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Introduction

Endgame theory was first analysed a long time ago. The legendary Stamma, Ponziani, Polerio and others analysed many specific positions. Recently computers have had an impact upon the scene by generating databases for various 5- and 6-man endgames, a classic example of which is John Nunn’s Secrets of Rook Endgames. All chess books, including those on the endgame, are valuable to the extent to which chess players can extract useful information from them and then apply this information to tournament praxis. The Yugoslavian Encyclopedia of Chess Endgames (referred to as ECE) only partly serves this purpose, as it comprises a collection of different positions without explaining the various methods of play. As the well-known trainer Mark Dvoretsky never tires of saying, endgame study consists of analysing both theoretical positions and playing methods in complicated positions. The aim of playing complicated positions is to simplify them, by means of exchanges or in other ways, to a familiar theoretical position. This is endgame technique. Of course endgame reference books are important for the tournament player, but even more valuable are books such as Speelman’s Analysing the Endgame, or Dvoretsky’s series of books.

This book discusses problems encountered by tournament players, and is targeted at the average to strong club player. Firstly we discuss methods of play in positions with various combinations of pieces and pawns (of course only touching a small part of all different chess positions). In particular we focus on the mistakes made by strong chess players. In endgames the choice of possible moves can usually be narrowed down to two or three continuations, and by knowing what is incorrect, the correct move may be reached more easily. The same mistakes crop up time and again, repeated from game to game and from player to player. It is not by chance that the maxim ‘you learn from your mistakes’ was coined long ago.

We have specialized in endgames for a long time, publishing articles in magazines such as New in Chess, Schach, and Torre e Cavallo. These articles were of a more theoretical nature than our current approach to certain positions and problems. By studying endgames it is important not only to solve concrete problems, but also to formulate general principles in all types of position. We hope
that all our readers will gain something from this book, and enjoy the wonderful and almost infinite world of chess analysis. We are sure that many readers will improve their endgame understanding and thereby achieve corresponding tournament successes. In other words, study the mistakes of grandmasters to avoid making such mistakes yourselves!
The authors of this book are certainly not immune to error, and would welcome any improvements found by our readers.

Alexander Beliavsky
Adrian Mikhalchishin
Lvov 1995
1 Pawn Endgames

Pawn endgames have a reputation for being straightforward, both strategically and tactically. Yet anyone who has tried to solve positions set by the famous endgame composer Grigoriev, or who has practical experience in these endgames, will know that they belong to a world with its own special characteristics. For the tournament player these endgames can be theoretically divided into two types:

1) Technical problems of the endgames themselves;
2) Exchanging into pawn endgames.

We shall discuss them in that order.

Technical problems in pawn endgames

In our very first chess playing days we learn about such concepts as simple and diagonal opposition, rule of the square, corresponding squares and other principles. In some ways pawn endgames are richer than other endgames, involving all these playing methods, the lengthy calculation of variations, and pawn endgame technique. Pawn endgames are also a battle of the kings! Let’s look at how and why first class chess players make mistakes in these endgames. The material is presented as a series of topics.

The opposition

Kupreichik – Mikhalchishin
Lvov 1988

Black, in slight time trouble, decided to play actively.

1 ... \textcolor{red}{\textit{d5}}?

An easy draw was at hand with 1...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{f6}} 2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f2}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{g6}} 3 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f3}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{h5}} 4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{gxh5+}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{xh5}} 5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e4}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{g4}} 6 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f5}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{g5}} 7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{xd4}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{xf5}} 8 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c5}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e5}} 9 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{b6}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d6}}, etc.

Now the fight has only just begun. There followed:

2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f2}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e4}}
3 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f5}} \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e5}}
4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e2}}?
It is White’s turn to blunder: he should have played 4 a5. After 4...d5 5 e2 e5 6 d3 d5 7 f6 e6 8 xd4 xf6 9 c5 g5 10 b6 xg4 11 xax6 h5 12 b6 h4 13 a6 and the white pawn queens first.

Alternatively after 4...h5 5 gxh5 xf5 6 e2 g5 7 d3 xh5 8 xd4 g5 9 c5 f6 10 b6 e6 11 xa6 d7 12 b7 the black king does not reach the c7-square in time.

4 ... h5?

After 4...a5! 5 d3 (or 5 f3 d5 6 f4 e4 7 f6 d3 8 f7 d2 9 f8[w d1] =) 5...d5 6 f6 e6 Black has his pawn a square further up the board and promotes first.

5 gxh5 xf5
6 d3 g5
7 xd4 xh5
8 e5 1-0

The position from the following game is even simpler.

Chiburdanidze – G. Flear
Brussels 1987

See how many blunders are made by the two Grandmasters, who both forgot about the distant opposition.

1 e3?

This leads to a draw, whereas 1 e3 wins: 1...d5 (Black’s other two options are also losing: 1...e7 2 g4 f7 3 d4! —; 1...e6 2 f4 f6 3 g4 e6 4 e4 and the white king penetrates) 2 g4! (not 2 f4? e6! drawing) 2...e5 3 f3 d5 4 f4 e6 5 e4 f6 6 d5 reaching a familiar winning position.

1 g4! also wins, provided after 1...e6 the precise 2 e2! is found (distant opposition), and if 2...d6 then 3 f3! wins, while against 2...f6 White wins with the symmetrical 3 d3!.

1 ... e7!
2 f4

2 g4 (or 2 g4 f7! and Black seizes the opposition) would be met by 2...f6.

2 ... e6!
3 g4 f6
4 f3 e7?

What’s this? Now Black has forgotten about the distant opposition, which was possible by 4...f7! 5 e3 e7!.

5 e3!

White’s turn to seize the opposition.

5 ... f7
6 d4 f6
7 d5 e7

Or 7...f7 8 e5 e7 9 f5 f7 10 h5 +–.

8 e5 f7
9 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{g7} \)
10 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{g6} \)
11 \( \text{h5+!} \) \( \text{g5} \)
12 \( \text{f7} \) \( \text{xg4} \)
13 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{f4} \)
14 \( \text{exh6} \) 1-0

Romanishin – Dvoretsky
Odessa 1974

Black has the choice between going into the pawn endgame and keeping the queens on. He played:

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

Dvoretsky calculated the following variation: 1...\( \text{e7} \) 2 \( \text{xe6+} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 3 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 4 \( \text{f3} \! \) and now 4...\( \text{f5} \)? loses (also bad is 4...\( \text{f7} \)? 5 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 6 \( \text{e3} \! \) and White seizes the opposition): 5 \( \text{g4+} \) \( \text{e5} \) 6 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 7 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 8 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{f7} \) 9 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{e7} \) 10 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{f7} \) 11 \( \text{h5} \! \). 

2 \( \text{g8+} \) \( \text{e7} \)
3 \( \text{g4} \! \)

It turns out that the white king easily reaches \( \text{h5} \) and wins the \( \text{h6} \)-pawn. What would have happened in the pawn endgame? Why did Dvoretsky, a renowned endgame specialist, decline it? As he himself wrote, during his calculations he missed the fact that Black only wants the opposition when the pawn is on \( \text{g4} \), but with the pawn on \( \text{g3} \) he must avoid it! When this principle becomes clear it is easy for Black to find the draw. So, returning to the position after 1...\( \text{e7} \) 2 \( \text{xe6+} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 3 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 4 \( \text{f3} \! \) (D):

4 ... \( \text{e7} \! \)

A sound understanding of similar positions could help one find another way of drawing: 4...\( \text{g6} \)! 5 \( \text{f4} \) (or 5 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{f6} \)! 6 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{e6} \) =) 5...\( \text{h5} \! \) 6 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{g4} \) 7 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 8 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{f4} \) 9 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{e5} \) 10 \( \text{exh6} \) \( \text{f6} \) with a draw.

5 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e6} \)!
6 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{f6} \)

Black seizes the opposition.

Azmaiparashvili – Eolian
USSR 1979

(See diagram on following page)

Here White played the faulty:

1 \( \text{g5} \)?
12 Pawn Endgames

Correct was 1 ♕xf5 ♕f7 2 f4 ♕e7 (or 2...h6 3 ♕e5 ♕e7 4 f5 ♕f7 5 f6 ♕f8! 6 ♕e4! ♕e8 7 ♕f4 ♕f8 8 ♕e5 with a well-known win) 3 ♕e5 ♕f7 4 ♕d6! ♕f6 5 h6! ♕f5 6 ♕e7 ♕xf4 7 ♕f6, winning easily.

The game continued:

1 ... ♕f8
2 ♕xf5 ♕f7?

Black missed the drawn position after 2...♕e7! 3 ♕g5 ♕f7 4 ♕h6 ♕g8 5 f4 ♕h8.

3 ♕g4?

Now White could have reached the position discussed after the first move with 3 f4!.

3 ... ♕f6
4 ♕f4 ♕f7?

The same mistake; correct was 4...♕e6! 5 ♕g5 ♕f7, etc.

5 ♕f5?

The winning variation is 5 ♕e5 ♕e7 6 f4! as indicated above.

5 ... ♕e7
6 ♕e5 ♕f7
7 ♕d6 ♕f6
8 ♕d7 ♕f7
9 h6 ♕g6!
10 f4 ♕f7!

11 f5 ♕f6
½-½

So many mistakes in such a simple ending! These elementary errors were caused by not knowing similar endgames or precise theoretical positions.

When there is a wide choice of possible continuations it is easy to go astray and miss the chance to gain the opposition.

Geller – Stein
USSR 1964

In this position Black has a choice between three variations:

a) 1...♕d6? 2 g5! ♕e7 3 g6 hxg6 4 hxg6 ♕f8 5 ♕e4 ♕g8 6 ♕d5 ♕g7 7 ♕c5 ♕xg6 8 ♕xb5 f5 9 a4 f4 10 ♕c4 ♕f5 11 a5 f3 12 ♕d3 ♕g4 13 a6 ♕g3 14 a7 f2 15 ♕e2! and White wins.

b) 1...♕e7? (the move played in the game) 2 ♕f5 ♕f7 3 g5! fxg5 4 ♕xg5 ♕g7 5 h6+ ♕f7 6 ♕f5 and Black resigned since White will win.
the b-pawn after which his a-pawn queens first.

c) 1...\textit{f7}! 2 \textit{f5} (or 2 g5 \textit{g7} 3 \textit{f5} fxg5 4 \textit{xg5} \textit{f7} 5 \textit{f5} \textit{g7} and the black h-pawn promotes before the white a-pawn) 2...h6! (it is also possible to transpose into the variation above by 2...\textit{e7}! 3 g5 fxg5 4 \textit{exg5} \textit{f7}) 3 \textit{f4} \textit{e7}! 4 \textit{e3} \textit{d7} 5 \textit{d3} \textit{e7}! and Black manages to draw by carefully maintaining the distant opposition.

\textbf{Chess 'Materialism'}

\textbf{Magerramov – Makarychev}

\textit{Pavlodar 1987}

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

White is obviously better due to his better-placed king and Black’s weakened kingside.

1 \textit{e4}

Two pawn moves deserve attention:

a) 1 g4 and now Black must be accurate:

a1) The standard counter-attack would have secured the draw with 1...h5! 2 h3 (or 2 gxh5) 2...hxg4 3 hxg4 b5 and now there is no breakthrough for White on the kingside.

a2) 1...b5? was the move played in the game: 2 \textit{d3} \textit{d6} 3 \textit{e3} \textit{e7} 4 \textit{f3} \textit{f8} 5 \textit{g3} \textit{f7} 6 \textit{h3}? (care is necessary, because 6 \textit{h4} g5+ 7 fxg6+ \textit{xg6} 8 h3 a6 only draws) 6...\textit{g8} 7 \textit{h4} \textit{f8} 8 \textit{h5} \textit{f7} 9 h3 \textit{f8} 10 \textit{g6} \textit{g8} 11 h4 \textit{f8} 12 g5 hxg5 13 hxg5 fxg5 14 \textit{xg5} \textit{f7} 15 \textit{g4} \textit{e7} 16 \textit{h4}!. Zugzvang by triangulation! After 16...\textit{f6} 17 \textit{h5} a6 18 \textit{h4}! Black resigned, because 18...g6 loses to 19 fxg6 \textit{xg6} 20 \textit{g4}, and if 18...\textit{e7}, 19 \textit{g4} \textit{f7} 20 \textit{g5} and 21 \textit{g6}.

b) 1 a4! is the correct move for White. 1...h5 (the line 1...a6 2 \textit{c4} b5+ 3 axb5+ axb5+ 4 \textit{d3}, etc., alters nothing) 2 a5 \textit{d6} 3 \textit{d3} \textit{e7} 4 \textit{e3} \textit{f7} 5 \textit{f3} h5 (we have already seen that 5...g5 loses to 6 fxg6+ \textit{exg6} 7 \textit{g4} a6 8 h3 ++) 6 g4! h4 (or 6...\textit{g8} 7 \textit{g3} \textit{h7} 8 \textit{h4} \textit{h6} 10 a6 ++) 7 g5! fxg5 8 \textit{g4} 9 \textit{h5} h3 10 a6 winning.

1 ... \textit{b5+}

2 \textit{d3} \textit{d6}

3 \textit{e3} \textit{e7}

4 \textit{f2}!

4 \textit{f3} is met by 4...\textit{f7} 5 \textit{g4} g5 6 fxg6+ \textit{exg6} 7 h3 a6 and Black draws.

4 ... \textit{f7}

5 \textit{f3} \textit{g5}

6 fxg6+ \textit{g7}!!

The only way to draw, since after the alternative 6...\textit{exg6} Black loses to 7 \textit{g4} h5+ 8 \textit{f3} \textit{g5} 9 h4+ \textit{h6} 10 g4 --.
14 Pawn Endgames

Ju. Horvath – S. Horvath
Budapest 1988

The obvious-looking continuation loses for White:

1 \textit{\texttt{f4}} \textit{\texttt{b3}}
2 \textit{\texttt{g3}} \textit{\texttt{g5}}
3 \textit{\texttt{xh3??}}

Instead of this move there is the fantastic riposte 3 \textit{\texttt{h2!!}} \textit{\texttt{h6}} 4 \textit{\texttt{g3!}} =. Amazingly neither side can take the pawn.

3 ... \textit{\texttt{xh5}}

Black seizes the opposition and draws.

Kengis – Yuneev
USSR 1989

In this position White made the obvious move:

White is a pawn up, but needs to find a way of breaking through the black fortress to win.

1 \textit{\texttt{b4}} \textit{\texttt{c7}}
2 \textit{\texttt{b5}}

After 2 a5 there would follow 2...\textit{\texttt{bxa5}} 3 \textit{\texttt{bxa5}} \textit{\texttt{b7}} 4 \textit{\texttt{b3}} \textit{\texttt{a6}} 5 \textit{\texttt{a4}} \textit{\texttt{h5!}} =. This is why Black kept his pawn on \textit{\texttt{h7}}.

2 ... \textit{\texttt{b7??}}

The king plays stubbornly on its own when 2...\textit{\texttt{h5!}} draws easily. But now...

3 \textit{\texttt{h5!}} \textit{\texttt{gxh5}}

Alternatively, playing 3...\textit{\texttt{c7}} 4 \textit{\texttt{hxg6}} \textit{\texttt{hxg6}} leaves the white king free to head for the \textit{\texttt{g5}}-square.

4 \textit{\texttt{d3}} \textit{\texttt{h4}}
5 \textit{\texttt{e3!}}

White should not be materialistic: 5 \textit{\texttt{gxh4?}} \textit{\texttt{h5!}} only draws.

5 ... \textit{\texttt{hxg3}}
6 \textit{\texttt{f3}} \textit{\texttt{1-0}}

Pekarek – A. Petrosian
Dortmund 1990
1 \( \text{\#xg5} \)

However White missed the idea of not capturing the pawn with 1 \( \text{\#e5!} \) and after 1...d4 2 \( \text{\#xd4 \#e6} \) 3 h6 \( \text{\#f6} \) 4 h7 \( \text{\#g7} \) 5 \( \text{\#e5} \) \( \text{\#xh7} \) 6 \( \text{\#f6} \) the position is clearly drawn.

After 1 \( \text{\#e5!} \), the alternative de­

fence 1...\( \text{\#f8} \) 2 \( \text{\#xd5 \#g7} \) 3 \( \text{\#e5} \) \( \text{\#h6} \) 4 \( \text{\#f6 \#xh5} \) 5 \( \text{\#xf7} \) produces the same result. Interestingly neither of the players nor Informator saw this possibility of saving the ending.

1 ... d4 2 \( \text{\#f4 \#f5!!} \)

White resigned, given the following variation:

3 \( \text{\#g3 \#f6} \)
4 \( \text{\#f2 \#g5} \)
5 \( \text{\#e2 \#xh5} \)
6 \( \text{\#d3 \#g5} \)
7 \( \text{\#xd4 \#f4} \)

Black wins the f3-pawn.

P. Nikolić – Liang Jinrong
Lucerne 1989

\( \text{\#xg5?} \)

There are two other possible vari­

ations:

a) 1...\( \text{\#g5?} \) 2 \( \text{\#f4! \#xf4+} \) 3 \( \text{\#h4 \#e4} \) 4 \( \text{\#g4 +} \).

b) 1...\( \text{\#h5!} \) 2 \( \text{\#f4 \#e4} \) 3 \( \text{\#h4 \#xf4} \) 4 \( \text{\#xh5 \#f3} \) 5 \( \text{\#g6 \#xf2} \) 6 \( \text{\#xg7} \) 7 \( \text{\#f6 \#xh3} \) 8 \( \text{\#e5 \#g4} \) and Black manages to reach the c8-squar e in time.

2 \( \text{\#f4+} \) \( \text{\#h5} \)

Or 2...\( \text{\#f5} \) 3 \( \text{\#f3 \#g6} \) 4 \( \text{\#e3 \#h5} \) 5 \( \text{\#f3 \#f6} \) 6 \( \text{\#e4 \#e6} \) 7 \( \text{\#h4 \#f6} \) 8 \( \text{\#f5} \)

9 \( \text{\#xg5+ \#xg5} \) 10 \( \text{\#e5} \) and after both sides have promoted White will win the black queen.

3 \( \text{\#f3 \#h4} \)
4 \( \text{\#g2 \#h5} \)
5 \( \text{\#g3 \#g6} \)
6 \( \text{\#g4 \#f6} \)
7 \( \text{\#f5 \#e5} \)
8 \( \text{\#f3 \#h5+} \)
9 \( \text{\#g5 \#h4} \)
10 \( \text{\#g4 \#1-0} \)

This is a surprising ending, which shows that even strong players often go astray in positions which involve a wide choice of continuations.

Overlooking typical counterattacks

Kharlov – Ernst
Haninge 1992

(See diagram on following page)

An easy draw was possible:

1 ... \( \text{\#d6} \)

However the Swedish grandmas­

ter decided to make use of the strong
e5-square for his king by playing the immediate 1...g5?, which was met by a typical counter-thrust, 2 g4!!,
and after 2...hxg4 3 h5 f5 4 h6 f4+ 5 f2 g3+ 6 g2 e4 7 h7 he was forced to resign.

The black king succeeds in reaching the key d6-square.

Even experienced grandmasters forget about such breaks in pawn endings. Here is another example.

**Ree – Ftačník**

*Kiev 1978*

Black stands better, but with no obvious way of winning he decided to play a logical-looking move:

1 ... g5

But this was met by a terrific reply:

2 g4!!

There followed:

2 ... hxg4
3 h5 e6
4 f2 f7
5 g3 g7
6 xg4 h6
7 f5 xh5
8 xf6 g4
9 e5 g3
10 e6 g2
11 e7 g1
12 e8 w+ h4
13 h8+ g3
14 g7+ f2
15 xg1+ xg1
16 e5 f2
17 d5 e3
18 c6 d2
19 xb6 c2
20 xa5 xb2
21 a4 c3
22 b5 1-0

The following endgame is a classic example on the same theme.

**Teed, 1885**

*(See diagram on following page)*

In reply to the forced

1 ... h5
White has a decisive reply:
2  h4!!

How to play with and against passed pawns

Gavrikov – Kharitonov
Sverdlovsk 1984

There followed
1  a5?
Correct was 1  c5  xh5 2 b4  g4 3 a4  h5 4 b5  axb5 5 a5! winning. However the game continued:
1  ...  xh5
2  xa6  g4
3  b4  h5
4  b5  h4

White has a decisive reply:
2  h4!!

How to play with and against passed pawns

Gavrikov – Kharitonov
Sverdlovsk 1984

There followed
1  a5?
Correct was 1  c5  xh5 2 b4  g4 3 a4  h5 4 b5  axb5 5 a5! winning. However the game continued:
1  ...  xh5
2  xa6  g4
3  b4  h5
4  b5  h4

The queen endgame turned out to be a drawn. The white king went the wrong way.

Tseshkovsky – Novostruev
Vladivostok 1990

White has the advantage of an extra pawn, but Black has compensation in the form of an outside passed pawn. In this position the following variations are possible:

1  c3

a) 1 h4  e5 2 g4  f4 3 g5  g4 4 d4  xh4 5 f4  g4 6 d5  f5 7 c3  f6! 8  c4  fxe5 9  fxe5  a5 10  c5  a4! with a draw.

b) 1 f4!. Now the game continued 1 ...  f5 2 g3  e6 (the magazine Shakhmaty v SSSR recommended 2...h5! 3  c3  e6 4  b4  d5, etc. with a draw; however this variation ignores the natural 3 h3! h4 {or 3...  e6 4  g4  h4! 5  xg4  5  c3  a5 7  g5  c5 8  d4  f5 9  d5, etc.} 4  xh4  xf4 5  h5  g5 6  d4  f5.
Pawn Endgames

{6...\text{xh5} 7 \text{d5} \text{g5} 8 \text{h4+} \text{f6} 9 \text{h5} +} 7 \text{d5} \text{f6} 8 \text{h6} \text{f4} 9 \text{h7} \text{g7} 10 \text{d6} +) 3 \text{g4!} \text{a5} 4 \text{h4} \text{d5} 5 \text{c3} \text{a4} 6 \text{h5} \text{a3} 7 \text{g5} \text{e6} \text{(or} \text{7...a2} \text{8} \text{b2} \text{d4} 9 \text{h6} \text{or} \text{9} \text{f5} +) 8 \text{d4} \text{f5} 9 \text{d5} \text{and Black resigned.}

1 ... \text{e5}
2 \text{c4} \text{a5}
3 \text{c5} \text{a4}
4 \text{d4+} \text{e4!}

The queen ending after 5 \text{d5} \text{a3} holds no advantage for White.

Timman – Sveshnikov
Tilburg 1992

To win White must either gain a tempo or block the kingside. This is achieved by
1 \text{d5!}

(analysis by Timman)

The game continued 1 \text{a3?} \text{c6} 2 \text{h3} \text{b6} 3 \text{h4} and a draw was agreed. The move actually played in the game needed to be carefully considered. Sometimes \text{a3} is a useful move and sometimes \text{a4}, depending upon the position.
1 ... \text{b5}
Zsu. Polgar - Larsen
Vienna 1993

\[ \text{1 ... } e7? \]

Capturing the pawn allows perpetual check, so the players agreed a draw.
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\[ \text{Zsu. Polgar - Larsen} \]

\[ \text{Vienna 1993} \]

\[ \text{1 ... } e7? \]
7 d6 is no improvement.
7 ...  
8  
9  
10  
11  

½-½

Barsov – Brunner
Bern 1994

1 ...  
Great care must always be taken over pawn moves. Black blunders, not having realized that the white king will now gain a tempo in attacking the black pawn base. Black could have won easily by means of a simple waiting move: 1...b6 2 f3 c6 3 e4 fxe4 4 fxe4 d6! 5 xb5 e5 6 c5 xe4 7 d6 f4 8 e6 g3 9 f6 xg2 10 h4 g3 10 g5 h5! +-.
2 h4!  
3 f3  
4 e4  
5 fxe4  
6 e5  
7 e6 

8  
9  

White could still have gone horribly wrong with 9 c5! e5! +-.
9 ...  
10 d6  
11 e6  
12 f6  
13 f5!

Despite the extra pawn Black is unable to win, e.g. 13...g4 14 f4 g3 15 f5! stalemate.

Vaganian – Portisch
Tilburg 1992

Who stands better? Each side has its own plus and minus: in Black’s favour there is his somewhat more active king and a passed pawn. On White’s side there are fewer pawn islands. Suppose we remove the a-pawns from the board. In that case White would push his e- and f-pawns, deflecting the black king from his passed c4-pawn. However this would allow the black king too close to the white kingside pawns. But with the a-pawns on the board,
the white king will be closer to the black a-pawn after capturing on c4 than the black king will be to the white kingside. Therefore the position must be evaluated as preferable for White.

1 h4?

An incorrect move. After the reply 1...h5 White is deprived of all flexibility in his pawn structure or the chance of creating a passed pawn (the h5-pawn holds both the white h- and g-pawns!). Correct is 1 d2 c5 2 c3 b5 (2...g5 is refuted by 3 g3 g4 4 a3 h5 5 a4 a5 6 e5 d5 7 f5! xe5 8 xc4 xf5 9 b5 winning) 3 g3 g6 4 h3 h5 5 g4 h4 6 g5 c5 7 a3 b5 8 d4 a4 9 xc4 xa3 10 f5 a5 11 fxg6 fxg6 12 e5 winning.

1 ... c5?

After 1...h5! White cannot create a passed pawn. There would follow 2 d2 c5 3 c3 b5 4 a3 c5 5 a4 a5 6 g3 g6 7 e5 d5 8 d2 d4 9 c2 c3 10 d1 d3 and Black wins easily.

2 h5 f6?

Why make it easier for White to create a passed pawn? After 2...d4 3 e5 c3 4 f5 b2 5 e6 fxe6 6 fxe6 c3 7 e7 c2 8 e8 c1 Black has a clear advantage in the queen ending.

3 e3 a5?

Pushing a weak pawn is another mistake. After 3...c3 4 d3 c2 5 xc2 d4 6 b3 xe4 7 a4 xf4 8 a5 g3 9 xa6 f5 10 a4 xg2 the resulting queen ending is better for Black.

4 a3 a4
5 e5! fxe5
6 fxe5 d5
7 e6 xe6
8 d4

Black resigned, unable to stop his a-pawn from dropping. Even Super-Gramdmasters can lose their way in pawn endings.

Timman – P. Nikolić
Belgrade 1987
g3 10 h×g3 fxg3 11 fxg3 ♕xc5 12
g4 is winning for White.
2...g6 loses to 3 h4 h6 4 f4 h5 5 c5
bxc5+ 6 dxc5 e5 7 fxe5 fxe5 8 ♕c4
e4 9 ♕d4.
3 f4!
The winning move; if White in-
stead plays 3 h4? g5 4 c5? bxc5+ 5
dxc5 then Black is doing well due to
his threat of ...e5.
3 ... g5
4 fxg5 fxg5
5 h3 ♕b7
6 ♕b5 ♕c7
7 g4 h4
Alternatively 7...hxg4 8 hxg4
♕b7 9 c5 bxc5 10 dxc5 e5 11 c6+
♕c7 12 ♕c5 e4 13 ♕d4 and White
wins.
8 c5 bxc5
9 dxc5 e5
10 ♕b4!
Black resigned, unable to prevent
the white king from winning the e5-
pawn.

Premature resignation in
pawn endgames

Belkadi – Pachman
Munich OL 1958

White resigned here.
A draw was possible after:
1 ♕e4
Not 1 a4? ♕xc2 2 ♕e4 ♕b3 3
♕d5 ♕b4! –+
1 ... ♕xa2
2 ♕d5 a4
3 ♕xc5 a3

Mnatsakanian – Vogt
Stary Smokovec 1979

(See diagram on following page
Instead of resigning White coul
have salvaged a draw:
1 ♕e2 ♕e5
2 ♕d3 ♕d5
3 c4+ ♕c5
4 ♕c3 a5
5 ♕d3 f5!
What next?

Chigorin – Tarrasch
Nuremberg 1896

At this point Chigorin resigned, having calculated the variation 1 gxf6 gxf6 2 g4 e5 3 h5 xf5 4 h6 g4 5 xh7 h5!. However, he could have played for stalemate with 1 g4 e5 2 g6! h6 3 h5!, and Black cannot win.

On a similar theme is the following famous game:

Golombek – Keres
Margate 1939

In this position White resigned without continuing, although Black was not sure how to win. Play might proceed as follows:

1 e2 e4
2 d2 f5
2...f3 3 gxf3+ xf3 4 c3 g4 5 b4, etc.

(See diagram on following page)

In this position White resigned, having calculated the following variation:

1 d2 c1 w+
2 xc1 xc1+
3 xc1 e5
4 b2 xe4
White seems to be losing after 5 $\text{a}3$ $f4$ 6 $\text{a}4$ $g4$ 7 $\text{xa}5$ $\text{hx}4$ 8 $\text{b}6$ $\text{xg}5$ 9 $a4$ $h4$ and the black pawn queens first, thereby covering the white queening square. Only later in analysis Euwe discovered that in fact the white king should head for the g-pawn!

5 $\text{c}3$! $f4$
6 $\text{d}4$ $g4$
7 $\text{e}5$ $\text{hx}4$
8 $\text{f}6$ $g4$
9 $\text{xg}6$ $h4$
10 $\text{f}6$ $h3$
11 $g6$

White even manages to start checking first! Thus both Golombek’s calculation and intuition were faulty. There always exist, even in the most critical positions, chances to save the game if the player has a sound knowledge of endgame principles. Often players do not fully exploit all their chances in critical positions.

**P1**

Is 1 $g4$ or 1 $\text{e}4$ the best move for White?

**Hansen – Nimzowitsch**

*Randers 1921*

Black to move. Who is better? Find the right variation.
Troger – Bertok  
*European Championship 1961*

White to play. Find the drawing method.

Lücke – T. Heinatz  
*Bundesliga 1993*

Black to play. Is 1...\textit{xc6} or 1...g5 Black’s best move?

Kuglin – Gapanovich  
*USSR 1986*

Is 1...\textit{xc6} or 1...g5 Black’s best move?

Beliavsky – Foisor  
*Bucharest 1980*

Is 1 h5 or 1 \textit{h3} the best move for White?
White to play and win. Three accurate moves are required.

White to play. Find the most accurate winning method.

White to play. How can he force a draw?

Black to play. Can he force a draw?
Tringov – Stein  
*Amsterdam 1964*

Black to play and win.

Tal – Rukavina  
*Sochi 1973*

Is 1...e5 or 1...e4 the correct move?

Stoltz – Nimzowitsch  
*Berlin 1928*

Black to play and win.

Barrera – Schatzle  
*Argentina 1975*

Black to play. What would you do?
Exchanging into pawn endgames

A common technique in chess is to swap off the remaining pieces on the board in the hope of realizing a material or positional advantage, or, if playing for a draw, in the hope of reaching a theoretically drawn position. In pawn endgames the material value of a pawn is much higher than in other endgames, and can only be counterbalanced by a very active king. Therefore exchanging into a pawn endgame in the hope of winning is far more common than swapping off to try to obtain a draw. Chess theory states that to realize a pawn advantage, pieces must be exchanged, while to defend when behind on material, pawns should be exchanged. From this it becomes clear which questions face a player considering whether to exchange into a pawn endgame. First it is necessary to have a knowledge of precise theoretical endgame positions. This means the range of positions to which the player is heading. Secondly, it is vital to have a theoretical knowledge of how to play pawn endgames, which is discussed in the first part of this chapter. The most important question is this: is it easier to realize an advantage (or obtain a draw) by exchanging into a pawn endgame, or by keeping the pieces on the board?

Simple examples

Geller – Mikhalchishin
USSR Ch (Riga) 1985

The easiest way for Black to convert his material advantage is by liquidation into a pawn endgame.

1 ... f4!
2 gxf4 gxf4
3 f3 a2
4 b1 g2!
5 bxc2 d4

White resigned straightaway.

Mikhalchishin – Bareev
Lvov 1987
These are relatively simple examples. There are two possible aims in exchanging into a pawn endgame: to win or to draw. Now we turn to various correct and incorrect ways of simplifying into pawn endgames from more difficult positions.

**Complex examples of exchanging into pawn endgames**

**Urzica – Tseshkovsky**  
*Moscow 1977*

White should be able to hold his own in this theoretically drawn endgame. The strongest move is a quiet one:

1 c6

White instead played 1 f2? with the idea of meeting 1...e7 with 2 e2! and c6, c7, c8. However, Black unexpectedly simplified into a pawn endgame: 1...xh4 2 xh4 a1 3 xal xal+ 4 f1 xf1+ 5 xf1 e7 6 e2 e6 7 e3 d5 8 c6 (or 8 f4 f6! winning easily) 8...xc6 9 e4 d6 10 f4 f6 11 e4 e6 12 h3 d6 13 d4 f5 0-1.

After the correct move, play may continue:
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1 ...  \( \text{Ke2} \)
2  c7  \( \text{Kb2} \)
3  \( \text{Kf2} \)  \( \text{Kb1}+ \)
4  \( \text{Kf1} \)

and Black cannot make any progress.

Kveinys – Djurhuus
Oslo 1992

White decided to simplify into the pawn ending, at the risk of falling into a trap.

1  \( g5+ \)
1 b5 axb5 2 \( \text{Kxb5} \) was simpler.
2  \( \text{Kxd5} \)
2 \( \text{Kxg5} \)
3  b5!

Not 3 \( \text{Kxe5}+ \)? \( \text{Kf6} \)!, which only draws.

3 ...  \( \text{Kf6} \)
3 ... axb5 loses to 4 \( \text{Kxe5}+ \) \( \text{Kf6} \)
\( \text{Kxe6}+ \) \( \text{Kxe6} \) 6 a6 ++.
4  b6  \( \text{Kb8} \)
Or 4 ... \( \text{Kd6} \) 5 b7 \( \text{Kd4}+ \) 6 \( \text{Kd3} \) \( \text{Kb4} \)
7 \( \text{Kc6}+ \) and \( \text{Kb6} \) winning.
5  \( \text{Kd5} \)  \( \text{Ke7} \)
6  \( \text{Cc7}+ \)  \( \text{Kd8} \)
7  \( \text{Ka7} \)  1-0

M. Gurevich – Adorjan
Akureyri 1988

When simplifying into pawn endgames the mistake of prematurely exchanging rooks is often made. It is very difficult to choose between an active rook or an active king, a difficulty which is compounded by the psychological desire to realize one's advantage by swapping off into a pawn endgame!

Black decided to play actively straightaway.

1 ...  \( \text{Kb5} \)

After 1 ... \( \text{Kxe4}+ \) 2 \( \text{Kd3} \) \( \text{Kxe6} \) 3 \( \text{Kxa7} \)
White has a superior rook ending.
Best, however, is 1 ... a5! 2 \( \text{Kxf7}! \) \( \text{Kf6} \)!
2  b4  a5

There followed an unexpected exchange:

3 \( \text{Kd5}! \)  \( \text{Kxd5} \)
4  exd5  \( \text{Kg6} \)

The natural 4 ... axb4 loses to the fantastic 5 a4!! \( \text{Kg6} \) 6 \( \text{Kd3} \) \( \text{Kf6} \) 7 \( \text{Kc4} \) \( \text{Ke5} \) 8 \( \text{Kxb4} \) \( \text{Kxd5} \) 9 \( \text{Kb5} \).
5  bxa5  bxa5
6  \( \text{Kd3} \)  \( \text{Kf6} \)
If 10...g5, the white king reaches the f-pawn’s square in time after 11 c4.

11 a4 g5
12 a5 d6
13 c4 c6
14 d4 b5
15 e5 f4
16 gxf4 gxf4
17 xf4 xa5
18 g4 b5
19 h5 c5
20 xh6 d6
21 g7 1-0

It is unfavourable for Black to simplify immediately into a pawn ending, which would be drawn. He must therefore improve his pawn structure ready for the forthcoming exchange.

1 ... b2+

2 e3 a5
3 h4 a4

In this position 3...h5, trying to reach the position in the game, would be incorrect, as White could counter with 4 f3 and 5 g4.

4 f4?

4 h5! is correct, after which the pawn ending would be drawn.

4 ... h5
5 d3 c6
6 e3 b3
7 d2 b5
8 e5 xc3!

After 8...g6 White would counter-attack with 9 d3! and 10 d7.

9 xc3 e6
10 c4 g6
11 c3 d5
12 d3 c4+
13 e3 c3
14 d3 c2
15 xc2 e4
16 c3 f3
17 b4 xg3
18 xa4 xh4
19 b4 g3

The black h-pawn queens, and thereby prevents the promotion of White’s pawn.

Yusupov – Ljubojević
Linares 1992

(See diagram on following page)

Black could win easily by

1 ... a3!

However Ljubo decided that the pawn ending was winning immediately and played 1...f5? but after 2
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\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Rogers – Shirov} \\
\text{Groningen 1990}
\end{array} \]

Black has the choice between 1...\( \text{g}3 \) and simplifying into the pawn ending which, Shirov decided, was drawn.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Dorfman – Kholmov} \\
\text{Saratov 1981}
\end{array} \]

(See diagram on following page)

Black’s position is difficult, at he decided to play:

1... \( \text{e}4 \)

In his preliminary calculation Dorfman had of course foreseen this, and judged his position winning after:

2 \( \text{d}4 \)
Having noticed the problem with his intended line, Dorfman in fact played 2 g4 fxg4 (not 2...AXB4? 3 gxf5 gxf5 4 Axd5 ++) 3 Axd4!?, but Black discovered a tactical resource: 3...g3+ 4 f3 g2 5 xg2 Bxe3 6 Axd5 Bxe4 and a draw was agreed.

2 ... Axd4
3 exd4

Here Dorfman calculated a fantastic resource:
3 ... f7
4 d5

The queen ending is more promising after 4 g2 e6 5 h3 d5 6 h4 Axd4 7 g5 c4 8 xg6 xh4 9 xf5 c4 10 g5 (weak is 10 e5 b4 11 f5 b3 12 f6 b2 13 f7 b1= 14 f8= Bf1+ with a draw) 10...b4 11 f5 d5 12 f6 e6 13 g6 b3 14 f7 b2 15 f8= b1= + 16 g5; here White maintains some winning chances. (Typesetter's note: The database proves that this position is a draw).

4 ... e7
5 e3 d7
6 d6! c6!!
7 d3 d7

Only at this point in his analysis did the disappointed Dorfman realize his oversight: the opposition is worth more than a pawn.

Disasters can happen as well:

Hübner – Adorjan
Bad Lauterberg 1980

See how one well-known grandmaster tried to simplify into a winning pawn ending. He went for a quick finish instead of securing a guaranteed but delayed victory with 1...Axb3.

1 ... c5??

But White refused the pawn ending by playing:
2 xg4!! Axg5

Stalemate!

Bareev – J. Polgar
Hastings 1992/3

(See diagram on following page)

1 h3?

1 f3 was correct, after which White can still fight for the draw.
1 ... \( \text{Hxh3} \)
2 \( \text{gxh3} \) \( \text{c6} \)
3 a4 \( \text{d5} \)
4 a5

White has to give up his pride and joy, the passed a-pawn.

4 ... \( \text{c6} \)
5 \( \text{d3} \) \( b5 \)
6 b3 \( x a5 \)
7 \( c4 \) \( b6 \)
8 \( d3!? \)

Hoping for 8...\( b5 \) 9 \( c3 \) after which Black must return to the plan in the game.

