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Preface

The modern master is not secretive. Just like any other branch of art, positional play is founded on technique, and technique can be learned – this is the point of my book and the reason for it.

It sets out to teach positional play: I shall explain lovingly and in depth (by means of articles scattered throughout the book) the stratagems which were hinted at in my maiden work and then they will be illustrated by games. And yet the book is quite independent of My System, since nowhere is it presupposed that the reader has any knowledge of the principles of the said system. Rather, wherever it appears necessary, the latter are – briefly – explained. It is really not very difficult to use words like “prophylaxis”, “overprotection”, etc. You just have to learn what they mean!

The book is also valuable as a games collection. It contains, apart from those published in My System and in The Blockade and therefore omitted here, 109 of my best games.

And a few words about the lay-out of the book. I have avoided self praise. In fact, I have come to the conclusion that this failing which has its origins in the pseudo-classical period and is still very popular, is just as out of place as 3...c7-c5 and other variations which were once much praised. Self praise is admissible only in one case, when due recognition is unjustly withheld. In all other cases, self praise comes over as tasteless and demoralizing.

This time I have provided plenty of indexes. As well as a detailed contents page, there is also an index of games and of openings. When dividing up the material it was impossible to go beyond all-embracing concepts such as “centralization”, “restraint” and so on, and so to bring in less general ideas such as “open files”, “the seventh rank”, etc., I have thought it a good idea to include an index of the “guerrilla” tactics used in the games. It should be obvious that the latter could not be exhaustive; however, if you should wish to, it is possible to look more deeply into those “elements” (the file, the passed pawn, etc.) which might interest you.

And one final point. I should have liked each game to have been provided with four or five diagrams in order to facilitate playing through the often complicated thicket of variations which can arise. But obesity is out of fashion these days – slim is the watchword. In any case there is a simple, tried and trusted method, which can be recommended to all readers: when playing through a game, use two chess sets at the same time (or one and a pocket set); the actual game is kept on one board and the analysis is looked at on the other. It is much simper than you might think; there is little effort involved and you do not miss the often interesting variations.

With that, I think that everything has been said and that the book is ready for the public.

August 1928

The author
From the Publisher

In publishing a new translation of Chess Praxis our plan is to get closer to the author’s original intentions than any previous English version. As with My System previous translations of Chess Praxis from the original German have diluted Nimzowitsch’s lively, confrontational style.

We have kept as true to the original language as possible, so you will read of mummification and frog positions: better a moment’s confusion than hours of toned-down boredom. Mummification is Nimzowitsch’s evocative term for a blocked position with interlocking pawn chains. Nimzowitsch published Chess Praxis six years after the discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb, when interest in all things Egyptian was high. A frog (or crouching) position is a cramped but solid position which has the potential to spring into life.

One of Nimzowitsch’s other quirks that we have left “uncorrected” was to vary in the way he referred to his own moves and thoughts. Sometimes “I played”, other times “he played”; the royal “we think” and “our theories” are also common. There is an intriguing tendency for Nimzowitsch’s bad moves to be mentioned as “he now made a mistake”.

There is no doubt that Nimzowitsch is the hero of his own book and the villain is Dr Tarrasch. In the introduction when Nimzowitsch cryptically writes “as out of place as 3...c7-c5” he means after 1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6, but can’t stomach naming the Tarrasch Defence. Nimzowitsch also mentions that the original publishers refused to include as many diagrams as he wanted. We have granted his wish.

We have also added to his work with a short closing article pointing out some analytical improvements. This is certainly not a comprehensive list of corrections, but rather a selection of positions where we think a fresh insight might interest the reader. These positions have been marked with superscript throughout the book.

John Shaw, Kilmarnock 2007
Chapter 1

Centralization

This leads to excellent results in modern tournament praxis. The reason is that up until now it has not been well known that under all circumstances the control of the central squares is a strategic necessity; quite often even experienced players simply “run away” from the centre. But in each individual case we must make absolutely sure that any neglect of the central area by the opponent is really punished. Sins of omission as far as the centre is concerned arise because the player is not in the habit of paying attention to the needs of strategy (that is – in other words – strategic carelessness) or because he develops a passion for the flank attack! In the first case, our opponent lets us take the centre away from him and in the second he voluntarily concedes it to us in order to try his luck with a bold sortie down the wing. But a flank attack only has a real chance of success when the centre is closed or can be held stable with a minimum of forces. If the latter is not the case, then the attack fails because of a lack of forces. How can it be possible to successfully link a difficult attack with the heavy demands of a difficult defence? Game 3 illustrates this clearly. The central breakthrough led to complete paralysis – I nearly said demoralization – of the troops taking part in the diversion.

The mechanics of centralization can be seen in the way that, after the necessary restraint of a possibly mobile opposing pawn centre, we draw the noose tighter and tighter around the central squares. In doing so, we are glad to seize any line or diagonal which may simply pass through the centre. But if we manage to make this long-range action effective and establish some of our pieces in the centre, then we should be really pleased with the success of our policy of centralization. See game 12.

Piling up pieces in the centre in the middlegame (as sketched in above) can be used for a strong attack on the flank, because in the final analysis centralization is not an end in itself, but simply the most rational way to accumulate forces which can be deployed on the wings (see game 8). It is however clear that a sensibly centralized position should in all circumstances be considered consolidated.

In spite of everything, a centralized position is not necessarily free from all danger. For example, the opponent might think of getting rid of the centralized pieces by exchanges. In such a case, we need to preserve into the endgame a sufficient remainder of our centralization (game 7). Another danger might be that the opponent sacrifices one of his own blockading pieces in order to suddenly extend the central terrain. This danger is warded off by aiming to adapt to the new circumstances as soon as possible, perhaps by making a return sacrifice in order to exploit in a sharp way a central blocking diagonal (see game 8). We shall leave you for the present with these short remarks; the rest will become clear from the games themselves and the introductory notes.
1. Neglect of the central square complex as a typical, recurring error • The concept of the "central focussing lens"

In games 1 and 2 the central area is neglected for no apparent reason, and in game 3 for the sake of a flank attack; such a strategy can only be successful against faulty counterplay. Compare, moreover, our remarks on pages 13 and 17.

The "central focussing lens" is of course an imaginary instrument, but a very effective one, which in every case tells you whether the move you are about to make would increase or decrease the effectiveness of your forces in the centre. If, during our tournament game in Berlin 1928, Brinckmann had made use of this focussing lens, he would hardly have chosen the move 5...\texttt{wb6} after 1.d4 d5 2.\texttt{c6} e6 3.\texttt{f4} \texttt{f6} 4.e3 c5 5.c3 because after 5...\texttt{wb6} 6.\texttt{b3} \texttt{c6} 7.\texttt{bd2} the centralizing 7...\texttt{d6} proved impossible. Now he should at least have played 7...\texttt{e7}, but he chose the decentralizing 7...\texttt{h5} and what came next was a short but effective punitive exploitation: 8.\texttt{xb6} axb6 9.\texttt{c7} c4 10.\texttt{xb6} 7.d7 and Black gets the attack. We shall find further opportunities to test the usefulness of our lens.

Game 1
Aron Nimzowitsch
Carl Oscar Ahues
Berlin 1928

1.c4 \texttt{f6} 2.\texttt{c3} c6 3.e4 d5 4.e5 d4 5.exf6 dxc3 6.bxc3 \texttt{xf6}

6...\texttt{xf6} was clearer. Why? It would then no longer be possible to prevent Black from developing with ...\texttt{d6}, 0-0 and ...\texttt{e8}. Such a set-up would mean centralization, which is the greatest possible safeguard against any surprise.

Things are very different after the text move (6...\texttt{xf6}). Black no doubt obtains a "proud" pawn centre, but it is doubtful whether there is a good reason to be proud of this pawn centre at all. Let us examine it: the 	extit{mobility} of the said centre is small, e.g. 6...\texttt{xf6} 7.\texttt{f3} e5 8.d4 e4? 9.\texttt{h4}! f5 10.g3 followed by \texttt{g2} and \texttt{f4} with paralysis effect. But, as is shown in the note to move 9, "hanging on" to the centre here also proves weak. So, 6...\texttt{xf6} was the correct continuation.

7.\texttt{f3} c5

7...e6 seems positionally more correct, adopting a defensive posture in the centre.

8.d4 \texttt{c6} 9.\texttt{e2}

9...\texttt{f5}

Worth considering was 9...e5 to make a stand (= the policy of hanging on or sitting tight). The continuation would be 10.\texttt{e3} \texttt{a5} (or 10...\texttt{b6} 11.0-0 then \texttt{d2}, \texttt{d1} and White has pressure down the d-file) 11.0-0 \texttt{xc3} 12.dxe5! (much better than 12.\texttt{c1}, which would only have driven the queen back into the defence: via a5 to c7) 12...\texttt{exe} 13.\texttt{xd5}! 13.\texttt{g5} \texttt{f5} 14.\texttt{h5} \texttt{g6} 15.\texttt{xg6} h\texttt{g6} 16.\texttt{d5} and wins.

The text move 9...\texttt{f5} is a serious error, which gives up the whole centre. Relatively the best move was 9...\texttt{g8}, although White also remains with an advantage after 10.g3 \texttt{h3} 11.\texttt{b1} \texttt{c7} 12.\texttt{a4} \texttt{d7} 13.\texttt{c2} etc.

10.d5 \texttt{a5} 11.\texttt{e5}

This decides matters.
11...\texttt{d}d7

Or 11...\texttt{g}g7 12.\texttt{wa}4+ \texttt{f}f8 (12...\texttt{d}d7? 13.\texttt{xd}d7! \texttt{xc}3+ 14.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{xa}1 15.\texttt{f}f6+ \texttt{f}f8 16.\texttt{h}h6 mate) 13.\texttt{f}f4 \texttt{f}f6 14.\texttt{f}f3 with total positional domination.

12.\texttt{h}h5 \texttt{g}g7 13.\texttt{xf}f7 \texttt{b}b6 14.\texttt{xh}8+ \texttt{f}f8 15.\texttt{f}f7

White quite simply returns all the captured material, but obtains a giant of a knight on e6. This is how to do things. You should not always just hang on to material! Flexibility is the watchword! That means transforming one advantage into another.

15...\texttt{e}e8 16.\texttt{g}g5 \texttt{xc}3+

17.\texttt{f}f1!

Not 17.\texttt{d}d2 on account of 17...\texttt{x}h5 18.\texttt{xh}5 \texttt{xd}2+ 19.\texttt{xd}2 \texttt{b}b2+.

17...\texttt{xa}1 18.\texttt{e}e6+ \texttt{g}g8 19.\texttt{xe}8 \texttt{xe}8 20.\texttt{h}h5 \texttt{a}a8 21.\texttt{xf}5 \texttt{b}b4 22.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{xc}4+ 23.\texttt{g}2 \texttt{e}e2

Black is helpless.

24.\texttt{d}d2

24.\texttt{e}e! seems even more accurate: 21...\texttt{xe}1 25.\texttt{g}5 \texttt{g}7! 26.\texttt{f}f7+ \texttt{h}h8 27.\texttt{b}b2! and wins.

24...\texttt{c}c4

Or 24...\texttt{xd}2 25.\texttt{g}5 \texttt{g}7 26.\texttt{e}6+ with a smothered mate.

25.\texttt{e}1 \texttt{xd}2 26.\texttt{g}5 \texttt{d}d6

The rest is somewhat bloody. Since we are not of a bloodthirsty nature, we shall be brief.

27.\texttt{h}h7+ \texttt{f}f8 28.\texttt{xe}7+ \texttt{g}g8 29.\texttt{h}h7+ \texttt{f}f8 30.\texttt{h}6+ \texttt{g}8 31.\texttt{g}6+ \texttt{g}7

Poor bishop, its hour has come; its only consolation is not to perish in foreign fields!

32.\texttt{h}h7+ \texttt{f}f8 33.\texttt{e}e6+ \texttt{e}e8 34.\texttt{g}g7+ \texttt{d}d8 35.\texttt{e}e6+ \texttt{e}e8 36.\texttt{e}e5

1–0

\textbf{Game 2}

\textbf{Efim Bogoljubow}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

\textbf{London 1927}

1.e4 e6 2.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{f}f6 3.e4 c5 4.g3

Worth considering was 4.\texttt{f}f3 \texttt{c}c6 5.d4 cxd4 6.\texttt{xd}4 \texttt{b}b4 7.\texttt{d}d3 (the idea is from Bogoljubow).

4...d5 5.e5 d4 6.\texttt{xf}6 \texttt{dxc}3 7.\texttt{xc}3

There was nothing wrong with 7.bxc3, e.g.

7.bxc3 gxf6 8.d4 (8...\texttt{cx}d4 9.\texttt{cx}d4 \texttt{bx}4+ 10.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{xd}4 11.\texttt{xb}4 \texttt{e}e4+ 12.\texttt{e}e2 \texttt{exe}1 13.\texttt{xd}6 \texttt{c}c6 \texttt{f}f3 and wins). However, the text move is also playable since the black pawn majority should hardly be able to get going.

7...\texttt{xf}6! 8.\texttt{f}f3

Here 8.\texttt{g}2 had to be weighed up carefully, e.g.

8...\texttt{c}c6 9.\texttt{e}e2 e5 10.0–0 and then f4. The text move makes it harder for the bishop's diagonal to be used effectively against the centre.

8...\texttt{h}6 9.\texttt{g}2 \texttt{d}d7! 10.\texttt{d}d2!

With this, he to some extent compensates for the error on move 8.

10...\texttt{c}c6 11.\texttt{e}e4 \texttt{g}6 12.\texttt{e}e2
12...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e7}}}}\)

Not 12...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f5}}}}\) on account of the reply 13.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f3}}}}\) then \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d2}}}}\) and the e5-square remains permanently weak. You can see that the problem White has to solve here is a double one:

1. Black's majority has to be \textit{restrained}.
2. Dominance of the \textit{centre} must be achieved.

This (double) problem can be solved, up to a point. However, it can only be done by the most accurate use of the forces he has available.

13.0–0 0–0 14.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{h4}}}}\)?

He is neglecting the centre! Why not 14.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f4}}}}\)! If then 14...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d7}}}}\), he plays 15.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d2}}}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{h8}}}!}\) 16.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{ae1}}}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f6}}}!}\) 17.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{c1}}}!}\) (intending \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e4-d2-f3-e5}}}!}\)). After the general exchanges started on move 17, then we can still see a possibility of Black advancing his pawn majority.

14...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f5}}}!}\) 15.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d2}}}!}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{xg2}}}!}\)

He is avoiding the trap 15...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{xh4}}}!\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f3}}}!}}\).

16.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{g2}}}!}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{c6}}}!}\) 17.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f3}}}!}\)

Intending \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f4}}}!}\).

17...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f4}}}!}\)

Barring the gate. Next comes a final attempt at consolidation and then White's game collapses.

18.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e1}}}!}\) 19.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e4}}}!}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{fxg3}}}!}\) 20.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{fxg3}}}!}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d6}}}!}\)

The g3-pawn is weak, he is badly developed and has an open king position – too much of a bad thing, even when you have a centralized position. It can now be appreciated how much damage was done by 14.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{h4}}}!}\).

21.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{g4}}}!}\) 22.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{xe4}}}!}\) 23.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e4}}}!}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f4}}}!}\)

Less experienced readers should pay attention to the work done down the f-file.

24.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{g5}}}!}\)

24.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{xe6}}}!}\) 25.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f2}}}!}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e5}}}!}\) leads to disaster.

24...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{g4}}}!}\) 25.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{h1}}}!}\)

Or 25.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f2}}}!}\) 26.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e2}}}!}\) 27.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{g2}}}!}\)

winning a piece.

25...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{hxg5}}}!}\) 26.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{hxg5}}}!}\)

26...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f7}}}!}\) 27.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{g1}}}!}\)

After 27.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{g6}}}!}\) the best is 27...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f6}}}!}\) (not 27...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e7}}}!}\) because of 28.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{h2}}}!}\) 29.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e2}}}!}\) 30.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{g5}}}!}\) ).

27...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{h8}}}!}\) 28.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d3}}}!}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e7}}}!}\) 29.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{b3}}}!}\) 30.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e4}}}!}\) 0–1

Game 3
Aron Nimzowitsch
Theodor von Scheve
Ostende 1907

1.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f3}}}!}\) d5 2.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d3}}}!}\) c6 3.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d4}}}!}\)

Because now the opposing c-pawn is blocked by its own knight.

3...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e6}}}!}\)

3...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f6}}}!}\) is better.

4.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e3}}}!}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{f6}}}!}\) 5.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{c4}}}!}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e7}}}!}\) 6.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{c3}}}!}\) 0–0 7.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d2}}}!}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e4}}}!}\)

Correct play. Note that the invasion could hardly be successfully prevented by 7.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d3}}}!}\) either (instead of 7.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d2}}}!}\) as played), e.g. 7...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{b4}}}!}\) 8.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{e2}}}!}\) c5.

8.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d3}}}!}\)

Not very good! You cannot play a Stonewall with a knight on c6. Black should have contended himself with 8...\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{xd2}}}!}\) 9.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{xd2}}}!}\) \(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{b4}}}!}\) 10.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{c2}}}!}\) dxc4 11.\(\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{xc4}}}!}\) c5.
9.a3 \( \text{a}3 \) f6 10.\( \text{c}2 \) h8 11.0–0 a6

In order to avoid a possible \( \text{b}5 \). Instead, it was time to give up all hope of a Stonewall-like attack (along the lines of \(...\text{g}5?\)); with the simple 11...\( \text{cxd}2 \) 12.\( \text{xd}2 \) dxc4 13.\( \text{xc}4 \) e5 14.\( \text{ad}1! \) e4! Black could still almost equalize (15.\( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 16.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}4 \)). And why not: it is not easy to set up pressure in the twinkling of an eye with moves like \( \text{d}3 \), then \( \text{d}4 \) and then \( \text{a}3 \)! In addition, Black has also achieved something: the diversion with the knight has got him the two bishops. So the possibility that things might still be level should not surprise us.

12.\( \text{ac}1 \) h6 13.\( \text{fd}1 \) g5

This would only be playable if White were not in the position of being able to open the central files. With an open centre, on the other hand, a flank attack seems hopeless.

14.\( \text{e}1 \) g4 15.\( \text{e}5! \)

Now the d-file which was previously in waiting is opened. See the next note.

15...\( \text{xe}5 \) 16.\( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{g}5 \)

If 16...\( \text{xe}5 \) then 17.\( \text{cxd}5 \) exd5 18.\( \text{xe}4 \) fxe4 19.\( \text{xd}5 \) etc.

17.\( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 18.\( \text{c}3 \) dxc4 19.\( \text{xc}4 \)

The effectiveness of the d-file is immense: Black cannot achieve any sort of attacking set-up.

19...\( \text{d}7 \) 20.\( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 21.\( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 22.\( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \)

23.\( \text{d}4 \) c6 24.\( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{g}6 \)

If 24...\( \text{d}5 \) then 25.\( \text{xd}5 \) exd5 26.\( \text{xc}7 \) etc.

25.\( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{h}4 \) 26.\( \text{f}6 \)

Compare the set-ups of both sides: White has 2 centre files, 2 centralized bishops and a monster of a knight, whilst the black pawns on c6 and \( \text{e}6 \) and the bishop on \( \text{d}7 \) are all hanging. Black has two knights making a diversionary attack and... nothing else. No wonder that the black attack which now gets going is repelled with terrible losses for the attacking side.

26...\( \text{g}6 \) 27.\( \text{b}6 \) \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{f}3 \) 28.\( \text{g}x\text{f}3 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 29.\( \text{xd}8 \) \( \text{xf}3 \) 30.\( \text{xf}1 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 31.\( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{x}f6 \) 32.\( \text{ex}f6 \) \( \text{xe}2 \) 33.\( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{b}3 \) 34.\( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 35.\( \text{xd}7 \)

1–0

2. Sins of omission committed in the centre

In game 4 Black had made a breakthrough, but with correct play White could have tidied up the position, starting from the centre (move 21). He omitted to do so and was at a disadvantage. In game 5 White was threatened by an attack on his king, but the opportunity presented itself to start a counterattack in the centre. He did not make use of it, because he could see in it no immediate success and rightfully lost to the opponent’s attack on his king. In game 6 Black was in the act of occupying some points in the centre. White should have combated this, because central squares should absolutely never be given up without a fight. But White underestimated the “central danger” and so his opponent was able to build up a powerful central position.

The errors which have been sketched in should be attributed not only to insufficient knowledge
of central strategy but also to a certain mood of panic. And the moral of the story? Well, even in apparently critical positions you can quite often redress the situation if you start from the centre, so: “Centralize and do not despair!”

Game 4
Erich Cohn
Aron Nimzowitsch
Ostende 1907

1.d4 @f6 2.@f3 d6 3.@f4 @h5

21...@xe4 22.@xe4

22...@g7! 23.exd5? @g4 24.@c4 @xh2† 25.@h1 @xe1 26.dxc6†
Or 26.@xe1 @f2† followed by mate in two moves.
26...@e6 27.@xe6† @xe6 28.@xf8† @xf8 29.@xe6 @f2
0–1

Game 5
Rudolf Spielmann
Aron Nimzowitsch
Karlsbad 1923

1.e4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.exd5 cxd5 4.c3 @c6 5.@f4 @f5
An innovation.
6.@f3 e6 7.@b3 @d7 8.@bd2 f6

As early as 1907 I was going my own way!

4.@d2 @f6 5.c4 @bd7 6.@c3
Or 6.@c3 e5 7.e4 @e7 and the tempo presented to White (@c1-d2) appears unimportant.

6...@e6 7.e3 d5
7...b6 is better, followed by ...@b7

8.c5
Playable.

8...@e4 9.@d3 f5 10.b4 @g6 11.@b2 @g7 12.@c3
12.0–0 then e5 and f3 was appropriate in the position.

12...0–0 13.@c2 c6 14.@e2 @e7 15.0–0
I would have preferred 15.@e5.

15...e5 16.dxe5 @xe5 17.@xe5 @xe5 18.@d4 @d7 19.f3! @f6 20.@ae1 @ae8 21.e4?

The decisive error. Correct was 21.f4 @c7 (21...@xd4 22.@xd4) 22.@f3 and then @d4, when White's position appears to have been consolidated; the move played leads to ruin... in a hurry.
This secures e5 and prepares a general advance on the kingside. A diversionary strategy is justified here because Black's own centre seems not so badly secured, since e6 is well protected and the f5-b1 diagonal looks both "central" and pleasant. The fact that an attack on the wing is inadmissible when your own centre is badly secured is something we have frequently emphasized.

9.\textit{\textbf{Q}}e2

9.c4 was called for, e.g. 9.c4 \textit{\textbf{b}}b4 10.cxd5 exd5 11.\textit{\textbf{b}}b5 with equality; or 9...\textit{\textbf{b}}b4 10.\textit{\textbf{c}}c1 and White has nothing to fear!

9...\textit{\textbf{g}}5 10.\textit{\textbf{g}}3 \textit{\textbf{h}}5 11.\textit{\textbf{h}}3 \textit{\textbf{Q}}ge7 12.0-0

At this point c3-c4 would not have noticeably improved the situation in the centre, e.g. 12.c4 dxc4 13.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xc4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}d5 with a huge central knight; and yet White should have preferred this line.

12.\textit{\textbf{h}}6 13.\textit{\textbf{e}}1 \textit{\textbf{g}}4 14.\textit{\textbf{w}}d1 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xd2

This wins a pawn.

15.\textit{\textbf{w}}xd2 \textit{\textbf{g}}xh3 16.\textit{\textbf{Q}}d3 \textit{\textbf{b}}6 17.\textit{\textbf{Q}}f1 \textit{\textbf{h}}4 18.\textit{\textbf{h}}h2 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f7

\textit{\textbf{Not}} 18...0-0-0 on account of 19.\textit{\textbf{c}}c5!.

19.\textit{\textbf{g}}4

White is lost after other moves too.

19...\textit{\textbf{x}}xg3 20.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xg3 \textit{\textbf{h}}2\textsuperscript{+} 21.\textit{\textbf{d}}g2

21...\textit{\textbf{e}}e4\textsuperscript{+}

Here there was a clear win after the continuation 21...e5!, e.g. 22.\textit{\textbf{d}}xe5 \textit{\textbf{e}}e4\textsuperscript{+} 23.\textit{\textbf{f}}3 \textit{\textbf{g}}xg8 24.\textit{\textbf{e}}6\textsuperscript{+} \textit{\textbf{w}}xe6 25.\textit{\textbf{f}}4 \textit{\textbf{g}}4\textsuperscript{+} or 24.\textit{\textbf{d}}f4 (instead of 24.\textit{\textbf{e}}6\textsuperscript{+}) 24...\textit{\textbf{f}}5 25.\textit{\textbf{f}}xe4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xg3 26.\textit{\textbf{w}}xf6\textsuperscript{+} \textit{\textbf{e}}e8 27.e6 \textit{\textbf{w}}h1\textsuperscript{+} 28.\textit{\textbf{h}}xh1 \textit{\textbf{Q}}xh1\textsuperscript{+} and wins.

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

22.\textit{\textbf{f}}3 would have permitted longer resistance.

22...\textit{\textbf{Q}}d5! 23.\textit{\textbf{x}}xe4 dx5 24.\textit{\textbf{f}}4

24.\textit{\textbf{x}}xe4 \textit{\textbf{w}}d5 etc.

24...\textit{\textbf{e}}5 25.\textit{\textbf{Q}}e2 \textit{\textbf{h}}4\textsuperscript{+} 26.\textit{\textbf{Q}}xh4 \textit{\textbf{g}}4\textsuperscript{+}

Followed by mate in a few moves.

0-1

Game 6
Frederick Yates
Aron Nimzowitsch
London 1927

1.e4 c5 2.\textit{\textbf{B}}3 \textit{\textbf{d}}6

My new move from San Sebastian.

3.e5 \textit{\textbf{d}}d5 4.\textit{\textbf{Q}}c4 \textit{\textbf{b}}6 5.\textit{\textbf{e}}2 \textit{\textbf{c}}6

White has lost two tempi with the bishop, but on the other hand the knight is not so well placed on b6, so the bishop manoeuvre should not be criticized.

6.c3 d5 7.d4

He should have preferred 7.exd6.

7...\textit{\textbf{x}}xd4 8.\textit{\textbf{x}}xd4 \textit{\textbf{Q}}f5 9.0-0 \textit{\textbf{e}}6 10.\textit{\textbf{c}}c3 \textit{\textbf{e}}7

11.\textit{\textbf{e}}e1

Should the planned attack with f4 then g4 and f5 really turn out to be possible, this would constitute proof that 8...\textit{\textbf{f}}5 was wrong, and that would be nonsense. But in reality, nothing special is achieved after 11.\textit{\textbf{e}}e1 and this diversion should have been replaced by a properly thought out plan down the c-file, e.g. 11.\textit{\textbf{e}}e3 0-0 12.\textit{\textbf{c}}c1 followed by a3 and b4, then \textit{\textbf{B}}3-d2-b3-c5, and
the sort of outpost recommended in *My System* is achieved.

11...\( \text{d}7 \) 12.\( \text{g}4 \)

Ingenious play! After 12.\( \text{f}4 \) there would have followed 12...\( \text{xd}4 \) 13.\( \text{xd}4 \)?? \( \text{c}5 \). Another unfavourable move would be 12.\( \text{xc}3 \) on account of 12...\( \text{dx}e5 \) 13.\( \text{dx}e5 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 14.\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 15.\( \text{xc}3 \) \( \text{xc}7 \) with something of a positional advantage for Black. With the help of the text move (12.\( \text{g}4 \)) Yates makes possible \( \text{f}4 \) which he had been aiming for in a totally surprising way!

12...\( \text{g}6 \) 13.\( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 14.\( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{c}6 \)

14...\( \text{c}5 \) was met by the strong 15.\( \text{b}4 \); 14...\( \text{exd}5 \) would be quite bad on account of 15.\( \text{xd}7 \) and then 16.\( \text{xd}4 \).

15.\( \text{xc}7 \) \( \text{b}6 \)† 16.\( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{xc}7 \)

17.\( \text{a}4 \)

Here we have just the sort of typical mistake mentioned in our preliminary notes! Obviously Black is planning to occupy the central squares, and naturally White should contest this, instead of simply avoiding it by means of 17.\( \text{xa}4 \). So 17.\( \text{e}2 \)! (intending \( \text{e}3 \)) 17...\( \text{d}5 \) 18.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 19.\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 20.\( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{e}7 \) and now possibly 21.\( \text{e}3 \) leaving White with “more” of the centre than Black. But even if he had not achieved that “more”, so what! He still had to fight! But now his deserved punishment is not long in coming.

17...\( \text{h}5 \) 18.\( \text{h}3 \)

Forced, because after 18.\( \text{f}3 \) then 18...\( \text{f}5 \) would follow with fresh territorial gains in the centre; in addition a threat of mate would pop up with ...\( \text{h}4 \) followed by ...\( \text{g}3 \)†.

18.\( \text{f}5 \) 19.\( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{b}5 \)

A manœuvre to clear space for the d7-knight which wants to get to b6 via d5.

20.\( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 21.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{bd}5 \) 22.\( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{b}6 \)† 23.\( \text{f}2 \)

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

This move, in conjunction with the next one, leads to a decentralization of one rook, rather spoiling the so harmoniously constructed set-up. harmony would not, on the other hand, have been disturbed by the continuation 23...0–0–0!. After 24...\( \text{b}8 \) and 25...\( \text{g}6 \), there would be nothing more to prevent the rooks being employed centrally, thus 26...\( \text{d}7 \) and 27...\( \text{c}8 \).

But even better here seems to be 23...\( \text{g}4 \)†, e.g. 23...\( \text{g}4 \) 24.\( \text{xg}4 \) \( \text{hxg}4 \) 25.\( \text{hxg}4 \) \( \text{xb}2 \) 26.\( \text{xb}7 \) 0–0–0 27.\( \text{xb}2 \) \( \text{xf}2 \) 28.\( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}2 \) and Black must win.

Finally a combination of both lines is possible, namely 23...0–0–0 24.\( \text{a}3 \) and then 24...\( \text{g}4 \). If then something along the lines of 25.\( \text{c}1 \)† \( \text{b}8 \) 26.\( \text{c}5 \) then 26...\( \text{xc}5 \) 27.\( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{xf}3 \) 28.\( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \) with a victorious invasion via the c-file.

24.\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{h}6 \)

Interesting. At long last, now that it has been centralized, Black’s position can sustain an adventurous sortie. However it was more correct to play 24...0–0! then ...\( \text{g}6 \) and ...\( \text{f}8 \).

25.\( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{hxh}3 \) 26.\( \text{hxh}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 27.\( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 28.\( \text{f}3 \)
28...\textit{\textbf{Gg4}} 29.h3 \textit{\textbf{Gg3}} 30.a4 \textit{\textbf{Qh4}}

Black's set-up is now suffering from an inner division. The position of the detached rook makes a mating attack seem desirable, but the other pieces are positioned more for an endgame. (The d5-knight would be hugely influential in an ending and also the light squares would without the slightest doubt be under Black's control.)

31.\textit{\textbf{Df1}} \textit{\textbf{Ee6!}}

To draw the sting from the threat of \textit{\textbf{Wh7}} and then \textit{\textbf{Wg8}}: the rook runs away in good time. Moreover Black must manoeuvre with great care.

32.a5 \textit{\textbf{Wd8}} 33.\textit{\textbf{Gg1}} \textit{\textbf{Df5}}

33...\textit{\textbf{Dxf3}}† 34.\textit{\textbf{Gxf3}} \textit{\textbf{Gxf3}} 35.\textit{\textbf{Wxf3}} g6 would not be good on account of 36.f5.

34.\textit{\textbf{Dh2}} a6 35.\textit{\textbf{Wb1}}

To threaten \textit{\textbf{Qd4}}.

35...\textit{\textbf{We7}}

He accepts the threat, but he has an eye on c5 (...\textit{\textbf{We5}}).

36.\textit{\textbf{Dd4}}

This loses. 36.\textit{\textbf{Ce1}} was better.

36...\textit{\textbf{Wh4!}}

Since the detached troops could not get back to the army, the army comes to them.

37.\textit{\textbf{Ce1}}

If 37.\textit{\textbf{Dxc6}} then 37...\textit{\textbf{Xh3}}† with mate in two.

37...\textit{\textbf{Dxf4}}

Again threatening mate (by ...\textit{\textbf{Xg2}}† etc.).

38.\textit{\textbf{Dxf4}} \textit{\textbf{Xh3}}†

The simplest.

39.\textit{\textbf{Dxh3}} \textit{\textbf{Wxf4}}† 40.\textit{\textbf{Qg2}} \textit{\textbf{Qe3}}†

And mate in two. I received a prize of ten pounds for this game (for the best played game). 0-1

3. The vitality of troops in the centre

The notes to game 7 enable us to show how a threatened centralization in the middlegame can be turned into one that can be used in the endgame. The use of this stratagem is important not only as a measure for self-defence (we have in mind those cases in which the defender intends to destroy the attacking forces by exchanges) but also when slow but steady progress is required.

In game 8 Black, by means of a pretty pawn sacrifice, had made a nonsense of his opponent's blocking attempt and many nice continuations were open to him. But here too he had counted his chickens before they were hatched (in other words forgotten about the vitality of the centre); the blockade he had apparently swept away comes back to life and is able to throttle him.

Game 7

3. Norwegian amateurs

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

Oslo 1921

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.\textit{\textbf{Cc3}} \textit{\textbf{Ab4}} 4.exd5 exd5 5.\textit{\textbf{Df3}} \textit{\textbf{Gg4}} 6.\textit{\textbf{Cxe2}} \textit{\textbf{Qe7}} 7.0-0 \textit{\textbf{Db6}} 8.\textit{\textbf{Df4}} \textit{\textbf{Qd6}} 9.\textit{\textbf{De5}}

9.\textit{\textbf{Dd2}} looks more natural.

9...\textit{\textbf{Ax e2}} 10.\textit{\textbf{Ax e2}} \textit{\textbf{Ax e2}} 11.\textit{\textbf{Qxe2}} \textit{\textbf{Qxe2}} 12.dxe5

Each side has its pawn majority, but the white one looks less mobile. Next came:

12...\textit{\textbf{Dd7}} 13.\textit{\textbf{f4}} 0-0-0 14.\textit{\textbf{Cc3}} \textit{\textbf{Db8}} 15.\textit{\textbf{Df3}} c5

16.\textit{\textbf{Dc1}}

16.\textit{\textbf{Dad1}}!

16...h5! 17.\textit{\textbf{Dh1}} \textit{\textbf{Df5}}

And now the mobility of White's majority has been reduced to a minimum. But it is a long way from there to a successful rolling up of the paralysed majority.

18.\textit{\textbf{Gg1}} h4 19.\textit{\textbf{Gb3}} d4 20.cxd4 cxd4 21.\textit{\textbf{Dd3}} \textit{\textbf{Qc3}} 22.\textit{\textbf{Df2}} \textit{\textbf{Dd5}}
Nevertheless Black has achieved something, namely a strong central position, a good passed pawn even if it is blockaded and the possibility of ...f6. Next came:

23.a3 f6

The said rolling up of the apparently isolated pawn mass (as a result of ...d5) could now be prepared by ...e7 and when possible ...a7-a6 (to threaten to break the blockade by ...b5). But the text move is completely correct and aimed at clarifying Black’s advantage.

24.exf6 gxf6 25.f5!

25...Ehg8

It was necessary to prevent or draw the teeth from the move f4 which was obviously being planned. For that, the preventive move 25...Ehe8 was indicated and if then 26.f4 then 26...Exf5 (even stronger and immediately decisive would of course be the combinatory refutation of 26.f4, namely the reply 26...Eg4!! 27.Exf5 Ed5 28.Exe8 Edxe8 29.Ed3 Ed6! 30.Exf6 Ec7 and all of Black’s pieces are on standby to support the d-pawn. The strategic content of the above variation could be characterized in the following way:

Black’s centralization has been passed down from the middlegame to the endgame: a stratagem which can be most heartily recommended in all suitable cases. However, in the name of objectivity I must point out that in no way does the move 25...Ehe8 automatically link to the stratagem I have just sketched in. The rook move to g8 is therefore totally correct.

26...Exe8 (instead of 25...Ehg8) 26.Efe2 Exg2?

27.Exe8 f6f4† 28.Ee4 Exe8 and wins.

26.f4 Ee6

The stratagem we have mentioned several times could have been reached here via the simple 26...Exf5, e.g. 27.Exf5 Dxf5 28.Eh5 Ed8! 29.Ec1 Ee3 30.Exf6 Ee6.

If you compare the position which has now arisen with that in the previous diagram, the unblocking of the passed pawn d4 must be reckoned as a definite plus. In addition, you can see that the centralization has taken on the character of an endgame, without losing any of its intensity. Next could come, for example, 31.Ed7† Ed8 32.Ed5 Ee6 33.Ed3 Exc1† 34.Ed1 d3! 35.Eb3 (Or 35.Ed2† Ee8!. If 35.Ed3 then 35...a6! 36.Ee2 Ed4! and wins.) 35...Ec4 36.Ed2 Exb2 37.Ed4 b5 then ...Ec4 and wins.

For that reason 26...Exf5 was the correct move, which would have allowed an easy and comfortable transition to the endgame (passing on the benefits of centralization!). The move chosen in the game (26...Ee6) does not allow matters to be cleared up at once.

27.Ed6

The correct move was 27.Ed6 because now Black could simply have won with the following elegant combination: (27.Ed6) 27...h3 28.Ee7 Exc7! 29.Exg8 Ed4! 30.Ee3 Exg3 31.hxg3 Exf2† 32.Ed1 Ed3 33.Ed1 h2† 34.Ed2 Exf2 35.Ed1 Ed4† and then ...Exg8. On the other hand, it would not have been easy for Black to show an advantage after 27.Edg1!, e.g. 27.Edg1 Ed4 28.Ee2 (28.Edx3? Edc1† 28...Edg8 29.Edg6 Exg6 30.fxg6 Edxg6 31.Ed2 Ee4 and Black’s position may look impressive, but he has some work to do in the middlegame which he might not enjoy.

27.Ed8?

An error caused by time trouble. Black was playing three games simultaneously and thus had to make three times twenty moves per hour. As said, he had a simple win by 27...h3.


This ought to have been of no more help to him, since after the error on move 27 the game could not be saved. But things turn out differently.
32.\textit{\textup{\textbf{ex}}4 \textit{\textup{\textbf{ex}}4}} 33.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qc}}6}f6

This is even clearer than 33.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qf}}3} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Wxd}}3} 34.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxd}}3} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}3} 35.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Rd}}4} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Be}}8} 36.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qg}}1} and then \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qf}}2}.

33...\textit{\textup{\textbf{Bxc}}6} 34.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Wxd}}5} cxd5 35.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxg}}2} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Be}}5}

36.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qf}}2}

This one weak move gives the dying embers of Black's centralization a chance to flare up again. The correct move was 36.\textit{\textup{\textbf{h4}}} and if then 36...\textit{\textup{\textbf{Exf}}5} 37.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Exf}}2} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Nh}}5} 38.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qh}}3} \textit{\textup{\textbf{f5}}} 39.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qd}}2} or 36.\textit{\textup{\textbf{h4}}} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qc}}7} 37.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qg}}3} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qd}}6} 38.\textit{\textup{\textbf{h5}}} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Exf}}5} 39.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Nh}}2} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qg}}5} 40.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qf}}4} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}6} 41.\textit{\textup{\textbf{h6}}} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Bg}}8} 42.\textit{\textup{\textbf{h7}}} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Nh}}8} 43.\textit{\textup{\textbf{b4}}}, and White wins.

36...\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qc}}7} 37.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qg}}3} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qd}}6} 38.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qg}}4} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}4}f6

And Black won as follows:

39.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Nh}}5}

Or 39.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qf}}4}? \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}5} 40.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxe}}4}f6 \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxe}}4} and wins.

39...\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qd}}4} 40.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qg}}6} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}5} 41.\textit{\textup{\textbf{b4}}} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Bg}}4}f6 42.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qf}}7} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Bf}}4} 43.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Exf}}4}?

A blunder of course; but the game should be lost in any case.

43...\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxf}}4} 44.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxf}}6} \textit{\textup{\textbf{d}}3} 45.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qg}}6} \textit{\textup{\textbf{d}}2} 46.\textit{\textup{\textbf{f6}}} \textit{\textup{\textbf{d1}}} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Q}}}

Black won.

0-1

Game 8
Aron Nimzowitsch
Grigory Levenfish
Karlsbad 1911

1.e4 \textit{\textbf{e}}6 2.d4 \textit{\textbf{d}}5 3.e5 \textit{\textbf{c}}5 4.c3 \textit{\textbf{Qc}}6 5.\textit{\textbf{Qf}}3 \textit{\textbf{f}}6

Strategically wrong. Pawn chains should only be attacked at the base - here \textit{\textbf{d4}}. So the correct plan was 5...\textit{\textup{\textbf{Wb}}6} 6.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}2} cxd4 7.cxd4 \textit{\textup{\textbf{Q}}d}7 with pressure against \textit{\textup{\textbf{d4}}}.

6.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qb}}5} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qd}}7} 7.0-0 \textit{\textup{\textbf{Wb}}6}

Not 7...\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxe}}5} on account of 8.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxe}}5} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxb}}5} 9.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Wh}}5}f7 10.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qf}}7}f6 11.\textit{\textup{\textbf{dxc}}5}f6 12.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}1}f5 13.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qh}}5}f5 g5 and 14.g4 mate.

8.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxc}}6} \textit{\textup{\textbf{bxc}}6} 9.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxf}}6} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxf}}6}

I would have chosen 9...\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxf}}6}.

10.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}5} \textit{\textup{\textbf{d6}}} 11.\textit{\textup{\textbf{dxc}}5} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxc}}5} 12.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qg}}5}

This move, which leads to a total blockade of Black's central pawns, is the point behind White's moves 8-12.

12...\textit{\textup{\textbf{Wd}}8} 13.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxf}}6} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxf}}6} 14.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qh}}5}f6 15.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Wc}}2} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qd}}8} 16.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qd}}2} 0-0 17.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qae}}1} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}8} 18.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qh}}1} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qd}}6} 19.\textit{\textup{\textbf{f4}}} c5 20.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qc}}4} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qf}}8}

The bridge between a blockading game (which is always a little devious) and outright attacking play is never an easy one to build. Now I think that this might best have been achieved by 20.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Wxa}}6}, e.g. 20.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxa}}6} \textit{\textup{\textbf{b}}8} 21.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qb}}3} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}7} 22.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qa}}5} or 20.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qa}}6} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}7} 21.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qf}}3}? and White is threatening, according to how things turn out, to follow up with \textit{\textup{\textbf{Wxa}}7} or \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qg}}5}.

After 20.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qc}}4} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qf}}8} Black loses a pawn, but the loss is rather pleasant, because now the bishops come into play and White will not find it easy to suddenly change his own game which has been based on blockading.

21.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxd}}5} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qc}}8} 22.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qe}}4} \textit{\textup{\textbf{Qg}}7} 23.\textit{\textup{\textbf{Qxe}}6}

After 23.\textit{\textup{\textbf{d6}}}! the aforementioned change would not have been necessary, but I wanted to "evaluate" the pawn sacrifice; 23.\textit{\textup{\textbf{d6}}} would have won easily.
23...\textit{\textbf{a}}xe6 24.\textit{\textbf{a}}a6 25.\textit{\textbf{h}}h8 26.\textit{\textbf{d}}d1 27.b3 28.\textit{\textbf{a}}d4 29.\textit{\textbf{e}}xd4 30.\textit{\textbf{b}}b7 31.\textit{\textbf{c}}c5

White avoids provoking the mighty bishops by some sort of diversion with a knight (\textit{\textbf{g}}g5). With the text move he prevents \textit{\textbf{d}}d8, but allows the occupation of the c-file. The struggle now becomes very dramatic.

Black's attack now seems all-powerful.

32.\textit{\textbf{d}}d8!!

The surprising point of this is 32...\textit{\textbf{x}}xd4 33.\textit{\textbf{e}}xd4 \textit{\textbf{g}}7 (or worse will happen) 34.\textit{\textbf{d}}d6! and then 35.\textit{\textbf{e}}e8 with an immediate win. Now I ask whether this salvation can be considered as mere chance? No, because the whole procedure is typical.

If your opponent manages to break your central blockade by means of a pawn sacrifice, then just sit tight in the centre and wait for the opportunity to use a central blockading diagonal for a return sacrifice. This return sacrifice will then be decisive in its effect.

32...\textit{\textbf{c}}c7 33.\textit{\textbf{d}}d7 34.\textit{\textbf{a}}a6 35.\textit{\textbf{d}}d3

In order to play \textit{\textbf{d}}d4. Once again we have the blockading diagonal d4-h8!

34...\textit{\textbf{f}}f8 35.\textit{\textbf{f}}f7+ \textit{\textbf{x}}xf7

Or 35...\textit{\textbf{g}}7 36.\textit{\textbf{d}}d4+ and mate in two moves.

36.\textit{\textbf{xf}}7 37.\textit{\textbf{c}}c8

A complete debacle.

1-e4 6 2.d4 65 3.\textit{\textbf{c}}c3 6b4 4.exd5 exd5 5.\textit{\textbf{d}}d3
\( \text{\textit{D}}e7. \text{\textit{D}}e2 \text{O-O O-O 7.O-O 0}\text{\textit{D}}g4 8.\text{\textit{D}}f3 0\text{\textit{D}}h5 \)

A slight weakness has arisen on e3, which can only be exposed by the rather bold-looking advance c7-c5.

9.\text{\textit{D}}f4 \text{\textit{D}}g6 10.0\text{\textit{D}}ce2 \text{\textit{D}}d6 11.\text{\textit{D}}e1

Black is clearly superior.

19.\text{\textit{D}}f3 0\text{\textit{D}}b4

This seizes the e3-square for the black pieces.

20.a3 0\text{\textit{D}}xd2 21.0\text{\textit{D}}xd2 a5 22.\text{\textit{D}}g1 0\text{\textit{D}}e3 23.\text{\textit{D}}d1 0\text{\textit{D}}ae8 24.\text{\textit{D}}f2

The central territory here is similar to the one we saw in game 7. Here too the d4-pawn is the nucleus of the centralization, and the e3-square and the e-file which goes with it seem logically connected to it. And, in both games, Black's central pressure leads (or should lead) to the destruction of the white blockade on d3.

Next came:

24...\text{\textit{D}}b3 25.\text{\textit{D}}d2 \text{\textit{D}}d6 26.c5 \text{\textit{D}}c4 27.\text{\textit{D}}xc4 0\text{\textit{D}}xc4

\text{\textit{D}}h5 17.\text{\textit{D}}f5 18.\text{\textit{D}}c3

This can be classified as "neglect of the central complex". Our central focussing lens clearly indicates 11.\text{\textit{D}}xg6 and 12.\text{\textit{D}}d3, and then the central squares c5 and e5 appear fixed.

11...\text{\textit{D}}c5 12.\text{\textit{D}}xc5 \text{\textit{D}}xc5 13.\text{\textit{D}}h1 \text{\textit{D}}bc6 14.\text{\textit{D}}d2 \text{\textit{D}}e8 15.\text{\textit{D}}xg6 h\text{\textit{D}}xg6 16.f4

A flank attack when the central position is inferior! Instead of this, the relatively best try was 16.\text{\textit{D}}h4 17.\text{\textit{D}}xg8 17.\text{\textit{D}}xg8 17.\text{\textit{D}}xd8 \text{\textit{D}}axd8 with only a slight endgame advantage for Black.

17...\text{\textit{D}}f5 17.c3

Task completed, the blockade has fallen! You should now attempt the following test: first, on a separate board set up the position from the diagram on page 22, game 7; add the moves 25...\text{\textit{D}}h8 26.\text{\textit{D}}f4 and then study the note to move 26. Once you have done that, compare how matters developed there compared to the present game (game 9, moves 24-27). Then you should try to identify and understand the different strategies used in each case. Our explanation will be given at the end of the game.

28.\text{\textit{D}}c2 0\text{\textit{D}}d5 29.\text{\textit{D}}c1 0\text{\textit{D}}e4

And now lines such as 30...\text{\textit{D}}xf3 31.\text{\textit{D}}xf3 0\text{\textit{D}}xf3 32.\text{\textit{D}}xf3 0\text{\textit{D}}e2 are in the air, with a decisive seizure of the second rank.

30.\text{\textit{D}}f5

An ingenious attempt to save himself.
30...\textit{\textit{exf3} 31.\textit{\textit{exf3} \textit{wxf5}} 32.b4! axb4 33.axb4 \textit{\textit{dxb4}}}

The continuation 33...\textit{\textit{e5}} is also not bad, e.g. 34.\textit{\textit{exe1 e6}}.

34.\textit{\textit{dxd4 d3 35.c2}}

Not 35.\textit{\textit{ex3}} on account of 31...\textit{\textit{exe1}}† then ...	extit{\textit{fxf1}}† and ...	extit{\textit{fxfx2}} mate.

35...\textit{\textit{ec8}}

A tempting but bad try would be 35...\textit{\textit{e1}}:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
& & \\
\hline
& & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

on account of 36.\textit{\textit{exe2}}!! \textit{\textit{exe2}} 37.\textit{\textit{d8}}† \textit{\textit{h7}} 38.\textit{\textit{g5}}† \textit{\textit{h6}} 39.\textit{\textit{fxf7}}† \textit{\textit{h5}} 40.\textit{\textit{h8}}† \textit{\textit{g4}} 41.\textit{\textit{he3}}† \textit{\textit{f4}} 42.\textit{\textit{g3}}† \textit{\textit{e4}} 43.\textit{\textit{d6}}† winning the queen².

36.\textit{\textit{c3 xc5}}

We have to be clear about this: Black's continuation from moves 34 to 37 should be understood as being a centralization undertaken based on the central diagonal f5-b1. The rest is then a matter of technique, above all the technique of the crouching (or frog) position. Next came:

37.\textit{b4 b6 38.\textit{g5 e8}}!

No false shame now, the crouching position is only temporary.

39.\textit{\textit{f3 d7 40.c4 d6 41.d3 d8 42.b5}}

The rook ending after 42.\textit{\textit{exe8 exe8}} 43.\textit{\textit{exe6 fxe6 44.d6 b8 45.exe6 f7}} would offer no prospects to White.

42.\textit{\textit{exe1}}† 43.\textit{\textit{h2 f1f1}}† 44.\textit{\textit{g3 f2f2}}† 45.\textit{\textit{h1 f1f1}}† 46.\textit{\textit{h2 c5}}

0–1

N.B. the answer to the question asked in the note to move 27.

In game 9, the blockader falls in defence, in game 7 during an attack which his side was obliged to undertake. The attack in game 7 can be considered to be unwillingly pursued since White would otherwise have been crushed by his opponent's central mass. This ability to force a decentralized opponent into a premature flank attack is very typical of a powerfully centralized position.

\textbf{Game 10}

\textbf{Richard Réti}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

Marienbad 1925

The introductory moves led via hypermodern-looking paths to a pawn formation well known from the Exchange Variation of the French Defence.

1.\textit{c4 e5 2.\textit{d3 d4 3.c4 c6 4.d2 c5 5.d3 f6 6.d4 exd3 7.exd3 d5 8.d4 e7}}

And next came in enterprising blockading style:

9.\textit{c5 f5}

Attempting to break open the position with 9...\textit{\textit{b6}} would have been premature, e.g. 9...\textit{\textit{b6}} 10.b4 a5 11.b5 and then c6.

10.\textit{\textit{d3}}

Of course 10.\textit{\textit{b5}} and then possibly \textit{\textit{exc6}} would have been the natural continuation.

10...\textit{\textit{xd3 11.d3 b6}}

Now is the correct time!

12.0–0
12.b4 a5 13.b5 now fails to 13...b4 gaining a tempo.
12...0-0
12...bxc5 and then 13...xc5 does not work because of 14.e5.
13.xg5! h6! 14.h4 bxc5 15.dxc5 e5 16.d4
g6 17.g3 c6
Black has a good d-pawn (which is badly blockaded) and the possibility of an attack on c5. The possession of the central diagonal g3-b8 does not seem to me to be full compensation for that. White should have played 10.xb5.
18.b4 xc8 19.h3 xe8
A move which clears space for the knight and at the same time starts the occupation of the central file, which the opponent cannot contest on account of the difficulties he has with c5.
20.ad1 f8 21.d3 a5
I saw that this would force 22.a4 and for that case I had worked out a very original centralizing manoeuvre.
22.a4
22.b4 a3 23.b1 e6 24.e5 d7 25.e1 xc5 26.bxc5 f6 would be bad.
22...xa4 23.xa4 e4
The knight now occupies the centre which has been freed by the diversion of its counterpart.
24.h2 c6
What is it aiming to do? The c5-pawn is easily protected!
25.b4
Seconded in an extremely unusual way! Two knights, one which can be driven away (by f3) and the other which is not protected... and yet they are masters of the board.
26.e1
26.f3 d2+ and then ...d4 g3+.
26.h4!
The triple alliance is complete.
27.e5
White was already in difficulties. The text move loses a pawn.
27...xe5
And then came:
28.xe5 xf2+ 29.xf2 xe1 30.xd4 g3
31.f3 e8 32.d1 e6 33.c1 f8
The king moves towards the threatened flank.
34.c3 xc3 35.xc3 e4 36.a3 d8 37.d3
An elegant move, which prepares to answer ...d7 with b5.
37...a6 38.d4 f5 39.a4 d7 40.b5
This fails to a small and yet study-like subtlety.
40...xb5 41.axb5 cxb5 42.xd5+
42...c6!!
Just like in game 1, the extra material is returned with thanks.
43.d4
Or 43.xf5 b4, etc.
43...xc5 44.xe4 xe4 45.d2 d4 46.e2
f4 47.b3+ c4 48.a5 c3 49.b7 b4
50.c5 c2 51.g3 xg3
0-1
Game 11
Grigory Levenfish
Aron Nimzowitsch
Vilnius 1912

1.e4 c6 2.c4 e6 3.d3 d5 4.exd5 exd5 5.cxd5

This allows Black's forces to be developed without disruption.
6...cxd5 7.0-0 d6
8.d4 g7 9.g5 f6 10.h4 0-0 11.bd2 g4
12.xc6 xc6 13.b3 b4

Reducing to absurdity White's attempts to show up his opponent's set-up as unstable.

14.e5

Directed against the threat of 14...b6.

14...xex5

14...xd2 15.xg4 g5 16.g3 f5 17.xb7 w8 would fail to the amusing reply 18.e5! xex5
19.wxc8 then 20.xe5 with a pawn plus, even if it is hard to make anything of it.

15.xb4

22.xe1 23.xe2 xg2 24.d2 h4 25.f3 g6

Consolidation by concentrating forces in the rear. This seems particularly appropriate after the success of the raid, since such raids are often somewhat disorganizing as your forces become separated from each other.

26.h1 g4 27.d2 d7 28.g1 c2

That too!

29.h3 g3

0-1

An amusing little game!

Game 12
Dr Saviely Tartakower
Aron Nimzowitsch
London 1927

1.d4 e6 2.f3 f6 3.e3 b6 4.d3 b7 5.bd2 c5 6.0-0 c6 7.c3 e8 8.e2 e7 9.dxc5 bxc5
10.e4 d5 11.exd5 exd5

Black has set up his position in an original fashion (moves 8 and 11). Play is approximately level, but even in this position Black has, as it were, preferential shares in the business of the centre, although they are hardly noticeable. Next came:

12.a6 xa6 13.xa6 0-0 14.ad1 a7 15.f1 b8 16.e2 fd8

16.e8 can be rejected since what is happening here is above all a consolidation of the position; the valuable d-pawn deserves a worthy escort.

17.e3 h6!
Central tactics: my intention was to deprive my opponent of almost all the central squares; his only central square f5 now loses most of its value (because f1-g3-f5 would simply be met by ...d8, and White would not have a suitable attacking continuation since g5 is prevented.

18.\( \texttt{\textit{f3}} \) \( \texttt{g3} \) \( \texttt{f8} \) 19.\( \texttt{w2} \) \( \texttt{g4} \)

Black is searching for central positions (the e5-square).

20.\( \texttt{f1} \) \( \texttt{ce5} \) 21.\( \texttt{xe5} \) \( \texttt{xe5} \) 22.\( \texttt{b3} \) \( \texttt{a5}! \)

An attack which is built on centralization.

23.\( \texttt{d2} \) \( \texttt{c4} \)

Another, possibly even "sounder" plan here consisted of ...\( \texttt{d7} \), ...\( \texttt{bd8} \) and ...\( \texttt{a5-a4} \); if bxa4 then ...\( \texttt{c4} \) and the rooks go on to infiltrate via the b-file.

24.\( \texttt{bxc4} \)

24.\( \texttt{ad1} \) would be a better defence, and if 24...\( \texttt{d3} \) then an exchange sacrifice on d3.

24.\( \texttt{xc4} \) 25.\( \texttt{d3} \)

25...\( \texttt{a4}! \)

An important entry point should now be created on b2 by means of a4-a3.

26.\( \texttt{d2} \) \( \texttt{xe3!} \) 27.\( \texttt{fxe3} \)

After 27.\( \texttt{exe3} \) \( \texttt{d4} \) 28.\( \texttt{ad3} \) \( \texttt{b4} \) White would for the first time be in real danger.

27...\( \texttt{a7} \) 28.\( \texttt{ab1} \) \( \texttt{xb1} \) 29.\( \texttt{xb1} \) \( \texttt{ac5} \) 30.\( \texttt{f2} \) \( \texttt{b8} \) 31.\( \texttt{c2} \) \( \texttt{d7} \)

White’s weaknesses, the e3-pawn, the b2-square and the somewhat vulnerable king position are now treated according to the rules of the art (see Chapter 5 on manoeuvring techniques against weaknesses, page 137).

32.\( \texttt{f3} \)

32.c4? d4!

32...\( \texttt{e6} \) 33.\( \texttt{c2} \)

33.\( \texttt{xa4} \) \( \texttt{xe3!} \)

33...\( \texttt{a3}! \)

At last!

34.\( \texttt{d2} \) \( \texttt{b1} \) 35.\( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 36.\( \texttt{f3} \) \( \texttt{e5} \)

And Black has reached his high point, both in the centre and on the flank. (Because what could be more "central" than e5, and what could be more effective than an infiltrating rook, which in addition controls the 2nd rank?)

37.\( \texttt{g3} \)

An error which should decide matters at once, but which was not exploited by Black. The only possible move was 37.\( \texttt{g3} \) which would be followed by 37...\( \texttt{xd4} \) 38.\( \texttt{cx} \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{e6} \) and White can still put up some (feeble) resistance. A plausible variation might be 39.\( \texttt{f7} \) (to anticipate ...\( \texttt{a6} \) ) 39...\( \texttt{a6} \) 40.\( \texttt{d8} \) 41.\( \texttt{xd5} \) \( \texttt{f1} \) 42.\( \texttt{g3} \) \( \texttt{b2} \) and wins. Worth noticing here is the decisive cooperation of the a3-pawn.

37...\( \texttt{xd4} \)?

There was an immediate win with 37...\( \texttt{c1} \). If 38.\( \texttt{e2} \) then 38...\( \texttt{xe3!} \) or if 38.\( \texttt{c6} \) then 38...\( \texttt{xc3} \) (the simplest) and wins.

38.\( \texttt{xd4} \) \( \texttt{e6} \) 39.\( \texttt{g2} \)

Enabling \( \texttt{f2} \) with some counterplay down the f-file, but White’s game cannot be held.

39...\( \texttt{b2} \)
Black’s main trump!

40.\textit{\textbf{xf2}} f5 41.\textit{\textbf{g1}} \textit{\textbf{b1}}

Time trouble. The correct move was 41...\textit{\textbf{h7}}
42.\textit{\textbf{g2}} (The f-pawn is untouchable, e.g. 42.\textit{\textbf{xf5}}
\textit{\textbf{xf5}} 43.\textit{\textbf{xf5}} \textit{\textbf{xa2}} 44.\textit{\textbf{xd5}} \textit{\textbf{b2}} and Black forces
the a-pawn through.) 42...\textit{\textbf{g6}} 43.\textit{\textbf{g1}} \textit{\textbf{e4}} and
wins in similar fashion to the game.

42.\textit{\textbf{g2}} g6

Protecting the f-pawn directly like this is far
from being as effective as protecting it indirectly,
cf. the previous note.

43.\textit{\textbf{xf4}} \textit{\textbf{e4}} 44.\textit{\textbf{xe4}} \textit{\textbf{dxe4}}

45.\textit{\textbf{xe2}}

Black is back on track. After 45.g4 fxg4 things
would have come to a halt, e.g. 46.\textit{\textbf{f6}} \textit{\textbf{b2}} 47.\textit{\textbf{g3!}} (certainly not back to the first rank) and
White need not lose. It is clear that this saving
possibility which came out of the blue was never
really “on”, because after 41...\textit{\textbf{h7}} and 42...\textit{\textbf{g6}}
Black could have exchanged queens without
allowing White any hope of a breakthrough.

45...\textit{\textbf{f7}}

What follows is an endgame which is charming
in its simplicity and which is a model of the special
case I treated in My System: the 7\textsuperscript{th} rank “absolute”
together with a passed pawn almost always wins.

(We call it “absolute” whenever, as is the case
here, the rook shuts the king in on the 8\textsuperscript{th} or 1\textsuperscript{st}
rank.)

46.\textit{\textbf{xf2}} \textit{\textbf{e6}} 47.\textit{\textbf{xd2}} \textit{\textbf{d5}} 48.\textit{\textbf{e2}} \textit{\textbf{b2}}

The sealed move, after which Black had foreseen
the following breakthrough:

49.\textit{\textbf{d1}}

Threatening to eliminate the annoying invader:
the b2-rook.

49...\textit{\textbf{g5}}

A rescue attempt from the other side. After
50.\textit{\textbf{xb2}} axb2 51.\textit{\textbf{c2}} f4 White is lost.

50.\textit{\textbf{c2}} f4! 51.\textit{\textbf{xf4}} \textit{\textbf{xf4}} 52.\textit{\textbf{c5}} \textit{\textbf{d6}} 53.\textit{\textbf{exf4}}
\textit{\textbf{xa2}}

We now have the 7\textsuperscript{th} rank “absolute” and a
passed pawn.

54.\textit{\textbf{a5}} e3 55.\textit{\textbf{e1}} \textit{\textbf{a1}} 56.\textit{\textbf{e2}} a2 57.\textit{\textbf{f5}} \textit{\textbf{h1}}

Black won in a few moves.

58.\textit{\textbf{xe3}} a1 59.\textit{\textbf{xa1}} \textit{\textbf{xa1}} 60.\textit{\textbf{f4}} \textit{\textbf{g1}} 61.\textit{\textbf{h3}}
\textit{\textbf{d5}} 62.\textit{\textbf{h4}} h5 63.\textit{\textbf{f6}} \textit{\textbf{e6}} 64.\textit{\textbf{f7}} \textit{\textbf{g4}} 65.\textit{\textbf{f3}}
\textit{\textbf{xf7}}

0–1

In spite of the carelessness on move 41, the
main idea stands out clearly: the combination of
pressure in the centre and a flanking manoeuvre.
An instructive example!

Game 13
Fritz Sämisch
Aron Nimzowitsch
Berlin 1928

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.\textit{\textbf{c3}} \textit{\textbf{f6}} 4.\textit{\textbf{g5}} \textit{\textbf{e7}} 5.e5
\textit{\textbf{g8}}

With this move, which has a bad reputation,
Black introduces a new and noteworthy plan of
campaign.

6.\textit{\textbf{e3}} b6
This is the point: the plan is to play $\text{a6}$ to exchange the light-squared bishops.

7.$\text{g4}$ $\text{g6}$ 8.$\text{h4}$ $\text{h5}$ 9.$\text{g3}$ $\text{a6}$ 10.$\text{f3}$ $\text{xf1}$

11.$\text{xf1}$ $\text{d7}$

Now amongst other threats there is the diversion ...$\text{c6}$, followed by ...$\text{b6}$-$\text{b5}$-$\text{b4}$. Notice how the white squares such as c2, c4 and b5 suffer from a certain weakness; that was the point behind the exchange of bishops.

12.$\text{a3}$ $\text{c6}$

Black can be content with his queen's transfer to d7. After all, a3 is now a weakness.

13.$\text{d1}$

White defends prophylactically, which makes the game more interesting. Sämisch, moreover, is one of those few players who fight for the central points. He is indeed a player with a brilliant sense of strategy.

13.$\text{a5}$ 14.$\text{g5}$ $\text{h6}$ 15.$\text{c1}$ 0–0–0 16.$\text{d3}$

$\text{b8}$ 17.$\text{b3}$

White's position now looks to be well consolidated, since the danger that will be posed by Black's knight on c4 may be considered to be purely localized. After ...$\text{c7}$-$\text{c5}$ there can always be d4xc5 with defensive chances (based on the d-file), and, what is the most important, the g5-knight, which can never be exchanged without conceding to the recapturing bishop a marvellous diagonal, keeps the whole kingside under pressure.

17.$\text{ed8}$

As will be seen shortly, this move is not without its sting.

18.$\text{g1}$

He underestimates the danger; the rook had to go to f3 at once, because now its exit will be blocked. After 18.$\text{f3}$ there would come 18.$\text{f5}$ 19.$\text{g3}$ $\text{f6}$ 20.$\text{exf6}$ $\text{xf6}$ (threatening ...$\text{c6}$ then e6-e5) 21.$\text{e1}$! $\text{e8}$! 22.$\text{f4}$! $\text{xe5}$ (not 22...$\text{d5}$ on account of the exchange sacrifice 23.$\text{dxe5}$ $\text{hxg5}$ 24.$\text{xd5}$ $\text{xf4}$ 25.$\text{xf4}$) 23.$\text{hxg5}$ $\text{c6}$ and Black would have something of an advantage because of the chance of a breakthrough with e6-e5. The opening has turned out in Black's favour.

18.$\text{f5}$ 19.$\text{e2}$ $\text{d8}$!

Now 19...$\text{f6}$ would not be so strong because of 20.$\text{f3}$.

20.$\text{g3}$

The threat was 20...$\text{xh4}$, see the first part of the note to move 18.

20...$\text{c5}$ 21.$\text{dxc5}$ $\text{bxc5}$ 22.$\text{g2}$ $\text{b6}$

The idea now is to attack the e-pawn intensively, until f4 is played; then ...$\text{xe5}$ will finally be played as the c1-bishop can no longer recapture and so the "$\text{g5}$ problem" appears to be solved!

23.$\text{f4}$

He could have delayed $\text{f2}$-$\text{f4}$ for a few moves, but Sämisch, for whom consolidation has become a psychological necessity, cannot stand the sight of unprotected pawns.

23.$\text{xg5}$ 24.$\text{hxg5}$ $\text{c8}$ 25.$\text{h2}$ $\text{h6}$

The newly available rooks become gluttons for work.

26.$\text{h3}$ $\text{d4}$
A slow advance of the central pawn mass accompanied, step by step, by the centralization of the pieces which support the advance.

27.\( \text{c}f3 \text{d}d5 \text{c}b3 \text{c}4! 29.\text{b}4 \text{c}c6 30.\text{c}3 \text{d}3 \)

This leads to a pleasing and apparently correct continuation. And yet from a practical point of view it would have been better to give preference to the strategy of simplification which we have illustrated on several occasions: Black would have been able without any special effort to carry over into the endgame parts of the centralization, as follows: 30.\( \text{c}c8d8 \text{c}c4d4 32.\text{c}xd4 \text{c}xd4 \text{c}e4 \text{d}f3 \text{e}3 \text{c}c7 would have won easily.

43.\( \text{d}h2 \text{b}7 44.a4 \text{c}c6 45.a5 \text{d}d5 46.h5 gxh5 47.\text{a}xh5 \)

There now begins, as it were, a whole new game after Sämisch missed a chance to draw.

47.\( \text{e}2e2 48.\text{h}2d1 49.\text{d}f2 \text{e}4 50.\text{h}2 \text{f}5 51.\text{g}2 \text{f}1 52.\text{g}3 \text{e}4 53.\text{f}2 \text{h}1 54.\text{g}2 \text{d}4 55.\text{h}2 \text{d}1 56.\text{f}2 \text{c}4 57.\text{f}2 \text{h}1 58.\text{h}2 \text{e}4 59.\text{f}2 \text{b}3 60.\text{h}2 \text{c}2 61.\text{f}2 \text{d}1 \text{c}c6 \text{g}4 \text{c}2 64.\text{g}3 \)

40...\( \text{c}xd3 41.\text{c}xd4 \text{c}xd4 42.\text{g}3 \text{e}4? \)

42...\( \text{a}1 \text{f}3 \text{a}3 \text{e}3 \text{c}7 \)

If 34.\( \text{c}c1 \) then 34...\( \text{c}xd1 35.\text{c}xd1 \text{f}3 36.\text{e}2 \text{c}8 37.\text{a}4 \text{f}3 \) and wins, or 37.\( \text{a}4 \text{c}7 \) followed by ...\( \text{d}5 \) and ...\( \text{e}3 \) with an immediate win.

34...\( \text{c}d3 35.\text{f}3 \text{d}8 36.\text{f}1 \text{d}5 37.\text{f}2 \text{d}3 \)

37...\( \text{h}4 \)

The triumph of middlegame-style centralization. White now loses his queen.

38.\( \text{c}xh4 \text{d}4 39.\text{c}xd4 \text{c}xd4 40.\text{c}xd3 \)

He had nothing better. The endgame should now be an easy win, but tiredness (which would hardly have set in if I had played ...\( \text{c}d8 \) instead of the pawn sacrifice) caused Black to make a serious mistake, which nearly deprived me of the fruits of my labours.

64...\( \text{c}xd2 \)

The only chance!

65.\( \text{c}xd2 \text{f}5! \text{c}e3 67.\text{g}6 \text{f}xg6 68.\text{f}6? \)

He is afraid of ghosts. 68.\( \text{f}xg6 \) would have led to a draw. e.g. 68...\( \text{d}2 69.\text{c}7 \text{d}1 \text{c}7 70.\text{e}8 \text{f}3 71.\text{h}2 \text{f}2 72.\text{g}x6. \)

68...\( \text{d}2 69.\text{f}7 \text{d}1 \text{f}1 70.\text{f}8 \text{g}1 71.\text{h}3 \text{e}4 72.b5 \text{h}1 73.\text{g}3 \text{e}1 74.\text{g}4 \text{a}5 75.\text{d}6 \text{b}6 76.\text{g}5 \text{xb}5 77.\text{f}6 \text{f}1 78.\text{g}7 \text{f}5 79.\text{c}6 \text{e}5 80.\text{c}5 \text{e}4 81.\text{a}7 \text{e}5 82.\text{g}1 \text{d}5 83.\text{d}1 \text{c}5 84.\text{c}1 \text{b}5 85.\text{b}2 \text{c}6 86.\text{c}3 \text{d}7 87.\text{d}2 \text{e}8 88.\text{d}5? \text{d}7 0–1.

After 88.\( \text{a}5 \) White could still put up some resistance; a very interesting queen ending.
Game 14
Alexander Alekhine
Aron Nimzowitsch
St Petersburg 1914; play-off for the first prize in
the St Petersburg tournament

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3...c3 Qf6 4.exd5 Qxd5
5...f3 b6 6...b5† c6 7...d3 Qe7 8.0-0 Qd7
9...xd5 cxd5 10...e2 0-0 11...f4 Qb7 12.c3
Qf6 13...fe1 Qe7 14.Qa6 Qxa6 15.Qxa6
Qb8 16.Qb5 Qb7 17.Qe3 Qc6 18.Qd3 g6
19...h6 Qg7 20.Qxg7 Qxg7 21.Qae1 Qc7
22.h4 Qae8 23.h5 Qf4 24.Qe5 Qxe5 25.Qxe5
Qe7 26.g3 Qf6 27.Qe3 Qd8 28.Qg2 Qed7
29.Qh1 Qf8 30.Qh4 Qe8 31.Qh6 Qe7 32.Qf4
Qh8 33.Qe1 Qe8 34.Qh1 Qg8 35.Qg5†
Qd6 36.Qe5† Qc6 37.a4 Qb7 38.Qa1 Qe8
39.Qf6 Qd8 40.Qf3 Qh8 41.Qe2 a6 42.Qe3
Qg7 43.h6 Qf8 44.Qe5 Qh8 45.Qf6 Qf8
46.Qh1 Qd8

47.Qf4

Compare this position with that in game 12
after Black's 33rd move; the difference lies in the
way in which the flank attack is carried out; in
game 12 the advanced pawn was backed up
along a file, here it is by a diagonal. The diagonal,
however, has less force.

47...Qc4

White's planned combined play in the centre
and on the kingside fails because of the weakness
of his own queenside, see introductory remarks.
Instead of the text move it was possible to put
the queens opposite each other, e.g. 47...h8
48.Qg7 Qxg7 49.hxg7 h5 50.g4 Qg8 51.gxh5
gxh5 52.Qxh5 Qxg7† 53.Qf3 and now something
like 53...a5 followed by a possible ...b5. Black
should be able to hold the rook ending. But the
text move is much better.

48.Qa1

Not the sort of move one likes to make, but
49.Qg7 was refuted by 49...f5, e.g. 50.Qe5 Qxa4
51.Qxe6 Qe7 52.Qf6 Qd8 and Black is better.

48...Qc6 49.Qf6

49.Qg7 would be quite dangerous on account
of 49...f5 50.Qe5 Qg5 51.Qh1 Qe7 and then
...Qe4.

49...Qb8 50.Qe3 Qe7 51.Qf3 Qe8 52.g4 Qd7
53.Qe1 Qc7

Black has made good progress: the f7-pawn is
protected, a4 is being attacked, and it is hard for
White to get to g7.

54.b3

This weakens the queenside even more.

54...Qa7 55.g5 Qd6 56.Qd3 Qa3

And Black moves over to the attack.

57.Qc2 Qb4 58.Qc1 Qd6 59.Qd3 Qa3 60.Qb1
If instead 60.Qc2 then 60...Qc6 and ...Qc7.

60...Qa2 61.Qb3 c5

Now that the breakthrough has been made
possible, White's creaking position can no longer
be held. Next came:

62.Qe3 c4 63.Qd1 f5 64.Qxf6 Qf7 65.Qa1 Qb2
66.Qb1 Qa3 67.c4 Qxf6 68.Qxd5 Qc7 69.Qe2
Qd6 70.Qc2 Qxd5
Black has achieved a powerful attack on the king.
71.\(\mathcal{f}1\)

71...\(e3\) 72.\(\mathcal{X}e3\) \(\mathcal{W}h1\)
Better than 72...\(\mathcal{X}xf2\)†.
73.\(\mathcal{W}e2\) \(\mathcal{X}xf2\)† 74.\(\mathcal{W}d3\) \(\mathcal{W}d5\) 75.\(\mathcal{W}c8\) \(\mathcal{W}d7\)
0–1
White resigned because of 76.\(\mathcal{X}e4\) \(\mathcal{X}f3\)† 77.\(\mathcal{W}d2\)
\(\mathcal{W}g5\)† which leads to mate.

Game 15
Aron Nimzowitsch
Alexander Alekhine
Semmering 1926

1.e4 \(\mathcal{Q}f6\) 2.\(\mathcal{Q}c3\) \(d5\) 3.\(e5\) \(\mathcal{Q}d7\) 4.f4 \(e6\) 5.\(\mathcal{Q}f3\) c5
6.g3 \(\mathcal{Q}c6\) 7.\(g2\)
Black’s kingside seems somewhat cramped, but in return his centre is all the more mobile.
7...\(\mathcal{Q}c7\) 8.0–0 0–0 9.d3 \(\mathcal{Q}b6\)
9...d4 would be bad on account of 10.\(\mathcal{Q}e4\), centralizing; on the other hand, 9...\(f6\) was well worth considering, e.g. 10.\(\mathcal{X}xf6\) \(\mathcal{X}xf6\) and Black controls the centre.
10.\(\mathcal{Q}e2\) d4?!
Black wishes to brand White’s knight move as an error, because now the knight cannot return to e4. But this is a mistake and so 10...d4 should have been replaced by 10...\(f6\), e.g. 10...\(f6\) 11.\(\mathcal{X}xf6\) \(\mathcal{X}xf6\) 12.c3 e5 13.\(\mathcal{X}xe5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe5\) and Black is not badly off.

11.g4! \(f6\)
This move, which Black had avoided twice, now leads – thanks to the weakening of e4 – to a not very enjoyable result for Black. The prophylactic defence 11...\(\mathcal{E}e8\) 12.\(\mathcal{G}g3\) \(\mathcal{F}f8\) 13.\(\mathcal{E}e4\) \(\mathcal{D}d5\) (preventing f4-f5) should have been preferred.
12.\(\mathcal{X}xf6\) \(gx\mathcal{F}\)
Nor would 12...\(\mathcal{X}xf6\) 13.\(\mathcal{G}g3\) e5 14.\(f5\) have been especially pleasant.
13.\(\mathcal{G}g3\) \(\mathcal{D}d5\)
Black is seeking to protect his threatened wing from the centre; it should not have succeeded.
14.\(\mathcal{W}e2\) \(\mathcal{D}d6\) 15.\(\mathcal{H}h4\)
In order to threaten \(\mathcal{X}xd5\) and then \(\mathcal{F}f5\).
15...\(\mathcal{Q}e7\) 16.\(\mathcal{D}d2\)
16.\(\mathcal{H}h5\) was sharper, e.g. 16...\(\mathcal{G}g6\) 17.\(\mathcal{X}xd5\) exd5 18.\(\mathcal{F}f5\) with a winning attack.
16...\(\mathcal{W}c7\) 17.\(\mathcal{W}f2\)
17.\(\mathcal{H}h5\) was still preferable.
17...c4! 18.dxc4 Qe3!
With this ingenious diversion Dr Alekhine manages to bring his opponent’s attack to a standstill for some time.

19.Qxe3 dxe3 20.Bf3 Bxc4
The position has cleared up to some extent: Black has a passed pawn, which may be sickly but is highly unlikely to die; what we mean is that the bishop diagonals c6-h1 (after a later ...Qc8-d7-c6) and c5-g1 would be compensation for the loss of the pawn. It would be more important for White to continue with the kingside attack rather than run after the dubious win of a pawn; this should be done by g4-g5. Omitting this move brings White the inferior game.

21.Qe4 Qc7 22.b3 Qd4 23.c3 Qb6 24.Qh1
With this White has managed to limit his opponent’s breakthrough.

24...Qd5
Better would be 24...Qd7.

30.Qxe3 Qc6 31.Qae1 Qd5
31...Qg8 would have allowed Black to increase the pressure.

32.Qd3 Qxc3
Nice, but not sufficient. In any case, accepting the sacrifice was damaging (33.Qxc3 Qxc3 34.Qxc3 Qf2) but White has a truly amazing counter combination at his disposal.

