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Key to symbols used

△ White to move
▼ Black to move

± White is slightly better
± Black is slightly better
± White is better
± Black is better
+- White has a decisive advantage
→ Black has a decisive advantage
= equality

‖ with compensation
‡ with counterplay
→ with attack
↑ with initiative
ø unclear
⊙ zugzwang

○ better is
△ intending

? a weak move
?? a blunder
! a good move
!! an excellent move
?! a move worth considering
?! a move of doubtful value
# mate
□ only move
Preface

It was a pleasure to have Artur Yusupov working as my second, both personally and professionally. It is therefore an honour for me to write the preface to this series of books.

This book was created by expanding and improving the original online lessons from the Chess Tigers University. As an honorary member of the Chess Tigers, it has given me great pleasure to see this logical follow-up take concrete form and meet the twin challenges of being both a valuable textbook and a bedside book.

It was in 1994 that I met Artur Yusupov in the semi-finals of the Candidates' cycle in Wijk aan Zee. I managed to come out ahead by 4.5–2.5, but I recognized that Artur harboured great potential, both in his chess knowledge and extensive match experience.

Artur's systematic and professional approach to analysing games was the decisive factor in having him as my second in the World Championship Finals in New York 1995 and Lausanne 1998. His mastery of the methods of the Russian chess school was very helpful in the preparation for the matches, as well as during the matches themselves. It was his idea that I should play the Trompovsky in the last game in Lausanne. I was 3-2 down, but was able to level the match at 3–3 and thus force a play-off.

I am still very grateful for everything that Artur did for me.

Artur's vast experience as a trainer convinced him that there is a considerable need for better tuition for amateurs. Matching the level to the needs of the student is perhaps not too difficult, but the masterstroke is structuring the information in such a way that makes it immediately useful for amateurs. I am naturally enthusiastic about the rich variety of material in this series, which can help beginners become top amateurs.

I wish Artur Yusupov all the best with the publication of this series of books. Making this work available in English means that even more people who are keen to learn can enjoy it to the full.

World Champion, Viswanathan Anand
Introduction

During my many years of work as a chess trainer, I have noticed that there are only a few books which are really suitable for most amateur players. Some good books treat individual aspects of the game (middlegame or endgame, tactics or positional play) without paying any real heed to the readers’ playing levels. This brought about the idea of working out a teaching programme aimed specifically at a certain playing strength. Such teaching programmes, in a brief form and intended as systematic help for trainers, are common only in Russia, where they are very popular. One very well known and much valued example is a publication by Golenischev, which inspired some aspects of my methodology.

In 2003 I began a 3 year training programme in my chess academy. Three groups were set up according to playing strength: under Elo 1500, under Elo 1800 and under Elo 2100. Each annual stage consisted of 24 teaching modules and 24 tests, plus a final test at the end of the course.

This programme was later taken over, in a different form, by the Chess Tigers University and is still being used there.

The overwhelmingly positive comments of my students encouraged me to rework this programme in the form of a series of books. In doing so, I was able to make use of many evaluations, corrections and suggestions from my students. While I was redrafting, especially the explanations in the solutions, that feedback from my students was very valuable.

This book is the third volume in the series of Mastery manuals, designed for players who wish to build on the foundations of their chess knowledge. The reader will receive further knowledge in six areas of the game – tactics, positional play, strategy, the calculation of variations, the opening and the endgame.

The reader will benefit from the methodical build-up in this book, even if some of the material is familiar, as it will close any possible gaps in his chess knowledge and thus construct solid foundations for future success. To make the book entertaining and varied, I have mixed up these different areas, but you can always see from the header to which area any particular chapter belongs.

At this point I must emphasize that just working with this book does not guarantee a rise in your rating. It simply gives you a solid basis for a leap forward in chess ability. You should also play in tournaments, analyse your own games, play through well-annotated games of stronger players and read books on chess.

I have also been concerned with another problem area since I moved to Germany: the role of trainers in chess education. In Germany there are unfortunately too few qualified trainers. There is also a widespread opinion that a talented chess player does not need a trainer. I do not share that opinion. I believe that many talented German chess players could develop much further, if they had support at the correct time and if they had not left gaps in their learning.

Chess is a complicated sport, which has to be studied for many years. It is hard to imagine any other sport without coaches. (Is there a single athletics club or football club that does not have a trainer?) This manual is intended for the many club players who unfortunately receive no support in attempting to master our complicated sport. In this way it is intended as a substitute for a trainer for those that have none (and a support for trainers), but not an equal replacement for a trainer.

I further believe that many chess lovers, who show great commitment to working with young players in chess clubs, will gain with this series of books (as well as with the programme of the
Chess Tigers University) important methodological support and high quality training material for their chess lessons. The students will certainly profit from the supplementary explanations given by trainers and from lively discussions about the themes in the books.

How to work with this book

First read through the lessons. **You absolutely must play through all the examples and all the variations on a chessboard.**

First think about every diagram position (for at least 5 minutes) and try to find the solutions on your own. On average, you will need 1 to 2 hours per lesson. However, there is no time limit; some students may need more time for specific lessons.

It is important to have a good understanding of the subject.

The second part of the lesson is a test with 12 positions. The stars near the number of each exercise indicate the level of difficulty and, at the same time, the maximum number of points which you can earn for the correct solution with all necessary variations (★ = 1 point). Try to solve the positions without moving the pieces! If you cannot solve the position straight away, you must try for a second time for approximately 10 minutes. This time you may move the pieces. You must look for new ideas.

**On absolutely no account may you get help from a computer!**

Normally you will also need 1 to 2 hours for each test. Try to solve all the exercises. Consider each position as though it were appearing in one of your own games and look for the best possible continuation. You do not always have to mate or win quickly. It is sometimes enough to suggest a good move. Especially in the lessons on the opening, it is more important for you to reflect on the position, take a decision and then carefully play through the solutions. This will help you better understand the ideas of the opening. Mistakes are part of the learning process!

**It is very important to write down all the necessary variations.** If you do this you will be able to compare your solution with the one given in the book and you can also see how well you have understood the particular subject. If your score is too low, we recommend that you work through the chapter again. **We also recommend that you play through the solutions, including all the variations, on a chessboard.**

You will find an explanation of the standard chess symbols used in this book on page 4.

At this point I should like to express my gratitude to a large number of people who have supported my work in various ways. There is firstly my wife Nadja for the design of the German edition book and her help in working through the solutions, my daughter Katja for many corrections to my German, my chess trainer Mark Dvoretsky, from whose training methods I have learned so much, the Chess Tigers and Hans-Walter Schmitt for their constructive and productive cooperation, Mike Rosa for correcting some mistakes, Reinhold from Schwerin for his proofreading, and finally to Semen Oxman and Oleg Aizman, who gave valuable advice concerning the design of the book.

I would also like to thank Augusto Caruso for his elaboration of Nadja’s design for the English edition and Ian Adams for translating the book.

GM Artur Yusupov
Desperadoes

Any piece which, perhaps only for a very short space of time, has the free rein to do anything is called a desperado piece.

One of the most commonplace cases of the desperado piece is the discovered attack, when the desperado piece can go to squares which it could not normally occupy without being captured. A desperado combination of this sort often leads to a gain of material.

Diagram 1-1

I. Von Popiel – G. Marco
Monre Carlo 1902

32.\textit{d}3
White pins the d4-bishop, sets up a battery with his queen and bishop, and prepares the very dangerous discovered attack e4-e5. Black tries to prevent this move.

32...e5 33.\textit{xe}5 \textit{xf}1\text{\textdagger}
33...\textit{dd}8??
34.\textit{xf}1 \textit{e}7?
Better is 34...\textit{dd}8??.
35.\textit{f}5?!
35.e6! \textit{xe}6 36.\textit{f}8\text{\textdagger} \textit{g}7 37.e5\text{\textdagger} \textit{g}6 38.\textit{f}6++ would be the simple solution. But White preferred to win the pinned piece.

35...\textit{xe}5 36.\textit{d}1?

Diagram 1-2

We have already seen this position in Chapter 7 of \textit{Build Up Your Chess}. Black thought at this point that he had simply lost his d4-bishop and resigned! 1–0

This bishop is a classic desperado piece! Black could move it to the unexpected square g1 and win a lot of material with it: 36...\textit{g}1!!+–

Instead of 36.\textit{d}1? White should play 36.\textit{h}4!+–. There is no good defence against the strong threats of 37.\textit{g}6\text{\textdagger} and 37.\textit{f}3.
Desperadoes

If during the course of a combination (or a series of exchanges) we condemn our own piece to 'death', then it takes on the qualities of a desperado. You should try to get as much material as possible in return for the desperado.

Diagram 1-3

A.Alekhine – R.Reti
Vienna 1922

The following annotations are based on analysis by Alekhine.

14.0–0

Alekhine begins a complicated combination.

If 14.\textit{f3}? then 14...\textit{xa3} 15.\textit{xa8} c4 16.exf6 cxb3 (16...\textit{e8}† 17.\textit{d2}±) 17.0–0 b2\color{red}{\textit{xa5}}.

The same position as in the game is reached after 14.exf6 \textit{xa3} 15.\textit{d5} c4 16.0–0 \textit{a5}.

14...\textit{xa3} 15.exf6 c4

The white bishop is now a typical desperado.

16.\textit{d5}!

White is threatening both 17.\textit{xa8} and 17.\textit{g5}.

16...\textit{a5}!

Black parries both threats by preparing the intermediate check ...\textit{b6}†.

17.fxg7

17.\textit{xa8} \textit{b6}† 18.\textit{h1} \textit{b7}–

17.\textit{g5}† \textit{b6}† 18.\textit{h1} \textit{xf6}–

17...\textit{b6}† 18.\textit{h1} \textit{gx7}!

If 18...\textit{d8}? then 19.\textit{xc4}! (desperado) 19...\textit{xc4}

20.\textit{xa8} \textit{b7} 21.\textit{ab1}!–.

Diagram 1-4

19.\textit{xc4}! \textit{b7}!

If 19...\textit{bxc4}, then 20.\textit{xa8} \textit{b7} 21.\textit{ab1}.

Diagram 1-5 (analysis)

Both queens behave like desperados: 21...\textit{xb1} 22.\textit{xf8}† \textit{xf8} 23.\textit{xb1} and White has won more material.

20.\textit{e5}†

20.\textit{g5}† \textit{g6} 21.\textit{d3} f5\color{red}{\textit{xa5}}

20...\textit{f6} 21.\textit{d3}†

Black can still save the game in this ending!
One often intentionally places a piece in a dangerous position. This desperado strategy is intended to confuse the opponent and divert him from a clear positional line. Here is a classic example.

Black stands worse. Lasker decides to bring his rook to c5, to make White's logical play more difficult. (Extensive comments on this game can be found in School of Chess Excellence 2 by Dvoretsky.)

15...\texttt{Ex}e5!? 16.\texttt{Dd}4!

Intending 17.\texttt{Df}5 followed by 18.f4.

Of course not 16.\texttt{Dxc}7?? \texttt{Ex}c5+.

If 16.\texttt{Dxc}7? then 16...\texttt{Ex}b5 17.\texttt{Dxd}6 \texttt{Ex}b2 18.\texttt{Dxd}7 \texttt{Exd}7 19.\texttt{Dxd}7 \texttt{Ex}c8+.

16...\texttt{Ex}c5!? 17.\texttt{Dxb}3 \texttt{Dxb}6 18.\texttt{Df}4 \texttt{Df}6 19.\texttt{Df}3

White plans to consolidate his queenside with b2-b3 and c3-c4.

19...\texttt{Ee}8?

A stereotypical move which does not achieve much.

There are better alternatives in 19...a5!? 20.b3 a4± and 19...\texttt{Df}4± (Makariev).

20.\texttt{Cc}3!

Not 20.b3? \texttt{Dd}5!=.

20...a5 21.b3

21.\texttt{Db}3?

21...\texttt{a}4

22.b4

22.c4 guaranteed White a slight but clear advantage. But Tarrasch tries to exploit the exposed position of the rook.

22...\texttt{Dc}4 23.g3

23.\texttt{Dc}5 \texttt{Ed}8 24.\texttt{Df}3 would be followed by 24...\texttt{Ed}5! and if 25.e5, then 25...\texttt{xf}4 26.\texttt{xf}4 \texttt{xf}4= (Kasparov).

23.\texttt{Df}8

Black prepares ...c7-c5.

The immediate 23...c5? is premature on account of 24.\texttt{Dc}5.
Diagram 1-8

24.\textit{e}e3?  
White stands better and has a variety of good options:

a) 24.\textit{e}5 dxe5 25.\textit{d}xe5±  

b) 24.a3?! (Tarrasch) 24...c5!? 25.\textit{b}b5 cxb4 26.cxb4±  

c) 24.\textit{e}e3! intending \textit{b}5, \textit{d}3 and \textit{a}3 (Relstäd).  

d) 24.\textit{b}b1! intending \textit{d}3, \textit{e}3, and \textit{b}5-a3 (Chernin).  

e) 24.\textit{d}d3! (Makariev)  

With the text move Tarrasch starts a combination, but underestimates the desperado qualities of the rook on c4.  

24...c5 25.\textit{b}b5?  
Better is 25.bxc5! \textit{x}c5 26.\textit{b}b1 \textit{c}c4 27.\textit{d}d3∞ followed by \textit{c}c2-e3 (Teichmann).  

25...cxb4 26.\textit{e}xd6?  
26.cxb4! (26.\textit{d}d3?) 26...\textit{xb}4 27.\textit{c}c3  

Diagram 1-9  

26...\textit{e}xd6 27.e5  

27.\textit{f}xf4!  
This intermediate move brings the white position into disarray. The black pieces have all the energy of a desperado.  

28.\textit{g}xf4  
28...\textit{d}d1+→  
28.\textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}3 29.\textit{xf}3 \textit{d}d1+ 30.\textit{g}g2 \textit{d}d2+ (30...\textit{d}d5?) 31.\textit{xf}2 \textit{xf}2+ 32.\textit{xf}2 b3→ (Tarrasch)  

28...\textit{g}6+ 29.\textit{h}1  
29.\textit{h}f1 \textit{c}c4?!→  

29...\textit{b}1+ 30.\textit{g}2 \textit{d}d2+ 31.\textit{e}e2 \textit{xa}2  
Black soon won the game.

In praxis the term desperado is also employed in some difficult positions. For example, if one player is at a clear material disadvantage or finds himself in the worse positional situation, he may feel forced to attack so as not to go down without a fight. Then he is also ready to undertake all sorts of desperado operations!
Lasker, who introduced the concept of a desperado piece, also gave this example. Since White is in a materially hopeless position, he must act energetically and if necessary also be prepared to sacrifice!

1. ♖xg6†!

Of course this combination can also be defined as a deflection. Finding the right names for moves is less important than actually finding the moves themselves!

1...♖g8

Black is quickly mated after both 1...fxg6 2.f7† and 1...hxg6 2.♖h4†.

2.♖h4+–

Black cannot parry the mate.

We finish the chapter with an important observation by Dvoretsky.

“During a game any piece or pawn can become the weak point in a position, can turn out to be vulnerable, or can disrupt one’s own forces. Such pieces are then subject to an inner striving towards self-sacrifice, they become desperado pieces. As chess players we must pay the greatest of attention to the appearance and possible activities of such absolutely fearless kamikaze warriors, be they pawns or pieces.”

– Mark Dvoretsky, *School of Chess Excellence 2 – Tactical Play*
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Solutions

Ex. 1-1

A.Ivanov – Y.Razuvaev
Ashkhabad 1978

22...㎏f6!

(1 point)

This prepares further heroic deeds by the bishop.

23.$c4 ∆xf2† 24.¢h1 ∆xe1!

(another 1 point)

Other moves lose:

a) 24...c7? 25.¢c1! (25.㎏xf8? ㎏e6=)
25...$c8 26.¢ed1 ㎏e8 27.¢e7!+-

b) 24...d7? 25.¢e2 ㎏e8 26.¢xd7!+-

c) 24...f5? 25.¢xd8 ㎏xd8 26.¢e8† ㎏xe8
27.¢xe8† ㎏g7 28.¢f8†+-

25.¢xd8 ∆xb4!

(another 1 point)

26.¢d1?

This puts White in a worse position.

26.¢xc8? would also be bad: 26...¢c8
27.¢xb4 ㎏c1†+-

26.¢xf8† was necessary: 26...¢xf8 27.¢xa4

26...¢xa3 27.¢xa4 ㎏c5 28.¢a1 ㎏f2†

Ex. 1-2

I.Levitina – N.Alexandria
Candidates Match (11), Dubna 1983

The game continued 27.¢d2 ㎏c7 28.a4

White failed to spot the desperado possibilities for the h4-rook. The correct continuation is:

27.¢xf5!! ㎏xf5 28.¢xh7!!

(2 points)

28...¢xh7

28...¢xh7? 29.¢xg6 ㎏h8 30.¢h4† ㎏h7
31.¢f6†+-

29.¢xg6† ㎏f8 30.¢g8† ㎏f7 31.¢g6† ㎏e7
32.¢xh7† ㎏d8 33.¢xe8†
33.¢g7 is less clear after 33...¢e6 34.¢a7

33...¢xe8 34.h4 ㎏c7 35.h5 ㎏e6 36.¢xf5†
36.h6?! ㎏f8± is not as good, but 36.¢g6†

Ex. 1-3

Analysis by M.Oppen

The c7-rook turns desperado!

1.¢d5!

(1 point)

1...¢xh7† is not as strong: 1...¢xh7 2.¢h5†

2...¢c5

If 1...¢b5, then 2.¢xh7†! ¢xh7 3.¢h5†

2...¢c5

Or 2...¢g8 3.¢h5 f5 4.¢g5† ¢xh7
5.¢e7†+-

3.¢h5† ¢g8 4.¢e7+-

Ex. 1-4

A.Dunkelblum – P.Keres
Ostend 1937

18...¢g2!

(1 point)

A desperado as part of an exchanging operation.

19.¢xg2 ㎏xd8 20.¢h1

20.¢d1 ㎏xc3 21.bxc3 .HttpSession actionable

20...¢a3! 21.¢d1 axb2 22.¢xd5 ㎏xd5

White resigned, in view of 23.¢c2 ㎏xd1†
24.¢xd1  HttpSession actionable+-

0–1

Ex. 1-5

A.Yusupov – V.Ivanchuk
Candidates Match (8), Brussels 1991

20.¢xh5!

(1 point)
There is no way back!

20.\textit{\textbf{xa}6?} would be bad: 20...\textit{\textbf{xa}6} 21.\textit{\textbf{g}4} \textit{\textbf{e}2+}

20.\textit{\textbf{g}4?} is met by 20...\textit{\textbf{xd}3} 21.\textit{\textbf{xd}3} \textit{\textbf{b}4??} followed by either ...\textit{\textbf{c}2} or ...\textit{\textbf{d}8} (Dvoretsky).

20.\textit{\textbf{g}xh5} 21.\textit{\textbf{h}7+}

21...\textit{\textbf{g}7}

After 21...\textit{\textbf{h}8} 22.\textit{\textbf{xa}xh5} White’s attack is strong.

22.\textit{\textbf{xa}xh5}

(another 1 point)

22...\textit{\textbf{f}6}?

The decisive mistake.

22...\textit{\textbf{e}2?} would also be bad: 23.\textit{\textbf{f}3}!+-

22...\textit{\textbf{e}g}5? is no better: 23.\textit{\textbf{e}g}5! \textit{\textbf{f}6} 24.\textit{\textbf{e}4!} \textit{\textbf{h}8} 25.\textit{\textbf{g}6}↑ \textit{\textbf{f}8} 26.\textit{\textbf{xd}5} \textit{\textbf{e}xd}5 (26...\textit{\textbf{f}g}5 27.\textit{\textbf{f}d}6↑) 27.\textit{\textbf{xf}6}↑ \textit{\textbf{g}8} 28.\textit{\textbf{g}6}↑ \textit{\textbf{f}8} 29.\textit{\textbf{d}2}!! \textit{\textbf{c}4} 30.\textit{\textbf{h}3}+- and White may play 31.\textit{\textbf{a}3} or 31.\textit{\textbf{f}4} next.

22...\textit{\textbf{d}6}!? is an improvement: 23.\textit{\textbf{h}3}! \textit{\textbf{f}4} 24.\textit{\textbf{xf}4} \textit{\textbf{h}8} 25.\textit{\textbf{g}5}↑ \textit{\textbf{f}8} 26.\textit{\textbf{g}6}↑ \textit{\textbf{f}g}6 27.\textit{\textbf{f}d}6↑ \textit{\textbf{e}8} 28.\textit{\textbf{xa}xh8}↑ \textit{\textbf{f}7}!!

22...\textit{\textbf{b}4}?! (Nunn) is also a better defence: 23.\textit{\textbf{xf}7} \textit{\textbf{xf}7} 24.\textit{\textbf{h}6}↑ \textit{\textbf{h}8} 25.\textit{\textbf{f}5}↑ \textit{\textbf{g}8} 26.\textit{\textbf{g}6}↑?! \textit{\textbf{h}8} 27.\textit{\textbf{xe}6} \textit{\textbf{g}8} 28.\textit{\textbf{xe}f}6 \textit{\textbf{xf}7} 29.\textit{\textbf{xf}7} \textit{\textbf{e}x}d5 30.\textit{\textbf{d}5} \textit{\textbf{c}1} 31.\textit{\textbf{b}3} \textit{\textbf{b}2}± (Lautier)

23.\textit{\textbf{x}xe}6↑+-

(another 1 point)

23...\textit{\textbf{fx}e}6 24.\textit{\textbf{h}6}↑ \textit{\textbf{h}8} 25.\textit{\textbf{f}5}↑ \textit{\textbf{g}8} 26.\textit{\textbf{g}5}↑ \textit{\textbf{h}8} 27.\textit{\textbf{h}4}↑ \textit{\textbf{g}8} 28.\textit{\textbf{g}5}↑ \textit{\textbf{h}8} 29.\textit{\textbf{h}4}↑ \textit{\textbf{g}8} 30.\textit{\textbf{g}3}↑ \textit{\textbf{h}8} 31.\textit{\textbf{h}3}↑ \textit{\textbf{g}7} 32.\textit{\textbf{g}3}↑ \textit{\textbf{h}8} 33.\textit{\textbf{h}3}↑ \textit{\textbf{g}7} 34.\textit{\textbf{x}xe}6+-

(another 1 point)

The threat of \textit{\textbf{h}6#} means that White wins the queen.

34...\textit{\textbf{x}xe}6 35.\textit{\textbf{x}e}6 \textit{\textbf{d}8}

Or 35...\textit{\textbf{e}8} 36.\textit{\textbf{g}5} \textit{\textbf{b}5} 37.\textit{\textbf{h}4}+-.

36.\textit{\textbf{g}4!} \textit{\textbf{e}8} 37.\textit{\textbf{f}5} \textit{\textbf{c}4} 38.\textit{\textbf{g}5}

1–0

38...\textit{\textbf{h}7} is met by 39.\textit{\textbf{d}5}+-.
Solutions

22...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{1}}.c5!? would be a better defence:
23.gxg7 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{2}}.d7 24.exd7 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{5}}.d6 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{6}}.a5
26.cxf8 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{7}}.xf8 27.e8±

23.gxg7 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{8}}.ed7 24.\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{9}}.d6 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{10}}.a5

If 24...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{11}}.xa2, then 25.exf8 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{12}}.xf8 26.e8±
and White's threats include 27.e5, 27.d3 and 27.c7.

25.cxf8
25.b4?!
25...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{13}}.xf8 26.e8!±

The desperado knight returns.
26.e6 27.f6! \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{14}}.h8 28.f4 h7 29.d4
\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{15}}.xf6 30.c6f6!±

\textbf{Ex. 1-8}

\textbf{V.Anand – N.Sulava}

\textit{Bastia 2004}

Black had underestimated the following combination.
13.d8! \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{16}}.xd8 14.xf7! \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{17}}.e7 15.\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{18}}.xh8
(2 points)

This knight will soon find a way back.

15...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{19}}.h5
Or 15...d6 16.g6! \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{20}}.f7 17.d3 e5
18.g3 e4 19.c4!±.

16.g3
16.g6! \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{21}}.e8 17.g3±

16...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{22}}.e4?!
16...b5 17.g6! \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{23}}.e8±

17.d3 1–0

17.xg3 is answered by 18.hxg3+-.

\textbf{Ex. 1-9}

\textbf{A.Alekhine – N.Boekdrukker}

\textit{Bussum simultaneous 1933}

15...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{24}}.xh3!!
(1 point)

If 15...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{25}}.xc5, then 16.xe6 fxe6 17.xc5=, so the light-squared bishop turns desperado.

16.xa6

Other solutions are not very satisfactory either:

a) 16.gxh3 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{26}}.xc5 17.d5 axb5 18.xc5 e4
19.e3 b4–

b) 16.xb7? \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{27}}.xb7 17.gxh3 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{28}}.d4 18.xd4 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{29}}.e5

16...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{30}}.h2!!

This is more convincing than 16...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{31}}.d7!? or 16...bxa6 17.gxh3±.

17.dh1 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{32}}.xg2! 18.xg2 bxa6 19.xc6 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{33}}.e3! 20.xe3?
20.d3

20...g3! 21.dh1 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{34}}.g1!!–+

Or 21...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{35}}.d6±.

22.d2 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{36}}.xf2 23.g1 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{37}}.e8 24.d3 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{38}}.xg3
25.d4 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{39}}.e4 26.d4 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{40}}.e5 27.dh2 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{41}}.g3

28.\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{42}}.e2 d2! 29.dg2 bh6 30.\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{43}}.c2

1–0

\textbf{Ex. 1-10}

\textbf{F.Sämisch – W.Schifferdecker}

\textit{Mainz 1953}

Black can no longer defend his position. But he can still attack!

1...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{44}}.dg8!!
(1 point)

2.dh1 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{45}}.g1!! 3.gxg1 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{46}}.xg8! 4.dh1
\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{47}}.c4!+–

(another 1 point)

5.dg1
5.dh1 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{48}}.e2#

5...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{49}}.g8! 6.dh1 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{50}}.f1#

\textbf{Ex. 1-11}

\textbf{Opening variation}

9...\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{51}}.xe4!
(1 point)

A typical exchanging desperado.

10.xe7 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{52}}.xc3 11.xd8 \textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{53}}.xd1 12.xc7
\textcolor{red}{\textsuperscript{54}}.xb2

(another 1 point)
Solutions

13. \( \text{\&}b5!? \)
   If 13. \( \text{\&}e2 \), then 13... \( \text{\&}a4 \) 14. \( \text{\&}b5 \) \( \text{\&}b6 \).

13...\( \text{\&}a6 \) 14. \( \text{\&}e2! \)

14. \( \text{\&}xc6? \) is followed by 14... \( \text{\&}d3 \) 15. \( \text{\&}d2 \)
\( \text{\&}xc1 \) 16. \( \text{\&}e4 \) \( \text{\&}xa2 \) 17. \( \text{\&}d6 \) \( \text{\&}d8 \) 18. \( \text{\&}c5 \) \( \text{\&}e5! \)
19. \( \text{\&}xe5 \) \( \text{\&}b4 \) (Beliavsky).
The desperado lives!

Ex. 1-12

\[ \text{Piket – A.Karpov} \]
Monte Carlo 2001

1. \( \text{\&}d4 \) \( \text{\&}f6 \) 2. \( \text{\&}c4 \) \( \text{\&}e6 \) 3. \( \text{\&}c3 \) \( \text{\&}b4 \) 4. \( \text{\&}c2 \) 0–0 5. \( \text{\&}a3 \)
\( \text{\&}xc3 \) 6. \( \text{\&}xc3 \) \( \text{\&}b6 \) 7. \( \text{\&}g5 \) \( \text{\&}b7 \) 8. \( \text{\&}f3 \) \( \text{\&}h6 \) 9. \( \text{\&}h4 \)
\( \text{\&}d5 \) 10. \( \text{\&}e3 \) \( \text{\&}bd7 \) 11. \( \text{\&}xd5 \) \( \text{\&}xd5 \) (A typical exchanging operation. The black knight now turns desperado.) 12. \( \text{\&}xd8 \) \( \text{\&}xc3 \) 13. \( \text{\&}xc7 \)

Diagram Ex. 1-12

13...\( \text{\&}d5! \)

(1 point)

14. \( \text{\&}d6 \) \( \text{\&}xe3 \) 15. \( \text{\&}f2 \)
   Or 15. \( \text{\&}xf8 \) \( \text{\&}c2 \) 16. \( \text{\&}d2 \) \( \text{\&}xa1 \) 17. \( \text{\&}d6 \)
\( \text{\&}c8 \).

   (1 point for this variation)

15...\( \text{\&}c2 \) 16. \( \text{\&}d1 \)
   16. \( \text{\&}c1 \)?! \( \text{\&}c8 \)

16...\( \text{\&}fc8 \) 17. \( \text{\&}b5 \) \( \text{\&}f6 \) 18. \( \text{\&}e2 \) \( \text{\&}a6 \) 19. \( \text{\&}a4 \)
   19. \( \text{\&}d3 \) \( \text{\&}d5 \)
19...\( \text{\&}b5 \) 20. \( \text{\&}b3 \) \( \text{\&}d5 \) 21. \( \text{\&}xd5 \) \( \text{\&}xd5 \) 22. \( \text{\&}d3 \)
\( \text{\&}c6 \) 23. \( \text{\&}c5 \) \( \text{\&}e5! \)
   Salvation draws nigh!
24. \( \text{\&}c1 \) \( \text{\&}xd4 \) 25. \( \text{\&}xd4 \) \( \text{\&}xc1 \) 26. \( \text{\&}xc1 \) \( \text{\&}xd4 \)
27. \( \text{\&}xd4 \) \( \text{\&}b6 \) 28. \( \text{\&}d3 \) \( \text{\&}c8 \) 29. \( \text{\&}d6 \) \( \text{\&}c4 \)
30. \( \text{\&}xa6 \) \( \text{\&}xb2 \) 31. \( \text{\&}xb2 \) \( \text{\&}c2 \)
1/2–1/2
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 26

21 points and above ➔ Excellent
17 points and above ➔ Good
13 points ➔ Pass mark

If you scored less than 13 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Static advantages

By static advantages we mean relatively stable advantages, which will still be there in the foreseeable future. Typical static advantages are: an advantage in material, the better pawn structure, weak/strong points, an advantage in space, or the bishop pair. Unlike dynamic advantages, such as a lead in development, which can completely disappear within a few moves, a static advantage remains available for a relatively long time.

Of course that does not mean that we have already won the game and need do no more. **But if our opponent has no counterplay, we can play quietly and slowly strengthen our position.** In such situations the **technical principles** we met in Chapter 20 of *Boost Your Chess 2* are very valuable.

See in the following games how cleverly Capablanca exploits such fixed advantages.

---

**J. Capablanca – V. Ragozin**

Moscow 1935

1. d4 ♜f6 2. c4 e6 3. ♜c3 ♜b4 4. a3 ♜xc3+ 5. bxc3 d6

The other plan for Black is 5...c5, intending ...b6, ...♖c6 and ...♗a6.

6. ♜c2!?

White prepares e2-e4.

6...0-0

6...e5!?

7. e4 e5 8. ♜d3 c5 9. ♜e2 ♜c6 10. d5

After this move White gets a clear advantage in space. But on account of the doubled c-pawns, he can realistically only operate on the kingside.

**Diagram 2-1**

10...♗e7

If 10...♖a5!? (intending ...b6 and ...♗a6), then 11. ♜g3 b6 and White has a choice:

a) 12.0-0 ♖a6 13. ♜f5!? (or 13. ♖a2 planning a3-a4, f2-f3, ♖e3 and ♖e2) 13...♩xc4 14. ♖xc4 ♖xc4 15. ♖d3 ♖a5 16. ♖g5 and White has a powerful attack for the sacrificed pawn.
b) 12.\texttt{a2 a6} 13.\texttt{g2} and 13...\texttt{b3} can be met by 14.\texttt{e3}.

c) 12.\texttt{f1} prepares to defend the c-pawn with \texttt{e3}.

11.\texttt{f3!}®

White prepares an attack on the kingside.

\textbf{Diagram 2-2}

11...\texttt{d7?!}

Black plays too passively and loses the struggle for the initiative.

11...\texttt{g6!} would be better, or 11...\texttt{e8?} (\Delta...f5)
12.\texttt{f4} (12.\texttt{g3 g6} 12...\texttt{g6±}.

12.\texttt{h4!}

Making ...\texttt{g6} difficult.

12...\texttt{b6} 13.\texttt{g4}

\textbf{Diagram 2-3}

13...\texttt{f6}

Black prepares an excursion by his king via f7-e8. Instead, he would do better to strive for counterplay on the queenside.

Ragozin recommended 13...\texttt{d7} 14.\texttt{g3 a4} (\Delta...a6 and ...\texttt{b5}), though instead of 14.\texttt{g3}, either 14.a4 or 14.h5 would be interesting.

14.\texttt{g3 f7} 15.\texttt{g5}

The centre is closed and so White does not have to worry about the safety of his own king.

15...\texttt{g8?}®

The paradoxical move 15...\texttt{g8} was worth considering, hoping to struggle more energetically for the initiative on the kingside. Black should try to post at least one knight more actively (with ...\texttt{g6}).

16.\texttt{f4! e8}

16...\texttt{xf4} (Panov) is followed by 17.\texttt{xf4} \texttt{g7} 18.0-0 and White will continue his attack with \texttt{f5}.

\textbf{Diagram 2-4}

17.\texttt{f5!}

Gaining even more space on the kingside.

17...\texttt{c7} 18.\texttt{g2}

"Black is deprived of any possibility of counterplay. So White can calmly go about preparing the decisive blow. It is clear that in the long run the decision will have to be arrived at on the g-file." (Euwe & Kramer)

18...\texttt{d8} 19.\texttt{h5! c7}

19...\texttt{g6?} (Panov) 20.\texttt{xf6±}
19...\textit{\texttt{f7}}?! 20.g6 hxg6 21.\texttt{Wxg6}± and the g7-pawn is weak (Panov).

20.\texttt{gx6} gx6 21.\texttt{d7} \textit{\texttt{g7}}

Capablanca very methodically improves his position on the kingside.

21...\texttt{d7} 22.h5?! \texttt{ac8} 23.h6±

This secures the g7-outpost for White.

23...\texttt{b8} 24.\texttt{g1} \texttt{f7}

\textbf{Diagram 2-5}

Notice how quietly Capablanca continues to play here. He does not seek to force an immediate decision, but first improves his position on the queenside. In this game we can see the two most important technical principles, \textit{Don't be too hasty!} and \textit{Create a second weakness}, and we can admire Capablanca's flawless technique.

25.\texttt{b1}

25.a4?!

25...\texttt{f8} 26.\texttt{e2}!

White also brings his bishop into a more active position.

26...\texttt{a8} 27.\texttt{h5} \texttt{e7}

27...\texttt{xc4} 28.\texttt{xf7} \texttt{xf7} is followed by 29.\texttt{e2} \texttt{b6} 30.\texttt{h5} \texttt{e7} 31.\texttt{e6}+-- followed by \texttt{g7} (Panov).

\textbf{Diagram 2-6}

28.\texttt{a2!} \texttt{d8} 29.\texttt{d2}

29.\texttt{e6} could also be played. But Capablanca is playing very carefully and first of all seeks to improve his position as much as is possible.

29...\texttt{a4} 30.\texttt{b3!} \texttt{b6}

The following variations show how White can combine play on both wings:

a) 30...\texttt{b8} 31.\texttt{e6}! (Euwe & Kramer) 31...\texttt{c8} 32.\texttt{g8}! \texttt{g8} 33.\texttt{c7}#

b) 30...\texttt{b6} 31.\texttt{e6}+-- (Euwe & Kramer)

c) 30...\texttt{b6}?! 31.\texttt{xh6} \texttt{xb6} 32.\texttt{e2} \texttt{e8} 33.\texttt{e6} \texttt{f7} 34.\texttt{f2} followed by \texttt{g7} and \texttt{bg1} (Panov).

\textbf{Diagram 2-7}

31.a4!

Playing quietly does not mean that you should avoid undertaking any operations at all. Capablanca continually finds resources to keep on improving his position.

31...\texttt{b8}
31...\(\text{\texttt{a4}}\) is followed by 32.\(\text{\texttt{a2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d7}}\) 33.\(\text{\texttt{e6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xe6}}\) 34.\(\text{\texttt{dxe6}}\) (34.\(\text{\texttt{fxe6}}\) is also good). White threatens \(\text{\texttt{f7}}\), and if 34...\(\text{\texttt{ec7?}}\) then 35.\(\text{\texttt{xb6+}}\).

32.\(\text{\texttt{a5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{c8}}\)

Not 32...\(\text{\texttt{a4}}\) 33.\(\text{\texttt{e6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xa5}}\) (33...\(\text{\texttt{xe6}}\) 34.\(\text{\texttt{dxe6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{f7}}\)), on account of 34.\(\text{\texttt{xb6+}}\) (Panov).

33.\(\text{\texttt{a2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{f8}}\) 34.\(\text{\texttt{e3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{b6}}\) 35.\(\text{\texttt{a6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d8}}\)

Directed against ...\(\text{\texttt{b5}}\).

Diagram 2-8

38...\(\text{\texttt{b5?}}\)

"Another attempt to introduce some counterplay. Continuing with a wait-and-see policy would soon allow White to penetrate the black position via the g-file.” (Euwe & Kramer)

39.\(\text{\texttt{cxb5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{b6}}\)

39...\(\text{\texttt{a5}}\) is followed by 40.\(\text{\texttt{d6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xe6}}\) 41.\(\text{\texttt{dxe6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{b6}}\) 42.\(\text{\texttt{a2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{c4†}}\) 43.\(\text{\texttt{e6†}}\).

40.\(\text{\texttt{a2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{c4}}\) 41.\(\text{\texttt{a3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{c7}}\) 42.\(\text{\texttt{c1!}}\)

Capablanca not only brings his king to safety, but he also improves the communication between his major pieces.

42...\(\text{\texttt{f8}}\) 43.\(\text{\texttt{bg2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{b8}}\)

43...\(\text{\texttt{xb5}}\) loses to 44.\(\text{\texttt{e6†}}\).

44.\(\text{\texttt{b4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d8}}\) 45.\(\text{\texttt{g3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{f8}}\)

Diagram 2-9

46.\(\text{\texttt{e6}}\)

"At last!” (Euwe & Kramer). As a matter of fact, this important move had been very carefully and perfectly prepared.

46...\(\text{\texttt{xe6}}\)

46...\(\text{\texttt{c8}}\) is met by 47.\(\text{\texttt{xb6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{axb6}}\) 48.\(\text{\texttt{a7†}}\) (Euwe & Kramer), or simply by 47.\(\text{\texttt{g7†}}\).

47.\(\text{\texttt{dxe6}}\)

Threatening \(\text{\texttt{f7}}\).

47...\(\text{\texttt{c7}}\) 48.\(\text{\texttt{xd6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{c7}}\)

48...\(\text{\texttt{d8}}\) 49.\(\text{\texttt{xd8†}}\) (Panov)

49.\(\text{\texttt{d1!}}\)

With this move Capablanca deprives his opponent of the final chance of activating his pieces by means of ...\(\text{\texttt{d8}}\).

1–0
Positional play 1

J. Capablanca – K. T. Trebval
Karlsbad 1929

1. d4 d5 2. c4 c6 3. f3 e6 4. g5 e7
4... f6 is the main alternative.

5. xe7 xe7 6. bd2 f5?!

After the exchange of the dark-squared bishops the Stonewall is not so good for Black, since without his good bishop he gets much less counterplay in return for the weakness on e5.

Better is 6... f6 7. e3 bd7 8. d3 0–0.

7. e3 d7?!

Black should prefer 7... f6 8. d3 0–0, intending ... e4 and only then ... d7.

8. d3 f6 h6

After 8... g6 9. cxd5 Black must recapture with either the c-pawn or the knight. In the first case White has chances to exploit the c-file. In the second he can prepare e3–e4, or simply occupy the e5-square after c4.

9. 0–0 0–0 10. c2 g6?!

Black did not need this move at all.

Better is 10... f6 11. e5+.

Diagram 2-10

11. ab1!

Capablanca prepares an attack on the queenside.

11... f6 12. e5 f7 13. f4

White has some stable, static advantages in the position, for example the black bishop is bad and will always remain bad.

13... d7

13... xe5 is met by: 14. fxe5 e4 15. xe4 dxe4 (or 15... fxe4 16. xf8† xf8 17. f1†) 16. c5† followed by c4–d6.

14. df3!

White is aiming for a position in which he will have a knight on e5 and be playing against the bad bishop.

14... fd8

If 14... e4, then 15. xf7 xf7 16. e5 followed by xe4, and White has reached his goal.

15. b4 e8 16. fc1 a6 17. f2 xe5 18. xe5 d7

Diagram 2-11

19. e3!
Static advantages

White wants to keep his knight and, as we have already mentioned, exchange his bishop for the black knight.

19...\( \text{Edc8} \) 20.c5

Gaining space on the queenside. Later he will prepare the breakthrough b4-b5.

20...\( \text{f6} \) 21.a4 \( \text{g4} \) 22.e1 \( \text{h6} \) 23.h3 \( \text{f7} \)

Diagram 2-12

Capablanca improves his position on both flanks. At the same time he makes it more difficult to obtain any counterplay with ...g5.

24.g4! \( \text{d7} \) 25.c2

The side which has the advantage in space also has better lines of communication. Capablanca plays on both sides of the board ("the principle of two weaknesses"), in order to best exploit that advantage. Defending against this strategy is very difficult, if at all possible.

25...\( \text{h8} \) 26.g2 \( \text{g8} \) 27.g5!

White gains even more space on the kingside and retains the option of opening a file there after the march forward of the h-pawn.

27...\( \text{d8} \) 28.h4 \( \text{g7} \)

28...h5 29.gxh6 \( \text{hxh6} \) 30.e5 would not be good for Black either.

29.h5 \( \text{h8} \) 30.h2 \( \text{c7} \)

Diagram 2-13

Black can only wait and play passively. Capablanca always exploited such situations by first finding the optimal positions for his pieces. (The principle "Don't be too hasty!") It is only when he has extracted the maximum from the existing situation that he will change tactics and attack.

31.c3 \( \text{d8} \) 32.f2 \( \text{c7} \) 33.bh1 \( \text{ag8} \) 34.a1 \( \text{b8} \) 35.a3!

Already preparing the subsequent operation.

35...\( \text{bg8} \)

36.b5!

We have already studied this position in Boost Your Chess 2 (Diagram 2-2). Capablanca now opens the a-file and closes down things on the other side. He has accurately spotted that he can win the game on the queenside.

36...\( \text{xb5} \) 37.h6\( \text{f8} \) 38.axb5 \( \text{e7} \)
Positional play 1

The point is 38...cxb5? 39.c6†++.

39.b6 wxb8 40.ea1 xc8

40...a8 is met by 41.e3++. However, if Black gives up his queen rather the file, it will still take a bit of work to create a breakthrough: 41...xa1 42.xa1 e8 43.e2 e2 44.g3 h8 45.xa2 xa2 46.d2 d8 (46...e8 47.e4!--) 47.e4! (or 47.e4!) 47...xc4 48.d5!+-

41.eb4 xbd8 42.xa7 xh8 43.e1 e8 44.ea1 g8 45.xa4 gb8 46.e3

Once more Capablanca first seeks the optimal position for his pieces and only then does he prepare a breakthrough.

46...g8 47.g3 d7 48.h4 h8 49.ea1 g8 50.g3 f8 51.e2 e8

Diagram 2-15

52.d2+--

After careful preparation White will now attack the b7-pawn.

52...d7 53.b3 e8

53...e8 54.a5 d7 55.xb7 xxb7 56.xb7 (56.a8+- is also good) 56...xb7 57.a6 b8 58.xc8 xxc8 59.b8 b7 60.a7+-

54.a5 d8 55.a6!

Diagram 2-16

After this blow the black position collapses.

55...bxa6 56.xd7 e7 57.xd8+! xd8 58.xc6+--

1–0

If we have any dynamic advantages (e.g. the initiative), we should either attack straight away or transform these advantages into static advantages. You can 'enjoy' static advantages for a longer period of time. Nevertheless, you must play with due care and attention, not allow counterplay and exploit your opportunities.
Exercises

Ex. 2-1

Ex. 2-2

Ex. 2-3

Ex. 2-4

Ex. 2-5

Ex. 2-6
Exercises
Solutions

Ex. 2-1

A. Alekhine – R. Reti
Semmering 1926

28.c5!

(2 points)

A logical plan; White attacks on the queenside.
28...exd5 29.c5 (also 2 points) is equally good.
28...exd4 29.exd4 ef7 30...e3 f5 31...f6 32...d4
White will now have the option of playing e2-e4.
32...h7 33.h4 g6 34...e4 f7 35.a5 a6?
A better defence is 35...e7 36.e4.
See Ex. 2-5.

Ex. 2-2

P. Keres – M. Euwe
World Ch, The Hague/Moscow 1948

19...c1!? 

(2 points)

White fights for the initiative on the queenside and tries to blockade the black pawns.
19...c5 is not very promising: 19...xb3 20...d4 b6 and although White has compensation for the pawn, he has no advantage.
If 19...c2 (1 consolation point), then 19...c5 20...xc5 21...xc5 xb3=.
19...c5!

19...b4 is a better response. After 20...c5 22...d4 24...c8 25...f2! 26...c1 27...c5 28...e6 29...e6 30...d7 31...e7 32...e4
White can probably improve on this with 20...e6. For example: 20...a8 21...d4 22...dc2! 23...e6 24.g3 25...d4 26...b7 27...d4 28...xb3 29...d4 28...b7

Ex. 2-3

A. Yusupov – G. Gruen
Bundesliga 1991

24...c1!

(2 points)

White regroups by bringing the knight to the b3-square, after which the weakness of the c5-pawn proves decisive.
24...g6 25...b3+ 26...f4 27...xc5 28...xc5 29...xc5 30...xb7 31...b7 32...b3
1-0

Ex. 2-4

S. Tarrasch – R. Teichmann
San Sebastian 1912

16...c2!?

(2 points)

With this standard redeployment White brings his knight into the centre and takes control.

But there is an alternative solution. White can attack on the queenside straight away with 16.b4! 27.a7 28...f4! 21...xf4 22...xf4 and Black must now avoid 22...fd6! 23...xe6.

16...d7 17...e4 28...h8 29...f2! 30...e3 31...e8
19...c8 looks more natural.
20...d2! 21...b7±

See Ex. 2-7.
Solutions

Ex. 2-5

J.C. Fernandez – A. Yusupov
Cienfuegos 1979

14...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}f5}!

(2 points)

A standard idea. White wanted to bring his strong light-squared bishop to a dream position on the d5-square, so Black swaps off this bishop. After the exchange of bishops it is not so simple for White to protect his weakness on c4.

15.f4?

White should prefer: 15.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}f5} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}f5} 16.e4 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}6} 17.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}4} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}d8}+

15...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}e}4 16.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}e}4 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}f4} 17.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}f4} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}c}3+-

18.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b}1} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}d8} 19.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}3} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}d1}+ 20.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}2} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}1} 21.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}b}7 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}5} 22.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}4} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}3} 23.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}3} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash g}1}+ 24.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash g}3} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}f4}

0–1

Ex. 2-6

A. Alekhine – R. Reti
Semmering 1926

36.c6!

(2 points)

White continues his attack on the queenside.

36...b5 37.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}xb}6 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}b}6 38.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}3} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}7} 39.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}a}6

It would be more prudent to first play 39.e3!++, intending \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}a}6 next move.

39...f4 40.g4 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}g}4 41.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}g}4 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f}3}+ 42.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}f}3 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f}4}+ 43.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}4} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}h}4 44.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}7} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}8} 45.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}3} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}2} 46.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}3} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}5} 47.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash g}3}+– 48.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f}3} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}4}+ 49.e4 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}2} 50.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}g}5 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b}2} 51.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}g}8+ \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}7} 52.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}g}7+ \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}8} 53.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}3} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}4} 54.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}4} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b}6}+ 55.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b}5} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}2} 56.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash g}8}+ \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}7} 57.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b}8} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}2} 58.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}b}6

1–0

Ex. 2-7

S. Tarrasch – R. Teichmann
San Sebastian 1912

21.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f}1}!

(3 points)

Another very strong redeployment. On the d3-square the bishop will protect the queenside and prepare an attack on the kingside. If Black swaps his knight for the bishop, he will be left without counterplay in a position with a bad light-squared bishop.

1 consolation point for any of 21.c3, 21.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b}3} or 21.g4.

21...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash a}5}?! 21...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}5} 22.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}3}±

22.b3! \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}6}?! 23.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}3} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}6} 24.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}c}6! \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}c}6

After the knight exchange too, White is clearly better.

25.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}4} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}7} 26.g4! \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}8} 27.h4 g6 28.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}1} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash g}7} 29.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}5} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}8} 30.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f}h}2 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}7} 31.g5 hxg5 32.fxg5 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}h}5

Euwe gave the alternatives:

a) 32...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}8} 33.hxg6 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}h}2 34.gxf7+–

b) 32...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}7} 33.h6+±

c) 32...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}c}8?!

33.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}h}5 gxh5 34.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}h}5 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f}8} 35.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}8}+ \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}7} 36.g6

More accurate is: 36.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}7} (Tarrasch)

36...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f}8} 37.g6 fxg6 38.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}g}6+–

36...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f}x}g6 37.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}g}6 b4

37...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}8} 38.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}7}+ \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}8} 39.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}c}7 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}c}7 40.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}c}5 \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}7} 41.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash f}7} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}8} 42.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash e}8} \textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b}7} 43.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash b}4} 44.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}8} 44.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash x}c}6+– (Tarrasch)

38.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}7}+ 38.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}3}?

38...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}8} 39.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash d}3}!

White should go back with 39.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}8} before playing this.

39...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}3}?

Instead of this, Black should play 39...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}6}!, because then 40.\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash h}8}+ is met by 40...\textit{\texttt{\textbackslash c}7}.

In this case Black would have good chances of a draw.

See Ex. 2-10.
Solutions

Ex. 2-8

H. Atkins – J. Capablanca
London 1922

34...a2!

(2 points)

Black clears the diagonal for his bishop and
threatens ...a3.

Another good line is: 34...a6 35.axa6 (also 2 points) 36.bxa6 b5 37.axb5
35.axa6 bxa6 36.bxa6 b4 37.bxa6 c4
38.bxc4 txc4 39.bxc4!
39.bxa1?
39...dxc4 40.b2 dxc2 41.b1 b6
42.b3 c3 d5 43.a1 g6 44.f3

See Ex. 2-11.

Ex. 2-9

S. Tarrasch – M. Lowcki
Breslau 1912

22.d1

(2 points)

22...xc5 (1 point) is less accurate: 22...xc5
23.a2 a4 24.d4 (24.b4 c3 25.d4
26.b5) 24...b6=
22...a2?? (also 2 points) was worth
considering. For example: 22...xc2 23.dxc2
xex2 24.bxc2 ecx2 25.c5 c8 (25...c7
26.d4) 26.a7 c8 27...c4

But it is understandable that Tarrasch prefers
to hang on to his superior pawn structure.
He places the queen on a1 so as to attack the
a-pawn straight away.

22...b6

22...b6 is met by 23.d3 ecx2 24.dxc2
xex2 25.d4 xf2 26.fxf2 ecx2 27.d5=

23.d4 ecx2

23...c5?? can be met tactically: 24.b4 c4
(24...xb4? 25.bxa4+ or 24...xa4? 25.bxc5
b4 26.c3) 25.bxc4 bxa4 26.b3 b3+ exb3!!
27.bxa5+

23...c3 is answered by 24.bxa5 bxa5
25.axa8 bxa8 26.c8+ c8 27.a5=+

24.c2 ecx2

Ex. 2-10

S. Tarrasch – R. Teichmann
San Sebastian 1912

40.a3!!

(2 points)

This entices the black a-pawn forward to
where White can better attack it.

It is equally good to first play 40.h8† and
then 41.a3!! (also 2 points).

40...a5 41.h8† c7
41...c7 is followed by 42.a8 b6
43.a6++ (Tarrasch).

Black now resigned without waiting for
White to play 42.a8++.

1-0

Ex. 2-11

H. Atkins – J. Capablanca
London 1922

44...b8!

(2 points)

Black is preparing ...b5.

45.a3 b5 46.axb5 axb5 47.a2 b4
Intending ...d3.

48.b3

48.a3 c3 d3 49.b3 cxb3--

48...xb3 49.axb3 c6+

Stronger is 49...d3† 50.a4 c4 51.axd3

50.c3 b1 51.a4??
51.a3=+

51...c1† 52.d2

52.d3† is a better defensive try.

52...c4 53.a1 a4 54.a3 a7 55.a1
b5 56.b1 c6 57.c3 c3† 58.d2
b3 59.c1† b7 60.c2 a3 61.a3 c4
62.b7† b6 63.c4 b5† 64.c8 c6
65.a8 b2† 66.a3 c4 67.a2 b4
0-1
26.\textit{xe}1!± (2 point)

White activates his rooks; the f4-pawn will fall in due course.

26...\textit{f}8 27.\textit{g}2

Black’s weaknesses are the g7-knight and the f4-pawn.

27.e5?! was an alternative approach.

27...\textit{fxe}4 28.\textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 29.\textit{xe}4 \textit{e}8??

Black lose after both 29...\textit{f}5? 30.\textit{xg}7+, and 29...\textit{f}5? 30.\textit{xf}4 followed by \textit{g}5.

The most resilient defence would be 29...\textit{e}7 and then ...\textit{f}8.

30.\textit{xf}4 \textit{g}4

30...\textit{f}6 31.\textit{g}6+-

31.\textit{e}3 \textit{f}6 32.\textit{f}3 \textit{xe}4 33.\textit{xf}4

33...\textit{x}3?!

33...\textit{f}6 34.\textit{g}5±

34.\textit{f}2! \textit{a}4

34...\textit{g}7 35.\textit{xd}6\textit{xd}6 36.\textit{e}6\textit{c}7 37.\textit{f}7+--

35.\textit{g}5!+-- \textit{g}7

35...\textit{e}8 36.\textit{f}7+\textit{b}8 37.\textit{e}7+-

35...\textit{e}8 36.\textit{xe}8 \textit{xe}8 37.\textit{f}7+\textit{b}8

38.\textit{gxh}5+-

36.\textit{f}6 \textit{xe}4 37.\textit{h}8 \textit{xc}4+ 38.\textit{b}1

39.\textit{a}1\textit{b}7 40.\textit{f}4 \textit{c}4

40...\textit{b}5 41.\textit{b}3+-

41.a3 \textit{b}5 42.\textit{e}7+ \textit{a}6 43.\textit{e}2

1–0
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 25

21 points and above → Excellent
16 points and above → Good
12 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 12 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
The comparison method

We became acquainted with the comparison method in Chapter 23 of *Build Up Your Chess 3*. We only use it in those situations in which we are called upon to decide between very similar moves or variations, or look for the correct order of moves. We then have to compare the moves (or variations). If one move presents a clear advantage, then we have the solution.

Diagram 3-1

End of a study by

G. Nada eishvili
1962

4. \textbf{B}b3\textbf{t} \textbf{a}a8 5. \textbf{a}a3\textbf{t}!

Here the decision is very clear; for White it is better if the black king is further away from the pawns.

5. \textbf{a}xe8t? gives Black an extra tempo: 5...\textbf{ax}b8
6. \textbf{a}e6 \textbf{c}c7 7. \textbf{a}e5 \textbf{d}d7 8. \textbf{a}f4 \textbf{e}e7 9. \textbf{g}g5 \textbf{f}f7+ 5... \textbf{a}a7t

5...\textbf{b}b7 6. \textbf{a}b3t=

6. \textbf{a}xa7t \textbf{a}xa7 7. \textbf{a}c6 \textbf{b}b7 8. \textbf{a}e5 \textbf{c}c6 9. \textbf{a}f4 \textbf{d}d6 10. \textbf{a}g5=

To make the correct decision, we often have to calculate the necessary variations very accurately, otherwise we can arrive at the wrong conclusion. When doing so, it is very important to consider all the active options available in the first moves.

Diagram 3-2

Black's threat is 1...\textbf{B}g2. White's only chance is to get his king behind the g-pawn. As well as the natural move 1. \textbf{f}f4, he also has 1. \textbf{f}f5. We must work out the essential difference between the two moves.

1. \textbf{f}f5!!

Instead of this, the natural move would lead to a loss. After 1. \textbf{f}f4? \textbf{B}g2 2. \textbf{x}xe3t Black plays: 2...\textbf{h}h4! (but not 2...\textbf{x}h2 3. \textbf{g}g5 \textbf{g}3 4. \textbf{h}h4! \textbf{B}g1 5. \textbf{a}a3=) 3. \textbf{e}e8 \textbf{f}f2t 4. \textbf{e}e3 \textbf{x}h2 5. \textbf{h}h8t \textbf{g}g3++
The comparison method

1...\( \text{xf1} \)

Here after 1...\( \text{g}2 \) 2.\( \text{ex}3 \) \( \text{h}4 \) (2...\( \text{xh}2 \) leads to the draw we have already seen: 3.\( \text{g}5 \) g3 4.\( \text{h}4 \)=), White has the saving grace: 2.\( \text{e}4 \) ! \( \text{f}2 \)+ 4.\( \text{f}4 \) Now we see the advantage of choosing the f5-square for the king on the first move. 4...\( \text{f}3 \) 5.\( \text{e}4 \)=

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

2.\( \text{e}4 \) would lose to 2...\( \text{f}2 \).

2...\( \text{f}3 \) 3.\( \text{e}1 \)!

Not 3.\( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{f}2 \) 4.\( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{xh}2 \) 5.\( \text{xe}3 \)+ g3--.

3...g3

If 3...\( \text{xh}2 \), then 4.\( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 5.\( \text{e}2 \)=.

3...\( \text{g}2 \) is followed by: 4.\( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{f}2 \) 5.\( \text{a}1 \) c2 6.\( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{g}3 \)+ 7.\( \text{f}5 \) e1\( \text{e}1 \) (or 7...\( \text{h}3 \) 8.\( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{a}3 \) 9.\( \text{b}1 \) e1\( \text{e}1 \) 10.\( \text{x}1 \) \( \text{x}1 \) 11.\( \text{h}5 \)=) 8.\( \text{x}1 \) \( \text{x}1 \) 9.\( \text{h}5 \)=

4.\( \text{hxg}3 \) \( \text{g}3 \) 5.\( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 6.\( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{f}2 \) 7.\( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{f}3 \) 8.\( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{g}3 \) 9.\( \text{e}2 \)=

Diagram 3-3

I had calculated the variation 22...\( \text{c}3 \) 23.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{xb}2 \)
24.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{h}4 \) and seen that a draw would result. But which move order is correct – first 22...\( \text{c}3 \), and only then 23...\( \text{xb}2 \), or vice versa? I saw that after 22...\( \text{xb}2 \) 23.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{c}3 \) White might play 24.\( \text{c}3 \), and decided to avoid that variation. Unfortunately I overrated the first move order and did not spot the important opportunity that it allowed my opponent.

22...\( \text{c}3 \)?

The correct way was: 22...\( \text{xb}2 \)! 23.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{c}3 \) 24.\( \text{f}3 \) (After 24.\( \text{f}3 \) Black has a simple solution: 24...\( \text{c}6 \) 25.\( \text{xb}6 \) axb6\( \text{f}6 \) with sufficient compensation for the exchange.) 24...\( \text{h}4 \) 25.\( \text{xb}2 \) \( \text{g}3 \)+ 26.\( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{x}3 \) 27.\( \text{x}3 \) \( \text{h}3 \)+ 28.\( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{g}3 \)+ 29.\( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{h}3 \)+

White cannot avoid perpetual check without taking a risk. 30.\( \text{f}2 \)! \( \text{h}2 \)+ 31.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}8 \)! 32.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{c}5 \) +

23.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 24.\( \text{f}4 \)!

I had simply overlooked this active move!

As we have seen, 24.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{h}4 \) achieves nothing.

Diagram 3-4

The knight now protects several important squares on the kingside. Black wants to attack at any cost, but White has enough resources for a successful defence.
Calculating variations 1

24...\(\text{d}xh3\)†

24...\(\text{e}4h4\)?! 25.exf4 f5 can be met by: 26.\(\text{e}4d5\)† \(\text{h}7\) (26...\(\text{h}8\) 27.\(\text{xd}6\)†) 27.\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{xe}2\) 28.\(\text{g}5\)† \(\text{h}6\) 29.\(\text{xe}2\)±

24...\(\text{c}7\)?! was possible, and Black obtains a certain amount of compensation for the piece, though not really enough. For example, 25.\(\text{xd}8\) \(\text{xd}8\) 26.exf4 and now either 26...exf4± or 26...\(\text{b}6\)† 27.\(\text{h}1\) f5 28.\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{dd}2\) 29.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{f}2\) 30.\(\text{c}4\)† \(\text{f}8\) 31.\(\text{f}1\)±.

25.\(\text{e}3xh3\) \(\text{f}4h4\)

26.\(\text{f}3\)!±

White consolidates his position. Black has only two pawns for the piece, and his final attempt at an attack will be refuted.

26.\(\text{c}1\)?! is bad on account of 26...\(\text{f}b8\)!−+, but not 26...\(\text{xe}3\) 27.\(\text{xb}2\) \(\text{g}4\)† 28.\(\text{g}2\)±.

White could also play: 26.\(\text{g}2\) f5?! (26...\(\text{c}7\)±) 27.\(\text{d}5\)† (but not 27.\(\text{xd}6\) fxe4−+) 27...\(\text{f}7\) 28.\(\text{f}1\)!−

26...f5?!

26...\(\text{xa}3\) would be an improvement, though White is better after either 27.\(\text{f}1\)± or 27.\(\text{eb}1\)±.

27.\(\text{gx}f5\) \(\text{gx}f5\)

27...\(\text{c}7\) 28.\(\text{eb}1\)−

28.\(\text{e}6d\) e4

29.\(\text{e}xe4\)!

White returns one of the pieces, but forces the exchange of queens.

29...\(\text{f}e4\) 30.\(\text{e}e6\)† \(\text{h}7\) 31.\(\text{h}3\)!−+ \(\text{xe}3\) 32.\(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{f}3\)

32...\(\text{fe}6\) is more resilient: 33.\(\text{ab}1\) \(\text{a}2\) 34.\(\text{b}5\) \(\text{g}6\)† 35.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{f}6\)† 36.\(\text{f}5\) \(\text{g}6\) 37.\(\text{xf}6\)† \(\text{xf}6\) 38.\(\text{g}2\)−

33.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{g}3\)† 34.\(\text{h}1\) \(\text{b}3\)

34...\(\text{a}6\) is met by 35.\(\text{a}2\)−.

35.\(\text{g}2\)

White has a decisive advantage in material.

35...\(\text{h}6\) 36.\(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{xe}3\) 37.\(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{xe}3\) 38.\(\text{c}6\)

\(\text{c}3\) 39.\(\text{b}5\) \(\text{g}5\) 40.\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{c}7\) 41.\(\text{d}1\)!

Threatening \(\text{ed}7\).

41...\(\text{e}8\) 42.\(\text{d}7\) \(\text{a}8\) 43.\(\text{xe}7\)† \(\text{f}5\) 44.\(\text{c}6\) \(\text{h}8\)†

45.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{h}6\) 46.\(\text{b}5\) \(\text{a}6\) 47.\(\text{d}3\)†

1−0
Exercises

Ex. 3-1

Ex. 3-2

Ex. 3-3

Ex. 3-4

Ex. 3-5

Ex. 3-6
Solutions

Ex. 3-1

J. Bradford – R. Byrne
USA Ch, Greenville 1980

The game continued:
30...d4?? 31.\text{hxh7}\# xh7 32.\text{xf8}\#+-
(1 point for this variation)
32...g8 33.\text{xd4} bc2 34.\text{xe4}
1-0
30...\text{d6}! (1 point) is a better move. After
31.\text{xf8} xd1 32.\text{xf8} xh7 33.\text{hxh7} c2
34.\text{g5}\# White still has drawing chances.
However, the correct move is: 30...d6!+-.
(2 points)
Black protects the rook on f8 and wins easily
in all variations. For example 31.e1 d2 or
31.b1 d4+-.

Ex. 3-2

V. Smyslov – V. Mikenas
USSR Ch, Moscow 1949

27.\text{e3}!=
(2 points)
Other bishop moves are no good:
a) 27.\text{g5}? g7 28.\text{h5} g8++
b) 27.\text{f8}? \text{e4} 28.\text{h6} h7+-
The move in the game leads to a perpetual
check: 27...\text{xe3} 27...\text{xe3}? 28.\text{f7}+-
28.\text{h5} g8 (28...g7? 29.\text{f7}+-)
29.\text{f7} g8= ½-½

Ex. 3-3

E. Kolesnikov
1989

1.\text{f8}!!
(1 point)
1.\text{xf7}? achieves nothing on account of:
1...\text{xd4}!
(1 point for this variation)
2.\text{f6} (2.\text{e6} e3 3.\text{f5} d4 4.\text{e5} f2
5.\text{d5} e3=) 2...\text{e3} 3.\text{e6} f3 4.\text{d6} e4
5.\text{e6} d4=

Ex. 3-4

V. Nedeljkovic – T. Zatulovskaya
Split Olympiad 1963

60...\text{f4}!!
(1 point)
60...\text{xf3}? is bad: 61.\text{xe5} g3 62.\text{f5}!
\text{h3} 63.e5 g3 64.e6 h2 65.e8 b7
66.e5 h2+ 67.e5 h2 68.e5 h2+=
61.\text{g6}
61.e6 g3 62.\text{xe5} \text{h3} 63.\text{f5} 63.\text{f4}
(63.\text{f4} g3=) 63...g3 64.e5 h2 65.e6 h2=
(another 1 point for this variation)
61...\text{xf3} 62.\text{f5}
62...\text{xf5} 62...\text{xf5} 63.\text{xf5} \text{h3} 64.\text{f5} g3
65.g5 h3 66.g6 h2 67.g7 h1 b7 68.g8=\text{f3}
69.e6 b3 \text{e2} 70.e5= ½-½

Ex. 3-5

End of a study by

V. Khortov
1962

4.\text{d4}!!
(2 points)
4.\text{d7}? loses because of the following line:
4...\text{c2} 5.\text{c7} b3 6.\text{d7} c4 7.\text{c7} b5
8.b7= 9.b1 a2=+
4...\text{c3} 5.\text{a4} b3 6.\text{d4} c2 7.\text{c4}=
(another 1 point)
7...\text{b2} 8.\text{b4}+ \text{c3} 9.\text{a4}=
½-½
Solutions

Ex. 3-6

V. Chekhover
1949

1. \( \text{g}8!! \) (2 points)

1. \( \text{g}6 \) loses to 1...h4 2. \( \text{h}6 \) h3 3. \( \text{x}h3 \) \( \text{g}2 \).

1...h4 2. \( \text{h}7 \) h3!? 

Or 2...\( \text{g}2 \) 3. \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{h}2 \) 4. \( \text{f}7 \) =.

3. \( \text{x}h3 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 4. \( \text{h}7 \)!

(another 1 point)

4...f1 \( \text{g}7 \) 5. \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{h}7 \) 6. \( \text{b}h7 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 7. \( \text{g}7 \) =.

Ex. 3-7

End of a study by

G. Nadareishvili
1951

2. \( \text{g}8!! \) (2 points)

Otherwise White loses an important tempo.

For example: 2. \( \text{h}7 \)? \( \text{e}5 \) 3. \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 4. \( \text{f}7 \) \( \text{c}3 \) 5. \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 6. \( \text{e}4 \) a2 =

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

6. \( \text{d}4 \) a2 7. \( \text{xa}2 \) \( \text{xa}2 \) 8. \( \text{c}3 \) a3 9. \( \text{c}2 \) =

Ex. 3-8

G. Nadareishvili
1952

1. \( \text{e}6! \) (1 point)

But not 1.e4? a3 2.\( \text{e}6 \) on account of:

2...f5! 3.exf5 e4 4.\( \text{g}8 \) e5 5.f6 a2 =.

1...f6

White also draw after 1...fxe6 2.e4 = or 1...a3 2.\( \text{xf}7 \) \( \text{xf}7 \) 3.e4 =.

2.e4!

(another 1 point)

2...a3 3.\( \text{g}8 \)!

(another 1 point)

3...f5! 4.exf5 e4 5.f6 e3 6.f7 e2 stalemate

Ex. 3-9

G. Nadareishvili
1955

1. \( \text{a}7! \) (1 point)

Of course not 1.h7?? \( \text{b}6 \)

1...\( \text{b}1 \) 2.\( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 3.\( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{b}1 \) 4.\( \text{h}7 \) \( \text{a}2 \) 5.\( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 6.\( \text{a}5 \)

White must be careful not to allow the rook to the 8th rank, for example 6.\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 7.\( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \) would be a draw.

6...\( \text{a}2 \) 7.\( \text{b}6 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 8.\( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 9.\( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{d}2 \) 10.\( \text{e}7 \) \( \text{e}2 \) 11.\( \text{f}7 \) \( \text{f}2 \) 12.\( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{f}2 \) 12...\( \text{f}8 \) 13.\( \text{g}7 \) =

13.\( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{a}2 \) 14.\( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{g}2 \)!

Or 14...\( \text{a}4 \) 15.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{a}3 \) 16.\( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{a}2 \) 17.\( \text{e}1 \) =.

15.\( \text{f}3 \) +

(another 1 point for this winning plan)

Ex. 3-10

End of a study by

G. Nadareishvili
1958

7.\( \text{c}8 ? \)!

(1 point)

7.\( \text{c}8 \) is bad: 7...\( \text{a}2 \) 8.\( \text{b}4 \) b1 9.\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{bb}2 \) 10.\( \text{xd}3 \) \( \text{e}2 \) 11.\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{ab}2 \) #

7...\( \text{c}5 \)

7...\( \text{xc}8 \) 8.\( \text{xc}8 \) b1 9.\( \text{b}8 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 10.\( \text{xb}1 \) =

8.\( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 9.\( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 10.\( \text{e}7 \) ! +

(another 1 point)

But not 10.\( \text{b}3 ? \) \( \text{d}4 \).
Solutions

Ex. 3-11

G. Nadareishvili
1960

1. c7!  

(1 point)

1. d7 is wrong: 1... Exd7! 2. cxd7 c3 3. d8= 

(1 point)

1... a8 2. d7 c3 3. c8=  

(another 1 point)

3. d8=? Exd8 4. cxd8= c2=  

3... Exc8 4. dxc8=  

(1 point)

This is simplest, although 4. dxc8 c2 5. f7!  

(also 1 point) is good enough too: 5... b1  

(5... b2 6. e5+) 6. f5 a1 7. f1 b2  

8. e5+  

4... b2 5. f7 c2 6. e5+  

The knight gets back in time.

Ex. 3-12

G. Nadareishvili
1961

1. g5!  

(1 point)

Other moves do not win:  

1... b2 2. b6 h3 3. c5 h1  

4. d4 h2= 

(b) 1. b6? g5!  

(another 1 point for this variation)

2. c5 h2 3. a1 (3. xg5 h3 4. d4 h1  

5. e3 h2=) 3... g4 4. d4 g3 5. e3 g2 6. f2  

h3 7. d1 g1= 8. xg1=  

(c) 1. g6? h2 2. b6 h3 3. c5 h1  

4. d4 h2 5. g3 g5 6. e3 g4=  

1... h2 2. b6 h3 3. c5 h1 4. d4 h2  

5. e3 g6 6. g3! g5 7. f2 g4 8. a3 g3=  

9. xg3 g1 10. a1#  

(another 1 point)

Scoring

Maximum number of points is 32

27 points and above → Excellent  

22 points and above → Good  

16 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 16 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Rook against two minor pieces

Situations in which one side has a rook plus one or two pawns in return for two minor pieces are very hard to evaluate and to play. The evaluation of such positions often depends on positional factors.

Here are some useful guidelines which are important for the evaluation:

1) In the middlegame two minor pieces are as a rule stronger than a rook plus a pawn, and often stronger even than a rook plus two pawns.

2) In the endgame the balance shifts more in the direction of the rook and pawns – even a rook plus one pawn can be better than two minor pieces. The pawn structure plays a decisive role in the evaluation of the position. (See also Guidelines 4, 6, 7 and 8.)

Diagram 4-1

P. Leko – V. Kramnik
Budapest (rapid – 4) 2001

White has only rook and one pawn for the two strong bishops. He does not yet have a passed pawn on the kingside. And most important of all, Black can protect his kingside very well with his dark-squared bishop, which has the safe f6-square at its disposal. The light-squared bishop can attack the white queenside pawns. The position is clearly better for Black.

27...\text{c3} 28.\text{d3} \text{f6} 29.f4

The only counterplay consists of a kingside attack.

29...\text{g6}

The bishops complement each other brilliantly.

30.\text{d1 h5!}

Kramnik first wants to contest the counterplay and block the white pawns.

31.\text{f2 c2} 32.\text{d2} \text{b1} 33.\text{f3 a5} 34.g3

If 34.h3? then 34...h4 and White can achieve nothing on the kingside.

34...\text{c3} 35.e2 \text{f5}

Black prevents h2-h3 followed by g3-g4.
36.\textit{e}e7 \textit{c}c6!

The black king joins in the play and supports the attack on the queenside.

Diagram 4-2
37.\textit{e}2 \textit{f}6 38.\textit{e}e3 \textit{c}5 39.\textit{d}d2 \textit{b}b4 40.\textit{c}c1 \textit{a}a3 41.\textit{e}e2 a4!

With this move Black isolates the white pawns and creates two pawn weaknesses on a2 and c4.

42.\textit{x}xa4 \textit{xa}4 43.\textit{e}e8 \textit{d}d4 44.\textit{c}h8 \textit{g}6 45.\textit{h}h7 \textit{c}6 46.\textit{c}c7 \textit{e}e4 47.h3

47.\textit{f}7 \textit{d}4 48.\textit{e}e7 \textit{f}5 49.\textit{c}c7 would also offer no hope on account of: 49...\textit{c}c3! 50.\textit{d}d1 (or 50.\textit{xc}6 \textit{c}c2! 51.\textit{e}e6 \textit{c}5--+) 50...\textit{e}4 51.\textit{e}e7 \textit{c}c2†+

47...\textit{xc}4 48.g4 \textit{hxg}4 49.\textit{hxg}4 \textit{c}5

Black has won a pawn and now simply wants to advance his pawns, either to get a passed pawn or even better to win the pawn on a2 and have two connected passed pawns.

Diagram 4-3
50.\textit{d}d2 \textit{b}5 51.\textit{f}7 \textit{c}3† 52.\textit{e}e3 \textit{b}b1 53.\textit{f}5

The counterplay comes too late. The bishops fight well against the white passed pawn, even from afar.

53...\textit{gx}f5 54.g5 \textit{b}4 55.g6 \textit{f}4†!

The simplest solution.

56.\textit{xf}4† \textit{d}4†

After the capture of the pawn on the kingside, White’s last hopes can be buried.

0–1

3) In general the side with a rook gets an advantage from the \textbf{exchange of pieces}, because this reduces the danger of his opponent mounting an attack on the king, and in addition it is much easier to penetrate the opposing position with a rook.

4) A \textbf{passed pawn} can be of enormous benefit to the side with the rook.

Diagram 4-4

I.\textit{Morovic} – A.\textit{Yusupov}

Tunis 1985

Black has two pawns and a rook for two minor pieces, and thus a slight advantage in material. The good pawn structure is even more important, as are the
possibilities of obtaining a passed pawn. Here Black has a clear advantage.

**25...f7**

The immediate 25...a5!? followed by 26...b4 is also possible, but it is more natural for the king to come and support its pawns.

**26.e2 e6 27.d6 e5 28.f3**

**Diagram 4-5**

Black has a passed pawn, but it is safely blockaded. It is now important for Black to make the most of his advantages on the kingside.

**33...g4?!**

Black unnecessarily allows his pawns to be blockaded and thus makes his task harder.

The correct move was 33...h6+. For example:

- 34.b4 a5 35.c2 d5 36.xa5 e4 37.e1 a7 38.b4 g4 39.d3 h5--
- 34.h6

White fails to find the correct defence of 34.e1!.

**34.e6 35.c5**

Again White should post his bishop on the e1-h4 diagonal, with 35.f4! followed by g3.

**35.f5 36.d3**

36.xa6?? loses to 36...f6.

**36.e7**

If 36...f6 37.f4! h5, then 38.g3 g5 39.c5!.

**37.d2**

Preventing 37...c2+.

**37.e6**

**Diagram 4-6**

White gets his priorities wrong. The d4-pawn is blockaded and less important. The real danger is threatening on the kingside, where White should not give up the blockade.

38.f4! is correct: 38.e4 39.g3 (39.f3?? 40.e5+--) 39.c8 40.h4 h5 (40.f3 41.e1+) 41.g3 f3 42.e1+ and Black makes no progress.
Rook against two minor pieces

38...h5! 39.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)xd4 \( \text{\textit{c}} \)e4 40.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)c5+ \( \text{\textit{c}} \)h4!+

White may have got rid of the d4-pawn, but now he has to fight against an even more dangerous outside passed pawn.

41.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)e2

Diagram 4-7

41...\( \text{\textit{a}} \)a5?!

41...g3 is also good: 42.hxg3 hxg3 43.b4 g2! (43...a5?! 44.\( \text{\textit{d}} \)f2+ \( \text{\textit{d}} \)d5! 45.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)h3 \( \text{\textit{c}} \)c4 46.\( \text{\textit{d}} \)f2 a5+- 42.\( \text{\textit{d}} \)f2+ \( \text{\textit{d}} \)d5 43.b4 g3?!

43...\( \text{\textit{a}} \)xb4 would be better: 44.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)xb4 \( \text{\textit{c}} \)c2+ 45.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)e3 \( \text{\textit{c}} \)6 46.hxg3 hxg3 47.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)h3 \( \text{\textit{c}} \)xa2 48.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)f3 g2 49.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)e1 \( \text{\textit{c}} \)c4+

44.hxg3 hxg3 45.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)d3?!

If 45.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)g4?! then 45...\( \text{\textit{c}} \)e4 46.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)e3 \( \text{\textit{a}} \)xb4 47.\( \text{\textit{a}} \)xb4 \( \text{\textit{c}} \)f6 48.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)e1 \( \text{\textit{c}} \)a6--.

45.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)d1! is more stubborn: 45...\( \text{\textit{c}} \)f6 46.a3 \( \text{\textit{a}} \)a4+

45...\( \text{\textit{a}} \)xb4 46.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)e3

46.\( \text{\textit{a}} \)xb4 loses after 46...\( \text{\textit{c}} \)c2+ 47.\( \text{\textit{d}} \)d2 \( \text{\textit{d}} \)d4.