Also losing was 8 b4 \( cxb4 \) 9 \( cxb4 \) \( c6 \) 10 \( c4 \) after which the black king goes to e7, preparing ...f5, etc.

8 ... \( c7! \)

An old manoeuvre comes to the rescue: triangulation.

9 \( c3 \) \( b7! \)
10 \( d3 \) \( b6 \)

White resigned, since after 11 \( c3 \) \( b5 \) there would follow ...\( b4 \) and the advance of the c-pawn.

In simplifying into the pawn ending White failed to calculate (or see) such a difficult idea as the triangle.

In the following example another important method, the horizontal opposition, turned out to be more valuable than a pawn.

**Hübner – Pfleger**

*Bundesliga 1989*

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
1 \text{f6?} \\
1 \text{b8} \text{ looks best, with the idea of } \text{b4+} \text{ and } f6. \text{ However there is no great danger, and after 1...d7 the h-pawn must be exchanged with 2 } \text{b4+} f3 3 h5 ghx5 4 hxh5 e3 5 g5 and only then does the threat of } b8 \text{ and } f8 \text{ with } f6 \text{ arise, hoping to exchange into a won pawn ending. However, White deemed the immediate simplification even better.} \\
1 ... \text{xf4} \\
2 \text{xf7} \text{ xf7+} \\
3 \text{xf7} \\
\text{White now got a nasty shock:} \\
3 ... \text{f5!!} \\
\text{This is much stronger than the capture 3...xe5 4 xg6 +–, which White was counting on.}
\end{array}
\]
Now another simplification is inevitable, leaving Black with a won pawn ending.

The next game demonstrates how a faulty calculation led to an attempt to simplify into a drawn queen ending, which turned out to be a lost pawn ending.

**Gelfand – Salov**  
*Moscow 1992*

There followed:

1 ...  
After 1...\texttt{We4}\? White stays a pawn up, but the remaining configuration of pieces offers no real winning chances.

2 \texttt{We6}  
3 \texttt{Wh8+}  
4 \texttt{Wh4+}  
5 \texttt{Wh4+}  

**Uhlmann – Drimer**  
*Leipzig OL 1960*

There followed:

1 ...  
2 \texttt{We4+}  
3 \texttt{Wh1}  
4 \texttt{Wh2}  
5 \texttt{Wh2}  

Black miscalculated that he could hold the draw by placing his king on e4.

7 ...  
8 \texttt{Wh2}  
9 \texttt{Wh2}  

Incorrect is 9 g4 g5 10 \texttt{Wh2} d5: 11 \texttt{We3} e5 12 e4 \texttt{xf4} (Editor’s note: 13 \texttt{We3} seems to win here) or 11 \texttt{Wh3} e5 12 e4 d4.

9 ...  
10 \texttt{Wh2}  
11 \texttt{We3}  
12 \texttt{Wh2}  
13 \texttt{Wh2}  

The e2-square is ‘mined’: 13 \texttt{Wh2}? \texttt{We4} =.  

1-0
6 $\text{e}3$ h6
7 h4 h5
8 $\text{e}2$ d4
9 d2 e3+
10 fxe3+ e4

Black missed the win by not playing 10...c4. Having calculated this far both players had missed this cunning winning move. They forgot about the technique of diagonal opposition.

11 $\text{e}2$ Draw

Nenashev – Lputian
Manila OL 1992

![Chessboard diagram]

Black carefully calculated the ensuing pawn endgame.

1 ... f5!
2 $\text{e}2$

After 2 g5 f4+ 3 h2 $\text{g}4$ the white king is trapped.

2 ... fxg4+
3 $\text{w}xg4+$
4 $\text{x}g4$

A draw was agreed, since after 4...a4 5 $\text{f}4$ h6 6 $\text{e}4$ h5 7 d4 $\text{x}h4$ 8 c4 g5 9 b4 $\text{f}6$ 10 $\text{x}a4$ e6 11 b5 d7 12 $\text{b}6$

$\text{c}8$ Black achieves his aim (the $\text{c}8$-square!).

This technique of simplifying into a two versus one ending often occurs in practice. But in the game Nikolić-Liang, for example, Black decided not to go for this ending.

The next example is an elegantly calculated endgame by Geller:

Geller – Fischer
Havana 1965

![Chessboard diagram with moves]

1 $\text{e}5+$ $\text{x}e5$
2 fxe5+$\text{x}e5$
3 gxf3 $\text{d}6$
4 f4!

Black was forced to resign, in view of 4...c6 5 h3 $\text{x}b6$ 6 $\text{x}h4$ c6 7 g5 d6 8 $\text{x}g6$, etc.

Shirov – Akopian
Oakham 1992

(See diagram on following page)

1 ... $\text{x}f3$?

Black exchanges into a pawn ending having forgotten a well-known
resource. Correct was 1...\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e6}}!} 2 c5 bxc5 3 a5 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{d7}} 4 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{xc5+ \textbf{c7}}} after which there is no clear way forward.

2 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{xf3}} h2
3 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{g2!}}

Not 3 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{g3? \textbf{d4}}, which draws.}

3 ... \texttt{\textbf{xe4}}
4 c5!

This is what Shirov saw. Akopian now played 4...\texttt{\textbf{d5}} 5 c6 \texttt{\textbf{d6}} and resigned a few moves later. Instead:

4 ... \texttt{\textbf{bxc5}}
5 a5 \texttt{\textbf{d5}}

Now after the conventional 6 \texttt{\textbf{b6?? \textbf{c6}}, Black wins. Advancing the b-pawn goes against Nimzowitsch's rule, which states that the queening pawn must always be pushed first. Thus:

6 \texttt{\textbf{a6!!}}
and only then 7 \texttt{\textbf{b6}}, and the pawn successfully promotes.

\textbf{Capablanca – Ed. Lasker}
\textit{London 1924}

Despite Black's material advantage, White wins after:

1 \texttt{\textbf{h6!}}

Black resigned. The enemy pawn controls the crucial f6-square, preventing the king from stopping the pawn.

But sometimes one's own pawns get in the way:

\textbf{Andreev – Demin}
\textit{Moscow 1984}

1 \texttt{\textbf{h5 \textbf{e5??}}}

Too active. After the more restrained 1...\texttt{\textbf{c7!}} 2 \texttt{\textbf{c4 h6!}} 3 \texttt{\textbf{gxh6 gxh6 4 b4 f6 5 xa4 xf5 6 b4}} the white king just reaches the f1-square in time. However, Black is playing to win.
2 f6! gxf6
3 g6! hxg6
4 h6

Black's own pawn prevents his king from stopping White’s passed pawn. Very often restraint is preferable to activity.

In the following game both players overlooked (or do not know) this well-known tactic.

Guliev – Tukmakov
Nikolaev Z 1993

After the correct 1...d7 the position would be equal, but Black decided to provoke a pawn ending.

1 ... de5?
2 xe5 dxe5
3 e3?? d6
4 e4 c4
5 a4 c3
6 d3 xd5

White was forced to resign because Black will deflect his king from the a- and b-pawns by pushing his own e-pawn. During and after the game both players deemed the pawn ending hopeless for White, but some time later Grandmaster Elmar Magerramov spotted the familiar manoeuvre of 3 a4! d6 4 a5 c4 (4...xd5 5 a6! followed by 6 b6!) 5 a6! (not 5 b6? a6! =) 5...c5 6 d6! xd6 7 b6 and White wins.

Gligorić – Szabo
Zurich Ct 1953

1 h3?

Black is a pawn up and furthermore White’s pawns are fixed on the same colour as his bishop. Therefore the bishop exchange suggests itself as a defensive plan: 1 d2 xd2 (if 1...b6 then 2 b4 a5 3 a3 a4 4 b4 f6 5 e6 and the black king is boxed in) 2 xd2 f8 3 c3 e7 4 b4 d7 5 c5! (not 5 a5? c5! 6 dxc5 c6 winning) 5...a5 6 b5 a4 7 xa4 c6 8 a5 and White is even somewhat better.

1 ... e1!

Alternatively 2 d2 g3! followed by ...f8-e8, after which the black king can escape.
2 ... g6
3 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{f}8\)
4 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{g}3\)

White resigned, having overlooked the idea of boxing in the black king.

Karpov – Polugaevsky

Tilburg 1983

The calm 1...\(\text{b}4\)! would have allowed Black to hold the position easily, but instead he exchanged into a lost pawn ending.

1 ... \(\text{d}4\)xa5??
2 \(\text{c}5\)xa5 \(\text{d}5\)xa5
3 \(\text{x}f4\) \(\text{b}5\)
4 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{c}5\)
5 \(\text{h}6\) \(\text{d}6\)
6 \(\text{x}h7\) \(\text{e}7\)
7 \(\text{x}h7\) \(\text{e}7\)
8 \(\text{g}7\)

The black king cannot reach f8 in time.

The next game shows a correct simplification into an analogous endgame.

Speelman – Chandler

Hastings 1988

1 ... \(\text{d}4\)xa4!
2 \(\text{c}4\)xa4
3 \(\text{f}3\)

Or 3 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{f}7\) 4 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{f}6\) 5 \(\text{e}4\) 
\(\text{e}7\) 6 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{f}6\) 7 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{xf}5\) 8 \(\text{b}4\) 
\(\text{e}6\) 9 \(\text{xa}4\) \(\text{d}7\) =.

1 ... \(\text{c}5\)
2 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{f}6\)
3 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{f}5\)
4 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{e}5\)
5 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{e}5\)
6 \(\text{xf}4\)
7 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{e}5\)
8 \(\text{xa}4\) \(\text{d}6\)

Draw

Filipenko – Scherbakov

Berdichev 1990

(See diagram on following page)

1 ... \(\text{c}5\)+

Black opts for the pawn endgame, as after 1...\(g5\) 2 \(\text{hxg}5\) \(\text{gx}5\) 3 \(\text{c}5!\) 
\(\text{dxc}5\) 4 \(\text{c}3\) White easily holds the draw.

2 \(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{dxc}5\)
3 \(\text{d}6\) \(\text{e}6\)
4 \(\text{d}7\) \(\text{xd}7\)
In the next game, one of the players managed to simplify correctly into a pawn endgame.

**Short – Vaganian**  
*Hastings 1983*

```
5  ♗xe5  ♗e7
6  ♔d5  ♗f7
7  ♗xc5!

Going the other way round loses after 7 ♗e5 ♗g7! 8 ♗e4 ♗f6 9 ♗f4 g5+!.

7 ...  g5
8  ♔d5  g4
9  ♗e4

Black has a protected passed pawn, but the white king manages both to defend the c4-pawn and stay in the square of the g-pawn. White must be careful not to allow zugzwang, i.e. the white king on d3 against Black’s king on c5 with White to move.

9 ...  ♗f6
10  ♗f4  ♗e6
11  ♗e4  ♗d6
12  ♗d4  ♗c6
13  ♗e3  ♗b6

Alternatively 13...♗c5 14 ♗d3 ♗b4 15 ♗d4 =.

14 ♗e4  ♗c6
15 ♗e3  ♗d6
16 ♗d4  ♗d7
17 ♗d3  ♗c6
18 ♗e4  Draw
```