33.Qg6+ hxg6 34.Qg4!!
The point. Hitting out at once would be bad: 34.fxg5 Qg7 35.Qh3 Qh8 36.Qd7+ Qxd7 37.Qxd7+ Qg6 and White is threatened with mate on h2.

34...Qf7
34...Qg8 was indicated. The continuation would be: 35.fxg5 Qg7 36.Qd7+ Qxd7 37.Qxd7+ Qg6 38.Qd3! Qh6 39.Qh3+ Qg7 40.Qg1+ Qxg1! And a win for White is still far away.

35.Qh3+ Qg7 36.Ac4! Qd5 37.fxg6 Qxe4 38.Qxf7+ Qf8 39.Qxe4
There was a simpler win after 39.Qg8+ Qe7 40.Qf8+ Qxf8 41.Qh7+ Qe8 42.Qxd5.

39...Qxe4+ 40.Qxe4 Qc7 41.Qf8+ Qxf8
The passed pawn’s lust to expand!

41...Qxf8 42.Qd5 Qd6
42...Qc6 would lead not so much to an exchange of queens as to the loss of his queen, namely by 43.Qh7+ Qe8 44.Qb5.

43.Qxb7+ Qd8 44.Qd3 Qd4 45.Qe4 Qe8 46.Qxd4
1–0
5. A mobile pawn mass in the centre • How the contact is maintained between the advancing pawns and pieces supporting the advance

In game 13 (see Black’s moves 26 and 27 and also the variation given in the note to move 30 (30...Kh8 31.cxd4, etc. p. 32) we have already experienced the procedure mentioned above: in that case the pawn advance was in no way an isolated, self-contained incident. No, on the contrary it drew its force from the readiness of the pieces behind it to occupy the liberated central points; so we are talking about a centralization which was in preparation in the wings. In games 16 and 17 too, the procedure is similar. In game 16, in which you should pay attention to the subtle little moves in the centre (e4-d4-d5) and their powerful effect on the flanks (b6 and g7), the advance d5-d6 is only made possible by the centralization. Also in game 17 the effort supplied by these pieces in the centre is not inconsiderable. As well as the voluntary surrender of the c-file, it is worth noting the positional try 32...h6-h5. This latter manoeuvre is typical. In positional games played by hard-working masters a strong central set-up often appears in this fashion.

Game 16
Aron Nimzowitsch
Romih
London match game 1927

1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.d3 f3 d6 4.d5 g5 5 Bd7 5.e3
6.cxd5 exd5 7.d3 d6
    Better would be 7...e7.
8.c2 h6 9.h4
    Black had serious troubles castling. By this we mean that in the given situation kingside castling was all too dangerous and queenside castling would be hard to prepare. Under such circumstances, Romih’s chosen manoeuvring strategy must be considered quite appropriate to the situation: he maintains the option of castling on either side.
9...a5 10.0-0-0 b4 11.ge2 e7
    Manoeuvring at its best! Black wanted to divert White’s king’s knight from the route g1-f3-e5. In any case, a subtle manoeuvre which shows more of a feel for chess than many a swashbuckling attack.
12.b1 b8 13.h3
    To have the option of retreating to g3, without having to fear ...d5.
13...e6 14.f3 a6 15.a3
    Trying to start a sustained attack now would cause problems. For example, 15.e4? dxe4 16.xe7 fxe3† followed by ...dxe7.
15...d7
    Preparing for e6-e7-b5.
16.xf6! xf6 17.e4 d6 18.e5 e7 19.f4
    The mobile pawn centre.
19...d7 20.f5 b5 21.hf1
    Contact is established, see our introductory remarks.
21...b6
    If he had played 21...xa3 I wanted to reply 22.xb5 axb5 23.xa3 xf6 24.a2 which would have failed to 24.xf5† if I hadn’t previously played 21.hf1. Thus we can see the effect of the contact.

Moreover the exchange on c3 followed by queenside castling was better than the text move, e.g. 21...xc3† 22.xc3 0-0 0 23.d4 a4 b8 24.b4 c7 25.a2 and it would not be easy for White to conduct an attack.
Forced, because after 27...bxa3 28.d5 axb2 the liquidation with 29.\textit{\texttt{W}}e7† \textit{\texttt{W}}xc7 30.\textit{\texttt{D}}xc7 \textit{\texttt{D}}xc7 31.d6† would be decisive.

\textit{\texttt{D}}d5 \textit{\texttt{D}}e8 29.\textit{\texttt{D}}e4

This central positioning of the queen considerably increases the mobility of White's central pawns.

29...\textit{\texttt{B}}e8 30.\textit{\texttt{B}}c1 \textit{\texttt{B}}b8 31.e6!

\textit{\texttt{D}}xe8 32.\textit{\texttt{D}}d4

Threatening \textit{\texttt{B}}b6†.

32...\textit{\texttt{B}}b6 33.\textit{\texttt{D}}d6!

If now 33...\textit{\texttt{W}}xd6 then 34.\textit{\texttt{B}}fd1! and wins. But if 33...\textit{\texttt{B}}xd6 then 34.\textit{\texttt{B}}fd1 \textit{\texttt{Q}}e7 35.\textit{\texttt{W}}xg7 \textit{\texttt{B}}f8 36.\textit{\texttt{W}}xh6 and matters are soon decided. Note how from d4 the queen's influence was felt both at b6 and g7: the usual consequence of centralization.

33...\textit{\texttt{Q}}f6 34.e7† \textit{\texttt{Q}}d7 35.\textit{\texttt{D}}d5 \textit{\texttt{A}}xf1 36.\textit{\texttt{W}}c6 mate

\textbf{Game 17}

\textbf{Ernst Grünfeld}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

Kecskemét 1927

1.d4 \textit{\texttt{D}}f6 2.c4 \textit{\texttt{C}}c3 \textit{\texttt{C}}c6 3.\textit{\texttt{C}}c3 \textit{\texttt{B}}b4 4.\textit{\texttt{W}}c2 d6

It is also possible to play 4...\textit{\texttt{B}}d6 5.e4 \textit{\texttt{A}}xc3† 6.bxc3 d6 7.f4 and now 7...\textit{\texttt{B}}fd7. Black would then go on to develop his pieces by ...\textit{\texttt{D}}bc6 (perhaps then ...\textit{\texttt{A}}a5),...\textit{\texttt{B}}b7, ...c5 (never...e5),...\textit{\texttt{D}}c7 and...0-0-0 and he would have a solid game.

5.\textit{\texttt{G}}g5 \textit{\texttt{A}}bd7 6.a3

Losing a tempo. Instead of this the best seems to be 6.e3, e.g. 6...b6 7.\textit{\texttt{G}}d3 \textit{\texttt{B}}b7 8.f3.

6...\textit{\texttt{B}}xc3† 7.\textit{\texttt{W}}xc3 b6 8.\textit{\texttt{A}}h4 b6

Another very good move would be 8...0-0 and then if 9.f3 (as in the game) simply 9...d5, etc.

9.f3 \textit{\texttt{B}}b7 10.e4

White's set-up is at most only good in a passive sense, since after something like 10...\textit{\texttt{C}}5 11.\textit{\texttt{F}}f2 c5 12.d5 (or 12.dxc5 dxc5 and then ...\textit{\texttt{W}}e7 and ...\textit{\texttt{B}}d7-b8-c6-d4) 12...g5, the two bishops are not dangerous. In any case, Black's attack will hardly be able to break through!

10...\textit{\texttt{D}}xe4

Overconfidence!

11.\textit{\texttt{A}}xd8 \textit{\texttt{A}}xc3 12.\textit{\texttt{A}}h4†

12.\textit{\texttt{A}}xc7 \textit{\texttt{B}}e7 13.bxc3 \textit{\texttt{A}}xc8 14.\textit{\texttt{A}}xd6† \textit{\texttt{D}}xd6 would not be so good, because the white c-pawn cannot be held against a set-up with ...\textit{\texttt{E}}c7, ...\textit{\texttt{D}}c8 followed by ...\textit{\texttt{B}}b8! and then ...\textit{\texttt{A}}a6. But now (after 12.\textit{\texttt{A}}h4!) Black must give up a piece.

12...\textit{\texttt{A}}a4

At this point Black thought about the American proverb: make the best of it! Don't despair, but even in the worst of positions find the best possible chance! Making it as difficult as possible for your opponent to win is the American way of thinking, and not a bad one at that! As is proved in this game.

13.b3 c5! 14.bxa4?

Weak. A better move was 14.d5 although in that case too Black sets up a defensive position which is hard to crack after 14...\textit{\texttt{A}}xd5 15.bxa4 dxc4 16.\textit{\texttt{A}}xc4 d5 17.\textit{\texttt{A}}b5! g5 18.\textit{\texttt{A}}g3 0-0-0. After the text move, however, White is really at a disadvantage.

14...\textit{\texttt{A}}xd4 15.\textit{\texttt{A}}e2 e5 16.\textit{\texttt{A}}c1 \textit{\texttt{A}}c5

Black now has a strong position with two pawns for the piece and good expectations for another two: he has the advantage.

17.a5 bxa5

This a5-pawn is helping to protect important squares, so it should not be underestimated.

18.\textit{\texttt{A}}d3
18...\( \text{d7} \)

The correct retreat, keeping an eye on e5, e.g. 19.c5? dxc5! and the e5-pawn is protected. Instead 18...\( \text{e6} \) would be bad, because now the reply 19.c5 would be unpleasant for Black. e.g. 19...\( \text{dx}c5 \) 20.\( \text{dx}c5 \) dxc5 21.\( \text{e}b5^+ \) with open play. 19.\( \text{ec}2 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 20.0-0 \( \text{xc}4 \) 21.\( \text{ec}1 \) a4 22.\( \text{b}4 \) d5 23.\( \text{fe}1 \) \( \text{f6} \)

Sacrificial combinations on e5 have to be prevented.

24.\( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{xe}2 \) 25.\( \text{xe}2 \) \( \text{f7} \)

I could also have played 25...\( \text{c}8 \) 26.\( \text{xa}4 \) \( \text{f7} \), but I wanted to give him the c-file so that my centre could advance more quickly. The course of the game proved me correct.

26.\( \text{ac}1 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 27.\( \text{c}7^+ \) \( \text{g}6 \) 28.\( \text{ec}2 \) e4!

32.\( \text{f}1 \)
32.\( \text{xa}7 \)? \( \text{c}8 \)
32...\( \text{h}5 \)

A feeler. New weaknesses have to be provoked.

33.\( \text{h}3 \)

Black was probably in a position to be able to force this move in the long run (by the threat ...\( \text{h}5 \)-h4-h3) but White should not have made the concession without a struggle! Now a terrible hole appears on g3.

33...\( \text{h}4 \)! 34.\( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 35.\( \text{f}2 \) e3† 36.\( \text{f}1 \) d2 37.\( \text{e}2 \) d4 38.\( \text{d}3 \)

It seems that we have reached a blockade; the knight manoeuvre which follows demonstrates that this is not the case.

38...\( \text{d}5 \)! 39.\( \text{c}5 \)

If 39.\( \text{c}4 \) then 39...\( \text{xb}4 \) 40.\( \text{xb}4 \) (40.\( \text{xb}4 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 40...\( \text{d}8 \) 41.\( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 42.\( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{xb}4 \) 43.\( \text{xb}4 \) \( \text{f}4 \) and ...\( \text{g}3 \) is decisive.

39...\( \text{d}8 \) 40.\( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 41.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{f}4 \)† 42.\( \text{xf}4 \) \( \text{xf}4 \) 43.\( \text{c}3 \)

Or 43.\( \text{c}7^+ \) \( \text{f}5 \), etc.

43...\( \text{g}3 \) 44.\( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 45.\( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 46.\( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 47.\( \text{xd}2 \)

47...\( \text{g}2 \)
0–1

6. Giving up the pawn centre

This need not be a catastrophe because, as we have seen in all the examples so far, it all boils down to one question: are the central squares well enough
controlled? When faced with strong control by the opponent, the mobility of a free pawn centre is noticeably restricted and in the long run it even becomes a target for attack. In game 18 Steiner misses the chance to set up pressure against the opposing free centre. In game 19 an insufficiently motivated attempt to paralyse a powerful and flexible centre is simply knocked on the head. That is, not the attempt itself, but the participants: the c4-pawn and not long after the e4-pawn. In game 20, the following rapid series of events takes place:
1. Surrender of the centre.
2. Recapture of the same, though at the cost of a pawn.
3. The missing pawn is compensated for by the "white-squared" centralization.
4. Black should have quickly seized an advantage.

However his 33rd move takes the game off its logical course and so the play loses its instructive interest.

9...f6?

I think that this move is the decisive mistake. The immediate 9...c5 was correct, e.g. 9...c5 10.e2 e6 11.0–0 0–0 12.d5 0–0 13.c3 e8 and then ...f8 with completely satisfactory centralization. Or 12...xd5 (instead of 12...0–0) 13.exd5 cxd4 14.d4 0–0 and then ...f6, and Black has a good position.

10.h4

A diversion which is in no way premature.

10...c5 11.e2 e6 12.f5

From now on Black cannot develop satisfactorily (12...c7 13.d5 xd5 14.exd5 xd4 15.xd4 and the knight's seizure of e6 will be decisive).

12.d7

12...g6 would be hitting out at thin air, e.g. 13.0–0 f7 14.c4.

13.0–0!

Not only a developing move but also a waiting move. Black is compelled, whatever he does, to concede a new weakness – or else he cannot manage any sensible sort of development – and so White calmly waits to see whether his opponent will now decide on 13...a6 or 13...b6. So in appearance 13.0–0 was a developing move but, underlying that, it was a feeler just like 32...h6–h5 in game 17.

13...b6

13...a6 also had its downsides. But 13...0–0–0 would be quite bad, e.g. 14.xa7 b6 15.a4 b7 16.a5 c7 17.axb6 cxb8 18.e7 b7 (the only move) 19.xb7 c7 20.a1 c8 21.a6 b6 22.b5 c7 23.d5 c7 24.e7† and wins.

Instead of the weaknesses provoked by ...a6 or ...b6, a Steinitz would have tried 13...c7, e.g. 14.d5 d8! 15.c4 0–0 16.c3 e8 and Black's game may be terribly cramped, but it is not all that easy to finish him off.

14.a4

Now everything goes like clockwork.

14...a5 15.d5 x4

15...0–0–0? 16.xb6!

16.xd4 b7 17.e6 c8 18.h5 g6

19.xf6† f7 20.xd7 xh5 21.xf8 1–0
As we have seen, Black’s position could have been held by \(9...\text{c5}\) and perhaps even by \(13...\text{c7}\) and then \(14...\text{d8}\). But it would have taken the defensive powers of a Steinitz! And \(10...\text{e5!}\) would really be highly effective. So giving up the centre is not a catastrophe.

**Game 19**

**Simon Alapin**

**Aron Nimzowitsch**

Karlsbad 1911

\[
\begin{align*}
1.e4 & \text{c6} & 2.c4 & \text{d6} & 3.d4 & \text{f6} & 4.e3 & \text{bd7} & 5.f4 & \text{e5} \\
6.\text{Bf3} & \text{exd4} & 7.\text{Bxd4} & \text{c5}
\end{align*}
\]

To tame the crouching tiger (in other words, the centre which is ready to advance): after \(8.e5?\) \text{dxe5} White has nothing.

\[
8.\text{Bd3} & \text{Bb6} \\
8...\text{Bxd3}^+ & \text{with the two bishops was worth considering.}
\]

\[
9.\text{Bc2} & \text{e7} & 10.0-0 & 0-0 & 11.\text{h1} & \text{Bd8} \\
\end{align*}
\]

A continuation of the taming process.

\[
12.Bb1 & \text{e6!}
\]

The counter-chance: \(c4\) can be rolled up. The fact that this must happen points out a deeper meaning: how can the \(c4\)-pawn imagine that it could paralyse Black’s flexible and powerful centre (= the \(d6\)-pawn)! It will have to be punished for that!

\[
13.f5 \\
\end{align*}
\]

This is a major concession, because it considerably deprives White’s centre of mobility.

Other moves however were followed by the rolling up process mentioned above, e.g. \(13.\text{Be3} & \text{a6} \ addition 14.b3 & \text{b5} \ addition \ (14...\text{d5} & 15.cxd5 & \text{cxd5} & 16.e5 & \text{Bf4})\); \(13.\text{d4} & \text{a6} \ addition 14.\text{Bd3} & \text{Bxb4} \ addition 15.\text{ec2} & \text{c5}\).

\[
\begin{align*}
13...\text{c8} & 14.\text{Bg5} & \text{Bd7} & 15.\text{Bd2} & \text{a6} & 16.\text{Bb3} & \text{Bc7} \\
17.\text{Bbd1} & \text{b5}
\end{align*}
\]

Black’s “righteous anger” now expresses itself.

\[
18.\text{Bf1} & \text{e5} \ addition 19.\text{Bxh5} & \text{axb5}
\]

The upshot on \(c4\) has been blown away without a trace.

\[
\begin{align*}
20.\text{Bb1} & \text{Bb7} & 21.\text{Bc1} & \text{Bb6} & 22.\text{h3} \\
& 22.\text{Be3} & \text{a5} & 23.\text{g1} & \text{seems more exact.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
22...\text{xf3}! \\
\end{align*}
\]

The start of a profound combination.

\[
\begin{align*}
23.\text{gxh3} & \text{h1} & 24.\text{Be3} & \text{g3} & 25.f4 & \text{Bxe3} & 26.\text{Be3} \\
& 27.\text{Bh4} & \text{b4}
\end{align*}
\]

Black’s last two pawn moves are what it is all about: the white centre is conquered in a surprising way.

\[
28.\text{Ba4}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
28...\text{Bxe4} & 29.\text{Be4} & \text{Bxh4} & 30.\text{Bxb4} & \text{Ba7}
\end{align*}
\]

And with his two bishops – bearing in mind White’s fragmented position – Black has a won game. Next came:

\[
\begin{align*}
31.\text{Be4} & \text{e7} & 32.\text{g5} & \text{d5} & 33.\text{Bb4} & \text{Bd6} & 34.\text{h2} \\
& \text{Bf6} & 35.\text{g4} & \text{d6} & 36.\text{Bc1} & \text{h5} & 37.\text{h3}
\end{align*}
\]

After 37.\text{xh5} comes 37...\text{xf5} 38.\text{g4} \text{xf4} winning a piece.

\[
\begin{align*}
37...\text{hxg4} & 38.\text{hxg4} & g5 & 39.\text{fxg6} & \text{fxg6} & 40.g5 & \text{Bf5} \\
& 41.\text{f3} & \text{Ba8} & 42.\text{c5} & \text{Bxc5} & 43.\text{Bxc5} & \text{Bxa2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
0-1
\]
Game 20
Dr Alexander Alekhine
Aron Nimzowitsch
Kecskemét 1927

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3...c3...f6 4.exd5...xd5
5...e4

At this very early stage Black found himself in the (not unpleasant) position of having to get by without a pawn centre.

He solved the problem at once and quite satisfactorily by:
5...d6 6...f3...c7 7...d3 b6 8.0–0...b4 9...c4
b7 10...e2 0–0 11.a3...d5 12...d1

A preventive measure against c7–c5. But Black was now led into opening up the game at too early a point.

12...c5

It was preferable to open things up slowly with 12...c6 and then ...c7 and ...f6 and finally ...c6–c5.

A cramped game should not be freed too quickly; the intoxication of rapidly gained liberty applies to the chess board as well.

But even after 12...c6 play could continue in a strong and lively manner. After 12...c6 and
13...c7 then ...f4 can become possible, for example if White plays ...d3.

13...b5...c7 14...xd7

Of course, Alekhine does not go in for 14...x5
dxb5 15...xb5...e4 16...xd7...e8 17...c6...c8.

14...xd7 15...x5...c6 16...d6!

He does without the possible win of a pawn by 16...xb6 axb6 17...e1 because then there would follow 17...d5 (18.c4...f6 19...xf6†...xf6 with two splendid diagonals for the bishops) and Black would get a powerfully centralized game, e.g. 17...d5 18...e5 18...c7 19...d3...c8 20...c3...f6 and White is at a disadvantage.

16...xd6!

There is nothing better. After 16...a6 17...b5 bxc5 18...e5...a4 19...h6!, e.g. 19...xd6
20...xd6 gxh6 21...g4†...h8 22...d7 with a winning position.

17...d6...e8 18...g5

Another subtle move.

18...f6 19...d4...d7 20...e7...f8 21...c3 e5

And now it turns out that Black's centralization could not be negated in spite of all White's subtle play. Also the e7-bishop is in a somewhat problematic position, whereas the b7-bishop is extremely effective. The game is level as the pawn difference is quite trivial.

22...g4

This tries to create some sort of field of action for the bishop which is shut in on e7. At the same time it tries to relieve the f3-knight, because now g2 is protected by the rook.

22...d5! 23...g3...c4! 24...d1

Alekhine believes that he could have taken the position by storm with 24...g5 h6? 25...d1...c6 26...xf7...xf7 27...h5†...g8 28...g6. But he overlooks a possible resource after 24...g5, namely 24...g6! 25...d1...c6! 26...f3 f5 and the
otherwise decisive sacrifice 27.\texttt{Exf5} is not possible because mate is threatened on g2.

After the text move Black uses a strange manoeuvre to achieve a much-desired exchange of rooks.

24.\texttt{We4} 25.\texttt{Wf1} \texttt{Wc2} 26.\texttt{Wd2} \texttt{Wa4} 27.\texttt{We2}

Alekhine recommended 27.\texttt{h3} as better. Against it I had considered, for example, changing fronts with ...\texttt{b7-e4-g6} and following up with ...f7-f5 etc. Note how all of Black’s manoeuvres in the centre pass over the e4-square.

27...\texttt{Exe4} 28.\texttt{Exe4} \texttt{Exe4} 29.\texttt{Wc1} h6 30.\texttt{h3} \texttt{Wh7} 31.\texttt{Wd1} g6

31...f5 would not do on account of the sacrifice 32.\texttt{Wh5} \texttt{Wf5} followed by 33.\texttt{Wh5} and 34.\texttt{Wxg5}.

32.\texttt{Wg4} \texttt{Wd5} 33.\texttt{Wc2}

As can be seen from this short analysis, 33...\texttt{Ee8}! was exactly what was needed to point out how illusory White’s “advantage” really was.

34.\texttt{Wh4}

Threatening \texttt{Wh5}.

34...\texttt{f6} 35.\texttt{c4} \texttt{We6} 36.\texttt{Wd2} \texttt{Wf5} 37.\texttt{Wd1} g5

As Alekhine correctly points out, 37...h5 should have been preferred, because the white rook now gets back out into the open. Both players were in time trouble.

38.\texttt{Ag4} \texttt{Wg6} 39.\texttt{Ag3} f5 40.\texttt{Ee3} e4

A draw was agreed here, considering that both players were in time trouble. After 41.\texttt{Wh3} and then c5, White seems to have the advantage again. But you should carefully play through this game again to help develop a feeling for identifying “weak squares of a specified colour” (here the white squares g2, e2, c4, g7).

7. Centralization as a deus ex machina (a sudden solution)

If you are interested in the subject, you should not underestimate what I am about to explain. Centralization occurring suddenly, like a saviour, may appear less typical than slow, methodical centralization! But that does not stop the former type being important from the psychological and the didactic point of view. What was perhaps not possible with a slow centralization can be achieved when it happens rapidly. And what would that be? Well, it might convince you totally of the value of
centralization. Because it is not enough to have learned the details, you need to have a belief in the power of centralization for it to work wonders. It's all about faith. Only those who believe in something can achieve success with it!

Game 21
Aron Nimzowitsch
Frank James Marshall
New York 1927

1.d3 Qf6 2.e3 d5 3.b3 Qg4 4.a3 Qbd7
5.b3
This pawn move discourages castling kingside at a later stage and thus limits White's options. 5..Re2 was good enough and then 0-0.
5...Qh5 6.d3 h6 7.Qbd2 e6 8.Qe2
After a possible 8..Re2 and 9.0-0 White would have to reckon on a pawn storm, e.g. 8..Re2 Qd6 9.0-0 Re7 10.c4 0-0-0 11.Qc1 g5. I lost in a similar sort of way against Vidmar in the same tournament.
8...Qb4 9.g4 Re6 10.Qe5 Qxe5 11.Qxe5 Qd6
12.Qf3 Qe7 13.Qg2 0-0-0 14.0-0-0 Qxe5
15.Qxe5 Rb7 16.c4
This loosens up White's position, but a line of communication along the 2nd rank had to be set up.
16..Qd7 17.Qxd7 Rxd7 18.cxd5 exd5 19.Qb2 f5

24.Qe5!
This unexpected centralization saves the game! The rescue has to be put down both to "centralization" and "prophylaxis" (= preventive tactics) since 24.Qe5 is to some extent a follow-up to 19.Qb2.
24...Qxh3
24...c6 25.Qc2 is no better.
25.Qxd5 Rg6 26.Qe4 Qf6 27.Qxf6 Qxf6 28.Qg1 Qf5

White has managed to secure his king position by preventive measures such as 16.c4 and

29.Qdg2
Things appear to be going according to plan: first the centralization and now the positionally well motivated switch of the rook to the right flank.

29...\texttt{ex}e4 30.dxe4 \texttt{Ad}3 31.\texttt{Exg}7 \texttt{Exe}3 32.\texttt{Exg}8†

The flank attack has turned into a breakthrough.

32.\texttt{Ed}7 33.\texttt{E}1\texttt{g}7† \texttt{Ec}6 34.\texttt{E}g6 \texttt{Ed}6

Even this ingenious attempt to drive the white king into a cul-de-sac should not be sufficient.

35.e5 \texttt{Ee}1† 36.\texttt{Eh}2 \texttt{Ee}2† 37.\texttt{E}a3 \texttt{Exg}6
38.\texttt{Exg}6† \texttt{E}d5 39.\texttt{E}xh6 a5 40.\texttt{Eh}7 \texttt{Ec}2

If instead 40...\texttt{Ec}6 then 41.\texttt{Ee}7 b5 42.b4 \texttt{Ee}3† 43.\texttt{E}b2 axb4 44.f5 and the cul-de-sac has turned out to be quite bearable (it has only cost a pawn, the loss of which is almost unimportant compared to White's two linked pawns).

41.\texttt{Ee}7 b5 42.b4

Not 42.f5? on account of 42...c6 43.b4 \texttt{Ec}4 and then mate.

42...a4?

There was a vague chance of a draw after 42...axb4† 43.\texttt{Exb}4 \texttt{Ec}4† 44.\texttt{Exb}5 \texttt{c6†} and then ...\texttt{Exf}4. After the text move Black is lost.

43.f5 c5

Because 46.f7 would be followed by 46...a3† 47.\texttt{Eb}1 \texttt{Ff}3 48.e6 \texttt{Ff}1† 49.\texttt{Ec}2 \texttt{Ff}2† 50.\texttt{Ed}3 b3 51.axb3 a2 52.\texttt{Ea}7 \texttt{Exc}6 with a draw. If it had not been for the blunder on move 44 White's centralization would have led to an easy win.

Game 22 (endgame)

Aron Nimzowitsch

Vladimir Vukovic

Kecskemét 1927

1.e4 \texttt{Ee}6 2.d3 c5 3.e4 \texttt{Ec}6 4.f4 d6 5.\texttt{Ec}3 \texttt{g}6
6.\texttt{Ee}2 \texttt{Eg}7 7.\texttt{Ec}3 \texttt{Ee}4 8.\texttt{Ed}2 \texttt{Ed}4 9.\texttt{E}x\texttt{g}4 \texttt{E}x\texttt{g}4 10.\texttt{E}x\texttt{d}4 \texttt{E}x\texttt{d}4 11.\texttt{E}x\texttt{e}2 \texttt{Eg}7 12.0–0 0–0
13.\texttt{E}d5 \texttt{Exe}2 14.\texttt{Exe}2 \texttt{Ee}6 15.\texttt{Ec}3 \texttt{Wa}5 16.\texttt{Exc}1

\texttt{Ea}e8 17.a3 \texttt{Fb}5 18.a5 \texttt{Wb}6 19.\texttt{Exf}5 a6 20.f6
\texttt{Exf}6 21.\texttt{Cc}3 \texttt{Ee}4† 22.\texttt{Fh}1 \texttt{Ee}3 23.\texttt{Bxc}3 \texttt{Bb}3
24.\texttt{Ed}2 \texttt{b}5 25.\texttt{cx}b5 \texttt{axb}5 26.\texttt{Ec}4 \texttt{Wb}4 27.\texttt{Cc}3
\texttt{Ea}8 28.\texttt{cx}b5 \texttt{Bxb}5 29.\texttt{d}4 \texttt{Bc}8 30.\texttt{Wf}3 \texttt{Ee}8
31.\texttt{dx}c5 \texttt{dx}c5 32.\texttt{Ec}3 e5 33.f5 \texttt{Gxf}5 34.\texttt{Cg}5† \texttt{Sh}8 35.\texttt{Cf}5 \texttt{Bxf}5 36.\texttt{Cf}5 \texttt{Cc}6

Black's position with his open king and isolated pawns would certainly look very shaky without the centralized queen. But with it, all appears to be quite in order, and Black is even planning an advance, namely ...c5-c4 and then ...e5-e4 or ...c4-c3 and if this is met with \texttt{Cc}2, then ...\texttt{Gg}8. But I was able to make my opponent decentralize.

37.\texttt{Eh}5!

Threatening 38.\texttt{Exc}5.

37...\texttt{Ec}7

Or 37...\texttt{Gg}7 38.\texttt{Cc}3.
38...\textit{a}d1 \textit{g}6

He had nothing better. But now I can occupy the central diagonal I have seized from my opponent.

39.\textit{c}f3

With tempo because of the threat of mate on f8.

39...\textit{g}7 40.\textit{d}5!

And the situation has been totally turned around.

40...\textit{h}5 41.\textit{e}d3 \textit{f}7 42.\textit{g}3\textsuperscript{+} \textit{h}8 43.\textit{xc}5 \textit{f}1\textsuperscript{+} 44.\textit{g}1 \textit{f}7

White has won a pawn, though he had to give back the central position. But the pawn is a sound one, and he retreated to a square he wanted to be on. The rook ending which soon arises is easy to win. Next came:

45.h3 \textit{c}4 46.\textit{h}2 \textit{e}2 47.\textit{xf}1 \textit{xf}1 48.\textit{e}3 \textit{a}1

Duras has chosen a move which goes against tradition. More usual is 9...\textit{f}5 with pressure against the d4-pawn. But he has thus set a fresh and interesting problem, which I would formulate as follows: “Can the move 9...\textit{g}6 be considered decentralizing here?”

A pawn chain (here the white d4- and e5-pawns against Black's d5 and e6) can generally only be attacked at the base (here d4); it is less advisable to try an attack against the head of the chain (in this case e5).

So much for pawn chains in general. When we look at specifics, things can be seen in a different light. We look at the knight on a3 and shudder at how absolutely useless it is if \(f7\)-f6 is played. So does 9...\textit{g}6 appear justified in a certain sense because it leads to action in the centre and cannot in any way be described as decentralizing? For the moment, we shall not say our final word on the subject.

Next came:

10.0-0

10.h4 was worth considering, e.g. 10.h4 \textit{b}4\textsuperscript{+} 11.\textit{f}1 f6 12.h5 but the success of this punitive expedition is in doubt, because Black could play either 12...\textit{g}e7 (13.h6 fxe5 14.hxg7 \textit{g}8 15.dxe5 \textit{x}g7) or – in sacrificial style – 12...\textit{g}xe5.
After 13.dxe5 fxe5 14...c2 (still the best) 14...c5 (not 14...0–0 because of 15.e3 and then g5) White would be in a bad way.

10...c7

10...f6 could also be played, but Duras liked to conceal his plans whenever possible.

11.c2

If 11.e1 then 11...b4 and the rook would have to make its way back to f1 (12.d2 dxd4).

11.f6 12.d3 0–0–0

Now it needs to be decided whether Black’s action against e5 is effective or not.

13.b4

Intending to relieve White’s centre by means of b4–b5. The consolidating move 13.e1 was also good. Both moves have to be made, no matter in which order.

![Chess Diagram]

13...f5?

This concedes the d4-square to White for his c2-knight, which brings into doubt the soundness of the f7–f6 attack (see the note to 9...g6). The correct line was 13...b8 and then 14.e8. A plausible variation might be: 13...b8 14.e1 c8 15.b1 (not 15.b5 on account of 15.a5 possibly followed by c4). White would have an advantage because he has a powerful initiative (16.d2 and then a2–a4–a5) whereas Black is hemmed in.

This main line strengthens our impression that g6 was ill-advised. And when you take into account that instead of 9...g6 Black had at his disposal the completely centralizing option of 9...f5, there is no way to avoid describing 9...g6 as “decentralizing”.

14...xg6 hxg6 15...e5?

With this move White gives away all of his advantage. The correct move was 15.dxe5 e.g. 15...xb4 16.e3 (not 16.b1 because of 16.a4) and then 17.d4. Certainly this would have cost White a pawn, but the impressive central island and the possible attacks down the files would have brought him quite a strong advantage.

The text move 15...e5 is a mistake because on one hand the rook gets the h4-square (from where it can exert influence on the centre!) and on the other the d7-bishop becomes effective. And even more, 15...e5 should be rejected on principle: “Every exchange of pieces is a relief to the player who is being blockaded.”

All that White should be left with now are chances for a draw.

15...xe5! 16.dxe5 a4 17.d2!

The only move. After 17...d4 White should be able to follow up with 18.b2 d3 19.d4!xd4 20.c3†.

17...b8?

Black returns the compliment (the mistake on move 15 by White). A pawn was up for grabs after 17...b4! 18.b2 bx4 19.xb4xb4 xxb4 20.a1† d7. Also the d4-square would be left permanently under Black’s control.

18.d4!

He intends to centralize even at the cost of a pawn. This sudden and bold affirmation of the
idea of the centre rescues White's game which was so close to falling apart. Had White thought of the idea of the sacrifice earlier, he would not have missed playing 15.dxe5. Perhaps back at move 15 he was not ready to take such "heroic" decisions...

18...\texttt{\textit{h5}}

If 18...\texttt{\textit{xh}4} then 19.\texttt{\textit{d}3} followed by \texttt{\textit{e}3} and \texttt{\textit{ab}1}, and White would obtain a harmonious game based on both blockade and attack, quite similar to that described in the note to move 15.

19.\texttt{\textit{d}3} \texttt{\textit{d}h}8 20.\texttt{\textit{h}3} \texttt{\textit{g}5} 21.\texttt{\textit{e}3} \texttt{\textit{g}4}

On one side, complete centralization (\texttt{\textit{d}4}!, \texttt{\textit{d}3}! and \texttt{\textit{e}3}!) and on the other touchingly helpless flank attacks: in such circumstances it is not hard to predict which side will win.

22.\texttt{\textit{f}5} \texttt{\textit{b}5}

Or 22...\texttt{\textit{d}8} 23.\texttt{\textit{e}c}7 \texttt{\textit{e}c}7 24.\texttt{\textit{e}4} and then \texttt{\textit{xg}4}. The centralization radiates over a wide area: from \texttt{d}4 to \texttt{a}7 and to \texttt{g}7.

23.\texttt{\textit{a}3} \texttt{\textit{a}6} 24.\texttt{\textit{xa}6} \texttt{\textit{xa}6} 25.\texttt{\textit{xc}7} \texttt{\textit{xf}1} 26.\texttt{\textit{xf}1}

35.\texttt{\textit{g}6}!

One g-pawn falls, but the other becomes very strong.

35...\texttt{\textit{g}7} 36.\texttt{\textit{g}5} \texttt{\textit{xe}6} 37.\texttt{\textit{e}g}4 \texttt{\textit{g}8} 38.\texttt{\textit{c}4} \texttt{\textit{d}8} 39.\texttt{\textit{b}5} \texttt{\textit{d}4} 40.\texttt{\textit{h}3} \texttt{\textit{c}7} 41.\texttt{\textit{g}6} \texttt{\textit{d}3} 42.\texttt{\textit{h}1} \texttt{\textit{d}7} 43.\texttt{\textit{b}6} \texttt{\textit{c}8} 44.\texttt{\textit{h}1} \texttt{\textit{d}7} 45.\texttt{\textit{g}5} \texttt{\textit{d}2} 46.\texttt{\textit{g}7} 1–0

A possible finish might be 46...\texttt{\textit{e}7} 47.\texttt{\textit{g}6} \texttt{\textit{d}1} 48.\texttt{\textit{x}d}1 \texttt{\textit{d}1} 49.\texttt{\textit{g}8} \texttt{\textit{g}1} 50.\texttt{\textit{h}7} \texttt{\textit{h}1} 51.\texttt{\textit{g}7} \texttt{\textit{g}1} 52.\texttt{\textit{h}8} \texttt{\textit{h}1} 53.\texttt{\textit{h}7} \texttt{\textit{x}h7} 54.\texttt{\textit{x}h7} \texttt{\textit{f}7} 55.\texttt{\textit{h}6} and wins the pawn ending. This is an extremely important game for the idea of "centralization" and we most urgently recommend that you study it in depth.
Chapter 2

Restraint and Blockade

Just as was the case with centralization, excellent results can be achieved by employing these two concepts. I can most highly recommend to all players – no matter what their level – the strategy of restraint! It is often surprising to see how a less advanced player is more at home with blockading than one playing at a higher level. But what I have said is particularly important for the use of my special stratagem “sacrificing to bring about a blockade”, which in future I shall refer to as the blockading sacrifice. In this case the older, more experienced top class amateur is often more in awe of the lost pawn than is a gifted student at a lower level. Take for example the following game which was played between two amateurs.

1.d4 d5 2.c4 e5 3.dxe5 d4 4.a3 Qf5 5.e3 c5 6.exd4 Qc6!

A quite surprising “blockading sacrifice”.

7.d5 Qxe5 8.Qf3 Qd6 9.Qe2 Qe7 10.0-0 Qc7!

For the moment White’s extra pawn is not active, but Black’s centralized army is a superb foundation for a slow but certain tying up of his opponent.

11.Qe5 Qxe5 12.f4

The pressure from the centre down the d6-h2 diagonal has led to a loosening of White’s position.

12.Qd4† 13.Qh1 0-0-0 14.Qc3 a6

14...Qxc3 and then ...Qd6 seems even better; the attack down the b-file could then be easily beaten off by ...b7-6 followed by ...a7-a5 to meet a3-a4.

15.g4

15.Qd2 followed by b4 is better.

15...Qxc3 16.bxc3 Qe4† 17.Qf3 Qxf3† 18.Qxf3

18...Qf5! 19.h3 g6

This wastes time: there was no need to fear gxf5. The immediate 19...Qb8 was worth considering.

20.Qc3 Qb8!

This creates space for the blockader! The knight would like to get to d6.

21.Qab1

21.Qf2 is better.

22.Qc8 22.Qb3 Qd6

White’s position now looks really helpless. The white squares c4 and e4 are weak, and the d5-pawn (and with it the f3-b7 diagonal) appears blocked.

23.Qfb1 Qa8 24.Qb6 Qhe8 25.Qf2
25...\texttt{Exe3}! 26.\texttt{Exe6} \texttt{Exe8} 27.\texttt{Edb6} \texttt{Ee2} 28.\texttt{Ef1}\texttt{Ee7} 29.\texttt{Gc2} \texttt{Ee4}! 30.\texttt{Eg1} \texttt{Ed3} 0-1

The player with the black pieces (Karl Jacobsen of Copenhagen) had just moved up to become a class 2 player after approximately three months of lessons.

Of course, the strategy of restraint is far from having been exhausted by what happened in the above game. Restraint covers a wide spectrum and so it is really not easy to assimilate. Above all, you must understand the intrinsic meaning of restraint. An enemy pawn mass wishes to advance, you try to counter that by pitting yourself against it. Does that procedure describe clearly enough the nature of restraint? No.

In reality, restraint is only one element in the slow preparation of an attack. In the long run it is only effective when linked to a definite idea for an attack rather than simply being employed in passive opposition to an advance. If the instrument of restraint is a file with a rook on it, then the pawn which is to be restrained becomes the object of an attack. If, on the other hand, it is a diagonal then the wing which is being targeted by the restraining bishop becomes the object of attack.

Your chess horizons will be broadened when you come to terms with the intrinsic, latent attacking value of restraint (see games 26-28).

We consider our next task to be increasing your understanding of the greater or lesser degree of dynamic weakness of a pawn (or a pawn complex). For this purpose we have included a series of games in which doubled pawn complexes, despite an initial flexibility, finally become boggled down in complete immobility. We consider this to be a relevant exercise. Dynamic weakness cannot be better illustrated than by considering the case of doubled pawns rather than any other pawn formation.

After such more or less preparatory exercises, you will be ready to consider the problem of the blockade (restraint is the prelude to it). You will learn to construct a blockading net and to avoid the dangers which could result from one which is not tight enough. Here we particularly recommend the use of prophylactic measures. And finally, we shall take a look at two recent and very original variations (my own Dresden Triangle Variation and the French Defence with the "boldly obstructed" c-pawn) and look for a bridge between these variations on one hand and the thought processes involved in blockading on the other.

You are particularly recommended to study all of section 2 with great care. There is a lot to be learned from it.

1. The restraint of freeing pawn advances

Here we have the first test of the power of the strategy of restraint, certainly a first appearance: we have not reached the point of demanding blockading plans which cover the whole board, but we shall content ourselves with a minimal demand: "How do we prevent freeing advances?" Let's see whether restraint can pass this test.

Game 24
Aron Nimzowitsch
Gyula Breyer
Gothenburg 1920

We start with the opening moves we know so well from game 18:
1.e4 c5 2.d3 d6 3.c3 f6 4.d4 f6 5.d5 d6 6.c6 bxc6 7.d3 c7 8.e5

8...e6 was White's choice in game 18 (p.39). In the present case he managed to achieve pressure way out on the queenside by exploiting the weakness of the a-pawn.

8...c5 9.c4 d7 10.b4 a6 11.e3 e7 12.0-0 0-0 13.a4 h6 14.b5 b8

Worth considering was the pawn sacrifice 14.g6 and if 15.a7 then 15...f5 16.b5 f4 with some counter-chances on the kingside.

15.c3!

Now White could have considered 22.h4 to roll up the kingside. But this attack would fail because the freeing move which had already been declared dead (...c7-c6) would suddenly spring back to life, e.g. 22.h4 c6 23.dxc6 bxc6 24.wxc6 g6xh4 with unclear play.

Take note of the vitality of possible (or even impossible) freeing moves. It quite often happens that a freeing pawn advance completely disappears from the playing surface, but it is much more frequent for such a move to linger under the surface as a possible threat.

The correct restraining strategy (against the possible threat of ...c7-c6) was 22.e2 and 23.d1 (not the immediate 22.d1 because of the disruptive reply 22..c2). After that, h2-h4 could no longer be stopped. But things would not be so simple, because Black could still attempt counter-measures, one instructive example being seen, for example, in the following line: 22.e2! h7! (Aiming to continue with 23..f7, which, without the previously played king move, would have failed to 23..e4. But now 23.d1 could very well be met by the diversion 23..f7, because 24.e4↑ would not do on account of 24..g6.) 25.h4! (this move is made possible because of the position of the king on h7) 23..c6 24.dxc6 bxc6 25.h5! Threatening hxg6 with check: White wins. This conclusively proves that 22.e2 was correct.

22.a2
This move gives his opponent the chance to free his game, though — because the latter's position was already so bad — it does not offer serious chances of saving the game.

22...\f7! 23.\xe4

Making a virtue out of necessity. The exchange sacrifice should win for White.

23...\c6 24.\dbxd6 \xd5 25.\we2 \xa2 26.\xa2 \xc7 27.b5 \xb5 28.axb5 \db8 29.\we6

Powerful centralization, brilliant development and the immediate chance of an attack with h2-h4 should be enough for a win.

29...a6

30.h4! \x6b5 31.\hxg5 \xa6 32.\xd1

If 32.gxh6 then 32...\c6.

32...\xc4

Breyer mounts an ingenious defence and does succeed in surviving the middlegame, but only to reach a losing endgame position.

33.\xc4 bxc4 34.gxh6 \xf6

At this point my play became weaker and weaker until the game ended in a draw. At that time I was still suffering from the emotional stress of the terrible period just after the war, which, like many others, I had just lived through as a victim.

35.\xb1 b6 36.\xbxb6 \xd7 37.\xc3 \xb4 38.\xc4

There was an easy win after 38.\xb7 e.g. 38...\xf6 39.\xf7+ \xf7 (the best) 40.\xf7 \xe4 41.\xe4 \xa3 42.\xd2 \xa2 43.\xd7.

38...\xf6 39.\xf6 \xf6 40.\xd2

Here too there was a win by \textit{direct} attack:

40.\xb7 \xc6 41.\xb6 \xc3 42.\xd7 \f7 43.\xb8+ \h7 44.\xb8+ \h8

45.\g5 \b3 46.\e8 and wins, or 40.\b7 e4 41.fxe4 \xc3 42.e5 \xc6 43.\d6! and White must win. White was not playing \textit{directly} enough — a phenomenon apparent during the depression!

40...\g8 41.\e4 \h4 42.\h2 \a2 43.\d2 \g3+

Now there is no longer a win for White.

44.\h3 \f4 45.\f6 \f8 46.\xf4 exf4 47.\b6 \a1 48.\g4 \g1 49.\xf4 \xf2 50.\f5 \h2 51.\g6 \g2+ 52.\g4 \g3 53.\b7

The 7th rank should have been exploited earlier.

Now it is too late!

53...\xf3 54.\h7+ \g8 55.\c7 \h8 56.\c4 \g8+ 57.\g7

½-½

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 25}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Dr Saviely Tartakower}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
Gothenburg 1920
\end{center}

\begin{center}
1.d4 \f5 2.e3 \f6 3.\f3 \f3 4.e2 g6 5.c4 \g7
\end{center}

\begin{center}
6.0-0 0-0 7.b4!
\end{center}

To shift the struggle to the queenside.

7...d6 8.\db2 \db7 9.\xb2 \we7 10.c5

And White undoubtedly has a positional advantage, because 10...e5 would now clearly fail to the line 11.cxd6 cxd6 12.dxe5 dxe5 13.\c4 and then 14.\b3, 15.\ac1, 16.\f1. Next came:

10...a5 11.\cxd6 cxd6 12.b5 \b6 13.\c4 \xc4
14.\(axc4\) d5 15.\(\text{d3}\) \(\text{d7}\) 16.a4 \(\text{xf8}\) 17.\(\text{e5}\) \(\text{e8}\) 18.\(\text{d2!}\)

Making it possible to bring about a situation with bishops of opposite colours!

18.\(\text{e4}\) 19.\(\text{exe4}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 20.\(\text{dxe5}\) \(\text{dxe4}\) 21.\(\text{eac1}\) \(\text{d8}\)

Bearing in mind that his a5- and b6-pawns are otherwise doomed, Black must avoid further exchanges.

22.\(\text{d4}\) g5!

How can the freeing pawn advance ...f5-f4 be prevented?

23.\(\text{c4!}\)

Very simply. 23...f4 would now be met by 24.exf4 gxf4 25.\(\text{xf4}\).

23...\(\text{f7}\) 24.\(\text{e2!}\)

24...f5-f4 had to be prevented, so 24.\(\text{c2}\) was the move. After 25.\(\text{c1}\) White could then start making use of the c-file. After the text move Tartakower nimbly escapes his fate.

24...\(\text{f4!}\) 25.exf4 \(\text{fxf4}\) 26.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{ac8}\)

White is suffering from a momentary weakness on his back rank; Tartakower built his whole rescue plan on this apparently tiny circumstance.

27.\(\text{ac1}\) \(\text{xc4}\) 28.\(\text{xc4}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 29.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{f4}\) 30.\(\text{hxg5}\) e5

Neither player can now win. Next came:

31.\(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{exf4}\) 32.\(\text{b6}\) \(\text{d61}\) 33.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{g6}\)

34.\(\text{xax5}\) e3 35.\(\text{xc8}\) f7 36.\(\text{xc7}\) \(\text{e6}\) 37.\(\text{xe3}\) fxe3 38.\(\text{b4}\) \(\text{d4}\) 39.\(\text{c5}\) \(\text{xa4}\) 40.\(\text{c7}\) \(\text{d5}\)

41.\(\text{xex3}\) \(\text{xe4}\) ½–½

2. Restraint of a central pawn mass

Since restraint has proved itself perfectly capable of making the opponent’s pawn thrusts difficult to achieve, we can try it out with something harder. This time its task is to stop a mobile central pawn mass — and we have demonstrated how hard that can be in the games against Grünfeld (17) and Romih (16). The player applying the restraint can make this really difficult job more bearable by grafting it on to some sort of attack, however modest. What is meant by this statement can be seen from the games against Alapin and Steiner (18 and 19). Typical cases here are when White has pawns on e4 and f2 against black pawns on d6 and f7 (this can be seen in the Steinitz Defence to the Ruy Lopez). Black’s e-file is being used to try and stop the threatened e4-e5 and at the same time also to threaten the e4-pawn.

In modern praxis it is frequently the case that restraint on the one hand and attack on the other appear on different parts of the board. For example, in game 27 Black is practising restraint in the centre while attacking on the queenside. Things are similar in game 28. In the brilliancy which was played against Marshall (game 26) there is not this separation as restraint and attack both take place only in the centre of the board, but only because I allowed my opponent a completely free hand in the centre because I wanted to attack his queenside.

To sum up: if the restraint is taking place on an open file, then it should happen only in the centre. But if a diagonal is the only instrument we have for restraint, then it is our duty to look beyond the centre in our search for fresh battlefields.

How this is done can be seen from the next three games.

Game 26
Aron Nimzowitsch
Frank James Marshall
New York 1927

1.c4 \(\text{d5}\) 2.d4 \(\text{e6}\) 3.\(\text{f3}\) c5

This gives a cramped game.
4.d5 d6 5.Qc3 exd5 6.cxd5 g6!

The bishop takes control of the central square e5 and, in doing so, the duty of preventing any further advance of White’s central pawn mass (in this case the pair of pawns on e4 and f4).

7.Qd2!

Many readers will regret that White to some extent avoids the problem of central restraint set by Marshall instead of trying to resolve it by, for example, 7.e4 Qg7 8.Qd3 0-0 9.0-0 a6 10.a4 Bxe8 11.h3. But I considered the position after 7.e4 etc. to be approximately level and thought that the possibility of 11...b6 ...Bxa8-a7-e7 had to be considered.

In any case, Black could have played 10...Qc8-g4 followed by ...Qxf3. What could then have been done against the restraining set-up of ...Qc7 followed by doubling rooks on the e-file?

So you will no doubt understand why I played for complications with the text move, instead of setting out with 7.e4 on a course of action which might lead to a position in which both players could end up developing all their forces and suddenly finding that no further progress was possible: a deadlock!

7...Qbd7 8.Qc4 Qb6 9.e4 Qg7

9...Qxc4 10.Qxc4 Qg7 could have been played. Then after, e.g., 11.0-0 0-0 12.h3 Bxe8 13.Bd3 a6 14.a4 Qd7 Black would be in a position to complete his set-up by ...Qc7 and then doubling rooks on the e-file.

Marshall had not expected this: White now intends to play a2-a4-a5 and reposition his knight on c4. From this point on White seems to have the advantage.

10...0-0 11.Qd3 Qh5 12.0-0 Qe5 13.a4 Qf4
14.a5 Qd7 15.Qc4 Qxd3 16.Bxd3 f5 17.exf5 Qxf5 18.f4

Since White allowed it, Black was able to roll up White’s pawn centre. But White is still strongly centralized (Qc4!) and also has chances on the queenside. However, instead of the combinatory text move, 18...Qe4 was also very good.

18...Qd4† 19.Qe3 Qxc3 20.Qxc3 Qf6 21.Qb3

White gets compensation for the d-pawn. e.g. Black will find it hard to develop his queenside.

21...Qxd5

21...Qxd5 would have been followed by 22.Qae1!! after which 22...Qe6 is prevented by the reply 23.Qxc5. Black would then be quite helpless. White could, for example, win by Qd2 followed by doubling rooks on the e-file.

22.f5! gxf5 23.Qg5

This move has an unusual point. If 23...Qe6 (the main reply with which White has to reckon) then 24.Bxb7 (threatening Qxf6 winning a piece) 24...Qc8 25.Qae1! and the bishop must abandon the protection of one of the rooks, leaving the unprotected one to its fate after Qxf6.

23...Qd4 24.Bb6† c4 25.Qc3 axb6 26.Bxd4 Qg7 27.Qae1 bxa5

10.Qc3!
7.e4!
Here and in what follows Sämisch shows his willpower and scientific turn of mind: how many other players would have given in to the temptation to drive away the unpleasant knight on b4 despite the weakening of their own position it would cause.

7...e5 8.g3 g6 9.g2 g7 10.ge2 0–0 11.0–0 d6 12.f4 exf4 13.gxf4 Be8 14.g3 Bd7

28.e8!
The quickest way to win.
28...Bxe8 29.Bxf6+ Bg8 30.Bh6
1–0

Game 27
Fritz Sämisch
Aron Nimzowitsch
Karlsbad 1923

After the very hypermodern looking opening moves, White's game was somewhat more free.

1.d4 Bf6 2.c4 b6 3.Qc3 Bb7 4.Bc2 Qc6 5.d5

Or 5.Qf3 e6 6.d5 Qb8, which is similar to the game, though in this case White could have achieved better play than in the game after the further moves g3, Qg2 and possibly Qd4.

5...Bb4 6.Qd1 a5
To prepare, in case of a2-a3, a trouble-free retreat via a6 to c5.

White's centre has been restrained. Black now seeks to graft on to this rather passive restraint – see the introductory remarks – an attack on the queenside.

However, we owe our attentive readers an explanation. Up till now we have diligently avoided the presence of the open e-file for Black and treated the restraint as though it was simply based on the diagonal g7-c3. Is this the right way of looking at things? Answer: from a wider point of view, yes, because the e-file had offered almost no prospects for an attack because e4 was so well protected. The real actors in our drama were White's centre and its lust to expand on the one hand, and on the other Black's diagonal which both restrained and (as will soon become obvious) aimed for a possible attack!

15.Bf3

We accept why Sämisch left the b4-knight alone, but we find it a bit over the top that he should now allow it access to c2. Centralization by Bb3 was the order of the day. For example:

15.Bb3 f5? 16.a3 Qa6 17.b4 or 15.Be3 f6
(to prevent $\text{d}4$) 16.e5! $\text{dxe5}$ 17.$\text{c}e4$ $\text{d}8$ 18.f5 with a strong attack.

15...$a4$!

The diagonal is becoming promising (there is the threat of ...$a3$).

16.$\text{xd}2$ $\text{a}6$ 17.$\text{d}1$ $\text{c}2$ 18.$\text{xc}1$ $\text{xd}4$

19.$\text{wa}3$

There is no more favourable square for the queen.

19...$\text{xc}5$

The breakthrough $b6-b5$ had been well enough prepared and so could have taken place at once.

20.$\text{xf}2$ $\text{f}5$

On the wrong track. As already pointed out, White's queenside was the correct side to attack. e.g. 20...$b5$! 21.$\text{b}4$ (wrongly seen by Maróczy as a refutation) 21...$\text{xc}4$ 22.$\text{xc}5$ $\text{dxc}5$ 23.$\text{wx}c5$ $\text{wd}6$ 24.$\text{wx}d6$ $\text{cxd}6$ and the $b2$-pawn cannot be stopped; Black has the advantage.

21.$\text{exf}5$ $\text{gxf}5$

22.$\text{h}5$!

So as to be able to meet 22...$\text{e}2$ and ...$\text{xc}1$ with the attacking move $\text{wg}3$ and gain the advantage.

22...$\text{ce}7$

There was another playable defence with 22...$\text{gh}8$ and ...$\text{f}7$.

23.$\text{gxg}7$

After this White should once more be at a disadvantage; he could have kept things level with 23.$\text{gh}1$ $\text{gh}8$! 24.$\text{wh}3$.

23...$\text{wg}7$ 24.$\text{wh}1$ $\text{ce}2$ 25.$\text{xc}3$ $\text{xc}4$

Now there is the threat of the queen sacrifice 26...$\text{wg}2$ 27.$\text{wxg}2$ $\text{xd}5$ 28.$\text{wh}3$ $\text{e}3$ 29.$\text{wh}4$ $\text{f}3$ 30.$\text{wh}5$ $\text{f}7$ etc. After 26.$\text{e}g1$ then 26...$\text{f}7$ would follow, e.g. 27.$\text{wa}3$ $\text{wg}1$ followed by 28...$\text{xf}3$ with advantage to Black. But the most interesting thing about it is that this sacrifice should have reappeared in a nobler form, see note to Black's 26th move.

26.$\text{wa}3$ $\text{f}8$?

An error caused by time trouble. The queen sacrifice would still have been strong: 26...$\text{xf}3$ 27.$\text{wxg}7$ $\text{xd}5$ and White would have appeared quite helpless, e.g. 28.$\text{wh}6$ $\text{f}7$ 29.$\text{cd}1$ $\text{ed}2$! 30.$\text{wx}d2$ $\text{exd}2$ 31.$\text{gg}1$ $\text{eg}8$ 32.$\text{gg}5$ $\text{f}3$ 33.$\text{gg}2$ $\text{exg}5$ 34.$\text{gg}3$ and then 34...$\text{f}3$ 35.$\text{gh}3$ $\text{ed}2$ 36.$\text{ed}1$ $\text{eg}2$ 37.$\text{gh}4$ $\text{f}3$ 38.$\text{gh}5$ $\text{ce}6$ 39.$\text{we}3$ $\text{eg}6$ or 39.$\text{wh}3$ $\text{gg}4$ and wins.

After 28.$\text{gg}2$ (instead of 28.$\text{wh}6$) 28...$\text{wxg}7$ 29.$\text{wh}3$ $\text{ce}6$ (30.$\text{gg}1$ $\text{ff}7$) Black would have been fractionally behind on material but would have had a strong attack, which would probably have been decisive. So Black could win the game elegantly (all these quiet moves!) at move 26.

27.$\text{x}d4$?

Returning the compliment for Black's error in time trouble. This one was also made in time trouble. 27.$\text{cd}1$ $\text{dd}3$ 28.$\text{x}d4$ $\text{wx}d4$ 29.$\text{xe}2$ $\text{fx}f2$ 30.$\text{xf}2$ $\text{xf}2$ 31.$\text{xc}4$ would have been decisive for White.

27...$\text{wx}d4$ 28.$\text{xe}2$ $\text{xe}2$ 29.$\text{wh}3$

White scarcely has anything better.
29...\textit{\textae} d5† 30.\textit{\textag} f1 \textit{\textaf} f1 31.\textit{\textah} h6† \textit{\textac} e8 32.\textit{\textaf} f1 \textit{\textad} d7 33.\textit{\textax} h7† \textit{\textac} c6

Black should now win without difficulty.

34.\textit{\textah} h3 \textit{\textat} g8 35.b4 axb3 36.axb3 \textit{\textab} b7 37.e3 \textit{\textaa} a8 38.\textit{\textaf} f3 \textit{\textac} a1†

Black makes his win that much harder: he should have left the rook on a8; the immediate ...\textit{\textac} e4 would have won easily.

39.\textit{\textag} g2 \textit{\textae} e4 40.\textit{\textax} e4 exf4 41.\textit{\textax} c7†

The resource made possible by 38...\textit{\textaa} a1†.

41...\textit{\textac} c7 42.\textit{\textaw} c3† \textit{\textab} b7 43.\textit{\textag} g7† \textit{\textac} c6 44.\textit{\textax} a1 c3†

The queen ending which follows is most instructive. Black has somewhat the better of it.

45.\textit{\textag} g3 \textit{\textaw} d2 46.\textit{\textaw} a8† \textit{\textac} c5 47.\textit{\textaw} a3† \textit{\textad} d5 48.\textit{\textaw} a4 \textit{\textae} e1† 49.\textit{\textag} g4 \textit{\textae} e2† 50.\textit{\textag} g3 b5 51.\textit{\textaw} b4 \textit{\textaf} f1

52.h4

There were drawing chances after 52.f5! e.g. 52...\textit{\textae} e5 53.\textit{\textaw} c3† \textit{\textac} e4 54.\textit{\textaw} c6† with a draw.

52...\textit{\textaw} e2† 53.\textit{\textag} g4 \textit{\textaw} g2† 54.\textit{\textaw} f5 \textit{\textaw} c2† 55.\textit{\textaw} g4 \textit{\textaf} e6!

White had missed this move in his calculations. If now 56.\textit{\textaw} xg5 then 56...\textit{\textaw} g2† 57.\textit{\textaw} h5 \textit{\textaw} d5† and wins.

56.f5† \textit{\textaw} xf5† 57.\textit{\textag} g3 e2 58.\textit{\textaw} c3 \textit{\textaf} f1 59.\textit{\textaw} e3† \textit{\textaf} f7 60.\textit{\textaw} a7† \textit{\textaw} g6 61.\textit{\textaw} h5†

From time to time some wood is thrown on to the fire in the hope of a perpetual check.

61...\textit{\textaw} xh5 62.\textit{\textaw} h7† \textit{\textaw} g5

Now the king escapes to b3. To get there he must arrange at the appropriate moment for a shield to protect his rear. The shield will consist of a pawn on d5.

63.\textit{\textaw} g7† \textit{\textaw} h5 64.\textit{\textaw} f7† \textit{\textaw} e5 65.\textit{\textaw} c7† \textit{\textaw} d5 66.\textit{\textaw} b7† \textit{\textaw} d4 67.\textit{\textaw} b6† \textit{\textaw} e4!

As of yet there is no point in heading for b2.

68.\textit{\textaw} c6† d5!

Safe passage has now been provided!

69.\textit{\textaw} e6† \textit{\textaw} d4 70.\textit{\textaw} b6† \textit{\textaw} d3 71.\textit{\textaw} xg5† \textit{\textaw} c2 0–1

If the pawn were on d6 instead of d5, then there would be a draw after 72.\textit{\textaw} c4†.

To sum up: If 23.\textit{\textaw} h1 had been played instead of 23.\textit{\textaw} xg7 it would hardly have been possible for Black to make decisive use of the e-file. On the other hand, the correct way of proceeding on the queenside (19...b5 or 20...b5) would have resulted in quite an easy win for Black.

Game 28

V. Buerger

Aron Nimzowitsch

London 1927

1.c4 \textit{\textaw} f6 2.\textit{\textaw} c3 c5 3.g3 g6 4.\textit{\textaw} g2 \textit{\textaw} g7 5.d3 0–0 6.\textit{\textaw} d2 e6

I was not afraid of threats from \textit{\textaw} c1 and then \textit{\textaw} h6, so I omitted the unimaginative ...h7–h6 followed by ...\textit{\textaw} h7 or some such line.

7.\textit{\textaw} c1 d5 8.\textit{\textaw} h3

He definitely has an idea in his head! He thinks he can force a decision in the centre by \textit{\textaw} f4. But White quite correctly does not go for 8.\textit{\textaw} h6 d4 9.\textit{\textaw} d1 \textit{\textaw} a5†.

8...d4 9.\textit{\textaw} a4 \textit{\textaw} a6 10.a3 \textit{\textaw} e8 11.b3 c5 12.\textit{\textaw} b2 \textit{\textaw} g4

To prevent him castling, though I now believe 12...\textit{\textaw} f5 was better. It was hard to spot that during the game.

13.\textit{\textaw} g5

Very cleverly played. He employs the knight usefully around the e4-square and at the same time removes it from the attack by the bishop. This means he is ready to continue with his sustained push far out on the queenside. In other words: White is seeking to counter his opponent's threatened central advance ...e5–e4 in a more "passive" manner and to graft on to this restraint
some sharp attacking play on the queenside (remember the introductory remarks).
13...\textbf{B}b8 14.b4 b6 15.b5 \textbf{Q}c7 16.a4 \textbf{Q}e8!
To swap off the g2-bishop.
17.a5 \textbf{B}b7 18.f3
It was simpler to play 18.\textbf{B}xb7 \textbf{B}xb7 19.axb6 axb6 20.0-0. The a-file might not be important immediately, but would have had to be continually watched by the opponent, thus diverting forces away from the kingside.
18...\textbf{Q}e6 19.a6

Just a few months ago I considered shutting things off like this to be playable. But nowadays I tend much more to think that White's defence, which from now on consists only of passive resistance, must fall apart sooner or later. 19.axb6 should be played.

19...\textbf{Q}a8!
Putting it in the corner where it has no moves, but hoping, after preparation, for the breakthrough e5-e4.

20.h4
Further weakening his position. It was relatively better to play \textbf{B}b2-d1-f2, in order to do something about the advance e5-e4 (= preventive tactics, but they would not have worked since White's defence is too passive).

20...\textbf{Q}h5 21.\textbf{Q}xe6 \textbf{Rx}6 22.g4 \textbf{Q}f6

It was worth considering the pawn sacrifice 22...\textbf{R}f4 23.\textbf{R}xf4 exf4 24.\textbf{R}xf4 \textbf{Q}e5 25.\textbf{R}d2 \textbf{R}d6 followed by ...\textbf{R}f4.

23.\textbf{R}h3 \textbf{R}d6 24.\textbf{Q}d1 h5 25.g5 \textbf{Q}h7 26.\textbf{Q}f2 f6

27.gxf6
Somewhat better would have been 27.\textbf{R}g1. After 27...\textbf{x}g5 there would follow 28.hxg5, and White retains his d2-bishop for the protection of the breakthrough square f4, which is not the case after the text move. However, 27.\textbf{R}g1 could have been met by 27...f5 and Black brings all his pieces into contact with e4. For example, the knight via f8, e6, c7, e8 to d6; the queen would be best placed on c7, the rooks on the e-file. And finally the breakthrough e5-e4 would be decisive.

27...\textbf{R}xf6 28.\textbf{R}g5 \textbf{R}xg5 29.hxg5 \textbf{Q}f4!
See the first part of the previous note.

30.\textbf{R}g1 \textbf{B}b8
Winning the pawn by 30...\textbf{B}e7 31.\textbf{R}d2 \textbf{Q}xg5
32.0-0-0 would be pathetic.

31.\textbf{Q}f1 \textbf{B}h4!
This prevents 32.\(\text{h}3\) because of the possibility of 32...\(e4\) 33.\(dxe4\) \(\text{w}h2\), winning a piece.

32.\(\text{w}d2\) \(\text{h}2!\) 33.\(\text{g}2\)

Forced. The pressure exerted by the \(h2\)-rook is just too strong.

33...\(\text{x}g2\) 34.\(\text{x}g2\)

34...\(e4!\)

The point behind the combination which exchanged rooks.

35.\(dxe4\) \(\text{w}g3\)

The breakthrough becomes a break-in.

36.\(\text{f}1\)

If 36.\(\text{f}1\) then 36...\(\text{x}e4\).

36...\(\text{x}g5\) 37.\(\text{x}g1\)

If 37.\(\text{h}1\) then 37...\(\text{x}e4\) 38.\(\text{g}xg3\) \(\text{x}d2\)† followed by ...\(\text{x}c4\) and the bishop which was shut in on a8 has the d5-square at its disposal.

I though for 20 minutes about whether there was a quicker win by 37...\(h4\). It would be followed by 38.\(\text{h}1\) \(\text{h}3\)† 39.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{w}h2\) 40.\(\text{x}h3\) \(\text{x}h1\)† 41.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{x}a1\) and the complications after the attack by 42.\(\text{w}h6\) would be unpleasant for Black. But 41...\(\text{w}h3\) 42.\(\text{g}1\) \(\text{h}2\)† 43.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{f}4\) would have won easily.

38.\(\text{x}g5\) \(\text{x}g5\) 39.\(\text{exf3}\) \(\text{e}3\) 40.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{b}3\)

41.\(\text{c}1\) g5 42.\(\text{h}2\) \(\text{e}3\) 43.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{e}2\) 44.\(\text{h}3\) d3

45.\(\text{f}2\) d2 46.\(\text{g}1\) \(\text{xc}4\) 47.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{c}1\) 48.\(\text{h}3\)

g4 49.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{xe}4\)

The bishop gets out at last.

50.\(\text{x}h5\) \(\text{f}3\)

0–1

3. Restraint of a qualitative majority

(especially a majority in a pawn chain)

We shall begin with an explanation of the concept of a qualitative majority. As I wrote in my treatment of The Blockade.

“A majority, e.g. three pawns against two, must of course be restrained; but in this sense, we must consider as a majority positions in which there is on one wing a pawn superiority of an ideal nature, not of numbers. In my game against Jacob Bernstein in Karlsbad 1923 (I had the white pieces), after the moves 1.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 2.d4 d5 3.c4 e6 4.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{c}7\) 5.e3 0–0 6.a3 a6 7.c5 c6 8.b4 \(\text{bd}7\) 9.\(\text{bd}2\) \(\text{wc}7\) 10.\(\text{wc}2\) e5 11.0–0! \(\text{e}4\)

we reached a position in which White has an ideal majority on the queenside and Black has one
on the kingside. Why? Because the e4-pawn is better than the e3-pawn and on the other side c5 is a better pawn than c6. If Black were not stopped, he would set up an attack by means of ...f5, ...g5, ...f4; this attack would be no less ferocious than the pawn storm of a real majority. As was the case with the latter, here the threat would be the establishment of a wedge (by ...f4-f3) and the opening of lines (by ...fxe3) followed by the capture of the e3-pawn which has been exposed from the side (rather than from the front). Now, if you recognize such a formation as a majority, this implies that you must undertake some measures against it. So next came 12.\(\text{Q}h4!\) \(\text{Q}b8\) (to prevent \(\text{Q}f5\)) 13.\(g3!\) \(\text{Q}e8\) 14.\(\text{Q}g2\) \(f5\) 15.\(h4\) and Black's kingside, which was apparently ready to advance has been paralysed. After a few moves the restraint turned into a blockade (by \(\text{Q}f4\))!"

The game ended:
15...\(\text{Q}d8\) 16.\(a4\) \(b6\) 17.\(b5\) \(\text{Q}f6\) 18.\(\text{Q}f4\) \(a3\) 19.\(ab5\) \(\text{Q}f7\) 20.\(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{Q}c7\) 21.\(\text{Q}xb6\) \(\text{Q}xf4\) 22.\(gxf4\) \(\text{Q}d7\) 23.\(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}xb5\) 24.\(\text{Q}a1\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 25.\(\text{Q}xb5\) \(\text{Q}a5\) 26.\(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{Q}fb8\) 27.\(\text{Q}a4\) 28.\(\text{Q}xa4\) 29.\(\text{Q}xb6\) 30.\(\text{Q}c3\) \(\text{Q}b3\) 31.\(\text{Q}xh8\) 32.\(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{Q}xc3\) 33.\(\text{Q}xc3\) \(\text{Q}c7\) 34.\(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}f7\) 35.\(\text{Q}g5\) \(g6\) 36.\(\text{Q}ha1\) \(\text{Q}b6\) 37.\(\text{Q}e2\) 38.\(\text{Q}g7\) 39.\(\text{Q}e1\) 40.\(\text{Q}g3\) \(h4\) 41.\(\text{Q}f1\) \(\text{Q}b3\) 42.\(\text{Q}c6\) \(\text{Q}b2\) 43.\(\text{Q}xg6\) \(\text{Q}xg6\) 44.\(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{Q}b7\) 45.\(\text{Q}a7\) \(\text{Q}b2\) 46.\(g2\) \(\text{Q}f6\) 47.\(\text{Q}h1\) \(\text{Q}h5\) 48.\(\text{Q}xh5\) \(\text{gxh5}\) 49.\(\text{Q}ha1\) 1–0

That was what I had to say in *The Blockade*. I should like to add the remark that the superiority of the e4-pawn over its counterpart on e3 was founded on the fact that the e3-pawn was blocked in its attempts to reach the centre (a terrible fate for a central pawn). The e4-pawn, on the other hand, has reached the centre. The strategy to be employed against a qualitative majority has already appeared with such clarity in games 13 and 27 that we think we need only recommend that you look at them. On the other hand, my teacher’s conscience requires that we look into a stratagem which has not yet been examined closely: “the king’s flight as a relieving measure”. The following situation is typical: a qualitative majority which slowly rolls forward will destroy the opposing pawn chain. This would also result in the defending side’s king being exposed, which would be doubly unpleasant. Relief can be obtained by restraining the advancing majority long enough for one’s own king to take flight; the attack is not being prevented, but simply weakened in its effect. The above procedure can be seen clearly in games 29 and 30.

**Game 29**

**Louis Van Vliet**

**Aron Nimzowitsch**

Ostende 1907

This game has already appeared in my pamphlet *The Blockade*. But fresh study of it has led me to partially revise the opinions I expressed on it and so I am including it here. In the opening Van Vliet showed that he intended to put pressure on e5.

1.d4 d5 2.\(\text{Q}f3\) c5 3.e3 e6 4.b3 \(\text{Q}f6\) 5.\(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 6.a3 \(\text{Q}d6\) 7.\(\text{Q}b2\) 0–0 8.0–0 b6 9.\(\text{Q}e5\) \(\text{Q}b7\) 10.\(\text{Q}d2\) a6 11.\(f4\)

I now considered it was time for some counter-action, so:

11...\(b5\) 12.\(\text{dxc5!}\) \(\text{Qxc5}\) 13.\(\text{Qf3}\)

For someone versed in the strategy of centralization, White’s manoeuvre 12.\(\text{dxc5}\) and 13.\(\text{Qf3}\) represents an attempt to control those central squares which have become free and go on to occupy them at a later date. It is obvious that Black will not just look on, but for his part will struggle for the control of the central squares.

13...\(\text{Q}d7\)
This attacks the e5-knight which has apparently been uprooted by 12.dxc5. In doing so, Black is apparently being extremely logical. But it is not the best move: a central knight (the f6-knight is definitely that as it is controlling e4) which is also protecting its own castled position should only be moved in an emergency, and this is not one. There was a possible sound move against the centre with 13...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_8\) (instead of 13...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_7\)). This would be followed, as in my game against Dus-Chotimirski in Karlsbad, by 14.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_3\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_5!\) 15.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_5\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_6\) 16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_4\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{c}}}_7!\) 17.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{b}}}_4\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_6!\) 18.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_5\) and now Black could easily have equalized by 18...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_7\) 19.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_7\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_7\) 20.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_4\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_6\).

It is interesting that instead of 13...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_7\), an immediate advance by ...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_5\)-\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_4\) was worth considering for Black. The attempt does fail after (13...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_4\)) 14.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_6\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_3\) 15.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{c}}}_4!\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_4\) 16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_8\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_2\) 17.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{h}}}_1\) \text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_3! \(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_1\) 18.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_6\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_2\) 19.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_1\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_2\) 20.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_7\), but though not good enough, it is instructive: it tells us that the ...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_5\)-\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_4\) advance must be prepared.

So 13...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_8\) and if 14.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_3\) then either 14...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_5\) as against Dus or 14...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_4\) 15.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_4\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_5\) 16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_3\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_7\) 17.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_3\) with chances and counter-chances. After the text move Black gets an extremely difficult game.

14.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_6\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_6\) 15.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_3!\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_6\)

If 15...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_6\) then 16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{h}}}_3!\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_5\) and now White occupies the central squares by 17.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{b}}}_4\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_7\) 18.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{b}}}_3\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_6\) 19.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_4\), but Black seems able to put up stiff resistance in the variation given after 19...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_8\) followed by ...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_6\) and ...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{b}}}_6\). So 15...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_6\) appears to be the correct move. After the text move the black position appears to allow White to remain in the driving seat by playing any order of moves he wants – he need not follow the strategic plan which was described.

16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{a}}}_6\)

This is of course a colourless sort of move. The central strategy with 16.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{b}}}_4!\) and \(\text{\textbf{\textit{b}}}_3\) was really not so hard to find.

16...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{a}}}_5\)

Black goes full out: now \(\text{\textbf{\textit{b}}}_4\), etc. is no longer possible and \(\text{\textbf{\textit{a}}}_3\) also seems weak. Despite this, White's position is hard to get at because he has a powerfully centralized game.

17.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{h}}}_3\)

Played in homespun style. A “system” player would have more likely thought of “the pawn sacrifice for blockading purposes”, namely 17.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_3!\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{x}}}_3\) 18.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{h}}}_1\), and White is occupying the central squares \(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_4\) and \(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_5\). Black's extra pawn would have no positive value as far as mobility is concerned, in fact its effect would be more negative, as it would get in the way of its own pieces. But, as was said, 17.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{h}}}_3\) is also very strong.

17...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{h}}}_6\)

To provoke \(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_2\)-\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_4\) and so sharpen the struggle. Another possibility consisted of 17...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_4\), e.g. 18.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_4\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_5\) 19.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_6\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_7\) (not 19...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_7\) on account of 20.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_6\) 20.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_3\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_4\) 21.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_1\) though in this case White's position would be preferable.

18.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_4\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_4\)

To force a locking of the pawn formation, a stratagem we shall later get to know in “From the workshop of the blockade” as an important component of the blockade.

19.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_4\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_7\)

In order to meet 20.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_5\) with 20...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_5\). The question is whether it would not have been better to play 19...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_5\). For example, 19...\(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_5\) 20.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_6\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_7\) 21.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{b}}}_3\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_7\) 22.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_3\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{a}}}_8\) 23.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_5\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{h}}}_5\). In this case too, Black's position does not inspire much confidence.

20.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{d}}}_1\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{e}}}_5\) 21.\(\text{\textbf{\textit{f}}}_5\) \(\text{\textbf{\textit{h}}}_7\)

Black fights as hard as he can against the threat of \(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_2\)-\(\text{\textbf{\textit{g}}}_4\) (after a preparatory queen move and then \(\text{\textbf{\textit{h}}}_2\)-\(\text{\textbf{\textit{h}}}_4\)) but he is already planning a future flight by his king. It would now be of great strategic interest.
to investigate the following question: would it not have been simpler to prepare for the flight by 21...\textit{W}e7 and then ...\textit{Q}f6-d7 and ...f7-f6; and would this not have saved two tempi compared to the manoeuvre in the game? (Because in the game the knight makes the journey \textit{Q}f6-h7-f8-d7.) Answer: 21...\textit{W}e7 would have been met by 22...\textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}d7 23...\textit{Q}h4! preventing ...f7-f6 and the flight of the king. (But on the other hand the threat of 24.f5-f6 and then \textit{Q}f5 would have been unpleasant.)

In the manoeuvre we recommended in the introductory remarks, (namely “Restrain until the king has fled”) speed is not the most important thing. It is more important to provoke the opponent into a pawn storm. But it is in the nature of a pawn advance that – at least for some time – one’s pieces are pushed into the background since squares are taken away from them. This circumstance will however be very welcome to us if we are planning a flight by our king, see also the note to move 24.

22...\textit{Q}f3 \textit{W}e7 23...\textit{g}g3 \textit{Q}fe8 24.h4 \textit{f}6

White’s pawn storm has cost him an important square for his pieces: \textit{Q}h4 is no longer possible.

