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Symbols

+       Check
++      Double check
#       Checkmate
± (⚐)  Slight advantage to White (Black)
± (◉)  Clear advantage to White (Black)
+- (+−) Winning advantage to White (Black)
=       Level position
!       Good move
?       Bad move
!!      Outstanding move
??      Blunder
!?      Interesting move
?!      Dubious move
Ch      Championship
Wch     World Championship
Z       Zonal
IZ      Interzonal
C       Candidates
OL      Olympiad
corr.   Postal game
Introduction

A Brief History

The surge of popularity in the Advance French during recent years has seen it become one of the most challenging openings available. The question of how to respond to the French Defence has in the past concentrated on 3 $\text{Q}c3$ and 3 $\text{Q}d2$, with a mass of theoretical analysis to absorb. Consequently, attention has turned to the lesser known Advance, with a wealth of promising new ideas being contributed by such world-class players as Anand, Nunn and Short. This book aims to present the common variations with an emphasis on the most popular lines and allow the reader to create a repertoire suited to his or her style.

It has a fine pedigree with early devotees such as Jaenisch and Paulsen. It was a frequent choice of Aron Nimzowitsch who transformed the understanding of the line. Since the 1930s its popularity has fluctuated as players began to follow fashion by exhaustively analysing the Tarrasch and Winawer variations. In the 1980s and 1990s the reversal of fortunes has been accomplished by shedding the unfair image as a gambit line to concentrate on adventurous, reliable systems that are still being explored.

Ideas in the Advance French

1) The Centre
This is the critical position of the Advance French. Black has developed so as to put pressure on d4. The 'Nimzowitsch' pawn centre (d4, e5 for White, e6, d5 for Black) requires White to support d4 and be ready to meet ...f6. White's space advantage affords him the luxury of choosing between positional and tactical continuations; thus White can sometimes instigate a kingside attack, or can otherwise try to restrict Black's forces further.

The current trend is 6 a3, which is discussed in Chapter 1. The idea is that b4 will gain greater space and rule out the prospect of a queenside pawn advance by Black. In tournament practice Black tends to adopt a direct plan of putting pressure on d4 and controlling the c-file with his queen's rook. A less positive response can see Black's game deteriorate due to the lack of active squares for his minor pieces.

The following position is typical:

![Chess Diagram]

Now White plays 10 d3 g4 11
White now plays 14 \( \mathcal{h}4! \) 0-0-0
15 \( \mathcal{d}g2 \) g4 16 \( \mathcal{d}e3 \) \( \mathcal{d}g8 \) 17 b4 \( \mathcal{d}c6 \)
18 a4 \( \mathcal{h}4 \) 19 \( \mathcal{d}x\mathcal{c}4 \)! and White has excellent prospects. See Game 5.
Thus Black cannot completely ignore White’s attacking prospects by merely launching a pawn storm.

Therefore an early \( ...f6 \) to contest the centre is sometimes considered the antidote. However, this move leaves e6 weak and backward, and White can then focus on controlling the e-file. In return Black has more freedom to find better posts for his pieces, resulting in a double-edged game. See Games 7 and 8.

White’s most ambitious approach is the Milner-Barry Gambit: 6 \( \mathcal{d}d3 \), placing the bishop on its most active square, is regarded as an extremely aggressive continuation. It is renowned for numerous tactical possibilities with White sacrificing his d- and e-pawns for active play. Black often has trouble neutralizing White’s lead in development, since the black queen is constantly hounded. The following position shows a key point of the gambit; the e- and d-files are open (see following diagram):

Now White can convert his lead in development into a mating combination: 17 g3 \( \mathcal{w}g5 \) 18 \( \mathcal{w}x\mathcal{d}5+! \) \( \mathcal{e}x\mathcal{d}5 \) 19 \( \mathcal{b}6+ \) \( \mathcal{a}xb6 \) 20 \( \mathcal{e}e8 \) mate. The complete game can be seen in the note to Black’s 12th move in Game 14.

There are various ways for Black to shield his exposed queen; note how many variations there are in

Chapter 2! In view of the defensive problems experienced when both pawns are taken, Black will often settle just for the d-pawn, when White has to rely on positional advantages as a form of compensation rather than a direct attack. See Game 16. It is worth paying an interest in the bizarre 9 \( \mathcal{d}g5 \) featured in Game 14, note to White’s 9th move.

A move that has largely been explored in Scandinavian postal games, it has tremendous surprise value and there is still a lot of scope for new ideas. The initial point is to provoke Black into weakening his kingside pawn structure while trying
to make use of the open lines to launch an attack.

Chapter 3 deals with 6 \( \boxtimes e2 \), which is a solid and reliable line. White will develop steadily while keeping d4 securely guarded. Black relies on queenside expansion to add tension to the position. The following position demonstrates the type of slight edge for which White is aiming:

Now 12 a3! \( \boxtimes xc3+ \) 13 \( \boxtimes xc3 \) 0-0 14 0-0 \( \boxtimes ac8 \) 15 b4 with advantage to White – see line ‘b’ in the note to Black’s 11th move in Game 17.

2) Black Avoids 5...\( \boxtimes b6 \)

The desire to follow an independent path has prompted research into a variety of alternatives. The common approach is 5...\( \boxtimes d7 \) which is discussed in Chapter 4 and often transposes to established lines. It has the benefit of not committing the queen until White has declared a plan of action. Sometimes Black follows up with ...f6. The task for White is to maintain a pawn on e5 and then seek to exploit the resultant space advantage.

An idea of White’s attacking possibilities can be gauged from Romanishin-Ivanchuk, Irkutsk 1986. White won in fine style with 18 \( \boxtimes b5!! \) \( \boxtimes xb5 \) 19 \( \boxtimes xb7+ \) 1-0. The note to Black’s 9th move in Game 20 illustrates the game.

The standard response is 6 \( \boxtimes e2 \), in the knowledge that 6...\( \boxtimes b6 \) would transpose to a poor line that is demonstrated in section 4 of this introduction. Instead, Black follows a plan of ...\( \boxtimes ae7-f5 \) while White counters with \( \boxtimes a3-c2 \) before trying to make progress on the kingside. See Games 21, 22 and 23. Also possible is 6 a3 which is less convincing with the queen on d8 but is perfectly feasible. The disadvantage is that ...\( \boxtimes c7 \) will put pressure on e5; Black follows up by ...f6 or the manoeuvre ...\( \boxtimes e7-c8-b6 \), having saved a tempo with his queen.

Chapter 5 examines an early knight sortie with ...\( \boxtimes a4)\].
similar to the previous chapter although White has the option of \( \text{d} \text{d}3 \). A likely continuation is ...\( \text{d} \text{f}5 \) to increase pressure on d4. White can reply with \( \text{d} \text{a}3 \text{c}2 \) and \( \text{d} \text{d}3 \) which can be seen in Game 31. A more active course of action is to be found in Game 30 by responding with \( \text{d} \text{d}3 \) and g4 to oust the knight on f5, followed by a kingside attack.

After 5...\( \text{d} \text{h}6 \) White can follow the illustrative game in Chapter 6 with 6 dxc5 or transpose to other lines. It represents one of Black's most fashionable defences and the relative lack of theory has encouraged a growing band of followers.

**3) Exchange of Light-Squared Bishops**

These lines feature Black resolving to exchange White's king's bishop. However, while this is positionally desirable, it involves a loss of time which allows White to seize the initiative. One of the most popular is the Wade Variation, which involves the manoeuvre ...\( \text{c} \text{c}8 \text{d}7 \text{b}5 \).

The most radical way to invite complications is to play c4 which is discussed in detail in Chapter 9. If Black routinely exchanges on c4 then White can cause disruption with the pawn thrust d5. Thus after 7 c4 \( \text{x} \text{c}4 \) 8 \( \text{x} \text{c}4 \) dxc4 9 d5 \( \text{d} \text{e}7 \) 10 dxe6 fxe6 11 0-0 \( \text{w} \text{c}6 \) 12 \( \text{w} \text{e}2 \) \( \text{d} \text{f}5 \) 13 \( \text{w} \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{d} \text{e}7 \) 14 \( \text{d} \text{c}3 \) 0-0 15 \( \text{d} \text{g}5 \) \( \text{w} \text{a}6 \) 16 \( \text{d} \text{b}5 \) \( \text{x} \text{g}5 \) 17 \( \text{x} \text{g}5 \) \( \text{d} \text{d}4 \) 18 \( \text{w} \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{d} \text{x} \text{b}5 \) 19 a4 White will take on b5 when the extra pawn should secure victory. See the note to Black's 8th move in Game 39. For those preferring a more positional approach, Game 40 examines 7 dxc5 \( \text{x} \text{c}5 \) 8 0-0 \( \text{d} \text{e}2 \) 9 \( \text{w} \text{xe}2 \) \( \text{w} \text{a}6 \) 10 \( \text{w} \text{c}2 \) \( \text{d} \text{d}7 \) 11 a4 which also gives White good prospects.

It is also possible to try to exchange bishops with 3...b6, planning ...\( \text{a} \text{a}6 \). This was once considered to be one of the main defences, but the modern treatment 4 \( \text{d} \text{b}5+ \), which has been championed by Anand, has forcibly demonstrated that White can pose Black numerous problems. The point is that 4...\( \text{d} \text{d}7 \) is answered strongly by 5 \( \text{d} \text{d}3 \) when the uncompleted fianchetto is a potential weakness. The main alternative 4...c6 5 \( \text{a} \text{a}4 \) gives White sufficient time to exploit his territorial advantage, especially as there is little pressure on d4. See Game 41.

Chapter 11 features a rare move: 3...\( \text{d} \text{d}7 \), aiming to continue with 4...a6 and 5...\( \text{b} \text{b}5 \). Black's positional aims are laudable, but this is
4) White exchanges on c5

The burden on White to maintain the chain of pawns c3, d4 and e5 has led Black to tempt fate by avoiding an exchange of pawns in the centre for as long as possible. While the aim may be to reduce White’s options, very often the opposite is the case. Thus there are cases when White can break up the pawn structure by taking on c5, generally followed by b4 intending to limit Black’s activity further:

Now White plays 7 dxc5! \textit{Wc}7 8 \textit{b}4 \textit{Wb}6 9 b5 ±) 8 \textit{d}d4 \textit{dxe5?} 9 \textit{d}b5 \textit{xc}5 10 \textit{d}d4 ±. The example is from the note to Black’s 6th move in Game 17.

5) White Deviations

5 \textit{e}3, which is examined in Chapter 7, represents White’s soundest way to avoid well-known lines. It has the benefit of keeping the option of \textit{d}e2 which allows White to adopt a set-up different from that which is usually associated with the opening. The d4 pawn is well supported, freeing White’s hands to attack on the kingside. It has only recently been subjected to serious attention at tournament level and so the theory of the line is still evolving.

Chapter 8 deals with various miscellaneous ideas for White. These offer independent lines which require little knowledge of theory to play. 4 \textit{g}4 is an aggressive line that attempts to disrupt Black’s development by targeting g7. However, while the activity of White’s queen
can prove useful, Black can gain counterplay by undermining White’s pawn centre.

By omitting 4 c3 in favour of 4 ðf3 (like 4 ðg4, an idea pioneered by Nimzowitsch) White aims to accelerate his development. The consequence of this may be that White must gambit the d4-pawn, in return for a firm grip on the e5 square and piece play. With best play White should restore material equality after a while, when the chances ought to be equal.

4 dxc5 is an interesting line. White continues by quietly developing and maintaining support of e5. It offers Black some chances to go wrong but is considered relatively harmless.

6) General Strategy and Suggested Repertoires

For those interested in creating a repertoire with the Advance French, the following alternatives might be considered.

Firstly, for players who wish to build up methodically:

1) Meet 5...ðb6 by either 6 a3 (Chapter 1) or 6 ðe2 (Chapter 3), and answer 5...ðd7 by 6 ðe2 (Chapter 4).

2) The Wade variation can be met by 7 dxc5.

3) The recommendation 4 ðb5+ is suitable for all players to seek an advantage in Chapter 9.

Secondly, for more aggressive players who delight in complications:

1) The games contained in Chapter 2 should provide suitable inspiration.

2) Meeting 5...ðd7 by 6 ðd3 will usually transpose to a Milner-Barry Gambit, but consideration should also be given to 6 dxc5 (see Game 29).

3) The Wade variation is well met by 7 c4.

However, in order to obtain a feel for the characteristic middlegame positions which arise from the Advance French, the reader is recommended to play through each illustrative game.
The Modern Variation was originally inspired by Paulsen. However, it is only in recent decades that its popularity has expanded to the point where it is considered the main line. The idea of 6 a3 is to gain space on the queenside. This forces Black to resolve c5-d4 pawn tension, which can then allow White to develop his light-squared bishop to its optimum square. The variation has been championed by such players as Fedorowicz, Korchnoi and Tal.

Game 1
Sveshnikov-Timman
Tilburg 1992

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 \(\text{\textcopyright}c6\)
5 \(\text{\textcopyright}f3\) \(\text{\textcopyright}b6\)
6 a3 (I)

White's plan is to continue with 7 b4 and take the pressure off the centre by removing the tension on d4.

6 ... c4

With this move Black pinpoints b3 as a weakness. The next stage usually consists of a long manoeuvring phase. White aims to control the kingside by advancing his pawns, while Black takes charge on the opposite flank.

The main alternatives 6...\(\text{\textcopyright}h6\), 6...a5 and 6...\(\text{\textcopyright}d7\) are examined later in this chapter.

The rarer continuations do not merit detailed coverage:

a) 6...\(f6\)?! and now:

a1) 7 exf6 \(\text{\textcopyright}x\text{f6}\) 8 \(\text{\textcopyright}e2\) (8 b4 cxd4 9 cxd4 \(\text{\textcopyright}d6\) 10 \(\text{\textcopyright}b2\) 0-0 11 \(\text{\textcopyright}e2\) a6 12 0-0 \(\text{\textcopyright}e4\) 13 \(\text{\textcopyright}bd2\) = Mestel-Comay, Tel Aviv 1977) 8...\(\text{\textcopyright}e7\) 9 b4 c4 10 0-0 0-0 11 \(\text{\textcopyright}g5\) a5 = Corvi-Santis, Rome 1990.

a2) 7 \(\text{\textcopyright}d3\)! \(\text{\textcopyright}d7\) (7...cxd4 8 cxd4 \(\text{\textcopyright}d7\) 9 b4 ± Nilsson-Thorbergsson,
Munich 1958) 8 0-0 (8 b4!?) 8...fxe5
9 dxe5 0-0 0-0 10 wC2 Qge7 11 &xh7
g6 12 Qxg6 Qxg6 13 Qxg6 &e7
and Black has active play in
compensation for the sacrificed pawns;
M.Schlosser-McDonald, Oakham

b) 6...Qge7 7 dxc5! &xc5 (or
7...wC7 8 Qd4! wxe5+ 9 &e2 \Eco) 8 &d3 &g6 9 we2 &e7 100-0
0-0 11 g3 wb6 12 &e3 Qc7 13 &d4
&d7 14 &bd2 &xd4 14 cxd4 mac8
16 h4 f5 17 exf6 gxf6 18 h5 Qh8 19
&h4 Qf7 20 Qf5 \pm Hloušek-Mišta,
Olomouc 1977.

7 &bd2 &d7

7...&ge7?? would be a disaster af-
fter 8 &xc4! (Xie-Akhsharumova,
Thessaloniki OL 1988) 8...dxc4 9
&xc4 intending &d6+ winning.

8 b3!?

This is unusual, but the opportu-
nity to free the position has pre-
sented itself since Black has avoided
the more common move-order
7...&a5. Now 8 &e2 would trans-
pose to the next illustrative game,
but Sveshnikov reveals a different
approach.

8 ...

cxb3

9 &xb3 &a5

The preparatory move 9...&c8
should be considered as a possible
improvement.

10 &xa5 wxa5

11 &d2 wa4

12 wb1! (2)

A delicate switch which results in

the queen adopting a more positive
role. The pawn on b7 is attacked,
while &d3 will prove to be bother-
some if Black envisages castling
kingside.

12 ...

Qc6

Black may try to reinforce his
control over c4 with 12...b5. How-
ever, this can be undermined by 13
&d3 intending &c2 and a4.

In Prié-Apicella, Paris 1990,
White’s unusually placed queen
proved its worth after 12...b6 13
&d3 &e7 14 0-0 &c8 15 &e1 g6 16
&c2 &g7 17 &e3 wc6 18 a4 wc7 19
c4 &c6 20 cxd5 &xd5 21 &xd5
&xd5 22 &b5+ &f8 23 &c1 wd8 24
wb4+ &g8 25 &xc8 &xc8 26 &e7
&f8 27 &xa7 &d8 28 &c1 h5 29
&c7 &h7 30 &xb6 &h4 31 h3 &e4
32 &f1 g5 32 &c8 1-0.

13 &d3 &e7

14 0-0 h6!?

Timman prefers 14...&c8 with the
idea of ...&b6 and and ...&d8 with
decent chances. However, White can
play the aggressive 15 &xh7 g6 16
16 \text{\underline{x}g6 f\underline{x}g6} 17 \text{\underline{w}xg6+ \underline{d}d7} 18 \text{\underline{w}f\underline{u} \underline{g}g8} 19 \text{\underline{d}g5 forcing 19...\underline{x}g5}, and White is better according to Sveshnikov.

15 \text{\underline{c}c1} \text{\underline{c}c8}
16 \text{c4} \text{dxc4?}

In a difficult position Black walks into a crafty trap. Necessary was 16...\text{\underline{d}b6}, after which White would still be better placed: 17 \text{cxd5 exd5} (17...\text{\underline{x}xd5} 18 \text{\underline{c}c4 \underline{w}b5} 19 \text{\underline{h}b4 --}) 18 \text{e6!} with the advantage.

17 \text{\underline{x}xc4} \text{\underline{w}b5}
18 \text{\underline{w}xb5} \text{\underline{x}b5} (3)

5...\text{f6} which aims to undermine the pawn chain, but Nimzowitsch demonstrated the way to handle this idea: 6 \text{\underline{b}b5! \underline{d}d7} (6...\text{a6?!} 7 \text{\underline{x}c6+ bxc6} 8 0-0 \text{cxd4} 9 \text{cxd4 c5} 10 \text{exf6 gxf6} 11 \text{\underline{e}e1} \pm) 7 0-0 \text{\underline{w}b6} (7...\text{\underline{d}xe5?!} \text{\underline{x}xe5} \text{\underline{x}xb5} \text{9 \underline{w}h5+ \underline{e}e7} 11 \text{\underline{f}f7+ \underline{d}d6} 12 \text{dxc5+ \underline{xe}5} 13 \text{\underline{e}e1+ \underline{f}f5} 14 \text{\underline{w}h5+ g5} 14 \text{g4#} \text{7...f5?!} 18 \text{c4! a6} 9 \text{\underline{x}xc6 bxc6} 10 \text{\underline{c}c3 cxd4} 11 \text{\underline{x}xd4} \pm Maudsley-Wise, British Junior Ch 1970) 8 \text{\underline{x}xc6 bxc6} 9 \text{exf6 \underline{d}xf6} (9...\text{gxf6} 10 \text{\underline{e}e5!}) 10 \text{\underline{e}e5 \underline{d}d6} 11 \text{dxc5 \underline{x}xc5} 12 \text{\underline{g}g5 \underline{w}d8} 13 \text{\underline{x}xf6 \underline{w}xf6} 14 \text{\underline{w}h5+! g6} 15 \text{\underline{w}e2 \underline{d}d8} 16 \text{\underline{d}d2} 0-0 17 \text{\underline{e}ae1 \underline{f}e8} 18 \text{\underline{h}h1 \underline{d}d6} 19 \text{f4 c5} (Nimzowitsch-Levenfish, Karlsbad 1911) 20 \text{\underline{a}a6}! \pm.

In Vasiukov-Velimirović, Vršac 1989, an attempt to stifle White's attacking ambitions with 5...f5?! failed after 6 \text{\underline{d}e2 c4} 7 \text{b3 cxb3} 8 \text{axb3 \underline{e}e7} 9 \text{h4 \underline{h}h6} 10 \text{\underline{x}h6 gxh6} 11 \text{\underline{c}c1}
\[ \text{bxc3 dxc4 18 We2 Fe8 19 Wxc4 +-- Kharlov-Guedon, Torcy 1991.} \]

b) 8...\( \text{d7} \) 0-0 and now:

b1) 9...0-0-0 10 b3! cxb3 11 \( \text{Qxb3} \) \( \text{Wc7} \) 12 \( \text{Bb1} \) \( \text{Re8} \) 13 \( \text{Qf4} \) h6 14 c4 \( \pm \) Sveshnikov-Meshkov, Podolsk 1990.

b2) 9...\( \text{Qa5} \) 10 \( \text{Be1} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 11 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 12 h4! \( \text{fxe5} \) 13 h5 e4 14 hxg6 \( \text{exf3} \) 15 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( \text{Bb3} \) 16 \( \text{Qe5!} \) \( \text{Qxa1} \) 17 \( \text{Qf7} \) hxg6 18 \( \text{Qxh8} \) \( \text{Wb3} \) 19 \( \text{Wf3} \) 0-0-0 20 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qxe8} \) 21 \( \text{Qxa1} +-- \) Kharlov-Edelman, Maringa 1991.

8 \( \text{Qe2} \)

There is little to be gained from trying 8 b3?! cxb3 9 \( \text{Bb1} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 10 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{a4} \) 11 c4 \( \text{dxc4} \) 12 \( \text{Qxc4} \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 13 \( \text{Qxc4} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) 14 \( \text{Qxb3} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 15 \( \text{Qxb3} \) \( \text{Wa6} \) 16 \( \text{Qd2} \) h6 17 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Wxe2+} \) 18 \( \text{Qxe2} \) b6 19 a4 \( \text{De7} \) 20 a5 \( \text{Qd5} \) with at least equality; Emadi-Glek, Budapest 1989.

8 ... \( \text{Qd7} \)

9 0-0 \( \text{De7} \) (5)

Black has tried a number of other moves:
a) 9...h6 and now:
   a1) 10 a4 \(\text{Qe7} ; 11 \text{We}1 \text{g5} 12\)
   \(\text{Qh1 Qg6} 13 \text{g3 \text{Qe}7} 14 \text{\text{Qd}1 h5} 15\)
   \(\text{Qc2 0-0-0} 16 \text{\text{Wd}1 g4} 17 \text{\text{Qe}1 \text{Qc}6}\)
   18 \(\text{Qg2 Qdg}8 19 \text{\text{Qe}1 Qwd}8 20 \text{Qf1}\)
   \(\text{Qf8} 21 \text{Qg1 \text{Qd}7} 22 \text{\text{Qw}2 Qg7} 23\)
   \(\text{Qd2 Qd8} 24 \text{\text{Qeb}1 \text{Qc}7} 25 \text{Qf4 \text{Qe}7}\)
   26 \(\text{Qg2 Qf8} 27 \text{\text{Qe}1 Qb}8 28 \text{\text{Qe}3 Qg6 ½-½\) Vasiukov-Kuzmin, Moscow 1991.\)

   a2) 10 \(\text{Qb}1 0-0-0 11 \text{b3 \text{Qxb}3} 12\)
   \(\text{Qxb}3 \text{cxb}3 13 \text{c4 dx}c4 14 \text{\text{Qxc}4 Qe}7 \text{15 \text{Wd}3 \text{Qc}6 16 \text{\text{Qxb}3 Qc}7 17\)
   \(\text{\text{Qe}3 Qb}8 18 \text{\text{Qf}1 Qg}8 19 \text{Qd2 ½-½\) Kjeldsen-Jensen, Lyngby 1989.\)

b) 9...0-0-0 and now:
   b1) 10 \(\text{\text{Qb}1 f5} 11 \text{b3 cxb}3 12 \text{c4\)
   \(\text{\text{Qa}4 13 \text{cx}d5 \text{ex}d5 14 \text{Qg}5 \text{Qh}6 15\)
   \(\text{\text{Qb}2 Qe}7 16 \text{Qf4 Qb}8 17 \text{\text{Qc}3 \text{Qc}4 18\)
   \(\text{Qxc}4 \text{dx}c4 19 \text{\text{Qxc}4 Qc}6 20 \text{\text{Qxb}3 Qx}c3 21 \text{\text{Qxa}4 We}3+ 22 \text{Qh1 Qxd}4\)
   23 \(\text{\text{Qb}3 Qxb}3 24 \text{\text{Qxb}3 Qg}4 25\)
   \(\text{Qe}6 Qd2 26 Qxg7 Qf2+ 27 Q\text{xf}2\)
   \(\text{Qxf}2 28 Qd5 Qd8 29 Qf3 \text{Qb}2 30\)
   \(\text{\text{Qxb}2 1-0\) Westerinen-Tisdall, Gausdal 1992.\)

   b2) 10 \(\text{\text{Qe}1 Qh}6 11 Qf1 Qf5 12\)
   \(\text{\text{Qe}3 h6 13 \text{Qf}1 \text{Qe}7 14 \text{\text{Qe}1 Qxe}3\)
   15 \(\text{\text{Qxe}3 \text{f}5 16 \text{ex}f6 \text{gxf}6 17 \text{\text{Qb}1 \text{Qe}8 18 \text{Qh}5 \text{Qxh}5 19 \text{Qxh}5 \text{\text{Qxa}3}\)
   20 \(\text{Qf3 \text{Qe}7 21 \text{\text{Qf}1 Qwd}6 22 \text{Qh}4\)
   \(\text{Qc}6 23 \text{Qg}6 \text{Qh}7 24 \text{\text{Qf}4 \text{Qd}7 25\)
   \(\text{Qg}4 e5 26 \text{\text{Qwd}7} 27 \text{\text{Qd}7 27 dxe5 fxe5 28 \text{\text{Qxe}5 \text{Qxe}5 29 \text{\text{Qxe}5 \text{Qd}6}\)
   30 \(\text{Qe}8+ Qc7 31 \text{\text{Qe}3 a6 ½-½\) Mukhametov-Naumkin, Leningrad 1991.\)

   c) 9...f6 10 \(\text{\text{Qb}1 0-0-0 11 \text{\text{Qe}1 \text{Qe}7} 12 \text{\text{Qf}1 Qg}6 13 \text{b3 cxb}3 14 \text{c4\)
   \(\text{fxe}5 15 \text{c}5 Qc7 16 \text{\text{Qxe}5 \text{Qxe}5 17\)
   \(\text{\text{Qxe}5 Qxc}5 18 \text{\text{Qxb}3 Qd}6 19 \text{\text{Qxa}5 \text{\text{Qxa}5 20 \text{Qd}2 Qc}7 21 \text{\text{Qe}3 \text{Qb}8 22\)
   \(\text{\text{Qeb}3 Qa}8 23 \text{\text{Qxb}7 Qx}b7 24 \text{\text{Qxb}7 \text{Qxb}7 25 \text{b}4 \pm\) Anand-Prasad, New Delhi 1987.\)

   10 \(\text{\text{Qe}1\) \)

   This is a safe continuation that offers White a small advantage with which to play for a win. The alternatives are:

   a) 10 g3 \(\text{Qb}3 (10...\text{\text{Qec}6 11 \text{\text{Qb}1 \text{Qe}7 12 \text{\text{Qe}1 0-0-0 13 \text{Qg}2 \text{Qb}8 14\)
   \(\text{\text{Qf}4 Qa}8 15 Qf3 \text{Qc}8 16 \text{\text{Qe}1 Qg}5\)
   17 b4 cxb3 18 Qxb3 h6 19 Qd3 with an unclear position; Nikolenko-Ristovic, Moscow 1991\)
   11 Qxb3 Qa4 12 Qd2 Qxb3 13 Qh4 Qg6 14 Qg2 Qc7 15 h4 Qc6 16 Qe3 h5 17 f4
   0-0-0 18 Qh2 f5 19 exf6 gxf6 20 Qf3 \(=\) Morales-Bellón, Palma 1991.

   b) 10 Qg5 h6 11 Qh3 0-0-0 12
   \(\text{\text{Qf}4 f5 13 \text{ex}f6 \text{gxf}6 14 \text{Qf}3 \text{Qwd}6 15\)
   \(\text{Qh}5 e5 16 \text{\text{Qe}1 e}4 17 \text{\text{Qe}2 f5 18 a4\)
   \(\text{\text{Qe}8 19 b4 Qxh}5 20 Qxh5 \text{Qac}6\)
   21 b5 Qa5 22 Qg8 23 \text{\text{Qa}3 \text{Qwd}7\)
   24 f4 Qf6 25 Qxf6 26 Qxf6 26 Qf1 \(\text{Qhg}8 27 \text{\text{Qe}3 Qc}7 28 \text{\text{Qa}2 Qg}7 29\)
   \(\text{Qh}1 \text{Qf}8 30 \text{Qg}1 \text{Qb}6 31 \text{Qc}2 \text{Qb}6 32\)
   \(\text{\text{Qwd}1 \text{Qd}7 33 \text{Qe}2 \text{Qe}6 ½-½\) Grošar-Bareev, Bled/Rogaška Slatina 1991.\)

   10 ...

   The queen makes room for the king's knight to shuffle along to b6. Such a slow process is possible due to the lack of feasible pawn breaks.

   Black has also tried alternatives,
but has received little reward for the endeavour:

a) 10...\( \text{Qc}8 \) 11 \( \text{Wc2} \) h6 12 a4 a6 13 \( \text{Qd}1 \) \( \text{Qa7} \) 14 h4 \( \text{E}c8 \) 15 h5 \( \text{Qe}7 \) 16 \( \text{Ee}3 \) \( \text{Qd}8 \) 17 \( \text{Wb}1 \) \( \text{Qf}7 \) 18 \( \text{wa}2 \) g5 19 \( \text{Qh}2 \) f5 20 exf6 \( \text{Qxf6} \) 21 \( \text{Qg}4 \) \( \text{Qg}7 \) 22 \( \text{xb}1 \) e5 23 b4 cxb3 24 \( \text{Qxb}3 \) \( \text{Qxb}3 \) 25 \( \text{Qxb}3 \) \( \text{wc}7 \) 26 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) \pm Si-

b) 10...\( \text{Qg}6 \) 11 g3 \( \text{Qe}7 \) 12 h4 f5 13 h5 \( \text{Qf}8 \) 14 \( \text{Qb}1 \) g5 15 b4 cxb3 16 c4 with an unclear position; Mot-

c) 10...h6 and now:

c1) 11 \( \text{wc}2 \) 0-0-0 12 \( \text{Qb}1 \) \( \text{Qb}8 \) 13 \( \text{Qf}1 \) \( \text{wb}3 \) 14 \( \text{wb}3 \) \( \text{Qxb}3 \) 15 \( \text{Qf}4 \) \( \text{Qc}8 \) 16 \( \text{Qg}3 \) \( \text{Qf}5-\text{Qf}5 \) Sveshnikov-Nik-

c2) 11 \( \text{Qb}1 \) \( \text{Qc}8 \) 12 \( \text{Qf}1 \) \( \text{wb}3 \) 13 \( \text{wb}3 \) \( \text{Qxb}3 \) 14 \( \text{Qf}4 \) \( \text{Qa}4 \) 15 \( \text{Qg}3 \) b5 16 \( \text{Qh}5 \) \( \text{Qb}6 \) 17 g4! \pm Sveshnikov-

\[ \begin{array}{c}
11 \text{wc2} \\
12 \text{Qg5}
\end{array} \]

The best way to break down Black's fortress is to provoke con-
cessions as part of a patient ma-
noeuvring game.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
12 ... \\
13 \text{Qh3} \\
14 \text{Qf4}
\end{array} \]

Black rightly judges that his king
will be safer on the queenside. Now a
standard misjudgment is that the
kingside pawns need only to be
pushed forward to force White to
take defensive measures. In reality,
such schemes are invariably flawed;

\[ \begin{array}{c}
15 \text{Qh5} \\
16 \text{a4}
\end{array} \]

With this useful move White pre-
pared to torment Black's kingside
pawns. The long-term plan is to ex-
plot the resulting weaknesses by
rapidly transferring the queenside
pieces to the other flank.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
18 ... \\
19 \text{Qg3} \\
20 \text{Qf6} \\
21 \text{Qxd7+} \\
22 \text{Qf3}
\end{array} \]

With this useful move White pre-
pared to torment Black's kingside
pawns. The long-term plan is to ex-
plot the resulting weaknesses by
rapidly transferring the queenside
pieces to the other flank.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
18 ... \\
19 \text{Qg3} \\
20 \text{Qf6} \\
21 \text{Qxd7+} \\
22 \text{Qf3}
\end{array} \]

Sveshnikov suggests 22 h4! as a
way to pursue the initiative. This is
similar to the actual game but saves
time in view of the fact that the rook
soon returns to g3.
22 ... \( \underline{\text{c7}} \)
23 \( \underline{\text{wb1}} \) \( \underline{\text{w8}} \)
24 \( \underline{\text{h4}} \) \( \underline{\text{h5}} \)

Now 24...\( \underline{\text{e7}} \) 25 \( \underline{\text{h3}} \) (25 \( \text{h5 gxh5} \) with an unclear position) 25...\( h5 \) 26 \( \underline{\text{d1}} \) intending \( \underline{\text{g5}} \) gives White the g5 square as a jumping-off point for invading Black's position.
25 \( \underline{\text{g3}} \) \( \underline{\text{d7}} \)
26 \( \underline{\text{f3}} \) \( \underline{\text{b3}}! \)

This simplifying exchange makes White's task of steadily claiming more space rather less smooth. It is necessary to hold on to the important dark-squared bishop but the drawback is that \( a4 \) is now under attack.
27 \( \underline{\text{xh3}} \) \( \underline{\text{xb3}} \)
28 \( \text{a5} \) \( \underline{\text{b5}} \)
29 \( \underline{\text{g5}} \) \( \underline{\text{e2}} \)
30 \( \underline{\text{f6}}?! \) (7)

30 ... \( \underline{\text{g8}} \)
31 \( \underline{\text{g5}} \) \( \underline{\text{h6}} \)
32 \( \underline{\text{h3}} \) \( \underline{\text{g4}} \)
33 \( \underline{\text{g5}} \) \( \underline{\text{hxh3}} \)
34 \( \underline{\text{hxh3}} \) \( \underline{\text{g3}} \)
35 \( \text{hgx5} \) \( \underline{\text{d8}} \)
36 \( \underline{\text{g3}} \) \( \underline{\text{c6}} \)
37 \( \underline{\text{f1}} \) \( \underline{\text{a6}} \)
38 \( \underline{\text{b5}} \) \( \underline{\text{e8}}! \)

The other rook comes across to the queenside to add to the defence. This ensures equality.
39 \( \text{c4} \) \( \underline{\text{dxc4}} \)
40 \( \underline{\text{c3}} \) \( \underline{\text{c6}} \)
41 \( \underline{\text{xc4}} \) \( \underline{\text{xc4}} \)
42 \( \underline{\text{xc4}} \) \( \underline{\text{xc4}} \)
43 \( \text{a6} \)

A blunt attack with 43 \( \underline{\text{c1}}?! \) actually manages to allow Black to contemplate trying to win the game after 43...\( \underline{\text{d8}}! \) 44 \( \text{a6} \) \( \underline{\text{e7}}! \), when \( \text{d4} \) will come under pressure.
43 ... \( \underline{\text{c8}} \)
44 \( \underline{\text{xb3}} \) \( \underline{\text{c1+}} \)
45 \( \underline{\text{xc1}} \) \( \underline{\text{xc1+}} \)
46 \( \underline{\text{h2}} \) \( \underline{\text{f4+}} \)

\( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)

Game 3
Haba-Knaak
Halle 1987

At this stage a finesse is required to present Black with more problems by temporarily shifting attention to the loose pawn on \( b3 \): 30 \( \underline{\text{d2}} \) \( \underline{\text{wb5}} \) 31 \( \underline{\text{e3}} \) \( \underline{\text{c4}} \) 32 \( \underline{\text{d1}} \) with a slight advantage according to Sveshnikov.
7 \( \text{Q} \text{bd2} \)

The rare alternatives are as follows:

a) 7 \( \text{Q} \text{g5} \) (suggested by Ciocaltea) 7...\( \text{Q} \text{d7} 8 \text{Q} \text{h5} \text{Q} \text{h6} 9 \text{Q} \text{h3} \text{g6}! \). Keres evaluated the position as slightly favourable to Black.

b) 7 \( \text{b} \text{b} 4 \text{a} 5 \) 8 \( \text{Q} \text{b} 2 \text{axb} 4 \) 9 \text{axb} 4 \( \text{Q} \text{x} 1 \text{a} 10 \text{Q} \text{x} 1 \text{a} 6 11 \text{Q} \text{bd2} \text{Q} \text{xb} 4! \) 12 \text{cxb} 4 \text{Q} \text{xb} 4 (intending ...\( \text{Q} \text{x} 1 \text{a} 1) 13 \text{Q} \text{c} 3 \text{Q} \text{a} 2 \text{followed by ...Q} \text{e} 7-\text{c} 6 \). and ...b5-b4 is Keres' recommendation to gain Black an advantage.

c) 7 \( \text{Q} \text{c} 2 \text{d} 7 \) 8 0-0 \text{f6}?! (or 8...\( \text{Q} \text{g} 7 \) 9 \( \text{Q} \text{bd2} \text{Q} \text{a} 5 \), transposing into Game 2, Sveshnikov-Eingorn) 9 \( \text{Q} \text{bd2} \text{fxe} 5 \) 10 \( \text{Q} \text{xe} 5 \text{Q} \text{xe} 5 \) 11 \text{dxe} 5 0-0-0 12 \( \text{a} 4 \text{Q} \text{e} 7 \) 13 b3 \text{cxb} 3 14 \( \text{Q} \text{xb} 3 \pm \) Batskivok-Zurakhov, USSR 1955.

7 ...
8 \( \text{Q} \text{a} 5 \)

A popular idea that prepares a future b3 or b4.

8 ...
9 \( \text{Q} \text{e} 2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{e} 7 \) 10 \( \text{Q} \text{f} 1 \) (8)

With this useful move White is cleverly trying to save a tempo. Normally White will castle, but then he must play \( \text{Q} \text{e} 1 \) in order to free \( \text{f} 1 \) for the knight to transfer to the kingside. By playing \( \text{Q} \text{f} 1 \) first, White saves the tempo with the rook.

After the routine 10 0-0 Black may play:

a) 10...\( \text{h} 6 \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{e} 1 \) (11 \( \text{g} 3 \) 0-0-0 12 \( \text{Q} \text{h} 4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{b} 8 \) (12...\( \text{f} 5 \) 13 \text{exf} 6 \text{gxf} 6 14 \( \text{Q} \text{g} 4 \) e5? 15 b3! \text{cxb} 3 16 \( \text{Q} \text{xb} 3 \) f5 17 \( \text{Q} \text{h} 3 \) \text{a} 4 18 \( \text{Q} \text{xa} 5 \) ± Zaitsev-Farago, Szolnok 1975) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{h} 5 \) g6 14 \( \text{Q} \text{c} 2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{c} 7 \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{g} 2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{c} 6 \) = was Timman-Liberzon, Venice 1974) 11...\( \text{Q} \text{c} 6 \) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{f} 1 \) \( \text{Q} \text{b} 3 \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{f} 4 \) \( \text{a} 4 \) (13...\( \text{Q} \text{x} 1 \) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{x} 1 \) intending g4 and \( \text{Q} \text{g} 3 \) ±) 14 \( \text{Q} \text{c} 1 \) \( \text{b} 6 \) 15 \( \text{Q} \text{x} 3 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{h} 4 \) (Sveshnikov-Eingorn, USSR Ch 1985) 17 \( \text{Q} \text{g} 4 \)? with equal chances.

b) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{b} 3 \)? 11 \( \text{Q} \text{c} 4 \) ! \( \text{Q} \text{d} 2 \) 12 \( \text{Q} \text{xd} 2 \) \( \text{d} 4 \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{c} 4 \) followed by \( \text{Q} \text{d} 6+ \) and \( \text{Q} \text{f} 7 \) +.;

c) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{c} 6 \) 11 \text{b} 4 \text{cxb} 3 12 \text{c} 4 \text{dxc} 4 13 \text{Q} \text{x} 4 \text{h} 6 =.

d) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{g} 6 \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{e} 1 \) \( \text{Q} \text{e} 7 \) 12 \text{g} 3 \( \text{Q} \text{c} 7 \) 13 \( \text{Q} \text{f} 1 \) \( \text{c} 6 \) 14 \text{h} 4 \( \text{Q} \text{d} 7 \) 15 \text{h} 5 = Tischbierek-Vogt, Halle 1987.

e) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{e} 6 \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{c} 2 \) \( \text{Q} \text{e} 7 \) 12 \text{b} 4 \text{cxb} 3 13 \text{Q} \text{xb} 3 \text{Q} \text{xb} 3 14 \text{Q} \text{xb} 3 \( \text{Q} \text{c} 7 \) 15 \text{c} 4 \( \text{Q} \text{a} 5 \) 16 \( \text{Q} \text{c} 3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{c} 8 \) 17 \text{c} 5 \( \text{Q} \text{c} 6 \) 18 \( \text{Q} \text{g} 5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{d} 8 \) 19 \( \text{Q} \text{g} 3 \) \( \text{Q} \text{x} 5 \) 20 \( \text{Q} \text{xg} 5 \) \( \text{Q} \text{d} 7 \) 21 \( \text{Q} \text{d} 2 \) ± Bartolomé-Goldschmidt, Acassuso 1991.

f) 10...\( \text{Q} \text{c} 7 \) 11 \( \text{Q} \text{g} 5 \) \text{h} 6 12 \( \text{Q} \text{h} 3 \) 0-0-0 13 \( \text{Q} \text{f} 4 \) \( \text{Q} \text{b} 8 \) (13...\( \text{g} 6 \)?) 14
with an unclear game; Zaitsev-Vasiukov, Moscow 1969.

10 ... f6

Black follows the traditional theme of striking at the centre in an effort to open up the position. In Sveshnikov-Eingorn, Sochi 1985, Black managed to defuse the situation by opting for an ending: 10...\[w3b3! 11 \[f4 \[a4 12 \[xb3 \[xb3 13 \[e3 \[g6 14 \[g3 h5 15 h4
\[e7 16 \[g5 \[d8 17 \[h3 \[c6 18
\[f4 \[xf4 19 \[xf4 \[e7 20 \[g5
\[g6 21 \[xd8 \[xd8 22 g3 \[a4 23
\[d2 \[d7 24 \[a1 \[e7 25 \[g2 \[h6
26 \[f4 =.

11 h4 0-0-0
12 h5 \[ec6
13 \[f4

White is reluctant to release the tension with 13 exf6 gxf6 as Black can attempt to force through ...e5 with bright prospects.

13 ... fxe5
14 \[xe5 \[xe5
15 \[xe5 \[c6

If 14...\[d6, then White maintains his territorial gains with 15 f4!.

16 \[g3 e5?! (9)

Without a supporting pawn on f6, this gallant gesture lacks conviction. The quieter 16...\[e7 is a steadier option, although 17 \[e3 and \[g4 keeps a hold on the important e5 square.

17 dxe5 \[c5

Not 17...d4? 18 \[d2 with a winning game.

18 b4 cxb3
19 \[xb3 \[a5
20 \[d2 \[he8

It is difficult for Black to justify his pawn sacrifice, for example 20...d4 (20...\[de8 21 c4!) 21 0-0 d3
(21...\[e6 22 \[b5 \[xa3 23 \[b1 ++) 22 e6 (22 \[g4 \[he8 23 e6 \[xe6!? \[±) 22...dxe2 (22...\[xe6 23 \[g4
\[d7 24 c4 ++) 23 exd7+ \[xd7 24
\[xe2 ± (Haba).

21 0-0 \[xe5
22 \[b1! \[c7 (10)

A practical choice, as it is the obvious way to defend b7. Other
treatments invite complications but White emerges on top:

a) 22...h6 23 hxb7 axb6 24 a3 wxa3 25 c5! wxc5 (25...wxc5 26
b8+ c7 27 axe5+ xe5 28
b7+ and 29 xd8) 26 a6 ab5 27
f5+ and White wins.

b) 22...c6 23 axb7 axb6 24
b3 wxa3 25 xd7 xd7 26 g4
±.

23 c4 a4?!

This leads to a speedy débâcle. Black has slightly more chance of surviving after 23...d4 24 e4 b6
(24...f8 25 e4 h4 e7 26 xe7
xe7 27 eb7 +--) 25 xc5 xc5 26
xh7 ±.

24 cxd5 xd5

Grabbing the exchange also does not enable Black to defend:
24...xb3 25 xb3 xd5 26 c1 b6
27 e4 d6 28 xc5 xc5 (28...xc5 29 f4 +--) 29 d1 d6 30
xh7 ±.

25 e4 xb3
26 wxb3 ed8

There is no redemption for Black:

a) 26...d4 27 w5 xe4 28
xe8+ d8 29 g4+ --.

b) 26...a5 27 c1 b8 28 c4
d4 29 a6! wxe6 (29...b6 30
f7 +--) 30 xc5 w6 (30...c6 31
xe5+ xe5 32 a6+ +--) 31 wf7
b5 32 e6 +--.

27 c4 d4
28 e6+ db8
29 xc5 xc5
30 e3 1-0

---

Game 4
Degraeve-Delmont
Belfort 1992/93

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 c6
5 f3 w6
6 a3 c4
7 db2

White can experiment with 7 h4, aiming to increase his control of the kingside while keeping options open as to where to position the king's bishop. It is relatively unknown, although Black tends to secure equality by forming a defence based upon an early...f6.

a) 7...d7 8 h5 and now:

a1) 8...f6 9 w2 a5 (9...xe5 10
xe5 xe5 11 dxe5 c5 =) 10 f4
b3 11 a2 0-0-0 12 g4 h6 13
h3 f7 14 0-0 g5! 15 e3 e7 16
xf6 xf6 17 e5 h8 18 xd7
d7 19 d2 xd2 20 xd2 e6
21 a1 = Djurić-Vaganian, Bled/Rogaška Slatina 1991.

a2) 7...d7 8 h5 h6 9 h4 a5

b) 7...f6 8 xf6 (8 w2) 8...xf6
9 db2 d6 10 b3 e6 11 wb3
xb3 12 xb3 0-0 = Miljanić-
Müller, Budapest 1989.

c) 7...a5 8 g3 transposes to
Game 6, Sveshnikov-Eingorn, Sochi 1986.
7 ... \( \text{Na5} \)  
8 \( \text{Be2} \) \( \text{Cd7} \)  
9 h4!? (II)  

The closed nature of the position allows White a certain amount of room for creativity. Normally when advancing his h-pawn, White has in mind the possibility of continuing with g3 and \( \text{Nh3} \). In this case, the purpose is to stifle Black's kingside play with h5.

9 ... h5  
A reflex move which blocks White's intended push, but gives up the g5 square for future operations.

10 \( \text{Nb1} \) \( \text{De7} \)  
11 \( \text{Qf1} \)  

This device to save time can be recognised from the game Haba-Knaak. White delays a decision about castling whilst the knight can leap to g3 or e3.

11 ... \( \text{Nb3} \)  
12 \( \text{Qg5} \)  

The drawback of ...h5 is clear; the bishop can take up an active post.

12 ... \( \text{Ra4} \)  
13 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Cc6} \) (12)  

14 \( \text{Qf1} \)  

A preliminary measure to lessen the influence of a possible discovered attack on the queen. Now 14...\( \text{wa6} \) can be met with \( \text{We1} \) followed by g3 and \( \text{g2} \) with a complex middlegame.

14 ... \( \text{xa3} \)?  
An interesting, if not completely sound, continuation. Black offers two pieces for the rook, which is dangerous due to the threat of the queenside pawns romping to the eighth rank.

15 \( \text{bxa3} \) \( \text{Qd2+} \)  
16 \( \text{Wxd2} \) \( \text{xb1+} \)  
17 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Wa1} \)  
18 f4!  

White has no choice but to relinquish his a-pawn, so opts for a lightning assault on the black king: Note that 18 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{xc2} \) leaves White passive, while the a-pawn drops anyway.
18 ...  \( \text{\texttt{Wxa3}} \)
19 \( \text{\texttt{f5}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Qa5}} \)

The straightforward 19...\( b5! \) is a suggestion by Jadoul to try to create a passed pawn which will distract White from his campaign. Now the knight is added to the task of hassling the queen but more importantly it takes away another defensive piece.

20 \( \text{\texttt{Qf3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Qb3}} \)
21 \( \text{\texttt{Wf2}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Cc1}} \)
22 \( \text{\texttt{Hh3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wxc3}} \)
23 \( \text{\texttt{fxe6}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{fxe6 (13)}} \)

The culmination of White's attack: the two bishops are about to snare the hapless king.

28 ...  \( \text{\texttt{Qf8}} \)
29 \( \text{\texttt{Qf3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Qd7}} \)
30 \( \text{\texttt{Qxb7}} \)

Also crushing is 30 \( \text{\texttt{Qf7+}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Qxf7}} \) (30...\( \text{\texttt{Qe8}} \) 31 \( \text{\texttt{Qg6}} \) 31 \( \text{\texttt{Wxf7+}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Qc8}} \) 32 \( \text{\texttt{Wg8+}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Cc7}} \) 33 \( \text{\texttt{Wxa8}} \)  

30 ...  \( \text{\texttt{Qxf3}} \)
31 \( \text{\texttt{Qxf3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Qf8}} \)
32 \( \text{\texttt{d5}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wb6}} \)
33 \( \text{\texttt{dxe6+}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Cc7}} \)
34 \( \text{\texttt{Qe3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wxe6}} \)
35 \( \text{\texttt{Qxa7}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{c3}} \)
36 \( \text{\texttt{Wc5+}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{1-0}} \)

24 \( \text{\texttt{Qxd5!}} \)

It is hardly surprising that with the black king shielded by a thin line of pawns there is an opportunity for a tactical explosion. The knight is taboo due to 24...\( \text{\texttt{exd5}} \) 25 \( \text{\texttt{Qxh5+}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Qxh5}} \) 26 \( \text{\texttt{Wxc3}} \).

24 ...  \( \text{\texttt{Wa5}} \)
25 \( \text{\texttt{Qc3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Qd3}} \)
26 \( \text{\texttt{Qxd3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wxc3}} \)
27 \( \text{\texttt{Qe1}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wb4}} \)
28 \( \text{\texttt{Qe4}} \)

Game 5
Yilmaz-Manni
Budapest 1992

1 \( \text{\texttt{e4}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{e6}} \)
2 \( \text{\texttt{d4}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{d5}} \)
3 \( \text{\texttt{e5}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{c5}} \)
4 \( \text{\texttt{c3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Qc6}} \)
5 \( \text{\texttt{Qf3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{Wb6}} \)
6 \( \text{\texttt{a3}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{c4}} \)
7 \( \text{\texttt{g3}} \)

White declares his intention to develop the bishop on \( h3 \). The idea is to reduce the effectiveness of Black's basic plan (...\( f6 \) to break up the pawn chain) by targeting the potentially weak point \( e6 \).

7 ...  \( \text{\texttt{Qd7}} \)
8 \( \text{\texttt{Qh3 (14)}} \)  \( \text{\texttt{h6}} \)

One of the most ambitious defences; Black simply envisages an
avalanche of pawns to smother White’s kingside. This line requires careful handling by White who needs to employ an unusual manoeuvre to thwart the problem. 8...\(\text{a}e7\) is also worth consideration. For example:

a) 9 \(\text{Qbd}2\) and now:

a1) 9...0-0-0 10 \(\text{Qf1}\) f5?! 11 exf6 \(\text{Qxf6}\) 12 \(\text{Qe}3\) e5 13 \(\text{Qxd}7+\) \(\text{Qxd}7\) 14 dxe5 \(\text{Qe}4\) 15 e6 ± Jezek-Lundquist, corr. 1956/59.

a2) 9...\(\text{Qa}5\) 10 0-0 (10 \(\text{Qb}1\) \(\text{Qc}8?!\) 11 0-0 h5 12 \(\text{Qe}1\) g6? 13 \(\text{Qg}2\) ± Walther-Frank, Amsterdam 1954) 10...h5 11 \(\text{Qe}1\) (11 \(\text{Qb}1\) 0-0-0 12 \(\text{Qe}1\) g5 13 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Qh}6\) 14 \(\text{Qh}1\) \(\text{Qf}5\) 15 \(\text{Qg}2\) with an unclear position; Bosboom-Brennikmeijer, Holland 1992) 11...g5 (11...0-0-0 12 \(\text{Qg}2\) g6 13 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{Qh}6\) ± Vitolinš-Zelinsky, Latvian Ch 1978) and now:

a21) 12 \(\text{Qc}2\) \(\text{Qa}4\) 13 \(\text{Qb}1\) g4 ± Blatny-Drvota, Dečin 1978.

a22) 12 f4 g4 13 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Qh}6\) 14 \(\text{W}e2\) \(\text{Qf}5\) ± Storm-Casper, Dečin 1978.

b) 9 0-0 0-0 0-0 10 \(\text{Qbd}2\) (10 \(\text{Qe}1\) g5 11 f4 gxf4 12 gxf4 f5 ± Makropoulos-Gavrilakis, Greek Ch 1976) 10...\(\text{Qa}5\) 11 \(\text{Qe}1\) g5 12 f4! gxf4 13 gxf4 h5 14 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Qh}6\) 15 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{Bd}g8+\) 16 \(\text{Qh}1\) \(\text{Qg}4?!\) 17 \(\text{Qxg}4\) \(\text{hxg}4\) 18 \(\text{Qxg}4\) f5 19 exf6 \(\text{Qxf6}\) 20 \(\text{Qg}1\) \(\text{W}d6\) 21 \(\text{Qf}3\) \(\text{Qb}3\) 22 \(\text{Qb}1\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 23 \(\text{W}e2\) \(\text{Qxg}4\) 24 \(\text{Qxg}4\) \(\text{Qh}5\) 25 \(\text{W}g2?!\) \(\text{Qxg}4\) 26 \(\text{W}xg4\) \(\text{Qa}5\) 27 f5! — Ciocaltea-Heim, Romania 1979.

9 \(\text{Qbd}2\) \(\text{Qa}5\)

10 0-0 \(\text{g}5\)

11 \(\text{Qb}1\) \(\text{Qe}7\)

In the game Silman-Kushnir, Lone Pine 1975, Black preferred to activate her king’s knight: 11...\(\text{Qge}7\) 12 \(\text{Qg}2\) 0-0-0 13 h4?! (13 \(\text{Qe}1\)!) 13...g4 14 \(\text{Qe}1\) h5 15 \(\text{Qh}1\) \(\text{Qf}5\) 16 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Qh}6\) 17 \(\text{Qe}1\) f6 18 \(\text{Qf}1\) \(\text{Qdf}8\) 19 exf6 \(\text{Qxf6}\) 20 \(\text{Qxh}6\) \(\text{Wxh}6\) 21 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{Qd}6\) 22 \(\text{Qf}4\) \(\text{Qxf}4!\) 23 gxf4 \(\text{W}d8\) 24 f5 \(\text{W}xh4\) 25 \(\text{fxe}6\) \(\text{Qxe}6\) 26 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Wf}6\) 27 \(\text{Wd}2\) \(\text{Qf}5\) 28 \(\text{Qad}1\) \(\text{Qe}4\) 29 \(\text{Wf}4\) \(\text{Wg}7\) 30 \(\text{Qh}4\) \(\text{Qf}6\) 31 \(\text{W}h2\) \(\text{Wg}5\) 32 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Qc}6\) 33 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 34 \(\text{Qxe}1\) \(\text{Qf}7\) 35 \(\text{Qxe}4\) \(\text{Qxe}4\) 36 \(\text{Qxe}4\) dxe4 37 \(\text{W}e5\) \(\text{Qxh}4\) 0-1.

12 \(\text{Qe}1\) \(\text{h}5\)

13 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Qh}6(15)\)

14 \(\text{Qh}1\)

An essential move if White is to create dynamic play. In practical tournament play, White often becomes congested and Black can steadily build up his forces behind the pawn shield. The difference here is that White embarks on a clever
manoeuvre to transfer the e1 knight to a more prominent post.

14 ... 0-0-0
15 \texttt{Qg2} g4
16 \texttt{Qe3} \texttt{Qd8g8}

Simple development, adding another rook to the offensive. However, the next step (...h4) carries no immediate threat, so White can now follow up his minor-piece manoeuvre with queenside counterplay.

17 b4 \texttt{Qc6}
18 a4 h4
19 \texttt{Qdxc4!}

A scintillating sacrifice. The knight is given up in order to penetrate into the heart of Black's camp. The attack will gather momentum as the queenside pawns roll forward.

19 ... dxc4
20 \texttt{Qxc4} \texttt{Wc7}
21 \texttt{Qf4} \texttt{Qd8}
22 \texttt{Qd6+} \texttt{Qxd6}
23 exd6 \texttt{Wc4}

Upon 23...\texttt{Wb8} White’s pawn avalanche crashes through with 24 b5 and c4-c5-c6.

25 b5!

All of a sudden, the queen is on the verge of being trapped by 26 \texttt{Qb4}, forcing Black to take evasive measures.

25 ... a5
26 bxa6 \texttt{Wxa6}
27 c4

The pair of bishops directed towards the opposing king will enhance their influence once the c- and d-pawns advance. It is too late for Black to switch his kingside forces to the other flank to create a defensive barrier.

27 ... \texttt{Qxd6}
28 d5 e5
29 \texttt{Qxe5} \texttt{Qh5}
30 \texttt{Qf4} \texttt{Qf5}
31 \texttt{Qbc1}

There is no respite for Black, as White energetically maintains the pressure.

31 ... \texttt{Qe4}
32 \texttt{Qxe4} \texttt{Qxe4}
33 \( \text{Wd4} \) \( \text{Qd6} \)
34 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{Qe8} \)
35 \( \text{c6} \)

The reward for having faith with the speculative 19 \( \text{Qdxc4} \) is the c-pawn reaching the sixth rank with a vengeance.