46...\( \text{\textit{c}} \)c2+ 47.\( \text{\textit{d}} \)d1

In time trouble, Black repeats moves. Of course 47...\( \text{\textit{d}} \)h2+ was already possible.

47...\( \text{\textit{c}} \)c3 48.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)e2

If 48.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)xb4+, then 48...\( \text{\textit{c}} \)c4 49.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)c2 \( \text{\textit{d}} \)d3+-.

48...\( \text{\textit{c}} \)e4 49.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)c5+ \( \text{\textit{d}} \)f5 50.\( \text{\textit{d}} \)d3 \( \text{\textit{c}} \)e4 51.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)c5+ \( \text{\textit{d}} \)d5 52.\( \text{\textit{d}} \)d3 \( \text{\textit{c}} \)c2+ 53.\( \text{\textit{d}} \)d1 \( \text{\textit{e}} \)h2!+-

Diagram 4-8

The white pieces can no longer be coordinated.

54.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)g1 \( \text{\textit{h}} \)h1 55.\( \text{\textit{f}} \)f4+ \( \text{\textit{e}} \)e4 56.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)e2 \( \text{\textit{f}} \)f3

White resigned, in view of 57.\( \text{\textit{c}} \)d2 \( \text{\textit{e}} \)h2!+-.

0–1

5) It is easy to coordinate a rook with its king. But a rook needs open files in order to penetrate the opposing camp (the seventh/second rank) and attack the opposing pawns or pieces.

6) For the side with the minor pieces, it can be very important that these pieces possess stable squares protected by pawns, so that the rook cannot attack them. The pieces, especially bishops, may then also protect their own pawns from an attack by the rook.

7) If the side with the minor pieces can blockade the opposing pawns, then his pieces will obtain some good squares, and he often gets an advantage.
8) If each player has only three pawns on one and the same wing, then the player with the rook can only have justified hopes of a draw if he does not allow any obvious weaknesses in his pawn structure. When the play is on both flanks, the strongest two minor pieces to possess are the bishop pair, whereas if the play is on one wing then two knights or knight plus bishop are more dangerous than the bishop pair.

Diagram 4-9

Black will win the c-pawn and gets a better ending. White must try to exchange a pair of rooks.

25...\textbf{c}b8!! 26.\textbf{c}d1 \textit{x}c5 27.\textbf{c}c1! \textit{d}d5

It makes no sense to let oneself be pinned: 27...\textit{c}c4?! 28.\textbf{c}e4 (28.\textbf{c}ed1!!) 28...\textit{d}d6 29.\textbf{c}d4+

28.\textbf{c}ed1 \textit{d}d4

In this way Black gains a few tempi.

29.\textbf{h}1

29.\textbf{c}c4?? \textit{e}2†+

29...\textit{e}7 30.\textbf{c}c4 \textit{e}2 31.\textbf{x}xd5 \textit{xd}5 32.\textbf{c}c2 \textit{f}4

33.\textbf{f}3 \textit{g}5 34.\textbf{g}1 \textit{h}5 35.\textbf{f}2

Diagram 4-10

Lasker managed to save a similar ending against Capablanca. However, in my game the position of the pawn on f7 provides better support for the bishop (Capablanca had already advanced his f-pawn). I am not convinced that Black should definitely win this ending, but the defence is extremely difficult for the opponent.

35...\textit{e}6 36.\textbf{c}c8 \textit{f}5 37.\textbf{d}d8 \textit{e}6 38.\textbf{a}8 \textit{d}3† 39.\textbf{e}e2 \textit{e}5 40.\textbf{h}8??

It would be better to control the fourth rank with 40.\textbf{a}4!.

40...\textit{h}4 41.\textbf{d}d8 \textit{d}7!

Black intends to continue with ...\textit{c}6 and ...\textit{h}3.

42.\textbf{b}8 \textit{c}6

42...\textit{h}3?! would also be interesting; 43.g4† \textit{e}6

44.\textbf{h}8 \textit{g}6 45.\textbf{h}6 \textit{e}5 46.\textbf{c}e3 \textit{f}4†

43.\textbf{b}3!?

43.h3?! is the correct defence: 43...\textit{f}4 44.\textbf{f}2†

43...\textit{d}5 44.\textbf{a}3 \textit{h}3!

Black aims to weaken the white pawns.
Rook against two minor pieces

Diagram 4-11

45.gxh3

After 45.g4†?! I cannot find a simple win for Black:
   a) If 45...@f4 46. Ea4† @c4† 47. E0f2 f6, as in the game, then: 48. Ea5† f5 (nothing is achieved by 48...@d3† 49. e2 @b2† 50. E0f2 @d1† 51. e1 @e3 52. ef2, nor 48...@b3 49. Eb5) 49.gxf5 @xf3 50. Ea4 @d2 (50...@e5? 51. f6=) 51. ef1! (51.f6? @e4† 52. e1 @d5=) 51...@e3 52. Ea3† @d3 53. f6 @f3† 54. d1 @e5 55. Ea5! @f7 56. Ea7 @g6 57. Ea3†
   b) 45...@e6?! is perhaps a better try: 46. Ea6† @e7† 45...@f4 46. Ea4† @c4† 47. Ef2 f6

Here White does not have a resource such as 48. Ea5 in variation 'a' above, and so he is in zugzwang.

Diagram 4-12

48. Ea3

After 48. e2?! @e3 49. ef3 f5-- the f3-pawn falls.
48...eb5 49. eb3

49. Ea5 is followed by 49...@c6 50. Ea6 f5--.
49...@d3† 50. ef2 @c4 51. Eb3??

This allows Black's subsequent regrouping.
51. Ea3! would be more resilient: 51...@b2! (Nothing is achieved by 51...@e3 52.h4! nor by 51...@c5 52. ef2 @d5 53. Ea4† @f5 54.h4.) 52. ef2 f5 53. ef2 @d5 54. ef2 @e6@ and now:
   a) 55. ef2 @c4 56. Ea4 (56. ef3 @e3†= or 56. @d3 @e5 57. @d6 @c4=) 56...@e3++
   b) 55. @a6 @c4 56. Ea3 @d3† 57. ef2 (57. ef2 @e3=) 57...@e5† 58. ef2 @b5 59. ef3 @c6 60. @b4† @a4=+
51...@e5 52. Ea3 @d5 53. Ea4† @e3 54. ef3 f5!--

Diagram 4-13

55. Ea3†
   55. f4 gxh4† 56. @xf4 @c4 57. h4 @e3=+
55...@d3 56. h4

Or 56. @xd3† @xd3 57. f4 @e3=+
56...@xh4† 57. @xh4 @xf3 58. @g5 @c4!

And the f-pawn decides the game.
59. @a6 f4 60. @f6 f3 61. h4 f2 62. @xf2 @xf2 63. h5 @f3 64. @f6

Black can easily disarm the h-pawn: 64. h6 @g4=+
64...@f4 65. h6 @h3

Black will play ...@g5 next. White had no desire to witness his opponent's mating technique.
0–1
Exercises

Ex. 4-7

Ex. 4-10

Ex. 4-8

Ex. 4-11

Ex. 4-9

Ex. 4-12

a b c d e f g h

a b c d e f g h

a b c d e f g h

a b c d e f g h

a b c d e f g h

a b c d e f g h
Solutions

Ex. 4-1

K.Mueller – A.Yusupov
Hamburg 1991

93...\texttt{g5}!

(1 point)
Black will win the h-pawn.
94.\texttt{g8} \texttt{f4} 95.\texttt{h8} \texttt{g4} 96.\texttt{h6} \texttt{h5} 97.\texttt{h7} \texttt{h6} 98.\texttt{f3} \texttt{g6}!

(another 1 point)
But not 98...\texttt{g7} 99.\texttt{f8} \texttt{hx7}? which lets White draw with 100.\texttt{xf6}.
99.\texttt{a8} \texttt{xh7} 100.\texttt{g4} \texttt{e7}! 101.\texttt{h5}
101.\texttt{a7} \texttt{g6}!→
101...\texttt{g7}→ 102.\texttt{a5} \texttt{f4} 103.\texttt{a6} \texttt{e5}
104.\texttt{b6} \texttt{f7} 105.\texttt{a6} \texttt{c8} 106.\texttt{c6} \texttt{d6}
107.\texttt{b6} \texttt{e4} 108.\texttt{g4} \texttt{g6} 109.\texttt{c6} \texttt{d6}
110.\texttt{a6} \texttt{f5}↑ 111.\texttt{a3} \texttt{f6} 112.\texttt{e3} \texttt{g5}
113.\texttt{e3} \texttt{d2}↑ 114.\texttt{e2} \texttt{f4} 115.\texttt{a4} \texttt{g4}
116.\texttt{f2} \texttt{e4}↑ 117.\texttt{g2} \texttt{d2}! 118.\texttt{c4}
\texttt{c3} 119.\texttt{d8} \texttt{f4} 120.\texttt{d3} \texttt{d2} 121.\texttt{a3} \texttt{c3}
122.\texttt{a4} \texttt{f3}↑ 123.\texttt{e1} \texttt{f4} 124.\texttt{a8} \texttt{b4}
125.\texttt{a4} \texttt{e3} 126.\texttt{b4} \texttt{d2}↑
0–1

Ex. 4-2

F.Simkovich
1927

Black threatens not only 1...\texttt{b1}, but also 1...\texttt{a2}.
1.\texttt{g4}↑
1...\texttt{x4}↑ \texttt{b1}→
1...\texttt{d6} 2.\texttt{d5}!

(1 point)
2...\texttt{a2} 3.\texttt{a2}!! \texttt{bxa2} 4.\texttt{c1} \texttt{a1}↑ 5.\texttt{b1}=

(another 1 point)
White will simply play \texttt{c2-c1-c2}, and Black can make no progress.

Ex. 4-3

J.Timman – A.Karpov
Bugojno 1980

The following annotations are based on analysis by Timman.
56...\texttt{c5}!

(2 points)
The alternatives are clearly worse:
a) 56...\texttt{d3} 57.\texttt{xe7} \texttt{xe7} 58.\texttt{h4}! \texttt{gxh4}
59.\texttt{hx5}=

b) 56...\texttt{d6}? 57.\texttt{xe7} \texttt{xe7} 58.\texttt{h4}! \texttt{gxh4}
59.\texttt{e5}! (59.\texttt{hx5}↑ \texttt{f5} 60.\texttt{gxh4} ↑ \texttt{f6} followed by ...\texttt{g6}→) 59...\texttt{f6} (59...\texttt{d8} 60.\texttt{e5}!) 60.\texttt{hx5}=
57.\texttt{xe7} \texttt{xe7}→

The weakness of the g3-pawn is the important factor.
58.\texttt{a7}

Or 58.\texttt{f4} \texttt{gxh4} 59.\texttt{fxh4} \texttt{f5}→ and Black will target the weak f4-pawn with ...\texttt{f6}, ...\texttt{d6} and ...\texttt{e6}.
58...\texttt{d6} 59.\texttt{b8} \texttt{h4} 60.\texttt{gxh4} \texttt{gxh4} 61.\texttt{e6}
\texttt{e6} 62.\texttt{a1} \texttt{e3}↑ 63.\texttt{e3} \texttt{f4} 64.\texttt{h1}
\texttt{f6} 65.\texttt{e4} \texttt{e6} 66.\texttt{d4} \texttt{f5} 67.\texttt{c3} \texttt{e6}
68.\texttt{d3} \texttt{f4} 69.\texttt{e2} \texttt{g5}!

Black avoids the trap 69...\texttt{d4}↑ 70.\texttt{xe3} \texttt{xf3}↑? 71.\texttt{f1}+, when \texttt{e2} will win the knight.
0–1

Ex. 4-4

A.Yusupov – A.Barreras
Cienfuegos 1979

28.\texttt{e4}!? (1 point)

28...\texttt{d4}↑ \texttt{f8} 29.\texttt{e4} (1 point) is less precise: 29...\texttt{e6} (29...\texttt{c8}↓ 30.\texttt{f4} \texttt{f5}
31.\texttt{f6} \texttt{d8} 32.\texttt{xb6} \texttt{xb6} 33.\texttt{xf5}→) 30.\texttt{f4} \texttt{e7}↑
28...\texttt{xe4} 29.\texttt{xe4} \texttt{xf7} 30.\texttt{e7}→

(another 1 point)
30...\texttt{c8} 31.\texttt{xa7} \texttt{g4} 32.\texttt{b7} \texttt{f6} 33.\texttt{xb6}
\texttt{e5} 34.a4 \texttt{f3} 35.a5 \texttt{d7} 36.\texttt{b7} \texttt{e6}

50
37.a6 c5 38.§c7 ♞d6 39.§c8 ♞b6 40.§f8 ♞e4 41.♕d2 ♞c7 42.§f7† ♞c6 43.g4 ♞c8 44.§e3 ♞b6 45.§f8 1–0

Ex. 4-5

A. Yusupov – E. Mortensen
Esbjerg 1980

44.g4!=

(2 points)

Now White can protect the g-pawn with the bishop.
44.§d3 ♞c1 45.§d2 is worse, because of 45...♖g1†.

First 44.§b3 ♞c1 and only then 45.g4 (also 2 points) is just as good.
44...♖f8
44...♖f6 45.§b3 ♞c1 46.§d2 ♖g1 47.§d1 c4 48.§b2!=

(1 point for this variation)
45.§b3 ♖g2

Or 45...♗c1 46.§d2 ♖g1 47.§d1 c4 48.§b2=.
46.§f3 ♖g1 47.§xc5 ♞c1 48.§e4 f5 49.gxf5 gxf5 50.§d2 ♞c3† 1/2–1/2

Ex. 4-6

A. Yusupov – H. Wegner
Hamburg 1991

23.§a3!

(2 points)

Other moves are slightly worse and earn 1 consolation point: 23.f4 ♖g7± or 23.§d1 ♖f8± or 23.♗c1 ♖f8±
23...♗xb5!
23...♗c6?! 24.b4 a6 25.§xd6 ♖xd6 26.bxc5++

The best defence is to give up a pawn with 23...♖f8 24.§xc5 dxc5 25.§xe5±.
24.axb5 ♖xa3 25.§a1 ♖xb3 26.§xb3 ♖xb3 27.§xa7 ♖c5 28.b6

(another 1 point)

Ex. 4-7

A. Yusupov – M. Muse
Bundesliga 2001

45.§f7!

(2 points)

But not 45.§f4? h4 46.gxh4! ♖xf4 47.§xc6 ♖h1 48.§b6 ♖e5 49.c5 ♖xh4 50.§xa6 ♖d5=.
45...♖f5
45...♗f1 46.§d8+–
46.§c7 ♖e7 47.§d6† ♖e6 48.§xc6+– ♖g7 49.§b7 ♖g4 50.c5 h4 51.§xh4 ♖xh4 52.§d6 1–0

Ex. 4-8

A. Yusupov – R. Schmaltz
German Ch, Bremen 1998

60.§e4!

(1 point)

60...d5

If 60...♖e7, then 61.§f3 ♖g8 62.§g5= and the h-pawn is lost.
61.§f3!=

(another 1 point)

The key move.
The immediate 61.§g5? is bad: 61...♖f6 62.§f3 ♖g3+–
61...♖g8 62.§g5† ♖f6 63.§g4 e5 64.§xe5† ♖xe5 65.§f4† ♖f6 66.§xh4 ♖xg5 67.§xg5† 1/2–1/2

Ex. 4-9

A. Sokolov – A. Yusupov
Moscow 1981

79...♗d3†! 80.§h2 ♔f5!=

(1 point)
Solutions

Exchanging queens is the simplest solution.
The game continued:
81. \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 82. \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{d3} \) 83. \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{g6} \)
84. \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{d2} \) 85. \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{b2} \) 86. \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{b3} \)
87. \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{c3} \) 88. \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{b3} \) 89. \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{c3} \)
90. \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{c2} \) 91. \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{a2} \) 92. \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{h6} \)
93. \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 94. \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{a8} \) 95. \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{f8} \)
96. \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{d8} \) 97. \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{a8} \) 98. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c8} \)
99. \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d8} \) 100. \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{c8} \) 101. \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c1} \)
102. \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{c8} \) 103. \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{d8} \) 104. \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{d7} \)
105. \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d8} \) 106. \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{d7} \) 107. \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{d2} \)
108. \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{h5} \) 109. \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 110. \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{f2} \)
111. \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{h5} \) 112. \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{g4} \) 113. \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{a2} \)
114. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{h2} \) 115. \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 116. \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{g3} \)
117. \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{f2} \)
\( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \)

Ex. 4-10

G.Kamsky - V.Anand
Candidates Match (2), Sanghi Nagar 1994

47... \( \text{d6} \)!
Here the exchange of rooks is fundamentally wrong (see Guideline 3). Anand had overlooked a tactical finesse by his opponent.
Either 47... \( \text{d6} \) (Anand) or 47... \( \text{g6} \) is correct.
(2 points for either move)
48. \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 49. \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 50. \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{b7} \)
51. \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{c4} \) 52. \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{xa5} \) 53. \( \text{h7} \) \( \text{g6} \)
54. \( \text{ed7} \) \( \text{c8} \) 55. \( \text{ed8} \) \( \text{e6} \) 56. \( \text{ed6} \) \( \text{f6} \)
57. \( \text{xa6} \) \( \text{c4} \) 58. \( \text{ec6} \) \( \text{e5} \) 59. \( \text{b6} \)
\( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \)

Ex. 4-11

E.Bogoljubow - Em.Lasker
Moscow 1925

46. \( \text{c3} \)!

46.a5 \( \text{d6} \) 47. \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{xe4\#} \)
46... \( \text{d6} \) 47. \( \text{xc6} \)!

(1 point)
(another 1 point)
The exchange sacrifice secures the white position.
47... \( \text{xc6} \) 48.a5 \( \text{c5} \) 49.a6 \( \text{b5} \) 50. \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{c4} \)
51. \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{d6} \) 52. \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{e6} \)
52... \( \text{c7} \) 53. \( \text{e5} \) does not promise Black anything.
\( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \)

Ex. 4-12

A.Beliavsky - A.Miles
Thessaloniki Olympiad 1984

69... \( \text{h8} \)!
This makes the defence considerably more difficult. In such situations every chance to force a draw must be exploited.
69...\( \text{c2} \) is correct: 70.\( \text{e3} \) \( \text{d2} \) 71.\( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{c8} \) and then ... \( \text{c3} \).
(3 points for this variation)
70. \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e1} \) 71. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d1} \) 72. \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{h7} \)

Unnecessarily wasting time.
72...\( \text{c1} \) would be correct: 73.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{b2} \) 74.\( \text{c4\#} \) \( \text{b3} \) 75.\( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f8} \)
Paradoxically, the king is better on the queenside than in the centre.
73.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{f7} \) 74.\( \text{e5} \) \( \text{e7\#} \) 75.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{e2} \)
76.\( \text{f6} \) \( \text{c7} \) 77.\( \text{e5} \) \( \text{e3} \) 78.\( \text{c2\#} \) \( \text{d2} \)
79.\( \text{f5} \) \( \text{c5\#} \) 80.\( \text{f4} \) \( \text{c8} \) 81.\( \text{g5} \)
Or 81.\( \text{f5\#} \)
81...\( \text{g8\#} \) 82.\( \text{f5} \) \( \text{f8} \) 83.\( \text{g6} \) \( \text{g8\#} \) 84.\( \text{f7} \)
\( \text{g4} \) 85.\( \text{h7} \) \( \text{h4} \) 86.\( \text{g6} \) \( \text{g4} \) 87.\( \text{a3} \) \( \text{c1} \)
88.\( \text{g7} \) \( \text{b2} \) 89.\( \text{f7} \) \( \text{f4} \) 90.\( \text{a2} \) \( \text{xf7\#} \)
91.\( \text{xf7} \)
1–0
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 26

22 points and above $\rightarrow$ Excellent
17 points and above $\rightarrow$ Good
13 points $\rightarrow$ Pass mark

If you scored less than 13 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Open games

In the open games, the sides come into contact more quickly. It is comparatively easy to get the minor pieces to active posts and to open lines. A lead in development plays a very important part, it may be possible to work up an initiative, and a quick attack cannot be discounted. Black especially must waste no time in the open games and must pay close attention to what is happening.

But in this chapter we shall concentrate on one specific situation, when Black tries to seize the initiative. That can either happen after a mistake by the first player, or as a result of a bold pawn sacrifice.

Some variations, such as the Marshall Attack, offer a long term initiative for the pawn. We shall study in this chapter how to deal with such a situation.

There follow two examples from the German Championship of 2005.

D.Baramidze – A.Graf
German Ch, Altenkirchen 2005

1.e4 e5 2.âf3 âc6 3.âb5 a6 4.âa4 âf6 5.0–0 âe7 6.âe1 b5 7.âb3 0–0

This move signals the second player’s readiness to aim for a sharp gambit variation (the Marshall Attack).

7...d6 is a quieter option.

8.a4

The typical reply, aiming to avoid the Marshall Attack.

After 8.c3 White must take into account the pawn sacrifice 8...d5.

8.h3 is the other Anti-Marshall variation. After 8...âb7 9.d3 d6 we have a complicated position, which is considered to be perhaps a slightly improved version of the Ruy Lopez for the second player.

8..b4 9.a5

This cheeky move provokes the opponent. 9.d3 is a safer variation.

9...d5??
Of course Black can also play 9...d6, but Graf is an aggressive player who always fights to win.

10.exd5 e4!?  
One standard idea is 10...hxg5 11.hxg5 hxg5 12.hxg5 c6 13.d4 and it is not quite clear who gains the most from this version of the Marshall Attack.

11.dxc6 exf3

Diagram 5-2

12.\textit{Wxf3}?  
White is playing very greedily and neglecting his development.

12.d4! is better: 12...fxg2 13.\textit{Wg5} (13.\textit{e4}?! or 13.\textit{d2}?! are also possible) 13...\textit{e5} After this White completed his development without any problems and was then able to seize the initiative. (Black should try either 13...\textit{g4}?! or 13...\textit{e8}?! here.) 14.\textit{Wxe7} \textit{Wxe7} 15.\textit{d5} \textit{g6} 16.\textit{Wd2} \textit{h4} Suetin – I. Zaitsev, USSR 1983, and now 17.\textit{e4} leads to a better position for White.

12...\textit{g4}

Diagram 5-3

13.\textit{Wd3}?!  
In order to exchange queens and be able to ward off the possible attack on the kingside, White sacrifices his pawn structure. The doubled d-pawns are not only weak, but they get in the way of the development of the knight on b1 and the bishop on c1.

13.\textit{Wxe8} 14.d3 \textit{c5} 15.\textit{Wd2} is also ugly. How can White then develop his queenside?

13.\textit{Wg3} \textit{d6} 14.\textit{Wh4} \textit{e8} 15.f3 would also be very dangerous in view of 15...\textit{c5}† 16.\textit{h1} \textit{xe1}† 17.\textit{xe1} \textit{e8} 18.\textit{f1} \textit{e6}.

And 13.\textit{Wf4}?! is followed by: 13...\textit{d6} 14.\textit{c4} \textit{e8} 15.\textit{xf7}† \textit{h8} 16.\textit{xe8}† \textit{xe8} 17.\textit{xe8}† \textit{xe8} 18.\textit{f3} \textit{e1}† 19.\textit{f2} \textit{xc1} 20.\textit{fxg4} \textit{e4}†

13...\textit{Wxd3} 14.\textit{cxd3} \textit{g5}

Diagram 5-4

Black is attacking and has three pieces more in play!

15.\textit{c4}  
Perhaps intending \textit{b2-b3} and \textit{b2}...

The only way for White to solve his problems of development was with the courageous sacrifice 15.\textit{c3}?!

15...\textit{e8}

Of course Black wants to exploit the open file.
16.\( \texttt{\textit{Re}}3 \)
This is forced, because otherwise the white king is left alone and without any protection. But now White gets no time to mobilize his queenside.

16...\( \texttt{\textit{Re}}xe3 \) 17.\( \texttt{\textit{Re}}xe3 \)

Diagram 5-5

17...\( \texttt{\textit{Re}}6!\)
Graf swaps off his opponent’s developed pieces so as to be able to attack the white pawns more easily.

18.\( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}2 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Re}}xe4 \) 19.\( \texttt{\textit{Re}}xe4 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Ff}}d8 \) 20.\( \texttt{\textit{Ff}}1 \)

20.\( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}2 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Fx}}xd3 \) 21.\( \texttt{\textit{Ff}}3 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}6 \) 22.\( \texttt{\textit{Ff}}2 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Ff}}6 \) 23.\( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}2 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}5 \) 24.\( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}3\+)

24.\( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}3\+) would perhaps have been slightly more resilient.

20...\( \texttt{\textit{Ff}}xd3 \) 21.\( \texttt{\textit{Ff}}e2 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}5 \) 22.\( \texttt{\textit{Fa}}4 \)

22.\( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}2 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}5 \) 23.\( \texttt{\textit{Bb}}3 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}5 \) 24.\( \texttt{\textit{Ff}}3 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Ff}}5 \) 25.\( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}3\+) would not be much better.

22...\( \texttt{\textit{Bb}}3 \) 23.\( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}2?! \)

White loses the game without putting up any resistance.

He should have at least tried 23.\( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}2 \) with the idea of 23...\( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}5 \) 24.\( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}3\+)\( \texttt{\textit{Bb}}3\). However, Black is doing very well after the simple 23...\( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}8\).

23...\( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}5\! \) 24.\( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}3?! \)

24.\( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}3 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}4 \) 25.\( \texttt{\textit{Dd}}4 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Bf}}c6 \) is certainly very good for Black, but he would still have some technical difficulties to overcome.

24...\( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}4 \)

After the exchange of rooks White has no more counterplay. White resigned at this appropriate moment.

0–1

A. Graf – J. Gustafsson
German Ch, Altenkirchen 2005

1.e4 e5 2.\( \texttt{\textit{Df}}3 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}6 \) 3.\( \texttt{\textit{Bb}}5 \) a6 4.\( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}4 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Df}}6 \) 5.0–0 \( \texttt{\textit{Dc}}7 \)

6.\( \texttt{\textit{Df}}1 \) b5 7.\( \texttt{\textit{Bb}}3 \) 0–0 8.c3 d5

Diagram 5-6

Frank Marshall’s idea is still very topical in modern times. Black’s active piece play compensates for the opponent’s slight material advantage.

9.\( \texttt{\textit{Dx}}d5 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Dx}}d5 \) 10.\( \texttt{\textit{Dx}}e5 \) \( \texttt{\textit{Dx}}e5 \) 11.\( \texttt{\textit{Dx}}e5 \) c6 12.\( \texttt{\textit{Dx}}d5 \)

This variation has not been popular since the legendary match between Tal and Spassky. Nowadays 12.d4 is played much more frequently.
12...cxd5 13.d4 \d6
Black brings his bishop to a more active position so as to be able to attack the kingside. The rook has to take a step back.
14.\e3
14.\xd5 loses material to 14...\h2t.
14...\h4 15.h3
After 15.g3 the light squares are weak and Black still has good counterplay.

Diagram 5-7

15...\f4
15...f5 (\f4) is an interesting alternative. White then plays either 16.\f3 followed by \d2, and tries to coordinate his forces rapidly, or the immediate 16.\d2.
16.\e5 \f6 17.\e1
17.\xd5 is too dangerous: 17...\b7 18.\g5 \fe8 and Black's attack is strong.
17...\g6 18.\f3 \d7?
Black wants to keep the e6-square free for his rook. 18...\e6 19.\e3 \ac8 20.\d2 b4 was also okay for Black in the game J.Polgar – Almasi, Groningen 1997.
18...\f5 is not so accurate, because after 19.\e3 \e4 White has 20.\g4.

Diagram 5-8

19.\e3
Playing for a win here is very risky.
19.\f4? \xf4 20.\xf4 \xh3 21.\g3= is a safer way out for White, known since the game Tal – Spassky, Tbilisi (4) 1965.
19...\ae8 20.\d2 \e6 21.\h1?!
White wants to protect the h3-pawn, but makes his king position worse.
If 21.\xd5 then 21...\c6 22.\g5 \xe3! 23.\xg6 \xe1† 24.\xe1 hxg6++.
21.\b3 \f6 22.\xd5 \xh3 23.\g5 (23.\c5!!) is a principled continuation.
21.\g4 \c2 22.\f3 \xb2 23.\xd5 \xc3 24.\e4 would lead to equality.
21...\b8? 22.\b3
It is now very difficult for White to defend.
If 22.\f1, then 22...\f6 23.\e2 \e8 and Black continues attacking.
22.\g1 is worth considering.
22...\(f6\)

Diagram 5-9

23.e2?

The only move is 23.d1!, so that after 23...\(\text{xh3}\) 24.gxh3 \(e4\uparrow\) 25.g1 \(g6\uparrow\) 26.f1= the white king retains the option of escaping via e2.

23...\(\text{xh3}\)\(\rightarrow\)

Now this sacrifice wins.

24.f4

White overlooked that 24.gxh3 \(e4\uparrow\) 25.f3 \(xf3\) 26.d2 is answered by a double check and mate.

Diagram 5-10

24...\(xg2\uparrow\) 25.xg2 \(h5\uparrow\) 26.h2

Or 26.g1 \(g6\rightarrow\).

26...\(f3\uparrow\) 27.g2 \(h6\uparrow\) 28.g1 \(g6\)

0–1

These examples show that the first player also has to be careful in open positions and that he must not neglect his development.

It is sometimes better not to accept a ‘present’ from one’s opponent, or else to return it later.

Of course, there is also a sort of inverted logic saying that one should jump at a material advantage, neutralize the opponent’s initiative and later turn the material advantage into the full point. But not many players are able to defend in such a clever way.
Exercises
Exercises
Here too, the computer finds an alternative win: 29...\texttt{g}f5 and it is only after 30.\texttt{e}d3 that 30...\texttt{e}e3! (also 2 points) is played.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \texttt{ffe3}
  \item 30.\texttt{f}xe3 \texttt{exe}d1+–
  \item 30...\texttt{f}e2
\end{itemize}

(another 1 point)

Threatening \ldots\texttt{h}f#.

31.\texttt{xf}t 32.\texttt{h}f1 \texttt{xe}3 33.\texttt{d}e5 \texttt{xe}5

34.\texttt{e}d8+ \texttt{h}h7 35.\texttt{e}d3 \texttt{g}f6

0–1

\begin{itemize}
  \item \texttt{ffe3}
\end{itemize}

(1 point)

This forces the draw.

Black should avoid 25...\texttt{e}e1+ 26.\texttt{h}h2 \texttt{f}5?
27.\texttt{xd}t \texttt{xe}4 28.\texttt{xe}5+ \texttt{f}f7 29.\texttt{d}f2+–, although in this line Black can play 26...\texttt{g}4? (1 point) and retain drawing chances.

26.\texttt{xe}3 \texttt{f}f1+ 27.\texttt{h}h2 \texttt{g}4

(another 1 point)

Threatening a perpetual check with ...\texttt{f}f2+.

28.\texttt{xd}t

28...\texttt{d}d2? \texttt{xa}1 29.\texttt{xd}t \texttt{xa}2+ \texttt{h}2–\texttt{h}2

Ex. 5-4

\begin{itemize}
  \item \texttt{ffe}4
\end{itemize}

(5 points)

\begin{itemize}
  \item 5.\texttt{f}e7 6.\texttt{e}e1 \texttt{b}5 7.\texttt{h}h3 0–0 8.\texttt{c}3 \texttt{d}5
  \item 9.\texttt{xd}t \texttt{xe}5 10.\texttt{xe}5 \texttt{xe}5 11.\texttt{xe}5 \texttt{f}f6
\end{itemize}
Solutions

12...\he1  \hd6  13...\hg4  14...\hf3  \hd4  15.d4
\hx2f2  16...\hg4

**Diagram Ex. 5-4**

17.hxg4!

(2 points)

17...\xf2f2? is bad: 17...\hg3  18...\f1f1 (18...\xg3
\xg3  19.hxg4  \ae8-++)  18...\xe2e2  19...\xe2e2

17...\bh2t  18...\f1f1  \hg3

18...\bh1 is followed by 19...\e3  \g3†
20...\e1  \f5†  21...\e2++.  

19...\xf2f2  \bh1†  20...\e2  \xf2f2

If 20...\xc1, then 21...\xf2f7†  \bh8  22...\xg3
\xb2t  23...\d2  \xa1  24...\f1f1  \xb2  25...\d3++.  

21...\d2?†

(another 1 point)

21...\h4  22...\h3  \ae8†  23...\d3  \f1f†
24...\c2  \f2f2  25...\xg3†  \g3  26...\d5  \c5
27...\xc5  \xc5  28...\d4  \d6  29...\a4  \a5  30...\xb5
\xb4  31...\a6  \xc3  32...\x3  \xb4  33...\b6  \xc3
34...\xc3  \h6  35...\b7  \e3  36...\xf7t†!

In this famous game Capablanca had to demonstrate all his ability in defence.

1-0

**Ex. 5-5**

A.Novopashin – B.Spassky
USSR Ch, Leningrad 1963

1.e4  e5  2...\f2f2  3...\c6  3...\b5  a6  4...\a4  \d6  5.0-
\e7  6...\e1  b5  7...\b3  0-0  8.c3  \d5  9...\xb5
\xd5  10...\xe5  \xe5  11...\xe5  \c6  12...\d4  \d6  13...\e1
\h4  14...\g3  \h3  15...\e3  \g4  16...\d3  \ae8
17...\d2  \e6  18...\a4  \bxa4  19...\xa4  \f5  20...\f4

**Diagram Ex. 5-5**

20...\xf4!!

(2 points)

Spassky destroys his opponent’s castled position.

21...\f2f2

This does not help at all.

Not much better is: 21...\xd5  \xd5  22...\gxf4
(22...\xa6  \xg3++)  22...\h6  23...\e2  \e8
24...\g2  \xe3  25...\f1f1  \g6  26...\xa6  \xa6
27...\xa6  \e1†  28...\f1f1  \e3†  29...\f2  \h6++

A more resilient try is 21...\gxf4 and now:

a) 21...\g6†!  22...\xd5†  \xd5  23...\xa6  \e2†
24...\g6†  \xd3†

b) 21...\h6† is even stronger: 22...\e2  \e8
23...\g2  \xe3  24...\f1f1  \e2!  (24...\g6?  25...\xa6)
25...\f2  \b5  26...\a1  \e2++

(another 1 point for 21...\g6 or 21...\h6)

21...\xe1†  22...\xe1  \e8!

If 23...\f2f2, then 23...\e2e2!  24...\c2  \xd2++.  

0-1

**Ex. 5-6**

A.Boucchechter – B.Spassky
Tel Aviv Olympiad 1964

1.e4  e5  2...\f2f2  3...\c6  3...b5  a6  4...\a4  \d6  5.0-
\e7  6...\e1  b5  7...\b3  0-0  8.c3  \d5  9...\xb5
\xd5  10...\xe5  \xe5  11...\xe5  \c6  12...\d4  \d6
13...\e1  \h4  14...\g3  \h3  15...\e3  \g4  16...\d3
\ae8  17...\d2  \e6  18...\d1†!  \xd1  19...\xd1
\f5  20...\f1  \h5  21...\e2

**Diagram Ex. 5-6**

21...\g6!

(2 points)

Of course Spassky wants to hang on to the queens and to attack.

21...\xe2 offers too little: 22...\xe2  \f4
(1 consolation point) 23...\gxf4  \xf4  24...\gxf4
\xe2  25...\xd6  \xf2f2  26...\e4†

22...\h1

Or 22...\d3  \f4!  23...\g6†  \xg6++ and Black wins a piece.

22...\f4!  23...\gxf4  \xf4  24...\f1f1  \d3  25...\g2
\h5  26...\f1f1  \xe3†!  27...\xe3
27...\xe3  \xd1†→

27...\xf2f2  28...\xd3  \xg2  29...\g2  \g6†!

0-1

**Ex. 5-7**

R.Fischer – J.Donner
Santa Monica 1966

1.e4  e5  2...\f3f3  \c6  3...b5  a6  4...\a4  \d6  5.0-
\e7  6...\e1  b5  7...\b3  0-0  8.c3  \d5  9...\xb5
\xd5  10...\xe5  \xe5  11...\xe5  \c6  12...\d4  \d6
13...\e1  \h4  14...\g3  \h3  15...\e3  \g4  16...\d3
\ae8  17...\d2  \e6  18...\d1†!  \xd1  19...\xd1
\f5  20...\f1  \h5  21...\e2

0-1
Solutions

14...g3  15...e3  16...d3  17...e3  18...f1  19...d2  20...f3  21...f3  22...d4  22...d4  23...d3  24...e1  25...dc3  26...c3  27...c2  28...c4  29...xc4  30...d3

White is better, but on account of the bishops of opposite colours he must avoid all unnecessary exchanges. Fischer’s careless move allows Black to force the draw.

White should defend his rook with 30...b1! or 30...d1!? or 30...c2!.

(1 point for any of these)

30...xc2!  31...xf5  32...xc1  33...h6  34...e2  35...f8

½–½

15...d3!

White quickly finishes his development and takes the initiative.

15...xf3  16...xf4  17.d4!  18.h3  19...d3± Almasi – Blatny, Germany 1995.

16...g5!

(another 1 point)

16...e7++ is also good.

17...xb2

18...f4  19...g6  19...h4  19...h6  20...f8+–

17...c5  18...e7  19...xd1†  19...xd1  20...xb3

18...e2

18...c2  19...g4  19...e7 can be met by 19...f4, with the point 20...e4  21...xf5.

18...b1! is more precise: 18...g4  19...e7  19...h6 (19...f4  20...e4!  21...xf4  22...xb1  22...xf4  23...xf8+)– 20...h3–

18...g4  19...e7  20...xd6  21...f8+  h5

21...xf8?  22...xe2  23...d1  24...c5

25...c1  26...e5

1–0

Ex. 5-9

P.Leko – V.Anand
Cap d’Agde (rapid) 2003

1.e4  e5  2...f3  3...c6  3...b5  a6  4...a4  5...f6  5...e7  6...e1  b5  7...b3  0–0  8...c3  d5  9...xd5  10...xe5  11...xe5  c6  12...e1  13...g3  14...f5  15...d7  15...e3  16...d2  17...c2  18...c1  19...f4  19...b4  20...h4  21...d1  f5  22...xg4  23...g5  24...d2  25...e8  26...xe6  26...xf4  27...f5  28...f1  29...xf4  30...f3  31...xf3  32...e1  33...f1  34...h3  35...g1  36...e3  37...h1

Diagram Ex. 5-9

16...e7++ is also good.

17...xb2

18...f4  19...g6  19...h4  19...h6  20...f8+–

17...c5  18...e7  19...xd1†  19...xd1  20...xb3

18...e2
Solutions

Diagram Ex. 5-10

14...d5!

(2 points)

A typical pawn sacrifice.

The alternative is 14...b8 15.e3 e6
(1 point).

15.g5?!

15.exd5 Qxd5 16.Qxe5 Qxe5 17.Qxe5 Qf6
18.Qe1 Qad8

15.Qg3=

15...h6=

15...xf6= 16.dxe4 c4! 17.Qe3

17...xf6! Qxd1 18.exd1 xf6 19.e3
d8 20.d5=

17...fd8 18.Qf5 Qe6 19.e2 Qb8 20.Qb1

Diagram Ex. 5-11

V.Anand – Z.Hrачek
Bundesliga 2002

1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.b5 a6 4.Qa4 Qf6 5.0-0
Qe7 6.e1 b5 7.b3 0-0 8.c3 d5 9.exd5
Qxd5 10.Qxe5 Qxe5 11.Qxe5 Qb7 12.d4 Qf6
Qxe1† 17.Qxe1 a4 18.Qxd5 Qxd5 19.e3
c6 20.h3 bxc3 21.bxc3 Qg5

Diagram Ex. 5-12

V.Anand – M.Adams
Dortmund 2000

1.e4 e5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.b5 a6 4.Qa4 Qf6 5.0-0
Qe7 6.e1 b5 7.b3 0-0 8.c3 d5 9.exd5 Qxd5
10.Qxe5 Qxe5 11.Qxe5 c6 12.Qe1 Qd6 13.d3
Qh4 14.g3 Qh3 15.Qe4 Qf5 16.Qd2 Qg6
17.Qe1 f5 18.a4 Qb8 19.axb5 axb5 20.Qe4
fxe4 21.dxe4 Qg4 22.Qd4 Qf3 23.exd5 c5
24.Qh4 Qbe8 25.Qe3 Qf5

Diagram Ex. 5-12

26/Qac1!

(2 points)

White defends actively by threatening Qc2.

The computer finds equality after 26.Qf4
Qxe1† 27.Qxe1 Qxf4 28.Qxf4 Qh3 29.d6†
c4 30.Qxc4† bxc4 31.Qxc4† Qh8 32.Qf1
(1 point), but I do not like the final position
for White.

26...Qe4?!

26...Qe4? 27.Qc2 Qxe1 28.Qxf4 Qh5+–

26...h6! is better: 27.Qc2 Qe4 (27...Qxd5
28.Qh3†) 28.Qxc5 Qxc5 29.Qxe4 Qxf2†
30.Qh1 Qc3

(another 1 point for this variation)
31.Qf1 (31.Qcd1 Qf4!) 31...Qe2 32.Qe1
Qd2=

27.Qd1 Qxd5?!

27...Qxd5 28.Qh5±

28.Qc2 Qf3?!

28...Qe4 29.Qxe4 Qxe4 30.Qg5†

29.Qxh7† Qf7 30.Qf5†+– Qg8 31.Qxf3
Qxf3 32.Qd3 c4 33.Qf1 Qe5 34.Qg2 Qh5
35.Qd4 Qxe1† 36.Qxe1 Qf7 37.Qa1 b4
38.Qb4 Qxb4 39.Qa8 Qxa8 40.Qxa8 g5
41.Qg2 Qh7 42.Qe4† Qh6 43.Qe3 Qh5
44.Qh3 Qc6 45.g4†

1-0
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 28

- 24 points and above → Excellent
- 19 points and above → Good
- 14 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 14 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
The minority attack

The minority attack is a strategic attack by a pawn minority against a chain with a greater number of pawns on that wing.

"Typical forms of the minority attack arise against the Karlsbad pawn structure in the Queen's Gambit, in which two pawns attack three" – E. & U. Boensch, *Schachlehre*

What sense, if any, does it make to attack an opponent who is numerically stronger? In many cases one prefers to play on the side where one has a pawn majority...

But we are talking about special situations, in which we possess a semi-open file and where it is difficult for the opposing pawn chain to advance.

Then we take the initiative on that side and start a pawn storm, with the aim of attacking the opponent's immobile pawns and possibly creating a weak backward pawn. The following typical game illustrates a standard way for things to proceed in the event of our opponent not finding an active plan.

**I. Khenkin – H. Namyslo**

German Ch, Altenkirchen 2005

1. d4 d5 2. c4 e6 3. d3 d6 4. c3 c6 5. g5 f6 6. cxd5

This is how White reaches the Karlsbad pawn structure.

6. e3 a5 leads to the Cambridge Springs Defence.

6... exd5 7. c2 e7 8. e3 0–0 9. d3 e8 10. h3

**Diagram 6-1**

A modern and flexible move which keeps various options open. This is how Karpov plays the QGD Exchange Variation. White takes control of the g4-square, and in some lines the dark-squared bishop can also retreat and find a hiding place on the b8-h2 diagonal. More aggressive players combine it with long castling and a pawn storm on the kingside. But Karpov plays more quietly and prefers, as does Khenkin in this game, to castle short.

10... f8 11. 0–0 g6
Black is planning to exchange the light-squared bishops after ...\texttt{e}6-g7 and ...\texttt{f}5.

\textbf{Diagram 6-2}

12.\texttt{ab1}

White shows his intentions with this move. He is preparing a minority attack on the queenside. His pieces will be well placed to support the pawn storm. The aim is – after b4-b5 – to create a weakness on c6.

12...\texttt{e}6 13.\texttt{h}4

13.\texttt{h}6 is the alternative.

13...\texttt{g}7 14.b4 a6

This cannot stop the minority attack, but Black is hoping to be able to obtain some counterplay on the a-file.

14...b5 is not good here since Black just gets a weakness on c6. But the move makes sense whenever Black can transfer his knight to c4.

15.a4 \texttt{f}5

Black exchanges his worse bishop, but also reduces his own attacking chances on the kingside.

15...\texttt{d}6 followed by ...\texttt{f}5 would have been an alternative. The bishop would be much more active on d6 than it is on f6 in the game.

16.\texttt{xf6}

White is aiming for a position in which in practical terms he is playing only on one flank, and in which the knight will be somewhat more valuable than the bishop. In doing so he also avoids the variations with ...\texttt{d}6. For example: 16.b5 axb5 17.axb5 \texttt{d}6

\textbf{Diagram 6-3}

16...\texttt{xf6}

17.b5\texttt{#}

White is able to carry out his plan and obtains a slight but lasting advantage. It must be said here that b4-b5 does not always bring an advantage. If, for example, the black queen were already on d6, Black could play ...c5 here...

17...axb5

After 17...\texttt{c}5? 18.axb5\texttt{#} the black pawn chain is destroyed and Black will have three pawn islands instead of two. The d5-pawn becomes weak, and White can also attack the other pawns on the queenside.

18.axb5 \texttt{xd}3 19.\texttt{x}d3 \texttt{a}3
Black’s hopes were pinned on this manoeuvre, but White can easily neutralize this initiative.

20.bxc6 bxc6

Diagram 6-4

21.\(\text{c2}\)!

White unpins the knight and parries the threat of \(...c5\).

21.\(\text{b1}!\) would also be good, and if 21...\(\text{a8}?!\) then 22.\(\text{xd5!} \text{xd3} 23.\text{xf6}\) (23...\(\text{h8}\)?! 24.\(\text{xa8} \text{xa8}\) 25.\(\text{e5}++\)) 24.\(\text{xe7} \text{g8} 25.\text{f6}\) (23...\(\text{g8}\)?) 26.\(\text{xa8} \text{xa8} 27.\text{c1}\) with a clearly better endgame.

21...\(\text{a8}\)

21...\(\text{c5}\) 22.\(\text{b5}++\)

22.\(\text{b2!} \text{c6} 23.\text{a1} \text{a6} 24.\text{xa6} \text{xa6} 25.\text{a1} \text{c8}\)

25...\(\text{d3}\) is followed by: 26.\(\text{e1} \text{f5} 27.\text{b7}\) (27.\(\text{b6}++\) is also good) 27...\(\text{xd4} 28.\text{a8} \text{d8}\) (28...\(\text{xa8} 29.\text{xa8} \text{g7} 30.\text{xd4} \text{xd4} 31.\text{d1}+) 29.\(\text{xa8} \text{xd8} 30.\text{xd4}\)

26.\(\text{b6}\)

Only now that White has got rid of any counterplay does he celebrate his strategic success and attack the weakness on c6.

26...\(\text{e7} 27.\text{c1}\)

Threatening \(\text{xd5}\).

27...\(\text{a8} 28.\text{e2} \text{c7} 29.\text{g4}?!\)

Diagram 6-5

With this attacking move on the kingside, White wants to secure the possibility of perhaps fixing a second weakness (the h7-pawn). It would probably have been better for Black to slip in the move \(...h5\) at some earlier point.

29...\(\text{c8} 30.\text{g2} \text{d8} 31.\text{b4} \text{a7} 32.\text{b3} \text{f6}\)

Black can defend his only weakness on c6, so White has to find a way to activate his knight.

33.\(\text{c2}\)!

White prepares \(\text{c1}-\text{d3}\).

33...\(\text{g7} 34.\text{c1} \text{h5}\)!

Black cannot stand the pressure. This move just weakens the kingside.

34...\(\text{c5}?!\) could be tried: 35.\(\text{g5!} (35.\text{xd5} \text{d8=}\) followed by \(...\text{xd4}\) 35...\(\text{g5} 36.\text{g5} \text{g5}\) 37.\(\text{xd5} \text{e7} 38.\text{c4} \text{b7}++ 39.\text{d5}?! (39.\text{f3} \text{d6} 40.\text{dxc5} \text{e7=} 39...\text{d6} 40.\text{d3}\) White is still somewhat better.
The minority attack

35.\textit{g}xh5 \textit{g}xh5 36.\textit{d}d3±

Diagram 6-6

36...\textit{g}g8

Black tries to complicate the play.

37.\textit{g}f5

White does not want to risk anything or get tempted into an unclear battle just before the time control.

37.\textit{a}x\textit{c}6 leads to sharper play: 37...\textit{d}d7 38.\textit{c}c2 \textit{h}8\textdagger 39.\textit{g}h2 \textit{e}e7 40.\textit{e}e5 (40.\textit{d}e2?!?) 40...\textit{d}d6 41.\textit{f}4 \textit{xe}5 42.\textit{dxe}5 \textit{d}4 43.\textit{d}d6 \textit{b}7 44.\textit{e}e2 \textit{dxe}3c

37...\textit{f}8\textdagger 38.\textit{f}1 \textit{a}6\textdagger 39.\textit{d}d3

39.\textit{e}e2?!?

39...\textit{a}4 40.\textit{b}3 \textit{a}6\textdagger

The ending after 40...\textit{b}5\textdagger 41.\textit{xb}5 \textit{cxb}5 42.\textit{c}6± is clearly better for White.

41.\textit{d}d3 \textit{a}4 42.\textit{a}2 \textit{b}4 43.\textit{b}3 \textit{d}6 44.\textit{d}3

White consolidates his position.

44...\textit{g}7 45.\textit{a}7

Preparing \textit{e}5.

Diagram 6-7

45...c5?

Now it is definitely too late for this move.

A more resilient try is 45...\textit{c}8 and then ...\textit{c}7±.

46.\textit{dxc}5 \textit{xc}5 47.\textit{b}4 \textit{e}4 48.\textit{xd}6 \textit{xd}6

49.\textit{f}4+-

White now harvests the fruits of his patient work and wins a pawn. Khenkin also went on to win the game.

Theoretically speaking, in the Karlsbad pawn structure Black can try to mount a minority attack on the kingside, but this works relatively rarely in praxis, because the pieces are not so well positioned for that and moving pawns on the kingside can weaken Black’s own castled position.

You can also get a typical Karlsbad pawn structure from other openings.

\textbf{T.Petrosian – N.Krogius}

USSR Ch, Tbilisi 1959

1.d4 \textit{f}6 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{g}6 3.c4 \textit{g}7 4.\textit{c}3 \textit{d}5 5.\textit{g}5

A solid variation against the Grünfeld Defence.
5...\textit{e}4 6.cxd5 \textit{x}g5 7.xg5 e6
Black recovers the pawn and we get a typical Karlsbad structure (all that is missing is the black pawn on c6).

\textbf{8.e}3 exd5 9.e3 0–0 10.e3
10.b4 is perhaps slightly more accurate.

10...\textit{c}6
Playing without ...c6 is hard. But a dynamic alternative here would be 10...c5!?

11.0–0 \textit{e}7

\textbf{Diagram 6-8}

12.b4
White can also act on the queenside without waiting for ...c6, since the pressure down the c-file will eventually push his opponent into playing ...c6.

12...\textit{f}5!?
It would be better to exchange the bishop for the knight: 12...\textit{g}4 13.h3 \textit{x}xf3 14.xxf3 c6± with only a minimal advantage for White.

12...\textit{a}6!? is also worth considering.

13.xxf5 \textit{xf}5

\textbf{Diagram 6-9}

14.b5!
If Black now plays ...c6, White certainly achieves what he wants – a backward c6-pawn.

14...\textit{d}6 15.\textit{b}3 \textit{e}7 16.\textit{fc}1
White prepares to double rooks on the c-file.

16...\textit{h}8?
Black does not find a plan against Petrosian’s clear strategic line and just makes his position worse.
Better was 16...c6± or 16...\textit{fc}8.

17.\textit{c}2 h6 18.\textit{ac}1 c6 19.\textit{a}4
This is somewhat more precise than: 19.bxc6 bxc6 20.a4 (20.e2) 20...\textit{ab}8 21.\textit{c}3±

19...\textit{ab}8
19...\textit{xb}5 20.\textit{xb}5 b6 is not a good solution either, as White still controls the c-file here.

20.g3

\textbf{Diagram 6-10}
Typical Petrosian. He takes precautions in advance against any possible attack on the kingside.

20...\textit{h}7
Black just waits.
20...f5 21.\textit{c}5 g5 can simply be answered by 22.e5± and the black position is too weakened.
21.\text{\texttt{c5}} \text{\texttt{f6}} 22.\text{\texttt{bxc6}}

Now White is optimally prepared for the opening of the game.

22...\text{\texttt{bxc6}} 23.\text{\texttt{a4}} \text{\texttt{f6}} 24.\text{\texttt{g2}}

24.\text{\texttt{e5}} would also be strong.

24...\text{\texttt{a8}}

\underline{Diagram 6-11}

25.\text{\texttt{b7}}

The knight goes to \texttt{a5} and the \texttt{c6}-pawn falls!

25...\text{\texttt{e8}} 26.\text{\texttt{a5}} \text{\texttt{g5}} 27.\text{\texttt{h3}}!

Petrosian does not allow his opponent any active possibilities. The \texttt{c6}-pawn can wait for another move.

27...\text{\texttt{f5}} 28.\text{\texttt{xc6}} \text{\texttt{e4}} 29.\text{\texttt{c5}}

Everything has become clear. Petrosian now makes certain with the exchange of queens!

29...\text{\texttt{f5}} 30.\text{\texttt{c2}} \text{\texttt{xc6}} 31.\text{\texttt{xc6}} \text{\texttt{f4}} 32.\text{\texttt{exf4}} \text{\texttt{gf4}}

33.\text{\texttt{g4}}!

The black attack has achieved nothing.

33...\text{\texttt{xd4}}

\underline{Diagram 6-12}

34.\text{\texttt{d2}}!

Black has temporarily regained the pawn, but his castled position is severely weakened. For that reason White now retains the queens.

34...\text{\texttt{g7}} 35.\text{\texttt{c1}} \text{\texttt{xa4}} 36.\text{\texttt{xd5+}} \text{\texttt{xe1}} 37.\text{\texttt{xe1}} \text{\texttt{f8}} 38.\text{\texttt{f3}} \text{\texttt{h8}} 39.\text{\texttt{c7}}

White launches the decisive attack.

39...\text{\texttt{a6}} 40.\text{\texttt{b7}} \text{\texttt{g8}} 41.\text{\texttt{h4}}

Things might continue 41...\text{\texttt{xa2}} 42.\text{\texttt{g6}} \text{\texttt{h7}} 43.\text{\texttt{e4}} \text{\texttt{f3}} 44.\text{\texttt{g3}} with a quick mate.

1–0
Exercises

Ex. 6-1

Ex. 6-2

Ex. 6-3

Ex. 6-4

Ex. 6-5

Ex. 6-6
Solutions

Ex. 6-1

A.Kotov – L.Pachman
Venice 1950

15.a4

(1 point)

White prepares b4-b5 directly.

However, it is also possible to prepare the minority attack with the standard move 15.a4 (also 1 point), transferring the knight to c5.

15...g7 16.b5 axb5 17.axb5 f5 18.exf5

19.bxc6 bxc6 20.a4+ b8 21.b5

21...b1?!

21...d6 22.d2 e7 23.b1 b7

23...a8?/!

24.b7 b7 25.a7 d6 26.a6 c7

27.c1 d8 28.c5 a5 29.d3 b5

30.g3 b6 31.b1 xd3 32.d3 a5

33.b3 d8 34.b5 c4 35.c4 c7

36.b8 c4 37.a1 c8 38.d7 c7

39.a8+ g7 40.c5 c5 41.c5 c6 42.d3 c6 f6?±

Better is 42...h5±.

See Ex. 6-2.

Ex. 6-2

A.Kotov – L.Pachman
Venice 1950

43.g4!±

(3 points)

This standard move fixes the second weakness – the h7-pawn.

43...c6 44.c2 b6 45.e8+ b7 46.eh8

f6 47.h4 b7 48.c3 f7 49.e8+ e7

50.d8 e7 51.c5+ e7 52.e8 c5 53.dxc5

54.b8 e6 55.d8 e7

56.d6 ba6 57.g5 fxg5 58.hxg5 f7 59.g3

f6 60.b3 d3 61.c4 a4+ 62.e5 a3

63.cxd5 bxe3+ 64.cxd5 e3+ 65.b3 c5+ 66.b5 c7

67.c6 c8 68.e8 69.d6 e8 70.c6
c1 71.g8+ f7 72.c7+--

65.e4!±

65.e5! e3+ 66.f4 c3 67.c7± e6

68.g4 c1 69.hxh7 c5 70.g7+--

65.c3 66.f4!±

66.d5! d7 67.d6+ c7 68.f4+-

66...c1 67.c7± d8?±

In Endgame Preparation, Speelman pointed out that 67...e6± is a better defensive try, setting a clever trap: 68.exh7? xc5 69.g7
c4+ 70.f3 xc6!! 71.exg6+ f5= 68.hxh7 xc5 69.f7

1–0

Ex. 6-3

A.Yusupov – V.Kupreichik
Rostov 1980

27.h4? (2 points)

A very nice move, which suits our subject perfectly. Before recapturing on d4, Black aims to improve his pawn structure by swapping off his (potentially weak) h-pawn.

27...exd4 would be worse on account of 28.cxd4.

27...xd4! 28.xd4 exd4 (1 point) 29.f3 d7 is less logical, since Black exchanges his potentially more active rook.

The best of the immediate recaptures is: 27...exd4 (also 2 points) 28.f3 During the game I thought that White was slightly better here, but the computer does not agree with this evaluation: 28...e7 29.f5 (29.b4 e5 30.bxc5 bxc5=) 29...e8 30.b4! (30.e1 e5 31.exd5 e5 32.f4 e7 33.e5 f7+ 34.g5 g2+ 35.e1 e4 36.bxc5 e3+ 32.f4 e8+ 33.f5 e2= 28.f3

Now Black manages to weaken the white pawns and seize the initiative.

I failed to spot the stronger idea: 28.g4! xg4?! (28...exd4 29.f3 e7 30.b4=) 29.f3 g8? 30.g1+--

(1 point for this variation)
Solutions

28...hxg3 29.hxg3 exd4 30.e5

With energetic play, White manages to hold the balance.

30.g4?! would also be good: 30...hxg7 31.e5 hxh3+ 32.gxf4 e2h2 (Δg2+) 33.b4=

30...dxg3 31.hg1 d5 32.hf4 e4h4+ 33.gf3 dh7?

33...e8g7?!?

34.f3 e6 35.xh5 d3!

35...xe5 36.ed7+ dh6 37.xb7=

36.xh7

36.eb7 xe5 (36...exg3+ 37.xg3 xg3+ 38.ye4=) 37.xxb6 xg3+ 38.xg3 xg3+ 39.xf2! xg2+ 40.ye1=

36...xe5?!

36...e6 37.xd7! c4

37...ed4! 38.ye1+ 38.ye1+ 39.ye1+ 39.xf6 39.ad6+ xf5 40.ad5+ xf6 41.ad6+ xf5 42.ad5+

½–½

Ex. 6-4

A.Yusupov – J.Eslo
Can Picafor 1981

14.a4?!

(2 points)

The minority attack on the queenside is a standard option. An advantage of this plan is that the opponent now has to concern himself with the protection of the b6-pawn, and so he gets fewer counter-chances.

Of course there are other options, for example 14.ad1 or 14.e5 (1 consolation point for each).

14...xb7 15.ad3 ac8 16.a5 ac7 17.axb6 axb6 18.ac1

The weakness of the b6-pawn gives White an edge.

18....bb8 19.ab1 ab8 20.a1 bb8 21.e5 dc5 22.ag5 h6 23.ye4 ac7 24.ed6+ Ex. 6-5

A.Karpov – L.Ljubojevic
Linares 1989

The following annotations are based on analysis by Karpov.

19.xg6 hxg6 20.b5!

(2 points)

20...cxb5 21.axb5 xch6 21...a5? 22.b6±

22.bxa6 bxa6 23.a4

The a-pawn is now very weak.

23...yb7?!

23...a8?! 24.xc5 xh4±

24.xd7 xbd7 25.xc5+ xc7 26.ca5 xh8 27.xb6 xa8 28.h4 xc7 29.xh2+– The king approaches the e4-pawn, which is now the second weakness.

But not 29.xe5+ xh7 30.xe4 a5±.

29...xh7 30.xg3 xc7 31.xb2 xb7 32.xc5+ xh6 33.a2 a6 34.xf4 xh5 35.xb2+ xa7 36.xc6!

Threatening xb6.

36...yb8 37.xa2!

37.a4 allows Black to defend with 37...yb5! followed by ...a5.

37...a5

37...exh4+? loses to 38.xg3, after which 39.xxa6+ will lead to the win of the e7-rook.

38.xa5+ xb7 39.xa6 xh4+ 40.xg3 e5 41.xa7+ xc6 42.xa6+ xh5 43.xe7+- xg5+ 44.yh2 xa6 45.xf7 1–0

Ex. 6-6

A.Karpov – A.Kharitonov
USSR Ch, Moscow 1988

The following annotations are based on analysis by Karpov and I.Zaitsev.

17.a4!

(2 points)

Threatening a4-a5-a6.
Solutions

17. b4 (1 point) is not so clear on account of:

17... c4 18. dxc4 dxc4 19. e4 b5 20. a4 a6
21. dxe5 dxe5 22. dxe5 fxe5 23. dxe5

17... Bc8

If 17... Bc8, then not 18. Bc5 Bc8? (and 19. b3), but simply 18. b3 followed by Bb2 and Bc5±.

18. Bc5 Bb8

18... Bxc5 19. dxc5 Bd7 (19... Bxa4?? 20. b3++) 19. b4 a5 21. Bxe5 Bxe5 22. Be2

18... Bc7? 19. Bc3 (19. a5 Bd7) 19... Bc8±

18... Bb8!! 19. b3 (19. a5 Bd7 20. Ba7 Bc8! Δ... Bc8++) 19... Bc7±

19. Bc3 a6

19... a5!? 20. Be2

Intending b2-b4 next.


25. b5? A rare case of Karpov overlooking a threat by his opponent!

It was better to play: 25. f4!

(2 points)

25... Bf6 26. Bf2! (26. b5 Bb6 27. a4 c5±) 26... Bf5 (26... Bb6 27. a3 Bf5 28. e4! with the point 28... Bxe4?? 29. Bxe4 Bxe4 30. Bxe4 Bc8 31. Bc6 f±)

Slightly more passive, but still clearly better than the move in the game is 25. Bf1? (1 point).

25... Bxg2!? (another 1 point for this variation)

26. Bxg2

26. Bg1 Bc4++

26... h5 27. Bxc6 hxg3 28. Bxg3 Bxe3

29. Bxe3


29... Bxc3 30. Bxb7 Bxb7 31. Bc3+

31. Bb2 Bc6+ (Mikhalchishin) or 31. Bb1 Bc8±.

31... Bxc5!++ 32. Bxc5 Bxd3 33. Bc4 Bc2± 34. Bg1 Bc6 35. Bc1 Bxd4! 36. Bf1 Bb5 0–1

A. Karpov – A. Beliavsky

Belfort 1988

The following annotations are based on analysis by Karpov.

19. Bfl!

(2 points)

White intends Bd3-c5. When Black has already played ... a6, this redeployment of the knight before advancing b4-b5 can be very useful.

The immediate 19. b5 (1 consolation point) is followed by 19... axb5 20. axb5 Bxa2 21. Bxa2 c5=.

19... Bf5 20. Bc2

Karpov is forced to be very prudent in his preparations for b4-b5.


20... Bf8! 21. Bb2 Bg6 22. Bf4 Bg8

22... Bf6 23. Bf4 Bg8

23. Bc1 h5 24. Bc2

24. Bc5 Bxb5 25. Bxb5 Bc3

24... Bc6 25. Bf3 Bg7 26. Bc1 Bb8

26... Bb5? 27. Bb7 Bdb8 28. Bxd6±

27. Bf6

27... axb5 28. axb5 cxb5 29. Bxb5±


Ex. 6-8

A. Karpov – A. Beliavsky

Tilburg 1986
Solutions

Ex. 6-9

L.Portisch – A.Yusupov
Bugojno 1986

31...f5!

(2 points)

Here there is the chance of a minority attack on the kingside.

32.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}e2 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}d8!

Clearing the way for \ldots \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}e7.

33.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}b6

Better is 33.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}eb2 to keep Black tied to the defence of the b7-pawn.

33...f4! → 34.exf4?! 

34.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xe2 35.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xe2 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}f6 36.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}b4 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xf4 

37.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}d2 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}e7 38.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}h1!?

After 38.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}g1 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}g5! Black threatens both \ldots f3\textdagger and \ldots \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xh3.

White had to try 38.f3\textdagger.

38...f3! 39.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}c3 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}g5 40.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xf3 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xf4\textdagger

It was right to avoid 40...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xh3? 41.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xb7\textdagger, but 40...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xf3?! 41.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}e1\textdagger would have been very strong.

Ex. 6-10

E.Bareev – U.Boensch
Bundesliga 2000

24...f4? 

(2 points)

Black logically attacks on the kingside.

25.g4

Or 25.gxf4 gxf4 26.e4 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}g7 (26...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}h4?!)

27.e5 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}c4\textdagger.

25...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}g7\textdagger

Targeting the weak d4-pawn.

26.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}d1 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}b5 

26...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}c4?!

27.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}d3 h5?! 28.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xb5 axb5 29.gxh5 g4

30.exf4 g3→ 31.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}be3 

31.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}e5?!\textdagger

31...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}x3 32.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xe3 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}f6 33.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}f1

33.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}d3 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}f5 34.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}c3 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}h4→

Ex. 6-11

A.Karpov – D.Campora
San Nicolas (2) 1994

The annotations to this exercise and the next are based on analysis by Karpov.

16.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}b1!?

(2 points)

White prepares the advance of his b-pawn.

The immediate 16.b5? is bad on account of 16...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}a3 17.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xb1 cxb5 18.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}b3 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}b4\textdagger.

16.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}c5 (1 point) is followed by: 16...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}c8 17.b5 b6 (17...cxb5 18.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xb5 b6? 19.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xe8 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xe8 20.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}a4\textdagger) 18.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}a4 c5\textdagger

16...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}d6

16...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}c8 17.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}fe1 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xh3 (17...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}d6 18.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}g5) 18.gxh3 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xh3 19.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}e5 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}d6 20.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}f1! \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}h4 (20...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}h5 21.f4) 21.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}f3 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}g4\textdagger 22.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}g2 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}e6 23.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}f1 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}g6 24.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}h1

17.b5 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}f6 18.bxc6 bxc6 19.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}h2

19.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}d2 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xh3! or 19.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}e2 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}f5 20.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}b2 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}e6\textdagger.

19...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}h4 20.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}f5?! 

Securing the kingside.

20...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}h5 21.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xe6 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xe6 22.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}f3\textdagger f5!

22...c5 23.dxc5 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xc5 24.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xc5 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xc5 (24...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xc5?! 25.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xc5 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xc5 26.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}b5 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xc5 27.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}d7) 25.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}b5\textdagger

22...\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}g5 23.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xg5 \textbf{\check{\textdollar}}xg5 24.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}c5\textdagger

23.\textbf{\check{\textdollar}}c3!

See Ex. 6-12.
23...d8?!  
You cannot play like this against Karpov!

23...g5? would also be bad: 24.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xf5 f7}}
25.\textcolor{red}{\textit{g4 g6}} 26.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xc6 h5}} 27.\textcolor{red}{\textit{h4+-}}

The correct move is: 23...f4! 

(2 points)

Black carries out a minority attack on the kingside. For example:

- a) 24.\textcolor{red}{\textit{e1 g5}} 25.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xg5 xg5}} 26.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xf4 xe1+}} 27.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xel xel}} (27...\textcolor{red}{\textit{c7}} 28.\textcolor{red}{\textit{d1 xf4}}
29.g3 followed by \textcolor{red}{\textit{xc6+}}) 28.\textcolor{red}{\textit{e8+}} (28.\textcolor{red}{\textit{e6+?!}}
\textcolor{red}{\textit{f7}}) 28...\textcolor{red}{\textit{f8=}}
- b) 24.e4 dxe4 25.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xe4 g5=}}

24.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xc5 xc5}}

24...f4 25.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xf4 xc5}} (25...\textcolor{red}{\textit{xf4}} 26.\textcolor{red}{\textit{d3+}})
26.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xc5 e6}} 27.\textcolor{red}{\textit{e3+}}

25.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xc5 e6}}

25...f4 26.\textcolor{red}{\textit{e5+}}

26.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xc3 f4}} 27.e4+±
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 26

22 points and above → Excellent
17 points and above → Good
13 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 13 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Complicated Combinations

In this chapter we shall take a look at various combinations in which the point behind them is somewhat hidden. After three or four forced moves a tactical nuance still has to be discovered.

But in a practical game nobody gives us the hint that we should look for a combination. We do not know whether it is worth searching for a tactical solution. Thus in the following game your author gave up his search for a winning combination too soon.

Diagram 7-1

A.Yusupov – R.Fontaine
Cannes 2005

As White, I underestimated the strength of my position, calculating the variation 27.\textit{xf6} gxf6 28.exf6 \textit{g6} 29.h5 \textit{g8} 30.hxg6 \textit{xg6}, and rejecting it.

I instead played 27.\textit{f4} and neither side found any way to make progress, soon agreeing a draw: 27...\textit{fle7} 28.\textit{g3} \textit{h7} 29.\textit{f1d1} \textit{g8} 30.\textit{h2} \textit{f8} 31.\textit{g1} \textit{c7} \frac{1}{2}–\frac{1}{2}

But the rejected option would have been correct:

\begin{itemize}
\item 27.\textit{xf6}! gxf6
\item 27...\textit{g6} 28.h5 gxf6 29.exf6 is just a transposition.
\item 28.exf6!
\end{itemize}

But not 28.\textit{xf6}? \textit{h7} 29.\textit{xh6} on account of:

29...\textit{c1t} 30.\textit{h2} \textit{xe3} 31.\textit{h5} \textit{f4t} 32.\textit{h3} \textit{f5t}++

\begin{itemize}
\item 28...\textit{g6} 29.h5 \textit{g8}
\end{itemize}

Or 29...\textit{h7} 30.\textit{hxg6t} fxg6 31.\textit{f7} \textit{e7} 32.\textit{e8} \textit{xe8} 33.\textit{f6l}++.

30.\textit{hxg6} \textit{xg6}

Diagram 7-2

Now there is an unexpected tactical point:

31.\textit{xg6l}

Both players had completely overlooked this move! A typical mistake when calculating variations – the variation was evaluated too soon and calculation was stopped, although there were still some active moves available!

31...\textit{fxg6} 32.\textit{f7}+-

80
The simplest way to increase the probability of finding the right idea at the correct moment is by doing lots of tactical exercises! Here are three further examples.

**Diagram 7-3**

M. Taimanov – A. Serebriskiy
Leningrad 1951

White starts a combination which is based on a double attack on the fourth move.

1. \textit{\texttt{xd6!}}

1. \textit{\texttt{d2!? d5 2. \texttt{a5}} would not be so clear after 2... \texttt{dxe4}.}

1... \textit{\texttt{xd6 2. \texttt{f5! \texttt{gxf5 3. \texttt{xd6}}} }}

**Diagram 7-4**

3... \textit{\texttt{c8?}}

Black cannot stand up to the pressure. He could have found better ways to defend.

If 3... \textit{\texttt{xd6?}} then we see the point of the combination: 4. \textit{\texttt{g3}}+ \textit{\texttt{f7 5. \texttt{xd6!}} (but not 5. \texttt{xd6?}} \textit{\texttt{f4! 6. \texttt{xf4}} \textit{\texttt{d5! 7. \texttt{g3}} \textit{\texttt{c3! 8. \texttt{f1}} \textit{\texttt{xe4!}}}}}

5... \textit{\texttt{d7+ (After 6. \texttt{d5 b4!? White may be clearly better, but Black can still fight on.) 6. \texttt{xd7 7. \texttt{d6}} \textit{\texttt{e5}} (or 7... \texttt{b8 8. \texttt{d8}} \textit{\texttt{d7 9. \texttt{c8}} \textit{\texttt{e5 10. \texttt{f4+}}}})) 8. \textit{\texttt{f4+}}}

3... \textit{\texttt{d7?!}} is trickier, as the tempting 4. \textit{\texttt{xc5?}} would be bad on account of 4... \textit{\texttt{c8!}}. Instead, White would have to find the difficult move 4. \textit{\texttt{e1!}} (with the threat of 5. \textit{\texttt{xc6}). Then 4... \textit{\texttt{xd6}} is followed by 5. \textit{\texttt{g3+}} transposing to the above variation with 3... \textit{\texttt{xd6}.}}

4. \textit{\texttt{xc5 fxe4}}

4... \textit{\texttt{c7 5. \texttt{xf5+}}}

5. \textit{\texttt{xb6}}

White simply clears up.

5... \textit{\texttt{xf3 6. \texttt{xc6 f2+ 7. \texttt{xf2}} \textit{\texttt{e8 8. \texttt{g1}}}} 1-0

**Diagram 7-5**

Em. Lasker – P. Romanovsky
Simultaneous St Petersburg 1909

In this position Black has numerous routes to his goal, but he finds a forced variation.

1... \textit{\texttt{c2!!}}

1... \textit{\texttt{d3+ also wins.}}
2.bate3
If 2.xxc2, then simply 2...c5† 3.b3 b4#.
2...b4† 3.xxc2 f2† 4.e2
Otherwise it is immediately mate: 4.d1 d4# or 4.d3 d4# or 4xb1 xb2#.
But even after the text there is nowhere for the white king to escape to.
4...xe2† 5.c3 c4† 6.d2 xb2† 7.e3 e2† 8.d4 d2† 9.c4 b4#

Diagram 7-6
Based on the game
L.Aronin – Shaposhnikov
Tula 1952

1.b8†!
In the game White also had a knight on f3, giving him additional ways to win.
1..xb8 2.a7† xa7 3.d8†!
The opponent has fewer options after a check than after a quiet move.
After 3.xa7 Black could still put up some resistance with 3...c6!±.
3..b7 4.xa7† xa7 5.c7† a6 6.c8† a7 7.a1†+-

Always check out the active moves first! An active move may decide the game on the spot, and then you do not have to calculate the other possibilities. Nor should we forget to consider active resources for the opponent.

As we have already emphasized, it is very important to look for forced sequences first of all. Forced variations oblige the opponent to turn to very specific replies and they are much easier to calculate.

Of course, there is not always a forced solution, so sometimes we also have to play positionally! But we must never forget that forced variations have the highest priority of all.
Exercises
Exercises
Solutions

Ex. 7-1

G. Gajewski – S. Maze
Dresden Olympiad 2008

37...\(\text{xf1}\)† 38.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{xf2}\)†!  

(2 points)

As well as seeing this combination, Black also had to anticipate what White could come up with in the way of defensive resources.

39.\(\text{g1}\)

39.\(\text{xf2}\)? \(\text{xf2}\)†+→

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

39...\(\text{d5}\)!→ was more accurate, aiming for the same finish as in the game, but without allowing the resource indicated in the next note.

40.\(\text{xh7}\)?

Both players were thinking in the same direction and thus did not notice that White could defend better with: 40.\(\text{f7}\)! \(\text{xe6}\) 41.\(\text{h6}\)† \(\text{g7}\) 42.\(\text{d4}\)† \(\text{f6}\) 43.\(\text{xf5}\)† \(\text{f7}\) 44.\(\text{xe7}\)! \(\text{xe6}\) 45.\(\text{g7}\)† \(\text{d7}\) 46.\(\text{h3}\)!† with some drawing chances.

40...\(\text{f2}\)†!!

(another 1 point)

Black’s brilliant point. White resigned as he loses material after: 41.\(\text{xe6}\) \(\text{xe6}\) 42.\(\text{xe6}\) \(\text{xe6}\) 43.\(\text{xe6}\) \(\text{d4}\)† 44.\(\text{xe4}\)†\(\text{xe4}\)†+→

0-1

Ex. 7-2

O. Bogatyrev – E. Zagoriansky
Moscow 1947

1...\(\text{a1}\)†

(1 point)

2.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{g1}\)† 3.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{a3}\)† 4.\(\text{d3}\)

King moves are followed either by 4...\(\text{b6}\) or by 4...\(\text{h2}\)! with a decisive attack.

4...\(\text{a7}\)?=

After this disappointing move the game ended in a draw, whereas Black could have finished the game in style: 4...\(\text{d4}\)!†+→

(another 1 point)

Ex. 7-3

Meister – Grozdov
USSR 1954

1...\(\text{h3}\)†!

(1 point)

2.\(\text{g3}\) \(\text{f3}\)† 3.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{g4}\)!† 4.\(\text{h1}\) \(\text{h5}\)!

(another 1 point)

5.\(\text{h6}\)

Or 5.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{hxg4}\).

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

6...\(\text{h6}\)# cannot be stopped.

0-1

Ex. 7-4

A. Kotov – G. Barcza
Saltsjobaden 1952

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

(1 point)

21...\(\text{xf5}\)

21...\(\text{xe3}\)?? 22.\(\text{xe7}\)!+→

If 21...\(\text{c7}\), then 22.\(\text{xe7}\) \(\text{f7}\) 23.\(\text{a5}\)† or 23.\(\text{g5}\)†.

22.\(\text{xf5}\) \(\text{c7}\)

22...\(\text{e6}\) is followed by: 23.\(\text{xe7}\) \(\text{c7}\) 24.\(\text{g5}\)

(1 point for this variation)

24...\(\text{f5}\) 25.\(\text{h6}\)! \(\text{h8}\) 26.\(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{dxe5}\) 27.\(\text{xd8}\) \(\text{xd8}\) 28.\(\text{xf7}\)!→ (Lisitsin)

After 22...\(\text{d7}\) White would play as he did in the game.

23.\(\text{g7}\)

23.\(\text{a5}\)† (1 point) is just as good: 23...\(\text{d7}\) 24.\(\text{xd8}\) \(\text{xd8}\) 25.\(\text{c5}\)†

23...\(\text{g7}\) 24.\(\text{f6}\)!

(another 1 point)

The castled position is so weakened and the bishop on \(\text{f6}\) is so powerful that White can bring his attack to a successful conclusion without much trouble.

24...\(\text{h8}\)

24...\(\text{e6}\) 25.\(\text{f4}\)! \(\text{d5}\) (25...\(\text{f8}\) 26.\(\text{f5}\)† or 25...\(\text{h6}\) 26.\(\text{f5}\) \(\text{e5}\) 27.\(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{hxg5}\) 28.\(\text{xe5}\)† \(\text{h7}\) 29.\(\text{f6}\) \(\text{g8}\) 30.\(\text{h5}\)† Lisitsin) 26.\(\text{f5}\) \(\text{dxc4}\)
Solutions

27.\textit{e2} h6 28.\textit{h5} \textit{h7} 29.\textit{fxe6} \textit{fxe6} 30.\textit{xd8}+-

25.\textit{g5}

Or 25.\textit{h6} \textit{g8} 26.\textit{e5}+-.

