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## Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± +</td>
<td>Slight advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>± +</td>
<td>Clear advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±± ±±</td>
<td>Winning advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Level position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∞</td>
<td>Unclear position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>Good move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!!</td>
<td>Outstanding move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!?</td>
<td>Interesting move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?!</td>
<td>Dubious move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Weak move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>Blunder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corres</td>
<td>Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ol</td>
<td>Olympiad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Z</td>
<td>Interzonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Championship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½f</td>
<td>Semi-final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preface

The basis for this book was a series of articles entitled ‘Black is OK’, some of which have been published in various countries since 1985. The first of them was the piece on the Keres Attack, which was created with the help of my friend, IM Endre Vegh, as were the sections on the Queen’s Indian. It is my pleasant duty to mention also IM Tamas Horvath, Zsolt Fusty and Jozsef Szentgyorgyi, who were ‘midwives’ in the creative process too.

IM Jeno Dory had already proved an ideal partner while we were writing our monograph Winning with the Grünfeld. He again took upon himself most of the editorial work and other practical problems, but in addition to that he had quite a lot of bright ideas on the board as well, especially in the Nimzo-Indian.

I feel really lucky not only for having found my vocation in life so early but also for having friends and collaborators like these.

Naturally I hope that this volume will be well received by its readers. But what will make me truly happy is if I am able to provide food for thought and if the ideas in my present and future work are used in practice to bring new life to tournament chess, for the pleasure and benefit of all players and fans of the game. I hope that sooner or later you’ll agree with me when I say: Black is OK!
Introduction
I say: Black is OK!

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is written: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword’ And indeed, in chess too, the aggressor often becomes a target.

How does a theoretical novelty come about?

Let us go behind the scenes of the Sicilian Defence Keres Attack Variation. The position after the following moves has occurred in a lot of games.

1  e4  c5
2  d4  e6
3  d4  cd
4  xd4  d6
5  c3  d6
6  g4  h6
7  h4  c6
8  g1  h5
9  g5  g4
10  e2  b6
11  xg4  h5
12  xc6  bc
13  xg4 (1)

Black has not been too successful with this line in tournament practice. Here is a brief overview of the early appearance of this modern line. Black’s first attempt was

13  e5

but this gave him no success in Makarichev-Aidarov, USSR 1981:

14  g3  e6
15  b3  d5
16  d2  0-0-0
17  0-0-0  f6
18  b1  d6
19  xe4  d4
20  a5  xd1+
21 $\text{Nxd1}$ $\text{Nxd1+}$
22 $\text{Qb2}$ $\text{Qd5}$
23 $\text{Qc3}$ $\text{f5}$
24 $\text{Nd2}$ $\text{f4}$
25 $\text{Wf3}$ $\text{Nh4}$
26 $\text{Qc4}$ $\text{Qe7}$
27 $\text{Qe4}$ $\text{Qg4}$
28 $\text{Qxe5}$ $\text{Qxg5}$
29 $\text{Wg6}$

Black resigned

Since White has committed himself to starting an early kingside attack, it seems logical to follow the classical advice and look for counterplay in the centre. This principle helped me to discover the move which keeps White busy there.

13 $\ldots$ $\text{d5!}$

This continuation was seen for the first time in Am.Rodriguez-Adorjan, Toluca IZ 1982. (As you can see, number 13 doesn’t always mean bad luck.) The game continued:

14 $\text{g6}$

Or 14 $\text{e5}$ $\text{g6}$!, blockading the h-pawn and with the idea of $\text{Qc5}$ and $\text{Qa6}$.

14 $\text{f6}$
15 $\text{h5}$ $\text{Qc5}$ (2)

![Diagram 3](image)

and White was a pawn to the good in Matulović-Ciocaltea, Titograd 1982.

I drew my conclusions from these games and felt an urge to find something new to improve Black’s miserable results. Let’s return to diagram 1.

16 $\text{Wf3?!}$ $\text{a6}$
17 $\text{h6}$ 0-0-0
18 $\text{Qd2}$?

18 $\text{h7}$ was more consistent, but then 18 $\text{Qd4}$ would paralyse...
White’s forces. A deterrent example: 19 b3? de 20 ♕g3 e3 and Black wins. This short but typical variation illustrates the dynamic spirit of the whole line.

18 ♕xb2
19 ♕b1 ♕xc2
20 ♕d1

White may have overlooked that 20 ♕c1 fails to the nice 20 ♕xd2+!.

20 ♕d3

White resigned

A few months later the line appeared again in the game Nunn-Andersson from the 1983 Tilburg tournament, which we publish here using John Nunn’s notes from Informant 34. From diagram 2:

16 ♕g2!

Thus deviating from the game Rodriguez-Adorjan.

16 e5
17 ♕f3 ♕a6
18 ♕e6 18 ♕d2 ♕xb2 19 ♕b1 ♕a3 (19 ♕xc2 20 ♕c1 ♕b2 21 ♕a4 ++) 20 ♕b3 ♕a5 (20 ... ♕a6 21 ed cd 22 ♕xd5 ++) 21 ♕xd5 ♕xa2 22 ♕xf6+! 22 ♕c7+! ♕d7 23 ♕xe6 ♕xe6 24 ♕f5+ wins more simply, for example 24 ♕d6 25 ♕d3+ ♕d4 26 ♕xd4+ ed 27 ♕f4+ ♕e7 28 ♕c5+ ♕d8 29 ♕d6+ ++ Adorjan/Vegh] 22 gf [22 ♕d8 is not at all clear, Adorjan/Vegh] 23 ♕xf6 ♕a1+ (23 ... ♕xb3 24 ♕xc6+ ++) 24 ♕e2 ♕c4+ 25 ♕d3 ♕xd3+ 26 cd ♕d7 27 g7 ♕hg8 28 ♕f7+ ♕e7 29 h6 ++.

18 ed 0-0-0
18 ♕d8 19 h6! cd 20 hg ♕h1+ 21 ♕d2 ++. Or 18 cd 19 ♕d5 ++.

19 ♕d2 cd
19 ♕xb2 20 ♕f5+ ♕c7 21 ♕b1 ♕a3 22 ♕b3 ♕c8 23 ♕e4 ♕a6 24 dc ++.

20 0-0-0 ♕b7
21 ♕a4 ♕c6
22 ♕xc5 ♕xc5
23 h6 ♕d4
24 ♕f5+ ♕b8
25 hg ♕hg8
26 ♕h2 ♕c8
27 ♕h6??

27 ♕h8! ♕d5 (27 ♕xg7? 28 ♕xc8+ ♕xc8 29 ♕xf6 ♕c7 30 c3 ++) 28 ♕xg8! ♕xg8 29 b3! ♕e6
30 ♕d3 ♕d5 (30 ... f5 31 ♕b1 e4 32 ♕g3+ ♕a8 33 ♕c1 ++) 31 ♕b2! ♕c6 32 ♕c1 ♕e4 33 ♕h3 ++.

27 ♕d5
28 f4 ♕c6!
29 ♕d3 ♕e4
30 ♕b3+ ♕a8
31 ♕f1 ♕d5

Draw agreed

Although I supposed that Black must have a stronger continuation than Andersson’s 17 ♕a6 (e.g. 17 d4 18 ♕e2 ♕a6 is worth studying), it seemed advisable to search for the ‘philosopher’s stone’ at an earlier stage.
Finally I discovered ‘The Move’ that makes the whole variation after 9 g5 dubious! I prepared the novelty together with my second Endre Vegh. Later I told my idea to Gary Kasparov, who took an interest in the matter – and he generally knows ‘which way the wind blows’.

The finishing touches were put to this novelty together with Gary Kasparov in a training camp in the USSR in August 1984. Kasparov was ready to play it against Karpov in the very first game of their 1984 match, but with his infallible sense of danger the then world champion avoided the complications and after the opening moves 1 e4 c5 2 d3 e6 3 d4 cd 4 xd4 e5 f5 5 c3 d6 6 g4 h6 7 h4 c6 8 g1 h5 he played

9 gh

The game continued

9 ... \(\triangle xh5\)
10 g5 \(\triangle f6\)
11 \(\triangle d2\) \(\triangle b6\)
12 \(\triangle b3\) \(\triangle d7\)
13 0-0-0 a6
14 \(\triangle g3\) \(\triangle c7\)
15 \(\triangle g2\) \(\triangle e7\)
16 f4 0-0-0
17 \(\triangle f2\) \(\triangle b8\)
18 f5 \(\triangle e5\)
19 \(\triangle h3\) \(\triangle c4\)
20 \(\triangle d2\) \(\triangle xd2\)
21 \(\triangle xd2\) \(\triangle c8\)
22 fe \(\triangle xe6\)

23 \(\triangle xe6\) fe
24 \(\triangle g1\) \(\triangle a5\)
25 \(\triangle d4\) \(\triangle c5\)

with equal chances, and a draw in 36 moves.

What was happening at the same time in the Dortmund grandmaster tournament? The Keres Attack was on the board in all of my Black games! In the eighth round I had the black pieces against IM Sznapik, who is a well-known attacking player and whose games are always full of excitement.

1 e4 c5
2 \(\triangle f3\) e6
3 d4 cd
4 \(\triangle xd4\) \(\triangle f6\)
5 \(\triangle c3\) d6
6 g4 h6
7 h4 \(\triangle c6\)
8 \(\triangle g1\) h5
9 g5 \(\triangle g4\)
10 \(\triangle e2\) d5! (3)

There we are! Two years had passed from the birth of the idea to its practical realization. Sznapik
thought for a long time here. No wonder; when somebody meets a surprise like this over the board he must concentrate very hard to react properly to the new and unexpected. After 30 minutes Sznapik played:

11 \( \text{dxc6} \)

There are other candidate moves here:
A 11 \( \text{b5} \)
B 11 \( \text{ed} \)
C 11 \( \text{g6} \)
D 11 \( \text{exg4} \)

Let’s examine these alternatives in detail.

A

11 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{c5} \) (4)

A1) 12 \( \text{c6} \) bc 13 \( \text{xc6} + \text{d7} \) 14 \( \text{xd7} + \) (after 14 \( \text{xa8} \) \( \text{xf2} + \) 15 \( \text{xf1} \) \( \text{g1} \) 16 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{b6} + \) White will be mated or lose his queen; 16 \( \text{b7} \) isn’t any better because of 16 ... \( \text{b6} \) 17 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{h2} ! \) and Black wins) 14 ... \( \text{xd7} \) 15 \( \text{g2} \) 0-0 16 \( \text{ed} \) (if 16 \( \text{e2} - 16 f3 \) \( \text{e5} ! - 16 \) ...

\( \text{ab8} ! \) and it’s not easy for White to develop, e.g. 17 b3 \( \text{b4} \) 18 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{fc8} \) 19 \( \text{g3} \) d4 and Black wins)

16 ... ed 17 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{c7} \) 18 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{b6} \)

(18 \( \text{fe8} \) is met by 19 g6 with unnecessary complications). Black now has excellent attacking chances on the open files.

A2) 12 \( \text{ed} \) 0-0! 13 dc \( \text{xd4} \) 14 \( \text{e4} \) (Or 14 \( \text{g2} \) bc 15 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{b6} \) 16 \( \text{xa8} \) \( \text{xf2} + \) 17 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{a6} + \) 18 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{xa8} \) with the tremendous threat of \( \text{xd8} \). If 15 \( \text{d3} \) then 15 \( \text{b7} \) followed by \( \text{c5} \) and Black hasn’t even had to sacrifice anything for his good position) 14 ... \( \text{a5} + ! \)

(Black can easily lose the right track, e.g. 14 \( \text{b6} \) 15 \( \text{e2} \) bc 16 \( \text{d3} \) is not convincing for Black, while after 14 \( \text{xf2} \) White can reply with the surprising 15 \( \text{f6} + ! \) \( \text{xf6} - \) of course not 15 ... \( \text{g6} \)?? 16 \( \text{g5} + \)

\( \text{g4} \) 17 \( \text{h4} \) + + + + 16 \( \text{xd8} \) \( \text{h8} \) 17 \( \text{xf2} \) bc 18 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{b8} \) 19 b3 with equal chances, or 15 \( \text{xf6} \) 16 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{xd1} \) 17 \( \text{xg7} + \) \( \text{h8} \) 18 \( \text{xd1} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 19 \( \text{g2} \) with a sharp endgame) 15 c3 \( \text{fxf2} + \) (15 \( \text{b5} \) cannot be suggested as 16 cd follows with the possibility of \( \text{f3} \) in the air)

16 \( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 17 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{h5} \) 18 \( \text{xd4} \) (18 \( \text{b7} \) \( \text{b7} \) 19 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{ad8} \) is hopeless for White) 18 \( \text{bc} \)

and the white king is rather exposed.

B

11 \( \text{ed} \) \( \text{ed} \)

12 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{d7} \) (5)
B1) 13 f3 \(\text{e}7+!\) (Black can also try 13 \(\text{g}e5\), e.g. 14 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{xd}4\)
15 \(\text{x}d7+\) \(\text{xd}7\) 16 \(\text{x}e5\) \(\text{c}6\) 17 \(\text{e}2\)
0-0-0 18 0-0-0 \(\text{e}6\) 19 \(\text{g}3\)
\(\text{c}5\) 20 \(\text{g}e1\) \(\text{h}e8\) 21 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{b}4\)
22 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{c}6\) 23 \(\text{x}e8\) \(\text{x}e8\) 24
\(\text{b}1\) \(d4\) 25 \(\text{xc}6+\) \(\text{xc}6\) 26 \(\text{e}4\)
\(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\) Klinger-Sax, Graz 1984. The
queen check leads to a more complex game) 14 \(\text{ce}2\) (14 \(\text{f}1\) is
weaker, e.g. 14 \(\text{e}3+\) 15 \(\text{xc}3\)
\(\text{xe}3\) intending ... \(\text{h}3+\); and after
14 \(\text{de}2\) \(d4\) 15 \(\text{d}5\) – 15 \(\text{fg} dc\) with
the idea of 0-0-0 – 15 \(\text{e}5\) 16
\(\text{fg}\) \(\text{xd}5\) 17 \(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{xc}6\) 18 \(\text{xd}4\)
\(\text{c}5!\) 19 \(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xd}5\) 20 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{hg}\)
21 \(\text{xg}4\) 0-0-0 Black’s position
is overwhelming) 14 \(\text{ge}5!\) (14
\(\text{e}3\) looks illogical since it frees
White’s forces: 15 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{xd}4\) 16
\(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{xc}2+\) 17 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{xd}4\) 18
\(\text{xd}7+\) \(\text{xd}7\) 19 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{c}5\) 20
\(\text{e}3\). White has the initiative for
the sacrificed pawn. The black
pieces are passively placed) 15 \(\text{f}2\)
g6!. Black’s plan is \(\text{g}7\), 0-0 and
\(\text{f}6\), or 0-0-0, depending
on White’s reply.
B2) 13 \(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{c}5\) 14 c3 (not 14
\(\text{e}2+\) \(\text{f}8\) and White loses mater-
ial) 14 0-0 15 \(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{bc}\) 16 \(\text{e}3\)
\(\text{e}8\). White has no constructive
plan.
B3) 13 \(\text{e}2+\) \(\text{e}7\) 14 \(\text{e}3\) (or 14
\(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{bc}\) 15 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{b}6\)! – like a scorp-
ion’s sting! – 16 \(\text{fg}\) \(\text{xd}4\) 17 \(\text{e}3\)
\(\text{b}4\) 14 \(\text{xe}3\) (we shall consider 14 \(\text{a}6!\) later) 15 \(\text{xc}3\)
(15 \(\text{fe}\) \(\text{b}4\) is more than satisfactory
for Black) 15 0-0 16 0-0-0 \(\text{c}5\).
Our original analysis finished here,
stating that Black was OK. While
writing this chapter the question
arose as to why White could not
play 17 \(\text{xd}5\). Well, after the most
obvious continuations Black must
lose!
B31) 17 \(\text{xd}4?\) 18 \(\text{f}6+!\) \(\text{h}8\)
(18 ... \(\text{gf}\) 19 \(\text{gf}\) \(\text{h}7\) 20 \(\text{g}7+\) 19 \(\text{xd}7\) \(\text{xb}5\) 20 \(\text{xc}5\).
B32) 17 \(\text{xd}4?\) 18 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{xd}4\)
19 \(\text{xd}7\) (6) and now:

B321) 19 \(\text{xd}7\) 20 \(\text{f}6+!\) \(\text{gf}\) 21
\(\text{gf}\) \(\text{h}7\) 22 \(\text{g}7+\).
B322) 19 ²e6 20 ²f6+! ²h8
(20 ²f1+ ²g7 22 ²e5 ±)
21 ²f3! g6 22 ²xe6 fe 23 ²xb7
±.
B323) 19 ... ²f5 20 ²e4 ²xd7 (20
²d6 21 ²e7+ ²h8 22 ²e2 g6
23 ²e5+ ±) 21 ²f6+ gf 22 ²f1+
²h8 (22 ²g7+ ²h8 24
²g5 ±) 23 ²f3 ±.
B324) 19 ²c6 20 ²xc6 bc 21
²e7+ (or 21 ²f6+ ²h8 22 ²f3 g6
23 ²c3 ±) 21 ²h7 (21 ²h8
22 g6 ±) 22 g6+ fg 23 ²g5 ²f6
24 ²xg6 ²xf2 25 ²e7! ±.
B325) 19 ... ²h8 20 ²xd4 ²xd7 21
²d1! g6 22 ²d4+! f6 23 ²f1 ±.
This mass of ‘knock-out’ lines
might scare Black’s supporters!
Is there any hope left?
Returning to the position after
17 ²xd5:
B33) 17 ²g4! (7)

This is it! This is the only move
that refutes White’s tricky 17 ²d5.
Some variations proving Black’s
decisive advantage: 18 ²xc6 (18
²f3? ²xd4 19 ²xd4 ²xd5! ±) 18
bc and now:
B331) 19 ²f6+ gf 20 ²g6 ²xf6 21 f3
²ad8 22 c3 ²e8 23 ²d3 (23 ²f2
²h8 ±±; 23 ²d2 ²xd4 24 cd
²xf3 ±) 23 ²xd4 24 cd ²f4+
25 ²d2 (25 ²b1 ²e3 ±) 25
²xf3 26 ²g5+ ²h7 ±±.
B332) 19 ²xg4 hg 20 ²c3 ²b6 21
²f4 (21 ²a4 ²xd4 22 ²xd4
²xd4 23 ²xd4 ²ad8 24 ²xg4
²e8 ±; 22 ²xd4 ²b5 ±) 21
²ad8 22 ²ce2 (22 ²a4 ²b4 23
²xc5 ²xc5 24 ²xg4 ²c4 ±) 22
²e8 23 ²xg4 ²xd4 24 ²xd4
²xd4 25 ²xd4 ²b4 26 c3 ²c4
±±.
B332) 19 f3 ²xd5 20 fg ²fd8 21 c3
²xa2 22 ²d3 ²ab8 23 ²b1 (23
²d2 ²xd4 24 cd ²b4 ±) 23
²xb2 (23 ²c4! is simpler) 24
²xa2 ²xa2 25 ²xc6 ²c8 26 ²b1
(26 ²d4 ²xd4 ±±) 26 ... ²a3 ±±.
Since the results of 16 0-0-0 are
unsatisfactory for White, he must
look for another solution. Perhaps
16 ²d5 might be worth a try.
We’ll have to find out! 16 ... ²b4+
(16 ²a5+ 17 ²f1!) 17 ²f1 (17
²xb4? ²e8 ±; 17 ²d1 ²g4+
±±) 17 ²h3+ (17 ²xd4? 18
²f6+! – a well-known motif!) 18
²xh3 ²xd5 19 ²xc6 ²xd4 20
²xb7 ²ab8 21 ²f3 ²xb7 (Safest.
Black can hardly achieve more
than a draw) 22 ²xb7+ ²c4+ 23
²g2 ²g4+ 24 ²f1 ²c4+ with
perpetual check.
I don’t think it’s a disgrace for Black to drop half a point if his opponent plays correctly. However, there is an interesting possibility to avoid the ‘forced draw’: 14... a6 (8) and now:

a) 15 ♘a4 (probably the weakest)
15 ♗xe3 16 ♙xe3 (or 16 fe ♘b4)
16 0-0 17 ♗xd5 (17 0-0-0 ♘c5
with similar consequences as in the variation without a6) 17 ♙a5+! (now the difference is clear – the knight on d5 hangs) 18 ♘c3 ♙fe8 and White is faced with insoluble problems, e.g:
a1) 19 ♘b3 ♙d8 ≡ with the double threat of ... b5 and a bishop move somewhere (e.g. ♘b4).
a2) 19 ♘xc6 ♘a3! ≡ is killing.
a3) 19 0-0-0 ♘c5 ≡ winning material.
b) 15 ♘d3 ♗xe3 16 ♙xe3 (after
16 fe ♘b4 17 ♙d2 ♗xd4 18 ed ♘c8
Black has a promising position)
16 ♙b6! 17 ♘xc6 (17 ♗xd5
would be an error: 17 ♙xd4 18

Now White has:
C1) 13 ♘xc6 ♘xf2+ 14 ♘f1 bc and if 15 ♘xg4? then 15 hg 16 ♘xf2
♗hx4+ with a mating attack: 17 ♘e3 (17 ♘f1 ♘g3! ≡) 17 ♘g5+ 18 ♘d4 (It’s not an endgame yet!
The centralization of the king doesn’t help. Other possibilities:
18 ♗f2 ♘h2+ etc ≡; 18 ♘d3
♕a6+ etc ≡) 18 e5+ 19 ♘c5
♗e7+ 20 ♘xc6 (10)
It looks like an avant-garde painting! It’s a matter of taste how to mate the white king. A recommendation: 20 \textit{$\text{d}7+$ 21 $\text{xd5}$} (or 21 $\text{b7}$ $\text{b5+}$ 22 $\text{xa8}$ $\text{xf7}$ mate) 21 $\text{c8}$ etc.

C2) 13 $\text{Xg4}$ $\text{xd4}$ 14 $\text{f3}$ (of course not 14 $\text{h5}$ $\text{hx4}$) 14 $\text{h4}$ (with his advance to g6
White has not achieved his aim, and suddenly the attacker has become a target) 15 $\text{e2}$ $\text{e5}$ (intending 16 $\text{xf2+}$ 17 $\text{xf2}$ $\text{xf3+}$ 18 $\text{f1}$ $\text{xf2+}$ 19 $\text{xf2}$ $\text{xg1}$ winning the exchange) 16 $\text{g5}$ (after 16 $\text{f1}$ $\text{xc3}$ 17 $\text{bc}$ $\text{xf3}$ Black stands better) 16 $\text{xc3+}$ (16 $\text{xf2+}$ is not good because of 17 $\text{f1}$ $\text{h3+}$ 18 $\text{g2}$ $\text{g4}$ favours Black) 17 $\text{xf3+}$ 18 $\text{xf3}$ $\text{xe4+}$ 20 $\text{xe4}$ de, and Black has good chances to grab the full point.

White’s final alternative in diagram 3 is:

D

11 $\text{Xg4}$ hg
12 g6 f6! (11)

12 $\text{h4}$ is not in tune with Black’s conception since there follows 13 $\text{g6+}$ $\text{xf7}$ 14 $\text{e3}$ preparing $\text{d2}$ and 0-0-0, when it is White who has a dangerous initiative for the sacrificed pawn. The same goes for 12 $\text{h4}$ 13 $\text{g6+}$ $\text{xf7}$ 14 $\text{e3}$ $\text{b4}$ 15 $\text{d2}$.

However, after

13 $\text{xc6}$ bc
14 $\text{xg4}$ d4
15 $\text{e2}$ $\text{b8}$

Black is OK.

Now we return to diagram 3 and the game Sznapik-Adorjan.

11 $\text{xc6}$ bc
12 $\text{xg4}$ hg
13 $\text{xg4}$ d4 (12)
14  \( \text{\#e2} \)

Probably the best. Alternatives:
a) 14  \( \text{\#d1} \)  \( \text{\#a5+} \)  15  \( \text{\#d2} \) (After 15  \( \text{\#c3} \)  \( \text{\#a6} \)  16  \( \text{\#g6} \)  f5  17  \( \text{\#f5+} \)  18  \( \text{\#d2} \)  \( \text{\#xh4!} \)  19  \( \text{\#f3} \)  \( \text{\#e4} \) White has no defence. 15  \( \text{\#f1} \) might be better than the text but after 15  \( \text{\#e5} \)  16  \( \text{\#g3} \)  \( \text{\#d6} \) Black has sufficient counterplay) 15  \( \text{\#b5} \) (13) and now:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{13 W}
\end{array} \]

1) 16  \( \text{\#c3} \)  \( \text{\#a6} \)  17  \( \text{\#c4} \)  dc  18  \( \text{\#xd3} \)  \( \text{\#h3} \)  19  \( \text{\#g4} \)  \( \text{\#b4!} \)  20  \( \text{\#c3} \)  \( \text{\#xc3} \)  21  \( \text{\#xc3} \)  \( \text{\#d3} \) (threatening 22  \( \text{\#h4} \)  22  \( \text{\#g6} \)  22  \( \text{\#d1} \)  \( \text{\#e3+!} \) mating) 22  \( \text{\#f5} \)  23  \( \text{\#ef} \)  24  \( \text{\#d1} \)  \( \text{\#e3+} \) and Black wins.

a2) 16  \( \text{\#b3} \)  \( \text{\#a6} \)  17  \( \text{\#c4} \)  dc  18  \( \text{\#xc3} \)  \( \text{\#d3} \)  19  \( \text{\#g3} \) (19  \( \text{\#d1} \)  0-0-0  20  \( \text{\#g3} \)  \( \text{\#b4} \)  21  \( \text{\#xd3} \)  \( \text{\#xd3} \) and now 22  \( \text{\#b1} \)  \( \text{\#xh4} \)  or 22  \( \text{\#a4} \)  \( \text{\#xd8} \)  0-0-0  20  \( \text{\#xd3} \)  \( \text{\#xd3} \)  21  \( \text{\#g3} \)  \( \text{\#xh4} \)  22  \( \text{\#xd3} \)  \( \text{\#h1}+ \)  22  \( \text{\#h1} \)  \( \text{\#b4} \)  22  \( \text{\#b1} \)  22  \( \text{\#c1} \)  \( \text{\#hd8} \)  22  \( \text{\#hd8} \)  21  \( \text{\#c5} \) (more accurate than the immediate capture on h4) 22  \( \text{\#g2} \)  \( \text{\#xh4} \) and Black is on top again.

b) 14  \( \text{\#b1} \) (this can’t be better than 14  \( \text{\#e2} \)  14  \( \text{\#a5+} \)  15  \( \text{\#d2} \)  \( \text{\#b5} \)  16  \( \text{\#b3} \)  \( \text{\#a6} \)  17  \( \text{\#h5} \) (after 17  \( \text{\#g6} \)  \( \text{\#xh4!} \)  18  \( \text{\#f7} \)  19  \( \text{\#f3} \)  \( \text{\#e5} \)  20  \( \text{\#g4} \)  \( \text{\#h5} \) White can resign; 17  \( \text{\#c4} \) dc  18  \( \text{\#xc3} \) is variation a2) 17 0-0-0 and it is hard to suggest a reasonable continuation for White. For example, 18  \( \text{\#a4} \)  \( \text{\#e5} \) and Black has excellent play for his pawn.

14  e5

For 14  \( \text{\#b8} \) see the game Schmittdiehl-Adorjan, Dortmund 1984, below. The attempt 14  \( \text{...d3} \) leads to a very sharp game. 15  \( \text{\#d3} \) and now:

a) 16  \( \text{\#d2} \) e5 regaining the pawn.
b) 16  \( \text{\#g3} \)  \( \text{\#b4+} \) and now:
b1) 17  \( \text{\#fl} \)  \( \text{\#d1+} \)  18  \( \text{\#g2} \) e5  19  \( \text{\#f3} \)  \( \text{\#xh4} \)  20  \( \text{\#g1} \)  \( \text{\#e1} \) and White is suffocated.
b2) 17  \( \text{\#c3} \)  \( \text{\#c4} \)  18  \( \text{\#g6?!} \) (18  \( \text{\#d2} \) e5 and White will lose the h4 pawn, although that is the least of his worries) 18  \( \text{\#a6!} \)  19  \( \text{\#f7} \) and White’s position is critical.
c) 16  \( \text{\#c3} \)  \( \text{\#b4} \)  17  \( \text{\#d2} \) e5  18  \( \text{\#e2} \) (18  \( \text{\#g3} \)  \( \text{\#c2} \)  19  \( \text{\#xe5+} \)  \( \text{\#e6} \) is complicated but should be fine for Black) 18  \( \text{\#xe2} \)  19  \( \text{\#xe2} \)  \( \text{\#xd2}+ \)  20  \( \text{\#xd2} \)  \( \text{\#xh4} \) and Black is OK.

Well, Black has a pleasant choice on move 14, which shows that the whole conception abounds with colourful possibilities.

15  \( \text{\#g3} \)  \( \text{\#d6} \)
16  f4?!
This looks suspect. 16 \( \text{a}d2 \) also came into consideration, e.g. 16...
\( \text{wb}6 \) 17 b3 (17 0-0-0 \( \text{bb}8 \) 18 b3 a5 with an attack) 17 a5 followed by a4 and ... a6, with a dangerous initiative.

16 \( \text{a}6! \)
17 fe \( \text{b}4+?! \)
17 \( \text{wa}5+ \) is better, e.g.:
a) 18 \( \text{zf}2? \) c5 \( \text{=f} \). Black wins at least the exchange.
b) 18 \( \text{a}d2 \) xe5 19 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 20 \( \text{ah}1 \) \( \text{b}8 \) and White’s position is miserable.
c) 18 \( \text{a}d1 \) xe5 19 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 20 \( \text{ah}1 \) 0-0-0 21 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{de}8 \) 22 \( \text{d}3 \) d6 23 e5 \( \text{xe}5 \) 24 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 25 \( \text{f}4 \) e4 26 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 27 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{xg}5 \)! 28 \( \text{c}1 \) (20 \( \text{d}2? \) \( \text{g}2 \)) 20... c5, with a hopeless endgame for White.

18 \( \text{d}2?! \)

Dubious, or even bad. Alternatives:
a) 18 \( \text{d}1 \) d3 19 \( \text{c}3 \) xc3 20 bc \( \text{a}5 \) is bad for White.
b) 18 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 19 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{c}5! \) with a strong initiative.
c) 18 c3! dc 19 bc \( \text{c}5 \) 20 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 21 \( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{xc}5 \) 22 \( \text{d}4 \) is unclear.
18 \( \text{xd}2+ \)
19 \( \text{xd}2 \)
20 \( \text{d}1 \)
20 c3 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{=f} \).
20 0-0-0
21 \( \text{f}4 \)

After 21 \( \text{c}1 \) c5 22 \( \text{b}3 \) (or 22 b3 d3 intending 23 \( \text{c}3 \)) 22...

\[ \text{wb}6 \] White is in trouble.

21 ... \( \text{xe}5 \)
22 \( \text{g}4+ \) \( \text{b}8 \) (14)

23 a4?

A bad mistake. 23 \( \text{d}3 \) would offer stronger resistance, but there is no question about the result: 23 \( \text{h}2 \) 24 \( \text{g}3+ \) (24 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{e}2+ \) 25 \( \text{xe}2 \) \( \text{g}1+ \) 26 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{a}1 \) 27 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 28 \( \text{x}c6 \) a5 \( \text{=f} \); 24 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{xh}4 \) \( \text{=f} \) 24 \( \text{xg}3 \) 25 \( \text{xg}3 \) \( \text{xh}4 \) 26 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{h}2 \) (26 \( \text{xe}4 \) 27 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{e}2+ \) 28 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 29 \( \text{ae}1 \) and White gains some space. A tactical line: 29 \( \text{xc}5 \) 30 \( \text{xe}2 \) \( \text{x}c2 \) 31 \( \text{xc}2 \) d3+ 32 \( \text{d}2 \) de 33 \( \text{xe}2 \) and White might survive). Black’s last move cuts off the communication between the white pieces and leaves him much better.

23 d3
24 c3 d2

The rest needs no comment.

25 g6 \( \text{c}4 \)
26 \( \text{g}2 \) f5
27 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{xf}4 \)
28  \( \text{Qx}f4  \)  \( \text{Qx}h4  \)
29  \( \text{Qg}2  \)  \( \text{Qb}3+  \)
30  \( \text{Qe}2  \)  \( \text{Qxe}4+  \)

White resigned.

Two rounds later I played against Schmittdiel, a local player, who presumably had prepared an improvement on the previous game. I wanted to pre-empt him at an early stage by choosing another continuation from diagram 12.

14  \( \text{Qe}2  \)  \( \text{b}8?!  \)

The game went as follows:

15  \( \text{h}5  \)

After 15 \( \text{g}6  \) \( \text{Qx}h4  \) 16 \( \text{gf}+  \) \( \text{Qxf}7  \)
17 \( \text{Qg}6+  \) \( \text{Qg}8  \) 18 \( \text{Qg}5  \) \( \text{Qa}5+  \) 19 \( \text{c}3  \)
dc 20 bc \( \text{Qh}7  \) Black is threatening \( \text{Qb}2  \) with a very dangerous attack.

15  ...  \( \text{Qa}6  \)

16  \( \text{Qd}2  \)

16 \( \text{g}6  \) \( \text{Qa}5+  \) (16 \( \text{f}5  \) doesn’t work: 17 \( \text{ef}  \) \( \text{Qb}4+  \) 18 \( \text{c}3  \) dc 19 bc
\( \text{Qf}6  \) 20 \( \text{Qd}2  \) 0-0 21 \( \text{Qd}4!  \) 17 \( \text{Qd}2  \)
\( \text{Qx}h5  \) 18 \( \text{gf}+  \) \( \text{Qxf}7  \) 19 \( \text{Qf}4+  \) \( \text{Qg}8  \)
20 \( \text{Qg}3  \) e5! 21 \( \text{Qxh}5  \) ef 22 \( \text{Qxf}4  \)
\( \text{Qxb}2  \) and Black enjoys a slight edge.

16  \( \text{Qxb}2  \)

17  \( \text{g}6  \)  \( \text{f}5!  \)

18  \( \text{ef}  \)  \( \text{ef}  \)

19  \( \text{Qxf}5?  \)

Better was 19 \( \text{Qxd}4  \) \( \text{Qxd}4  \) 20 \( \text{Qxd}4  \) \( \text{Qxh}5  \), and now:

a) 21 0-0-0? \( \text{Qa}3  \) 22 \( \text{Qc}3  \) \( \text{Qb}7+  \) 23
\( \text{Qd}2  \) \( \text{Qd}7  \) 24 \( \text{Qe}1  \) (24 \( \text{Qe}3  \) \( \text{Qe}7+  \\
25 \( \text{Qf}3  \) c5 and Black must win) 24

b) 21 \( \text{Qc}3  \) \( \text{Qb}7  \) (21 ... \( \text{Qb}8  \) 22 \( \text{Qe}6  \\
22 \( \text{Qd}2  \) with a lot of fight left.

19  \( \text{Qe}7!  \) (15)

20  \( \text{Qf}7+  \\

a) 20 0-0-0 \( \text{Qb}5  \)  \\

b) 20 \( \text{Qf}3  \) \( \text{Qxe}2+  \) (20 \( \text{Qxe}2  \) 21
\( \text{Qxc}6+  \) ) 21 \( \text{Qxe}2  \) \( \text{Qxe}2  \) 22 \( \text{Qxe}2  \\
\( \text{Qxh}5  \). The endgame is favourable for Black.

20  \( \text{Qxf}7  \\

21  \( \text{gf}+  \)  \( \text{Qxf}7  \\

22  \( \text{Qxd}4  \)  \( \text{Qxh}5  \\

23  \( \text{Qc}3  \)  \( \text{Qb}8  \\

24  \( \text{Qg}3  \\

a) 24 \( \text{Qd}2  \) \( \text{Qd}5  \) 25 \( \text{Qe}3  \) \( \text{Qe}8+  \) 26
\( \text{Qf}3  \) c5 27 \( \text{Qb}3  \) \( \text{Qb}7+  \)  \\

b) 24 \( \text{Qxc}6  \) \( \text{Qe}8+  \) 25 \( \text{Qd}1  \) (25 \( \text{Qe}5+  \\
\( \text{Qxe}5+  \) 26 \( \text{Qxe}5  \) \( \text{Qxe}5+  \) 27 \( \text{Qd}2- \\
27 \( \text{Qd}1  \) \( \text{Qd}5+  \)  \\
27 \( \text{Qe}2+  \\
28 \( \text{Qc}3  \) \( \text{Qxf}2  \)  \\
25 \( \text{Qc}5  \\
26 \( \text{Qe}5+  \) (26 \( \text{Qb}4  \) \( \text{Qxc}3  \) 27 \( \text{Qxa}6  \) \( \text{c}6  \\
26 \( \text{Qxe}5  \\
27 \( \text{Qxe}5  \) \( \text{Qd}5+  \\
28 \( \text{Qc}1  \) \( \text{Qxe}5  \\
and Black has real winning chances.

24  \( \text{Qe}8+  \\

25  \( \text{Qe}3  \\

25  \( \text{Qe}3  \\

25  \( \text{Qe}3  \\

25  \( \text{Qe}3  \\

25  \( \text{Qe}3  \\

25 \textit{\textit{\textbullet}}d2  \textit{\textbullet}d5  26 \textit{\textbullet}c1  \textit{\textbullet}a3+  27 \	extit{\textbullet}b1  \textit{\textbullet}xd4  \textit{\textbullet}.

25 \ldots  \textit{\textbullet}xe3+

26 fe (16)

26 \textit{\textbullet}b4!  \textit{\textbullet}.

The point. White has no escape.
The rest is an easy technical win.

27 \textit{\textbullet}xb4

27 \textit{\textbullet}d2  \textit{\textbullet}h2+  \textit{\textbullet}.

27 \ldots  \textit{\textbullet}h1+

28 \textit{\textbullet}d2  \textit{\textbullet}xa1

29 \textit{\textbullet}xc6  g5!

30 \textit{\textbullet}xa7  g4

31 \textit{\textbullet}d6  \textit{\textbullet}e6

32 \textit{\textbullet}f4  \textit{\textbullet}d5

33 c4+  \textit{\textbullet}xc4

34 \textit{\textbullet}c8  \textit{\textbullet}xa2+

35 \textit{\textbullet}e1  \textit{\textbullet}e2+

36 \textit{\textbullet}d1  \textit{\textbullet}a6

37 \textit{\textbullet}b6+  \textit{\textbullet}e4

38 \textit{\textbullet}d7  \textit{\textbullet}b5

39 \textit{\textbullet}c5+  \textit{\textbullet}f3

40 \textit{\textbullet}e6  \textit{\textbullet}a4+

41 \textit{\textbullet}c1  \textit{\textbullet}a1+

42 \textit{\textbullet}d2  \textit{\textbullet}d1+

43 \textit{\textbullet}c3  g3

and White finally resigned.

The novelty, 10 \textit{\textbullet}d5!, was recognized as the most important one of \textit{Informant} 38.
Playing a new and good move at an early stage of the game is becoming more and more difficult. The theory of such openings as the Ruy Lopez has developed so far that innovations are occurring later and later.

A typical example is the game Adorjan-Ivkov, Vrbas 1980, when I improved on the 28th move of the game Karpov-Ivkov, Bugojno 1980!

So an innovation on the fifth move in a very well known position has a flabbergasting effect. Certainly, I wonder if it will stand the test of time.

\[
\begin{array}{c c c c}
1 & d4 & e5 & 6 \\
2 & c4 & e6 & \\
3 & d3 & b6 & \\
4 & g3 & a6 & \\
5 & b3 & b5!? \ (17)
\end{array}
\]

In high-level tournaments, as far as I know, this original move first appeared in Ivkov-Adorjan, Stara Pazova 1983. However, it was only after the 1983 Indonesian tournament — where it was played twice, in Torre-Adorjan (round one) and Seirawan-Adorjan (round seven) — that this move was seen outside Hungary. Not long ago, I came across a copy of the Polish magazine Szachy (June 1985) and I was surprised by an article written by IM Dobozs. He quotes some games in which the move \(5 \ldots b5!?\) had been played by him in 1982 and 1979! There is nothing new under the sun. Nevertheless, his idea connected with \(5 \ b5!?\) does not fit with that of the Indonesian games.

That was the preamble. Now let us get down to business!

‘First of all, complete your development!’ says a golden rule. However, chess is not always strictly logical; it has exceptions too. As you know, you should not move the same piece twice in the opening. But if you have a good reason to do so, why not?

The essence of Black’s idea is to
gain control of the centre by exchanging the ‘less valuable’ b-pawn for White’s c-pawn and then offering a ‘c5 for d4’ exchange. In the main line, after 6 cb Qxb5 7 Qc3 Qb4 8 Qd2 Qxc3 9 Qxc3 Black gets active counterplay by a5-a4, as you will see later in the game Torre-Adorjan.

It is true that, because of the pawn structure, if an ending should arise, White can get a strong passed b-pawn. But to go into an ending you must survive the middlegame and during the middlegame controlling the centre has very great importance.

Is this move a cure-all? Certainly not. I only want to prove that this is just as good a line as the other ones. And it has a particular advantage: it is relatively rare and your opponents won’t have a home library on it.

Well, let us see what has happened in practice since the first appearance of 5 ... b5!? We shall consider four possible replies, of which the first two are by far the most important.

A 6 Qg2
B 6 cb
C 6 c5
D 6 Qbd2

6 Qg2

This continuation gives Black no trouble.

\[
\begin{align*}
6 & \ldots & \text{bc} \\
7 & Qe5 & Qb4+ (18)
\end{align*}
\]

The motifs of this line remind us of the position arising after 4 g3 Qa6 5 b3 d5 6 Qg2 dc 7 Qe5 Qb4+. The difference is that in diagram 18 Black’s d-pawn is still on its original square and so Black can block the long diagonal at the appropriate time.

A1 8 Qf1
A2 8 Qd2
A3 8 Qd2

A1

8 Qf1 d5
9 bc 0-0
10 cd

Others:

a) 10 Qa4 c5 11 a3 Qa5 12 dc Qfd7 with an excellent game for Black.
b) 10 c5 Qfd7 11 Qa4 (11 Qxd7 Qxd7) 11 Qxe5 12 Qxb4 Qc4
13 Qd2 (13 Qf4? Qf6) 13 Qf6
14 Qc3 (14 Qxc4 Qxd4) 14 ... Qc6

10 ... Qxd5
11 Qb3?!
A pointless excursion. 11 $\text{f3}$ is the recommended move here.

11 $\text{c5}$
12 $\text{a3}$ $\text{a5}$
13 $\text{dxc4}$ $\text{c7}$
14 $\text{d3}$

Or 14 $\text{xb2}$ $\text{xe5!}$ 15 $\text{xe5}$ $\text{c6}$
16 $\text{d6}$ (16 $\text{xb2}$ $\text{b8}$ 17 $\text{xc2}$ $\text{cxf4}$!
18 gf $\text{xb2}$) 16 $\text{d4}$ 17 $\text{a4}$
$\text{xe2+}$ 18 $\text{g1}$ (18 $\text{e1}$ $\text{f6}$) 18 $\text{xf6}$ 19 $\text{xf8}$ $\text{xf8}$ 20 $\text{a2}$
$\text{f4!}$ 21 gf (21 $\text{d2}$ $\text{b5}$) 21...
$\text{f3+}$ 22 $\text{xf3}$ $\text{g6+}$ and Black mates.

14 $\ldots$ $\text{c6}$
15 $\text{b2}$ $\text{b8}$
16 $\text{c2}$ $\text{xd3}$
17 $\text{d}$ $\text{xb2}$!
18 $\text{wxf6}$ 19 $\text{xf8}$ $\text{xf8}$ 20 $\text{a2}$
$\text{xf4!}$ 21 gf (21 $\text{d2}$ $\text{b5}$) 21...
$\text{f3+}$ 22 $\text{xf3}$ $\text{g6+}$ and Black mates.

After 19 $\text{a2}$, 19 $\text{xf6}$ wins.

19 $\text{wd7!}$
20 $\text{d4}$ $\text{xd4}$
21 $\text{wa2}$ $\text{b8}$
22 $\text{wd3}$ $\text{e5}$
23 $\text{wd1}$

Or 23 $\text{xd4}$ $\text{b1+}$ 24 $\text{e2}$
$\text{f4+!}$ 25 $\text{e3}$ $\text{xg2+}$ 26 $\text{e4}$
$\text{c6+}$ 27 $\text{xe5}$ $\text{f6}$ mate!

23 $\ldots$ $\text{b5+}$
24 $\text{e1}$ $\text{d3+}$
25 $\text{d2}$ $\text{xf2}$

White resigns

This was Hawksworth-Wells, Oakham 1984.

A2

8 $\text{d2}$ $\text{cb!}$

And now:

A21 9 $\text{xb4}$
A22 9 $\text{ab}$

A21

9 $\text{xb4}$ $\text{b2}$
10 $\text{c3}$ $\text{ba}$
11 $\text{xa1}$ ($19$)

19

B

11 $\text{d5}$
11 $\ldots$ $\text{c6}$ also deserves consideration, e.g. 12 0-0 $\text{d5}$; 12 $\text{a3}$ $\text{a5}$
13 $\text{c1}$ $\text{d5}$ 14 $\text{xd5}$ cd with the idea of...

12 0-0

12 $\text{d1}$ combined with $\text{a4}$
seems to be strong, but Black still has defensive ‘reserves’. After 12
$\text{fd7}$ 13 $\text{a4}$ f6 14 $\text{c6}$ $\text{c8}$, it is Black who has a threat ($\ldots$ $\text{b6}$).
White has inadequate compensation for the material deficit.

12 $\ldots$ $\text{fd7}$
13 $\text{xd7}$ $\text{xd7}$

After 13 $\text{xd7}$ 14 $\text{el}$ $\text{c6}$
15 $\text{c5}$ $\text{c7}$ 16 e4 $\text{de}$ 17 $\text{xe4}$, in
spite of his material loss, White is
able to hold his position by active counterplay. If the occasion arises, White can become threatening with $\text{b2/c1}$ and then $\text{a3}$.

14 $\text{e1}$ $\text{b8}$
15 $\text{a3}$
15 $\text{a3}$ $\text{c5}!$ 16 dc $\text{a5}$ 17 $\text{c1}$ 0-0 18 c6 $\text{f8}$!.
15 $\text{c4}$
16 $\text{e4}$ a5!
17 $\text{xa5}$ 0-0
18 ed ed
19 $\text{xd5} \text{xd5}$
20 $\text{xd5} \text{b7}$

Black has better chances.

A22

9 ab $\text{xd2+}$
10 $\text{xd2}$ (20)

10 c6

Not 10 $\text{c5}?!$ 11 $\text{a5!} \text{b7}$ 12 $\text{c3} \text{c6} 13 \text{xc6 xc6}$ (13 ... bc 14 $\text{e4} \pm$) 14 $\text{xd5}$ ed 15 $\text{xd5}$ with the better position for White. However, 10 ... d5 (!) looks more attractive, for instance 11 $\text{c3}$ (11 0-0 c5?! 12 dc $\text{c7}$) 11 0-0 (now 11 ... c5 does not work

because of 12 dc $\text{c7}$ 13 $\text{d4}$, and the e2 pawn is defended) 12 0-0 $\text{fd7} 13 \text{fd1 xc5} 14 \text{d6 b7} 15 \text{e4} c6 and White's compensation is nebulous.

11 0-0 0-0
12 $\text{c1} \text{b6}$

On 12 $\text{b7}$, 13 $\text{c4}?!$.

13 $\text{c3} \text{b5}$

14 $\text{xb5} \text{xb5}$
15 $\text{c4} \text{b6}$
15 a5 is worth consideration, but 16 $\text{c2}!$ looks strong, while 15 $\text{xb3}??$ loses to 16 $\text{b4}$.

16 $\text{b4} \text{a6}$
17 $\text{xb6} \text{ab}$

18 $\text{xd7}!!$

An interesting exchange.

18 ... $\text{xd7}$
19 $\text{xc6} \text{b5}$
20 $\text{xb5}$

20 $\text{c1} \text{a7}!$ 21 $\text{xb5} \text{db8}$
22 $\text{c4}$ (22 $\text{c2} \text{b4}$) 22 ... $\text{c7} 23 \text{xa7} \text{xb5} 24 \text{a8} (24 \text{a5} \text{d6}$
25 $\text{c7} \text{d8}$ followed by $\text{f8-e8}$ and $\text{d7}) 24 ... $\text{d7}$, with only a slightly better position for White.

20 $\text{b6}$

21 $\text{xa6} \text{xa6}$

22 $\text{xa6} \text{c4}$

23 $\text{bc} \text{a8}$

24 $\text{b5} \text{a2}$

25 c5 $\text{f8}$

26 h4 e5

27 de $\text{a5}$

Draw agreed

Cserna-Dobosz, Balatonbereny 1982.
A3

8 \(\text{c}d2\) (21)

8 c6!

A sober and strong move. The inviting forceful continuations are worse, e.g. 8 \(\text{c}c3\) 9 \(\text{b}b1\) \(\text{x}d4\) (9 c6 10 0-0 \(\text{x}d4\) 11 \(\text{d}xc4\) \(\text{xe}5\) 12 \(\text{xe}5\) 0-0 13 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{e}e8\) 14 \(\text{d}6\), with awkward pressure) 10 \(\text{xa}8\) \(\text{xe}5\) 11 \(\text{xc}4\) with advantage to White; or 8 ... c3 9 \(\text{xa}8\) c6 10 0-0 cd 11 \(\text{xd}2\) \(\text{xd}2\) 12 \(\text{xd}2\) \(\text{d}5\) 13 \(\text{fc}1\) \(\text{b}6\) (13 0-0!? with the idea of ... f5-f4 also merits consideration) 14 \(\text{xc}6\) \(\text{xc}6\) 15 \(\text{xc}6\) dc 16 \(\text{xc}6\), when White’s rook and two pawns seem to be more valuable than Black’s two minor pieces.

9 \(\text{exc}4\) d5!

This is the right answer! Picking up the pawn with 9 \(\text{xc}4\) 10 bc \(\text{c}c3\) 11 \(\text{b}1\) \(\text{x}d4\) leads, after 12 \(\text{e}4\)! \(\text{e}5\) 13 \(\text{d}6\)+, to drudgery for Black.

10 \(\text{a}3\)

10 \(\text{e}5\)? \(\text{c}3\).

10 \(\text{xa}3\)

11 \(\text{xa}3\) c5!