Black to move. How can he play for the win in this endgame? At first sight it looks dead drawn, but Vaganian finds a fantastic resource which involves simplifying into a pawn ending. To carry out this plan he makes a move against Capablanca’s rule by putting a pawn on the same colour as his bishop.

```
1 ...  ♗f6!!
2  ♗e2  ♗f7
3  h3?

Better was 3 a4 ♗e6 4 b3 ♗d5 5 h3 ♗e4 6 f3+ ♗f4 7 ♗e1! after which White’s position should hold, even though Black is the only one with any winning chances.

3 ...  ♗e6
4  a4?

A tardy move. Better was 4 ♗d3 ♗e5 5 ♗xe5 ♗xe5 6 ♗c4 ♗e4 7 a4 with the idea of a5, b4, and ♗c5,
threatening a breakthrough on the queenside. White has more defensive chances in this ending than in the game.

4 ... \( \text{e5} \)
5 \( \text{e}3 \text{xc}3 \)
6 \( \text{xc}3 \text{d}5 \)

Black’s better-placed king gives him good winning chances.

7 \( \text{d}3?! \)

The last chance was 7 b4, striving for the position indicated after move four.

7 ... \( \text{c}5 \)
8 \( \text{c}3 \text{a}5! \)
9 b3 h5
10 g3 g5
11 g4 h4
12 f3 \( \text{d}5 \)
13 b4

Alternatively Black is easily winning after 13 \( \text{d}3 \text{e}5 \) 14 \( \text{e}3 \text{f}5 \) 15 \( \text{e}2 \text{fxg}4 \) 16 \( \text{fxg}4 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 17 \( \text{f}2 \text{d}3 \) 18 \( \text{f}3 \text{b}6 \) 19 \( \text{f}2 \text{c}3 \).

13 ... \( \text{e}5! \)
14 bxa5 \( \text{f}4 \)
15 \( \text{d}4 \text{xf}3 \)
16 \( \text{c}5 \text{g}3 \)
17 \( \text{b}6 \text{h}3 \)
18 \( \text{xb}7 \text{g}4 \)
19 a6 h3
20 a7 h2
21 a8\( \text{w} \) h1\( \text{w} \)
22 \( \text{b}8 \text{xa}8 \)
23 \( \text{xa}8 \) f5

White resigned, since he is unable to prevent a second pawn race followed by another queen exchange and then a third black pawn promotion.

Black could play the simple 1...\( \text{c}8 \), after which he should fully equalize. However he instead forced the game into a pawn ending:

1 ... \( \text{d}5? \)
2 \( \text{x}e8+ \text{x}e8 \)
3 \( \text{xe}8+ \text{xe}8 \)
4 \( \text{xd}5 \text{e}1+ \)
5 \( \text{g}2 \text{e}4+ \)
6 \( \text{f}3 \text{xd}5 \)

6...\( \text{xd}5 \) loses even more quickly:
7 \( \text{xe}4 \text{dxe}4 \) 8 g4 \( \text{h}7 \) (or 8...g5 9 \( \text{hxg}5 \text{hxg}5 \) 10 f3 \(+\) 9 h5 g6 10 d5 \( \text{g}7 \) 11 d6 \( \text{f}8 \) followed by the familiar trick 12 g5!.

7 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{cxd}5 \)
8 \( \text{f}3 \) f6
9 h5 \( \text{f}7 \)
10 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \)

After 10...g6 Salov gives the following variation: 11 a4 a5 12 f3 \( \text{g}7 \) 13 \( \text{hxg}6 \text{hxg}6 \) 14 g4 f5 15 \( \text{e}5! \text{fxg}4 \) 16 \( \text{fxg}4 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 17 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 18 \( \text{e}5 \) h5 19 d5 h4 20 d6 h3 21 d7 h2 22 d8\( \text{w} \) h1\( \text{w} \) 23 \( \text{g}8+ \)
and after the inevitable exchange of
queens, another king and pawn endgame arises which is easily winning for White.

11 g4  a6
12 a4  a5
13 b3  b6
14 f3  e7
14...f5 is refuted by 15 g5! and White wins.

15 f5  f7
16 f4  g6+
17 hxg6+ g7
18 e6  xg6
19 f5+ g5
20 f7  xg4
21 xf6  h5
22 e5  1-0

Korchnoi – Barcza
Budapest 1961

Instead of crudely regaining the pawn by 1 xxb6, White played:

1 e5! d8
2 d4  d7?

Black is a pawn up but passively waits for the pawn endgame. 2...g5 is better, hindering White’s expansion. He did not believe that a pawn ending with an extra pawn could be lost.

3 f4! d8
If 3...c7 then 4 xxd6! xxd6 5 a5! bxa5 6 c5, winning easily.

4 h3  d7
5 g4  d8
6 g5  d7
7 h4?

Korchnoi has played brilliantly thus far, but here he misses a simple win with 7 f6! d8 8 xxd6 xxd6 9 e5 xfx6 10 gxf6 d7 11 xd5. Interestingly, the same variation was possible a move later.

7 ...
8 h5?  gxh5

White’s winning chances have evaporated.

9 h6  d7
10 d3  c5
11 xd6+ Draw

Kron – Baburin
Gorky 1989

In this position Black should play 1...b5! 2 e4 bxa4 (2...xd4+ 3 xd4 c5 4 e5 c4 5 f5+ gxf5+ 6
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If Black had played 1...c5 followed by 2...f5 and 3...e5(+), White would clearly have been in trouble, but instead he played the immediate:

1 ... f5?

A truly horrible blunder. There followed:

2 ∆xg5+ ∆xg5
3 ∆e5 a6
4 a3 a5
5 a4 1-0

Smyslov – Averkin
USSR 1979

If Black had played 1...c5 followed by 2...f5 and 3...e5(+), White would clearly have been in trouble, but instead he played the immediate:

1 ... f5?

A truly horrible blunder. There followed:

2 ∆xg5+ ∆xg5
3 ∆e5 a6
4 a3 a5
5 a4 1-0

Smyslov – Averkin
USSR 1979

The white pawn simultaneously promotes to a queen and covers the black pawn’s queening square.
Smyslov had a clear plan to consolidate his position: 1 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{f}5+ \) 2 \( \text{d}3 \) followed by transferring the king to \( \text{b}5 \), after which Black will find it hard to defend, but the pawn endgame on the other hand is very tricky.

1 \( \text{x}e7 \) \( \text{x}e7 \)
2 \( \text{xc}7+ \) \( \text{xc}7 \)
3 \( \text{d}5+ \) \( \text{d}6 \)
4 \( \text{xc}7 \) \( \text{xc}7 \)
5 \( \text{e}4? \)
The right move is 5 \( \text{h}4! \).

5 ... \( \text{d}6 \)
6 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{f}5+ \)
7 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{c}5 \)
8 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{g}5! \)
9 \( \text{b}4+ \) \( \text{d}5 \)
10 \( \text{d}3 \)

Neither 10 \( \text{h}3 \) nor 10 \( \text{h}4 \) can change anything.

10 ... \( \text{g}4 \)
11 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}6! \)

11 ... \( \text{f}4? \) fails to 12 \( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{bxa}5 \) 13 \( \text{bxa}5 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 14 \( \text{gxf}4 \) \( \text{e}3 \) 15 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{winning.} \)

12 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
13 \( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{b}5+! \)

This is the essence of Black’s defensive idea: White has a protected passed pawn but his king cannot penetrate the black position.

14 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
15 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
16 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
17 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
18 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
19 \( \text{fxg}4 \) \( \text{hxg}4 \)
20 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{gxh}3+ \)
21 \( \text{wh}3 \) \( \text{d}5 \)
22 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{fxg}4+ \)

In this position Black declined the rook exchange:

1 ... \( \text{d}8? \)

Strangely Karpov did not opt for the pawn endgame, which is forced after 1...\( \text{xa}b7 \) 2 \( \text{xb}7 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 3 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 4 \( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 5 \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{b}3 \) 6 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 7 \( \text{xb}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 8 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 9 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{xb}7 \) 10 \( \text{xb}7 \) \( \text{xb}7 \) 11 \( \text{xb}7+ \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 12 \( \text{c}6 \) 13 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{d}6 \). He calculated well in advance that this pawn ending was lost; we will return to it later.

2 \( \text{e}1! \) \( \text{a}5 \)
3 \( \text{h}3! \) \( \text{g}6 \)
4 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
5 \( \text{xf}7! \) \( \text{xf}7 \)
6 \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{e}8 \)

Black now has a lost position.
The simplest way to win was $7 \text{b} \text{b} 8 \text{d} 6 8 \text{d} 7$.

This was the position Karpov believed to be lost. However, Black can play the simple:

1 ... \text{f} 6

It is not clear how White can make progress. Karpov overestimated the strength of his opponent's more active king. As the reader will already have realized from the large number of wrong decisions taken by grandmasters, simplifying into pawn endgames is no easy matter. We must learn from their mistakes. These endgames should not be a lottery of guessing or not guessing the correct move, rather involve working out the right move by drawing on one's theoretical knowledge and accurately calculating the possible variations. In conclusion to this chapter there are several exercises for readers to test themselves.

Exchanging into pawn endgames: exercises

Furman – Zhukhovitsky
Leningrad 1969

Is 1...\text{c} 5 or 1...\text{d} xd4 Black's best winning attempt?

Kaunas – Mordvinov
Tashkent 1969

White to move. Find the simplest win.
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P. Ricardi – G. Garcia
Bayamo 1986

White to move. Which pawn endgame should he opt for: 1 \( \text{xg}4 \text{fxg}4 \) 2 b5 or 1 b5 immediately?

Rozentalis – Smagin
Odessa 1989

Is 1 b6 or 1 \( \text{xc}4 \) the best move?

Piskov – Dvoirys
Helsinki 1992

1 b6 or 1 \( \text{xc}4 \) the best move?

Berman, 1961

White to move. Is it better to play 1 \( \text{f}3 \) with the idea of 2 g6, or simply 1 \( \text{xf}7 \)?

How can White simplify into a won pawn endgame?
**Briedis – Timoshenko**  
*Riga 1991*

Is 1 $\texttt{g}xh7$ the best way to win?

**Glek – Dautov**  
*Frunze 1988*

Is 1 $\texttt{d}d3$ the best move?

**A. Selesniev**  
*Tidschrift für Schack, 1923*

How should White exchange into a pawn endgame?

**Vaulin – Groszpeter**  
*Kecskemet 1993*

Should Black play the immediate 1...$\texttt{xe}5$ or wait before exchanging into a pawn ending?
2 Rook endings with two extra pawns

In all other endings the advantage of two pawns nearly always guarantees victory – but it was no accident that Rudolf Spielmann commented jokingly that all rook endings are drawn. There are some well-known examples of drawn positions, such as those with the a- and f-pawns or two rooks’ pawns, although drawing chances depend on the activity of the pieces. In this chapter we discuss less well-known positions in which the weaker side has excellent drawing chances two pawns down, analysing both positions which were successfully defended and games where the players did not use all the possible resources.

Beliavsky – Kupreichik
Yugoslavia 1992

Black has the obvious plan of sacrificing his h-pawn in order to bring his king to the d-pawn, thereby reaching a theoretically winning position. However, in this initial position White has the chance to make life difficult for Black by impeding this plan.

1 \( \text{d5!} \)

In the game White played 1 \( \text{d2?} \) but after 1...\( \text{f5} \) 2 \( \text{xh5} \) he had missed the crushing 2...\( \text{e3!!} \). After 3 \( \text{f2} \) (or 3 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{e6} \) 4 \( \text{a5} \) d5 5 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 6 \( \text{a8} \) \( \text{e4} \) ->) 3...\( \text{e4} \) 4 \( \text{g4} \) d5 5 \( \text{f8} \) d4 6 \( \text{e8} + \) \( \text{d3} \) 7 \( \text{a8} \) \( \text{e1} \) he was forced to resign.

With colours reversed this very position (after 1 \( \text{d5} \)) arose in Beliavsky’s twenty-year-old analysis, published in Dvoretsky’s Secrets of Chess Training! Now White can draw in the following variations:

a) 1...\( \text{f6} \) 2 \( \text{xh5} \) \( \text{f7} \) 3 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{e6} \) is met by 4 \( \text{h1} \) followed by checking from in front.

b) 1...\( \text{f6} \) 2 \( \text{xh5} ! \) \( \text{e1} \) 3 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e6} \) (3...\( \text{f1} \) 4 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{f4} \) 5 \( \text{g3} \)=) 4 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{e4} (4...\text{e5} 5 \text{xe5}=) 5 \text{f3} \) d5 6 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{e5} \) 7 \( \text{a1} \) with a well-known draw.

c) 1...\( \text{f7} \) 2 \( \text{xh5} !\) (not 2 \( \text{hx5} ? \) \( \text{g6} ! \) ->) 2...\( \text{e5} + \) 3 \( \text{xe5} \) dxe5 4
Surprisingly, what is required in this position is to put the other side in zugzwang! Therefore:

1 ... \textit{Ke4+!}  
2 \textit{Kg3} \textit{Ke3+!}  
3 \textit{Kh4} \textit{Ke6}  
4 \textit{Kd1} \textit{Kf5}  
5 \textit{Kh1+}  
5 \textit{Kxh5} \textit{Ke3!} transposes into the game.

6 ... \textit{Ke5}  
7 \textit{Kd1+} \textit{Kd5}  
8 \textit{Ka1+} \textit{Kd7}  
9 \textit{Kxh5} \textit{Ke4!}  
10 \textit{Kg5} \textit{d5}  
11 \textit{Kf5} \textit{Kd6}  
12 \textit{Kd1} \textit{Kc5!}  
13 \textit{Kc1+}  
13 \textit{Ka1} is answered by 13...\textit{Ke3!} 
14 \textit{Ka5+} \textit{Kc4} 15 \textit{Ka4+} \textit{Kb5} with a winning position for Black.

14 ... \textit{Kc4}  
14 \textit{Ka1}  
Or 14 \textit{Kd1} \textit{Kc3!} 15 \textit{Ke5} \textit{Ke3+} 16 \textit{Kf4} \textit{d4} and Black wins.

14 ... \textit{Kc3}  
15 \textit{Ka5+} \textit{Kc4}  
16 \textit{Ka4+} \textit{Kb5}  
17 \textit{Ka1} \textit{Ke3!}  
18 \textit{Kd1} \textit{Kc4}  
19 \textit{Kc1+} \textit{Kc3}  
Now the d-pawn is unstoppable.

In this position White (to move) knew the winning theoretical position, which involves advancing the f-pawn to f6, cutting the black king off from its crucial defensive post of g7. White can then win using the tactical trick \textit{Kh8}, meeting ...\textit{Kxh7} by \textit{Kh7+}. He therefore played 1 \textit{hxg3?}, with the intention of then pushing f4, etc. However White forgot that the position is drawn with the g-pawn, and one can imagine his disappointment after 1 ...\textit{g4+}! 2 \textit{fxg4} and three pawns up White cannot win! White would win easily after 1 \textit{Kxg3!} 
followed by the pawn sacrifice 2 \textit{h4!} and only then smoothly advancing the f-pawn up to f6. It is always dangerous to think there is a choice between two equally good moves; usually only one move is correct and the other one is flawed.

The next game is provided from one of the authors of this book.
Mikhalchishin – Kluger
Pecs 1978

\[
\begin{array}{c}
W \\
B
\end{array}
\]

This position looks easily won.
There followed:
1 \( \textit{h8} \) \( g1 \)
2 \( \textit{e2} \) \( g3 \)
3 \( \textit{f2} ? \)
In fact the win was hard to find:
3 \( h7 \) \( g1 \) 4 \( f2 \) \( e7 \) (after 4... \( fxe5 \)
5 \( f8 \) there is no defence from 6
\( g8 \) 5 \( a2 \) \( g6 \) 6 \( a7+ \) \( f8 \) 7
\( a8+ \) \( f7 \) 8 \( g8 \) \( e6 \) 9 \( g7+! \) \( g8 \)
10 \( g5! \) \( f7 \) 11 \( f5+ \) \( g6 \) 12 \( f8! \)
(12 \( f6+? \) \( xf6 \) 13 \( exf6 \) \( f7! \) is
stalemate) 12... \( e7 \) 13 \( f6+ \) \( g5 \) 14
\( g8 \) and the pawn finally threatens
to queen.
3 ... \( fxe5 \)
4 \( f8 \) \( e6 \)
5 \( h7 \)
I thought there was no defence to
6 \( g8 \), but my adversary found a
cold-blooded move:
5 ... \( h3! \)
6 \( g7 \) \( g3+ \)
7 \( h6 \) \( h3+ \)
8 \( g6 \) \( g3+ \)
I was forced to concede a draw.

Brunner – Hulak
Berlin 1990

There followed:
1 ... \( f4+ \)
Nothing is gained by 1... \( h3 \) 2
\( f2+ \) \( h2 \) 3 \( x6 \) 4 \( e3 \) \( f5 \)
5 \( e4! \), etc.
2 \( g2 \) \( f6 \)
3 \( a4+ \) \( g4 \)
4 \( a5 \) \( c6 \)
5 \( a2 \) \( b6 \)
6 \( h2? \)
Why allow one’s opponent to im­
prove his position? Stronger is the
simple 6 \( a3! \) when 6... \( g3 \) fails to 7
\( a4+ \).
6 ... \( g3+ \)
7 \( g2 \) \( xg6 \)
8 \( a4+? \)
In a similar position the World
Champion, Garry Kasparov, found
the correct drawing method: 8 \( a3! \)
\( h5 \) 9 \( a4! \) \( h6 \) 10 \( a5 \) \( h7 \) 11
\( h5+ \) \( g8 \) 12 \( f5 \) \( g7 \) 13 \( f3 \) \( a5 \)
14 \( f5 \) \( a4 \) 15 \( f4 \) \( a6 \) 16 \( xg3 \) \( a3 \)
17 \( f1 \) \( a2 \) 18 \( a1 \) \( f6 \) 19 \( f4 \) and
the white king reaches the a2-pawn.
8 ... \( h5 \)
Rook endings with two extra pawns

The next endgame is a classic.

Larsen – Torre

*Leningrad IZ 1973*

![Chess Board](image)

9 \text{\underline{\text{a}5}}+ \text{\underline{\text{g}4}}
10 \text{\underline{\text{e}5}} \text{\underline{\text{f}4}}
11 \text{\underline{\text{e}8}}

White tries in vain to build a line of defence by cutting the black king off along the e-file.

11 ... \text{\underline{\text{g}5}}
12 \text{\underline{\text{e}6}} \text{\underline{\text{a}5}}
13 \text{\underline{\text{e}8}} \text{\underline{\text{f}5}!}
14 \text{\underline{\text{e}1}} \text{\underline{\text{a}4}}
15 \text{\underline{\text{e}8}} \text{\underline{\text{g}4}}
16 \text{\underline{\text{e}7}} \text{\underline{\text{e}4}}
17 \text{\underline{\text{a}7}} \text{\underline{\text{f}4}}
18 \text{\underline{\text{f}7}+} \text{\underline{\text{e}3}}
19 \text{\underline{\text{g}x}g3} \text{\underline{\text{d}2}}
20 \text{\underline{\text{f}3}} \text{\underline{\text{e}3}+}
21 \text{\underline{\text{f}2}} \text{\underline{\text{a}3}}

0-1

An unexpected defensive idea occurred in the following game.

Gurgenidze – T. Petrosian

*Moscow 1983*

1 \text{\underline{\text{c}7}?}

Inaccurate. 1 \text{\underline{\text{g}5}} \text{\underline{\text{x}c}5} 2 \text{\underline{\text{g}6}} followed by 3 \text{\underline{\text{h}8}+} was easily winning.

1 ... \text{\underline{\text{d}8}}

It appears as if the white rook is ideally positioned and he merely needs to move the king to the b3-pawn. This was not fated to happen however, as Black managed to cut off the white king.
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Correct was 1...\(\text{g}4\) 2 \(\text{d}3 \text{g}3+\) 3 \(\text{c}4 \text{g}4+\) 4 \(\text{b}5 \text{x}g5+\) 5 \(\text{b}6 \text{g}4!\) 6 \(\text{a}8 \text{f}4!\) (or 6...\(\text{h}7!\)) 7 a5 \(\text{f}6+!\), followed by the well-known resource of checking from the side. The game continued:

1 \(\text{d}4 \text{h}4+\)
2 \(\text{e}5?\)

Hecht writes that White is winning after 3 \(\text{c}5\), since 3 ...\(\text{x}g5\) is met by 4 \(\text{a}8 \text{f}4\) 5 a5 \(\text{f}5+\) 6 \(\text{d}6 \text{g}6\) 7 a6 \(\text{g}7\) 8 \(\text{e}8 \text{a}5\) 9 \(\text{e}7+\) \(\text{f}8\) 10 \(\text{a}7 \text{a}1\) 11 \(\text{a}8+\) \(\text{f}7\) 12 \(\text{c}6\). In the game Black managed to draw after:

3 ... \(\text{x}g5\)
4 \(\text{a}8\)

Typesetter's note: White could still have won by 4 \(\text{a}6!\); the main variation runs 4...\(\text{h}8\) 5 \(\text{d}5 \text{f}8\) 6 \(\text{e}6 \text{a}8\) 7 \(\text{e}4 \text{f}5\) 8 \(\text{b}4 \text{a}6\) 9 \(\text{c}5\), and we have transposed into line 1 of diagram 146 in Secrets of Rook Endings, to which readers are referred for more details.

4 ... \(\text{g}6\)
5 a5 \(\text{g}7\)
6 \(\text{d}5 \text{f}4\)
7 a6 \(\text{f}6\)

Veselovsky – Varavin
Budapest 1973

(See diagram on following page)
1 c6! \(\text{b}2+!\)

In the game Black faced insoluble problems after 1...\(\text{b}8?\) 2 c7 \(\text{c}8\) 3 \(\text{e}7 \text{c}5\) 4 \(\text{e}3 \text{d}6\) 5 \(\text{g}7 \text{e}5\) 6 \(\text{h}7!\).

2 \(\text{c}1 \text{b}8\)
If White now plays 3 c7, then 3...c8 4 e7 c5 5 d2 d6 leads to a drawn pawn endgame.

3 e6 e8

4 d2

If White plays 4 b2 there would follow 4...c5, threatening to simplify into a drawn pawn endgame. It follows that White's only winning chance is for his king to reach the f4-square in the pawn ending.

4 ... c7

5 e2 f7!

The white king cannot cross the f-file.

Kasparov – Short

London PCA Wch (9) 1993

1 e4?

This looks logical, but White could have quickly lost this pawn. Any other sensible move is winning, e.g. 1 e2 (or 1 a2 f5 2 e4+ e5 3 e3 a8 4 a5 h8 5 f2! with the threat of 6 f5) 1...e4 2 f1! followed by switching the rook to the fourth rank.

1 ... e6?

Correct was the surprise attack 1...c5! 2 a3 c4 3 a5 cxe4 4 a6 f4+ and 5...f8, managing to stop the white pawn.

The game is now quickly over.

2 e3 d6

3 d4 d7

4 c4 c6

5 b4 e5

6 c1+ b6

7 c4 1-0

Even when two pawns down it is vitally important to activate the king and use the power of one's passed pawn. Here is an example of this.

Kozlov – Mikhachishin

USSR 1978
It appears as if White should play 1 $\texttt{AXB}_3$, but then after 1...$\texttt{Ag}_3$ 2 $\texttt{Ad}_4$ $h_5$ the white king is cut off from the black h-pawn, which will proceed to run down the board. In this position White made use of his best chance, paying no attention to the $g_3$-pawn and undistracted by the passed $b_3$-pawn, in order to get optimum use of his e-pawn. In other words:

1 $e_4!!$ $\texttt{AXg}_3$
2 $e_5$ $\texttt{Ag}_6$
2...$h_5$ is met by 3 $e_6$ $h_4$ 4 $e_7$ $\texttt{Ae}_3$
5 $\texttt{Ad}_6$ threatening 6 $\texttt{AXB}_3$.
3 $e_6$ $\texttt{Ad}_3$+
4 $\texttt{Ae}_5$!

White must avoid 4 $\texttt{Ae}_4$? $\texttt{Ad}_2$ 5 $\texttt{AXB}_3$ $\texttt{Af}_6$ 6 $\texttt{Ab}_7$ $\texttt{Ae}_2+$ and now Black wins. The black king must be squeezed, i.e. the shoulder budge!

4 ... $\texttt{Ae}_3+$
5 $\texttt{Ad}_6$ $\texttt{Ad}_3$+
6 $\texttt{Ae}_5$ $h_5$
7 $\texttt{Ab}_8$!

7 $e_7$ is weak due to 7...$\texttt{Af}_7$, but now this advance is threatened.

7 ... $\texttt{Ae}_3+$
8 $\texttt{Ad}_6$ $\texttt{Af}_6$
8...$\texttt{Af}_5$ fails to 9 $e_7$ $h_4$ 10 $\texttt{AXB}_3$
$\texttt{Ae}_1$ 11 $\texttt{Ab}_8$ $h_3$ 12 $e_8\texttt{W}$ $\texttt{Axe}_8$ 13 $\texttt{Axe}_8$ $g_5$ 14 $\texttt{Ah}_8$ $g_4$ 15 $\texttt{Ae}_7$ $\texttt{Af}_4$ 16 $\texttt{Af}_6$ $g_3$ 17 $\texttt{Ah}_4+$!, drawing.

9 $\texttt{Af}_8+$
10 $e_7$ $b_2$
11 $\texttt{Ab}_8$ $\texttt{Af}_6$
12 $\texttt{Af}_8+$!

Of course not 12 $\texttt{AXB}_2$ $\texttt{Ae}_6+$! and Black wins.

12 ... $\texttt{Ag}_5$
13 $\texttt{Ab}_8$ $\texttt{Af}_6$

Draw
The rook's pawn

Van der Wiel – Seirawan
Haninge 1990

1 ... $\text{Nh5}$!
This resembles the manoeuvre Karpov adopted in his game against Knaak, showing that the main task is to position the rook correctly. Pushing the h-pawn straightaway is a serious mistake, which allows White to improve his position substantially by playing $\text{d4-d8-h8-a8}$. Black's plan is to play $...\text{h5-d5-d7}$ followed by $...\text{h7}.$

2 $\text{g4}$ $\text{f7!}$

Retreating the king from the centre looks like a mistake, but the king's main task is to provide back-up support for the h-pawn.

3 $\text{b4}$

After 3 $\text{f4+}$ there would follow 3...$\text{g6}$ 4 $\text{f8}$ $\text{f5}$ 5 $\text{g8+}$ $\text{h5}$ 6 $\text{c4}$ $\text{g5}$ 7 $\text{a8}$ $\text{g7}$ 8 $\text{b5}$ $\text{g5}$ and the h-pawn is ready to bound forwards.

3 $...$ $\text{e5}$

4 $\text{d4}$ $\text{e6!}$

5 $\text{d5}$ $\text{h5!}$

6 $\text{h4}$ $\text{h6}$

The first part of Black's plan is complete, and the rest is achieved with the skilful use of zugzwang.

7 $\text{e5}$ $\text{g6}$

8 $\text{f4}$ $\text{f6!}$

The white king has to cede ground, allowing the black king to go either to the h-pawn, or to attack to White's pawns on the queenside.

9 $\text{g3}$ $\text{e5}$

10 $\text{h3}$ $\text{a6!}$

11 $\text{c4}$ $\text{d5}$

12 $\text{c8}$ $\text{c6}$

13 $\text{a8}$ $\text{b5}$

14 $\text{axb5}$ $\text{axb5}$

15 $\text{a1}$ $\text{c4}$

16 $\text{b1}$ $\text{d4}$

0-1

The next position is a fairly typical endgame.

\textbf{Keitlinghaus – Schmittdier}  
\textit{Prague 1991}

There followed:

1 $\text{g5+}$ $\text{hxg5+}$

2 $\text{hxg5+}$ $\text{e6}$

3 $\text{a6+}$ $\text{e7?}$

The right move was 3...$\text{d5!}$ hindering the white king with the 'shoulder budge'.

4 $\text{a5}$ $\text{f8}$

Better is 4...$\text{a3}$, to which White would reply 5 $\text{e4}$ and 6 $f4$.

5 $\text{e5}$ $\text{g7}$

After 5...$\text{a3}$ White would play 6 $f4$ $\text{a4}$ 7 $f5!$ $\text{gx}f5$ 8 $\text{f6}$.

6 $\text{d5}$ $\text{a3}$

The last chance to attack the f-pawn.

7 $\text{f4}$ $\text{a4}$

8 $\text{c5}$ $\text{xf4}$

9 $\text{d6!}$
An excellent square for the rook. 9...\textit{H}f5 is met by 10 \textit{H}d5.

\begin{align*}
9 & \ldots \quad \textit{H}a4 \\
10 & a6 \quad \textit{H}f8 \\
11 & \textit{H}b6 \quad \textit{H}e7 \\
12 & \textit{H}f6 \quad \textit{H}a1 \\
13 & \textit{H}b7 \quad \textit{H}d1 \\
14 & a7 \quad \textit{H}d7+ \\
15 & \textit{H}a6 \quad \textit{H}d8 \\
16 & \textit{H}b6 \quad 1-0
\end{align*}

Karpov – Knaak
Baden-Baden 1992

Black is counting on kingside counterplay.

\begin{align*}
5 & \quad \textit{K}c2 \quad \textit{H}a8 \\
5...f5 & \text{ is met by } 6 \textit{H}c6+ \textit{H}g7 \ 7 \textit{H}b3 \textit{H}b5+ 8 \textit{H}c3 \textit{H}b1 \ 9 \textit{H}c5, \text{ etc.} \\
6 & \quad \textit{H}b3 \quad \textit{H}b8+ \\
7 & \quad \textit{H}a2 \quad \textit{H}a8
\end{align*}

A more active plan of action was 7...\textit{H}d8 8 \textit{H}c2 \textit{H}d3 9 a4 f5 10 \textit{H}b2 but White is already threatening to push the a-pawn.

8 \textit{H}c4!

Preparing the advance of the a-pawn, however slow, is vital.

\begin{align*}
8 & \ldots \quad f5 \\
9 & a4 \quad \textit{H}f6 \\
10 & \textit{H}a3 \quad \textit{H}e5 \\
11 & \textit{H}c5+ \\
11 h4 & \text{ fails to } 11...g4 12 g3 \textit{H}d6 \\
13 & \textit{H}f4 \textit{H}a5 14 \textit{H}b4 \textit{H}e5 \text{ and it is hard to make progress.} \\
11 & \ldots \quad \textit{H}e4 \\
12 & a5 \quad h4 \\
13 & \textit{H}a4 \quad \textit{H}f4
\end{align*}

The alternative 13...g4 14 hxg4 hxg4 15 \textit{H}h5 loses immediately.

\begin{align*}
14 & \textit{H}c4+ \quad \textit{H}e5 \\
15 & \textit{H}b4 \quad \textit{H}d5 \\
16 & \textit{H}b5+ \quad \textit{H}e4 \\
17 & \textit{H}b6!
\end{align*}

White skillfully edges forward with his passed pawn, depriving Black of any counterplay on the other flank.

\begin{align*}
17 & \ldots \quad \textit{H}f4 \\
18 & a6 \quad g4 \\
19 & \textit{H}a5 \quad g3
\end{align*}

After 19...gxh3 there would also follow the preparatory 20 \textit{H}b4+!, pushing the black king back.
20 \textit{\text{n}b4}+ \textit{\text{e}5}
21 \textit{f3} \textit{f4}
22 \textit{\text{n}e4}+ \textit{\text{f}5}
23 \textit{\text{n}e2} \textit{\text{f}6}
24 \textit{\text{g}b6} 1-0

This is the strength of placing the rook behind the passed pawn: it can also defend from the side.

7 ... \textit{\text{d}d5}
8 \textit{\text{n}e7} \textit{f5}
9 \textit{\text{n}xh7} \textit{\text{x}a4}
10 \textit{\text{g}g7} \textit{\text{a}3}+

Alternatively 10...\textit{\text{a}6} 11 \textit{\text{f}4} and 12 \textit{\text{g}5} ++.

Kholmov – Rasik  
\textit{\text{B}rno 1991}

1 \textit{\text{n}e3}!

White cuts off the opponent’s king and threatens to bring his own to the a3-pawn.

1 ... \textit{\text{c}c5}
2 \textit{\text{n}e1}!

Exploiting this chance of putting his rook behind the passed pawn.

2 ... \textit{\text{a}a5}
3 \textit{\text{a}a1} \textit{\text{e}7}??!

Of course it was worth thinking about 3...\textit{\text{a}a4}, and only then bringing the king in.

4 \textit{a4} \textit{\text{d}d6}
5 \textit{\text{g}g2} \textit{\text{c}5}
6 \textit{\text{f}f3} \textit{\text{d}4}
6...\textit{h}5 is better.

7 \textit{\text{n}e1}!

1 ... \textit{\text{e}6}
2 \textit{\text{h}4}?!

2 \textit{g}4 was better, trying to prevent Black’s plan of freeing his king with ...\textit{f}5.

2 ... \textit{f5}
3 \textit{\text{e}3} \textit{\text{d}5}
4 \textit{\text{d}3} \textit{\text{c}5}
5 \textit{\text{b}7}

White attempts to stop the black king from reaching his passed pawn.

5 ... \textit{a5}
5...b6 is also possible.
6  c3  a6
7  e7  d5
8  b3  e6!

Black has succeeded in diverting the white king to the outside passed pawn and now proceeds to attack the white pawns himself.
9  c7  f4!
10  c3  e4
11  a3  fxg3
12  d3+  e5
13  xg3  f5
14  d5+  e5
15  d3  g4
16  a4  h3
17  e3  e4+
18  xa5  g4

0-1

The correct way of defending is shown in the next game.

**Chernin – Mikhalchishin**  
*USSR 1984*

White intends playing the rook to the third rank, the king to e3, the pawn to f4, followed by the plan in the last game. Therefore Black must start a counter-attack:

1  ...  g5!
2  f3  c2
3  hxg5  hxg5
4  a5!?  

A cunning move: White wants to force ...f6, after which he can play a7 and cut the black king off.

4  ...  h7

Perhaps 4...f8 is a better defence?

5  a4  a2
6  g4

6 e3 is met by 6...g6 followed by ...f5.

6  ...  xf2
7  f5

After 7 xg5 there would follow 7...a2 8 a5 f6 9 b5 g6 and the black rook can then check from the side.

7  ...  a2
8  xf7+  g6
9  a7  a3!

The only move that holds the draw.

10  a6+  g7
11  a7+  h6
12  a6+  g7
13  a5  f7
14  a8  g6
15  a6

15 g8+ is met by 15...h6, when 16 xg5? fails to the reply 16...a4+.

15  ...  a4+
16  f3  a3+
17  e4  h5!
18  d4  Draw
The knight’s pawn

Chekhov – Eingorn
USSR 1984

1 ... \( \text{\#e8} \)

Black has the obvious plan of bringing the king to the b6-pawn. The other possibility 1...h5, also leads to nothing after 2 \( \text{\#b7 \#c6} \) 3 g4 \( \text{\#e8} \) 4 \( \text{\#h7 \#c3} \) 5 \( \text{\#g2 \#xh4} \) 6 \( \text{\#g7 \#c6} \) 7 \( \text{\#g3 \#d8} \) 8 \( \text{\#xg4 \#c8} \) 9 \( \text{\#g5} \) b5 10 \( \text{\#xg6} \), with a draw.

2 \( \text{\#b7} \)

Also strong is 2 g4 h5 3 \( \text{\#b7} \) \( \text{\#c3} \) 4 \( \text{\#g2 \#c6} \) 5 \( \text{\#xh5} \) 6 \( \text{\#h7 \#c5} \) 7 \( \text{\#f3 \#d8} \) 8 \( \text{\#e3} \) b5 9 \( \text{\#b7} \) \( \text{\#c8} \) 10 \( \text{\#h7} \) b4 11 \( \text{\#d4 \#b5} \) 12 \( \text{\#c4 \#b6} \) 13 \( \text{\#c5} \) with a draw.

3 \( \text{\#h7} \)

Now 3 g4 is bad in view of 3...\( \text{\#d8} \) 4 \( \text{\#h7} \) g5! and Black gets a winning position.

3 ... \( \text{\#c3} \)

4 \( \text{\#h2} \) h5

5 g4?

He should have played 5 \( \text{\#g7} \) \( \text{\#c6} \) 6 g4 \( \text{\#d8} \) 7 \( \text{\#g3} \) \( \text{\#c8} \) 8 \( \text{\#xh5} \) gxh5 9 \( \text{\#h7} \) \( \text{\#c5} \) 10 \( \text{\#f3} \) b5 11 \( \text{\#e3} \) and now 11...b4? fails to 12 \( \text{\#d4} \) b3? 13 \( \text{\#xc5} \) b2 14 \( \text{\#c6} \) !+-.

5 ... \( \text{\#c4}! \)

6 \( \text{\#xh5} \) \( \text{\#xh5} \)

7 \( \text{\#g3} \) \( \text{\#xh5} \)

8 \( \text{\#g7} \) \( \text{\#g5} \)

9 \( \text{\#h4} \) \( \text{\#f8}! \)

10 \( \text{\#b7} \) \( \text{\#b5} \)

11 \( \text{\#g4} \) g5

Black won easily.

Mikhalchishin – Losev
Moscow 1974

1 \( \text{\#f1} \) \( \text{\#f7} \)

2 g3

After 2 g4 there would follow 2...\( \text{\#f6} \) 3 \( \text{\#e1} \) \( \text{\#g5} \) 4 \( \text{\#d1} \) \( \text{\#f4} \) 5 \( \text{\#c1} \) \( \text{\#h2} \) 6 \( \text{\#c3} \) \( \text{\#e4} \) 7 b4 \( \text{\#d4} \) 8 \( \text{\#f3} \) \( \text{\#c4} \) and the black king’s mobility seals the draw.

2 ... \( \text{\#h5} \)

3 \( \text{\#e1} \) \( \text{\#f6} \)

4 \( \text{\#d1} \) \( \text{\#h2} \)

5 \( \text{\#h4} \)

Correct was 5 g4 h4 (or 5...hxg4 6 \( \text{\#xg4} \) \( \text{\#g5} \) 7 \( \text{\#e4} \) and the b-pawn runs while the black king is boxed
in) 6 c1 g2 7 b4 g3 8 d2 winning.

5 ... g5!
6 hxg5+ xg5 (D)


7 c1 g4?
Black misses the clever trick 7...f5! 8 b4 h4! 9 gxh4 xh4 with a draw.
8 b4 h4
After 8...h3 9 d2 xg3 10 xg3+ xg3 11 b5 the pawn promotes with check, and a won queen versus pawn endgame results.
9 gxh4 f5
10 b5 xh4
11 b2
Dvoretsky thought this move was a mistake and that 11 c2 b4 12 b3 c4+ 13 d3 c8 14 c3 b8 15 c5+ e6 16 c4 d7 17 b4 was winning, but the mistake occurred not here, but later.

11 ... f4
12 c3?
This is the decisive error. In all his books Dvoretsky missed the fact that 12 d3 e4 13 c3 h5 14 d4+! is winning.

12 ... e5
13 a3 d6
14 b6 d7!
15 c7+ d8
Of course not 15...d6? 16 c8! with the threat of b7.
16 c6 d7
Draw

Bronstein – Romanishin
Erevan 1975
Typical Rook Endgames

62

White has cut off the black king, but it appears that Black can push his h-pawn all the way. White however gets there first.