25...\textit{g8} 26.\textit{h4}! \textit{de8} 27.\textit{h5} \textit{e5} 28.\textit{axe5} \textit{dxe5} 29.\textit{f6}! \textit{dc8} 30.\textit{h6} \textit{e7} 31.\textit{ed2} 1-0

Ex. 7-5

\textit{A.Tolush – G.Stoltz}

Bucharest 1953

26.\textit{c3}!

(1 point)

26...\textit{b3}

A principled move.

26...\textit{c6} is bad: 27.\textit{xb6}+-

After 26...\textit{d5} 27.\textit{d2}? too, the black position remains difficult.

27.\textit{xb6} \textit{axb6} 27...\textit{xc1} 28.\textit{xd8}+-

28.\textit{exe6}

(another 1 point)

28...\textit{xc1}

28...\textit{xe6} 29.\textit{xc4}+-

29.\textit{xc4} \textit{h8}?! 29...\textit{b5} is followed by 30.\textit{e8}+ \textit{exe8} 31.\textit{xf7}+ \textit{xf7} 32.\textit{xc1}+-.

29...\textit{d1}+! would be more resilient: 30.\textit{e1} (another 1 point for this variation)

30...\textit{exe1}+ 31.\textit{exe1} \textit{f8} 32.\textit{c2} (32.\textit{xc1}? \textit{c8}) 32...\textit{c7} 33.\textit{a4}! \textit{c8} 34.\textit{b3} \textit{xb3}

35.\textit{xb3}±

30.\textit{e1}! \textit{h5}

30...\textit{a2}? 31.\textit{b3} \textit{h5} 32.\textit{g2}+-

31.\textit{xc1} \textit{xb3} 32.\textit{e1}+! \textit{h5} 33.\textit{g2} g5 34.\textit{e6} \textit{d6} 35.\textit{g5} \textit{h6} 36.\textit{h1} \textit{g7}

37.\textit{b3} g4 38.\textit{h4} \textit{b7}+ 39.\textit{h2} \textit{g7}

40.\textit{g1} \textit{g5} 41.\textit{g6}+ \textit{g7} 42.\textit{exe7}+! 1-0

Ex. 7-6

\textit{S.Flohr – I.Horowitz}

USA – USSR Radio Match (1) 1945

18.\textit{xe5}! \textit{fxe5} 19.\textit{g5} (1 point)

19...\textit{g7} 19...\textit{f5} 20.\textit{xe6}+-

20.\textit{xe7}+! 21.\textit{e4}+ \textit{e7} 22.\textit{h4}+ Or 22.\textit{dc1}!+- (1 point) straight away.

22.\textit{f6}

22...\textit{e8} 23.\textit{f6}+ \textit{e7} 24.\textit{d5}+-

23.\textit{dc1}+– (another 1 point)

This is somewhat more precise than 23.\textit{ac1} (also 1 point), since there is no need to calculate 23...\textit{ad8}.

23...\textit{ac8}

23...\textit{h8} 24.\textit{xf6}+–

24.\textit{xc5} \textit{xb8} 25.\textit{f4} \textit{xc5} 26.\textit{xc5} \textit{b6} 27.\textit{xe6} \textit{xe3}+ 28.\textit{h1} \textit{xe6} 29.\textit{exe5} \textit{fxe5}

30.\textit{g4}+ \textit{f5} 31.\textit{g6} \textit{f6} 32.\textit{e8}+ \textit{f5}

33.\textit{f1}+

1-0

Ex. 7-7

End of a study by

\textit{L.Kubbel} 1926

3.\textit{d7}!

(1 point)

The order of moves is important. 3.\textit{a4}? would be bad on account of: 3...\textit{f3}! 4.\textit{g6} \textit{d1}+ 5.\textit{b4} \textit{d6}+–

3...\textit{d6}+ 4.\textit{a4}! \textit{exe7} 5.\textit{xe6}+ \textit{g7} 6.\textit{d5}!

(another 1 point)

6...\textit{h3}

Or 6...\textit{xd5} stalemate.

7.\textit{e6}! \textit{f1} 8.\textit{c4}! \textit{xc4} stalemate
Solutions

Ex. 7-8

H.Fahrni
1922

1.\textit{e7} b4

1...\textit{b8} is less interesting: 2.\textit{d7} b4 3.a7†
\textit{xa7} 4.\textit{xc7} b3 5.d6=
2.d6!

(1 point)

2...\textit{cxd6} 3.\textit{xd6} b3 4.\textit{c6} \textit{b8}

4...b2? 5.a7--
5.\textit{b6} b2 6.a7† \textit{a8} 7.\textit{a6}

(another 1 point)

The important idea!

7...\textit{b1}!!?

7...\textit{b1} and 7...\textit{b1} are both stalemate.
7...\textit{b1} leads to a known fortress – White brings his king to \textit{g1}.

(1 point)

8.\textit{b6}

Or 8.\textit{b5}.

8...\textit{d2} 9.\textit{c5} \textit{f3} 10.\textit{d5} \textit{e4} \textit{g4}

11.\textit{f1} 12.\textit{f2} followed by ...\textit{e2} also leads to a draw.
12.\textit{f2} \textit{xa7} 13.\textit{g3} \textit{h2} 14.\textit{g2}=

(1 point)

See Fortress II in Chapter 6 of \textit{Boost Your Chess}.

Ex. 7-9

Chukaev – R.Nezhmetdinov
USSR 1950

1.\textit{h2}!!

(1 point)

More incisive than 1...\textit{d3} 2.\textit{e1} \textit{f5}!
3.\textit{a5} \textit{h5}† (1 consolation point).

2.\textit{exh2}

2.\textit{e2} would be quickly followed by mate:
2...\textit{ah8} 3.\textit{f3} (3.\textit{g3} \textit{h1}†
4.\textit{g2} \textit{h2}#) 3...g3--

(1 point for this variation)

2...\textit{g3}†!

(1 point)

The idea of the rook sacrifice.

3.\textit{xg3}

3.\textit{f2} is followed by: 3...\textit{xe3} 4.\textit{c8} \textit{xd4}
(4...\textit{e1} also wins after 5.\textit{f1} \textit{h1}†
7.\textit{e2} \textit{g2}† 8.\textit{d3} \textit{f4}†– Litsin.)
5.\textit{g4} \textit{e5}† 6.\textit{h1} \textit{g3} 7.\textit{g1} \textit{d4}†–
3...\textit{h5}

Threatening ...\textit{h4}†.

4.\textit{h1} \textit{d4} 5.\textit{f3} \textit{d1}† 6.\textit{e2} \textit{d3}

Even stronger is 6...\textit{e5}!!

7.\textit{h2}

7.\textit{d2} \textit{e4}† 8.\textit{e2} \textit{e2} \textit{g2}†–
7...\textit{g5} 8.\textit{g4} \textit{h8} 9.\textit{g2} \textit{d1} 10.\textit{g3} \textit{f1}

0–1

Ex. 7-10

N.N. – N.N.
Correspondence game 1934

1.\textit{g3}!

(1 point)

Black threatens ...\textit{c3}†.
1...\textit{g2}† 2.\textit{g2} \textit{c3} is bad on account of 3.\textit{h1}.
1...\textit{d3} 2.\textit{d3} \textit{g4}† 3.\textit{d4} \textit{g4} 4.\textit{d4} \textit{g4}†
5.\textit{e5}†–

1...\textit{g4}† also wins, but is more complicated:
2.\textit{h1} \textit{e4}† (1 point) 3.\textit{d4} (3.\textit{h2}
\textit{g2}†–) 3...\textit{h3} 4.\textit{g1} \textit{h5} 5.\textit{g1} \textit{f3}
6.\textit{f1} \textit{g5}† (another 1 point)

2.\textit{xg3}

Or 2.\textit{g3} \textit{d3}† 3.\textit{hxh3} 4.\textit{h3} \textit{a3}† 4.\textit{g4}†
5.\textit{xh3} \textit{h5}† 6.\textit{g1} \textit{g5}† 7.\textit{e2} \textit{g4}†
8.\textit{d3} \textit{e3}† 9.\textit{h3} \textit{g2}#.

2...\textit{g4}† 3.\textit{h1} \textit{g3} 4.\textit{xg4} \textit{h4}#

(another 1 point)
Solutions

Ex. 7-11
End of a study by

V. Jakontov
1950

3.♗c7! b4
3...♗c3 leads to the main line after 4.♗d6 b4.

4.♗d6!
(1 point)

4...♗c3
If 4...b3, then 5.♕e7 b2 6.h8♔ ♔h8 7.♗f7 b1♔ 8.g7†=
(1 point for this variation)

5.♗c5!
But not: 5.♕e7? ♔d5† 6.♕e8 (6.♕e6 ♔f4† 7.♖e5 b3++) 6...♔f6† 7.♕e7 ♔xh7++

5...b3 6.♗b4! b2 7.♔a3
(another 1 point)

The idea of the study.

7...b1♔
Neither 7...b1♕ 8.♕b2= nor 7...b1♔= changes anything.

8.h8♔ ♔h8 9.g7† ♔h7 10.g8♔ ♔xg8 stalemate

Ex. 7-12

I. Kan – I. Rudakovskiy
USSR Ch, Moscow 1945

32...♖xc4!
(1 point)

33.♖xc4 ♖xb2!
This breakthrough decides the game.

34.♖e1
Other moves are no better:

a) 34.♖xb2 ♖xb2 35.♖e1 (35.♖h4 ♖xe2 36.♖xg5 ♖xg5 37.♖xa4 ♖f4†++) d3++
(1 point for this variation)

b) 34.♘f1 ♖d2 35.♖xa4 (35.♖h2? ♖f4† 36.♖xf4 ♖xf4†++) 35...♖b1++

34...♖d2 35.♕g2 ♖b3 36.♖f1 ♖xa3 37.♗b1 ♖a2! 38.♗b7†
38.♖e1 is followed by 38...a3 39.♖a4 ♖ac2 40.♖xa3 c4 41.♖c1 d3 42.♖xd3 cxd3 43.♖xd3 ♖xd3 44.♖xd3 ♖f2† 45.♘g1 ♖d4++.

38...♖f8 39.♖c1 ♖a1
39...d3 would not be as good on account of 40.♖xd3 ♖xe2 42.♖xa4!.

40.♖e1 d3 41.♖b8† ♖e7 42.♖b7† ♖d8 43.♖xd3 ♖xd3 44.♖e2 ♖d4++ 45.♖xd4 ♖xd4 46.♖d2 a3
0–1
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 31

26 points and above → Excellent
21 points and above → Good
16 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 16 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Fortresses

In the endgame we can sometimes set up an impregnable fortress and thus save the game. We considered the ten most important elementary fortresses in Chapter 22 of *Build Up Your Chess* I and Chapter 6 of *Boost Your Chess* I. We have also become acquainted with some fortresses in the form of barriers.

In some endings, for example, those with opposite-coloured bishops, or rook and pawn against queen, constructing a fortress is the most important idea for the defending side.

There are many different types of fortress: a secure position, a pawn barrier, a king which is shut in, some other piece which is shut in, and fortresses involving pins.

The fortress can often be successful despite a clear disadvantage in material, and thus it can save a game which seems almost certainly lost.

**Diagram 8-1**

K. Bischoff – J. Gustafsson
German Ch, Altenkirchen 2005

40...\(\text{Wf6}\)?

This move allows White to construct a secure fortress.

40...\(\text{Wxg6}^+\) would clearly have been better, although it is still difficult to play against the good knight on d4.

\[\begin{array}{cccccccc}
41.\text{Wxf6} & \text{gx6} & 42.\text{c3} & \text{f8} & 43.\text{b4} & \text{axb4}^+ & 44.\text{xb4} & \text{e7} & 45.\text{c5} \\
45...\text{e6} & 46.\text{e2} & \text{f5} & 47.\text{d4} & \text{f6} & 48.\text{f4} & \text{g5} & 49.\text{h3}^+ & \text{f6} & 50.\text{f4} & \text{f3} & 51.\text{h5} \\
\end{array}\]

White does not need the f2-pawn – he has built a fortress. His f4-knight has enough squares to prevent Black forcing it into zugzwang.

51...\(\text{xf2} \ 52.\text{f4}\)
Fortresses

Diagram 8-2
52...\f4 \g5 \f5 \e6 \f4 \f6 \e6 \e8 \f4 \f7 \h3 \g3
60.\f4 \f3
White still has a square for his knight.
½–½

Of course it is not always possible to construct an impregnable fortress. Sometimes your opponent can break through the defensive line.

Diagram 8-3

S. Brzozka – D. Bronstein
Miskolc 1963

46...\a6!
The position looks completely blocked, but Black has prepared a breakthrough.
46...\a8! with the same idea would be equally good.
47.\e1 \d5 48.\e5
After 48.cxd5 c4!+ Black opens lines for his rooks.
48...\b3!!
Only this sacrifice can force the remaining black rook into the opposing camp.

49.\b3
49.a\xb3 is followed by 49...a2 50.\xa2 \xa2 51.\d2 \e1 52.\g2 \e6+, when White is in zugzwang and cannot protect all his weaknesses.
49...\b6 50.\c2 \b2+ 51.\c1 \e2
White’s pieces are so badly placed that he cannot protect his pawns.

52.\e1 \xe3 53.\e1 \e3+ 54.\d2 \xc4+
Here the three connected passed pawns are clearly stronger than the bishop.

55.\c2 d5 56.\b1 d4 57.\d1
57.\b3 is followed by 57...\e3+ 58.\d3 \e2 59.\b7+ \d8 60.\b8+ \c7 61.\e8 \c3+ 62.\d2 \c4+. Black threatens ...\e3, and 63.\e2? is met by 63...\xc2+–.

57...\c3 58.\b3 \e3+ 59.\e2 \c1

Diagram 8-4

60.\xa3?
White lets the black pawns get too far.
Defending was very difficult, but 60...\texttt{d3}! would have been better: 60...\texttt{d6} 61.\texttt{b3} \texttt{g1} (61...\texttt{c6} 62.\texttt{d1} \texttt{xd1} 63.\texttt{xe1} \texttt{c4} 64.\texttt{a4}! \texttt{c5} 65.\texttt{e8} \texttt{b4} 66.\texttt{d7} \texttt{c3} 67.\texttt{b5} or 61...\texttt{c4} 62.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{c5} 63.\texttt{d1} =) 62.\texttt{c4}! White retains some drawing chances.

60...\texttt{c4} 61.\texttt{a7}?! 
61.\texttt{a4} is more stubborn: 61...\texttt{d6} 62.\texttt{a3} \texttt{c5} 63.\texttt{a5} \texttt{b6} 64.\texttt{a4} \texttt{b5} 65.\texttt{a4} \texttt{b6} 66.\texttt{c5} \texttt{g1} 67.\texttt{b5} \texttt{d6} 68.\texttt{b6} \texttt{e7} 
61...\texttt{d6} 62.\texttt{a4} \texttt{h1} 63.\texttt{d7} \texttt{c5} 64.\texttt{c7} \texttt{b4} 65.\texttt{a3} 

Diagram 8-5

In the next example your author failed to grab his chance.

65...\texttt{c3}!+

The king now supports the pawns as well.
66.\texttt{b5} \texttt{h2} 67.\texttt{f1} \texttt{d3} 68.\texttt{xc4} \texttt{b2} 69.\texttt{g1} \texttt{e2} 
0–1

In the next example your author failed to grab his chance.

\textbf{Diagram 8-6}

A. Sokolov – A. Yusupov
Candidates Match (7), Riga 1986

The following annotations are based on analysis by Dvoretsky.

38.\texttt{c1}?

White underestimates his opponent’s defensive options.

38.\texttt{c2} was correct.

38...\texttt{xc3} 39.\texttt{exe3} \texttt{exe3}! 40.\texttt{xc3} \texttt{e1}??

The last move before the time control was a blunder. Instead, Black could have constructed a fortress after: 40...\texttt{xd4!} 41.\texttt{c4}! (41.\texttt{c8} or 41.\texttt{c2} \texttt{xd3}) 41...\texttt{e6} (or 41...\texttt{h8}) 42.\texttt{f1} \texttt{xc3} 43.\texttt{xe6} \texttt{h8} 

Diagram 8-7

The fortress holds up even after the loss of the h-pawn. 44.\texttt{c6} \texttt{f6} 45.\texttt{e2} \texttt{b2} 46.\texttt{f3} \texttt{c3} 47.\texttt{e4} \texttt{b2} 48.\texttt{f5} \texttt{c3} 49.\texttt{g6} \texttt{b2} 50.\texttt{g4} \texttt{c3} 51.\texttt{d8} \texttt{b2} 52.\texttt{f7} \texttt{g8} 53.\texttt{xh6} \texttt{h8} The king must remain in the corner. 54.\texttt{f5} \texttt{c3} 55.\texttt{g3}


\text{Diagram 8-8}

61...d2! The only difficult moment. White is threatening to bring his bishop to g8, but Black can prevent that. (61...b2? 62.h7 gxh6 63.gxh6+ xh7 64.g5+-) 62.h7 gxh6 63.g6 h6=

With the rooks on the board, Black cannot defend the position.

1–0

The following example shows us the typical course of a game in which one side has to struggle against a queen with a rook and a bishop.

\text{Diagram 8-9}

\text{J.Timman – A.Yusupov}

Montpellier Candidates 1985

In endings like this the defender must aim for two things – firstly to place his pieces in safe positions, and secondly to prevent his opponent from getting a passed pawn.

32...g6!?

Black wants to build a safe fortress after ...h5 and ...

33.d5+ g7 34.e5+

34.b4!? would give White better chances of a win, since Black cannot blockade the passed pawn until a very late stage: 34.e5 35.d7+ f7 36.e6 axb4 (36...f5 37.e7+ g8 38.g4+-) 37.a5! a7±

34...f7 35.h5 f5! 36.hxg6+ xg6 37.e6+ g5 38.g8+ f6 39.f8+ g6 40.g8+ f6 41.g4 g5

\text{Diagram 8-10}

The rook finds its safe position. The only serious danger for the black fortress is now zugzwang.

42.e8+ g6 43.e8+ f6 44.h3 g7

44...c5!?

45.e7+ g8 46.f6 h7 47.f7+ h8

48.f8+

48.g3 c5!=

48...h7 49.f6

\text{Diagram 8-11}
Fortunately Black has this move, which limits the damage.

50.\texttt{Wf7+ \texttt{Kh8} 51.\texttt{We8+ \texttt{Kg7} 52.\texttt{Wd7+ \texttt{Kf6} 53.\texttt{Wxc7
}}}

If 53.\texttt{Wc6+? \texttt{Kd6} 54.\texttt{b4}, then 54...\texttt{axb4
}}

55.\texttt{Wxa8 \texttt{Kg7} 56.\texttt{a5 \texttt{b3} 57.\texttt{a6 \texttt{Kxa5}! with sufficient
}}

\texttt{counterplay.}

\texttt{53...\texttt{b4=}

White cannot break open this fortress.

\textit{Diagram 8-12}

\texttt{54.\texttt{Wh7 \texttt{g6} 55.\texttt{f3
}}}

55.\texttt{Wh8+ \texttt{Kf7} 56.\texttt{h4} is followed by 56...\texttt{e1+}, and after 57.\texttt{h5 \texttt{g5} 58.xh6 \texttt{d2}! 59.\texttt{h7 \texttt{g6} it would be Black who was playing for a win.
}}

\texttt{55...\texttt{d6+ 56.\texttt{f3
}}}

56.\texttt{h4} is no better, on account of: 56...\texttt{e7} (or 56...\texttt{f8}?) 57.\texttt{Wh8+ \texttt{f7} 58.\texttt{h5 \texttt{g5} 59.\texttt{h6 \texttt{g6} \texttt{f6=}
}}

56...\texttt{b4 57.\texttt{d7 \texttt{g5} 58.\texttt{h7 \texttt{g6} 59.\texttt{h8+ \texttt{f7} 60.\texttt{d4 \texttt{g5} 61.\texttt{f4 \texttt{g8} 62.\texttt{f6 \texttt{h7} 63.\texttt{f7+ \texttt{h8} 64.\texttt{f3 \texttt{g7} 65.\texttt{h5 \texttt{h7} 66.\texttt{e4 \texttt{g5=}
}}

White cannot find a way to invade the fortress.

67.\texttt{f7+ \texttt{h8} 68.\texttt{f4 \texttt{d6+ 69.\texttt{e3 \texttt{c5} 70.\texttt{f3 \texttt{b4} 71.\texttt{e4 \texttt{e1} 72.\texttt{f6+ \texttt{h7} 73.\texttt{d3 \texttt{b4} 74.\texttt{f7+ \texttt{h8} 75.\texttt{d7 \texttt{g8} 76.\texttt{e4 \texttt{h8}
}}}

\texttt{1/2–1/2

In the test which follows, please try to construct a fortress. We shall also revise some elementary fortresses.
Exercises

Ex. 8-1

Ex. 8-2

Ex. 8-3

Ex. 8-4

Ex. 8-5

Ex. 8-6
Exercises
Solutions

Ex. 8-1

M. Tronov
1913

1. b5!

(1 point)

1... axb5

Otherwise the white b-pawn goes straight through.

2. g6

The threat is 3. d4#.

2... d5 3. d4! 6. c6 5. b4!

(another 1 point)

White has set up a pawn barrier.

Ex. 8-2

End of a study by

V. Smyslov
2002

3. d5!

(1 point)

3... a2

Or 3... exd5 4. e6 followed by 5. f6=.

4. d6! a1

Threatening 5... h1++.

5. g2!

(another 1 point)

Black even has two pieces shut in – the king and the bishop!

Ex. 8-3

End of a study by

A. Grin & E. Dragomaretsky
1981

3. d7!

(1 point)

3. g6? is bad on account of 3... f5!

4. h4+ e4++.

3... d2

But not 3... f5?? 4. b6! d2 5. c4 d1

6. e3+–.

4. e5+ h5!

(another 1 point)

Ex. 8-4

End of a study by

G. Zakhodjakin
1930

3. c5!

(1 point)

3... f1 4. h6+ h8 5. d6!!

(another 1 point)

White will continue with e5= to set up a fortress involving a pin, the bishop and the g-pawn being indirectly defended by the fork on f7.

Ex. 8-5

C. Lutz – A. Onischuk

Bundesliga 1999

44. a6!

(1 point)

44... a6 45. c5 h6 46. g3=

(another 1 point)

The fortress involves Black being tied to the defence of the pinned knight. 46... g6 is met by 47. h6, maintaining the fortress.

Ex. 8-6

End of a study by

V. Smyslov
2000

4. b8t!

(1 point)

4. g6? is bad: 4... xg7 5. g5 e5+ 6. g4

(or 6. h6 h4+ 7. g5 h8+–) 6... e4+–.
Solutions

4...\( \text{exb8} \) 5.g6 \( \text{cxd5} \) 6.e6! \( \text{c7} \)

6...\( \text{xf6} \) stalemate

7.e7!=

(another 1 point)

The fortress has been set up. White makes use of the stalemate idea to protect the g7-pawn.

Ex. 8-7
End of a study by

Y. Zemliansky
2002

4.d6!

(1 point)

4.fx3? is hopeless: 4...d3 5.g4 e3--

4...\( \text{exd6} \) 5.d5!

(another 1 point)

5.e6 6.g8=

The fortress! If Black activates his rook, he loses the b3-pawn. For example:

6...\( \text{d6} \) 7.f7 c6 8.g8 b7 9.f7 a6

10.g8 a5 11.f7 a4 12.g8 d6

13.xb3!=

(another 1 point)

Ex. 8-8
End of a study by

A. Troitzyk
1896

1.b4! \( \text{xb5} \) 2xb64! \( \text{xb6} \) 3.b2= (2 points)

The ‘wrong bishop’.

Ex. 8-9
End of a study by

C. Salvioli
1888

2.exb3! cxb3 3.e4=

(1 point)

White continues with \( \text{exd4} \) and \( \text{e3-d2-c1} \), with a well-known elementary fortress.

Ex. 8-10

J. Berger
1890

1.g1t! (1 point)

1.b4t b2--

1...\( \text{b2} \) 2.a1a! a1a 3.a2c2!= (another 1 point)

Once again an elementary fortress.

Ex. 8-11

End of a study by

A. Troitzyk
1906

1.g5! (1 point)

1.a1a

1...\( \text{g7} \) 2.f6f6t xf6 3.f3f3+ e5 4.f1 c3 5.a1=

1.fxg5 2.h3h3+ g7 3.h1 c3 4.a1 a1 5.g6 a2 a3 f5 6.f3f3+ e4 7.a1a=

2.f6f6t a1a 3.h3h3+ g7 4.g3g3+ h6

4...f7 5.f3=

5.h3t= (another 1 point)

We saw a similar draw in Diagram 24-1 in Chess Evolution 1.

Ex. 8-12

M. Lewitt
1919

1.a4! (2 points)

1.g8b? xg8 2.b4 (2.a4 b4) 2...\( \text{b3} \)--

1...\( \text{bxa4} \) 2.g8b xg8 3.b4

3.b3 draws in similar fashion, either by stalemate or the ‘wrong bishop’.

3...axb3 stalemate
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 25

21 points and above → Excellent
17 points and above → Good
13 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 13 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Complex positions

In this chapter we shall do some training in the calculation of variations. As we go through it we shall concentrate on the following points:

1) Special attention must be paid to the choice of candidate moves.

2) It is important to be accurate when calculating short variations and to take into account all active possibilities.

3) Variations you have calculated must finish with an evaluation.

4) It is very important to work out what our opponent is thinking and also to discover his best moves!

5) The calculation of variations should not be stopped too soon. If any active moves are still available either to you or to your opponent, then you must calculate further.

Try to carry out your calculations for each of the following positions in ten minutes. If you do not see any solution, think things over for a further ten minutes (making a specific effort to find new options), and then make your decision, as you would do during a game. After that you can look at the solutions.

Diagram 9-1

B. Larsen – R. Teschner
Wageningen 1957

A confusing position.

9...dxc3!

Although this allows a typical tactical trick, it is the best solution.

The alternatives are:

a) 9...b4 10.exf6 (10.0-0=) 10...xf6 11.0-0∞
b) 9...g4?! 10.e6 xe6 (10...xf4 11.exf7+xd8
12.xd4+e5) 11.xe6 e5∞

10.xf7+

After 10.xd8+ xe8 11.exf6 gxf6 12.bxc3 e6+ White does not obtain sufficient compensation for the pawn.
Complex positions

10...\texttt{\textocircled{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}}f7}! 11.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}}xd8 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}xb2
11...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}4? 12.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}7+ \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}6 13.0-0+-
12.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}7+
12.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}2? \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}4+->

Diagram 9-2

The main difficulty is that after this queen check one might want to end the calculation already! But Black still has a strong idea.
12...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}6!!
Suddenly Black it becomes apparent that Black will win material back.
13.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}}e8+
13.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}2 is followed by 13...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}a6! and White loses his queen after both 14.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}d8 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}4+ and 14.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}a5 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}4+.
13...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}d7 14.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}}xb7!?
14.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}d8 is met by 14...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}a1+++, or even stronger, first 14...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}4+--+.
14.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}d7+ is more resilient: 14...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}d7 15.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}b2 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}4+ 16.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}e2 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}}e5 17.f4 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}}c4 18.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}}g7 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}}}he8++
14...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}a1++ 15.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}d6+ \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}f7 16.d6+ \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}}g8 17.0-0
Larsen fought on regardless and actually achieved a draw from this position, although objectively speaking he was already lost!

Diagram 9-3

\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}} Wittmann – \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{R}}} Vaganian
Teesside 1974

White wants to consolidate his position and bring the bishop to g3. Black aims to prevent that!
19...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}d8!!
Threatening 20...h6 or 20...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}xd5.
Nothing is achieved by 19...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}d4?! 20.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}f3=, nor by19...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}xb2?! 20.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}}g3=.
19...h6 promises only a slight advantage, for example: 20.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}f3 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}}}xh4 21.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}}}xh4 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}}xb2 22.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}e4 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}d8 23.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}f5 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}xd5 24.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}xd6 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}}xd6 25.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}xa4++
20.g3
If now 20.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}}g3, then Black wins after 20...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}}g3 21.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}}g3 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}}xd5++. 20...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}}5+!

The h4-bishop is left hanging, and will be captured when either the white queen or knight moves away.
21.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}}}ad1!
Calculating variations 2

21. \(\text{bxb2}\)

21. \(\text{exd5}\) is not so clear: 22. \(\text{c6}\) (or 22. \(\text{xf7}\) \(\text{exd1}\) 23. \(\text{xd8}\) \(\text{xd8}\) 24. \(\text{h6}\) + \(\text{g6}\) 25. \(\text{c2}\)) 22... \(\text{c8}\) 23. \(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{hxh4}\) (23... \(\text{fxe6}\)?? 24. \(\text{xf8}\) + \(\text{xf8}\) 25. \(\text{ex5}\) \(\text{h6}\)) 24. \(\text{e4}\) \(\text{exe6}\) 25. \(\text{ex5}\) \(\text{exe5}\) 26. \(\text{xe4}\) =

22. \(\text{f1}\)

22. \(\text{f3}\)!! \(\text{exh4}\) 23. \(\text{fxh4}\) \(\text{g6}\) 24. \(\text{e4}\) \(\text{d6}\)

22. \(\text{f6}\) 23. \(\text{f3}\)

White loses patience. It was correct to first play 23. \(\text{e4}\) before retreating the knight.

23. \(\text{exh4}\) 24. \(\text{gh4}\) \(\text{exh4}\) 25. \(\text{exh4}\) \(\text{exe4}\) 26. \(\text{exh4}\) +

White has not obtained sufficient compensation for the pawn.

27. \(\text{e7}\) \(\text{b5}\) 28. \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{f3}\) 29. \(\text{g3}\)

After this final mistake the outcome of the game is clear.

29... \(\text{f5}\) +

And Black successfully converted his material advantage.

Diagram 9-4

Diagram 9-5

Diagram 9-5

The knight is well placed on \(\text{d6}\), and White should leave it there. But I thought that 21. \(\text{c2}\)?? could be answered by 21... \(\text{d4}\)?? (21... \(\text{b2}\)?? loses to 22. \(\text{exe8}\) or 22. \(\text{b5}\)). However, I overlooked a simple refutation: 22. \(\text{xd4}\)!! (but not 22. \(\text{xd4}\) \(\text{xd6}\)) 22... \(\text{xd4}\) 23. \(\text{exe8}\) and the two minor pieces are superior to the rook. Black should instead defend patiently with 21... \(\text{e7}\)??, when he is ready to recapture on \(\text{e8}\) with the queen, and he will be able to simplify the position after 22... \(\text{e5}\). Despite that, 21. \(\text{c2}\)?? is a better attempt to set Black some problems.

21. \(\text{exe8}\)?? \(\text{xd1}\)

21... \(\text{exe8}\)? 22. \(\text{a4}\)

22. \(\text{xd1}\) \(\text{xe8}\) 23. \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{d8}\) 24. \(\text{c1}\)

With only a minimal advantage for White.

A.Yusupov - V.Anand

Candidates match Wijk aan Zee (4) 1994
1...a5!
The best option. Passive moves would lead to the loss of the game: 1...\texttt{d}d7 2.e6!+- or 1...\texttt{d}d8 2.a5!+–.

2.\texttt{xd}5
Perhaps Black would hold slightly the better cards in the complicated ending after: 2.a5 \texttt{a}a3 3.xd5 cxd5 4.e2 (4.d4?! \texttt{x}xa5 5.xd5 \texttt{x}a2† 6.xh1\texttt{a}4) \texttt{x}a5 5.xc2 \texttt{d}8+

2...cxd5 3.c6!
White begins a combination.

3...\texttt{xb}4
3...dxe4 would lose to 4.c7.
A possible alternative is: 3...\texttt{d}8 4.e6 dxe4 5.c7 \texttt{x}c7 6.e7 \texttt{d}8 7.exd8\texttt{a}4† \texttt{xd}8 8.d6±

4.e4??
White overlooks his opponent’s 5th move.
4.xb4 \texttt{c}3 5.d4\texttt{f} would be correct of course.

4...dxc4 5.c7 \texttt{d}8
0–1

In the test which follows, please try to concentrate on the points mentioned above. Candidate moves and your opponent’s resources are the two most important themes in the test. Be meticulous in checking out the active moves available to your opponent!

If you cannot find a clear advantage, try to do what you would do in a practical game and simply make a sensible move. Sometimes the solution is not all that dramatic!
Exercises

Ex. 9-1

Ex. 9-4

Ex. 9-2

Ex. 9-5

Ex. 9-3

Ex. 9-6
Exercises

Ex. 9-7

Ex. 9-10

Ex. 9-8

Ex. 9-11

Ex. 9-9

Ex. 9-12
Solutions

Ex. 9-1

I. Berzina – A. Yusupov

Zürich 2009

In this example the grandmaster got things totally wrong. Even the well-worn excuse of time trouble does not apply here – the time pressure on my opponent was even greater.

33...\underline{x}f3??

This combination is wrong.

The correct route to victory is: 33...d3!

(1 point)

34.\underline{xc}6 (34.\underline{xc}2 is met by 34...\underline{xe}6–+ or 34...h6–+) 34...d2?? (34...\underline{xf}8–+) 35.\underline{c}8+ \underline{f}8 36.\underline{xf}8+ \underline{xf}8 37.\underline{f}1 \underline{e}1–+

(33...h6 (1 point) would also be good, intending 34.\underline{xc}6 \underline{xf}3–+ 35.\underline{xf}6\underline{f}+ \underline{xc}1. 34.\underline{c}8+?

Both players overlooked that 34.gxf3 \underline{g}6+ is answered by 35.\underline{f}1!.

(another 1 point for this variation)

For example: 35...\underline{xf}3† 36.\underline{e}2 h3+ (or 36...\underline{h}1+ 37.\underline{e}2 \underline{e}4† 38.\underline{d}2 \underline{e}3† 39.\underline{d}1 \underline{g}1† 40.\underline{f}1 \underline{f}3† 41.\underline{c}2++) 37.\underline{e}2 h6–+

After the move played in the game, Black wins after all.

34.\underline{xf}8 35.\underline{xf}8† \underline{xf}8 36.\underline{xf}3 \underline{xf}3 37.\underline{xc}6 h5 38.\underline{c}1c5 d3 39.\underline{c}3 \underline{g}4† 40.\underline{f}2 d2

0–1

Ex. 9-2

R. Singh – S. Sahu

India 1994

1...\underline{xf}3! 2.\underline{xf}3 \underline{d}4!!

(1 point)

2...\underline{xf}3† is not so good: 3.\underline{xf}3 \underline{xd}6 4.c5 \underline{d}4\underline{d}

3.\underline{b}2

3...\underline{xd}6 4.\underline{c}2 \underline{ad}8–+

The white king in the centre is in danger.

5.\underline{c}2

Or 5.\underline{f}1 \underline{fg}4 (5...\underline{e}6?–+) 6.\underline{xf}4 \underline{h}6–+

5...\underline{fg}4! 6.\underline{xf}4 \underline{xf}4

The weakness of the e3 and f2-squares is ruinous.

7.0–0–0

7.c5 \underline{h}6–+ or 7.\underline{d}1 \underline{fe}8–+

7...\underline{e}3 8.\underline{e}2 \underline{xd}1 9.\underline{xd}1 \underline{h}6† 0–1

Ex. 9-3

I. Rabinovich – A. Tolush

Leningrad 1938

16.\underline{a}4!

(1 point)

The most active continuation. Black reacted in panic.

16...\underline{e}5?

16...b6?? would also be bad: 17.\underline{d}xb6\underline{t} \underline{xc}6 18.\underline{xb}6+–

16...\underline{g}4?! is followed by: 17.\underline{d}1d2 (or 17.\underline{f}3 c4 18.\underline{c}3 \underline{e}6 19.\underline{xc}4\underline{t}) 17...b6 18.\underline{g}3\underline{t}

The correct move is 16...\underline{c}4! and now:

a) 17.\underline{d}b6\underline{t} \underline{xc}6 18.\underline{xd}7 \underline{e}8++

b) 17.\underline{d}3\underline{d}2 \underline{e}8+

18.\underline{d}xh5–+

Besides being a pawn up, White threatens 19.\underline{f}4 \underline{g}6 20.\underline{xd}7 \underline{e}7+ 21.\underline{d}b6\underline{t}.

Ex. 9-4

H. Mecking – P. Nikolic

San Paulo (3) 1991

25.\underline{a}7!

(1 point)
Solutions

It is important to note that after 25...\texttt{\textbar{e}b8} or 25...\texttt{\textbar{e}8} the reply is simply 26.\texttt{\textbar{c}xc4}!

(1 point for this variation)

The move in the game is very strong, taking aim at the \texttt{f2}-pawn and preparing \texttt{...\textbar{e}8} or \texttt{...\textbar{b}8}.

However, 25...\texttt{\textbar{c}c8}! (also 1 point) would be good too, defending the knight and activating his rook, although it was already quite well placed. Computer moves like this are difficult for human beings to find, since one tends to want to employ the rook on the f-file. After the rook move, possible lines are:

a) 26.\texttt{\textbar{d}d4} \texttt{\textbar{e}8}--

b) 26.\texttt{\textbar{b}3} \texttt{\textbar{a}5}! 27.\texttt{\textbar{d}d3} \texttt{\textbar{g}6}--

c) 26.\texttt{\textbar{d}d7} \texttt{\textbar{f}8} 27.\texttt{\textbar{d}d4} \texttt{\textbar{d}xe5}+

26.\texttt{\textbar{e}3}!

26.\texttt{\textbar{e}3} loses after 26...\texttt{\textbar{e}8}! 27.\texttt{\textbar{b}3} \texttt{\textbar{a}4} 28.\texttt{\textbar{a}2} \texttt{\textbar{xf}2}! 29.\texttt{\textbar{xf}2} \texttt{\textbar{xe}3} 30.\texttt{\textbar{xe}3} \texttt{\textbar{h}4}t--+

26.\texttt{\textbar{b}3}! would be an improvement:

a) 26...\texttt{\textbar{c}5} 27.\texttt{\textbar{e}3} \texttt{\textbar{xe}3} 28.\texttt{\textbar{xe}3} \texttt{\textbar{d}xe5}+

b) 26...\texttt{\textbar{xe}5} is not so clear either: 27.\texttt{\textbar{d}d4} \texttt{\textbar{c}5} 28.\texttt{\textbar{e}3} \texttt{\textbar{d}c4}?! 29.\texttt{\textbar{c}c6}∞

26...\texttt{\textbar{xe}3} 27.\texttt{\textbar{xe}3} \texttt{\textbar{h}4}t?

27...\texttt{\textbar{c}7}t is very strong: 28.f4? g5--

28.\texttt{\textbar{d}d2}

28.\texttt{\textbar{e}2} is followed by 28...\texttt{\textbar{g}6} 29.\texttt{\textbar{f}1} \texttt{\textbar{d}4}t.

28.\texttt{\textbar{b}4}? would be a better defensive try:

28...\texttt{\textbar{g}6} 29.\texttt{\textbar{d}2}t

28...\texttt{\textbar{xf}2}t 29.\texttt{\textbar{xf}2}

29.\texttt{\textbar{xf}2} \texttt{\textbar{e}8}t--+

29...\texttt{\textbar{xe}3} 30.\texttt{\textbar{e}2} \texttt{\textbar{d}4}t

White has weak pawns on b2 and e5, and his king position is not very secure either.

Ex. 9-5

A.Sokolovs – A.Savko

Latvian Ch 1994

14.\texttt{\textbar{xd}5}!

(1 point)

Pieces are not always well placed in the centre. Here White can win a piece after the surprising exchange of his light-squared bishop: 14...\texttt{\textbar{xd}5} 15.e3 \texttt{\textbar{e}6} (15...\texttt{\textbar{e}6} 16.e4-- or 15...\texttt{\textbar{f}5} 16.\texttt{\textbar{xe}d} \texttt{\textbar{xd}5} 17.e4--)

16.\texttt{\textbar{xd}4} \texttt{\textbar{xd}4} 17.\texttt{\textbar{d}de}4±

Ex. 9-6

S.Lputian – V.Tukmakov

Tilburg 1994

43...\texttt{\textbar{e}5}! 44.\texttt{\textbar{d}xe6}

44.\texttt{\textbar{h}3} \texttt{\textbar{xc}4}--

44...\texttt{\textbar{c}6}t 45.\texttt{\textbar{d}d}5 \texttt{\textbar{xc}4}--

(1 point)

46.\texttt{\textbar{d}d}3

46.\texttt{\textbar{d}d}1 would be somewhat more resilient, but after 46...\texttt{\textbar{e}8} 47.\texttt{\textbar{g}3} \texttt{\textbar{g}4}t? followed by 48...\texttt{\textbar{xd}5}, Black should win.

46...\texttt{\textbar{e}8} 47.\texttt{\textbar{g}1}t \texttt{\textbar{h}7}!

47...\texttt{\textbar{f}8}?! 48.\texttt{\textbar{g}6} allows White counterplay.

48.\texttt{\textbar{e}2} \texttt{\textbar{xe}6} 49.\texttt{\textbar{d}2} \texttt{\textbar{xe}4} 50.\texttt{\textbar{f}4} \texttt{\textbar{f}6} 51.\texttt{\textbar{c}3}

Three extra pawns are too many. Black’s simplest is 51...\texttt{\textbar{f}3}t--+, preventing \texttt{\textbar{g}d}1.

0–1

Ex. 9-7

N.Short – E.Bareev

Tilburg 1991

Black has to play carefully.

27...\texttt{\textbar{b}b3} is obviously bad on account of 28.\texttt{\textbar{b}b5}.

The correct move is: 27...\texttt{\textbar{cd}7}

(1 point)

28.f4 and only now does Black play 28...\texttt{\textbar{xa}3}t.

Instead of this, the game continued:

27...\texttt{\textbar{xe}5}?

Black had overlooked the following tactical strike.

28.\texttt{\textbar{f}5}t--

(another 1 point for this variation)

Taking the knight is no good: 28...\texttt{\textbar{xf}5} 29.\texttt{\textbar{b}4}t \texttt{\textbar{e}8} 30.\texttt{\textbar{xe}5}t++
Solutions

And 28...\texttt{Ex}d1 is also hopeless: 29.\texttt{Ex}xg7+ \texttt{Ex}e8 30.\texttt{Ex}xg8+ \texttt{Ex}d7 31.\texttt{Ex}xd1+ \texttt{Ex}c6 32.\texttt{Ex}d6+–
1–0

Ex. 9-8

\textbf{L.Vogt – V.Hort}
Baden-Baden 1992

Although he is two pawns up, Black's position is lost – the dark squares are too weak! But suddenly there is a combination...

35.\texttt{Ex}xb3??
White would do better to retreat the attacked bishop with either 35.\texttt{Ex}g5 (1 point) or 35.\texttt{Ex}f4?! (also 1 point) 35...\texttt{Ex}f8 36.\texttt{Ex}b2±.
(36.\texttt{Ex}c3 \texttt{Ex}d4 37.\texttt{Ex}xd4 \texttt{Ex}xd4 38.\texttt{Ex}d4 \texttt{Ex}f2 39.\texttt{Ex}b2 \texttt{Ex}f4 40.\texttt{Ex}e2± is not so convincing.)
But strongest of all is to bring the knight into the attack: 35.\texttt{Ex}g5! (35.\texttt{Ex}d4! \texttt{Ex}xh6 36.\texttt{Ex}xe6 comes to the same thing) 35...\texttt{Ex}h6 36.\texttt{Ex}xe6 (36.\texttt{Ex}e7? \texttt{Ex}c7 37.\texttt{Ex}xe6+ \texttt{Ex}g7+-) (1 point)
36...\texttt{Ex}f5 37.\texttt{Ex}g4+–
(another 1 point)
37...\texttt{Ex}a5 38.\texttt{Ex}xf5 \texttt{Ex}c3 39.\texttt{Ex}e7 \texttt{Ex}xf5 40.\texttt{Ex}xb3+–
35...\texttt{Ex}xh6!
(another 1 point for this variation)

White had forgotten about his back rank weakness, and now Black wins. But White even hastened his defeat with another mistake...
36.g3? \texttt{Ex}xf2+! 37.\texttt{Ex}xf2 \texttt{Ex}g4+ 38.\texttt{Ex}e2 \texttt{Ex}xh6 0–1

Ex. 9-9

\textbf{S.Lputian – M.Petursson}
Lucerne 1993

The following annotations are based on analysis by Fracnik.

21.\texttt{Ex}e2?

White has a lot of sensible moves, all of which lead to level positions: 21.\texttt{Ex}c2 or 21.b5?! or 21.\texttt{Ex}d1, or even 21.\texttt{Ex}d1 with the point 21...\texttt{Ex}a3 (21...b5=) 22.\texttt{Ex}c2.
(1 point for any of these)

The move in the game allows a tactical blow.

21...\texttt{Ex}xf3! 22.\texttt{Ex}xb6

The idea behind the sacrifice is: 22.gxf3 \texttt{Ex}g5† 23.\texttt{Ex}g3 \texttt{Ex}xd2!
(1 point for this variation)
24.\texttt{Ex}xd2? \texttt{Ex}xf3† 25.\texttt{Ex}f2 \texttt{Ex}xd2–+
22...\texttt{Ex}g5
22...\texttt{Ex}c4!– is also good, but not 22...\texttt{Ex}xe4? 23.\texttt{Ex}d4±.
23.\texttt{Ex}xb7?! \texttt{Ex}h3!!
23...\texttt{Ex}xd2 24.\texttt{Ex}xf3 \texttt{Ex}e3†=
24.\texttt{Ex}a7

White has no defence:
 a) 24.\texttt{Ex}dd1 \texttt{Ex}e3† 25.\texttt{Ex}h1 \texttt{Ex}xh2† 26.\texttt{Ex}xh2 \texttt{Ex}g4† 27.\texttt{Ex}h1 \texttt{Ex}h6† 28.\texttt{Ex}g1 \texttt{Ex}h2#
 b) 24.\texttt{Ex}h1 \texttt{Ex}g4+–
 c) 24.\texttt{Ex}f2 \texttt{Ex}h4† 25.g3 (25.\texttt{Ex}g3 \texttt{Ex}xh2–+) 25...\texttt{Ex}xh2† (Or 25...\texttt{Ex}f6† 26.\texttt{Ex}g2 \texttt{Ex}g4! 27.\texttt{Ex}xh3 \texttt{Ex}e3– and the threat of ...\texttt{Ex}h6# is decisive.) 26.\texttt{Ex}g2 \texttt{Ex}g4† 27.\texttt{Ex}f3 \texttt{Ex}f6† 28.\texttt{Ex}f4 (28.\texttt{Ex}xg4 h5#) 28...\texttt{Ex}c3† 29.\texttt{Ex}xg4 f5† 30.\texttt{Ex}xf5 \texttt{Ex}f5† 31.\texttt{Ex}g5 \texttt{Ex}f6#
24...\texttt{Ex}f3† 25.\texttt{Ex}f2 \texttt{Ex}xd2
White resigned on account of the variation 26.\texttt{Ex}xh3 \texttt{Ex}e4† 27.\texttt{Ex}f3 \texttt{Ex}d2† 28.\texttt{Ex}f2 \texttt{Ex}f6†–+
0–1

Ex. 9-10

\textbf{K.Junge – Ahrens}
Luebeck 1939

1...\texttt{Ex}e5?

This move needed to be prepared. The correct way to do this was 1...\texttt{Ex}c8! 2.\texttt{Ex}e2 \texttt{Ex}e5 3.\texttt{Ex}f6=, or first 1...\texttt{Ex}a6 2.b3 and only then 2...\texttt{Ex}c8!.
(1 point for either option)
1...\texttt{Ex}f8? would be bad: 2.e5 d5 (2...dxe5 3.\texttt{Ex}e4−) 3.\texttt{Ex}f6 \texttt{Ex}g7 4.\texttt{Ex}xg7† \texttt{Ex}xg7 5.\texttt{Ex}h6† \texttt{Ex}g8 6.c5 \texttt{Ex}c8 7.\texttt{Ex}e2 \texttt{Ex}g6 8.\texttt{Ex}h5+–
2.\texttt{Ex}xe6†! \texttt{Ex}h8
The point of White’s sacrifice is: 2...
3.
3.
3...
3...
4.
Threatening both \( \textsf{Wxd6} \) and \( \textsf{Ah7} \).
4...
4...
5.
Ex. 9-11
\begin{center}
\textbf{Poliak – Levin}
\end{center}
Kiev 1949
1...
2...
2.
2...
The rook may also choose various other squares along the c-file, e.g. 2...
3.
3.
Black now threatens to win back the queen with 4...
4.
(another 1 point)
Or 4...
(also 1 point).
Ex. 9-12
\begin{center}
\textbf{R.Fischer – S.Schweber}
Buenos Aires 1970
\end{center}
23.
23...
23...
24.
24.
24...
25.
25.
26.
27.
28.
29.
30.
31.
32.
33.
Scoring
Maximum number of points is 23
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
20 points and above & \textbf{Excellent} \\
16 points and above & \textbf{Good} \\
12 points & \textbf{Pass mark} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\textbf{If you scored less than 12 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.}
The transition to the middlegame

Whenever we learn to play chess, we study various important principles concerning play in the opening. We learn to develop the pieces quickly, so as to fight for the centre and quickly get our king into safety. We are then at the start of the middlegame, and we try to develop strategic plans and to move on to specific operations.

But in modern chess the separation between the opening and the middlegame is no longer so hard and fast. The transition to the middlegame takes place relatively early; right from the opening we at least have to understand the direction play will take in the middlegame. Right in the opening we have to think about where we actually want to play and thus develop our pieces in a targeted fashion. Even castling is not played just with the intention of protecting our king, but rather after taking into consideration our opponent’s development and our own attacking prospects.

V. Filippov – A. Yusupov

Minneapolis 2005

1. c4 e6 2. d4 d5 3. cxd5 exd5 4. c4 f6 5. dxe6 fxe6 6. b5+ d7 7. f3 0-0 8. d3

At this point already, Black is trying to develop his pieces in such a way that it will not be too dangerous for him if his opponent castles queenside. The knight will go to f8, where it defends the h7-pawn and protects any weakening of the castled position.

8... e8 9. h3?

The modern variation. Filippov delays his decision about castling, so that his opponent does not know how and where White intends to play. The move h2-h3 is useful in many variations.

9... f8

Why does Black not play ...c6? He wants to save
a tempo and in the event of White’s long castling to play ...e6, ...a6, ...c8 and directly ...c7-c5 with counterplay on the c-file.

10...f4

This move too has a dual significance. If White castles long, then after g2-g4 the way is free for further pawn movement. In the event of him castling short, the bishop is very well placed on the b8-h2 diagonal and will support the standard plan of the minority attack.

10...d6?!

Black’s plan should include swapping off the strong white dark-squared bishop. However, he makes a slight mistake here. I was not at all sure to which side my opponent intended to evacuate his king. I did without the move ...g6, because that is not the optimal place for the knight in the event of long castling. But if the opponent, as he did in the game, castles short (which is actually more likely), then in practical terms Black gains a valuable tempo by preferring 10...g6 11.h2 d6.

11.xd6 w.xd6 12.c2!

Continuing the same two-pronged strategy. This is the optimal place for the queen.

12...a6

This pushes the opponent into castling short.

12...c6 could be met by 13.0–0–0?.

13.0–0

If 13.0–0–0, then 13...e6, intending ...ac8 and ...c5.

13...e6

At this point the position could certainly be classified as a middlegame, but we have seen that the struggle between the two plans had started earlier.

Unfortunately there is no other way for Black to develop his bishop. 13...b6? is followed by the very unpleasant 14.e4! dxe4 15.xe4 dxe4 16.xe4+ and the c7-pawn is very weak.

14.ab1

White prepares a classic minority attack. Black will seek counterplay on the kingside.

14...e7

Planning ...ae8.
Opening 2

15.b4 c6 16.Qa4!

The negative consequences of the move ...a6 can be seen very clearly here – the queenside is weakened. Before carrying out the a4-b5 pawn storm, White brings his knight to an active position on c5.

16...Qae8 17.Qc5 Qc8

This retreat prepares the move ...Qe4.

18.a4 Qg6

Black now regrets that he did not gain a tempo with 10...Qg6.

18...Qe4!? looks premature on account of 19.Qxe4 dxe4 20.Qe5, but Black could still try 20...Qd5 or even 20...Qh6±.

Diagram 10-4

19.b5 axb5 20.axb5

White is clearly developing his initiative on the queenside more rapidly than Black’s counterattack is developing on the kingside.

20...Qxe4 21.bxc6 bxc6 22.bxc1 Qf6

Only now has Black created a threat, that of ...Qxh3.

Diagram 10-5

23.Qb8?!

White completely secures his position, but he is playing too cautiously. By taking more of a risk he could have obtained more serious winning chances: 23.Qxe4! dxe4 24.Qf2 Qf5 (24...Qh4 25.Qdxe4 Qxe4 26.Qxe4 Qxe4 27.Qxe4 Qxe4 28.Qxc6 is clearly better for White.) 25.Qf1± followed by Qg3. Black has problems since his queenside is totally destroyed.

23...Qxc5! 24.bxc5 Qxh3 25.Qxe8+ Qxe8 26.Qxc6 Qxc6

But not 26...Qc8? 27.Qxe8+ Qxc8 28.Qxc8+ Qf8 because of 29.Qxh7+! (29.Qe5 Qe7!) 29...Qxh7 30.Qxf8+– and Black loses the f7-pawn too.

27.Qxc6 Qe6±

White can try to win this ending without taking any risks, but he did not succeed in doing so.

Modern grandmasters hardly ever study openings in isolation anymore; instead they actually prepare deep middlegame plans. Nowadays it is not enough to know the first moves of the opening, you also have to study middlegame plans and manoeuvres.
1.e4 e6 2.d3
An interesting system, which became popular on the back of some spectacular wins by Fischer.
2...d5 3.Qd2 Qf6 4.Qg5 c5 5.g3 Qc6 6.Qg2 Qe7
7.0–0 0–0

Diagram 10-6
At this point one can already say that the opening is over. The kings have been made secure and now a plan needs to be worked out.
8.e5
White closes the centre and wants to carry out operations on the kingside.
8...Qd7 9.Qe1
White plans Qf1, h4 and Qh2.
9...b5
It is not sufficient for Black to simply develop his queenside (e.g. with ...b6 and ...Qb7). He must decide how he is going to achieve a counterattack on the queenside. Black logically wants to move his pawns forward as quickly as possible.
10.Qf1 a5 11.h4 b4 12.Qf4 a6
Both sides develop their pieces according to their own plans. White now tries to achieve a direct attack.
13.Qg5
The threat is Wh5.
13...Qh2 a4 14.a3 Qb5= is the alternative.

Diagram 10-7
13...Qe8!
This clever move draws the teeth from the threat of Wh5, without weakening the kingside with ...h6.
14.Wh5
After 14.Wg4 Black should play 14...Qd4 (but not 14...a4?? 15.Qxe6!+-).
14...Qxg5 15.Qxg5
We see the idea behind Black's 13th move in the variation 15.hxg5 f5!=-.
15...Qa4
Black prepares his counterplay. Now White has to take into account the breakthrough ...b3.
16.Qe3 Qh8 17.Qd1 h6!

Diagram 10-8
At just the right moment! Now Black seals up the kingside and in doing so secures his king position.

18.\(\text{h}5\)
18.\(\text{g}4\) is bad on account of 18...\(\text{d}xe5\)\color{red}{\text{+}}.

18...f5! 19.\(\text{x}e8\) \(\text{ax}e8\)

**Diagram 10-9**

Black is strategically better, so White is absolutely correct to try to retaliate immediately.

20.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{d}4\)! 21.\(\text{d}6\)!

It is only here that White strays from the safe path.
21.\(\text{c}3\)! is correct, with a roughly level position:
21...\(\text{dxc}4\) 22.\(\text{dxc}4\) \(\text{d}xc4\) 23.\(\text{d}xa2\) 24.\(\text{c}6\) \(\text{d}8\)
25.\(\text{xa}4=\)

21...\(\text{d}xc2\)! 22.\(\text{d}xe8\) \(\text{xe}8\)?? 23.\(\text{e}2\) b3 24.\(\text{ax}b3\) \(\text{ax}b3\) 25.\(\text{d}ed2\) \(\text{b}5\)

Preparing the penetration of the rook to a2.

26.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{a}8\) 27.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{a}2\) 28.\(\text{d}1\)

If 28.\(\text{b}1\), then 29...\(\text{b}6\) 29.\(\text{d}d1\)?? \(\text{a}4\) 30.\(\text{c}1\) \(\text{d}4\)\color{red}{\text{+}}.

28...\(\text{a}4\)??
28...\(\text{d}xb2\) 29.\(\text{d}xc2\) \(\text{bxc}2\) 30.\(\text{d}xc2\) \(\text{d}xc2\) 31.\(\text{d}xc2\) \(\text{d}xd3\) 32.\(\text{a}2=\)

29.\(\text{b}1\) \(\text{g}8\)

White has survived the first storm, but the defence is still very difficult.

30.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{fx}g4\) 31.\(\text{d}g4\) \(\text{f}7\) 32.\(\text{d}g2??\)

White contributes to his own demise – the white king is badly placed here.
32.\(\text{h}2\) was a better defence.

**Diagram 10-10**

32...\(\text{b}5\) 33.\(\text{g}3??\)
33.\(\text{d}1\) loses to 33...\(\text{xd}3\)!!.
White should avoid such tactics by playing 32.\(\text{h}3\).

33...\(\text{b}6\)\color{red}{\text{+}}

Intending ...\(\text{a}4\) to pick off the b2-pawn.

34.\(\text{d}1??\) \(\text{xd}3\)!!

This strike decides the game.

35.\(\text{xd}3\) \(\text{e}1\)\color{red}{\text{+}} 36.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{xd}3\) 37.\(\text{xb}3\) \(\text{xb}2\)
38.\(\text{xb}2\) \(\text{xb}2\) 39.\(\text{c}2\) c4→ 40.\(\text{c}2\) d4 41.\(\text{e}4\)
42.\(\text{d}3\)\color{red}{\text{+}} 43.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{c}5\) 44.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{b}3\)

0–1

Computers and various databases allow us access to hundreds of games. But not all ideas are good and
The transition to the middlegame

correct. It is much better to concentrate only on a few games by the experts and to play through games which have good written comments.

In this chapter we have concentrated on the moment when one side came up with a specific plan and thus ended the opening for practical purposes, and many of the following exercises feature such a moment.
Exercises
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Ex. 10-2

Ex. 10-3

Ex. 10-4

Ex. 10-5

Ex. 10-6
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Solutions

Ex. 10-1

**A.Yusupov – N.Mitkov**

**Chicago 2005**

10.\(\&e5\)!

(3 points)

There are a lot of developing moves in the position, 10.\(\&bd2\), 10.\(\&c3\), 10.\(\&c2\) or 10.\(\&e1\) (1 consolation point for any of these), but none of them prevent the opponent’s plan of ...e5.

10...\(\&xe5\)

Or 10...\(\&d8?!\) 11.\(\&e2\) \(\&xe5\) 12.\(\&xe5\) \(\&d5\) 13.\(\&d2\±.

11.\(\&xe5\) \(\&d7\) 12.\(\&f4\) \(\&d8\) 13.\(\&c2!\) \(\&f8\)

After 13...\(\&b6\) 14.\(\&d3\) White has the initiative.

14.\(\&d2\) \(\&d7\) 15.\(\&e4\±

White controls the centre and the play.

Ex. 10-2

**I.Tsuyganov – A.Yusupov**

**Chicago 2005**

1.d4 e6 2.c4 \(\&f6\) 3.\(\&f3\) d5 4.\(\&c3\) \(\&bd7\)
5.cxd5 exd5 6.\(\&f4\) c6 7.e3 \(\&h5\) 8.\(\&g3\) \(\&e7\)
9.\(\&d3\) \(\&f8\) 10.\(\&e5\) g6 11.\(\&e2\) \(\&xg3\) 12.\(\&xg3\) f6

**Diagram Ex. 10-2**

13.\(\&d3?!\)

(2 points)

White wants to play a minority attack, so his knight belongs on d3, supporting b2-b4.

13.\(\&f3\) \(\&e6=\)

13...\(\&e6\) 14.b4 \(\&d7\) 15.0–0 \(\&f7?!\)

Better is 15...0–0.

16.b5! 0–0 17.bxc6 bxc6 18.\(\&a4\±

Ex. 10-3

**A.Yusupov – A.Wojtkiewicz**

**Chicago 2005**

1.d4 d5 2.\(\&f3\) c6 3.\(\&c4\) \(\&f6\) 4.e3 \(\&f5\) 5.\(\&d3\) \(\&xd3\) 6.\(\&xd3\) e6 7.\(\&c3\) \(\&bd7\) 8.0–0 \(\&b4\)
9.\(\&d2\) a5 10.a3 \(\&e7\) 11.e4 (\(\odot\) 11.\(\&fe1\))

Diagram Ex. 10-3

Black solves all his opening problems with a little tactical trick.

11...\(\&c5!\)

12.\(\&xc5\) dxc5 13.\(\&xd8\)† \(\&xd8\) 14.\(\&xe4\) \(\&xe4\) 15.\(\&xa5\) \(\&a8\) 16.\(\&b4\) \(\&xc5\)

\(\frac{1}{2}–\frac{1}{2}\)

Ex. 10-4

**J.Plaskett – K.Arkell**

**London 1991**

1.\(\&f3\) \(\&f6\) 2.d4 e6 3.\(\&f3\) c5 4.\(\&d3\) b6 5.0–0 \(\&b7\) 6.\(\&e7\) \(\&c6\) 7.\(\&d5\) \(\&xf4\) 8.\(\&xe4\) d5 9.\(\&xe5\) \(\&c6\) 10.\(\&e5\) 0–0 11.\(\&g4\) \(\&f6\) 12.\(\&h4\) \(\&c6\) (\(\odot\) 12...\(\&bd7\))

**Diagram Ex. 10-4**

13.\(\&g5!\)

(1 point)

White seizes his chance and attacks at once.

13...\(\&g6\)

If 13...h6, then 14.\(\&xf6\) \(\&xf6\) 15.\(\&e4\) \(\&g6\) 16.\(\&xc6\) \(\&e7\) 17.\(\&f3\) \(\&g7\) 18.\(\&e4\) \(\&f5\) 19.\(\&e7\)†+-.

13...\(\&xe5\) is met by 14.\(\&xf6\) \(\&xd3\) 15.\(\&xe7\)±.

14.\(\&a6\)!+-

(another 1 point)

14...\(\&h6\)

14...\(\&xe5\) 15.\(\&xe5\) \(\&xa6\) 16.\(\&xf6\)±

14...\(\&xa6\) 15.\(\&xc6\) \(\&d7\) 16.\(\&xe7\)†+-.

15.\(\&h6\) \(\&d5\) 16.\(\&h3\) \(\&xc3\)

16...\(\&xa6\) 17.\(\&xc6\) \(\&d6\) 18.\(\&xd5\) \(\&exd5\) 19.\(\&xe7\)† \(\&xe7\) 20.\(\&xf8\)±

17.\(\&xb7\)

Or 17.\(\&xc3\) \(\&xa6\) 18.\(\&xc6\) \(\&d7\) 19.\(\&xe7\)† \(\&xe7\) 20.\(\&xf8\) \(\&xf8\) 21.\(\&e1\) \(\&c4\) 22.\(\&h6\) 1–0


17...\(\&e2\)† 18.\(\&h1\) \(\&xd4\) 19.\(\&xf8\) \(\&xf8\)
20.\(\&xa8\) \(\&xa8\) 21.\(\&e3\) \(\&d5\) 22.\(\&ae1\) \(\&d6\)
23.\(\&f4\) g5 24.\(\&xe2\)

1–0
Solutions

Ex. 10-5

A. Yusupov – A. Simutowe
Minneapolis 2005

1. d4  \( \text{d6} \) 2. \( \text{d3} \)  d5 3.e3  c5 4.\( \text{bd2} \)  cxd4
5.exd4  \( \text{d6} \) 6.c3  \( \text{g4} \) 7.\( \text{d3} \)  \( \text{c7} \) 8.0–0  e6
9.e1  \( \text{d6} \) 10.\( \text{f1} \)  \( \text{h5} \) 11.\( \text{g5} \)  \( \text{g6} \) 12.\( \text{xf6} \)  \( \text{gx6} \) 13.\( \text{c1} \) 0–0

Diagram Ex. 10-5

14.\( \text{h4} \)?

(2 points)

The alternatives 14.\( \text{xd6} \), 14.g3 or 14.\( \text{e3} \) each earn 1 consolation point. White must aim to play on the kingside and exploit the slight weakening of Black’s castled position.

14...f5 15.\( \text{ff3} \)  \( \text{d8} \) 16.\( \text{wh3} \)  \( \text{g7} \) 17.\( \text{cd1} \)  \( \text{xf6} \) 18.\( \text{e3} \)  \( \text{ad8} \) 19.g3 a6 20.\( \text{f4} \)

Ex. 10-6

A. Yusupov – A. Lein
Minneapolis 2005

1. d4  \( \text{d6} \) 2. \( \text{d3} \)  b6 3.\( \text{g5} \)  \( \text{b7} \) 4.\( \text{bd2} \)  g6
5.\( \text{xf6} \)  \( \text{xf6} \) 6.e4  \( \text{g7} \) 7.\( \text{d3} \) 0–0 8.0–0  d6
9.e1  \( \text{e8} \) 10.c3  \( \text{d7} \) 11.a4

Diagram Ex. 10-6

11...a6!

(2 points)

Black must slow down the white initiative on the queenside and counter the threat of \( a4-a5 \) (by being ready to meet it with ...b5).

Playing 11...a5 (1 point) is less precise since the b5-square becomes weak.

12.\( \text{b3} \)

White could try 12.b4? or 12.d5?.

12...\( \text{b8} \) 13.\( \text{c4} \)  \( \text{e7} \) 14.\( \text{c2} \)  c6!

Preparing ...b5.
15.d5 c5 16.\( \text{d3} \)  \( \text{a8} \) 17.\( \text{f1} \)  \( \text{c7} \)

Ex. 10-7

A. Yusupov – C. Jones
Minneapolis 2005

1. d4 e6 2.\( \text{f3} \)  \( \text{f6} \) 3.e3  c5 4.\( \text{d3} \)  \( \text{c6} \) 5.0–0  b6 6.c4  \( \text{e7} \) 7.\( \text{c3} \) 0–0

Diagram Ex. 10-7

8.d5!

(2 points)

White takes advantage of the opportunity to gain more space in the centre.

8...\( \text{b4} \) 9.\( \text{e2} \)

Retreating in the other direction with 9.\( \text{b1} \)? is also interesting.

9...d6 10.a3  \( \text{a6} \) 11.\( \text{d2} \)  \( \text{c7} \) 12.e4  e5
13.b4  \( \text{fe8} \) 14.\( \text{g4} \)

Ex. 10-8

A. Yusupov – N. Mitkov
Chicago 2005

1. d4  \( \text{d6} \) 2. \( \text{d3} \)  d5 3.e3  \( \text{c6} \) 4.c4  e6 5.a3  dxc4 6.\( \text{xc4} \)  \( \text{d6} \) 7.b4

Diagram Ex. 10-8

7...0–0

Black should have the courage to risk the principled move: 7...e5?!

(2 points)

8.b5  \( \text{a5} \) 9.\( \text{xf7} \)  \( \text{xf7} \) 10.dxe5  \( \text{e7} \) 11.\( \text{a4} \)  b6 12.\( \text{xf6} \)  \( \text{xf6} \)  Now if 13.\( \text{e2} \), then 13...\( \text{c5} \) 14.\( \text{d2} \)  \( \text{e8} \) 15.\( \text{b4} \)  \( \text{e4} \).

8.\( \text{b2} \)  a6 9.0–0  \( \text{e7} \)

See Ex. 10-1.

Ex. 10-9

V. Smyslov – N. Rudnev
Gorky 1938

1.e4 e6 2.d4  d5 3.\( \text{c3} \)  dxe4 4.\( \text{xe4} \)  \( \text{d7} \) 5.\( \text{f3} \)  \( \text{gf6} \) 6.\( \text{d3} \)  \( \text{xe4} \) 7.\( \text{xe4} \)  \( \text{f6} \) 8.\( \text{g5} \)  \( \text{g7} \) 9.\( \text{xf6} \)  \( \text{xf6} \)  (9...\( \text{xf6} \)?) 10.c3  \( \text{d6} \)  \( \Delta...c5, ...e5 \)

Diagram Ex. 10-9

11.\( \text{e2} \! \)

(2 points)

11.0–0 (1 point) is not unreasonable, but the move in the game is much more interesting. White fights against ...e5 and ...c5 and prepares to castle long.

11...0–0 12.0–0–0  c5 13.\( \text{b1} \)  cxd4 14.\( \text{xd4} \)  \( \text{b6} \) 15.f4  \( \text{d7} \) 16.\( \text{c2} \)  h6 17.\( \text{f3} \)  \( \text{c6} \)
Solutions

18...\textit{ex}c6 \textit{wxc}6 19.h4+\textit{!}

The threat is 20.\textit{d}g5.

19...\textit{Q}fd8 20.\textit{Q}d\textit{f}1! \textit{Q}d5 21.g4 \textit{Q}d3 22.g5\textit{!}

\textbf{Ex. 10-10}

\textit{V.Smyslov – A.Lilienthal}

Moscow 1938

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.\textit{Q}c3 \textit{Q}f6 4.e5 \textit{Q}g8

(4...\textit{Q}fd7) 5.\textit{Q}g4 h5 6.\textit{Q}f4 c5 (6...b6?! \textit{△}...\textit{a}6) 7.dxc5 \textit{Q}xc5 8.\textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}c6 9.\textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}b4

10.0–0 \textit{Q}xd3 11.cxd3 \textit{Q}d7

\textbf{Diagram Ex. 10-10}

12.\textit{Q}e3!

(2 points)

White first wants to exchange the dark-squared bishops and then attack on the dark squares.

The immediate 12.\textit{Q}g3 (also 2 points) was worth considering too.

12...\textit{Q}e7

12...\textit{Q}xe3 13.fxe3 gives White the initiative.

13.\textit{Q}g3 g6 14.\textit{Q}g5 \textit{Q}h6 15.\textit{Q}xe7 \textit{Q}xe7

16.\textit{Q}ac1!\textit{!}

White prevents long castling and at the same time contests the open c-file.

\textbf{Ex. 10-11}

\textit{V.Baturinsky – V.Smyslov}

Moscow 1938

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}c6 3.d4 exd4 4.\textit{Q}xd4 \textit{Q}c5

5.\textit{Q}e3 \textit{Q}f6 6.c3 \textit{Q}ge7 7.\textit{Q}c4 \textit{Q}e5 8.\textit{Q}e2 d5

9.\textit{Q}d2 (9.0–0!) 9...\textit{Q}g6 10.0–0 \textit{Q}h3 11.\textit{Q}f3

\textbf{Diagram Ex. 10-11}

11...0–0–0–0?

(2 points)

Black is fighting for the initiative and wants to get his rook to a central file as quickly as possible.

11.0–0 (1 consolation point) is not so impressive.

12.\textit{Q}f5?!

After 12.exd5 White should not be tempted by 12...\textit{Q}xf3 13.\textit{Q}xf3 \textit{Q}g4 14.\textit{Q}g3 \textit{Q}xd5, on account of 15.\textit{Q}g5! \textit{Q}xg5 16.\textit{Q}e4=+. But instead 12...\textit{Q}xd5 is simple and good.

12...\textit{Q}e4! 13.\textit{Q}xe7\textit{!}

13...\textit{Q}e4 \textit{Q}xe4 14.\textit{Q}xf5+ \textit{Q}xf5 15.\textit{Q}xc5 \textit{Q}xd2?!

13...\textit{Q}xe7 14.\textit{Q}xe4 f5 15.\textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}d3\textit{!}

15...\textit{Q}d6?! is also strong.

\textbf{Ex. 10-12}

\textit{V.Smyslov – Kirillov}

Moscow 1940

The following annotations are based on analysis by Smyslov.

1.e4 e5 2.\textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}c6 3.\textit{Q}b5 a6 4.\textit{Q}a4 d6 5.d4 b5 6.\textit{Q}b3 \textit{Q}xd4 7.\textit{Q}xd4 exd4 8.c3 dxc3

9.\textit{Q}h5 \textit{Q}e7 (\textit{⊙}...g6 10.\textit{Q}d5 \textit{Q}e6 11.\textit{Q}c6\textit{!} \textit{Q}d7=) 10.\textit{Q}xc3 \textit{Q}f6 11.\textit{Q}e2 \textit{Q}e6 12.0–0 c6

13.\textit{Q}g5 \textit{Q}xb3 14.axb3 \textit{Q}e6

\textbf{Diagram Ex. 10-12}

15.\textit{Q}c2!

(1 point)

15...\textit{Q}d7

Smyslov’s idea can be seen in the line:

15...\textit{Q}e7 16.\textit{Q}xb5 cxb5 17.\textit{Q}c6?!

(another 1 point for this variation)

16.\textit{Q}xa6!!

(another 1 point)

16...\textit{Q}c8

16...\textit{Q}xa6 17.\textit{Q}xb5!+–

17.\textit{Q}d8\textit{!}

17...\textit{Q}d7

18.\textit{Q}xc6?!

18.\textit{Q}d5! \textit{Q}xg5 19.\textit{Q}e8 \textit{Q}e8 20.\textit{Q}xa8++–

18...\textit{Q}xc6 19.\textit{Q}a8\textit{!} \textit{Q}d8 20.\textit{Q}xb8\textit{!} \textit{Q}c8

20...\textit{Q}d7 21.\textit{Q}d8\textit{!} \textit{Q}c7 22.\textit{Q}xb5\textit{!} \textit{Q}b7

23.\textit{Q}xc6\textit{!} \textit{Q}xc6 24.\textit{Q}d4\textit{!} \textit{Q}c7 25.\textit{Q}xe6\textit{!} \textit{Q}xe6 26.\textit{Q}c7+–

21.\textit{Q}d5! \textit{Q}xb8 22.\textit{Q}c6\textit{!} \textit{Q}d7 23.\textit{Q}c7#
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 26

22 points and above ➞ Excellent
17 points and above ➞ Good
13 points ➞ Pass mark

If you scored less than 13 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
The bishop pair

This chapter is the continuation of Chapter 14 of *Boost Your Chess 2*. There we established that the bishop pair often brings a greater advantage than simply the advantage of a bishop compared to a knight. This happens because the two bishops complement each other and can attack all the squares on the board. The bishop pair is normally clearly stronger than two knights, and very often stronger than bishop and knight.

The bishop pair is stronger in open positions, and in semi-open positions, provided the knight does not have good and secure squares protected by its pawns.

In closed positions, and in those situations in which the side with the knight controls some strong outposts, the knight can be more valuable than the bishop.

The most important methods of playing with the bishop pair:

1) **Playing against the knight.** If we deprive the knight of protected squares, we can attack it successfully.

2) **Exchanging one of the bishops at a favourable moment.**

3) **Opening the position.** The bishops need open diagonals. However, the other pieces also play their part. Essentially, the side which benefits from the opening of the position is the one which has the initiative (which is usually but not always the side with the bishop pair).

If you have to defend against the bishop pair, try to:

1) **Keep the game as closed as possible** (there are exceptions in situations in which you have the initiative and are able to post your own pieces actively).

2) **Swap off one of the bishops.**

3) **Obtain some safe squares for your knight.**
The following two games demonstrate the typical advantages of the bishop pair.

**G.Kasparov – V.Smyslov**  
Candidates Match (9), Vilnius 1984

1.\(d4\) \(d5\) 2.\(\textcircled{g}f3\) \(\textcircled{f6}\) 3.\(c4\) \(c6\) 4.\(\textcircled{c}c3\) \(e6\) 5.\(g5\) \(\textcircled{bd}7\)  
6.e3 \(\textcircled{a}5\) 7.\(\text{x}d5\) \(\text{x}d5\) 8.\(d2\) \(b4\) 9.\(c1\) \(e5?!\)  
Here modern theory prefers 9...0–0 or 9...h6.  
10.\(a3!\)  
White aims to simplify the position and get the bishop pair.  
10.dxe5?! would not be clear on account of 10...\(\textcircled{c}5\).  
10...\(d6\)  
Accepting the pawn is dangerous: 10...\(\text{x}c3\)  
11.bxc3 \(\text{w}x\text{a}3\) (11...e4 is met by 12.c4!) 12.e4 \(\textcircled{c}7\)  
13.\(\text{d}3\) White has a strong initiative.  
11.\(dxe5\)  
11.\(\textcircled{d}x\text{d}5\) does not promise any special advantage: 11...\(\text{w}x\text{d}2\)  
12.\(\text{x}d2\) \(\text{x}d5\) 13.dxe5 (13.\(\text{b}5\) e4=) 13...\(\text{w}x\text{e}5\) 14.\(\text{g}x\text{e}5\) \(\text{w}x\text{e}5\) 15.\(\text{b}5\) \(\text{x}d7\) 16.\(\text{c}5\) \(\text{x}b5\)  
17.\(\text{xb}7\text{f}6\)! 18.\(\text{h}4\) (18.\(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xb}2\)) 18...0–0–0=  
11...\(\text{w}x\text{e}5\) 12.\(\text{w}x\text{e}5\) \(\text{w}x\text{e}5\)  
**Diagram 11-1**

13.\(b4!\)  
This little exchanging combination leads to a better ending for White.  
13...\(\text{w}x\text{c}3\)  
13...\(\text{w}x\text{a}3\) is bad: 14.\(\text{w}x\text{d}5\) \(\text{x}d5\) 15.\(\text{b}5\) \(e8\)  
16.0–0 \(\text{e}6\) 17.f4 \(d6\) 18.f5 \(\text{xb}4\) 19.\(\text{w}d4\)+  
14.\(\text{w}x\text{c}3\)  
14.\(\text{w}x\text{c}3\) would be less clear on account of: 14...\(\text{b}6\)  
15.\(\text{c}1\) \(h6\) 16.\(h4\) \(f5\)±  
14...\(\text{w}x\text{c}3\) 15.\(\text{b}x\text{a}5\) \(\text{e}4\) 16.\(f4\)±  
**Diagram 11-2**

White is better because he has the bishop pair in an open position and the black knight does not have any protected squares. Also, White can attack the b7-pawn quite effectively down the open b-file (for that reason Kasparov considers his doubled pawns on the a-file as an additional advantage for White).  
16...0–0 17.\(f3\)  
The typical plan – White plays against the knight and forces it away from any active positions.
17...\textit{f6} 18.e4

18...\textit{e8}!!