Black is OK – as usual.
We now consider White’s second possibility from diagram 17.

B

6 cb

This is the natural continuation.
6 \(\text{xb}5\) (22)

In diagram 22 three moves have been tried.
B1 7 \(\text{a}3\)
B2 7 \(\text{c}3\)
B3 7 \(\text{g}2\)

B1

7 \(\text{a}3\)

This move does not cause Black any problems.

7 ... \(\text{xa}3\)
8 \(\text{xa}3\) \(\text{c}6\)
9 \(\text{g}2\) a5
10 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{d}5\)
11 0-0 \(\text{c}6\)

Black has a comfortable position.
11 0-0 12 \(\text{cd}2?!\) \(\text{a}6\)!, with the idea of c5, was also good.

12 \(\text{cd}2\) 0-0
13 \text{\textit{\v{c}c}1?!}

A dubious move. Perhaps White should play 13 $\text{\textit{\v{c}b}}1$, when Black should continue 13 $\text{\textit{\v{e}7}}$.

13 ... $\text{\textit{\v{a}7}}$!

14 $\text{\textit{\v{c}2}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{a}8}}$!

Black has taken the initiative: his pieces are efficiently and pleasantly posted. White stands worse, but he should not lose in three moves!

15 e3?

15 a3? loses to 15 $\text{\textit{\v{d}x}d}4$. 15 $\text{\textit{\v{c}3}}$ is a realistic try to parry the direct threats, but after 15 $\text{\textit{\v{b}8}}$ 16 $\text{\textit{\v{f}e}1}$ $\text{\textit{\v{e}7}}$! there is not a sound plan within sight for White, while Black can still improve his position.

15 ... a4

16 $\text{\textit{\v{c}3}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{b}8}}$

17 $\text{\textit{\v{e}1}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{b}4}}$

White resigns

Maybe a little early, but not without reason – Al-Oman–Stohl, Finland (World Under 20 Championship) 1984.

B2

7 $\text{\textit{\v{d}c}3}$ (23)

This is the logical move. Schmidt-Dobosz, Poland 1979, continued 7 $\text{\textit{\v{a}6}}$ 8 $\text{\textit{\v{g}2}}$ c5?! (8 ... d5 deserves consideration, after which 9 0-0 c5 would transpose into the lines considered under B31) 9 d5 $\text{\textit{\v{b}7}}$ 10 e4 ed 11 $\text{\textit{\v{x}d}5}$ $\text{\textit{\v{x}d}5}$ 12 ed $\text{\textit{\v{e}7}}$ 13 0-0 d6 14 $\text{\textit{\v{d}2}}$ 0-0 15 $\text{\textit{\v{c}4}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{d}7}}$ 16 $\text{\textit{\v{f}4}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{f}6}}$ 17 $\text{\textit{\v{e}1}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{e}8}}$ 18 $\text{\textit{\v{d}2}}$ a5 19 a4 $\text{\textit{\v{f}8}}$ 20 $\text{\textit{\v{x}e}8}$ $\text{\textit{\v{x}e}8}$ 21 $\text{\textit{\v{d}1}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{c}6}}$ 22 $\text{\textit{\v{e}1}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{c}7}}$ 23 $\text{\textit{\v{d}2}}$, with a position already won for White.

8 $\text{\textit{\v{d}2}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{x}c}3}$

8 $\text{\textit{\v{c}6}}$ proved good enough for a draw in Kavalek-Browne, US Championship 1984, after 9 $\text{\textit{\v{g}2}}$ 0-0 10 0-0 a5 11 $\text{\textit{\v{c}2}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{x}c}3}$ 12 $\text{\textit{\v{x}c}3}$ $\text{\textit{\v{e}4}}$ (The idea is similar to the line 4 g3 $\text{\textit{\v{a}6}}$ 5 $\text{\textit{\v{b}d}2}$ $\text{\textit{\v{b}4}}$ 6 $\text{\textit{\v{c}2}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{b}7}}$ 7 $\text{\textit{\v{g}2}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{e}4}}$, which was played in Tal-Bronstein, Tallinn 1981, among others. The essence of Black’s idea is to exploit the weaknesses of the light squares) 13 $\text{\textit{\v{d}2}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{c}6}}$ 14 $\text{\textit{\v{e}5}}$ $\text{\textit{\v{x}g}2}$ 15 $\text{\textit{\v{x}g}2}$ $\text{\textit{\v{x}e}5}$ 16 de $\text{\textit{\v{e}4}}$ 17 $\text{\textit{\v{e}3}}$ $\frac{1}{2}$-$\frac{1}{2}$. However, White’s position seems to be better after the obvious 17 $\text{\textit{\v{x}c}3}$ 18 $\text{\textit{\v{x}c}3}$.

9 $\text{\textit{\v{x}c}3}$ a5

This move is an obligatory and logical part of Black’s ‘rolling-up’ plan, since 9 0-0 10 b4 leads to White’s advantage.

10 $\text{\textit{\v{g}2}}$

Or 10 a4 $\text{\textit{\v{c}6}}$ with the idea of ... $\text{\textit{\v{d}5}}$ and ... $\text{\textit{\v{c}6}}$. 
10 \( \mathcal{D}d5 \)

The immediate 10 ... a4 was also worth considering.

Now White has tried:

B21 11 \( \mathcal{A}d2 \)
B22 11 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \)
B21

11 \( \mathcal{A}d2 \) a4
12 b4 \( \mathcal{A}c6 \)

A draw was now agreed in Torre-Adorjan, Indonesia 1983 (round one). In the final position Black has an excellent game, e.g.:

a) 13 0-0 \( \mathcal{W}f6 \)! 14 \( \mathcal{A}g5 \)! \( \mathcal{W}g6 \), with the twin threats of \( \mathcal{W}xb4 \) and \( \mathcal{C}c3 \). If instead 14 \( \mathcal{A}e1 \) then 14 a3 15 \( \mathcal{A}c1 \) d6, when White's pieces look paralysed.

b) 13 a3 \( \mathcal{W}f6 \)! 14 e4(!) (or 14 \( \mathcal{A}g5 \) \( \mathcal{W}g6 \) and now 15 \( \mathcal{A}c1 \) h6 16 \( \mathcal{A}d2 \) \( \mathcal{W}e4 \) and 15 \( \mathcal{W}b1 \) f5 16 \( \mathcal{A}d2 \) 0-0 17 \( \mathcal{W}d1 \) h6 18 0-0 \( \mathcal{W}f6 \) 19 \( \mathcal{A}c1 \) g5! both favour Black) 14 \( \mathcal{A}xd4 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}xd4 \) \( \mathcal{W}xd4 \) 16 ed \( \mathcal{W}e5+ \) 17 \( \mathcal{A}e3 \) \( \mathcal{W}c3+ \) =.

Equality – that is what we wanted. But of course, White should have been made to find this line. Yes, you are right – it is easier to work things out after the game.

B22

11 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \) a4
12 \( \mathcal{A}e5 \) 0-0
13 \( \mathcal{A}b2 \) d6
14 \( \mathcal{A}c4 \) ab
15 ab \( \mathcal{A}xa1+ \)
16 \( \mathcal{A}xa1 \) \( \mathcal{A}b6 \)
17 \( \mathcal{A}xb6 \) cb

18 d5

After 18 0-0 d5, Black's position is at least equal.

18 e5
19 0-0 \( \mathcal{W}d7 \)

Perhaps Black should try 19 \( \mathcal{A}a6 \) with the idea of \( \mathcal{D}d7 \).

20 f4 ef
21 \( \mathcal{W}xf4 \)

21 gff lends even more grist to Black's mill, e.g. 21 \( \mathcal{A}e8 \) 22 \( \mathcal{A}e1 \) \( \mathcal{W}g4 \) 23 e4 \( \mathcal{D}d7 \), with excellent counterplay for Black.

21 ... \( \mathcal{W}d8 \)
22 \( \mathcal{A}e4 \) f6
23 \( \mathcal{W}c2 \) h6
24 \( \mathcal{W}d2 \) \( \mathcal{D}d7 \)
25 \( \mathcal{A}b1 \) \( \mathcal{E}e8 \)
26 \( \mathcal{W}c2 \) \( \mathcal{F}f8 \)

Black stands better, Sygulski-Popović, Naleczow 1984, though the game was in fact drawn on move 52.

B3

7 \( \mathcal{A}g2 \) (24)

\[ \text{Diagram} \]
B31

7 d5
8 0-0

After 8 a3 not 8 xxa3 9 xa3 and now 9 ... c5? 10 b4 ± or 9 a6 10 b4 ±. Instead, 8...
d6! is adequate for Black. 8 c3 a6 (8 ... b4!?) 9 b4 also deserves consideration.

8 ... c5
9 c3 a6
10 g5 bd7
11 e1 c8?

A gross error. 11 ... cd 12 xd4 c8 was the right solution. 11 e7? is another mistake, because
of 12 e4 de 13 xe4 xe4 14 xe7 xf2 (14 xe7 15 xe4 ±) 15 xd8 xd1 16 a5 b2 17 de5
and Black’s position is helpless.

12 e4 de
12 ... cd 13 xd5!.

13 xe4 e7

Agreed drawn (?)

Guralka-Dobosz, Poland 1979. White’s decision is absolutely nonsensical, since after 14 xf6 he
has a clear advantage – indeed a winning position. By way of illustration: 14 xf6 (14 ... gf 15 d5
±) 15 xc5 xc5 16 dc xc5 17 xd8+ xd8 18 e5 c7 19 xc1 f8 20 c6+ e8 21 ed1
±, or 16 xd1 17 ed1 xc5 18 xc1 ± ±.

B32

7 a7
8 0-0 0-0

9 c3
9 a3!? a5 10 xe7 xe7 11 e5 a7 12 c3 a6 13 c1 d6
14 d3 is promising for White.

9 ... a6
10 b2 b7

Or 10 ... c5 11 d5!.

11 c2

White builds up his position by simple means.

11 a6
12 a3! c5
13 dc xc5
14 b4 a6

On 14 ce4, White stands better after 15 g5! xg5 16 xb7 b8 17 g2, with the threat of h4.

15 e4 c7
16 fd1

White’s space advantage is obvious. Black has no constructive plan.

16 ... c8
17 e2 d5
18 xc1

Or 18 e3!.

18 ... e8
19 e5 de
20 xe4 xe4

20 cd5 21 c5 xc5 22 bc wa4 23 d4 leads to an advantage
for White.

21 xe4 xe4
22 xe4 d5
23 xc8

23 d4! wa4 24 c6 f6 25 xa7 is even better than the text.
23  \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash w}xc8}
24  \texttt{\textbackslash c}c1

Even so, White is in firm control.
24  ...  \texttt{\textbackslash w}b7
25  \texttt{\textbackslash d}c6  \texttt{\textbackslash g}g5
26  \texttt{\textbackslash h}c5  \texttt{\textbackslash d}7

26 \texttt{a}6 is better.
27  \texttt{b}5  \texttt{h}6
28  \texttt{h}4  \texttt{f}5
29  \texttt{\textbackslash d}3  \texttt{\textbackslash f}6
30  \texttt{\textbackslash x}f6  \texttt{gf}
31  \texttt{\textbackslash c}4!  \texttt{\textbackslash a}8
32  \texttt{\textbackslash h}2  \texttt{\textbackslash e}8
33  \texttt{\textbackslash d}4  \texttt{\textbackslash d}8
34  \texttt{\textbackslash c}6  \texttt{\textbackslash e}7
35  \texttt{\textbackslash x}e6  \texttt{\textbackslash d}7
36  \texttt{\textbackslash e}2  \texttt{\textbackslash x}d4
37  \texttt{\textbackslash x}e7  \texttt{\textbackslash d}5
38  \texttt{\textbackslash x}a7  \texttt{\textbackslash c}5
39  \texttt{\textbackslash e}6+

\textbf{Black resigns}

A. Mikhailchishin-Aseyev, USSR 1984 (with the help of GM Mikhailchishin’s annotations).

The moral of the story: Black cannot equalize with either 7 ... d5 or 7 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7.

Let us see the third continuation.

\textbf{B33}

7  \texttt{c}5 (!)

\textbf{B331} 8 0-0
\textbf{B332} 8 dc
\textbf{B331}

8  0-0

8 \texttt{\textbackslash a}3 \texttt{\textbackslash a}6; 8 \texttt{\textbackslash e}5 d5 9 \texttt{\textbackslash c}3 cd!
10 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d4 \texttt{\textbackslash c}6 11 \texttt{\textbackslash x}c6 \texttt{\textbackslash x}c6 with the idea of \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 and \texttt{\textbackslash b}6, leads to a balanced game; for 8 dc, see later under B332.

8  \texttt{\textbackslash c}6 (25)

9 \texttt{\textbackslash a}3 (!)

And now it is White who must be on the alert. On other moves Black frees himself immediately, for example 9 \texttt{\textbackslash d}bd2 cd 10 \texttt{\textbackslash b}2 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 11 \texttt{\textbackslash c}4 0-0 12 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d4 \texttt{\textbackslash d}5! 13 \texttt{\textbackslash e}3 \texttt{\textbackslash b}7 14 \texttt{\textbackslash a}4?! (much better is 14 \texttt{\textbackslash g}4! \texttt{\textbackslash c}6 15 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f6+ \texttt{\textbackslash x}f6
16 \texttt{\textbackslash d}2 \texttt{\textbackslash x}b2 17 \texttt{\textbackslash x}b2 \texttt{\textbackslash b}6 18 \texttt{\textbackslash f}d1 d5 19 \texttt{\textbackslash a}c1 \texttt{\textbackslash a}c8 20 e3 with equality, as in the game Sinkovics-Adorjan, Hungarian Team Ch 1986 – drawn in 31) 14 ... \texttt{\textbackslash a}6! 15 \texttt{\textbackslash a}c1 \texttt{\textbackslash c}5 16 \texttt{\textbackslash d}4 \texttt{\textbackslash b}6 17 \texttt{\textbackslash c}4 d5
18 \texttt{\textbackslash c}2. Here a draw was agreed, but the position is \texttt{\textbackslash d} – Seirawan-Adorjan, Indonesia 1983.

9  \texttt{\textbackslash a}6

9 \texttt{\textbackslash a}5(?!?) did not work in Pinter-Schneider, Budapest 1983, because Black’s queen soon had to leave her post. The game went on 10 \texttt{\textbackslash c}1 \texttt{\textbackslash a}6 11 \texttt{\textbackslash b}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash e}8 12 \texttt{\textbackslash c}4 \texttt{\textbackslash c}7 13 \texttt{\textbackslash d}1 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f3 14 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f3 d5 15 \texttt{\textbackslash e}5 \texttt{\textbackslash e}7 (15 \texttt{\textbackslash d}6! 16 \texttt{\textbackslash d}3 0-0
was much better) 16 ♕d2 0-0 17 ♦ac1 and White got an ideal position which he duly converted into a win.

10 ♦bd2 ♦e7

GM Browne, who is a Queen’s Indian specialist, tried 10 ♦c8 against Tarjan in the 1984 US Championship and suffered an unexpected knockout defeat. There followed 11 ♦c1 ♦xf3? (11... ♢b7 12 ♢c4 d5 13 ♢ce5 ♦c7 14 ♢g5 0-0 15 ♢h3 ♕d6 16 ♢xf7 ♢xf7 17 ♢xe6 ♢e8 18 ♢xf7+ ♢xf7 19 ♢xf7 ♦xf7 20 dc also must be in White’s favour; here 13 ♤a5 is not promising for Black either: 14 ♢xc5 ♢xc5 - 14... ♢xc5 15 b4! ♕xb4 16 bc ±/± - 15 dc ♢xc5 16 ♕d4! ♕b6 17 ♤g4! ♤cd7 18 ♢xf6+ ♢xf6 19 ♤a4+ ♤c6 20 ♤a3, with decisive threats of attacking the black king stuck in the centre) 12 ♢xf3 cd (12... d5 13 dc and now: 13 ♢xc5? 14 ♕c2 ±; 13 ♢xc5 14 ♢xc5 ♢xc5 15 ♢xc5 ♢xc5 16 ♕c2 ±; 13 ♤a5 14 ♤b2 ♢xc5 - 14 ♢xc5? 15 a3 ± - 15 ♤xf6! gf 16 e4 ±) 13 ♤xf8 ♤xf8 (13... ♤xf8 14 ♤b7 ♤xc1 15 ♤xc1 is also hopeless) 14 ♤c4 ♤xc4 (14... d5 15 ♤d6+) 15 ♤xc4 e5 (Black’s resistance is only symbolic) 16 ♤c1 ♤b6 17 ♤a3 ♤c7 18 ♤fc1 ♤e6 19 ♤c8+ ♤d8 20 ♤c1c5 1-0.

After 10... ♤e7 two moves have been played:

B3311 11 ♤c1
B3312 11 dc
B3311
11 ♤c1 cd
12 ♤xe7 ♕xe7
13 ♤c4 0-0
14 ♕xd4 ♤xf3

In this position Timman played 14 d5 against van der Sterren (Dutch Ch 1987). After 15 ♤fe5 ♤fc8 16 ♤xc6 ♤xc6 17 ♤e5 ♤c7 18 ♤xc7 ♕xc7 19 ♤d3 White had some advantage.

15 ♤xf3

15 ef!? with the idea of f4-f5 is interesting.

15 ... d5
16 ♤e5 ♕fc8
17 ♤d3?!

It is not easy to find an adequate defence to 17 ♤c6. For example, 17 ♕b7 18 ♤a4 ♤c7 19 ♤c2 ♤ac8 20 ♤fc1 leaves White with a much better game. The right path is 17 ♕d6 18 ♤xa7 ♤c5! 19 ♤xc5 ♕xc5 20 ♕xc5 ♤xc5 21 ♤c1 ♤fd7 22 b4 ♤xa7 23 bc ♤c7 24 c6 ♤e5 with an equal game.

17 ♕b7
18 b4 ♤d4!
19 ♤fd1 ♕b6
20 ♕b2 ♤d6
21 a3 ♤c7
22 ♤c5 a5
23 e3?!

23 e4 would lead to a balanced position.

23 ... ab
24 $\text{hxb4}$
24 ab is better.

24 $\text{a5!}$
25 $\text{e4?!}$
26 $\text{xa3}$
27 $\text{g2}$
28 $\text{ed}$
29 $\text{d3}$
30 $\text{b1}$
31 $\text{e1}$

Time trouble. 31 g6 was the right move, with some advantage for Black.

32 $\text{e2}$
33 $\text{c6}$

Draw agreed

This was Smyslov-Belyavsky, Tilburg 1984.

B3312

11 $\text{dc}$ (26)

B33121 11 $\text{xc5}$
B33122 11 $\text{xc5}$ (!)
B33121

11 ... $\text{xc5}$
12 $\text{xc5}$
13 $\text{c1}$
14 $\text{e5}$

14 $\text{xc6}$ is not dangerous for Black after 14 ... $\text{dc}$ 15 $\text{xe4}$ $\text{xe4}$
16 $\text{e5}$ (16 $\text{d4}$? $\text{c3}$! $\text{xf7}$; 16 $\text{c2}$ $\text{f6}$ 17 $\text{xc6+}$ $\text{f8}$ $\text{xf7}$) 16 f5! (here Black has to be careful: 16 $\text{d5??}$ 17 $\text{xe4}$ $\text{xe4}$; 16 $\text{xd1??}$ 17 $\text{xd1}$ f5 18 $\text{xe4}$ fe 19 $\text{xc6}$! with an advantage to White) 17 $\text{xc6}$ $\text{c7}$. The position is dynamically balanced.

14 ... $\text{xd2}$
15 $\text{xd2}$

but draw agreed, Ivkov-Adorjan, Stara Pazova 1983. Instead of the text, 15 $\text{xc6??}$ would have been a big error because of 15 $\text{dc}$ 16 $\text{xc6+}$ $\text{e7}$ 17 $\text{xa8}$ $\text{xf1}$ and wherever White's bishop moves Black wins by 18 $\text{d2}$.

Returning to the game, the encounter might have continued 15 $\text{xbg2}$ 16 $\text{xbg2}$ 0-0 17 $\text{fd1}$
18 $\text{c6}$ $\text{d7}$ (18 $\text{b6}$ does not look good either because of 19 $\text{b4}$) 19 $\text{a5}$ $\text{fc8}$ 20 $\text{xa7?}$
$\text{xc1}$ 21 $\text{xc1}$ $\text{e8}$! $\text{xf7}$. However, after the better 19 $\text{b4}$! Black must prepare himself for a long and not very pleasant 'massage'

B33122

11 $\text{xc5}$ (!)
12 $\text{c1}$
13 $\text{c6}$
14 $\text{e5}$

Better than 12 ... $\text{xc4}$? 13 $\text{xe7}$
$\text{xe7}$ 14 $\text{xc6!}$ $\text{dc}$ 15 $\text{xe4}$ $\text{xe4}$
16 $\text{c2}$ $\text{c5}$ 17 $\text{e5}$ $\text{xe5}$; or 12
$\text{xb7??}$ 13 $\text{b2}$ 0-0 14 $\text{c4}$ $\text{e8}$ 15
$\text{d3}$ $\text{e4}$ 16 $\text{xe3}$ d5 17 $\text{ce5}$ $\text{c5}$
18 \( \text{d}d4 \text{w}d6 19 \text{g}5 \text{w}xe5 \) (19 \( \text{x}g2 \) 20 \( \text{x}g2 \text{b}6? 21 \text{x}c5! followed by \( \text{d}3, b4 \) \( \pm\)) 20 \( \text{x}c5 \) \( \text{w}f5 \) 21 \( \text{x}c8 \text{x}c8 22 \text{f}3 \text{b}1 23 \text{h}3 \text{c}2 24 \text{xe}6 \text{c}7 25 \text{xf}7+ \text{xf}7 26 \text{xf}7 \text{xf}7 27 \text{c}1 \text{f}5 28 \text{c}7+ \text{g}6 29 \text{xb}7 1-0 Garcia Gonzalez-Cuartas, Thessaloniki Ol 1984.

13 \( \text{xe}7 \text{xe}7 \)
14 e4

The pawn is taboo, because of 14... \( \text{xe}4 \) (14... \( \text{xe}4? 15 \text{xc}6!) 15 \( \text{xe}4 \text{xe}4 16 \text{e}5 \text{d}5 17 \text{xe}4 \text{we}2.

14 0-0
15 \( \text{e}5 \)

15 \( \text{we}2 \) deserves examination. In the course of analysing we came to the conclusion that after this move Black can also equalize. Moreover, if White is careless, he may easily get into trouble! 15 \( \text{b}7! \) (this is the correct move since after 15... \( \text{c}5 16 \text{d}4 \text{b}7 17 \text{b}4 \) White emerges with an advantage) 16 \( \text{d}4 \text{b}4! 17 \text{e}5 \text{xg}2 18 \text{xg}2 \text{fd}5 19 \text{c}4 \text{fc}8 and now:

a) 20 \( \text{d}6? \text{xc}1 21 \text{xc}1 \text{f}6 and now White loses after 22 \text{f}4 \text{e}6 23 \text{fe} \text{g}5, 22 \text{a}3 \text{f}6 23 \text{exe}5 \text{d}3 or 22 \text{c}4 \text{f}6 23 \text{exe}5 \text{g}5 24 \text{e}1 \text{f}4+ 25 \text{g}1 \text{fd}3 \text{f}7.

b) 20 \a3 \b6 21 \text{d}6 \text{xd}4 22 \text{xc}8 \text{xe}2 23 \text{xe}7+ \text{xe}7 and now:

b1) 24 \text{c}7 (it is interesting that
penetrating on the 7th is not the strongest continuation; however, some people would choose this move!) 24 \( \text{d}5 25 \text{xd}7 \text{d}4 26 \text{b}4 \text{g}5 (26... \text{c}2? 27 \text{c}1 \text{xa}3 28 \text{xa}7 \text{f}6 27 \text{c}1 \text{a}5 \text{f}6 b2) 24 \text{c}2! \text{d}4 25 \text{xd}2 (25 \text{c}7 \text{d}8! 26 \text{d}1 \text{ec}6 27 \text{b}4 \text{a}6 28 \text{a}4 \text{b}8! \text{f}6 25 \text{ec}6 26 \text{fd}1 \text{f}8! 27 \text{xd}4 \text{xd}4 28 \text{xd}4 \text{e}7 29 \text{a}4 \text{b}8, and the rook endgame is even.

15 \( \text{d}5 \)
16 \( \text{c}4 \text{b}6 \)
17 \( \text{e}1 \text{xc}4 \)
18 \( \text{xc}4 \text{d}5 \)
19 \( \text{g}4 \text{b}4 \)
20 \( \text{a}3 \text{c}6 \)
21 \( \text{b}4 \text{f}5 \)

Why does Black not play the more flexible 21... f6!? (threatening 22... \( \text{xf}3) ? \) For instance: 22 \( \text{f}4 (22 \text{b}5? \text{xf}3; for 22 \text{ef} see later) 22 \text{ac}8! (the threat is 23 \( \text{xf}3 \) again) 23 \text{ef} \text{xf}6 24 \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 25 \( \text{h}4 \text{xg}2 26 \text{xg}2 \text{d}4 27 \text{d}3 \text{xf}3+ 28 \text{xf}3 \text{xf}3 29 \text{xf}3 \text{f}7, with the idea of \( \text{c}2. \) With his more active rook Black stands slightly better.

22 \( \text{h}4 \)

White does not do Black the favour of taking on f6, e.g. 22 \( \text{ef} \) \( \text{xf}6 23 \text{f}4 \text{b}2 24 \text{xf}+ \text{xf}8 25 \text{e}3 \text{e}5! 26 \text{exe}5 (26 \text{h}3 \text{c}4 \text{f}6 26 \text{xf}3 27 \text{e}1 \text{yg}2 28 \text{yg}2 \text{xa}3 29 \text{a}5 \text{f}3+ 30 \text{g}1 \text{b}7 \text{f}6, when it is White who
must fight for a draw.

22 ... \[\text{Bf8}\]
23 \[\text{c6}]; \[\text{xb6}\]
24 \[\text{xg2}\] a5
25 \[\text{xc6}\] dc
26 \[\text{wd6}\] wxd6
27 ed ab
28 ab \[\text{f7}\]
29 \[\text{Ec4}\] a6
30 \[\text{Ec1}\] e5
31 d7 \[\text{Ed8}\]
32 \[\text{Ec5}\] \[\text{xd7}\]
33 \[\text{Exe5}\] g6

Draw agreed


B332

8 dc \[\text{xc5}\]
9 \[\text{c6}\] dc 10 \[\text{xc6}\] \[\text{xc6}\] dc 12 \[\text{wC2}\]! (after 12 \[\text{xd8}\] + \[\text{xd8}\] 13 \[\text{b2}\] 0-0 in spite of his structural weaknesses, it does not necessarily follow that Black stands worse, since he has a lead in development) 12 ... \[\text{wd4/d5}\] 13 0-0! ±.
10 \[\text{xd4}\] \[\text{c6}\]
11 e4 (27)

A critical position. We shall consider:

B3321 11 0-0
B3322 11 \[\text{wb6}\]!
B3321

11 ... 0-0
12 \[\text{a3}\] e5
13 \[\text{d3}\]
13 \[\text{wd6}\] was worth consideration, e.g. 13 ... \[\text{e8}\] 14 \[\text{c3}\] \[\text{e6}\] 15 \[\text{wd2}\]! and White's position is overwhelming.
13 ... \[\text{e8}\]
14 \[\text{d6}\]
14 \[\text{c3}\] d5! 15 ed e4, or 14 0-0 d5.
14 \[\text{wb6}\]
14 \[\text{b7}\]! 15 \[\text{a3}\] \[\text{a5}\] +; or 15 \[\text{d2}\] \[\text{a6}\] 16 \[\text{c4}\] \[\text{a5}\] +! 17 \[\text{xa5}\] \[\text{xd3}\] 18 f3 \[\text{e6}\], with the idea of d5. Nevertheless, White can improve by 17 \[\text{wd2}\]!.
15 \[\text{a3}\]!

Better than 15 \[\text{c3}\] \[\text{b7}\]!.

15 \[\text{b7}\]
15 \[\text{e6}\] 16 \[\text{c4}\] \[\text{d4}\] 17 \[\text{xd4}\] ed 18 f3 \[\text{b5}\] 19 e5 \[\text{e8}\] 20 f4 \[\text{c6}\]
21 \[\text{d5}\] \[\text{h6}\] 22 \[\text{a3}\] \[\text{c7}\] 23 \[\text{f3}\]. With his two bishops White stands better.

16 f3 a5
17 0-0 \[\text{a6}\]
18 \[\text{fd1}\] \[\text{ac8}\]
18 ... \[\text{a7}\] + 19 \[\text{h1}\] \[\text{c5}\] 20 \[\text{e3}\] \[\text{b7}\] 21 \[\text{xa7}\] \[\text{xa7}\] 22 \[\text{c7}\]! (22 ... d5? 23 \[\text{ac1}\] ±) 22 \[\text{d8}\] 23 \[\text{b6}\] \[\text{a6}\] 24 \[\text{c4}\] \[\text{b7}\] 25 \[\text{c7}\]! ± Gavrikov.
19 \( \text{d}2 \) \( a4 \)
20 \( \text{c}4! \) \( ab \)
21 \( \text{ab} \) \( \text{b}5 \)
21 \( \text{xb}3 \) 22 \( \text{xe}5 \).
22 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{e}6 \)
23 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{c}2 \)
24 \( \text{dc1} \) \( \text{xc1}+ \)
25 \( \text{xc1} \) \( \text{e}8 \)

Black is in an awkward situation.
26 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{b}8 \)
27 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{h}5?! \)

Time pressure.
28 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{a}6 \)
29 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{d}6? \)

In time trouble Black strays.
29 \( \text{d}6 \) was better.
30 \( \text{c}8 \) \( \text{b}6 \)
31 \( \text{xa}6 \) \( \text{xa}6 \)
31 \( \text{xa}6 \) would be met by
32 \( \text{c}4! \).
32 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
33 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{e}5 \)
34 \( \text{xd}6! \)

Black resigns
Gavrikov-Stempin, Naleczow 1984.

B3322
11 ... \( \text{b}6! \)
12 \( \text{b}2?! \) \( \text{xe}4! \)
13 \( \text{xb}6 \)

After 13 \( \text{xb}7 \) \( \text{xf}2+ \) 14 \( \text{d}1 \)
\( \text{f}8 \) 15 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) Black wins.
13 ... \( \text{ab} \)
14 \( \text{xb}7 \) \( \text{g}8 \)
15 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \)
16 0-0 \( \text{xe}2 \)
17 \( \text{xe}2 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
18 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{g}5! \)

Black is more active.
19 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{a}6 \)
20 \( \text{fd}1 \) \( \text{e}7 \)
21 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}5 \)
22 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
23 \( \text{x}d5 \) \( \text{ed} \)
24 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{d}4 \)
25 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{b}5 \)

Draw agreed

In the final position White still stands slightly worse.

Contemporary theory thought 12 \( \text{e}3 \) to be better than the text, but this move was not examined carefully. It is clear that now 12 ... \( \text{xe}4 \) 13 \( \text{xg}7 \) is not the same as in the previous variation. However, 12 \( \text{xa}6 \) comes into consideration, e.g. 13 \( \text{c}3 \) 0-0 14 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{b}7 \)
15 0-0 \( \text{d}5 \) 16 ed \( \text{xd}5 \) 17 \( \text{xd}5 \)
\( \text{xd}5 \) 18 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{ed} \) 19 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}8 \)
followed by \( \text{c}6 \). The best continuation perhaps is 12 ... \( \text{xd}4 \) 13 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 14 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 15 \( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 16 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{d}5 \), followed by \( \text{d}7 \) and \( \text{c}6 \) with rough equality.

The move order is vital in this, which is why we also mention the following continuations from diagram 17:

C
6 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
7 \( \text{cd} \)
7 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{b}7 \), followed by \( \text{a}5 \).
7 ... \( \text{xd}6 \)
8 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{b}7 \)
9 0-0 0-0
10 ♜c3 a6
11 ♜b2 ♜bd7

Black’s plan has worked and he can equalize effortlessly.

D

6 ♜bd2 ♜b4
7 cb

7 ♜g2 bc 8 ♜e5 c6 would lead, via a different move order, to A3, which is a pleasant variation for Black. 7 c5 can be answered by d6 both at once and after 7 ♜c3

8 ♜b1.

7 ...
8 ♜xb5
9 0-0 d5
10 ♜b2 ♜bd7

Depending on White’s answer, Black can continue a5 or c5 and get a fully satisfactory position.

We have reached the end of this line and you have been initiated into its secrets. Do not forget: Black is not so dark! Black is OK!
A defence is never supposed to mean passivity; just the opposite! The player who takes the initiative is bound to create weaknesses in his own position which can be used for a counterblow by the defender. As Cromwell said: ‘Trust in God and keep the gunpowder dry’

1  d4  \( \triangleleft f6 \\
2  c4  e6 \\
3  \triangleleft c3  \triangleleft b4 \\
4  e3  c5 \\
5  \triangleleft e2  cd \\
6  ed  0-0 \\
7  a3  \triangleleft e7 \\
8  d5  ed \\
9  cd  \text{\( \triangleleft e8 \) (28)}  \\

This position makes a frequent appearance at modern tournaments. White now has four main possibilities. We shall consider his most ambitious move, 10 d6, in this chapter and come back to 10 h3, 10 g3 and 10 \( \triangleleft e3 \) in the following chapter.

10  d6!?

At first sight, a very committal move. It is indeed and, what is more, it is a pawn sacrifice. Black can pick up the advanced pawn in a few moves. This manoeuvre, however, requires time, during which White can trust in his lead in development and his more harmoniously placed pieces. Let us see the possible consequences.

10  \( \triangleleft f8 \\
11  g3 \\

Black now has three continuations worth consideration.

A  11  \( \triangleleft e6 \\
B  11  \text{\( w b6?! \) \\
C  11  b6!

Continuations A and B are connected with winning the d-pawn and condemn Black to a long defence. In variation C, however,
the second player eschews pawn grabbing and aims at counterplay by a quick mobilization of his queenside forces.

A

11  \( \text{\eepslive}\text{e}_6\) (29)

A1 12  \( \text{\bxc8}\text{g}_2\)  
A2 12  \( \text{\bxc8}\text{f}_4\)

The first well-known game in this variation was the encounter Gligorić-Karpov, Bugojno 1980, which went

A1

12  \( \text{\bxc8}\text{g}_2\)  \( \text{\bxc8}d_6\)  
13  \( \text{\bxc8}c_2\)  \( \text{\bxc8}c_6\)  
14  0-0  \( \text{\eepslive}\text{e}_6\) (30)

An important position.

A11 15  \( \text{\bxc8}f_4?!\)  
A12 15  \( \text{\bxc8}b_4!\)  
A13 15  \( \text{\bxc8}f_4?!\)  
A14 15  \( \text{\bxc8}g_5\)

A11

15  \( \text{\bxc8}f_4?!\)  

This was played in the archetypal game mentioned above, but it is not White’s most efficient plan.

15  \( \text{\eepslive}\text{e}_8\)  
16  \( \text{\bxc8}b_4\)  \( \text{\bxc8}d_6\)  
17  \( \text{\bxc8}b_2?!\)  

The bishop has no future on this diagonal.

17  ...  \( \text{\bxc8}d_7\)  
18  \( \text{\bxc8}c_5\)  \( \text{\bxc8}d_5\)  
19  \( \text{\bxc8}x_5\)  \( \text{\bxc8}c_8\)  
20  \( \text{\bxc8}b_3\)  \( \text{\eepslive}\text{e}_7\)  
21  \( \text{\bxc8}d_1\)  \( \text{\bxc8}b_5!\)  
22  \( \text{\bxc8}g_2\)  \( \text{\eepslive}\text{e}_8\)  
23  \( \text{\bxc8}d_5\)  \( \text{\eepslive}\text{e}_7\)  
24  \( \text{\bxc8}g_2\)  \( \text{\bxc8}e_5!\)  
25  \( \text{\eepslive}\text{e}_6\)  \( \text{\bxc8}c_4\)  
26  \( \text{\bxc8}d_1\)  \( \text{\bxc8}e_8\)  
27  \( \text{\bxc8}d_4\)  \( \text{\bxc8}c_6\)  

After returning his extra pawn the then world champion gained better chances and finally, after a long fight, he managed to win the game in 62 moves.

White’s play was first improved in Tal-Andersson, Tilburg 1980. Instead of 15 \( \text{\bxc8}f_4?!\) Tal played

A12

15  \( \text{\bxc8}b_4!\)  

which was poorly answered with

15  ...  \( \text{\bxc8}a_6?\)
weakening the b6 square. True, 15 d6 would not have been very attractive either because of 16 b5 Qe5 17 Qd4! Qe8 18 Qg5 with the threat of Qxf6 and Qc3-d5-c7. 15 d5!?, however, deserved consideration.

16 Qf4 Qe8
17 Qfd5 Qxd5
18 Qxd5 d6
19 Qe3 Qb8

Forced, in view of the threats of Qb6 and Qc7.

20 Qe4 h6
21 Qb6 Qg5
22 f4 Qh5

Now White played 23 f5?!, instead of which 23 Qfe1 would have given him slightly better chances.

Another attempt to improve White’s play from diagram 30 is A13

15 Qf4?!

This proved less successful than 15 b4 after

15 d6
16 Qad1 a6
17 h3 Qd7
18 g4 Qc8

Black easily developed his forces and kept his extra pawn, Gyorkos-Dory, Budapest 1984.

A14

15 Qg5

This move was tried in Chernin-V.Salov, USSR Ch 1984, but again with no particular success. That game continued

15 ... h6!
16 Qxf6 Qxf6
17 Qf4 Qe5!
18 Qfd5 Qd8
19 f4 Qe6
20 Qb5 Qb8

21 Qad1 21 Qbc7 can simply be answered by 21 Qd6 with the threat of 22 Qe7. Accepting V.Salov’s suggestion, 21 Qd4? 22 Qxe6 de 23 Qc7 Qxc7, would, however be a bad decision, for after 24 Qxc7 White’s knight cannot be encircled. For instance, 24 ... Qd6 25 Qe8 or 24 Qd7 25 Qh1! Qc8 26 Qac1 Qd6 27 Qfd1.

21 Qe7
22 f5

22 Qcd7 could be met by the exchange sacrifice 22 Qc6!.

22 Qe5
23 f6! Qxd5
24 Qxd5 d6!

Black has weathered the storm and stands no worse. The encounter finished in a draw in 41 moves.

I don’t think any of these examples should shake one’s faith in the defensive potential of Black’s position. The real improvement was seen in Korchnoi-Kindermann, Beer-Sheva 1984. In diagram 29 Korchnoi played A2

12 Qf4!

This move was also played some months earlier in Tatai-Hmadi,
Lugano 1984. There, however, Black soon missed the right path and after 12 ... \( \text{h5} \) 13 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{xd6} \)
14 \( \text{g3}!? \) \( \text{c}6 \) 15 \( \text{g2} \) b6? 16 \( \text{b5} \)
\( \text{e6} \) 17 \( \text{ed4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 18 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{a}6 \)
19 \( \text{xh5} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 20 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{c}8 \) 21
\( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e8} \) 22 \( \text{d2}! \) g6 23 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{g7} \)
24 \( \text{a4} \) Black resigned.

12 ... \( \text{h5} \)
13 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{xd6} \)
14 \( \text{c}2 \)
14 \( \text{d4}?! \) did not work in R. Vera-Garcia Martinez, Havana 1984, since after 14 \( \text{c}6 \) 15 \( \text{e}4 \)
\( \text{xd4}! \) 16 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{e}8 \) 17 \( \text{g2} \) f5
Black had the superior position.

14 ... \( \text{e6} \)
15 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{c}6 \)
16 0-0 \( \text{f6} \) (31)

The knight has no future on the edge of the board. In this position, however, White has an extra tempo (\( \text{e}3 \)) compared with the position in the games Tal-Andersson and Gligorić-Karpov after 14 moves!

17 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{e8} \)
18 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{xd4} \)

In 1985, at the first Szirak tour-

manent, Petran now played 18 d5!? against Utasi, and after 19 \( \text{g5} \) the players, without examining the worth of the novelty, agreed a draw at once.

19 \( \text{xd4} \) d5
20 \( \text{xf6} \)

According to Kindermann’s analysis, 20 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{e}6 \) 21 \( \text{xb7} \) a5 22 \( \text{b3} \) would still have led to White’s advantage.

20 ... \( \text{xf6} \)
21 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{e}5 \)
22 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{f5} \)
23 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{ec8}! \)

On 23 \( \text{ac8}! \) White replies with 24 \( \text{de1}! \).

24 \( \text{d5} \)

Draw agreed

After the exchanges following 24 ... \( \text{xc7} \) the position will become totally simplified and level.

Let us return to diagram 31. Tal’s plan with 17 b4! looks to be stronger than 17 \( \text{ad1} \). Now Andersson’s answer, 17 \( \text{a6}?! \), is out of the question owing to 18 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e8} \) 19 \( \text{fd5} \), when the extra tempo \( \text{e3} \) significantly improves White’s chances and the second player faces ruin because of the weaknesses of the b6 and c7 squares. A characteristic line: 19

\( \text{xd5} \) 20 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{b8} \) 21 \( \text{b6} \)
\( \text{g5} \) 22 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{a8} \) 23 \( \text{f4} \) and if the queen moves then 24 \( \text{c7} \) wins.

The unpleasant consequences of 17 ... d6 18 b5 \( \text{e5} \) 19 \( \text{d4}! \) \( \text{e8} \)

\( \text{f6} \)
20 \( \textit{g}5 \) have already been mentioned in the analysis of the above game, while after 17 \( \textit{d}5 \), which looks forced, White's continuation 18 \( \textit{b}5 \) \( \textit{\textit{a}}5 \) 19 \( \textit{\textit{f}d1} \) is very strong.

\[ \text{B} \]

11 \( \textit{w}b6?! (32) \]

This queen move was tried in Korchnoi-Miles, Wijk aan Zee 1984. The attempt turned out badly for Black and it has been neglected in tournament practice since that time. You can see why below.

12 \( \textit{\textit{g}2} \) \( \textit{\textit{x}d6} \)

The queen must not capture the pawn because 12... \( \textit{\textit{w}x}d6? \) 13 \( \textit{\textit{w}x}d6 \) \( \textit{\textit{h}x}d6 \) 14 \( \textit{\textit{b}5} \) \( \textit{\textit{e}6} \) 15 \( \textit{\textit{h}3} \) leads directly to the loss of the exchange.

13 \( \textit{\textit{e}3!} \) \( \textit{\textit{a}6??} \)

Other moves are not encouraging either.

a) 13 \( \textit{\textit{e}2} \)

14 \( \textit{\textit{b}2??} \) 14 \( \textit{\textit{a}2} \) traps the queen) 14 \( \textit{\textit{f}e} \) 15 \( \textit{\textit{e}5} \) 15 \( \textit{0-0} \) \( \textit{\textit{w}e}3+ \) 16 \( \textit{\textit{h}1} \). Though Black has sufficient material for the exchange, his undeveloped position must bring about his ruin. For example, 16 \( \textit{\textit{d}6} \) 17 \( \textit{\textit{d}5!} \) \( \textit{\textit{x}d5} \) 18 \( \textit{\textit{w}x}d5 \) and the second player has no hope of survival.

b) 13 ... \( \textit{\textit{e}7} \) 14 0-0 \( \textit{\textit{e}5} \) 15 \( \textit{\textit{b}5} \) \( \textit{\textit{w}d8} \) 16 \( \textit{\textit{d}6} \) \( \textit{\textit{xd}6} \) 17 \( \textit{\textit{w}x}d6 \) and White has sufficient compensation for his material loss. For example, 17 \( \textit{\textit{c}6} \) 18 \( \textit{\textit{f}d1}! \) and Black cannot complete his development by 18 \( \textit{\textit{b}6} \) because of 19 \( \textit{\textit{x}c6} \). Nevertheless, he should have chosen this course since after returning the pawn with 18 \( \textit{\textit{e}6} \) 19 \( \textit{\textit{w}d2} \) \( \textit{d6} \) 20 \( \textit{\textit{f}4} \) \( \textit{\textit{e}8} \) 21 \( \textit{\textit{w}x}d6 \) \( \textit{\textit{g}4} \) Black has only a slight disadvantage.

14 0-0 \( \textit{\textit{e}5} \)

15 \( \textit{\textit{f}4} \) \( \textit{d5}! \)

Again, returning the extra material is the best chance. This can be easily understood by analysing the position arising after 15 \( \textit{\textit{c}6} \) 16 \( \textit{\textit{d}5}! \), when the c8 bishop is unable to develop, as 16 \( \textit{\textit{d}6} \) would be answered with 17 \( \textit{\textit{c}7} \), while 16 \( \textit{\textit{b}6} \) would be met by 17 \( \textit{\textit{e}1} \) with the threat of 18 \( \textit{\textit{f}1} \). Black's situation cannot be improved by the 16... \( \textit{\textit{x}d}5 \) 17 \( \textit{\textit{x}d}5 \) trade either.

16 \( \textit{\textit{c}xd}5 \) \( \textit{\textit{c}6} \)

17 \( \textit{\textit{xf}6+} \) \( \textit{\textit{xf}6} \)

18 \( \textit{\textit{d}5} \) \( \textit{\textit{e}5} \)

19 \( \textit{\textit{w}h}5 \) \( \textit{\textit{a}4} \)

20 \( \textit{\textit{f}4!} \) \( \textit{\textit{d}7} \)

Finally, the bishop has a chance to develop. Later, however, the fact that it is unprotected will cause problems.
21 b3! \(\mathbb{w}a5\)

If Black grabs the pawn with 21 \(\mathbb{w}xb3\) then White binds Black hand and foot by 22 \(\mathbb{h}ab1\) \(\mathbb{x}a3\)
23 \(\mathbb{x}b7\) \(\mathbb{d}d6\) (on 23 ... \(\mathbb{d}d8\) White wins by 24 \(\mathbb{c}g5\) \(f6\) 25 \(\mathbb{x}d7\)) 24 \(\mathbb{d}d1\) (Miles’ analysis).

22 b4 \(\mathbb{w}a4\)

Now, however, the black queen is shut out of the game and cannot control the 4th rank.

23 \(\mathbb{h}ad1\) \(\mathbb{x}xf4\)

On the immediate 23 \(\mathbb{d}d8\) White can play 24 \(\mathbb{c}c7\).

24 \(gf\) \(\mathbb{h}ad8\)

25 \(\mathbb{d}d3\) \(\mathbb{g}h8\)

White threatened 26 \(\mathbb{g}g3\) as well as doubling the rooks on the d-file.

26 \(\mathbb{c}c7!\) \(\mathbb{e}e7\)

26 \(\mathbb{f}f8\) is no better due to 27 \(\mathbb{f}fd1\), and if 27 \(\mathbb{c}c8\) then the interpolation 28 \(\mathbb{x}xc6\) wins.

27 \(\mathbb{c}c5\) \(\mathbb{e}e2\)

28 \(\mathbb{x}xd7\!\)

Black resigns

As we have seen, winning White’s d-pawn by 11 \(\mathbb{e}e6\) or 11 ... \(\mathbb{b}b6\) gives Black a difficult defence. White’s pieces are so harmoniously posted that, sooner or later, Black is forced to give back the extra pawn in order to get hopes of equalizing. So the idea came to me that it is not necessary to win the pawn immediately. Why not develop the queenside first?

It did not take long to try the new idea out in practice; first against Csom in the Hungarian Super Championship 1984, and then in a game played in New York a month later where D. Gurevich was my opponent.

In practice, the move 11 b6 has proved not just a reasonable idea, it has also become a breeding ground for new possibilities and plans. It became clear that Black can gain good counter-chances, instead of being reduced to passive defence. To carry out this plan, of course, you must not shrink from sacrifices, including the exchange or even more.

The next moves are obvious.

12 \(\mathbb{g}g2\) \(\mathbb{c}c6\)

White can now choose between the following:

C1 13 \(\mathbb{b}b5?!\)

C2 13 0-0

C3 13 b4

C1

13 \(\mathbb{b}b5?!\) (34)
At first sight, White’s last move contains dangerous threats. White, however, falls behind in his development. R. Grünberg-Dory, Stockholm 1984-85, now continued:

13...\(\text{a6}\)

14...\(\text{a4}\)

14...\(\text{a4}\)? would be a great mistake because 14...\(\text{a}2+!\) 15\(\text{xe2}\) \(\text{xb5+}\) 16\(\text{xb5}\) \(\text{d4+}\) wins the queen.

14...\(\text{e6}\)

Preparing an exchange sacrifice. Fedorowicz-Sosonko, New York 1984, finished in a draw after 14...\(\text{c8}\) 15 0-0 \(\text{xb5}\) 16 ab \(\text{a5}\) 17 \(\text{c3}\) h6 18 \(\text{f4}\) g5 19 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{e6}\). The Dutch grandmaster probably did not trust in the possibility of exploiting the plus pawn which would have been gained.

At the same tournament, in my above-mentioned game against D. Gurevich, I played 14...\(\text{e4}!\)\. Play continued 15 \(\text{e3}\) (on 15 0-0? Black can capture the pawn with his knight) 15 \(\text{f6}\) (also 15 \(\text{e6}!\) deserves serious consideration) 16 0-0 (on 16 \(\text{c7}\)? another tactical blow can be played: 16 \(\text{xf2!}\) 16 \(\text{x}b2\) 17 \(\text{e1}\) (White has sufficient compensation for his sacrificed pawn) 17 \(\text{xb5}\) 18 ab \(\text{a5}\) (18 \(\text{xb5}\)? loses to 19 \(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{xe4}\) 20 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{c4}\) 21 \(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{xe4}\) 22 \(\text{xb6}\) 19 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{d6}\) 20 \(\text{a8}\) \(\text{xa8}\) 21 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{dc4}\) 22 \(\text{xd7}\). An extremely complicated and interesting fight has developed, in which 22 \(\text{xe3}\) – instead of 22 ... \(\text{xb5}?! – 23 \text{fe} \(\text{xb5}\) would have led to chances for both sides.

The plan beginning with 14 \(\text{e6}\)! gives White fewer options.

15...0-0

The eager 15 \(\text{h3}\)? can be met by an unusual double exchange sacrifice in the form of 15 \(\text{e5}\)! 16 \(\text{xe6}\), when after 16 \(\text{f3}\) + 17 \(\text{f1}\) fe 18 \(\text{c7}\) \(\text{b7}\)! 19 \(\text{xa8}\) \(\text{xa8}\) 20 h3 \(\text{a6}\) (the threat is 21 \(\text{d4}\) 21 \(\text{g1}\) \(\text{e4}\)! 22 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{xg1}\) 23 \(\text{g1}\) \(\text{b7}\) there is no defence to Black’s threats.