25...\textit{a}a1 \textit{W}b7 26...\textit{f}fe1 \textit{Q}f7 27...\textit{e}e2 \textit{Q}h8 28...\textit{g}g2 \textit{Q}f8 29.g5 hgx5 30.hxg5 \textit{Q}d7

31...\textit{g}xf6

He is aiming to occupy g6 with the knight. The plan is a good one and we can see no reason to criticize the move (the tournament book gives it a question mark). It may well be that 31...\textit{g}g1 looks better but what could White do after 31...\textit{Q}e7, ...\textit{Q}ae8 and ...\textit{Q}e7-d8-c8? And a3 is unprotected... No, there can be no criticism of 31...\textit{g}xf6. White’s position still looks nice but there is a worm gnawing at it and neither 31...\textit{g}g1 nor 31...\textit{g}g1 can do much about that.

31...\textit{g}xf6 32...\textit{h}h4 \textit{Q}ag8 33...\textit{g}g6 \textit{Q}h5 34...\textit{f}f2 \textit{Q}f8 35...\textit{g}g1 \textit{Q}g5

All this is quite correct play by Black; the g6-square can hardly be held. Also possible was 35...\textit{Q}xg6 36...\textit{f}xg6+ \textit{Q}g7 and later ...\textit{g}g8-h8.

36...\textit{h}h4

36...\textit{Q}xg1 seems necessary.

36...\textit{Q}xg1

Black does not go in for the other solution which has appeared by chance, 36...\textit{Q}xg6, which would not have been possible after 36...\textit{Q}h2!.

37...\textit{Q}xg1 \textit{Q}xg6 38...\textit{a}a5 \textit{Q}f8 39...\textit{f}xg6 \textit{Q}g7 40...\textit{Q}g2 \textit{Q}h8 41...\textit{Q}e2

41...\textit{Q}h4!?

Black goes off on the wrong track (which I would still have considered the correct one in 1925, see \textit{The Blockade}). Black wrongly believes that the e4-pawn would be unstoppable after the discovered check by the c5-bishop. The game should have been decided by simple attacking play, namely 41...\textit{Q}h6 42...\textit{Q}g4 \textit{Q}d7 43...\textit{Q}g3 \textit{Q}e8 and wins.
42.\textbf{\textit{c1}}  \textit{\textbf{xe4?!}}

The game starts off as a seemingly harmless looking Dutch but from moves 6-10 seems to want to follow an unusual path.

1.b3  \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textit{d6}}}  2.\textbf{\textit{b2}}  e6  3.f4  d5  4.\textbf{\textit{d3}}  a7  5.e3  \textit{\textbf{\textit{\textit{bd7}}}  6.d3}

43.\textbf{\textit{e2}}?

He does not see that fortune has smiled upon him. But Teichmann and I and all the others missed the possibility of saving the game. White had the queen sacrifice 43.\textbf{\textit{xe4}}  \textit{\textbf{xe4}}  44.\textbf{\textit{xe4}} with the threat of \textit{\textbf{g2}}-\textit{h2}-\textit{h7} which led to a draw. The check by 44...\textit{\textbf{d3}}+ would be useless on account of the reply 45.\textit{\textbf{f1}}. After the text move, however, White is finished.

43...\textit{\textbf{h4}}  44.\textbf{\textit{xe5}}  \textit{\textbf{d7}}  45.\textbf{\textit{g7}}+  \textit{\textbf{g8}}  46.\textbf{\textit{c4}}+  \textit{\textbf{xc4}}  47.\textbf{\textit{xc5}}  \textit{\textbf{h1}}+

0–1

And here is an exercise for you: take Black in the position reached after 30...\textit{\textbf{d7}} and have an opponent of equal strength try 31.\textbf{\textit{g1}}. Try to hold Black’s position together. Begin, as shown above, with 31...\textit{\textbf{e7}} and follow up when possible with ...\textit{\textbf{ac8}} and ...\textit{\textbf{e7}}-\textit{d8-c8}. The heart of the problem is how quickly will the exchanges which favour Black come about, and \textit{what will force} them to happen? Can your opponent somehow penetrate to \textit{g7} without allowing the exchanges? Or does the game slowly and surely head for an endgame, which is in Black’s favour? The exercise will be both interesting and instructive.

Game 30
Aron Nimzowitsch
V. Buerger
London, Imperial Chess Club 1927

In order to castle after 6...\textit{\textbf{c5}}. After 7.0–0 \textit{\textbf{xd3}} 8.cxd3 there comes d3-d4, d2-d3, \textit{\textbf{xe5}} with play down the c-file.

6...\textit{\textbf{e4}}  7.\textit{\textbf{e5}}  0–0  8.0–0  \textit{\textbf{xe5}}  9.\textbf{\textit{xe4}}  \textit{\textbf{d7}}

10.\textit{\textbf{f3}}  \textit{\textbf{f6}}

It is looking drawish.

11.\textit{\textbf{c3}}  \textit{\textbf{c5}}  12.\textbf{\textit{e1}}

12.\textit{\textbf{e2}}  d4  13.\textit{\textbf{e4}}?  d3!  14.\textit{\textbf{xf6}}+  \textit{\textbf{xf6}}

15.\textit{\textbf{xf6}} dxe2 and wins.

12...\textit{\textbf{b6}}

I should prefer 12...\textit{\textbf{b6}} in order to prepare ...\textit{e6-c5}.

13.g4  \textit{\textbf{a6}}  14.d3  \textit{\textbf{d4}}
This simply results in a stiffening of the pawn skeleton, whereas Black should be looking to open up the game. The correct move was 14...Ec8 and then possibly c5-c4.

15.Ke4 Ec8 16.Qxf6+ Qxf6 17.e4 e5 18.f5 h6 19.Qg3 Ec8?

20.h4 Qh7 21.Qc1 f6 22.Qf2 Qc7 23.Qg2 Qe7 24.Qh3 Ec6 25.Qd2 Qd8 26.Qh1 Qdd6 27.a4

The move...b6-b5 previously always failed to the reply a2-a4, but now White needs the queen’s rook on the kingside. So he first takes precautions on the queenside.

27...Qc8 28.Qag1 a6 29.Qh2

Now g4-g5 can no longer be prevented.

29...Qh8 30.g5

The position now bears certain similarities to that the previous game (page 61). In both cases the king appears to need to flee and in both cases White’s advance g4-g5 (after a preparatory h2-h4) cannot be prevented. In our previous example (game 29) Black was obliged to provoke the opposing pawn storm with slow strategic moves, because it resulted in White blocking a square for one of his own pieces (the h4-square for the knight) and allowed the flight to be carried out without disturbance. Things are quite different here. The danger that the planned escape could be prevented by White did not exist here, and so the “deliberate lack of speed” (insofar as it actually was desired) would just be a harmful waste of time here. The correct idea was the immediate 19...Qd7 followed by...f7-f6 and...Qf7. For example, 20.h4 f6 21.Qc1 Qf7 22.g5 hxg5 23.hxg5 Qh8 and Black can transfer his king via d6 to b8 without being disturbed. Later he can think about an attack (...b6-b5 then...c5-c4) which appears to be “on” in this position. In short, Black was in a position to consolidate fully. After the erroneous text move Black’s king is no longer able to escape from the burning castle and dies a miserable death by fire (who says that death by burning is beautiful?!).

30...fxg5 31.hxg5 b5 32.axb5 axb5 33.Qh4 c4

There was no longer any defence.

34.Qxh6 Qxh4 35.hxg7†

1–0

The finish might be 35...Qg8 36.Qxh4 Qd8 37.Qa5 Qe8 38.Qh5 Qe7 39.Qf7† Qxf7 40.Qxh7 Qxh7 41.g8Q† etc.

The moral: Only provoke your opponent into a pawn storm if squares will be barred to the hostile pieces, which will then help you achieve your aim (the escape of the king). In any other case, run away as fast as you can; the “deliberate slowness” of game 29 would be totally useless!

4. Restraint in the case of doubled pawn complexes

a) White: pawns on a2, c3, c4, d3, e4; Black: pawns on e5, d6, c7, b7, a7 (games 31–34).
b) The fixed doubled pawns c2, c3 (or c7, c6); White: pawns on c2, c3, d4, the e-pawn on e3 or e5; Black: pawns on c4, d5, e6 (game 35).
c) The doubled pawns (c2, c3) blockaded by “$\text{dxc}4$”.

a) If White does not want to do anything, Black will find it hard to provoke into any action the complex which is curled up like a hedgehog (d3-d4). It will remain rolled up, it will “hang on” or sit tight. On the other hand, any such lack of ambition will hardly contribute to creating for White a more promising position; the opposite is far more likely to be the case (game 31). Once it comes out of its shell (d3-d4), the complex is usually not satisfied with the advance to d4 and usually gets round to d4-d5, meaning that the whole complex is compromised. This is based, in my opinion, on a certain nervousness (the unpleasant pressure being experienced down the e-file) and cannot be traced back to objective grounds. Compare, for example, the following opening from a game between Dr Saviely Tartakower (White) and me in Berlin 1928: 1.d4 $\text{dxc}6$ 2.e4 e6 3.$\text{dxc}3$ $\text{bxc}4$ 4.$\text{gxc}5$ $\text{xc}3$+$\text{f}$ 5.bxc3 $\text{e}7$ 6.$\text{c}2$ d6 7.e4 e5 8.$\text{d}3$ h6 9.$\text{e}3$ 0-0 10.$\text{e}2$ (or also 10.$\text{f}3$ in the style of game 33) 10...$\text{c}6$ 11.d5

In game 33 too – see the note to Black’s move 13 – we shall have the opportunity to convince ourselves of the great capacity for resistance offered by the complex once extended by d3-d4. On the other hand, once d4-d5 has been played (without Black having resorted to the extreme measure of ...c7-c5) the weakness of the complex becomes apparent, cf. game 32, note to move 39. The possibilities which arise after ...c7-c5, d4-d5 are clarified in games 33 and 34.

b) When taken together, these two weaknesses (the isolated a-pawn on one hand and the doubled c-pawns on the other) make not only not a very pleasant picture, because the very presence of the blockaded doubled pawns leaves the isolated pawn all that more isolated and cut off from the rest of the army (game 35). If the white pawn chain (c3, d4, e5) goes as far as e5, then White of course has a counter-chance and in such cases it is worth considering a prophylactic defence of the complex, see the later games against Kmoch (Nienдорf 1927) and Vajda (Kecskeméth 1927), i.e. 50 and 49 respectively.

c) Compare the following two openings: Morrison (White), London 1927: 1.e4 e6 2.g3 d5 3.$\text{dxc}3$ $\text{dxc}6$ 4.exd5 exd5 5.d4 $\text{d}5$ 6.a3 $\text{d}7$ 7.$\text{g}2$ 0-0 0-0 8.$\text{gxe}4$ $\text{cxe}7$! 9.$\text{f}4$ $\text{d}6$ 10.$\text{h}3$ h5 11.$\text{d}3$ $\text{e}4$ 12.$\text{d}3$ $\text{xc}3$! 13.$\text{bxc}3$ $\text{d}6$ 14.$\text{d}4$ $\text{e}6$ 15.$\text{e}2$ $\text{a}5$

There was no objective cause for this; the tiny threat of 11...exd4 12.cxd4 b4 could also be prevented by 11.$\text{b}1$.
11...$\text{b}8$ 12.0-0 $\text{a}6$ 13.$\text{h}3$ $\text{c}5$ 14.$\text{xc}5$ $\text{dxc}5$ 15.$\text{f}4$ exf4 16.$\text{xf}4$ $\text{d}7$ 17.$\text{f}2$ $\text{e}5$ 18.$\text{af}1$ $\text{d}7$ 19.$\text{d}2$ $\text{e}8$ 20.$\text{e}2$ $\text{g}5$ 21.$\text{h}2$ $\text{b}6$ 22.$\text{g}4$ $\text{g}6$ 23.$\text{d}3$ $\text{e}5$ 24.$\text{e}2$ $\text{g}6$ 25.$\text{d}3$ $\text{e}5$

and Paul Saladin Leonhardt (W) Berlin 1928:
1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.c3 b4 4.exd5 exd5 5.d3 c6 6.ge2 gc7 7.0-0 0-0 8.f4 g4 9.h3 h5 10.c1 a5!

If now 11.a3 (to prevent ...b4) then 11...xc3 12.bxc3 a5, when by moving his bishop twice Black has managed to have the opposing a-pawn brought closer to him (it would not have been so easy to attack on a2).

11.e3 b4 12.g3 xd3 13.xh5 xb2 14.h6 c4 15.g5 g6 16.xd5 f6 17.dxe6† xfe6 18.xg7 f7 19.xf6 xd6 20.xad1 xaf8 21.xb5 x6 22.xc6 bxc6 23.g5 xh3 24.f4 e3 25.g4 xg7 26.f5 xf1 27.xf1 xc3 28.xd1 e7 29.xd3 x5 30.xg2 x8 31.xf3 xb2 32.xf6† xfe6 33.xf6 exa2 34.g5 xcx2 35.e5 a5 36.g6 a4 37.xd1 x2 38.xb1 x2 39.gxh7† xh7 40.xg1 x4 41.g7† x8 42.g2† xxe5 43.xd2 a3 44.e2 xb2 45.e8† g7 46.a8 b4 0-1

We now turn to the games.

Game 31
Aron Nimzowitsch
Fritz Sämisch
Dresden 1926

Black does not manage to push the opposing doubled pawn complex into an advance (White “sits tight” rather) and so its weakness does not appear quite so clearly. But this is made up for by the fact that we get the chance to observe a secondary symptom, the typical “helplessness” of the white pieces. Although ready for action, these pieces are paralysed in their desire for action by the fact they are unable to count on the support of their foot soldiers. Since the said pawn mass is also somewhat unreliable in defence (because it is may be threatened by ...c7-c6 and then ...d6-d5), the indecisive behaviour of the pieces (10.wc2, 11.wd2) appears to have sufficient motivation. Thus the hidden pawn weakness is made clearly visible for the student and the study of the game is rewarding.

1.c4 e5 2.c3 f6 3.d3 d6 4.e4 b4 5.d3 d6 6.g3 g4 7.e2

The move is only apparently illogical, because the move g2-g3 was conceived of as protection for the knight which wanted to get to h4. Also 7.g2 would allow 7...d4.

7...h6 8.xe3 xxc3† 9.bxc3 xd7

10.wc2

White recognizes that his own central pawn mass is not very mobile, because d3-d4 and even d4-d5 would only lead to it being paralysed because of the weakness of the c5-square. So he tries to match his piece moves to the relatively modest territory at his disposal. Bearing that in mind, it was worth considering 10.xd2 to achieve by means of f2-f3 a crouching position, for example 10...xe2 11.xe2 x4 12.f3 x3 13.xe3 0-0 14.0-0 with an approximately level game.

On the other hand 10.wd2 can be seen as
a misuse of the modest terrain at his disposal, because the d2-square should remain free and the queen would be better placed on c2 to keep an eye on a4 and on the secondary threat of d4. After 10...\textit{With 10...\texttt{d2} we recommend 10...\texttt{a5}, e.g. 11.\texttt{xc4} 0-0 and then \texttt{f8} \texttt{c7-c6} and \texttt{d6-d5}, when Black should have the advantage.

10...0-0?

Here too 10...\texttt{a5} should have been preferred (11.\texttt{d4} \texttt{xc4}).

11.\texttt{d2}!

The correct square this time; Black’s castled position is in danger.

11...\texttt{h7}?

To continue with f7-f5, but this turns out to be impossible and so he is left with a decentralized knight on h7 as a result.

After completing his consolidation — moves 24 and 25 — White now tries to contest the d5-square, and Black’s last hope disappears.

27...\texttt{e5}

If 27...\texttt{d7} then 28.\texttt{a5} etc.

28.\texttt{d4} \texttt{fd8} 29.\texttt{a5} \texttt{h5} 30.\texttt{xc7} \texttt{e8}

31.d6

1-0

\textbf{Game 32}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

\textbf{Edgar Colle}

London 1927

In this game the doubled pawn complex of the previous game is seen extended and... weakened. This is the theme of the struggle here. Though White’s advance (d4) may overall have stimulated his game, it meant the first step down a slippery slope for the complex itself. And d4-d5 was the second and final step.

Let us be clear about what I am saying here: the good or bad fortune of the complex need not \textit{always} be identical to that of the game as a whole, though this is generally the case.

Note how White, despite all his efforts, was forced into d4-d5.

1.d4 \texttt{f6} 2.\texttt{f3} \texttt{e6} 3.\texttt{c4} \texttt{b6} 4.g3 \texttt{d7} 5.\texttt{g2}

\texttt{b4} 6.\texttt{e3}

To raise the problem of the doubled pawn complex.

6...0-0 7.0-0 \texttt{xc3} 8.bxc3 \texttt{d6}
Bearing in mind the threatened 31...h4.

31...xh5
A simpler line seems to be 31...h4 f6 32...h6 f7 and then the queen’s rook is moved back and forward (a1-d1-a1 etc.).

31...eag8 32...f2 f6

33...h2!
This consolidates matters.

33...g5 34...h4 h5 35...g1 f8 36...g4 h6 37...xh6 xh6 38...f2
38...xg8† xg8 39...f2 would have led to a clear draw.

38...xh2† 39...xh2

39...b8!
It is typical of the great weakness of a paralysed doubled pawn complex that Black can forget about the fact that his own pawns are sickly
(they are all on the same colour of squares as the opposing bishop) and still try to win. And not simply with the text move, but also after 39...\textit{\textbf{xc}}8. For example: 40.\textit{\textbf{egl}}! \textit{\textbf{c}}6 (When the formation has been enticed forwards and is paralysed this is an especially appropriate way of challenging it: first the advance is provoked, \textit{\textbf{d}}3-\textit{\textbf{d}}4-\textit{\textbf{d}}5, and then the bill is presented by means of \textit{\textbf{c}}6. Here the course is not smooth, because for his part White could also have provoked weaknesses by a direct attack on his opponent's king.) 41.\textit{\textbf{xb}}1! \textit{\textbf{cxd}}5 42.\textit{\textbf{cxd}}5 \textit{\textbf{exc}}3 43.\textit{\textbf{xb}}6 \textit{\textbf{fxc}}3 44.\textit{\textbf{xa}}5 \textit{\textbf{c}}5 The position is then extremely double-edged, though it seems to me that Black has the advantage.

40.\textit{\textbf{gl}} \textit{\textbf{c}}5 41.\textit{\textbf{a}}1 \textit{\textbf{g}}7 42.\textit{\textbf{e}}3 \textit{\textbf{f}}7 43.\textit{\textbf{a}}2 \textit{\textbf{d}}3

That is just what the last two preventive moves were aimed at stopping. Black should be happy with a draw.

44.\textit{\textbf{d}}2 \textit{\textbf{el}} 45.\textit{\textbf{g}}3 \textit{\textbf{g}}8↑ 46.\textit{\textbf{f}}2 \textit{\textbf{g}}2 47.\textit{\textbf{h}}6!

The counter, which reaches its high point in the winning of the knight, namely 47...\textit{\textbf{h}}4 48.\textit{\textbf{e}}3 \textit{\textbf{g}}3 49.\textit{\textbf{h}}2 \textit{\textbf{xf}}3 50.\textit{\textbf{f}}2 \textit{\textbf{hx}}2 51.\textit{\textbf{gx}}3 \textit{\textbf{fl}}↑ 52.\textit{\textbf{g}}2 and the knight is trapped.

47...\textit{\textbf{f}}4?

This costs him a pawn and, after tough resistance, the game too. By 47...\textit{\textbf{h}}4 48.\textit{\textbf{e}}3 \textit{\textbf{g}}2↑ Colle could easily get a draw from a game in which he has played so well. The endgame is an extremely instructive illustration of the 7th rank absolute.

48.\textit{\textbf{xf}}4 \textit{\textbf{exf}}4 49.\textit{\textbf{ad}}1 \textit{\textbf{e}}7 50.\textit{\textbf{ah}}1 \textit{\textbf{ag}}7 51.\textit{\textbf{ah}}4 \textit{\textbf{c}}6

A late challenge, but not an easy one to answer.

52.\textit{\textbf{xf}}4 \textit{\textbf{h}}5 53.\textit{\textbf{bh}}4 \textit{\textbf{bh}}7 54.\textit{\textbf{h}}1 \textit{\textbf{d}}7 55.\textit{\textbf{g}}1 \textit{\textbf{cx}}5 56.\textit{\textbf{cx}}5 \textit{\textbf{h}}4 57.\textit{\textbf{ag}}8 \textit{\textbf{h}}3 58.\textit{\textbf{a}}8 \textit{\textbf{Ah}}6 59.\textit{\textbf{a}}7↑ \textit{\textbf{c}}8

Now the rook has the 7th rank absolute, whereas the king will do the blockading.

60.\textit{\textbf{gl}} \textit{\textbf{h}}2↑ 61.\textit{\textbf{h}}1

61...\textit{\textbf{h}}3

All now depends on who is quicker.

62.\textit{\textbf{f}}7 \textit{\textbf{xf}}3 63.\textit{\textbf{xf}}6 \textit{\textbf{d}}7 64.\textit{\textbf{f}}7↑ \textit{\textbf{e}}8 65.\textit{\textbf{b}}7 \textit{\textbf{xc}}3 66.\textit{\textbf{xb}}6 \textit{\textbf{e}}7 67.\textit{\textbf{b}}7↑

Still the same leitmotif, the 7th rank!

67...\textit{\textbf{g}}8 68.\textit{\textbf{a}}7 \textit{\textbf{e}}4 69.\textit{\textbf{xa}}5 \textit{\textbf{xe}}4 70.\textit{\textbf{a}}7 \textit{\textbf{f}}4 71.\textit{\textbf{a}}5 \textit{\textbf{xf}}5 72.\textit{\textbf{a}}6

The triumph of the 7th rank absolute occurs when the rook occupies the seventh rank and the opposing king is cut off on the eighth, see game 12.

72...\textit{\textbf{f}}1↑

Because after 72...\textit{\textbf{xd}}5 73.\textit{\textbf{b}}7 \textit{\textbf{a}}5 there is the decisive 74.\textit{\textbf{a}}7 followed by 75.\textit{\textbf{b}}8 with check.

73.\textit{\textbf{d}}xh2 \textit{\textbf{e}}1 74.\textit{\textbf{a}}8↑ \textit{\textbf{g}}7

Or 74.\textit{\textbf{e}}7 75.\textit{\textbf{a}}7 and then \textit{\textbf{h}}8, etc.

75.\textit{\textbf{g}}3 \textit{\textbf{a}}4 76.\textit{\textbf{b}}3 \textit{\textbf{f}}6 77.\textit{\textbf{a}}7 \textit{\textbf{g}}7 78.\textit{\textbf{e}}3 1–0

\textbf{Game 33}

\textbf{David Markelowicz Janowski}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

\textbf{St Petersburg 1914}
1.d4 ♜f6 2.c4 e6 3.♕c3 ♛b4 4.e3 b6 5.♕d3 ♛b7 6.♕f3 ♛xc3† 7.bxc3 d6
7...c5 then ...♛e6 was also possible.
8.♖c2 ♛bd7 9.e4 e5

Black has apparently reached a solid position. However the b7-bishop is playing a rather dubious part, since on one hand it is not strong enough to force White into d4-d5 and on the other its absence from the c8-g4 diagonal will soon make itself unpleasantly felt.

10.0-0 0-0 11.♗g5 h6 12.♗d2 ♣e8 13.♗ae1

But probably 13...♛e6 would be met with 14.♖e2! and then for example 14...♕e8 15.♕f1 and White stubbornly continues the policy of sitting tight. But Black would have one success to his name: thanks to the removal of the f-rook the possibility of f2-f4 has retreated into the distance.

Apart from 13...♛e6 it was also worth considering 13...♕f8, e.g. 14.h3 ♕g6 15.♕h2 ♣e7 16.f4? ♣xf4 17.♗xf4 ♣e8 and d4-d5 is forced.

And, finally, the immediate 13...c5 was possible, but in this case White could block everything with 14.d5.

14.h3

After 14.♕h1 (as suggested in the tournament book) amongst other options there is 14...♕df6, e.g. 15.♕g1 ♕g5 and the advance f2-f4 would not be feasible.

14...♕f8

Here too 14...♕df6 would have been possible.

15.♕h2 ♣e6 16.♕e3 c5 17.d5 ♕f4
Black has chances on the kingside to replace the ones he lost on the queenside after ...c7-c5.

18.♗e2 ♣f8 19.♗g4 ♣e8
At last the bishop reaches the correct diagonal.

20.♖d2

13...♗h7

By trying the somewhat strange looking 13...♛e6 (followed by ...♕e8) Black could have tried to prevent his opponent from sitting tight (i.e. try to force d4-d5). The continuation might have been (13...♛e6) 14.♕h4! (to exploit the weakness of the f5-square, see note to move 9) 14...g6! 15.f4 (not 15.♗xh6 because of 15...♕g4) 15...♕xf4 16.♕xf4 and now Black would have the choice between 16...g5?, 16...♕h5 and 16...♕e8. The strategic goal which Black might have set would show at its clearest after 16...♕e8, e.g. 16...♕e8 17.d5 ♤e7 18.♗xh6 ♕g4 19.♕g5 f6 20.♕c1 ♕ge5 and White may be a pawn up, but his life is no bed of roses since his doubled pawn complex is paralysed and Black has some central squares.

Even more illuminating however would be the variation 16...♕h5 17.♗f2† ♘f6 18.g3 g5 19.e5 ♤xf4 20.gxf4 ♤xf4 and wins; or 16...♕h5 17.♕g3 ♤xg3 18.hxg3 ♤g5 followed by ...♕ae8 and Black has nothing to fear.

20...♕a6

20...♕g6 would have been simpler, but Black has no faith in his own attack on the king. He had been depressed by the fact that he could not manage to force d4-d5 without some concession on his part - because ...c7-c5 was one. So in what follows he contents himself with a crouching
(fog) position and by doing so... could nearly have won the game.

21.g3 \( \text{Qg6} \) 22.\( \text{Re2} \) \( \text{Qh7} \) 23.h4 \( \text{Qf6} \) 24.\( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Kb8} \)

The rook is brought to e7 to help with prevention.

25.\( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Bb7} \) 26.\( \text{Lc1} \) \( \text{Bce7} \) 27.\( \text{Wh1} \) \( \text{Lc8} \) 28.\( \text{Qg1} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 29.\( \text{h5} \) \( \text{Qh8} \) 30.\( g4 \) \( \text{Qh7} \) 31.\( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Bb7} \) 32.\( \text{f4} \) \( f6 \)

Janowski has finally got in the planned advance, but to do so he had to give up some valuable points, e.g. g5. This will come back to haunt him.

33.\( \text{fxe5} \)

33.g5 led nowhere, e.g. 33.g5 \( \text{fxg5} \) 34.\( \text{fxg5} \) hgx5 35.\( \text{Qg3} \) Qf7 36.\( \text{Qf3} \) g4, etc.

33...\( \text{dxe5} \) 34.\( \text{Qd3} \) Qf7 35.\( \text{Qe1} \) Qg8 36.\( \text{Qh4} \) Qd6 37.\( \text{Qf5} \) Qxf5 38.gxf5 Qg5

See the note to move 33.

39.\( \text{Qxg5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \)

40.\( \text{Qa4} \)

He does not bother about his own h-pawn which is in need of protection and tries instead to roll up his opponent’s queenside (\( \text{Qc6} \) then \( a2-a5-a5 \), etc.). We shall see in future games this attempt at rolling up is in the nature of a punitive expedition (revenge for ...c7-c5?). Janowski deserves the highest praise for trying, despite the weaknesses in his own camp, to expose those of his opponent; Janowski has a wonderfully subtle chess sense.

Yet another opinion is expressed in the tournament book, which criticizes Janowski’s sharp combination and considers the resulting loss of a pawn as decisive. But even if this were the case – which we doubt – in one sense this would in no way alter the value of the variation. Janowski’s manoeuvre – correct or not – unveils the secret behind the position!

40...\( \text{Qf8} \) 41.\( \text{Qc6} \) \( \text{Bb8} \) 42.\( \text{a4} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 43.\( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Bh8} \) 44.\( \text{Wh1} \) \( \text{Bh6} \) 45.\( \text{Ba1} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 46.\( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Bbh8} \) 47.\( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 48.\( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 49.a5 \( \text{Qxh5} \) 50.\( \text{Qxh5} \) \( \text{Qxh5} \) 51.axb6 \( \text{Qh3} \) 52.\( \text{Qc2} \) axb6 53.\( \text{Qa8} \) \( \text{Qh7} \) 54.\( \text{Qd8} \) \( \text{Qa7} \) 55.\( \text{Qa8} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 56.\( \text{Qb3} \)

Here White takes his eye off the ball. How could Black win after 56.\( \text{Qd8} \)? Consider 56.\( \text{Qd8} \) \( \text{Qa7} \) 57.\( \text{Qa8} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 58.\( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qh4} \) 59.\( \text{Qa2} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 60.\( \text{Qf8} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) 61.\( \text{Qa8} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 62.\( \text{Qd8} \), etc. Or 60...g6 (instead of 60...\( \text{Qxf5} \) ) 61.\( \text{Qa8} \) \( \text{gxf5} \) 62.\( \text{Qh4} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 63.\( \text{Qe8} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 64.\( \text{Qh5} \) and mate in a few moves. So it appears that the rolling up turns into a flanking movement and that the tournament book is wrong to consider the loss of the pawn as decisive. However, after the wrong move in the game Black should win easily.

56...\( \text{Qh5} \)! 57.\( \text{Qxh5} \) \( \text{Qxh5} \) 58.\( \text{Qe8} \)

58...\( \text{Qxe8} \)?

Exhausted by the long defensive struggle, Black misses a continuation which would be decisive at once: 58...\( \text{Qh6} \)! If now 59.\( \text{Qd8} \) then simply 59...g4, etc. Or if 59.\( \text{Qg6} \) then Black wins by 59...\( \text{Qxg6} \) 60.\( \text{Qxg6} \) \( \text{Qxg6} \) 61.\( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 62.\( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qf5} \) (this is the move which Black overlooked in his calculations). After the text move there should no longer be a win for Black.
59. exd 60. d5 cxd4 61. b5 cxb5 62. cxc6 d5 63. bxc6 dxc6 64. b6

The best move. The threat was ...dxe4 followed by ...f3 and a rapid advance of the passed pawns.

64...dxe4 65. cxe4 fxe5 66. cxb7 d2 67. c6 e4 68. d6 d2 69. d7 e3

A subtle move. If now 9...e5 then 10. d5 c7 (not 10...d5 because of 11. c3 11. e4 with a pawn formation such as we met in the previous game (move 22); the only difference perhaps worth taking into account would be that the black pawn is still on b7 rather than having advanced to b6, and so there is no threat of being rolled up with a2-a4-a5. But with the b-file being open, can the pawn stay on b7?

9...b6

To clear b7 for the knight; Black is planning 10...e5 11. d5 c5 and if now 12. c3 then 12...b7.

10. c5

The move indicated was 10. f4. After 10...e5 11. e5 dxe5 12. d5 c5 13. c4 b7 14. e4 dxe5 15. b6 we should have reached the same pawn formation as in game 33 after move 36. On the whole it comes across as rather mummified.

10...e5! 11. f4

70. cxb6

70...c7 would lose the game for White.
70...e7 71. e6 cxd3 72. e5 d2 73. c2 d8

And a draw was agreed after 12 more moves. A difficult game.
74. e1 c8 75. c7 d8 76. d6 d8 77. c5 c8 78. d6 c4 79. c5 d8 80. e4 e7 81. c3 d4 82. e1 e3 83. e5 e4 84. c7 e3 85. c6 f4

½–½

Game 34
Paul J. Johner
Aron Nimzowitsch
Dresden 1926

This game was already in My System. I am repeating it here, though with different annotations, because I feel it is an essential companion to game 33.

1. d4 d5 2. c4 e6 3. c3 b4 4. e3 0–0

Here, against Janowski I played 4...b6 (see the previous game).

5. d3 c5 6. f3 c6 7.0–0 cxc3 8. bxc3 d6 9. d2

11...e4!

This move would also have followed 11. d5, e.g. 12. e2 e5 and Black is centralized, or 11. d5 e4 12. dxe6 dx3 with advantage to Black.

The point of the previous apparently bloodless struggle (moves 9–11) is simply that it was in reality full of tension and very bloody: White had played f2–f4 a tempo too late, which meant that the thrusting e-pawn only just escaped the righteous anger of the f-pawn. If on move 11 Black had played 11... f7 (instead of 11...e4!) so
that after 12...f5 13.d5 he might choose the retreat 13...d8 (though a better move would be 13...e4!) then we would once more have seen 14.e4 e8 and once again we have mummification (= deadlock).

After the text move, 11...e4, Black had a new and a very difficult problem to solve: how to restrain White’s kingside (the f-, g- and h-pawns). 12...e2

12...d7!!

This sees the start of an extremely difficult and complicated process of restraint. Another restraining method would have been 12...e8, but this too would lead after 13.g4 f5 14.d5 e7 15.g5 to a petrified position, since the c5-square and, above all, the f5-square are not available for the knights.

The need to carry out a process of restraint without allowing mummification of the position makes the problem very difficult to solve.

13.h3 e7 14.e1

Is White’s attack not even strong enough to block (mummify) the position, that is the question. Check it out: 14.d2 f5 (this square helps with the initiative, e.g. there is now the threat of ...g3 as well as the exchange of the e2-bishop which is supporting the c4-pawn) 15.e1 g6 16.g4 g7 17.h4 e8 and now 18.a4 (preventing ...a4 as well as other things). If now 18...f5 then 19.g5 and 20.d5. This would take us to a position which is hard to evaluate, e.g. 19.g5 c7 20.d5 a6! (a preventive move aimed against the threatened a4-a5, which can now always be met with ...b5) 21.f2 f7! 22.ad1 (22.h6 fails to the combination 22...xd5 23.cxd5 e2 24.e2 xd5 25.c1 h5! and the queen is permanently imprisoned: Black wins by a general pawn advance) 22...h8 and then 23...h5, after which Black tries to prepare the breakthrough h7-h6 by means of ...g8 and ...h8-g7-f8-e7-d7. If we imagine that Black could have played ...a7-a5 before 20...a6 (to cut out the counter-chance with a4-a5) then we realize that any attempt at a mummification of the position by White must come up against great difficulties.

14...h5

This starts the process of tying White up.

15.d2

Or 15.h4 f5 16.g5 h7 17.xh5 g3. 15...f5!

In order to make its way to h7, which was the original idea behind the restraining manoeuvre.

16.h2 h7!

17.a4 f5

Threatening 18.g4† 19.hxg4 hxg4† 20.g1 etc.

18.g3 a5

The b6-pawn is easily protected.

19.g1 h6 20.f1 d7 21.c1 a8

Now we have a different state of affairs from after move 14. Black no longer has to fear the closing up of the queenside by d4-d5; he has sufficient play on the kingside.
31.\(\text{Exe}2\)

He sees his chance. The e-pawn is now in need of protection. Purely defensive play such as 31.\(\text{cxd}2\) would have been met with a pretty combination, namely 31...\(\text{ex}g6!\) 32.\(\text{cxe}1\) \(\text{g}4\)\(t\) 33.\(\text{hx}g4\) \(\text{hx}g4\)\(t\) 34.\(\text{c}g2\) \(\text{x}c4\)! 35.\(\text{xc}4\) followed by the quiet move 35...\(\text{e}3\)! and the only way to prevent mate on h3 is by 36.\(\text{dxe}3\), which costs him his queen.

31...\(\text{h}h3\) 32.\(\text{c}e3\)

I had of course expected 32.\(\text{c}d2\) because White’s only counter-chance lies in the important e4-pawn’s need for protection. It would have been followed by a charming queen sacrifice: 32.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{c}8\) 33.\(\text{dxe}4\) \(\text{fg}5\)! 34.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{xh}3\)\(t\) 35.\(\text{dxe}3\) \(\text{g}4\) mate.

The point is that the moves \(\text{c}8\) and \(\text{f}5\) can in no way be reversed, e.g. 32.\(\text{c}2\) \(\text{f}5\)? (instead of 32...\(\text{c}8\)) 33.\(\text{d}1\)! \(\text{c}8\) 34.\(\text{f}1\) and everything is protected, whereas after 32...\(\text{c}8\)! 33.\(\text{d}1\) the move 33...\(\text{x}h3\)! would sweep away the cornerstone of the white building (34.\(\text{dxe}3\) \(\text{f}5\)\(t\) etc.).

32...\(\text{c}8\) 33.\(\text{c}2\) \(\text{x}h3\)! 34.\(\text{d}xe4\)

34.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{f}5\)\(t\) 35.\(\text{h}2\) would have led to mate in three.

34...\(\text{f}5\)

The best, because now \(\text{h}5\)-\(\text{h}4\) can no longer be stopped. After the fall of the h3-pawn there is no hope of any defence.

40...\(\text{e}8!\)

This precise move finishes the game, because there is now the threat of 41...\(\text{d}xg2\) 42.\(\text{d}xg2\) \(\text{h}1\)\(t\) 43.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{g}2\)\(t\) against which White has no defence. 41.\(\text{e}1\) would even be followed by mate after 41...\(\text{d}3\)\(t\) 42.\(\text{f}1\) (or 42.\(\text{d}d1\)) 42...\(\text{h}1\)\(t\).

0–1

This was one of the best blockading games I have ever played.

Game 35

Aron Nimzowitsch

Dr Milan Vidmar Sr.

Karlsbad 1907

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

To force Black to make up his mind: after 4...\(\text{e}6\) the bishop remains shut in, and if he plays 4...\(\text{f}5\) it is met by 5.\(\text{c}3\), then \(\text{c}4\) and possibly \(\text{b}3\); after 4...\(\text{g}4\) then 5.\(\text{e}5\) should be played.

4...\(\text{g}4\) 5.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{h}5\) 6.\(\text{c}4\)

This move is based on the following surprising combination: 6.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{dxc}4\) 7.\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{dxc}4\) 8.\(\text{dxc}6\) \(\text{d}7\) 9.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{x}g4\) 10.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{e}5\) 11.\(\text{b}5\) and White hangs on to the piece. It is remarkable that no one has thought of the possibility of 9...\(\text{g}6\) (instead of 9...\(\text{dxc}4\)) since after 10.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{xc}6\) 11.\(\text{xc}6\)\(t\) \(\text{bxc}6\) 12.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{d}7\) 13.\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{e}8\) the defender would have the advantage.

But White had a simpler and better line with
6.c4 dxc4 7.\( \texttt{\textit{c6}} \) bxc6 8.\( \texttt{\textit{a4}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{d7}} \) 9.e3 with a good game. Thus the 4th move, which is playing for a zugzwang, seems to have been correct, which is a rarity at such an early stage of the game.

6...e6 7.\( \texttt{\textit{a4}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{d6}} \)

This plays into White's hands, since the restricting move c4-c5 can now be played with tempo. But 7...\( \texttt{\textit{c7}} \) would have been followed by 8.\( \texttt{\textit{c3}} \) and after the further moves 8...0-0 9.\( \texttt{\textit{xc6}} \) bxc6 10.\( \texttt{\textit{xc6}} \) Black would not have been able to make use of his extra tempo and so the pawn he had lost would have become of decisive importance.

8.\( \texttt{\textit{xc6}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{d7}} \) 9.e5! \( \texttt{\textit{e7}} \) 10.\( \texttt{\textit{f4}} \)

To prevent 10...\( \texttt{\textit{xc6}} \); the blockader must generally attempt to avoid exchanges.

10...\( \texttt{\textit{bxc6}} \) 11.e3 0-0

11...a5 was out of the question because of b2-b4xa5, etc., but now the a-pawn becomes immobile.

14.0-0

White can always win the exchange by \( \texttt{\textit{b1-d2}} \)-b3-a5, but he is trying for more than that.

14...\( \texttt{\textit{f6}} \) 15.\( \texttt{\textit{d2}} \) g5 16.\( \texttt{\textit{g3}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{g7}} \) 17.h3

In order to retain the bishop.

17...\( \texttt{\textit{e8}} \) 18.\( \texttt{\textit{h2}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{d8}} \)

19.g4!

To hem in the knight. The strategic reason for this – because doing so is a question of tactics – can be seen from the following evaluation: Black will have to run up against the annoying g-pawn (...h7-h5), then lines will be opened which, because of the way things lie, will suit the white and not the black rooks. So White plays first on one wing and then on the other: considering his precarious situation on the left, Black is forced into countermeasures which must appear hopeless from the very start for one good reason. This can be seen in the problems he has communicating with his left flank. There are no express routes between the two flanks.

19...h5 20.\( \texttt{\textit{d1}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{g6}} \) 21.\( \texttt{\textit{b3}} \) hxg4 22.hxg4 \( \texttt{\textit{h5}} \) 23.\( \texttt{\textit{c5}} \) fxg4 24.\( \texttt{\textit{xg4}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{d5}} \) 25.\( \texttt{\textit{a5}} \) \( \texttt{\textit{h7}} \) 26.\( \texttt{\textit{e2}} \)

Note that I did not retreat the bishop earlier; the replacement (the knight on a5) must be brought into play first. The knight was there so that not for a single moment would Black be in a position to play the freeing ...a7-a5, see the note to move 12.

26.\( \texttt{\textit{d7}} \)

12.\( \texttt{\textit{a6}} \)

This blockade is very unpleasant for Black because it crosses a plan which was most important to him: that plan consisted of eventually getting rid of the a-pawn by advancing it. The fact that the blockading also controls the b7-square comes as no surprise, because we know that:

"Blockading squares, almost without exception, turn out to be strong squares in every respect."

12.\( \texttt{\textit{f8}} \) 13.b4 \( \texttt{\textit{e8}} \)

Black is planning to break through in the centre by ...f7-f6, possibly ...e6-e5. That's all he can do.
27.\( \text{\texttt{h3}} \)

Nowadays I would prefer 27.\( \text{\texttt{f4}} \) because I do not like giving any freedom to a blockaded pawn (here the g5-pawn). After 27.\( \text{\texttt{f4}} \) there could follow: 27.\( \text{\texttt{f7}} \) (27...\( \text{\texttt{xf7}} \) 28.\( \text{\texttt{h3}} \) 28.\( \text{\texttt{fxg5 e7}} \) 29.e4 dxe4 30.\( \text{\texttt{c4 e8}} \) (the threat was 31.\( \text{\texttt{xf5}} \) 31.\( \text{\texttt{ad1}} \) with an easy win because Black cannot do anything, e.g. 31...\( \text{\texttt{e3}} \) 32.\( \text{\texttt{wh3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xf1}} \) 33.\( \text{\texttt{xe6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{w8}} \) 34.\( \text{\texttt{xg6}} \).

27.\( \text{\texttt{f7}} \) 28.\( \text{\texttt{f4}} \) g4!

Vidmar prevents the opening of the f-file, which he would not have been able to do after 27.\( \text{\texttt{f4}} \). In any case, his game is of course lost.

29.\( \text{\texttt{xg4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xc4}} \) 30.\( \text{\texttt{a2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{g8}} \) 31.\( \text{\texttt{g2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{h4}} \) 32.\( \text{\texttt{fg3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xa8}} \)

The best he had available. 32...\( \text{\texttt{f5}} \) would be insufficient: 33.\( \text{\texttt{xf5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xf5}} \) 34.\( \text{\texttt{wh6}} \) 35.\( \text{\texttt{wh6}} \) and White will very soon force the win by \( \text{\texttt{f2}} \) and \( \text{\texttt{fg1}} \).

33.\( \text{\texttt{f2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{h8}} \)

Despair. Waiting meant certain death, e.g. 33...\( \text{\texttt{ba8}} \) 34.\( \text{\texttt{fg1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{af8}} \) 35.\( \text{\texttt{d1}} \) etc.

34.\( \text{\texttt{xe8}} \) \( \text{\texttt{hxe8}} \) 35.\( \text{\texttt{fg1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{h6}} \) 36.\( \text{\texttt{h5}} \)

Marco describes this as "a splendid, decisive combination". But four moves later I blunder and it is not decisive.

36...\( \text{\texttt{xe5}} \) 37.\( \text{\texttt{eg7}} \) 38.\( \text{\texttt{eg8}} \) 39.\( \text{\texttt{xe4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{wh7}} \) 40.\( \text{\texttt{xf8}} \)??

A hallucination, the results of which were disastrous. 40.\( \text{\texttt{h1g7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xf7}} \) (if 40...\( \text{\texttt{c2}} \) then 41.\( \text{\texttt{xf7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{h7}} \) 41.d8.\( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{h8}} \) 42.\( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{h8}} \) 43.\( \text{\texttt{xc6}} \) would have won quickly.

40.\( \text{\texttt{xf8}} \) 41.\( \text{\texttt{f5}} \)

After 40.\( \text{\texttt{xf8}} \) White was thinking of 41.\( \text{\texttt{h5}} \) and had completely overlooked the reply 42...\( \text{\texttt{e8}} \).

41.\( \text{\texttt{f5}} \)

The correct move was 41...\( \text{\texttt{xf5}} \) .

42.\( \text{\texttt{h1}} \)

White has again reached a winning position.

42...\( \text{\texttt{f4}} \)

43.\( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e8}} \) 44.\( \text{\texttt{f6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xf6}} \) 45.\( \text{\texttt{xe7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{h7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f7}} \)

\( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)

Instead of the drawing combination, 43.\( \text{\texttt{xf4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e8}} \) 44.\( \texttt{e4} \) would have won, but I was still suffering from the shock of my previous error. In spite of the horrible mistake on move 40, this is a very instructive game. Moreover, Vidmar has escaped my clutches three times in quite similar fashion.

Game 36
Frank James Marshall
Aron Nimzowitsch
New York 1927

1.\( \text{\texttt{e4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e6}} \) 2.\( \text{\texttt{d4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d5}} \) 3.\( \text{\texttt{c3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b4}} \) 4.\( \text{\texttt{exd5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{exd5}} \) 5.\( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) 6.\( \text{\texttt{d3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d6}} \) 7.\( \text{\texttt{h3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e6}} \) 8.0-0 \( \text{\texttt{wd7}} \) 9.\( \text{\texttt{f4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xc3}} \) 10.\( \text{\texttt{bxc3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f6}} \)

To secure the e6-bishop against a possible \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \). We can now see the prophylactic importance of the move 7...\( \text{\texttt{e6}} \). White now tried an attack down the b-file, but you should not be surprised to learn that it came to nothing because of the dynamic weakness of the doubled pawn complex.
11.\texttt{Bb1 g5 12.\texttt{Bg3 0-0-0}}

This looks audacious, but it follows the plan of campaign started on move 9.

13.\texttt{We2}

13.\texttt{Dd2!}
13...\texttt{Fde8!}

And not 13...\texttt{Edg8} because a flank attack is best defused by concentration on the centre and not by a counter-attack on the flank.

14.\texttt{Ff1 Ff5}

41...\texttt{a5}

41...\texttt{Ff5} was also possible, e.g. 42.\texttt{a4 Xxb1}
43.\texttt{AXB5 Bxb}1 44.\texttt{Ff4 Fc4} 45.\texttt{Fxe5 Fd7} 46.\texttt{Ff}-
moves \texttt{c6!} 47.\texttt{Bxc6}+ \texttt{Fxc6} and the king heads for \texttt{b3}.

42.\texttt{Fd2}

A win similar to that in the previous note was there after 42.\texttt{Ff4} (to prevent ...\texttt{Ff5}) 42...\texttt{Ff7}
43.\texttt{a4 Fg6} 44.\texttt{AXB5 Bxb}1 45.\texttt{Fxe5 Bc}2 46.\texttt{Ff6}
\texttt{Fc4} and then ...\texttt{Fb7} and ...\texttt{c6}, etc.

42...\texttt{Ff5} 43.\texttt{Ba3 Xxa3} 44.\texttt{Xxa3 Bb1} 45.\texttt{Fb8}
\texttt{Xxa2} 46.\texttt{Xg7 Fc4} 47.\texttt{Xe3 Fb7} 48.\texttt{Bb6} \texttt{Ba6}

15.\texttt{Fxf5}

15.\texttt{Fa6} is insufficient because of 15...\texttt{bxa6}.
15...\texttt{Fxf5} 16.\texttt{Bb5 Fd8} 17.\texttt{Ff5 Fb6} 18.\texttt{Ff3}
\texttt{Fb7} 19.\texttt{Wb3 Fc6}

A blockader is already heading for \texttt{c4} to show up the weakness of \texttt{c2}, \texttt{c3}.

20.\texttt{Ff2 Ff5} 21.\texttt{Wb2 Fxe1}+ 22.\texttt{Fxe1 Bxe8}
23.\texttt{Fxe8 Wxe8} 24.\texttt{Wb1 Fc8}

24...\texttt{Wf2} would also be strong here.

25.\texttt{Wd1 Wf6} 26.\texttt{Fb3 Fc4} 27.\texttt{Ff2 Ff2} 28.\texttt{Ff1}
\texttt{Fxc2}

We now have an ending where Black is a pawn up but with bishops of opposite colours; it was considered drawn by many of the spectators.

29.\texttt{Fb5 Fd3} 30.\texttt{Fd1 We4}

Not 30...\texttt{Wf2} at once because of 31.\texttt{Wxc2 Xxe2}
32.\texttt{Ff3}.

31.\texttt{Ff2}

If 31.\texttt{Ff3} then 31...\texttt{Wf2}!.

31...\texttt{Wxe2} 32.\texttt{Wxe2 Xxe2} 33.\texttt{Ff4 Ff4} 34.\texttt{Fg5 Fg5}
35.\texttt{Ff2 Fh5} 36.\texttt{Fg5} 37.\texttt{hxg4} 38.\texttt{Fxe3}
39.\texttt{Fg7 Ff6} 40.\texttt{Fb8 Fb5} 41.\texttt{Fb1}

49.\texttt{Ff2}

After 49.\texttt{Ff8} the win was secured by penetration of the king to \texttt{b3}, e.g. 49.\texttt{Ff8 Fb5!} 50.\texttt{Fxf7}
\texttt{Ff4} 51.\texttt{Fxb6 a4} and then ...\texttt{Fb3} and wins. The variation I have just shown demonstrates the weakness caused by the doubled pawns. The passed
a-pawn mirrors and emphasizes the weakness of White’s departed a-pawn, and the blockaded long diagonal (f6-a1) is a memorial to the blocking effect of the c3- and c4-pawns. Marshall could have resigned here.

49...\textit{f1} 50.g3 \textit{b5} 51.\textit{c1} \textit{c4} 52.\textit{b2} c5 53.\textit{e3} \textit{xd4} 54.\textit{xd4} b5 55.\textit{b6} a4 56.\textit{a5} d4 57.\textit{xd4} b4 58.\textit{b6} a3† 59.\textit{a2} \textit{b5} 60.\textit{c5} \textit{a4}

\begin{center}
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\end{center}

0–1

5. From the workshop of the blockade

a) Spreading the blockading net
b) Prophylactic ways of preventing gaps appearing in your position
c) The blockading net in operation
d) Sacrificing “to achieve a blockade”

Two armies of pawns stand opposite each other, but there are no open files; is it at all possible in such circumstances to force them to interlock?

We have frequently come across open files as a splendid instrument for restraint: an open file can make the advance of the opponent’s pawns difficult, and the fact that they are stopped can easily turn into restraint and blockade.

But what can be done if there are no open lines? Answer: extreme caution is the order of the day, because any violent attempts to bring about by force the interlocking of the pawns must fail.

Compare the openings of the next two games with each other:

I. Nimzowitsch – Morrison, London 1927:
1.b3 g6 2.\textit{b2} \textit{f6} 3.\textit{g3} \textit{g7} 4.\textit{g2} d6 5.d4 0–0 6.c4 \textit{c6}

A violent attempt. Black sacrifices two tempi just to obtain d4-d5 and with it a stiffening of the pawn skeleton. 6...\textit{bd7} seems much more solid. 7.d5 \textit{b8} 8.\textit{c3} \textit{bd7}

Aiming to play ...a5 and ...\textit{c5} (the Burns stratagem).

9.\textit{f3} a5

And now White could obtain excellent play in the centre by 10.0–0 \textit{c5} 11.\textit{d4} e5 12.dxe6 fxe6 and Black’s loss of tempi would be telling. But in the game, we had:

10.\textit{a4}

Instead of 10.0–0, and White also obtained excellent play after the moves:

10...e5 11.dxe6 fxe6 12.0–0 \textit{e7} 13.\textit{e1} e5

The best follow-up would have been 14.\textit{c2} and 15.\textit{e3}.

II. Fairhurst – Nimzowitsch, London 1927:
1.d4 e6 2.\textit{c4} \textit{f6} 3.\textit{f3} \textit{b4†} 4.\textit{d2} \textit{e7} 5.g3 \textit{xd2†} 6.\textit{bxd2} d6 7.\textit{g2} 0–0 8.0–0 \textit{h6}!

Black takes his time, because ...e6-e5 will still be there for some time. Also an immediate opening of the game by 8...e5 9.dxe5 dxe5 10.\textit{c2} and then a possible \textit{f3}-g5-e4 might not be all that pleasant for Black.
9.\texttt{b2} \texttt{e8} 10.e4 e5!

Only now that White has deprived himself of e4 for his pieces does this move become a good blockading one.

11.d5

Better, however, would be 11.\texttt{b1} c6 12.\texttt{c3} though even then Black would not be so badly off.

11...\texttt{a5}

And the c5-square (\texttt{b8-a6-c5}) will be the basis of future blockading operations.

Where there is careful, probing strategy, one is quite justified in expecting the use of preventive measures. And in fact, prophylaxis is significant in such cases. If Black, for example, manages in games 38 and 39 to protect his at yet unfinished attempt at a blockade from being shattered, it is above all thanks to his use of appropriate prophylactic stratagems. In games 40 and 41 too, setting up the blockade could not have taken place without preventive measures, even though the blockade which is achieved appears fully established. So we can express it as follows:

Fully established or not, the setting up of a blockade is always logically linked to the stratagem of prophylaxis.

The game against Colle (41) is especially significant, since it shows how hard it is to prevent an extensive blockading net being ripped apart. But it is not impossible, and games 42-45, to which I could add numerous other examples, are convincing proof of this.

\textbf{Game 37}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

\textbf{Richard Réti}

Karlsbad 1923

This is a negative example. Réti does not manage to force the interlocking of the pawn chains (if I say “negative” I mean that only in connection with the theoretical and instructional value of the play and absolutely not that the game was badly played).

1.\texttt{f3} \texttt{f6} 2.c4 g6 3.b4

An innovation of mine, which Réti himself later found occasion to employ; see Réti – Marshall, New York 1924.

3...\texttt{a5}

Of dubious value.

4.b5 \texttt{g7} 5.\texttt{b2} 0–0 6.e3 d6 7.d4 \texttt{bd7} 8.\texttt{e2} e5

This move would only be strong if Black were in a position to force d4-d5 or at least e4xd5, because he would then obtain the splendid blockading square e5, e.g. 9.dxe5? \texttt{g4}, etc.

9.0–0

\textbf{9...exd4}

He recognizes the failure of his first attempt at a blockade. Strategically and theoretically, the only correct move appears to be 9...\texttt{e8} and if now
10. \( \triangleleft \) bd2 then 10...c6 in order, according to the circumstances, to defend with ...\( \heartsuit \) c7 or to set up a pawn chain by means of ...e4 and ...d5.

10. exd4 \( \heartsuit \) e8 11. \( \triangleleft \) bd2

It is not easy for White to make something of his better pawn structure, but he could have come significantly closer to achieving his goals with \( \triangleleft \) c3 instead of the text move which took so little notice of his opponent’s d6-d5 thrust.

11...\( \heartsuit \) f8 12. \( \heartsuit \) e1 \( \heartsuit \) e6 13. g3 h6 14. \( \triangleleft \) f1 \( \heartsuit \) g5 15. \( \triangleleft \) xg5 hxg5 16. \( \triangleleft \) g2

If the knight were on c3 instead of d2, the pressure now exerted by White would have to be considered very promising. But since unfortunately the knight is on d2 Black can more or less equalize.

16...d5!

21...\( \heartsuit \) e8

The simple 21...\( \heartsuit \) e8 22. \( \heartsuit \) e4 g4 23. h3 gxh3 24. \( \triangleleft \) xh3 \( \heartsuit \) d8 etc. was also playable.

22. \( \heartsuit \) xh3 \( \heartsuit \) f1 23. \( \heartsuit \) f1 \( \heartsuit \) xf1 24. \( \heartsuit \) xf1 \( \heartsuit \) d5 25. \( \heartsuit \) b7 \( \heartsuit \) b1 26. \( \heartsuit \) b8+ \( \heartsuit \) h7 27. \( \heartsuit \) b5 \( \heartsuit \) c7 28. \( \heartsuit \) b7 \( \heartsuit \) e6 29. \( \heartsuit \) g2 \( \heartsuit \) xd4 30. \( \heartsuit \) xf7+ \( \heartsuit \) g8 31. \( \heartsuit \) e7 \( \heartsuit \) xb2 32. \( \heartsuit \) c4 \( \heartsuit \) f2+ 33. \( \heartsuit \) h3 \( \heartsuit \) f6 34. \( \heartsuit \) xe6+ \( \heartsuit \) f8 35. \( \heartsuit \) d7 \( \heartsuit \) xe6 36. \( \heartsuit \) xd4

17. \( \heartsuit \) xe8†

The only possibility to hang on to his fast disappearing advantage was 17.c5, by which White would have reached a clearly better position, at least on the queenside. But whether he could have done anything with it after 17...\( \heartsuit \) f5 18. \( \heartsuit \) a4 b6 is more than doubtful. So it seems that there is no way of making up for 11. \( \triangleleft \) bd2, which can be criticized because it does not centralize.

17...\( \heartsuit \) xe8 18. cxd5 \( \heartsuit \) xb5 19. \( \heartsuit \) b3 \( \heartsuit \) d7 20. \( \heartsuit \) xb5

Or 20. \( \heartsuit \) c1 \( \heartsuit \) e8 21. \( \heartsuit \) xb5 \( \heartsuit \) xb5 22. \( \heartsuit \) e4 g4 with a possible future ...\( \heartsuit \) d8, etc.

20...\( \heartsuit \) xb5 21. \( \heartsuit \) c1

After the interesting to and fro of the last fourteen moves we now come down to a rook ending in which White may be somewhat better but where he cannot force a win.

36...\( \heartsuit \) e5 37. \( \heartsuit \) d6 \( \heartsuit \) f7 38. \( \heartsuit \) a6 \( \heartsuit \) c5 39. \( \heartsuit \) g4 \( \heartsuit \) d5

And the game was abandoned as a draw, though not until the 90th move.

40. \( \heartsuit \) h3 \( \heartsuit \) g7 41. a4 \( \heartsuit \) g4† 42. \( \heartsuit \) xg4 \( \heartsuit \) d4† 43. \( \heartsuit \) g5 \( \heartsuit \) d5† 44. \( \heartsuit \) h4 \( \heartsuit \) c5 45. \( \heartsuit \) h3 \( \heartsuit \) h6

The mistake on move 41 created somewhat
more space for Black's king, so the loss of the pawn is a matter of some regret.
46.\(\text{Exf}6\) \(\text{Ec}4\) 47.\(\text{Ef}4\) \(\text{Eb}4\) 48.\(\text{Eg}4\) \(g5\) 49.\(\text{Exb}4\) \(\text{axb}4\) 50.a5 \(\text{b}3\)

The queen ending proved impossible to win... \(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\)

**Game 38**

**Carl Oscar Ahues**

**Aron Nimzowitsch**

Berlin 1927

In contrast to the previous game, here the blockading player manages to extend his blockading net according to all the rules of the art. To do so he makes extensive use of prophylaxis.

1.d4 \(\text{Df}6\) 2.c4 \(e6\) 3.\(\text{Ec}3\) \(\text{Eb}4\) 4.\(\text{Ed}2\) 0-0 5.\(\text{Eg}3\) \(b6\) 6.c3

Black now exchanged on \(c3\), because had he first played \(6...\text{Ab}7\) then would come \(7.\text{Ad}3\) and White would be ready to defend against the threatened occupation of \(e4\) as follows: \(6...\text{Ab}7?\) \(7.\text{Ad}3\) \(\text{Ax}c3\) \(8.\text{Ax}c3\) \(\text{De}4\) \(9.\text{Ax}e4\) \(\text{Ax}e4\) \(10.\text{Ad}2\) \(\text{Axg}2?\) \(11.\text{Ag}1\) with a promising attack.

So:

\begin{align*}
6...&\text{Ax}c3 \\
7.\text{Ax}c3 & \text{De}4 \\
8.\text{Ec}2 & \text{Ab}7 \\
9.0-0 & 0-0 \\
10.\text{De}5 \\
\text{After }10.\text{Ad}3 \text{ I would have chosen a preventive move directed against the possible breakthrough } & \text{d}4-\text{d}5, \text{namely } 10.\text{Ad}3 \text{ Wh}6! \text{ and if } 11.\text{d}5 \text{ Exc}3 \\
12.\text{Wh}c3 & \text{Wxc}3 \text{+} \\
13.\text{bxc}3 & \text{Dxa}6 \text{ and then } ...\text{Dc}5 \\
& \text{with a positionally won game for Black.} \\
10... & \text{Dc}7 \\
\text{The move } ...\text{d}7-\text{d}6 \text{ won't go away; firstly the e6-square must be strengthened against a } & \text{possible } \text{Dc}5-\text{d}3-\text{f}4 \text{ (in the line beginning with } \text{...d}7-\text{d}6).} \\
11.\text{f}3 & \text{Dxc}3 \\
12.\text{Wxc}3 & \text{Dd}6 \\
13.\text{Dd}3 & \text{Dd}7 \\
14.\text{Dd}1! & \text{Wad}8! \\
\text{A preventive move. Black stops the ingenious threat } & \text{c}4-\text{c}5. \text{ After } 14...\text{Dae}8 \text{ an unpleasant situation could arise: } 15.\text{wa}3 \text{ a}5 \text{ 16.c}5! \text{ dxc}5 \\
17.\text{dxc}5 & \text{Dxc}5 \\
18.\text{Dxc}5 & \text{Wxc}5 \\
19.\text{Wxc}5 & \text{bxc}5 \\
20.\text{Dc}1 & 15.h4
\end{align*}

It is true that 15.Wa3 and then 16.c5 would no longer suffice, on account of 15.Wa3 a5 16.c5? dxc5 17.dxc5 Dc5 (this is stronger than 17...Dxc5 18.Bc1) with the double threat of 18...Dc4 and 18...Dxf3!. But on the other hand, the text move
is very double-edged. Worth considering was 15...\textit{f}2 and if 15...\textit{e}5 then 16...\textit{c}1 (not 16.d5 on account of 16...\textit{g}5).

\textbf{15...\textit{f}6}

To add force to ...\textit{e}6-\textit{e}5 when it comes.

\textbf{16...\textit{a}3 \textit{a}5 17...\textit{e}2 \textit{e}5 18...d5}

The slow, prophylactic system of development has proved its worth. White has been forced into d4-d5 and the blockading net already covers the queenside and the centre. In the next few moves the kingside is also drawn into it.

\textbf{18...\textit{f}4! 19...e4}

Forced, since 19...\textit{f}4 \textit{e}4 would concede the e-file to Black as well as valuable central squares.

\textbf{19...\textit{g}6}

The g2-pawn, the g3-square and the h4-pawn all now appear weak.

\textbf{20...\textit{d}g1 \textit{f}6}

Intending \textit{f}6-h5-g3, e.g. 21.c5 (not a bad counterattack) 21...\textit{h}5! 22.g4 \textit{fxg3} 23.cxb6 cxb6 24...\textit{b}3 \textit{a}6 25...\textit{x}e5 \textit{dxe5} 26...\textit{x}a6 \textit{g}2 and wins.

\textbf{21.g3 \textit{fxg3} 22...c5}

An ingenious attempt to save the game, but one which is refuted by a counter-sacrifice.

\textbf{22...\textit{d}xe4!}

A nice combination! It goes 23...\textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 24...\textit{d}1 (24...\textit{f}1? \textit{f}1\textskip and then ...\textit{g}2) 24...\textit{g}2 25...\textit{h}2 \textit{a}6 26...\textit{c}2 \textit{c}1? or 23...\textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 24...\textit{e}1 \textit{g}2 25...\textit{h}g1 \textit{dxc5} and wins.

\textbf{23.cxb6 \textit{d}2\textskip 24...\textit{a}1}

\textbf{26...\textit{c}3}

If 26...\textit{h}2 I intended to sacrifice my queen by 26...\textit{xf}3 27...\textit{x}g2 \textit{d}xg1 28...\textit{g}6 \textit{hxg6}.

\textbf{26...\textit{h}6 27...\textit{g}2 \textit{h}8 28...\textit{a}3 \textit{xf}3 29...\textit{h}1 \textit{d}xg5}

Even more horrible than 29...\textit{e}4, because now all his pieces are hanging.

\textbf{0-1}

\textbf{Game 39}

\textbf{Carl Oscar Ahues}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

\textbf{Kecskemét 1927}

The moment in the struggle which interests us here could be described as follows: Black has forced the interlocking of the pawn formation (13.d4-d5), but cannot gain any advantage from this, since the “blockading” continuation ...\textit{d}7-\textit{c}5 would fail to a breakthrough which would become possible. But he prevents this counterchance and so enables a simple liquidation of the blockade, which is moreover sharpened by giving it an attacking turn.
1.\( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 2.e3

2.e4 would be followed by 2...\( \text{b}7 \) 3.\( \text{c}3 \) e6 4.d4 \( \text{b}4 \) and then \( \text{d}6 \), and Black is somewhat cramped but not badly off.

2...\( \text{b}7 \) 3.\( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 4.\( \text{b}2 \) e6

4...\( \text{f}6 \) would not be good on account of 5.\( \text{x}f6 \) exf6 6.\( \text{h}4 \) g6 and now perhaps 7.\( \text{c}4 \) in order to provoke \( \text{d}7-d5 \), e.g. 7...d5 8.\( \text{e}2 \) and I would be inclined to prefer White's position.

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

To imitate his opponent's Dutch-style build-up. But a better move would be 5.c4 and then \( \text{c}3 \).

5...\( \text{f}6 \) 6.\( \text{f}4 \) g6 7.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 8.\( \text{c}3 \) 0-0 9.\( \text{e}2 \) d6

Black has prepared this advance well, because he is now ready to follow it up with \( ...e6-e5 \).

10.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{bd}7 \) 11.d4 \( \text{e}7 \) 12.0-0-0 \( \text{e}5 \)

Mission accomplished.

13.d5 a5 14.\( \text{d}2 \)

White is now catching up on development; his position appears quite secure, because if Black plays 14...\( \text{c}5 \) then White has 15.\( \text{xe}5 \) dxe5 16.d6! with a quite favourable breakthrough.

14...\( \text{h}5 \)!!

A combination aimed at preventing the breakthrough referred to; firstly g2-g3 must be provoked.

15.g3 \( \text{c}5 \)

Because now 16.\( \text{xe}5 \) dxe5 17.d6 would be impossible because of 17...\( \text{xd}6 \) when \( \text{xf}3 \) is threatened.

16.\( \text{e}2 \) a4! 17.b4 a3! 18.\( \text{a}1 \)

Success for Black consists of the fact that the bishop is now unprotected on a1.

18...\( \text{e}4 \) 19.\( \text{xe}4 \)

If 19.\( \text{w}1 \) then 19...\( \text{xe}4 \) 20.\( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 21.\( \text{xc}3 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 22.\( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xe}2 \).

19...\( \text{xe}4 \) 20.\( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{xe}4 \)

After the exchange of bishops on g7, a mate in two would be threatened.

21.\( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{xe}7 \) 22.\( \text{d}4 \) f3

Black has harvested the fruits of his long combination. Now all he has to do is to hang on to the material.

23.\( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 24.\( \text{h}3 \)

Of course not 24.\( \text{xe}4 \) on account of 24...\( \text{xe}4 \).

24...\( \text{e}8 \)

24...\( \text{a}4 \) would be dubious because of 25.\( \text{e}6 \) f8 26.\( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 27.\( \text{d}7 \), although even in this
case Black would receive sufficient compensation for the exchange after 27...\texttt{Exb4}.

25.\texttt{Exc8 Exxc8} 26.b5 \texttt{Exe5} 27.\texttt{Ee6} \texttt{Ee7} 28.\texttt{Eb1}\texttt{Eg7} 29.\texttt{Ef4} \texttt{Ed7} 30.h4

The threat was ...g5.

30.\texttt{Df5} 31.\texttt{We3} \texttt{Dxg3} 32.\texttt{Hhg1} \texttt{Dh5} 33.\texttt{Dc6} \texttt{Dg7} 34.\texttt{Dd1} \texttt{Eg8}

0–1

After 35.\texttt{Wxa3} would come 35...\texttt{Dh5} 36.\texttt{Dc1} \texttt{Dg4} 37.\texttt{Dg1} \texttt{Exh4} 38.\texttt{Dxg4} \texttt{Exh1+} then 39...\texttt{f2} and wins.

The value of the strategy chosen by Black on move 14 (see diagram on the previous page) can be seen from the following variation: imagine White omits 15.g3 and plays instead 15.\texttt{Dc2} which is followed by 15...\texttt{Dc5}! If now 16.\texttt{fxe5 dxe5} 17.d6 then 17...\texttt{cx}d6 18.\texttt{Dxd6} \texttt{Dxd6} 19.\texttt{Dxd6} \texttt{Dh6}, e.g. 20.\texttt{Dxe5} \texttt{Dxe3+} 21.\texttt{Dc2} \texttt{Dxg2} 22.\texttt{Dhd1} \texttt{Df4} and Black should win.

Game 40
Ernst Schenber
Aron Nimzowitsch
Berlin 1927

This was an Exchange Variation of the French with a rather unusual bishop development.

1.e4 \texttt{Dc6} 2.\texttt{Df3} e6 3.d4 d5 4.exd5 exd5 5.\texttt{Dd3}\texttt{Dg4} 6.\texttt{Dc3} \texttt{Dd6} 7.c3 \texttt{Dge7} 8.\texttt{Dbd2} \texttt{Dd7} 9.\texttt{Db3} 0–0 10.h3 \texttt{Dh5} 11.\texttt{Dc2} \texttt{f5} 12.0–0–0 \texttt{f4} 13.\texttt{Dd2} \texttt{Dxf3} 14.\texttt{gx}f3 \texttt{Df6}!
27...b6
Since in all respects Black is superior, all he has to do now is to “liquidate” the c5-knight, without bothering about any weakness he may incur in doing so. Now, forcible means are rarely good, and moreover White’s position is only suffering from a lack of mobility rather than being truly weak. So a slow strategy should have been preferred, namely 27...c6 28...d3 d7 (threatening ...b6 and ...c4†) 29.a5 and now 29...a6! White’s pawn advance would then appear to be completely halted and Black would have time and leisure for long-winded manoeuvres, such as 30...a7, 31...c7 and then d8-b7-d6-c4, and White would hardly be able resist the growing pressure.
28...b3 a8 29.c1
29.a6 was to be preferred, e.g. 29...b7 with complicated play, which would only be fractionally in Black’s favour.
29...c6 30.d3 c5
The immediate 29...c5 would have been met by 30.a5.

31.dxc5
On move 29 White missed marking out the a6-square as a weakness, but now it would be too late, although this is not easy to prove. For example, 31...a6 (instead of 31.dxc5) 31...xd4 32.a5! (this move was suggested by Dr Em. Lasker) 32...dxc3† 33...xc3 d4! 34...xd4 c6 35.axb6 xb6 36.b7†xb7 37...xd6 and now the simple liquidation 37...xb4† in conjunction with the “centralization” would not be enough for a win. After the text move Black’s attack becomes too powerful.
31...bxc5 32...b3 b7!!
A decisive pawn sacrifice. Instead, the continuation 32...c4 33...xc4 dx4 34...xd6 d7 would be insufficient on account of 35...xf4 g5 36...xg5.
33...xd5 dx5 34...d5 cxb4 35.a5

A final ingenious attempt. After 35.cxb4 then 35...d8 would be decisive.
35...d8
The threat 36.a6 can be ignored.
36.a6 bxc3† 37...c2 b4 38...c6
After 38.axb7† xb7 the queen on h4 takes up the protection of the rook on d8.
38...xd2† 39...b1 b8
The same move would have followed 38...b3.
0–1

Game 41
Edgar Colle
Aron Nimzowitsch
Baden-Baden 1925

1.d4 f5 2.e3 c6 3...d3 d6 4...e2 e5 5.c4 c5
Since Black thinks he has stored up enough mobility in his pawn pair (e5 and f5) a mummification of the position on the queenside and in the centre must appear desirable to him and he tries to force just such a formation.
6.0–0...c6 7...bc3 g5
16.\(\text{O}f1\) \(\text{O}e6\) 17.\(\text{O}c3\) \(\text{O}xc3\) 18.\(\text{O}xc3\) \(\text{O}e5\) 19.b3 \(\text{O}hg8\)

Here and on the next move, Black misses an important prophylactic measure, namely ...\(b7-b6\) (to make \(b3-b4\) pointless) and this omission leads to the loss of all his advantage.

20.\(\text{O}b2\) \(\text{f4}\) 21.\(\text{O}d2\) \(\text{O}f5\) 22.b4

This splits the blockading net which had been cast with so much effort.

22...\(\text{O}ed7\) 23.\(\text{exf4}\)

He should have continued the breakthrough begun by \(b4\), i.e. 23.\(\text{bxc5}\) \(\text{O}xc5\) 24.\(\text{b3}\) \(\text{O}xb3\) 25.\(\text{exb3}\) \(b6\) 26.\(\text{O}b5\) etc.

23...\(\text{gxf4}\) 24.\(\text{O}e1\) \(\text{O}f7\)

24...\(\text{O}f8\) should be played.

\(15\ldots\text{h4}\)

The following line should have been preferred: 15...\(\text{f4}\) 16.\(\text{O}f1\) \(\text{g4}\)! e.g. 17.\(\text{O}xg4\) \(hxg4\) 18.\(\text{exf4}\) \(\text{gx}f4\) 18.\(\text{O}e1\) \(\text{O}e6\) with a strongly centralized set-up.

Or 15...\(\text{f4}\) 16.\(\text{O}f1\) \(\text{g4}\)! 17.\(\text{O}xg4\) \(hxg4\) 18.\(\text{O}e1\) \(\text{f3}\)! 19.\(\text{g3}\) \(a6\) 20.\(\text{O}a3\) \(\text{O}hd8\) 21.b4 \(\text{O}d3\) 22.\(\text{O}c2\) \(\text{O}ad8\) and wins.

25.\(\text{O}dx4!\) \(\text{O}xe4\) 26.\(\text{O}h5\) \(\text{O}g7\) 27.\(\text{O}xe4\) \(\text{O}h6\)

In a desperate position Black finds an interesting saving manoeuvre.

28.\(\text{O}f7\)

If 28.\(\text{O}f3\) then 28...\(\text{O}e5\).

28...\(\text{f3!!}\) 29.\(\text{O}xg8\) \(\text{O}xg8\) 30.\(\text{O}d6\)

30.\(g3\) would have been met with 30...\(\text{O}e8\).

30...\(\text{O}xg2\) 31.\(\text{O}h1\) \(\text{O}h3\) 32.\(\text{O}g1\)

He should be happy with a draw, which can be achieved, for example, by 32.\(\text{O}f7\) \(\text{O}g7\) 33.\(\text{O}e5\) \(\text{O}g5\) 34.\(\text{O}d7\) \(\text{O}g2\) etc.

32...\(\text{O}e5!\)

Now White cannot exchange because of the mate in two. But there is a threat of 33...\(\text{O}d3\).

33.\(\text{bxc5}\)

There is a neat win after 33.\(\text{O}d2\) \(\text{O}g4\) 34.\(\text{O}xg2\) \(\text{fxg2}\) 35.\(\text{O}g1\) \(\text{O}e5!!\) and the knight returns.
33...\texttt{Qd}3 34.\texttt{Qd}2 \texttt{Qxg}1\texttt{#} 35.\texttt{Qxg}1 \texttt{Qf}4

A nasty mating threat with so little material! 36.\texttt{Qf}7\texttt{#} \texttt{Qg}7 37.\texttt{Qe}5 \texttt{Qe}2\texttt{#} 38.\texttt{Qxe}2 \texttt{fxe}2 39.\texttt{Qd}3 \texttt{Qe}6

The endgame is in Black’s favour as his king can get involved. 40.\texttt{Qxe}4 \texttt{Qc}4 41.\texttt{Qe}1 \texttt{Qf}6 42.\texttt{f}3 \texttt{Qe}5 43.\texttt{Qf}2 \texttt{Qd}4 44.\texttt{Qg}2 \texttt{Qxc}5 45.\texttt{Qh}4 \texttt{b}5 46.\texttt{f}4 \texttt{a}5 47.\texttt{Qf}3 \texttt{a}4 48.\texttt{f}5 \texttt{b}4 49.\texttt{axb}4\texttt{#} \texttt{Qxb}4 50.\texttt{f}6 \texttt{a}3 51.\texttt{Qd}4 \texttt{a}2 52.\texttt{Qc}2\texttt{#} \texttt{Qc}3 0–1

Game 42
Hage
Aron Nimzowitsch
Simultaneous display in Arnstadt 1926

This is a companion game to the previous one and shows how a blockade could have worked out without problems had there not been some omission.

1.d\texttt{d}4 \texttt{f}5 2.e\texttt{e}3 \texttt{d}6 3.\texttt{Qd}3 e\texttt{e}5 4.d\texttt{xe}5 d\texttt{exe}5 5.\texttt{Qb}5\texttt{c}6 6.\texttt{Qxd}8\texttt{#} \texttt{Qxd}8 7.\texttt{Qc}4 \texttt{Qd}6 8.\texttt{Qf}3 \texttt{Qf}6 9.\texttt{Qc}3

A much better continuation seems to be a\texttt{4} then b\texttt{3} and a\texttt{b}2 followed by a\texttt{a}3.

9...\texttt{Qc}7 10.a\texttt{a}3 \texttt{Qd}8 11.\texttt{Qd}2 b\texttt{5} 12.\texttt{Qa}2 a\texttt{5} 13.0–0 \texttt{b}4 14.\texttt{Qb}1 c\texttt{5} 15.\texttt{Qc}4 \texttt{e}4 16.\texttt{Qg}5 \texttt{a}6 17.\texttt{Qxa}6 \texttt{Qxa}6 18.axb4 axb4 19.\texttt{Qxa}6 \texttt{Qxa}6

White’s position looks forlorn. 32.\texttt{Qd}1 \texttt{Qe}6 33.\texttt{Qb}1 \texttt{Qcd}3 34.\texttt{Qa}3 \texttt{Qa}8 35.h\texttt{h}3 \texttt{Qf}5 36.\texttt{Qf}1 \texttt{Qxc}1

This leads to an immediate win. 37.\texttt{Qxc}1 \texttt{Qd}3 38.\texttt{Qb}1 \texttt{Qxb}2 39.\texttt{Qxb}2 \texttt{Qxa}3 40.\texttt{Qb}1 \texttt{b}2 0–1

This was a genuine blockading game with a blockade which included both wings and the centre. Without wishing to underestimate the value of the restricting flank operation, we should like to point out that we tend to consider the central manoeuvres around the squares e5 and d3 as more important: It was a blockade which originated in the centre!