10 ...  

Better is 4...f5! 5 f4 g5 6 hxg5 hxg5 7 fxg5 g6 8 f4 f2+ 9 f3 g2!, providing a strong counter-attack against the g3-pawn.

5 hxg5 hxg5

White hopes to deprive his opponent of any counterchances, but the best move was 6 f4! f6 7 fxg5+ xg5 8 d4 g4 9 c3 g2 10 b4 and White is winning the pawn ending.

6 ...  

Correct was 6...f5! 7 gxf5 f6 8 f3 xh5 9 d4 f4 10 c3 f2 and now the pawn ending is drawn.

7 d6+  

After 7 f3 e5 there is no obvious way forward.

7 ...  

After 7...e7 there would follow 8 b6 f6 9 f3 and 10 e4.

8 b6 d5

9 f3 b1
9...\textit{c}c5 is met by 10 \textit{f}f6 \textit{x}xb3+ (or 10...\textit{d}d5 11 \textit{f}f5+ \textit{e}e6 12 \textit{h}b5 followed by \textit{d}d3, \textit{c}c3 and \textit{f}f5) 11 \textit{e}e4 \textit{b}b4+ (or 11...\textit{b}b7) 12 \textit{f}f5 and White wins.

10 \textit{d}d3 \textit{c}c5
11 \textit{f}f6! \textit{xb}b3+
Black resigned as all his pawns are lost.

\textbf{Vyzhmanavin – Smyslov}
\textit{Gelsenkirchen 1991}

There followed:

1 ... \textit{g}g5
This looks very logical, but now Black is saddled with a permanent weakness on h6.

2 \textit{h}b6+ \textit{e}e5
3 \textit{h}5 g4+?
3...\textit{c}c2 followed by 4...\textit{c}c3+ is stronger, hindering White’s play on the kingside.

4 \textit{e}e3 \textit{c}c2
5 f4+ \textit{xf}3?
Another possibility is 5...\textit{d}d5, and if 6 \textit{x}xh6 (better is 6 \textit{b}b5+ \textit{d}d6 7 \textit{x}xf5 \textit{g}g2 8 \textit{e}e4 \textit{x}xg3 9 \textit{f}f6+ \textit{e}e7 10 \textit{x}xh6 \textit{xb}3 11 \textit{g}g6 \textit{f}f7 12 \textit{f}f5 g3, although Black has drawing chances) 6...\textit{c}c3+ 7 \textit{f}f2 \textit{c}c2+ 8 \textit{g}g1 \textit{e}e4 and Black is fantastically active.

6 \textit{xf}3 \textit{c}c3+
7 \textit{g}g2 \textit{d}d3
8 \textit{x}xh6! \textit{xb}3
9 \textit{g}g6!
The two versus one ending is very unpleasant for Black, unable to stop the h-pawn with his king stranded on the e-file.

9 ... \textit{h}h2+
Black’s last chance was 9...f4. White would then play 10 \textit{g}g5+ (10 \textit{h}h6 \textit{b}b2+ 11 \textit{h}h3 \textit{b}b1) 10...\textit{e}e4 11 \textit{g}g4 \textit{f}f5 12 \textit{x}xh4+ \textit{g}g5 13 \textit{h}h4 \textit{h}h6 but now the white pawns are blockaded.

10 \textit{h}3 \textit{b}b1
11 \textit{h}4 \textit{h}h1+
12 \textit{g}g5 \textit{g}1
13 \textit{h}6 \textit{h}1
14 \textit{a}a6 \textit{a}1
15 \textit{a}a3 \textit{f}f6
16 \textit{e}e3 \textit{g}2?
Another mistake; it would have been better to play 16...\textit{h}h1 and, if appropriate, 17...\textit{h}h3.

17 \textit{h}7 \textit{g}5
18 \textit{h}6 \textit{a}2
Ftačník gives the line 18...\textit{h}h2 19 \textit{e}e6 \textit{h}h3 20 \textit{g}g6+ \textit{h}5 21 \textit{g}g7 and White wins.

19 \textit{e}e6 \textit{a}3
20 \textit{g}g7 \textit{g}4
21 \textit{f}f6 1-0
A different pawn set-up for the weaker side is considered preferable.
This is a classic position that has been reached many times. Black must go for immediate activity by means of 1...f6 and 2...g5, but instead he played passively:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Black has lost five tempi (!) but now he finally gets on with the correct plan. If he now plays 7...b2 8 d5 g2 is better, attacking the white pawn chain.

7

Black is many tempi behind and White easily queens.

11...

12 c4!

13 b7+

14 d7

15 c5

15...g5 is refuted by 16 hxg5+! xg5 (16...fxg5 is answered by 17 b7 threatening d6+ and b6) 17 d4 intending b4.

16 d6 d1+

17 c7 c1+

18 d8 b1

19 d6! 1-0

If the number of pawns on one wing is increased to four then the stronger side certainly has greater winning chances, but the position can still be defended.

Piket – Tukmakov

Amsterdam 1990

1 h4?

1 g4! is better, immediately creating trouble for Black on the kingside.
1 ... $\textit{g7}$
1...h5? is weak due to 2 $\textit{a}8+$ and 3 $\textit{b}8$, activating Black’s rook.
2 $g3$ $h5$
3 $g2$ $b2$
4 $a8$ $d2$!
It is vital to transfer the rook to a more active position, from where it will defend its pawns and open the way up for the king.
5 $b8$ $d7$
6 $f3$ $f6$
7 $g4$?! White’s last chance was 7 $e4$ $e6$ 8 $f3$ $f5+$ 9 $f4$ $f6$ 10 $g4$
7 ... $hgx4+$
8 $xg4$ $e5$
9 $f8$ $e6$
10 $f3$ $d5$
11 $e4+$ $d4$
12 $g5$ $c7$!
White has no defence to 13...$c4$ and the inevitable advance of the b-pawn.

Romanishin – Razuvaev
Odessa 1974

It is useful to improve the pawn structure.
1 ... $g6$
2 $g2$ $g7$
3 $f4$ $a5$
4 $a6$ $a2$
5 $f3$ $a3+$
6 $f2$ $a1$
7 $a8$ $a2$
8 $f3$ $a3+$
9 $f2$ $a4$
10 $f3$ $a3+$
11 $g2$ $f6$
12 $a7$ $a1$
12...$f5$ fails to 13 $xf7+$ $g4$
14 $f2$ $xg3$ 15 $f6$, etc.

The bishop’s pawn

Beliavsky – M. Gurevich
Groningen 1992

(See diagram on following page)
Black’s position is critical because of the weak b6-pawn.
1 $e6$!
White’s aim is to position his rook on the ideal e3-square.
Typical Rook Endgames

1 ... $\text{f1}$
18 $\text{g2?!}$

White should have played 18 $\text{c6! d4 e6!}$, etc., but now the black king makes it to the corner, forcing White to search for study-like possibilities.

18 ... $\text{d6!}$
19 $\text{a5 a1+}$
20 $\text{a2 h1}$
21 $\text{d2+ c6}$
22 $\text{b2 h8}$
23 $\text{g2 a8}$
24 $\text{g6+ c7}$
25 $\text{a6 c8}$
26 $\text{a3 b8}$
27 $\text{a4 a7}$
28 $\text{a5 b8}$
29 $\text{g7+ a8}$
30 $\text{b7 c8}$

This is what Black was counting on: a- and c-pawns plus stalemate ideas such as 31 $\text{b6 c6+!}$.

31 $\text{b6 a7}$
32 $\text{b5 h8}$
33 $\text{c6 h3}$
34 $\text{c7+ a8}$
35 $\text{a4 h5}$
36 $\text{d7 h8}$

This move loses simply; the last chance was 36...$\text{h6}$, when in order to win White must find 37 $\text{d3! b6}$
38 $\text{a5 b4 d8+ a7}$
39 $\text{d7+ a8}$
40 $\text{d7+ a4+}$
41 $\text{b7 a4+!}$
42 $\text{b5 a5+}$
43 $\text{c6 xa6+}$
44 $\text{xb6 a4}$
45 $\text{b5}$
and White wins.

37 $\text{c7 h5}$
38 $\text{a5 h3}$
39 $\text{b7 h6}$
40 $\text{b6 1-0}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\text{f2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\text{d7}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\text{d6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\text{e6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$\text{h2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$\text{e2+}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$\text{f3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$\text{h2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$\text{f5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$\text{h3+}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$\text{xf4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$\text{e5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$\text{h6!}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$\text{g6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$\text{h6+}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$\text{a3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$\text{h1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$\text{g2?!}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correctly cutting the black king off from the queenside.

13 ... $\text{h2+}$
14 $\text{c3 h3+}$
15 $\text{b2 h2+}$
16 $\text{a3 h1}$

Not a mistake, but simpler is 17 $\text{c6 d4}$
18 $\text{g6 c3}$
19 $\text{g3+}$
20 $\text{f2+ c3}$
21 $\text{a5 a1+}$
22 $\text{a2 b1}$
23 $\text{a4}$
24 $\text{a3+}$. 

Black could make life hard for White after 5...$\text{f6}$, in which case 6 $\text{d5}$ fails to 6...$\text{d2+}$. He would have to play 6 $\text{h3 g6}$
7 $\text{f5+}$
8 $\text{xh6+}!$ 

17 ... $\text{h1}$
18 $\text{g2?!}$

White should have played 18 $\text{c6! d4 e6!}$, etc., but now the black king makes it to the corner, forcing White to search for study-like possibilities.

18 ... $\text{d6!}$
19 $\text{a5 a1+}$
20 $\text{a2 h1}$
21 $\text{d2+ c6}$
22 $\text{b2 h8}$
23 $\text{g2 a8}$
24 $\text{g6+ c7}$
25 $\text{a6 c8}$
26 $\text{a3 b8}$
27 $\text{a4 a7}$
28 $\text{a5 b8}$
29 $\text{g7+ a8}$
30 $\text{b7 c8}$

This is what Black was counting on: a- and c-pawns plus stalemate ideas such as 31 $\text{b6 c6+!}$.

31 $\text{b6 a7}$
32 $\text{b5 h8}$
33 $\text{c6 h3}$
34 $\text{c7+ a8}$
35 $\text{a4 h5}$
36 $\text{d7 h8}$

This move loses simply; the last chance was 36...$\text{h6}$, when in order to win White must find 37 $\text{d3! b6}$
38 $\text{a5 b4 d8+ a7}$
39 $\text{d7+ a8}$
40 $\text{d7+ a4+}$
41 $\text{b7 a4+!}$
42 $\text{b5 a5+}$
43 $\text{c6 xa6+}$
44 $\text{xb6 a4}$
45 $\text{b5}$
and White wins.

37 $\text{c7 h5}$
38 $\text{a5 h3}$
39 $\text{b7 h6}$
40 $\text{b6 1-0}$
Rozentalis – Nijboer
Groningen 1992

1 h4 g5
2 g3 f6!
The best possible pawn structure: now Black always has the threat of ...g5.

3 c4
3 c4 leads to nothing after 3...f1
4 e2 c1.

3 ... f5
4 f4+ e5
5 c4 g5!
6 d4 f1!
7 d2 gxh4
8 gxh4 f5
9 c5 h1
10 d4 f4!
11 d5+ e4
12 hxh5 f3!

At the price of a pawn Black has achieved maximum activity. An old truth in rook endgames: activity always compensates material.

13 c4 xf2
14 d6 f3
15 c5 g3

Draw

Mnatsakanian – Vladimirov
Moscow 1979

1 c5
A more logical plan is 1 d3, followed by h4, f4, f3, g3 and e3 with the idea of making a king breakthrough on the queenside via the d4-square.

1 ... h5!
2 h4 e6
3 f3 g6
4 g3 f6!

As in the previous game, the best plan for Black is to prepare the ...g5 break.

5 e3 d6
6 c8 e5
7 c6 f5
8 c5+ e6
9 c4 d5
10 c7 e5
11 c4 d5
12 d4+ e6
13 d3

White finally understands that there is no other way to play for the win, but Black has already prepared the counterplay.
13 ... g5!
14 hxg5 fxg5
15 f4 h4!
16 gxh4 gxh4
17 e4 e2+
18 f3 c2
19 g4 g2+
20 xh4 f5!

Again Black puts activity above material: although two pawns down his rook and king are very active.

21 h3 f2!
22 g3 xf4
23 d5+ e6

Draw

Miles – Gheorghiu
Ostend 1986

3 h4 a2
4 c4

Miles gives 4 e1 c2 5 f3 and transferring the king to g3 as an alternative, but this seems dubious.
4 ... f8
5 e1?!

5 c5 looks more natural, intending c6, and after defending the pawn with f6, moving the king up to the c6-square.

5 ... e7
6 f1 c2
7 g2 c3
8 f3 c2+
9 g3 f5!

Miles gives this move an exclamation mark, but it was perfectly feasible for Black simply to bide time.

10 d4

After 10 gxf6+ there would follow 10...f7 11 d4 xf6 12 f4 e6 13 e4 c3 14 f4 h5.

10 ... e6
11 f4 c3+?

After 11...e7 White’s best chance would have been 12 h5 gxh5 13 d5 xc4 14 xf5 c1, but this leaves very few winning chances.

12 f2 h3
13 e2 h6

Upon 13...e7 there follows 14 c5 c3 15 d5 with the unpleasant threat of h5 followed by d2-d3.

14 c5! e7
14...xh4 is refuted by 15 c6 hxg5 16 c7 h8 17 d8+–.

15 c6 hxg5
16 hxg5 c3

1 ... a2?!

It is generally a good idea to cut off the opponent’s king, but given White’s unfortunate pawn structure he should have begun an immediate attack against it with 1...h6 2 h4 hxg5 3 hxg5 a2.

2 f4 a5

Black has to make another rook move.
17 \text{c7+} \text{f8}?! \\
9 \text{c7+} \text{f8}?! \\
Not bad, but again this is passive. \\
9...\text{f6} is more logical.

10 \text{c5} \text{e8} \\
11 \text{c6} \text{d8} \\
12 \text{xf7} \text{xc6} \\
13 \text{d2} \text{e8} \\
14 \text{a7} \text{f8}

Cutting the king off with 14...\text{c4} would have been stronger.

15 \text{d3} \text{e6} \\
16 \text{d4} \text{e2} \\
17 \text{f4} \text{e8} \\
18 \text{f5} \text{xf5} \\
19 \text{a5} \text{e4} \\
20 \text{d3} \text{g4} \\
21 \text{xf5+} \text{g7}

Draw

\text{Khivitsky – Vasiukov} \\
\text{Erevan 1954}

1 \text{h4} \\
An interesting alternative is 1 g4 and 2 h4, preventing Black’s defensive set-up.

1 ... \text{h5} \\
2 \text{c6} \text{f8} \\
3 \text{c7} \text{g7} \\
4 \text{g2} \text{f6} \\
5 \text{f1}

It would have been stronger to push the pawn from c4 to c6 and only then trying to activate the white king.

5 ... \text{c2} \\
6 \text{e1} \text{g7}?! \\
This is somewhat passive; more attractive is 6...\text{e6}.

7 \text{c8} \text{f6} \\
8 \text{c6+} \text{e7}

\text{Khivitsky – Vasiukov} \\
\text{Erevan 1954}

1 \text{c6}?! \\
This move is a decisive error. In such positions it is always best to cut off the opponent’s king, here by playing 1 \text{c7}. After 1...\text{g5+} 2 \text{f5} Black has the following possibilities:
a) 2...\textit{g1} 3 \textit{xc2} \textit{xc3} 4 \textit{c6+} \textit{h7} 5 f4 g4 6 f5 can only be dangerous for Black.

b) 2...g4 3 f4 h4 4 gxh4 g3 5 \textit{xc6+} \textit{g7} (5...\textit{h5} 6 \textit{c8} 6 \textit{c7+} \textit{f8} 7 \textit{f6} \textit{e8} 8 \textit{e7+}! \textit{d8} 9 \textit{e2}, and by attacking from the side instead of from behind, White secures the draw.

c) 2...h4 3 g4 h3 4 \textit{xc6+} \textit{g7} 5 \textit{c7+} \textit{f8} 6 \textit{f6} \textit{e8} 7 \textit{e7+} \textit{d8} 8 \textit{e2} and again this can only be dangerous for Black, facing the loss of his g5-pawn.

Back to the game:

1 ... \textit{g7}
2 \textit{g5} \textit{f7}
3 \textit{f4} \textit{e7}
4 \textit{e3} g5
5 \textit{d2} \textit{f1}
6 \textit{xc2}

The pawn endgame arising after 6 \textit{xc2} \textit{f2+} is lost for White because of the potential passed h-pawn.

6 ... \textit{xf3}
7 \textit{h6} \textit{xf3}
8 \textit{h5} \textit{xh5}
9 \textit{d2} \textit{xf5}
10 \textit{e2} \textit{g4}
11 \textit{h1}

Alternatively 11 \textit{h8} \textit{xf3} 12 \textit{h1} \textit{f4} 13 \textit{f1} \textit{xh1} 14 \textit{xf1} \textit{xf3} or 11 \textit{f2} \textit{f3}+! 12 \textit{g2} \textit{e3} 13 \textit{xf3} \textit{h4}, with a winning position for Black in both cases.

11 ... \textit{g2+}
0-1

Defensive difficulties can also arise when the material is level.

\textbf{Mikhalchishin – Basin}

\textit{Minsk 1985}

1 ... \textit{f4}
2 \textit{c5}?! An inaccuracy: it is always best to cramp the enemy king. Therefore he should have played 2 \textit{d5} \textit{f5} 3 \textit{c2}, although after 3...\textit{e8} 4 \textit{c7} \textit{e8} 5 \textit{d6} \textit{e4} 6 \textit{d7} \textit{h8} 7 \textit{c8} \textit{xc8} 8 \textit{xc8} \textit{f3} 9 \textit{xf3}+ \textit{xf3} 10 \textit{e6} g3 11 h3 \textit{e2} 12 \textit{e5} \textit{h3} 13 \textit{f4} g2 the position is drawn.

2 ... \textit{e5}
3 \textit{d6} \textit{h7}
4 \textit{c7} \textit{xc7}!

Black is losing after 4...\textit{h8} 5 \textit{c6} \textit{c8} 6 \textit{e8} \textit{xc8}+ 7 \textit{xf3} \textit{e3} 8 \textit{g3} \textit{xg3} 9 \textit{h3} 10 \textit{e8}+ \textit{d3} 11 \textit{d6} \textit{f2} 12 \textit{f8} \textit{e2} 13 \textit{e5}, etc.

5 \textit{e7} \textit{f3}
6 \textit{xf3}

If White plays 6 \textit{g3} there would follow 6...\textit{xg3} 7 \textit{hxg3} \textit{e4} 8 \textit{e6} \textit{e3} 9 \textit{d1} \textit{f2} 10 \textit{e5} \textit{b5} 11 \textit{e2} \textit{g3} 12 \textit{e3} \textit{e2} 13 \textit{g2} 14 \textit{h1} \textit{h2} 15 \textit{f3} (15 \textit{f1} is met by 15...\textit{h1} =) 15...\textit{f1}+! 16 \textit{xf1} \textit{g2} 17 \textit{f2} \textit{h1} drawing.
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bxc6
f2
'itfg3
<ritg5!
6
7
\[d6
\[e4!

Not 7...\[f4? because of 8 \[d4+ \[e3 9 \[e5! f2 10 \[f4 \[e2 11 \[f5 winning.

8 h3 \[e3
9 \[d1 \[e2
10 \[a1 f2
11 \[e5 f1\[w
12 \[xf1 \[xf1
13 \[f4 \[f2
14 \[g4 \[e3
15 \[xh4 \[f4

Draw

Balashov – Salov
Lvov 1984

\[h3 f5
\[a3?!

An inaccuracy, although not a decisive mistake. Simpler is 2 \[c3 or 2 \[d3 followed by playing the rook to the seventh rank.

\[a6
\[d3 \[f6
\[c4?

White could have scored an easy draw with 4 \[d7 \[e7 5 \[xe7 \[xe7

6 \[e3 \[e6 7 \[f4 b5 8 c3 followed by b3 and c4.

4 ...
5 c5?!

He should have played 5 b4 intending 6 b5.

5 ...
6 b4 f4
7 a4 \[g4
8 b5 f3
9 \[d6

White has no time to play 9 bxa6 f2! 10 a7 f1\[w 11 a8\[w \[e2+ giving Black a mating attack.

9 ...

A good plan. Now White cannot easily find a satisfactory way of sacrificing his rook for Black’s passed pawn.

10 c6 bxc6
11 \[xc6

If 11 bxc6, then 11...f2 12 \[f6 \[g3 13 \[g6+ \[f3 14 \[f6+ \[g2 15 \[g6+ \[f1 16 \[f6 \[g7! 17 \[d3 \[g2 18 \[c4 f1\[w+ 19 \[xf1 \[xf1 20 \[b5 =.

11 ...
12 \[f6 \[g3
13 \[g6+?

A definite mistake: after 13 b6 \[g2 14 \[g6+ \[f1 15 \[f6 \[e2+ 16 \[c3 Black cannot make progress.

13 ...
14 \[f6+ \[g2
15 \[g6+ \[f1
16 b6 \[e2+!
17 \[d1 \[b2!

Given the fatal zugzwang, White resigned. If 18 \[c1 there follows 18...\[e1, and upon 18 \[f6 there is
the simple 18... g2 19 g5+ f3
20 f6+ e3 21 e6+ d3 22 d6+ c3 23 f6 d2+ 24 c1 e2.

The central pawn

Ghitescu – Rajković
Skopje 1984

The central pawn deserves serious attention, as Black holds the position by tactical means.

4 e2+

The Dutch chess player Peter Boel noted in *New in Chess* magazine (no. 2, 1993) that the pawn endgame after 4 d5+! xxd5 5 xxd5 xxd5 6 g5 e5 (6... e6 7 f4 e7 8 f5 gxf5 9 xh5 ++) 7 f3 d4 8 f6 is easily won for White.

4 ... d6
5 b2 e6
6 e4 a1

Black is making unnecessary moves; 6... a4 7 b5 a2 is more logical, immediately attacking the white pawns.

7 d5+ f6

7... e7 looks more logical, pushing the white rook into a less favourable position after 8 b7+ f6. In this position 9 d6 fails to 9... d1 10 d7 e6, but 9 d4 is better, transposing into the Schmidt-Pytel game on the following page.

8 d2 e7
9 d6+

In the game White played 9 e5?

ECE Ghitescu makes no comment on this move, although the continuation 3... f6 4 b2 a6 5 e4 a4 6 b6+ e7 7 b7+ e6 8 g7 a5! deserves serious attention, as Black holds the position by tactical means.

1 a2!

One of the most important plans for the side a central pawn up is to place the rook behind the passed pawn. The enemy rook and king can be deflected into stopping the passed pawn, during which time the king can try to attack the enemy pawns.

1 ... e6
2 d2 a1

If Black plays 2... e1+, the following manoeuvre is decisive: 3 f4 d5 4 g5 e6 5 h6 d6 6 g7 f5 7 h6 e6 8 g5.

3 f4 a5

In *ECE* Ghitescu makes no comment on this move, although the continuation 3... f6 4 b2 a6 5 e4 a4 6 b6+ e7 7 b7+ e6 8 g7 a5! deserves serious attention, as Black holds the position by tactical means.

4 e2+

The Dutch chess player Peter Boel noted in *New in Chess* magazine (no. 2, 1993) that the pawn endgame after 4 d5+! xxd5 5 xxd5 xxd5 6 g5 e5 (6... e6 7 f4 e7 8 f5 gxf5 9 xh5 ++) 7 f3 d4 8 f6 is easily won for White.

4 ... d6
5 b2 e6
6 e4 a1

Black is making unnecessary moves; 6... a4 7 b5 a2 is more logical, immediately attacking the white pawns.

7 d5+ f6

7... e7 looks more logical, pushing the white rook into a less favourable position after 8 b7+ f6. In this position 9 d6 fails to 9... d1 10 d7 e6, but 9 d4 is better, transposing into the Schmidt-Pytel game on the following page.

8 d2 e7
9 d6+

In the game White played 9 e5?

ECE Ghitescu makes no comment on this move, although the continuation 3... f6 4 b2 a6 5 e4 a4 6 b6+ e7 7 b7+ e6 8 g7 a5! deserves serious attention, as Black holds the position by tactical means.
17 \( \text{h5} \)  \( \text{e5} \) 
18 \( \text{g5} \)
White wins easily.

D. Schmidt – Pytel  
1970/71

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{W} & \text{B} \\
\text{K} & \text{K}
\end{array}
\]

1 \( \text{b3} \) 
This is a fairly slow plan, but there is no obvious difference in 1 \( \text{c3} \). 

1 … \( \text{e7} \) 
2 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{h5} \) 
3 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{a1} \)?
Kantorovich’s question mark. He prefers 3... \( \text{d6} \) 4 \( \text{b6}+ \) \( \text{e7} \):

a) 5 \( \text{b7}+ \) \( \text{e6} \) 6 \( \text{d5}+ \) \( \text{xd5} \) 7 \( \text{xf7} \) \( \text{d1} \) and the ending is drawn.

b) White should play 5 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{a3} \) 6 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 7 \( \text{b7}+ \) \( \text{f6} \) 8 \( \text{b5} \) (not 8 \( \text{d6} \) in view of 8... \( \text{d6} \) 9 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{g3} \) 10 \( \text{e5} \)!) 9 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{e7} \) 10 \( \text{d8}+ \) \( \text{xd8} \) 11 \( \text{xf7} \) \( \text{a3} \) and it is not obvious how White can win.

8... \( \text{d6} \) 9 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{g3} \) 10 \( \text{xf7}+ \) \( \text{f4} \) 11 \( \text{d8} \) \( \text{e4} \) and again Black holds the draw.

4 \( \text{b7}+ \) \( \text{f6} \) 
5 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{c1}+ \) 
6 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d1}+ \)

According to Kantorovich, Black can draw by 6... \( \text{g1} \). However after 7 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{xg3} \) 8 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{d3} \) (8... \( \text{c3}+ \) 9 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{d3}+ \) 10 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{d4} \) 11 \( \text{b8} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 12 \( \text{d7} \) is in fact winning; instead 10... \( \text{c3}+ \) 11 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{c4} \) transposes to the variation in the game) 9 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{f5} \) 10 \( \text{xf7}+ \) \( \text{g4} \) 11 \( \text{f6} \) White is winning.

7 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{d3} \)
8 \( \text{c6} \)

D. Schmidt awards this a double exclamation mark, but 8 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{xg3} \) 9 \( \text{e7} \)! intending \( \text{e5-d5} \) is better.

A better try is 10... \( \text{c4} \)!, after which White has the following winning attempts:

a) 11 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 12 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{xh4} \) 13 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{d4} \) =.

b) 11 \( \text{b8} \) \( \text{xh4} \) 12 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{xh4} \) 13 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{d4} \) 14 \( \text{d8}+ \) \( \text{xd8} \) 15 \( \text{xf4} \) 16 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{d4} \) 17 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{d4} \) 18 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{d4} \) =.

c) 11 \( \text{d8} \) \( \text{xf4} \) (not 11... \( \text{f5} \) because of 12 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 13 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{d4} \) 14 \( \text{d7} \) winning) 12 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{d4} \) 13 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{b7} \) \( \text{f5} \) 14 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{d4} \) 15 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{c4}+ \) 16 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{b4} \) 17 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{b8} \) 18 \( \text{d8}+ \) \( \text{xd8} \) 19 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{e4} \) and again Black holds the draw.
In the game Black was forced to resign after:

11 $\textsf{b5+!} \ \textsf{xf4}$
12 $\textsf{g5!} \ \textsf{f5}$
13 $\textsf{xg6} \ \textsf{e4}$
14 $\textsf{e6} \ \textsf{f4}$
15 $\textsf{d7} \ \textsf{d3}$
16 $\textsf{e7!} \ \textsf{e5}$
17 $\textsf{e6+}$

This game shows that it is very dangerous for the weaker side to transfer his king to the c-file.

Novikov - Gavrikov
Lvov 1987

White has a permanent weakness on h3, and this proves sufficiently serious to determine the outcome of the game.

1 $\ldots \ \textsf{d4}$

Gavrikov himself views this as an inaccuracy, preferring 1...$\textsf{e7} \ 2 \textsf{f4}$ $\textsf{gxf4} \ 3 \textsf{h8} \ \textsf{d2+} \ 4 \textsf{f3} \ \textsf{d3+} \ 5 \textsf{g2} \ \textsf{g3+} \ 6 \textsf{h2} \ \textsf{f3} \ 7 \textsf{hxh4} \ \textsf{f2}$ and Black wins.

2 $\textsf{e8} \ \textsf{a4}$
3 $\textsf{g8} \ \textsf{a5}$
4 $\textsf{b8}$

After 4 $\textsf{h8}$ Black can transpose to the plan in the game with 4...$\textsf{b5} \ 5 \textsf{g8} \ \textsf{e6}$.

4 $\ldots \ \textsf{e6}$
5 $\textsf{e8+} \ \textsf{d7}$
6 $\textsf{e4} \ \textsf{f6}$
7 $\textsf{b4} \ \textsf{a2}$
8 $\textsf{b3} \ \textsf{e2!}$
9 $\textsf{b7+}$

After 9 $\textsf{f3}$ Black should play the rook to e6, then push the d-pawn using king as back-up support.

9 $\ldots \ \textsf{c6}$
10 $\textsf{f7} \ \textsf{e6}$
11 f4

This is White's only counterplay.

11 $\ldots \ \textsf{gxf4}$
12 $\textsf{f3} \ \textsf{d5}$
13 $\textsf{xf4} \ \textsf{d4}$
14 $\textsf{f8} \ \textsf{d3}$
15 $\textsf{d8} \ \textsf{d6}$
16 $\textsf{c8+}$

Simplifying into a pawn endgame was also hopeless after 16 $\textsf{xd6+} \ \textsf{xd6} \ 17 \textsf{e3} \ \textsf{e5} \ 18 \textsf{xd3} \ \textsf{f4} \ 19 \textsf{d4} \ \textsf{g3} \ 20 \textsf{e4} \ \textsf{hxh3} \ 21 \textsf{f3} \ \textsf{h2} \ 22 \textsf{f2} \ \textsf{h3}$, etc.

16 $\ldots \ \textsf{b5}$
17 $\textsf{c1} \ \textsf{d2}$
18 $\textsf{d1} \ \textsf{c4}$
19 g5 $\textsf{fxg5+}$
20 $\textsf{xg5} \ \textsf{d4}$

0-1

Ermenkov - Castro
Linares 1979

(See diagram on following page)

1 $\ldots \ \textsf{h5}$
2 $\textsf{f3} \ \textsf{b5}$
19 ... $f5$
20 $e3$ g5!
20...g2 is not entirely successful due to 21 f4! $xg3$ 22 $d1!$ and Black is in difficulties.
21 $hxg5$ fxg5
22 f4 g4 (D)
22...$xg3$ 23 fxg5 h4 24 $d1!$ $e5+$ 25 $d4$ is no improvement.

$e4$

An alternative defensive possibility is 23 $d3$, after which 23...$f8$
24 $f2$ $a8$ 25 $b3$ (or 25 f5 $a5!$
+−) 25...$a2+$ 26 $g1$ (or 26 $f1$
h4 27 gxh4+ $h2!$ and now there is no stopping the g-pawn) 26...$g2+$
(26...h4 no longer works after 27
$gxh4+ g3$ 28 $b1!$ drawing) 27 $h1$
$xc3$ 28 $xc3+ $xc3$ 29 f5 $f2$
30 f6 g3 leads to Black giving mate.
23 ... $f8$
24 $d3$ h4!
25 $gxh4+$ g3
26 $f3$

The continuation 26 f5 does not
save White because of 26...$g4$ 27
$d6$ $e8+$ 28 $d3$ (or 28 $e6$
$xe6+$ 29 fxe6 g2 and the white
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queen is skewered after the check) 28...\( \text{xf5} \) 29 h5 \( \text{g8} \) ++.

26 .... \( \text{g2} \)
27 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{g8} \)
28 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{h2} \)
29 \( \text{xg2} \)

Alternatively 29 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{g4} \) ++.

29 .... \( \text{exg2} \)
30 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{h3} \)
31 h5 \( \text{g1} \)
32 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{h4} \)
33 h6 \( \text{f1} \+)
34 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{g5} \)
35 h7 \( \text{xf5} \+)

Black gets on with the main task of weakening White’s pawn structure. After ...\( \text{b4} \) and ...\( \text{c4} \) White will sooner or later have to exchange on g5.

14 \( \text{hxg5} \) \text{fxg5}
15 \( \text{a4} \) \text{b8}!

Intending ...\( \text{h8} \) and ...\( \text{h4} \).

16 \( \text{f3} \)

Anything but this; now White’s second rank is fatally weak.

16 .... \( \text{b2} \)
17 \( \text{f1} \)

Paying the price for his 16th move. 17 \( \text{e3} \) fails to 17 ...\( \text{g2} \) so the white king is banished to the first rank.

17 .... \( \text{c2} \)

Black can afford to ignore 18 \( \text{g4} \), which is refuted by 18 ...\( \text{hxg4} \)
19 \( \text{exg4} \) (19 \( \text{fxg4} \+) \( \text{e5} \) intending ...

\( \text{c4} \) and ...

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

\( \text{c4} \) 20 \( \text{g2} \)

\( \text{f4} \) ++.

18 \( \text{g1} \) (D)

18 .... \( \text{e5} \)

Stronger is 18 ...

\( \text{c4} \) 19 \( \text{a8} \) \( \text{g4} \)!
20 \( \text{f8} \+) \( \text{e5} \) 21 \( \text{fxg4} \) \( \text{hxg4} \) 22 \( \text{f2} \)
 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{c3} \+)

23 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{d4} \)

and the king then reaches c4, as we have shown in many games.

19 \( \text{f4} \+) \text{xf4}
20 \( \text{xf4} \)

Better was 20 ...\( \text{xf4} \)
21 \( \text{f5} \)

\( \text{d4} \)

\( \text{c5} \) 22 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{g4} \) 23 \( \text{g2} \) with the

---

Van Riemsdijk – Brendel
Biel 1993

1 .... \( \text{h5} \)
2 \( \text{f4} \+) \( \text{e6} \)
3 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{a8} \)

Advancing the pawn would at the moment be premature, so Black switches to the normal plan.

4 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{a3} \+)
5 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{b3} \)
6 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{b1} \)
7 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{f6} \)

0-1
idea of countering 23...h4 with 24 f5+.

20 ... d4
21 ♕f1 d3?

Here Black should have played 21...♖h2! to reply to 22 ♗g1 (or 22 ♗e1 ♗d5! and the black king gets to the d-pawn via c3 with unstoppable threats, while the pawn ending with the pawn on d4 is lost) with 22...♗e2! 23 ♘h4 d3 24 ♙xh5+ ♗e4 and Black wins.

22 ♗e1! ♗e2+
23 ♗d1 ♗e4
24 ♘h4!

This is what Black missed: the pawn ending is now drawn.

Finally a position with reduced material.

Diaz – A. Rodriguez
Bayamo 1991

1 ♙b2!

Again we see the plan of positioning the rook behind the passed pawn which simultaneously defends the pawns on the second rank.

1 ... ♕f5
2 ♕e2!? ♕f1+

Black manages to avoid the transparent ‘cheapo’ 2...♗xe2? 3 g4+, winning for White.

3 ♗e3 ♗e6
4 ♗d3+ ♗d6
5 ♙a2 ♙d1+
6 ♗e4 ♗e1+
7 ♗f5 ♗f1+?

Rodriguez’s question mark; he prefers 7...♗g1, hitting the g-pawn. White would have to defend temporarily with the rook, playing 8 h4 ♗d5 9 ♙d2.

8 ♗g5 ♗f7 (D)
9...\( \text{d5} \) 10 \( \text{h8} \)! is unpleasant.

10 \( \text{h8} \) \( \text{b5}^+ \)

11 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{h6} \)

12 \( \text{g8} \) \( \text{g5} \)

Clearly better than the passive 12...\( \text{b7} \) 13 \( \text{f5} \).

13 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{e6} \)

14 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{d5} \)

15 \( \text{e4} \)

Alternatively 15 \( \text{xg7} \) \( \text{xd4}^+ \) 16 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{a4} \) 17 \( \text{g6}^+ \) \( \text{e5} \) gives Black good counterplay.

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

16 \( \text{e8}^+ \)

A different plan is 16 \( \text{a8} \), intending 17 \( \text{a6}^+ \) \( \text{f7} \) 18 \( \text{d5} \) and 19 \( \text{e5} \), and White has excellent winning chances.

16 ... \( \text{f7} \) (D)

17 \( \text{a8} \)

17 \( \text{c8}! \) looks stronger.

17 ... \( \text{e7}^+ \)

18 \( \text{d3}! \)

After 18 \( \text{d5} \) Rodriguez gives the following variation: 18...\( \text{d7}^+ \) 19 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{c7}^+ \) 20 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{e7}! \) threatening ...\( \text{e4} \).

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

18...\( \text{e1} \) is a strong alternative, taking advantage of the first opportunity to attack.

19 \( \text{a6}^+ \) \( \text{d5} \)

20 \( \text{a5}^+ \) \( \text{d6} \)

21 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{e1}^? \)

After the correct 21...\( \text{b7} \) 22 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e7}^+ \) 23 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{f7} \) 24 \( \text{d5} \) White advances his d-pawn.

22 \( \text{f7} \) \( \text{g6} \)

22...\( \text{e6} \) 23 \( \text{xg7} \) \( \text{f6} \) 24 \( \text{h7} \) \( \text{g6} \) 25 \( \text{a7} \) \( \text{g1} \) 26 \( \text{h5}^+ \) is winning.

23 \( \text{e6}^+ \) \( \text{d5} \)

24 \( \text{xg6} \) \( \text{h1} \)

25 \( \text{xh6} \) \( \text{h3}^+ \)

26 \( \text{c2} \) 1-0

Somewhat surprising is the feeble plan that White adopts in the following game.

Gelfand – Timman