35 ... \( \text{bxc6} \)
36 \( \text{dxc6} \) \( \text{Qxc6} \)
37 \( \text{Af6} \) \( \text{Qf7} \)
38 \( \text{Wd7+} \) \( \text{Qa8} \)
39 \( \text{Exc6} \) 1-0

Game 6
Sveshnikov-Eingorn
Sochi 1986

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e6} \)
2 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d5} \)
3 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{c5} \)
4 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \)
5 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Wb6} \)
6 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{c4} \)
7 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \)
8 \( \text{h4} \)

Since Black may have in mind a pawn storm commencing with ...\( g5 \), White takes immediate steps to prevent such activity.

8 ... \( \text{Qa5} \)
9 \( \text{Qbd2} \) \( \text{Wc6?!} \) (17)

A sortie to disrupt White's plan of kingside expansion. Black prepares to offer the trade of queens and, should White avoid the exchange, infiltrate the opposition's camp.

A number of other moves have been tried:

a) 9...\( \text{h5} \) and now:
a1) 10 \( \text{Qg5}?! \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 11 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Qf5} \)
12 \( \text{Qh3} \) \( g6 \) 13 \( \text{Qxf5!} \) \( \text{gxf5} \) 14 \( \text{We2} \)
15 \( \text{Qa4} \) 15 \( \text{Qdf3} \) \( \text{Qb3} \) 16 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qxc1} \) 17
\( \text{Qxc1} \) ± Degraeve-I.Sokolov, Baguio City 1987.

a2) 10 \( \text{Qh3} \) \( \text{Qh6} \) 11 0-0 \( \text{Qc7} \) 12
\( \text{Qe1} \) \( g6 \) 13 \( \text{Qg2} \) 0-0-0 14 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qb8} \)
15 \( \text{Qf3!} \) \( \text{Wb3} \) 16 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Qa4} \) 17 \( \text{Qg5} \)
18 \( \text{Qxg5} \) \( \text{Wc2} \) 19 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Qb3} \) 20
\( \text{Wf4!} \) ± Sax-Ree, Amsterdam 1979.

b) 9...\( \text{h6} \) 10 \( \text{Qh3} \) \( \text{Qh6} \) (10 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 11
\( \text{Qh3} \) \( \text{Qb3}? \) 12 \( \text{Qxb3} \) \( \text{Qa4} \) 13 \( \text{Qfd2} \)
14 0-0 \( \text{Qa5} \) 15 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 16
\( \text{Qxb3} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 17 \( \text{Wf6} \) ± was Bronstein-Mestel, London rapid 1976)
10...0-0-0 11 0-0 \( \text{Qe7} \) 12 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Qb8} \)
13 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qf5} \) 14 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 15 \( \text{Wf3} \)
\( \text{Qc8} \) 16 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{Qhf8} \) 17 \( \text{Qf4} \) ± Sax-Knaak, Szirak 1985.

c) 9...0-0-0 10 \( \text{Qh3} \) \( f5 \) (more accurate than 10...\( \text{Qb8}?! \) 11 0-0 \( \text{h6} \) 12
\( \text{h5} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 13 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( g6 \) 14 \( \text{Qh2} \) \( gxh5 \) 15
\( \text{Wxh5} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) 16 \( \text{Wf3} \) ± Hodgson-Lee,
London 1977) 11 0-0 \( \text{Qh6} \) 12 \( \text{Qe1} \)
\( \text{Qf7} \) 13 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( g5 \) 14 \( \text{hxg5} \) \( \text{Qxg5} \) 15
\( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qxh3+} \) 16 \( \text{Qxh3} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 17 \( \text{Qb1} \)
\[ \text{Modern Variation} \]

10 \text{Qg5}

It is natural that White is keen to make room for the queen to escape Black's attentions.

After 10 \text{Qh3?!} (10 \text{Qe2} gives White a slight plus) 10...\text{wa4} 11 \text{We2? \text{Wc2} 12 0-0 \text{Qb3}} Black is better.

10 \ldots \text{h6}

11 \text{Qh3} \text{Wa4}

12 \text{Qf3!}

Sveshnikov suggests that the ending after 12 \text{Qe2 \text{Wxd1+} 13 \text{Qxd1}} slightly favours White. However, the text declares more aggressive intentions.

12 \ldots \text{wa4}

13 \text{Qf4}

The knight is heading for the central post e3 to oust the queen.

13 \ldots \text{Qe7}

14 \text{Qg2} \text{Wh7?!}

An interesting idea to bring the queen to the defence of the kingside and enforce ...g5. It would, however, be more precise to preserve control of b3 in order to keep the queenside closed: 14...\text{La4} (14...\text{Qf5} 15 \text{Qe3 \pm}) 15 \text{De3 \text{Wh7} 16 \text{Qh3 \text{Qb3} 17 \text{Qxb3 \text{Qxb3}} when White has a slight edge.}

15 \text{b4!} \text{exb3 (18)}

16 \text{Qd3}

As the knight has not been obliged to occupy e3, White's thematic pawn sacrifice allows him to gain time by attacking the enemy queen. The main point is that as Black has transferred the queen to the kingside, White now signals the attack on the opposite flank. As usual with the advance of the b-pawn, the priority is not necessarily to recapture on b3 but to open up the position with c4.

16 \ldots \text{Wg8}

17 \text{Qb1} \text{La4}

18 \text{Qe3} \text{Ac8}

If 18...b5 then 19 c4! \text{bxc4 10 \text{Qdx4}} is strong due to the d-pawn being pinned.

19 c4 \text{dxc4}

20 \text{Qdx4} \text{Qxc4}

21 \text{Qxc4} \text{Qd5}

The flurry of tactics fails to make an impression: after 21...\text{Qxc4} 22 \text{Qxc4 Qc6 23 Wxb3! Qxh1 24 f3} the
bishop is blocked and White will demolish the queenside.

22 \( \text{Qd2} \)
23 \( \text{Qe7} \)

As the king is quite safe in the centre, Sveshnikov recommends dislodging Black’s most active piece: 23 \( \text{Qe3} \ \text{Qc6} \) 24 \( \text{Qe4} \) with the superior chances. Now Black can create some counterplay by utilizing the power of his dormant queen.

23 ... \( g5! \)
24 \( h5 \) \( \text{Wg7} \)
25 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \)
26 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \)
27 \( \text{Qe4} \) (19)

27 ... \( g4 \)

Black will not readily allow a bishop exchange, as the blockade of d5 is soon undermined by 27...\( \text{Qd8} \)
28 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 29 \( \text{Qxb3} \) b6 30 \( \text{Qb5+} \).

28 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qc4} \)
29 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qd5} \)
30 \( \text{Qb5+} \) \( \text{Qc6?!} \)

A valiant attempt to create counterplay by offering the exchange in

return for control of the h1-a8 diagonal. 30...\( \text{Qc6} \) 31 \( \text{Qxc6+} \) \( \text{bxc6} \) 32 \( \text{Qxb3} \) is better for White, but the more restrained 30...\( \text{Qd8}?! \) deserved consideration.

31 \( \text{Qxc6+} \) \( \text{bxc6} \)
32 \( \text{Qxb3!} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \)
33 \( \text{Qb1} \) 0-0

On 33...\( \text{Qd5} \) comes 34 \( \text{Qb8+} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 35 \( \text{Qa5} \) (35 \( \text{Qxd8+?} \) \( \text{Qxd8} \) 36 \( \text{Qa6} \) f5 37 \( \text{Qa5+} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) \( \text{f} \)) 35...0-0 36 \( \text{Qxd8} \) ±.

34 \( \text{Qxb3} \) \( \text{Qd8} \)
35 \( \text{Qa5} \) \( \text{Qe8} \)
36 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qc8} \)
37 \( \text{Qd2!} \)

Black can no longer adequately defend his shattered queenside pawn structure.

37 ... \( \text{Qd8} \)
38 \( \text{Qb7} \) \( \text{Qb6} \)
39 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qd8} \)
40 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{Qh8} \)
41 \( \text{Qxc6} \) \( \text{Qh7} \)
42 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{Qxa5} \)
43 \( \text{Qxa7} \) 1-0

Game 7
Sax-Uhlmann
Sarajevo 1982

1 \( e4 \) \( e6 \)
2 \( d4 \) \( d5 \)
3 \( e5 \) \( c5 \)
4 \( c3 \) \( Qc6 \)
5 \( Qf3 \) \( Wb6 \)
6 \( a3 \) \( c4 \)
7 \( g3 \) \( f6 \)
Black employs a popular method of attacking White's pawn chain.

8 exf6

In Malaniuk-Uhlmann, Tallinn 1987, White preferred to allow exchanges on e5: 8 \( \text{\text{a}} \text{h3?! fxe5 9 } \text{\text{dxe5 Qxe5 10 dxe5 Qc5 11 Wh5+ g6 12 We2 Qd7 13 Qd2 Qe7 14 Qf3 h6 15 0-0 0-0-0 16 He1 \pm John Watson has suggested 8 Qh4?! fxe5 (8...Wc7!?) 9 Wh5+ g6 10 Qxg6 Qf6 11 Wh4 Qg8 12 Wxf6! Qxg6 13 Wh4 exd4 14 Qe2! dxc3 15 bxc3 with good play, but curiously there have been few devotees of the plan.\) 8 ... Qxf6

9 Qg2 (20)

The alternatives are rare guests at tournament level:

a) 9 Qbd2 Qd6 10 Qg2 0-0 11 0-0 Qd7 12 We2 Wc7 13 He1 Qh8 14 Qe5 Qe8 15 f4 Qh5 = Ratsch-Franz, Germany 1958.

b) 9 \( \text{\text{h3 and now:}\) b1) 9...Qd6 10 We2 (10 0-0 0-0 and now: 11 He1?! e5! 12 Qxc8 Qxc8 13 dxe5 Qg4! + or 11 Qbd2 e5 12 Qxc8 Qxc8 13 dxe5 Qxe5 14 Qe1 Qf8 15 Qf1 d4 16 cxd4 Qxd4 17 Qe3 Qxe3 18 Qxe3 Qe4 19 Wd5+ Qh8 20 Qd1 Wc5 \mp Gillen-Harding, Dublin 1991) 10...0-0 11 Qxe6+ Qxe6 12 Wxe6+ Qh8 13 0-0 Qa5 14 Qbd2 Qae8 15 Wh3 Qxe 16 Qe1 Qxe1+ 17 Qxe1 Wh5 18 Qc2 We8 19 Qe3 h6 and Black has compensation for the sacrificed pawn; S.Arkell-J.Cooper, British Ch 1990.

b2) 9...Qa5 10 Qbd2 Qd6 11 0-0?! (11 Wxe2 transposes to the note above) 11...0-0 12 Qe5 (12 He1 Qh8 13 Qxe6 Qxe6 14 Qxe6 Qae8 15 Qxe8 Qxe8 with an unclear position according to Botterill) 12...Qxe5 13 dxe5 Qd7 14 Qf3 Qd3 15 Qe3 Qdc5 16 Kh1 Qc7 17 Qxc5 Qxc5 18 We2 Qd7 (18...Qd3?! 19 Qd4 Wxe5 20 Wxe5 Qxe5 21 f4 Qd3 23 Qxe6 \pm 19 Qd4 Qae8 20 f4 Qe7 (Botterill-Botto, Llanelli 1977) 21 Qg2 =.

It is necessary to prevent ...e5; Przewoznik-Uhlmann, Poland 1980, continued 11 Qbd2?! e5! 12 dxe5 Qxe5 13 Qxe5 (13 Wc2 is equal) 13...Qxe5 14 Wxe2?! (14 Qf3?! may be better) 14...Qc8! 15 Qf3 Qg4 16 Qd1 Qad8 17 Qe3 Wxb2 18 Qd4 b6 19 h3 Qxf3+ 20 Qxf3 Qxf3 21 Wxf3 Qe2 22 Wf4 Wf4 23 Qg5 h6 24 Qd2 Qf5 25 Qxf6 Wxf6 26 Qad1 b5 27 Qhb2 a6 28 a4 bxa4 29 Qai
\( \mathbf{W}f3 \) 30 \( \mathbf{a}xa4 \) \( \mathbf{e}e2 \) 31 \( \mathbf{w}c1? \) \( \mathbf{f}f8 \) 32 \( \mathbf{w}d1 \) \( \mathbf{a}xf2 \) 0-1.

11 ... \( \mathbf{h}h8 \)

This is the most popular try in contemporary practice but the alternatives merit consideration:

a) 11...\( \mathbf{d}d7 \) 12 \( \mathbf{e}e5 \) \( \mathbf{e}e8?! \) (Uhlmann prefers 12...\( \mathbf{a}ae8! \) whereupon 13 \( \mathbf{a}xd7 \) \( \mathbf{a}xd7 \) 14 \( \mathbf{a}e3 \) keeps an edge for White) 13 \( \mathbf{a}xc4! \) \( \mathbf{a}xd4 \) (13...\( \mathbf{d}xc4 \) 14 \( \mathbf{w}xe6+ \)) 14 \( \mathbf{c}xd4 \) \( \mathbf{d}xc4 \) 15 \( \mathbf{d}c3 \pm \) Alexander-Uhlmann, Munich OL (prelims) 1958.

b) 11...\( \mathbf{a}a5 \) 12 \( \mathbf{a}bd2 \) \( \mathbf{d}d7 \) 13 \( \mathbf{d}e5 \) \( \mathbf{e}e8 \pm \).

Black instantly exchanges the powerful knight but according to Uhlmann a more restrained approach is necessary. For example: 12...\( \mathbf{d}d7! \) 13 \( \mathbf{f}f4 \) (or 13 \( \mathbf{a}xc6 \) \( \mathbf{w}xc6 \) 14 \( \mathbf{w}xe6 \) \( \mathbf{d}f6 \) intending ...\( \mathbf{f}f5 \) with an unclear game) 13...\( \mathbf{d}xe5 \) 14 \( \mathbf{f}xe5 \) \( \mathbf{a}xf1+ \) 15 \( \mathbf{w}xf1 \) \( \mathbf{e}e7 = \).

13 \( \mathbf{d}xe5 \) \( \mathbf{d}d7 \)

14 \( \mathbf{e}e3 \) \( \mathbf{a}a5 \) (21)

The other paths are pleasant for White:

a) 14...\( \mathbf{a}c5 \) 15 \( \mathbf{d}d2 \) \( \mathbf{a}a5 \) 16 \( \mathbf{f}f4 \) \( \mathbf{d}d7 \) (Alexander-Uhlmann, Munich OL 1958) 17 \( \mathbf{f}f3 \pm \).

b) 14...\( \mathbf{w}c7 \) 15 \( \mathbf{f}f4 \) \( \mathbf{a}a5 \) 16 \( \mathbf{d}d2 \) \( \mathbf{c}c5 \) 17 \( \mathbf{a}xc5 \) \( \mathbf{w}xc5+ \) 18 \( \mathbf{w}f2 \) \( \mathbf{w}xf2+ \) 19 \( \mathbf{w}xf2! \) \( \mathbf{d}d7 \) (19...\( \mathbf{g}g5?! \) 20 \( \mathbf{e}e3 \pm \)) 20 \( \mathbf{e}e3 \) \( \mathbf{a}ae8 \) (Mestel-Botterill, London 1978) 21 \( \mathbf{a}ae1! \) \( \mathbf{e}e7 \)

22 \( \mathbf{f}f5?! \) (22...\( \mathbf{e}e5 \) 23 \( \mathbf{a}xd5 \) \( \mathbf{a}xe5+ \) 24 \( \mathbf{d}d4 \) \( \mathbf{a}xe1 \) 25 \( \mathbf{a}xe1 \) \( \pm \)) 22...\( \mathbf{w}xf5 \)

23 \( \mathbf{a}xf5 \) \( \mathbf{e}xd5 \) 24 \( \mathbf{a}d4 \) \( \mathbf{d}c6+ \) 25 \( \mathbf{a}xd5 \) \( \mathbf{e}e6+ \) 26 \( \mathbf{w}d6 \pm \).

15 \( \mathbf{f}f4 \) \( \mathbf{d}c5 \)

16 \( \mathbf{d}d2 \) \( \mathbf{d}d7 \)

17 \( \mathbf{a}ad1! \)

White accentuates his control of the position by centralizing the queen's rook while threatening 18 \( \mathbf{a}xc4 \) \( \mathbf{d}xc4 \) 19 \( \mathbf{w}xc4 \) \( b6 \) 20 \( \mathbf{a}xc5 \) +–.

17 ... \( \mathbf{e}e8 \)

18 \( \mathbf{f}f5! \) \( \mathbf{e}e5 \)

After 18...\( \mathbf{a}xe5 \) 19 \( \mathbf{f}xe5! \) Black has double trouble in the form of backrank mate and a vulnerable d5 pawn.

19 \( \mathbf{a}xd5 \) \( \mathbf{d}d3! \)

20 \( \mathbf{a}xc4! \)

White is exposed on the light squares after 20 \( \mathbf{a}xc6?! \) \( \mathbf{a}xc6 \) 21 \( \mathbf{a}xc4 \) \( \mathbf{w}d5 \) 22 \( \mathbf{a}xd3 \) \( \mathbf{w}xc4 \) intending ...\( \mathbf{b}b5 \) and Black is better.

20 ... \( \mathbf{w}xd5 \)

21 \( \mathbf{w}xd3 \) \( \mathbf{w}xd3 \)

22 \( \mathbf{a}xd3 \) \( \mathbf{a}h5 \)

If Black aspires to steal the e5 pawn then White's greater activity
triumphs: 22...\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}7} 23 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}6} \textit{\textbf{\text{xe}}5} 24 \textit{\textbf{\text{xf7+}}} \textit{\textbf{\text{x}}f7} 25 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}5} \textit{\textbf{\text{c}}4} 26 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}4!} \textit{\textbf{\text{xb}}2} 27 \textit{\textbf{\text{dxf5}}} \textit{\textbf{\text{xf5}}} 28 \textit{\textbf{\text{xf5}}}, intending 29 \textit{\textbf{\text{f7}}} or 29 \textit{\textbf{\text{b}}5} with advantage.

23 \textit{\textbf{\text{xe}}1?!}

The problem with this move is that the pressure is taken off f5, so the previous note is now redundant. On 23 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}2!} b5 24 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}6} \textit{\textbf{\text{xe}}5} 25 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}5} White has a clear advantage.

23 ... \textit{\textbf{\text{f7}}}!

24 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}2}

Not 24 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}6}? \textit{\textbf{\text{xe}}5} and Black wins.

24 ... \textit{\textbf{\text{xe}}5}

25 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}6} \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}8}

26 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}4} \textit{\textbf{\text{c}}6}

27 \textit{\textbf{\text{xe}}8+} \textit{\textbf{\text{x}}e8}

Otherwise White will invade the seventh rank: 27...\textit{\textbf{\text{xe}}8} 28 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}7} \textit{\textbf{\text{c}}7} 29 \textit{\textbf{\text{xe}}7} \textit{\textbf{\text{xe}}7} 30 \textit{\textbf{\text{xa}}7} +--.

28 \textit{\textbf{\text{f}}3} \textit{\textbf{\text{g}}8}

29 \textit{\textbf{\text{f}}2} \textit{\textbf{\text{b}}6}

30 \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}3} \textit{\textbf{\text{f}}8}

31 \textit{\textbf{\text{f}}4} \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}7!}

32 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}5} \textit{\textbf{\text{g}}6}

33 \textit{\textbf{\text{h}}4} \textit{\textbf{\text{h}}6}?

It appears logical to deprive the king of the g5 square but it proves to be only a temporary measure and merely weakens g6. The best way to ensure equality is swap the roving rook: 33...\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}8} 34 \textit{\textbf{\text{xd}}8} \textit{\textbf{\text{xd}}8}. Approaching from another angle with 33...\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}7} also works, since 34 \textit{\textbf{\text{f6+}}} \textit{\textbf{\text{x}}f6} 35 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}6+} \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}6} 36 \textit{\textbf{\text{xc}}6} \textit{\textbf{\text{c}}8} 37 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}6} \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}7} 37 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}2} \textit{\textbf{\text{f}}6} is equal.

34 \textit{\textbf{\text{g}}7!} \textit{\textbf{\text{h}}5}

35 \textit{\textbf{\text{g}}5} \textit{\textbf{\text{c}}8}

36 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}2} \textit{\textbf{\text{f}}7}

37 \textit{\textbf{\text{h}}6} \textit{\textbf{\text{c}}7}

The position is bleak after 37...\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}7} 38 \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}5+} \textit{\textbf{\text{g}}8} 39 \textit{\textbf{\text{f6}}} and the g-pawn must fall.

38 \textit{\textbf{\text{g5+}}} \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}7} (22)

39 \textit{\textbf{\text{f8+}}}!

A stylish way to deliver the knockout blow.

39 ... \textit{\textbf{\text{f}}6}

40 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}6+} \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}5}

41 \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}6+} \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}5}

42 \textit{\textbf{\text{xe}}8} \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}5}

43 \textit{\textbf{\text{g}}7} 1-0

Game 8

Zaitsev-Pokojowczyk

Sochi 1976

1 \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}4} \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}6}

2 \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}4} \textit{\textbf{\text{d}}5}

3 \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}5} \textit{\textbf{\text{c}}5}

4 \textit{\textbf{\text{c}}3} \textit{\textbf{\text{c}}6}

5 \textit{\textbf{\text{f}}3} \textit{\textbf{\text{b}}6
6 a3 c4
7 Qbd2

This flexible move-order is favoured by those who wish to incorporate g3 in their play but prefer to avoid the complications of the previous game.

7 ... Qa5
8 g3 Qd7
9 Ah3

The old line 9 Ag2 is no longer popular because in some instances g2 is useful for the manœuvre Qe1-g2-c3 and the bishop on h3 can stifle the option of ...f6. The game Clarke-Petrosian, Munich OL 1958 provides a good example of likely play: 9...0-0-0 10 0-0 h6!? (10...Qb8 11 Ae1 Ae7 12 Af1 Ab3 = Alexander-O’Kelly, Hastings 1953/54) 11 Ae1 Ae7 12 Af1 (12 We2 g5!? 13 Qf1 Ag6 14 Qd3d2 Ae7 = Casper-Knaak, East Berlin 1982) 12...Af5 13 Qe3 (Clarke suggested 13 g4 Ae7 14 Ab1 as better) 13...Qxe3 14 Axe3 Ae7 15 Ae1 Wb3! 16 We2 Aa4 17 Ac3 Ab8 (17...Wc2!) 18 Mad1! Wc2 19 Md2 Wf5 20 Af1 g5 (20...Qb3 21 Axd1!?) 21 h3 h5 22 Ah2 Hdg8 23 g4 Wg6 24 Af3? (24 f4!!?) 24...hxg4 25 Aeg4 Qc6 26 f3?! Aa8 27 Qf2 Qe7 28 Ae1 Ah6 29 Af1?! (29 Ag3 Agh8 30 Wg2!) 29...Agh8 30 Ag3 Ah3! 31 Qxh3 Aa3 32 Ag2 Wh7 33 Qc3 Ag6 34 Qg4 Qf4 35 Qxf4 gx4 36 Af1 Ag3 37 Wf2 Wh3+ 38 Ae2 Ag2 39 Ag1 Axf2+ 40 Qxf2 Wh7 41 Ah1 Wg6 0-1.

9 ... f6?! (23)

White is well prepared to meet this typical freeing move. Black has a choice of alternatives:

a) 9...h6 10 0-0 0-0 0-0 11 Qe1 and now:

  a1) 11...f5?! 12 exf6 gxf6 13 Qe3! Qe7 14 Ae1 Qg6 15 Ab1 f5 16 We2 Qc7 17 b3 cxb3 18 Qxb3 Qc4 19 Qfd2 Ab6 20 Ag2 Qb8 21 c4! Ivanov-Suetin, RSFSR Spartakiad 1978.

  a2) 11...Qe7 12 Ab1 Qb8 13 Qg2 Qc7 14 Wf3 Ae8 15 Qf4 Qa4 16 Ag4 Ac2 17 Ah1 g6 18 Wg2 h5 = Ničevski-Vilela, Dečin 1978.

  a3) 11...g5 12 Ag2 Ae7 13 Ab1 h5 14 We2 (14 Ah1!? and Qg2) 14...Qh6! 15 Qc2 Qb8 16 Qe3 Ac8 17 Ae1 h4 18 g4 f6 = Pinter-Schmidt, Budapest 1977.

b) 9...Qe7 10 0-0 h6 (10...Wc7 11 Qh4 Qc8 = Pinter-Mednis, Budapest 1976; 10...Ag6 11 Qe1 0-0-0 12 Ah1 f6 13 exf6 gxf6 = Giuliani-Ilersić, corr. 1982/83) 11 Qh4 0-0-0 12 Qg2 and now:

  b1) 12...Qb8 13 Ab1 Wc7 14 Qe3 Qc8 15 f4 g6 16 f5 gxf5 17 g4 fxg4 18 Qxg4 Ae8 19 Qf6 = Zaitsev-Savan, Dubna 1976.

  b2) 12...g6 13 Qe3 h5 14 Ab1 Ah6 15 Ag2 Adf8 = Platonov-Ree, Kiev 1978.

c) 9...Wc6 10 0-0 Wa4 11 We2 Wc2 12 Qe1 Wg6 13 f4 Qe7 14 Qg2 Qf5 15 Qe3 = Stähberg-Angos, Munich OL 1958.
10 exf6 gxf6
11 0-0 0-0
12 Ne1

White continues in a logical fashion by pinpointing the pawn at e6.

12 ... Ng7
13 Nb1! Bb8 (24)

13...Qge7 can be answered strongly by 14 b3 cxb3 15 Qxb3 ± a4? 16 Nxe6 winning.

14 b4! cxb3
15 Qxb3 Qxb3

Black would dearly like to pin the knight but this would allow a clever riposte: 15...a4 16 Nxe6 Qxb3 17

17a1 Qc4 (17...Qc6 18 Qf4+ a8 19 Qd2 —) 18 Qf4+ a8 19 We1!

16 Nxb3!

The consistent continuation. After 16 Wxb3 Wc6 17 f4+ a8 18 Wc2 Ne8 19 Nec1 the attack is less effective.

16 ... a4?

Krogius suggested 16...Wb6! as an alternative.

17 Nxb6 a3 18 a6! a5 19 Qf4+ Qa8 (25)

20 Qc7!

This is the point; the sting in the tail is revealed. The danger of backrank mate swings the game in White's favour. Nothing can be gained from 20 Ne8 Qh6 but after the text 20...Ec8 (20...f8 21 Ne8+) 21 Ne8 Qe7 22 Nh5 Ne5 Qf3 23 Le6 wins.

20 ... Qh6
21 Qxd8 Qxd8
22 Ne8 1-0
A brave effort to complicate matters by proposing a kingside offensive while simultaneously fending off White's attack. It is based on the misguided premise that the closed nature of the queenside allows sufficient time for a build-up of forces. After the better 10...\texttt{d6}!? 11 \texttt{h3} 0-0 12 \texttt{xe6+ \texttt{h8} 13 \texttt{xd7 \texttt{xd7} (13...\texttt{ae8 14 \texttt{xe8 \texttt{xe8 15 \texttt{e5 \texttt{xe5 16 0-0 +} -}) 14 0-0 \texttt{ae8 15 \texttt{d1 Black has some compensation for the pawn.}}\texttt{g2} \texttt{b8}

This is too cautious and therefore slow. At least 11...h6 intending 12...g5 poses White some problems and aims to fight for the initiative.

\textbf{12} 0-0 \texttt{c8}

\textbf{13} b3! (27)

The recurring theme ...f6 is not appropriate here, as 7...\texttt{d7} is rather slow compared to 7...\texttt{a5} which at least uncovers the queen to support e6 and reduces the movement of the opposing queen's knight.

Kavalek-Fuchs, Havana 1966, saw yet another approach: 8...h6!? 9 \texttt{h4 (9 h4) 9...\texttt{a5 10 f4 \texttt{e7 11 \texttt{h3 g6 12 \texttt{g2 \texttt{f5}?! 13 g4 \texttt{de7 14 \texttt{e3 h5 15 f5 hxg4 16 fxe6 \texttt{xe6 17 \texttt{xg4 0-0-0 =.}}}}}}}

\textbf{9} \texttt{exf6} \texttt{xf6}

\textbf{10} \texttt{xe2} 0-0-0

\textbf{27} B

It is of considerable importance for White's attack that the b-file be opened. This is not just for the rooks to make an impression, but to facilitate c4 allowing the rest of the forces to join in the fray.
13 ... cxb3
14 a3 b2
15 axb2 d6
16 c4

The opening has been a complete success for White. Black has failed to register any aggressive intent, while Torre has set in motion the decisive storming of the queenside.

16 ... a6
17 Qf3 h6
18 Qe5

After this move the king’s bishop is uncovered to add weight to the onslaught.

18 ... Qxe5
19 dxe5 Qd7
20 Wd3

At last the queen steps aside to avoid the pin, leaving Black with all sorts of problems.

20 ... Qb6
21 cxd5 exd5
22 Qd4

Now both rooks are revealed to exert immense power by dominating the b- and c-files. On 22...Qa4? 23 Qf1! Wa5 24 Qxc6 wins a piece.

22 ... Qc4
23 Qxc4 dxc4
24 Qa1 Qd3
25 Wc5 Qa5
26 e6! (28)

The loss of the pawn is irrelevant when it allows the queen’s bishop to deliver a devastating check.

26 ... Qxe6
27 Qe5+ 1-0

Black resigned in view of the variation 27...Qa8 28 Wxa5! Wa5 29 Qxb7#.

Game 10

Kharlamov-Shinau

Moscow 1991

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 Qc6
5 Qf3 Wb6
6 a3 a5!?

Now 7 b4 is not feasible; however, the drawback is that this move creates a weakness on b5.

7 Qd3 (29)

This is considered the antidote. The idea is to reach a favourable form of the Milner-Barry Gambit where Black’s inability to play ...a6 causes extra defensive problems.

The quieter 7 Qe2 is also possible:

a) 7...cxd4 8 cxd4 Qge7 9 b3 (9 Qc3!? Qf5 10 Qb5; Keres evaluates
the position as better for White) 9...\(\text{Qf5}\) 10 \(\text{b2 e7}\) 11 0-0?! (11 g4 \(\text{Qh6}\) 12 \(\text{g1}±\) 11...
\(\text{d7}\) 12 \(\text{h1}\) h5 13 \(\text{c3}\) g5! 14 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{wa7}\) \(\text{f6}\) Kliavin-Klasup, USSR 1955.

b) 7...\(\text{d7}\) 8 b3 \(\text{xd4}\) 9 cxd4 \(\text{Qe7}\) 10 0-0 \(\text{Qf5}\) 11 \(\text{d3}\) 12 \(\text{c3}\) 0-0 13 \(\text{d3}\) 14 \(\text{fxe3}\) 14 \(\text{fxe6}\) h6 15 \(\text{Qg5}?!\) (15 \(\text{exf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 16 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{d8}\) 17 \(\text{a2}\) with an unclear position) 15...
\(\text{f5}\) (15...
\(\text{fxg5}\) 16 \(\text{h5}\) g6? 17 \(\text{xe6}\) h5 18 \(\text{f5}\) 19 g4 g5? 20 \(\text{dxe6}\) \(\text{xe6}\) 21 \(\text{f5}\) b5 22 \(\text{f6}\) 1-0 Cortlever-van Seters, Beverwijk 1958.

7...\(\text{d7}\)

The acceptance of the gambit is the acid test but Black has also preferred increasing the pressure on d4, e.g. 7...\(\text{Qe7}\) 8 0-0 \(\text{cxd4}\) 9 \(\text{cxd4}\) \(\text{Qf5}\) 10 \(\text{Qxf5}\) \(\text{exf5}\) 11 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{e6}\) 12 \(\text{d4}\)!

\(\text{wb5}\) 13 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{d7}\) 14 \(\text{d1}\) 0-0 15 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{d8}\) 16 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{d7}\) (16...
\(\text{d7}\) 17 \(\text{d5}\) b6? 18 a4 ++) 17 \(\text{d5}\) b6 18 a4 \(\text{we8}\) 19 \(\text{dxe6}\) \(\text{fxe6}\) 20 \(\text{wb3}\) \(\text{xc1}\)

21 \(\text{dxc1}\) \(\text{d8}\) 22 h4! h6 23 \(\text{Qf4}\) g5 24 hxg5 hxg5 25 \(\text{dxd5}\)! exd5 (or 25...
\(\text{f4}\) 26 \(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{xf4}\) 27 \(\text{xf4}\) ++) 26 \(\text{wd5}\) \(\text{g7}\) (26...
\(\text{f7}\) 27 e6 \(\text{we7}\) 28 \(\text{xg5}\) ++) 27 f4! g4 28 b3 \(\text{f7}\) 29 \(\text{wa8}\) !— Georgadze-Draško, Tbilisi

8 0-0

The old-fashioned 8 \(\text{c2}?!\) has some follows:

a) 8...\(\text{Qe7}\) 9 0-0 \(\text{cxd4}\) (9...\(\text{Qf5}\) 10 \(\text{dxc5}\) \(\text{xc5}\) 11 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{d7}\) Tal-Sokolsky, USSR 1955) 10 \(\text{cxd4}\) \(\text{Qf5}\) 11
\(\text{xf5}\) \(\text{xf5}\) 12 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{a6}\) 13 \(\text{d4}\) (13 \(\text{wa4}\) \(\text{xc8}\) 14 \(\text{wb5}\) \(\text{xc5}\) 15 \(\text{dxb5}\) with equality, Koch-Schwertfeger, corr. 1964) 13...
\(\text{wa7}\) 14 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{e7}\) 15
\(\text{xc1}\) h6 16 \(\text{d5}\) 0-0 17 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{d7}\) 18 
\(\text{f4}?!\) \(\text{g8}\) 19 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{c8}\) 20 \(\text{wb3}\) \(\text{d8}\) 21 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{b5}\) ! 22 \(\text{wb5}\) \(\text{d4}\) !— Leisebein-Hunger, corr. 1985/86.

b) 8...\(\text{h6}\) 9 \(\text{h4}\) h5 10 b3 \(\text{h6}\) 11
\(\text{xe6}\) ?! \(\text{exe6}\) 12 dxc5 \(\text{xc5}\) 13 0-0
\(\text{f8}\) 14 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{f6}\) 15 \(\text{xb6}\) \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{b8}\) Vatter-Korchnoi, Lugano 1986.

c) 8...\(\text{wb5}\) 9 c4 \(\text{dxc4}\) 10 \(\text{d3}\)
\(\text{b5}\) 11 d5 \(\text{dxd5}\) 12 \(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{d8}\) 13
0-0 \(\text{e6}\) 14 \(\text{e4}\) \(\text{d4}\) 15 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{g4}\) 16 \(\text{xb7}\) \(\text{b8}\) 17 \(\text{e4}\) \(\text{xf3}\) 18 
\(\text{xf3}\) \(\text{xd1}\) 19 \(\text{xd1}\) \(\text{f5}\) 20 \(\text{d5}\) 
\(\text{d7}\) 21 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{d8}\) 22 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{d3}\) 23
\(\text{d1}\) \(\text{d7}\) 24 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{b6}\) 25 \(\text{ac1}\) \(\text{d8}\) Kiselev-Shaposhnikov, USSR 1989.

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

In answer to the push 8...a4 White should not follow the example of Dowden-Beliavsky, Lucerne OL
1982, which continued 9 dxc5?!
\[ \text{xc} 5 \text{ } 10 \text{ } \text{Qbd} 2 \text{ } f6 \text{ } 11 \text{ } \text{We} 2 \text{ } \text{Qge} 7 \text{ } \mp. \]
A better try is 9 \text{We} 2 or even 9 \text{Qh} 1 to play a future f4 after the exchanges on d4.

9 \text{cxd} 4 \text{ } \text{Qxd} 4

In the game Maki-Hadjiyiannis, Haifa 1989, Black reacted cautiously with 9...h6?! 10 \text{Qc} 3 \text{Qxd} 4 11 \text{Qxd} 4 \text{Wxd} 4 12 \text{We} 2 \text{Qe} 7 13 \text{Qh} 1 \text{Mc} 8 14 f4 \text{Wb} 6 15 \text{Qb} 5 \text{Qxb} 5 16 \text{Qxb} 5+ \text{Qc} 6 17 f5 \text{Qe} 7 18 \text{Qxc} 6+ \text{Qxc} 6 19 \text{Wg} 4 \text{exf} 5 20 \text{Wxg} 7 \text{Mf} 8 21 \text{Wg} 3 \text{Mg} 6 22 \text{Wf} 3 \text{We} 6 23 \text{Qf} 4 \text{Mfg} 8 24 \text{Mf} 2 \text{Qc} 5 25 \text{Mc} 2 b6 26 b4 \text{Qd} 4 27 \text{Mx} 1-0.

10 \text{Qxd} 4 \text{Wxd} 4

11 \text{Qc} 3 \text{Wxe} 5 (30)

As can be seen in the chapter on the Milner-Barry, at this stage Black often inserts ...a6 to stop \text{Qb} 5. As this is not possible here, other paths have been followed:

a) 11...\text{Qh} 6!? 12 \text{Qb} 5 \text{Wxe} 5 13 \text{Mc} 1 \text{Wb} 8 14 \text{Mf} 3 \text{Qd} 6 15 \text{Qxd} 6+ \text{Wxd} 6 16 \text{Qf} 4 \text{Wc} 7 17 \text{Wg} 3! f6 (½-½ Zaitsev-Uhlmann, Berlin 1982) 18 \text{Qd} 6! \text{Wf} 7 19 \text{Mxc} 1 \text{Mc} 6 20 b4 axb4 21 axb4 ±.

b) 11...\text{Wb} 6 and now:

b1) 12 \text{Qh} 1 \text{Qe} 7 13 f4 g6 14 \text{Mc} 1 (14 \text{We} 2!??) 14...\text{Qc} 6 15 \text{Qe} 3 d4 16 \text{Qf} 2 \text{Qf} 5 17 \text{Qe} 4 \text{Qe} 7 18 \text{Mf} 3 0-0 19 \text{Qxc} 6 \text{Wxc} 6 20 \text{Qd} 4 \text{Mxc} 8 21 g4 \text{Qe} 3 22 \text{Qxe} 3 dxe 3 23 \text{Qxe} 3 \text{Qf} 8 24 \text{Mc} 3 \text{Wb} 5 25 \text{Mc} 3 = Rosenthal-Gerstner, Bundesliga 1991/92.

b2) 12 \text{Wg} 4?! f5 13 exf 6 \text{Qxf} 6 14 \text{Wg} 3 \text{Qe} 7 15 \text{Wxg} 7 \text{Hg} 8 16 \text{Wh} 6 \text{Wd} 4 17 \text{Md} 1 \text{Wg} 4 18 \text{Qf} 1 \text{Qg} 6 19 \text{Wf} 4 \text{Wh} 5 20 \text{Qe} 2 \text{Wf} 3 21 \text{Wf} 1 \text{Qe} 5 22 \text{Wxh} 3 \text{Qxh} 3 23 g3 \text{Qe} 6 = Shteinberg-Silov, Kharkov 1967.

b3) 12 \text{We} 2 \text{Qe} 7 13 \text{Qg} 5 h6 14 \text{Qd} 2 g6 15 \text{Qe} 3 d4 16 \text{Qe} 4 \text{Qd} 5 17 \text{Qd} 2 \text{Qe} 7 18 h4 \text{Qc} 6 19 \text{Mxc} 1 \text{Wc} 7 20 \text{Qc} 5 \text{Qxc} 5 21 \text{Mxc} 5 \text{Wc} 7 22 \text{Mxc} 1 \text{Wxh} 4 23 \text{Qb} 5 0-0 24 \text{Qxc} 6 bxc 6 25 g3 \text{Wf} 3 26 \text{Mc} 4 \text{Qe} 7 27 \text{Mxd} 4 \text{Qf} 5 28 \text{Mx} 3 += Schlosser-Claesen, Adelaie 1988.

12 \text{Mc} 1 \text{Wd} 6

In normal lines of the Milner-Barry 12...\text{Wb} 8 is popular, but now 13 \text{Qxd} 5 has more venom due to the threat of \text{Qb} 6.

13 \text{Qb} 5 \text{Wb} 8

13...\text{Qxb} 5 leaves Black’s king stranded in the centre of the board, after which a game Prié-Villeneuve, Paris 1990, continued 14 \text{Qxb} 5+ \text{Qd} 8 15 \text{Wh} 5 \text{Qf} 6 16 \text{Wxf} 7 \text{We} 7 17 \text{Wxe} 6 \text{Wxe} 6 18 \text{Qxe} 6 \text{Qc} 5 19 \text{Qg} 5 \text{Qd} 4 20 \text{Qd} 1 \text{Qxb} 2 21 \text{Mxd} 5+ \text{Qc} 8 22 \text{Mc} 5+ \text{Qd} 8 23 \text{Mc} 2 1-0.
14 $\text{w}f3$ $\text{d}6$
15 $\text{w}xd5$ $\text{h}xh2+$
16 $\text{h}1$ $\text{c}e7$ (31)

Game 11
Prié-de la Villa García
León 1991

1 $e4$ $e6$
2 $d4$ $d5$
3 $e5$ $c5$
4 $c3$ $\text{c}c6$
5 $\text{f}3$ $\text{w}b6$
6 $a3$ $\text{h}6$ (32)

17 $\text{w}d4$

White is poised to demolish the opposition. The queen exerts considerable pressure by hitting g7, while preventing castling due to the need to defend d7.

17 ... $\text{c}6$
18 $\text{g}5!$ $f6$
19 $\text{xe}6$

Now White's rooks crash through into Black's position, sealing his fate.

19 ... $\text{e}5$
20 $\text{c}5$ 0-0
21 $\text{xe}7$ $\text{xb}5$
22 $\text{xb}5$ $\text{d}8$
23 $\text{xe}5$ $\text{xg}5$
24 $\text{ae}1$ $\text{f}6$
25 $\text{f}5$ $\text{h}6+$
26 $\text{g}1$ $\text{fd}8$
27 $\text{xb}7$ $\text{ab}8$
28 $\text{f}7+$ $\text{h}8$
29 $\text{fe}5$ 1-0

This system has experienced fluctuating bouts of popularity. The idea is to exert pressure on d4 while taking White outside normal lines.

7 $b4$ $\text{cxd}4$

8 $\text{cxd}4$

The alternative 8 $\text{xe}6$ doubles the h-pawns at the cost of opening up the g-file. Practice indicates that it deserves respect: 8...gxh6 9 $\text{cxd}4$ $\text{d}7$ (9...$\text{g}7$ 10 $\text{c}c3$ $f6$ 11 $\text{a}4$ intending $\text{b}5 ?$; 9...$\text{g}8$! followed by 9...$\text{g}4$ is unclear according to Fedorowicz) 10 $\text{e}2$ (not 10 $\text{c}3$? $\text{xb}4$ $\rightarrow$) 10...$\text{a}5$ (10...$\text{g}8$ 10 0-0 ?; 10...$\text{g}7$ 11 0-0 ?) 11 $b5$ $\text{e}7$ 12
\( \text{Dc3 a4 13 0-0 \textit{wa5} 14 \textit{wd2 \textit{dc8}} (14...\textit{xc8}? 15 \textit{xd5} \rightarrow ) 15 \textit{xfc1} \textit{db6} 16 h3! \textit{xc8} 17 \textit{zh2 \textit{dc4} 18} \textit{xc4 xc4 19 \textit{g4 xb5} 20 \textit{wb2!} \textit{xc6} 21 \textit{xd5! \textit{xc1+} (21...\textit{xd5}?) 22 \textit{xf6+} \rightarrow ; 21...\textit{xd5} 22 \textit{xc4 \textit{xc4} 23 \textit{xf6+ \textit{d8} 24 \textit{wb7} \rightarrow ; 21...\textit{xd5} 22 \textit{xc4 dxc4} 23 \textit{xf6+ \textit{e7} 24 d5! \textit{xd5} (24...c3 25 \textit{wa2} \rightarrow ) 25 \textit{wd4!} \textit{e6} 26 \textit{xd1} \rightarrow ) 22} \textit{xc1 \textit{xd5} (22...\textit{xd5} 23 \textit{xc6!} \textit{bxc6} 24 \textit{xf6+} \rightarrow ) 23 \textit{xf6+ \textit{e7} 24 \textit{xd5+! \textit{wd5} 25 \textit{wb4+ \textit{e8} (Rogers-Velimirović, Vršac 1987) 26 \textit{xc8+! \textit{d7 27 \textit{wc3} \rightarrow . 8 ... \textit{xf5} 9 \textit{xe3!} \textit{The question of how to defend the d-pawn is important. The text is a refinement on the old line that was based on two games at Wijk aan Zee in 1989; 9 \textit{b2 e7 (9...\textit{d7} 10 g4 \textit{dh6} 11 h3 f6 12 \textit{dc3 fxe5} 13 dxe5 \textit{xe7} (13...\textit{xf7} 14 \textit{a4 wd8} 15 h4 \pm) 14 \textit{a4 wd8} 15 \textit{xc1 0-0 16 dc5 xc5 17 xc5 df7 18 g2 = Svishn
kov-Lputian, Sochi 1993) and now: a) The stem game, Fedorowicz-Dokhoian, Wijk aan Zee 1989, continued 10 \textit{xd3 \textit{xd7} (10...a5?! 11 \textit{xf5 exf5} 12 dc3 xe6 13 b5 a4! 14 0-0 \textit{db8} 15 \textit{ec1 \textit{d7} is unclear; Campora-Dokhoian, Wijk aan Zee 1989) 11 0-0 g5 (11...0-0 12 dc3 \textit{xd4} 13 xd4 wxd4 14 xf5 wdx1 15 wxd1 exf5 16 \textit{xd5 \pm; 11...\textit{fxd4} 12 \textit{xd4 \textit{d4} 13 wg4! 7) 12 xf5 exf5 13 dc3 xe6 14 \textit{da4 wb5} (14...\textit{wd8} 15 dc5 b6 16 \textit{dxe6 fxe6} 17 \textit{xc1 \textit{xc8} 18 b5 da5} 19 xc8 xc8 20 xg5! ±) 15 dc5 g4 16 de1 xc5 17 dxc5 a5 and now 18 \textit{wd3! \textit{xd3} 19 \textit{xd3} gives White a clear advantage. b) 10 \textit{de2 \textit{d7} 11 0-0 is an attempt to revive Fedorowicz's plan, which so far has proved uniformly successful: b1) 11...0-0 12 \textit{wd2 a6 13 \textit{d1 f6} 14 dc3 fxe5 15 dxe5 \textit{ad8} 16 \textit{ac1 \textit{wa7} 17 \textit{d3 \textit{d4} 18 \textit{d4 \textit{xc4} 19 \textit{xf1 \textit{dxe5} 20 \textit{b1 \textit{d4} 21 g3 \textit{dg5} 22 \textit{wc2 \textit{fx5} 23 \textit{xe1 \textit{df8} 24 \textit{xe2 \textit{e3} 25 \textit{d1 \textit{b5} 26 \textit{dxe3} \textit{dxe3} 27 \textit{dxe3 \textit{xf1} 28 g4 d4 29 gxf5 dxe3 30 fxe6 1-0 Grosar-Jelen, Bled 1992. b2) 11...\textit{c8} 12 \textit{wd2 0-0 13 \textit{d1 \textit{d4} 14 \textit{d4 \textit{f4} 15 \textit{f4 \textit{e7} 16 \textit{d3 f6 17 \textit{wh4} h6 18 \textit{wg3 fxe5} 19 dxe5 \textit{g5} 20 dc3 \textit{d4} 21 \textit{wg6} \textit{dxe5} 22 \textit{wh7+ \textit{f7} 23 \textit{e2 \textit{g8} 24 \textit{h5+ \textit{f8} 25 \textit{e2 \textit{h4} 26 \textit{xf4 \textit{xf4} 27 \textit{xe5 \textit{xf2} 28 \textit{wh1 1-0 Relange-Bauer, French Ch 1993. 9 ... \textit{f6 10 \textit{d3! (33) This move has largely put 6...\textit{dh6 out of business. Black sprung a surprising sacrifice to secure a draw in Romanishin-Lputian, Erevan 1988. After 10 b5 \textit{dxe5}! 11 dxe5 \textit{dxe3} 12 fxe3 \textit{we3+} 13 \textit{we2 \textit{c1}+ 14 \textit{wd1 with perpetual check. 10 ... \textit{exe3}}.}
}
11 fxe3 fxe5?!

White also has a pleasant position after the safer 11...f5 12 0-0 e7 13 dxc3 intending 14 dxa4 and 15 xcl or dxe2-f4 and w e1 with some advantage.

12 b5 e4

After 12...dxa5 13 dxe5 the central knight is strong and the threat of w h5+ is lethal.

13 bxc6 exd3

14 dxe5

There is no hurry to take on d3 when the king can be pursued instead.

14 ... bxc6

15 wh5+ g6

16 dxe6 hxe6

17 w xh8 wc7

In response to 17...wb2, White can avoid a calamity by means of 18 0-0! →

18 0-0 wg7

19 wh4 da6

20 d2 d7

21 wh4 dd7

22 d3 (34)

Once again the weakness in Black’s camp imposed by the lack of control over e5 is emphasized by the manoeuvres of the knight, which constitute a prelude to taking control of the seventh rank.

22 ... dd6

23 dxe5+ cc7

24 w f7+ w x f7

25 x f7+ dd6

26 a b1+ cc7

27 dxc6+ dd4

28 c b2 d a3

29 c e1 d c4

30 x a7+ x a7

31 x a7 dd6

32 c c8 dd7

33 c b6+ cc3

34 d d2 cc2

35 b b4 1-0

Game 12
Galdunts-Ambartsumian
Armenian Ch 1991

1 e4 e6

2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 Qc6
5 Qf3 Qb6
6 a3 Qd7

Black is prepared to allow White's plan of gaining space on the queenside, since he plans to seize control of the c-file.

7 b4 cxd4
8 cxd4 Qc8 (35)

The move-order is important, as now 9 Qc3? is ruled out by the reply 9...Qxb4.

The text is an improvement on 8...Qge7, as played in Kamber-Michaud, Germany 1993, which saw White secure a crushing advantage: 9 Qc3 Qf5 10 Qa4 Qc7 11 Qb2 Qe7 (11...b6 12 Qc1 g6 13 Qa6 Qh6 14 Qc3 Qb8 15 h4 was slightly better for White in the game Zaichik-Rozentalis, USSR 1987) 12 Qd3 Qc8 13 0-0 f6 14 Qc1 Qd8 15 Qc5 b6 16 Qxd7 Qxd7 17 Qa4 Qd8 18 Qxc6! Qxc6 19 Qb5 Qe7 20 Qc1 1-0.

9 Qb2

The alternatives 9 Qe3 and 9 Qe2 are discussed in the next illustrative game.

9 ... Qa5

A game Roos-Paulsen, Baden-Baden 1990, saw a passive approach being exploited: 9...a6 10 Qd3 Qa7 11 Qc3 Qe7 12 0-0 Qb5 13 Qa4 Qa7 14 Qc5 Qc6 15 a4 Qc7 16 b5 b6 17 Qxa6 Qxa6 18 bxa6 Qd7 19 Qe2 Qc6 20 Qfc1 Qb4 21 Qa3 Qxa3 22 Qxa3 Qb4 23 Qxc8+ Qxc8 24 Qb5+ Qe7 25 Qd2 Qxa6 26 Qg5+ 1-0.

The spectacular 9...Qxb4?! used to be acknowledged as a refutation of the variation. Angelov-Poriazov, Plovdiv 1988 continued 10 axb4 Qxb4+ 11 Qd2 (11 Qc3 Qxc3 12 Qxc3 Qxc3+ 13 Qd2 Qxd4 and Black wins) 11...Qc2 12 Qc3 Qb3 13 Qe3 Qb6 14 Qe2 Qf5 15 Qd3 Qc1+ 16 Qd1 Qb5 17 Qxb5+ Qxb5 18 Qd2 Qxd1+ 0-1. However, Abramovic pointed out that the sacrifice is faulty: 12 Qa3! Qb3 13 Qd3 Qb4+ 14 Qbd2 Qc3 15 Qxb3 Qxd3 16 Qxb4 with a clear advantage.

10 Qbd2

In Petronic-Paulic, Belgrade 1988, White conceded the c4 square to Black and equality arose after 10 Qc3?! Qc4 11 Qb3 (after 11 Qd3, Parma considers 11...Qh6 12 0-0 Qe7 13 Qbd2 Qe3 14 fxe3 Qxc3 15 Qe2 0-0 unclear, whilst 11...Qe7 12 0-0 Qh6 13 Qe2 Qf5 = was Klinger-Arencibia, Gausdal 1986) 11...a5 12
\[d3\] a4 13 [e1 14 0-0 b5 15 [c2] c6 16 [e1 h6.

10 ... [c4

11 [xc4!

This is the best way to seek an edge. After 11 [xc4 [xc4 12 [c1 (12 [c3?! [e7 13 [e4 [xd5 14 0-0 [e7 15 [c2 h6 " Afek-Khuzman, Berlin 1990) Black equalizes by sacrificing a pawn: 12...c3! 13 [xc3 [e7 14 0-0 [xd5 15 [e4 [e7 16 [d2 0-0 17 [c5 [c6 18 [g5 [d8 19 [d2 [e7 20 [e3 b6 21 [e4 ½-½ Sax-Nogueiras, Lucerne 1989.

11 ... [xc4

12 [c1 a5 (36)

Black counter-attacks by neglecting the defence of c4 in favour of an assault on b4. At this critical juncture, Black has investigated other possibilities:

a) 12...c3 13 [xc3 [xc3 14 [xc3 [e7 15 [d3 [xd5 16 [d2 [e7 17 0-0 0-0 18 [c2 h6 19 [c1 [c8 20 [xc8+ [xc8 21 [f8 22 b5 g5 23 a4 g4 24 h4 [g7 25 hxg5 hxg5 26 [d3 [e7 27 [e3 [b4 28 [e4 [a7 29 [xd5 exd5 30 [g5 [f8 31 [c6+ [g8 32 [e7 1-0 Murey-Touzane, Podolsk 1991.

b) 12...b5 13 [d2! (13 d5 is possible) 13...c3 14 [xc3 [xc3 15 [xc3 [xf1 16 [xf1! [e7 17 [e3. Psakhis considers the position to be in White's favour.

c) 12...[a6 13 d5! exd5 14 [xd5 [e6 (14...[e7 15 [e4 b5 16 [e2 [g6 17 [e3 [c6 18 [h4 [e6 19 h3 h5 20 f4 with an unclear position; Motwani-Wegener, Vienna 1991) 15 [e4 [e7 16 [e2 [d5 17 [d4 b5 18 0-0 [b7 19 [xf1 [e6 (19...[c6 20 e6! —) 20 [g5 [f5 21 [f4 [e7 22 [xe6 [xe6 23 [c3 [c7 24 [d5! [b6 (24...exd5 25 [xf5 intending e6 —) 25 g4 [f8! 26 [h1 [h4 27 [g3 [d8 28 [xd8 [xd8 29 [e3 a6 30 f4 ± Afek-Psakhis, Israel 1990.

\[36\]

13 [d2 axb4

14 [c4 [wd8

In the game Sveshnikov-Nevednichy, Bled 1991, Black lost control of d6: 14...[wa7?! 15 axb4 [xb4+ 16 [c3 [xc3+? (16...[e7!?}) 17 [xc3 [f8 19 [a3 [b6 20 [d6 [d8 21 [f3 [h6 22 [d3 ±

15 axb4 b5

The b-pawn is taboo due to the danger of [d6+: 15...[xb4+ 16 [c3 [xc3+ (16...[e7 17 [a5 —) 17 [xc3 ±

16 [d6+ [xd6

17 exd6 [f6
18 \( \text{Bc5} \)

Sveshnikov has suggested 18 \( \text{Qd3} \) 0-0 19 0-0 \( \text{Bc6} \) 20 d5!± as another course of action to be considered.

18 ... 0-0
19 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qd5} \)
20 0-0 \( \text{Qxb4?!} \)

The act of stealing a pawn allows a violent attack to be unleashed. Black has to find recourse in the alternative. After 20...\( \text{Wb6} \) 21 \( \text{Wh5} \) f5 22 \( \text{Wfc1} \) play might proceed:

a) 22...\( \text{Ba8?!} \) 23 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Ba2} \) 24 \( \text{Qb1} \) \( \text{Ba6} \) 25 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Wxd6} \) 26 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \text{Qxb5} \) 27 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \text{Ma2} \) 28 \( \text{Ma5} \) \( \text{Qf4}! \)
29 \( \text{Wd2} \) \( \text{Qxb2} \) 30 \( \text{Wxb2} \) \( \text{Qd3} \) 31 \( \text{Wd2} \) \( \text{Qxc1} \) 32 \( \text{Wxc1} \) \( \text{Wxb4} \) 33 \( \text{Bxe5} \) \( \text{Wxd4} \)
34 \( \text{Bxe6} \) \( \text{Qd8} = \) Sveshnikov-Lputian, Moscow 1991.

b) 22...\( \text{Wxd6} \) 23 \( \text{Bxb5} \) is better for White according to Sveshnikov.

c) 22...\( \text{Qxb4} \) 23 \( \text{Bxc8} \) \( \text{Bxc8} \) 24 \( \text{We2!} \) (24 \( \text{Bxc8?} \) \( \text{Bxc8} \) 25 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 26 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qd5} \) 27 \( \text{We8} \) \( \text{Wd6!} \) 28 \( \text{d8W} \)
\( \text{Wxd8} \) 29 \( \text{Qxe6+} \) \( \text{Qh8} \) 30 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \text{Qc7} \)
31 \( \text{We5} \) \( \text{Bxb5} \) 32 \( \text{Bxb5} \) \( \text{Bb8} = + \) and now:

c1) 24...\( \text{Qxd3?} \) 25 \( \text{Bxc8} \) \( \text{Qf4} \) 26 \( \text{xf8} + \text{Qf8} \) 27 \( \text{Wf5} = + \).

c2) 24...\( \text{Wxd6?} \) 25 \( \text{Bc3} \) \( \text{Bb7} !? \)
(25...\( \text{Wxd4} \) 26 \( \text{Qxb4} \) \( \text{Wxb4} \) 27 \( \text{Bxc8} \)
+ -) 26 \( \text{Wd2!} \) \( \text{Wd5} \) 27 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qc6} \)
(27...\( \text{Qa2} \) 28 \( \text{Bc5!} \) \( \text{Wb3} \) 29 \( \text{Bxb5} \)
\( \text{Qxa3} \) 30 \( \text{Bxb7} \) \( \text{Qc3} \) 31 \( \text{We3} = + \).
28 \( \text{Qxf8} \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) 29 \( \text{Wf4} = + . \)

23 \( \text{d5!} \)

This advance of the d-pawn is the keystone of White’s attacking ambitions: it opens the long dark-squared diagonal and disrupts Black’s pawn structure.