15 \(\text{f4}\), however, raises a more difficult problem. For example, 15 \(\text{h5}\)? 16 0-0! \(\text{xf4}\) 17 \(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{xb5}\) 18 ab \(\text{d6}\) 19 \(\text{f3}\) leads to a White victory. Playing the correct 15 \(\text{e8}\)! requires some courage for after 16 \(\text{f3}\) White threatens 17 \(\text{c7}\), a four-fold knight fork; moreover Black cannot even get rid of the dangerous knight since after 16 ... \(\text{b5}?\) 17 ab \(\text{e5}\) 18 \(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{xe5}\) the rook on a8 is hanging.
For all that, there is still a solution! Let us begin with a diversionary pawn sacrifice: 16 ... g5!!. Entering deep into Black's territory is now forced. 17 ²c7 (on 17 ²xg5? Black wins virtually by force: 17 ²e5 18 ²g2 ²xb5 19 ab ²xd6 20 ²b3 ²d3+ 21 ²f1 ²e4! 22 ²e3 ²dxf2!) and now a forced line follows: 17 ²xe2! 18 ²xe2 gf 19 ²xe8 ³ae8 20 gf (20 0-0 ²xe2 is also nice for Black) 20 ... ²xe2+ 21 ²xe2 ²xe2+ 22 ²xe2 ²xd6. This position, with its unusual material balance, merits a diagram (35).

Black's superiority is obvious since the f4 pawn will fall sooner or later and the minor pieces can be posted in good positions.

It should also be noted that in the line 16 ²h3 (instead of 16 ²f3) 16 ³e4! 17 ²g2 (17 f3?! ²xb5! 18 fe - 18 ab ²d4 19 ²b3 ²b4 + - 18 ... ²xe4 19 ²g1 ²a6 +) there is no need to repeat moves since Black can play 17 ²d4! sacrificing the exchange. Play might continue 18 ²e3! (18 ²xd4? loses immediately to 18 ... ²xd4 19 ²d2 ²xd6 with the threat of 20 ... ²b4) 18 ²xb5 19 ab ²xb5 20 ²xe4 (20 0-0? ²xe3!) 20 ... ²xe4 21 ²g1 ²d5! 22 ²d4 ²f3 23 ²d2 ²xe3 24 ²xe3 ²h5 with significant advantage to Black.

Finally, it is also important that on 16 ²a3 Black can simply play 16 ... ³c8 with the immediate threat of 17 ²xb5.

After this little detour, let us return to the game.

15 ... ²xd6
16 ²d3

After the tempting 16 ²ed4? Black regains the exchange with an extra pawn by 16 ²xd4 17 ²xd4 ²c8! 18 ²xe6! de 19 ²e1 ²b4.

16 ... ²c5
17 ²xe6 fe (36)

Black has sufficient compensation for the exchange; that is beyond question since White's king position is also weakened.
18 \( \text{f4} \)

On 18 \( \text{e3} \) the move 18... \( \text{e5} \) guarantees Black good compensation. For instance, 19 \( \text{xc5 bc} \) 20 \( \text{c4} \) 21 \( \text{cl d5} \) 22 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 23 \( \text{xcl} \) \( \text{xb3} \) 24 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{b5} \) 25 \( \text{al} \) 26 \( \text{xcl} \) \( \text{xh6} \) 27 \( \text{al} \) 28 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{f8} \).!

18 \( \text{...} \) \( \text{d5} \)
19 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{f6} \)
20 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{d6} \)
21 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{f3} \)
22 \( \text{b5}? \)

Contributing to the quick finish. White should have played 22 \( \text{f1}! \) \( \text{e5}! \) 23 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{h5} \) 24 \( \text{f4} \), although it is obvious that after 24 \( \text{d3} \) the four knights posed on the d-file are not of the same value. Black’s are better, for example 25 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{f6} \) or 25 \( \text{ed1} \) \( \text{f8} \) and the knight sacrifice on f4 is already threatened.

22 \( \text{...} \) \( \text{e5} \)
23 \( \text{ed4} \)
23 \( \text{a3}? \) loses to 23 \( \text{xa3}! \).
23 \( \text{...} \) \( \text{b7} \)
24 \( \text{d1} \) (37)

Sidestepping the \( \text{f3}+ \) queen-winning motif, but helping Black to mate immediately. However, there was no salvation. For instance, 24 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{e3}! \) 25 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{xf3}+ \) 26 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{g5}+ \) 27 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{xf3}+ \) 28 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{h3} \) mate, or 24 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{g2}+ \) mating as well.

24 \( \text{...} \) \( \text{g2}++ \)
25 \( \text{fg2} \) \( \text{f4}++ \)
25 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{h3} \) mate!

C2
13 \( \text{0-0} \) (38)

The game Csom-Adorjan, Hungarian Super Championship 1984, now continued

13 \( \text{a6} \)

13 \( \text{f6}? \) intending to win the \( \text{d6} \) pawn at once would be a premature plan, which is well demonstrated by the line 14 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{h5} \) 15 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 16 \( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 17 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{h6} \) 18 \( \text{xf7}+ \) 19 \( \text{xf7} \) 19 \( \text{d5+} \) \( \text{e8} \) 20 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{e7} \) (20 \( \text{e7} \) 21 \( \text{g8}+ \) ) 21 \( \text{h5}++ \) !\( \text{h5}+ \) 22 \( \text{d6} \) mate.

14 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{c8} \)
15 Ne1 Ne5
16 Wa4 Nx2?

In the post mortem the possibility of 16... Cc4! was discovered. This was later played by Csom himself in a game against Miles (Esbjerg 1984), where after 17 Ced1 Cg6 18 Cd2 a5 19 Wd1 b5 he obtained a good position. Instead of 17 Cg6 Black might try 17 Cxe2!? 18 Cxe2 Cc4 19 Cdc1 (or 19 Cxd4) 19 Cxe2 20 Cxc4 Cxc4 21 Wxc4 Ce8 with a level game.

17 Cxe2 Cd3
18 Cd2 Cxf4
19 Wf4 Ce6

As it turned out, it would have been more exact to play 19 Cc5 here and only after 20 Cd5 to have played 20 Ce6.

20 Ch3 Ce8
21 Cxd1?!

Here, however, 21 Wa4! was the right move, aiming at the weaknesses on the queenside.

21 Cc5
22 Cc3 Cc8
23 Cg2 Ce5
24 Cf3 Ce1+
25 Kg2 Cxd1
26 Cxd1 Ce6

Now 27 Wc5, winning the d6 pawn, is already threatened. His last few hesitant moves have made White’s position difficult. The remaining moves of the session were, however, played under the shadow of great mutual time trouble.

27 Cb5 a6!
28 Cc1 Wb8
29 Cd4

White’s original plan was probably 28 Cc7, which does not work because of the interpolation 28 Cxd6. The pawn, of course, will fall even so.

29 ... Cxd6
30 Wd2 Ce5?!

It would have been worth trying 20 ... Ce8 to secure the back rank.

31 Wd3 Cc5?

This is, however, a bad oversight. A5 keeps the material advantage.

32 Wxa6 Ce8

Of course not 32 Cxd4? 33 Cc8+ winning the queen.

33 Wb3 We5
34 Cc2 g5?!
35 Wc4 d5
36 Wa4 d4
37 Ce2 Wxe2?!

The ending that arises after 37 Wb8 38 Cxe8+ Wxe8 39 Wxe8+ would be hopeless for Black.

38 Cxe2 Cxe2
39 Cxd4?

White is also pressed by time trouble. 39 Wc4! Wxb2 40 Cxc5 bc 41 Wxc5 Cf2+ 42 Kg1! would have led to a winning position.

39 Wxb2
40 g4 Kg7
41 Wc4 Cxd2
42 Ce2 Cxa3!
**Nimzo-Indian – Defence or Counter-Attack?**

43 h4 h6
44 g3 c5
45 f5+ f8
46 c3 xf2+
47 h3 (39)

An important attempt to improve White’s play. White prevents the active a6 and tries to cramp Black.

13 b7
14 0-0 b8?!

Preparing e5 with the idea of trading off the light-squared bishops, but Black will not achieve this. In the game D.Gurevich-Fedorowicz, New York 1985, the continuation 14 a6 15 g5 h6 16 xf6 xf6 17 d5 xd6 18 xb6 ad8 19 xd6 xd6 20 fd1 c7 also gave White some advantage. But 14 e6!? (41) intending to attack the d6 pawn right away looks more expedient.

47 xf5!

A study-like solution!

48 gf g4+
49 g2 g7

Draw agreed
Black’s fortress is impregnable.

C3

13 b4!? (40)

Here 15 b5? would be inadequate since Black can win with a typical motif: 15 a6! 16 c7 xd6. After 14 e6, therefore, 15 f4 is forced. Play might continue: 15 ... b8! 16 b5 (16 h3? is a mistake again owing to 16 e5! 17 d4 xd6 18 xe6 xd4! and Black wins) 16 ... h5 17 d5! (the only good move since 16 e3?
can be met by 16 ... a6 and 16 ∆h3 can be answered with 16  ♢xf4 17  ♢xf4  ♣h6 with the double threat of 18  g5 and 18  ♤e5) 17  ♢xf4 (17  ♣xe2? is insufficient because of 18  ♤xe2  ♢xf4 19 gf  ♣xd6 20  ♣xd6  ♤xd6 21  ♤e4!) 18  ♢xf4  ♣h6.

In this position, winning the exchange with 19  ♤c7?! is obviously a mistake in view of 19  ♣xd6 20  ♤xa8  ♢xf4 21 gf  ♤xf4. Also dubious is 19  ♤b3?! because of 19  ♣xd6 20  ♤xf7+  ♤h8 21  ♣xd6  ♤d4 22  ♤xb7  ♤xb3 23  ♤xb3 g5! 24  ♤d3  ♤xb7 25  ♤e5  ♣f8 26  ♤f7+  ♤xf7 27  ♤xf7 d5 28  ♤e8  ♤c8 would lead to a decisive advantage for Black. There is hardly a better choice for White than 19  ♣xf7+! ♤xf7 20  ♤d5+  ♤e6 21  ♤f5+  ♤f6 22  ♤d5+ forcing perpetual check, which cannot be avoided by Black with 22  ♤e8 on account of 23  ♤h5! ♣xd6 24 ♤fe1+ ♤d8 25 ♤f7.

15  ♦b5!

After the stereotyped 15  ♦f4 Black gets an attractive position by 15  ♤e5 16  ♤xb7 ♤xb7 17  ♦b5 a6 18  ♤c7  ♤f3+ 19  ♤h1 ♣xc7! 20 dc ♤a8.

15 ... ♦a6

16  ♤ec3 ♤e5

17  ♦a4?!

Kengis evaluates 17 ♤a4! ♤xb5 18 ♤xb5 a6 19 ♤c3 b5 20 ♤d1 to be in White’s favour. Now winning the pawn with 20  ♤e6 21  ♤f4 ♤e5 does not work because of 22  ♤h3.

17 ... ♤e6!

18  ♤g5  h6

19  ♤xf6  ♤xf6

20  ♤d5  ♤g6!

Of course not 20  ♣xd6? in view of 21  ♣xd6 xf1 22 xf7!. After the text White’s prospects look more attractive, but Black’s position can endure almost anything!

21 ♤b1

Our previous note would also be illustrated by the variation 21  ♤e4  ♤xb5! 22 ab  ♣xd6 23 bc dc.

21  ♤b7

22  f4?!  a6

23  f5  ♦g4

The rook is still in the firing-line. After 24  ♤bc3 ♣xd6 25 ♤e4 ♤xb4! 26  ♤xb4 ♤xb4 27 ♤xb4 ♤xe4 28 ♤xe4 d5 29 ♤ad1 ♤e8! it would be Black who stands better (Kengis).

24 ♤d1  ♤c4

25 ♤a3  ♤d4

26 ♤e2  ♤g5!

27 ♤c4  b5

28 ab  ab

29 ♤ce3  ♤xb4

30 ♤e7+ ♤xe7

and in view of their mutual time trouble the players agreed a draw in Gurevich-Kengis, Lvov 1984, though after 31 de ♤xg2 32 ♤xg2 ♤e8 33 ♤xb5 ♤c6! Black would
already have the better game.

Based on the games and notes presented above, we think that in this variation Black’s situation is OK – not bad at all. Although, in the variations covered in A and B (11 \( \text{\texttt{e}}6 \) and 11 \( \text{\texttt{wb}}6 \)), after winning the gambit pawn Black is forced into a long defence, by accurate play he is near to equalizing. 11 \( \text{\texttt{b}}6 \)! (line C), however, offers Black excellent counter-chances and tactical possibilities, and in this line it is already the second player who has the initiative.
A space advantage is a very nice thing to have, but not a decisive factor. A number of examples prove (see, for example, Chapter 5) that we may emerge victorious from a somewhat cramped position if there is a harmony in our camp and we maintain the flexibility of our position.

1  d4  \( \text{\underline{f6}} \)
2  c4  e6
3  \( \text{\underline{c3}} \)  \( \text{\underline{b4}} \)
4  e3  c5
5  \( \text{\underline{e2}} \) (42)

7 bc d6 8 e4 e5. In books on theory this set-up is frequently called the Hübner System.

I think that this label is totally OK, but if we dig a little bit in the past we can find another potential godfather to this line: Aron Nimzowitsch, the originator of the Nimzo-Indian Defence, who first elaborated and played these moves more than sixty years ago!

Here is the evidence, offered as a homage to the great chess philosopher who was born just over a century ago in 1886.

**Johnen-Nimzowitsch**

*Dresden 1926*

1  d4  \( \text{\underline{f6}} \) 2 c4  e6 3  \( \text{\underline{c3}} \)  \( \text{\underline{b4}} \) 4 e3 c5 5  \( \text{\underline{d3}} \)  \( \text{\underline{c6}} \) 6  \( \text{\underline{f3}} \)  \( \text{\underline{xc3+}} \) 7 bc d6 8 0-0 e5 9  \( \text{\underline{d2}} \) 0-0 10  \( \text{\underline{b3}} \) b6 11 f4 e4 12  \( \text{\underline{e2}} \) \( \text{\underline{d7!}} \) 13 h3  \( \text{\underline{e7}} \) 14  \( \text{\underline{e1}} \) (43)

This knight move has achieved a fair degree of popularity recently. The more natural 5  \( \text{\underline{f3}} \) used to be the fashionable way of developing. Then, however, Black can develop a solid and effective defensive position by 5  \( \text{\underline{c6}} \) 6  \( \text{\underline{d3}} \)  \( \text{\underline{xc3+}} \)
14 ... h5! 15 g2 f5 16 g2 h7! 17 a4 f5 18 g3 a5 19 g1 g6 20 f1 d7 21 c1 ac8 22 d5 h8 23 d2 g8 24 g2 g5 25 f1 g7 26 a2 f5 27 h1 cg8 28 wd1 gf 29 ef c8 30 wb3 a6 31 e2 h4 32 e3 c8 33 wc2 xh3! 34 xe4 f5 35 xf5 xf5 36 e2 h4 37 gg2 hg++ 38 g1 wh3 39 e3 h4 40 f1 e8 0-1.

From the point of view of opening theory, the blockade manoeuvre carried out on moves 10-18 is very instructive.

This set-up is still alive and kicking: indeed tournament statistics show a healthy surplus for Black.

White’s supporters, of course, have elaborated other ways to try to demolish this system of defence for Black. Among these tries the most important are the variations beginning with 5 d3 c6 6 e2 or the immediate 5 e2. The latter one is the theme of this chapter.

5 cd
6 ed 0-0
7 a3 e7
8 d5 ed
9 cd (44)

This is the position White has been playing for. After driving back the bishop, he plays a further space-gaining move in order to cramp his opponent’s forces. This plan, of course, entails some concessions: the knight is not as active on e2 as on f3 and stunts a quick kingside development. On Black’s side, he must counterbalance his spatial disadvantage by opening the position and capitalizing on his lead in development.

9 e8 (45)

45 W

The other good continuation here is 9 c5. This is more committal as White can trade off the powerful bishop by 10 b4 b6 11 a4. (Not that this would be a tragedy for Black, as evidenced by a game Miles-Adorjan, Wijk aan Zee 1984, won by Black.) This line is of independent significance,
however; its ramified variations do not belong in this chapter.

9  $e8, played in the game, is more flexible than 9 ... $c5 but, at the same time, it also gives White a greater choice.

In diagram 45 White has four main possibilities. We considered 10 d6 in the previous chapter and this chapter is devoted to the other three.

A  10 h3. This prevents $g4 and prepares active kingside development by g4 and $g2. Dukić-Csom covers this plan.

B  10 g3. This move, concentrating on immediate development will be considered in analysis of Chandler-Andersson, Sharif-Adorjan and Gligorić-Timman.

C  10 $e3. This move tries to prevent Black activating his bishop on e7 and will be analysed in the games Groszpeter-Adorjan and Lukov-Horvath.

It should also be noted here that if in the line with 9  $c5 White does not play 10 b4 $b6 11 $a4 but continues with 10 h3 or 10 g3, then the game transposes to variations A or B of the 9  $e8 line.

A  10 h3 (46)

Preventing the sally $g4 and preparing $e3, after which White could easily develop his kingside. This plan will, of course, be prevented by Black even at the price of losing a tempo. He can afford to do so since White has already made eight (!) pawn moves, which will be followed – partly by force – by further ones.

10  $c5

11 b4

In Singleton-Bryson, England 1984, the immediate 11 g4? was played, and the weakness of this violent pawn advance was revealed by Black’s reply 11  $b6!. After the forced 12 $h2 the move 12 a6 gave Black a clear advantage. There followed: 13 $c2 (after 13 $a4 $d6 the h2 rook is hanging, while 13 b4 $d4! 14 $a4 $c7 also favours Black) 13 $d6 14 $g2 $xd5 15 $e4 $g6 16 f3 $a7 17 $d3 $f6 18 $f4 $g5 19 $e2 $h4+ 20 $d1 $xe4 21 $xex4 $f8! 22 g5 $f2 23 $d2 $c6 24 $d5 $d4. White had no compensation for his pawn, and his king stuck in the centre gave him no hope of survival.

11  $b6

After the passive 11  $f8?!
White's plan proved good in Gligorić-Miles, Nikšić 1983, when after 12 g4 a5 13 b1 ab 14 ab
\[ \text{\#b6} \ 15 \text{\#g2} \text{\#a6} 16 0-0! \text{\#xb4} 17 \text{\#g3} \text{\#h6} 18 \text{\#f5} \]
his better placed pieces and the pin on the b4 knight gave the Yugoslav grandmaster the advantage.

12 g4 a5!
13 b5 d6

Here, for the sake of historical truth, is the original move order of the game: 9 \text{\#c5} 10 b4 \text{\#b6} 11
\text{\#h3} a5 12 b5 \text{\#e8} 13 g4 d6.

In Keene-Mednis, New York 1981, the weaker 13 \text{\#e4}? was seen, when White obtained the
tempi to complete his development and gained a significant space
advantage by 14 \text{\#xe4}! \text{\#xe4} 15
\text{\#g2} \text{\#e8} 16 0-0 \text{\#f6} 17 \text{\#d2} d6
18 \text{\#c3} \text{\#g5} 19 \text{\#d4}.

13 \text{\#c7!} intending 14 \text{\#b2}
\text{\#c5+} was, however, seriously to be considered. This idea will be
fully analysed in the similar game Gligorić-Timman.

14 \text{\#g2} (47)

14 h5!

Provoking the advanced pawn on this side of the board as well and forcing further weak points in
White's camp, whilst preventing his opponent's plan of 0-0, \text{\#g3}
and g5.

15 g5 \text{\#h7}
16 \text{\#a4} \text{\#a7}
17 0-0 \text{\#d7}

17 \text{\#xg5} was out of the question at present because of 18 \text{\#xg5}!
\text{\#xg5} 19 b6 \text{\#xh3} 20 \text{\#f4}!, when
after both 20 \text{\#g4} 21 f3 and 20
\text{\#xg2} 21 \text{\#xg2} h4 22 f4 \text{\#g6} 23
\text{\#f3} White has his hand in the till.

After 17 \text{\#xg5} 18 b6?, however, the piece sacrifice 18 ... \text{\#xh3}+ 19
\text{\#xh3} \text{\#xh3} 20 ba \text{\#d7}! proves
good for Black since 21 \text{\#e1} is bad
in view of 21 ... \text{\#e5} 22 \text{\#g3} \text{\#f3}+!
and 21 \text{\#e3} does not work either
owing to 21 \text{\#xe3}!.

18 \text{\#g3} h4
19 \text{\#e4} \text{\#df8}
20 b6?!

An involuntary pawn sacrifice, but – perhaps – the best practical
chance, since White was forced to do something about the threats of
20 ... \text{\#xh3} and 20 ... \text{\#f5}. 20 \text{\#f4}
would not prevent them because of the interpolation 20 \text{\#g6}!,
when both 21 \text{\#h2} \text{\#xh3}! 22
\text{\#xd6} \text{\#xg2} 23 \text{\#xg2} \text{\#xg5}+ 24
\text{\#h1} \text{\#ed8} 25 \text{\#g1} \text{\#e7} and 21
\text{\#d2} \text{\#xh3}! 22 \text{\#xd6} \text{\#xg2} 23
\text{\#xg2} \text{\#b8}! are hopeless for White.
20 ... $\text{AXB}_6$
21 $\text{Q}_x\text{B}_6$ $\text{B}_x\text{B}_6$
22 $\text{Q}_f4$ $\text{Q}_d8$?!

Inconsistent. Instead, the active 22 $\text{Q}_g6$! was possible, for after 23 $\text{Q}_x\text{d6}$ Black decides things with a nice exchange sacrifice: 23 $\text{Q}_x\text{f4}$! 24 $\text{Q}_x\text{e}8$ $\text{Q}_x\text{g}2$ 25 $\text{Q}_x\text{g}2$ $\text{Q}_x\text{g}5$. 26 $\text{Q}_e1$ $\text{Q}_x\text{h}3$+ 27 $\text{Q}_g1$ $\text{Q}_g6$ and now on 28 $\text{Q}_h2$ Black wins with 28 ... $\text{Q}_f5$ and 28 ... $\text{Q}_h1$ $\text{Q}_e4$. 29 $\text{Q}_f3$ $\text{Q}_x\text{e}8$ gives the same result.

So, after 22 $\text{Q}_g6$! White must play 23 $\text{Q}_b1$, but then Black still gets the better game with 23 $\text{B}_d8$. 24 $\text{Q}_h2$ $\text{Q}_x\text{h}3$! 25 $\text{Q}_x\text{d6}$ $\text{Q}_x\text{g}2$. 26 $\text{Q}_x\text{g}2$ $\text{Q}_x\text{g}5$. 27 $\text{Q}_h1$ $\text{Q}_e7$.

23 $\text{Q}_b1$ $\text{Q}_a6$
24 $\text{Q}_e1$ $\text{Q}_f5$
25 $\text{Q}_f1$ $\text{Q}_a7$
26 $\text{Q}_x\text{d6}$ $\text{Q}_x\text{d6}$?

An exaggerated safety-first policy again. 26 $\text{Q}_x\text{b}1$ 27 $\text{Q}_x\text{b}1$ $\text{Q}_g6$ would have kept Black’s advantage.

27 $\text{Q}_x\text{d6}$ $\text{Q}_x\text{b}1$
27 $\text{Q}_x\text{b}1$ $\text{Q}_d8$?

Time pressure takes its toll once more. 28 $\text{Q}_x\text{g}5$ or even 28 $\text{Q}_g6$ was better.

29 $\text{Q}_x\text{f}8$?

White is not on the ball either. Black’s previous lapses should have been punished by 29 $\text{Q}_c7$!, when the $d_5$ pawn is taboo since 29 $\text{Q}_x\text{d}5$ loses virtually by force to 30 $\text{Q}_c4$ $\text{Q}_d4$. (30 ... $\text{Q}_d2$ 31 $\text{Q}_f5$ $+$; 30 $\text{Q}_x\text{g}5 + 31 \text{Q}_x\text{g}5$ $\text{Q}_x\text{g}5$

32 $\text{Q}_f5$ $\text{Q}_d4$. 33 $\text{Q}_d5$ $+$) 31 $\text{Q}_x\text{f}7$!

32 $\text{Q}_x\text{f}7$ 32 $\text{B}_b3$+ $\text{Q}_g6$. 33 $\text{Q}_c2$+ $\text{Q}_h5$. 34 $\text{Q}_f5$!

White resigns


B

10 $\text{Q}_g3$

This is a more solid continuation than playing for an immediate $h_3$ and $g_4$. White wants to complete his development as soon as possible. Here, too, Black’s answer is to activate his dark-squared bishop before playing $d_6$. 10 $\text{Q}_c5$ (48)

48
12 h3
Defending against the pin \texttt{Ag4} and preparing the manoeuvre g4 and \texttt{Ag3}.

12 a6
Kasparov-Csorn, Baku 1980, continued 12... \texttt{Af5} 13 0-0 \texttt{Abd7}?.
Let us see how the world champion-to-be did his job. First of all, he brings the kingside under his control. 14 g4! \texttt{Ae4} (14... \texttt{Ag6} 15 \texttt{Ag3} \texttt{Ae5} 16 g5 \texttt{Af6} 17 \texttt{Axe4} also gives
White an initiative on the kingside. Black, however, tries to play for simplification) 15 \texttt{Ag3}! \texttt{Axg2} 16
\texttt{Axe2} \texttt{Af8} 17 g5 \texttt{Ad6} 18 h4 \texttt{Ae5}?! 19 h5! f6 20 \texttt{Axe4} fg 21 \texttt{Axg5} \texttt{Wb6}
22 h6 (White has obtained the advantage on the kingside and now he begins to capitalize on it) 22
\texttt{Af7} 23 hg \texttt{Ad7} 24 \texttt{Af6+} \texttt{Axg6} 25
\texttt{Axf6} \texttt{Wb5} 26 \texttt{Ah1} \texttt{Ab6} 27 \texttt{Wf3}
\texttt{Ac5} 28 \texttt{Af5}! \texttt{Af7} 29 \texttt{Axh7}! 1-0.
An improvement on Black's play was first seen in Zilberman-Zidkov, USSR 1981, when instead of 13
\texttt{Abd7}? Black chose 13 \texttt{Ae4}!.
This time White lost rapidly. There followed 14 \texttt{Aa4}?! \texttt{Ad7} 15
g4?! (15 \texttt{Axg5} \texttt{Agx5} with equality) 15
\texttt{Ag6} 16 \texttt{Af4}? \texttt{Axg2}! 17 \texttt{Af2}
\texttt{Axg2}+ 18 \texttt{Axf2} \texttt{Wg4}+ 19 \texttt{Af1}
\texttt{Ac2}!!.
Seeing his knight's tragic fate, White resigned.
Even so, Andersson's 12 a6 looks the most sober move since it hurries to safeguard the strong bishop from a potential exchange.

13 0-0 \texttt{Ab7}
14 \texttt{Ad4}

At Wijk aan Zee 1986 Law played another natural plan against Van der Sterren. That game went on
14 g4 \texttt{Ag5} (14... h5?!) 15 \texttt{Ag3} \texttt{Ag6}
16 \texttt{Axe4}?! (White should have played 16 \texttt{Ag5} h6 17 \texttt{Axf6} \texttt{Axf6}
18 \texttt{Ag4} \texttt{Wh4} – after the more 'materialistically minded' 18
\texttt{Wxb2}?! the situation is not clear either – 19 \texttt{Af5}, dc, with a strong
d-pawn compensating for White's weaknesses on the kingside) 16
\texttt{Axe4} 17 \texttt{Axe4} \texttt{Ae7} 18 \texttt{Wd3}, when
(instead of the immediate 18... f5) 18... h6 intending... \texttt{Ah4} and... f5
would have given Black excellent
counter-chances, e.g. 19 \texttt{Wb4} f5 20
\texttt{Wxd6} \texttt{Ah4}! or 20 \texttt{Axg6}? a5, both
\texttt{W+}. The rest of the game is also interesting, containing some witty
tactical motifs. 18... f5 19 \texttt{Ag5}?! (19
gf! \texttt{Af5} 20 \texttt{Ag5} \texttt{Ah4} with chances
for both sides) 19... fg 20 hg \texttt{Axg4}
21 \texttt{Wxb7} \texttt{Wf6} 22 \texttt{Ae6} \texttt{Ad5} 23 \texttt{Ag6}
\texttt{Axe6} 24 \texttt{Ae4} \texttt{Af3}+ 25 \texttt{Ag2} \texttt{Ah4}+
26 \texttt{Axh4} (26 \texttt{Ah2} \texttt{Af5}) 26
\texttt{Axe6}+ 27 \texttt{f3} \texttt{Ae2}+ 28 \texttt{Ag3} \texttt{Axg6}
29 \texttt{Ae1}? \texttt{Af2}+ 0-1.

14 ... \texttt{Ae5}
15 \texttt{Ae2} \texttt{Ad7}
16 b4?

16 b3, controlling the c4 square,
was safer. Black then has the interesting plan of 16 \texttt{Ag6} followed
by \texttt{Ae5-h5}.

16 ... \texttt{Aa7}
This loses immediately, but White was already beyond salvation. After 29 g4, preventing the threat of 29 \( \text{Wh5} \), Black wins by force with 29 \( \text{Qxg4!} \) 30 hg \( \text{Qxg4+} \) 31 \( \text{Qh3} \) \( \text{Wh5+} \) 32 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Wh2+} \) 33 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qxe3+} \) 34 fe \( \text{Qf2+} \) 35 \( \text{Qg4} \) \( \text{Qe4+} \) 36 \( \text{Qh3/5} \) \( \text{Qh4} \) mate.

29 \( \text{Qf5} \)

White resigns

Chandler-Andersson, Malta Ol 1980.

And now two games in which after 10 g3 White also advances on the queenside with b4.

B2

11 b4

Driving the bishop back and preventing \( \text{ab ovo} \) the possibility of a later \( \text{Qb6} \). This move has, however, a drawback as well: it weakens the c3 and c4 squares.

11 \( \text{Qb6 (50)} \)

Putting the rook into action while threatening to double on the e-file by 24 \( \text{Qce8} \).

24 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qg6} \)
25 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qce8} \)
26 \( \text{Qh2} \) h6
27 \( \text{Qg1} \) \( \text{Qxd4!} \)
28 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \)
29 \( \text{Qf3?} \)

B21 12 \( \text{Qg2} \)
B22 12 \( \text{Qh3??} \)
B21 12 \( \text{Qg2} \)
We will follow Sharif-Adorjan, Thessaloniki Ol 1984.

12 \(d6\)

13 0-0

On the immediate 13 \(\text{a}4\) play may continue 13 \(\text{g}4\) 14 \(\text{a}2\) \(\text{bd}7\) 15 0-0 \(\text{e}5\) 16 \(\text{xb}6\) \(\text{ab}\) with active piece play for Black.

13 \(\text{bd}7?!\)

13 a6! would have been more accurate, since now White could have played 14 \(\text{a}4\)!, embracing the opportunity provided by Black’s superficial move.

14 \(h3?!\)

15 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{a}6\)

16 \(\text{a}2\)

Both 16 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}4\) and 16 \(\text{h}5\)? \(\text{hx}5\) 17 \(\text{x}h5\) \(\text{d}4\) leave Black on top.

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

17 \(\text{h}5?\)

17 \(\text{d}3\) or perhaps 17 \(\text{e}4\) were more advisable, since after a knight exchange on h5 and the queen’s retreat from her own people, the ‘hinterland’ becomes unprotected. The text move, however, does contain some poison, since on the ‘active’ 17 \(\text{c}8\)? White wins by 18 \(\text{g}5\)! \(\text{x}c3\) 19 \(\text{x}f6\) \(gf\) 20 \(\text{d}2\), attacking the rook and also threatening 21 \(\text{h}6\) with mate!

17 ... \(h6!\)

18 \(\text{h}2?!\)

18 \(\text{h}1\) would not have been a happy idea since Black has 18 \(\text{c}8\) 19 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{x}h5\) 20 \(\text{x}h5\) \(\text{d}3\) 21 \(\text{a}1\) \(\text{f}2+!\) 22 \(\text{xf}2\) \(\text{xf}2\) 23 \(\text{xf}2\) \(\text{e}1+\) with a plus tempo, when on 24 \(\text{f}1\) Black decides with 24 ... \(\text{xf}1+\) 25 \(\text{xf}1\) \(\text{f}6\) 26 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{x}c3\) 27 \(\text{x}c3\) \(\text{xc}3\) 28 \(\text{e}7\) \(\text{f}5\) 29 \(\text{xd}6\) \(\text{e}1\); and 24 \(\text{h}2\) does not help White either because of 24 ... \(\text{x}a1\) 25 \(\text{f}7+\) \(\text{h}8\) 26 \(\text{g}6\) \(\text{xc}3\) 27 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{g}8\) 28 \(\text{f}8\) \(\text{e}2\)

If you think that 18 \(\text{xf}6\) is somewhat better, you are right; after 18 ... \(\text{xf}6\) 19 \(\text{f}4\) the onlookers would have had to wait for the KO, but due to his weaknesses White’s situation is critical even then.

18 ... \(\text{c}8\)

19 \(\text{d}2\) (51)

51

B

The matter is ripe for decision.

19 ... \(\text{f}4+!\)

20 \(\text{h}1\)

20 \(\text{hg}\) \(\text{xg}4\) adds a pawn to Black’s mill, it is true. But why did my opponent not defend the f2 square? I think that he saw that after 20 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{xf}2!\) 21 \(\text{xf}2\) \(\text{xf}2+\) 22 \(\text{xf}2\) \(\text{b}6+\) 23 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{c}4\) 24
This position varies very little from the picture after White’s twelfth move in Dukić-Csom and Sharif-Adorjan; in the first White’s g-pawn was on g4 (instead of g3), while in the second White had played 12 g2.

GM Timman has another plan for Black up his sleeve; eschewing the move d6, he immediately launches a counter-attack. The undeveloped White kingside is again an important factor.

12 a5
13 b5 (?) c7!
14 b2?!

14 d2 c5 15 e3 was perhaps better, though in this case after 15 xe3! 16 fe xe3 Black has sufficient compensation for the exchange. For example, 17 h2 d6 18 d2 e5. Personally, though, I would still prefer not to be in White’s shoes.

14 c5
15 h2

There is nothing better – the white king is doomed to remain in the centre.

15 a4!

Of course not 15 ... d6? because after 16 a4 xb5 17 xf6! gf 18 b1 White emerges a piece up. The a4 pawn, obviously, cannot be taken on account of 16 xe4?? a5+.

16 d3 d6
17 e1 (53)
17 $\Box$bd7!

Offering a queen sacrifice in order to increase his pieces' teamwork.

Now 17 $\Box$xa4? would be an embarrassing mistake since it would give the rook on a8 wings. For example, 17 $\Box$xa4 18 $\Box$xc5 $\Box$xc5 19 $\Box$e2 $\Box$ae4 with the threats of 20 $\Box$f5 and 20 ... $\Box$d7 is more than unpleasant.

White, however, must defend himself against 18 ... $\Box$e5. So there is no choice by to play

18 $\Box$e4

which allows Black to play his queen sacrifice in another form:

18 $\Box$xe4!
19 $\Box$xc5 $\Box$exc5
20 $\Box$c2 $\Box$e5
21 $\Box$d1 $\Box$ed3
22 $\Box$c3 $\Box$f5
23 $\Box$d4

White was already only able to choose how to die. 23 $\Box$f4 $\Box$ac8!
24 $\Box$xd3 $\Box$xd3 25 $\Box$xd3 $\Box$e4 26 $\Box$b4 $\Box$xc2 27 $\Box$xc2 $\Box$e8+ 28 $\Box$d1

$\Box$c3+ (Timman's variation) would have led to a lost ending for White. The text makes his agony a little bit shorter

23 $\Box$g6
24 g4 $\Box$ac8
25 f3 $\Box$b4
26 $\Box$b2

Timman also gives 26 $\Box$d2 $\Box$xd5 27 $\Box$f5 $\Box$e4! - that is not bad either.

26 ... $\Box$cd3
27 $\Box$d2 $\Box$xd5

White resigned rather than face 28 $\Box$e2 $\Box$xe2! 29 $\Box$xe2 $\Box$e3+.

C

10 $\Box$e3 (54)

In this line White first thwarts the e7 bishop's development, intending to complete his own development only after this. If he gets sufficient time to do so, his advantage in space should give him the better position. As an illustration, let us look at the game Kasparov-Andersson, Moscow 1981. There followed 10 ... d6?! 11 h3 $\Box$bd7
12 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{f8} \) 13 \( \text{e2} \), when Black, instead of acquiescing in a long struggle after 13 \( \text{g6} \) 14 0-0 \( \text{g7} \) 15 \( \text{d4} \), decided to play an exchange sacrifice with 13 ... \( \text{xe3} \), but after 14 \( \text{fe} \) \( \text{g6} \) 15 0-0 \( \text{we7} \) 16 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{g7} \) 17 \( \text{f4} \) he had insufficient compensation for his material deficit.

So in diagram 54 Black’s logical continuation is

\[
\begin{align*}
10 & \quad \text{g4} \\
11 & \quad \text{d4} (55)
\end{align*}
\]

Earlier, 11 \( \text{d6} \) and 11 \( \text{f6} \) had been tried by Black here.

In Gligorić-Sosonko, Plovdiv 1983, 11 ... \( \text{d6} \) 12 \( \text{g3} \)!? (of course, 12 \( \text{h3} \) is also good) 12 \( \text{h6} \) 13 \( \text{b5} \) ! \( \text{d7} \) 14 0-0 \( \text{xb5} \) 15 \( \text{xb5} \) a6 16 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 17 \( \text{e1} \) was not enough for Black.

11 \( \text{f6} \) did not give Black much more joy in Ree-Ligterink, Dutch Ch 1982: 12 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 13 \( \text{e4} \) d6 14 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g6} \)? 15 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 16 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 17 0-0 \( \text{e5} \) 18 \( \text{e1} \) a6 19 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{d8} \) 20 \( \text{b3} \) b5 21 a4! (it is obvious that Black is not able to complete his development) 21

\( \text{a7} \) 22 \( \text{ab} \) \( \text{b7} \) 23 \( \text{c5} \) 1-0.

In the knowledge of all this, Black decides to make an unexpected and original move.

11 \( \text{h6} \)!

Is there a new slogan ‘Going back is half the battle’? Is this how you should play for a win these days? Should you withdraw your only active piece? Not at all. You must do so only in this position; Black threatens 12 ... \( \text{f5} \) exchanging his opponent’s most active piece. If you want, you can name this ‘concrete chess’

C1 12 \( \text{g4} \)!

C2 12 \( \text{wd3} \)

a) The modest 12 \( \text{g3} \) would lead to Black’s advantage: 12 \( \text{f5} \) 13 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 14 \( \text{wd4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 15 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xc3} \)! 16 \( \text{xc3} \) (16 \( \text{bc} \) would only increase White’s weaknesses and after 16 \( \text{d6} \) followed by \( \text{d7} \) or \( \text{a6} \) Black would stand superbly) 16 \( \text{b6} \) 17 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{a6} \) 18 \( \text{f1} \) d6 19 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d7} \)! 20 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{c8} \) 21 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{e5} \), when a sample (but not forced) continuation is 22 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{b7} \) 23 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{xc6} \)! 24 dc \( \text{xf3} \) 25 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{xc6+} \) 26 \( \text{g4} \) h5+! 27 \( \text{xf5} \) (27 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{c8}+) \) 27 \( \text{f3}+ \) 28 g4 g6+ 29 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{h4} \) mate!

b) The tactical move 12 \( \text{d6} \) also comes into consideration. Yrjölä-Wedberg, Gausdal 1983, continued 12 \( \text{f8} \) 13 \( \text{c2} \)! \( \text{xd6} \) 14 0-0 0 15 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 16 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 17 f4 \( \text{e8} \) 18 \( \text{c4} \) White obtained
a strong initiative for his pawn.

Instead of the passive 12... \(\text{f8}\), it is more advisable for Black to accept the gauntlet. After 12 \(\text{xd6}\) 13 \(\text{xg7}\) \(\text{f5}\)! (still in the spirit of activity) 14 \(\text{h6}\) (14 \(\text{d4}\)? would be a bad mistake because of 14... \(\text{c6}\) 15 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{xe3}\) 16 \(\text{fe}\) \(\text{c5}\)) 14 \(\text{h4}\) 15 \(\text{c1}\) (15 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{c5}\)!) 15 \(\text{c5}\) 16 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{d4}\) 17 \(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{xd4}\) 18 \(\text{b1}\) (18 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{d5}\)! 18... \(\text{d5}\) White has some headaches.

c) For the sake of completeness we should mention a series of sacrifices that occurred in Ree-Ligterink, Wijk aan Zee 1984: 12 \(\text{g3}\)? \(\text{xa3}\)+ 13 \(\text{e2}\) \(\text{xb2}\) 14 \(\text{b5}\) \(\text{xd4}\)! 15 \(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{d6}\) 16 \(\text{xa7}\) \(\text{xa7}\) 17 \(\text{xa7}\) \(\text{a6}\) and White had no compensation for his pawn.

C1

12 \(\text{g4}\)?? \(\text{d6}\)

12 \(\text{xg4}\)?? was worth considering since 13 \(\text{g1}\) \(\text{d6}\) 14 \(\text{xg7}\) \(\text{xg7}\) 15 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{h5}\) 16 \(\text{hg}\) \(\text{hg}\) with the idea of 17 \(\text{g5}\) would have led to Black’s advantage.

13 \(\text{h3}\) \(\text{f5}\)!

This is already the signal for the counter-attack. After 14 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{h4}\)+ 15 \(\text{f2}\) \(\text{f6}\) or 14 \(\text{gf}\) \(\text{xf5}\) Black emerges with a clear advantage.

14 \(\text{c2}\) \(\text{g5}\)??

14 \(\text{fg}\)! 15 \(\text{hg}\) \(\text{xg4}\) 16 0-0-0 \(\text{g5}\)+ 17 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{f6}\) was even more energetic.

15 \(\text{g2}\) \(\text{d7}\)!

16 \(\text{gf}\)

Kingside castling was obviously out of the question, while after 16 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{h4}\)+ 17 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{fg}\) 18 \(\text{hg}\) \(\text{b6}\)! White’s position is full of wounds.

16 \(\text{f6}\)

17 \(\text{h4}\) \(\text{xf5}\)

18 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{d7}\)

19 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{f4}\)

20 \(\text{f1}\)

20 0-0 was still dubious because of 20 \(\text{h5}\) 21 \(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{xf4}\), when White cannot play 21 \(\text{xd6}\) owing to 21 \(\text{g2}\) 22 \(\text{g2}\) \(\text{h3}\)+.

20 \(\text{e5}\)

21 \(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{xe5}\)

22 \(\text{xd6}\) \(\text{fg4}\)!

23 \(\text{g1}\) \(\text{f5}\)

24 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{h4}\)

Like an avalanche crashing down – the momentum of Black’s attack increases step by step.

25 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{f6}\)!

26 \(\text{ce4}\) \(\text{f3}\)+

27 \(\text{xf3}\)

27 \(\text{f1}\)?? \(\text{xe4}\)! 28 \(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{a6}\)+ with mate – a nice variation!

27 ... \(\text{xf3}\)

28 \(\text{xb7}\)

(Background music: F.Liszt – Danse Macabre)

28 ... \(\text{f8}\)!

29 \(\text{xd7}\) \(\text{xf2}\)

30 \(\text{h2}\) \(\text{xe4}\)

31 \(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{xe4}\)

32 \(\text{d6}\) \(\text{g4}\)+

White resigns

Groszpeter-Adorjan, Hungarian Team Ch 1983.
This is a natural move which also prevents the threat of \( \text{Q}f5 \).

13 \text{f}4?

This is, of course, a mistake since Black’s bishop can now develop with an extra tempo.

Kiril Georgiev played the correct move, 13 \text{g}3!, against Qi Jingxuan at the 1984 Thessaloniki Olympiad. There followed: 13 ... \text{f}6+ 14 \text{e}2 \text{x}d4 (14 ... \text{f}5 15 \text{x}f6 \text{x}f6 16 0-0 \text{x}g3?! 17 fg \text{d}8?!! 18 \text{xf}7!! \text{d}7 19 \text{f}2 with a clear edge for White in Paunović-Maksimović, Yugoslavia 1983) 15 \text{x}d4 \text{f}5 16 \text{f}4! \text{h}4 17 0-0 \text{g}6 18 \text{b}4! with a definite advantage for the Bulgarian grandmaster, who won in 67 moves.

In Georgiev-Miralles, France 1985, the French player improved on Black’s play by 14 \text{d}7?! (instead of 14 ... \text{x}d4). The game continued 15 \text{ce}4 \text{a}5+ 16 \text{b}4 \text{x}d5 17 \text{d}1 (I think that after 17 \text{xf}6+ \text{xf}6 18 0-0 \text{f}5 – 18 \text{hg}4 is also acceptable – 19 \text{xf}6 \text{x}d3 20 \text{xd}3 \text{x}g3 21 fg gf 22 \text{xf}6 \text{e}6 Black has good chances since on 23 \text{h}6 he can play 23 \text{ac}8! with good counterplay for the pawn) 17 ... \text{e}5? (this is, however, the wrong plan) 18 0-0 \text{f}8 19 \text{xe}5 \text{x}d3 20 \text{xd}3 \text{de} 21 \text{b}5 \text{e}7 22 \text{d}8 \text{a}6 23 \text{d}6! \text{c}7 24 \text{c}4 b5 25 \text{d}5 \text{b}8 26 \text{ge}4 \text{d}7? (losing a piece, but he already had no adequate defence to 27 \text{g}5) 27 \text{xc}8! 1-0.

I think that Black could have equalized by 17 \text{xd}4 18 \text{xd}4 \text{xd}4 19 \text{xd}4 d5! returning the extra pawn. For instance, 20 \text{xd}5 \text{b}6 21 \text{d}2 \text{e}6 22 \text{d}6 \text{c}7.

Let us return to our main game and see how White is punished for neglecting his development.

13 ... \text{f}5

14 \text{d}2 \text{d}7

15 g3 \text{f}6

16 h3 \text{xd}4

17 \text{xd}4 \text{c}5 (57)
Now there is no defence to the assault from the excellently posted black pieces. The threat of ... $\text{b}3$ cannot be prevented by $18 \text{b}1?$ since $18 \text{c}2$ wins the exchange even then, so White's next move is forced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$\text{e}2$</td>
<td>$\text{d}3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$g4$</td>
<td>$\text{h}4+$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$\text{f}2$</td>
<td>$\text{e}7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$\text{d}4$</td>
<td>$\text{ac}8!$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$\text{f}2$</td>
<td>$\text{h}4+$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 $\text{g}1$

23 $\text{g}2$ was not enough to survive either: 23 $\text{e}4!$ 24 $\text{g}1$ $\text{xe}2$ 25 $\text{xe}2$ $\text{c}2$ 26 $\text{d}3$ $\text{f}2+$ 27 $\text{h}1$ $\text{xe}2$ 28 $\text{xe}2$ $\text{c}5$ and Black wins.

23 ... $\text{xe}2$

24 $\text{xe}2$ $\text{xe}2!$

25 $\text{xe}2$ $\text{g}3+$

26 $\text{f}1$ $\text{b}3$

White resigns

5 The Quill of the Hedgehog †

The hedgehog is a peaceful creature. But those who try to hurt it soon experience the sharpness of its quills.

1 \textit{Q}f3 c5
2 c4 \textit{Q}f6
3 \textit{Q}c3 e6
4 g3 b6
5 \textit{Q}g2 \textit{Q}b7
6 0-0 d6
7 d4 cd
8 \textit{W}xd4 a6
9 \textit{Q}d1 \textit{Q}e7
10 \textit{Q}g5 \textit{Q}bd7
11 \textit{Q}d2 \textit{Q}xg2
12 \textit{Q}xg2 0-0
13 \textit{Q}de4 \textit{W}c7 (58)

We are following Korchnoi-Adorjan, Cannes 1986.

The psychology of tournament chess is a peculiar thing. At Wijk aan Zee 1984 I played a double fianchettto against Korchnoi. In the course of that game I let real winning chances slip away and finally, after two adjournments, we agreed a draw. Yet in this game, I was the one who varied from the previous game. Korchnoi, in turn, ‘surprised’ me with a plan in the Hedgehog which I had wanted to try as White against Tarjan seven years before at the Riga Interzonal 1979. There Black had diverted the course of the game by playing \textit{d}5 on move 4. (Perhaps it was better that it happened so ..)

† I dedicate this chapter with respect and gratitude to the memory of Gideon Barcza, who encouraged me to write when I was only a teenager. In my early days, and for many years thereafter, this great man edited my articles and analyses with affection and tactful care.

Gideon Barcza died on 27 February 1986. R.I.P.
I have learned since then that direct tries of this kind can only hold out any promises of success if White is able to bring matters to a head in a few moves. If the first player has no success by storming tactics, Black’s position will be solid and flexible and able to sting back at White. The long and the short of it is whether capturing the d6 pawn is good or bad.

Let us take the variations after 14 Qxd6 Qfd8 one by one.

a) 15 Qf4? e5 16 Qf5 Qc5 and Black wins.

b) 15 Qde4 Qe5 16 W3 (16 Qxf6+? gf winning a piece) 16 Qxc4 17 Qxd8+ Qxd8 18 Wc1 Qxe4 19 Qxe7 Wxe7 20 Qxe4 Qd4!, with advantage to Black (21 f3? would lose to 21 Qd1!).

c) 15 b4!. This had been my intention at the time, but I later thought it was ‘simply’ refuted by 15 ... a5. However, this refutation does not work! Let us see: 16 ba Qc5 17 Qcb5 Qc6+ 18 f3 Qxa5 19 e4! Qxb5 20 cb Wxd6 21 Wxd6 Qxd6 22 e5 Qxd1 23 Qxd1 Qd5 24 Qxe7 Qe3+ 25 Qg1 Qxd1 26 Qxc5, and White can calmly rest on his laurels. Certainly, Black’s play was rather ‘helpmate-like’, but the dangers are well demonstrated.

I analysed the position again and again. Sometimes I analysed alone, sometimes with a friend and sometimes at my club. Here, now, is our ‘last word’ on the variation.