*Linares 1993*

There followed:

1 \( \text{e1}^? \)

1 \( \text{c3}! \) is clearly better, freeing the way for the king and aiming for the D.Schmidt-Pytel game.
1 ... $\text{Ha4!}$
2 $\text{Ad1}$ $\text{Ha3!}$

Now White's king is restricted.

3 g4?
3 $\text{Ad2}$ is better, with the idea of transferring the king to e2, and then playing $\text{Ad3}$.

3 ... $\text{Fe7}$
4 $\text{Fe1+}$ $\text{Fd6}$
5 h4?

Again 5 f3 or the immediate 5 $\text{Fe4}$ is better.

5 ... $\text{Fd3}$
6 $\text{Fe4}$ g5!
7 h5 $\text{Fd5}$
8 $\text{Fe8}$ $\text{Xxd4}$
9 $\text{Fg3}$ $\text{Ff4}$
10 $\text{Fa8}$ $\text{Ff6}$

White has lost his d4-pawn and has no real winning chances left.
4 Various Rook Endgames

The Riddle of Duchamp

Marcel Duchamp is an enigmatic figure both in the world of chess and in the world of art. Art historians to this day argue about his place in the hierarchy of contemporary art, and chess players find it hard to understand why a successful artist threw down his brush to become a professional chess player for thirty years. Duchamp played for France in the Olympics four times, published an endgame book about the theory of corresponding squares with the well-known theoretician V. Halberstadt, and featured his favourite game in many of his pictures, the majority of which are displayed in famous museums such as the New York Museum of Modern Art and the Paris National Museum. He composed one enigmatic study but never gave the solution. In the 1980s the magazine *Chess Life and Review* published a discussion with the participation of Grandmaster Larry Evans, reaching the conclusion that there is no win. The author of an article in the Soviet magazine *64* from 1990 came to the same conclusion: there is no solution. We believe, however, that the truth of the riddle of Duchamp can be found.

Duchamp

White has three possibilities: A) 1 e4; B) 1 g7+; C) 1 e3.

A) 1 e4 h4 2 d5 (or 2 g7+ f2 3 h7 h3 4 xh3 xh7 5 f3+ {White also gets nowhere with 5 b3 b6 6 d5 f5 7 c5 b8 8 b6 f4, etc.} 5...g2 6 f5 g3 7 d5 g4 8 c6 f7 and Black secures a draw by pushing the f-pawn) 2...h3 3 c6 h2 4 g7+ f2 5 h7 g2 6 c7 g8 7 b8 w x8 8 x8 h1 w 9 xh1 xh1 10 b6 f5 11 b7 f4 12 c7 f3 13 b8 w f2 and Black can draw.

B) 1 g7+ f2
2 h7 h4
If 2...e2, then 3 e4 with the unstoppable threat of d5 and c6, and if 3...d8 then 4 d7! opens the way for the king.

White now has a further choice:

3 hx4

Two other moves need examination:

a) After 3 e4 h3, both 4 d5 and 4 hx3 lead to a draw as in variation A.

b) 3 f5 h3!? (after 3...g3 4 e6 h3 5 d5 h2 6 c7 g8 7 b8 wxb8 8 xb8 f5 9 b6 f4 10 b7 f3 11 c8 f2 12 b8 w+ and White wins) 4 e6 g2 5 d6 h2 (also not bad is 5...f5 6 c7 g8 7 b8 wxb8 8 xb8 f4 9 b6 f3 10 g7+! f2! 11 b7 h2 12 h7 g2 13 c8 h1 w with a draw, or 10 b7 f2 11 a8 f1 w 12 b8 w wa6+! forcing the exchange of queens, after which h-pawn against rook is drawn) 6 c7 g8 7 b8 w xb8 8 xb8 h1 w 9 xh1 xh1 10 b6 f5 11 b7 f4 12 c7 f3 13 b8 w f2 draw.

3... wxb7

4 h2+ e1

5 wxb2 (D)

Now Black has two possibilities:

a) 5...b6 6 e3 e6+! (the alternatives are bad: 6...d1 7 d4 c1 8 c5! b8 9 f2 and White pushes the b-pawn and wins by threatening the f-pawn; if 6...f1 then 7 f2+ g1 8 f5 g2 9 d4 g3 10 c5 e6 11 b6 is winning) 7 d4 d6+ (if 7...f5, then 8 b6 f4 9 b7 e8 10 b8 w xb8 11 xb8 f3 12 e3 ++) 8 c5 (the cunning 8 e4 fails for other reasons, namely 8...b6 9 d5 f5 10 c5 b8 11 b4 e2 12 f4 f8! 13 b6 e3, etc.) 8...d8 9 b6 (if 9 b4, then 9...f5 10 f4 f8 11 b6 e2 reaching the last variation) 9...f5 10 b7 f4 11 b8 w xb8 12 xb8 f3 13 c4 f2 is a theoretical draw.

b) 5...d1 6 b6 c1 7 b5 c2 8 e4 f5+! (the only move; Black loses after 8...c3 9 d5 f5 10 c6) 9 d5 (if 9 xf5, then 9...c3 10 e5 c4 and the black king reaches the b6-pawn before the white king) 9...d3 (also playable is 9...f4) 10 c6 xb6+! 11 xb6 f4 12 d5 f3 13 b3+ e2 14 e4 f2 again arriving at a theoretical draw.

C) 1 e3 h4

2 g7+ f1

3 f3 e1!

White wins beautifully in the variation 3...h3 4 h7 g1 5 c7! h2 6 c2+ g1 7 c1+ h2 8 b1!! xb7 9 b6 f5 10 f2 f4 11 f3 d7 12 b7 d3+ 13 xf4 d8 14 b8 w xb8 15 xb8 g2 16 b2+, etc.
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4 b6 h3
5 \( \texttt{h7} \) (D)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
4 \text{ b6 } h3 \\
5 \texttt{h7} \\
\end{array}
\]

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

5 \ldots f5

The best move. The other two lines are clearly worse.

a) 5...h2 6 \texttt{h}2 \texttt{e}7 7 \texttt{e}3!
\texttt{e}7+ 8 \texttt{d}4 f5 9 \texttt{b}2 \texttt{b}7 10 \texttt{e}5 \texttt{d}1 11 \texttt{x}f5 \texttt{c}1 12 \texttt{b}5 \texttt{c}2 13 \texttt{e}5 \texttt{c}3 14 \texttt{d}5 winning.

b) 5...\texttt{d}2 6 \texttt{e}4 h2 7 \texttt{h}2+ \texttt{c}3 8 \texttt{d}5 \texttt{h}7 9 \texttt{c}6 and now 9...\texttt{f}7 10 \texttt{f}7 11 \texttt{h}4! \texttt{d}3 12 \texttt{a}4! \texttt{b}8 13 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{f}8 14 \texttt{c}7 \texttt{f}7+ 15 \texttt{b}6 \texttt{f}8 16 \texttt{a}7 or 9...\texttt{b}8 10 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{f}8 11 \texttt{d}5! f5 (11...\texttt{d}8+ 12 \texttt{c}5! \texttt{f}8 13 \texttt{b}7 threatening \texttt{x}f6) 12 \texttt{b}7 \texttt{d}3 13 \texttt{x}f3+! \texttt{f}2 14 \texttt{b}3 f4 15 \texttt{e}4! f3 16 \texttt{e}3+ \texttt{d}2 17 \texttt{x}f3+ winning.

6 \texttt{e}3

White has one other winning attempt: 6 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{d}2 7 \texttt{x}f5 (the other two possibilities are unpromising: 7 \texttt{e}5 f4! and then 8 \texttt{d}6 f3 9 \texttt{c}7 f2 10 \texttt{h}7 \texttt{x}b7+ 11 \texttt{x}b7 \texttt{e}1, once again a draw, or 8 \texttt{x}f4 h2 9 \texttt{x}h2+ \texttt{c}3 10 \texttt{h}7 \texttt{d}4 and Black destroys all the white pawns; 7 \texttt{x}h3

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\texttt{Axb7} 8 \texttt{h}6 \texttt{f}7 9 \texttt{c}6 \texttt{d}3 10 \texttt{c}7 \texttt{f}6 11 \texttt{b}7 \texttt{b}6 12 \texttt{xf}5 \texttt{d}4 leads to a theoretical draw) 7...h2! (but not 7...\texttt{c}3?, given in 64, because of 8 \texttt{c}5 h2 9 \texttt{d}6 \texttt{h}7 10 \texttt{h}3+! \texttt{b}4 11 \texttt{c}6 winning) 8 \texttt{h}2+ \texttt{c}3, transposing to the drawn variation shown above.

6 \ldots \texttt{d}1! (D)

If 6...\texttt{f}1 then 7 \texttt{x}h3 \texttt{h}7 8 \texttt{h}6 \texttt{f}7 9 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{f}2 10 \texttt{e}6+ \texttt{f}8 11 \texttt{b}7 \texttt{b}8 12 \texttt{e}7, etc. is winning.

7 \texttt{d}3

White has another possibility: 7 \texttt{d}4 f4 (Black should play 7...h2 8 \texttt{c}5 \texttt{h}7 9 \texttt{x}h2 \texttt{f}4! 10 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{f}7 11 \texttt{c}6 \texttt{e}1 =) 8 \texttt{c}5 f3 9 \texttt{x}h3 f2 10 \texttt{h}1+ (10 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{e}2 11 \texttt{x}f2+ \texttt{x}f2 12 \texttt{c}6 \texttt{h}8 13 \texttt{b}5 \{ or 13 \texttt{c}7 \texttt{h}7+ 14 \texttt{b}8 \texttt{h}3! drawing\} 13...\texttt{e}3 14 \texttt{a}6 \texttt{d}4 15 \texttt{a}7 \texttt{c}5 is also a draw) 10...\texttt{e}2 11 \texttt{c}6 \texttt{g}8 12 \texttt{b}5 \texttt{g}1 13 \texttt{b}8 \texttt{x}h1 14 \texttt{w}5+ winning.

7 \ldots \texttt{e}1

8 \texttt{d}4 h2

9 \texttt{x}h2 \texttt{xb}7

10 \texttt{b}2 \texttt{d}1
Worse is 10...f4 11 e4 d1 12 xf4 e1 13 b5 winning, as in the variations above.

11 e5

After 11 d3 d7+ 12 e3 b7 13 d2+ c1 14 d6 c2 15 d4 f4! 16 e4 (or 16 c5 f7 17 c6 f3 18 b7 f2 19 b8 f1 and White has no checks) 16...c3 17 d5 f7 18 c6+ d3 the position is clearly drawn.

11 ...
12 b4!
13 d6

After 13...f4, 14 c6 f7 15 b7 is winning.

14 e6! b8

It is not hard to prove that the pawn ending is lost.

15 f4 f8
16 b7

White wins. However if Black plays 12...d2! 13 d6 e3! he manages to draw! Thus the riddle of Duchamp remains an enigma.

Botvinnik’s puzzle

Levenfish – Botvinnik
Match, Moscow 1937

White continued:

1 b5

After 1 b6 Black can force a drawn pawn endgame: 1...g5 2 fxg5 xg5 3 d6 b5 4 d2 e6 5 d4 d5+ 6 c3 xd2 7 xd2 d6!.

1 ...

This is Botvinnik’s puzzle: which is the more important, maintaining the black rook’s attack on the b2-pawn, or using the rook to attack the white king and the f4-pawn? Botvinnik chose the latter, but incorrectly. 1...f6 2 b4 b2 3 e4 e2+! is best, since the white king is now exposed to attack: 4 d4 b2 and the king is tied to the defence of the f4-pawn.

2 d3
3 b4

An alternative is 3 d1+ 4 c2 f1 5 d4 f6 6 c4 and then b4.

4 b3

Why limit the rook’s activity? Again 4...f6 is better.

5 e4
g3

6 b5
g1

7 d5
gb1

8 b5 (D)

After 8 d3 e6 9 f3 f6 10 d4 f5 11 c4 g4 Black draws easily, having activated his king.

8 ...

He should play the immediate 8 e1+ 9 d5 f1.

9 b6+

If 9...e7, then 10 b4 e1+ 11 d5 f1 12 xg6 xf4 13 b5 d7
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14 \text{e}c6! \text{f}5+ 15 \text{e}c4 is winning for White.

10 \text{b}4 \text{e}e1+
11 \text{d}d4 \text{f}1
12 \text{e}e5 \text{e}e1+
13 \text{d}6! \text{e}e4
14 \text{b}5 \text{f}4
15 \text{c}6!

Black resigned, as after 15...g5 there would follow 16 b6 \text{b}4 17 \text{c}7 g4 18 b7 and, after White wins the rook for the b-pawn, the black pawn, cut off from the king, will soon be lost.

**Capablanca's puzzle**

When we analysed the 1921 world championship match between Capablanca and Lasker, our attention was drawn to the following rook endgame, which occurred in the first game.

Capablanca - Lasker
Havana Wch (1) 1921

White is clearly better, but in this position he played 1 \text{e}e3 and a draw was agreed a few moves later. About the move

1 \text{c}5

Capablanca, an unrivalled master of the endgame, wrote: ‘This is a very risky continuation; probably Black even has the better chances.’ We were puzzled how the natural move 1 \text{c}5 could be bad, and analysed this position in depth. Black's most logical reply is:

1 ... \text{d}3

Of course 1...\text{f}6 and 1...\text{e}6 must be considered. After 1...\text{f}6 2 \text{c}3 \text{f}8 3 \text{e}3 a5 4 a4 \text{f}5+ 5 \text{b}6 \text{g}7 6 \text{b}4! axb4 7 a5 Black is in trouble.

Let's look at 1...\text{e}6. There are various possibilities, but the best continuation seems to be 2 \text{c}3 \text{f}8 3 a4 \text{e}7 4 \text{d}3 a5 5 \text{b}5 \text{e}5+ 6 \text{b}6 \text{f}6 7 \text{b}4! axb4 8 a5 and there is no obvious defence.

2 \text{f}2

Now Black is at a crossroads.

2 ... a5

The other possibilities are:

a) 2...\text{f}8 3 \text{b}6 \text{d}6+ 4 a5 \text{e}7 5 a4 \text{d}7 6 \text{c}2! and now
6...\texttt{d}d3 7 b4 \texttt{x}xf3 8 \texttt{xa}6 \texttt{x}g3 9 b5 \texttt{b}3 10 a5 g4 11 \texttt{b}6 f5 12 \texttt{b}7 f4 13 a6 f3 14 a7 \texttt{a}3 15 a8\texttt{w} \texttt{xa}8 16 \texttt{w}xa8 g3 17 b7 winning, or 6...f5 7 b4 f4 8 g4 \texttt{d}d3 9 \texttt{xa}6 \texttt{xf}3 10 b5 and White should win easily.

b) 2...g4 3 fxg4 \texttt{g}3 (D):
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b1) 4 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{e}e3 5 \texttt{f}6 a5 6 \texttt{a}6 f5 7 gxf5 gxf5 with sufficient counterplay for Black.

b2) Better is 4 \texttt{f}6 \texttt{x}g4 (a better try for Black is 4...a5! 5 \texttt{b}5 \texttt{g}4 6 \texttt{xa}5 \texttt{g}7 7 \texttt{f}3 f5 8 \texttt{b}4 f4 9 b5 g5 10 b6 \texttt{g}3 11 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{a}3+ 12 \texttt{b}4 \texttt{a}6 13 \texttt{b}5 \texttt{a}8 14 a4 but again White has serious winning chances) 5 \texttt{xa}6 f5 6 b4 f4 7 b5 f3 8 \texttt{f}6 \texttt{g}5+ 9 \texttt{c}4 and White wins.

3 \texttt{b}6 \texttt{d}5

4 a3?!

Also interesting is 4 a4 with a further b4 and a5 in mind.

4 ... \texttt{d}3

5 b4

Even stronger is 5 \texttt{b}2 a4 6 bxa4 \texttt{xa}3 7 a5 \texttt{xf}3 8 a6 \texttt{x}g3 9 a7 \texttt{a}3 10 b5 \texttt{a}7 11 \texttt{xa}7 f5 12 \texttt{b}6 g4 13 \texttt{c}5 f4 14 \texttt{d}4 and White wins.
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5 ... a4

6 \texttt{a}2 \texttt{xf}3

7 \texttt{b}5 \texttt{g}3

8 \texttt{xa}4 f5

9 b5

The white pawns are more dangerous.

Black has the most chances in variation 'b', although even this line is clearly in White's favour. Capablanca's commentary is strange: why did he refuse to play actively with his king when in all these positions Black is playing virtually a king down?

\textbf{Is the J. Polgar – Spassky endgame lost?}

In the final game of the J.Polgar-Spassky match there occurred a very interesting position: rook ending with two pawns against one on the same flank. It seems to be completely drawn but praxis shows that this configuration (f- and g-pawns versus h-pawn) is quite dangerous for the weaker side. In 1983 this kind of ending was extensively analysed by the Soviet master Kuzminykh in \textit{Shakhmatny Biulleten} no. 7, and there also exist some analyses of IM N.Minev and GM Ftačník. However, in \textit{ECE} there are no final conclusions on this subject. Given the dearth of actual games involving this position and the lack of any definite theoretical assessment we have reviewed current praxis and
tried to draw some conclusions. The first example shows the correct way of defending against the advanced pawns.

Brodsky – Magerramov

Helsinki 1992

1 ...  $b2+$
2 ♕f3  $h2$
3 $h8+$

Of course not 3 $h8? falling for the standard trick 3...$xh3+.

3 ...
4 $g8+$
4 $h4? $h3+! is very dangerous for White.

4 ...
5 $h8  $g7
6 $h5  $g6
7 $h8  $f6
8 ♕g4!

Wrong is 8 $f8+? (or 8 $h5? ♕f5 9 $h8 $xh3+! →) 8...$g7.

8 ...
9 ♕f3  $a2

9...$g3+ 10 ♕f2 gets nowhere as it is impossible to penetrate White’s position with the king.

10 $h6+  $f5
11 $h8  $a3+
12 ♕g2  $e4
13 $e8+  $d4
14 $d8+  $e3
15 $e8+  $d2 (D)

16 $e5!

White’s only chance is to combine an attack on the g5-pawn with checks.

16 ...
17 $e3
17 $a5!

Activity is much more important than a pawn: after 17 $xg5? $e2
18 $f5 $f3+! 19 ♕g3/g1 $e8! Black wins immediately.

17 ...
18 $h2
18 ♕f2 is preferable.

18 ...
19 ♕g2  $e2
20 $a2+  $e3
21 ♕f2!  $c1
22 ♕f3+  $e4
23 ♕f2 (D)

A very important theoretical position: White holds a draw.

23 ...
24 $c3
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\( \text{Psakhis and Vaiser give this move two exclamation marks. A logical possibility was 1 h5, which could lead to the well-known ending with f- and h-pawns.} \)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
24 \text{ h}2 \\
25 \text{ g}2 \\
26 \text{ f}2 \\
27 \text{ a}2 \\
\text{Once more the players have reached the main position.} \\
27 \ldots \text{ d}1 \\
28 \text{ f}3+ \\
29 \text{ e}1 \\
30 \text{ a}2 \\
31 \text{ e}2+ \\
\text{This is a useful check in a position with many good possibilities, such as 31 f2.} \\
31 \ldots \text{ d}3 (D)
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
32 \text{ a}2! \text{ e}3 \\
\text{The pawn ending which arises after 32...d2+ 33 xd2+ e3 34 f3 and 35 h4 is totally drawn.} \\
33 \text{ a}3+ \\
34 \text{ a}4+ \\
35 \text{ a}2 \\
\text{Now the pawn ending is winning for Black after 35 xd4+ e4 36 f3 e5.} \\
35 \ldots \text{ d}3 \\
36 \text{ e}2+ \\
\text{Alternatively 36...e3 37 a2 g3+ 38 h2 c3 39 g2 is similar to a position already reached.} \\
37 \text{ a}2 \\
38 \text{ h}4+ \\
39 \text{ f}1! \text{ h}3 \\
40 \text{ g}2+ \\
41 \text{ a}2 \\
\text{Draw}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Vaiser – Djurić} \\
\text{Szirak 1985}
\end{array}
\]
Various Rook Endgames

This kind of position with the pawn of the weaker side on his fourth rank is considered to be lost, except the case when the rook of the weaker side is on his eighth rank, because it is very important to check from behind.

There are various other possibilities. In the game Gliksman-Novak, Stary Smokovec 1976 there followed 1 h5 g5 2 h6 f7 3 a6 g7 4 f5 b7 5 h6+ (or 5 a5 h6! 6 xf6 b1 7 f5 xh5 —+) 5...xh6 6 xf6+ h5 7 e5 b3! 8 f1 h4 9 h1+ h3 and Black won.

Other variations are also winning for Black: 1 a3 b8 2 f3 b6! 3 g3 h5 4 h3 a6 5 g3 f5 —+

Alternatively 1 b6 f5+ 2 f4 a8 3 b7 a4+ 4 g3 a3+ 5 g2 h5 6 h7+ g4 7 h6 a6 8 f2 g5 —+

This is all theory. Interestingly the position before White's first move is considered lost due to Kuzminyk's analysis, yet it is entirely similar, with reversed colours, to the game Gliksman-Novak (ECE no. 736).

This means that Vaiser has found a very interesting plan. Let us return to the game.

1 f5
2 a3!

This is a very important move for White's defensive strategy. From b3 the rook controls the third rank and stands ready to move to g3.

A poor move; control over the back rank is crucial. The immediate 2...b8 was better.

3 b3

Official theory considers this a mistake, and that 3 a8 is correct, but Vaiser's plan is no worse.

3...

5 e7 (D)

4 g3!

This is the new defensive idea: White targets the g6-pawn and is ready to meet 4...h5 with 5 g5+.

5 e8
6 h2 d3
7 g2 d6

Such tries as 7...f4 are useless because of 8 g4! d2+ 9 g1 f3 10 f4 d3 11 g4 intending 12 f2.

8 h3 f6
9 g5!

Here a draw was agreed because

9...
f4

would be met by

10 g2 f3+
11 f2 f4
12 g3 h5
13 g5+!
Vaiser’s idea is very important since it means that all positions where the weaker side’s pawn is on its fourth rank are drawn if the rook can be positioned on the g-file.

In more complex positions the weaker side sometimes has to prepare the drawing set-up even at the cost of a pawn.

Yakovich – Savchenko
Rostov 1993
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In this position White played:
1 \texttt{g1!!}
White prepares his defensive set-up straight away. This is much more effective than either 1 \texttt{h2 a4!} 2 \texttt{g3 h5}, when Black has some unpleasant threats, or 1 \texttt{e5 h5} and again White is in trouble.
1 ... \texttt{xa5}
Black gets nowhere after 1...\texttt{h5}
2 \texttt{h2 a4} 3 \texttt{g5+}.
2 \texttt{h3 a8}
3 \texttt{g3 e8}
4 \texttt{g1 e6}
5 \texttt{g3 f6}

6 \texttt{g2 f8}
Alternatively 6...f4 is met by 7 \texttt{g4} and 8 \texttt{f2}.
7 \texttt{g1!}
Now 7 \texttt{g3} would be refuted by 7...f4 8 \texttt{g1} f3 9 \texttt{g3 f2} 10 \texttt{f1 h5} 11 \texttt{h3 f3+} 12 \texttt{g2 g4}.
7 ... f4
8 \texttt{g2 f3+}
9 \texttt{f2}

The king’s task is to blockade the passed pawn.
9 ... \texttt{f5}
10 \texttt{g4!} \texttt{h5}
11 \texttt{a4} Draw

Nijboer – Peebu
Netherlands 1982
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1 ... \texttt{h5}
In \textit{Schaakbulletin} 174 Wim An- driessen writes that after this move Black’s position is hopeless. However a new plan of defence has been demonstrated in the Vaiser-Djuric game. Here the pawn structure is a bit different, but of course it is simpler to keep the pawn on h6.
2 \texttt{g2 g5?}
Stronger is 2...\(a2\) 3 \(\text{h}f8\) \(\text{g}5\) 4 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{g}6\) and now 5 \(\text{h}4\) (or 5 \(f4\) \(\text{a}1\) or 5 \(f3\) \(\text{a}3\))! does not work because of 5...\(\text{a}1\) 6 \(\text{g}8+\) \(\text{h}6\) 7 \(\text{h}8+\) \(\text{g}6\).

\(3\) \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{a}2\)

After 3...\(\text{a}1\) White would play 4 \(\text{b}8!\) \(\text{h}1+\) 5 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{a}1\) 6 \(\text{b}2!\) followed by 7 \(f3\), 8 \(\text{f}2\), 9 \(\text{f}1\), 10 \(\text{h}3\) and 11 \(f4\) winning.

4 \(f4+\) \(\text{g}6\)

5 \(\text{g}8+\) \(\text{h}6\)

6 \(\text{b}8!\) (D)

In this position Black would hold the draw if he could check on his eighth rank.

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

7 \(\text{b}6+\) \(\text{g}7\)

8 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{h}2+\)

9 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{h}3\)

10 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{g}8\)

11 \(f5\) \(h4\)

12 \(\text{b}8+\) \(\text{f}7\)

13 \(\text{b}7+\) \(\text{g}8\)

14 \(g4\) 1-0

Kuzminykh believed that the pawn structure \(f3+g2\) (\(f6+g7\)) is won while the structure \(f2+g3\) (\(f7+g6\)) is drawish. However, Vaiser’s game would suggest that in both positions the weaker side has strong drawing chances.

We shall now investigate the ending which was the starting-point for our discussion in this section.

J. Polgar – Spassky

\(Budapest\ 1993\)

1 \(\text{f}3??\)

A big mistake. Almost any other move would have been better, for example 1 \(\text{b}7\) or 1 \(\text{b}4\).

1 ... \(f5\)

2 \(\text{f}4\)

Otherwise Black’s king goes to \(h4\), pawns to \(f4\) and \(g5\), and finally \(\text{e}2\), \(\text{e}3\).

2 ... \(\text{e}2\)

With the idea 3...\(\text{e}4\) and 4...\(\text{h}4\) and Black wins.

3 \(\text{h}1\)

After 3 \(\text{a}4\) \(g5\) 4 \(\text{b}4\) \(f4\) and 5...\(\text{h}4\) White’s position is hopeless.

3 ... \(\text{e}4\) (D)
Obviously Spassky had planned 6...f4, but then he saw the variation 7 \( \text{\textit{g2}} \) (Vaiser's plan) 7...g5 8 \( \text{\textit{g4}} \) \( \text{\textit{h5}} \) 9 \( \text{\textit{g2}} \) and could not see how to win the resulting position. Now we see that Vaiser's plan works when the stronger side's pawns are on g6 and f5 against h4, or g5 and f4 against h3.

**7 \( \text{\textit{g2}} \) f4! (D)**

Now Vaiser's plan does not work: 8 \( \text{\textit{h2}} \) g5 9 \( \text{\textit{g2}} \) f3 10 \( \text{\textit{g1}} \) \( \text{\textit{e2}} \) and Black wins.

**8 \( \text{\textit{f3}} \)**

**8 \( \text{\textit{e5!}} \)**

The winning move; White cannot save the h-pawn.

9 \( \text{\textit{g2}} \) g5
10 \( \text{\textit{g4}} \) \( \text{\textit{xh3}} \)
11 \( \text{\textit{g3}} \) \( \text{\textit{h4}} \)

0-1

**Maiorov – Legky**

**Cannes 1992**
Various Rook Endgames

This critical position was analysed in Kuzminykh's article. He believed that there are two ways to achieve a draw:

a) 15...\texttt{b}1 16 \texttt{f}6 (or 16 \texttt{f}6 \texttt{a}1 17 \texttt{e}8+ \texttt{f}7 18 \texttt{h}8 \texttt{h}1) 16...\texttt{b}8 17 \texttt{g}7+ \texttt{h}8 18 \texttt{d}7 \texttt{g}8 19 \texttt{e}7 \texttt{g}7 20 \texttt{f}6+ \texttt{g}8 21 \texttt{f}7+ \texttt{g}7!.

b) 15...\texttt{b}8 16 \texttt{h}6 \texttt{b}4!.

15 ... \texttt{a}6
16 \texttt{e}6 \texttt{a}7

In this position either 16...\texttt{a}1 or 16...\texttt{a}8 is logical.

17 \texttt{b}6 \texttt{g}7??

The decisive mistake: 17...\texttt{a}1 is correct, transposing into a position from Kuzminykh's analysis.

18 \texttt{f}6+ \texttt{f}7

Alternatively 18...\texttt{g}8 19 \texttt{b}8+ \texttt{f}7 20 \texttt{h}8 \texttt{a}5+ 21 \texttt{h}6 \texttt{xf}6 22 \texttt{f}8+! (22 \texttt{h}7? \texttt{g}5! 23 \texttt{f}7+ \texttt{xf}7 24 \texttt{xg}5 \texttt{g}7 leads to a draw) 22...\texttt{e}6 (22...\texttt{e}7 23 \texttt{f}4 ++) 23 \texttt{g}5 \texttt{b}5 24 \texttt{h}8 \texttt{f}5 25 \texttt{h}7 \texttt{g}4 26 \texttt{a}7 ++.

19 \texttt{h}6 \texttt{a}1
20 \texttt{b}7+ \texttt{xf}6
21 \texttt{g}5+ \texttt{f}5 (D)

22 \texttt{b}5+ \texttt{e}6
23 \texttt{e}7 \texttt{a}7+
24 \texttt{h}6 \texttt{a}8

Or 24...\texttt{f}7 25 \texttt{g}6+! winning.

25 \texttt{g}6 \texttt{h}8+
26 \texttt{g}7 \texttt{h}1
27 \texttt{b}6+ \texttt{e}7
28 \texttt{b}7+ \texttt{e}6
29 \texttt{g}8 \texttt{h}2
30 \texttt{g}7 \texttt{h}1
31 \texttt{f}8 \texttt{f}1+
32 \texttt{e}8 \texttt{g}1
33 \texttt{b}6+ \texttt{e}5
34 \texttt{f}7 \texttt{f}1+
35 \texttt{g}6 1-0

Gelfand – Karpov
Reggio Emilia 1991/2
Various Rook Endgames

1 ... \texttt{Ka3}
2 \texttt{Kb2 Kg5}

It is impossible to make use of the king's position on f4 so Black tries to create some threats via the queenside.

3 \texttt{Kb8!}
White's best defence against the threat of ...\texttt{h4}.

3 ... \texttt{Ka2+}
4 \texttt{Kg1 b2}
5 \texttt{Kxa8 f4}
6 \texttt{Kxa3 Ke2}
7 \texttt{Kb1!}

7 \texttt{Kb3} was also possible.

7 ... \texttt{Kf3}
8 \texttt{Kf1+ Kc4}
9 \texttt{Ka1 f4}
10 \texttt{Kd1 Ec2}
11 \texttt{Ke1+ Ke3}
12 \texttt{Kf1+ Ke3}
13 \texttt{Ke1+ Ke2}
14 \texttt{Ka1 Ec2}
15 \texttt{Ke1+ Dd3}
16 \texttt{Kf1 f3}
17 \texttt{Ka1}

Of course not 17 \texttt{h3? Kg2+} 18 \texttt{Kh1 Ke2} ++.

17 ... \texttt{Ke2}
18 \texttt{Kb1!}

Black has successfully achieved optimum activity for his pieces, but it is still impossible to win.

18 ... \texttt{Kc2}
19 \texttt{Kf1 Ke3}
20 \texttt{Kb1 Kd4}
21 \texttt{Kb3+ Kf4}
22 \texttt{Kb8 Ka1+}
23 \texttt{Kf2 Ka2+}
24 \texttt{Kg1 Kg2+}

25 \texttt{Kh1 Ke2}
26 \texttt{Kg1 Ec2 (D)}
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27 \texttt{Kb4+ Kg3}
28 \texttt{Kb3+ Kg2}
29 \texttt{Kb1 Kd2}
30 \texttt{Ka1 Kb2}
31 \texttt{Kc1 Kg3}
32 \texttt{Ka1}

Black has not made any progress and the position was repeated once more.

32 ... \texttt{Kg2+}
33 \texttt{Kh1 g3}

The last chance, which of course achieves nothing against careful defence.

34 \texttt{Ka3+ Kh4}
35 \texttt{Ka4+ Kg5}
36 \texttt{hxg3} \texttt{Kxg3}
37 \texttt{Kh2 Kg4}
38 \texttt{Ka5+!}

The pawn ending is lost after 38 \texttt{Kxg4? Kg4} 39 \texttt{Kh1 Kh3}, etc.

38 ... \texttt{Kh4}
39 \texttt{Ka4+ Kg5}
40 \texttt{Ka3 f2}
41 \texttt{Kf3 Kh4}
42 \texttt{Kxf4! Draw}

It is impossible to make use of the king's position on f4 so Black tries to create some threats via the queenside.

3 \texttt{Kb8!}
White's best defence against the threat of ...\texttt{h4}.

3 ... \texttt{Ka2+}
4 \texttt{Kg1 b2}
5 \texttt{Kxa8 f4}
6 \texttt{Kxa3 Ke2}
7 \texttt{Kb1!}

7 \texttt{Kb3} was also possible.

7 ... \texttt{Kf3}
8 \texttt{Kf1+ Kc4}
9 \texttt{Ka1 f4}
10 \texttt{Kd1 Ec2}
11 \texttt{Ke1+ Ke3}
12 \texttt{Kf1+ Ke3}
13 \texttt{Ke1+ Ke2}
14 \texttt{Ka1 Ec2}
15 \texttt{Ke1+ Dd3}
16 \texttt{Kf1 f3}
17 \texttt{Ka1}

Of course not 17 \texttt{h3? Kg2+} 18 \texttt{Kh1 Ke2} ++.

17 ... \texttt{Ke2}
18 \texttt{Kb1!}

Black has successfully achieved optimum activity for his pieces, but it is still impossible to win.

18 ... \texttt{Kc2}
19 \texttt{Kf1 Ke3}
20 \texttt{Kb1 Kd4}
21 \texttt{Kb3+ Kf4}
22 \texttt{Kb8 Ka1+}
23 \texttt{Kf2 Ka2+}
24 \texttt{Kg1 Kg2+}
The next game is an easy job for Boris Gelfand.

Růžele – Gelfand
Kramatorsk 1989

The white king is too far from the kingside.

1 \( \text{f}4! \)
This move wins more easily than 1...\( \text{d}3+ \) 2 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{x}h3 \) 3 \( \text{x}g6 \) \( \text{e}4 \).

2 \( \text{x}g6 \) \( \text{f}3 \)
3 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{e}4 \)
4 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{e}3 \)
5 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{x}e4! \)

0-1

A cunning king manoeuvre

Yakovich – Itkis
USSR 1985

1 ... \( \text{e}2! \)
2 \( \text{x}e2 \) \( \text{e}4! \)
The best move. If Black plays 2...\( \text{e}5 \) he fails to get his king to the crucial h5-square after 3 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 4

\( \text{f}4 \)
4 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{g}4 \)
5 \( \text{e}3 \)
If White plays 5 \( \text{g}2 \) there is the pitfall 5...\( \text{h}5? \) 6 \( \text{h}3! \) ++.

5 ... \( \text{e}4 \)
6 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{g}4 \)
7 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{h}4! \)
The only move because 7...\( \text{e}8+ \) (7...\( \text{h}5 \) is bad due to 8 \( \text{f}4 \) and then 8...\( \text{h}4 \) 9 \( \text{a}1! \) \( \text{f}8+ \) 10 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{a}8 \) 11 \( \text{f}6 ++ \) or 8...\( \text{f}8+ \) 9 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{a}8 \) 10 \( \text{h}3 ++ \)) allows the king to penetrate with 8 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{a}8 \) 9 \( \text{e}6 \).

8 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{f}8+! \)
9 \( \text{e}4 \)
The point: White doesn’t have 9 \( \text{e}5? \) due to 9...\( \text{f}5+! \) ++.
13 a4+ f3
14 a3+ f4
15 b7 xa7+
16 xa7 g5

Draw

A similar idea occurred in the following game:

Tomaszewski – Wojtkiewicz
Naleczow 1988

1 ... a5!
The black king hides, waiting for the h-pawn to advance.

2 f3 d4
3 g3 e4
4 d5 c4
5 h6 e4
6 h7 e8
7 h5 h8

Now the white king must reach the h7-pawn, but how can he pass the fifth rank without losing the b-pawn? White has a more active king and rook, and an extra pawn, but there is no win. One might analyse various moves in this position but the main continuation is:

8 f4 b4
9 e4 a5
10 d5 xb5
11 d6+ a4!
Not 11 ... c4? 12 c6 and White wins.

12 c6 b5

Draw

Another possibility is 8 f3 b4
9 e4 a5 10 d4 b4 11 d3 a5 12 c4 c8+! but once again the king cannot pass the fifth rank.

Prophylactic ‘cutting off’ (cramping) moves

Prophylactic moves provide a warning (or threat) to your opponent which can be important in all stages of the game. Here are some examples from rook endings.

Kir. Georgiev – Ljubojević
Linares 1988

1 ... a3!!

This move controls the black pawn’s advance as well as creating
the possibility of giving an unpleasant check on the third rank.

1 ... \( \texttt{\textit{Kd4}} \)

Alternatively 1...\( \texttt{\textit{Ke8}} \) 2 \( \texttt{d6} \) c3 3 \( \texttt{d7+ Ke7} \) 4 \( \texttt{Ka8} \) \( \texttt{Kd4} \) 5 \( \texttt{Kc8}+ \texttt{Kf7} \) 6 \( \texttt{Ke2!} \) and then 6...\( \texttt{Kg6} \) 7 \( \texttt{Kc2} \) \( \texttt{Kd3} \) 8 \( \texttt{Kc7}++ \) or 6...\( \texttt{Kf6} \) 7 \( \texttt{Kc7!} \) \( \texttt{Kc4+} \) 8 \( \texttt{Kd8} \) c2 9 \( \texttt{Ke8}+ \).

2 \( \texttt{d6} \) \( \texttt{Ke6} \)
3 \( \texttt{Ke3+} \) \( \texttt{Kf5} \)
4 \( \texttt{d7} \) \( \texttt{Kf4} \)
5 \( \texttt{Ke1!} \) \( \texttt{c3} \)
6 \( \texttt{Ke7} \) \( \texttt{Kc4+} \)
7 \( \texttt{Ke6} \) \( \texttt{1-0} \)

T. Georgadze – Gulko

USSR 1978

After 8...\( \texttt{Ke8} \), 9 \( \texttt{Ka8}+ \texttt{Kf7} \) 10 \( \texttt{d7} \) wins quickly.

9 \( \texttt{Ke4!} \) \( \texttt{1-0} \)

What is the best position for the rook in the endgame?

One of the first golden laws that beginners learn is the maxim of the great chess teacher Siegbert Tarrasch: ‘Always put your rook behind the pawn, whether your own or your opponent’s.’ However, in chess, laws can always be broken – sometimes the rook stands badly behind the pawn.

A. Petrosian – Monin

St. Petersburg 1993

There followed

1 \( \texttt{Kd6+} \)?

White decides to put his rook behind the black pawn, but he should have positioned it in front with 1 \( \texttt{Kd4} \) \( \texttt{Kf5} \) 2 \( \texttt{Kf2} \) \( \texttt{Ke5} \) 3 \( \texttt{Ke2} \) \( \texttt{Kd5} \) 4 \( \texttt{Kd2} \) \( \texttt{Ke5} \) 5 \( \texttt{Kf4} \), after which his
pawns can be pushed. If the black king stays on g6 or f6, then White can play his king to e2 followed by g4 and king to e4, and rest is easy. In the game Black manages to exploit the position of the b6-rook.

1 ... $\text{f7}$
2 $\text{Hb6}$ $\text{e7!}$
3 g4 $\text{d7}$
4 $\text{g3}$ $\text{c7}$
5 $\text{He6}$ b4
6 $\text{He2}$ b3
7 $\text{Hb2}$ $\text{Hb5!}$

The white king cannot abandon his pawns, or the enemy rook will quickly ‘eat’ them.

**Yusupov – Timman**

**Linares 1992**

1 $\text{Ha1?}$

Natural but bad. Correct is 1 $\text{He4!}$ threatening to bring the king to the a-pawn, and if Black responds with 1...$\text{f5}$ then 2 $\text{He5+} \text{g4}$ 3 $\text{g5+} \text{h3}$ 4 a5 gives the white rook an ideal position, defending both the a-pawn and the g-pawn.

1 ... $\text{Ha5}$

2 $\text{He3}$ e5!
3 $\text{He4}$

If 3 fxe5+ there would follow 3...$\text{He5}$ 4 $\text{d3}$ $\text{d5}$ 5 $\text{He3}$ $\text{c6}$ 5 $\text{b4} \text{He5!}$ and the black rook’s mobility secures the draw.

3 ... exf4
4 $\text{xf4}$ $\text{e6}$
5 $\text{He4}$

5 $\text{e1+}$ and 6 $\text{e4}$ is a better attempt, although the win has already escaped.

5 ... g5
6 $\text{hxg5} \text{Xg5}$
7 $\text{f3}$ $\text{a5}$
8 $\text{He1+}$ $\text{f5}$
9 $\text{He4}$ $\text{c5!} \text{(D)}$

