit{\textbullet}b3.

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

13...c4!? This is the only way for Black to create active counterplay even at the price of a pawn. 14.\textit{\textbullet}xc4 \textit{\textbullet}xc4 15.\textit{\textbullet}xc4 \textit{\textbullet}c5 16.e5±
1.d4 d5 2.c4 c5 3.d5 e6 4.dxe6 dxe6 5.c3 ed 6.e4 g6 7.f4 g7 8.b5 

He has some initiative, but it is insufficient to compensate the missing pawn.

The alternatives are very bad for Black, for example: 13...f6 14.e5 dxe5 15.fxe5 Mecking – Goncalves, Campinas 2011, or 13...b6 14.c4! xc3 15.wxc3 xe4, Yuneev – Bakalarz, Miedzybrodzie 1991, 16.b3+- (following 15...f8, White can simply capture on c4: 16.wxe2 g4 17.wxc4± – remaining with an extra pawn and a very good position, Porat – Z.Mamedjarova, Porto Carras 2011) 16.d2! Once again the weakness of the c4-pawn leads to Black’s demise. 16...d3 17.xd3 cxd3 18.wf3 d7 19.wx3±

14.wc2

Black is preparing g4.

It is worse for him to opt for 13...xe8 14.wc3 xc5 15.w.d4. White wishes to exchange Black’s active bishop. 15...h6, Ovod – Gritsayeva, St Petersburg 2009

13...c5

14.wb3 wg4 15.wc4 wxf3 16.wxf3 wbd7

Black completes the development of his pieces.

It seems less precise for him to opt for 16...wxd4+ 17.wxd4 wb6 (it is preferable for Black to choose 17...wbd7 18.wxc4 – see 16...wbd7) 18.wc2?! wbd7 19.wc3 wa8 20.wxc4± Krueger – Herzog, Internet 2003.

17. wge7 wge7 18.wd4+

18...f6

18...wb8 19.wxc4 wb6. Black is trying to create counterplay on the dark squares (19...b5?! 20.wd4±) 20.wf2 wa8 21.wb1 wb6
22.\textit{\textbf{\textit{d}}\textbf{d}4} \textit{\textbf{\textit{g}}\textbf{g}4} 23.\textit{\textbf{\textit{d}}\textbf{d}2} \textit{\textbf{\textit{d}}\textbf{d}7} 24.\textit{\textbf{\textit{xb}}\textbf{b}6} \textit{\textbf{\textit{xb}}\textbf{b}6}, Basin – Kapengut, Minsk 1985. White has succeeded in neutralising Black’s activity and has all the chances of realising his extra pawn in the forthcoming endgame. Here, White’s most precise move would be 25.\textit{\textbf{\textit{b}}\textbf{b}3}, preventing \textit{\textbf{\textit{c}}\textbf{c}4}.

19.\textit{\textbf{\textit{xc}}\textbf{c}4} \textit{\textbf{\textit{b}}\textbf{b}6} 20.\textit{\textbf{\textit{f}}\textbf{f}2} \textit{\textbf{\textit{ac}}\textbf{c}8} 21.\textit{\textbf{\textit{d}}\textbf{d}4} (21.\textit{\textbf{\textit{e}}\textbf{b}1} \textbf{\textit{?}}) 21...\textit{\textbf{\textit{x}}\textbf{xb}2} 22.\textit{\textbf{\textit{b}}\textbf{b}1} \textit{\textbf{\textit{b}}\textbf{b}3}, Bermudez Vives – Gonzalez Bernal, Costa Rica 1997. This tactical resource is the only way for Black to defend effectively. Now, White’s most precise reaction is 23.\textit{\textbf{\textit{a}}\textbf{a}7}! \textit{\textbf{\textit{xb}}\textbf{b}1}+ 24.\textit{\textbf{\textit{x}}\textbf{xb}1} \textit{\textbf{\textit{bc}}\textbf{c}5}. Black was basing his hopes on this move, since White’s queen would not manage to run away from the a7-square. 25.\textit{\textbf{\textit{b}}\textbf{b}2} \textit{\textbf{\textit{a}}\textbf{a}8} 26.\textit{\textbf{\textit{x}}\textbf{xb}7} \textit{\textbf{\textit{xa}}\textbf{a}7} 27.\textit{\textbf{\textit{xa}}\textbf{a}7}± – Now, White can try for long to realise his extra pawn in this endgame, although Black’s counterplay (\textit{\textbf{\textit{b}}\textbf{b}8-b2}) should not be underestimated.

\textbf{C1b}) 10...\textit{\textbf{\textit{a}}\textbf{a}6}

Black is preparing the transfer of his knight to the c7-square, solving in the process the problem with the development of his knight on b8, because its usual d7-square has been occupied by his other knight.

11.\textit{\textbf{\textit{h}}\textbf{h}1}?

This is a thematic move for White. He must remove immediately his king away from the g1-a7 diagonal.

11...\textit{\textbf{\textit{c}}\textbf{c}7} 12.\textit{\textbf{\textit{d}}\textbf{d}3}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image1}
\caption{Diagram 1}
\end{figure}

12...\textit{\textbf{\textit{b}}\textbf{b}8}

Black is preparing b7-b5.

It is worse for him to opt for 12...\textit{\textbf{\textit{f}}\textbf{f}6}, in view of 13.\textit{\textbf{\textit{f}}\textbf{f}5}!

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image2}
\caption{Diagram 2}
\end{figure}

This pawn-break, together
with e4-e5, is one of the basic strategical resources for White in this variation. He is preparing the development of his bishop to g5 or f4. Naturally, this line includes certain risk and this is the weakening of the e5-square, so it is usually played when Black cannot exploit the e5-outpost. 13...b5, Mellano – Giaccio, Buenos Aires 1992 (It would be too precocious for Black to try 13...gxf5 14...g5 and White has powerful initiative for the sacrificed pawn) 14.fxg6 fxg6 15.e5 dxe5 16.d6. He has broken through in the centre and Black can hardly manage to coordinate his pieces. 16...Qce8 17. Qe3 c4 18.Qe4 Qxe4 19.Qd5+ Qh8 20.Qxa8± – His compensation for the exchange is insufficient. The move 12...a6 often leads to transposition of moves: 13.a4 b6 (Black’s best here is 13...Qb8 14.f5 – see 12...Qb8.) 14.f5 Qe5 (14...Qe8 15.Qg5 Qf6 16.Qxf6 Qxf6 17. Qd2± Temirbaev – Agapov, USSR 1986. The exchange of the dark-squared bishops has led to the compromising of Black’s king position. He can hardly parry the threats: Qh6, Qg5 followed by fxg6.). 15.Qg5 f6. This move weakens the e6-square and reduces the mobility of the bishop on g7. 16.Qxe5 dxe5 17.Qe3± – The bishop on g7 is passive and in view of the threats b2-b4, a4-a5, Black fails to transfer his knight to the blocking d6-square, Milov – Sulic, Mainz 2004.

13.a4 a6
It is bad for Black to play here 13...Qf6, because of the already familiar motive 14.Qc4! a6 15.e5 Qxe8, Sliwa – Forintos, Tel Aviv 1964, 16.a5± and his pieces are terribly squeezed.

14.f5!
This is the beginning of active actions. White wishes to play Qg5 and either to exchange the dark-squared bishops after Qg7-f6, or to provoke f7-f6.

14...b5
It is understandable that Black is trying to organize counterplay on the queenside.

After 14...Qe5, Likavsky – Maslik, Slovakia 2010, the simplest line for White would be 15.Qxe5 Qxe5 16.Qf4!? Qxf4 17.Qxf4± and here, he may either triple his major pieces on the f-file, or transfer his queen to h6, followed by f5-f6 or Qh4. Black cannot exploit the weakening of the e5-square, since his knight on c7 can hardly go there.
15.axb5

15...AXB5

15...AXB5 16.g5 f6 (It does not seem so reliable for Black to play 16...f6 17.gxf6 AXf6, Rawlings – H.Ivanov, Chessfriend.com 2005. Now, White can begin an offensive against the enemy king: 18. Wh1!? b4 19.Ae1 gxf5 20.Ae3! White's pieces are very active, while Black's king shelter has been weakened. His attempt to win a piece would not work: 20...fxe4? 21.h3 g8 22.g5 exd3 23. h4 Ae8 24.Axf6 AXf6 25.Af1 Ab8 26.Axf6 Aa1+ 27.Af1+-) 17.e3

Now, it would be too risky for Black to accept the pawn-sacrifice 17...gxf5 due to 18.Ah4! b4 19. Be2 fxe4 (It is possible that Black's best move here is 19... Ae5, although even then after 20.Axf5 Axg5 21.Axg5± White regains his pawn and maintains the advantage thanks to the weakness on f6 and Black's misplaced bishop on g7.) 20.Axe4 followed by Ag3(Af4) and Ah5. White's attack is running effortlessly.

It seems more solid for Black to choose 17...Be5 18.Axe5 fxe5 19.Wd2 b4 20.Ae2± Balashov – Shmatkov, Moscow 2010, but even then White has excellent chances of exploiting his pawn-majority on the queenside. Black's extra pawn on the other side of the board is practically irrelevant, since he can hardly advance c5-c4.

16.g5

16...f6

Black has a very good alternative here – 16...f6 17.Axb5 axb5 18.d2 c4 19.Ac2 b4 (19...Ag5 20.Axg5 Ae5, Kratz – Meyer, Email 2007, 21.h3!?± White not
only exchanges his opponent’s powerful knight, but also prepares \( \text{h6.} \) 20.\( \text{xf6} \) 21.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{g5} \) 22.\( \text{c6} \pm \) White’s knight on \( \text{c6} \) is very powerful and Black’s pawns on \( \text{c4} \) and \( \text{b4} \) are excellent targets for attack, Zaichik – Taborov, Tallinn 1976.

After 16...\( \text{c7} \), White’s simplest reaction would be 17.\( \text{d2} \pm \) followed by \( \text{h6} \).

Following 16...\( \text{xc3} \) 17.\( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{c7} \) 18.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{a8} \) 19.\( \text{h6} \) White does not have a weakness on \( \text{b2} \) any more and can attack on the kingside without any risk at all.

17.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e5} \)

It is worse for Black to choose 17...\( \text{e7} \) because of 18.\( \text{fxg6} \) \( \text{hxg6} \) 19.\( \text{h4} \) Vedrunes – Milgram, France 1992.

18.\( \text{h3} \) Spassky – Savon, Moscow 1971.

White’s prospects seem preferable in the oncoming complicated battle, because the pawns on \( \text{a6} \) and \( \text{d6} \) are weak in Black’s camp and his bishop on \( \text{g7} \) is misplaced. In addition, White can exploit the vulnerability of the e6-square (\( \text{c3-e2-f4-e6} \)).

**C2) 9...a6**

This is the most logical plan for Black. If White does not prevent the move \( \text{b7-b5} \), then Black should better occupy immediately space on the queenside.

10.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{b5} \)

About 10...0–0 11.0–0 – see variation C1a.

11.0–0 0–0 12.\( \text{h1} \)

Now, just like in variation C1, White removes his king away from the dangerous diagonal.

(diagram)

12...\( \text{e8} \)

This is the most popular move for Black. He occupies the semi-open file with his rook and does not reveal yet his future plans.
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About 12...\textlambdab7 13.\textlambdab3 \textc7 14. \textbfc1 – see 12...\textc7.

12...\textc7, Zheleznyakov – Mylnikov, St Petersburg 2012, 13.\textlambdab3 \textb7b7 14.\textbfc1 c4 15.\textlambdad2 \textc5 16.\textd4± White has occupied firmly the d4-square and is threatening the pawn-advance e4-e5.

After 12...\textd7b8, he maintains an edge transferring his bishop along the route c1-e3-f2 and eventually f2-h4. 13.\textlambdab3 \texte8 14.\textf2± Happel – Pigusov, Reykjavik 1994.

It is not good for Black to play 12...\textd7f6, because White can follow with 13.e5! dxe5 14.fxe5 \textg4 (Unfortunately for Black, he cannot play 14...\textdxe5 due to 15.\texte4 \textxc3 16.\textxh8 \textxh8 17.\textxa8± and his compensation for the exchange is evidently insufficient.) 15.\textg5± White’s pieces are very active and this, in combination with the pawn-tandem e5+d5, provides him with long lasting initiative, Matisson – Decallonne, France 1987.

Following 12...b4 13.\textd7a4, it will be very difficult for Black to advance in the future c5-c4.

13...\textf5 14.exf5 gxf5, Wiedenkeller – Ingbrandt, Norrköping 1988, 15.\textg5±

After 13...\texte8, Koerholz – Ragozin, Germany 1993, White can follow with the energetic breakthrough in the centre. 14.e5! dxe5 15.\textc4 exf4 16.\textd6± and he will capture on f4 on his next move and his active pieces and the powerful passed d6-pawn will be more than sufficient to compensate his minimal material deficit.

13.\textd7b6 14.\textdxb6 \textxb6 15. \textd2 \textd8 16.\textc4± Milov – Uritzky, Israel 1994. Now, you can see the defects of Black’s move 12. White has complete control over the c4-square and this nullifies completely Black’s pawn-majority on the queenside.

If he wishes to realise an immediate offensive on the queenside, Black should begin with the move 12...c4. After 13.\textc2, he has a choice.
Following 13...c5, White should occupy immediately the d4-square with his pieces. 14.e3 bd7 (14...c7 15.d4+) 15.d4 f6 16.b4 cxb3 17.axb3t Heberla - Szoeen, Polanica Zdroj 2008. White has exchanged the enemy c4-pawn and reduced considerably his opponent’s queenside activity. In the forthcoming fight, Black will have great problems to protect the numerous weaknesses of his position and particularly the c6 and e6-squares, where White’s knight may try to go.

13...b4. Black ousts immediately White’s knight. 14.a4

After 14...f6 15.e3 bd7, Iotov – Racherbaumer, Bad Wörishofen 2009, White can begin immediate active actions against Black’s weak c4-pawn: 16.d2!?± 14...b6 15.f5. This is a thematic move. Now, it is particularly strong, because with his previous move Black has weakened his control over the e5-square. 15...xa4 16 gxf5 17.exf5 xf5, Iotov – Lupulescu, Albena 2010, 18.e5! e4 (It is even worse for Black to opt for 18...xe5 19.xf5± and his king’s position has been weakened, so White has excellent attacking chances. In addition, he can regain his sacrificed pawn in many variations with the move g4xc4, preserving all the advantages of his position.) 19.xc4± White has regained his pawn and thanks to his superior pawn-structure preserves a slight but stable edge.

There arises a complicated but favourable position for White after 12...b6 13.f5

After 14...a5, Rafayevych – Lubbe, Wismar 2009, White should better continue with 15.e3± followed by d4. Black’s queenside pawn-structure is much rather a liability than strength.

Following 13...b4, White should better retreat with his knight to the edge of the board
14...\( \text{d}a4! ? \)±, because from there he can exchange it for the enemy knight on \( b6 \) (It is worse for White to play 14.\( \text{d}e2 \), because there, the knight will be very passive and will be much weaker than its counterpart on \( b6 \)). 14...\( \text{d}8d7 \) 15.\( \text{g}g5 \) \( \text{f}f6 \) 16.\( \text{d}xb6 \) \( \text{d}xb6 \) 17.\( \text{d}d2 \) \( \text{d}xg5 \) 18.\( \text{d}xg5 \). White’s pieces exert powerful pressure on the kingside, while Black can hardly exploit the weakness of the \( e5 \)-square. 18...\( \text{h}h6 \) 19.\( \text{h}h3 \) \( \text{h}h7 \), Cardoso Garcia – Amila, Email 2003. With his move 18, Black has broken a well familiar rule in chess “Do not advance pawns where you are weaker!” and here, White could have obtained a decisive advantage with a piece-sacrifice. 20.\( \text{f}f4! \) \( g5 \) 21.\( \text{d}e6! \) \( \text{fxe}6 \) 22.\( \text{fxe}6 \) \( \text{a}a7 \) 23.\( \text{xf}8 \) \( \text{xf}8 \) 24.\( \text{e}5+ \) \( \text{g}7 \) 25.\( \text{f}f1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 26.\( \text{exe}6 \). White’s central pawns are so powerful that Black has nothing better than to give back the piece after which White will have a crushing attack against the enemy king in a position with material equality. 26...\( \text{exe}6 \) 27.\( \text{dxe}6 \) \( \text{exe}6 \) 28.\( \text{f}f2 \) \( \text{d}d7 \) 29.\( \text{h}4+– \)

13...\( \text{d}8d7 \). Now, after 14.\( \text{g}5 \), White obtains good attacking prospects.

14...\( \text{we}8 \) 15.\( \text{d}d2 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 16.\( \text{f}f4 \)± Black has succeeded in fortifying his position in the centre and on the kingside, but has paid a high price for that. His bishop on \( g7 \) is passive and his \( e6 \)-square is very weak, Chueca Forcen – Juan Mas, Calvia 2011.

It is not preferable for Black to choose 14...\( \text{c}7 \) 15.\( \text{d}d2 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 16.\( \text{d}d1 ! \) This is the right move! White plans later to bring his knight into the attack against the enemy king with the manoeuvre \( \text{d}d1-e3-g4 \).

16...\( \text{a}5 \) 17.\( \text{h}h6 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 18.\( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{bd}7 \) 19.\( \text{e}3 \)± – The concentration of White’s pieces on the kingside is threatening, Alekseev – Morozov, corr. 1985.

14...\( \text{f}6 \). This move leads to a passive position for Black. 15.\( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 16.\( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{fxe}5 \) 17.\( \text{d}d2 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 18.\( \text{d}d1 \) \( \text{gxf}5 \) 19.\( \text{exf}5 \) \( \text{b}7 \), Szabo – Borocz, Balatonbereny 1996. Now, White can seize the initiative with a temporary pawn-sacrifice: 20.\( \text{f}f2! \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 21.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 22.\( \text{exe}4 \) \( d5 \) 23.\( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 24.\( \text{we}2 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 25.\( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{wb}6 \) 26.\( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{ad}8 \) 27.\( \text{wc}1! \)± followed by \( \text{we}6 \). Black cannot exploit the power of his passed pawns in the forthcoming fight, because his king’s shelter has been considerably weakened.

14...\( \text{f}6 \) 15.\( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{we}7 \) 16.\( \text{d}d2 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 17.\( \text{ae}1 \) \( \text{ac}8 \) 18.\( \text{d}d1 \). Once again White transfers his knight to the \( e3 \)-square. 18...\( \text{fe}8 \) 19.\( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 20.\( \text{e}3 \)± (followed by \( \text{g}4 \)) and Black will hardly parry his opponent’s threats, Glek – Anikaev, Minsk 1983.

264
13.a3!

This is another prophylactic move. White postpones f4-f5, but prevents Black's counterplay, connected with c5-c4 and b5-b4.

13...c4

Black prepares 14...c5 with this move, but weakens the important d4-square.

But not 13...d6, because of 14.e5! dxe5 15.fxe5 dxe5 16.fxe4 dxe3 17.dxe3 e5, Caprio - Melone, Arvier 2010, 16.dxe5 e5 17.fxe6± and Black's compensation for the exchange is insufficient.

After the other possibilities White, as a rule, advances f4-f5 and obtains an advantage. For example: 13...d6 14.f5 d8d7 15.g5 d6 16.d2 e5 17.gxf6 e5 18.gxe5 e5 (18.dxe5 19.fxe6 e5 20.g xf3±) 19.e3!± followed by eaf1. White's pressure on the kingside is more important than Black's dominance over the e5-square.

It may be interesting for him to try 13...a7, a move which has not been analysed thoroughly yet. From this square, Black's rook protects the f7-pawn and later may go to e7, increasing in the process the pressure against the enemy e4-pawn. 14.f5 e5 15.g5 d6 16.gxf6 e5 17.e5 e5 18.dxe5± White has an easy plan to improve his position: e3, eaf1, e5, but still, it will not be simple for him to break Black's position, Glushenkov – Zoll, Email 2011.

13...b7 14.f5 d6 (14...e5 15.g5 c7, Caprio – Melone, Arvier 2010, 16.g5 c7 17.e3±) 15.g5 d7 16.e1 e8 17.f4 e4 18.ea1 c4 19.c2± Black can hardly create counterplay on the queenside (after a6-a5, with the idea b5-b4, White will play a2-a4), Ibarra Padron – Walsh, Email 2008.

14.d6 15.e1 c5 16.e3± – The pin on the g1-a7 diagonal is very unpleasant for Black, Nguyen Chi Minh – La Bella, Cappelle la Grande 2011.
15.f5 \texttt{bd}7 16.g5
White develops his bishop with tempo.

16...\texttt{f6}

Following 16...\texttt{c7}, White can obtain excellent attacking prospects by transferring his queen to the h4-square. 17.\texttt{e1} \texttt{b8} 18.\texttt{h4} b4 19.axb4 \texttt{xb4} 20.d1. This knight is going via an already familiar route to the g4-square. 20...\texttt{b3} 21.a3 a5 22.e3! De-makov – Manaenkov, Email 2010.

After 16...\texttt{b6}, Belous – Seme-niuk, Vladivostok 2012, it is again good for White to play 17.e1!±

17.h4
White’s pawn is joining in the fight for the dark squares. It is understandable that the weakening of his king’s shelter is not important, since only White can attack on the kingside.

![Diagram]

17...\texttt{xg5}

Black loses immediately after

17...\texttt{e5}? 18.\texttt{xex5} \texttt{exe5} 19.fgx6 \texttt{gxg5} 20.gxf7+ \texttt{f8} 21.\texttt{h5} \texttt{d7} 22.\texttt{xh7} \texttt{f6} 23.\texttt{f4}+– Vitiugov – Maze, Moscow 2009.

Following 17...\texttt{b}8 18.\texttt{d2} a5, Perelshteyn – Bluvstein, Toronto 2011, White’s simplest reaction would be 19.\texttt{d4}!?±, creating the rather unpleasant threat to penetrate with the knight to the c6-square.

It seems too risky for Black to play 17...gxf5, because this move weakens considerably the shelter of his king. 18.exf5 \texttt{h8} 19.\texttt{d2} \texttt{b}7 20.\texttt{ae1} \texttt{g8} 21.\texttt{f4} \texttt{f8} 22.\texttt{f2} \texttt{e5} 23.\texttt{xe5} dxe5 24.\texttt{xe5}! f6 25.\texttt{e3} fxg5 26.\texttt{xh7} \texttt{g7} 27.f6 \texttt{xd5}, Botsari – J.Polgar, Eretria 2011, 28.f7! \texttt{g7} 29.\texttt{e8}+ \texttt{f8} 30.\texttt{d6} \texttt{h4}+ 31.\texttt{g1} \texttt{xf2}+ 32.\texttt{xh2} \texttt{xf2}+ 33.\texttt{g1} \texttt{xe8} 34.\texttt{xc5} \texttt{g8} 35.\texttt{d4} \texttt{e}1+ 36.\texttt{h2} \texttt{ef1} 37.\texttt{e4}± White has a powerful passed d-pawn and Black will have great problems neutralising the power of White’s attacking tandem queen and knight.

It is bad for Black to opt for 17...\texttt{a}7, Hossain – Praveen Ku-mar, Bhubaneswar 2011, because of 18.\texttt{d4}!? \texttt{g5} 19.\texttt{c6} \texttt{c7} 20.\texttt{hxg5} \texttt{b}7 21.\texttt{e1}± followed by \texttt{h4}, threatening \texttt{h6} and f6, or \texttt{f1-f3-h3}.

18.hxg5 \texttt{g5} 19.\texttt{xe5} \texttt{xe5} 20.\texttt{g4} \texttt{d7} 21.\texttt{f4}± – It is very difficult for Black to neutralise the
activity of White's pieces and particularly the well-familiar transfer of the knight (a1f1, h4, d1-e3-g4), Dreev – Maze, Reykjavik 2010.

Conclusion

In the Modern Benoni System, there arise, as a rule, complicated asymmetrical positions. Still, thanks to his powerful pawn-centre and the permanent threat of the pawn-break e4-e5, White's prospects are preferable. Among all possible defences for Black on move 8, the best for him seems to be 8...c5.

Against the other possibilities, White obtains an advantage effortlessly:

- after 8...d7 9. e5 White attacks the enemy knight and occupies the centre with tempo and obtains the advantage;
- following 8...bd7 9.e5, there arises practically by force an end-game with a non-standard material ratio in which White's pieces prove to be stronger than Black's rook and pawn (sometimes even two pawns...).

After 8...fd7, there arise positions which are not easy to play at all. Black attacks on the queenside: a7-a6, b7-b5, c5-c4, d7-c5). White plays at first some prophylactic moves – h1, a2-a3 and then begins an offensive on the kingside: f4-f5 and g5, trying to provoke the exchange of the important defender of Black's king – the bishop on g7.

The players for White should pay great attention to the transfer of the knight to the kingside in order to enhance the power of the attack c3-d1-f2-g4. In general, playing with Black is much more difficult, because every imprecise move may lead to an immediate disaster for him.
Chapter 19  
1.d4 d6 2.c4 c5 3.d5 b5

In this chapter we will analyse the Volga Gambit.

At first, it was named the Volga Gambit after in the year 1946, in the magazine "Chess in the USSR", there was published an article by the chess player from Kuibishev (the city on Volga river) B.Argunov with an analysis of this opening.

The main idea of this gambit is that after the pawn-sacrifice (b7-b5 followed by a7-a6) Black opens the a and b-files for his rooks and later, they will exert pressure against White's pawns on a2 and b2. The activity of Black's bishop on the long diagonal may create great problems for White as well.

Still, a pawn is a pawn and in our computer century White more and more often tends to punish Black for his frivolity in the opening. Naturally, we cannot say that White obtains immediately a winning position, but after an accurate play, he neutralises gradually Black's threats and forces him to begin defending. Still, the Volga Gambit has been tried, and still is not only in games with a shorter time-control, by such great players like V. Anand, V. Bologan, M. Carlsen, F. Caruana, V. Ivanchuk, G. Kasparov, V. Topalov and many others.

4.cxb5

This is White's most principled and strongest move. He follows the traditional wisdom "If they give you - take!".

We will analyse now A) 4...e6 and B) 4...a6.

About 4...b7 5.c3 e6 6.e4 – see variation A.

4...g6 5.c3 g7 6.e4 d6 7.e2 0-0 8.g5 or 7...a6 8.a4 0-0 9. g5 – see volume 2, Chapter 11, variation B.

4...d6 5.c3 a6 (5...g6 6.e4 g7 7.e2 – see 4...g6) 6.e4 g6 7.bxa6 – see 4...a6.
A) 4...e6
This move resembles the Blumenfeld Gambit (1.d4 ��f6 2.c4 e6 3.��f3 c5 4.d5 b5), but contrary to it White has not lost a tempo for the move ��f3 and manages to hold the d5-square.
5.��c3

5...exd5

About 5...a6 6.bxa6 – see variation B1.

It is bad for Black to choose 5...��b7, because his counterplay against the enemy d5-pawn is futile and his bishop on b7 will remain very passive in the future. 6.e4 exd5 7.exd5 d6 8.��f3 ��e7 9.��c4 ��bd7 10.0−0 0−0 11.��e1 ��e8 12.��d3 ��b6 13.b3 ��d7 14.a4± – with an extra pawn for White, Rohde – Simpson, Los Angeles 1989.

6.��xd5 ��b7 7.e4
With this energetic move White continues the fight for the d5-square and is ready to sacrifice material.

7...a6
Black exchanges the enemy b5-pawn and wishes to develop his knight on b8.

It seems too risky for him to play 7...��xe4?! 8.��c4!

Black loses now after 8...��d6, Mitenkov – Kravtsov, Moscow 1995 9.��f4! ��xc4 10.��c7+ ��e7 11.��e2+ ��f6 12.��e8+-

He suffers material losses following 8...��d6 9.��g4 0−0 10.��h6 g6 11.��xf8+- Prosch – Rindler, Neumuenster 2002.

8...��e7 9.��f3 ��d6 10...b3 0−0, Skomorokhin – Fedoseev, Nizhnij Novgorod 1998, 11.��f4± and Black can hardly defend against his opponent’s numerous threats. For example, he loses im-
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Black has no compensation for the pawn following 7...\texttt{x}d5 8. exd5, for example: 8...d6 9.e2!? White transfers his knight to the c3-square and from there it will protect simultaneously the pawns on b5 and d5. 9...e7 10.c3 0–0 11.e2 d7 (11...a6 12.0–0 axb5 13. \texttt{x}b5 a6 14.e1± White has completed his development and preserved his material advantage, Jahnel – Boidman, Wiesbaden 2012) 12.0–0

This position was defended 4 times by D. Werner. Black scored 1\frac{1}{2} points out of these 4 games, but White was clearly better after the opening in all the games. 12...e8 (Black only weakens the e6-square with 12...f5 13.c2± Chetverik – Werner, Budapest 2005, or 12...f6, Kaufman – Werner, Balatonlelle 2006, 13.f4± White exerts immediate pressure against the weak enemy d6-pawn.) 13.f4 b6 (13...f8 14.c2±) 14.f3 f6, Citak – Werner, Budapest 2007, 15.a4!? c4 16.c2 e5 17.xe5 xe5 18.e2± and White remains with an extra pawn and a winning position.

8.Bxa6 Bxa6 9.e4

He not only fortifies the knight on d5, but also eyes the f7-square.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
8.Bxa6 Bxa6 9.e4
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

9.Bb4

9...\texttt{x}d5 10.exd5 d6 11.f3 e7 12.e3 e4 13.c1± followed by 0–0, Mendez Ataria – Rego, Paraguay 2012. White has excellent chances of realising his extra pawn. He must only watch carefully about his weak pawn on d5 – d2(c2), fd1.

This position was reached in the game Gleizerov – Capece, Ticino 1993. Black has regained his pawn indeed, but his numerous pawn-weaknesses preclude him from equalising. 13...e3 d6 14.dxe5 dxe5 15.xd5 e4 16.g4+ – After the trade of the queens, there will arise on the board an endgame in which White will have an easy play against Black’s weak pawns on b4 and d7.

B) 4...a6
This is Black’s main line in the Volga Gambit.
5.bxa6
Now, White will have an extra pawn, but Black will not need to lose time for the development of his queen’s rook and his bishop will exert powerful pressure on the a6-f1 diagonal.

We will analyse now B1) 5...e6, B2) 5...g6 and B3) 5...xa6.

B1) 5...e6
Here, just like in variation A, Black wishes to fight for the d5-square.

6.c3
(diagram)
6...xd5

6...exd5 7.xd5 a6 (After 7...xa6 8.e4 xf1 9.xf1 e7, Rotaru – Turko, Email 2010, the simplest line for White would be: 10.c3!? d6 11.g3 0–0 12.g2± fol-

owed by g3, e1 and Black would not have compensation for the pawn.) 8.g5 e7 9.xe7 xxe7. White has an extra pawn and two powerful bishops. He only needs to complete his development. 10.f3 h6 11.h4 0–0 12.e3 d5 13.e2 d8 14.0–0 g5 15.g3 e4 16.d2 xg3 17.xg3 f5 18.a3 c7 19.c1 c4 20.b3 cxb3 21.xb3± Slivko – Rooms, Email 2012.

7.xd5 exd5 8.xd5 c6
9.f3
White develops his kingside pieces and is threatening e5 in the process.

9...e7
Black is preparing to castle kingside.

After 9...\(\text{\textipa{x}}a6\) 10.e4 \(\text{\textipa{d}}b4\) 11.\(\text{\textipa{w}}b3\) \(\text{\textipa{e}}b6\) 12.\(\text{\textipa{c}}c4\) White creates powerful pressure against the f7-square, Bertin - Hamar, corr. 1976.

Following 9...\(\text{\textipa{x}}a6\) 10.\(\text{\textipa{d}}d2\) \(\text{\textipa{e}}7\), White's simplest decision would be 11.e3!? \(\text{\textipa{xf}}1\) 12.\(\text{\textipa{x}}xf1\) and the loss of the castling rights is not dangerous for him. He needs to simplify the position having extra material. 12...0-0 13.g3 \(\text{\textipa{w}}b6\) 14.\(\text{\textipa{e}}b1\) \(\text{\textipa{f}}6\) 15.\(\text{\textipa{g}}g2\) \(\text{\textipa{e}}7\) 16.\(\text{\textipa{w}}xh7\) \(\text{\textipa{x}}xa2\) 17.\(\text{\textipa{h}}h5\) \(\text{\textipa{b}}b2\) 18.\(\text{\textipa{x}}xb2\) \(\text{\textipa{w}}xh7\) 19.\(\text{\textipa{c}}c1\) \(\text{\textipa{w}}b6\) 20.e4 \(\text{\textipa{d}}d8\) 21.\(\text{\textipa{b}}b1\) \(\text{\textipa{x}}xd7\) 22.\(\text{\textipa{a}}xa6\) \(\text{\textipa{g}}g6\) 23.\(\text{\textipa{c}}c6\) \(\text{\textipa{e}}7\) 24.\(\text{\textipa{e}}e3\) \(\text{\textipa{f}}6\) 25.\(\text{\textipa{x}}c5\) and in the game Reicher - Masek, Email 2011, White managed to realise his extra pawn. We have to mention that the rook endgame with 3 pawns against 4 pawns on the same flank is with very strong drawish tendencies. The presence of minor pieces however, complicates considerably the defence of the weaker side.

10.\(\text{\textipa{d}}e5\) 0-0

After 10...\(\text{\textipa{x}}xe5\) 11.\(\text{\textipa{w}}xa8\) Black has no compensation for the sacrificed material.

11.\(\text{\textipa{x}}c6\) \(\text{\textipa{x}}c6\) 12.\(\text{\textipa{w}}xd8\) \(\text{\textipa{x}}xd8\)

White has simplified the position and there has arisen an endgame.

13.e3

Black bases his hopes on exerting pressure against White's queenside.

13...\(\text{\textipa{x}}f6\)

After 13...\(\text{\textipa{x}}f6\) 14.\(\text{\textipa{c}}c4\) \(\text{\textipa{x}}xa6\) 15.\(\text{\textipa{x}}xa6\) \(\text{\textipa{x}}a6\) 16.\(\text{\textipa{c}}c4\) \(\text{\textipa{e}}2\) 17.\(\text{\textipa{e}}e2\) \(\text{\textipa{c}}c4\) 18.\(\text{\textipa{e}}e2\)

White's king is in a hurry to help in the protection of his queenside pawns.

18...\(\text{\textipa{x}}xb2\)

After 18...\(\text{\textipa{x}}xb2\) 19.\(\text{\textipa{c}}c2\) the b2-pawn is reliably protected, Sahovic - Rogers, Nis 1985.

19.\(\text{\textipa{x}}xb2\) \(\text{\textipa{x}}xb2\) 20.\(\text{\textipa{c}}c3\) \(\text{\textipa{b}}b8\) 21.\(\text{\textipa{a}}4\) Black has succeeded in
regaining his pawn indeed, but his defence in this endgame will be very difficult. His pawns on c4 and c6 are weak, while White has a powerful passed a-pawn and what is most important his king is much more active which is a great achievement in the endgame, Rensen – Emonot, Email 1998.

This move is stronger than 8...
\( \text{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{x}a6}}\) \( 9.\text{\texttt{x}a6} \) \( \text{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{x}a6}}\) 10.0–0 \( \text{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{x}a6}}\) \( 9...\text{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{x}a6}}\) \( 10.0–0 \) – see variation B3a. \) Black waits for his opponent to waste a tempo for the development of the bishop on f1 and will reply with \( \text{\texttt{x}a6} \) only then.

9.\texttt{e2}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image}
\end{figure}

9...\texttt{x}a6
Now is the right time.

About 9...\texttt{bd}7 10.0–0 \( \text{\texttt{x}a6} \) 11.h3 – see 9...\texttt{a}6.

9...\texttt{wa}5 10.0–0 \( \text{\texttt{x}a6} \) 11.\texttt{e}1 or 10...\texttt{bd}7 11.\texttt{e}1 \( \text{\texttt{x}a6} \) 12.h3 – see 9...\texttt{a}6.

It seems passive for Black to capture with his knight 9...\texttt{x}a6, because after that White's bishop on e2 will be more active than Black's bishop on c8. 10.0–0 \( \text{\texttt{b}6} \) (10...\texttt{c}7 11.\texttt{f}4 \( \text{\texttt{g}4} \). Sooner or later, Black will come to the conclusion that the exchange of the light-squared bishops is obligatory. 12.\texttt{d}2 \( \text{\texttt{xe}2} \) 13.\texttt{xe}2 \( \text{\texttt{b}8} \) 14.\texttt{ab}1 \( \text{\texttt{d}7} \) 15.\texttt{c}4 \( \text{\texttt{+Taborov – Ko-}} \)
sikov, Kiev 2004. Black has lost too many tempi in comparison to the main lines. This has enabled White to complete his development and to redeploy his knight to an active position.) 11.\textit{\texttt{c}}d2 \textit{\texttt{d}}d7 12.\textit{\texttt{c}}c4 \textit{\texttt{a}}a7 13.\textit{\texttt{g}}g5 \textit{\texttt{e}}e8 14.\textit{\texttt{w}}d2± – The passive position of the bishop on c8, which practically has no moves and only impedes the mobility of the rest of his pieces, only confirms that the move 9...\textit{\texttt{a}}a6 is quite dubious, Savina – Belous, Serpukhov 2009.

Following 9...\textit{\texttt{b}}b6 10.0–0 \textit{\texttt{g}}g4 11.\textit{\texttt{d}}d2 \textit{\texttt{x}}xe2 12.\textit{\texttt{w}}xe2 \textit{\texttt{b}}bd7 13.\textit{\texttt{c}}c4 \textit{\texttt{c}}c7, Shariyazdanov – Nisipeanu, Siofok 1996, White obtains a great advantage by a transfer of his knight to the c6-square: 14.\textit{\texttt{b}}b5! \textit{\texttt{b}}b8 15.\textit{\texttt{a}}a5 \textit{\texttt{x}}xa6 16.\textit{\texttt{c}}c6±

10.0–0
After White has lost a tempo for the development of his bishop, capturing on a6 will not be so effective.

10...\textit{\texttt{b}}bd7
This is Black’s most popular move. His plans include the moves \textit{\texttt{a}}5 and \textit{\texttt{f}}b8, after which his pieces will occupy the typical positions for the Volga Gambit.

About 10...\textit{\texttt{a}}a5 11.\textit{\texttt{e}}e1 \textit{\texttt{b}}bd7 12.h3 – see 10...\textit{\texttt{b}}bd7.

It seems less consistent for Black to play 10...\textit{\texttt{x}}xe2. In this variation, as a rule Black waits for the moment when White will have no useful moves and will need to exchange on a6 himself. 11.\textit{\texttt{w}}xe2 \textit{\texttt{a}}a6, Obodchuk – Egorov, Moscow 2007. Here, White had to continue with 12.\textit{\texttt{d}}d1!?, preparing the typical pawn-break for this variation – e4–e5. 12...\textit{\texttt{d}}d7 13.\textit{\texttt{f}}f4 \textit{\texttt{b}}b6 14.\textit{\texttt{f}}f1 \textit{\texttt{c}}c7 15.e5± – He has an extra pawn and more actively placed pieces.