Smyslov does not find the correct positions for his pieces.

It was worth considering 18...\textit{d7} (\textit{\Delta \textit{b6}}) 19.\textit{f2} and now:

a) 19...\textit{b6}?! 20.\textit{a6}! \textit{e8} (20...\textit{c5} 21.\textit{b7} \textit{ad8} 22.\textit{c7} \textit{de8} 23.\textit{d6}+) 21.\textit{e2} \textit{d7} (21...\textit{c5} 22.\textit{c7} \textit{d7}?! 23.\textit{hd1}+) 22.\textit{hd1} \textit{b5} 23.\textit{g5}+

b) 19...\textit{fc8}?! 20.\textit{e2} \textit{c5} and Black seeks counterplay on the queenside, although White remains clearly better.

18...\textit{e6}?! does not solve Black's problems either:

19.a6?! (19.\textit{f2} \textit{fc8} 20.\textit{e3}±) 19...\textit{b6} 20.\textit{xc6} \textit{fc8} 21.\textit{xc8}+ \textit{xc8} 22.\textit{b5}±

19.\textit{f2} a6!?

Smyslov did not want to allow a5-a6, but after this move Black has no more active play.

19...\textit{e6} 20.a6± is clearly good for White.

Black would be better trying 19...\textit{d7} 20.\textit{b1} \textit{b5}±.

20.\textit{e2}±

But not 20.\textit{b1} \textit{e7} 21.\textit{d6} because of 21...\textit{xe4}!±.

20...\textit{e6} 21.\textit{b1} \textit{e7} 22.\textit{hd1} \textit{ae8}

23.\textit{b2}!

Kasparov wants to control the d-file. He is also prepared to exchange a pair of rooks. Then he wants to set his pawns on the kingside going. Black's defence is very difficult.

23.g4 is bad on account of 23...\textit{xd4}!.

23...\textit{c8} 24.\textit{bd2} \textit{d7} 25.\textit{xd7} \textit{xd7} 26.\textit{g4}!

White wants to strengthen his position on the kingside.

26...\textit{c5}!!

26...h6 would an improvement, as then 27.h4 and g4-g5 would allow the exchange of some pawns on the kingside.

Another better defence is 26...\textit{f8}! intending ...\textit{e6}, ...\textit{f6} and ...\textit{e7-d7}.

27.\textit{e3} \textit{d7}

27...\textit{e6}! is followed by: 28.f4 \textit{d8} (28...\textit{g6} 29.\textit{f5} \textit{c7} 30.\textit{f3}±) 29.\textit{f5} \textit{xd1} 30.\textit{xd1} \textit{c7}
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31. a4! \( \text{Qe8} \) 32. \( \text{Ab3} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 33. \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 34. \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 35. \( \text{e5±} \)

If 27. ... \( \text{Qb3} \), then 28. \( \text{Ab6} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 29. \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 30. \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 31. \( \text{Qd7±} \).

28. \( \text{g5!} \)

Preventing ... \( \text{h6} \).

28. ... \( \text{Qe5} \)

If 28. ... \( \text{Qg5} \), then 29. \( \text{f4!} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 30. \( \text{Qg4} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 31. \( \text{Qc5±} \).

**Diagram 11-5**

29. \( \text{Qd4!} \)

But not 29. \( \text{Qg3} \) which allows 29. ... \( \text{Qe6} \), intending either knight or bishop to \( c4 \).

29. ... \( \text{Qg6} \) 30. \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qf8} \)

Black has lost a lot of time with this knight.

31. \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 32. \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 33. \( \text{Qc3} \)

33. \( \text{f5} \) would not be so good: 33. ... \( \text{Qb3} \) 34. \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{c5} \)
35. \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qxd2} \) 36. \( \text{Qxd2} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 37. \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{f6} \) and Black's defensive chances are better than in the game.

33. ... \( \text{Qxd1} \) 34. \( \text{Qxd1} \) \( \text{Qd7} \)

34. ... \( \text{g6} \) is met by 35. \( \text{Qc2} \) and White will get in \( f4-f5 \).

35. \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{Qc4} \)

**Diagram 11-6**

36. \( \text{h5!} \) \( \text{h6} \)

Now the black \( h \)-pawn becomes weak.

36. ... \( \text{f6} \) is followed by 37. \( \text{h6!} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) and now 38. \( \text{Qf3±} \) or 38. \( \text{Qc2±} \).

37. \( \text{gxh6} \) \( \text{gxh6} \) 38. \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 39. \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qd5} \) 40. \( \text{Qc2±} \)

**Diagram 11-7**

White's advantage has become quite obvious – Kasparov has greatly improved his position on the kingside. Such positions are incredibly difficult to hold, since there are practically no active ideas. The best thing for Smyslov to do here is nothing, just simply wait. But he tries to clear up the situation on the kingside.

40. ... \( \text{f6?} \)

40. ... \( \text{Qc4±} \)

41. \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 42. \( \text{Qb4} \)

White will overrun the black fortress.

42. \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{Qb3} \) 43. \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 44. \( \text{xf6+} \) would also be good.

42. ... \( \text{Qb3} \) 43. \( \text{Qe3} \)

The knight is in danger.
43...c5

As Kasparov shows, after 43...c4 Black eventually ends up in zugzwang: 44...c3 d5 45...e4! c4 (45...c5 46...xd5 cxd5 47...d4 e4 48...b4 g3 49...xd5 xf5 50...c5 g3 51...b6 xh5 52...xb7 f4 53...xa6 xex6 54...b6+) 46...f3 c1 (46...b5 47...e2! 47...c7 48...d1+- 44...c3

Diagram 11-8

Smyslov thought about his sealed move for 53 minutes, but could not find any defence. The following variations given by Kasparov show that White is winning easily:

a) 44...c1 45...a4+-
b) 44...c4 45...e4 c6 46...xc6 bxc6 47...e4+-
c) 44...f8 45...xb3 (also good is 45...e4 xe4 46...xe4 e7 47...d5+-) 45...xb3 46...xf6+-

1-0

A.Yusupov – A.Sokolov

USSR ch, Moscow 1988

1.d4 df6 2.c4 e6 3.g3 d5 4.g2 xc4 5...f3 c5
6.0-0 c6 7...e5 d7 8...xe4!?

A popular alternative for White is 8...a3 cxd4 9...xc4.

8...xc4 9...f4 d5 10...d6+ xd6 11...xd6

Diagram 11-9

12...d2?!

White obtains good compensation for the pawn. He has the bishop pair and strong pressure against the d4-pawn.

12...b3 a5

Diagram 11-10

12...0-0 13...b3 c8

13...b6 is a logical alternative. After 14...c4 c8 15...fd1 e8 16.e3? (16...a3?±) 16...f5 17.e4 Black has the counter-blow 17...a5! with equal chances.

14...c4 e8

Black could try 14...a5 here. Then 15...xe7 xb3 16...xd8 xa1 17.e7 is followed by: 17...c2 18...xf8 (18...c1? d3! 19.exd3 d4?) 18...xf8 19...e1 d3 20.exd3 d4 21...f1±
15.\texttt{Efd1}
15.\texttt{a3}?! is also possible.
15...\texttt{Qf5} 16.\texttt{xc5} e5
If 16...\texttt{Wf6}, then 17.g4! \texttt{h4} 18.\texttt{xc6}+.

\textbf{Diagram 11-10}

17.e4!
A difficult move, played with a specific idea.
17.\texttt{Qe7}
17...\texttt{h6} is followed by 18.\texttt{d6} \texttt{e6} 19.\texttt{xc8} \texttt{xc8} 20.\texttt{h3} \texttt{a5} 21.\texttt{d5}+.
18.\texttt{d6} \texttt{f8} 19.\texttt{xb7} \texttt{xb7} 20.\texttt{xb7} \texttt{b8}

\textbf{Diagram 11-11}

21.\texttt{wa6}!
White tries his luck with a new pawn sacrifice, not being particularly satisfied with the variation:
21.\texttt{xc7} \texttt{xc7} (21...\texttt{xb7}?! 22.\texttt{xd8} \texttt{xd8} 23.\texttt{ac1} \texttt{d6} 24.b3 intending \texttt{f1-c4} is somewhat better for White) 22.\texttt{xa7} \texttt{d6}! 21.\texttt{xb2}
White has two good bishops against two ‘hanging’ knights. Although not everything is clear-cut here, the position is certainly much easier to play for White.
22.\texttt{wa4}!?
A prophylactic move which is directed against ...	exttt{d7}.
22.\texttt{ac1} would not be so good on account of 22...	exttt{d7} 23.\texttt{f1} \texttt{fb8}.
22...	exttt{b8}?!?
22...	exttt{d7}?! now loses to 23.\texttt{xc7}.
If 22...	exttt{c8}, then 23.\texttt{a3}.

\textbf{Diagram 11-12}

23.\texttt{f1}!
Bringing the bishop to a better position.
23...\texttt{f5}?!?
A risky move. Black wants to support his active rook on \texttt{b2} by involving his \texttt{f8-rook}, but he is overestimating his chances. It turns out that opening up the position helps his opponent.
23...\texttt{d8} would have been more appropriate, although White still has good compensation for the pawn.
24.\texttt{a3}!
This ends the counterplay.
Of course not 24.\texttt{a3}?! on account of 24...\texttt{f4} 25.\texttt{xe7} \texttt{xf2}, and Black’s threats include ...\texttt{e8},

\textbf{Diagram 11-12}
transferring the queen to join the attack on the kingside.

24...\texttt{Ab}6

If 24...\texttt{fxe}4? then 25.\texttt{xb}2 \texttt{xb}2 26.\texttt{b}3\texttt{t}±, and the weakness of the e4-pawn ensures White a clear advantage.

25.\texttt{exf}5 \texttt{xb}4

There will be no peace for the knight here either. Better is 25...\texttt{xf}5 26.\texttt{ac}1±.

26.\texttt{ab}1!

White plays against the knight.

\textbf{Diagram 11-13}

26...\texttt{Dec}6?

Perhaps the decisive mistake.

Black should find a more active post for his knight with 26...\texttt{ed}5 and now:

a) 27.\texttt{c}4 \texttt{h}8 28.\texttt{xd}5 \texttt{xd}5 29.\texttt{xb}6 \texttt{xb}6= Sokolov probably overlooked that he could save the exchange in this line.

b) 27.\texttt{dc}1! \texttt{c}3?! (27...\texttt{d}8±) 28.\texttt{xc}3 dxc3 29.\texttt{xb}4 \texttt{xb}4 30.\texttt{xb}4 c2 31.\texttt{a}3 \texttt{c}7 32.\texttt{c}1±

27.\texttt{g}2 \texttt{d}8

27...\texttt{c}8 28.\texttt{dc}1 (28.\texttt{xb}4 \texttt{xb}4 29.\texttt{a}3 \texttt{a}6±) 28...d3 29.\texttt{xb}4 \texttt{xb}4 30.\texttt{xc}8\texttt{t} \texttt{xc}8 31.\texttt{xb}4 d2 32.\texttt{xb}6 axb6 33.\texttt{f}3++

28.\texttt{xc}6!

The correct moment for the exchange of the bishop. White simplifies the position and transforms his advantage. He exploits the weakness of his opponent's castled position to mount a forceful attack.

28...\texttt{xc}6 29.\texttt{xb}6 \texttt{xb}6 30.\texttt{c}4\texttt{t} \texttt{h}8 31.\texttt{f}7!

Threatening both \texttt{f}5-\texttt{f}6 and \texttt{f}8.

The immediate 31.\texttt{f}6 is less convincing: 31...\texttt{a}5! 32.\texttt{fxg}7\texttt{t} \texttt{xg}7±

31...\texttt{g}8\texttt{t} 31...\texttt{b}4 loses after 32.\texttt{f}6! \texttt{g}8 33.\texttt{fxg}7\texttt{t} \texttt{xg}7 34.\texttt{f}8\texttt{t}++ (or 34.\texttt{e}8++).

32.\texttt{f}6 \texttt{d}8

\textbf{Diagram 11-15}

33.\texttt{e}7!

A new transformation of advantages. In place of an attack, White gets a super-strong passed pawn.
The bishop pair

33...\textbullet xe7 34.fxe7 \textbullet d7 35.E\textbullet d3!+-

The final subtlety. White threatens \textbullet f3 and then \textbullet xg8†.

35...h6

35...e4 does not save Black:

\textbf{Diagram 11-16}

36.E\textbullet xd4!! \textbullet xd4 37.E\textbullet xg8† \textbullet h8 38.e8\textbullet #

36.E\textbullet f3

Black can no longer hold his position.

36...\textbullet c8 37.E\textbullet f8† \textbullet h7 38.E\textbullet f7 \textbullet c1† 39.E\textbullet g2 \textbullet c6†

Black has only a few checks left.

40.E\textbullet h3 \textbullet e6† 41.E\textbullet h4

Black will soon be mated.
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Ex. 11-1

G.Kasparov – V.Smyslov
Candidates (3), Vilnius 1984

The annotations to this exercise and the next are based on analysis by Kasparov.

26.c5!

White cuts off the knight on a4.

26...e8 27.exe8† exe8 28.d6

28.c4† is not so clear: 28...d1! (28...b2? 29.b4†) 29.xa4 † g6 30.xa7 † d3 31.h3 xf1† 32.h2 h5±

28...f7

28...b7 29.g3! f7 (29...b2? 30.b4†) or 29...b2 30.e1 † g6 31.g2 e8 31.e1 f7?! 32.h3!+-

29.b1 d5?

29...h5± is a better defence, meeting 30.d3 with 30...d8.

30.b8† f7 31.f8† e6

31...g6 32.d3† h6 33.f4† h5 (33...g5 34.xf6† g7 35.e5±) 34.f5 † f7 (34...e6 35.g4†) 35.g4† h4 36.g3† g5 37.h4† h6 38.g8† g5 39.d6 g7 40.g8 f7 41.e7+-

32.g3

32.a6! xd6 33.cxd6 xd6 34.a8 c7 35.xa7† b6 36.a8 c5 37.d8+-

32...g6

See Ex. 11-6.

The alternatives would not save the game either:

a) 32...f5 33.a6 f7 34.e8† f6 (34...d7 35.h8†) 35.e5† g6 36.d4+-

b) 32...e4 33.b3! f2 34.c4† f5 35.a6! g6 36.h4! h5 37.g4 hxg4 38.fxg4 f5 39.c8 f7 40.h5† f6 41.g5+–

Ex. 11-2

A.Dreev – S.Karjakin
Dos Hermanas 2005

24.b3!

(2 points)

Preparing an attack on the c5-knight.

24...b6 25.a3 c8 26.f3 c7 27.f1 c8 28.d5 g6† 29.h1 a6 30.h3 Or 30.g2+-.

30.b6

30...e6 31.xe7 xe3 32.xc3 xe3 33.xc3 f1† 34.h2 xf2† 35.g2 xf4† 36.h1 h5 37.a3+-

31.h2

31.e6? xe6 32.xc5 xc5 33.xe6† h8 34.xf5 g8±

31...f8 32.c4 a7 33.b4 axb4 34.axb4 wb6 35.xc2 g6 36.d4 e8 37.a5 wb5 38.a6!+– xa4 39.d6

39...f6 40.exf6† e7 41.e2+–

39...c5 40.xc7 xc7 41.b4 a6 42.b8†

42...c8 is met by 43.b7+-.

1–0

Ex. 11-3

L.Psakhis – A.Yusupov
USSR Ch, Vilnius 1980

61.f5†

(2 points)

Black now has two weaknesses — the g7-pawn and the hanging knights. His king cannot protect everything.

61...e5

Or 61...f7 62.d3 g8 63.c4! dc4† 64.xc4 d7 65.c5 c8 66.d7+-

62.f8 c3 63.c6 a6 64.b7!

White forces the knight back, and will take the g7-pawn next.

1–0

Ex. 11-4

B.Gulko – A.Kremenietsky
Moscow 1983

44.c4!

(2 points)

Since the knight does not have a move, the exchange of bishops wins immediately.
The alternatives $44.\text{g}8$ (1 point) $44...\text{fxg}5$ $45.\text{fg}5$ and $44.\text{h}4$ (1 point) are less incisive, although they do not spoil White's winning position.

$44...\text{xc}4$ $45.\text{xc}4 \text{fxg}5$ $46.\text{fxg}5$
After $46...\text{f}f7$ $47.\text{dd}5$ Black will be in zugzwang.

$1-0$

**Ex. 11-5**

J. Timman – A. Karpov
Linares 1993

$33.\text{f}5!$
(2 points)

This will give Black a new weakness on e6.

$33...\text{hxg}3$ $34.\text{hxg}3 \text{d}f8$ $35.\text{e}6+- \text{b}4$

Capturing in $f5$ would be hopeless:

a) $35...\text{wx}f5$ $36.\text{wx}f5 \text{e}f5$ $37.\text{xe}f8 \text{xe}f8$
$38.\text{xd}5 \text{xd}5$ $39.\text{xc}x\text{c}7+-$

b) $35...\text{ex}f5$ $36.\text{wx}d5 \text{xd}5$ $37.\text{xe}f6 \text{gx}f6$
$38.\text{xd}5+-$.  

While making his 35th move, Black overstepped the time limit. But in any case, after $36.\text{xc}x\text{c}7 \text{xd}4$ $37.\text{we}2+-$ his position would have been most unenviable.

$1-0$

**Ex. 11-6**

G. Kasparov – V. Smyslov
Candidates (3), Vilnius 1984

$33.\text{a}6!+-$
(1 point)

The threat of $\text{c}8$ wins White the exchange. $33.\text{h}3f5$ $34.\text{g}4 \text{e}e4$ is not so strong.

$33...\text{xd}6$ $34.\text{cx}d6 \text{d}x\text{d}6$ $35.\text{xe}f6+ \text{e}e5$
$36.\text{e}8 \text{c}5$ $37.\text{e}8 \text{d}4$ $38.\text{e}8 \text{e}5$ $39.\text{f}4+ \text{f}4$ $40.\text{f}1 \text{b}3$ $41.\text{f}2 \text{b}2$
$41...\text{c}3$ $42.\text{d}3+$
$41...\text{c}4$ $42.\text{g}2+ \text{f}5$ $43.\text{d}5+-$.  

After the move played, Black resigned on account of the variation $42.\text{b}8 \text{c}4$
$43.\text{xc}4+-$.  

$1-0$

**Ex. 11-7**

W. Steinitz – J. Zukertort
World Ch (18), USA 1886

$35.\text{f}4+-$
(1 point)

White opens the $f$-file and brings the desired support for the bishop on $d5$.

$35...\text{d}7$
$35...\text{ex}f4$ $36.\text{xf}4+-$
$36.\text{f}5 \text{e}7$
$36...\text{gx}f5$ $37.\text{xf}5 \text{xf}5$ $38.\text{xe}f5 \text{e}c7$
$38...\text{e}7$ $39.\text{xf}7 \text{h}8$ $40.\text{f}3+-$ or $38...\text{d}8$
$39.\text{g}6+-$ (Steinitz) $39.\text{g}6 \text{d}4$ $40.\text{xf}7+-$
$
$36...\text{f}8$ $37.\text{g}3+-$

$37.\text{a}2$

Threatening $\text{f}5-f6$.

$37...\text{gx}f5$
$37...\text{e}8$ $38.\text{xf}7 \text{f}7$ $39.\text{g}6 \text{g}7$
$39...\text{e}6$ $40.\text{f}6 \text{b}6$ $41.\text{h}7$

$38.\text{xf}5 \text{e}8$ $39.\text{f}3!$

$39.\text{x}b6? \text{d}5$ followed by $...\text{c}5+$ gives Black counterplay (Steinitz).

$39...\text{e}4$ $40.\text{h}5$

Mate is imminent: $40...\text{xc}3$ $41.\text{xf}7 \text{g}7$
$42.\text{f}6#$

$1-0$

**Ex. 11-8**

I. Kan – J. Capablanca
Moscow 1936

$19...\text{c}8!$
(3 points)

Capablanca is playing to win this endgame and prepares $...\text{a}6$ to exchange the lightsquared bishops.

$19...\text{dx}3$ (1 point) $20.\text{cx}d3$ is likely to lead to a draw due to the opposite-coloured bishops.

$20.\text{f}1$
$20.\text{a}1$, intending $\text{b}2-\text{b}3$ and $\text{a}3-\text{a}4$, can be met with $20...\text{a}8??$ followed by $...\text{a}6$.

$20...\text{a}6$ $21.\text{xa}6?$

$21.\text{d}4??$
Solutions

21...\( \text{Rx}a6 \) 22.\( \text{Rx}xe5! \)  \( \text{fxe5} \) 23.\( \text{Rd}3 \)  \( \text{b}5! \uparrow \\

Black is clearly better in this rook ending, because he has a mobile pawn structure and can take advantage of the semi-open a- and f-files.

You can find a later stage of this endgame as Ex. 11-2 in *Chess Evolution I*.

Ex. 11-9

\[ \text{V.Ivanchuk} - \text{G.Kasparov} \]

New York (rapid) 1995

32.\( \text{hx}c2! \rightarrow \)

(1 point)

The immediate 32...\( \text{hx}e4! \rightarrow \) (also 1 point) is just as good, threatening to take on f3 with either rook or bishop.

Likewise 32...\( \text{hx}g4! \rightarrow \) (also 1 point) is very strong.

33.\( \text{Rd}2 \)

If 33.\( \text{Ra}1 \), then 33...\( \text{hx}e4 \) 34.\( \text{Re}3 \)  \( \text{Rx}f3! \) 35.\( \text{gx}f3 \)  \( \text{Rx}f3 \rightarrow \).

33...\( \text{Rx}d2 \) 34.\( \text{Rx}d2 \)  \( \text{g}3 \) 35.\( \text{b}7 \)  \( \text{Rxb7} \)

0–1

Ex. 11-10

\[ \text{P.Svidler} - \text{G.Kasparov} \]

Linares 1999

The following annotations are based on analysis by Ftacnik.

22...\( \text{c}6! \)

(2 points)

Kasparov provokes a weakening of the white position.

However, 22...\( \text{Rx}d1 \) 23.\( \text{Rx}d1 \)  \( \text{b}5 \) (also 2 points) would be equally good.

23.\( \text{f}3 \)  \( \text{Rx}d1 \) 24.\( \text{Rx}d1 \)  \( \text{c}5 \) 25.\( \text{d}3 \)

25.\( \text{d}4?! \)  \( \text{bxc}3 \) 26.\( \text{bxc}3 \)  \( \text{d}5 \) 27.\( \text{e}2 \)  \( \text{Rx}d4 \) 28.\( \text{cx}d4 \)  \( \text{c}4 \) 29.\( \text{f}2 \)  \( \text{a}4 \uparrow \)

25...\( \text{b}5 \) 26.\( \text{d}2 \)  \( \text{e}3 \) 27.\( \text{d}6 \)

27.\( \text{c}2? \)  \( \text{d}3 \rightarrow \)

27...\( \text{bxc}3 \) 28.\( \text{xc}3 \)

28.\( \text{bxc}3 \)  \( \text{c}4 \uparrow \)

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

Black recovers the pawn and is clearly better thanks to the bishop pair.

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

29.\( \text{h}4?! \)  \( \text{f}8 \uparrow \)

29...\( \text{g}5 \) 30.\( \text{e}1 \)

30.\( \text{g}3 \)  \( \text{g}7 \uparrow \)

30...\( \text{Rx}g2 \) 31.\( \text{e}2 \)  \( \text{f}4 \) 32.\( \text{g}3 \)  \( \text{c}1 \) 33.\( \text{a}4 \)

33.\( \text{d}1 \)  \( \text{h}5 \uparrow \) or 33.\( \text{b}6 \)  \( \text{h}5 \uparrow \).

33...\( \text{h}5! \) 34.\( \text{d}1 \)

34.\( \text{e}1 \)  \( \text{f}4 \) 35.\( \text{g}3 \)  \( \text{c}2 \uparrow \) 36.\( \text{d}3 \)  \( \text{d}2 \uparrow \) 37.\( \text{c}3 \)  \( \text{e}2 \uparrow \)

34.\( \text{h}4 \) 35.\( \text{e}1 \)  \( \text{f}4 \) 36.\( \text{c}3 \)

36.\( \text{a}5 \)  \( \text{c}2 \uparrow \) 37.\( \text{d}3 \)  \( \text{f}2 \rightarrow \)

36...\( \text{g}7 \) 37.\( \text{b}6 \)  \( \text{h}8 \) 38.\( \text{f}2 \)

38.\( \text{a}5 \)  \( \text{h}2 \) 39.\( \text{c}4 \) 40.\( \text{d}3 \) 40.\( \text{e}3 \)  \( \text{xe}5 \uparrow \)

38...\( \text{h}3 \) 39.\( \text{d}2? \)

39.\( \text{c}4 \) 44 (39...\( \text{hx}h4 \) 40.\( \text{e}3 \) 40.\( \text{d}4 \)  \( \text{hx}h2 \) 41.\( \text{xd}4 \)  \( \text{f}8 \) 42.\( \text{xd}4 \)  \( \text{hx}g2 \) 43.\( \text{xd}4 \) 4a\uparrow \)

39...\( \text{hx}h2 \) 40.\( \text{d}7 \)

40.\( \text{xd}5 \)  \( \text{xe}5 \) 41.\( \text{d}4 \)  \( \text{c}7 \rightarrow \)

40...\( \text{g}6 \) 41.\( \text{e}3 \) 44 (42.\( \text{fx}g4 \))

42.\( \text{fx}g4 \) 42.\( \text{g}3 \) 43.\( \text{e}2 \)  \( \text{f}5 \rightarrow \)

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

43.\( \text{c}5 \) is followed by 43...\( \text{hx}e5 \) 44.\( \text{d}3 \)  \( \text{f}6 \) 45.\( \text{f}4 \)  \( \text{xf}4 \) 46.\( \text{xf}4 \)  \( \text{f}7 \rightarrow \).  

0–1

Ex. 11-11

\[ \text{L.van Wely} - \text{G.Kasparov} \]

Internet (rapid) 2000

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

(2 points)

Black now threatens to win with ...\( \text{fx}f1 \uparrow \).

As in the previous example, Kasparov coordinates his rook and two bishops to mount a strong attack.

The immediate 34...\( \text{fx}f1 \uparrow \) is not so impressive: 35.\( \text{g}3 \)  \( \text{d}6 \uparrow \) 36.\( \text{g}4 \)  \( \text{a}1 \) 37.\( \text{d}7 \infty \)

35.\( \text{h}3 \)  \( \text{c}1 \) 36.\( \text{d}4 \)  \( \text{f}1 \uparrow \) 37.\( \text{g}2 \)

37.\( \text{g}4 \)  \( \text{c}4 \rightarrow \)
Solutions

37...Ec3† 38.f3 Ed3† 39.Eb3 Exb3 40.Edxb3 Ed4 41.Ed4 Ee5 42.£xe4 £xe4 43.£e4 £d5 44.£d3 £c7 45.£f4 £f4 46.£e4 £d5 47.£d3 £c7 48.£f6 £f6 £f4 49.£g4 £xb2 50.g6 e5 51.£f5 £e6† 52.£g5 £f4† 53.£h5 £d5 54.£g4 fxg6 55.£xg6 £e6† 56.£f3 £g5 0–1

23...£f6! (2 points)

This limits the activity of the dark-squared bishop.

24.a5

24.£c7 would not be good: 24...£d2

25.EXxb6 £xb6 26.£d1 £bb2†

24...£c8

24...£xe5 25.axb6 £xb6 26.£a5=

25.£c3 £d6 26.£e1 £f7 27.£e2 £e7†

27...£e5 28.h4 £e6†

It can clearly be seen that the bishop pair does not confer an automatic advantage. All the black pieces are more active than their white counterparts, and so Black has the better chances.

28.£f1 £db8 29.h3 £e5 30.£g1 £b2 31.£d3 £c6 32.h4 g5! 33.hxg5 hxg5 34.£f1 £g4 35.£c3 £b3 36.£c2 £f5 37.£e1 £b2 38.£d3 £b2 39.£e2 £b2 40.£d3 £h8 41.£cb1 £bb8 42.£xb8 £xb8 43.£c1 £b3 44.£c2 £a3 45.£e4 £xe4 46.£d1 £f5 47.£e2 £a2 48.£f1 £a4 49.£d1 £xc4 50.£c1 £b5 51.£g1 £a6 52.£h2 £b2→ 53.£c2 £d3 54.£d2 £xf2 55.£e3 £d3 56.£g3 £a3 57.£xg4† £g6 58.£d2 £b4† 59.£c3 £a2 60.£c1 £c4 61.£e6 £d3 62.£xc4 £xc4 63.£xc4 £f5 64.£c8 £e1 65.£f8† £e6 66.£e8† £d7 67.£a8 £xg2† 68.£h3 £c2 69.£h6 £e3! 70.£a7† £e6 71.£xe3 £c3 72.£g4 £xe3 73.£xa† £d5 74.£a8 £e4! 75.a6 £a3 76.a7 £f3

0–1

Ex. 11-12

V.Salov – G.Kamsy

Candidates match (6), Sanghi Nagar 1995

23...£f6! (2 points)

This limits the activity of the dark-squared bishop.

24.a5

24.£c7 would not be good: 24...£d2

25.EXxb6 £xb6 26.£d1 £bb2†

24...£c8

24...£xe5 25.axb6 £xb6 26.£a5=

25.£c3 £d6 26.£e1 £f7 27.£e2 £e7†

27...£e5 28.h4 £e6†

It can clearly be seen that the bishop pair does not confer an automatic advantage. All the black pieces are more active than their white counterparts, and so Black has the better chances.

28.£f1 £db8 29.h3 £e5 30.£g1 £b2 31.£d3 £c6 32.h4 g5! 33.hxg5 hxg5 34.£f1 £g4 35.£c3 £b3 36.£c2 £f5 37.£e1 £b2 38.£d3 £b2 39.£e2 £b2 40.£d3 £h8 41.£cb1 £bb8 42.£xb8 £xb8 43.£c1 £b3 44.£c2 £a3 45.£e4 £xe4 46.£d1 £f5 47.£e2 £a2 48.£f1 £a4 49.£d1 £xc4 50.£c1 £b5 51.£g1 £a6 52.£h2 £b2→ 53.£c2 £d3 54.£d2 £xf2 55.£e3 £d3 56.£g3 £a3 57.£xg4† £g6 58.£d2 £b4† 59.£c3 £a2 60.£c1 £c4 61.£e6 £d3 62.£xc4 £xc4 63.£xc4 £f5 64.£c8 £e1 65.£f8† £e6 66.£e8† £d7 67.£a8 £xg2† 68.£h3 £c2 69.£h6 £e3! 70.£a7† £e6 71.£xe3 £c3 72.£g4 £xe3 73.£xa† £d5 74.£a8 £e4! 75.a6 £a3 76.a7 £f3

0–1

Scoring

Maximum number of points is 21

18 points and above → Excellent
14 points and above → Good
10 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 10 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Shutting out a piece

Shutting out a piece is a powerful tool, which can often even lead to the winning of a game. Whenever we manage to keep one or more of our opponent's pieces out of play for a certain amount of time, this will constitute such a major disadvantage to our opponent that he will be unable to put up proper resistance. We saw an example of this in the game Hort – Ciocaltea, Ex. 2-4 in Boost Your Chess 3.

Of course, we still have to make proper use of such opportunities. If, for example, an opposing piece is hemmed in on the kingside, we should open up the play on the queenside and exploit our numerical advantage there. Here is a classic example of this strategy.

W.Winter – J.Capablanca
Hastings 1919

1.e4 e5 2.d3 c6 3.d3 f6 4.b5 b4 5.0-0 0-0 6.xc6
Many of the ideas behind this variation come from Nimzowitsch. 6.d3 is the main line.
6...dxc6 7.d3
7.xe5 x3=
7...d6? 8.g5?!
8.h3 is better, intending e2-g3 and active play on the kingside; later White can also prepare f2-f4.
8.h6 9.h4 c5
This prevents d3-d4.

10.d5?
White does not see the positional trap.
10.d2= is correct, and then c4-e3.
10...g5!
Black unpins his knight and puts the white bishop into a passive situation.
11.xf6†
After 11.xg5 x5 12.f3 f6 13.d2 e7
White has no compensation for the piece.
11.g3 is no better either: 11...x5 12.exd5 g4 13.h3 h5 (or 13...xf3 14.xf3 f5, intending
Shutting out a piece

...\(...\text{e}6, \ldots\text{h}7, \ldots\text{f}7, \ldots\text{g}8\) and then \(...\text{g}4\) with a powerful attack) 14.\(\text{h}2\) \(\text{f}5\) and Black is clearly better (Kasparov).

11.\(\text{xf}6\) 12.\(\text{g}3\) \(\text{g}4\) 13.\(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{xf}3\) 14.\(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{xf}3\) 15.\(\text{gxf}3\)\(\triangleleft\)

Diagram 12-2

The bishop has been shut out. To get it back into play White has to sacrifice a pawn (after \(\text{g}2\), \(\text{h}2\), \(\text{f}3\)-\(\text{f}4\) and \(\text{f}2\)-\(\text{f}3\)), which is of course a very high price. Black should aim to open the play on the queenside, where in practical terms he has an extra piece.

15...\(\text{f}6\)! 16.\(\text{g}2\)

Here Kasparov recommends 16.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{ad}8\) 17.\(\text{fd}1\) \(\text{d}7\) 18.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{f}7\) 19.\(\text{e}2\)\(\triangleleft\).

16...\(\text{a}5\) 17.\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{f}7\)

Diagram 12-3

18.\(\text{h}1\)

Kasparov also criticizes this move – opening the h-file does not change the fate of the bishop. Perhaps Winter wanted to swap off a potential weakness, the \(\text{h}3\)-pawn. But White absolutely had to try to block the queenside.

18.\(\text{c}4?!\) is an interesting recommendation by Kasparov:

a) After 18...\(\text{c}6\) 19.\(\text{fc}1\) \(\text{fb}8\) 20.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{b}5\) 21.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{b}6\) 22.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{bxc}4?!\) 23.\(\text{dxc}4!\) \(\text{ab}8\) 24.\(\text{a}3!\) (Kasparov) White in fact constructs a fortress.

Black would do better to play 22...\(\text{bxa}4\) 23.\(\text{xa}4\) \(\text{b}4\) with more options on the queenside, where White has a lot of weaknesses to protect. Despite that, Kasparov is correct in his evaluation of the situation in the game – every chance should be taken to try to set up a fortress.

b) Perhaps 18...\(\text{a}6?!\) first is better. 19.\(\text{a}3\) \(\text{b}6\) 20.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{d}8\) 21.\(\text{d}1\) \(\text{b}4\) (21...\(\text{f}8\) 22.\(\text{f}1\)\(\triangleleft\)) and only now does Black prepare \(...\text{c}6\) and \(...\text{b}5\).

18.\(\text{e}6\)

Capablanca consolidates his position and prepares the attack on the queenside.

19.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{fb}8\) 20.\(\text{hxg}5\) \(\text{hxg}5\)

Diagram 12-4

21.\(\text{b}3\)

It was not yet too late for 21.\(\text{c}4!\) \(\text{c}6\) 22.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{b}5\) 23.\(\text{a}3\) \(\text{bxa}4\) 24.\(\text{xa}4\)\(\triangleleft\). Black would still have to fight to achieve the win.
21...c6
Black prepares the ...b5 thrust.
The immediate 21...b5? 22.axb5 axb5 23.a4 b4 24.a1 would give White counterplay.
Playing 21...c4?! to bring his bishop into play would have been interesting, but Capablanca wants to win without sacrificing.

22.a2?!  
Almost the last chance to play 22.c4!.

22...b5 23.a1?  
23.c4 bxc4 24.bxc4 a3 25.a1 would have been more resilient.

23...c4!  
"The decisive advance, after which the bishop on d6 can breathe." – Donev

24.axb5  
Or 24.dxc4 bxc4 25.bxc4 a3, followed by ...a8 and c4+-.

24...cxb3 25.cxb3  
25.a5? a5 26.a5 b2+-

25...xb5  
Black has attained his strategic goal. He can employ both his king and his bishop on the queenside, but the white king and bishop remain in offside positions.

26.a4 xb3 27.d4 b5! 28.c4  
28.dxe5 fxe5+-

28...b4 29.xc6  
29.xb4 a6 30.dxe5 fxe5 31.h1 a7+-

29...xd4  0–1  
A wonderful game on our subject!

In my games too, I have sometimes managed to shut in a bishop in a similar fashion.

40...d7!  
Black is better; he has a good pawn structure and the more active pieces. Now he prepares ...c4.

41.d1 c4 42.b4  
42.b5!? cxd3 43.exd3 would be more interesting,
but after 43...c4 44.xb7 xbd3 Black retains the advantage.

42...c5 43.e3

Diagram 12-7

43...e4!

Black cranks up the pressure against the d3-pawn. At the same time Black is also pursuing another hidden aim - he wants to try to exclude White’s light-squared bishop from the play.

43...b3↑ 44.e1 xa3 is not good on account of 45.dxc4.

44.d4 h5!? 44...b3↑ 45.e1 xa3 46.xe4 a4↑ is promising for Black, but he wants to achieve even more.

45.e1?

White does not see the positional threat. He had to play 45.h3, so as to meet 45...f5 with 46.g4↑.

45...a4 46.c2

Diagram 12-8

46...f5!

Now the white bishop will not get another chance to break out of its prison.

47.h3 g6↑

So that after 48.g4 he has the reply 48...h4 available.

48.a2 a5

Black’s strategy is straightforward – as in Winter – Capablanca he wants to operate on the queenside, where he simply has one more piece than his opponent. Since the position there is completely open, the technical phase does not present Black with any great difficulties.

49.g4

Diagram 12-9

49...h4! 50.d2

If 50.c3, then 50...xc3 51.xc3 b5 followed by ...a7. Of course the exchange of a few pieces does not bother Black at all – he has an even easier game with his ‘extra piece’.

50...g7 51.f1 e6

51...h6 52.f4 g5 would not be so clear on account of 53.gxf5 gxf5 54.c1, intending g1 with counterplay.

52.f4

139
Diagram 12-10
White is seeking counterplay, but he cannot coordinate his forces well.
White also loses after 52.gxf5 gxf5 53.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{xc3} \)
54.\( \text{bxc3} \) b5-+
52...\( \text{b6}! \)
Black starts his active play on the queenside, since now the white rook is also absent from there.
53.gxf5 gxf5 54.\( \text{xc3} \) 54.\( \text{h4} \)
\( \text{xc3} \) 55.\( \text{h4} \)
is slightly better, but after
55...\( \text{d5} \) 56.\( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 57.\( \text{f4} \) b5-+ the black passed pawns quickly roll forward.
Diagram 12-11
54...\( \text{c3} \) t-+
The decisive blow.
55.\( \text{c1} \)
Other moves also lose: 55.\( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{c4} \) t-+ or
55.\( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{xa3} \) t-+-.
55...\( \text{b3} \) 56.\( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{xc2} \) 57.\( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{xa3} \) 58.\( \text{xe4} \)
Salov said after the game that he hated his imprisoned g2-bishop so much that he was almost relieved at this point! But of course a rook is too high a price to pay to free a bishop. All Black has to do now is to remain alert.
58...\( \text{xe4} \) 59.\( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 60.\( \text{d3} \) \( \text{g3} \) 61.\( \text{d2} \) \( \text{g8} \)
But not 61...\( \text{d5} \)?? 62.\( \text{h7} \) t-+-.
62.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d5} \) t 63.\( \text{c4} \) \( \text{e3} \) t 64.\( \text{c5} \) \( \text{g5} \) t 65.\( \text{b4} \)
\( \text{f5} \)!
The exchange of pieces makes the task easier.
66.\( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 67.\( \text{e4} \)
The final trap.
Diagram 12-12
67...\( \text{f1} \)
67...\( \text{xd4} \)?? is followed by 68.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{d5} \)
69.\( \text{g4} \) t-+.
68.\( \text{d5} \) \( \text{c7} \)
0-1

The most spectacular case of the exclusion of several pieces was one that I saw in one of our training tournaments.
38...c3!
After this move three (!!) white pieces are left without any possible moves. Despite his advantage in material White is worse.
39.$c2!?
39.$b2?!
39...$f7!
Black brings his knight to e5.
40.$b3?
White is in shock and cannot find a plan. He should try 40.$e4.
40...$e5
41.$h7 $xf3† 42.$h1 $xe1
42...$f6?!
43.$xe1 $d3 44.$xg7?
Desperation. 44.$f3† was a better defence.
44...$d2!+
The pawn phalanx decides the game.
45.$d3 $xd3 46.$h7† $xh7 47.$xc3 $xc3
48.$xc3 $d3 49.$d1 $xc3
0–1

Even if a piece is not totally shut in but is just limited in its mobility, this brings clear advantages. The strategy remains the same – **operate on the other flank**, open lines there, employ the extra piece there so as to have more pieces in the attack than the opponent can mobilize for the defence. It is also worth **swapping off your opponent's better pieces**, so as to leave him with the bad piece.

**Diagram 12-14**

E.Geller – H.Mecking
Palma de Mallorca 1970

17.b4!
The black knight is in a wretched position on b7, and White prevents it from coming into play via c5. White bases all his play on this bad piece!
17...$fc8 18.$f5 $f8 19.$h2!
A regrouping typical of the Ruy Lopez, in order to play on the kingside.
19...a5 20.\textbf{Be3}!

Geller wants to provoke the exchange on f5 and threatens \textbf{Bg}3. After the exchange his bishop on c2 becomes more active and the pawn gets to a promising attacking position. He also gets the use of the important e4-square.

20...\textbf{axb4} 21.\textbf{cxb4} \textbf{Bxf5} 22.\textbf{exf5} c3

Black does not want a slow death on the kingside, so he looks for counterplay with ...\textbf{Wc4}.

23.\textbf{Bg4}!

23.g4? can be met by 23...\textbf{Wc4}?!?, or first 23...h6 and then ...\textbf{Wc4}.

23...\textbf{Be7} 24.\textbf{Bxf6}† \textbf{Bxf6} 25.\textbf{Be4}†

\textbf{Diagram 12-15}

White consolidates his position and is ready to advance his pawns on the kingside. Black has no counterplay since his knight is absent without leave.

25...\textbf{Wd7} 26.\textbf{Wf3} \textbf{Ec7} 27.\textbf{h4} \textbf{Ee7} 28.\textbf{g3} \textbf{Bd8}

The knight is no better here either.

29.\textbf{a3} \textbf{Ec8} 30.\textbf{Bb1} \textbf{Ec7} 31.\textbf{We2} \textbf{Bb8} 32.\textbf{Bb3}

The pawn on c3 can also be attacked!

32...\textbf{Wd7} 33.\textbf{Wf3}

With a double threat - White intends to play g3-g4, and if Black plays 33...\textbf{Wc7} to prevent this, then 34.\textbf{Be3} follows with an attack on c3.

33...\textbf{Be7} 34.\textbf{Be3} \textbf{Bf6} 35.\textbf{Be4}

White repeats moves.

But not 35.\textbf{Bxc3}?! \textbf{Bxc3} 36.\textbf{Bxc3} because of 36...\textbf{e4}\textsuperscript{∞}.

35...\textbf{Be7}

\textbf{Diagram 12-16}

36.\textbf{g4}! \textbf{f6}

Otherwise White plays g4-g5 with a powerful attack: 36...\textbf{Bc8} 37.\textbf{g5} g6 38.\textbf{f6}+-

Not 36...\textbf{Bxh4}? on account of 37.\textbf{g5}+-.

37.\textbf{Be3} \textbf{Bf7}

The knight at last gets some breathing space, but unfortunately it is too late.

38.\textbf{Bxc3}+- \textbf{Bc8} 39.\textbf{Be4}!

Blocks the e-pawn so that Black cannot try ...\textbf{e4} followed by ...\textbf{B}e5.

39...\textbf{Bd8} 40.\textbf{Bd2}

Exploiting the outpost with 40.\textbf{Bc6}! would have been even better.

40...\textbf{Bc4} 41.\textbf{Bxc4} \textbf{Bxc4}
After 41...bxc4 Geller had planned 42.c3 followed by b1-a2 and e4, when the c4-pawn would fall.

42.c3 b6 43.xc4 bxc4

Diagram 12-17

44.g5!

Even after some exchanges, this attack is strong enough.

44...fxg5 45.hxg5 d8 46.h5 c3 47.e3!

Threatening g5-g6. The immediate 47.f6 was also strong.

47...h6 48.f6

And Black could not find a defence.

1–0
Exercises
Solutions

Ex. 12-1

N.Short – V.Kramnik

London 2011

19...d5!!

(2 points)

“And that was that! Now the b3-bishop is dead for the remainder of the game. Black is playing with an extra piece! Winning this was no more than trouble for a Kramnik than playing a few scales...” – Poldauf

19...a5 (1 point) is also good.

20.£e5 c6 21.£ae1 £c7 22.£e5£c8 23.a4 £d7 24.£h4 £xe2 25.£e2 £e8 26.£xe8£xe8 27.£g3 £d8 28.£e5£f6 29.£e8 £g6 30.axb5 axb5 31.£f1 £f7 32.£e2 £e6 33.£e3 £b6 (34.£e2 £h5 35.£a2 g5 36.£b3 £f5 37.£a2 £f4 38.£b3 £f5 39.£d6 £g4 40.£f1 £g3 41.£xg3 £xg3 42.£xg3 £xf3 43.£a2 £e3) 0–1

Ex. 12-2

D.Bronstein – A.Beliavsky

USSR Ch, Yerevan 1975

34.£d1!!

(2 points)

Since the black bishop on g6 cannot join the play, White aims to exchange some superfluous pieces and to play on the queenside.

34...£xh5 £xh5 35.£xh5 (1 consolation point) is not very promising: 35...g6 36.£f4=

34...£ed7 35.£xd7 £xd7 36.£d1£xd1† 37.£xd1 £d6 38.£c2 a5 39.a4 £b6?! 40.£d3 £c7?

Better is 40...£c5.

41.£d4 £c8 42.b4 axb4 43.cx£b4 £e7 44.a5 £f6

44...£c6† 45.£xc6 £xc6 46.£c4 £g6 45.g£f6 £xf6 46.£c5 £f7 47.b5 £c8 48.£b6 1–0

Ex. 12-3

Y.Nikolaevsky – G.Kasparov

Moscow 1976

18.e5£f6 (1 point)

The knight on a5 is out of the game.

18...£xe5 19.£xd7!! £xd7 20.£xe5 £d6 21.£g4 h5 22.£e5 £f6 23.£e3 £ad8 24.£f3 £g7 25.£e1± £d6 26.b4 26...£b7 27.£a3 a5 28.bxa5 £xa5 29.£a4 £h6 30.£ee3 h4 31.gxh4 £xh4 32.£xf7 32.£c2? 32...£f6?

33.£x£f6 £xf6 34.£h6† £g7 35.£g4 £d4 36.£xe7† £h8 37.h3+ £c3 38.£d7 £xh3 39.£e£e3 £f3 40.£e7 £h3 41.£e6 £h5 42.£e8 £g7 43.£d7† £f7 44.£c8 £h7 45.d6 g5 46.d7 £b1† 47.£g2

Right to the end of the game, the knight on a5 never took an active part.

1–0

Ex. 12-4

V.Zvjaginsev – S.Volkov

Samara 1998

The following annotations are based on analysis by Zvjaginsev.

21.g4!

(3 points)

This game is a lovely example of how to target the play against a knight. White also shuts out the second black knight.

Any of the following suggestions earn 1 consolation point:

a) 21...£b7 is not so clear on account of 21...£f8 followed by ...£f5–e7.

b) 21.h3 is met either by 21...£f6 (intending ...£f7), or by 21...£f5?! 22.g4 £h4.

c) 21...£xh6 gx£h6± gives White some advantage, but not enough.

21...£f8?!
Solutions

Nor can the bishop find a good position.
21...\texttt{\texttt{Qd7}} 22.\texttt{Qc6}! \texttt{Qf8} (22...\texttt{Qf8} 23.\texttt{Qb7}+- or 22...\texttt{Qa3} 23.\texttt{Qb7} \texttt{Qf8} 24.\texttt{Qa7}+-) 23.\texttt{Qxe7}+ \texttt{Qxe7} 24.\texttt{Qb8}+-
21...\texttt{Qxg4}?! 22.\texttt{Qg1} \texttt{Qxe5}+
22.\texttt{Qh3} f5?!  
When you don't have any good moves, all you can find are bad ones...
23.\texttt{Qxh6} \texttt{Qxg4} 24.\texttt{Qh2}!+ \texttt{Qxh6} 25.\texttt{Qxg4} \texttt{Qd7} 26.\texttt{Qb7} h5 27.\texttt{Qxd7} \texttt{Qxg4} 28.\texttt{Qxg4} \texttt{Qb8} 29.\texttt{Qc6} \texttt{Qb2}+ 30.\texttt{Qf3} \texttt{Qa3} 31.\texttt{Qg5} \texttt{Qb6} 32.\texttt{Qc7} \texttt{Qb2} 33.\texttt{Qg4} \texttt{Qa6} 33...\texttt{Qxd4} 34.\texttt{Qxd4} \texttt{Qb4} 35.\texttt{Qe7} \texttt{Qxd4}+ 36.f4+- 34.\texttt{g6} \texttt{Qa1} 35.\texttt{Qe7}+ \texttt{Qh8} 36.\texttt{Qg5} \texttt{Qc1} 37.\texttt{Qf6} 1-0

Ex. 12-5

\textbf{A.Yusupov – A.Lein}

Minneapolis 2005

27...\texttt{b5}!

(1 point)

28.\texttt{Qd3} \texttt{Qb8}!\texttt{xf}

(another 1 point)

Black activates his queen and plans \ldots \texttt{Qxb6}. The \texttt{Qb2}-knight is now very badly positioned.

Ex. 12-6

\textbf{A.Lilienthal – M.Botvinnik}

USSR Ch, Moscow 1940

The annotations to this exercise and the next three are based on analysis by Lilienthal.

14.\texttt{Qd2}!

(2 points)

White forces the \texttt{Qb4}-knight away to a bad position.
14.\texttt{Qb3} a5 15.a3 \texttt{Qa6}! achieves nothing.
However 14.\texttt{Qc4}?! (also 2 points) would probably be very similar to game: 14...\texttt{a5} 15.a3 \texttt{Qa6} (15...\texttt{Qa6}?! 16.\texttt{Qb3} \texttt{Qxe2} 17.axb4 axb4 18.\texttt{Qxa8} \texttt{Qxa8} 19.\texttt{Qc2}!+) 16.b4 \texttt{Qf6} 17.\texttt{Qb1} axb4 18.axb4 \texttt{Qb8} 19.\texttt{d3}± (Dvoretsky).

14...\texttt{a5}  
Better is 14...\texttt{c5} (Botvinnik) 15.\texttt{dxc6} \texttt{Qxc6} 16.\texttt{Qd3}±
15.\texttt{a3} \texttt{Qa6} 16.\texttt{b4}!±  
Shutting out the \texttt{Qa6}-knight.
16...\texttt{Qf6} 17.\texttt{Qb2} \texttt{Qd7}  
After 17...\texttt{Qxb2} 18.\texttt{Qxb2} \texttt{Qf6} 19.\texttt{Qxf6} \texttt{Qxf6} 20.\texttt{Qd3}± the weakness of the \texttt{Qc7}-pawn and the \texttt{Qa6}-knight gives White a clear advantage.
18.\texttt{Qxf6} \texttt{Qxf6} 19.\texttt{Qd3}  
White now threatens \texttt{Qxa5}.
The immediate 19.\texttt{bxa5}? could be met by 19...\texttt{Qc5} threatening \ldots \texttt{Qb3}.
19...\texttt{a4}  
19...axb4 20.axb4 \texttt{Qb5} 21.\texttt{Qf4} (or 21.\texttt{Qa3} followed by \texttt{Qfa1}) 21...\texttt{Qxb4} 22.\texttt{Qxb4} \texttt{Qxb4} 23.\texttt{Qxa8}+ \texttt{Qxa8} 24.\texttt{Qa1} \texttt{Qf8} 25.\texttt{Qa4} c5 26.\texttt{dxc6} \texttt{Qxc6} 27.\texttt{Qd5}+ \texttt{Qh8} 28.\texttt{Qg6}!± (Lilienthal).
20.\texttt{Qac1}  
Black has weaknesses on \texttt{Qc7}, \texttt{Qc6} and \texttt{Qe6}.
20...\texttt{Qf7} 21.\texttt{Qf4} \texttt{Qc8} 22.\texttt{Qc3} \texttt{Qd7} 23.\texttt{Qfc1} \texttt{h6}?!  
See Ex. 12-7.

Ex. 12-7

\textbf{A.Lilienthal – M.Botvinnik}

USSR Ch, Moscow 1940

24.\texttt{Qh4}!  
(2 points)

White is so well placed that he has several good moves to choose from: 24.\texttt{Qd3}, 24.\texttt{Qd4}, 24.\texttt{e3} or 24.\texttt{Qf3} (1 point for any of these).
However I prefer Lilienthal’s move. It fixes the weaknesses on the kingside, where he will shortly be attacking. The knight on \texttt{Qa6} and the rook on \texttt{Qa8} remain cut off from the play.
24...\texttt{Qa7}  
24...\texttt{g5} 25.\texttt{Qxg5} \texttt{hxg5} 26.\texttt{Qe6}+-
25.\texttt{h5}  
Now \texttt{g6} is a serious weakness.
25...\texttt{Qa8} 26.\texttt{Qe3}!  
Even better than 26.e3 (\texttt{Qxf1}) 26...\texttt{b5}±.
26...\texttt{Qh7}  
Or 26...\texttt{Qe8} 27.\texttt{Qe3}.

147
Solutions

27...Nc3 Bb8 28.Nd3 Qa8 29.Qg6 Bxg6
30.hxg6+ Qxg6
30...Qxg6 31.Qe7+
31.Qe6†

Another good move is 31.g4!+-.

31...Kh7 32.g4f+ c5 33.b5

Or 33.Qxd6 cxb4 34.axb4 Qxb4 35.Qg3 f4 36.Qe3+-.

33...Qc7 34.gxf5 Qxb5 35.f6+ Qg8 36.Qe4 Be8 37.Qg4 g5 38.Qxe8+ Qxe8 39.Qe5+ Qf8 40.Qc7 Qg6 41.Qxe4 Qh5 42.Qf3 Qg6
33...Qxe8?! Black loses after 33...Qxe8 34.Qh7 Qf7 35.Qxh6+ Qg8 36.Qh5+-.

1-0

Ex. 12-8

A. Lilienthal – P. Keres

Leningrad 1941

In this game too, the knight remains excluded from the play.

26.Qe2!

(2 points)

26...Qb8

The knight is Black’s main problem.

If 26...Qb4? then 27.Qd2 and White threatens a2-a3.

26...Qa5? is bad on account of 27.Qc4.

26...b5 is followed by 27.Rc1 Qxc1 28.Qxc1 Qxc1+ 29.Qg2 d6 30.Qxb5 Qc5 31.Qe2 and then 32.Qc4+-.

27.Rd2 Qf8 28.Qc2 Qa3 29.Qc4

29.Qfc1? Qxc1+ is not clear.

29...Qb4 30.Qfc1 Qfd8+ See Ex. 12-9.

Ex. 12-9

A. Lilienthal – P. Keres

Leningrad 1941

31.h4!

(2 points)

As in the game against Botvinnik, White makes use of his positional superiority and better lines of communication for an attack on the kingside. There he will have one piece more in the action than his opponent.

31...Qxf8 32.Qe3 Qxc2 33.Qxc2 Qc8 34.Qxc8 Qxc8 35.Qf3 Qg7 36.Qg4 Qf8

36...Qd8 (Fine) is slightly better: 37.h5 d6 38.Qe3 g5 39.h6+ Qf7 40.Qf3+-

37.Qh5!

Threatening 38.h6+.

37...Qxh5 38.Qe3 d6 39.Qf5+ Qg6 40.Qc3 Qa6 41.Qc6 Qc5 42.f3

This is more precise than 42.Qxd6.

42...Qd3 43.Qc7 b5 44.Qxa7

1-0

Ex. 12-10

T. Petrosian – S. Gligoric

Bled/Zagreb/Belgrade Candidates 1959

The following annotations are based on analysis by Petrosian.

21.Qc4?!

21.Qxe5 Qxe5! 22.Qc4 f4± is equally unclear.

A stronger option is 21.a4!±.

(2 points)

Not only the c8-bishop, but also the a8-rook remains shut out.

21...Qxf4 22.Qxf4 b5 23.Qd2

23.Qa5 Qxc3 24.Qxc3 Qe4† 25.Qg1 Qxb4 26.Qe1 Qe4†

23...Qe4 24.Qxf6 Qxf6 25.Qf3?!

25.Qb3? is stronger, with the point that 25...Qxc3?! 26.Qxc3 Qe4† 27.Qf3! Qxb4?! 28.Qg1+ gives White a strong attack on the kingside.

25...a5?

Ex. 12-11

H. Wolf – A. Alekhine

Karlsbad 1923

27...a5!

(2 points)
The b2-bishop has been cut off. You have already seen the author using the same idea in Salov – Yusupov on page 138.

28.g4  f7 29.a3 b6 30.h4 g6! 31.f1 h5!+ 32.fxg6+ xg6 33.exh5+ f7 34.g1 e6 35.h6 h8 36.eg6 ef8 0–1

Ex. 12-12

I. Boleslavsky – I. Bondarevsky
Tbilisi 1951

The following annotations are based on analysis by Boleslavsky.

20.b4+ (1 point)

This standard move highlights the weakness of the b7-knight.

20...eac8 21.g4 d8

Black could try 21...f6!? followed by ...d8-f7.

21...exg4?! 22.hxg4 d7 23.g5±

22.e2 f5?! 23.exf5 xf5

Better is 23...xf5.

24.h6+ h8 25.g4?+&

Black’s g7-knight is also poorly placed.

25...e8

Black should try: 25...e4 26.xf5 xf5 27.xf5 xc1 28.xc1 xf5 29.gxf5 xf5 30.e4±

26.gxf5

26.d4!

26..xf5

26...h5 27.g5! xg5 28.xh5 xh5 29.xg5+ 27.xe5! d4

Black is losing in all lines:

a) 27..dxe5 28.xe5+ f6 29.xe8+-

b) 27..xh6 28.xd7 xd7 29.xe7 xe7 30.xe7 f7 31.xe1! xh2 32.xh6+-

c) 27..xc2 28.xc2 xh6 (28...d4 29.exf7+ xf7 30.xf7+ xf7 31.xe7+-)

29.xd7 g6+ 30.h1 xc2 31.xf8 xf8 32.xh6 xe2 33.xe2 xh6 34.xe7+-

28.e4

28.exf7+ xf7 29.xf7+ xf7 30.xe7 g8+--

28..xc2 29.xd7 xe1

29.xd7 30.xe7 xh3 31.xc2 g8+ 32.g5+--

30.xf8 xf8

30..xf3+ 31 xf3 xc1+ 32.xc1 xf8 33.xf6+ g7 34.f6 g6+ 35.xh1+--

31.xc8 xc8 32.xe1 g7 33.e6 1–0

Scoring

Maximum number of points is 23

20 points and above ➔ Excellent
16 points and above ➔ Good
12 points ➔ Pass mark

If you scored less than 12 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Playing against pieces

In this chapter we shall continue with the theme of ‘restricting the activity of the opponent’s pieces’. As has already been mentioned, directing the play against specific opposing pieces can lead to a great advantage.

Shutting out a piece represents the ideal case, but it can be useful enough simply to be able to control squares which are important for the opposing piece. Of course our pawns are the most suited to this task.

The following classic game shows that even the greatest expert in this field (see the exercises!) – former World Champion Anatoly Karpov – can be defeated with his own weapons.

The victor – Garry Kasparov – went on to win the World Championship. In my opinion this game is the best in the history of chess, because it brings together on the one hand prophylactic thinking and playing against pieces, and on the other fantastic tactical ideas and very precise calculation of variations.

Diagram 13-1

A.Karpov – G.Kasparov
World Ch (16), Moscow 1985

The following annotations are based on analysis by Kasparov.

Kasparov had prepared an interesting positional pawn sacrifice. Black has active play, but still no concrete threats. Kasparov plays purely prophylactically, first preventing the move \( \text{c}\text{e}4 \) as well as the possible development of the other knight to c4.

14...\text{e}8! 15.\text{d}2

15.\text{c}4 is followed by 15...\text{d}3, and if 16.\text{e}2? then 16...\text{e}2!\text{f}.

15...\text{b}5

A very typical move; Black once again prevents \( \text{c}\text{c}4 \) and prepares a possible advance...b4.

16.\text{ad}1

Karpov underestimates his opponent’s initiative.
But also after 16.\textit{f}4 \textit{g}6 17.\textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 18.\textit{xf}6 gxf6\textdagger Black is well placed.

**Diagram 13-2**

16...\textit{d}3\textdagger

This is the ideal place for the knight. The threat is ...\textit{b}4.

17.\textit{ab}1?

White continues to be unable to find a good position for his knight.

17.\textit{e}2? would be bad on account of 17...\textit{xf}2 18.\textit{xf}2 \textit{b}4\textdagger.

White should play 17.d6! here, though after 17...\textit{xd}6 18.\textit{xa}8 \textit{xa}8 Black has a dangerous initiative, for example 19.\textit{c}2? \textit{g}4!++.

17...\textit{h}6! 18.\textit{h}4 \textit{b}4!

**Diagram 13-3**

19.\textit{a}4

Now the significance of Black’s 17th move becomes clear. The natural retreat of the knight, 19.\textit{e}2, is followed by 19...\textit{g}5 20.\textit{hxg}5 \textit{xf}2 21.\textit{xf}2 hxg5 22.\textit{xf}5\textdagger \textit{g}6 23.\textit{d}2 \textit{xf}2\textdagger and White is in trouble. For example: 24.\textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 25.\textit{xd}5 \textit{xe}2 26.\textit{xa}8 \textit{xf}2\textdagger 27.\textit{h}1 (or 27.\textit{f}1 \textit{d}3++) 27...\textit{c}2 and Black wins.

19...\textit{d}6

This secures the f4-square for the black minor pieces. Kasparov continues to play with great care and forestalls every freeing operation open to his opponent.

20.\textit{g}3

20.\textit{c}2? is followed by 20...\textit{c}8 21.\textit{b}3 \textit{f}4 22.\textit{c}1 \textit{xc}1 23.\textit{xc}1 \textit{g}5 24.\textit{g}3 \textit{g}4++.

20...\textit{c}8

Black also deprives White of the c2-square. The queen too no longer has a move.

21.\textit{b}3

**Diagram 13-4**

21...\textit{g}5\textdagger

Another brilliant prophylactic move. White wanted to bring his bad knight from a4 to b2 and swap off the good black knight on d3.

22.\textit{xd}6

22.\textit{b}2? now loses to 22...\textit{xb}2 23.\textit{xb}2 \textit{g}4.

22.\textit{e}2? is bad because of 22...\textit{e}4++.

22...\textit{xd}6 23.\textit{g}3
White again prepares to offer the exchange of the knight, since his bishop has the g2-square and no longer has to fear the move ...g4. But Kasparov finds another brilliant piece of prophylaxis!

23...\texttt{d7}!! 24.\texttt{g2}

The following variation illustrates Kasparov's brilliant idea: 24.\texttt{b2} \texttt{f6}!! 25.\texttt{x}d3?! (25.\texttt{c}4\texttt{f}) 25...\texttt{x}d3 26.\texttt{x}d3 \texttt{e}5--+ and White loses not a minor piece, but the queen!

24...\texttt{f6}!

Once more Black does not let the knight back into the game.

25.a3 a5 26.axb4 axb4 27.\texttt{a}2

With the hope of at least activating the second knight via d2.

27...\texttt{g6}!

Black also prevents \texttt{d}2.

28.\texttt{d}6

28.\texttt{d}2? \texttt{e}2--

28...\texttt{g}4!--

Depriving White of the h3-square.

29.\texttt{d}2

White no longer has any useful moves.

29...\texttt{g}7 30.\texttt{f}3

In his desperation, White tries to open the game. Of course, Kasparov can now fully deploy his active pieces.

If 30.f4, then 30...\texttt{f}5!--.

30...\texttt{x}d6

This pawn is removed now, because otherwise it might divert Black from his attack.

31.\texttt{f}xg4 \texttt{d}4† 32.\texttt{h}1 \texttt{f}6!!

The attacking part of the game is also a joy to behold. Kasparov finds the most active positions for his pieces. The knight is going to e4.

33.\texttt{f}4

Or 33.\texttt{h}3 \texttt{e}3! 34.\texttt{f}4 \texttt{e}5--.

33...\texttt{e}4 34.\texttt{x}d3

Other moves lose even more quickly.

34...\texttt{f}2† 35.\texttt{x}f2

35.\texttt{g}1 is equally hopeless: 35...\texttt{h}3† 36.\texttt{h}1 \texttt{xd}3 37.\texttt{xd}3 \texttt{e}1† 38.\texttt{f}1 \texttt{x}f4--
35...\textit{\texttt{a}}xd3 36.\textit{\texttt{b}}fd2 \textit{\texttt{e}}e3!→
Kasparov finishes the game in great style.

37.\textit{\texttt{a}}xd3

\textbf{Diagram 13-8}

37...\textit{\texttt{c}}e1!! 38.\textit{\texttt{b}}b2
Too late...

38...\textit{\texttt{f}}f2!\textit{\texttt{!}}
The threat is \textit{\texttt{e}}e1†...

39.\textit{\texttt{d}}d2 \textit{\texttt{x}}xd1†
Or 39...\texttt{e}e2† with mate next move.

40.\textit{\texttt{a}}xd1 \textit{\texttt{e}}e1†
With mate in two moves.

0–1

When a piece is apparently well placed, but is not getting proper support from the other pieces, if can for all practical purposes be isolated. This technique is illustrated in the following example.

\textbf{Diagram 13-9}

\texttt{B.Larsen – J.Donner}
Beverwijk 1960

26.h\texttt{h}1
As Larsen said, the d4-knight is quite good and deserves a little respect! White plays in such a way that the knight is never really properly deployed. 26.\texttt{x}xe5?! is followed by 26...\texttt{x}xa2\textit{\texttt{!}}.

But there is nothing wrong with the active move 26.\texttt{ed}6± and White takes charge in the centre.

26...\textit{\texttt{d}}d5 27.\textit{\texttt{f}}f1 \textit{\texttt{e}}e6 28.\textit{\texttt{f}}f2 \textit{\texttt{f}}f7 29.\textit{\texttt{d}}df1
Threatening 30.\textit{\texttt{g}}g5.
The immediate 29.\texttt{g}g5? is bad: 29...\textit{\texttt{x}}g3† 30.\texttt{hx}g3 \textit{\texttt{xf}f}2→

29...\texttt{xc}4 30.\texttt{xc}4
30.\texttt{xc}4? \texttt{e}e3\textit{\texttt{!}}

30...\text{h}h6
If 30...h6? then 31.g4+++.
31.\texttt{xf}f7 \texttt{xf}f7

\textbf{Diagram 13-10}

32.\texttt{d}d1†
White attacks the a4-pawn and at the same time prepares the transfer of his queen to the kingside. Take good note of the isolated position of the knight on d4!
...Re5 33.Rh5 Rc7 34.Rh3 Rg6?
Black also takes the rook out of the play.
34...Rc8? would also be bad on account of
35.Rg5+-.
34...Rc7± was required.
35.Rg4 Rg6
35...Re6? loses to 36.Re6! Rx6 37.Rx6.
36.Rd1 Ra7

White prepares the decisive penetration of the queen
via b6. The black pieces are totally uncoordinated.
37...Qd8?
37...Qd8 would be more resilient: 38.Rb6 Rc7±
38.Rb6! Ra8=*
38...Rx6 39.cxb6+-
39.Qxg5 Rg5 40.Qc7 h6

41.Qc1
Straight past the black pieces!
41...Rh7
After 42.Qg2! the black position collapses, while
42.Qb8 Ra6 43.f1! e4 44.Qc6+- is also strong.
1–0

The following methods are available to us to limit the
activity of the opposing pieces:
1) Exchanging active pieces.
2) Driving pieces away from active positions, often
by attacking them with a pawn or a piece of lesser
value.
3) Controlling the squares to which the opposing
pieces can move.

Effective play against the opposing pieces restricts the
opponent's options and can lead to the isolation or
shutting out of a piece, or even to the capture of a
piece.
Exercises

Ex. 13-1

Ex. 13-4

Ex. 13-2

Ex. 13-5

Ex. 13-3

Ex. 13-6
Exercises

Ex. 13-7

Ex. 13-10

Ex. 13-8

Ex. 13-11

Ex. 13-9

Ex. 13-12
Solutions

Ex. 13-1

A.Karpov – V.Bagirov

USSR Ch, Riga 1970

21.b4!  
(1 point)
A logical move, which forces away the black knight.

21...c6? would be bad: 22.Axe6±

The alternative would be to sacrifice a pawn: 21...c4!? 22.Axc4 dxc4 23.Axc4 Bxd5 24.Bd3± and White may continue with Bb3 and Bc5.

22.Af4! Bbd6 23.Ba5±  
(another 1 point)

23...Axe5 24.Axe5 Aa7
See Ex. 13-5.

Ex. 13-2

A.Karpov – G.Kuzmin

Leningrad 1973

19.f4!  
(2 points)
Depriving the knights of the e5-square.

19...Bfd8 20.a3!
Note how well Karpov handles his pawns. He takes further control of the b4-square, so now he can reply to 20...d4 with 21.c4 without any worries.

See Ex. 13-6.

Ex. 13-3

A.Karpov – E.Torre

Leningrad 1973

21.b3!±  
(2 points)
This typical idea prepares Aa3 and prevents the black knight coming to c4. Torre now fails to see that his queen is getting into danger and quickly loses the game.

21...Aa7?!  
It is hard to give good advice here. 21...a5 is followed by 22.Aa3 Aa4 23.Axb4 axb4 24.Bd2±.

22.Aa3 Bf7?!

If 22...Afc8, then 23.Ag3 Bf4 24.Ag2 Bf7 25.Ag5 Be8 26.Bf7++.  

23.Bg4! Be4

After 23...Bf4 24.Ag1 Bf4 the queen is lost to both 25.Ag5+ and 25.Ag3++.  

24.Ag5


1-0

Ex. 13-4

A.Karpov – V.Hort

Moscow 1971

23.h4!  
(2 points)
Now White can chase away the knight at the right moment. And in addition the pawn is safer on h4, since the bishop can protect it from g5.

23.Bb4 (1 point) is less precise: 23...Cc7 (23...0-0-0? 24.Ag5++) 24.Ag5 Bf5 25.h4 (25.Bxb7? f6) 25...e6±  

23...Cc2 is followed by 23...Cc2 24.Ag3 Bf5† 25.Ag3 Bxh2++.  

23...Bf5

Black must avoid both 23...Bh4? 24.Ag5 Bf2? 25.Bb5+ and 23...0-0-0 24.Ag5++.  

24.Ag4!  
Once more White prevents long castling.

24...Bf6  
24...0-0-0? 25.Ag5+  

25.h5


25...Cc7  
25...Cc7? 26.Ag4++
26.\textit{E}f4 \textit{W}e5 27.\textit{E}f3?! 

It is better to give the e2-bishop additional protection: 27.\textit{E}f2! 0–0–0 (27...\textit{E}xd5 28.\textit{E}f3 \textit{O}c7 29.\textit{O}xb7++ 28.\textit{O}c2±) 27...\textit{O}c2±

27...\textit{E}xd5?! 27...0–0–0! is more resilient, and if 28.\textit{E}d3?! \textit{O}dg8 29.\textit{O}c2? then 29...\textit{O}xh6++. 

28.\textit{E}d3 \textit{E}xh6 29.\textit{E}xd5 \textit{W}e4 30.\textit{E}d3 \textit{W}h1†? 30...\textit{W}h7±

31.\textit{O}c2 \textit{W}xa1 32.\textit{W}xh6 \textit{O}e5 33.\textit{W}g5

Black overstepped the time limit. But White is by now almost winning: 33...\textit{W}f8 34.\textit{h}6± or 33...\textit{d}8 34.\textit{h}6 (or 34.\textit{O}xb3++) 34...\textit{O}xa2 35.\textit{O}e3 \textit{W}a4† 36.\textit{O}b1 \textit{d}7 37.\textit{W}g4† \textit{d}6 38.\textit{h}7 \textit{W}h8 39.\textit{O}f3† \textit{d}7 40.\textit{O}xe5 \textit{dxe}5 41.\textit{O}f5†++. 

1–0

\textbf{Ex. 13-5}

\begin{center}
\textbf{A.Karpov – V.Bagirov}  
USSR Ch, Riga 1970
\end{center}

25.\textit{O}b3?!  

(2 points)

Understandably Karpov does not want to exchange the bad b7-knight. 

25.\textit{O}d3 (1 point) is less clear: 25...\textit{O}xc5 26.\textit{E}xc5±  

25.\textit{O}a4 (1 point) denies the b6-square to the black queen, but the reply 25...\textit{f}6 offers Black counterplay. 

25.\textit{O}a6 is even less promising: 25...\textit{O}xc5 26.\textit{E}xc5 \textit{W}b6 27.\textit{O}d3 \textit{f}6±

Nor does 25.\textit{W}a4 promise anything: 25...\textit{O}xc5 26.\textit{E}xc5 \textit{f}6±

25...\textit{W}b6 25...\textit{f}6 is followed by 26.\textit{O}d4 \textit{O}xd4 27.\textit{W}xd4±, and if 27...\textit{W}b6, then 28.\textit{W}xb6 \textit{axb}6 29.\textit{f}4! The b7-knight remains out of the game.

26.\textit{O}d3 \textit{O}c7 26...\textit{a}5 27.\textit{O}xf5 \textit{exf}5 28.\textit{W}d4!±

27.\textit{W}g4!  

White threatens 28.\textit{W}xh7† \textit{O}xh7 29.\textit{W}h4† \textit{g}8 30.\textit{W}xe7.

The queen move is also aimed against 27...\textit{a}5, which is answered by 28.\textit{b}5 and Black cannot continue 28...\textit{a}4.

27...\textit{f}5?!  

A strategic mistake; Black closes the game, after which he gets almost no counterplay. 

Better counterplay existed after 27...\textit{f}6? 28.\textit{W}h4 \textit{g}6 29.\textit{W}xg6 \textit{hxg}6 30.\textit{W}g3 \textit{W}bd8?!± or 27...\textit{g}6?! 28.\textit{W}xg6 \textit{hxg}6 29.\textit{O}c3 \textit{W}e8±.

28.\textit{W}d4?!  

Less convincing is: 28.\textit{Exf}6 \textit{Exf}6 29.\textit{W}g3 \textit{W}b8 30.\textit{O}c7 \textit{W}d6±

28...\textit{O}d8  

See Ex. 13-8.

\textbf{Ex. 13-6}

\begin{center}
\textbf{A.Karpov – G.Kuzmin}  
Leningrad 1973
\end{center}

27.\textit{g}4!  

(3 points)

Karpov takes advantage of the opportunity to strengthen his position on the kingside. But it would be equally good to first slip in 27.\textit{b}4! (also 3 points).

27...\textit{E}c7 28.\textit{g}5 \textit{E}h8 29.\textit{E}g3! \textit{O}c5 30.\textit{E}f5

The alternatives 30.\textit{E}h2! and 30.\textit{g}6! are both very strong.

30...\textit{g}6  

See Ex. 13-9.

\textbf{Ex. 13-7}

\begin{center}
\textbf{A.Karpov – W.Uhlmann}  
Madrid 1973
\end{center}

The annotations to this exercise are based on analysis by Karpov.

22.\textit{g}4!!±  

(3 points)

Typical Karpov! He is already thinking of the endgame to come and deprives the bishop of the f5-square. (Otherwise after the wholesale exchanges on d4 Black would be able to bring his bishop to e6 and block the important e-file.)

158
The ‘normal’ moves 22...d2 and 22.f3 earn you 1 consolation point.

22...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{x}}xd4
22...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}ac8 looks to be a better option.

23.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}xd4  \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}xd4} 24.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}xd4  \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}ac8} 25.f3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}g6
26.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}e7 b6}}
Black could try 26...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}c2.

27.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}ae1 h6 28.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}b7 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}d6
28...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}c2 29.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}e2 \texttt{\textbf{E}}xe2 30.\texttt{\textbf{E}}xe2 \texttt{\textbf{E}}d6
31.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}b5± Karpov loves positions like this, where his opponent has no counterplay!

29.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}ee7 h5
29...h7!? was worth considering.
29...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}c2!? is followed by 30.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}b8† \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}h7
31.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}e8 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}c1† 32.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}h2 \texttt{\textbf{E}}b1 33.f4 and now:
   a) 33...f5 34.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}h8† \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}g6 and now 35.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}b8!± or 35.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}e8†++.}
   b) 33...g6 34.g5!+-
   c) 33...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}e4 34.f5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}g6 (34...g5 35.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}h8† \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}g7
36.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}bg8† \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}f6 37.\texttt{\textbf{E}}xh6† \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}c7 38.\texttt{\textbf{E}}e8#) 35.f6
   g6 36.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}g8! \texttt{\textbf{E}}xf6 37.\texttt{\textbf{E}}xh8† \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}g7 38.\texttt{\textbf{E}}bg8#
   d) 33...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}g6! 34.\texttt{\textbf{E}}e7±

30.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}xh5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}xh5
See Ex. 13-12.

Ex. 13-8
\textbf{A.Karpov – V.Bagirov}
USSR Ch Riga 1970

29.b5!?
(2 points)
Logical play; once more the black knights are deprived of some squares.

In a good position there are usually a lot of good moves. For that reason you also get 2 points for the following suggestions: 29...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}fe1, 29.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}c5 or 29.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}c5.

29...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}g5?}
Black will try to attack the e5-pawn.
29...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}f7!? was also worth considering.

30.a4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}g6 31.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}a1!}
Another strong option is 31...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}fe1! \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}f7
32.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}c5, intending 32...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}fc8 33.a5!±.

31...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}b7!}
Better is 31...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}f4 32...\texttt{\textbf{E}}fd1±.

32.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}fe1 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}g7
32...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}c8!? could be tried here or on the next move.