14 Qxd6 Qad8! (59)

Why this rook? It will all become clear below (note d).

a) 15 Qf4? e5 etc., as mentioned above.

b) 15 Qde4 Qc5 16 W3 Qxc4 17 Wc1 Qxd1 18 Qxd1 Qxe4 19 Qxe7 Qc8, with a clear edge to Black.

c) 15 Qce4 (this looks suspect from the start, but let us be scrupulously thorough) 15 h6! 16 Qxf6 (16 Qf4 e5 17 Qf5 Qc5 18 Qxc5 bc 19, 16 Qxf6+ Qxf6 17 Qf4 Qxd6 18 Qxd6 Wc6+ 19 f3 Qe8 17 and 16 Qe3 Qxe4 17 Qxe4 Qc5 15 are equally bad for White) 16 Qxf6 17 Qxf6+ Qxf6 18 Wf4 e5 19 Wd2 Qe7 17.

d) 15 b4 Qb8! (of course!) 16 c5 Qc6 17 Wf4 Qxb4! 18 Wxb4 (On 18 Qce4, 18 Qbd5 would be decisive. This contrasts with the almost twin position which would arise after 14 Qfd8 instead of 14 ... Qad8. Then, after 18 ... Qbd5,
White builds up his position in too leisurely a manner and after the text move he will not obtain the ‘ideal’ set-up (with pawns on a4 and e4). White’s space advantage may look impressive but it does not actually benefit him much. On the other hand the sacrifice 19 \$a4? is clearly bad because of 19 b5 20 cb (20 \$b2 \$a5) 20 \$xc1 21 \$xc1 \$xd1+ 22 \$g2 ab 23 \$b6 \$dc8 24 \$xb5 \$c8c2, and Black’s rooks obviously triumph over the queen.

Now, from diagram 58:

14 \$ac1 \$fd8
15 \$g1?!

Nobody likes positions with a check on the long diagonal in the air. However, White will play f3 in a few moves, so he would have done better to play it immediately and to delay or save the king move.

15 ... h6
16 \$xf6+ \$xf6
17 \$xf6 \$xf6
18 b3 \$ac8

If you play Korchnoi you must be prepared for everything, and especially for a fight! So my draw offer in this absolutely balanced position was really just to confirm the mood he was in. Korchnoi declined it unhesitatingly. I did not regret this very much – at least I was now able to examine the secrets of the position instead of studying my opponent’s face.

19 f3
the advantage too) 22 c6 23 e4 xcl 24 xf6+ gf 25 xcl xd6 26 xd6 xd6 27 c8+ g7 28 a8 d2 29 xa6 xe2, when the point will obviously be shared.

In spite of this, I restrained myself – the text aims higher!

21 e4 (60)

From diagram 61: 17 b5! 18 cb ab 19 wd3 e5 20 xb5 wa7! 21 e4 w3! 22 w1 g5!! 23 c2. Now:

a) 23 b3 g4 24 fg dxg4 (with the idea of wh6) 25 w1 (25 h3 xc3! 26 xc3 xa2! f) 25 xc3 26 xc3 de+ f.

b) 23 a3 g4 24 f4 c3 25 c4 ef3+ f.

c) 23 h3 h5! (with the idea of 24 g4 or 24 h4).

So play continued 23 xa2! 24 d5 (24 e1 wd3 f) 24 xc2! 25 xe3 xb2 26 we2 g4! 27 f4 (27 xg4 xg4 28 fg g5 f) 27 xe4 28 ef1 xd2 (28 c3 29 e1 f3 is even quicker) 29 xd2 xd2 30 xd2 f3 31 wc4 xd2+ 32 wf1 f6 0-1 Miles-Adorjan, Riga IZ 1979.

23 e5

A difficult decision, the result of 45 minutes’ meditation. 23 ba was clearly unplayable because after 23 ... de 24 we3 ef the naked white monarch will soon fall victim to
brute force. The position after 23 ed \( \text{Qxd5} \) 24 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 25 \( \text{Wxe2} \) does not look very promising either, though it might be defended by White.

Korchnoi prevents the full opening up of the position. Certainly, this has its own price too – you can see Black's great achievement on d5: a powerful protected passed pawn.

23 ... \( \text{Qd7} \)
24 \( \text{Wxe2} \)

The remains of White's once proud centre clearly cannot be left to their fate: 24 ba \( \text{Qxe5} \) 25 \( \text{Wxe2} \) \( \text{Cc6} \) (with the threats of 26 ... \( \text{Qb4} \) or 26 \( \text{Qb8} \)) leads to an overwhelming position for Black. 26 f4 would create a new weakness in White's camp, but Korchnoi will soon be forced to play it anyway, so the thesis of spreading weaknesses will be justified. (The specific problem with the move is the continuation 24 f4 ab 25 \( \text{Wxb5} \) \( \text{Wxa3} \)!

24 \( \text{Cc5}! \)

This is serious! White suddenly has problems on the c-file in the form of a cankerous pin.

25 a4

25 ba does not work either since after 25 \( \text{Qdc8} \) 26 \( \text{Wxe3} \) \( \text{Wxa6} \) 27 f4 \( \text{Wxa3} \) 28 \( \text{Cc2} \) \( \text{Wb4} \) 29 \( \text{Qd3} \) Black finishes White off quickly with 29 \( \text{Qb8} \).

25 ... \( \text{Qdc8} \)
26 \( \text{Wxe3} \) (62)

If 26 \( \text{Qa2} \) then 26 ab 27 ab \( \text{Wxa3} \)! 28 \( \text{Qxc5} \) \( \text{Qxc5} \) with a decisive penetration.

26 \( \text{Wb8}!! \)

The best move of the game. Before playing it I had to curb fanciful notions of 26 d4?, in view of 27 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 28 \( \text{Qe4} \) (±), and disregard the illogical 26 ... ab 27 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \text{Qxc1} \) 28 \( \text{Qxc1} \) \( \text{Qxc1} + \) 29 \( \text{Wxc1} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) regaining the pawn but (such is the justice of chess) leading to White's advantage after 30 \( \text{Qc3} \).

27 f4 \( \text{Wb6} \)

It never rains but what it pours – to crown everything we were now in unpleasant time trouble. Black threatens 28 ... \( \text{Qxc3} \), and so

28 \( \text{Qg2} \) ab

No position is so good that it cannot be lost by a single move. Everybody can quote examples, and here is another: 28 \( \text{Qxb5}?? \) 29 \( \text{Qxd5} \) turning the tables.

29 \( \text{Qh3} \)

One would prefer to hide such a
king in one’s pocket! Korchnoi sticks to the rules and seeks an ‘asylum’ for him on the board.

After 29 ab, my intention was 29 \( \mathbb{W}a5 \) (of course 29 \( \mathbb{A}xb5 \) loses in the way mentioned above) with material equality and a fine positional advantage for Black.

29 \( \mathbb{E}5c6! \)

From now on the pace of events accelerates, mainly because of the harassing lack of time. White cannot avoid the exchange of queens because on 30 \( \mathbb{W}f3/d3 \) 30 \( \mathbb{W}a5 \) decide immediately and after 30 \( \mathbb{W}e1 \), 30 \( ba \) 31 \( ba \) \( \mathbb{W}a5 \) wins.

30 \( \mathbb{W}xb6 \) \( \mathbb{A}xb6 \)
31 \( a5! \) \( \mathbb{A}xc3 \) (63)

32 \( \mathbb{W}a5 \)?

Selling his last chance to defend for a mess of pottage. (32 ... \( \mathbb{A}xc1 \)? 33 \( \mathbb{A}xc1 \) \( \mathbb{A}xc1 \) 34 b7 \( \mathbb{A}xc1 \) was the trick.)

32 \( \mathbb{A}xc3 \) \( \mathbb{A}xc3 \) 33 \( ab \) \( \mathbb{C}c6 \) 34 \( \mathbb{C}c1! \) \( \mathbb{A}xb6 \) would have allowed more resistance since – in contrast to the situation in the middlegame – White would obtain activity in compensation for his pawn. However, the obvious-looking 35 \( \mathbb{C}c7 \) paradoxically just loses due to 35 \( \mathbb{A}a6! \) 36 \( \mathbb{B}7 \) \( \mathbb{A}a2 \) 37 \( \mathbb{A}xb5 \) g5!, when the black king tears apart the chain of pawns and Black escorts the d-pawn home. Neverthe less, 35 \( \mathbb{G}4! \) preparing 36 h4 in answer to 35 ... \( \mathbb{H}7 \) would have kept away the black monarch and offered good chances of a draw.

After reading these lines you might ask: where is the justice of chess? Can White be let off with a draw after he has made several mistakes and his opponent has apparently played the best moves?

Well, in this game it was the justice of tournament chess that was illustrated. It very often happens that players who have been on the defensive for a long time will sooner or later lose the thread of the game because of the pressure (especially in time trouble). It is no rarity in practice for defenders to lose when the dangers were about to move away.

32 ... \( b4! \)
33 \( \mathbb{G}4 \)

Here White’s position was already beyond salvation, e.g. 33 \( \mathbb{A}xc3 \) bc 34 b7 \( \mathbb{B}8 \) 35 \( \mathbb{D}3 \) (35 \( \mathbb{C}1 \) d4 \( \mathbb{A}d4 \) 35 ... c2 36 \( \mathbb{C}c3 \) \( \mathbb{A}xb7 \) 37 \( \mathbb{A}xc2 \) \( \mathbb{A}xb3 \) 38 \( \mathbb{G}4 \) (on 38 \( \mathbb{C}7 \), 38 \( \mathbb{B}2! \) with the idea of ... \( \mathbb{A}c2 \), \( g5 \) and ... \( \mathbb{G}7-g6 \) etc \( \mathbb{A}d4 \)) 38 ...
\(\text{\#h7 39 h4 h5+! 40 \#h3 (40 \#xh5 \#xg3 with the threat of ...g6 mate) 40 \#g6 and Black wins easily. 33 \#h7!}

Sometimes you only recognize later what a good move you have played. I shall not cast a mist before your eyes and claim that I foresaw my 37th move here – in the last-minute rush I had been guided only by my instincts. My decision to leave the back rank was designed to activate my king via g6 and prevent White thwarting this with 34 h4, which now loses to 34 ... h5+! 35 \#xh5 (35 \#h3 \#g6 etc with an easy win) 35 \#xg3!, and mate cannot be avoided. (The other advantage of the text move is that the c8 rook cannot be taken with check.)

This motif had already appeared in the previous note and it would also play an essential part after 34 b7 \#b8 35 \#xc3 bc 36 \#d3 c2 37 \#c3 \#xb6 38 \#xc2 \#xb3 39 h4: 39 h5+! 40 \#h3 (otherwise we will meet the familiar mate) 40 \#g6, and now Black should win fairly easily. White’s rook will be placed on c7, Black’s will go to d2, Black’s d-pawn will march forward and finally – at a proper moment – Black’s king will penetrate via f5/e4 with decisive effect.

34 \#xc3 \#bc
35 \#c1

Virtually provoking the nice finish, but 35 b7 was also hopeless (as you can see above) and 35 \#f3 would simply be met by 35 ... c2 36 \#c1 \#c3+ followed by \#xb3.

35 \#d4
36 \#f3 \#d3
37 b7 (64)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
& \\
\hline
37 & d2! \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

A move of this kind can be overlooked even when there is no time pressure, especially if you have to foresee it several moves previously! Korchnoi’s saving idea was probably 37 \#e8?! 38 b8\#! \#xb8? 39 \#xc3 \#d8 40 \#c1. It is quite interesting that in this variation 38 d2! would still win: 39 \#xd8 bc \#d3+ g6 41 \#d7 \#g7 42 \#d8 \#h1+ 43 \#e3/g4 \#xh2 etc. It really is true – the former target, the d6 quill of the hedgehog, finally ends up as the aggressor.

38 bc \#d3+ \#c5
39 \#c4 \#d1+

At this moment White’s flag fell, but there was no need to find out how many moves we had made as Korchnoi resigned anyway.
Everyone has his own ideas (or at least could have). All sorts of ideas, both bright and silly. It is an open question what the value of an idea is and who can decide it. We are subjective creatures and just as predisposed to our spiritual children as we are to our real ones. It would be an obvious solution to say that the best test is the result in practice – if an idea is good then it will bring in victories (or at least reassuring draws) to its inventor. In general, this holds true. But not always!

In this chapter I shall describe the birth and development of an idea of mine, which has so far only brought me several defeats and some draws (I have never won a single game with it!). Nevertheless, when I first used it, although I lost the game, I won the most important theoretical novelty prize awarded by the Informant jury. And in the same year Korchnoi also included it in his arsenal and won a memorable victory against Gary Kasparov himself in the very first game of their 1983 match in London.

Well, let us put my paradox story on the road: once upon a time an idea struck me

1   d4   ♘f6
2   c4   e6
3   ♘f3   b6
4   a3   ♘b7
5   ♘c3   d5
6   cd   ♘xd5
7   e3   g6!?  (65)

Well, this is it! According to the great and the wise, the moves ... e6 and ... g6 are unhappy bedfellows. This opinion may sometimes be right – though not always and not in this case. This chapter will give some examples. The idea leads to positions analogous to certain variations of the Grünfeld Defence
(mainly the Exchange Variation); so one could call this the ‘Grünfeld Variation’ of the 4 a3 Queen’s Indian.’

Black snipes at White’s centre from afar and tries to undermine it by c5 and dxc6 etc, while his bishops both add to the pressure on that sector of the board.

Now White can try:
A 8 b5+
B 8 d5
C 8 h4
A

8 b5+ c6 69

Now we consider:
A1 c3
A2 9 e2
A3 9 a4
A4 9 c4
A1

9 d3

This was White’s choice in the idea’s ‘world premiere’, Ftacnik-Adorjan, Banja Luka 1983, which we will now follow.

9 g7

This is, of course, the logical move. There is no need to play c5 yet.

10 e4

In Tarjan-Adorjan, Vršac 1983, White tried 10 0-0 0-0 11 d5. There followed 11 cd (11 ed also comes into consideration) 12 d2 c6 13 c1 d8 (13 ... d6 combined with c8 is also interesting) 14 a4 c7 15 b5

... c8?! (15 a8 followed by f8 would have given Black a promising position) 16 c3 a6 17 x6 x6 18 f1 c4? (18 x3 19 x3 d8 was the lesser of the two evils) 19 x4 dc 20 x4 a8 21 e2 d8 22 e3, when Black had no compensation for his pawn. White won in 55 moves.

We should also mention the game Reshevsky-H. Olafsson, New York 1984, which continued 11 a4 (instead of 11 d5) 11 c7 12 e2 d7 13 d1 e8 14 d2 e5 15 de c5 16 e4 x5 17 x5 xe5 18 x7 19 x7 20 b3 21 e3 22 c2 d8 23 d7 24 d1 xd1+ 25 xd1 e6 26 b3 d4 1/2-1/2.

White’s premature attempt at a kingside attack recoiled in the game Maksimović-Vegh, W Berlin 1987, when after 10 h4 0-0 11 h5 x3 12 bc c5 13 hg hg 14 e4 c6 15 g5?! (15 g5?!) 15 cd 16 f4 dc 17 g4 e8! (if 17 xd3? then 18 h8+! wins) 18 h3 d4! Black won easily.

10 x3

11 bc 0-0

For 11 c5 see Kasparov-Korchnoi later in this chapter.

12 g5?!

Ftacnik criticizes this move, but after 12 0-0 c5 13 e3, which he evaluates as better, Black can con-
continue 13 cd 14 cd @c6 with the following variations:
a) 15 @b5 a6(!) 16 @xc6 @xc6, when 17 @d3 does not work on account of 17 @b5, while after 17 e5 Black replies 17 @d5 and stands comfortably.

b) 15 @c2 @c8 and Black is at least equal.

12 h4 was played in Gelpke-van der Vliet, OHRA 1984, which continued 12... c5 13 @e3 cd 14 cd @c6 15 e5 @d5?! (I would give my vote to 15 h5!!?) 16 h5 @a5 17 hg hg 18 @h4 @ac8 19 @g5 @b3 20 @d2 @xf3 (20 @c4? 21 @xc4 @xc4 22 @f6 @c2 23 @xg7! and White wins) 21 gf f5?? (a terrible move, but it bears fruit) 22 ef @xf6 23 @xf6 @xf6 24 @h6 @c3+ 25 @e2 @f7 26 @h7+? (26 @xg6+! wold have won! How? I think you will find the solution) 26... @f8 27 @d1 @b3 28 @h6+ @e7 29 @g7+ @f7 30 @e5 @c1+ and here Black already stood better, and he went on to win the game.

12 ... @d6
13 @d2 c5
14 @f4

14 0-0 @c6 15 e5 @d5 16 @f4 cd 17 cd h6 18 @xh6 @xh6 19 @xh6 @xd4 20 @xg6 @xf3+ 21 gf fg 22 @xg6+ leads to a level game according to Ftacnik's analysis. I agree, but I think that 17 @xe5!, simply winning a pawn, is not a bad move either.

14 ... @d7
15 @h6 @c6

Black could have forced a draw here by 15 @xh6 16 @xh6 @c6 17 @b5 (the only move; 17 @e3 loses a pawn after 17 cd 18 cd @ad8) 17 cd 18 cd a6 19 @xc6 @xc6 20 0-0 @xe4 21 @g5 f5 22 @xe4 fe 23 @e3 @d5 with a level game.

16 @xg7 @xg7
17 @b5

Or 17 @b2 @ad8 with the following alternatives:
a) 18 @d1 cd 19 cd @xd4 20 @e2 e5! 21 @xe5 @e7 22 @f3 (66) 22 @xa3!! and Black wins.
b) 18 d5 cd 19 ed @fe8+ 20 @e2 @e5 21 c4 f6 22 0-0. According to Ftacnik this position is equal, but in my opinion White has a slight advantage. To avoid this Black can play the surprising and neat 20 @xe2+! when after 21 @xe2 @xd5 22 c4 @d4+ 23 @xd4 @xd4 24 @xd4 @xd4 Black can fight in the expectation of gathering the
full point.
c) 18 \textit{\textbullet} b5 a6 19 \textit{\textbullet} e5 \textit{\textbullet} c7 20 \textit{\textbullet} xc6 \textit{\textbullet} xc6 21 f3 with a position somewhat better for White, according to Ftacnik. Black, however, if he wants something better, can play 19 \textit{\textbullet} xe5!, when after 20 \textit{\textbullet} xd7 \textit{\textbullet} d3+ his extra piece wins the game. (Therefore please complete the previous variation with some question marks.)

17 cd
18 cd a6
19 \textit{\textbullet} e2

After 19 \textit{\textbullet} a4 b5 20 \textit{\textbullet} c2 \textit{\textbullet} fd8 Black is well on top.
19 \textit{\textbullet} ad8

19 \textit{\textbullet} a5!? was also worth attention, for example 20 \textit{\textbullet} b2 b5 (20 \textit{\textbullet} xe4 21 d5+ \textit{\textbullet} g8 22 de \textit{\textbullet} xe6 23 \textit{\textbullet} g5 \textit{\textbullet} c7 24 \textit{\textbullet} xe4 \textit{\textbullet} xe4 25 0-0 \textit{\textbullet} e6 does not look bad either, though White has some compensation for his pawn) 21 d5+ f6 22 \textit{\textbullet} c3 \textit{\textbullet} c4 23 \textit{\textbullet} xc4 \textit{\textbullet} ac8 24 de \textit{\textbullet} e7 and Black has nothing to complain about at all.

20 \textit{\textbullet} d1 \textit{\textbullet} a5?

20 ... \textit{\textbullet} e7! and its consequences would have been very favourable for Black! Let us have a look:
a) 21 d5 ed 22 \textit{\textbullet} b2+ \textit{\textbullet} g8 23 \textit{\textbullet} xb6 \textit{\textbullet} c8 24 e5 d4! 25 0-0 \textit{\textbullet} d5 26 \textit{\textbullet} b2 \textit{\textbullet} c3 27 \textit{\textbullet} c1 \textit{\textbullet} xf3! 28 \textit{\textbullet} xf3 \textit{\textbullet} fe8 29 \textit{\textbullet} fe1 \textit{\textbullet} c5 and Black rules, OK?
b) 21 \textit{\textbullet} e3 \textit{\textbullet} c6! 22 \textit{\textbullet} d2 \textit{\textbullet} a4 23 \textit{\textbullet} f3 \textit{\textbullet} c2 24 \textit{\textbullet} d3 \textit{\textbullet} b1+ etc with an overwhelming position for Black.

21 d5! \textit{\textbullet} g8
21 ed 22 \textit{\textbullet} b2+ \textit{\textbullet} g8 23 \textit{\textbullet} xb6 is good for White.
22 \textit{\textbullet} e3?!

22 \textit{\textbullet} b2! seems stronger. For instance: 22 ... b5 23 \textit{\textbullet} e5, or 22 ... \textit{\textbullet} c7 23 \textit{\textbullet} e5 \textit{\textbullet} c8 24 de fe 25 \textit{\textbullet} d7 look dangerous for Black.
22 \textit{\textbullet} d6
23 h4 ed
24 e5 \textit{\textbullet} e7

If 24 \textit{\textbullet} c5, then White can play 25 \textit{\textbullet} h6 with an attack.
25 h5 d4

Black was now in time trouble.
26 \textit{\textbullet} xd4 \textit{\textbullet} c6?

26 \textit{\textbullet} xg2 27 \textit{\textbullet} g1 \textit{\textbullet} d5 28 e6 \textit{\textbullet} c4 29 \textit{\textbullet} h6 \textit{\textbullet} xe6 30 hg fg 31 \textit{\textbullet} xg6+ hg 32 \textit{\textbullet} xg6+ \textit{\textbullet} h8 33 \textit{\textbullet} d3 leads to a position assessed by Ftacnik as unclear. I think that after 33 \textit{\textbullet} h4! White might even resign, for after 34 \textit{\textbullet} g3 \textit{\textbullet} g8 or 34 \textit{\textbullet} xe6 \textit{\textbullet} h1+ his situation is totally hopeless. 33 \textit{\textbullet} h6+ (instead of 33 \textit{\textbullet} d3) does not help either, because after the cool 33 \textit{\textbullet} h7 White cannot capture on e6 owing to 34 ... \textit{\textbullet} h1+ followed by \textit{\textbullet} e8, as in the previous variation.

27 hg fg
28 \textit{\textbullet} c4+ \textit{\textbullet} h8
29 \textit{\textbullet} e6 \textit{\textbullet} xd1+
30 \textit{\textbullet} xd1 \textit{\textbullet} f5
31 f4 \textit{\textbullet} a5
32 \textit{\textbullet} a2 \textit{\textbullet} xg2
33 \textit{\textbullet} h2 \textit{\textbullet} d7+
34  \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{f}}}} e1
34 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{d}}}} d2 was better, for example
34 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c6 35 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{g}}}} g5 h5 36 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} xd7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} xd7 37 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{d}}}} d2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} a4+ 38 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{e}}}} e2 leads
to a position hardly defensible for Black. White’s strong passed e-pawn
and his ideally posted pieces out-
weigh Black’s extra pawn.
34  ...  \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{d}}}} d5
33  \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{g}}}} g5
After 35 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} xb6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} xe6 36 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{d}}}} d8+
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} g8 (36 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{g}}}} g7 37 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} xd5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} xe5+
38 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{f}}}} fe \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} xe5+ 39 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{e}}}} e2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c3 + 40 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{f}}}} f1
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} h3+ 41 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{g}}}} g2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{f}}}} f5 + 42 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{g}}}} g1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c5+
43 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{f}}}} f2 and White wins) 37 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} xd5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} xd5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{g}}}} g7? (38 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{h}}}} xf4
39 e6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c4 40 e7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{d}}}} d6 41 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{e}}}} e2 with
winning chances for White) 39
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{h}}}} xf4 40 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} a4 41 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c8
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{d}}}} d4! 42 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} a4 one cannot see
how White could exploit the ex-
posed position of Black’s knight
and rook.
35  h5?
A blunder, which can mainly be
blamed on Black’s time trouble.
35 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} xa2 36 e6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} xe6 37 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} xh7+
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} xh7 38 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} xh7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{a}}}} xh7 39 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} xe6
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{h}}}} xf4 40 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} xh6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{h}}}} xf5 leads to an
easy draw. Now, however, after
36 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{d}}}} d2
Black was forced to resign.
Shortly after this game was
published in \textit{Informator 35} the
idea was put into action at summit
level, in the Kasparov-Korchnoi
Candidates match.
Play followed Ftacnik-Adorjan
as far as White’s 11th move.
11  ...  c5
12  \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{g}}}} g5
After 12 0-0 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c6 13 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{e}}}} e3 0-0 14
e5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c8 Black may be able to claim
a slight edge, while after 12 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{b}}}} b5+
\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c6 13 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}} xc6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{x}}}} xc6 14 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{e}}}} e3 the
position is approximately level.
12  \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{d}}}} d6
13  e5
Maybe too hasty. 13 0-0 seems
better.
13  \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{d}}}} d7
14  dc? (67)

This is already a mistake. Prob-
ably White did not seriously con-
sider Black’s next move. 14 0-0-0
15 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} d2 was better.
14  0-0!
After the stereotyped recapture
White would get good play on the
b-file.
15  cb  ab
16  0-0  \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{c}}}} c7
Here Black already stands slight-
ly better. It is easier for him to form
a plan as his pieces are extremely
active. Quite apart from that, this sort of position suits Korchnoi down to the ground since he can also be regarded as one of the 'professors' of the Grünfeld Defence.

17 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{b}}5 \)
17 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}1 \textcolor{red}{\text{xf}}3! \) 18 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xf}}3 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}7 \) is no joyride for White either.
17 ... \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xe}}5! \)
18 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{h}}6 \)

The bishop cannot be taken, because after 18 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xe}}5 \) two of White's pieces would be hanging.
18 ... \( \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}7 \)
19 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xg}}7 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}x7 \)
20 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}4+ \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}8 \)

After 20 f6 21 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}5! \) White would suddenly cause some problems.

21 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}5 \)

Some people suggested 21 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{a}}d1 \), but after 21 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xf}}3 \) 22 gf \( \textcolor{red}{\text{a}}6 \) White has permanent weaknesses.
21 ... \( \textcolor{red}{\text{h}}6 \)
22 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}4 \textcolor{red}{\text{xe}}4 \)
23 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xe}}4 \textcolor{red}{\text{a}}6 \)
24 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}3 \)

White should have played 24 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xa}}6 \textcolor{red}{\text{xa}}6 \) 25 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}3 \) with drawing chances.
24 ... \( \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}5! \)
25 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xc}}5 \)

After 25 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xa}}6 \textcolor{red}{\text{xe}}3 \) 26 fe \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xa}}6 \) Black sooner or later wins the a- and c-pawns in exchange for his b-pawn. Moreover, he can even strengthen his position before doing so. After exchanging a pair

of rooks, with his e-, g- and h-pawns remaining against Black's e-, f-, g- and h-pawns, White has good chances of losing the game.

25 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xc}}5 \)
26 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{fb}}1 \textcolor{red}{\text{fd}}8 \)
27 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{f}}1 \)

After 27 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}6 \) there is a nice variation: 27 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{ac}}8! \) 28 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xb}}6 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}6 \) 29 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{b}}7 \textcolor{red}{\text{xb}}6 \) 30 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xc}}8 \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}6 \) and Black wins.

27 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}6 \)
28 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{b}}4 \textcolor{red}{\text{f}}8 \)
29 a4

29 f3 deserved consideration, e.g. 29 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{a}}4 \) 30 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}1 \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}6 \) 31 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xa}}4! \textcolor{red}{\text{xa}}4 \) 32 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{b}}5 \textcolor{red}{\text{ac}}4 \) 33 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xc}}6 \textcolor{red}{\text{xc}}6 \) 34 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{f}}2 \) with White fighting for a draw. Now an ending with rook and four pawns against rook and three can easily arise, admittedly in a better version than some moves earlier. White must struggle to survive. This is, anyway, a recurrent motif in this ending.

29 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{a}}5 \)
30 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}3 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}7 \)
31 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{g}}2 \) f5!
32 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{b}}5 \)

White could have offered tougher resistance by 32 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{a}}2 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}4 \) 33 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}2 \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}5 \) 34 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{b}}3 \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}8 \) 35 f3.

32 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}2 \)
33 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{d}}4? \)

A decisive mistake made in time trouble. 33 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{f}}1 \) deserved consideration. For instance, 33 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{e}}4 \) 34 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{c}}6 \textcolor{red}{\text{xc}}6 \) 35 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{xb}}6 \textcolor{red}{\text{xa}}4 \) 36
\[ \text{x}a4 \text{x}a4 37 \text{e}e1! \text{d}d6 38 \text{x}d6 \text{g}xd8 39 \text{h}4 \text{a} with a likely draw. True, 33... \text{c}2 \text{c}4 \text{a}8 seems to be better. \text{d}8 is not immediately threatened because of a5; in chess, however, the necessity of making moves is an old rule, and it is not easy for White to comply with it now.

33 \text{x}d4
34 \text{c}d (68)

\[ \text{68} \]

34 ... \text{a}x\text{a}4!
A spectacular move, after which there is no escape for White.
35 \text{x}a4
If 35 \text{a}x\text{a}4 then 35 \text{b}5.
35 ... \text{x}b\text{b}5
The rest demands no comment.
36 \text{a}7+ \text{d}6 37 \text{h}7 \text{h}5 38 \text{g}7 \text{d}5 39 \text{g}6 \text{b}5 40 \text{f}3 \text{b}4 41 \text{e}3 \text{b}3 42 \text{d}2 \text{xd}4+ 43 \text{c}3 \text{b}2 44 \text{xb}2 \text{d}2+ 45 \text{c}3 \text{f}2 46 \text{h}4 \text{f}4 47 \text{g}5 \text{f}3+ 48 \text{d}4 \text{g}3 49 \text{hx}5 \text{e}3 50 \text{h}6 \text{e}7 51 \text{h}5 \text{e}5+ 52 \text{d}5 \text{f}3 \text{White resigned.}

And now let us look at the alternatives at move nine.

A2
9 \text{e}2
This solid continuation is harmless to Black.
9 ... \text{g}7
10 \text{e}4 \text{xc}3
11 \text{bc} \text{c}5
Black does not fear 12 \text{b}5+, which he could have prevented by 11 0-0.
12 \text{d}3 \text{a}6
13 \text{e}3 \text{xe}2
14 \text{xe}2 \text{c}6
15 \text{g}5
This time this sally is forced.
15 ... \text{c}7
16 \text{d}1 0-0
17 0-0 \text{fe}8!
Preventing a possible \text{d}5 and avoiding the trade of bishops.
18 \text{e}3 \text{a}5
19 \text{h}6 \text{c}4
20 \text{c}1 \text{h}8
21 \text{e}5 \text{ac}8
22 \text{h}4 \text{cd}?
22 ... \text{b}5! with the idea of ... \text{b}6-d5 would have set White a hard
task, since his queenside weaknesses (the a3 and c3 pawns) would have been sitting targets for Black. Now, however, the advantage slips away.

\[
\begin{align*}
23 & \text{cd} & \text{We7} \\
24 & \text{Wf4} & \text{Qxa2} \\
25 & \text{Ag5} & \text{Wf8} \\
26 & \text{Ah6} & \text{We7} \\
27 & \text{Ag5} & \text{Wf8}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{Draw agreed}


A3

\[
\begin{align*}
9 & \text{Aa4} (70)
\end{align*}
\]

A somewhat eccentric continuation by which White tries to discourage the move c5 and ‘secretly’ help the advance of his d-pawn.

\[
\begin{align*}
9 & \ldots & \text{Ag7} \\
10 & 0-0 & \text{Qxc3} \\
11 & \text{bc} & 0-0 \\
12 & \text{e4} & \text{c5}
\end{align*}
\]

12 ... b5!? is worth consideration, e.g. 13 Ac2 c5 14 Ab1 cd 15 cd Ac6 16 Ae3 Wa5 with a good game for Black.

\[
\begin{align*}
13 & \text{Ag5} & \text{Wd6!}
\end{align*}
\]

After 13 f6 14 Ah4 Axe4 15 We2 White has the initiative, while after 13 Wc7!? 14 d5 ed 15 ed Wd6 the ‘obligatory’ exchange sacrifice 16 c4 gives White an excellent game, e.g. 16 Qxa1 17 Wxa1 f6 18 Ah6 Ef7 19 We1 We7 20 Cd2 f5 (only move) 21 Qf3.

\[
\begin{align*}
14 & \text{e5} & \text{Wc7} \\
15 & \text{Qd2} & \text{Qc6} \\
16 & \text{Wg4}
\end{align*}
\]

After 16 Qe4? Qxe5! 17 Qf6+ Qxf6 18 Qxf6 Qd7 19 Qxd7 Wxd7 20 Qd2 Qd5 Black’s attack comes more rapidly.

\[
\begin{align*}
16 & \ldots & \text{h6!} \\
17 & \text{Qe3}
\end{align*}
\]

After 17 Ah4 Qe7 18 Qe4 Qf5 19 Qf6+ Qh8 White will get nowhere, while after 17 Qf6 Qxf6 18 ef cd 19 cd Qd8 White’s pawns are weak.

\[
\begin{align*}
17 & \ldots & \text{Qe7} \\
18 & \text{Wac1?!}
\end{align*}
\]

Makarichev recommended 18 Qe4, but I think that Black would still stand well, e.g. 18 Qf5 when 19 h4 does not work because of 19 h5!.

\[
\begin{align*}
18 & \ldots & \text{Qf5} \\
19 & \text{Ac2} & \text{cd} \\
20 & \text{cd} & \text{Qxe3} \\
21 & \text{fe} & \text{Wc3}
\end{align*}
\]

For a while now Black has been dictating events, and of course he has the better game.
22 \( \mathsf{wx} \)xe2 \( \mathsf{wx} \)xa3
23 \( \mathsf{xe} \)e4
23 \( \mathsf{d} \)c4 \( \mathsf{a} \)a6!.
23 ... \( \mathsf{a} \)a6!
24 \( \mathsf{we} \)e1
24 \( \mathsf{d} \)c4 was perhaps slightly better.
24 ... \( \mathsf{xf} \)f1
25 \( \mathsf{xa} \)xa8 \( \mathsf{xa} \)xa8
26 \( \mathsf{xf} \)xf1 \( \mathsf{we} \)e7
27 \( \mathsf{we} \)e2 \( \mathsf{wb} \)b7
28 \( \mathsf{wc} \)c2 \( \mathsf{b} \)b5
29 \( \mathsf{d} \)d2 \( \mathsf{b} \)b4
30 \( \mathsf{wb} \)b1 \( \mathsf{xf} \)f8
31 \( \mathsf{h} \)h4 \( \mathsf{h} \)h5
32 \( \mathsf{e} \)e4 \( \mathsf{e} \)e7

with a decisive advantage to Black who won in 43 moves, Kupreichik-Makarichev, USSR 1984.

A4

9 \( \mathsf{c} \)c4(!) (71)
The American GM Browne’s move.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
71
\end{array} \]

9 \( \mathsf{g} \)g7
10 e4 \( \mathsf{xc} \)xc3
11 bc c5
12 \( \mathsf{g} \)g5! \( \mathsf{d} \)d6

12 ... \( \mathsf{f} \)f6 13 \( \mathsf{xf} \)xf6 \( \mathsf{xf} \)xf6 14 \( \mathsf{b} \)b5+ \( \mathsf{f} \)f8 15 \( \mathsf{d} \)d3 is not too attractive for Black. However, 12 ... \( \mathsf{c} \)c7!? is more in keeping with the position than the text move.

13 \( \mathsf{d} \)d3 \( \mathsf{d} \)d6 (!?)

It is more urgent to castle than to develop the knight.

14 \( \mathsf{d} \)d1 (!?)

White is not provoked: 14 d5? \( \mathsf{e} \)e5! 15 \( \mathsf{xe} \)xe5 \( \mathsf{wb} \)e5 16 \( \mathsf{d} \)d2 ed 17 \( \mathsf{xd} \)xd5 \( \mathsf{xd} \)xd5 18 \( \mathsf{xd} \)xd5 \( \mathsf{xd} \)xd5 19 ed \( \mathsf{d} \)d8 wins a pawn for Black. White also loses one or two pawns without any compensation after 15 \( \mathsf{b} \)b5+ \( \mathsf{f} \)f8.

14 0-0
15 0-0 \( \mathsf{a} \)a5
16 \( \mathsf{a} \)a2 c4?

One should only play such a move if it wins by force. A lock-jaw move of this kind does not fit in with Black’s plan. 16 ... \( \mathsf{ac} \)c8 maintains the flexibility of Black’s position and the tension in the centre.

17 \( \mathsf{we} \)e3 \( \mathsf{xa} \)xa3
18 \( \mathsf{b} \)b1 \( \mathsf{fe} \)e8
19 h4

Black’s pieces have wandered and a storming attack is about to hit him. Believe it or not, this position was seen again, in the game Matamoros-Gil, Gausdal (Junior World Ch) 1986, where Black was well beaten. Have a look at it! 19 b5 20 e5 b4 21 h5 \( \mathsf{xc} \)xc3 22 \( \mathsf{f} \)f4 \( \mathsf{xf} \)xf3 23 gf b3 24 \( \mathsf{f} \)f6 \( \mathsf{b} \)b4
25 hg fg (72)

26 $\text{axg6!} \text{hg} 27 \text{hxg7} \text{hxg7} 28 \text{f6} \text{h7} 29 \text{d5 ed} 30 \text{xd5} \text{c6} 31 \text{g4 f8} 32 \text{e6+ f7} 33 \text{xc6 c8} 34 \text{e6 c3} 35 \text{g2 e8} 36 \text{h1} 1-0.

19 ... \text{f6}

20 \text{h6} \text{h6}

21 \text{ff8} \text{xc3?} 22 \text{h5 gh} 23 \text{e5 f5} 24 \text{g5+ h8} 25 \text{f6+ g8} 26 \text{g5} \text{is fatal for Black.}

22 \text{e3} \text{ad8}

Or 22 \text{c6} 23 \text{h5 g5} 24 \text{h2!} with the threat of \text{g4} and \text{f4}. In such positions the defender's lot is not a happy one.

23 \text{h5} \text{c6}

24 \text{hg} \text{hg}

25 \text{e5 f5?!}

After 25 \text{e7!} 26 \text{ef} \text{xf6} 27 \text{e5 d5} \text{the situation is not clear-cut!}

26 \text{g5 h6?!}

Black should have played 26 \text{d7}!.

27 \text{g3 e7?!}

28 \text{xe6 d5}

29 \text{xd8 f4} (73)

Black was probably relying on this, but White gives him a nasty surprise.

30 \text{xf4! xf4}

31 \text{xb7 e7}

32 \text{d6 h7}

33 \text{e1 h2}

34 \text{e3 h4}

35 \text{f1 h1+}

36 \text{e2 g4+}

37 \text{f3 xd1}

38 \text{xd1 xg2}

39 \text{e2 h1}

40 \text{e6 f8}

41 \text{xe3 e7}

42 \text{c8+}


Since we are rooting for Black, we cannot, of course, be satisfied with this result. Where is the improvement? I can reveal that something has been bubbling in my 'devil’s kitchen', and I will serve it
up with pleasure to anybody in a tournament game!

We have arrived at the end of variation A. I hope you are still interested in this line. If so, then let us move on to variation B.

8  \(\text{\textit{B}}\)

\[ \text{\textit{B}} \]

8  \(\text{\textit{B}}\)

By this early knight exchange, White tries to prevent Black from creating Grünfeld-like positions.

Now there are two main continuations:

B1 8  \(\text{\textit{B}}\)

B2 8  \(\text{\textit{B}}\)

B1

8  ...  \(\text{\textit{B}}\)

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

This line has not really been elaborated, though the stem game for this move was Timman-Short, London 1982: 9  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 10 c4  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 11  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 12  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 0-0 13 0-0  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 14  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 15  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 16  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 17  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 18  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 19  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 20  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 21  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 22  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 23  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 24  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 25  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 26  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 27  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 28  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 29  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 30  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 31  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 32  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 33  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 34  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 1-0.

White played this game elegantly and self-confidently. An interesting attempt to improve was produced in R.Hernandez-Vilela, Bayamo 1984, which we will now follow.

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

Sacrificing an important pawn, and trusting in his lead in development.

10  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 11  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 12  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 13 0-0

In this position Hernandez suggests 13  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 14  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) According to my analysis, play might continue 14  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 15  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 16  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 17  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 18  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 19  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 20  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 21  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 22  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 23  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 24  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 25  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 26  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 27  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 28  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 29  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 30  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 31  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 32  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 33  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 34  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 1-0 with a level game) 18  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 19  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) 20  \(\text{\textit{B}}\) with a favourable position for Black. In spite of his extra pawn White has problems
to wrestle with.

And now, the other recapture:

B2

8 ed (76)

Now we have a further subdivision:

B21 9 b4
B22 9  a5+
B23 9  d2?!

B21

9 b4

White plans to prevent Black's queenside expansion and – at the proper time – to create a passed pawn on the queenside. The path divides again:

B211 9  g7?!
B212 9  d7(!)
B211

9  g7?!

It is interesting that this natural move can be called inaccurate.

10  b3  0-0
11  e2

After 11 a4  d7 12  a3 (now and later 12 a5!? comes into consideration) 12  e8 13  c1 c6

14  d3 a5 15 0-0 ab 16 xb4  a7
17  fe1  a8 Black got a promising position in Kiril Georgiev-Ornstein, Stockholm 1983-84.

11 ...  d7
12  b2  c6
13 0-0  e7??!

An unsuspecting move. With hindsight Black should have played 13  a5?.

14  a4!  ac8

Now it turns out that 14  a5 does not work because of 15 ba  a5 16  a3.

15  a5!  c7
16  fc1  fc8
17  c2  c5?

Black does not have iron nerves and now falls into a virtually hopeless ending.

18  a6!  a8

After 18 ... c4 19 ab! White wins.

19  dc  bc
20  xg7  xg7
21  bc  f6
22  ac1  xc5
23  a3  b6
24  d4  e6
25  xe6+  fe
26  a1+  g8
27  xc7  xc7
28  b1!  c6
29  b8+  c8
30  xc8+  xc8
31  h4

If the rooks had been exchanged on c7, Black could now play 31 ... e5.
31 ... \( \text{c6} \)
32 h5 gh
33 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d8} \)
34 \( \text{e5} \)

White, exploiting his overwhelming positional advantage, won in 41 moves, Miles-Miralles, Metz 1985.

B212

9 \( \text{d7}(\text{!}) \)

A useful waiting move, which takes us to our final subdivision.

B2121 10 \( \text{b3} \)
B2122 10 \( \text{d3} \)
B2121

10 \( \text{b3} \)

We will now follow the game Portisch-Adorjan from the 1983 Hungarian Team Championship in which, for the sake of interest, I include the clock times.

10 ... \( \text{a6} \) 21
11 \( \text{b2} \) 35 \( \text{d6} \) 27

I think it is important to know that in positions of this nature the bishop stands much more actively on \( \text{d6} \) than \( \text{g7} \), defending \( \text{c7} \) and attacking \( \text{b4} \), \( \text{a3} \) and \( \text{h2} \) at the same time.

12 \( \text{e2} \) 40 \( \text{e7} \) 35
13 0-0 43 0-0 35
14 \( \text{ac1} \) 44 \( \text{b5} \) 43
15 \( \text{e1} \) 47 \( \text{b6} \) 50
16 \( \text{d3} \) 49 \( \text{c4} \) 60
17 \( \text{c3} \) 53 \( \text{h4} \) 62
18 \( \text{g3} \) 67

Draw agreed

In the final position Black already has slightly the better chances after 18 \( \text{e4} \), for instance 19 \( \text{c5} \)!
\( \text{xc5} \) 20 bc (20 dc?? \( \text{d4} \) and Black wins) 20 \( \text{c8} \) with the threat of \( \text{h3} \). 19 \( \text{fe1} \) followed by \( \text{f1-g2} \) was better.

B2122

10 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d6} \)
11 0-0 0-0
12 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{a6} \)
13 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{e7} \)
14 \( \text{d2} \)

After 14 \( \text{a3} \) Black replies with 14 ... \( \text{c6} \) threatening ... \( \text{b5} \). Perhaps White should try 14 \( \text{b1} \)!!.

14 ... \( \text{f6} \)
15 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{ab} \)
16 \( \text{ab} \) \( \text{e4} \)
17 \( \text{xa8} \) \( \text{xa8} \)
18 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{d8} \)
19 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{c8} \)!
20 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{e6} \)
21 \( \text{e5} \)
21 \( \text{xe4} \) de 22 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{c4} \).
21 ... \( \text{xe5} \)
22 \( \text{de} \) \( \text{c5} \)
23 \( \text{e2} \)!

23 \( \text{d4} \) was the proper move.
23 ... \( \text{a2} \)
24 \( \text{b1} \)!!

White should have tried 24 \( \text{a1} \), e.g. 24 ... \( \text{f5} \) 25 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{a4} \) 26 \( \text{xa2} \) with a position similar to that at the end of the game.

24 ... \( \text{d4} \)?

24 ... \( \text{a8} \)!, with the threat of \( \text{f5} \) followed by \( \text{a4} \), would have given Black a strong initiative.
25 $\text{d1}$

25 ed?? $\text{a4}$ and Black wins.

25 $\text{a4}$

26 $\text{xd4}$ $\text{e7}$

27 $\text{xa2}$ $\text{xa2}$

28 $\text{xa4}$ $\text{d5}$

29 $\text{d4}$ $\text{g5}$

30 $\text{f3}$ $\text{h5}$

**Draw agreed**

Timman-Kurajica.

---

B22

9 $\text{b5+}$ c6

10 $\text{d3}$ $\text{g7}! (77)$

---

Are we contradicting ourselves? Not at all, since the reason for White’s intermediate check is that after 10 $\text{d6}?!$ he could now play 11 e4. You should go by concrete calculation rather than by stereotypes!

11 0-0 0-0

12 b4 a5(!)

13 $\text{d2}$ ab

14 ab $\text{d7}$

15 $\text{c2}$ $\text{c7}$

The weaknesses of Black’s posi-

tion are hardly accessible.

16 $\text{c3}$ $\text{fc8}$

17 $\text{fc1}$ $\text{f8}$

18 $\text{xa8}$ $\text{xa8}$

19 $\text{a1}$ $\text{e6}!$

The knight has also found his proper place.

20 h3 $\text{b7}$

21 $\text{b2}$ $\text{a8}$

22 $\text{c1}?!$

22 $\text{xa8}$ was better.

22 ... $\text{b8}$

23 $\text{f1}$

After 23 b5 Black must, as usual, play 23 c5.

23 ... $\text{f8}$

24 $\text{d2}$ $\text{a4}$

25 $\text{b3}$ $\text{c7}$

26 $\text{c2}$ $\text{a7}$

27 $\text{b2}$ $\text{a8}$

28 $\text{d3}$

**Draw agreed**

This was the game Portisch-Adorjan, Indonesia 1983. After 28 $\text{a6}$ Black would already be a little better.

B23

9 $\text{d2}!?$

This move was first seen in Portisch-Sosonko, Tunis IZ 1985, which continued

9 ... $\text{d7}$

10 $\text{a4}$ a6

11 $\text{c1}$ $\text{g7}$

12 $\text{b4}$ $\text{c8}$

13 $\text{d3}$

On 13 $\text{xa6}$ Sosonko gives the surprising variations 13 $\text{a8} 14$
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\textit{\textbf{Whid7+!? Whxd7 (14 \textit{\textbf{Whxd7 15 Wxb7 Wxa7 16 Whxd5 and White has the better game) 15 Wxb7 c5 16 Wxa8 0-0 with an unclear position. Portisch, however, does not take such pawns}}}

\textit{\textbf{13 a5}}

This move will be forced sooner or later. In fact Black survives this weakness.

\textit{\textbf{14 Whd2 0-0}}

\textit{\textbf{15 Wb5 Whb8}}

\textit{\textbf{16 0-0 c6}}

\textit{\textbf{17 Wxe2 Wd7}}

\textit{\textbf{18 Whfd1}}

Or 18 b4 b5 19 Wc2 (19 Whxa5? Whb6 20 Wha7 Wc7 21 Wxb5 Wxa8 22 Wxc6 Wxc6 and Black wins) 19 ... a4 with the threat of ... Wxe8 followed by Whb6. White can hardly play 20 e4 without punishment.

\textit{\textbf{18 ... We7}}

\textit{\textbf{19 Whb3 Wha8}}

Threatening b5.

\textit{\textbf{20 a4 Whfc8}}

\textit{\textbf{21 Wd3 Whd6}}

While White has been tinkering away, Black has methodically prepared his scheduled counterplay.

\textit{\textbf{22 Whc3 c5}}

\textit{\textbf{23 Wha3}}

After 23 dc bc! 24 Whxb7? Wcb8 the queen is trapped.

\textit{\textbf{23 ... Whc7}}

\textit{\textbf{24 Whb5 Wac8}}

\textit{\textbf{25 h3 Wf6}}

\textit{\textbf{26 Whd2 We4}}

\textit{\textbf{27 Whxe4 de}}

\textit{\textbf{28 Whc2?}}

28 Whd2 leaves White with no problems. The text move, however, nearly costs White a full point.

\textit{\textbf{28 Whd5!}}

This tempo was badly needed by Black. Now the attack is able to begin!

\textit{\textbf{29 Whcd2 c4}}

\textit{\textbf{30 Wha2 f5}}

\textit{\textbf{31 Whc2 f4}}

\textit{\textbf{32 ef?}}

After 32 Whd1 Black can play 32 Wf6!? intending Whd5. 32 Whf7!? also comes into consideration.

\textit{\textbf{32 ... Whh6}}

\textit{\textbf{33 Whh1 Whxf4}}

\textit{\textbf{34 Whce2 e3}}

\textit{\textbf{35 fe Whxe3+}}

\textit{\textbf{36 Whh1 Whf8}}

\textit{\textbf{37 Wha3 Whf2?}}

After 37 Whcf7! White might well have resigned. After the text he achieves a draw!

\textit{\textbf{38 Whxf8+! Whxf8}}

\textit{\textbf{39 Whf2+ Whf7}}

\textit{\textbf{40 Whh8+ Whg7}}

\textit{\textbf{41 Whfe2}}

and the game was agreed drawn after 52 moves.

\textit{\textbf{C}}

\textit{\textbf{8 h4 (78)}}

If Black plays accurately, this aggressive continuation gives White no advantage but plenty of problems.
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C1  11  Qxd5
C2  11  c2
C3  11  Qe4?
C4  11  e4
C1

11  Qxd5  ed

Razuayev-Rodriguez, Moscow 1985, now concluded 12  Qd2  Qd7
13  d3  e8  14  c3  a5  15  Qc2
Qa6  16  xa6  1/2-1/2.