10...\textit{\texttt{c}}c7. Black’s queen is not so actively placed here as on a5. 11.\textit{\texttt{e}}e1 \textit{\texttt{b}}bd7 12.\textit{\texttt{b}}b1 (In the game Taimanov – Bronstein, Zuerich 1953, after 12.\textit{\texttt{a}}xa6 \textit{\texttt{x}}xa6 13.\textit{\texttt{e}}e2 \textit{\texttt{f}}a8 14.h3 \textit{\texttt{b}}b6 15.\textit{\texttt{g}}g5 \textit{\texttt{e}}e8 16.\textit{\texttt{d}}d2 \textit{\texttt{a}}a4\textit{\texttt{b}} Black managed to regain his pawn and later he even scored a full point. This game was commented by D.Bronstein in the book devoted to the Candidates tournament in 1953 and was a very good example of what could happen to White if he underestimated the activity of Black’s pieces in the Volga Gambit.) 12...\textit{\texttt{f}}b8 13.\textit{\texttt{a}}xa6 \textit{\texttt{x}}xa6 14.\textit{\texttt{e}}e2 \textit{\texttt{b}}b7 15.\textit{\texttt{b}}b3 \textit{\texttt{e}}e8 16.\textit{\texttt{b}}b2± White has developed his bishop on the long diag-
10... discretionary and has managed to neutralise almost completely the activity of Black's pieces, Morley – Prevenios, Email 2010.

10...\$fd7 11.\$e1!? This move will be very useful when White advances e4-e5. 11...\$b6 (11...\$b6 12.\$f4 \$c4 13.\$b3 \$a5 14.\$c2± The manoeuvres of Black's knight have only led to the loss of valuable time for him, Morris – Akshat, Canberra 2011.) 12.\$c2 \$e5 13.\$xe5 \$xe5, Kiss – Simon, Aggtelek 1998, 14.a4± Black's pieces are actively placed indeed, but this is not sufficient to compensate fully the sacrificed pawn.

10...\$b6 11.h3 \$fd7 (11...\$bd7 12.\$e1 – see 10...\$bd7) 12.\$e1 \$c8, Gligoric – Udovicic, Sombor 1957 (12...\$e5 13.\$xe5 \$xe5 14.\$a4 \$xe2 15.\$xe2 \$a6, M.Marin – Salmensuu, Koszalin 1999, 16.\$g5!? \$fe8 17.\$d2± – The exchange of two couples of minor pieces is much rather in favour of White, since he has an extra pawn.) 13.a4!?± and in the arising typical Volga Gambit middle game White's prospects seem preferable because of the extra pawn.

11.h3

This is not only a leeway for the king, but also prophylactic against the possible manoeuvre \$g4-e5.

11...\$a5

It is not so good for Black to play here 11...\$b8, Bartel – Deszczynski, Ustron 2006, because his rook will be better placed there. 12.\$b1!?±

Following 11...\$c7 12.\$e1 \$fb8 13.\$c2 \$e8 14.\$g5 \$f8 15.\$d2± White succeeds in completing the development of his pieces and squeezes the enemy forces with the protection of the e7-pawn, S.Savchenko – Labensky, Alushta 2000.

After 11...\$b6 12.a4 \$fd7 13.\$b5, it seems too dubious for Black to continue with the plan including the move 13...c4, since this weakens the d4-square. 14.\$bd4. White exploits this immediately sending his knight to the c6-square. 14...\$c5 15.a5 \$bd7 16.\$c6± White has an extra pawn and his knight on c6 exerts powerful pressure against Black's position, Jussupow – Vitolinsh, Frunze 1979.
11...\texttt{xb6} 12..\texttt{e1}

Now, Black can play immediately 12...\texttt{e8}. This is a typical manoeuvre for the Volga Gambit – his knight is going to b5 via the c7-square. 13 \texttt{xa6} (13...\texttt{xa6} 14..\texttt{g5} \texttt{xc3} 15..\texttt{bxc3} \texttt{f6} 16. \texttt{h6}± and although Black has prevented e4-e5, he has been deprived of the powerful bishop on g7, Gonzalez Garcia – Szmetan, Dos Hermanas 2003) 14..\texttt{e2}. This is a very good square for the rook. From there it not only prepares e4-e5, but also frees the bishop on c1 from the protection of the b2-pawn. 14...\texttt{c7} 15..\texttt{g5}± – There has arisen a typical position for the Volga Gambit in which Black exerts pressure on the a and b-files, while White has an extra pawn, Schelle – Schatz, Germany 1997.

Black can also play at first 12...\texttt{fb8} 13..\texttt{b1} and only then to send his knight along the route e8-c7-b5. 13...\texttt{e8} 14..\texttt{d2} \texttt{c7} 15..\texttt{xe2} 16..\texttt{xe2} \texttt{b5} (Black can also play in the centre with 16...\texttt{e6}, although even then after 17..\texttt{dx6} fxe6 18..\texttt{c1}± White’s pieces would be better prepared for playing in the centre, Flear – Gregory, Saint Affrique 2000) 17..\texttt{xb5} \texttt{xb5} 18. \texttt{f4} c4 19..\texttt{c2}± Black has no compensation for the pawn, Pachman – Bellon Lopez, Haifa 1976.

It is weaker for him to opt for 12...\texttt{e8} 13..\texttt{g5} \texttt{f6} 14..\texttt{d2} \texttt{xe2} 15..\texttt{xe2}± White has provoked the weakening f7-f6 and thus has facilitated considerably the realisation of his extra pawn, Loureiro – Camara, Sao Paulo 1983.

It is also possible for Black to try here 12...\texttt{b6} 13..\texttt{g5}± Lukacs – Szell, Szekszard 1994.

13..\texttt{xa6}

Now is the right time, since White has no more useful moves.

13...\texttt{xa6} 14..\texttt{c2}

From this square, White’s queen not only protects the b2-pawn, but also the knight on c2, which will be useful if he advances b2–b3.
14...\textbf{b}6

Following 14...\textbf{e}8 15.\textbf{f}4 \textbf{c}4, Ghitescu – Ghizdavu, Bucharest 1973, White obtains an advantage ousting immediately the enemy queen from its active position: 16.\textbf{d}2±

15.\textbf{f}4 \textbf{a}4 16.\textbf{x}a4 \textbf{x}a4 17.b3 \textbf{a}6 18.\textbf{d}2±

This position was reached in the game Hjartarson – Lagerman, Reykjavik 2010. Black's compensation for the pawn is insufficient. White's later plan includes the move \textbf{c}3, neutralising his opponent's pressure on the long diagonal and transferring his knight to the c4-square (\textbf{f}3-d2-c4), after which he will not only manage to advance his queenside pawns, but will also prepare e4-e5, opening the game in the centre.

B3) 5...\textbf{xa}6 6.\textbf{c}3 (diagram)

6...g6

Here, just like in the Modern Benoni Defence, there will be no better place for this bishop than the long diagonal.

About 6...d6 7.e4 \textbf{xf}1 8.\textbf{x}f1 g6 9.g3 or 8...\textbf{bd}7 9.g3 g6 10.\textbf{g}2 \textbf{g}7 11.\textbf{f}3 – see 6...g6.

6...\textbf{a}5 7.\textbf{d}2 \textbf{b}6. The attack against the b2-pawn cannot be dangerous for White, because Black's kingside pieces are not developed yet. (Following 7...d6, White's simplest reaction would be 8.\textbf{e}4!? \textbf{b}6 9.\textbf{x}f6+ exf6 10.\textbf{c}3± – He lags in development a bit, but has an extra pawn and a superior pawn-structure, Dautov – Meszaros, Muenster 1990.) 8.\textbf{b}3. White would not mind a transfer into an endgame. He is even ready to let his pawns be doubled in order to do that. 8...\textbf{x}b3 (but not 8...\textbf{c}7 9.\textbf{f}3 g6 10.e4 \textbf{xf}1 11.\textbf{xf}1+= followed by g2-g3, \textbf{g}2 and Black will have to pay for the loss of tempi on manoeuvres with his queen.) 9.axb3 \textbf{b}7 10.\textbf{xa}8 \textbf{xa}8 11.e4 e6, Lalic – Fong, Saint John 1988. Black's compensation for the sacrificed pawn is insufficient. The only
thing White must do is watch carefully about the d5-square. 12.\( \text{xf4} \) d6 13.\( \text{c4} \) exd5 14.exd5 \( \text{bd7} \) 15.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{b6} \). It looks like Black has managed to complicate the issue, but after 16.\( \text{b5}+ \) \( \text{d8} \) 17.\( \text{g5} \) his position remains very difficult.

7.e4

White occupies the centre without being afraid of the loss of his castling rights.

8....\( \text{xa6} \)

Black has also captured on a6 with his knight. 8....\( \text{xa6} \) 9.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 10.0–0 0–0 11.\( \text{e2} \). From this square, White’s queen supports the pawn-advance e4–e5, defends the b2-pawn and will protect the knight if it is transferred to the c4-square.

Naturally, now Black’s most reasonable and strongest move is B3b) 7....\( \text{xf1} \), but before that we will analyse B3a) 7....d6.

B3a) 7....d6

This move is only seldom played in practice and this is not surprising, since Black reaches a worsened version of the variation B2.

8.\( \text{xa6} \)

Now, contrary to variation B2, White can capture on a6 directly, without the preliminary move \( \text{xe2} \).

After 11....\( \text{a5} \), White can accomplish the pawn-break in the centre immediately: 12.e5!? dxe5 13.\( \text{cxe5} \) (followed by \( \text{c4} \) or \( \text{c6} \)) and he not only has an extra pawn, but exerts pressure too against the weakness on e7.

After 11....\( \text{b6} \), White can transfer his knight to c4 with tempo. 12.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c7} \) 13.\( \text{c4} \) \( \text{wa6} \), Raptis – Mezentsev, Reno 2003, 14.
\[d4 \text{ \ensuremath{\text{\text{\text{1}}}}}.f6 \ 2.c4 \text{\text{\text{2}}}.c5 \text{\text{\text{3}}}.d5 \text{\text{\text{3}}}.b5 \text{\text{\text{4}}}.c6 \text{\text{\text{4}}}.b6 \]

\[g5!?\] – He has a material advantage and a much freer game too.

11...\text{\text{\text{2}}}.d7 \ 12.\text{\text{\text{1}}}.f4. White is again threatening e4-e5. 12...\text{\text{\text{2}}}.b6 (12...\text{\text{\text{3}}}.b8 13.\text{\text{\text{4}}}.f1 \text{\text{\text{4}}}.b4 14.\text{\text{\text{5}}}.ab1 Goetz – Franz, Bayern 1998) 13.\text{\text{\text{6}}}.fd1 \text{\text{\text{6}}}.c7 14.e5\footnote{– He has broken through in the centre and Black’s pieces are deflected from their queenside actions, S. Ivanov – Sznapi\k, Slupsk 1992.}

9.\text{\text{\text{9}}}.f3 \text{\text{\text{9}}}.g7 \ 10.0–0 0–0

About 10...\text{\text{\text{10}}}.bd7 11.h3 0–0 12.\text{\text{\text{12}}}.e1 – see 10...0–0.

11.\text{\text{\text{11}}}.e1 \text{\text{\text{11}}}.bd7 12.h3
White defends against \text{\text{\text{12}}}.g4-e5.

\[12...\text{\text{\text{12}}}.b6\]

After 12...\text{\text{\text{12}}}.b8 13.\text{\text{\text{13}}}.e2 \text{\text{\text{13}}}.b7 14.\text{\text{\text{14}}}.g5 h6 15.\text{\text{\text{15}}}.e3 \text{\text{\text{15}}}.b6 16.b3 \text{\text{\text{16}}}.b4, Ornstein – Bellon Lopez, Sweden 2003, White maintains his edge with 17.\text{\text{\text{17}}}.d2 \text{\text{\text{17}}}.a8 18.\text{\text{\text{18}}}.c1 – Having accomplished the development of his queenside pieces, White has reduced considerably the tactical possibilities of his opponent.

Following 12...\text{\text{\text{12}}}.a8, White can exploit the fact that Black does not exert pressure against the b2-pawn and complete the development of his pieces with: 13.\text{\text{\text{13}}}.g5!? \text{\text{\text{13}}}.b8 14.\text{\text{\text{14}}}.d2 \text{\text{\text{14}}}.b4 15.\text{\text{\text{15}}}.ab1±

13.\text{\text{\text{13}}}.\text{\text{c2}} \text{\text{\text{13}}}.\text{\text{b8}}, Gosci\n\n14.\text{\text{\text{14}}}.b1 \text{\text{\text{14}}}.e8. Now, White maintains the advantage with 15.\text{\text{\text{15}}}.f4\footnote{– Creating the threat e4-e5, as well as with 15.\text{\text{\text{15}}}.g5\footnote{– Squeezing the enemy pieces with the protection of the e7-pawn.}}, squeezing the enemy pieces with the protection of the e7-pawn.

B3b) 7...\text{\text{\text{7}}}.\text{xf1} 8.\text{\text{\text{8}}}.\text{xf1}

8...d6

After 8...\text{\text{\text{8}}}.g7, White can oust the enemy knight from the centre with 9.e5 \text{\text{\text{9}}}.g8 10.\text{\text{\text{10}}}.f3\footnote{– Followed by g2-g3, \text{\text{\text{10}}}.g2, Dobos – Mohacs, Szekszard 1995.}, having accomplished the development of his queenside pieces, White has

9.g3
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He is preparing an artificial castling.

9...\texttt{g7}

About 9...\texttt{bd7} 10.\texttt{g2} \texttt{g7} 11.\texttt{f3} – see 9...\texttt{g7}.

10.\texttt{g2}

10...0–0

The line 10...\texttt{bd7} 11.\texttt{f3}, as a rule, transposes to the main variation.

11...0–0 12.a4, or 11...\texttt{a6} 12.a4!? 0–0 13.\texttt{c2}, or 11...\texttt{b6} 12.a4!? 0–0 13.\texttt{e2}, or 11...\texttt{a5} 12.a4!? 0–0 13.\texttt{d2}, or 11...\texttt{b6} 12.a4!? 0–0 13.\texttt{e2} – see 10...0–0.

There are some exceptions as well.

11...\texttt{g4} This transfer of the knight seems premature, because Black will fail to preserve it in the centre of the board. 12.\texttt{d2} \texttt{ge5} (after 12...\texttt{gf6} 13.\texttt{e2± Black simply loses two tempi) 13.\texttt{e2} \texttt{b6}. He defends against f2-f4. (Black weakens considerably his kingside with 13...g5, Romanova – Reimche, Germany 2003, 14.\texttt{c4±} 14.a4! White is preparing a4-a5 and now Black’s knights will come under attack by White’s pawns. 14...0–0 (Here, it seems again too risky for Black to opt for 14...g5, Pecurica – Meribanov, Prague 2012, 15.\texttt{f3!? \texttt{x}f3 16.\texttt{xf}3± White has an extra pawn and excellent attacking prospects on the kingside.) 15.a5 \texttt{c8} 16.f4 \texttt{d7} 17.\texttt{c4±} – Having squeezed the enemy knights, White has seized completely the initiative, Ulibin – Skytte, Stockholm 1998.

After the other possibilities for Black, White will play a2-a4 with the ideas to transpose to the main variations. 11...\texttt{a7} 12.a4 \texttt{a8} 13.\texttt{e1} 0–0 14.\texttt{b5} \texttt{b7} 15.\texttt{d2} \texttt{g4} 16.\texttt{c3} \texttt{xc3 17.bxc3± Gurevich – De Vreugt, Groningen 1997. After the exchange of the dark-squared bishops, Black has no compensation at all. White’s e4-pawn is not only extra, but it is a passed pawn too.

11.\texttt{f3} \texttt{bd7}

After this move, there arises on the board the main theoretical
position of this variation. Still, before we begin its analysis, we will deal in short with Black’s alternatives.

11...\(\text{Q}f6\). He opens the way for his bishop, but impedes the development of his knight on b8. Now, it can go only to the edge of the board. 12.\(\text{Q}f4\) \(\text{b}6\) (12...\(\text{a}6\) 13.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{b}6\) – see 11...\(\text{a}6\)) 13.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{a}6\) 14.e5!? White sacrifices his b2-pawn and begins immediate active actions in the centre seizing completely the initiative. 14...dxe5 15.\(\text{Q}xe5\) \(\text{Q}xe5\) 16.\(\text{Q}xe5\) \(\text{Q}xe5\) 17.\(\text{Q}xe5\) \(\text{Q}xb2\) 18.\(\text{ab}1\) \(\text{c}2\), Arvola – Holm, Sandefjord 2012. Here, his most precise move is 19.a3!, after which Black’s knight is totally isolated from the actions. For example: 19...\(\text{a}7\) 20.\(\text{hc}1\) \(\text{f}5\) 21.\(\text{xf}5\) \(\text{gx}f5\) 22.\(\text{b}6\) \(\text{c}7\) 23.\(\text{c}6\)± (followed by \(\text{c}5\) and \(\text{a}3\)-\(\text{a}4\)) and White has all the chances of realising his extra pawn in this endgame.

Following 11...\(\text{a}6\), White must choose again the plan including the preparation of the pawn-advance e4-e5, since Black’s knight cannot prevent it. 12.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{b}6\) 13.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{f}b8\), Camara – Hook, Siegen 1970 (13...\(\text{h}5\) 14.\(\text{g}5\) h6 15.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{f}b8\) 16.\(\text{ab}1\)± White has completed the development of his queenside pieces, while Black’s knight on h5 is misplaced, Donchenko – Carow, Saarbruecken 2013.) 14.e5!? \(\text{h}5\) 15.\(\text{c}1\) dxe5 16.\(\text{xe}5\)±

After 11...\(\text{b}6\), White’s most practical move seems to be 12.\(\text{e}2\)!, with the idea to transpose to the main variation. 12...\(\text{bd}7\) (12...\(\text{a}6\), Krush – Alburt, Rockville USA 2013, 13.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{bd}7\) 14.\(\text{a}4\)±) 13.\(\text{a}4\) – see 11...\(\text{bd}7\).

12.\(\text{a}4\)!

It is amazing but this strong and logical move has remained for long in the shadow of the moves 12.\(\text{h}3\) and 12.\(\text{e}1\), but during the last several years the move 12.a4 is becoming more and more popular and has brought White numerous wins.

The point is that the moves 12.\(\text{h}3\) and 12.\(\text{e}1\) are useless for White from the point of view of playing on the queenside, while with 12.a4 he demonstrates immediately his intentions to play on that side of the board. His plans include \(\text{e}2(c2)\), followed by \(\text{b}5\), \(\text{d}2-c3\), \(\text{f}3-d2-c4\), after which Black will have no play on the a and b-files (Black’s rooks will be restricted by the pawn on a4 and the knight on b5.), or any pressure on the long diagonal.
Meanwhile, you should not forget that White’s passed a-pawn makes immediately two steps on his road to promotion.

Now, we will analyse the main lines for Black: B3b1) 12...\(\text{a5}\), B3b2) 12...\(\text{a6}\) and B3b3) 12...\(\text{b6}\).

12...\(\text{e8}\) 13.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{b6}\) 14.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{f6}\) 15.\(\text{f4}\)\(±\). White has managed to provoke f7-f6 and thus he has increased his advantage, Sochacki – Meskovs, Prague 2012.

12...\(\text{c7}\) 13.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{fb8}\) 14.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{wb7}\) 15.\(\text{b5}\) \(\text{a6}\) 16.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{e6}\), Merbis – Sergeev, Amsterdam 2012, 17.dxe6?! \(\text{fxe6}\) 18.\(\text{he1}\) \(\text{d5}\) 19.\(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 20.\(\text{ad1}\) \(\text{d4}\) 21.\(\text{c4}\)\(±\). Black’s central pawns have been reliably blocked.

12...\(\text{b8}\) 13.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{fb7}\) 14.\(\text{a3}\) \(\text{a6}\) 15.\(\text{e1}\) \(\text{e6}\), A.Vovk – Cuenca Jimenez, La Massana 2013, 16. \(\text{dxe6}\)!? \(\text{fxe6}\) 17.\(\text{b5}\) \(\text{d5}\) 18.exd5 exd5 19.\(\text{g5}\)\(±\). White’s pieces are very active. Following 19...\(\text{d4}\)\(±\)?! 20.\(\text{f3}\)! You can see another strong point of the move 12.a4 – White’s rook on a1 has entered the action very quickly and now, it not only protects his king but takes part in the attack as well.

Black’s attempt to occupy the e5-square with his knight fails. 12...\(\text{g4}\) 13.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{a5}\) (after 13...\(\text{ge5}\) 14.\(\text{d2}\)\(±\), as well as following 13...\(\text{b6}\) 14.\(\text{d2}\)\(±\). Black’s knight will be sent back into his own camp, Thorfinnsson – Rodriguez Guerrero, England 2012) 14.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{gf6}\). This is a signal to retreat (Black’s attempt to win a pawn loses a piece for him after 14...\(\text{xc3}\) 15.\(\text{xc3}\) \(\text{xc3}\)? 16.\(\text{a3}\)\(−\)) 15.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{a6}\) 16.\(\text{b5}\) \(\text{b6}\) 17.\(\text{xb6}\) \(\text{xb6}\), Sarkar – Chiang, Rockville 2013, 18.\(\text{d2}\)!?\(±\) (followed by \(\text{c3}\)) and Black can hardly organize any counterplay in the nearest future and he is a pawn down just like before.

12...\(\text{b6}\). This counterplay is not dangerous for White and after 13.\(\text{e2}\) Black’s knight will hardly come to the c4-square.

Following 13...\(\text{c8}\) 14.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{a6}\), Paunovic – Marinkovic,
Vrnjacka Banja 2012, White could have continued with 15...b5! preventing the access to the c4-square to the enemy pieces. 15...fb8 16.b3 e8 17.a1± and Black has no compensation for the pawn at all.

After 13...d7, White can continue with 14.a5!? I would like to mention that the move a4-a5 is a very important decision for White, because this pawn goes too far from the rest of his forces and might be won by Black. 14...fb8 15.a2 c8, Colon Garcia – Cabrera, Barcelona 2013, 16.e5!± White has seized completely the initiative.

13...e8 14.g5 xc3 15.bxc3 xa4 16.xa4 e8, Lenderman – Martinez Alcantara, Cochabamba 2013. Black has managed to regain his pawn, but his position remains very difficult, since his knights have no good squares. After White’s precise reaction 17.a1! b6 18.h6 g7 19.a7± (followed by b5) Black is doomed to a passive defence.

B3b1) 12...a5
This is not the best square for Black’s queen.

13.d2
Now, it is forced to retreat.

We have already mentioned that White’s plan includes the move c3, after the preliminary move b5.

13...b4
Black is attacking the pawns on b2 and e4.

It is obviously bad for him to choose 13...b6, because in that case there arises a position from the variation with 12...b6, but with an extra tempo for White. 14.e2 b3 15.h1 b6 16.a5 c4 17.a4 xd2 18.xd2± – He has managed to oust Black’s queen from its active position, Lysyj – Pakhmov, Uljanovsk 2012.

After 13...fb8 14.b5 d8 (14...b6 15.c2 e8, Andersen – Zaragatski, Dortmund 2012, White could have simply advanced b2-b4: 16.ab1!? c7 17.xc7 xc7 18.b4±) 15.c2 e8 (15...b6 16.b3 d7 17.e1 b7 18.c± White has an extra pawn and a positional advantage as well, Pacher – Antoniewski, Slovakia 2012) 16.c3 c7 17.xc7 xc7 18.xg7 xg7 19.d4 b7 20.b5± Levin – Collutiis, Ortisei 2013.
13...\textit{a}6. This is an attempt to exploit the weakness of the f1-a6 diagonal. 14.\textit{c}2. White defends against the possible penetration to the d3-square.

Now, if Black undermines the enemy centre, the position would remain inferior for him after 14...e6 15.dxe6 fxe6 16.\textit{he}1 d5 (16...\textit{c}6 17.\textit{g}5 d5 18.exd5 \textit{xd}5 19.\textit{e}4 \textit{ae}8 20.\textit{xd}5 exd5 21.\textit{xe}8 \textit{xe}8 22.\textit{xe}8+ \textit{f}8 23.\textit{ae}1 \textit{h}6 24.\textit{f}3 \textit{xa}4 25.\textit{f}4± – in the game Tauber – Romizin, Email 2006, White's two rooks proved to be stronger than Black's queen) 17.\textit{g}5 d4 18.\textit{b}5 \textit{ac}8, Docx – Claesen, Antwerp 2013, 19.\textit{e}4! \textit{c}6 20.f4± – After this precise move, Black cannot oust White's queen from the e5-square.

It is not preferable for Black to choose here 14...\textit{fc}8 15.\textit{b}5 c4 16.\textit{c}3 \textit{c}5 17.\textit{d}2 \textit{b}7 18.f3 \textit{d}7 19.\textit{d}4 \textit{xa}4 20.\textit{c}3 \textit{xc}3 21.\textit{xa}8 \textit{xa}8 22.\textit{xc}3 \textit{b}5 23.\textit{xc}4± – The pawn-shelter of White's king has been weakened a bit with the move f2-f3, but this is small consolation for Black, since he has no compensation for the sacrificed pawn, Lennartz – Hess, Email 2009.

14.\textit{e}2!
This is the best for White – he defends his e4-pawn.

Now, if Black undermines the enemy centre, the position would remain inferior for him after 14...e6 15.dxe6 fxe6 16.\textit{he}1 d5 (16...\textit{c}6 17.\textit{g}5 d5 18.exd5 \textit{xd}5 19.\textit{e}4 \textit{ae}8 20.\textit{xd}5 exd5 21.\textit{xe}8 \textit{xe}8 22.\textit{xe}8+ \textit{f}8 23.\textit{ae}1 \textit{h}6 24.\textit{f}3 \textit{xa}4 25.\textit{f}4± – in the game Tauber – Romizin, Email 2006, White's two rooks proved to be stronger than Black's queen) 17.\textit{g}5 d4 18.\textit{b}5 \textit{ac}8, Docx – Claesen, Antwerp 2013, 19.\textit{e}4! \textit{c}6 20.f4± – After this precise move, Black cannot oust White's queen from the e5-square.

14...\textit{fb}8
Black cannot capture on b2, because this would lead to the loss of his queen (14...\textit{xb}2?? 15.\textit{hb}1).

The raids of Black's cavalry cannot be dangerous for White.
For example: 14...\textit{g}4 15.\textit{hb}1 \textit{b}6 16.\textit{g}1?! f5 (16...\textit{e}5 17.\textit{b}3±) 17.\textit{xf}5 \textit{gx}5 18.\textit{a}5 \textit{xa}5 19.\textit{xa}5 \textit{xa}5 20.\textit{xe}7± Cattani – Gerola, Email 2009. White has managed to parry his opponent's initiative. Now, Black is a pawn down and his king is endangered.

Or 14...\textit{b}6 15.\textit{hc}1 \textit{fb}8 16.\textit{b}3 \textit{bd}7 (16...\textit{xb}3? 17.\textit{cb}1 \textit{c}4 18.\textit{xb}6+-) 17.\textit{ab}1 \textit{b}7 18.\textit{b}5± and again White has succeeded in ousting the enemy pieces from their active positions, Degtarev – Luminaria, Email 2006.
15.b3
With this move White is threatening to trap the enemy queen.

The evaluation of the position remains the same after the other possible retreat of Black's queen 15...b6 16.ab1 e8 17.b5 c7 18.xc7 xc7 19.a5 b7 20.b4 cxb4 21.xb4 xb4 22.axb4 bb7 23.d2± Jambrich – Rosen, Email 2010.

Following 15...e8 16.b5 xb3 17.hb1 c2 18.e1+– Black does not obtain sufficient compensation for his queen.

16.b5 e8 17.ab1 a6 18.c4 b7 19.e1± White has an extra pawn and very active pieces, Dobrica – B.Ivanov, Email 2011.

B3b2) 12...a6
With this move Black prepares the transfer of his queen to the a8-square followed by undermining White's central pawn on d5 with the move e7-e6. Now, this plan is not so effective as after 12.h3; nevertheless, White must play very carefully and accurately.

13.c2
White protects his e4-pawn and prepares b5.

13...a8 14.a3!? This is an important move. White's rook enters the actions on the third rank.

He must play very carefully in this variation and if he does not – then see what might happen to him – Moiseenko – Dubov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2013: 14.b5 c8 15.d2 c4∞ Here, White decided to transfer his knight to the c6-square, but overlooked a tactical strike. 16.fd4? xd5! 17.exd5 xd4 18.xd4 xd5 White ends up a pawn down, because he fails to keep the extra piece. Black will counter 19.f3 with 19...e5 20. d1 xf3 21.xf3 xd2.
This is a logical move for Black, begun with his previous move.

He has also tried the preliminary line: 14...\textit{c}8 15.\textit{d}1 \textit{e}6 16.\textit{dxe6 fxe6} 17.\textit{f}4 \textit{f}8 (After 17...d5 18.exd5 exd5, White’s pieces become tremendously active. 19.\textit{b}5 \textit{c}6 20.\textit{e}1 \textit{f}8 21.\textit{g}5 \textit{c}4 22.\textit{e}6 \textit{b}7 23.\textit{f}3 \textit{xe6} 24.\textit{xe6}± Romm - Arreaga, Email 2009) 18.\textit{aa1}. White’s rook must retreat, because it may come under attack in the future by Black’s bishop on f8 after d6-d5 and c5-c4. 18...d5 19.exd5 exd5 20.\textit{b}5 \textit{b}7 21.\textit{b}3± – The pawns on c5+d5 seem to be stronger than the pawns on a4+b3, but this is still insufficient to compensate the missing material for Black, Dutra – Rook, Internet 2010.

14...\textit{c}4. This move looks very dangerous. 15.\textit{e}3. White is preparing \textit{f}3-d4-c6. 15...\textit{e}6 16.\textit{dxe6 fxe6}, Gajewski – Beukema, Ljubljana 2012, 17.\textit{b}4! cxb3 18.\textit{xb3 h}8 19.\textit{e}1 \textit{xe4} 20.\textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 21.\textit{f}4 \textit{a}8 22.\textit{xe6}± – The position has been simplified and Black will have to fight long and hard for a draw.

After 14...\textit{b}8 15.\textit{b}5 \textit{e}8, Plischki – Haba, Plzen 2012, White can go back to the standard plan for similar positions with 16.\textit{d}2!?± followed by \textit{c}3, \textit{f}3-d2-c4.

15.\textit{dxe6 fxe6} 16.\textit{e}1 \textit{d}5

16...\textit{g}4 17.\textit{b}5 \textit{b}7 18.\textit{f}4 \textit{d}5 19.exd5 exd5, Leitao – Leon Hoyos, Istanbul 2012, 20.\textit{h}3! \textit{gf}6 21.\textit{e}7 \textit{fa}8 22.\textit{d}6 \textit{a}7 23.\textit{g}5+-, White has a crushing attack and a material advantage.

17.\textit{exd5 exd5} 18.\textit{b}5 \textit{b}7

This is a position from the game Timoschenko – Vaisser, Rijeka 2011. Here, White had to play very energetically – 19.\textit{g}5!, trying to exploit the vulnerability of the c6-square in the enemy camp. 19...\textit{g}4 20.\textit{f}4. White should not let Black’s knight to the e5-
square. 20...Ec8 21.Ee6 Exe6 22.Exxe6± White has an extra pawn and his king is safe from eventual attacks by Black.

B2b3) 12...Wb6
This is the best move for Black. Now, just like in the variation with 12...Wa5, he is preparing Efb8, but his queen will not be attacked with tempo after d2.

13.We2

13...Efb8
Black’s alternatives are weaker.

About 13...Wb4 14.d2! – see 12...Wa5.

It is useless for him to opt for 13...g4 14.d2! Ef6 15.c4± – Black has simply lost two tempi, Thorfinnsson – Rodriguez Guerrero, England 2012.

Following 13...Ea6 14.d2 Ef8 (14...Wb7 15.b5 Ef8 16.b3 e6 17.dxe6 fxe6 18.Ea1 Eb6 19. Kg5± – opening of the game in the centre has turned out to be in favour of White, because Black’s pawns on d6 and e6 are excellent targets for attack for White’s pieces, Klimakovs – Cullen, Email 2010) 15.b3 Ee8 16.Eab1± Black’s rooks on the a-file are passive restricted by White’s a4-pawn, Zatonshik – Alburt, Rockville 2013.

After 13...e6 14.dxe6 fxe6 15. Ed1 d5, Jayakumar – Leon Hoyos, Las Vegas 2013, the best move for White would be 16.a5! (the position is not so clear after 16. exd5 Khxd5 17.Kxd5 exd5 18.Ed5 Ec6= and despite the two extra pawns, it would not be easy for White to neutralise Black’s initiative) 16...Ec6 (16...Exa5 17. Exa5 Exa5 18.exd5 exd5 19. Khxd5 White has an extra pawn and excellent attacking prospects: We6, Kg5) 17.Eb5± Black’s position is very difficult, because it would not work for him to play 17...Wxb5 18.Kxb5 Kxe4 19. Kg7++ and he must either give up the exchange, or allow the move Kg6.

14.d2
The pressure against the b2-pawn squeezes White’s actions.

It would not work for him to play in the standard fashion 14.b5 Ke8 15.Kg5 (but not 15. d2 due to the loss of the b2-pawn) and here, the position remains very complicated after
15...h6! 16.♗xe7 ♕b7++; and despite White’s two extra pawns, the position is completely unclear, since his bishop on e7 is endangered, Diermair – Milanovic, Bad Gleichenberg 2013.

The endgame is preferable for White after 15...♕a6 16.♕xa6 ♕xa6 17.a5± Ulibin – Beletic, Trieste 2013.

16.♕d1!
He is preparing a4-a5.

16...♕a6

It is worse for Black to opt for 16...♕b7 17.♕c3 ♕a6, Brynell – Aslan, Germany 2012 and here, White maintains a considerable advantage after 18.♕c2± followed by ♕d1-e3-c4.

17.♕xa6 ♕xa6 18.a5 f5
After this move White’s centre crumbles, but thanks to his powerful passed pawn he preserves better prospects.

14...♕e8
Black is preparing ♕c7, after which White would not be able to play ♕b5.

Once again, it is impossible for Black to follow with 14...♕xb2?? 15.♕hb1 ♕c2 16.♕e1+-

After 14...♕b3, White’s best reaction would be 15.a5?!±, preventing ♕b6 (15.♕hb1 ♕b6++; Munkhgal – Nguyen Ngoc Truong Son, Manila 2013).

It seems rather dubious for Black to opt for 14...♕a6 15.♕b5 ♕b6 16.b3± – he has played rather indifferently and White has managed to deploy his knight on b5, Michael – Taylor, Email 2012.

15.♕hb1 ♕c7

19.exf5 ♕xd5 20.fxg6 hxg6
21.♕a4± Nakamura – Bologan, Biel 2012. There followed later: 21...♕b4 22.♕e3 ♕b5 23.b3 e6 (23...♕xa5? 24.♕d5!±) 24.♕xb4 ♕xb4 25.♕xb4 cxb4 26.♕c1 ♕c5 (after 26...♕c3, White has good chances of realising his extra pawn: 27.♕d1 ♕f6 28.♕c4 ♕xa5
1.d4 งf6 2.c4 งc5 3.d5 งb5 4.cb งa6 5.ba

29.ผxb4±) 27.ผc4 ผc3 28.ผd1 ผxb3 29.ผxc3 บxc3 30.ผxc3 ผc5 31.ผa3 ง5 (Unfortunately for Black, he cannot regain his pawn: 31...ผb7 32.ผb3 ผxa5 33.ผa3 ผa7 34.ผg5 ง5 35.ผe4± and the d-pawn is lost.) 32.ผd2± and White won the game later.

**Conclusion**

As a main weapon for White in the Volga Gambit, we have chosen the variation 12.a4, because Black’s defence is very difficult after it.

If he plays passively, White obtains the advantage implementing the following plan: ผe2(c2), ผb5, ผd2-c3, ผf3-d2-c4.

If Black tries to undermine the enemy d5-pawn (ผa6, ผa8, e7-e6) White must play actively, attacking Black’s weak d6 and e6-pawns (ผb5 and ผg5). In this situation, it is very important that White’s rook joins in the actions via the third rank (ผa1-a3-f3).

It is not so easy for White to obtain an edge after Black’s best move 12...ผb6. Here, White must rely on his passed a-pawn (ผe2, ผd2, ผhd1, ผd1, a4-a5) and in the middle game, as well as in the endgame, his prospects seem preferable.
The Nimzo-Indian Defence
1.d4 ♜f6 2.c4 e6 3.♘c3 ♜b4

This opening was named after the outstanding chess theoretician Aron Nimzowitsch, who played like this about one hundred years ago. In the contemporary tournament practice this defence is a part of the opening repertoire of almost all the grandmasters of top class. It has been encountered in nearly all World championship matches played lately.

What is the reason of the popularity of the move 3...♗b4? The point is that this opening has a very sound positional basis. Black exerts pressure against his opponent's centre (mostly against the d5 and e4-squares), castles quickly and White will have great problems to organise later an attack against Black's king. His choice seems quite reasonable also due to the fact that contrary to the majority of the other openings for Black after 1.d4, he has no "bad" pieces. He exchanges usually his dark-squared bishop for the knight on c3 and his bishop on c8 is developed either to b7, or remains well placed on the c8-h3 diagonal after d7-d6 and e6-e5.

How should White fight for the advantage? I believe that he should forget about obtaining a great advantage right at the beginning of the game and be prepared for a long and tough fight, relying mostly on his two-bishop advantage and having extra space. In addition, White must be very careful, since Black usually leads in development.

As a main opening weapon for White against this defence we will analyse the Rubinstein System – 4.e3. Akiba Rubinstein was a remarkable master of positional play and in this system White tries to deploy harmoniously his
pieces and to get rid of the pin of his knight after Ngf2 and a2-a3. It is very important that he avoids the doubling of his pawns in the process. One of the drawbacks of this system however is that White's bishop on c1 remains closed inside his own camp.

The Rubinstein System is a part of the opening repertoire of almost all the World Champions. M. Botvinnik, T. Petrosian and G. Kasparov played often like this and quite successfully at that. Still, at the beginning of the 80ies of the past century it went out of fashion and the system with 4.Nc2 was encountered more and more often in the tournament practice.

Among the contemporary grandmasters the move 4.e3 is regularly used by B. Gelfand, V. Ivanchuk, F. Caruana, H. Nakamura, V. Topalov... Sometimes even the actual World Champion M. Carlsen plays like this.
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Black's basic lines will be analysed in the next five chapters. Here, we will deal with some not so popular variations: A) 4...c6, B) 4...d6, C) 4...e4 and D) 4...exc3.

A) 4...c6

This move was played during the last century by master Puc, but failed to attract followers in the tournament practice.

Black frees the c7-square for the retreat of his bishop (a4-a5-c7), but does not exert pressure against his opponent's centre. This idea is much more effective after the inclusion of the moves

4...0-0 5.ege2 (see Chapter 25).

5.d3

Before playing ege2, White develops his bishop to an active position.

5...d6

Black is preparing e6-e5.

Following 5...d5 6.ege2 dbd7 7.a3 dxc4 8.exc4 ed6, Kesik - Fleischer, Germany 1995, White can prevent the enemy pawn-break e6-e5 in a radical way with 9.f4!? c5 10.e4±, creating the threat e4-e5 and seizing completely the initiative.

6.ege2 e5

After 6...dbd7 Black obtains a very passive position. 7.0-0 e5 8.a3 c5 9.e3 0-0 10.b4. White begins active actions on the queenside. 10...c7 11.d5 cxd5 12.cxd5 a5 13.e3 axb4 14.axb4 bxa1 15.c1xa1 followed by c1, e3-e4, db5, Gligoric - Smederevac, Yugoslavia 1973.

7.0-0
7...0–0

About 7...\texttt{bd7} 8.a3 – see 6...\texttt{bd7}.

\textbf{8.a3}

White occupies space and prepares the development of his bishop to the b2-square.