Game 43
Max Blümich
Aron Nimzowitsch
Breslau 1926

This game, which is not in the tournament book (probably due to an oversight) should be
recommended to the reader and not just as a blocking game. At the same time it is a game based on a file from A to Z! So what happens on the open file will be looked at very carefully. The game starts of in a closed manner.

1.\( \text{d} \text{f}3 \text{e}6 2.\text{g}3 \text{b}6 3.\text{g}2 \text{b}7 4.0-0 \text{c}5 5.d3 \text{f}6 6.e4 \text{c}7 7.\text{c}3 0-0 8.\text{d}2 \text{c}6 9.e5 \)

Now the game comes alive. However, further development by \( \text{h}1 \) and then \( \text{g}1 \) and \( f2-f4 \) would have been less committal.

9...\( \text{d} \text{e}6 \) 10.\( \text{e} \text{e}4 \text{c}8 \)

A preventive move, aimed against a possible future c2-c3 and then d3-d4.

11.\( \text{c} \text{c}3 \text{b}5 \)

Aiming to provoke 12.b3; we shall soon see why.

12.b3 \( f6 \) 13.\( \text{e} \text{x}6 \) \( \text{e} \text{x}6 \) 14.\( \text{e} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{d} \text{d}5 \) 15.\( \text{b} \text{b}2 \) \( b4 \)

Now Black has a central knight which cannot be driven away, but so does White and it is hard to see how things will turn out.

16.\( \text{f} \text{a}1 \) \( a5 \) 17.\( a4 \)

Not good. What was needed was 17.\( \text{f} \text{d}2 \) and \( f2-f4 \).

17...\( \text{e} \text{e}8 \)

He should just have opened things up: 17...\( \text{b} \text{a}3 \) 18.\( \text{a} \text{a}3 \) \( \text{d} \text{d}4 \) 19.\( \text{d} \text{x}d4 \) (White cannot play 19.\( \text{d} \text{d}1 \) on account of 19...\( \text{c} \text{c}3 \) 20.\( \text{f} \text{d}x3 \) \( \text{x}f3 \) 21.\( \text{c} \text{c}1 \) \( \text{e} \text{e}8 \) and 22...\( \text{h} \text{h}5 \)) 19...\( \text{c} \text{d}4 \), and it would be the turn of the c-file to show the value of the preventive move 10...\( \text{c} \text{c}8 \). After the text move the threatened mummification can no longer be avoided.

18.\( \text{d} \text{e} \text{d}2 \)

The other knight should have gone here, e.g. 18.\( \text{f} \text{f}6 \) \( \text{d} \text{d}4 \) 19.\( \text{d} \text{e} \text{d}1 \) then 20.\( \text{f} \text{a}4 \) and 21.\( \text{f} \text{f}3 \).

18...\( \text{f} \text{f}6 \) 19.\( \text{x} \text{x}6 \) \( \text{g} \text{x} \text{x}6 ! \)

The black position is becoming more compact by the minute and at the same time the value of White's e-file is growing less: e6 is still there like a block of granite, but the e4- and e5-squares are already under Black's control.

20.\( \text{c} \text{c}4 \) \( \text{h} \text{h}5 \) 21.\( \text{d} \text{d}4 \) \( \text{x} \text{e} \text{e}2 \) 22.\( \text{x} \text{x}e2 \) \( \text{c} \text{c}7 ! \) 23.\( \text{f} \text{f}4 \) \( \text{a} \text{a}6 \) 24.\( \text{x} \text{x}d5 \) \( \text{e} \text{x}d5 \) 25.\( \text{d} \text{d}6 \) \( f5 \)

What a courageous knight on d6! To help its side secure the e-file it went into a cul-de-sac. Now things become very interesting: will the white e-file be able to compensate for the cul-de-sac?

26.\( \text{f} \text{f}2 ! \) \( \text{d} \text{d}8 \) 27.\( \text{c} \text{c}1 \) \( \text{c} \text{c}6 \) 28.\( \text{b} \text{b}5 \) \( \text{x} \text{b} \text{b}5 \) 29.\( \text{x} \text{x}b5 \) \( \text{e} \text{e}6 \)

And now we see: out of respect for the e-file, the b6-rook has to be displaced.

30.\( \text{f} \text{f} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{f} \text{f}7 \) 31.\( \text{f} \text{f} \text{f} \text{2} \)

Play down the e-file by means of the occupation of the e5-outpost seems to be urgently indicated. Black would then have a difficult problem to solve: 31.\( \text{e} \text{e}5 \) \( \text{f} \text{f}6 \) 32.\( \text{f} \text{f}2 \) \( d6 \) 33.\( \text{x} \text{x}d5 \) (not 33.\( \text{x} \text{x}d5 \) on account of 33...\( \text{x} \text{x}e1 \) 34.\( \text{x} \text{x}e1 \) \( \text{e} \text{e}6 \) ) 33...\( \text{x} \text{x}e6 \) 34.\( \text{e} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{b} \text{b}8 \) 35.\( \text{a} \text{a}1 ! \) \( \text{x} \text{x}b5 \) 36.\( \text{c} \text{c}4 \) \( \text{x} \text{x}c3 \) 37.\( \text{x} \text{x}c3 \) \( \text{x} \text{x}b3 \) 38.\( \text{x} \text{x}d5 \) \( \text{f} \text{f}7 ! \) 39.\( \text{x} \text{x}a5 \) \( \text{x} \text{x}d3 \) 40.\( \text{e} \text{e}7 \) \( \text{e} \text{e}8 \) 41.\( \text{f} \text{f}6 \) \( \text{d} \text{d}8 \) 42.\( \text{x} \text{x}h7 \) \( \text{c} \text{c}4 \) 43.\( \text{g} \text{g}5 ! \) \( \text{c} \text{c}5 ! \) 44.\( \text{e} \text{e}2 \) and then 44...\( \text{e} \text{e}8 ! \)
The threat is now the advance of the c-pawn, which would still have been a mistake on move 44 on account of $\text{dxe6}$. Next comes $45.\text{dxc7}! \text{c3} 46.\text{dxf7}$ etc. (If now $46...\text{c2}$ then $47.\text{dxe6}$ etc. But if $46...\text{d5}$ in order after $47.\text{dxe6}$ to play $47...\text{d8}$ - not $47...\text{d8}$ on account of $48.\text{exe5}$ - then $48.\text{b7! c2? 49.\text{exe5} c1\text{\text{\#}}} 50.\text{e6}$ and wins.) $46...\text{d2}$ (the winning move) $47.\text{e3} \text{d5} 48.\text{d6} \text{d8}$ and the c-pawn marches through with check. The only way to prolong the game would be by $49.\text{f7} \text{g8} 50.\text{xf5} \text{c2} 51.\text{d4}$ $\text{c1\text{\#}}$.

In the position after Black's 44th move White could not save the game with any other move either, e.g. $45.\text{h4} \text{c3} 46.\text{h5} \text{c2} 47.\text{a1} \text{a3} 48.\text{c1} \text{b3} 49.\text{xc2} \text{d4}$ and wins.

This long, but always very interesting, line is the solution to the problem which arose on move 31. Possibly $44...\text{c8}$ (with the later intention of ...\text{b8}) constitutes a partial solution, but it does not detract from the beauty of the author's solution. So we can say: "the cul-de-sac is more important than the e-file".

$31.\text{f6} 32.\text{Bf7}$

It was still possible for White to conjure up the problem sketched above by playing $32.\text{e5}$. And in any case, the technique of play down the file should not suddenly come to an end. The exploitation of a file, especially the occupation of outposts, is something you should be able to do in your sleep. See my explanations about open files in the first chapter of My System.

$32.\text{f7}$

This secures e5 from possible invasion. The b-pawn is lost.

$33.\text{a2 d4! 34.a1 Bb8}$

It is finally time to think of carting home the booty. Note the very remarkable effect of the blockade. It is difficult for White to regroup his pieces and this causes internal friction as the nimble-footed black pieces dominate the board.

$35.\text{c1} \text{xb5} 36.\text{d2} \text{d8} 37.\text{e2} \text{c6}$

$38.\text{g1}$

$38...\text{d5}$

The queen's pawn has not got going until move 38!

$39.\text{e2 Bb8}$ $40.\text{a4 Bb8}$

Black is finally master of the e-file.

$41.\text{a1 h5 42.\text{a1} \text{e3}\# 43.\text{f2}}$

At last the position is ready for a breakthrough.

$44...\text{c4}$

Or $44.\text{dxc4 dxc4}$ $45.\text{bxc4 a3}$.

$44...\text{c3} 45.\text{e2 a4!}$

A sacrificial combination crowns the setting up of the blockade.

$46.\text{bxa4 b3} 47.\text{cxb3 a4}$

And Black won:

$48.\text{exe3 exe3} 49.\text{d2} \text{c2} 50.\text{a1} \text{d3}\# 51.\text{a1} \text{exe2} 52.\text{exe2 c1\text{\#}} 53.\text{xc1} \text{xc1}\#$

$54.\text{f3 \text{xb3} 55.\text{h3 d3} 56.g4 hgx4}\#$

$0–1$
Game 44
Walther von Holzhausen
Aron Nimzowitsch
Dresden 1926

1.e4 c5 2.d3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.Qxd4 d5

An innovation which I first tried against Rubinstein in Karlsbad 1923.

5.Qb5

The best line seems to be 5.Qxc6 bxc6 6.exd5 Qxd5 7.Qc3 Qxd1+ 8.Qxd1 and White has the more compact pawn structure, even if otherwise the game appears level.

5...Qxe4 6.Qxc6 Qxd1+ 7.Qxd1 a6 8.Qd4+ Qxb5 9.Qb5 Qg4+ 10.Ke1 Qd8

The position after queenside castling appears unstable. For example: 10...0-0-0 11.Qc3 e5 12.h3! Qh5 13.g4 Qg6 14.a4 then 15.a5 and 16.a6. Or, instead of 12...Qh5, 12...a7! 13.Qe3 Qb4 14.Qe2. In both cases Black’s king position appears open to attack.

11.Qc3

11...e5

No matter how good this move may look, it in no way fits the strict demands a blockading strategy imposes on a player. The basis for the blockading operation lay in the g4-d1 diagonal. So this diagonal should be protected and overprotected, all the more so because the opponent is now intending to destroy said basis, namely by means of 12.h3 Qh5 13.g4. The correct blockading procedure consisted of 11...f5 (instead of 11...e5).

If then 12.h3 Qh5 13.g4 fxg4 14.Qxe4 gxf3, then White could avoid greater losses by 15.Qf4 Qf3 16.Qg5 Qxh1 17.Qc7+ Qd7 18.Qf7 but he would have been in a position to resign after 18...Qf3! 19.Qxh8 e5 20.Qxe5 Qd6 21.Qxd6 Qxd6.

But if White does not attempt to use violent means to break the blockade, and instead tries to develop much more quietly by for example (11...f5) 12.Qf4 there then follows 12...Qf6 and ...e6, ...Qf7 and White would have nothing in exchange for the misplaced rook on h1. On the other hand, matters become dubious after the text move.

12.h3! Qh5

I could not make up my mind to play 12...Qd7 13.Qc7+ Qe7 14.Qd5+ Qd6 15.Qe3.

13.g4 Qg6

14.Qc7+

The correct continuation was 14.Qe3 and if then 14...Qf5 15.Qe2 and the rook was no longer misplaced. Strategically speaking, Black would then be duty bound to play to recapture the proud h1-d5 diagonal, something like as follows: 15...fxg4! 16.hxg4 Qf6 17.g5 Qh5 18.Qe1 Qf3 19.Qh4 Qg4 20.Qxe4 Qxe4 21.Qxg4 Qxc2 22.Qc3 with a more or less level game. This variation is impressive because of the strictly logical lines on which it is built.

14...Qd7 15.Qd5 Qc6 16.Qe3

16.Qe3 was tempting but after 16...Qxd5 17.Qxd5 Qxd5 18.Qd1+ Qc6 19.Qd8 there would come 19...Qf6 20.Qe2 Qg8 and unpinning by ...Qe7 could not be avoided.
16...\textbf{\textit{b4}}

The logic of the game demanded the immediate ...\textit{h7-h5}, e.g. 16...\textit{h5}! 17.g5 \textit{f5} or 17...\textit{h4} with advantage to Black. By neglecting this in favour of more or less mechanical “development” Black is paying tribute to the erroneous teachings of the old school, namely that all the “puppets” must be on stage before attacking. How laughable and ancient such rules seem nowadays!

17.\textbf{\textit{d2 e7}} 18.\textbf{\textit{h4}}

18.a3 seems somewhat better, allowing him to achieve some counterplay.

18...\textit{h5}!

---

31.\textbf{\textit{cxb5}}

This makes the win easier. After 31.\textbf{\textit{g3}} the king would first wander to e6. Then at a moment when the white rook was on g3, the liquidation would take place: ...\textbf{\textit{xb3}}, \textbf{\textit{d2}} ...\textbf{\textit{xc4}}, \textbf{\textit{xc4}} ...\textbf{\textit{xb4}}, \textbf{\textit{e3}} and now the black rook would occupy the opponent’s first rank. Of course such a position cannot be held by White; apart from anything else, Black could (with the white rook on h3) force an exchange of rooks by ...\textbf{\textit{h1}}, and then follow up with ...\textbf{\textit{f7-f6}} and an effortless win. White is simply stranded!

31...\textbf{\textit{b6}} 32.\textbf{\textit{g3}} \textbf{\textit{xb5}} 33.\textbf{\textit{h3}} \textbf{\textit{xb4}} 34.\textbf{\textit{fl}} \textbf{\textit{xb3}} 35.\textbf{\textit{g1}} \textbf{\textit{b2}} 36.\textbf{\textit{d5}}† \textbf{\textit{c4}} 37.\textbf{\textit{e3}}† \textbf{\textit{d3}} 38.\textbf{\textit{g2}} \textbf{\textit{b1}}† 39.\textbf{\textit{h2}} \textbf{\textit{e2}}

It is comical to see the black king advancing.

40.\textbf{\textit{g3}} \textbf{\textit{g1}} 41.\textbf{\textit{h2}} \textbf{\textit{fl}} 42.\textbf{\textit{h3}} \textbf{\textit{xg2}}† 0–1

---

\textbf{Game 45}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

\textbf{Hans Duhrm}

Hanover 1926

A short but edifying blockading game! In its pawn structure it resembles games 41 and 42, but for the blockade built along a diagonal it is more reminiscent of game 44. However that may be, here the blockading net works quickly and surely.

1.\textbf{\textit{c4}} \textbf{\textit{e6}} 2.\textbf{\textit{e4}} \textbf{\textit{c5}}

Better was 2...\textbf{\textit{d5}} 3.\textbf{\textit{cxd5}} \textbf{\textit{exd5}} 4.\textbf{\textit{exd5}} \textbf{\textit{f6}}!

3.\textbf{\textit{dc3}} \textbf{\textit{dc6}} 4.\textbf{\textit{f4}} \textbf{\textit{d6}}
4...f6!
5...e3 g6 6.d4 g7 7.dxe5
This confirms the advantage.
7.dxe5
If first 7...xh3+ 8.bxh3 dxe5 then White exchanges queens, 9...xd8+, and obtains the advantage by 9...xd8 10.e5!. But if the knight recaptures, 9...xd8, he follows up with 10.a4 then 11.e3 and 12.a5 and comfortably rolls up the queenside.
8...xd8+ xxd8 9.e5

9...h5
9...f6 absolutely had to be played here to destroy the blockade pawn on e5 which is also attacking d6. The plan Black chooses instead (posting a knight on f5 to try and set up a counter blockade, since the f5-knight will restrain his opponent's qualitative majority on the kingside) turns out to be impossible to carry out. The immediate onset of White's attack does not allow Black any time-consuming manoeuvres.
10.e3 b6 11.0-0-0+ e7 12.f2! h6
13.h4+ f8 14.d3 b7 15.e4
What is decisive about the effect of the bishop down the h4-d8 diagonal is the fact that Black is deprived of the chance to put up any opposition with ...d8 and must therefore concede the d-file to his opponent. This means he is left with a hopeless game, especially when his dislocated rook on h8 is taken into account.
15.a5 xxb7 a7 17.e7 b8 18.hd1 g8 19.e7!

In order to play g5 without leaving the bishop cut off on h4.
19...f5 20.g5 e8 21.f6 xf6 22.exf6 a5 23.ed8
The start of a mating attack.
23...f8 24.e1 d7 h6 25.e4! c6
26.xf7+ xf7 27.xe6+ g8 28.xe8+ h7 29.g65+
And mate in two.
1-0

Game 46
Alfred Brinckmann
Aron Nimzowitsch
Kolding (match) 1922

This game illustrates the art of “sacrificing to achieve a blockade” for which my games against Spielmann and Leonhardt in San Sebastian 1912 had until now been considered the precursors. But it has now been realized that in 1910 in Hamburg I played a similar sort of pawn sacrifice against John, from which I now quote at length and which must now be considered the stem game.

Walter John - Aron Nimzowitsch
10.d5 c4 11.e1 Bb8 12.0xc6
The knight would find it hard to remain on e5. With the text move White plays for the “hanging pawns”.
12...\text{ex}c6 13.\text{cx}d5 \text{ex}d5 14.\text{e}c2

He delays d4xc5, which is part of his plan, for a more favourable moment.

14.\text{h}6 15.\text{f}d1 \text{ac}8 16.\text{g}5 \text{ec}7 17.\text{c}3 c4!!

18.\text{bxc}4 dxc4 19.\text{ax}c4 \text{e}4

19...\text{a}4 could also be a move, but would not help with the combination of sacrifice and blockade.

20.\text{e}1

The idea would have been more clearly seen after 20.\text{xe}4 \text{xe}4! 21.\text{g}d2 \text{g}5 22.\text{f}4 \text{d}5.

66.\text{a}2 \text{a}4 67.\text{g}3 \text{g}1\dagger 68.\text{h}2 \text{g}x\text{g}4
69.\text{d}6 \text{g}6 70.\text{g}3 \text{b}6 71.\text{e}5 \text{b}3 72.\text{g}2
73.\text{h}2 \text{e}6 74.\text{h}8 \text{d}3 75.\text{g}2 \text{h}4
76.\text{h}2 \text{d}5 77.\text{g}2 \text{c}4 78.\text{f}6 \text{d}1 79.\text{c}2\dagger
\text{b}3 80.\text{c}3\dagger \text{b}4 81.\text{h}3 a2 82.\text{h}4\dagger \text{b}5 0-1

After this enlightening introduction to the essence of the blockading sacrifice, we shall concentrate on game 46, which shows our stratagem in extremely graphic fashion and which I therefore count among my best games.

1.d4 e6 2.c4 \text{f}6 3.\text{c}3 \text{b}4 4.\text{d}2 0-0

The immediate 4...\text{b}6 is also possible.

5.\text{f}3 \text{d}6 6.e3 \text{b}6 7.\text{d}3 \text{b}7 8.\text{e}2

Black now embarks on a dangerous course.

8...\text{xf}3 9.\text{gx}f3 \text{bd}7 10.a3 \text{xc}3 11.\text{xc}3 \text{c}6!
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The pawn minus would appear to be compensated for by the blockaded position.

After the mistaken text move, Black won as follows:

20.\text{b}4 21.\text{e}2 \text{b}5 22.\text{xe}4

22.\text{f}3 would be somewhat better.

22...\text{xe}4 23.\text{d}6

There was nothing better.

23...\text{xe}2 24.\text{xe}4 \text{e}7 25.\text{g}3 \text{xd}1

And Black won after a hard struggle.

26.\text{xd}1 \text{ec}7 27.a3 \text{ec}2 28.\text{eb}1 \text{ed}6 29.\text{f}5 \text{g}6
30.\text{xd}6 \text{xd}6 31.e4 \text{ec}6 32.g3 \text{ed}2 33.\text{a}1
\text{dc}2 34.\text{f}2 \text{ed}2 35.\text{a}1 \text{cc}2 36.\text{f}1 \text{fb}8
37.\text{g}2 \text{e}7 38.d5 \text{f}6 39.g4 \text{g}5 40.e5 \text{fxe}5
41.\text{xe}5 \text{xd}5 42.\text{g}7 \text{ed}6 43.\text{e}5 \text{e}6 44.\text{b}8
a6 45.\text{b}1 \text{d}7 46.\text{b}3 \text{c}6 47.\text{g}3 \text{d}5 48.h4
\text{gh}4 49.\text{hx}h4 \text{ec}6 50.\text{d}8 \text{ec}3 51.\text{b}2 \text{ex}a3
52.\text{xb}6 \text{eg}6 53.\text{b}4 \text{ec}3 54.\text{d}4 \text{fc}6 55.\text{a}5
\text{a}3 56.\text{d}2 a5 57.\text{c}1 \text{a}1 58.\text{e}3 a4 59.\text{b}4
\text{c}7 60.\text{f}3 \text{f}6 61.\text{f}8\dagger \text{d}7 62.\text{b}7\dagger \text{e}8 63.\text{b}2 a3 64.\text{e}2\dagger \text{f}7 65.\text{e}5 \text{b}1

Since Black is simultaneously trying to exploit the dynamic weakness of the doubled pawn complex and to blockade the bishops, he of course avoids any premature opening of the position, such as 11...d5. It could be followed by 12.\text{cx}d5 \text{ex}d5 13.0-0-0 and then \text{b}1 and \text{c}1. White would then have play on both the c-file and the g-file, whereas Black's only counter chance, the advance ...c6-c5, would bring about the reply d4xc5 which liberates the bishops.

12.0-0-0 d5 13.e4

Such an advance may create attacking chances, but on the other hand it quite considerably weakens the doubled pawn complex.
13...g6
Forced. And not as bad as you might think at first glance; the rolling up process h2-h4-h5 is inhibited by the f6-knight.

14.cxd5
14.h4 or 14.Qb1 would have been better, but White wants to be able to play e4-e5, which would currently be unfavourable after 14.e5 dxc4 15.Bxc4 Qd5.

14...cxd5 15.e5 Qh5
Now Black can be happy about having paralysed the doubled pawn complex.

16.h4 a5
The regrouping ...Qe7, ...Qf8 and then ...Qf8 will be possible after limiting the c3-bishop like this.

17.Bd1 Qe7 18.d2 Qf8 19.f4 b5!!

This is what the position looks like when Black has solved the problem pointed out in the note to move 11. The doubled f-pawns are hopelessly blockaded and White has weaknesses everywhere.

27.Bxf5
A despairing attempt which is powerfully refuted.

27...exf5 28.Bxa5 Qb3 29.Qe2 Qb7 30.Qb4 Qa6
0–1
Since 31.Qe1 fails to 31...Qxb4 32.axb4 Qa1† 33.Qd1 Qc1.

Game 47
Aron Nimzowitsch
Paul Saladin Leonhardt
San Sebastian 1912

The blockading sacrifice: a pawn is sacrificed so that the king's bishop can be exchanged; after that White becomes weak on the white squares and must lose.

20.Qxb5 Qab8 21.Qe2 Qb6
A correct piece sacrifice but even stronger and more in the style of the game was 21...Qg7 22.h5 Qf5 and ...Qd7-b6-c4 with the better game.

22.Qd1
Accepting by 22.Qxh5 Qc4 23.Qe2 Qxa3! 23.Qd2! Qc4 with a draw was the best White had.

22.Qc4 23.Qxc4 Qxc4 24.Bg5 Qg7 25.h5 Qf5 26.hxg6 fxg6

This is the stem game for the stratagem "the blockading sacrifice" (see the introduction to game 46).

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.e5 c5 4.Qb3 Qb6
4...cxd4 could be met in gambit style by 5.Qd3 or by 5.Qxd4 Qc6 6.Qf4 with solid pressure.

5.Qd3 cxd4 6.0–0 Qc6 7.a3
We have reached the sort of position which is typical for our stratagem. The valuable e-pawn looks to be sufficient compensation for the minor sacrifice White has made. The e5-pawn appears valuable because it helps to cramp Black's position.

7...Qge7
After the game my opponent wanted to know what I had intended to play after 7...a5. I pointed out to him the line 8.\(\texttt{\textipa{\textbf{f4}}}\) \texttt{\textipa{xb2}} 9.\(\texttt{\textipa{bd2}}\).
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"You would never have dared to play that," thought Leonhardt. But I would have done so; this second blockading sacrifice is a logical extension of the first one. Whether there would be enough compensation after 7...a5 8.\(\texttt{\textipa{f4}}\) \texttt{\textipa{xb2}} 9.\(\texttt{\textipa{bd2}}\) \texttt{\textipa{b6}} (after 9.\(\texttt{\textipa{xa3}}\) White could force a draw by 10.\(\texttt{\textipa{b3}}\) then \texttt{\textipa{c1}} and \texttt{\textipa{d2}}) is not easy to decide. In any case Black's extra pawns would be immobile and his development would be difficult.

In addition to the move on which my new stratagem was based (8.\(\texttt{\textipa{f4}}\) 8.a4 was also worth considering, e.g. 7...a5 8.a4 \texttt{\textipa{c5}} 9.\(\texttt{\textipa{a3}}\) with chances and counter-chances.

Finally, it should be pointed out that in a similar situation Lasker played 7...f5. I recommend the reply 8.b4 a6 9.c4! dxc3 10.\(\texttt{\textipa{xc3}}\) and White is threatening to occupy the b6-square after \texttt{\textipa{e3}} and \(\texttt{\textipa{a4}}\).

8.b4 \texttt{\textipa{g6}} 9.\texttt{\textipa{e1}} \texttt{\textipa{e7}} 10.\texttt{\textipa{b2}} a5

A somewhat better move would be 10...a6.

11.b5 a4 12.\texttt{\textipa{bd2}}

Threatening 13.\texttt{\textipa{xc6}} \texttt{\textipa{xb2}} 14.\texttt{\textipa{b1}} and 15.\texttt{\textipa{xb7}}.

12...\texttt{\textipa{a7}} 13.\texttt{\textipa{xd4}} \texttt{\textipa{c5}} 14.\texttt{\textipa{xc5}!}

14.c3 would have won the a4-pawn.

14...\texttt{\textipa{xc5}} 15.c4 dxc4 16.\texttt{\textipa{e4}} \texttt{\textipa{d5}} 17.\texttt{\textipa{d6}+} \texttt{\textipa{e7}} 18.\texttt{\textipa{xc4}} \texttt{\textipa{c5}}

To prevent 19.\texttt{\textipa{b6}}.

19.\texttt{\textipa{xg6}!} \texttt{\textipa{hxg6}}

Or 19...\texttt{\textipa{xc4}} 20.\texttt{\textipa{d6}+} \texttt{\textipa{e8}} 21.\texttt{\textipa{ed1} f6} 22.\texttt{\textipa{d8}+} and then 23.\texttt{\textipa{g5} mate}.

20.\texttt{\textipa{d6}+} \texttt{\textipa{x6d6} 21.\texttt{\textipa{exd6}+}}

1-0

Because 21...\texttt{\textipa{e8}} is followed by 22.\texttt{\textipa{b6} \texttt{\textipa{b8}} 23.\texttt{\textipa{e5} and there is no defence to the threat of d6-d7.}

Game 48

Aron Nimzowitsch
Carl Oscar Ahues
Bad Niendorf 1927

The sacrifice on move 25 only looks like a blockading sacrifice. If fact it is a diversionary attack, as the blockade existed before the sacrifice. But since everything must be classified, we would describe this game as follows: a blockading game topped off with a sacrifice.

1.c4 \texttt{\textipa{f6}} 2.\texttt{\textipa{c3} d6} 3.d4 \texttt{\textipa{bd7}} 4.e3 e5 5.\texttt{\textipa{d3} \texttt{\textipa{c7}}}

The usual continuation here is \texttt{\textipa{ge2}, 0-0 and f2-f4}, which is without doubt a sound strategy. But White tries to employ a sharper method of development.

6.f4 0-0 7.\texttt{\textipa{f3} exd4}! 8.exd4 d5

Black has met it well and achieved a more or less level game.

9.c5! c6!

From now on there is always the threat of rolling up the queenside by b7-b6.
10.0–0

Doing without 10.a3 because of 10...b6 11.b4 bxc5 12.bxc5 dxc5 13.dxc5 exd5 with a strong attack.

10...a5

There was no reason for delaying the freeing move 10...b6, e.g. 10...b6! 11.e5 c7 12.xb6 (the best) 12...axb6 13.d2 and then 14.e1 with a more or less even game. After the text move Black is at a disadvantage.

11.e5 c7 12.a4

This makes b7-b5 difficult if not impossible. During the game I was actually under the impression that 12...b5 was perhaps possible, based on some combinative nuances, e.g. 12...b5 13.xb6 wb6 14.xc6 1d6 and this impression was so strong that I could not shake it off later. For example, in Kagan's nearest Schachnachrichten I recommended after 12...b5 the line 13.wc2 and the opponent's plan to occupy e4 would fail as follows: 13...b4 14.a4 1a6 15.xa6 1xa6 (there is now the threat of 16.f4) 16.f4 and wins on account of the indirect threat to the e7-bishop.

Nowadays I cannot see why the pawn sacrifice should not be accepted; after 12...b5 13.xb6 wb6 14.xc6 1d6 White would simply have been able to play 15.xh1 and then 16.f5, and Black would not have any compensation.

12.e8 13.h1 1f8

And once more I tried in K.N. Schachnachrichten to counter 13...b5 (instead of the text move) in the most complicated way, instead of transposing to the aforementioned variation by 14.xb6, e.g. 13...b5 14.xb6 wb6 15.xc6 (in KNS I only gave 15.xc6) 15...b7 or 15...d6 16.f5 16.e5 xe5 17.fxe5 1e4 18.xe4 dxg4 19.a4 1f8 20.b3 etc. So it would appear that on his 10th move Black committed an error of omission which he cannot make up for.

14.b3

Now the moves b7-b6 or b7-b5 should be directly prevented.

14.e6!

Very good! If 15.a3 then 15...xc5!.

15.f2 d7

Black may have managed to discourage the c3-knight from the route via a4 to b6, but the price of this success (having a knight on e6) is, as we shall soon see, a high one. Now he will be cramped.

16.xd7 xd7

Here I should have recaptured with the queen, because then Black always gets in ...f6, which is not the case after the text move.

17.f5 f8 18.f4 c8 19.e5! f6

See the previous note.

20.g3 a4 21.b4!

The only move to keep the blockading ring intact, e.g. 21.c3 b6! 22.xb6 d8 and then possibly ...b7.

21...b5 22.d2

Now White has a free hand on the kingside while the queenside is all locked up.

22.d8
It would be well worth thinking of 22...d8 to get the d7-bishop to f7 as quickly as possible.

23.\text{h}3 \text{c}7 24.\text{e}a1 \text{e}7

This allows an interesting sortie by White. So a somewhat better try might be 24...\text{h}g3, e.g. 24...\text{h}g3 25.\text{h}xg3 \text{c}7 26.\text{h}xh5 \text{c}e7 27.g4 h6 28.h4 \text{h}h7. But even in this case White ought to be ready for an attack after 29.\text{h}f4 and 30.\text{h}h3.

25.\text{d}6! \text{d}6

A deeply calculated pawn sacrifice! Of course the d6-pawn will go, but just when it suits Black to take it, his king position will be demolished by a knight sacrifice on f6.

26.\text{c}x\text{d}6 \text{e}e8 27.\text{g}g3 \text{d}d8 28.\text{c}c1!

Another quiet move: ...\text{c}c8 is prevented (28...\text{c}c8? 29.\text{c}x\text{c}6).

28...\text{b}6 29.\text{f}4 \text{e}e6 30.\text{h}5 \text{a}7

Because after 30...\text{e}e8 there would have come 31.\text{d}x\text{f}6+ smashing his position! For example, 30...\text{e}e8 31.\text{d}x\text{f}6+ gxf6 32.\text{d}g3+ \text{h}-moves 33.\text{w}h6.

31.\text{d}x\text{f}6+

1-0

After 31...\text{h}h8 I had planned 32.\text{d}xh7 which I demonstrated after the game finished. Thus: 31...\text{h}h8 32.\text{d}xh7 \text{c}xh7 33.\text{w}h4 \text{g}g8 34.\text{f}6 \text{d}x\text{f}6 35.\text{d}x\text{f}6 etc., or 31...\text{h}h8 32.\text{d}xh7 \text{c}xh7 33.\text{f}6+ \text{g}6 34.\text{w}h4+ \text{g}8 35.\text{f}7+ \text{g}7 36.\text{f}6+ \text{h}7 37.\text{f}4 etc. It would have been weaker to follow 31...\text{h}h8 with 32.\text{w}h4 because then comes 32...h6, e.g. 33.\text{g}g4 \text{h}7 34.\text{f}6 \text{x}g4 and some fresh effort is required.

For example, 35.\text{w}xg4! \text{d}x\text{f}6 36.\text{w}g6 and White's attack should break through.

6. My new treatment of the problem of pawn chains • The Dresden Variation.

In games 49-51 I do not make an early attack on the pawn chain, but instead look for white-squared positional play. That is, I exchange the f1-bishop and then operate on the white squares which have been weakened.

The logical precondition for success is to make safe your own kingside first, and that is the main difficulty with the whole procedure.

First, let us consider a pawn chain (for example the one arising after 1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.\text{c}c3 \text{b}4 4.\text{e}5 c5): restraint of the white kingside which is ready to advance could be achieved by the pawn moves ...h7-h5 and ...g7-g6. But in such a case the black squares g5, f6, etc. become weak. See game 50 and also the following opening.

Lajos Steiner - Aron Nimzowitsch, Berlin 1928
1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.\text{c}c3 \text{b}4 4.\text{e}5 c5

As we shall soon see, this attack is not serious as the pawn later goes on its way peacefully.

5.\text{d}d2 \text{e}7 6.a3 \text{c}c3 7.bxc3 c4? 8.h4 h5 9.\text{e}2! \text{f}5 10.g3! g6 11.\text{g}g5 \text{a}5 12.\text{d}d2

The diagonal creates pressure and the blockade by the f5-knight turns out to be unsustainable.
12...c6 13.\textit{f}6 \textit{g}8 14.\textit{h}3 \textit{d}7 15.\textit{g}5 \textit{h}6 16.f3 \textit{c}7 17.g4 \textit{e}8 18.\textit{g}7 \textit{g}8

6...a6 7.c3  
Worth considering was the immediate 7.\textit{g}3, e.g. 7...\textit{xf}1 8.\textit{xf}1 \textit{h}5 (or else 9.\textit{h}5) 9.h4 and then \textit{g}5.

7...\textit{d}7 8.\textit{g}3 \textit{x}f1 9.\textit{x}f1 \textit{h}5 10.\textit{g}5 \textit{a}5  
The play against the white squares b5, c4 and f5 now becomes clear.

11.\textit{e}2 \textit{a}6 12.\textit{e}3 \textit{b}5 13.b4 \textit{xe}2+ 14.\textit{xe}2 \textit{c}6  
14...\textit{c}4 and 14...\textit{b}7 are both worse. 14...\textit{c}4 on account of 15.\textit{xc}4 dxc4 16.\textit{xc}7 followed by 17.\textit{d}2 b5 18.a4. 14...\textit{b}7 because ...\textit{c}7-c5 would favour only White, e.g. 14...\textit{b}7 15.\textit{e}1 c5 16.bxc5 bxc5 17.\textit{b}1 etc.

15.\textit{e}1 \textit{g}6 16.\textit{d}3 \textit{e}7

And Black has been completely repulsed. After:

19.gxh5 gxh5 20.f4  
My position could not be held.

20...\textit{ce}7 21.\textit{hx}5 \textit{f}5 22.\textit{xf}7 \textit{gx}7 23.\textit{xe}8 \textit{xe}8 24.\textit{f}7 \textit{g}6 25.\textit{fx}6 \textit{xf}6 26.\textit{g}5 \textit{h}5 27.\textit{e}3 \textit{d}7 28.\textit{e}5+ \textit{b}6 29.\textit{d}6+ \textit{c}6 30.\textit{d}2 a6 31.\textit{xe}6 \textit{a}7 32.\textit{ag}1 \textit{e}8 33.\textit{g}6 \textit{e}8 34.\textit{h}g1 \textit{b}5 35.\textit{b}4 \textit{h}8 36.\textit{xb}5 \textit{axb}5 37.\textit{f}5 \textit{h}7 38.f6 \textit{e}8 39.\textit{g}5 \textit{c}7 40.\textit{h}6 1-0

**Game 49**

Dr Arpad Vajda  
Aron Nimzowitsch  
Kecskemét 1927

1.e4 \textit{c}6 2.d4 \textit{d}5 3.\textit{c}3 \textit{c}6 4.e5 \textit{ge}7!  
Not 4...\textit{b}4 on account of 5.\textit{g}4.

5.\textit{f}3  
Because now 5.\textit{g}4 would be met by 5...\textit{h}5.

5...\textit{b}6 6.\textit{e}2  
As a somewhat melancholy author once said “They both indulged in monologues each pausing for the other to speak, and they thought they were having a dialogue.” This is also the case here: Black is trying to seize the white squares and White is trying to occupy the black ones — he is planning \textit{e}2-g3-h5 with pressure against \textit{g}7 and \textit{f}6. The only thing the two players have in common is that they are taking turns to move.

The monologues are over, the bloody dialogue can begin!

17.\textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}7 18.f4 \textit{h}4!  
This seizes the \textit{f}-square. Had White prevented this on the previous move by 18.g3, then the follow up would have been 18...\textit{f}8! ...\textit{d}7, ...0-0, ...\textit{fc}8 and finally ...\textit{c}7-c5 with good play for Black.

19.g3 \textit{h}f5 20.\textit{x}f5 \textit{x}f5 21.\textit{f}3  
An attack on the \textit{f}-knight is being planned, namely h3, \textit{g}4, etc. How can it be thwarted?

21...\textit{a}5  
Just at the right moment.

22.a3  
White did not want to go in for 22.b5 \textit{c}6 23.bxc6 \textit{xc}8. The pressure on the c-file would
have become a nuisance and White's b-file would not have been real compensation.

22...\(\text{Qd7} \) 23.h3

He overlooks his opponent's combination. Worth considering was 23...h\(\text{b1} \) and then \(\text{Qd3-e1-c2-e3} \), though even then Black would be slightly better.

23...\(\text{axb4} \) 24...\(\text{Qxb4} \)

A bitter pill to swallow! After 24.axb4 there would have come 24...h4 25.g4 \(\text{Qg3} \) 26...\(\text{Qhc1} \) \(\text{Qe4} \) seizing either the a-file or the c-pawn.

24...\(\text{Ra4} \)

Here too the above manoeuvre was worth considering. However, 24...\(\text{Ra4} \) should also be good enough.

25.g4 \(\text{Qe7} \) 26...\(\text{Qe3}! \)

Black avoids the variation 26...hxg4 27.hxg4 \(\text{Qxh1} \) 28...\(\text{Qxh1} \) \(\text{Qxa3} \), which would concede the a-file to his opponent.

27...\(\text{Qc2} \) 28...\(\text{Qc6} \) 29...\(\text{Qab1} \) \(\text{Qc8} \)

There was an easy win for Black with 28...\(\text{Qxd4} \)† 29...\(\text{Qxd4} \) (29...\(\text{Qxd4?} \) \(\text{Qxa3} \)) 29...\(\text{Qc4} \) 30...\(\text{Qd3} \) \(\text{Qc8} \)

31...\(\text{Qxb6} \) 32...\(\text{Qxe5} \)† 32...\(\text{Qxe5} \) 33...\(\text{Qd2} \) 34...\(\text{Qxc2} \)† 34...\(\text{Qe3} \) g5. Black was in time trouble.

29...\(\text{Qxb6} \) 30...\(\text{Qxd4} \) 31...\(\text{Qxe5} \) 31...\(\text{Qxe5} \) 32...\(\text{Qxc2} \)

Black's advantage has evaporated.

32...\(\text{hxg4} \) 33...\(\text{hxg4} \)

There was an extremely amusing drawing combination here: 33...\(\text{Qf1} \) 34...\(\text{Qh2} \) 34...\(\text{Qxf7} \)† 35...\(\text{Qe8} \) 35...\(\text{Qbb7} \)!

Looks like a blunder. 35...\(\text{Qxa3} \)† 36...\(\text{Qf4} \) 37...\(\text{Qg4} \) 37...\(\text{Qxf7} \)† but now it is White's move and 38...\(\text{Qg8} \)† draws.

33...\(\text{Qg2} \) 34...\(\text{Qb7} \)†

34...\(\text{Qf3} \) would have drawn, e.g. 34...\(\text{Qa2} \) 35...\(\text{Qh7} \) or 34...\(\text{Qd2} \) 35...\(\text{Qh7} \) etc.

34...\(\text{Qc6} \) 35...\(\text{Qxb1} \) 36...\(\text{Qxa3} \) 36...\(\text{Qf4} \) 37...\(\text{Qg5} \)

Or 37...\(\text{Qf3} \) 38...\(\text{Qg1} \).

37...\(\text{f6} \)†

Not 37...\(\text{f5} \) on account of 38...\(\text{Qxg7} \) 39...\(\text{Qxf6} \) etc.

38...\(\text{Qxf6} \) 39...\(\text{Qxf6} \) 40...\(\text{Qg4} \) 40...\(\text{Qe7} \)

Nor would other moves help much. White's king is too badly placed for an endgame and he does not have enough forces left for a mating attack.

40...\(\text{Qf4} \)† 41...\(\text{Qxe6} \) 42...\(\text{Qf5} \) 43...\(\text{Qe6} \) 44...\(\text{Qf6} \) 45...\(\text{Qe7} \) 46...\(\text{Qe8} \) 47...\(\text{Qe4} \) 0–1
Despite what was missed on move 28, we consider this game to be a significant strategic performance. Who else would have dared to delay the advance ...c7-c5 until move 26? This is the saving advance without which Dr Tarrasch cannot imagine struggling against an opposing pawn chain! To tell the truth, this game broke new ground.

Game 50
Hans Kmoch
Aron Nimzowitsch
Bad Niendorf 1927

1.e4 c6 2.d4 c3 e6 3.d4 cxb4
3...d5 would be safer.
4.Qe2 d5 5.e5
Black chooses our preventive set-up:
5...h5
But we should prefer 5...Ge7, e.g. 6.Qf4 Qg6
7.Qh5 Qg8 and then ...Qe7, and Black plays for
the queen's side castling.
6.Qf4! g6 7.Qe3

White should be able to win without too much
effort. Compare this to the Steiner game quoted
in the introduction (page 97).
13...Qg8 14.0–0
Feeble; the correct move was 14.Qg5 and
then either f3 and g4 or 15.g4. After 15...hxg4
16.Qxg4, h2-h4-h5 would be decisive.
14...Wa5
A tiny counter-chance.
15.Wd2 Qb5 16.Qfd1
There was a more economical way of developing
the rooks (16.Qad1); of course the a-pawn would
be taboo.
16...Qd7!

7...Qxc3?!?
Extremely risky play. The weakness of the
opponent's doubled pawn complex is more than
compensated for by the possession of the g5-d8
diagonal.

Better was 7...Qge7 or even 7...Qf8!.
8.bxc3 a5 9.Qd3 Qe7 10.Qh3 c5 11.Qg5 c4
12.Qe2 Qac6 13.Qf6

A difficult decision. The king leaves the f-pawn
to its fate. And yet the plan appears justified and is
as mentioned in games 29 and 30 "the king's flight
as a relieving measure".
17.\(\text{\textdollar}g5\) \(\text{\textdollar}8\)

The question is whether the straightforward 17...\(\text{\textdollar}c7\) is more in the spirit of the above stratagem. Here what is important is not the f-pawn as such but rather stopping White from using the f7-square (after taking that pawn with his knight) as a base for further attacks. This plan for White would have been thwarted by 17...\(\text{\textdollar}c7\) 18.\(\text{\textdollar}xf7\) \(\text{\textdollar}d7\) 19.f3 \(\text{\textdollar}a8\) 20.\(\text{\textdollar}g5\) and now either 20...\(\text{\textdollar}g7\) and then 21...\(\text{\textdollar}e8\) or 20...\(\text{\textdollar}b8\).

18.\(h3?\)

The wrong method. 18.f3 would have been better.

18...\(\text{\textdollar}c7\) 19.g4 \(\text{hxg4}\) 20.\(\text{hxg4}\) \(\text{\textdollar}fe7\) 21.\(\text{\textdollar}g2\) \(\text{\textdollar}g8}\)

A bad mistake, but one his opponent does not exploit. By 21...\(\text{\textdollar}d7\) 22.\(\text{\textdollar}h1\) \(\text{\textdollar}ae8\) 23.\(\text{\textdollar}h7\) \(\text{\textdollar}d8\) Black could have curled up like a hedgehog.

22.\(\text{\textdollar}g7\) \(\text{\textdollar}e8\) 23.\(\text{\textdollar}h1?\)

23.\(\text{\textdollar}xf7!}\) would have seized not only the pawn but the base square d6. If after 23.\(\text{\textdollar}xf7\) \(\text{\textdollar}e7\) 24.\(\text{\textdollar}d6\) \(\text{\textdollar}d7\) (24...\(\text{\textdollar}xg7?\) 25.\(\text{\textdollar}e8\) 26.\(\text{\textdollar}xg7\) \(\text{\textdollar}g7\) 27.\(\text{\textdollar}g5\)\textsuperscript{+}) 25.\(\text{\textdollar}h6\) White would be well placed.

23...\(\text{\textdollar}d7\) 24.\(\text{\textdollar}h3\) \(\text{\textdollar}d8\) 25.\(\text{\textdollar}f3\) \(\text{\textdollar}c8!\)

26.\(\text{\textdollar}h1?\)

There was no good reason for this pawn sacrifice. It soon turns out that the planned doubling of rooks was hitting out at thin air. Worth considering was 26.\(\text{\textdollar}xf7\) or 26.\(\text{\textdollar}xc1\) and then 27.\(\text{\textdollar}b2.\) After 26.\(\text{\textdollar}xf7\) would come 26...\(\text{\textdollar}xf7\) 27.\(\text{\textdollar}xf7\) \(\text{\textdollar}e7\) 28.\(\text{\textdollar}xe7\) \(\text{\textdollar}xe7\). After 26.\(\text{\textdollar}c1,\) on the other hand, there is 26...\(\text{\textdollar}b8,\) e.g. 27.\(\text{\textdollar}b2\) \(\text{\textdollar}xc6\) 28.\(\text{\textdollar}b4\) \(\text{\textdollar}c7\) 29.\(\text{\textdollar}f8\) \(\text{\textdollar}b6?\) 30.\(\text{\textdollar}d6.\) What has been said leads to two conclusions. Firstly, the prophylactic method 26.\(\text{\textdollar}c1\) and then 27.\(\text{\textdollar}b2\) was correct. Secondly, there is an intrinsic affinity between the white minor pieces and the d6-square. The pieces can develop their own logic, untroubled by the occasionally odd plans of humans; and, as is the case here, that logic is often beautiful and compelling.

26...\(\text{\textdollar}xa2\)

Of course Black can be very happy about gaining this result out of a very tiny possibility of a counterattack.

27.\(\text{\textdollar}h7\) \(\text{\textdollar}b8\) 28.\(\text{\textdollar}xf7\) \(\text{\textdollar}xf7\) 29.\(\text{\textdollar}xf7\) \(\text{\textdollar}c6\)

The doubled rooks are badly positioned.

30.\(\text{\textdollar}f6\) \(\text{\textdollar}a5\)

Preference should have been given to 30...\(\text{\textdollar}b2\), to anticipate the preventive move 31.\(\text{\textdollar}c1.\) But White is not thinking of preventive manoeuvres.

31.\(\text{\textdollar}h1\) \(\text{\textdollar}b2\) 32.\(\text{\textdollar}g5\) \(\text{\textdollar}fb8\) 33.\(\text{\textdollar}h7\) \(\text{\textdollar}fc7\) 34.\(\text{\textdollar}xc7\)

Or 34.\(\text{\textdollar}xh3\) \(\text{\textdollar}xc7\).

34...\(\text{\textdollar}xc7\) 35.\(\text{\textdollar}c1!\)

White may not have been brilliant in playing for a win up till now, but he certainly knows how to make use of his minuscule drawing chances. The attempts at saving the game which he now makes are first class – one is involuntarily reminded of Schlechter.

35...\(\text{\textdollar}xc3\) 36.\(\text{\textdollar}a1!\) \(\text{\textdollar}xa1\) 37.\(\text{\textdollar}xa1\) \(\text{\textdollar}a8\) 38.\(\text{\textdollar}d2\) \(\text{\textdollar}b6\) 39.\(\text{\textdollar}g3\)
Now the king is threatening to march forward
to g5.
39...Ec7 40.d4! Ad7

The only way for Black to win, if there is such a
way, was by 40...Ab7.
41.Ab4! Ac6 42.Ad6! Ab7 43.c3 b5 44.Ab1
b4 45.Ac4!

Not 45.cxb4 axb4 46.Axb4 Ad4 47.Ac5 Ab5 etc.
45...b3

This looks good but starts a process of
mummification. But 45...Ad4 46.Axd7 Ac2+ 47.Ac3 Axg3 48.Axe6 Ac6 etc. would be
double-edged.
46.Ax6+ Ac6 47.g5!

Barring the bishop's way out via g6.
47...Ab7 48.Ab2 Ab7 49.Ac4

With this move White allows a study-like
breakthrough. 49.Ab3 would have drawn.
49...Ac8

Threatening 50...Ad7.
50.Ac3 Ab4!!

59.Ac3
59.Ad3 Ab6 mate.
59...Ab7 60.Ac1 Ac4+ 61.Ac2 b2 62.f5 exf5
63.c6 Ac6
0–1

Game 51
Alfred Brinckmann
Aron Nimzowitsch
Bad Niendorf 1927

1.e4 Ac6 2.Ac3 c6 3.d4 d5 4.e5 Ac7 5.Ab3
b6 6.Ac2! Ac6

These moves have already been discussed in the
notes to game 49.
7.Ac3 Axf1 8.Exf1 h5 9.Ab5

White is threatening to seize the black squares
as follows: Ah4 ...g6, Af6, then Ah4-f3-g5 etc.
How can the h5-pawn be defended without the
help of the weakening move ...g7-g6?
9...Bc8!

The winning move.
51.cb4

Necessary, or else 51...Ab4 etc.
51...Ab4 52.Ac5+ Ab5 53.Ab3 c3 54.Ac1 Ac4

Since the a3-bishop and the b1-rook cannot now
move – or else ...b2 followed by ...Ab3 would be
immediately decisive – the king can calmly take
the d4-pawn and then return to c4. This is the
decisive point.
55.Ac4 Ad4 56.Ac2 Ac4 57.Ac1 d4 58.Ac2 Ad5

If now 10.Ac4 then 10...Ac6+ 11.Ag1 Ab4!!
12.c3 Ad1+ and h5 is well enough defended
without needing the g-pawn.
10.Bd3 Ag6 11.c3 h4

This move, which in itself is loosening (by that
I mean self-weakening) is meant as preventive
action against White's intended h2-h4.

For example, 11...Ac7 (instead of 11...h4)
12.h4. However, 11...Ac7 seems a totally valid
plan.
12.De2 Ae7
12...h3 13.gxh3 \(e7\) or 13.g3 a5 then ...\(a6\) are both well worth considering.

13.h3 \(xg5\)

13...\(h5\) was possible.

14.\(xg5\) \(ce7\)

Here too it was worth thinking about 14...\(h5\).

15.\(g1\)

This allows his opponent time for a comprehensive attack in the centre. For that reason Brinckmann considers the counterattack 15.\(f3\) to be correct, but in this case too we would much prefer Black's position after 15...\(f5\) 16.g4 \(xg3\) 17.\(xg3\) (or 17.\(xg3\) \(gh4\)) 17...\(d7\) 18.h4 0–0–0 19.h5 \(ge7\) 20.g4 \(h6\).

15...\(f6\) 16.\(b3\) \(d7\)

After this move White gets a chance (which he did not take) to play an extremely subtle saving line. So an immediate 16...c5 and later 17...\(c7\) would have been a better way to hold on to the advantage.

17.\(h2\) c5

I was not very keen on the possibility of 21...\(f5\) 22.\(dxe5\) \(dxe5\) 23.\(dxe5\) \(xe5\) 24.\(f4\) \(d6\) and then something like 25.\(e6\) threatening 26.\(xc4\).

22.\(c3\) \(f5\) 23.\(xe5\)

Not 23.\(d5\) on account of 23...\(xf3\) then 24...\(e5\) with a decisive attack.

23...\(f5\) 24.\(dxe5\)

The correct move was 24.\(e5\)!! e.g. 24...\(c6\)

25.\(d5\) \(d6\) 26.\(xc4\) \(dxe5\) 27.\(dxe5\) \(dxe5\) 28.\(f4\) \(e6\) 29.\(f5\) \(d5\) 30.\(d1\) \(d7\) 31.\(d1\) \(c3\) and Black cannot strengthen his position, so it's a draw.

24...\(d4\) 25.\(b5\) \(d5\) 26.\(d6\) \(d3\)

Not 26...\(b5\) on account of 27.\(d4\) with a centralized set-up.

27.\(xc4\) 28.\(xc4\) \(e2\) 29.\(d4\) \(e2\)

What follows is a textbook example of play on the 7th and 8th ranks (here the 1st and 2nd).

29.\(d1\) \(d8\) 30.\(d4\) \(d8\) 31.\(d4\) \(f5\)

To prevent \(d6\).

32.\(a4\)

32.e6 would be met by 32...\(e2\)!! e.g. 33.\(xd3\) (33.\(xe2\) is met by 34.\(xd8\) \(h7\) and Black wins) 33...\(e1\) 34.\(xd8\) \(h7\) and the threat of ...\(g3\) is decisive.

If after 32.e6 \(e2\) White tries to gain a valuable tempo for the defence (e.g. 33.\(e7\) \(xe7\) 34.\(xd3\) \(xe1\) 35.\(xd8\) \(f7\) 36.\(d6\) \(e6\) 37.\(c8\) with a draw) Black simply plays 33...\(e8\) and wins the pawn.

32...\(f7\)

18.c4!

Very bold and ingenious play. The only regret is that on move 24 he does not find the – very difficult – correct continuation.

18...\(d7\) 19.\(xd5\) c4

19...\(xe5\) would be met by 20.\(d5\) \(f8\)

21.\(g5\) \(d4\) 22.\(f4\) \(xf4\) 23.\(h1\) \(exd5\)?

24.\(xe6\) and wins.

20.\(c2\) \(exd5\) 21.\(e1\) 0–0
This move is totally correct, as the following analysis will show: 33.e6† .getAs8! 34.Æe5 d2 35.Æe4 ¼d4 (of course not the amusing 35... ½f1 which would be met by 36.Àxf1 ¼g3 and the equally amusing 37.½f8† ½xf8 38.Æg6† followed by 39.Æxh4 and Black would be mated by ½h8.) 36.Àxh4 ¼xh4 37.Àc4 ¼b3 38.Æg1 ¼f4 39.Àe3 ¼xa4

Moreover, instead of the game move (32... ½f7) 32...Æe2 could easily have been played, but it is always better to play for a blockade.

33.Æe4 Æe2 34.Æf4 ¼e6

Black has now achieved all his aims: the rook on e2 and the blockading position on e6. Now all that remains to be done is to chase the knight away from c4.

35.Àg4 d2 36.Àg6† ½f7 37.Àg4 a6 38.Æf4 ¼e6 39.Àd6 Æe3
0–1

Game 52
Lajos Steiner
Aron Nimzowitsch
Dresden 1926

1.e4 c5 2.Àf3 Æc6 3.Àc3 e5

Black takes his time. His opponent is short of effective moves.

8.Àd5

To emphasize the strength of d5, but as soon becomes clear, this can only be achieved by sacrifices – of either material or position.

8...Æf6

Taking aim at d5.

9.Àh4

At the same time White tries to hang on to d5 by combinatory methods.

9...Àxd5

9...Àxe4 10.dxe4 ¼xh4 would be bad on account of 11.f4.

10.exd5 ¼xd5 11.Àf5

The sacrifice which supports the plan (see move 8 and the note to it): White does win his pawn back, but receives doubled pawns. So the sacrifice has been positional in nature. Instead he could have sacrificed material, by 11.Àxd5 ¼xh4 and then 12.f4 with attacking chances. Other things being equal, either the positional or the material sacrifice should be enough for a draw.

11...Àxc4 12.dxc4 g6!

Or 12...0–0? 13.Àg4 ¼g5 14.h4 etc.

13.Àxh6 ¼d7 14.Àd5 ¼d8 15.Àe3

If 15.Àg4 then 15...f5 16.Àe3 ¼e6 followed by ...0–0–0. The position could then be summed up as follows: Black would have play down the h-file, whilst any attempt by White to attack would peter out against the compact mass of his opponent's pawns.

To play such a move you need to have courage, and belief in the importance of the blockade. The text move sacrifices a tempo (by not developing a piece) and creates a hole on d5, all to prevent d2-d4 and so restrain the opponent.

4.Àc4 d6 5.h3 ¼e6 6.d3 ¼e7 7.0–0 h6
15...f5 16.g8 h4 17.g3 e6

18.ad1?
The losing move. Nowadays I think that the immediate 18.gxh4 Exg8 (not 18...xd5? because of 19.d6†) would have been enough for a draw. For example 19.g5 xd5 20.cxd5 h8 21.f4 e4 22.ea1 and 23.e3.

18...Exg8 19.gxh4 f4
Now the bishop can no longer get to g5.

20.exf4
Or 20.e1 xd5 21.xd5 f7 and then ...0–0–0 and ...h8 with an easy win.

20...xd5 21.axd5 e4 22.xd6 e7 23.fd1 b6 24.xd7† f6

...0–1
White resigned after a few unimportant moves. One gains the impression that the plan to weaken the d5-square somewhat (1...c5 in conjunction with 3...e5) is correct, because it cost White quite an effort to hang on to d5 and the best he could have achieved was a draw.
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Overprotection and other forms of Prophylaxis

A rule which I discovered states that strategically important squares should be overprotected. "Because, should the pieces do this, their reward is that for their efforts in protecting the strategically important squares they end up in good positions; so they bathe in the reflected glory of the strategic squares, one might say in somewhat emotional fashion." The thought could be expressed more simply as follows:

The contact between one's own strong square and the pieces which are overprotecting it must be to the benefit of both parties. It suits the square, which receives from the prophylactic measures the greatest possible security against potential attacks. And it also suits the overprotecting pieces, because the square becomes for them a source of energy from which they can continually draw new strength.

Your author has almost always had excellent results with overprotection. To be sure, from time to time some spiteful critic has tried to make fun of the idea, but any objective summing up will prove him wrong. The difficulties in the next games were alleged to be due to overprotection.

I. Aron Nimzowitsch – José Raul Capablanca
New York 1927

1.e4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.e5
This leads to easy equality.
3...dxe5 4.dxe5 @xd3 5.@xd3 e6 6.©c3 ¥b6
7.©e2 c5 8.dxc5 ©xc5 9.0–0 ©e7 10.©a4
©e6 11.©xc5 ©xc5 12.©e3 ¥c7 13.f4
Also good was 13.©d4 in order to prevent
13...©f5.
13...©f6 14.c3
This starts the systematic overprotection of the d4-square, which appears to merit this concentrated attention; after all, d4 is a central blockading square and – if that were not enough – we once had a pawn on d4, which was the base of a proud chain. Even if the d4-pawn disappeared long ago and if the chain now has the f4-pawn as its base, there has been practically no change in the glamour and huge importance of the d4-square. So it follows that grouping one’s own pieces around the d4-square must be of enormous value in consolidating the position. Admittedly, other plans were possible, e.g. 14...Ac1 (instead of 14.c3) and then 15.c4. But what would that prove? Only that overprotection was not the only possible stratagem here.

14...Cc6 15.Ad1 g6 16.g4

This is where the mistake was made. After 16.Af2 h5 17.g3 Black would be wondering what to do next.

16...Cxe3 17.Cxe3 h5 18.g5 0–0 19.Ad4 Bb6

37.Cxd4 Cc4 38.Cg2 b5 39.Cg1 b4 40.axb4 axb4 41.Cg2 Cc1 42.Cg3 Bh1 43.Cd3 Ce1 44.Cf3 Ed1 45.b3 Cc1 46.Ce3 Ef1 0–1

II. Rudolf Spielmann – Aron Nimzowitsch from the same tournament

1.e4 Cc6 2.Cf3 Ce6 3.d4 d5 4.e5 b6 5.c3 Cc7 6.Cd3 a5 7.Ab5 Cc5

This is a precursor of my game against Sämisch in Berlin (game 13, p. 39).

8.h4 h5 9.Cg5 g6

The wrong way to overprotect, something which was unfortunately missed by the critics. The correct way was the immediate ...Cg7. White would then not manage to carry out the manoeuvre he did in the game (Cb1-d2-f1 then f3 and g4), e.g. 9...Cg7 10.Cd2 c5 and the base of the chain, d4, is hanging.

10.Cd2 Cg7

Now 10...Cc5 would have been better, because there is no point in overprotection here, since f3 and g4 cannot be prevented.

11.Cf1 Cc5 12.Cc4 Cc2 b5 14.g4 Cg7

And White was better, even if he lost later by being over-hasty with his attack. So, here too overprotection would have been useful if it had been carried out properly.

15.Ag3 Cc6 16.Ag2 Cc7 17.gxh5 gxh5 18.Ag1 Cc7 19.Cxf7 Cxf7 20.Chx5 Cxh4† 21.Ce2 Cxh5 22.Cg6† Cc7 23.Cxh5 Cd7
24. \textgambit{g7} \textgambit{e7} 25. \textgambit{f7} \textgambit{h2} 26. \textgambit{d1} \textgambit{c7} 27. \textgambit{f4} \textgambit{xb2} 28. \textgambit{h7} \textgambit{b6} 29. \textgambit{g8} \textgambit{c7} 30. \textgambit{h8} \textgambit{d8} 31. \textgambit{g6} \textgambit{g2} 32. \textgambit{wh1} \textgambit{xg6} 33. \textgambit{exg6} b4 34. \textgambit{eg7} \textgambit{c6} 35. \textgambit{h8} \textgambit{a4} 36. \textgambit{e1} \textgambit{c6} 37. \textgambit{xc8} \textgambit{h4} 38. \textgambit{g3} \textgambit{exg7} 39. \textgambit{axh4} \textgambit{c2} 40. \textgambit{d8} \textgambit{xd8} 41. \textgambit{b8} \textgambit{b7} 0–1

Something else to be said about overprotection is that only important, strong squares (not weak ones) deserve overprotection. In addition, it is also desirable that the squares should be at least partially a point of contention between the players.

Our games 20 and 44 are instructive examples. For prophylaxis, see games 53 to 56. We were particularly interested in demonstrating the affinity between waiting moves and preventive moves. In the game against Behting (53) 8...a6 would apparently have achieved nothing after the reply 9.a4! and yet White would have weakened his chances for the endgame.

A move which prevents a sharp threat by your opponent need not be devoid of deeper prophylactic significance; we can see that from move 6 in game 55. If you have prevented your own options from being reduced, then what you have done has been prophylaxis (see game 55). It is rare for prophylaxis to be linked to a threat, but this can happen and even constitutes a remarkable sort of prophylaxis, see move 24 in game 54.

And something else: What unpleasant events are worth systematic prevention? Well, any "positional" threats which your opponent would like to set up.

For this, game 53 is particularly instructive: the difficult, extremely complicated manoeuvre (Black's 21st move, etc) is intended to help prevent a threatened centralization by his opponent. Modern tournament praxis is full of prophylactic manoeuvring; see, for example, games 7, 13, 20, 21, 32, 33, 38, 39 and 43.

**Game 53**

C. Behting

Aron Nimzowitsch

Informal game, Riga 1910

1. e4 d6 2. \textgambit{c3} \textgambit{d6} 3. f4 e5

This leads to a position from the King's Gambit Declined with ...d7-d6.

4. \textgambit{b3} \textgambit{bd7} 5. d4

The move does not deserve criticism, because e4 will be easy to hold, see note to move 8.

5...\textgambit{exd4} 6. \textgambit{exd4} \textgambit{g7} 7. \textgambit{c4} 0–0 8.0–0 a6

One of these mysterious moves on which the pseudo-classical school used to pour scorn. The closed position after ...c5 and ...b5 is only a side issue here. The main purpose of the move is to wait for White to play \textgambit{f3}, and then to choose the prophylactic set-up of ...\textgambit{e8} and ...\textgambit{f8}. The immediate 8...\textgambit{e8} would fail to 9.\textgambit{f3}! with the double threat of 10.e5 and 10.\textgambit{g5}. So 8...a6 is the sacrifice of a tempo in order to enable the prophylaxis of ...\textgambit{e8} etc. This thought must have appeared to be a huge piece of intellectual arrogance to positional players of that time, as they simply shrugged their shoulders at the idea of prophylaxis. The idea of preparing for the latter by sacrificing a tempo was "bizarre", "crazy", etc...

Well, in reality 8...a6 had to be a very fine move. The e4-pawn is both statically and dynamically full of life and restraint requires care and patience, in other words, waiting moves and preventive moves. Direct action, such as 8...\textgambit{b6} (instead of 8...a6)
would only have left Black at a disadvantage after 9...e2! d5 10.e5 0e4 11.f5.

9.0-0

A possible move was 9.a4, which would have restored the status quo. I would probably in that case have chosen 9...c6, e.g. 9.a4 c6 10.a2! (the threat was ...d5 followed by ...g6) and then 10...e8. If now 11.e3 then 11...h6 and the thrust 12.e5? would have failed to 12...dxe5 13.fxe5 0xe5 14.0xe5 0xd1 15.xf7+ 0xf8 16.xd1 0c5† 17.0f1 0xe5.

9...0c5 10.0g3

If 10.0xe7+ 0xe7 11.0e1 then 11...b5 (not 11...0xe4 on account of 12.0xe4 0xe4 13.0d5) 12.0d5 0xd5 13.0xd5 0d8 (or d7) and after 0e8 and ...b7 Black gets some play against the e4-pawn. The text move may thoroughly protect that pawn, but means a decentralization: 0d4-f5-g3.

10...b5 11.0d3 b4 12.0d5 0xd5 13.exd5

Black can chalk up the success of having taken the dynamism out of White's centre – thanks to 13.exd5 – but on the other hand he is facing the difficult task of having to take preventive measures in two directions at the same time. White is planning a3 to roll up the queenside and also f5 to gain space. 13...a5! would have prevented both of them (in spite of the threat of 14...0xd3 15.cxd3 0a6).

13...f5

This prevents a possible f4-f5, but also plans activity on the e-file (...h4, ...xg3, ...e8 as well as settling the knight solidly on e4).

14.a3! bxa3 15.0xa3 0b8 16.c3 0h4 17.0f3 0xg3 18.0xg3 0e8 19.0c2 0f6 20.b4 0e4 21.0d3

Things have worked out for Black without preventive action on the queenside, because the weakness of the a-pawn is compensated for by the strength of the e-file. But now he can no longer do without preventive measures as White is planning to centralize (c1-e3-d4) and then Black would be somewhat worse off. How can the planned set-up be prevented?

21...0f7! 22.0e3 0f6! 23.0b3 0b7 24.0d1

This is not good. I had of course expected 24.c4 and intended 24...c8 25.0d2 0e4 26.0e1 0f6, bringing about the earlier position, except that the long diagonal would then be irretrievably lost to my opponent. This preventive combination, with its return after six moves to a previous position, should help you to get a feel for the richness and variety of combinations which are available as preventive measures. I count it among my favourite combinations.

24...0xd5! 25.0xd5 0xd5 26.0xd5† 0xd5 27.0a7

A dangerous move, but one which Black had spotted when he went in for the exchanges. The continuation 27.0xd5 0xe3 28.0xf5 0xe8 would favour Black.

27...0e3! 28.0d3 0g4 29.0d1 0a8 30.0d4

Black would also gain an advantage after 30.0xa6 following 30...0e4 31.g3 0e2 or 31.0f1 0g4-e4-d5.
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30...e6 31.h3 dxe3 32...xe3
Forced now on account of 32...c4 or 32...d5.
32...xe3 33...f2 e4 34.g3 f7
Black surrenders the a6-pawn in order to bring his king into the game with decisive effect.
35...d1 e6 36...xa6...xa6 37...d5 38...a5†
The threat was 38...c4 and then d5-e4-d3.
38...c4 39...xf5 e7!

Because his position – a crouching or frog position par excellence – can hardly be changed in any way; the waiting move was meant to emphasize this.
11.h3 c7 12.d4 g6 13...e3 h7
Black sits tight.
14...d2 e6 15...c2 e7 16.d5
White too would have done better to sit tight. The only possible idea behind d4-d5 would be to start an attack against the opponent’s queenside. But White wants to operate on the kingside and d4-d5 is bad preparation for that.
16...d7 17...h2

The white king is shut off and Black is threatening to create two connected passed pawns. White tried:
40.b5 hxc3 41.b6† cxb6
Not 41...c6 on account of 42...a5 b7 43...a7...xb6 44...xg7 when matters are still in doubt.
42...d5...d7 43...b5 b7 44...d5 b5 45...xd6 b4 46...e2 b3 47...c6†...b2 48.f5...b1 49.g4 b2 50.g5...a2
And after a few more moves White resigned.
...0–1

Game 54
Carl Schlechter
Aron Nimzowitsch
Karlsbad 1907

1.e4 e5 2...f3 c6 3.b5 a6 4...a4 f6 5...c3
b4 6...d5 e7 7.0–0 0–0 8...e1 d6 9...xf6†
exf6 10.c3
Black now played a waiting game with:
10...h6

17...h8!
A preventive move, which is directed against the plan of...g1 and then...f2–f4.
18...g1 g5 19.g3...g6 20...d1...g7 21...b3 a5
More prophylactic play, this time to prevent the possibility of c4 and then b4.
22...e2...b5 23...a4...d7
He has done what he set out to do. White’s queenside no longer has the strength to break through (which he was planning to do starting with c4 and b4).
24...h1!
Schlechter is now planning to break through when possible with h3–h4, e.g. 23...b6 24.h4 gxh4 25.gxh4...xh4 26...h5 f5 27...g1 etc. But Black finds a move which not only is excellent prophylaxis but which also forces his opponent to act quickly.
24...c8!!
31.\textit{Wxh3 exd3 32.\textit{Nxh6 Nh8!}} 0-1

Amongst other things, the game is distinguished by its all-embracing prophylaxis: preventive measures were taken against c4 and b4, and against f4, and against h4. I should also like to say a few words about the character of the preventive moves chosen here: the wait and see procedure 10...h6 fit in with this style, because:

Waiting moves form the start of all prophylaxis!

The fact that the preventive move 24...\textit{Wc8!} also contains a threat in no way makes the move “unfit for purpose” because what is involved here is a quite specific type of prophylaxis, part of which involves the goading of the opponent into starting his plan hastily.

Game 55
Wendel
Aron Nimzowitsch
Stockholm 1921

1.e4 \textit{c5} 2.d4 d5 3.\textit{c3} dxe4 4.d5 \textit{c6} 5.\textit{f4} \textit{c6} 6.\textit{g3} a6

You need to understand this move. The threat of 7.\textit{b5} was apparently more easily beaten back by 6...f5, as f7-f5 will be played later anyway. But what Black wants – and this is the essence of prophylaxis – is not to show his cards too soon. 6...f5 would be followed by 7.h4 and Black would

Threatening 25...\textit{Wc8} 26.h4 \textit{g4}, winning the knight. So White has no more time for further preparations and opens the battle for the breakthrough.

25.h4 \textit{Wc8!}

Threatening 26...\textit{g4}.

26.\textit{d3 g4} 27.\textit{g2 gxh4} 28.f3 h3 29.\textit{f1}

The breakthrough appears to be going to succeed, because if now 29...\textit{d7} then 30.g4 followed by \textit{Wxh3} with a decisive attack.

29...\textit{f5!}

The counter-thrust which was prepared a long time ago and which will decide the struggle in Black's favour.

30.\textit{fxg4 fxg4}

Only now do the full implications of 28...h3 become apparent. It forced the queen from g2 to f1 and into the line of fire of the f8-rook.
have a problem, e.g. 7...f4 8.h5 fxg3 9.hxg6 gxh2† 10.\texttt{gxh2} and now – better late than never – being able to access the b5-square would be important.

7.f3! \texttt{f5} 8.fx4

If now 8.h4 then 8...\texttt{e5} 9.h5 \texttt{g5} with advantage to Black.

8...\texttt{f4} 9.\texttt{xf2} \texttt{e5} 10.\texttt{xf3} \texttt{d6}

According to the law of the blockade, passed pawns and partially passed pawns must be blocked! The position is now approximately equal. White should set about getting his majority on the move (c2-c4-c5), but there are great difficulties with that there.

11.h4

At this point I would have preferred \texttt{d3}, 0–0, \texttt{e2} and c2-c4.

11...b5!

This diversion stems naturally from the preventive move 6...a6.

12.h5 \texttt{g8} 13.\texttt{h4} \texttt{d7}!

The threat is 14...\texttt{g4}.

14.d2 \texttt{b4}! 15.d1 \texttt{f6}!

White has to some extent consolidated and his opponent now has to reckon with the attempts to shake off the yoke by 29.\texttt{f2} or even 29.\texttt{f5} \texttt{xh5} 30.exf5 with the amusing threat of a draw by 31.h3 \texttt{g5} 32.h4 etc. At this point the prophylactic king march 28...\texttt{d8} and 29...\texttt{c7} would be very good. Then there would be the threat of doubling rooks on the b-file. If after 28...\texttt{d8} White plays his intended 29.\texttt{f2} there then follows 29...\texttt{xf2}† 30.d2 \texttt{b2}† 31.d1 \texttt{f5} 32.e1 \texttt{a2} 33.exf5 \texttt{c7}; but if after 28...\texttt{d8} there is the diversion 29.d5 then after 29..\texttt{xf5} 30.exf5 \texttt{e8} the rook has occupied the correct file at once and after 31.h3 the queen disappears to g8 with a much superior game. So 28...\texttt{d8} was an excellent preventive move which would blunt the edge of those attacks on king and queen which were still far away in the future.

But there is here – instead of 28...\texttt{d8} – a deeper combination which gets to the goal more quickly and which I chose.

28.\texttt{b5}† 29.c4 \texttt{xc4}† 30.\texttt{xc4} \texttt{b2} 31.\texttt{e2} \texttt{g4}! 32.\texttt{c1}

The parry I had foreseen. If instead of it, 32.h3 then 32...\texttt{xh4} 33.\texttt{xg3} d1† 34.\texttt{f2} \texttt{fxg3}† 35.d\texttt{g3} \texttt{xa1}. Black wins the a-pawn and decides the game by direct attacks with the rooks, with the passed pawn lurking in the background.

32...\texttt{xh4} 33.\texttt{xh4} \texttt{xe2} 34.\texttt{xe2} \texttt{c2}†!
The point. The rook on g3 is going nowhere and Black obtains a decisive pawn superiority.

35.d4 f1 36.d2

The otherwise better 36.c2 would fail to the problem-like mate: 36...d3+ 37.b2 a4 36...d3+ 37.e1 g3+ 38.f1 xh4

It seems more logical to completely shut off the queen by 8...b6. Black would then have the option of ...a6 or ...b7.

9.d1 0-0 10.b1 a6 11.d4

White is lost.

39.g1 g3+ 40.h1 h3+ 41.g1 xe4 42.c6+

This brings the queen into the defence on g2, with the help of a few checks.

42.f7 43.c7+ g6 44.g7+ h5 45.g2 e3+ 46.h2 f2 47.f1

47.g1 is simply followed by 47...e2 and White has no sensible check.

47.g4+ 48.h1 e4 49.g1 f8 50.a4 xh6 51.a5 g5 52.b1 b3 53.b2 f2

0-1

One of my best games.

Game 56
Frederick Yates
Aron Nimzowitsch
London 1927

1.e4 c5 2.f3 f6 3.e5 d5 4.c3 xc3 5.bxc3 a5

A deliberate exaggeration of the principle of prophylaxis; one should not use the queen but rather a minor piece. But I wanted to set him problems at any cost.

6.c4 e6 7.w2 e7 8.0-0 c6

Yates has very neatly solved the problem he was set on move 5. If Black now plays 11...xc3 he intends 12.b2 a5 13.d5 b8 (or 13...a7) 14.d6 d8 and Black is the one in danger.

11...b5 12.d3 c4 13.e4 f5

Or else 14.d5 will follow.

14.xf6 xf6 15.e5 xe5

Forced.

16.xe5 b7 17.h5

A terrifying onslaught!

17...g6 18.xg6 hxg6 19.xg6+ g7 20.e8+ h7 21.h5+ g8 22.h6 xa2

In his unfortunate position Black finds the only move which promises him salvation. On the other hand he would have lost at once after 22...xc3, e.g. 23.e8+ h7 24.xg7 xg7 25.xd7+ xd7 26.xd7+ h8 27.xc6 and wins.

23.xg7

It was well worth considering hanging on to the bishop, e.g. 23.b1 a3 24.xd6.

23...xg7 24.xg5 f7 25.e1 a3 26.e8

This area is under heavy fire, so the king leaves it. At this point White should have remembered that his h-pawn is passed... but Yates continues to play for mate!

27.e4 c7 28.xh6 d8 29.xd1 c7 30.g4 c5 31.e4
A very beautiful combination was possible after 31.h4.

It goes: 31.h4 a5 32.g7 a4 33.h5 a3 34.h6 a2 35.h7 a1=Q 36.xa1 cxa1† 37.h2 and now Black wins as follows 37...xf2 38.h8=Q g1† 39.g3 e3† 40.h2

40...xf1!! (threatening 41...e1 and then mate) 41.h4 h4 42.h6f6! e1!! (not 42...xf6 because of 43.exf6 and wins) 43.xf1 e1f1 and Black must win.

Despite this, 31.h4 is good, but only if White does not meet 31...a5 with 32.g7. The correct line is rather 32.h5 a4 33.d2!

But after all that, the best line appears to be 31.h4 a5 32.h5 xe5! 33.f4 xe4 34.xf4 b7 35.f7 d5 36.xg7 d5† 37.f4 e8 38.exe5 xh5 39.e1 f5! and Black has much the better of things.