```
Just as the white rook has reached the fourth rank his adversary threatens check on the third.

10 $\text{He3}$ $\text{a5}$
11 $\text{Ha3}$ $\text{e5}$
12 $\text{He3}$ $\text{e6}$
13 $\text{He2}$ $\text{d6}$

Black can draw by 13...h4 14 gxh4 $\text{Hh5!}$.
```

14 $\text{f2}$ $\text{e6}$
15 $\text{He3+} \text{d5}$
Various Rook Endgames

The 'Shoulder Budge'

This fascinating method is a way in which kings do battle in endgames. It occurs most often in rook endgames.

Mikhalchishin – Azmaiparashvili
Tbilisi 1980

The other pawn push is bad: 3 b5? c4 4 b6 d5 5 b7 b1 and White is in trouble.

Obviously White is fighting for the draw in this position; the question is whether the black king can retreat in time. There followed:

1 xf7 a1
2 Exa1 Exa1
3 f5!

If 3...xb4, then 4 f6 c5 5 g7 and Black is helpless against the pawn push f7.

4 e6!

Now the kings stand shoulder to shoulder. This 'shoulder budge' is the only move since 4 f6 loses to 4...d5 5 g7 e6 6 f7 a7, etc.

4... a6+

If 4...a6+ then 5 e5! and the white king, by retreating, crucially keeps the enemy king at bay.

5 d6! f1
6 e6 e1+

A draw was agreed.

This same idea is brilliantly demonstrated in one of Mitrofanov’s studies.

L. Mitrofanov, 1990

Bad is 1 f7+ e4! 2 e7+ d5 3 d7+ e6 4 d8 c5+ and then 5...d5.

1... e4
2 g4!
The only move: if 2 \( \text{g6} \), then 2...\( \text{c6}+ \) 3 \( \text{g7} \text{c7} \). 

2 ... \( \text{c4}! \) 
3 \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{e3}+ \) 
4 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{xd2} \) 
5 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{e3} \) 
6 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{c5}+ \) 
7 \( \text{g4}!! \)

This move backwards maintains the opposition, while the ‘active’ 7 \( \text{g6?} \) loses to 7...\( \text{f4} \) 8 \( \text{h6} \text{c6}+ \) 9 \( \text{g7} \text{g5} \) 10 \( \text{h7} \text{c7}+ \) 11 \( \text{g8} \text{g6} \) 12 \( \text{h8} \text{f6} \).

**Rook ending exercises**

**Polugaevsky – Korchnoi**
*Tilburg 1985*

Is 1 \( \text{g7} \) or 1 \( \text{g4} \) the drawing move?

**Matsukevich – Lein**
*USSR 1968*

How can White draw?

**Ubilava – Matulović**
*Belgrade 1989*

How can Black draw?
Black to play and win.

Keres 1951
*Shakhmaty v SSSR*

How can White draw?

Scheeren – Van der Sterren
*Wijk aan Zee 1981*

Find a winning plan for Black.
Schneider – Romanishin  
_Buenos Aires 1978_

Is 1...\texttt{c5} or 1...\texttt{e5} Black’s best move?

Spassky – Beliavsky  
_Montpellier Ct 1985_

Is 1 c4 or 1 b4 the best move?

Sokolov – Ivanović  
_Yugoslavia 1971_

Should Black continue 1...\texttt{d8} or 1...\texttt{e2}+? Calculate the variations.
5 Bishop Endings

Same-coloured bishops with an isolated pawn

In this kind of position the isolani is a serious weakness, especially if the stronger side’s king is blockading it. The position of the bishops is not especially significant, although the bishop attacking the isolated pawn is clearly better placed than the bishop defending it. The pawn structure is crucially important: if the side with the isolated pawn has further pawns fixed on the same colour as the bishop then the double weakness can be fatal.

Dragašević – Aleksandria

Jajce 1983

The main alternative is to put a pawn on the right colour square with 1 g4. After 1...hxg4 2 hxg4 d5 3 f3 b6 4 f2 and then 4...e5 5 e1 x d4 Black wins an extra pawn by force, but given that his pawns are on the same colour as the bishop the position is probably impossible to win. This is a fairly typical way of building a defensive fortress in such positions. Black should play more subtly with 4...f5!? and now 5 e3 (5 gxf5 exf5 6 e3 g4 7 fxg4 fxg4 8 f2 c7 and ...g3-g2) 5...f6 6 d2 x d4 7 e1 e5 8 d2 e4+! 9 fxe4+ e5 after which Black can force the win by pushing his pawn to f3 (10 e1 is the most stubborn – editor’s note).

1 ... f5+

Forced, or White plays g4 and f4.

2 d3 g4

3 hxg4 hxg4

4 f4+ c6?!

This does not alter anything, but surely 4...d5 is better?

5 e5 b6

6 e3?

A poor waiting move in principle, as d3 is the best square for the king. Better is 6 f6 d5 7 g7 a8 8 h6 e7 9 d2 f6 10 c3 g5 11 b2 h6 12 c3 (bad is 12 a1 c1 13 c3 a3 14 d2 b2 15
Dizdarević - Kovačević
Zagreb 1993

1 ... a3!
A typical manoeuvre, which prevents White from improving his pawn structure by means of a4.

2 d2
After 2 c3 Black could win a pawn with 2 ... d6 3 e1 b5! 4 xa5 xg3 5 d8 f2.

2 ... b2
3 e3 b5
4 a4

White attempts to fix at least one black pawn on the dark squares as an object of future attack.

4 ... b4
5 f4?!

White goes on the counter-offensive, although 5 f2 was also possible. This move probably holds the draw in the resulting pawn ending:

5 ... c1 6 e3 xe3 7 xe3.

5 d4
6 c7 e5
7 xa5 xg3
8 d8

The games reaches the position after 8 xb4 in a few more moves.

8 ... e5!
9 c7 f6
10 xb4 xh4
11 e3 f6 (D)

11 ... g5 would be a very poor move, refuted by 12 d8, which ties the bishop down to the g5-pawn.
14 b4 e4+
15 g2 g4?

Stronger is 15...c4 16 b5 d4! hindering the advance of the white pawns and preparing ...g4 and ...e3-e2.

16 g3 e5+
17 g2

Very wisely White does not go in for 17 h4? e3 18 xh5? g3.

17 ... e3
18 b5 e5
19 h4 d4

A good try would have been 19...b4 20 b6 xa4 21 d8! with the idea of 22 c7 and 23 b7. Black’s best response would be 20...a5! 21 d8 a6 22 f1 g3!? 23 a5 f4 24 f6 xa5 25 b7 b6 26 g5, drawing.

20 f1 b4 (D)

21 d8 xa4!

White would meet 21...g3 with 22 h4! e5! 23 g5! and it is not at all clear how Black can make progress.

22 b6 b5
23 b7 e5

24 e2 c6
25 xe3 xb7
26 h4!

White is ready so sacrifice his bishop for a pawn to reach a drawn position.

26 ... c7
27 e4 c6

Alternatively 27...c8 28 f5 d8 29 e1 d7 30 g3 e7 31 e1 f7 and it is not obvious what next. So it was worth trying to penetrate with the king on the queenside with 27...c6.

28 f5 d5
29 g6 e4
30 xh5 f3
31 g6 Draw

A fantastic battle!

Wojtkiewicz – Khalifman
Rakvere 1993

Black’s doubled pawns (the second weakness) are the cause of his subsequent suffering. Doubled pawns are less mobile, which makes them easier to attack.
Crumbling the enemy bishop is more important than putting pawns on the same colour as the bishop.

1 ...  \( \text{f7} \)
2  \( b4 \)  \( \text{e8} \)
3  \( b5 \)  \( \text{f7} \)
4  \( \text{d1}! \)

The start of a familiar plan with the bishop on \( b3 \) and then \( e4 \).

4 ...  \( \text{g8} \)
5  \( \text{b3} \)  \( \text{f7} \)
6  \( e4 \)  \( \text{g8} \)
7  \( \text{x} d5 \)  \( \text{x} d5 \)
8  \( \text{ex} d5 \)  \( \text{c7} \)

White has reached a pawn ending a whole pawn up, but the win still requires good technique.

10  \( \text{c3} \)  \( \text{d6} \)
11  \( \text{c4} \)  \( (D) \)

White played:

1  \( \text{f1} \)

1  \( g4 \) is worse, because after 1 ... \( \text{e7} \) 2  \( \text{f1} \)  \( \text{d7} \) 3  \( \text{e2} \)  \( \text{c6} \) the black king arrives at \( d5 \); similarly 1  \( g2 \)  \( \text{e7} \) 2  \( \text{f3} \)  \( \text{d7} \) 3  \( \text{e4} \)  \( \text{c6} \) 4  \( g4 \)  \( g6 \) followed by ... \( f5+ \) and again the king reaches the \( d5 \)-square.

1 ...  \( \text{h5}! \)

Given that the black king cannot go directly to \( d5 \), Black tries to maximize his initiative on the kingside,
leaving open the option of playing the king to f5.

2 \( \text{e2?!} \)

White has a favourable set-up, but here he should have improved his pawn structure with 2 h3 and 3 g4, although this gives Black the new resource of exchanging into a pawn endgame with ...\( f4 \). On the other hand 2 h4? is a mistake, since after 2...\( e7 \) 3 \( e2 \) \( d7 \) 4 \( d3 \) \( c6 \) 5 \( c4 \) \( e7 \)! and 6...g5 followed by 7...gxh4 7 gxh4 f5, the h4-pawn becomes a new weakness in the white camp.

2 ... g5
3 \( d3 \)

If White now plays 3 h3 Black responds with 3...g4, fixing the white pawns on the wrong colour.

3 ... g4!
4 \( c4 \) \( e7 \)

Playing the king towards f5 by 4...\( g6 \) does not work in view of 5 d5 \( f5 \) 6 \( c5 \).

5 \( d2 \)

White finds no plan and so plays a waiting move. However, 5 d5 is better, liquidating the isolani; then if 5...e5, the white bishop can stay on the g1-a7 diagonal and if ...f5-f4, then he would swap bishops with \( c5 \).

5 ... \( d7 \)
6 \( c1 \)?

Again White has no sense of the danger and misses the chance to play 6 d5.

6 ... \( d6 \)
7 \( e3 \) \( c7 \)

Black’s plan is to cramp the white pawns on the kingside as much as possible.

9 \( d4 \) \( e5 \)
10 \( d2 \) \( h4 \)
11 \( f4 \) \( g5 \)
12 \( d2 \)

White must guard the a5-square, preventing a black bishop invasion on e1.

12 ... \( c7 \)
13 \( e3 \)
13 \( c3 \) loses to 13...f4! and 14...fxg3, threatening 15...\( xg3 \).

13 ... \( a5 \)
14 \( f4 \) \( e1 \)
15 \( e3 \) \( d6 \)
16 \( f4+ \) \( d7+ \)
17 \( e3 \) \( c6 \) (D)

Because of triangulation White has been ‘zugged’ and is forced to cede the key d5-square. He could now offer more stubborn resistance with 18 d5+!? exd5+ 19 \( d4 \), but after 19...a5!? 20 \( e5 \) \( c3+ \) 21 \( xf5 \) d4 22 \( f4 \) \( c5 \) 23 \( xg4 \) \( b4 \)

24 \( xh3 \) \( xa4 \) White cannot, in
In the game Black played 1 ...  \( \text{e6?} \)

The commentary in *Informator* by Grandmaster Szabo and in the book *Endgame Strategy* by Master Shereshevsky gives 1...\( \text{f5} \) 2 \( \text{e8} \)

\( \text{xe6} \) 3 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{e7} \) 4 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{d6} \) 5 \( \text{b7} \) \( \text{f6} \) 6 \( \text{gxf6} \) \( \text{f7} \) as a draw, since the b3-

square is occupied. We shall investigate this position below.

\[ 2 \text{e8} \text{e7} \]
\[ 3 \text{e6} \text{d6} \]
\[ 4 \text{b7} \]

This is an analogous zugzwang to the previous game. Black is forced to play:

\[ 4 \ldots \text{f5} \]
\[ 5 \text{gxf6} \text{f7} \]
\[ 6 \text{c8} \text{g8} \]
\[ 7 \text{g4} \text{f7} \]
\[ 8 \text{d1} \]

Now, however, the white bishop goes to b3 and the e3-e4 push is decisive.

Now let us return to the position claimed to be drawn by Szabo and Shereshevsky.

\[ 0-1 \]

As we have seen, zugzwang plays a crucial role in this kind of endgame.

**Szabo – Korenski**

*Sochi 1973*
b6 \( \text{d5} \) and White has to settle for the draw with \( 12 \text{.e8} \).

1 \( \text{.c8} \) \( \text{e8} \)
2 \( \text{.g4} \) \( \text{f7} \)
3 \( \text{.f3} \)

This is the only real chance to win. The f5-push is unsuccessful: 3 \( f5 \) \( gxf5 \)! (not 3... \( g5 \)? 4 \( \text{.f3} \) \( g8 \) 5 \( \text{.h5} \)) 4 \( \text{.xf5} \) \( \text{e8} \) and it is not obvious how White can make progress.

3 ... \( \text{e6} \)
4 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{f7} \)
5 \( b4 \) \( \text{axb4} \)
6 \( \text{b3} \) (D)

In the next game there occurred a less successful defence.

**Matanović – Uhlmann**

Skopje 1976

Without the two b-pawns, a draw would be fairly straightforward, but this position offers the possibility of zugzwang.

1 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{h3} \)

If 1... \( \text{c6} \), 2 \( \text{f3} \) is unpleasant.

2 \( b3!! \)

A profound idea, creating various zugzwangs, for example 2... \( \text{f1} \) 3 \( \text{f3} \) or 2... \( \text{g2} \) 3 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{c6} \) 4 \( \text{hxg5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \) 5 \( f3 \) \( \text{h3} \) 6 \( g4 \) \( f5 \) 7 \( \text{gxf5} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 8 \( \text{e5} ++ \).

2 ... \( \text{d7} \)
3 \( \text{f7} \) \( \text{c6} \)
4 \( f4 \) \( \text{gxh4} \)
5 \( \text{gxh4} \) \( \text{b7} \)
6 \( \text{h5} \)

If 6 \( \text{e8} \), then after 6... \( \text{c6} \) 7 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) the pawn ending is drawn.

6 ... \( \text{c6} \)

Not 6... \( \text{c8} \) because of 7 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{a6} \) 8 \( b4 ++ \).
7 \( \text{hgf3} \) \( \text{a}\text{a8} \) \\
8 \( \text{c4} (D) \)

Black now blunders:

8 \( \ldots \) dxc4? \\
Black misses an excellent defensive resource: 8...bxc4 9 bxc4 \( \text{c6} \) 10 \( \text{x} \)xd5 \( \text{e8} \) 11 c5+ \( \text{c7} \) and although a pawn down the bishop ending is drawn. A brilliant idea!

9 \( \text{x} \)xa8 cxb3 \\
10 \( \text{e} \)xe4 b2 \\
11 h5 b4 \\
12 \( \text{e} \)e3 1-0

The most important factor for the side with the isolated pawn is not the position of the bishop but the pawn structure; if the structure cannot be improved then the situation is fairly sad. For example:

Plaskett – Zak
London 1983

1 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{e} \)e8 \\
In the game Black played 1...f5? 2 h5! g\text{hxh5} 3 g3 and was forced to resign, although if he had played the

best defence it would have taken Plaskett’s study-like analysis to find the win.

2 g4 \( \text{c6} \) \\
3 g5 hxg5 \\
4 h\text{hxg5} \( \text{d} \)d7 \\
5 \( \text{e} \)e2 \( \text{c6} \) \\
6 \( \text{g} \)g4 \( \text{e} \)e8 \\
7 f5 gxg5

After the alternative 7...\( \text{c6} \) 8 \( \text{fgx6} \) \( \text{fgx6} \) 9 \( \text{e} \)e2 \( \text{d} \)d7 10 \( \text{d} \)d3 \( \text{e} \)e8 11 \( \text{b} \)b1! \( \text{f} \)f7 12 \( \text{c} \)c2 \( \text{e} \)e8 13 \( \text{d} \)d3
Black is ‘zugged’.

8 \( \text{x} \)xf5 \( \text{e} \)e6 \\
9 \( \text{g} \)g4 \( \text{e} \)e8 \\
10 \( \text{h} \)h5 \( \text{c6} \)

Not 10...\( \text{c6} \) because of 11 \( \text{f} \)f3 winning.

11 \( \text{c} \)c5 \( \text{f} \)f5 \\
12 \( \text{d} \)xd5 \( \text{g} \)xg5 \\
13 \( \text{e} \)e2 \( \text{f} \)f5 \\
14 \( \text{d} \)d3+

The only winning plan.

14 \( \ldots \) \( \text{g} \)g4 \\
15 e4! \( \text{f} \)f4 \\
16 \( \text{c} \)c5 \( \text{e} \)e3 \\
17 \( \text{xb} \)xb5 \( \text{xb} \)xb5 \\
18 \( \text{xb} \)xb5 \( \text{xe} \)e4 \\
19 \( \text{c} \)c5! \( \text{f} \)f5
20 b5 f4
21 b6 f3
22 b7 f2
23 b8\# f1\#  
24 \#e8+!

White wins after the exchange of queens.

A fairly unhappy pawn structure was the reason for defeat in the following game.

Polugaevsky – Mecking  
*Mar del Plata 1971*

1 h4  
2 b4 i.hl  
3 i.e2 i.g2  

If 3 ... i.e4, there would follow 4 i.g4 i.f5 5 i.f3 i.e6 6 e4 dxe4 7 i.xe4 i.c8 8 i.f3 i.e7 9 i.e5 and White wins easily.

7 i.g8 h6  
8 i.f7 h5  
9 i.e8 c2  
10 i.f7 i.e4  
11 f5!! i.xf5  

If 11...gx5, then 12 i.xh5 gives White an outside passed pawn, in this position a decisive factor.

12 i.xd5 c8  
13 e4 e7  
14 i.e5 g5  
15 hxg5 h4  
16 g6 h3  
17 g7 h2  
18 g8\# h1\#  
19 \#f7+ d8  
20 \#f8+ 1-0

White’s task in the following game proved to be much harder.

B. Pytel – Hoidarova  
*Hungary, 1969*

1 th5 \#f5+  
2 i.e3 \#d7  
3 h4 g4  

After 3...gxh4 4 gxh4 i.e6 (Black must prevent 4 i.g4 followed by
\( \text{\textcopyright c8 at all costs} \) 5 \( \text{\textcopyright e8} \) \( \text{\textcopyright c8} \) 6 \( \text{\textcopyright c6} \) \( \text{\textcopyright d6} \) 7 \( \text{\textcopyright a8} \) \( \text{\textcopyright e5} \) 8 \( \text{\textcopyright d3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright f5+} \) 9 \( \text{\textcopyright d2} \) \( \text{\textcopyright c8} \) 10 \( \text{\textcopyright e3} \) Black is in zugzwang and must cede the d4-square to the white king, resulting in a rapid loss.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
4 & \textbf{\textcopyright g6} \\
5 & \textbf{\textcopyright c2} \\
6 & \textbf{\textcopyright d3} \\
7 & \textbf{\textcopyright e2} \\
8 & \textbf{\textcopyright d1!} \\
9 & \textbf{a4} \\
10 & \textbf{axb5} \\
11 & \textbf{\textcopyright e2!} \\
12 & \textbf{\textcopyright f1} \\
13 & \textbf{\textcopyright d3} \\
14 & \textbf{\textcopyright c2} \\
15 & \textbf{\textcopyright h7!} \\
16 & \textbf{\textcopyright d3!} \\
17 & \textbf{\textcopyright d4} \\
18 & \textbf{\textcopyright f5} \\
19 & \textbf{\textcopyright h7!} \\
20 & \textbf{\textcopyright g8} \\
\end{array}
\]

In order to win, White had to put Black in zugzwang no less than five times!

\textit{Petrosian – Benko}

\textit{Stockholm 1962}

Black has prepared \( \ldots \text{g5} \) after which only one pawn will remain on the wrong-coloured square; a single weakness can be defended successfully. There followed

1 \( \textbf{\textcopyright g2} \)

If 1 \( \text{g4} \), Black would reply 1 \( \ldots \text{g5} \) 2 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright f7} \). Then 3 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g8} \) 4 \( \text{\textcopyright g2} \) \( \text{\textcopyright f7} \) 5 \( \text{\textcopyright f3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g8} \) 6 \( \text{\textcopyright d1} \) \( \text{\textcopyright f7} \) 7 \( \text{\textcopyright b3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g8} \) 8 \( \text{\textcopyright e4} \) \( \text{\textcopyright f7} \) 9 \( \text{\textcopyright xd5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright xd5} \) 10 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{b5} \) 11 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{a6} \) and the pawn ending is drawn. White could try the preparatory 3 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright e8} \) 4 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{\textcopyright f7} \) 5 \( \text{\textcopyright d1} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g8} \) 6 \( \text{\textcopyright b3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright f7} \) 7 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g8} \) 8 \( \text{\textcopyright xd5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright xd5} \) 9 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright d7} \) but again the pawn ending is drawn.

1 \( \ldots \) \( \text{\textcopyright f7} \)

2 \( \text{\textcopyright f1} \) \( \text{\textcopyright e6} \)

3 \( \text{\textcopyright d3} \) \( \text{g5!} \)

Weaker is 3 \( \ldots \text{\textcopyright f7} \) 4 \( \text{h4} \) and Black is in trouble.

4 \( \text{\textcopyright c2} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g4!} \) (D)

Black activates his bishop.

5 \( \text{\textcopyright a4} \) \( \text{\textcopyright f3} \)

6 \( \text{\textcopyright b5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g2} \)

7 \( \text{fxg5} \) \( \text{fxg5} \)

Of course not 7 \( \ldots \text{hxg5} \) 8 \( \text{h4} \) which gives White an outside passed pawn.
Same-coloured bishops with a passed pawn

Beliavsky – Kotronias
Belgrade 1993

White’s outside passed pawn deflects the black king to the queenside, but material is so reduced that he must find something extraordinary on the kingside to win.

1...g5!
2...hxg5
3...fxe5

If 3...fxe5 White wins in the following way: 4...f4 a7 5...g5 b6
6...e2 a7 7...xg4 d3 8...c8 b6 9...h4 a7 10...e6 xa6 11...f7 b6 12...xg6 e2 13...h5 b5 14...g4 e8 15...f5 c7 16...g6 d8 17...f6!.

4...f6 f3
5...xg6 d1
6...g5 a7
7...f4 b6
8...d3 a7
9...f5 g3!
10...xg3!

This is the only correct move; White’s passed pawn should be as far away as possible from the enemy king.

10...

...xa6 (D)

11...g4(?)

Although it seems unimportant, the best move was 11...h4! and only then 12...g4, but both sides missed a chance for Black. After 11...h4 12...g4, if Black continues 12...b3 13...h5 c7 14...h6...g8 15...e6 h7 16...f4 d8 17...f5...g8 18...g5...
\( \texttt{\#e7 19 \#g6 \#f8 20 \#f6! he will find himself in zugzwang. However Kotronias later found the line 12...\texttt{\#c7!! 13 h5 \#d8 14 \#xd1 (14 h6 \#c2 =) 14...\texttt{\#e7, drawing.}} \)

11 ... \texttt{\#c2?}

Correct was 11...\texttt{\#a4 or 11...\#b3 with the following variation: 12 h4 \#e8 13 \#f4 \#b6 14 \#g5 (14 \#e5 \#c7 15 \#f6 \#d8 16 \#d1 \#c7 17 \#e7 \#g6 18 \#g4 \#c6! 19 \#d7+ \#d5 20 \#e8 \#xe8 21 \#xe8 \#e5 and the king gets to the h-pawn) 14...\texttt{\#c7 15 \#f5 \#d8 16 \#g6 \#e7 with a draw.}}

12 \#f4 \#b6
13 \#g5 \#c7
14 h4 \#d8
15 \#f6 \#e8
16 \#g7 1-0

Winning with the rook’s pawn can be very tricky.

\textbf{Mikhalchishin, 1991}
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\end{center}

The winning method goes like this:

1 \#b5! \#a8

2 \#a6 \#f3
3 \#d7 \#a8
4 \#h3

A waiting move to force Black’s bishop away from a8.

4 ... \#f3
5 \#c8 \#e2+
6 \#b7 \#f3+
7 \#c7
7 \#b8? \#b6 =.
7 ... \#f3
8 \#b7 +–

A very simple endgame arose in the following game:

\textbf{Ernst – Stohl
Manila OL 1992}
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White should have played 1 \#a3, although after 1...\#e7 2 \#c1 \#d5 3 \#f3 \#d4 4 \#e2 \#c3 5 \#d1 \#b3 he is in zugzwang and loses. Instead of this he played:

1 \#f3

Black could win easily with 1...\#e7 2 \#c3 a3 and then 3...\#f6. However he let the win slip with:

1 ... \#d5?
114 Bishop Endings

2  \textit{e3}  \textit{c4}  \\
3  \textit{f8}  \\
The position is clearly drawn.

The passed pawn which advances either on its own or backed up by the king serves to deflect enemy forces. Very often pawns are exchanged and a new passed pawn is created, which when pushed is decisive (see Mikhalchishin-Holzmann). In bishop endgames zugzwang is particularly common.

\textbf{Czerniak – Mikhalchishin}  \\
\textit{Groningen 1992}
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\end{center}

White must create a passed pawn on the kingside; after g4, h4, and g5 Black will be totally squeezed, therefore his first move is forced.

1 ...  \textit{h5}  \\
2  \textit{e5}  \textit{c6}  \\
3  \textit{b8}  \textit{h6}  \\
4  g3  \textit{c1}  \\
5  \textit{e5}  \textit{d2}  \\
6  h3  \textit{g5}  \\
7  \textit{f4}  \textit{f6}  \\
8  g4  \textit{hxg4}  \\

If Black plays 8...h4 White must respond by 9 g5 \textit{g7} 10 \textit{e3}, with the unstoppable threat of 11 \textit{d4}.

9  \textit{hxg4}  \textit{e7}  \\
10  \textit{g5}  \textit{a3}  \\
11  \textit{e3}  \textit{d6}  \\
If 11...\textit{e7} then White wins with 12 \textit{g6} \textit{f6} 13 \textit{g5}+!.

12  \textit{d4}  \textit{c7}  \\
13  \textit{g6}  \textit{b8} \textit{(D)}
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14  \textit{f3}!  \\
The immediate 14 \textit{g7} is weak, since after 14...\textit{f7} 15 \textit{f5} \textit{c7} 16 \textit{g5} \textit{d8}+ 17 \textit{h6} \textit{g8} 18 \textit{g6} \textit{c7} 19 \textit{f6} \textit{a5} it is not clear how White can win.

14 ...  \textit{d6}  \\
15  \textit{g4}  \textit{b4}  \\
16  \textit{e3}!  \\
It is best to take control of this diagonal, since 16 \textit{h5} is met by 16...\textit{d2}!.

16 ...  \textit{f6}  \\
17  \textit{h5}  \textit{f8}  \\
18  \textit{c1}  \\
Simpler was 18 \textit{d4}+! \textit{f5} and now not 19 \textit{g7}, as Black was counting on, but simply 19 \textit{c5}! and only
then 20 g7. After the immediate 19 g7 there would follow 19...\texttt{1}xg7 20 \texttt{2}xg7 c5! and White cannot stop the black king winning the c4-pawn.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
18 ... \texttt{1}e6 (D)
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

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

19 \texttt{1}h6 \texttt{2}a3
20 \texttt{1}f4 \texttt{2}f8
21 \texttt{1}g5 \texttt{2}g7
22 \texttt{1}g3 \texttt{2}f8
23 \texttt{1}e1! \texttt{2}g7

23...\texttt{1}e5 is refuted by 24 \texttt{1}b4! c5
25 \texttt{1}xc5!.

24 \texttt{1}b4 \texttt{2}f6+

Alternatively 24...\texttt{1}d7 25 \texttt{1}f5 and the bishop gets to f6 via d2 and g5.

25 \texttt{1}h6 \texttt{2}f5
26 \texttt{1}f8 \texttt{2}e4
27 c5! 1-0

\textbf{Mikhalchishin – Holzmann}

\textit{Budapest 1990}

There followed

\begin{center}
1 ... \texttt{1}f2?
\end{center}

More resilient is 1...\texttt{1}b6 2 \texttt{1}g5 \texttt{a}d8+ 3 \texttt{1}g4 \texttt{g}6 4 h5+ \texttt{h}h6 5 \texttt{c}c3 \texttt{b}6 6 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{h}7 7 \texttt{f}f3! \texttt{d}d4 8

\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{b}6 (8...\texttt{1}xc3 9 bxc3 \texttt{h}6 10 \texttt{g}g4 ++) 9 \texttt{e}e4 \texttt{c}c7 10 \texttt{e}e5 \texttt{b}6
11 \texttt{d}d6 \texttt{h}6 12 \texttt{e}e5 \texttt{x}h5 13 \texttt{xe}6 \texttt{g}4 14 f5, although White is also winning in this variation.

2 \texttt{g}5 \texttt{g}8

Or 2...\texttt{1}b6 3 \texttt{f}f6! \texttt{e}e3 4 h5 \texttt{xf}4+ 5 \texttt{xf}4 \texttt{xf}6 6 h6 \texttt{g}6 7 \texttt{c}e5 winning.

3 \texttt{f}f6! \texttt{xf}4+
4 \texttt{xe}6 \texttt{f}f8
5 \texttt{f}5 \texttt{e}e8
6 \texttt{f}6 \texttt{d}8
7 \texttt{f}7 1-0

\textbf{Same-coloured bishops with pawns on one wing}

This configuration of material has drawish tendencies for two reasons:

1) bishops cannot make use of their real power at short range on only part of the board;

2) often the bishop is of a different colour to the corner square on the wing where the game is being played.
Here is a classic example:

**Euwe – Alekhine**  
*The Hague Wch (3) 1937*

1. **f1?**

As Ermolinsky demonstrated, the draw was possible after 1 **e2! f7**  
2. **f2 h5 3 d5 h3 4 g1 f3 5 e6 and Black is tied to defending his weakness on g4.**

1. ... **f3!**

2. **h3**

Or 2 **e3 g3 3 hxg3+ (3 xf3 d5+) 3...xg3 4 e2 f2 5 f1 d7! (zugzwang) 6 c4 g2 7 f4 g1 8 g3 c6 9 d3 g2 10 b5 f1 11 d7 c4 12 h3 d5! (again White is in zugzwang) 13 f4 g2 =.  

1. ... **g3+**

2. **xf3 d7!**

Black could still go wrong with 3...xh3? 4 g2! =.  

4. **e3**

Alternatively 4 g2 xh3+ 5 g1 xf1 6 xf1 h3 =.  

4. ... **hxh3**

5. **c4 d7**

6. **f1 c6**

7. **f4 b7**

The alternative 8...d7 9 e4 g8 10 f5+ e7 11 c8 h7, etc. would also have enabled Black to draw.

9. **e4 g8**

10. **f3 e7**

11. **g4 e6**

12. **f4**

Or 12 h5 xe5 13 xh6 e6 with a simple draw.

12. ... **e7**

White is unable to make any progress.

13. **g4 b3**

14. **c8 f7**

Draw
Repeated zugzwangs force White to concede space to the black king.

9 ...  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  and Black won.

See how many inaccuracies are made by both sides despite the limited material on the board!

1  
Correct is 1 f4! and only then 2 e4.

1 ...  
Black should have played 1...g5!, blocking White’s plan, with an inevitable draw.

2  
Again 2 f4 is mandatory.

2 ...  
This was his last chance to play 2...g5.

3  
3...e3 fails to 4 f5 gxf5 5 gxf5 exf5 6 e5 7 e6+ g8 8 c7! and 9 d8 +-. 

4 1-0

Now for an incredible game:

White is two pawns up but is cramped by Black’s g4-pawn and centralized king. Clearly the pawn ending arising from 1...e3 2 fxe3 xe3 3 h4 is lost for Black. Also bad is 1...c7 2 h3 gxh3+ 3 xh3 f3 4 h4! followed by the decisive 5 h5 and marching the g-pawn up the board. So Black’s only hope is:

1 ...  
2 h3  
3 xh3  
4 g4  
5 g5
6 ♕xg5 ♖xf2

**Draw**

This game emphasizes the importance of an active king in the endgame.

Four pawns versus three on the same side of the board with same-coloured bishops was considered drawn as long ago as Fine's book, on the basis of the following game.

**Ståhlberg – Fine**

*Kemer 1937*

![Chessboard Diagram]

In this position equality was easily maintained after:

1 ... ♘f6
2 ♕c5 ♘d7
3 ♗g8 ♗h6
4 ♗d5 ♘a4
5 ♗d4 ♘d7
6 ♗c4 ♘a4
7 ♗d3 ♘e8
8 ♘4 ♗g5

**Draw**

The famous endgame expert Grandmaster Yuri Averbakh writes in his book that a draw is inevitable in endgames with pawns on the same side if there is no chance of a breakthrough with the king. Tournament praxis in recent years has given several instructive examples of this.

**Hort – Bertok**

*Zagreb 1970*

![Chessboard Diagram]

The pawn structure is somewhat worse in this position than in Fine’s game, but this does not look decisive at first.

1 ♕d5 ♗g7
2 ♗g2 ♗e2
3 ♘3 ♗f6?

A slight inaccuracy; it was more logical to immediately go for the drawing set-up with 3...f6 4 ♗f2 ♘b5 5 e4 ♗f8 6 ♘e3 ♘e7 7 ♗f4 ♗f8 8 g4 hxg4 9 fxg4 ♘d3 10 g5 fxg5+ 11 hxg5 (11 ♘xg5 ♘xe4 12 ♘xe4 ♗g7 =) 11...♘e7 12 e5 ♘b5 13 ♘e4 ♘e8 and Black's defence is solid.

4 ♗f2 ♗b5
5 e4 ♗e8
6 ♘e3 ♗e5
Bertok completely misjudges the position. However, Black is already in serious difficulties – his bishop is confined to the e8-square, and if he plays 8...g5 then 9 hxg5 fxg5 10 f4+ \( \textit{f6} \) (or 10...\( \textit{gx}f4+ \) 11 \( \textit{gx}f4+ \) \( \textit{f6} \) 12 e5+ \( \textit{f5} \) 13 \( \textit{b}1+ \) \( \textit{e}6 \) 14 \( \textit{d}4 \) winning) 11 e5+ \( \textit{f5} \) 12 \( \textit{b}1+ \) \( \textit{g}4 \) 13 \( \textit{f}5 \) h4 14 e6 hxg3 (or 14...h3 15 \( \textit{e}4! \) h2 16 f6 \( \textit{f}2 \) and the white pawn queens.

The only move is 8...\( \textit{d}6 \), and there might follow 9 \( \textit{d}4 \) \( \textit{e}7 \) with two possible plans for White:

a) 10 e5 \( \textit{c}6 \) 11 \( \textit{d}5 \) \( \textit{d}7 \) 12 \( \textit{e}4 \) \( \textit{b}5 \) 13 \( \textit{f}4 \) \( \textit{d}7 \) 14 g4 hxg4 15 fxg4 \( \textit{c}8! \) (15...\textit{fxe5+}! appears to give White 16 \( \textit{g}5 \), but after 16...\textit{hxg4} there arises a well-known draw) and White cannot make any progress.

b) 10 g4 hxg4 (10...\( \textit{d}7 \) leads to a difficult position after 11 gxh5 gxh5 12 \( \textit{b}3 \) followed by 13 \( \textit{d}1 \) and 14 f4 aiming at the h5-weakness) 11 fxg4 \( \textit{d}7 \) 12 g5 fxg5 13 hxg5 and Black holds the position.

Therefore White should try this plan with the king standing on f4, which is entirely feasible (viz. 9 \( \textit{f}4 \) instead of 9 \( \textit{d}4 \)). In that case after 9...\textit{e7} 10 g4 hxg4 11 fxg4 \( \textit{d}7 \) 12 g5 \( \textit{e}8 \) (or 12...\textit{f5} 13 h5! \( \textit{+-} \)) 13 \( \textit{gx}f6+ \) \( \textit{xf}6 \) 14 e5+ \( \textit{g}7 \) 15 \( \textit{g}5 \) \( \textit{c}6 \) 16 \( \textit{b}1 \) \( \textit{e}8 \) 17 e6 Black is losing the g6-pawn along with the game because of zugzwang.

9 \( \textit{f}4+ \) \( \textit{f}6 \)

To destroy the blockade White prepares a decisive breakthrough.

14 ...

15 \( \textit{b}3 \)

Black resigned because of the following variations:

a) 15...\( \textit{e}2 \) 16 \( \textit{g}8 \) \( \textit{f}8 \) 17 \( \textit{h}7 \) \( \textit{g}7 \) 18 e6 \( \textit{hx}h7 \) 19 e7 \( \textit{b}5 \) 20 \( \textit{d}8 \) and wins.

b) 15...\( \textit{e}8 \) 16 \( \textit{g}8 \) \( \textit{a}4 \) 17 e6 \( \textit{e}8 \) 18 \( \textit{f}7! \) \( \textit{xf}7 \) 19 \( \textit{ex}f7 \) \( \textit{xf}7 \) 20 \( \textit{d}7 \) \( \textit{g}7 \) 21 \( \textit{e}7 \) \( \textit{h}7 \) 22 \( \textit{f}7 \) winning.

Now for two very similar positions:

G. Polgar – Barcza
Hungary
4 $\text{h}xc6$ $\text{c}c3$
5 $\text{c}c7$!

If 5 $b5$? then 5...$\text{h}xb5$! 6 $\text{h}xb5$ $\text{b}b4$! =.

5 ... $\text{xb}b4$
6 $\text{b}b6$ $\text{e}e6$
7 $\text{b}b7$ $\text{d}d7$
8 $\text{h}xa6$ $\text{h}h3$
9 $\text{b}b5$ $\text{c}c8$
10 $\text{c}c6$! 1-0

Martinez – Cobo
Havana 1966

1 ... $f4$!
2 $gxf4$

After 2 $\text{h}xf4$ $\text{h}xf4$ 3 $gxf4$ $\text{d}d2$ the pawn ending is won for Black.

2 ... $\text{b}b6$
3 $f5$ $\text{g}xf5$
4 $\text{f}f4$ $\text{d}d8$
5 $\text{g}g5$ $\text{c}c7$
6 $\text{e}e1$

The only defence to 6...$f4$.

6 ... $\text{d}d6$!
7 $\text{f}f2$ $f4$!
8 $\text{h}h6$ $\text{f}xe3+$
9 $\text{h}xe3$ $\text{g}g3$+!

0-1

Several years ago we composed our only study.

Original

![Chess Diagram]

The intended solution is 1...$g4$!
(the pawn ending after 1...$\text{c}c4$ is not winning) 2 $\text{h}xg4$ $\text{h}xf3$+ 3 $\text{xf}3$ (3 $\text{g}xf3$ $\text{h}3$ 4 $\text{f}f2$ $\text{xd}3$ 5 $g5$ $\text{e}4$ 6 $\text{xe}4$ $\text{h}2$ 7 $\text{g}g2$ $f3$+ and wins) 3...$\text{xd}3$ 4 $\text{g}g5$ $e4$+ 5 $\text{xf}4$ $\text{e}3$ 6 $\text{g}6$ $e2$ 7 $\text{g}7$ $e1$ $\text{w}w$ 8 $\text{g}8$ $\text{w}w$ $e4$+ 9 $\text{g}g5$ $\text{w}xg2$+ with a win for Black. However one of our students later found the surprise 2 $\text{f}f5$!.

1 ... $g4$!
2 $\text{f}f5$! $\text{c}c4+$

Now after 3 $\text{f}f2$ $g3$+ 4 $\text{g}g1$ $\text{d}d5$ 5 $\text{f}f1$ $\text{d}2$ 6 $\text{g}1$ $\text{e}3$ Black is threatening to sacrifice the bishop for three pawns with ...$\text{xf}3$, easily winning, so White has to play 7 $\text{g}g4$ $\text{e}2$ 8 $\text{h}h5$ $\text{e}6$ 9 $\text{g}g4$ (the only move; if the bishop goes the other way Black could play the decisive ...$\text{h}xh3$ and ...$\text{xf}3$) 9...$\text{g}xg4$ 10 $\text{h}xg4$ $e4$ 11 $\text{f}xe4$ $h3$ 12 $e5$ $h2$+ 13 $\text{h}1$ $f3$ 14 $\text{g}xf3$ $\text{f}f2$ and Black wins.
But what if White keeps his king on e1? This proves to be the correct defence.

3  ♕e1!  g3
4  ♕e4!  ♕d3
5  ♕d5  ♕d4
6  ♕e6  ♕e3

7  ♕d5  e4
8  ♕xe4!  ♕xe4
9  fxe4  f3

There is no win; the study contained a good idea, but was refuted by a simple move.
6 Which is better, the bishop or the knight?

This is a particularly important question in chess, but for some reason insufficient attention has been paid to it. Contemporary theory (of middlegames and endgames) rates bishops stronger than knights approximately 60 percent of the time. This is a debatable figure, but it did allow Grandmaster Dorfman to say only half-jokingly ‘The very worst bishop is better than the very best knight.’ However, things are not that bad for knights, and sometimes it works the other way around. The famous Ukrainian trainer, International Master Yuri Sakharov, compared the knight to a bus which can walk where it likes, and the bishop to a trolleybus which can only travel along pre-determined routes, the diagonals. We are not concerned with the middlegame, but in the endgame the bishop does have a slight superiority over the knight because most of the positions that arise are open positions. Another advantage is that bishops are easy to manoeuvre, whilst to play well with a knight requires great technique. Bishops and knights do not exist and operate in isolation, but interact with the other pieces. It was discovered long ago that the bishop works well with a rook, and the knight makes an excellent partner for the queen. Two bishops are usually stronger than a bishop and knight, but two knights might put up strong resistance. The pawn structure is also vitally important; the more symmetrical the pawns are, the better the knight. The knight is best suited to occupying outposts in the centre, while the bishop is strongest when it can attack targets on both wings or a series of weak squares of the same colour. We focus on those games in which great skill has been shown in manoeuvring that capricious animal, the knight.

Kholmov – Vasiukov

Moscow 1971
1 ... g5!
Obviously Black is better, but he still needs a concrete plan to improve his position. Firstly he intends to cramp the white bishop.

2 \textit{d}e2 \textit{g}4
3 \textit{d}d1 \textit{e}6
4 \textit{c}c2

If White plays 4 \textit{e}e2 there would follow 4...\textit{g}6 and 5...\textit{e}e5, with a further repositioning of the knight.

4 ... \textit{f}f3
5 \textit{d}d3 \textit{e}5
6 \textit{c}c2 \textit{d}d4
7 \textit{b}b1 \textit{e}6

Clearly the black knight should aim for b4, but he is going about it in a strange way.

8 \textit{c}c2 \textit{d}d8
9 \textit{b}b1 \textit{f}7
10 \textit{c}c2 \textit{d}d6
11 \textit{d}d3 \textit{b}7
12 \textit{c}c2 \textit{a}5
13 \textit{b}b1 \textit{c}6
14 \textit{c}c2 \textit{b}4
15 \textit{b}b1 \textit{a}6
16 a3 \textit{c}6
17 \textit{c}c2 \textit{a}5
18 \textit{d}d3 \textit{c}6
19 \textit{e}e3 \textit{d}4
20 \textit{d}d1 f5!

The e4-square is a serious weakness for White, but there is no way to exploit it. Therefore Black aims his king at the white queenside.

21 \textit{e}xf5 \textit{xf}5+
22 \textit{f}f2 \textit{d}d4
23 \textit{c}c2 \textit{g}7

The knight retreats into a passive position in return for an active king.

24 \textit{e}e2 \textit{c}c3
25 \textit{d}d1 \textit{e}8!
26 \textit{c}d1 \textit{f}6
27 \textit{d}d1 \textit{d}7
28 \textit{g}6 \textit{f}6
29 \textit{e}c2 \textit{b}2
30 \textit{d}d2

White opts to sacrifice a pawn. If 30 a4 then 30...\textit{c}c3 31 \textit{c}c1 \textit{d}d4 32 \textit{d}d2 \textit{e}e4+! 33 \textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 34 \textit{e}e2 a5! and the pawn ending is easily winning for Black.

30 ... \textit{xa}3
31 \textit{c}c3 \textit{b}5
32 \textit{xb}5 \textit{ax}b5
33 \textit{g}6 \textit{d}5+
34 \textit{e}c2 \textit{b}4! (D)

Black sacrifices a pawn in return for a decisive attack on the queenside.

35 \textit{x}h5 \textit{c}4!
36 \textit{g}6

Or 36 \textit{b}c4 \textit{b}3+ 37 \textit{b}b1 \textit{c}3+ and 38...\textit{b}2 winning.

36 ... \textit{xb}3+
37 \textit{d}d3 \textit{b}2
38 \textit{d}d4 \textit{f}6
39 \textit{b}b1 \textit{h}5
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An important manoeuvre, guaranteeing the promotion of the black pawn.

After the centralization of the queen White has a difficult choice between a poor queen endgame and facing the strong combination of queen and knight.

The knight can be particularly ferocious in endings on the one wing in which the bishop can only operate on squares of one colour. The superiority of knight over bishop reaches its apogee in endings such as the following:

Gulko – Romanishin
Lvov 1978

The game continued

The plan of playing the king to c4 was also possible but there is more action on the kingside.
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16  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d6}}}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{d4}}}}}}
17  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e7}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{d5}}}}}}

By means of a cunning triangulation Black tries to force the white bishop off the d8-h4 diagonal.

18  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g3}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{d4}}}}}}
19  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d8}?}}}}

White stubbornly maintains his bishop on the same diagonal, but he should have played 19 \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a3}}}}} with the idea of \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b2}}}}}, hitting the e5-pawn.

19  ...  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h3}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{d4}}}}}}
20  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c7}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e4}}}} (D)

White did not expect his weak f3-pawn to be exchanged, but for Black the most important thing is to penetrate to the f3-square with his king.

22  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{f4}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xe4}}}}
23  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{b6}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f3}}}}
24  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{c5}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g6}}}}
25  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{b6}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d6}}}}

The next stage of the Black's plan is to attack the f2-pawn with his knight.

26  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{h2}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{c4}}!}}

The immediate 26...\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{e4}}}}} allows White to save the game with 27 \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{g1}}}}}

16  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{g4}}}}} 28  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e3}}!}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xh4}}}  29  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g2}}}}} followed by f3.
27  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d4}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{d2}}}}
28  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b6}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{g4}}}}
29  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c8}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{f3}}}}
30  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g2}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{xh4}}}}
31  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h2}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{f3}}}}
32  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g2}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{h4}}}}

Time for the h-pawn to start its decisive march down the board.

33  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c7}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{h3}}}}
34  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f1}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{g5}}}}
35  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d8}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{f5}}}}
36  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c7}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{g4}}}}
37  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b8}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{e4}}}}
38  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c7}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{d4}}}}
39  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b8}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{f3}}}}
40  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c7}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{e2}}}}
41  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h2}}}}}

Black was threatening 41...\texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f4}}}}}  42 \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g1}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{d3}}}}  43 \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g3}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{xf2}}}!  44 \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xf2}}} h2+ and wins.
41  ...  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{c3}}}}}
42  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b8}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{e4}}}}
43  \texttt{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g1}}}}}  \texttt{\textbf{\textbf{\textcolor{blue}{xf2}}}}

0-1

Zaichik – Mikhalchishin
Riga
Black appears to have a reasonable position; after 1...\texttt{Af}d8 and then 2...\texttt{Ad}d4 Black’s bishop is strongly placed in the centre of the board. However after having analysed the position more deeply one of the authors of this book began to feel a certain discomfort, as White can mount pressure by doubling rooks on the d-file. At the post-mortem Tigran Petrosian and Eduard Gufeld completely disagreed on the nature of the position, in particular on the role and strength of the dark-squared bishop. Gufeld declared that Black must be fine with a bishop that controls half the board. Petrosian countered ‘But what will it attack on the dark squares?’ The great Tigran was right: the bishop is less effective than it looks and White can play powerfully on the light squares. In order to create some counterplay Black should try 1...a5 and even sacrifice a pawn if necessary. He attempts this in a different way:

1 ... \texttt{Cc}5?
2 \texttt{Bd}6 \texttt{Ad}4

If Black plays 2...a5 White would reply 3 a4, after which the b3-pawn is easily defensible while the a5-pawn is a more serious weakness.

3 f3 \texttt{Bb}6
4 \texttt{Cc}4 \texttt{Be}6
5 \texttt{Bhe}1

White plans to swap one pair of rooks to defuse any threats to his king.

5 ... \texttt{Bfe}8
6 \texttt{Bxe}6 \texttt{Bxe}6

7 \texttt{Bd}3 \texttt{Bg}7

The d4-bishop not only fails to help the rook to create threats, but positively hinders this process.

8 \texttt{Bc}1 h5
9 \texttt{Bc}2!

Ideal light-squared strategy by White: nearly all his pieces are on the light squares. This is how the knight can often show its advantage, by playing on the squares the bishop cannot reach!

9 ... \texttt{Be}1
10 \texttt{Bd}5 a6

If Black plays 10...\texttt{Bd}4 White can retort 11 \texttt{Bc}6.

11 \texttt{Bb}7 (D)

White can already convert his positional plus into material gains.

11 ... \texttt{Bc}6
12 \texttt{Bc}4 f5
13 \texttt{Bxc}5 \texttt{Bd}6
14 B4 g5
15 a4 g4

A long-winded way of trying to create some counterplay.

16 b5 \texttt{Bd}4+
17 \texttt{Bb}3 axb5
If Black plays 17...a5 then White would respond with 18 \( \text{Qa6} \), threatening 19 \( \text{Qc6} \) and 20 b6.

18 \( \text{axb5} \) \( \text{Qd1} \) 
19 \( \text{Qe6} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 
20 \( \text{f4!} \) \( \text{Qb1+} \) 
21 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 
22 \( \text{Qc5} \) \( \text{h4} \) 
23 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 
24 \( \text{Qd5!} \) \( \text{Qb8} \) 
25 \( \text{Qe6} \) \( \text{Qh1} \) 
26 \( \text{Qb7} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 
27 \( \text{b6!} \) \( \text{Qxh2} \) 
28 \( \text{Qc7+!} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 
29 \( \text{Qe6!} \) 

An elegant finish.

29 ... \( \text{h3} \) 
30 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{hxg2} \) 
31 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Qh6+} \) 
32 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qxb6} \) 
33 \( \text{Qxf5} \) \( \text{Qb3} \) 
34 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qg3} \) 
35 \( \text{Qg6} \) 1-0

P. Nikolić – Vaganian
Lucerne 1989

In this open position Black managed to co-ordinate his rook and knight in a very interesting way.

White must try to free his rook from the a3-square.

1 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) 
2 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qe4} \) 
3 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qb4!} \) 
4 \( \text{Qc1} \)

Clearly 4 \( \text{Qxb4} \) axb4 5 \( \text{Qf1} \) b3! is winning for Black.

4 ... \( \text{Qd2}! ? \) 
5 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qe4} \) 
6 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{f5} \) 

Black decides to support his centrally posted knight, but stronger is the variation shown by Vaganian:

6 ... \( \text{Qe7!} \) 7 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{Qd2} \) 8 \( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Qxb2} \) 9 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qxc2} \) 10 \( \text{Qxc2} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 11 \( \text{Qe2} \) 
12 \( \text{Qc4} \) 13 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 14 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 14 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qf5} \) 16 \( \text{Qb2} \) \( \text{Qh4} \) after which Black has a big advantage.

7 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 
8 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{Qd2+} \) 
9 \( \text{Qf2} \) 

9 \( \text{Qe2} \) is slightly better.

9 ... \( \text{Qc4} \) 
10 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qb2} \) 
11 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 
12 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{h5!} \) 

It is highly appropriate to improve the black pawn structure before capturing the pawn.

13 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{h4} \) 
14 \( \text{Qe8} \) 

Alternatively there is the passive 14 \( \text{Qa3} \), but after 14 ... \( \text{g6} \) 15 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 
16 \( \text{fxe5+} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 17 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qc4+} \) 18 \( \text{Qxc4} \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) White has a very difficult rook ending.

14 ... \( \text{Qxa4} \) 
15 \( \text{Qxa4} \) \( \text{Qxa4} \) \( \text{(D)} \)
A rook ending has been reached in which Black has both an extra pawn and weak white pawns to attack.

16 \textit{g8} \hfill

If White plays 16 \textit{d8+}, Black would reply 16...\textit{e7} (16...\textit{c5} is also playable) 17 \textit{a8} \textit{a1} 18 \textit{a7+} \textit{f6} 19 \textit{f3} a4 20 g4 hxg3 21 \textit{xg3} a3 22 \textit{g2} g5 23 fxg5+ \textit{xg5} 24 \textit{a4} a2 25 \textit{a8} e5 26 \textit{a5} \textit{h4} 27 \textit{a8} f4! and the advance of the f-pawn is terminal.

16 ... \textit{a2+} \hfill
17 \textit{f3} \textit{c2!} \hfill

The rook is to be positioned behind the valuable pawn.

18 \textit{xg7} \textit{c7!} \hfill
19 \textit{g8} \textit{a7} \hfill
20 \textit{e2} a4 \hfill
21 \textit{d8+} \textit{e7} \hfill
22 \textit{d2} a3 \hfill
23 \textit{a2} \textit{d6} \hfill
24 \textit{d2} \textit{d5} \hfill
25 \textit{d3} \textit{a8} \hfill
26 \textit{c3} \textit{e4} \hfill
27 \textit{d2} \textit{d8+!} \hfill

0-1 \hfill

Impressive technique.

Black hopes to brunt the force of White’s attack by playing ...\textit{d7}, taking the c5 and e5-squares under control. The knight is crucial to Black’s defence, therefore it must be eliminated!

1 \textit{xf6!} \textit{gxf6} \hfill
2 \textit{d1} \textit{b8} \hfill

If Black plays 2...\textit{d8}, then 3 \textit{xg7} \textit{f8} 4 \textit{d3}+ \textit{e7} 5 \textit{xe4} wins the a7-pawn.

3 \textit{d3!} \hfill

Threatening to play \textit{a3}.

3 ... \textit{b4} \hfill
4 \textit{d2} \textit{g8} \hfill
5 \textit{g3} \textit{xc4} \hfill
6 \textit{xc4} \textit{g4} \hfill
7 \textit{f4} \textit{h5} \hfill

7...\textit{e5} is poor due to 8 \textit{h3} \textit{g6} 9 fxe5, winning a pawn. Black hopes to weaken the g3-pawn and thereby deflect the white rook from its imminent attack on Black’s a7-pawn.

Which white piece is still inactive? The king. What is to be done? Defend g3! Therefore White proceeds:
8 d2
9 e2
10 hxg3
11 a3
12 f3

If Black plays 12...h2, then 13 c3.

13 xa7 1-0

Look at the e7-bishop: it did not make a single move!

Positions which have knight against bishop with isolated pawn are considered very unpleasant for the side with the bishop. There are several classical examples of this position in endgame books, the most well-known being the game Flohr-Capablanca. According to theory there is neither a definite win nor a certain draw in these positions.

**Dienen – Dolmatov**

*Mexico 1980*

Black has full control over the d5-square, but this is part of his dilemma. Should he blockade with the king or the knight? He must also take care not to allow the white king to breakthrough on the kingside. White should play 1 e1 with the idea of meeting 1...d5 with 2 a5, stopping the knight from reaching c4.