\textbf{8...\texttt{a5} 9.\texttt{c2} \texttt{e8} 10.\texttt{b4}}

\texttt{\texttt{c7} 11.\texttt{b2} \texttt{bd7}}

Black’s defence would not be any easier if he gives up the centre: 11...\texttt{exd4} 12.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{bd7} 13.\texttt{ad1} \texttt{e5} 14.\texttt{e2}± White’s pieces are more actively placed and Black’s d6-pawn needs permanent protection, Likavsky – Vukovic, Zala-karos 2001.

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

1.d4 \texttt{f6} 2.c4 \texttt{e6} 3.\texttt{c3} \texttt{b4} 4.e3

\textbf{12.\texttt{ad1} \texttt{e7} 13.\texttt{g3} \texttt{f8}}

\textbf{14.\texttt{d5}±} White has more space, while Black’s bishop is very passive on c7, Taimanov – Golombek, Moscow 1956.

\textbf{B) 4...d6}

This move is a bit passive, because Black does not exert pressure against his opponent’s centre.

\textbf{5.\texttt{ge2}}

This is the simplest move for White, because now Black cannot double his opponent’s pawns.

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

5...0–0

About 5...\texttt{c5} 6.a3 – see Chapter 24, variation \textbf{B}.

White should not be afraid of the enemy knight-sortie 5...\texttt{e4} 6.\texttt{c2} f5 7.\texttt{g3}± followed by \texttt{g2}, 0–0, completing his development and maintaining the advantage, Mejia – Perttierra, Parla 2010.

It may be interesting for Black to try here 5...\texttt{c6}!? , after which there arises a position just like
in variation A, but with the difference that White's knight on e2 prevents the development of his bishop to the d3-square, but even then after 6.a3 a5 7.g3 h5, Bertok – Puc, Ljubljana 1955, 8.d3!? h4 9.ge2 h3 10.g3± Black's pawn on h3 is too far away from the rest of his forces and is much rather a liability than strength.

6.a3
Now, Black cannot avoid the exchange and White obtains the two-bishop advantage.

6...txc3+ 7.ltxc3 e5 8.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{A}}}e2
He is preparing to castle kingside.

8...\texttt{\texttt{A}}e8
8...\texttt{\texttt{A}}c6 9.d5. White is occupying space. 9...\texttt{\texttt{A}}e7 10.e4 \texttt{\texttt{A}}e8 11.\texttt{\texttt{A}}e3. He plans to castle queenside, because after 11.0–0 his king may come under attack. 11...f5 12.f3 g6 13.\texttt{\texttt{A}}d2 a6 14.0–0–0 \texttt{\texttt{A}}d7 15.c5± followed by \texttt{\texttt{A}}b1, \texttt{\texttt{A}}c1 and actions on the c-file, Ludgate – Franklin, Blackpool 1971.

After 8...\texttt{\texttt{A}}e7 9.0–0 \texttt{\texttt{A}}f5, White can begin immediately the fight for the e4-square: 10.f3 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{A}}}c6 11.\texttt{\texttt{A}}d5 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{A}}}xd5 12.\texttt{\texttt{A}}xd5 \texttt{\texttt{A}}b8 13.e4± followed by \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{A}}}e3, \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{A}}}c1, Euwe – Yanofsky, Groningen 1946. White has more space, two powerful bishops and good prospects to attack the weak enemy c7-pawn.

9.0–0 \texttt{\texttt{A}}bd7

It is not good for Black to develop his bishop – 9...\texttt{\texttt{A}}f5 due to 10.f3±

He should better avoid 9...exd4 10.exd4, because the opening of the position is in favour of White who has two bishops. 10...\texttt{\texttt{A}}e4 11.\texttt{\texttt{A}}xe4 \texttt{\texttt{A}}xe4 12.\texttt{\texttt{A}}d3± Vaitonis – Berner, Winnipeg 1953.

10.\texttt{\texttt{A}}c2!? This is a very reliable move. White is not in a hurry to force the issue.

It is also possible for him to choose the sharper line: 10.f4 exd4 11.exd4 d5 12.f5± followed
by \( \text{f4} \), Milov - Dizdarevic, Struga 1995.

10...h6 11.h3 \( \text{f8} \) 12.dxe5 \( \text{xe5} \)

Or 12...dxe5?! 13.d1 \( \text{e7} \) 14.d5 \( \text{xd5} \) 15.cxd5\( \pm \) and then \( \text{d2}, \text{ac1} \).

13.e4\( \pm \)

Now, White’s bishop on \( \text{c1} \), which has been idle, enters the actions. He has a stable advantage thanks to his extra space and his bishops may become very powerful in the future. Black has some counterplay against the enemy \( \text{d4} \)-pawn, but this is insufficient for equality.

C) 4...\( \text{e4} \)

This move contradicts one of the basic principles of playing in the opening – not to play a second time with an already developed piece. Black bases his hopes on tactical tricks connected with his pressure against the \( \text{c3} \) and \( \text{f2} \)-squares. Therefore, White must play very accurately.

5.\( \text{c2} \)

5...f5

This is the strongest move for Black. He is reluctant to give up the key \( \text{e4} \)-square without a fight.

It is bad for him to opt for 5...d5, because after 6.d3 \( \text{xc3} \) (6...f5 7.ge2 – see 5.f5) 7.bxc3 \( \text{d6} \) 8.f3 \( \text{h6} \) 9.0-0\( \pm \) Black lags considerably in development and White can always get rid of his doubled pawns by exchanging on \( \text{d5} \), Werle - Meijers, Germany 2011.

Following 5...\( \text{xc3} \) 6.bxc3, Black doubles the enemy pawns, but must lose time to retreat with his bishop. 6...a5 (6...\( \text{e7} \) 7.d3 \( \text{d6} \) 8.e2 b6 9.0-0 \( \text{a6} \) 10.f4 c6 11.g3 \( \text{g6} \) 12.e4\( \pm \) – The vulnerability of White’s \( \text{c4} \)-pawn cannot compensate for Black the absence of a pawn-centre and his lag in development, Sasikiran – Levitt, Kolkata 1997) 7.d3 \( \text{d6} \) (7...h6 8.e2 d6 9.0-0 – see 7...d6)
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8.\( \text{c}e2 \) h6 9.0-0 0-0 (9...\( \text{d}d7 \)
10.e4 e5 11.f4± followed by \( \text{c}e3, \text{g}g3, \text{f}f3, \text{e}a1, \text{f}f5 \) 10.e4 c5 11.f4 \( \text{c}c6 \) 12.d5 \( \text{b}8 \) 13.f5 exf5 14.exf5. White has powerful initiative and Black cannot exploit the weakness of his opponent's queenside pawn-structure, because he is forced to defend. 14...\( \text{d}d7 \) (It would be a disaster for Black to play 14...f6? 15.\( \text{f}f4 \)± and White's knight will penetrate to the e6-square, Korobov – Fier, Beijing 2008.) 15.\( \text{f}f4 \) \( \text{f}f6 \) 16.\( \text{a}c1 \) followed by \( \text{g}3-e4 \) (h5), sending Black's queen away and opening the way forward of the pawn on f5.

6.\( \text{a}d3 \)

White develops his pieces and continues the fight for the e4-square.

6...0-0

6...d5?! 7.\( \text{g}e2 \) 0-0 8.cxd5 exd5 9.0-0 \( \text{h}8 \) 10.\( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 11.bxc3 c6 12.\( \text{c}4 \)± Najdorf – Quinters, Sao Paulo 1978. White has two powerful bishops and good prospects on the weakened dark squares. Black's knight will not remain for long in the centre of the board, because it will be ousted after f2-f3.

It is not good for him to choose 6...\( \text{xc}3 \) 7.bxc3. Black doubles the enemy pawns, but gives up without a fight the important e4-square. 7.\( \text{e}7 \) 8.e4 g6 9.\( \text{f}3 \)± – He is behind in development and his kingside has been compromised, Ovsejevitsch – Spiess, Gau Algesheim 2011.

6...\( \text{xc}3 \) 7.bxc3 0-0 8.\( \text{h}3 \).

It would be too dangerous for White to accept the pawn-sacrifice, because Black will have strong counterplay on the light squares. 8...b6 9.0-0 \( \text{c}6 \) 10.\( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 11.f3 \( \text{f}6 \), Li Ruofan – Tolentino, Manila 2007. White has removed the enemy knight from the centre and will maintain a great advantage after the pawn-break 12.e4!±

It may be interesting for Black to try the brave pawn-sacrifice 6...b6!? , but White should better refrain from accepting it 7.\( \text{h}3 \)? (Following 7.\( \text{x}e4 \) \( \text{fxe} \) 8.\( \text{x}e4 \) 0-0 9.\( \text{f}3 \) 9...d5 10.\( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{a}6 \)± despite the extra pawn, White's game is much more difficult, Es tremera Panos – Belezky, Palma de Mallorca 2008; or 9.\( \text{x}a8 \) \( \text{c}6 \)± followed by \( \text{f}6, \text{a}6.\) ) 7...\( \text{h}4 \) 8.0-0 \( \text{xc}3 \) 9.bxc3 \( \text{b}7 \) 10. \( \text{f}4 \)± (Capturing of the bishop leads
to a perpetual check: 10.cxb4 \( \text{\&}xg2 11.\text{\&}xg2 \text{\&}g4+ 12.\text{\&}h1 \text{\&}f3=) 10...\text{\&}e7 11.e4\text{\&} White has won the fight for the e4-square, while Black lags in the development of his pieces.

7.\text{\&}ge2
White is trying to develop his pieces as quickly as possible.
He should better refrain from capturing the pawn: 7.\text{\&}xe4 fxe4 8.\text{\&}xe4 d5∞

7...b6
Black is preparing the development of his bishop to b7.
About 7...d5 8.cxd5 – see 6...d5.

8.0–0
Now, the knight on c3 is not pinned and White is threatening \( \text{\&}xe4 \).

8...\text{\&}xc3
Or 8...\text{\&}xc3, Nikolaidis – Rozentalis, Vrachati 2011, 9.bxc3 \( \text{\&}d6 10.e4\text{\&} 

9.\text{\&}xc3 \text{\&}xc3 10.\text{\&}xc3
There has arisen a position which is typical for numerous variations of the Nimzo-Indian Defence. White has two bishops and good prospects on the queenside, so he is clearly better.

10...\text{\&}b7 11.f3 d6

12.b3
White is preparing the development of his bishop to the b2-square. Black will have problems to neutralise its pressure on the long diagonal.

12...\text{\&}d7 13.\text{\&}b2 \text{\&}g5 14.\text{\&}ae1 \text{\&}f6

It seems less precise for Black to opt for 14...\text{\&}f6, Khairul – Sadorra, Kuala Lumpur 2007, because in that case White can break through in the centre immediately with 15.d5!? e5 (15...exd5 16.cxd5 \( \text{\&}xd5 17.\text{\&}c4 \text{\&}h8 18.\text{\&}xd5 \text{\&}xd5 19.\text{\&}xc7± and in the arising middle game with bishops of opposite colours White’s prospects are clearly preferable. His bishop takes part in the attack, while Black’s bishop is restricted by the
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pawn on f3.) 16.f4± White opens advantageously the long diagonal.


White is not afraid of Black’s counterplay on the kingside, since he can protect the g2-square with the moves f2 or d2. Black’s main problem is that his minor piece do not participate in the attack. His bishop is restricted by the pawn on d5 and his knight on c5 will be soon ousted from there after the move b3-b4.

D) 4...xc3+

This is the most dangerous move for White among all the possibilities which we analyse in this chapter.

5.bxc3 (diagram)

Now, Black has a choice. He can develop his bishop with D1) 5...b6 to the b7-square, or leave it on c8 for the time being and begin the deployment of his pawns on the dark squares D2) 5...d6 (followed by c5 and e5).

There do not arise original positions after 5...0–0 6.d3, for example: 6...d6 7.e4 – see 5...d6, or 6...c5 7.e2 – see 5...c5.

5...c6. Black is preparing e6-e5. 6.d3 e5 7.e2 d6 (7...e4 8.c2 a5 9.g3 xc4 10.xe4 xe4 11.xe4 d5 12.d3 0–0 13.0–0 – The exchange of the pawns is no doubt in favour of White, since he has got rid of his weakness on c4, Recoulat – Bronstein, Acasusso 1994.) 8.e4 h6 (8...e7 9.f3 b6 10.0–0 a5 11.f4± followed by g3 and Black fails to create counterplay against the pawn on c4, Edzveradze – Gugenzidze, Tbilisi 1996) 9.0–0 h6 (8...e7 9.f3 b6 10.0–0 a5 11.f4± followed by g3 and White’s kingside initiative compensates with an interest the weaknesses of his pawn-structure.

5...e7. Black is trying to advance e7-e5 as quickly as possible. 6.d3 e5 7.e2 d6 8.0–0 0–0 9.g3 c5 10.f3 c6 11.d5 a5 12.e4± White has extra space,
two bishops and good prospects on the kingside and this more than compensates his weakened queenside, Hoffman – Carbajal, Mar del Plata 1988.

After 5...c5, the game usually transposes to 5...d6, since Black can hardly continue the game without this move. 6.\textit{\textproc{d}3} \textit{\textproc{c}6} (6...0–0 7.\textit{\textproc{e}2} \textit{\textproc{d}6} 8.0–0 – see 5...\textit{\textproc{d}6}; 6...\textit{\textproc{d}6} 7.\textit{\textproc{e}2} – see 5...\textit{\textproc{d}6}) 7.\textit{\textproc{e}2} 0–0 (7...\textit{\textproc{d}6} 8.e4 – see 5...\textit{\textproc{d}6}; 7...e5 8.0–0 0–0 9.e4 \textit{\textproc{d}6} 10.\textit{\textproc{b}1} – see 5...\textit{\textproc{d}6}; 7...\textit{\textproc{b}6} 8.e4 \textit{\textproc{d}6} 9.f4 – see 5...\textit{\textproc{d}6}) 8.0–0 \textit{\textproc{b}6} 9.e4 \textit{\textproc{c}8}. Black is planning to transfer his knight to the \textit{\textproc{d}6}-square. This manoeuvre has been tried in the games of J.R.Capablanca. 10.e5 \textit{\textproc{f}5}, Punteri – Stella, Ceriano Laghetto 2008. Here, White maintains a stable advantage with the move 11.\textit{\textproc{e}1}!±

\textbf{D1) 5...\textit{\textproc{b}6} 6.\textit{\textproc{d}3}}

![Diagram](image)

White’s set-up is very simple: f2-f3, \textit{\textproc{e}2}, 0–0 followed by further occupation of the centre with e3-e4 and the development of his bishop to the active position – \textit{\textproc{g}5}.

6...\textit{\textproc{b}7}

About 6...0–0 7.\textit{\textproc{e}2} \textit{\textproc{b}7} 8.f3 – see 6...\textit{\textproc{b}7}.

The move 6...\textit{\textproc{c}6} has the drawback that White can advance 7.e4 without the preliminary move f2–f3. 7...e5 8.f4. He has the two-bishop advantage and should strive to open the position. 8...exd4 (8...\textit{\textproc{d}6} 9.\textit{\textproc{f}3}±) 9.e5 \textit{\textproc{g}8} 10.cxd4 \textit{\textproc{d}4} 11.\textit{\textproc{f}3}!± White has more than sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn. Black’s defence is very difficult, because he lags considerably in development.

7.f3 \textit{\textproc{d}6}

Black’s threat \textit{\textproc{h}4}, arising after 7...\textit{\textproc{h}5}, can be parried by White simply with the move 8.\textit{\textproc{h}3}± Ahumada – Larrain Cortes, Santiago de Chile 2008.

The other moves usually lead to transposition: 7...0–0 8.\textit{\textproc{e}2} \textit{\textproc{d}6} 9.e4, or 7...\textit{\textproc{c}6} 8.e4 \textit{\textproc{d}6} 9.\textit{\textproc{e}2}, or 7...c5 8.\textit{\textproc{e}2} \textit{\textproc{d}6} 9.0–0 – see 7...\textit{\textproc{d}6}.

![Diagram](image)

8...\textit{\textproc{c}6}

Black is preparing the standard transfer for similar positions.
of his knight to the a5-square.

8...c5 9.0–0 c6 10.e4 wC7, Janev – Bojchev, Sofia 2011, 11.g5 White’s dark-squared bishop is becoming very active.

After 8...0–0 9.e4 c5 10.g5 bd7 11.0–0 wC7 12.d2± Black has a solid but passive position. He can hardly exploit the vulnerability of the enemy c4-pawn, because the knight on d7 will not come easily to the a5-square.

9.e4 da5

Following 9...we7 10.e3 h6 11.0–0 e5 12.g3± White will have good prospects on the kingside with f5 or f2-f4, Urban – Cao Sang, Dresden 2007.

After 9...e5 10.0–0 we7 11.f4!± in the game Ivkov – Lombard, Bath 1973, White scored a quick victory.

10.g5

Now, Black will have to weaken his pawn-structure if he wishes to get rid of the pin of his knight.

10...h6 11.h4 g5 12.f2 d7

13.c1

White transfers his knight to b3 in order to exchange the knight on a5 and to reduce the enemy pressure against the pawn on c4.

13...0–0–0 14.b3 wa4 15. xa5 xa5 16.b3 h5 17. b4 f4 18.f1 xb4 19.cxb4± White has succeeded in correcting the defects of his pawn-structure and his prospects are preferable in this endgame, Shulman – Yudasin, St Petersburg 1998.

D2) 5...d6 6.d3
White’s piece set-up is analogous to variation D1: \( \text{d2, e3-e4, 0-0.} \) His knight is better placed on e2 than on f3, since it does not prevent f2-f4.

6...c5

Black has also tried in practice 6...0-0 7.e4 e5. The way for White to obtain an advantage in this position is well familiar after the games of Rubinstein. 8.d2 d8 9.f3 b6 (9...\( \text{b7 10.0-0 d8 11.d3 b6} \) 12.d2 h8 13.g3± followed by g3-f5, f3-f4, Garcia Palermo – Granda Zuniga, Río Hondo 1987) 10.0-0 c6 11.e3 a6 12.g3 a5 13.e2 c5 14.d5 h8 15.f4± Rubinstein – Colle, Liege 1930. Later, White’s attack proved to be much more powerful than Black’s counterplay against the weak c4-pawn.

The move 6...e5 usually transposes to the main lines. 7.e4 d7 (7...0-0 8.d2 – see 6...0-0; 7...c5 8.d2 – see 6...c5; 7...c6 8.d2 – see 5...c6) 8.d2 h5. This move looks too risky. (8...c5 9.0-0 – see 6...c5) 9.0-0 g5, Graf – Sulskis, Yucatan 2004. The best way for White to exploit the weakness of the f5-square is 10.g3!? xg3 11.fxg3!± followed by h5 and doubling of the rooks on the f-file.

7.d2 e5

About 7...0-0 8.0-0 c6 9.e4 e5 10.b1 – see 7...e5.

Following 7...c6 8.e4 b6 (8...e5 9.0-0 – see 7...e5) 9.f4 e5 10.d5 a5 11.fx e5 dx e5, Donner – Csom, Palma de Mallorca 1971, White maintains an advantage with 12.0-0!? h6 13.g3 d7 14.f3±, exerting powerful pressure on the f-file. For example, Black cannot play 14...0-0 due to 15.xh6.

8.e4

After 8.h5, Winants – Sulskis, Heraklio 2007, White should better play 9.0-0!± followed by f2-f4.

8...c6

8...d7 9.0-0 c6 10.d5 d8 11.g3± Black will have great difficulties to parry White’s threats connected with h2-h3, f2-f4, because Black’s knight on d8 does not control the e5-square, Rausis – Reddmann, Hamburg 2002.
Chapter 20

9.0–0

It seems strategically very risky for Black to opt for 9...
cxd4 10.cxd4 exd4 11.b1 h6 12.b2 0–0 13.d± White has
regained his pawn and his dark-squared bishop has become very

9...h6. Black is not in a hurry to castle. 10.h3. White takes the
g4-square under control and prepares e3.

9...0–0

mature opening of the centre for Black has led to the irrevocable
weakening of his d6-pawn, Khis-matullin – Provotorov, Voronezh
2010.

After 10...0–0 11.e3 b6 12.d5 a5 13.g3 a6 14.e2 c8, Ruiz
Jarabo Pelayo – Rodriguez Rey, Email 2006, White can begin ac­
tive actions on the kingside with 15.f4±. It is worth mentioning that
White’s set-up is analogous to the game Rubinstein – Colle, Liege
1930.

10...g5. Black impedes his opponent’s pawn-advance f2–f4. 11.
e3 b6 12.c2 a5 13.g3 d7 (It would be too risky for him to accept the pawn-sacrifice: 13...
xc4?! 14.d3 xe3 15.b5+! d7 16.xd7+ xd7 17.fxe3+ followed by f5. Black has an extra
pawn indeed, but his defence will be very difficult, since all light
squares in his position are hope­lessly weak.) 14.e2± Black must be permanently on the alert about the threat f5, Tasic – Leonard, Email 2008.

10...b6 11.d5 ±

After 10...e8 11.d5 a5 12.
g3 b6, Sorm – Rojas Keim, Spain 2013, White maintains the
advantage with 13.h3!?± followed by f2–f4.

11.d5 e7 12.g3 g6 13.g5 d7 14.f5±
This position was reached in the game Mayer – Cossmann, IECC 2013. White’s pieces are more actively deployed and after the careless move 14...h6?! he had the possibility to organize a dangerous attack with a piecesacrifice. 15.\textit{hxh6} gxh6 16.\textit{h5 d8} 17.\textit{hxh6+ g7} 18.f5+ \textit{g8} 19.\textit{f1}. White is threatening \textit{e1-e3-h3}, forcing Black to part with the extra material. 19... \textit{f6} 20.\textit{h6 xf5} 21.exf5 \textit{g4} 22.\textit{h5 h4} 23.\textit{h4 xh4} 24.\textit{e4 f3+} 25.gxf3 \textit{f6} 26.\textit{h4}± and White already has a material advantage.

**Conclusion**

We have just analysed some seldom played lines for Black on move four in the Rubinstein System.

After 4...c6 or 4...d6, White obtains two bishops and has a space advantage. Meanwhile, Black’s position is very passive and he can hardly create meaningful counterplay.

After 4...\textit{e4}, White must fight for the key e4-square with all his forces: \textit{c2}, \textit{d3}, \textit{e2}, 0–0 and eventually f2-f3.

White should mostly be afraid of the move 4...\textit{xc3}, because in that case he must continue the game with doubled pawns and that is not to everybody’s liking. He should arrange his pieces according to Rubinstein’s plan: \textit{d3}, \textit{e2-g3}, 0–0, e3-e4, \textit{e3} followed by f2-f4 and \textit{f5}, beginning active operations on the kingside.
Black develops his knight and prepares e6-e5, keeping the possibility to advance d7-d5.

This variation was named after the Leningrad grandmaster Mark Taimanov who contributed greatly to the development of the theory of the move 4...c6 and played it regularly at the beginning of the 50ies of the past century. Nowadays, it is not used often in the tournament practice, because it has a serious positional defect. Black's knight has been developed in front of his pawn on c7 and he will have great problems later to accomplish the typical pawn-advance for similar positions – c7-c5.

5...d3!?

This is White's most reliable way of fighting for the opening advantage. Before developing his knight, White places his bishop to an active position. After the "standard" move 5...ge2, it would be more difficult for him to develop the bishop on f1.

Now, Black has a choice. He may either advance the typical move for the Taimanov Variation – B) 5...e5, or refrain from it in favour of A) 5...0–0.

There do not arise original positions after 5...bc3 + 6.bxc3 – see Chapter 20, variation D or 5...d5 6.ge2, for example 6...e5 7.cxd5 – see variation B3, or 6...0–0 7.a3 – see variation A.

A) 5...0–0 6.ge2
White develops his knight and prevents the possible doubling of his pawns after xc3.

(diagram)

6...d5
After this move, there arise on the board positions resembling the Ragozin Defence, but with a
misplaced black knight on c6 (in the Ragozin Defence White plays \( \text{Na4} \) in order to provoke \( \text{Qc6} \)). Well, the placement of the knight on e2 may turn out to be not so active as on the f3-square, but on the other hand White may play in some variations f2-f4, preventing the freeing move for Black e6-e5.

About 6...e5 7.0-0 – see variation B1.

6...\( \text{Re8} \). The idea of this move is that Black is preparing a square for the retreat of his bishop on b4. 7.0-0 d5 (7...e5 8.d5 – see variation B1) 8.a3 \( \text{Af8} \) 9.b4

Black has a solid but passive position and his attempt to accomplish the freeing pawn-advancement e6-e5 leads to the weakening of the a2-g8 diagonal.

9...g6 10.\( \text{Bb2} \) \( \text{g7} \) 11.\( \text{Cc1} \) dxc4 12.\( \text{Bxc4} \) e5 13.\( \text{Bb3} \) – The vulnerability of the f7-pawn is hurting Black, Zamora – Larduet Despaigne, Holguin 1991.

He cannot equalise with the immediate pawn-break in the centre 9...e5, because White is better prepared for it. 10.\( \text{Bxd5} \) \( \text{Bxd5} \) 11.cxd5 \( \text{Bxd5} \) 12.b5 \( \text{Bc5} \), Kolasinski – Zvolanek, Olomouc 1989. Here, it would be very strong for him to choose 13.dxe5 \( \text{Bxe5} \) 14.\( \text{Bc2} \) followed by \( \text{Bb2} \), while after 14...\( \text{Bxa1} \)?! 15.\( \text{Bb2} \) \( \text{Bxf1} \) + 16.\( \text{Bxf1} \) White’s queen will be stronger than Black’s two rooks, since Black’s knight is misplaced at the edge of the board, while White’s pieces are very active.

9...dxc4 10.\( \text{Bxc4} \) e5 11.\( \text{Bb3} \) \( \text{Be7} \) 12.d5 \( \text{Bb8} \) 13.e4 \( \text{Bd7} \), Kuzubov – Ovetchkin, St Petersburg 2003, 14.\( \text{Ae3} \)?! \( \text{Bb6} \) 15.\( \text{Bb5} \) \( \text{Ad7} \) 16.\( \text{Bxd7} \). The exchange of the bishops is in favour of White because his central pawns are placed on light squares. 16...\( \text{Bxd7} \) 17.a4 \( \text{Bc8} \) 18.f3 \( \text{Bd6} \) 19.\( \text{Bc1} \) followed by doubling of the rooks on the c-file and pressure against the pawn on c7.

Black’s position is very passive after 6...d6 7.0-0.

(digram)

Following 7...\( \text{Bxc3} \), he presents his opponent with the two-bishop advantage, but contrary to the other variations of the Nimzo-
Indian Defence without doubling his pawns. 8.\texttt{Qxc3 e5 9.d5 \texttt{Qe7 10.\texttt{Cc2 \texttt{Qg6, Kasparov - Jones, Cannes 1988.} White may obtain an advantage now in numerous ways, but the most reliable is 11.\texttt{b3!} followed by \texttt{\texttt{Qb2, \texttt{Qae1, f2-f4}.}}

After 7...\texttt{e5, White has the resource 8.\texttt{Qd5?!} and Black's bishop on b4 is endangered. 8...\texttt{exd4 9.exd4 \texttt{Qxd5 10.cxd5 \texttt{Qe7} 11.\texttt{wa4 c5 12.dxc6 \texttt{Qxc6 13.d5 \texttt{Qa5} (It is preferable for Black to continue here with 13...\texttt{Qe5, but even then after 14.\texttt{Qxh7+ \texttt{Qxh7 15.\texttt{Wxb4\pm he has no compensation for the pawn.) 14.\texttt{Wxa5 \texttt{Qxa5 15.\texttt{Qb1+-, Black is helpless against a2-a3 followed by b2-b4, Milov - Rodriguez, New York 1997.}}}}}}}

\textbf{7.a3}

White forces the enemy bishop to clarify its intentions.

\textbf{7...\texttt{dxc4}}

This is Black's most popular response and later, he will try to advance e6-e5.

After 7...\texttt{\texttt{Qe7} 8.0-0\pm Black will hardly manage to push e6-e5, because his bishop on e7 does not support this pawn-advance.

7...\texttt{Qd6 8.c5 \texttt{Qe7, Paehl - Reeh, Germany 1991, 9.0-0 e5 10.f3 \texttt{Qe6 11.b4\pm and White's game is much easier.}}}

\textbf{8.\texttt{Qxc4}}

\textbf{8...\texttt{Qxc3+}}

Black does not wish to lose time for the retreat of his bishop.

8...\texttt{\texttt{Qe7} 9.0-0 e5 10.d5 \texttt{Qb8 11. \texttt{Qg3 \texttt{Qe8 12.e4 \texttt{Qd6 13.\texttt{Qe2+ followed by \texttt{\texttt{Qe3, \texttt{Qc1, exerting pressure against the weak c7-pawn, Cebalo - Knezevic, Pula 1984.}}}}}}}}}

After 8...\texttt{Qd6 White has the resource 9.f4?!}, preventing radically
the pawn-advance e6-e5. 9...\(\text{\textit{d}}\)\textit{d}5 (It seems very bad for Black to retreat his knight to its initial position – 9...\(\text{\textit{b}}\)\textit{b}8 10.e4± Greenfeld – Mikhailovski, Beer Sheva 1997.) 10.0–0 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)\textit{e}7, Wohlmann – Lerner, Oberwart 1996, 11.\(\text{\textit{d}}\)\textit{d}2± Black can hardly organise any counterplay.

8...\(\text{\textit{a}}\)\textit{a}5. He prepares the transfer of his bishop to the b6-square. 9.0–0 a6 (9...e5 10.d5 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)\textit{e}7 11.b4 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)\textit{b}6 12.\(\text{\textit{b}}\)\textit{b}2 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)\textit{f}5, Nezad – Ali, Doha 2013. Black's bishop is very active on b6 and White should better get rid of it immediately with 13.\(\text{\textit{a}}\)\textit{a}4!?± followed by \(\text{\textit{b}}\)\textit{b}6, obtaining the two-bishop advantage.) 10.b4 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)\textit{b}6 11.\(\text{\textit{b}}\)\textit{b}2 e5 12.\(\text{\textit{a}}\)\textit{a}4 \(\text{\textit{a}}\)\textit{a}7 13.\(\text{\textit{c}}\)\textit{c}5 exd4, Kekki – Rantanen, Pori 1986. Now, after 14.\(\text{\textit{d}}\)\textit{d}4!? \(\text{\textit{e}}\)\textit{e}5 15.\(\text{\textit{b}}\)\textit{b}3± White's pieces are considerably more active.

9.\(\text{\textit{a}}\)\textit{xc}3 e5 10.d5 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)\textit{e}7

White has a bishop pair and a space advantage, but must play very precisely, because Black has a clear-cut plan for his further actions – to transfer the knight to d6 and to undermine the enemy centre with f7-f5.

11.e4 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)\textit{g}6

There arise similar positions as in the main variation after 11...\(\text{\textit{e}}\)\textit{e}8, Lafuente – Moiseenko, Barbera del Valles 2009, 12.0–0 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)\textit{d}6 13.\(\text{\textit{e}}\)\textit{e}2 f5 14.f3±

Black should better avoid 11...c6, because he should not open the game when the opponent has the two-bishop advantage. 12.\(\text{\textit{g}}\)\textit{g}5 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)\textit{g}6, Auer – Schoenthier, Germany 2008, 13.\(\text{\textit{w}}\)\textit{f}3!?± and later, White will manage at least to compromise his opponent's pawn-structure with \(\text{\textit{xf}}\)\textit{f}6.

12.0–0 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)\textit{e}8

This is a position from the game Artemenko – Lalith, Chennai 2011. 13.\(\text{\textit{d}}\)\textit{d}2!? (It is less accurate for White to choose here 13.\(\text{\textit{e}}\)\textit{e}3 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)\textit{d}6 14.\(\text{\textit{d}}\)\textit{d}3 f5 15.f3 f4 16.\(\text{\textit{f}}\)\textit{f}2 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)\textit{g}5± followed by \(\text{\textit{h}}\)\textit{h}4, \(\text{\textit{f}}\)\textit{f}6–g6. The bishop on f2 prevents White from protecting his g2-pawn.)
13...\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Dd6}}} 14.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Dd3}}} f5 15.f3 Dd7 16.Dc1+}}}}}} In the arising complicated position, White can exert pressure against the enemy c7-pawn and this provides him with long lasting initiative. Later, he can choose between Dc3-a4-c5 or Dc1, Df1-f2-c2.

\textbf{B) }5...e5 6.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{Dgge2}}}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Diagram of move 6.\texttt{\textbf{\texttt{Dgge2}}}}
\end{figure}

We will analyse now \textbf{B1) }6...0-0, \textbf{B2) }6...exd4 and \textbf{B3) }6...d5.

\textbf{B1) }6...0-0 7.0-0 \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{De8}}}

This move leads to a cramped position for Black.

7...exd4 8.exd4 h6, Neunhoeffer – Hecht, Germany 1989. This move is too slow (It is preferable for Black to opt for 8...d5 9.c5 – see variation \textbf{B2).} 9.Db5!? Dxd5 10.exd5 Db7 11.Dg3! Dxd5 12.a3. White has more than sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn. 12...Db7 13.Dxh6! gxh6 14.Df3 Df6 15.Df4+– and Black’s king is under a checkmating attack.

\textbf{B2) }6...exd4 7.c5

8.Dd5

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Diagram of move 8.Dd5}
\end{figure}

We will analyse now \textbf{B1) }6...0-0, \textbf{B2) }6...exd4 and \textbf{B3) }6...d5.

\textbf{B1) }6...0-0 7.0-0 \texttt{\textbf{\texttt{De8}}}

This move leads to a cramped position for Black.

7...exd4 8.exd4 h6, Neunhoeffer – Hecht, Germany 1989. This move is too slow (It is preferable for Black to opt for 8...d5 9.c5 – see variation \textbf{B2).} 9.Db5!? Dxd5 10.exd5 Db7 11.Dg3! Dxd5 12.a3. White has more than sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn. 12...Db7 13.Dxh6! gxh6 14.Df3 Df6 15.Df4+– and Black’s king is under a checkmating attack.

\textbf{B2) }6...exd4 7.c5

8.Dd5

8...Db8 9.a3 Df8 10.e4 Dd6 11.b4 Dbd7 12.f3± followed by De3 and the preparation of a breakthrough on the queenside with c4-c5, Boleslavsky – Kasparian, Moscow 1952.

Black cannot equalise with the sharp move 8...e4, Cvetkovic – Planinec, Novi Travnik 1969, in view of 9.Dc2?! De5 10.Dxe4 Dxe4 11.Dxe4 Dh4 12.Dg3. The activity of Black’s pieces does not provide him with sufficient compensation for the sacrificed pawn and following 12...Dxc4?! 13.Db3! Dd2 14.Dxd2 Dxd2 15.Da4± he regains his pawn indeed, but this cannot make him happy since his bishop on d2 might get trapped in the enemy camp.

\[ \text{\textit{e8} 19.\textit{f4}± and Black has practically no moves.} \]

B2) 6...exd4 7.exd4 d5 8.c5!?

This is the only way for White to fight for the opening advantage. He should not enter a position with an isolated pawn on the d-file, since his knight will be better placed on f3 than on the e2-square.

8...0–0

About 8...h6 9.0–0 \textit{xc3} 10.bxc3 0–0 11.\textit{g3} or 8...\textit{xc3}+ 9.bxc3 h6 10.0–0 0–0 11.\textit{g3} – see 8...0–0.

9.0–0 \textit{xc3}

With his move eight White has cut off the possible retreats of the enemy bishop on b4 and Black is forced to exchange it, because White is threatening to exchange his knight from c3 and to follow that with a2-a3 and b2-b4.

After 9...b6, Ungureanu – Sydor, Bucharest 1971, White again obtains the two-bishop advantage with 10.\textit{a4}!? \textit{xc3} 11.\textit{xc3}±

10.bxc3 h6

Black should not allow the enemy bishop to g5, because after that the pin of the knight on f6 would be very unpleasant for him: 10...\textit{g4}, Zacurdaev – Yakovlev, St Petersburg 2002, 11.\textit{g5}±; or 10...b6 11.\textit{g5} h6 12.\textit{h4} bxc5 13.dxc5 \textit{e5} 14.\textit{d4} \textit{g6} 15.\textit{g6} fxg6 16.\textit{e1}± Geller – Taimanov, Moscow 1952; or 10...\textit{e7}, Mileikaita – Tal, USSR 1953, 11.\textit{g5}! \textit{g6} 12.\textit{f4} \textit{xf4} 13.\textit{xf4}± White has a stable advantage thanks to his two bishops.

11.\textit{g3}

11...b6

Following 11...\textit{e8}, Alves – Rocha, Recife 1963, 12.\textit{f4}± White again preserves a slight edge.

12.\textit{a3} \textit{e8} 13.\textit{xf3} \textit{g4}
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13...\(\text{\texttt{e}}6\) 14.\(\text{\texttt{e}}6\)\(\texttt{e}1\)\(\texttt{e}1\) Black has a solid but rather cramped position, Gligoric – De Greif, Portoroz 1958.

14.\(\text{\texttt{w}}f4\) \(\text{\texttt{d}}e7\)

After 14...\(\text{\texttt{d}}a5\), White should bring into the actions his queen's rook: 15.\(\text{\texttt{e}}ae1\)\(\texttt{e}1\)

15.\(\text{\texttt{e}}ae1\) \(\text{\texttt{d}}e6\) 16.\(\text{\texttt{w}}c1\) \(\text{\texttt{b}}xc5\) 17.\(\text{\texttt{w}}xc5\)\(\texttt{e}1\) Gligoric – Pachman, Havana 1966. He can play for a win for a long time thanks to his bishop-pair. Black's position is solid indeed, but is very passive.

B3) 6...\(\text{\texttt{d}}5\)

8...\(\text{\texttt{a}}b6\)

Black's knight will control the a4-square from here.

After 8...\(\text{\texttt{a}}f6\) 9.d5\(\texttt{e}1\), he will have to exchange his bishop on c3; otherwise, he may lose it.

It is bad for Black to opt for 8...exd4 9.exd5 \(\text{\texttt{a}}d5\), Arlamowski – Sliwa, Lodz 1954, 10.a3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}a5\) 11.b4 dxc3 12.bxa5\(\texttt{e}1\) and in the middle game White's piece will be stronger than Black's pawns.

He should better avoid 8...\(\text{\texttt{d}}xc3\), since this move will only fortify White's centre. 9.bxc3 \(\text{\texttt{d}}d6\) 10.0–0 0–0 11.\(\text{\texttt{e}}e3\) f5 (11...\(\text{\texttt{h}}h8\) 12.f4\(\texttt{e}1\)) 12.f4 exd4 13.\(\text{\texttt{d}}xd4\) \(\text{\texttt{d}}xd4\) 14.\(\text{\texttt{d}}xd4\) c5 15.\(\text{\texttt{e}}e5\) \(\text{\texttt{x}}e5\), Rovner – Mukhitdinov, Riga 1954, 16.\(\text{\texttt{c}}c4\)\(\texttt{e}1\) White does not allow the enemy bishop to the e6-square. 16...\(\text{\texttt{h}}h8\) 17.fxe5\(\texttt{e}1\) and Black's position is tremendously difficult because of the lag in the development of his
queenside pieces.

9.d5 e7 10.0–0 0–0

After 10...c6, White should not exchange on c6, since this will activate the knight on e7. 11 wb3 c5 12.g5 h6 13.h4± followed by ac1, fd1, Feldman – Gedevanishvili, Sydney 1995. Black will have problems to complete his development.