31...e7! 32.d2

32.e3 was needed. White’s passed pawns can only become dangerous when the queens have been exchanged: 32...xe3 33.xe3 b7 34.g4 g6 35.h3 E8 36.xf1 f4 with the threat of 37.g2 or 36...a5 (instead of 36...f4) 37.h2 a4 38.g3 and now 38...f4 (with the threat of 39...g2 40.e2 f3†) and Black should be better off.

32..d5 33.h4 d7 34.d4 d6 35.e1 c6 36.a3 f8 37.f4 f5

With decisive effect.

41...f6!

Not 41...f4 on account of 42.xd7† etc.

42.e3 xd1†

An elegant way to decide matters.

43.xd1 h1† 44.f2 g4† 45.e2 h2† 46.e1 xe3

0–1

Game 57
Morrison
Aron Nimzowitsch
London 1927

This game and the next one are dedicated to overprotection.

1.e4 e6 2.g3

Tartakower’s interesting suggestion.

2..d5 3.c3

A more obvious move was 3...g2 and then 4.d3.

On c3 the knight is exposed to attack.

3..c6 4.exd5

4.d3 and then 5..g2 would have been better.

4..exd5 5.d4 f5 6.a3 d7 7.g2 0–0–0!

Because the d-pawn appears indirectly protected, e.g. 8.xd5 e6† 9.e3 xd4 or 8.xd5 f6 9.xc6 xc6 with a superior attacking game.

8.g2 e7!

The individual elements of this strange looking plan are:

1) The e4-square should obviously be considered an important strategic point (= an outpost on the e-file).
2. For that reason the d5-pawn, which
is supporting the e4-square, is valuable.
Overprotection of a valuable pawn would fit in
with our stratagem of overprotection.

So the only question is whether:
3. The knight which is occupying e4 is able to
remain there. The fact that this is the case should
be clear. See Black’s 12th move.

A much weaker choice at this point would have
been the “natural” defensive move 8...\(\text{d}f6\) on
account of 9.\(\text{g}5\).

9.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{f}6\)

Now \(\text{g}5\) is no longer possible.

10.h3 b5 11.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}4\) 12.\(\text{e}3\)

This is threatening the exchange followed by
\(\text{c}5\). The prospects for the outpost knight on e4
appear to be shrinking; in fact the whole set-up
from 8...\(\text{ge}7\) appears almost refuted. But that is
not true!

12...\(\text{xc}3\)!

The e4-knight inflicts a bloody wound on
the enemy, namely doubled pawns on c2 and
c3; White’s b-file is pretty useless and White
is being slowly crushed. (So, even if not in the
narrowest interpretation, the e4-knight has
managed to justify its position; cf. note to
move 8.)

13.bxc3 \(\text{d}6\) 14.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{e}6\) 15.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{a}5\) 16.\(\text{h}4\)
c6 17.0–0 \(\text{d}6\) 18.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{g}4\)

19.\(\text{f}3\)

He scarcely has anything better.

19...\(\text{d}e8\) 20.\(\text{xg}4\) \(\text{xg}4\) 21.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{c}4\)

Avoiding the trap 21...\(\text{xg}3\)? 22.\(\text{c}5\) and
wins.

22.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{xf}4\) 23.\(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{g}5\) 24.\(\text{hxg}5\) \(\text{f}5\) 25.\(\text{g}2\)
\(\text{xg}5\) 26.\(\text{f}4\)

If 26.\(\text{h}4\) then 26...\(\text{exh}4\) 27.\(\text{g}xh4\) \(\text{h}4\)
28.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{h}8\) 29.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{h}1\)† 30.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{f}3\)† etc.

Note how the c4-knight cooperates.

26...\(\text{h}5\)

27.\(\text{f}2\)

A pity. I had expected 27.\(\text{e}1\) for which I had
prepared the fine move 27...\(\text{e}3\), e.g. 28.\(\text{xe}3\)
\(\text{h}1\)† and then 29...\(\text{h}2\)†.

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

Neglecting the c4-square, but e4 is now even
stronger.

28.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{e}4\)†

0–1

Because 29.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{xg}3\) is decisive.

Game 58
Aron Nimzowitsch
A. Håkansson
Kristianstad (match) 1922

1.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{e}6\) 2.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}5\) 3.\(\text{e}5\)

I have considered this move a good one since
1911, but it has taken 17 long years to convince
the chess world of its correctness...

3...\(\text{c}5\) 4.\(\text{g}4\)

With an enormously influential outpost on c4
and splendid development, Black now starts the
attack against the weakened kingside.
My innovation, which was used for the first time in this game. As will soon become apparent, it is based on the idea of overprotection.

4...cxd4 5.Qf3 Qc6 6.Qd3 f5

A pawn down, White is playing to blockade his opponent, thus using the stratagem we know from games 46 and 47: "the blockading sacrifice". But for it to work, he has to overprotect the e5-square which lies at the heart of the blockading idea. The overprotecting pieces will then gain kudos from their task; that is the essence of the stratagem of overprotection.

7.g3 Qg7 8.0-0 Qg6 9.h4

Poor knight!

9...c7 10.Qe1 Qd7

Here 10...c5 11.h5 Qf8 was necessary.

11.a3 0-0-0 12.b4

Here White could already win the exchange: 12.h5 Qge7 13.Qg5 Qe8 14.Qf7 Qg8 15.Qd6† but afterwards he would have some problems to overcome (h5 is unprotected and White is not developed). The text move is the logical continuation of White’s build-up.

12...a6

Somewhat better was 12...Qb8 13.c3! dxc3 14.Qxc3 Qxb4 15.axb4 Qxc3 16.Qe3 Qxd3 17.Qxa7† Qc8 18.Qec1† Qc6 19.b5! Qxb5 20.Qd4 with complications. White could also meet 12...Qb8 with 13.Qb2, of course.

13.h5 Qge7 14.Qd2 h6 15.a4 g5 16.b5 f4

The only move. Black must undertake a remarkable redeployment of his forces to save material.

19.cxd4 Qd8 20.Qc1 Qb6 21.a5 Qa7 22.b6 Qa8

Without any effort on its part, the overprotecting piece, the e1-rook, gets to occupy the c-file and becomes really important, like an understudy having a leading role fall into his lap. Why? That was what the director wanted! So in our game who was the all-powerful director who was handing out the parts? The answer is: the stratagem of overprotection!

18...Qe8

The only move. Black must undertake a remarkable redeployment of his forces to save material.

19.cxd4 Qd8 20.Qc1 Qb6 21.a5 Qa7 22.b6 Qa8

The only time the queen is seen in such a position is in problems.
23.\textit{Cc}7 \textit{Df}5 24.\textit{Dc}3 \textit{Ce}7 25.\textit{Dxd}5 \textit{Dxd}4

Or 25...\textit{exd}5 26.\textit{Dxf}5 etc.

26.\textit{Dxd}4 \textit{exd}5 27.\textit{Wxd}7†

With mate on the next move by \textit{De}6!

1-0

\textbf{Game 59}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

\textbf{Jeno Székely}

Kecskemét 1927

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.e5 c5 4.\textit{Wg}4

This innovation of mine suits only a few people: it is not to everyone’s taste to sacrifice a pawn in order… not to have an attack!

4...\textit{cx}d4 5.\textit{Df}3 \textit{Dc}6 6.\textit{Dd}3 \textit{Dg}7 7.0-0 \textit{Dg}6

8.\textit{Be}1 \textit{Cc}7 9.\textit{Dg}3

Your question will be: What has White actually achieved after his pawn sacrifice? The answer is simple, he has provided excellent support for the e5-square, which will be the key point for all future blockading operations, and thus created a spearhead for his own play. The idea behind White’s chosen set-up comes out clearly: the loss of the d4-pawn, as can be seen from the formation which has been reached, is not so great since its main function is being fulfilled by other pieces. In fact the e5-pawn, on which the whole clamping strategy rests, no longer needs protection from the d4-pawn, since that task is being carried out by the rook, knight and queen. Therefore White may have a pawn less, but a lot of play with the e5-

pawn at the heart of all future operations (cf. the note to move 6 in the previous game). Moreover, we consider Black’s 8th move to be weak; the correct move was 8...\textit{Dc}7 which would also have prevented h2-h4.

9...\textit{Cc}5 10.\textit{h}4

Less of an attacking move than an attempt to relieve the e5-pawn.

10...\textit{Df}8

There was a better move in 10...\textit{Dd}7, e.g. 11.h5 \textit{Dg}7 12.\textit{Wx}g7 0-0-0 although 13.\textit{Dg}5 would be unpleasant enough.

11.\textit{h}5 \textit{Dg}7 12.\textit{b}6 \textit{g}6 13.a3!

To provoke a fresh weakening move (...\textit{a}7-\textit{a}5).

13...\textit{a}5

Now b5 has become available for the white pieces, but allowing b2-b4 would have been even more dangerous.

14.\textit{Dg}5 \textit{Dg}8

Forced, because otherwise there is \textit{Df}6 and then \textit{Dg}5.

15.\textit{Dd}2 \textit{f}6

The question is whether this violent attempt to free himself is better than sitting tight, but on the other hand it is only natural that the person under siege should try some sorties. The attempt at active defence is understandable, because if he had remained passive White could have tried, for example, the manœuvre \textit{Dd}2-\textit{f}1-\textit{h}2-\textit{g}4-\textit{f}6.

16.\textit{Db}3!!

I am, to tell the truth, quite proud of this intermediate move which aims to provoke ...\textit{b}7-\textit{b}6
and with it a weakening of the position of the knight on c6. After the immediate 16.exf6 I had feared 16...\&d6 (but not the exchange of queens 16...\&xg3? 17.fxg3 \&d6 18.\&e2! \&xg3 19.\&f1 and Black would be rather helpless, since the g8-knight is dead and there is also a possible line opening by f6-f7) e.g. 16...\&d6! 17.\&h4 e5 18.\&b5 \&d7 and I could not see how I could sacrifice; I was clear that just about any sacrifice must succeed because of my opponent's effective lack of a rook and knight, but where and how? No, first, I said to myself, the c6-knight would have to be rooted out, which would create the basis for a breakthrough sacrifice, on either d4 or e5.

16...b6! 17.exf6 \&xg3

If instead of this, 17...\&d6 then 18.\&h4 e5 19.\&b5! (with a pawn on b6, this move is far more effective than previously!) 19...\&d7 20.\&xc6 \&xc6 21.\&f4 exf4 22.\&bxd4 \&d7 23.\&g5 and wins.

18.fxg3 \&d6

For 18...a4 I had planned the following combination 19.\&xc5 bxc5 20.f7! \&xf7 21.\&b5 \&ge7 22.\&e5! \&xe5 23.\&xe5 and wins.

19.\&b5 \&a7 20.\&fxd4! \&f7

Or 20...e5 21.\&c6 \&b8 22.\&b5 etc.

21.c4 e5 22.cxd5 exd5 23.\&e8+ \&f8 24.f7 \&f5

The rest is silence! (24...\&e7 25.\&f6)

25.\&xd4 \&c5 26.\&ad1 \&b5 27.fxg8\&## 8xg8

28.\&xb5 \&f7 29.d6

1–0

In this game too, the overprotecting pieces have done an excellent job.

Game 60
Efim Bogoljubow
Aron Nimzowitsch

Russian Championships 1913

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.\&c3 \&f6 4.e5 \&fd7

White now chose the Gledhill Attack.

5.\&g4 c5 6.\&f3 a6

This cleverly avoids the line 6...cxd4 7.\&xd4 \&xe5 8.\&g3 with which I was less familiar.

7.dxc5 \&c7 8.\&g3 \&xc5 9.\&d3 g6 10.\&f4

Though Bogoljubow may not have known it – I had not yet discovered this rule – he is using my stratagem of overprotection.

10...\&c6 11.0–0 \&c7

He is manoeuvring. After 11...\&g7 and then...0–0 the overprotecting pieces would have become fully effective, e.g. by \&fe1, \&h4, \&h6 etc.

12.\&ac1!

An ingenious preventive measure against the intended ...\&xd3 and ...\&f5.

12...\&g7 13.b4!

To secure the bishop once and for all. Of course it does somewhat weaken the queenside.

13...\&d7 14.\&e2 0–0 15.\&ed4 \&c6 16.\&xc6 bxc6 17.c4

If now the obvious 17...\&b8 then 18.cxd5 cxd5 19.a3 and White has a free hand on the kingside. For example, 19...\&b7 20.\&h4 h5 21.\&ce1 (overprotection), and White now has the threats of 22.\&d4 followed by \&xe6 as well as 22.\&h3
and then g4. Note how easily and elegantly the overprotecting pieces suddenly swing into action.

But there is now the following question: was the attempt to find security and the relieving action which was introduced by 17.c4 (because after 17.c4 \textit{\textarrowright} b8 18.cxd5 etc. White's queenside was relieved) really necessary? Would it not have been possible to burn his boats? Namely by 17.\textit{\textarrowright} c1. The continuation might be 17...a5 18.c3 axb4 19.cxb4 \textit{\textarrowright} b6 (19...\textit{\textarrowright} xa2? 20.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} d4!) 20.h4 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow}xb4 21.h5. If now 21...\textit{\textarrowrightarrow}xa2 22.hxg6 fxg6 then 23.\textit{\textarrowright} e3. After the exchange sacrifice 23...\textit{\textarrowrightarrow}xb3! 24.gxf3 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow}xe5 25.\textit{\textarrowright} c5 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow}h4! Black should be able to win. So Bogoljubow was correct not to go for an all-out kingside attack.

17...\textit{\textarrowrightarrow}c4!!

Heroic stuff, ending in a pawn sacrifice. What now follows is a mighty duel between... the two players? No, between centralization and overprotection. This time overprotection comes off worse.

18.\textit{\textarrowright} xc4 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} b8 19.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} b1 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} b6 20.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} d2

An anti-overprotection move!

20...\textit{\textarrowright} d8 21.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} fc1 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} d5!

The centralization! After 22.\textit{\textarrowright}xd5 the rook should recapture, e.g. 22...\textit{\textarrowrightarrow}xd5 23.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xc6 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} b7 24.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} d6 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} c7 with the threat of ...\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} c2; the game would then be approximately level. Also possible would be the continuation 23...\textit{\textarrowrightarrow}xe5 (instead of 23...\textit{\textarrowrightarrow}b7), e.g. 24.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xe5 (if 24.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xc8 then later ...\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} c2) 24...\textit{\textarrowrightarrow}xe5 25.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xe5 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xe5 26.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} c4 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} e2 27.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} b6 \textit{\textarrowright} b7 28.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} c7 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} b8 29.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} d7 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} d8 30.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xb7 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} d2 with equality.

22.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} e1?

The correct move was 22.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xd5, as demonstrated in the previous note. After the text move things go downhill fast.

22...\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} f4 23.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xf4 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xe5! 24.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xe5 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} d2

25.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} g5?

Some resistance could still be put up with 25.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xe2 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xe5 26.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} d8.

25...\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} d6 26.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} e1 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} d4

Continuing centralization.

27.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} f1 \textit{\textarrowrightarrow} xf2† 28.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} h1 f6 29.\textit{\textarrowrightarrow} e3 fxe5 0–1
Chapter 4

The Isolated Queen’s Pawn, the two Hanging Pawns - the two Bishops

Imagine the following pawn skeleton: White: pawns on a2, b2, d4, f2, g2, h2. Black: pawns on a7, b7, e7, f7, g7, h7. Despite its static weakness, the isolated pawn on d4 is filled with a certain dynamic power. We must distinguish with absolute accuracy between “static” and “dynamic” because this is the only way to understand completely. A static weakness shows up in the endgame and in two ways: firstly, the d4-pawn needs protection and, secondly, “neighbouring weak squares” show up clearly (e.g. the black king can try to get to c4 or e4 via d5). As far as dynamic strength is concerned, there is the pawn’s lust to expand (d4-d5!) and in addition White can plan to leave his isolated pawn where it is and occupy one of the dynamically extremely valuable squares e5 or c5 which have been created by the d4-pawn.

There are weapons of war which even twenty years ago would have struck terror into the hearts of all and which nowadays appear simple playthings. Defensive technique has made great progress. The “dynamic power of the isolated queen’s pawn” has become such a plaything, and we find it hard to understand how anyone could have been put to flight by such a weapon. The harmlessness of such dynamism can be seen from the following openings.

I. Erich Cohn – Aron Nimzowitsch, Karlsbad 1911:
1. d4 d5 2. c4 e6 3.c3 c5 4.e3 d5 5.d3 d6
6.0-0 0-0 7.a3 cxd4 8.exd4 dxc4 9.xc4 c6
10.c3 b6 11. g5 b7 12.e2 h6 13.e3 d7 14.e5

An attempt to make use of the dynamic strength of the isolated pawn; it is refuted out of hand.
14...d5 15. d5 d5 16.h5 x5
17.xe5 f6 18.f1 d5 19.d3 c8 20.ac1
g4 21.g3 x3 22.fx3 d7
II. Aron Nimzowitsch – Gemsöe, Copenhagen 1922:
1.e3 d5 2.c4 e6 3.d3 f6 4.d4 c5 5.c3 c6
6.e2 e7 7.0-0 0-0 8.dxc5 cxd5 9.cxd5 exd5
10.b3 e6 11.b2 c8 12.b1 e7 13.b5 d8 14.fd4 c7 15.cxd6 cxd6 16.d4
e7 17.d3 exd8 18.b5 Bd8 19.fd1 Bf8
20.exc7 Bxc7 21.g3!

The pawn pair (d4, e3) is not very impressive.
f5 27.fd2 Bd7 28.c3 Ba4 29.g3 Bh7 30.Bg2
Bb5 31.Bxd5 exd5

And Black got to work on the e-pawn and later
on the g-pawn too (because White had to play
h2-h4) for 70 (!) moves and won. The concluding
phase of the game will be commented on in the
chapter on manoeuvring techniques.
32.Bd2 h5 33.Bc3 Bb5 34.Bd2 Bb3 35.Bc3
Bb5 36.Bd2 Be7 37.Bc2 Bd7 38.Bd3 Be4
39.Bf2 Bg6 40.Bf1 Bg6 41.Bg2 Be6 42.Bf2
Bf6 43.Bg2 Be6 44.Bf2 Bh6 45.Bc1 Bh7
46.Bg2 Bg7 47.Bg2 Be5 48.Bf2 Bg6 49.Be2
Be6 50.Bf3 Bg6 51.Be2 Bh7 52.Bf2 Bc8
53.Bg2 Be6 54.Bf2 Bg6 55.Bg2 Bg5 56.Bf2
Bc6 57.Bg2 Bg5 58.Bf2 Bg6 59.Bg2 Bc6
60.Bf2 Bc8 61.Bg2 Be6 62.Bf2 Be8 63.Bg2
a5 64.Bh4 Bg6 65.Bh2 h5 66.Bg2 Bh6 67.Bf2
g6 68.Bf1 Bg7 69.Be2 Bf7 70.Bh2 Be7 71.Bc2
Be1 72.Bf2 Bd7 73.Be1 Bc6 74.Bg2 Bg4
75.Bf1 Bc7 76.Bf3 Bc8 77.Bf2 Bb8 78.Bh3
Bd7 79.Bg1 Bd7 80.Bh2 Bd6 81.Bh3 Bc6
82.Bc1 Bxe3 83.Bh2 Bc4 84.Bh3 Bc6 85.Bh2
Bc7 86.Bh3 Bc4 87.Bg1 Bc6 88.Bh2 Bc4
89.Bc1 Bxe3 90.Bf4 Bc2 91.Bh3 Bc6 92.Bd4
axb4 93.axb4 Bb5 94.Bc7 Bc4 95.Bxe4 Bxe4
Bc4 100.B5 d4
0–1

Note how little the “dynamic” trumps are
actually worth, i.e. the c-file: it is more the statically
feeble isolated pawn which is in the foreground.
The slowness of White’s knight manoeuvre
accentuates what we are talking about here.
21...Ba7 22.Bf3 Bd7 23.Bc2 Be4

The “dynamic” joy turns out to be of short
duration.
24.Bf4 Bf6

What else?
and after a wearisome endgame:
1–0

Let us move on now to the next weapon which
is on our agenda, namely the two hanging pawns
(White: pawns on a2, b2, e3, f2, g2, h2: Black:
pawns on a7, c5, d5, f7, g7, h7). The latter
weapon, unlike the isolated pawn, does not appear
outdated at all. All that is necessary is not to rate
its dynamic value too highly; many a tournament
game has been lost by too violent an advance
(=...d5-d4 with hopes for a breakthrough).
However it would be a mistake to give up on
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...every attempt at the initiative just to try and secure your position; by this I mean the plan with ...c5-c4 which appears to leave the hanging pawns protected, but which has meant giving up all hopes of a breakthrough (I call this: heading for "blockaded safety"). The truth here would lie in a blending of "the dynamic" and "the static": blockaded safety with a dash of initiative, (e.g. play against the b2-pawn, see game 65) that should be the correct strategy! Compare, moreover, what I have said about this subject in My System. The high rate of "infant mortality" among hanging pawns should not seduce us into over-hasty — somewhat sceptical — judgements. These high mortality statistics just mentioned can be brought down by the application of a little care; see, for example, my little accident in Gothenburg.

Akiba Rubinstein — Aron Nimzowitsch, Gothenburg 1920:
1.d4 e6 2.c4 b6 3.d3 b7 4.g3 b4 5.d2 d2 6.exd2 e7 7.c3 d5 8.cxd5 exd5 9.c2 c5 10.dxc5 bxc5 11.0-0 d7 12.f1 0-0 13.e1 b6 14.d3 d6 15.e4 f6?

The mistake; 15...e5 was necessary as will be explained in the next note!

16.b3

And Rubinstein won after exchanging minor pieces and playing a classic rook ending.
20...xd5 21.xd5 bxd5 22.xd5 d5 23.d5 f8 24.e3 e6 25.a4 g6 26.ad1 g7 27.d8 d8 28.d8 f6 29.f1 a6 30.d4 f6 31.e2 b6 32.g4 b2 33.f3 a2 34.g5 g7 35.h4 e6 36.f4 e7 37.g3 f8 38.h5 a1 39.xg6 hxg6 40.xe4 a2 41.x a1 42.xh a1 43.xb4 a5 44.e4 a4 45.g3 a3 46.f1 a2 47.xf7 50.xf6 51.c4 xf6 52.xf3 xe6 53.e4 d6 54.e3 a1 55.e4 d1 56.e3 c1 57.g1 f1 58.h1 e4 59.h4 h1 60.g5 b4 1-0

Game 61
Aron Nimzowitsch — Egil Jacobsen
Copenhagen 1923

1.d4 d5 2.c3 f6 3.c4 e6 4.e3 e7 5.g5 0-0 6.x c2 e7 7.0-0

The individual moves such as c2 and 0-0 are known, and yet when you look at White's plan as a whole, you can see a certain new twist; cf. note to move 9.
7.c5 8.dxc5 xc5 9.e3

Now 16...f8 does not work because of the reply 17.e4 and if after that 17...d4 then 17.e5! winning the bishop on b7.

16.c4 17.bxc4 xc4 18.wd4 xd4 19 xd4 b6 20.xd5

The possible win of a pawn would be bad here. Now we are expecting something like 9...a5 with an easily mounted attack after White's somewhat careless looking queenside castling. This attack
has frequently led to victory, for example in the classic game Rotlevi – Teichmann, 1911: 1.d4 d5 2...f3 g5 3.e4 c6 4.c3 c7 5.g5 bbd7 6.e3 0–0 7...c2 c5 8.0–0–0...a5 9.cxd5 exd5 10.dxc5 gxc5 11.d4 dxe6 12...b1...ac8 13.d3 h6 14...xf6 xf6 15.d5...d8 and Black had a comfortable game. But the transposition of moves I have gone in for enables me to put off c4xd5 (which suits only Black) and this nuance considerably strengthens White’s chances.

9...d7
If 9...a5 then first 10.b1.

10.b1...e4 11...xe4...xe4?
11...dxe4 was the correct move.

12...xe7...xe7 13.d3...f6 14.cxd5 exd5
15.d4

Now we have our isolated pawn!

15...fc8 16.b3 b5 17.f3
To play g4. White's centralized formation can put up with the tiny weakness on e3.

17...g6 18...e1 b4
This allows a sortie by the opponent which leads to a temporary seizure of the c-file; so it would be better to play 18...ab8.

19.a6!...cb8 20.g4...b6 21.f1...e6
This is pleasant for White, because it breaks the line of attack (e7–e3) but the isolated pawn already needed direct protection.

22.c1 a5 23.a4...d7 24.b5 c5 25...c2...c8
26.h4...bb8 27.h2

27...c6 could lead to winning the exchange.

27...c7 28.xc7?

White was stronger on the diagonals: occupying the f-outpost on the diagonal would have won easily, e.g. 28...f4...xf4 29.exf4 and there is no stopping f4–f5.

28...xc7 29.c6
Play goes: 1.h5 gxh5 2.\f5 hxh5 \g8 3.\e8 \e6 4.\b5 \f7 5.\d3 \e6 6.e4 fxe4 7.fxe4 dxe4 8.\xe4 \g8 9.\d3 and the black king has to leave the gate open. This proves what we said in the introductory remarks about the weakness of the squares next to the isolated pawn (here c5 and e5). We now return to the game.

30.\xb5 \d3 31.\xa5 \e7 32.\c6 \b7 33.\d4 \xe1

33...\d7 34.\ed1 leads back to the game.

34.\xe1 \d7 35.\c1 \xb5 36.\c5 \d7

A pawn is lost.

37.\xd5 \f8 38.\c2 \d6 39.\e3 \e7 40.\h5 \e6 41.\c5 \d6 42.\c6+ \d7 43.\hxg6 \hxg6 44.\e6 \e6 45.\c5 \d6 46.\g5 \g7 47.\f4 \g8 48.\xb3 \e7 49.\c4 \e8 50.\c5 \h8 51.\c7+ \f6 52.e4 \g5 53.e5 \f6 54.f5+ \e5 55.\c6+ \g7 56.gxf3 \h2 57.b4 \c2+ 58.\d5 \xc6 59.\xc6 g4 60.e6 \g3 61.e7 \g2 62.e8\e+ \g1 63.\e6+ 1-0

Game 62
Aron Nimzowitsch
Prof. Kudrjawzev and Dr Landau
Dorpat 1910, at the same time as three other consultation games

1.d4 d5 2.\f3 \f6 3.c4 e6 4.\c3 c5 5.cxd5

5...\xe5 is much better.

6.\g5 cxd4 7.\xd4 \e7 8.c3 0-0 9.\e2 \c6 10.\xc6

The “isolated pawn pair” soon shows up as a weakness.

10...\bxc6 11.0-0 \e6

We could think of this development of the bishop as a preparation for ...c6-c5, but, on the other hand, an immediate ...\d7 was undoubtedly preferable.

12.\c1 \b8 13.\c2 \d7

Would 13...c5 really have been so hopeless? For example: 13...c5 14.\fd1 \a5 15.\f3 \fd8 16.b3 c4 or 16.\xf6 (instead of 16.b3) \xf6 17.\xd5 \xc3 18.\xe6 \xb2 with equality. The fact that Black does not obtain hanging pawns (d5 and c5) and instead prefers to let himself be suffocated with the pawn duo c6, d5 can be considered the decisive mistake.

14.\fd1 \e8 15.\xe7 \xe7 16.\a4 \f6

There was a better defence after 16...\c7, e.g. 17.\c5 \e8 and then \e6.

17.\c5 \b6 18.\d4

The blockade continues. In addition, the a7-pawn is hard to protect.

18...\b8 19.b3 \e8 20.\d3 h6 21.\c3

Overprotecting the d4-square.

21...\d7 22.\a4 \a8 23.\d4 \e8 24.\a5 \c7 25.\a4 \b5 26.\xb5 cxb5 27.\d4

The d-pawn is isolated once more.

27...\c6 28.b4 \ab8 29.\b3 \f6 30.\c5! \xc5 31.\xc5 \a8 32.\e3

The a-pawn is lost.

32...\e8!

The best. He is trying to achieve that free play which he has so sorely missed until now.

33.\xa7 d4! 34.\d3 dxe3 35.\xe3 \xe3 36.\xe3 \d5 37.a3 \c4 38.\f2 \d6 39.\e7

The piece pressure which White has carried over from the blockading period is still effective and still has a paralysing effect now that there is an open board.

39...\xd7 40.\xd7 \f7

Now it is all about the centre. White apparently cannot prevent Black’s king from taking up a central position (d5 or e5). But that would mean the victory of the freeing movement over the blockade.

41.\b6!
It looks like he is in danger of losing the knight! But White has thought things through.

41...\textit{b}3 42.\textit{f}3 \textit{e}6 43.\textit{e}4 \textit{d}6 44.\textit{d}4

Now 44...\textit{c}6 would simply be met by 45.\textit{c}8, and since the knight has two escape routes (via a7 or e7) Black cannot get at it.

44...\textit{e}6 45.\textit{a}4 \textit{c}6 46.\textit{a}5 \textit{h}5 47.\textit{e}4 \textit{f}5 48.\textit{e}x\textit{f}\textit{f}5

Any move wins here, even 48.\textit{e}5 fxe4 49.\textit{xe}6 e3 50.\textit{d}7 e2 51.\textit{e}5\textit{e}5 etc.

48...\textit{x}f5 49.\textit{d}5 \textit{b}7 50.\textit{e}5

and after a few moves...

1-0

The isolated pawn pair did not do so well; White's blockade held out until the end, that is, beyond the opponent's successful freeing manoeuvre. But the isolated pawn had a rather poor part to play.

\textbf{Game 63}

\textbf{Dr Orla H Krause}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

Correspondence 1924-25

1.e4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.exd5 cxd5 4.c4 \textit{f}6 5.\textit{c}3 \textit{c}6 6.\textit{f}3 \textit{g}4

6...\textit{g}6 was worth considering.

7.\textit{c}xd5 \textit{c}cxd5

And White has his isolated pawn.

8.\textit{b}5!

Better than the attempted attack with 8.\textit{b}b3 e.g. 8...\textit{x}f3 9.gxf3 \textit{e}6! – recommended by Dr Krause – 10.\textit{xb}7 \textit{xb}4 11.\textit{b}5 \textit{xb}5 12.\textit{c}6 \textit{e}7 13.\textit{xb}5 \textit{xc}3 14.\textit{xc}3 \textit{d}5 and Black has a good position. But after 8.\textit{b}b3 \textit{x}f3 9.gxf3 the simple continuation 9...\textit{b}b6 10.d5 \textit{d}4 11.\textit{d}1 e5 would also not be bad either.

8...\textit{e}8 9.h3 \textit{f}xf3 10.\textit{xf}3 \textit{e}6 11.0-0 \textit{e}7 12.\textit{xd}5!

This is a very strong move and Black must come up with the most subtle counterplay just to keep things level. And yet, in the strategic and theoretical sense, the text move must be considered as a concession: all the talk about the alleged dynamic strength of the isolated pawn is... just talk. No, the cold light of reality shows us another picture: if you have an isolated pawn, you should be glad if you can manage to conceal its weakness.

12...\textit{xd}5 13.\textit{xd}5 \textit{exd}5 14.\textit{e}3 a6 15.\textit{a}4 \textit{d}6

After this move Black's problems become enormous. He would have had easier play after castling (but what master considers castling in the endgame? e.g. 15...0-0 16.\textit{b}b3 \textit{cd}8! 17.\textit{ac}1 \textit{d}5 18.\textit{c}2 \textit{xb}3 19.axb3 \textit{d}6 20.\textit{fc}1 and White's c-file is bearable.

16.\textit{b}3 \textit{e}7 17.\textit{d}2!

This threatens the doubling of rooks on the e-file. The d5-pawn's need of protection has a paralysing effect and White has good free play with his two bishops.

17...\textit{b}6!!

The introduction to a deep defensive manoeuvre.
18.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{\textit{a}}}}\texttt{e}1 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}}}7 19.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}2} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{h}}}6 20.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}e}1 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{h}}}d8 21.a3

Now there is the threat of \texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}}}b4.

21...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}c7!

Black's defensive plan now becomes clear: he wanted to have the rooks on d8 and c7, so 17...b6 was necessary (directed against \texttt{\textbf{\textit{a}}}a5). But 19...h6 was also needed, otherwise White could play \texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}}}g5 to force him to loosen his structure with ...f5. The hole on e6 would then have been too much to bear.

22.g4

Or 22.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}}}b4? \texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}xb4 23.axb4 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}}}d6.

22...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}c8

With the defensive threat of \ldots\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}c6, \texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}c3 \ldots\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}f8! and Black has freed his game.

23.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}c3! \texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}}}g6!

Black cannot take too long about freeing his game; he needs prophylactic measures to avoid

White strengthening his game by \texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}2-\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}4-\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}5.

24.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}xd5 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}f4

Forcing equality.

25.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}xf4 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}xf4 26.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}}}e8 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}c1 27.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}xd8\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}f6

28.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{a}}}a1 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}xe1\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}f 29.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}xe1 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}c1 30.b3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}xa3

31.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{h}}}xf7 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}}}b2 32.d5 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}}}e7 33.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}}}e6 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}}}d6

½-½

The isolated d4-pawn more or less proved its worth here, but only when measured in the generally accepted sense.

Theoretically speaking, this game essentially consists of a declaration of the bankruptcy of the isolated pawn: instead of an alleged dynamism, there was the covering up of a static weakness. Dr Krause planned and played an excellent game; the fact that nothing could be gained from the possession of the isolated pawn is obviously not his fault.

\textbf{Game 64}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

\textbf{David Markelowicz Janowski}

Karlsbad 1907

1.e4 e5 2.d3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}f6 3.d4 exd4 4.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}xd4 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}f6

5.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}c3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}}}b4 6.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}}xc6 bxc6 7.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}}}d3 d5 8.exd5 cxd5

9.0-0 0-0 10.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}}}g5 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}c6 11.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}}}e2 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}}}c5 12.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}}}g3 h6

13.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}f4 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}}}e8 14.h3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}}}e6 15.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}}}f3

The opening is easy to understand; the game is approximately level. White has a bit of an edge in the centre but Black still has a powerful pawn centre.
First blockaded, then destroyed, that was the fate of the IQP in the present game.
41...\textd{d} 42.\textx{d} 5

And the pedagogical interest of this game is not over yet. We should do well to note how White's manoeuvres use the d4-square as a pivotal point, which had been the important blockading point when the isolated pawn existed.
42.\textd{c}7 43.\textf{f}3 \textg{6} 44.\textb{c}3 \textb{1} 45.\textc{4} \textg{7} 46.\texte{5} \texte{1} 47.\textx{e}7 \textx{e} 7 48.\textb{5} \texte{6} 49.\textc{6} \textd{7} 50.\textd{d} 5 \textf{6} 51.\textg{3} \textb{6} 52.\textb{3} \textd{7} 53.\textx{f}6 \textx{f} 6

The result of White's play is now evident: Black could not avoid the simplifying exchange.
54.\textf{3} \texte{7} 55.\texte{3} \textf{6} 56.\textd{d} 4 \textd{6}

The isolated pawn coyly appears on the board.
22.\textf{e}1 \texte{d} 8 23.\texta{3} \textb{4} 24.\textb{2} \texta{4} 25.\textf{5}!

Threatening 26.\textx{h} 6.
25...\textf{4} 26.\textc{7} \texth{8} 27.\textx{d} 5 \textx{d} 5

At last it becomes an IQP, better late than never.
28.\textc{3} \textxb{3} 29.\textxb{3} \textb{8} 30.\textc{2} \textc{8} 31.\textd{2}

White's isolated pawn is a nuisance in that it makes demands on the c2-bishop for protection. But this can easily be dealt with.
31.\textf{6} 32.\texta{1}! \textb{7} 33.\texta{4} \textb{c} 7 34.\textf{5} \textb{8} 35.\textd{4} \texte{7}

Or 35...\textxb{3} 36.\textx{d} 5 !.
36.\texte{7} \textx{e} 7 37.\textb{4}

Now White is at least as well placed as his opponent.
37.\texte{5} 38.\textg{4} \texta{8}

He scorches the draw which could be obtained by 38...\textx{g} 4.
39.\textf{4} \texta{1} \texth{2} \texte{7}

A better move would be 40.\textb{8}, e.g. 41.\textf{3} \textb{1}.
41.\textf{3}
Now White seizes the “neighbouring” e5-square, just as if it was a real and not an imaginary IQP position. What can we learn from this? Well, the isolated pawn is not just a weak pawn but also a weak square. When the d5-pawn fell, play against the d5-square – and its neighbouring weak squares – was not over in the least. It kept on going without interruption!

The rest needs no comment.

61.\texttt{fxg5} \texttt{fxg5} 62.\texttt{hxg5} \texttt{hxg5} 63.b6 g4 64.b7 \texttt{\textbf{c}7}
65.\texttt{e5} g3 66.\textbf{\textit{d}f4} \texttt{g8} 67.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}g3}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}f6}} 68.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}3}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}d7}} 69.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}4}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}d6}} 70.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}5}} \texttt{\textbf{e}7} 71.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}6}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}b8}}
72.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}5}}

1–0

Game 65
Akiba Rubinstein
Aron Nimzowitsch
Karlsbad 1907

1.\texttt{d4} d5 2.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}3}} e6 3.c4 c5 4.cxd5 exd5 5.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}3}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}6}} 6.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}4}}

The refutation – 6.g3 – was not known at that time.

6...\texttt{cxd4} 7.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}d4}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}b4}} 8.e3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}6}} 9.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}c6}} \texttt{bxc6}
10.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}d3}} 0–0 11.0–0 12.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}d6}}!

Of course Black is not thinking of allowing himself to be encircled as in game 62. Rather, he is preparing c6-c5.

12.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}3}}

12.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}5}} would be nullified by powerful centralization, e.g. 12.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}5}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}b8}} 13.b3 (13.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}2?}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{xh2?}}}) 13...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}5!}} 14.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}c1}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}d6}}.

12...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}g3}} 13.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}g3}} c5 14.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}1}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}6}} 15.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{a}4}}

The attempt to break up Black’s position by 15.e4 would only lead to equality after 15...\texttt{dxe4}
16.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}c4}} c4 17.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xf6?}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}f6}} 18.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xc4}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{xb2}}}}.

15...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}6}}

I was already quite clear that the correct plan had to be ...c5-c4 and not ...d5-d4, because ...d5-d4 with aims of breaking through would only mean a highly developed “dynamism” which was therefore open to criticism. The move ...c5-c4 would be less dynamic here, a plan which gives a certain safety (our “blockaded security”) and on the other hand enables the development of a limited but reasonable initiative. See the introductory remarks.

16.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{a}3}}

He “forces” ...c5-c4, because at that time it was reckoned to be compromising.

16...\texttt{c4} 17.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}2}} a5 18.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}d1}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}4}}

The limited initiative.

19.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}4}}

White has no need to fear the doubling of his a-pawn.

19...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}d8}}

If 19...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}a3}} 20.bxa3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}b8}} (or else 21.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}1}}) then 21.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}3}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}d8}} 22.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}c1}}.

20.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}d1}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}7}} 21.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}3}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{ad8}}}

This wonderfully tight-knit and economical position in which all the pieces have reached their optimum positions is like a Greek masterpiece. There need be no more changes to this magnificently complete position. 22.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}f1}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{f}8}} 23.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}1}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{g}8}} etc., with a draw would be a fitting end.

22.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}1}}

This disturbs the equilibrium and leads to the destruction of his own position.

22...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}8}} 23.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}1d2}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}a3!}}

This is stronger than 23...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}b7}}, e.g. 24.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}3!}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{xc3}}} 25.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xc3}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{xb2}}} 26.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xb2}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{xb2}}}} 27.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xd5}}}
\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xd5}}} 28.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xd5}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{xa2}}} 29.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xc4}} with equality.}

24.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xa3}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{b}b8}}}

Not 24...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{d}b7}} on account of 25.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xc4}}}.

25.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{e}4}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{dxe4}}} 26.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xd7}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{xd7}}} 27.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{xc4}} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{c}5}}
28...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d4}}

The weakness of the b2-pawn would also have been noticeable even after the best continuation 28...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash cd6}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d5}} 29...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e4}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a4}}. However, after the text move, the win is not easy.

28...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash dxe4}} 29...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash exe4}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash axb2}} 30...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash dxe4}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash bx4}} 31...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c6}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash dxe4}} 32...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash dxe4}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash axa2}} 33...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c3}}

After 33...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f1}} there would have followed 33...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c4}} and 34...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d5}}!. But if 33...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c5}} then 33...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d7}} 34...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d6}}! 35...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b7}}? 36...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d5}} 36...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d6}} and wins.

33...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d6}} 34...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f1}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e7}} 35...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f2}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d6}} 36...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e3}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c5}} 37...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash g4}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b4}} 38...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d4}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b3}} 39...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash g5}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a4}} 40...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b1}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e6}} 41...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash g3}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b3}} 42...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c3}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e3}} 43...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d3}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash g6}} 44...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d4}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e2}}

0–1

In the game which follows the hanging pawns are maintained in position (d4, c4) for some time. On top of this – static – security is grafted a “limited” initiative on the far queenside and down the f3-b7 diagonal.

\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash Game \texttt{\textbackslash 66}}}
\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash Aron \texttt{\textbackslash Nimzowitsch}}}
\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash Dr Milan Vidmar Sr.}}
\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash New York 1927}}

1...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e4}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c5}} 2...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d3}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e6}} 3...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c3}}

I only needed a draw, whereas Vidmar had to play for a win.

3...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f6}} 4...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e5}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d5}} 5...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d4}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash cxd4}} 6...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash cxd4}} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e7}}

6...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b6}} would be preferable.
This move results in the gain of a whole tempo. Black cannot accept the pawn sacrifice which it offers without giving away all his chances, e.g. 19...\texttt{e}xa1 20.\texttt{f}xa1 \texttt{xf}3 21.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{xc}4 22.\texttt{xc}4 \texttt{xc}4 23.\texttt{a}8\# \texttt{f}8 24.d5 and White is in control.

19...\texttt{eb}8 20.\texttt{xa}8 \texttt{xa}8

The double movement \texttt{e}8-c8-b8 was what gained the tempo for White. See above.

21.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{e}7 22.\texttt{f}f3 \texttt{a}3 23.\texttt{b}b2 \texttt{xf}3 24.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{a}5 25.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{a}3 26.\texttt{c}2 \texttt{d}6 27.\texttt{c}1 \texttt{a}3 28.\texttt{c}2 \texttt{d}6 29.\texttt{c}1 \texttt{a}7 30.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{a}3 31.\texttt{e}4

Black's operations on the wing involved extreme effort, but they were beaten back by cold-blooded play in the centre. You can see what would happen if the sacrifice was accepted after, for example, 33.\texttt{f}xe3 \texttt{a}3 34.\texttt{e}e1 \texttt{g}g3 35.\texttt{f}f1 \texttt{xe}3\# 36.\texttt{h}1 \texttt{e}4 and the main threat is ...\texttt{f}4.

A well-played game by both sides.

\textbf{Game 67}

\textbf{Dr Siegbert Tarrasch}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

Hamburg 1910

1.d4 d5 2.\texttt{f}f3 e6 3.c4 c5 4.e3 \texttt{f}f6 5.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{c}6 6.\texttt{d}d3 \texttt{d}d6 7.0-0 0-0 8.b3 \texttt{b}6 9.\texttt{b}b2 \texttt{b}7 10.\texttt{e}e2 \texttt{dxc}4 11.bxc4 \texttt{cx}d4 12.\texttt{cx}d4

The pros and cons of the hanging pawns appear in balance here.

12...\texttt{e}c8 13.\texttt{ad}1

White's central dominance is quite within the logic of the game as a whole. You will certainly have noticed how the flank attack started by White (a2-a4-a5xb6) has led only to his opponent moving to an attack. But this transfer of the attack to his opponent could only be explained by errors by White, by the fact that White's attack lacked any inner justification. But, in fact, neither of these two explanations is correct. White played his attack correctly and it was justified, because it was the one and only way to maintain the stability of the hanging pawns. So, in other words, Black had to take over the attack out on the wing, but he could only do this by giving up other more important territory, namely in the centre. After all this, the central dominance achieved by White becomes comprehensible.

The final phase is also convincingly logical.

31.\texttt{f}f6 32.\texttt{c}c6 \texttt{xe}3! 33.\texttt{xd}6

½-½

Weak. He had to play 13.a3 to prevent a possible attack on the best support for his hanging pawns, the d3-bishop. The line could be: 13.a3 \texttt{a}5 14.\texttt{e}e5 \texttt{a}6 (\textit{not} 14...\texttt{b}3 15.\texttt{ad}1 \texttt{xd}4 because of 16.\texttt{xb}7\# etc.) 15.\texttt{ad}1 \texttt{xe}5 (15...\texttt{c}7? would lose a piece on account of the reply 16.\texttt{c}5! etc.; on the other hand 15...\texttt{c}7 is worth considering, e.g. 16.\texttt{b}5 \texttt{xb}5) 16.\texttt{xe}5 \texttt{d}7 and now White had two possibilities, 17.c5 or 17.\texttt{b}5. White can equally well choose 17.\texttt{c}5 \texttt{xd}3 18.\texttt{xd}3 \texttt{e}7 19.\texttt{e}4! (threatening 20.\texttt{f}6\# etc.) 19...\texttt{fd}8! 20.\texttt{xb}6 \texttt{xb}6 21.\texttt{d}6 or the more positional treatment 17.\texttt{b}5 \texttt{xb}5 18.\texttt{xb}5 \texttt{c}7 19.\texttt{e}4 g6
20...\textit{Wb4} with a safe game (the weakness of the white squares is well protected) but also with some initiative. For example: 20...\textit{Wc8} 21.\textit{Ae1} \textit{Ac5} 22.\textit{Ad1} \textit{Ed8} 23.\textit{Ac1} with the threat of 24.\textit{Ag5}.

13...\textit{Ab4} 14.\textit{Ae1} \textit{Ab3} 15.\textit{fxg4} \textit{Axb8}!

Another strong move here was 15...\textit{Ah5}.

16.\textit{Aa3} \textit{Ac7} 17.\textit{Af4} \textit{Axh4} 18.\textit{Af3} \textit{Ac6}

White has lost a pawn, but the two bishops, the g-file and, last but not least, the two hanging pawns promise him some attacking chances.

19.\textit{Ag4} \textit{Af7} 20.\textit{Ah1} \textit{Ac7} 21.\textit{Ac1} \textit{Ac7}

22.\textit{Axg6t} \textit{gxg6} 23.\textit{Ag2t} \textit{Ag6} 24.\textit{Ad2} \textit{Ah8}

25.\textit{Af4} \textit{Ah4} 26.\textit{Wf3} \textit{Af5} 27.d5

In order to exploit the b2-f6 diagonal for attacking purposes. Advancing a pawn to open lines for the pieces behind it really must be classified under “dynamics”. (We should have preferred a “static” approach, along the lines of 27.b5 then \textit{Wf3} and the placing of the rooks on the d- and c-files. Note how Black meets dynamic play with positional play (static): he restrains and blockades the c4- and d5-pawns to the best of his ability.

27...\textit{g8} 28.\textit{Ah2} \textit{Ag6} 29.\textit{Ag1} \textit{Ag8} 30.\textit{Ag6} \textit{Ag6} 31.\textit{Af1} \textit{Ac5} 32.\textit{Af3} \textit{Ad6}

The blockade.

33.\textit{Wf2} \textit{Wxf2}

The blockading squares d6 and especially c5 act as springboards for all sorts of invasions; for example there is the threat of ...\textit{Wc6}-e3.

34.\textit{Wxf2} \textit{Ac5} 35.\textit{Ag2} \textit{Ag7} 36.\textit{Ag6t} \textit{hxg6}

Things are no longer difficult.

37.\textit{Ag2} \textit{Ad4} 38.\textit{Ac1} \textit{Ac3}

This cute bishop manoeuvre forces an exchange.

39.\textit{Adxe3} \textit{Adxe3t} 40.\textit{Axe3} \textit{Ah5} 41.\textit{Ah4} \textit{Ad6}

42.\textit{Ad3} e5 43.\textit{Ag4} \textit{f5t} 44.\textit{Ag3} \textit{f6} 45.\textit{h4} \textit{Ah7}

46.\textit{Ac2} \textit{Ah8} 47.\textit{Af6} \textit{Ac8} 48.\textit{Ah3} \textit{Ag7} 49.\textit{Af3} \textit{Ad6}

The knight is aiming for \textit{h5} to undouble the pawns; meanwhile the king replaces it on blockade duty.

50.\textit{Ah1} \textit{Ah5} 51.\textit{Axh5t}

The pawn ending after 51.\textit{Ahxh5} would be hopeless for White because of the possibility of a breakthrough by ...\textit{b6-b5}.

51...\textit{fxe5} 52.\textit{Af3} \textit{Ac5} 53.\textit{Ag4} \textit{Af6} 54.\textit{Ac2} \textit{Ah8}

55.\textit{Ah3} \textit{Ad6} 56.\textit{Af1} e4 57.\textit{Ah2} \textit{f4} 58.\textit{Af3} \textit{f3}

0–1

Game 68

Brekke

Aron Nimzowitsch

Informal game with clocks, Oslo 1921

In this long but interesting game (the ending is quite amusing) the hanging pawns appear only as a latent threat, a ghost.

1.d4 d5 2.\textit{Af3} \textit{Af6} 3.\textit{c3} g6 4.\textit{Ac2} \textit{Ag7} 5.0–0

0–0 6.\textit{b3} c5 7.\textit{Ah2} \textit{cxd4} 8.\textit{cxad4}

Now Black thinks that in reply to a possible \textit{c4} he can bring about the hanging pawns by \textit{d5xc4}.

8...\textit{Ag4} 9.\textit{Ac5} \textit{Axh2} 10.\textit{Wf1} \textit{Wbd7} 11.\textit{f4} \textit{Ac8}
12.\( \text{a3} \)

39.a5 \text{Ax}b3 40.\text{A}h5 \text{Ax}b1 41.\text{A}e2

41...\text{g}6 could easily be played.

41...b3 42.\text{Ax}h7+ \text{e}6 43.\text{A}h3 b2 44.\text{A}b3 \text{e}a1

45.\text{A}ab6 \text{A}xa5 46.\text{A}xb2

This move could have waited.

46...\text{A}xb2 47.\text{A}xb2 \text{A}c4 48.\text{A}c2 \text{A}d5 49.\text{A}f3

\text{A}a4 50.\text{A}e2 \text{f}e5 51.\text{A}f2 \text{f}4 52.\text{h}3 \text{A}a3 53.\text{A}d2+ \text{A}e4 54.\text{A}e2 \text{A}e3 55.\text{A}a2 \text{A}d3† 56.\text{A}g1 \text{e}1+ 57.\text{A}h2 \text{d}e3 58.\text{A}a3 \text{e}e2 59.\text{A}g1 \text{A}b2 60.\text{A}a1

\text{A}c2 61.\text{A}a3 \text{A}c2 62.\text{A}a4 \text{A}c1† 63.\text{A}h2 \text{A}c3

64.\text{A}a3 \text{A}b1 65.\text{A}c3 \text{A}b2 66.\text{A}g1 \text{A}d4 67.\text{A}a3

\text{A}e1 68.\text{A}a4†

Original and by no means bad.

12...\text{b6} 13.\text{A}ac1 \text{a}6 14.\text{f}5

14.c4 dxc4 15.bxc4 and then as soon as possible c4-c5 and \text{A}ac4 would have given the first situation we consider worth aiming for, namely blockaded security with a slight initiative. So 14.\text{f}5 can be considered as straying from the straight and narrow, though a forgivable error.

14...\text{gx}f5 15.\text{A}xf5 \text{d}e4 16.\text{A}c1 \text{f}6 17.\text{A}g4 \text{e}6

18.\text{A}h5

This rook’s absence will soon be felt. A better move was 18.\text{A}5f3.

18.\text{f}5 19.\text{A}e5 \text{A}c7 20.\text{A}e3 \text{A}d7 21.\text{c}4

Brekk, who is without doubt a player of master strength, finally decides on this advance. But now other pawn configurations appear rather than the hanging pawns.

21.\text{A}xe5 22.\text{dxe}5 \text{A}d7

Note the flexibility of the rook along its own second rank.

23.\text{A}xd5 \text{A}xd5

Now the d-file becomes enormously effective, cf. note to move 18.

24.\text{A}c4 \text{b}5 25.\text{A}d6!

The best option.

25.\text{A}x\text{d}6 26.\text{ex}d6 \text{A}x\text{b}2 27.\text{A}h6 \text{A}d4† 28.\text{A}h1

\text{f}7 29.\text{A}x\text{e}6 \text{A}x\text{d}6 30.\text{A}g5† \text{A}g7 31.\text{A}x\text{d}6

\text{A}x\text{d}6 32.\text{A}d1

The ending is obviously hard to win.

32.\text{A}f6 33.\text{A}g1 \text{f}7 34.\text{A}a4 \text{b}4 35.\text{A}d5

\text{e}6 36.\text{A}a5 \text{A}c3 37.\text{A}a6 \text{A}d4 38.\text{A}f1 \text{A}e5

What follows is an interesting duel between the king and the rook.

68.\text{A}e5 69.\text{A}a5† \text{A}f6 70.\text{A}a6† \text{A}g5

It was simpler to escape to h4 via g7, h8 and h5. But Black foresees a piquant turn of events that he did not want to miss out on.

71.\text{A}a8 \text{h}6 72.\text{A}g8 \text{h}7! 73.\text{A}g4 \text{f}3! 74.\text{A}f1

If 74.gxf3 then of course 74...\text{A}xf3†, mating or winning the rook.

74...\text{f}x\text{g}2†!

More elegant and quicker than 74...\text{A}x\text{g}2

75.\text{A}e4 etc.

75.\text{A}x\text{e}1 \text{h}6

Winning by zugzwang.

75...\text{A}h6 76.\text{h}4 \text{A}h5 77.\text{A}g5† \text{A}x\text{h}4

...0–1
Game 69
Aron Nimzowitsch
Paul Saladin Leonhardt
Ostende 1907

1.e4 e5 2.d3 c6 3.d3 c3 d6 4.d4 b4
5..xe5!
The first appearance of a new move.
5...e7
The best. 5..xe5 6.dxe5 xe4 would be unfavourable on account of 7.g4!.
6..xc6!
If you do not want to sacrifice a pawn, there is also 6..d3 xe5 7.dxe5 xe5 8..d2, which, by the way, is recommended by Dr. Krause.
6..xe4+ 7..e2 xe6 8.0-0 xc3 9..xc3 xc3 10..b1 0-0 11..d5!
This activates the two bishops.
11..e5 12..e4
12.d6 xe6 13.xd6 cxd6 14..a3 etc. is also playable.
12..e8 13..d3 d6 14..b2 h5 15..d2 e4?

18..f8
To offer better protection to the rook.
19..h3
Not 19..e1 because of 19...g3! The text move prepares the decisive attack with ..f3, which if it was played at once would fail to ..g4.
19..h5 20..f3 d7 21..e1
1-0
One gains the impression that the two bishops should be taken seriously. Prophylaxis based on either physical or positional sideling of one of the bishops (cf. note to move 15) seems however to be a noteworthy remedy.

Game 70
ME Goldstein
Aron Nimzowitsch
London 1927, Double round tournament

1.d4 d5 2.f3 e6 3.c4 d6 4..c3 g6 5..g5 b4
Spielmann's ingenious variation.
6.cxd5 exd5 7..e3
The immediate 7..a4 can be met with 7...c5 8.dxc5 xc3+ 9.bxc3 0-0 10..f3!.
7..h6
7..c5 was also possible, e.g. 8.dxc5 ..a5 etc.
8..xf6 xf6
Instead of this, the line 8..xc3+ 9.bxc3 xf6 seems very solid and after 10..f4 the counterthrust 10..c5 would be possible.
9..b3 b6
To complicate the game. Otherwise 9..d6

He obviously underestimates the opposing bishops! Why not 15..g4?! and then 16.h3 xe5, and Black is threatening to draw the teeth of the bishops either in a concrete fashion (..xd3) or in a positional way (f7-f6, blocking the b2-g7 diagonal). But not everybody likes prophylaxis.
16..f1 f5 17..f4 f6 18..e3
The attempt to force matters by 18.g4 would fail to 18..xf2!
could be played, e.g. 10.\textbf{\texttt{a}}e2 c5 11.dxc5 \textbf{\texttt{d}}xc5
12.\textbf{\texttt{w}}c2 \textbf{\texttt{e}}e4 13.0-0 \textbf{\texttt{a}}xc3.

10.\textbf{\texttt{d}}d3

Accepting the pawn sacrifice by 10.\textbf{\texttt{w}}xd5 would have led to unclear play after 10...\textbf{\texttt{a}}xc3† 11.bxc3
\textbf{\texttt{w}}b2 12.\textbf{\texttt{w}}e4† \textbf{\texttt{d}}d8 13.\textbf{\texttt{a}}d1 \textbf{\texttt{w}}xc3† 14.\textbf{\texttt{d}}d2 \textbf{\texttt{e}}e8
15.\textbf{\texttt{w}}b1! \textbf{\texttt{b}}b6! (15...\textbf{\texttt{w}}xd4 would be risky) 16.\textbf{\texttt{e}}e2
\textbf{\texttt{d}}d7.

10...\textbf{\texttt{f}}f6 11.0-0 0-0!!

A pawn sacrifice based simply on the superiority of the two bishops.

12.\textbf{\texttt{d}}xd5 \textbf{\texttt{d}}xd5 13.\textbf{\texttt{w}}xd5 \textbf{\texttt{e}}e6 14.\textbf{\texttt{b}}b5

Not 14.\textbf{\texttt{w}}e4 because of 14...\textbf{\texttt{f}}5 15.\textbf{\texttt{e}}e5 \textbf{\texttt{a}}ae8.

14...\textbf{\texttt{a}}e7! 15.\textbf{\texttt{f}}fc1 \textbf{\texttt{c}}6 16.\textbf{\texttt{w}}xb6 axb6 17.a3 b5
18.\textbf{\texttt{f}}e5 \textbf{\texttt{d}}d6 19.\textbf{\texttt{f}}4

He advances his central majority too quickly. Note how the bishops entice it forwards and restrain it.

19...\textbf{\texttt{f}}f6 20.\textbf{\texttt{f}}f3 \textbf{\texttt{d}}d5! 21.e4 \textbf{\texttt{f}}f7 22.e5 \textbf{\texttt{b}}b8

The d4-pawn now looks very weak.

23.\textbf{\texttt{e}}e1 \textbf{\texttt{x}}e5!

23...\textbf{\texttt{a}}a7 could, for example, be met by 24.exf6 and 25.\textbf{\texttt{e}}e7.

24.\textbf{\texttt{x}}e5

If 24.dxe5 then 24...\textbf{\texttt{e}}e6 25.g3 g5 etc.

24.\textbf{\texttt{e}}e6

The restraint, cf. note to move 19.

25.\textbf{\texttt{f}}f2 \textbf{\texttt{a}}a7 26.\textbf{\texttt{g}}g3

26.\textbf{\texttt{e}}e3 would be no better.

26...\textbf{\texttt{a}}ad8 27.\textbf{\texttt{a}}ad1 \textbf{\texttt{a}}d7 28.\textbf{\texttt{a}}ad2 \textbf{\texttt{a}}fd8

Well worth considering was 28...g5. For example, 29.h3 \textbf{\texttt{g}}g7 with serious threats.

29.\textbf{\texttt{a}}c2 g5 30.h3 \textbf{\texttt{f}}f7

There is no hurry to get the pawn back. If 30...\textbf{\texttt{a}}xd4 then 31.\textbf{\texttt{d}}xd4 \textbf{\texttt{d}}xd4 32.\textbf{\texttt{d}}xd4 \textbf{\texttt{d}}xd4
33.\textbf{\texttt{e}}d1 with equality. The king move also acts as a preventive measure directed against the passed e-pawn: the king would play the part of reserve blockader on e7.

31.\textbf{\texttt{e}}ed1 \textbf{\texttt{e}}e7 32.\textbf{\texttt{e}}e4 h5 33.d5!

Goldstein puts up an excellent defence in a difficult position.

33...\textbf{\texttt{c}}xd5 34.\textbf{\texttt{a}}d3 \textbf{\texttt{g}}g8 35.\textbf{\texttt{a}}xb5 \textbf{\texttt{g}}4 36.\textbf{\texttt{h}}xg4
\textbf{\texttt{x}}xg4† 37.\textbf{\texttt{h}}h2 \textbf{\texttt{c}}c7 38.\textbf{\texttt{d}}d3?

The game could be held by 38.\textbf{\texttt{d}}d4.

38...\textbf{\texttt{a}}a3 39.\textbf{\texttt{e}}c2 \textbf{\texttt{x}}xc2 40.\textbf{\texttt{a}}xc2 \textbf{\texttt{d}}4 41.\textbf{\texttt{b}}b4 \textbf{\texttt{h}}4! 42.\textbf{\texttt{d}}d3 \textbf{\texttt{h}}3! 43.\textbf{\texttt{f}}f1

If 43.gxh3 then 43...\textbf{\texttt{f}}f4† 44.\textbf{\texttt{h}}h1 \textbf{\texttt{d}}d5!, but if 43.\textbf{\texttt{a}}xb3 then 43...\textbf{\texttt{g}}g8† 44.\textbf{\texttt{a}}h2 \textbf{\texttt{f}}f2 45.\textbf{\texttt{g}}g1
\textbf{\texttt{d}}d5 46.\textbf{\texttt{f}}f1 \textbf{\texttt{g}}g3† 47.\textbf{\texttt{h}}h1 \textbf{\texttt{h}}h8† 48.\textbf{\texttt{h}}h3 \textbf{\texttt{x}}xh3†
and wins.

43...\textbf{\texttt{h}}xg2 44.\textbf{\texttt{x}}xg2

The advance of the h-pawn has not only led to a devaluation of the white bishop (to the status of a pawn) but it has also lifted the blockade on Black’s passed pawn. That was the idea behind Black’s manoeuvre.

44...\textbf{\texttt{a}}b3 45.\textbf{\texttt{a}}e1 \textbf{\texttt{f}}f4† 46.\textbf{\texttt{h}}h1

If 46.\textbf{\texttt{f}}g1 then 46...\textbf{\texttt{d}}d5 47.\textbf{\texttt{f}}f1 d3.

46...\textbf{\texttt{d}}d5 47.\textbf{\texttt{a}}d1 \textbf{\texttt{g}}g8 48.\textbf{\texttt{x}}x4 \textbf{\texttt{h}}h8†
0-1

The work done by the two bishops in this game was really varied. They enticed the opposing
majority forward and restrained it until it lost all of its value. Then they took aim at the opposing king and did so from all possible diagonals. And, finally, they provided a high degree of protection to the insignificant little pawn on d4, and this passed pawn turned into a giant.
Chapter 5

Manoeuvring against Opposing Weaknesses when You have an Advantage in Space

In the combination of “opposing weaknesses” and “your advantage in space”, which we shall now look into in greater detail, the dominant factor is the advantage in space. Weaknesses quite often seem linked to the latter, to some extent as the logical consequence of territorial pressure by the opponent, cf. for example games 71 and 73. Alternating manoeuvres against two opposing weaknesses might be described as follows:

Two weakness, which individually are quite capable of being defended, are attacked turn and about by an opponent who relies on his superior lines of communication; the result is the loss of the game, because at some point the defender cannot keep pace with the rapidity with which his opponent can regroup.

So the point of the stratagem in which we are interested is obviously how to make correct use of the lines of communication. What is this correct use?

Almost without exception, lines of communication operate via one specific square, which thus forms the pivotal point for the manoeuvres. The relationship between the square itself and the pieces which try to get into the opposing camp via the said square resembles that between a “strong square” and the pieces which are “overprotecting” it.

Take for example the game against Schlage (71) and the position after Black’s 48th move:

The d5-square is our pivotal point. With threats on the kingside, Black was able to divert White’s sentinels (the knights), and then he broke through with ...c4 and ...d3 and then ...b2. Notice
how d5, c4 and d3 were all weak white squares. In the queen ending against Antze (game 75), the pivotal point was d4 (and then the squares linked to it: e5 and f6). The course taken by the queen was: d4-f6-f7-e8-f7-f6-d4. In the game against von Gottschall there was also the *deus ex machina* of a zugzwang, forcing the defender to destroy his painfully constructed fortress with his own hands. In game 74 the alternating manoeuvres were along internal lines, whereas what is remarkable about game 76 is that the two squares which formed the pivotal points (e6 and later e5) were first white then black, whereas the square complex tends to be of one single colour, e.g. in games 71, 75, etc.

It is also possible to manoeuvre against a single weakness; in that case the lack of a second weakness is replaced by the differing means of attacking the single one (e.g. frontal, from the side, from the rear).

All else that needs to be said will be found in the carefully annotated games 71-77.

**Game 71**

**Willi Schlage**

**Aron Nimzowitsch**

Berlin 1928

1.e4 c5 2.\(\text{\textit{\&}}\)f3 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\)f6 3.\(\text{\textit{\&}}\)c3 d5 4.exd5 \(\text{\textit{\&}}\)xd5 5.\(\text{\textit{\&}}\)b5†

5.\(\text{\textit{\&}}\)e5 was also worth considering.

5...\(\text{\textit{\&}}}d7 6.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}c4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}b6 7.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}e2 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}e6 8.0-0

He correctly avoids 8.d4, e.g. 8...\(\text{\textit{\&}}}xd4 9.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}xd4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}xd4 10.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}xd4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}c6.

8...\(\text{\textit{\&}}}f5

To control all the central squares (here d4 and e4) as far as possible. In this case the classical 8...e5 was just as good.

9.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}e1 a6

Indirectly defending the central e5-square.

10.d3 c6 11.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}e4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}c7 12.c3 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}d8 13.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}c2 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}d5

Each player now has a knight in the centre and the game is about level.

14.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}g5! \(\text{\textit{\&}}}e7 15.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}xc7 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}xc7 16.h3 0-0 17.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}ad1 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}d7 18.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}f1 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}d8 19.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}c1 h6 20.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}h2 g5

Considering the solidity of my own centre, this slight loosening appears acceptable, but 20...\(\text{\textit{\&}}}h7 would have been more solid, e.g. 21.d4? \(\text{\textit{\&}}}xe4 and then ...\(\text{\textit{\&}}}f6, etc.

21.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}g3

The complications after 21.h4 g4 22.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}xh6 gx\(\text{\textit{\&}}}f3 23.c4† work out in Black's favour on account of 23...\(\text{\textit{\&}}}e5 24.gxf3 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}xf3† 25.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}h1 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}xe1. With the text move White obtains a clear and level game.

21...\(\text{\textit{\&}}}g6 22.d4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}b6

Taking account of a possible planned diversion towards a4.

23.dxc5 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}xc5 24.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}xd7 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}xd7 25.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}g1 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}e7

A well-motivated retreat; the queen would not have achieved much on c5 any more and would even have been somewhat exposed to a possible b4.

26.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}d1 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}xd1 27.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}xd1 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}d8 28.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}c1 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}g7 29.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}e3 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}d5 30.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}d2 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}f4 31.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}xd8

The game is heading towards an ending, for which Black seems better equipped due to his more mobile king.

31...\(\text{\textit{\&}}}xd8 32.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}e5! \(\text{\textit{\&}}}b1 33.a3 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}f6 34.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}d7 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}f7 35.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}c5

An excellent position for the knight.

35...\(\text{\textit{\&}}}e7 36.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}c4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}f5 37.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}e2

This gives Black a chance to remove White's excellent bishop. However 37.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}f1 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}d6 38.b4 b5 39.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}b3 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}e2† 40.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}h2 a5! would have been even less favourable.

37...\(\text{\textit{\&}}}d6 38.b4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}a2! 39.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}xf4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}xc4 40.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}h5 b6 41.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}c4 \(\text{\textit{\&}}}b3 42.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}b2

42.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}xb6? \(\text{\textit{\&}}}c7! 43.\(\text{\textit{\&}}}a8† \(\text{\textit{\&}}}b7
42...d7 43.g3 d5 44.f1 b5
Black clearly has the better position, but it is hard to make any progress because the knights are good sentinels.
45.d2 d5 46.a4 h5 47.axb5 axb5 48.f3 e6

The knight has used the c4-square as a springboard. White has lost ground over the past few moves.
52.d5 53.c2 b2 54.d4+ b6 55.h2 d1 56.e2 e5

The introduction to some complicated manoeuvring. The two necessary weaknesses are there of course: the white kingside is one (the threat is...g5-g4 or...e6-e5-e4) and the queenside the other (the long-term threat is penetrating with the king via c4). The pivotal point will be d5 and all the terrain next to that point, for example, c4 and the diversionary squares which become available once it has been occupied. The king move allows the e5-knight to move, because after, for example, ...f7 the advance c3-c4 would lose a pawn to...bxc4, xc4...xc4, xc4...xb5.

White is forced to be cautious. If 49.f2 (instead of 49.f1) then 49...g4 50.hxg4 hxg4 51.fxg4 xg4+ 52.g1 e3 and things become unpleasant for White.

49.h4 50.d1 e4+
Compare to note to move 48.

51.g1
If 51.xc4 then 51...xc4 52.e2 d5 53.d3 e5 and White is at a disadvantage.

51...d3 52.e3
xc4 would still be very dubious, e.g. 52.xc4 bxc4 53.e3 b5 54.c2 a4 55.d4 e5 56.xf5 b3 57.b5 xc3 etc.

52...d5 53.c2 b2 54.d4+ b6 55.h2 d1 56.e2 e5

There was the threat of 61.g4, e.g. 61.f1 f4 62.xf4 gx4 63.e2 d5 followed by e5-e4-e3 and wins.

Note too how full use was made of the pivotal point d5 by both the bishop and the knight.

61 hxg3+ 62.xg3 f6 63.f2

The planned h3 would fail to the reply 63.f4 64.h3 e6+. But now the weakness of White's kingside has become clear (the h3-pawn will soon become a problem for him).

When the weaknesses are clearly defined, it is easier to manoeuvre.

63.d6 64.g3 e6 65.e2 d5 66.g3 f6 67.c1 a5 68.d3 h5+ 69.hh2 e4

At last the majority can roll forward. The white king is tied to the weak point on h3 and cannot help to stem the opponent's devastating breakthrough.

70.fx e4 fx e4 71.e1 f4 72.c2 e2!
This knight forces its way into play for the second time.

73.b1
73.d4+ xd4 74.cxd4 d3 loses at once.
73...c4 74.g2 d3 75.ca3 f4† 76.f2!
He offers something, but ...
76...d5!

...Black doesn't accept it. Now both knights are stalemated.
77.g3
Or 77.d2 e3† etc.
77...e3 78.f3 e5 79.c4
Forced, because after 79.g3 f4 80.f3 e2 81.f2 g2 it would be all over.
79...bxc4 80.b5 d6 81.b6 c6 82.b7 xb7
83.b5
Zugzwang! He has run out of moves!
83...xb1 84.d6† c7 85.xc4 f5
0–1

The game lasted for twelve hours and is one of my best endgame performances. Schläge, for his part, put up an excellent defence.

Game 72
Hermann von Gottschall
Aron Nimzowitsch
Hanover 1926

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.d3 c5 4.c3 dxe4 5.xe4 f6
6.f3
Depriving the g1-knight of its natural developing square and allowing the later freeing move...e6-e5.
6...b6 7.c2 e7 8.0–0 0–0
For no visible reason Black gives up his battle plan of 8...e5 and so runs into difficulties.

9.e3 cxd4 10.cxd4 b6 11.bc3 d7!!

To consolidate his position as soon as possible by ...d8 and ...d5.
12.b1?
It was preferable to play 12.b3 and follow up with e2-f3-d3; that way at least he could have made best use of his isolated pawn.
12...d8 13.b3 f6 14.xd5
He is playing for a draw.
14.xd5 15.xd5 xd5 16.xd5 xe5 17.c3 e5 18.xd1 b4
To forestall d4-d5.
19.a3 xc3 20.xc3 d7

A totally drawn position! It's all over and done with?
No, there is still plenty of action to come. This is only the opening of the play. The conflict between
the good and the bad sides of the isolated pawn does not come till the "third act"!

21.\texttt{Ec5} \texttt{Exc5} 22.\texttt{dxc5} \texttt{Cc6}

The isolated pawn represents not only a weak pawn but also a weak square: the neighbouring squares d5, c4 and e4 are hard to defend and so the disappearance of the isolated pawn from the board will not change much.

Compare the introductory remarks to Chapter 4 (p. 121).

23.\texttt{f3} \texttt{f6} 24.\texttt{g2} \texttt{f7} 25.\texttt{d4} \texttt{a5} 26.\texttt{g3} 26.\texttt{b3} \texttt{d5} 27.\texttt{d3} appears better. After 28.\texttt{h3} White's position would be hard to shake.

26...\texttt{a4} 27.\texttt{f4} \texttt{h5} 28.\texttt{h3} \texttt{Bb8}!

A preventive measure against his opponent's planned g3-g4.

29.\texttt{d1} \texttt{g6} 30.\texttt{d4} \texttt{f5} 31.\texttt{d2} \texttt{Bb8}! 32.\texttt{e1} \texttt{e5} 33.\texttt{fxe5} \texttt{fxe5} 34.\texttt{h4} \texttt{g5}! 35.\texttt{Bb4} 35.\texttt{Bxh5}? \texttt{g6}† and wins.

35...\texttt{e6}† 36.\texttt{e2} \texttt{e4} 37.\texttt{d2} \texttt{f3}

Now we have the basis for systematic manoeuvring as both c5 and h3 already seem to be weak: after 38...\texttt{e4} 39.\texttt{gxh4} \texttt{gxh4} 40.\texttt{Bxh4} the bishop will have to leave the c5-pawn unprotected for a moment. But how can this tiny circumstance be exploited?

38.\texttt{Bb6} \texttt{Cc5}! 39.\texttt{Bb4} \texttt{Cd5}!

The win is no longer all that difficult. Black's army functions like a single unit and, despite some disturbing checks, rolls forward. There are now clear targets for the alternating manoeuvres and all the necessary space to carry them out (with \texttt{g4} etc. as a pivotal point). What follows does not need much in the way of explanation.

44.\texttt{Ee8}† \texttt{Cc6} 45.\texttt{Ed8}

The threat was 45...\texttt{Bb3}.

45...\texttt{f4} 46.\texttt{Bf8}† \texttt{Bf5} 47.\texttt{Bf7} \texttt{Eh2}

\texttt{Note} 47...\texttt{e3} on account of 48.\texttt{g1}!!

48.\texttt{Ec7} \texttt{Bf4}† 49.\texttt{Be1}

49.\texttt{f1}? \texttt{Eh1}† 50.\texttt{g1} \texttt{g3} etc.

49...\texttt{Ee3} 50.\texttt{Ee7}† \texttt{g2} 51.\texttt{Ee2} \texttt{f1} 52.\texttt{Ee3}

53.\texttt{Bf3} \texttt{Bxh2} 54.\texttt{Ee6} \texttt{Bb3}† 55.\texttt{d4} \texttt{f2}

56.\texttt{Ec7} \texttt{e3} 57.\texttt{Bg3}† \texttt{f1} 58.\texttt{Ee7} \texttt{e2} 59.\texttt{Ee7} \texttt{Cc6}

0–1

This game, which I count amongst the best ones I have played, is also important for showing the isolated pawn as an endgame weakness.
Game 73
Walther von Holzhausen
Aron Nimzowitsch
Hanover 1926

1.e4 c6 2.d4 f3 e5 3.d5 exd5 4.exd5 e5 5.g5
\xe7 6.\xf5 \xe7 7.\xe2

Playing for a draw. 7.\xe2 could easily have been played. For example: 7...\xb4+ 8.\xe3!
7...\xf5 8.c3 \xe4

This successful occupation of an outpost is the start of Black’s play down the e-file.
9.\xbd2 0–0–0 10.0–0–0 \xe6!

To prevent the freeing move \xd3–e5! which might otherwise have been possible (for example after 10...\xf6).

11.\xe5

Preferable was h2–h3, e.g. 11.h3 a6 (or else 12.\xb5) 12.\xe3.

11...\xe5 12.dxe5 \xe6

Preparations are being made for manoeuvring. The opposing weaknesses will be the e5-pawn and the inadequately protected g6-b1 diagonal. The pivot for the manoeuvres will be the fortified “outpost on a diagonal” e4.

13.\xf3 \xe8 14.\xe3! \xe8 15.\xe4 \xe4!

As explained in the previous note.

16.\xe1

Because 16.\xe5 would lose a pawn to 16...\xe3 17.gx3 \xe5.

16...\xe5 17.\xe2 \xe6 18.\xe3 \xe6 19.\xe4 f6
20.f4 \xe5 21.\xe5

If 23.\xe4 then 23...\xe5 24.\xe4 dxe4 25.\xe4 \xe6 26.\xe5 \xe5 and wins.

23...\xe5 24.\xe3 \xe7 25.\xe3 \xe8 26.\xe4 dxe4 27.\xe4 \xe6 28.\xe7+ \xe7 29.\xe3!

So White has set up an excellent blockading position; this means that a win for Black is a long, long way away.

29.\xe7

To bring his badly placed knight to a centralized position on d6. The alternative was 29...\xe8 (to take up the struggle down the f-file). For example, 30.\xe1 \xe8 31.e4 \xe6 32.\xe2 and now 32...g6! with the intention of playing 33...\xe5; the play might continue 33.g4 \xe3. It is hard to say which plan is the more advantageous.

30.\xe2 \xe6 31.e4 \xe6 32.\xe1 \xe6!
This move was created based on an exact knowledge of the laws of manoeuvring. Black’s plan will be ...a7–a6 and then ...b7–b5; then, since his opponent will be fully occupied keeping an eye on the e4-pawn, he would have a chance of forcing his way into the game (via either the b- or the a-file which would be opened).

That would create the pivot point which is required for successful alternating manoeuvres; but there is not yet the obligatory second weakness to attack, because of course White’s need to keep an eye on the e4-pawn constitutes only one weakness. The manoeuvre 32...h6 is about creating the second weakness, the presence of which will be decisive in the ensuing rook ending.

33.\(b3\) \(\text{Bg6}\) 34.\(\text{Be2}\) a6 35.\(\text{Ef4}\) b5 36.\(\text{b3}\) \(\text{Gg5}\) 37.\(\text{g4}\) \(\text{Ge5}\) 38.\(\text{Cc3}\) a5!

Next we shall see ...a5–a4 and a double exchange of pawns. There is nothing left which can stand in the way of a penetration by the rook, perhaps by ...\(\text{Be6–c7–a7–a3}\) (or a1).

39.\(\text{Ef2}\) a4 40.\(\text{bxa4}\) bxc4!

Black needed this move, bearing in mind the rook ending which will arise after move 44.

41.\(\text{Ef8}\) \(\text{Ee7}\)

Not 41...\(\text{Exf8}\), because the white rook would penetrate Black’s position.