1 c1?
2 d2
3 a5
4 e1

Stronger resistance would have been shown by 4 b4! d5 2 e1 f4! 6 g4 e3 7 f2 xg4! 8 fxg4 hxg4 9 e1 g3 which gives rise to a very interesting position in which Black’s pawns overpower the white bishop, e.g. 10 e2 e4 11 d5 f3+ 12 f1 g2+ 13 f2 xd5 14 d2 c4 and the b-pawn wins.

4 ...
5 b4

A decisive pawn sacrifice. If White declines it with 6 g4, there would follow 6...e3 7 gxh5 gxh5 8 e7 g2 9 g5 b4 --.

6 gxf4

The pawn ending is hopeless for White as his king will be decoyed too far away by the b-pawn.

7 ...
8 f2
9 e1
10 f2

Deflecting the white king to the b-file is decisive.

11 c2
12 xb2
13 c1
14 g3
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It is very often hard to choose between playing with a knight against a bishop, or with a bishop against a knight. Even the great players go astray.

Smyslov – Tal
Moscow 1969

In this position the correct choice was to give up the bishop by playing 1...\(\text{Qf}d\)\text{8} 2 \(\text{Qxf5} \) gxf5 3 f4 \(\text{Qf}8\) followed by ...\(\text{e}6\) and ...\(\text{Qe}7\), liquidating White’s initiative. However, Black played:

1 ... \(\text{Qe}6?\)
2 \(\text{Qxc6} \) bxc6
3 \(\text{Qf3} \) f6

White was threatening to hit the c6-pawn with 4 \(\text{Qe}5. 3...\text{Qg}4\) would be met by 4 \(\text{Qe}5 \) \(\text{Qxe}2\) 5 \(\text{Qe}1\) \(\text{Qa}6\) 6 \(\text{Qd}7\) \(\text{Qf}e8\) 7 \(\text{Qxc5} \) \(\text{Qc}8\) 8 \(\text{Qad}1\).

Smyslov made an interesting observation concerning similar positions: when there are doubled pawns on the board the knight is usually stronger than the bishop!

4 \(\text{Qd}2 \) \(\text{Qfd}8\)
5 \(\text{Qe}4 \) c4
6 \(\text{Qe}5 \) \(\text{Qf}5\)
7 f3!?  

White is prepared to give up the open file, having determined that his king will manage to chase the enemy rook from the d2-square.

7 ... \(\text{Qc}2\)
8 \(\text{Qxd}8+ \) \(\text{Qxd}8\)
9 \(\text{Qf}2 \) \(\text{Qf}7\)
10 b4 \(\text{Qf}5\)
11 \(\text{Qe}1 \) e5

Slightly better was 11...\(\text{Qc}8\), although White could then gradually improve his position, for example with 12 a4.

12 \(\text{Qb}7 \) \(\text{Qd}7\)

Black has no other options for his rook.

13 \(\text{Qa}5 \) c5
14 bxc5 \(\text{Qd}5\)
15 \(\text{Qb}7\)

15 e4 is less effective as it leads to a rook ending with drawing chances for Black: 15...\(\text{Qxc}5\) 16 \(\text{Qb}7 \) \(\text{Qc}7\) 17 \(\text{Qd}6+ \) \(\text{Qe}7\) 18 \(\text{Qxf}5+ \) gxf5 19 exf5 \(\text{Qb}7\).

15 ... \(\text{Qd}7\)
16 \(\text{Qd}6+ \) \(\text{Qe}7\)
17 g4!

A useful move, gaining the b1-square for the rook. 17...\(\text{Qc}2\) fails to 18 \(\text{Qxc}4 \) \(\text{Qc}7\) 19 \(\text{Qe}3\).

17 ... \(\text{Qe}6\)
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After 19...d7 White would respond 20 xc7+ xc7 21 e8+. 20 xb7 d7 (D)

We certainly do not wish to create the false impression that the knight is stronger than the bishop. The knight is a highly versatile piece, and to take full advantage of this often requires very impressive technique.

It is well-known that Bobby Fischer liked to play with bishops against knights, but look at his fantastic technique when using the knight in the next game - a game that supports the thesis that the knight is stronger than a bishop if the pawns are symmetrical.

Saidy - Fischer
USA Ch (New York) 1963/4

Black's first task is to find the best square for his knight. The answer is to play the knight to where it attacks the white d-pawn. Therefore:

1   e2
2  f1 d8!
3  e2

White does not sense the danger; he should have played 3 g4! followed by f3 and h3, optimizing his
pawn structure and creating maximum difficulties for his opponent.

3 ... $\text{d}e6$

4 $\text{d}3$ h5

5 $\text{e}3$ $\text{h}7$

6 f3 $\text{g}6$

Fischer's plan is now in its second stage: activate the king and advance the pawns.

7 a4 $\text{f}5$

8 $\text{e}2$ g5

9 f2 $\text{d}8$

10 $\text{d}2$ $\text{g}6$

11 $\text{e}3$ $\text{e}6$

12 $\text{d}3$ $\text{f}5$

13 $\text{e}3$ f6

14 $\text{e}2$ $\text{g}6$

15 $\text{d}3$ f5

After some repetitions Fischer begins his main plan, although he cannot activate his king and advance the pawns at the same time.

16 $\text{e}2$?!

White's lackadaisical approach ignores more active continuations such as 16 g4. After 16...hxg4 17 fxg4 18 $\text{f}2$ g3! 19 $\text{x}g3$ $\text{f}5$ the black king penetrates. However 16 g3! f4 17 gxf4 g4! 18 fxg4 hxg4 19 $\text{f}2$ $\text{x}f4+$ 20 $\text{e}3$ $\text{f}5$ 21 $\text{g}3$ was correct; it is hard to see how Black can make progress.

16 ... f4

17 $\text{f}2$ $\text{g}7$? (D)

On the last move before the time control Fischer repeats moves, not yet having decided on the correct idea ...g4. White could now escape with 18 g4! fxg3 19 $\text{x}g3$ $\text{e}6$ 20 h3, building a fortress.

18 h3 $\text{f}5$

19 $\text{d}3$ g4!

20 hxg4 hxg4

21 fxg4 $\text{h}6$

22 $\text{e}1$

White could have offered more resistance with 22 $\text{e}2$ $\text{x}g4$ 23 $\text{g}1$ $\text{f}5$ 24 $\text{f}3$ $\text{f}6$ 25 $\text{h}2$ $\text{h}5$

26 a5 $\text{g}5$ 27 g4 fxg3 28 $\text{x}g3$ $\text{g}7$! although this is also lost, since Black will win the white d-pawn by checking away the white king.

22 ...

23 $\text{d}2$ $\text{f}5$ (D)

24 $\text{e}1$ $\text{f}6$

Grandmaster Vladimirov found another way of winning: 24...$\text{e}3$
25 g3 \(\text{g2}\) 26 \(\text{f2}\) fxg3 27 \(\text{xg3}\) g4 28 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{f3}\) followed by 29...\(\text{f4+}\), forcing White’s king to retreat.

\[
\begin{align*}
25 & \text{h4} & \text{e4} \\
26 & \text{e1} & \text{g4} \\
27 & \text{e2} &
\end{align*}
\]

After 27 b3 Black can put White in zugzwang by means of triangulation: 27...\(\text{g5!}\) 28 \(\text{e2}\) \(\text{f5}\) 29 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{g4}\).

\[
\begin{align*}
27 & \ldots & \text{g3} \\
28 & \text{d3} & \text{f5!} \quad \text{There is no defence against the crushing } ...\text{h4}. \\
29 & \text{f2} & \text{h4} \\
30 & \text{a5} & \text{\text{g2}} \\
31 & \text{e3} & \text{\text{f3}} \\
32 & \text{g1} & \text{e2} \\
33 & \text{h2} & \text{f3} \\
34 & \text{g3} & \text{e3} \\
& & \text{0-1}
\end{align*}
\]
7 An Unusual Endgame

The drawish tendencies in rook endgames with the f- and h-pawns are well-known. Less familiar are the similar positions of bishop against knight with f- and h-pawns (or a- and c-pawns). Admittedly, these endgames occur very infrequently. There are two varieties: either with bishop on the same colour as the queening square of the rook pawn, or with the bishop differing in colour from the corner square. The second position is much simpler to win, although some positions can be successfully defended in the right circumstances. This type of position is best described by Averbakh.

Ljubojević – Spassky
Thessaloniki OL 1988

In this position Black has no real drawing chances as his bishop is the wrong colour and the white king has already penetrated too far.

1 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{b7} \)
2 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{e5} \)
3 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{g3} \)
4 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{h2} \)
5 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{g3} \)
6 \( \text{e3!} \)

Re-routing the knight to its optimum position.

6 ... \( \text{f4} \)
7 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{g3} \)
8 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{c7} \)
9 \( \text{a5!} \) \( \text{(D)} \)

Alternatively 11...\( \text{a7} \) 12 \( \text{d7}! \)
\( \text{xa6} \) 13 \( \text{c6} \) and Black is defenceless against c7 and c8\( \text{Q} \).

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

In this position Black has no real drawing chances as his bishop is the wrong colour and the white king has already penetrated too far.
12 \( \text{Q}\text{b}5 \) \( \text{Qh}4 \)
12...\( \text{Q}g1 \) fails to 13 \( \text{Q}b6 \) with the idea of a7+ and \( \text{Q}c7 \) mate.

13 a7+ \( \text{Qa}8 \)
14 \( \text{Q}b6 \) \( \text{Qd}8+ \)
15 \( \text{Q}a6! \)
15 \( \text{Q}c7+ \) is also strong.

15 ... \( \text{Qb}6 \)
16 c6! 1-0

Vuksanović – Petrovich
Lvov 1993

There followed:

1 \( \text{Qe}7+ \)
1 a5 is also possible.

1 ... \( \text{Qb}7? \)
Black intends to defend from the back, but clearly 1...\( \text{Q}c5 \) is stronger (although insufficient to save the game).

2 \( \text{Qg}6 \) \( \text{Qd}4 \)
3 \( \text{Qb}4 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \)
4 \( \text{Qe}7+ \) \( \text{Qb}6 \)
5 a5+ \( \text{Qa}6 \)
6 \( \text{Qc}6! \)
White must get his king to the b5-square, after which the end is near.

6 ... \( \text{Qf}2 \)
7 \( \text{Qa}4 \) \( \text{Qb}7 \)
8 \( \text{Qb}5 \) \( \text{Qg}3 \)
9 \( \text{Qd}8+ \) \( \text{Qc}8 \)
10 \( \text{Qe}6 \) \( \text{Qb}7 \)
11 c5
Also strong is 11 a6+ \( \text{Qa}8 \) (the alternative 11...\( \text{Q}b8 \) is decisively met by 12 \( \text{Q}b6 \) intending a7+) 12 c5 \( \text{Q}c5 \) 13 c6 \( \text{Q}b8 \) 14 \( \text{Q}b6 \) ++.
11 ... \( \text{Qf}2 \)
12 c6+ \( \text{Qc}8 \)
13 \( \text{Q}c5 \) (D)

The immediate 13 a6 \( \text{Qa}7 \) 14 c7 \( \text{Qd}7! \) begs the question: what next?

13 ... \( \text{Qg}3 \)
14 \( \text{Qd}7 \) \( \text{Qf}2 \)
15 \( \text{Qb}6+ \) \( \text{Qc}7 \)
16 \( \text{Qd}5+ \) \( \text{Qd}6 \)
16...\( \text{Q}c8 \) leads to the same thing; in any case White has to play the knight to c5 to win.

17 \( \text{Qf}6 \) \( \text{Qc}7 \)
18 \( \text{Qe}4 \) \( \text{Qa}7 \)

If Black plays 18...\( \text{Q}g1 \), there would follow 19 \( \text{Q}c5 \) \( \text{Q}b8 \) 20 a6 \( \text{Q}h2 \) 21 \( \text{Q}e6 \) \( \text{Q}g3 \) 22 \( \text{Q}b6 \) and White wins.
19 \textit{d}c5 \textit{d}d6

After 19...\textit{c}8 there follows 20 \textit{e}6, transposing into the variation shown above.

20 \textit{a}6!

A superb sacrifice.

20 ... \textit{xe}5

21 \textit{b}7 \textit{b}8

22 a6 1-0

Now let us turn to the position with bishop and corner square the same colour. Averbakh analysed positions with the king on the fifth rank many years ago.

\textbf{Averbakh, 1958}
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The strongest continuation is:

1 \textit{c}c2!

1...\textit{h}3 2 a6 \textit{a}7 (nothing is altered by 2...\textit{c}7 3 \textit{a}3 \textit{d}7+ 4 \textit{c}5 and 5 \textit{b}5+, transposing into the main variation) 3 \textit{a}5 \textit{c}8 4 \textit{b}4 \textit{d}7 5 c5 \textit{e}8 6 \textit{c}2 \textit{d}7 7 \textit{d}4 and 8 \textit{b}5+ and White wins easily.

2 \textit{a}3 \textit{e}2

3 a6 \textit{a}7
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Or 3...\textit{c}7 4 \textit{c}5 \textit{f}3 5 \textit{b}5+ \textit{b}8 6 \textit{b}6+.

4 \textit{a}5 \textit{f}3

5 \textit{b}5+ \textit{b}8

6 \textit{b}6 \textit{c}8

7 a7

There is no defence from 8 \textit{c}7.

The next position is much more complicated.

\textbf{Averbakh, 1958}
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Black to move. Curiously Black is losing because he has insufficient squares on the a8-h1 diagonal. If it were White to move he would win by means of 1 \textit{e}6+ \textit{d}7 2 \textit{f}4 and 3 \textit{b}6, followed by pushing the c-pawn after due preparation.

1 ... \textit{f}1+

2 \textit{a}5 \textit{g}2

3 \textit{b}4!!

An unexpected zugzwang.

3 ... \textit{e}4

There are two other possibilities:

a) 3...\textit{d}5 4 \textit{b}5 \textit{e}4 5 \textit{e}6+ \textit{d}7 6 \textit{g}5! and the king invades on b6.
b) 3...\texttt{f}1 4 \texttt{b}5+ \texttt{c}6 5 a7! \texttt{b}7 6 c6+ \texttt{a}8 7 \texttt{a}5! \texttt{x}b5 8 \texttt{x}b5 \texttt{x}a7 9 \texttt{a}5 \texttt{a}8 10 \texttt{a}6 \texttt{b}8 11 \texttt{b}6 winning.

After 4...\texttt{c}6, White plays 5 a7 \texttt{d}7 6 \texttt{a}5 and 7 \texttt{b}6, etc.

Alternatively 5...\texttt{c}6 (or to another square on the long diagonal) 6 \texttt{a}5 \texttt{c}7 7 \texttt{b}5+ and White wins.

5 \texttt{d}6 \texttt{a}8

There is no defence from the a-pawn.

Mikhalechishin – Anikaev

\textit{Nikolaev 1981}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.3\textwidth]{chessboard.png}
\end{center}

1 \texttt{b}7!

Anikaev indicates in \textit{Informator} 32 that after 1 \texttt{d}5? Black wins with 1...\texttt{d}2+ 2 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{e}4+ 3 \texttt{f}3 (3 \texttt{h}3 \texttt{f}4 4 \texttt{h}4 \texttt{f}6 5 \texttt{e}6 \texttt{e}4 and then 6...\texttt{f}4 is no improvement) 3...\texttt{h}5 4 \texttt{c}6 (4 \texttt{x}e4 \texttt{f}xe4+ 5 \texttt{e}4 \texttt{g}4 ) 4...\texttt{h}4 5 \texttt{d}7 \texttt{d}2+ 6 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{c}4 7 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{g}4 and Black's king reaches the necessary square.

1 \texttt{d}2+

Alternatively 1...\texttt{e}5+ 2 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{h}5 3 \texttt{d}5 \texttt{h}4+ 4 \texttt{h}3 \texttt{g}6 5 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{f}4 6 \texttt{h}5 and the h4-pawn is lost.

2 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{e}4+

3 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{h}5

4 \texttt{e}8

This move is awarded a question-mark by Anikaev, who prefers 4 \texttt{a}6 \texttt{h}4 5 \texttt{g}2 \texttt{g}3 6 \texttt{b}7 \texttt{h}5 7 \texttt{f}3 \texttt{f}4+ 8 \texttt{h}2 \texttt{d}3 9 \texttt{h}3 \texttt{e}1 10 \texttt{c}6 \texttt{f}4 11 \texttt{b}7 \texttt{f}3 12 \texttt{c}6 \texttt{f}2 13 \texttt{b}5 drawing. However, White can still save the game after the move played.

4 \texttt{h}4 (D)

5 \texttt{g}2?

One of your authors cannot explain why he ceded ground to his opponent's king. He should have continued 5 \texttt{b}7 \texttt{h}3 6 \texttt{a}6 \texttt{f}6 (6...\texttt{f}4!? – editor's note) 7 \texttt{b}7 \texttt{e}5 8 \texttt{c}6 (not 8 \texttt{c}8? \texttt{g}5+! 9 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{e}4 10 \texttt{a}6 \texttt{e}3 –+) 8...\texttt{g}5+ 9 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{f}4+ 10 \texttt{f}2 \texttt{d}4 11 \texttt{b}7! \texttt{d}3 12 \texttt{c}6 \texttt{d}2 13 \texttt{b}7 \texttt{f}3 14 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{h}2 15 \texttt{x}f3! \texttt{xf}3 16 \texttt{g}2 leading to a well-known theoretical draw.
An Unusual Endgame
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10...

In the corner the bishop loses its manoeuvrability, unable now to control the h3-c8 diagonal. On the other hand, after 10 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{e4+} \) 11 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 12 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{g5+} \) 13 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{e4} \) 14 \( \text{c6+} \) \( \text{d3} \) 15 \( \text{b5+} \) \( \text{d2} \) 16 \( \text{c6} \) the position is drawn. The mistake of White’s tenth move allows a pretty finish.

10 ... \( \text{e4+} \)
11 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e5}! \)
12 \( \text{b7} \)

White cannot play 12 \( \text{xe4} \) because of 12...h2 13 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 14 \( \text{xh2} \) \( \text{e3} \).

12 ...

There is no defence to the h-pawn queening.
A very interesting and similar endgame arose in the following game.

**Suetin – Stein**  
*Kislovodsk 1972*

1 \textit{c6?}

1 \textit{e3} is a better attempt. There follows 1...\textit{d5+} and then:

a) If White plays 2 \textit{xd5}, then after 2...\textit{xd5} 3 \textit{f4} \textit{e6} 4 \textit{g5} \textit{e5} 5 \textit{hx4 f4} 6 \textit{h5 g3} 7 \textit{g5 f4} 8 \textit{h4 f3} the black pawn queens.

b) 2 \textit{f2} and here Black must play precisely:

b1) After 2...\textit{f4} 3 \textit{e3} \textit{xh3} 4 \textit{b7} there arises one of the aforementioned positions.

b2) Black has another possibility which we had missed when publishing this position in *New in Chess* magazine, namely 2...\textit{b6!} 3 \textit{e3} \textit{c4+} 4 \textit{d3 f4!} and Black wins.

The game continued:

\begin{verbatim}
1 ... \textit{f4}  
2 \textit{b7} \textit{e4+}  
3 \textit{g2} \textit{e3}  
4 \textit{c8} \textit{f4}  
5 \textit{a6} \textit{d2}  
6 \textit{b5} \textit{f3+}  
7 \textit{g1} \textit{f4}  
8 \textit{h2} \textit{f2}  
9 \textit{c4} \textit{gl}  
10 \textit{d1!} \textit{d3 f2}.
\end{verbatim}

Black's aim is to reach the g3-square with his king.

\begin{verbatim}
8 ... \textit{e4}  
9 \textit{a6} \textit{c3!}  
10 \textit{g1} \textit{g3}  
\end{verbatim}

10 \textit{c4} is met by 10...\textit{d1!} with the idea of 11...\textit{e3} to be followed by 12...\textit{f2}.

10 ... \textit{g3}  
0-1
This is one of the least well analysed endings in chess endgame theory; there is no clear idea of what the stronger side’s winning chances are, either with rooks or without. Only Jonathan Speelman’s book *Endgame Preparation* touches on it; no other endgame book deals with this position. *ECE* gives only two positions.

Why are books written on the endgame? In order to make definite judgements of various positions on the basis of tournament practice and home analysis. The evaluation of this type of position reminds me of an episode in a certain literary work in which two doctors were diagnosing a patient’s illness. One doctor said ‘The patient is more dead than alive’. The other doctor said ‘The patient is more alive than dead’. These evaluations aptly describe the conclusions that some chapters on endgame theory reach. It is altogether simpler to reach a correct and definitive evaluation of a position in opening theory, with its many games, analyses and conclusions reached in works such as *Informator*. Endgames often have too few practical examples, and also demand very accurate analysis.

We have divided this chapter into two parts; knight and four pawns against bishop and three pawns; rook, knight and four pawns against rook, bishop and three pawns. Is either of these endings winning? When should rooks be exchanged and when should the position be simplified into a rook endgame? The general plan is obvious: the optimum positioning of pieces together with advancing the pawn phalanx. As in other endgames, the weaker side must strive to exchange pawns, and the stronger side pieces.

Converting the material advantage of one pawn when all the pieces are on the same flank can be very problematic. It requires pure technique. The weaker side has practically no counterplay, but the stronger side also faces certain limitations: each pawn exchange makes the draw more likely. These endings on the same wing occur very frequently and are basically drawish. More often than not there are also rooks on
the board, and rook and bishop usually work together better than rook and knight. However if the ending is on one wing the power of the knight increases considerably since it can attack both light and dark squares, and there are no long range objects of attack on the other wing. There is as yet no definite evaluation of this type of position, although most experts prefer the weaker side’s drawing chances to the stronger side’s winning chances. However, the statistics do not bear this out, as in fact winning chances are held at about 70-80%.

Black chooses to create a passed pawn on the e-file. However, he could have opted for another plan by first playing his knight to d6, then advancing ...e4; after fxe4 Δxe4 a position from the game Lyskov-Beilin, Moscow 1949 would have been reached.

This game continued 1 Δd7 (it is stronger to play 1 Δf1 Δf4 2 Δc6 Δc5 3 Δf2 Δd3+ 4 Δe2 Δe5 5 Δb7 Δg3 followed by playing the knight to e5 and advancing the pawn to f3) 1...Δe2 2 Δc8 Δg3 3 Δd7 Δe1! 4 Δc8 Δe2+ 5 Δh2 Δf2 6 Δd7 Δd4 7 Δh1 f5 8 Δc8 f4 9 Δd7 f3 10 gxf3 Δxf3 11 Δg4 Δg3 12 Δf5 Δd4 13 Δg4 Δc2 14 Δg1 Δe1 15 Δe2 Δg2 followed by ...Δf4, winning the white h-pawn.

Back to Chekhlov-Katisonok:

The pawn structure in this position is clearly in Black’s favour, but the win is far from simple.

1 ... Δf6
2 Δg1
2 g3 is met by 2...g5, handicapping White with chronic weaknesses on f3 and g3.

2 ... Δe5
10  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d5}}} \)  e4
11  fxe4  fxe4
12  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b7}}} \)

In this position the simplest way to win is 12...e3+ 13 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f1}}} \) g3 14 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d5}}} \) h2!, for example 15 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e4}}} \)
\( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e6}}} \) 16 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e2}}} \) f4+ 17 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xex3}}} \) g3 18 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f5}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{dxe2+}}} \) followed by ...f4 and ...\( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{dxe2}}} \), winning easily.

\[ 
\text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Yurtaev – Serper}}}
\text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{USSR 1988}}}
\]

White has an almost ideal position with his extra pawn, more active pieces and a strong pawn structure. The plan is fairly simple: win the h5-pawn.

1  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e4}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b6}}} \)

If Black plays 1...g7 White would respond with 2 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g7}}} \) White was threatening both 3 f6 and 3 fxg6 fxg6 4 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d6}}} \) followed by e6.

3  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f6+}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g7}}} \)

\[ 
\text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{8 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{c6}}?}}}
\]

Simpler was 8 e6 fxe6+ 9 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xe6}}} \) f4 10 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e5}}} \) g3 11 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f5!}}} \) h2 (or 11...f3+ 12 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{dxe2}}} \) f2 13 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g2+}}} \)) 11 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h4+}}} \) h5 12 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f3}}} \) g3 13 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f5}}} \) followed by the knight tour \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d4-e2xf4}}} \).

8 ... \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d4}}} \)
9  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c4}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c3}}} \)
10  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d5}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g5}}} \)
11  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d6}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g6}}} \)
12  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b5}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b2}}} \)
13  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d4}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g5}}} \)
14  g3 \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c3}}} \)
15  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f3+}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g6}}} \)
16  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d6}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b4+}}} \)
17  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d7}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c3}}} \)
18  e6!

Finally White hits upon the correct plan.

18 ... \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{fxe6}}} \)
19  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xe6}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f6}}} \)
20  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e5+}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xe5}}} \)
21  \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xe5}}} \) \( \text{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g5}}} \)
22 h4+ g4
23 h5 1-0

Romanishin – Balashov
Irkutsk 1986

According to Romanishin this apparently obvious plan is faulty, and he should instead have played 5 e3 followed by d3, f4, g4 putting Black in a dilemma over whether to allow the weakening of his h-pawn after gxh5, or to exchange with ...hxg4, which would allow White to form a passed pawn on the h-file. Although the latter is the lesser of two evils, defending this position would be very tricky.

5 ...
6 d3

Another option for White is 6 g4 hxg4 7 fxg4 g5 8 hxg5 fxg5 9 h3, but then 9...d7! holds the position.

11 ...
12 e5 h3
13 e4 g4
14 d3 f5+
15 e2 b1
16 f2 f7
17 f3 e7
18 e3 c2
19 f4 f7
20 a6

White should try to make progress by playing his knight to d4, king to g5, then transferring the knight to f4, although this is probably impossible to carry out.

20 ...

Better is 8 b4 b7 9 c2 and then e3 and f5, creating huge problems for Black (Romanishin).

8 ...
9 e5 f3
10 e4 fxe5+
11 fxe5 (D)

If White plays 11 xe5 the pawn ending after 11...xe4 12 xe4 e6 is drawn.
In this position Black made the ‘natural’ move:

25 ... $d5??

... but was forced to resign:

26 $f7 $e6
27 $h8 1-0

There is no defence from $g5. Instead Black could have drawn with 25...$e7.

**Popchev – Cvitan**

*Dubrovnik 1990*
Some games can be very amusing. A fascinating endgame arose in the following game:

Novikov – Mikhachishin
Lvov 1987

White has doubled pawns but paradoxically this gives him winning chances.

1 \(\text{c4} \) \(\text{c3} \)

The knight impedes the path of the white king, but this is easily overcome.

2 \(\text{f1} \) \(\text{f6} \)
3 \(\text{f3} \) \(\text{e7} \)
4 \(\text{e1} \) \(\text{a4} \)
5 \(\text{d2} \) \(\text{b6} \)
6 \(\text{d3} \) \(\text{c8} \)

Black’s other defence 6...\(\text{d7} \) is no improvement, as White would respond with 7 \(\text{d4} \) \(\text{d6} \) 8 \(\text{b5} \) \(\text{f6} \) 9 e4 fxe4 10 fxe4 \(\text{e7} \) 11 e5 \(\text{g4} \) 12 \(\text{d3} \) \(\text{f7} \) 13 \(\text{d5} \) followed by \(\text{d6} \) and e6(+) Black’s general difficulty in this ending is the passivity of his knight, which White seeks to restrict as far as possible.

7 \(\text{d4} \) \(\text{a7} \)

13 \(\text{c6} \) \(\text{c3} \)
14 \(\text{b7} \) \(\text{d1+} \)
15 \(\text{g2} \) \(\text{e3} \)
16 \(\text{g3} \) \(\text{c3} \)
17 \(\text{e6?} \)

This loses to a surprising combination. White could have continued his resistance by playing 17 \(\text{g2} \) \(\text{e2} \) 18 \(\text{e4} \) \(\text{d4} \) 19 \(\text{g3} \) and now 19...\(\text{xf3} \) fails to 20 \(\text{xf3} \) e4 21 \(\text{g2} \) \(\text{d3} \) 22 \(\text{f2} \), but Black could maintain winning chances by means of 19...\(\text{e2} \) 20 \(\text{g2} \) \(\text{e6!} \) followed by ...\(\text{f4+} \) meeting \(\text{g3} \) with ...\(\text{f1} \) followed by ...\(\text{e2+} \) and ...\(\text{f2} \) picking up the f-pawn. After ...\(\text{f4+} \) White should retreat the king to g1, but in that case Black has the resource ...\(\text{f4-d3-e1} \).

17 ... \(\text{e2+} \)
18 \(\text{g2} \) \(\text{d4} \)
19 \(\text{b7} \) (D)

A fantastic tactical solution!

20 \(\text{xf3} \) e4
21 \(\text{d1} \) \(\text{d2} \)

White is forced into a lost pawn ending, and therefore he resigned.
It, J and K vs A, D and G on the same wing

9 ... fxe4

Of course Black does not want to undouble the white pawns, but otherwise his lack of space would quickly become fatal: 9...Dd6 10 e5 De8 11 Dc6 Dg7 12 Dc7 De8+ 13 Dc8 Dg7 14 Dd5 De8 15 Dc6 Dg7 16 Dd7 Dh8 17 Dd8 Dh7 18 Dc8 De8 19 e6+ Df8 20 e7+ Dh7 21 De6+.

10 fxe4 Dd6
11 Dd4

12 Dd3 is also fully playable.

11 ... De8
12 e5 Dg7
13 Dd3 De6+
14 De3 Df8
15 Dc2!

Zugzwang!

15 ... De6
16 Dd4 De7
17 f5! gxf5
18 Dxf5

Look at the poor black knight.

18 ... Dh7
19 De4 Dg7

20 Dh3!

White's triangulation helps overcome any remaining resistance.

20 ... Dh6
21 Df4 Dg7
22 Dg5 1-0

Accurate work!

With Rooks

Nei – Averbakh
USSR 1976

1 ... g5!?

A surprise! Reducing pawns usually favours the weaker side, but Averbakh intends cramping White's bishop and pawns.

2 hxg5 hxg5
3 Db7 g4
4 Dc8?

This is passive according to Averbakh, who prefers 4 Db5, attempting to hinder Black's pawn advances.

4 ... Da4
5 Db7 f5
6 Dc2 Da3
7 Db2 Dh7
8 Dc2 Dh6
9 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{c}f3! (D) \)
A fascinating decision, as 9...\( \text{c}c4 \) or 9...\( \text{d}d3 \) with ...\( e6-e5-e4 \), or ...\( e6-e5 \) and ...\( f5-f4 \) to follow, looks like the natural way forward.

19 ... \( \text{h}3 \)
20 \( g4 \) \( f4! \)
0-1

Adorjan – Tseshkovsky
Riga IZ 1979

10 \( \text{xf}3 \)
It was worth trying 10 \( \text{b}6 \), hindering the advance of the e-pawn.
10 ... \( \text{gxf}3+ \)
11 \( \text{d}2 \) \( e5 \)
12 \( \text{b}8 \) \( \text{g}5 \)
13 \( \text{g}8+ \) \( \text{h}5 \)
14 \( \text{g}7 \)
Alternatively 14 \( \text{h}8+ \) \( \text{g}4 \) 15 \( \text{h}4+ \) \( \text{g}5 \), with a decisive advantage for Black.
14 ... \( \text{e}4 \)
15 \( \text{g}8 \)
Here the quickest road to victory is 15...\( e3+! \) 16 \( \text{x}e3 \) \( \text{a}1 \). In the game Black won after:
15 ... \( \text{b}3 \)
16 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{d}3+ \)
17 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{d}8 \)
18 \( \text{h}7+ \) \( \text{g}4 \)
19 \( \text{g}7+? \)
White could have offered more resistance by 19 \( \text{h}4+ \) \( \text{g}5 \) 20 \( \text{h}7 \).

1 \( \text{f}2 \)
The plan of gaining space by playing 1 \( g4 \) and then \( h4 \) and \( \text{f}2 \) looks good.
1 ... \( \text{h}5 \)
The late International Master Lev Aronin considered this plan faulty, recommending a different defensive set-up with 1...\( g5 \). This seems dubious, however, as after 2 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 3 \( \text{b}3 \) followed by \( \text{b}6+ \), \( \text{g}3 \) and \( h4 \), Black’s position is very difficult, if it can be defended at all.
2 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{a}6 \)
3 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{a}7 \)
4 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{d}3 \)
5 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{c}4 \)
6 \( e4 \) \( \text{a}1 \)
Why not 6...\( \text{a}2 \) 7 \( \text{x}a2 \) \( \text{x}a2 \) reaching the position from the game Romanishin-Balashov?
7 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \)
Donaldson criticizes this move, although he approves of Black’s defensive system.

8 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{xa5} \)?
Black should play his rook to his second rank and await White’s plan.

9 \( \text{Qc6} \) \( \text{c5} \)
10 \( \text{Qd7+} \) \( \text{Qf8} \)
11 \( \text{Qd6} \) \( \text{b5} \) \( (D) \)

Although Black would be forced to exchange rooks after 12...\( \text{Qe7} \) 13 \( \text{Qb6} \) \( \text{c4} \) 14 \( \text{Qc6+} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 15 \( \text{Qe3} \), this would have been better than what happened in the game.

13 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{f5?} \)
Desperation. 13...\( \text{Qf7} \) is better.

14 \( \text{hxg5} \) \( \text{fxe4} \)
15 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{h4} \)
16 \( \text{Qd5}! \) \( \text{c3+} \)
17 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{g3} \)
18 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \text{Qxg2+} \)
19 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{h3} \)
20 \( \text{Qb6} \) \( \text{g2} \)
21 \( \text{Qf6+} \) \( \text{Qg7} \)
22 \( \text{Qd5} \)

Black resigned, having shown a fantastic lack of any defensive plan.

Portisch – Pritchett
Buenos Aires OL 1978

The bishop is a different colour from that in the Adorjan-Tseshkovsky game. Now White could opt for a plan of \( \text{Qb3}, \text{h2-h3}, \text{f2-f4}, \text{Qf3}, \text{Qe4} \) and, when appropriate, g4. Portisch tries another method.

1 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{e7} \)
2 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{e6} \)
3 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{e7} \)
4 \( \text{Qb7} \) \( \text{e5} \)
5 \( \text{Qd7} \) \( \text{e6} \)
6 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{f8} \)
7 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{e7} \)
8 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{e5} \)
9 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{e7} \)
10 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{e7} \)
11 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{e6} \)
12 e4!

After some stalling White gets on with his plan.

12 ...
13 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{g8} \)
14 h3 \( \text{h6+} \)
15 f4 \( \text{a3} \)
16 g4 \( \text{hxg4} \)
17 hxg4 \( \text{g7?} \)
Probably a decisive error. Black must play 17...f6, trying to avoid being completely squeezed by White’s pawns.

18 \text{d}d8+ \text{h}h7
19 g5 \text{a}a1
20 e5

Now the bishop has been made totally passive it is time to bring the knight to either d6 or f6.

20 ... \text{g}g1
21 \text{c}c5 \text{g}g3+
22 \text{f}f2 \text{a}a3
23 \text{e}e4

Also winning is 23 \text{b}b7 with the idea of \text{d}d6 and \text{d}d7.

23 ... \text{a}a2+
24 \text{g}g3 \text{a}a3+
25 \text{g}g4 \text{a}a4
26 \text{f}f6+ \text{x}x f6
27 gxf6 (D)

The simplest path to victory, as discussed earlier, is to calculate the pawn ending carefully.

31 ... \text{h}h7
32 \text{x}xh7+ \text{h}h7
33 \text{g}g5 \text{h}h8
34 \text{x}xg6 \text{g}g8
35 f7+ \text{f}f8
36 \text{f}f6 e5
37 \text{x}xe5 \text{x}xf7
38 \text{f}f5! 1-0

Romanishin – Gipslis
Jurmala 1987

Compare this position to the Nei-Averbakh game.

27 ... \text{a}a6
28 \text{f}f8 \text{a}a7
29 e6! \text{f}x e6
30 \text{e}e8 \text{h}h6
31 \text{h}h8+!

All the black pieces are placed perfectly while the white knight seems to have no good squares. Perhaps White should try to activate his knight by playing 1 \text{b}b8 and 2 \text{d}d7, followed by \text{c}c5 or \text{e}e5 depending on where Black puts his bishop. Instead of this White went for the breakthrough:

1 g4 hxg4+
2 h x g4 \text{h}h4!

Unexpectedly threatening mate.

3 \text{e}e7+ \text{x}x e7
4 \text{x}xe7 \text{f}f8
5 $\text{Kc7}$
5 $\text{Kc5}$ is slightly better, forcing the exchange on g4, although after 5...fxg4+ 6 $\text{Kxg4} \text{f7}$ this ending should finish in a draw.

5 ... $\text{Kd6}$
6 $\text{Kh7} \text{Ke6}$!
7 gxf5 gxf5
8 $\text{Ke2} \text{Ke7}$!
9 $\text{Kb5}$

The pawn ending after 9 $\text{Kxe7}+ \text{Kxe7}$ 10 $\text{Kd3} \text{Kd7}$! is drawn.

9 ... $\text{Kf7}$
10 $\text{Kd3} \text{Ke7}$
11 $\text{Kd5} \text{Kf7}$
12 $\text{Kc5} \text{Kc7}$+!
13 $\text{Kd6} \text{Kc3}$

Draw

Magerramov – Annageldiev
Pavlodar 1987

Black tries to avoid simplifying into a minor piece ending, as after 6...c3 7 $\text{Kd5} \text{Kxe4}$ 8 $\text{Kxe4} \text{Ke1}$ 9 $\text{h5}$ White threatens f5. After 9...h6 10 f5 Black should play 10...gxh5 11 gxh5 but now White threatens f5-f6, $\text{Kf5}$ and e3-e4-e5-e6. The only defence to this is 11...$\text{Kb4}$, but after 12 $\text{Kf4}$ it is zugzwang: 12...g5+ loses to 13 $\text{Kc5}$. Therefore Black must play 12...f6. White then plays 13 $\text{Ke4} \text{Kf7}$ 14 $\text{Kd4} \text{Ke8}$ 15 $\text{Kc5} \text{Kd7}$ 16 $\text{Kb6}$+$\text{Kc7}$ 17 $\text{Ke4} \text{Kd7}$ 18 $\text{Kd5}$, followed by e3-e4, transferring the knight to c5, the king to c6, and then playing the knight to d5. By gradually reaching a position with $\text{Kc6}$, the win becomes simple: the knight is played to d7 and the pawn pushed to e5. Black’s idea in the game is to give White a weakness on h4.

7 $\text{g5} \text{Kc3}$
8 $\text{Kd3} \text{Ka7}$

Once again Black avoids exchanging rooks, since after 8...$\text{Kxe4}$ 9 $\text{Kxe4}$ the white king goes to d5 and the pawns to e4 and f5, threatening to win by f6 and e4-e5-e6.

9 $\text{Kc4} \text{Kc1}$
10 e4

A critical position; 10 f5!? deserves serious attention; 10...gxf5 is met by 11 $\text{Kf4}$, and if 10...f6 then 11 $\text{Kc6}$ gxf5 12 $\text{Kf4}$.
10 ... f6!? (D)
There is no other way of defending against e5, e4 and f5.

11 e5
11 f5 deserves serious attention; if 11...a3 then 12 c7+ (perhaps stronger is 12 e2 a2+ 13 e3 h2 14 c7+ g8 15 f4 xh4 16 c8+ g7 17 e6+ f7 18 c7+ e8 19 fxg6 fxg5 20 g7 and again White is better) 12...g8 13 e2 gxf5 14 exf5 a5 15 c5 d4 16 c8+.

11 ... fxe5
12 fxe5 f7
13 e4 a5

Black attacks the e5-pawn in an attempt to hinder White’s progress.

14 c7+ e8
15 c5

Also possible is the exchange into a minor piece ending with 15 c5 xc5 16 xc5 c3 17 d3 d2 18 d5 e7 19 e6 followed by d5, winning.

15 ... c3
16 c6 f7
17 c7+

After 17 f6+, 17...g7 fails to 18 e6+ h7 19 f8+ and then xg6, so Black must play 17...e7 18 d3 a4+.

17 ... e8
18 e6 b4
19 d7

An artificial move; 19 d3 d6 20 g7 is more natural.

19 ... e7
20 e5+ xe6
21 c6+ e7
22 c4

It would be interesting to ask whether 22 xg6+ d7 23 f6 d6 24 c4 a4+ is winning.

22 ... d6
23 d4+

In this position 23 xg6 is met by 23 a1.

23 ... e6
24 c6 e1
25 xa5 a5

White has an extra exchange, but there are enormous difficulties in winning this position. An attractive continuation is 26 f3 and 27 e4+ forcing 27...f7. The white king goes to d7; meanwhile the black bishop occupies the g3-square. Then White loses a tempo to give Black the move; he is forced to play ...g7, to which White replies e6-f6-g6 winning. White’s plan in the actual game only led to a draw.

26 c4 e1
27 c6+

It is still not too late to try 27 f3 and 28 e4.

27 ... f7
28 $\text{Cc7+} \quad \text{f8}$

Draw

When the material is further reduced, i.e. one set of pawns has been exchanged, the weaker side should have far greater chances of drawing. However the following game is a classic example of unsuccessful defence.

D. Yanofsky – Fischer
Stockholm 1962

![Chessboard diagram]

1 ... $g6$
2 $\text{Ce2} \quad \text{g7}$
3 $\text{Ce3} \quad \text{Cd7}$
4 $\text{Cf2} \quad \text{Ce5}$
5 $\text{Ca3} \quad \text{Cc2}$
6 $\text{Ag3} \quad \text{Af6}$
7 $\text{Ce4}$

Here White should think about his pawn structure and play 7 h4, as in the Beliavsky-Yusupov game.

7 ... $\text{Cc4}$
8 $\text{Cf3} \quad \text{g5}$
9 $\text{Ce3} \quad \text{f6}$
10 $\text{Ce4} \quad \text{Cc3}$

There is little point in exchanging into a minor piece ending as this would only increase White's drawing chances.

11 $\text{Af4} \quad \text{f5}$
12 h4+ $\text{Af6}$
13 $\text{Ca4} \quad \text{Cd3}$
14 $\text{Cd4} \quad \text{Cc5}$
15 $\text{Cd6+?!}$

White should play 15 $\text{Af2}$, preparing to exchange another pawn with g4.

15 ... $\text{Fe5}$
16 $\text{Cd5+} \quad \text{Fe6}$
17 $\text{Cd4} \quad \text{h6}$
18 $\text{Af2} \quad \text{Dd3+}$
19 $\text{Fe2} \quad \text{Cc5}$
20 $\text{Af2}$

After 20 g4 Black would reply 20...$\text{Fe5} \quad 21 \text{Cd5+} \quad \text{Ff4} \quad 22 \text{Cd4+} \quad \text{Ce4}$.

20 ... $\text{g5}$
21 hxg5 $\text{hxg5}$
22 $\text{Fe2} \quad \text{Cb3}$
23 $\text{Cd8} \quad \text{Cc2}$
24 $\text{Cd1} \quad \text{Cc1}$
25 $\text{Fe2} \quad \text{Fe5 (D)}$

Black is now threatening to penetrate with his king via f4 to g3.
26 $\text{Ke8+}$

However 26...$\text{f4}$ is refuted by 27 $\text{f2}$.

27 $\text{f8+}$
28 $\text{g8+}$
29 $\text{d5}$
30 $\text{e3}$
31 $\text{f2}$
32 $\text{f3}$
33 $\text{d8}$
34 $\text{d6}$
35 $\text{e2}$

35 g3 36 $\text{g2} \text{h5}$ is dangerous for White, leaving the g3-pawn indefensible.

35 ...
36 $\text{b7}$
37 $\text{e1}$
38 $\text{f2}$
39 $\text{e1}$
40 $\text{f2}$
41 $\text{a8}$
42 $\text{e1}$
43 $\text{d1}$

Now 43 $\text{f2}$ is met by 43...$\text{f4}$ with the crushing threat of ...$\text{e2+}$ and ...$\text{e1}$.

43 ...
44 $\text{b7}$
45 $\text{d4}$
46 $\text{e1}$
47 $\text{e2}$
48 $\text{d6}$
49 $\text{a8}$
50 $\text{d3}$
51 $\text{e1}$
52 $\text{c6}$
53 $\text{a8}$

54 $\text{d4}$
55 $\text{b7}$
56 $\text{d8}$
57 $\text{d2}$
58 $\text{d4}$
59 $\text{a8}$

60 $\text{e1}$
61 $\text{d8}$
62 $\text{d4}$?

Why not 62 $\text{g8+}$ trying to stop the f4-pawn?

62 ...
63 $\text{d2}$
64 $\text{e2}$
65 $\text{d2}$
66 $\text{f2}$
67 $\text{e4}$
68 $\text{c6}$
69 $\text{b2}$
70 $\text{b4}$

After a long series of manoeuvres Fischer gets on with an active plan.

Alternatively 70 $\text{d2} \text{g3} \rightarrow$. 
The invasion of the king decides the outcome of this titanic struggle.

70 ... \texttt{Ha2+}
71 \texttt{He1} \texttt{Hg3}

The play needs no commentary.

1 \texttt{Hd5} \texttt{Hf5}
2 \texttt{Hf3} \texttt{Ha4}
3 \texttt{Hd1} \texttt{Ha3}
4 \texttt{Hf3} \texttt{Hg7}
5 \texttt{Hb2} \texttt{Hc3}
6 \texttt{Ha2} \texttt{Hd6}
7 \texttt{Hd2} \texttt{Hc4}

Finally Black starts his plan of threatening ...f5-f4, aiming to destroy White's pawn structure and win the h4-pawn.
32 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
33 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{d}4 \)
34 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{c}4 \)
35 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{d}2+ \)
36 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{e}3 \)
37 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{c}2 \)
38 \( \text{c}7+ \) \( \text{f}6 \)
39 \( \text{c}6+ \) \( \text{g}7 \)
40 \( \text{c}7+ \) \( \text{h}6 \)
41 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{e}3 \)
42 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}4 \)
43 \( \text{gx}f4 \) \( \text{d}4 \)

Perhaps 43...\( \text{f}5 \) was worth trying.

44 \( \text{e}7 \) \( \text{f}5 \)
45 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{x}h4 \)
46 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{D} \)

46...\( \text{d}2 \) is better.

47 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{f}5 \)
48 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{d}2+ \)
49 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{d}3+ \)
50 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{d}2+ \)
51 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{e}3 \)
52 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{c}4 \)
53 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{d}3+ \)
54 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
55 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{d}2 \)

56 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{d}4 \)
57 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{g}7 \)
58 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{h}4 \)
59 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{d}3 \)
60 \( \text{a}7+ \) \( \text{h}6 \)
61 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{c}4 \)
62 \( \text{a}8 \) \( \text{e}3+ \)
63 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{d}1+ \)
64 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{Draw} \)

Chandler – Karpov
Reykjavik 1991

1 \( \text{d}2?! \)
According to Karpov 1 \( \text{b}6 \) is best, chasing the black knight.

1 ... \( \text{b}5 \)
2 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{g}6 \)
3 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{b}2+ \)
4 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{b}4 \)
5 \( \text{a}2? \)

Karpov recommends 5 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{d}4 \)
6 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{ex}d4 \), exchanging into a rook ending with a passed d-pawn, which is also incorrectly evaluated by theory.

5 ... \( \text{h}5 \)
6 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{h}4 \)
7 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{f}5 \)
The rook ending is clearly lost after 9...\textit{xf}4, followed by ...g5, ...f5 and ...e4.

After 14...\textit{d}5 15 \textit{b}5+ \textit{c}4 16 \textit{a}5 \textit{xa}5 17 \textit{xa}5 \textit{d}3 the ending should be easily winning for Black, who has the simple plan of ...f5 and ...e5-e4-e3.

21 \textit{d}2 loses to 21...\textit{d}3 22 \textit{g}5 f4 23 \textit{h}4 \textit{c}3 24 \textit{b}7 \textit{f}5!  +.

Karpov considers the best line as 23 \textit{f}3 24 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}4 25 \textit{e}1 \textit{f}5 26 \textit{d}2+ \textit{c}4 27 \textit{c}+ \textit{d}5 28 \textit{d}2 \textit{g}3 29 \textit{e}1 and White is still holding the position.

23 \textit{c}4?

23...\textit{f}4! wins thus: 24 \textit{d}2 g5 25 \textit{xf}4 \textit{xf}4 26 \textit{b}5 \textit{a}2+ 27 \textit{g}1 e4 28 \textit{d}5+ \textit{e}2 29 \textit{xf}5 e3 30 \textit{xf}4 \textit{a}1+ 31 \textit{h}2 \textit{f}2 32 \textit{xf}4 \textit{g}1!.

34 \textit{d}2 is countered by 34...\textit{g}3!

35 \textit{e}1 \textit{f}5  + (Karpov).

The ending arising from 35 \textit{e}2 \textit{xe}2+ 36 \textit{xe}2 \textit{d}4 37 \textit{c}7 e3 is lost for White.

35 ... \textit{d}3

36 \textit{c}1+ \textit{d}5

38 \textit{d}1+ \textit{e}6

39 \textit{e}1 \textit{a}4

40 \textit{f}2 \textit{f}6

41 \textit{e}2 g5

42 \textit{c}1?

The only move, according to Karpov, is 42 \textit{c}7.

42 ... \textit{c}4
43 \( \text{He1} \) \( \text{Hc2+} \)
44 \( \text{Hg1} \) (D)

The final mistake. 48...\( \text{Hg3+} \) 49 \( \text{Hg1 Ha2!} \) was again correct.
49 \( \text{Ha1} \) \( \text{Hxg2} \)
50 \( \text{Ha5+} \) \( \text{He6} \)
51 \( \text{Ha6+!} \) \( \text{Hd5} \)
52 \( \text{Ha5+} \) \( \text{Hc4} \)
53 \( \text{Ha4+} \) \( \text{Hc3} \)
54 \( \text{Hxg5} \) \( \text{e3} \)
55 \( \text{Hf6+!} \) \( \text{Hb3} \)
At long last, and after so many mistakes!
9 Rook against Bishop

In the majority of positions, especially endgame positions, the rook is clearly stronger than a bishop. However sometimes the bishop holds its own or is even better than a rook. There is one fairly rare method of converting an advantage which involves sacrificing the exchange for a pawn.

Tal – Bronstein
Moscow 1974

1 \( \text{\textit{xd}5!} \quad \text{\textit{cxd}5} \)
2 \( \text{\textit{d}4} \quad \text{\textit{e}7} \)
If Black plays 2...\( \text{\textit{e}8} \) White would respond 3 \( \text{c6 \textit{e}6} \) 4 \( \text{\textit{c}5 \textit{e}7} \) 5 \( \text{\textit{b}6} \) and there is no defence to 6 \( \text{\textit{b}7} \) and the advance of the c-pawn.
3 \( \text{\textit{xd}5} \quad \text{\textit{d}7} \)
4 \( \text{b}4! \)
This reinforces White's queen-side pawn structure and prepares for the creation of connected passed pawns.

4 ... \( \text{\textit{e}8} \)
4...\( \text{\textit{c}6} \) is met by 5 \( \text{c4 \textit{bxc}4} \) 6 \( \text{b}5 \) and White wins.
5 \( \text{c6+} \quad \text{\textit{c}8} \)
6 \( \text{\textit{c}4} \quad \text{\textit{e}5+} \)
7 \( \text{\textit{d}4} \quad \text{\textit{bxc}4} \)
8 \( \text{\textit{xc}4} \quad \text{\textit{e}2} \)
9 \( \text{b}5 \quad \text{\textit{c}2+} \)
10 \( \text{\textit{d}5} \quad \text{\textit{a}2} \)
11 \( \text{\textit{c}3} \quad \text{\textit{xg}2} \)
12 \( \text{\textit{b}6} \quad \text{\textit{f}2} \)
13 \( \text{\textit{b}7+} \quad \text{\textit{b}8} \)
14 \( \text{\textit{xf}6} \quad 1-0 \)

Converting an extra exchange into victory can be either straightforward or difficult, depending on the position.

Beliavsky – Lobron
Munich 1991

1 \( \text{\textit{xd}5!} \quad \text{\textit{cxd}5} \)
2 \( \text{\textit{d}4} \quad \text{\textit{e}7} \)

W
Black has the unpleasant threat of advancing his pawns on the queenside to the fourth rank and then playing ...b3, creating serious problems for White. Therefore White must get his king in the action as quickly as possible.

1 f4! c3

This looks good, but in fact only reduces the bishop’s mobility. Better was 1...f6.

2 d3 b4

Clearly Black’s plan is to play ...a4, and ...b3, meeting axb3 with ...a3, but White finds a clever way of preventing this.

3 e2 f6

Black finally realizes that the best place for the bishop was f6. If he instead plays 4...a4, White would reply 5 d8 b3 6 axb3 a3 7 a8 and the advance of the a-pawn is halted.

4 e2 f6

The advance of the b-pawn gives Black a lost kingside ending.

5 e3+! d5

6 d3! a4

7 e4 c5

White should play 1 a4 g5 2 e4 with a later exchange on b5 and activation of his king. In the game White underestimated the strength of the black position.

1 d3 a5!

2 e4 g5

3 a4

In any case White is forced to play a4 as Black was threatening to himself advance with 4...a4 and 5...b4 after which he could make a breakthrough at any point.

3 ... bxa4

3...b4? would be a mistake, as after 4 e8 and 5 a8 White’s a-pawn would certainly be stronger than Black’s h-pawn.

4 h4+!

4 xa4? is bad, allowing 4...b4 and 5...h4.
4 ... $f5 
5 $xa4 $b4 
6 $a1 $e5!

6...$g4? is a mistake, allowing the rook to dominate the board after 7 $c1 $d6 8 $c4+.

7 $c4 (D)
Alternatively 7 $g1 $e7! =.

9...$d6 is bad, allowing 10 $a6+ and 11 $h6, winning the h5-pawn.

10 $a8 $f6 
11 $h8 $h4!
Better than 11...$e7 12 $e8 $d6 13 $h8 $h4 14 $h6+ $d7 15 $d4 $g5 16 $h5 $f6+ 17 $e4 $d6 18 $h6+ $e7 19 $f5 and Black loses a pawn.

12 $f7 $f5!
A timely activation; by giving up a pawn and coming to the help of his own passed pawn the black king secures a draw.

13 $xc7 $h3 
14 $h7 $g4 
15 d6 $g3 

16 $h6 $d8
Not falling for the trap 16...$h2? 17 $g6! =.

17 $g6+ $f2
Draw

When the pawns are on the same wing it would appear that drawing chances are slim, however...

Khasin – Filipenko
Moscow 1985

White’s position looks like it should be winning, but analysis shows that Black can build a fortress. The game continued:

1 $b5 g6 
2 $e3 f6 
3 $d4 $h3 
4 $b6 $g4 
5 $c5 $h3 
6 $d6 $g4 
7 $c6 $f3+ 
8 $c7 $g4 
9 $b6 $h3 
10 $d6 $g4 
11 $d3 $h3 
12 $e3+ $f7
White cannot make any further progress, and therefore the players agreed a draw.

In principle any normal configuration of three versus three on the same wing should be easily won for the stronger side. Examples can be found in any endgame book. An interesting variation on this position occurred in the following game.

**Dorfman – Anikaev**  
*Volgodonsk 1981*