11.g5 h8

11...a6. He takes the b5-square under control. 12.g3 h6 13.e3 d7 14.ec1 f6 15.b3 d6 16.f3 g6 17.fd1 f4 18.f1± White has much more space, Sherbakov

This position was reached in the game Nakamura – Ivanchuk, Medias 2011. Here, the simplest decision for White would be 12.b3!? d6 13.b5± (followed by a2-a4), beginning active actions on the queenside.

Conclusion

The Taimanov Variation does not promise equality for Black, since he would not have the possibility to exert pressure against his opponent’s centre with c7-c5. White either obtains the two-bishop advantage (if Black exchanges on c3), or a space advantage and pressure against the c7-pawn on the semi-open c-file (after Black retreats with his bishop to d6 and advances e6-e5).
This natural and logical move (Black is fighting for the centre.) has the drawback that now, White should not worry about the possible doubling of his pawns on c3. Therefore, the move 4...d5, which was popular during the middle of the past century, is not encountered so often in the contemporary tournament practice.

If Black insists on placing a pawn on d5, then usually he plays at first 4...0-0 – we will analyse these variations in Chapter 25.

5.a3

This is White's strongest and most principled move. He clarifies immediately his opponent's further intentions.

Here, Black can either exchange B) 5...\textbf{xc3}, or retreat with his bishop A) 5...\textbf{e7}.

It is not so good for Black to play 5...\textbf{d6}, because the bishop will be attacked with tempo on this square. 6.c5 White occupies space on the queenside. You can see as an example of how to play similar positions with White the game Petrosian – Fischer, Yugoslavia 1959: 6...\textbf{e7} 7.cf3 0-0 8. b4 \textbf{e4} 9.Bb2 \textbf{d7} 10.Bd3 f5.

Black's desire to preserve his knight on e4 is understandable, but now, he will have a weakness on e5. 11.Be2 \textbf{f6} 12.0-0 \textbf{e7} 13. Bxe5 Bxe5 14.dxe5 Bg5 15.Bd4 Bh6 16.f3\pm Black's knight is ousted from its position in the centre.

16...Bg5 17.c6 b6 18.b5 a6 19. a4\+– White’s position is strategically winning, because Black’s bishop on c8 is trapped inside his own camp. There still followed: 19...\textbf{xb5} 20.axb5 \textbf{xa1} 21.\textbf{xa1} \textbf{f7} 22.Bc3 Bh4 23.Ba1 Gg5 24. Be1 Bh5 25.Ba7 Bg6 26.Bh1 Bh5 27.f4 \textbf{e4} 28.Bxh7+ g6 29.Bxb6 Bb8 30.Bxe4 fxe4 31.Bc5 Kg8 1-0
A) 5...\textbf{e}e7

This is an interesting move. Black loses a tempo but reaches positions which are more typical for the Queen's Gambit. In addition, White's bishop on c1 cannot go to g5. Therefore, he must try to obtain an advantage with the pawn-advance b2-b4, in order to exploit the tempo presented generously to him by Black.

6.\textbf{f}f3

This is White's most natural move. Before playing b2-b4, he develops his knight.

6...0-0

Black will hardly continue the game without castling.

About 6...c6 7.d\textbf{d}3 \textbf{bd}7 8.b4 – see 6...\textbf{bd}7.

It is not advisable for Black to play 6...\textbf{c}c6, because the knight is placed in front of his own pawn on c7. 7.d\textbf{d}3 0-0 8.0-0 b6 9.exd5 exd5 10.\textbf{e}c2 \textbf{b}7, Pliester – Velicka, Pardubice 1996, 11.b4± followed by \textbf{b}2, \textbf{ac}1.

After 6...c5, White can reach a favourable position for him with an isolated black pawn on d5. 7.\textbf{d}xc5 \textbf{xc}5 8.b4 \textbf{e}7 9.cxd5 exd5 10.\textbf{b}2 0-0 11.\textbf{e}2 \textbf{e}6 12.0-0± followed by \textbf{c}3-b5-d4, forcing Black to defend passively, Petrosian – Lisitsin, Riga 1954.

After 6...\textbf{bd}7 7.b4 c6 8.d\textbf{d}3, White should not be in a hurry to play \textbf{b}2, because in some variations after b3-b4, it will be better placed on the c1-h6 diagonal. 8...dxc4 (8...0-0 9.0-0 – see 6...0-0) 9.\textbf{xc}4 \textbf{d}6 10.\textbf{b}2 0-0, Barca – Unzicker, Saltsjobaden 1952, 11.0-0 e5 12.\textbf{c}2 exd4 13.\textbf{xd}4 \textbf{b}6 14.\textbf{a}2± – White's pieces are deployed much more actively than their counterparts.

Following 6...b6, White should better clarify immediately the situation in the centre. 7.cxd5!? exd5 (It is worse for Black to choose 7...\textbf{xd}5, because after 8.\textbf{d}3 \textbf{b}7, there arises the Petrosian System in the Queen's Indian Defence, but with an extra tempo for White. 9.0-0 \textbf{xc}3 10.bxc3 c5 11.e4 \textbf{c}6 12.\textbf{b}2 0-0 13.d5± White has seized completely the initiative, Bareev – B.Savchenko, Dagomys 2009) 8.b4 c6 (8...0-0 9.\textbf{e}2 – see 6...0-0) 9.\textbf{d}3 0-0 10.0-0 \textbf{b}7 11.h3 \textbf{bd}7 12.\textbf{d}2 – see 6...0-0.

7.b4
...\textit{bd7}

7...c6 8.d3 \textit{bd7} 9.0–0 – see 7...\textit{bd7}.

7...b6 8.cxd5 exd5 9.e2 c5 10.dxc5 bxc5 11.bxc5 cxc5 12.0–0 c6 13.c2 e7 14.b2 f5 15.d3 xd3 16.f3± Black is faced with a long and laborious defence of a position with an isolated queen’s pawn, Graf – Lushenko, Cappelle la Grande 2009.

7...a5. Black plans to advance c5, but White is better prepared for the opening of the game on the queenside. 8.b5 c5 9.dxc5 cxc5 10.b2 b6 (10...dxc4 11.cxe4 \textit{bd7}, Navrotescu – Lazarev, Cremon 2011, 12.a4±) 11.cxd5 exd5 12.d3 b7 13.a4!± White’s knight is well placed at the edge of the board. It attacks the enemy bishop on c5 and eyes the weak black pawn on b6, S.Atalik – Yermolinsky, Stillwater 2011.

8.d3

Now, contrary to 7...b6, Black will have problems to advance c7-c5, so White can develop his bishop to a more active position without being afraid of losing his control over the d4-square.

8...b6

Black is preparing to fianchetto his bishop.

After 8...c6 9.0–0 b6, I.Sokolov – Admiraal, playchess.com 2011, 10.e4!? dxe4 11...xe4± Black’s position is solid but very passive.

9.cxd5

This is a timely exchange. Now, after Black’s bishop is developed on b7, it will be restricted by his own pawn on d5.

9...exd5 10.f3 b7 11.0–0

11...c6

He is preparing the move d6.

It is bad for Black to opt for 11...b8?! due to 12.b5! White is preparing the trade of the bishops, preventing c7-c5 in the process. 12.d6 13.a4 f7 14.a3 fc8 15.xd6 xd6 16.b1 g6 17.
1. d4 \textit{f}6 2. c4 e6 3. d3 d5 4. c4 e6

\textit{Knaak - Mititelu, Bucharest} 1975, 18. a5\pm with powerful initiative for White on the queenside.

After 11... \textit{e}8, he continues with the standard plan for similar positions: 12. a4 followed by b4-b5 and \textit{a}a3, exchanging Black's active bishop. 12... a5 13. b5 \textit{d}6 14. \textit{a}a3 \textit{f}8 (14... \textit{xa}3 15. \textit{xa}a3 \textit{e}4, Ruban - Podgaets, USSR 1967, 16. \textit{ac}1\pm followed by doubling of the rooks and exerting pressure against Black's weak c7-pawn) 15. \textit{c}c1 \textit{g}6 16. \textit{xd}6 cxd6 17. \textit{e}c2 \textit{d}7 18. \textit{ac}1 \textit{ac}8 19. \textit{e}e2 \textit{xc}2 20. \textit{xc}2 \textit{c}8 21. \textit{e}e1 \textit{xc}2 22. \textit{xc}2\pm Black's defence will be long and difficult due to his numerous pawn-weaknesses, Peralta - Panchanathan, Badalona 2009.

Black can control the b5-square with his other pawn too. 11... a6 12. a4

It seems a bit awkward for Black to try 12... \textit{a}7 13. \textit{a}a3 c5, Osnos - Bagirov, Alma-Ata 1968, 14. bxc5 bxc5 15. dxc5 \textit{xc}5 16. \textit{c}c2\pm and White will have an easy game against Black's isolated pawn, while his rook on a7 is misplaced.

12... \textit{d}6 13. \textit{a}a3 \textit{e}7, Brodsky - Brunet, Metz 2010, 14. \textit{fc}1\pm Black has failed to solve all his problems in the opening.

12. \textit{d}2 \textit{d}6

Or 12... a5, Korchnoi - Karpov, Buenos Aires 2001, 13. \textit{ac}1\pm followed by \textit{fc}1 and e3-e4.

13. \textit{fc}1

Black has consolidated his position reliably on the queenside and White changes his plan. He will try to open the game in the centre with e3-e4.

13... a5 14. \textit{ac}1 axb4 15. axb4 \textit{b}8, Geller - Bobotsov, Beverwijk 1965, 16. e4! dxe4 17. \textit{xe}4\pm White's pieces are much
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more actively placed, while Black’s pawn on c6 is weak.

B) 5...\textit{\textbf{xc}3}+ 6.b\textit{x}c3

Now, we will analyse: \textbf{B1) 6...0–0 and \textbf{B2) 6...c5}.}

About 6...b6 7.c\textit{x}d5 \textit{ex}d5 8.\textit{d}3 0–0 – see variation \textbf{B1}.

It is not good for Black to choose 6...d\textit{xc}4, because White captures on c4 without losing a tempo. 7.\textit{xe}c4 c5 8.\textit{xe}3 \textit{c}7 (8...\textit{bd}7 9.\textit{e}2 \textit{c}7 10.0–0 – see 8...\textit{c}7) 9.\textit{e}2 b6 (It is not so precise for Black to opt for 9...0–0 10.0–0 \textit{d}6 11.e4± – White has occupied the centre with his pawn and his edge has increased, Erdos – Horvath, Budapest 2002, while after 9...\textit{bd}7 10.0–0 0–0 11.e4 e5, Grachev – Balmaga, Plovdiv 2012, he maintains a great advantage with 12.\textit{g}5!± and White’s bishops are very active.) 10.0–0 \textit{b}7, Mikenas – Sokolsky, Leningrad 1947, 11.d3!? \textit{e}4 12.d2 0–0 13.c4± – After Black exchanges on d4, there arises a very favourable standard position for White with hanging pawns.

It is interesting for Black to try 6...c6 with the idea for him to capture with his c-pawn after the exchange on d5 and to exert pressure on the semi-open c-file against the enemy c3-pawn. Therefore, White should better get rid of his pawn-weaknesses immediately. 7.\textit{c}d5!? \textit{c}xd5 8.c4 \textit{c}6 (8...0–0 9.\textit{f}3 b6, Karavade – Tan, Ho Chi Minh City 2012, 10.a4 \textit{a}6 11.a3 \textit{e}8 12.c1±) 9.\textit{f}3 0–0 10.a3 \textit{d}xc4 11.\textit{xc}4 b6 12.0–0 \textit{b}7 13.d3 \textit{d}5 14.\textit{b}1± and White’s bishop-pair guarantees his edge, Milov – Lahuente, Odense 2011.

\textbf{B1) 6...0–0}

Now, we will analyse only the variations in which Black is not in a hurry to advance c7–c5.

7.\textit{c}d5 \textit{ex}d5

The other possible capture 7...\textit{xd}5 is in fact giving up the centre by Black. 8.\textit{f}3!? b6 9.e4 \textit{c}6 10.c4 c5 11.d5 \textit{d}6 12.e2 \textit{bd}7 13.e3 \textit{e}5 14.c3 \textit{a}6 15.e2 c6 16.0–0± White has the two-bishop advantage and extra space, Gustafsson – Hoelzl, Austria 2002.

8.\textit{d}3
8...b6
Black is preparing a6, in order to trade his opponent’s active bishop.

About 8...c5 9.e2 – see variation B2.

Black’s attempt to organise counterplay on the light squares fails 8...e4 9.e2 f5 10.c2 g6. White plays simply 11.f4 (followed by xg6), Karasev - Orlov, St Petersburg 1995.

8...g4 9.e2

About 9...c5 10.f3 – see variation B2.

After 9...d7 10.0-0 h5, Khairullin – Ponkratov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2012, White maintains a stable advantage with 11.c4!? c6 12.a4 e8 13.a3 (followed by b3, ab1, fc1) with powerful pressure on the queenside.

Following 9...h5, it is essential for White to prevent the trade of the light-squared bishops. The simplest way for him to do that is 10.b3 b6 11.f4 ± Cvetkovic - Dizdar, Sibenik 1986.

9...c8 10.0-0 c5 11.f5 f5 12.e4! This is a timely pawn-break in the centre. Now, there arise complications favourable for White. 12...dxe4 13.fxe4 g6, Krush – I. Sokolov, Hastings 2000 (If Black accepts the pawn-sacrifice, he comes under a very dangerous attack: 13...xe4 14.xf6! xd3 15.exd3 gxf6 16.h6++; or 13...xe4 14.c2 e8 15.xf5 xf5 16.g3+ White’s two minor pieces are stronger than Black’s rook and pawns.) 14.f4+ White has a mobile pawn-centre and two powerful bishops. Black is still incapable of capturing on e4, for example: 14...xe4?! 15.h5! xh5 16.xe4 g6 (16...f6 17.xf6 gxf6 18.h5++) 17.h6 g7 18.f3+- followed by f6.
About 9...b6 10.0-0 – see 8...b6.

9...c5 10.0-0 – see line B2.

It is not good for Black to transfer his bishop on the route c8-g4-h5-g6, because all this takes too much time. 9...\(\text{\&}g4\) 10.0-0 \(\text{\&}h5\) 11.\(\text{\&}b3\) b6 12.\(\text{\&}f4\) \(\text{\&}g6\) 13.\(\text{\&}xg6\) hxg6 14.c4± – The position is opened and White’s bishops are obviously more powerful than Black’s knights, Drummond – Tao, Sydney 1995.

9...\(\text{\&}bd7\). Black prepares the transfer of his knight to the g6-square. 10.0-0 \(\text{\&}f8\) 11.f3 \(\text{\&}g6\) (11...c5 12.\(\text{\&}g3\) cxd4 13.exd4 a6 14.\(\text{\&}d2\) \(\text{\&}d7\) 15.e4 dxe4 16.fxe4 \(\text{\&}c6\) 17.d5± White begins the advance of his pawn-centre, Euwe – Steiner, Groningen 1946) 12.\(\text{\&}e1\) c5 13.\(\text{\&}f2\) \(\text{\&}c7\) 14.\(\text{\&}d2\) b6 15.\(\text{\&}g3\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 16.\(\text{\&}ae1\)± and White is perfectly prepared to advance e3-e4, Taimanov – Abramov, Leningrad 1950.

9.\(\text{\&}e2\)

It is much easier to play this position with White. He has a clear-cut strategical plan to prepare e3-e4: 0–0, \(\text{\&}g3\), f2-f3 followed by \(\text{\&}a2\)-e2, or (if Black exchanges on d3) – \(\text{\&}b2\) and \(\text{\&}ae1\). It is much more difficult for Black to find good moves.

9...\(\text{\&}a6\)

About 9...c5 10.0-0 – see variation B2b.

9...\(\text{\&}e8\) 10.0-0 c5 (10...\(\text{\&}a6\) 11.f3 – see 9...\(\text{\&}a6\)) 11.f3 – see variation B2b.

10.0-0 \(\text{\&}xd3\)

Or 10...\(\text{\&}e8\) 11.f3 \(\text{\&}xd3\) 12.\(\text{\&}xd3\) or 10...\(\text{\&}c8\) 11.f3 \(\text{\&}xd3\) 12.\(\text{\&}xd3\) – see 10...\(\text{\&}xd3\).

11.\(\text{\&}xd3\)

11...\(\text{\&}c8\)

Black is preparing \(\text{\&}a6\) and contrary to White’s actions on the centre, Black is planning active operations on the light squares.

About 11...\(\text{\&}e8\) 12.f3 \(\text{\&}c8\) (12...
c5 13.\( \text{c}3 \) – see variation B2b)
13.\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 14.\( \text{c}2 \) – see 11...\( \text{c}8 \).

Black cannot equalise by transferring his knight to \( \text{c}4 \), because White simply advances \( \text{e}3-\text{e}4 \) obtaining an advantage. 11...
\( \text{c}6 \) 12.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 13.\( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) (13...
\( \text{e}8 \) 14.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 15.\( \text{e}4 \) Arizmendi – Cori Tello, La Massana 2010)
14.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 15.\( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 16.\( \text{e}4 \) Uribe – Satyapragyan, Barcelona 2013.

12.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{a}6 \)

About 12...\( \text{e}8 \) 13.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 14.\( \text{c}2 \) – see 12...\( \text{a}6 \).

13.\( \text{c}2 \)

White should avoid the trade of queens, since his basic plan is connected with an attack on the kingside.

Following 13...\( \text{e}8 \) 14.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{c}4 \) (after 14...\( \text{c}5 \), White can break through in the centre immediate-
ly 15.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 16.\( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 17.\( \text{g}5 \) Lautier – J.Polgar, Monte Carlo 1996 and his knight is very powerful on \( \text{f}5 \)!) 15.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \). Now, White must simply defend against capturing on \( \text{d}4 \) – 16.\( \text{a}2 \) followed by \( \text{e}4-\text{e}5 \), \( \text{f}3-\text{f}4-\text{f}5 \), Kezin – Bublei, Novosibirsk 2012.

14.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 15.\( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{c}8 \)
16.\( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{cxd}4 \) 17.\( \text{cxd}4 \) \( \text{d}3 \) 18.\( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 19.\( \text{e}4 \)!

White seizes the initiative after this pawn-break in the centre.

19...\( \text{e}7 \)

Accepting the sacrifice loses for Black: 19...\( \text{d}xe4 \) 20.\( \text{f}xe4 \) \( \text{d}xe4 \) 21.\( \text{d}xe4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 22.d5 \( \text{a}5 \) 23.\( \text{xe}7 \)! \( \text{xe}7 \) 24.\( \text{f}6+ \) \( \text{g}8 \) 25.\( \text{f}3+-

20.\( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 21.\( \text{a}3 \)

Black’s position is very passive and he must watch permanently about White’s possible pawn-ad-

dances \( \text{e}4-\text{e}5 \) and \( \text{f}3-\text{f}4-\text{f}5 \), Alter-
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B2) 6...c5 7.cxd5

7...exd5

Black gives up the centre and this cannot provide him with equality.

For example: 7...\( \square \! \! \! d5 \) 8.c4 \( \square \! \! \! f6 \) 9.\( \square \! \! \! f3 \) 0–0 10.\( \square \! \! \! d3 \) \( \square \! \! \! bd7 \) 11.0–0 \( \square \! \! \! c7 \) 12.\( \square \! \! \! b2 \) cxd4 13.exd4 b6 14.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! e1 \! \! \! ± \) – He has lost several tempi on manoeuvres of his knight and White has deployed harmoniously his forces.

7...\( \varepsilon \! \! \! x d5 \) 8.\( \square \! \! \! f3 \)

8...\( \square \! \! \! b d7 \) 9.\( \square \! \! \! d3 \) b6 10.0–0 \( \square \! \! \! b7 \) 11.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! e2 \) 0–0 12.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! e1 \) \( \varepsilon \! \! \! e4 \) 13.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! b2 \) \( \varepsilon \! \! \! c8 \) 14.c4 \( \varepsilon \! \! \! h 5 \) 15.a4 a5 16.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! a b1 \) f5 17.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! e d1 \! \! \! ± \) White has two bishops and an easy play against Black's weak b6-pawn, Ibragimov – Friedel, Las Vegas 2007.

After 8...b6 9.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! b 5 \! \! \! + \) \( \varepsilon \! \! \! d 7 \) 10.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! e 2 \) cxd4 11.c4 \( \varepsilon \! \! \! b 7 \) 12.exd4 \( \varepsilon \! \! \! c 6 \) 13.0–0 \( \varepsilon \! \! \! b d 7 \) 14.a4± Black's position is solid indeed, but very passive, Grachev – Ovetchkin, Olgin-ka 2011.

8...0–0 9.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! d 3 \) b6 (9...cxd4 10.cxd4 \( \varepsilon \! \! \! c 6 \) 11.0–0 e5 12.dxe5 \( \varepsilon \! \! \! x e 5 \) 13.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! x e 5 \) \( \varepsilon \! \! \! x e 5 \) 14.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! b 1 \! \! \! ± \) – The position has been opened and this is in favour of White due to his powerful bishop-pair, Sevilla – Rodriguez, Madrid 2010) 10.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! e 2 \)

Following 10...\( \varepsilon \! \! \! b 7 \), White can accomplish immediately a pawn-advance in the centre. 11.e4 \( \varepsilon \! \! \! h 5 \) (but not 11...\( \varepsilon \! \! \! x e 4 ? \) 12.c4 \( \varepsilon \! \! \! c 6 \) 13.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! e 5 \) \( \varepsilon \! \! \! d 6 \) 14.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! x e 4 \) \( \varepsilon \! \! \! x e 4 \) 15.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! x e 4 \) \( \varepsilon \! \! \! x d 4 \) 16.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! x d 4 \) cxd4 17.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! f 4 \! \! \! + \) and Black has no compensation for the piece) 12.0–0 \( \varepsilon \! \! \! b d 7 \) 13.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! e 1 \! \! \! ± \) White has a powerful pawn-centre, Li Shilong – Qashashvili, Albena 2012.

10...cxd4 11.cxd4 \( \varepsilon \! \! \! b 7 \) (Black cannot equalise by exchanging the bishops: 11...\( \varepsilon \! \! \! a 6 \) 12.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! x a 6 \) \( \varepsilon \! \! \! a 5 \! \! \! + \) 13.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! d 2 \) \( \varepsilon \! \! \! x a 6 \) 14.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! x a 6 \) \( \varepsilon \! \! \! x a 6 \) 15.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! e 2 \) \( \varepsilon \! \! \! e 4 \) 16.\( \varepsilon \! \! \! h c 1 \! \! \! ± \), because his knight...
on a6 is misplaced, Kasimdzhanov – Loeffler, Germany 1999) 12.0–0 \( \text{Q} \text{bd7} \) 13.\( \text{b} \text{b2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{fd8} \) (13...\( \text{Q} \text{ac8} \) 14.\( \text{Q} \text{fcl} \)) 14.\( \text{K} \text{fd1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{ac8} \). White has the two-bishop advantage and neutralised Black’s pressure on the long diagonal with 15.\( \text{K} \text{e1}! \) \( \text{Q} \text{f8} \) 16.f3\( \pm \) Jussupow – Luther, Essen 2002. After White has taken control over the e4-square, Black will hardly create any counterplay.

8.\( \text{K} \text{d3} \)

This is the best square for White’s bishop, because it controls the important e4-square from there.

8...0–0

Black can hardly continue the game without castling.

He has also tried in practice 8...\( \text{Q} \text{g4} \) 9.\( \text{Q} \text{e2} \) \( \text{Q} \text{h5} \) 10.0–0 \( \text{Q} \text{bd7} \) 11.f3 \( \text{Q} \text{g6} \) 12.\( \text{Q} \text{f4} \pm \) Ki.Georgiev – Mitkov, Poikovsky 2001.

Black plays sometimes 8...\( \text{Q} \text{a5} \) with the idea to force his opponent to capture with his e-pawn after the exchange on d4. This is not dangerous for White however, because his dark-squared bishop becomes very active, while Black is incapable of exploiting the weakness of the c3-pawn. 9.\( \text{Q} \text{e2} \) cxd4 10.exd4 0–0 11.0–0 \( \text{Q} \text{c6} \) 12.f3 h6. Black should not let the enemy bishop to the g5-square (12...\( \text{Q} \text{e8} \) 13.\( \text{Q} \text{g5} \pm \) Prusikin – Korchnoi, Switzerland 2005). 13.\( \text{Q} \text{f4} \) \( \text{Q} \text{e8} \) 14.\( \text{Q} \text{d2} \pm \) and thanks to his powerful bishops White’s prospects seem preferable, I.Sokolov – Inkiov, Stockholm 1987.

As a rule, there arise original positions only rarely after 8...\( \text{Q} \text{c6} \) 9.\( \text{Q} \text{e2} \), for example: 9...\( \text{Q} \text{g4} \) (9...0–0 10.0–0 – see 8...0–0; 9...c4 10.\( \text{Q} \text{c2} \) 0–0 11.0–0 – see 8...0–0.) 10.f3 \( \text{Q} \text{h5} \), Reshetnikov – Matlakov, Moscow 2012, 11.\( \text{Q} \text{b1} \) \( \text{Q} \text{b8} \) 12.\( \text{Q} \text{f4} \)!\( \pm \)

9.\( \text{Q} \text{e2} \)

This is the basic position of the variation. Now, Black has a choice. He may strive to obtain lively piece-play with B2a) 9...\( \text{Q} \text{e6} \), or choose B2b) 9...b6,
paring the development of his bishop on a6.

About 9...cxd4 10.cxd4 b6 11.0–0 or 9...\=e8 10.0–0 b6 (10...\=c6 11.f3 – see variation B2a) 11.f3 – see variation B2b.

Following 9...\=e8 10.f3 \=e8 11.0–0 b6, White can continue with a very promising pawn-sacrifice: 12.e4!? dxe4 13.fxe4 \=e4, Csizmadia – Tompa, Hungary 2011, 14.\=c4! and all White’s pieces are very active.

It seems strategically very risky for Black to choose 9...c4 10.\=c2, for example: 10...\=g4 (10...\=c6 11.0–0 – see 9...\=c6) 11.f3 \=h5 12.\=f4 \=g6 13.\=xg6 hxg6 14.0–0± – He is faced with a long and laborious defence, since he cannot counter effectively White’s plan connected with a pawn-offensive in the centre and on the kingside, Petursson – Van Riemsdijk, Manila 1990.

Black fails to trade the bishops via the g6-square. 9...\=g4 10.f3 \=h5 11.b1 b6 12.\=f4 \=g6 13.\=xg6 hxg6 14.0–0± White’s two powerful bishops provide him with superior prospects, Balashov – Fedoseev, Kazan 2006.

B2a) 9...\=c6

This active move has a serious drawback. Now, Black cannot accomplish the plan with the trade of the light-squared bishops.

10.0–0 \=e8

10...c4?! 11.\=c2 \=e8 (11...b5 12.\f3 \=e8 – see 11...\=e8) 12.f3 b5 (12...\=a5 13.\=e1±) 13.\=g3 a5 14.\e4± followed by \e4-e5, f3-f4-f5, Fabrego – Galego, Merida 2005.

10...\=c7 11.f3 \=d8 (11...\=e8 – see 10...\=e8) 12.\=e1± followed by \=f2, \=d2, \=ae1, Supatashvili – Dizdarevic, Moscow 1994.

Now, just like on the previous move, Black cannot equalise by transferring his bishop to the g6-square: 10...\=g4 11.f3 \=h5 12.\=b1 b6 (12...\=b8 13.\=f4 \=g6 14.\=xg6 hxg6 15.a4± Lalic – Garcia Ilundain, Andorra 1993) 13.\=f4 \=g6, Reshevsky – Fischer, Los Angeles 1961, 14.\=xg6 hxg6 15.a4±

10...b6 11.\=g3 \=c7 (11...\=e8 12.f3 or 11...\=a5 12.f3 \=e8 13.\=a2 – see 10...\=e8) 12.f3 \=b7 13.\=a2?!±, preparing the transfer of his rook to the kingside, Cebalo – Pilgaard, Pula 2002.

11.f3
11...b6

Now, the pawn on c5 will not need additional protection any more.

Meanwhile, Black has a great choice of possibilities, but neither of them promises him an easy game.

About 11...c4 12...c2 – see 10...c4.

11...wc7 12...g3 ...d7 13...a2 – see 11...d7.

11...a5 12...g3 cxd4 13.cxd4 e6 14...b1 Heidenfeld – Rabinowitz, Johannesburg 1955.

11...h6 12...a2 e6 13...f4 ...c8 14.g4± followed by ...g2-g5, Bratanov – Acs, Budapest 2000.

11...a6 12...e1 b5 13...f2 e6 14.h3 ...a7 15...d2 ...b6 16...fb1 ...ae7 17.a4 c4 18...c2 ...c8 19...g3± Lilienthal – Ragozin, Moscow 1935. White has succeeded in provoking the pawn-advance c5-c4 and has thus reduced the pressure against his central d4-pawn. Now, Black is practically incapable of countering White’s plan connected with e3-e4.

After 11...b8, Hoeksema – Sosonko, Eindhoven 1993, it seems very good for White to transfer his queen to the f2-square. 12...e1!!±

Following 11...e6, it seems purposeful for White to follow the plan with ...f4 and g2-g4. 12...a2 ...c8 13...f4 ...d7 14.g4! Milov – Valenti, Bratto 2001.

11...d7 12...g3

After 12...a5 13...d2 ...a4 14...b1 ...a5, Petrosian – Ljubojevic, Niksic 1983, White should better remove immediately his queen from the possible attack of the enemy knight: 15...f2!? ...ac8 16.e4±

Following 12...c8, White maintains an advantage by doubling his rooks on the e-file and then e3-e4. 13...e1 ...c7 14...a2 ...c8 15...ae2± Brodsky – Kalugin, Sochi 2008.

Or 12...c7 13...a2 ...ac8 (13...h6 14...e2±) 14...e2 ...b6 15...h1± and in the forthcoming complicated middle game White’s prospects seem preferable. Later, in the game Vaganian – Balashov, Leningrad 1977, he managed to advance e3-e4 and to increase his advantage: 15...cxd4 16.cxd4 ...a5 17...b2 ...d6 18...b4 ...c7 19.e4±

12...g3
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12...\texttt{b7}

After the other moves, White maintains an advantage with the standard transfer of his rook along the second rank.

About 12...\texttt{xd4} 13.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{b7} 14.\texttt{a2} – see 12...\texttt{b7}.

12...\texttt{e6} 13.\texttt{e2} \texttt{c8} 14.\texttt{e1} \texttt{a5} 15.\texttt{f2} \texttt{cxd4} 16.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{c4} 17.\texttt{b1} \texttt{d3} 18.\texttt{d1} \texttt{d6} 19.\texttt{d1±} followed by e3-e4, Malaniuk, – Grabber, Triesen 2010.

13...\texttt{c7} 13.\texttt{a2} \texttt{e6}, Kluss – Maksimenko, Lublin 1993, 14.\texttt{e2±}

12...\texttt{h6} 13.\texttt{a2} \texttt{b7} 14.\texttt{e2} \texttt{a5} 15.\texttt{b2} \texttt{c8} 16.\texttt{e4±} Shen – T. Kosintseva, Sochi 2009.

12...\texttt{a5} 13.\texttt{a2} \texttt{b7} (13...\texttt{b7} – see 12...\texttt{b7}) 14.\texttt{e2} \texttt{cxd4} 15.\texttt{cxd4} \texttt{h5} 16.\texttt{h1} \texttt{d6} 17.\texttt{f2} \texttt{f5} 18.\texttt{xf5} \texttt{xf5}, Vaganian – Ivanovic, Tallinn 1979 and here, it would be very strong for White to play 19.e4!±?

move, if Black chooses something else, White obtains an edge by transferring his rook to f2 (e2).

13...\texttt{a5} 14.\texttt{af2±} Nguyen – Doan, Da Lat 2011.

13...\texttt{c8} 14.\texttt{af2} \texttt{c7} 15.\texttt{e1±} Cebalo – Kovacevic, Pula 2002.

13...\texttt{g6} 14.\texttt{af2} (14.\texttt{e2±}) 14...\texttt{c8} 15.e4 \texttt{cxd4} 16.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{xd4}, Markotic – Kovacevic, Pula 1990, 17.\texttt{b2?!} Black has an extra pawn, but his defence is very difficult. The dark squares are very weak in his camp.

13...\texttt{c7} 14.\texttt{af2} a5, Cebalo – Pilgaard, Pula 2002. Here, White can advance immediately 15.e4! It would be too dangerous for Black to accept the pawn-sacrifice: 15...\texttt{cxd4} 16.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{xd4} 17.\texttt{b2} \texttt{e6} 18.\texttt{xf6} \texttt{xf6} 19.\texttt{xd5} \texttt{xd5} 20.\texttt{h5±} and his king will be seriously endangered.

14.\texttt{cxd4}

Now, just like on the previous

14...\texttt{h5}
Black wishes to oust the enemy knight from g3 by advancing his h-pawn.

After 14...\textit{c}c8, it seems very good for White to play 15.d2!± depriving Black of the counterplay connected with a5-c4.

15.e2 g6 16.e1 h4 17.h1 dh5 18.f2± Black's defence is difficult, since besides the threat e3-e4, he must watch carefully about his weak h4-pawn, Nogueiras – Inkiov, Saint John 1988.

**B2b) 9...b6**

This plan is considered to be the best for Black and quite deservedly so. He wishes to deprive his opponent of the two-bishop advantage and also to leave him with a bad bishop on c1. Still, White's standard plan, connected with the preparation of the pawn-advance e3-e4, provides him with a better game here as well.

10.0–0 a6

The other possibilities for Black lead to transposition.

10...\textit{c}c6 11.g3 – see 9...\textit{c}c6.

10...cxd4 11.cxd4 a6 12.f3 – see 10...a6.

10...b7 11.f3 e8 12.g3 – see 10...e8.

10...e8 11.f3 b7 (11...a6 12.g3 – see 10...a6; 11...c6 12.g3 – see 9...c6) 12.g3 c6 13.a2 – see 9...c6.

**11.f3**

White is waiting until his opponent captures on d3.

This move is considered to be the most precise by the contemporary theory although after 11...\textit{xa}6, White won may be one of the most famous games (Botvinnik – Capablanca, Holland 1938) in this variation. 11...\textit{xa}6 12.\textit{b}b2 \textit{d}d7 13.a4 \textit{fe}8 14.\textit{d}d3 c4?! This move is too optimistic (Black could have equalised with 14...\textit{b}b7=) 15.\textit{c}c2 \textit{b}b8 16.\textit{ae}1 \textit{c}c6 17.g3 a5 18.f3 \textit{b}b3 19.e4 \textit{xa}4 20.e5± Black has won a pawn indeed, but is helpless to counter White's powerful kingside initiative. 20...\textit{d}d7 21.\textit{f}f2 g6 22.f4 f5. J.R. Capablanca's desire to close the position is understandable. Naturally, White is reluctant to comply with this. 23.exf6 \textit{xf}6 24.f5! \textit{exe}1 25.\textit{exe}1 \textit{e}8 26.\textit{e}e6! \textit{exe}6 27.\textit{fxe}6 \textit{g}7 28.\textit{f}f4 \textit{e}8 29.\textit{e}e5 \textit{e}7
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Now, there follows a remarkable combination, which is included in almost all the books devoted to tactics in chess. 30...a3!! 31...h5+! gxh5 32...g5+ 33...xf8 34...xf6+ 35...g8 36.e7. This pawn is unstoppable. There still followed:

34...c1+ 35.f2 c2+ 36.g3 d3+ 37.h4 e4+ 38.xh5 e2+ 39.h4 e4+ 40.g4 e1+ 41.h5 1-0

11...xd3 12...xd3 c6. This is an imprecise move and it enables White to advance immediately e3-e4 (It is better for Black to opt for 12...e8 13.g3 – see 11...e8). 13.e4! cxd4 (13...d7 14.g5 c4 15.c2+ Ibragimov – Kachishvili, USA 2002) 14.cxd4 dxe4 (After 14...d7, Euwe – Van den Bosch, Amsterdam 1934, it is very strong for White to play 15.e5! d8 16.f4+) 15.fxe4 e8 16.g3+ and Black is incapable of countering White’s mobile pawn-centre, Lazovic – Zelcic, Pula 1999.

12...g3

The alternatives for Black are less precise, since they enable White to advance e3-e4. For example: 12...h5 13.xa6 xxa6, Liardet – Sher, Geneve 1992, 14.e4! dxe4 15.fxe4 cxd4 16.cxd4 xe4 17.f5→ and Black will have great problems to parry the threats against his king.

Or 12...c8 13.e4! cxd4 14.
1.d4 əf6 2.c4 əf6 3.əc3 əb4 4.e3 əd5 5.a3 əxc3 6.bc
cxd4 əxd3 15.əxd3 əa6 16.əe3 əc6 17.əf5!+ with threats which are not easy for Black to parry, Kouatly – Jacobs, London 1988.

Even after 12...əd7, it is very good for White to continue with 13.e4!? cxd4 14.əg5.

13...əc6
This is the best square for Black's knight.

13...əbd7. This move looks very passive. 14.əa2 əc8 15.əe2 əe6 16.əb2 h5 17.e4 h4 (17...cxd4 18.cxd4 h4 19.əf5 dxe4 20.fxe4± White's centre, together with his knight on f5 is powerful force, Jedyanak – Faibisovich, Oberwart 2007) 18.əf5 əh5 19.əd2 cxd4 20.cxd4± Balashov – Groszpeter, Minsk 1982. Black’s defence is very difficult, because his pieces are discoordinated and his kingside is compromised. After the careless move 20...əec6? White obtained a decisive advantage with a simple combination: 21. əe7+! əxe7 22.exd5+-

About 13...cxd4 14.cxd4 əc6 15.əb2 – see 13...əc6.

14.əb2
White is preparing əae1.

13.əxd3

Black has an extra pawn, but his defence is very difficult.
14...əxd3 15.əxd3 dxe4 16. əxe4 əxc3 17.əxc3 əc8 18.əb2 əe8 19.əf5 əc6 20.əh6+ and White's pieces are very active.
14...dxc3 15.əxf6 gxf6 16.exd5 əe7 17.əh1 əe3 18.əxa6 əxa6 19.əe4± and Black’s king is seriously endangered, Caire – Hinterberger, Email 2008.

14...əc8
It is imprecise for Black to play
14... \( \textit{\text{d7}} \) due to 15.e4! and White's centre advances. 15...dxe4 16.fxe4 \( \textit{\text{e5}} \) (16...g4 17.e5 \( \textit{\text{h5}} \) 18.\( \textit{\text{f5}} \) \( \textit{\text{xf5}} \) 19.\( \textit{\text{xf5}} \)± Black's knight is misplaced at the edge of the board, Ipatov – Baron, Athens 2012) 17.\( \textit{\text{e2}} \) \( \textit{\text{g6}} \), Aleksandrov – Stupak, Minsk 2010. White sacrifices the exchange and begins a decisive attack. 18.\( \textit{\text{xf6}} \) gxf6 19.\( \textit{\text{h5}} \) \( \textit{\text{e6}} \) 20.d5 \( \textit{\text{d6}} \) 21.c4 \( \textit{\text{e5}} \) 22.\( \textit{\text{f2}} \) \( \textit{\text{f8}} \) 23.\( \textit{\text{g3}} \) \( \textit{\text{e8}} \) 24.\( \textit{\text{g7+}} \) \( \textit{\text{e7}} \) 25.\( \textit{\text{f1}} \) 1-0

14...c4. This move is strategically risky for Black, just like on the previous moves. 15.\( \textit{\text{e2}} \) b5 (White can counter 15...h5 with the energetic response 16.e4! dxe4 17.fxe4 h4 18.\( \textit{\text{h5}} \) \( \textit{\text{xe4}} \) 19.\( \textit{\text{xc4}} \) \( \textit{\text{d7}} \) 20.\( \textit{\text{f4}} \) \( \textit{\text{a5}} \) 21.\( \textit{\text{d3+}} \) and the advance of Black's h-pawn has only led to the weakening of his king's position, Morrow – Stika, Email 2011.) 16.e4 a5 (Following 16...\( \textit{\text{b6}} \) 17.\( \textit{\text{f2}} \) \( \textit{\text{e7}} \), Dumitrache – Ionescu, Bucharest 1998, White can advance immediately his pawns: 18.e5 \( \textit{\text{d7}} \) 19.f4±) 17.e5 b4, Gonzalez de la Torre – Cheparinov, Ortiguera 2003, 18.\( \textit{\text{f4?!±}} \) Black is faced with a very difficult defence, since White is threatening to advance his pawns and to penetrate with his knight to the d6-square.