22 ... \( \text{exd5} \)

In his notes to the game (upon which these notes are based) Gal- dunts demonstrates the possible complications:

a) 22...\( \text{Qxd3} \) 23 \( \text{Wxd3} \) \( \text{Ac4} \) 24
\( \text{Wc6} \) h6 25 \( \text{dxe6!} \) \( \text{Axe6} \) 26 \( \text{Bxb6} \)
x\( \text{cxb6} \)
27 \( \text{Wxb6} \) \( \text{Ag4} \) (27...\( \text{Wd7} \) 28 \( \text{Wh8} + \text{g7} \) 29 \( \text{Bh5} + \text{Ag8} \) 30 \( \text{Wg6} + \))
28 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{Ag5} \) 29 \( \text{We6} + \) intending \( \text{Bc1} = + . \)

b) 22...\( \text{Qxd5} \) 23 \( \text{Bxf5} \) \( \text{exf5} \) (or 23...\( \text{Bxf5} \) 24 \( \text{Bxf5} \) \( \text{exf5} \) 25 \( \text{Wxd5} + \)

37

W

The battering of the kingside will reach a climax after 21...g6 (or 21...\( \text{Qxd3} \) 22 \( \text{Wxd3} \) g6 23 d5!) 22 d5! when the domination of the dark squares ensures victory: 22...\( \text{Qxd5} \)
(22...gxh5 23 \( \text{Qxh7} + \text{Qxh7} \) 24 \( \text{Wxh5} + \text{Ag8} \) 25 \( \text{Wh8} \)) 23 \( \text{Ah7} \)
\( \text{Qxh7} \) 24 \( \text{Wxh5} + \text{Ag8} \) 25 \( \text{Wh8} \).
\(\text{\#f8 26 \text{\#e}1 \text{-+}) 24 \text{\#xd}5+ \text{\#h}8 25 \text{\#d}2!! \text{+-).} \)

23 \text{\#b}3 \text{\#xd}3
24 \text{\#xd}3 \text{\#c}4

The game is brought to an abrupt finish after the alternatives: 24...\text{\#f7}
25 \text{\#h}3 \text{\#h}6 26 \text{\#h}6 \text{\#h}6 27 \text{\#h}6
+- or 24...\text{\#e}6 25 \text{\#h}3 \text{\#h}6 26 \text{\#h}6
\text{gxh}6 27 \text{\#h}6
+-.

25 \text{\#xd}5+

The point of Black's defensive rook manoeuvre is revealed upon 25
\text{\#h}3 \text{\#h}6 26 \text{\#h}6 \text{\#h}6 27 \text{\#h}6 \text{d}4
28 \text{\#g}6+ \text{\#h}8 29 \text{\#h}6+ with a draw.

25 ...

26 \text{\#d}2!

Now 27 \text{\#h}6 is ominous.

26 ...

27 \text{\#xg}7 \text{\#xg}7
28 \text{\#h}6+ \text{\#f}7
29 \text{\#e}1

The rook is brought into play to aid the king hunt.

29 ...

30 \text{\#xe}4 \text{fxe}4
31 \text{\#xh}7+ \text{\#f}6
32 \text{\#h}6+ \text{\#f}7
33 \text{\#h}7+

It would be a fitting finish to a fine game if White (in time-trouble) had
found 33 \text{\#g}5! \text{\#f}6 34 \text{\#h}5+ \text{\#e}6
35 \text{\#g}6 +-.

33 ...

34 \text{\#xe}4 \text{\#g}8
35 \text{\#h}6+ \text{\#f}7
36 \text{\#d}5+

36 \text{\#h}7+ \text{\#f}6 (36...\text{\#g}7 37 \text{\#d}5+)
37 \text{\#e}7 is a clean kill (Nunn).

Now victory is only achieved by Black failing to fathom the onslaught.

36 ...

37 \text{\#h}5 \text{\#f}5
38 g4 \text{\#d}3?
38...\text{\#e}8 is a sterner defence.

39 \text{\#e}6 \text{\#f}8
40 \text{\#e}7 \text{\#g}6
41 \text{\#h}6+ 1-0

Game 13
Langner-Bashkov
Ostrava 1991

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 \text{\#c}6
5 \text{\#f}3 \text{\#b}6
6 a3 \text{\#d}7
7 b4

White has experimented with the flexible 7 \text{\#e}2:

a) 7...c4 8 \text{\#bd}2 \text{\#a}5 transposes
into Game 2, Sveshnikov-Eingorn,
Palma 1989.

b) 7...\text{\#g}7 8 \text{dxc}5 \text{\#c}7 9 0-0
\text{\#g}6 10 b4 \text{\#gxe}5 11 \text{\#bd}2 \text{g}6 12
\text{\#e}1 \text{\#xf}3+ 13 \text{\#xf}3 \text{\#g}7 14 \text{\#d}4
a6 15 \text{\#g}5 0-0 16 \text{\#d}2 \text{f}6 17 \text{\#h}6
e5 18 \text{\#xg}7 \text{\#xg}7 19 \text{\#xc}6 \text{\#xc}6
20 \text{\#d}3 \text{\#ad}8 21 \text{\#e}3 \text{\#d}7 22 \text{\#ae}1
\text{\#f}7 23 \text{\#c}2 \text{\#c}7 24 \text{\#h}3 \text{\#d}7 25
\text{\#h}6+ \text{\#g}8 26 \text{\#xg}6 \text{\#g}7 27 \text{\#h}7+
\text{\#f}7 28 \text{\#f}3 \text{\#c}6 29 \text{\#h}5+ \text{\#e}7 30
\text{\#xe}5+ \text{fxe}5 31 \text{\#xe}5+ 1-0 Kettner-Schmitt, Baden-Baden 1990.
c) 7...\(\text{Q}h6\) 8 b4 cxd4 9 \(\text{Q}xh6\) (9 cxd4 \(\text{Q}f5\) 10 \(\text{Q}b2\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 11 0-0 f6 = Beckett-Bus, Oakham 1992) 9...d3! 10 \(\text{Q}xd3\) gxh6 11 0-0 \(\text{Q}g7\) 12 \(\text{Q}e1\) 0-0 13 \(\text{Q}bd2\) f6 14 exf6 \(\text{Q}xf6\) \(\text{f}3\) Sveshnikov-Razuvaev, Palma 1989.

7 ... cxd4
8 cxd4 \(\text{Q}c8\)
9 \(\text{Q}e3\) (38)

With this useful move White aims to develop the kingside briskly. It has grown in popularity as a viable alternative to the standard 9 \(\text{Q}b2\). The position offers fresh challenges as the bishop can be easily exchanged, but at least that would boost the support for d4 and open the f-file for future attacking operations. White has occasionally employed 9 \(\text{Q}e2\):

a) 9...\(\text{Q}ge7\) 10 0-0 \(\text{Q}f5\) 11 \(\text{Q}b2\) (11 \(\text{Q}e3\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 12 \(\text{Q}bd2\) f6 13 \(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{Q}xe3\) 14 fxe3 \(\text{Q}d8\)!! 15 \(\text{Q}c1\) \(\text{Q}xe5\) 16 \(\text{Q}xc8\) + \(\text{Q}xc8\) 17 \(\text{Q}xe5\) fxe5 18 \(\text{Q}g4\) is unclear; Blatny-Teske, Leipzig 1988) 11...\(\text{Q}e7\) 12 \(\text{W}d2\) 0-0 13 \(\text{Q}d1\) f6 14 \(\text{Q}c3\) fxe5 15 \(\text{Q}xe5\) \(\text{Q}e8\) (15...\(\text{Q}h8\)!! 16 \(\text{Q}ac1\) \(\text{W}d8\) 17 \(\text{Q}d3\) intending \(\text{Q}e2\) ?) 16 \(\text{Q}ac1\) \(\text{Q}h5\)!

(16...\(\text{Q}h4\)!! 17 \(\text{Q}xf3\) + 18 \(\text{Q}xf3\) \(\text{Q}xe5\) 19 \(\text{Q}xd5\) \(\text{Q}xf3\) + 20 \(\text{gx}f3\) \(\text{exd}5\) 21 \(\text{Q}xc8\) 17 \(\text{Q}a4\) \(\text{W}d8\) 18 \(\text{Q}c5\) \(\text{Q}xc5\) 19 \(\text{Q}xc5\) \(\text{Q}h4\) 20 \(\text{Q}xh4\) \(\text{Q}xe2\)!

(20...\(\text{Q}xh4\) 23 \(\text{Q}d3\) ?) 21 \(\text{Q}xh4\) \(\text{Q}xh4\) 22 \(\text{Q}xc1\) with equality, Sveshnikov-Lputian, USSR 1990.

b) 9...\(\text{Q}xd4\)!! 10 \(\text{Q}xd4\) \(\text{Q}xc1\) 11 \(\text{Q}xc1\) \(\text{W}xd4\) 12 \(\text{W}c3\) ±.

c) 9...a5 10 b5 \(\text{Q}xd4\) 11 \(\text{Q}xd4\) \(\text{Q}xc1\) 12 \(\text{W}xc1\) \(\text{W}xd4\) 13 \(\text{W}c3\)!! (13 \(\text{W}c7\)! \(\text{W}xa1\) 14 \(\text{W}b8+\) \(\text{Q}e7\) 15 \(\text{W}d6+\) \(\text{Q}e8\) 16 \(\text{W}b8\) \(\text{Q}e7\) ...\(\text{Q}c5\)!! 14 0-0 \(\text{W}xc3\) 15 \(\text{Q}xc3\) \(\text{Q}d4\) 16 \(\text{Q}ac1\) \(\text{Q}xe5\)

\(\text{f}3\) Striković-Čabrilo, Prokuplje 1987.

There are a lot of supporters for 9...\(\text{Q}ge7\), which is designed to occupy f5 as a way to put pressure on d4 while reserving the option of taking on e3. The problem is that it allows White to exchange on f5. After 10 \(\text{Q}d3\) \(\text{Q}f5\) play might proceed:

a) 11 \(\text{Q}xf5\) exf5 12 0-0 \(\text{Q}e7\) 13 \(\text{W}d2\) 0-0 14 \(\text{Q}c3\) \(\text{Q}e6\) 15 h4 (15 \(\text{Q}fc1\) a5 16 b5 \(\text{Q}a7\) 17 \(\text{W}d3\) h6 18 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{W}d8\) 19 \(\text{Q}a4\) b6 20 \(\text{Q}xc8\) \(\text{W}xc8\) 21 \(\text{Q}b1\) \(\text{W}b7\) 22 \(\text{Q}bc3\) \(\text{Q}c8\) 23 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}d8\) 24 \(\text{Q}b2\) = Haba-Schmidt, Prague 1990) 15...a5 (15...\(\text{Q}fe8\) 16 \(\text{Q}g5\) a5 17 \(\text{Q}xe7\) \(\text{Q}xe7\) 18 b5 \(\text{Q}a7\) 19 \(\text{Q}fb1\) \(\text{Q}c4\) 20 \(\text{Q}d1\) \(\text{Q}c7\) 21 a4 ± Andrienko-Danielian, Jurmala 1991) 16 b5 \(\text{Q}a7\) 17 \(\text{W}b2\) \(\text{Q}c4\) 18 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}c7\) 19 \(\text{Q}fb1\) f4 20 \(\text{Q}xf4\) \(\text{W}xd4\) 21 \(\text{Q}e2\) \(\text{W}xb2\) 22 \(\text{Q}xb2\) \(\text{Q}c8\) 23 \(\text{Q}e3\) \(\text{Q}xh4\)
24 b6 \( \text{f}d7 \) 25 \( \text{Q}b3 \) d4 26 \( \text{Q}x\text{d}4\) \( \text{\text{f}}d5 \) 27 \( \text{Q}c5 \) \( \text{Q}g4 \) 28 \( \text{Q}x\text{b}7 \) \( \text{Q}xe5 \) 29 \( \text{Q}c6 \) \( \text{\text{h}}5 \) 30 \( \text{f}c1 \) \( \text{f}f6 \) 31 \( \text{\text{b}}b1 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 32 \( \text{Q}x\text{b}a5 \) 1-0 Andrienko-Kiriakov, Alma-Ata 1991.

b) 11 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) (11...\( \text{Q}d8 \)!! 12 \( \text{Q}x\text{f}5 \) \( \text{e}xf5 \) 13 \( \text{w}d2 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 14 \( \text{c}c1 \) \( \text{x}c1 \) 15 \( \text{w}x\text{c}1 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 16 \( \text{c}c3 = \) Shrenzel-Pein, Haringey 1989) 12 \( \text{Q}bd2 \) 0-0 13 \( \text{Q}b3 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 14 \( \text{c}c5 \) \( \text{a}b5 \) 15 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{x}d3 \) 16 \( \text{w}x\text{d}3 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 17 \( \text{x}ce7 \) \( \text{x}e7 \) 18 \( \text{f}c1 \) \( \text{w}c7 \) 19 \( \text{w}d2 \) \( \text{w}b6 \) 20 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 21 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{b}c6 \) 22 \( \text{a}b1 \) \( \text{f}c8 \) 23 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 24 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 25 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{c}c8 \) 26 \( \text{d}d7 \) \( \text{w}d8 \) 27 \( \text{f}6+ \)! \( \text{g}x\text{f}6 \) 28 \( \text{e}xf6 \) \( \text{h}7 \) 29 \( \text{x}e7 \) \( \text{w}b6 \) 30 \( \text{w}f4 \) 1-0 Grosar-Ottavi, Rome 1990.

10 \( \text{x}d3 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 11 0-0 \( \text{x}e3 \)

In the game van der Werf-Jolles, Groningen 1990, White had a vigorous offensive after 11...\( \text{e}7 \) 12 \( \text{Q}bd2 \) \( \text{x}e3 \) 13 \( \text{x}e3 \) 0-0 14 \( \text{Q}b3 \) \( \text{f}6 \)?? 15 \( \text{e}xf6 \) \( \text{x}f6 \) 16 \( \text{c}c5 \) \( \text{c}d8 \) 17 \( \text{e}5! \) \( \text{x}e5 \) (17...\( \text{c}8 \) 18 \( \text{w}h5 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 19 \( \text{x}g6 \) \( \text{e}+ \) ) 18 \( \text{x}h7+ \)! \( \text{x}h7 \) 19 \( \text{x}f8 \) \( \text{x}f8 \) 20 \( \text{d}x\text{d}7 \) \( \text{w}d8 \) 21 \( \text{x}f8+ \) \( \text{x}f8 \) 22 \( \text{w}h5+ \) \( \text{g}8 \) 23 \( \text{d}xe5 \) \( \text{w}b8 \) 1-0.

12 \( \text{x}e3 \) \( \text{g}6 \)

The system involving this move has a good reputation, based on the game Piriyi-Khuzman, Balatonbereny 1988, which continued 13 \( \text{h}1 \) (not 13 \( \text{Q}g5? \) \( \text{x}e5! \) ) 13...\( \text{g}7 \) 14 \( \text{g}5?! \) 0-0 15 \( \text{w}d4? \) \( \text{x}e5! \) 16 \( \text{d}xe5 \) \( \text{w}x\text{e}3 \) 17 \( \text{a}a2 \) \( \text{w}x\text{d}3 \) 18 \( \text{a}f2 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 19 \( \text{w}h3 \) \( \text{w}xh3 \) 20 \( \text{g}xh3 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 21 \( \text{d}d2 \)

\( \text{c}3 \) 22 a4 \( \text{h}6 \) 23 \( \text{Q}g3 \) \( \text{x}a4 \) 24 \( \text{w}e1 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 25 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{h}c8 \) 26 \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{c}1 \) 0-1.

However, White's play can be dramatically improved by launching a kingside attack using both his knights to invade the dark squares around the black king.

13 \( \text{Q}c3 \) (39)

![Chess diagram]
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13 ...
14 \( \text{w}e1 \) 0-0
15 \( \text{d}d1 \)

This is the start of a slow but powerful manoeuvre to harass the bishop.

15 ...
16 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{w}d8 \)

Even at this early stage Black is obliged to go on the defensive by thwarting White's plan of an eventual \( \text{w}h4 \). On 16...\( \text{f}6 \) 17 \( \text{e}xf6 \) \( \text{xf6} \) 18 \( \text{Q}g4 \) \( \text{g}7 \)? 19 \( \text{w}h4 \) \( \text{w}d8 \) 20 \( \text{Q}g5 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 21 \( \text{a}xg6 \) Black is destroyed.

17 \( \text{Q}g4 \) \( \text{a}6 \)
18 \( \text{w}g3 \) \( \text{d}b8? \) (40)

Black chooses a faulty plan, which he will not get the time to put
into effect. After ...\textit{b}5 the idea is that White’s attack will be stunted, while a rook invading at c3 will prove to be a distraction.

The only way to make an impression on the game is to play 18...f6 19 exf6 \textit{xf}6 20 \textit{x}xf6+ \textit{xf}6 21 \textit{g}5!, but this is in White’s favour nevertheless.

\begin{align*}
19 \textit{w}f4 & \textit{b}5 \\
20 \textit{x}b5 & \textit{xb}5 \\
21 \textit{xf}6+ & \textit{xf}6 \\
\text{Now 21...\textit{h}8 loses to 22 \textit{x}h7!} \\
\textit{h}7 23 \textit{g}5+ & \textit{g}8 24 \textit{h}4.
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
22 \textit{xf}6 & \textit{h}8 \\
23 \textit{e}5 & \textit{c}7 \\
24 \textit{f}3 & \text{The final key to White’s victory; the rook will be added to the attack on the h-file.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
24 ... & \textit{g}8 \\
25 \textit{w}4 & \textit{w}8 \\
26 \textit{h}3 & 1-0
\end{align*}
The concept of 6 \( \text{d}3 \) followed by sacrificing at least the \text{d}-pawn was popularized by the Englishman Sir Stuart Milner-Barry. This cavalier approach naturally attracted Tal who revelled in the tactical possibilities. In recent times, Rozentalis and Sveshnikov, in particular, have refined the approach to the point where only one pawn is discarded in pursuit of the black king. The gambit is difficult to contend with, and will appeal to aggressive players. If Black is unprepared for them, the complications are extremely difficult to fathom over the board.

**Game 14**

*Strauts-Kantoris*

*USSR 1985*

1. \( \text{e}4 \)  \( \text{e}6 \)
2. \( \text{d}4 \)  \( \text{d}5 \)
3. \( \text{e}5 \)  \( \text{c}5 \)
4. \( \text{c}3 \)  \( \text{d}c6 \)
5. \( \text{f}3 \)  \( \text{b}6 \)
6. \( \text{d}3 \) \((41)\)

The most active posting for the bishop.

**Diagram B**

6. ...  \text{cxd4}

It is misguided to try to transpose to other lines with 6...\text{d}ge7?!. This occurred in Milner-Barry–Trott, England 1951: 7 \text{dxc}5 \text{w}c7 (7...\text{w}xc5 8 \text{b}4 \text{b}6 9 \text{e}3 \pm) 8 \text{a}3 \text{dxe}5 9 \text{b}3 \text{xd}3 + 10 \text{xd}3 \text{xc}5 11 \text{e}3 \text{d}4 12 \text{xd}4 \text{c}6 13 \text{e}5 \text{w}xg2 14 \text{d}d6+ \text{d}d8 15 \text{b}6 1-0.

A common error is 6...\text{d}7 when White can continue with 7 0-0 as in the illustrative game or take the chance to seize the initiative. After 7 \text{dxc}5! \text{xc}5 (7...\text{w}c7 8 \text{f}4 \text{xc}5 9 0-0 \text{d}ge7 10 \text{b}4 \text{b}6 11 \text{a}4 \pm) play might proceed:

a) 8 0-0 and now:

a1) 8...\text{d}ge7? 9 \text{b}4 \text{xb}4 10
cxb4 Qxb4 11 Ne3 Wc7 12 Da3 Wc3 13 Qb5 Wxd3 14 Qc7+ Qd8 15 Wxd3 Qxd3 16 Qxa8 ++- Molnar-Joppien, Vienna 1990.

a2) 8...f6 9 b4 Ne7 10 Qf4 fxe5 (10...Cc8 11 Qbd2 Wd8 12 a3 f5 13 c4 g5? 14 Qxg5 1-0 Almeida-Purgimon, Andorra-Purgimon, Andorra 1987) 11 Qxe5 Qxe5 12 Qxe5 Qf6 (12...Qf6 13 Wh5+ g6 14 Qxg6+ Qxg6 15 Wxg6+ ++) 13 Qd2 0-0 14 Qd3 Qd6 15 Wxe2! Qac8 16 Qd4 Wc7 17 Qe5 Qe8 18 Rae1 Qxe5 19 Qxe5 ± Nimzowitsch-Salwe, Karlsbad 1911.

a3) 8...a5!? 9 a4 (9 Qe2 f6 10 Qf4 Qge7 11 Qbd2 Qg6 12 Qg3 0-0 13 Qb3 Ne7 14 exf6 Qxf6 15 Qbd4 = Rubinetti-Ivkov, Palma de Mallorca 1970) 9...Qge7 (9...Qce7 10 Qa3 Qg6 11 Qe2 Qe8 12 Qb5 Qxb5 13 Qxb5+ Qc6 14 h4 h6 15 g3 Qge7 16 Qg2 Qd8 17 Qd2 Qa7 18 Qad1 Qb6 19 h5 0-0 20 Qd3 with unclear play; Mellado-Bykholovsky, St. Barbara 1992) 10 Qa3 Qg6 11 Qe2 0-0 12 Qb5 Qad8 13 h4 f6 14 exf6 gxf6 15 Qh6 Qfe8 16 b4! axb4 17 a5 Qxa5 18 exb4 Qxb4 19 h5 Qc4 20 hxg6 Qxb5 21 gxh7+ Qf7 22 Qab1 Qd6 23 Qg5+! fxg5 24 Qxg5 e5 25 Wh5+ Qg7 26 Qxb4 e4 27 Qxb5 Wc6 28 Qxb7+ Jonkman-Nacinovic, Holland 1993.

b) 8 Qe2 a5 9 Qbd2 a4 (after 9...Cc7?! 10 0-0 Qge7 11 Qb3 intending Qbd4 White has the advantage; C.Hawthorne-Evans, Bristol 1983) 10 b4 axb3 11 Qxb3 Qa3! 12 0-0 Qge7 13 Qd2 Qg6 14 Qbd4! Qe7 15 Qfe1 0-0 16 h4! f5 17 exf6 Qxf6 18 Qab1 Wa7 19 Qc3 Qxd4 20 Qxd4 Qe8 21 Qg5 Qxg5 22 hxg5 Qf4 23 Qxf4 Qxf4 24 g3 Qf8 25 Wxe6+ Qf7 (Hort-Andersson, Reykjavik 1972) 26 Wh3! g6 27 Wg4 ±.

7 cxd4 Qd7

It would be a grave error to grab the pawn because of 7...Qxd4?? 8 Qxd4 Qxd4 9 Qb5+ picking up the queen.

8 0-0

The move-order involving 8 Qc3 is also perfectly playable. The older lines are somewhat doubtful:

a) 8 Qe2?! Qge7 9 b3 Qf5 10 Qb2 Qb4+ 11 Qf1 0-0 12 Qd3 f6 13 Qxf5 exf5 and Nimzowitsch felt Black was better, so he switched to 6 Qe2 to save a tempo.

b) 8 Qc2?! Qd4 9 Qc3 Qxc2+ 10 Qxc2 Qc8 11 0-0 Qc7 12 Qd1 Qc6 13 a4 Qa5 ± Basjouni-Uhlmann, Prague 1954.

8 ...

Qxd4

9 Qxd4

The speculative 9 Qg5?? can be traced to the game Sorensen-Thapper, Karlskrona 1963, which continued 9...g6 10 Ne3!? Qc5 11 Qc3 h6 12 Qa4 Qxa4 13 Wxa4+ Qf8 with an unclear position. It has since been heavily analyzed by the Malmo chess club and has become popular in correspondence chess. It is certainly useful as a surprise weapon,
although its soundness has not yet been confirmed by strenuous competitive play. For example:

a) 9...g6 10 e3 and now:
   a1) 10...xb2 11 Qc3! (not 11
   Qxg6? Qe2+! —;; 11 Qxf7 Wxa1
   12 Qd6+ or 12 Qxh8 Qc6 is unclear
   according to Krantz) 11...Wxc3 12
   Wc1 Wxa5 13 Wxd4 Wh6 14 h4 Qe7
   15 Wf3 Qxg5? (15...0-0 16 Qc5
   Wd8 17 Wf6 Qxg5 18 hxg5 is unclear)
   16 hxg5 0-0 17 a5 Wfe8 18
   Wf6 Qc6 19 Wfe1 Wd8 20 Wf4 b6
   21 a6 bxc8 22 a6 1-0 Krantz-Tie-

a2) 10...c5 11 Qc3 and now:
   a21) 11...Qf5? 12 Qxf5 Qxe3
   (Stork-Pinarelli, Malmö 1979) 13
   Wxd5! exd5 14 Qxd7+ Wx7 15
   Wxd5+ Qc8 16 fxe3 Qe7 17 Qac1+
   Qb8 18 Wxf7 Wxe3+ 19 Wh1 Wxg5
   20 Wf8+! — Krantz.

a22) 11...Qe7 12 Qc1 0-0 (or
   12...Qc8 13 Qa4 Wb4 14 Qxc5
   Qxc5 15 Wxc5 Wxc5 16 Wxf7! 0-0
   17 Qh6+ Wg7 18 Qg4 Qc8 19 Qf6
   Qc7 20 Qg4 Qc6 21 Wh4 h5 22
   Qhx5+ gxh5 23 Wf6+ Qg8 24
   Wg6+ Qf8 1-0 Keogh-Walsh, Dun-
   blin 1976; 12...Qb3?! Krantz) 13
   Wg4! h5 14 Wf4 Qe5 15 Qxf5
   Qxf5 16 Qxc5 Wxc5 17 Qce4 Wc7
   18 Qf6+ Qg7 19 Qc7 Wfd8 20 g4
   hxg4 21 Wxg4 b6 22 h4 a5 23 h5 —

b) 9...h6?! 10 Wh5 (10 Qxf7!?
   Qxf7 11 Wh5+ Qe7 12 Qc3 is an-
   other idea) 10...0-0-0 11 Qxf7 Qe8
   12 Qc3 Qd7 13 Qg6 intending 14
   Qe3 ± (Krantz).

c) 9...f6? 10 Wh5+ g6 11 Qxg6+
   ± (Krantz).

d) 9...Qe7?! 10 Qxh7 ±.

e) 9...f5 10 exf6 Qxf6 11 Qxh7!
   0-0-0 (11...Qxh7 12 Wh5+ Qd8 13
   Qxh7 Qc2 14 Qg5+ Qe7 15 Qxe7+ Qx7
   16 Wg5+; 14...Qc8 15 Qc1
   Qxb2 16 Qg6 +-) 12 Qg5 a6 13
   h3 Qh4 14 Qe3 Qdh8 (14...Wxb2
   15 Qc3 intending 16 Qxf7) 15 Qd2
   Qg4!? 16 Qxd4 Qxd4 17 Qdf3
   Qh2+ (Stork-Ohlsson, Sweden 1987)
   18 Qxh2 Qxh2 19 Qxh2 Wf5+ 20
   g3 +—.

f) 9...Qe7 and now:

f1) 10 h4 h5? 11 Qe3! Qc5 (or
   11...Wxb2 12 Qxf7! Wxf7 13 Qxh4;
   11...Qxg5 12 hxg5 Wxb2 13 g6
   Wxa1 14 gxf7+ Wxf7 15 Qxh4) 12
   Qc3 Qe7 13 Qc1 Qc8 14 Qa4 Qxa4
   15 Wxa4+ Qc6 (Sorensen-Dehl-
   ryd, Malmö 1979) 16 Qxc5! Wxc5
   17 Qc1 and 18 Qxd4 +—.

f2) 10 Qh7?? Qc6 11 Wh5 0-0-0
   12 Wxf7 Wd4 13 Wxg7 Qxe5 14
   Wh1 (14 Wxh8? Qf3+) 14...Wxd3
   15 Qe1 Whxh7 16 Wxe5 Qf6 17 Wd6
e5 18 Qf4 exf4 19 Qc1+ Qc6 0-1

g) 9...Qe6!? 10 Qe1 (Harding
   considers 10 Qxh7 Qh6 followed by
   ...Qe7 to be unclear) 10...Qc5
   (10...g6 11 Qxf3 Qh6 12 Wf6! =) 11
   Wf3 Qxe5 (11...Qh6 12 h3!) 12
   Qxe5 f6 13 Wh5+ Qe7 14 Wf7+
   Qd8 15 Wxg7 Qxf2+ 16 Wh1 Wd4?
17 Qxe6+ A xe6 18 A xe6 Wxd3 19 Wf8+ ← (Harding).

h) 9...Ac5?! 10 A xh7 (10 Ac3 g6 11 A e3 transposes to note 'a') 10...Ac6! 11 W h5 (with the idea 12 Af6+) 11...A h6 (11...0-0-0 12 Wxf7 ∆) 12 Ac3 intending 13 Aa4 with equal chances (Harding).

9 ... Wxd4
10 Ac3 Wxe5 (42)

The major alternative 10...a6 is examined in Game 16, Sveshnikov-Razuvaev. Black should accept the challenge as the less common ideas are just not good enough:

a) 10...Ab4?! 11 Ab5 Wxe5 12 Wg4! Aa5 13 Af4 A h6 14 Wg3 Wh5 15 Wxg7 Ag8 16 Wxh6 Wg4 17 Ag3 a6 18 Ad6+ A e7 19 Wc3 Ab4 20 Af5+ 1-0 Kottnauer-Palmer, England 1961.

b) 10...Wb6?! and now:

b1) 11 Wg4 h5 12 Wg5 g6 13 a4! A h6 (not 13...a6? 14 Ac6 fxg6 15 Wxg6+ Ad8 16 Axd5! +--; 13...Ae7 14 Wf4 Wb4 15 Ab5 with compensation according to Tal) 14 Wh4 a6 15 A xh6 A xh6 16 Wf6 Wf8 17 Axd5 Wd8 18 Wf4 exd5 19 Wxh6 We7 20 Wc3 Ac6 21 Ac1 Ag8 22 f4 Af8 23 f5 gxf5 24 Wh6+ Ag7 25 Axf5 Ad7 26 Ac7 We6 27 Wh8+! Ag8 28 Wxh5 Ac8 29 Axc8 Axc8 30 Axf6 We7 31 Wh6+ Ah7 32 Ad6 Wxe5 33 Wh8+ 1-0 Tal-Stahlberg, Stockholm 1961.

b2) 11 a4 Ae7 (11...a5? 12 Ae3 Ac5 13 Ac5 Wxc5 14 Ac1 Wb6 15 Wg4! ± Möhring-Forintos, Halle 1958) 12 Ae3 Wd8 13 Ag5! h6 14 Ab5! Ac6 15 Ad6+ Ad7 16 Axf7 Wc7 17 A xh8 hxg5 18 Wc2 A f5 19 A xf5 exf5 20 e6+ Ae7 21 Wh5 Wxe6 22 Afe1+ Ad6 23 b4 d4 24 Wg6+ 1-0 Moles-Miyasaka, Skopje 1972.

c) 10...Ae7?! 11 Ab5 Wxe5 12 Ae1 (Keres suggests 12 f4! Wb8 13 f5 a6 14 Wf3 with advantage to White) 12...Wb8 13 Wf3 Ac5 14 Axb5+ Ac6 15 Wxd5 Ad6 16 Axc6+ bxc6 17 Wxc6+ Ae7 18 Ac3 Ac8 19 We4 h6 20 Ad4 A xh2+ 21 Ah1 Wf4 22 Wb7+ Ac7 23 Ab3 Ab6 24 Ac7 Wa5 25 Ab7+ Ae8 26 Wf3 Ab8 27 A ad1 Ae7 28 Ag1 Ab5? 29 Wd3 A d5 30 Wh7 Af8 31 Axf8 1-0 Corden-Knox, British Ch 1969.

11 Ae1 Wd6

This old-fashioned move attempts to hang on to the d-pawn, but it is the first step on a perilous journey for Black.
The more resolute 11...\textsuperscript{b}b8 is covered in Game 16, Borg-P.Nikolić.

It is not wise to play 11...\textsuperscript{c}c7? since 12 \textsuperscript{d}xd5 merely gives White a tempo. Play can continue:

a) 12...\textsuperscript{d}d8 13 \textsuperscript{e}f4 \textsuperscript{c}c8 14 \textsuperscript{w}b3 \textsuperscript{c}c6 15 \textsuperscript{e}c4 \textsuperscript{e}e7 16 \textsuperscript{d}xe7 \textsuperscript{d}xe7 17 \textsuperscript{h}ad1 with a clear plus for White, Clarke-Elliott, England 1959.

b) 12...\textsuperscript{a}a5 13 \textsuperscript{d}xe6+ fxe6 (certainly not 13...\textsuperscript{d}xe6? 14 \textsuperscript{b}b5+ \textsuperscript{d}d8 15 a4! \textsuperscript{d}xd5 16 \textsuperscript{w}xd5+ 1-0 Friedmann-Beneda, corr. 1974) 14 \textsuperscript{w}h5+ \\
\textsuperscript{d}d8 (14...\textsuperscript{g}g6? 15 \textsuperscript{d}f6+) 15 \textsuperscript{g}g5+ \textsuperscript{d}f6 16 \textsuperscript{w}xf6 \textsuperscript{e}e7! 17 \textsuperscript{d}e4 and White has the better game due to Black's stranded king.

12 \textsuperscript{b}b5 \textsuperscript{w}b8 (43)

There are those reckless enough to continue 12...\textsuperscript{e}x\textsuperscript{b}5 13 \textsuperscript{e}xb5+ \textsuperscript{d}d8 and hope to survive the onslaught. White should be able to claim a sizeable advantage by following general attacking ideas based on sacrificial combinations at d5, penetrating on the c-file and preventing Black developing his forces. For example:

a) 14 \textsuperscript{e}e3 \textsuperscript{e}e7 15 \textsuperscript{c}c1 \textsuperscript{d}f5 16 \textsuperscript{c}c5 \textsuperscript{w}f4 (16...\textsuperscript{w}xc5!) 17 g3 \textsuperscript{g}g5 18 \textsuperscript{w}xd5+! exd5 19 \textsuperscript{b}b6+ axb6 20 \textsuperscript{e}e8# (1-0) Foulds-Lang, New Zealand 1956.

b) 14 \textsuperscript{w}h5! and now:

b1) 14...\textsuperscript{g}g6 15 \textsuperscript{w}f3 f6 (15...f5 16 \textsuperscript{f}f4 \textsuperscript{b}b6 17 \textsuperscript{w}xd5+! ++) 16 \textsuperscript{f}f4 e5 17 \textsuperscript{e}xe5! fxe5 18 \textsuperscript{e}xe5 \textsuperscript{w}xe5 19 \textsuperscript{w}xf8+ \textsuperscript{c}c7 20 \textsuperscript{c}c1+ 1-0 Moyer-Kozmerek, corr. 1969.

b2) 14...\textsuperscript{e}e7 15 \textsuperscript{w}h4+ \textsuperscript{d}f6 16 \textsuperscript{d}d2! a5 17 \textsuperscript{a}a1 intending \textsuperscript{f}f4 with excellent chances according to Griffiths.

b3) 14...\textsuperscript{e}e7 15 \textsuperscript{f}f4 (15 \textsuperscript{g}g5!? 15...\textsuperscript{d}f6 15 \textsuperscript{w}f3 \textsuperscript{a}a8 16 \textsuperscript{a}a1 ±.

13 \textsuperscript{w}f3 \textsuperscript{d}d6
14 \textsuperscript{d}xd6+

Flasy play led to success in Tal-Nei, USSR 1958, which finished in brilliant fashion after 14 \textsuperscript{w}xd5 \textsuperscript{a}h2+ 15 \textsuperscript{h}h1 \textsuperscript{c}c6 16 \textsuperscript{w}g5 \textsuperscript{d}f6 17 f4 h6 18 \textsuperscript{w}xg7 \textsuperscript{g}g8 19 \textsuperscript{a}x\textsuperscript{e}6+! fxe6 20 \textsuperscript{g}g6+ \textsuperscript{d}d8 21 \textsuperscript{w}xf6+ 1-0.

14...
15 \textsuperscript{f}f4 \textsuperscript{w}b6
16 \textsuperscript{g}g3 \textsuperscript{g}6

On 16...\textsuperscript{c}c8 comes 17 \textsuperscript{a}a1! \textsuperscript{c}c6 (17...\textsuperscript{w}xb2? 18 \textsuperscript{e}e5!) 18 \textsuperscript{e}e1 \textsuperscript{a}a4 19 b3 \textsuperscript{w}d4 21 \textsuperscript{e}e5 ±.

17 \textsuperscript{e}e5 \textsuperscript{f}6
18 \textsuperscript{a}x\textsuperscript{g}6+ \textsuperscript{e}e7

There is no long-term reward in taking the offered piece: 18...\textsuperscript{h}xg6
19 \(\text{wxg6+}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{d8}\) 20 \(\text{wg7}\) \(\text{f}xe5\) 21
\(\text{wxh8}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{c7}\) 22 \(\text{wg7+}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{d6}\) 23 \(h4!\) ±.
19 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{h5!}\) \(\text{f}xe5\)
20 \(\text{wg7+}\) 1-0

Game 15
Borg-P.Nikolić
Kavala 1985

\begin{align*}
1 & \text{e}4 & \text{e}6 \\
2 & \text{d}4 & \text{d}5 \\
3 & \text{e}5 & \text{c}5 \\
4 & \text{c}3 & \text{\text{Q}}\text{c6} \\
5 & \text{\text{Q}}\text{f3} & \text{wb6} \\
6 & \text{\text{Q}}\text{d3} & \text{cxd4} \\
7 & \text{cxd4} & \text{\text{Q}}\text{d7} \\
8 & 0-0 & \text{\text{Q}}\text{xd4} (44)
\end{align*}

with a slight plus for White, Nun-Razuvaev, Sochi 1989.

b) 9...\(\text{\text{Q}}\text{c6}!\)? 10 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{b3}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{ge7}\) 11
\(\text{\text{Q}}\text{e3}\) \(\text{w}c7\) 12 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{c1}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{g6}\) and White has insufficient compensation
for the pawn; Nun-Schmidttel, Prague 1990.

9 \(\ldots\) \(\text{w}xd4\)
10 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{c3}\) \(\text{w}xe5\)
11 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{e1}\) \(\text{w}b8\)

Black's intention is to avoid his queen being harassed and to develop
his kingside quickly.

12 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{xd5}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{d6}\)
13 \(\text{w}g4\)

This is Milner-Barry's original idea to maintain the tension. Now the
queen targets \(g7\) and sets a trap if the h-pawn is grabbed: 13...\(\text{\text{Q}}\text{xe2}+?\) 14
\(\text{\text{Q}}\text{h1}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{e5}\) 15 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{f4}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{xf4}\) 16 \(\text{w}xg7\)
\(\text{w}d8\) 17 \(\text{w}xh8++\). The obvious 13
\(\text{w}h5\) to protect h2 soon runs into
trouble: 13...\(\text{w}f8\) 14 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{c3}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{f6}\) 15
\(\text{\text{Q}}\text{h4}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{c6}\) 16 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{g5}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{e5}\)! (16...\(\text{\text{Q}}\text{d5}\)?
17 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{xd5}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{xd5}\) 18 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{c4}!\) ±) 17 \(f4?!\)
(after 17 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{b5}?!\) h6 the pin of the
pawn is ineffective due to the threat of
18...\(\text{\text{Q}}\text{xe2}+)\) 17...\(\text{\text{Q}}\text{d4}+\) 18 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{h1}\)
h6 19 \(f5\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{g8}\) 20 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{c3}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{xe3}\) 21 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{xe3}\)
\(\text{\text{Q}}\text{xf5}\) 22 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{xf5}\) \(g5)! 23 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{d4}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{f4}\) and
Black can hang on to the extra pawn;

13 \(\ldots\) \(\text{w}f8\)
14 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{d2}\) \(h5\)

The queen is dislodged from its
optimum square. Less accurate is
14...\(\text{\text{Q}}\text{c6}\) 15 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{c3}!\) \(e5\) 16 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{e3}\) \(h5\) 17
\(\text{w}h3\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{f6}\) 18 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{ad1}\) \(e4\) 19 \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{c2}\) \(\text{\text{Q}}\text{e5}\)
20 \textit{b4+ g8} 21 \textit{d5} g6 22 \textit{d6 e8} 23 \textit{e7+ g7} 24 \textit{xe5 wxe7} 25 \textit{xc3 hhd8} 26 h3 \textit{ac8} 27 \textit{xd8 xxd8} 28 \textit{xe4} ± Soylu-Züger, Haifa 1989.

15 \textit{wh3 (45)}

Another approach is possible: 15...\textit{c6} 16 \textit{c3} (16 \textit{b4 d7} 17 \textit{d5 c6} 18 \textit{b4} \textit{a5} Motwani-Brunner, Clichy 1991) 16...\textit{xf6} 17 \textit{d4 \textit{c7}} 18 \textit{d3 d5} 19 \textit{d5} \textit{xc3} 20 \textit{xf7+ \textit{h2}}+ (20...\textit{xf7} 21 \textit{xe6+ \textit{f8}} 22 \textit{f5+ \textit{g8}} 23 \textit{c4+ d5} 24 \textit{xd5} \textit{xd5} 25 \textit{xd5+ h7} 26 \textit{f5+} with a drawn position – analysis by I.Kuznekov) 21 \textit{h1 \textit{e4}} 22 \textit{xe4 xf7} 23 \textit{xc6 \textit{h6}} 24 \textit{d7 e5} 25 f4 \textit{xf4} 26 \textit{xe6+ \textit{f8}} 27 \textit{ad1} 1-0 Salnikov-Prudnikov, USSR 1991.

16 \textit{xd7} \textit{xb2+}

17 \textit{h1} \textit{xf6}

18 \textit{df5}

It is essential for White to maintain a grip on the situation by keeping his queen strongly centralized. There is no joy to be gained from 18 \textit{we7+ g8} 19 g3 \textit{g4}! when Black is on top.

18 ... \textit{d6}

19 \textit{ac1}

The dormant rook is brought to the scene of battle.

19 ... \textit{wd8}

20 \textit{g5} \textit{e7}?!?

A possible improvement is to seek sanctuary in the ending: 20...\textit{wd7} 21 \textit{xf6 xf5} 22 \textit{xf5 gxf6} 23 \textit{ed1} with equal chances.

21 \textit{e5}! \textit{g8 (46)}
22 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{\textbf{x}}}}} \text{xf6} \)

White has the luxury of another line that preserves an advantage: 22 \( \textscr{h} \text{c1} \text{xf1} \) 23 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}f6} \) (23 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{h}}}e8 \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}xe8} \) 24 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}xe8} \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}e8} \) 25 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}xf6 \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{g}}}xf6} \) 26 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}xd5} \pm \) 23...\( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}xf6} \) 24 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}xf6} \) 25 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{h}}}xd5} \pm \) (analysis by Borg).

22 ... \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}xf6} \)

23 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{h}}}xd5} \) \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}e8} \)

24 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}d7}?! \)

After this move it is clear that White has managed to establish a commanding position, although it will take time to convert to victory. However, the strongest remedy against the prospect of exchanging queens is to allow the other rook to take up residence on the seventh rank: 24 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}c7} \) \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}xb2} \) (24...\( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}d8} \) 25 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{h}}}xd8} \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}d8} \) 26 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}d7} \) \( \rightarrow \) 25 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}c4} \) g6? 26 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}xg6}+ \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}xg6} \) 27 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}f5}+ \) \( \rightarrow \).

24 ... \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}e5} \)

25 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{w}}}xe5} \)

26 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}xb7} \)

To exploit the initiative to the utmost, Black should be forced into complete passivity: 27 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}c4} \) \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}f8} \) 28 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}xb7} \) \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}d4} \) 29 f3 when a queenside pawn will romp home to promotion.

26 ... \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{g}}}6} \)

27 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}c4} \)

28 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{h}}}d1} \)

A stubborn manoeuvre which shields the king and protects the g-pawn after the bishop takes on f7.

29 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}d7} \)

30 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}xf7} \)

31 g3 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}c2} \)

32 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{g}}}g2} \)

33 a5

The task is easy after 32...\( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{x}}}xb2} \)

33 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{a}}}a7} \) 34 a4 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{a}}}a1} \) 37 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{f}}}f6} \) winning.

35 ... \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{e}}}e1} \)

36 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}c7} \)

37 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{h}}}h3} \)

38 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}c4} \)

39 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}d7} \)

\( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)

**Game 16**

Sveshnikov-Razuvaev

*Belgrade 1988*

1 e4 e6

2 d4 d5

3 e5 c5

4 c3 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}c6} \)

5 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}f3} \)

6 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{d}}}d3} \)

\( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textbf{c}}}xd4} \)
7 cxd4  
8 0-0  
9 Qxd4  
10 Qc3  a6

Tal introduced this move, which has the virtue of ruling out Qb5.

11 We2 (47)

This is an important moment for White. For some time the alternatives were the trusted continuations. However, theory has evolved to the point where the text is accepted as being the best chance for the initiative, as the rook is free to hassle the queen from d1 and the e-pawn is preserved. The other paths are:

a) 11 Wh1 and now:
   a1) 11...Qe7 12 f4 g6? (12...Qc6 13 a3! ±; 12...0-0-0 13 We2 Qb6 14 Qe3 d4 15 Qc1 Qb8 is unclear – Schwarz) 13 We2 Qb6 14 Qe3 Qd8 15 Qf2 Qc6 16 Qb6 Qc8 17 f5! Qxe5 18 fxe5 Qxe6 19 Qf6 Qxd3 20 Qxh8 Qc6 21 Qd4 Qc4 22 Qe3 Qc8 23 Qad1 Qxb2 24 Qxd5 Qxd1 25 Qf6+ Qe7 26 Qa3+ 1-0 Wade-Cafferty, British Ch 1957.
   a2) 11...Qxe5 12 Qe1 (12 f4 Qd6 13 Qe3 Qe7 14 Qd4 Qf6 15 Qe5 Qxe5 16 fxe5 Qxe5 17 Qg4 h5 18 Qb4 Qe7 ± Wade-Menvielle, Palma de Mallorca 1966) 12...Qd6 13 Qf3 Qe7 14 Qf4 Qb6 15 Qg3 Qf6 16 Qe5 Qf8 17 Qac1 Qe8 18 Qe2 Qxc1 19 Qxc1 Qe8 20 Qc7 Qb5 21 Qc8 f6 22 Qd4 Wa5 with an equal position, Brinck-Claussen-Sørensen, Copenhagen 1989.

b) 11 Qe1 and now:
   b1) 11...Qe7 12 Qe3 (12 Qe2 Qxe5 13 Qf4 Qf6 14 Qb3 e5? 15 Qxb7! Qc6 16 Qc7 ± Natapov-Karlsson, USSR 1972) 12...Qxe5 13 Qf3 Qg6 14 Qxg6 hxg6 15 Qf4 Qh5 16 g4 Qh3 17 Qxh3 Qxh3 18 Qxd5 Qc8 with unclear play; Parkanyi-Anka, Budapest 1990.
   b2) 11...Qb4? 12 Qe3 Qxe5 13 Qc5 Qf4 14 Qxd5 +–.
   b3) 11...Qb6 12 We2 (12 Qg4?!) 12...Qe7 13 Qg5 Qc6 14 Qad1 Qe7 15 Qc1 0-0-0 16 a3 f6 17 exf6 gxf6 18 b4 ± McDonald-McKay, Scotland 1988.

11 ...  Qe7

The knight heads for c6 to put immediate pressure on e5 and prepare ...Qb4 to exchange on d3. The alternative treatments are not so forcing:

a) 11...Qb4?! 12 Qd1 Qe7 (12...Qb6 13 Qg4 ±) 13 Qxa6 Qb6 14 Qd3 0-0 15 Qe3 Qc7 16 Qh5 g6 17 Qh4 Qc6 18 f4 Qe7 19 Qh6 ± Rozentalis-Neveryov, Odessa 1989.
b) 11...\(\text{Wh4}\) 12 f4 \(\text{Qh6}\) 13 \(\text{Ae3}\) \(\text{Cc8}\) 14 \(\text{Af3}\) \(\text{Cc5}\) 15 \(\text{Axc5}\) \(\text{Bxc5}\) 16 \(\text{Aaf1}\) \(\text{We7}\) 17 \(\text{Ahh3}\) \(\text{Df5}\) 18 \(\text{Wf2}\) \(\text{Ae6}\) 19 g4 d4 20 \(\text{Axd1}\) \(\text{Dxe3}\) 21 \(\text{Axe3}\) dxe3 22 \(\text{Wxe3}\) \(\text{Aa5}\) 23 a3 g6 ½-½ Rozentalis-Epishin, USSR Ch 1990.

c) 11...\(\text{Cc8}\) and now:

c1) 12 a3 g6 13 \(\text{Gh1}\) \(\text{Gg7}\) 14 f4 \(\text{Wf7}\) 15 \(\text{Ae3}\) \(\text{Wb8}\) 16 \(\text{Wi2}\) \(\text{Ae6}\) 17 \(\text{Aae1}\) \(\text{De7}\) 18 \(\text{Ae5}\) h5 19 \(\text{Ab4}\) \(\text{Wd8}\) 20 \(\text{De2}\) 0-0 21 \(\text{Wf7}\) \(\text{Ae8}\) 22 \(\text{Dd4}\) \(\text{Cc8}\) 23 \(\text{Wxb7}\) a5 24 \(\text{Axd6}\) + Pirrot-Maiwald, Bad Wörishofen, 1991.

c2) 12 \(\text{Ad1}\) \(\text{Ae5}\) 13 \(\text{Ac2}\) (13 \(\text{Axe6}\) \(\text{Wxf2+}\) 14 \(\text{Wxf2}\) \(\text{Axf2}\) + 15 \(\text{Wxf2}\) bxa6 =) 13...\(\text{Wh4}\) 14 g3 \(\text{Wd7} =\) Cuartas-Mecking, Bogota 1977.

c3) 12 \(\text{Qh1}\) \(\text{Cc5}\) 13 \(\text{Gg5}\) h6 14 \(\text{Axd2}\) \(\text{De7}\) 15 \(\text{Aac1}\) (perhaps 15 f4!? 15...\(\text{Wh4}\) 16 f4 \(\text{Qf5}\) 17 \(\text{Axf5}\) exf5 18 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{Aa7}\) 19 \(\text{Qxd5}\) 0-0 = Padevsky-Darga, Siegen OL 1970.

d) 11...\(\text{Wa7}\) 12 \(\text{Qh1}\) \(\text{Cc5}\) 13 f4 ± Lane-Sims, Cardiff 1981.

12 \(\text{Qh1}\)

A necessary precaution as the e-pawn has to be supported, otherwise Black has a comfortable game. For example: 12 \(\text{Ad1}\) \(\text{Wh4}\) (12...\(\text{Cc6}\) 13 \(\text{Axa6}\) \(\text{Bxe5}\) 14 \(\text{Axh7}\) \(\text{Bxe2}\) 15 \(\text{Axe2}\) \(\text{Aa7}\) 16 \(\text{Axc6}\) \(\text{Axc6}\) =) 13 g3 \(\text{Wb4}\) 14 \(\text{Axd2}\) \(\text{Wb6}\) 15 b4 \(\text{Cc6}\) 16 a3 \(\text{Wc7}\) 17 f4 \(\text{Qd4}\) 18 \(\text{Wf2}\) \(\text{Dd3}\) 19 \(\text{Aa2}\) \(\text{Axd2}\) 20 \(\text{Wxd2}\) + Ozanne-Bauza, Novi Sad OL 1990.

12...\(\text{Dc6}\)

White obtained an advantage in the game Formanek-Byrne, Atlanta 1967, after 12...\(\text{Wh4}\) 13 f4 \(\text{Cc6}\) 14 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{Qf5}\) 15 \(\text{Axf5}\) \(\text{Axb4}\) 16 \(\text{Aad2}\) \(\text{Axc3}\) 17 \(\text{Axc3}\) exf5 18 \(\text{Wc2}\) \(\text{Wg4}\) 19 \(\text{Axb4}\) ±. If 12...\(\text{Gg6}\)? to hit e5 then the knight soon becomes a liability: 13 f4 \(\text{Wb6}\) 14 f5 exf5 15 \(\text{Qxd5}\) \(\text{Aa5}\) 16 \(\text{Ae4}\) \(\text{Ac6}\) 17 \(\text{Ad1}\) \(\text{Cc8}\) 18 \(\text{Cc5}\) 19 b4! \(\text{Axb4}\) 20 \(\text{Aa6}\) \(\text{Wd4}\) 21 \(\text{Dc7}\) + \(\text{Gd7}\) 22 \(\text{Axe6}\) fxe6 23 \(\text{Wc4}\) \(\text{Whd8}\) 24 \(\text{Cc5}\) + 0-0 C.Hawthorne-Boyne, Paimonton 1983.

13 f4 \(\text{Qd4}\)

On 13...\(\text{Cc5}\) comes 14 a3! (14 \(\text{Aad2}\) \(\text{Qb4}\) 15 \(\text{Af3}\) \(\text{Qxd3}\) 16 \(\text{Axd3}\) \(\text{Wf2}\) 17 \(\text{Wg4}\) 0-0 0-0 18 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{Aa7}\) 19 \(\text{Axd1}\) \(\text{Cc6}\) + Zila-Borsov, Budapest 1990) 14...\(\text{Aa7}\) 15 \(\text{Aad2}\) g6 16 \(\text{Af3}\) \(\text{Wb6}\) 17 \(\text{Ae3}\) \(\text{Wc7}\) 18 \(\text{Axa7}\) \(\text{Axa7}\) 19 \(\text{Wf2}\) with reasonable chances for both sides; Luchan-McEntee, Chicago 1989.

14 \(\text{Axd1}\)

Not 14 \(\text{Ab1}\) ?! \(\text{Ac4}\) 15 \(\text{Axd1}\) d4 16 \(\text{Axc4}\) \(\text{Ab5}\) 17 \(\text{Ae1}\) d3 + Miles-Wise, British Junior Ch 1970.

14...\(\text{Qxd3}\)

The principal argument against 14...\(\text{Cc5}\) is line 'c', with which White secures an enduring edge in the endgame:

a) 15 \(\text{Axb5}\)? \(\text{Wf2}\) 16 \(\text{Axd7+}\) \(\text{Axd7}\) 17 \(\text{Wg4}\) \(\text{Qd3}\) 18 h3 h5 19 \(\text{Wxg7}\) \(\text{Bag8}\) 20 \(\text{Wxf7+}\) \(\text{Qd8}\) +.

b) 15 \(\text{Axa6}\) \(\text{Wf2}\) 16 \(\text{Wxf2}\) (16 \(\text{Ab5}\) \(\text{Axe2}\) 17 \(\text{Axe2}\) =) 16...\(\text{Wxf2}\) (Ogradzij-Draško, Skopje 1992) 17 \(\text{Ae2}\) 0-0 (17...\(\text{Gd7}\) 18 f5!) 18 \(\text{Axd2}\) (intending \(\text{Cc4}\)) 18...\(\text{Cc6}\) 19
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\begin{quote}
\textbf{hab1 $\text{Qd}e3$ 20 $\text{Hdc1}$ $\text{Hfc8}$ is unclear (Draško).}

c) 15 $\text{Hxh7}$ $\text{Wf2}$ 16 $\text{Wxf2}$ $\text{Qxf2}$ 17 $\text{Qb1}$ $\text{Qe7}$ 18 $\text{h3}$ $\text{Hac8}$ 19 $\text{f5}$ exf5 20 $\text{Hf1}$ $\pm$ Blasek-Kishnev, Gelsenkirchen 1991.

15 $\text{Hxd3}$ $\text{Wc4}$

The retreat 15...$\text{Wb6}$ is aimed at nullifying White's attack by shielding the queen behind the rest of Black's forces:

a) 16 $\text{Qe3}$ $\text{Qc5}$ 17 $\text{Hxc5}$ $\text{Wxc5}$ 18 $\text{f5}$ (18 $\text{Wd2}$ 0-0? {18...$\text{Qc6}$ 19 $\text{Qf1}$} 19 $\text{Qxd5!}$ $\text{Qb5}$ 20 b4 $\text{Wa7}$ 21 $\text{Qe7}$ $\text{Wf8}$ 22 $\text{Hh3}$ b6 23 $\text{f5}$ $\text{Wxe7}$ 24 f6 $\text{Hfd8}$ 25 $\text{Qc2}$ 1-0 Rogovskoi-Kolomoitsev, Volgograd 1989) 18...$\text{Qc6}$! (18...exf5 19 $\text{Qxd5}$ $\text{Qb5}$ 20 $\text{Wf3}$ $\text{Wxe3}$ 21 $\text{Qc7}$ $\text{Qe7}$ 22 $\text{Qd5}$ $\text{Wf8}$ 23 $\text{Hxe3}$ g6 24 e6 =; 18...d4 19 b4! $\text{Wc7}$ {19...$\text{Wxb4}$ 20 $\text{Qe4}$ is unclear} 20 $\text{Hd1}$ $\text{dxc3}$ 21 $\text{Hxd7}$ $\text{Wxd7}$ 22 $\text{Hxd7}$ $\text{Qxd7}$ =) 19 $\text{Wg4}$ 0-0-0 20 $\text{fxe6}$ fxe6 21 $\text{Qe2}$ (21 $\text{Qa4}$!? $\text{Wa5}$ {21...$\text{Wf7}$ 22 $\text{Qb6}$ $\text{Qe7}$ 23 $\text{Wd4}$} 22 $\text{Qc1}$ $\text{b8}$ 23 $\text{Qc5}$ d4 =) 21...$\text{Qb8}$ 22 $\text{Qd4}$ $\text{Qc8}$ 23 h3 $\text{Wf7}$ 24 $\text{Qf3}$ $\text{Qd7}$ 25 $\text{Qb3}$ = Pirrot-Müller, Bundesliga 1989/90.

b) 16 a4 g6 17 f5 $\text{gxf5}$ 18 $\text{Hxd5}$ $\text{Qc6}$ 19 a5 $\text{Wc7}$ 20 $\text{Hd3}$ $\text{Hg8}$ 21 $\text{Hg3}$ $\text{Hxg3}$ 22 $\text{hxg3}$ 0-0-0 $\mp$ Dyke-Henly, New York 1989.