C2

11  Qc2  c5
12  Qxd5  Qxd5
13  Qc4  Qc6
14  dc  Qd7!
15  Qd2

After 15 cb??  Qac8 Black wins easily. We are following Cebalo-
Timman, Zagreb 1985, which continued 15  b5  16  Qe2  Qxc5  17
Qb3  Qd5  18  Qxb5  Qxb5  19  Qxb5
Qe5  20  Qc3  Qxf3+  21  gf  Qxc3+  22  bc  Qxf3  23  Qh4  Qfc8  24  Qf4
Qd5  25  Qd2  Qab8 (Black’s position is slightly better) 26  a4  Qb6  27
Qc1  e5  28  Qb4  Qf6  29  Qe1  Qc5  30
Qd3  Qc6  31  Qb5  Qd5  32  Qd3
1/2-1/2.

C3

11  Qe4?

Too much is as bad as nothing at all... This is too much of a (no,
not good, but) bad thing! It is simply a lousy idea.

11  Qd7!

Exercising self-restraint! After
11  Qxe3  12  Qxe3  Qxe4  13  Qg5
Qd5  14  Qg4  Qd7  15  Qh7  Qe8  16
\( g5 \ f6 \ 17 \ \text{e}3 \ g5 \) White might make something of the position...

12 \( \text{D}e\text{g}5 \)

After 12 \( \text{D}f5 \text{g} \ 13 \text{D}f3 \text{D}x\text{e}4 \ 14 \text{D}x\text{e}4 \text{D}x\text{e}4 \ 15 \text{D}x\text{e}4 \text{c}5 \) Black seizes the initiative.

12 ... \( \text{D}5\text{f}6 \)
13 \( \text{D}c4 \) \( \text{D}e7 \)
14 \( \text{D}c2 \) \( \text{c}5 \)
15 \( \text{D}h4 \) \( \text{D}d5! \)
16 \( \text{e}4 \)
16 \( \text{D}x\text{d}5 \) \( \text{D}x\text{d}5 \) or 16 \( \text{D}d3 \) \( \text{c}d \)
17 ed \( \text{e}5 \) 18 de \( \text{D}x\text{e}5+ \) gives Black an excellent position.

16 ... \( \text{D}x\text{c}4 \)
17 \( \text{D}x\text{c}4 \) \( \text{D}a\text{c}8! \)
18 \( \text{D}h\text{f}3 \)

White is forced to sound the retreat; his 'attack' was totally unfounded.

18 ... \( \text{c}d \)
19 \( \text{D}x\text{d}4 \) \( \text{D}g4! \) (80)

\( d8 \) leads to a rook ending with winning chances for Black. For fastidious readers, who might say that after 28 \( \text{D}c7 \) White can still struggle, I suggest the more prosaic 21 \( \text{D}x\text{e}5 \) 22 \( \text{D}h4 \) \( \text{D}d3+ \) followed by \( \text{D}f\text{d}8 \), with a totally lost position for White.

20 ... \( \text{D}c5 \)
21 0-0 \( \text{D}c7! \)
22 \( \text{D}c4 \) \( \text{D}f\text{d}8 \)
23 \( \text{D}b1 \) \( \text{D}d3 \)
24 \( \text{D}x\text{c}7 \) \( \text{D}x\text{c}7 \)
25 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{D}g\text{xf}2 \)

Black is already winning.

26 \( \text{D}e3 \) \( \text{D}g4 \)
27 \( \text{D}d2 \) \( \text{D}d7 \)
28 \( \text{D}b\text{d}1 \) \( \text{D}f8? \)

After 28 ... \( \text{D}b2 \) 29 a4 \( \text{D}a3 \) most players would not have the stomach to continue.

29 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \)
30 \( \text{D}b1 \) \( \text{ab} \)
31 \( \text{ab} \) \( \text{b}5? \)

Time trouble. Black should have played 31 \( \text{D}c4 \) \( \text{f}f7. \)

32 \( \text{D}b3 \) \( \text{D}c4!? \)

Overlooking his best pawn.

33 \( \text{D}x\text{f}7! \)

On 33 \( \text{D}a1 \) Black wins with 33 \( \text{D}c1! \).

33 ... \( \text{D}c5! \)
34 \( \text{D}7\text{e}5 \) \( \text{D}x\text{b}3 \)
35 \( \text{D}x\text{d}7 \) \( \text{D}e7? \)
35 \( \text{D}g7! \) was still winning without too much trouble.

36 \( \text{D}g5 \) \( \text{D}x\text{b}4 \)
37 \( \text{D}h2 \) (81)
37 \( \Box xh2? \)

After 37 \( \Box c5+! \) 38 \( \Box xc5 \) \( \Box xh2 \) 39 \( \Box xb3 \) (39 \( \Box xh2 \) \( \Box xc5 \) 40 \( \Box b1 \) b4 41 \( \Box d2 \) \( \Box a6 \) 42 \( \Box a1 \) \( \Box c6 \) with a decisive edge) 39 \( \Box xf1 \) 40 \( \Box xf1 \) \( \Box xe4 \) Black can play for a win without any risk. Now all of a sudden White gets a very dangerous attack.

38 \( \Box xh2 \) \( \Box d2 \)
39 \( \Box f6+ \) \( \Box g7 \)
40 \( \Box f4 \)

40 \( \Box a1 \) \( \Box d6+ \) 41 \( \Box h3 \) \( \Box f7! \) 42 \( \Box a2 \) \( \Box c5! \) gives Black the advantage.

40 \( \Box c8 \)
41 e5
41 \( \Box g4?! \) looks nasty too.
41 ... \( \Box c4 \)
42 \( \Box e4 \)

42 \( \Box h4 \) \( \Box h8 \) 43 \( \Box e8+! \) \( \Box xe8 \) 44 \( \Box f6+ \) leads to perpetual check, and 42 \( \Box g4 \) \( \Box h8+ \) 43 \( \Box g1 \) \( \Box c5+ \) 44 \( \Box f1 \) \( \Box e3+ \) 45 \( \Box xe3 \) \( \Box xe3 \) 46 \( \Box f6+ \) \( \Box f7 \) 47 \( \Box f3 \) \( \Box h1+ \) 48 \( \Box e2 \) \( \Box d4 \) 49 \( \Box b3 \) gives equal chances.
42 ... \( \Box e1 \)

Or 42 \( \Box f8 \) 43 \( \Box f6+ \) \( \Box f7 \) 44 \( \Box g5+ \) \( \Box e8 \) 45 \( \Box xe6 \) \( \Box f7 \) 46 \( \Box d4 \) \( \Box e7 \) 47 \( \Box c7+ \) \( \Box f8 \) 48 \( \Box xb5 \) \( \Box xf6 \) 49 ef \( \Box h7+ \) 50 \( \Box g3 \) with winning chances for White, while after 42 \( \Box h8+ \) 43 \( \Box g3 \) \( \Box e1+ \) 44 \( \Box f3 \), though a pawn down, White has the better game.

43 \( \Box f3 \)

43 \( \Box f6+ \) \( \Box g8 \) 44 \( \Box f3 \) was better.

43 ... \( \Box h8+ \)
44 \( \Box g1 \) \( \Box h5 \)
45 \( \Box f6+ \) \( \Box g8 \)
46 \( \Box d3? \)

The last mistake. 46 g4! \( \Box xe5 \) 47 \( \Box f1 \) \( \Box xg4 \) 48 \( \Box xe1 \) \( \Box h3 \) leads to equality.

46 ... \( \Box xe5 \)
47 \( \Box e3 \) \( \Box a5 \)

Here Black, now in a winning position, lost on time! This was the game Miles-Adorjan, Reggio Emilia 1984-85.

Last but not least: a small taste of an analysis carried out by the then challenger Gary Kasparov and myself.

The time: August 1984. The scene: a training camp ‘somewhere in the USSR’

Gary wanted to find an improvement on his Korchnoi game (see earlier), and put it into action in an important future game — perhaps against Karpov. During our analysis, however, it was Black who usually came out on top, so at lunch I could hardly get a word out of
my old friend. If I saw aright, in his heart of hearts Gary was sad; he did not want to acquiesce in the fact that Black safely withstood White’s attacks. Nevertheless, he should not have been sad, since we had got a little bit closer to the truth of chess and that is the real thing.

C4

11  e4 (82)

This looks to be more logical and harmonious with h4.

11  ...  \textit{Dxc3}
12  bc  c5! (83)
12  ...  \textit{Dxe4?} 13  \textit{Dg5} followed by \textit{Wg4} is dangerous for Black.

C41 13  \textit{Dc3}
C42 13  \textit{Dg5}

C41

13  \textit{Dc3}  \textit{Ec6}
13  \textit{Wc7} 14  \textit{Cc1}  \textit{Dc6} 15  \textit{Dg5}  
16  cd 16 cd \textit{Wc7} 17  \textit{Wg4}  \textit{Ffd8} 18  \textit{Hh7} gives White the advantage.

C411 14  \textit{Cc4}
C412 14  \textit{Wd3}

C411

14  \textit{Cc4}  cd
15  cd  \textit{Ec8}
16  \textit{Ca2}  \textit{Dd6}
17  e5  \textit{Dd7}
18  \textit{Wd2}
18  \textit{Dg5}  \textit{Ffd8}.
18  ...  \textit{Ffd8}
19  \textit{Dd1}  \textit{Ee7}
20  \textit{Dh6}  \textit{Df5}
21  \textit{Dxg7}  \textit{Dxg7}
22  g4  \textit{Hh8!} (84) and White is taken to the cleaners.

C412

14  \textit{Wd3}  cd
15  cd  b5!

Potential labyrinths: 15  \textit{Ec8}
16  \textit{Dd1}  \textit{Da5} 17  \textit{Dg5}  \textit{Dc4} 18  \textit{Af4}
... \[19 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}g3 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}fd8} 20 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xc4 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xc4} 21 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}e5}, \text{ or } 15 \ldots \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}d6 16 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}d1 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}fd8} 17 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}e2 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}ac8} 18 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}f1 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}b8} 19 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}g5 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}d7} 20 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}e3 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}c2} 21 \text{e5} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}d5} 22 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}d3 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}c3} 23 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xf6} \text{ and the game will soon be over.}

16 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}d1}

If 16 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}xb5} then 16 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xd4}.
16 \ldots \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}a5+}
17 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}d2} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}a4!}

Black has an excellent game.
C42

13 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}g5} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}c7}

Now White has several continuations from which to choose.
C421 14 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}h4}
C422 14 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}d3}
C423 14 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}d3}
C424 14 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}d2}
C421

14 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}h4} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}c6}
15 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}d2} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{cd}}} 16 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{cd}}} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}fd8!} (85)

85
\[W\]

This fine exchange sacrifice avoids the horrors of
a) 16 \ldots \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}a5?} 17 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}h6} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}b3} 18 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xg7} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xd2} 19 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}f6}, \text{ when Black gets}
mated, and
b) 16 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}d7} 17 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}d1} (17 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}h6? \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xd4}) 17 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}fc8} 18 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}h6} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}h8} 19 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}f8} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}f6} 20 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}h6}, \text{ and in this curious position one cannot see a defence to the deadly threat of 21 e5.}

After 16 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}fd8!} Black stands well, e.g.
a) 17 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}e5?} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xe5} \text{ and}
b) 17 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}h6?} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xd4} 18 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xd4 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xd4} 19 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}c1 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}e7} \text{ are guaranteed lost for White.}
c) 17 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xd8} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xd8} 18 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}c1 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}e7}, \text{ and here you could hardly wish for more as Black. White's a3 and d4 pawns are condemned to death; the h4 rook is hanging in mid air; the black king is unattackable - not so his colleague standing insecurely in the centre. All of Black's pieces are excellently posted and it is to be expected that the bishop - as so often - will prove more useful than the rook.}
C422

14 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}d3} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}c6}
15 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}c1}
15 \text{e5?} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{cd}}} 16 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{cd}}} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xd4.}}
15 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{cd}}}}
16 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{cd}}} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}d6}}

Black is more than OK.
C423

14 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}d3} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}c8}
15 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}c1} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}a6}
16 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{W}}}e3} \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{cd}}} \text{ 17 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xd4 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xf1} 18 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xf1 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}c6} \text{ and if 19 \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}h6?} \text{ then 19 \ldots \text{ \textcolor{red}{\textup{\textit{A}}}xd4 20}}}}}}}
\( \text{\&} xg7 \text{\&} c4+ \) and Black wins.

17 ... \( \text{\&} x c1+ \)
18 \( \text{\&} x c1 \) \( \text{\&} x c1+ \)
19 \( \text{\&} x c1 \) \( \text{\&} x f1 \)
20 \( \text{\&} x f1 \) \( \text{\&} c6 \)
21 \( \text{\&} b2 \) \( \text{\&} d8 \)
22 e5 \( \text{\&} d5 \)

and White is squirming for a draw. C424

14 \( \text{\&} d2 \) cd (86)

Beware! Black can miss the right path. For example: 14 \( \text{\&} e8 \) 15 \( \text{\&} h6 \) \( \text{\&} h8 \) 16 \( \text{\&} f8! \) f6 17 \( \text{\&} d6! \) \( \text{\&} x d6 \) 18 \( \text{\&} x h8+ \) \( \text{\&} x h8 \) 19 \( \text{\&} h6+ \) \( \text{\&} g8 \) 20 \( \text{\&} x g6+ \) \( \text{\&} f8 \) 21 \( \text{\&} x f6+ \) \( \text{\&} g8 \) 22 \( \text{\&} g5 \) \( \text{\&} e7 \) 23 \( \text{\&} c4 \) and the massacre is over; or 14 ... \( \text{\&} x e 4 \) 15 \( \text{\&} h6 \) f6 (15 \( \text{\&} f6 \) 16 \( \text{\&} x f 8 \) \( \text{\&} x f 8 \) 17 \( \text{\&} g5 \) with a decisive advantage to White) 16 \( \text{\&} c 4 \) (16 \( \text{\&} d 3 \)?? \( \text{\&} f 5 \) 17 \( \text{\&} h 4 \)) 16 \( \text{\&} d 5 \) 17 \( \text{\&} d 3 \) and White has the initiative.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cc}
86 & W \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

15 cd \( \text{\&} e 8 \)
16 \( \text{\&} d 3 \) \( \text{\&} c 6 \)
17 \( \text{\&} h 6 \)

Better than 17 e5? \( \text{\&} x d 4 \) 18 \( \text{\&} x d 4 \) \( \text{\&} x e 5+ \) 19 \( \text{\&} e 3 \) \( \text{\&} d 8 \), when White's

jumbled forces face defeat.

After the text 17 \( \text{\&} x d 4 \) (17 \( \text{\&} h 8 \) fails to 18 \( \text{\&} f 8! \)) 18 \( \text{\&} x g 7 \) \( \text{\&} f 3+ \) 19 gf \( \text{\&} x g 7 \) 20 \( \text{\&} h 6+ \) \( \text{\&} f 6 \) 21 \( \text{\&} h 4+ \) \( \text{\&} g 7 \) 22 \( \text{\&} h 6+ \) leads to a ‘humanitarian’ draw.

Well, we have arrived at the end of the chapter, my dear readers; the story, however, goes on. As you can see, this variation has been enriched by new ideas from the greatest players of our time and is even granted civic rights in the highest category events.

And as far as my personal benefit is concerned? A tale comes to my mind, a tale about an old man who planted a walnut tree.

‘You are a fool, old man’, people would tell him. ‘You will not eat the nuts which will grow on that tree.’ The old man answered gently, ‘I know, but the people who will enjoy the benefit of my labours while cracking nuts and resting in the shadow of the tree, will remember me with a good grace.’

**Epilogue**

The irony of fate . . . . Just two days after completing this chapter I had another opportunity to play this beloved variation of mine – and I won my first ever game with it!

\begin{tabular}{ll}
1 & d4 \\
2 & \( \text{\&} f 6 \) \\
3 & c4 \\
4 & a3 \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
1 & e6 \\
2 & b6 \\
3 & \( \text{\&} b 7 \) \\
\end{tabular}
lots of compensation for the pawn.
17 d1 c8
18 g5!!

At least consistent, but it looks like what we usually call in Hungarian ‘escaping forward’

18 b3?

We’re all dogmatic, only in different ways, my dear chess friends! I usually hate to be greedy (for reasons of principle), but this time grabbing the pawn would have been by far the best continuation, and the logical refutation of White’s attacking dreams. 18 xg2! 19 g1 d5 (88) and now:

14 h5!

This was the improvement I suggested on the game Gelpke-van der Vliet, 1984 (see p. 67).

15 e2 cd
16 cd e5

I also considered 16 e7 for some time and this looks OK too. Strangely enough I only started to wonder hours later what would happen after the fairly normal move 16 d4?! (?!). Let’s see: 17 xd4 xe5 18 d1! (not 18 c2 xa1 19 xa1 d5!?) 18 xd4 19 xg6 fg (after 19... c3+ 20 f1 White is much better: 20... a6 21 d3 etc) 20 xd4 with

a) 20 h7 xh7 (20... d4 4!) 21 xf8 xf8 leads to a similarly favourable result without any excitement en route, as Black has two pawns and a fantastic position for the exchange) 21 xh5+ g8 22 xg6 fg 23 xg6 f6! (the only move, but sufficient) 24 d7 f8 25 g5 (25 h6 xg6 26 xg6 c7 is easily winning for Black, while 25 ef xf6 26 g5 f3 27
Instead of this I was silly enough
to create problems for myself, as
you will soon see.

19  \textit{\&xe6!} \textit{fe}

20  \textit{\&xg6}  \textit{\&f5}

My original intention, 20
\textit{\&d5}, fails to 21 \textit{\&xh5} \textit{\&f5} 22 \textit{\&h7+}
\textit{\&f8} 23 \textit{f3!!} (threatening 24 \textit{\&h6}),
when Black’s messy position
collapses in a few moves.

21  \textit{\&h3!!}

Fuel to the fire in mutual
time trouble. 21 \textit{\&xf5} \textit{ef} 22 \textit{\&xh5} \textit{\&d5}
23 \textit{f3} was not as strong as in
the previous note, but still rather pro-
mising.

21  \ldots   \textit{\&d5}

22  \textit{\&xf5}  \textit{ef}

23  \textit{\&g3}  \textit{\&a5+}

Succumbing to the temptation
of 22 ... \textit{f4} would be a decisive mis-
take because after 23 \textit{\&xf4} \textit{\&xd4}
24 \textit{\&xh5} it is White’s attack
that breaks through first:

a) 24  \ldots  \textit{\&c2+} 25 \textit{\&f1} \textit{\&c4+} 26
\textit{\&g1} \textit{\&xf4} 27 \textit{\&xg7+}!  \\

b) 24  \ldots  \textit{\&e4+} 25 \textit{\&e3} \textit{\&c2+} (25 ... \textit{\&f5} 26 \textit{\&g4} \textit{\&xe5} 27 \textit{\&xg7+}!  \\

26 \textit{\&f1} \textit{\&xe3+} 27 \textit{fe} and Black is
helpless against the threats.

After 24 \textit{\&f1??} \textit{\&a6} 25 \textit{\&d3}
\textit{\&c1} (!) would be the end of White.

24  \ldots  \textit{\&d2}

25  \textit{\&xd2}  \textit{\&xd2+}

26  \textit{\&xd2}  \textit{\&c4?}

The natural move was 26 ... \textit{\&f7}
with a nice game.

27  \textit{\&e3}  \textit{\&f7}

28  \textit{e6+?}

Time trouble! White should have
tried another ‘escape forward’ by
28 \textit{\&f4!} with the intention of 28 ... \textit{\&e4} 29 \textit{\&g5!, shuffling the cards}
completely.

28  \ldots  \textit{\&f6}

29  \textit{\&d3}  \textit{\&c7}

30  \textit{\&e1}  \textit{\&h6!}

Threatening mate in one.

31  \textit{\&g5}  \textit{\&e4+}

32  \textit{\&d2}  \textit{\&xg2!}

33  \textit{f4}  \textit{\&e4}

34  \textit{d5}

and \textit{White overstepped the time
limit}. His position was pretty lost
as well: 34 \textit{\&xd5} 35 \textit{e7} \textit{\&xe7} 36
\textit{\&xf5+} (36 \textit{\&xe7} \textit{\&xg5}) 36 ... \textit{\&xf5}
37 \textit{\&xe7} \textit{\&xf4+} etc.

This was Deak-Adorjan, from
the 1987 Hungarian Team Cham-
pionship.
As in life, sometimes on the chessboard it is the last move towards the coveted aim which can be the hardest to make. For instance, a situation of this kind can arise when you need ‘only’ a draw to reach final success in a tournament or a match. As you probably know, after winning game 22 Gary Kasparov reached just such a situation in his third match with Karpov; getting a mere draw from the remaining two games was sufficient for him to retain his title.

However, if you have ever found yourself in a similar situation, you must know that playing for a draw is no easier than playing to win (mainly for psychological reasons). Certainly, a lot of games have been lost due to the passivity created by exaggerated efforts to play safe: in the end the passive party has been unable to survive his opponent’s pressure.

Apparently, this risk was taken by Kasparov in choosing the so-called ‘double fianchetto’ in the decisive battle, a variation which in recent decades has been regarded as a defence with a solid and safe, but unambitious, reputation. For a long time I also thought that in this sort of symmetrical position Black is condemned to a long and patient defence.

Then I came across the following game:

```
1 d3 d6 2 c4 c5 3 g3 b6 4 g2 b7 5 0-0 g6 6 c3 g7 7 d4 cd 8 xd4 xg2 9 xg2 0-0 10 e4 w c7?! (89)
```

This move, preparing the counter-attack 11 xa4!? after 11 b3, is the point of Black’s idea.

```
11 w d3?! a6 12 c2 ac8 13 e3 c5 14 c2 e6 15 f3 a6 16 d2 d6 17 ad1 cd7 18 a4 e5
```
(perhaps Black should try 18 \( \text{wb7} \) 19 b3 \( \text{Rfd8} \) 20 \( \text{wb1} \) \( \text{wc5} \) (still 20 ... \( \text{wb7} \)!?)) 21 h3 h5 23 \( \text{dc2} \) d5 23 f4 \( \text{dxc4} \)!

The natural 23 \( \text{dc6} \) gave Black an excellent game without any kind of ‘trick’ For example, 24 cd ed 25 e5 \( \text{dd7} \).

24 bc d4 25 \( \text{a2} \) \( \text{exe4} \)

After further struggles, the game concluded in a draw (Horvath-L. Bronstein, Ribnica 1979).

Tamas Horvath is an old accomplice of mine, and inflamed by the inspiration of this game, we set about elaborating this system. Over the years I have managed to show several times that by playing with an approach of this kind you can ‘bite’ even with a variation such as the double fianchetto which is labelled as harmless.

Here is the first piece of evidence:

From Diagram 89 play continued:

11 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{dc6} \)

12 \( \text{dc2} \)

After 12 \( \text{dxc6 wbxc6} \) Black equalises easily, while 12 \( \text{dc3} \) loses a pawn after 12 \( \text{exe4} \).

12 ... a6

13 \( \text{d5} \) e6!

14 \( \text{Rfd1} \) d6

15 \( \text{Ec1} \) h6!

An overture of interesting complications.

16 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \)

17 \( \text{wd2} \) \( \text{we5}! \)

18 \( \text{dc3} \)

Not 18 \( \text{wb6} \)? \( \text{wb6} \) 19 \( \text{wxd6 dxc4} \) \( \text{Ta} \); on 18 \( \text{wbh6} \) the reply is of course 18 ... \( \text{dxc4} \); 18 b3 would be met by the strong move 18 \( \text{wb7} \) (intending 19 \( \text{wbh6 dxc4} \)).

18 \( \text{wb7}! \)

18 \( \text{dxc4} \) would have been eager, illogical and bad in view of 19 \( \text{cd5}! \) \( \text{dxe3} + 20 \) \( \text{we3} \) \( \text{d8} \) 21 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xb6} \) 22 b3! when the whole ‘family’ is hanging and White regains his pawn with an edge.

19 f4

After 19 \( \text{wb6} \) White receives an instructive punishment: 19

\( \text{ad8} \) 20 \( \text{wa3} \) \( \text{dc3} \) 21 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{dxc3} \) 23 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{exe4} \) 23 f3 (if 23 \( \text{dg1} \) then 23 \( \text{de5} \)) 23 \( \text{we3} \) 24 \( \text{dxd3} \) (24 \( \text{cxd3} \) \( \text{we2} + 25 \) \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{wb6} \) 26 \( \text{wb6} \) \( \text{xd1} + 27 \) \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{Rfd8} \) \( \text{T} \)) 24 ... \( \text{we2} + 25 \) \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{dxd3} \) 26 \( \text{dxd3} \) b5! 27 c5 \( \text{dc8} \) 28 b4 a5! 29 ba b4 etc, with a decisive opening of lines. Incidentally, at this point we were in tremendous time trouble; after playing 18 \( \text{wb7} \) my clock displayed 2h 16 min, while the hand of my opponent’s clock had just leapt to 2h 24 min!

19 ... \( \text{dc6} \)

20 \( \text{h3} \)

Now 20 \( \text{wb6} \) would be answered by 20 \( \text{d4}! \) 21 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{ad8} \) 22 \( \text{wa3} \) \( \text{a5} \) with unpleasant threats.

20 ... \( \text{ad8} \)

21 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{h7} \)

22 \( \text{d1} \) b5
Black’s advantage will soon be decisive; only the dangling flags cause excitement.

23 cb ab
24 a3 h5!?

Preventing f5 and Qg4. 24 ... b4 was also good.
25 g4 h8!
26 g5

Of course, after 26 gh, 26 ... Qg7 would be terribly strong.
26 Qg7
27 f5 Qe5
28 Qe2 Kh8
29 Qf4 Qd4!
30 Wd3 Rc8
31 Qe2 Wb6
32 Qc3 b4
33 Qc4?

A blunder in a bad position.
33 ... Qxc4!
34 Wxc4 bc
35 bc

Another mistake, though 35 Wxc3 would not have offered White real chances of survival either.

35 ... Qc2
36 Qb1 We3+
37 Qg2 Qd2+
38 Qf3 Qxh2
38 Qxa3 or 38 Qe3 were not bad either
39 Qf2 Qg3+
40 Qe2 Qxa3
41 Qb8 Qxb8
42 Qc7 Qg4+
43 Qf1 Qd1+

43 Qb1 mate also came into serious consideration.

44 Qg2 Qg4+
45 Qf1 Qb1 mate

This was A.Petrosian-Adorjan, Riga 1980.

Two years passed before I got a chance to use the ‘wonder-weapon’ again, but it was worth waiting, since in the summer of 1983 I succeeded in creating a sort of ‘evergreen’ game.

The first twelve moves followed the previous game, reaching this position:

13 Qd1 e6
13 b3

After 14 Qf4 Wb7 15 Qd6 Qfc8 the bishop’s intrusion into the enemy camp causes White trouble rather than joy (16 Qe8 is threatened as well as 16 Qa5).

14 ... Wb7!
15 Qb2 Qfd8
16 f3 d6
17 Qe3 Qe5
18 Qd2 (91)
Black has regrouped his pieces in an ideal way. He has pressure against the centre, he has weakened White’s king position by the exchange of the light-squared bishops, and he is ready to break through on the queenside. But not only there.

18 g5!

An attack with the pawns protecting one’s own king position always has a bad aesthetic effect and, with all due modesty, it demands some courage as well.

19 h4
20 c2?

‘The proof of the pudding is in the eating’, as the saying rightly goes. Hansen took fright at the possible drawbacks of 20 xh6 xh6 21 xh6 g4!, but in fact it was just this line that offered him the relatively best chances. Let us see: 22 fg xxe4 (22 ... hg, awarded an exclamation mark in my original analysis, would be refuted by 23 ccd5!, when Black’s position would collapse pitifully. After all, you can’t dilly-dally in such a sharp position.) 23 xxe4 xxe4+ 24 f2 hg! (not 24 ... h1 25 gh! xh2+ 26 g2 ±) 25 d4! d7! 26 xg4 f5!! 27 xe5 xh2+ 28 f3 xh2+ 29 xe2 xce5 30 d2 leads to a probable draw. (30 xg3?! is dubious because of 31 f3!). Like the text, 20 h3? also plays into Black’s hands. After 20 h4!, 21 gh d5 22 h2 gh 27 or 21 g4 e8 unpleasant things soon set in on the queenside and on the dark squares of the royal court.

20 g4

21 e1

On 21 f4 Black’s reply, 21 f3! 22 xd6 xh6 23 xh6 b5!, is devastating as usual. For example 24 cb ab 25 b4 xxe4 26 xxe4 xa2! (26 ... xxb2 is also good) 27 xg7 xc2! etc, and Black wins.

21 ... b5!

Black is showered with blessings as a result of White’s weaknesses.

24 f4

22 xxb5 does not heal the reopening wounds in White’s position either, e.g. 22 ... gf+ 23 xxf3 ab 24 xxe5 (24 xxe5? xxe4+ 25 xxe4 xxe4 26 e2 – 26 c6? xhd2 27 xh4 xh6! 27 – 26 xa2 28) 24 xxe4 25 xg7 xed2 winning the exchange. White’s position also collapses totally after 22 cb ab 23 xxb5 gf+ 24 xxf3 xxb5 25 xxb5 xxe4.
22 $\text{g6}$

The direct try to win with 22 ... b4 would rebound on Black after 23 $\text{d5! ed 24 fe xxe4 (24 de 25 ed) 25 xxd5. Sometimes, moderation can be useful}$

23 cb ab
24 b4 $\text{dc8!}$
25 $\text{g1 (92)}$

After 25 $\text{xd6}$ Black avenges himself by 25 $\text{xc3 26 xc3 xe4.}$

25 $\text{xc3?!}$

Well, you cannot cross your own shadow! Once again, a nice exchange sacrifice was too great a temptation for me. Instead 25 $\text{c4 26 d4 (26 xd6 xe4) 26 ... ac8 27 d3 e8 (28 xc4 bc) wins a pawn without worries.}$

26 $\text{xc3 xe4}$
27 $\text{xg7 xg7}$

27 $\text{xd2}$ and 28 ... $\text{c4}$ was simple and good for Black. There is nothing to worry about on the long diagonal; 28 ... $\text{c4}$ prevents the threats after any bishop move.

28 $\text{xd6?}$

Capitulation. Admittedly Black also has more than sufficient counterplay after 28 $\text{c2. Now, however, he even wins a pawn.}$

28 ... $\text{xd6}$
29 $\text{xd6 a7+}$
30 $\text{f1 xa2}$
31 $\text{d2}$

Trading off the queens was also hopeless: 31 $\text{xa2 xa2 32 b6 h4 33 xb5 h3 34 g5 (34 g1 e2 35 d3 g2+ etc $\text{+}$) 34 $\text{xh2 35 xg4 h1+ 36 f2 xe1 queening.}$

31 ... $\text{a6}$
32 $\text{e4}$

Or 32 $\text{d3 c6 33 g1 a1+ 34 d1 xd1+ 35 xd1 e4+}$

32 ... $\text{c8}$
33 $\text{d4+ g8}$
34 $\text{d3 a8}$
35 $\text{g1 f3?!}$

Time trouble. 35 $\text{c4},$ also preserving the possibility of a direct attack, was stronger.

36 $\text{c5}$

Not 36 $\text{f2? d1+ 37 f1 d2 38 f2 c1+ 39 g2 d1 mating or winning the queen.}$

36 ... $\text{h4}$
37 $\text{d3 c6}$
38 $\text{d7 xd7}$
39 $\text{xd7 a8}$
40 gh

It makes no difference. The way to the win is also a joyride after 40 $\text{b7 a1+ 41 f2 h3 42 xb5}$
\[ \text{h1 43 } \text{b8+ } \text{g7 44 b5 } \text{xh2+ 45 g1 } \text{g2+ 46 h1 } \text{xg3 47 b6 } \text{e3! 48 b7 g3 49 g8+ } \text{h7!}.
40 ... \text{xf4}
41 \text{f2}
\]
Or 41 \text{b7 } \text{a2 42 } \text{xb5 } \text{h3+ 43 f1 (after 43 h1 Black mates in two) 43 } \text{xh2 } \text{f.}
41 ... \text{a2+}
42 \text{e3}
After 42 \text{g3 there is a final blow: 42 ... } \text{h5+ 43 xg4 } \text{f6+}.
42 ... \text{d5+}
43 \text{d4 } \text{xh2}

**White resigns**

C.Hansen-Adorjan, Copenhagen 1983.

An interesting deviation was seen in the following game, but it can hardly be considered an improvement on White’s play.

From Diagram 89:

11 \text{e3?!}

We have already seen the idea of a pawn sacrifice to accelerate development in similar positions. Here, however, it only gives White just enough to draw, with some luck.

11 \text{xc4}
12 \text{c1 } \text{c6?}

Now the game ends in a mutually forced repetition of moves. After 12 \text{a6!}, however, one cannot see sufficient compensation for White, e.g:

(a) 13 \text{e5 } \text{b7+ 14 } \text{f3 } \text{xf3+ 15 } \text{xf3 (15 } \text{xf3 } \text{g4) 15 ... } \text{e8 16 }

\[ \text{d5 e6 } \text{f.}
\]
b) 13 \text{ch5 } \text{b7 14 c7 } \text{xa4 14 }
\text{f3 (14 } \text{xa8 } \text{d2+ with two extra pawns for Black) 14 ... } \text{xd4 15 } \text{xd4 } \text{c6 and Black wins.}

13 \text{ch5! } \text{xa2}
14 \text{a1 } \text{c4}
15 \text{c1 } \text{a2}
16 \text{a1 } \text{xb2}
17 \text{b1 } \text{c4}
18 \text{a1 } \text{c4}
19 \text{c1 } \text{a2}
20 \text{a1 } \text{c4}

**Draw agreed**

Ftacnik-Adorjan, Gjovik 1983.

I hope that the games presented above have given the reader an appetite for the double fianchetto. Now, it is rightly expected of me to enter upon the critical variation arising from Diagram 89 after

11 \text{b3 } \text{xe4}
12 \text{xe4 } \text{e5}
13 \text{f3 } \text{xd4 (93)}

14 \text{e3 is clearly White's weakest continuation and it led to a quick win for Black in Capelan-}
Adorjan, Vršac 1983 after 14
\(\text{W}e5\) 15 c5 (after 15 \(\text{Ad1}\) \(\text{W}c7\) 16 \(\text{Af4}\) \(\text{W}c6!\) White’s initiative was also easily repulsed in Kharitonov-Gavrikov, USSR 1983) 15 \(\text{Ac6}\) 16 cb ab 17 a4 (17 \(\text{Afxb6}\) \(\text{W}b5\) \(\text{F}\)) 17 \(\text{W}e6\) 18 \(\text{Ab1}\) \(\text{De5}\) 19 \(\text{We2}\) h6 20 f3 \(\text{F}c8\) 21 \(\text{W}d2\) g5 22 \(\text{Af2}\) \(\text{W}c6\) 23 \(\text{De4}\) g4, and White resigned.

A somewhat more promising try begins with

14 \(\text{La3}\)

This was played by Karpov in game 13 of his first match against Kasparov in 1984. There followed:

14 ... \(\text{Cc6}\)
15 \(\text{Ad1}\) \(\text{We5}\)
16 \(\text{Xxd7}\) \(\text{W}a5!\) (94)

Keene-Adorjan, European Team Championship, Plovdiv 1983, dissolved into a draw after 16
\(\text{Ad8}\) 17 \(\text{Af1}\) \(\text{Xd7}\) 18 \(\text{Xxd7}\) \(\text{Ed8}\) 19 \(\text{Gg5}\) \(\text{Ff6}\) 20 \(\text{Wxc6}\) \(\text{Xxd7}\) 21 \(\text{Wxd7}\) \(\text{Xg5}\) 22 \(\text{Wd5}\) \(\text{Xxd5}\) 23 cd. A similar outcome is to be expected after 19 \(\text{Dd6}\)!? \(\text{We6}\) 20 \(\text{Xxd8+}\) \(\text{Xxd8}\) 21 \(\text{Wa8}\) (or 21 \(\text{De8}\) \(\text{f8}\) 21 \(\text{ed}\) 22 \(\text{Wxd8+}\) \(\text{f8}\) 23 \(\text{Wa8}\) a6! when White’s nominal advantage can hardly be exploited because of the reduced material and perpetual check always in the air. It is interesting that Kasparov’s queen move (‘which we had found during our preparation for the match in a Soviet game played some months earlier) forced the then world champion to think for 50 minutes! Yet he could not have been surprised by the double fianchetto, which had first been put into action by Kasparov (on my advice) in game 11. Then, the wary Karpov – according to his habit – had eliminated every bit of fun from the position and postponed the theoretical battle. For the sake of completeness, here is the game in question: 6 b3 \(\text{Gg7}\) 7 \(\text{Ab2}\) 0-0 8 e3 e6 9 d4 \(\text{We7}\) 10 \(\text{Cc3}\) \(\text{Aa6}\) 11 \(\text{We2}\) d5 12 \(\text{Fd1}\) \(\text{Ffd8}\) 13 \(\text{Ac1}\) dc 14 bc \(\text{Aac8}\) 15 \(\text{Db5}\) \(\text{Ae4}\) 16 a3 \(\text{Db8}\) 17 dc bc 18 \(\text{We5}\) \(\text{De8}\) 19 \(\text{Gg7}\) \(\text{Fxg7}\) 20 \(\text{Ee5}\) \(\text{Exg2}\) 21 \(\text{Exg2}\) f6 22 \(\text{Dd3}\) \(\text{Cc6}\) 23 \(\text{Cc3}\) \(\text{Dd6}\) 24 \(\text{Aa4}\) \(\text{De5}\) 25 \(\text{Xxe5}\) fe 26 \(\text{Cc3}\) \(\text{Wb7+}\) 27 \(\text{Wf3}\) \(\text{Wxf3+}\) 28 \(\text{Wxf3}\) \(\text{Bb8}\) 29 \(\text{Bb1}\) e4+ 30 \(\text{Ee2}\) \(\text{Xxb1}\) 31 \(\text{Xxb1}\) \(\text{Wf6}\) 32 \(\text{Dd1}\) \(\text{We5}\) 33 \(\text{Bb5}\) \(\text{Dd7}\) 34 g4 h6 35 a4 a6 36 \(\text{Xxd6}\) \(\text{Xxd6}\) 37 \(\text{Bb1}\) \(\text{Ed3}\) 38 f4+ \(\text{Wf6}\) 39 \(\text{Bb6}\) \(\text{Cc3}\) 40 \(\text{Xxa6}\) \(\text{Cc2+}\) 41 \(\text{Sh1}\) (sealed). A draw was agreed without resumption.

17 \(\text{Xxe7}\)

Not 17 b4 \(\text{Xxb4}\) 18 \(\text{Xxe7}\)
because of 18 \( \square c2 \) followed by \( \square d4 \).

17 ... \( \square e5 \)
18 \( \text{x}d1! \)

The above-mentioned stem game was Loginov-Ivanov, Borzomi 1984, which White actually lost after 19 \( \text{x}d5?! \) \( \square xf3 \) 20 \( \text{x}a5 \) \( \text{f}e8 \) 21 \( \square xf3? \) ba 22 \( \text{g}5 \) f5, since he could not acquiesce in the fact that after 20 \( \text{x}d5/a6 \) \( \text{x}h2 \) he has no advantage.

18 ... \( \text{x}d7 \)
19 \( \text{x}d7 \) \( \text{x}a2! \)

The simplest way to draw; staying the exchange up does not promise any more.

20 \( \text{x}f8 \) \( \text{x}f8 \)
21 \( \text{e}1 \)

21 \( \text{d}3 \) was similar to the text. Now, however, there is a kind of shadow-boxing on. The ‘colour-superstitious’ Karpov wanted to draw and he managed to do so.

21 ... \( \text{xb}3 \) 22 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{c}3 \) 23 \( \text{e}7 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 24 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 25 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{x}d4 \)
26 \( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 27 \( \text{xa}7 \) h6 28 \( \text{b}7 \)
29 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 30 h4 f5 31 \( \text{d}2 \)
32 \( \text{f}6 \) 33 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 1/2-1/2.

In Diagram 93 by far the best move is

14 \( \text{b}1 \)

threatening to trap the queen by \( \text{b}2 \). This continuation was also seen in the first Karpov-Kasparov match, in game 20 (with Kasparov playing as White!). As a matter of fact, that game did not make us any wiser for after 14 ... \( \text{e}5 \) 15 \( \text{f}4 \) the antagonists came to a ‘compromise’ (1½-½) right away! By way of compensation here is my analysis at the time which I elaborated with the help of IM Endre Vehg.

15 \( \text{e}6 \)

Not 15 \( \text{f}5? \) 16 \( \text{d}6 \) ±.

16 \( \text{f}6+ \)

Or 16 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) and now 17 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{d}4! \) followed by \( \text{c}6 \) or 17 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 19 \( \text{d}5 \) g5!

16 ... \( \text{xf6} \)
17 \( \text{xa}8 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
18 \( \text{b}7 \) g5! (95)

From this piquant position we have some quite mysterious paths to follow:

a) 19 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 20 \( \text{a}6 \) (20 \( \text{c}7? \) \( \text{e}5 \) trapping the queen) 20 \( \text{e}4 + \) 21 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 22 \( \text{xa}7 \) \( \text{a}8 \)
23 \( \text{xb}6 \) \( \text{f}3 + \) 24 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{xa}2! \) and White is unable to avoid mate or serious material loss.

b) 19 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 20 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{e}4 + \) 21 f3 (the only move) 21 \( \text{c}2! \) 22
\[ \text{A Decisive Draw} \]

\[ \text{\( f6 (\text{if 22 \( bd1, \) then 22 ... \( c3) \) 22 ... \( d3! 23 \text{e1 (what else?) 23 e2+ 24 f2 e5 25 xa7 xf3+ 26 g1 a8 etc. Black wins easily.} \) \) c7 h5! (this bayonet assault is also a recurrent motif):} \]

\[ c1) 20 fbd1 h4! 21 h3 g4! 22 hg we4+ 23 f3 (23 sh3 sh7! 24 gh \( f3+ 25 g3 xh4 \) leading to mate and after 24 \( de1 wd3! 25 d1 \) \( f3 \) the result is the same) 23 \( e2+ 24 h3 \) (after 24 g(h)1 \( h3 \) is of course decisive) 24 ... hg 25 xg3 g7 26 h1 (96). \]

\[ 96 \]

Apparently defending everything, but 26 \( h4+!! \) comes even so! The fight is over: 27 xh4 xd1 is plain sailing, while after 27 xh4 there follows 27 xf3 with a quick mate.

c2) 20 b1 f5 21 f4 (21 f3 h4 22 h3 – 22 g4? \( c2+ 23 f2 h3+ 24 f1 \) (or 24 g3? \( h7! \)) 24 d3+ 25 e2 d4 and Black wins – 22 ... d3 also gives Black great activity) 21 h4! 22 e5 (the only move that does not lose immediately, e.g. 22 fg? h3+ 23 sh1 c2 24 g1 d4) 22 xe5 23 fe h3+ 24 g1 d3! (threatening 25 d2) 25 f2 xe5! 26 e4 (after 26 xe5 \( d1+ 27 f1 d4+ \) Black regains the sacrificed exchange with a decisive advantage) 26 ... xe4 27 xe4 f6 and Black has good winning chances. The question now arises of how much difference the interpolation of the move 19 be1 would make in Diagram 95. Well, I think that the line 19 ... f5 20 c1 h5! still offers Black dangerous activity and this at least compensates for his material investment: 21 d1 d4! and 21 f3 g7 (intending 22 h4 23 g4 h3+) both lead to positions rich in tactical possibilities, just as much as the other variations stemming from 13 g5!.

Before I forget, there is another deviation at move 15, but this does not spread confusion in Black’s ranks either.

Returning to Diagram 93, after 14 b1 e5 play can continue: 15 b2 c7 16 xg7 (or 16 c3 xc3 17 xc3 f6) 16 xg7 17 c3+ (17 c3? Black replies with 17 c6 18 d5 e6) 17 f6. Now it is rather problematical whether White has any compensation for the pawn.

It is a curious thing that in the
position arising from Diagram 89 after 11 b3 Qxe4 nobody has ever mentioned the foxy idea

12 Qd5?! (97)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Qd5!}
\end{array}
\]

In this line (especially next to a ticking chess clock) Black can easily miss the right path, e.g. 12 Fe5 (12 Fc5? 13 e3 \(\pm\)) 13 b2 Qc6 14 f4! Fb8 (after 14 Fd6 the reply 15 Qb5 is more than uncivil) 15 Qxc6 dc 16 Qxe7+ Fh8 17 Qxg7+ Qxg7 18 Qd4+ Qf6 19 g4! Fb7 (after 19 c5 White answers with 20 Fb2 followed by Qd5) 20 Fe5 Fae8 21 Fael and Black can make himself scarce.

Another example: 12... Fb7 13 Qxe7+ (after 13 Ff3? Qxd4 14 Fxe4 Qc6 15 Qxe7+ Qg7 White would be disappointed) 13 Qh8 14 Qd5 Qc3 15 Ff3! Qxd5 (15... Qxd4 is clearly bad owing to 16 Qb2) 16 Qb2, with troubled waters. However, 12... Fd8, with Christian humility, gains its proper reward after 13 Fe1 e6! 14 Fxe4 ed 15 cd Qa6 when it is Black, if anybody, who has the advantage.

Incidentally, in his preparations for his first match against Karpov, Kasparov also studied the deviation 11 Qd5?! as well and found a reliable antidote to it in the form of 11 Qxd5 12 cd Fe5 13 Qf3 Fxe4 14 Fe1 Ff5! 15 Qxe7 Qa6. It is easy to see that White has considerable development difficulties and his advanced d5 pawn is also vulnerable.

It will be a long time before we hear the final word on the line beginning with 8 Qxd4. Nevertheless, recently more and more players have recaptured the d4 pawn with the queen. A classic example of the dangers for Black can be seen in the following game, with which GM Ribli won the brilliancy prize at the World Team Championship, Lucerne 1985. (A good part of the analysis is borrowed from him.)

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
1 & Qf3 \\
2 & c4 \\
3 & g3 & b6 \\
4 & Qg2 & b7 \\
5 & 0-0 & g6 \\
6 & Qc3 & Qg7 \\
7 & d4 & cd \\
8 & Fxd4 & Qc6?! (98)
\end{array}
\]

This gains a tempo, but is hardly the best continuation since in such positions this knight is more useful on d7, as will be
demonstrated in later games. Regarding the tempo, the queen cannot lounge on d4 for ever anyway, so instead of cashing in on this at once, Black should invest for the future.

9 \( \text{Wh}4 \) \( \text{Ac}8 \)
10 \( \text{Ed}1 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
11 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{De}4 \)

Black hoped for some relief by making this offer to trade off, but White’s answer came as an unpleasant surprise to him.

12 \( \text{Dxe}4! \) \( \text{Dxa}1 \)
13 \( \text{Da}3 \) \( \text{Dg}7 \)

Or 13\( \ldots \) \( \text{De}5 \) 14 \( \text{Dxe}5 \) \( \text{Dxe}5 \) 15 \( \text{Dxd}6+ \) ed 16 \( \text{Dxb}7 \) crushing Black’s defence; after 13 \( \text{Df}6 \) the nicest win is 14 \( \text{Dxd}6! \) ed (14\( \ldots \) \( \text{Dc}7 \) 15 \( \text{Dxf}6! \) ) 15 \( \text{Dxd}6+ \) \( \text{Dd}7 \) 16 \( \text{Dh}3+ \) mating or winning the queen.

14 \( \text{Dfg}5 \) \text{0-0 (99)}

Or 14 \( \text{De}5 \) 15 \( \text{Dxd}6+ \) ed 16 \( \text{Dxb}7 \) \( \text{Cc}7 \) 17 \( \text{Dxd}6 \) \( \text{Dd}7 \) 18 \( \text{De}6! \)

\( \pm \).

15 \( \text{Dxh}7! \) \( \text{Dxh}7 \)
16 \( \text{Dg}5+ \) \( \text{Dg}8 \)
17 \( \text{Wh}4 \) \( \text{He}8 \)
18 \( \text{Dh}3!! \)

A quiet move with devastating effect! The main threat is 19 \( \text{Wh}7+ \) \( \text{Df}8 \) 20 \( \text{Dxe}6+ \) fe 21 \( \text{Dxe}6 \) \( \text{Df}7 \) 22 \( \text{Db}2! \) \( \pm \)

b) 18\( \ldots \) \( \text{e}6 \) 19 \( \text{Dxd}6 \) \( \text{We}7 \) 20 \( \text{Wh}7+ \) \( \text{Df}8 \) 21 \( \text{Dd}7! \) \( \pm \).

c) 18\( \ldots \) \( \text{e}5 \) 19 \( \text{Dxd}6 \) \( \text{We}7 \) 20 \( \text{Wh}7+ \) \( \text{Df}8 \) 21 \( \text{Df}6!! \) \( \text{Dd}8 \) 22 \( \text{Dxf}7+! \) \( \text{Dxf}7 \) 23 \( \text{Dxe}6 \) mate!

18 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Df}8 \)
19 \( \text{Dg}6+ \) \( \text{Dg}8 \)

No better was 19\( \ldots \) fe 20 \( \text{Dxe}6 \) \( \text{De}5 \) 21 \( \text{Wh}7 \) \( \text{Df}7 \) 22 \( \text{Db}2! \).

20 \( \text{Dg}5 \) \( \text{Df}8 \)
21 \( \text{Df}6+ \) \( \text{Dg}8 \)
22 \( \text{Dxd}8 \)

As may be guessed from the
repetitions, Ribli first spent some time trying to find a mate but then reluctantly decided to win the queen. The rest was already a formality for him: the game wins itself.