42.\(\text{Exe8}\) \(\text{Exe8}\) 43.\(\text{Dxc4}\) \(\text{Dxc4}\) 44.\(\text{Dxc4}\) \(\text{Ea8}\) 45.\(\text{Df7}\)

Or 45.\(\text{Db3}\) \(\text{Dd5}\) etc.

45...\(\text{Bxa4}^+\) 46.\(\text{Db3}\) \(\text{Bb4}^+\) 47.\(\text{Cc3}\) \(\text{Bb7}\)

In this rook ending the loose nature of White’s kingside (the pawns on h3 and g4) constitutes a decisive weakness, as you will soon see.

48.\(\text{Df5}\) \(\text{Ea7}\) 49.\(\text{Cc4}\) \(\text{Bb4}^+\) 50.\(\text{Dd4}\) \(\text{Dd4}\) 51.\(\text{Be5}\) \(\text{Dd6}\) 52.\(\text{Dd8}\) \(\text{Bb3}^+\) 53.\(\text{Cc4}\) \(\text{Bh3}\)

Compare this with the notes to moves 47 and 32.

54.\(\text{Bxe4}\) \(\text{Bb3}\) 55.\(\text{Bc2}\) \(\text{Bb4}^+\) 56.\(\text{Bd5}\) \(\text{Bxg4}\) 57.\(\text{Bd4}\) \(\text{Bb4}^+\) 58.\(\text{Bd5}\) h5 59.\(\text{Bh2}\) \(\text{Bc6}\)

With the threat of 60...\(\text{Bb8}\).

60.\(\text{Bc2}\) \(\text{Bg4}\) 61.\(\text{Bf6}\) \(\text{Bd5}\) 62.\(\text{Dh8}\) \(\text{h4}\) 63.\(\text{Bd8}\) \(\text{Bc4}\) 64.\(\text{Bb6}\) h3 65.\(\text{Bd1}\) \(\text{Bb4}\) 66.\(\text{Bb1}^+\) \(\text{Bxa4}\) 67.\(\text{Bxc5}\) g5 68.\(\text{Bh1}\) \(\text{Bg3}\) 69.\(\text{Dd4}\) g4 70.\(\text{Bd4}\) \(\text{Bf2}\) 71.\(\text{Bf4}\) h2

0–1

This game was a particularly vivid example of the logical connection between the "pivotal point" and the "two weaknesses".

Game 74
Aron Nimzowitsch
Buerger
London 1927

What is worth noting about the following manoeuvring game is how the manoeuvring happens within one camp, so to speak, along internal lines of communication. The opening seemed to go in White’s favour.

1.\(\text{C4}\) \(\text{Cf6}\) 2.\(\text{Cc3}\) d5 3.\(\text{Cxd5}\) \(\text{Cxd5}\) 4.g3 \(\text{Cxc3}\) 5.\(\text{Bxc3}\) g6 6.\(\text{Cg2}\) \(\text{Bg7}\) 7.\(\text{Bb3}\)

Instead of 6...\(\text{Bg7}\) he could have played 6...c5 when now he could have comfortably protected his pawn by ...\(\text{Cc7}\).

7...c6 8.d4 0–0 9.\(\text{Cc3}\) \(\text{Bd7}\)

And White suddenly found himself highly embarrassed by the threat of ...\(\text{Bb6}\) and the occupation of the central c4-square. Could anything be done?

10.\(\text{Bh3}\)!

A drastic preventive measure. White wants to get rid of the unpleasant bishop, whatever the cost.

10...\(\text{Ee8}\) 11.\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{Cc7}\) 12.\(\text{Cc3}\) \(\text{Bf6}\) 13.\(\text{Cxc8}\)

Another option was 13.\(\text{Cg5}\).

13...\(\text{Bxc8}\) 14.0–0 \(\text{e6}\) 15.\(\text{Bc1}\)!
Starting to amass pieces on the d-file as a prophylactic measure against ...c6-c5, cf. the next annotation.

15...b6 16.c4 ed8 17.d31

Now 17...c5 is to be met by 18.dxc6 and if after that 18...bxc5 then 19.fd1.

17...f8 18.b2 g7 19.a3 f8 20.xf8 xf8 21.wb2 e7 22.e5 fd8 23.fd1 e4

As the freeing attempt with ...c6-c5 has lost almost all its charm, the gifted English master now tries something else: he starts to restrain White in the centre.

24.wc2 f6 25.db3 b5 26.c5

Also worth considering was 26.d2.

26...f5

Completing the consolidation of the centre.

27.e3

The immediate attack by 27.d2 would be beaten back straight away by 27...xd2! 28.xd2 ed5 29.e4 fd4 30.e2 (rooks in front, the queen behind seems to be the best arrangement!) 30...fd6 31.xe4 and now the preventive move 31...h5! to forestall g4. Black would have a satisfactory position.

27...a5 28.e5 ec7 29.a3 dg7 30.pg2

Intending g3-g4-g5 and then h3-h4-h5, etc.

30...h5

I also had to assure myself that after restraining the above-mentioned majority I would have a won game, since the preconditions for successful alternating manoeuvres are fully met. We shall soon see what I mean by this.

31...xe4 32.wxe4 wb6 33.xc6 ed5

Returning the sacrifice by 33...xc6 34.xc6 edx4 would not be sufficient, on account of the intermediate move 35.w7! because if the king now goes to h6, then there follows 36.db1, e.g. 36...b4 37.xa5 and wins.

34.db5

If 34.xa5 then 34...xc5.

34...wb5 35.db3! xd3

The threat was the fork, e.g. 35...xc5? 36.e4.

36.xd3 ed8 37蜩3 ed8 38.db3

The blockader, with its concealed dagger.

38...b4 39.a4 db8 40.db4 cc8

White’s ultimate threat is obviously to obtain two connected passed pawns, perhaps by posting his king on c4, and following up with e2-e4 and d4-d5. But considerable difficulties stand in the way of the plan of posting the king on c4. For example, the immediate 41.db3? would be a blunder on account of 41...xc5. So slow manoeuvring will be necessary to get the king positioned as White wishes.

41.db4 a8 42.db3 db6 43.db2 dc7 44.tb3

31.xe4

An obvious exchange sacrifice? Certainly, but when playing the sacrifice it was necessary to have prepared a defensive plan against the opponent’s queenside majority, and that was certainly not easy.

Unveiling the planned manoeuvre: the blockading square b3 will be occupied alternately by the knight and the rook, whilst the free member of that duo undertakes attacks. So by move 55
we reach the same position as after Black’s 40th
move, except there is one important difference:
the white king has occupied the much coveted
d4-square.
44...\text{Ea}6 45.\text{Ed}3 \text{Ed}5 46.\text{h}4 \text{Ea}8 47.\text{Ec}4 \text{Ed}7
48.\text{Ed}3 \text{Ec}7 49.\text{Ed}1 \text{Ed}7 50.\text{Eg}1 \text{Ff}7 51.\text{Eb}1!
The sealed move and the changing of the
guard!
51...\text{Eb}7
A possible attempt at a breakthrough by 51...g5
would not be sufficient. To crown it all, there
would be the fine parry: 52.\text{Eg}1!
52.\text{Dd}2 \text{Ec}6 53.\text{Df}3 \text{Cc}7 54.\text{De}5 \text{Bg}7 55.\text{Bb}3
\text{Ab}8 56.e4

And away they go!
56...\text{Eg}8 57.\text{Dd}5 \text{exd}5 58.\text{exd}5 \text{Ec}8 59.\text{Df}6+
\text{Dd}8 60.\text{Dd}5 \text{Eg}7 61.c6
1–0

Game 75
Aron Nimzowitsch
Dr Oskar Hans Antze
Hanover 1926

Once again we will see manoeuvring against
original looking “weaknesses”. The side which
was manoeuvring – White – threatened to wait things
out with a defensive manoeuvre, which would have
led to the complete destruction of any possible
counterplay. In his efforts to prevent the above-
mentioned manoeuvre, Black lost because of the
second weakness.

1.d4 \text{Df}6 2.c4 \text{g}6 3.g3 \text{Bg}7 4.g2 0–0 5.f4 \text{d}6
6.\text{Df}3 \text{c}6!
The counter ...d6-d5 is planned!
7.0–0 \text{Dd}5 8 \text{cx}d5 \text{cx}d5 9.\text{Dc}5 \text{wb}6 10.\text{Dc}3 \text{Dd}8
11.b3 \text{Da}6
11...\text{Dc}6 would have been followed by the
combination 12.\text{Da}3! \text{Dd}4 13.\text{Df}a4 \text{Dxe}2†
14.\text{Dh}1 \text{Da}6 15.\text{Df}3.
12.\text{Df}a3 \text{Da}8 13.\text{Df}a4 \text{Dh}5 14.\text{Dd}3 \text{Da}5
Exchanging queens would be simpler.
15.\text{Df}1 \text{Df}5 16.\text{Df}a3 \text{Dh}5 17.\text{Df}1 \text{Df}4 18.\text{Df}1
\text{Df}8 19.e3

White may have managed to prevent the
opposing queen from entering the triangle b6,
b5 and a5, but Black might have played for the
advance ...e7-e5 by means of 19...f6 20.\text{Df}3 \text{Dg}4.
He omits to do so and instead makes a mistake
which should have led to a rather quick decision.
19...\text{b}5? 20.\text{Dc}6 \text{Dc}8 21.\text{Dx}b5 \text{Dd}7 22.\text{Dx}a6
\text{Dxc}6 23.\text{Dc}7 \text{Dxc}1 24.\text{Dxc}1 \text{Dd}8
If 24...\text{Df}8 then 25.\text{Dx}d5 \text{Df}6 26.\text{Df}3 \text{Dx}a4
27.bxa4 \text{Dxa}4 28.\text{Dc}3 followed by \text{Dc}6 with an
easily won game.
25.\text{Dc}5
Here too, 25.\text{Dx}d5 would have been strong, e.g.
25.\text{Dx}g3 26.\text{hx}g3 \text{Dx}a4 27.\text{Dxf}7† \text{Dxf}7 28.bxa4
\text{Dxa}2 29.\text{Dc}3 with an exchange of queens at some
point after which the endgame would be an easy
win.
25...\text{Dc}8 26.\text{Dc}8
Again 26.\text{Dx}d5 was worth considering.
26...\text{Ex}c8 27.\text{Dc}5 \text{e}6 28.\text{Dxe}4 \text{dx}e4 29.\text{Dx}c8
\[ \text{Exchanging on c5 is a bad idea.} \]

31.\( \text{Exc5?} \)

With this error, resulting from exhaustion, White almost gives away the whole game. 31.dxc5 would have led to resignation a few moves later; after 31...\( \text{Efd7} \), which appeared unpleasant, there would have followed 32.\( \text{Exf3} \) ! \( \text{Efd1} \) 33.\( \text{Exf2} \) \( \text{Exf3} \) 34.\( \text{Exe1} \) and the king easily escapes to a3. That would have been decisive. After the mistake White has to win the game all over again.

31...\( \text{Ed6} \) 32.\( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{Exa5} \) 33.\( \text{Exf2} \) \( \text{Eh5} \) 34.\( \text{Exe4} \) \( \text{Exh2} \) 35.\( \text{Exf2} \) \( \text{Eh5} \) 36.\( \text{g4} \) \( \text{Exa5} \) 37.\( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h6} \)

37...\( \text{h3} \) looks better.

38.\( \text{Exf2} \) \( \text{Exf1} \) 39.\( \text{Exh3} \) \( \text{f3} \) 40.\( \text{gxh5} \) \( \text{gxh5} \) 41.\( \text{d5} ! \) \( \text{Exd5} \) 42.\( \text{Exg2} \) ! \( \text{Eh7} \) 43.\( \text{Exd5} ! \) \( \text{Exf6} \)

This is the start of an extremely long manoeuvring phase. Black's weaknesses are:

a) the queenside: White is threatening to create a passed pawn;

b) the kingside: the white king is threatening to penetrate via h5; also checks by White from the rear would be disruptive since the isolated f- and h-pawns are in need of protection;

c) the threatened centralization of the white queen, perhaps on d4 followed by the flight of the white king; cf. the note to move 65.

On the other hand, Black's counter-chances lie in a series of checks against the badly protected king and in his passed h-pawn.

44.\( \text{Exd4} \) \( \text{Exg6} \) 45.\( \text{Ed2} \) \( \text{Eh6} \) 46.\( \text{Eb2} \) \( \text{Exg6} \) 47.\( \text{b4} \) \( \text{Cc4} \) 48.\( \text{Ed2} \) \( \text{Exh5} \) 49.\( \text{a4} \) \( \text{Ea6} \) 50.\( \text{Exg3} \) \( \text{Exg8} \)

Just a tiny, almost imperceptible move by the king (\( \text{h3-g3} \)) and Black is obliged to lose defensive measures on his kingside. In this struggle it is important to note how Black is obliged to react to the slightest hint of a threat.

51.\( \text{h2} \) \( \text{Cc4} \) 52.\( \text{b2} \) \( \text{Dd3} \) 53.\( \text{g2} \) \( \text{Cc4} \)

53...\( \text{Exe3} \)?? 54.\( \text{h3} \)

54.\( \text{g3} \) \( \text{Exg8} \)

54...\( \text{Exd3} \) was preferable.

55.\( \text{h3} \) \( \text{Cc4} \) 56.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{Exg6} \) 57.\( \text{h4} \) \( \text{Exg7} \)

If 57...\( \text{Exb4} \) then 58.\( \text{Cc6} \) followed by 59.\( \text{h5} \).

58.\( \text{b7} \) \( \text{Exg6} \) 59.\( \text{b6} \) \( \text{Exh7} \) 60.\( \text{Exf6} ! \)

Seizing this important square advances White's cause considerably.

60...\( \text{Ed5} \) 61.\( \text{Exg3} \) \( \text{Exg8} \) 62.\( \text{h2} \) \( \text{a2} \) 63.\( \text{h3} \) \( \text{Ed5} \) 64.\( \text{Ec7} \) \( \text{Exg6} \) 65.\( \text{Exe8} \)!

Here e8 is even more important than f6.
65...h7

After this White manages to play the winning move a4-a5 without any danger, but the same was the case after 65...f6 66.g3 d3! (still the best!) 67.a5! when there would not be too much trouble. For example, 67...f1 (if 67...b1 then 68.c6† e7 69.b7† e8 70.xa6, as in the game) 68.e5† g6 69.e6† g7 70.xf5 g1† 71.f3 f1† 72.e4 c4† 73.e5 b5† 74.e6 and wins.

66.g3 b3 67.a5!

The simplest, because now the threat of b4-b5 is powerful. There was another possibility: 67.d7† g6 68.c6† h7 69.b7† g8 70.b8† h7 71.b7† g8 and once more 72.h4.

67...b1

67...d3 would be better. The winning continuation would then be complicated, namely: 68.f7† h8 69.f6† h7 70.d4!

Now there are two lines, depending where the queen goes (b1 or h1). In both cases, the next move is 71.d7† and White goes on to capture whichever pawn is unprotected (the a-pawn or the f-pawn). e.g. 70...b1 71.d7† g6 72.c6† g7 73.b7† f8 74.xa6 as in the game, or 70...f1 71.d7† g6 72.e6† g7 73.xf5 and the king flees, as was shown in the note to Black’s 65th move. So, after a sufficiently long period of manoeuvring we can see one of the weak pawns must drop. A triumph for the logic involved in alternating manoeuvres.

68.d7† g6 69.c6† g7 70.b7† f8

71.xa6 e1† 72.f3 d1† 73.e2 d5† 74.f2 d8 75.a6 h4† 76.g2 e7 77.f3 c7 78.b5 g7† 79.f2 b2† 80.e2 a1 81.b6 1–0

White’s defensive threat – the escape of his king after he had secured the centre – persistently played a part in what happened. The typical position would be:

White plays f2! and the king gets away to the queenside. All that remains to be done is to decide on the pivotal point: it should be found somewhere along the d4-f6 diagonal; proof of this can be seen in the main line (i.e. 67...d3! instead of the obviously weaker 67...f1) when the queen returns from e8 to f6 and d4. An extremely instructive endgame from the point of view of manoeuvring strategy.

We shall close this section with two endgames.

Game 76

Aron Nimzowitsch
Strange Petersen
Copenhagen 1928

After an extremely tough defensive game played by my youthful opponent, we reached an endgame which was apparently totally level.

1.b3 d5 2.b2 f5 3.e3 e6 4.f4 f6 5.b3 bd7 6.g3 d6 7.g2 e7 8.0–0 e5!
The advance d4-d5 should follow, when the d5-pawn and the c6-bishop would make a pretty picture.

25...\text{ed}8 26.\text{fc}1 \text{fb}8 27.d5 \text{a}6 28.\text{e}1 \text{f}6 29.\text{e}4 \text{c}8 30.\text{a}4 a6 31.\text{c}3 \text{f}7 32.\text{e}1 h6 33.b4 \text{c}7 34.b5 a5

The bishop is now as firm as a rock on c6, but on the other hand it looks a little hemmed in.

35.\text{f}2 \text{fb}8 36.\text{e}e4 \text{f}7 37.\text{c}c4 \text{f}5 38.g4 \text{fb}1 39.a3 \text{a}2 40.\text{d}d4 \text{b}3 41.\text{d}2 a4 42.\text{f}3 g6 43.\text{e}4

Black’s weaknesses are not so much pawns as squares. These weak squares are almost exclusively along the e-file and White could aim to seize either e5 or e6. For example, \text{g}3, exchange bishops, then \text{d}4 and finally \text{d}2-e2-e6. Or h2-h4 and g4-g5; after ...h6xg5, hxg5 ...f5, would come \text{f}3 then \text{f}2-e3-f4, exchange the bishops, and then \text{e}5.

43...h5

Black misses the correct plan. He should play 43...g5 when the assault on e5 would be nipped in the bud; the attack on e6 could be defended against by (43...g5!) 44.\text{g}3 \text{d}6 45.\text{x}d6 \text{x}d6 46.\text{d}4 \text{f}8 47.\text{e}2 \text{f}7 and White can make no more progress (48.\text{e}8? \text{xc}6!).

If, after 43...g5!, White tries 44.\text{d}4 then there simply follows 44...\text{c}4 45.\text{f}2 \text{d}6 (46.\text{e}5? \text{xc}6).

A win is simply impossible after 43...g5. White has one bishop fewer in play and the d4-pawn is in need of protection. He may be strong on the
e-file, but this alone is not enough for a win.

44...gxh5 fxg5†

After 44...gxh5 the method demonstrated above would be much more likely to lead to the goal, because h5 would then be our second weakness. For example, 44...gxh5 45...g3 d6 46...xd6 e6 d6 47...d4 f8 48...e2 dxf7 and then 49...e3!!

50...e8† f8 51...g6 b3 52...e8† g7 53...e4 with a winning position.

45...f3 g5

Or 45...gxh5 46...h4 e6 47...g3 f4 48...xf4

56...f4 49.d6.

46...g3 d6

If 46...f4 then of course 47...f2 followed by h4 etc.

47...xd6 e6d6 48...g3 g7 49.h4 h6

50.hxg5† g5 51...f3 exf5 52...f4 g6

53...e5 e8d8 54.d6 f7 55...f2 e6 56...f4

1-0

Game 77
Erich Cohn
Arno Nimzowitsch
Karlsbad 1911

1.d4 d5 2...f3 e6 3.c4 c5 4.e3 a6 5.d3 d6

6.0-0 0-0 7.a3 cxd4 8.exd4 dxc4 9...xc4 c6

10...c3 b6 11...g5 b7 12...e2 h6 13...e3
e7 14...e5 dxe5 15...d5 gxd5 16...h5

17...xe5 18...f6 19...e1 d5 19...f3 e8

20...e1 g4 21...g3 e3 22...e3 d7

23...ad6 exb1 24...e4 c5 25...f1 e3 26...f2

f5 27...d2 e7 28...c3 c4 29.g3 h7 30...g2

31...xd5 exd5 32...d2 e3 33...e3 d2 b3 34...c2

35...b1 c5 36...d2 e7 37...c2

38...d3 e4 39...f2 e6 40...f1 g6

41...g2 e6 42...f2 g6 43...g2 e6 44...f2

45...c1 h7 46...c2 g6 47...g2 g5

48...f2 g6 49...e2 e6 50...f3 g6 51...e2

h7 52...f2 e8 53...g2 e6 54...g2 g6

55...g2 g5 56...f2 g6 57...g2 g5 58...f2

g6 59...g2 e6 60...f2 c8 61...g2 e6

62...f2 c8 63...g2

63...a5

Black wants to offer his king a safe square on a7!

64.h4 g6 65.h2 h5 66.g2 h6 67.h2 g6

68.h1 f7

The king starts its journey to a7.

69...f2 f7 70.h2 a7 71...c1 72...h2
d7 73...c6 74.c2 a4

Alternating the pressure on the opponent’s weaknesses is a tried and tested method of manoeuvring. Otherwise 74...c7 would also have been possible straight away.

75...f1

If 75...f2 (to make ...c7 more difficult) then something like 75...e4 76...h2 c1 77...g2
d1 78.h2 d3 and the king still gets to a7 and the game continues.

75...c7 76...f3 c8 77...f2 b8 78...h3

79...g7

White must also bear in mind the possibility of...g6-g5, so he has indeed many threats to reckon with. No wonder things finally went wrong for him.

79...d7 80.h2 d6 81.h3 c6 82...e1

86...e6

All this moving to and fro is more than just psychological: the terrain is being explored in search of flexible lines of communication. The question is: will our opponent be able to keep up with the speed with which we are able to regroup?

83...d4 84...h3 d6 85...h2 e7 86...h3
e4 87...g1 d6 88...h2 e4 89...e1
After 89...e1 Cohn had feared the breakthrough 89...g5 90.hxg5 h4:

For example, 91.gxh4 f4 92.g6 f3 with complications which threatened to become dangerous. You should check this to see if he was correct.

89...exe3 90.f4 exe2† 91.h3 a6 92.b4 axb4 93.axb4 b5 94.c7 e4 95.exe4 exe4 96.g7 e6 97.d7 c4 98.g2 xd4 99.f3 c4 100.b5 d4

0–1

Even though the logical reason for Black's victory may not appear as clearly as I would like, one thing is certain: the difficulties the defence had to overcome were so great that the idea of a possible draw put forward in the tournament book was out of the question. With this game we conclude our fifth chapter.
Chapter 6

A Brief Survey of Hypermodern Territory - Old and New

Firstly, you have to get rid of the wrong-headed idea that this part is hypermodern in contrast with the previous parts. That is not the case. The first five parts fully deserve the same name. Thus “restraint” and above all “overprotection” which can almost be said to be the vanguard of modern chess (and which were building blocks of my system) are still not accepted. That was the case with my teachings on the centre and other parts of my system; considerable time had to elapse before they were incorporated into modern theory. There can be no question of any sort of contrast. The idea behind this sixth chapter is partly to provide a series of minor incentives, but above all to evaluate at our leisure the first revolutionary achievements.

We still consider the pseudo-classical school (the Tarrasch period) to be the symbol of conventional thinking in chess, while we see in the hypermodern school a tendency to seek out the intrinsic truth. This is often only a slight distinction, but it is enough to show us in a warm and natural light what is actually taking place (instead of seeing it through the cold and artificial light of the days of conventional thinking). One example will suffice. The claim that I am making in section 3 of this chapter is that when you have a solid central position then you can undertake diversions on the flank, however veiled their aims. If we were to interpret “a solid central position” in the terms of conventional thinking (i.e. at least the same number of pawns in the centre and advanced at least as far as those of the opponent) then the whole thing would be wrong and fake. This is also the case of we drop the nuance veiled aims. Because that is exactly the point; in this specific case we are seriously speaking out in favour of “a speculative attack”.

Now let us turn to the analysis of the individual components in our chapter.

1. The thesis of the relative harmlessness of the pawn roller

This stratagem was first used by the author of this book in 1911, and it soon showed itself to be a fruitful one. The stem game with the opening moves 1.e4 c5 2.d3 c6! (Spielmann - Nimzowitsch, San Sebastian 1911) gave rise, amongst others, to lines such as 1.d4 d6 (Bogoljubow) and 1.e4 d6 (Alekhine). Nowadays such a challenge to the pawn roller is one of the most popular and best known plans and is almost as well known to every player in minor tournaments as to its inventor. So, what was in 1911 a new world now belongs to the old world of hypermodernism.
Game 78
Reginald Pryce Michell
Aron Nimzowitsch
Marienbad 1925

1.e4 c5 2.d3 d6 3.e5 dxe5 4.d3! dxe5 5.dxc3 b6

4...e6 is safer. 4...b6 is also worth considering.
5.dxc3 b6

An idea of “hypermodern” boldness; he tries to slow down his own development artificially in order to force his opponent to show his colours too early, a very audacious start. A more correct move would seem to be 5...d5, e.g. 6.exd6 exd6 and the d-pawn can be held.

6.d3

More energetic would be 6.a4 c6 7.a4 then d2 and d1 or 0–0–0.

6...d7 7.d4 c7

He continues to manoeuvre (cf. note to move 5), retaining as options the right to castle on either side and all possible pawn structures; he also hopes his opponent will go wrong.

8.d3

I would prefer 8.d2.

8...e6 9.0–0 e7 10.d2!

A splendid centralizing plan: the threat is now d2–c4–d6, in order to disrupt his opponent’s development.

10.h5

A decidedly dubious parry, because a diversion on the flank is rarely strong enough to be able to neutralize an attack in the centre.

So it would have been better to think of 10...c6 or 10...d5.

11.h3 g5

12.e4?

Why oh why delay d4 and d6+? For example: 12.d4 b5 13.d6+ d6 14.exd6 c6 15.f3 f5? 16.e5 g8 17.e2! and wins (17...c4 18.xf5 exf5 19.f6+ d7 20.d7+ g6 21.xg5 with a winning attack). Or 12.e4 d6 13.d6+ d6 14.exd6 c6d8 15.e2 f6 16.e4 with a superior central position. Or finally 12.d4 a6 13.e2 0–0–0 14.a5 and White sidelines the attacking bishop on b7 and retains the better pawn formation. So 12.d4 would have been strong.

12...d6 13.e1 0–0–0 14.d4

Now this attack evaporates ineffectually.

14...b5!

This creates a square on b6 for the queen.

15.d6+ d6 16.ex6 b6 17.d3

This concedes the remains of his central superiority. The correct move was 17.e5 though Black could have gone fishing in troubled waters with 17...f5 18.exh8 xh8 19.d3 (e.g. 19.g4 20.h4 g3 21.fxg3 c4+ would cost White a piece). But after 19.xc6 (instead of 19.d3) 19...xc6 20.f3 g4 21.e5 or 21.e3 we would prefer White’s position. After the weaker text move the flank attack dominates the board.

17...g4! 18.hxg4 hxg4 19.xg4 f5 20.f3 h7 21.xf1 e5! 22.xc6
There is nothing else against the double threat of ...e5-e4 and ...f5-f4.
22...\(\text{dxc6} \ 23.\text{b3 e4} \ 24.\text{fxe4 g8} \ 25.\text{f2 fxe4} \ 26.\text{d2}

(\text{Diagram})

Threatening \(\text{e3}\) with a blockade.
26...\(\text{e3} \ 27.\text{xe3 xg2+} \ 28.\text{e2 f7}

With the neat threat 29...\(\text{xf2+} \ 30.\text{xf2 e8+} \ 31.\text{d1} \) and now 31...\(\text{f3} \) and wins (not the immediate 31...\(\text{xf2} \ 32.\text{xe8} \) mate).
29.\text{d1}

Threatening mate on \(e8\).
29...\(\text{b8} \ 30.\text{xg1 xf2!}

A decisive queen sacrifice!
31.\text{gxg2 ffxg2}

Even stronger than 31...\(\text{gxd2}\).
32.\text{b3 g1+}

And Black won easily:
33.\text{d2 g8}\# \ 34.\text{d3 xal} \ 35.\text{xc5 d1+} \ 36.\text{e3 e1+} \ 37.\text{d3}

If 37...\(\text{d4}\) then 37...\(\text{f1}\) \ 38.\text{e3 f3} \ 39.\text{d4 g4} \ 40.\text{e5 e4} \) mate.
37...\(\text{e4}\# \ 38.\text{d4 d2}\# \ 39.\text{e5 d5}\# \ 40.\text{xd5}

\text{h1+}

0-1

Game 79
Werner Nielsen
Aron Nimzowitsch
Copenhagen 1928

1.e4 c5 2.d3 d6 3.e5 d5 4.d4 cxd4 5.\(\text{xd4}\) e6 6.\(\text{d3}\)

My game against Schlechter (who had White) in San Sebastian 1912 went: 6.\(\text{c4 c6} \ 7.\text{e4 d6} \ 8.\text{exd6 f6} \ 9.\text{h4 xd6} \ 10.\text{c3 e5!} \) (This emphasizes White's central inferiority which came about as a result of the badly timed excursion with the queen.) 11.\(\text{xe5 xxe5} \ 12.0-0 \ 0-0 \ 13.\text{d3 xd4}\) (to meet 14.\(\text{h3}\) with \(\ldots\text{g4}\) and a correct pawn sacrifice, namely 14...\(\text{g4} \ 15.\text{xh7+ h8} \ 16.\text{f5+ xh3} \ 17.\text{xh3 xc3} \ 18.\text{xc3 e5} \) with advantage to Black) 14.\(\text{xd4 xd4}\) (Dr Tarrasch now declares the game level; I do not agree. Black appears much better centralized.) 15.\(\text{b5 c5} \ 16.\text{f4 d7} \ 17.\text{ad1 a6} \ 18.\text{d6} \) (18.\(\text{c3}\) is better) 18...\(\text{f8}\) 19.\(\text{xc5 xb5} \ 20.\text{d4 xd3} \ 21.\text{xd3!!}

(\text{Diagram})

Schlechter shows his wonderfully subtle feeling for chess by preferring to lose a pawn rather than allow the centralizing ...\(\text{d5}\).
21...\textit{\textbf{Exc2}} 22.\textit{\textbf{Exb3}} b5 23.\textit{\textbf{Exf6}} gxf6 24.\textit{\textbf{Ed1 }}
\textit{\textbf{Aa8}} 25.\textit{\textbf{Af1}} f5

Here Dr Tarrasch recommends 25...\textit{\textbf{Ec8}}. But after that Schlechter would calmly have played
26.\textit{\textbf{g1}} and if 26...\textit{\textbf{f5}} then 27.\textit{\textbf{Af1}} and the win
would still have been difficult.

26.\textit{\textbf{Ae1}} \textit{\textbf{Ec4}} 27.\textit{\textbf{Ad2}}

And on move 79 Schlechter achieved a draw
that was most honourable, considering that he
was a pawn down:
27.\textit{\textbf{Ec1}} 28.\textit{\textbf{Ae2}} \textit{\textbf{Aa4}} 29.\textit{\textbf{Aa3}} \textit{\textbf{Ag1}} 30.\textit{\textbf{Bxg3}}+ \textit{\textbf{Af8}}
31.\textit{\textbf{Ba1}} 32.\textit{\textbf{Bd3}} \textit{\textbf{Aa2}} 33.\textit{\textbf{Ae1}} \textit{\textbf{F4}} 34.\textit{\textbf{Bh3}} \textit{\textbf{Gg7}}
35.\textit{\textbf{Bb3}} \textit{\textbf{Gg6}} 36.\textit{\textbf{Bhc3}} \textit{\textbf{f5}} 37.\textit{\textbf{Gg3}} \textit{\textbf{Fxg3}} 38.\textit{\textbf{Hxg3}} e5
39.\textit{\textbf{Ff1}} \textit{\textbf{Gg5}} 40.\textit{\textbf{Gg2}} \textit{\textbf{h5}} 41.\textit{\textbf{Bc3}} \textit{\textbf{e4}} 42.\textit{\textbf{Ec3}} \textit{\textbf{Cc2}}
43.\textit{\textbf{Ff1}} a5 44.bxa5 \textit{\textbf{Bxa5}} 45.\textit{\textbf{Bb4}} \textit{\textbf{Aa2}} 46.\textit{\textbf{Beb3}}
\textit{\textbf{Bc2}} 47.\textit{\textbf{Dg1}} \textit{\textbf{Ba2}} 48.\textit{\textbf{Aa1}} \textit{\textbf{Cc2}} 49.\textit{\textbf{Gg1}} \textit{\textbf{Dd2}} 50.\textit{\textbf{Aa1}}
\textit{\textbf{Ba2}} 51.\textit{\textbf{Gg1}} \textit{\textbf{Bb4}} 52.\textit{\textbf{Gxd4}}+ \textit{\textbf{Bxd4}} 53.\textit{\textbf{Bxb5}} \textit{\textbf{Bxh5}}
54.\textit{\textbf{Bxh5}} \textit{\textbf{Dg4}} 55.\textit{\textbf{Bc5}} \textit{\textbf{Df4}} 56.\textit{\textbf{Bc5}} \textit{\textbf{Df4}} 57.\textit{\textbf{Bc5}}
58.\textit{\textbf{Bxh8}} \textit{\textbf{Aa8}} 59.\textit{\textbf{Ae1}} \textit{\textbf{Aa1}} 60.\textit{\textbf{Bxg2}} \textit{\textbf{Ab1}}
61.\textit{\textbf{Bc8}} \textit{\textbf{Bf4}} 62.\textit{\textbf{Bxe2}} \textit{\textbf{Bc1}} 63.\textit{\textbf{Bb8}} \textit{\textbf{Ba1}} 64.\textit{\textbf{Bc8}} \textit{\textbf{Dd1}}
65.\textit{\textbf{Bc8}} \textit{\textbf{Dd2}} 66.\textit{\textbf{Bc8}} \textit{\textbf{Da2}} 67.\textit{\textbf{Bc7}} \textit{\textbf{De2}} 68.\textit{\textbf{Bc7}} \textit{\textbf{Bc2}}
69.\textit{\textbf{Bc7}} \textit{\textbf{Dd8}} 70.\textit{\textbf{Bc7}} \textit{\textbf{Df5}} 71.\textit{\textbf{Bc7}} \textit{\textbf{Ff4}} 72.\textit{\textbf{Ff4}} 73.\textit{\textbf{Ff4}}
74.\textit{\textbf{Bc7}} 75.\textit{\textbf{Bc7}} 76.\textit{\textbf{Bc7}} 77.\textit{\textbf{Bc7}}
78.\textit{\textbf{Ff8}} 79.\textit{\textbf{Ae1}} f5 79.\textit{\textbf{Ae2}}

\textbf{½ - ½}

C. Schlechter – A. Nimzowitsch, San Sebastian 1912

6...\textit{\textbf{Ac6}} 7.\textit{\textbf{Be4}} f5

Looking for a hypermodern pawn structure. Otherwise I could have played 7...\textit{\textbf{Db6}} or
7...\textit{\textbf{Ad6}}.

8.\textit{\textbf{Bc5}}

"Hanging pawns" could have been achieved by
8.\textit{\textbf{Exf6 }}\textit{\textbf{Axf6}} 9.\textit{\textbf{Ae2}}.

8...\textit{\textbf{Ad6}}

Exploring the position for central points (d4).
I would not be so keen on the more cautious
8...\textit{\textbf{Bc7}}.

9.0–0 0–0 10.a3 \textit{\textbf{Bc7}}

\textit{Not} 10...\textit{\textbf{Aa5}} which would unnecessarily weaken b5.

11.\textit{\textbf{Cc4 }}\textit{\textbf{Dc7}} 12.\textit{\textbf{Bb4}} \textit{\textbf{Dd4}}

See the note to Black's 8th move.

13.\textit{\textbf{Dxd4 }}\textit{\textbf{Dxd4}} 14.\textit{\textbf{Bb2 }}\textit{\textbf{Bxb2}} 15.\textit{\textbf{Bxb2}} \textit{\textbf{Dg6}}

16.\textit{\textbf{Ae1}} b6 17.\textit{\textbf{Cc3}} a6 18.\textit{\textbf{Dd1}} \textit{\textbf{Ab7}} 19.\textit{\textbf{Dd4}}

There would have been excellent chances to consolidate after 19.f3 then \textit{\textbf{Af1}} and \textit{\textbf{Df2}}.

19...\textit{\textbf{Dad8}} 20.\textit{\textbf{Wd6}}

He overlooks Black's move 24. The balance
could be kept with 20.c5.

20.\textit{\textbf{Wxd6}} 21.\textit{\textbf{exd6}} \textit{\textbf{Dxg2}} 22.\textit{\textbf{Dxg2}} f4†

23.\textit{\textbf{Dg3}} \textit{\textbf{Dxd3}}

Black of course has a won endgame, but what
happens next is very interesting.

24.\textit{\textbf{Bc3}} e5 25.\textit{\textbf{Dg2}} f4† 26.\textit{\textbf{Df1}} e4 27.\textit{\textbf{Bf3}} \textit{\textbf{Dxf3}}
28.\textit{\textbf{Dxh3}} \textit{\textbf{Dg6}} 29.\textit{\textbf{Bc1}} \textit{\textbf{Dc5}}

What is interesting is the excellent cooperation
between the passed pawn and the knight: at one
point we have a pawn on f5 and knight on g4,
at another pawns on f4 and the knight on e3. In
other words the knight highlights the territory
which has been gained by the advance of the
pawn.

30.\textit{\textbf{Dc3}} g4 31.\textit{\textbf{De2}} f4 32.\textit{\textbf{Bh6}} 33.\textit{\textbf{Bc3}}
\textit{\textbf{Ec8}} 34.\textit{\textbf{Dc2}} \textit{\textbf{Dh5}} 35.\textit{\textbf{Fe2}} \textit{\textbf{Dxd6}} 36.\textit{\textbf{Bf3}} g5
37.\textit{\textbf{Bxd3}} f5 38.\textit{\textbf{Bxd7}} \textit{\textbf{Dc3}}† 39.\textit{\textbf{Bc1}} g4 40.\textit{\textbf{Bf2}}
g3 41.\textit{\textbf{Bf3}} \textit{\textbf{Bce8}}

0–1

2. Flexible handling of the opening (the
transposition from one opening to another)

When your author introduced this stratagem it
was hailed as decadent by the smart-alecks of the
Tarrasch era. For example, Therkatz, an amateur
who played weakly enough to be able to write
quite an important chess column, claimed that
hiding your opening plans showed a "lack of
moral fibre". Of course it is really just a transfer
of the principle of manoeuvring to the opening phase. Although this stratagem had already been employed several times in 1907, 1910 and 1911 (see games 4, 53 and 19) the stratagem is not yet well enough understood. For example, the following method tried out by the author is not well known.

I. Ernst Grünfeld – Aron Nimzowitsch, Breslau 1925
1.d4  ♜f6 2.c4  e6 3.♗f3  b6 4.g3  ♖a6!

The idea was as follows: 3...b6 threatened centralization by ...♗b7; to blunt the threat White played g3 intending ♖g2, but in doing so left the c4-pawn poorly protected. This was the signal for Black to set up an attack on c4.

5.♗a4  ♖c6 6.♗g2  b5 7.♗xb5  axb5 8.♖d1  ♒b7

And after getting rid of the c4-pawn Black had at least a level game.

9.0–0  ♖c7 10.♗bd2 0–0 11.♗b3

And now 11...♖c6 had to be played to prevent a4.

11...d6 12.a4  b4 13.a5  ♖d5 14.♖e1  ♖xb3

15.♖xb3  d5 16.♖a4  ♖d7 17.♖d3  ♖c6

18.♗g5  ♖b7 19.e3  ♖f8 20.♖f1  h6 21.♖xf6  ♖xf6 22.♖c5  ♖xc5 23.♘xc5  ♖a6 24.♗ac1  ♖e7

25.♗f1  ♖xc5 26.♖xc5  ♖f 27.♗c2  ♖a7 28.♗d3  ♖g7 29.♖d1  ♖b8 30.♖b3  ♖d6 31.g4  ♖xg4

32.♖xg4†  ♖g6 33.♖g3  ♖xg3† 34.hxg3  ♖e7

35.♖f1  ♖e8 36.♗e2  ♖e7 37.♗d2  ♖d7 38.♖c2  ♖d6 39.♖b3  ♖c6 40.♖c1  ♖xa5 41.♗xb4

♖c6† 42.♖a3  ♖c7 43.♖h1  a5 44.♖xh6  ♖b4

45.♖b5  ♖c2 46.♖h2  ♖c7 47.♖b3  ♖b6 48.♖f1  ♖e2 49.♖c3  ♖c2† 50.♖b3  ♖d2

½–½

II. Ernst Grünfeld – Aron Nimzowitsch, Semmering 1926
1.d4  ♜f6 2.c4  e6 3.♗f3  b6 4.g3  ♖e7 5.♗g2 0–0

6.0–0  ♖a6 7.♗bd2  c6 8.b3  d5 9.♖b2  ♖bd7

10.♖c1  ♖c8 11.♗c2  c5

And Black is fully developed.

12.♗b1  dxc4 13.♗xc4  cxd4 14.♗xd4  ♖xc4

15.bxc4  ♖c5 16.♖fd1  ♖c7 17.e3  h5 18.♖c2  ♖fd8 19.♖c6  ♖e8 20.♖a4  a5 21.♖de4  ♖de5

22.♗b5  ♖b8 23.♗a7  ♖xa7 24.♖xe5  b5

25.♗xb5  ♖e8 26.♖xf6  ♖xf6 27.♗b7  ♖xb7

28.♖xb7  ♖xd1 29.♖xd1  ♖c7 30.♖f3  ♖f8

31.♖h5  a4 32.♖c1  f5 33.♖f1  ♖c5 34.♗f3  ♖a3 35.♖c2  ♖g7 36.♖e2  ♖f6 37.♖d3  ♖d7† 38.♖e2  ♖c7 39.♖g2  ♖b4 40.f4  a3 41.♖e4  e5

42.♖xe5†  ♖xe5 43.♖f4  ♖xf5 44.♖d3  ♖c5

45.♖e2  f6 46.♖d5  ♖g1 47.♖e6†  ♖g6 48.h4  f5

49.g4  ♖xg4 50.♖xg4  ♖c5 51.♖e6†  ♖f7 52.♖e5

♖f6 53.♖d5  ♖c6 54.♖f5†  ♖g7 55.♖f3  ♖c8

56.♖h5  ♖e7 57.♖d5  ♖h6 58.♖f3  ♖b8 59.♖e5  ♖d8† 60.♖c2  ♖g5 61.♖e6†  ♖h7 62.♖e4†  ♖h8

63.♖d2† 64.♖b3  ♖b2† 65.♖xa3  ♖c1 66.♖c6

♖g7 67.♖g6†  ♖f7 68.♖g1  ♖c2† 69.♖b3  ♖c5

70.♖b4  ♖c3 71.♖d4  ♖d4 72.h6

1–0

If you examine these two examples for their strategic content, you come to realize that the necessary components for a manoeuvring game
(namely the two weaknesses and the pivot point) are present. Here the central threat of ...\textbf{b}7 was one of the weaknesses and the possible play against the c4-pawn the other. The pivotal point for the manoeuvres was the complex of white squares of c4 and d5 all the way to a6 and b7.

As an illustration of the stratagem we are discussing here, see games 80 to 83, in which there is a blending of the Indian and Dutch defences. Note how the blending is not confined to the opening, but rather includes all sorts of middlegame motifs. The linking of the Dutch and Indian openings (stem game Bernstein – Nimzowitsch, St Petersburg 1914) was the first example of this in its day and in some sense is the gateway to a new way of playing the game.

\textbf{Game 80}
Dr Milan Vidmar, Sr.
Aron Nimzowitsch
New York 1927

1.d4 \textbf{f}6 2.\textbf{f}3 e6 3.c4 \textbf{b}4 4.d2 \textbf{e}7

This innovation by your author is based on the idea of not committing yourself too early to any specific opening set-up: in \textit{either} case (Indian or Dutch), the queen is extremely well placed on e7.

5.\textbf{c}3

5.g3 would be somewhat better.

5...0-0 6.e3 d6

Black is still able to decide between Dutch (...b6 and then ...\textbf{b}7) and Indian (...c5 and then ...\textbf{c}6 or ...e5); the decision is not made till the next move.

7.\textbf{e}2

He does without 7.\textbf{d}3, which must be chalked up as a victory for Black’s manoeuvring. 7.\textbf{d}3 would have been followed by 7...e5.

7...b6 8.0-0 \textbf{b}7 9.\textbf{c}2 \textbf{b}d7 10.\textbf{ad}1 \textbf{xc}3

11.\textbf{xc}3 \textbf{e}4 12.\textbf{e}1 \textbf{f}5

Everything is now Dutch.

13.\textbf{b}3

The idea behind this rather mysterious move is to protect the e3-pawn, e.g. after \textbf{d}2 ...\textbf{xd}2, \textbf{xd}2 ...\textbf{g}5, f3 and the e3-pawn is protected.

13...c5

This completes the Dutch set-up: the e4-square, and the related c5-pawn (making c4-c5 impossible).

14.\textbf{d}2 \textbf{xd}2 15.\textbf{xd}2 e5 16.dxe5 dxe5 17.f3 \textbf{g}5

Black’s task is now to conduct the flank attack in such a way that his opponent cannot penetrate via the d-file during it.

18.f2 \textbf{d}6 19.\textbf{ff}1 \textbf{ae}8 20.\textbf{a}4 \textbf{a}8

21.\textbf{d}6

The exchange sacrifice 21.\textbf{d}7 \textbf{xd}7 22.\textbf{xd}7 would not do on account of 22...\textbf{f}6 23.\textbf{xa}7 and then simply 23...h6.

21...\textbf{g}7 22.\textbf{ff}1

There was a better defence by 22.\textbf{e}1. If now 22...e4 then 23.\textbf{c}3; but if 22...g4 then 23.\textbf{xg}4 \textbf{xc}4 24.\textbf{ed}7 \textbf{g}5 25.\textbf{xg}4 \textbf{xc}4 26.\textbf{c}2.

22...e4! 23.\textbf{e}1 \textbf{exf}3 24.\textbf{c}3
This diversion comes too late, as the pretty reply demonstrates:
24...\(\text{\textbar e7}\)!

After 25.\(\text{\textbar xf6}\) mate would follow: 25...\(\text{\textbar xe3}\) 26.\(\text{\textbar h1}\) \(\text{\textbar xg2}\) 27.\(\text{\textbar xg2}\) and then 27...\(\text{\textbar e1}\) !

25.\(\text{\textbar e3d3}\) \(\text{\textbar sf2}\) 26.\(\text{\textbar xg2}\) \(\text{\textbar xg2}\) 27.\(\text{\textbar xf6}\)

After 27.\(\text{\textbar xg2}\) comes 27...\(\text{\textbar e4}\) ! 28.\(\text{\textbar e1d2}\) \(\text{\textbar h3}\) 29.\(\text{\textbar a3}\) \(\text{\textbar g4}\) !

And mate in two.

0–1

Game 81
David Przepiorka
Aron Nimzowitsch
Kecskemét 1927

1.d4 \(\text{\textbar f6}\) 2.\(\text{\textbar f3}\) e6 3.c4 b6 4.\(\text{\textbar c3}\) \(\text{\textbar b7}\) 5.\(\text{\textbar e2}\) \(\text{\textbar b4}\) 6.a3

This move looks a bit like a loss of tempo, so why not 6.g3!?

6...\(\text{\textbar xe3}\) ! 7.\(\text{\textbar xc3}\) d6

Better than the immediate 7...\(\text{\textbar e4}\), e.g. 8.\(\text{\textbar c2}\) d5 9.g3 \(\text{\textbar d7}\) 10.\(\text{\textbar g2}\) and when the threatened \(\text{\textbar g5}\) is taken into account, Black is forced into the uninviting defensive move 10...\(\text{\textbar b8}\). So the transposition to the “second” opening formation should not come too quickly!

8.g3 \(\text{\textbar bd7}\) 9.\(\text{\textbar g2}\) \(\text{\textbar e7}\) 10.0–0 0–0 11.b4 \(\text{\textbar e4}\)

If this worked it would mean that Black’s preventive set-up (...\(\text{\textbar f7}\) and ...\(\text{\textbar a8}\)) had been useless. But the move simply does not work, because the f-file which he is so cheerfully opening ends up swallowing him whole. A better try is 20.e3 though even then White would be at a disadvantage, e.g. 20...\(\text{\textbar h4}\) 21.\(\text{\textbar g2}\) \(\text{\textbar h5}\).

20...\(\text{\textbar fxe4}\) 21.\(\text{\textbar fxe4}\) \(\text{\textbar f4}\)

The start of the execution so cheerfully announced in the previous note.

22.\(\text{\textbar h3}\) \(\text{\textbar e2}\) 23.\(\text{\textbar xh3}\) \(\text{\textbar xh3}\) ! 24.\(\text{\textbar h1}\) \(\text{\textbar g5}\)

25.\(\text{\textbar xfl}\) 26.\(\text{\textbar xfl}\) \(\text{\textbar f2}\) ! 27.\(\text{\textbar a1}\) \(\text{\textbar e3}\)

0–1

To understand this game as a whole you have to grasp the logical connection between Black’s waiting and attacking strategies: all Black’s waiting moves (moves 7, 17 and 18) were successful to some extent because of the powerful effect of the attacking move 19...\(\text{\textbar h5}\). Seen from this angle, the enormous effectiveness of move 19 becomes clear. A victory for the manoeuvring strategy transferred to the opening phase.
Game 82
Aron Nimzowitsch
Rudolf Spielmann
New York 1927


And now we are reaching the Dutch.

10...Be8

At this point in our game in Karlsbad 1923, H. Wolf played 10...d7. The game continued:

White went on to set up a strong attack with h3, Bh2, Bf2, Bg1 and g4 and won:

11.f4 Bc7 12.Bg4 Bx5


13.Bxe5


White could then choose to equalize with 15.e4 followed by 16.exd5 Bxd5 (forced) or 15.Bf1 followed by Bg3 and Bh5. Compare the results of this with move diagram 2 on the next page.

13...Bf6 14.Bf3 Bxe5 15.fxe5 Bc7

Now 15...Bxf5 would not work because of 16.Bg3 and then Bf3.

16.Bh5 h6

The freeing move 16...f5 does not yet work (16...f5? 17.exf6 Bxf6 18.Bxf6 Bxf6 19.Bg4†) but it should have been prepared by 16.Bxe8. For example, 16...Bexf5 17.Bh3 h6 18.Bf3 f5 and it would not be easy for White to conduct his attack.

17.Bf1 g6

White could have reached a clear superiority in the centre after 17...Bxg6 (instead of 17...g6), e.g. 18.Bg3 f5 19.Bxh6 Bxe5 (threatening ...Bxg3) 20.Bxe4 Bf6 21.Bf3. But after 17...Bxg6 the sacrificial continuation 18.Bf6 would appear less clear, e.g. 18...Bxf5! (the same queen sortie again!) 19.Bxh6 gxh6 etc.


White was threatening some unpleasantness after g2-g4 and Bf1-f3-h3. The text move costs a pawn; Black struggles on but in vain.
20.\textsuperscript{\textit{g}}h5 g\textit{x}h5 21.\textsuperscript{\textit{f}}f3 \textit{c}c7 22.\textsuperscript{\textit{h}}h6 \textit{f}6 23.\textsuperscript{\textit{h}}h4 \textit{e}e8 24.\textsuperscript{\textit{h}}xh6 \textit{x}h6 25.\textsuperscript{\textit{x}}xf6 \textit{f}e7 26.\textsuperscript{\textit{x}}f2

This clears the b3-square for his king. Of course the d3-pawn is going nowhere.
45.\textsuperscript{\textit{h}}d6 46.\textsuperscript{\textit{x}}xd3 \textit{g}g2 47.\textsuperscript{\textit{d}}d2 \textit{f}f3† 48.\textsuperscript{\textit{x}}c2 \textit{e}e6 49.\textit{e}e2† \textit{d}d6 50.\textsuperscript{\textit{b}}b3 \textit{e}e3 51.\textsuperscript{\textit{e}}e5 \textit{h}h4 52.g\textit{x}h4 \textit{h}h3 53.\textsuperscript{\textit{h}}h5 \textit{c}c6 54.\textsuperscript{\textit{h}}h6† \textit{b}b7 55.h5 1–0

Game 83
Aron Nimzowitsch
Akiba Rubinstein
S Meisinger 1926

1.\textsuperscript{\textit{d}}d3 \textit{d}5 2.d\textit{d}5 \textit{c}5 3.\textsuperscript{\textit{b}}b2 \textit{d}c6 4.e\textit{c}6 \textsuperscript{\textit{g}}f6 5.\textsuperscript{\textit{b}}b5 \textit{d}d7 6.0–0 \textit{e}e6 7.d\textit{d}3 \textit{f}f7 8.\textsuperscript{\textit{b}}bd2 0–0 9.\textsuperscript{\textit{c}}c6 \textit{xc}6

The same as in the previous game.
10.\textsuperscript{\textit{c}}c5 \textit{e}e8 11.\textit{f}f4 \textit{d}d7 12.\textsuperscript{\textit{x}}xd7

It is worth the trouble to spend some time on a continuation which was possible here, namely 12.\textsuperscript{\textit{w}}g4 \textit{x}xe5 13.\textit{f}xe5 \textsuperscript{\textit{w}}a5† (more aggressive than 13...\textit{d}d7 and then ...\textit{f}5) 14.\textsuperscript{\textit{f}}f2. (This diagram is the one mentioned in previous game)

26\textsuperscript{\textit{g}}g7 27.\textsuperscript{\textit{f}f}4 \textit{e}e7 28.\textsuperscript{\textit{e}e}2

This is it. He should have played 28.\textsuperscript{\textit{e}e}1. White’s intrinsic strength on the black squares is absolutely clear. (When playing on the black squares, he would be much more likely to think only of e5 or g5 as key squares.)

28.e5 29.\textsuperscript{\textit{e}e}5 \textit{e}e8

Because of the position of his king 30.\textsuperscript{\textit{x}}xh5 is now out of the question.

30.\textsuperscript{\textit{f}f}2 \textit{e}4 31.\textsuperscript{\textit{f}f}4

Slowly but surely, he gets back to those black squares.

31...\textsuperscript{\textit{e}e}5 32.\textsuperscript{\textit{d}d}2 b5 33.g3 \textsuperscript{\textit{b}b}3!

Turning the knight into a temporary prisoner.

34.d4 \textsuperscript{\textit{x}d}4 35.\textsuperscript{\textit{x}d}4 a5 36.e3 a4 37.\textsuperscript{\textit{e}e}3 \textit{a}3 39.\textsuperscript{\textit{d}d}1 \textit{f}f1 40.\textsuperscript{\textit{f}f}1 \textit{c}d3 41.\textsuperscript{\textit{d}d}2

The roles are now reversed and the bishop is the prisoner and the knight dances about, swinging his club.

41...\textsuperscript{\textit{e}e}5 42.\textsuperscript{\textit{c}c}4 \textit{f}7 43.\textit{d}d1

Now the threat is 43.\textsuperscript{\textit{d}d}3 which was not previously available because of ...\textsuperscript{\textit{f}f}3†.

43.\textsuperscript{\textit{e}e}7 44.\textsuperscript{\textit{d}d}3 \textit{e}e3 45.\textit{b}4

Planning the knight manoeuvre \textsuperscript{\textit{d}d}2–\textit{f}1–\textsuperscript{\textit{g}3}, etc. 14...\textsuperscript{\textit{w}b}4 (putting a spoke in the wheel again!) 15.e4 \textit{c}6 (best: centralization is the only way to succeed!) 16.a3 \textsuperscript{\textit{w}a}5 17.\textsuperscript{\textit{x}d}5 \textit{a}x\textsuperscript{\textit{x}d}5 (17...\textsuperscript{\textit{x}d}5 seems bad on account of 18.e6 \textit{f}6 19.\textsuperscript{\textit{d}d}3 threatening \textsuperscript{\textit{x}h}4 and \textsuperscript{\textit{f}f}5) 18.\textsuperscript{\textit{f}f}1 (18.\textit{a}4, with the aim of preventing ...\textit{b}5, would allow 18...\textsuperscript{\textit{w}b}4) 18...\textsuperscript{\textit{c}c}7! (not 18...\textit{b}5 on account of 19.\textit{a}4 and Black’s queenside is paralysed) 19.\textsuperscript{\textit{e}e}3\textit{b}5 (the characteristic counter-chance; ...\textit{c}5–\textit{c}4
must be made possible – even at the cost of a pawn sacrifice! 20...\(\text{gxf}5\) 21.e6 \(f6\) 22.\(f1\) and White gets in first, e.g. 22...\(\text{h}8\) 23.\(b3\) and then \(h3\).

This analysis seems to prove that White would have retained good prospects after 12.\(g4\).

12...\(x\)d7 13.e4 \(f6\) 14.\(f3\)

Now we appear to have more of an Indian formation.

14...\(b7\) 15.a4

There is no long-term preventive measure against ...c5-c4.

15...\(b6\)

Not the immediate 15...a6? because of 16.a5 when paralysis sets in.

16.\(ae1\)

Instead of 16.\(ae1\), the advance g4-h4-g5 would have been possible. Perhaps 16.\(a2\) then 17.\(fa1\) as prophylaxis against the threatened ...a7-a6 and ...b6-b5 would have been worth considering? How could Black then make further progress?

16...\(a6\) 17.\(f5\) dxe4

17...\(xf5\) would be bad on account of 18.\(a5\) \(\text{xd}5\)? 19.\(\text{xe}7\)!

18.\(wx\)e4 e5 19.\(e3\)

21.bxc4 bxc4 22.\(e3\) and White is threatening to follow up with 23.\(h3\), e.g. 23.h3 h6 24.\(g3\) etc. This redeployment would combine attack with the defence of the queenside should it be needed.

19...\(b5\) 20.\(g3\)

Now he threatens to win a piece by \(g4\) \(g6\) \(fxf6\) \(xg4\) 23.\(xf7\) and then \(xg4\).

20...\(h8\) 21.\(f3\)

\(g4\) (g6) and \(e4\) would still have been appropriate.

21...\(xa4\)

A mistake. He had to play 21...\(d6\).

22.\(xe5!\) \(e8\)

If 22...\(xe5\) then 23.\(wxe5\) \(f6\) 24.\(xf6\) \(gxf6\) 25.\(bxf6\) mate.

23.\(g4\) \(g8\) 24.\(xf7\) \(wxf7\) 25.\(xa4\)

White now has an extra pawn and the pleasant choice between a winning mating attack and a victorious endgame (the a5- and c5-pawns are serious endgame weaknesses. In short, the game is as good as won.

25...\(d5\) 26.\(g4\) \(d8\) 27.\(g6\) \(h6\) 28.\(e1\) \(d7\) 29.\(e6\)

It would have been simpler to play 29.\(e4\) with total domination of the board. The text move, which plans \(xf6\), should however win even more quickly.

29...\(c4\)!

In order to get at the apparently cramped opposing kingside. But the attack is not easy to conduct, especially when you consider White’s somewhat misplaced queen (the e4-square would be much better occupied by the knight). Instead of 19.\(e3\) we would suggest the following regrouping of the pieces: 19.\(\text{h}4\) b5 20.\(e4\) c4

30.\(bxc4\)?

White was so annoyed at allowing the breakthrough (when prophylaxis was so easy
to achieve with 29...e4!) and believed so much (based on how the game had gone) that the move ...c5-c4 would be effective that he could not find the courage to play the winning move he had planned. White was also in time trouble. The game was there for the taking with 30...xf6 xf6 31...xf6 gxf6 32...xh6+ wh7 33...xf6+ xg7 34...g6 cxb3 35.cxb3 xg8 36...h6 xf7 37...g5+ xg7 38...f4 and wins.

30...b8 31...c3 b1† 32...e1 a6†

It is quite curious that this plausible check gives away the drawing possibility that was there after the immediate 32...exe1† 33...xe1 wa4.

33...f1 exe1† 34...xe1!

The resourceful bishop is heading for squares such as f2 or b4.

34...a4

If 34...e8 then 35...b4 and ...e7 has been prevented.

35...h3! a8

After other rook moves the rook sacrifice on h6 is decisive, e.g. 35...e8 36...xh6+ gxh6 37...xh6+ g8 38...g6+ h8 39...xf6+ and then 40...xh6.

36...c3 d8

The final mistake. Black had a slight chance of a draw after 36...xc2 37...xh6+ gxh6 38...xh6+ g8 39...g6+ h8 40...xf6+ xxf6 41...xf6+ g8 42...xb6 because next comes 42...xd3+ and White still has some problems with the queen ending.

37...d2 xc2

We now have an endgame in which you might expect a banal discovered attack; but you will be most agreeably surprised.

38...xb6+ 39...e2 c2† 40...e3!!

The point. 40...d2† would not be so good on account of 40...g8 41...h7 f7 with the threat 42...e7†

40...b6†

Or 40...c1† 41...e4 e1† 42...e3 h4† 43...d5! gxh6 44...h3 and wins.

41...e4! c2† 42...e3!!

1–0

3. The centre and play on the flank

What is “better” (in the American sense of the word, i.e. of greater practical value for achieving success), the central attack or the diversion on the flank? This question is a very difficult one. It is in any case clear that flank attacks can only be undertaken when you have a sufficiently solid position in the centre, though what do we understand as a sufficiently sound central position? In the pawn position in which White has c4, d4, e3 and Black has c6, d5, e6, it has already been proved by the author (back in 1913) that the Tarrasch-style idea that the move c4-c5 can be refuted by the central thrust ...e6-e5 can hardly be sustained (as I showed in My System). The move ...e6-e5 (or ...f7-f5 in the position where White has pawns on d5, e4, and f2 and Black on d6, e5, f7 etc.) must rather be considered to be a normal reaction and can scarcely be seriously called a “refutation”. The prospects for both sides’ pawn chains (because the closing up brought about by c4-c5 or d4-d5 in both cases leads automatically to the formation of pawn chains) can be called approximately equal. This view (my view) has long since been accepted. I had done so as far back as 1907. See the start of my game in Karlsbad against Chigorin:

Aron Nimzowitsch – Mikhail Chigorin, Karlsbad 1907

1.d4 d5 2.Bf3 g4 3.e5 h5 4.e4 e6 5.c3

5...b3 is met with 5...e6.
5...c6 6.\h3 b6 7.\f4 \f6 8.c5 \xf3 9.axb3 \bd7 10.b4 \h5 11.\xd7 \xd7 12.\d2

White is not considering preventing ...e6-e5 at all.
12...\e7 13.b5 \f6 14.e3 e5

So what?
15.\e2 \e8

Now he even loses a pawn. The attack which was begun with ...e6-e5 should in any case be continued by 15...\e4 or 15...\xd4 instead of 15...\e8, but this would not of course have been able to shake White’s central position in any way.
16.bxc6† bxc6 17.dxe5!

17...\xc5 is out of the question on account of 18.\d4 winning the exchange after \b6†.
17...\c7 18.\a4 \h8 19.0-0 \f6 20.\xf6 \xf6 21.\c3 \c2 22.\f1 \b3 23.\xf6 \xf6 24.\c3 \b4 25.\d3 \h6 26.\e2 a5 27.\e5† \e8
28.\d4 \a4 29.b3 \b5 30.\a3 a4 31.\c1 \e6 32.bxa4 \bxa4 33.a4 \e4 34.\xa4 \e4 35.\d3 \d7 36.\f1 \b5 37.\xb5 \xb5 38.\e4 \b4 39.\d2 \a6 40.e6† \e6 41.\c2 \c5 42.\b3 \b6 43.g4 \c5† 44.\c2 \e4
45.\f3 \d6 46.\b3 \c4 47.\xb4 \xe3 48.\c3 \c4 49.\d3 \e5† 50.\c3 \xc6 51.\xc6 \xc6 52.\d4 \d6 53.f4 \e6 54.\c5 \f5 55.h3
fxg4 56.hxg4 d4 57.\xd4 \d6 58.\f5

in such a striking way that in following my rule:

*If you have a strong central position, attacks on the flank are justified, however vague their goals.*

I undertake a highly individual (critics would say “bizarre”) flank attack. In game 88, you will find another pioneering rule. It goes: “Keep you eye on the flanks and your mind on the centre – that is the essence of positional play.”

We recommend that a reader with an eye for modern chess should play through the following games with some care.

**Game 84**

Aron Nimzowitsch

Allan Nilsson

Copenhagen 1924

1.\f3 \f6 2.c4 \c6 3.e3 \d5 4.\e2 \e5 5.\c3 \e6 6.d4

By a roundabout way we have reached a very well known position.
6...\d6

6...\bd7 first would be better.
7.\b3 \b6

7...\c8 was preferable.
8.c5 \xb3 9.axb3 \c7 10.b4

Modern thought obviously tends to consider as defensible (solid) any sound central formation, however cramped it may be. In game 85 I do this

The coming counterattack (...e6-e5) is ignored with an easy conscience, because even if Black gets in ...e6-e5 he will have achieved nothing.
The further advance ...e5-e4 (...e5xd4 is certainly harmless) would just lead to a mummification of the position, which might be lifted by an advance of the f-pawn (...f7-f5-f4), but that would cost too much time. So ...e6-e5 turns out not to be dangerous and White can continue his flank attack without bothering about it.

10...\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)bd7 11.b5 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)e7 12.b4 a5!

An ingenious attempt to open the game. Otherwise White's game would be visibly superior.

13.bxa6 bxa6 14.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)h4!

Taking the pawn can hardly be recommended, e.g. 14.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)xa6 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)xa6 15.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)xa6 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)b8 16.b5 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)e4 17.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)d2 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)xc3 18.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)xc3 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)d3. On the other hand protecting the h-pawn by 14.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)a4 is not as good, as in some variations White must be in a position to meet ...a6-a5 by b4-b5. So the a-file must be left voluntarily in order to secure the b1-square.

14.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)hb8 15.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)xf5+ exf5 16.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)b1 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)e4 17.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)xe4 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)xe4

Now it looks as if ...e6-e5-e4 was played.

18.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)d2!

The point of the exchanges. The king will hurry to the right wing to give its best support to the rook which will penetrate via the f-file. The h-pawn will also lend its support (see the note to White's move 37), while the black pieces, for their part, are unable to organize any real cooperation. 30...\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)e7 31.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)e2 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)e6 32.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)f2 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)d7 33.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)a5!

A blockading move with a possible future threat (\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)xb5).

33...\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)c6 34.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)g3 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)b7 35.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)f1 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)c6 36.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)f5! \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)e7 37.h4

This threatens h4-h5-h6 and then \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)f6†.

37...\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)a7

Giving up the 8th rank, but 37...\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)d7 would have been followed by 38.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)e5.

38.h5 \(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)e6

After 38...h6 both 39.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)h4 followed by g2-g4-g5 and 39.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)b7 40.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)d8 would win. Black simply has too many weaknesses.

39.\(\textit{\textbf{B}}\)f8
8...a5, since his opponent’s central operations are not of any great importance.

9.exd5

9.f4 would have been a blunder on account of 9...dxe4 10.dxe4 b4 then ...c5‡. So the “threat” of ...b5-b4 has already worked.

9...exd5

Now Black has a really good position.

10.\(\text{\textit{de2}}\)

To prevent ...f5-f4.

10...\(\text{\textit{de7}}\) 11.\(\text{\textit{df4}}\)

The play against the black squares has turned out badly. The correct move was 11.c4 \(\textbf{\textit{db6}}\) with approximately level chances.

11...\(\text{\textit{db6}}!\)

This continues the flank attack started with 7...b5. It also prevents the possibility of c2-c4.

12.\(\text{\textit{dd1}}\) 13.\(\text{\textit{dxe4}}\) 14.\(\text{\textit{dxex4}}\) \(\text{\textit{df6}}\)

The play against White’s queenside at last begins to take shape: Black intends to force a loosening move (c2-c3).

15.\(\text{\textit{c3}}\)

Or 15.\(\text{\textit{d1b1}}\ \text{\textit{d7}}\) and then ...\(\text{\textit{ae8}}\), leaving Black well placed.

15...\(\text{\textit{xf4}}?\)

The exchange is a mistake and only serves to weaken the e5-square. Black should have played 15...\(\text{\textit{d7}}\) and then ...\(\text{\textit{ae8}}\). He could later consider ...a5 and ...\(\text{\textit{b4}}\).

16.\(\text{\textit{xf4}}\) \(\text{\textit{da4}}\) 17.\(\text{\textit{db1}}\)

The knight now threatens to settle on e5 (d3-d4, \(\text{\textit{e1-f3-e5}}\)).

17...\(\text{\textit{dc5}}\)
The earlier mistake has made such a difference in the situation that the very flank attack, which previously had to be taken seriously because of the solidity of Black's centre, is starting to look like a shattered body of troops lashing out helplessly.

Instead of the text move Black should have played 17...\textit{a}6, e.g. 18.\textit{f}3 \textit{a}e8 19.\textit{f}e1 (19.d4? b4 20.\textit{c}c1 \textit{d}3 and then ...\textit{xb}2) 19...\textit{xe}1\texttt{t} 20.\textit{xe}1 \textit{e}8 21.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}5 22.\textit{d}1 \textit{b}7.

19.\textit{f}4 \textit{a}6!?

Interesting but not correct! 19...\textit{d}7 had to be played, e.g. 20.\textit{f}3 \textit{f}6 21.\textit{e}5 \textit{g}4! 22.\textit{h}2 \textit{d}7 23.d4 (or else ...d5-d4 will be played) 23...a5! 24.\textit{be}1 \textit{e}8 25.\textit{d}3 a4! (securing the queenside against a possible b3 and c4) and Black seems to have fully consolidated.

20.\textit{f}3 \textit{b}4 21.\textit{b}d1 \textit{bxc}3 22.bxc3 \textit{a}4 23.\textit{d}4 \textit{w}a3

In the position reached the chances would be approximately even, although the weakness of the black squares e5, d6, c7, d4 should still count for something. For example: 23.\textit{c}7 \textit{d}8 (or 23...\textit{w}e7 24.\textit{w}a5 continuing to harry his opponent) 24.\textit{xd}8 \textit{xd}8 25.e4 (25.e5? \textit{d}7?) 25...g6 26.b4 \textit{a}4 27.\textit{c}c1 \textit{f}7 28.e3! and Black would have difficulties to face, because there are the twin threats of 29.c4 and 29.a5.

Despite this we tend to consider 17...\textit{a}6 as relatively the best defence.

18.\textit{w}c3?

He completely misunderstands the importance of the f4-c7 diagonal. 18.\textit{d}1 absolutely had to be played, e.g. 18...\textit{w}e6 19.\textit{w}d6.

18...\textit{w}d6

Very good. He could also have achieved equality after the line: 18...\textit{w}e6 19.f4 d4 20.cxd4 \textit{xd}4 21.\textit{xd}4 \textit{c}x\textit{f}3\texttt{t} 22.\textit{xf}3 \textit{b}7, although White might just be a fraction better. With the text move it was possible to completely solve the problem of the threatened black squares.

Black's attack does not look at all bad, but it does not have a sound basis: Black is not well enough centralized. And the moral of the story is: after the error which weakened the centre (15...\textit{xf}4) Black should no longer have based his game on a flank attack; he should instead have tried to consolidate (with the help of a strategic retreat, see previous note). The way he has played should let White gain the advantage.

24.\textit{e}5

The correct move was 24.\textit{d}2!, e.g. 24...\textit{xc}3 25.\textit{b}3 \textit{c}1\texttt{t} 26.\textit{h}2 \textit{b}5 27.\textit{b}4 with the threat of 28.a4 and then 29.\textit{b}1. This would have given White the advantage.

The ingenious text move is preparing a surprise attack aiming at achieving the Siegfried Line he had been longing for (based on e5).

24...\textit{xc}3 25.\textit{e}1 \textit{xb}1 26.\textit{xb}1

The tempting 26.\textit{xd}5\texttt{t} \textit{xd}5 27.\textit{xd}5\texttt{t} \textit{h}8 28.\textit{f}7\texttt{t} \textit{xf}7 29.\textit{xa}8\texttt{t} \textit{f}8 30.\textit{e}8 fails to 30...\textit{c}5\texttt{t} then 31.\textit{g}8.

26...\textit{h}8 27.\textit{h}5 \textit{d}6 28.\textit{f}2
A blockade (28...c1 then...c5) would be much better than the attack which starts with 28...f2.
28...e8!!

A deep combination.
29.h6 xh6 30.xh1 xf6 31.xa7 xe5 32.fxe5 xe5 33.xa6 d4

The immediate 33...f4 would be easier for White to defend against, namely by 34.gxf4 xf4 35.xf3 or 34...xf4 35.xg1.
34.xf1 f4

If now 35.gxf4 then Black has 35...xf4 36.xe1 xf8!!
35.xd4! xg8 36.xh4

Ingenious. After 36...fxg3 37.xf8 White wins.
36...g5 37.xf4 xal 38.xf2 fxg3 39.xg3 xe5 40.xh3 h5 41.xe4 g4 42.xh4 xh4

Since the black king can defend itself.
43.xa7 44.a7b6 45.xa7 0–1

Mate would follow after 46.xh3 47.xh3 48.xh2 xh3. This game won first prize for brilliancy.

Game 86
Aron Nimzowitsch
Gemsöe
Copenhagen 1928

1.e3 g6 2.c3 xf6 3.d4 g7 4.xc4

In order to provoke ...d7-d5, but ...d7-d6 which White apparently fears would have been quite bearable, e.g. 4.xd3! d6 5.xe2 with a similar set-up to the previous game.
4...d5 5.xe2 bd7

Worth considering was 5...c6.
6.xf3 0–0 7.0–0 xe8 8.b4!

The same stratagem as in game 85. He thinks he is prepared for ...e7-e5 as well as for ...xe4 (he would not contest e5) and so sets out to attack down the flank.
8...xe4 9.a4! f5 10.a5

This does deprive his opponent of the b6-square, but, as soon becomes apparent, it leaves a hole on b5. 10.c4 should have been preferred.
10...a6 11.b2 c6 12.xe1 xd6

If 12...e5 then 13.xd3 and 14.f4 followed by xxe5 and White consolidates.
13.c4! xxc4 14.xe4 dxc4 15.xc2 xg6

Not a good move. The correct move was 15...e5 to create space for the two bishops. Another playable move was 15...b5, e.g. 16.axb6 xxb6 17.xa3 xe6 18.xf3 xh8 19.xd2 b8 because the exchanges 20.xxc4 xxc4 21.xxc4 xxb4 22.xe5 would, after 22...exe5 23.dxe5 xc4, appear quite acceptable for Black.
16.xd2 xe6 17.xc4

I should prefer 17.xe5.
17...xc7

The attempt to gain control of the white squares by 17...xc4 18.xxc4 xxc4 should fail to 19.xe3 then xae1, f3 and e4. This seems to refute 15.xf6.
18.xd3 xad8 19.xf4 xd5 20.xe5
White's threat lies in the sequence \( bae1, f3 \) and e4; it is hard to find an answer to it.

20...\( \text{h}6 \) 21.\( \text{ae}1 \)

21.\( \text{fd}3 \) would be more prudent.

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

21...\( \text{xf}4 \) 22.\( \text{xf}4 \) e6 would have allowed some resistance.

22.\( \text{f}3 \)

22.\( \text{fd}3 \) first is better.

22...\( \text{g}7 \)

Once again 22...\( \text{xf}4 \) is better.

23.\( \text{fd}3 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 24.e4

Now White has the better game.

24...\( \text{c}8 \) 25.\( \text{c}5 \)

To revive the memory of the previous flank attack, but the obvious 25.\( \text{e}2 \) and 26.g4 would have been very strong. For example: 25.\( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{h}8 \)

26.g4 \( \text{g}7 \) 27.\( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 28.g5 \( \text{d}5 \) 29.f4 and White gets an attack on the king.

25.\( \text{h}8 \) 26.\( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 27.\( \text{xf}5 \)

\( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \)

The queen cannot escape the "perpetual check".

The following game illustrates our stratagem with a case which is particularly typical of modern tournament praxis. The central security which Black uses as the base for starting his flank attack is not immediately obvious; indeed the pseudo-classical school would dismiss it as fiction. And yet Black, with his hypermodern leanings, is able to turn it into the basis for a long-lasting flank attack. The game can now speak for itself:

**Game 87**

Paul F Johner

Aron Nimzowitsch

Berlin 1928

1.d4 \( \text{f}6 \) 2.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 3.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 4.g3 \( \text{b}7 \) 5.\( \text{g}2 \)

6.\( \text{b}4 \) 7.\( \text{x}d2 \) 8.\( \text{c}5 ! \)

Black considers the central position he gets after 8.dxc5 bxc5 to be totally defensible.

8.0-0
In our game in Berlin 1927, Bogoljubow chose the continuation 8.dxc5 bxc5 9.0–0  \( \text{wc7} \) 10.\( \text{wc2} \) 0–0 11.\( \text{ad1} \) h6! (in order to prevent a later regrouping by \( \text{db3-g5} \) and \( \text{dce4} \)) 12.a3 \( \text{dc6} \) 13.\( \text{ae1} \) \( \text{ab8} \) 14.\( \text{bb1} \) a5 but already he was obliged to take account of the weaknesses which were starting to become noticeable on his queenside by 15.b3.

15...\( \text{fd8} \) 16.\( \text{bb2} \) \( \text{de7} \) 17.e4 d6 18.\( \text{db1} \) \( \text{dc6} \)
19.\( \text{dc3} \) \( \text{ec7} \) 20.\( \text{db5} \) \( \text{a6} \) 21.\( \text{ed2} \) \( \text{ed7} \) 22.\( \text{ed2} \) \( \text{de5} \) 23.a4 \( \text{xf3} \) 24.\( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{ed7} \) 25.\( \text{ec3} \) \( \text{eb8} \) 26.\( \text{ed1} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 27.\( \text{axb5} \) \( \text{d4} \) 28.\( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 29.\( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{bb7} \) 30.\( \text{ea1} \) \( \text{ec7} \) 31.\( \text{fl1} \) \( \text{ec5} \) 32.\( \text{ec3} \) \( \text{f8} \) 33.\( \text{exa5} \) \( \text{a7} \) 34.b4 \( \text{xe3} \) 35.\( \text{fxe3} \) e5 36.\( \text{hh3} \) \( \text{he7} \) 37.b6 \( \text{ab7} \) 38.e5 \( \text{ee8} \) 39.\( \text{a6} \) 1–0

8...0–0 9.\( \text{bb3} \) \( \text{cc7} \) 10.\( \text{fd1} \) h6

He takes his time.

11.\( \text{we3} \) d6 12.dxc5 bxc5

Despite being backward, this pawn is as sound as a bell!

13.\( \text{de1} \) \( \text{xg2} \) 14.\( \text{xg2} \) \( \text{cc6} \) 15.\( \text{wc3} \)

Of course White does not want to leave the beautiful central diagonal to his opponent, but after the exchange of queens the black king can play its part in the defence.

15.\( \text{xf3} \) 16.\( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{ed8} \) 17.\( \text{ed3} \) \( \text{dc6} \) 18.\( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{de8} \)

This knight will soon be relieved by the king.