16 $\text{b3}$ $\text{Wc7}$

17 $\text{Qb2}$ $\text{Qc6}$

A game Wallyn-Mednis, Cannes 1992, saw another approach: 17...$\text{b5}$ (17...$\text{Hc8}$ 18 f5!) 18 $\text{Qc1}$ (18 $\text{Wf2}$ b4 19 $\text{Qe2}$? $\text{Wc2}$!?) 18...$\text{Wb7}$ 19 $\text{Wd2}$ (19 f5! b4 {19...$\text{Hg8}$ 20 $\text{fxe6}$ fxe6 21 $\text{Wh5}$+ g6 22 $\text{Wxh7}$ $\text{Qg7}$ 23 $\text{Wh8}$ $\text{Qc6}$ 24 $\text{Qe2}$ $\mp$; 19...$\text{Qe7}$ 20 f6 $\mp$; 19...$\text{Qc8}$ 20 $\text{Qf1}$ $\mp$) 20 $\text{Qxd5}$ exd5 21 e6 fxe6 22 f6 $\text{Qc8}$ {22...$\text{g6}$ 23 $\text{Qf7}$+ $\mp$; 22...$\text{gxf6}$ 23 $\text{Hh5}$+ $\text{Qe7}$ 24 $\text{Hh4}$ $\text{Qg8}$ 25 $\text{Wxf6}$+ $\text{Qe8}$ 26 $\text{Wxh7}$++) 23 $\text{Qf1}$ $\text{Qd8}$ 24 $\text{fxg7}$ $\text{Qxg7}$ 25 $\text{Qxg7}$ $\text{Qg8}$ 26 $\text{Wf5}$ $\text{Qc6}$ 27 $\text{Qdf3}$ $\text{Qe8}$ 28 $\text{Qh6}$ $\text{Qc7}$ 29 $\text{Wd4}$ $\text{Wb6}$?! {29...$\text{Qa5}$ is unclear} 30 $\text{Hh4}$+ $\text{Qe8}$ 31 $\text{Qf8}$ $\text{Qxf8}$ 32 $\text{Qxf8}$ $\text{Qd7}$ 33 $\text{Qf4}$ $\text{Qg6}$ 34 $\text{Wf6}$ $\text{Qc8}$ 35 $\text{Wg7}$+ $\mp$ Molokhin-Pechkin, Volvograd 1993) 19...$\text{Qc8}$! 20 $\text{Hd1}$ $\text{Qe7}$ 21 f5!? b4 22 $\text{Qxd5}$ exd5 23 f6 $\text{Qe6}$ 24 fxe7 $\text{Wxe7}$ 25 $\text{Hg3}$ g6 $\mp$. Byrne and Mednis only consider 18 f5? b4 19 $\text{Qd1}$ $\text{b5}$ winning but I believe there is significant room for improvement on White's play: 18 f5! b4 19 fxe6! fxe6 20 $\text{Qxd5}$ exd5 21 e6 and now:

a) 21...$\text{b5}$ 22 $\text{Wg5}$+ g6 23 $\text{Wxd5}$ $\text{Qc6}$ 24 $\text{Qc1}$ $\text{Qxd5}$ (24...$\text{Qc8}$ 25 $\text{Qxc6}$! $\text{Wxc6}$ 26 $\text{Wd7}$++) 25 $\text{Qxc6}$ $\text{Qe4}$ 26 $\text{Qdd7}$ $\text{Qg8}$ 27 e7 $\text{Qg7}$ (27...$\text{Qh6}$ 28 $\text{Qf6}$! {intending $\text{Hd8}$+ and $\text{e8W}$+} 28...$\text{Qf7}$ 29 e8$\text{W}$+! $\text{Qxe8}$ 30 $\text{Qe7}$++) 28 $\text{Qxg7}$ $\text{Qxg7}$ 29 $\text{Qd8}$+ $\text{Hxd8}$ 30 exd8$\text{W}$+ $\text{Qxd8}$ 31 $\text{Hxg7}$++.

b) 21...$\text{Qc6}$ 22 $\text{Qc1}$ 0-0-0 23 $\text{Qf3}$ (23 $\text{Qd3}$? $\text{Qb7}$ 24 $\text{Qdc2}$ d4 25 $\text{Qxc6}$ $\text{Qxc6}$ 26 $\text{Qxc6}$ $\text{Qxc6}$ 27 $\text{Qxa6}$+ $\text{Qd5}$ 28 $\text{Qc4}$+ $\text{Qe5}$ 29 $\text{Qe7}$+ $\text{Qd6}$ 30 $\text{Qxg7}$+ $\text{Qxe6}$ 31 $\text{Qxd4}$ $\text{Qhf8}$ 32 g3 =; 24...$\text{Qd6}$ 25 $\text{Qe5}$}
\[ \text{x}e6 \text{26 } \text{x}c7 \text{x}e2 \text{27 } \text{x}e2 \text{ } c7 \\
28 \text{e}c2 +; 24... \text{a}c8 \text{25 } \text{x}c6 \\
\text{w}x6 \text{26 } \text{x}c6 \text{ } \text{x}c6 \text{27 } \text{e}7 + \rightarrow \)

\text{23...d}d6 (23... \text{b}b8 \text{24 } \text{f}7 \text{ } \text{b}5 \text{25 } \text{w}x5 +; 23... \text{b}7 \text{24 } \text{f}7 \text{ } \text{e}7 \text{25 } \text{e} \text{e}5 \text{d}6 \text{26 } \text{x}d6 \text{w}x6 \text{d}6 \text{27 } \text{x}c6!
\text{c}x6 \text{28 } \text{w}x6+ \text{c}5 \text{29 } \text{w}a7+ \text{c}6 \\
30 \text{c}x7 +; 24 \text{w}x6+ \text{b}7 (\text{or} 24... \text{b}b8 \text{25 } \text{e}5 \text{ } \text{b}5 \text{26 } \text{x}f8+ \\
\text{xf}8 \text{27 } \text{x}d6 \text{f}1+ \text{28 } \text{xf}1 \text{w}x6 \text{d}6 \text{29 } \text{x}d6+ +; 24... \text{d}8 \text{25 } \text{f}7 \text{ } \text{e}7 \\
26 \text{e}5 \text{b}7 \text{27 } \text{x}d6+ \text{x}d6+ \text{28 } \text{x}c6 \text{x}c7 \text{29 } \text{x}c7 \text{e}6 \{29... \text{e}8 \\
30 \text{e}7+ \text{e}8 \text{31 } \text{c}8+ +} \text{30 } \text{a}7 \\
\text{c}8 \text{31 } \text{x}g7 \text{g}8 \text{32 } \text{f}6+ \text{e}8 \\
33 \text{a}8 +; \text{25 } \text{w}x7+ \text{x}b7+ \text{26 } \\
\text{f}7+ \text{a}8 (26... \text{a}6 \text{27 } \text{d}4; \\
26... \text{b}8 \text{27 } \text{e}5) \text{27 } \text{e}7 \text{ } \text{e}7 \text{28 } \text{x}e7 \pm \text{is analysis by Lane and Ady.}

18 \text{c}1 \text{ } \text{d}8 \\
\text{Black must be constantly on guard against the familiar theme of undermining d5: 18... } \text{e}7 \text{19 f5! } \pm.

19 \text{w}f2 \text{ } \text{e}7 \\
20 \text{c}e2 \text{ } 0-0 \\
21 \text{d}4 \\
\text{White continues to manoeuvre with great verve and prepares for an attack based around the advance f5.}

21 ... \text{w}d7 \\
22 \text{f}5 \text{exf5 (48)} \\
23 \text{g}3!

The final phase of the attack commences; the major pieces are transferred to the kingside to storm the monarch's citadel. Now 23... \text{h}4 can be rejected in view of 24 \text{x}g7+ \text{x}g7 \text{25 } \text{xh4 (intending wff6+ and}

\text{xf5) 25...f6 } \text{26 } \text{e}6 \text{w}c7 \text{27 } \text{e}7 \text{w}x7 \\
28 \text{xf5} +; .

If instead 23 \text{xf5}, Black can confuse the issue by 23...d4! 24 \text{xd4 } \text{w}e6 which activates the light-squared bishop.

23 ... \text{g}6 \\
24 \text{w}f4 \\
\text{Another direct move which threatens wh6 and } \text{h}3.

24 ... \text{f}e8 \\
25 \text{xf5 } \text{f}8 \\
26 \text{d}4 \text{e}6 \\
\text{The rook thwarts a future e6 which would release the bishop. On}

26...f6!? comes 27 \text{exf6 } \text{e}4 28 \text{xe7+ (28 } \text{w}f2 \text{ } \text{e}8 \text{with counterplay) 28... } \text{f7 } \text{29 } \text{w}f2 \text{with a clear plus for White.}

27 \text{h}6+ \text{ } \text{x}h6 \\
\text{There is nothing to be gained from 27...g7 when 28 } \text{f}1 \text{seals}

Black's fate.

28 \text{w}xh6 \text{e}8 \\
29 \text{f}1 \text{c}7 \\
30 \text{h}3 \text{f}5 \\
31 \text{xf6 } \text{f}7 (49)
A classy finish is available after
31...e1 32 \textit{wxh7}+! \textit{wxh7} 33 f7+
\textit{xf7} 34 \textit{h8}#.
32 \textit{wxh7}+! \text{ 1-0}
Modern practitioners of the Advance have often adopted the positional 6 \( \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}e2 \) to claim a slight advantage without undue risk. It has been incorporated into the repertoires of such players as Bronstein, Kosten and Nunn. The line has a reputation for the middlegame to drift into equality if White is not accurate.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{50} \\
B \\
\end{array}
\]

Game 17
Nunn-Schmittdie1
Dortmund 1991

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 dxe5
5 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}f3} \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}c6}
6 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}e2} (50)

The bishop is developed on e2 in order to keep d4 over-protected. If left undisturbed, White intends a gradual build-up of forces which would benefit from the extra space afforded by the Advance Variation.

6 ... cxd4

The double-edged alternative 6...\texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}h6} is examined in Game 19, Kosten-Brunner. There are a number of dubious possibilities:

a) 6...\texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}g77} 7 dxc5! \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}c7} (after 7...\texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}xc5} 8 b4 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}b6} 9 b5 Keres claimed that White is much better) 8 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}d4} \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}xe5}? (8...\texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}xe5} 9 0-0 \pm) 9 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}b5} \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}xc5} 10 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}d4} \leftarrow Euwe-Kramer, Zaandam 1946.

b) 6...f6 7 0-0 fxe5 (7...\texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}d7} \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}a3}) 8 dxe5! g6 (8...\texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}ge7} 9 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}d3}?! \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}g6} 10 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}e1} \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}d7} 11 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}e2} 0-0-0 \pm Lane-Mitchell-Baker, London 1981) 9 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}e1} \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}h6} 10 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}a3} \pm Mackenzie-Gunsberg, Frankfurt 1887.

c) 6...\texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}d7} 7 0-0 and now:

c1) 7...\texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}c8} 8 dxc5 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}xc5} 9 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}bd2} (9 b4 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}f8} 10 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}a3} \pm Antoshin-Bannik, USSR 1955) 9...\texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}c7} 10 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}b3} \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}b6} 11 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}f4} \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}ge7} 12 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}e1} f5 13 h4 0-0 14 h5 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}d8} 15 h6 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}f7} 16 \texttt{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textsf{\textbf{\textup{\textast}}}}}xg7}
8 ... \text{\textit{\text{f5}}}

9 \text{\textit{\text{a4}} (51)}

To deflect pressure off d4. Less convincing is 9 \textit{f1} when Black can play:

a) 9...\textit{d7}!? 10 \textit{a4} \textit{w5} 11 \textit{d2} \textit{w8} 12 \textit{f4} \textit{f6} 13 \textit{d3}! \textit{fxd4} 14 \textit{exd4} \textit{exd4} 15 \textit{w5}+ \textit{e7} 16 \textit{e3} \textit{xa4} 17 \textit{xd4} \textit{e8} 18 \textit{w3} with unclear play; Dunhaupt-Khasin, corr. 1975-77.

b) 9...\textit{e7} 10 \textit{h4} \textit{h5} 11 \textit{g3} \textit{d7} 12 \textit{a4} \textit{w8} 13 \textit{f4} \textit{g6} 14 \textit{e1} \textit{c8} = Hecht-Pietzsch, Germany 1964.

c) 9...\textit{h5} 10 \textit{h4} \textit{d7} 11 \textit{a4} \textit{w8} 12 \textit{g3} \textit{e7} 13 \textit{f4} \textit{c8} 14 \textit{e1} \textit{a5} 15 \textit{c5} 0-0 16 \textit{b4} \textit{xc5} 17 \textit{dxc5} 18 \textit{g2} \textit{b5} 19 \textit{d4} \textit{xd4} 20 \textit{wxd4} \textit{f6} 21 \textit{whe1} \textit{fxe5} 22 \textit{xe5} \textit{exe5} 23 \textit{exe5} \textit{w5} 24 \textit{w4} \textit{f6} 25 \textit{wxf6} \textit{gxf6} 26 \textit{xd1} \textit{e5} 27 \textit{w3d3} \textit{c3} — Lane-Dighton, London 1981.

d) 9...\textit{fxd4}!? and now:

d1) 10 \textit{exe3} \textit{wxb2} 11 \textit{xd5} \textit{exe2}+! 12 \textit{exe2} \textit{exe2} 13 \textit{c7+} \textit{d7} 14 \textit{xa8} \textit{d3} 15 \textit{d4} \textit{b4} 16 \textit{a4} \textit{xd4} 17 \textit{xd4} \textit{b6} 18 \textit{c3} \textit{a6} – Schuermans-Claesen, Belgian Ch 1987.

d2) 10 \textit{a4} \textit{w4} 11 \textit{d2} \textit{w7} 12 \textit{g5} \textit{f6} 13 \textit{exe6} \textit{gxf6} 14 \textit{exd4} \textit{fxg5} 15 \textit{h5}+ \textit{d8} 16 \textit{w1} \textit{xd4} 17 \textit{wxd4} \textit{g7} and in Boey's opinion Black is better.

9 ... \textit{w5+}

9...\textit{b4}+ 10 \textit{d2} \textit{w5} transposes to the text.

8 ... \text{\textit{\text{c3}}}

The alternative 8 b3 is studied in the next game.

7 \textit{cxd4} \textit{h6}

A transposition normally occurs after 7...\textit{d7} 8 \textit{c3}.

However, White has an extra option available. Play may continue 8 \textit{d3}! (8...\textit{xa3} is no longer possible) 8...\textit{d5} 9 \textit{c2} \textit{b4+} (9...\textit{h5} 10 0-0 \textit{d7} 11 \textit{g5} \textit{e7} 12 \textit{exe7} \textit{exe7} 13 \textit{w2} 14 \textit{w2} \textit{a5} 14 \textit{d3} \textit{fxd4} 15 \textit{fxd4} \textit{fxd4} 16 \textit{e3} += P. Morris-S. Morris, Dublin 1991) 10 \textit{f1} \textit{e7} 11 \textit{h4} (11 \textit{g3} 12 \textit{g2} \textit{h5} 13 \textit{h3} += Klaman-Chistiakov, USSR 1949) 11...\textit{f6} 12 \textit{g4} \textit{fxd4} (12...\textit{h6} 13 \textit{exf6} —) 13 \textit{cxd4} \textit{fxc5} 14 \textit{xc6} bxc6 15 \textit{exe5} 0-0 16 \textit{f4} \textit{d6} 17 \textit{c4} \textit{wc7} 18 \textit{xd6} \textit{wxd6} 19 \textit{g2} 2-0 Bronstein-Borges, USSR 1988.

Lesser known alternatives are:

a) 7...\textit{b4+} 8 \textit{f1}! 9 \textit{d7} 9 \textit{a3} \textit{e7} 10 \textit{c3} \textit{f6} 11 \textit{b4} \textit{c8} 12 \textit{a4} \textit{w8} 13 \textit{h4} \textit{b6} 14 \textit{h3} \textit{f8} 15 \textit{f4} += Dückstein-Lombard, Austria 1974.

b) 7...\textit{d7} 8 \textit{c3} \textit{h6} 9 \textit{a3}! \textit{f5} 10 \textit{a4} \textit{w8} 11 \textit{h4} += Hübnner-Dückstein, Clare Benedict 1972.

8 \text{\textit{c3}}

The alternative 8 b3 is studied in the next game.
11 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b5} \)

Black has tried other moves here:

a) 11...\( \text{x} \text{c}3+ \) 12 \( \text{x} \text{c}3 \) \( \text{w} \text{b6} \)
(12...\( \text{w} \text{b}4 \) is met by 13 a3!\) 13 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{b5} \)
(the line 13 \( \text{a}4!? \) \( \text{w} \text{a}5+ \) 14 \( \text{f}1 \) is unclear according to Keres) 13...\( \text{d} \text{d}7 \) 14 \( \text{c} \text{c}6 \) \( \text{c} \text{c}6 \) \( \text{w} \text{d}2 \) ±
Gurtner-Jurkovic, Geneva 1991) 14
\( \text{c} \text{c}6 \) \( \text{w} \text{x} \text{b}2 \) 15 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{w} \text{x} \text{b}4+ \) 16 \( \text{w} \text{d}2 \)
\( \text{x} \text{d}2+ \) 17 \( \text{c} \text{x} \text{d}2 \) \( \text{b} \text{x} \text{c}6 \) 18 \( \text{c} \text{c}5! \) ±
Nimzowitsch-Stahlberg, 1934.

b) 11...\( \text{d} \text{d}7 \) 12 a3! \( \text{c} \text{c}3+ \) 13
\( \text{c} \text{c} \text{c}3 \) 0-0 (13...\( \text{c} \text{h}5 \) 14 0-0 \( \text{c} \text{c}8 \) 15
\( \text{w} \text{d}2 \) with a distinct plus for White;
Nimzowitsch-Spielmann, Stockholm 1920) 14 0-0 \( \text{c} \text{c} \text{c} \text{c}8 \) 15 b4 ±

c) 11...a6!? 12 g4 \( \text{f} \text{f}7 \) 13 0-0
\( \text{c} \text{c}7 \) 14 \( \text{x} \text{d}4 \) \( \text{w} \text{x} \text{d}4 \) 15 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 16 h3
\( \text{g} \text{g}6 \) 17 \( \text{c} \text{c}6 \) 18 b4 \( \text{d} \text{d}8 \) 19 \( \text{w} \text{d}2 \)
\( \text{d} \text{h}4 \) 20 \( \text{w} \text{f}4 \) ±

12 \( \text{a}3 \)
13 \( \text{c} \text{c} \text{c}3 \)
14 \( \text{a} \text{x} \text{b}4 \)
15 \( \text{a} \text{b}5 \)

The best chance for success.

Other continuations make fewer demands on Black's forces:

a) 15 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{d} \text{d}7 \) (15...\( \text{w} \text{x} \text{a}4 \) 16
\( \text{x} \text{a}4 \) \( \text{d} \text{d}7 \) 17 g4 \( \text{f} \text{f}7 \) 18 0-0 0-0 19
\( \text{f} \text{a}1 \) \( \text{a} \text{b} \) 18 16 \( \text{w} \text{x} \text{b}4 \) \( \text{x} \text{b}4 \) 17 0-0
\( \text{c} \text{c}2! \) 18 \( \text{a} \text{d}1 \) \( \text{e} \text{e}7 \) 19 \( \text{a} \text{d}2 \) \( \text{b} \text{b}4 \) 20
\( \text{a} \text{a}1 \) a5! ± Dushak-Voronkov, corr. 1973.

b) 15 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{x} \text{b}2 \) 16 \( \text{a} \text{b}5 \) 0-0 17
\( \text{d} \text{d}7 \) 18 \( \text{a} \text{a}1 \) \( \text{x} \text{e}5! \) 19 \( \text{b} \text{b}1 \)
\( \text{a} \text{f} \text{f}3+ \) 20 \( \text{g} \text{f}3 \) \( \text{x} \text{b}1 \) 21 \( \text{x} \text{b}1 \)
\( \text{a} \text{b}8 \) 22 \( \text{a} \text{a}1 \) \( \text{a} \text{x} \text{b}5 \) 23 \( \text{a} \text{x} \text{b}5 \) \( \text{a} \text{x} \text{b}5 \)
and Black is better according to Hutchings.

15 ...
16 \( \text{c} \text{x} \text{c}6 \)

Also worthy of interest is 16
\( \text{a}4 ?! \) \( \text{x} \text{b}2 \) 17 \( \text{x} \text{d}5? ! \) exd5 18 0-0
\( \text{f} \text{f}4 \) 19 \( \text{b} \text{f}1 \) \( \text{x} \text{f}3+ \) 20 \( \text{g} \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c} \text{c}3 \)
21 \( \text{a} \text{c}1 \) \( \text{b} \text{b}4 \) 22 \( \text{a} \text{x} \text{c}6 \) \( \text{w} \text{x} \text{a}4 \) 23
\( \text{x} \text{a}4 \) \( \text{x} \text{c}6 \) 24 \( \text{x} \text{c}6 \) ±
Kupreichik-Ulybin, Moscow 1989.

16 ...
17 \( \text{w} \text{d}2 \) (52)

This position is critical for the future of the line. White can activate
his rooks along the a- and c-files and possibly advance his kingside pawns to keep Black busy on both flanks. Black has play against b2 and a fairly solid position.

17 ... $\text{\&b5}$

A device to temporarily prevent White castling, and misguided encouraging White to exchange pieces to steer the game towards a draw.

Completing development with the obvious 17...0-0 is a less committal strategy:

a) 18 g4 $\text{\&e7}$ 19 0-0 a5 20 $\text{\&e1}$ (20 h4!??) 20...f6 21 $\text{\&c2}$ $\text{\&b6}$ 22 f4 $\text{fxe5}$ 23 $\text{fxe5} = $ Zankovich-Nedochetov, Simferopol 1989.

b) 18 0-0 $\text{\&f8}$ 19 $\text{\&a1}$ and now:

b1) 19...$\text{\&e7}$ 20 $\text{\&c1}$ $\text{\&b7}$ 21 $\text{\&e2}$ $\text{\&b5}$ 22 $\text{\&g3}$ $\text{\&xg3}$ 23 hxg3 ± Dunworth-Bus, Cappelle la Grande 1991.

b2) 19...$\text{\&b5}$ 20 $\text{\&fd1}$ $\text{\&c4}$ 21 g4 $\text{\&h6}$ 22 h3 $\text{\&b6}$ 23 $\text{\&g5}$ $\text{\&b3}$ 24 $\text{\&d1}$ 25 $\text{\&d3}$ 26 $\text{\&e3}$ $\text{\&g7}$ 27 $\text{\&f3}$ $\text{\&c7}$ 28 $\text{\&f4}$ $\text{\&g8}$ 29 $\text{\&a1}$ ± Kamber-Borgstadt, Lugano 1989.

18 $\text{\&xb5}$ $\text{\&xb5}$
19 $\text{\&a5}$ $\text{\&b6}$
20 0-0 0-0
21 $\text{\&c1}$

Naturally, White activates his king's rook in an attempt to control the c-file.

21 ... $\text{\&ab8}$
22 $\text{\&c2}$ h6
23 $\text{\&ac5}$ $\text{\&b7}$
24 g4

Now that the rooks have found strong posts, the second stage of the long-term plan is instigated. The kingside pawns begin an advance to force the knight to retreat and create various attacking possibilities.

24 ... $\text{\&e7}$
25 h4 $\text{\&f8}$

Black is banking on the threat to h2 to curtail White's ambitions.

26 h5 $\text{\&d8}$
27 $\text{\&c1}$ $\text{\&f8}$
28 g5!

Despite the quiet nature of the position, White is pursuing vigorous action on the kingside to provoke weaknesses.

28 ... $\text{\&h7}$
29 $\text{\&f4}$ $\text{\&f5}$
30 $\text{\&c7}$ $\text{\&d8}$
31 $\text{\&c1}$

The rook is maintained on the seventh rank and under the stifled conditions Black is running out of useful moves.

31 ... $\text{\&b3}$
32 $\text{\&c8}$ $\text{\&xc8}$
33 $\text{\&xc8}$ $\text{\&a5}$ (53)
34 $\text{\&c6}$!

This is the culmination of White's strategy. The c-file has proved to be of the utmost importance to infiltrate the heart of Black's camp, while the kingside pawns cover the monarch's escape squares. There is no time to take the knight: 34...$\text{\&xf3}$ (34...$\text{\&e7}$ 35 $\text{\&e8}$ $\text{\&xc8}$ 36 g6+) 35 $\text{\&h8+}$! (certainly not 35 $\text{\&e8}??$ $\text{\&e1+}$ →)
35...\textit{\textit{w}}xh8 36 \textit{\textit{w}}e8+ \textit{\textit{w}}h7 37 g6+ fxg6 38 hxg6#.
34 ... \textit{\textit{w}}a1+
35 \textit{\textit{f}}g2 \textit{\textit{h}}4+
36 \textit{\textit{d}}xh4 1-0

Game 18
Galdunts-Naroditsky
Moscow 1991

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 \textit{\textit{d}}c6
5 \textit{\textit{d}}f3 \textit{\textit{w}}b6
6 \textit{\textit{e}}e2 cxd4
7 cxd4 \textit{\textit{d}}h6
8 b3 (54)

White embarks on a plan to reinforce d4 at the cost of giving up the right to castle.

It is an error to seek a positional treatment by doubling the h-pawns: 8 \textit{\textit{d}}xh6? \textit{\textit{w}}xb2 9 \textit{\textit{d}}bd2 gxh6 10 0-0 \textit{\textit{g}}g7 (or even 10...\textit{\textit{d}}xd4! \textit{\textit{f}}) 11 \textit{\textit{d}}b3 \textit{\textit{w}}a3 and White has insufficient compensation for the pawn;


8 ... \textit{\textit{f}}f5
9 \textit{\textit{b}}b2 \textit{\textit{b}}b4+

Also possible is 9...\textit{\textit{e}}e7 10 0-0 \textit{\textit{d}}d7 11 g4 (11 \textit{\textit{h}}h1 0-0 12 \textit{\textit{d}}d3 \textit{\textit{f}} Lputian; 11 \textit{\textit{d}}d3 g5 {11...\textit{\textit{d}}fxd4 12 \textit{\textit{d}}xd4 \textit{\textit{d}}xd4 13 \textit{\textit{w}}g4 \textit{\textit{c}}c5 14 \textit{\textit{w}}xg7 0-0-0 with unclear play} 12 \textit{\textit{d}}xf5 exf5 13 2c3 \textit{\textit{e}}e6 14 a4 \textit{\textit{d}}d8 with an unclear game according to Hertneck) 11...\textit{\textit{d}}h4 12 \textit{\textit{d}}xh4 \textit{\textit{x}}xh4 13 \textit{\textit{d}}a3 0-0 14 f4 f6 15 \textit{\textit{g}}g2! fxe5 16 dxe5 \textit{\textit{d}}f7! 17 \textit{\textit{d}}d2 \textit{\textit{b}}f8 (Kupreichik-Hertneck, Debrecen 1992) 18 g5 \textit{\textit{w}}b4 19 \textit{\textit{w}}xb4 \textit{\textit{b}}xb4 20 \textit{\textit{d}}c1 d4 21 \textit{\textit{c}}c4! \textit{\textit{d}}d5 (21...h6 22 \textit{\textit{d}}d2 \textit{\textit{d}}c6 23 g6 \textit{\textit{d}}f5 24 \textit{\textit{d}}d3 \textit{\textit{e}}e8 25 \textit{\textit{d}}xf5 \textit{\textit{d}}xf5 26 \textit{\textit{b}}b5 \textit{\textit{d}}xg6 27 \textit{\textit{d}}d6 \textit{\textit{f}}; 21...\textit{\textit{c}}c6+ 22 \textit{\textit{h}}h3 \textit{\textit{g}}g5 23 \textit{\textit{d}}d2! 

→) 22 \textit{\textit{d}}xd5 exd5 23 \textit{\textit{d}}c2! \textit{\textit{b}}b5 24 \textit{\textit{d}}f3 \textit{\textit{e}}e2 25 \textit{\textit{d}}xd4 \textit{\textit{d}}xf3+ 26 \textit{\textit{d}}f3 \textit{\textit{d}}xf4 27 2f4 \textit{\textit{d}}xf4 28 \textit{\textit{c}}c1 \textit{\textit{f}}.

Black chose to develop the queen's bishop in the game Yudasin-Illescas, León 1993: 9...\textit{\textit{d}}d7 10 g4 \textit{\textit{d}}fe7 11 \textit{\textit{c}}c3 \textit{\textit{g}}g6 12 \textit{\textit{w}}d2 f6 (12...\textit{\textit{b}}b4 13 \textit{\textit{c}}c1! intending a3 and
b4 ±; 12...h5 13 g5 with the aim 0-0 and (cb4-c5 ±; 12...g7 13 xc1 followed by cb4-c5 — Yuhasin) 13 cb4 (13 cb3? cbxe5 14 cbxg6+ hxg6 15 dxg5 cb7 ±) 13...cb4!!? (13...cxd5 14 cbxd5 cbxa5 15 xc5 ±; 13...cb7 14 xc1! fxg5 15 cbxe5 cbxe5 16 dxg5 ±; 13...w8d8 14 exf6 cbxf6 15 xc5 is unclear) 14 cbxb6 cbxd2+ 15 cb2 axb6 16 exf6 gxf6 17 h4! h6! (17...cd4 18 cb1 h5 ±; 17...e5 18 dxg5 cbxe5 19 cbh2 intending f4 ±) 18 h5 cd4 19 cb1 cb8 (19...e5 20 dxg5 cbxg4 21 cbh4 cbxh3 22 cbxh4 cdf5 23 cbd4 cbxh4 24 cbxd4 cb6 25 cbxb6?! (25 cb2! cb5 26 cd2! ±) 25...cb4!=.

10 cb1 (55)

The king serenely side-steps the check to ensure the safety of d4. White can solve with the problem of activating the rook by playing h4 followed by cbh3. Another idea is g4, to push back the knight, followed by a pawn storm when the rook is ideally placed on h1. Black often takes advantage of the situation by ...f6 and then utilizing the f-file. This can lead to a direct attack on the king or the undermining of the protection given to d4.

10...

0-0

This is Watson's recommendation and is potentially the most dangerous line available. Less confrontational approaches are feasible:

a) 10...cb7 and now:

a1) 11 h4 cb7d7 (11...h5 12 cb3 intending cbxh5 ±) 12 cb3 (12 g4 cbh6 13 cbg1 f6 with unclear play) 12...cbxd4 13 cbxd5 exd5 14 cbxd4 cbxd4 (14...cb5? 15 e6! cbxd4 15...fxe5 16 cbxh5 cbxh5 17 wxd5±) 16 exd5 cbxh7 17 cb5 cbxh6 18 wb4+ ±) 18 cbx4 (15 wxd4!?) 15...cb5 16 cbxc5 cbxc5 17 cb1 cb5 18 h5!!? (18 cbg4?? cbxe6 19 cbxe6 cb6 19...cb6+ 20 cb2 cbxh6 21 cbh3 0-0 22 cbh3 =) 20 wbh5+ g6 21 wb4 0-0 (with unclear play) 18...h6 19 cbg4 cb6 20 wbh3 0-0 (20...cbxa5 21 f4!!) 21 cbg1 = Kosten-Lputian, Altensteig 1989.

a2) 11 cb3 cbxd8 12 g3 f6 13 cb2 fxe5 14 dxg5 0-0 15 cb1 cb7 (15...b6?! 16 cb5 cb7 17 cb4 ±) 16 cb3 (16 cb5 and cbd4 ±) 16...wb8 (16...g5?! 17 h3 ±) 17 cb2 cb7 18 cb1 cbd8 19 a3 g5 20 h3 cb8 (20...h5 21 a4 g4 22 cbxg4 hgx4 23 cbh2 ++) 21 b4 a6 22 wb2 h6 23 cb1 c4 24 cb4 d3 25 cb1 cbd4
(Sveshnikov-Portisch, Biel IZ 1993) and now 26 \texttt{Wxd3!} gives White the advantage.

b) 10...h5 and now:

b1) 11 \texttt{Qc3 Bxc3 (11...\texttt{Qxd4?} 12 \texttt{Qa4} \texttt{Bd7 13 Qd2}} a5 (Kholmov-Petrosian, USSR Ch 1949) 14 \texttt{h4! =}.

b2) 11 \texttt{h4 Bxd7} (11...h5 12 \texttt{Qb1!? \texttt{Qd7}} 13 b4 \texttt{Qc8 =} Lane-Bowden, London 1981) 12 a3 \texttt{Qe7 13 b4 a6} 14 g3 0-0 15 \texttt{Qg2 f6!?} 16 \texttt{Qc3! \texttt{Qxd4} 17 \texttt{Qxd5 exd5 18 \texttt{Qxd4 fxe5} 19 \texttt{Qf3 \pm Bigot-Watzl, corr. 1954-6.}}

11 \texttt{Qc3}

It used to be assumed that the old main line was unclear after 11 g4 \texttt{Qh6} but exhaustive analysis indicates that Black has a pleasant game. For example:

a) 12 h3 \texttt{Bd7} 13 a3 \texttt{Be7} 14 b4 f6! 15 \texttt{exf6 Bxf6} and now:

a1) 16 \texttt{Qc3?! Baf8} 17 \texttt{Qa4 Qc7} 18 \texttt{Qc1?! (18 Qg2?!) 18...Bxf3!} 19 \texttt{Bxf3 Bf4} 20 \texttt{Qg2 Qxd4} 21 \texttt{Qxd4 Qxa4} 22 \texttt{Qd3 Qc6} 23 \texttt{Qe3 Qf7} 24 \texttt{Qfe1 e5!} 25 b5 exd4 26 \texttt{Qb3 d3} 27 \texttt{Qe3 d4} 28 \texttt{Qxf7+ Qxf7} 29 \texttt{Qxe7+ Qxe7} 30 \texttt{bxc6 bxc6 \pm Franke-Treffler, New York 1975.}

a2) 16 \texttt{Qg2 Baf8} 17 \texttt{Qbd2 Bf7} 18 b5 (18 \texttt{Qf1?!}) 18...\texttt{Qa5} 19 a4 \texttt{Qg5!} 20 \texttt{Af1 Bxf3} 21 \texttt{Bxf3 Qc4} 22 \texttt{Qc1 Qd6 \mp Bönsch-Thormann, E.Germany 1975.}

b) 12 \texttt{Qg1 f6! 13 exf6 Bxf6 14 g5 (14 \texttt{Qc3?!} 14...Bxf3! and now:

b1) 15 \texttt{gxh6 Bf7} 16 \texttt{Qd3 e5} 17 \texttt{Wh5 e4} 18 \texttt{Qe2 Qe6} (18...g6! \mp Botterill) 19 \texttt{Qc3 Bxc3} 20 \texttt{Bxc3 Qxd4} 21 \texttt{We5 Qf5! 22 h5 Qe7} 23 \texttt{Qg4} and now Botterill-Ligterink, London 1978 was agreed drawn, but Botterill felt that 23...d4! 24 \texttt{Qe1 Bf7} 25 \texttt{Qxf5 e5!} 26 f4 dxc3 27 \texttt{Wg5 Qf6} would have left Black clearly better.

b2) 15 \texttt{Bxf3 Qf5} 16 \texttt{Qg4 Qd7} 17 \texttt{Qc3! Qxd4} 18 \texttt{Qxd5 Bb5+} 19 \texttt{Qg2 Qf3} 20 \texttt{Qc7 Qc6!} 21 \texttt{Bxf3 Qxc7} intending ...\texttt{Qc6} and ...\texttt{Qh4+} gives Black the edge according to J.Watson.

11...

12 \texttt{Qa4} \texttt{Wd8} (56)

13 \texttt{h4!}

This is an improvement on the standard reference: 13 a3?! \texttt{Qc7} 14 b4 fxe5 15 dxe5 \texttt{Bd7} \mp Sorokin-Sokolsky, USSR 1951.

Rather than instantly trying to contain Black on the queenside, White signals aggressive intentions.
13 ... fx e5
14 dxe5 e7
15 a d3

White is combining the merits of attack and containment. Now the bishop has more scope and g4 is a real possibility.

15 ... h5
16 a c1 e8
17 a g1 f17

Black has doubled on the f-file but it is still difficult to conjure up counterplay. Another problem is responding to White's increasing influence on the queenside, with the bothersome a5 difficult to prevent.

18 a e2 g6
19 a3 e8
20 h3

The long-term plan is working extremely well. White is gradually closing down the queenside with a3 intending b4, while the rook has emerged on the kingside. All this is designed to severely limit Black's opportunities by forcing cramped conditions.

20 ... a d7
21 a c5 b8
22 b4 a d8
23 b5 a a5
24 a d4

At the moment, the black knight is denying the rook access to g3 so it is logical to liquidate it.

24 ... a xd4
25 a xd4 f4
26 a g3 1-0

Game 19
Kosten-Brunner
Altensteig 1989

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 e5
4 c3 a c6
5 a f3 b b6
6 e2 a h6

This is a sly way to avoid the line given in Game 17, Nunn-Schmittendi by delaying the capture on d4.

Instead of White's next move, the only other option is 7 b3 cxd4 8 cxd4 a5 which is featured in Game 18, Galdunts-Naroditsky.

7 a xh6

The most testing way to treat this move-order. For the sake of doubled h-pawns, Black counts on steering the game towards relatively unfamiliar territory by castling swiftly and following up with ...f6.

7 ... g xh6

Black fell for a trap in the game Survila-Skobilov, Podolsk 1978, after 7 ... a b2? 8 a e3! a xa1 9 a c2 cxd4 10 a xd4 a xd4 11 a xd4 a a3 12 a b5+ a d8 13 0-0 a b2 14 a a4 a e7 15 a a5+ 1-0.

8 a d2 a g7 (57)

It is difficult for Black to get by without following the plan laid out in the text. For example:

a) 8 ... cxd4 9 cxd4 a d7 10 0-0 0-0-0 11 a c3 a a5 12 a f1 a b8 13 a f4 a e8 14 a d3 a c8 15 a c2 a d8
16 aac1 d4c 17 aec2 aeb6 18 aac8+ dac8 19 aag3 aeb6 20 aeh5 aed7 21 aaf6 axf6 22 exf6+ edd6 23 aed5 a6 24 g3 aeg8 25 aec3 axh8 26 aec1 afd8 27 axa6! bxa6 28 ab3+ a8a8 29 axf7! 1-0 Larkin-Georgadze, Spartakiad 1967.

b) 8...axd7 9 0-0 ag7 10 aada3 0-0 11 aed2 cxd4 12 cxd4 f6?! 13 aec3 fxe5 14 axe5 aex5 15 dxe5 axb2 16 a4 aac8 17 aab1 aec3 18 aeb3 b6 19 aed4 aec5 20 aec6 aec3 21 aad3 aec5 22 g4 aec7 23 ab3 aeh8 24 aec1 aec8 25 aec4 aeg8 26 axh1 aec7 27 ag1 aec4 28 g5! ac5 29 aexh6 ag7 30 aef3 aee7 31 axh7 aeh7 32 a6 1-0 Sveshnikov-Filipenko, USSR 1975.

9 0-0 0-0

10 aad3 cxd4

A natural reaction is 10...f6?! to undermine the centre, but in Kupreichik-Khuzman, Sverdlovsk 1987, it was shown to be flawed: 11 axf6 axf6 12 dxc5! axc5 13 b4 af8 14 aec2 aed7 15 b5 aec7 (or 15...aad5 16 c4 ±) 16 aed5 ed8 17 aad4 ag6 18 aed7 aed7 19 ag4 ed6 (19...af4 20 aad1 a6 21 g3 h5 22 aed1 is slightly better for White) 20 aec6! afd6 21 aex6+ aec6 22 aed5 af7 (22...af4 23 axb7 aec3 24 aec1 ±) 23 f4! aec7 24 af3 ±.

11 cxd4 aed7
12 aec2 f6
13 exf6 aec6
14 b4! (58)

An energetic response to the situation. The aim is to dislodge the black knight from control of e5, so White can occupy the dominating square and contain the backward e-pawn. If 14...a6 15 a4 ensures b5.

14 ... aaf8
15 b5 aed7
16 aec5 aec8
17 a4

The theme of expansion on the queenside and maintaining the stronghold on e5 also featured in the game Kupreichik-Lautier, Belgrade 1988: 17 g3 h5 18 a4 af5 19 a5 aec7 20 aac1 aed6 21 aec3 af7 22
\[ \text{ wb2 h4 23 d3 hxg3 24 hxg3 de4 25 xe4 dx4 26 b6 axb6 27 wb6 wa3 28 deg4 xf2 and now Bykhovsky supplies the following line to demonstrate that White can win: 29 xf2! wxg3+ 30 h1 f6 (or 30...xf2 31 xf2 xf2 32 we6+ h8 33 wh3 +=) 31 df4 wh3+ 32 dh2 +=.} \]

17 ... df5

Black has insufficient compensation for the exchange after Bykhovsky's suggestion 17...dg6 18 dg4 xf4 19 g3 xd4 20 xd4 wxd4 21 wxd4 xd4.

18 eae1 dh8
19 f4 wd8
20 de3 dd6
21 g3

White has managed to implement the short-term plan of securing e5 and stunting the power of the doubled rooks with f4 and g3. The next stage is to increase operations on the kingside to force the black pieces into a passive role.

21 ... de4
22 wb4 dg8
23 dg4 f8
24 wb2 df5
25 ad3

White plays to eliminate Black's only genuinely active piece.

25 ... dh5
26 xe4 dx4
27 de3 df6
28 ac1! (59)

A high-class quiet move. The rook swings across to the c-file revealing the hidden agenda. With Black's pieces in disarray the time is right to penetrate the enemy camp.

28 ... dg7
29 ef2 ef8
30 dg2

There is still need for caution: 30 ffc2? xf4 31 xf4 xe5+ 32 gg2 xd4 +=.

30 ... ef3
31 aec2 wb6
32 ac5 h5
33 wd2 wd6

Still Black continues to put up stubborn resistance. The idea is 34...xe2 35 xg2 (the queen is now obliged to guard d4) 35...h4 to undouble the pawns.

34 dh4 dg4
35 ec7 ef6
36 dg2 gg7
37 xg7 exg7
38 we3 ef5

The loose e-pawn requires Black to take defensive measures.

39 dh4 gg8?
An understandable mistake, as the rook was obliged to guard against \( \mathcal{D}f7+ \).
4 Euwe Variation

The first prominent player to recommend 5...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d7}}} was Max Euwe. It is now accepted as one of Black’s main lines due to the flexibility available by retaining the options of ...f6, ...	exttt{\texttt{g7}} and ...	exttt{\texttt{b6}}. The theory and understanding of the positions that arise have been influenced by such players as Mikhail Gurevich, Viktor Korchnoi, Nigel Short and Predrag Nikolić. White has various alternatives that can gain the initiative with the confrontation commencing in the middlegame.

\textbf{Game 20}

\textbf{Ivanchuk-Short}

\textit{Novi Sad OL 1990}

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 \texttt{\texttt{c6}}
5 \texttt{\texttt{d3}} \texttt{\texttt{d7}}

The starting point of the variation.

6 \texttt{\texttt{e2}}

This natural move has long been White’s most popular choice. The main alternatives 6 dxc5 and 6 a3 are discussed later in this chapter.

6 ... f6!?
Black takes the opportunity to attack the pawn chain now that the e-file has been blocked.

7 0-0! (60)

\textbf{Diagram 60}

In the game Wang-Galliamova, Subotica wom 12 1991, White managed to secure a slight pull after 7 exf6 \texttt{\texttt{xf6}} 8 0-0 \texttt{\texttt{d6}} 9 \texttt{\texttt{e3}} \texttt{\texttt{g4}} 10 \texttt{\texttt{g5}} \texttt{\texttt{b6}} 11 \texttt{\texttt{a3}} 0-0 12 \texttt{\texttt{b5}} \texttt{\texttt{b8}} 13 h3 \texttt{\texttt{f6}} 14 dxc5 \texttt{\texttt{xc5}} 15 \texttt{\texttt{e3}} \texttt{\texttt{e7}} 16 c4 a6 17 \texttt{\texttt{c3}} \texttt{\texttt{d6}} 18 \texttt{\texttt{e1}} \texttt{\texttt{c7}} 19 \texttt{\texttt{d2}} \texttt{\texttt{ad8}} 20 \texttt{\texttt{ad1}} \texttt{\texttt{e8}} 21 cxd5 exd5 22 g3. However, Black’s play can be improved upon and taking on f6 is considered harmless.

A poor alternative is 7 c4!? cxd4!
8 cxd5 exd5 9 exf6 \texttt{\texttt{xf6}} 10 \texttt{\texttt{xd4}}
\[a5 \text{ c6} 11 \text{ Qxc6?! (11 \text{ Qb3? Qxf2+ 12 Qxf2 Qe4+ --)} 11...Qxc6 12 \text{ 0-0 0-0 13 Qd2 Wb6 14 Wb3 Rae8! 15 Wxb6 Axb6 16 Ad3 Qg4 17 Qf3 Axf3! 18 gxf3 Qe5 19 Ae2 d4 + Ku-}\

}\[
\text{preichik-Dolmatov, USSR 1980.}
\]

7 ... fxe5

Not 7...Wb6 8 dxc5 Axc5 9 b4 Ae7 10 Axf4 Wc7? 11 exf6 Wxf4 12 fxg7 Axf6 13 g3 Wd6 14 gxh8W Wh8 15 Qg5 ++ Andruet-Tal, Marseille 1989. An interesting try is to put pressure on e5 with 7...Wc7:

a) 8 Axf4 Qge7 and now:

a1) 9 Ad3 f5 10 Aa1 c4 11 Ac2 Qg6 12 Qg3 Aec7 13 h4 0-0 14 b3 b5 15 Qbd2 Wd6 16 h5 Aeh8 17 a4 exb3 18 Qxb3 b4 19 Qc5 bxc3 20 Qa3 Axe5 21 dxe5 Wa5 22 Wd3 Qb4 23 Wxc3 ffc8 ½-½ Galdunts-Komarov, USSR 1991.

a2) 9 Aa3 Axf5 10 exf6 Axe3 11 f7+! (11 fxg3 gx6 12 Qh4 0-0-0! F J.Watson) 11...Axf7 12 fxg3 Qg8 13 dxc5 Axc5+ 14 Wh1 Aeh8 15 c4 d4 16 a3 Ae7 17 Qbd2 g6 18 b4 e5 19 c5 Qg7 20 Qd3 Aeh8 21 We2 a6 22 h3 Aeh8 23 g4 Ae6 24 Ae4 Qd8 25 Aac1 Adb8 26 Ac4 Axc4 27 Axc4 Wh4 28 Axe1 Qd7 29 g3 Aef7 30 Axd4! ++ Prié-Dimitrov, France 1990.

a3) 9 Qa3?! a6 10 Aa3 Axf5 11 exf6 Axf3 12 f7+ Axf7 13 fxg3 Qe8 14 c4 cxd4 15 cxd5 exd5 16 Ad3 Ae7 17 Qc2 Whd8 ± Bastian-Lobron, Bundesliga 1990.

b) 8 Aa1 fxe5 (8...0-0-0!! 9 Axf4 Qe7 10 Wd2 Qg6 11 Qg3 Wb6 =) 9 Qxe5 Qxe5 10 dxe5 0-0-0 with an unclear position according to J.Watson.

The idea is to strengthen the centre in preparation for castling queenside.

The game Glek-Yurtayev, USSR 1987 featured a different approach: 9...Qe7!? 10 Qg5 Wc7 11 Qh5+ g6 12 Qf6 Qg8 13 Qg4 Qg7 (13...0-0-0 14 Qd2 ±) 14 Qe1 Qf7 15 Qf4! d4 (15...Qxf6 16 Qxf6 Qxf6 17 Qc3 ±) 16 Qd2 Aec6 17 b4! b6 18 b5 Qb7 19 Qf3 ±.

In recent times, Black has strived to take advantage of the loose e-pawn by 9...Wc7, but with only limited success:

a) 10 c4 and now:

a1) 10...Wxe5 11 Qh5+! g6 12 Qf3 0-0-0 (12...d4 13 Qxb7 Qb8 14 Qf3 Qg7 ±) 13 Qe1 Wh6 (13...Wd4 14 Wxd4 cxd4 15 cxd5 exd5 16 Qf4!
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10...$d3

Now 11 $Wh5+ is White's threat. The game Sax-Speelman, Hastings 1990/91, continued 10 $c4! $De4 11 $g4 $Wd7 12 $Dc3 $dxc4 13 $We2 $Df5 14 $Wxc4 $Dd4 15 a4 $h5 16 $h3 $Wf7 17 $f4 $Ad8 18 $Af2 with equality.

10... $Wd7

11 $Dg5

A necessary move if White wants to maintain the pressure by preventing queenside castling. On 11...$De7 12 $Wh5+ $g6? 13 $Xg6+ wins.

11... $Dh6

12 $Dd2 $Df7

13 $Ah4 $De7

If the pawn is taken, then White exploits the open e-file: 13...$Dxe5?! 14 $Wh5+ $Af7 15 $Afe1 $De7 16 $Df3 $Ah4 17 $Wxh4 $We7 18 $Wg4 0-0 19 $Dxe6 $f5 20 $Dh5 $f4 21 $Df3 $De7 22 $Dd5 $Dg6 23 $f5 $g6! 0-1 Becker-Bruckner, Bundesliga 1985/86.

14 $Xe7 $Wxe7

15 $f4 0-0-0

16 $We2

White is busy centralizing his pieces to have greater influence, and preparing f5 in an attempt to secure a passed pawn.

16... $Db8

17 $Dae1 $g6

18 a3

Now White embarks on a task to disturb Black's pawn formation. The idea is $b4 followed by a future $a4, while ...$c4 would give up control of the d4 square.

18... $c4

19 $Cc2 $Wc5+
20 \( \text{Wf2} \) d4!

Black must not allow White to consolidate with \( \text{Wf3} \), as a knight on d4 would be strong.

21 \( \text{Le4} \) \( \text{Lb6} \)  
22 \( \text{exd4} \) \( \text{Wxd4} \)  
23 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Lxf2+} \)  
24 \( \text{Wxf2} \) \( \text{Lc8} \) (62)

The ending offers White reasonable prospects since his forces enjoy greater harmony and he holds the initiative. Black is relying on his queenside pawn majority to pose problems.

Not 24...\( \text{xe4?!} \) 25 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{ed1+} \) 
26 \( \text{Wf1} \) \( \text{xf1+} \) 27 \( \text{Wxf1} \) \( \text{e8} \) 28 \( \text{Lg5!} \) when White must win a pawn.

25 \( \text{Lxc6} \) \( \text{Lxc6} \)  
26 \( \text{Ld2} \) \( \text{Lf5} \)  
27 \( \text{Lg5} \) h5  
28 \( \text{Lf2} \) \( \text{Lhc8} \)  
29 h3 \( \text{h5?!} \)

With White poised to push back the knight and take another step nearer a passed pawn, it would be better to invite complications:

20...e3! (20...h4 30 \( \text{Le4} \) intending \( \text{Wf3-g4-g5} \) 30 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{Lxc3} \) 31 \( \text{Lxe6} \) \( \text{Lxa3} \) and Cebalo evaluates the position as unclear.

30 g4 \( \text{hxg4} \)  
31 hxg4 \( \text{Lg7} \)

If 31...\( \text{Lh6} \) (31...\( \text{Ld7} \) 32 \( \text{Wd6} \) ±) 
32 \( \text{Wh1!} \) (not 32 \( \text{Lg3?} \) c3 33 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{Lxc3+} \) 34 \( \text{Lh4} \) \( \text{Lh8} \) \( \text{-+) 32...Wxg4+} \) 
33 \( \text{Wf3} \). White wins a piece.

32 \( \text{Wf3} \) c3  
33 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{Lxc3} \)  
34 \( \text{Wh7} \) \( \text{Lc7} \)

The knight is trapped after 34...\( \text{Wc7} \) 35 \( \text{Ld8+} \) \( \text{Wb7} \) 36 \( \text{Lg8} \) +-

35 \( \text{Wh6} \) \( \text{Lf8} \)  
36 \( \text{Lxc3} \) a5

Trying to create sufficient counterplay is a forlorn effort: 36...\( \text{Lc3+} \) 
37 \( \text{Ld3} \) \( \text{Lxd3}+ \) 38 \( \text{Lxd3} \) \( \text{Lxf4} \) 39 \( \text{Lg6} \) +-

37 \( \text{Lxg6} \) \( \text{Lh8} \)  
38 \( \text{Lxe6} \) \( \text{Lxe6} \)  
39 \( \text{Lxe6} \) \( \text{Lc3}+ \)

On 39...\( \text{Lh3+} \) 40 \( \text{Lxe4} \) \( \text{Lxa3} \) 41 \( \text{Lb6+} \) \( \text{Lb7} \) 42 \( \text{Lxb7+} \) \( \text{Lxb7} \) 43 e6 
White wins.

40 \( \text{Lxe4} \) \( \text{Lxa3} \)  
41 \( \text{Lb6}+ \) 1-0

Game 21

Anand-M. Gurevich
Manila IZ 1990

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e6} \)  
2 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d5} \)  
3 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c5} \)  
4 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{Lc6} \)
If 6...\(\text{Ac}8\), play can transpose to the note to Black's ninth move after 7 0-0 cxd4 8 cxd4 \(\text{Qge7}\) 9 \(\text{Da}3\) (9 \(\text{Qc}3?!?)\) 9...\(\text{Af}5\) 10 \(\text{Qc}2\) \(\text{Wb}6\) (or 10...\(\text{Lc}7\) 11 g4!? \(\text{Qh}4\) 12 \(\text{Qh}4\) \(\text{Lxh}4\) 13 f4 ± Torre-Gausel, Manila OL 1992) 11 g4. In the game Bastian-Korchnoi, Baden-Baden 1981, an independent approach was employed: 7...\(\text{Qge7}\) 8 dxc5! \(\text{Qg}6\) 9 \(\text{Le}3\) \(\text{Qxe}5\) 10 \(\text{Qxe}5\) \(\text{Lxe}5\) 11 b4 \(\text{Lc}7\) 12 f4 \(\text{Qc}6\) (12...\(\text{Qg}6\) 13 \(\text{Dd}2\) b6 14 \(\text{Dc}3\) ±) 13 \(\text{Dd}2\) \(\text{Lf}6\) 14 \(\text{Lc}1\) 0-0 (14...d4?! 15 cxd4 \(\text{Qxd}4\) 16 \(\text{Dc}4\) ±) 15 \(\text{Df}3\) \(\text{Wc}7\) 16 \(\text{Wd}2\) \(\text{Lcd}8\) 17 \(\text{Dd}4\) \(\text{Lc}7\) 18 \(\text{We}3\) f6 19 \(\text{Ld}3\) \(\text{Lf}7\) 20 \(\text{Lce}1\) ±.

7 \(\text{Da}3\)

A standard idea to manœuvre the knight to c2 where it can reinforce d4.

In the game Prié-Kindermann, Uzes 1990, White tried the adventurous 7 h4!? cxd4?! (7...\(\text{Ac}8\) 8 \(\text{Da}3\) cxd4 9 cxd4 \(\text{Af}5\) 10 \(\text{Qc}2\) \(\text{Dd}4\) =) 8 cxd4 \(\text{Df}5\) 9 g4! \(\text{Dh}6\) 10 \(\text{Axh}6\) gxh6 11 g5! \(\text{Wb}6\) 12 \(\text{Wd}2\) hxg5 13 hxg5 \(\text{Da}5\) 14 \(\text{Qc}3\) 0-0-0 15 g6 fxg6 16 \(\text{Qg}5\) and achieved an advantage.

The main alternative 7 0-0 is examined later in this chapter.

7...

7...