33.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}c5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}f7 34.a5
35.\texttt{\textbf{E}}a6±

34...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}e7 35.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}a6 \texttt{\textbf{E}}a8 36.\texttt{\textbf{E}}f1! \textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}f7 37.\texttt{\textbf{E}}c7
\texttt{\textbf{E}}d8
37...\texttt{\textbf{E}}b8 38.\texttt{\textbf{E}}b6 axb6 39.a6+-

38.\texttt{\textbf{E}}c6 \texttt{\textbf{E}}f8 39.\texttt{\textbf{E}}b6! \texttt{\textbf{E}}xb6 40.a6+- \texttt{\textbf{E}}h6
40...\texttt{\textbf{E}}d4 41.\texttt{\textbf{E}}c4+-

41.\texttt{\textbf{E}}ec1 \texttt{\textbf{E}}g4 42.a7 \texttt{\textbf{E}}xe5 43.\texttt{\textbf{E}}c2 \texttt{\textbf{E}}c4
44.a8\texttt{\textbf{E}}d8 45.\texttt{\textbf{E}}xa8 b5 46.\texttt{\textbf{E}}a2
1-0

Ex. 13-9
\textbf{A.Karpov – G.Kuzmin}
Leningrad 1973

31.b4!
(2 points)
Karpov solves the problem of the e4-square. Things would not be so clear after 31.\texttt{\textbf{E}}h2 \texttt{\textbf{E}}g7, nor after 31.\texttt{\textbf{E}}d3 \texttt{\textbf{E}}xd3 32.\texttt{\textbf{E}}xd3 \texttt{\textbf{E}}d7
33.\texttt{\textbf{E}}h2 \texttt{\textbf{E}}xh2 34.\texttt{\textbf{E}}xh2 \texttt{\textbf{E}}c7 35.\texttt{\textbf{E}}g4 \texttt{\textbf{E}}f5†?.

31...\texttt{\textbf{E}}e4†
31...\texttt{\textbf{E}}d7?! 32.\texttt{\textbf{E}}xg6! \texttt{\textbf{E}}xg6 33.\texttt{\textbf{E}}xg6+-
31...\texttt{\textbf{E}}xf5? 32.bxc5 \texttt{\textbf{E}}d7 33.\texttt{\textbf{E}}h2 \texttt{\textbf{E}}g7
34.\texttt{\textbf{E}}h4+-

32.\texttt{\textbf{E}}xe4 \texttt{\textbf{E}}xe4 33.\texttt{\textbf{E}}xe4 \texttt{\textbf{E}}g7
See Ex. 13-11.

Ex. 13-10
\textbf{L.Ljubojevic – A.Karpov}
Moscow 1977

27...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbf{E}}f5!
(2 points)
Black does not allow the h2-knight into the game.
With 27...\texttt{\textbf{E}}d5? (1 point), White intends 28.\texttt{\textbf{E}}f3 (28.\texttt{\textbf{E}}f1 \texttt{\textbf{E}}e5) 28...\texttt{\textbf{E}}xb2. But after 29.\texttt{\textbf{E}}d4 g6 30.\texttt{\textbf{E}}c2 the position is not totally clear.

If 27...\texttt{\textbf{E}}d5, then 28.\texttt{\textbf{E}}f1=.

28.\texttt{\textbf{E}}d2 \texttt{\textbf{E}}d4 29.\texttt{\textbf{E}}c2
Solutions

29...h4?!  
29...g5! would also be good:  
a) 30...c3? e1!--+  
b) 30.e1f1 e1f1  
c) 30.b3 xb3 31.axb3 c1 32.xd4 e2f1 33.e2f1 xd4f1

30.gxh4  
30...c3 d5f1 is good for Black.  
White should try 30.e1f1!.

30...h3 31.c6  
Or 31.f3 e1f1 and now:  
a) 32.d1 xb2f1 33.xh2f1 e2d2f1+  
b) 32.c1 e3f3+ 33.xf3f1 g3f1+  
c) 32.c3 32...d3f3 33.e1f1 xf3f1+

31...xe4 32.g2 f5 33.g3 d4 34.g6 fg4f6 35.e3 d5 36.e1f1 f4f1 37.xf4f1

37.e1f1 should have been preferred.  
With the move played, White was hoping to construct a fortress. But these hopes (as Karpov demonstrated) are totally unrealistic. The remaining moves require no comment:

37...xf4 38.xd5 g4f1 39.g3 c4f1 40.xd8f1 h7f1 41.b3 c2f1 42.g2f1 g5f1 43.xd6 c2f1 44.e4 a5f1 45.e8f1 f5f1 46.c3 b5f1 47.d4 d4f1 48.e3 xb3f1 49.e4 f3f1 50.e5 e5f1 51.g5f1 g8f1 52.e4 b5f1 53.e6 b4f1

0–1

Ex. 13-11

A.Karpov – G.Kuzmin  
Leningrad 1973

34.b5!  
(2 points)

Once more Karpov uses a pawn to drive an opposing piece away from a good position.

34...a5 35.e7f1 x7f1  
35...xc3 is also hopeless: 36.e3f1 b2 (36...c8 37.e6f1) 37.e5f1 c4 (or 37...d8f1 38.f5 gxf5 39.xf5 c4 40.g6f1) 38.f6f1 g8 39.e8f1 h7f1 40.e7f1 g7f1 41.h1f1

36.xe7 d3f1 37.c7 b3 38.g4 f8f1  
38...d2 can be answered either by 39.xf7f1 or with the even more elegant: 39.e5h3 40.xf7f1 g8 41.xg6 xf7 42.e7f1 xg6f1 42...g8 43.xh8f1 43.f5f1

39.xe7  
There is no good defence against 40.e5f1 or 40.xf7f1 xf7 41.e7f1 xf7 42.e5f1.

1–0

Ex. 13-12

A.Karpov – W.Uhlmann  
Madrid 1973

The annotations to this exercise are based on analysis by Karpov.

31.g4!  
(2 points)

Once again Karpov uses his pawns for an attack. He allows only very restricted counterplay – just one rook and bishop of the opponent are allowed to become active; the other rook remains excluded from the play. But two pieces alone cannot create any dangerous threats to his king. At the same time he attacks with all his pieces together with two pawns!

31...g6 32.f4 c1f1 33.h2 f2f1 34.e3 e4f1  
34...e6f1 35.xe6f1 xe6 36.xb6f1

35.xf7 g6f1  
35...h6 36.xg7f1 h8 37.f5f1

36.g5 h7f1 37.e7f1 xb2 38.e8 b3f1 39.e2 b2f1 40.e1 d6f1  
40...e1f1 41.h2f1 e2f1 42.xc3 c2f1 43.xb3f1  
41.xg7f1 h8f1 42.g7f1

1–0
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pass mark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you scored less than 13 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Principles of rook endings

In this chapter we deal with the rules concerning rook endings with several pawns. Such endings occur very frequently in practice, so it is worthwhile studying them with particular care.

The activity of the rook

The rook is the strongest piece in a rook ending, and so the activity of the rook is the most important consideration!

"This activity can take on various forms – attacking opposing pawns, supporting one's own passed pawns or cutting off or pursuing the opposing king." – Dvoretsky's Endgame Manual

An active rook can constitute a major advantage, whereas a rook in a passive position often leads to bitter defeat. For that reason, “one should look for every opportunity to activate one’s rook and sometimes even be prepared to sacrifice pawns or worsen the position of one’s king to achieve that.” – Dvoretsky's Endgame Manual

25...a5 26.a4 e4?! An unfortunate move, creating another weakness. 26...h5?! would be a better option.

It would also be interesting to activate the rook straight away: 26...c8 27.d5 c2 28.xa5 a2±

27.d5 f7 28.g4! White wants to isolate the e4-pawn and then attack it.

28...g5 Otherwise the white king could get to f4.

29.g2 g6 Intending ...h5.
Principles of rook endings

Diagram 14-2

30.h4!
White prevents ...h5 and threatens to play h4-h5 himself.

30...gxh4
If Black allows h4-h5 he acquires a new weakness - the h6-pawn. White would then aim to transfer his king to the queenside. In this case too, the defence is extremely difficult. But in avoiding this, the black position has been weakened.

31...h3 b8
Passive defence would be hopeless, since White can simply move his king to f4 and attack the e4-pawn.

32.xh4 b1 33.xa5
White has won a pawn, but Black has activated his rook. Endings like this are hard to play, but here the unhealthy black pawn structure plays a fatal role.

33...h1 34.g3 g1 35.h3
But not 35.f4? on account of 35...g2.

35...h1 36.g2 a1 37.h2
White aims to reach the time control safely.

37...a2 38.g3 a1 39.g2 a2 40.g3 a1

Diagram 14-3

In such positions the stronger side has at its disposal two standard plans; either he advances his pawn to the 7th rank and tries to win another pawn by zugzwang, or he goes with his king to the queenside to support the passed pawn, which then only advances as far as the 6th rank. Here the first plan wins.

41.a8 f5
The following variations show how White wins against passive defence. 41...a2 42.a5 g7 43.a6 f7 44.a7 g7 45.g2 a1 46.h2 a6 47.g1 a1 48.g2∞ and here there are two possibilities:

a) 48...a6 Black lets the king go further. 49.f1 a2 50.e1 h7 51.d1 g7 52.c1 h7 (if 52...f5 53.gxf5 h5, then 54.f6+ f7 55.h8+-) 53.b1 a6 54.b2 g7 (54...f5 55.gxf5 h5 56.f6+) 55.b3 a1 56.c4 a2 57.d4 a4 58.d5 Black is put in zugzwang and loses another pawn: 58...h7 59.e6 g7 60.f5∞ and if 60...f7, then 61.h8+-.

b) 48...h7 Black allows the exchange of pawns.
49.g3 a2 50.f8! axa7 51.xf6 e7 (or 51...g7 52.f5 g6 53.f4 a4 54.e5 and then h4+-)
Endgame 3

52.\textit{f4} \textit{g7} 53.\textit{f5} \textit{g6} 54.\textit{e5}! (but not 54.\textit{g5}?! on account of 54...\textit{h5}!±) 54...\textit{xa5} (We are following Andersson – Hübnner, Ter Apel 1997!) 55.\textit{xe5} \textit{g5} 56.\textit{xe4} \textit{g6} 57.\textit{d3} (\textit{d2}-f1) Black resigned on account of 57...\textit{f6} 58.\textit{e4} \textit{h5} 59.\textit{e5} \textit{h4} 60.\textit{e6} \textit{h3} 61.\textit{e7} \textit{h2} 62.\textit{e8}\textit{xf2} 63.\textit{e7}h5+-.

42.\textit{gxf5} \textit{xf5} 43.\textit{a5}

The plan is simple – the pawn goes to a7 and then White can create a second passed pawn.

43...\textit{eg1} \textit{44.\textit{h3} \textit{h1}+ 45.\textit{g2} \textit{a1} 46.\textit{a6} \textit{g4}}

Or 46...\textit{g6} 47.a7 \textit{h7} 48.f4+-.

47.a7 \textit{h4}

The black king has to remain in the shadow of the h-pawn and blocks its own passed pawn.

\textbf{Diagram 14-4}

48.\textit{f4}!

After 48...\textit{exf3} \textit{49.\textit{xf3} White wins quite simply by advancing the e-pawn.}

48...\textit{e2} \textit{49.\textit{h1} \textit{a1} 50.\textit{e2} \textit{a1} 51.\textit{d1}}

51.\textit{d1} would be even more precise: 51...\textit{a1} 52.\textit{d2} \textit{a6} 53.\textit{f5} \textit{d6}+ 54.\textit{c3} \textit{d7} 55.\textit{c4}+-.

51...\textit{a6}

Black wants to bring his rook to the side to stop the f-pawn, but this strategy does not work here.

52.\textit{f5} \textit{d6}+ 53.\textit{c2} \textit{d7} 54.\textit{c3} \textit{h5} 55.\textit{c4} \textit{h3} 56.\textit{f6} \textit{h4} 57.\textit{c5} \textit{h2} 58.\textit{h8}

For his a7-pawn, White will get both the black pawns.

1-0

\textbf{Rook behind the passed pawn}

Most frequently the best place for the rook is behind the passed pawn (its own or an opposing one). However, there are certain situations where the rook does better to support the passed pawn from the side, when that is a more active post from which it can fulfill other tasks.

\textbf{Diagram 14-5}

M.Botvinnik – I.Boleslavsky
Leningrad/Moscow 1941

34.\textit{b1}!

\textit{Where possible, a rook should be placed behind the passed pawn.} (Please remember that in chess
Principles of rook endings

there are no absolute rules and that here too there are some exceptions.)

34...\texttt{\textit{?}}!

34...\texttt{c6} 35.b5 \texttt{b6±} is objectively better. One should \textbf{blockade a passed pawn as soon as possible}. With the text move, Black is playing for a trap.

35.b5 \texttt{e6} 36.b6 \texttt{c8} 37.h3

Black was hoping for 37.b7? \texttt{b8} 38.g1 \texttt{d6} 39.f2 \texttt{c7} 40.g3 \texttt{xb7} 41.xb7\texttt{+} \texttt{xb7} 42.f4 \texttt{c6} 43.e5 \texttt{d7=} and the white king does not get through.

37...\texttt{b8} 38.h2 \texttt{d5} 39.g3 \texttt{c6}

A standard idea – the king will replace the rook as the blockader of the passed pawn, freeing the rook to defends its pawns.

After 39...\texttt{b7} 40.f4 the black king is not able to protect both flanks from invasion by the white king, since White will always have a waiting move with the rook and can thus put his opponent in zugzwang. The winning method is then similar to that in the game. For example: 40...\texttt{f7+} 41.g5 \texttt{b7} 42.g3 \texttt{e5} 43.h4 \texttt{d5} 44.g4 \texttt{c5} 45.h5 \texttt{d5} 46.h6 gxh6\texttt{+} 47.xh6 \texttt{e5} 48.g5 \texttt{f5} 49.b4 \texttt{e5} 50.a4 \texttt{f5} 51.b6 \texttt{f4} 52.h5 \texttt{f5} 53.a7 \texttt{xb6} 54.f7\texttt{+} \texttt{e5} 55.xh7\texttt{+}

40.b4 \texttt{b7}

\textbf{Diagram 14-6}

41.e1!

If the opposing king is in front of a passed pawn, it is better to post the rook to the side.

41.e8

41...\texttt{xb6} loses to 42.b1\texttt{+}.

42.e6 a6 43.e5 \texttt{b7}

Black's position is passive. Botvinnik simply improves his position by advancing his pawns, and then he prepares h5-h6.

\textbf{Diagram 14-7}

44.h4! \texttt{a6} 45.h5 \texttt{b6} 46.g4 \texttt{a6} 47.h4 \texttt{b7} 48.h6 gxh6 49.xh6 \texttt{g7} 50.h5

White intends to play g4-g5 followed by \texttt{e6} and \texttt{h6}, and then attack the h7-pawn.

50.a6

White wins even more quickly after this move.

51.e6 \texttt{e7} 52.e7 \texttt{e5+} 53.g5 \texttt{xb6} 54.xh7\texttt{+} \texttt{c6} 55.h6 \texttt{d6} 56.g6 \texttt{e1} 57.f7
57...g7 is also good: 57...h7 58.g6 g1 59.f7 f1 60.g8 and then 61.h8+.

Diagram 14-8
57...e6 58.a1 59.g7 h1 60.g6 g1 61.h7 h1 62.g8 e7

Botvinnik is aiming for the theoretically won position with a bridge.
63.e2 d7 64.e4
White builds the bridge.
64...h2 65.f7
1–0

The activity of the king
Of course in rook endings the activity of the king plays a large part, though the activity of the rook has higher priority.

A king on the edge of the board can be a serious disadvantage. It is often easier for the opponent to promote his passed pawn or for his king to exploit the unfortunate position of our king by being able to combine the advance with mating threats.

Cutting the king off from strategically important points (from our passed pawns which it would like to stop, or from its own which it would like to support) is one of the most important methods of play in rook endings. We have already seen this method in elementary endgames.

Division of roles in unbalanced positions with passed pawns
The ideal division of roles is when the rook fights against the opponent’s passed pawn (from behind!) and the king supports your own passed pawn.

But if you cannot activate your king and have no chance of getting your own passed pawn, you should try to block your opponent’s passed pawn with your king so as to free your rook for counterplay.

Diagram 14-9

E. Eliskases – G. Levenfish
Moscow 1936

40.d6! Black was threatening 40...e7! to put his rook behind the passed pawn. White must immediately
post his rook behind the c-pawn.

40...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}f5 41.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}c6  
41.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}c5\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}e5 does not change much.

Now the black rook must go \textbf{in front of} the passed pawn in order to support it.

41...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{a}}e1\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}c1 42.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}c7 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}}5?!  

The position after 42...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}c4 43.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{a}}xa7 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}c4 should also be drawn, since White gets a passed pawn on the kingside.

44.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{a}}xa7 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}c4  

\texttt{Diagram 14-10}

45.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}c5\textcolor{red}{\texttt{a}}e6!  

45...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}}6? 46.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}c5 =

46.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{a}}a6\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}d5 47.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}}xh6 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}3  

The c-pawn is too strong.

48.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}h8 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{a}}a1!  

Black now wins the a-pawn.

49.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}c8 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{a}}xa3 50.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}h3  

50.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}4 fails to draw: 50...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}}4 51.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}}1 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}4 52.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}2 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{a}}2\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}} 53.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}1 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}2?! The white king is unfavourably posted, cut off on the edge of the board. 54.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}8\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}3 55.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}8\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}3 56.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}8\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}2 57.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}8 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}2 58.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}8\textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}1 59.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}2 60.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}6 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}1 61.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}7 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}1 62.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}8 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{c}}2# (Levenfish)

50...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}4

\texttt{Diagram 14-11}

51.\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}}4?  

White’s plan is to create a passed pawn, give up his rook for the c-pawn and then win the black rook in return for his own passed pawn. But the result turns on a single lost tempo!
51...\textit{\texttt{a}5!}  
Black builds a bridge and gains an important tempo.

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}[scale=0.7, notation=true]
% Diagram 14-12
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

52.f4 \textit{\texttt{e}c}5 53.\textit{\texttt{e}d}8\texttt{t} \textit{\texttt{e}e}3 54.\textit{\texttt{e}d}1

54.\textit{\texttt{e}e}8\texttt{t} is followed by: 54...\textit{\texttt{f}2} 55.\textit{\texttt{a}a}8 c2 56.\textit{\texttt{a}a}1 gx\texttt{f}4 57.\textit{\texttt{x}x}f4 (or 57.gxf4 c1\texttt{w} 58.\texttt{e}x\texttt{c}1 \texttt{e}x\texttt{c}1 59.\textit{\texttt{f}5} \textit{\texttt{e}e}3 60.\textit{\texttt{f}6} \textit{\texttt{e}e}4 61.\textit{\texttt{g}g}5 \textit{\texttt{e}e}5 62.\textit{\texttt{f}f}1 \textit{\texttt{f}f}1 63.\textit{\texttt{g}g}6 \textit{\texttt{e}e}6\texttt{t} 57...c1\texttt{w}\texttt{t} 58.\textit{\texttt{e}x}c1 \texttt{e}x\texttt{c}1 59.\textit{\texttt{g}4} \textit{\texttt{c}c}4\texttt{t} 60.\textit{\texttt{f}f}5 \textit{\texttt{g}g}3 61.\textit{\texttt{g}g}5 \textit{\texttt{h}h}4 62.\textit{\texttt{g}g}6 \textit{\texttt{h}h}5 63.\textit{\texttt{g}g}7 \textit{\texttt{g}g}4\texttt{t} 54...c2 55.\textit{\texttt{c}c}1 \textit{\texttt{x}x}f4 56.gxf4 \textit{\texttt{x}x}d2 57.\textit{\texttt{a}a}1 c1\texttt{w} 58.\textit{\texttt{e}x}c1 \texttt{e}x\texttt{c}1

Black can now stop the white passed pawns in time.

Not 58...\textit{\texttt{e}x}c1? 59.\textit{\texttt{f}5}\texttt{=}.

59.\textit{\texttt{g}5}

59.\textit{\texttt{f}5} is no better: 59...\textit{\texttt{e}e}3 60.\textit{\texttt{f}6} \textit{\texttt{f}f}1! 61.\textit{\texttt{g}g}5 \textit{\texttt{e}e}4 62.\textit{\texttt{g}g}6 \textit{\texttt{e}e}5 63.\textit{\texttt{f}f}7 \textit{\texttt{e}e}6\texttt{t} 59...\textit{\texttt{e}e}3 60.\textit{\texttt{f}5} \textit{\texttt{e}e}4 61.\textit{\texttt{g}4} \textit{\texttt{e}e}5 62.\textit{\texttt{g}g}6 \textit{\texttt{c}c}6\texttt{t} 63.\textit{\texttt{g}g}7 \textit{\texttt{a}a}6\texttt{t} 63...\textit{\texttt{f}f}4\texttt{t} 64.\textit{\texttt{f}f}6= 64.\textit{\texttt{f}f}7 64...\textit{\texttt{h}h}7 \textit{\texttt{f}f}6\texttt{t} 64...\textit{\texttt{f}f}4 65.\textit{\texttt{g}g}7 \textit{\texttt{g}g}5! 65...\textit{\texttt{x}x}g4? 66.\textit{\texttt{f}f}6= 0–1

Being aware of the possibility of \textbf{transition to a technical position} can be of great help when calculating complicated endings (see for example Botvinnik – Boleslavsky). As the last example showed, knowledge of typical ideas can often be vital!
Exercises

Ex. 14-1

Ex. 14-4
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Ex. 14-11

Ex. 14-9

Ex. 14-12
Solutions

Ex. 14-1
Variation from the game

A.Beliavsky – A.Yusupov
USSR Ch, Minsk 1987

53...f5!

(2 points)
Themes: the activity of the king; the king on the edge of the board.

54.e1
54.a6 is followed by: 54...g4 55.axe6 f3 56.g1 a3 57.a6 g2+ 58.h1 a2
59.c6 c2 60.c7 xc7 61.axa2 xe3+

54...g4 55.axe6 f3 56.c6
If 56.f5, then 56...xe3 57.d1 a3 58.c1 xe2 59.a6 xf5 60.c6 f7.+

56...xe3 57.d1 d3
Black is also winning after 57...d2+ or 57...h2.

58.c1 a3 59.b1 f2
Or 59...b2+.

60.c7 c2 61.c7 a2+ 62.a3 e3 63.f5 e2

64.f6 xc7+-

Ex. 14-2

S.Flohr – M.Vidmar
Nottingham 1936

38.e4!

(3 points)
Theme: the activity of the king.
Here White employs the typical idea of ‘widening the theatre of operations’. After the exchange of pawns, the white king can penetrate on the kingside.
The preparatory move 38.h4 (1 point) is less accurate, since Black can play 38...c7! (intending ...b6 followed by the activation of the rook).

38.a4?! is worse because of 38...b8.

38...fxe4 39.fx e4 dxe4 40.xe4 a7?

“Black continues with his dangerously passive wait-and-see policy. Once again he had to transfer the king over to the pawn on b6, in order to free his rook: 40...c7!” – Dvoretsky

In rook endings the rook is the stronger piece and the activity of the rook takes priority!

41.h4 h6 42.h4 e6 43.g4 a8
44.h5! g5
44...gxh5 45.xh5 a8 46.g4 d6
47.axe6+-

45.g1 b7 46.f3 a8 47.xe4 a7 48.d4
d6 49.e4 e6 50.e5 f6 51.g6 d6
50...f6 51.xc7 52.e5 a7 53.d4 e6 54.c5 g7 55.axa6 d3 56.xc6 f7 57.a4 f3 58.xh6+-

51.e8+-

White prepares to attack the weak h6-pawn.

51...c5

After 51...e7+ 52.xe7 x7 53.e5 White wins the pawn ending easily.

52.d8+ c6
52...c7 is followed by: 53.h8 cxb4 54.h7+ b8 55.xa7 x7 56.axb4 c6 57.f5 b5 58.g6 xb4 59.c6 h6 a5
60.xg5 a4 61.h6+-

53.e8+ b6 54.xc5 h7 55.e5 c6
56.e6+ f6 57.f5 f7+ 58.f6
1–0

You can find more extensive comments on this ending in Dvoretsky’s Endgame Manual.

Ex. 14-3

J.Capablanca – S.Tartakower
New York 1924

The black rook is invading the opposing camp and White is losing at least one pawn. On the other hand, the black king is very badly placed on the back rank, and that promises White, who also has at his disposal a strong passed pawn on the g-file, some prospects of success. If White can bring his king into the attack, the situation may become critical for Black.

35.g3!

(2 points)
Theme: the king on the edge of the board.

35...bxc3 36.b4 f3?
36...a6! is a tougher defence, although I.Zaitsev has shown that White can still win
with 37. hx5! b5 38. g6! g8 39. g7 f8 40. f7 g8 41. f6 followed by xxa6
37. g6! xfx4† 38. g5 e4
Black is forced to defend passively.
39. f6!
For the moment the black f-pawn takes care of the protection of the white king.
39 ... g8 40. g7†!
The intermediate check worsens the position of the black king.
40 ... h8 41. xxc7 e8 42. xxf5 e4 43. f6 e4† 44. e5 g4 45. g7†
“Here the intermediate check on move 40 pays off…” – Dvoretsky
45 ... g8
45 ... xg7 46. xg7 f4 47. xxd5 f7 48. e6 e7 49. b7=
46. xxa7 g1 47. xxd5 c1 48. d6 c2 49. d5 c1 50. c7 a1 51. c6 xxa4 52. d6
1–0

Ex. 14-4

Em.Lasker – G.Levenfish
Moscow 1925

59... a8!

(1 point)
Black must certainly avoid: 59... xh7?
60. xh7 f2 61. f1 d3 62. a1!=
(another 1 point for this variation)
60. g7 f2 61. a1 b3 62. f1 a1=†
63. xxa1 xxa1 64. h8 g1†
0–1

Ex. 14-5

P.Keres – M.Botvinnik
World Ch, The Hague/Moscow 1948

53. d3?
Theme: the activity of the rook.
A fatal error; White places his rook in a passive position.
It is necessary to play: 53. d5!

(3 points)

53... c3† (53... c4 54. a5=) 54. g2 h4 55. d6 a5 56. d5 g4 (56... c2† 57. f1)
57. xxa5 c2† 58. f1 g3 59. a8= 53. e4† is not good on account of 53... c3† 54. g2 a3 55. d4 g4 56. d5 h4 57. a5 a2† 58. f1 h3+. Compared to the above variation, White has lost a few tempi.
53... c4! 54. a3
54. a5 a4 55. d5 a3† 56. g2 h4= and Black will continue with ... g4 and ... a2†.
54... a5! 55. h3 b4 56. g3 f4 57. a1 g4† 58. h3 e4 59. a3 g6 60. g3 f5 61. h3 e5 62. g3 e4 63. a1 d5 64. b1 b4+–
But not 64... xxa4? 65. b5† c4 66. xg5 a1 67. h2= and White draws with the Vancura defence.
65. b1 c4 66. e1† 66. g4 xxa4 67. xg5 c4=–
66... d4 67. h2†!
Other moves are more resilient, but still lose:
a) 67. f1 xxa4 68. f5 a1 69. h2 g4 70. g5 c3 71. xg4 e1 72. a4 d5=–
b) 67. f3 c3! 68. e5 g4†=–
67... xxa4 68. g1 c4 69. xg5 a4 70. g2 c3
Or 70... a3 71. a5 c2† 72. f3 a2–+
71. f3 a3 72. a5 b3
0–1

Ex. 14-6

M.Botvinnik – G.Borisenko
USSR Ch, G.Borisenko

Theme: cutting off the king.
53. g4= (1 point)

53. h7? g7 54. h4 h8=–
53... f8 54. f4 a6 55. g4 e7 56. f4 g8 57. xf6 a4 58. f2 h7 59. a2 xh6 60. f2 g5 61. e3
½–½
Solutions

Ex. 14-7

L.Polugaevsky – V.Korchnoi
Tilburg 1985

The following annotations are based on analysis by Korchnoi.

63...g7?

Theme: the division of roles.

The rook should fight against the passed pawn from behind while the king leads the counter-attack. White can draw with:

63...e4b4 64...xb3

(2 points)

63...e3† 64...xg5...xf3 65...f5...e3

66...e5...d3 67...d5...c3 68...c5=

Ex. 14-8

Variation from the game

A.Yusupov – L.van Wely
Bundesliga 1998

Theme: the transition to a pawn ending.

30...a6!

(2 points)

Black prepares ...xb5.

30...a4 (1 point) and 30...b2 (1 point) are slightly less accurate, since White can continue to play for a win.

31...e2...b5 32...xb5...xb5 33...e3...e6

Ex. 14-9

G.Stoltz – A.Nimzowitsch
Berlin 1928

Themes: the transition to a pawn ending; the activity of the rook.

51...d2?

Going into the pawn ending is wrong.

In order to force a draw White should post his rook behind the a-pawn: 51...a3!

(2 points)

51...e4 52.a5 d3 53.a6...e3 54...xd3†...xd3

55.a7...b1† 56...f2...b2†=

An equally good way to achieve the same result is 51.a5!...xb5 52...a3= (also 2 points).

51...xd2 52...xd2...f4! 53...xf4†

White also loses after 53.b6...d6= or 53.a5...d6 54.a6...c7=.

53...d6†!

(2 another 1 point for this variation)

53...xf4?? is bad: 54.b6+-.

54.a5 g3 55.a6...c7 56...e2...d3† 57...xd3 g2 58...e4...g1木质 59...f5...b6 60...g5...d7

61...f5...e7

0–1

Ex. 14-10

V.Korchnoi – A.Miles
Baden-Baden 1981

46.g4!

(2 points)

White frees his king from a dangerous zone and simplifies the position. He forces Black to accept a weakness on either h5 or g6. That is good defence!

46...h4 or 46...e1† each earn 1 consolation point – the position can probably still be held.

46...b3†
Solutions

46...\(\text{b}5\) is followed by: 47.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{d}5\) (47...\(\text{f}3\) 48.\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{e}2\) 49.\(\text{f}6\)=) 48.\(\text{xh}5\) \(\text{gxh}5\) 49.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{d}6\) 50.\(\text{f}1\)= If Black now tries 50...\(\text{f}5\), White can draw the pawn ending after 51.\(\text{xf}5\) \(\text{exf}5\) 52.\(\text{g}3\)=.

If 46...\(\text{f}4\), then simply 47.\(\text{h}4\)=.

47.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{hxg}4\)

47...\(\text{f}4\) 48.\(\text{d}4\)=!

48.\(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 49.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{b}2\) 50.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{d}5\)

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

Or 51...\(\text{g}2\)= 52.\(\text{f}6\) \(\text{e}4\) 53.\(\text{d}1\)= \(\text{c}4\)

54.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{e}3\) 55.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{e}2\) 56.\(\text{d}1\)= \(\text{b}3\) 57.\(\text{f}3\)=.

52.\(\text{h}5\) \(\text{gxh}5\) 53.\(\text{f}5\)! \(\text{b}5\) 54.\(\text{xe}5\)= \(\text{c}4\)

55.\(\text{xb}5\) \(\text{xb}5\) 56.\(\text{g}5\) \(\text{a}5\) 57.\(\text{xe}5\)

\(1/2-1/2\)

Ex. 14-11

Variation from the game

L.\(\text{McShane} - \text{A.Yusupov}\)

Bundesliga 2000

51.\(\text{xe}5\)

(1 point)

51...\(\text{b}3\)

Or 51...\(\text{x}5\) stalemate.

52.\(\text{g}2=\)

Ex. 14-12

A.\(\text{Yusupov} - \text{I.Nikolaidis}\)

Corfu 1999

Theme: the division of roles.

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

The correct division of roles is the same as in Ex. 14-7 – the king must support its passed pawn, while the rook takes up the struggle against the opponent’s passed pawn. Here, however, the rook must operate from the side: 48...\(\text{d}3\)!

(3 points)

49.\(\text{xe}7\) \(\text{d}4\)

(49...\(\text{d}6\)= is also playable, but not 49...\(\text{d}8\)? 50.\(\text{c}7\)=+) 50.\(\text{h}5\) \(\text{d}3\)

51.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{d}4\) 52.\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{d}6\) 53.\(\text{c}7\)= \(\text{b}4\)

54.\(\text{h}5\) \(\text{d}5\) 55.\(\text{h}6\) \(\text{d}4\) 56.\(\text{g}6\) \(\text{xe}4\)

The move in the game does not help Black, since his king remains cut off horizontally.

49.\(\text{xe}7\) \(\text{e}6\) 50.\(\text{c}7\)

50...\(\text{d}6\) 51.\(\text{g}6\)=

50...\(\text{d}3\) 51.\(\text{g}6\)

1-0
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 26

22 points and above → Excellent
17 points and above → Good
13 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 13 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Playing for traps

People tend to have a bad habit – they make mistakes. We actually make enough mistakes ‘voluntarily’, but a hidden trap can perhaps raise the opponent’s error ratio! When one studies the games of World Champion Mikhail Tal, it becomes noticeable that he very much enjoyed setting tactical traps, even when the move he played was not objectively the very strongest. In this chapter we shall see a lot of Tal’s game.

Of course, benign traps (whenever our move is also objectively strong) are better, but in a practical game it is not necessarily the best moves which are required to win, but those moves which set the opponent the most problems.

The subject of playing for traps was first dealt with in Chapter 9 of *Boost Your Chess* 1. Here are some more examples.

**M. Tal – I. Zilber**

Riga 1954

1.\( e4 \) e5 2.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}3 \) \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}6 \) 3.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}5 \) \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}4 \) 4.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d4 \) exd4 5.0–0 c6 6.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}4 \) \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}6 \) 7.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}1 \) d6 8.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}3 \) \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}7 \) 9.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d4 \) d5 10.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d5 \) \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}5 \) 11.d3 0–0 12.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}3 \) \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}6 \) 13.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}3 \) \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}6 \)

An original position. White is a pawn up, but his d4-pawn is weak. Tal protects that pawn with a tactical trick.

**Diagram 15-1**

14.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}3 \) ! \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}c4 \)

Black is badly placed after this move.

14...\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d4 ?? \) loses on account of: 15.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d4 \) \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}c4 \) (15...\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d4 \) is of course met by 16.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{xf}}7+?? \)–) 16.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}5 \) (another good move is 16.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{g}}7++ \) –) 16...\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}6 \) 17.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}4+\)

14...\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}6 \) deserves to be considered.

15.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{d}}4 \) \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{e}}6 \) 16.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}3 \) \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d4 \) 17.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}1 \) c5 18.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d4 \)

18.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{b}}5 \) is also good, but Tal wants to avoid opposite-coloured bishops.

18...\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d4 \) 19.\( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{b}}}5 \) \( \textsf{\textit{\textbf{a}}}5 \)

**Diagram 15-2**
20.\(\text{e}2\)?!

The young Tal (he was 18 at the time) did not want a technical win after 20.\(\text{c}xd4\) and went for broke, but he underestimated the danger which a passed pawn can cause.

White should play 20.\(\text{c}xd4\) \(\text{a}xa2\) 21.\(\text{f}xb7\)±.

20...\(\text{ad}8\) 21.\(\text{xb}7\)

21.\(\text{c}xd4\)?

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

Diagram 15-3

22.\(\text{b}2\)?!

Directed against 22...\(\text{a}6\).

If 22.\(\text{ed}2\), then 22...\(\text{a}6\) 23.\(\text{c}7\) \(\text{b}4\)∞.

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

Avoiding the trap: 22...\(\text{a}6\)? 23.\(\text{c}7\) \(\text{b}4\) 24.\(\text{a}3\)±

23.\(\text{e}4\) a6 24.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{xc}4\)!

24...\(\text{c}3\) is followed by: 25.\(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{xb}2\) 26.\(\text{xf}8\) \(\text{e}2\) 27.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{xf}8\) 28.\(\text{c}5\)±

Diagram 15-4

25.\(\text{c}6\)!

Typically for Tal, he finds a good intermediate move and sets his opponent some problems.

25.bxc4 \(\text{c}3\) 26.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{xd}4\) 27.\(\text{xf}7\) \(\text{xf}7\) 28.\(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{c}8\) would give Black chances of a draw.

25...\(\text{c}3\)?

If 25...\(\text{d}5\), then 26.\(\text{xf}7\) \(\text{xf}7\) 27.\(\text{xa}5\) \(\text{e}8\) 28.\(\text{f}3\)±.

The correct way is: 25...\(\text{a}3\)! 26.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{xb}2\) 27.\(\text{xd}7\) \(\text{e}2\) 28.\(\text{xe}2\) \(\text{xe}2\) 29.\(\text{e}1\) \(\text{d}8\) 30.bxc4 \(\text{xd}7\) 31.f3 \(\text{d}2\)=

26.\(\text{bd}2\)?

A human move, but not the best one.

Neither 26.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{d}4\)++, nor 26.\(\text{e}7\) \(\text{exe}7\) 27.\(\text{xe}7\) \(\text{xb}2\) 28.bxc4 \(\text{c}2\)± would be good.

A stronger option is 26.\(\text{e}5!\) \(\text{c}2\) 27.\(\text{e}1\)! If now 27...\(\text{xb}3\), then 28.\(\text{xc}2\) \(\text{xc}2\) 29.\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}2\) 30.\(\text{xc}2\) \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{xa}1\) \(\text{xa}1\) 32.\(\text{e}1\)±.

26...\(\text{xb}5!\) 27.\(\text{e}7\)

27.\(\text{e}4\) \(\text{d}4\) 28.\(\text{d}5\) \(\text{xd}2\)++

27.\(\text{e}5\) \(\text{e}8\)±

27...\(\text{h}8\) 28.\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{c}5\)!

28...\(\text{c}7\) is interesting, with the threat of ...\(\text{d}2\).

But it is met by 29.\(\text{g}3\)! and if 29...\(\text{e}8\), then 30.axb5 \(\text{xc}7\) 31.\(\text{xe}7\) \(\text{xe}7\) 32.\(\text{xd}3\) \(\text{e}5\) 33.\(\text{d}8\) \(\text{e}8\) 34.bxa6+-.
29.\texttt{Re1}?! 
Tal does not want a draw after 29.axb5 \texttt{Rxe7} 
30.\texttt{Rxd3 axb5=}

29...\texttt{c3} 
29...\texttt{d6?!} would be even better, intending 30.axb5 \texttt{Rxe6}.

30.\texttt{Rdd1}? 
The young Tal only played to win... 
30.\texttt{Rxd1=} is more prudent.

30...\texttt{d2} 31.\texttt{Rf3}

\textbf{Diagram 15-5}

31...\texttt{g7}?? 
31...\texttt{d3?!} would be correct here, and Black is clearly better.

32.\texttt{Rxh7\#}! 
What use was it to Black to have played well, but then to overlook the final trap? 
1–0

\textbf{Diagram 15-6}

L.Listengarten – M.Tal
Kharkov 1953

Black begins fighting for the initiative on the queenside.
15...\texttt{a5} 16.\texttt{Rc2 b4} 17.\texttt{b1 Re4} 18.\texttt{b3 Rd3} 
19.\texttt{Rd2 \texttt{Rxb1} 20.\texttt{Rxb1 Re2} 21.\texttt{Rxc8?!} 
21.\texttt{Rbxd2} would be correct and Black cannot yet do much.

21...\texttt{e7}! 
Tal's speciality – an intermediate move! Black now wins the struggle for the open c-file and gets a clear advantage.

22.\texttt{Rbxd2} 
22.\texttt{Rxh8} is followed by 22...\texttt{xa2} and if 23.\texttt{Rxh7}, then 23...\texttt{b5} 24.\texttt{c3 c2} 25.\texttt{xb5 Rxh7=}.

22...\texttt{Rxc8\#}! 
Black went on to win in 48 moves. 
...0–1
Playing for traps

Diagram 15-8

M. Tal – A. Bannik
USSR Ch, Yerevan 1962

14. \( \text{N}d5! \)?

The direct attempts to take advantage of the undefended knight on h5 do not succeed: 14.e5 dxe5 15.\( \text{N}f5 \) g6 or 14.g4 \( \text{N}xc3 \).

14... \( \text{Nx}b2 \)

14... \( \text{N}xd5 \) 15.\( \text{N}xd5 \) g6 16.e5 (or 16.c3\( \pm \)) 16...dxe5 17.\( \text{N}xc5 \) d6 18.\( \text{N}ad1 \) \( \text{N}xc5 \) 19.\( \text{N}xc5 \)\( \pm \)

15. \( \text{N}ab1 \) \( \text{N}xd5 \) 16.\( \text{exd5} \)

With this move White sets a trap, as the obvious way for Black to defend the b2-bishop is a mistake.

16.\( \text{N}xd5! \)? \( \text{f}6 \) 17.\( \text{N}d3 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 18.\( \text{N}xe5 \) dxe5 19.\( \text{N}xc5 \) \( \text{N}xd3 \) 20.\( \text{cxd3} \) \( \text{N}fd8 \)\( \pm \)

16... \( \text{N}b8?! \)

Black has only one way to maintain the balance:

a) 16... \( \text{N}f6?! \) 17.\( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{N}d7?! \) 18.\( \text{h}3?! \pm \\

b) 16... \( \text{c}5 \) 17.\( \text{N}xe5 \) dxe5 18.\( \text{N}xc5 \) \( \text{N}f4 \) 19.\( \text{N}e4 \)\( \pm \)

c) 16... \( \text{N}f6?! \) 17.\( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 18.\( \text{N}e4 \) \( \text{h}8= \)

17.\( \text{c}3?! \) \( \text{N}f6 \) 18.\( \text{N}e2! \)

Diagram 15-9

18... \( \text{N}xc3? \)

The crucial point of Tal’s idea is 18... \( \text{N}xc3 \)

19.\( \text{N}c1?! \) \( \text{N}xc1?! \) 20.\( \text{N}xb8 \) \( \text{N}xb8 \) 21.\( \text{N}e8\# \)

19.\( \text{N}xb8 \) \( \text{N}xb8 \) 20.\( \text{N}g5! \) \( \text{N}xe1 \) 21.\( \text{N}xf6 \) \( \text{N}xf6 \)

22.\( \text{N}xe1\#. \) \( \text{N}xd5 \) 23.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 24.\( \text{N}c4 \) \( \text{N}f6 \) 25.\( \text{N}c6 \) \( \text{b}1= \) 26.\( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 27.\( \text{N}xc7 \) \( \text{N}xa2 \) 28.\( \text{N}b8\# \)

1-0

Diagram 15-10

G. Khodos – M. Tal
USSR Ch, Yerevan 1962

1.d4 \( \text{d}5 \) 2.c4 \( \text{dxc}4 \) 3.\( \text{N}f3 \) \( \text{N}f6 \) 4.e3 \( \text{g}4 \) 5.\( \text{N}xc4 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 6.\( \text{N}b3 \) \( \text{N}xf3 \) 7.\( \text{gx}f3 \) \( \text{N}bd7 \) 8.\( \text{N}xb7 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 9.\( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{g}6 \)

10.\( \text{N}c3 \) \( \text{N}e7 \) 11.\( \text{dxc}5 \) \( \text{N}xe5?! \)

The queen is given a choice of two checks, but did not realise that the most obvious one is a trap.

12.\( \text{N}c6?! \)

12.\( \text{N}b5\# \) is correct, as White may then create an escape for the queen by moving the c4-bishop.

12... \( \text{N}f8 \) 13.f4

Aiming to retreat the queen along the long diagonal.

Diagram 15-10
Calculating variations 3

13...\(\textsf{Be}4!\)
13...\(\textsf{Bc}8\) is not as strong: 14.\(\textsf{Bf}3\ \textsf{Dd}3\) 15.\(\textsf{Bxd}3\) \(\textsf{Dxd}3\) 16.\(\textsf{Bd}2\) (or 16.\(\textsf{Bd}1\)) 16...\(\textsf{Bc}2\) 17.\(\textsf{Bb}7\)=
14.\(\textsf{Bc}6\)
14.\(\textsf{Bxe}4\) \(\textsf{Bc}8\) 15.\(\textsf{Bb}5\) \(a6\)→
14...\(\textsf{Bb}8!\)
First exchanging knights is equally good: 14...\(\textsf{Bxc}3\) 15.\(\textsf{Bxc}3\) \(\textsf{Bb}6\) 16.\(\textsf{Bc}3\) \(\textsf{Bc}8\) 17.\(\textsf{Bxc}8\) \(\textsf{Bxd}3\)= 19.\(\textsf{Bc}2\) \(\textsf{Bxa}3\) 20.\(\textsf{Bxd}3\) \(\textsf{Bd}7\)=
15.\(\textsf{Bxe}4\) \(\textsf{Bb}6\) 16.\(\textsf{Bc}8\)
16.\(\textsf{Bxc}5\) \(\textsf{Bxc}5\) 17.\(\textsf{Bxe}5\) \(\textsf{Bd}6\)=→
16...\(\textsf{Bxc}8\) 17.\(\textsf{Bxc}8\) \(\textsf{Bxe}4\)

Diagram 15-11

The queen has been saved, but now the white bishop is in danger!
18.\(\textsf{Bb}4\)= 19.\(\textsf{Be}2\) \(\textsf{Bc}5\) 20.\(\textsf{Bg}5\) \(f5\) 21.\(\textsf{Bf}4\) \(\textsf{Bd}7\)=→
22.\(\textsf{Bxf}5\) \(\textsf{Bxc}8\) 23.\(\textsf{Bxg}6\) \(\textsf{Bb}3\)
0–1

Diagram 15-12

A. Yusupov – W. Rappaport
Switzerland 2004

In this example your author was in time trouble and overlooked his opponent's drawing trap.
39.\(\textsf{f}4\)?
White had a stronger move in 39.\(\textsf{Be}1\) and now:
a) 39...\(\textsf{d}4\)? 40.\(\textsf{Bxc}2\) \(\textsf{Bxe}1\) 41.\(\textsf{Bc}5\)=→
b) 39...\(\textsf{Bxc}1\)? 40.\(\textsf{Bxc}1\) \(\textsf{Bxe}1\) 41.\(\textsf{Bxd}3\)=→
c) 39...\(\textsf{Bxe}1\) 40.\(\textsf{Bxe}1\) and White is clearly better.
39...\(\textsf{Bd}6!\)
Now White cannot avoid the draw.
40.\(\textsf{Bxd}3\) \(\textsf{Bc}2\)= 41.\(\textsf{Bf}3\) \(\textsf{Bf}2\)=

Diagram 15-13

42.\(\textsf{Bf}3\)
42.\(\textsf{Be}3??\) \(\textsf{Bce}2\)= 43.\(\textsf{Bd}4\) \(\textsf{Bxf}4\)= 44.\(\textsf{Bc}3\) \(\textsf{Bc}4\#
42...\(\textsf{Bf}2\)= 43.\(\textsf{Bf}3\) \(\textsf{Bf}2\)= 44.\(\textsf{Bg}3\)
1/2 – 1/2

In the first four exercises in the test which follows you should be trying to spot a trap and to avoid falling into it.

Then in the final eight exercises, your aim should be to set a trap for the opponent.
Exercises

Ex. 15-1

Ex. 15-4

Ex. 15-2

Ex. 15-5

Ex. 15-3

Ex. 15-6
Exercises
Solutions

Ex. 15-1

A. Yusupov – B. Nideroest

Switzerland 2010

35...Exd5?
Black falls straight into the trap.
Black would stand only slightly worse after defending his back rank with 35...d8=.

(1 point)

36.b8t g7 37.xh7t!
(another 1 point for this variation)

37...fx6
37...gxh7 38.h4† g7 39.h8#

38.fx8t xe5 39.f4t
1–0

Ex. 15-2

A. Khasin – M. Tal

USSR Ch, Leningrad 1956

27.e1?
White overlooks his opponent's reply.
He should force a draw: 27.xf4!

(2 points)

27...xe2 28.fx3 d2 (28...xe4?? 29.xe4 xe4 30.xf7† --) 29.xf4=
27...xd5! → 28.xf2
28.xd5 xe1 29.xf7† h8 30.xf4 g6→

28...e5 29.d3 d7 30.f4

Trying to entice his opponent into a trap.

30...c5!
Typical Tal! He sees the trap perfectly well, but goes into it because he has found a tactical refutation!

30...e1 is not bad: 31.a7 c5 32.xe1 xe1† 33.f1 xe7 34.xe7 xe7 35.xd4 xe6 But Tal's solution is even stronger.

31.xf7?
If you dig a hole for other people, you can still fall into it yourself!

31...b1xe2 32.xf3 xe1†

31...xd3! 32.xf3 xe1!

32...e1?! 33.xe7 xf3 34.xe8† xe8 35.xf3†

Ex. 15-3

M. Tal – K. Klaman

USSR Ch, Moscow 1957

Tal has just played 22.a1?! and in his words: “The aim of this move is to lure my opponent into a trap.”

22...f5?

Black duly falls into the trap.

Tal pointed out that Black should immediately seek counterplay on the queenside: 22...a5!

(1 point)

23.h5 e5 24.xf3 xc2 25.g6 c5†

Moves such as 22...c5?? (Moiseev) or 22...b6 are also sensible and earn 1 point.

23.xf5! exf5?
23...b3?? is more resilient.

24.xe7† xe7 25.e1† 25.d8

The point of White's 22nd move is shown by: 25...e6 26.xe6 xc2 (without check!) 27.xf8† ++ (Tal)

26.h4† f6 27.h6 c5 28.b3†--

(another 2 points for this variation)

28.xf8† c7 29.xf6?? (29.b3??+) 29...b3++ (Tal)

28...d5 29.xf8† c7 30.xf6 c8

31.c1 a4 32.c4!

Another little trap!

32...b7
32...xb3? 33.cxb3++

33.d1 c6
33...d8 34.c5++ (Moiseev)

34.c4†
34...d7 35.c5++
1–0
Solutions

Ex. 15-4

V. Smyslov – M. Tal
Bled/Zagreb/ Belgrade Candidates 1959

38. \( \text{e}5?! \)

White does not see the trap and misses the win. Let us examine the alternatives:

a) Several moves just lose to the discovered check: 38. \( \text{h}3?? \) \( \text{e}3\text{f}++ \) or 38. \( \text{c}8?? \) \( \text{e}3\text{f}\text{--} \) or 38. \( \text{c}2?? \) \( \text{e}3\text{f} \) 39. \( \text{f}3 \) (39. \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{g}1\text{f}++) \) 39...\( \text{d}2f++ \) 40.\( \text{x}d2 \) \( \text{xd}2\text{--} \).

b) 38. \( \text{c}3? \) is met by 38...\( \text{e}3\text{f} \) 39. \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{g}2d2f+.

c) 38. \( \text{h}2?! \) \( \text{e}3 \) (not 39...\( \text{g}2\text{x}g2?? \) 40.\( \text{g}2\text{x}g2 \) \( \text{xd}2 \) 41.\( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{xf}2\text{f}+ \) 42.\( \text{g}3\text{f}++ \), nor 39...\( \text{ex}f2?? \) 40.\( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 41.\( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{xb}5 \) 42.\( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{b}3= \)

d) The defence after 38. \( \text{e}3? \) (1 point) is less obvious: 38...\( \text{f}5! \) (not 38...\( \text{d}3? \) 39. \( \text{b}6! \) \( \text{e}3\text{f}+ \) 40. \( \text{h}2++ \) – 39. \( \text{f}6 \) (or 39. \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}3 \) 40. \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{d}2! \) 41. \( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{g}4+t= \) ) 39...\( \text{g}4t \) 40.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h}5! \) 41.\( \text{h}2! \) \( \text{g}4t= \)

e) 38. \( \text{c}1? \) (1 point) is strong: 38...\( \text{e}3f \) (38...\( \text{xc}1 \) 39. \( \text{xc}1\text{f}++) \) 39.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}2 \) 40.\( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 41.\( \text{e}1\text{f}+ \) (another 1 point)

f) The strongest move of all is: 38. \( \text{h}2\text{f}+-- \) (2 points)

38...\( \text{e}3\text{f} \) 39. \( \text{g}3 \)

(another point)

39...\( \text{g}1\text{f}+ \) (39...\( \text{h}1 \) 40.\( \text{h}6\text{f}++ \) – 40.\( \text{x}g1 \) \( \text{e}2 \) 41.\( \text{b}1\text{f}+ \) 42.\( \text{c}1++ \)

38...\( \text{g}1\text{f} \)!

(another point for spotting this idea)

39. \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{h}1\text{f}+ \) 40. \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{g}1\text{f} \)

White cannot escape the perpetual check: 41.\( \text{x}g1 \) \( \text{d}1\text{f}+ \) 42.\( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{h}5\text{f}+ \) 43.\( \text{g}2 \)

\( \text{g}3\text{f}+ \)

\( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)

Ex. 15-5

A. Yusupov – A. Sokolov
Basle (rapid) 2005

16...\( \text{a}6! \)

(2 points)

A benign trap. Black wants to trap the e5-knight!

Nothing is achieved by 16...\( \text{f}6 \) 17. \( \text{c}4 \).

16...\( \text{g}5?! \) and 16...\( \text{c}7 \) are both good moves

and earn 1 consolation point.

17. \( \text{f}c1? \)

White falls into the trap.

17. \( \text{xa}6?? \) would be even worse:

17...\( \text{a}8++ \).

17. \( \text{b}3\text{f}+ \) was a better reply.

17.\( \text{b}5 \) 18. \( \text{d}1 \)

Or 18. \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{xc}1\text{f}+ \) 19. \( \text{xc}1 \) \( \text{f}6\text{f}+. \)

18...\( \text{f}6 \) 19. \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{h}5++ \)

Ex. 15-6

P. Keres – M. Tal
USSR Ch, Moscow 1957

22...\( \text{d}8! \) (2 points)

A good move, which also happens to set a trap.

22...\( \text{a}6 \) (1 consolation point) is rather modest.

23. \( \text{b}4?! \)

White wants to force a draw, but overlooks an intermediate move.

Retreating the bishop is better: 23. \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{d}1\text{f}+ \) or 23. \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{xc}2 \) 24. \( \text{xc}2 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 25. \( \text{f}4\text{f}+ \).

23. \( \text{c}6\text{f} \) 24. \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{xd}3 \) 25. \( \text{xd}3 \)

25. \( \text{bxa}5 \) \( \text{xa}3 \) 26. \( \text{a}6 \) would be more resilient (Tal).

25...\( \text{xd}3 \) 26. \( \text{bxa}5 \) \( \text{xa}3 \) 27. \( \text{xa}7 \) \( \text{xa}5\text{f} 

28. \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{a}2 \) 29. \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{d}2 \) 30. \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{c}2 \)

31. \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 32. \( \text{h}4 \)

32. \( \text{h}3 \) is a better try (Tal).

32...\( \text{g}6 \) 33. \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{h}6++ \)

Black intends to continue with ...\( \text{f}4 \) or ...\( \text{h}5 \).

34. \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{xb}2 \) 35. \( \text{xb}2 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 36. \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{h}4\text{f}+ \)

37. \( \text{f}8 \) \( \text{g}3 \) 38. \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 39. \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{xf}3!+ \)

40. \( \text{gx}f3 \) \( \text{xf}3 \) 41. \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 42. \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{h}4 \) 43. \( \text{b}4 \)

h3 44. \( \text{g}1\text{f} \) \( \text{e}2 \)

0–1
Solutions

Ex. 15-7

S. Berndt – D. Fridman
Germany 2008

15...c6!

(2 points)

Black is seemingly only interested in getting the bishop out, but at the same time sets a nice trap that White falls straight into.

16. Rad1?

16.c4 g4 17.c3= was better.

16...g4!

(another 1 point)

17. Rxd8 Bxd8—

Black finishes an exchange up; the white queen is trapped.


21.c4 d7 22. Bd1 e6 23. c3 d5 24.e5

d5 25. ex5 Bxe2 26. Bxe2 d5 27.g4

d4 28. g5 Bxb2 29. Bxf6 g5 30. Bd4

Bd8 31.f4 Bxf2 32. Bxh5 d3 33. Bxf2 Bxf4

34. Be2 Be3+

0–1

Ex. 15-8

A. Yusupov – A. Jankovic
Bastia (rapid) 2012

This was a short game where both players were short of time, neither of them able to think about traps.

25...Ba1†!

(1 point)

The best try for Black is this trap.

Here I wanted to play 26.Bb1, but for some reason I touched the king! My opponent immediately made me aware that I had to move it, when I put it back. Who says there is no luck in chess?

26.d2!

26.Bb1? would be falling into the trap.

Black wins with: 26...Bxc2† 27. Bxc2 Bc3#

(another 1 point for this variation)

26...Bd8† 27. Bd4!

Had my opponent anticipated this move, he would not have been so eager for me to move my king. White wins.

27...Bxd4† 28. Bf2.e4† 29. Bf1 c8

30. Bd5 Bf4 31. Bc5 f4 32. Bc8 1–0

Ex. 15-9

B. Gurgenidze – M. Tal
USSR Ch, Moscow 1957

13... g4?

(2 points)

A benign trap.

The sensible moves 13... Ba6, 13... Bd7 or 13... Bxe7 each earn 1 point.

14. h3?

White falls into the trap.

He should have played 14. Bxg4 Bxg4


14... Bxf2! 15. Bxf2 Wh4† 16. Bf1 Bf4

17. Bd1 Bxh3!

This is even stronger than 17... Bxh3


Black brings in the reserves.

22... Bxe3 is less clear: 23. Bxe3 Bxc4†


27. Bd7=.

23. Bc3 Bae8 24. Bd2

24. Bd3 Bf5!—

24... Bxd5† 25. Bd5† Bxd5 26. Bf2 Bxe3

27. Be3 Bxe4†

The position can no longer be held:

28. Bxe4 Bxg2† 29. Bf1 Bxd2# or 28. Bd1

Ex3 29. Bxe3 Bg1† 30. Bx1 Bf2 31. Bc1 Bb3

32. Bc3 Bxe1† 33. Bxe1 Bd1#.

0–1
Solutions

Ex. 15-10
A. Gorovets – A. Yusupov
Warsaw (rapid) 2012

36...d3!

(2 points)

A strong move, preparing ...\(\text{Wd}4\). But White believed he could prevent this by simply taking the pawn.

37.\(\text{Wxd}3?\)

Better is: 37.\(\text{a}5\) \(\text{Wd}4\) 38.\(\text{c}3\) \(\text{Wf}4\) 39.\(\text{b}1=\)

37...\(\text{a}8+t\) 38.\(\text{a}6\) \(\text{xa}6+t\) 39.\(\text{xa}6\) \(\text{Wxd}2+t!!\)

(another 2 points)

A beautiful move, although not the only way to win.

39...\(\text{Wd}4\) (also 2 points) is good enough for victory too.

40.\(\text{a}3\)

40.\(\text{xd}2\) \(\text{a}1\#\)

40...\(\text{xb}1+\) 41.\(\text{xf}7+t\) \(\text{h}6\) 42.\(\text{c}4\) \(\text{a}1+t\)

43.\(\text{a}2\) \(\text{b}2+t\)

0–1

Ex. 15-11
M. Tal – R. Wade
Havana 1963

27.\(\text{Wxd}6!\)

(2 points)

Equally good is 27.\(\text{de}7?!\) (also 2 points) and now:

a) 27...\(\text{xe}7\) 28.\(\text{xd}6!\) (another 1 point)

28...\(\text{h}6\) 29.\(\text{g}6+–\)

b) 27...\(\text{e}5\) 28.\(\text{g}6+t\) \(\text{hx}g6\) 29.\(\text{h}3+t\) \(\text{g}8\)

30.\(\text{h}6+t+–\)

c) 27...\(\text{g}6\) 28.\(\text{xe}6+t\) \(\text{hx}g6\) 29.\(\text{h}3+t\) \(\text{h}7\)

30.\(\text{x}h7+t\) \(\text{gx}h7\) 31.\(\text{xd}6\) \(\text{e}2+\)

27...\(\text{Wxd}6\)

The main idea is: 27...\(\text{xe}4\) 28.\(\text{xe}8!\) (28.\(\text{f}7+t\) \(\text{g}8\) 29.\(\text{h}6+t\) \(\text{gx}h6\) 30.\(\text{f}6+t\) \(\text{g}7\) 31.\(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{xe}2\) 28...\(\text{h}5\) (28...\(\text{e}7\) 29.\(\text{f}8+t\) \(\text{g}8\) 30.\(\text{xe}8\) \(\text{x}g8\) 31.\(\text{ef}6+t+–\))

29.\(\text{f}8+t\) \(\text{h}7\) 30.\(\text{ef}6+t\) \(\text{gx}f6\) 31.\(\text{xf}6+t\) \(\text{g}7\) 32.\(\text{xe}4+–\)

(another 1 point for this variation)

28.\(\text{c}4+\) \(\text{h}6\) 29.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 30.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{g}8\) 31.\(\text{g}6\)

\(\text{e}3\)

31...\(\text{xb}2\) 32.\(\text{d}7+–\)

32.\(\text{h}5\) \(\text{c}5?\) 33.\(\text{b}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 34.\(\text{f}5\) \(\text{d}6\) 35.\(\text{c}1\)

\(\text{f}6\) 36.\(\text{xe}5\)

1–0

Ex. 15-12
I. Boleslavsky – I. Bondarevsky
Moscow/Leningrad 1941

25...\(\text{h}6!\)

(1 point)

26.\(\text{ex}h5?\)

In order to fight on, White has to play:

26.\(\text{f}2\) \(\text{xf}2\) 27.\(\text{xf}2\) \(\text{e}6\) 28.\(\text{f}6+t\) (28.\(\text{h}2+!\)

\(\text{g}7!\) 29.\(\text{c}6\) \(\text{xd}4\) 30.\(\text{c}x8\) \(\text{xc}8\) 31.\(\text{h}5+\) 28...\(\text{e}7\) 29.\(\text{xd}7\) \(\text{e}3\) 30.\(\text{f}5+t\) \(\text{xf}5\) 31.\(\text{e}2\)

\(\text{f}4\) 32.\(\text{e}5+\)

26...\(\text{g}8!+–\)

(another 1 point)

26...\(\text{g}7?\) would be weak: 27.\(\text{f}4\) \(\text{xf}4?\)

28.\(\text{xf}4+–\)

After 26...\(\text{g}6\) White plays 27.\(\text{h}1+\).

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

27.\(\text{ex}h6\) \(\text{g}1+–\)

27...\(\text{g}1+\)

28.\(\text{d}1\) runs into 28...\(\text{c}1+\).

0–1
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 31

26 points and above → Excellent
21 points and above → Good
15 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 15 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Castling on opposite sides

We have already looked at situations in which the kings are on opposite wings in the chapter on pawn storms (Chapter 20 of *Boost Your Chess 3*). A pawn storm is the typical and often the most effective way to open files and to weaken the opposing position, but it is sometimes possible to operate without a pawn storm.

Playing such positions well is very difficult. **Essentially you have to play with great energy.** If you waste too much time you can be destroyed by your opponent's attack. But also you must not completely neglect your own defence!

The main problem is finding the **correct blend of active operations and necessary defence!**

The following classic examples give us a lot of useful tips on how to play positions where the players have castled on opposite sides!

**B.Spassky – L.Evans**

Varna Olympiad 1962

1.d4 ♜f6 2.c4 g6 3.♘c3 ♗g7 4.e4 d6 5.♗c6 6.♗e3 a6 7.♗d2 b5 8.0–0–0

**Diagram 16-1**

A brave move, which was typical of the young Spassky. White aims for a complicated position with the players castled on opposite sides.

8...♗xc4?!

This is clearly premature. It may open the b-file, but Black is not yet able to make use of it. The disadvantage of the move is that White gains time for his development and gets a strong bishop on the a2–g8 diagonal.

8...♖a5?! would be better, retaining the option of ...♗b4.

And 8...0–0 is also possible.

9.♖xc4 0–0 10.h4

A typical pawn storm attack.

10...d5

Black was hoping that this central break would thwart his opponent. But the problem is his lack
of development and the opponent's stable central position.

If 10...e6, then 11.xe6 fxe6 12.g4± and White attacks quickly with h4-h5.

11.b3 dxe4

Diagram 16-2

12.h5!

This is how to handle such positions. Spassky opens lines on the kingside and is ready to accept the idea of a sacrifice!

12...exf3

13.hxg6 hxg6 14.xh6!

White goes for a quick attack, though capturing on f3 would also be good.

14.fxg2 15.xh4!

15.wxg2 is not so good because of 15...g4∞ and Black can protect his kingside with ...h5.

15.xg4

Of course 15...g4 now loses to 16.xg7.

16.xg7 xg7 17.wxg2

Diagram 16-3

In return for two pawns, White has a strong attack along the opened lines towards the black king. But he must conduct this attack very energetically, as otherwise Black could finally develop his forces.

17.xh6

Not 17...e3? on account of 18.wxh2++, threatening both h7+ and e5+.

The best solution would be 17...h8 18.xg4 xg4 19.wxg4 d7, although after 20.f3 White is still better.

On the other hand, 17...f5? weakens the kingside and 18.f3 gives White a strong attack:

a) 18...e3 loses after: 19.wxg5 or (19.wxh2++) 19.xd1 20.e5 e8 21.h6+ f6 22.e4+ fxe4 23.f4+ f5 24.g4#

b) The following variation is particularly nice: 18...h8 19.dh1 (19.xh8! followed by 20.h1+ is simpler) 19...h4 20.xh4 d7?

Diagram 16-4 (analysis)

21.xh7!! xh7 22.g5+ and White wins the queen.
All the white pieces are developed and almost all of them are already attacking... and what are the black pieces doing on the queenside?

18...e5 19.a6 f6

If 19...h8, then 20.xf7! xf7 21.e5+-. 19...e6 would be more resilient, though White should still triumph: 20.h1 g8 21.h7 f8 22.e5 a7 23.xg6+! fxg6 (23...xg6 24.xg6 fxg6 25.h8+ e7 26.h7+-) 24.a7+-

20.g5 d7

Too late...

21.e4 c7 22.dh1

The open file decides the game.

22...g8

22...f6 is met by 23.xf7+-.

23.h7+ f8 24.xf7+ e8

Diagram 16-6

25.wxg6!

The quickest and most efficient route to victory.

25...xe5 26.b8+!

1-0

B.Spassky – T.Petrosian

World Ch (19), Moscow 1969

1.e4 c5 2.f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.xd4 f6 5.c3 a6 6.g5 bd7 7.c4 a5 8.d2

Diagram 16-7

8...h6!?

This move weakens the kingside in the long term. The immediate 8...e6 would be better, intending ...b5 and ...b7.

9.xf6

Spassky aims to develop his forces very quickly, and then to attack his opponent in the centre.

9...xf6 10.0-0-0 e6

10...e5 is not pleasant on account of 11.f5 xf5 12.exf5 c8 13.b3 e7 14.b1± and White gains control of the d5-square.

10...g6 is followed by 11.f4 g7 and White may prepare to advance the e-pawn with 12.he1, or even play 12.e5!? straight away.

11.he1 e7?!
Having played ...h6, the plan with short castling is very dangerous. White can really speed up his attack since he clearly comes in contact with the black pawns more quickly and thus also opens the play more rapidly.

11...\textit{d7}! followed by long castling was better.

\textbf{12.f4 0–0 13.b3}

Although White has a lead in development, he must first consolidate his position on the queenside.

13.e5 dxe5 14.fxe5 would be too optimistic on account of 14...\textit{g4}, and the threat is ...\textit{g5}.

\textbf{13....e8}

Black is afraid of f4-f5 and defends the e6-pawn.

13...\textit{d7} would be followed by 14.b1 preparing f4-f5±.

13...\textit{d8}! would be interesting.

\textbf{14.b1!}

\textbf{Diagram 16-8}

A typical idea. Before opening the game, Spassky improves the position of his king.

\textbf{14....f8}

Avoiding a clever trap. If 14...\textit{d7}? then 15.e5! dxe5 16.fxe5 \textit{h7} 17.\textit{f5}! \textit{c6} 18.\textit{xe7}+ \textit{xe7} 19.\textit{d5}+-.

14...\textit{d7} intending ...\textit{c5} was worth considering.

\textbf{Diagram 16-9}

\textbf{15.g4!}

Of course, this is the way! Spassky is prepared to sacrifice a pawn to open a file leading towards the black king.

\textbf{15....xg4}

Played according to the motto: if you have to suffer, then at least get something in return.

15...\textit{d7} is met by 16.\textit{g1}± and the threat is g4-g5 (Bondarevsky).

After 15...e5?! White has a pleasant choice

a) The simple 16.fxe5 dxe5 17.\textit{f5} \textit{xf5} 18.gxf5 \textit{ad8} 19.\textit{g2} \textit{c7} 20.\textit{xd8} \textit{xd8} 21.\textit{g1} \textit{h8} 22.\textit{d5} gives White a clear advantage (Boleslavsky).

b) 16.\textit{f5} is even stronger: 16...\textit{xf5} 17.gxf5 \textit{exf4} 18.\textit{d5}! \textit{d8} 19.\textit{xf4}± White is clearly better due to his active bishop on b3.

\textbf{16.\textit{g2} \textit{f6}}

Or 16...e5 17.\textit{f5} \textit{xf5} 18.\textit{exf5} \textit{f6} 19.\textit{xb7}±.

16...\textit{h5} is met by 17.\textit{d3} intending \textit{h3}±.
17...\textit{\textbf{g}1}

Diagram 16-10

Of course Spassky now exerts pressure along the open g-file. In addition, there is also the threat of f4-f5 in order to activate the light-squared bishop.

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

Petrosian does not find a good defensive plan.

Here 17...\textit{\textbf{c}7} could be tried, so as to protect f7 and prepare ...b5.

18...\textit{\textbf{f}5} \textit{\textbf{h}8}

18...\textit{\textbf{e}xf5} is too dangerous after 19...\textit{\textbf{g}6}! \textit{\textbf{h}8} 20...\textit{\textbf{xf}7}. For example: 20...\textit{\textbf{fxe}4}?! 21...\textit{\textbf{d}6}! (\textit{\textbf{xf}6}) 21...\textit{\textbf{d}8} (or 21...\textit{\textbf{e}5} 22...\textit{\textbf{f}5} \textit{\textbf{xf}5} 23...\textit{\textbf{xf}5} \textit{\textbf{e}7} 24...\textit{\textbf{d}5} \textit{\textbf{xd}5} 25...\textit{\textbf{xd}5}++)

Diagram 16-11

22...\textit{\textbf{d}5}! \textit{\textbf{xd}5} 23...\textit{\textbf{g}8}!! \textit{\textbf{xg}8} 24...\textit{\textbf{xf}8}+

19...\textit{\textbf{d}8}!?

This prepares 20...\textit{\textbf{fxe}6} followed by 21...\textit{\textbf{xf}6}.

19...\textit{\textbf{fxe}6}! would perhaps be slightly more accurate, although Black then sacrifices the pawn back: 19...\textit{\textbf{xe}6} 20...\textit{\textbf{xe}6} \textit{\textbf{fxe}6} 21...\textit{\textbf{xd}6} \textit{\textbf{ac}8}±

19...\textit{\textbf{d}8}?

Petrosian is playing too passively.

Although it would be hard to calculate in an over-the-board game, it was possible to play 19...\textit{\textbf{e}5}! with the idea: 20...\textit{\textbf{f}6} \textit{\textbf{fxe}6} 21...\textit{\textbf{fxe}6} \textit{\textbf{xf}6}! (but not 21...\textit{\textbf{xe}6} 22...\textit{\textbf{xf}6}++) 22...\textit{\textbf{xe}6} \textit{\textbf{xe}6} 23...\textit{\textbf{xf}6} \textit{\textbf{gxf}6} 24...\textit{\textbf{g}6} \textit{\textbf{c}4} 25...\textit{\textbf{xf}6}+ \textit{\textbf{h}7} 26...\textit{\textbf{g}6}+ \textit{\textbf{h}8} and it is not clear whether White has more than perpetual check. However, White does not have to play 20...\textit{\textbf{e}6}.

Instead he gets a position with some pressure after the simple 20...\textit{\textbf{de}2}.

19...\textit{\textbf{e}5}! is probably the best defence, though Black will lead a very dangerous life, as can be seen from the following variations: 20...\textit{\textbf{f}3} \textit{\textbf{a}5} (20...\textit{\textbf{f}4} 21...\textit{\textbf{d}4}± or 20...\textit{\textbf{c}5} 21...\textit{\textbf{h}4} \textit{\textbf{g}5}) 21...\textit{\textbf{h}4} \textit{\textbf{ac}8} 22...\textit{\textbf{fxe}6} \textit{\textbf{xe}6} 22...\textit{\textbf{exe}6}? 23...\textit{\textbf{d}4} \textit{\textbf{e}5} \textit{\textbf{dxe}5} 24...\textit{\textbf{xf}6}!

20...\textit{\textbf{fxe}6} \textit{\textbf{fxe}6}

20...\textit{\textbf{fxe}6} is followed by 21...\textit{\textbf{xe}6} \textit{\textbf{fxe}6} and now 22...\textit{\textbf{de}2}! intending \textit{\textbf{f}4}± (Smyslov), is clearer than 22...\textit{\textbf{e}5} \textit{\textbf{dxe}5} 23...\textit{\textbf{e}4} \textit{\textbf{h}5}.  

Diagram 16-12

21...\textit{\textbf{e}5}!+

Clearing the e4-square for the knight.
21...dxe5 22.\(\text{c}\)xe4!
The decisive attack.

22...\(\text{h}\)h5 □
22...\(\text{c}\)xe4 23.\(\text{xf}\)xf8\(\text{+}\) + or 22...exd4 23.\(\text{c}\)xf6+-.

23.\(\text{g}\)g6!
Spassky attacks with all his forces.

23...exd4
Geller demonstrated a nice win for White after:
23...\(\text{c}\)f4 24.\(\text{xf}\)f4! exf4 25.\(\text{f}\)f3 \(\text{b}\)b6

Diagram 16-13
26.\(\text{g}\)g5!! \(\text{c}\)c6 (26...hxg5 27.\(\text{c}\)exg5+- or 26...\(\text{d}\)d8 27.\(\text{c}\)e5+-) 27.\(\text{f}\)f6 \(\text{e}\)e4 28.\(\text{xf}\)xh6\(\text{+}\)!!+

24.\(\text{g}\)g5!
There is no longer any defence: 24...hxg5 25.\(\text{xf}\)xh5\(\text{+}\) \(\text{g}\)g8 26.\(\text{f}\)f7\(\text{+}\) \(\text{h}\)h7 27.\(\text{f}\)f3 and the threat of \(\text{h}\)h3# is decisive.

1–0

In the test which follows you should try to act in accordance with the typical ideas for play with castling on opposite sides:
1) Attack with a pawn storm.
2) Open lines.
3) Attack very energetically.
4) When necessary, put the brakes on any attack by your opponent!

Not all the positions are particularly tactical, but they will help us to better understand the character of the play when the kings are on opposite flanks!
Exercises
Exercises
Solutions

Ex. 16-1

A.Yusupov – K.Bischoff
Munich 1990

22...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbackslash d}f6}\texttt{+} (2 points)

Playing 22...\texttt{\textbackslash h}7\texttt{+} first is just as good:
22...\texttt{\textbackslash g}8 23.\texttt{\textbackslash f}6 (also 2 points) 23...\texttt{\textbackslash xf}6
24.\texttt{\textbackslash f}3 \texttt{\textbackslash g}7 25.\texttt{\textbackslash exf}6 \texttt{\textbackslash xf}6 26.\texttt{\textbackslash e}5+–
22...\texttt{\textbackslash xf}6 23.\texttt{\textbackslash f}3!+–

The knight will be very strong on e5.
23...\texttt{\textbackslash h}7\texttt{+} is also possible, transposing to the
previous note.
23...\texttt{\textbackslash g}7 24.\texttt{\textbackslash exf}6 \texttt{\textbackslash xf}6 25.\texttt{\textbackslash e}5 \texttt{\textbackslash f}8
25...\texttt{\textbackslash e}8 26.\texttt{\textbackslash h}7\texttt{+} \texttt{\textbackslash f}8 27.\texttt{\textbackslash g}6\texttt{+}–

Ex. 16-2

Variation from the game

A.Yusupov – L.Christiansen
Mexico 1980

22...\texttt{\textbackslash b}5! (1 point)

23.axb5

After 23.\texttt{\textbackslash x}b5 \texttt{\textbackslash b}4 24.\texttt{\textbackslash xb}4?! \texttt{\textbackslash cxb}4 25.\texttt{\textbackslash xd}7
\texttt{\textbackslash e}2 Black's attack is very dangerous.
23...\texttt{\textbackslash b}6– (another 1 point)

Ex. 16-3

A.Yusupov – L.Christiansen
Mexico 1980

27.\texttt{\textbackslash d}1! (2 points)

White plays to eliminate any counterplay, as
would arise after 27.\texttt{\textbackslash xa}6 \texttt{\textbackslash xa}4\texttt{\textbackslash e}.

Ex. 16-4

V.Korchnoi – A.Yusupov
Dortmund 1994

23.\texttt{\textbackslash d}1! (2 points)

With this prophylactic solution, White
blocks the pawns on the queenside.
Both 23.h5 and 23.g5 (1 consolation
point for either) can be met by 23...a4 with
counterplay.
23...\texttt{\textbackslash f}6 24.\texttt{\textbackslash c}2\texttt{\textbackslash f}6

Ex. 16-5

London (3) 1863

White plays to eliminate any counterplay, as
would arise after 27.\texttt{\textbackslash xa}6 \texttt{\textbackslash xa}4\texttt{\textbackslash e}.

Ex. 16-5

W.Steinitz – A.Mongredien
London (3) 1863

15.\texttt{\textbackslash d}h7! (1 point)
Solutions

15...\texttt{d}xh7 16.\texttt{d}xh7! (another 1 point)

Equally good is 16.\texttt{d}h5! \texttt{f}6 17.\texttt{x}g6+-- (also 1 point).

16...\texttt{d}xh7 17.\texttt{d}h5\texttt{+} \texttt{g}8 18.\texttt{h}1 \texttt{e}8

19.\texttt{x}g6 \texttt{f}6 20.\texttt{x}f7\texttt{+}!

20.\texttt{h}7\texttt{+} \texttt{f}8 21.\texttt{h}3+-

20...\texttt{x}f7

20...\texttt{f}8 21.\texttt{xe}8 \texttt{exe}8 22.\texttt{h}8\texttt{+} \texttt{d}xh8

22.\texttt{h}6\texttt{+} \texttt{e}7 24.\texttt{g}5+--

21.\texttt{h}8\texttt{+}! \texttt{d}xh8 22.\texttt{xf}7+-

1–0

Ex. 16-6

\section*{Ex. 16-6}

\textbf{H. Pillsbury - Em. Lasker}

St Petersburg 1895

18...\texttt{c}a3!! (3 points)

18...\texttt{c}6 (1 consolation point) is not so strong: 19.\texttt{ex}f7\texttt{+} \texttt{d}f7 20.h4=.

Instead of retreating Black pours more oil on the fire.

19.\texttt{ex}f7\texttt{+}

19.bxa3 is followed by 19...\texttt{b}b6\texttt{+} and then:

a) 20.\texttt{a}1 \texttt{xd}4 21.\texttt{xd}4 \texttt{cxd}4 22.\texttt{x}b1 \texttt{fxe}6 23.\texttt{e}2 \texttt{f}4 24.\texttt{a}1 \texttt{e}2 25.\texttt{xf}7 (Kasparov)

b) 20.\texttt{c}2 \texttt{e}8 21.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{xd}4 22.\texttt{c}1 (22.\texttt{a}3 \texttt{c}2\texttt{+}! 23.\texttt{xc}2 \texttt{c}2\texttt{b}2\texttt{#}) 22...\texttt{e}3\texttt{+} (Tischbierek) 23.\texttt{e}2\texttt{+} 24.\texttt{f}1 \texttt{fxe}6 25.\texttt{f}3 \texttt{f}8 Black threatens to win by advancing his e-pawn.