It seems too optimistic for Black to transfer his knight to the c4-square, because that would take too much time. 14...\( \textit{\text{a5}} \) 15.\( \textit{\text{ae1}} \) \( \textit{\text{c4}} \) (15...\( \textit{\text{c7}} \) 16.e4 cxd4 17.\( \textit{\text{cxd4}} \) \( \textit{\text{c4}} \) 18.\( \textit{\text{d2}} \) White's should not trade his queen, because he will need it in his attack. 18...\( \textit{\text{b3}} \) 19.\( \textit{\text{f5}} \)± Arias – Paikidze, USA 2013) 16.\( \textit{\text{c1}} \) b5 (16...\( \textit{\text{d4}} \) 17.\( \textit{\text{cxd4}} \) 18...\( \textit{\text{xf4}} \) \( \textit{\text{xf4}} \) 19.e5 \( \textit{\text{d5}} \) 20.\( \textit{\text{f3}} \) \( \textit{\text{e6}} \) 21.\( \textit{\text{e4}} \)± Black fails to preserve the blockade of the pawns on e5 and d4, Hughes – Delgado Ramirez, ICC 2009.

14...\( \textit{\text{cxd4}} \) 15.\( \textit{\text{cxd4}} \) \( \textit{\text{a5}} \) (15...h5 16.\( \textit{\text{ae1}} \) – see 14...h5; 15...\( \textit{\text{c8}} \) 16.\( \textit{\text{e4}} \) dxe4 17.\( \textit{\text{fxe4}} \) \( \textit{\text{e5}} \) 18.\( \textit{\text{e2}} \) \( \textit{\text{c4}} \) 19.\( \textit{\text{ae1}} \)± White's powerful pawn-centre provides him with better prospects.) 16.\( \textit{\text{ae1}} \) \( \textit{\text{c4}} \) 17.\( \textit{\text{c1}} \) b5 18.e4 \( \textit{\text{b6}} \) 19.\( \textit{\text{h1}} \) \( \textit{\text{d7}} \), Simantsev – Teske, Pardubice 2013, 20.\( \textit{\text{f5?!±}} \) followed by e4-e5 and f3-f4.

Black’s plan, connected with the ousting of White’s knight from the g3-square, is also insufficient for equality. 14...h5 15.\( \textit{\text{ae1}} \) cxd4 (15...\( \textit{\text{e7}} \) 16.e4±; the character of the fight is not changed after 15...g6 16.e4 h4 17.\( \textit{\text{h1}} \) cxd4 18.cxd4± V.Georgiev – Thavandiran, Montreal 2009) 16.cxd4 h4. It is best for Black to attack immediately the enemy knight. (After 16...g6 17.e4 h4, White can retreat his knight to a more active position. 18.\( \textit{\text{e2}} \)± Korchnoi – Tolnai, Austria 1996. Black cannot win a pawn, because after 18...\( \textit{\text{fxe4?!}} \) 19.fxe4 \( \textit{\text{xe4}} \), White has the resource 20.\( \textit{\text{f4}} \) \( \textit{\text{e7}} \) 21.\( \textit{\text{g6}} \) fxg6 22.\( \textit{\text{f4+}} \) 17.\( \textit{\text{f5}} \) \( \textit{\text{h5}} \) (after 17...\( \textit{\text{h3}} \), Petrovian – Fridstein, Mos-
cow 1947, the simplest for White would be to play 18.gxh3!±, opening the g-file for attack) 18. e4 \( \text{Wh}6 \) 19. \( \text{Ac}1 \) \( \text{We}8 \) 20. e5 \( \text{Wg}6 \) 21.f4+- and the advance of White's e and f-pawns should settle the issue in his favour, Botvinnik – Kurajica, Hastings 1966.

15.\( \text{Ae}1 \)
White brings his last reserves.

15...\( \text{Wc}7 \)
About 15...cxd4 16.cxd4 \( \text{Da}5 \) 17. e4 \( \text{Ac}4 \) 18. \( \text{Ac}1 \) – see 15...\( \text{Da}5 \).

16.e4 cxd4
Or 16...\( \text{De}7 \) 17. e5± followed by f3-f4.

17.cxd4 \( \text{Da}5 \) 18.e5 \( \text{Dd}7 \) 19.\( \text{De}2 \) g6 20.f4→, Black can hardly parry his opponent's attack on the kingside, Bareev – Matychenkov, Nabereznye Chelny 1988.

Conclusion
This turned out to be a long chapter; nevertheless, White's plans are quite typical:
- if Black does not exchange on c3, but retreats with his bishop to e7, then White begins active actions on the queenside after b2-b4;
- if Black exchanges on c3, then White should try to advance e3-e4: \( \text{Dd}3 \), \( \text{De}2 \), 0–0, f2-f3, \( \text{Dg}3 \), followed by bringing of his queen's rook into the actions with \( \text{D}a1-a2-e2 \), or \( \text{Db}2 \), \( \text{Ae}1 \).
Black is preparing to develop his bishop on b7 or to a6 in order to increase his control over the e4-square, or to attack the enemy c4-pawn.

5. \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash \texttt{ge2}}}

With this move White prevents the possible doubling of his pawns and prepares a2-a3.

We will analyse now: A) 5... $\texttt{\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash \texttt{ge4}}}}$, B) 5...c5, C) 5...\texttt{\texttt{\textbackslash \texttt{\textbackslash \texttt{b7}}}}, D) 5...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{a6}}}}}}.

About 5...0-0 6.a3 – see Chapter 25, variation A.

\textbf{A) 5...\texttt{\textit{\texttt{ge4}}}}

Black creates the threat to double the enemy pawns and eventually he can try to keep his knight in the centre with the moves \texttt{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash \texttt{b7}}}}, f7-f5}.

6.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{b3}}}}?

This is a radical solution of the problems. White is ready to have his pawns doubled but gains time for development.

6...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c3}}}

Black doubles his opponent’s pawns, without presenting him with the two-bishop advantage.

6...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}c3}}+ 7.\texttt{\texttt{bxc3 \textit{\texttt{d6}}}}. Black’s knight is threatening the enemy c4-pawn from this square. 8.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g3}}}

8...f5 9.\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d3}} 0-0 10.0-0 \texttt{\texttt{c6}} 11.e4± White has occupied the centre with his pawns, Ingbrandt – Wedberg, Sweden 2011.

Following 8...\texttt{\texttt{a6}} 9.\texttt{\texttt{\textit{\texttt{a4}}}}, White’s queen impedes the devel-
1.\textit{d}4 \textit{\texttt{f}6} 2.e\textit{\texttt{c}4} e\textit{\texttt{6}} 3.\textit{\texttt{c}3} \textit{\texttt{b}4} 4.e\textit{\texttt{3}} b\textit{\texttt{6}} 5.\textit{\texttt{g}e\texttt{2}}

opment of Black’s knight on \textit{b}8. 9...\textit{\texttt{b}7} 10.\textit{\texttt{a}3±} Freeman – Johansen, Melbourne 1996.

8...\textit{\texttt{c}6} 9.e\textit{\texttt{4}} \textit{\texttt{a}6} 10.e\textit{\texttt{5}!}\? White sacrifices his weak \textit{c}4-pawn and seizes the initiative. 10...\textit{\texttt{x}c}4 11.\textit{\texttt{d}3} \textit{\texttt{d}6} a\textit{\texttt{5}} 12.0–0 \textit{\texttt{b}7} 13.\textit{\texttt{w}e\texttt{2}} \textit{\texttt{d}5} 14.\textit{\texttt{h}5} \textit{\texttt{w}h\texttt{4}} 15.f\textit{\texttt{4} 0–0–0 16.\textit{\texttt{g}3 \textit{\texttt{w}e\texttt{7}}, Fedorowicz – Ward, Cannes 1988. Here, White had to con­tinue with 17.f\textit{\texttt{5}!}\? \textit{\texttt{b}8} 18.f\textit{\texttt{6} gxf\textit{\texttt{6} 19.\textit{\texttt{x}f}6 \textit{\texttt{h}6} 20.\textit{\texttt{b}1\texttt{è}} followed by \textit{\texttt{b}4}, emphasizing the vulner­able placement of Black’s knight on \textit{c}4.

7.\textit{\texttt{b}xc}3

7...\textit{\texttt{a}7}

After 7...\textit{\texttt{d}6} 8.e\textit{\texttt{4}} 0–0, White should continue with 9.\textit{\texttt{g}3!±} and thanks to his powerful centre his prospects are preferable. It is not so precise for him to opt for 9.e\textit{\texttt{5} \textit{\texttt{e}7} 10.\textit{\texttt{g}3 \textit{\texttt{d}6±} and the far-advanced e5-pawn has turned into a target for attack for Black, Potkin – Moiseenko, Khanty-Mansiysk 2013.

8.e\textit{\texttt{4}} \textit{\texttt{c}6}

Black wishes to play \textit{\texttt{a}6} and \textit{\texttt{a}5}, attacking the enemy \textit{c}4-pawn.

8...d\textit{\texttt{6}} 9.\textit{\texttt{g}3} e\textit{\texttt{5}} 10.\textit{\texttt{e}2} \textit{\texttt{b}7} 11.0–0\? followed by \textit{\texttt{f}5}, Bekker Jensen – S.Christensen, Copenhagen 1999.

8...\textit{\texttt{a}6} 9.\textit{\texttt{g}3} h\textit{\texttt{5}} (9...\textit{\texttt{c}6} 10.\textit{\texttt{d}3} – see 8...\textit{\texttt{c}6}) 10.\textit{\texttt{d}3} h\textit{\texttt{4} (after 10...\textit{\texttt{c}6}, Bromberger – Belezky, Munich 2013, 11.f\textit{\texttt{4}±, White’s powerful pawn-centre is a more important factor than his weakness on \textit{c}4) 11.\textit{\texttt{f}1 \textit{\texttt{c}6}, Lev­itt – Rayner, Swansea 2002, 12.\textit{\texttt{f}4!± followed by \textit{\texttt{e}3}, 0–0 and advancing the pawn in the centre.

9.\textit{\texttt{g}3}

The knight opens the way forward of his bishop.

9...\textit{\texttt{a}6}

White should not be afraid of the advance of Black’s rook pawn. 9...h\textit{\texttt{5}, Bekker Jensen – S.Christensens, Copenhagen 2001, 10.\textit{\texttt{e}2!? h4 11.\textit{\texttt{f}1± followed by \textit{\texttt{e}3,}}
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where White's knight is may be better placed than on g3. The weakening of Black's kingside may turn out to be an important factor in the future.

10.\textit{d}3  \textit{a}5 11.\textit{e}2  \textit{d}6

It is interesting for Black to try here 11...c6, preparing d7-d5. 12. e5 d5 13.exd6  \textit{xd}6 14.0-0\, list followed by  \textit{e}e4 or f3-f4-f5 and  \textit{f}4, Salvermoser - Friedel, Bad Wiessee 2007.

12.0-0  \textit{d}7
This move is played with the idea to transfer the queen to e4.

13.\textit{f}4

![Chess Diagram]

White is playing actively and he can even sacrifice his c4-pawn.

13...\textit{a}4

13...0-0-0 14.\textit{b}1. White is defending against  \textit{a}4, since now, he can counter that with  \textit{b}4. 14...c5, Hedman - Tallaksen, Gausdal 2001, 15.\textit{d}1!?± and after the possible opening of the game in the centre, the position of Black's king may become unsafe.

14.\textit{h}5  \textit{g}8 15.\textit{f}5
White's pieces have become very active.

15...\textit{x}c4 16.\textit{fxe}6  \textit{fxe}6 17. \textit{f}4 0-0-0, Bekker Jensen - Brynell, Gothenburg 2000. Here, White could have simply regained the sacrificed pawn: 18.\textit{xe}6!+, preserving all the advantages of his position. Of course not 18...\textit{xe}6?? due to 19.\textit{b}5+-

B) 5...c5
This move is like a hybrid between the variations with 4...b6 and 4...c5. Now, Black's pawn on c5 is protected and after a3 he can retreat his bishop to a5.

6.a3

![Chess Diagram]

White should better clarify immediately the intentions of Black's bishop.

6...\textit{a}5
This is the logical continuation
of his plan in the opening.

The alternatives for Black are less consistent.

After 6...cxd4, White’s best response would be 7.axb4! dxc3 8...xc3± and he not only has the two-bishop advantage, but his rook has become active from its initial square exerting pressure against the enemy a7-pawn.

As a rule, there do not arise original positions after 6...xc3+ 7...xc3 cxd4 (7...xb7 8.d5 – see variation C1). 7...0–0 – see Chapter 25, variation A1) 8.exd4 xb7 9.f4± White has two powerful bishops, while the d6 and c7-squares are very weak in Black’s camp and he must always consider the threat b5, MacDonald – Orton, Guernsey 1991.

7...b1

White is creating the threat b2-b4.

The exchange 7...xc3+ seems even less logical for Black now, than on the previous move. 8...xc3 7b7 9.dxc5 bxc5, Kis – Szalai, Hungary 2000. Here, White can begin an immediate pawn-offensive on the queenside with 10.b4!?±

The move 7...c6 has the drawback that White can attack this knight. 8.d5 exd5 9.cxd5 xc3+ Black is forced to exchange his bishop now. 10.xc3 6e5 11. e4 d6 12.e2 0–0 13.0–0 e8 14. f3!? This is a very reliable move. White is not in a hurry to advance f4, in order not to present his opponent with a chance to attack the e4-pawn. 14...e7 15.e3 g6 16. d2 h6 17.b4± White has completed successfully the mobilisation of his forces and Black is incapable of countering his opponent’s active actions in the centre and on the queenside, M.Gurevich – Stavrianakis, Chalkida 2009.

Bl) 7...e7 8.d2

Black can defend against that in two different ways: B1) 7...e7 and B2) 7...a6.
White defends his knight on c3, so that after the retreat of the knight on e2, Black cannot double his pawns. Meanwhile, in some variations Black must consider the possible tactical threat b2-b4.

8...\textcolor{red}{a}6

Black takes care against the threat b2-b4.

It seems too risky for Black to play 8...\textcolor{red}{a}a6, because after 9.b4, there arise favourable complications for White. 9...\textcolor{red}{x}xb4 10.\textcolor{red}{a}xb4 \textcolor{red}{x}xb4 11.\textcolor{red}{x}xb4 \textcolor{red}{w}xb4 12.\textcolor{red}{d}b5 \textcolor{red}{w}e7 13.\textcolor{red}{c}c7+ \textcolor{red}{d}d8 14.\textcolor{red}{x}xa8 \textcolor{red}{x}xc4 15.\textcolor{red}{c}c3 \textcolor{red}{xf}1 16.\textcolor{red}{x}xf1 d5 17.\textcolor{red}{b}b5 \textcolor{red}{w}b7, A.Onischuk – Rogozenco, Skopje 2002. Here, White should continue with 18.\textcolor{red}{w}c1! and it would turn out that it would be rather difficult for Black to capture the enemy knight on a8. 18...\textcolor{red}{e}e8 19.\textcolor{red}{d}ac7 \textcolor{red}{d}f6 20.f3 a6 21.\textcolor{red}{x}xa6 \textcolor{red}{x}xa6 22.\textcolor{red}{d}d6 \textcolor{red}{w}d7 23.\textcolor{red}{w}a3 \textcolor{red}{c}c7 24.\textcolor{red}{f}f2 \textcolor{red}{f}e8 25.\textcolor{red}{x}xe8 \textcolor{red}{x}xe8 26.\textcolor{red}{b}b1 \textcolor{red}{w}d6 27.\textcolor{red}{b}b4 \textcolor{red}{c}c7 28.\textcolor{red}{c}c1+– Black has not only restored the material balance, but has even an extra pawn now, but despite that his position is completely hopeless. His king is stranded in the centre and will come under the attack of all his opponent's pieces, while the rook on h8 will be completely incapable of assisting in the defence.

Following 8...\textcolor{red}{c}c6, White can occupy immediately additional space in the centre with 9.d5 \textcolor{red}{e}e5 10.\textcolor{red}{g}g3 \textcolor{red}{x}xc3 11.\textcolor{red}{x}xc3 d6 12.\textcolor{red}{e}e2 exd5 13.cxd5 h5 14.h4 0–0 15.e4± and he has more space and two-bishops, Zueger – Medancic, Lugano 1989.

Black obtains a solid but passive position after 8...\textcolor{red}{x}xc3 9.\textcolor{red}{x}xc3

White has two powerful bishops and good prospects for a pawn-offensive on the queenside. 9...0–0 10.\textcolor{red}{g}g3 \textcolor{red}{b}b7, Lugovoi – Csom, Hungary 1994, 11.dxc5!? bxc5 12.b4±

White exploits an analogous resource after 9...\textcolor{red}{b}b7 10.dxc5 bxc5, Jovanovic – Nestorovic, Belgrade 2005, 11.b4?±

9...d6, Lesiege – Bluvshtein, Montreal 2003. Here, White can compromise his opponent’s pawn-structure with 10.dxc5 bxc5 11.\textcolor{red}{x}xf6 gxf6 12.\textcolor{red}{c}c3± and eventually threatening \textcolor{red}{e}e4, or \textcolor{red}{b}b5.

Black obtains a rather cramped position after 8...0–0 9.d5 \textcolor{red}{a}a6 10.\textcolor{red}{g}g3±. He has great problems to organise counterplay against White's centre. After the mistake 10...exd5?, in the game Epishin – Komljenovic, Cergy Pontoise
2003, White obtained a decisive advantage with 11.b4 cxb4 12. axb4 \textit{\#}xb4 13.\textit{\#}xb4 \textit{\textit{\#}}xb4 14.\textit{\textit{\#}}xd5 and here, Black cannot play 14... \textit{\textit{\#}}d6 in view of 15.\textit{\textit{\#}}f5 \textit{\textit{\#}}e6 16. \textit{\textit{\#}}xg7 \textit{\textit{\#}}xg7 17.\textit{\textit{\#}}c3+-

9.\textit{\textit{\#}}g3
White is preparing \textit{\textit{\#}}e2 and takes the e4-square under control.

9...\textit{\textit{\#}}b7

About 9...0–0 10.\textit{\textit{\#}}e2 \textit{\textit{\#}}b7 11. d5 – see 9...\textit{\textit{\#}}b7.

10.d5
White restricts the enemy bishop on b7.
Now, Black will have great problems to activate his knight on a6 and his bishop on b7.

10...0–0

Black should not weaken his control over the b4-square. 10... \textit{\textit{\#}}c7?!, Conquest – Montoya Irigoien, Bergara 2010, 11.dxe6! fxe6 12.b4 cxb4 13.axb4 \textit{\textit{\#}}xb4 14.\textit{\textit{\#}}xb4 \textit{\textit{\#}}xb4 15.\textit{\textit{\#}}d5± and he will have to part with his queen without obtaining for it sufficient compensation, because it would not work for him to play 15...\textit{\textit{\#}}d6? due to 16.\textit{\textit{\#}}b4 \textit{\textit{\#}}e5 17.\textit{\textit{\#}}c3+-

11.\textit{\textit{\#}}e2 exd5


12.\textit{\textit{\#}}xd5 \textit{\textit{\#}}xd5 13.cxd5 \textit{\textit{\#}}xd2+ 14.\textit{\textit{\#}}xd2 \textit{\#}e8 15.0–0 d6 16.e4 \textit{\textit{\#}}c7 17.b4± Black has facilitated his defence a bit by exchanging pieces, but White's prospects are preferable. He can organise active actions in the centre as well as on the kingside with \textit{\textit{\#}}d3, \textit{\#}f1, f2–f4, \textit{\#}f5, Ress – Hatsek, Lechenicher SchachServer 2012.

B2) 7...\textit{\textit{\#}}a6
This is Black's main response in this position. Usually it is not acceptable to place the knight at
the edge of the board, but in this case it prevents reliably b2-b4.

8.g3!?

White begins the fight for the long diagonal on which two strategically very important squares are placed – e4 and d5.

8...b7

Black is trying by all means to thwart his opponent’s plan.

After 8...cxd4 9.exd4, Black ends up in a passive position. 9...b7 (9...xc3+ 10.xc3 b7 11.d5 – see 9...b7) 10.d5 xc3+ 11.xc3

9.d5

He wishes to undermine the base under the enemy d5-pawn.

9...0-0 10.g2 b5?! Lenderman – Smith, Arlington 2013 (It is preferable for Black to play here 10...exd5 11.0-0 xc3 12.xc3 – see 9...exd5.) 11.b4!? cxb4 12.axb4 xb4 13.0-0 bxc4 14.a2 xd5 15.xb4 xg2 16.xg2 xb4 17.xb4 White's bishop is stronger than Black’s three pawns.
Following 9...\(d_e4\), Black doubles his opponent’s pawns, but enables White to complete the development of his pieces. 10.\(g_2\) \(x_c3\) + 11.\(x_c3\) \(x_c3\) 12.\(bxc3\) 0–0 (It is not so precise for Black to opt for 12...d6, because of 13.\(a_4++!\) \(e_7\) 14.0–0 \(c_7\) 15.e4± and his king remains stranded in the centre, Gelfand – Aronian, Leon 2010.) 13.0–0 \(e_5\) 14.e4 \(c_7\) 15.f4± White has two bishops and good prospects for an attack on the kingside. Black cannot exploit the vulnerability of his opponent’s c4-pawn, because his knight can hardly attack it, Yang – Narditsky, Lubbock 2011.

After 9...exd5 10.\(g_2\), White manages to hold on to the key d5-square.

Following 10...\(b_8\) 11.\(cxd5\) \(b_5\) 12.0–0 \(b_4\), Bluvshtein – Huber, Toronto 2006, the simplest for White would be to continue with 13.\(e_4!\)± and Black’s knight on a6 and his bishop on a5 are horribly isolated from the actions.

He cannot equalise with 10...\(e_4\) 11.\(cxd5\) \(x_c3\), Timman – Ikonnikov, Dieren 2009 and here White plays 12.\(x_c3\)± followed by 0–0 and e3-e4.

10.\(g_2\) \(bxc4\)

It does not seem logical for Black to play 10...b4, since he reduces voluntarily the tension against the enemy d5-pawn. 11.\(axb4\) \(axb4\) 12.0–0 exd5 13.\(f_4\) \(a_6\) 14.\(cxd5\) \(fxd5\), Sadilek – Shengelia, Vienna 2012, 15.\(x_d5!\) \(x_d5\) 16.\(w_d5\)± – The d5-square is completely in White’s hands.

11.0–0

(diagram)

11...0–0

Black can hardly continue the game without castling.

It does not seem precise for him to play 11...\(b_8\), because after 12.e4 0–0 13.\(f_4\)± White wins a tempo for the development of his

White pins the enemy knight and increases his control over the d5-square.

13...h6
Black gets rid of the pin immediately.

13...exd5 14.Qxd5 Qxd5 15. Qxf6 Qxf6 16.Qxd5 Qe6 (16... Qab8 17.Qxc4±) 17.Qc6 Qc7 18. Qf4 Qe5 19.Qfd1 Qab8 20.Qa4 Qb6 21.Qxc4± White has regained his pawn and can exploit the vulnerability of the enemy d6-pawn in the forthcoming battle, S.Popov – Savic, Mataruska Banja 2007.

After 13...Qc7 14.Qf4 Qb8 15.Qa4 Qb6, Schandorff – Carstensen, Denmark 2012, White can force the enemy knight to occupy an unfavourable position: 16.Qh5!? Qce8 17.dxe6 fxe6 18. Qbd1 Qe7 19.Qxc4± White has regained his pawn preserving his superior pawn-structure.

14.Qxf6 Qxf6 15.dxe6 Qxe6 16.Qa4

16...Qb6 (16...Qd8 17.Qf4 Qe5 18.Qfd1 Qc7, Nisipeanu – Kunin, Bad Wiessee 2011, 19. Qxc4±) 17.Qf4 Qe5, Damaso – Gomez Esteban, Leon 1997. Here, it seems very good for White to transfer his knight to the c3-square: 18.Qfd5 Qc7 19.Qe3 Qbd8 20.Qfd1 Qe7 21.Qd2± followed by Qbd1, Qc4, Qf5(Qcd5). Black will have to defend long and hard an inferior position.

C) 5...Qb7
This is the natural development of Black's bishop.

6.a3
White eliminates immediately the pin.
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Now, Black is faced with a choice. He can either exchange his bishop C1) 6...\(\text{x}c3\), or retreat it: C2) 6...\(\text{d}6\), C3) 6...\(\text{e}7\).

C1) 6...\(\text{x}c3\)+
This is an indifferent move after which Black obtains a solid but passive position. Its main drawback is that after it White completes easily the development of his kingside pieces.

7.\(\text{xc}3\)

We will analyse now C1a) 7...d5 and C1b) 7...0–0.

About 7...c5 8.d5 exd5 9.cxd5 0–0 10.\(\text{e}2\) – see Chapter 25, variation A1.

As a rule, there do not arise original positions after 7...d6 8.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{bd}7\) (The exchange of the g-pawns is in favour of White: 8...\(\text{x}g2\) 9.\(\text{g}1\) \(\text{b}7\) 10.\(\text{x}g7\) Kezin – Kuznetsov, Novosibirsk 2008.) 9.0–0 0–0 10.\(\text{e}4\) – see 7...0–0.

The move 7...\(\text{e}4\) has the drawback that after 8.\(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{xe}4\) 9.\(\text{g}4\), Black's bishop must abandon the long diagonal. 9...\(\text{g}6\) 10.\(\text{d}2\) White has the two-bishop advantage, Pavlovic – Dabrowska, Cappelle la Grande 1995.

C1a) 7...d5 8.cxd5
White should better clarify the situation in the centre immediately, so that later Black does not have the possibility to open the diagonal for his bishop with the move dxc4.

8...exd5

After 8...\(\text{xd}5\) 9.\(\text{b}5\)\(\text{d}7\) 10.0–0 0–0 11.\(\text{e}2\)\(\text{f}6\) 12.f3\(\text{f}3\) (followed by e3-e4), White not only has the two-bishop advantage, but he also dominates in the centre, Quintana Fernandez – Vega Viejo, Gijon 1994.

9.b4

This is a useful move which impedes the pawn-advance c7-c5 for Black.
9...0-0 10.\textit{\&d3} \textit{\&bd7}

After 10...\textit{\&e4} 11.\textit{\&c2} \textit{\&xc3} 12.\textit{\&xc3} \textit{\&d7} 13.\textit{\&b2} \textit{\&f6} 14.0-0 \textit{\&e4} 15.\textit{\&c2} f5 16.\textit{\&ac1} \textit{\&f7} 17.b5 a6 18.a4± White has good prospects to attack Black’s weak c7-pawn, Shirov – Bordell Rosell, Terrassa 1996.

Following 10...c5 11.bxc5 bxc5 12.0-0 cxd4 (12...\textit{\&bd7} 13.\textit{\&b1} – see 10...\textit{\&bd7}) 13.exd4 \textit{\&e4} 14.\textit{\&b3}± the position is opened and this is in favour of White, since he has two powerful bishops, Lenic – Babula, Austria 2012.

11.0-0

\textbf{11...c5}

Black cannot fortify his knights in the centre, because White has always the move f2-f3: 11...\textit{\&e4} 12.\textit{\&b3} \textit{\&d6} 13.f3± Pelletier – Jenni, Zuerich 2004.

Following 11...\textit{\&e8}, White can begin a pawn-offensive on the queenside: 12.a4 a6, Mahalaksh-

mi – Akshaya, Chennai 2011, 13.\textit{\&b3}!?± followed by \textit{\&a3} and doubling of the rooks on the c-file.

12.bxc5

White opens the file for his rook.

12...bxc5 13.\textit{\&b1} \textit{\&c6}

After 13...\textit{\&b8} 14.a4 c4 15.\textit{\&c2} \textit{\&c6} 16.\textit{\&a3}± White has two powerful bishops and good prospects to play against the weak enemy d5-pawn, Moehring – Lehmann, Strausberg 1971.

14.dxc5

White creates an isolated pawn for his opponent, but it is also good for him to play 14.a4!?± with the idea to develop the bishop to the a3-square.

14...\textit{\&xc5} 15.\textit{\&e2}±

Black’s weakness on d5 needs permanent protection and you should not forget that White has the two-bishop advantage, Volkov – Ogunmefun, Dos Hermanas 2003.
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C1b) 7...0–0
Black conceals his intentions in the centre for the moment.
8.\textit{\textit{d}3}!

![](image)

This is the most active square for White’s bishop.
\textbf{8...c5}

It would be too risky for Black to accept the pawn-sacrifice: 8...\textit{\textit{x}g}2 9.\textit{\textit{e}g1} \textit{\textit{b}7} 10.e4. The power of White’s attack can be illustrated by the following variation: 10...\textit{\textit{e}e8} 11.\textit{\textit{h}5} \textit{\textit{g}6} 12.e5 \textit{\textit{g}7} 13.\textit{\textit{h}6} \textit{\textit{f}6}. Here, there followed the decisive rook-sacrifice – 14.\textit{\textit{x}g6}+– Loureiro – Nagashima, Santos 1998.

8...\textit{\textit{d}5} 9.exd5 \textit{\textit{xd}5} (9...\textit{\textit{e}d}5 10.b4 – see variation \textbf{C1a}) 10.0–0 \textit{\textit{xc}3} 11.bxc3 \textit{\textit{c}5}, Zherebukh – Manik, Warsaw 2009, 12.a4!?± (followed by \textit{\textit{e}e2}, a4-a5) and White preserves very good prospects in the centre and on the queenside.

After 8...\textit{d}6 9.0–0, Black obtains a very passive position. 9...\textit{\textit{bd}7} (9...\textit{\textit{e}e8} 10.d5 \textit{\textit{e}e7} 11.e4± – His pieces obviously lack space.) 10.e4 \textit{\textit{e}5} 11.d5 a5 (after 11...\textit{h}6 12.b4 \textit{\textit{c}5} 13.dxc6 \textit{\textit{xc}6} 14.\textit{\textit{e}e3}± Black manages to activate his bishop on b7, but pays a dear price for that – his d6-pawn becomes very weak, Sundararajan – Lalith, Forni di Sopra 2012) 12.\textit{\textit{b}1} \textit{\textit{c}5} 13.\textit{\textit{c}2} \textit{\textit{c}8} 14.b4± White has ousted the enemy knight from the c5-square, Pimonenko – Potapov, Kaluga 2003.

\textbf{9.d5}

![](image)

White not only occupies space, but also restricts the enemy bishop on b7.

\textbf{9...\textit{\textit{e}x}d5}

Black cannot facilitate his defence with the undermining pawn-break 9...\textit{b}5 10.0–0, for example: 10...bxc4 11.\textit{\textit{xc}4} \textit{\textit{ex}d}5 (11...\textit{\textit{e}e8} 12.e4± White has protected reliably his d5-pawn.) 12.\textit{\textit{e}d}5 \textit{\textit{c}6}, Botvinnik – Bronstein, Moscow 1951, 13.b4! \textit{\textit{e}5} 14.\textit{\textit{b}2}± Black’s position is difficult, since it would not work for him to
play 14...\( \text{Bxc4?} \) because of 15.\( \text{Bxf6+ gxf6} \) 16.\( \text{Bg4+ h8} \) 17.\( \text{Bxc4+} \) White regains the sacrificed piece, while Black’s castling position has been hopelessly compromised.

10.\( \text{cxd5 d6} \) 11.0-0

\[ 
\text{C2) 6...Bd6}
\]

This is an original retreat of Black’s bishop, but it has the drawback that now, he would not have the possibility to advance d7-d5.

\[ 
7.\text{Bc2?!}
\]

This is not a popular move, but it is very strong. White takes the e4-square under control.

7...\( \text{c5} \)

Following 7...0-0, Yang – Perelshteyn, Saint Louis 2011, White obtains an edge by occupying additional space: 8.e4!? e5 9.d5± followed by \( \text{Be2-g3, Bd3, 0-0 and b2-b4} \).

8.\( \text{d5} \)

White exploits the fact that Black cannot win a pawn and occupies space.

8...\( \text{exd5} \)

8...0-0 9.Bb5. It is better to exchange the enemy bishop, because it can occupy an active position on the e5-square later. 9...\( \text{Be8} \) 10.Bxd6 Bxd6 11.Bc3 exd5 12.cxd5= Gilbert – Soldano, Email 2012. Black’s queenside pieces have occupies passive positions. Naturally, White should be careful about the protection of his d5-
pawn. The best way to do that is – \( \text{\textit{e2}}, 0-0 \) and \( \text{\textit{d1}} \).

9.\( cxd5 \)

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

Black loses after 9...\( \text{\textit{xd5}} \)?? due to 10.\( \text{\textit{xd5}} \) \( \text{\textit{xd5}} \) 11.\( \text{\textit{d3}} \) –

9...0–0 10.\( \text{\textit{b5}} \) \( \text{\textit{e7}} \) 11.\( \text{\textit{xd6}} \) \( \text{\textit{xd6}} \) 12.\( \text{\textit{e4}} \) \( \text{\textit{e7}} \) 13.\( \text{\textit{f3}} \) d6 14.\( \text{\textit{f2}} \) \( \text{\textit{a6}} \) 15.\( \text{\textit{g3}} \) g6 16.\( \text{\textit{xa6}} \) \( \text{\textit{xa6}} \) 17.\( \text{\textit{h4}} \) \( \text{\textit{fc8}} \) 18.\( \text{\textit{h5}} \) – with a powerful attack on the h-file, Kuhne – Lukasevicius, ICCF 2013.

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

White is threatening \( \text{\textit{f5}} \) and wins a tempo for the protection of his d5-pawn.

10...\( \text{\textit{g6}} \) 11.\( \text{\textit{c4}} \) 0–0 12.\( \text{\textit{e4}} \) a6, Arizmendi Martinez – Iturrizaga Bonelli, Erits La Massana 2012, 13.\( \text{\textit{g5}} \) – The pin of the knight on f6 is very unpleasant for Black.

C3) 6...\( \text{\textit{e7}} \)

The bishop is better placed here than on \( \text{\textit{d6}} \).

7.\( \text{\textit{d5}} \)

Now, White must solve the problem how to develop his kingside pieces, because his knight on \( \text{\textit{e2}} \) impedes the development of his bishop on \( \text{\textit{f1}} \). The best set-up of his pieces here would be \( \text{\textit{g3}}, \text{\textit{e2}} \), but before that he would need to restrict Black’s bishop on \( \text{\textit{b7}} \).

7...0–0

This is a natural move.

The moves 7...b5 and 7...d6 usually transpose to 7...0–0, for example: 7...b5 8.dxe6 \( \text{\textit{fxe6}} \) 9.\( \text{\textit{xb5}} \) 0–0 10.\( \text{\textit{g3}} \), or 7...d6 8.\( \text{\textit{g3}} \) 0–0 9.e4, or 8...c6 9.e4 \( \text{\textit{a6}} \) 10.\( \text{\textit{e2}} \) 0–0 11.0–0, or 10...\( \text{\textit{c7}} \) 11.dxc6 \( \text{\textit{xc6}} \) 12.0–0 0–0 13.\( \text{\textit{f4}} \) – see 7...0–0.

Following 7...e5 8.\( \text{\textit{g3}} \) g6 9.\( \text{\textit{d3}} \) d6 10.f4 \( \text{\textit{bd7}} \) 11.f5+ White preserves a great space advantage, Reshevsky – Kramer, New York 1951.

7...a5. Black is preparing \( \text{\textit{a6}} \)-c5 followed by \( \text{\textit{a5}} \)-a4. 8.e4 e5
(8...0–0 9.\(\text{Ng}3\) – see 7...0–0) 9.\(\text{Ng}3\) 0–0 10.\(\text{Nd}3\) Black’s bishop on b7 is very passive and does not control the f5-square where White’s knight may go at any moment, Lilienthal – Kotov, Moscow 1945.

7...exd5. Black is planning to organise counterplay on the e-file. 8.cxd5 0–0 9.\(\text{Ng}3\)

9...\(\text{d}6\) 10.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{e}8\) 11.0–0 \text{c}6 12.\(\text{f}5\) \(\text{f}8\) 13.\(\text{e}4\) cxd5 14.exd5± Black lags in development and White’s knight on e5 is very active, Ulko – Novichkov, Moscow 1998.

9...\(\text{e}8\) 10.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{f}8\) 11.0–0 \text{c}6. Black undermines the enemy d5-pawn, because it cramps his position considerably (after 11...\text{c}5 12.e4± Black’s bishop on b7 is restricted by his own pawn on d5). 12.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{a}6\) 13.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{c}7\), Beliavsky – G.Kuzmin, Moscow 1973, 14. dxc6 dxc6 15.\(\text{b}2\)± White’s bishop on f3 is much more active than its counterpart on b7.

8.\(\text{Ng}3\)

(diagram)

8...d6

8...\(\text{e}8\) 9.\(\text{e}2\)

8...a5 9.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{a}6\) 10.\(\text{e}2\) \text{d}6 11.0–0 \text{c}6 (11...\(\text{e}8\) 12.\(\text{b}1\)!! followed by b2–b4, restricting the enemy knight on a6) 12.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}5\), Vidal – Mihailovs, Montcada 2010 and here, White needed to oust the enemy knight with the move 13.\(\text{b}4\)±

8...b5. This is an interesting move, but still insufficient for equality. 9.dxe6 fxe6 10.\(\text{xb}5\) \text{c}5 (after 10...\(\text{a}6\) 11.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{b}8\), Furman – Ragozin, Moscow 1948, 12.\(\text{e}2\)± Black’s compensation for the pawn is not good enough) 11.\(\text{f}3\) d5, Grigorian – Kupreichik, Moscow 1976, 12.cxd5 exd5 13.\(\text{e}2\)± followed by 0–0, \(\text{f}5\).

8...\(\text{e}8\) 9.\(\text{e}2\)
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About 9...exd5 10.cxd5 – see 7...exd5.

9...d6 10.0-0 ufact8 11.e4 – see 9...ufact8.

After 9...ufact6, it is essential for White not to allow ufacte5 – 10.f4!? ☐b7

9...ufact8 10.e4 1d6 11.0-0 ☐f8 11.e4 – see 9...ufact8.

After 9...ufact6, it is essential for White not to allow ufacte5 – 10.f4!? ☐b7

(11...c6 12.dxe6 ☐xe6, Supatashvilii – Ionescu, Elista 1998, 13.☐e3± followed by ☐c2) 12.☐e3 c6 13. dxe6 fxe6 14.f4± Black has less space and his e6 and d6-pawns are weak, Dumitrache – Cioara, Bucharest 2003.

9.e4

Following 9...c5 10.☐e2 ☐e8 11.0-0±, White has the advantage thanks to his extra space, Gabriel – Hertneck, Germany 2008.