8 cxd4 \(\text{Af}5\)

9 \(\text{Qc}2\) (63) \(\text{Db}4\)

The most popular continuation, although other paths have been investigated:

a) 9...\(\text{Wxa}5+\) 10 \(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Wb}6\) 11 \(\text{Qc}3\) \(\text{Le}7\) 12 0-0 a5 13 a4! (13 \(\text{Qe}3\) g6 14 \(\text{Wd}2\) h5 15 g3 \(\text{Ac}8\) 16 \(\text{Rfd}1\) \(\text{Dd}4\) 17 a3 \(\text{Df}8\) 18 \(\text{Qxf}5\) exf5 19 h4 with unclear play; Lein-Dizard, Berlin 1987) 13...0-0 14 \(\text{Da}3\) f6 15 exf6 \(\text{Ax}f6\) 16 \(\text{Db}5\) \(\text{Raf}8\) 17 \(\text{Wd}2\) \(\text{Qd}6\) 18 \(\text{Racl}\) \(\text{Qe}4\) 19 \(\text{We}3\) \(\text{Lc}8\) 20 \(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Qxc}3\) 21 bxc3 e5 22 \(\text{Db}1\) exd4 23 \(\text{Qxd}4\) \(\text{Wa}7\) 24 \(\text{Qf}3\) \(\text{Df}7\) 25 \(\text{Rb}5\) \(\text{Qc}5\) 26 \(\text{Qb}3\) \(\text{Me}8\) 27 \(\text{Qxc}6\) \(\text{Qxc}6\) 28 \(\text{Wd}2\) \(\text{Qd}8\) 29 \(\text{Hb}1\) b6 30 \(\text{Qxc}5\) bxc5 31 \(\text{Ab}7\) \(\text{Wa}6\) 32 \(\text{Gg}5\) \(\text{Qcc}8\) 33 \(\text{Ab}6\) \(\text{Wd}3\) 34 \(\text{Qxf}7\) ! \(\text{Qxf}7\) 35 \(\text{Ab}7+\) \(\text{Me}6\) 36 \(\text{Me}7+\) \(\text{Dd}6\) 37 \(\text{We}5+\) 1-0 Rostenalis-King, Mondorf 1991.

b) 9...\(\text{Wb}6\) 10 0-0 and now:

b1) 10...a5 11 g4 \(\text{Qfe}7\) 12 \(\text{Qh}4\)

(12 \(\text{Qfe}1\) h5 13 gxh5 \(\text{Df}5\) 14 \(\text{Qe}3\) f6 15 \(\text{Qd}3\) 0-0-0 16 \(\text{Qxf}5\) exf5 17 exf6 {17 \(\text{Qd}3?!\) \(\text{Le}8\) 18 \(\text{Wf}3\) \(\text{Qxh}5\) 19 exf6 gxf6 20 \(\text{Qf}4\) ±} 17...\(\text{Le}8\) 18 h6 18 gxh6 19 \(\text{Wd}2\) = Svendsen-Razuvaev, Moscow 1985) 12...\(\text{Qg}6\) 13 \(\text{Qg}2\) \(\text{Le}7\) 14 f4 0-0 15 \(\text{Qe}3\) f5 16 exf6 \(\text{Qxf}6\) 17 h4 {17 \(\text{Qd}3?!\) \(\text{Qd}6\) 18 h4 \(\text{Raf}8\) 19 g5 \(\text{Qf}6\) 20 \(\text{Qg}6\) hxg6...}
21 h5 gxh5 22 Wh5 g6! 23 Wxg6+ Hg7 24 Wd3 Qe7 25 Wb3 Wxb3! 26 axb3 b6 27 Qd2 Qf5 28 Qf3 Qh7 29 Qaf1?! Qb5 30 Qe1 Qf7 with a clear plus for Black; Benjamin-Gulko, USA Ch 1992) 17...Qd6 18 h5 Qge7 19 Qd3 Qc8 20 We2 Qff8 21 Qh4 h6 (21...Qb4 22 Qxb4 Wxb4 23 Qad1 ±) 22 g5 hxg5 23 fxg5 Qf5 24 h6?! Qce7 (24...Qxh4? 25 Wh5 g6 26 Qxg6 Qe7 27 Qf7+ Qh8 28 Qxh4 Qf5 29 Wh5 ±) 25 Wh5 Qg3? 26 g6! Qxh4 27 hxg7 Qxg7 28 Wh7+ Qf6 29 Wxh4+ Qg7 30 Qh7+ Qf6 31 Qh6 1-0 Sveshnikov-Gulko, USSR Ch 1985.

b2) 10...Qa5 11 g4! Qe7 (or 11...Qh6?! 12 h3 ±) 12 Qfe1 Qb5 13 Qd3 h5 14 gxh5 Qf5 15 Qe3 Qc4 16 a4 Qxce3 17 fxe3 Qc4 18 Qf4! Qb3 19 Qb5+ Qd8 20 We2 Qxc2 21 a5 Qc7 22 Qfc1 Qc8 23 a6 b6 24 Qa4 Wc4! (24...Wc7 25 Qxc2 Wg5+ 26 Qh1 gives White an edge) 25 Qxc2 Qxe2 (Sveshnikov-Dolmatov, USSR 1988) 26 Qxe2 Qe7 27 Qg2! Qc4 28 Qf2 Qh4+ 29 Qe2 Qb4 30 Qd3 ±.

b3) 10...Qc8 11 g4 Qfe7 and now:

b31) 12 Qfe1 h5 13 gxh5 Qf5 14 Qe3 Qb4 (14...Wxb2 15 Qb1 Wxa2 16 Qxb7 ±) 15 Qxb4 Qxb4 16 Qd3 Qb5 17 a4 Qc4 (not 17...Qxd3? 18 Qxd3 Qxd4 19 a5 —) 18 a5 Qb5 19 b3 Qxd3 20 Qxd3 Qd7 21 a6 b6 22 Qh1 Qc3 23 Qc1 Qxc1 24 Qxc1 g6 25 hxg6 fxg6 26 Qg1 Qh7 27 Qg2 Qe7 28 Wg4 Qf7 29 Qg5 Qh3 30 Qxf5 exf5 31 e6+ Qe8 32 Wf4 Qxg5 33 Wxg5 Qh6 34 Wf6 1-0 Sveshnikov-Skalikot, Athens 1983.

b32) 12 Qh4?! Qb4 13 Qxb4 Wxb4 14 f4 Qc6 (or 14...Qb5 15 Wd2 Qa4 16 b3 Wa6 17 Qxb5 Wxb5 18 f5 Qc6 19 Qb2 ± Sveshnikov-Gleizerov, Russia 1992) 15 Qe3 Qe7 16 Qg2 f6 17 a3 Wxb2 18 Qb1 Qa3 19 Qb7 Qd8 20 Qd7 Qd7 21 Qb5 Qc7! 22 Qb1 Qb4! 23 f5 Qb6 24 Qd7 Qc3 (Sveshnikov-Ulybin, Russia 1992) 25 fxe6 Qe3 26 e7 Qb3 27 Wh7 Qe7 28 Wh8 Wb4 29 Qxg7 Wd4 30 Qh1 Qd3 31 Qg1 ±.

10 Qxb4

The main alternatives 10 Qe3 and 10 0-0 are examined later in the chapter.

10 ...

11 Qd2 Wf5

Anand suggests the alternative 11...Wb6 12 Qxb4 (12 a3 Qxd2+ 13 Wxd2 Qb5 =) 12...Wxb4+ 13 Wd2 Qxd2+ with equal chances. For example: 14 Qxd2 Qe7 15 Ab1 Qc6 16 b4 a6 17 a3 f5 ½-½ Blaszk-Züger, Gelsenkirchen 1991.

12 a3!

This is an improvement on Sieiro-M.Gurevich, Havana 1986, when Black equalized after 12 Qxb4 Wxb4+ 13 Wd2 Wd2+ 14 Qxd2 Qe7! 15 Qhc1 f6! 16 Qc5 Wd8.

12 ...

13 Wxd2 Wxd2+

14 Qxd2 f6 (64)
15 $\texttt{N}a\text{c1}$

The basis of White's game is to make the most of the extra space available to manoeuvre the pieces and force Black into a cramped position.
15 ... $\texttt{Q}e7$
16 $b4$ $\texttt{Q}d8$

If 16...$\texttt{Qc6}$ 17 $b5!!?\texttt{Qa5}$ 18 $\texttt{Q}c3\texttt{a6}$ 19 $\texttt{a4}$ intending $\texttt{b}b4$ gives White excellent prospects.
17 $\texttt{Q}d3$ $\texttt{R}e8$
18 $\texttt{Qxe8+}$ $\texttt{Qxe8}$
19 $g4$ $h6$!!

This is not the way to defend against the potential kingside pawn advance, especially when $g6$ is made vacant for a knight to occupy.

A more commendable solution is suggested by Anand: 19...$\texttt{Q}b6!!$ 20 $b5$ (20 $\texttt{exf6}$ $\texttt{gx}f6$ 21 $g5$ $\texttt{Q}c4+$ 22 $\texttt{Qxc4\texttt{dxc4}}$ 23 $\texttt{gxf6}$ $\texttt{Q}c6$ with unclear play) 20...$\texttt{Q}e7$ 21 $\texttt{Q}c1!!?$ when White has a small edge.
20 $\texttt{Q}h4$ $\texttt{Q}e7$
21 $f4$ $a6$

On 21...$\texttt{fxe5}$ 22 $\texttt{dxe5!}$ maintains the initiative.

22 $\texttt{Qf1}$ $\texttt{Qb5}$
23 $f5$!!

The simple 23 $\texttt{He1}$ is good while 23 $\texttt{exf6\texttt{gx}f6}$ 24 $\texttt{He1\texttt{Hg8}}$! allows Black back into the game.
23 ... $\texttt{h5}$!!

A more precise method is necessary: 23...$\texttt{Lxd3}$! 24 $\texttt{Qxd3}$ $h5$ 25 $\texttt{Qg6}$ $\texttt{Qh6}$ 26 $\texttt{Qf4}$ $\texttt{hxg4}$ 27 $\texttt{Qxe6+}$ $\texttt{Qe8}$ 27 $\texttt{Qxg7+}$ $\texttt{Qf7}$ when Black has at least equality.
24 $\texttt{Qg6}$ $\texttt{Qxg6}$
25 $\texttt{exf6}$ $\texttt{gxf6}$
26 $\texttt{fxg6}$ $\texttt{Qe7}$ (65)

The line 26...$\texttt{Lxd3}$ 27 $\texttt{Lxd3}$ $\texttt{Qe7}$
(27...$\texttt{hxg4}$ 28 $\texttt{Lxf6}$ $\texttt{Qe7}$ 29 $g7$ $\texttt{Qg8}$
30 $\texttt{Qg6}$) 28 $g5$ $\texttt{fxg5}$ 29 $\texttt{Qf7+}$ leaves White with a clear advantage.

27 $g5$ $f5$
28 $\texttt{Qxb5}$ $\texttt{axb5}$
29 $\texttt{Qc1}$ $\texttt{Qd6}$
30 $\texttt{Qe3}$

The passed g-pawns provide the necessary distraction to allow the white king to advance.
30 ... $\texttt{Qg8}$
31 \( \textit{\phi f4} \) b6
32 \( \textit{\&c3} \) \( \textit{\&xg6} \)
33 \( \textit{\&h3} \) \( \textit{\&g8} \)
34 \( \textit{\&xh5} \) \( \textit{\&c8} \)
35 \( \textit{\textbf{g6}} \) \( \textit{\&c4} \)
36 \( \textit{\&g5!} \) \( \textit{\&xd4+} \)
37 \( \textit{\&e3} \) \( \textit{\&e4+} \)
38 \( \textit{\&f2} \) 1-0

**Game 22**
**Sax-Breninkmeijer**
**Wijk aan Zee 1992**

1 \( \textit{e4} \) e6
2 \( \textit{d4} \) d5
3 \( \textit{e5} \) c5
4 \( \textit{c3} \) \( \textit{\&c6} \)
5 \( \textit{\&f3} \) \( \textit{\&d7} \)
6 \( \textit{\&e2} \) \( \textit{\&ge7} \)
7 \( \textit{\&a3} \) \( \textit{\&f5} \)

The unusual 7...\( \textit{\&g6} \), which Larsen originally suggested, is occasion-ally tested:

a) 8 \( \textit{\&c2} \) \( \textit{\&e7} \) 9 0-0 0-0 10 \( \textit{\&e1} \)
\( \textit{\&c7} \) 11 \( \textit{\&d3} \) c4 12 \( \textit{\&xg6} \) \( \textit{hxg6} \) 13 \( \textit{\&g5} \) h6 14 \( \textit{\&xe7} \) \( \textit{\&xe7} \) 15 \( \textit{\&e3} \) =

b) 8 h4!? \( \textit{\&e7} \) 9 g3 (9 h5??)
9...\text{cx}d4 10 \text{cx}d4 0-0 11 h5 \( \textit{\&h8} \) 12
\( \textit{\&c2} \) f6! 13 \text{ex}f6 \( \textit{\&xf6} \) 14 b3 \( \textit{\&f7} \) 15
\( \textit{\&b2} \) \( \textit{\&a5+} \) (de la Villa Garcia-Korchnoi, Pamplona 1990) 16 \text{f1} with unclear play.

8 \( \textit{\&c2} \) cxd4
9 \( \textit{cxd4} \) \( \textit{\&b4} \)
10 \( \textit{\&e3} \) (66)

**pawns is agreeable as it bolsters the**
**d-pawn and opens up the f-file.**

10 ... \( \textit{\&xe3} \)
11 \( \textit{fxe3} \)

Stein states that 11 \( \textit{\&xe3} \) \( \textit{\&c8} \) 12
0-0 \( \textit{\&c2} \) offers a level game.
11 ... \( \textit{\&e7} \)
12 0-0

A new idea which has revived in-
**terest in the set-up. This differs from**
the game Spassky-Korchnoi, Bel-
grade C (18) 1978 which catapulted
the line into prominence: 12 \( \textit{\&c6} \)
13 b4 a6 14 \( \textit{\&b1} \) \( \textit{\&a7} \) 15 a4 \( \textit{\&c6} \) 16
\( \textit{\&d2} \) a5 17 b5 \( \textit{\&b4} \) 18 0-0 0-0 19
\( \textit{\&e1} \) \( \textit{\&h8} \) 20 \( \textit{\&g3} \) f6 21 \( \textit{\&bc1} \) f5 22
h4 \( \textit{\&c8} \) 23 h5 \( \textit{\&xc1} \) 24 \( \textit{\&xc1} \) \( \textit{\&a2} \) 25
\( \textit{\&a1} \) \( \textit{\&b4} \) 26 \( \textit{\&h3} \) =.

12 ... 0-0
13 \( \textit{\&d2} \) \( \textit{\&b6} \) ?!

The queen makes little impression
here because the usual pressure on
b2, which restrains the development
of the c1 bishop, is absent.

Breninkmeijer has put forward
13...a5?? as an alternative, with un-
clear play.
14 a3 Qc6
15 b4!

White has gained space by employing a typical pawn structure while pushing back the knight.

15 ... f5

Another approach is 15...a6, intending ...a7 followed by ...b5 in order to exchange the light-squared bishop.

16 exf6 Qxf6
17 Qd3 Qe7
18 Wb1! h6?! 

It is a better idea to play 18...g6 in an effort to blunt the effectiveness of the b1-h7 diagonal.

19 a4 Qf5
20 b5 a5 (67)

The only way to avoid instant calamity: 24...Qh4 (24...Qd6 25 a3 and Qe5 ++) 25 Qxh4 Qxh4 26 Qh7+ Qh8 27 Qf7 ++.

25 Qxc1 Qd6
26 Qe5 Qc8
27 Wb1 Qe8

Now the game could have been finished off in style after 28 h4! intending 29 g5 hxg5 30 hgx5 Qxg5 31 Qf8+ Qxf8 32 Qh7+ Qh8 33 Qxf8#.

28 g5 hxg5
29 Qh7+

White is beginning to lose his way as 29 Qg4 would quickly secure the win.

29 ... Qh8
30 Qf3 g4
31 Qxg4 Qh5
32 Qg3

Less clear cut is the ending that can be forced: 32 Qxf6 gxf6 33 Qh3 Wxh7 34 Wxh7+ Qxh7 35 Qxh5+ Qg6.

32 ... Qh4
33 Qg2 Qg5
34 Qg6 Qxg4
35 Qxg4 Qxe3+
36 Qg2 e5
37 We1 Qc4
38 Qf7 Wf6 (68)
39 Qg3?

In time-trouble White misses a superb opportunity to demolish his opponent by 39 Qh4+ Qh6 40 Wxh6+!

gxh6 41 Qh7+ Qg8 42 Qf5+ ++ .

39 ... Qh6
Brenninkmeijer shows how White can still make progress: 42 \( \text{Axh6!} \) \( \text{Qg4+} \) 43 \( \text{Kg2} \) \( \text{Axh6} \) (the other capture is no better: 43...\( g \times h6 \)) 44 \( \text{f5!} \) \( \text{Kc2+} \) 45 \( \text{Kh3} \) \( \text{Wxf7} \) 46 \( \text{Wg4+} \) \( \text{Kf8} \) 47 \( \text{Kxc2} \) \( \text{Wf1+} \) 48 \( \text{Wg2} \) \(+\) 44 \( \text{Axg7}+ \) \( \text{Kf8} \) 45 \( \text{Kxb7} \) \( \text{Wg4} \) 46 \( \text{Wxg4} \) \( \text{Oxg4} \) 47 \( \text{Kf7+} \) \( \text{Kg8} \) 48 \( \text{b6} \) ++.

42 ... \( e4 \) \\
43 \( \text{Kxf4?!} \) \( \text{Kc2+} \) \\
44 \( \text{Kxe3} \) \( \text{We7?!} \)

Black would actually have the better chances upon 44...\( \text{Kc3+} \) 45 \( \text{Kf2} \) \( \text{Xg3} \) 46 \( \text{Kf7+} \) \( \text{Wxf7} \) 47 \( \text{Kxf7} \) \( \text{Ke3+} \) 48 \( \text{Kxg3} \) \( \text{Kxf7} \) ++.

45 \( \text{Kf7+} \) \( \text{Wxf7} \) \\
46 \( \text{Kxh6} \) \( \text{Kc3+} \) \\
47 \( \text{Kf2} \) \( \text{Xg3} \) \\
48 \( \text{Kxf7} \) \( \text{Kxf7} \) \\
49 \( \text{Kd6} \) \( \frac{1}{2}\) - \( \frac{1}{2} \)

Sveshnikov has pioneered this course of action. The idea is that the defence of \( d4 \) can still be adequately maintained despite allowing Black to fulfil the plan of exchanging on \( c2 \).

10 ... \( \text{Qxc2} \) \\
11 \( \text{Wxc2} \) \( \text{h5?!} \)

Black is concerned about the prospect of a future \( g4 \) while even harbouring ambitions of a minor pawn storm with ...\( g5 \). The policy of direct action against \( d4 \) by 11...\( \text{Wb6} \) is more logical although it can be easily contained. On 12 \( \text{Wd3} \) play might continue:
a) 12...a6 13 \text{d}d2 h5 14 a4 a5 15 \text{Q}fd1 \text{e}e7 16 h3 \text{R}c8 17 \text{d}c3! h4 18 \text{W}d2 \text{R}a8 19 \text{R}db1 \text{b}b4 20 \text{h}b5 \text{R}xb5 21 \text{R}xb4 \text{d}d7 22 \text{c}c5 \text{W}d8 23 b4 b6 24 \text{d}d6 f6 25 \text{R}c1 \text{a}a7 26 b5 \text{Q}xd6 27 exd6 g5 28 \text{R}a3 0-0 29 \text{R}ac3 \text{e}e8 30 \text{R}c7 \text{R}f7 31 \text{R}c8 \text{W}d7 32 \text{R}1c6 \text{f}f8 33 \text{W}c2 \text{h}5 34 \text{R}8c7 \text{R}xc7 35 \text{R}xc7 1-0 Sveshnikov-Zlotnik, Moscow 1991.

b) 12...\text{e}e7 13 a4 0-0 14 a5 \text{W}c7 15 \text{d}d2 a6 16 \text{R}fc1 \text{c}c6 17 \text{W}b3 \pm Sveshnikov-Nikolaev, Šibenik 1990.

c) 12...\text{R}c8 13 \text{d}d2 \text{b}b4! (or 13...\text{e}e7 14 g4! with a clear plus for White) 14 \text{f}f4?! (14 \text{R}xb4 \text{W}xb4 15 a3 \text{W}b6 \pm) 14...a6 15 a4 \text{Q}e7 16 h4 \text{a}a5 17 \text{R}fc1 \text{R}xc1 18 \text{R}xc1 h6 (1/2-1/2 Sveshnikov-Dreev, Rostov-on-Don 1993) 19 b3 0-0 20 \text{R}b2 =.

12 \text{d}d2 \text{e}e7

13 \text{d}d3

On 13 \text{W}b3?!., 13...g5! poses some problems due to the threat of ...g4.

13...

\text{W}b6

The situation has changed to the extent where the standard attack on d4 is no longer feasible. Sveshnikov suggests that 13...g5 14 \text{Q}xf5 exf5 15 \text{W}b3 is unclear, although the kingside pawn rush should fail without significant support from the major pieces.

14 \text{Q}xf5 exf5 (70)

An enterprising idea is 14...\text{R}c8 which seeks counter-play on the basis of the bishop exploiting the light squares: 15 \text{W}b3 exf5 16 \text{W}xd5 \text{R}e6 17 \text{W}a5 \text{W}xa5 18 \text{Q}xa5 b6 19 \text{d}d2 \text{d}d5 20 \text{R}fc1 \text{R}d7 21 \text{Q}e1 a5! 22 \text{Q}c2 g5 23 \text{Q}e3 \text{Q}e6 24 a3 f4?! (24...h4 is unclear) 25 \text{Q}xd5 \text{Q}xd5 26 h4 g4 27 \text{Q}xf4 \text{Q}xh4 28 a4 with an edge for White; Yagupov-Dreev, Rostov-on-Don 1993.

15 \text{g}5!

This is the point of White’s play. Black cannot castle without allowing a strong knight to be posted on g5, while grabbing the d-pawn invites the white rooks to seize the central files.

15...

\text{Q}xg5

16 \text{Q}xg5 \text{W}xd4

The quieter 16...0-0 17 \text{W}d2 leaves White in a commanding position.

17 \text{R}fd1 \text{W}h4

It would appear that 17...\text{W}c4 defending d5 and offering the exchange of queens is Black’s salvation but it fails to 18 \text{W}xc4 dxc4 19 \text{Q}xf7! \text{Q}xf7 20 \text{R}xd7+ \text{R}e6 21
\textbf{Euwe Variation}

\[ \text{Hd1 \pm. If 17...Bb6 18 Bxd5 Bc6 19 Bd6 \pm.} \]

18 Bd2! Bc4
19 Bxc1 Bb5
20 a4

White spends some time molesting the queen in order to take on d5 without permitting an exchange of queens.

20 ... Bb3
21 Bc3 Bb6
22 Bxd5 0-0
23 a5

Not 23 Bxd7?! Bd8 --.
23 ... Bxb2 (71)

\[ \text{71} \]

24 Bf3! g6

Now the bishop leaves the board, but there is no escape after 24...Bfd8 25 Bxb5 Bxc3 26 Bxf7+ Bh8 27 Wh5+ Bg8 28 Wh7+ Bf8 29 Wh8+ Be7 30 Bxg7+ Be8 31 Wf7#.

25 Bxd7 Bc8
26 Bxc8 Bxc8
27 Bd1 Bc1
28 Bd5 Bxd1+
29 Bd1 Bxe5

30 Bd8+ Bg7
31 Bh8+!

An unpleasant surprise for Black which brings the game to an abrupt finish.

31 ... Bxh8
32 Bxf7+ Bh8
33 Bxe5 Bf6
34 f4 g5
35 Bf2 gxf4
36 Bd3 b5
37 Bxd4 b4
38 Be3 Be5
39 Bg6+ 1-0

\textbf{Game 24}

Hort-Tukmakov

\textit{Bern 1992}

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 Bc6
5 Bd3 Bd7
6 Be2 Bge7
7 0-0

A standard procedure which is the latest fashion. The intention is to relieve the pressure on d4 by undermining the knight when it occupies f5.

7 ... cxd4

This relieves the tension, allowing the b1 knight to develop quickly on c3. In the game Thipsay-Speelman, London 1992, the queen's rook played a greater role after 7...Bc8 8 Be1!? (or 8 Ba3, transposing to
notes in Game 21, Anand-M.Gurevich) 8...cxd4 9 cxd4 Qf5 10 Qc3 a6 (10...Ke7?! 11 Kh3! is a suggestion by Larsen) 11 Kh1 Ke7 (11...Kb6? 12 Qa4 Ke7 13 g4! ±) 12 g4 Qh4 13 Qxh4 Qxh4 14 Qe3 0-0 15 Kg1 f6! 16 exf6 Qxf6 and now 17 Wd2 g6 would have been unclear.

Psakhis prefers the more patient alternatives 7...Qf5 and 7...Qg6 which are examined later in this chapter.

8 cxd4 Qf5
9 Qc3 Ke7

See the next game for 9...Kc8.

10 g4 (72)

10 a3 would bring about Kamsky-Kasparov, New York (exhibition game) 1989, where White's passive play was punished: 10...Kc8 11 Kh4?! g5! 12 Ke3 g4 13 Ke1 h5 14 Qc2 f6 15 exf6 Qxf6 16 Qd3 Qc7 17 Wd2 0-0 18 Kg5 Qg6 19 Qxf6 Wxf6 20 Mc1 Qh4 with advantage to Black.

There is little to recommend the meek 10...Qh5?! after 11 h3 0-0 12 Qe3 f6 13 exf6 Qxf6 14 Qe5 Qf8 15 f4 Qb4 16 Qf3 Qxc3 17 bxc3 ± Sveshnikov-Lalic, Sochi 1987.

11 Qxh4 Qxh4
12 Ke3 0-0
13 f4 Ke7

This retreat is an attempt to improve on the critical encounter Nunn-Anand, Munich 1991. That game proceeded: 13...f6 14 exf6 Qxf6 15 Mc1 (Nunn considers 15 g5 Ke7 16 Qd3 g6 intending ...Qd6 and ...Qe7 unclear) 15...g6 16 Wd2 Kg7 17 Kg3?! (17 Qa4! ±) 17...Wb5! 18 Kg2 Qh8 19 Kh1 Mc8 20 h3 Wb4 21 Mc1 h6 22 Kg1 Qa5 23 b3 Kg6?! (23...Wc7 =) 24 Kg4! We7 (24...Wxd2 25 Qxd2 intending Qf3 ±) and now 25 Kg2 followed by Kg1 and Qd3 offers White the better chances.

14 Kd3 f6
15 Wc2

A clear indication of White's aggressive intentions, this forces a weakening of the pawn structure because 15...g6? fails to 16 Qxg6! hxg6 17 Wxg6+ Kh8 18 Kg3 winning.

15 ... h6
16 Wg2! (73) Ke8

The light-squared bishop is added to the defence to meet White's Kh1 and Wc2 by either...g6, blocking the diagonal, or by...Kh8 followed by...Kf7-g8.
Continuing the onslaught while snuffing out Black's counterplay by defending d4.

26 ... \( \text{Nh7} \)
27 g6 \( \text{Ng8} \)
28 \( \text{Qb5} \)

Hort acknowledges that 28 \( \text{Qe2} \) to over-protect d4 is a winning strategy as it releases the queen and bishop for the attack.

28 ... \( \text{Kd8} \)
29 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Wd7} \)
30 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{We7} \)
31 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Wd7} \) (74)

32 \( \text{Wf4!} \)

In a moment of mutual time-trouble White finds the winning combination by preparing 33 \( \text{Qf6} \) with the threat 34 \( \text{Wxh6} \).

32 ... a6
33 \( \text{Qf6} \) gx\( \text{f6} \)
34 exf6 \( \text{Qh7} \)
35 g7+

White is in the enviable position of having a choice of wins; 35 \( \text{Wxh6} \) and 35 \( f7 \) were also effective.
35 ... φg8
36 φxh6?!

A quicker solution is 36 f7+ φxg7 37 f8φ φxf8 38 φxf8#.
36 ... φf5
37 φh8+ φf7
38 φh5+??

The pressures of time-trouble take their toll as 38 φxf5! exf5 39 φxf5
φxf5 40 φd6+ wins.
38 ... φxf6
39 φh6+ φf7
40 φxf5 exf5
41 φd6+ φxd6
42 φxf5+ φe7
43 φg5+ φd7
44 φxd5 φxd4+
45 φf1 φg8!
46 φf5+ ½-½

Game 25
Blatny-Ghinda
Stara Zagora Z 1990

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 c3 c5
4 c3 φc6
5 φf3 φd7
6 φe2 φge7
7 0-0 cxd4
8 φxd4 φf5
9 φc3 φc8

10 φe3 (75)

White continues in traditional fashion by supporting d4.

In Petkovski-Elimov, Corfu 1991, White tried to make progress on the queenside: 10 a3 φe7 11 g4 (11 φd3
g6 12 φe2 φb6 13 φh1 φa5 14 b4
c4 15 g4 φg7 16 φf4 a5 17 bxa5
φxa5 18 φe2 ± Antonio-Nolte, Manila 1991) 11...φh4 12 φxh4 φh4 13 φe3 φe7 14 φc1 φa5 15 φa4
c4 16 φxc4 dxc4 17 φc5 φc6 18
f3 h5 19 gxh5 b5 20 φe4 φh5 21
φd2 f5 22 φg2 φf7 23 φg3 φh4 24
c2 g5 25 φf2 φh7 26 φe3 g4 27
φf4 φg5 28 d5 φxf4 29 dxe6+
φxe6 0-1.

10 φh1!? a6 11 g4 φfe7 12 φd3!
φa5? (Vatter-Kindermann, Baden- Baden 1993: 12...h5 13 gxh5 φxh5
14 φg5 g6 15 φf3 φf5 16 φxf5
φd4 17 φxe6 φxe6; 15 φe3 ±) and
now 13 φg5! h6 14 φh7 gives
White the better chances.

This move represents the major
diversion in the line. The rook is
brought into play as a waiting tactic
to deter b3 before deciding where to
develop the rest of the pieces.

10 ... φe7
11 φd3 g6
If 11...\(\text{Qxe3}\) 12 fxe3 0-0 13 \(\text{Wxe2}\) White has a good plan in doubling rooks by \(\text{Rf2}\) and \(\text{Rafl}\), with a small advantage.

12 \(\text{Cc1}\) 0-0?!

Black hopes that in return for allowing the king to be exposed, he can take possession of the g-file with his rook.

Blatny suggests 12...\(\text{Qxe3}\) is a superior alternative but after 13 fxe3 0-0 14 \(\text{Ab1}\) intending \(\text{Cc2-f2}\) White has good prospects.

13 \(\text{xf5}\) \(\text{gxf5}\)
14 \(\text{h6}\) \(\text{Cc8}\)
15 \(\text{h4!}\)

A clever attacking device that prepares the deadly \(\text{Qg5}\) and \(\text{Wh5}\).

15 ... \(\text{Rh4}\) (76)

In his analysis of the game, Blatny reveals the depth of the offensive: 15...f6 16 \(\text{Wd2}\) (16 \(\text{Ab5}\)? fxe5 17 dxe5 a6! 18 \(\text{Qd6}\) \(\text{Qxd6}\) 19 exd6 \(\text{Wxf6}\) 20 \(\text{Wd2}\) d4! followed by 21...e5) 16...\(\text{Qf7}\) (16...fexe5 17 dxe5 \(\text{Qf7}\) 18 \(\text{Qg5+}\) \(\text{Qg6}\) 19 h5+ \(\text{Qxh5}\) 20 \(\text{Qf7}\) \(\text{Wc7}\) 21 \(\text{Qf8!}\) +++; 16...\(\text{Qf8}\) 17 \(\text{exf6}\) \(\text{Wxf6}\) 18 \(\text{Qxf8}\) \(\text{Qxf8}\) 19 \(\text{Qe1}\) ±) 17 exf6 \(\text{Qxf6}\) 18 \(\text{Qb5}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 19 \(\text{Qf4!}\) e5 20 dxe5 \(\text{Qxe5}\) 21 \(\text{Wd5+}\) ++.

16 \(\text{Wd2!}\) \(\text{Qe7}\)
17 \(\text{Wf4}\)

Black is unable to deal with the mounting pressure adequately. Now the immediate \(\text{Wg3+}\) is threatened, while \(\text{Qg5}\) and \(\text{Wh4}\) is dangerous.

17 ... \(\text{Qh8}\)
18 \(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{xf8}\)

On 17...\(\text{Qg8}\) 18 \(\text{Qxe6!}\) allows \(\text{Qg3+}++\).

19 \(\text{Wh4}\) \(\text{Qxg5}\)

There is no way out of the calamity: 19...\(\text{Qg8}\) 20 \(\text{Wg3}\) f4 21 \(\text{Wg4}\) \(\text{Qh8}\) 22 \(\text{Qxe6}++\).

20 \(\text{Qxg5}\) \(\text{f6}\)
21 \(\text{Qxf6+}\) \(\text{Qxf6}\)
22 \(\text{exf6}\) \(\text{Qg8}\)
23 \(\text{Qb5}\) \(\text{Qg4}\) (77)

The f-pawn proves its worth on 23...\(\text{Wg6}\) 24 f7 \(\text{Qf8}\) 25 \(\text{Qd6}\) e5 26 \(\text{Qxc6}\) \(\text{Qxc6}\) 27 \(\text{Wxe7}++\).
26 \textit{Wh6} \textit{g8}
27 f7+ \textit{xf7}
28 \textit{Qxf7} \textit{Qxf7}
29 \textit{Whxh7+} \textit{Qe8}
30 \textit{Kc3} \textit{Qd8}
31 \textit{Ke1} a5
32 \textit{Kf3} \textit{Qc7}
33 \textit{Wh2} e5
34 dxe5 \textit{Qd4}
35 \textit{Qxf4} \textit{Qe2+}
36 \textit{Qxe2} \textit{Qxe2}
37 \textit{Qg3} \textit{Wxb2}
38 e6 \textit{Qxe6}
39 \textit{Qb4+} 1-0

Game 26
Kupreichik-Levitt
Badenweiler 1990

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 Qc6
5 Qf3 Qd7
6 Qe2 Qge7
7 0-0 Qf5

This waiting move allows White to cast aside traditional methods and reposition his bishop to adapt to the changing situation.

8 \textit{Qd3} (78)

The regular move, although Rozentalis-Züger, Chiasso 1991, saw White try to transpose to a previous main line in this chapter, but Black replied with an independent continuation: 8 \textit{Qa3} cxd4 9 cxd4 \textit{Qxa3} 10 bxa3 \textit{Qb6} 11 \textit{Le3} 0-0 12 \textit{Qd3} \textit{Qac8}
13 g4 \textit{Qxe3} 14 fxe3 \textit{Qd8} 15 \textit{Qe1} f5
16 gxf5 exf5 17 \textit{Qb1} b6 18 \textit{Qg3} \textit{Qe7}
19 \textit{Qg5} \textit{Qc3} 20 \textit{Qb3} \textit{Qc6} 21 \textit{Qh1}
\textit{Qg6} 22 \textit{Wh4} \textit{Qh6} 23 \textit{Wf2} \textit{Qc7} 24
\textit{Qg1} \textit{Qg6} 25 \textit{Qbb1} h6 26 \textit{Qh3}
\textit{Qxg1+} 27 \textit{Qxg1} \textit{Qc6} 28 \textit{Wh4} \textit{Qf7}
29 \textit{Qf4} \textit{Qf8} 30 \textit{Qh5} \textit{Qe8} 31 \textit{Wh3}
\textit{Qd7} 32 \textit{Qg3} \textit{Qe6} 33 \textit{Qb5} \textit{Qc8} 34
\textit{Wh4} 1-0.

8 dxc5 is an unusual line with similarities to Game 29, Sveshnikov-Popović, discussed later in this chapter. After 8...\textit{Qxc5} 9 b4 play might continue:

a) 9...\textit{Qe7} 10 \textit{Qd3} g6 11 \textit{Qe1} \textit{Qc7}
12 \textit{Qf4} a6 13 \textit{Qbd2} \textit{Qa7} 14 \textit{Qc1}
\textit{Qc6} 15 \textit{Qb3} with an unclear position; Braga-Micalizzi, Rome 1990.

b) 9...\textit{Qb6} 10 b5 \textit{Qa5} 11 \textit{Qd3} a6
12 a4 \textit{Qc7} 13 \textit{Qf4} 0-0 14 \textit{Qc2} h6 15
\textit{Qbd2} with equality; Carlier-Barsov, Holland 1993.

8 \textit{...} \textit{Qh4}

The decision to exchange the kingside knights can be linked to continued pressure on d4.
92 *Euwe Variation*

The alternative 8...cxd4 has been explored. For example, after 9 《xf5 exf5 10 《xd4 《e7 play might continue:

a) 11 ♕b3 and now:
   a1) 11...《xd4 12 cxd4 ♕b6 13 ♕xb6 (13 ♕xd5? 《c6 14 ♕b3 ♕xd4 15 e6 fxe6 16 ♕xe6 ♕d5 《; 13 《c3 ♕e6 14 ♕a4+ ♕d7 =) 13...axb6 14 《c3 《e6 15 《d2 ♕d7 16 a3 (16 ♕b5 《hc8 17 a4 《c4 {17...《c2 18 ♕c3 f4 19 ♕fe1 and ♕a3 =} 18 b3 《c2 《) 16...《hc8 17 《a2 《c4 (17...《c2 18 ♕c3 f4 19 ♕fe1 intending ♕b4 =) 18 ♕c3 f4 19 ♕fd1 ♕f5 (Romero Holmes-Ulybin, Las Palmas 1992) 20 ♕b4! ♕c2 21 ♕dc1 (not 21 ♕d2? ♕xb4 —) 21...《b3 (21...《g5?! 22 ♕c3 ♕b3 23 ♕b5! ♕ac8 24 ♕e1! with the idea ♕d6 ±) 22 ♕xc4 ♕xc4 23 《xe7 ♕xa2 = (Ulybin and Lysenko).

   a2) 11...《c8 12 f4 0-0 0 13 《e3 f6 14 exf6 (14 《d2 fxe5 15 《xc6 bxc6 16 fxe5 is unclear) 14...《xf6 15 ♕d2 ♕e8 16 《ae1 ♕xe3?! (16...《h8 ±) 17 ♕xc6 ♕e8 18 《e5 ♕xel (18...《xe5 19 ♕xe3 ♕d4 20 cxd4 —) 19 ♕xe1 ♕e6 20 ♕xb7 ♕b8 21 ♕xa7 ♕xb2 22 ♕db3 ♕c8! 23 ♕a3 ♕c2 24 ♕e3 d4 25 ♕xd4 ♕xa2 26 ♕wd6 ♕a6 27 ♕b4 ♕d5 28 ♕xf5 h6 29 ♕b5 ♕a8? 30 ♕g4! ♕a1+ 31 ♕f2 ♕a2+ 32 ♕g3 ♕xg2+ 33 ♕h3 1-0 Kupreichik-Kosten, Torcy 1989.

b) 11 《f3 ♕e6 12 ♕e3 g5!? 13 ♕a3! f4 14 ♕d4 ♕g8 15 ♕c1 ♕xd4?! (15...《wa5 16 《ac2 ♕f5 with unclear play) 16 ♕xd4 ♕a5 17 ♕ec2 h5 18 ♕d3 0-0-0 19 ♕d4 g4 20 ♕ab5 a6 21 ♕xe6 fxe6 22 ♕d4 ♕b6 23 ♕g5 24 ♕ae1 ♕d7 (Romanishin-Hort, Biel 1987) 25 c4! dxc4 26 ♕xc4 ♕c8 27 ♕b3 and ♕d1 +–.

c) 11 ♕e1 ♕xd4 12 ♕xd4 ♕e6 13 ♕a4+ ♕d7 14 ♕xd7+ ♕xd7 15 ♕e3 g5 16 ♕d2 f4 17 ♕d4 b5 18 a4 ♕2-½ Gallagher-Züger, Switzerland 1992.

9 ♕g5

White is prepared to take risks by offering the d-pawn and thereby inviting complications.

A steadier response, 9 《xh4, is the standard continuation. Upon 9...《xh4 play might proceed:

a) 10 ♕d2 cxd4 11 ♕f3 ♕d8 12 cxd4 ♕b6 13 ♕e3 ♕b4 14 ♕b1 ♕e7 15 a3 《c6 16 b3 a5 17 h4 h6 18 h5 0-0-0 19 b4 axb4 20 axb4 ♕xb4 21 ♕d3 ♕c7 22 ♕c1 ♕a5 23 ♕a1 ♕b6 24 ♕b1 ♕a5 25 ♕a1 ½-½ Prié-Murey, France 1991.

b) 10 ♕e3 and now:
   b1) 10...《wd8 11 ♕d2 ♕b6! 12 ♕f3 c4 13 ♕c2 ♕xb2 14 ♕d2 ♕b6 15 ♕g5 h6 16 ♕h3 0-0-0 17 ♕f4 ♕e7 18 ♕h5 ♕dg8 19 ♕fb1 ♕d8 20 ♕a4 ♕a5 21 ♕d1 g6 22 ♕f4 h5 23 ♕c1 ♕b8 24 ♕a3 and White has some compensation for the pawn; Vasiukov-Levitt, Græsted 1990.

   b2) 10...cx4 11 cxd4 ♕d8 (or 11...《b4 12 a3 ♕a5 13 g3 ♕e7 14 ♕c3 f5 15 b4 ♕b6 16 ♕c2 0-0 17 ♕d2 with an edge for White, as in
the game Kupreichik-Levitt, Copenhagen 1988, but not 11...\texttt{Qxd4? 12 g3} \texttt{\textendash\textendash} 12 \texttt{Qc3 a7 13 f4 g6 14 g4 Wb6 15 a3 0-0-0 (15...\texttt{Qxd4? 16 Wh1! a5 17 De2 A5 18 b4! axb4 19 axb4 Dxa1 20 Wxa1} \texttt{\textendash\textendash}) 16 b4 Df8 17 Wd2 Dd8 18 Aab1 Wd8 19 b5 Dd5 20 Da4 b6 21 Dfc1 A4 22 Wc3 Ab7 23 Qc5! \pm Blatny-Ruxton, Oakham 1990.

9 ... exd4
10 cxd4 Qxd4
11 Wh5 Qg6
12 Qc3 (79)

White needs to exercise caution, for example 12 Qxf7? (12 Qxh7? Qf5 \textendash\textendash) 12...Qxf7 13 xg6+ hxg6 14 Wxh8 Qc2 \textendash\textendash.

Any attempt to castle must first deal with the threat to h7: 16...g6 17 Wh6 (17 We5 Df6 18 Wxd5 0-0 with unclear play) 17...Qf8 (17...a6!?) 18 Wf4 Dg7 19 Db5! Qxb5 20 Qxb5+ Dg7 21 Wb4+ Dd6 22 Qg5+ f6 23 Qxe6+ :=

17 Qf4

Now the rooks are connected. The immediate 17 Qb5 fails to make an impression on the position: after 17...Qxb5 18 Qxb5 Wxb5 19 Qxe6 Wd7 Black has a material advantage.

17 ... h6

Kupreichik suggests Black should bring the knight back as a defensive measure: 17...Qc6!? 18 Qb5 (18 Qxe6 Wxe6 19 Qxd5 Qd8 is unclear) 18...Qc8 19 Qxe6 Wxe6 20 Qf5 Wf6! 21 Qc3 Wxb2 also with unclear play after either 22 Qxc8!? Wxa1 23 Qxd5 or 22 Qb1 Wxc3 23 Qxc8 0-0 24 Qxb7.

18 Qb5! Qxb5
19 Qxb5 Wxb5
20 Qxe6 Qf8

If 20...Wd7 21 Qae1 wins.

21 Wf5

White also has fine prospects after 21 Exe7 Qxe7 22 Qe1+ Qf8 23 Qd6+ Qg8 24 Qe7 Qf8 25 Qc7.

21 ... Wd7? (80)

Black is under the misapprehension that White must head for the ending with 22 Qe5; instead there was an amusing (for White) finish.

The game could have continued 21...Qg5! 22 Qae1 Qg8 23 Qd6!?
(23 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\text{dxg5}} \textit{hxg5}} 24 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\text{He7}}} \textit{\text{Hf8}} 25 \textcolor{green}{\textit{\text{He1e5}}} \textit{\text{Wxb2}} 26 \textcolor{yellow}{\textit{\text{Hxf7}}} \textit{\text{Hxh2+}}! = 23...\textit{\text{Wb2}} (23...\textcolor{red}{\textit{\text{Hxf4?}}} 24 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\text{He7}}} \textit{\text{Hf8}} 25 \textcolor{green}{\textit{\text{Hd8}}}) 24 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\text{Hd7}}} \textit{\text{Hf8}} 25 \textcolor{green}{\textit{\text{He8!}}} (25 \textcolor{green}{\textit{\text{He5}}} \textit{\text{Wd2}} 26 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\text{Hd6}}} \textit{\text{g6}} 27 \textit{\text{We5}} \textit{\text{is unclear}}) 25...\textit{\text{Wf6}} 26 \textit{\text{Hxf8+}} \textit{\text{Wxf8}} 27 \textit{\text{Wxd5?!}} \textit{\text{±}} (Kupreichik).

\textit{22 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\text{Hxh6!}}} \textit{\text{Wxf5}}
\textit{23 \textcolor{green}{\textit{\text{Hxh8#}}} (1-0)}

\textbf{Game 27}

\textit{Hjartarson-Korchnoi}

\textit{Amsterdam 1991}

1 \textit{e4} \textit{e6}
2 \textit{d4} \textit{d5}
3 \textit{e5} \textit{c5}
4 \textit{c3} \textit{\text{Qc6}}
5 \textit{\text{Qf3}} \textit{\text{Qd7}}
6 \textit{\text{Qe2}} \textit{\text{Qge7}}
7 0-0

Black faced the unusual 7 \textit{dxc5} in the game Velimirović-Züger, Lucerne 1989: 7...\textcolor{red}{\textit{\text{Hg6}}} 8 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\text{He3}}} \textit{\text{Qxe5}} 9 \textit{\text{Qxe5}} \textit{\text{Qxe5}} 10 \textit{\text{f4}} \textit{\text{Qc6}} 11 \textit{\text{Qd2}} \textit{\text{b6}} 12 \textit{\text{Qb3}} \textit{\text{bxc5}} 13 \textit{\text{Qxc5}} \textit{\text{Wb6}} 14 \textit{\text{Qxd7}} \textit{\text{Wxe3}} 15 \textit{\text{Qxf8}} \textit{\text{Qxf8}} 16 \textit{\text{Wd2}}

\textcolor{red}{\textit{\text{Wxd2}}} 17 \textit{\text{Qxd2}} \textit{\text{Qe7}} 18 \textit{\text{b4}} \textit{\text{Hac8}} 19 \textit{\text{Hhc1}} \textit{\text{Hhd8}} 20 \textit{\text{Hab1}} \textit{\text{f6}} 21 \textit{\text{Qd3}} \textit{\text{g6}} 22 \textit{\text{Qe1}} \textit{\text{Qd6}} 23 \textit{\text{Hfl}} \textit{\text{Qc7}} 24 \textit{\text{Hf3}} \textit{\text{e5}} 25 \textit{\text{Hh3}} \textit{\text{Hh6}} 26 \textit{\text{b5}} \textit{\text{Qa5}} 27 \textit{\text{fxe5}} \textit{\text{fxe5}} 28 \textit{\text{Qb4}} \textit{\text{e4}} 20 \textit{\text{Ha4}} 1-0.

7 ... \textit{\text{Qg6}} (81)

Korchnoi acknowledges that Werner Hug first suggested this set-up. On \it{g6} the knight is less active than on \it{f5}, but at least it avoids the threat of \textit{Qe2-d3xf5}.

8 \textit{g3}

In the game Mephisto Lyon-Psakhis, Berlin 1991, the computer used a new approach: 8 \textit{\text{Qg5}} \textit{f6?!} (8...\textit{\text{Wb6}} 9 \textit{\text{Wd2}} \textit{\text{h6}} 10 \textit{\text{Qe3}} \textit{±}) 9 \textit{\text{exf6}} \textit{\text{gxf6}} 10 \textit{\text{Qe3}} \textit{\text{cxd4}} 11 \textit{\text{Qxd4}} \textit{\text{Qd6}} 12 \textit{\text{Qc3}} \textit{\text{Qd4}} 13 \textit{\text{Qb5}} \textit{\text{Qb8}} 14 \textit{\text{Wd2}} (14 \textit{\text{Qe1?!})} 14...\textit{\text{Qxe2+}} 15 \textit{\text{Qxe2}} \textit{\text{Wxe7}} 16 \textit{\text{Qh6}} \textit{\text{Wf7}} and now White can improve with 17 \textit{\text{Wd2!}} \textit{\text{Wh5}} 18 \textit{\text{Qf4}} \textit{±}.

The major alternative is 8 \textit{\text{Qe3}}:

a) 8...cxd4?! 9 \textit{\text{cxd4}} \textit{\text{Qe7}} (9...f6?! 10 \textit{\text{Qc3}} \textit{\text{Qe7}} 11 \textit{\text{Qd3}} 0-0 12 \textit{\text{exf6}} \textit{\text{Qxf6}} 13 \textit{\text{Qe1}} \textit{\text{Wc7}} 14 \textit{\text{g3}} \textit{\text{Qe8 = Chipsay-Gulko, Manila IZ 1990})} 10
b1) 9 dxc5 Qxe5 (or 9...Wc7!?) 10 Qa3 Qxe5 11 Qxe5 Qxe5
{11...Wxe5?! 12 Qd4 Wg5 13 g3! \(=\)} 12 Qb5 Qxb5 13 Qxb5+ Qc6 14 c4
Axd8 \(\{14...a6 15 Qxc6+! bxc6 16
cxd5 exd5 17 Axd4!\} 15 cxd5 exd5?! \(\{15...Axd5!?\} 16 Qxc6+ Wxc6 17
Axd4 0-0 18 b4 Axf6 19 a4 \(=\) Kharlov-
Sakaev, Podolsk 1992) 10 Qxe5 Qxe5 11 f4 Qc6 12 Qd2 0-0 13 Qd3
g6 14 Wh3! Axf6 \(\{14...b6 15 cxb6
taxb6 16 Wh2 \(=\)\} 15 Wh2 A.g7 16 Wh3
Qe7 17 h4! f6 \(\{17...Qh5 18 Qd4! \(=\}\)
18 h5 e5 19 h6 A.h8 20 fxe5 fxe5 21
Qg5 W.e8 \(\{21...e4 22 Wh4 Wh7 23
Aae1 Wh8 24 Qxe7 Wxe7 25 Wxe7
Wxe7 26 Qg5 is slightly better for
White) 22 Aae1 A.c6 (22...e4?! 23
Qxe4! dxe4 24 Qc4+ and White wins) 23 c4 \(=\) Kharlov-Sakaev, São

b2) 9 A.d3 Wh6 10 Wd2 cxd4 11
cxd4 A.b4 12 A.e2 A.b5 13 Qc3
Qxe2 14 Whxe2 Qc6 15 g3 0-0 16 h4
Afc8 17 Qad1 A.d5 18 Qe1 Qc4 19
Qd3 Qf8 20 A.a4 Qd8 21 b3 A.a3
22 h5 Qc2 23 Qd5 b6 24 Qb7 Wh7
25 Qd6 \(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\) Sax-Nikolić, Manila

b3) 9 g3 cxd4 10 cxd4 f6 11 exf6
Axf6 12 A.c3 0-0 13 Wh2 (13 A.d3!?)
A.e8 14 Wh2 e5 =) 13...Qge7 14
A.d3 h6 (Romanishin-Nikolić, Len-
ingrad 1987) 15 Whf1 =.

b4) 9 A.e1 0-0 10 f4 Wh6 11 Whd2
cxd4 12 cxd4 f6 13 Qf3 fxe5 14 fxe5
Axc8 15 Qc3 Aa5 16 A.f2 Qc4 17
Qxc4 Axc4 18 Aaf1 A.cc8 19 g3 Axf5
20 h4 = Kupreichik-Nikolić, Ljub-
ljana 1989.

8 ... Qe7
9 h4

This advance forces the knight to
retreat. Black relies on eventually
breaking out of the cramped condi-
tions whereupon White’s kingside
pawns might become a liability.

9 ... cd4
10 cxd4 0-0
11 h5

On 11 A.a3 comes 11...f6 12 exf6
Axf6 13 A.c2 A.ge7 with equal
chances.

11 ... A.h8
12 h6

To combat Black’s plan of break-
ing out with ...f6 it might be advis-
able to consider 12 A.d3!?, e.g.
12...f6?! 13 Whc2 with excellent pros-
spects. Thus, 12...A.b4 13 h6 g6 14
A.c3 Axd3 15 Whxd3 is likely, when
White has relinquished the useful
light-squared bishop in return for
greater control of e5.

12 ... A.g6
13 A.bd2

The queen’s knight will support
d4 although Korchnoi suggests that
13 A.c3 should be considered, to
contest the central light squares. The
reason for the exchange 9...cxd4 becomes apparent because otherwise White could now play 12 dxc5 (12 c4?) 12...\(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xc5 13 c4 with advantage.

13 ... h6
14 exf6 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xf6
15 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) b3 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f7
16 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) h2! (82)

White intends either \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) g4 to restrain ...e5, or \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) g4 to target e6.

Not 16 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f4? g5 and ...\(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xh6, nor 16 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) e3 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) d6 \(\neg\).

16 ... \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) d6

Now 17 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) g4 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f5 is satisfactory.

After 16...e5 17 dxe5 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) cxe5 18 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xd5 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) c6! 19 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xd8 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xd8 Black has insufficient compensation for the pawn.

17 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) g4! \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) c8
18 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f3 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) e4
18...\(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) b6 19 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) e1 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f5 20 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xf5 exf5
21 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f4 is better for White.

19 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) e3 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f7?!

Black is slow to sense that the queen’s knight should immediately aim for f5 to hinder White’s progress. On 19...e5? 20 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xe5 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xe5 21 dxe5 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xg4 22 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xg4 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xe5 23 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) e6+ White has a big plus.

20 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) c1 b6
21 a3 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) e7
22 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) c8 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) e8
23 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) bd2 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f5
24 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f4?!

Korchnoi prefers 24 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xe4 dxe4 25 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) e5 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xe5 26 dxe5 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xe3 27 fxe3 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xf1+ 28 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f1 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) b5+ 29 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) g2 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) d3 30 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) d2 intending 30 ...\(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f2 with a clear advantage.

24 ... \text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)} c7?

Black would have equal chances after the superior 24...\(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xd4! 25 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xd4 e5.

25 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) e1 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xh6
26 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xh6 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xh6
27 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xe4 dxe4
28 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xe4 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) g7 (83)

29 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) xe6?

Just one more preliminary move would have ensured White a decisive advantage: 29 \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) c2! \(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) f8 (29...\(\text{\(\text{\texttt{\textdagger}}\)}\) e7
30 d5! e5 31 \( \text{Ax}d7 \text{Ax}d7 32 \text{Qxe}5 \)
30 \( \text{Wc}7 \text{Af}7 31 \text{Wc}4 \).

Now Black can activate his queen to cause a few problems.

29 ... \( \text{Axe}6 \)
30 \( \text{Wxe}6 \text{Wh}5 \)
31 \( \text{Wb}3 \text{Ad}7 \)

A sterner test is 31... \( \text{Wf}5 \) (intending 32... \( \text{Ax}d4 \)) when Black has counterplay after either 32 d5 g5 or 32 \( \text{Ke}2 \text{h}5 \).

32 \( \text{Ke}8 \text{Wd}5 \)
33 \( \text{Wb}4 \text{Wd}6 \)
34 \( \text{Wc}4 \text{Wd}5 \)
35 \( \text{Wb}4 \text{Wd}6 \)
36 \( \text{Wxd}4 \text{Wxd}6 \)
37 \( \text{Ke}4 \text{h}5 \)
38 \( \text{Wf}1?! \)

The best practical try is 38 \( \text{Qe}5 \) followed by f4.

38 ... \( \text{Ad}5 \)
39 \( \text{Ke}3 \text{g}5 \)
40 \( \text{Ke}3 \text{g}4 \)
41 \( \text{Kc}7+ \text{Wh}6 \)
42 \( \text{Kc}6 \text{g}7 \)
43 \( \text{Ke}7+ \text{Wh}6 \)
44 \( \text{Kc}6 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)

Game 28
Illiescas-Speelman
Linares 1992

This continuation is a popular idea, which often results in play very similar to lines arising from 5...\( \text{Wb}6 \) 6 a3. The difference is that Black is not obliged to transpose into such lines, but can delay moving the queen; this offers increased flexibility.

6 ...