26.\texttt{g}4 (26.\texttt{h}4 \texttt{f}3\texttt{+}++) 26...\texttt{a}5! 27.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{b}6 28.\texttt{e}1 \texttt{d}3 29.\texttt{e}2 \texttt{e}5--

c) 20.\texttt{b}5\texttt{?} \texttt{xb}5 21.\texttt{a}1 \texttt{fxe}6\texttt{+}

19.e7!? is answered with: 19...\texttt{e}8\texttt{?} (19...\texttt{e}8?? 20.\texttt{f}5\texttt{!}) 20.bxa3 \texttt{b}b6 21.\texttt{c}2 \texttt{c}8\texttt{?} 22.\texttt{c}2 \texttt{d}4 23.\texttt{e}2 \texttt{e}6 24.\texttt{f}3 \texttt{e}3\texttt{+} 25.\texttt{g}4 \texttt{g}6 26.\texttt{x}d5 \texttt{h}5\texttt{+}-- (Kasparov)

19...\texttt{ex}f7 20.bxa3 \texttt{b}b6 21.\texttt{a}5?!

21.\texttt{a}1 \texttt{xd}4 22.\texttt{xd}4 \texttt{cxd}4 23.\texttt{b}1 \texttt{e}4\texttt{+}--

21.\texttt{c}2 \texttt{c}7\texttt{+} 22.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{xd}4\texttt{+} 23.\texttt{e}1 \texttt{c}3\texttt{+} 24.\texttt{d}2 (24.\texttt{a}1 \texttt{c}3++ 25.\texttt{x}d4 \texttt{xd}4\texttt{+} 26.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{c}3\texttt{+}++) 24...\texttt{e}7\texttt{+} 25.\texttt{e}2 (25.\texttt{d}1 \texttt{a}1\texttt{+}

26.\texttt{c}2 \texttt{b}2\texttt{+} 27.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{c}3\texttt{#}) 25...\texttt{g}5\texttt{--+}

21...\texttt{xb}5\texttt{+} 22.\texttt{a}1

See Ex. 16-7.

\section*{Ex. 16-7}

\textbf{H. Pillsbury - Em. Lasker}

St Petersburg 1895

22...\texttt{c}7?!

For choosing the same move as Lasker you get 1 consolation point.

Kasparov pointed out the correct line:

22...\texttt{c}4! (1 point)

23.\texttt{g}4 \texttt{e}7!

(another 2 points)

Black threatens ...\texttt{e}4 or ...\texttt{e}2, and 24.\texttt{he}1 is simply met by 24...\texttt{xe}1 25.\texttt{xe}1 \texttt{c}3\texttt{+}--.

23.\texttt{d}2 \texttt{c}4 24.\texttt{hd}1?

White had am opportunity to save the game here: 24.\texttt{he}1! \texttt{a}5! 25.\texttt{e}8\texttt{+} \texttt{h}7 26.\texttt{f}5\texttt{+} \texttt{g}6 27.\texttt{e}7\texttt{+}! (27.\texttt{xf}6?? \texttt{g}1\texttt{+} 28.\texttt{b}2 \texttt{c}3\texttt{#})

27...\texttt{xe}7 28.\texttt{f}7\texttt{+} \texttt{h}8 29.\texttt{e}8\texttt{+} \texttt{g}7 30.\texttt{xe}7\texttt{=} (Kasparov)

24...\texttt{c}3?

24...\texttt{c}6! 25.\texttt{b}1 \texttt{g}5\texttt{+}

25.\texttt{f}5

25.\texttt{e}1! \texttt{c}8\texttt{+}

25...\texttt{c}4 26.\texttt{b}2?

26.\texttt{b}1! \texttt{xa}3 27.\texttt{b}1!!

26...\texttt{xa}3!! 27.\texttt{e}6\texttt{+}

27.\texttt{b}1\texttt{?} \texttt{xd}4\texttt{+}

27...\texttt{h}7?!

The correct square for the king is 27...\texttt{h}8! and now:

a) 28.\texttt{e}8\texttt{+} \texttt{h}7 29.\texttt{xa}3 \texttt{c}3\texttt{+} 30.\texttt{a}4 \texttt{a}6 31.\texttt{b}2 (31.\texttt{b}1 \texttt{b}5\texttt{+} 32.\texttt{xb}5 \texttt{axb}5\texttt{+} 33.\texttt{xb}5 \texttt{xd}2--++) 31...\texttt{xb}2--+

b) 28.\texttt{b}1 \texttt{xd}4 29.\texttt{xd}4 \texttt{xa}2\texttt{+} 30.\texttt{c}1 \texttt{c}3\texttt{#}

28.\texttt{xa}3?

28.\texttt{b}1 \texttt{xd}4! 29.\texttt{f}5\texttt{+} \texttt{g}6 30.\texttt{d}7\texttt{+} \texttt{g}7\texttt{+} (Kasparov)

After 28.\texttt{f}5\texttt{+} Black can retrace his steps and then make the correct choice as given
Solutions

in the note to his 27th move: 28...\textit{?}g8!
29.\textit{?}e6\texttt{?}h8!–+
28...\textit{?}c3\texttt{?} 29.\textit{?}a4 \texttt{b}5?! 30.\textit{?}xb5 \textit{?}c4\texttt{?}
31.\textit{?}a5 \texttt{d}8\texttt{?} 32.\textit{?}b6 \textit{?}xb6#

Ex. 16-8

\begin{center}
\textbf{R. Fischer – E. Geller}
Skopje 1967
\end{center}

21...\textit{a}4\texttt{?}!!

(2 points)

21...\textit{d}2\texttt{?} 22.\textit{?}xd2 \texttt{c}xd2 would be bad:
23.\textit{?}xg7\texttt{?} 24.\textit{?}g4\texttt{?} \texttt{h}8 25.\textit{?}d4\texttt{?}–+
22.\textit{?}g4

22.\textit{?}h6 \textit{?}f6 23.\textit{?}xf6 \textit{?}xb3 24.\textit{?}xd6
(24.\textit{?}xb3 \textit{?}xb3 25.\textit{?}f2 \texttt{xd}1\texttt{?} followed by:
26...\textit{d}4\texttt{?}–+ 24...\textit{a}2\texttt{?}!–+ (Geller)
(another 1 point for this variation)

22...\textit{?}f6\texttt{?} 23.\textit{?}xf6 \textit{?}xb3!

(another 1 point)

White is lost after 24.\textit{?}f4 \textit{?}a2\texttt{?} or 24.\textit{?}xb3
\textit{?}xf6.

0–1

Ex. 16-9

\begin{center}
\textbf{V. Korchnoi – B. Spassky}
Candidates Match (6), Kiev 1968
\end{center}

26.\textit{?}xg6\texttt{?}!!

(2 points)

26...\textit{h}xg6 27.\textit{?}h8\texttt{?} \textit{?}f7 28.\textit{?}h1\texttt{?} \textit{?}e8
29.\textit{?}xf8\texttt{?} \textit{f}xf8

29...\textit{?}xf8 is followed by: 30.\textit{?}xc7 \textit{?}a4
31.\textit{?}b5 (after 31.\textit{?}xa4 \textit{?}xa4 the d4-pawn is
weak) 31...\textit{?}a2 32.\textit{?}h7\texttt{?} (\texttt{?}c7\texttt{?}–+)
30.\textit{?}xc7 \textit{?}c4 31.\textit{?}xb7 \textit{?}xc3 32.\textit{?}xc3 \texttt{b}2\texttt{?}

32...\textit{?}a5?! 33.\textit{?}b5 (After 33.\textit{?}a7 \textit{?}c4 White
has nothing better than putting the rook
back on b7.) 33...\textit{?}e7\texttt{?} (but not 33...\textit{?}a2
34.\textit{?}d2\texttt{?})
33.\textit{?}c2 \textit{?}e8 34.\textit{?}g5\texttt{?} \textit{?}a6?

Better is 34...\textit{?}d7\texttt{?}.

35.\textit{?}d2\texttt{?} \textit{?}c8 36.\textit{?}c7\texttt{?} \textit{f}8 37.\textit{?}xc4 \texttt{d}xc4
38.\textit{?}xb2 \textit{?}b6\texttt{?} 39.\textit{?}c2 \textit{?}b7 40.\textit{?}xb7

Or 40.\textit{?}c7\texttt{?}–.

40...\textit{?}xb7 41.\textit{f}4 \textit{?}h7 42.\textit{?}b2!

Black resigned in view of 42...\textit{?}b7\texttt{?} 43.\textit{?}a3
\textit{?}b3\texttt{?} 44.\textit{?}a4 \textit{?}x3 45.\textit{?}b4\texttt{?}–.
1–0

Ex. 16-10

\begin{center}
\textbf{B. Spassky – V. Korchnoi}
Candidates Match (7), Kiev 1968
\end{center}

33.\textit{?}c7\texttt{?}–+

The defence is now overstretched.
33.\textit{?}h1 \textit{g}5 34.\textit{f}4 would not be so clear:
34...\textit{?}b7 35.\textit{?}b3 \textit{?}xb3 36.\textit{xe}3 \textit{f}4 37.\textit{?}c3
\textit{?}xb3\texttt{?} 38.\textit{?}xb3 \textit{?}xb3\texttt{?}–

33...\textit{?}e2

Other squares for the queen are no better:
a) 33...\textit{?}b6 34.\textit{?}e8\texttt{?} \textit{?}g8 (34...\textit{?}f8 35.\textit{?}c8
\textit{?}e7 36.\textit{?}c7 \textit{?}d7 37.\textit{?}d5\texttt{?}–) 35.\textit{?}h6 \textit{?}b5
36.\textit{?}xf6\texttt{?} \textit{?}xf6 37.\textit{?}c8\texttt{?}–

b) 33...\textit{?}d7 34.\textit{?}xa6\texttt{?}

c) 33...\textit{?}b7 34.\textit{?}e8\texttt{?} \textit{?}f8 35.\textit{?}d6–

34.\textit{?}e6\texttt{?} \textit{h}7\texttt{?}!

See Ex. 21-9 in \textit{Boost Your Chess 1}.
34...\textit{?}g8 35.\textit{?}c8\texttt{?} \textit{?}h7 36.\textit{?}xe2 \textit{?}xe2
37.\textit{?}a8\texttt{?}–
35.\textit{?}h6\texttt{?}!
1–0

Ex. 16-11

\begin{center}
\textbf{J. Capablanca – D. Janowski}
St Petersburg 1914
\end{center}

21.\textit{?}d1\texttt{?}±

(2 points)

White prepares a breakthrough in the centre
with d3–d4.

21...\textit{?}b7?!

A better defence is 21...\textit{?}d6 22.\textit{d}4 \textit{?}g5±.

22.\textit{d}4 \textit{?}d6 23.\textit{?}c2! \textit{ex}d4

23...\textit{?}g5 24.\textit{c}5–

24.\textit{ex}d4 \textit{?}f4 25.\textit{c}5 \textit{?}xd5 26.\textit{ex}d5 \textit{?}xd5
27.\textit{c}6\texttt{?}– 28.\textit{?}b8 28.\textit{?}xd7 \textit{?}xd7 29.\textit{d}5 \textit{?}e8
30.\textit{d}6 \textit{c}xd6 31.\textit{?}c6
1–0
Solutions

Ex. 16-12

E.Berg – E.Bareev
Gothenburg 2005

16...\textbf{g6}!!

(2 points)

16...\textit{exf7} (1 point) is not so clear: 16...\textit{exf7} \\
17...\textit{xe6} \textit{d5} 18...\textit{h7} \textit{dxe5} \textit{hxg5} \\
20...\textit{xa8} \textit{f8}^= \\
16...\textit{hxg5}

16...\textit{fxg6} 17.\textit{exe6}±

17...\textit{hxg5} \textit{fxg6} 18.\textit{exe6} \textit{e4}^= \\
18...\textit{h7} 19.\textit{exe6} \textit{f7} 20...\textit{f4}! (threatening \textit{exh7}) 20...\textit{exg5} 21...\textit{fxg5} \textit{exg2} 22...\textit{exh7}! \\
\textit{exh7} 23.\textit{exe5} and White still has a powerful attack.

But it would be a brave man who would willingly advance his king like this without having first analysed it at home.

19...\textit{h8}^= 20.\textit{exe5} \textit{dxe5} 21...\textit{h5}^= \textit{g6} \\
22...\textit{h7}^= 23.\textit{hxg7} \textit{hgx7} 24.\textit{h6}+ \\
\textit{f7} 25...\textit{h7}^= 26.\textit{exe6}+ \textit{f7} 27...\textit{c6}!

27...\textit{hxg5} 28.\textit{b1} \textit{xc6} 29.\textit{fxe6} \textit{f8} 30...\textit{xc6} \textit{e8}^= \\
28.\textit{exe6}

28...\textit{g8}?! may be even stronger.

28...\textit{b7}

Returning a piece with 28...\textit{f8}?! was Black’s last chance to fight on.

29...\textit{g6}+ \textit{g7} 30.\textit{h1} \textit{f6} 31.\textit{h8}+ \textit{g8} \\
32.\textit{g7}

1-0

Scoring

Maximum number of points is 29

25 points and above\rightarrow\textbf{Excellent} \\
20 points and above\rightarrow\textbf{Good} \\
14 points\rightarrow\textbf{Pass mark}

If you scored less than 14 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
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Pawn chains

Pawns on the same diagonal without an empty square between them form a pawn chain. We want to examine the situation in which opposing pawn chains mutually block each other.

Such interlocked positions can occur rather quickly in the French Defence after the moves 1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.e5. But similar interlocked positions can be found in other openings as well. In the King’s Indian Defence, if White meets the typical move ...e5 with d4-d5, both sides get pawn chains: d5-e4 against c7-d6-e5 (for example, after the moves 1.d4 ♞f6 2.c4 g6 3.♕c3 ♛g7 4.e4 d6 5.♕f3 0-0 6.♕e2 e5 7.d5).

Nimzowitsch studied situations like this (especially those arising from the Advance Variation of the French Defence) and has provided us with some important recommendations. The interlocking pawn chains divide the board into two wings and determine the plans of the individual sides. Thus in the Advance Variation, White usually plays on the kingside, whilst Black prepares his counter-measures on the queenside.

In addition to piece play on the appropriate flank, there is a standard strategic option: attacking the pawn chain.

According to Nimzowitsch, one must attack the pawn chain at its base (the last blocked pawn). Consider 1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.e5.

Diagram 17-1

Here the move 3...c5 is correct, in order to have a go at the base of the chain (the d4-pawn). And the strategy White would like to pursue would be an attack on the base of Black’s chain (the e6-pawn) prepared by f4-f5. The aim of the attack on the base is not just to weaken the chain, but also to open files and invade the opposing position.

Nimzowitsch was fundamentally more sceptical about the other form of attacking the pawn chain – attacking its head (in the Advance Variation with the move ...f6) – although he himself did recommend this idea at the correct moment.
However, modern praxis has shown that this strategic option can also be used. Frequently one is prevented from carrying out the main plan (attacking the base), or a good opportunity occurs to operate on the side on which the opponent is nominally stronger so as to seize the initiative there, or at least to prevent the opponent’s operations there in good time. A brilliant example of the attack against the head of a chain can be found in the game Sveshnikov – Timman from Chapter 4 of *Boost Your Chess 2.*

Another of Nimzowitsch’s strategic ideas – **transferring the attack from one member of the chain to another** – has also received confirmation in modern chess and is especially successful in the King’s Indian Defence. There Black frequently plays ...f5-f4 as a reply to f2-f3 and transfers his attack from the e4-pawn to the pawn on f3, after advancing further on the kingside with the g-pawn.

The following two examples show a lot of ideas which are typical for pawn chains.

**T.Petrosian – A.Lutikov**

USSR Ch, Moscow 1961

1.d4 ♙f6 2.c4 g6 3.♕c3 ♙g7 4.e4 d6 5.♕e2 0–0 6.♕f3 e5 7.d5

**Diagram 17-2**

After this move we get two pawn chains: e4-d5 and e5-d6-c7. Typical of White’s play is the preparation of the advance c4-c5 (attacking the base d6-pawn). Black generally aims to continue playing on the kingside with ...f5. By doing so he wishes to at least slow down the white attack on the queenside.

7...a5

This prevents for the moment b2-b4 and then c4-c5, and prepares to bring the knight to the c5-square which he has secured.

8.♕g5

This has become known as the Petrosian System. White tries to draw the teeth from the black play on the kingside.

8...h6 9.♕h4 ♙a6

9...g5 10.♕g3 ♙h5 is the main alternative.
10.\( \text{d2} \)

Diagram 17-3

10...\( \text{d7?}! \)
Later a much better set-up was found, 10...\( \text{e8} \) 11.0-0 \( \text{h7} \) 12.a3 \( \text{d7} \) as, for example, Kasparov played against me in Barcelona 1989. In this case, White cannot play b2-b4 straight away and must first continue with 13.b3, to meet the threat of ...a4 blockading the queenside.

11.a3 \( \text{h7} \)
Black prepares ...f5.

12.f3
White protects his e4-pawn in advance, and at the same time prepares for his dark-squared bishop to retreat to f2.

12...f5
12...h5, intending ...\( \text{h6} \) (or ...\( \text{f6} \)), is the other plan for Black.

Diagram 17-4

13.b4?!\( \)
White takes advantage of his opponent’s inaccurate play and saves some tempi.

13...\( \text{xb4?!} \) 14.axb4
The knight is pinned and there is the threat of b4-b5.

14...\( \text{b8} \) 15.\( \text{b1} \)
15.b5? \( \text{c5} \) just leads to a blockade of the queenside.

15...\( \text{f6} \) 16.\( \text{f2} \)
Petrosian prepares c4-c5.

16...\( \text{c7} \)
Black tries to prevent it.

17.c5!\( \)
Petrosian plays it nevertheless!

Diagram 17-5

17...\( \text{h7} \)
17...dxc5 is bad on account of: 18.\( \text{xa6} \) cxb4 (or 18...\( \text{xa6} \) 19.\( \text{xc5} \!+) 19.\( \text{c4} \!+) with the threat of 20.d6\( \text{.} \)

18.\( \text{xd6} \) cxd6
At first sight White’s achievements appear to be modest; he has only opened the c-file. But the weakness on b6 lets White further develop his play on the queenside.

19.0-0
Transferring the attack, according to Nimzowitsch’s strategy! Black now wants to attack the new base of the white chain, the f3-pawn. This attempt is ambitious because the possible opening of the g-file would bring many attacking chances. However, Black needs too much time for that. Petrosian plays energetically on the queenside and does not allow this potential attack.

19 ... fxe4 20. dxe4 f5 21. d3± would give White control over the e4-square and a very comfortable game.

19 ... h5, intending ... f4, is worth considering. White usually reacts to this move with 20.g3± or 20.e4! f4 21.f1± intending to follow up with g2-g3.

20.e4! c7 21. b6±

After this move White will always be able to exchange Black’s light-squared bishop. This exchange is strategically very important for White, since the potential black attack on the kingside is very hard (or even impossible) to execute without the light-squared bishop.

21...g5 22.a1 e8 23.h1 d7 24. xd7!

Otherwise Black could save his bishop.

24...xd7 25.a4 f8 26.b6 g7

Black has laboriously prepared ... g5-g4, but now Petrosian carries out a prophylactic operation on the kingside.

27.g4!

White improves his position on the kingside with this typical move. Black either takes the g4-pawn en passant, and then the attack on the head of the black chain would for practical purposes have been carried out successfully, or else he leaves the g4-pawn alone, which is perhaps even more favourable for White because it brings to a stop his opponent’s play on the kingside.

27...h5

27...fxg3 looks better, but after 28.hxg3 (28.xg3 h5 is less clear) 28...h5 29.g2 followed by h1, White nevertheless has a clear advantage.
28.\textit{h3}

Black can no longer get through on the kingside, whereas on the queenside White has major advantages.

\textit{28.\textit{...\textit{h8} 29.\textit{g2 g8 30.\textit{h1 h}xg4 31.hxg4 \textit{h}xh1 32.\textit{w}xh1 \textit{d}7}}}

\textbf{Diagram 17-9}

From a strategic point of view, the game is practically over. Petrosian now activates his forces on the queenside.

\textit{33.\textit{w}c1 \textit{xb6 34.\textit{xb6 a}8 35.a7 \textit{d}8 36.b5}}

36.f2?! \textit{b8 37.b5} (intending b5-b6) would be a good alternative.

\textit{36.\textit{c}7 37.f2 f7 38.e2 \textit{h}8 39.h1}

This gets rid of the final active counter-chance.

\textit{39.\textit{hxh1 40.hxh1 \textit{h}h8 41.g2 \textit{b}8?!}

Black tries to bring his knight into the game. However, 41...\textit{d}8 was a better defence.

\textbf{Diagram 17-10}

\textit{42.d7!}

White exploits the opportunity to activate the bishop.

\textit{42...\textit{c}7?!}

Black still had a surprising defensive idea in reserve. The only practical chance was to try 42...\textit{d}8?! (\textit{\ldots e}6). If White replies 43.\textit{w}c8? then Black has 43...\textit{xc}8 44.\textit{xc}e8 b5 45.d7 \textit{b}6 with a fortress. The correct response is 43.\textit{w}d1± intending \textit{h}1.

\textit{43.\textit{w}c1 \textit{a}6 44.\textit{w}h1 \textit{g}7}

44...\textit{xb}4? leads to a rapid mate: 45.\textit{h}7\textit{f}e6 46.\textit{d}5+-

\textit{45.f5 \textit{h}8 46.b1 \textit{e}8 47.h1 \textit{h}8 48.a1?!}

48...\textit{b}8?

48...\textit{xb}4? is bad: 49.b1 \textit{a}6 50.\textit{xb}7+-

48...\textit{e}8\textit{!}\texttt{±} would be more resilient.

\textbf{Diagram 17-11}

\textit{49.\textit{w}a4!+-}

Black can no longer prevent the penetration of the white queen and the attack on the light squares decides matters.

\textit{49...\textit{f}8}

49...\textit{c}7 50.e8+- or 49...\textit{d}8 50.b5+-.

\textit{50.d7! \textit{xb}4 51.e6 \textit{c}7 52.h7?!}
Pawn chains

52.\(\mathbb{Wh}6\) is also good: 52...\(\mathbb{e}8\) 53.\(\mathbb{W}g6\) 54.\(\mathbb{e}6\)–
52...\(\mathbb{e}8\) 53.\(\mathbb{W}g6\)
1–0

L. Forgacs – S. Tartakower
St Petersburg 1909

1.e4 \(e6\) 2.d4 \(d5\) 3.\(\mathbb{Cc}3\) \(\mathbb{Df}6\) 4.\(\mathbb{Gg}5\) \(\mathbb{e}7\) 5.e5 \(\mathbb{Df}4\)!
5...\(\mathbb{D}d7\) is a better reply.
6.\(\mathbb{D}xe4\) \(\mathbb{D}xg5\) 7.\(\mathbb{D}xg5\) \(\mathbb{W}xg5\)

Diagram 17-12

8.\(\mathbb{G}3?\)
8.\(\mathbb{D}f3\) is a standard reaction, but White does not want to block his \(f\)-pawn.
8...\(e5\)
Black attacks the base of the white chain.
9.\(\mathbb{Cc}3\) \(\mathbb{Cc}6\) 10.\(\mathbb{F}f4\) \(\mathbb{W}e7\) 11.\(\mathbb{D}f3\)
White has a minimal advantage.
11...\(\mathbb{C}d7\)
11...cxd4 12.cxd4 \(\mathbb{W}b4\) 13.\(\mathbb{D}d2\) is slightly better for White.
12.\(\mathbb{W}d2\) 0–0 13.\(\mathbb{D}d3\)

Diagram 17-13

13...\(c4?\)
Transferring the attack to the new base \(c3\)-pawn is not strategically justified here. Black has no time for his slow play on the queenside.

He should instead open the \(c\)-file. Then White would not be able to attack so freely on the kingside:
13...cxd4 14.cxd4 \(\mathbb{W}b4\)

14.\(\mathbb{Cc}2\) \(b5\) 15.0–0

“Action and counter-action are in full flow, but whereas the white attack is aimed directly at the heart of the opposing position, all Black achieves with his counter-attack is the occupation of a piece of no-man's land” – Euwe & Kramer

15...\(a5\) 16.\(\mathbb{B}ae1\) \(b4\)

Diagram 17-14

17.\(\mathbb{F}5!\)
White threatens \(f5\)-f6.

“The start of a magnificent breakthrough. The more methodical 17.\(g4\) would give Black the opportunity to play 17...\(f5\)” – Euwe & Kramer. Despite that,

205
I believe that White would still be better after continuing 18.exf6 \( \text{Exf6} \) 19.\( \text{Qg5} \) with attacking chances.

17...exf5

17...f6? 18.fxe6 \( \text{fxe6} \) 19.exf6 \( \text{gxf6} \) 20.\( \text{Qh7} \) \( \text{gxh7} \) 21.\( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 22.\( \text{gxf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 23.\( \text{Qxe6} \) (Euwe)

18.g4!

18...fxg4

Black could try 18...f4? 19.\( \text{Exf4} \) and now he must avoid 19...\( \text{Qe6} \) 20.\( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{h6} \) 21.\( \text{Qh7} \) \( \text{Be8} \) 22.\( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 23.\( \text{Qxh6} \)++. But instead 19...\( \text{Qd8} \) followed by 20...\( \text{Qe6} \) is correct, and Black can still put up a defence.

18...f6 is met by 19.e6± (Euwe).

19.\( \text{Qg5} \) g6?

This weakens the dark squares.

The variation 19...\( \text{h6} \)?! 20.\( \text{Qh7} \) \( \text{bxc3} \)?! 21.\( \text{Qxc3} \) \( \text{Qfb8} \) 22.\( \text{Qf6} \)++ is no better. However, in this line the exchange sacrifice 20...\( \text{Qh4} \)! is worth considering.

20.\( \text{Exf6} \)

The strong e5-pawn gives the white rook the necessary support.

20...\( \text{Qg7} \)

20...\( \text{h6} \) is followed by 21.\( \text{Qxg6} \) \( \text{fxg6} \) 22.\( \text{Qg6} \) \( \text{h8} \) 23.\( \text{Qxh6} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 24.\( \text{Qg6} \) \( \text{h8} \) 25.e6 \( \text{Qe8} \) 26.\( \text{Qf7} \)++ and White mates.

21.\( \text{Qef1} \)

Threatening \( \text{Qxf7} \)++.

21...\( \text{Qe8} \) 22.\( \text{Qf4} \)

This makes the threat of \( \text{Qe6} \)++ stronger.

The immediate 22.\( \text{Qe6} \)++ \( \text{fxe6} \) 23.\( \text{Qxf8} \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) 24.\( \text{Qxf8} \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) would give Black drawing chances.

22...\( \text{Qd8} \)

Black tries to hold the position but there are too many weaknesses on the dark squares.

23.e6!

23.\( \text{Qxg4} \) would also be good, but the move played is much more energetic.

23...\( \text{Qa6} \) 24.\( \text{Qe5} \)

Threatening a discovered check.
24...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{h}6}}

\textbf{Diagram 17-18}

25.\texttt{\textbf{f}5}

The most elegant solution – White prepares \texttt{\textit{xf}7\texttt{\textbf{t}}}.

25...\texttt{\textit{fxe}6} 26.\texttt{\textit{xf}7\texttt{\textbf{t}}}! \texttt{\textit{xf}7}

Or 26...\texttt{\textit{g}7} 27.\texttt{\textit{xg}6\texttt{\textbf{t}}} \texttt{\textit{gxg}6} 28.\texttt{\textit{f}4\#}.

27.\texttt{\textit{h}5\texttt{\textbf{t}}} \texttt{\textit{g}7} 28.\texttt{\textit{gxg}6\#}
Exercises
Solutions

Ex. 17-1

**L. Shamkovich – R. Nezhmetdinov**

USSR Ch, Baku 1961

1.d4 ♙f6 2.c4 g6 3.♘c3 ♙g7 4.e4 0–0 5.♗f3 d6 6.♗g5 e5 7.0–0 ♙c6 8.d5 ♙e7 9.♗d2 ♙e8 10.b4 f5 11.f3

**Diagram Ex. 17-1**

11...♗f4!?  

(1 point)

The main line.

11...♗xe4 is less interesting: 12.♗xe4± or 12.♗xe4 ♙f5 13.♗d3±.

12.♘c5 ♗g5 13.♗xe4 ♗f7 14.♗d2 ♗g6 15.♗e1 ♖f8 16.♗f2 ♧5 17.♗c1 ♙f6 18.cxd6 ♔xd6

19.♗b5

See Ex. 17-2.

Ex. 17-2

**L. Shamkovich – R. Nezhmetdinov**

USSR Ch, Baku 1961

19...♗g4!  

(2 points)

The critical continuation.

White is better after 19...♗b6 20.a4 (or 20.c3?).

20.♗xa7

20.♗xa7!? is stronger, and now:

a) 20...♗g3 21.♗b6 ♖d7 22.a5±

b) 20...♗h4 is a better way for Black to seek counterplay. Although White may be objectively well placed, Black has very good practical chances, since he is mounting an attack on the king.

20...♗d7 21.a4 ♗g3 22.♗b6 ♗e7 23.♗h1?!

After 23.♗b5!? Black should not be tempted by 23...♗xe4? 24.♗xe4 ♖h4, because of 25.hxg3 ♖xg3 26.♗xf7 ♖h2† 27.♗f1 ♖h1† 28.♗g1++. However, either 23...♘h2! or 23...♗h7!? followed by ...♖h4 is quite promising for Black.

23...♗h7?!

23...♗h7?!

24.♗b5 ♗g4! 25.♗h3 ♖h4 26.♗d2

Or 26.♗g1 ♖e3! followed by 27...♖xh3+–.

26...♖e3! 27.♗d3

27.♗xe3 ♖xh3+–

27...♖xh3 28.♖xh3 ♗g2† 29.♗g1 ρxh1† 30.♖xf1 ♖g3† 31.♗g2 ♖h4† 32.♖f2  ♖xg2 33.♖xg3† ♖xg3 0–1

Ex. 17-3

**L. Nisipeanu – A. Yusupov**

Bundesliga 2004

11.♗a4!  

(2 points)

Black is surprisingly counter-attacked on his stronger flank.

11...c4?!

11...♗xa4 12.♗xa4+

Black should try 11...b4 12.a5 ♖d7±.

12.axb5 ♖c7 13.♗a5± ♖d7 14.♗f4 ♗g6 15.h4 ♖xb5 16.♗h5 0–0 0–0 17.♗g5 ♖h6 18.♗h3!± – ♖d8 19.♖xe6 ♖xe6 20.♖xh6 ♖f5 21.♖g5 ♖b7 22.g4 ♖xg5 23.♖xg5 ♖xh6 24.♖f6 ♖g8 25.g5 ♖e8 26.♖c2 ♖g6 27.♖fa1 ♖a8 28.♖a4 ♖ac7 29.♖xa7† ♖xa7 30.♖xa7† ♖c8 31.♖c5

1–0

Ex. 17-4

**G. Kamsky – A. Yusupov**

Belgrade 1991

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.♗c3 ♗b4 4.e5 c5 5.♗a3 ♖xc3† 6.bxc3 ♖e7 7.♖g4 0–0 8.♗d3 ♖bc6 9.♗h5 ♗g6 10.♗f3 (Δ11.♗g5 ♖h6 12.♖xf7!) 10...♖c7† 11.0–0 (11.♖g5 ♖h6 12.♖xf7 ♖xf7 13.♖xg6 ♖xg6 [13...♖xf2?? 14.♖d1++] 14.♖xg6 ♖d4=) 11...c4 12.♗e2 (12.♗g5?! ♖h6 13.♖xf7 ♖xd3 14.♖h6† ♖xh6 15.♖xg6† ♖g7++)

**Diagram Ex. 17-4**

12...f6!  

(2 points)
13...exf6 14...d1
14.g3 15...e3?! 16...g5 J.Polgar – Hertneck, Cologne 1991, and now Black should play 16...e8?!.
14...d7 15...e1 16...b1 h6 17...h1?! 18...g1 b6 19...d2 20...f1 21...h3 e5 22.g4 e4 23...xf5 24...g3
16...xf3 25...xc2 26...c1 27...d3!

Ex. 17-5
A.Yusupov – V.Akopian
Yerevan 2001
1.d4 d5 2.c4 c6 3.e3 3...f6 4...f3 5...c3 6...h4 6.g6 7...b3 8...xg6 hxg6 9.g3 10...d2 11...c1 12.c5 13...g2
Diagram Ex. 17-5
13...e5!
13...b6 (1 point) is followed by 14.cxb6 axb6 15.e4!? dxe4 16...xe4 17...d5± and the c6-pawn is a weakness.
14.0–0 0–0 15...c2 16.b4 17.b5 18...e6 19...c3 19...f3 20...c5 21...g5 22...g4 23...h3 24...e3 12...f5 25...h2 26...d1 27...a5
28...e1 29...d2 30...xd2 31...b2 0–1

Ex. 17-6
Y.Pelletier – A.Yusupov
Basle (rapid) 2005
1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3...c3 3...b4 4.e5 5...e7 5...c5 6.bxc3 c5 7...g4 0–0 8...d3 9...c6 9...h5 10...d3 11...c6 12...g6
fxg6 13...g4 14...h4 15.h5 gxh5 16...xh5 17...xh5 18...h2 19...d2 20...f8 21...e1 b5 22.g4
Diagram Ex. 17-6
22...a5
22...a5
(2 points)
Black obtains counterplay by preparing to break with ...b4.
However, first playing 22...e8 (also 2 points) is just as good.
23...g5 24...g6?!
White should play 24...xh5 25...xh5 25...xh5, although 25...e8 gives Black compensation for the pawn.
24...xg6 25...g2?! b4 26...f4 27...xf4 28...xf4 29...g3 30...e3 31...e8 32...f5?!

Ex. 17-7
A.Yusupov – S.Mariotti
Dubai Olympiad 1986
14...e5!
15.e3
Or 15.b3 16...b2 17...b5±.
15...f4 16.gxf4 exd4 17.exd4 18...e3 19...xe3 20...f2 21...d1 22...h1! 23...h5 24...g2 25...f5 26...e3 27...e1 28...f1 29...d2 30...xd2 31...b2 ½–½

Ex. 17-8
J.Marcote – A.Yusupov
Oviedo rapid 1993
12...b6!
(2 points)
A standard attack against the pawn chain. 12...e8? is a decent alternative and earns 1 point.
13...c1 14...f3 15.b4
After 15.cxb6?! 16...xb6 the d4-pawn is weak.
15...a5! 16.a3
16...a4 17...b6 18...xb6 axb6 18...xb6 19...b6 19...b3 20...b3 20...b3 21...a4 22.g4
Diagram Ex. 17-8
22...a5
(2 points)
Black obtains counterplay by preparing to break with ...b4.
Ex. 17-9

A. Shirov – A. Yusupov

Prague (rapid) 2002

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.e5 c5 4.c3 6.c6 5.d3 d6 7.e2 Ec8 7.0–0 Eg7 8.a3 cxd4 9.cxd4 Gg6 10.c2 e7 11.c3 d6 0–0 12.Re1

Diagram Ex. 17-9

12...f6!

(2 points)

A standard idea in the French Defence.

13.exg6

13.exf6 is followed by 13...fxe6 (or 13...Exf6!!) 14.Exg6 hxg6.

13...hxg6 14.Wd3?! f5 15.Wd2 f4 16.b4 g5 17.h3 e8! 18.a3 Gg6

Ex. 17-10

A. Yusupov – Z. Lanka

Eupen 1996

23.g4!

(3 points)

A typical idea which we saw in Petrosian’s game. White stops the counterplay on the kingside, while on the queenside his position is already superior.

The sensible moves 23.Ac7 or 23.Ab6 each earn 1 consolation point.

23...hxg4

23...fxg3 24.hxg3 h4 25.Ac2


Ex. 17-11

Y. Seirawan – A. Yusupov

Belgrade 1991

16...c6!? (2 points)

Certainly not 16...Oe8?? 17.b5+-.

17.dxc6! bxc6 18.Ac2±


18.d5?! 19.c5!


19.b5?! Oxb4 20.Oxb4 Oxh4 21.bxc6 Oc5 22.Ac1 Ac6= 19...Ac6!? It is stronger to play 19...dxe4 20.fxe4 Oc4, with the idea 21.Ac4? Oxh4+-.

20.Ac4! dxe4 21.fxe4 Oc4!±

Ex. 17-12

U. Adianto – A. Yusupov

Indonesia 1983

12...f5!?

(2 points)

If 12...Exg6, then 13.exf6 gxf6 14.g3±.

12...0–0 (1 consolation point) is also met by 13.exf6±.

It is better for Black to keep the position closed.

13.g3!

Better is either 13.a4= or 13.Ac5!? 0–0 14.h4=.

13...Ac4! 14.Ac2

14.Ac5!? h6 15.Ac5± g6 16.Ac4 Ocxc4±

14.h6± 15.h4 0–0 0–0 16.Ac2 Ac8!

16...Acg8 17.h5! Ae8 18.Ac4 g5 19.hxg6 Acg6 20.Ac6 Ac6 21.Ac4 followed by Ac4∞

17.Ac2! Ac7 18.Ac1 Ac7 19.f4 Acg8

Black has the initiative.
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 24

21 points and above → Excellent
17 points and above → Good
12 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 12 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Transition from the opening to the ending

In some openings there is the possibility of exchanging queens very early and heading for the endgame. It is usually White who makes use of this opportunity, for example in the Exchange Variation of the Ruy Lopez, the Petroff Defence or the Classical Variation of the King’s Indian Defence (after dxe5).

But there are also some opening variations for Black which are based on a transition from the opening to the ending. The most famous is the Berlin Wall in the Ruy Lopez. We have already seen some examples in which the game was steered rather early into an endgame (for example, Yusupov – Christiansen in Chapter 2 of Boost Your Chess 3).

A.Yusupov – B.Lalic
European Team Ch, Pula 1997

1.d4 ♕f6 2.e4 g6 3.♕c3 d5 4.cxd5 ♕xd5 5.e4 ♕xc3 6.bxc3 ♕g7 7.♕e3 c5 8.♕d2

In this variation White accepts the fact that his opponent can exchange queens very early on.

8...♕a5

In my game against Khalifman, Ubeda 1997, Black played: 8...cxd4 9.cxd4 ♕c6 10.♕d1 ♕a5 (After the game Khalifman suggested that 10...0-0!? is better, intending 11.d5 ♕a5!=.) 11.♕xa5 ♕xa5 12.♕d3 0-0 13.♕e2 ♕d7 14.♕b1!? (Alexander) 14...b6 15.♕d2 White was slightly better because his king is safe in the centre and the opposing queenside is open to attack. See Boost Your Chess 2, Chapter 9.

9.♕b1 b6 10.♕b5+ ♕d7 11.♕e2

Once more Black heads for the endgame without really sensing the danger. Later Kasparov found a better idea here: 11...♕c6! followed by ...♕d7 and ...♕d8, Shaked – Kasparov, Tilburg 1997.

12.cxd4 ♕c6 13.♕xa5 ♕xa5 14.♕a6?

White prepares ♕e2. The king will go to d2, then White will try to capitalize on the c-file.
14...0–0 15.\( \text{d}e2 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 16.\( \text{b}d3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 17.\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{f}c8 \)

Black could consider 17...\( \text{e}6 \)? followed by \...\( \text{c}6 \) and \...\( \text{f}d8 \).

18.\( \text{h}c1 \)

**Diagram 18-2**

18...\text{e}6

After 18...\( \text{xc}1 \)?! 19.\( \text{xc}1 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 20.\( \text{xc}8 \)\( +\), White (as in the Yusupov – Khalifman game referred to above) is clearly better because the a7-pawn can be attacked. His plan is \( \text{c}3\)-\( b5 \).

19.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}8 \)

**Diagram 18-3**

20.\( \text{h}4 \)\( +\)

White strengthens his positions on the kingside.

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

20...\( \text{a}3 \)?! 21.\( \text{xc}3 \)\( +\)

20...\( \text{xc}1 \)?! 21.\( \text{xc}1 \) \( \text{b}4 \)\( +\) 22.\( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{c}8 \)\( +\)

21.\( \text{h}5 \)

21.\( \text{xc}4 \) is met by 21...\( \text{b}5 \)\( \# \).

21...\( \text{a}3 \) 22.\( \text{c}2 \)

22.\( \text{xc}4 \) is once more met by 22...\( \text{b}5 \)!

22...\( \text{b}4 \) 23.\( \text{xc}8 \)\( +\) \( \text{xc}8 \) 24.\( \text{b}3 \)!

White is better.

For the rest of the game see Diagram 9-7 in *Boost Your Chess 2*.

Some players try to cash in on their endgame ability and deliberately aim for the ending. A top example of this strategy is the ex-World Champion Vladimir Kramnik. In his world championship match against Kasparov he tried to get into the ending as quickly as possible and in doing so put Kasparov off his stride.

In the 70s and 80s Larsen used to play endgame variations with great success, showing that not every objectively level endgame is easy to play.

**B. Larsen – R. Hübner**

Leningrad 1973

1.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{d}f6 \) 2.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 3.\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 4.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 5.\( \text{d}4 \) 0–0 6.\( \text{e}3 \)

**Diagram 18-4**

Larsen’s idea is that when White captures on e5 on the following move, then he has played the useful move \( \text{c}e3 \) instead of the slightly more modest \( \text{c}2 \).
6...e5
6...\(\text{Q}d\text{bd7}\) is the alternative, but then White can reply \(7.h3\).

7.dxe5 dxe5 8.\(\text{W}x\text{xd8}\) \(\text{W}x\text{xd8}\) 9.\(\text{Q}d\text{d5}\)

Diagram 18-5

9...\(\text{Q}x\text{d5}\)

A natural move, but one that suits White.
Against 9...\(\text{Q}e\text{e8}\), Larsen played: 10.0–0–0 (another good move is 10.\(\text{Q}e\text{e7}?!\) followed by \(\text{Q}xc8\)) 10...\(\text{Q}d7\) 11.\(\text{Q}e\text{e2}\) c6 12.\(\text{Q}c3\) f6 13.c5 \(\text{Q}x\text{d1}?!\) 14.\(\text{Q}x\text{d1}\) \(\text{Q}d7\) 15.\(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}d7\) 16.\(\text{Q}b3\) \(\text{Q}c8\)?! (16...b6?!) 17.\(\text{Q}c4\) (first 17.\(\text{Q}a5\) would be better) 17...\(\text{Q}xc4\) (17...\(\text{Q}xc5\) 18.\(\text{Q}xc5\)±) 19.\(\text{Q}x\text{d7}\) \(\text{Q}x\text{b3}\)? (the correct move is 18...\(\text{Q}c7\) and then 19...\(\text{Q}e6\)=) 19.\(\text{Q}x\text{b3}\) \(\text{Q}c7\) 20.\(\text{Q}d8\) White’s more active rook secures him a clear advantage. We give the remainder of the game for your enjoyment: 20...\(\text{Q}f7\) 21.g4 \(\text{Q}f8\) 22.\(\text{Q}a8\) a6 23.\(\text{Q}a4\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 24.\(\text{Q}b8\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 25.\(\text{Q}b6\) \(\text{Q}e6\) 26.b4 \(\text{Q}x\text{c7}\) 27.\(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 28.h4 \(\text{Q}d8\) 29.\(\text{Q}c2\) \(\text{Q}e6\) 30.f4 f5 31.\(\text{exf5}\) \(\text{Q}xf5\) 32.\(\text{Q}g5\) exf4 33.\(\text{Q}xf4\) \(\text{Q}d7\) 34.\(\text{Q}d6\) \(\text{Q}x\text{d6}\) 35.\(\text{Q}x\text{d6}\) f4 36.\(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{Q}f7\)? 37.\(\text{Q}x\text{e}8\) \(\text{Q}d5\) 38.\(\text{Q}c4\) (\(\text{Q}a\text{b6}\)?) 1–0

Larsen – Myagmasuren, Sousse 1967

Facing 9...\(\text{Q}d7\)? Larsen showed how to exploit slight advantages: 10.\(\text{Q}x\text{f6}\) \(\text{Q}x\text{f6}\) 11.c5 \(\text{Q}e7\) (11...\(\text{Q}c6\) 12.\(\text{Q}b5\?) 12.0–0–0 \(\text{Q}c6\) 13.\(\text{Q}c4\) This is the optimal position for the bishop. 13...\(\text{Q}g4\) 14.\(\text{Q}d5\) \(\text{Q}d8\) 15.h3 (15.\(\text{Q}c2\)?) 15...\(\text{Q}x\text{f3}\) 16.\(\text{Q}x\text{f3}\) c6 17.\(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}e6\) 18.\(\text{Q}d6\) \(\text{Q}g5\) 19.\(\text{Q}x\text{e6}\) \(\text{Q}xe3\)? 20.\(\text{Q}xe3\) \(\text{Q}xe6\) 21.\(\text{Q}xe6\) (21.\(\text{Q}d7\) \(\text{b6}\)=) 21...\(\text{Q}xe6\) 22.\(\text{Q}d2\) The ending is only slightly better for White, but Larsen wins it almost effortlessly! 22...\(\text{Q}d8\) 23.\(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{Q}g7\) 24.b4 \(\text{Q}h6\) 25.\(\text{Q}b1\) \(\text{Q}d7\) 26.a4 \(\text{a6}\) (\(\text{Q}a6\)?) 27.b5 axb5 28.axb5 cxb5 29.\(\text{Q}x\text{b5}\) \(\text{Q}g5\) 30.\(\text{Q}c6\) bx6 31.\(\text{Q}x\text{e5}\) \(\text{Q}h4\) (\(\text{Q}e3\)?) 32.\(\text{Q}e5\) \(\text{Q}b7\) 33.\(\text{Q}f4\) \(\text{Q}b1\) 32.\(\text{Q}x\text{e6}\) \(\text{Q}c7\) 33.\(\text{Q}f4\) c5 34.\(\text{Q}x\text{f4}\) \(\text{Q}g5\) 35.\(\text{Q}x\text{f4}\) \(\text{Q}f4\) \(\text{Q}c3\) 37.\(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{Q}g5\) 38.e4 \(\text{Q}g6\) 39.\(\text{Q}c2\) (39...\(\text{Q}f7\)?) 39...\(\text{Q}c8\)? (39...\(\text{Q}f7\) loses to 40.e7\!), but Black can draw with 39...\(\text{Q}c5\)! 40.e5 \(\text{Q}f7\)?=) 40.e5 h5 41.\(\text{Q}x\text{e}7\) 1–0 Larsen – Kavalek, Bugojno 1980

It was only later that a better defence was found: 9...\(\text{Q}a6\) 10.0–0–0 (10.\(\text{Q}g5\) \(\text{Q}d6\)=) 10...\(\text{Q}g4\) Yusupov – A.Rodriguez, Mexico 1980.

Diagram 18-6

The position remains balanced, for example: 11.h3 \(\text{Q}x\text{f3}\) 12.\(\text{Q}x\text{f3}\) \(\text{Q}d7\)= followed by \(\text{...c6}\).

10.\(\text{Q}x\text{d5}\) c6 11.\(\text{Q}c4\)\(\text{f}\)
Transition from the opening to the ending

Diagram 18-7

The gain of a tempo compared to the similar line after 6...e2 allows White to retain the initiative in the endgame. Black must play very precisely.

11...cxd5

11...b5 12.cxb3 1b7 is followed by: 13.b c1! a5 (13...cxd5? is bad due to 14.b c7 1d7 15.xxb7!±) 14.a3 (14.bxc6? 1xc6 15.d5 1a8 16.0-0±) 14...a4 15.a2 b4

Diagram 18-8


12.bxc6 1xc6 13.bxc6

Nothing is achieved by 13.0-0-0 1d7 14.g5 1f8= (Larsen).

13...bxc6 14.0-0

White has the slightly more pleasant position since he has the superior pawn structure.

14...f5

This move does not lead to the desired opening up of the game, since White can simply ignore the threat of ...fxe4.

14...1b8?! is followed by 15.xd1± (Larsen). An immediate 14.a5! would be better.

15.1e1

15.xd1?! 1xd1 16.xd1 1e6= (Larsen)

15...a5

If 15...fxe4, then 16.d2 1f5 17.xc6±.

Diagram 18-9

16.e5!

16.bxc6 1b7 17.e5 1xe4 18.xxe5 1d5 would result in an opposite-coloured bishop ending where Black should have enough for a draw.

16...a4 17.c1

17.xe5?± is possible, leaving White slightly better.

17...1b8

17...fxe4! 18.xe5±

18.xe5 1xe5

18.xb2 19.xxc6 1e8 20.e7±.

19.xe5 1xb2 20.h4??

Even with minimal forces, Larsen tries to keep his opponent under pressure and to conduct an
Opening 3

attack. In the future course of play he manages to confuse his opponent and win the game. Because of the weakness of the dark squares, the defence is not easy.

Diagram 18-10

20...\texttt{Bb4}?

Better is 20...\texttt{Bxa2} 21.\texttt{Bg5} \texttt{Bf8} 22.\texttt{Bh6} \texttt{Ed8} 23.\texttt{Be7} \texttt{Be2}, although White clearly has good compensation for the pawn.

21.\texttt{Bg5} \texttt{Bf8} 22.\texttt{Bh6} \texttt{Ed8} 23.\texttt{Be7} \texttt{Bxe4} 24.\texttt{Bg7}t \texttt{Bh8} 25.\texttt{Ba7} \texttt{Bg8} 26.\texttt{f3} \texttt{Be6} 27.\texttt{Be4} \texttt{Ed7}

28.\texttt{Exa4}

28.\texttt{Ba8} \texttt{Ba8} 29.\texttt{Ba4}±

28...\texttt{Bf7} 29.\texttt{Exd7}t \texttt{Bxd7} 30.\texttt{Ba7}

30.\texttt{Ba8}! looks stronger.

30...\texttt{Bd6} 31.\texttt{Ba6} \texttt{Bd6} 32.\texttt{Bh8} c5?!

32...\texttt{Bd4}= 33.\texttt{Bxh7} \texttt{Bb5}

33.\texttt{Bxa6} 34.\texttt{Bg5}±

34.\texttt{Ba7} \texttt{Ba6} 35.\texttt{Exa6}t \texttt{Exa6} 36.\texttt{Bf2}

Diagram 18-11

36...\texttt{Bb5}?

Better is 36...c4!? hoping to construct a fortress after 37.\texttt{Bd2}? c3! 38.\texttt{Bxc3} f4= (Larsen).

37.\texttt{Be3} \texttt{Bc5}

After 37...\texttt{Bf1}!? 38.\texttt{Bf2} \texttt{Bb5}, White can make progress with 39.\texttt{Bf8} \texttt{Bd5} 40.\texttt{Be3} \texttt{Bf1} 41.g3.

38.\texttt{Bg7}t \texttt{Bc6} 39.\texttt{Bf8} \texttt{Bd5} 40.\texttt{Bf4} c4

40...\texttt{Bd4} 41.\texttt{Bg5} \texttt{Bc8} 42.\texttt{Bf6}+=

41.\texttt{Bg7} \texttt{Bc3} \texttt{Bd7} 43.\texttt{Bg5} \texttt{Bf7} 44.\texttt{a3} \texttt{Bc8}

45.a4 \texttt{Bd7} 46.a5 \texttt{Bc8} 47.\texttt{Bb2} \texttt{Ba6} 48.h5 gxh5

49.\texttt{Bxf5}+-

1–0

It is very important to feel at home in endgames, so that you are not tempted to avoid an exchange of queens without good reason.

It is also advantageous to do more than just look at opening variations; you should also recognize the contours of any possible endgames, and in particular study the endings which are typical for your openings.
1. d4 \( \text{d}f6 \) 2. c4 \( \text{e}6 \) 3. c3 \( \text{b}4 \) 4. c2 \( \text{d}5 \) 5. cxd5 \( \text{c}x\text{d}5 \)

An interesting alternative to 5...\( \text{ex}d5 \).

6. \( \text{d}f3 \) \( \text{d}f5 \)

Black aims for an endgame, despite getting doubled pawns. As the following examples show, good development and control of the centre compensate for this handicap.

7. \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \)

**Diagram 18-12**

8. a3

8. \( \text{d}2 \) is simply answered by 8...c6 9.e3 \( \text{bd}7 \)
10. \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) with equality: 11.0–0 0–0 12.\( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 13. \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{bd}5 \) 14. \( \text{ac}1 \) a5 15. \( \text{fd}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 16. g3 h6 17. \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 18. a3 a4 19. \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 20. \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 21. \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 22. \( \text{c}5 \) ½–½ Azmaiparashvili - Yusupov, Pula 1997.

8...\( \text{d}6 \) 9. \( \text{b}5 \)

Black is also happy to surrender the other bishop:
9.g3 \( \text{e}6 \) 10. \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{bd}7 \) 11. \( \text{g}5 \) c6 12. \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{xe}6 \) 13.0–0 \( \text{b}6 \) 14. \( \text{d}1= \) Gelfand – Yusupov, Vienna 1996. The knights have good squares and are in no way inferior to the bishops.

9...\( \text{e}6 \) 10.e3 a6

Another solid move is 10...\( \text{c}6 \) 11. \( \text{d}2 \) a6 12. \( \text{xd}6 \)† \( \text{xd}6 \) 13. \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 14. \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 15. f3 To make progress White must prepare the e3-e4 break.
15...h6 16. \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \)! 17. \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{c}4 \) The exchange of White’s good light-squared bishop defuses the e3-e4 idea. 18. \( \text{ac}1 \) \( \text{xd}3 \)† 19. \( \text{xd}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 20. \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \)† 21. \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{x}c1 \) 22. \( \text{x}c1 \) \( \text{g}4 \)! 23. \( \text{fl} \) f5! 24. \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{xh}2= \) 25. \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 26. \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{x}f6 \) 27. \( \text{x}f6 \) gxf6 28. \( \text{xh}6 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 29. \( \text{d}2 \) f5 ½–½ Timman – Yusupov, Frankfurt (rapid) 1998.

11. \( \text{xd}6 \)† \( \text{xd}6 \) 12. \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 13. \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 14.0–0 \( \text{bd}7= \)

**Diagram 18-13**

Black has equalized, but continues to play quietly and solidly, hoping to exploit any mistakes by his opponent.
15. \( \text{fc}1 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 16. \( \text{xc}8 \) \( \text{xc}8 \) 17. \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 18. \( \text{c}2 \) b5 19.b3 \( \text{xd}2 \) 20. \( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{xc}2 \) 21. \( \text{xc}2 \) b4! 22.axb4?!
Black now gets the chance to invade on the queenside.
22.a4 would have been correct.

22...\( \text{d}5\) 23.b5 axb5 24.d3 d7 25.g3 h6 26.h4

Diagram 18-14

26...\( \text{d}8\) 27.f1 \( \text{c}7\) 28.e1 \( \text{b}6\)

The threatened invasion by the black king makes White nervous, and he tries to play actively in the centre. But the exchange of the doubled f5-pawn just helps Black.

29.e4?

A more solid defence is: 29.d1 a5 30.c1 c3 31.c2 b4 32.b2

29...fxe4 30.dxe4 b4 31.b1 f5 32.d2 c6 33.d3?

33.e3 had to be played.

33...\( \text{e}4\) 34.dxe4 \( \text{xd}4\) 35.d5 \( \text{c}5\) 36.xf7 b4 37.c1 c6 38.c2 d4 39.e8 e5 40.d2 d3

Diagram 18-15

Black provokes the weakening of the kingside and prepares an invasion in the centre. The weak b3-pawn, the active position of the black king and the mobility of the knight decide the game.

41.f3 \( \text{c}5\) 42.f7 d5 43.c2 d7! 44.e6 e5 45.f4 f3 46.f7 e4 47.h5 e3 48.f5 d4\+ 0-1

Of course, even after the exchange of queens there are often enough forces left to start a dangerous attack on the king. For that reason, the safety of your king should not be ignored in any endgame with a lot of pieces still on the board.

A.Yusupov – J.Hickl

Nusloch 1996

1.d4 d6 2.g3 e5 3.dxe5 dxe5 4.xd8\+ xd8 5.c3

Diagram 18-16

After the exchange of queens the black king remains in the centre and can be attacked down the open file, which secures a long-term initiative for White. However, there are no weaknesses in the black camp. If Black solves the problem of his king, he can look to the future with some optimism.
5...\( \textit{\text{c6}} \)

In my opinion this move is too aggressive. More prudent is 5...\( \textit{\text{d7}} \) intending ...\( \textit{\text{c6}} \) and ...\( \textit{\text{c7}} \).

6.\( \textit{\text{g5}} \+)

A simple reaction – White gains a tempo for his development.

6.\( \textit{\text{e3}} \) \( \textit{\text{e6}} \) 7.0–0–0\( \textit{\text{d8}} \) is also possible.

But not 6.\( \textit{\text{g2}} \) on account of 6...\( \textit{\text{d4}} \).

6...\( \textit{\text{f6}} \) 7.0–0–0\( \textit{\text{d7}} \)

7...\( \textit{\text{d6}} \) is followed by 8.\( \textit{\text{e3}} \) \( \textit{\text{ge7}} \) 9.\( \textit{\text{c5}} \) \( \textit{\text{f5}} \)

10.\( \textit{\text{h3}} \) \( \textit{\text{e7}} \) 11.\( \textit{\text{d5}} \) with the initiative.

8.\( \textit{\text{h3}} \)

White attacks and forces a strategically favourable exchange.

8...\( \textit{\text{d6}} \) 9.\( \textit{\text{e3}} \) \( \textit{\text{hxh3}} \) 10.\( \textit{\text{hxh3}} \) \( \textit{\text{e7}} \)

10...\( \textit{\text{ge7}} \) 11.\( \textit{\text{c5}} \) \( \textit{\text{f5}} \) 12.\( \textit{\text{g4}} \) \( \textit{\text{e7}} \) 13.\( \textit{\text{d5}} \)\( \textit{\text{d5}} \)\( \textit{\text{d5}} \).

Diagram 18-17

11.\( \textit{\text{f4}} \)

White must act very energetically, or else he loses the initiative and the advantage.

11.\( \textit{\text{f3}} \) is followed by: 11...\( \textit{\text{e6}} \) 12.\( \textit{\text{f2}} \) (\( \textit{\text{d5}} \)\( \textit{\text{f4}} \))

12...\( \textit{\text{f5}} \) is followed by ...\( \textit{\text{f6}} \).

11...\( \textit{\text{exf4}} \)!

This move brings the h3-knight into play.

11...\( \textit{\text{h6}} \) would not be good either: 12.\( \textit{\text{fxe5}} \) 12.\( \textit{\text{xe5}} \) 13.\( \textit{\text{d5}} \)

The modest 11...\( \textit{\text{e6}} \) (preparing ...\( \textit{\text{ge7}} \)) would be better.

12.\( \textit{\text{xf4}} \)!

White now obtains active piece play.

12...\( \textit{\text{f7}} \)

Diagram 18-18

13.\( \textit{\text{b5}} \)!

The black king is not the only target! White attacks the c7-pawn, though in doing so he also exploits the slightly exposed position of the king.

13...\( \textit{\text{d8}} \)

13...\( \textit{\text{e8}} \) is met by 14.\( \textit{\text{xd6}} ^\text{+} \).

If 13...\( \textit{\text{e5}} \), then simply 14.\( \textit{\text{xc7}} ^\text{+} \).

14.\( \textit{\text{d5}} \) \( \textit{\text{ge7}} \) 15.\( \textit{\text{bxc7}} ^\text{+} \)

White has won a pawn and stands better. But due to White’s weakened pawn structure (a negative consequence of 12.\( \textit{\text{xf4}} \) – one can’t have everything!), Black still has decent defensive possibilities.

Nevertheless White won in 38 moves.
Exercises
Exercises

Ex. 18-7

Ex. 18-10

Ex. 18-8

Ex. 18-11

Ex. 18-9

Ex. 18-12
Solutions

Ex. 18-1

A. Yusupov – H. Wirthensohn
Hamburg 1991

1. d4  d5 2.  f3  d5 3.  g5  e4 4.  h4! (or 4.  f4) 4...  d6! (4...  c5!? 5.  e3  b6=) 5.  b2  h6 (Δ...g5)

Diagram Ex. 18-1

6.  c1!

In order to avert the positional threat of ...g5, White is forced to make the transition to an endgame.

6...  xd2

6...  c6?!

7.  xd2  xd2† 8.  xd2±  f5 9.e3  e6

10.  e2  d6

10...  e7 11.  xe7  xe7 12.  h4±

11.  g3

Preparing  h4.

11...  h6

11...  xg3 12.  xg3  h6 13.  h4 and White intends g4-g5±.

12.  xd6  xd6±

I admit that White’s advantage is in fact microscopic! We saw the further course of the game in Chess Evolution 2 (Exercises 12-3, 12-5 & 12-8, and then Diagram 20-7).

Ex. 18-2

A. Yusupov – J. Lautier
Amsterdam 1994

1.d4  d5 2.c4  e6 3.  c3  b4 4.e3  e7 5.  d2? 0–0 6.a3  xc3 7.  xc3  b6 8.  f3  a6 9.b3  c5

Diagram Ex. 18-2

10.  dxc5!

(2 points)

I was less convinced by other moves. Here are two sample variations which illustrate Black’s counterplay:

a) 10.  d3 (1 point) 10...  cxd4 11.exd4  d7 12.0–0  xe8 13.e2  g6! 14.g3  c7 15.e2  e5!

b) 10.  c1 (1 point) 10...  dxc4 11.bxc4  cxd4

12.  exd4  d7 13.  d3  c8 14.  b2  g6! 15.  d2  b7 16.e3  f6†

10...  dxc4

White can meet 10...  bxc5 with either 11.  c1?!± or 11.  d3.±

11.  xc4

11.cxb6 is not met with 11...  bxc5 12.  b4±, but with 11...  d5?!±.

11.bxc4!  xd1† (11...  bxc5 12.  d3) 12.xd1  bxc5 13.  e2±

11...  xc4  12.  xc4  bxc5  13.  xd8  xd8

14.  e2  d7 15.  d2  c6?! ±

Better is 15...  e8 followed by ...  d6.

16.  h1  b8$±

See Diagram 12-1 in Chess Evolution 2.

Ex. 18-3

V. Smyslov – L. Polugayevsky
Palma de Mallorca 1970

1.  f3  f6 2.g3  g6 3.b3  g7 4.  b2  d6 (4...  c5?) 5.d4 0–0? (5...  c5) 6.g2  e5 7.  xe5  g4

Diagram Ex. 18-3

8.h3?

(2 points)

This forces the endgame.

8.  c3?! (also 2 points) is equally good:

8...  xe5 9.  xe5  xe5 10.  d2±

8...  xe5 9.  xe5  dxe5 10.  xd8  xd8

11.  d2  d7 12.0–0–0  e8 13.  c4  b6

14.  a5!  b8$±

See Exercise F-22 in Build Up Your Chess 1.

Ex. 18-4

A. Yusupov – A. Zapata
Innsbruck 1977

1.  f3  f6 2.g3  g6 3.b3  g7 4.  b2  d6 5.d4 0–0? 6.g2  d7 7.0–0  e5?! (7...  e8 or 7...  c6) 8.  xe5  g4 9.  c3  dxe5?! (Δ9...  xe5) 10.  d2  e8 (Δ10...  f5 11.e4±)

Diagram Ex. 18-4

11.  c4

(2 points)
Solutions

White soon gets an endgame advantage, since his pieces are clearly more active.

11...b6 12.axb6! cxb6
12.axb6 is followed by: 13.exd8+ exd8
14.Rxd1 e5 (14...e8 15.d5++) 15.Rxb7
16.axa8+ dxc1 17.Rxh8+
13.exd8 exd8 14.Rad1 Rf5
14...e8 15.b5++
15.Rxb7±

**Ex. 18-5**

**A.Yusupov – K.Spraggett**

Candidates Match (3), Quebec 1989

1.d4 d5 2.c4 c5 3.c3 e6 4.exd5 exd5 5.dxc5
d6 6.g3 e6 7.g2 e7 8.0-0-0 9.d5
e6 10.dxc5 dxc5 11.Rxf6 Rxf6 12.Rxd5

**Diagram Ex. 18-5**

13.d7 (1 point)
13...Rd8 14.Rc1
(another 1 point)

An important idea – the c5-bishop will be under attack after the exchange of queens.

17.Rc4 Rf6 18.e3±

Denying Black access to the d4-square.

**Ex. 18-6**

**A.Yusupov – M.Rivas Pastor**

Las Palmas 1993

1.d4 d6 2.g3 e5 3.dxe5 dx e5 4.Rxd8+ Rxd8
5.d3 d7

**Diagram Ex. 18-6**

6.f4 (2 points)

A dynamic attempt.

The more modest moves 6.g3, 6.g2 or 6.e3 each earn 1 point.

6...gf6?

After 6...h4 7.d3 f6 8.fxe5 Rxe5 9.e4
White has good attacking chances.

7.d3

7...exd5??

8.e5!!

8...ef6

9...d5±

10.g3

10.b3 c6 and Black will continue with...

**Diagram Ex. 18-7**

**Ex. 18-7**

**A.Yusupov – E.Rozentalis**

Bundesliga 1995

1.d4 d6 2.c4 e6 3.d3 d5 4.e3 0-0
5.e4 c5 6.d3 d5 7.0-0 dxc4 8.Rxc4 b6
9.a3 cxd4 10.axb4 (10.exd4 Rxc3 11.bxc3
b7=) 10...dxc3

**Diagram Ex. 18-7**

11.Rxd8

(1 point)

After 11.bxc3 Rxc7 the black queen is more active than the white one.

11...Rxd8 12.bxc3 a5 13.Rb2 Rb7 14.Rc2
bd7 15.Rb1 Rbc8

15...axb4?! 16.cxb4 Rxa1 17.Rxa1 Rb8
18.Rxa8† Rxa8 19.d2± Stein – Kholmov,
USSR Ch 1963.

**Ex. 18-8**

**A.Yusupov – F.Nijboer**

Groningen 1992

1.d4 d6 2.c4 g6 3.d3 g7 4.e4 d6 5.f3 e5
6.dxe5 dxe5 7.Bxd8† Rxd8 8.e3

**Diagram Ex. 18-8**

8...e6± (2 points)

Black makes the development of the g1-knight more difficult.

8...c6 (1 point) is a reasonable alternative.

9.0-0-0† Rfd7?!

9...Rbd7 (Δ...c6, ...c7) 10.d5=

10.g3

10.b3 c6 and Black will continue with...

**Diagram Ex. 18-8**

10...h4?

10...Rc6

11.d3 Rb4 12.f4 c5 13.Rxe6
13.d5 b6?
13...fxe6 14.\(\text{Q}f\text{e}2 \text{h}6=\)
14...\(\text{Q}e7\) could be met by 15.fxe5 followed by \(\text{Q}g5\)†.

Ex. 18-9

V. Milov – G. Dizdar
Dresden 1998

1.c4 e6 2.d\text{c}3 d\text{f}6 3.e4 d5 4.e5 d4 5.exf6 dxc3 6.bxc3 \(\text{Q}xf6\) 7.e3 e5 8.d\text{d}3 d\text{a}6 9.0-0 d\text{d}6 10.d\text{c}2

Diagram Ex. 18-9

10...\(\text{Q}g4\)!

Black takes advantage of an opportunity to weaken the white pawn structure.
10...0-0 (1 consolation point) is less incisive.

11.d\text{d}4

11.d\text{e}4 d\text{c}5 does not help White.

11...\(\text{Q}xf3\) 12.\(\text{Q}xf3\) \(\text{Q}xf3\) 13.d\text{f}4 ex\text{d}4

13...0-0-0 14.g\text{d}4 allows White some initiative.

14.\(\text{Q}e1\)†

14.cxd4 c5 15.b\text{b}1 0-0-0=

14...\(\text{Q}d8\) 15.d\text{e}4

15.cxd4 c5 16.d\text{e}4 \(\text{Q}c7\) 17.b\text{b}1 \(\text{Q}ab8=\)

15...\(\text{Q}b8=\)

Or 15...\(\text{Q}e8\) and now:
a) 16.e5 \(\text{Q}g5=\) f6 17.b\text{xe}7 \(\text{Q}xe1=\) (or 17...\(\text{Q}b8\)) 18.\(\text{Q}xe1\) \(\text{Q}b8\) 19.\(\text{Q}xa6\) f\text{g}5 20.cxd4=  
b) 16.cxd4= ±

16.cxd4 c5 17.d\text{e}3

17.b\text{b}2= \(\text{Q}c7\) 18.d\text{d}5=

17...\(\text{Q}c7=\)

Ex. 18-10

R. Fischer – T. Petrosian
Candidates Match (7), Buenos Aires 1971

1.e4 c5 2.\(\text{Q}f3\) e6 3.d\text{d}4 \text{cxd}4 4.\(\text{Q}xd4\) a\text{a}6 5.d\text{d}3 \(\text{Q}c6\) 6.\(\text{Q}xc6\) bxc6 7.0-0 d\text{d}5 8.c4 \(\text{Q}f6\) 9.c\text{xd}5 \text{cxd}5 10.exd5 exd5 11.\(\text{Q}c3=\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 12.\(\text{Q}a4=\)

Diagram Ex. 18-10

12...\(\text{Q}d7=\)

A theoretical mistake. Black has the inferior pawn structure (an isolated pawn) and should try to compensate for it with active piece play.

The correct approach is: 12...\(\text{Q}d7\)

(2 points)

13.\(\text{Q}d4\) (13.\(\text{Q}c2\) 0-0 14.\(\text{Q}g5\) d\text{d}4=) 13...\(\text{Q}e6\)

14.\(\text{Q}f4\) 0-0 15.\(\text{Q}f1\) \(\text{Q}a5=\)

13.d\text{e}1

This is stronger than: 13.b\text{b}5 axb5 14.\(\text{Q}xa8\) \(\text{Q}a3=\) 0-0 15.\(\text{Q}g5=\) \(\text{Q}b7\) 16.\(\text{Q}d4\) 17.\(\text{Q}xf6\) \(\text{Q}xf6\) 18.\(\text{Q}xb5\) \(\text{Q}xb2=\)

13...\(\text{Q}xa4\) 14.\(\text{Q}xa4\) \(\text{Q}e6\) 15.\(\text{Q}e3\) 0-0

15...d\text{d}7 16.f\text{d}7 17.d\text{d}7 0-0 18.\(\text{Q}d1=\)

16.\(\text{Q}d5=\) \(\text{Q}e8\) 17.\(\text{Q}xe7\) \(\text{Q}xe7\)

See Diagram 5-1 in Chess Evolution 2.

Ex. 18-11

G. Hertneck – A. Yusupov
Bundesliga 1996

1.d\text{d}4 \(\text{Q}f6\) 2.c\text{c}4 e6 3.\(\text{Q}f3\) d\text{d}5 4.g\text{g}3 \(\text{Q}b4=\)

5.d\text{d}2 \(\text{Q}e7\) 6.\(\text{Q}g2=\) 0-0 7.0-0 \(\text{Q}c6\) 8.b\text{b}3 \(\text{Q}bd7\)

9.\(\text{Q}f3\) \(\text{Q}e4\) 10.d\text{a}2 f\text{f}5 (10...b\text{b}5=) 11.d\text{b}1 (11.\(\text{Q}e1=\)) 11...\(\text{Q}e8\) 12.e\text{e}3 (12.\(\text{Q}e1\) \(\text{Q}f3\), \(\text{d}3\))

Diagram Ex. 18-11

12...\(\text{Q}h5=\)

(2 points)

12...g\text{g}5= (also 2 points) is interesting too:

13.\(\text{Q}e4\) (13.\(\text{Q}e1\) g\text{g}4=) 13...d\text{xe}4 14.d\text{a}2 \(\text{Q}xd1\) 15.\(\text{Q}a5=\)

Ex. 18-12

R. Slobodjan – A. Yusupov
German Ch, Altenkirchen 2001

1.e\text{e}4 \(\text{Q}e5\) 2.\(\text{Q}f3\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 3.\(\text{Q}b5\) \(\text{a}6\) 4.\(\text{Q}xc6\) d\text{xc}6 5.d\text{d}4

(\(\text{Q}5.0-0\)) 5...d\text{xe}4 6.\(\text{Q}xd4\) \(\text{Q}xd4\) 7.\(\text{Q}xd4\)

Diagram Ex. 18-12

7...\(\text{Q}d7=\)

(2 points)
Solutions

Black’s plan is linked to queenside castling. For that reason Black should first get his king to safety and only then consider how to position his other pieces.

7...\(\text{d}6\) (1 point) is less accurate.

8.\(\text{c}3\)

Better is 8.\(\text{e}3\)! followed by \(\text{d}2\).

8...0–0–0 9.\(\text{e}3\) g6!?

9...\(\text{b}4=\)

10.0–0–0 \(\text{g}7\) 11.\(\text{de}2\) \(\text{e}7\)

The bishop pair allows Black to look to the future with optimism.

Scoring

Maximum number of points is 23

20 points and above \(\rightarrow\) Excellent
16 points and above \(\rightarrow\) Good
12 points \(\rightarrow\) Pass mark

If you scored less than 12 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Exchanging queens – the transition to the ending

In the previous chapter we saw how important it is to correctly evaluate the transition to the endgame. An exchange of queens can completely transform the character of the play. Naturally, exchanging queens does not automatically mean that we have reached the endgame, but it is a big step in that direction. So it is worth paying special attention to the exchange of queens, since that particular operation is so important.

The reasons for an exchange of queens can be very diverse; we shall consider various cases with examples.

1) Swapping off the opponent’s more active pieces. When defending, this is often carried out with the intention of simplifying the position.

S.Gligoric – V.Smyslov
Zurich Candidates 1953

1.c4 d6 2.d3 e6 3.d3 c5 4.g3 b6 5.g2 b7 6.0-0 e7 7.d4 cxd4 8.Nxd4 0-0 9.Bd1 Bc6 10.Bf4

Diagram 19-1

10...Bb8

In this variation Black aims for the exchange of queens. The white queen is clearly the more active piece.

11.Bxb8

11.b3?

11...Baxb8 12.Bf4 Bc8 13.d6

White suddenly puts himself in danger.

13.Be5= would be simpler.

13...Bxd6 14.Bxd6 Bc7! 15.Be5?

This is a clear mistake.

15.b3 would be correct: 15...Bf5 16.Bdd1 (But not, as suggested by Bronstein, 16.Bd3?! d5 17.cxd5? on account of 17...Bxa6!+) 16.d5 17.Be5 a8 18.Bac1= 15...Bxg2 16.Bxg2 Bf5 17.Bd2 d6#
Diagram 19-2
Black wins a pawn. The remainder of the game can be found in Chapter 13 of *Build Up Your Chess 1*.

2) **Securing a superior position against possible counterplay**, often with static positional advantages such as a better pawn structure.

Diagram 19-3

B. Gelfand – A. Karpov
Vienna 1996

16.\( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{W}}}_d2 \)
White brings his queen to f4. In the ending White will have a slight but lasting advantage on account of his better pawn structure. Offering the exchange of queens is a typical idea when playing against an isolated pawn.

16... \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{R}}}_a_d8 \)
Or 16... \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{N}}}_e4 \) 17. \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{W}}}_f4 \).

17. \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{R}}}_e1 \) g6 18. \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{W}}}_f4! \)

Diagram 19-4

18... \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{W}}}_x f4?! \)
Gelfand criticized this decision, which leaves Black without active counterplay.

18... \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{R}}}_e7 \) is a better option.

19. \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{x}}}_f4 \) \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{blue}{B}}}_f8 \) 20. \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{e}}}_3 \) \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{blue}{d}}}_6?! \)
The rook is not well placed here.

20... \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{blue}{N}}}_f6 \) should have been preferred.

21. \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{b}}}_4 \) \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{blue}{c}}}_e6 \)
After 21... \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{N}}}_c4 \) Gelfand intended to reply 22. \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{a}}}_a4?! \) with the threat of f2-f3.

22. \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{c}}}_e2 \) \( \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{e}}}_7 \)
We saw the continuation of the game as Exercise F-3 in *Boost Your Chess 3*, and the final part of the game in Chapter 20 of *Chess Evolution 2*.

3) **The transition to a technically won ending**, in particular when the advantage is in material. We have already dealt with several such operations, one example being the position from Azmaiparashvili – Yusupov, Las Palmas 1993, which appears in in Diagram 3-6 on page 36.
4) **Swapping off a good defensive piece**, as part of the struggle for important points.

Diagram 19-5

\[ \text{Diagram 19-5} \]

\[ \text{Diagram 19-5} \]

18.\( \textnormal{a} \text{xc4} \text{dxc4} \) 19.\( \textnormal{d}4! \)

This operation gets rid of an important piece which can defend the dark squares. Of course, the suppression of counterplay plays a role here. Sometimes there are a lot of arguments in favour of an exchange of queens!

19...\( \textnormal{c}7 \)

19...\( \textnormal{c}6 \) 20.\( \textnormal{d}a5 \text{wxg2} \) 21.0–0–0!

20.\( \textnormal{c}5! \text{xc5}?! \)

Better is 20...\( \textnormal{f}7 \) 21.\( \textnormal{d}c7 \text{xc7} \) 22.\( \textnormal{d}4 \text{b}5 \pm \).

21.\( \textnormal{d}5 \text{b6} \) 22.\( \textnormal{c}5 \text{a}4 \text{b}8 \) 23.0–0–0 \( \text{b}5 \) 24.\( \text{c}5 \)

Diagram 19-6

White is better – just compare the bishop on c8 and the knight on c5! Also, the dark squares (c5, d6, e5) are weak.

For the rest of the game see Diagram 2-1 in *Build Up Your Chess 2*, and Diagram 18-3 in *Build Up Your Chess 1*.

5) **An exchange during the struggle for an open file or diagonal.** A very good example of this can be found in Botvinnik – Sorokin, Exercise F-1 in *Build Up Your Chess 3*.

6) **To force a favourable transformation of the position**, often by damaging the opposing pawn structure.

Diagram 19-7

\[ \text{Diagram 19-7} \]

A.Yusupov – K.Shirazi

Lone Pine 1981

White has a strong initiative and Black feels forced to exchange queens (exchanging the active piece).

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

15...\( \text{d}8 \) is strongly met by 16.\( \text{e}5! \) when 16...\( \text{xe}5? \) is not good: 17.\( \text{xc}7 \text{a}8 \) 18.\( \text{xe}5 \) and White threatens \( \text{c}7 \).
Exchanging queens – the transition to the ending

16.\textit{\textbf{xd}6}

For White this is a logical transformation of advantages – instead of the initiative White now gets a better pawn structure.