9...☐bd7 10.☐e2 ☐e8 (10...c6 11.0-0 ☐c7 12. dxc6 ☐xc6 13.☐f4 ☐d7, Cebalo – Vucinic, Novi Sad 1985 and here after 14.☐d3!± followed by ☐fd1, White exerts powerful pressure on the d6-pawn. If Black plays e6-e5, White will obtain an excellent outpost for the penetration of his knight – ☐d5.

11.exd5 cxd5 12.cxd5

much more active than their black counterparts, Yrjola – Gavrikov, Turku 1988.

10.☐e2 exd5

About 10...exd5 11.cxd5 exd5 12.exd5 – see 10...exd5.

10...☐bd7 11.0-0 a6 (11...☐e8 12.dxe6 fxe6 13.☐e3 ☐f8 14.f4 – see 8...☐e8) 12.☐f4 cxd5 13.cxd5 e5 14.☐e3± White has very good prospects on the c-file, Kaminik – Peters, Hamburg 1992.

Black cannot equalise by a transfer of his knight to the c7-square. 10...☐a6 11.0-0 ☐c7 12. dxc6 ☐xc6 13.☐f4 ☐d7, Cebalo – Vucinic, Novi Sad 1985 and here after 14.☐d3!± followed by ☐fd1, White exerts powerful pressure on the d6-pawn. If Black plays e6-e5, White will obtain an excellent outpost for the penetration of his knight – ☐d5.

11.exd5 cxd5 12.cxd5

Black cannot equalise by a transfer of his knight to the c7-square. 10...☐a6 11.0-0 ☐c7 12. dxc6 ☐xc6 13.☐f4 ☐d7, Cebalo – Vucinic, Novi Sad 1985 and here after 14.☐d3!± followed by ☐fd1, White exerts powerful pressure on the d6-pawn. If Black plays e6-e5, White will obtain an excellent outpost for the penetration of his knight – ☐d5.

12...☐e8
12...c6 13.0-0 c7 14.f3 d7 15.e1 e8 16.d4 f8 17.
g5 xe1+ 18.xe1 e8 19.d1± Soler – Fernandez, Cienfuegos 1975. White has protected reliably his d5-pawn. Black has great problems to find good squares for his pieces, since he lacks space.

13.0-0 bd7
13...a6 14.f4±

14.f5 f8 15.f4

15...e4

15...e5 16.b5± – The light squares are very weak in Black’s camp, Moiseenko – Klimov, Moscow 2007.

16.b5± White’s pieces are much more active, M.Gurevich – Khalifman, Minsk 1987.

D) 5...a6
Black wishes to exploit the drawbacks of the move g2ge2 (White’s bishop on f1 does not protect his c4-pawn any more.).

6.g3
White not only protects his c4-pawn, but prepares e3-e4 too. Now however, Black can double his opponent’s pawns again after xc3.

As his main possibilities, we will analyse: D1) 6...c5, D2) 6...h5, D3) 6...0–0 and D4) 6...xc3.

6...d5?? 7.a4+-
6...b7 7.d2 0–0, Soffer – Lerner, Herzliya 2009, 8.a3!? xc3 9.xc3± White has a bishop-pair and a free game.

Following 6...c6 7.e4 e5 (It is preferable for Black to choose here 7...0–0 8.d3 – see 6...0–0.) White can oust the enemy knight from the f6-square: 8.dxe5 xe5 9.f4 c6 10.e5± Furman – Tseskovsky, USSR 1971.

D1) 6...c5
Black undermines immediately White’s pawn-centre.
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7.d5

He occupies space. White should not be afraid of the possible loss of his castling rights, since the position is of a closed type. 7...exd5

After 7...b:c3 + 8.b xc3 0-0 9.e4 B:e8 10.f3 d6 11.\textit{\textasciitilde}f4 e5 12.\textit{\textasciitilde}e3 + Colin - Inkiov, Marseille 2006 White has very good prospects on the kingside. Black can hardly exploit the weakness of his opponent's c4-pawn.

7...0-0 8.e4

About 8...\textit{\textasciitilde}xc3+ 8.bxc3 0-0 9.e4 \textit{\textasciitilde}e8 10.f3 d6 11.\textit{\textasciitilde}f4 e5 12.\textit{\textasciitilde}e3 ± Colin - Inkiov, Marseille 2006 White has very good prospects on the kingside. Black can hardly exploit the weakness of his opponent's c4-pawn.

7...0-0 8.e4

About 8...exd5 9.cxd5 \textit{\textasciitilde}xf1 10.\textit{\textasciitilde}xf1 – see 7...exd5.

8...d6 9.\textit{\textasciitilde}e2 exd5 10.exd5 \textit{\textasciitilde}xc3 + 11.bxc3 \textit{\textasciitilde}e8 (11...\textit{\textasciitilde}fd7 12.

0-0 \textit{\textasciitilde}e5, Iashvili - Alterman, Formia 1994, 13.\textit{\textasciitilde}a4±) 12.0-0 \textit{\textasciitilde}bd7, Bareev - Wilder, Belgrade 1988, after 13.f4 ± Black cannot attack effectively the enemy c4-pawn, because his knight cannot occupy the e5-square.

8...\textit{\textasciitilde}e8 9.f3 d6 10.\textit{\textasciitilde}e2 exd5 11.cxd5 \textit{\textasciitilde}xe2 (The character of the position remains more or less the same after 11...\textit{\textasciitilde}xc3+ 12.bxc3 \textit{\textasciitilde}xe2 13.\textit{\textasciitilde}xe2 ± Mchedlishvili - Istratescu, Ohrid 2001.) 12.\textit{\textasciitilde}gx e2 b5 13.0-0 a6 14.a4 ± Black's queenside activity on the queenside (b6-b5) has turned out to be in favour of White, Korchnoi - Short, Madrid 1995.

8.cxd5 \textit{\textasciitilde}xf1 9.\textit{\textasciitilde}xf1

9...0-0

About 9...\textit{\textasciitilde}xc3 10.bxc3 0-0 (10...d6 11.e4 0-0 12.\textit{\textasciitilde}f4 – see 9...0-0) 11.e4 d6 12.\textit{\textasciitilde}f4 – see 9...0-0.

10.e4 \textit{\textasciitilde}xc3

About 10...d6 11.\textit{\textasciitilde}f4 \textit{\textasciitilde}e8 12.f3 \textit{\textasciitilde}xc3 13.bxc3 – see 10...\textit{\textasciitilde}c3.
Following 10...\textit{f}e8 11.f3 \textit{xc}3 12.bxc3 \textit{d}6, Jaracz – Hertneck, Dresden 2012, White can begin immediately active actions: 13. \textit{f}5! g6 14.h6+ \textit{g}7 15.h4 \textit{h}5 16.f2!± followed by g2-g4, h4-h5.

11.bxc3 \textit{d}6 12.\textit{f}4 \textit{e}8

It seems too passive for Black to play 12...\textit{e}8, because of 13.h4! \textit{d}7, Moreno Ruiz – Igarza, Collado Villalba 2003, 14.h5± and White has powerful initiative on the kingside.

13.f3 \textit{fd}7

13...\textit{bd}7?! This is a rather dubious pawn-sacrifice. 14.\textit{xd}6 \textit{xe}4 15.\textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 16.fxe4 \textit{f}6+ 17.\textit{f}3 \textit{xd}6 18.g3± and Black’s compensation for the sacrificed material is insufficient, Hoi – Utasi, Jurmala 1985.

After 14.\textit{xd}6 \textit{f}6 15.\textit{xb}8 \textit{axb}8 16.\textit{c}2 \textit{e}5± Black obtains good compensation for the pawn, Lautier – Leitao, New Delhi/Teheran 2000.

14...\textit{e}5 15.\textit{a}4 \textit{f}8

Black is defending against the threat \textit{xd}6.

16.\textit{xe}5 \textit{dxe}5 17.\textit{d}6 \textit{g}6 18. \textit{e}7+ \textit{g}7 19.\textit{d}1± White’s powerful passed d-pawn squeezes considerably Black’s position.

D2) 6...\textit{h}5

This is an active move. Black wishes to advance h5-h4 and to oust the enemy knight from the g3-square. He weakens his kingside however...

7.\textit{h}4

White must play this move and should not allow h5-h4.

\textbf{14.\textit{f}5!}

This is the best. White does not need to accept the pawn-sacrifice.

7...\textit{xc}3+

Now, there arise positions, similar to variation \textbf{D4}, but with the inclusion of the moves h4 – h5.
After 7...\(b7\), White holds on to his e4-square with the move 8.\(d3\)? Later, in the game Knaak – Bronstein, Tallinn 1979, there followed: 8...d5 9.cxd5 exd5 10.\(c2\) c5 11.a3 cxd4 12.axb4 dxc3 13.bxc3; White had the two-bishop advantage and Black’s isolated d5-pawn was weak.

8.\(bxc3\) d5 9.\(f3\)

White protects indirectly his c4-pawn and prepares e3-e4.

It is also good for him to choose here 9.\(a3\) – see variation D4.

9...\(d7\)

9...c6 10.e4 dxe4 11.\(xe4\) \(xe4\) 12.\(xe4\) \(d7\), Tarjan – Olafsson, Lone Pine 1977, 13.\(g5\) – It has become evident that the inclusion of the moves h5 – h4 has turned out to be in favour of White.

The position is very difficult for Black after 9...\(b7\) 10.\(d3\) c5 11.cxd5 \(xd5\) 12.e4 \(d8\) 13.\(g5\) ±

White’s bishops are tremendously active. After Black’s careless move 13...\(xd4?!\) 14.\(b5\) \(c6\) 15.e5 \(xb5\) 16.exf6 g6 17.\(xa8\) \(c7\) 18.\(f3\)++, White obtained a decisive material advantage, Gligoric – Rubinetti, Palma de Mallorca 1970.

10.e4 dxe4 11.\(xe4\) \(xe4\)

12.\(xe4\)± Tarjan – Grefe, Oberlin 1975. If Black’s pawn had been on the h7-square, the position could have been evaluated as equal. With a pawn on h5, Black’s kingside has been weakened and White can rely on maintaining a slight edge.

D3) 6...0–0

Black would not mind his opponent occupying the centre and plans later to organise counterplay by attacking it.

7.e4

7...\(c6\)

He is preparing e6-e5.

About 7...c5 8.d5 – see variation D1.
Black’s attempt to create counterplay on the light squares fails. 7...d5 8.cxd5 †xc3+ (8...†xf1 9. †xf1 exd5 10.e5 †e8 11.†f5 f6 12.e6 c6, Sherwin – Pachman, Portoroz 1958, 13.†f4+ White’s pieces are active and his pawn on e6 is very powerful.) 9.bxc3 †xf1 10.†xf1 exd5 11.e5 †e4 12. †d3 f5 13.†xe2 †g5. Black plans to deploy his knight on the blocking e6-square, so White should better exchange it. 14.†xg5! †xg5 15.g3 †h6 16.†f4+ Petrosian – Butnorius, Riga 1975. White has a powerful passed e5-pawn. His knight on f4 is perfectly placed, while Black has not completed the development of his queenside yet.

7...d6 8.†d3 †c6 (8...e5 9.0–0 †xc3 10.bxc3 †bd7 11.f4+ followed by †f5 and White seized completely the initiative in the game Potkin – Maletin, Serpukhov 2008) 9.0–0 †xc3 10.bxc3 †e4 11.†e3 †a5 (10...e5 11.†e3 †a5 12.†xe2 †d7 13.f4+ White’s kingside initiative is developing effortlessly, Donner – Andersen, Buesum 1968) 11.†xe2 c5 12.e5 dxe5 13. dxe5 †d7, Potkin – Vovk, Warsaw 2011. Here, White could have begun an attack against the enemy king with 14.†h5! ± followed by †g4.

8.†d3
This is a logical continuation of White’s opening plan.

8...e5
Black does not obtain sufficient compensation for the piece after 8...†xd4?! 9.†a4 †a5 10. b4+

Black’s attack against the c4-pawn is not dangerous for White. 8...†a5, Knaak – Adorjan, Szirak 1985, 9.†e2±

Now, just like on move 7, the plan with d7-d5 is not promising for Black at all. 8...d5 9.cxd5 †xd5 10.†xd3 exd5 11.e5 †e4 12.a3 †xc3+ 13.bxc3 f5 14.†e2 †a5 15. h4 †b3 16.†b1 †xc1 17.†xc1 f4 18. †f3 †e7 (18...c5 19.†xf4+ – He does not have sufficient compensation for the pawn, Portisch – Shamkovich, Sarajevo 1963.) 19. c4 c6 20.cxd5 cxd5 21.†xf4+ Portisch – Spassky, Moscow 1967. I will mention that White should not be afraid of the pin of his knight, because he can always play g2-g3.

9.d5 †xc3+
About 9...†a5 10.†e2 †xc3+ 11.bxc3 – see 9...†c3.
10. **bxc3 a5**

The knight attacks White’s c4-pawn from this square.

10... **e7**. This move does not seem so active. 11. **g5 e8** 12. 0–0?± followed by **e2** and after the retreat of the bishop – f2-f4.

11. **e2 c6**

Or 11... **e8** 12. **a3 d6** 13. 0–0?± followed by **f5** and f2-f4, Sadler – Arkell, London 1991.

12. **f5 e8** 13. f4± White has already begun active actions on the kingside, while Black’s achievements on the other side of the board are just minimal, Spassky – Huebner, Munich 1979.

### D4) 6... **xc3**+

Black is preparing d7-d5.

7. **bxc3 d5**

About 7...0–0 8. **e4** d6 9. **d3 c6** 10. 0–0 – see variation **D3**.

8. **a3**

White exploits the basic drawback of Black’s move 6 – the weakening of the a3-f8 diagonal.

8... **xc4**

After this move White is deprived of his two-bishop advantage.

It is interesting but still insufficient for equality for Black to include the moves h5 – h4. 8... **h5** 9. **h4 xc4** 10. **xc4 dxc4** 11. **a4+ d7** 12. **xc4 c6** 13. **e4** 0–0–0 14. **e2 b8**. After Black has castled queenside, the placement of the bishop on a3 is completely useless for White. Therefore, he transfers it to the weakened g5-square. 15. **c1!± White has a powerful pawn-centre, while Black’s h5-pawn is weak, Gligoric – Speelman, Luzern 1982.

The move 8... **xc4** was often played during the 70ies of the past century. It was established rather quickly that White had more than sufficient compensa-
1.d4 .df6 2.c4 e6 3...c3 4.b4 5.e3 b6 6.ge2 7a6 6.g3

...tion for the pawn. 9...e2 8d7 10.e4 2c6 11.0–0 0–0–0 (11...e7 12.xe7 2xe7 13.c1±, White creates the threat 2a3 and Black's king is seriously endangered in the centre of the board, Vaisser – Tseshkovsky, Novosibirsk 1971) 12.2e2 h5 13.5fd1 h4 14.2f1 2a5 (following 14...2h5, White has at his disposal the pawn-break – 15. d5! 2e5 16.dxe6 2e8 17.5xd8+ 5xd8 18.5xh5 2xh5 19.f4 2d3 20.exf7+ – and his powerful pawn on f7 provides him with a decisive advantage, Portisch – Fischer, Siegen 1970) 15.2b4 2c6, Najdorf – Donner, Wijk aan Zee 1971. Here, White should simply compromise his opponent's pawn-structure with 16.2xa5! bxa5 17. 2f3 h3 18.g3± and Black's king is vulnerable and his extra pawn is absolutely immaterial, because all his queenside pawns are hopelessly weak.

9.xc4 dxc4 10.2a4+

This is the simplest. White regains immediately his pawn.

10...2d7 11.2xc4

11...2c6

After this move, there arises a slightly better endgame for White.

11...h5 12.h4 – see 8...h5.

11...2c6 12.0–0 2a5, Gerzhoy – Lenderman, Montreal 2010, 13.2e2 2a4 14.c1 0–0 15.e4± followed by 2g5.

12.2xc6+ 2xc6 13.c4

White prevents the blockade of his c3-pawn with 2c6-a5-c4.

13...0–0–0

After 13...2a5 14.c1 2c8 15.e4 c5 16.d5 White's protected passed pawn on d5 provides him with a stable advantage, Spassky – Szabo, Amsterdam 1973.

13...e5 14.d5 2a5 15.c1 h5 (following 15...2b7 16.2e2 2d7, in the game Lupulescu – Naroditsky, Golden Sands 2012, White transferred his knight to the weakened c6-square and obtained an edge: 17.2f5 g6 18.2e7 f6 19. 2c6±) 16.2b2 2d7 17.0–0 f6 18.
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\[ \text{a3 g6 19.e4 c8 20.c5} \] – After White has managed to advance d5 and c5, his queenside initiative has become quite threatening, Spassky – Huebner, Solingen 1977.

14.f3!? This is the simplest. White wishes to play \( \text{h2} \), followed by \( \text{ab1} \) and \( \text{hc1} \).

It is worse for him to play with the same idea \( \text{e2} \), since in this way White cannot play any more \( \text{g3-e2-c3} \).

14...\( \text{b7} \)

After 14...\( \text{d7} \) 15.\( \text{f2} \) \( \text{hd8} \) 16.\( \text{hc1} \) \( \text{b7} \) 17.\( \text{e2} \), there arises almost the same endgame as in the main variation, Gerola – Tricomi, Email 2011.

15.\( \text{f2} \)
White connects his rooks.

15...\( \text{h5} \) 16.\( \text{h4} \) a6 17.\( \text{ab1} \) \( \text{hg8} \) 18.\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{ge8} \) 19.\( \text{hc1} \) \( \text{d7} \) 20.\( \text{c2} \) Kurbasov – Schmidt, Email 2010.

Black will need to defend a slightly inferior position in this endgame, because he is deprived of active counterplay. White will always counter e6-e5 with d4-d5. He can combine his queenside actions (a2-a4-a5) with playing in the centre (the preparation of e3-e4).

Conclusion

After 4...b6 5.\( \text{e4} \), Black has numerous possibilities, but White can always rely on obtaining an advantage in the opening.

Following 5...\( \text{e4} \), White can occupy his centre with his pawns immediately – 6.f3 and then e3-e4. Later, he should try to organise active actions on the kingside: \( \text{g3-h5} \), followed by f3-f4-f5.

After 5...c5, White’s main task is to fight for the h1-a8 diagonal. This is why he fiancettes his bishop. The battle is focused on the d5-square.

White obtains an advantage effortlessly after 5...\( \text{b7} \) 6.a3. If Black captures 6...\( \text{xc3} \), then White obtains the two-bishop advantage and has a very good position. If Black’s bishop retreats 6...\( \text{e7} \) or 6...\( \text{d6} \), White should try to reduce the mobility of the enemy bishop on b7 with the move d4-d5. Black does not have sufficient space for the manoeuvres of his pieces.

In the variation with 5...\( \text{a6} \) White often manages to advance e3-e4, obtaining a great space advantage. If Black prevents this (6...\( \text{xc3} \) 7. \( \text{bxc3 d5} \)), then the game, as a rule, enters a slightly better endgame for White.
This active move (Black attacks immediately his opponent’s centre.) has the advantage, in comparison to 4...d5, that after 5.a3 \(\text{bxc3} \text{ 6. bxc3}\), White cannot get rid later of his doubled pawns by exchanging on c5.

5.\(\text{g}e2\)

White defends against the possible doubling of his pawns and prepares a2-a3.

Now, Black has two main plans for his further actions: either C) 5...d5, occupying immediately the centre with his pawn, or D) 5...\(\text{cxd}4\), preserving the possibility to retreat later his bishop to the e7-square. Before that however, we will pay attention to some less popular lines for Black:

A) 5...\(\text{e}4\) and B) 5...d6.

About 5...b6 – see Chapter 23, variation B.

5...0–0 6.a3 – see Chapter 25.

5...\(\text{c}6\) 6.a3 \(\text{xc3}+\) 7.\(\text{xc3}\) \(\text{cxd}4\) 8.\text{exd}4 d5 – see variation C2a.

A) 5...\(\text{e}4\)

Here, this move is less justified as in the previous chapter (there, instead of c7-c5, Black had played b7-b6), since Black cannot fight for the e4-square with the move \(\text{b}7\).

6.\(\text{b}c2\)
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This is a multi-purpose move. White is defending against the possibility to have his pawns doubled and begins the fight for the e4-square.

6...cxd4

Following 6...d5 7.a3 a5 8. dxc5 Qf6, White parries easily the sorties of the enemy pieces with 9.f3 Qxc3 10.Qxc3 Qxc3+ 11.Qxc3 Qxc3+ 12.bxc3 dxc4 (12...Qa6?! 13.cxd5 exd5, Jankovic – Asis Gargatagli, Barbera del Valles 2007, 14.c4!? dxc4 15.c6! bxc6 16.Qxc4+ and Black's queenside pawns are weak, while White's two bishops are powerful force.) 13.Qxc4 Qd7 14.c6. Now, Black has some weak pawns too. 14... bxc6 15.a4± and White's bishop-pair guarantees his stable advantage.

Black fails to keep his knight in the centre after 6...f5 7.a3 Qxc3+ (7...Qa5 8.dxc5! Qxc5 9. Qb1 Qxc3 10.b4 Qc7 11.Qxc3 Qf8 12.b2± White exerts pressure against the g7-square and Black can hardly complete the development of his kingside pieces.) 8. Qxc3 Qxc3 9.Qxc3 Qf6 10.Qe2± and once again White has obtained the two-bishop advantage, Barth – Lange, Germany 1997.

7.exd4 d5 8.a3 Qxc3

About 8...Qxc3+ 9.Qxc3 Qxc3 10.bxc3 – see 8...Qc3.

9.Qxc3

White's knight has abandoned the e2-square and now, he can develop his bishop on f1 without any problems.

9...Qe7

After 9...Qxc3+ 10.bxc3 Qc6 11.Qb1 0–0 12.Qd3 h6 13.0–0± White's two bishops are much more important than the slight weakening of his queenside pawn-structure, Mi.Gurevich – Yudasin, Sverdlovsk 1984.

10.Qxd5 exd5 11.Qxd5 Qc6 12.Qxe7 Wxe7+ 13.Qe3 Qxd4

The position has been opened.

14.Qc3 Qe6

This retreat is more reliable than 14...Qf5 15.Qb5+ Qd7, Gligoric – Olafsson, Wijk aan Zee 1971. Here, White maintains a great advantage with 16.0–0!, completing his development. 16... Qxb5 (16...Qxe3 17.Qxd7+ Wxd7 18.Qxg7) 17.Qc5 Qc7 18.Qe1+ Qd8 19.Qad1+ Qc8 20.Qd5 Qd7
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(20...\textit{e}e8 21.\textit{xf}5 \textit{xe}1+ 22.\textit{xe}1± He has regained the sacrificed material, while Black's king has remained under attack.) 21.\textit{c}c1 \textit{e}e7 22.\textit{xe}7 \textit{xc}3 23.\textit{xc}3+ \textit{c}c6 24.\textit{f}5 \textit{f}6 25.\textit{g}3± White has regained the sacrificed piece and Black will have to defend a very difficult endgame, because he loses one of his kingside pawns.

This position was reached in the game Borik – Miles, Germany 1981. After 15.\textit{d}d3 0–0 16.0–0 \textit{d}d7 17.\textit{ac}1± Black is faced with a long and laborious defence, because in this open position White’s two bishops are stronger than Black’s bishop and knight.

B) 5...d6

This is not the most active move. Black defends his c5-pawn and now, his bishop may retreat to the a5-square if necessary.

6.a3

(diagram)

6...\textit{a}5

After 6...\textit{xc}3+ 7.\textit{xc}3 0–0

8.\textit{e}2, Black ends up in a passive position.

8...\textit{c}6 9.0–0 e5 (9...\textit{e}7 10.\textit{f}3±) 10.dxc5 dxc5 11.b4± White begins active operations on the queenside, Ivkov – Ricetto, Nice 1974.

8...\textit{e}7 9.0–0 b6 (9...e5, Shulman – Voloshin, Pardubice 1996, 10.dxc5!? dxc5 11.\textit{d}5 \textit{xd}5 12.\textit{xd}5± White has two powerful bishops and a passed d-pawn.) 10.b4 \textit{b}7, Aleksandrov – Laxman, Abu Dhabi 2009, 11.\textit{c}2!?± (followed by \textit{fd}1, \textit{b}2, \textit{ac}1) and Black’s position is solid but very passive.

7.g3

Black has not exchanged on c3, so White has not solved the
problem with his bishop on f1. Therefore, he fianchettoes it in order to complete the development of his kingside pieces.

![Diagram](image)

7...d5

This is an interesting solution. Black changes his opening strategy hoping that after the opening of the position, White’s move g3 will hardly be useful for him.

About 7...c6 8.g2 0–0 9.0–0 – see 7...0–0.

Following 7...c7, Shvedov – Chepukaitis, Novgorod 1999, White can play simply 8.g2!, since he should not be afraid of Black’s counterplay against the c4-pawn: 8...cxd4 9.xd4 c6 10.d2± followed by 0–0, b2-b3, xd1, ac1.

Black cannot equalise with 7...d7 8.g2 c6. He forces the move d4-d5 indeed, but loses two tempi in the process. 9.d5 exd5 10.cxd5 d7 11.0–0 0–0 (Black cannot change the character of the fight with 11...a6 12.e4±

Swapnil – Gorbatov, Albena 2013.) 12.e4 a6, Shchukin – Bratchenko, St Petersburg 2003, 13. b1± followed by b2-b4. White has deprived his opponent of the plan on the queenside connected with b7-b5-b4.

The move 7...0–0 leads to solid but passive positions for Black. 8.g2 c6 9.0–0 b8 (9...d7 10.b3 e7 11.b2 fd8 12.f4± and he must worry permanently about White’s threat d4-d5, Giorgadze – Ilundain, Ampuriabrava 1997) 10.b3 e5 (10...a6 11.xc5 dxc5, Salem – Short, Caleta 2012, 12.c2! e7 13.b2± Black can hardly activate his bishop on c8, because the move e6-e5 would lead to the weakening of the d5-square.) 11.xc5 dxc5 12.d5 f5 13.b2± White’s dominance over the d5-square guarantees a stable advantage for him. After the careless move 13...e4?! he began immediate active actions on the kingside with 14.g4! g6 15.f4± Bosch – Winants, Netherlands 2001.

Now, just like on move six, White should not be afraid of 7...e4 8.c2 c3 9.xc3 cxd4 10.exd4 c6 11.e3 e5 12.dxe5 xe5, Gligoric – Ivkov, Amsterdam 1971, 13.f4! He ousts Black’s knight away from the centre. 13...c6 14.g2 0–0 15.0–0± White’s knight has access to the wonderful d5-square, while Black’s d6-pawn is very weak.
8.\textit{dxc5}
This is the simplest, because now there arises an endgame favourable for White.
\textit{8...dxc4 9.\textit{\textbf{wxd8+ \textit{xd8}}}}
\textit{10.\textit{\textbf{g2}}}

![Diagram]

\textit{10...\textit{\textbf{bd7}}}

After 10...\textit{e5}, Balashov – Olafsson, Moscow 1971, White has an original resource 11.\textit{\textbf{g1?! \textit{e6}}}
\textit{12.f3 \textit{bd7 13.g5 \textit{d5}}}
\textit{14.\textbf{c1 xc5} 15.\textit{\textbf{xc4 xc3} 16.xe6+ xe6 17.xe6 fxe6 18.xc3 xc3+ 19.xc3\pm}} – The position has been simplified considerably, but Black’s pawn-structure has been compromised, so White has good winning chances in this endgame with four rooks.

\textit{11.\textit{\textbf{c1 xc5} 12.xc4 \textit{b6}}}
\textit{13.f3 d7 14.b4 a4 15.a4 xxa4 xxa4 16.d3 \textit{xd8} 17.xc1 e7}
\textit{18.b2 d7 19.e2 xd8 20. a4. White’s game is much freer. He wishes to advance his queenside pawns and to acquire even more space. Later, in the game Toth – Kruse, Email 2010 Black decided to complicate the game, but after 20...\textit{e5 21.a5 e4 22. axb6 \textit{xf3+ 23.xe1 \textit{h3}} 24. \textit{d3 xc1+ 25.xc1 \textit{g2}} 26.\textit{xf1 xf1} 27.xf1 axb6 28.f2 \textit{g4+ 29.xf3 \textit{h2+} 30.\textit{e2 g4 31.e4\pm}}} White’s two bishops turned out to be more powerful than Black’s rook and two pawns.

C) 5...\textit{d5}
One of the drawbacks of this active move is the fact that as a rule, White obtains the two-bishop advantage.
\textit{6.a3}

Now, Black is faced with a choice: C1) \textit{6...\textit{xd4}} or C2) \textit{6...\textit{xc3}}.

He plays only seldom \textit{6...\textit{a5} 7.dxc5 dxc4 8.d2?!} White is protecting his knight on c3. Now, after his knight is removed from e2, Black will be incapable of compromising his opponent’s pawn-structure. \textit{8...\textit{bd7} (8...\textit{c6} 9. \textit{g3\pm}) 9.g3 \textit{d5 10.g4 \textit{xc3} 11.xc3 \textit{xc3} 12.xg7 f6 13. \textit{xf6 xf6} 14.bxc3\pm} Black’s com-
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Compensation for the pawn is insufficient. Fedoseev – Aleksandrov, Vladivostok 2012.

C1) 6...cxd4 7.axb4!
This is the best for White. His rook on a1 enters the actions and will exert unpleasant pressure against Black's a7-pawn.
7...dxc3 8.Qxc3 0–0

The move 8...dxc4 leads to a difficult endgame for Black. 9. Qxd8+ Qxd8 10 Qc6 11.b5 Qe5 12.Qe2 Qe7 13.f4 Qed7 14. b3± (followed by Qa3) White's bishops are very powerful, while Black can hardly complete the development of his pieces, Botvinnik – Smyslov, Moscow 1952.

9.cxd5 exd5

After 9...Qxd5 10.Qxd5 Qxd5 11.Qxd5 exd5 12.Qe2 Qf5 13.0–0 Qc6 14.b5 Qe5 15.Qd1± White's pieces exert powerful pressure against the pawns on d5 and a7, Aleksandrov – Lomako, Minsk 2007.

10.Qe2

Following 10...Qa6, Ricardi – Panno, Rio Hondo 1987, the simplest reaction for White would be 11.Qxd4!?± and on top of all the problems for Black, he must worry about his misplaced knight at the edge of the board.

10...Qe6 11.0–0

11...Qb6 12.b5 Qbd7 13.Qd4!?± White's prospects are preferable both in the middle game and in the endgame, Danilov – Cioara, Brasov 2011.

11...Qc6 12.b5 Qe7 (following 12...Qa5, White can begin immediate active actions on the kingside: 13.f4! g6 14.g4!± followed by f4-f5) 13.Qa4. He is preparing to develop his knight on d1 in order to increase the pressure against the enemy d5-pawn. 13...Qc7 (13...Qf5, Graf – Kiselev, Frunze 1988, 14.Qf4 h6 15.Qd1±) 14.Qd1± Black's position is passive and he must concentrate on the protection of his pawns on d5 and a7, R.Garcia – Heyns, Havana 1966.

11.b5
White fixes the enemy weakness on a7.

11...\(\text{\textit{d}e7}\)

After 11...\(\text{\textit{d}e5}\) 12.\(\text{\textit{d}d4}\) \(\text{\textit{e}e8}\) 13.0–0 \(\text{b}6\) 14.\(\text{\textit{d}d1}\) \(\text{\textit{b}7}\) 15.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{\textit{c}8}\) 16.\(\text{\textit{b}2}\)\(\pm\) - White completes the development of his pieces and his dark-squared bishop is very powerful, Gomez Esteban - Cuadras Avellana, San Sebastian 1994.

12.0–0

12...\(\text{\textit{f}5}\)

About 12...\(\text{\textit{d}e6}\) 13.\(\text{\textit{a}4}\) - see 10...\(\text{\textit{d}e6}\).

Following 12...\(\text{\textit{f}5}\), Zaja - Zelcic, Tucepi 1996, White can increase the pressure against the enemy d5-pawn with tempo: 13.\(\text{\textit{d}d4}\)!? \(\text{b}6\) 14.\(\text{\textit{d}d1}\)\(\pm\)

13.\(\text{\textit{a}4}\) \(\text{\textit{c}7}\) (13...\(\text{\textit{d}e6}\) 14.\(\text{\textit{f}4}\) - see 10...\(\text{\textit{d}e6}\) 14.\(\text{\textit{d}d1}\) \(\text{\textit{e}6}\) 15.\(\text{\textit{d}2}\)\(\pm\) Black’s pieces are active, but this is insufficient to compensate the weakness of his isolated d5-pawn, Bischoff - Seuffert, Bad Wiessee 2005.

C2) 6...\(\text{\textit{xc}3}\)\(\pm\)

We have already seen that after this exchange White not only obtains the two-bishop advantage, but gets rid of the difficulties connected with the development of his kingside.

7.\(\text{\textit{xc}3}\) \(\text{\textit{c}xd4}\)

About 7...\(\text{\textit{d}xc4}\) 8.\(\text{\textit{xc}4}\) \(\text{\textit{c}xd4}\) 9.\(\text{\textit{e}xd4}\) - see variation C2c.

8.\(\text{\textit{e}xd4}\)

Here, Black’s best move is C2c) 8...\(\text{\textit{d}xc4}\), but it leads to positions with an isolated pawn on d4. Before that however, we will analyse C2a) 8...\(\text{\textit{c}6}\) and C2b) 8...0–0.

C2a) 8...\(\text{\textit{c}6}\) 9.\(\text{c}5\)

White occupies space on the queenside. There arises an analogous pawn-structure in the Panov attack in the Caro-Kann Defence.

9...\(\text{\textit{d}e4}\)

Black must be in a hurry, because if White completes his de-
development his advantage will increase.

9...0–0 10.\( \text{f4} \) – see 8...0–0.

Following 9...b6, Kasimdzhanov – Sadvakasov, Guangzhou 2010, White’s simplest line would be 10.\( \text{f4} \)!? bx\( c5 \) 11.dxc5± and his queenside pawns, supported by his bishops, can be very powerful. Naturally, it would not work for Black to opt for 11...e5? because of 12.\( \text{b5} \)–

It is bad for him to choose 9...e5, since the opening of the game is in favour of White. 10.dxe5 \( \text{xe5} \) 11.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 12.\( \text{e2} \) 0–0 13.0–0 \( \text{d8} \) 14.\( \text{e1} \)± White has completed his development and the pin on the e-file is very unpleasant for Black, Prins – Mezgailis, Stockholm 1937.

The drawback of the move 9...a5 can be best emphasized by a transfer of White’s bishop to the d6-square. 10.\( \text{f4} \) 0–0 11.\( \text{d6} \) \( \text{e8} \) 12.\( \text{b5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 13.0–0± Hort – Bauert, Biel 1992. Black can hardly find an active plan, because the move e6–e5 would only lead to the opening of the game and the creation of new weaknesses in his camp.

10.\( \text{b5} \)

(diagram)

10...\( \text{xc3} \)

Now, Black will have counterplay against the weak enemy c3-pawn.

It is bad for him to play 10...\( \text{a5} \), Ghitescu – Pomar, Tel Aviv 1964, because of 11.\( \text{g4} \)± and he can hardly protect his g7-pawn.

Following 10...0–0 11.0–0 \( \text{a5} \) 12.\( \text{xe4} \) dxe4 13.\( \text{xc6} \) bxc6 14.\( \text{e1} \) f5 15.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{a6} \) 16.\( \text{e3} \)± White has good attacking chances in the middle game (\( \text{e3} \)-\( \text{g3} \), \( \text{f4} \)-\( \text{e5} \)), because his bishop is considerably more active than its counterpart, Zagorskis – Wege, Berlin 1996.

11.\( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{a5} \)

The character of the fight remains the same after 11...\( \text{d7} \) 12.0–0 0–0, Lehmann – Sae- mismisch, Kiel 1959, 13.\( \text{b1} \)±
12.\textit{W}b3 0–0 13.0–0 \textit{A}d7, Zagorskis – Ruzele, Bonn 1996, 14.\textit{Ab}1!?± White is defending against the threat \textit{A}xd4. His two powerful bishops and the freer game compensate with an interest the vulnerability of his c3-pawn.

\textbf{C2b) 8...0–0 9.c5}

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

9...\textit{Ac}6

About 9...\textit{A}e4 10.\textit{A}xe4 dxe4 11.\textit{Af}4 \textit{Ac}6 12.\textit{Ad}6 – see 9...\textit{Ac}6.

The position is very difficult for Black after 9...a5 10.\textit{Af}4 \textit{Ad}7 11.\textit{Ad}3± (followed by 0–0, \textit{Ad}6), Sherbakov – T. Ivanov, Moscow 1999.

9...b6. Black’s attempts to organise counterplay on the queenside only complicate his defence. 10.b4 bxc5 (10...a5 11.b5±) 11. dxc5 e5 (after 11...a5 12.b5± White’s connected passed pawns are very powerful) 12.\textit{Ag}5 \textit{Ab}7 13.\textit{Ax}f6 \textit{W}xf6 14.\textit{A}xd5 \textit{Ax}d5 15. \textit{W}xd5 e4, Khismatullin – Harutjunyan, Izhevsk 2011, 16.\textit{Ac}1! \textit{W}b2 17.\textit{W}d2 \textit{W}xa3 18.b5 \textit{Ac}7 19.\textit{Cc}3 \textit{W}xc3+ 20.\textit{W}xc3± Black will have great problems to fight against his opponent’s passed c-pawn. In addition, in actions on the different sides of the board, White’s bishop is obviously stronger than Black’s knight.

10.\textit{Af}4 \textit{A}e4

10...\textit{We}8 11.\textit{Ab}5 \textit{Ad}7 12.0–0± Black’s position is solid, but very passive, Khismatullin – Kravtsiv, Voronezh 2007.

Black can try an interesting pawn-sacrifice here, which is still insufficient for equality: 10...e5 11.dxe5 d4 12.exf6 \textit{W}xf6 13.\textit{E}e2 \textit{We}8 14.\textit{W}d2 d3 15.\textit{A}e3 dxe2 16. \textit{A}xe2 \textit{Wg}6, Neverov – Bazeev, St Petersburg 2012, 17.0–0± – his initiative is not enough to compensate the sacrificed material.

11.\textit{A}xe4 dxe4

Now, Black has some play against the enemy d4-pawn.

12.\textit{Ad}6 \textit{We}8
13...dxc4!?

This move is recommended by GM Ivan Sokolov.

13...\textsuperscript{2}f6

13...\textsuperscript{2}a5+. It would be too risky for Black to win a pawn here. 14.b4 \textsuperscript{2}xb4 15.0-0 \textsuperscript{2}d5 16.\textsuperscript{2}b3= White’s threats are very powerful and Black has great problems to complete the development of his queenside pieces.

Following 13...d7 14.0-0 \textsuperscript{2}f6 15.\textsuperscript{2}e1 \textsuperscript{2}xd4 16.\textsuperscript{2}xe4= White regains his pawn and maintains an edge thanks to his bishop-pair.

14.\textsuperscript{2}b5 \textsuperscript{2}d7 15.0-0 \textsuperscript{2}ad8 16.\textsuperscript{2}xc6 \textsuperscript{2}xc6 17.\textsuperscript{2}e1= White has the advantage in this complicated middle game with bishops of opposite colours. His bishop restricts considerably the movements of the enemy rook.

C2c) 8...dxc4 9.\textsuperscript{2}xc4

![Diagram]

There has arisen a position with an isolated queen’s pawn.