\( \text{Qe}7 (84) \)

There are valid alternative treatments:

a) 6...f6 7 \( \text{Qd}3 \) (7 b4?! \text{fxe}5 8 dxe5 e4 9 \( \text{Qd}4 \text{Qf}6 \) 10 \( \text{Qf}4 \text{Qe}7 \) 11 \( \text{Qb}5 \) 0-0 \( \text{f} \) Popchev-Dolmatov, Polanica Zdroj 1987) 7...\( \text{Wc}7 \) 8 0-0 c4 9 \( \text{Qc}2 \text{Qg}7 \) 10 \( \text{Qe}1 \text{Qg}6 \) 11 \( \text{Qh}4! \)
\( \text{Qxh}4 \) 12 \( \text{Wh}5+ \text{g}6 \) 13 \( \text{Wxh}4 \) f5 14 \( \text{Qg}5 \text{Wb}6 \) 15 \( \text{Qa}2 \text{h}6 \) 16 \( \text{Qf}6 \text{Qg}8 \) 17 \( \text{Qd}2 \text{Qd}8 \) 18 a4 a5 19 \( \text{Qh}1 \text{Qf}7 \)
20 \( \text{Qb}1 \text{Wc}7 \) 21 g4 \( \text{Qg}5 \) 22 \( \text{Qxf}5 \) 23 \( \text{Wg}3 \text{Qe}6 \) 24 b3 \( \text{Qe}4 \) 25 \( \text{Qxe}4 \text{dxe}4 \) 26 \( \text{bxc}4 \text{Qxc}4 \) 27 \( \text{Qb}2 \text{b}5 \) 28 \( \text{Qxb}5 \text{Qxb}5 \) 29 \( \text{Qxb}5 \text{g}5 \) 30 \( \text{Qb}3 \text{Qg}6 \) 31 \( \text{Wh}3 \text{Wd}7 \) 32 \( \text{Wh}5 \text{Wh}7 \)
33 \( \text{Qb}7 \) 1-0 Donguines-R.Rodriguez, Cebu 1992.
b) 6...\(\text{Nc8}\) 7 \(\text{d3}\) (7 \(\text{b4 cxd4 8 cxd4 \text{Nb6}\) 9 \(\text{Nb2}\) transposes to Game 12, Galdunts-Ambarstuman}) 7...\(\text{cxd4}\) 8 \(\text{cxd4 \text{Nb6}\) 9 \(\text{Qc2}\) g5 10 h3 \(\text{Qxd4}\) 11 \(\text{Qxd4 \text{Qc5}\) 12 \(\text{Qe2 \text{Qxf2+}\) 13 \(\text{Qf1}\) f6 14 \(\text{Qbc3}\) a5 15 \(\text{Qa4 Qe7}\) 16 \(\text{Qxd7+}\) \(\text{Qxd7}\) 17 exf6 with an unclear position; Afek-Welin, Biel 1989.

c) 6...c4 and now:

c1) 7 \(g3\) and now:

c11) 7...\(\text{Qc7}\) 8 h4 f5 9 \(\text{g2}\) \(\text{Qge7}\) 10 0-0 h6 11 \(\text{Qbd2 \text{Qa5}\) 12 a4 0-0-0 13 b3 cxb4 14 \(\text{Qxb4 Qxb3}\) 15 \(\text{Qxb3 \text{Qc6}\) 16 \(\text{Qa2 Qa5}\) 17 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qb8}\) 18 \(\text{Qd2 QC8}\) 19 \(\text{Qfc1 Qe7}\) 20 h5 \(\text{Qc4}\) 21 \(\text{Qxc4 QCxc4}\) 22 \(\text{Qb2 QCd8}\) 23 \(\text{Qf1 QC7}\) 24 c4 \(\text{Qe4}\) 25 \(\text{Qab1 dxc4}\) 26 \(\text{Qxc4 QCd7}\) 27 \(\text{Qwa2 Qd5}\) ½-½ Adams-Levitt, British Ch 1989.

c12) 7...\(\text{Qa5}\) 8 \(\text{Qbd2 Qe7}\) 9 \(\text{g2}\) \(\text{Qc8}\) 10 0-0 \(\text{Qb6}\) 11 \(\text{Qe1 QC7}\) 12 \(\text{Qb1}\) 0-0-0 13 \(\text{Qdf3}\) h6 14 h4 \(\text{Qe7}\) 15 \(\text{Qwe2 QC6}\) 16 \(\text{Qh3 QA4}\) 17 \(\text{Qg2}\) \(\text{Qwb3}\) 18 \(\text{Qe3 Qa4}\) 19 \(\text{Qd2 QC2}\) 20 f4 \(\text{Qd7}\) 21 \(\text{Qf2 QB3}\) 22 \(\text{Qe1 Qxd2}\) 23 \(\text{Qxd2}\) g6 24 \(\text{Qe3 Qwb3}\) 25 h5 \(\text{Qdg8}\) 26 \(\text{Qh2 QC8}\) 27 \(\text{Qfc1 QC8}\) 28 \(\text{Qe1 a5}\) 29 \(\text{Qf2 QA8}\) 30 \(\text{Qg1 QC7}\) 31 g4 a4 32 \(\text{Qg3 QC5}\) 33 \(\text{Qbf1 QC8}\) 34 \(\text{Qf3}\) with a slight plus for White; Anand-Garma, Calcutta 1992.

c2) 7 \(\text{Qe2 QA5}\) 8 \(\text{Qbd2}\) f5!? 9 0-0 \(\text{Qe7}\) 10 a4!? \(\text{Qwb6}\) 11 b4 cxb4 12 \(\text{Qa3 Qg6}\) (12...\(\text{Qxa4}\) ? 13 \(\text{Qb4}\) ?) 13 \(\text{Qxf8 Qxf8}\) 14 c4 dxc4 15 \(\text{Qxc4 QCxc4}\) 16 \(\text{Qxc4}\) b2 17 \(\text{Qb1 QC8}\) 18 \(\text{Qa2 QC3}\) 19 d5 \(\text{Qa3}\) 20 \(\text{Qc4 Qxa4}\) 21 \(\text{Qd2 QC5}\) 22 \(\text{Qxb2 QCxf3}\) 23 \(\text{Qcl}\) ! \(\text{Qd7}\) ? (23...b6! 24 gxf3 \(\text{Qxe5}\) 25 \(\text{Qb5+ QCxb5}\) 26 \(\text{Qxc5 QCxf3+}\) 27 \(\text{Qh1 QC5}\) 28 \(\text{Qxb5 QCxd5}\) 29 \(\text{Qxc5 QCf7}\) ?) 24 \(\text{Qxb7 QC8}\) 25 \(\text{Qxa7 QC5}\) 26 dxe6 \(\text{Qxe6}\) 27 \(\text{Qb5+ Qd8}\) 28 \(\text{Qg5+ Qf6}\) 29 \(\text{Qxg7}\) 1-0 Nikolić-Schulz, Lugano 1986.

c3) 7 \(\text{Qf4}\) !? \(\text{Qwb6}\) (7...\(\text{Qge7}\) 8 h4 \(\text{Qc8}\) 9 \(\text{Qbd2}\) h6 10 g3 \(\text{Qb6}\) 11 \(\text{Qh3 QC7}\) 12 h5 \(\text{Qa5}\) 13 \(\text{Qe3 QA4}\) = Khalifman-Yusupov, Minsk 1987) 8 \(\text{Qc1 QC7}\) 9 \(\text{Qbd2}\) f6 10 exf6 gxf6 11 \(\text{Qbl QC6}\) 12 \(\text{Qe3 QA5}\) 13 h4?! \(\text{Qd6}\) 14 h5 \(\text{Qce7}\) 15 \(\text{Qh4}\) 0-0-0 16 g3 \(\text{Qf5}\) !? 17 \(\text{Qxf5 exf5}\) 18 \(\text{Qg2 QC8}\) 19 0-0 \(\text{Qxg3}\) ! 20 b4 cxb4 21 \(\text{fxg3 QCx3}\) 22 \(\text{Qxb3 QCxg3}\) 23 \(\text{Qxa5 QCa5}\) 24 \(\text{Qf4 QCd8}\) 25 \(\text{Qf2 QCx3}\) 26 \(\text{Qe1 QCg4}\) 27 \(\text{Qwd4}\) 28 \(\text{Qd3 QC3}\) 29 \(\text{Qf1 QC6}\) 0-1 J.Littlewood-Adams, Sheffield 1991.

c4) 7 \(\text{Qh4 QC7}\) 8 h5 h6 9 g3 \(\text{Qa5}\) 10 \(\text{Qbd2 QC8}\) 11 \(\text{Qh4}\) !? \(\text{Qb6}\) 12 \(\text{Qg2 QC7}\) (12...\(\text{Qa4}\) 13 \(\text{Qwe2 QC2}\) ?! 14 \(\text{Qxc4}\) !? \(\text{Qb3}\) 15 \(\text{Qxb6 axb6}\) 16 \(\text{Qxc2 QCxa1}\) 17 \(\text{Qb5+ QC6}\) 18 \(\text{Qd1 QC5}\) 19 b4 \(\text{Qxb5}\) 20 \(\text{Qb2}\) ?) 13 \(\text{Qe3}\) 0-0-0 (13...f6!? 14 \(\text{Qf6}\) 15 \(\text{fxe5}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 16 \(\text{Qg4}\) 0-0 with an unclear position) 14 \(\text{Qe4}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 15 \(\text{Qh3 QC8}\) 16 \(\text{Qe2 QCd8}\) 17 0-0 a6 18 \(\text{Qh2 QC7}\) 19 \(\text{Qbl QCg8}\) 20 \(\text{Qg2}\) ? \(\text{Qa4}\) 21 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qxa3}\) 22 \(\text{f5}\) !? \(\text{exf5}\) 23 \(\text{Qf4 QC6}\) 24 \(\text{Qxd8}\) 25 \(\text{Qxb6 QCxe2}\) 26 \(\text{Qb2}\) \(\text{Qxf4}\) 27 \(\text{Qxf4 QC6}\) 28 \(\text{Qh4 QC6}\) 29 \(\text{Qxf5 QCf5}\) 30 \(\text{Qxf5 QCd4}\) 31 \(\text{Qxd5}\)
and White wins; Malaniuk-Bareev, USSR 1987.

d) 6...cxd4 7 cxd4 Qe7 8 Qd3 Qf5 9 Le3 Wb6 10 Qc3 Qxe3 11 fxe3 Le7 12 b4 Qc8 13 Qc1 Qd8 14 0-0 0-0 15 Wb3 f5 16 exf6 Qxf6 17 Qc2 Qh8 18 Qe5 Qe8 19 Wf2 Qf7 20 Qxd5! — Masserey-Summermatter, Silavplana 1993.

e) 6...Qh6 7 b4 cxd4 8 cxd4 Qf5 transposes to the text.

7 b4 cxd4
8 cxd4 Qf5
9 Qc3?! (85)

Illescas and Zlotnik prepared this idea based on the premise that 9...Wb6 is ineffective after 10 Qa4.

The usual move is 9...Qb2:

a) 9...Le7 and now:

a1) 10 Qd3 0-0 11 0-0 f6 12 Qxf5! exf5 13 Qc3 Le8 14 Wd3 f4 15 e6! Qh5 16 Qf1 a6 17 Qf5! Qxf3 18 gxf3 Qxd4 19 Wd3 Qc6 20 Qxd5 Wxe8 21 Qad1 Qd8 22 We4 Wh5 23 Qxf4 Wg5+ 24 Qh1 Qxh1 25 Qxd1 Qd8 26 Qg1 Wb5 27 Qg6! Le8 (27...hxg6 28 Wxg6 Qf8 29 Wf7+ Qh8 30 Qxf6 ++) 28 Qxe7+ Qxe7 29 Qxf6! — Nikolić-Christiansen, Ljubljana/Portoroz 1985.

b) 9...Wb6 10 Qe2 and now:

b1) 10...Qc8 11 0-0 h5 (11...a6 12 Qh1 Le7 13 g4 Qh4 14 Qc3 Qxf3 15 Qa4 Wc7 16 Qxf3 0-0 17 Qc5 b6 18 Qxd7 Wxd7 19 Le2 b5 20 f4 f6 21 Wd2 = Kontić-Miljanić, Nikšić 1991) 12 Qh1 Le7 13 Qc3 Wd8 14 Qd3 g6 15 Qc1 a5 16 b5 Qa7 17 a4 Qa8 18 Qd2 Qc8 19 Qb3 Qb6 20 Qc5 Qc8 21 Qe2 h4 22 Qf4 Qc4 23 Qxc4! dxc4 24 Qxc4 b6 25 Qe4 Qb7 26 d5 h3 27 g4 Qh4 28 f3 Qg2 29 Qd6+ Qxd6 30 exd6 Qxf4 31 dx6 fxe6 32 Qxh8 ± Galdunts-Orlov, Belgrade 1989.

b2) 10...Qe7 11 0-0 transposes to the notes in Game 11, Prié-de la Villa Garcia.

c) 9...b5 10 Qc3 a6 (10...a5!? 11 Qxb5 axb4 12 a4 Qa5 13 Qc1 Qc4 14 Qxc4 dxc4 15 Qxc4 Qxb5 16 Qxb5 Qd5 ± 11 Qd3 g6 12 0-0 h5 13 Qe2 Qe7 14 Qc3 Wb6 15 Qf4 Qg7 16 h4 a5 17 Qe2! axb4 18 axb4 Qb8 19 Qfb1 0-0 20 Qc2 Qd8 21 g3 Qc8 22 Ha3 Qa5! 23 Qd3 Qc4 24 Ha7 Qc7 25 Qba1 Qb8 26 Qc5 Qc6 27 Qxc7 Qxc7 28 Qd2 Ma8 29 Qd1 Wb8 30 Qc3 Qxa1 31 Wxa1 Qa8 ½-½ Grosar-L.B.Hansen, Bled/Rogaška Slatina 1991.

9 ...

![Chess Diagram](image)

9 ... Qc8

9...Qe7 10 Qd3! (10 Qe2?! Qc8 11 Qb2 0-0 12 Qx7 0-0 f6 13 Qc1 Wc8 14)
100 Euwe Variation

\( \text{xe}1 \text{fxe}5 \text{ 15 } \text{dxe}5 \text{ } \text{d}d8! \text{ with an edge for Black; Miljanović-Draško, Belgrade 1987) 10... } \text{xfxd}4 \text{ 11 } \text{xd}4 \text{ } \text{xd}4 \text{ 12 } \text{wg}4 \text{ gives White an advantage.} \)

10 \text{b}2 \text{ } \text{h}4!

Black has implemented a novel procedure in order to make the defence of d4 difficult. The idea of exchanging the king’s knight is not feared in the 9 \text{b}2 lines because the knight can be supported by \text{d}1d2 or the bishop is on e7.

11 \text{xb}4

In Kimpinsky-Zysk, Bundesliga 1992, White tried the surprising resource 11 \text{g}1 which proved dependable: 11...\text{e}7 12 g3 \text{f}5 13 \text{g}e2 f6 14 \text{h}3 \text{fxe}5 15 \text{xf}5 \text{exf}5 16 \text{xd}5 \text{e}4 17 \text{w}b3 \text{d}6 18 0-0 \text{e}7 19 \text{ec}3 \text{xd}5 20 \text{wd}5 \text{w}e7 21 \text{b}5 \text{xb}5 22 \text{w}b5+ \text{wd}7 23 \text{wd}5 \text{b}8 24 \text{wb}3 \text{f}7 25 \text{wa}4+ \text{wd}7 26 \text{wb}3 \text{f}7 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}.

11 ... \text{xb4}

12 \text{a}2

The only move in view of 12 b5? (12 \text{e}2? \text{xb}4 –+) 12...\text{xd}4! 13 g3 \text{xc}3! 14 \text{g}g4 \text{f}3+ 15 \text{we}2 \text{xb}5+ –+.

12 ... \text{e}4+

12...\text{e}7 13 \text{d}3 leaves the queen in a vulnerable state.

13 \text{we}2 \text{g}6

14 \text{c}1

It is necessary to thwart the possibility of 14...\text{xb}4 followed by ...\text{c}2. However, Illescas indicates that the best chance is 14 \text{wd}3!? a6 15 \text{wg}6 \text{h}xg6 intending ...\text{a}7, ...\text{b}5 and ...\text{h}4, which gives Black the better chances.

14 ... \text{e}7

15 \text{f}3 0-0

16 \text{d}3 \text{w}h6

17 0-0 \text{f}6

With White having to disrupt the harmony of his pieces to defend d4, Black is in the ascendancy. Now the plan is to introduce the light-squared bishop into the game via e8-h5.

18 \text{we}2 \text{xe}5

19 dxe5 \text{g}5

20 \text{c}1

Speelman suggests 20 \text{c}2 as an improvement, based on the line 20...\text{e}8 21 b5 \text{h}5 22 g4 with equal chances. Illescas points out a refinement to tip the scales in Black’s favour after 21...\text{f}4! 22 g3 \text{h}5 23 f3 \text{e}3+.

20 ... \text{e}8

21 g3 \text{h}5

22 f3 \text{d}2

23 \text{d}1 \text{e}3+

24 \text{g}2 (86) \text{xf}3+?

This impetuous move appears to be lethal but the course of the game proves it to be faulty. Black can retain the advantage upon 24...d4.

25 \text{xf}3 \text{xf}3

26 \text{xf}3 \text{h}8

27 \text{a}6

The refutation of the sacrifice is revealed. Black is overloaded and is obliged to relinquish material.
Black is still posing a number of problems thanks to White's difficulty in activating his forces. A better try is 31 \text{x}d4 \text{xd}8 32 \text{c}c3 \text{wd}4 33 \text{x}d4 \text{x}d4 (33...\text{x}d4 34 \text{g}2 \text{c}8 35 \text{xd}4 \text{x}c3 36 \text{a}4 ++-) 34 \text{x}d4 \text{x}d4 35 \text{f}2 \text{c}6 36 \text{b}5 a6 37 \text{d}6 b5 38 \text{e}3! \text{xe}5 39 \text{d}4 which is a favourable ending for White.

On 35...\text{c}8, White could reply 36 \text{d}3! \text{d}8 37 \text{g}5 \text{d}7 38 \text{f}2 when the knight acts as a shield to the king, ensuring an edge.

Now 36 \text{e}2 is the winning try.

36 \text{wd}8+? \text{f}8?

In time-trouble Speelman passes up the chance of a probable draw with 36...\text{h}7 37 \text{h}4+ \text{xh}4 38 \text{g}xh4 \text{h}3.

37 \text{d}2 \text{f}3
38 \text{e}2! \text{e}5
39 \text{c}3 \text{d}4+
40 \text{xd}4 \text{exd}4
41 \text{b}5 \text{d}3

If 41...\text{xd}3 42 \text{f}1 \text{d}2 43 \text{xd}4 a6 44 \text{e}1! ensures White's advantage.

42 \text{c}1 a6
43 \text{c}3 \text{f}6

No better is 43...\text{f}7 44 \text{f}4 intending 45 \text{g}2.

44 \text{h}4

White's victory is sealed. The rook has no opportunity to enter White's camp due to the minor pieces blocking the files, while the \text{d}3 pawn will soon leave the board. White efficiently concludes the game: 44...\text{f}7 45 \text{f}4 \text{c}6 46 \text{d}2 \text{e}6 47 \text{f}2 \text{e}5 48 \text{e}3 \text{g}6 49 \text{e}1 \text{f}5 50 \text{xd}3 \text{d}6 51 \text{e}3 \text{g}4 52 \text{e}2! \text{e}6+ 53 \text{d}3 \text{e}8 54 \text{c}3 \text{f}3 55 \text{d}4+ \text{g}3 56 \text{f}5+ \text{g}4 57 \text{x}g7 \text{d}8 58 \text{c}2 \text{c}8 59 \text{h}5 \text{g}5 60 \text{d}3 \text{h}6 61 \text{e}5 \text{b}5 62 \text{c}3 \text{c}6 63 \text{e}5 \text{c}4 64 \text{e}6 a5 1-0.

Game 29
Sveshnikov-Popović
Palma de Mallorca 1989

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 Qc6
5 Qf3 Qd7
6 dxc5 (87)

An almost automatic response, although Nikolenko-Shur, USSR 1991 continued 6...Qc7 7 Qa3! (7 Qf4 Qxc5 8 Qd3 h6 9 h4 Qge7 10 b4 Qb6 11 a4 is unclear; Mamedov-Shur, USSR 1990) 7...Qxe5 8 Qb5 Qxf3+ 9 Qxf3 Qe5+ 10 Qd1 Qc8 11 Qf4 Qf6 12 Qg3 Qg6 13 Qxa7 Qxg3 14 hxg3 Qxc5 15 Qe3 Qa5 16 Qb6 Qa4 17 f3 Qd6 18 b3 Qa3 19 Qb5 Qxb5 20 Qxb5+ Qe7 21 g4 Qa8 22 Qd4 e5 23 Qe1 f6 24 f4 Qe6 25 Qc2 Qc7 26 a4 Qc6 27 Qf2 Qac8 28 Qad1 Qc7 29 f5+ Qf7 30 Qd7 Qc7 31 Qe6+ --.

7 b4

This is the modern treatment of the position. The main alternative is 7 Qd3, whereupon play might proceed:

a) 7...f5 8 Qbd2 Qge7 9 Qb3 Qb6 10 0-0 Qg6 11 He1 0-0 12 Qbd4 Qxd4 13 cxd4 Qh4 14 Qe2 Qxf3+ 15 Qxf3 1/2-1/2 Mascarinhas-Meier, Switzerland 1991.

b) 7...f6 8 b4 (8 Qf4 fxe5 9 Qxe5 Qxe5 10 Qxe5 Qf6 =); 8 exf6 Qxf6 9 0-0 0-0 10 Qg5 Qe8 11 We2 e5 1/2 Potick-Fiorito, Konex 1991) 8...Qe7 9 b5 Qxe5 10 Qxe5 fxe5 11 Wh5+ Qf8 12 Qxe5 Qf6 (Sveshnikov-Sax, Lvoev 1978) 13 Qg3! e5 14 0-0 Qe7 15 Qg5 ±.

c) 7...Qge7 and now:

c1) 8 0-0 Qg6 9 He1 Qc7 10 We2 (10 Qxg6 fxg6! 11 Qf4 0-0 12 Qg3 Qe7 1/2 Sveshnikov-Balashov, USSR Ch 1976) 10...f6 11 exf6 gxf6
12 c4! d4 13 a3 0-0 0-0 14 b4 d6 15 c5 f4 16 g3 xc1 17 xc1 f4 Pachman-Voiculescu, Bucharest 1954.

c2) 8 f4 g6 9 g3 0-0 10 bd2 f5 11 exf6 gxf6 12 b3 b6 13 0-0 ce5 14 dx5 dx5 15 c2

f7 16 cd4 w8 17 wh5 w7 18 fe1 xd4 19 xd4 w6 20 f4 f5 21 xe3 xd4 22 b6 f4 23 xf4

xf4 24 xh7+ wh8 25 wxd7 x8 26 xex6 x6 27 xh3 xxb2 28

wh8+ wh7 29 wh7+ wf8 30 xf1 d4 31 xg3 f7 32 wh6+ we8 33 b3 x7 34 wh3 1-0 Bastian-Geveke, Bundesliga 1991/92.

c3) 8 b4 b6 9 b5 da5 10 0-0
g6 11 a4 xc8 12 ka2 drug 13 e2

a6 14 bxa6 bxa6 15 da3 dx3 16

xa3 xc5 17 xc5 xc5 18 xaxa6

wa5 19 db5 db5 20 axb5 wb5 21 cd4 wd7 22 f4 0-0 23 f5! exf5 24
e6 wa7 25 exf7+ xxf7 26 x8+! f8

27 xxf8+ xxf8 28 xif5 g6 29

h1 x7 30 wg4 w8 31 h4 x4 32

wg5 xc8 33 h5 df8 34 de7

xe8 35 x7 de6 36 h6 x8 37

hxg7+ dxg7 38 wxg7+! 1-0 Bronstein-M.Gurevich, Brussels Rapidplay 1993.

d) 7...wc7 8 we2 dg7 9 f4 (9

b4) 9...a6 10 0-0 f5 11 db2 0-0 12

bd3 ca7 13 db4 dg6 14 xg3 f4 15 xg5 xex5 16 wh5 h6 17 xdf3

wf6 18 ah7 xhx7 19 ah4 w5f 20

xf5 xxf5 21 xg5+ xg5 22 xg5

wh8 with an unclear game; Fishbein-


e) 7...wb6?! transposes to the line

5...wb6 6 ad3 ad7 7 dxc5 which is examined in the chapter on the Milner-Barry Gambit — see the note to Black’s sixth move in Game 14.

7 ...

lb6

8 b5 da5

9 ad3 wc7 (88)

In the game Kharlov-Dreev, USSR 1991, Black chose to bring the queen’s knight back into play: 9...d4 10 a4 wc7 11 wc2 a6 12

bx6 dx6 13 0-0 de7 (13...xa4

14 xxa4 xxa4 15 da3 with unclear play) 14 da3 dx4 15 xc4 dxc4 (15...xaxa1 16 x66+ wh8 17 dg5

+) xxa4 xxa4 17 xc4 0-0 18

xd3 dg6 ½-½ and now Dreev analysed 19 h4 x6 20 h5 xf3 21 gxf3 xex5! (21...de5? 22 x4 f6 23 we4

+) 22 hxg6 xg3+ 23 wh1 wh3+ with a draw.

The immediate 9...dg7 is the usual alternative. The game might continue: 10 0-0 xc8 (10...wc7 transposes to the text) 11 a4 dg6 and now:

a) 12 da3 dc5 13 xc5 xc5 14 g3 wc7 15 we1 dc4 16 we2 0-0 17 h4 f6 18 xg6 hxg6 19 exf6

fx6 20 da4 da6 21 db3 dc4 22

ld2 xc3 23 xac1 x8 24 we5

xc1 25 xc1 wb6 26 dc5 ½-½


b) 12 de1 f6 13 da2 0-0 14

xg6 hxg6 15 wd3 d7 16 de3

xh8 17 xae2 dc4 18 da4 x6 19

h4 a6 20 bxa6 bxa6 21 db2 xdx4

22 cxd4 xh8 23 db3 fxe5 24 dxe5
Sveshnikov suggests another possibility: 13 h4!? f6 14 Ǻxg6+ hxg6 15 Ǻf4 with unclear play.

13 ... 0-0-0
14 Ǻe3 Ǻxe3
15 Ǻxe3 f6
16 Ǻae2

The e5 strongpoint is reinforced. Now 16...fxe5 (16... Ǻxe5 17 Ǻxe5 fxe5 18 Ǻxe5 ±) 17 Ǻxg6 hxg6 18 Ǻxe5 is favourable for White so Black chooses to delay the capture.

16 ... Ǻb8
17 h3 Ǻc8?!

This move gives the queen greater freedom, but the plan has a flaw. The emphasis on e5 is a sufficient role for the queen at the moment and there is little point in fianchettoing when e6 is under attack. A better way forward is 17... Ǻc8! when further pressure is applied to c3, the weak link in White's camp.

18 Ǽe2! f5

The line 18... Ǽf4 19 Ǻe1 诰x3 20 词条 Ǻc4 21 Ǻ3e2 intending 诰bd2 is assessed by Sveshnikov to be good for White.

19 Ǻe1 b6
20 诰d4 Ǻhe8
21 g4?!

A brave gesture to gain the initiative. As Black's forces are relatively constrained, it is deemed feasible to open the kingside.

21 ... fxg6
22 Ǻxg6 hxg6
23 词条  gàx3 (89)
24 $\text{Ng3?!}$

The simple 24 $\text{Nh3}$ provides excellent chances, e.g. 24...$\text{Kh8?!}$ 25 $\text{Qxe6 We7}$ 26 $\text{Qd8!}$ (26 $\text{Nh8?}$ $\text{Nh8}$ 27 $\text{Qd4 Wh4}$ 28 $\text{Wg2 Nh5}$ 29 $\text{Re3 Kh3} -+$) 26...$\text{Nh3}$ 27 $\text{Wd6+}$ $\text{Wxd6}$ 28 $\text{exd6 Nh6}$ 29 $\text{Qf7}$ $\text{Kh6}$ 30 $\text{Re7}$ ±.

24 ...

25 $\text{f3}$

There is still time for 25 $\text{Nh3}$ without the need to expose the king further.

25 ...

26 $\text{Nh3}$ $\text{Qc4}$

27 $\text{Wg5}$ $\text{Kh8}$

28 $\text{Nh8}$ $\text{Nh8}$

29 $\text{Qg2}$

If 29 $\text{Re2 Wd8!}$ 30 $\text{Qg2}$ (but not 30 $\text{Wxg7??}$ $\text{Ng8} -+$) 30...$\text{Wxg5}$ 31 $\text{Nhxg5}$ with equality.

29 ...

30 $\text{Nh1}$ $\text{Nh1}$

31 $\text{Qxh1}$ $\text{Qxa4}$

32 $\text{Wxg7}$ $\text{b7??}$

Black can also enter the queen ending; 32...$\text{Qxc3}$ 33 $\text{Qxc3 Wxc3}$ 34 $\text{Wxd7 Wxd4}$ 35 $\text{Wxe6 Wh4+}$ 36 $\text{Qg2 Wg5+}$ 37 $\text{Qh3 Wh5+}$ 38 $\text{Ng3}$ $\text{Wg5+}$ 39 $\text{Qg4 Wxe5+}$ 40 $\text{Wf4 Wc7!}$.

33 $\text{Qg2}$ $\text{c8}$

34 $\text{Wxc7+}$ $\text{xc7}$

35 $\text{f4?!}$

Now the game meanders to a draw. The last chance to keep slim winning chances is 35 $\text{Qg3}$ intending $\text{f4-g5-f6}$. 

35 ...

36 $\text{Qf3}$ a6!

37 $\text{Qg4}$ axb5

38 $\text{Nh5}$ a6

39 $\text{Qa3}$ $\text{e7}$

40 $\text{Qg5}$ $\text{xb5}$

41 $\text{Qxb5}$ $\text{Qc5}$

42 $\text{Qd6}$ $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$
5 Systems with ...\(\text{Qe7}\)

The introduction of the early knight sortie 5...\(\text{Qe7}\) is designed to put pressure on d4 without the need for \(\text{Qd7}\). It has been championed by such players as Korchnoi and Portisch, who have added much to the understanding of the line. The attraction of 4...\(\text{Qe7}\) intending 5...\(\text{Qc6}\) lies in its unusual knight formation which can confuse an unsuspecting opponent. It has been employed occasionally by Botvinnik and Keene. The strength of Black's positional play can be somewhat muted by accurate play and White should emerge with at least a slight advantage.

Game 30
Sveshnikov-Farago
Hastings 1984/85

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 \(\text{Qc6}\)
5 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) (90)

Black declares an intention to attack d4 via f5.
6 \(\text{Qa3}\)

White exploits the temporarily

\[\text{ blocked diagonal to manoeuvre the knight to c2 whence it reinforces d4.}\]

\[\text{6 ... cxd4}\]
\[\text{7 cxd4 Qf5}\]
\[\text{8 Qc2 Qe7}\]

White obtained a slight advantage in the game Psakhis-Chernin, USSR Ch 1985, after 8...\(\text{Qb4}\) 9 \(\text{Qxb4}\) \(\text{Qxb4}\)+ 10 \(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Qxd2}\)+ 11 \(\text{Qxd2}\) \(\text{Wb6}\) 12 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 13 \(\text{Qxf5}\) exf5 14 0-0 0-0.

Also possible is a straightforward attempt to put pressure on d4: 8...\(\text{Wb6}\) 9 \(\text{Qd3}\) \(\text{Qb4}\)+ 10 \(\text{Qf1}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 11 h4! (11 g3 \(\text{Qd7}\) 12 \(\text{Qg2}\) \(\text{Qc8}\)! 13 \(\text{Qxf5}\) exf5 14 b3 0-0 \(\text{f}\) Short-Vaganian, Montpellier C 1985) 11...h5 (11...\(\text{Qd7}\)?! 12 g4 \(\text{Qh6}\) 13 \(\text{Qg1}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) 14 \(\text{Qb1}\) a5 15 \(\text{Wc2}\) \(\text{Qb4}\) 16 \(\text{Qxb4}\)
axb4 17 a3 ± Rohde-Spraggett, New York 1986) 12 g3 a5 13 g2 d7 14 xf5 exf5 15 g5 xg5 16 xg5 f4 17 f3! ± Malaniuk-Lputian, USSR Ch 1986.

9 d3 0-0?! (91)

At this juncture, Black has various possibilities:

a) 9...d7 10 0-0 wb6 11 b1 a6 12 xf5 exf5 13 g5! 0-0 14 wd2 ac8 15 fc1 c7 16 xe3 e6 17 xe7 xe7 18 xc7 wc7 19 ac1 wd7 20 de1 b6 21 h3 h6 22 xd3 dc8 23 xc8+ xc8 24 df4 de7 25 wb4! wc7? 26 wd6! wxd6 27 exd6 dc8 28 de6 1-0 Haba-Meyer, Hassloch 1991.

b) 9...wb6 and now:

b1) 10 g4!? th4 11 xh4 xh4 12 0-0 e7 (12...f6 13 g5! ±) 13 xe3 d7 = Plaskett-Mestel, Hastings 1986/87.

b2) 10 0-0 d7 11 b1 a5 (not 11...xfd4 12 fxd4 xd4 13 xe3 xc5 14 b4 ++) 12 xf5 exf5 (Carlier-Rasidović, Lugano 1987) 13 g5! ±.

10 g4!

A survey of older sources reveals that the position is assumed to be equal, on the basis of the continuation 10 0-0. This assessment stems from the game Sax-F.Portisch, Hungary 1978, which continued 10...f6 11 xf5 exf5 12 e1 fxe5 13 dxe5 f4! 14 h3 c5 15 a3 a5 16 b1 h8 (16...d4? 17 b4 d3 18 bxc5 dxc2 19 xc2 xf5 20 wb3+ ±) 17 b4 axb4 18 axb4 wb6 19 e2 f5 20 b2 xe7! 21 xd5 ad8 22 wb3 ad1+ 23 e1 xc2 24 xc2 xe1+ 25 xe1 xe5=.

The text, which launches a dangerous attack, is a strong antidote to Black’s system.

10 ... th4

If the knight retreats, then the pawn barrier can be shattered: 10...h6 11 xh6 gh6 12 g5!? hxg5 13 xg5 xg5 14 wh5 h6 15 h4 with good play (Kuijf).

11 xh4 xh4 12 g5!

This rapid sharpening of the position is the reasoning behind 10 g4. The pawn traps the bishop, so Black is obliged to take it. This opens up the g-file for the benefit of the rooks.

12 ... xg5

13 wh5

It would be premature to lash out with another sacrifice: 13 xh7+? xh7 14 wh5+ gh6 15 bg1 (intending xg7+) 15...g8 16 e2 wf8! —.
13 ... h6
14 e5 g5

White’s plan is easy to follow with the natural moves Wh5 and e5 posing all sorts of problems. The ominous threat of 15 xg5 dictates Black’s response.

Not so good is 14...f5? (14...f6? 15 f4! wins) 15 exf6 Whxf6 16 xg5! Whxf2+ 17 d1 which is again winning for White.

15 xc1 f5

Even at this early stage, Black is on the brink of collapse. For example: 15...h8 16 e2 (intending xg7) 16...g8 17 Whf7 We8 18 xg7! --.

16 Whxh6 f7
17 e2 Wb6
18 Wh4

The opening has been a great success for White. Material equality has been re-established while the onslaught continues in earnest.

18 ... d7
19 g5! Whxb2
20 d2 (92)

White is understandably anxious to rule out any hint of counterplay and has time to take precautions. However, Sveshnikov points out that a direct approach would reap instant dividends: 20 h5 d4 21 d1! Whf8 22 Whd4 Whd4 (22...Wxa2 23 b1 --) 23 Whd4 --.

20 ...

Other paths also offer little resistance:

a) 20...xe5 21 dxe5 Whxe5 22 Wh5 g6 23 d1 Whf6 24 xg6+ Whxg6 25 Wh8+ Whg7 26 Wha8 1-0.

b) 20 Ac8 21 h5 Whf8 22 d1 +.

21 Wh5 Whg6

No better is 21...Whf8 22 Whh8+ Whg8 23 Wh7 +.

22 Wh3 Whf8

23 Wh3

Now the other rook will be added to the attack with decisive consequences.

23 ...

The resource 23...Whg6 can be rebuffed by 24 d1 winning.

24 Whh8+ Whf7
25 Whg1 Wha4
26 Whh5+ g6
27 Whxg6 1-0

Game 31
Fedorowicz-Jackelen
Porz 1988

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 Qc6
5 Qf3 Qe7
6 da3

White also has other possibilities to fight for the advantage:

a) 6 Re3!? Qf5 7 d3 (7 w2 dxe3 8 fxe3 Re7 9 d3 0-0 Tolush-Botvinnik, USSR 1938) 7...dxe3 8 fxe3 Re7! 9 0-0 0-0 0-0 0-10 w2c2 (10 w2d7 11 db2 db6 f) 10...h6 11 Qbd2 Qd7 12 Qae1 Qc8 13 Qb1 b5! 14 dx5 a Qxc5 15 db3 Re7 16 Qbd4 b4 17 cxb4 axb4 18 Re2 Qb6 f Heidenfeld-Donner, Lugano 1968.

b) 6 a3 cxd4 7 cxd4 Qf5 8 Qc3 Re7 and now:

b1) 9 Qxb5 Qd7 10 Qa4 Qb6 11 Qe2 f6 12 g4 Qh6 13 exf6 Qf8 14 Qg6 gxf6 15 Qd2 0-0 16 Qxc6 Qxc6 17 Qe5 Qe8 18 0-0 ± Romanishin-Razuvaev, Moscow 1985.

b2) 9 Qd3!? Qxd4 10 Qxd4 Qxd4 11 Qg4 Qf5 12 Qxf5 exf5 13 Qxg7 f8 14 0-0 Qd6 15 Qh6 Qd7 16 Qf1 Qg8 17 Qxh7 Qc7 18 Qac1 Qb8 19 Qxd5 Qxd5 20 Qxd5 Qxg2 21 Qxg2 Qxg2 + 22 Qgl b6 23 Qxf5 + Pyhälä-Kanko, Helsinki 1989.

c) 6 Re2 Qf5 (6...cxd4 7 cxd4 Qf5 transposes to Game 18, Galundts-Naroditsky) 7 dx5 (7 g4?! Qh4 8 Qxh4 Qxh4 9 Re3 Qd7 10 0-0 {10 Qd2 cxd4 11 Qf3 Qxg4! f}) 10...f6 11 f4 fxe5 12 dxe5 g5! with the better game for Black - Psakhis)

7...Qxc5 8 b4 Qe7 9 b5 Qa5 10 0-0 0-0 11 Qd3 Qc7 12 g4! Qh4 13 Qxh4 Qxh4 14 g5 h6 15 f4 f6 16 gxf6 gxf6 17 Qh5 fxe5 18 Qxh4 e4 19 Re2 Qh7 20 Re3 1-0 Ekström-Schauwecker, Switzerland 1993.

d) 6 Qd3 is examined in the next illustrative game.

6 ... cxd4
7 cxd4 Qf5
8 Qc2 Qa5+ (93)

A popular way of handling the position as it lures White’s queen’s bishop out. This is a debatable achievement as it will over-protect d4 whilst Black argues that it will lack scope on c3.

Also feasible is 8...Qb4 9 Qe3 Qe7 10 Qx5 exf5 11 a3 Qc6 12 Qd3 Re6 13 0-0 a6 14 Re3 Re8 15 b4 when White has the slightly better chances; Vučinić-Dizdar, Pula 1990.

9 Qd2 Qb6
10 Qc3 Qe7

In the game Marjanović-Popović, Yugoslavia 1986, Black adopted an
alternative plan of development: 10...d7 11 d3 e7 12 d2?! (12 0-0?! ±) 12...a5! 13 a3 h5 and now 14 xf5 exf5 15 h4 offered equal chances.

11 d3 a5
12 a3

White is keen to nullify Black's counterplay by ruling out the chance of a piece occupying b4.

It is also possible to proceed in more robust fashion as shown by Sveshnikov-Ortega, Sochi 1987: 12 e3 g6 13 0-0 d7 14 c2 h5 (14...0-0 15 g4 intending f6+?) 15 d2 f8 16 g3 b4 17 xf5! gxf5 (17...exf5? 18 a3 ++) 18 h4 b5 19 f1a6 20 g5 c8 21 a3 c6 22 g2 g7 23 e1 c4 24 f4 b3 25 e3 b5 (25...xg5? 26 e6+! fx6 27 xg5+ f7 28 f6+ and White wins) 26 c1 c4 27 g2 c8 28 f3 f8? 29 fxe6+ 1-0.

12 ... 0-0
13 g4

This is a familiar theme, particularly when Black castles before White. One way to counter the problem is 12...h5!? but this has the drawback of weakening the kingside.

13 ... h4
14 g1 (94)

A novel way to conduct the attack. The immediate threat is illusory: 15 xh4 xh4 16 g5 xe5! 17 g4 xg4 18 xg4 e5 19 xh4 f5 and Black has very good chances. However, White can follow up with 15 xe2, so Black is obliged to be wary.

14 ... f5
15 gxf5 xfx5
16 e3

This removes a vital defender, and so increases the pressure on Black's kingside. Black's problems are compounded by the prospect of 17 xh5 exf5 18 xd5, thus forcing the issue.

16 ... xxe3
17 fxe3 d7
18 e2

White's forces are perfectly poised to start an avalanche on the flank by doubling on the g-file or targeting h7. Black is unable to adjust swiftly enough to the changed circumstances when the queen is a remote figure and the rest of the pieces lack harmony.

18 ... f7
19 g2 b8
The start of a cumbersome manoeuvre to transfer the knight to f8.
20 \textit{Wh3} \textit{g6 (95)}

21 \textit{\textit{A}xg6!}
A stylish way to terminate the game.

\begin{align*}
21 & \text{...} & \text{hxg6} \\
22 & \textit{\textit{A}xg6+} & \textit{\textit{B}g7} \\
23 & \textit{\textit{A}xg7+} & \textit{\textit{S}xg7} \\
24 & 0-0-0 & \textit{\textit{L}f8} \\
25 & \textit{\textit{D}g5} & 1-0
\end{align*}

Game 32
Blatny-Moldovan
Stara Zagora Z 1990

1 \textit{e4} \textit{e6} \\
2 \textit{d4} \textit{d5} \\
3 \textit{e5} \textit{c5} \\
4 \textit{c3} \textit{\textit{D}c6} \\
5 \textit{\textit{D}f3} \textit{\textit{D}ge7} \\
6 \textit{\textit{D}d3 (96)}

The most energetic reply, which has Psakhis’ stamp of approval.

6 \text{...} \textit{cxd4}
Black wisely prefers to exchange on d4 without further ado, since delaying this decision would give White more options. In Kupreichik-Légky, Lvov 1984, White was permitted to recapture on d4 with the knight, and gained an advantage after 6...\textit{\textit{D}f5} 7 0-0 (7 dxc5!? \textit{\textit{A}xc5} 8 0-0 b6 9 b4 \textit{\textit{A}e7} 10 b5 \textit{\textit{A}a5} 11 \textit{\textit{D}d4} was unclear in Lazić-Velimirović, Yugoslavia 1991) 7...\textit{\textit{c}xd4} 8 \textit{\textit{A}xf5} \textit{\textit{exf5}} 9 \textit{\textit{A}xd4!} \textit{\textit{A}e6} 10 \textit{\textit{A}e3} \textit{\textit{A}e7} 11 f4.

7 \textit{\textit{c}xd4} \textit{\textit{D}f5} \\
8 \textit{\textit{A}xf5}

A direct course of action to relieve the pressure against d4. A survey of the alternatives reveals:

\begin{itemize}
\item a) 8 \textit{\textit{A}e3}?! and now:
\begin{itemize}
\item a1) 8...\textit{\textit{A}e7} 9 0-0 0-0 10 \textit{\textit{D}c3} \textit{\textit{D}xe3} 11 fxe3 \textit{f5} 12 \textit{\textit{exf6} \textit{A}xf6} 13 \textit{\textit{W}c2} \textit{h6} 14 \textit{\textit{A}e2} \textit{\textit{A}d7} 15 \textit{\textit{D}f4} \textit{\textit{A}c7} (Bellon-Moles, Groningen 1968/69) 16 \textit{\textit{A}h5} with a distinct advantage for White.
\item a2) 8...\textit{\textit{b}b4+} 9 \textit{\textit{D}c3} 0-0 10 0-0 \textit{\textit{D}xe3} 11 fxe3 \textit{f6} 12 \textit{\textit{exf6} \textit{W}xf6} 13 \textit{\textit{\textit{A}h1} \textit{\textit{W}h6} 14 \textit{\textit{e}4 \textit{\textit{D}d6} 15 \textit{\textit{e}5} \textit{\textit{A}e7} 16}
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
a3 d7 17 b4 c8 18 c2 e8 19 c1! xc1 20 cxc1 and White has the better ending due to his territorial advantage; C. Hawthorne-Corfield, Bournemouth 1981.

b) 8 0-0?! fxd4 9 cxd4 d4 10 c3 d6! 11 f4 e7 12 e1 (or 12 g4 g5!) 12...g5! 13 g3 0-0 14 h5 (Haag-Portisch, Hungary 1959) 14...g6 15 e2 f5 16 exf6 xf6; White has insufficient compensation for the pawn.

8 ... exf5
9 0-0 (97)

At this point, there is a major junction. One particular value of the little-known text is that it explodes the myth that it is necessary to prevent ...g5 in order to install a knight on f4.

After 9 c3 e6 play might continue:

a) 10 0-0 e7 (10...h6 11 d1 e7 12 f4 g5 13 c2 b6 14 d3 Zaitsev-Volke, Podolsk 1991) 11 d1! (11 d2 g5! 12 d1 f4 13 f3 b6 14 h1 f5 is even slightly better for Black; Teschner-Portisch, Monte Carlo 1969) 11...b6 (11...c8 12 c2 0-0 13 d3 d7 14 f4 a6 15 d2 ± Zaitsev-Moskalenko, Moscow 1992) 12 d2 0-0 13 h1! h8 (13...a5 14 f4 ± Blatny-Machulsky, Alma-Ata 1989) 14 d3 c8 15 e3 d4 16 c5 d6 17 d4 d8 18 a3 d7 19 d2 e8 20 f3 b5 21 g3 was unclear; Thipsay-Gdanski, Manila OL 1992.

b) 10 g5 b6 11 0-0 h6 12 c1 e7 13 d2 g5 14 b3 c8 15 b2 0-0 16 h1 f4 = Markland-Moles, Birmingham 1968.

c) 10 c2 and now:

c1) 10...b6!! 11 f4 h6 12 h4 g6 13 f1 (13 0-0 e7 14 g3 a5 15 g2 a4 16 b1 ± Sax) 13...e7 14 g3 0-0-0 15 f2 b8 (15...g5 16 cxe6 c6 17 hgx5 hxg5 18 xh8 xh8 19 g5 g5 20 g5 c4 21 c2 ± Sax) 16 c8 17 hgx5 hxg5 18 xh8 h8 19 cxe6 cxe6 20 a5 c5 21 g5 c4 22 c2 c8 23 b4 ± Sax) 17 c6 c6 18 cxe6 c6 19 cxe6 cxe6 19 c1 e5! (19...d5 20 e5 ±) 20 cxe5 cxe5 21 f4 f6 22 dxe5 ½-½ Sax-M. Gurevich, Munich 1993.

c2) 10...e7 11 h4 c8 12 f1 (12 f4 h6 13 h3 d7 14 h5 e8 15 g3 f8 16 f1 c7 17 a3 b8 18 b4 ± Nun-Langner, Ostrava 1991) 12 b6 13 d4 b4 14 d2 d7 15 c3 a6+ 16 g1 h8 17 g3 b5 18 a4 d6 19 e2 b8 20 g5 h6 21 cxf7! c8 22 c6 c6 23 dxc6 e8 24 d3 cxd6 25 d2 f7 26 cxe6+ 1-0 Orr-Poulton, British Ch 1988.

c21) 11...h6 12 f4 b6 13 a3 (13 h3? g6 14 f1 0-0 0-15 g1 d8 16 b1 g5 17 hxg5 hxg5 18 xh8 xh8 19 c6 c6 20 c5 c5 21 c5 c5 22 c5 23 g3 = Sveshnikov-Temirbaev, Kuibyshev 1987) 13...0-0 14 d3 c8 15 b1 a5 16 b4 c4 17
The rare alternatives are not convincing:

a) 10 \( \text{Q}d2 \text{e}6 11 \text{Q}b3 0-0 12 \\
\text{e}3 a5 13 \text{c}1 a4 14 \text{c}5 a3 15 \\
bxa3 \text{x}c5 16 \text{x}c5 1/2-1/2 Piancatelli-Marino, Rome 1990.

b) 10 a3 a6 11 b4 b5 12 \text{e}3 0-0 13 \\
\text{c}3 \text{e}6 14 \text{wd}2 \text{wb}6 15 \text{e}2 a5 16 \text{g}5 h6 17 \text{xe}7 \text{xe}7 18 \\
\text{ac}1 \text{axb}4 19 \text{axb}4 \text{fc}8 20 \text{ac}5 \\
with a slight plus for White; Salai-

10 ... 

For some time this prophylactic 
move, which rules out the usual idea 
\text{e}2-f4, was considered the antidote 
to White’s plan.

If 10...\text{e}6 11 \text{e}1 

transposes to note ‘a’ after White’s ninth move.

11 \text{e}1 

12 h4 

The weakening of White’s defensive 
barrier is a calculated risk to 
dermine Black’s pawns before he 
can support them with his pieces.

12 ... 

13 \text{Wh}5! 

It is more critical to steal the d-
pawn: 13...\text{xd}4!? 14 \text{hxg}5 \text{hxg}5 \\
15 \text{wd}1! \text{c}6 16 \text{wd}5 \text{f}5 (or 16...\text{e}6 17 \text{we}4) 17 \text{df}3 when the 
complications favour White.

14 \text{xf}4 
15 \text{e}6 
16 \text{d}3 
17 e6!

At a stroke an escape route is ex-
posed. If 17...\text{xh}5 (17...\text{xe}6 18
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 \(\mathcal{Q}e7\)

This is usually a prelude to 5...\(\mathcal{Q}bc6\) which would return to the lines already considered.

5 \(\mathcal{Q}f3\) \(\mathcal{Q}ec6\) (99)

Now Black has revealed his true intentions. The idea is to keep pressure on d4 while exchanging the light-squared bishop after ...b6 and ...

\(\mathcal{Q}a6\) or, as in the game, continue with queenside development. Other tries have not emerged with much credit:

a) 5...\(\mathcal{Q}f5\) 6 dxc5 \(\mathcal{Q}xc5\) 7 d3 \(\mathcal{Q}c6\) and now:

a1) 8 0-0 \(\mathcal{Q}h4!\) ? 9 \(\mathcal{Q}e1\) (9 \(\mathcal{Q}bd2!\))

9...\(\mathcal{Q}d7\) 10 b4?! \(\mathcal{Q}b6\) 11 b5 \(\mathcal{Q}xf3+\) 12 \(\mathcal{W}xf3\) \(\mathcal{Q}e7\) 13 \(\mathcal{Q}a3\) \(\mathcal{A}c8\) 14 \(\mathcal{W}g3\)

\(\mathcal{Q}g6\) \(\text{†}\) Barden-Botvinnik, Hastings 1961/62.

a2) 8 \(\mathcal{Q}xf5!\) exf5 9 0-0 \(\mathcal{Q}e7\) 10

\(\mathcal{Q}bd2\) 0-0 11 \(\mathcal{Q}b3\) \(\mathcal{Q}e6\) 12 \(\mathcal{W}e2\) \(\mathcal{W}c7\)

13 \(\mathcal{Q}f4\) \(\mathcal{A}c8\) 14 \(\mathcal{Q}fe1\) a6 15 \(\mathcal{Q}g5!\)

\(\mathcal{x}g5\) 16 \(\mathcal{Q}xg5\) h6 17 \(\mathcal{Q}f3\) \(\mathcal{Q}e7\) 18

Game 33
Kupreichik-Kovačević
Ljubljana/Rogaška Slatina 1989

1 e4 e6
\( \text{bd4} \pm \text{Basman-Keene, British Ch 1968.} \)

b) 5...\( \text{Qxd7} \) 6 a3! \( \text{Wb6} \) 7 b4 \( \text{cxd4} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 9 \( \text{b2} \) intending 10 \( \text{Qd3} \) is considered by Szily to give White an advantage.

6 \( \text{Qe3} \)

White can choose other paths:

a) 6 \( \text{Qd3} \) and now:

a1) 6...b6 7 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Wd7} \) 8 0-0 \( \text{Qa6} \) 9 \( \text{dxc5} \) \( \text{bxc5} \) 10 \( \text{Qxa6} \) \( \text{Qxa6} \) 11 c4 h6 12 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 13 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 14 \( \text{Qxe7} \) \( \text{Qxe7} \) 15 \( \text{Mc1} \) \( \text{Mc8} \) 16 \( \text{We2} \) 0-0 17 \( \text{Mfd1} \) \( \text{Wc6} \) 18 b3 \( \pm \) \( \text{Sveshnikov-Lputian, Moscow 1989.} \)

a2) 6...\( \text{Qd7} \) 7 0-0 \( \text{cxd4} \) 8 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 9 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qb6} \) 10 a3 a5 11 \( \text{Mc2} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 12 g3 \( \text{Qa7} \) 13 h4 h6 14 \( \text{Qb2} \) \( \text{Wc7} \) 15 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qc4} \) 16 a4 \( \text{Qb4} \) 17 \( \text{Wg4} \) \( \pm \) \( \text{Maciejewski-Sprečić, Tuzla 1989.} \)

b) 6 \( \text{Le2} \) b6 7 0-0 \( \text{Qa6} \) 8 \( \text{Qxa6} \)?? \( \text{Qxa6} \) 9 \( \text{Wa4} \) \( \text{Wab8} \) 10 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Wd7} \) 11 \( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{Le7} \) 12 \( \text{Qbd2} \) 0-0 13 g3 c4 14 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qxg5} \) 15 \( \text{Qxg5} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) 16 f4 \( \text{Qc7} \) 17 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) 18 f5 exf5 19 \( \text{Qxf5} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 20 \( \text{Qaf1} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 21 \( \text{Qxe7} \) \( \text{Qxe7} \) 22 \( \text{Wd1} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 23 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Qad8} \) 24 \( \text{We3} \) b5 25 \( \text{Qf2} \) h6 26 h4 \( \text{Wh7} \) 27 \( \text{Qf1} \) g6 28 \( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 29 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 30 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qh5} \) 31 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Wd8} \) 32 g4 1-0 \( \text{Soos-Havaši, Hungary 1991.} \)

c) 6 a3?? a5 7 \( \text{Qd3} \) b6 8 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Wd7} \) 9 dxc5 \( \text{bxc5} \) 10 \( \text{Qbd2} \) c4 11 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) 12 b4 \( \text{cx} \) b3 13 \( \text{Qxb3} \) a4 14 \( \text{Qbd4} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 15 0-0 h6 16 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) 17 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qc4} \) 18 \( \text{Qxc6} \) \( \text{Qxc6} \) 19 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Wa6} \) 20 \( \text{Qe3} \) with an equal position; \( \text{Dekić-F.Portisch, Budapest 1992.} \)

d) 6 h4?? \( \text{Qd7} \) 7 g3 (7 h5? f6! 8 \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 9 h6 g6 \( \pm \) \( \text{Sveshnikov-Kovačević, Belgrade 1988} \) 7...\( \text{Qe7} \) 8 \( \text{Qh3} \) b5 9 a3 a5 10 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qxg5} \) 11 \( \text{Qxg5} \) f6 12 \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 13 dxc5 0-0 14 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Wf7} \) 15 \( \text{Qxf6} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 16 b4 \( \text{Qg6} \) 17 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Wf6} \) 18 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{We5} \) 19 \( \text{We1} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 20 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 21 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 22 \( \text{Qad1} \) \( \text{Qh8} \) 23 h5 \( \text{Qh6} \) 24 f4 \( \text{Wf7} \) 25 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \pm \) \( \text{Espinoza-Paneque, Cali 1990.} \)

6...

7...\( \text{Qd7} \)

Also worth consideration is 6...b6 which prepares ...\( \text{Qa6} \) and bolsters c5. \( \text{Fishbein-Friedman, New York 1990} \) continued 7 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) 8 \( \text{Qxa6} \) \( \text{Qxa6} \) 9 \( \text{Wa4} \) \( \text{Qab8} \) 10 0-0 \( \text{Wd7} \) 11 \( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 12 h4 \( \text{Wd8} \) 13 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 14 h5 0-0 15 \( \text{Qe2} \) f6 16 \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 17 h6 g6 18 c4 \( \text{cxd4} \) 19 cxd5 \( \text{exd5} \) 20 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qxd4} \) 21 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qxd4} \) 22 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 23 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Wd6} \) 24 \( \text{Qd2} \) with advantage to White.

7...\( \text{Qd3} \) a5

8...\( \text{Qbd2} \)

Kupreichik's suggestion 8 \( \text{Qg5} \)?? merits attention, for example 8...\( \text{cxd4} \) 9 \( \text{cxd4} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) (9...h6?! 10 \( \text{Wh5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \) 11 \( \text{Whxh8} \) \( \text{Qb4} \) 12 \( \text{Wh7} \) g6 \( \pm \) \( \text{Qxg5} \) 11 \( \text{Qxg5} \) \( \text{Wb6} \) \( \pm \) \( \text{Wh5} \) 10...\( \text{Wb6} \) (10...h6 11 \( \text{Wh5} \) ) 11 \( \text{Qc3} \) and White has an edge.

8...

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

9...\( \text{cxd4} \) a4?!

10...a3?!
Though White is gradually improving his position, a more adventurous course of action was called for to highlight the inadequacies of neglecting development. Rather than pushing the a-pawn, 10 \( \mathcal{D}g5! \mathcal{L}e7 \) 10 h4 \( \mathrel{\mathcal{W}}b6 \) 11 \( \mathrel{\mathcal{W}}g4 \mathrel{\mathcal{W}}xb2 \) 12 0-0 was called for, when the attack continues in earnest.

10 ... \( \mathcal{L}e7 \)
11 h4 \( \mathcal{h}6 \) \((100)\)

12 h5
A standard device to hem in the kingside pawns. The pawn effectively puts a block on a future \( ...g6 \), so White can continue to concentrate his resources on direct action towards snaring the king.

12 ... \( \mathcal{D}b6 \)
13 \( \mathcal{D}h2 \) \( \mathcal{Q}a5 \)
14 \( \mathrel{\mathcal{W}}g4 \) \( \mathcal{Q}f8 \)

An unpleasant move to make, but after 14...\( \mathcal{Q}f8 \) 15 \( \mathcal{X}c1 \) White can continue in robust fashion with 0-0 and f4-f5.

15 \( \mathcal{X}c1 \) \( \mathcal{Q}d7 \)

16 0-0 \( \mathcal{D}bc4! \)
If given no opposition, the pawn-roller f4-f5 would pose a serious problem. This inspires Black to start counterplay on the other flank.

17 \( \mathcal{D}xc4 \) \( \mathcal{D}xc4 \)
18 \( \mathrel{\mathcal{W}}e2 \)

There is nothing to be gained from trading pieces: 18 \( \mathcal{D}xc4 \mathcal{D}xc4 \) 19 d5 exd5 20 \( \mathrel{\mathcal{W}}d4 \mathcal{Q}f5! \) 21 g4 \( \mathcal{Q}d3 \) and it is Black who has the better game thanks to the extra pawn.

18 ... \( \mathcal{b}5 \)
19 f4 \( \mathcal{L}e7 \)
20 f5!?

It is also tempting to seek complications, which emerge after 20 \( \mathcal{D}xc4 \mathcal{D}xc4 \) (20...bxc4 21 g4!) 21 f5!? (21 d5 exd5 22 f5 d4! 23 \( \mathcal{D}xd4 \mathcal{Q}xf5 \) leaves Black with the better chances) 21...exf5 22 d5. Kupreichik considers this position to be unclear.

20 ... \( \mathcal{X}f5 \)

Black is positionally bankrupt after 20...\( \mathcal{Q}g5? \) 21 \( \mathcal{D}xc4 \mathcal{b}xc4 \) (21...\( \mathcal{D}xc4 \) 22 d5! \( \pm \) ) 22 \( \mathcal{X}xg5 \mathcal{W}xg5 \) 23 f6 \( \pm \).