\textbf{16...\textit{\textbf{c}xd6} 17.\textit{\textbf{xe}7 \textit{\textbf{xe}7} 18.\textit{\textbf{xd}7 \textit{\textbf{xd}7} 19.\textit{\textbf{ad}1}±}}

\textbf{Diagram 19-8}

See Ex. 4-4 in \textit{Build Up Your Chess 2}.

7) \textbf{Preventing castling or gaining a tempo}. This occurs more rarely, because an exchange of queens also reduces attacking potential.

\textbf{Diagram 19-9}

\textbf{\textit{\textbf{A. Yusupov – A. Sokolov}}}

\textbf{Tilburg 1987}

\textbf{24.\textit{\textbf{c}7}!}

This is even stronger than 24.\textit{\textbf{e}5}?! \textit{\textbf{c}5} 25.\textit{\textbf{xf}6 \textit{\textbf{gx}f}6 26.\textit{\textbf{ac}1}±.}

\textbf{24...\textit{\textbf{c}5} 25.\textit{\textbf{xc}5}}

White swaps off the defender of the d4-pawn and gains a tempo for the continuation of his attack.

\textbf{25...\textit{\textbf{xc}5} 26.\textit{\textbf{ac}1} \textit{\textbf{e}4}?}

It would be slightly better to play 26...\textit{\textbf{b}6} 27.\textit{\textbf{xb}6 \textit{\textbf{axb}6} 28.\textit{\textbf{xd}4 \textit{\textbf{xa}2} 29.\textit{\textbf{b}4} and now:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item a) 29...\textit{\textbf{h}5} 30.\textit{\textbf{xb}6 \textit{\textbf{g}4} (30...\textit{\textbf{e}2 31.\textit{\textbf{f}5}!} 31.\textit{\textbf{f}1 \textit{\textbf{e}5}±

  \item b) 29...\textit{\textbf{d}5} 30.\textit{\textbf{b}5 \textit{\textbf{a}5} 31.\textit{\textbf{xa}5 \textit{\textbf{bxa}5} 32.\textit{\textbf{c}5}±

\end{itemize}

\textbf{27.\textit{\textbf{f}5!} \textit{\textbf{b}6} 28.\textit{\textbf{d}7}!}

White carries out a forcing attack on the black pieces, which wins material.

\textbf{28.\textit{\textbf{xb}6 \textit{\textbf{axb}6} 29.\textit{\textbf{xd}4}––} would also be good.

\textbf{28.\textit{\textbf{e}7} 29.\textit{\textbf{c}6 \textit{\textbf{f}8}}}

Or 29...\textit{\textbf{e}8} 30.\textit{\textbf{xb}6 \textit{\textbf{axb}6} 31.\textit{\textbf{xe}4}––.

\textbf{30.\textit{\textbf{xb}6 \textit{\textbf{axb}6}}}

\textbf{Diagram 19-10}

\textbf{31.\textit{\textbf{e}1} \textit{\textbf{f}5} 32.\textit{\textbf{f}3} \textit{\textbf{d}3 33.\textit{\textbf{cd}1} \textit{\textbf{d}2 34.\textit{\textbf{d}5}!}}

But not 34.\textit{\textbf{e}3}? on account of 34...\textit{\textbf{c}3}!.

\textbf{34...\textit{\textbf{h}8} 35.\textit{\textbf{xd}2}!}

35.\textit{\textbf{e}2? \textit{\textbf{c}3}!}

\textbf{35...\textit{\textbf{xd}2} 36.\textit{\textbf{xe}7}}

White is winning, not just because he has won a pawn, but also because the black knight has strayed to d2.
36...g6
36...\( \text{g6} \) can be met by either 37.\( \text{f2} \) g6 38.\( \text{e5} \) or 37.\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{b1} \) 38.\( \text{e3} \) followed by \( \text{d3} \).
37.\( \text{e2} \) \( \text{b1} \) 38.\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d8} \)

Diagram 19-11
39.\( \text{d1} \)!
After \( \text{f2} \)-e3-\( \text{d4} \) White will capture the trapped knight.
1-0

8) Aiming for a specific distribution of material – rook and bishop against rook and knight, for example.

We have already looked at the game Yusupov – Anand in Chapter 17 of *Boost Your Chess 2*. Here is just a short fragment.

Diagram 19-12

A.Yusupov – V.Anand
Linares 1992

25.\( \text{d1} \)!
White wants an ending with rook and bishop against rook and knight. He will then have a slight advantage because in the open position the bishop is better than the knight, and it is easier coordinating a rook and bishop.

25...\( \text{xd1} \)†
25...\( \text{b7} \) is met by 26.\( \text{c2} \).

26.\( \text{xd1} \) \( \text{Ed8} \) 27.\( \text{c1} \)

The exchange of rooks would be wrong, since Black could then set up a barrier with his knight on c6.

With the rooks still on the board, White kept some pressure and succeeded in grinding out a win in 70 moves.

9) Psychological motivation. For example, if endgames are not the opponent's strength.

We saw an example of this theme in Yusupov – Lautier in Ex. 18-2 in the previous chapter: White did not want to take any risks against a strong opponent and preferred to play an ending.

In the test you have to decide which side profits more from an exchange of queens.
Exercises
Exercises
Ex. 19-1

Going into an ending is the correct decision:

17...Wa4?

(2 points)

18.Wxe6 Qxf2† (another possibility is 18...fxe6
19.f3 Qf2† 20.Qe2 Qxh1 21.Qxc5) 19.Qe1
fxe6 20.Qxc5 Qxh1 21.Qxe6. The position is
very complicated, but after 21...Qf7!? 22.Qc7
Qc6 23.Qxa8 Qxe5 24.Qc1 Qf2 25.Qe8† Qg7
26.Qc7† Qf6 27.Qxb7 Qg4 Black is first to
coordinate his forces and is well placed.

18.f3! Qc6 19.fxe4 Qe8?

19...Qxe5!?

20.Qc3+ Qxe3 21.exd5 Qd4 22.Qf6 Qe4
23.Qd3 Qf4 24.Qxh6 Qh4 25.Qf6 Qe8
26.Qf1 Qd7 27.Qxd4 Qxd4 28.Qxd4
1–0

Ex. 19-2

It is very important for Black to weaken his
opponent's pawn phalanx.

White is somewhat better after 24...exd5
25.exd5† Qd7 26.Qxc6† Qxc6.

25.bxc3 exd5 26.exd5† Qd7 27.Qb1
Qa4 28.Qg3 Qf8 29.Qd2 Qa5 30.Qe4†
31.Qa1 h5 32.Qd3 Qd5 33.Qg4 Qxa2† 34.Qxa2†
35.Qb1 Qh2 36.Qe3 h4 37.Qc1
Qxd6 38.f5 Qf2 39.Qd1 Qf3
0–1

Ex. 19-3

White should retain the queens, because as
long as the queens are on the board, the pawns
will play a lesser role. It is important to make
use of the extra piece for an attack.

So the correct move is 27.Wg2:

a) 27...Qd6 28.Qh1 (Dvoretsky) renews
White's threat of 28.Qe5.

b) 27...Qe8 allows White and to attack on
the kingside with 28.h3!.

(another 1 point for this variation)

27...Qxe6 28.Qxe6 Qf7 29.Qe1

Black also holds after 29.Qe5 Qe8! and
now:

a) 30.Qxh5 Qe3! 31.Qb1 (31.a1 Qe6=)
31...Qxe2

b) 30.Qe1 Qc7 31.Qxe8 Qxe8 32.Qxe8
Qxe8=

29...Qe8 30.Qxe8 Qxe8 31.Qe8

31.Qd1 Qe3 32.Qf2!? Qh3= 33...Qxe8=
32.Qc3 Qd7 33.a5 Qd8
34.b4 b6 35.a6 Qf6 36.Qc3 Qe8 37.Qg2
Qg5 38.Qe2 Qg6 39.Qd1 Qc7 40.Qd2 Qd8
41.Qe3

½–½

Ex. 19-4

The following annotations are based on
analysis by Belavenets.

17.Qe1!

(2 points)

Here too, it is better to retain the queens.
Black's light-squared bishop does not get into
the game and White can coordinate his queen
and knight wonderfully well.

17...a5 18.Qxc3 Qa6 19.Qf1 Qb5 20.Qd4!
Solutions

20.\textit{xa5} \textit{xa5} 21.\textit{xa5} (21.\textit{xa5} \textit{d1}+)
21...\textit{xa5} 22.\textit{xa5} \textit{d8}±
20...\textit{e7} 21.\textit{ed6}++ - a4

21...\textit{f5} 22.\textit{xe5} \textit{xe5} 23.\textit{af3} \textit{af8} 24.\textit{f3}
\textit{xf6} 25.\textit{e1} and White threatens c2-c4 as well as \textit{d7}.
22.\textit{e3} \textit{e7} 23.\textit{d2} a3 24.\textit{c4} \textit{a4} 25.\textit{exe6}
Or 25...\textit{xa3}+-.

25...\textit{xf6}

After 25...\textit{xf6} 26.\textit{xa3} White threatens 27.\textit{b4}.
26.\textit{xa3} \textit{e8} 27.\textit{h3} \textit{a8} 28.\textit{f3} \textit{b2}
29.\textit{e5} \textit{b1}++ 30.\textit{h2} \textit{f5} 31.\textit{g3}
32.\textit{f3} is a decisive threat.

1–0

Ex. 19-5

\textbf{I.Koenig - V.Smyslov}

England - USSR Radio match 1946

20...d5!

21.\textit{exd5} \textit{xd5} 22.\textit{xd5} \textit{xd5}

(1 point)

By exchanging queens, Black avoids any counterplay on the kingside.
22...\textit{xd5}?! 23.\textit{h5}±
23.\textit{e2} \textit{c4}!

(2 points)

24.\textit{xc4} \textit{xc4} 25.\textit{f1} \textit{ac8} 26.\textit{b3} \textit{f7}
27.\textit{g3} \textit{fd8} 28.\textit{e3}#

See Ex.11-7 in \textit{Chess Evolution 1}.

Ex. 19-6

\textbf{A.Yusupov - L.Ljubojevic}

Belgrade 1991

25.\textit{b5}!

(2 points)

25...\textit{d3}

Black certainly cannot play 25...\textit{xc3}? 26.\textit{ac1}++, but he could consider 25...\textit{xb5}?! 26.\textit{axb5} a6±.
26.\textit{ed1} \textit{xb5} 27.\textit{xb5} \textit{xc3} 28.\textit{xa7} \textit{a8}
29.\textit{d4} \textit{xa1} 30.\textit{xa1} \textit{b3} 31.\textit{b6}+-

Ex. 19-7

\textbf{A.Yusupov – S.Dolmatov}

USSR Ch, Frunze 1979

20.\textit{d6}!

(2 points)

White exchanges a good defensive piece and avoids the possible counterplay in the centre which could arise after 20.\textit{d6} e4. Note also that it is easier to make use of the white queenside pawn majority in the ending.
20...\textit{xd6} 21.\textit{xd6} a5 22.\textit{f3}±

Fixing the e5-pawn as a weakness.
22...\textit{g6} 23.\textit{d1} a4 24.\textit{b5} \textit{f6} 25.\textit{xc6}
\textit{bxc6} 26.\textit{c4} \textit{e8} 27.\textit{d6}++ \textit{e6} 28.\textit{b6}

Black loses material after both 28...\textit{xb8} 29.\textit{d8}+ and 28...\textit{xd6} 29.\textit{cxd6} \textit{xb8} 30.\textit{d7}
\textit{a7} 31.\textit{c8}+-.

1–0

Ex. 19-8

Variation from the game

\textbf{M.Botvinnik – M.Najdorf}

Amsterdam Olympiad 1954

29.\textit{c3}!

(2 points)

The transition to the ending is the simplest way to secure White’s positional advantage.
Botvinnik suggested 29.\textit{e3}? (1 point), although Black can then reply 29...\textit{d4}.
29.\textit{f6}++ \textit{g7} 30.\textit{g5}?? would be bad because of 30...\textit{xf5} 31.\textit{fxg5} \textit{xf5}+.
29...\textit{xc3}
29...\textit{xf4} 30.\textit{f6}++ \textit{h8} 31.\textit{e4}+-
30.\textit{xc3}+

Ex. 19-9

\textbf{M.Botvinnik – C.Guimard}

Groningen 1946

White takes no chances and forces the exchange of queens, going into a technically won endgame.
### Solutions

45. \( \text{Nb2} \)!

(1 point)

46. \( \text{Nh1} \)

46. \( \text{a1} \)!

(also another point)

46. \( \text{g3} \) 50. \( \text{f4} \) 51. \( \text{g5} \)

52. \( \text{h5} \) 53. \( \text{f4} \) 54. \( \text{e2} \)

54. \( \text{h4} \)?? \( \text{h7} \)

55. \( \text{g6} \) 56. \( \text{e8} \)

54... \( \text{h7} \)

55. \( \text{h4} \) 56. \( \text{g3} \) 57. \( \text{f2} \)

1–0

**Ex. 19-10**

M. Botvinnik – C. Kottnauer

Moscow 1947

31. \( \text{Nd2} \)!

(2 points)

The white queen heads for the c-file. The exchange of queens makes sense here, since the white king position is slightly weakened. After the exchange of queens the king can take an active role and protect the weak pawns on d4 and f4. White's hopes are tied in with the bad bishop on c8. He would like above all to remove all the other pieces from the board and play with a knight against the bad bishop!

31... \( \text{d6} \)

32. \( \text{c2} \)

32... \( \text{e7} \) is worth considering: 33. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b7} \)

34. \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{c4} \)±

33. \( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{f7} \)!

Absolutely the wrong strategy; Black should hang on to the knight.

The correct idea is: 33... \( \text{b4} \) 34. \( \text{d3} \)!

(34. \( \text{axb4} \) \( \text{b5} \) 34... \( \text{h5} \)!! (or 34... \( \text{bxa3} \))

35. \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 36. \( \text{axb4} \) \( \text{gf5} \) and the weakness of the d4-pawn gives Black enough play.

34. \( \text{c3} \)

Also interesting is 34. \( \text{d2} \)!! intending b3-b4 followed by \( \text{b3-c5} \).

34... \( \text{xe5} \)!

This just improves the white pawn structure.

35. \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{e8} \)

36. \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c7} \)

37. \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f7} \)

38. \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{e7} \)

39. \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{a5} \)

40. \( \text{dd3} \)

40. \( \text{h4} \)!! would be more accurate. For example: 40... \( \text{b4} \)!! 41. \( \text{axb4} \) \( \text{axb4} \) 42. \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{g5} \)

42... \( \text{gxh5} \) 43. \( \text{axh7} \) 43. \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{a6} \) 44. \( \text{h6} \)± (Botvinnik)

40. \( \text{a6} \) 41. \( \text{b4} \)

41. \( \text{axb4} \) 42. \( \text{axb4} \) \( \text{b8} \)

43. \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c6} \) 44. \( \text{c3} \)

45. \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{f7} \)

46. \( \text{f4} \!+ 

47. \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{e8} \)

48. \( \text{dd3} \) \( \text{h6} \)

49. \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{d5} \)

50. \( \text{hxg6} \) \( \text{hxg6} \)

51. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f7} \)

52. \( \text{e2} \)

52. \( \text{f1} \)!

52... \( \text{d7} \)

53. \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{e7} \)

54. \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{e8} \)

55. \( \text{a6} \)

56. \( \text{g4} \)

57. \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{e7} \)

58. \( \text{d3} \)

58. \( \text{e8} \)

Better is 58... \( \text{g5} \)!

59. \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{e8} \)!

59... \( \text{h4} \)!! is followed by: 60. \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{g5} \) 61. \( \text{f4} \)

gxf4† 62. \( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{g6} \)† 63. \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{lf8} \) 64. \( \text{f1} \)†

59... \( \text{d7} \)!! is bad too: 60. \( \text{xd7} \) \( \text{xd7} \)

61. \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 62. \( \text{e3} \)–+

The correct move is 59... \( \text{h6} \)!! and Black can still put up a sturdy defence.

60. \( \text{e3} \)

After 60... \( \text{d7} \) 61. \( \text{f1} \)–+ the threat of \( \text{xd7} \) wins a pawn.

1–0

**Ex. 19-11**

K. Päter – M. Botvinnik

Moscow 1947

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

(2 points)

14. \( \text{c3} \)

14. \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{cxd3} \) 15. \( \text{cxd3} \)

14. \( \text{xd3} \) 15. \( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{cxd3} \)

16. \( \text{f2} \)

17. \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{c5} \)!

17... \( \text{e5} \) 18. \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{f5} \)

19. \( \text{e3} \)

18. \( \text{xd3} \)

18. \( \text{xd3} \) \( \text{xb3} \) 19. \( \text{xb3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 20. \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{e4} \)–+

18. \( \text{d7} \) 19. \( \text{e3} \)

19. \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{xb3} \) 20. \( \text{xb3} \) \( \text{b5} \)±

19. \( \text{xe3} \) 20. \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{b5} \)±
20.\textit{c}1!

(3 points)

White prepares to offer an exchange of queens, after which the remaining black pieces will be tied down by the weakness of the d5-pawn.

20.\textit{f}5!? (2 consolation points) may improve the position of the queen, but White has no real opportunities in the middlegame for action on the kingside. But perhaps later an exchange of queens could be offered via the g3-square.

20...\textit{bd}7 21.\textit{a}3 \textit{xa}3 22.\textit{xa}3 \textit{f}8

22...g5!?

23.h4\textit{ad}8 24.\textit{f}3 \textit{e}6 25.\textit{h}5 \textit{h}5

26.\textit{x}h5 g6 27.\textit{f}3 f5 28.\textit{a}2 \textit{g}7 29.\textit{f}1\textit{h}6 30.g3 \textit{f}6 31.\textit{g}2 \textit{h}8 32.\textit{h}1 \textit{he}8

33.\textit{d}2 \textit{e}7 34.\textit{e}2 \textit{ee}8 35.\textit{f}1 \textit{h}8

36.\textit{e}1 \textit{he}8 37.\textit{d}2 \textit{e}7 38.\textit{ee}1 \textit{ee}8

39.\textit{e}2 \textit{h}8

Better is 39...h5.

40.g4!

White aims to provoke a second weakness on the kingside.

40...\textit{h}g8 41.\textit{eg}1 \textit{fxg}4?! 42.\textit{xg}4+ \textit{df}8?

42...\textit{c}8

43.\textit{xe}6 \textit{xe}6 44.\textit{f}4+ \textit{d}6 45.\textit{h}2 \textit{f}6

46.\textit{hg}2 \textit{e}8 47.\textit{xg}6 \textit{gxg}6 48.\textit{xc}6 \textit{xg}6

49.\textit{xg}6 \textit{f}5 50.\textit{e}5 \textit{b}1 51.\textit{xc}3 \textit{a}2

52.e4!+- \textit{dxex} 53.\textit{xc}4+ \textit{xc}4 54.\textit{xc}4 \textit{h}5

55.d5 \textit{e}5 56.d6 \textit{xd}6 57.\textit{d}4

1–0
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 26

- 22 points and above → Excellent
- 17 points and above → Good
- 13 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 13 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
A knight becomes dangerous when it gets close to the opposing pieces. To do so it often needs the support of a pawn or a piece. But when the knight is on a protected square it can develop its capacities to the full extent.

A knight in an outpost position is dangerous to the defending side for several reasons:
1) The knight can provide very strong back-up for an attack.
2) The knight itself can become active at any moment.
3) The knight controls important squares deep in the opposing camp, thus hindering effective coordination between the defensive pieces.

Frequently the only option for the defence is to get rid of such a knight at any cost, even if it means sacrificing an exchange.

In the following positions you should try to exploit the outpost position of the knight for an energetic attack.

Diagram 20-1

Kulis – Balik
Czechoslovakia 1954

White wins by force here.
1.\texttt{Wh6} \texttt{gxh6} 2.\texttt{Wh4} \texttt{g5}
2...\texttt{g7} 3.\texttt{hxh7#}
3.\texttt{cl} \texttt{h4} 4.\texttt{f4} \texttt{g5} 5.\texttt{f3}†
   Or 5.\texttt{g4}† \texttt{f5} 6.\texttt{g5}.
5...\texttt{h4} 6.\texttt{h3}#
Outposts for knights

Diagram 20-2

Duric – Ortel
Oberwart 1981

1.\(\text{exd} 5!\)

After this rook sacrifice the white knight reaches a dream position on \(\text{f6}\).

\(1...\text{exd} 5\ 2.\text{\textit{\#f7}}\)

Or \(2...\text{\textit{\#c5}}\ 3.\text{\textit{\#g7}}\ \text{\textit{\#xd5}}\ 4.\text{\textit{\#xh8\#d7}}\ 5.\text{\textit{\#c4}}\)

\(\text{\textit{\#xc4}}\ 6.\text{\textit{\#d1\#c7}}\ 7.\text{\textit{\#d8\#+-}}\)

3.\(\text{\textit{\#c4}}\)

White brings all his reserves into the attack with tempo.

\(3...\text{\textit{\#e6}}\ 4.\text{\textit{\#f6\#e7}}\)

4...\(\text{\textit{\#d8}}\ 5.\text{\textit{\#xe6 \textit{\#xe6}}\ 6.\text{\textit{\#g7 \#e8}}\ 7.\text{\textit{\#xb7\#+-}}\)

5.\(\text{\textit{\#xe6 \textit{\#xe6}}\ 6.\text{\textit{\#d1}}\)

Despite his advantage in material here, Black is losing due to the strength of the white pieces.

6...\(\text{\textit{\#f8}}\)

Or \(6...\text{\textit{\#e7}}\ 7.\text{\textit{\#d6\#f7}}\ 8.\text{\textit{\#d5 \#e8}}\ 9.\text{\textit{\#e6\#+-}}\)

Diagram 20-3

7.\(\text{\textit{\#h3!}}\)

The queen attacks the king via the queenside!

7...\(\text{\textit{\#b4}}\)

This wards off the threat of \(\text{\textit{\#b3\#}}\), but allows his opponent to invade via the kingside.

7...\(\text{\textit{\#f7}}\ 8.\text{\textit{\#b3\#g7}}\ 9.\text{\textit{\#xb7\#+-}}\)

8.\(\text{\textit{\#d5}}\)

The knight does not have to stay on \(\text{f6}\) forever!

8...\(\text{\textit{\#c4}}\ 9.\text{\textit{\#h4}}\)

Black can no longer hold the position together.

1–0

Diagram 20-4

Variation from the game

Winkle – Munko
1975

21.e6!

A logical move. White either opens the position or gets the \(\text{f7}\)-square for his knight.

21...\(\text{\textit{\#f6}}\)

21...\text{\textit{\#fxe6}}\ is followed by \(22.\text{\textit{\#e5 0–0}}\ 23.\text{\textit{\#xe6\#+-}}\)

22.\(\text{\textit{\#f7 0–0}}\)

A legal move!
This is the most effective way for White to continue his attack.

The alternative 23...xf5!? is tempting, but allows Black to struggle on with:

23...Exf7 (not 23...gxf5 24.E:hgl#) 24.exf7t Dxf7 25.Df4±

23...h8 24.e7 Ef8 25.Dd6 Dg7 26.Dxf5† gxf5 27.De6+-

Diagram 20-6

Ambroz - H. Suri
Berne 1993

35.De8†!

35...xf8 36.Exf8h7 37.De4† leads to mate.

1–0

Diagram 20-7

A. Alekhine - N.N.
1923

Alekhine destroys the castled position.

1.Dxf6!

Another strong continuation is 1.Dg7! Dg7 2.Exf6+-.

1...gxf6 2.Exf6†!!

This quickly leads to mate.

2...Dxf6

2...Dg8 3.Exg6† h8 4.Dh6†+-

3.De3† De7 4.Gg7#

242
Outposts for knights

Diagram 20-8

Juarez – Gourgei
Mexico 1980

1. dxe5

A tempting sacrifice, but White could have absolutely steamrollered his opponent by sacrificing the bishop instead: 1...dxe5! 2. Qxe5! fxe6 3. Qxe6++

1...dxe5 2. Bxe5 Bb6 3. Nxe6 fxe6 4. c4

The white pieces exert strong pressure on the black position.

4...h5 5. g4 g7

5...g7 6. Bhf1 (6. Bxf7 Bxf7 7. Bhf1+ g8 8.g6 is also very strong) 6...f5 7. Bxf7 Bxf7 8. Bxf7 gxf7 (8...g7 9. Bf6 Qe3+ 10. Qb1 g5 11.gf7!+--) 9.gxf7+ g7 10.gxf6+ g8 (10...h7 11.gf7#) 11.gd8#--

Diagram 20-9

6. h5

White exploits the strength of his d6-knight.

6...f8 7. d3!

White intensifies his threats, and Black has to surrender material so as not to lose on the spot.

7. Bxf7+ Bxf7 8. xe6 also wins.

7...e3+ 8. Bxf7 loses the game immediately to 8.Bxf7 Bxf7 9.Qg6+ Qh8 10.Qf7#.

8. Bb1 g5 9. Qxg5 hxg5 10. Qxb7

1-0

Diagram 20-10

Bemporad – Caselli
Italy 1978

The strong position of the knight encourages Black to play a forcing combination.

1. dxe5? 2. exd5

2.Bh2 Qxe3 3. Qxg3 Qf4--

2...Qc1+ 3. Bf3 h4

Threatening ...Qh1#.

4. fg1 Qfl+ 5. Bf3 Qf4

But not 4...Qf4? on account of 5.Qd1=.

5. Bh1 Qf4
The threat is $\text{Qg3}^+$ and then $\text{Qe2}^+$. White loses the queen or the rook.

6. $\text{g4}$ $\text{Qg3}^+$ 7. $\text{Qh2}$

7. $\text{Qh2}$ $\text{Qe2}^+\rightarrow$

7...$\text{Qe4}^+$ 8. $\text{Qh2}$ $\text{Qxb7}$

0–1

Diagram 20-11

Here too the knight has such a powerful post on g3 that White cannot hold his position together.

32...$\text{Qf8}!!$

32...$\text{Qf8}??$ is weaker since White could then reply 33. $\text{Qf2}$, and after 33...$\text{Qxd1}^+$ 34. $\text{Qxd1}$ Black cannot play 34...$\text{Qc1}$ as he did in the game, because of 35. $\text{Qxf6}^+$.

33. $\text{Qf2}$ $\text{Qxd1}^+$ 34. $\text{Qxd1}$ $\text{Qc1}!$ 35. $\text{Qb3}$

No better is 35. $\text{Qd2}$ $\text{b4}!\rightarrow$, nor 35. $\text{Qxf8}$ $\text{Qxd1}^+$ 36. $\text{Qf2}$ $\text{Qf1}#$.

35...$\text{Qb4}!$

White cannot fend off the threats of mate.

0–1
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Ex. 20-1

Ex. 20-4

Ex. 20-2

Ex. 20-5

Ex. 20-3

Ex. 20-6
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Ex. 20-7

Ex. 20-8

Ex. 20-9

Ex. 20-10
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Ex. 20-12
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## Solutions

### Ex. 20-1

**Jeromin – Gaponov**  
Kislovodsk 1988

1. $\text{xf7}$!  
(1 point)

1... $\text{h8}$

The main variation is: 1... $\text{xf7}$ 2. $\text{h7}+\text{e6}$
3. $\text{f5}+\text{xe5}$ 4. $\text{xe}+\text{f7}$

(another 1 point for this variation)
4... $\text{f4}$ (4... $\text{d4}$ 5. $\text{e4}+\text{c5}$ 6. $\text{b4}$#)
5. $\text{e4}+\text{g5}$ 6. $\text{h7}+\text{h4}$ 7. $\text{g5}+\text{h5}$ 8. $\text{f3}+\text{h4}$ 9. $\text{h3}$#

1... $\text{xf6}$ is followed by: 2. $\text{xf6}+\text{h8}$ 3. $\text{g6}$
$\text{xf7}$ 4. $\text{xf7}+\text{g8}$ 5. $\text{h7}+\text{h4}$ 6. $\text{f5}+\text{h8}$
7. $\text{f7}+$

2. $\text{g6}$+ $\text{f8}$ 3. $\text{h7}$+! $\text{xe7}$ 4. $\text{g8}$#

### Ex. 20-2

**Prodanov – Zlatilov**  
Bulgaria 1981

1. $\text{xd7}$!

(1 point)

1... $\text{xd7}$ 2. $\text{h4}$

But not 2. $\text{f4}?$ $\text{g7}$=.

2... $\text{h5}$ 3. $\text{xf5}$!

(another 1 point)

3... $\text{g7}$ 4. $\text{xg6}$ $\text{h8}$

4... $\text{fg6}$ 5. $\text{h7}+\text{f8}$ 6. $\text{d5}+\text{f7}$

5. $\text{h7}$

(another 1 point)

White threatens $\text{g5}+$.
5... $\text{f5}$ 6. $\text{g3}+\text{g6}$ 7. $\text{xg6}+\text{fg6}$ 8. $\text{xd7}$

1–0

### Ex. 20-3

**Vinogradov – Fedin**  
USSR 1973

1. $\text{xe7}+\text{h6}$! $\text{gxh6}$ 2. $\text{xh6}+\text{g7}$ 3. $\text{h7}+\text{f8}$
4. $\text{h8}+\text{g7}$ 5. $\text{g8}+\text{h6}$ 6. $\text{g5}$#

(1 point)

### Ex. 20-4

**Graf – Wurm**  
Augsburg 1953

1. $\text{xc5}$!

(1 point)

1... $\text{bxc5}$ 2. $\text{h6}$

Threatening $\text{g7}$#.
2. $\text{d7}$

2... $\text{f7}$ 3. $\text{xh7}+\text{e8}$ 4. $\text{h8}+\text{d7}$
5. $\text{xa8}+\text{e8}$

(another 1 point)

3... $\text{xf7}$

3... $\text{xf7}$ 4. $\text{xh7}+\text{g7}$ 5. $\text{xe7}+\text{e8}$
6. $\text{xe6}$#

### Ex. 20-5

**S. Urusov – Kalinsky**  
Russia 1880

1. $\text{g5}+\text{f5}$ $\text{fxf5}$

1... $\text{f7}$ 2. $\text{g7}+\text{e8}$ 3. $\text{d7}$#.

2. $\text{h6}+\text{h8}$ 3. $\text{b2}+\text{f6}$ 4. $\text{xf6}$#

(1 point)

### Ex. 20-6

**Chistiakov – Peiko**  
USSR 1963

1. $\text{xe7}+\text{f7}$!

(1 point)

Certainly not 1. $\text{f7}??+\text{xc1}$#.

1... $\text{xe7}$ 2. $\text{f7}+\text{d8}$ 3. $\text{b7}$

(another 1 point)

The combination ‘only’ leads to a draw.
3. $\text{f8}$= (also 1 point) is just as good.
3... $\text{c8}$ 4. $\text{d6}+\text{d8}$

But not 4... $\text{b8}?$ 5. $\text{f8}+\text{c7}$ 6. $\text{c8}+\text{d7}$
7. $\text{xc6}+\text{e7}$ 8. $\text{e8}$#.
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Ex. 20-7

V. Kirillov – J. Vatnikov
Vilnius 1949

1. † e8!

(1 point)

1... † xe8
2. † xe8 † xe8 3. † e6

(another 1 point)

3. † e3 † b8 4. † e6++ (also 1 point) is an alternative way to win.

1–0

White wins in all lines:

a) 3... † xg6 4. hxg6 † h8 5. † e8++
b) 3... † b8 4. † xd6++
c) 3... † a4 4. † xf5 † g8 5. † c8 † f7 6. † d8
   † a6 7. † h8 † e6 8. † c8++
d) 3... b3 4. † xe8 † b8 5. † e1 b2 6. † b1++

Ex. 20-8

J. Speelman – P. Benko
Rotterdam 1987

1. † f3!

(1 point)

1–0

The finish could be: 1... † xd4 2. † g6! and now 2... † f7 3. † xe6+ or 2... † e8 3. † xe6+!
   † xe6 4. † f8 † h7 5. † h8#.
   (another 1 point for this variation)

Ex. 20-9

E. Kengis – E. Gufeld
Moscow 1983

46. † e6!

(1 point)

Threatening † xf8#.
46... † xc8
46... † xe6 47. † xf8 † h7 48. † h8#
47. † e7 † h7 48. † xf7

(another 1 point)

White now threatens † g8#.
48. † e6

After 48... † d7 White can choose between
49. † xc8 d1† 50. † e7++ and 49. † f5++.
49. † xc8 d1† 50. † e7 † d8 51. † xe6++

Ex. 20-10

Alexandrow – Yegorshev
USSR 1978

1. † xc4!

(1 point)

2. dx c4
2. † x d5 † x d5++
2... † e3† 3. † h2 † xg3† 4. † xg3 † e5#

(another 1 point)

Ex. 20-11

Based on the game

S. Warmlander – M. Krasenkow
Berlin 1990

1... † b4!

(1 point)

1... † c5† 2. † e3 ++
2. † xb4
2. † x b4 † x b4++
2... † c5† 3. † h1 † f2† 4. † g1 † h3† 5. † h1
   † g1† 6. † xg1 † f2#

(another 1 point for this variation)

Ex. 20-12

Balogh – J. Pogats
Budapest 1957

1... † xg3!

(1 point)

2. h x g3 † f1† 3. † h2 † e1!

(another 1 point)

This is simpler than 3... f2 4. † g1.
4. † b4 † f3† 5. † h3 † h1† 6. † h2 † x h2†
7. † g4 h5#
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 23

20 points and above → Excellent
16 points and above → Good
12 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 12 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
CHAPTER 21
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Having a plan

We have already discussed plans in Chapter 14 of *Build Up Your Chess 2*. There we emphasized the difference between the more or less random moves of an amateur and the constructive play of a master.

In chess literature one often sees comments describing incredibly long plans. (Alekhine especially wanted to portray himself as a super-strategist and we shall see an example of that.) One must really admire those players who are capable of developing such a programme consisting of many steps. However, rather than happening during actual play, such multi-stage plans are normally described later during analysis. It is in the endgame that complicated plans can best be worked out, but from a practical point of view such work does not make much sense. What use is a five-stage plan to us if our opponent does not cooperate and perhaps does not even allow us to carry out the first stage?

Diagram 21-1

E. Znosko-Borovsky – A. Alekhine
Paris 1933

The following annotations are based on analysis by Alekhine.

16. \( \text{xh6} \)

Alekhine now describes a 6-point super-plan!
1) Exchange a pair of rooks.
2) Bring the king to the centre.
3) Advance the h-pawn and open the h-file
4) Tie the white pieces down to the h-file.
5) Push forward the a- and b-pawns and open another file.
6) Penetrate to the second rank with the rook via the queenside.

No chess player can think that far ahead, not even Alekhine. I am certain that he only developed a series of mini-plans, and after each one he then thought further ahead to develop the next one. Of course he was following a certain line of play, a thread which was based on a correct evaluation of the position,
which he later presented and commented on as if it were a super-plan!

Another way for White to play would have been 16...e3 followed by f2-f3.

16...f6

This accomplishes the first mini-plan – Black will force an exchange of rooks.

Diagram 21-2

17...f1?

We can see that White had not spotted the danger inherent in the position and is just making simple moves. At this point White should prevent the second point in Alekhine's plan.

17...f4! (Dvoretzky) is correct, and White is in no way worse. 17...e4 is met by 18.f5! and the black king does not get to e6.

17...f3 would also be slightly better than the move in the game.

17...g4 is another decent alternative, which makes things somewhat harder for Black.

17.f5

Black now centralizes his king and can thinks things out a bit further.

18...d8t...d8

Black may now be threatening ...f4. To avoid his bishop being cut off, White resorts to putting another pawn on a dark square.

19.g3?!

19...e1 f6 20.e3+ would be a better defence.

19...f7 20.e3

Diagram 21-3

And only now does Black consider the 'third' phase. Based on the pawn structure, the attack with the h-pawn is natural. Its goal is to open the h-file and at the same time improve Black's pawn structure!

20...h5 21...e2 e6 22.d1 g8t

Naturally Alekhine wants to hang on to a rook. He plays the ending very well and demonstrates excellent technique based on the four technical principles: "no counterplay", "do not be too hasty", "two weaknesses", and, at this point, "make the correct exchanges".

23.f3

23.h4?! is no better on account of 23...g4, threatening ...f4. We can see that White has not posted his pawns correctly.
23...h4 24.gxf2 hxg3 25.hxg3 Nh8 26.g1
White could try 26.gfl? followed by g2 and Nh1.

26..d6 27.f1
White wants to be able to defend his g3-pawn by g2 should Black play ...e4.

27..g8 28.f2
Diagram 21-4
Black has achieved his goals on the kingside and directed his play against the g3-pawn. But his opponent can still successfully defend a single weakness. Alekhine now aims to provoke a second weakness on the queenside.

28..b5!
Intending ...c5-c4, followed by ...a5 and...b4.

29.b3?! Moving this pawn helps Black come into contact with the white pawns more quickly.
Either 29.g2 or 29.e2 would be better.

29..a5 30.g2 a4 31.d2
Black can now open a file on the queenside.
But if 31.b4, then 31..c8 32.c5 Ea8 followed by ...a6-c6+.

31.axb3 32.axb3 Ea8
The penetration by the black rook makes the defence practically impossible. Alekhine continues to play with great concentration and increases the pressure on the white position, after he has optimized the positions of his pieces.

33.c4?!
An attempt to exchange pawns, but it just weakens his position even more.

33.b4 Ea1 34.Ed3? Ea3+ is no better.
33.g4 was worth considering, since passive defence may no longer work.

Diagram 21-5
33..Ea3 34.c5
34.Eb2 bxc4 35.bxc4 Ee3 36.c5+ would have been more resilient.

34..Ed7 35.Ed2 b4!
With this move Black fixes the new weaknesses - the c5- and b3-pawns.

36.Ed2?
Only now does White try to defend more actively, but it is already too late!
Having a plan

Diagram 21-6

36...f4!
This fine move restricts the white bishop. There is not much the passed pawn can do on its own.
37.\(f1\) \(a1\)
Strengthening his position again.
38.\(e2\) \(c1\) 39.\(e2\) \(c3\)
The optimal position for the rook. White loses a pawn.
40.\(a7\) \(d7\) 41.\(b7\) \(xb3\) 42.\(b8\) \(f2\) 43.\(f1\) 

Diagram 21-7

45...\(d5\)
Don’t be too hasty! 45...\(xc5\)? 46.\(xc5\) \(f2\) 47.g5 would allow unwelcome counterplay.
However, 45...e4! 46.fxe4 f3++ would have been even more accurate.
46.\(b7\) e4!
Alekhine turns to specifics.
47.fxe4\(\\uparrow\)
If 47.\(xc7\), then 47...e3 48.\(xe3\) fxe3 49.\(xc7\) \(f2\) 50.\(e1\) \(b2\) 51.\(xc3\) \(h2\)++.
47...\(xe4\) 48.\(xc7\) \(f3\) 49.\(xc7\)
Or 49.\(e1\) \(h2\) 50.\(g1\) \(g2\) 51.\(h1\) \(b2\) 52.\(b7\) \(xc5\) 53.\(b3\) \(e3\) 54.\(c3\) \(g3\)++.
49...\(xf2\) 50.\(e1\) \(b2\) 51.\(b7\) \(c2\) 52.c6 

Diagram 21-8

52...\(g3\)!
But not 52...\(c1\)? 53.\(d2\) \(b1\)?? 54.\(xb1\) \(xb1\)?? on account of 55.\(c7\)++.
53.c7 \(f3\) 54.\(d1\) \(xc7\) 55.\(xb2\) \(f2\)
An outstanding performance by Alekhine, which demonstrates fantastic technique, but which had nothing to do with the ‘super-plan’!
0–1

A good plan is based on a correct assessment of the position, one which emphasizes certain elements in the position. In most cases a plan tends to be a relatively short regrouping which improves the positions of some pieces or pawns.

It is very important to study typical ideas and typical plans; then we can employ them in similar situations. A good example of how such knowledge
can be applied can be seen in my games against Taimanov and Rubinetti from Chapter 14 of Build Up Your Chess 2. They are based on a classic game by Fischer.

Diagram 21-9

Here Fischer comes up with a new idea.

13.\textit{\textbf{h1!!}}

White wants to play on the kingside. The idea is very attractive. After \textit{\textbf{g1}}, \textit{\textbf{g2-g4}}, \textit{\textbf{g3}} and \textit{\textbf{ag1}} White concentrates a lot of his forces on the kingside.

13.\textit{\textbf{d4}} would be a standard alternative.

13...\textit{\textbf{d7}} 14.\textit{\textbf{g1}} \textit{\textbf{ad8}} 15.\textit{\textbf{e4}}!

With the threat of \textit{\textbf{c5}}.

15...\textit{\textbf{f7}}

So that he can meet 16.\textit{\textbf{c5}} with 16...\textit{\textbf{c8}}.

16.\textit{\textbf{g4}} \textit{\textbf{g6?!}}

Black weakens his kingside.

16...\textit{\textbf{b6}} would be better: 17.\textit{\textbf{fd2}} \textit{\textbf{d5}} and the position remains level.

17.\textit{\textbf{g3}} \textit{\textbf{g7}} 18.\textit{\textbf{ag1}} \textit{\textbf{b6}} 19.\textit{\textbf{c5}} \textit{\textbf{c8}}

Diagram 21-10

20.\textit{\textbf{h4}}

This prepares \textit{\textbf{f5}}. Black plays inaccurately and fails to parry this threat.

20...\textit{\textbf{d7}}

20...\textit{\textbf{f8?!}} 21.\textit{\textbf{e4}} \textit{\textbf{d5±}} would have been better.

21.\textit{\textbf{e4}} \textit{\textbf{f8}}?

Better is 21...\textit{\textbf{h8±}}.

Diagram 21-11

22.\textit{\textbf{f5}}!

Now the black position falls apart.

22...\textit{\textbf{e6}} 23.\textit{\textbf{c5}} \textit{\textbf{e7}} 24.\textit{\textbf{xg7}} \textit{\textbf{xg7}} 25.\textit{\textbf{g5+-}}

And Black resigned after a few more moves.

...1–0
Having a plan

Diagram 21-12

A.Yusupov – J.Rubinetti
Toluca 1982

White can only play on the kingside. To make progress I wanted to play g2-g3 and f2-f4. Since my h3-pawn needed protection I had to first put my king on h2 and the rook on g1.

13.\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{h}2! \textnormal{\textsc{d}8!}}\)

Black has found a good plan. He wants to activate his bad bishop by playing it to b6 to swap it for the strong bishop on e3.

After 13...\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{f}8}}\) or 13...h6 there comes 14.\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{g}1!}}\) followed by 15.g3.

14.\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{g}1!}}\)

This of course looks similar to Fischer’s plan.

Not 14.g3 \(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{d}7!}}\) and White does not have a convenient way to defend the h3-pawn.

Diagram 21-13

14...\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{b}6?}}\)

In order to prepare the exchange of bishops, Black puts his queen too far away from the kingside. The idea was correct, but not its execution!

As Vladimir Kramnik later showed, Black could have linked his plan with prophylactic play against White’s intentions by playing: 14...\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{d}7!}}\) 15.\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{f}1}}\) (15.g4?! \(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{h}5!}}\) 15...\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{b}6=}}\)

15.\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{b}1?!}}\)

White defends the pawn this way so that the queen remains closer to the kingside. 15.\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{c}2}}\) is not as good.

15...\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{a}7}}\)

Making way for ...\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{b}6}}\).

16.g4!±

White modifies his original plan, since the dark squares would be weakened after g2-g3 and f2-f4, and he tries to exploit the unfortunate position of the black queen and to act more quickly on the kingside.

16...\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{f}8?}}\)

Not the best defence, as White now gets a strong attack.

For better or worse, Black should play: 16...\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{b}6}}\)
17.g5 \(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{f}d7}}\) 18.h4! (18.\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{f}1?! \textnormal{\textsc{f}8}}\) 19.dxc6 bxc6 20.\(\text{\textnormal{\textsc{xd6 \textnormal{\textsc{b}7?\textsc{\textnormal{e}8, \Delta\textnormal{\textsc{e}}ad8, \textnormal{\textsc{c}e6 and ...\textnormal{\textsc{g}6}}}}\}
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18...\(\text{d}f8\) 19.h5 \(\text{d}a6\) 20.\(\text{g}g3\) \(\rightarrow\) White is better, but Black can still put up a defence.

We have already looked at the rest of the game (Diagram 14-6 in *Build Up Your Chess* 2), so I will only give the moves here.

**Diagram 21-14**

17.\(\text{f}f1!\) \(\text{e}e8\) 18.\(\text{g}g3\) \(\text{f}6\) 19.\(\text{f}f5\) \(\text{xf}5?\) 20.\(\text{g}x\text{f}5\) \(\rightarrow\) \(\text{b}6\) 21.\(\text{h}h5!\) \(\text{d}d8\) 22.\(\text{b}h6!\) \(\text{d}d7\) 23.\(\text{e}xe8\) \(\text{e}e8\) 24.\(\text{h}h5\) \(\text{b}b8\) 25.\(\text{g}xg7!\)

1–0

The exercises in the test are based on the games of Salo Flohr, who in the 1930s was among the best players in the world.

The first thing to do is to evaluate the position.

Where should you play?

What is the essential element in the position?

Try then to strengthen your position, to place your pieces or pawns in more active positions.
Exercises

Ex. 21-1

Ex. 21-2

Ex. 21-3

Ex. 21-4

Ex. 21-5

Ex. 21-6
Exercises

Ex. 21-7

Ex. 21-10

Ex. 21-8

Ex. 21-11

Ex. 21-9

Ex. 21-12
31. \textit{Wb3}! \ 
\ 
In the middlegame White has good attacking chances. He increases the pressure on the f7-pawn and at the same time takes control of the b-file.

On the other hand, the ending after 31. \textit{Bb7} (1 point) 31... \textit{Cc7} 32. \textit{Bxa6} \textit{Bxc3} is very hard to win on account of the opposite-coloured bishops.

31. \textit{c4} (1 point) is also less accurate; Black can reply 31... \textit{Bf8}, intending to defend with ... \textit{Be8} and ... \textit{d6}.

After 31. \textit{Ba2} (1 point) White has to reckon with the possibility of 31... \textit{Bxc3}.

The move played sets some traps, which Black must first avoid.

31... \textit{Bc7} \ 
If 31... \textit{Bc7}? then 32. \textit{Bxf7}! \textit{Bxf7} 33. \textit{Bd7} \textit{Bf8} 34. \textit{Bb7} \textit{Bf6} 35. \textit{Bb8} \textit{Bd8} 36. \textit{Bd5}+-.

32. \textit{Bb1} \ 
Taking control of the b-file.

32... \textit{Bf8} 33. \textit{Ba2}?! \ 
Threatening \textit{Bb7}.

Also possible is 33. \textit{c4} \textit{d6} 34. \textit{Bc3}±.

33... \textit{Bd7} \ 
33... \textit{Bxc3}?! 34. \textit{Bxf7}+ \textit{g7}±

34. \textit{Bb6} \textit{Bg7} \ 
34... \textit{Bxc3}?! 35. \textit{Bf6} \textit{Bh3} 36. \textit{Bd2} \textit{Cc7} 37. \textit{Ba6}±

35. \textit{c4}+- 35. \textit{Ba2} \textit{Bd6} 37. \textit{Bb5} \textit{Bd8} 38. \textit{Bb7} \textit{Bc7} \ 
38... \textit{Bc7} 39. \textit{Bxa5}+-

39. \textit{Bc6} \textit{h5} 40. \textit{Ba4} \textit{Bc7} 41. \textit{Bd8} 42. \textit{Bc2} \textit{Bf8} 43. \textit{Bc5} \textit{Bg7} 44. \textit{Bxf7}! \textit{Bxf7} 45. \textit{Bd6} \textit{Bd6} 46. \textit{Bd5}+ \textit{Bg7} 47. \textit{Bxd6} \textit{Be8} 48. \textit{Bc5} \textit{Bxc5} 49. \textit{Bb7}+ 1–0

14. \textit{Bd3}! \ 
(2 points)

The queen is too valuable a piece to be wasted on the blockade of a pawn. White prepares the transfer \textit{Bb5}-\textit{d4}.

14... \textit{Bd4} \ 
Black should play 14... \textit{a6} and now:

a) 15. \textit{Bb4} \textit{Bxa3} 16. \textit{Bxg5} \textit{Bxb4}! 17. \textit{Bxf6} \textit{Bxd3} 18. \textit{Bxd3} \textit{Bxd5} 19. \textit{Bxd5} \textit{Bxd5} 20. \textit{Bc3} \textit{Bd6}±

b) 15. \textit{Bc3}! followed by \textit{Bd4} retains an edge for White.

15. \textit{Bf4} \textit{Bf5} 15... \textit{Bb6} 16. \textit{Bxf6}+±

16. \textit{Bxf6} \textit{Bxf4} \ 
16... \textit{Bxf6} 17. \textit{Bc4}±

16... \textit{Bxf6} 17. \textit{Bxf4}+ \textit{gxf6} 18. \textit{Bf3}!± and White threatens \textit{b2-b4} followed by \textit{Bc5}.

17. \textit{Bxf6} \textit{Bxf6} 18. \textit{Bf7}+ \textit{Bf8} 19. \textit{Bd4} \textit{Bd7} 20. \textit{Bb4} \textit{Bb6} 21. \textit{Bc5} \textit{Bd6} 22. \textit{Bc1} \textit{Bad8} 23. \textit{Bf3} \textit{Bb4} 24. \textit{Bc6} \textit{Bc5} 25. \textit{Bd3} \textit{Bd5} 26. \textit{Bc4} \textit{Bc5} 27. \textit{Bf4} \textit{Bc3}+ 28. \textit{Bxc2} \textit{a6} 29. \textit{Bc1} \textit{Bc5} \textit{Ba5} 30. \textit{Bxa6} \textit{Bxb4} 31. \textit{Bxb4} \textit{Bc7} 32. \textit{Bf1} \textit{Bd8} 33. \textit{Bc5}! \textit{Bc7} 34. \textit{Bxe7}+ \textit{Bxe7} 35. \textit{Bc6} \textit{Bb8} 36. \textit{Bb5} \textit{Bb4} 37. \textit{Bc7}+ \textit{Bd8} 38. \textit{Bxb7} \textit{Bxb7} 39. \textit{Bc3} \textit{Bc5} 40. \textit{Ba2} \textit{Bc2} 41. \textit{Bc4} \textit{Bc3}+ 42. \textit{Bc2} \textit{Bb3} 43. \textit{Bc2} 44. \textit{Bb4} \textit{Bd6} 45. \textit{Bf8} 1–0

13. \textit{e4}! \ 
(2 points)

White is fighting against the move ...\textit{c7-c5}, which is strategically important for Black.

13... \textit{c5} 14. \textit{dxc5} (14. \textit{e4} \textit{g5}! 15. \textit{dxc5} \textit{Be8} 16. \textit{Be3} \textit{Bg4}!) 14... \textit{c8}= 13... \textit{Be7}?!
Solutions

Now Black is left without counterplay, and with a weak c-pawn.
13...\( \square f5f6 \) would be more combative, and now:

a) If White prevents the advance of the c-pawn with 14.\( \square f6 \) then Black can react with:
   14...e5! 15.dxe5 (15.0-0?! \( g8 \)) 15...\( \square x e5 \) 16.\( \square x e5 \) \( \square d4 \)

b) White should prefer 14.e5 \( \square d5 \) 15.\( \square g5 \) g6 16.h4, with a dangerous attack.

14.0-0 \( e8 \) 15.\( \square e3! \) c6 16.\( \square f c1 \) \( \square h8 \)

17.\( \square e2 \) h6 18.\( \square e5 \) f6
18...\( \square x e5 \) 19.\( \square x e5 \pm 

19.\( \square d3 \) \( \square e8 \) 20.\( \square f 4 \)
20.\( \square a b 1 \)?

20...\( \square f 7 \)
20...e5 21.dxe5 fxe5 22.\( \square x e 5 \pm 

21.\( \square a b 1 \) \( \square b 6 \) 22.a4! \( \square f d 8 \)
22...\( \square x a 4 \) 23.\( \square a 2 \) \( \square b 6 \) 24.\( \square x a 7 \) \( \square a 8 \)
25.\( \square b 7 \) +--

23.a5 \( \square a 8 \) 24.\( \square b 7 \) +-- \( \square x d 4 \) 25.\( \square c 5 \) e5
26.\( \square e 3 \) \( \square d d 8 \) 27.\( \square x a 7 \) ?!

Better is 27.\( \square a 6 \) + --,

27...\( \square c 7 \) 28.h3 \( \square b 5 \) 29.\( \square b 7 \) \( \square d 6 \) ±

----

Ex. 21-4

S.Flohr – J.Capablanca
Moscow 1936

The following annotations are based on analysis by Flohr.

10.\( \square e 5 ! \) ± (2 points)

White will continue with f2-f4, a standard plan which we already know from games by Pillsbury – see Diagram 8-6 in Build Up Your Chess 1.

10...\( \square f d 7 \) 11.\( \square x c 7 \) \( \square x c 7 \) 12.\( \square f 4 \) \( c x d 4 \)
12...\( \square x e 5 \) 13.\( \square x e 5 \) \( \square c 6 \) 14.\( \square b 5 \) + --

13.\( \square x d 4 \) \( \square x e 5 \) 14.\( \square x e 5 \)

Black's d5-pawn and e6-bishop are weak, and f5-f6 is liable to be strong at some stage.

14.\( \square c 6 \) 15.\( \square c 1 ! \)

It is too soon for 15.f5?! \( \square d 7 \) 16.\( \square x d 5 ? ? \) \( \square c 5 \) + -- .

15...\( \square a c 8 \) 16.\( \square b 1 ! \)
16.f5 \( \square d 7 \) 17.\( \square x d 5 \) \( \square x e 5 \) 18.\( \square f 6 \) \( \square e 6 \)
(Capablanca)

16...d4 17.\( \square e 4 \) ±
17.\( \square d 3 \)? and 17.\( \square b 5 \) are also promising.

17...\( \square f d 8 \) 18.\( \square d 6 \)
18.\( \square d 3 \) \( \square f 5 \) (18...g6±) 19.\( \square f 6 \) \( \square x f 6 \)
20.\( \square x f 5 \) \( \square x f 5 \) 21.\( \square x f 5 \) \( \square c 7 \) 22.\( \square f d 1 \) ±
18...\( \square x d 6 \) 19.\( \square x d 6 \) \( \square x d 6 \) 20.\( \square f 5 \) ±
20.\( \square e 4 \) ± is also strong.

Capablanca held this difficult position!

Ex. 21-5

S. Flohr – Em. Lasker
Moscow 1936

14.cxd5!

14...\( \square x d 5 \) 15.\( \square x e 4 \) ±

(1 point)

(another 1 point)

15...\( \square x e 4 \) 16.\( \square c 4 \) \( \square d 8 \) 17.\( \square g 4 \) ! ±

(1 point)

The operation in the centre was very successful. White has activated his forces and is ready to storm forward on the kingside.

17...\( \square c 6 \) 18.\( \square x d 8 \) \( \square x d 8 \) 19.\( \square d 1 \) \( \square a 8 \) 20.\( \square a 4 \) !
a6 21.e6 f6 22.\( \square x d 7 \) \( \square x d 7 \) 23.\( \square x d 7 \) \( \square h 8 \)
24.\( \square x e 6 \) \( \square d 8 \) 25.\( \square a x a 6 \) f5 26.\( \square c 5 \) c4 27.\( \square c 4 \) \( \square c 5 \) 28.g3 \( \square d 7 \) 29.\( \square c 7 \) \( \square x e 6 \) 30.\( \square x e 6 \) \( \square e 7 \)
31.b4 h6 32.a5 bxa5 33.bxa5 g6 34.\( \square d 5 \) 1-0

----

Ex. 21-6

S. Flohr – A. Lilienthal
Moscow 1936

16.g4!

(2 points)

After forcing the bishop to retreat, Flohr will skilfully exploit the e4-square.

16...\( \square d 7 \) 17.\( \square f 3 \) \( \square b 8 \) 18.\( \square g 5 \) \( \square f 6 \) 19.\( \square g 1 \) \( \square x g 4 \)
\( \square g 7 \) 20.\( \square c e 1 \) \( \square f 6 \) 21.\( \square g 3 \) \( \square h 8 \) 22.f4 \( \square g 8 \)
23.\( \square c e 4 \) \( \square x e 4 \) 24.\( \square x e 4 \) \( \square x e 4 \) 25.\( \square g 5 \) ! ±
\( \square b 8 \) 26.\( \square x e 5 \) \( \square x e 5 \)
26...\( \square x e 5 \) 27.d6 \( \square x d 6 \) 28.\( \square x b 6 \) ±
Solutions

Ex. 21-7
S.Flohr – S.Landau
Kemeri 1937

14.c5!
(2 points)

We already know this idea – see Diagram 11-3 in Chess Evolution 2.

14...bxc5 15.dxe5 dxe5 16.dxe5 g6
17.dxe5 xe5 18.fxe5+

After White recovers the c5-pawn, Black is left with a weak isolated pawn on c7. One can understand why Black now starts to look for complications.

18...g5 19.xc5 e5 20.xa7 xh3
21.f1 g6 22.xc5 xxc5 23.xc5 e8
24.a4 h5 25.a5 h4 26.d5 f5 27.a6 e4
28.d7 f5 29.e7 h3 30.a7 e4 31.d7
32.xh3 c5 33.xd7 c6 34.xc6
35.a5 e4 36.f3 b7 37.xc5 xxa7
38.xf6 d8 39.d5 h8 40.b5
1–0

Ex. 21-8
I.Rabinovich – S.Flohr
Leningrad 1939

16...h5!
(2 points)

Flohr’s great class can be seen here! In just one more move White would secure his advantage on the kingside with g3. But right at this moment Black hits his opponent with a counter-punch!

17.g3 h2
17.g5 h7 18.h4 c5 19.d1h2 d7+ and Black may continue with ...g6 and then ...f6.

17...hxg4 18.hxg4 g7!
18...d5?
19.g3 g5!

(another 1 point)

The dark squares in White’s position are now weak.

20.g2 b8 21.d2 c5 22.xf1 d8
23.xg2 g6 24.xg5 xg5 25.e3 d7
26.xf1 f8 27.e1 d8 28.d2 d5
29.d1 f7 30.d2 f6 31.e2 h8+
32.hf3 xg4 33.xg5 h2+ 34.xh2
xf2+ 35.h1 h8+ 36.h3 xh3
0–1

Ex. 21-9
S.Flohr – M.Christoffel
Groningen 1946

17.xc1!
(2 points)

White hits a sore point in the black position – the c4-pawn.

17.a3 or 17.xd1 each earn 1 point.

17...e5 18.b3 c3 19.axb6
19.xc3!± and 19.a3!?± are tempting alternatives.

19...cxb6 20.xc3 e7

20.bxc3 would be followed by: 21.xc6 d8 (21...xc7 22.e8# or 21...c7
22.a8+ b8 23.xa6+→) 22.xb6+ c7
23.xa6+–

17.e4
21.a4 e2+!

21...h5 22.h4+– e2

Better is 22...fxe3.

23.e3 h6 24.xb6 f8 25.xc1 lxc1 25.xc1 d5
26.c3! bxc3

If the queen moves, White can play xe2 followed by xc6.

27.xd5 cxd5 28.e3!
1–0
Solutions

Ex. 21-10

S. Flohr – S. Furman
USSR Ch, Moscow 1948

16. h4!

(2 points)

White plans to attack with h4-h5.

Natural moves like 16. Wd3 or 16. h5
(1 point each) are not bad, but they do not
point towards the future course of the game.
Flohr wants to operate on the kingside and
to open up the position since he possesses the
bishop pair.

16... Ac8 17. d3 c4 18. g5 f6 19. g3
e8 20. xf6 gxf6 21. h5±

The black kingside is weakened, so the
opposite-coloured bishops mean that an
attack is on the cards.

21... g7 22. g2 d2 23. h1 b4
24. hxg6 fxg6 25. h4 g5 26. xd5 e7
27. h2 e1

27... c8 28. ah1! xd3 29. h7 f8
30. h8 f7 31. h7 f6 32. d8 f6

28. xe1 xe1 29. h1 b4 30. b3

30. e4! is strong: 30... f5 31. xf5+
30... d7 31. c4 d2? 32. e4!+-
33. h8 d8 34. xd8 xd8 35. xb7 h8
36. xa7 d2 37. f7 g5 38. h5 f6
39. f7 h8 40. d3

1–0

Ex. 21-11

S. Flohr – P. Benko
Budapest 1949

12. f1!±

(2 points)

The displacement of White’s king is not a
concern as he is able to continue with f3
and g2.

12. e2?! is weaker: 12... xe2+ 13. xe2
0–0–0±

12... b8

12... 0–0–0? 13. f3±

13. a2 d6 14. d2 f6 15. b3 0–0

16. xc5

16. xa5 c6±

16... xc5 17. d3 c6 18. a4 cxb5

18... d5 19. d2±

19. axb5 fc8 20. c2 b4? 21. f3

The immediate 21. a3! looks even
stronger.

21... f8? 22. a3!+- 23. c1

The threat of d1 is decisive.

1–0

Ex. 21-12

S. Flohr – A. Lilienthal
USSR Ch, Moscow 1949

12. a4!

(2 points)

Harassing the b6-knight with a4-a5 is a
typical idea.

12... e5 13. a5 bd7

13... bc4? 14. f4+-

14. e3 f6 15. fd1 g4 16. h3 f3\n
17. xf3 xf3 f6 18. g2 e5 19. xb7 c4

20. c5 d7 21. b4±
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 26

22 points and above → Excellent
17 points and above → Good
13 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 13 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Chapter 22
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Diagram 22-1

Pirc and Modern Defences

In this chapter we shall deal with a few strategic ideas in the Pirc Defence (and in the Modern Defence, which differs only very slightly from the Pirc). A short survey of this opening will also be given.

The Pirc Defence arises from the initial moves:
1.e4 d6 2.d4 tLf6 3.tLl c3 g6

Diagram 22-1

In the Modern Defence the move ...tLf6 is delayed and Black plays ...g6 at once and then ...tLg7.

Black develops his pieces and fianchettoes his king’s bishop. This plan is particularly well suited to those players who also have the King’s Indian Defence in their repertoire.

Black constructs a solid defensive position and tries later (but not too late!) to attack the white centre.

Since there is as yet no confrontation in the centre, White has on the 4th move a whole series of different systems to choose from.

W-1) **White aims to quickly prepare an e4-e5 breakthrough in the centre.**

He can utilize this plan in the following variations:

a) 4.f4 (Austrian Attack)

b) 4.tLg5

c) 4.tLc4

W-2) **White prepares for play on the kingside.**

a) 4.tL3

b) 4.tLe3

c) 4.tLe2

W-3) **White focuses his play on the centre** (but does not want to commit to e4-e5 too soon).

a) 4.tLf3

b) 4.g3

As already emphasized, Black must later take some action against the white pawn centre. A natural target of the counterplay is the **white pawn on d4**. Black can attack this pawn or try to exchange it or tempt it forward. The latter two operations can also help Black make even better use of his dark-squared bishop.

Black has three important strategic operations
which he can employ, taking into account the system chosen by his opponent. We shall look at an example of each.

B-1) **Black prepares ...e5.**

![Diagram 22-2](image)

1.e4 d6 2.d4 \( \Box f6 \) 3.\( \Box c3 \) g6 4.\( \Box f3 \) g7 5.\( \Box e2 \) 0–0 6.0–0

**Diagram 22-2**

6...\( \Box g4?! \)

Black is prepared to exchange the f3-knight so as to be able to exert more pressure on d4.

Note that 6...\( \Box bd7?! \) is inadvisable on account of 7.e5!±.

7.\( \Box e3 \)

7.h3 \( \Box xf3 \) 8.\( \Box xf3 \) c6= 7...c6 8.\( \Box d2 \)

8.d5 \( \Box xf3 \) (8...\( \Box b8?! \) followed by ...c6 is another idea) 9.\( \Box xf3 \) e5 10.\( \Box e2 \) c6 11.a4 a5! 12.\( \Box e1 \) c7 13.d4 cxd4! 14.\( \Box f1 \) \( \Box ac8 \) 15.\( \Box d2 \) c8= 8...c8=!

Black is seeking a complicated struggle. This move is not only useful for preparing ...e5. If White ever plays \( \Box h6 \), the important dark-squared can be saved from exchange.

Another good move here is the immediate 8...e5:

**Diagram 22-3**

a) 9.dxe5 dxe5=

b) 9.\( \Box d1 \)? \( \Box xf3 \) 10.\( \Box xf3 \) exd4 11.\( \Box xd4 \) \( \Box xe4! \) 12.\( \Box xe4 \) \( \Box xd4=+ \)

c) 9.d5 \( \Box e7 \) is the main line, and is reckoned to offer equal chances.

9.\( \Box f1 \)

After 9.d5 \( \Box b8 \) Black will attack the centre with ...c6.

9...a6

Black would also like to expand on the queenside. White can prevent ...b5, but even so, control over the b5-square is useful for Black.

10.a4

10.\( \Box d1 \) b5= 10...e5
11. \textit{d5}

11.\textit{dxe5} \textit{dxe5} 12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{ad1}} leads to equality.

11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xf3}}

Black makes use of the peculiarities of the position which allow him to go with his knight to \textit{d4}.

11.\textit{\textcolor{red}{e7}} is an alternative. Black gets a position like those in the King’s Indian Defence. He should aim to prepare \textit{...f5} and to play on the kingside.

12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xf3}}

12.\textit{\textcolor{red}{dxc6}} would be followed by: 12...\textit{\textcolor{red}{xe4!}} 13.\textit{\textcolor{red}{d3}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{xc3}} (13...\textit{\textcolor{red}{xe2?!}} 14.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xe4\textcolor{red}{+}}}) 14.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xf3}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{e4}} 15.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xb7}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{b8}} 16.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xa6}} exf3 with advantage for Black.

12...\textit{\textcolor{red}{ad1!}} 13.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xf3}}

13.\textit{\textcolor{red}{d1}} is met by 13...\textit{\textcolor{red}{c6!\textcolor{red}{\textcolor{red}{+}}}.

13...\textit{\textcolor{red}{exd4}} 14.\textit{\textcolor{red}{a2}}

14.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xd4}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{xe4}} is somewhat better for Black.

14...\textit{\textcolor{red}{d7}} 15.\textit{\textcolor{red}{c3}}

White does not have enough time to attack the black d4-pawn: 15.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xc1}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{h4}} (or 15...c5!!) 16.\textit{\textcolor{red}{b3}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{c5}} 17.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xd4}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{xe4\textcolor{red}{+}}}

15...\textit{\textcolor{red}{c5!}} 16.\textit{\textcolor{red}{d1}}

16.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xd4}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{b3\textcolor{red}{+}}}

16...\textit{\textcolor{red}{dxc3}} 17.\textit{\textcolor{red}{xc3}}

17...\textit{\textcolor{red}{xc3!\textcolor{red}{\textcolor{red}{+}}}.

A strong positional idea. White is left with a bad bishop on f3. The black knight on c5 is on a secure outpost and is attacking the white pawns. White is not in any position to exploit the weakness of the dark squares since a lot of minor pieces have already exchanged.

18.\textit{\textcolor{red}{bxc3}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{a5!}}

Fixing the weakness on a4.

19.\textit{\textcolor{red}{b1?}}

19.\textit{\textcolor{red}{g3}} followed by \textit{\textcolor{red}{g2}} would be better.

19...\textit{\textcolor{red}{e5}}

This prepares an attack on the e4-pawn.

20.\textit{\textcolor{red}{g3}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{e8}} 21.\textit{\textcolor{red}{g2}}

For the moment White can hold the position by tactical means, since if Black takes either pawn then the b7-pawn is hanging. But after Black’s next obvious move, the two white pawns will be hanging again.

21...\textit{\textcolor{red}{b6}} 22.\textit{\textcolor{red}{f4}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{e7}} 23.\textit{\textcolor{red}{d4}} \textit{\textcolor{red}{xa4}} 24.\textit{\textcolor{red}{e5}}

\textit{Diagram 22-6}
24...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
24...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
25...cxd4 \texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
followed by \ldots \texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}} also
leads to an advantage for Black.

---

25...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
26...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
White's only chance is to attack in the centre,
but the a-pawn can divert the white forces from
the attack. For example: 26...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
27...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
28...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
29...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}

Diagram 22-7

26...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
26...a3 is stronger: 27...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
(\ldots \texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
26...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
27...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
28...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
29...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
27...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
28...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
28...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}

Diagram 22-8

B-2) Black prepares \ldots c5.

B.Ivanovic – M.Gurevich
Lucerne 1989

The following annotations are based on analysis by
Gurevich.

1.e4 d6 2.d4 \texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
3...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
4...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
5...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}

Diagram 22-8

5...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
6...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
A typical idea. Black takes the opportunity to break
up the white centre.

7...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
8...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
If 8...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
9...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
cxd4 10...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
then
10...\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
and the threat of \ldots \texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}\texttt{\textit{\textdagger}}
is very strong.
The developing move 8.\texttt{e}e3 looks better.

8...\texttt{a}a5!

A typical attacking move.

8...\texttt{xc}5 is not so good: 9.\texttt{c}c4 exd6 10.0-0

9.\texttt{d}e2

9.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{xc}5 10.dxe7 \texttt{e}e8 11.\texttt{e}c2 \texttt{xe}7 is good for Black. In return for the sacrificed pawn, he has open files and diagonals which provide sufficient compensation.

Perhaps White could try 9.\texttt{e}e3?.

9...\texttt{xc}3†!

If 9...\texttt{xc}5?! then 10.\texttt{d}d3±.

10.bxc3 \texttt{xc}3† 11.\texttt{d}d2 \texttt{xc}5 12.dxe7 \texttt{e}e8!

Black does not hurry to recover the pawn, but prefers to prevent his opponent from castling.

13.\texttt{b}b1 \texttt{c}c6 14.\texttt{b}b3!

14.\texttt{b}b5? would be worse: 14...\texttt{xe}7 15.\texttt{c}c3 b6†

14...\texttt{xe}7 15.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{b}b6 16.\texttt{b}b3 \texttt{c}c7?

Black is playing for a win.

17.0-0 \texttt{c}c5 18.\texttt{a}a3?!

Or 18.\texttt{e}e3 \texttt{e}e4 19.\texttt{d}d3 \texttt{f}f5 and Black has an active position.

18...\texttt{g}g4

18...\texttt{f}f5?!± would also be good.

19.h3 \texttt{xf}3 20.\texttt{xf}3 \texttt{d}d8 21.\texttt{c}c1 \texttt{d}d4

Black controls the centre and so he is better!

22.f5

Threatening \texttt{g}g5.

22...\texttt{e}e2†

22...\texttt{e}e4† would have been a stronger way to deal with the threat.

23.\texttt{xe}2 \texttt{xe}2 24.\texttt{h}h6∞ \texttt{e}e4 25.\texttt{b}b2

25.\texttt{d}d3 \texttt{xd}3 26.cxd3 \texttt{xe}2† 27.\texttt{x}xg2 \texttt{g}g3†

25...\texttt{f}f6

The position is now balanced. White has his share of the chances, but he soon makes the decisive mistake.

26.\texttt{b}b3†?!

26.\texttt{b}b3∞ could lead to an amusing perpetual check: 26...\texttt{x}xg2†? 27.\texttt{x}xg2 \texttt{d}d2† 28.\texttt{f}f3 \texttt{g}g3† 29.\texttt{x}xe4 \texttt{h}h4† 30.\texttt{f}f4 (30.\texttt{f}f4 \texttt{g}gx5† 31.\texttt{x}xf5 \texttt{h}h5†)

32.\texttt{xf}6 \texttt{g}g6† 33.\texttt{e}e5 \texttt{g}g7†) 30.\texttt{g}gx5† 31.\texttt{x}xf5

268
26...h8 27.b5?
    27..f3 xc2 28.fxg6 hxg6 29..e3∞
    27...xc2→

Diagram 22-12
The white position collapses.
28.h1 xg2 29.h4 xf2! 30.h3 xf3 31.xf3 d1†
   Or 31...a6++.  
32.f1 f2†
   32...c6! 33.xc6 xf1† 34.g2 f2†→
33.g2 e4† 34.g3
   34.xf2 xf4†→
34...d3†
0–1

B-3) Black waits with ...e5 and carefully prepares his counterplay on the queenside with ...c6 and ...b5, or even ...a6 and ...b5.

P.Leko – M.Gurevich
Wijk aan Zee 1993

1.e4 g6 2.d4 d6 3.e3 g7 4.g5
   A good plan against the Modern set-up.
4...c6 5.d2 b5

Diagram 22-13
The idea behind this expansion is to push back the c3-knight with a well-timed ...b4, and thus to bring the d5-and e4-squares under black control.
6.f4 f6
   Black naturally wants to attack the e4-pawn.
   6...b4 7.c1 b6 8.e5 f6?!±
7.d3
   7.e5 is of course followed by 7...b4! 8.exf6 exf6.
7...bd7 8.f3 0–0
   8...b6?! can be met with: 9.e5 b4 10.a4 a5
   11.exf6 xf6 12.a3!±
   8...b6?! is worth considering.
9.e5
   The thematic move, which obliges Black to hit back.
   9...0–0 is followed by: 9...b6 10.ae1 b4 11.e2
c5 12.c4 bxc3 13.bxc3 cxd4 14.cxd4 d5!=

Diagram 22-14
9...b4! 10.d1?!
A passive move.
If 10.exf6, then 10...bxc3 11...xc3 fxe6!? 12...xc6 b8=.
10...e2! would be better:

**Diagram 22-15**

10...d5!? (10...dxe5 11.fxe5 d5 12.h6=) 11.exd6 f6! 12.dxe7 xc7 13.h4= White’s idea is to meet 13...e3? with 14.f2. Black still has to show that he has compensation.

10...d5 11.exd6
11.0-0 f6!? 12.exf6 exf6 13.h4 h6 14.g3 xe8=.

11...f6 12.h4
Without his knight blocking the e-file, White cannot play 12.dxe7?? xe7=.

12.exd6
Or first 12...h6.

13.0-0
After 13.f5 xe8+ 14.hf1 Black can reply 14...g5 15.g3 h7b6=, or try the interesting 14...xf5!? with the point that 15.xf5 c5 16.xc8 xe4? gives him a strong initiative.

**Diagram 22-16**

13...h6=?
Black has seriously improved his position in the centre, and the game looks level.

14.g3 h7b6 15.a3
If 15...c4! then 15...bxc3 16.xc3 (16.bxc3 f5) 16...xe6=.

15.a5 16.axb4 xb4? 17.xa8 xa8 18.c4 bxc3 19.bxc3 and now rather than 19...ab6 20.c4±, Black should prefer 19...a5=.

17.e2 e8
The key to such positions lies as usual in the centre.

**Diagram 22-17**

18.c3 d4 19.d3 c5= Intending 20...c4.

20.dxc5
This just improves the black position.
Better is 20.b3.

20...dxc5 21.f2 c7
Black attacks the f4-pawn.
21...c4 22.e2 e3= leads to equality.
22.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}e1} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{d}}e8}! 23.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c}}2}?!  
White sacrifices the f-pawn, but only gets a limited amount of compensation.

The alternatives would perhaps be better:

a) 23.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}}4}! 24.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf}}4} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{xf}}4} 25.\textit{\textbf{c}}4+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}5} 26.\textit{\textbf{a}}2+  

b) 23.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}}4}! \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}5} 24.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{xf}}2} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c}}4} 25.\textit{\textbf{c}}2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf}}4} 26.\textit{\textbf{xf}}6+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}6} 27.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf}}5}! (27.\textit{\textbf{xf}}4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf}}4} 28.\textit{\textbf{xf}}4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf}}4} 29.\textit{\textbf{xb}}6=) 27...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xg}}3} 28.\textit{\textbf{e}}6+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}7} 29.\textit{\textbf{hxg}}3+  

Diagram 22-18

23...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf}}4} 24.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{xf}}4} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{xf}}4} 25.\textit{\textbf{e}}4 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b}}7}  
25...\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b}}8}!±  
26.\textit{\textbf{g}}3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h}}5}  
26...f5!?  
27.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xb}}7} \textit{\textbf{xb}}7 28.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}}4} \textit{\textbf{c}}7!  
28...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xe}}4} 29.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{xe}}4}=  
29.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}6}+ \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f}}8} 30.\textit{\textbf{g}}4?  
30.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}3} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}}8} 31.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}4} would be more resilient.  
30...\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}}8} 31.\textit{\textbf{b}}3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}}4}+  

The white king is exposed; Black is controlling the centre and the game!  
32.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}xe8}+ \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{x}}xe8} 33.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xa}}5}  
33...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}}6}! 34.\textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{a}}7} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}}7}  
34...c4 35.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}4}+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}}8}+  
35.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}}7}  
35.c4 is also followed by 35...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf}}3}!++ (Stohl).  

Diagram 22-19

35...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf}}3}!  
A nice finish, based on 36.\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf}}3} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}}1}#.  
0–1

In order to understand these openings and to prepare them, I recommend you to study the games of experts, to choose a model and to follow his games (for example, GM Alex Chernin, who has also written a fine and beautiful book on the Pirc, or GM Mikhail Gurevich). The examples in the test will help you to find reasonable lines against the white systems described above!

The Pirc and the Modern are difficult to play, though the same holds true for your opponents! You must play through all the examples in the test on a board. You will find some valuable ideas in them.
Exercises

> Ex. 22-1 ◀ 

> Ex. 22-2 ◀

> Ex. 22-3 ◀ 

> Ex. 22-4 ◀ 

> Ex. 22-4 ◀

> Ex. 22-5 ◀

> Ex. 22-6 ◀ 
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Exercises

Ex. 22-7

Ex. 22-8

Ex. 22-9

Ex. 22-10

Ex. 22-11

Ex. 22-12
Solutions

Ex. 22-1

C. Landenberque – B. Zueger
Suhr 1991

1. d4 g6 2. e4 d5 3. c3 d6 4. e2 f6 5. f3 0–0 6. h3?! c5 7. d5?!

Diagram Ex. 22-1

We already know this trick – see Diagram 8-3 in Boost Your Chess 1.

7... b5!

(2 points)

8. axb5

8. d2 b4

8... cxe4! 9. dxe4 a5 10. c3 bxc3

11. bxc3 b5 12. cxd6 exd6

Black is better.

13. c3 d3 a4 14. 0–0?

Better is 14. c4.