22 ... \( \text{\textit{E}cx}d8 \\
23 \text{\textit{E}}g2 \text{\textit{E}f}6 \\
24 \text{\textit{W}h}6 \text{\textit{e}}6 \\
25 \text{h}4 \text{d}5 \\
26 \text{h}5 \text{\textit{g}7} \\
27 \text{\textit{W}g}5 \text{dc} \\
28 \text{\textit{E}x}d8 \text{\textit{E}x}d8 \\
29 \text{bc} \text{gh} \\
30 \text{\textit{E}b}2 \text{\textit{e}}5 \\
31 \text{\textit{E}d}5 \text{\textit{d}6} \\
32 \text{\textit{W}x}h5 \text{\textit{d}7} \\
33 \text{\textit{W}f}5 \\

Black resigns


Later, we again searched for a stylish finish but, as far as we could judge, Black could always offer some kind of propitiatory sacrifice. For instance: 21 \textit{W}h7?! e6! 22 \textit{E}xd6+ \textit{E}e7 (22 \ldots \textit{E}e7 23 \textit{E}xe6+ fe 24 \textit{E}xe6 \( \pm \)) 23 \textit{E}xe6 threatening 24 \textit{W}xg6!! mocked me for a long time, but finally I realised that 22 \ldots \textit{W}xd6! 23 \textit{E}xd6 \textit{E}cd8 not only obviates the immediate difficulties, but gives Black some counterchances.

Let us not forget that we are rooting for Black, so we should rather talk about how Black can improve his play! Fortunately, there is, indeed, a refinement, which we will see in the next game.

1 \textit{E}f3 e5 \\
2 c4 b6 \\
3 g3 g6 \\
4 \textit{E}g2 \textit{b}7 \\
5 d4 cd \\
6 \textit{W}xd4 \textit{f}6 \\
7 b3 \textit{g}7 \\
8 \textit{E}b2 0-0 \\
9 0-0 d6 \\
10 \textit{E}c3 \textit{bd}7!

This is this knight's proper place and there is an end to it!

11 \textit{W}d2

After 11 \textit{E}d5?! b5 it is already Black's serve

11 \textit{E}c8 \\
12 \textit{E}fd1

Now 12 \textit{E}d5?? would already be a bad mistake because of 12 \textit{E}xd5 13 cd \textit{E}e4.

12 ... a6 \\
13 \textit{E}d4 \textit{E}xg2 \\
14 \textit{E}xg2 \textit{W}c7 \\
15 f3 \textit{W}b7

A familiar picture, is it not?

16 e4 e6!? (100)
16  \( \text{Kf8} \) 17  \( \text{Qd4} \)  \( \text{Qe5} \) was also simple and good, but I wanted to avoid trading off the knights. According to dogma, if you have a space disadvantage you should try to exchange. Otherwise it is harder for you to regroup your huddled pieces than it is for your opponent who can manoeuvre on a more spacious field. In fact, experience has shown that hedgehog like positions (such as in the present game) form a clear exception to this normally valid rule. It is important that you should always study the actual position on the board and not search your memory for the sometimes inappropriate ideas of earlier writers. Talking of concrete analysis, before playing the text move I had to consider in detail the possible leaps of the d4 knight. Let us see:

a) 17  \( \text{Qc2} \) b5?! 18  \( \text{Qxd6} \) (18  \( \text{Qe3} \)  \( \text{Cxc6} \) ) 18  bc 19  e5 cb 20 ef bc (also after 20  \( \text{Qxf6} \) White is outnumbered) 21 fg cd \( \text{Qxc6} \) 22 fg \( \text{Qxf6} \) 23  \( \text{Qxd1} \)  \( \text{Cxc2+} \) followed by 24  \( \text{Qxf3} \) with a quick mate (24  \( \text{Qf2} \)  \( \text{Qxf2+} \) ).

b) 17  \( \text{Qde2} \) b5 18  \( \text{Qxd6} \) (18 cb ab 19  \( \text{Qxd6} \)  \( \text{Cxc5}! \) with the threats of b4 and ...  \( \text{Qxd4} \) ) 18 ... bc 19 e5  \( \text{Qd5} \) 20  \( \text{Qxd5} \) ed 21  \( \text{Qxd5} \) (or 21  \( \text{Qxd5} \) cb!) 21 ...  \( \text{Qxd5} \) 22  \( \text{Qxd5} \) cb 23  \( \text{Qxd7} \)  \( \text{Cxc2} \) and White must struggle to survive.

Korchnoi, however, was not inquisitive about this matter. He just automatically grouped his pieces.

17  \( \text{Qac1} \)  \( \text{Kfd8} \)

For the moment, the freeing move ... d5 does not work because of 18 ed ed 19 cd  \( \text{Qxd5} \) 20  \( \text{Qxd5} \)  \( \text{Qxd5} \) 21  \( \text{Cxc6} \) !.

18  \( \text{Qc2} \)  \( \text{Qe5} \)

19  \( \text{Qdc1} \)

After 19  \( \text{Qc1} \) ?! Black can already play 19  d5, e.g. 20 cd ed 21 ed (21 f4?  \( \text{Qh6} \) ! ⊕) 21  \( \text{Qxd5} \) 22  \( \text{Qxd5} \)  \( \text{Qxc2+} \) 23  \( \text{Qxc2} \) (or 23  \( \text{Qxc2} \)  \( \text{Qxd5} \) ) 23 ...  \( \text{Qxd5} \) with a palpable advantage to Black.

19 ...  \( \text{Qa8} \)

Now or later, the typical regrouping  \( \text{Qe8} \) and  \( \text{Qdc8} \), intending ... d5 also comes into serious consideration.

20  \( \text{Qa1} \)

Commenting on moves like this, the late grandmaster Barcza used to say: 'The advantage of the move is that my opponent does not know what I am playing for. The disadvantage is that I don’t know either.'

20 ...  \( \text{Qc7} \)

21  \( \text{Qd1} \)  \( \text{Qdc8} \)

21  \( \text{Qe7} \)! with the idea of ... d5 was better.

22  \( \text{Qf2} \)  \( \text{Qb7} \)

23  \( \text{Qe2} \)  \( \text{Qc6} \)

Do not bother to look for some kind of logical thread around this
stage. Impending time trouble is not the most inspiring muse.

24 ♘b2 ♜a8
25 h3 ♜b8
26 ♘d4 ♜f6c7
27 ♘a3 ♜d7
28 f4 ♜b7
29 ♜e2 ♜c6
30 ♘f3 ♜c8
31 ♘g4!? ♜xg4
32 hg ♘d4
33 ♘xd4 ♜xd4
34 ♜d1 e5!
35 ♜f5 ♜c8
36 ♘h1?

White should have played 36 ♘b2 with equal chances. Korchnoi, however, bewitched by the h-file, precipitates events.

36 ... b5!
37 ♘c1 f6?

Unnecessary tardiness. 37 bc would have repulsed the aggressor:
38 bc (38 ♜xc4 ♜xc7?) 38 ... ♜xc7 39 ♘f3 d5! 40 ♜h2 (40 ed ♜xc4 ⊕) 40 ... h5! and the good guys triumph.

38 fg hg
39 ♜h6 ♜g7
40 ♜f3 bc
41 ♘h1!

My opponent meditated upon this sealed move a good thirty minutes, and I a little longer upon the answer. During the dinner-break I mainly analysed the move 41 g5 and found the following ‘winning’ plan in reply: 41 f5! (41 ♜f7? 42 gf+ ♜xf6 43 ♜g4 ♜cf8 44 ♜h4 ⊕) 42 ef gf 43 bc ♜e4! 44 ♜xe4 fe 45 ♘a3 d5 46 c5 ♘e3 etc. Later, however, I discovered that after 47 c6 it soon becomes clear that the correct result is a draw: 47 ♜f7 48 ♘d6! ♜xg5 49 ♜e6 ♜f6 50 ♘xe5. I also had high hopes of the line 41 bc? ♜dc7 42 g5 ♜f8! 43 gf+ ♜xf6 44 ♜g4 ♜b1. You can imagine how difficult I found it to play my next move, inviting a repetition of moves.

41 ♘g8!

The stubborn 41 ... cb was more than dangerous because of 42 ♘h6+ ♜f7 43 ♜xc8 ♜xc8 44 ♜g5, while after 41 ... c3 42 ♘h6+ ♜g8 43 ♘e3! (with the idea of 44 ♜d1) Black stands no better in spite of the extra pawn.

42 bc?!

Beginning a cloak-and-dagger adventure. He should, of course, have played 42 ♜h6.

42 ♜dc7!
43 ♜e2 ♜f7!
44 ♜h6?

44 ♜e2 was the rational continuation.

44 ... ♜g7
45 ♜f1 ♜c6?

A harmful over-insurance again!
45 ♜xc4 46 ♜h1 ♜f8! (46 ♜c2? 47 ♜h7+ ⊕) 47 ♜h8+ (47 ♜xg6? ♜c2+ ⊕) 47 ♜e7 48 ♜h7 ♜e6 would have won for Black.

46 ♜h1 ♜xc4
47 \text{g}xg6+! \text{f}8
47 \text{g}xg6?? 48 \text{h}6 mate.
48 \text{h}6+ \text{e}7
49 \text{d}1 \text{b}8
49 ... d5!! looks better, e.g. 50 g5 de 51 gf+ \text{e}6 52 \text{xc}4 \text{c}2+ 53 \text{xc}2 \text{xc}2+ 54 \text{h}3 \text{xf}6 55 \text{xf}6+ \text{xf}6 with a big advantage to Black.
50 \text{h}3 \text{b}2?!
51 \text{xb}2 \text{xb}2
52 \text{f}3?!

Here 52 g5! could have caused some excitement, since after 52 ... \text{xe}4 53 gf+ \text{xf}6? the unexpected blow 54 \text{f}8+!! comes with decisive effect. So 53 \text{d}7 54 \text{g}4 \text{c}6 55 \text{g}7 \text{c}4! is forced, and Black can just defend himself.
52 ... \text{c}1!
53 \text{xc}1

Not 53 \text{g}7? \text{g}5!.
53 \text{xc}1
54 g5!

Need is the best schoolmaster; the ‘only’ moves are relatively easier to find.

54 \text{fg}

The result is the same after 54 ... f5!? 55 ef \text{h}7+ 56 \text{h}6 (56 \text{g}4?? \text{f}4+ 57 \text{gh} \text{xf}6 58 \text{g}2 (58 \text{g}4? \text{f}6) 59 ... \text{d}2+ 59 \text{h}3 \text{f}6 60 \text{h}5 (\text{g}5) \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}.
55 \text{d}3 \text{f}1+ 56 \text{xf}1 \text{xf}1 57 \text{g}4 \text{a}1 58 \text{f}5! \text{d}7 59 \text{xd}5 \text{xa}2 60 \text{g}7+ \text{c}6 61 \text{g}4 \text{c}5 62 \text{d}7! (=) a5 63 g5 \text{f}2+ 64 \text{e}6 \text{g}2 65 \text{xd}6 \text{xd}5+ \text{h}4 67 \text{f}6 \text{h}5 68 \text{g}6 \text{h}8 69 \text{xe}5 a4 70 \text{d}5 \text{a}8 71 e5 a3 72 e6 Draw agreed.


Now let us get down to brass tacks, to the ‘Decisive Draw’ itself:

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Karpov-Kasparov & Match III, Game 23  \\
Leningrad 1986 &  \\
\hline
1 & \text{f}3 \text{f}6 \\
2 & c4 b6 \\
3 & g3 c5 \\
4 & \text{g}2 \text{b}7 \\
5 & 0-0 g6 \\
6 & d4 cd \\
7 & \text{xd}4 \text{g}7 \\
8 & \text{c}3 d6! \\
9 & \text{d}1 \text{bd}7 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Not only the positioning of pieces is important but also the move order. For example, if Black castled too early, the white queen would find an excellent post on h4 threatening the king by \text{h}6. Now, however, a similar try would be easily parried by \text{h}6.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
10 & b3 \text{c}8 \\
11 & \text{b}2 0-0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The order is the moving spirit of everything.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
12 & \text{e}3 \text{e}8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Some months later, in the game Plaskett-Adorjan, Hastings 1986-87, I played 12 ... a6 here. There followed 13 \text{d}4 \text{g}2 14 \text{xg}2
\( \text{He8 15 } \text{Ac1} \text{Cc5}!? 16 \text{h3 } \text{Cc8 (a multi-purpose move, threatening b5 and focusing the glance of the queen with X-ray eyes on h3)} \text{17 } \text{Aa3}?! (17 \text{a4}) 17 \text{Cc7 (A meek retreat instead of which I was at first inclined to play 17 }} \text{Ah5. I worked out that 18 g4 } \text{Ah6 19 f4 would be bad for White after 19 } \text{Aa5! 20 } \text{Ab4 e5 21 } \text{Axa5 } \text{xf4! 22 } \text{Wf3 } \text{xc1 and Black is a piece up. 20 g5 } \text{Axa3 21 gh } \text{Aa5 was the lesser evil for White, but I was not sure about the consequences of the exchange sacrifice 19 } \text{Wf3}!?. \text{It may be subjective, but I prefer offering the exchange to accepting it. Now, after the event, I do not think that after 19 } \text{xc1 20 } \text{xc1 } \text{e5 White has sufficient compensation, although he is able to cause some problems by } \text{Cc6 and } \text{Cd5 because of the tricky position of the rook in the centre) 18 } \text{Cd5}?! (I could now have punished White’s impatience by 18 } \text{Wa8! 19 } \text{f3 – 19 } \text{f3 } \text{Cd5 20 ed } \text{xc1 20 } \text{xc1 } \text{Df6 is also agreeable for Black – 19 } \text{Cd5 20 } \text{xd5 b5!}, \text{since after 20 } \text{xa8 } \text{xa8 21 cb } \text{xc1 22 } \text{xc1 ab, and now 24 a3 } \text{Cc5 25 b4 } \text{xd4! 26 } \text{xd4 } \text{d7 or 24 } \text{xb5? } \text{xa2, White’s fate would be to suffer. However, I played tentatively and squandered this opportunity) 18 } \text{Wb7 19 } \text{f3 } \text{xd5 20 } \text{xd5 (20 cd? } \text{xc1 21 } \text{xc1 } \text{e5 22 } \text{e4 f5 loses a pawn) 20 } \text{Cc8? (20 } \text{Cc8! } \text{f3) 21 } \text{xb7 } \text{xb7 22 } \text{Cc2! b5 23 } \text{b4 (even 23 } \text{e3 was playable, for after 23 } \text{b4? White has the nasty trick 24 } \text{xb4 } \text{xb4 25 } \text{cd5 } \text{cb8 26 } \text{xe7+! } \text{f8 27 } \text{Cc6) 23 bc 24 } \text{Cd5! (not 24 bc } \text{b2!! } \text{f3) 24 } \text{db6 25 } \text{xb6 } \text{xb6 } \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}, \text{since 26 } \text{xc4 } \text{xc4 27 bc } \text{Cc6 28 c5! dc 29 } \text{Cd5! leads to a dead drawn position.}}}

\text{Let us return to the great ones!}

13 \text{Ac1 a6}

14 \text{Aa1 (101)}

14 \text{Cd4 would have transposed to the Plaskett-Adorjan line.}

14 \text{Cc5!}

\text{Killing two birds with one stone! Black threatens the ‘standard’ b5 and}

15 \text{a4 Wa8!}

\text{as well! Who is playing for equality?}

16 \text{e1 f5!}

\text{An original rook move again, forcing a further weakening move by the threat of 17 } \text{g4.}
17 \( \text{x}b7 \text{x}b7 \\
18 f3

This was the last of the second batch of moves by telex. ‘If this game were not for the world title,’ I said to my fellow members at Statisztika Club, ‘I am sure that Gary would play h5’ And Gary, without taking the stake into consideration, went ahead anyway! Nevertheless, the simplifying 18 ... d5 would have worked as well, e.g. 19 cd \( \text{x}d5 \ 20 \text{x}d5 \text{x}d5 \ 21 \text{e}4 \text{e}6 \ 22 \text{x}g7 \text{x}g7 23 \text{x}d5 \text{xd}5 \ 24 \text{xd}5 \text{e}d 25 \text{f}2 \text{c}5 with a level game.

18 ... h5!? \\
19 \text{g}2 \text{c}5

The Moor has done his duty

20 \text{b}2 \text{c}c8

and he can go away! After the rook’s return, the d7 knight now begins his dance.

21 \text{a}3 \text{c}5 \\
22 \text{b}1 \text{e}6! \\
23 \text{d}3 \text{c}7! \\
24 \text{f}4 (102)

This precisely timed rolling up was the aim of the extraordinary knight manoeuvre.

25 cb ab \\
26 \text{x}b5 \text{x}b5 \\
27 \text{x}b5

The a-pawn could not have recaptured because of \( \text{a}7+ \\) winning a piece.

27 \text{xb}5 \\
28 ab \text{b}8 \\
29 \text{b}2

After 29 \text{d}5 \text{xd}5 30 \text{xd}5 Black solves his problems by 30 ... \text{b}7 regaining the pawn. Now the impetuous 29 ... \text{xb}5? would be a mistake owing to 30 \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 31 \text{d}5.

29 ... \text{b}7! \\
30 b6 \text{eb}8 \\
31 b4 \text{d}7 \\
32 \text{x}g7

And here Karpov himself offered the draw that would concede the match and, in accordance with such situations, Kasparov accepted without hesitation. White’s remaining b-pawn is weak rather than passed, and so it was the Champion, if anybody, who stood better.

This draw meant that Kasparov kept his title and confirmed a new era in chess history.

It is a great satisfaction for me that – in my own way – I had been able to make my own contribution.
I have never seriously thought that the system with 2 c3 could undermine the confidence of a Sicilian Defence fan. It can be a useful surprise weapon, but I have honestly never understood players who carry on playing a system which in my opinion permits Black to achieve a promising position without too much difficulty.

Even so, I was rather surprised when I looked through my games while preparing this chapter and found that my record was ten wins and only one defeat, without counting draws. In other words, Black is (more than) OK!

It would, of course, be unwise to assert that the variation with 2 c3 is bad for White, but the facts speak for themselves.

In the following games (except my games against Zuckerman and Fodre) there is a common theme. In the opening stage Black, contrary to earlier practice, holds back the exchange on d4. The reason for this is the realisation that though the c3 pawn supports the centre it also prevents the b1 knight from developing on the normal square c3. As a result the knight is sometimes forced to move to d2 or a3. Black can develop quickly and harmoniously and this is worth more than the potential weakness created by isolating White's pawn on d4.

Now let us see the games:

1 e4 c5
2 Qf3 Qc6
3 c3 d5
4 ed Qxd5
5 d4 e6
6 Qd3 Qf6
7 0-0 Qe7
8 dc

Another possibility here is 8 c4 Nh5 (8 Nd8 proved inadequate in the game Sveshnikov-Tompa, Decin 1974. There followed 9 dc Nxc5 10 a3 Qg4? – better is 10 0-0 11 b4 Qe7 12 Qb2 b6 13 Qc2 h6 ± – 11 b4 Qce5 12 Qxe5 Qxe5 13 Qe2 Qxd1 14 Qxd1 Qe7 15 Qc3 Qd7 16 Qb2 f6 17 c5 0-0-0 18 Qac1 Qb8 19 Qe4 Qc6 20 Qg5! and Black lost material) 9 Qc3 (White can now force a draw by 9 Qe2 cd 10 Qg5 Qg6 11 Qd3)
cd 10  ♞b5 0-0 11  ♞fxd4  ♞xd4 12  ♞xd4  ♞d8 13  ♞c2  ♞h4 14  ♞e2 e5! and Black seized the initiative in Chandler-Sosonko, Wijk aan Zee 1982.

8 0-0!

Black is not forced to recapture immediately since White cannot save his plunder.

9  ♞c2

If White hangs on to his material advantage then after 9 b4  ♞d8 10  ♞c2  ♞xd1 11  ♞xd1  ♞xd1+ 12  ♞xd1 a5 Black has the better game. 9  ♞e3 is not very tempting either: 9  ♞d8 10  ♞c2  ♞xd1 11  ♞xd1  ♞xd1+ 12  ♞xd1  ♞g4 13  b4  ♞xe3 14  fe a5 15  ♞a4 (15  b5 can be simply answered by 15 ...  ♞b8 or  ♞a7) 15 ... ab 16  ♞xc6 b3! (a delicate interpolation) 17  ♞bd2  ♞xa2 18  ♞b1  ♞xc5! 19  ♞xb3  ♞xe3+ 20  ♞f1  ♞xd2 21  ♞xb7  ♞xb7 22  ♞xb7 h6.

9  ♞d8

10  ♞d1  ♞xc5

11  ♞g5  h6

12  ♞xf6  ♞xf6

13  ♞bd2  ♞e7

Black saves his bishop pair since 13  ♞d7 14  ♞e4 would lead to an equal game. Apart from the text 13  ♞b6 and even 13  ♞f8 would have given Black possibilities to complicate.

14  ♞h7+  ♞h8

15  ♞e4  ♞d7

16  ♞b3  ♞b6

17  ♞e2

White could have reduced material by 17  ♞xd7?!  ♞xd7 18  ♞xc6  ♞xc6! 19  ♞e5  ♞d5 20  ♞xd7 (20  ♞xf7+ would be a mistake because of 20  ♞g8 21  ♞g6  ♞d1+), but after 20 ...  ♞xd7 Black has a slight advantage.

17 ...

18  ♞e3  ♞f6

19  g3  ♞g8

20  ♞d2  ♞e8

21  ♞ad1  ♞xd2

22  ♞xd2  ♞d8

Exchanging rooks favours Black

23  ♞g2?!  b6

24  ♞xd8  ♞xd8

25  ♞bd4  ♞e7!

but there is no need to exchange everything.

26  c4  ♞c7

27  b3  ♞c5

28  a4  a6

29  ♞b7 (103)

One of my favourite moves (see also Miles-Adorjan and Hansen-
Adorjan). I was able to sacrifice a pawn for the attack since Black rules the dark squares.

30 \( \text{\#c2?} \)

30 h3 was better.

30 ... \( \text{\#c7!} \)

31 \( \text{\&xa6} \)

After 31 \( \text{\&e4 \&c6} \) Black increases his positional advantage.

31 ... \( \text{\&f5} \)

32 \( \text{\&d3 \&c6} \)

33 \( \text{\&g1 \&a8!} \)

Unpleasant things for White lurk on the long diagonal.

34 g4?

Time-trouble! 34 \( \text{\&d2} \) would have been better though after 34 ... \( \text{\&c6} \) 35 f3 Black's reply g4 is dangerous again.

34 ... \( \text{\&f4!} \)

35 gxf4 \( \text{\&xf3} \)

36 \( \text{\&e1 \&e4} \)

37 \( \text{\&e3 \&g4+} \)

38 \( \text{\&f1 \&d4!} \)

Firing volleys at the white king.

39 \( \text{\&g3 \&xf5} \)

40 \( \text{c5 \&xc5} \)

41 \( \text{\&d3 \&g7} \)

Mind the paint! After 41 \( \text{\&xf2? 42 \&xe4 \&xe1+ 43 \&xf5 \&xg3 44 hg ef 45 b4} \) it is White who wins!

42 h4?

But now there is no mercy.

42 ... \( \text{\&xf2!} \)

43 \( \text{\&xe4 \&xe1+} \)

White resigns

Hulak-Adorjan, Osijek 1978.
A mistake on the Second Move?

\( \text{\textit{A}} \text{ge5, but after 14} \text{\textit{A}} \text{xe5} \text{\textit{A}} \text{xe5} 15 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xd4} \text{\textit{A}} \text{c6} 16 \text{\textit{W}} \text{e3!} \text{\textit{A}} \text{d7? 17} \text{\textit{A}} \text{d1} \text{\textit{A}} \text{c5} 18 \text{\textit{W}} \text{g3} \text{\textit{A}} \text{d4} 19 \text{\textit{A}} \text{c3} \text{\textit{A}} \text{c2} 20 \text{\textit{A}} \text{ab1! White had the better of it and soon won} 14 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xd4} \text{\textit{A}} \text{xd4} 15 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xd4} \text{\textit{A}} \text{d7} \text{with an equal position.} \)

10 ... \text{\textit{cd}}
11 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xd4} \text{\textit{A}} \text{xd4}
12 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xd4} (104)

12 \text{\textit{A}} \text{d8!}

By this unpleasant pin Black has seized the initiative and stands better.

13 \text{\textit{A}} \text{e3}

This was a hard decision for White since 13 \text{\textit{A}} \text{c3} \text{\textit{W}} \text{xd1} 14 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xd1} \text{\textit{A}} \text{e4!} is good for Black while 13 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xe5?} just loses to 13 ... \text{\textit{A}} \text{xe5} 14 \text{\textit{A}} \text{d1} \text{\textit{A}} \text{f4!}. White might, however, have tried 13 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xf6} \text{\textit{W}} \text{xd1} 14 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xd1} \text{\textit{A}} \text{xf6} 15 \text{\textit{A}} \text{c3} \text{\textit{A}} \text{xc3} 16 \text{\textit{bc} \text{\textit{A}} \text{d7} 17 \text{\textit{A}} \text{e4} \text{\textit{A}} \text{c6} 18 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xc6 bc 19} \text{\textit{A}} \text{ab1} when converting Black’s advantage does not look simple.

13 ... \text{\textit{W}} \text{e5}
14 \text{\textit{A}} \text{c3} \text{\textit{b6?!}}

An inaccuracy in consequence of which Black’s slight advantage melts into thin air. The psychology of moves of this nature is very interesting. When you feel that you have the better game you are inclined to look at the board with less care. As a result, of course, mistakes creep into your play more easily. After 14 \text{\textit{A}} \text{d7} followed by \text{\textit{A}} \text{c6} Black’s advantage is beyond any shadow of a doubt, especially in view of his control of the long diagonal.

15 \text{\textit{W}} \text{f3!} \text{\textit{A}} \text{a6}
16 \text{\textit{E}} \text{ad1} \text{\textit{A}} \text{ac8}
17 \text{\textit{E}} \text{fe1} \text{\textit{A}} \text{d6}

Gobbling a pawn is very expensive after 17 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xc4? 18 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xc4} (if 18 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xb6? then} \text{\textit{E}} \text{d3!) 18} \text{\textit{A}} \text{xc4} 19 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xd8+ \textit{A}} \text{xd8} 20 \text{\textit{W}} \text{a8} \text{\textit{A}} \text{d6} 21 \text{\textit{E}} \text{d1} \text{\textit{A}} \text{d5} 22 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xd5 ed 23 \text{\textit{E}} \text{xd5 \textit{A}} \text{c8 (the only move) 24 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xd6 \textit{A}} \text{xa8 25 \textit{E}} \text{d7 and Black’s forces look very pitiful.} \}

18 \text{\textit{g3} \text{\textit{A}} \text{c5}
19 \text{\textit{A}} \text{f4?}

Paying off old scores. My opponent could have maintained equality easily by 19 \text{\textit{A}} \text{xc5 \textit{A}} \text{xc5 20 b3. After the text, however, the tables turn again.}

19 ... \text{\textit{W}} \text{h5}
20 \text{\textit{W}} \text{g2}

20 \text{\textit{W}} \text{hx5 \textit{A}} \text{hx5 or 20 g4 \textit{W}} \text{h4 with the threat of} \text{\textit{A}} \text{b7 favour Black.}

20 ... \text{\textit{A}} \text{d4!}
21 \text{\textit{E}} \text{d2} \text{\textit{E}} \text{d7}
22 \( \text{\#e2} \) \( \text{\#c5} \)  
23 \( \text{\#e1} \) \( \text{\#cd8} \)  
24 \( \text{\#h2} \) \( \text{h6!} \)

Here both players were already in time pressure. My last move aims to play \( \text{g5} \). In his despair, my opponent tries a pseudo-exchange sacrifice, but without success.

25 \( \text{\#xd4} \) \( \text{\#xd4} \)  
26 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{e5} \)  
27 \( \text{\#b5} \) \( \text{\#xb5} \)  
28 \( \text{\#b} \) \( \text{\#c2} \)  
29 \( \text{\#e1} \) \( \text{\#xb2} \)  
30 \( \text{\#xd4} \) \( \text{ed} \)  
31 \( \text{\#d3} \) \( \text{\#xa2} \)

A harvesting expedition.

32 \( \text{\#d1} \) \( \text{\#d5} \)  
33 \( \text{\#f1} \) \( \text{\#e4} \)  
34 \( \text{\#e2?} \) \( \text{\#c3} \)

White resigns

Amrozan-Adorjan, Riga 1981.

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{c5} \)  
2 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d5} \)  
3 \( \text{ed} \) \( \text{\#xd5} \)  
4 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{e6} \)  
5 \( \text{\#f3} \) \( \text{\#f6} \)  
6 \( \text{\#e2} \) \( \text{\#e7} \)  
7 \( \text{0-0} \) \( \text{0-0} \)  
8 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#g4!} \)  
9 \( \text{\#f4} \) \( \text{\#c6} \)  
10 \( \text{c4!} \)

This is far superior to 10 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{\#f6} \) with the following possibilities:

a) 11 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{\#d8} \) 12 \( \text{dc} \) \( \text{\#f5} \) 13 \( \text{\#d4} \)  
13 \( \text{\#b3} \) \( \text{\#d5} \) 14 \( \text{\#d4} \) \( \text{\#g6} \) leads to a slight advantage for Black)

13 \( \text{\#xc5} \) 14 \( \text{\#b3} \) (Alternatives are no better, e.g. 14 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{\#e5} \) 15 \( \text{\#c1} \) \( \text{\#d5} \) 16 \( \text{\#f3} \) \( \text{\#f5} \) 17 \( \text{\#d2} \) 16 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{\#f6} \) and White has problems developing his queenside, Vooremaa-Sax, Tallinn 1979; 14 \( \text{\#xc6} \) \( \text{\#xd1} \) 15 \( \text{\#xc5} \) \( \text{\#xf1+} \) 16 \( \text{\#xf1} \) \( \text{\#xc5} \) and again Black stands well.) 14 ... \( \text{\#a5} \) 15 \( \text{\#d2} \) 15 \( \text{\#xc6} \) (16 \( \text{\#c4} \) \( \text{\#c7} \) 17 \( \text{\#b5} \) \( \text{\#b8} \) is harmless for Black) 16 \( \text{bc} \) 17 \( \text{\#c4} \) \( \text{\#c7} \) 18 \( \text{\#a4} \) \( \text{\#d5} \) 19 \( \text{\#ad1} \) \( \text{\#e6} \) 20 \( \text{\#c1} \) \( \text{a5} \) 21 \( \text{\#fe1} \) \( \text{e4} \) 22 \( \text{\#e3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 23 \( \text{\#c4} \) \( \text{\#h8} \) 24 \( \text{\#xd5} \) \( \text{cd} \) 25 \( \text{\#c2} \) \( \text{f4} \) with a decisive attack for Black, Botterill-Sax, Hastings 1977-8.

b) 11 \( \text{\#e5?!} \) \( \text{cd} \) 12 \( \text{\#f3} \) \( \text{\#b5} \) 13 \( \text{\#xc6} \) \( \text{bc} \) 14 \( \text{\#b3!} \) \( \text{\#a6!} \) (14 \( \text{\#f5?} \) 15 \( \text{\#h2} \) \( \text{\#a6} \) 16 \( \text{\#e1} \) \( \text{dc} \) 17 \( \text{\#xc3} \) \( \text{\#d5} \) 18 \( \text{\#xd5} \) \( \text{ed} \) 19 \( \text{\#xd5} \) leads only to equality (Csapo-Tompa, Hungary 1978) 15 \( \text{\#xb5} \) \( \text{\#xb5} \) 16 \( \text{\#e1} \) \( \text{dc} \) 17 \( \text{\#xc3} \) \( \text{\#ac8} \) and Black keeps his extra pawn.

c) 11 \( \text{\#e1} \) \( \text{\#d8} \) 12 \( \text{\#c7!} \) \( \text{\#e8} \) 13 \( \text{\#e5} \) \( \text{\#xe5} \) 14 \( \text{\#xe5} \) \( \text{cd} \) 15 \( \text{\#xd4?!} \) \( \text{e5!} \) 16 \( \text{\#f3} \) \( \text{e4} \) 17 \( \text{\#xf6} \) \( \text{\#xd1} \) 18 \( \text{\#xd1} \) \( \text{\#xf6} \) 19 \( \text{\#c2} \) \( \text{\#g5!} \) 20 \( \text{\#a3} \) (M.Horvath-Dorfy, Hungary 1984) and after 20 \( \text{f5} \) Black has an initiative.

10 ... \( \text{\#f5} \)

11 \( \text{\#c7!} \)

Only so! After 11 \( \text{\#g3} \) \( \text{\#d8} \) Black would stand better.

11. \( \text{cd} \)

I was rather confused by White's unexpected bishop move. After 11
\( \text{\textcopyright{f6}} \) 12 \( \text{\textcopyright{c3 cd}} \) 13 \( \text{\textcopyright{xd4 \textcopyright{xd4}} \textcopyright{xd4}} \) 14 \( \text{\textcopyright{xd4 \textcopyright{\textcopyright{d7}} \textcopyright{7}}} \) the game is level.

12 \( \text{\textcopyright{xd4 \textcopyright{xd4}} \textcopyright{\textcopyright{f6}}} \)

The attractive-looking 13 \( \text{\textcopyright{xf2}} \) would work after 14 \( \text{\textcopyright{d6}} \)? \( \text{\textcopyright{xd6}} \) 15 \( \text{\textcopyright{xd6 \textcopyright{e4}} \textcopyright{16 \textcopyright{d4 \textcopyright{c5}}} \) but 14 \( \text{\textcopyright{xf2 \textcopyright{c5}}} \) 15 \( \text{\textcopyright{f4 \textcopyright{c2}} \textcopyright{16 \textcopyright{\textcopyright{d2}} \textcopyright{refutes the idea. 13 \textcopyright{h6}!? was, however, worth consideration.}} \)

14 \( \text{\textcopyright{f3}} \!\!\! \text{!}\)

White’s two bishops immobilise the queenside. White has a clear advantage:

14 ... \( \text{\textcopyright{d7}} \)

15 \( \text{\textcopyright{c3 \textcopyright{f6}}} \)

16 \( \text{\textcopyright{e3 \textcopyright{e5}}} \)

17 \( \text{\textcopyright{e2}} \)

Of course not 17 \( \text{\textcopyright{e4}!? in view of 17 \text{\textcopyright{xc4!}} \textcopyright{18 \textcopyright{d3 \textcopyright{xb2 and Black wins.}}}} \)

17 \( \text{\textcopyright{c6}} \)

17 \( \text{\textcopyright{d7}} \) again does not work because of 18 \( \text{\textcopyright{e4}} \). At the same time, White threatens 19 \( \text{\textcopyright{d6 as well as 19 \textcopyright{g3.}}}} \)

18 \( \text{\textcopyright{ad1 \textcopyright{xc3}}} \)

19 \( \text{\textcopyright{xc3 \textcopyright{b6}??}} \)

A mistake in a difficult position again. Black should have played 19 ... \( \text{\textcopyright{e5 and put his trust in Caissa.}} \)

20 \( \text{\textcopyright{d3}??} \)

Luckily for me, my opponent also strays. After 20 \( \text{\textcopyright{f3 \textcopyright{xf3}}} \textcopyright{21 \textcopyright{xf3 \textcopyright{b7}} \textcopyright{22 \textcopyright{\textcopyright{d7}} there is not too much hope of survival.}} \)

20 \( \text{\textcopyright{b7}} \)

21 \( \text{\textcopyright{g3 \textcopyright{g6}}} \)

The only move. If 21 \( \text{\textcopyright{f6 then 22 \textcopyright{g4}}; after 21 \textcopyright{e5 White finishes with 22 \textcopyright{f4 \textcopyright{d4 \textcopyright{d3 \textcopyright{e4 24 \textcopyright{xe5.}}}}} \)

22 \( \text{\textcopyright{h4 \textcopyright{ac8}??}} \)

Here, however, 22 \( \text{\textcopyright{e5 would have been a good move.}} \)

23 \( \text{\textcopyright{d6 \textcopyright{f8}}} \)

24 \( \text{\textcopyright{f3}??} \)

A product of the onset of time pressure. After 24 \( \text{\textcopyright{g5 \textcopyright{e4 \textcopyright{d4 \textcopyright{f6}! (with the threat of 27 \textcopyright{\textcopyright{f6}} \textcopyright{xd4 \textcopyright{\textcopyright{d4 \textcopyright{e2+ 29 \textcopyright{h1 \textcopyright{xc4 30 \textcopyright{h2 \textcopyright{d2! White is a piece up, but the position is hard to evaluate because of the activity of Black’s pieces.}}}} \)

24 ... \( \text{\textcopyright{e4}} \)

25 \( \text{\textcopyright{f6 \textcopyright{d7 (105)}} \)
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Threatening 26 \( \text{\textcopyright{d4 to defend the attack.}} \)

26 \( \text{\textcopyright{f4}??} \)

Both players are in time pressure and hardly in any condition to think. They now begin to fight a knife-duel in a dark room. White is forced to attack since after 26
concerted action of Black’s pieces.

37 ...  
38  
39  

White resigns

This was Sveshnikov-Adorjan, Sarajevo 1983.

The next game was played immediately after the Sarajevo tournament. When I knew that I had to play as Black against Hulak I counted on a repetition of our duel in the Sicilian with 2 c3 played five years earlier. So I prepared an innovation on my game against Sveshnikov – partly influenced by the unpleasant experiences of the previous game. Let us see what happened.

1  e4  c5
2  c3  d5
3  ed  xd5
4  d4  e6
5  f3  f6
6  e2  e7
7  0-0  0-0
8  e3  g4!
9  f4  d8?? (107)

Choosing a quick death. Now the white king falls prey to the
This is the innovation heralded above. In the present game it was a success, but later tournament games questioned its effectiveness.

10 \( \text{c}2? \)

White should have played 10 h3! \( \text{f}6 \) 11 \( \text{c}7! \) \( \text{e}8 \) (not 11 \( \text{d}7 \) because of 12 c4 when after 12 ... \( \text{c}6 \) 13 \( \text{x}b8 \) \( \text{x}b8 \) 14 \( \text{c}5 \) White wins the exchange and after 12 \( \text{f}5 \) White has the choice between 13 g4 \( \text{g}6 \) 14 \( \text{c}5 \) winning the exchange and 13 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 14 g5 winning a piece) 12 \( \text{e}5 \) cd (at first sight 12 \( \text{a}6?! \)) 13 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}4 \) looks better, but 14 \( \text{c}2! \) leads to a decisive advantage for White, e.g. 14 f5 - the only move - 15 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{x}c7 \) 16 \( \text{xe}4 \) fe - 16 ... \( \text{d}8 \) 17 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \pm \) - 17 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 18 \( \text{x}h7+ \) \( \text{f}8 \) 19 \( \text{g}6 \) mating) 13 cd \( \text{e}4 \) (the only move) 14 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{h}4 \) 15 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 16 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 17 \( \text{xc}6 \) bc 18 \( \text{xd}8 \) \( \text{xd}8 \) 19 \( \text{xc}6 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 20 \( \text{b}3 \) (20 b4! is even better) 20 ... \( \text{b}7 \) 21 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{g}5 \) with advantage to White, Hresc-Vegh, Balatonbereny 1983.

10 \( \text{c}6 \)

10 cd is not so good since White can continue with 11 cd \( \text{c}6 \) 12 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 13 \( \text{fd}1 \) with a slight edge.

11 \( \text{d}1 \) cd

12 cd?!

12 \( \text{xd}4 \) is better, after which both 12 e5 13 \( \text{xc}6 \) \( \text{xc}6 \) 14 \( \text{xd}8+ \) \( \text{xd}8 \) 15 \( \text{g}3 \) and 12

\( \text{c}5?! \) 13 \( \text{xc}6 (13 \text{xc}6? \text{xf}2+ \) 14 \( \text{h}1 \) bc 15 \( \text{xd}8+ \) \( \text{xd}8 \) 16 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{a}6! \) and Black wins) 13 \( \text{xd}4 \) 14 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 15 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 16 \( \text{d}2 \) e5 17 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{a}5 \) leads to equality. After the text, however, I am able to seize the initiative.

12 ... \( \text{b}4! \)

13 \( \text{w}2 \) \( \text{f}5! \)

After the glutinous 13 ... \( \text{xa}2 \) 14 \( \text{c}3! \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 15 bc White gets sufficient compensation by the idea of c3-c4.

14 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \)

15 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{d}5 \)

16 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{xc}3 \)

17 bc \( \text{a}4! \)

Reaching its destination by winning a tempo.

18 \( \text{db}1 \) \( \text{c}6 \)

19 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{h}5 \)

20 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{h}4 \)

21 \( \text{hg} \) \( \text{g}5 \)

22 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \)

23 \( \text{xh}4 \)

23 \( \text{h}2?! \) h6 24 g5 hg 25 g3 gf 26 gh leads to interesting complications, but after 26 ... e5 Black has more than enough counterplay for the sacrificed bishop, especially in view of White's denuded king.

23 ... \( \text{nh}4 \)

24 \( \text{e}3 \) h6

My opponent offered a draw here, but I decided to try to capitalise on my slight advantage. As we shall see, with success.

25 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{ac}8 \)
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114 A Mistake on the Second Move?

1 e4 c5
2 c3 d5
3 ed \(\text{\(\text{\#}\text{xd5}\))}
4 d4 e6
5 \(\text{\(\text{\#}f3\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}f6\))}
6 \(\text{\(\text{\#}e2\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}e7\))}
7 0-0 0-0
8 c4

8 \(\text{\(\text{\#}e5\))} is the dernier cri against which it is not easy to equalise. At least, in tournament practice the balance is in White’s favour. For example: 8 cd 9 cd \(\text{\(\text{\#}d8\))} (after 9 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d8\))}!?) 10 \(\text{\(\text{\#}c3\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}a5\))} 11 \(\text{\(\text{\#}f3\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}bd7\))} 12 \(\text{\(\text{\#}e2\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}xe5\))} 13 de \(\text{\(\text{\#}d7\))} 14 \(\text{\(\text{\#}f4\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}b8\))} 15 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d5\))}! \(\text{\(\text{\#}f8\))} 16 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d2\))}! White forces the exchange of queens and the ending after 16 \(\text{\(\text{\#}a6\))} 17 \(\text{\(\text{\#}g5\))! \(\text{\(\text{\#}xe2\))} 18 \(\text{\(\text{\#}xe2\))} promises a win without problems) 10 \(\text{\(\text{\#}c3\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}c6\))} 11 \(\text{\(\text{\#}e3\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}b4\))} 12 \(\text{\(\text{\#}f3\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}bd5\))} 13 \(\text{\(\text{\#}b3\))} a5 14 \(\text{\(\text{\#}ac1\))} h6 15 \(\text{\(\text{\#}fd1\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}a6\))} 16 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d2\))}! \(\text{\(\text{\#}b6\))} 17 \(\text{\(\text{\#}b5\))} a4 18 a3 \(\text{\(\text{\#}e8\))} 19 \(\text{\(\text{\#}f1\))} with advantage for White (Sveshnikov-Georgadze, Tashkent 1984).

8 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d8\))}

8 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d8\))} is probably better, e.g. 9 \(\text{\(\text{\#}c3\))} (9 dc is too unassuming and in Chiburdanidze-Khadilkar, 1982, after 9 \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd1\))} 10 \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd1\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}xc5\))} 11 \(\text{\(\text{\#}c3\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}c6\))} 12 a3 b6 13 b4 \(\text{\(\text{\#}e7\))} 14 \(\text{\(\text{\#}f4\))} b7 15 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d6\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd6\))} 16 \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd6\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}f8\))} 19 c5? bc 20 bc \(\text{\(\text{\#}e8\))} 21 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d2\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}a5\))} 22 \(\text{\(\text{\#}a4\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}c6\))} 23 \(\text{\(\text{\#}a6\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}c7\))} etc. Black had the better game) 9 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d8\))}! 10 \(\text{\(\text{\#}e3\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}c6\))} 11 \(\text{\(\text{\#}e5\))} (if 11 dc then 11 \(\text{\(\text{\#}g4\))} 11 \(\text{\(\text{\#}e8\))} 12 \(\text{\(\text{\#}b5\))} cd! and Black has solved his opening problems.

9 \(\text{\(\text{\#}c3\))} cd
10 \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd4\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}d7\))}
10 e5 does not make matters any easier for Black. Mariotti-Sos, Rome 1982, continued 11 \(\text{\(\text{\#}db5\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}c6\))} 12 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d5\))} a6 13 \(\text{\(\text{\#}bc7\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}b8\))} 14 \(\text{\(\text{\#}e3\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd5\))} 15 \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd5\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}e6\))} 16 \(\text{\(\text{\#}b6\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}d7\))} 17 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d2\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd5\))} 18 cd \(\text{\(\text{\#}f6\))} 19 \(\text{\(\text{\#}c4\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}bc8\))} 20 b3 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d4\))} 21 a4 with a clear advantage for White.

11 \(\text{\(\text{\#}f3\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}c8\))}
12 \(\text{\(\text{\#}e2\))}

This nicely defends the c4 pawn, but after 12 \(\text{\(\text{\#}f4\))} I probably would have felt like choking since White can sidestep \(\text{\(\text{\#}c6\))} with \(\text{\(\text{\#}db5\))} when the weakness of the d6 square would be revealed.

12 ...
13 \(\text{\(\text{\#}xc6\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}xc6\))}
14 b3 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d8\))}
15 \(\text{\(\text{\#}g5\))}

The last two moves seem a little illogical to me. Why not 15 \(\text{\(\text{\#}b2\))}?

15 ...
16 \(\text{\(\text{\#}h4\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}c7\))}
17 \(\text{\(\text{\#}xc6\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}xc6\))}
18 \(\text{\(\text{\#}ad1\))} a6
19 \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd8\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd8\))}
20 \(\text{\(\text{\#}d1\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd1\))}
21 \(\text{\(\text{\#}xd1\))} \(\text{\(\text{\#}d7\))}

The position is fully equal and a stubborn positional fight begins. In any case, I have succeeded in controlling the d-file!
A Mistake on the Second Move?

22  \( g3 \)  \( c5 \)
23  \( h3 \)

You cherish hopes, but frequently in vain. 23 \( d3? \)  \( d4 \)  24 \( e5 \)  \( xf2+! \) would have been much to my taste. Now, however, the manoeuvring continues.

23  \( \ldots \)  \( d8 \)
24  \( c3 \)  \( d4 \)
25  \( e5 \)  \( h4 \)
26  \( f3 \)  \( h7 \)
27  \( e4 \)  \( g5 \)
28  \( xg5 \)  \( xg5 \)
29  \( f4?! \)

By his hard work, White has exchanged a piece again, but the racquet quivers in his hand now. After 23 \( g3 \) the exchange of queens leads to an inevitable draw. After the text my hopes rose.

29  \( \ldots \)  \( h5 \)
30  \( g3 \)  \( d1+ \)
31  \( h2 \)  \( f8 \)
32  \( c5? \)

I would not stake everything on this move either. The idea is obvious, but after the exchange of bishops the isolated pawn will be hopelessly weak.

32  \( \ldots \)  \( d5 \)
33  \( d6 \)  \( xd6 \)
34  \( cd \)  \( f8 \)
35  \( f4 \)  \( a5 \)
36  \( g3 \)  \( b5 \)

White’s queen is shut out from the queenside and the d6 pawn is surrounded.

37  \( h4 \)  \( e5 \)
38  \( f5 \)  \( xd6 \)
39  \( h7 \)  \( f6 \) (109)

40  \( h8+? \)

A favour again, granted under time pressure. After 40 \( g1 \) White can make a nuisance of himself both after 40 \( e7 \) by 41 \( e4 \) and after 40 \( b4/a4 \) by 41 \( h8+ \) or \( b8(a8) \).

40  \( e7 \)
41  \( g1 \)  \( g5! \)

A winning sealed move!

42  \( b8 \)  \( gh \)
43  \( xb5 \)  \( hg \)
44  \( fg \)  \( g5 \)
45  \( c5+ \)  \( f6 \)
46  \( c6+ \)  \( g7 \)
47  \( c3 \)  \( h5 \)
48  \( f1 \)  \( g6 \)
49  \( xa5 \)

White is weary of passivity and he pluckily grabs the pawn; the ending, however, cannot be held since Black’s pawns are quicker.

49  \( \ldots \)  \( xg3 \)
50  \( b6+ \)  \( f6 \)
51 a4  \[ \text{f}3+ \]
52 \[ \text{g}5 \]  e4
53 \[ \text{c}6 \]  h4
54 \[ \text{e}8+ \]  g5
55 \[ \text{g}8+ \]  f4
56 \[ \text{b}8+ \]  g4

Black's king walks slowly towards his impregnable fortress on h3.

57 a5  e3
58 \[ \text{c}8+ \]  

White resigns

Bjelajac-Adorjan, Vršac 1983.

The next game was played in the European Team Championship 1983, where I was in good form, scoring 5\( \frac{1}{2} \) out of 7, the best score in the Hungarian team. As it turned out, this game was the third of a sequence of four wins.

1  e4  c5
2  \[ \text{f}3 \]  e6
3  c3  d5
4  ed  \[ \text{xd}5 \]
5  \[ \text{e}2 \]  f6
6  0-0  e7
7  \[ \text{a}3 \]  0-0
8  \[ \text{c}2?! \]

My opponent refrains from d4 and develops his pieces instead. This unusual plan, however, does not promise him success.

8  \[ \ldots \]  b6!
9  d4  \[ \text{b}7 \]
10 \[ \text{f}4?! \]

White would have done better to take his chance by 10 \[ \text{g}5?! \] when after 10 \[ \text{bd}7 \] 11 \[ \text{e}3 \] \[ \text{c}6 \] 12 \[ \text{e}5 \] \[ \text{xe}5 \] 13 de \[ \text{d}5 \] 14 \[ \text{xe}7 \] (14 \[ \text{xd}5? \] would be a mistake because after 14 \[ \text{xe}3! \] 15 f4 ed 16 fg \[ \text{e}6 \] Black's position can be considered winning) 14 \[ \text{xe}3! \] 15 \[ \text{f}3 \] \[ \text{e}8! \] (15 ... \[ \text{c}7 \] can be answered with 16 \[ \text{d}6! \] ) 16 \[ \text{e}2 \] (On 16 \[ \text{d}6? \] the knight backs out and after 16 \[ \text{f}5! \] 17 \[ \text{c}7 \] \[ \text{xf}3 \] 18 \[ \text{xf}8 \] \[ \text{c}8! \] 19 \[ \text{xa}7 \] \[ \text{c}6 \] Black has an overwhelming position. 16 fe \[ \text{xe}7 \] with a slight advantage to Black is the lesser of the two evils.) 16 \[ \text{xf}3 \] 17 \[ \text{xe}3 \] (17 \[ \text{xf}3 \] does not work because of 17 \[ \text{xf}1 \] 18 \[ \text{xf}8 \] \[ \text{h}2! \] ) 17 \[ \text{xe}7 \] (17 \[ \text{g}2 \] gives Black nothing owing to 18 \[ \text{xf}8 \] \[ \text{xf}1 \] 19 \[ \text{g}7! \] ) 18 \[ \text{xf}3 \] with a level game.