19.\( \text{ba3} \)

Apparently an attacking move, but only apparently. The threat was something along the lines of ...\( \text{db8} \) and if b3 then ...a5 etc. The text move is therefore a subtle preventive measure against this threat.

19...a6!

To get rid of any chance of \( \text{a6} \).

20.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{db8} \) 21.\( \text{ed2} \) \( \text{ab4} \) 22.\( \text{ec2} \) \( \text{fb8} \) 23.\( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f7} \) 24.\( \text{b4} \) \( \text{dc7} \) 25.\( \text{dd3} \) \( \text{bb7} \) 26.\( \text{dd2} \) a5 27.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{db4} \) 28.\( \text{xb4} \) \( \text{xb4} \)

It is difficult to find a focus for the attack, since White continually refuses to play the weakening b2–b3, but on the other hand with the passage of time weaknesses have arisen on the other wing.

29.\( \text{f2} \) a4 30.\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{d7} \) 31.\( \text{c1} \) \( \text{c6} \) 32.\( \text{e4} \) \( \text{f5} \) 33.\( \text{e2} \) e5 34.\( \text{ed3} \) \( \text{ab8} \) 35.\( \text{c1} \)

White has defended very skilfully.

35...\( \text{e6} \) 36.a3 \( \text{b3} \) 37.\( \text{ed2} \) \( \text{xd3} \) 38.\( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{cc7} \) 39.\( \text{ec2} \) \( \text{a8} \)

Threatening ...\( \text{db6} \) as well as a possible pawn push ...d6–d5.

40.\( \text{e4} \) \( \text{db6} \) 41.b3 \( \text{axb3} \) 42.\( \text{xb3} \) \( \text{bb8} \) 43.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{da4} \) 44.\( \text{ed3} \) \( \text{db6} \) 45.\( \text{ec3} \) \( \text{da4} \) 46.\( \text{ed3} \) \( \text{db6} \) 47.\( \text{ec3} \)

\( \frac{1}{2}–\frac{1}{2} \)

A draw was not at all what Black wanted, but he overlooked the threefold repetition of the position. On move 45 he should have played 45...g6 and then there would have been the threats of ...h5 and ...f4. After 46.\( \text{bb3!} \) \( \text{bb8} \) 47.\( \text{dd3} \) there could follow 47...\( \text{xe4} \) 48.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 49.\( \text{cd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 50.\( \text{c4} \) (not 50...\( \text{c2?} \) c4) 50...\( \text{bb6} \) 51.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{a4} \)†. But there probably would not have been much more than a draw.

For the whole game it was Black who had the
attack and the more compact pawn structure: our stratagem showed its worth.

Game 88
Carl Nilsson
Aron Nimzowitsch
Eskilstuna 1921, Simultaneously with 33 other games

Keep you eye on the flanks and your mind on the centre – that is the essence of positional play.

1.e4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.e5 c5 4.a3
In order to be able to play c3.
4...e6 5.dxc6 h5
Early preventive play against White's advance f4, g4, etc.
5...g6 6.f4 dxe5 7.fxe5 h6 8.Nf3 Qg4!
In order, in the future, to provoke the weakening move h2-h3.
9.Qg1 h4 10.h3 Qh6 11.Qe3 Qe7 12.Qd2 a6!
Acting as if, after White castles queenside, he will play b7-b5.

13.0-0-0! Bb8!
13...b5 would simply have led to mummification and to a mutual weakening of the c5-square after 14.Qa2 (not 14.Qxb5 on account of 14...0-0 and ...Bb8) 14...Bb8 15.b4. However, the hidden threat of the text move is immediately effective.

14.Qa2 Be4!

Keep you eye on the flanks and your mind on the centre – that is the essence of positional play!

15.Qe1 Qf5 16.Qb1 Qg3 17.Qg1 Qxf1!
18.Qxf1 Bg8
In order to open the g-file to exert pressure on the backward g2-pawn.
19.Qa1 d7
To link the major pieces.
20.Qg1 Qc8
The king is aiming for b7.
21.Qc1 b6
Now the threat is also ...Qc6-a5-c4; the white squares are obviously hard to defend.
22.b4 a5 23.c3 axb4 24.cxb4 Qa8 25.Qb2 Qb7

25...Qxa3 was also possible, but Black wants to see all his positional chances come to fruition (...g5-g6) before he strikes out. Now there is the strong threat of 26.Qxa3.

26.Qa2 g5 27.fxg5 fxg5 28.g4! hXg3 29.Qxg3 Qxe3 30.Qxe3 Wh4
Black has seized the g-file; d4 and h3 are weaknesses.
31.Qc3 Qa7 32.Qc1
32.a4 was better, but Black is in a superior position anyway.
32...Qf2† 33.Qb3 Qb5 34.Qc6† Qb8 35.Qxb5 Qxe3†
0-1

The logic behind the above game is made clear by the moves 12...a6, 13...Qb8 and 14.Qa2 Qe4. After 12...a6 and 13...Qb8 the queenside started to look threatening; White was forced into
countermeasures (14. \( \diamondsuit \)a2), the effect of which was decentralizing. By 14...\( \heartsuit \)e4 Black took advantage of White’s decentralization and the stone began to roll.

The great effect of a flank attack which did not threaten all that much must appear surprising. The explanation seems to lie in the fact that the balance had already been tilted in Black’s favour beforehand (i.e. before 12...a6); he was obviously strong on the white squares. The moves after 12...a6 simply allowed a latent possibility to become real. So this simultaneous game was logically conducted from A to Z.

We further refer you to the move ...g7-g5 in game 71 (p. 138) and the game Sämisc – Alekhine, Dresden 1926.

4. The small but solid centre

As we know, the possession of a small, though cramped, centre is justification for starting flank attacks, which are to a certain extent supported by the solidarity of this centre. In games 85 and 86 there was a noticeable distance between the centre and the flank attack; logically separate, both actions were independent. Things are quite different in the Paulsen formation which is so popular nowadays, as can frequently be seen, for example, in the games of Sämisc: there the flank attack is intended to free one’s own somewhat cramped centre. Thus it is a subsidiary operation. Also there is less of a distance between the centre and the flank attack. It is important to study the stratagem I have just pointed out.

The two main demands made on a good Paulsen player are:

a) Prophylaxis
b) The ability to manoeuvre within his own position

Both can be found in the openings of the following games.

I. Dr Milan Vidmar Sr. – Aron Nimzowitsch, Semmering 1926:

1.d4 \( \heartsuit \)f6 2.c4 e6 3.\( \diamondsuit \)B \( \heartsuit \)b4† 4.\( \heartsuit \)d2 \( \heartsuit \)e7 5.e3 \( \heartsuit \)xd2† 6.\( \heartsuit \)bx\( \heartsuit \)d2 d6 7.\( \heartsuit \)c2 c5 8.g3 b6 9.\( \heartsuit \)g2 \( \heartsuit \)b7 10.0-0 \( \diamondsuit \)c6!

Although there is no reason to fear 11.e4 in itself, since it could always be met by 11...\( \text{x} \)xd4 12.\( \text{x} \)xd4 with a Paulsen position, Black prefers to take preventive measures.

11.a3 0-0 12.\( \text{f} \)d1 \( \text{f} \)d8 13.\( \text{f} \)e1 \( \text{f} \)c8 14.\( \text{b} \)3 \( \text{c} \)xd4 15.\( \text{e} \)xd4 \( \diamondsuit \)b8!

Internal manoeuvring is starting.

16.\( \text{f} \)d2 \( \text{x} \)g2 17.\( \text{g} \)xg2 \( \text{w} \)b7† 18.\( \text{g} \)g1 \( \text{c} \)c7

18...d5 or 19.b5 would be bad on account of the reply 19.c5.

19.\( \text{c} \)d3 \( \text{b} \)d7 20.f4 g6 21.\( \text{c} \)c1 \( \text{f} \)c8 22.h3 h5

A preventive move aimed against g4.

23.\( \text{c} \)c3 d5!

And Black had somewhat the better game.

24.\( \text{x} \)xd5 \( \text{x} \)c3 25.\( \text{b} \)xc3 \( \text{w} \)xd5 26.c4 \( \text{w} \)d6

The hanging pawns on c4 and d4 do not inspire a great deal of confidence.
27.\textit{f3}  \textit{g7}  28.\textit{g2}  \textit{xa3}  29.\textit{e1}  \textit{wb2}  
30.\textit{b1}  \textit{c2}  31.\textit{e1}  \textit{f5}  32.\textit{e1}  \textit{d8}  33.\textit{e3}  
\textit{h4}  34.\textit{d5}  \textit{hxg3}  35.\textit{d4}  \textit{xf4}  36.\textit{h1}  \textit{d6}  
37.\textit{e4}  \textit{c7}  38.\textit{xf6}  \textit{xf6}  39.\textit{b5}  \textit{e7}  
40.\textit{d6}  \textit{f8}  41.\textit{xf6}  \textit{g8}  42.\textit{h4}  \textit{d7}  43.\textit{h4}  
\textit{g7}  44.\textit{hxg7}  \textit{c8}  45.\textit{d4}  \textit{a6}  46.\textit{c7}  \textit{f6}  
47.\textit{d1}  \textit{c5}  48.\textit{e8}  a5  49.\textit{g3}  \textit{xg3}  a4  50.\textit{g4}  
a3  51.\textit{a1}  \textit{d4}  52.\textit{f6}  \textit{xh6}  53.\textit{d1}  \textit{xc4}  
54.\textit{xd6}  b2  55.\textit{c6}  \textit{b5}  56.\textit{b1}  \textit{a4}  57.\textit{d7}  
b5  58.\textit{c5}  \textit{a3}  59.\textit{d3}  \textit{b3}  60.\textit{c5}  \textit{a3}  
61.\textit{d3}  \textit{b3}  62.\textit{f3}  
1-0

II. Akiba Rubinstein – Fritz Sämisch, Berlin 1926: 
1.d4  \textit{f6}  2.c4  e6  3.\textit{c3}  \textit{b4}  4.\textit{e2}  c5  5.\textit{dxc5}  
\textit{xc5}  6.\textit{f3}  \textit{c6}  7.\textit{g5}  \textit{b6}  8.e3  \textit{c7}  

If you intend to set up pawns on e6 and d6, you need a bishop on e7.

9.\textit{xd1}  a6  10.\textit{e2}  \textit{b7}  11.0-0  \textit{d6}  12.\textit{a2d}  0-0  
13.\textit{b1}  \textit{c8}  

The small centre with e6 and d6 also seems defensible against a possible 14.\textit{xf6}  \textit{gxf6}! 
15.\textit{e4}?  \textit{b4}. So 13...c8 is well-timed. 

14.\textit{f4}  \textit{e8}  15.\textit{b1}  \textit{a5}! 

The struggle is based on the attempt to encircle the small centre, i.e. the c4-pawn.

16.b3  b5!  17.\textit{e4}  \textit{exe4}  18.\textit{wxe4}  bxc4  19.bxc4  
\textit{c7}  20.\textit{b1}  \textit{b8}  21.\textit{ec2}  \textit{b7}  

The d6-pawn is overprotected: what justifies (because we shall soon see it is justified) this overprotection? The strength of the d-pawn, because

only strong points should be overprotected; see the chapter on overprotection.

22.e4  \textit{f6}  23.\textit{e3}  \textit{d5}  24.\textit{d4}  \textit{e7}  25.\textit{b3}  
\textit{f6}  26.f3  \textit{fc8}  27.g4  

This attack is unwarranted.

27...\textit{h6}  28.\textit{g2}  \textit{fd7}  

There has been a lot of manoeuvring via the f6-square.

29.\textit{d4}  \textit{b6}  

And Black achieved an advantage on the b-file.

30.\textit{h1}  \textit{cb8}  31.\textit{h4}  \textit{bb7}  32.\textit{g5}  \textit{hxg5}  33.\textit{hxg5} 
\textit{e5}  34.\textit{e1}  \textit{c6}  35.\textit{xc6}  \textit{xc6}  36.\textit{h1}  
\textit{c5}  37.\textit{d1}  \textit{g6}  38.\textit{c1}  \textit{b1}  39.\textit{h4}  \textit{exh1}  
40.\textit{hxh1}  \textit{b1}  41.\textit{g2}  \textit{b6}  42.\textit{g3}  \textit{b2}  
43.\textit{xc5}  \textit{dxc5}  44.\textit{xb2}  \textit{xb2}  45.\textit{f2}  \textit{d4}  
46.\textit{f1}  \textit{a1}  47.\textit{f2}  \textit{xa2}  48.\textit{g4}  \textit{d2}  
49.\textit{f8}  \textit{g7}  50.\textit{xa6}  \textit{g5}  51.\textit{a1}  \textit{b4}  
52.\textit{a1}  \textit{f6}  53.\textit{d1}  \textit{e3}  54.\textit{g2}  \textit{c2}  55.\textit{h1}  
\textit{c3}  56.\textit{f1}  \textit{h6}  57.\textit{f2}  \textit{b4}  58.\textit{f1}  \textit{f3}  
59.\textit{h3}  60.\textit{g2}  \textit{h4}  61.\textit{h1}  \textit{f5}  62.\textit{c5}  
\textit{g5}  63.\textit{g2}  \textit{f3}  64.\textit{c2}  \textit{f6}  65.\textit{g1}  \textit{d4}  
66.\textit{g2}  \textit{h4}  67.\textit{g1}  \textit{f4}  68.\textit{f2}  \textit{h6}  69.\textit{g2}  
\textit{e3}  70.\textit{c2}  \textit{g5}  71.\textit{h3}  \textit{h5}  72.\textit{g2}  
\textit{g6}  73.\textit{h3}  \textit{h7}  74.\textit{g2}  \textit{g8}  75.\textit{h3}  
\textit{h8}  76.\textit{g2}  \textit{g7}  77.\textit{h3}  \textit{h6}  78.\textit{g2}  
\textit{g5}  79.\textit{h3}  \textit{h5}  80.\textit{g2}  \textit{d4}  81.\textit{f1}  
\textit{g5}  82.\textit{g3}  \textit{e3}  83.\textit{h3}  \textit{f1}  84.\textit{g2}  
\textit{d2}  85.\textit{h3}  \textit{f2}  86.\textit{g8}  \textit{h6}  87.\textit{g2}  \textit{d4}  
88.\textit{w8d8}  \textit{g6}  89.\textit{d6}  \textit{h5}  90.\textit{h4xh6}  \textit{xb6}  
91.\textit{f4}  \textit{e4}  92.\textit{c2}  
½-½
After all this it is clear that the small centre belongs to the hypermodern repertoire. Followers of the pseudo-classical school, who required a great deal of space in which to carry out their not very original manoeuvres, would no doubt be suffocated in such a case. Or they would not be able to prevent the opponent’s breakthroughs for any length of time, because the “preventive measures” of that era would not have been sufficient.

During 20 years of teaching chess, we have realized that the study of such games (i.e. with a small centre) has brought about a healthy aversion for the “loose formation” which is unfortunately so popular in wider chess circles. We have from time to time experienced this effect, for example, after finishing simultaneous tours, which are not all that helpful for the development of the style of chess needed for tournaments. We shall now study two games with the small centre and a game with a “loose formation”.

Game 89
José Raul Capablanca
Aron Nimzowitsch
New York 1927

1.d4 ∆f6 2.∆f3 e6 3.∆g5 h6

Of doubtful value. The increase in possible resources appears smaller than the danger caused by this loosening of the position.

And above all you should beware of overloading the small centre! A large, active centre is much more able to cope with weaknesses on your own flanks; the small centre is too passive for that.

4.∆h4 b6 5.∆bd2 ∆b7 6.c3 ∆e7 7.∆d3 d6 8.c3 0–0 9.h3

This last move is in order to play h5 at a later point without being exposed to an exchange by ...∆h5. A much more natural move is 9.∆c2 then 0-0-0 and a kingside attack. An instructive game with this plan had the following opening: 1.e4 d5 2.∆f3 ∆f6 3.b3 ∆g4 4.∆b2 ∆bd7 5.h3? Now we have the present game with reversed colours. 5...∆h5 6.∆c2 e6 7.∆e5 ∆xe5 8.∆xe2 8.d6 9.∆xd7 ∆xd7 10.c4 c6 11.0–0 0–0–0 12.∆c3 ∆c7 13.d4 h5 14.c5 g5 15.b4 h4 16.b5 ∆d8! and Vidmar won with a direct kingside attack in Aron Nimzowitsch – Dr Milan Vidmar Sr., New York 1927.

9...c5 10.0–0 ∆c6 11.∆c2 h5! 12.∆xe7 ∆xe7 13.∆a6 ∆f6 14.∆fd1 ∆fd8 15.e4 ∆xa6!

This is because he has at his disposal a manoeuvre which will show that the white-squared weakness is an illusion. Instead, 15...e5 would be much weaker on account of 16.d5 with possibilities on both wings.

16.∆xa6 ∆c7! 17.∆ac1 ∆d7 18.b4 ∆ad8 19.∆c2

Going there of her own free will.

19...∆e7 20.∆c1 ∆g6 21.g3 ∆c8 22.bxc5 ∆xc5 23.∆b3 cxd4 24.cxd4 ∆b7

White has achieved nothing.

25.∆xc8+ ∆xc8 26.∆e1 ∆c7 27.∆xc7 ∆xc7 28.∆fd2 ∆c3 29.∆a6 ∆c7 30.∆e2 ∆c3
31. \textit{a}6 \textit{c}7
$\frac{1}{2}$-$\frac{1}{2}$

What was typical of the small centre was the slow manoeuvring of the major pieces within Black’s own lines (cf. Black's moves 16, 17, 18, 21 and 26).

Game 90
Egil Jacobsen
Aron Nimzowitsch
Copenhagen 1923

1.d4 \textit{f}6 2.\textit{f}3 b6 3.c4 \textit{b}7 4.\textit{c}3 e6 5.\textit{g}5
\textit{h}6

This move appears more appropriate here.
6.\textit{h}4 \textit{e}7 7.e3 d6 8.\textit{e}1 \textit{bd}7 9.\textit{g}3 0-0
10.\textit{d}3 a6

15.\textit{f}4 \textit{g}7!

If you compare this position with the one reached after White's 11\textsuperscript{th} move, you have the impression that the d7-knight has made its way to g7, whereas it is in fact the other knight: this was real internal manoeuvring, changing places and roles.

16.\textit{e}2 \textit{f}5 17.\textit{x}f5

Or 17.dxc5 bxc5 18.\textit{x}f5 exf5 then ...\textit{e}8 and ...	extit{f}8, with a queenside attack and Black would have a good game.

17...\textit{x}f5 18.d5 b5 19.b3 \textit{e}8 20.\textit{d}3 \textit{g}4

He is now trying to conquer squares on the e-file, whilst working in prophylactic fashion against the move e3-e4. (White is planning \textit{e}2 followed by e3-e4.)

21.\textit{e}2 \textit{h}4

The preventive measure pointed out in the previous note! Similar – but in our opinion less effective – would be 21...\textit{c}8, e.g. 22.\textit{e}2 \textit{f}6

23.e4 \textit{x}e4 24.\textit{x}xe4 \textit{f}5 25.\textit{xf}6\textsuperscript{+} etc.

22.e4

After this Black clearly has the better game. 22.\textit{x}h4 \textit{x}h4 23.h3 \textit{e}5 24.\textit{d}3 seems better.

22...\textit{x}g3 23.hxg3 \textit{x}xe4 24.\textit{x}xe4 \textit{c}8 25.\textit{f}3!

\textit{f}6

Not 25...\textit{e}3 on account of 26.\textit{c}3! and then possibly \textit{f}6\textsuperscript{+}.

26.\textit{xf}6\textsuperscript{+}

26.\textit{c}3 would be better.

26...\textit{x}f6 27.\textit{d}2 \textit{a}7 28.\textit{e}1 \textit{a}e7 29.\textit{xe}7

\textit{xe}7 30.\textit{f}2 \textit{b}xc4

Note how Black appears to feel right at home in his narrow quarters (he controls just three ranks), because for the moment he is obviously thinking neither of ...c5 nor ...e5. Instead he finds a remarkable internal manoeuvre which will bring some real attacking impetus to ...c5. In White's set-up it is hard to see the point of 8.\textit{c}1, because ...	extit{d}6-d5 (the rook move was surely intended to prevent this possible thrust?) did not figure in Black's plan.

11.0-0 \textit{h}5 12.\textit{b}1 g6 13.\textit{c}2 \textit{d}f6 14.\textit{d}2 c5

This move achieves – at least – a complete “Paulsenization” of the position (namely ...c5xd4 then ...\textit{ac}8). But Black has more in mind.
White has managed to secure the e-file to some extent, but the weak c-pawn which he now gets is more than his position can bear.

31.\textbf{bxc4} a5 32.\textbf{\textit{d3 f6}}

Manoeuvring: White's weaknesses are the c-pawn, the e-file and the f6-b2 diagonal.

33.\textbf{\textit{b2 xb2}} 34.\textbf{\textit{xxb2 f5}}

The exchange of queens has not improved White's position. The c4-pawn is not as easy to protect as it was before, though the f6-b2 diagonal seems to have been made safe.

35.\textbf{\textit{xc1 h5}}

Not 35...\textbf{b8 36.\textbf{\textit{d1}}} etc., because the white king should be kept at a distance for as long as possible. The pawn move is preparation for the future pawn storm.

36.\textbf{\textit{xc3 a4 37.\textbf{\textit{d1}}}}

If 37.\textbf{\textit{xxa4}} \textbf{a8} 38.\textbf{\textit{xb2}}! (38.\textbf{\textit{b6?}} \textbf{\textit{xa2}}} then...\textbf{\textit{a6 and the king creeps closer to the encircled knight}}) 38...\textbf{\textit{xa2}} 39.\textbf{\textit{xb3 g5}} with a superior endgame. If however 37.\textbf{\textit{\textit{a3}} then 37...\textbf{\textit{b8}} 38.\textbf{\textit{\textit{xa4?}} \textbf{\textit{a8}} and wins.}

37...\textbf{\textit{g5 38.\textbf{\textit{e3 d7 39.e2 f5 40.d2}}}}

After this the kingside becomes weak, but also 40.f4, which was better, would hardly have been enough. For example, 40...\textbf{\textit{gxf4}} 41.\textbf{\textit{gxf4 h4 or 40.gf7}} 41.\textbf{\textit{fxg5}} \textbf{\textit{g6}} and in both cases White has problems to face.

40...\textbf{\textit{f4}}! 41.\textbf{\textit{gxf4 gxf4}}

\textbf{42.d1?}

Of course the correct move was 42.\textbf{\textit{c2}} followed by a possible \textbf{\textit{e1}}, but even in this case Black would retain a strong endgame attack. For example, 42.\textbf{\textit{c2 f7}} 43.\textbf{\textit{e1 f6 44.c2 b8}} 45.\textbf{\textit{c3 b1}} 46.\textbf{\textit{e2 c1† 47.c2 f5}} with a general exchange of pieces and a won pawn ending, since the black king can penetrate to g3.

Now Black has an easy win.

42...\textbf{\textit{f7}} 43.\textbf{\textit{f2 g8 44.c2 xg2}} 45.\textbf{\textit{c1 f5}} 46.a3 \textbf{\textit{h4 47.xf1 f6 48.d1 h3 49.e2 h2 50.a1 d3† 51.xd3 exf2 52.e4 f5}} 53.\textbf{\textit{b1 e2† 54.d3 e3†}}

0–1

In this endgame it was worth noting the reflex weakness of the white kingside: in the sense that the weakness of White's queenside to some extent carried over to the kingside, meaning that the black f-, g- and h-pawns could feel and act like a qualitative majority. And they did so, not without success. The game itself is typical of the hypermodern aim of carrying out difficult manoeuvres even when the spatial balance is not in their favour. The sight of Black emerging from a terribly cramped position, slowly but surely gaining territory and finally obtaining a strong endgame attack makes this game both instructive and enjoyable. The small centre once more proved its worth.

\textbf{Game 91}

Eigil Hansen

Aron Nimzowitsch

Copenhagen 1928

1.c4 c5 2.f4

The impression created by this move is somewhat odd, but as we shall soon see it is not the move that it is odd but the impression! It really is rather pathetic to judge a move by its appearance, and yet that was unfortunately very common in the days of the pseudo-classical school.

2...\textbf{\textit{xf6}} 3.d3 d5

Or else White plays 4.e4 with a solid set-up.

4.\textbf{\textit{cxd5 xd5}} 5.e4

Compare the above with the following opening: 1.c4 c5 2.\textbf{\textit{d3 f6}} 3.\textbf{\textit{f3 d5}} 4.\textbf{\textit{cxd5 xd5}} 5.e4 (the brainchild of your author, the so-called Dresden Variation). Hansen's position resembles it in principle (the d3-pawn on an open file)
but when looked at in detail it represents an improvement, since the option of ...\textdaggerdbl}d5xc3 and then ...g6 now seems to have been avoided. Hansen deserves recognition!

5...\textdaggerdbl}f6 6..\textdaggerdbl}e3! e6 7.\textdaggerdbl}c3 \textdaggerdbl}c6 8.\textdaggerdbl}f3 \textdaggerdbl}d7

To make d3-d4 easier for White!

9.d4?

There looks to be a much more solid line in 9.h3 then \textdaggerdbl}f2, e.g. 9...\textdaggerdbl}h5? 10.\textdaggerdbl}\textdaggerdbl}f2 then 11.g4. The text move betrays White’s lack of awareness of what constitutes a solid formation – the idea of d3-d4(?) would never have occurred to a player like Sämisch.

9...\textdaggerdbl}xd4 10.\textdaggerdbl}xd4 \textdaggerdbl}b4

Now everything is loose in White’s formation.

11.\textdaggerdbl}xc6 \textdaggerdbl}xc6 12.\textdaggerdbl}xd8† \textdaggerdbl}xd8 13.e5

\textdaggerdbl}xc6 14.a3

An ingenious try: he starts to play for bishops of opposite colours.

13...\textdaggerdbl}xc3† 15.bxc3 \textdaggerdbl}xc3 16.\textdaggerdbl}c4

16.\textdaggerdbl}xa7 is impossible because of 16...\textdaggerdbl}d5 and the g-pawn cannot be protected: 17.g3? \textdaggerdbl}xf4 18.gxf4 \textdaggerdbl}xh1

16...\textdaggerdbl}c8

This is the strategy to follow when your opponent’s formation is loose! Let all that is hanging continue to do so and create more tension!

17.\textdaggerdbl}c1 \textdaggerdbl}xg2 18.\textdaggerdbl}g1 \textdaggerdbl}xc4 19.\textdaggerdbl}xg2 b5

20.\textdaggerdbl}c2

Or 20.\textdaggerdbl}xg7 \textdaggerdbl}e7 then ...\textdaggerdbl}hc8 with serious threats.

20...\textdaggerdbl}d5

A good solid knight!

21.\textdaggerdbl}xc4 \textdaggerdbl}xc4 22.\textdaggerdbl}xc4 \textdaggerdbl}d7 23.\textdaggerdbl}xa7 \textdaggerdbl}c8

The triumph of the solid formation! White has ingeniously won back everything which could be won back, all the \textit{material} he had lost. But now he is left with a footloose and fancy-fancy pawn on f4, a greyhound on a7 and two mangy sheep on a3 and h2, and on top of all that his king is on its throne... miles away. His fate will be terrible!

24.\textdaggerdbl}e4

After 24.\textdaggerdbl}xc8 \textdaggerdbl}xc8 the f4-pawn would have had it.

24...\textdaggerdbl}c1† 25.\textdaggerdbl}f2

25.\textdaggerdbl}d2 would be followed by 25...\textdaggerdbl}h1 26.\textdaggerdbl}e2 \textdaggerdbl}a1! (not the immediate 26...\textdaggerdbl}xf4 because of 27.\textdaggerdbl}f2 g5 28.\textdaggerdbl}c3) 27.\textdaggerdbl}c5 \textdaggerdbl}xf4.

25...\textdaggerdbl}c2† 26.\textdaggerdbl}g3

Or 26.\textdaggerdbl}g1 \textdaggerdbl}c3 27.a4 \textdaggerdbl}f3.

26...\textdaggerdbl}c3† 27.\textdaggerdbl}g4

An error in time trouble, but there was no saving move.

27...\textdaggerdbl}f5†

0–1

Because after 28.exf6 there is of course 28...\textdaggerdbl}xf6† winning the rook. There could be no clearer demonstration than the above game of the weakness of an extended centre which has advanced too impulsively.
5. The asymmetric treatment of symmetrical variations

Followers of the pseudo-classical school not only had a preference (which is incomprehensible today) for symmetrical variations, but they also managed to give this unpleasant situation an air of scientific respectability. They suggested that many positions or openings tended towards symmetry and that we would be acting illogically if we tried to avoid this god-given symmetry, and all such attempts were wrong and had to lead to defeat if met by correct counterplay.

Let us look at things in more depth with an example:

1.d4 d5

What could possibly be wrong with the asymmetrical 1...c6?

2.e4 e6 3.d3 c5?

Aiming for symmetry or a level position. It is typical of them that this loosening move is supposed to be the only correct reply. Of course the only correct response is the asymmetrical 3...c6 followed by ...bd7, etc.

4.e3?

Then considered the correct reply. Of course the only correct line is 4.cxd5 and then d3 and g3, in other words the Schlechter-Rubinstein Variation.

4...c6 5.d3 c6 6.d3 d6

In Tarrasch's day if anybody had come up with the idea of playing 6...e7 they would have turned their noses up. And yet this departure from symmetrical development is the logical continuation. The weakness of 6...d3 lay in the fact that the d4-pawn would then need protection. This circumstance is exploited by 6...e7 which allows the queen to continue without interruption the attack from d8 to d4; e.g. 6...e7! 7.0-0 0-0 8.e2 cxd4 9.exd4 dx4 10.c4 cxd4 11.cxd4 cxd4 and it is hard to evaluate how things will go.

So even at a cursory glance you get the impression that every chess game is full of problems, and yet symmetrical chess with all its worries and lack of ideas tries to sidestep them all! The impression becomes even stronger when you consider symmetrical openings. In the Exchange Variation of the French Defence, after 1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.exd5 exd5 4.d3 c6 the kings' knights can either be developed centrally or "in diversionary fashion", i.e. either d3 and ...c6, or e2 and ...e7.

It should also be pointed out that this "diversionary" development (e2 or ...e7) should go hand in hand with defensive measures in the centre (the breakthrough points e4 or e5 will be protected by f3 or ...f6. Otherwise this would make no strategic sense. (Diversions on the flank without sufficient security in the centre have been repeatedly shown to be absurd in this book.)

From what has been said, it can be deduced with compelling logic (though many chess players seem to want to shake off any compulsion about it) that the development "d3" must be answered by "...e7", and "d2" by "...c6".

The asymmetrical treatment recommended by Svenonius is logically far superior to the symmetrical approach. Just watch how clearly this contrast in attitudes to the struggle shows in the following game:

**Strande – Nimzowitsch**, Simultaneous at Aalesund 1925:

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.exd5 exd5 4.d3 d6 5.d3 c6 6...e7! 6.0-0 c5 7.a3

To weaken the effectiveness of ...g4.

7...f5 8.c3 0-0 9.e1 a6 d3
This introduces a knight manoeuvre which is intended to combine a clearing up of the position in the centre with increased aspirations on the flank.

10.\( \text{Nxd3} \) \( \text{Nbd4} \) 11.\( \text{Nxd2} \) c6 12.a3 \( \text{Na6} \) 13.\( \text{Ne2} \)

He rightly chooses his own chance (centralization), though perhaps 13.\( \text{Ng5} \) might technically be preferable.

13...\( \text{Qc7} \) 14.\( \text{Nae1} \) \( \text{Nde6} \) 15.\( \text{Nzd3} \)

15.\( \text{Ng5} \) would be harmless on account of the possible reply 15...\( \text{Qg}6 \), e.g. 16.\( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{fxe6} \) 17.\( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{c7} \).

15...\( \text{Qg6} \)

Black tries to stem the tide of his opponent’s central aspirations.

16.g3 \( \text{Nxe8} \) 17.\( \text{Nc1} \)

The central file is now clear for an attack! But Black has already made his preparations.

17.\( \text{Nbd7} \) 18.\( \text{Nd1} \)

Good or bad, 18.\( \text{Nxe5} \) should have been played; occupying the e5-outpost is the only possible way to continue the central initiative.

18.\( \text{Nxe7} \) 19.\( \text{Nc3} \) \( \text{Qef4} \)

Now the moment for a diversion appears with lethal force. Earlier 19.\( \text{Nxe5} \) would still have been correct. After 19...\( \text{Nxe5} \) 20.\( \text{dxe5} \) there would follow 20...\( \text{Nxe8} \) and the thrust 21.\( \text{f4} \) could then be tested with the promising pawn sacrifice 21...\( \text{Nc5} \) 22.\( \text{Nxd4} \) \( \text{Nde4} \) 23.\( \text{Nxa7} \) f6 24.\( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{gx6} \). We would then be confronted by the interesting case that lasting defence in the centre led to centralization, a favourable turn of events which the latent effect of Black’s intended diversion is also partially responsible. After the error 19.\( \text{Nc3} \) that possibility has disappeared.

20.\( \text{gx}f4 \) \( \text{Qxf4} \) 21.\( \text{Nh3} \)

0–1

In this game Black protected the e5-square indirectly, by admittedly allowing its occupation by \( \text{Ne5} \), but by being able to limit the effectiveness of this knight. As has been said, it was also possible to stop it getting there by direct methods (...f6).

Let us now move on to some sample games while repeating the remark that the addiction to symmetrical development deserves to be put down to a lack of ideas at a time when they are, in any case, sadly in short supply.

The next two games are dedicated to the combination of an attack on the flank and defence in the centre.

**Game 92**
J. Möller
Aron Nimzowitsch
Clock friendly, Copenhagen 1922

1.\( \text{e4} \) e6 2.d4 d5 3.\( \text{Nc3} \) \( \text{Nbd7} \) 4.exd5 exd5 5.\( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Nf6} \) 6.a3 \( \text{Qa5} \)

If 6...\( \text{Nxc3} \) 7.bxc3 \( \text{b6} \) 8.\( \text{Nbd2} \) \( \text{Qge7} \) 9.0–0 0–0 then 10.\( \text{Nf4} \) and as well as not doing badly in the centre, White would have the advantage (which should not be underestimated) that his is the better protected of the two bishops on d3 and f5.

7.\( \text{b5} \) \( \text{Qge7} \) 8.0–0 0–0 9.\( \text{Qa4} \) \( \text{b6} \) 10.\( \text{Nxb6} \) axb6 11.\( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{f5} \)

Black is not only better developed, but he has the more solid set-up; White’s knight manoeuvre simply took too much time.

12.\( \text{Qe1} \)

Operating in the centre, but for the reasons given in the previous note it can hardly be considered optimistically.

12...\( \text{Nbd7} \)

Why did Black not play the obvious 12...f6 which would nip in the bud the central manoeuvres initiated by his opponent? Because without \( \text{Nc5} \), in other words the occupation of the outpost on
the e-file, there would apparently be no way for White to make progress on the central file in question! The reply to this question is important for a correct judgement of positions typified by “Dxe5” and “...Dxe7”. The threat of Dxe5 is not at this moment real and would much more likely lead to a deterioration in White's own position, e.g. 13.Dxe5 Dxe5 14.dxe5, and White's kingside majority would not be very mobile. On the other hand, the move ...f7-f6 would simply give new impetus to White's e-file, because the e6-square would then be vulnerable.

And the moral of the story? If it seems possible to defer ...f7-f6, then the e6-square must first be strengthened; when that has been done, ...f7-f6 can be played with a clear conscience.

Now consider the extremely instructive variations which would follow 12...f7-f6. 13.Dh4 (an interesting attempt) 13...Dxd4! (another sound and appropriate continuation would be 13...Dxd3 14.Dxd3 Dd7 15.Dd2 g5 and then 16...Df5) 14.Dxf5 (or 14.Dxe7, see note A below) 14...Dxf5 15.Dg4 Dd6! (if 15...Dc8 then 16.Dh3 with the threat of g4) 16.Df4! f5 17.Dh3 Dd7 18.Dxe2 Dg6! 19.Dxd6 cxd6 20.g3 Dh5, and Black is somewhat better. Note how it took Black some effort to ward off White's attack.


And now something like 22...Dh8 and then ...Dc6 when his phalanx of pawns will be ready to advance. In this position too Black has a definite, if slight, advantage (a position for Capablanca).

We are now in a position to be able to sum up. 12...f6 should be good enough, but it leads in all cases to a temporary loosening of Black's otherwise solid position, and so the game move must be considered more appropriate to the needs of the position, especially since at this point “Dxe5” would not achieve anything.

13.De5

As was said, this achieves nothing here. 13.Df4 would seem much better.


Black's position would also be preferable after 14.Dxe5.

14...Dae8 15.De2 f6

Only now can this be played without worrying. 16.Dc3 c5 17.c3 c4 18.Dc2 g5!

His diversionary plans are correctly only carried out after securing the centre. The text move creates a base on h4 for the knight on e7 which would like to get into the attack.

19.b3 Dxc2 20.Dxc2 Df5 21.Dxe8 Dxe8

Now Black has also seized the e-file; White's central operations started with the badly timed Dxe5 can be considered to have failed completely.

22.Dd2 Dh4

Note the comment on move 18.

Black still has to consider the characteristic combination of flank attack and central defence. For example, he must never leave the d5-square unprotected.

26.\textit{b}5? \textit{e}4!

Instead of 26.\textit{b}5, 26.\textit{b}1 had to be played, though even then the game could not have been saved, e.g. 26.\textit{b}1 \textit{g}4 27.\textit{f}1 \textit{h}6! 28.\textit{h}3 \textit{e}4 and then \textit{f}6-\textit{f}5-\textit{f}4 etc.

27.\textit{f}1 \textit{x}e3

0–1

\textbf{Game 93}

\textbf{David Enoch}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

Berlin 1927

1.e4 \textit{e}6 2.d4 \textit{d}5 3.exd5 \textit{exd}5 4.\textit{f}3 \textit{d}6 5.\textit{d}3 \textit{c}6 6.c3 \textit{g}e7 7.0–0 \textit{g}4 8.\textit{e}1 \textit{d}7 9.\textit{g}5 \textit{f}6

Since the e6-square is strongly protected, ...\textit{f}7-\textit{f}6 can be played with no qualms.

10.\textit{h}4 \textit{b}5

A little innovation! If now 11.\textit{g}6† \textit{f}8 12.\textit{c}2? then 12...\textit{x}g6 13.\textit{x}g6 \textit{f}5 winning the queen.

11.\textit{bd}2 \textit{g}5 12.\textit{g}3 \textit{xe}3

Black has to accept the weakening of the c5-square which goes with this.

13.\textit{fx}g3! 0–0 0–0 14.\textit{b}4

20.\textit{d}xc5!! (a wonderful winning line; 20.\textit{e}7 \textit{c}4! would be bad) 20...\textit{xc}5† 21.\textit{h}1 \textit{x}f3 (he was defenceless against the double threat of \textit{a}6† and \textit{x}g4) 22.\textit{a}6† \textit{b}8 23.\textit{ab}1† \textit{a}8 24.\textit{b}7† \textit{b}8 25.\textit{xd}5† \textit{c}8 26.\textit{e}6† and then mate on the move.

For that reason Black had to avoid 15...\textit{h}4, after 14.\textit{b}3 \textit{d}6 15.\textit{c}5. Good and positionally justified was 15...\textit{de}8. The continuation might be 16.\textit{bb}3 (16.\textit{a}4? \textit{h}4 17.\textit{b}4 \textit{b}8 18.\textit{b}5 \textit{d}8
and White is in danger) 16...\(\text{Qd8}\) 17.\(\text{Be3}~\text{Qe6}\) 18.\(\text{Ae1}~\text{Rxe3}\) 19.\(\text{Rxe3}~\text{h4}\) 20.\(\text{Qd2}~\text{hxg3}\) 21.\(\text{hxg3}\) with an approximately level position. The latter variation is an example of how to carry out the combination of play on the flank and in the centre which we have recommended several times. In what follows White somewhat neglects the centre, allowing Black to ensure the safety of his centre with a minimum of his forces, meaning that any half-way usable troops can be flung into battle on the kingside.

14...\(\text{Edg8}\)

This is clarified by Black’s next move. Of course 14...\(\text{Ede8}\) would also be good and safe.

15.\(\text{We2}~\text{Bg7!}\)

This aims at providing any protection necessary for the e-file. The g7-rook is fulfilling the idea of combined play which has been mentioned often.

16.a4

The initiative in the centre 16.h3 \(\text{Af5}\) 17.\(\text{Afxf5}~\text{Qxf5}\) 18.\(\text{Wc6}\) would fail to the reply 18...\(\text{g4}\).

16.\(\text{Wd6}\) 17.a5 \(\text{h4}\) 18.\(\text{b5}~\text{Qd8}\) 19.\(\text{b6}~\text{Qb8}\) 20.\(\text{bxc7}\)

20.c4 seems somewhat better.

20.\(\text{Wxc7}~\text{21.c4}~\text{hxg3}~\text{22.hxg3}~\text{dxc4!}\)

On one hand this secures the central d5-square for the black knight and on the other it diverts White’s d2-knight away from the protection of the kingside.

23.\(\text{Qxc4}\)

If 23.\(\text{Qxc4}\) then 23...\(\text{Qf5}\) with a decisive attack.

23...\(\text{Wxg3}\) 24.\(\text{a6}~\text{Qd5}\) 25.\(\text{Qe4}\)

There is the interesting variation 25.axb7 \(\text{Qf4}\) 26.\(\text{Wxa2}~\text{a6!}\) (not 26...\(\text{Wxb7}\) on account of 27.\(\text{Wb1}\) with the threat of 28.\(\text{Wxa7}\)!) and Black wins.

25.\(\text{Qf4}\) 26.\(\text{Wb2}~\text{Qf3}\) 27.\(\text{Qxf3}~\text{Qxh7}\) 0–1

On move 14, White missed the chance to send his knight to c5; this led to the evaporation of both pressure on the centre and a kingside attack. Black, on the other hand, was able – by 15.\(\text{Qg7}\) – to combine defence in the centre with a flank attack. And not only did the attacking plans succeed fully, but also the g7-rook was a fully effective defensive piece: its protection went right through the centre to b7 and a7. A very instructive case of asymmetric play.

Game 94
Frank James Marshall
Aron Nimzowitsch
New York 1927

The protagonists developed their knights on e2 and e7 and at first the game seemed really monotonous.

1.\(\text{e4}\) 2.\(\text{e5}\) 3.\(\text{d4}\) 4.\(\text{exd4}\) 5.\(\text{Qxd4}\) 6.\(\text{Qxe5}\) 7.\(\text{Qxe5}\) 8.\(\text{Qg3}\) 9.\(\text{Qe2}\) 10.\(\text{Qf4}\) 11.\(\text{Wd2}\) 12.\(\text{Wd7}\)

But now the game sprang to life.

13.\(\text{c3}\) 14.\(\text{c8}\) 15.\(\text{c6}\) 16.c7!
heading for e4 the black set-up suddenly takes on the character of the variation in which an f6-knight faces one on e2.

This quite original retreat had moreover already been employed by your author against Spielmann (Copenhagen 1923): there what happened was ...e7-e8, ...c6-e7 and then ...g8-f6-e4.

15.\(\text{xf4}\) \(xf4\) 16.\(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{xd3}\) 17.\(\text{xd3}\) \(g6\) 18.\(\text{f3}\)

18.\(\text{d2}\) would have been met by 18...\(\text{d6}\), but Black also gets some play after the text move.

18...\(\text{f5}\) 19.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{exf6}\) 20.\(\text{exf6}\) \(\text{f4}\) 21.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{f5}\)

21...\(\text{h4}\) would also not be bad, e.g. 22.\(\text{h5}\) \(\text{g2}\) 23.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{f3}\) 24.\(\text{h1}\) \(\text{e2}\) 25.\(\text{xe2}\) and now perhaps 25...\(\text{e7}\) and ...\(\text{f5}\) with play on the white squares.

22.c4!

\[\text{Diagram}\]

A clever counter; he is looking to create a breach in his opponent’s defensive wall.

22...\(\text{b6}\)

Not 22...\(\text{e4}\) on account of 23.\(\text{xe4}\) dxe4 24.\(\text{c3}\).

23.\(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{xd5}\) 24.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{xc3}\) 25.\(\text{xc3}\) c6 26.\(\text{b4}\) \(\text{d8}\) 27.\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{f7}\) 28.\(\text{a3}\) b6 29.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{f6}\) 30.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{d5}\) 31.\(\text{e8}\) \(\text{h7}\) 32.\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{f5}\) 33.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{g4}\)

Black wanted more. The endgame after 33...\(\text{exe4}\) 34.\(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{g8}\) 35.\(\text{hxg3}\) \(\text{f7}\) 37.\(\text{a8}\) a6 38.\(\text{b8}\) \(\text{d7}\) 39.\(\text{e7}\) \(\text{e7}\) 40.\(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{d5}\) did not seem to offer him enough of an advantage.

34.\(\text{f3}\) \(\text{g5}\) 35.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{f6}\)

However 35...\(\text{d8}\) would be simpler, e.g. 36.\(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{xd4}\) 37.\(\text{f5}\) \(\text{d7}\) 38.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{d3}\) and the bishop cannot occupy the important c3-g7 diagonal.

36.\(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{xd4}\) 37.\(\text{c2}\) \(\text{d5}\)

Overlooking the reply; 37...\(\text{d8}\) should be played.

38.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{d8}\) 39.\(\text{c3}\)

White now has the advantage due to his free and active bishop.

39.\(\text{d3}\) 40.\(\text{e4}\) \(\text{d5}\) 41.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{d7}\) 42.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{h5}\) 43.\(\text{d6}\) \(\text{d1}\) 44.\(\text{a8}\) a6 45.\(\text{b8}\)

Intending to tempt forward the pawns (the threat is \(\text{xb7}\)) after which the exchange of queens would be followed by a won bishop and minor piece endgame. But Black finds a most mischievous counter. The correct move was 45.\(\text{e4}\) when Black would have tried to keep his head above water with 45...\(\text{f7}\) and then ...\(\text{d1-5-5}\). The defence would not have been easy.

45...\(\text{h1}\)!! 46.\(\text{xh1}\)

After thinking for 70 (!) minutes, Marshall decided on the above move. He would lose after 46.\(\text{e8}\). For example, 46...\(\text{f4}\) 47.\(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{h3}\) 48.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{f1}\) 49.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{xh3}\) 50.\(\text{d4}\) \(\text{d5}\) 51.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{f3}\) 52.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{d3}\) 53.\(\text{e1}\) \(\text{f1}\) mate. Also unfavourable was 46.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{xh4}\) 47.\(\text{gxh4}\) \(\text{h3}\) 48.\(\text{f2}\) \(\text{h2}\) 49.\(\text{e3}\) and then 49...\(\text{xh8}\).

So accepting the offer seems forced and this interesting game is drawn.

46...\(\text{h3}\) 47.\(\text{h2}\)
Of course not 47...g1? on account of 47...xg3† 48.g2 xb8 49.g5 f4 50.xh5† h6 and Black has the advantage.
47...f1† 48.g1 h3†
½–½

6. The bishop, with and without outposts

As you play through the next three games you will get the distinct impression that we are dealing with “neo-romantically inclined” bishops, which can “in no way be confused” with those of olden days. And yet the differences here are minimal.

In game 95 a bishop’s diagonal is treated according to the principles of play along a line. In the position with White: Ed1, c3, pawn on e4, and Black: pawns on c7 and d6 (we are here following the ideas of My System and the position is taken from that book), we must work out a clear point of attack for the play along the file, since penetration to the 7th rank can hardly be considered a realistic possibility because of the solid defensive formation (c7, d6). But there followed 1.c3-d5, after which the vague idea of working down the file was given more substance by the presence of an outpost knight (what came next was 1...c7-f6, to chase off the unpleasant intruder and then after 2.d5-c3 the play down the file had a clear target to attack, d6.

The procedure outlined here, namely “materialization” of an abstract concept such as a diagonal into a single point, is the point of game 95! Compare for example in game 61 the move we recommended 28.h2-f4 (p. 124). The f4-queen can be thought of as the outpost on the diagonal.

In game 96 the bishops are remarkable for their boldness in attack, and in game 97 in defence. All in all, the “minimal differences” mentioned above arise because the masters of the present generation are more able than their predecessors to put a higher value on concrete thought. Also courage and fantasy now appear in new and better clothes. See for example how the bishops in game 96 hover in midair and the courageous lack of selfishness shown by the b7-bishop in game 97. Now let us move to the games themselves.

Game 95
Aron Nimzowitsch
Dr Saviely Tartakower
Karlsbad 1923

1. d3 f5 2.b3 b6 3.b2 b7 4.g3 xf3
The exchange appears unfavourable because Black’s pawn structure soon turns out to be lacking in dynamism.
5.exf3 e6 6.f4 e6 7.b2 c6 8.0–0 c7 9.e2 0–0
White’s bishops may have strong posts, but for the moment they are not very effective.
10.a3!
This knight now puts itself in the service of the bishops: not only does it check out the ground for them but it also entices the black pawns forwards. But its most important function is not seen till move 13.
10...a5
The only way to develop the b8-knight; 10...b5 would fail to 11.xb5.
11.a4 a4 12.d4 b5 13.e5

If during the game I had considered that the e5-knight was an outpost on a file (= outpost on the e-file), then I would have had no reason to publish the game here; but in reality the knight seemed to me simply an outpost on a diagonal: a vague and as yet undefined pressure along the diagonal becomes real from the placing of the knight there and it also gains clear attacking targets. In other words the effect of the diagonal is “materialized”. 
13...\textit{d}5

13...\textit{a}6 would not be followed by some sort of sacrifice on \textit{c}6, but rather by quiet development by \textit{f}\textit{c}1 and then \textit{c}4.

14.c4 \textit{b}xc4 15.bxc4 \textit{b}4

This was played for the understandable reason that he wanted to get some use from the (very temporary) centralization of the knight on \textit{d}5; the slogan is: into enemy territory via the centre. But it turns out to be harmful to him. The passive 15...\textit{c}7 would however have run into a decisive breakthrough on \textit{d}5 (d4-d4-d5).

16.\textit{c}3 a3 17.d4 \textit{a}8a6 18.\textit{e}\textit{ab} 1\textit{b}8 19.c5!

![Chess Diagram]

Otherwise d4-d5 would be worth aiming for, but it is not so easy to exploit the unfortunate position of the knight.

19.\textit{f}6 20.\textit{b}3 \textit{xe}5 21.\textit{fx}e 5 \textit{a}5

There was no other way to protect the a-pawn.

22.\textit{f}1 23.\textit{d}d2 \textit{f}6\textit{b}8 24.\textit{f}1

24...\textit{c}7

There was no way left to save the game.

25.\textit{xb}4 \textit{xb}4 26.\textit{xb}4 \textit{a}5 27.\textit{xb}7 \textit{xd}2

28.\textit{b}8f7 29.\textit{ac}4 \textit{xd}4 30.\textit{b}3 \textit{xc}5

31.\textit{b}7 \textit{xe}5 32.\textit{xd}7f6 33.\textit{bd}1 \textit{c}5

34.\textit{d}6 \textit{d}3 35.\textit{xe}6f6 36.\textit{xe}6 \textit{g}5 36.\textit{e}3 \textit{b}4

37.\textit{c}1 f4 38.\textit{e}5f6 39.\textit{exe}5 \textit{fx}3

And mate on move 48.

40.\textit{hx}3 g6 41.\textit{c}1c4 \textit{e}1f4 42.\textit{g}2 \textit{g}5 43.\textit{c}6f7

44.\textit{c}7f6 45.\textit{d}4c6f5 46.\textit{f}7f5 47.\textit{f}3h5 48.\textit{xb}7

1-0

---

**Game 96**

**Dalség and Geelmuyden**

**Aron Nimzowitsch**

Oslo 1922

(One of three consultation games played at the same time)

1.e3 g6 2.d4 \textit{g}7 3.\textit{f}3 d6 4.\textit{e}2 \textit{d}7 5.0-0 e5 6.\textit{xe}5

![Chess Diagram]

This sudden transition to an open game comes as a surprise, since you might rather have expected a closed method of development with \textit{c}4, \textit{c}3 and \textit{h}3. After 6.\textit{c}4 Black would hardly have turned to Chigorin's method of ...\textit{f}7-\textit{f}5, which would only have unnecessarily weakened the option of ...\textit{e}5\textit{xd}4. He would far rather have played 6...\textit{g}6, e.g. 7.\textit{c}3 0-0 8.b3 and now perhaps 8...\textit{exe}4 9.\textit{exe}4 d5 10.c5 \textit{d}4 11.\textit{xd}5 \textit{d}x\textit{d}c5 etc.

6...\textit{exe}5

The \textit{g}7-bishop is starting to stir. After 6...\textit{exe}5 7.e4 \textit{g}6 8.\textit{c}4! 0-0 9.\textit{e}2 Black would have reached a Hanham with two extra tempi – thanks to White having already played \textit{e}2-\textit{e}4 and \textit{f}1-\textit{e}2-\textit{c}4, but it would be open to question whether the bishop fianchetto would be the best way to take advantage of the tempi. The \textit{a}3-\textit{f}8 diagonal might become a little weak, for example after 9...\textit{c}6

10.a4 \textit{c}7 11.\textit{b}3 \textit{b}6 12.\textit{a}3 \textit{e}8 13.\textit{bd}2

7.\textit{exe}5 \textit{exe}5 8.f4 \textit{g}7 9.\textit{e}4 \textit{d}7 10.\textit{c}3

The attempt 10.\textit{f}5 could, if accepting the sacrifice by 10...\textit{gf}5 11.\textit{xf}5 12.\textit{g}5 \textit{xb}2
13.\texttt{\textbackslash bx}f5 \texttt{\textbackslash bx}a1 was felt to be too dangerous, also be refuted in a quite quiet way: (10.f5) 10.gxf5 11.exf5 \texttt{\textbackslash bd}f6 12.\texttt{\textbackslash d}c3 d5 followed by \texttt{\textbackslash d}c6, \texttt{\textbackslash d}d7, \texttt{\textbackslash d}d7 (or \texttt{\textbackslash d}b6) and \texttt{\textbackslash d}0-0-0.

\texttt{\textbackslash b}f5 11.\texttt{\textbackslash d}d3

Black is obviously planning the exchange ...f6x4 and then ...d5. But this expansion would lead to a weakening of some central squares, e.g. e5. So 11.\texttt{\textbackslash d}d2 was preferable. The reconnaissancy by the knight could not be undertaken soon enough. A plausible variation might go like: (11.\texttt{\textbackslash d}d2) 11...0-0 12.\texttt{\textbackslash d}c4+ \texttt{\textbackslash d}h8 13.\texttt{\textbackslash b}b3 fxe4 14.\texttt{\textbackslash d}xe4 d5 15.\texttt{\textbackslash d}g5 h6 16.\texttt{\textbackslash d}f3 and White is in control of the centre.

11...f6x4 12.\texttt{\textbackslash d}xe4 d5 13.\texttt{\textbackslash c}e2 d4!

With this move and those which follow, Black is trying to thwart the attempt at consolidation by his opponents which was pointed out in the previous note. At this point the unimaginative 13...\texttt{\textbackslash d}f5 was decidedly weaker.

14.\texttt{\textbackslash x}d4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d4+ 15.\texttt{\textbackslash x}d4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d4+ 16.\texttt{\textbackslash b}h1 \texttt{\textbackslash d}g4!

There are several ideas behind this move. Firstly, the feared manoeuvre \texttt{\textbackslash d}b1-d2-f3 should be blunted by a possible ...\texttt{\textbackslash x}f3; secondly, 17.\texttt{\textbackslash e}1 could be met by 17...\texttt{\textbackslash d}d7, without allowing the possibility of 18.\texttt{\textbackslash d}1; and thirdly, after 17.h3 the bishop should hang in there stubbornly on g4.

17.\texttt{\textbackslash e}1

If 17.h3 then 17...h5 (17...\texttt{\textbackslash d}f5 would be much weaker, e.g. 17...\texttt{\textbackslash d}f5 18.\texttt{\textbackslash d}e4 c6 19.\texttt{\textbackslash d}d2! 0-0-0 20.\texttt{\textbackslash d}f3 and White would have some chances to consolidate) 18.\texttt{\textbackslash d}h2 \texttt{\textbackslash d}f5!. If now 19.\texttt{\textbackslash x}f5 then 19...\texttt{\textbackslash x}f5 and Black would have the advantage of the two bishops. But if 19.g3 -- to capture the bishop -- then 19...h4!, and Black wins, e.g. 20.\texttt{\textbackslash x}g4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}g4 21.\texttt{\textbackslash x}g4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}h2+ 22.\texttt{\textbackslash d}f3 \texttt{\textbackslash x}c2 23.\texttt{\textbackslash d}a3 (or 23.gxf5 g2 24.\texttt{\textbackslash d}e1+ \texttt{\textbackslash d}f7 25.\texttt{\textbackslash d}c3? \texttt{\textbackslash d}xe3 26.\texttt{\textbackslash x}e3 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e8) 23...\texttt{\textbackslash d}f2+ 24.\texttt{\textbackslash d}f2 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f2 25.\texttt{\textbackslash d}f2 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f2 and Black has an advantage in material.

Or (17.h3 h5 18.\texttt{\textbackslash d}h2 \texttt{\textbackslash d}f5 19.g3 h4!) 20.\texttt{\textbackslash x}f5 (to bring the bishop to safety) 20...\texttt{\textbackslash x}f7 21.\texttt{\textbackslash x}g4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}g4 22.\texttt{\textbackslash x}g4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}h2+ 23.\texttt{\textbackslash d}f3 g2 24.\texttt{\textbackslash d}d1 \texttt{\textbackslash x}h8! 25.gxf5 gxf5! and White is defenceless against the threat of 26...\texttt{\textbackslash d}h3+ 27.\texttt{\textbackslash d}e2 g1\texttt{\textbackslash w} mate. It should also be clear that if White plays (instead of 17.h3) 17.\texttt{\textbackslash d}d2 he gets a worse position after 17...0-0 18.\texttt{\textbackslash d}e1 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f3 19.\texttt{\textbackslash x}f3 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e8 20.\texttt{\textbackslash d}b1 \texttt{\textbackslash d}f5, with for example the line 21.\texttt{\textbackslash x}f5+ gxf5 22.\texttt{\textbackslash x}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash x}b2! 23.\texttt{\textbackslash x}b2 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d2 and wins.

17...\texttt{\textbackslash d}d7!

The king advances courageously. The fact that in doing so it is taking its support from the bishops which are more or less suspended in thin air involuntarily calls up the image of the most daring of acrobatic feats – the human pyramid!

18.\texttt{\textbackslash d}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e8 19.\texttt{\textbackslash c}e4! \texttt{\textbackslash d}d5

\texttt{\textbackslash d}2?\texttt{\textbackslash d}2?

Much stronger resistance could be put up by 20.\texttt{\textbackslash e}5+ (this opportunity to consolidate runs through the whole of the game like a red thread). Black nevertheless retains something of an advantage, e.g. (20.\texttt{\textbackslash e}5+ \texttt{\textbackslash d}c8 21.\texttt{\textbackslash d}b1 \texttt{\textbackslash d}f5! 22.\texttt{\textbackslash x}f5+ gxf5 23.\texttt{\textbackslash d}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e5 24.\texttt{\textbackslash x}e5 \texttt{\textbackslash d}d7 and ...\texttt{\textbackslash d}e6 with a superior endgame in any case.
20...\textit{c}e2

Wins a pawn. The game should now go smoothly in Black’s favour.

21.\textit{b}3 \textit{xc}4 22.\textit{xc}x4 \textit{b}6 23.\textit{xb}3 \textit{xb}2

24.\textit{Ed}1 \textit{exe}1†?

A mistake which lets the opposing bishops have their say. After 24...\textit{c}c8 White would have had no compensation for the lost pawn.

25.\textit{exe}1† \textit{c}c8 26.\textit{e}e6† \textit{b}8 27.\textit{h}4

Black’s position now appears critical: it will be difficult to find a counter to the threatened exchange of rooks (\textit{Ed}8†) followed by the pawn hunt (\textit{Ag}8 etc.).

27...\textit{c}c8

27...\textit{c}c5 would also have sufficed for a draw, e.g. 28.\textit{Ed}8† \textit{Exd}8 29.\textit{Ax}d8 \textit{c}4 30.\textit{Ax}b6 \textit{axb}6 31.\textit{xc}4 and now for example 31...\textit{Ac}1 32.g3 g5 33.f5 \textit{c}c7 34.\textit{g}g2 \textit{dd}6 35.\textit{f}f3 \textit{e}e5 36.\textit{g}g4 \textit{ff}6 37.\textit{hh}5 \textit{gg}7, or 35.\textit{f}f6 (instead of 35.\textit{f}f3)

35...\textit{e}e5 36.f7 \textit{Aa}3 37.\textit{f}f3 \textit{h}5.

28.\textit{Ed}8 \textit{Exd}8 29.\textit{Ax}d8 \textit{Aa}3!

On the other hand, 30.\textit{Af}6! clearly seems to equalize, e.g. 30...\textit{ce}7 31.g4 then \textit{Ag}2 with the threat of \textit{Ax}e7, g5 and \textit{Ag}8. Or 30...\textit{ce}7 31.\textit{Ag}7 \textit{dd}6 32.f5 \textit{gx}f5 33.\textit{Ax}f5 \textit{h}5 34.\textit{h}4 etc. The premature exchange of rooks (24...\textit{exe}1†) seems to have given away Black’s winning chances.

30...\textit{ce}7

The winning move. Next came:

31.\textit{Ax}c8 \textit{Ax}d8 32.\textit{Aa}6 g5 33.f5 b5

White now has no hope despite the bishops of opposite colours.

34.\textit{Ag}2 c5 35.\textit{Af}3 \textit{Ag}7 36.\textit{Ac}4 \textit{Ad}6 37.\textit{Ab}3 c4 38.\textit{Ac}2 \textit{Af}6 39.\textit{Ad}1 a5 40.\textit{Ac}2 a4 41.\textit{Ad}1 a3

0–1

Game 97

Goesta Stoltz

Aron Nimzowitsch

Berlin 1928

1.e4 c5 2.\textit{Ac}3 \textit{Ac}6 3.g3 g6 4.\textit{Ag}2 \textit{Ag}7 5.\textit{Ag}e2 \textit{e}6

In order to support by the second knight on \textit{c}6 the diagonal outpost which will be established on \textit{d}4.

6.d3 \textit{Ag}e7 7.\textit{Aa}3 \textit{Ad}4 8.\textit{wd}2 \textit{Ac}6

Compare the previous note.

9.\textit{Ad}1

In our game in Niendorf, Kostic chose 9.0–0 and we continued: 9...d6 10.\textit{Dd}1 \textit{Daa}5 11.\textit{Xd}4 \textit{Xd}2 12.\textit{Xd}2 \textit{xd}d4 13.c3 (the immediate 13.c4 seems clearer) 13...\textit{Ad}7 14.f4 dx\textit{c}3 15.bxc\textit{c}3 \textit{Ac}8

Black had been relying on this counter.

30.\textit{Ag}4?

This loses. But in any case 30.\textit{Ag}8 would be dubious, on account of 30...\textit{Ag}7 (30...\textit{h}5? 31.\textit{Af}6! \textit{Ag}7 32.\textit{Ae}5 \textit{h}4 33.\textit{Ah}7! g5 34.f5 \textit{Ad}6 35.f6 \textit{Af}8 36.g3! hx\textit{g}3 37.hx\textit{g}3 \textit{c}5 38.\textit{Ag}2 \textit{b}5 39.\textit{Af}3 threatening \textit{Ag}4). After 30...\textit{Ag}7 31.\textit{Ax}e7 \textit{Xxe}7 32.\textit{Xh}7 \textit{Ae}8 33.\textit{g}4 \textit{Xg}7 34.h4 \textit{b}5 (\textit{not} 34...\textit{Ac}6 on account of 35.\textit{Axg}6) 35.h5 \textit{gxh}5 36.\textit{gxh}5 \textit{Ae}6 37.h6 \textit{Af}6 38.\textit{Ag}2 c5 39.\textit{Af}3 a5 40.\textit{Ac}4 a4 White would not be out of danger.
With some play on the diagonal. 16.\(\text{f}1\) b6 17.\(\text{d}3\) a5 18.\(\text{f}1\) c7 19.\(\text{d}1\) f5 20.exf5 gxf5 21.d4 \(\text{c}6\) 22.\(\text{d}3\) e4 23.\(\text{x}e4\) fxe4 24.f5 \(\text{d}7\) 25.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{h}6\) 26.\(\text{x}e6\) \(\text{x}e6\) 27.d5 \(\text{f}7\) 28.\(\text{f}7\) \(\text{c}8\) 29.\(\text{b}1\) \(\text{d}8\) 30.\(\text{h}7\) \(\text{c}7\) 31.\(\text{f}6\) \(\text{c}3\) 32.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{c}4\) 33.\(\text{x}d4\) \(\text{e}5\) 34.\(\text{d}6\) \(\text{f}3\) 35.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{x}d4\) 36.\(\text{x}d4\) b5 37.\(\text{x}e3\) a5 38.\(\text{x}e4\) \(\text{d}7\) 39.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{f}7\) 40.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{f}3\) 41.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}3\) 42.\(\text{x}e3\) h5 43.\(\text{x}h3\) \(\text{d}7\) 44.a3 \(\text{x}e7\) 45.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}6\) 46.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{g}5\) 47.\(\text{e}3\) \(\text{i}5\) 48.\(\text{d}3\) \(\text{h}4\) 49.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{f}4\) 50.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{e}4\) 51.a4 \(\text{b}4\) 52.\(\text{c}4\) a3 53.\(\text{b}3\) a2 54.\(\text{a}2\) 55.\(\text{a}3\) \(\text{x}d4\) 56.\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{c}4\) 57.\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{d}5\) 58.\(\text{a}5\) \(\text{e}5\) 59.\(\text{b}5\) \(\text{i}5\) 60.\(\text{c}6\) \(\text{x}g3\) 61.\(\text{x}d6\) \(\text{f}4\) 62.\(\text{d}5\) \(\text{g}3\) 63.\(\text{i}4\) \(\text{xh}3\) 64.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{f}2\) 1/2–1/2

B. Kostic – A. Nimzowitsch, Bad Nienendorf 1927.

9...\(\text{dxe2}\)

Nor should there be anything wrong with the direct 9...d5, e.g. 10.\(\text{d}4\) cxd4 with overt pressure on the c-file and latent pressure on the g7-b2 diagonal. After c2-c3, a move which cannot be avoided in the long run, this would come into its own.

10.\(\text{xe2}\) \(\text{a}5\) 11.\(\text{d}2\)

11.c3 would be followed by 11...\(\text{d}4\) 12.\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{b}3\).

11...\(\text{xd2}\) 12.\(\text{xd2}\) d6

Pressure down a diagonal which is not yet clearly defined must be treated with great care, or else it melts away. The move 12...b6! would have created possibilities, e.g. 13.c3 \(\text{b}7\) 14.\(\text{f}4\) d5 15.exd5 \(\text{e}7\) 16.\(\text{f}2\) and now perhaps 16...\(\text{f}5\). It was important to retain the possibility of \(\text{c}xd5\). After the text move, which unnecessarily reduces the number of options, it should no longer be possible to prove a win.

13.\(\text{f}4\) b6 14.e5 \(\text{b}7\) 15.\(\text{exd6}\) 0–0–0 16.c3 \(\text{xd6}\) 17.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{b}8\)

Black’s position may now be solid, but it does not offer much of a choice of possible attacking formations.

18.\(\text{ad1}\)

A drawn position, because d3 is impregnable. Steinitz had only managed to draw several such endgames despite dogged perseverance. For example: 18...\(\text{e}7\) 19.\(\text{xb7}\) \(\text{xb7}\) 20.\(\text{c}2\) \(\text{f}5\)

21.\(\text{xe1}\) h5 22.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{d}7\) 23.\(\text{c}1\). Or (18.\(\text{e}7\) 19.\(\text{xb7}\) \(\text{xb7}\) 20.\(\text{c}2\) 20...\(\text{d}5\) 21.\(\text{xe1}\) \(\text{f}5\) 22.\(\text{c}1\). Black can bring his king to f7 to secure e6, but White places his rooks on the e-file and can face up to the coming attack by his opponent (...b6-b5-b4) with confidence.

18...e5

An “energetic” attempt, but one easily parried by my youthful opponent.

19.\(\text{h}1\) \(\text{f}5\) 20.\(\text{xc6}\) \(\text{xc6}\)

If 20...\(\text{xc6}\) then 21.\(\text{xe5}\) a5 22.\(\text{xc5}\).

21.\(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 22.\(\text{g5}\) \(\text{f}6\) 23.\(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 24.\(\text{c}7\)

Now White has obtained an initiative which should not be underestimated.

24...\(\text{d}7\) 25.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{d}5\)!

Black is not afraid to have his proud bishop assume a crouching (frog) position on f7. This type of courage which was rather foreign to pseudo-classical chess appears to be typical of the neo-romantic style.

26.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{b}6\) 27.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{f}7\) 28.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{d}8\) 29.\(\text{xd7}\)

The retreat 29.\(\text{xe5}\) would lead to liquidation after 29...g5 30.hxg5 hxg5 31.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{f}4\) 32.\(\text{xe5}\) (or 32.g4 \(\text{g}6\) 33.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{xd3}\) and ...c4) 32...\(\text{f}6\) 33.\(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{xb2}\). But after the text move White is at a disadvantage.

29...\(\text{xd7}\) 30.a3 \(\text{g}5\) 31.\(\text{hxg5}\) hxg5 32.\(\text{h}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 33.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{e}6\)

The bishop now builds a “bridge” for the planned manoeuvre \(\text{d}7\)-e7-f6.

34.\(\text{e}1\)
34.d4 could make the bridge unfit for purpose, but next would have come 34...cxd4 35.cxd4 f4 36.exg5 fxg5 37.fxg5 fxg5 and White would be forced to deal with the "distant passed pawn".
34...dxe7 35.b4 d6 36.e3 e8 37.e2 d5
The bishop now comes out of its shell.
38.c4 f7

46...cxd4 47.ed3 e5 48.db5 xb5 49.cxb5 db2!
This is the introduction to an interesting breakthrough.
50.a4 g4 51.ad2
Only 51.a5! xb5 52.a3 would have left him some chances of a draw.
51...xb2 52.axb2 f4! 53.gxf4+

The simple 38...b7 would be preferable. After 39.g1 h8 40.f2 then 40...f4 would not be bad. For example 41.gxf4 gx4 42.e2 g8+ 43.f1 g2+ 44.e1 f3 45.c2 g1+ with the advantage. Or 42.e1 (instead of 42.e2) 42...g8+ 43.f1 g2+ 44.e2 e8+ 45.d2 xe1 46.xe1 e5 47.d2 d4 48.bxc5 bxc5 49.e2 f3+ 50.d2 f1 and wins. Other defensive set-ups would be even less favourable, e.g. (38...b7) 39.g1 h8 40.f3 xf3 41.xf3 h2 and wins (42.e2 xe2 43.xe2 e5 etc.).
39.g1 h8 40.f3 h1 41.e5!
Better than 41.e1 xe1 etc.
41...e6 42.c6
Now White should not lose.
42...h2+ 43.e1 a2 44.bxc5 bxc5 45.xa7 d7
A last try.
46.d4
46.db5 was a draw, e.g. 46...xb5 47.cxb5 xa3 48.e8 (the simplest) 48...xd3 (if 48...b3 then 49.b6 b3 50.b8! e5 51.b7 d6 52.d8+ c7 53.c6+ xxb7 54.xc5 f3 55.g4 etc.

53...d6!
White is lost. There were a few remaining twitches:
54.a5 g3 55.a6 c7 56.e2 d3+ 57.xd3 g2 58.xe4 g1= 59.e5 h6 60.g5 d7 61.e7

7. A weak complex of squares of a specific colour

Typical of today's master games is the following: one side suffers from some weaknesses, which are generally all on the same colour of squares. The process of centralization (game 23, p. 45) and that of restraint take place with astonishing regularity on squares of a specific colour. Things are not much different when we look at manoeuvring (chapter 5, p. 137), where the obligatory two weaknesses are either both on white squares or both on black squares, but hardly ever mixed (cf. Game 71, p. 138). Suppose we look at the following exception: the defender of a file dominated by his opponent (say the e-file) must keep his eye on two entry
squares, say e6 and e7 (cf. game 93, p. 179); this would be a complex of weak squares of mixed colours.

How should the defence now be conducted? (We already gave some rules in chapter 5 for the attacking side.) There were three possibilities:

1. You can try to start counterplay on the opposite colour. Such a strategy (see game 98) would only suit the pure attacking player and positional player would not feel at ease with it. Such positions, in which one player has dug in on the white squares and the other is occupying the black ones, are often hard to liquidate and the most important time for liquidation (that of general exchanges) rarely comes into consideration because of the way things lie (cf. note to move 9 in game 98).

2. You can play to win back territory lost on squares of one of the colours: a sound strategy, which we should like to illustrate with one example at this point:

**Geza Maroczy – Aron Nimzowitsch** (Karlsbad 1923). See the position after Black's 22nd move:

1.e4 \( \square c6 \) 2.d4 \( \square c3 \) e6 3.d4 \( \square b4 \) 4.e3 \( \square ge7 \) 5.g4 0-0 6.\( \square h4 \) f5 7.\( \square f3 \) d5 8.e5 \( \square a5 \) 9.a3 \( \square xc3 \) 10.bxc3 \( \square e8 \) 11.\( \square b3 \) \( \square c4 \) 12.\( \square g5 \) \( \square g6 \) 13.\( \square f2 \) \( \square c6 \) 14.\( \square xc4 \) \( \square xc4 \) 15.\( \square d2 \) b6 16.\( \square f4 \) \( \square xf4 \) 17.\( \square xf4 \) c5 18.\( \square c3 \) \( \square xd4 \) 19.\( \square xd4 \) f4 20.\( \square f2 \) \( \square a6 \) 21.a4 \( \square f5 \) 22.a6 \( \square ab1 \) \( \square af8 \)

25.\( \square x e1 \) 26.\( \square xe1 \) \( \square e8 \) 27.\( \square e5 \)

He has apparently achieved his aim.

27.\( \square x c7 \) 28.\( \square d4 \)

A better try would be 28.\( \square b6 \) to prevent 28...\( \square c7 \). But after 28...b4 29.\( \square x b4 \) \( \square x b4 \) 30.\( \square g1 \) there would come 30...h6 and ...\( \square h7 \), when Black would not be badly off.

28.\( \square c7 \) 29.\( \square e1 \) \( \square xe5 \) 30.\( \square xe5 \) \( \square f7 \) 31.g3 \( \square x g3 \) 1\( \square x g3 \) 32.\( \square x g3 \) \( \square f8 \) 33.\( \square b1 \) \( \square c8 \)

The possession of the central e5-square is hardly of overwhelming importance here.

34.\( \square b4 \) g5 35.\( \square c3 \) \( \square f7 \) 36.g4 \( \square g6 \) 37.\( \square b1 \) h5 1\( \frac{1}{2} \)-1\( \frac{1}{2} \)

3. Preventing the opponent from becoming too dominant on squares of one specific colour can also be managed in a prophylactic manner, cf. the 12\( \text{th} \) move for White which we recommend in game 99 (\( \square b5 \)). It should be clear that we tend to prefer the last of the three methods.

**Game 98**

Aron Nimzowitsch  
Jacques Mieses  
Hanover 1926

1.c4 e5 2.\( \square c3 \) \( \square f6 \) 3.\( \square f3 \) \( \square c6 \) 4.e4

My special Dresden Variation, see games 31 (p. 66) and 52 (p. 104).

4...\( \square b4 \) 5.d3 d6 6.g3 \( \square c5 \) 7.\( \square g2 \)

The preventive move 7.h3 was also worth considering.
7...Qg4 8.0-0 f5

And we reach a position which is hard to evaluate: Black appears strong on the black squares (e.g. f2 and d4) but White seems to be in a position to initiate some counterplay based on the light-coloured squares.

9.0d5

Instead of the text move, two variations were worth considering:

I. 9.exf5 Qxf5 10.Qg5 Wd7 11.Qd5 Qf8 12.Qe4 Qb6 and Black would be better.

II. 9.Qg5 Qf6 10.Qxf5 Qxf5 11.Qh4 Qe6 12.Qe4 0-0 13.Qh1; and if next 13...Wd7 then 14.Qxf6 gxf6 15.f4 Qh8 16.f5 Qg8 17.Qxc5 dxc5 18.Qe4 Qd4 with approximately level chances.

Note (after 18...Qd4) that the opposite build-ups on white and black squares could be said to last almost unaltered right into the endgame! (See the preliminary remarks to game 7, p. 21).

9...h6?

This damages his own black-squared initiative (because 9...h6 is a loss of time) and it also helps his opponent with his white-squared plans: you really can’t ask much more from just one move.

Castling seems almost obvious (instead of 9...h6). After 9...0-0 10.Qg5 Wc8 11.Qxc7 Wh5 then 12.Qxa8 would be out (12...Qxc4 13.dxc4 Qxf3), and also 12.h3 would be unpleasant for White after 12...Qxf2 13.Qxf2 Qxf2+ 14.Qxf2 Qxe4 15.dxe4 Qxg5 16.Qxa8 Qd4 17.Qc1 (because of the threat of 17...Qh3) 17...Qxh3 18.Qc3 Qg4 19.Qc7 Qh5 20.Qb5 Qxf3 21.Qxf3 Wh2+ 22.Qf1 Wh1+ and wins.

So White could not play 10.Qg5 and after 10.h3 (what else?) 10...Qxf2 11.Qxf2 Qxf2+ 12.Qxf2 Qxe4 13.dxe4 Qd4 14.Qe3 Qxh3 15.Qxf3 Qh3 it is approximately level.

The text move causes difficulties for Black.

10.exf5 Qxf5 11.Qh4 Qe6 12.Qg6 Qg8 13.h3

Now that he has control of all the white squares, White now sets about driving his opponent off the black ones.

13...Qh6 14.Qe3!

Preparing for b4, because if he had played it straight away the reply 14...Qd4 would have been possible.

14...Qxd5?

14...Qf7 seemed necessary. Black is defending against the individual threats made by his opponent, but he is not achieving anything by way of clearing up the situation on the white squares as a whole.

It is interesting to note that 14...Wd7 (intending...Qf7) would not have been sufficient, e.g. 15.b4 Qxe3 16.fxe3 0-0-0 (not 16...Qh3 on account of 17.Qxf6) 17.Qa4 Qb8 18.b5 Qxd5 19.bxc6! Qxc6 20.Qxc6 bxc6 21.Qab1 Qa8 22.Qe7 and wins.

15.cxd5 Qd4

Or 15...Qe7 16.Qxe7 Qxe7 17.d4 with advantage to White.