14... a6 15. c4 bxc4 16. d2 c7→

17. g5 b6 18. a1 b7 19. e1 xd5

20. a5 b4 21. xb4 cxb4 22. a3 f6 23. d2 bx a3 24. a1 b6 25. a3 4 4 26. a4 b c8 27. f4 axf3 28. a7 e5 0–1

Ex. 22-2

M. Sadler – V. Ivanuchk
Monte Carlo (rapid) 1998

1. d4 a6 2. d3 g6 3. c3 g7 4. e4 d6 5. c3 a6?! 6. d4 b5 7. d5 0–0 8. c3 c6! (D... e5) 9. e5 (9. d5 e5=) 9... dxe5 10. dxe5 g4 11. xg7 w7 12. a4

Diagram Ex. 22-2

12... cxe5!

(2 points)

A great tactical trick.

12... gxe5 (1 point) is not quite so accurate: 13. x e5 w d6 14. x g6 hxg6

15. e3=

13. cxe5 w d6 14. x g6

An important variation is 14. e4 cxe5 15. d3+–.

(1 point for this variation)

14... hxg6 15. x d6 cxd6

The rest follows without comments:

16. e2 f6 17. f3 a7 18. 0–0 a c7 19. c4 d6 20. e1 f2 21. b1 e5 22. a2 c5 23. e3 e7 24. e4 b4 25. b3 f4 26. c5 a5 27. a3 e4 28. e2 c4 29. c5 a5 30. d1 f5 31. f5

Ex. 22-3

I. Gazik – A. Chernin
Budapest 1993

1. e4 d6 2. d4 a6 3. c3 g6 4. e3 c6 5. d2 b5 6. f3 b6 7. g5 c7 8. g4 h5 9. h4 h4 10. g5 d7 11. f4 g7 12. f5 0–0 13. a3

(1 point for this variation)

13... c5!

(2 points)

With this typical move, Black aims to show that the e4-pawn is a weakness.

13... b4 14. e3 c5! (also 2 points) is equally good.

White’s play has been very risky. However, 13... gxf5 (1 consolation point for courage) would be no less risky for Black.

14. fxe6?!

14. g4?! b4 15. e3 could be tried, intending 15... g5 16. f3.

14... fxe6 15. ge2 b4 16. d5 d5 17. e6 h7 18. xd5 h4 19. c4 bxc3

20. ecx3 e8 21. 0–0 a6 22. dxe6 c d6 23. dxc5 dxc4 24. e1 f5 25. e1 a6

Threatening... w a3 followed by... c4.

26. b4 e8 27. b1 b7 28. e2 h4 29. w d7 a3 30. e1 b4 31. a4 c4

32. e4 f3 33. c5 e3? 34. d2 e2 35. e3 b8

35... c f2! 36. axb4 b f b3#
Solutions

36.\text{\texttt{ed6 ecf2 37.e5 dc2}} \uparrow 38.\text{\texttt{e4 ef8}} \uparrow 39.\text{\texttt{d5 a8}} \uparrow 40.\text{\texttt{ec6 d2}} \uparrow 41.\text{\texttt{d4 fxd4}} \uparrow
0-1

Ex. 22-4

G. Mohr – A. Chernin
Portoroz 1997

1.e4 d6 2.d4 \texttt{f6} 3.\texttt{c3} g6 4.g3 c6 5.a4 \texttt{bd7} 6.g2 \texttt{g7} 7.\texttt{ge2} 0-0 8.0-0 b6 9.h3 a6 10.\texttt{e3} (10.f4 [\texttt{e4-e5}] 10...e5) 10...\texttt{b7}
11.g4 e5 12.\texttt{g3} b5 (12...h6) 13.g5 \texttt{e8}
14.d5 cxd5 15.\texttt{cxd5}

Diagram Ex. 22-4

15...\texttt{c7}?! (2 points)
It is correct to exchange the strong knight on d5.
15...\texttt{f6} (1 consolation point) is not so good.
16.axb5 axb5 17.\texttt{e2} \texttt{c5} 18.\texttt{xa8} \texttt{xa8}
19.\texttt{d1} 5e6 20.\texttt{xc7 \texttt{xc7}} 21.\texttt{xb5} \texttt{xb8}
22.\texttt{a4 \texttt{c6}} 23.\texttt{b2} \texttt{f4}\uparrow 24.\texttt{c3} h6 25.h4
hxg5 26.hxg5 \texttt{d7} 27.\texttt{d2} \texttt{e6} 28.\texttt{a6} \texttt{f8}
29.\texttt{xf4 exf4} 30.\texttt{e2} \texttt{c5}=.

Ex. 22-5

A. Kveinys – J. Speelman
Moscow Olympiad 1994

1.e4 d6 2.d4 \texttt{f6} 3.\texttt{c3} g6 4.\texttt{c4 \texttt{g7}} 5.\texttt{e2}
\texttt{c6} 6.e5 \texttt{d7}?! 7.\texttt{f3} (7.\texttt{xf7} \texttt{xf7} 8.e6\uparrow
\texttt{e8} 9.exd6 \texttt{xd7} 10.\texttt{d3} \texttt{g4}) 7...\texttt{b6}!
8.\texttt{b3}?! (8.\texttt{b5}) 8...0-0 9.h3

Diagram Ex. 22-5

9...\texttt{a5}! (2 points)
To secure his position Black must swap off the dangerous bishop.
9...\texttt{dxe5} is weaker: 10.dxe5 \texttt{d4} 11.\texttt{xd4}
\texttt{fxd4} 12.f4\uparrow
10.0-0 \texttt{h6}?! 11.\texttt{e4 \texttt{xb3}} 12.axb3 \texttt{f6=}
12...f5 is also playable.
13.\texttt{c4 dxe5} 14.dxe5 \texttt{d7}?! 14...g5?!?
Ex. 22-7

V. Anand – A. Chernin
Eupen 1999

1.e4 d6 2.d4 גf6 3.גc3 g6 4.גe3 c6 5.f3 b5 6.g4 h6! (6...גg7 7.גd2 h5 8.g5 גfd7 9.f4 גb6 10.גf3 and White may continue with גh4 and f4-f5) 7.גd2 גg7 8.h4

Diagram Ex. 22-7

8...h5!

(2 points)

Only after White has occupied the h4-square does Black blockade the kingside.

8...b4 and 8...גbd7 (1 point each) are sensible alternatives.

9.g5 גfd7 10.גge2 גb7 11.גg3 0–0
12.f4 b4 13.גd1 c5! 14.d5 גb6
15.גc bx c3 16.גxc3 גa6 17.גxa6 גxa6
18.גe2 גc8 19.f5 גc7?

Better is 19...גd7.

20.0–0

20.f6! exf6 21.גxh5→

20...גd7

Intending ...Гa6.

21.גxh5?! גxh5 22.גxh5 גb8 23.גf2 גe8
23...גa6!?

24.גaf1 גe5

24...גa6?

25.גg2 גc4 26.גc1 גd4! 27.גh1 גg7
28.גh6– גxb2? 29.גxb2 גxb2 30.גf3 גxc3 31.גf6 גe8 32.גg6 גxf6 33.גxf7 ג1–0

Ex. 22-8

J. Smeets – T. Nyback
Bundesliga 2005

1.e4 g6 2.d4 גg7 3.גc3 d6 4.f4 גf6 5.גf3 גc5 6.גb5 גd7 7.e5 גg4 8.e6 (8.גxd7 גzd7 9.d5 גxe5 10.h3 גe4! 11.גxe4 גf6) 8...גxe6 9.גg5 גxb5 10.גxb5 גa5! 11.c3 גxb5 12.גxg4 גxd4
13.גxe6 גc4! 14.גxg7+ גf7 15.גf5

Diagram Ex. 22-8

15...גe6 ג16.גe3 גxe3 (1 point) is also playable. 17.f5 גxf5 18.0–0 may look dangerous, but Black can survive: 18...גc6 (or 18...גe2?) 19.גxf5 גe8 20.גf8 גd7
21.גxe6 גxe6 22.גxa8 גe2 23.גxe3 גxa8
24.גf1=

16.גg5 גe6 ג17.גe3 גxe3 18.גb5?

18.f5 גxf5 19.0–0 גd7 (19...גe2?) 20.גxf5 גf6=

18...גd7 19.גe2 גg4 20.גxe3 גxe2 ג1
21.גxe2 גhc8= 22.גh3 גf6 23.גf3 גd5
24.גd4 גb5 25.גb3 גc4 26.גg 27.גg5 גhx5
28.גf5 גe8 29.גe4 גf6 30.גd3 גa6 31.גhg1 גd5 32.גaf1 גd7 33.גg6 גc6
34.גe3 גe4 35.גxc6 גxc6 36.גf4 גd6
37.גe5 גc6 38.גd4 גd6 39.גe5 גc6
40.גd4

½–½

Ex. 22-9

E. Bareev – V. Anand
Paris (rapid) 1992

1.d4 d6 2.e4 גg6 3.גc3 גg7 4.גf3 גg7 5.גe2 0–0 6.0–0 גc5 7.גxc5 גxc5 8.גxd8 גxd8 9.גe3 גb6 10.גf1 גc6 11.גxd8 גd8 12.גd1 גb7
13.גd2 גe6 14.גf3 גd8 15.גf2 גd7 16.גb3

Diagram Ex. 22-9

16...גxc3!

(2 points)

In the annotated games in this chapter we saw that Black can sometimes part with this strong bishop. Such a decision is easier in the endgame. The weakness of the castled position plays no part; the weakening of the white pawn structure is, on the other hand, important!

17.גxc3 גb8 ג18.גb1 גa6 19.גd2 גxe2
31.גb7 גhx2 32.גe5 גf8 33.גe3 גh5
34.גxa7 גg4 35.גe6 גd6 36.גc4 גd5 37.גf6 גf6 38.גc3 גg3 39.גe4 גd1 40.גf5 גg2
41.גa8 גg7 42.גe7 גe1 43.גa7 גh6

0–1
Solutions

Ex. 22-10

N.de Firmian – A.Chernin

Biel 1994

1.e4 d6 2.d4  Qf6 3. Qc3 g6 4.f4  Qg7 5. Qf3
c5 6. b5  Qd7 7.e5  Qg4 8.e6 fx6 9.Qg5
  Qxb5 10.Qxe6

Diagram Ex. 22-10

10... Qxd4!

(2 points)

11. Qxb5

Black's 10th move was first played in Sax – Seirawan, Brussels 1988, which finished:
11. Qxd8  Qf2† 12. Qd2  Qe3† ½–½
11... Qa5† 12. Qf2  Qf2† 13. Qd1  Qe3†
14. Qe2  Qxb5† 15. Qxf2  Qg4† 16. Qg3∞

See Ex. 22-11.

Ex. 22-11

N.de Firmian – A.Chernin

Biel 1994

16... Qa6!

(2 points)

Another way to deal with White's threat is:
16... Qd7 17.Qe1  Qh6 (also 2 points) 18.b3
  Qf5† 19.Qf2  Qc6 20.Qb2  Qcd4∞
17.Qe1

17.Qxe4 is followed by: 17... Qd7! 18.Qe1
  Qc7 19.Qe2  Qf7

(another 1 point)
20.f5? Qxf5† 21.Qxf5 Qag8→ and ... Qg6 next.
17... Qh6 18.b3  Qf5† 19.Qf2  h5 20.Qb2
  Qg8 21.Qad1  Qd7 22.Qc4∞

½–½

Ex. 22-12

M.Jonker – M.Gurevich

Zwolle 1996

1.e4 d6 2.d4 Qf6 3. Qc3 g6 4.f4 Qg7 5. Qf3
c5 6. b5  Qd7 7.e5 Qg4 8.e6 fx6 9.Qg5
  Qxb5 10.Qxe6 11.Qxb5

Diagram Ex. 22-12

9... b4!

(2 points)

This is more ambitious than 9... dxe5
10.dxe5 Qfd5 (1 point).
10.Qc2  Qfd5 11.h5 Qxe3 12.Qxe3 Qd5
13.Qf2 g5! 14.Qg5 Qh6 15.Qd2 dxe5
16.dxe5 c6 17.Qf4 Qc5 18.Qxd5 Qxd5
19.f4 0–0–0 20.Qb1 Qhxg8 21.Qc2 Qb6
22.Qc4  Qc5 23.Qh3 Qg4→ 24.g3 Qdg8
25.0–0–0 Qc3† 26.Qd2 Qxg3 27.Qxg3
  Qxg3 28.Qf1 Qd4 29.Qxe3 Qxe3 30.Qd1 c5
31.Qf2 Qg2 32.Qc2 Qd5 33.fxe6 fx6 34.Qc4
  Qf2 35.Qd6† Qc7 36.Qc4 Qc6 0–1

Scoring

Maximum number of points is 26

22 points and above → Excellent
17 points and above → Good
13 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 13 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Complex positions 2

In this chapter we continue training in the calculation of variations. First remind yourself of the five points that we discussed in Chapter 9:

1) Special attention must be paid to the choice of candidate moves.

2) It is important to be accurate when calculating short variations and to take into account all active possibilities.

3) Variations you have calculated must finish with an evaluation.

4) It is very important to work out what our opponent is thinking and also to discover his best moves!

5) The calculation of variations should not be stopped too soon. If any active moves are still available either to you or to your opponent, then you must calculate further.

For the following positions take 10 to 15 minutes thinking time, then note down your variations. After that you can compare your variations with the solution. This is the method which GM Kotov used, and which he highly recommended in his books. If you cannot see any specific solution, then please make a practical decision as you would in a game. You should go about the test in the same way.

Diagram 23-1

Variation from the game

M.Botvinnik – J.Capablanca
Netherlands 1938

White must sacrifice the bishop.

27.fxg6! ♘xb2

Black cannot ward off his opponent’s attack with 27...hxg6 either. For example: 28.♗g5 (28.♗h6 is also good) 28...♕f7 (28...♕xb2 29.♕xg6† ♤h8 30.♕f5++ ) 29.♕f1 ♤e6 (29...♕e7 30.♕f2 ♘b1† 31.♕f1 ♘e4 32.♕a3†++ ) 30.♕f2 ♘b1† 31.♕f1 ♘e4 32.♕a3 ♤f7 33.♗g3 ♤d7 34.♗d6† ♤c8 35.♗c6†+-

28.g7!

If 28.gxh7†, then 28...♤h8.

278
28...hxg7

28...hxg7 is followed by: 29...b8+ hxg7 30...f5+ g6 31...g3+ h5 32...h4+ g6 33...h6+ xf5 34...e5+ g4 35...g5#

29...f5+ h8

Diagram 23-2

30...d6!

If you saw as far as this move, your calculations were perfect.

But not 30...h6? on account of 30...xf2+!!

31...xf2 g4+--

30...g7

30...g8 31...g3+--

31...xf6+ xf6 32...e8+--

Diagram 23-3

M.Botvinnik – I.Kan

USSR Ch, Moscow 1952

23...g4?

Botvinnik finds a good positional move, but he could have won by force!

23...f4! is even stronger, with the possible continuations:

a) 23...f8 24...d5! xd5 25...c3+--

b) 23...e5 24...e4 e5 (24...xc4 25...h4 h5 26...xh5 h8 27.b3+!) 25...d6 a5 26.b4--

c) 23...a5 24...h4 h5 25.b4! xb4 26...xh5! (the key move) and now:

Diagram 23-4

c1) 26...gxh5 27...g5+ h7 28...xh5+ g7 29...g5+ h8 30...e4+-

c2) 26...e8 27.a3! xa3 28...h6+ f6 29...e4+ c7 30...g5+ d7 31...d1+ c7 32...d6+--

23...f3

23...f6 would be slightly better.

24...f3 f6 25...d7

Simpler and perhaps even better than 25...h3.

25...f8 26...d3+

White stands better. He controls the only open file and he is also threatening...e4. The further course of the game is given without comments:

26...xd7 27...d7 e8 28...e4 f3 29...d4+ g8 30...g5 c5 31...xh4 xd4 32.b3 c8 33...d4 f6 34...xa7 xg4 35...b7 d8 36...f3 d1+ 37...g2
Calculating variations 4

Diagram 23-5

S. Rublevsky – Z. Varga
Chalkidiki 2002

If the knight had to retreat, White would be better. But Black has a strong resource.

19...\(\text{g5}\)!

White cannot take the knight: 20.hxg4?! \(\text{Exg4}\)
21.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{d7}\) 22.\(\text{h3}\) f5 (threatening ...\(\text{h4}\))
23.\(\text{d5}\) \(\text{b8}\) 24.\(\text{xe7}\) \(\text{h8}\)+

20.\(\text{d5}\) is also bad: 20...\(\text{xf2}\)!
21.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{xd3}\)
22.\(\text{xb6}\) \(\text{xc2}\)+–

20...\(\text{e3}\)+

This is stronger than 20...\(\text{xf2}\)
21.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{h3}\)
22.\(\text{d5}\)=

21.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{xf1}\)†

Diagram 23-6

22...\(\text{b7}\)

Black wants to continue playing on the kingside with ...f5-f4, ...\(\text{f7}\) and ...\(\text{h8}\).

22...\(\text{e6}\) is less accurate because of 23.\(\text{d5}\)!

23.\(\text{d3}\) \(\text{c6}\) 24.\(\text{e1}\) f5 25.\(\text{e2}\) f4 26.\(\text{d5}\) \(\text{f7}\)

27.\(\text{f3}\)

27...\(\text{c4}\)+–

27...\(\text{d7}\)

Even stronger is 27...\(\text{h8}\)! with the tactical point
28.\(\text{xf4}\)! \(\text{f5}\)+–.

28.\(\text{d2}\) \(\text{e6}\)+

White does not have sufficient compensation for the exchange, although after Black later missed several winning opportunities, the game eventually finished as a draw.

Diagram 23-5

1-0
It is necessary to calculate this study all the way to the end. The first moves are forced.
1.\text{a7}\text{e8} 2.\text{\textit{c6}}\text{f8} 3.\text{\textit{a8}}\text{\textit{f8}} 4.\text{\textit{xa8}}\text{\textit{d3}}
Otherwise 5.\text{\textit{e4}} will secure the draw.
5.\text{\textit{b3}}!
Provoking ...\text{a4}.
5...\text{a4} 6.\text{\textit{a2}}!
This forces a known finish.
But not 6.\text{\textit{a3}? on account of} 6...\text{\textit{e3!}}++. Did you spot that important detail?
6...\text{c2} 7.\text{\textit{e4}}!\text{\textit{xe4}} 8.\text{\textit{b2}}\text{\textit{d3}} 9.\text{\textit{c1}}=
To avoid stalemate Black must give up the c-pawn, resulting in a trivial draw.
Exercises

Ex. 23-1

Ex. 23-2

Ex. 23-3

Ex. 23-4

Ex. 23-5

Ex. 23-6
Exercises

Ex. 23-7

Ex. 23-10

Ex. 23-8

Ex. 23-11

Ex. 23-9

Ex. 23-12
Solutions

Ex. 23-1

Gilinsky – B.Spassky
Rostov 1952

1. ♘xf7†
   (1 point)

1...♘xf7 2. ♗g5†
   Slightly more accurate is 2. ♗b3† (1 point) and now:
   a) 2...♗e8 3. ♗g5 ♘h6 4. ♘xf7† ♘d7
   5. ♘e3+-
   b) 2...♗d5 3. ♗g5†+-
   c) 2...♗b5 3. exd5 ♘xd5 4. ♘a4±

2...♗g8 3. ♗b3†
   (another 1 point)

3...♗d5?
   Better is 3...♗b5 4. exd5 ♘xd5±.

4. ♘h3! ♘h6 5. ♘e6† ♘h8 6. ♘f7† ♘h7
7. ♘xd8 ♘f6 8. ♘f7
1-0

Ex. 23-2

V.Korchnoi – D.Solak
Basle 2002

15. ♘xd6!
   (1 point)

15...♗g4
15...♗xd6 16. ♘d2† ♘c6 (16...♗e6
17. ♘g5† ♘e7 18. ♘d5†+-) 17. ♘xe5† ♘c7
18. ♘d5†+-
   (1 point for these variations)

16. ♘g5†
   Or 16. ♘d2 ♘h6 17. ♘g5 ♘xg5 18. ♘xg5† ♘xd6 19. ♘d1†+-.

16...♗xd6
16...♗f7 17. ♘h4+-
16...♗e8 17. ♘hd1 ♘h6 18. ♘d8† ♘f7
19. ♘h8 ♘xg5† 20. ♘xg5† ♘f6 21. ♘h4 ♘h6
22. ♘h7 ♘xg5 23. ♘d6† ♘e6 24. ♘d5#.

17. ♘d2† ♘e6
17...♗c6 18. ♘d5† ♘c7 19. ♘b5†+-
18. ♘g5† ♘f6 19. ♘d5#

Ex. 23-3

R.Ponomariov – S.Vokarev
Briansk 1995

27...♗xf3! 28. gxf3 ♘xf3 29. ♖g1
29. ♖xf3 ♘xf3† 30. ♖xf3 ♘xf3† 31. ♖g1 ♖xd1→
   (1 point for this variation)

29...♖c3
   (1 point)

29...♖e3! (also 1 point) is equally good:
30. ♖xe3 ♖xe3 31. ♖e3 ♖g2#
30. ♖f2
30. ♖f6 ♖h1† 31. ♖f2 ♖g2† 32. ♖e1 ♖xe2†
33. ♖xe2 ♖xc2† 34. ♖e1 ♖d5!→
30...♖g2†
   Or 30...♖c2→.
31. ♖e1 ♖xe2† 32. ♖xe2 ♖xc2† 33. ♖e1 ♖xa2 34. ♖f2
0-1

Ex. 23-4

K.Opocensky – E.Grünfeld
Bad Pissyan 1922

28...♖xd3! 29. cxd3 ♖xc3!→
   (1 point)

30. ♖e2
30. bxc3 ♖a2†→
   (1 point for this variation)
30. ♖xe5 ♖xd3†→
30. ♖xc3 ♖c8† and now:
   a) 31. ♖b4 a5† 32. ♖a4 b5† 33. ♖xa5 ♖a8†!
34. ♖xb5 (34. ♖b6 ♖c6† 35. ♖xb5 ♖b7†+-)
34...♖c6† 35. ♖b4 ♖b8†+-
   b) 31. ♖d2 ♖b3
   (another 1 point for this variation)
32. ♖xe2 (32. ♖e2 ♖xb2†→ or 32. ♖c1
♖xb2†→) 32...♖c2† 33. ♖f1 ♖xd3†→
30. ♖b3
   Even stronger is 30...♖fc8! 31. bxc3 ♖a2†
32. ♖d1 ♖a1†+-.
31. ♖b1 ♖c8 32. ♖c4 ♖xe4 33. ♖xe4 ♖h6 34. ♖g3
♖xg3 35. ♖hg1 a5 36. ♖xg3 ♖h7 37. ♖f3
♖c7 38. ♖f8 ♖cc3 39. bxc3 ♖xb1 40. ♖d8
Solutions

Ex. 23-5
L.Csanadi – J.Pogats
Budapest 1963

22...<d6!
(1 point)

23.<d1
23.<c4 <xh2† 24.<h1 h5→ followed by ...<d6.
(1 point for this variation)

23...<xh2†!
(another 1 point)

24.<xh2 <xh2† 25.<xh2 <xd1
0–1

Ex. 23-6
M.Krakops – R.Ponomariov
Siofok 1996

44...<a6!→
(1 point)

0–1

White loses after 45.<xa6 <h4! 46.<e2 <xh3† 47.<gxh3 <g2† 48.<h2 <g1<#
(another 1 point for this variation)

Ex. 23-7
A.Grischuk – E.Barcev
Panormo 2001

16.<xf7! <xf7 17.<xe6†
(1 point)

1–0

17...<e7 is followed by: 18.<xe7† <xe7
19.<e1† <f8 (19...<f6 20.<xh6† <f5
21.<e5† <g4 22.<h3#) 20.<xh6† <g8
21.<g5†++
(another 1 point)

Ex. 23-8
K.Sakaev – Z.Izoria
Moscow 2003

15.<d5!
(1 point)

15...<xd5
15...<d8 16.<xf6† <xf6 17.<xh7†+-
16.<xh7† <h8 17.<xc7 <xc7 18.<xd7
<xf3 19.<xf3 <xh7 20.<xc7†
(another 1 point)

Ex. 23-9
T.Petrosian – I.Pogrebissky
Tbilisi 1949

22.<f5†!
(1 point)

22...<xf5
22...<xf5 23.<b1!+-
(1 point for this variation)

23.<d6!+-
(another 1 point)

23...<g4 24.<e4† <h5 25.<f4!
Or 25.<c2!+- (Dvoretsky).

25...<f5
25...<xd1 26.<h4† <g5 27.<c1#
26.<xg4! <xf4 27.<d2 <h8 28.<g2
1–0

Ex. 23-10
C.Lutz – G.Kasparov
Bled Olympiad 2002

The following annotations are based on analysis by Dokhoian.

34...<e8!
(1 point)

34...d5 35.<d6†

35.<a7
35.<xd6 is met by: 35...<f8! (Δ36...<xf4!)
36.<g3 <g5++
(1 point for this variation)
Solutions

If 35...\texttt{b6}, then 35...\texttt{f8} 36.\texttt{g3} \texttt{f3}\dagger 37.\texttt{f2} g5+-.

(another 1 point for this variation)

35...\texttt{d7}

35...\texttt{f8}!? 36.\texttt{xc6} \texttt{bxc6} 37.\texttt{g3} g5\dagger

36.\texttt{d5}?! 36.\texttt{c1} g5 37.\texttt{c7} \texttt{xf4} 38.\texttt{xd7} \texttt{e1}\dagger 39.\texttt{f2} (39.\texttt{h2}? \texttt{f5}-- \Delta 40...\texttt{g3}) 39...\texttt{e2}\dagger 40.\texttt{f1} \texttt{c2}! and Black intends 41...\texttt{f5}\dagger.

36...\texttt{h5}?! 37.\texttt{b6} \texttt{f5} 38.\texttt{h2} g5 39.\texttt{c1}?

39.\texttt{c4}!? \texttt{d8}! 40.\texttt{b6} \texttt{g7} 41.\texttt{c1} \texttt{f6}?! 42.\texttt{c7} \texttt{xd3} 43.\texttt{xb7} \texttt{e4} 44.\texttt{c7} g4\dagger

39...\texttt{g4} 40.\texttt{hxg4}

40.\texttt{c3} \texttt{e3}+ 41.\texttt{h1} \texttt{xe2}--

40...\texttt{hxg4}-- 41.\texttt{ac8} g3\dagger 42.\texttt{h1} \texttt{xe6} 0–1

Ex. 23-11

\begin{center}
L.\texttt{van Wel} – E.\texttt{Bacrot}
\end{center}

Bled Olympiad 2002

The following annotations are based on analysis by Dvoretsky.

17...\texttt{xf4}!!

(1 point)

18.\texttt{g7}\dagger!

(1 point for seeing this reply)

After 18.exf4 \texttt{d4}\dagger the white king has no good squares, and 19...\texttt{xb3} (attacking the \texttt{g1}-rook) wins for Black.

18...\texttt{h8}!

(another 1 point)

18...\texttt{xg7}? loses the queen after 19.\texttt{c3}\dagger+.

18...\texttt{f8}?! is less accurate than the move played: 19.\texttt{xf7}! \texttt{xf7} 20.\texttt{f1}\dagger

19.\texttt{g1}

19.exf4 \texttt{d4}\dagger 20.\texttt{e1} \texttt{xb3} 21.\texttt{hx7}\dagger \texttt{hx7} 22.\texttt{xb3} (22.axb3 \texttt{d4}--+) 22...\texttt{g8}--

19...\texttt{xd2}\dagger?!

Even stronger is: 19...\texttt{xe4}! 20.\texttt{c3} (20.\texttt{d3} \texttt{xd3} 21.\texttt{xd3} \texttt{d4}\dagger) 20...\texttt{d4}\dagger 21.\texttt{d1} \texttt{b1}\dagger 22.\texttt{c1} \texttt{xc1}+ 23.\texttt{xc1} \texttt{f3} 24.\texttt{c3} \texttt{xe3}\dagger 25.\texttt{c2} \texttt{xe1} 26.\texttt{e1}\dagger e5--

20.\texttt{xd2} \texttt{f2}!

Again Black has a more convincing line:

20...\texttt{e8}! 21.\texttt{xe4} \texttt{xe4} 22.\texttt{d3}?! \texttt{d4}\dagger! 23.\texttt{d1} (23.\texttt{e1} \texttt{f3}\dagger) 23...\texttt{xd3} 24.\texttt{xd3} \texttt{d5} 25.\texttt{xf7} \texttt{xd3}\dagger 26.\texttt{c2} \texttt{xe3}--

21.\texttt{c1} \texttt{xe3}\dagger 22.\texttt{xe3} \texttt{xe3}\dagger 23.\texttt{c2} \texttt{xg1} 24.\texttt{g1} \texttt{g8} 25.\texttt{g8} \texttt{g8} 26.\texttt{c3} \texttt{b8}\dagger 27.\texttt{d4} \texttt{f8} 28.e5 \texttt{e7} 29.a3 a5 30.\texttt{b5} \texttt{d7} 31.\texttt{xd7}? \texttt{xd7}+ 32.\texttt{c4} \texttt{e8}!!

Black also wins after 32...\texttt{f5} (or 32...\texttt{f6}) 33.\texttt{xf6} \texttt{e8}.

33.\texttt{b4} axb4 34.\texttt{xb4} \texttt{f5} 35.\texttt{xf6} \texttt{f7} 36.a4 \texttt{e5}! 37.a5 \texttt{bxa5}+ 38.\texttt{xa5} \texttt{xf6} 39.\texttt{b4} \texttt{f5} 40.\texttt{c3} \texttt{g4} 0–1

Ex. 23-12

\begin{center}
V.\texttt{Bagirov} – \texttt{Vooremaa}
\end{center}

Tallinn 1981

32...\texttt{f4}!!

(1 point)

33.\texttt{f3}

33.\texttt{xf4} is followed by: 33...\texttt{xf4} 34.\texttt{xe1} (34.\texttt{e2} \texttt{f3} 35.\texttt{e3} \texttt{g6}\dagger--) 34...\texttt{g6}\dagger 35.\texttt{h1} (35.\texttt{h2} \texttt{c2}-- or 35.\texttt{f1} \texttt{f3}--) 35...\texttt{c2} 36.\texttt{b1} \texttt{d3}!+

(another 1 point)

33...\texttt{b6}! 34.\texttt{ae1} \texttt{d3}!

0–1

(another 1 point)
Scoring

Maximum number of points is 30

26 points and above → Excellent
21 points and above → Good
15 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 15 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
Chapter 24

Queen endings

Queen endings are difficult to play because queen is a very mobile piece. For that reason one must proceed with great care. However, since these endings are relatively rare, we shall limit ourselves to just the most important suggestions.

Queen and pawn against queen

The theory of this ending is complicated. But there are only a few typical considerations which a practical player has to understand.

For the defending side the following remarks are very important:

1) If the king of the weaker side is in front of the pawn, the position is normally drawn.
2) If the king is cut off far away from the pawn and cannot be brought in front of the pawn, there is a great danger of losing. With best play one can usually still hold the draw against the rook’s pawn, but one has fewer chances of doing so against the other pawns. Nevertheless, a draw is sometimes possible if the opponent does not have his pieces on their optimal squares.
3) In such cases the most important defensive methods are checks and pinning the pawn. You must try not to let the pawn advance. In the ideal case you can achieve perpetual check. It should also be mentioned that a draw can sometimes be reached even against two pawns!
4) In the struggle against a knight’s or rook’s pawn, the king of the weaker side (if it cannot get in front of the pawn) should head towards the opposite corner of the board from the queening square.

For the stronger side the following ideas are relevant:
1) You should not voluntarily place your king in front of your pawn.
2) You must try to advance your passed pawn as far as possible.
3) The queen is best placed in the centre. From there it controls a lot of squares.
4) To avoid or escape a perpetual check, you must often put your own king on the same or a neighbouring rank or file to that on which the opposing king is standing.

5) An important method consists of a march towards the opposing king, so as to meet your opponent's checks with a check of your own and thus to exchange queens.

Diagram 24-1

M. Tal – M. Taimanov
USSR Ch, Riga 1958

I analysed this ending with the help of the Nalimov tablebases. Play is so complicated that even these two outstanding grandmasters were not able to avoid making a few mistakes.

54...c7† e8! 55...c8† e7! 56...c7†

Objectively speaking, this ending is drawn, but it is not an easy draw for the defence.

56...e8!

Taimanov plays correctly here and tries to keep his king as close as possible to the a-pawn, in order to support his queen in the struggle against the opposing pieces.

57.d6

The white king heads to the 8th rank in order to shield itself from the opponent's checks with the help of its queen.

57...d4† 58.d6 c6 e4† 59.d6 c6=

Diagram 24-2

59...b4†?

The queen gets too close to the king. It would be better to remain at a greater distance.

The correct defence is: 59...e3† 60.b7 b3†! 61.b6 f7†! 62.b8 c4! 63.a6 c7 White cannot advance the pawn further on account of the mate on c8. 64.b7† d8 65.a7 f4†! 66.a8 c7=

Another possible defence is 59...e6† 60.c6† d8!=

60.c6?

You should not block the pawn voluntarily!

60.a7! would have led to a win. After 60...d4† 61.b7 b2† 62.c8 g2 White can force away

289
the opposing king. Here is the computer's winning variation:

Diagram 24-3
63.\(d8\)\(t\) \(\text{a}7\)\(t\) 64.\(\text{a}6\) \(e8\) 65.\(a6\) \(h3\)\(t\) 66.\(b7\) \(h7\)\(t\) 67.\(b8\) \(h2\)\(t\) 68.\(c7\) \(b2\)\(t\) 69.\(c8\) \(a3\) 70.\(c6\) \(f8\) 71.\(b8\) \(b4\)\(t\) 72.\(a8\) \(e5\) 73.\(d6\)\(t\) \(f7\) 74.\(b7\) \(b5\)\(t\) 75.\(b6\) \(d5\)\(t\) 76.\(c6\) \(b3\)\(t\) 77.\(c8\) \(g8\) 78.\(e8\)\(t\) \(h7\) 79.\(d7\)\(t\) \(g8\) 80.\(d8\)\(t\) \(f7\) 81.\(a7\) \(f3\) 82.\(c7\)\(t\) \(e8\) 83.\(e5\) \(f7\) 84.\(c7\) \(g3\)\(t\) 85.\(b6\) \(b3\)\(t\) 86.\(c6\) \(e6\)\(t\) 87.\(b7\) \(b3\)\(t\) 88.\(b6\) \(d5\)\(t\) 89.\(c6\) \(b3\)\(t\) 90.\(c8\)\(t\)

60...\(a4\)
60...\(a3\)! leads to a draw: 61.\(a7\) \(e3\)\(t\) 62.\(b8\) \(b3\)\(t\) 63.\(b6\) \(c4\) 64.\(a6\) \(d7\)\(t\)

61.\(b7\)\(t\)
61.\(a7\)\(t\)\(+-

Diagram 24-4
61...\(b4\)\(t\)?
61...\(b3\)\(t\)! would be correct: 62.\(b6\) \(f7\)\(t\) 63.\(c8\) \(c4\)\(t\)
62.\(b6\)\(t\) \(c8\)\(t\) 63.\(e7\)\(t\) 64.\(c8\) \(e4\)
This is not the optimal situation for the defence. White can now force away the opposing king.
If 63...\(d7\)\(t\), then 64.\(b8\) and Black has no more checks left.
64.\(b5\)\(t\) \(f8\)
64...\(e7\) loses immediately to 65.\(b7\)\(t\).
65.a6
The pawn takes an important step forward. The black king is poorly placed on f8, since White can also keep his king on the 7th or 8th rank and will perhaps get the opportunity to exchange queens.
65...\(e6\)\(t\) 66.\(c7\) \(e7\)\(t\) 67.\(d7\) \(c5\)\(t\)
67...\(e5\)\(t\)? 68.\(d6\)\(t\)\(+-
68.\(c6\) \(e3\) 69.\(b7\) \(e7\)\(t\) 70.\(c8\)
70...\(b8\)\(t\) 71.\(a8\)\(t\) \(b4\)\(t\) and then 72.a7.
70...\(c3\)

Diagram 24-5
71.\(f6\)\(t\)?!
This achieves nothing.
71...\(b8\) would be correct: 71...\(f4\)\(t\) 72.\(b7\) \(b4\)\(t\) 73.\(a8\)\(t\)
71...\(g8\) 72.\(d8\)\(t\) \(h7\) 73.\(c7\)\(t\) \(h6\)??
Here the black king is even worse placed than on the 8th rank.
Queen endings

Black should play 73...\(\texttt{h}8\), when White cannot immediately advance the pawn: 74.a7? \(\texttt{h}3t\) 75.d7 c3t=
74.a7

Diagram 24-6

Another step forward; Black does not have a perpetual check.
74...\(\texttt{e}4\)

Or 74...\(\texttt{e}8t\) 75.b7-- and after check on b5 or e4, White can reply with check.

The same situation arises after 74...\(\texttt{h}3t\) 75.b7--, when a further black check is answered with a check.
75.\(\texttt{b}6t\)

If now 75...\(\texttt{g}7\), then 76.b7t+-.
75...\(\texttt{h}5\) (or 75...\(\texttt{g}5\)) is followed by 76.a5t and promoting the pawn, and there is no perpetual check. For example: 76...\(\texttt{g}4\) 77.a8\(\texttt{e}\) 78.b7 \(\texttt{e}4t\) 79.b6 \(\texttt{d}4t\) 80.c5 \(\texttt{b}2t\) 81.b5 \(\texttt{d}4t\) 82.a5+-
1–0

Queen endings with several pawns are also complicated. The tactical nuances absolutely have to be taken into consideration – playing for mate, winning the queen, exchanging queens, perpetual check and stalemate. Zugzwang is also always a possibility in queen endings.

In this type of endgame the following elements are particularly important: the activity of the queen, a passed pawn, a sound pawn structure, the activity of the king and the safety of the king’s position.
We shall these elements frequently in our test positions.

Diagram 24-7

Mompellier Candidates 1985

Black forces the transition to a queen ending in which his extra pawn gives him very good chances of victory.
41...\(\texttt{g}3\) 42.f1 \(\texttt{e}1t\)

The exchange of rooks is important because it makes the black king more secure.
43. \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{xf}1 \) \(+\)
\( 44. \text{xf}1 \) \( \text{g}5 \)
Black first consolidates his position.

45. \( \text{g}4?! \)
This does not bring White any benefits, while it weakens his h3-pawn.

45. \( \text{g}4 +\) would be better.

Diagram 24-8

45... \( \text{f}7 \)
The black king is in any case not well sheltered on the kingside, so it is better to get it actively involved!

Exchanging a pair of pawns is possible, but Black sees no need for it for the moment: 45...h5 46.gxh5 \( \text{h}xh5 +\)

46. \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{e}7 +\)

47. \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
48. \( \text{f}2 +\)!

48...h4 should be played, to prevent the pawn being fixed on h3.

48... \( \text{g}8 \)
Black retreats the king, since he has seen a regrouping which will improve the position of his queen.

49. \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{h}2 +\)

50. \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{g}3 +\)
51. \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{g}2 +\)
52. \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{f}3 +\)
53. \( \text{d}2 \)

Diagram 24-9

53...g5
Black fixes the white pawns. White must now be careful since Black has prepared an exchange of queens on e4 or f4.

54. \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{g}2 +\)

But not 54...\( \text{e}4 +\)!

55. \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{f}1 +\)
56. \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{e}2 +\)
57. \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{f}3 +\)
58. \( \text{c}2 \)

In order to gain time Black repeated the position. Now he returns to his plan of activating his king. To do so he is prepared to sacrifice his extra pawn.

Diagram 24-10

58...f7! 59. \( \text{e}5 \)
If 59...\( \text{a}7 +\) e6 60.\( \text{b}6 +\) e5 61.\( \text{x}h6 \), then 61...\( \text{f}6 +\). The king then heads for the h3-pawn, and White faces problems.

59...\( \text{g}2 +\)
60. \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{f}1 +\)
61. \( \text{c}2 \)

But not 61.\( \text{d}2 +\) \( \text{f}4 +\)!

61...\( \text{c}4 +\)
62. \( \text{b}2 \)

The white king is pushed further away.
62. \(\text{d}1\) would be bad because of 62...\(\text{e}4\)\(\text{#}\)!

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

Black continues to aim for the exchange of queens, now threatening \(\text{e}6\).

63. \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 64. \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}6\) 65. \(\text{a}7\) \(\text{e}6\) 66. \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{d}7\)

The king is running to the b-file, to once more threaten an exchange of queens.

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

67. \(\text{a}7\) \(\text{c}7\) 68. \(\text{c}2\)

If 68. \(\text{h}7\) \(\text{b}6\) 69. \(\text{d}3\), then 69...\(\text{c}5\) 70. \(\text{g}6\) \(\text{c}6\).

68...\(\text{c}5\) 69. \(\text{d}1\)

69. \(\text{b}3\) is met by 69...\(\text{b}6\), threatening \(\text{b}5\).

69...\(\text{g}1\) 70. \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{g}2\) 71. \(\text{d}1\)

But not 71. \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{e}4\)\(\text{#}\).

Diagram 24-11

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

The new target is the kingside.

72. \(\text{a}6\)\(\text{#}\)

Or 72. \(\text{g}6\) \(\text{e}5\) 73. \(\text{g}7\) \(\text{f}4\)\(\text{#}\).

72...\(\text{e}5\) 73. \(\text{x}h6\) \(\text{f}1\) 74. \(\text{d}2\)

74. \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{f}6\)

74...\(\text{f}6!\)

Diagram 24-12

This is the position Black was aiming for 15 moves ago.

75. \(\text{h}7\) \(\text{f}4\)

In return for sacrificing pawn, Black succeeds in activating his king.

But perhaps Black should first centralize his queen: 75...\(\text{f}2\)\(\text{#}\)!

76. \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{d}4\) 77. \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{e}3\) 76. \(\text{d}3?\)

A more resilient defensive try would be: 76. \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{e}5\) 77. \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{g}3\) 78. \(\text{d}3\)\(\text{#}\).

Diagram 24-13

76...\(\text{a}6\)\(\text{#}\)

Black can now activate his queen with tempo.

76...\(\text{e}6\) is also good.

77. \(\text{d}2\)

77. \(\text{d}4\) loses immediately to 77...\(\text{c}4\)\(\text{#}\).

77...\(\text{a}2\) 78. \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{a}1\) 79. \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{b}2\) 80. \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{c}1\)
81...e2

81...g2 is followed by: 81...d2† 82.g1 (82.f1 g3 83.c7† f4†→+) 82.e1† 83.h2 (83.g2 e4†→+) 83...f2† 84.h1 g3 85.c7† f4 86.c3† f3†→

81...e3† 82.d1

82.f1 loses to 82...g3.

82...g3→

The black pieces have reached their best possible positions. Black is simply threatening to advance his d-pawn, when the threats of mate will make the exchange of queens unavoidable.

83.h6 d4 84.h7 d3 85.c7† g2!

85...xh3?? leads to a draw, as White plays for stalemate with 86.h2† xg4 87.h5†= etc.

Diagram 24-15

Black now threatens ...e2†, and 86.c6† is met by 86...f3†→.

0–1
Exercises

Ex. 24-1

Ex. 24-2

Ex. 24-3

Ex. 24-4

Ex. 24-5

Ex. 24-6
Exercises
Ex. 24-1

Z.Azmaiparashvili – Ye Jiangchuan
Beijing 1988

1. ♖c6!

(1 point)

There is only a draw after both 1. ♖xa5? ♖d6= 2. ♖b6 ♖a8= (or 2...♖c8=) and 1. ♖b5 ♖c8 2. ♖xa5 ♖d6=.

1...♖b4
1...♖d3 2. ♖b5+=
2. ♖d7!

(another 1 point)

2. ♖b5+ is also winning, though after 2...♖c8 3. ♖f5+ ♖b8 White must then play 4. ♖d7! as in the game.

1–0

Ex. 24-2

V.Topalov – V.Anand
San Luis 2005

76...♕g5†?

The right move leads to a draw: 76...♖h3†! (2 points)

77.♕d4 (77.♕e2 ♖h5† 78.♕e1 ♖h1=) 77...♕g4† 78.♕c5 (78.♕c3 ♖f3† 79.♕b4 ♖b7† 80.♕a3 ♖a6† 81.♕b3 ♖b5† 82.♕a2 ♖a4† 83.♕a3 ♖c2† 84.♕a1 ♖d1† 85.♕b2 ♖e2=) 78...♖h5† 79.♕b6 ♖xh6= 77.♕f4 ♖g3† 78.♕e1† 79.♕f3 ♖f1† 80.♕g3 ♖g1† 81.♕e2+ ♖b1 82.♕e6† ♖f7 83.♕d7† ♖xe6 84.♕g7† ♖e6 85.♕e5† 85.♕f5†! ♖xf5 86.♖h7 ♖d3† 87.♖h4 ♕b1 88.♖h8 ♕h1† 89.♕g3 ♕g1† 90.♕f3 ♕f1† 91.♕e3 ♕e1† 92.♕d3 ♕d1† 93.♕c3 ♕c1† 94.♕b4–
85...♕f7 86.♖h5† ♖f6 87.♕g5† ♖f7 88.♕h5† ♖f6 89.♕h4† ♖f7 90.♕h7?

This allows Black to force a perpetual check.

White should play: 90.♕g4 ♕e1† 91.♕h2 ♖d2† 92.♕h3 ♕e3† 93.♕h4=– 90...♕e1† 91.♕g4 ♖d1† 92.♕g5 ♕d8† 93.♕h5 ♕d5† 94.♕g5 ♕h1† 95.♕h4 ♕d5† 96.♕g4 ♖d1† 97.♕g3 ♕e1= ½–½

Ex. 24-3

I.Ivanov – A.Yusupov
USSR Ch 1st League Ashkhabad 1978

45...♖e3† 46.♗g2 ♖g7

(2 points)

The threat of ...♖f6 nets Black a second pawn.

47.♗a5

No better is 47.♗f1 ♖f6=, nor 47.♗h1 ♖h3† 48.♗g1 ♖f6=.

47...♕xf4 48.g5

48.♕xa6 ♕xg4†=

48...♕f5 49.♗d2 a5 50.♗g1 ♕e5 0–1

Ex. 24-4

M.Gurevich – A.Yusupov
Groningen 1992

49...c5

(2 points)

Black can also play 49...♕d2† 50.♕h3, and now not 50...♖xe3? 51.♕xe6 ♖e6† 52.♕xe6 ♖xe6 53.♕g3 ♖h6 54.♕f4 ♖f5 55.♕f3 e5 56.♖xe5 ♖xe5 57.♕e3=, but 50...♖c3 (also 2 points) is just as good as the game continuation.

50.e4 ♖d2† 51.♕g3 ♖d4 52.e5 c4 53.♖e7?

Black also wins after 53.♖h3 ♖f4= or 53.e6: ♕g1† 54.♕h3 ♖h1† 55.♕g3 ♕e1=–.

The most resilient defence is 53.♕g2! and now:

a) 53...c3? 54.♖e6= b) 53...♖h4? 54.e6 ♕g5† 55.♕f1= c) 53...♖f8 54.♕c8† ♕e7 55.♕e6 c3? 56.♖f6† ♕e8 57.♖h8† ♕d7?? (57...♕e7=) 58.♖e6†=– d) 53...♕f4! 54.♕e7 (54.♕c5 ♖xh4 55.♖e6 ♖xe6=+) 54...♖d2† (54...c3 55.♖e6 is less clear) 55.♕h3 (55.♕g3 ♖d4 56.♕c7 ♖f8=+) 55...♕d5–

53...♕g1† 54.♕h3 ♖b6! 0–1
Solutions

Ex. 24-5

A. Yusupov – N. Padevsy
Warsaw 1985

74. \( \text{b6} \)+–

1–0

74... \( \text{xf7} \)+ loses immediately to 75. \( \text{c7} \).
74... \( \text{f3} \)+ is followed by 75. \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{b3} \)+
76. \( \text{c8} \) \( \text{g8} \)+ 77. \( \text{c7} \)+–.

(1 point)

Ex. 24-6

A. Yusupov – V. Korchnoi
Zürich 1994

47. \( \text{b4} \)+–

(2 points)

Black now has no defence against the march
of the a-pawn.
47. \( \text{c8} \) \( \text{f4} \)+ is less clear.

47... \( \text{f5} \)
47... \( \text{e5} \) 48. \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{e4} \) 49. \( \text{xe4} \)+–
48. \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f7} \)
48... \( \text{e5} \) 49. \( \text{e7} \)+ \( \text{g8} \) 50. \( \text{e6} \)+ \( \text{g7} \)
51. \( \text{d7} \)+–
49. \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{f4} \) 50. \( \text{a6} \) \( \text{f3} \) 51. \( \text{a7} \)

Now 51... \( \text{g3} \) is simply met by 52. \( \text{f8} \)+!
\( \text{xf8} \) 53. \( \text{b8} \)+–.

1–0

Ex. 24-7

A. Yusupov – S. Zollinger
Winterthur simultaneous 2004

55. \( \text{f4} \)?!

White must certainly avoid the trap
55. \( \text{d5} \)?? \( \text{c4} \)+.

(1 point)

The correct way to try and make progress
is: 55. \( \text{d4} \)! \( \text{c4} \)+ 56. \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{c1} \)+ 57. \( \text{f2} \)
\( \text{d2} \)+ 58. \( \text{g3} \)+

(1 point)

55... \( \text{h2} \)+ 56. \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{e4} \)+ \( \text{e2} \)+
\( \frac{1}{2} \)–\( \frac{1}{2} \)

Ex. 24-8

A. Yusupov – V. Malaniuk
USSR Ch, Moscow 1983

57. \( \text{d8} \)+!

1–0

White forces the exchange of queens:
a) 57... \( \text{g4} \) 58. \( \text{d1} \)+–
b) 57... \( \text{h5} \) 58. \( \text{d1} \)+–
c) 57... \( \text{g3} \) 58. \( \text{d3} \)+–
d) 57... \( \text{h3} \) 58. \( \text{d3} \)+–

(1 point)

Ex. 24-9

K. Grigorian – D. Bronstein
Vilnius 1975

76... \( \text{c6} \)+–

(1 point)

0–1

Black will promote the pawn, at the same
time defending against a perpetual:
77. \( \text{b8} \) \( \text{h1} \) 78. \( \text{e1} \)+ \( \text{g1} \) 79. \( \text{h4} \)+ \( \text{h2} \)+–

(1 point)

Ex. 24-10

End of a study by

J. Vandiest
1951

2. \( \text{d7} \)!

2. \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{f8} \)+ is only a draw.
2... \( \text{xe5} \)+ 3. \( \text{c6} \)+ \( \text{a6} \) 4. \( \text{d3} \)+ \( \text{a7} \)
4... \( \text{a5} \) 5. \( \text{a3} \)+
5. \( \text{a3} \)+ \( \text{b8} \)
5... \( \text{a5} \) 6. \( \text{e7} \)+–
6. \( \text{f8} \)+ \( \text{a7} \) 7. \( \text{f7} \)+ \( \text{a6} \) 8. \( \text{a2} \)+ \( \text{a5} \)
9. \( \text{c4} \)+ \( \text{b5} \) 10. \( \text{d4} \)!\( \text{c} \)

(1 point)

10. \( \text{c5} \)+– (also 2 points) wins the same way.

10... \( \text{b4} \) 11. \( \text{c4} \)+

Or 11. \( \text{d3} \)+–

11... \( \text{a7} \) 12. \( \text{f7} \)+–
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Ex. 24-11
End of a study by

J. Vandiest
1952

6...g4†!

6...g6 7.EXe6† g5 8.EXe3† g6
9.EXd3† g5
9...Exf6 10.EXf5† Exe7 11.EXh7† Exh7†
12.EXh7 Exf6 13.EXh6+
(another 1 point for this variation)
10.EXe3† Exg6 11.EXe7!
11...Exf4 12.EXg7#

Ex. 24-12

J. Vandiest
1956

1...EXa2†!

1...d5† Exh8 2.EXc6 EXe7=
1...Exh8
1...Exg7 2.EXa7†+–
2.EXa7!
(another 1 point)
The threaten is Exh7#.
2...Exg7
2...Exg8 3.EXh6+
3.EXb8† Exg8 4.EXb7!
Threatening Exh6.
4...EXg7 5.EXc8† Exg8 6.EXd7† Exg7 7.EXd8† Exg8 8.EXxf6†
(another 1 point)
8...EXg7 9.EXg5† Exg8
9...Exxf6† 10.EXxf6 Exg8 11.g7+
10.EXd8† Exf8 11.EXd5† Exh8
11...g7 12.EXb7† Exg8 13.EXh7#
12.EXh1† Exg8 13.EXh7#
(another 1 point)

Scoring

Maximum number of points is 28

24 points and above → Excellent
19 points and above → Good
14 points → Pass mark

If you scored less than 14 points, we recommend that you read the chapter again and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
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Final test

F-1

F-4

F-2

F-5

F-3

F-6
Final test
Final test
Final test
Solutions

F-1
Tactics /Chapter 1
R. Dautov – V. Bologan
Mainz 2004

15...\texttt{d}d3!

(1 point)

But not 15...\texttt{e}5?! 16.\texttt{g}2 \texttt{bd}3 17.\texttt{b}1+- followed by f2-f4.

F-2
Positional play /Chapter 2
L. Kritz – A. Yusupov
German Ch, Osterburg 2006

34...\texttt{d}d6!

(2 points)

A practical solution. White cannot satisfactorily protect the \texttt{f}4-pawn, since 35.\texttt{d}2? is met by 35...\texttt{g}5+.

34...\texttt{c}8 achieves nothing on account of 35.\texttt{h}4.

35.\texttt{a}4 \texttt{c}4 36.\texttt{a}xa7 \texttt{f}4 37.\texttt{f}1?! 37.\texttt{f}2+?

37...\texttt{xf}1 38.\texttt{xf}1 \texttt{c}1+ 39.\texttt{e}1 \texttt{xb}2

It is even better to play 39...\texttt{i}5! 40.\texttt{xc}7+ \texttt{g}8 with a powerful attack. For example:
41.\texttt{xb}6 \texttt{g}3+ 42.\texttt{i}2 \texttt{e}4+ 43.\texttt{f}1 \texttt{e}3+-

40.\texttt{xc}7 \texttt{xa}3 41.\texttt{xb}6 \texttt{xc}3+

F-3
Calculating variations /Chapter 3
End of a study by
G. Nadareishvili
1962

3.\texttt{c}8\texttt{b}8

(1 point)

There is only a draw after 3.\texttt{b}8? \texttt{xb}8 4.\texttt{xb}8\texttt{c}2=.

3...\texttt{xc}8 4.\texttt{xc}8\texttt{b}6!!!

(another 1 point)

If 4.\texttt{xc}8? then 4...\texttt{c}2! 5.\texttt{b}6 \texttt{b}1+=

F-4
Endgame /Chapter 4
A. Beliaevsky – S. Dolmatov
Minsk 1979

53...\texttt{c}5!+-

(1 point)

Black aims to disrupt the coordination of the white pieces. He starts by threatening ...\texttt{c}2.

54.\texttt{d}3 \texttt{d}5

(another 1 point)

55.\texttt{a}6?

The wrong diagonal!

It is more resilient to play 55.\texttt{e}4! \texttt{d}2 56.\texttt{c}1 and now:

a} 56...\texttt{c}2 57.\texttt{d}x\texttt{a}2 \texttt{a}xa2 is a drawn ending.

b) Black does better to try 56...\texttt{c}7 57.\texttt{f}3
\texttt{d}6 58.\texttt{e}3 \texttt{d}1 59.\texttt{a}2 \texttt{c}5+

55...\texttt{d}2! 56.\texttt{c}4 \texttt{d}4

(another 1 point)

Black gains a decisive tempo for the invasion by his king: 57.\texttt{c}2 \texttt{f}5 58.\texttt{g}4+ \texttt{e}4+ 0–1

F-5
Calculating variations /Chapter 3
G. Nadareishvili
1974

1.\texttt{e}8!!

(1 point)

Other moves lose:

a) 1.\texttt{e}6? \texttt{g}7 2.\texttt{f}5 \texttt{d}4+–

b) 1.\texttt{e}6? \texttt{g}7 2.\texttt{e}8 \texttt{d}4 3.\texttt{f}8 \texttt{e}5! –+

1...\texttt{h}7

1...\texttt{f}3 2.\texttt{e}6= or 1...\texttt{g}7 2.\texttt{f}8=.

2.\texttt{f}5!

(another 1 point)

But not 2.\texttt{e}6? \texttt{d}4 3.\texttt{f}8 \texttt{e}5+–.

2...\texttt{h}5 3.\texttt{c}6 \texttt{h}7 4.\texttt{f}5 \texttt{g}7 5.\texttt{f}8 \texttt{g}5
6.\texttt{e}6=
Solutions

F-6
Strategy /Chapter 6

C. Gabriel – A. Yusupov
Bad Homburg 1998

19...c5!

(2 points)

A typical idea; Black obtains counterplay in the centre.

20...a3 d7= 20...b6 21.a5 b6±

21.d1 b6

21...f1 22.a5 b6 23.a5±

22. b2 d6

22...c4 23.d2 f6 24.e1=

23.e1 d8 24.g3

24.dxc5?! bxc5 25.g3 h4↑

24...h4 25.g2 h5 26.h6 24...c4 27.d2 d5 28.e1

28.d6 f8 29.e5 d6 30.e6 a5↑

28...d6 29.e4?! dxe4 30.dxe4 dxe4

31.dxe4 dxe4 32.dxe4 dxe4 33.dxe4 dxe4

34.d5 35.d6 d6 36.d6 e1 37.d6 d6 38.d6 39.d6 40.e2 b7+ 41.e3 c8

½–½

F-7
Tactics /Chapter 7

I. Rausis – J. Lautier
Gonfreville 2003

31...dxe5!

(1 point)

32.dxe5?! White’s chances of survival are higher after:

32.b7! bxf2+ 33.d2 f7↑

32...dxe5 33.b7

This counter-blow absolutely must be taken into account during the calculation of variations.

33...dxd6 33...c5 is be equally good: 34...xf7+ h8–+ (1 point)

34.d8+ e8!

(another 1 point)

35...dxd6 e7

35...e1+ 36.h2 xf2 37.d1 xg3+ 38.xg3 xd1–+

36.c8 e1+ 0–1

F-8
Endgame /Chapter 8

V. Chekhov
1947

1...d1!

(1 point)

Other moves are weaker:

a) 1.d2? d2! 2.d1 d1 3.f3 d2+–

b) 1.g4? d2 2.f3 d1–+

c) 1.f3?! d8 2.h5 d8 3.f2 d2 f4

1...d2 2.d1!!

(another 1 point)

2...dxe4 3.d1 d3 4.d1 d1 5.d1 d1 6.f3

White has constructed an impregnable fortress.

6...d6 7.d1 d6 8.d2 d2 9.d2 d2 f5 10.d1=

F-9
Calculating variations /Chapter 9

End of a study by

A. Sadikov
1968

4.b7+ d7 5.d8+!

5.d7 does not work: 5...xb7 6.cxb7 g1+ 7.e2 g2–+

5...dxd8 6.c7!=

(2 points)
11...\( \text{g}h5 \)  

(2 points)  
A standard plan: Black prepares \( ...f5 \).  
11...a5 first would be equally good.

12.\( \text{g}d2 \)  
12.\( \text{g}3 \) \( f5= \) was played in Goldin – Yermolinsky, Chicago 2002.

12...\( \text{f}5 \) 13.\( \text{e}e2 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 14.\( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{g}5!? \)  
14...a5?! 15.\( \text{h}4 \) (15.\( \text{b}xa5 \) \( \text{a}6 \)) 15...\( \text{axb}4 \)  
16.\( \text{axb}4 \) \( \text{xa}1+ \) 17.\( \text{xa}1 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 18.\( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{f}7 \)  
19.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h}3= \)  
15.0–0–0  
15.0–0  \( \text{d}7 \) 16.\( \text{exf}5 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 17.\( \text{e}e4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \)  
18.\( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 19.\( \text{g}3 \)†  
The move in the game could be followed by: 15...\( \text{xe}4 \) (15...\( \text{g}6 \) 16.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 17.\( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{h}6 \)  
18.\( \text{xe}4= \)) 16.\( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 17.\( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h}6 \)  
18.\( \text{d}2 \) a5±  
0.5–0.5

F-11  
Strategy /Chapter 11  
A.Karpov – G.Kamsky  
Tilburg 1991

56...\( \text{g}2+! \)  

(1 point)  
56...\( \text{exd}3 \)† would not be clear: 57.\( \text{xd}3 \) \( \text{xa}5 \) 58.\( \text{f}5∞ \)  
57.\( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{xe}2 \) 58.\( \text{xe}2 \) \( \text{c}4++ \)  
(another 1 point)  
59.\( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{exd}5 \) 60.\( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{xd}3 \) 61.\( \text{xd}3 \) d4  
62.\( \text{e}2 \) h3 63.\( \text{f}3 \) d3 64.\( \text{c}e3 \)  
64...\( \text{d}4++! \)  
64...\( \text{xa}5 \) 65.\( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 66.\( \text{f}4 \) a5++  
65.\( \text{g}3 \) h2 66.\( \text{hx}2 \) \( \text{f}3++ \) 67.\( \text{g}3 \) d2  
68.\( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{xd}2 \) 69.\( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 70.\( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{xa}5 \)  
71.\( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 72.\( \text{d}5 \) a5  
0–1

F-13  
Positional play /Chapter 13  
G.Kasparov – T.Petrosian  
Bugojno 1982

21.a3!  

(3 points)  
21.f4 would not be so good: 21...f6 22.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 23.\( \text{xb}6 \) \( \text{xb}6 \) 24.\( \text{xb}6 \) \( \text{c}6 \).  
If 21.\( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{xc}5 \) 22.\( \text{xc}5 \), then 22...f6  
23.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \).  
21.\( \text{g}4 \) is met not by 21...\( \text{d}7 \) 22.\( \text{c}7++ \),  
but by 21...\( \text{f}5 \) 22.\( \text{e}3 \).  
For any of these attempts (and also for  
21.\( \text{d}2 \)) you get 1 consolation point.  
21...\( \text{g}7 \)  
Kasparov’s prophylactic idea becomes clear  
in the variation: 21...f6 22.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 23.\( \text{xb}6 \) \( \text{xb}6 \) 24.\( \text{xb}6 \).  
22.b3  
White is planning 23.a4 and eventually  
a4–a5 to kick the knight.  
Another good plan is 22.\( \text{c}3 \)† intending  
\( \text{c}7++ \).  
22...\( \text{g}8 \)  
22...f6 23.\( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 24.\( \text{xb}6 \) \( \text{xb}6 \) 25.\( \text{b}4 \)++
23.a4+– b8 24.e5!
Black loses after both 24...e8 25.g4! and 24...xc5 25.xd8+ f8 26.xf8+ xf8 27.c7 (Kasparov).
1–0

**F-14**  
Endgame /Chapter 14

I.Miladinovic – A.Yusupov  
Corfu 1999

40...e7!  
(2 points)

Black’s plan is to head with his king towards the queenside to help activate the pawn majority.
41.a4 d8 42.e4 c7 43.a4 ba3  
43...b7? 44.a5+
44.c2+ b7 45.b2 a6 46.c4 d3  
47.b4 d1 48.e4 a5 49.bc4 d2  
50.a4 a6
White has no defence against ...a2 followed by ...dd2.
0–1

**F-15**  
Calculating variations /Chapter 15

I.Brener – A.Berelovich  
Internet (blitz) 2005

21...xd5?  
Black falls into the trap.
21...xd5? would also be bad because of 22.xh7+! with the idea 22...xh7 23.f5+ g8? 24.xe7+–.

The correct move is 21...h6!  
(1 point)

22.xf6 xf6=  
22.xd5 xd5 23.f5+–  
23.h3!  
(another 1 point for this variation)
Black now faces a few difficulties.
23...e6?  
23...d8 was necessary, after which 24.xf6

**F-16**  
Tactics /Chapter 16

M.Adams – G.Kasparov  
Linares 2005

22...xc2!  
(1 point)

23.xc5  
23.xc2 xc3+–  
23...a3+ 24.a2  
24.c1 xc5 25.h6 g6+  
24...xc5 25.a4 xc2!  
(another 1 point)

26.b1  
26.xc5 xb2#  
26.c1 xb2+ 27.xb2 a3+ 28.b1  
xb2#  
26...a3  
Now 27.xc2 is followed by 27...xc8 28.d2 xa4+.
0–1

**F-17**  
Strategy /Chapter 17

M.Wahls – A.Yusupov  
Bundesliga 1992

17...f6!  
(2 points)

Black attacks the white pawn chain, and at the same time clears the way for the h8-knight to re-enter the game.
18.g1?  
White could keep some advantage with 18.h6! g6 (18...xe5 19.hxg7 xg7 20.h5 f7 21.dxe5+–) 19.e3 and now:

a) 19...f7 20.exf6 xf6 21.xd5+  
b) 19...f7 20.g1 xe5! 21.xe5+  
c) 19...f5 20.g3 f7 21.h5+  

307
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18...\( \text{\textit{\&}}f7 \) 19.\( \text{\textit{\&}}g3 \) fxe5 20.dxe5 \( \text{\textit{\&}}h8= \)

The weakness of the e5-pawn limits White’s options.

F-18
Opening /Chapter 18

The following annotations are based on analysis by Dvoretsky.

14.\( \text{\textit{\&}}d1 \)

(2 points)

The exchange of queens is good for White, since he has the better pawn structure.

14...\( \text{\textit{\&}}xe3 \)
14...\( \text{\textit{\&}}xd1 \) 15.\( \text{\textit{\&}}d6 \) 16.f4±

15.\( \text{\textit{\&}}d8+ \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}xd8 \) 16.\( \text{\textit{\&}}d1+ \)
16.fxe3?

16...\( \text{\textit{\&}}c8 \)
16...\( \text{\textit{\&}}d6 \) 17.fxe3 \( \text{\textit{\&}}e7± \)
16...\( \text{\textit{\&}}e8 \) 17.fxe3 \( \text{\textit{\&}}c5 \) 18.\( \text{\textit{\&}}f2 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}e7± \)
16...\( \text{\textit{\&}}d2? \) 17.\( \text{\textit{\&}}xd2+ \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}e8± \)

17.\( \text{\textit{\&}}xe3 \) g6?

Black would be better off trying one of 17...\( \text{\textit{\&}}c5 \) or 17...f6 or 17...\( \text{\textit{\&}}b4 \) 18.\( \text{\textit{\&}}e2 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}d8 \).

18.e5! \( \text{\textit{\&}}g7 \)
18...\( \text{\textit{\&}}c5 \) 19.\( \text{\textit{\&}}f2 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}e8 \) 20.f4 f6? 21.\( \text{\textit{\&}}e4+- \)

19.f4 f6
Better is 19...\( \text{\textit{\&}}d8± \).

20.exf6 \( \text{\textit{\&}}xf6 \) 21.e4 h5 22.\( \text{\textit{\&}}g2 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}xc3?! \)

23.bxc3 b5 24.e5+-
24.\( \text{\textit{\&}}h3 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}e8 \) 25.e5 g5?!

24...a5 25.\( \text{\textit{\&}}h3 \) b4 26.\( \text{\textit{\&}}h4 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}e8 \) 27.\( \text{\textit{\&}}g5 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}e6 \) 28.\( \text{\textit{\&}}h6 \)
White will continue with \( \text{\textit{\&}}g7-f7 \).
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F-19
Positional play /Chapter 19

D.Bronstein – Y.Rantanen
Tallinn 1975

The following annotations are based on analysis by Shereshevsky.

18.\( \text{\textit{\&}}f3 \)

(1 point)

White is better placed in the ending. He has the more active pieces and the pawn majority on the queenside.

18...\( \text{\textit{\&}}f3 \) 19.\( \text{\textit{\&}}xf3 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}e8 \) 20.g4! a6
Black threatens ...b5.

21.g5 \( \text{\textit{\&}}e8 \)

Now the d7-square is a weakness.

22.a4 \( \text{\textit{\&}}a7 \) 23.\( \text{\textit{\&}}h4 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}b7 \)
Black could try 23...\( \text{\textit{\&}}f8 \) followed by ...\( \text{\textit{\&}}c5 \) and ...\( \text{\textit{\&}}e7 \).

24.\( \text{\textit{\&}}d3 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}c5 \)

Threatening ...e5.

25.\( \text{\textit{\&}}e1 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}d7?! \) 26.\( \text{\textit{\&}}e1+d1=! \) g6
26...e5 27.\( \text{\textit{\&}}f5 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}xd3 \) 28.\( \text{\textit{\&}}xd3 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}f8 \)
29.\( \text{\textit{\&}}e3+ \)

27.\( \text{\textit{\&}}e2! \)
White takes control of the d-file.

27...\( \text{\textit{\&}}xd3 \) 28.\( \text{\textit{\&}}xd3 \) b5?! 29.\( \text{\textit{\&}}xb5 \) axb5
30.\( \text{\textit{\&}}d7 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}f8 \) 31.a5+– \( \text{\textit{\&}}e6 \) 32.\( \text{\textit{\&}}b7 \) b4 33.\( \text{\textit{\&}}b8 \)
\( \text{\textit{\&}}c5 \) 34.\( \text{\textit{\&}}g3! \)
White will continue with \( \text{\textit{\&}}e4 \), and Black soon loses material.
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F-20
Tactics /Chapter 20

A.Kotov – L.Szabo
Zürich 1953

38.\( \text{\textit{\&}}b3 \)

(1 point)

38...\( \text{\textit{\&}}c3 \)

38...\( \text{\textit{\&}}f6 \) loses after 39.\( \text{\textit{\&}}c6 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}c2\) 40.\( \text{\textit{\&}}a2 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}xc1 \) 41.\( \text{\textit{\&}}b8+ \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}h7 \) 42.\( \text{\textit{\&}}c7+–. \)
38...\( \text{\textit{\&}}c2\) 39.\( \text{\textit{\&}}a2 \) \( \text{\textit{\&}}xc1 \) is no good either; White wins with either 40.\( \text{\textit{\&}}b8 \) or 40.\( \text{\textit{\&}}xd7 \).
Solutions

39.\( \texttt{Qxe2!} \)++

(Another point)

39.\( \texttt{Qd3!} \)++ (also another point) is equally good.

Nothing is achieved by 39.\( \texttt{Qxb8} \) \( \texttt{Qxb8} \ 40.\texttt{Qe8+} \ \texttt{Qh7} \), and White only has a perpetual.

After the move played, Black resigned in view of the variation: 39...\( \texttt{Qxe2} \) 40.\( \texttt{Qxb8} \) \( \texttt{Qxb8} \ 41.\texttt{Qe8+} \ \texttt{Qh7} \ 42.\texttt{Qf7+} \ \texttt{Qh6} \ 43.\texttt{Qg7+} \ \texttt{Qh5} \ 44.\texttt{Qg5#} \)

1–0

F-21
Strategy /Chapter 21

E. Geller – G. Tringov
Belgrade 1969

15.\( \texttt{Qe1!} \)

(2 points)

White wants to continue playing in the centre with \( f1 \) and e2–e4.

15.\( \texttt{Qc2} \) (1 point) is also good: 15...\( \texttt{Qfe8} \) 16.\( \texttt{Qfe1} \ \texttt{Qad8} \) 17.\( \texttt{Qad1} \)

15...\( \texttt{Qxe4} \) 16.\( \texttt{Qxe4} \) a6 17.e4

Threatening e4–e5.

17...g5 18.\( \texttt{Qg3} \) \( \texttt{Qd7} \) 19.\( \texttt{Qf1} \) \( \texttt{Qe5} \)

19...b5? 20.\( \texttt{Qh5} \) \( \texttt{Qae8} \) 21.h4 \( \texttt{Qf6} \) 22.\( \texttt{Qxe5} \) \( \texttt{hxg5} \)

23.\( \texttt{Qd1} \)

The knight sets off towards the weak f5-square.

23...\( \texttt{Qg6} \) 24.\( \texttt{Qe3!} \) \( \texttt{Qxe4} \)

24...\( \texttt{Qf4} \) 25.\( \texttt{Qxf4} \) \( \texttt{Qxf4} \) 26.\( \texttt{Qf5} \)

25.\( \texttt{Qg4} \) \( \texttt{Qxg4} \)

25...\( \texttt{Qxe7} \) 26.\( \texttt{Qxd6} \) 26.\( \texttt{Qxe4} \) \( \texttt{Qxe4} \) 27.\( \texttt{Qxd6} \) \( \texttt{Qc8} \) 28.\( \texttt{Qh3} \) \( \texttt{Qe8} \) 29.\( \texttt{Qd1=} \) 26...\( \texttt{Qxd6} \) 27.\( \texttt{Qxe4} \) f5 28.\( \texttt{Qe6} \) \( \texttt{Qxe6} \) 29.\( \texttt{Qh6=} \) \( \texttt{Qxh6} \) 30.\( \texttt{Qxe6} \) \( \texttt{Qg7} \) 31.\( \texttt{Qxe6=} \)

26.\( \texttt{Qxg4} \) \( \texttt{Qxd5} \) 27.\( \texttt{Qad1} \) \( \texttt{Qdf4} \) 28.\( \texttt{Qd7} \) \( \texttt{Qxb2} \)

28...d5 29.\( \texttt{Qxa6=} \)

29.\( \texttt{Qxd6} \) \( \texttt{Qb4=} \) 30.\( \texttt{Qe8} \) c4 31.\( \texttt{Qxf4} \) \( \texttt{gxf4} \)

31...\( \texttt{Qxf4} \) 32.\( \texttt{Qxf8=} \) \( \texttt{Qxf8} \) 33.\( \texttt{Qf6=} \)

32.\( \texttt{Qe4=} \)

32.\( \texttt{Qxf8=} \) may be stronger.

32...b5?

32...\( \texttt{Qe5} \) 33.\( \texttt{Qc7} \) \( \texttt{Qb1} \) 34.\( \texttt{Qxf4} \) also looks excellent for White.

32...\( \texttt{Qb1=} \) was Black's best try.

33.\( \texttt{Qxa6} \) \( \texttt{Qb1} \) 34.\( \texttt{Qd5} \)

Now 34...c3 is followed by: 35.\( \texttt{Qxg6} \) c2 36.\( \texttt{Qxe7} \) \( \texttt{Qxe7} \) 37.\( \texttt{Qg5} \) \( \texttt{Qh7} \) 38.\( \texttt{Qxf4} \) \( \texttt{Qxf1} \) 39.\( \texttt{Qh2}+)++

1–0

F-22
Calculating variations /Chapter 9

N. Huschenbeth – A. Yusupov
German Ch, Osterburg 2006

19...\( \texttt{Qf5} \)

The correct move is: 19...\( \texttt{Qxd3} \)++

(2 points)

20.\( \texttt{cxd3} \) \( \texttt{Qf5} \) 21.\( \texttt{Qxe5} \) (21.\( \texttt{Qh2} \) \( \texttt{Qxd4} \) 22.\( \texttt{Qxd4} \) \( \texttt{Qc3=} \) 23.\( \texttt{Qxe2} \) \( \texttt{Qb2=}+=+ ) 21...\( \texttt{Qe8} \) 22.\( \texttt{Qd2} \) (22.\( \texttt{Qh2} \) \( \texttt{Qxc3=} \) 23.\( \texttt{Qf1} \) \( \texttt{Qxe5}+=+ ) 22...\( \texttt{Qxe5} \)

23.\( \texttt{Qg4} \) \( \texttt{Qb6=} \)

19...\( \texttt{g6=} \) (1 point) also wins, but Black should not unnecessarily weaken his king position.

20.\( \texttt{Qxf5} \) \( \texttt{Qxf5} \) 21.\( \texttt{Qxg7} \)++

(Another point for this variation)

Black was only reckoning on 21.\( \texttt{Qc5=} \) \( \texttt{g6} \) 22.\( \texttt{Qb4} \) a5–+.

21...\( \texttt{Qxg7} \) 22.\( \texttt{Qxg7} \) \( \texttt{Qxg7} \) 23.\( \texttt{Qxe5} \) \( \texttt{Qh6} \) 24.\( \texttt{Qxf4} \) \( \texttt{Qxh5} \)

\( \frac{1}{2}–\frac{1}{2} \)

F-23
Calculating variations /Chapter 23

Z. Kozul – A. Graf
Calvia Olympiad 2004

31.b3!

(1 point)

31.\( \texttt{Qxf7} \) is less clear: 31...\( \texttt{Qxf7} \) 32.\( \texttt{Qxf7} \) \( \texttt{Qxf7} \) 33.\( \texttt{Qxf7} \) \( \texttt{Qxf7} \) 34.\( \texttt{Qd1} \) \( \texttt{Qg8} \) 35.\( \texttt{Qf3} \)

31.\( \texttt{Qd5} \)

31...\( \texttt{Qxd4} \) can be met by either 32.\( \texttt{bxc4} \) \( \texttt{Qxf4} \) 33.\( \texttt{Qxf4} \) or 32.\( \texttt{Qxd4} \) \( \texttt{Qxd4} \) 33.e7–+=.
Solutions

32.e7
This is good enough to win and earns 1 point.
However, White has an even stronger option in 32.\texttt{c6}:

(1 point)

a) 32...\texttt{xc6} 33.exf7\texttt{h7} 34.\texttt{xd8} \texttt{xd8} 35.\texttt{h4}+-

b) 32...\texttt{xd1} 33.exf7\texttt{xf7} (33...\texttt{h7} 34.\texttt{h4} \texttt{g6} 35.e5#) 34.\texttt{xf7} \texttt{h7} 35.\texttt{xd8}+-

c) 32...fxe6 33.\texttt{xd5} \texttt{xd5} 34.c4+- (or 34.\texttt{c1}+-)

(another 1 point for these variations)

32...\texttt{xe7} 33.\texttt{f5} \texttt{b7}

33...\texttt{e6} 34.\texttt{de1} \texttt{d6} 35.\texttt{h4} \texttt{g6} 36.\texttt{d1}! \texttt{fe8} 37.\texttt{d3}+-

34.\texttt{f3}!!

White can win convincingly with: 34.\texttt{xd8} \texttt{xd8} (34...\texttt{xd8} 35.\texttt{g7} \texttt{g7} 36.\texttt{g4} \texttt{h4} 37.\texttt{f5}+-) 35.\texttt{g7}+-

34...\texttt{xd1} 35.\texttt{xd1} \texttt{c7}?

Black had to try 35...\texttt{b8} 36.\texttt{d7}! \texttt{xd7} 37.\texttt{g4} \texttt{xf5} 38.\texttt{xf5}+.

36.\texttt{g3}!

1–0

Scoring

Maximum number of points is 50

43 points and above $\rightarrow$ Excellent
36 points and above $\rightarrow$ Good
25 points $\rightarrow$ Pass mark

If you scored less than 25 points, we recommend that you read again those chapters dealing with the areas where you made a lot of mistakes and repeat the exercises which you got wrong.
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