10  \[ \text{bd}7 \]
11 \[ \text{e}1 \] \[ \text{ad}8 \]

The plan is \[ \text{c}6\text{-c}8\text{-a}8 \] increasing the pressure on the long diagonal.

12 \[ \text{c}7 \] \[ \text{c}8 \]

White is on the alert. No matter – this rook also has an excellent position on c8 and his colleague will come to d8.

13 \[ \text{e}3 \] \[ \text{c}6 \]
14 \[ \text{g}3 \] \[ \text{fd}8 \]
15 \[ \text{b}3 \] cd
16 \[ \text{xd}4 \]

Or 16 cd a6 with the following continuations:

a) 17 \[ \text{ac}1? \] \[ \text{xc}1 \] 18 \[ \text{xc}1 \] \[ \text{xc}1+ \] 19 \[ \text{fl} \] \[ \text{d}5 \] with the initiative for Black.

b) 17 \[ \text{d}2 \] b5 with a more comfortable position for Black.
c) 17 $\text{e}5$ $\text{xe}5$ 18 $\text{de}$ (if 18 $\text{xe}5$ then 18 $\text{b}5$!) 18 $\text{d}7$ 19 $\text{f}3$ $\text{c}7$ 20 $\text{xb}7$ $\text{xb}7$ with a slight edge to Black.

16 $\text{e}5$
17 $\text{ad}1$ $\text{f}8$
17 $\text{f}8$? is worth consideration.
18 $\text{a}4$ $\text{a}6$
19 $\text{b}3$ $\text{g}5$
20 $\text{f}4$

White decides to exchange queens, but after this Black will get a free game.

20 $\text{xf}4$
21 $\text{xf}4$ $\text{g}6$
22 $\text{xd}8$ $\text{xd}8$
23 $\text{g}3$ $\text{e}4$
24 $\text{c}4$ $\text{b}5$!

White’s pieces are as clumsy as a bull in a china shop. Black’s advantage keeps increasing.

25 $\text{d}6$

25 $\text{e}3$ allows 25... $f5$ threatening to fork. 25 $\text{ca}5$ $\text{d}5$ leads to a clear advantage for Black. 25 $\text{cd}2$ is relatively best.

25 ... $\text{xd}6$
26 $\text{xd}6$ $\text{b}6$
27 $\text{d}1$ $\text{d}5$
28 $\text{f}1$ $\text{f}6$
29 $\text{g}3$ $\text{c}6$
30 $\text{b}4$

30 $\text{b}8$? deserves serious consideration.
30 ... $\text{e}5$
31 $\text{a}5$ $\text{c}8$
32 $\text{e}2$ (110)

32 ... $\text{xa}5$!
33 $\text{xa}5$ $\text{c}4$!

Because the a5 bishop is hopelessly shut out of the game the exchange would favour Black.

34 $\text{f}1$

34 $\text{f}1$ was a little bit better but the continuation would be similar to the text.

34 ... $\text{xf}1$
35 $\text{xf}1$ $\text{c}4$
36 $\text{b}4$ $\text{c}6$!
37 $\text{d}7$ $\text{b}2$
38 $\text{d}8$ $\text{a}4$
39 $\text{e}7$ $\text{xc}3$
40 $\text{f}4$ $\text{h}5$

40 $\text{xa}2$ is simpler.

41 $\text{a}3$ $\text{b}1$
42 $\text{c}5$

After 42 $\text{d}3$ Black wins by 42 $\text{c}3$ 43 $\text{d}6$ $\text{f}7$.

42 ... $\text{xa}3$
43 $\text{g}2$ $\text{b}1$
44 $\text{h}3$ $\text{c}3$
45 $\text{d}8$+

Or 45 $\text{h}4$ $\text{e}4$ 46 $\text{xc}5$ $\text{xc}5$
47 bc $\text{h}7$ and wins.
45 $\text{h7}$
46 $\text{d7}$ $\text{e4}$
47 $\text{f8}$ $\text{c8}$
48 $\text{xg7}$ $\text{g6}$
49 $\text{e7}$ $\text{d2}$

White resigns

The g7 bishop is a captive for good. This was Kr.Georgiev-Adorjan, Plovdiv 1983.

I dread even to think of the following game. Scene – Thessaloniki; date – December 4, 1984 (the last round of the Olympiad); opponent – Cuba.

It is usually the loser who mentions unfavourable conditions and omens. I know this is not a good habit, but this time I feel that I should explain the background. The Hungarian team did not do very well in that event, but our position could have been significantly improved by a big score in the last round. So the atmosphere in the team was very tense. For example, Gyozo Forintos (2395), the captain, engaged in a discussion with Zoltan Ribli (2590), world championship candidate. The theme of the discussion was: is the Queen's Indian Defence playable or not? Problems of this nature and other things of great importance took Mr Forintos’ attention off his only important duty; he lost count of time and did not deliver the list of our team to the tournament committee on time. In consequence of this mishap we had to play with a different selection from our original plan. I need hardly say that our nerves were jarred by this intermezzo.

And the worst is yet to come.

1 $\text{e4}$ $\text{c5}$
2 $\text{f3}$ $\text{e6}$
3 $\text{c3}$ $\text{d5}$
4 $\text{ed}$ $\text{xd5}$
5 $\text{d4}$ $\text{f6}$
6 $\text{a3}$ $\text{e7}$

Probably not the most accurate. 6 $\text{d8}$ is the proper move, when play may continue: 7 $\text{c2}$ $\text{bd7}$ 8 $\text{d3}$ $\text{c7}$ 9 $\text{g5}$ a6 10 0-0 $\text{c4}$ 11 $\text{e2}$ b5 12 $\text{xf6}$ $\text{xf6}$ 13 $\text{e5}$ $\text{b7}$ 14 f4 $\text{d6}$ with equal chances (Vorotnikov-Lerner, USSR 1981).

Recently, in the game Lane-Adorjan, Pinerolo 1987, my opponent played a new plan after 6 $\text{d8}$ 7 $\text{c2}$ $\text{e7}$, but I had no difficulty equalising after 8 $\text{g3?! b6}$ 9 $\text{g2}$ $\text{b7}$ 10 0-0 $\text{bd7}$ 11 $\text{c4}$ 0-0 12 $\text{f4}$ $\text{c8}$ 13 $\text{e2}$ $\text{e8}$ 14 $\text{e5}$ $\text{xg2}$ 15 $\text{xg2}$ cd 16 $\text{xd4}$ $\text{xe5}$ 17 $\text{xe5}$ $\text{d7}$ 18 $\text{f3}$ $\text{xe5}$ 19 $\text{xe5}$ $\text{f6}$ 19 $\text{c7!}$ would have been even stronger. Many players believe in the dogma of the advantage of the queenside pawn majority in such positions. This is not to be feared in the present situation, as $\text{f6}$ after $\text{ad8}$ can chase away the knight, and the e-pawn may also be set in motion.
There is a Tarrasch maxim: a knight on the edge of the board is a shame. Notwithstanding, there are some systems – for example the Queen’s Indian Defence and the English Defence – where a knight can properly be posted on the edge of the board. The Sicilian with 2 c3 is, however, scarcely one of them.

8  c4  \[d8

The adventurous 8  e4+ does not bid fair either, e.g. 9  e2 cd 10 0-0-0 0-11  d3  g4 12  e1!  d7 3  a3!  ac5 14  xh7+  xh7
15  g5+  xg5 16  xg5  xg5 17  b4  a6 18  h5+  h6 and Black has three pieces for his queen, but his position looks hopeless.

9  e2  0-0
10  0-0  cd

Perhaps 10...  c7 11  c3 cd 12  xd4!  xd4 13  xd4  d8 followed by  d7-e8 is the lesser of two evils.

11  f4  d7

Ree-Langeweg, Amsterdam 1980, now continued 11  e8 12  xd4 xd4 13  fxd4 with the better ending for White.

12  bxd4  b6?
13  b1  a5?
14  a3  fc8
15  b4  d8

After 15  xa3? White wins with 16  c2!  a4 (if 16  a2 then 17  a1  b2 18  e5  b3 19  a3) 17  a1  c6 18  b5.

16  e5  a4
17  d3  d6
18  e3  e7
19  bc1  b8

There now!

20  c5  xex5
21  xex5  c6
22  d6  d7
23  f3  a6

A pitiful spectacle... and I had to play it. Just imagine!

24  d3  h6
25  e1  d8
26  b1  a5
27  c4!  b5
28  f4  ab
29  ab  a4
30  d2  ac8
31  h4  a3

Black has some activity, but he is in time pressure.

32  d1  e5
33  f5  e4
34  e5  xex5
35  xe5  d3
36  e7  d7?

The decisive mistake. 36  c8 would still have allowed a more stubborn resistance, for example 37  xf6 gf 38  h5  g4!

37  xf6  gf
38  xe4!  d8
39  xh6  a1
40  e3  c7
41  g3+  g6
42  xg6+

Black resigns

The vivisection of this game,
Black has an excellent position. 12 
\( \text{Q} \text{b}d2 \text{Q} \text{xc}5 \) 13 h3 \( \text{Q} \text{b}4 \) is relatively better, but Black can then also have confidence in the future.

12 \( \text{Q} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{Cc}7 \)
13 \( \text{Q} \text{c}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{xc}2 \)
14 \( \text{Q} \text{xc}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{xc}5 \)
15 \( b3 \) \( b6 \)
16 \( a4 \)

Exposing a target again in the shape of the weakened b3 pawn. 16 \( \text{Q} \text{e}4 \) is better (after 16 \( \text{Q} \text{b}5 \), 16 \( \text{Q} \text{h}5 \) is strong) though after 16
\( \text{Q} \text{xe}4 \) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{b}8 \) (17
\( \text{Q} \text{d}7!? \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{e}5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{e}8 \) also comes into consideration) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{b}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{b}7 \) 19 \( \text{Q} \text{g}4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{f}8 \) 20 \( \text{Q} \text{ad}1 \) (20 \( \text{Q} \text{e}5 \) does not work because of 20
\( \text{Q} \text{d}2 \) 21 \( \text{Q} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{xb}2) \) 20 ... \( \text{Q} \text{e}7 \), in spite of his temporary retreat Black has a slight advantage.

16 ... \( \text{Q} \text{h}5! \)
17 \( \text{Q} \text{e}2 \)

After the aggressive 17 \( \text{Q} \text{e}5 \) Black answers with the moderate 17 \( \text{Q} \text{g}6 \). Exchanging queens would increase Black’s advantage in view of his two bishops.

17 ... \( \text{Q} \text{b}7 \)
18 \( \text{Q} \text{f}4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{c}5 \)
19 \( \text{Q} \text{a}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{c}7 \)
20 \( \text{Q} \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{Q} \text{xe}7 \)
21 \( \text{Q} \text{e}5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{c}7 \)
22 \( \text{Q} \text{e}3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{d}4! \) (III)

While the black queen was walking peacefully all over the board White tried to improve his position with knight manoeuvres.
- without too much success. With this energetic rook move Black seizes the initiative for good.

23 \( \text{\texttt{de}2} \) \( \text{\texttt{se}4} \)
24 \( \text{\texttt{exe}4} \) \( \text{\texttt{exe}4} \)
25 \( \text{\texttt{df}3} \) \( \text{\texttt{sd}8} \)
26 \( \text{\texttt{sd}1} \) \( \text{\texttt{h}6} \)
27 \( \text{\texttt{h}3} \) \( \text{\texttt{a}5} \)
28 \( \text{\texttt{sd}4} \) \( \text{\texttt{xd}4} \)
29 \( \text{\texttt{ex}d4} \) \( \text{\texttt{wf}4!} \)

Penetrating into the position of the enemy as though it were a wax fortress.

30 \( \text{\texttt{wb}2} \) \( \text{\texttt{dc}5} \)
31 \( \text{\texttt{wd}2} \) \( \text{\texttt{we}4} \)
32 \( \text{\texttt{wc}3} \) \( \text{\texttt{sh}7} \)
33 \( \text{\texttt{wb}2} \) \( \text{\texttt{f}6} \)

The game is effectively over. The threat of \( e5 \) and the encirclement of the \( b3 \) pawn cannot be prevented.

34 \( \text{\texttt{de}2} \) \( \text{\texttt{wd}3} \)
35 \( \text{\texttt{de}1} \) \( \text{\texttt{xb}3} \)
36 \( \text{\texttt{wb}3} \) \( \text{\texttt{xb}3} \)
37 \( \text{\texttt{df}4} \) \( \text{\texttt{cc}8!} \)
38 \( \text{\texttt{ed}d3} \) \( \text{\texttt{dd}7} \)
39 \( \text{\texttt{g}4} \) \( \text{\texttt{g}5} \)

40 \( \text{\texttt{yh}5} \) \( \text{\texttt{gg}6} \)
41 \( \text{\texttt{f}4} \) \( \text{\texttt{xa}a4} \)
42 \( \text{\texttt{yg}3} \) \( \text{\texttt{cc}6} \)
43 \( \text{\texttt{f}5+} \) \( \text{\texttt{ff}7} \)
44 \( \text{\texttt{yf}2} \) \( \text{\texttt{cc}5} \)
45 \( \text{\texttt{ye}3} \) \( \text{\texttt{x}d3} \)
46 \( \text{\texttt{xc}d3} \) \( \text{\texttt{gg}2} \)
47 \( \text{\texttt{fe}+} \) \( \text{\texttt{xe}6} \)
48 \( \text{\texttt{yf}5} \) \( \text{\texttt{xe}3} \)
49 \( \text{\texttt{xc}h6} \) \( \text{\texttt{ge}5} \)
50 \( \text{\texttt{yf}7+} \) \( \text{\texttt{ff}4} \)

**White resigns**

In this event the time control was 3 hours for 50 moves, so we should have adjourned now. But my opponent was getting tired of the struggle. This was Rogers-Adorjan, Reggio Emilia 1984-85.

In the New York tournament of 1984 my opponent in the following game had played a Sicilian with 2 c3 against Kavalek some rounds earlier and he very easily drew against the variation with \( d5 \). When I saw Zuckerman’s third move I had a hunch that he was again aiming at a half point, so I decided to reject my favourite move and seek a less well trodden path.

1 \( \text{\texttt{e}4} \) \( \text{\texttt{c}5} \)
2 \( \text{\texttt{gf}3} \) \( \text{\texttt{e}6} \)
3 \( \text{\texttt{c}3} \) \( \text{\texttt{b}6!?} \)
4 \( \text{\texttt{d}4} \) \( \text{\texttt{bb}7} \)
5 \( \text{\texttt{dd}3} \) \( \text{\texttt{ff}6} \)
6 \( \text{\texttt{bd}2} \)

White could have sought an opening advantage with 6 \( \text{\texttt{ee}2} \) cd 7 \( \text{\texttt{cd}c}6 \) 8 a3!.
6 cd
d
7 cd e7
e
8 0-0 0-0
\n9 e1 d6
\n10 a3 bd7

So we have the well known hedgehog formation again! The little thorny thing is lying in wait for the careless beast of prey who will try to assault him.

11 e5?

White is too impatient. 11 b4 c8 12 b2 c7, with the idea of a8. 11 f1!? was also worth considering.

11 de
d
12 de g4

g2?

White has already missed the right path and now inflicts further damage on himself, although Black also stands slightly better after both 13 e4 c7 14 xb7 xb7 15 h3 h6 and 13 h3 dxe5 14 xe5 xe5 15 xe5 f6 16 df3 xe5 17 xe5 d5 18 f3 (forced) 18 xe5 19 xb7 e1+ 20 h2 ad8 21 e4 xe4 22 xe4 d1.

13 ...

14 b1

e7+ h8 15 a4 xf2!

leads to very fine prospects for Black.

14 ...
15 e2 xf2+

15 xf2 was more forcing.

For example:

a) 16 xh7+ h8 17 b4 d1+! 18 bc c3 with a winning position for Black.

b) 16 xf2 xe5! 17 xe5 xf2+ 18 xf2 (after 18 h1 e3 White’s forces are terribly paralysed) 18 d4+ 19 f1 xe5 and owing to White’s undeveloped and unharmonious position a Black victory cannot be in doubt.

16 xf2 xf2

17 xf2 xe5!

18 e2

Forced.

18 ...
19 g4+

19 g1 (112)

After 19 e1 e3 or 19 g3 f5 White has no defence.

19 b5?

A hasty move. 19 c7 is the proper continuation, when White is without even a minimal chance. Let us see why: 20 b4 b5! 21 h3 (or 21 d3 fd8 22 xb5 d5 and Black wins) 21 b6+ 22 h1 f2 23 hg xe2 and White cannot escape Black’s grip.
20 \( \text{Qd3!} \) \( \text{Qc7} \)
21 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{Qfd8} \)
22 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \text{De3} \)
23 \( \text{Qg5} \)

White cannot escape either after 23 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qc2} \) 24 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qxf3} \) 25 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( \text{De1}! \) nor 23 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qc2} \) 24
\( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qxf3} \) 25 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( \text{Dd4} \) 26 \( \text{Qd3} \)
\( \text{Qxf3}+ \) 27 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( \text{Qc2} \). White is unable to harmonise the play of his pieces.

23 \( ... \) \( \text{Qc2} \)
24 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qb6+} \)
25 \( \text{Qh2} \) \( \text{Qf2} \)
26 \( \text{Qd1} \)

How can you dance in fetters?
My opponent had no answer to this question. After 26 \( \text{Qg1} \) \( \text{Qd5} \)
27 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qxg3+} \) 28 \( \text{Qxg3} \) \( \text{Qg5+} \) 29
\( \text{Qg4} \) \( \text{h5} \) 30 \( \text{Qdf3} \) \( \text{Qd5} \) the bishop is walled in.

26 \( ... \) \( \text{Qe3} \)
27 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qd7!} \)

The destiny of the d1 bishop and the game is sealed. The following moves are motivated only by time pressure.

28 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qxg3+} \) 29 \( \text{Qxg3} \) \( \text{Qdc7} \) 30
\( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Qf5} \) 31 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 32 \( \text{Qxc4} \)
\( \text{Qxc4} \) 33 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qc2} \) 34 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{Qd4} \) 35 \( \text{b4} \)
\( \text{e5} \) 36 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{h6} \) 37 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{Qe4} \) 38 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qg6} \)
39 \( \text{Qa1} \) \( \text{Qc3+} \) 40 \( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Qxh3} \) 41
\( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qc3} \) White resigns.


The next game, Fodre-Adorjan, was played in the 1984 Hungarian Team Championship.

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{c5} \)
2 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d6} \)
3 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \)
4 \( \text{Qd3} \)

White may also choose the ‘dragon’s teeth’ set-up with 4 f3 or the common 4 dc.

4 \( ... \) \( \text{Qc6} \)
5 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qg4} \)
6 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{Qxf3} \)
7 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( \text{Qe5} \)
8 \( \text{Qb5+} \) \( \text{Qed7} \)
9 \( \text{Qg5}! \) \( \text{a6} \)
10 \( \text{Qa4} \) \( \text{b5} \)
11 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{g6} \)
12 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qg7} \)
13 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{Qg7} \)
14 \( 0-0 \) \( \text{Qb8} \)
15 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{Qh5} \)

I nominated this knight as agent provocateur. My opponent holds back for a while, but he soon swallows the bait.

16 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Qb6} \)
17 \( \text{f5?!} \) \( \text{Qd7}! \)
18 \( \text{Qf3} \)

Up to now White has fought bravely and he undoubtedly has the better position, but it seems that the combat had consumed too much of his energy. Gathering all his strength he offered a draw, but after my negative answer he soon collapsed.

18 \( \text{Qe5} \)

Up to now Black has made eight knight moves. This friskiness certainly upset White.
ambitious continuation. The game Makarichev-Dzindzhishvili, USSR 1973, continued 6... d6 7 a3 cd 8 b5 d7 9 bxd4 d5 10 b5 xe3 11 fe wc7 with equality. I chose another way.

White eagerly accepts the sacrificed pawn. He should have fixed the queenside by c4 a long time ago.

24 bc
25 bc d4
26 e3 b2
27 f1 h6

Like the forest of Birnham in Macbeth, Black’s forces go for White’s fortress.

28 xe7? xe7
29 e4 xg2+
30 h1 g4

White resigns

We have arrived at the last station on our journey through the Sicilian with 2 c3. I played this game in the first World Team Championship. I succeeded in winning it after an ending as long as a serpent and so my trust in the variation with d5, which had been a little shaken by my loss to Rodriguez, was totally restored.

1 e4 c5
2 d3 e6
3 c3 d5
4 ed wxd5
5 d4 f6
6 e3!?

A rarely played and fairly un-

6 e7
7 dc xd1+
8 xd1 0-0
9 bd2 g4
10 b4 a5
11 d4 ab
12 cb (113)

12 xd8?

After 12 b6! White’s unstable pawn chain collapses and Black regains his pawn with the better position.

13 c2 f6
14 zb3 e5
15 b5 c6
16 a3 f5+
17 c3 e4+
18 zd4 xd4
19 xd4

After 19 xd4? Black finishes with 19 ... xd4 20 xd4 d8 21
\[ \text{\&d1 \&xf2. Seret, however, does not do me this favour; rather he doggedly saves his extra pawn. True, I have some counterplay, but this does not seem to be enough at all. The situation filled me with increasing apprehension.} \]

19 \[ \text{\&ac8} \]
20 \[ \text{\&b5 \&e6} \]
21 \[ \text{c6 \&xd4+} \]
22 \[ \text{\&xe4 \&d7} \]
23 \[ \text{\&xb6} \]

A move the strength of which I had underestimated earlier.

23 \[ \ldots \text{\&xc6} \]
24 \[ \text{\&c4 \&e8} \]
25 \[ \text{\&c5?!} \]

The influence of time trouble is starting now. 25 \&a2 looks better.

25 \[ \text{\&xf2(!)} \]

I cannot look on with folded arms and so I try to instigate some complications. I have regained the pawn and my opponent must make his choice: to take it or not to take it?

26 \[ \text{\&he1?} \]

He undoubtedly should have taken it. It is true that 26 \&xf2 e3 27 \&g3 \&d5 favours Black, but after 27 \&he1! ef?(27 \ldots \&d5! is still the best) 28 \&xe8+ \&xe8 (28 \&xe8 is no better either because of 29 \&f1) 29 \&d4 there is no doubt about White’s advantage.

26 \[ \text{\&g4} \]
27 \[ \text{h3 \&e5} \]
28 \[ \text{\&a6 \&a8} \]

29 \[ \text{\&b5? \&d3} \]
30 \[ \text{\&e3 \&xe1} \]
31 \[ \text{\&xe1 \&xb5!} \]

Although after 31 \&d7- I remain the exchange up, my position looks suspect owing to the very dangerous queenside pawns which are supported by White’s two bishops.

32 \[ \text{\&xb5 \&xa3+} \]
33 \[ \text{\&b4 \&ea8} \]
34 \[ \text{\&c6?} \]
34 \[ \text{\&f4! was the proper move!} \]
34 \[ \text{\&a1} \]
35 \[ \text{\&e2 \&ea2} \]
36 \[ \text{\&d2 \&b1+} \]
37 \[ \text{\&c5 \&c1+} \]
38 \[ \text{\&b6 \&xd2} \]
39 \[ \text{\&xd2 \&c2} \]
40 \[ \text{\&f4 \&xg2} \]
41 \[ \text{\&xe4} \]

A curious ending: rook and three pawns against two bishops and a pawn.

41 \[ \ldots \text{\&f2} \]
42 \[ \text{\&d6 \&e2} \]
43 \[ \text{\&f3 \&e3} \]
44 \[ \text{\&g2 \&c3} \]

Black tries to hold the white king at a distance to gain time in marching his kingside pawns.

45 \[ \text{\&b5 \&h5} \]
46 \[ \text{\&b4 \&c2} \]
47 \[ \text{\&e4 \&d2} \]
48 \[ \text{\&c5 \&g6} \]
49 \[ \text{\&f4 \&d1} \]
50 \[ \text{\&e5 \&h7} \]
51 \[ \text{h4 \&f1} \]
52 $d4$ f6
53 $g3$ $h6$
54 $e3$ g5
55 $d3$ $a1$
56 hg+ (!?)

White wants to avoid this exchange, but Black can force it in any case. Nevertheless, the win is still a very hard technical task.

56 ... fg
57 $e5$ $a2$
58 $d6$ (114)

58 ... h4
59 $e2$ $a4$
60 $b5$ $a8$
61 $e2$ $e8+$
62 $f2$ $e6$

62 $e4$? would be too hasty because of 63 $f8+$ followed by 64 $d3$.

63 $c7$ $e4$
64 $d8$

After 64 $f3$ $c4$ 65 $d8$ Black would spoil everything by playing 65 g4? since after 66 $h4$ $f4$ (66 gf 67 $d8! =) 67 g3$ he cannot win. But 65 $g6$ still offers him winning chances.

64 ... $h4$
65 $e7$ $b2$
66 $e3$ $g6$
67 $d8$

After 67 $g4$? Black wins by 67 h3! 68 $xh3$ $b3+$.

67 ... $b3+$
68 $f2$

After 68 $d3+$ $h5$ 69 $c7$ h3 70 $e2$ h2 71 $e4$ $b1$! the pawn marches in!

68 ... $f5$
69 $f1$ $c3!$
70 $e7$ $c6$

70 h3 was again bad since after 71 $d6$ g4 72 $h2$ Black's pawns have been stopped.

71 $b5$ $b6$
72 $d3+$ $f4$
73 $d8$ $b7$ (115)

74 $e2$?

The losing move. The analysis of this position during the second adjournment was a head-splitting task. If you still have some patience, please have a look at the result of my work with my seconds.
74 \( \text{f}6 \text{h}3 \) 75 \( \text{e}2 \text{g}4 \) 76 \( \text{h}4 \text{b}3 \) followed by \( \text{g}3 \) wins simply, but 74 \( \text{f}1 \text{!} \) is a harder nut to crack. Now Black must continue with 74 \( \text{d}7 \text{!} \) (74 \( \text{h}7 \text{!} \) 75 \( \text{a}5 \text{g}4 \) 76 \( \text{d}2 \text{e}4 \) 77 \( \text{g}2 \text{f}5 \) - 77 \( \text{d}3 \) 78 \( \text{g}5 \text{h}3 \) 79 \( \text{f}1 \text{e}4 \) 80 \( \text{g}3 \text{h}2 \text{81} \text{g}2 \text{f}5 \) 82 \( \text{h}4 \) = - 78 \( \text{b}4 \text{c}7 \) 78 ... h3 79 \( \text{h}1 \text{ h}2 \text{80} \text{d}6 \text{ is also equal} \) 79 \( \text{d}6 \text{ c}2 \text{+ 80} \text{g}1 \text{ c}1 \text{+ 81} \text{h}2 \text{c}3 \text{82} \text{b}7 \text{b}3 \text{83} \text{c}8 \text{+!} \text{g}5 \) 84 \( \text{x}g4 \) with a theoretical draw) and 75 \( \text{f}6 \text{f}7 \text{76} \text{d}8 \text{g}4 \text{77} \text{g}1 \text{ (77} \text{g}2 \text{? h}3 \text{+ wins) 77} \text{d}7 \text{ (77} \text{ h}3 \text{? 78} \text{x}h3 \text{+!} \text{x}h3 \text{79} \text{x}g5 \text{g}7 \text{80} \text{h}1 \text{ x}g5 \text{ stalemate!} \) 78 \( \text{f}6 \text{d}1 \text{ (78} \text{f}5 \text{79} \text{h}3 \text{+! g}4 \text{80} \text{x}g4 \text{+ x}g4 \text{81} \text{e}5 \text{ =}) 79 \text{f}2 \text{f}5 \text{80} \text{e}7 \text{d}2 \text{+ 81} \text{g}1 \text{f}4 \text{82} \text{f}6 \text{ (82} \text{b}5 \text{ h}3 \text{; 82} \text{g}2 \text{ g}3 \text{; 82} \text{b}4 \text{d}1 \text{83} \text{f}2 \text{g}4 \text{! 84} \text{e}2 \text{d}7 \text{! 85} \text{x}g4 \text{x}g4 \text{86} \text{g}2 \text{d}4 \text{87} \text{a}5 \text{c}4 \text{88} \text{b}6 \text{h}3 \text{+ 89} \text{h}1 \text{c}1 \text{+ 90} \text{g}1 \text{f}3 \text{! 91} \text{h}2 \text{c}2 \text{+! 92} \text{x}h3 \text{ 92} \text{h}1 \text{g}3 \text{93} \text{any} \text{ h}2 \text{ 92} \text{ ...} \text{c}7 \text{all win for Black) 82} \text{d}6 \text{83} \text{e}7 \text{d}7 \text{84} \text{f}6 \text{f}7 \text{85} \text{d}8 \text{h}7 \text{! 86} \text{a}5 \text{g}4 \text{87} \text{d}2 \text{e}4 \text{88} \text{g}2 \text{f}5 \text{89} \text{b}4 \text{h}3 \text{90} \text{f}1 \text{e}4 \text{91} \text{h}2 \text{f}3 \text{92} \text{d}6 \text{d}7 \text{gains the full point. The third possibility is 74} \text{a}5 \text{, but I know that your patience has a limit too} \text{74} \text{ ...} \text{h}3 \text{!} \text{75} \text{f}3 \text{Neither does 75} \text{a}5 \text{h}2 \text{76} \text{d}2 \text{+ f}5 \text{ help White.} \text{75} \text{b}2 \text{+} \text{76} \text{e}2 \text{xe}2 \text{+!} \text{The most elegant.} \text{77} \text{xe}2 \text{g}3 \text{White resigns} \text{Queening cannot be prevented. Seret-Adorjan, Lucerne 1985.}
Winning with Black – 15 Great Victories

I have been trying to convince you in the first eight chapters that playing with Black is no disadvantage at all. You may not only survive but even win a lot of games if you only believe it's possible. I have also given you all sorts of evidence, and I hope that many of you have already got the message. But I know only too well the power of prejudices. It's not your fault if you're still struggling with doubts.

Let me help with a selection of my most memorable battles

1 The first swallow

The following game was the first one of mine that was ever published in a newspaper. Maybe it was fate that I was Black! The late master Jeno Ban put it in the Christmas issue of the daily Nepszava. In his commentary on the game Ban wrote: ‘At the end of the year one usually looks back at the past year. However, the player of the black pieces in this game is only thirteen, so perhaps publishing it means some sort of a looking into the future.’

S.Szabo-Jocha*
Budapest 1963

1 e4 e5
2 ∆f3 c6
3 ∆b5 a6
4 ∆a4 ∆f6
5 0-0 ∆e7
6 ∆e1 b5
7 ∆b3 0-0
8 c3 d5
9 ed ∆xd5
10 ∆xe5 ∆xe5
11 ∆xe5 ∆f6
12 d4 ∆d6
13 ∆e1 ∆g4
14 g3? (116)

* At that time I was called Jocha. In 1968 I adopted my mother’s surname, Adorjan.
\[ \text{\textit{Winning with Black – 15 Great Victories}} \quad 129 \]

\[ \text{\textit{19}} \quad \text{\textit{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{Qf4 (117)}}}}} \textit{ leads to a slight advantage for White. The text move allows destructive sacrifices.} \]

\[ 14 \quad \ldots \quad \text{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{\textit{Qxh2!}}}}} \]

\[ 15 \quad \text{\textit{\textbf{\texttt{Qd5}}} \]

After \[ 15 \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxh2 Qh4+ 16 Qg1 Qxg3 17 fg Qxg3+ 18 Qh1 Qg4}} \]

Black would win easily.

\[ 15 \quad \text{\textbf{\texttt{Qxg3!}}} \]

\[ 16 \quad \text{\textbf{\texttt{fg}}} \]

Two months later the same position was reached in a team championship. My opponent, Denkinger, chose the ‘quicker death’. The game continued \[ 16 \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxa8 Qg4 17 fg}}} \]

(or \[ 17 \text{\textit{\texttt{f3 Qxa8 18 fg Qf3+ 19 Qg2 Qxe1+ 20 Qxg3 Qg2+ mating}}} \]

17 \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxd1 18 Qxh2 Qxa8 19 Qxd1 Qe8 20 d5 Qe2+ 21 Qh3 Qc8+ 21 g4 h5 and White resigned a few moves later. I was delighted to receive the congratulations and typical accompanying smiles of our team captain, my trainer Bela Papp.}}} \]

Team championships have played an important role and have a great tradition in Hungary. Master Bela Papp has achieved an unprecedented feat. He organized a team consisting of complete beginners which, after a few years, qualified for the first division of the team championship!

\[ 16 \quad \ldots \quad \text{\textbf{\texttt{Qxd5}}} \]

\[ 17 \quad \text{\textbf{\texttt{Qxh2 Qb7}}} \]

\[ 18 \quad \text{\textbf{\texttt{Qg1 Qae8}}} \]

\[ \textit{\textbf{\texttt{2 Beating your opponent at his own game}}} \]

The odd thing about the opening of this game is that it was the influence of my opponent Ribli which had persuaded me to take up the Sicilian Dragon.
Ribli-Jocha
Hungary 1968

1  e4  c5
2  d3  c6
3  d4  cd
4  cxd4  g6
5  c3  g7
6  e3  f6
7  c4  d6
8  f3  a5
9  b3  d7
10  d2  0-0
11  0-0 0-fc8
12  b1  e5
13  f2?!

The treatment with 11  ffc8 was a new weapon at the time. Besides the natural 13 h4, White also experimented with the text move, accepting the loss of a tempo in order to prevent c4.

13  a6

14  f4?!

Better is 14 g4 b5 15 g5 h5 16 d5 d8! with great complications that still favour Black somewhat.

14  ...  g4
15  f3  (118)

15  xc3!

This sacrifice, which was the idea of IM Karoly Honfi, casts doubt on the whole sub-variation 13 w-e2 and 14 f4. So it disappeared from tournament practice.

16  fe

16 bc fails to 16 xf3 17 gf xe4!, whilst after 16 d2 xf3 17 xc3 h5 18 h3 gl! Black wins at least a pawn.

16  xb3!

17  ab

The other possibility was 17 ef (119), whereupon the 'kamikaze rook' can continue the devastation by

17  xb2+. Accepting this sacrifice is compulsory, and Black obtains a great advantage after 18 xb2 xf6+ 19 d4 w-b4+ 20 c1 xf3 21 xf3 xd4.

17  xe5!

The key move of the variation. White's following moves are forced.

18  d4!
18 Qxe5 Qxe2 19 Rd1 b5 would give Black two pawns and an active position for the exchange.

18 wxe4
19 wxe4 dxe4
20 Bhe1 f5!
21 hxg7 hxg7
22 h3 Bh5
23 Bd3

After 23 g4 fg 24 Bxe4 (24 hg Bxg4 25 Bxe4 Bxf3 26 Bxe7+ Bh6 27 Rd1 h5 28 f4 Bxf4 29 gxf4 the strong pawn on f3 and his active king would give Black good winning chances.

23
g5
24 Bd4 Bg6
25 g4 f4
26 h4 h6
27 b4?

The thematic finish would have been 27 Qf5+ Bxf5 28 gf Qc5 29 Qc3 (29 Bxe7+ Bh6) 29 Bh7 30 b4 Bd7 31 Bc7 Bc5 with an easy win for Black. After the text move the end comes sooner.

27 ...
28 Qf5 Bxf5
29 gf Bxf5
30 Bd4 f3!

White resigns

3 Defeating the invincible opponent

This game took place a few months after the World Junior Championship in Stockholm, in the first round of the four-round international match between the USSR and Hungary. My opponent had won the World Junior Championship three points ahead of me. Some people thought that Karpov was simply an invincible player. However, I attempted the impossible

Karpov-Adorjan
Budapest 1969

1 d4
d6
2 c4
c7
3 Qc3
e6
4 Qf3
d6
5 g3
e7
6 Bg2 Bb7
7 0-0 a6!! (120)

This move was introduced into practice by the Hungarian IM Navarovsky. Its tactical correctness has been verified by the following variations:
a) 8 e4 c5 9 d5 b5! 10 Bd2 Bb6! 11 cb ab 12 Bxb5? Aa6 13 e2 Bd7 and Black wins.
b) 8 e4 c5 9 e5 d8 10 ed d6 11 dc Bxc5 12 Bc3 Bxc3! 13 bc Bc7 and Black stands well.
If White restrains Black's expansion on the queenside by 8 a4 Black can reply 8 ... a5!? He loses a tempo but after c6 and e5 the weakness of the black squares in White's camp gives him ample compensation.

8 e4 c5
9 He1 cd
10 Qxd4 Qc5

The position reminds me of the Maroczy Bind variation of the Sicilian Dragon. Now, however, Black's queen's knight has reached c5 (instead of c6) and is ready by Qa4 to exchange the knight on c3, the strongest white piece. After this exchange the weakness of the square d5 would disappear and both the doubling of the black rooks on the c-file and the powerful manoeuvre Qd7-e5 would be feasible. Naturally, I have only described Black's plan in rough outline.

11 h3 Qd7
12 Qc3 Qc8
13 Qc1 Qa5!

Preparing counterplay by b5, which would have been bad at once in view of 14 cb ab 15 b4! Qa6 16 a3. The following defensive move by White, however, allows the exchange of knights, with the consequences mentioned above.

14 a3 Qa4!
15 b4!?

A dubious move, as it weakens the pawn on c4 and promotes Black's play on the queenside, although it will hang by a single hair that White's aim of c5 fails. On the other hand, after the more modest 15 Qxa4 Qxa4 16 b3 Qe8! 17 a4 Qd7 Black would have an easy game without the traumas which now follow.

15 Qxc3
16 Qxc3 Qa4!
17 Qb1 Qc7
18 Qec1 Qfc8
19 Qd3 (121)

19 Qe8!

The best move of the game, and one that arises from a difficult decision. Only after a ten-minute consideration did I come to realize that, objectively, Black cannot win by combinative means such as e5 and d5 or b5, a5 and Qe6.

The text move heralds the manoeuvre Qd7-e5, which White has no good way to prevent.

20 Qf3
If White tries to prevent the knight manoeuvre by 20 f4, then 20 ... h5! 21 g4 (or 21 h2 e5! 22 f3 e5 23 e3 ed 22 xd4 xd4 23 xd4 b5! leads to Black's advantage.

20 ... d7!

21 d1?

21 f1 might have been better, although after 21 e5 22 e2 Black's position is slightly preferable, e.g. 22 d7 23 c5 c6 24 d1 xd4 25 xd4 wa4 +.

21 ... e5

22 f1

After 22 xa4 xd3 23 xd3 xa4 24 dc3 d7 25 h2 f5! 26 ef gf I could have obtained a decisive advantage by means of the threats d5 and e5.

22 d7

23 c5 b5!

24 b3 dc

25 xc5 xc5

26 bc c4!

A little combination which clarifies the position in Black's favour.

Much to my surprise, Karpov did not put up his usual stout resistance, and this makes the ending easier.

27 xc4 xd4

28 d1 e5

29 xd4 ed

30 d5 xc5

31 xd4 c8!

32 h4 c2!

33 e5?

This loses a pawn without any compensation. Perhaps 33 h5!? should have been tried.

33 ... c3!

34 d3 xe5

35 g2

35 e3 can be answered by 35 ... xd5 36 xe8+ g7 37 a1+ f6 38 e+ h6 39 g4 d2 40 g5+ h5! 41 xh7+ g4, and White's king falls into a mating net.

35 ... g7

36 f3?

White could have put up a more stubborn resistance by 36 e4 xe4 37 xe4 c6! 38 xc6 xc6, though the rook ending is still hopeless for him.

36 ... e1+

37 g2 c1

38 g4 h1+

39 g3 g1+

40 f4 h2+

41 e4 xh4

White resigns

In my next game against the future world champion I 'only' drew (I was White), but this was good enough to win our 'mini-match.' Sadly, I have not had the opportunity to play any further matches with Karpov. This is certainly not Karpov's fault.

4 A bookworm can also be good at chess

In my youth, some of my well-
wishers ascribed my successes only to my theoretical training and encyclopaedic knowledge. I wanted to show at any price that I had a real understanding of chess as well. So I began to play 1 g6, which was considered at the time as uncharted territory.

Sax-Adorjan
Hungarian Ch 1971
1 e4 g6
2 d4 \( \text{\textdagger} \)g7
3 \( \text{\textdagger} \)c3 d6
4 \( \text{\textdagger} \)e3 c6
5 \( \text{\textdagger} \)d2 \( \text{\textdagger} \)d7
6 \( \text{\textdagger} \)e2?!

This doesn’t fit into this system. 6 h4 seems more logical.

6 b5
7 f4 \( \text{\textdagger} \)gf6!

The first ‘offer’. Since, however, 8 e5 b4! 9 ef bc 10 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xc3 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xf6 11 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xc6+ can be met by 11 \( \text{\textdagger} \)d7 12 \( \text{\textdagger} \)f3 (or 12 \( \text{\textdagger} \)c4 \( \text{\textdagger} \)c8 13 \( \text{\textdagger} \)b3 \( \text{\textdagger} \)b8! and \( \text{\textdagger} \)d5) 12 ... \( \text{\textdagger} \)b8 13 b3 \( \text{\textdagger} \)a5+ 14 \( \text{\textdagger} \)d2 \( \text{\textdagger} \)b6 15 c3 0-0 16 \( \text{\textdagger} \)h3 e5! with very good chances for Black, White doesn’t accept the pawn sacrifice.

8 \( \text{\textdagger} \)f3 \( \text{\textdagger} \)b6
9 b3 0-0
10 \( \text{\textdagger} \)ge2 e5!

It is worth having a close look at this move which determines the further direction of the game. The white pieces are somewhat misplaced, while Black already has threats, e.g. if 11 0-0 then 11 ... b4 12 \( \text{\textdagger} \)d1 ed and c5 and \( \text{\textdagger} \)b7 starting an attack on the white centre. However, the rate of play must also be borne in mind. Black has only an hour till the time control.

11 \( \text{\textdagger} \)d1 ef

11 b4 would be an error at this stage because White would get ample compensation for the sacrificed piece by 12 de.

12 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xf4 b4?!

It was very much worth considering preparing this move by 12 \( \text{\textdagger} \)e8. 13 \( \text{\textdagger} \)g5 can then be answered by 13 ... \( \text{\textdagger} \)c7, while after 13 e5?! b4! the complications favour Black, e.g. 14 ef bc 15 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xc3 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xf6 16 0-0 (16 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xc6? \( \text{\textdagger} \)xe2+! 17 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xe2 \( \text{\textdagger} \)g4+ 18 \( \text{\textdagger} \)e3 \( \text{\textdagger} \)e8+! ±) 16 \( \text{\textdagger} \)a6 and 17 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xc6 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xe2 18 \( \text{\textdagger} \)e5 doesn’t work because of the simple 18 \( \text{\textdagger} \)e7 19 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xe8 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xe8.

13 \( \text{\textdagger} \)b1 \( \text{\textdagger} \)e8
14 \( \text{\textdagger} \)g5!

This not only defends the pawn at e4 but also threatens e5. The following few moves are thus practically forced.

14 ... h6!
15 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xf6 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xf6
16 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xb4 c5!
17 \( \text{\textdagger} \)d2?!

Instead 17 dc dc 18 \( \text{\textdagger} \)xc5 was necessary, when Black’s attacking chances by 18 \( \text{\textdagger} \)b7 would be more questionable, though not negligible, e.g. 19 0-0 \( \text{\textdagger} \)ac8 20
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\( \text{\textit{a5}} \text{\textit{xc2}} 21 \text{\textit{xa7}} \text{\textit{c6!}} \) or 19 c4 dxe4 20 0-0 dxf3 21 dxf3 dxb2 (!)

22 dxe3 dad8 etc.

17 cd (122)

\[ \text{\textit{e3}+!} \]

22 \text{\textit{e2}} (123)

22 dxe3 dxe3 23 dxe2 \text{\textit{a6}}

would clearly be useless, so White keeps pinning the bishop at e2.

18 0-0

\textit{‘Winning’ the exchange is not rewarding: 18 e5? de 19 dxa8 dxa8 \textit{--}, or 18 dxd4 \textit{a6}} 19 c4 d5! 20 0-0 (20 ed dxd5) 20 ... dc 21 e5 dxe5 22 dxa8 cb! 23 dxe6 dxe4+ 24 dxe4 dxe4 25 dxe4 dxf1 (and 26 ba) \textit{--}.

18 d6!

19 e5

Forced. 19 dfe1 dxe2 20 dxe2 dxc8 would be hopeless for White.

19 dxe5

20 dxa8 dxe2

21 dxe1

21 d6 was also suggested, but after 21 dxc8 22 dde1 d3! 23 cd dxc5+ 24 dfl d4 25 dxe2 dxc6 Black has plenty of play. By the way, cast a glance at the clock. Black is already in very severe time trouble with only three to four minutes for twenty moves.

22 d4!!

One can easily overlook such a move!

23 dxe3 de

24 d2 (!)

This offers the best chances, especially as White was in very grave time trouble as well. Otherwise, the point of the combination would have been revealed after 24 dxa5 by the reply 24 ... d4!! The rest requires nothing but a large degree of technique.

24 dxe2

25 dxe2 dxa8

26 d2 d4

27 d3 d6

28 d1 d7

29 b4 e6

30 d5 e7

31 d4?

31 g3 wouldn’t be any better
because of 31 \( \text{g5} \)!. However, 31 \( \text{e1} \) gave more chances.

\[
\begin{align*}
31 & \text{e2+!} \\
32 & \text{e}1 \text{d4} \\
33 & \text{d}5 \text{x}f3+ \\
34 & \text{d}4 \\
35 & \text{c}5 \text{dc} \\
36 & \text{bc} \text{xc}5 \\
37 & \text{wc}3 \text{b}6 \\
\end{align*}
\]

White resigns

5 Entry to the highest circles

In summer 1971, having won the Master Group the year before, I was invited to the traditional IBM grandmaster tournament in Amsterdam. This was my first really strong competition and I also won against a leading grandmaster for the first time here. The following game is not absolutely sound but it is full of action.

\text{Uhlmann-Adorjan}

\text{Amsterdam 1971}

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \text{d4} \text{g6} \\
2 & \text{c4} \text{g}7 \\
3 & \text{e}3 \text{c}5 \\
4 & \text{d}5 \text{d}6 \\
5 & \text{e}4 \text{f}6 \\
6 & \text{e}2 \text{g}5 \\
7 & \text{f}4 (124) \text{e}5!?/??! \\
8 & \text{f}4 (124) \text{e}5!?/??! \\
\end{align*}
\]

An interesting pawn sacrifice. If White takes the pawn Black gets active piece play. But White can choose the line 9 \( \text{g}3! \)? \text{e}8 10 \text{c}1 \text{h}7 11 \text{h}4 \text{f}5 12 \text{h}5 and he has a real advantage. So next time I played 8 \text{e}6 here (see game 7).

\[
\begin{align*}
9 & \text{de} \text{xe}6 \\
10 & \text{xd}6 \\
\end{align*}
\]

The more aggressive 10 \text{d}2 is the theme of the above-mentioned game.

\[
\begin{align*}
10 & \ldots \text{e}8 \\
11 & \text{f}3 \\
\end{align*}
\]

11 \text{xc}5? \text{a}5 12 \text{b}4 \text{a}6! is very unpleasant for White. For example, 13 \text{b}5 \text{xe}4 14 \text{c}7 \text{c}6! 15 \text{xe}8 \text{c}3+ 16 \text{f}1 \text{d}2+ 17 \text{e}1 \text{g}2 and Black wins.

11 \text{e}5? \text{f}d7 12 \text{f}4 is also the wrong plan. The refutation is 12... \text{g}5! 13 \text{d}2 \text{g}f 14 \text{f}3 \text{c}6 15 \text{xf}4 \text{dxe}5!! 16 \text{xe}5 \text{xe}5 17 \text{xe}5 \text{d}4! and Black has an almost winning position, because after 18 \text{xd}4 \text{cd} or 18 \text{d}3 \text{xc}4 Black wins back the piece with great advantage.

\[
\begin{align*}
11 & \text{c}6 \\
12 & \text{d}4! \\
\end{align*}
\]

Now we transpose into the home analysis of grandmaster I. Bilek, from whom, besides this variation,
I learnt to respect exchange sacrifices and good red wine. Uhlmann obviously did not know this move because he thought for a long time. Now 13 \( \text{\textcopyright x}5? \) \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}2+ 14 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}2 \text{\textcopyright} \text{c}8 \) would decide the fight suddenly, and after 13 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}4 \text{cd} 14 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}4 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}4! 15 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}4 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}6 16 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xb}7 \text{\textcopyright} \text{ab}8 17 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xa}7 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xb}2 \) Black’s attack is worth more than the two ‘gambit’ pawns.

13 e5 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{d}7 \\
14 \text{\textcopyright} \text{e}1 (125)

If 14 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}4 \text{cd} 15 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}4 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 16 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}4 17 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}4 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}4 \) Black’s activity compensates for the pawn. In Uhlmann-Schmidt, Polanica Zdroj 1975, White played 18 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{a}1 \) and after 18 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{ad}8 19 \text{b}3 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xc}3 20 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xc}3 \text{\textcopyright} \text{d}2 21 \text{\textcopyright} \text{f}3 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xa}2 22 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xb}7 \text{\textcopyright} \text{b}8 23 \text{\textcopyright} \text{c}6 \text{\textcopyright} \text{a}3 \) the position was equal. White improved many years later at New York 1986 by 23 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{f}3?! \) \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{a}3 24 \text{\textcopyright} \text{d}1 \text{a}5 25 \text{\textcopyright} \text{e}3! \text{a}4 26 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xa}4 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}3 27 \text{fe} \text{\textcopyright} \text{xc}4 28 \text{\textcopyright} \text{f}4 \) and White had the advantage (Barlov-Ramayrat). Some day I shall reveal how Black can also make an easy draw after 23 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{f}3 \), but I wonder why others have not yet found the right reply.

14 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{c}6! \\
A justified loss of tempo. Black’s target is the pawn on e5. If now 15 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{d}5 \) then 15 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{c}8 16 \text{\textcopyright} \text{b}3 \text{\textcopyright} \text{dx}5! 17 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xc}5 \text{b}6 18 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 \text{\textcopyright} \text{a}5!! \) is a beautiful way to obtain an advantage. After 19 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{e}7+ \text{\textcopyright} \text{h}7 \) and 19 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{g}3 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xc}5! 20 \text{b}4 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 21 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}5 22 \text{\textcopyright} \text{f}4 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xc}4 \) Black stands well.