9...\textsuperscript{2}c6

Black can hardly continue the game without this move. For example:

9...0-0 10.0-0 \textsuperscript{2}bd7 (10...\textsuperscript{2}c6 11.\textsuperscript{2}e3 – see 9...\textsuperscript{2}c6; 10...h6 11.\textsuperscript{2}e3 and here it is bad for Black to play 11...b6 because of 12.\textsuperscript{2}f3±) Barle – Marjanovic, Bled 1979) 11.\textsuperscript{2}d3 b6 12.\textsuperscript{2}f3 \textsuperscript{2}b8 13.\textsuperscript{2}f4 \textsuperscript{2}b7 14.\textsuperscript{2}h3 \textsuperscript{2}c8 15.\textsuperscript{2}b5= White’s pieces are tremendously active, Epishin – Eriksson, Haarlem 2004.

10.\textsuperscript{2}e3 0-0 11.0-0

![Diagram]

Now, Black has two basic plans. He can prevents the appearance of the enemy bishop to the g5-square with the move C2c1) 11...h6, or to prepare the development of his bishop on b7 with C2c2) 11...b6.

After 11...\textsuperscript{2}e7 12.\textsuperscript{2}g5 \textsuperscript{2}d7, Zueger – Gruen, Berlin West 1988, White’s most reliable plan is to try to advance immediately d4-d5: 13.\textsuperscript{2}xf6!? gxf6 14.d5= and the vulnerability of Black’s king may tell in the future.
After 11...\texttt{d}d5, White's best reply would be 12.\texttt{d}xd5!? exd5 13.\texttt{d}d3± and his two bishops guarantee for him a slight but long lasting advantage, Thomsen – Maier, corr. 1992.

\textbf{C2c1) 11...h6 12.\texttt{e}e1 \texttt{e}e7}

Black must watch very carefully about the possible pawn-break d4-d5.

Following 12...b6 13.d5! Black's defence becomes very difficult. 13...\texttt{a}a5 14.\texttt{a}a2 exd5 15.\texttt{a}xd5 \texttt{b}7 16.\texttt{c}c3!? This move is stronger than the exchange on f6. Now, Black can hardly find a good position for his queen. 16...\texttt{c}c8 17.\texttt{a}a4 \texttt{f}f5 18.\texttt{f}f4 \texttt{h}h5 19.\texttt{d}d4 \texttt{g}g6 20.\texttt{g}g3 \texttt{x}xg3 21.hxg3 \texttt{d}d7 22.\texttt{a}a4± White's pieces control almost the entire board and Black's defence will be very difficult, Dydyshko – Macieja, Lubniewice 2003.

13.\texttt{f}f4

White is preparing the transfer of his bishop to e5.

13...\texttt{d}ed5

There do not arise original positions after 13...\texttt{d}d7 14.\texttt{e}e5, for example, 14...\texttt{g}g6 15.\texttt{d}d3 – see 13...\texttt{g}g6 or 14...\texttt{ed}5 15.\texttt{w}d3 – see 13...\texttt{ed}5.

After 13...\texttt{g}g6 14.\texttt{e}e5 \texttt{d}d7, Miles – Hulak, Bad Woerishofen 1985, it is very good for White to play 15.\texttt{d}d3!? , creating the threat to capture on g6 and practically forcing the line: 15...\texttt{xe}5 16.dxe5 \texttt{d}d5 17.\texttt{xd}5 exd5 18.\texttt{b}b3±. White has a better pawn-structure and a more active bishop.

14.\texttt{e}e5

White's plans include the move \texttt{w}d3, followed by \texttt{c}c4-\texttt{a}2-b1, creating threats against the enemy king.

14...\texttt{d}d7 15.\texttt{w}d3 \texttt{c}c6 16.\texttt{a}a2 \texttt{d}d7

Black is afraid of being attacked and weakens his control over the d5-square.

Following 16...\texttt{g}g4, Graf – Bosshku, Katerini 1993, it is very good for White to play 17.\texttt{b}b1±, provoking weaknesses in the shelter of the enemy king (17...\texttt{g}6 18.\texttt{g}3).
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17.\(\text{cxd5} \text{xd5}\), Safin – Xu Jun, Jodhpur 2003, 18.\(\text{cxd5}\)!
\(\text{exd5} 19.\text{wb5} \text{b6} 20.\text{b3}\) White restricts the enemy knight and maintains an edge.

C2c2) 11...b6

12.\(\text{xf3}\)
He is developing his queen to an active position with tempo. Later, it is usually transferred to the \(h3\)-square.

12...\(\text{b7} 13.\text{d3}\)
White’s pieces are eyeing the \(h7\)-square.

13...\(\text{d7}\)
Black protects his bishop and plans a knight-sortie.

It is worse for him to try 13...\(\text{e8} \ 14.\text{ad1} \text{d5} 15.\text{xd5} \text{exd5} 16.\text{c1}\). White’s pieces have occupied active positions, while Black’s bishop has been severely restricted by the pawn on \(d5\), V.Gaprindashvili – Enders, Oldenbourg 2001.

It seems less precise for Black to opt for 13...\(\text{b8}\), since later, White can win a tempo (\(\text{xf4}\)), by attacking the enemy rook. 14.\(\text{h3} \text{e7}\), Iljushin – Andersson, Antalya 2004, 15.\(\text{f4}\)! \(\text{c8} 16.\text{b5}\) Black will have problems to protect his \(a7\)-pawn and to prevent the penetration of the enemy pieces on the \(h6\)-square.

There arise interesting complications after 13...\(\text{c8} 14.\text{ad1}\).

12.\(\text{xf3}\)
Black should better refrain from 14...\(\text{h6}\), because of 15.\(\text{g3} \text{h8} 16.\text{h3}\) and he must be permanently on the alert about White’s possible sacrifice on \(h6\), Korchnoi – Vyzmanavin, Moscow 1994.

14...\(\text{c7}\) 15.\(\text{h3} \text{e7}\) 16.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{g6} 17.\text{g3} \text{d7} 18.\text{d5}\) This is an interesting pawn-sacrifice with the idea to open the position. 18...\(\text{exd5}\) (It is worse for Black to play 18...\(\text{xd5} 19.\text{b5} \text{c7} 20.\text{xf6}\) \(\text{gxf6} 21.\text{d4}\) followed by \(\text{fd1}\). White regains easily the sacrificed pawn, while the weakening of Black’s monarch may turn into a cause of worries for him in the future.) 19.\(\text{f5}\) \(\text{e7}\), Kasparov – Psakhis, Murcia 1990, 20.\(\text{xf6}\)! \(\text{gxf6} 21.\text{f4}\) White has more than
sufficient compensation of the pawn. Black’s king is weak and his pawn-structure has been weakened.

14.\(\text{Wh}3\) \(\text{Qe}7\)

14...\(\text{Qxd}4?\) 15.\(\text{Ad}1+-\)

14...g6?! 15.\(\text{Ag}5\) \(\text{Qh}5\) 16.d5\(+\) Labollita – Ricardi, Buenos Aires 2003.

15.\(\text{Ag}5\) \(\text{Gg}6\) 16.\(\text{Axf}6\)

White weakens the castling position of the enemy king.

16...gxf6 17.\(\text{Ad}1\)

Following 18...f5 19.d5 \(\text{Qxd}5\) 20.\(\text{Axf}5\) \(\text{Ab}7\) 21.\(\text{AGxg}6!\) hxg6 22.\(\text{Ad}4\)\(+\) Black will have great problems to parry White’s threats connected with \(\text{A}h4\) and not to lose a pawn due to the pin after \(\text{A}e6\), Giorgadze – Ayas Fernandez, Vendrell 1996.

18...\(\text{Ag}7\), Burnier – Naumkin, Arco 2012, 19.d5?! This is a standard pawn-break. 19...\(\text{Qxd}5\) 20.\(\text{Ae}4\) \(\text{Ac}6\) 21.\(\text{Qxd}5\) exd5 22.\(\text{Ad}4\). White has accomplished the standard pawn-break in the centre and obtained an excellent position.

17...\(\text{Aed}8\)

It is bad for Black to play 17...f5? 18.d5\(+\) Vaisser – Landenbergue, Evry 2008, as well as 17...\(\text{Ah}8?\) 18.d5\(+\) Bagaturov – Khetsuriani, Korinthos 1998. White has accomplished the standard pawn-break in the centre and obtained an excellent position.

It is quite possible for Black to try 17...\(\text{Af}d8\) 18.\(\text{Af}e1\).

18.\(\text{Af}e1\) \(\text{Ag}7\)

The careless move 18...\(\text{Ac}7?!\) can be countered by White with 19.\(\text{Agxg}6!\) hxg6 (It is more resilient for Black to defend with 19...fxg6, although even then after 20.\(\text{Axe}6\) he has no compensation for the pawn.) 20.\(\text{Ah}6\) \(\text{Ac}6\) 21.\(\text{Ae}4\) and Black will have to part with his queen in order not to be checkmated: 21...\(\text{Ax}e4\) 22.\(\text{Ax}e4+-\)
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18...f5 19.d5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xd5, Lugovoi – Kochyev, St Petersburg 2002, 20...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}c4!? \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}e7 21.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xd5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xd5 22.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xd5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xd5 23.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}e5 d4 24.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xf5± White's prospects are preferable in this endgame with major pieces, because Black's king is very weak.

19.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}e4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xe4 20.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xe4 e5

21.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}f3! \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}c8

It would not work for Black to play 21...f5 22.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xe5! and he loses after 22...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xe4? 23.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}f6+-

22.d5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}f5, Monacell – Moura, Email 2004, 23.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}a4!? \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}d7 24.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}c4± (followed by \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}c6) White's king is safer and his passed d5-pawn is very powerful.

D) 5...cxd4

After this move, as a rule, Black does not exchange on c3, but retreats his bishop to the e7-square.

6.exd4

Now, Black has two main replies at his disposal: D1) 6...0-0 and D2) 6...d5.

About 6...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}e4 7.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}c2 – see 5...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}e4.

It is bad for Black to choose 6...a6 7.a3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}e7 and there arises a position similar to the main variation, except that instead of 0–0, he has played the not so useful move a6. 8.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}f4 d6 9.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}e2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}bd7 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}e3 and Black has a solid but passive position, Volkov – Tolstikh, Tomsk 1999.

Following 6...b6 7.a3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}e7 8.d5, Black must be permanently on the alert about the threat d5-d6, since he fails to accomplish the typical set-up for similar positions 0–0 and \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}e8. 8...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xd5 (It seems too risky for Black to opt for 8...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}b7 in view of 9.d6!? \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}f8 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}b5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}a6 11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}d4± and the pawn on d6 cramps Black's position considerably.) 9.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}xd5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}d6 10.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}b5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}e7 11.g3± followed by \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{\textit{\$}}}}g2, 0–0
and $\text{fxe6}$ exchanging Black's important bishop. His d-pawn has remained on its initial square and impedes the development of his queenside pieces, Nisipeanu – Warakomski, Ortisei 2013.

**D1) 6...0–0 7. a3 $\text{e7}$**

About 7...$\text{xc3+}$ 8.$\text{xc3}$ d5 9. $\text{c5}$ – see variation **C2b**.

8.$\text{f4}!$?

This is the most reliable move for White which leads to a slight but stable edge for him.

It seems less convincing for him to opt for 8.d5 exd5 9.cxd5, after which Black's bishop obtains the wonderful c5-square and in some variations, in order to fight for the opening advantage White must advance his pawn to the d6-square. It often perishes there and playing a pawn down may not be to everybody's liking.

Black's main move here is – **D1b) 8...d5**, but before that we will pay attention to **D1a) 8...d6**.

About 8...$\text{e8}$ 9.$\text{e3}$ d6 10.$\text{e2}$ $\text{bd7}$ 11.0–0 – see 8...d6.

Black obtains a cramped position after 8...b6 9.$\text{e2}$ $\text{b7}$ 10. d5!? White is restricting the enemy bishop on b7 and impeding the development of the knight on b8. 10...$\text{e8}$ 11.0–0 $\text{f8}$ 12.$\text{c3}$ $\pm$ Kristinsson – Bjarnason, Reykjavik 1984.

**D1a) 8...d6**

Black gives up the idea to play d7-d5, so he cannot rely on equalising.

9.$\text{e3}$

9...$\text{bd7}$

The pawn-advance e6-e5 leads to the weakening of the d5-square, for example: 9...$\text{c6}$ 10.$\text{e2}$ e5 11.$\text{dxe5}$ dxe5 12.$\text{fd5}$ $\text{e6}$ (12... $\text{xd5}$ 13.$\text{cx}d5 \pm$) 13.$\text{c1}$ $\text{c8}$ 14. 0–0 $\pm$ and the powerful position of the knight in the centre of the board guarantees a stable advantage for White, Becker – Janssen, Germany 2008.
There arise almost the same positions after the immediate move 9...e5 10.dxe5 dxe5 11.\( \text{\&} \text{d}5 \text{\&} \text{xd}5 \) (11...\( \text{\&} \text{c}6 \) 12.\( \text{\&} \text{e}2 \) – see 9...\( \text{\&} \text{c}6 \)) 12.cxd5\( \pm \) White has a powerful passed pawn in the centre, Jones – Gordon, North Shields 2012.

10.\( \text{\&} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{\&} \text{e}8 \)
Black is preparing the transfer of his knight to the g6-square.

10...a6 11.0–0 \( \text{\&} \text{c}7 \) (11...\( \text{\&} \text{e}8 \) 12.\( \text{\&} \text{f}3 \) – see 10...\( \text{\&} \text{e}8 \). After 11...b6 12.\( \text{\&} \text{f}3 \) \( \text{\&} \text{b}8 \) 13.\( \text{\&} \text{c}1 \)\( \pm \) White’s hands are free for actions.) 12.\( \text{\&} \text{c}1 \) b6 (following 12...\( \text{\&} \text{d}8 \), White can again begin active actions on the queenside with 13.b4\( \pm \)) 13.b4 \( \text{\&} \text{b}7 \) 14.d5 e5 15.\( \text{\&} \text{d}3 \) \( \text{\&} \text{ac}8 \) 16.f3 \( \text{\&} \text{b}8 \) 17.\( \text{\&} \text{f}2 \)\( \pm \) Talla – Rozum, Pardubice 2013. It is not easy for Black to organise counterplay here and he is forced to wait until White begins to advance his queenside pawns, Niemela – Raaste, Finland 2001.

11.0–0 \( \text{\&} \text{f}8 \)

After 11...\( \text{\&} \text{f}8 \), Boettger – Sorokin, Dresden 2007, it is good for White to play 12.\( \text{\&} \text{c}1! \)\( ? \) e5 13.\( \text{\&} \text{dxe}5 \) \( \text{\&} \text{xe}5 \) 14.\( \text{\&} \text{f}5 \)\( \pm \)

Following 11...a6, White can increase the pressure against Black’s queenside with 12.\( \text{\&} \text{f}3 \)\( \pm \) Van den Bersselaar – Grooten, Gibraltar 2006.

12.b4
White occupies space on the queenside.

12...\( \text{\&} \text{g}6 \)

12...\( \text{\&} \text{d}7 \) 13.\( \text{\&} \text{c}1 \) b6 14.\( \text{\&} \text{b}3 \) \( \text{\&} \text{b}8 \) 15.\( \text{\&} \text{d}1 \)\( \pm \) – It is very difficult for Black to organise active counterplay here and he is forced to wait until White begins to advance his queenside pawns, Niemela – Raaste, Finland 2001.

13.\( \text{\&} \text{xg}6 \) \( \text{\&} \text{xg}6 \) 14.\( \text{\&} \text{f}3 \)\( \pm \) White has a stable advantage, since he has extra space and can begin active actions on the queenside, Lautier – Cvitan, Ohrid 2001.

D1b) 8...d5 9.\( \text{\&} \text{xd}5 \)
After this move, there arise on the board positions with isolated pawns on d4 – d5.

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

Black wishes to facilitate his defence by exchanging a couple of minor pieces.

He has also tried in practice 9...exd5 10.\(\text{d3} \text{c6} 11.0-0 \text{g4} 12.f3 \text{e6} 13.\text{xe3} \text{d6} 14.\text{xe6} \text{fxe6} 15.\text{c1±} \text{White has a bishop-pair, while Black’s e6-pawn is very weak, Mitchell – Tran Tuan Minh, Budapest 2010.}

10.\(\text{cxd5}\)

White exchanges this particular knight, because his other knight on f4 will be much more active in the forthcoming fight.

10...\(\text{exd5} \text{11.} \text{d3} \text{c6}\)

Black’s alternatives do not lead to original positions:

About 11...\(\text{g5} 12.0-0 \text{c6} 13.\text{e1} – \text{see variation D1b1.}

11...\(\text{f6} 12.0-0 \text{c6} 13.\text{e3} \text{f6} 14.\text{c1} – \text{see variation D1b2.}

12.0-0

We will deal now with D1b1) \(12...\text{g5} \) and D1b2) \(12...\text{f6.}

About 12...\(\text{g6} 13.\text{e3} \text{f6} 14.\text{c1} – \text{see variation D1b2.}

Following 12...\(\text{x4} 13.\text{xh7+} \text{xh7} 14.\text{xd4± it will not be easy for Black to hold on to his d5-pawn.}

12...\(\text{d6} 13.\text{e1} \text{g6} (13...\text{xf4} 14.\text{xf4} – \text{see variation D1b1.}

13...\(\text{xf4} 14.\text{d5} \text{xd5} 15.\text{e3} \text{h4} 16.\text{g3± – The position has been opened and White maintains an edge thanks to his more actively placed pieces, Adly – Dzagnidze, Heraklio 2004) 14.\text{e3} \text{e8} 15.\text{f3} \text{e1} 16.\text{a1} \text{f6} 17.\text{e2} \text{a8, Jussupow – Huebner, Switzerland 2011, 18.\text{x6!} \text{xe6} 19.\text{g3± and White has a bishop-pair.}

D1b1) \(12...\text{g5}\)

Black wishes to trade the enemy knight on f4 and thus to reduce White’s tension against the d5-pawn, ensuring for his bishop the possible development to the e6-square.

Still, this plan has the drawback that White obtains the two-bishop advantage.

13.\(\text{e1} \text{xf4}\)

Following 13...\(\text{g6} 14.\text{c2} \text{f6}, there arises almost the same position as in the variation with \(12...\text{f6, but with an extra tempo for White.} 15.\text{e3} \text{e8} 16.\text{d6} 17.\text{f3± and Black’s d5-pawn is an excellent target for the attack of White’s pieces, Hort – Lигterink, Amsterdam 1983.} \)
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After 13... \( \text{\textit{d6}} \), White's simplest line would be: 14. \( \text{\textit{e6! \textit{xe6}}} \) 15. \( \text{\textit{xb5}} \) and once again he has the two-bishop advantage, I. Sokolov – Epishin, Groningen 1997.

13...h6 14. \( \text{\textit{c2}} \). White protects his d4-pawn and prepares the move \( \text{\textit{b3}} \) in order to increase his pressure against the enemy d5-pawn. 14... \( \text{\textit{d6}} \) (14...g6 15. \( \text{\textit{b3\pm}} \) 15.g3 \( \text{\textit{d8}} \) (after 15... \( \text{\textit{d8}} \), it seems very good for White to continue with 16.b4\pm); while following 15... \( \text{\textit{e7}} \) 16.h4 \( \text{\textit{f6}} \), Hjartarson – Schussler, Neskaupstad 1984, he should better play 17. \( \text{\textit{d2\pm}} \), creating the threat \( \text{\textit{d2-b4}} \) 16.h4 \( \text{\textit{xf4}} \) 17. \( \text{\textit{xf4\pm}} \) White's powerful bishop-pair provides him with a great advantage, Khalifman – Anand, New Delhi/Teheran 2000.

14. \( \text{\textit{xf4 \textit{f6}}} \)

Black begins immediate actions against the enemy d4-pawn.

It is not so precise for him to opt for 14... \( \text{\textit{e6}} \), because this enables White to activate his queen after 15. \( \text{\textit{h5}} \) g6 16. \( \text{\textit{h6\pm}} \) Kacheishvili – Blauert, Wiesbaden 1996.

The character of the fight remains more or less the same following 14... \( \text{\textit{h4}} \) 15. \( \text{\textit{d2 \textit{e6}}} \) 16. \( \text{\textit{ac1\pm}} \) Supatashvili – Christiansen, Yerevan 1996.

15. \( \text{\textit{xe5}} \)

White is trying to reach a position with a “good” bishop on d3 against a “bad” bishop on c8.

It is possible that it may be even stronger for White to continue here with 15. \( \text{\textit{h5!? \textit{g6}}} \) 16. \( \text{\textit{h6\pm}} \) and it would not work for Black to play 16... \( \text{\textit{xd4??}} \) because of 17. \( \text{\textit{xf8\pm}}} \) \( \text{\textit{xf8}} \) 18. \( \text{\textit{h6\pm}} \)

15... \( \text{\textit{xe5}} \) 16. \( \text{\textit{xe5 \textit{e6}}} \)

16... \( \text{\textit{d8}} \) 17. \( \text{\textit{d2\pm}} \)

17. \( \text{\textit{d2 \textit{ad8}}} \) 18. \( \text{\textit{ae1 \textit{h6}}} \) 19. \( \text{\textit{e3\pm}} \) White's bishop is obviously more active. Later, in the game Kramnik – Leko, Budapest 2001, there followed: 19... \( \text{\textit{d7}} \) 20. \( \text{\textit{h3 \textit{d6}}} \) 21. \( \text{\textit{a5 \textit{b6}}} \) 22. \( \text{\textit{xb6 \textit{axb6}}} \) 23. \( \text{\textit{e2 \textit{e6}}} \) 24. \( \text{\textit{f4 \textit{g6}}} \) 25. \( \text{\textit{d3 \textit{c8}}} \) 26. \( \text{\textit{e7 \textit{g7}}} \) 27. \( \text{\textit{b5 \textit{f6}}} \) 28. \( \text{\textit{e7\pm}} \). White's rook has penetrated to the penultimate rank, while Black still has not solved the problem with his bishop on c8. 28... \( \text{\textit{d6}} \) 29. \( \text{\textit{ec3 \textit{dd8}}} \) 30. \( \text{\textit{ec3 \textit{d6}}} \) 31. \( \text{\textit{a4 \textit{dd8}}} \) 32. \( \text{\textit{f2 \textit{d6}}} \) 33. \( \text{\textit{g4 \textit{dd8}}} \) 34.
The bishop on c8 has remained inside Black’s camp and failed to make a single move to the end of the game.

D1b2) 12...f6
This is a more active plan for Black, but White has reliable ways of obtaining an advantage against it.

13.e3
The d4-pawn needs protection.

13...g6
Black defends against the possible threat against the h7-square and prepares the retreat of his bishop to g7.

14.Bc1

The position is simplified after 14...cxd4 15.Bxd4 Bxd4 16.Bxg6 Bxf2+ (It is worse for Black to opt for 16.Bxb2 due to 17.Bxh7+ and he cannot play 17...Bxh7? 18.Bc2+ Bg8 19.Bxb2+−, because his king would remain without any pawn-shelter and will become an easy prey for White’s pieces, Chernuschevich – Bodnar, Lvov 1999.) 17.Bxf2 hxg6 (17...fxg6 18.Bd4+ – Black’s compromised pawn-shelter spells trouble for his king in the future.) 18.Bd4+ – Naturally, White will regain effortlessly his sacrificed pawn and will have an edge thanks to his superior pawn-structure.

After 14...e7 15.Bf3+, the pressure against the d5-pawn is very unpleasant for Black, V.Georgiev – Leon Hoyos, Merida 2006.

Following 14...e6 15.Bxe6 fxe6, White maintains a stable advantage thanks to his bishop-pair and the vulnerability of Black’s e6-pawn. 16.Bg4 Be7, Del Rio de Angelis – Dzhumagaliev, St Petersburg 2009 (16...Bd7 17.h4+) 17.Bc5!? a6 18.Bfc1+

14...Be7 15.Bb1 Be7 (15...Bd6 16.Bel+ 16...Be8, Timman – Anand, Wijk aan Zee 2000, 17.Bb3± White’s queen exerts pressure against the d5 and b7-squares and impedes the development of Black’s pieces.

15.Bb1 Be6

After 15...Bd8, Khruschiov – Gavrilov, Moscow 2008, it seems very good for White to choose 16.Ba2!?+, increasing the pressure against the d5-pawn.

16.Be1 Bf8 17.Bd2 Bc8 18.h3± White’s position seems
more pleasant and the least that he can do is exchange on e6, obtaining the two-bishop advantage in the process, Timman – Ravi, Amsterdam 2000.

**D2) 6...d5**

![Diagram](image)

7.a3!?

This is White’s most practical decision. He wishes to transpose to the already analysed variations.

7...\(\text{\&}e7\)

About 7...\(\text{\&}xc3\) + 8.\(\text{\&}xc3\) – see variation C2.

8.\(\text{\&}f4\) dxc4

Now, there arises on the board a position with an isolated queen’s pawn for White.

About 8...0–0 9.cxd5 – see variation D1b.

After 8...\(\text{\&}c6\) 9.cxd5 exd5 (9...\(\text{\&}xd5\) 10.\(\text{\&}xd5\) exd5 11.\(\text{\&}d3\) 0–0 12.0–0 – see variation D1b) 10.\(\text{\&}e2\) 0–0 11.\(\text{\&}f3\) \(\text{\&}e6\) 12.0–0 \(\text{\&}d7\) 13.\(\text{\&}e3\)± White can continue later to exert pressure against the d5-pawn, or after \(\text{\&}xe6\) to obtain the two-bishop advantage, Tikkanen – Kockum, Gothenburg 2012.

9.\(\text{\&}xc4\)

You cannot see so often a position with an isolated queen’s pawn and a knight on f4 for White.

9...0–0

Black will hardly continue the game without this move.

About 9...\(\text{\&}c6\) 10.\(\text{\&}e3\) 0–0 11.0–0 – see 9...0–0.

9...a6 10.0–0 \(\text{\&}c7\) (10...0–0 11.\(\text{\&}e3\) – see 9...0–0) 11.\(\text{\&}a2\) 0–0 12.\(\text{\&}e3\) \(\text{\&}d6\) 13.\(\text{\&}f3\) \(\text{\&}c6\) 14.\(\text{\&}fd1\) \(\text{\&}e7\) 15.\(\text{\&}ac1\) \(\text{\&}b8\), Speelman – Van der Wiel, Antwerp 1993. Now, the best move for White is the pawn-break in the centre – 16.d5!±

10.0–0 \(\text{\&}c6\)

Following 10...\(\text{\&}d6\), Gomez Esteban – Anand, Oviedo 1993, it seems purposeful for White to
play 11.d5?! exd5 12.exd5 $\text{cxd5}$ 13.$\text{cxd5}$ and his pieces are much more actively deployed.

After 10...a6 11.$\text{h3}$ 12.$\text{a2}$ $\text{c6}$ 13.$\text{h5}$ 14.$\text{f3}$ $\text{xc3}$ 15.$\text{xc3}$ $\text{h4}$ 16.$\text{g3}$ $\text{h3}$ 17.$\text{f4}$ $\text{f5}$ 18.$\text{b1}$ $\text{f6}$, Hoffman – Sli­pak, Villa Gesell 1996, 19.$\text{e2}$, White has removed his queen away from the pin.

If 10...$\text{bd7}$ 11.$\text{e1}$ $\text{b6}$ 12.$\text{a2}$ $\text{d7}$, then, White can transfer his knight 13.$\text{d3}!$ followed by $\text{xe5}$.

\textbf{11.$\text{h5}$ $\text{d6}$}

11...$\text{e5}$. The opening of the game is in favour of White. 12. $\text{dx}e5$ $\text{xe5}$ 13.$\text{a2}$ $\text{fg4}$ (13...$\text{eg4}$ 14.$\text{c1}!$ followed by h2-h3) 14.$\text{d2}$ and then $\text{cd5}$, occupying key-squares with his pieces, Milanovic – Laketic, Kra­gujevac 2013. White can always oust his opponent’s knight from its active position on $g4$ with the move h2-h3.

12.$\text{h5}$

White wishes to trade the ene­my knight on $f6$ and thus to re­duce Black’s control over the im­portant d5-square.

\textbf{12...$\text{d5}$}

Black avoids the exchange.

The alternatives for him would not equalise either, for example: 12...$\text{d7}$, Chiburdanidze – Oll, Kalev 1997, 13.$\text{c1}!$; or 12...$\text{e7}$ 13.$\text{d5}$ $\text{e5}$ 14.$\text{a2}$ $\text{xd5}$, Predke – Shaposhnikov, Samara 2012, 15. $\text{xd5}!$ exd5 16.$\text{d4}$ $\text{f6}$ 17. $\text{xd5}$ Black’s can hardly neutral­ise White’s powerful positional pressure.

After 12...$\text{h5}$ 13.$\text{h5}$ $\text{e7}$, Sturua – Mchedlishvili, Panormo 1998, it is good for White to choose 14.$\text{ad1}!$, threatening the pawn-break d4-d5 at an oppor­tune moment.

\textbf{13.$\text{c1}$}

White is not afraid of the ex­change on $e3$, because this would lead to the opening of the f-file.

13...$\text{xe3}$ 14.$\text{fxe3}$ $\text{g5}$ 15. $\text{f3}$ threatening $\text{e4}$, I.Sokolov – Meier, Antwerp 2010. White has seized completely the ini­tia­tive. The pawn-advance f7-f5 would lead to the weakening of the e6-pawn.

\textbf{Conclusion}

In the variation 4...c5 there usually arise positions either with iso­lated pawns on d4 – d5, or with an isolated pawn on d4. In both cases, White maintains a slight but stable advantage. In the first case, he must play against Black’s weak light-squared bishop, which is restricted by his own pawn on d5. In the second case, White should plan active op­erations on the kingside, or organise a pawn-break in the centre – d4-d5.
This is the main line for Black in the Rubinstein System which we are analysing. He is not in a hurry to play d7-d5 and makes a useful move, depriving his opponent of the possibility 5.a3, like in the Botvinnik Variation.

5. \( \text{\textit{d}} \text{ge2} \)

Once again, White takes care at first about his pawn-structure.

In this position, Black can choose between the following possibilities: A) 5...b6, B) 5...\( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e8} \) and C) 5...d5.

About 5...d6 6.a3 – see Chapter 20, variation B.

The variations after 5...c5 6.a3 have been analysed after other move-orders: 6...\( \text{\textit{c}} \text{xd4} \) 7.a\( \text{xb4} \) dxc3 8.\( \text{\textit{xc}} \text{c3} \) d5 9.cxd5 – see Chapter 24, variation C1; 6...\( \text{\textit{xc}} \text{c3+} \) 7.\( \text{\textit{xc}} \text{c3} \) cxd4 (7...b6 8.\( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e2} \) – see variation A1; 7...d6 8.\( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e2} \) – see Chapter 24, variation B) 8.exd4 d5 9.c5 – see Chapter 24, variation C2b.

5...b5. This pawn-sacrifice has not become popular in the tournament practice. 6.cxb5 a6 7.\( \text{\textit{f}} \text{f4} \) \( \text{\textit{b7}} \) 8.\( \text{\textit{d2}} \) \( \text{\textit{d6}} \), Kratochvil – Wickstroem, Email 2007, 9. \( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d3?!} \) a\( \text{xb5} \) 10.\( \text{\textit{xb5}} \) \( \text{\textit{e7}} \) 11.f3\( \text{±} \)

White lags a bit in development indeed, but this is not sufficient to compensate Black's sacrificed pawn.

White has no problems after 5...\( \text{\textit{e}} \text{e4} \) 6.\( \text{\textit{wc2}} \) f5 7.g3 d5, Ushenina – Rakitskaja, St Petersburg 2003, 8.\( \text{\textit{g2}} \)\( \text{±} \) followed by 0–0, f2-f3 and e3-e4.

The move 5...\( \text{\textit{c}} \text{c6} \) transposes as a rule to the Taimanov Variation: 6.a3 \( \text{\textit{xc3+}} \) 7.\( \text{\textit{xc3}} \) d5 8.\( \text{\textit{e2}} \) dxc4 9.\( \text{\textit{xc4}} \) – see Chapter 21, variation A.
5...c6!? This move is played with the idea to transfer the bishop to the c7-square. It has become popular in the last years and it brings Black excellent practical results. 6.a3 \( \underline{\text{b}5} \) 7.\( \underline{\text{d}2} \)?! White protects his knight on c3 and prepares \( \underline{\text{g}3} \) (He has played 7.b4 in the majority of the games, but I believe this is in favour of Black, because it weakens White's queenside and helps Black to transfer his bishop to c7.). 7...d5 8.\( \underline{\text{g}3} \) \( \underline{\text{bd}7} \) 9.\( \underline{\text{e}2} \) dxc4 (9...e5 10.0-0 exd4 11.exd4 \( \underline{\text{e}8} \) 12.\( \underline{\text{c}5} \) \( \underline{\text{xc}3} \) 13.bxc3 cxd5, Zakhartsov – Isajevsky, Kazan 2013, 14.\( \underline{\text{f}4} \)± followed by \( \underline{\text{f}5} \) and active play on the weakened dark squares) 10.\( \underline{\text{xc}4} \) e5, Bekker Jensen – Fedorchuk, Reykjavik 2013. After 11.0-0?! exd4 12.exd4 \( \underline{\text{c}7} \) 13.\( \underline{\text{a}2} \) \( \underline{\text{c}6} \) 14.\( \underline{\text{e}1} \)± there may arise a position with a pawn-structure which we have analysed in volume 1, when we dealt with the Queen's Gambit Accepted (variation 1.d4 d5 2.c4 dxc4 3.e3 e5 4.\( \underline{\text{xc}4} \) exd4 5.exd4). White's prospects seems preferable, because his pieces are very actively deployed, while Black can hardly find a good square for his bishop on c8.

A) 5...\( \underline{\text{b}6} \) 6.\( \underline{\text{a}3} \)

(diagram)

We will analyse now A1) 6...\( \underline{\text{xc}3} \) and A2) 6...\( \underline{\text{e}7} \).

A1) 6...\( \underline{\text{xc}3} \)+ 7.\( \underline{\text{xc}3} \) d5

About 7...\( \underline{\text{b}7} \) 8.\( \underline{\text{d}3} \)! – see Chapter 23, variation C1b.

The move 7...\( \underline{\text{a}6} \) enables White to play 8.e4!, for example: 8...d6 9.\( \underline{\text{e}3} \) \( \underline{\text{bd}7} \) 10.\( \underline{\text{e}2} \) c5 11.0-0± he has two bishops and extra space, Raicovic – Baretic, Donji Milanovac 1979.

Following 7...c5 8.\( \underline{\text{e}2} \) \( \underline{\text{b}7} \) 9.\( \underline{\text{d}5} \), there arises a position analogous to the one we have analysed in our Chapter 23, except that White's bishop is not on d3, but on the e2-square. 9...exd5 (The active move 9...b5 only worsens Black's position after 10.0-0 bxc4 11.\( \underline{\text{xc}4} \) \( \underline{\text{e}8} \) 12.e4 exd5 13.\( \underline{\text{e}5} \)± followed by \( \underline{\text{g}5} \), Gligoric – Rajkovic, Vrnjacka Banja 1962.) 10.\( \underline{\text{xc}5} \) \( \underline{\text{e}8} \) (10...d6 11.0-0 \( \underline{\text{e}8} \) 12.f3! White is preparing e3-e4. 12...a6 13.\( \underline{\text{a}4} \) \( \underline{\text{bd}7} \) 14.e4 \( \underline{\text{c}7} \) 15.b3± followed by \( \underline{\text{b}2} \) and White has two bishops and a space advantage, Dittmar – Bruno, Ortisei 2012.) 11.0-0 \( \underline{\text{a}6} \). Black is trying to facilitate his defence by exchanging pieces. 12.e4 \( \underline{\text{xe}2} \) 13.\( \underline{\text{xe}2} \) d6 14.\( \underline{\text{f}4} \)± – His d6-pawn is

8.\(\text{\textalpha}d3\) \(\text{\texta}6\)

About 8...\(\text{\textb}7\) 9.cxd5 – see Chapter 23, variation C1b.

9.cxd5 \(\text{\textxd}3\) 10.\(\text{\textxd}3\) exd5

11.0–0

After 11...'\(\text{\textbd}7\), Incutto – Rodriguez Vargas, Mar del Plata 1973, it is very strong for White to play 12.b3!? preparing the development of the bishop to a3. 12...\(\text{\texte}8\) 13.a4 c6 14.\(\text{\texta}3\) \(\text{\textf}8\) 15.\(\text{\textac}1\)± followed by the doubling of the rooks on the c-file.

12.b4

White prevents his opponent’s counterplay connected with the pawn-advance c7-c5.

12...'\(\text{\textbd}7\)

After 12...a6, it is very good for White to play 13.f3!± followed by e3-e4.

13.\(\text{\textb}2\) a6 14.\(\text{\textad}1\) \(\text{\texte}6\), Sадler – Anastasian, Cappelle la Grande 1991 and here after 15.f3!± Black will hardly manage to prevent e3-e4.

A2) 6...'\(\text{\texte}7\)

Now, contrary to the scheme with the retreat of the bishop to the e7-square from Chapter 23 (variation C3), Black does not control the e4-square. White can exploit immediately this circumstance.

7.e4!?

13.\(\text{\textb}2\) a6 14.\(\text{\textad}1\) \(\text{\texte}6\), Sadler – Anastasian, Cappelle la Grande 1991 and here after 15.f3!± Black will hardly manage to prevent e3-e4.

7.d6

It is bad for Black to opt for 7...d5 due to 8.cxd5 exd5 9.e5 \(\text{\texte}4\), Ihlenfeld – Andersen, Germany 1988, 10.\(\text{\textxe}4\) dxe4 11.\(\text{\textc}3\)± (followed by \(\text{\textc}4\)) and White has a mobile pawn-centre, while Black’s e4-pawn is weak.

His attempt to advance d7-d5, with the inclusion of the moves 7...'\(\text{\textb}7\) 8.\(\text{\textg}3\) d5 (it is preferable for Black to choose here 8...d6
9.\( \text{xe2} \) – see 7...\( d6 \) fails after 9. \\
\( \text{cxd5 exd5 10.e5 } \text{xe4}, \) Caruana – \\
Brunello, Siena 2010. Here, White \\
could have obtained a great ad-
\( \text{vantage with } 11.\text{gxe4! } \text{dxe4} \\
12.\text{c4±} \)

8.\( \text{g3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 9.\( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{bd7} \) \\
10.0–0 \( \text{e8} \) 11.\( \text{e3} \) \( \text{h4} \)

This position was reached in 
the game Lugovoi – Chernyshov,
Budapest 1994. Black has no 
pawn-weaknesses but he can 
hardly find an effective plan for 
his further actions due to the lack 
of space. White must play accu-
\( \text{rately in order not to allow the ac-
\( \text{tivation of Black’s pieces. The best} 
\text{way to do that is } 12.\text{c2!} \pm, pro-
\text{tecting additionally his e4-pawn.} 
\)

B) 5...\( \text{e8} \)
Black prepares the retreat of 
his bishop to f8.
6.a3 \( \text{f8} \) 
(diagram)
7.\( \text{g3} \)!
After this move, White has a 
slight but stable edge.