16.f4 Qd7

16...Qxf4 17.Qxf4 Qe6 would be useless, on account of 18.Qxe5 Qxf4 19.Qe1 Qf7 20.Qxf4 Qe8 21.Qe6 and White maintains his material advantage.

17.b4 Qb6 18.Qxe5 Qxe5 19.Qxe5 Qe7 20.Qc4

Black is of course lost. But Mieses’ inventiveness in looking for a saving grace is all the more commendable.

20...Qd8!

Queenside castling would not do because of 21.Qg6+. But now he is planning 21...Qe8.

21.a4

A pity. There was an elegant win after 21.Qe1 Qxb4 22.Qb1 Qc3 23.Qa4 Qc2 (the only move) 24.Qxb6! Qxe1 25.Qxc7+ Qxc7 26.Qxb7+ Qxb7 27.d6+ Qxc2 28.Qb5+ and mate in three.

There was also an easy win after 21.d6 Qxd6 22.Qe1 Qc7 23.a4 a6 24.Qxb6 Qxb6 25.Qd2 Qe8 26.Qf2. Naturally, the text move also wins.

21...Qe8 22.Qh2 Qe2! 23.d6

White lets himself be hoodwinked. Simply 23.Qxe2 Qxe3 24.Qf3 would have won quite easily.

23...Qxd6 24.Qe1 Qxe3 25.Qxe2 Qg1+ 26.Qg1 Qxe2

Now White still has some work to do.

27.Qxd6 Qe7 28.a5 Qd7 29.Qe1 Qd2 30.Qc4 Qxb4 31.a6

The attack has to break through.

31...Qe8

31...Qb5 is met by 32.Qe5, e.g. 32...Qc8 33.Qxd7 Qxd7 34.Qb1 Qc5 35.Qxc5 Qxc5 36.d4 Qb5 37.Qc6.
Or 31...b8 32.Qe5 (threatening Qxa7 which if played on move 32 would have allowed the riposte 32...bxa6) 32...d4 (the best) 33.Qf7† Qc7 34.Qc1† Qxb6 35.Qxb1† Qxa6 36.Qc1 Qxd3 37.Qf1.

32.Qb1 Qa4 33.axb7 Qb8 34.Qc5 Qc7 35.Qd4† Qd7

Or 35...Qd7 36.Qe5 Qc7 37.Qa5 with the deadly threat of 38.Qc6† Qxc6 39.Qxb8†.

36.Qxg7 Qc5 37.Qh8† Qc7 38.Qxb6 Qc2 39.Qd6† Qd8 40.Qf1 Qe8 41.Qf8†

1–0

The continuation could have been 41...Qxf8 42.Qxb8† Qf7 43.Qxf8† Qxf8 44.b8Q† Qf7 45.Qxa7† Qe6 46.Qxc5.

The loss of the exchange did force the game away from the normal course of development, but it made no difference to the essential element of the situation — namely the attacking possibilities on the white squares.

Game 99

Erik Andersen and J.W. Nielsen

Aron Nimzowitsch

Simultaneous in Copenhagen 1923

(A three board consultation simultaneous)

1.e4 Qc6 2.d4 d5 3.exd5 Qxd5 4.Qe3 e6

Probably the objectively correct move here is 4...e5.

5.Qf3 Qd7

Intended to frighten my opponents a little, since Black is now "threatening" to castle long, adding pressure on the d-file. Objectively speaking, the more correct move should of course be 5.Qf6 and then, for example, 6.h3 (against a possible ...Qg4) 6...e5 7.dxe5 Qxd1† 8.Qxd1 Qd5. Or (5...Qf6 6.h3) 6...Qa5† 7.c3 e5 8.b4 Qd5 9.b5 exd4 10.exd4 Qe7† 11.Qc3 Qd8 and then 12.Qed5 and Black has consolidated his position.

6.Qbd2

6.Qe2 was preferable, e.g. 6...0–0–0 7.0–0 Qf6 8.c4 Qf5 9.h3 and the position of Black’s queen gives cause for concern. But probably (after the move 6.Qe2 0–0–0 7.0–0) Black would have gone in for the apparently fantastic manoeuvre 7...f6 8.c4 Qh5 9.Qc3 Qf7. But in that case too, his position would have been hard to defend.

6...0–0–0 7.Qd3

A subtle idea! He does without the obvious attacking line 7.Qc4 (followed by Qe2 then 0–0–0) and leaves the opposing queen completely untroubled. The presence of the queen on d5 does not seem unwelcome to him, because the thrust ...e6–e5 could then always be beaten off by c4 and then d5 with tempo.

7.Qf6 8.0–0 h6 9.c3 g5

To discourage the f3-knight from heading to e5, and at the same time planning to develop the bishop to g7.

10.c4

This thrust remains just as double-edged as ever; the opposing queen ends up on some unusual squares, but these turn out not to be bad ones.

The plan which was the logical follow-up to move 9 was rather 10.b4. The continuation could be 10...g4 11.Qe1 Qh5 12.b5 Qc7 (not first 12...Qd6, because 13.g3 and 14.c4 would cause the bishop some problems) 13.c4 Qf5 14.c5 Qd5 with chances for both sides.

10...Qd6 11.c5 Qe7 12.Qc4

Since Black is intent on gaining white-squared territory, the resistance would have been better on the white squares, thus 12.Qb5!.

12...Qd5 13.Qf6

And here it would have been preferable to sacrifice with 13.b4. After 13...Qxb4 14.Qb1, White’s attack should not be under-estimated, since it appears to go hand in hand with a blockade.

13.Qg7 14.Qe1 Qxe5 15.Qxe5 Qxe5 16.dxe5 Qc6

Now on the other hand White’s position is a white-squared ruin. Note how obvious the rest of the game is.

17.Qc1 Qf4 18.Qf1 Qd3 19.Qxd3 Qxd3 20.b4 Qd7 21.Qc4 Qd8 22.a3 Qa4 23.Qe1 b5 24.Qc2 Qd5 25.Qe1 g4 26.Qe2 h5 27.a4 Qc4 28.Qc2 h4 29.Qe2 Qd4 30.Qb2 Qd3 31.Qe2 Qg8 32.Qh1 h3

This new white-squared weakness which has arisen on g2 is a worthy addition to the old ones
on c6, d5, b5, d3, etc. It was indeed the final straw...

33.\(\text{g1} \text{hxg2}\) 34.\(\text{hxg2} \text{\textbf{a3}}\) 35.\(\text{\textbf{e1}} \text{\textbf{exa1}}\) 36.\(\text{\textbf{wxal}} \text{\textbf{f3}}\) 37.\(\text{\textbf{g1}} \text{\textbf{Ed8}}\) 0–1

8. A victory parade of “bizarre” and “ugly” moves

It was with these kind adjectives that masters of the pseudo-classical school used to describe our moves. Nowadays, since our ideas have been totally victorious, can anybody claim to understand how such a natural, beautiful and profound line such as, for example, the Hanham Variation was ever considered ugly?! After the moves 1.\(\text{e4}\) 2.\(\text{e5}\) 2.\(\text{d3}\) d6 3.d4 2.\(\text{d6}\) 4.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{bd7}\)! Black aims to place another pawn in the centre by 5...\(\text{c6}\), which would achieve for him a certain dominance of the centre. What does it matter, compared to that, that the \(\text{c8}\)-bishop has not yet been developed?! But the pseudo-classical school had only one concept of the ideal: free and unhindered development of the pieces. But we have no desire to settle old scores, the formalistic pseudo-classical way of looking at things is dead, and you can’t flog a dead horse. If in what follows we should mention some value judgements of the old days, it is not with the intention of settling old scores, but purely out of objective interest.

I. 1.\(\text{e4}\) 2.\(\text{e6}\) 2.\(\text{d4}\) d5 3.e5 The “decisive mistake”. This was meant to signify that this “unmotivated” move (because it attacked nothing since there is no knight on f6) is ugly. But in reality, 3.e5 (as I had to insist for 20 long years since nobody would believe me) is neither a mistake nor “ugly”, but it is a good and sensible move. After 3...\(\text{c5}\) White has no less than four (!) good equalizing lines, namely 4.\(\text{c3}\), 4.\(\text{dxc5}\), 4.\(\text{f3}\) and 4.\(\text{g4}\)! Nowadays there is universal recognition that the move is correct.

II. 1.\(\text{e4}\) 2.\(\text{e5}\) 3.\(\text{d3}\) 3.\(\text{d6}\) 4.\(\text{f6}\) 4.\(\text{g5}\) A “duffer’s move”? Today everyone knows that 4.\(\text{g5}\) constitutes a logical attempt to punish Black’s premature development of his knight (3...\(\text{f6}\)?)

III. 1.\(\text{e4}\) 2.\(\text{e5}\) 2.\(\text{d3}\) 3.\(\text{b5}\) 4.\(\text{f6}\) 4.\(\text{c4}\) o–0 5.\(\text{d4}\) \(\text{e7}\) 6.\(\text{e2}\) 2.\(\text{d6}\) 7.\(\text{c6}\) \(\text{bc6}\)!! 8.\(\text{dxc5}\) \(\text{b7}\)! A splendid strategic retreat! No, not a retreat, but a fighting withdrawal! As he moves back, he inflicts two bloody wounds on his opponent: he has robbed him of his bishop and has created for his own side a compact and dynamically valuable pawn centre. Charming play! The judgement of the pseudo-classical school was somewhat different; it saw neither the dynamism of the move back nor its intrinsic beauty; as far as it was concerned, the whole business was and remained… just a pitiful jump by a knight!

We shall look at two games. In game 101 we find an example of “\(\text{b5}\) in a closed game”, which was, according to Tarrasch, “more unforgivable for a master than leaving a piece en prise”. In reality, however, “\(\text{b5}\)” seems to be a very good move and can be played in 70 per cent of all closed games without any disadvantage and probably even to some advantage. In game 100 we see the prelude to a fianchetto (g2-g3), which for “some incomprehensible reason” never takes place. As it goes on, the game seems somewhat “mysterious”, partly lacking in harmony. And yet it is a logically thought out game. But the point is that in chess aesthetics must be firmly anchored in concrete thought. If you only judge by external appearances, you can easily consider some moves ugly which are not so. Beauty in chess, in the final judgement, exists only in thought.

Game 100
Aron Nimzowitsch
Alexander Alekhine
New York 1927

1.\(\text{\textbf{f3}}\) 2.\(\text{f6}\) 2.\(\text{b3}\) d6 3.\(\text{g3}\) e5 4.\(\text{c4}\)!

“Bizarre!” He is not afraid of ...e5–e4. Anyone else would have chosen 4.d3.

4...e4

This move, which weakens the dark squares, is at the bottom of all the difficulties which will crop up.

5.\(\text{h4}\)!
So the g2-square was not intended for the bishop to fianchetto but rather for the "bizarre" knight!

5...d5

This move, which would have been strong if 5...d4? had been played, leads in the given circumstances to a queen sortie which might well be criticized. But there was hardly anything better.

6.cxd5 exd5 7.Qc3 Qc6! 8.e3

Giving up for all time the possibility of a fianchetto.

8...a6

More logical was 8...Qg4; the best reply would be 9.Qxg4! (because the f6-knight later loses a tempo when forced to retreat) 9...Qxg4 10.Qb5 Qxf6 11.Qb2 a6 12.Qxc6+ Qxc6 13.Qe2 Qg4! 14.f3 (otherwise there follows 14...Qce5) 14...exf3 15.Qxf3 0–0–0 with only a minimal advantage to White. This variation gives us an insight into Black's defensive resources: he obviously has some white-squared counterplay; if he correctly plays his (not all that numerous) trump cards, he has a chance of being able to restrain his opponent's rather black-squared attack. The move chosen by Alekhine makes the defence harder, without it being hopeless.

9.Qb2 Qg4 10.Qe2 Qxe2 11.Qxe2 Qbd7 12.Qc1 Qb6 13.0–0

13.Qc2 would be well worth considering, e.g. 13...Qd6 14.Qf5. But Black apparently had a better line: 13.Qc2 Qc5! And if now 14.Qd4 then 14...Qd3† 15.Qxd3 Qxd3 16.Qxb6 cxb6 17.Qd4 (or 17.Qc3 Qa3! and Black seizes the c-file) 17...Qc5 18.Qc3 Qd5 19.Qxd3 Qb4 20.Qc3 Qxd4 21.exd4 Qxa2 and Black is better. In spite of that, the variation beginning with 13.Qc2 Qc5 appears to me to favour White; all he has to do, instead of 14.Qd4, is to castle with 14.0–0.

For example, 14...Qd3 15.Qxf6 (or pawn)xf6 16.Qf4 (threatening 17.Qd5) and White has the advantage.

13.Qc2 would also give White the advantage after other moves too (instead of 13...Qc5), for example: 13.Qc2 0–0–0 14.0–0 and Black has problems finding a plausible continuation. The variations I have quoted give the impression that

the mistake made by Black on move 8 cannot be made good: 13.Qc2 would have maintained the pressure. But even the weaker text move (13.0–0) should not allow his opponent to shake off the pressure. Once the opportunity for white-squared counterplay was missed, it could not return. And for that reason we are extremely dubious about Alekhine's attempted white-squared coup d'état in the following moves.

13...Qd6 14.f3

Alekhine considered 14.d3 to be better.

14...Qe5!? (??)

Extremely interesting! He wants to occupy the white squares (d3) at any cost. But what is the logic of the game? Well, he takes a rather sceptical attitude to it. Why and how should the white squares suddenly be able to put the black squares in the shade!? After Black's slip on move 8 his black squares had become chronically weak; White had not made any mistakes (because 13.0–0 was not one), so his opponent's violent, though ingenious, attempt must somehow be wrong.

15.Qxe5 Qxe5 16.fxe4 Qd3 17.Qc3 0–0–0 18.Qb1 Qxe4

You cannot have a coup d'état without some sort of sacrifice! Whether 18...Qc5 would have been better appears doubtful after the moves 19.d3 Qa4 20.bxa4 Qxe3† 21.Qf2 (there would also be chances after 21.Qh1 Qxe2 22.Qf1) 21...Qg4 22.Qf1.

19.Qxd3 Qxd2 20.Qxd8† Qxd8 21.Qf5† Qb8 22.Qe1
22...c5 was also worth considering.

22... xe3† 23. f2 d3 24. d4

24...c3?

24...c2 would have left Black good chances of a draw. But how would things turn out? Would the coup d’état be correct? Or would the black or the white squares be able to achieve dominance at will? No, neither. Firstly, the draw (after 24...c2!) would not be certain and secondly it has not yet been proved that White did not have a stronger line somewhere along the way (for example on move 22), and thirdly, there are unfortunately many positions in which a clearly demonstrable advantage is not enough for a win (victory by attrition should be included!).

25. e3 c1†

There follows a bitter struggle; White wins, but only after hours of hard effort.

36. g2 c6† 27. b3 g5 28. d3 x f3 29. x f3 c2† 30. f2 f5 31. e2 c5 32. d3 d4 33. c5 f4 34. d4

According to Spielmann, 34.g4 was a safe move because White had to set up a middlegame attack. But when it finally gets to an endgame, might the protected passed pawn not become unpleasant?

34...xg3 35. d2 h8 36. d8† x d8 37. xg3 d4 38. b1 a7 39. f2 x f2† 40. x f2 b5

The win is still hanging by a thread, namely a study-like turn of events, see the note to Black’s 41st move.

41. e3

The sealed move.

41...c5

The main line consists of 41...b5 42. d2! h4 43.g4 h3 44. b3 c5 45. e4 c4 46. b4 b6, because now the way the king manoeuvres itself into the play seems unpleasant enough; all the more so because there is not the time needed to take the g5-pawn. We now get to the point: 47. g3 and if 47...c6 then and only then the pawn can suddenly be won, namely by 48. xg5 c3 49. b3! and wins.

42. a4 b5 43. axb5 axb5 44. d2 b6 45. e4 h4 46. g4 h3 47. b3 b4!

A final ingenious flurry before it is all over.

48. xg5 c4 49. e4 x b3

Or 49...c3 50. f2 and then d3.

50. g5 b2 51. d2 c5 52. g6 h2 53. g2 d4 54. g7 d3 55. g8 w dxd4 56. a2 c2 57. w c4†

1–0

A battle of giants.

Game 101
Aron Nimzowitsch
Karl Gilg
Kecskemé 1927

1. e4 c5 2. b3 d6 3. b5

This move is much better than its reputation and guarantees at least sound equality.

3... c7

3...d6 ought to be best.

4. c3!

Because now after c3 the counterplay by ...f6 can easily be parried; White can simply protect e4 by w e2.

4...a6 5. d4 f6 6. w e2 c5 7.0–0 w c7 8. d4

White now offers a pawn sacrifice, which Black should have refused by 8...d6.

8... cxd4

8...0–0 would not do either because of 9. x f6 w xf6 10. dxe5 w xe4 11. e1 f5 12. exf6 wxf6 13. x f7 w e8 14. x e8† w x e8 15. x e8† w f7 16. w e5† and White remains a piece up.

9. cxd4 w d4 10. d f4 w x d4 11. e5 d3

If 11...d5 then 12. e6 fxe6 13. w x e6 w b6 14. g5! w d8 15. x c7 w d8 16. w b3 w e7 17. x a4 with a superior game for White. On the
other hand, after 11...\textit{\textsf{d}}5 12.e6 fxe6 13.\textit{\textsf{xe}}6 \textsf{b}6\textsf{b} the continuation 14.\textit{\textsf{e}}1 \textit{\textsf{d}}8 15.\textit{\textsf{g}}5 \textit{\textsf{x}}a4 16.\textit{\textsf{xe}}7\textsf{f} 17.\textit{\textsf{xe}}7\textsf{f} \textit{\textsf{f}}8 would be less clear and the advantage would be questionable.

12.\textit{\textsf{e}}3 \textit{\textsf{d}}5

Nor did 12...\textsf{c}5 save him, e.g. 13.\textit{\textsf{g}}3 \textit{\textsf{e}}4 14.\textit{\textsf{x}}g7 \textit{\textsf{x}}f2\f 15.\textit{\textsf{h}}1 (not 15.\textit{\textsf{xf}}2 on account of 15...\textit{\textsf{xc}}1\f 16.\textit{\textsf{f}}1 \textit{\textsf{e}}3\f and mate in 4) 15...\textit{\textsf{f}}8 16.\textit{\textsf{h}}6 \textit{\textsf{c}}5 17.e6! and wins.

13.\textit{\textsf{g}}3 \textit{\textsf{g}}6

13...0–0 would be met by the immediate

14.\textit{\textsf{b}}3.

14.\textit{\textsf{b}}3 \textit{\textsf{b}}4

15.\textit{\textsf{xf}}7\f! \textit{\textsf{d}}8 16.\textit{\textsf{h}}6!

You would hardly think that this bishop has designs on b6, but it does!

16...\textsf{c}2 17.\textsf{c}3 \textsf{d}4

Despair. If 17...\textsf{xa}1 then 18.\textsf{d}5 \textit{\textsf{c}}6 (the best) 19.\textit{\textsf{e}}3! \textit{\textsf{d}}6 20.\textit{\textsf{b}}6\f \textit{\textsf{d}}7 21.e6 mate!!

White wins in high style after the text move.

18.\textit{\textsf{x}}d3 \textit{\textsf{xe}}5 19.\textit{\textsf{fe}}1 \textit{\textsf{ff}}6 20.\textit{\textsf{xe}}7

1–0

20...\textit{\textsf{xe}}7 is of course followed by 21.\textsf{d}5\f and 20...\textit{\textsf{xe}}7 by 21.\textit{\textsf{xd}}4.

9. Heroic defence

A priori, you might think that all areas of practical play are influenced to the same extent by the new ideas. But that is not so. Defensive play seems to stubbornly resist the rejuvenating influence of modern thought. It even looks as if the pseudo-classical style, which has been driven out of all other areas, wants to make its stand here. At least, progress in this field has been minimal: people still tremble at the sight of a target which could be attacked in their own camp and conventional ideas still seem to reign. The anxious care about the correctness of moves and the avoidance of unusual paths and above all the fear of anything which looks colossal (i.e. on a big scale) – all this reminds one of the pseudo-classical era, long since dead and buried!

In my opinion, the mistake lies in the fact that too little use is being made of the newly discovered stratagems. The use of prophylaxis, restraint, centralization and overprotection ought to be of the greatest importance in defensive technique. I am even inclined to believe that the whole skill of defence could be raised to new heights by employing them. It does make a great difference if the flank which is under attack is dependent only on its own resources or if defensive energy pours into it from the whole board. Because what else is centralization but coordination spread over the whole board?!

We shall look at four games which illustrate heroic defence. They clearly demonstrate an intense cooperation between the motifs mentioned above.

In game 102 a small centre is specifically overprotected, and successfully so, in that this centre confers some solidity on a set-up which looks rather undeveloped. The way Black defends by retreating his queen on moves 9 and 10 is really imbued with this modern spirit.

Game 103 demonstrates in a remarkable fashion the uninhibited way in which the defence can be conducted. A highly improbable looking line from the field of endgame composition is employed for the purposes of the defence.

What is particularly remarkable about game 104 is how the new defensive technique really earns its spurs there: a violent flank attack is brought to a standstill by well-timed counterplay, namely an extremely intensely driven centralization. Moreover, this game is also significant for the large scale of matters mentioned above, which is so little in harmony with the pseudo-classical school: enormously violent attacks are neutralized by equally powerful defensive measures. It should be
noted that this whole question of scale is basically only the product of a new way of looking at things, and does not require any special playing strength and should thus be attainable by less experienced players.

In game 105 defensive technique based on the principles of hypermodernism celebrates a new triumph. My opponent's black-squared attack is held up by appropriate use of white-squared counter-measures until the opportunity is offered to instigate a "white-squared coup d'état" by returning material (similar to Alekhine's coup d'état in game 100, except that in game 105 it is based on more solid foundations).

The number of great defenders is extremely small; I can only name the following: Steinitz, Dr Em. Lasker, Amos Burn, Dr O.S. Bernstein, Duras and, last but not least, Louis Paulsen. We hope that our researches will contribute to a rise in the numbers of good defensive players. We should like to take this opportunity to point out, with the greatest of satisfaction, that some younger masters, for example the strategically brilliant Sämisch, are showing both interest and skill in the defence of difficult positions. Good hunting to them!

Game 102
Alfred Brinckmann
Aron Nimzowitsch
Berlin 1927

1.e4 \( \text{\&}c6 \) 2.d4 d5 3.exd5 \( \text{\&}xd5 \) 4.a3 \( \text{\&}e6 \)
5.a2
5.a3, as played in game 99 (p. 190), would have caused his opponent some anxiety. However, the bishop move is also strong.

5...\( \text{\&}xg2 \)!

We believe in the strength of defence.

6.a3 \( \text{\&}g6 \) 7.a2 \( \text{\&}b4 \)

Vigorous modern defensive technique: centralization (by ...a5) is being prepared.

8.a3 \( \text{\&}d5 \) 9.a4

The correct continuation consisted of 9.a3 e6, e.g. 9...c6 (the best) 10.a4! \( \text{\&}xf4 \) 11.a4 c7 12.a7 \( \text{\&}xg2 \) and the outcome is unclear. Attempts made by Dr Lasker and the author suggested a draw.

9...\( \text{\&}f6 \)!! 10.a3 \( \text{\&}d8 \)!

What is the meaning of this manoeuvre? There are two things! The queen is seeking safety and the idea of centralization is emphasized, because there are now three pieces cooperating against the opponent's planned breakthrough by c4 and d5 (of course once the knight has left \( \text{\&}c4 \)). In short: the central knight is being overprotected. It is moreover clear that the chosen retreat looks highly neo-romantic, since Black shows by playing it that he has faith in the strength of resistance offered by the initial position, whereas the pseudo-classical school was fanatical in its insistence on rapid development.

11.a2 \( \text{\&}g6 \) 12.a5 c6!

Continuing the overprotection!

13.a5 c6

Overprotection and a waiting move at the same time! Black wants to retain the option of castling to either side until his opponent shows his colours, i.e. until he castles either long or short. Having to delay like this constitutes an extra resource for the cramped black position. Remember the fourth section of this chapter (The small centre, p. 170).

13.a0–0!

13.0–0–0 would have been met by 13...\( \text{\&}b4 \), e.g. 14.c3 \( \text{\&}e7 \) and Black prepares to castle long by means of ...\( \text{\&}c7 \) or ...\( \text{\&}a5 \), ...\( \text{\&}d7 \) and ...\( \text{\&}f8 \)!

But after the text move ...0-0-0 would be too dangerous.

13...\( \text{\&}d6 \) 14.a1 \( \text{\&}c7 \) 15.a4 \( \text{\&}xe3 \) 16.\( \text{\&}xe3 \) c5
Our forefathers already knew how effective a counterattack can be, psychologically too. But on the other hand, this loosens the position. So 16...\textit{d}7 should be preferable.

17.\textit{g}5

Aiming to punish his opponent for his “cheek”. But a more correct try was 17.\textit{ae}1 cxd4 18.\textit{xd}4 \textit{d}7, although Black would not be in any special danger in this case either (19.\textit{f}5? exf5 20.\textit{g}6+ \textit{e}6 21.\textit{hx}8 \textit{e}7 and wins).

17.\textit{d}3 cxd4 18.\textit{xd}4 would also be worth considering.

17...cxd4 18.\textit{ae}1

If 18.\textit{w}xg7 then 18...\textit{g}8 19.\textit{wxf}6 \textit{xe}5 with a slight advantage to Black.

18...\textit{f}8!

It would be wrong to castle, e.g. 18...0–0 19.\textit{g}1 h6 20.\textit{w}f4 \textit{xe}5 21.\textit{xe}5 \textit{d}7 22.\textit{h}5+! \textit{w}xe5 23.\textit{hx}h6 g6 24.\textit{g}5 \textit{w}h8 25.\textit{gx}g6† and mate in two.

19.\textit{g}1 h6 20.\textit{w}f4 \textit{xe}5 21.\textit{w}xe5

Or 21.\textit{xe}5 \textit{d}d7 etc.

21...\textit{w}xe5 22.\textit{w}xe5 \textit{d}d7

22...\textit{g}6 would be simpler, e.g. 23.\textit{d}d1 \textit{e}7 24.\textit{xd}4 \textit{d}8 with a winning ending.

23.\textit{b}5

23.\textit{a}5†! would have left Black with much greater problems to solve.

23...\textit{a}6 24.\textit{b}3

Or 24.\textit{b}4 \textit{e}5 25.\textit{g}2 (25.\textit{xb}7? \textit{b}8) 25...\textit{d}3! with the threat of ...\textit{xf}2 mate.

24...\textit{c}5 25.\textit{a}3 \textit{b}8 26.\textit{b}4 \textit{d}7 27.\textit{c}5 \textit{e}5

28.\textit{e}1 \textit{xf}3 29.\textit{ef}3 \textit{d}7 30.\textit{d}3 \textit{d}8

31.\textit{g}1 \textit{b}5 32.\textit{d}2 \textit{d}5 33.\textit{e}4 \textit{e}7

34.\textit{d}6

A mistake in a hopeless position. Relatively best was 34.f3 \textit{b}8 35.\textit{d}6 \textit{b}6 36.\textit{xb}5 axb5 37.\textit{xb}5 \textit{xb}6, and Black wins easily.

34...\textit{g}5† 35.\textit{h}1 \textit{c}6†

0–1

Game 103

Paul Saladin Leonhardt
Aron Nimzowitsch
Berlin 1928

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.\textit{c}3 \textit{b}4 4.\textit{ex}d5 \textit{ex}d5 5.\textit{d}3 \textit{c}6 6.\textit{ge}2 \textit{ge}7 7.0–0 0–0 8.\textit{f}4 \textit{g}4

After an unadventurous start, Leonhardt suddenly appeared to want to start an attack and played:

9.h3

It does seem simpler to play 9.f3 \textit{h}5 10.\textit{d}2 or 10.\textit{e}3 and then 11.\textit{f}4. The weakening of the e3-square was quite bearable.

9...\textit{h}5 10.\textit{c}1 \textit{a}5!

You can hardly claim that Black is avoiding unusual paths. After 11.a3 (to prevent ...\textit{b}4) he intended 11...\textit{xc}3 12.bxc3 and the pawn which had been lured to a3 would represent a certain weakness in White’s otherwise unexceptional set-up. Instead of 11...\textit{xc}3 (after 11.a3), other moves would of course be possible, e.g. 11...\textit{b}6 or 11...\textit{g}6.

11.\textit{we}3 \textit{b}4 12.\textit{g}3 \textit{xd}3 13.\textit{hx}h5 \textit{xb}2
14.\textcolor{red}{\text{h6}!}

The reply Black expected.

14...\textcolor{blue}{\text{\text{\text{c4}}} 15.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{g5}}}}

After 15.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{g3}}} (the main line) there would have followed 15...\textcolor{blue}{\text{\text{\text{e5}}} 16.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{g4}}} \textcolor{brown}{\text{\text{g6}}} 17.\textcolor{red}{\text{\text{xf8}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{cxd3}}} and White's bishop has no retreat square. This is a motif listed by Rinck and known as the "bishop's cross".

15.\textcolor{blue}{\text{\text{g6}}} 16.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{xd5}}}

16...\textcolor{red}{\text{f6}}

At this point, as well as the text move, Black had two other good continuations. Firstly the simple exchanging line 16...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{xf6}}} 17.\textcolor{blue}{\text{\text{xf6}}} \textcolor{red}{\text{\text{g5}}} 18.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{e3}}} \textcolor{brown}{\text{\text{d8}}} with an endgame in which he is dominant on the white squares. Or the variation suggested by Kostic: 16...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{cxd8}}} 17.\textcolor{brown}{\text{\text{\text{xd8}}} 18.\textcolor{blue}{\text{\text{cxd2}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{cxd2}}} 19.\textcolor{red}{\text{\text{\text{fd1}}} \textcolor{brown}{\text{\text{d5}}} 20.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{d2}}} \textcolor{red}{\text{\text{exh5}}} Or (16...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{d2}}} 17.\textcolor{red}{\text{\text{\text{fxg5}}} 18.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{g5}}} \textcolor{brown}{\text{\text{f6}}} 19.\textcolor{red}{\text{\text{\text{g5}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{g5}}} and Black is a pawn ahead, or finally 17.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{e3}}} \textcolor{brown}{\text{\text{g6}}} 18.\textcolor{red}{\text{\text{\text{xf6}}} 19.\textcolor{blue}{\text{\text{\text{xf6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{d8}}} 20.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{cxd1}}} \textcolor{brown}{\text{\text{d8}}} again with an extra pawn.

The line chosen does appear to be stronger.

17.\textcolor{blue}{\text{\text{\text{xf6}}} \textcolor{red}{\text{\text{xf6}}}

Or 17...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{gxf6}}} 18.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{b5}}}.

18.\textcolor{red}{\text{\text{g7}}} \textcolor{blue}{\text{\text{\text{e7}}} 19.\textcolor{blue}{\text{\text{\text{d6}}} 20.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{d1}}}\textcolor{red}{\text{\text{d1}}}

After 20.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{h6}}} there could come 20...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{e8}}} 21.\textcolor{red}{\text{\text{f5}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{e2}}} 22.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{f2}}} 23.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{g6}}} \textcolor{blue}{\text{\text{hxh6}}} 24.\textcolor{red}{\text{\text{xf7}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{f8}}}, and Black wins; or 23.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{g5}}} (instead of 23.\textcolor{red}{\text{\text{xf6}}}) 23...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{e3}}} and Black not only has an extra piece, but also a very strong attack.

20...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{f8}}} 21.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{b5}}}

If 21.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{h6}}} then 21...\textcolor{brown}{\text{\text{c6} (threatening ...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{d8}}}}}}

22.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{f4}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{e3}}} 23.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{f5}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{xf1}}} 24.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{xf1}}} (24.\textcolor{red}{\text{\text{\text{xf6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{h2}}} etc.) 24...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{d2}}} 25.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{xd2}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{xf6}}} 26.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{xf6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{xf6}}} and Black wins.

21...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 22.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 23.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 24.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c4}}} 25.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{f4}}} 26.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{f4}}} 27.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{xf1}}} 28.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{\text{d1}}} 29.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{d3}}} 30.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{d3}}} 31.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{g8}}} 32.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{g6}}}

Since I did not want to give up the lovely central knight, but of course the simple 32...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{xf6}}} 33.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c3}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{b6}}} would have won without any difficulty. The rest is easy to understand:

33.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 34.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 35.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 36.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 37.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 38.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 39.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 40.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 41.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 42.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 43.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 44.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 45.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} 46.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}}

0–1

Game 104
Alfred Brinckmann
Aron Nimzowitsch
Copenhagen 1924

1.\textcolor{green}{\text{d4}} \textcolor{green}{\text{f5}} 2.\textcolor{green}{\text{e4}} \textcolor{green}{\text{f6}} 3.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c3}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{f6}}} 4.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{g5}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{b6}}

A very bold-looking innovation. The usual 4...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6}}} can be met either by 5.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{d5}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{e5}} 6.\textcolor{green}{\text{d4}}} 7.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{xf6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{exf6}}} 8.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c4}}} 9.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c4}}} 10.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c4}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{h6}}} 11.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{f3}}} or by the following as yet untested try: (4...\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c6?)}} 5.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{xf6}}} \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{exf6}}} 6.a3! 5.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c4}}} 6.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c4}}} 7.\textcolor{green}{\text{\text{c4}}} 8.d5 \textcolor{green}{\text{\text{d5}}} leaving White ready to exploit the weakness which will arise on e6 after a possible ...d7–d6.
5...c4

The liquidation mentioned in the previous note seems much better here: 5...xf6! exf6 6.a3! with serious difficulties for Black.

5...e6 6.xf6 xf6 7.e4 e7!

After only a few moves the position is full of fantastic possibilities. Consider for example the following variations: 7...g6 8.f3 b7! (not 8...d5 on account of 9.d3!) 9.d6+? xd6 10.xb7 0-0 11.xa8 c6 and then ...xg2. Or else there is 7...f6 8.f3 b7 9.e6+? xf6 10.xb7 bx4 11.xa8 b4+ 12.c3 xcf6! 13.f1 0-0 and Black must win. Or finally (7...g6 8.f3 b7) 9.d3! b4+ 10.c3 f8 11.d6+ e7 12.xb7 bx4 13.xg6 xc3 14.e2 c4 15.xd3 xd4 16.a3 and White should win. The attempt 7...g6 would thus have led to a disadvantage for Black.

8.d3 c6 9.c3 b7 10.f3 0-0-0

Now Black has fortunately reached a position which, by common consent, is indefensible. But public opinion is not always correct. For example, only very few positions are felt to be defensible, whereas in reality the majority of all positions can be held.

Moreover, at this point 10...d5 followed by e5 seems to have been possible, e.g. 10...d5 11.e5 c5 12.xe5 xe5 13.0-0 xe3+ 14.xf3 0-0-0, but Black would be left with certain weaknesses in the e-file and on the white squares, for instance after 15.a4 b8 16.ae1 f6 17.e5. Such a result should not surprise you, since a rapid transition to open play is rarely without difficulties.

11.0-0 g8!

Intending to centralize with ...g7-g5-g4 and then to see to the relief of the e5-square. Instead it was again possible to try the "freeing" move 11...d5 but that would be a mistake here because of 12.g3 e5 13.xe5 xe5 14.e1. But there was a playable line (though not one sanctioned by present-day theory), namely: 11...d5 12.g3 h5 13.h4 and now 13...e5, since the capture on e5 which was previously mentioned (14.xe5) now fails because the h4-pawn has been left hanging.

12.e2 b8 13.a4

Perhaps 13.a6 should have been preferred, since the pawn storm can always be played later.

13...a5

Since it is not blocked by the bishop on a6, the pawn demonstrates its mobility.

14.b1 g5 15.b4 d5

The right moment, since the e4-knight can no longer go to the favourable d2-square. If 16.ed2 then 16...xb4 and the planned 17.a5 no longer works because of 17.bxc3 attacking the knight on d2.

16.g3 axb4 17.a5! g4 18.e5 xe5 19.dxe5 c5!

With 20.axb6 White could now force his opponent into the remarkable series of moves he had intended: (20.axb6) 20...c4 21.cxb4! xg8! (opening the c-file by 21...cxd3 would be ominous for Black; 21...cxd3? 22.a2! etc.) 22.a2 c6
23. a7† c8 24. b5 c5!! You don’t often see a rook in a position like this!

The position which has arisen is full of tension, powerful attacks remain ineffective against equally colossal defensive resources; it is a position of a heroic nature. As an illustration: 25. e2 g7 26. xg4 xe5 27. e1 xg4 28. exe5 c3 29. f5 d7 30. a3 gc4 31. e3 xb5 32. xc4 xc4 33. xe6 c2 34. ee1 and White should win. But Black has a better line with 25. e2 g7 26. xg4 xe5 27. e1 d4 with mighty complications.

However in the game there followed: 20. cxb4 cxb4 21. c1

21. axb6 is simply met by 21... c5.

21... h6 22. c1 c5 23. cxb6 xb6 24. a4 f8 25. h5

The knight is threatening to settle on f6.

25... c5 26. d6 g7 27. b5 c8 28. a1 b7

Black is continually tormented.

29. h1

White, who has been playing with remarkable spirit, should once more have preferred b1 to the text move.

29... d4! 30. b1 c3 31. e8 g5 32. f1 xe5 33. d6 d6 34. xg4 g5 35. f3

36. a6! b6 37. d3 c8

The immediate return of the rooks is forced.

38.xb7 xB7 39. xh7† c7 40. d3 g8 41. h3?

Better was 41. e3 with threats such as d1 or c2.

41... e8 42. e3 c5 43. f4 b5

Consolidating.

44. d1 a8! 45. a8 xa8 46. f5

A mistake, but in any case White’s position cannot be held; the c3-bishop and the passed pawns rule the roost.

46... d4 47. f6 dxe3 48. f3† c6 49. xe3 dxe6 50. f1

Or 50.xb4 c1† 51. h2 d6† 52. h4 e5.

50... c2 51. g3 e5 52. g8† b7 0–1

Game 105
Akiba Rubinstein
Aron Nimzowitsch
Karlsbad 1923

1. e4 c5 2. f3 c6 3. d4 cxd4 4. xd4 d5

This innovation, which was being played for the first time here, leads to difficult positions and can only be recommended to those who think there is more than one single correct route, the wide main road. This is more of a walking tour, which may lead past steep drops but also involves splendid views; it is not for the faint of heart.

5. exd5
For the possible main line here (5.♗b5 dxe4!) see game 44 (p. 91). Moreover, at this point Dr Lasker recommends 5.♕xc6 bxc6 6.exd5 ♙xd5 7.♕c3 ♙xd1† 8.♕xd1. But the endgame advantage which White obtains seems to us to be somewhat problematic.

**5...♕xd5 6.♕e3 e6!**

6...e5 would be bad on account of the reply 7.♕b5. Black needs the e5-square for his queen. If his a-pawn were already on a6 (it would already be on a3 in a Reversed Sicilian) then ...e7-e5 would be fine, though it would not secure for Black either an easy or a comfortable game. This game is heading for heroic defence not quiet wood-pushing. Compare it with the opening of a game I played in July 1928:

**Aron Nimzowitsch – Norman-Hansen:**

1.c4 e5 2.a3 (White is playing a Sicilian with an extra tempo) 2...♗f6 3.♕c3 d5 4.cxd5 ♘xd5 5.d4 exd4 6.♗xd4 ♙e6

7.e4 ♗c6 8.♗b5 ♘de7! 9.♕e2 a6 10.♕a4 b5! 11.♗xd8† ♘xd8 12.♕e5 (12...♕a5 was also worth considering) Black had some space in the centre of the board. The "energetic" thrust 7.e4 would have been better replaced by the reticent 7.e3!, e.g. 7...♗c6 8.♗b5 if now 8...♘de7 then 9.♘e4! Even 9.♗f3 (instead of 9.♗e4) would leave White better off than in the game after the moves 9...a6 10.♕a4 b5 11.♗xd8† ♘xd8 12.♗c2, because his position would be more solid. The exhilarating advance e2-e4 (or ...e7-e5 when Black plays the Sicilian) does not quite seem to fit in with the heavyweight nature of the game.

**7.♗c3 ♗b4 8.♗d5**

It was worth considering 8.♗e2 ♗ge7 (8...♗xg2? 9.♗f3) 9.0–0.

8...♗e5!!

The lighter side of the reticent 6...e6 now comes to the fore.

**9.a3**

9...♗xc3†!

The retreat to e7 was also good enough, e.g. 9...♗e7 10.♕e2 a6 11.♕d4 ♗f6 intending ...0–0 and ...♗d8. But in my opinion the continuation which was chosen is more logical, because the storm on the black squares which White is now in a position to start must be able to be weathered, and on the other hand the avoidance of complications would be in contradiction to what has happened in the whole of the game. A frightful struggle is the result.

**10.bxc3?**

After 10.♕xc3 ♗f6 White would have the two bishops, but Black would be better centralized. The text allows penetration on d6, though it does cost a pawn.

10...a6 11.♕d6† ♗e7 12.♕c4 ♘xc3† 13.♗d2 ♗d4

To meet 14.♗b4† with ...♗xb4.

14.♗d3 b5

To get the knight off the black squares: at the
same time white-squared counterplay (...\texttt{b}b7) is initiated.
\[ 15.\texttt{Q}a5 \texttt{Q}e5\uparrow 16.\texttt{Q}e2 \texttt{Q}xa5 17.\texttt{Q}xa5 \texttt{Q}b7 \]

In order to force the exchange of queens after 18.0-0 by 18...\texttt{Q}d5.
\[ 18.\texttt{Q}f3 \texttt{Q}f6 \]

At last Black has found the time and the leisure to develop the poor knight: the opportunities it has on d5 and e3, however, fully compensate for the long wait.
\[ 19.\texttt{Q}b4\uparrow \texttt{Q}e8 \]

28...\texttt{Q}xd3! 29.\texttt{Q}f4 \texttt{Q}d6 30.\texttt{Q}g5?

An anti-prophylactic move, which actually helps Black’s planned ...f6 and ...\texttt{Q}f7, see previous note. 30.\texttt{Q}e3 would have been appropriate.
\[ 30...\texttt{Q}f6 31.\texttt{Q}e3 \texttt{Q}e5 32.\texttt{Q}b4 \]

He is still aiming to create mischief on the black squares.
\[ 32.\texttt{Q}d4 33.\texttt{Q}b3 \texttt{Q}d5 34.\texttt{Q}c2 \texttt{Q}d3 35.\texttt{Q}e5 \texttt{Q}f7 36.\texttt{B}c2 \texttt{Q}h8 \]

Black finally manages to fully develop his forces.
\[ 37.\texttt{Q}e2 \texttt{Q}f5 38.\texttt{Q}xd7\uparrow \texttt{Q}xd7 39.\texttt{Q}c2! \texttt{Q}c8! \]

39...\texttt{Q}c8 would have been followed by 40.\texttt{Q}h7.
\[ 40.\texttt{Q}d1 \texttt{Q}f5 \]

The defence is of course conducted on the white squares.
\[ 41.\texttt{Q}c7\uparrow \texttt{Q}g6 42.\texttt{h}3 \texttt{Q}e8 43.\texttt{B}c1 \texttt{Q}f4 44.\texttt{B}c6 \texttt{Q}f5 \]

Threatening ...\texttt{Q}c8.
\[ 45.\texttt{Q}d6 \texttt{h}4 \]

Stronger than 45...\texttt{B}e6.
\[ 46.\texttt{Q}d2 \texttt{Q}g3 47.\texttt{B}c3 \texttt{a}5! \]

A coup d'état: he sacrifices all his extra material, but obtains a combined attack on both wings at the same time; cf. the next note.
\[ 48.\texttt{f}4 \texttt{e}2 49.\texttt{f}3 \texttt{e}2 50.\texttt{f}xe5 \texttt{B}xe5 51.\texttt{f}4 \texttt{b}4 \]
\[ 52.\texttt{axb}4 \texttt{a}4 53.\texttt{xh}4 \texttt{a}3 54.\texttt{h}2 \texttt{a}2 \]

White is of course hopelessly lost. On one side he has to tame a passed pawn, while on the other he is facing a mating attack. But what follows is quite interesting.
\[ 55.\texttt{B}c3 \texttt{B}e3 56.\texttt{B}b2 \]

Le roi s'amuse.
\[ 20.0-0 \texttt{Q}d8 21.\texttt{Q}d3 \texttt{Q}d5 22.\texttt{Q}a5 \texttt{Q}d7 23.\texttt{Q}e1 \texttt{Q}d4\uparrow \]

And the tournament book said in astonishment:
"The black queen always has a way out with check."
\[ 24.\texttt{Q}h1 \texttt{Q}f4 \]

To get rid of the "two bishops". This has become possible only thanks to the intensive drive towards centralization.
\[ 25.\texttt{Q}d2 \texttt{Q}xd3 26.cxd3 \texttt{b}5! \]

With a rook fewer in play, Black must for the moment refuse the offer of the d3-pawn: instead he plans the manoeuvre ...h4 followed by \texttt{Q}h8-h5-d5 or even \texttt{Q}h8-h6-g6.
\[ 27.\texttt{Q}ac1 \texttt{Q}h6 28.\texttt{Q}e3 \]

28.\texttt{Q}e3 (followed by 29.\texttt{Q}c1) would have been better, because, firstly, the d3-pawn is less taboo than White (somewhat too optimistically) may be thinking. And secondly, this would prevent Black from developing with ...f6 then ...\texttt{Q}f7.
56.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{x}}e5} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{w}}}}xe5\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{f}}}xe5} and the a-pawn queens.
56...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{g}}}}}e1} 57.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{d}}}}}d4} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{b}}}}e3
Threatening \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{g}}}}}g3\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{f}}}}} etc.
58.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{f}}}}}f4} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{e}}}}e4 59.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{g}}}}}g3\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{f}}}}}xg3\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{f}}}xg3} 60.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{d}}}}}xg3} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{e}}}}e2
61.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{d}}}}d4 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{d}}}}d2

0–1

Play could have continued 62.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{a}}}}}a1} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{b}}}}}b1} 63.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{b}}}}}b2}
\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{b}}}}}b1} 64.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{d}}}}}d4} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{b}}}}b3\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{f}}} then \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{e}}}xb4}} and \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{e}}}xd4} and \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{a}}}a1}. White's misfortune in the final phase lay in the fact that he had to pay far too high a price for the h-pawn which he won – in the form of a misplaced rook.

In the game itself, it is worth paying attention to Black's queen moves; on the surface they appeared to be defences to danger threatened from time to time and thus without any connecting thread. In reality, it was more in the nature of a planned exploitation of the central terrain he had at his disposition, while at the same time specifically making use of all possible counter-chances on the white squares. So: centralization plus white-squared counterplay on one hand, and powerful black-squared pressure on the other. The victory for Black may in such circumstances be hailed as a triumph of heroic defence based on modern stratagems.

And in conclusion we have an endgame, in which the basis on which the heroic defence rests can be seen with absolute clarity.

Black, whose move it was, produced the obvious sacrifice:
1...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{d}}}}}d3} 2.gxf3 \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{h}}}}}hxh3} 3.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{d}}}}}d4\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{f}}}}}g8 4.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{e}}}}}xe4} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{f}}}}}f3}

And now White did not want to have to accept a draw and scorned the safe counter 5.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{f}}}fe1}; instead he went in for a "great adventure", but then had to sacrifice a whole rook to avoid mate, coming out an exchange down, apparently without any compensation. And then this wonderful adventure took a fresh turn.
5.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{c}}}}}c8} 6.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{h}}}h7} 7.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{f}}}f1} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{d}}}}}xe4} 8.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{c}}}}}c7} 9.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{g}}}g6} 10.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{g}}}g7} 11.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{h}}}h5} \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{g}}}g5} 11.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{h}}}h8} 12.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{g}}}g6}

Now at least White has got rid of the terrible threat of mate via h3 (...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{g}}}}}h3}, \texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{g}}}}}g1} ...\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{\textbf{\textit{g}}}}}g4} mate). But at what cost! And moreover, the queen and the d4-bishop are still hanging. And there is nothing left of his attack!

12.\texttt{\textbf{\textit{\textsc{f}}}f2}!

This completes his defensive formation. White's defenders hang disjointedly in thin air in the most incredible and almost comical fashion; this in comparison to the solidly clumsy and brutal attacking trio of queen and two rooks. But what do aesthetics matter? White is an exchange down and must lose? No! White's heroic defence is based on centralization and in fact the d4-bishop and the queen on c2 (the latter aiming via e4 at g6) appear
as central forces. But the central energy which had been amassed for defensive purposes can also, as we now see, be unleashed for attacking purposes, for quite imperceptibly there has developed a sharp threat, namely that of 13…\textit{e}g8\textdagger and if 13…\textit{h}h7\textdagger then 14…\textit{c}c7\textdagger \textit{x}xg8 15…\textit{g}g7 mate.

12…\textit{e}e1 13…\textit{c}c7

With various threats.

13…\textit{e}e1\textdagger†

Fortunately Black still has this way out.

14…\textit{xe}1 \textit{b}b1\textdagger† 15…\textit{e}e2 \textit{d}d3\textdagger

½–½

Perpetual check.

In this endgame the heroic defence was totally based on centralization. You should look carefully at each member of White’s trio (\textit{c}c2, \textit{d}d4, \textit{h}h8) and try to establish the type and importance of the functional changes which affected it on move 12. Move 12 was, as we know, the key moment when the white pieces suddenly had to change from being defenders into storm troopers.

This brings to an end section 9 which has been devoted to heroic defence.

10. “Combinations slumbering under a thin blanket”

Adolf Anderssen, who coined this excellent phrase, was describing combinations in the closed games. If this great player of classical times were still alive, it would not be unlikely that he would have included all the combinations of the hypermodern school. In fact, modern combinations seem to have something deliberately unassuming about them: from time to time their ghostly presence is felt between the lines without daring to make an appearance in the text itself. But even when a powerful wave sweeps them from the depths of the ocean to the surface (the game), their appearance is still a modest one, not at all like thunder and lightning. And their modest exterior (see for example 17…\textit{g}g6 in the note to move 16 of game 107) seems very often in contrast – and deliberate contrast, it might almost be said – to the depth of thought which lies behind them.

We would hardly claim that modesty is one of the most obvious characteristics of our era; but there is one branch of modesty which does seem typical of our age: we mean the voluntary subordination of the self to the needs of the whole (Reinhardt, Stanislavsky; think for example of the film The Potemkin in which there is only one “main character”, which is “the people”!). As well as modesty, also requiring of consideration is the loving treatment of pure technique, which is so typical of our age. Finally some importance must be accorded to the campaign I have led with the goal of replacing the existing idea of beauty in chess with a new one: what should be thought of as beautiful is neither the accumulation of small advantages nor the game moulded by textbook notions, but rather anything which somehow links the chaotic happenings on the board to the laws of nature, in order to make clear “how benevolently, wonderfully and mysteriously Mother Nature organizes her realm”. I have just quoted from my article in Kajans neueste Schachnachrichten (1926, p. 484) and will also borrow from it the following description of a struggle, which should serve as a textbook example of the new idea of beauty in chess: “Thanks to careless play, Black got on to a slippery slope. But with a great effort of will he now finds a move which just holds the game. The downwards slide is brought to an end. Then no matter how the position may appear, things start to go uphill, because the game is a simple draw. So why did Black win it? Because the process of stopping the slide awakened the slumbering strength which lay in Black’s position, and that suddenly came to the fore. A specialist in tuberculosis is well aware of this phenomenon: once the illness is stopped in its tracks, things must improve, resulting in the cure.”

Lack of space prevents us from going into this in more detail, so we refer you to the above-mentioned article. We think however that the few remarks above should show quite clearly that today’s combinations are less ostentatious, they tend to avoid showy brilliance and are subordinated to strategy, quite unlike the combinations of the old school. So the modern combination fully deserves the description given by Anderssen.
Game 107
Dr G. Fluss, Budapest
Aron Nimzowitsch
Correspondence 1912-1914

1.e4 e5 2.ªf3 ªc6 3.ªc3 ªf6 4.ªc4 ªc5 5.d3 d6 6.ªg5 h6 7.ªh4 g5 8.ªg3 ªg4 9.h3 ªh5 10.h4

The immediate 9.h4 would have been strongly met by 9...ªh5, e.g. 10.hxg5 ªxg5 11.fxg3 ªd4
12.ªd5 ªxf3 13.gxf3 ªxg5! and wins (14.g4 c6 15.ªh5 cxd5!! etc.).

10...g4 11.ªd2 a6

A waiting move, but one which at the same time prevents any possibility of ªb5.

12.ªd5 ªxd5 13.ªxd5 ªe7!

A pawn sacrifice with a really unusual point to it.

14.ªxb7 ªa7 15.ªd5 f5 16.f4

The point would have been seen after the natural continuation 16.ªe6 f4 17.ªh2 when Black would not have gone for the sacrifice with 17...ªxf2† but would have turned to the modest protective move 17...ªg6. After 17...ªxf2† 18.ªf1 ªe3 19.ªc4 ªg6 (the only way to protect the important g-pawn) 20.ªg1!! ªxg1 21.ªxg4! White would have the advantage. On the other hand 17...ªg6 (to meet 18.ªxg4? by 18...ªxh4; note how the knight on g6 prevents a possible check after the moves 18...ªxg4? ªxh4 19.ªxh5) would have been very effective. For example: 18.g3 (to protect h4) 18...ªf3 and the h2-bishop is shut in.

Or (17...ªg6) 18.ªg1 f3 19.gxf3 gxf3 and...ªf4 with advantage to Black. We consider the deliberately modest combination 17...ªg6 (and not 17...ªxf2†) to be extremely significant in view of the remarks above.

Also worth considering instead of 16.ªe6 was 16.ªe2 which would have been followed by 16...ªxd5 17.exd5 ªa8 18.c4 (not 18.ªxe5 on account of 18...0-0!) 18...ªc6 19.dxc6 ªxc6 and Black – with among other things a very mobile queen’s rook (just look at the possibility of...ªa7-e7 or...ªa7-g7) – should have a decisive advantage.

The move chosen in the game (16.f4) also has its downside.

16...ªxf3 17.gxf3 ªxd5 18.exd5 ªg8 19.ªf1

19.ªf2 would be met by 19...ªxf2† 20.ªxf2 c6!!

A move which helps both the queen on d8 and the a7-rook become fearfully mobile, e.g. 21.dxc6 ªb6† 22.ªf1 ªa7 and then mate.

19...ªb8!

Much stronger than 19...e4 which is followed by 20.ªd2 threatening 21.ªxh6 and then possibly 22.ªe6†.

20.d4

A final attempt to save the game, otherwise, after for example 20.b3, there would be 20...ªb4† 21.ªe2 e4 or 20.ªb1 ªb7! 21.b3. Now there would be no deadly queen check on b4 but 21...ªb4† would be similar in effect, and after 22.ªf2 ªa7† 23.d4 ªc3! and wins.
20...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{x}}}}}d4 21.c3
A bit like an Evans Gambit, if now 21...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c5 22.b4! but...

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 &  &  &  &  &  &  & \\
\hline
 &  &  &  &  &  &  & \\
\hline
 &  &  &  &  &  &  & \\
\hline
 &  &  &  &  &  &  & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

21...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{b}}}}}xb2!!}}
An elegant final combination.

22.cxd4 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c3† 23.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{f}}}}}f2  \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{b}}}}}b7!}}
There is no antidote to this.

24.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c1
Or 24.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{h}}}}}h2 with a similar finish.

24.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{b}}}}}b2† 25.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{g}}}}}g1  \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{x}}}}}xg3†
0–1

Because next comes 26.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d3  \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}}}}}e3† and mate on f2.

A similar sacrifice was possible after 24.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{h}}}}}h2 instead of 24.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c1. 24...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{b}}}}}b2† 25.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{g}}}}}g1  \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{b}}}}}xb2† 26.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d3. After 26...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}}}}}e3† White did have 27.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d1 but it would have been no use against 27...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}dxe3†.

\textbf{Game 108}

\textbf{Aron Nimzowitsch}

\textbf{Dr Orla Hermann Krause}

Copenhagen 1924

This game, which does not look very combinatory in style, is in fact seething with brilliant and colourful combinations, only they do not come into the game itself but hover about in the background. You are particularly advised to play over with special care the variations analysed in the annotations.

1.d4 f5 2.e3 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c6 3.d4 d6
Dr Krause's pet variation, which he is also in the habit of playing against 3.c4. The idea behind it is the plan to get in the advance ...e7-e5, even at the cost of a pawn sacrifice. See Black's 6th move.

4.e3 h6 5.h4
Aiming to forestall his opponent's plans for expansion: ...g5 and ...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{g}}}}}g7.

5...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d6 6.d5
If this has to be played, it must be played at once. Waiting by 6.c4 or 6.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d2 would have as a consequence 6...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{g}}}}}g4 after which the lines beginning with 7.d5 e5 would be less favourable for White than what happens in the text (because 6...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d4 would represent a valuable extra tempo for Black).

6...e5
Krause's solution, but one which does not quite seem to work here.

7.dxc6 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}}}}}xf4 8.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{b}}}}}b5
But not 8.cxb7 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{g}}}}}xb7 9.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}}}}}xe4 10.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c2 11.gxf3 and the f-pawns are tripled.

8...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{b}}}}}b6
Dr Krause recommends 8...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c7 as a better move.

It could apparently be followed by 9.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}}}}}e4 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}}}}}c7† (not 9...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c8† on account of 10.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c5† dxe5 11.cxb7 and wins) 10.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c2 11.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}}}}}exe2 bx\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c6 12.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d6 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{b}}}}}xb8 or by 9.0–0 fxe3 10.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}}}}}e5† \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{g}}}}}g8 11.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{f}}}}}xe3 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}c7 12.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d6 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{e}}}}}xe3† 13.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{c}}}}}h1 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{g}}}}}g3 14.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d3 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d4 and wins; both replies are unfavourable for Black. But by modestly centralizing after 8...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d7 with 9.\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{d}}}}}d4 White would have the superior game; for example...
8....gf7 9...d4 fxe3 10.fxe3 d5 11...e5† g8 12...d2 b6 13.b4 (to prevent ...e5) and White clearly has the better game.

Notice the calming effect of the move 9...d4 on a board which was open to all sorts of combinations! The incorporation of positional moves is really significant as far as modern combinative play is concerned.

9.exf4 d5! 10.0-0 c5 11.g3 e4 12.g2 g5

The best chance, but the sharpest move. Also worth considering was 12...d6. It would have been followed by something along the lines of 13...e5? e6 14.f3 f6 with the threat of 15...d4 and then f6-d5-e3† or 13.c3 a5 14.d4 and White is better off.

13...e5! 0-0!

13...g4? would be wrong of course: 14.d7 d4 15.b4 xb4 16...d4 and White wins a piece. After the text move the critical position is reached.

14.hxg5!

The logical move: since an immediate 14...h5 fails to the amusing reply 14...xe8 15...xh6? h6, the queen on h5 should be able to be protected by a rook on h1, so 14.hxg5 hxg5 15...h5 e8 16...h1. But extraordinarily lively play would have been the result of the illogical move 14.f3 (anti-positional blocking of the important d1-h5 diagonal): 14...d6! 15...d5† h7 16.hxg5! (16...c3 xb5 17...d8 e8d8 18...xb5 d2† only gives White a draw) 16...xb5 17...c3!:

17...xc3? 18.h1! and wins, e.g. 18...f6 (the threat was mate in three moves) 19.gxf6 xd5 20.xh6† and mate in a few more moves.

After 14.f3 d6 15...xd5† h7 16.hxg5 d5 17...c3 Black could (instead of 17...xc3) exchange queens with 17...xd5 18...xd5. The position would then be difficult and 18...hxg5 would allow his opponent's attack to gain the ascendancy by 19.h1† g7 20.h5. Stiffer resistance could be put up by 18...h8, e.g. 19.a4 (19.f7? e6! 20.xh8 xxd5 etc.) 19...d4 20...c7 h8 21.h1 g7 22.gxh6† h7 (not 22...hx6 because of the intermediate check on e8, the exchange of rooks and mate, i.e. 23...e8† h7 24.h6† h6 25.h1 mate) 23...d5 e8 (mate was threatened) 24.c3 and White still has some hard work to do to get the win.

So the logical text move was preferable, which should not be all that surprising since even in fantastic positions logic rules.

14...hxg5 15...h5 f6 16.f3!

The end of fear! White is no longer afraid of the ghostly presence of 16...xf4 17.fxe4 xxe5 since that line will be met quite simply by 18...c3! and White’s e-pawn is taboo! 18...f7, which some critics considered sufficient, would then be met by 19.xf4 after which Black must shyly hold back his trump card of ...h7, because after 19...h7 there would be a catastrophe in the form of 20.g4† h8 21.h7†. So he would have nothing better than the developing move 19...c6!.

The win would then have to be forced by the
following study-like manoeuvre: (19...e6)
20.exf5 exf5 21.h1 (threatening xf5!) 21...e4!
Black now has to seek simplifications! 22.Qxe4
Wxh5 23.Qxh5 Bxf4 24.Qxc5 Bb4 25.Qa6 Qxb5
26.b4!! and wins. But on no account 26.Qxc7?
because of 26...Qxb2 27.Qxa8 Qxc2† 28.Qf3
Qxc6 winning the knight and leading to a draw.

The totally unusual position reached after
the final move in the line is worth its own diagram:

But in the game, Black played the retreat:
16...d6 17.c3 e6 18.fxg5 Qxe5 19.Qg6†
Qg7 20.Qxe6† Qf7 21.Qxf7† Qxf7 22.Qd3
Qd4

22...d4 would have been followed by 23.Qd5
with the threat of 24.b4.
23.Qxd5 Qhx2 24.Qae1 Qae8 25.Qxc7 Qxc1
26.Qxe7 Qxe7 27.Qd5!
This is more accurate than 27.Qe6 Qe8 28.c7 Qxe6
29.Qc4. What White has in mind is a terrible
stalemating of all Black's pieces!
27...Qxc6 28.Qe7†
1–0

28...Qg6 would simply be met by 29.Qf4†
Qxg5 30.Qe6 Qf6 31.c4! and zugzwang brings
Black down. It seemed to be the fate of this
game that the combinations could never be executed;
but who would deny that they nevertheless had a
stimulating influence on the course of events!

And finally a short and exciting game, which can
hardly make any claim to having been particularly
correctly played. Black first plays a quite correct
combination, but then, in order to avoid an
exchange of queens, he rushes headlong into an
adventure which could have turned out badly for
him.

**Game 109**

**Rudolf Spielmann**

**Aron Nimzowitch**

Stockholm 1920

1.e4 Qc6 2.d4 d5 3.e5 Qf5
This is simpler than 3...f6.
4.Qe2

4.Qf3 would be a more natural move.
4...e6 5.Qg3 Qg6 6.h4 h5 7.Qe2 Qc7
And so White's manoeuvre is justified! But Black
could have played better: 7...Qb4 8.Qa3 c5 9.c3
Qc6 and White's efforts against Black's h-pawn
look excessive in view of the serious situation in
the centre.
8.Qxh5 Qxh5 9.Qxh5 g6 10.Qf4 Qxh4 11.Qxh4
Qxh4 12.Qd3
This prevents 12...Qg5 as then 13.Qxe6! would
win.
12...Qge7!! 13.g3 Qf5 14.gxh4 Qfxd4

There is now a double threat, namely 15.Qb4
16.Qxd4 Qxc2† and 15...Qxe5 16.Qxd4 Qf3†. A
near turn of events.

15.Qa3 Qxh4

A simpler line would be 15...Qxe5 16.Qh3
Qd6† 17.Qf1 Qxh4 with a promising ending, but
Black wanted to avoid the exchange of queens.
16. \( \text{h3} \)
In order to force the exchange.
16... \( \text{g5?!} \)

Intending 17. \( \text{h8}\# \) \( \text{d7} \) 18. \( \text{xa8} \) \( \text{g1}\# \) 19. \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xf2}\# \) 20. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b3}?! \). After the game a second solution was found in 20... \( \text{f3} \). Nevertheless, 16... \( \text{xh3} \) was necessary.

17. \( \text{e3?} \)

Now White could have played 17. \( \text{d3} \) with the advantage: 17... \( \text{g1}\# \) 18. \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 19. \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xf2}\# \) would do just as well here as would (17... \( \text{g1}\# \) 18. \( \text{d2} \)) 18... \( \text{d7} \) 19. \( \text{c5}\# \) (not 19.\( \text{c3} \) on account of 19... \( \text{h8} \) 20. \( \text{xh8} \) \( \text{g5}\# \) with perpetual check) 19... \( \text{e7} \) 20. \( \text{h4}\# \) \( \text{e8} \) (or 20... \( \text{g5} \) 21. \( \text{g3} \) 21. \( \text{h8}\# \) \( \text{e7} \) 22. \( \text{f6}\# \) \( \text{e8} \) 23.\( \text{c3} \).

17... \( \text{g1}\# \) 18. \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{f3}\# \) 19. \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{fd4}\# \) 20. \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{f3}\# \) 21. \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{cd4}\# \)

22. \( \text{d3} \)
Fatal. White had no choice but to go in for the line 22. \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xd4}\# \) 23. \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{g5} \), although his position would then look not at all enviable (24. \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xf4}\# \) 25. \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{c5} \)).

22... \( \text{g5} \) 23. \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 24. \( \text{f1} \) 0–0–0 25. \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{b5} \) 26. \( \text{xb5} \) \( \text{e4}\# \) 27. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{xc2}\# \) 28. \( \text{b4} \) \( \text{c5}\# \) 0–1

And so I close my book and bid a friendly, I hope, farewell to you, my readers.
Postscript

When producing a new edition of a classic work it is natural that modern players will notice some points in the games that Nimzowitsch may have overlooked. We have learned from all the chess thinkers who came after Nimzowitsch and, most of all, we have helpful computer programs. Our purpose in this short article is to suggest some improvements over the original analysis. We would like to emphasize that these examples are not intended as a comprehensive list of corrections or possible improvements: only positions that we find particularly interesting or instructive are included.

The format of this article is simple. Throughout the book small superscript numbers have been added to the moves in question. These numbers are replicated here, where an explanation of the tactic or idea that Nimzowitsch missed or ignored is given. We also give the page number where the position can be found.

Jacob Aagaard and John Shaw, Glasgow 2007
28...\[g4

Nimzowitsch passes this move without comment, but Black had a beautiful win: 28...\[d8! Threatening a discovered attack seems crude and simplistic but White cannot escape the various pins. 29.\[e2 (or 29.\[c1 \[xg2\[† 30.\[xg2 \[d3\[†) 29...\[c3!! 30.\[xc3 \[xd1\[† 31.\[xd1 \[xg2\[†! 32.\[xg2 \[e3\[†

The game continued 35...\[e8, but as an alternative Nimzowitsch gives: 35...\[e1 36.\[e2 \[xe2 37.\[d8\[† \[h7 38.\[g5\[†

Now Nimzowitsch's line is 38...\[h6 39.\[xf7\[† \[h5 40.\[h8\[† \[g4 41.\[h3 \[f4 42.\[g3 \[e4 43.\[d6\[†.

Beautiful stuff and a famous combination quoted in many books, but Black has another option at move 38: he has to try 38...\[xg5 39.\[xg5 \[d3 40.h3 \[e5 41.\[g3 \[d5 when Black has good drawing chances. Dig out your endgame textbooks and also look at 41...\[xc5?! 42.\[xd3. Will Black's fortress hold?
3. Richard Réti – Aron Nimzowitsch
Marienbad 1925

Page 27

The game continued 22.\textit{\texttt{w}}a4, but Nimzowitsch mentioned 22.b4 \textit{\texttt{w}}a3 23.\textit{\texttt{b}}b1 \textit{\texttt{c}}e6 24.\textit{\texttt{e}}e5 \textit{\texttt{d}}d7 25.\textit{\texttt{e}}e1:

And now he gave 25...\textit{\texttt{d}}xe5 26.bxc5 \textit{\texttt{f}}f6 as bad for White, no doubt missing 27.\textit{\texttt{b}}b3!. Nimzowitsch's line is clever and tempting, but Black has a winner on move 25. After 25...\textit{\texttt{d}}d4! the double threats of ...\textit{\texttt{d}}xc5 and ...\textit{\texttt{d}}xc3! are decisive.

4. Ernst Grünfeld – Aron Nimzowitsch
Kecskemét 1927

Page 37

10...\textit{\texttt{d}}xe4?
A standard trick in the Nimzo-Indian, but there is a trick here that Nimzowitsch missed.
11.\textit{\texttt{d}}xd8 \textit{\texttt{d}}xc3 12.\textit{\texttt{h}}h4

This was the game and the reason Nimzowitsch was unhappy with 10...\textit{\texttt{d}}xe4. The vital line is 12.\textit{\texttt{h}}xc7 \textit{\texttt{e}}e7:

Nimzowitsch analysed 13.bxc3 \textit{\texttt{b}}b8 14.\textit{\texttt{d}}xd6\textit{\texttt{d}}x6, but 13.c5! would win at least a pawn on the spot. One point is that after 13...bxc5 the c7-bishop now has an escape square on a5. Missing 13.c5! is a typical tactical oversight, because c5 is covered three times by Black and so is subconsciously rejected as “impossible”.
28.\texttt{\textsl{Wf1}} is the only move mentioned, but the alternative leads to some instructive points. 28.\texttt{\textsl{Wg3}} \texttt{\textsc{Be3}} 29.\texttt{\textsl{Wh4}} and now:

29...\texttt{\textsl{Rh2}}!! wins in all lines:
\begin{itemize}
\item[a)] 30.\texttt{\textsl{Xh2}} \texttt{\textsc{Xf4}} and now:
\begin{itemize}
\item[a1)] After 31.\texttt{\textsl{Xh1}} Black must nudge the queen away from g3. 31...g5! 32.\texttt{\textsl{Wh6}} \texttt{\textsc{e4}}!! A simple but instructive example of coordination, as 32...\texttt{\textsl{Wf3}} would of course get in the rook's way. 33.\texttt{\textsl{Xg1}} \texttt{\textsc{Xg3}} 34.\texttt{\textsl{Xf1}} \texttt{\textsc{h1}} 35.\texttt{\textsl{Xe2}} \texttt{\textsc{h2}} 36.\texttt{\textsl{Xf1}} \texttt{\textsc{g1}} is mate.
\item[a2)] 31.\texttt{\textsl{Xg1}} \texttt{\textsc{g3}} 32.\texttt{\textsl{Xxg3}} \texttt{\textsc{Xxg3}} With a little care, Black should win.
\item[b)] 30.\texttt{\textsl{Xg1}} \texttt{\textsc{hxh3}}! (this effectively forces a pawn ending and is thus much clearer than 30...\texttt{\textsc{exh3}}
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

All forced, but is it a win? The kingside pawns can't promote on their own so the black king will at some point have to support them and let the d-pawn run. It is easy to visualize that when White is able to push d5-d6 Black's pawns will both hit the sixth rank. That this wins by a tempo is worth remembering.

For example: 37...\texttt{\textsl{Cc7}} 38.\texttt{\textsl{Xg5}} h5 39.a4 a5 40.\texttt{\textsl{Xh4}} \texttt{\textsc{d7}} 41.\texttt{\textsl{Xg5}} \texttt{\textsc{e7}} 42.\texttt{\textsl{Xh4}} \texttt{\textsc{f6}} 43.\texttt{\textsl{Xg3}} g5 44.\texttt{\textsc{f3}} g4 45.\texttt{\textsl{Xf4}} \texttt{\textsc{g6}} 46.\texttt{\textsl{Xg3}} \texttt{\textsc{g5}} 47.\texttt{\textsl{Xg2}} h4 48.\texttt{\textsl{Xf2}} g3 49.\texttt{\textsc{f3}} \texttt{\textsc{f5}} 50.\texttt{\textsl{Xg2}} Now is the moment when Black must trust his arithmetic (or 50.\texttt{\textsl{Xe2}} h3 51.\texttt{\textsc{f3}} h2! 52.\texttt{\textsl{Xg2}} \texttt{\textsc{f4}} 53.d6 \texttt{\textsc{e3}} 54.d7 h1\texttt{\textsl{W}} 55.\texttt{\textsl{Xh1}} \texttt{\textsc{f2}}). 50...\texttt{\textsl{Xg4}} 51.d6 h3 52.\texttt{\textsl{Xg1}} \texttt{\textsc{f3}} 53.d7 h2 54.\texttt{\textsl{Xh1}} \texttt{\textsc{f2}} 55.d8\texttt{\textsl{W}} It is rather important that this is not check. 55...g2 56.\texttt{\textsl{Xh2}} g1\texttt{\textsl{W}} 57.\texttt{\textsl{Xh3}} \texttt{\textsc{g3}} mate.
24...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd5}

Capturing a pawn while skewering queen and rook feels like it must be right, however 24...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}g8!!} was a tremendous resource. It prepares ...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd5} which is deadlier than ...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd5}. Black wins material after 25.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}d2} \texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd5} 26.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd5} \texttt{\textit{\texttimes}c7} or, to be precise, two exchanges. White has some compensation, but he should lose.

A sharp position with glorious possibilities.

27.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd4}

This was the game but there was so much more to be said here.

27.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}c1} and now 27...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}d3} is the line given, as 27...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}e3!!} is easy to miss. After 28.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd4} \texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd4!}

29.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xa3} Black will be a pawn up.

27.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}b4!!} seems to just win a piece, but Black has some amazing resources up his sleeve: 27...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}b5!}

...Forced.

28.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}c1} \texttt{\textit{\texttimes}h6}

The play has been wild just to get here, but the real fun is just beginning.

29.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd4}

29.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd4} \texttt{\textit{\texttimes}e4!!} 30.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xe4} fxe4 leads to unclear play. For example: 31.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}c3} \texttt{\textit{\texttimes}h5} 32.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}g1} e3! with roughly even chances.

29...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}c2!} 30.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xc4} \texttt{\textit{\texttimes}d3!!} 31.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}g7!!}

White is trying to find a saving check for his queen.

31...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xg7}

31...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xg7} would remove the mate threat on h2, allowing 32.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd3}.

32.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xc7!!} \texttt{\textit{\texttimes}g8}

32...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xc7} also ends the threat to h2, so

33.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd3}.

33.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}g7!!} \texttt{\textit{\texttimes}g8}

33...\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}h8} 34.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}d4} \texttt{\textit{\texttimes}g7} 35.\texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xd3} \texttt{\textit{\texttimes}xb2}
36.\textit{xf5} \textit{xf2} 37.\textit{xf2} \textit{xf2} 38.\textit{g6} is a draw.
Now White seems to have run out of bullets.

\textbf{8. Rudolf Spielmann – Aron Nimzowitsch}
\textit{New York 1927}
Page 108

34.\textit{g6}!!
The whole line seems too incredible to be true.
34...\textit{hxg6} 35.\textit{xd6}†
White draws by perpetual check.

If instead 34.\textit{Exh7}? \textit{xf2}† 35.\textit{xf2} \textit{c1}† 36.\textit{f1}!! (36.\textit{g2} \textit{g6}†) 36...\textit{xf1}† 37.\textit{g2} \textit{h7} 38.\textit{xd6}† (38.\textit{xf1} \textit{h3}† 39.\textit{f2} \textit{h2}† 40.\textit{f1} \textit{h6} and Black should win) 38...\textit{c7} 39.\textit{h6}† \textit{g7}† 40.\textit{xc7} \textit{g7} 41.\textit{xf1} \textit{c8}, then Black wins the endgame.

So, 27.\textit{fd1} was the winning move. The point is that in various lines the rook is not hanging on \textit{f1}. White really does win a piece in this position, and though it is only two minor pieces for a rook, it is still enough to claim a decisive advantage. 27...\textit{d3} (27...\textit{xf2} 28.\textit{xd4} \textit{f1}† 29.\textit{xf1} \textit{xd4} 30.\textit{fd1} \textit{xf4} 31.\textit{c3}! and White wins due to the double threat to \textit{c4} and \textit{h8}) 28.\textit{xd3} \textit{xd3} 29.\textit{b4}! \textit{e4} 30.\textit{xe4} \textit{fxe4} 31.\textit{xd4} \textit{f7} 32.\textit{c4}!
In this line the rook is trapped, and White should win.

Nimzowitsch stopped three moves before this with the comment: "White was better, even if he lost later by being over-hasty with his attack." This position is worth noting as a simple but instructive example of logical play:

\textbf{18.\textit{g1}}

Not bad but not best. Where is the big weakness and what is defending it? 18.\textit{h7}! The answers are \textit{f6} and the \textit{e7}-bishop. 18...\textit{d7} (The only calculation required is trivial: 18...\textit{hxh4} 19.\textit{xb4} \textit{xa1} 20.\textit{g5} and the queen is trapped.) 19.\textit{g5} White is dominant.
Nimzowitsch gives the impression that Black has been winning for some time, but it is White's next move that ends all hope.

41...b6?

No comment from Nimzowitsch, but a fatal thematic mistake. In rook endings the rook belongs behind the passed pawn: now Black will have this pleasure. White had to try 41...f8!. For example: 41...d5 (or 41...c4 42.b8 c5 43.b7 intending b6) 42.c8 d3 43.a8 d4 44.a7 This feels like a draw.

41...cxb6 42.d5 d7 43.b5 b7 44.d5 b5 45.xd6 b4

Picture perfect for Black.

Black's last move, 5...b6, is now known to fall into a beautiful opening trap. The game continued 6.d3, but 6.e6!! is inspired. One of the many threats is e5. Now:

a) 6...f6 does not stop the threat. 7.e5! fx5 8.h5 g6 9.xe5 g8 10.d5 c6 11.exd7+ xxd7 12.xg8 Black's rooks do struggle in this opening.

b) 6...dxe6 7.xd8+ xd8 8.e5 The king's rook is in immediate danger; the hidden threats to the queen's rook are the real problem. 8.e8 9.b5+ d7 (or 9.d7 10.c6 b8 11.f4) 10.xd7 xd7 11.f4! White simply plans to castle long. 11...a6 12.c6 c8 13.b7 d8 14.c7 Losing the exchange would be the least of Black's problems.

It feels appropriate that it was Tigran Petrosian who first played 6.e6!! Of all the world champions, perhaps Petrosian was most influenced by Nimzowitsch.
Chess Praxis is a superb collection of Aron Nimzowitsch's best games annotated by the great man himself, but it is even more than that. Nimzowitsch and his hypermodern ideas had a huge influence on modern chess thinking. Nimzowitsch first expounded his views in My System. In his follow-up Chess Praxis he demonstrated and explained how his concepts worked in his own games.

This is a completely new translation of Nimzowitsch's classic work, which will allow the reader to appreciate influential ideas explained in modern language.

Aron Nimzowitsch was one of the greatest chess players of the 1920s and 1930s, ranked just behind the famous World Champions Alekhine and Capablanca. His reputation as an author is higher still.