21 \( \mathcal{X}xf5 \) \( \mathcal{D}xe3 \)
22 \( \mathrel{\mathcal{W}}xe3 \) \( \mathcal{Q}g5 \)
23 \( \mathrel{\mathcal{W}}g3 \) \( \mathcal{X}xf5 \)
24 \( \mathcal{X}xf5 \) \((101)\) \( \mathcal{X}c8? \)

A perilous journey appears to await Black if the rook is snatched, but Kupreichik’s analysis demonstrates it is the only way to seek salvation (at least). Play might continue 24...\( \mathcal{X}xc1! \) 25 \( \mathrel{\mathcal{W}}xg7 \mathcal{F}f8 \) and now:

\( \)
118 Systems with ...\(\texttt{Qg7}\)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\(\texttt{Qh1}\) & \(\texttt{Hx8}\) & 32 & \(\texttt{Wxe8+}\) & \(\texttt{Qc7}\) & \(\texttt{Kx}\) \\
\hline
27...\(\texttt{Qd7}\) & 28 & \(\texttt{Qf3}\) & \(\texttt{Qc7}\) & 29 & \(\texttt{Hf6}\) & \(\texttt{we7}\) \\
\hline
30 & \(\texttt{Wg6}\) & with an unclear game. \\
25 & \(\texttt{Hcf1}\) & 0-0 & 26 & \(\texttt{e6}\) \\
\hline
With the oppressed king finally seeking shelter by castling, White administers a crushing blow by a successful breakthrough.
26...\(\texttt{We7}\) \\
If 26...\(\texttt{f6}\) 27 \(\texttt{Wf3}\) wins the d5 pawn.
27 \(\texttt{We1}\) ! \(\texttt{We7}\) \\
If Black plays 27...\(\texttt{Qf6}\) to block the f-file, White can instigate a thunderous attack: 28 \(\texttt{Hxf6}\) \(\texttt{gxf6}\) 29 \(\texttt{Qg4}\) \(\texttt{fxe6}\) 30 \(\texttt{Wxe6+}\) \(\texttt{Qg7}\) 31 \(\texttt{Hxf6}\) with a clear advantage.
28 \(\texttt{Hxf7}\) \(\texttt{Hxf7}\) \\
29 \(\texttt{Hxf7}\) \(\texttt{Kc1}\) \\
On 29...\(\texttt{Wd6}\) 30 \(\texttt{Hd7}\) \(\texttt{Wb6}\) 31 \(\texttt{We5}\) \(\texttt{Kf6}\) 32 \(\texttt{Wxd5}\) wins.
30 \(\texttt{Wxc1}\) \(\texttt{Wxe6}\) \\
31 \(\texttt{Hf4}\) 1-0
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
The idea is to reach positions similar to those which arise from 5...\( \text{Q} \)g7, while thwarting \( \text{Q} \)a3 because of ...\( \text{c} \)xd4 and ...\( \text{Q} \)xa3. The attraction of the line for Black is that it avoids main-line theory. Sveshnikov's remedy 6 \( \text{d} \)xc5 is the critical continuation, with White generally emerging on top.

**Game 34**

Sveshnikov-Bareev

*Match: Polio-T.Petrosian 1991*

1 \( e4 \) \( e6 \)
2 \( d4 \) \( d5 \)
3 \( e5 \) \( c5 \)
4 \( c3 \) \( Qc6 \)
5 \( Qf3 \) \( Qh6?! \)

The start of the variation.

6 \( \text{d} \)xc5

Sveshnikov pounces on the chance to exploit the unusual move-order. The idea is that the exchange on c5 lures the bishop out, presenting White with the options of \( \text{Q} \)xh6 followed by \( \text{W} \)d2, or b4-b5, which oblige the bishop to retreat. After 6 \( \text{Q} \)d3 the game could transpose into Game 32, Blatny-Moldovan, or Black might adopt an independent line: 6...f6! 7 \( \text{Q} \)xh6 \( \text{g} \)xh6 8 0-0 \( \text{c} \)xd4 9 \( \text{c} \)xd4 \( \text{Q} \)g7 10 \( \text{W} \)e1 0-0 11 \( \text{Q} \)bd2 \( \text{W} \)b6 12 \( \text{Q} \)xf6 \( \text{Q} \)xf6 13 \( \text{Q} \)b3 \( \text{Q} \)d7 14 \( \text{Q} \)c5 \( \text{Q} \)d8 15 \( \text{Q} \)c1 \( \text{Q} \)c8 16 \( \text{Q} \)b1 \( \text{Q} \)df8 17 \( \text{W} \)d3 \( \text{Q} \)f5 18 \( \text{Q} \)xe6 \( \text{Q} \)xe6 19 \( \text{Q} \)xe6 \( \text{Q} \)xb2 20 \( \text{Q} \)f1 \( \text{Q} \)xd4 21 \( \text{Q} \)h4 \( \text{Q} \)xe6 22 \( \text{Q} \)xf5 \( \text{Q} \)d8 23 \( \text{Q} \)xh6+ and now White has a clear plus; Hendriks-Crouch, Dieren 1992.

The immediate 6 \( \text{Q} \)xh6 normally transposes to the note to Black's sixth move, although the game Gofshtein-Soffer, Tel Aviv followed a different direction: 6...gxh6 7 \( \text{d} \)xc5 \( \text{Q} \)g7 8 \( \text{Q} \)b5 0-0 9 \( \text{Q} \)xc6 \( \text{b} \)xc6 10 0-0 \( \text{f} \)6 11 \( \text{W} \)e2 \( \text{Q} \)d7 12 \( \text{Q} \)e1 \( \text{Q} \)b8 13 \( \text{b} \)4 \( \text{Q} \)e8 14 \( \text{Q} \)bd2 \( \text{Q} \)h5 15 \( \text{W} \)e3 \( \text{W} \)c7 16 \( \text{Q} \)c1 \( \text{Q} \)xf3 17 \( \text{Q} \)xf3 \( \text{Q} \)xe5 18 \( \text{Q} \)xe5 \( \text{Q} \)f5 19 \( \text{Q} \)g4 \pm.

6 ... \( \text{Q} \)g4?! (102)

Black assumes that taking away the natural defender of e5 allows the knight to enter the fray. After 6...\( \text{Q} \)xc5 play might continue:

a) 7 \( b4 \) and now:

a1) 7...\( \text{Q} \)c7 8 \( \text{Q} \)d3 \( \text{Q} \)g4 9 \( \text{Q} \)f4 \( f6 \) 10 \( b5 \) \( \text{Q} \)cxe5 11 \( \text{Q} \)xe5 \( \text{Q} \)xe5 12 \( \text{Q} \)xe5 \( fxe5 \) 13 \( \text{W} \)h5+ \( \text{Q} \)f8 = Rozentalis-Kuporosov, Budapest 1990.
a2) 7...â8 8 b5 (8 âd3?! is worth consideration) 8...âa5 9 âd3 f6 10 âxh6 gxh6 11 âd4 âc7 12
exf6 âe5+ 13 âxe2 âd6 14 f7+ âxf7 15 g3 âg7 16 0-0 h8 17 âd2 âd7 18 âg4 âae8 19 âh3 âe7 20
âa4 âh5 21 âg2 b6 22 c4 e5 23 âc6 âxc6 24 dxc6 âwe2 25 âad1 âc5 26 cxd5 âxf2 27 âxf2 âxf2+ 28 âh1 âf7 29 âg4+ âf8 30 c7 1-0

a3) 7...âb6 8 âxh6 (8 b5 âe7 9
âd3 âg6 10 0-0 0-0 11 âxh6 gxh6 12 a4?! f6 13 âxg6? hxg6 14 âd3 âg7 15 âbd2 âd7 16 c4 fxe5 17
cxd5 (17 âxe5 âe8 18 âad1 âc8 is unclear) 17...exd5 18 âxd5 âf5 19
âxe5+ âf6 with unclear play;
Sveshnikov-Moskalenko, Rostov-on-Don 1993) 8...gxh6 9 b5 âe7 10
âd3 âg6 11 0-0 âc7 (not 11...f6?
12 âxg6 hxg6 13 âd3 âf7 14 exf6
âxf6 15 âbd2 âd8 16 âae1 âe6 17
âe5+ âg7 18 âdf3 âd7 19 âd4
âxd4 20 âxd4 axb5 (20...âxb5 21
âe3 âxf1 22 âf3 wins) 21 âe3 âa4
22 âb6 âf4 23 âc7 g5 24 âxd7
âe7 25 âc5 1-0 Sveshnikov-Dukhov, Moscow 1992; or 11...0-0 12
âe1?!; 12 a4?! unclear - Glek) 12
âe1 0-0 13 a4 âd7 14 âa2? f6
(14...a6?!) 15 âxg6 hxg6 16 âd3 f5
17 âbd2 âfc8 18 âc2 a6 19 âec1
axb5 20 axb5 âa3 21 âe2 âe5 22
âd4 âca8 23 g4 f4 24 g5 h5 25
âf3 âg7 26 âwd2 âf8 27 âa2 âa5
28 âxa3 âxa3 29 âc2 âe7 30 c4

b) 7 âxh6 gxh6 and now:

b1) 8 b4 âf8 9 b5 âc7 10 âd3
âg7 11 0-0 âg6 (Sveshnikov-Gleks, Moscow 1991) 12 âwe2 0-0 (12...âc7
13 âxg6 hxg6 14 c4 is also unclear)
13 c4 with an unclear game according to Sveshnikov.

b2) 8 âd3 f6! 9 b4 âf8 10 b5
âxe5 11 âxe5 fxe5 12 âhn5+ âd7
13 âwe5 âg8 ± Khalifman-Kaidanov, Moscow 1987.

In the game Mukhametov-Lempert, Moscow 1992, Black wrongly tried to delay the capture: 6...âc7?!
7 b4! âg4 (7...âxe5 8 âf4 âxf3+
{8...f6 9 âb5+!; 8...âd3+ 9 âxd3
âxf4 10 âb5+ ±} 9 âxf3 âwd8 10
âb5+ âd7 11 âxd7+ âwd7 12 0-0
âf5 13 âd2 âe7 14 c4 ±) 8 âf4 f6
(8...âgxe5 9 âxe5 âxe5 10 âb5+ ±)
and now 9 âb5! gives White an advantage.

7 âwe4!

The point. At a stroke the queen's knight is pinned while the king's knight comes under attack. If now
7...\(\mathcal{D}h6\), White maintains a clear extra pawn with 8 b4 or 8 \(\mathcal{A}e3\).

7 ... \(h5\)
8 \(h3\) \(\mathcal{D}h6\)
9 \(\mathcal{A}e3\) \(\mathcal{D}f5\)
10 \(\mathcal{A}d4\)

Even though the bishop acts like a pawn, it has an important role. It protects c5 and e5, which allows White to bring out the rest of the forces with impunity.

10 ... \(\mathcal{A}d7\)
11 \(\mathcal{A}b5\) \(g5?!\)

An ambitious measure to induce complications by preparing g4. On 11...a6 comes 12 \(\mathcal{A}xc6\) \(\mathcal{A}xc6\) 13 \(\mathcal{W}c2\) \(\mathcal{A}xd4\) 14 \(cxd4\) \(b6\) 15 \(cxb6\) \(\mathcal{W}xb6\) 16 0-0 with a clear advantage to White.

12 \(\mathcal{A}bd2\) \(\mathcal{Z}h6\)
13 0-0-0 \(g4\) (103)

White has the benefit of choosing the right moment for hxg4, while Black would have trouble justifying ...gxh3 which allows White to double rooks on the h-file.

14 ... \(a6\)
15 \(\mathcal{A}xc6\) \(\mathcal{A}xc6\)
16 \(\mathcal{W}c2\) \(\mathcal{W}c7\)

Black's wretched position is rather passive. The main concern is to restore material equality by capturing on c5.

17 \(\mathcal{A}d3\) \(\mathcal{A}b5\)
18 \(\mathcal{F}f4\) 0-0-0

If Black plays 18...\(\mathcal{A}xc5\), White gains material by 19 \(\mathcal{A}xd5\) exd5 20 \(\mathcal{A}xc5\).

19 \(g3!\) \(\mathcal{W}b8\)

The same idea to the previous note applies: 19...\(\mathcal{A}xc5\) 20 \(\mathcal{A}xc5\) \(\mathcal{W}xc5\) 21 hxg4 hxg4 22 \(\mathcal{A}xh6\) \(\mathcal{A}xh6\) 23 \(\mathcal{W}h7\) ±.

20 \(\mathcal{A}b3\) \(\mathcal{E}e7\)
21 hxg4 hxg4
22 \(\mathcal{A}xh6\) \(\mathcal{A}xh6\)
23 \(\mathcal{E}b1\)

The situation has clarified. White has firmly secured c5 and Black has few prospects of counterplay.

23 ... \(\mathcal{A}f5\)
24 \(\mathcal{H}h1\) \(\mathcal{G}g5\)
25 \(\mathcal{G}g2!\)

With this manoeuvre, White starts an infiltration on the kingside.

25 ... \(\mathcal{W}c8\)
26 \(\mathcal{A}h5\) \(\mathcal{G}g8\)
27 \(\mathcal{W}d1\) \(\mathcal{E}e7\)
28 \(\mathcal{A}e3\)
A logical reaction to trade the knight which covers the pivotal square d4.

28 ... \( \text{Qxe3} \)
29 \( \text{Qxe3} \) \( \text{Qe8} \)
30 \( \text{Qa1} \) \( \text{Qa8} \)
31 \( \text{Wd4!} (104) \)

In view of the intended c6 to threaten mate, Black is obliged to go further on the defensive.

31 ... \( \text{Qd8} \)
32 \( \text{Kh7} \) \( \text{Wc6} \)
33 \( \text{Qc1} \)

White's superiority is such that there is plenty of time to relocate the knight to d3, as the central role allows it to protect c5 and threaten \( \text{Qb4} \).

33 ... \( \text{a5} \)
34 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qe7} \)
35 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{Qb8} \)
36 \( \text{Qb2} \)

The king slightly improves its position in preparation for an eventual b4.

36 ... \( \text{Wa6} \)
37 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{Qc8} \)
38 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qd8} \)
39 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( f6?! \)
40 \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{Qg6} \)
41 \( \text{Qg7} \) 1-0
7 Kupreichik Variation

The system that is signified by 5 \( \text{Le}3 \) is known as the Kupreichik Variation. For a long time it has been regarded as a doubtful continuation, with Lewis in 1835 suggesting 5...\( \text{W}b6 \), ...\( \text{d}7 \) and ...\( \text{c}8 \) as the antidote. In modern tournament practice the Byelorussian is predestined to add his name to the line, due to his large number of games that have proved it to be a viable weapon. The primary idea is to avoid the main lines by delaying the development of the king’s knight.

Game 35
Kupreichik-Farago
Passau 1993

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 \( \text{dc}6 \)
5 \( \text{Le}3 \) (105)

A committal but solid continuation. It looks rather simplistic to over-protect d4 with the bishop but there is no clear way for Black to take advantage of the situation. Now Black is obliged to enter relatively unknown territory as early as move five.

The other rare moves should be quite harmless:

a) 5 f4 cxd4 (5...\( \text{W}b6 \) 6 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{Qh}6 \) 7 b3 cxd4 8 cxd4 \( \text{lb}4+ \) 9 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{Qf}5 \) 10 \( \text{lb}2 \) h5 \( \text{f} \) Cohnen-Harberditz, 1940) 6 cxd4 \( \text{W}b6 \) 7 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{ld}7 \) 8 \( \text{Le}3 \) \( \text{lc}8 \) 9 \( \text{lb}1 \) \( \text{lb}4 \) 10 \( \text{ld}3 \) a6 11 a3 \( \text{Le}7 \) 12 b4 \( \text{la}6 \) 13 \( \text{Le}3 \) \( \text{Qf}5 \) 14 \( \text{lf}2 \) \( \text{la}7 \) 15 g4 \( \text{lb}5 \) 16 \( \text{la}4 \) \( \text{f} \) Capablanca-Paredes, Havana 1901.

b) 5 \( \text{Wg}4 \) cxd4 6 cxd4 \( \text{W}b6 \) 7 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{Qh}6 \) 8 \( \text{Wf}4 \) \( \text{Qf}5 \) 9 \( \text{lb}3 \) \( \text{Qc}xd4 \) → Weiss-Harberditz and Kellner, corr. 1933.

c) 5 \( \text{Qe}2 \) f6 6 f4 fxe5 7 dxe5 \( \text{Qh}6 \) 8 \( \text{Qg}3 \) \( \text{Qd}7 \) 9 \( \text{Qe}2 \) \( \text{Wb}6 \) 10 0-0 0-0 0 11 c4?! \( \text{Qd}4 \) 12 f5 \( \text{Qhxf5} \) 13 \( \text{xf}5 \)
Kupreichik Variation

124 Kupreichik Variation

exf5 14 cxd5 6a4 15 b3 (15 6xa4 6xe2+ 16 6h1 6xc1 17 6xc1 6xd5 +) 15...6xe2+ 16 6xe2 6b5 17
6f3 6xf1 18 6xf1 6b5+ 19 6f2
6b4 20 6e3 f4! 21 6g4+ 6d7 22
6xf4 h5 23 6f3 6f7 0-1 Romero Holmes-Korchnoi, Pamplona 1990.

5 ...
6 6d2 6b6
cxd4

The backbone of the variation rests on its ability to deal with the flexible 6...6d7. Kupreichik has formulated a way to handle the situation by making the most of the deployment of the queen and bishop. After 7 6f3 play might proceed:

a) 7...6c8 8 dxc5 6xc5 9 6xc5 6xc5 10 6g5 6ge7!? (10...6f8 ±) 11 6bd2 (11 6xg7?! 6g8 12 6xh7
d4!  tà) 11...0-0 12 6d3 6b6!? (12...f6? 13 exf6 6xf6 14 6e4 ±; 12...h6 13 6g3 ±) 13 6xh7+ 6xh7
14 6wh5+ 6g8 15 6g5 6fe8! 16
6f7+ 6h8 17 6h5+ 6g8 18 6df3
(18 0-0 6xe5!) 18...6b5! (18...6xb2
19 6wh7+ 6f8 20 6f6 0-0 with unclear play) 19 0-0-0 (19 6d1 d4! 20 cxd4
6b4!; 19 6wh7+ 6f8 20 6wh8+ 6g8
21 6wh5 6h6 22 6h7+ 6e7 23
6h4+ 6f7 24 6f6 6f5! with unclear play) 19...6c4! 20 g3 6a2 = Kupreichik-Dolmatov, Yugoslavia

b) 7...cxd4 8 6xd4? (8 6xd4 6xe5 9 6b5 6c5; 8 cxd4 6b4
(8...6e8 9 a3? 6a5 10 6a2 6b3 11
6c3 6xc3! 12 bx6 6wbl+ → Morris-Schaffner, Bern 1991) 9 6c3
6a5 10 6c1 6c8 is unclear) 8...6xd4
9 6xd4 6e7 10 6d3 6c6 11 6f3
with unclear play.

c) 7...f6 8 6d3 fxe5 9 6xe5 (9
6xe5?! 6h6 10 0-0 6f7 11 6f4 6e7
12 6e1 0-0-0  tà Westerinen-Ulybin,
Benidorm 1993) 9...6f6 10 0-0 6d6
11 f4 0-0 and the position is equal
according to Ulybin and Lysenko.

7 cxd4 6ge7
8 6d3 6f5

Staking a claim to central territory and simultaneously putting pressure on d4.

9 6c3 6b4
10 6ge2

White now reveals his intention to plant the knight on e2 rather than the
usual f3. This has the benefit of supporting c3 and introduces the possibility of advancing the kingside
pawns.

10 ...
11 0-0 6c7
12 a3
Not 11...0-0 12 6xf5 exf5 13
6xd5 6xd2 14 6xb6 6xe3 15
6xd7 +-

With his development completed White undertakes action to put pressure on Black, initially by forcing the trade of the bishop.

12 ...
13 bxc3 0-0
14 6ab1 6c7
15 6g5

This is the type of position White was aiming for with 5 6e3. Unlike
other Advance positions, the knight on e2 opens up different possibilities, while Black has already made a limited concession by transferring the queen’s knight to the kingside as an extra defensive measure. The transparent threat of 16 g4 is sufficient to start a strong initiative on the flank.

15 ... h6
16 Qf4 Qg6
17 Qxf5 exf5 (106)

18 Qxh6!

In a seemingly peaceful position White decides to lash out with a bold sacrifice. The reasoning is that the lack of co-ordination amongst Black’s pieces allows the slow Qg3-h5 to be a powerful menace to the exposed king.

18 ... gxh6
19 Wh6 Wc6
20 Wg5

The immediate 20 Qg3 fails to 20...Qxe5, so a more restrained response is required, which also introduces the prospect of h4.

20 ... Qh7
21 Qg3 b6

After 21...f6!? 22 exf6 Wxf6 23 Qh5 (23 Qxb7 Wxb7 24 Wxf6 Wf8 is unclear) 23...Wf7 24 f4 Qg8 25 Wf3 Qe7 the position is unclear according to Kupreichik.

22 Qh5 Wh8
23 h4

With this move White shows that, although he has no immediate mate threat, Black is paralysed to the extent that the attack can at least restore material equality.

23 Wf6 is refuted by 23...Qh6!.

23 ... Qe6
24 Ahc1 Wc4
25 Ahf1 Wd3
26 He3 Wd2
27 Ahf1

A necessary precaution to prevent Black’s queen becoming a nuisance.

27 ... Ac8
28 Qf6+ Qg7
29 h5 Ah6

Unfortunately for Black, 29...Ahc3 allows 30 hxg6 fxg6 31 Qg4! fxg4 32 Wf6+ Qh7 33 Wxe6 Ahx3 34 Wf7+ Qh6 35 Wf4+ g5 36 Wf6+ Qh7 37 Wf7+ Ah6 38 fx e3 which Kupreichik assesses as winning for White.

30 hxg6 Ahxg6
31 Qh5+ Qf8
32 Wh4

The situation has become much clearer. White enjoys a superior pawn structure, an extra pawn and
the attack is still raging. Black has to contend with sheltering the exposed king while trying to maximize the value of his active queen.

32 ... \( \texttt{g}4 \\
33 \texttt{w}f6 \texttt{gg}6 \\
34 \texttt{wh}4 \texttt{gg}4 \\
35 \texttt{wh}2

Having conducted a little dance with the queen for the benefit of the clock, White is obliged temporarily to retreat.

35 ... \( \texttt{he}4 \\
36 \texttt{exe}4

There is a more precise way to preserve the initiative: 36 \( \texttt{df}4! \texttt{exe}3 \\
37 \texttt{exe}6+ \texttt{fxe}6! 38 \texttt{wh}8+ \texttt{he}7 39 \texttt{wx}c8 \texttt{xc}3 40 \texttt{wb}7+ \texttt{gf}8 41 \texttt{wb}8+ \texttt{gg}7 42 \texttt{wx}a7+ \texttt{fg}8 43 \texttt{wx}b6 \texttt{xc}1 44 \texttt{wd}8+ \texttt{gg}7 45 \texttt{wf}6+ \texttt{hh}7 46 \texttt{wh}4± Kupreichik.

36 ... \( \texttt{fxe}4 \\
37 \texttt{df}4 \texttt{xc}6

Kupreichik points out that Black can put up a stout defence by means of 37...\( \texttt{xc}3! (37...e3 38 \texttt{de}6±) 38 \texttt{wh}8+ \texttt{he}7 39 \texttt{wf}6+ \texttt{dd}7 40 \texttt{exe}6 (40 \texttt{dx}d5 \texttt{dx}d5 41 \texttt{wd}6+ \texttt{ee}8! 42 \texttt{wx}d5 e3!=) 40...\texttt{fxe}6 41 \texttt{ff}7+ \texttt{dd}8 42 \texttt{wx}e6 \texttt{wx}d4 43 \texttt{wd}6+ \texttt{cc}8 44 \texttt{ee}6 e3 with an unclear position.

38 \texttt{wh}4 \texttt{ee}8

It is necessary to avoid the deadly 39 \texttt{wd}8+ \texttt{gg}7 40 \texttt{wg}5+ \texttt{hh}7 41 \texttt{dx}e6 with a discovered attack on the queen.

39 \texttt{hh}5 \texttt{dd}7 \\
40 \texttt{dd}6+ \texttt{cc}7 \\
41 \texttt{de}8+ \texttt{bb}7 \\
42 \texttt{we}7+ \texttt{aa}6 \\
43 \texttt{dd}6 \texttt{xxd}6 \\
44 \texttt{ex}d6 e3 (107)

White's extra exchange gives him a clear advantage. A forlorn gesture to prolong the game by a series of checks is Black's best chance, but faced with a strong passed pawn the prospects for a draw are bleak. The game concluded as follows: 45 \texttt{fx}e3 \texttt{xe}3+ 46 \texttt{hh}2 \texttt{wh}6+ 47 \texttt{gg}3 \texttt{gg}6+ 48 \texttt{ff}2 \texttt{cc}2+ 49 \texttt{gg}1 \texttt{xc}3 50 \texttt{wh}4 \texttt{xa}3 51 \texttt{ff}4 \texttt{wa}4 52 \texttt{cc}1 \texttt{bb}5 53 \texttt{ff}1+ \texttt{bb}4 54 \texttt{we}1+ \texttt{bb}5 55 \texttt{we}2+ \texttt{aa}5 56 \texttt{wb}2 \texttt{wb}4 57 \texttt{xa}1+ \texttt{bb}5 58 \texttt{xb}4+ \texttt{xb}4 59 \texttt{xa}7 \texttt{cc}4 60 \texttt{dd}7 1-0.
It was Nimzowitsch who first proposed the daring sortie 4 \( \textit{wg4} \) in an effort to disrupt Black's development by attacking \( g7 \). The drawback is that the queen can become a target and the pawn chain to support \( e5 \) is broken.

The intention of 4 \( \textit{df3} \) is to develop rapidly while preserving \( e5 \) in an effort to restrict the activity of the opposing forces. It has been adopted by a number of players who have a penchant for aggressive off-beat lines such as Hodgson and Velimirović.

With 4 \( dxc5 \) White conjures up an ambitious attacking scheme. It was originally promoted by Steinitz and attracted the attention of Keres and Reshevsky.

These three options are usually employed as surprise weapons.

\[ \begin{align*}
8 \quad \text{White Deviations on Move Four} \\
\end{align*} \]

4 \( \textit{wg4} \) \( \textit{dc6} \)

The immediate 4...\( \textit{cx} \textit{d4} \) tends to transpose to the independent line: 5 \( \textit{df3} \) \( f5! \) 6 \( \textit{wg3} \) \( \textit{dc} \textit{c6} \) 7 \( \textit{d} \textit{d3} \) \( \textit{d7} \) 8 0-0 \( \textit{wc7} \) 9 \( \textit{ae1} \) (9 a3 intending \( b4 \) is a suggestion by \( \textit{ECO} \) 9...\( \textit{dc} \textit{g7} \) 10 a3 0-0 0 11 b4 h6 12 h4 g6? 13 \( \textit{db} \textit{db2} \) \( \textit{db} \textit{b8} \) 14 \( \textit{db} \textit{b3} \) ± Basman-van Seters, Bognor Regis 1964.

5 \( \textit{df3} \) \( \textit{cx} \textit{d4} \)

The unusual move 5...\( \textit{wa} \textit{a} \textit{a5} \) has been tested: 6 c3 \( \textit{cx} \textit{d} \textit{d4} \) 7 \( \textit{dx} \textit{d4} \) \( f5 \) (7...\( \textit{dx} \textit{e} \textit{e} \textit{c5} \) 8 \( \textit{wg3} \) intending \( \textit{df} \textit{f4} \) and \( \textit{db} \textit{b5} \) 8 \( \textit{wd} \textit{d1} \) \( \textit{dx} \textit{d4} \) 9 \( \textit{dx} \textit{d4} \) \( \textit{ae} \textit{e7} \) 10 \( \textit{df} \textit{f4} \) \( \textit{dc} \textit{c6} \) 11 \( \textit{wd} \textit{d2} \) \( \textit{ae} \textit{e7} \) 12 \( \textit{dx} \textit{d3} \) 0-0 13 0-0 \( \textit{dx} \textit{d7} \) 14 \( \textit{we} \textit{e2} \) \( \textit{wc} \textit{c7} \) 15 \( \textit{ae} \textit{e1} \) \( \textit{ff} \textit{f7} \)

16 \( \textit{ac} \textit{c1} \) f4 17 \( \textit{dx} \textit{d2} \) g5 18 b4 \( \textit{ag} \textit{g7} \) 19 \( \textit{db} \textit{b3} \) \( \textit{xf} \textit{f8} \) 20 f3 \( \textit{ae} \textit{e8} \) 21 \( \textit{db} \textit{b2} \) a6 22 a4 \( \textit{g} \textit{g6} \) 23 \( \textit{xx} \textit{g6} \) \( \textit{xx} \textit{g6} \) 24 b5 \( \textit{da} \textit{a5} \) 25 \( \textit{dx} \textit{a5} \) \( \textit{wa} \textit{a} \textit{a5} \) 1/2-1/2 Hector-Dokhoian, Copenhagen 1991.

The decision to exchange knights on \( d4 \) also offers Black no advantage: 5...\( \textit{dc} \textit{g7} \) 6 \( \textit{dx} \textit{d3} \) \( \textit{dx} \textit{d4} \) 7 \( \textit{dx} \textit{d4} \) \( \textit{cx} \textit{d4} \) 8 0-0 \( \textit{dc} \textit{c6} \) 9 \( \textit{ae} \textit{e1} \) \( \textit{wc} \textit{c7} \) 10 \( \textit{df} \textit{f4} \) \( \textit{wb} \textit{b6} \) 11 \( \textit{dx} \textit{d2} \) \( \textit{db} \textit{b4} \) 12 a3 \( \textit{cx} \textit{d3} \) 13 \( \textit{cx} \textit{d3} \) \( \textit{dx} \textit{d7} \) 14 \( \textit{ec} \textit{e1} \) \( \textit{db} \textit{b5} \) 15 \( \textit{wa} \textit{a5} \) \( \textit{wa} \textit{a6} \) 16 \( \textit{db} \textit{b3} \) ± Turci-Bukal, Reggio Emilia 1987/88.
6 ... g6?! 

A rather passive continuation, allowing White to support the strongpoint of e5. The idea of the text is to blunt an attack against g7 while making room for the bishop to put pressure on e5. The whole process is too slow and compromises the kingside pawn structure.

There are a number of options available, but the critical line is to instigate immediate threats to e5:

a) 6...Qge7 7 0-0 Qg6 8 He1 Wc7 9 Wg3 Ac5 10 h4 ± Nimzowitsch-Szekely, Kecskemet 1927.

b) 6...f5 7 Wg3 and now:

b1) 7...Qge7 8 0-0 Qg6 9 h4 Wc7 10 He1 Ad7 11 a3 0-0-0 12 b4 a6 13 h5 Qge7 14 Ac2 h6 15 a4 g5 16 b5 f4 17 Wg4 Ab8 18 c3 Ac8 19 cxd4 Ac8 20 Ac1 Wb6 21 a5 Wa7 22 b6 Wa8 23 Ac7 Af5 24 Ac3! Ac7 25 cxd5 Qxd4 26 Qxd4 exd5 27 Wxd7+! 1-0 Nimzowitsch-Håkansson, Kristianstad 1922.

b2) 7...Ad7 8 0-0 Qge7 9 h4 Wc7 10 He1 h6 11 Qbd2 0-0-0 12 Ab3 a6 13 Ac2 Ab8 14 Ac5 Ac8 15 Qxd7+ Wxd7 16 Ab1 Qb6 17 b4 Ac4 18 b5 axb5 19 Ac5 Wf7 20 Heb1 Ed7 21 Ac1 Ac7 22 Ab2 g5 23 Ac4 gh4 24 Wh3 dxc4 25 Qxd4 Qxd4 26 Axh4 Qg8 27 Wf3 Ac8 28 Ae3 Ag7 29 Ab5 Wg6 30 Aa7+ Ac8 31 Ac5 Hf5 32 Ha8+ 1-0 Trapl-Backwinkel, Bundesliga 1992.

c) 6...Wc7! 7 0-0 (7Af4 Ab4 8 Qxd4 Qxd3+ 9 cxd3 Wb6! 10 Ab3? Wb4+ 11 Qld2 g5! 0-1 Smolkin-Matiukhin, corr. 1988) 7...Qxe5 8 Qxe5 Wxe5 9 Ac4 Af6?! (9...Wf6 10 Ac5 Ae5 11 Qd2 with unclear play according to Short) and now:

c1) 10 Ac5 Qxg4 11 Qxd4 Qd6=*

c2) 10 Wg3 Wh5=*

(c3) 10 Ab5+ Ac6 11 Ac7+ Ac6 12 Wg3 Wf5! intending ...Af5 gives Black a clear advantage.

7 0-0 f5

It is now clear that the simple He1 and Af4 will safeguard e5, so Black decides to try to limit the scope of the queen.

8 Wg3 Wb6

Black is keen to lend support to the extra pawn. However, White is in no hurry to restore material equality, but instead intends to complete development and further compromise the opposing kingside with the thrust h4.
9 a3 a5
10 c3 (109)

Now that Black has been induced to play 9...a5, White is eager to post a knight on b5 as ...a6 is not an option. Also, the threat to invade on d6 would disrupt Black's efforts to employ his dormant kingside pieces.

10 ...
11 h4

A familiar feature of the Advance Variation is this pawn thrust, which seeks to add pressure to the attack by keeping open the option of h5.

11 ...
12 a4
13 Qa3
14 Qf4

The plan for White is relatively straightforward with the knight heading for b5 and a desire to oust the intruding knight on g4. The main theme is to secure e5, which will act as a pivot for the rest of White's forces. Black has to rely on the extra pawn as compensation for the lack of co-ordination amongst his forces, which is largely due to the lack of space to manoeuvre.

14 ...
0-0

The pawn is taboo because after 14...Wxb2? the reply 15 Qb5 0-0 16 Qfb1 picks up the queen.

15 Qb5
dxc3
16 bxc3
Wc5 (110)

17 Be1

The e-pawn requires extra reinforcements because the king's knight must move to facilitate f3, which would further force Black on to the defensive.

17 ...
18 Qfd4
19 Qac1
20 f3

A more prudent try is 20...Qgh6, although Black remains congested with little chance of counterplay.

21 Wxe5
22 Qxe5
23 We1
24 Qd6

1-0
Game 37
Short-Bareev
Tilburg 1991

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 ∆f3 cxd4
5 ∆d3 (111)

White can also follow a different path:

a) 5 ∆xd4 ∆c6 6 ∆f3 ∆ge7 7 ∆d3 ∆g6 which is assessed as equal by Pachman.

b) 5 wxd4 ∆c6 6 w4 and now:

b1) 6...f5 7 ∆d3 ∆ge7 8 0-0 ∆g6 9 wg3 ∆e7 10 xe1 0-0 11 a3 ∆b8?! 12 ∆bd2 a5 13 ∆b3 ∆a6 (Keres-Euwe, Zanvoort 1936) 14 ∆xa6 ∆xa6 15 ∆g5 ±.

b2) 6...wc7 7 ∆c3 a6 8 ∆d3 ∆ge7 9 0-0 ∆g6 10 wg3 ∆xe5 11 ∆xe5 ∆xe5 12 xe1 f6 13 ∆xd5! exd5 14 f4 ∆c5+ 15 ∆h1 ∆e6 16 fxe5 f5 17 ∆e3 with a small advantage for White; Velimirović-Kholmov, Yugoslavia-USSR 1975.

5 ...
∆e7

This is an unusual move which prepares 6...wb6 as a strong reply to 6...f4, when it would not be so easy for White to justify jettisoning the b-pawn. The move-order difference is important because, compared to normal lines, it is more difficult for White to develop swiftly:

a) 5...∆c6 6 0-0 and now:

a1) 6...∆f4 7 ∆f4 8 bg3 (8 bg6!) 8...e7 9 dbd2 (9...0-0 10 db3 e8 11 e1 wb6 12 h4 db4 13 df1 d3 14 cxd3 d7 15 h5 ∆f8 16 a3 ∆c6 17 d4 ± Heyken-Geveke, Bundesliga 1992) 9...f5 with a further division:

a11) 10 exf6 gxf6 11 wh4! ∆ge5 12 w5+ dh7 13 dh5 we8 14 we2 a6 15 xc6+ xc6 16 c4! dxc3 17 bxc3 wb7 18 ad1 dh8 19 dh4 xc5 20 dh3 dh7 21 dh1 dh8 22 c4 with an edge for White; Spraggett-M.Gurevich, Havana 1986.

a12) 10 h3 0-0 11 xe1 dh4 12 xh4 xh4 13 db3 d7 14 xh4 wbh4 15 xh4 16 xc5 xc6 16 xc6 17 ∆xd4 dh4 18 c3 b5 19 a3 a5 20 w3 f8 21 xf5 1-0 Hodgson-Ree, Wijk aan Zee 1986.

a2) 6...f6 7 we2 fxe5 (7...wc7 8 df4?! (8 db5!?) 8...g5! 9 bg3 g4 10 dh4 f5 11 f3 dh6 12 d2 bg7 ±) 8 dx5 dx5 9 wx5 df6 10 df4 xc5 11 db5+ ef7 12 d2 d7 13 ∆d3 g6 14 df3 e8 15 wg5 dh5 16
\[ \text{xg6+ hgx6} 17 \text{Qe5+ Qg8} 18 \text{Wxg6+ Qg7} 19 \text{Wf7+ Qh8} 20 \text{Qh6} \text{Qg8} 21 \text{Qxd7 Qe7} 22 \text{Qe5 Qf6} 23 \text{Qfe1} 1-0 \text{Bator-Ottenklev, Stockholm 1986.} \]

a3) 6...f5 7 Qbd2 Qge7 (7...c5 8 a3 a5 9 Qb3 Qb6 10 Qb5 Qd7 11 a4 Qge7 12 Qbx4 = Trapl-Müller, Bundesliga 1991/92) 8 Qb3 Qg6 9 Qbxd4 (Keres suggested that 9 Qe1 Qe7 10 Qbxd4 0-0 11 c4 is slightly better for White) 9...Qe7 10 Qb5 Qd7 11 c4 a6 12 cxd5 axb5 13 dxc6 bxc6 14 Qb3 Qc8 15 Qg5 h6 16 Qxe7 Qxe7 17 Qf1 Qb7 18 h4 Qhc8 19 h5 Qf4 20 Qxf5+ exf5 21 Qwb4+ c5 22 Qxf4 ± Bingham-Hajek, Vienna 1991.

a4) 6...g6 7 a3 Qg7 8 Qf4 Qge7 9 Qc1 0-0 10 b4 a6 11 Qe1 f6 12 Qxf6 Qxf6 13 Qbd2 Qe8 14 Qb3 Qf7 15 Qd2 Qe8 16 Qe2 Qg7 17 Qae1 b6 18 Qg5 with a slight plus for White; Koselev-Lobach, USSR 1988.

a5) 6...Qc5 7 Qf4 (7 Qbd2 Qge7 8 Qb3 Qb6 9 Qf4 Qg6 10 Qg3 intending 11 h4 is slightly better for White according to Keres) 7...Qge7 8 Qbd2 Qg6!? 9 Qg3 Qd7 10 Qb3 Qwb6 11 Qe1 Qc8 12 h4 ± Spraggett-Ivanov, Canada 1986.

a6) 6...Wb6 7 Qe1 Qge7 8 a3 Qg6 9 h4 f6 10 Qxf6 gxf6 11 c4 dxc4 12 Qxc4 e5 13 h5 Qge7 14 Qbd2 Qf5 15 Qe4 Qe7 16 b4 Qd7 with unclear play in the game Kinlay-Formanek, London 1977.

a7) 6...Qd7 7 Qf4 (White can follow the same plan as in the illustrative game, so Kogan-Djurhuus, Oakham 1992 continued 7 Qe1 Qge7 8 a3 Qg6 9 Qb4 Qc7 10 Qe2 f6 11 exf6 Qxf6 12 b5 Qce7 13 Qxd4 e5 14 Qh5 0-0-0 15 Qb3 Qb8 16 a4 Qg8 17 a5 with an unclear position) 7...Qc8 8 Qbd2 Qd4 9 Qb3 Qxd3 10 Qxd3 h6 11 Qfxd4 a6 12 c3 Qe7 13 Qd2 Qc6 14 f4 Qwb6 15 Qe3 Qc7 16 Qae1 ± Heur-Tonningen, Germany 1992.

b) 5...Qb6 6 0-0 and now:

b1) 6...Qd7 7 Qbd2 Qe7 8 Qb3 Qc6 9 Qe1 g6 10 Qf4 Qg7 11 Qwd2 0-0 12 h4?! Qc7 (12...f6?! 13 exf6 Qxf6 14 Qd6 Qe8 15 Qc5 ±) 13 Qe2 f6?! 14 exf6 Qxf4 15 Qxe6+ Qf7 16 Qxg7 Qde5?! 17 Qwe8+ Qxg7 18 Qxe5 Qh3? (18...Qf8 19 Qxf8+! Qxf8 20 Qxd5 was judged by Keres to be better for White; 18...Qg4! 19 Qxa8 Qxe5 20 Qxe5 Qxf2+ 21 Qh1 Qxh4+ ½-½ Strauss-Müller, West Germany 1964) 19 Qxa8 Qxe5 (19...Qxg2 20 Qf5!) 20 Qe8 Qc6 21 Qxf7+ Qxf7 22 Qg5+ Qf6 23 Qxh3 Qxh4 24 Qe1 g5 25 Qd2 Qh6 26 Qf3 f4 27 Qdg5 Qh5 28 Qxh7 Qe7 29 Qf4 Qh6 30 Qg5 Qwd6 31 Qh5+ Qf8 32 Qe6 Qwb4 33 Qg6 Qe7 34 Qf6+ Qg8 35 Qh7+ 1-0 Keres-Stahlberg, Warsaw 1935.

b2) 6...Qc6 7 a3 Qge7 8 Qb4 Qg6 9 Qe1 Qe7 10 Qb2 a5?! 11 b5 a4 12 Qbd2 Qa7 13 Qxd4 Qc5 14 Qxc5 Qxc5 15 c4 dxc4 16 Qe4! Qd5 17
\( \text{Qd6+ Qe7 18 Qxc4 wC5 19 Qxg6 hXg6 (19...wxc4 20 wd6+ we8 21 Qad1 fxg6 22 wd8+) 20 wd6+ wxd6 21 exd6+ 1-0 Nimzowitsch-Leonhardt, San Sebastian 1912.} \)

6 0-0

White can also follow another course: 6 Qf4 Qd7 (as noted above, 6...wb6 is logical) 7 0-0 Qc6 8 Qbd2 Qc5 9 Qb3 Qxd3 10 Qxd3 Qe7 11 Qfxd4 0-0 12 Qg3 with equal chances; Heyken-Luther, Bundesliga 1990/91.

6 ... Qg6
7 Qe1

Short has suggested 7 Qxg6 hxg6 8 Qxd4 Qc6 9 Qf4 as a way to obtain equal chances.

7 ... Qc6
8 a3?!

The start of a dubious plan to advance the queenside pawns and molest Black’s queen’s knight, in order to lessen the pressure on e5 and allow the d4 pawn to be captured.

A better scheme of action is 8 Qbd2 and Qe2.

8 ... Qd7
9 b4 Qc7

There is no immediate concern about the effect of b5, so Black is content to pile up the pressure on e5.

10 Qe2 Qe7
11 b5 Qa5
12 Qg5?!

A distinctly ambitious attempt to instigate play on the kingside. It would be more sensible to keep faith with the original plan by 12 Qxd4, when Black would be only slightly better.

12 ... Qc4?!

Black misses a chance to fully exploit White’s mistake. The critical reply is 12...Qxg5 13 Qxg5 Qc4 when another pawn leaves the board, giving Black a clear advantage.

13 Qxe7 Qxe7 (1/2)

It is feasible to give up the right to castle in this position as the king is under no immediate danger and can seek sanctuary on f8 as soon as the king’s rook has become centralized.

14 g3!

In his analysis to the game (upon which these notes are based) Short demonstrates the problems that arise after 14 Qxc4 Qxc4 15 Qxc4 dxc4 16 Qxd4 Qhc8 17 a4 Qc5 18 Qf3 a6!; this is in Black’s favour because of White’s vulnerable queenside pawns.

14 ... Qxb5
15 h4
A more exact line is 15 Qbd2! Hc8 (15...Qxd2 16 Wxd2 Qxd3 17 Wb4+! with unclear play) 16 Qxd4 a6 17 Q2f3 when Black has only slightly the better chances.

15 ... Hc8!
16 Qbd2

After 16 h5, Black has a tactical reply available: 16...Qgxe5 17 Qxe5 Wxe5 18 Axc4 (18 Wxe5 Qxe5 19 Hxe5 Axd3 20 cxd3 Ac1+ 21 Qg2 Aac8 —+) 18...We2 19 Aexe2 Aa4! 20 Qd2 Axc2 —+

A superior try is 16 Qxd4 a6 17 f4 although Black still has an edge.

16 ... Qxd2
17 Wxd2 Axd3
18 cxd3 Wc3

To a large extent Black has managed to snuff out White’s resistance by exchanging pieces in an attempt to capitalize on the extra pawns. The White strategy is now to try to confuse matters with a kingside lunge.

19 Wg5+ f8
20 h5 h6!

The most precise way to fend off the attack; alternatively 20...Ae7? 21 h6 gives White good prospects against the exposed king.

21 Wg4 Ae7
22 Qxd4 Oc6
23 Ab5 Wxd3
24 Qd6 Ac7
25 Ad1 Wa6
26 Axd5!? Id8

It is not advisable to snatch the rook due to 27 Qf5 with mating threats, but 26...Qxe5! seals White’s fate. For example: 27 Hxe5 exd5 28 Qf5 Wf6 or 27 Hxe5 Wxd6 and in both cases the attack has fizzled out, leaving Black with a devastating pawn advantage.

27 Add1 Qxe5??

A remarkable move. Black overlooks a crafty response, so his whole game collapses.

The quieter 27...Acd7 28 f4 Wxa3 would have reaped greater dividends.

28 Qf5! (113) 1-0

Bareev capitulates immediately; the finish would have been 28...Qxg4 29 Hxd8#) 29 Hxd8+ Ae7 30 Wxg7 Hxd8 31 Wxe5 and White wins.

Game 38
J.Littlewood-Brooks
Manchester 1985

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
A necessary preliminary measure as other paths allow White the initiative:

a) After 4...\textit{xc}5 5 wg4 \textit{c}7 6 b4 \textit{b}6 7 wxg7 Keres felt that Black had no real compensation for the pawn.

b) 4...\textit{d}7 5 \textit{f}3 \textit{xc}5 6 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}7 (after 6...f6?! Reshevsky analysed 7 exf6 \textit{gf}xf6 8 \textit{w}e2 \textit{w}7 9 \textit{f}4 0-0 10 0-0 with play on the e-file) 7 0-0 \textit{c}6 8 \textit{f}4 \textit{c}7 (8...0-0? 9 \textit{xh}7+ --) 9 \textit{c}3 a6 10 \textit{e}1 wb6 11 g3 wb2 12 \textit{xd}5! exd5 13 b1 wa3 14 e6 \textit{f}6 15 exf7+ \textit{x}f7 16 h4 ± Reshevsky-Vasconcellos, Boston 1944.

8...wb6 9 \textit{b}1 \textit{d}8 10 0-0 and Black is better.

5 ...
6 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}7!?

Other possibilities are:

a) 6...f5 7 0-0 \textit{g}7 8 a3 intending b4 and \textit{b}2 which is slightly better for White according to Keres.

b) 6...f6 7 \textit{w}e2 \textit{xf}e5 8 \textit{xe}5 and now:

b1) 8...\textit{f}6 9 \textit{f}4 0-0 10 0-0 \textit{d}4 11 \textit{xc}6 bxc6 12 \textit{e}3 \textit{xe}3 13 \textit{w}e3 \textit{f}6 14 \textit{d}2 (Becker-Marczoczy, Karlovy Vary 1929) 14...wb6! 15 \textit{w}e5 \textit{g}4 16 \textit{h}5 \textit{f}6 with equality (Becker).

b2) 8...\textit{xe}5 9 \textit{wxe}5 \textit{f}6?! (9...\textit{w}f6 = BCO) 10 \textit{b}5+ \textit{f}7 11 0-0 \textit{wb}6 12 \textit{c}3 ± Nimzowitsch-Bogoljubow, Stockholm 1920.

7 \textit{d}4 \textit{d}7

Black has also attempted to wrest an initiative from the alternatives:

a) 7...\textit{g}6 8 \textit{g}3 0-0 9 0-0 f5 10 exf6 \textit{w}xf6 11 \textit{c}3 \textit{h}8 12 \textit{c}2 \textit{b}6 13 \textit{xg}6 \textit{xg}6 14 \textit{f}4 \textit{g}4 15 \textit{d}3 \textit{d}7 16 a4 \textit{e}8 17 \textit{d}fe5 \textit{f}5 18 \textit{xc}6 bxc6 19 a5 \textit{d}8 20 \textit{e}1 ± Todorčević-van Setters, Nice OL 1974.

b) 7...wb6 8 0-0 and now:

b1) 8...\textit{xb}2 9 \textit{b}2 \textit{b}6 10 c4

h6 (10...0-0? 11 \textit{xd}7+) 11 \textit{w}c1 (intending 12 cxd5 exd5 13 \textit{b}1) 11...\textit{b}4 12 \textit{c}2 \textit{d}7 13 a3 \textit{a}6 14 \textit{b}1 \textit{w}c6 15 \textit{g}3! \textit{f}5?! 16 cxd5 exd5 16 e6! \textit{fxe}6 18 \textit{d}5 \textit{xg}3 19 hxg3 \textit{w}c7 20 \textit{xd}7 \textit{x}d7 21 \textit{w}b2
\( \text{b6 (21...\texttt{hb}g8 22 \texttt{fc}1! \texttt{wb}6 23 \texttt{wc}2 \texttt{xf}2+ 24 \texttt{ff}1) 22 \texttt{wg}7+ \texttt{dd}6 23 \texttt{dc}4+ \texttt{dx}c4 24 \texttt{fd}1+ 1-0 Keres-Alexandrescu, Munich 1936.} \)

b2) 8...\texttt{dg}6 9 \texttt{gg}3 (Keres assessed the position after 9 \texttt{wc}1 \texttt{xf}4 10 \texttt{xf}4 \texttt{xb}2 11 \texttt{bd}2 as reasonable for White) 9...\texttt{xb}2 10 \texttt{bd}2 \texttt{gxe}5! 11 \texttt{xe}5 \texttt{xe}5 12 \texttt{bb}1 \texttt{wc}3 13 \texttt{bb}3 \texttt{wd}4 14 \texttt{bb}5+ \texttt{dd}7 15 \texttt{xd}7 \texttt{xd}7 16 \texttt{xb}7 is unclear (Pachman).

8 0-0 \texttt{dg}6
9 \texttt{gg}3 \texttt{db}4
10 \texttt{le}2

The light-squared bishop is worth preserving for a future attack whereas the knight is soon ousted from its active post.

10 ... \texttt{cc}8
11 \texttt{cc}3

White takes advantage of the omission of c3 to play the knight to a central post.

There was a still a chance to opt for a more usual set-up: 11 c3 \texttt{cc}6 12 \texttt{dd}3 0-0 14 \texttt{bd}2 with a slight plus for White.

11 ... \texttt{wb}6
12 a3 \texttt{aa}6
13 \texttt{dd}3 \texttt{wb}2?! (115)

The moment of crisis has arisen. Black has followed a regular theme in this line by taking on b2. The problem is that White is already developed and an initiative can be gained by hounding the queen.

14 \texttt{bb}5!

This is the point. To give his queen flight squares, Black must give up the right to castle.

14 ... \texttt{xb}5
15 \texttt{bb}1 \texttt{xa}3
16 \texttt{xb}5+ \texttt{ff}8
17 \texttt{gg}5 \texttt{le}7

Black's pieces are too disorganized to present any coherent defence, for example 17...\texttt{h}6 18 \texttt{xe}6+! \texttt{fxe}6 19 \texttt{g}4 \texttt{e}7 (19...\texttt{f}7 20 \texttt{bb}3 \texttt{wa}5 21 \texttt{f}3+ \texttt{g}8 22 \texttt{xe}6+ \texttt{h}7 23 \texttt{d}d3 =) 20 \texttt{bb}3 \texttt{wa}5 21 \texttt{xe}6 and \texttt{f}3 wins.

18 \texttt{bb}3 \texttt{ec}5
19 \texttt{xe}6+! \texttt{fxe}6
20 \texttt{g}4 \texttt{cc}6
21 \texttt{fb}1 \texttt{gg}8
22 \texttt{h}4

There is no hurry to start recovering the material deficit, so the h-pawn is used as a battering-ram to create further weaknesses.

22 ... \texttt{f}8
23 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{h}5
24 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{gg}6
25 \texttt{f}7+ 1-0
9 Wade Variation

It was Bob Wade in his match against Lothar Schmid in 1950 who introduced the manoeuvre 4...\(\text{Wb6}\) and 5...\(\text{Kd7}\) to exchange bishops. It has since had fluctuating periods of popularity with Karpov and Beliavsky being the most eminent players who have adopted it for occasional use. The most common reply is 6 \(\text{Ke2}\) intending to meet 6...\(\text{Kb5}\) with the sharp 7 \(\text{c4}\). A simpler method is explored in the game Kupreichik-Molner which examines a more positional approach.

Game 39
J. Wolf-Gerbić
Corr 1988

\begin{align*}
1 & e4 & e6 \\
2 & d4 & d5 \\
3 & e5 & c5 \\
4 & c3 & \text{Wb6} \\
5 & \text{Kf3} & \text{Kd7} \\
6 & \text{Kb2} & \text{Kb5}
\end{align*}

Psakhis has recommended the exchange 6...\(\text{cxd4}\) to avoid the forthcoming complications. This method severely reduces Black’s options and the best he can hope for is a drawish middlegame. After 7 \(\text{cxd4}\) play might proceed:

a) 7...\(\text{Kb5}\) and now:
   \begin{enumerate}
   \item a1) 8 0-0 \(\text{Kxe2}\) 9 \(\text{Wxe2}\) \(\text{Kc6}\) (9...\(\text{Wa6}\)!? 10 \(\text{Wd1}\) \(\text{Kc6}\) 11 \(\text{Ke3}\) \(h6\) 12 \(\text{Kbd2}\) \(\text{Kge7}\) 13 \(\text{Kb3}\) \(\text{Kf5} = \text{Szitkey-Styblo, Czechoslovakia 1988}\)) 10 \(\text{Ke3}\) \(\text{Kge7}\) 11 a3 \(\text{Kd5}\) 12 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{Kc4}\) 13 \(\text{Kbd2} \pm \text{Pietzsch-Czerniak, Varna OL 1962}\).
   \item a2) 8 \(\text{Kxb5}\) \(\text{Wxb5}\) 9 \(\text{Kc3}\) \(\text{Wa6}\) (9...\(\text{b4}\) 10 \(\text{Kd2}\) \(\text{Wd3}\) 11 \(\text{Wa4}\) \(\text{Kc6}\) with unclear play; Kupreichik-Eingorn, USSR 1977) 10 \(\text{Ke2}\) \(\text{b4}\) 11 \(\text{Kd2}\) \(\text{Kxd2}\) 12 \(\text{Wxd2}\) \(\text{Kge7}\) 13 0-0 0-0 14 \(\text{Kfc1}\) \(\text{Kbc6}\) 15 \(\text{Kf4} \pm \text{Kupreichik-Kapengut, Minsk 1979}\).
\end{enumerate}

b) 7...\(\text{Kb4}\) + 8 \(\text{Kc3}\) \(\text{Kb5}\) 9 0-0 \(\text{Kxe2}\) 10 \(\text{Kxe2}\) \(\text{Kc6}\) 11 \(\text{Wd3}\) \(h6\) 12 a3 \(\text{Kf8}\) 13 \(\text{b4} \pm \text{Hübner-Debarnot, Las Palmas 1976}\).

7 \(\text{c4}\) (116)

It was Zaitsev who first advocated this move as a way for White to wrest the initiative.

7 ... \(\text{Kxc4}\)

This move has been accepted as the norm for years, since the other possibilities can cause Black problems:
a) 7...c6 8 0-0 Qd7 9 Qc3 Qe7 10 dxc5 Qxc5 11 Qc2 dxc4 12 Qd2 Qf5 13 Qxc4 Qd8 14 Qd1 Wh4 15 b4 Qe4 16 Qxe4 Qxe4 17 Qxe4 Qxe4 18 a3 Qd8 19 Qg5 ± Yanovsky-Rohlmann, Moscow 1991.

b) 7...dxc4 8 Qc3 (or 8 d5!?) 8...Qc6 9 d5 exd5 10 Qxb5 Qxb5 11 Qxd5 Qe7 12 Qxc4 ± Nikolenko-Shaboian, Pula 1990.

8 Qxc4 Qb4+!

A refinement designed to improve on the old system that has scored heavily in White’s favour. Play might instead continue 8...dxc4 9 d5 and now:

a) 9...exd5 10 Qxd5 and now:

a1) 10...c6 11 Qxc4 a6 12 Qa3 Qxc4 13 Qxc4 Qc6 14 Qf4 0-0 0-0 15 Qe7 16 Qfd1 ± Edelman-Bicknell, Los Angeles 1991.

a2) 10...Qe7 11 Qe4 (11 Qxc4 Qb4+ 12 Qbd2 Qxc4 13 Qxc4 Qec6 14 Qe3 Qb4 15 Qe2 = I Horvath-Hetenyi, Hungary 1992) and now:

a21) 11...Qd7 12 0-0 Qc6 13 Qxc4 Qb6 14 Qe2 Qed5 15 a4! ± Zaitsev-Doda, Riga 1968.

a22) 11...c6 12 Qxc4 a6 13 Qa3 Qxc4 14 Qxc4 Qf5 (14...Qec6 15 Qf4 Qd4! with unclear play) 15 b3 Qc6 16 Qb2 Qe7 17 0-0-0 0-0 18 g4 Qh4 19 Qxh4 Qxh4 20 Qhf1 f5 21 gxf5 Qxf5 22 Qd7 ± Zlotnik-Scherbakov, Moscow 1968.

b) 9...Qe7 10 dx6 fxe6 11 0-0 Qc6 12 Qe2 Qf5 13 Qxc4 Qe7 14 Qc3 0-0 15 Qg5 Qa6 16 Qb5 Qxg5 17 Qxg5 Qd4 18 Qxc5 Qxb5 19 a4 Qd7 20 Qxb5 Qxb5 21 axb5 Qxe5 22 Qxe6 Qf6 23 Qc7 Qd8 24 Qxa7 and White wins; Zaitsev-Bonch-Osmolovsky, USSR 1968.