15 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{e}4 \) b6
16 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{f}1 \) \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{c}8?! \\
16 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{dx}5 17 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 18 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 19 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xc}5! \) is of course a draw, but 16 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{g}4! \) was much stronger. Unfortunately at this stage I had not yet recognized that I do not need the white-squared bishop.

17 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{b}3 \) \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{g}4! \\
18 \text{\textcopyright} \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{xf}3 \\
After 18 ... \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{d}4? \) 19 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}4 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}1 20 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}1 \text{cd} 21 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}4 \) Black is hamstrung.

19 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{d}4 \\
20 \text{\textcopyright} \text{h}3 \) \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 \\
21 \text{b}4

In great time trouble for both sides, this is a reasonable attempt because the quiet continuations would be bad, e.g. 21 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 22 \text{\textcopyright} \text{c}3 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5+ 23 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 \text{\textcopyright} \text{c}6! 24 \text{\textcopyright} \text{d}5 \text{\textcopyright} \text{e}6 25 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}6 \text{fe}! 26 \text{\textcopyright} \text{f}4 \text{\textcopyright} \text{f}6, \) or 21 \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 22 \text{\textcopyright} \text{d}6 \text{\textcopyright} \text{c}7 23 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xe}5 24 \text{\textcopyright} \text{b}5 \text{\textcopyright} \text{d}7 25 \text{\textcopyright} \text{xd}4 \)
\( \text{\&xd4} \) 

21 ... \( \text{f5!} \)

22 \( \text{\&xe5} \)

22 bc? is a mistake in view of 
22 ... fe 23 \( \text{\&xd4} \) \( \text{\&f3+} \) 24 gf \( \text{\&xd4} \)
25 \( \text{\&h6} \) \( \text{\&f6} \).

22 \( \text{\&c3} \)
23 \( \text{\&xe5} \) \( \text{\&e8!} \)

24 \( \text{\&xe5} \)
25 bc
26 \( \text{\&d5} \)
27 \( \text{\&b8} \)
28 \( \text{\&a3 (126)} \)

27 ... \( \text{\&b2!!} \)

This surprising move shows that Black has more attacking chances.

If 28 \( \text{\&xc5} \) then 28 \( \text{\&xa2} \).
28 \( \text{\&xa7} \)
29 \( \text{\&a4} \)
30 \( \text{\&e4!} \)

Too greedy! After the clever preparatory move 29 \( \text{\&h7!} \) there is no adequate defence against \( \text{\&h4} \). An interesting mating variation: 30 h3 \( \text{\&h4} \) 31 g3 \( \text{\&xg3+} \)
32 fg \( \text{\&f3+} \) 33 \( \text{\&h1} \) \( \text{\&h2} \) mate!
30 \( \text{\&e8+!} \)
31 \( \text{\&h7} \)
31 \( \text{\&e3} \)
31 \( \text{\&e7?} \) is met by 31 \( \text{\&f3+!!} \)

and Black mates 'earlier'

31 ... \( \text{\&xa2} \)
32 \( \text{\&b1} \)
33 \( \text{g3?} \)

White also makes a mistake. After 33 \( \text{\&b7!} \) \( \text{\&e6} \) 34 g3 \( \text{\&d4} \) 35 \( \text{\&xd4} \) \( \text{cd} \) 36 \( \text{\&f6+} \) the position is drawn.

33 ... \( \text{\&e4!} \)
34 \( \text{\&xe4?} \)
35 \( \text{\&g2} \)

Or 35 \( \text{\&g2} \) \( \text{\&f3+} \) \( \text{\&xf3} \).

35 \( \text{\&f5?} \)

The last error. Black could have won very simply with 35 \( \text{\&f3} \)
36 \( \text{\&e3} \) \( \text{\&d4} \) 37 \( \text{\&b3} \) \( \text{\&h6!} \) followed by 38 \( \text{\&d2!} \), but he had only a few seconds left.

Here White overstepped the time limit and this solved all my problems. It would have been much more difficult if he had played on, although Black would still have had winning chances after 36 \( \text{\&e1!} \)
37 \( \text{\&d6} \) 37 \( \text{\&e2} \) 38 \( \text{\&c2} \) \( \text{\&d4!} \) planning to march his king to e5 and then play \( \text{\&e3} \).

6 War or peace?

It often happens that a chess player has to fight against a good friend. But who knows after a short draw, which so often happens, how much creative energy has been suppressed? The following game provides an example.

I offered a draw to my old friend Jacek Bednarski. The offer was
justified not only by our friendship but also by my position in the tournament. Fortunately he refused it and so I was forced to struggle.

**Bednarski-Adorjan**

**Varna 1972**

1. e4  c5
2. d4  d6
3. e5  cxd4
4. cxd4  g6
5. c3  g7
6. e3  f6
7. c4  0-0
8. b3  d6
9. f3  d7
10. w2  a5!

This is the most precise reply.

11. wd3?

White was afraid of the plan 11 0-0-0 Ec8 threatening ... Exc3, and I think he was right. But now he wastes a whole move.

11. Ec8

12. g4? (127)

Black firmly grabs the initiative. Sacrifices are already in the air and the game will soon move to a violent conclusion.

13. de2

After 13 db5 xb3 Black obtains the advantage in both the following variations:

a) 14 ab d5! 15 g5 (or 15 ed e4 16 fe xg4) 15 de 16 fe g4 17 0-0 a5!

b) 14 cb d5! 15 xd5 xb5! 16 wb5 xd5 17 ed wh4+ 18 f2 wh3.

13. xb3

14. ab

14 cb is met by 14 d5! and after 15 xdx5 xdx5 16 wxd5 wh4+ 17 f2 we7 Black has excellent counterplay for the sacrificed pawn.

14. ... d5!

15. g5?!

White tries to maintain the balance, which would be completely upset if he accepted the pawn sacrifices, e.g.

a) 15 xdx5 xdx5 16 ed e4! 17 fe (17 we4 f5) 17 xg4.

b) 15 ed e4! 16 fe xg4 17 d4 xdx4! 18 xdx4 f5 19 xe7 wh4+ 20 g3 wf6.

In both cases Black has the better position.

15. ... d4

16. d5 (128)

Now my friend gives me a chance to prove I am not a stingy man. If he doesn’t want my pawns I’ll give him my queen.
I shouldn’t have dared to dream of it! The variation 21 \( \texttt{wb1} \texttt{e6} \) 22 \( \texttt{wxh3} \texttt{exg7} \) 23 \( \texttt{wxh7} \texttt{f6} \) would be a really prosaic finish after so much poetry.

21 \( \texttt{xe6}!! \)

This rhymes. Black finishes in style. At the same time, this is a practical example of my old belief that two pieces and a pawn can sometimes be enough compensation for a queen.

22 \( \texttt{xf8} \texttt{xf8} \)
23 \( \texttt{xb7} \texttt{c2} \)
24 \( \texttt{d1} \texttt{c4} \)
24 \( \texttt{d3} \) is also good.
25 \( \texttt{g3} \texttt{d3} \)
26 \( \texttt{fl} \texttt{c2+} \)
27 \( \texttt{d1} \texttt{xb2} \)

White resigns

7 Fight against the opponent and the clock

In the seventies I fought a lot of hard battles against GM Gyozo Forintos. In the next game we did not shrink from complications and so we both got into tremendous time trouble. After great confusion we reached the 41st move. The arbiter was not equal to the task of reconstructing the game, but Forintos and I found a plausible sequence of moves which led to the adjourned position. Nobody knows if this was what actually happened! It remains a secret for ever.
Forintos-Adorjan
Budapest 1973

1  c4  g6
2  d3  g7
3  d4  c5
4  d5  d6
5  e4  f6
6  e2  0-0
7  g5  h6
8  f4  e6
9  de

After 9  d2 ed 10 ed  h7 and now 11  d3  a6 12  ge2  g4! or 11  f3  f5 Black has no problems.

9  ...  xe6

10  d2  (130)

White declares his intention to attack.

At that time this was a novelty, the normal move being 10 ...  a5.

11  0-0-0

After 11  xh6 I had the surprising continuation 11  xh6 12  xh6  xh2 13  c1  c6 14 h4  e5 15 h5?  fg4! 16  f4  xf2!!.

11  ...  h7

12  h4  c6
13  h5  g5
14  xd6  fd8
15  e3

If 15  e5 then 15  e8 or 15 ...  d7 wins back the pawn with the better position.

15  ...  d4
16  e7  xe2+
17  gxe2  xd1+
18  xd1  g4!
19  xc5  xf2

Black has achieved his purpose. Although he has not yet won back the pawn, he has a pair of bishops and has destroyed White's pawn structure. Now 20  xb6 ab 21  d8  xd8 22  xd8  xc4 23  a6 24  xb6  xe4 would lead to a favourable ending for Black.

20  d2  e8
21  xb6

White was rightly afraid of the threatened  xe7 sacrifice. One pretty variation runs 21  g3  xe7!
22  xe7  e3 23  ge2  xc4 24  a3  xe2 25  xe2 (131)
25 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xb2}+!! \) and Black wins.

After 21 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a3} \) Black could also play 21 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xe7}?! \)
22 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xe7} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xc4} \)
23 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d6}! \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e3} 24 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{g3} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d3}+ 25 \)
\( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c2} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b4}+ 26 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c1} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d3}+ \) with a draw. In this variation 26 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d1} \)
\( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xe2}+ 27 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xe2} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xe4} \) would lead to a sharp, unclear position. But the simple
21 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xc4} \) is good enough.
The text move is an admission of defeat; Black is now winning easily.

21 ... \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{ab} \)
22 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d8} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xc4} \)
23 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xb6} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xe4} \)
22 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xe4} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xe4} \)
25 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c3} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{h4} \)
26 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c2} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{hxh5} \)
27 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a4} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{h2}?! \)

Sometimes one thinks that every move wins. Probably this happened now. Naturally Black has a great advantage with his extra pawn, the bishop pair and the activity of his pieces, but one must always be careful. 27 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{h4}! \) would prevent White's counterplay.

28 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c7} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{h1}? \)
29 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e4}! \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{g1}? \)

29 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a1} \) was better.

30 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b6} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e1}? \)
31 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d6} \)

Now everything has gone. The play from here to the time control hardly reminds us of chess.

31 ... \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e6} \)
32 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xb7} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e5} \)
33 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f2} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a1} \)
34 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c5} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f5}+ \)
35 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b3} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f4} \)
36 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d5} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{g6} \)
37 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{g3}? \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c7} \)
38 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d2} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f1}? \)
39 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b4} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{h5} \)
40 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a5} \)

Why?

40 ... \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a1} \)
41 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b3}? \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a2} \)

Here the players concluded that the time control had been reached and resumed keeping the score, so the end of the game is 'valid' again.

42 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b5} \)

The sealed move, which allows Black to win suddenly. Of course White's position is hopeless in the long run, e.g. 42 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e2} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e6} 43 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e1} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xb3} 44 \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xb3} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a1} \) etc.

42 ... \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{h4}! \)
43 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{gh} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f4} \)
44 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c1} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xa5}+! \)
45 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xa5} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xd2}+ \)
46 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b4} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{xc1} \)
47 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{hg} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{gxg5} \)
48 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b5} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e4} \)
49 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a6} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{d3} \)
50 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a5} \)

Here White could quietly resign.

50 ... \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f5} \)
51 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e1} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f4} \)
52 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b6} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e3} \)
53 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b7} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{a7} \)
54 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f2} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b8} \)
55 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b6} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{g4} \)
56 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{c6} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{e4}+ \)
57 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{b6} \text{\textit{\textbullet}} \text{f3} \)

and at long last \textbf{White resigned.}
8. *In exchange for the exchange...*

If someone gives up the exchange this is – as they rightly say – the smallest risk among all kinds of sacrifices. This is especially so if the sacrifice weakens the opponent’s pawn structure and a pawn is obtained as additional compensation.

**Honfi-Adorjan**

**Hungarian Ch 1974**

1. e4  
2. d4  
3. c3  
4. c4  
5. c3  
6. 0-0  
7. xf7+  
8. xe4  
9. h3  

At the time this queen move was an important novelty in place of the known moves 9 d5 and 9 d7.

10. e1  
10. xh3? misfires after the intermediate move 11 fg5!, when 11 ... hg 12 gh leads to an advantage for White.

11. d5? (132)

This is already the effect of the surprise, although after the solid 11 c3 Black gets excellent play by 11 e5.

11. xf3!!

The point of Black’s plan. White is forced to accept the exchange sacrifice since after 12 dc he faces grave problems even without any material compensation.

12. gf

It is necessary to keep the queens on because White has no chance after 12 xf3 xf3 13 gf d4.

12. ...  
13. g2?

Better is 13 f4, which should be met by 13 f7! followed by e6 with a great initiative for Black. Black could go wrong by 13 xh3? 14 c3 g5 15 xf3, when the bishop is trapped.

13. g5!

14. c3

A little finesse. Not 14 g3? xf3! 15 xf3 xh3+ winning the queen.

14. f5  
15. h1  
16. f1  
17. e3  
18. d2  
19. b3  

If 19 c8 20 f3! xh3+ 21
21 e6!
After the opening of the position the two bishops become very active. It is very important that Black dominates the white squares.
22 de Qxe6
23 a4 Qd5
24 d1
Or 24 h2 g3 25 xf3 Qxf3+ 26 d2 e5 27 g3 Qd5+ and Black wins quickly.
24 hxh1
25 a1 c5
26 d1 d5
27 b1 d4!
28 cd b5!
29 axb5 cd
30 c6 g6+?! 30 b8 was a stronger move since 31 d6 does not work on account of 31 ... Qb7 with a double threat to b2 and h1. Of course it is still not difficult to solve the technical problems after the text move.
31 xg6 Qxg6
32 xg5 hg
33 e4 e8
34 f3 d3
35 g1 h4
36 xg5 b8
37 b3 e8
38 d5 d4
39 c1 c8
40 g5 e2+
41 d2 c3+

Now 42 xd3 loses to 42 xf4+, so

White resigns.

9 I can't live without gipsy music
The following game has an interesting background. At the same tournament some rounds earlier I played a promising queen sacrifice against Bellon. I gave up my queen for two pieces, but later I made mistakes and lost. When I sacrificed my queen again against Cardoso one of the participants asked me, with a jocular shake of the head during the game:

'Are you crazy - risking that again?'

'Not crazy, just romantic'.
I replied, and sitting down at the board again I concentrated on the game with all my might. My effort was rewarded with the brilliancy prize.
If 18 \( \text{c1} \) then 18 \( \text{g4}! \) 19 \( \text{xg4 xxc3} \) 20 \( \text{d1 f6} \) and White has no defence, e.g. 21 \( \text{xc8+ xxc8} \) 22 \( \text{d2 d4+} \) 23 \( \text{h1 xg4} \) 24 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{c1+} \). But the text move is wrong for another reason.

18 ... \( \text{xc3}!! \)
19 \( \text{xc3 xxe4}! \)

This is another powerful stroke. The queen cannot be taken because of 20 \( \text{xd4+} \), and 20 \( \text{a1} \) is met by 20 \( \text{xd4+} \) 21 \( \text{xd4 c3} \), while after the natural

20 \( \text{b8+} \) (135)

\[ \text{Diagram 135} \]

The old move, 12 \( \text{fc8} \), is good for White after 13 \( \text{b3 a6 14 f4 b5 15 f5 d7 16 fg hg 17 c5!} \)
13 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{b5} \)
14 \( \text{cb} \) \( \text{ab} \)
15 \( \text{b4?} \)

After the consistent 15 \( \text{f5} \), 15 \( \text{c4} \) ensures equality, and Black could also consider 15 \( \text{d7} \) or even 15 \( \text{b4?!} \)

15 \( \text{xb4} \)
16 \( \text{b1 a3} \)
17 \( \text{xb5 fc8} \)
18 \( \text{d4} \) (134)

\[ \text{Diagram 134} \]

20 \( \text{xb8}! \)

the combination reaches its climax!

21 \( \text{xa3 xd4+} \)
22 \( \text{h1 f2+} \)
23 \( \text{xf2} \)

Or 23 \( \text{g1 b2} \) (23 \( \text{c5} \) and 23 \( \text{d5} \) are also promising) with some exciting possibilities:

a) 24 \( \text{xb2 h3+} \) 25 \( \text{h1 xb2} \) 26 gh \( \text{xa2} \)

b) 24 \( \text{a4 c5} \) and now 25 \( \text{c4} \)
\( \text{\&} g4+ 26 \text{\&} h1 \text{\&} xc4 27 \text{\&} xc4 \text{\&} xg2!! \text{\&} e4!! \) or 25 \( \text{\&} f3 \text{\&} g7!! \) threatening 26 \( \text{\&} e4+ 27 \text{\&} h1 \text{\&} d2 28 \text{\&} d1 \text{\&} xf3 29 \text{gf} \text{\&} h3 30 \text{\&} g1 \text{\&} g2+ and mate.

One can understand that White would like to avoid these dangers.

23 ... \text{\&} xf2
24 \text{h}3 \text{h}5!
25 \text{\&} f3 \text{\&} b1+
26 \text{\&} h2 \text{\&} g1+
27 \text{\&} g3 \text{\&} b2!

The a-pawn cannot move because of \text{\&} b3.

28 \text{\&} e4 \text{\&} xa2
29 \text{h}4 \text{d}5!

29 \text{\&} f2+(!?) 30 \text{\&} xf2 \text{\&} g4 also wins, but the text move and its connected plan are very clear and logical, so this is a more fitting end to the game.

30 \text{\&} e5 \text{\&} c5!
31 \text{\&} b8+ \text{\&} g7

Not 31 \text{\&} h7?! 32 \text{\&} xh5!.

32 \text{\&} e5+ \text{\&} h7
33 \text{\&} f3 \text{\&} a4!

No quarter given!

34 \text{\&} c7 \text{\&} d6
35 \text{\&} c6 \text{\&} xf4
36 \text{\&} f2 \text{\&} c4
37 \text{\&} b5 \text{\&} xh4
38 \text{\&} xd5 \text{\&} f4+
39 \text{\&} f3 \text{\&} g4
40 \text{\&} d5 \text{\&} f5
41 \text{\&} d3 \text{h}4

Here the game was adjourned, but White resigned without resuming play.

10 When ‘bels esprits’ meet

I have already mentioned my romantic attitude to chess. But what happens when your opponent has a similar approach and he, too, has no fear of complications. In that case, the chances are greater that a very interesting encounter will come about, which will be enjoyable for the readers too. Let us now see an example, with which I carried off a brilliancy prize.

\text{Nunn-Adorjan}
\text{London 1975}

1 \text{e}4 \text{g}6
2 \text{d}4 \text{\&} g7
3 \text{\&} c3 \text{d}6
4 \text{f}4 \text{\&} f6
5 \text{\&} f3 \text{0-0}
6 \text{\&} e3 \text{\&} a6!?

In this relatively seldom played variation 6 ... \text{c}5 is the better route to equality according to theory.

7 \text{h}3 \text{c}5
8 \text{e}5 (136)

While considering my reply I
realized that 8 \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \) was quite playable. However, what is going on if \( ? \) ? And after twenty minutes' consideration I decided on another move which gives rise to practically unfathomable complications.

8 \( \mathcal{B}h5!!?? \)

9 \( \mathcal{A}xa6 \) ba!

As I discovered after the game, this position was not quite unknown to my opponent. Some months earlier he had reached it as Black! After 9 \( \mathcal{E}g3? \) 10 \( \mathcal{F}f1! \) \( \mathcal{X}h1 \) 11 g4 Black stood worse, Ligterink-Nunn, Amsterdam 1975.

My idea was on a larger scale – perhaps even too large!

10 g4

White hunts down the straying knight in the simplest way. However, now, or even on the previous move, \( \mathcal{F}f2!?? \) or \( \mathcal{E}e2 \) also had to be taken into consideration. After 9 \( \mathcal{E}e2 \) there is a nice variation: 9... cd 10 \( \mathcal{A}xd4 \) \( \mathcal{W}a5+! \) 11 \( \mathcal{C}c3 \) \( \mathcal{W}b6 \) and the voracious 12 g4? would be punished by 12... \( \mathcal{X}xf4!! \) 13 \( \mathcal{X}xf4 \) \( \mathcal{W}e3+ \).

10 ... cd

11 \( \mathcal{W}xd4 \)

11 \( \mathcal{A}xd4 \) could naturally be answered by 11 \( \mathcal{X}xf4! \).

11 \( \mathcal{B}b7 \)

12 \( \mathcal{F}f2 \) \( \mathcal{X}xf4 \)

This move doesn't deserve an exclamation mark as it is the logical sequel of the plan begun on move 8. Regarding the compensation for the sacrifice, we have to mention first of all the liquidation of the white centre, and then the vulnerability of White's king and the enormous potential strength of Black's two bishops. Of course, the momentary incapacity of the white pieces is not of minor importance either.

I considered the variation 13 \( \mathcal{W}xf4 \) de 14 \( \mathcal{W}b4 \) (14 \( \mathcal{X}xe5? \) g5! \( \square \)) 14 \( \mathcal{B}b8 \) 15 \( \mathcal{A}hd1 \) \( \mathcal{X}f3 \) 16 \( \mathcal{X}xd8 \) \( \mathcal{A}xb4 \) 17 \( \mathcal{W}xf8+ \) \( \mathcal{W}xf8 \) 18 \( \mathcal{X}f3 \) \( \mathcal{A}xb2 \) favourable for me – all the more because 19 \( \mathcal{B}b1? \) loses to 19 e4+!

13 \( \mathcal{A}xf4 \) g5?

But this is already more than recklessness! 13 f5! 14 g5! \( \mathcal{X}xf3 \) 15 \( \mathcal{W}xf3 \) de 16 \( \mathcal{W}xd8 \) \( \mathcal{X}fxd8 \) 17 \( \mathcal{E}e3 \) \( \mathcal{A}dc8! \) 18 \( \mathfrak{e}2 \) e4 19 \( \mathfrak{d}d2 \) \( \mathfrak{b}b8 \) would have given ample compensation for the sacrificed material.

14 \( \mathcal{X}g5?? \) (137)

The losing move. 14 \( \mathfrak{e}3 \) or 14 \( \mathfrak{g}3 \) could be answered by the
simple 14 f5, but White could turn the tables by 14 \( \texttt{\textit{xg5}} \), e.g. 14 ... f6 15 ef \( \texttt{\textit{xf6}} \) 16 \( \texttt{\textit{xf6}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{xf6}} \) 17 \( \texttt{\textit{d5}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{xf3+}} \) 18 \( \texttt{\textit{xf3}} \) c6 19 \( \texttt{\textit{g3}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{xd5}} \) 20 \( \texttt{\textit{hf1}} \) \( ++ \). Now, however

14 f6!

and White could already resign! Unfortunately for him he cannot even slow up Black’s attack by ‘propitiatory’ sacrifices. Black’s idea has completely triumphed!

15 \( \texttt{\textit{e6}} \) fe

16 \( \texttt{\textit{c4}} \)

After 16 \( \texttt{\textit{xd8}} \) ed 17 \( \texttt{\textit{xb7}} \) dc 18 \( \texttt{\textit{g3}} \) cb Black’s splendid advanced pawn on b2 would ensure him an easy win.

16 ... \( \texttt{\textit{b6}} \)

17 \( \texttt{\textit{e2}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{ac8}} \)

18 \( \texttt{\textit{d3}} \) ef

I myself don’t know why I rejected 18 \( \texttt{\textit{xh1}} \). Maybe it was too unimaginative? I cannot find any other ‘fault’ with it, since it wins easily.

19 \( \texttt{\textit{xf8}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{xf8}} \)

20 \( \texttt{\textit{d5}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{xb2?}} \)

We were both already in time trouble and here I missed the obvious 20 ... f3+! which would have won simply because it breaks the connection between White’s rooks.

After 20 \( \texttt{\textit{he1}} \), which would have prevented this, the pretty 20 ... \( \texttt{\textit{g2}} \)! would have been effective.

21 \( \texttt{\textit{xe7+}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{h8}} \)

22 \( \texttt{\textit{he1}} \) f3+

23 \( \texttt{\textit{f1?}} \)

23 \( \texttt{\textit{f2}} \) would have set Black a much more difficult task. But now Black wins more or less by force.

23 ... \( \texttt{\textit{f2}} \)

24 \( \texttt{\textit{eb1}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{e5}} \)

25 \( \texttt{\textit{f5}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{e4}} \)

26 \( \texttt{\textit{xd6}} \)

26 \( \texttt{\textit{e2}} \) would have allowed a nice finish: 26 \( \texttt{\textit{g2+}} \) 27 \( \texttt{\textit{xf2}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{h2}} \)

26 ... \( \texttt{\textit{c3}} \)

27 \( \texttt{\textit{g3}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{c4+}} \)

28 \( \texttt{\textit{xf2}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{d4+}} \)

29 \( \texttt{\textit{e1}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{xf5}} \)

30 gf \( \texttt{\textit{e8+}} \)

Seeing that 31 \( \texttt{\textit{d1}} \) would be answered by 31 \( \texttt{\textit{c3}} \), White resigned.

11 Those were the days, my friend.

The following game dates from the period when my score against Portisch was good, and it even put me into the lead. The statistics of the past few years have been quite different. So I look back on those earlier days with a certain nostalgia.

**Portisch-Adorjan**

**Budapest (Tungsram) 1975**

1 d4 \( \texttt{\textit{f6}} \)

2 c4 \( \texttt{\textit{g6}} \)

3 \( \texttt{\textit{f3}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{g7}} \)

4 g3 \( \texttt{\textit{0-0}} \)

5 \( \texttt{\textit{g2}} \) d6

6 \( \texttt{\textit{c3}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{c6}} \)
7 h3 a6
8 0-0 Bb8
9 e4 b5
10 cb ab
11 Be1 (138)

14 Bd2 seems somewhat better as the move h6, which White now induces, actually helps Black. 14 wc2 is naturally bad in view of the tactical trick 14 b3!
14 ... h6
15 Bd2 Ce8!
16 Bc1 e5!

Just in time! The opening of the position will now favour Black, whose pieces stand more harmoniously. But White has no choice, e.g. 17 d5 Ce7 18 Bxb4 Bd5! 19 Bb5 Ab6 !

17 de Bxe5
18 Bxe5 Bxe5
19 wc2 (139)

After the most problematical move, 19 f4, I intended 19 Bxe4! 20 Bxe4 Bxe4 21 wc2 g5!!, and the position after 22 Bxe4 Bxe4 23 Bxe4 gf 24 Bxf4 Bxd7 25 Bb3 Bb5! is obviously good for Black.

12 Bc3 b4
13 Ba4 Bb7!

The pawn at e4 couldn’t be captured because after 13 ... Bxe4 14 wc2 Bb7 15 Bxe4 Bxd4 16 Bxd4! Bxe4 17 Bxe4 White’s position would be preferable.
14 Bg5?!
after the typical variation 20 \( \text{\textit{\text{\textsc{\texttt{W}}\text{\textit{\texttt{xc7}}}}}} \) \\
\( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxe4}} 21 \text{\textit{\texttt{\textsc{\texttt{x}}e4}}} \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxe4}}} 22 \text{\textit{\texttt{hxe4}}} \text{\textit{\texttt{Wxe4!!}}}} \) 23 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Wxb8+}}} \text{\textit{\texttt{Qh7}}} 24 \text{\textit{\texttt{Qf1}}} \) \\
\( \text{\textit{\texttt{Wih1+}}} 25 \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe2}}} \text{\textit{\texttt{a6+}}} 26 \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe3}}} \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd5}}} \) \\
with unavoidable mating threats.

20 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe7}}} \) \\
21 \( \text{b3} \) \\
21 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxb4}}} \) would have been met \\
by 21 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxe4}}} \).

21 \( \ldots \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{a8}}} \) \\
22 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qh2}}} \) \\
Or 22 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qb2}}} \) \( \text{d5} \)!

22 \( \ldots \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qh5!}}} \) \\
23 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qh1}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qh7}}} \) \\
24 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qb2}}} \) \( \text{f5} \) \\
25 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd3}}} \) \( \text{fe} \) \\
26 \( \text{fe} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxe4?!}}} \) \\

Such a serious departure from 
the logical line is reprehensible 
from the point of view of both 
artistry and practice. To take a 
‘poor’ pawn is not worthy of what 
has gone before when the thematic 
26 \( \text{c5!} \) was available. White 
could then, at best, put up ‘symbolic’ resistance, e.g. 27 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qf2}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe5}}} \) 28 
\( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qg1}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd4}}} \) or 27 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qg4}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qf6}}} \) 28 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe5}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd5}}} \), 
and Black is winning in both cases.

27 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxe4}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxe4}}} \) \\
28 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxe4}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Wxe4}}} \) \\
29 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe1}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd4?!}}} \) \\

Black should have played 29 
\( \text{\textit{\texttt{Wf3}}} \) since after the text move 30 
\( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qc1!}}} \) could have made Black’s 
task much more difficult, e.g. 30 \ldots 
\( \text{c5} \) 31 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qb2}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd5}}} \) 32 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxg7}}}! \) (32 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe7}}} \) 
\( \text{\textit{\texttt{Wg5}}} \)) 32 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxg7}}} \) 33 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe7}}} \). 
30 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe7?!}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qf8}}} \) \\

31 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qf4}}} \) \( \text{c5} \) \\
32 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Wxe2}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qf5!}}} \) \\
33 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd7?}}} \) \\

Losing another pawn, but it 
already made no difference.

33 \( \ldots \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd5}}} \) \\
34 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qf2}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxf4}}} \) \\
35 \( \text{gf} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Wxf4+}}} \) \\
36 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qg2}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd2}}} \) \\
37 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Wf3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Wxf3+}}} \) \\
38 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxf3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxa2}}} \) \\
39 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe4}}} \) \( \text{g5} \) \\
40 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qxd6}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qg6}}} \) \\
41 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe4}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd4}}} \) \\

This was the sealed move. The 
game finished:

42 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd6+}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qg7}}} \) \\
43 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qg4}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qb2}}} \) \\
44 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qg3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qg2!}}} \) \\
45 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qd7+}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qf6}}} \) \\
46 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qf3}}} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qf2+}}} \) \\

White resigned, for after 47 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe4}}} \) 
\( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qe6}}} \) he also loses the knight.

12 The force of surprise

Who has not had occasion to see 
that the force of a surprise is as 
powerful as the force of a kick 
from a horse? Especially when the 
kick comes from a ‘chess horse’.

In the following game, the innovation 
9 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qb6}}} \) confused my 
opponent to such an extent that he 
lost almost without any resistance.

Pinter-Adorjan
Hungarian Ch 1975

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{g6} \) \\
2 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{\textit{\texttt{Qg7}}} \)
3 \( \diamond c3 \) \( d6 \)
4 \( f4 \) \( \diamond f6 \)
5 \( \diamond f3 \) \( 0-0 \)
6 \( \diamond d3 \) \( \diamond c6 \)
7 \( e5 \) \( de \)
8 \( de \)

This quieter continuation gives Black fewer problems than 8 \( fe \).
9 \( \diamond d2 \) (140)

After the retreat of Black’s knight White could have consolidated his position. So, instead, Black takes the initiative by means of a pawn sacrifice.
13 \( f5! \)
14 \( ab \) \( fe \)
15 \( \diamond e5 \) \( \diamond xe5! \)
16 \( fe \) \( \mathbb{h}h4+ \)
17 \( g3 \) \( \mathbb{h}h3 \)
18 \( \diamond xe4 \)

If White had one more move, he could complete his development by \( \diamond f6+ \).
18 \( \ldots \) \( \diamond g4 \)
19 \( \diamond g5 \)

If 19 \( \diamond f2 \) then 19 \( \mathbb{g}g2 \), and 19 \( \mathbb{d}d3 \) can be answered by 19 \( \diamond f3 \). After 19 \( \mathbb{e}e3 \) \( \diamond c4 \) 20 \( \mathbb{d}d4 \) (or 20 \( \mathbb{b}b3 \) b5) 20 \( \ldots \) b5 Black has a decisive attack, e.g. 21 \( \diamond f2 \) \( \mathbb{g}g2 \) or 21 \( \diamond f6+ \) \( \mathbb{x}xf6! \) 22 \( ef \) \( \mathbb{e}e8+ \). Black’s knight on b6 prevents \( \mathbb{c}c4+ \).
19 \( \ldots \) \( \mathbb{h}h5 \)
20 \( \mathbb{e}e3 \) \( h6! \)

Now White realized that 21 \( \mathbb{b}b3+ \) would be easily refuted by 21 \( \mathbb{g}g7 \) 22 \( \diamond e6+ \) \( \diamond xe6 \) 23 \( \mathbb{x}xe6 \) \( \mathbb{a}ae8 \). He played
21 \( \ldots \) \( e6 \)
but resigned at the same time.

13 \( \text{Draw? – No!} \)

My opponent’s move 5 e3 could be taken as a silent peace offer, especially combined with his significant glance at me. Nevertheless, I was in the mood to fight that day, as my
reply showed beyond any shadow of doubt.

Barczay-Adorjan
Hungarian Ch 1975
1  c4  g6
2  g3  g7
3  g2  c5
4  c3  c6
5  e3  e5
6  ge2  ge7
7  0-0  0-0
8  d3  d6
9  d5  e6
9  b8  10  ec3  xd5  11  xd5  e7 would indeed have led to simplifications and full equality.
10  ec3  b8
11  h3  a6
12  a4  b6!
13  d2  d7
14  h2  f5
15  f4 (141)

So far both sides have played solidly. Black has no worries but he wants to disturb the balance of the position.

141

That’s it! 16 xb4 cb 17 d5 a5 would turn the scales in Black’s favour.

16  fe  xe5?!

Black sets his sights on White’s king’s position and targets the g3 square. More consistent, however, would have been 16  de and if 17  e4 then 17  f4! 18 gf  xd5 19  xd5  exd5 20 cd  xd3 with the better prospects for Black.
17  d4!  g7
18  xb4  cb
19  d5  a5
20  b3  h8
21  xe7  xe7
22  d3  d7
23  b3

The ‘offer’ 23  d5  f7 24  b3 could be met by 24 ... g5! ignoring the exchange sacrifice as on several other occasions during the game.
24  c5?!  bc
25  dc (142)

25  ...  e5!

Black politely declines the ‘gift’ because he has another aim in view.
26 \( \text{Bac}1 \) \( \text{Wc}7 \)
27 \( \text{Be}1 \) \( \text{Bbd}8 \)
28 \( \text{Ef}4? \)

White is again very ‘attentive’ to Black. He lays the exchange at Black’s feet. But Black is not forced to accept it. Therefore 29 \( \text{Ef}2 \) was better.

28 \( \text{g}5! \)
29 \( \text{Ed}4 \)

White offers his merchandise again, but Black is not tempted.

29 \( \text{f}4! \)
30 \( \text{ef} \) \( \text{gf} \)
31 \( \text{gf} \) \( \text{Ax}f4 \)
32 \( \text{g}3 (143) \)

\[ \]

32 \( \text{Bg}8! \)

The tide turns! From now on Black offers his rooks. For example, 33 \( \text{B}e1 \) could be answered by 33 \( \text{Bx}g3! \) 34 \( \text{Wx}g3 \) \( \text{Be}4. \)

33 \( \text{Bxd}5 \) \( \text{Bxd}5 \)

After five offers Black finally accepts. But he doesn’t want to retain his booty.

34 \( \text{Wxd}5 \) \( \text{Bx}g3! \)
35 \( \text{Be}1 \) \( \text{Ef}2 \)

and in view of the unstoppable threats \text{White resigned.}

Seven exchange sacrifices within ten moves! This record should last a long time.

14 Original or eccentric?

The opening of the following game was described in the tournament bulletin as ‘irregular’ My friend the editor, Peter Griffiths, explained with an apologetic gesture: ‘It seemed so dreadful we couldn’t imagine it was your own opening.’

\text{Miles-Adorjan}

\text{Hastings 1976-77}

1 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \)
2 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \)
3 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{Bf}6 \)
4 \( \text{Bf}3 (144) \)

4 \( \text{d}e \) \( \text{Bxe}4 \) 5 \( \text{B}d3 \) \( \text{Bc}5 \) 6 \( \text{Bf}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
7 \( \text{Bc}2 \) \( \text{Bc}6 \) 8 \( \text{B}c3 \) \( \text{d}e \) gives White no advantage, e.g. 9 \( \text{Wxd}8+ \) \( \text{Bxd}8 \)
10 \( \text{Bd}5 \) \( \text{Be}6 \) 11 \( \text{Bf}6+ \) \( \text{Be}7 \) 12 \( \text{Bd}5+ \), when White should repeat moves, as after 12 ... \( \text{Be}7 \) 13 \( \text{Bxe}5 \) \( \text{Bg}7 \) and \( \text{c}6 \) he would be driven back.
According to recent theory it would be safer to play 4 e5 first and only after 5 e5 to answer 5 \( \text{d}b4+ \). After 6 \( \text{d}d2 \text{e}7 7 \text{xe}b4 \text{xb}4+ 8 \text{d}d2 \text{xd}2+ 9 \text{b}x\text{d}2 \text{g}8 the chances are level.

5 \text{d}d2 \text{xd}2+
5 \text{e}7 again deserved consideration.

6 \text{xd}2+!? ed
6 \text{xe}4 was insufficient on account of 7 \text{e}3 d5 8 de 0-0 9 \text{c}3!

7 e5 \text{e}4
8 \text{xd}4 \text{g}5
9 \text{x}g5 \text{xd}4
10 f4 \text{c}6
11 \text{d}2

Even better would have been the withdrawal 11 \text{f}2, as the continuation will soon show.

11 ... \text{d}8
12 \text{c}3 0-0
13 0-0-0 d6

If White's queen were on f2, he could obtain a significant advantage by 14 c5.

14 ed cd
15 \text{xd}6?

By winning the pawn White gives Black counterchances. I would have felt more uncomfortable after the logical 15 \text{d}5! \text{e}6 16 \text{c}3 \text{xd}5 17 \text{xd}5.

15 ... \text{a}5!
16 \text{d}5 \text{b}6
17 \text{d}2 \text{e}6

After 21 a3 Black retains an edge by 21 \text{c}2 22 \text{a}2 \text{e}3 23 \text{c}1 \text{xc}1 24 \text{xc}4 \text{d}4.

21 ... \text{e}5
22 \text{e}2?

22 \text{c}4 would have been better, as Black could then have easily missed his way: 22 \text{fc}8 23 b3 \text{a}5? 24 a4 b5 25 d6! bc 26 d7 \text{d}8 27 \text{hel} and the threat of 28 \text{e}8+ cannot be satisfactorily averted. Instead of 23 \text{a}5? Black can play 23 \text{xd}5! exploiting the fact that the bishop is not able to recapture because of 24 \text{c}1+. After 24 g3 \text{c}3+! 25 \text{xc}3 \text{xc}4 Black secures the initiative.

After the text move White will no longer have the opportunity to exchange minor pieces.

22 ... \text{fc}8
23 \text{e}5 (145)

Or 23 \text{d}2 \text{xd}5 24 \text{g}4 \text{c}3+ 25 \text{c}1 \text{e}2+!! \pm.

\[\text{Diagram: 145}\]
23 \( \text{Qxa2!} \)
24 \( \text{Qd3} \)

Naturally, the knight could not be captured because of 24 \( \text{Qxa2} \) \( \text{Qa5+} \) 25 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qb3} \). The fight is effectively over.
24 \( \text{Qc3}+ \)
25 \( \text{Qxc3} \) \( \text{Qxc3} \)
26 \( \text{d6} \)

The queen sacrifice 26 \( \text{Qg4} \) \( \text{Qe3} \) 27 \( \text{Qxc8} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 28 \( \text{Qe} \) fails to 28
\( \text{Wc7} \) 29 \( \text{Qg4} \) \( \text{Wxe5} \) 30 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( a5 \) 31
\( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Wd6} \).
26 \( \text{Qe3} \)
27 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{Qd8} \)
28 \( \text{Wb5} \) \( \text{Wxb5} \)
29 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( a6 \)
30 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Qf8} \)

White resigns

This ‘irregular’ opening can’t be so bad, especially if we consider that such players as Ribli, Sax and Timman have also played it several times and gained numerous victories with it.

In the four-volume monograph on the English Opening which was later published by John Watson this variation was named the ‘Adorjan Variation’. So this ‘irregular variation’ has now been accepted by ‘serious’ theory.

15 Inspiration by the muse

In the GM tournament at Sochi 1976 I played as a bridegroom, and my wife accompanied me. Inspiration would be given by the muse, as the saying goes. Maybe it’s true.

Zakharov-Adorjan
Sochi 1976

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{d6} \)
2 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \)
3 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{g6} \)
4 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qg7} \)
5 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( 0-0 \)
6 \( \text{Qe} \) \( \text{c6} \)
7 \( \text{Qg5?!} \) \( \text{h6} \)
8 \( \text{Qf4} \) (146)

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{146} \\
\text{B}
\end{array} \]

8 \( \text{Qg4!} \)

This idea of this knight move is to play \( \text{e5} \) at any price. So 9 \( \text{d5} \) would be answered by 9... \( \text{e5} \) and if 10 \( \text{de} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{=} \). After 9 \( \text{Wd2} \) the situation is more complicated, but 9 \( \text{Qh7} \) 10 \( \text{Qad1} \) (10 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 11 \( \text{hg} \) ef \( \text{=} \) 10 \( \text{Qxd4!} \) 11 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 12 \( \text{Qxg4} \) \( \text{ed} \) 13 \( \text{Qe2!} \) \( \text{Qxg4} \) 14 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 15 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qh7} \) gives Black a comfortable position.

9 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{e5} \)
10 \( \text{de} \) \( \text{Qgxe5} \)
11 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{de} \)
12 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qd4} \)
13 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{h}4 \\
14 \text{d}5! \text{c}6! \\
15 \text{c}7 (147) \\

If the attacked rook had to move then White would be all right.

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

17 gh \( \text{f}3+ \\
18 \text{h}1 \text{h}4+ \\
19 f3 \text{xe}3 \\
20 \text{c}7 \\

20 \text{e}1?? \text{f}5 21 \text{xe}3 \text{xe}3 22 \text{b}3 \text{xf}1 23 \text{xf}1 \text{xa}8 24 \text{d}1 would certainly have assured a draw. Now, however, White is a rook up, but Black has enormous compensation.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
& & & \\
\hline
20 & & \text{f}4 \\
21 & \text{d}3 \\
22 \text{e}2 & \text{e}4! \\
23 \text{h}2 \\
23 \text{fe} loses to 23 \text{e}5, but 23 \text{f}4?? \text{f}3 24 \text{g}2 \text{xf}4 25 \text{d}5! \text{cd} \\
26 \text{xd}5 \text{d}8 27 \text{xe}4 \text{xe}4 28 \text{xf}3 \text{xf}3 29 \text{xf}3 \text{d}2 probably leads to a draw again.
\end{array}
\]

An error in time trouble which precipitates the end. 26 \text{e}6 would have set Black a more difficult task, although 26 \text{xc}4! 27 \text{xf}8 \text{xf}8! (27 \text{xf}8?? 28 \text{ad}1 \text{e}3 29 \text{d}8+ \text{e}7 30 \text{d}7+ \text{xd}7 31 \text{xf}7+ would not be clear at all) 28 \text{fd}1 \text{c}5 shows almost beyond question that Black will win.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
26 & & \\
27 \text{xg}7 \text{xg}7 \\
28 \text{fe}1 & \text{f}5 \\
\end{array}
\]
29  Rd1  f7  34  g2  f4
30  b3  e5  35  Rd6  h4+
31  d6  f3  36  f1  e3
32  ed1  e7  37  c4  e2+
33  d7  f7  White resigns
Black is OK forever – Your Pocket Reminder

To win in 40 moves is commonplace, especially with Black. But to win three games in a total of 40 moves is something remarkable. Let me present you with a modest bunch of three miniatures of mine. You may tear them out of the book, if you like, and carry them with you all the time as a talisman. Derive strength and courage from them when storms are raging in your games. Remember: Black is OK forever!

My Shortest Ever

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

1  d4  df6
2  c4  c5
3  d5  d6
4  f3  g6
5  g3  g7
6  g2

White could avoid the early complications by 6 c3.

6  b5!?
7  cb  a6
8  ba  a5+!?
9  c3?

9 fd2 would transpose into a variation of the Benko Gambit, while on 9 d2 Black gets good counterplay by 9 ... xa6 followed by bd7, b6 etc.

9  ...  e4
10  c2??

Losing right away, but White also stood badly after the better move 10 d2, when 10 ... xc3 11 bc xc3 regains both the pawns with a clear advantage for Black.

10  ...  c3
11  d2 (148)

White was relying on this pin. The knight is condemned to death, but it is still ready for a last service.

11  ...  a4!

White resigns
12 b3 \(\text{Re}4\)! is the end.

Heavy Traffic on the Chessboard

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

1 \(d4\) \(\text{f6}\)
2 \(c4\) \(e6\)
3 \(\text{f3}\) \(b6\)
4 \(g3\) \(\text{a6}\)
5 \(b3\) \(d5(!)\)

A surprise which has its effect. My opponent was probably prepared only for 5 \(b5\) and 5 \(\text{b4+}\).

6 \(\text{g2}\) \(dc\)
7 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{b4+}\)
8 \(\text{d2?!}\)

White goes astray, not knowing the variation well. Instead 8 \(\text{f1!}\) was correct, when Black can play 8 ... \(\text{d6}\) or 8 ... \(\text{f7d7?!}\) with a position that has not yet been evaluated.

9 \(\text{c6?}\)

A grave error after 80 minutes’ meditation. 9 \(\text{x}b4?\) b2 10 \(\text{c}3\) ba\(\text{w}\) 11 \(\text{x}a1\) \(\text{x}d4\) or 9 \(\text{x}b3?\) \(\text{x}d2+\) 10 \(\text{x}d2\) \(\text{x}d4\) would equally have led to a won position for Black. 9 ab! was the only move, when after 9 \(\text{x}d2+\) 10 \(\text{x}d2\) \(\text{d}5\) 11 0-0 0-0-0-0 12 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{b}7\) 13 \(\text{c}3\) White could try to claim the pawn loss as a sacrifice.

9 ... \(\text{b}2\)
10 \(\text{x}b4\)
10 \(\text{x}d8\) ba\(\text{w}\) 11 \(\text{x}b4\) \(\text{d}5\) was no better as White would again be a rook down.

10 ... \(\text{ba}\)\(\text{w}\)
11 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{xc}3\)\(+\)
12 \(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{c}6\)

The storm has blown over. White now apparently realised that he had lost a rook in the confusion. Therefore

White resigns


Those Tricky Knights

The following game reminds me of the advice of my former teacher on how to avoid oversights: ‘Before each move consider your opponent’s possible checks, captures and knight moves!’

1 \(d4\) \(\text{f6}\)
2 \(c4\) \(e6\)
3 \(\text{f3}\) \(b6\)
4 \(a3\) \(\text{b}7\)
5 \(\text{c}3\) \(d5\)
6 cd Qxd5
7 wc2 Qxc3
8 wxc3?! h6!
9 b4

Some months later, in the decisive match Soviet Union v Hungary in the Chess Olympiad at Dubai, Vaganian played 9 e3 against me. After 9 Qe7 10 Qb5+ c6 11 Qe2 0-0 12 0-0 Qd7 13 Qd1 Qc8 14 b4 c5! 15 bc bc 16 Qb2 Qf6 I again equalised without difficulty.

9 ... Qe7
10 Qb2 0-0
11 e3 Qd7!

An improvement on 11 a6 which proved a useless loss of tempo in the stem game of this line, Polugayevsky-Sax, Biel 1985.

12 Qd1

12 Qe2 would be met by 12...c5, and 12 b5 by 12 a6, when the opening of the position would favour Black as he is better developed, e.g. 13 a4 ab 14 ab Qxal+ 15 Qxal wc8 16 Qc2 Qb4! 17 Qxb4 Qxal+ 18 Qd1 Qxf3 19 gf e5! ±.

12 ... Qc8
13 Qb5 c6
14 Qa4?

White does not realise that this otherwise natural move (with the aim of preventing the freeing c6-c5) is here fraught with great dangers. 14 Qe2 was necessary, although after 14 c5 15 dc Qf6 16 wc2 Qxb2 17 Qxb2 bc 18 bc (18 0-0 Qf6) 18 Qc7 Black stands well (better?).

14 Qa6!

White’s king will now be forced to stay in the centre, where his fate is sealed.

15 e4

15 Qxc6? loses to 15 Qf6 16 a4 b5 threatening Qb8. The ‘repentant’ 15 Qc2 would have led to a clear advantage for Black after 15 Qf6 16 Qd3 Qd5 17 Qb3 Qxd3 18 Qxd3 b5! 19 0-0 a5. The text move threatens 16 d5, which at present could be answered by Qf6.

15 ... Qf6

16 Qd2

If 16 Qe5 Qxe4 17 wc3 Qd6 ±; or 16 wc3 Qc7 ±.

16 Qc7

17 f3? (150)

Feeling himself in the frying pan on e1, the white king hopes to escape to f2. Whether this would be ‘into the fire’ doesn’t matter – the text move sets the pan itself alight!
Seeing the continuation 18 ed 
\[ \text{h4+ 19 g3} \ \text{\textit{\#xg3}} \ 20 \text{hg} \ \text{\textit{\#xg3}} \] 
mate

White resigns

This was Hardicsay-Adorjan, played in the Hungarian Team Championship 1986.
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Sax–Adorjan 134
Schmidt–Adorjan 14
Seirawan–Adorjan 24
Seret–Adorjan 127
Sharif–Adorjan 51
Smyslov–Bejiyavsky 26
Sveshnikov–Adorjan 111
Szabo, S.–Jocha 128
Sznopik–Adorjan 6

Tarjan–Browne 25
Tatai–Hmadi 33
Timman–Kurajica 78
Timman–Short 75
Torre–Adorjan 22

Uhlmann–Adorjan 136
Utasi–Petran 79

Zakharov–Adorjan 155
Zilberman–Zidkov 49
Zuckerman–Adorjan 123
Many chessplayers adopt an unnecessarily defensive approach when they have the Black pieces. But not Grandmaster Adorján, who claims that the reason many players rarely win with Black is that they don't even try!

The author makes his point by recommending specific opening variations in which Black can play for a win without taking undue risks. He illustrates his ideas with complete games, explained in his own effervescent style.

Black is OK! should enable club and tournament players not only to win more games as Black, but actually to enjoy having the Black pieces.

Grandmaster Andras Adorján has represented Hungary in many Olympiads, and was a World Championship Candidate in 1980. He is a respected writer and lecturer, and has acted as second to Gary Kasparov.
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