In reply to the more popular 
move 7.d5, Black has the resource 
7...a5, beginning a very unpleas-
ant plan for White. Black wishes 
to transfer his knight to c5 and to 
play a5-a4, exploiting the weak-
\( \text{ness of the b3-square. 8.g3 } \text{a6} \\
9.\text{g2 } \text{c5 10.b3 } \text{d6 11.0–0 } \text{a4} \\
12.\text{xa4 } \text{xa4 13.bxa4 } \text{d7 14.} \\
\text{c2 } \text{c5 15.c3 } \text{d7 16.b1 } \text{e5} \\
17.b4 \text{c8 18.e4 } \text{a6 19.b1 } \text{c5} \\
20.b4 \text{a6 21.b1 } \text{c5 22.b4} \\
\text{a6 23.b1 } \text{c5, draw, Kornev –} 
\text{Aleksandrov, Moscow 2012.} 

7...d5

7...d6. This move leads to a 
cramped position for Black. 8.\( \text{d3} \\
e5 (8...\text{c5 9.dxc5 dxc5 10.c2} \\
\text{c6}, \) Graf – Mochalov, Azov 1991, 
11.b3!\( \pm \) followed by \( \text{b2}, 0–0, \\
\text{ad1, } \text{e4}) 9.0–0 \text{exd4 10.exd4} \\
\text{c6 11.d5 } \text{e5 12.e2±} \) Bilek – 
Barcza, Budapest 1958.

8.\( \text{e2} \)
White should not be in a hurry 
to exchange on d5, because after 
that Black’s rook and bishop are 
activated considerably.
Besides this move, Black has a great choice of possibilities but neither of them equalises.

About 8...c6 9.0–0 a6 10.e4 – see 8...a6.

8...a6 9.0–0 c6 10.e4 dxc4 11.\text{xc}4 b5 12.\text{a}2 c5 13.e5 \text{fd}7, Alvarado Ascanio – Mitkov, Albacete 1994 and here, White could have transferred his knight to the d6-square: 14.\text{xc}5! \text{c}6 15.\text{ce}4 \text{xc}5 16.\text{d}6±

Or 8...g6 9.0–0 \text{g}7 10.\text{c}2 b6, Jaime Montalvan – Hammer, Gibraltar 2008, 11.b4!? \text{b}7 12.\text{b}2± (followed by \text{fd}1, \text{ac}1) and White’s game is much freer.

8...\text{bd}7 9.0–0 a6 (9...dxc4 10.\text{xc}4 – see 8...dxc4) 10.b4 c6, Wade – Ivkov, Buenos Aires 1960. Here, White maintains a stable advantage after 11.\text{b}2?!± followed by \text{c}2, \text{ac}1, \text{fd}1 and e3-e4.

After 8...c5 9.\text{xc}5 \text{xc}5 (9...dxc4 10.0–0 – see 8...dxc4) 10.

Following 8...b6, White can already exchange on d5. 9.\text{xd}5 exd5 10.0–0 c5. Black is reluctant to play \text{b}7, because after that his bishop would be restricted by his pawn on d5. 11.\text{xc}5 \text{xc}5 12.\text{h}5 \text{xh}5 13.\text{h}5 \text{b}7 14.\text{f}3 \text{e}5, Berovski – Dobrev, Shumen 1995. Now, White can continue with the logical move 15.b4!?±. It would be very dangerous for Black to accept the pawn-sacrifice 15...\text{xb}4 16.\text{xb}4 \text{xb}4 17.\text{b}3 \text{xc}3 18.\text{xc}3 \text{d}7 19.\text{d}1± (followed by \text{b}2), because White’s pieces would be tremendously active and despite the extra pawn Black’s defence would be very difficult.

9.0–0
1.d4 \( \mathcal{Q} f6 \) 2.c4 e6 3.\( \mathcal{Q} c3 \) \( \mathcal{B} b4 \) 4.e3 0-0 5.\( \mathcal{Q} ge2 \) d5 6.a3

9...c5

About 9...a6 10.\( \mathcal{X} xc4 \) c5 11.\( \mathcal{X} xc5 \) \( \mathcal{X} xc5 \) 12.b4 – see 9...c5.

After 9...\( \mathcal{Q} bd7 \) 10.\( \mathcal{X} xc4 \) c5 11.\( \mathcal{X} xc5 \) \( \mathcal{X} x c5 \) 12.b4 \( \mathcal{E} e 7 \) 13.\( \mathcal{W} b3 \)± White's pieces are very active.

Following 9...b6 10.\( \mathcal{X} xc4 \) \( \mathcal{B} b7 \), Yang – Shabalov, Philadelphia 2013, White maintains an edge after 11.\( \mathcal{W} e 2 \)± c5 12.\( \mathcal{X} xc5 \) \( \mathcal{X} xc5 \) 13.b4 \( \mathcal{F} f8 \) 14.\( \mathcal{E} d1 \) \( \mathcal{B} bd7 \) 15.\( \mathcal{B} b2 \)± followed by \( \mathcal{F} ac1 \), occupying with his rooks the key files for similar positions c and d.

10.\( \mathcal{X} xc5 \) \( \mathcal{X} xc5 \) 11.\( \mathcal{X} xc4 \)

The position is symmetrical, but White's prospects are preferable thanks to his superior development.

11...a6

After 11...\( \mathcal{Q} c6 \) 12.b4 \( \mathcal{F} f8 \) 13.\( \mathcal{B} b2 \) b6 14.\( \mathcal{E} e 4 \) \( \mathcal{X} xe4 \) 15.\( \mathcal{X} xe4 \)± White's pieces are much more actively placed than their counterparts, Bluvshtein – Baklan, Groningen 2010.

12.b4 \( \mathcal{E} e 7 \) 13.\( \mathcal{E} e 2 \) a5 14.b5 \( \mathcal{Q} bd7 \) 15.\( \mathcal{Q} a 4 \) \( \mathcal{B} b 6 \) 16.\( \mathcal{W} xd8 \) \( \mathcal{X} xd8 \) 17.\( \mathcal{Q} xb6 \) \( \mathcal{X} xb6 \), Epishin – Polak, Dresden 2007, 18.\( \mathcal{B} b 2 \)± a4 19.\( \mathcal{F} fd1 \)± (followed by \( \mathcal{F} ac1 \)) and White maintains a slight but stable advantage in this endgame.

C) 5...d5

This is Black's basic and strongest move – he occupies the centre with his pawn.

6.a3

White ousts the enemy bishop from its active position.

Now, Black usually chooses between two possibilities: C1) 6...\( \mathcal{E} d6 \) or C2) 6...\( \mathcal{E} e 7 \).

About 6...\( \mathcal{X} xc3 \)± 7.\( \mathcal{X} xc3 \) \( \mathcal{Q} c6 \) (7...b6 8.\( \mathcal{Q} d 3 \) – see variation A1) 8.\( \mathcal{E} e 2 \) \( \mathcal{X} xc4 \) 9.\( \mathcal{X} xc4 \) – see Chapter 21, variation A.

C1) 6...\( \mathcal{E} d6 \)

This move has remained in the shadow of 6...\( \mathcal{E} e 7 \) for a long time, because Black was afraid of the plan with c4-c5, but lately it has
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turned out that the plan is not so dangerous.

7.\textit{\text{\textbf{g3}}}!

White opens to way for his bishop trying to develop his kingside pieces as quickly as possible.

The plan with 7.cxd5 is not so effective with Black's bishop on d6, because his rook joins in the actions immediately after \textit{\text{\textbf{e8}}}.

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

\begin{itemize}
\item 7...\textit{\text{\textbf{c5}}}
\end{itemize}

About 7...\textit{\text{\textbf{e8}}} 8.\textit{\text{\textbf{e2}}} b6 (8...\textit{\text{\textbf{c6}}} 9.0-0 – see 7...\textit{\text{\textbf{c6}}}) 9.cxd5 exd5 10.0-0 – see 7...b6.

7...a5, Jobava – Almasi, Wijk aan Zee 2006, 8.\textit{\text{\textbf{d3}}} c5 9.0-0 \textit{\text{\textbf{c6}}}. I.Sololov, in his book “The Strategic Nimzo-Indian”, has evaluated this position as quite acceptable for Black. Still, White has possibilities to fight for the opening advantage. 10.dxc5 \textit{\text{\textbf{xc5}}} and now 11.\textit{\text{\textbf{h5}}}!? \textit{\text{\textbf{xh5}}} (11...dxc4 12.\textit{\text{\textbf{xf6}}}+ \textit{\text{\textbf{xf6}}} 13.\textit{\text{\textbf{h7}}}+ \textit{\text{\textbf{h7}}} 14.\textit{\text{\textbf{h5}}}+ \textit{\text{\textbf{g8}}} 15.\textit{\text{\textbf{xc5}}}+ followed by \textit{\text{\textbf{xc4}}} and White will have an extra pawn.) 12.cxd5! This is an important intermediate move.

12...\textit{\text{\textbf{f6}}} 13.dxc6 bxc6 14.\textit{\text{\textbf{c2}}}± and Black's c6-pawn is very weak.

It looks like a positional concession for Black to play 7...dxc4, because in that case White's bishop goes to c4 without losing a tempo. 8.\textit{\text{\textbf{xc4}}} c5 9.dxc5 \textit{\text{\textbf{xc5}}} 10.0-0 \textit{\text{\textbf{bd7}}} (10...\textit{\text{\textbf{xd1}}} 11.\textit{\text{\textbf{xd1}}} b6 12.b4 \textit{\text{\textbf{e7}}}, Sedlak – Delchev, Bosnjači 2013, 13.\textit{\text{\textbf{b2}}}± followed by \textit{\text{\textbf{ac1}}} and White preserves a slight edge in the endgame) 11.b4 \textit{\text{\textbf{e7}}} 12.\textit{\text{\textbf{b2}}} a5 13.\textit{\text{\textbf{b3}}} axb4 14.\textit{\text{\textbf{axb4}}} \textit{\text{\textbf{xa1}}} 15.\textit{\text{\textbf{xa1}}} \textit{\text{\textbf{b6}}} 16.\textit{\text{\textbf{e2}}}± White’s pieces are more actively placed, Schandorff – Hansen, Helsingor 2012.

Following 7...\textit{\text{\textbf{bd7}}}, White has the possibility to exchange his bishop on d6 for the enemy knight. 8.cxd5 exd5 9.\textit{\text{\textbf{f5}}} \textit{\text{\textbf{b6}}} 10.\textit{\text{\textbf{xd5}}} \textit{\text{\textbf{xd5}}} 11.\textit{\text{\textbf{d3}}} \textit{\text{\textbf{e6}}} (11...\textit{\text{\textbf{g4}}} 12.\textit{\text{\textbf{c2}}}±) 12.a4!? White wishes to oust Black’s knight from the b6-square, so that it would not be able to occupy the c4-square later, 12...\textit{\text{\textbf{fe8}}} 13.a5 \textit{\text{\textbf{c8}}} 14.\textit{\text{\textbf{c2}}} \textit{\text{\textbf{d7}}} 15.f3 \textit{\text{\textbf{d6}}} 16.\textit{\text{\textbf{g4}}}! White begins active actions on the kingside. 16...\textit{\text{\textbf{ac8}}} 17.\textit{\text{\textbf{g5}}} \textit{\text{\textbf{h5}}} 18.\textit{\text{\textbf{xe7}}}+ \textit{\text{\textbf{h8}}} 19.\textit{\text{\textbf{d3}}}± – He has won a pawn with an energetic play, but has fallen back in development a bit, I.Sokolov – Jakovenko, Poikovsky 2010.

7...b6 8.cxd5 exd5 9.\textit{\text{\textbf{e2}}} \textit{\text{\textbf{e8}}} 10.0-0 c6 11.b4 a6 12.\textit{\text{\textbf{b2}}} \textit{\text{\textbf{bd7}}} 13.\textit{\text{\textbf{c2}}} \textit{\text{\textbf{f8}}} (It is less reliable for Black to play 13...\textit{\text{\textbf{b5}}} 14.\textit{\text{\textbf{d3}}} \textit{\text{\textbf{b6}}}
15.e4!± White has accomplished a pawn-break in the centre and later the vulnerability of Black's c6-pawn may tell, Graf – Topalov, Benidorm 2003.) 14...dxe4?! White's knight had no good prospects on the c3-square, so White decided to transfer it to f3, from where it could go to e5 at an opportune moment. 14...c7 15.d2 dxe4 16.dxe4 followed by dac1, dc5 and dxe5, Joppich – Kurgansky, Email 2011.

Black has often tried in practice 7...c6 8.e2.

About 8...e5 9.0–0 dxe4 10. hxg4 – see 8...dxe4.

8...dxe4 9.hxg4 e5 10.0–0 d7 11.a2 b6, Zakhartsov – Estremera Panos, Groningen 2013, 12.dxe5 dxe5 13.c2± followed by a pawn-offensive on the kingside and in the centre with f2-f4 and e3-e4.

8...a5 9.0–0 e8 10.c2 d7, Gual Pascual – Baches Garcia, Barcelona 2011. Black's position is solid but passive. 11.e4!?± White opens the game in the centre and Black will have problems to bring his bishop on c8 into the actions.

8...e8, preparing e6-e5. 9. 0–0 e5, Graf – Nisipeanu, Aghia Pelagia 2004 (following 9...d7, Bitalzadeh – Nisipeanu, Sarajevo 2010, White can prevent Black's counterplay in the centre with 10.f4!±) 10.cxd5? dxd5 11.d5 cxd5 12.dxe5 dxe5 13.a2!?± followed by b2-b4, a2-d2, emphasizing the vulnerability of Black's isolated pawn.

8.dxc5

White is preparing b2-b4 and c1-b2, in order to solve the problem with the development of his bishop on c1.

8...hxg4 9.b4

9.e7

Black has tried in practice the other possible retreats of his bishop:

9...d6 10.b2 a5 (10...c6 11.c2!±) 11.b5 e5, Karsa – Lukacs, Budapest 1982, 12.f4!? hxg3+ 13.hxg3± White's dark-squared bishop is very powerful.

9...b6 10.a4!? It is essential
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for him to oust the enemy bishop from the b6-square in order to impede Black’s pawn-advance d5-d4. 10...\textit{c}c7 11.\textit{b}2 \textit{c}6 (after 11...dxc4, I.Sokolov – Meier, Mülhouse 2011, the best move for White would be 12.\textit{xc}4\textit{c}6, without the preliminary exchange on d8) 12.cxd5 exd5 13.\textit{e}2 e7 14.0–0± and White maintains a slight edge exerting pressure against Black’s isolated d5-pawn, Volkov – C. Balogh, Moscow 2007.

10.\textit{b}2

After 10...a5 11.b5 dxc4 12.\textit{xc}4 \textit{bd}7 13.0–0 b6, Graf – Sturua, Moscow 1992 (Following 13...\textit{c}5, White has the powerful resource 14.\textit{f}3!± impeding the pawn-advance b7–b6. Black fails to equalise with 13...\textit{b}6, Chernin – Granda Zuniga, Pamplona 1991, 14.e2!±) 14.\textit{a}4 \textit{b}7 15.e2± followed by \textit{fd}1, \textit{ac}1. White’s pieces are noticeably more actively placed, while the vulnerability of Black’s b6-pawn may become a telling factor in the future.

After 10...dxc4 11.\textit{xc}4, there arises a position in which White maintains better chances, since his pieces are better developed. 11...\textit{x}d1+ (11...a5 12.b5 – see 10...a5; 11...\textit{c}6 12.\textit{ce}4!?) 12.\textit{xd}1 \textit{bd}7 13.\textit{ge}4± Mueller – Kvas, Germany 2012.

10...\textit{c}6 11.\textit{c}2

11...a5? 12.b5 \textit{e}5 13.\textit{xd}5! exd5 14.\textit{xe}5± and White wins a pawn, Ipatov – Kravtsiv, Wroclaw 2008.

Following 11...\textit{d}7 12.\textit{d}1 \textit{e}8, Graf – Dokutchaev, Novgorod 1999, it seems very attractive for White to play 13.cxd5!? exd5 14.f5±

After 11...d4 12.\textit{d}1 e5 13.e2± Black’s d4-pawn is much rather a liability than strength, Graf – Loginov, Tashkent 1992.

11...dxc4 12.\textit{xc}4 \textit{d}7 (The character of the position remains the same after 12...\textit{e}5 13.e2 \textit{c}7 14.\textit{c}1± Vaisser – Hauchard, Narbonne 1999, or 12...\textit{c}7, Chernikov – Karpov, Kuibyshev 1970, 13.e2±) 13.0–0 \textit{ec}8 14.e2 \textit{e}5
1.d4 \( \texttt{f6} \) 2.c4 e6 3.d3 d4 4.e3 0-0 5.\( \texttt{ge2} \) d5 6.a3 \( \texttt{e7} \) 7.cd

15.\( \texttt{wb3} \) (followed by \( \texttt{fbd1}, \texttt{acc1} \)) – It will be very difficult for Black to find a good square for his queen, Moreno Trujillo – Suba, Collado Villalba 2004.

11.cxd5 exd5
There has arisen a position with an isolated queen’s pawn for Black.

12.\( \texttt{ad3} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 13.\( \texttt{ace2} \)
White is preventing d5-d4.

13...\( \texttt{ad6} \)

13...\( \texttt{le8} \) 14.0-0\( \texttt{e6} \)

14.0-0 14.\( \texttt{e6} \)

15.f4!
White takes the e5-square under control.

15...\( \texttt{ac7} \) 16.\( \texttt{ac2} \) – His pieces are very active, while Black can hardly exploit the weakness of the e3-pawn, Svidler – Bologan, Tromsoe 2013.

C2) 6...\( \texttt{e7} \) 7.cxd5
White clarifies immediately the situation in the centre.

Now, Black has a choice between: C2a) 7...\( \texttt{xd5} \) or C2b) 7...exd5.

C2a) 7...\( \texttt{xd5} \)
In this variation, as a rule, Black should not be trying for too much. He should strive to equalise a slightly worse position by exchanging pieces.

8.\( \texttt{d2} \)
White wishes to be able to capture on c3 with his bishop in case of an exchange there.

8...\( \texttt{d7} \)
This is a very elastic move. Black does not clarify his plans yet.
It seems too passive for him to opt for 8...c6 9.\(g3\)±

8...\(\texttt{f6}\) 9.g3 c5 (9...\(\texttt{bd7}\) 10.\(g2\) – see 8...\(d7\)) 10.dxc5 \(d7\), Mitchell – Gormally, Scarborough 2013. Here, White maintains a slight but stable edge with 11.\(g2\) \(c6\) 12.e4±

After 8...b6, Groffen – Ligterink, Netherlands 2005, 9.\(\texttt{xd5}\) \(\texttt{exd5}\) 10.\(\texttt{f4}\) \(\texttt{b7}\) 11.\(\texttt{d3}\) \(d7\) 12.0-0± Black’s bishop on b7 is very passive, restricted by his own pawn on d5.

He cannot equalise with 8...

\(\texttt{b6}\) 9.\(\texttt{c2}\) \(\texttt{bd7}\) (9...\(d7\), Deglmann – Acs, Austria 2014, 10.\(\texttt{f4}\)?! c5 11.dxc5 \(\texttt{xc5}\) 12.d3± followed by 0–0, \(\texttt{fd1}\), \(\texttt{ac1}\)) 10.\(\texttt{d1}\) c5 11.\(g3\) \(\texttt{f6}\), Epishin – Gashimov, Tromso 2007, 12.dxc5?! \(\texttt{xc5}\) 13.\(g2\)± and White’s pieces are more active.

8...c5. This move only increases Black’s difficulties. 9.dxc5 \(\texttt{xc5}\) 10.g3 \(\texttt{xc3}\) 11.\(\texttt{xc3}\) \(d7\) 12.d4 e5 13.\(\texttt{b3}\) \(\texttt{c6}\) 14.\(\texttt{xd8}\) \(\texttt{xd8}\) 15.\(\texttt{g1}\) \(\texttt{d6}\) (15...\(\texttt{d7}\) 16.\(\texttt{xc5}\) \(\texttt{xc5}\) 17.\(\texttt{xe5}\) \(\texttt{f3}\) 18.\(\texttt{c3}\) \(\texttt{ac8}\) 19.\(\texttt{e2}\) \(\texttt{d3}\)+ 20.\(\texttt{xd3}\) \(\texttt{xd3}\) 21.g4± and despite the presence of bishops of opposite colours in the endgame, White has all the chances of realising his extra pawn.) 16.\(\texttt{a5}\)! \(\texttt{c7}\) 17.\(\texttt{xc6}\) \(\texttt{xc6}\) 18.\(\texttt{g2}\)± – His bishops are very powerful in this endgame, Navara – Berg, Heraklio 2007.

8...\(\texttt{xc3}\) 9.\(\texttt{xc3}\) b6 10.\(\texttt{g3}\) 

\(\texttt{b7}\) 11.\(\texttt{d3}\) \(d7\) (11...\(\texttt{xg2}\)? 12.\(\texttt{g1}\) \(\texttt{b7}\) 13.d5!±, White’s dark-squared bishop joins with a decisive effect in the fight for the g7-square.) 12.\(\texttt{xc6}\) h6 (12...g6 13.\(\texttt{e4}\) \(\texttt{xe4}\) 14.\(\texttt{xf6}\) \(\texttt{xf6}\) 15.\(\texttt{xf6}\) \(\texttt{xf6}\) 16.0-0± followed by \(\texttt{ac1}\), \(\texttt{fd1}\) and the c7-pawn may become very weak, J.Schmidt – Lomineishvili, Plovdiv 2003) 13.0–0

13...c5 14.dxc5 \(\texttt{xc5}\) (Black loses after 14...\(\texttt{xc5}\)? Sargissian – Tiviakov, Tripoli 2004, due to 15.\(\texttt{ad1}\)! \(\texttt{c8}\) 16.\(\texttt{h5}\) e5 17.\(\texttt{b5}\) \(\texttt{c6}\) 18.\(\texttt{c4}\) \(\texttt{h8}\) 19.\(\texttt{f5}\) \(\texttt{e7}\) 20.\(\texttt{xf7}\) \(\texttt{f6}\) 21.\(\texttt{g6}\) \(\texttt{hxh5}\) 22.\(\texttt{g6}\)± and White has an extra pawn and a winning position.) 15.\(\texttt{h7}\)+ \(\texttt{h8}\) 16.\(\texttt{h5}\)± – It would be very difficult for Black to neutralise the activity of White’s pieces.

13...\(\texttt{f6}\) 14.e4 c5 15.dxc5 \(\texttt{bxc5}\) 16.\(\texttt{c4}\)± and Black’s c5-pawn is very weak, Aronian – Anand, Mallorca 2004.

9.g3

White prepares the development of his bishop to the g2-square. Once again, Black has a
choice between numerous possibilities.

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{9...}Q5f6
\end{array}
\]

It seems very bad for him to play 9...Q7f6, because after that it would be very difficult for Black to advance c7-c5 or e6-e5.

10.g2 d7 11.e4 Qxc3 12.Qxc3 Q5 13.0-0 Qb5 14.Qe1± (followed by d4-d5) – White’s pieces are much more harmoniously deployed, Hari

9...Q5b6. Black removes his knight away from the centre and prepares the freeing moves c7-c5 or e6-e5. 10.g2

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{10...c5 11.0-0 Qf6 (It would be too passive for Black to play 11... a6 12.Qc2±) 12.dxc5 Qxc5 13.Qc2 Qe7 14.Qfd1± – He can hardly complete the development of his queenside pieces, because White’s bishop exerts rather unpleasant pressure against the b7-pawn, Harikrishna – Tiviakov, Pamplona 2005.}
\end{array}
\]

10...e5 11.0-0 exd4 12.Qxd4 Q5 13.b4 Qec4 14.Qc1 a5 15.b5 a4, Mohota – Maletin, Delhi 2010, 16.Qe2!? Qd6 17.Qd5 Qe8 18.Qxb6 Qxb6 19.Qb2± White’s pieces are very active and he only needs to bring his rooks into the action with Qac1 and Qfd1.

9...Qxc3. Black hopes to facilitate his defence by exchanging pieces. 10.Qxc3

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Or 10...b6 11.g2 Qb8 12.0-0 c5 13.dxc5 bxc5 14.Qa4± and Black’s queenside pawns are weak, Campos Moreno – Carlsson, Calvia 2005.}
\end{array}
\]

10...c5 11.g2 cxd4 (11...Qf6 12.0-0±) 12.Qxd4 Qb6 (12...Qf6 13.0-0 Qd5 14.Qc1 – see 12... Qb6) 13.0-0 Qd5, Volkov – Tom
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17.\texttt{exd1=}\texttt{=} Black's two-bishop advantage is absolutely immaterial here, since he can hardly complete the development of his queenside pieces without material losses.

Following 9...b6 10.\texttt{exd5 exd5}, Black obtains a solid but passive position. 11.\texttt{g2}

![Diagram]

After 11...\texttt{b7}, White can get rid of his "bad" bishop immediately: 12.\texttt{b4!}\texttt{? f6} 13.0–0 \texttt{e8} 14.\texttt{xc1 c6} 15.\texttt{xex7 \text{xe7} 16.\texttt{e1 d6} 17.\texttt{f4 c8} 18.\texttt{a4=–} He has a clear-cut plan for his further actions connected with exerting pressure against the weak enemy c6-pawn, Carlsen – Anand, Moscow 2013.

11...\texttt{f6} 12.0–0 \texttt{e4} (12...\texttt{b7} 13.\texttt{b4=} – see 11...\texttt{b7}; 12...\texttt{f5} 13.\texttt{b4} a5 14.\texttt{xe7 \text{xe7} 15.\texttt{c1= Martinovic – Papp, Chur 2010) 13.\texttt{c1 b7} 14.\texttt{c2 c8} 15.\texttt{d1 d6} 16.\texttt{b4=} Once again, White gets rid of his "bad" bishop. 16...\texttt{f6} 17.\texttt{c3 c3} 18.\texttt{c3 c6} 19.\texttt{xd6 xd6} 20.\texttt{b4=} with good prospects on the queenside, moreover that White's bishop is much more active than its counterpart, Ponomariov – Kramnik, Wijk aan Zee 2003.

10.\texttt{g2}

![Diagram]

10...\texttt{e5}

Or 10...c6 11.\texttt{xc2 e5} 12.\texttt{d1 exd4} 13.\texttt{xd4=} and in the middle game, White can advance successfully his e and f-pawns, Graf – Xu Jun, Bled 2002.

10...c5 11.0–0 \texttt{cxd4} (11...\texttt{b6} 12.\texttt{dxc5 \text{xc5} 13.\texttt{c2=} – see 9...\texttt{b6}) 12.\texttt{xd4 e5} 13.\texttt{f3 b8} 14.\texttt{e2 b5} 15.\texttt{f1=– and White's rooks are much better deployed in the fight for the central files, Graf – Arutinian, Dresden 2009.}

11.0–0 \texttt{exd4}

11...\texttt{c6} 12.\texttt{c2 exd4} 13.\texttt{xd4 b6} 14.\texttt{ad1=} Black can hardly neutralise his opponent's pressure. Later, in the game Malakhov – Nielsen, Istanbul 2003, there followed: 14...\texttt{c5} 15.\texttt{e4 \text{xd4} 16.\texttt{b4 e8} 17.\texttt{xd4=} and White had two powerful bishops and his
1.d4 ½f6 2.c4 e6 3.½c3 ½b4 4.e3 0-0 5.½ge2 d5 6.a3 ½e7 7.cd

The knight was ready to penetrate to the d6-square.

Or 12...c5 13.½f3!?± and White does not let the enemy knight to the e5-square.

13.½c2 c5

13...c6 14.h3 ½e8, Garcia Palermo – Suba, Dortmund 1985, 15.½a4!?± followed by ½c5.

14.½f5 ½xf5 15.½xf5 ½xd2

16.½xe5 ½d6 17.½f5 ½xb2 18.½f1 ½ad8, Aronian – Gelfand, Merida 2005, 19.½b1!? ½xa3 20.½xb7± White’s prospects seem preferable despite the absence of a pawn, because Black’s a7 and c5-pawns may become an easy prey for White’s pieces.

C2b) 7...exd5

Now, there arises a pawn-structure analogous to the exchange variation of the Queen’s Gambit (which was analysed by us in our first volume) except that White’s bishop on f1 is not so active now. Therefore, the plan with the pawn-minority attack is not so effective here.

8.½f4!?

White’s plan is: ½d3-c2, 0–0, f2-f3, e3-e4.

8...c6

This is Black’s most popular response.

He fails to equalise after 8... ½c6 9.½e2 ½f5 (following 9...½a5 10.0–0 c6, it is very good for White to play 11.e4!± and exploiting the misplacement of the enemy knight at the edge of the board, White accomplished quickly the thematic pawn-break in the centre, Sarno – Genocchio, Arvier 2013) 10.g4! ½e6, Botvinnik – Taimanov, Moscow 1952, 11.g5! ½d7 12.½xe6 fxe6 13.½g4±

Later, we will analyse variations in which Black wishes to continue the game without the move c7-c6.
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Following 8...\textit{\textbf{e}}e8 9.d3 \&d6 (9...a5 10.0-0 – see 8...a5; after 9...c5 10.0-0 cxd4 11.exd4 \&c6 12.\&e3 \&d6 13.h3 \&b8 14.\textit{\textbf{w}}f3= Black’s d5-pawn needs additional protection, Repina – Ulko, Moscow 2011) 10.0-0 \textit{\textbf{xf}}4 11.\textit{\textbf{xf}}4 \&c6, Sasikiran – Karjakin, Tromso 2013. This is a very interesting idea. Black wishes to transfer his knight to the e7-square, followed by \textit{\textbf{f}}5 or \textit{\textbf{f}}5. 12.\&e3!? This is the only way for White to fight for the opening advantage. 12...\&e7 13.\&e1 \&f5 14.\&e2± – He has managed to preserve his two bishops and his subsequent plan is connected with the advance of his kingside pawns.

8...b6. Black is preparing to fianchetto his bishop, but it will be misplaced on b7, because it will be restricted by his own pawn on d5. 9.\&d3

About 9...\textit{\textbf{e}}e8 10.0-0 \&b7 11.\&b4 – see 9...\&b7.

9...\&b7 10.b4 \textit{\textbf{e}}e8 (10...c6 11.0-0 \textit{\textbf{d}}d6, Zaichik – Kengis, Katerini 1992, 12.\&d2!?± White’s pieces are much more harmoniously deployed than their counterparts. After 10...\&d6, it is very good for White to play 11.\textit{\textbf{w}}f3= with powerful pressure against the d5-pawn.) 11.0-0 \textit{\textbf{bd}}7 12.\textit{\textbf{wb}}3 \&f8 13.e4!? This is a very concrete decision – White sacrifices a pawn in order to attack the f7-square. 13...\textit{\textbf{xe}}4 14.\textit{\textbf{xe}}4 dxe4 15.\&c4 \&e6 16.\textit{\textbf{xe}}6 \textit{\textbf{fxe}}6 17.\textit{\textbf{xe}}6+ \&h8 18.\&b2= followed by d4-d5, \&ad1, \&fe1, Botsari – Maric, Athens 1992.

9...a6 10.0-0 \&xd3 11.\textit{\textbf{wd}}3= and after the trade of the light-squared bishops, the weakening of Black’s queenside may tell.

After 9...c6 10.0-0 \&d6 White can accomplish an immediate pawn-break in the centre: 11.e4!? dxe4 12.\textit{\textbf{xe}}4 \textit{\textbf{xe}}4 13.\textit{\textbf{xe}}4= and Black’s weak c6-pawn needs permanent protection.

8...a5 9.d3 \textit{\textbf{e}}e8 (9...\&a6 10.0-0 \textit{\textbf{e}}e8 11.\&c2 – see 9...\textit{\textbf{e}}e8) 10.0-0 \&a6 (after 10...g6, it is very good for White to continue with 11.\&c2!? \&f8 12.f3= followed by e3-e4.) 11.\&c2 \&f8, Salem – Debashish, Sharjah 2013, 12.\&h5!? c6 13.\textit{\textbf{xf}}6+ \textit{\textbf{xf}}6 14.e4 dxe4 15.\textit{\textbf{xe}}4= – The position has been opened and Black’s knight is misplaced at the edge of the board.

9.\&d3

(diagram)

9...\textit{\textbf{e}}e8

About 9...\textit{\textbf{bd}}7 10.0-0 \&d6 11.f3 – see 9...\&d6; 10...\textit{\textbf{e}}e8 11.f3 – see variation C2b2.
1.d4 ıf6 2.c4 e6 3.ıc3 ıb4 4.e3 0-0 5.ıge2 d5 6.a3 ıe7 7.cd

9...a5 10.0-0 ıa6 (10...ıd6 11.f3 – see 9...ıd6; 10...ıe8 11.f3 – see variation C2b1) 11.f3 ıc7 (11...ıe8 12.ıd2 – see variation C2b1) 12.ıd2 c5 13.dxc5 ıxc5 14.ıh1± and Black’s isolated d5-pawn needs defending all the time, So – Van Wely, Hoogeveen 2013.

10...ıd6 10.0-0

9...ıd6 10.0-0

About 10...ıe8 11.f3 – see variation C2b3.

It seems premature for Black to play 10...ıxf4 11.exf4 ıbd7, Richardson – Turner, England 2010, 12.ıe1±, because he clarifies his plans too early.

10...ıbd7 11.f3 ıb6 12.ıc2 ıc7 13.g3 ıd8 14.ıd3 ıxf4 15.exf4± – It is much more pleasant to play this position with White, since Black has difficulties to find an active plan, Johannesson – Shyam, London 2013.

10...a5 11.f3 ıxf4 (11...ıe8 12.ıc2 – see variation C2b3) 12.exf4 b6, Siedentopf – Seres, Dresden 2013, 13.ıe1!? ıa6 14.ıc2±. White has prevented the trade of his bishop and has an easy plan to improve his position, connected with the advance of his kingside pawns.

10.0-0

Now, Black has a choice between: C2b1) 10...a5, C2b2) 10...ıbd7 or C2b3) 10...ıd6.

C2b1) 10...a5

Black is preparing active actions on the queenside.

11.f3

(diagram)

11...b5

The move 11...c5? loses a pawn for Black: 12.dxc5 ıxc5 13.ıfxd5± Ponomariov – Bacrot, Villarrobledo 2009.
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Following 11...b6, White should better avoid the exchange of the bishops with the line: 12. \( \text{c2 e7 13.h1 a6 14.e1} \) followed by e3-e4, Yang – Corrales Jimenez, Wheeling 2013.

After 11...f8 12.e1 g6 13. \( \text{f2} \) White has protected his d4-pawn and Black must consider permanently the threat e3-e4, Szelényi – Lugovoi, Harkany 1993.

11...a6 12.c2

The plan with the move 12...b5 is not so effective here as on move 11. 13.e4 b4 14.a4 dxe4 15.fxe4 \( \text{c5} \), S.Kasparov – Devangi, Balaguer 2008, 15.e5! \( \text{g4} 16.e6\# – He must be very careful not to lose immediately.

Black does not obtain sufficient compensation after 12...c5 13.dxc5 \( \text{x5} 14.cxd5 \text{xd5}, Nguyen Ngoc Truong Son – Pomarov, Khanty-Mansiysk 2013, 15.\( \text{xd5?!} \)±

12...f8 13.e4 dxe4 14.fxe4 c5, Volke – Lau, Bad Neuenahr 1991, 15.d5?!± followed by \( \text{e1-g3(f2).} \)

12.c2

In anticipation of the development of Black’s bishop on a6, White retreats his bishop, because later he will need it very much in the preparation of the pawn-advance e3-e4. 12...a6 13.e1 b4 14.a4 \( \text{bd7} 15.e4 \) f8 16.e5 \( \text{d7} \), Rasmussen – J.Polgar, Istanbul 2012, 17. axb4!? axb4 18.e3 \( \text{b5} 19. \text{d2} \). Black can hardly parry White’s further offensive (after the retreat of his knight from the
f4-square – f3-f4-f5). Black’s queenside counterplay looks almost harmless.

The exchange of the knights would facilitate considerably Black’s defence.

13...b6

In answer to 13...a5, Bekker Jensen – Olsen, Denmark 2000, White should better reply with 14.h1!?, removing his king away from the g1-a7 diagonal.

C2b2) 10...bd7

This knight usually follows the route d7-f8-e6.

11.f3 e8

11...b6 12.h1 c5 13.a4 cxd4 14.exd4 a5 15.b3 d7 16.d2± Black’s knight is misplaced on the b6-square, Kharlov – Kharitonov, Moscow 1992.

12.b4

Before advancing e3-e4, White must take care about Black’s possibility c6-c5.

12...e6

After 12...b6, White has the powerful resource 13.b5! and here, Black loses after 13...c5? 14.cx5 d5 15.cx5± Martinovic – Palac, Marija Bistrica 2011.

13.fe2

14.b1 a5. Black is trying to create counterplay on the queenside. 15.bxa5 bxa5 16.a4 d6 17.h1 c5 18.b5 e7, I.Sokolov – Nikcevic, Sarajevo 2010, 19.e4! xd4 20.xd4 cxd4 21.xd4 c5 22.d3 d4 23.g5± White’s pieces are actively placed, while Black’s d4-pawn may become a target for attack.

C2b3) 10...d6

Now, White should consider the possible exchange on f4.

11.f3

(diagram)

11...b6

Black is preparing the development of his bishop to a6 or b7.
11...a5. Black is preventing b2-b4. 12...c2 c7 (12...xf4 13.exf4 b6 14.f5!± followed by f4 or g5. White’s dark-squared bishop has been idle for a long time on the c1-square and now, it enters the actions with a great effect, Youngworth – Lobo, Palo Alto 1981) 13.g3. White is defending against the threat g7-g5. 13...xf4 14.exf4 h3 15.e1 bd7 16.e3 h5 17.d3 b6, Malakhov – Fedorchuk, Sibenik 2009. Black has succeeded in preventing the advance of his opponent’s queenside pawns, but his position remains worse, since his knights have no access to comfortable squares. 18.b3!±, White squeezes the enemy queen with the protection of the knight on b6.

After 11...xf4 12.exf4 b6, White does not need to take care about preserving his bishop-pair. His main task should be to activate the bishop on c1 as quickly as possible. 13.f5 a6 14.xa6 xa6 15.d3 b8 16.f4± Black has difficulties to find an active plan for his further actions, because the pawn-advance c6-c5 would lead to the weakening of his d5-pawn, Kravchenko – Mulenko, Myrhorod 2011.

After 11...c7, it would be interesting for White to play 12. d2!? threatening e3-e4. 12...xf4 13.exf4 b6, Jones – Hawkins, North Shields 2012, 14.e1!? xe1+ 15.xe1 a6 16.c2± White has the two-bishop advantage and a more active position.

12.b4 b7

12...a6, Gonzalez Vidal – Hervia Alejano, Santa Clara 2014, 13.xa6!? xa6 14.d3 c7. White succeeds in advancing the thematic – 15.e4±

13.b1 a5

This position was reached in the game I. Sokolov – Vitiugov, Poikovsky 2010.

Here, after 14.d2!? axb4 15.axb4± there would have arisen a very complicated middle game position. Still, White's
prospects seem preferable, because Black must be permanently on the alert about the threat e3-e4.

**Conclusion**

We have just completed the analysis of Black's main response against the Rubinstein System – 4...0-0.

His best possibility is the move 5...d5.

After 6.a3 d6, White should try to develop his kingside pieces as quickly as possible with 7.g3. Still, if Black manages to advance c7-c5, then there will arise a position with an isolated pawn for him, which is in fact favourable for White. He must only take care to prevent Black's pawn-break – d5-d4.

Following 6.a3 e7 7.cxd5 exd5, there arises a position with a slight but stable edge for White. He must have however very good knowledge of some theoretical variations, because his advantage is not so great and may evaporate after even a minimal imprecision. Meanwhile, Black's task is not easy at all. This is confirmed by the fact that in this variation great masters of this defence as V.Anand and V.Kramnik have lost games.

Finally, after 7...exd5, White has a clear-cut plan for his further actions: f4, d3, 0-0, f2-f3 and e3-e4.
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