9 Qbd2 dxc4

10 a3

Not obligatory, as there have been experiments with 10 0-0:

a) 10...cxd4 11 Qxd4 Qd7 12 Wh5! Qb6 13 Qf4 Qc6 14 Qe1 Qe7 15 Qe4 ± Afek-Ghinda, Netanya 1987.

b) 10...Qc6 11 dxc5 Qxc5 12 Qe2 Qge7 13 Qxc4 0-0 14 b3 Qb5 = Malaniuk-Vaiser, Tashkent 1987.

10 ...

Qa5 (1/7)

At this juncture the major alternative 10...Qb5 deserves attention:

a) 11 0-0 Qc6 12 dxc5 Qxc5 13 Qe2 Qge7 and now:

a1) 14 Qxc4 (14 b4?! Qd4! with an edge for Black; Stean-Forintos, Moscow 1975) 14...Qxc4 15 Qxc4 b5 16 Qe3 bxc4 17 Qxc5 ± Meshkov-Moroz, Podolsk 1990.
a2) 14 \(\text{Qxc4 Qf5}\) 15 b4 \(\text{Qcd4}\) 16 \(\text{Qxd4 xd4}\) 17 \(\text{xa2 0-0 18 Qf4}\)
\(\text{Hfd8}\) 19 g4 \(\text{Qe7}\) 20 \(\text{Qd6 Wxe2}\) 21 \(\text{Qxe2 Qd5}\) 22 \(\text{Qg3 Hdb8}\) 23 \(\text{Hd2}\)
\(\text{Ab6 24 Ac1 a5 25 b5 a4 26 Ac4 Qf8}\) 27 \(\text{Hd3 Qe7}\) 28 g5 \(\text{Hxa5}\) 29 \(\text{Hf3 Hf8}\)
30 \(\text{Hc8 Hd8}\) 31 \(\text{Hxd8!}\) 1-0 Galdunts-Gavrilov, USSR 1988.

b) 11 \(\text{We2 cxd4}\) (11...\(\text{Qc6}\)!! 12 \(\text{Qxc4 Wa4}\) 13 dxc5 \(\text{Qxc5}\) 14 \(\text{We4!}\) with a clear plus for White; Boey-Berta, corr. 1980) and now:

b1) 12 \(\text{Qxc4 Wd5}\) 13 b3 \(\text{Qc6}\) 14 \(\text{Ab2 b5}\) 15 \(\text{Qcd2 Qg7}\) 16 a4 d3 with unclear play; M.Horvath-Rozkovec, Prague 1987.

b2) 12 \(\text{Qxd4 Wd5}\) 13 \(\text{Qf3!}\) (13 \(\text{Qf3?! Qc5}\) 14 \(\text{Qe3 Qxd4}\) 15 \(\text{Qxd4 Qc6}\) 16 0-0-0 \(\text{Qge7}\) 17 h4 0-0 18 \(\text{Qc3 Wb5}\) 19 \(\text{Qg5 + Ivell-Beliavsky, London 1985}\) ) 13...\(\text{Qd7}\) 14 \(\text{Qxc4 Ac8}\) 15 \(\text{Qe3 We4}\) 16 b4! \(\text{Qxe5}\) (16...\(\text{Qe7}\)!! 17 \(\text{Ab2 Qd5 = Howell-Mestel, British Ch 1987}\) ) 17 \(\text{Qxe5 Wxe5}\) 18 \(\text{Ab2 We4}\) 19 0-0 \(\text{Qe7}\) 20 \(\text{Hac1 ± Pinter-Omsnstein, Budapest 1977.}\)

11 0-0 \(\text{Qc6}\)
12 \(\text{Qxc4 Wa6}\)

Zlotnik considers the position to be equal, but the evidence suggests otherwise.

13 \(\text{Qd6+?}\) \(\text{Qxd6}\)
14 exd6 cxd4
15 d7+! \(\text{Qe7}\)

White could meet 15...\(\text{Qxd7}\) by 16 \(\text{Qxd4 Qe7}\) 17 \(\text{Ab2}\) with advantage.

16 \(\text{Qxd4 Af6 (118)}\)

17 \(\text{Qf5+!}\)

A brilliant tactical stroke. White invests a piece to expose the king, so the rest of the forces can use the influence of the d7 pawn to stage a daring attack.

17 ... \(\text{exf5}\)
18 \(\text{He1+}\)
19 \(\text{Hd8}\)

Black can fare no better with a different retreat, according to Wolf; 18...\(\text{Qf8?!}\) 19 \(\text{Wd6+ Qg8}\) 20 \(\text{Ah6!}\) and now:

a) 20...\(\text{Qf8}\) 21 \(\text{Wxf6! gxf6}\) 22 \(\text{He8 +}.\)
b) 20...De4 21 Exe4! fxe4 22 Wg3 f8 23 Wxg7+ De7 24 Ad1 Wd3 25 Ag5+ xd7 26 Wxf7+ Ad6 27 Af4+ Ac5 28 Ac1+ Ab6 29 Wc7+ Aa6 30 Ac6+ bxc6 31 Wxc6+ Aa5 32 Ac7#.

c) 20...Dxd7 21 Wg3 g6 22 Wc3 D6e5 23 Aexe5 Wf6 24 Aae1 Dxe5 25 Wxe5 Wxe5 26 Aexe5+.

19 Af4 De7

The ploy of blocking the d-file appears to be strong but Black has an improvement on the text: 19...Wb6!? (19...Dxd7? 20 Wd5 Ae8 21 Wxf7 ++) 20 We2 Wd4 (20...Wxd7? 21 Wd3+ wins for White) 21 Ag5 with unclear play.

20 Ac1 Dfd5

After 20...Ded5 21 Ag5 Wd6 22 Wb3 Wxd7 23 Axf6+ gxf6 24 Ac5 intending Ad1 wins material.

21 Aexe7! Dxf4

Of course, 21...Dxe7 allows 22 Ac7#.

22 We1 Wd6

Wolf points out that there is no respite whatever obstacles Black constructs:

a) 22...Ag6 23 Ae8+ Dxd7 24 Ae2+.

b) 22...D6e 23 Axf7 Wd6 (or 23...Wb6 24 Wf5 h5 25 Ae1 Wh6 26 Af8+!) 24 Ad1 Wc6 25 Wb4 Wc5 26 Wh4+ g5 27 Wh6 We5 28 f4! +.

23 Axf7 We6

The prospects for Black are bleak in every line:

a) 23...Ad3 24 Wa5+ b6 (or 24...Wb6 25 Wxf5 Axc1 26 Wg5+ ++) 25 Wxa7! Ab8 26 Ac8 Axc8 27 dxca8+ Wc8 28 Af6+ --.

b) 23...Ag6 24 Wa5+ Wb6 25 Wxf5 De7 26 Ac8+! ++.

c) 23...Af8 24 Wa5+ b6 25 Axf8+ Wfxf8 26 We5 Wxd7 27 Ac7+ ++.

d) 23...b6 24 Ac6! ++.

24 Wa5+ b6 (119)

The swarming pieces cannot be rebuffed, for example 24...Wb6 25 Wxf5 De2+ 26 Af1 Axc1 27 Wg5+ ++.

119

25 Wxa7! We1+
26 Aexe1 Axa7
27 Ae8+ Aexe8
28 dxe8W+ Aexe8
29 Axa7 1-0

Game 40
Kupreichik-Molnar
Gemer 1990

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 c5
4 c3 \textit{wb6}
5 d3 d7
6 \textit{le2} (120)

The alternative treatments are useful as surprise weapons:

a) 6 a3 \textit{lb5} and now:
   a1) 7 c4 \textit{xc4} (7...\textit{c6}?! 8 b4! \textit{cxb4} 9 c5 \textit{wa5} 10 \textit{d2} \textit{a4} 11 \textit{wc1} \textit{b5} 12 \textit{axb4} \textit{wa1} 13 \textit{xb5}+ \textit{dc6} 14 \textit{wc2} 1-0 Fruteau-Roumegous, Paris 1993) 8 \textit{xc4} \textit{dxc4} 9 \textit{dxb2} \textit{wa6} 10 \textit{we2} \textit{cx4} 11 \textit{xd4} \textit{lc5} 12 \textit{d4f3} c3 13 \textit{le4} \textit{xe2}+ 14 \textit{xc2} \textit{cx2} 15 \textit{lb2} \textit{a6} 16 \textit{hd1} \textit{le7} 17 \textit{lac1} b6 18 \textit{d6+} \textit{lf8} 19 \textit{dg5} h6 20 \textit{dgxf7} ± Sveshnikov-Ehlvest, Leningrad 1984.

a2) 7 \textit{d3} \textit{xd3} (7...\textit{wa6}?! 8 \textit{lc2} \textit{dd7} 9 a4 ± Ciocalteu-Wade, Bucharest 1954) 8 \textit{xd3} \textit{wa6} 9 \textit{wxax6} \textit{axa6} with equality; Toran-Heidenfeld, Venice 1953.

a3) 7 \textit{xb5+} \textit{wb5} 8 dxc5 (8 \textit{we2}?!?) 8...\textit{xc5} 9 \textit{dxb2} \textit{le7} 10 c4 \textit{dxc4} 11 \textit{we2} \textit{dxc6} 12 \textit{wx4} \textit{wc4} 13 \textit{dxc4} \textit{dg6}! 14 b4 b5 15 bxc5 bx5 16 0-0 0-0 17 \textit{le3} \textit{ld7}! 18 \textit{hfc1} \textit{da5} ± Witkowski-Portisch, Munich 1958.

b) 6 \textit{d3} and now:
   b1) 6...\textit{d6} 7 \textit{le2} \textit{cxd4} 8 \textit{cxd4} \textit{lb4}+ 9 \textit{f1} f6 (9...\textit{dh6}?! 10 \textit{le2} \textit{e7} 11 \textit{lxh6} \textit{gxh6} 12 \textit{b1} f6 = Clarke-Heidenfeld, Ilford 1953) 10 \textit{lc2} \textit{fxe5} 11 \textit{dxb4} \textit{dxb4} 12 \textit{dxe5} \textit{b5} 13 a3 \textit{d6} 14 \textit{le3} \textit{wa6} 15 \textit{xb5} \textit{wx5}+ 16 \textit{g1} \textit{ge7} 17 b4 b6 18 \textit{g5} \textit{d8} 19 \textit{lc1} \textit{dd7}? 20 \textit{wh5+} g6 21 \textit{lxh7}! +− Schmid-Wade, England (9) 1950.
   b2) 6...\textit{cxd4} 7 \textit{cxd4} \textit{lb4}+ 8 \textit{d2} \textit{dc6} 9 \textit{dc2} a5 10 \textit{d3} \textit{xd2}+ 11 \textit{wx2} \textit{d4} 12 \textit{dxb4} \textit{wb4} 13 \textit{wb4} \textit{axb4} 14 \textit{d2} \textit{de7} = Kupreichik-Zlotnik, Cheliabinsk 1975.
   b3) 6 \textit{d3} \textit{cxd4} and now:
      b1) 7 \textit{cxd4} \textit{lb5} 8 0-0 \textit{le3} (8...\textit{wa6}! =) 9 \textit{wd3} \textit{dc6} 10 \textit{lc3} \textit{ge7} 11 \textit{d2} ± Natapov-Kolkert, USSR 1968.
   b2) 7 \textit{dxd4} \textit{dc6} 8 \textit{dxc6} (8 \textit{dxf3} \textit{f6}! =) 8...\textit{bxc6} 9 0-0 \textit{le7} 10 \textit{d2} \textit{g6} 11 \textit{lc3} \textit{le7} 12 \textit{we2} \textit{wc7} 13 \textit{xe1} 0-0 14 \textit{lg5} (15 h4 \textit{f5} = Knoch-Schmidt, corr. 1951) 14...\textit{lxg5} 15 \textit{lxg5} \textit{wx5} 16 \textit{wx5} \textit{dxe5} 17 \textit{xe5} \textit{f6} 18 \textit{xf6} \textit{gxf6} 19 \textit{lh5} \textit{lf7} 20 \textit{fxe8} 21 \textit{xe1} \textit{xe7} intending ...\textit{de8} and ...\textit{lg7} with a slight advantage to Black according to Schmid.
   b3) 6 a4 \textit{dc6} 7 \textit{лае2} \textit{c4} = Messere-Tarnovsky, London 1960.
   e) 6 \textit{wb3}?! \textit{dc6} 7 \textit{le3} \textit{cxd4} (7...\textit{xb3}?! 8 \textit{wb6} \textit{xb6} (Babriowski-Espig, East German Ch 1976) 9 \textit{dxd4}! with the idea 10 \textit{db5} gives White the better game.

6...

7 \textit{dxc5}

White abandons the pawn chain in order to gain space and strive for the initiative. Other paths are available:

a) 7 0-0 and now:
   a1) 7...\textit{d6}?! 8 \textit{lxh5} \textit{lxh5} 9 a4
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{120} \\
B
\end{array} \]

\[ \text{\textit{Wb6 10 dxc5 \textit{\textit{Exc5} 11 b4 \textit{f8} 12 \textit{Ee1 \textit{Qe7} 13 a5 \textit{Cw7} 14 \textit{Wa4} \pm Pietzsch-Uhlmann, East Germany 1958.}}}} \]

\[ \text{\textit{a2}} \] \text{7...\textit{Exe2} 8 \textit{Wxe2 Wa6} 9 \textit{Wd1 (9 \textit{Wc2 \textit{Qd7} 10 \textit{Qe3 \textit{Cc8} 11 \textit{Qbd2 h6 12 a3 \textit{Qe7} 13 h4 \textit{Qc6} 14 \textit{Qfe1 \textit{Qe7} 15 Qf1 0-0 16 \textit{Wd2} \pm Santana-Turner, Pinar del Rio 1990)) 9...c4 (after 9...\textit{Qd7}, 10 \textit{Qa3 \textit{Qe7} 11 dxc5 \textit{\textit{Qxc5} 12 \textit{Qd4} \textit{Qc6} = was Netusil-Alster, Czechoslovakia 1988, but White can try for more with 10 dxc5!? \textit{\textit{Qxc5} 11 b4 \textit{Qd3} 12 \textit{Qe3 \textit{Qdb2} 13 \textit{Wb3 \textit{Qc4} 14 \textit{Qbd2! \textit{Qxe3}}}} 15 \textit{fxe3} \pm Kaidanov-Zlotnik, Moscow 1979) 10 \textit{\textit{Qe1 \textit{Qc6} 11 \textit{Qbd2 0-0-0 12 Qf1 \textit{Qd7} 13 \textit{Qf4}?! \textit{Qge7}! 14 h4 h5 15 Qg3 \textit{Qg6} 16 Qg5 \textit{Qe7} 17 \textit{Qd2 \textit{Wb6} 18 \textit{Qxe7 \textit{Qxe7} 19 \textit{Qe2 \textit{Wd8} 20 Qf1 f6 21 Q1h2 fxe5 22 Qxe5 (Hecht-Karpov, Bath 1973) 22...Qgxe5 23 de \textit{Qd7} =.}}}}}}
\]

\[ \text{\textit{b2}} \] \text{7 \textit{\textit{Qbd2?! \textit{\textit{Qxe2} 8 \textit{Wxe2 cxd4 9 \textit{Qxd4 \textit{Qc6} 10 \textit{Qf3 \textit{Qxd4} 11 \textit{Qxd4 \textit{Qc5} 12 \textit{Qc2 \textit{Qc6} 13 \textit{Wg4 \textit{Qe7} 14 \textit{Wxg7} 0-0-0 15 \textit{Qe3 \textit{Qf5 16 \textit{Wxf7 Qd7 17 \textit{Qh5 Qg8} 18 0-0-0 \textit{Qxe3}+ 19 fxe3 \textit{Qxg2} 20 \textit{Qf3 \textit{Qd7} 21 \textit{Qd2 \textit{Qxd2} 22 Qxd2 Qb5 23 Qc1 with a slight plus for White; Braun-} Muhr, Bundesliga 1986/87.}}}}}}}}
\]

\[ \text{\textit{c3}} \] \text{7 \textit{Qe3}?! \textit{\textit{\textit{Qxe2} 8 \textit{Wxe2 Qc6} 9 dxc5 \textit{\textit{Qxc5} 10 \textit{Qxc5} Qxc5 11 \textit{Qbd2 Qge7} 12 Qb3 Qb6 13 Qbd4 0-0 14 0-0 \textit{Qae8} 15 Qad1 = Pilgaard-Johansson, Lyngby 1988.}}}}

\[ \text{8...Qxe5} \]

\[ \text{9...Qf5} \]

\[ \text{It used to be the accepted practice to continue with the committal 8 b4, which creates dynamic positions:} \]

\[ \text{a3 8...Qf8 9 0-0 Qd7 10 Qa3 Qxe2 11 \textit{Wxe2 a6} 12 c4 Qe7 13 Qd2 \pm Widenmann-Berge, corr. 1983.} \]

\[ \text{b3 8...Qe7 9 0-0 (9 \textit{Qe3 \textit{Wae6} 10 \textit{Qxb5+ \textit{Wxb5} 11 Qa3 \textit{Wd7} 12 0-0 h5 13 Qd4! Qc6 14 Qab5 a6 15 Qxc6 bx\textit{c6} 16 Qd4 c5 17 \textit{Qxc5} 18 Qb1 \pm Gonsior-Alster, Czechoslovakia 1988) 9...Qxe2 10 \textit{Wxe2 Qh6 11 a4 Qf5} 12 g4 (12 Qbd2?! 12...Qh6 13 h3 Qc6 14 Qf4 Qg8 15 Qbd2 h5 16 Qb3 hxg4 17 hxg4 Qh6 18 Qf3 Qc8 19 Qf1 Qd8 20 b5 Qb8 21 c4 dxc4 22 Qxc4 \textit{Qd7} = Mestel-Small, Haifa 1976.}}}}
\]

\[ \text{c4 However, Black has found new nuances to cause White difficulties: 8...Qxf2+?! 9 Qf1 Qc6! (it was formerly thought that the dark-squared bishop would be trapped but there is no forced win) and now:} \]

\[ \text{c5 10 c4?! dxc4 11 Qa3 Qd5 12 Qxc4 Qxc4 13 Qxc4 Qc6 14 Qe2} \]
\( \texttt{d4} 15 \texttt{db1} \texttt{ge7} \mp \text{Nederkoorn-Kahn, corr. 1982.} \\
\text{c2) 10} \texttt{Wd2} \texttt{d4! 11} \texttt{xf2} \texttt{d3+ 12} \texttt{We3} \texttt{xe3+ 13} \texttt{xe3} \texttt{dxe2} \text{and Black is slightly better.} \\
\text{c3) 10} \texttt{Wd3} \texttt{Qe7} 11 \texttt{a4} \texttt{a5 12} \texttt{b5} \texttt{Qd7} \text{with unclear play; Vanka-Matoušek, Prague 1986.} \\
8 \ldots \texttt{Qxe2} \\
9 \texttt{Wxe2} \texttt{W6} \\
10 \texttt{Wc2} \\
\text{The ending offers equal chances, so White prefers to avoid an exchange of queens in the hope of obtaining attacking chances with a queenside advance.} \\
10 \ldots \texttt{Qd7} \\
11 \texttt{a4} \texttt{Cc8} \\
12 \texttt{a5} \\
\text{Of course 12} \texttt{b4?} \text{is refuted by 12...\texttt{xb4} due to the pin on the c-file.} \\
12 \ldots \texttt{Wc6 (121)} \\
\text{13} \texttt{Wc2} \\
\text{White’s strategy is proceeding smoothly. He has expanded on the queenside to stifle the opposition, and the plan is to develop behind the pawn mass before striking out with a further advance. In the meantime, it is difficult for Black to create counterplay against such a solid pawn structure and instead he must concentrate on getting the rest of his forces into play.} \\
13 \ldots \texttt{a6} \\
14 \texttt{b4} \texttt{Qa7} \\
15 \texttt{Qa3} \texttt{Qe7} \\
\text{It is too risky to snatch the pawn. For example: 15...\texttt{Wxc3}?! 16 \texttt{Qd2} \texttt{Wc7} (16...\texttt{Wb3}? 17 \texttt{Qfb1} \texttt{Wa4} 18 \texttt{Cc4} \mp) 17 \texttt{b5} \texttt{Cc5} 18 \texttt{bxa6} \texttt{bxa6} 19 \texttt{Wxa6} \text{with a formidable passed pawn.} \\
16 \texttt{b5} \texttt{axb5} \\
17 \texttt{Qxb5} \texttt{Cc5} \\
18 \texttt{a6!} \\
\text{A neat trick which takes advantage of the opposing king being left in the centre. Now after 18...\texttt{bxa6} 19 \texttt{xa6} \texttt{Wb7} (19...\texttt{xa6} 20 \texttt{Cc7} \mp) 21 \texttt{Qc3} \text{White has the better chances.} \\
18 \ldots \texttt{0-0} \\
19 \texttt{a7} \texttt{W6} \\
20 \texttt{Qfd4} \\
\text{This manoeuvre spells trouble for Black. The knight is transferred to the queenside in an effort to exchange a defensive piece, which would increase the likelihood of making use of the mighty pawn on the seventh rank.} \\
20 \ldots \texttt{Wb6}
21 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{c6} \)
22 \( \text{x e5} \) \( \text{x e5} \) \( \text{122} \)

Astute tactical awareness. The a-pawn is jettisoned in order to unleash a winning combination based on the vulnerability of the pinned knight.

23 ... \( \text{xa7} \)
24 \( \text{we3} \) \( \text{fc8} \)
25 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{c7} \)
26 \( \text{fb1} \) \( \text{c6} \)

Black is overloaded with defensive duties and this can inevitably be exploited.

27 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \)
28 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \)
29 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{xc3} \)
30 \( \text{f1} \) 1-0
10 Systems with ...b6

The choice of 3...b6 is a popular way of avoiding the main lines. It prepares to exchange Black’s light-squared bishop, which normally has a restricted rôle in the French. This inevitably results in Black’s development being retarded while the process is carried out, which can cause problems. With 3...Qe7 and 4...b6 Black is trying to avoid certain lines. The original idea was that the closed nature of the position would allow Black to activate the pieces at a later stage, but the current trends indicate that White gains too much territory to justify Black’s passive opening.

At this juncture Black has experimented with 4...c6 5 Qa4! when White has used his space advantage to maximum effect:

a) 5...a5 6 c3 and now:
   a1) 6...Qa6 7 Qe2 h5 8 Qd2 Qh6 9 Qf3 Qf5 10 Qg5 Qe7 11 h4
       Qxg5 12 hxg5 Qxe2 13 Wxe2 g6 14
       Qc2 0-0 15 0-0-0 c5 16 Qxf5 exf5
       17 e6! Qc6 18 dxc5 bxc5 19 exf7
       Qxf7 20 Wb5 1-0 Murey–Brinck-Claussen, Copenhagen 1986.
   a2) 6...b5 7 Qc2 c5 8 Qf3 Qc6 9
       0-0 c4 10 Qe1 h6 11 Qbd2 Qge7 12
       Qf1 Qd7 13 Qe3 Qc8 14 b3 cxb3
       15 axb3 Qb6 16 Qd3 b4 17 c4 Qe7
       18 Qd2 Qc6 19 c5 Qd7 20 Qa2 ±

b) 5...Qe7 and now:

Game 41
Anand-Rogers
Manila IZ 1990

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 b6
4 Qb5+(123)

A recent concept. The check is intended to disrupt Black’s slow manoeuvring game.

4 ... Qd7
b1) 6 \(\text{Qe}2\) \(\text{Qf}5\) 7 0-0 \(\text{Qe}7\) 8 c3 \(\text{Qa}6\) 9 \(\text{Qe}1\) \(\text{Qf}8\) 10 \(\text{Qd}2\) c5 11 \(\text{Qf}1\) cxd4 12 cxd4 \(\text{Qxe}2\) 13 \(\text{Qxe}2\) \(\text{Qa}6\) 14 \(\text{Qe}3\) \(\text{Qxe}3\) 15 \(\text{Qxe}3\) \(\text{Qc}7\) 16 \(\text{Qc}1\) a6 17 \(\text{Qec}2\) \(\text{Qa}7\) 18 \(\text{Qc}6\) b5 19 \(\text{Qc}2\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 20 \(\text{Qc}8\) \(\text{Qb}6\) 21 \(\text{Qb}3\) h6 22 \(\text{Qc}6\) \(\text{Qxc}6\) 23 \(\text{Qxc}6\) \(\text{Qb}4\) 24 \(\text{Qxe}8+!\) 1-0 \(\text{Marić-Mitrović, Belgrade 1989.}\)

b2) 6 c3 \(\text{Qf}5\) 7 \(\text{Qd}2\) \(\text{Qe}7\) 8 \(\text{Qdf}3\) \(\text{Qd}7\) 9 \(\text{Qc}2\) \(\text{Qa}6\) 10 h4 \(\text{Qc}7\) 11 \(\text{Qg}5\) \(\text{Qc}8\) 12 \(\text{Qwd}2\) \(\text{Qa}6\) 13 \(\text{Qe}2\) h6 14 \(\text{Qxe}7\) \(\text{Qxe}7\) 15 h5 \(\text{Qwd}7\) 16 \(\text{Qf}4\) c5 17 \(\text{Qg}3\) \(\text{Qg}8\) 18 0-0-0 0-0 0-0-0 19 dxc5! bxc5 20 \(\text{Qe}4\) \(\text{Qc}6\) 21 \(\text{Qd}6+\) \(\text{Qb}8\) 22 \(\text{Qxf}7\) and wins; \(\text{Lein-Blees, Belgrade 1988.}\)

5 \(\text{Qd}3\) c5 6 c3 \(\text{Qc}6\) 7 \(\text{Qf}3\)

As usual, the knight belongs on f3 to support d4.

7 ... f6

This is the only way to put pressure on White’s position because the pawn on b6 has reduced Black’s options.

5 0-0 fxe5

The most exact reply is 9 \(\text{Qxe}5!\) \(\text{Qxe}5\) 10 dxe5 when the threat of 11 \(\text{Wh}5+\) ensures that Black must compromise his kingside.

9 ... \(\text{Qc}7\)

10 \(\text{Qe}1\) \(\text{Qh}6\) (124)

After 11 \(\text{Qxh}6\) Black gains compensation for the doubled pawns because the open g-file is available for the rooks to start an attack.

The natural continuation 10...\(\text{Qe}7\) lands Black in dire straits: 11 \(\text{Qa}3\) a6 (11...\(\text{Qe}8\) ±) 12 \(\text{Qxa6!}\) \(\text{Qxa6}\) 13 \(\text{Qb}5\) \(\text{Qb}8\) 14 \(\text{Qd}6+\) \(\text{Qd}8\) 15 \(\text{Qf}7+\) \(\text{Qe}8\) 16 \(\text{Qxh}8\) ++.

11 c4 d4 12 \(\text{Qa}3\)

In his analysis of the game (upon which these notes are based) Anand prefers a more forceful continuation: 12 \(\text{Qxh}6\) \(\text{gxh}6\) 13 \(\text{Qbd}2\) 0-0-0 (not 13...\(\text{Qg}7\) 14 \(\text{Qe}2\) 0-0? 14 \(\text{We}4\) —) 14 a3 ±.

12 ... a6 13 \(\text{Qe}4\) 0-0-0

There is nothing to be gained from a delay in whisking the king to safety. For example: 13...\(\text{Qe}7\) (13...\(\text{Qf}7\) 14 \(\text{Qg}5!)\) 14 \(\text{Qxh}6\) \(\text{gxh}6\) 15 b4 \(\text{cx}b4\) 16 \(\text{Qb}5\) ±.

14 \(\text{Qc}2\) \(\text{Qf}7\)

15 \(\text{Qf}4\)

White proceeds in an acceptable manner by securing e5 — by now a familiar theme. However, the different circumstances that are apparent due to queenside castling suggest
another approach: 15 b4 cxb4 16 a3 with unclear play.

15 ... e7
16 b4 g5
17 g3 g4?!

This is the logical conclusion of a brash plan to snatch e5, despite the deployment of White's forces in an attacking stance.

If Black had been more alert to the danger, then a way to deflect the onslaught could have been pursued: 17...h5! 18 bxc5 bxc5! (18...h4 19 cxb6 xb6 20 b1 with unclear play) 19 h3 dg8 intending 20...g4 21 hxg4 hxg4 22 h2 h4 when White is forced to embark upon defensive measures.

18 d2 cxe5
19 a4! (125)

19 ... cxb4

After 19...a5 20 bxa5 bxa5 21 b1 the rook invades into the heart of Black's camp.

20 a5! bxa5
21 d4

With the pair of bishops bearing down on the queenside White is in the ascendancy. Anand prefers an even more stylish continuation to take advantage of the vulnerable knight on e5: 21 c5! b5 (21...cxc5 22 c4++) 22 b3 a4 23 b4! a5 24 d3 xd3 25 xd3 axb3 26 a6+ d7 (26...b8 27 e5! ++) 27 b5+ c8 28 xb3 ±.

21 ... c5
22 d3 a4
23 xc5 xc5
24 c2 a5

Anand supplies the following variations to demonstrate White's superiority:

a) 24...a3 25 e4 c7 26 c5 c6 27 d6+ xd6 28 cxd6 xd6 29 e2 ++.

b) 24...b3 25 xb3 (25 e4?! b4 with unclear play) 25...axb3 26 cxb3! (26 xb3 c6) 26...xc4! (26...c7 27 xa6 c6 28 a1 b7 29 a5 ±) 27 xe5 (27 c1 c6) 27...xe5 28 xe5 a4 29 e1xb3 (29...xb3 30 c1 c2 31 e2!) 30 c5+ d7 31 b1 a2! 32 a5 c2 (32...e8? 33 xa4!; 32...e7 33 b4++; 32...b8 33 a1 ±) 33 xa6 ±.

25 e4 c7
26 $\mathcal{L}xa4 \mathcal{L}c6
27 \mathcal{W}c2 \mathcal{L}b7
28 c5 \mathcal{X}d5

The demands on the defender are enormous. The text is designed to reinforce e5, while 28...\mathcal{W}b8 fails to 29 \mathcal{D}g5!.

29 \mathcal{L}b3 \mathcal{W}hd8
30 \mathcal{X}c1!

After 30 \mathcal{X}xd5 \mathcal{X}xd5 31 \mathcal{X}c1 \mathcal{W}c6 Black can struggle on. The preferred move-order will extinguish any lingering hopes for a revival.

30 ...
31 \mathcal{L}a4 \mathcal{W}c7
32 \mathcal{D}d6+ \mathcal{X}8xd6
33 cxd6 \mathcal{W}xc2
34 \mathcal{X}xc2+ \mathcal{W}b8
35 \mathcal{L}b3 \mathcal{X}xd6
36 \mathcal{X}xe5! 1-0

\[ \mathcal{D}b8 10 \mathcal{D}e2 \mathcal{D}bc6 11 0-0 \mathcal{h}5 12 \mathcal{D}d2 \mathcal{D}f5 13 \mathcal{D}g3 \mathcal{D}ce7 14 \mathcal{D}e2 \mathcal{c}4 15 \mathcal{W}c2 0-0-0 16 \mathcal{b}3 \mathcal{f}6 = Castro-Ornstein, Budapest 1977. \]

32 ... \mathcal{D}f3 \mathcal{D}e7 7 \mathcal{D}e3 \mathcal{W}d7 8 0-0 \mathcal{h}6 9 \mathcal{W}e2 \mathcal{D}bc6 10 a3 \mathcal{D}a5 11 \mathcal{L}a2 \mathcal{D}d5 12 \mathcal{X}d2 \mathcal{X}xc3 13 \mathcal{b}xc3 c5 14 \mathcal{X}ad1 \mathcal{c}4 15 \mathcal{D}e1 \mathcal{W}d5 16 f4 \mathcal{g}6 17 \mathcal{D}e2 \pm Zaitsev-Kärner, Sochi 1977.

34 dm3 \mathcal{W}d7 5 c4 \mathcal{L}b4+?! 6 \mathcal{D}c3 \mathcal{D}e7 7 a3 \mathcal{X}xc3+ 8 \mathcal{b}xc3 \mathcal{D}xc4 9 \mathcal{L}xc4 \mathcal{B}a6 10 \mathcal{D}xa6 \mathcal{D}xa6 11 0-0 \mathcal{c}5 12 \mathcal{D}g5 \mathcal{W}d7? and 1-0 Hodgson-Kalinin, Bath Z 1987.

4 ...

A necessary precaution in view of the elementary mistake 3...\mathcal{L}a6? 4 \mathcal{X}xa6 \mathcal{D}xa6 5 \mathcal{W}a4+ which picks up a piece.

5 h4 (126)

White prefers to expand rapidly on the kingside to take advantage of Black's slow manoeuvring game. Other possibilities are:

a) 5 f4 and now:
   a1) 5...\mathcal{A}a6 6 \mathcal{X}xa6 \mathcal{D}xa6 7 \mathcal{W}d3 \mathcal{D}b8 8 \mathcal{D}e2 \mathcal{g}6 9 0-0 \mathcal{D}e7 10 \mathcal{b}3 \mathcal{h}5 11 \mathcal{L}a3 \mathcal{D}f5 12 \mathcal{X}xf8 \mathcal{A}xf8 = Witkowski-Raisman, USSR 1958.
   a2) 5...\mathcal{h}5 6 \mathcal{f}5?! \mathcal{Exf}5 7 \mathcal{D}h3 \mathcal{c}6 8 \mathcal{X}d3 \mathcal{g}6 9 0-0 \mathcal{A}h6 10 \mathcal{X}d2 \mathcal{A}a6 11 \mathcal{D}f3 \mathcal{D}e7 12 c4 \mathcal{D}e7 13 \mathcal{X}h6 \mathcal{X}xh6 14 \mathcal{W}d2 \mathcal{A}h8 15 b4 \mathcal{D}xc4 16 \mathcal{X}xc4 \mathcal{W}d8 17 \mathcal{D}hg5 \mathcal{A}e6 18 \mathcal{X}c1 \mathcal{X}c4 19 \mathcal{A}xc4 \mathcal{W}d5 20 \mathcal{A}fc1 \mathcal{A}e6 \mp Pyhälä-Nei, Helsinki 1989.
   a3) 5...c5 6 \mathcal{D}d2 \mathcal{X}xd4 7 \mathcal{c}xd4
b) 5 \( \text{Qh}3 \) c5 6 \( \text{Da}3 \) cxd4 7 cxd4 \( \text{Da}6 \) 8 \( \text{axa6} \) \( \text{Dxa6} \) 9 0-0 \( \text{a}3 \) a3 10 bxa3 \( \text{De}7 \) = Mohrlok-Ivkov, Vrnjačka Banja 1967.

c) 5 \( \text{Axd}3 \) \( \text{Da}6 \) and now:

c1) 6 \( \text{Ac}2 \) c5 7 \( \text{De}2 \) \( \text{Dc}6 \) 8 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{Dg}e7 \) 9 0-0 \( \text{Af}5 \) 10 \( \text{Ac}1 \) \( \text{Cc}8 \) 11 dxc5 bxc5 12 \( \text{Dd}2 \) \( \text{De}7 \) 13 \( \text{Df}4 \) 0-0 14 \( \text{Df}3 \) \( \text{Bf}d8 \) 15 \( \text{Ac}2 \) d4 \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \) Calvo-Andersson, Las Palmas 1972.

c2) 6 \( \text{a}xe6 \) \( \text{a}xe6 \) 7 \( \text{De}2 \) c5 8 0-0 \( \text{Dc}7 \) 9 a4 \( \text{Dg}e7 \) 10 \( \text{Dg}3 \) \( \text{Cc}6 \) 11 \( \text{Cc}3 \) c4 12 \( \text{Dd}2 \) \( \text{Da}5 \) 13 \( \text{Dh}5 \) 0-0-0 14 b3 \( \text{cx}b3 \) 15 \( \text{Dxb}3 \) \( \text{Dc}4 \) = Kontić-Nikolić, Vrnjačka Banja 1989.

d) 5 \( \text{Ae}3 \) \( \text{De}7 \) 6 f4 h5 7 \( \text{Dd}2 \) \( \text{Df}5 \) 8 \( \text{Af}2 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 9 \( \text{a}xa6 \) \( \text{xa}6 \) 10 \( \text{De}2 \) g6 11 \( \text{Df}3 \) \( \text{De}7 \) 12 \( \text{Dc}3 \) \( \text{Db}8 \) 13 0-0 c5 14 \( \text{Cc}4 \) \( \text{Cc}6 \) 15 dxc5 bxc5 16 cxd5 \( \text{Db}4 \) = Kupreichik-Vaganian, USSR Ch 1976.

e) 5 a4!? and now:

e1) 5...a5 6 \( \text{Df}3 \) \( \text{De}7 \) 7 \( \text{Axd}3 \) \( \text{Aa}6 \) 8 0-0 \( \text{Dxd}3 \) 9 \( \text{Wxd}3 \) \( \text{Df}5 \) 10 \( \text{Da}3 \) \( \text{De}7 \) 11 b3 \( \text{Da}6 \) 12 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{Dxa}3 \) 13 \( \text{Dxa}3 \) \( \text{De}7 \) 14 \( \text{Dg}5 \) c5 15 \( \text{f}4 \) ! \( \text{Cc}6 \) 16 f5 \( \text{Wd}8 \) 17 h4 h6 18 fxe6 \text{hxg5} 19 \( \text{Hxf}7 \) 1-0 Eley–MacDonald-Ross, Glasgow 1975.

e2) 5...\( \text{a}6 \) 6 \( \text{Dxa}6 \) \( \text{Dxa}6 \) 7 a5 b5 8 b4 \( \text{Dg}7 \) 9 \( \text{Df}3 \) f6 10 h4 \( \text{Dc}6 \) 11 \( \text{Df}4 \) \( \text{fxe}5 \) 12 \( \text{Dxe}5 \) \( \text{Dxe}5 \) 13 \( \text{Kxe}5 \) \( \text{Dd}6 \) 14 \( \text{Dd}2 \) (14 \( \text{We}2 \)!) 14...\( \text{Df}8 \)

15 \( \text{Wh}5+ \) \( \text{Wf}7 \) 16 \( \text{Wxf}7+ \) \( \text{Cf}7 \) 18 \( \text{Df}3 \) = Grosar-Siegel, Geneva 1991.

5 \( \ldots \) \( \text{De}7 \)

Black is reluctant to impede the pawn’s progress with 5...h5 as it makes it easier for a knight or bishop to be established on g5. White obtained a winning attack in the game Galdunts-Paris, St. Ingbert 1992, after 5...c5 6 h5 \( \text{f}5 \) 7 \( \text{Dd}2 \) cxd4 8 \( \text{Dc}4 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 9 \( \text{De}2 \) \( \text{Cc}6 \) 10 \( \text{Df}3 \) \( \text{Bb}4+ \) 11 \( \text{Dd}2 \) \( \text{Wh}6 \) 12 \( \text{Df}4 \) \( \text{Axf}1 \) 13 \( \text{Axf}1 \) \( \text{Axf}7 \) 14 \( \text{A}3 \) 0-0-0 15 \( \text{Wa}4 \) \( \text{Axd}2 \) 16 \( \text{Axd}2 \) \( \text{Db}7 \) 17 \( \text{Aa}3 \) g5 18 18 \( \text{Cc}1 \) !

\( \text{Df}4 \) 19 \( \text{Dxc}6 \) \( \text{Dx}c6 \) 20 \( \text{Dxa}7+ \) \( \text{Cc}8 \) 21 \( \text{Cc}3 \) —.

6 h5 h6
7 \( \text{Dd}2 \) c5
8 \( \text{Dh}3 \)

The knight is heading for f4, where it will also lend support to h5 if there is a need for kingside castling.

8 \( \ldots \) \( \text{a}6 \)
9 \( \text{Dxa}6 \) \( \text{a}6 \)
10 \( \text{Df}4 \) 0-0-0
This is where the king belongs as Black can now form a long-term plan based upon closing the queenside and eventually advancing on the kingside to create a counter-attack.

11 a3 \textbf{b7}
12 b4 cxd4
13 cxd4 \textbf{c8 (127)}

Of course, 18 \textbf{c5+} has to be ruled out.
18 a4 \textbf{c6}
19 \textbf{a3} \textbf{a8}
20 b5

The pawns advance to ensure the retreat of Black's last active piece. Now the game enters the final phase, which sees White in hot pursuit of Black's king.
20 ... \textbf{xh3}
21 \textbf{xa3} \textbf{a3}
22 \textbf{a1} \textbf{c7}
23 a5 \textbf{xb5}

Good or bad, the queen is obliged to capture the pawn to avoid instant calamity, thus opening up another path for the rooks.
24 axb6 \textbf{xb6}
25 \textbf{bc5} \textbf{c6}
26 \textbf{e3} fxe5 (128)

The strategy of building up the forces on the queenside is simple but effective. Black is obliged to adopt a dour defensive set-up as the cramped nature of the position presents little opportunity for counterplay.
17 ... \textbf{d8}

27 \textbf{e2}!

At first sight, it appears that White has intended to shore up e5 but the real purpose of the manoeuvre is now revealed.
27 ... \( \text{\texttt{b4}} \)
28 \( \text{\texttt{xb2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{dxb4}} \)
29 \( \text{\texttt{xd3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{wd6}} \)
30 \( \text{\texttt{wa3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d1f}} \)
31 \( \text{\texttt{db3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{hec8}} \)
32 \( \text{\texttt{kb7}} \) 1-0

Game 43
Kupreichik-Vaganian
USSR 1980

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 e5 \( \text{\texttt{de7}} \)

The introduction of 3...\( \text{\texttt{de7}} \) is closely linked to lines with 3...b6. The move-order is designed to avoid various continuations by feigning a desire to transpose to the main lines. There are no benefits to be found from immediately undermining the pawn formation: 3...f6?! 4 \( \text{\texttt{d3!}} \) (intending 5 \( \text{\texttt{wh5+}} \)) 4...g6 5 \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) 6 exf6 \( \text{\texttt{xf6}} \) 7 0-0 \( \text{\texttt{g7}} \) 8 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) 0-0 9 \( \text{\texttt{wd2}} \) ± Weiss-Blackburne, Hamburg 1885.

4 \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) b6
5 c4 (129)

A popular way to confront the system is to open up the game as soon as possible. Once again, gaining territory on the kingside is also a viable alternative:

a) 5 c3 \( \text{\texttt{wd7}} \) 6 h4 h5 7 a4 \( \text{\texttt{a6}} \) 8 \( \text{\texttt{xa6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xa6}} \) 9 a5 \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) 10 axb6 cxb6 11 \( \text{\texttt{db2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{bc6}} \) 12 \( \text{\texttt{xf1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f5}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{g3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xg3}} \) 14 fxg3 \( \text{\texttt{e7}} \) 15 0-0 f6 16 exf6 gxf6 17 \( \text{\texttt{we2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d6}} \) 18 \( \text{\texttt{f4}} \) 0-0-0 19 b4 \( \text{\texttt{de8}} \) 20 \( \text{\texttt{wa6+}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) 21 b5 +- Romero Holmes-Purgimon, Andorra 1987.

b) 5 h4 \( \text{\texttt{wd7}} \) 6 h5 h6 7 \( \text{\texttt{c3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{a6}} \) 8 \( \text{\texttt{xa6}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xa6}} \) 9 \( \text{\texttt{de2}} \) c5 10 c3 \( \text{\texttt{c8}} \) 11 0-0 \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) 12 \( \text{\texttt{dh2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d7}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{g4}} \) ± Fedorowicz-Prié, Paris 1989.

5 ... \( \text{\texttt{b7}} \)

After 5...\( \text{\texttt{a6}} \) the simple reply 6 b3 avoids the trade of bishops.

6 \( \text{\texttt{c3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{wd7}} \)
7 cxd5

The prospect of opening up the a8-h1 diagonal is of little concern as it is difficult to exploit, while White can quickly develop without distraction.

White soon had an advantage in the game Sax-Short, London 1980, after 7 \( \text{\texttt{e2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{bc6}} \) 8 0-0 dxc4 9 \( \text{\texttt{xc4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{da5?!}} \) (9...0-0-0!?) 10 \( \text{\texttt{xb5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xc6}} \) 11 \( \text{\texttt{xd3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d5}} \) 12 \( \text{\texttt{d2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e7}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{e4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b4}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{c1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b5}} \) 15 \( \text{\texttt{xb4}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xd3}} \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{wd3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xb4}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{wd2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d5}} \) 18 \( \text{\texttt{wg5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b8}} \) (18...0-0? 19 \( \text{\texttt{d6+}} \) gxf6 20 \( \text{\texttt{exf6}} \) g6 21 \( \text{\texttt{wh6}} \) +–) 19 \( \text{\texttt{xc3}} \) ±.
7 \( \ldots \) \( \mathcal{Q} \)xd5
8 \( \mathcal{L} \)d3 c5
9 0-0

There is no problem adjusting to the situation after 9...cxd4 10 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xd4 as Black remains congested, while in certain positions the white queen is able to roam on the kingside via g4 or h5.

9 \( \ldots \) \( \mathcal{Q} \)xc3
10 bxc3 cxd4

If Black seeks to add pressure to d4 the situation can be brought under control: 10...\( \mathcal{Q} \)c6 11 dxc5 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xc5 12 \( \mathcal{W} \)e2 \( \mathcal{R} \)d8 13 \( \mathcal{L} \)c2 ±.
11 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xd4 (130)

11 \( \ldots \) \( \mathcal{Q} \)c6
12 \( \mathcal{L} \)b1

With a series of exchanges White can exploit the opposing king being in the centre: 12 \( \mathcal{L} \)b5 a6 13 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xc6 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xc6 14 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xc6 \( \mathcal{W} \)xc6 15 \( \mathcal{W} \)d3! \( \mathcal{L} \)e7 16 \( \mathcal{W} \)g3 ±.
12 \( \ldots \) \( \mathcal{L} \)c5
13 \( \mathcal{L} \)e3 0-0-0
14 \( \mathcal{L} \)b5 \( \mathcal{L} \)xd4?! \\

The chance for equality is lost. Much better is to activate the queen immediately: 14...\( \mathcal{W} \)d5! 15 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xc6 (15 c4?! \( \mathcal{W} \)e4) 15...\( \mathcal{Q} \)xc6 16 \( \mathcal{W} \)xd5 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xd5 17 \( \mathcal{Q} \)xc5 bxc5 =.
15 \( \mathcal{L} \)xd4 \( \mathcal{W} \)d5
16 \( \mathcal{L} \)xc6 \( \mathcal{L} \)xc6

Little is gained from 16...\( \mathcal{W} \)xc6 17 \( \mathcal{L} \)d5 18 \( \mathcal{L} \)b4, intending a4 with a promising attack.
17 \( \mathcal{L} \)

A simple but effective remedy, which blunts the power of controlling the diagonal.
17 \( \ldots \) h5
18 a4 \( \mathcal{C} \)b7
19 \( \mathcal{W} \)e2

The first step towards a decisive infiltration. Now Black must be beware of the likelihood of opening up the a-file for the rook: 20 a5 \( \mathcal{W} \)xa5 21 \( \mathcal{R} \)a1 \( \mathcal{W} \)b5 22 c4 \( \mathcal{W} \)b4 23 \( \mathcal{R} \)fb1 \( \mathcal{W} \)e7 24 \( \mathcal{W} \)xa7+! \( \mathcal{L} \)xa7 25 \( \mathcal{L} \)xb6+ --. It would be premature to advance the pawn too rapidly: 19 a5?! \( \mathcal{W} \)xa5 and now 20 \( \mathcal{W} \)e2 \( \mathcal{W} \)a6! 21 \( \mathcal{W} \)e3 \( \mathcal{R} \)d5 ± or 20 \( \mathcal{R} \)a1 \( \mathcal{W} \)d5 21 \( \mathcal{W} \)e2 \( \mathcal{L} \)b5 ±.
19 \( \ldots \) \( \mathcal{W} \)a5
20 h4  d5
21 h5  d8
22 a4  a8
23 h2  x4? (131)

24 x6!
A sparkling sacrifice that will launch a formidable onslaught based on the might of the rooks.
24 ...  axb6
25 x6  a7
26 b7+  a8
27 b2  x7

The attempt to neutralize the attack with 27...x5 results in a lost ending: 28 x5  x5 29 x5 x5 30 x5 +.
28 x7?

All lines lead to victory, but checkmate would be more impressive: 28 b8+ a7 29 a8+! x8 30 b8#.

Black's patience finally cracks. Vaganian hopes that the deadlock can be broken in a positive way by stealing the a-pawn.

28 ...
29 e2  x8
30 d8+  1-0
11 3...\textit{d}7

The desire to exchange White’s light-squared bishop has resulted in an unusual opening strategy. It involves the simplistic 3...\textit{d}7 and 4...\textit{a}6 to support the outpost \textit{b}5. The idea is to tempt White into trading pieces, which has the drawback of doubling the \textit{b}-pawns, but offers dynamic compensation in the form of the open \textit{a}-file. It has been occasionally adopted by a number of players who wish to seek an unbalanced position. However, Bronstein’s model example of how to deal with the situation casts doubt on the viability of Black’s variation.

5 \textit{g}5 \textit{(132)}

Black achieves the aim of reaching an uncharted position after the alternatives:

a) 5 \textit{bd}2 \textit{c}5 6 \textit{dxc}5 \textit{xc}5 7 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}7 8 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}6 9 \textit{f}4 \textit{bc}6 10 0-0 \textit{g}6 11 \textit{g}3 0-0 12 \textit{xg}6 \textit{hxg}6 13 \textit{e}1 \textit{e}7 14 \textit{bd}4 \textit{g}5 Renet-Mellado, Palma de Mallorca 1989.

b) 5 \textit{c}4!? \textit{dxc}4 6 \textit{xc}4 \textit{c}6 7 0-0 \textit{e}7 with unclear play; Lau-Benjamin, New York 1985.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Game 44}

\textbf{Bronstein-Kärner}

\textit{Tallinn 1981}
\end{center}

1 \textit{e}4 \textit{e}6
2 \textit{d}4 \textit{d}5
3 \textit{e}5 \textit{d}7
4 \textit{\textit{f}3} \textit{a}6!?

An ambitious and controversial idea. It paves the way for Black to relieve the traditional problem of the dormant ‘French’ bishop by exchanging it for White’s more active light-squared bishop.

5 \textit{\textit{g}6?!}

Black responds timidly to White’s aggressive plan, wishing to preserve his dark-squared bishop from exchange; in that case \textit{d}6 would act
like a beacon to a white knight after a future ...c5. The ...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}}b5 idea is unconvincing when the dark-squared bishop is not available to support the pawn thrust ...b4 to undouble the pawns.

A more acceptable line is available: 5...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}e7} 6 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}c3} c5 7 dxc5 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}a5} 8 a3 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}xc5} 9 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}d3} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}g6} \pm Borngässer-Basman, Birmingham 1972.

6 c4

White is keen to open up the position to facilitate a rapid deployment of his forces. This has added appeal due to Black’s cumbersome opening and especially now that the queen is misplaced.

6 ... h6
7 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}e3} dxc4
8 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}xc4} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}e7}
9 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}c3} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}c6}

It is a hollow victory to have activated the bishop at last, as the rest of the queenside remains congested.

10 0-0 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}d7}
11 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}c1}

The rook moves to the most active square and further limits the options at Black’s disposal.

11 ... a5 (133)

The necessity to make space for the queen’s knight has resulted in an admission that the initial opening scheme has proved to be a failure. There is no respite if the bishop is given up to clear c6: 11...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}xf3} 12 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}xf3} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}c6} (12...c6 13 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}e4} with an edge for White) 13 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}fd1} (intending \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}e4} and d5) 13...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}ad8} 14 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}g4} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}d5} 15 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}e4} \pm.

12 d5!

An ingenious sacrifice of a pawn to keep a grip on the position, which is energetically executed. Against the capture 12...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}xd5}, White claims a clear advantage with 13 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}xd5} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}xd5} (13...exd5 14 e6 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}xe6} 15 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}e1} \pm) 14 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}xd5} exd5 15 e6 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}xe6} 17 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}xc7} \pm.

12 ... exd5
13 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}d3}

A calm response that gives Black plenty of opportunities to go wrong. White holds the pawn-push e5-e6 in reserve, intending \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}e1} and \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}d4}. In the meantime, Black faces a crisis in deploying his pieces before the attack gathers momentum.

13 ... \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{Q}}}a6}
14 a3 g6
15 e6!

Another clever device which quickly opens a direct avenue to the king. The e-file will be accessible to the rook and Black’s kingside can be
compromised by staking a claim for control of the a1-h8 diagonal.

15 ... $\text{Wxe6}$
16 $\text{Qd4}$ f6 (134)

If the rook takes evasive action it makes little difference to Black's bleak prospects in Bronstein's opinion: 16...$\text{Hg8}$ 17 $\text{He1}$ $\text{Wd6}$ 18 $\text{Qe5}$ $\text{Hg7}$ 19 $\text{Db5}$ $\text{Wd8}$ 20 $\text{Xc6!}$ $\text{Xe5}$
21 $\text{Hxa6}$ bxa6 22 $\text{Hxe5}$ axb5 23 $\text{Xxb5+ Hf8}$ 24 $\text{Qc5}+$—.

17 $\text{Qxg6+}$ $\text{Hd8}$
18 $\text{He1}$ $\text{Wd6}$
19 $\text{Qf7}$ $\text{Hg7}$

20 $\text{He6}$ $\text{Wd7}$
21 $\text{Qxf6}$ $\text{Qxf6}$
22 $\text{Qxf6}$ 1-0
Index of Variations

1  e4  e6
2  d4  d5
3  e5  c5
3...b6 4  a5+ (4  c3 148; 4  f4 148;
4  c4 148; 4  d3 148) 4...d7
(4...c6 145) 5  d3 146
3...f6 151
3...d7 155
4  c3
4  g4 127
4  d3 130
4  dxc5 134
4   2c6
4...b6 5  d3  d7 6  e2  b5 7
4...e7 115
5  d3 123
5  f4 123
5  g4 123
5  e2 123
5   b6
5...f5 15
5...f6 15
5...h6 6  dxc5  g4 (6...xc5
119) 7  a4 120
5...e7 6  a3 107; 6  e3 110; 6
e2 110; 6  d3 112
5...d7 6  e2 (6  a3 97; 6  dxc5
102; 6  d3 102) 6...e7 (6...f6
75; 6...c8 79) 7  a3 (7  h4 79; 7
0-0 86) 7...xd4 (7...g6 82) 8
xd4  d5 9  c2  b4 (9...a5+
79; 9...b6 79) 10  xb4 (10  e3
82; 10 0-0 84) 10...xb4+ 80

A) 6  a3
B) 6  d3
C) 6  e2

A)
6  a3  c4
6...a5 36
6...h6 39
6...d7 7  b4 (7  e2 45) 7...xd4 8
xd4  c8 9  b2 (9  c3 42; 9  e3
46; 9  e2 46) 9...a5 (9...a6 42;
9...xb4 42) 10  d2 (10  c3
42) 10...c4 11  xc4 (11  xc4
42) 11...xc4 12  c1  a5 (12...c3
43; 12...b5 43; 12...a6 43) 13
d2 43
7  d2
7  g5 20
7  b4 20
7  e2 20
7  g3  d7 (7...f6 29) 8  h3 (8  h4
27) 8...h6 24
7...a5
7...\textit{D}e7 14; 7...\textit{d}d7 14; 7...f6 16
8 ... \textit{L}e2
8 b3 16
8 g3 33
8 ... \textit{L}d7
9 0-0 \textit{D}e7
9...h6 17
9...0-0-0 17
9...f6 17
10 \textit{E}e1
10 g3 17
10 \textit{D}g5 17
10 ... \textit{W}c6
10...\textit{D}c8 18
10...\textit{D}g6 18
10...h6 18
11 \textit{W}c2 18

B)

6 ... \textit{L}d3 cxd4
6...\textit{D}ge7 49
6...\textit{L}d7 49
7 cxd4 \textit{L}d7
8 0-0
8 \textit{L}c2 50
8 \textit{L}c2 50
8 ... \textit{O}xd4
8 ... \textit{O}xd4
9 \textit{O}xd4
9 \textit{D}g5 50
9 \textit{D}bd2 54
9 ... \textit{W}xd4
10 ... \textit{O}c3 \textit{W}xe5
10...\textit{b}4 52
10...\textit{W}b6 52
10...\textit{D}ge7 52
10...a6 11 \textit{W}e2 (11 \textit{O}h1 57; 11 \textit{E}e1 57) 11...\textit{D}e7 (11...\textit{b}b4 57; 11...\textit{W}h4 58; 11...\textit{O}c8 58) 12 \textit{O}h1 (12 \textit{D}d1 58) 12...\textit{O}c6 (12...\textit{W}h4 58; 12...\textit{D}g6 58) 13 f4 58
11 \textit{E}e1 \textit{W}d6
11...\textit{W}c7 53
11...\textit{W}b8 53
12 \textit{D}b5 \textit{W}b8
12...\textit{L}xb5 53
13 \textit{W}f3 53

C)

6 ... \textit{L}e2 cxd4
6...\textit{D}ge7 64
6...f6 64
6...\textit{L}d7 64
6...\textit{W}b6 70
7 cxd4 \textit{O}h6
8 ... \textit{O}c3
8 \textit{L}xc6 67
8 b3 \textit{O}f5 9 \textit{b}2 \textit{b}b4+ (9...\textit{L}e7 67; 9...\textit{L}d7 67) 10 \textit{W}f1 0-0 (10...\textit{L}e7 68; 10...h5 69) 11 \textit{O}c3 (11 g4 69) 11...f6 69
8 ... \textit{O}f5
9 \textit{O}a4
9 \textit{W}f1 64
10 ... \textit{W}a5+
10 \textit{L}d2 \textit{b}b4
11 \textit{O}c3 \textit{b}5
11...\textit{L}xc3+ 65
11...\textit{L}d7 65
11...a6 65
12 a3 65