```
Rook against Bishop 161

13 \( \text{\#d6} \) \( \text{\#g4} \)
14 \( \text{\#e7}+ \) \( \text{\#f8} \)
15 \( \text{\#a7} \) \( \text{\#h3} \)

White is finally forced to switch his bishop to the other diagonal, or else Black would simplify into a won pawn ending.

The exchange 13...\( \text{\#xg3} \) is premature, allowing White to draw by utilizing the distant opposition: 14 \( \text{\#xg3} \) \( \text{\#d3} \) 15 \( \text{\#h3}! = \).

Now this combination works! Exchanging into pawn endings requires great care.

White resigned, as the black king will capture the f3-pawn.
```
Chiburdanidze – Gaprindashvili  
_Pitsunda Wch wom 1978_

1 f5!  
Of course White’s first task is to liquidate the doubled pawns, although as the game shows this move also serves to cramp the black position.

1 ...  
2 f6+!

After 2 fxg6 fxg6 it would be far more complex for White to win. She would have had to play her king to g5, then h4 and f4, while the black bishop was on the b1-h7 diagonal, followed by h5. This would lead to the well-known winning position from the Polugayevsky-Gligoric game.

2 ...  
3 f4  
4 e5  
5 d8  
6 f8

The only chance is to attack the white pawns.

5 d8  
6 f8

Clearly better is 5...b3 and 6...e6, although this is also insufficient to draw.

And now, here is an interesting endgame with two pawns each.

Benjamin – Tseshkovsky  
_Somerset 1986_

16 h8  
17 d6  
18 g8+  
19 g7  
20 xg7  
21 h7

13 g7 would be answered by 13...g4.

13 ...  
14 g7  
15 xg5+  
16 d6

There is an easier win with 16 f7  
17 xf7  
18 e5  
19 h1  
20 f4  
21 g7  
22 h7  
1-0
White has reorganized his troops so that the rook can hold the f4-pawn and is ready to support the passed h5-pawn. The question is now whether a king raid into the enemy camp will bring victory.

9 ...  
10  
White starts to carry out his plan, although 10 f5 was also entirely possible, which would lead to a position arising later.

10 ...  
11  
Black himself goes for the position shown above, although he could have played 11 ... f5 12 d6 f6 13 e7 e5, with counterplay.

12 fxe5+  
13  
14  
15  
16 h8  
17  
17 h6 f6 18 h7 g7 is insufficient as there is no rook move that attacks the black bishop.

17 ...  
18  
19  
20  
White has achieved the minor victory of seizing the d7-square and somewhat cramping the black king.

30 ...  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 f1+  
38 ... g5 39 xf7 xh5 40 h1+ g5 41 h2! Black loses his bishop because of zugzwang.

39  
40  
41 h6!
A typical winning manoeuvre, taking control of the g6-square.

41 ... \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xe6} \)
42 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f6} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g5+} \)
43 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g6} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{h4} \)
44 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f4} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g3} \)
45 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g4!} \) 1-0

Miles – Polugaevsky
Riga IZ 1979

In this position White must counterattack the weak black pawns. If the f5-pawn were on g6, then Black would have no problems in converting his material advantage. Polugaevsky writes: ‘Most of all we were worried about a white king on f3, from where it could go to f4 at the right moment, attacking the black pawns. To destroy White’s position the black king has to go all the way around to the f2-pawn. But at that moment when the black king is most distant from his own pawns the white bishop will start to attack the black pawns from h5 or e8, and furthermore the white king will be free to join in. This is not to mention the additional resource of h3 and g4. Miles’ plan of not allowing the black king to get to e1 is fairly risky, because if it fails, he will be deprived of any active counterplay, unable to attack the enemy pawns.’ Therefore the best chance was 1 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{e2} \), followed by 2 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{b3} \) and 3 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f3} \), heading for the position described above.

1 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{d2} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f6} \)
2 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f3} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{e5} \)
3 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g2} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{a2+} \)
4 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{e1} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{d6} \)
5 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f3} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{c5} \)
6 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g2} \)

White’s defensive plan is very passive, and passivity never works.

6 ... \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{b2} \)
7 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f1} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{b1+} \)
8 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{e2} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{c4} \)
9 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g2} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{b2+} \)
10 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{e1} \) \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{c3} \)
11 \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f1} (D) \)

This is the position that Miles thought was unassailable. Although Black cannot reach the f2-pawn, he now takes the bull by the horns:

11 ... \( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{e5!} \)
12 \( \text{g2} \) \( f6 \)
13 \( \text{h3} \) \( f4 \)
14 \( \text{exf4} \) \( \text{exf4} \)
15 \( \text{g4} \)

The first step in Black’s plan is accomplished; there remains only to force White to capture on \( f4 \), after which Black’s position will be won. Black cannot play the immediate \( 15...\text{fxg3} \) as after 16 \( \text{hxg3} \) the position is drawn.

\[ 15 \ldots \text{d3} \ (D) \]

16 \( \text{f5+} \) \( \text{d4} \)
17 \( \text{gxf4} \)

White has little choice as 17...\( f3 \) was threatened, and 17 \( \text{g4} \) is met by 17...\( \text{e4} \).

\[ 17 \ldots \text{d5!} \]
18 \( \text{f1} \)

18 \( \text{g6} \) is countered by 18...\( \text{b4} \)
19 \( f5 \) \( \text{h4} \).

\[ 18 \ldots \text{b4} \]
19 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{xf4} \)
20 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{b4} \)
21 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e5} \)

This position is similar to the Polugaevsky-Gligorić game given in the book *Grandmaster Preparation*.

22 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{h5!} \)
23 \( \text{a6} \) \( \text{b3+} \)
24 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{h4} \ (D) \)

25 \( \text{c8} \)

If White had played 25 \( \text{h3} \) then Polugaevsky would have responded by advancing his pawn to \( f4 \), forcing the bishop onto the \( h1-a8 \) diagonal. Then the black king would follow the route \( e5-d4-c5-b4-c1-d2 \) with the rook on \( c3 \). White will not be able to play \( \text{f1} \) because of \( f3 \), which means that the black king will reach \( e1 \).

\[ 25 \ldots \text{f5} \]
26 \( \text{d7!} \) \( \text{c3!} \)

The last trap was 26...\( h3+27 \text{f1} \) \( \text{a1+} \) 28 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{h1} \) 29 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{xh2} \) 30 \( \text{f1} \), with a draw. The advance of the \( f \)-pawn with the king on \( e4 \) must be prepared, taking the \( h1-a8 \) diagonal away from the bishop.

\[ 27 \text{e8} \text{e4} \]
28 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{f4} \)
29 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{d3} \)

0-1
When there is increased material on the board with an extra minor piece, endgames on the same wing become particularly difficult.

Karpov – Beliavsky
Moscow 1983

Black’s pawn structure is favourable, but nevertheless White has plans to improve his position.

1 ... f6?

This is a clear concession on Black’s part. It gives away his plan, i.e. to play ...h6 after the exchange of knights, and then control either the b1-h7 or the a2-g8 diagonal depending on which way the white king approaches. A more natural way of playing is with 1...a4, followed by ...b3 and ...e6. Black would then play ...h5 or ...f5 at the right moment, following the principle which states that the weaker side should exchange pawns while the stronger side should exchange pieces.

2 a6 h5
3 c5 f7
4 e4 hxg4

5 hxg4 e6
6 g3 f7
7 a6 d3

Black decides to reorganize his defensive set-up, intending to attack the f3-pawn from e5, although this is hardly appropriate in the present position.

8 a7+ g6
9 e7 d5
10 d6!

Black cannot play ...f5 without the g5-pawn becoming a decisive weakness, although now White’s f5-knight powerfully cramps Black’s game.

10 ... e5
11 f5 f7
12 f2 c4 (D)

While Black can only move his knight, White calmly improves the position of his king.

13 e7 e5
14 e3 c4+
15 d4 e5
16 e4 c4
17 e7+ g7
18 d5 e5
18...\textit{Qd}6+ is met by 19 \textit{Qe}3 \textit{Qg}6 and now 20 \textit{Qc}6!? \textit{Qe}8 21 \textit{Qe}4 or 20 \textit{Qe}7+ \textit{Qg}7 21 \textit{Qd}7.

\begin{itemize}
  \item 19 \textit{Qc}3 \textit{Qg}6
  \item 20 \textit{Qd}4 \textit{Qh}4
  \item 21 \textit{Qe}5 \textit{Qg}6
  \item 22 \textit{Qd}6 \textit{Qe}5
  \item 23 \textit{Qe}3! \textit{Qg}6
  \item 24 \textit{Qe}7!
\end{itemize}

Now if 24...\textit{Qxf}3, White wins by 25 \textit{Qc}6 \textit{Qe}5 26 \textit{Qxf}6+ \textit{Qg}7 27 \textit{Qf}5+.

Therefore \textit{Black resigned} immediately.

Sometimes material has to be sacrificed in order to reach a position on only one flank.

\textbf{Aleksandria – Savereide}

\textit{Tbilisi 1978}

\begin{center}
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\end{center}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1 ... \textit{Qc}4?
\end{itemize}

Black should have bravely played 1...\textit{Qg}4! 2 \textit{Qxb}5 \textit{Qe}6 3 \textit{Qb}6+ \textit{Qe}7 4 \textit{Qb}7+ \textit{Qf}8! (4...\textit{Qe}6 is also possible). It is not obvious how the black defence can be broken.

\begin{itemize}
  \item 2 \textit{Qb}7+ \textit{Qe}6
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Eingorn – Mikhalchishin}

\textit{Simferopol 1983}
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\begin{itemize}
  \item 3 \textit{Qg}7!
  \item 3 \textit{f}5+ would have been premature, for after 3...\textit{gx}f5+ 4 \textit{Qf}4 \textit{Qe}2 5 \textit{Qh}7 \textit{b}4 6 \textit{h}5 \textit{b}3 7 \textit{h}6 \textit{b}2 8 \textit{Qb}7 \textit{b}1 \textit{Qf}7 the black king manages a timely retreat.
  \item 3 ... \textit{Qb}3?
  \item 3...\textit{f}5+ 4 \textit{Qd}4 \textit{Qf}6 is a better try, although it should not be enough to draw.
  \item 4 \textit{f}5+ \textit{gx}f5+
  \item 5 \textit{Qf}4 \textit{Qd}1
  \item 6 \textit{Qh}7 \textit{b}4
  \item 7 \textit{h}5 \textit{Qx}h5
\end{itemize}

After 7...\textit{b}3 there follows 8 \textit{h}6 \textit{b}2 9 \textit{Qb}7 and the d1-bishop will be under fire in the event of 9...\textit{b}1 \textit{Qf} 10 \textit{Qxb}1.

\begin{itemize}
  \item 8 \textit{Qx}h5 \textit{Qd}5
  \item 9 \textit{Qe}3 1-0
\end{itemize}

The most interesting positions occur when the weaker side has a passed pawn on the other wing.
A questionable and impetuous decision. 1...h5! is better. Eingorn considers the best chance to draw is 1...b5 2 e3 d7 with a later ...e6-c4, when Black will passively observe White's play on the kingside. White would play his pieces thus: d6 and b7 against Black's g4 and f8. White can then continue with h4, g4 and g5, and after the exchange on g5 the following position arises.

![Diagram](image.png)

There are two defences to the threat of g6: 1...d3 and 1...g6. After the latter there is no obvious win: 1...g6 2 e5 e8 3 f6 d3 4 e6 c4+. Let us return to the game.

2 e3 h5

Consistent.

3 d1 b5
4 c1 d6
5 d4 h4

There is no other defence from the threat of c5.

6 gxh4 gxh4
7 c5 e8
8 d5+ e7
9 c5 f7

10 d6 g6?
Black tries to prevent his king from being shut in by f5 at any cost, but clearly better is 10...c4 11 b6 f7 and ...g6, which offers more drawing chances.

11 b6 d3
12 d5?!

Even more unpleasant was 12 d4 c4 13 f5, further cramping the black king.

12 ... f7
13 d4 c2

The passed pawn must be sacrificed to prevent f5.

14 xb5 g6
15 e3 f5
16 b8 g7 (D)

Black has constructed a defensive position in which he controls the light squares and where the h4-pawn is immune to attack from king or rook, but White has possibilities of smashing this defence by occupying the g-file.

17 f3 h3
18 e8 f5
19 e1 f7
It would be senseless to play 19...\( \text{h7} \), since this allows the white king to get to e7 after 20 \( \text{g1} \).

20 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{c8} \) (D)

21 \( \text{e4} \)

Eingorn evaluated the pawn ending arising after 21 \( \text{g4} \) as drawn in Informator 35 (Game 30), although we cannot see any draw after 23 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{g7} \) 24 \( \text{xh4 h6} \) 25 \( \text{g4 h7} \) 26 \( \text{f4 h6} \) 27 \( \text{e4 h5} \) 28 \( \text{h3 h4} \) 29 \( \text{d5} \). Eingorn probably did not feel like calculating the pawn ending.

21 ... \( \text{b7} \)

22 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{c8} \)

22...\( \text{f3} \) is met by 23 \( \text{f5} \).

23 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{f5} \)

24 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{h3} \)

25 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{g6} \)

26 \( \text{a5!} \) \( \text{f1} \)

27 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{d3} \)

28 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{h1} \)

29 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{f5} \)

30 \( \text{xf6+} \) \( \text{g4} \)

31 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{f3} \)

31...\( \text{h3} \) allows 32 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{hxh2} \) 33 \( \text{xh4+} \) \( \text{g3} \) 34 \( \text{h1} \) +--

This position is similar to the Eingorn-Mikhalchishin game, but the big question here is whether White should push his b-pawn or not. The pawn on b2 has its plus points, not least in blocking the second rank. But is this enough to draw? White should try 1 \( \text{h4} \) and 2 \( \text{g3} \).

1 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{e6} \)

2 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{f4?!} \)

This seems dubious; 2...\( \text{d5} \) 3 \( \text{f3 c4} \) and 4...\( \text{d3} \) was preferable.

3 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f5} \)

4 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{h1} \)

5 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g5?!} \)

The right plan, but poorly executed. 5...\( \text{h5} \) is better, stopping 6 \( \text{g4+} \) since Black can reply 6...\( \text{hxg4} \) 7 \( \text{hxg4+} \) \( \text{g5} \) and ...\( \text{h3} \).

6 \( \text{g4+} \) \( \text{fxg3} \)

This looks like the only natural move, because after 6...\( \text{e6} \) 7 \( \text{g2} \)
Rook against Bishop

White manages to attack the black pawns.

7  $\text{hxg3}$  $\text{Ad1}$
8  $\text{f3}$  $\text{Ad3+}$
9  $\text{g2}$  $\text{h5} (D)$

10  $\text{g7}$  $\text{g4}$
11  $\text{hxg4+}$  $\text{hxg4}$

The capture 11...hxg4 achieves nothing.

12  $\text{e5}$  $\text{h4}$
13  $\text{b4!}$  $\text{h3+}$
14  $\text{h2}$  $\text{d2}$
15  $\text{g3}$  $\text{b2}$
16  $\text{b5}$  $\text{xb5}$
17  $\text{d6!}$

White secures the draw by preparing to switch his bishop onto the g1-a7 diagonal, which sets up an impenetrable fortress.

17  ...  $\text{Ad5}$
18  $\text{c7}$  $\text{Ab5}$
19  $\text{d6}$  $\text{h4}$
20  $\text{e7+}$  $\text{Draw}$

During analysis of one of his games Timman found an interesting defensive idea.

Timman – Romanishin
Wijk aan Zee 1985

There followed:

1  ...  $\text{d5?}$
2  $\text{f4}$  $\text{c5}$
3  $\text{g4!}$

Breaking up the kingside pawns.

3  ...  $\text{b4}$
4  $\text{gxh5}$  $\text{gxh5}$
5  $\text{g5}$  $\text{e2}$
6  $\text{f4}$  $\text{a5}$
7  $\text{e1}$  $\text{g4}$
8  $\text{f5}$  $\text{a4}$
9  $\text{e7!}$  1-0

In principle Black should play his king towards his passed pawn at the right moment, but Timman considers 1...$\text{d5}$ to be the decisive mistake. According to Timman the best continuation was simply to hide the king on the kingside with 1...$\text{f5}$ 2 $\text{d4}$ $\text{f6}$ and then ...$\text{g7}$, during which time the white king will reach e5, and his rook a7. In this position White’s only plan is to play for the f4-f5 break, and after ...$\text{gxf5}$ and then $\text{xf5}$ the following position would arise:
Here is one possible variation:

1...e2 2 g5 a5! 3 xa5 f6+ 4 f5 g4+ 5 e4 f7 6 a7+ f8! 7 d5 h3 8 g4 g4 8 a4 h3!. The white king cannot get closer to the f6-pawn, so the game is drawn. This method gives Black drawing chances in various analogous positions with different passed pawns.

Agzamov – Mikhalchishin

USSR Ch (Riga) 1985

Black's desire to push his passed pawn is understandable, but 2...b6 (or 2...d6) looks very strong.

3 c3+ b6
4 d3 e5

There are very promising alternatives such as 4...f5! and 4...d6.

5 c8 a3
6 a8 b2?!

The bishop stands very passively on b2, and would be much better placed on d6. The king race begins.

7 e4

7 c4 is met by 7...b7 8 a5 b6 9 a4 c6 10 b3 d5 11 a5+ e4 12 xh5 d4 13 h6 xf2 14 xf6 xg3 15 h5 f4 with a draw.

7...b5
8 f5 b4
9 g6 d4 (D)

Black sealed his ninth move. Agzamov analysed the following drawing variation: 9...b3 10 xh5 f5! 11 g5 a2 12 xa2 xa2 13 xf5 d4! 14 xg4 xf2 15 h5 b3 16 h6 c4 17 h7 d4 18 f5 d5 19 g4 d6 20 g5 e7. The move Black adopted in the game also draws, although in a somewhat more complex way.
A blunder; the draw was close at hand after 12...\texttt{c}1! 13 \texttt{h}5 \texttt{b}3 14 \texttt{e}e8 \texttt{a}5! 15 \texttt{e}e3+ \texttt{a}4! 16 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{b}3 17 \texttt{xf}5 \texttt{a}2 18 \texttt{xa}2 \texttt{xa}2 19 \texttt{g}4 \texttt{b}3 20 \texttt{f}5 \texttt{c}4 21 \texttt{g}4 \texttt{d}5 22 \texttt{g}5 \texttt{d}6 23 \texttt{f}6 (23 \texttt{g}6 \texttt{d}2!!) 23...\texttt{d}8+ 24 \texttt{g}6 \texttt{g}5 25 \texttt{g}5 \texttt{c}7 =.

\textbf{Mikhalchishin – Bareev}

\textit{USSR Ch (Lvov) 1987}

If White could advance his pawn to a6, the draw would be easy. At the moment, however, all he can do is wait for Black’s plan.

1 \texttt{e}8 \texttt{c}3!

Played with the aim of attacking at any moment the bishop on the seventh or eighth rank.

2 \texttt{g}2 \texttt{c}7

2...\texttt{c}5 only draws after 3 \texttt{h}5 \texttt{g}5 4 \texttt{d}7 \texttt{g}xf4 5 \texttt{xf}4 \texttt{c}4 6 \texttt{g}3.

If Black tries 2...\texttt{d}5 then 3 a5 \texttt{a}3 4 \texttt{f}7+ and 5 \texttt{g}8 is strong for White (Bareev).

3 \texttt{b}5 \texttt{c}3

4 \texttt{e}8 \texttt{e}6!
A cunning triangulation; Black wins a tempo and threatens to invade the e4-square.

5  ♖f1  ♖d5  
6  ♖h5  

After 6 a5 Bareev gives this variation: 6...♖e4 7  ♖f7 ♖c5! 8 a6 ♖f3 9 ♖g1 ♖c1+ 10 ♖h2 ♖a1 11 ♖g8 h6! →.

6 ... ♖d4  
7 ♖g2?!  

This again is passive; the more active 7 ♖e2 is better, although probably not enough to draw.

7 ... ♖c7  
8 ♖f3 ♖c3  
9 ♖e2 ♖e7+  
10 ♖f1? (D)  

This is another passive decision and a serious mistake. White should actively fight for space by playing 10 ♖d1 ♖e6 11 ♖f1 ♖d6+ 12 ♖e1 ♖c2 (or 12...♖d2 13 ♖b5 ♖c2 14 ♖f1 ♖d4 15 ♖a6!) 13 ♖b5 ♖e6+ 14 ♖f1 ♖d2 15 a5 ♖e1+ 16 ♖g2 ♖a1 17 a6 ♖e1 18 ♖g1 ♖a2 19 ♖c4!, with a draw.

11 a5  ♖b7!  
12 ♖c4 ♖c7  
13 ♖g8 ♖c3  
14 a6 ♖a7!  
15 ♖g2 ♖b4  
16 ♖f3  

16 h5 is met by 16...♖b5 17 hxg6 hxg6 18 ♖f3 ♖xa6 19 g4 fxg4+ 20 ♖xg4 ♖b5 →.

16 ... ♖b5  
17 g4 fxg4+  
18 ♖xg4 ♖h5+!  

At all costs Black must stop White from playing f5.

19 ♖f3 ♖g7  
19...f5 is also strong.

20 ♖e6 ♖xa6  
21 ♖e4 ♖b6  
22 ♖d5 ♖c7  
23 ♖h3 ♖e7  
24 ♖e6 ♖d8  
25 f5 ♖xf5!  

Also winning is 25...g5 26 hxg5 fxg5 27 f6 ♖a7 28 ♖e4 ♖a5.  
26 f4 ♖g7  
27 ♖xf5 ♖e7  
28 ♖e4 ♖g3!  

Black now has enough time to bring his king across, having intercepted the white king.

29 ♖c8 ♖f7  
30 ♖d7 ♖g7  
31 ♖e8 ♖h6  
32 ♖d7 ♖g4!  
33 ♖f3 ♖xh4  
34 ♖g3 ♖h1  
35 ♖h3 ♖xh3+  
36 ♖xh3 ♖g6  

The pawn ending is completely hopeless. Therefore White resigned.
It looks as if White has good winning chances. However the continuation 1 \( \text{d5} \) is met by 1 ... \( \text{f5!} \) intending 2 ... \( \text{g4} \) and then 3 ... \( \text{h3} \). White is forced to play 2 \( \text{g7} \), but after 2 ... \( \text{e5} \) 3 \( \text{h3} \) a4 4 g4+ hxg4 5 hxg4+ \( \text{f4} \) 6 g5 a3! a draw is inevitable.

1 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{b4} \)
2 \( \text{d7} \)

White could also choose the plan of playing his rook to the fourth rank with 2 \( \text{c4} \), but after 2 ... \( \text{g5} \) 3 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 4 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{f5} \) there is no obvious way of making progress.

2 ... \( \text{c3} \)
3 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{b4} \)
4 \( \text{c8} \) \( \text{a3?} \)

White is trying out various plans and Black loses concentration. After the correct 4 ... \( \text{e1} \) 5 \( \text{d8} \) \( \text{b4!} \) 6 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e1!} \) 7 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{b4} \) White has no winning chances. However after the move in the game White employs a standard manoeuvre to gain access to the f5-square.

1 \( \text{f4} \)
The move 1 \( \text{g2} \) fails to 1 ... \( \text{c3} \)
2 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{d2} \) followed by ...\( \text{a2} \) and ...\( \text{a1+} \), allowing the black king to occupy the e1-square.

1 ... \( \text{c3} \)
2 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{b7?!} \)
2...d2 is better than the move in the game, although after 3 fxg5 fxg5 4 e4 b5 5 g8 a5 6 e6 e2 7 d7 f2 8 e6 g3 there is still plenty of play left in the position.

3 g6 e7
4 f5 d2
5 e4 c3 (D)

In this position, if White bides time, Black would play ...d6 and ...h8, forcing White to exchange on g5, thus giving him a very difficult position. In the position in the diagram the best move for White is 6 e5! and after 6...fxe5 7 fxg5 d4 8 g6 Black has two possible plans:

a) 8...e4+ 9 xe4! xe4 10 g7 e8 11 f4 g8 12 f5 xg7 13 g5 d5 14 g6 a7 15 f6 drawing.

b) 8...e8!? and now:

b1) If g7, then 9...g8.

b2) White can play 9 g5! f8 10 g4 and after 10...e4 11 e6 e3 12 g7 e8 13 f7 b8 14 f3! Black is even losing, but 10...g8 11 h5 h8+ is a simple draw.

b3) 9 c2 f8+ 10 f5 e4+ 11 f4 e3 12 f3 e8 13 e2 and

Black should not win. For example 13 b8 14 f3!.

Of course it is instructive to see how the actual game progressed.

6 e3 c4
7 g6 c5
8 f5 e8
9 g6 h8
10 h5

10 e5 loses to 10...fxe5 11 fxe5 d5.

10...
11 fxg5 fxg5
12 d4 e6
13 g6 d8+
14 e3 e5

The first stage of Black's plan is complete, and now he starts to constrict the white king.

15 f5 a8
16 f3 a3+
17 f2 f4
18 e2 a2+
19 f1 f3
20 e1 e2+!
21 d1

After 21 f1 Black is winning with 21...e3! 22 g1 e1+ 23 h2 f2 24 h7 a1 25 g6 a6 26 f7 h6+ 27 h5 e6 -- (or indeed 27...xh5+ 28 gxh5 g4 - editor's note).

21...
22 e3
23 c1

If White plays 22 e5, this would be met by 22...f3! 23 e6 f2 24 c1 e1 25 b1 d1! 26 a1 c1! forcing zugzwang and thereby winning the e6-pawn.

22...
23 d3
23 \textit{\texttt{d1}}

After 23 \textit{\texttt{g6}} the simplest is 23...\textit{\texttt{e1+}} 24 \textit{\texttt{b2}} \textit{\texttt{xe4}}!

23 ... \textit{\texttt{e3}}

24 \textit{\texttt{g6}} \textit{\texttt{g3}} (D)

The next game is an interesting ending that shows Bronstein's superb technique.

Bronstein - Tukmakov

Reykjavik 1990

This position is identical to the game Rotov-Zhuravlev, USSR 1973 in ECE, except for the pawn on h2. The result of the game should be a draw after normal play, but Black makes the dubious decision to exchange a pair of pawns.

1 ... \textit{\texttt{g5}}

2 \textit{\texttt{hxg5}} \textit{\texttt{hxg5}}

3 \textit{\texttt{f3}} \textit{\texttt{f5}}

4 \textit{\texttt{f8+}} \textit{\texttt{f6}}

5 \textit{\texttt{e3}} \textit{\texttt{e5}}

6 \textit{\texttt{f7}} \textit{\texttt{f5}}

7 \textit{\texttt{f3}} \textit{\texttt{g6}}

8 \textit{\texttt{b7}} \textit{\texttt{f5}}

9 \textit{\texttt{b6}} \textit{\texttt{g7??}}

In order to secure the draw the plan of 9...\textit{\texttt{e5}}, keeping the bishop on the h2-b8 diagonal and eyeing the g3-pawn is scarcely sufficient, but Black has another promising plan of controlling the c1-h6 diagonal.

25 \textit{\texttt{e1}}

White is in zugzwang. 25 \textit{\texttt{e5+}} fails to 25...\textit{\texttt{d4}} 26 \textit{\texttt{e6}} \textit{\texttt{e3}} 27 \textit{\texttt{f7}} (or 27 \textit{\texttt{f5}} \textit{\texttt{c3}}! with zugzwang) 27...\textit{\texttt{c3}} 28 \textit{\texttt{g8}} \textit{\texttt{e5}} 29 \textit{\texttt{f7}} \textit{\texttt{d3}} 30 \textit{\texttt{g6+}} \textit{\texttt{d4}} (30...\textit{\texttt{e3}} 31 \textit{\texttt{f5}}) and now 31 \textit{\texttt{f5}} \textit{\texttt{c3}}! or 31 \textit{\texttt{f7}} \textit{\texttt{e3}} winning the g4-pawn.

25 ... \textit{\texttt{e3}}

26 \textit{\texttt{f1}} \textit{\texttt{xg4}}

27 \textit{\texttt{e5}} \textit{\texttt{a4}}

28 \textit{\texttt{g2}} \textit{\texttt{f1}}

29 \textit{\texttt{e6}} \textit{\texttt{a7}}

30 \textit{\texttt{d3}} \textit{\texttt{a2+}}

31 \textit{\texttt{g1}} \textit{\texttt{g3}}

32 \textit{\texttt{f1}}

Or 32 \textit{\texttt{e7}} \textit{\texttt{a1+}} 33 \textit{\texttt{f1}} \textit{\texttt{e1}} --.

32 ... \textit{\texttt{a5}}

33 \textit{\texttt{e7}} \textit{\texttt{e5}}

34 \textit{\texttt{h5}} \textit{\texttt{xe7}}

35 \textit{\texttt{g1}} \textit{\texttt{e1+}}

36 \textit{\texttt{f1}} \textit{\texttt{d1}}

0-1
In this type of position, the stronger side should try to prevent Black from setting up the drawn structure of pawns on g6 and h5 (giving up the e6-pawn if necessary). Therefore White should have taken the chance to play 1 g4!

1 ... \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d4}?}}

Again the right move is 1...h5! transposing to the Bronstein-Tukmakov game with an extra pawn on e6. Strangely, over the next few moves neither White nor Black sees g4 as improving White’s position.

2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f3}}}? g6??

3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e4}}}. f6

4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a7+}}}. g8

5 g4!

Better late than never!

5 ... \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c3}}}

6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e7}}}

6 h4! looks very strong, preventing Black from constructing a drawn position.

6 ... \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f6}}}

7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xe6}}}. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f7}}}

8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a6}}}. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c3}?}}

Black now has a second chance of securing a draw by means of 8...h6 and 9...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h4}}!}, completely halting White’s plan.

9 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a7+}}}. g8

10 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d7}}?}

White also fails to see that 10 h4! is necessary.

10 ... \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f6}}}

11 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f4}}}. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b2}?}}

12 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c7}?}}. \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f6}}}

13 g5!
With this move White reaches a position which according to theory is drawn, but as analysis by Wolff and Elkies shows, is in fact winning.

13 ... d4
14 h4 b2
15 g4 e5

This loses quickly. Theory recommends that Black should keep the bishop on the a3-f8 diagonal. However, White would put his rook on b7 and then play h5, when the following position arises after ...gxh5(+), \( \text{gxh5} \):

White can win this position in the following way: 1 b3 d6 (alternatively, 1 ... f8 2 b8 f7 3 b7+ g8 4 g6 +- 2 g4 c5 3 b5! f8 (3 ... d6 4 f5 c7 5 d5 b6 6 f6 c7 7 d7 a5 8 g7+! h8 9 f7 ++) 4 f5 g7 5 g6! h6 b8+ f8 7 f6 +-.

Back to the game:

16 e6! b2
17 a6 c3
18 a4! e5

The bishop cannot go to g7 due to 19 a8+ f7 20 a7+ g8 21 h5 g6+ 22 xh5 f8 23 g6! winning easily.

19 h5! e3
19...gxh5+ is met by 20 xh5 d6 21 a8+ g7 22 a7+ g8 23 g6 hxg6+ 24 xg6 f8 25 f6 e8 (25 ... g8 26 g7+! f8 27 d7 ++) 26 e6!. This is why the bishop is weak on d6!

20 h6 e4
21 f3 d6
22 c8 e6
24 h8

The end is near.

24 ... f5
25 xh7 xg5
26 d7 1-0

Mikhalchishin – Buturin
Lvov 1978
was executed in the game De Fotis-Podgaets, San Juan 1971 (on the other wing). In this position Black must try to push the white king back and advance with his own king.

2 ...  
3  
4  
4...  fails to 5 b4.

5  5  is met by 5 ... 6 , as in the game.

Another possible plan is to play the king to a5 with 8 ... 9 10  11  12  13  14  15  16 and , after which there is no obvious way forward.

9  10  11  12  13  14  15  16  17

Another possibility is 17 18  19  20  21  22  23 , but this also only draws.

17 ...  18  19  

A draw was agreed. An important position for endgame theory.

When the pawns blockade each other, the possibility of the weaker side attacking the enemy pawn is crucially important.

Geller – Novikov  
Helsinki 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a2</td>
<td>b4</td>
<td>g6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a4</td>
<td>h4</td>
<td>f3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a6</td>
<td>h3+</td>
<td>d6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c4</td>
<td>d4</td>
<td>b7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d2</td>
<td>g7</td>
<td>e2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f3</td>
<td>g1</td>
<td>d3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black's last winning attempt was 23... 24  25  26 , but this also only draws.

24  25  26

A draw was agreed. An important position for endgame theory.

Black's plan is first to defend his pawn with the king, then improve the position of his rook, and finally try to break through with his king.

4  4
After 9...c2 10 f1 e3 there is no way of reaching the g3-pawn.

10 a8 f7+
11 g2 e3
12 d5 c7
13 g1 c5
14 b7 d4
15 f2 c7
16 a8 f7+
17 g1 e7
18 f2 c5
19 g1

A draw was agreed.

We used to think that endgames, especially those with reduced material, were without any lacunae and had all been thoroughly analysed, but when we started our research we discovered that endgame theory is in fact very weak. The key work, *The Encyclopedia of Chess Endings* (ECE) is poorly written, with no general conclusions about many types of positions, and also very little analysis from actual games. It would be interesting to computer-analyse the very simplest endings, such as rook and pawn against bishop and pawn. This could produce some very revealing results. If the reader is interested in this type of position, he may wish to consult similar endings that arose in the following games: 1 Gelfand-Ivanchuk, Tilburg 1990 *Informator* 50/490; 2 Malaniuk-Stanojloski, Dubrovnik 1990, 50/463; 3 Korchnoi-Spassky, Clermont Ferrand 1989, 48/568; 4 Kuzhanov-Pushkin, USSR 1987; 5 M. Gurevich-Gavrikov, Riga 1985; 6 Ioseliani-Gaprindashvili, USSR 1981; 7 Larsen-Christiansen, Mar del Plata 1981, 31/131; 8 Ivanov-Zakharov, USSR 1976, 21/489; 9 Smejkal-Parma, Siegen OL 1970, 10/538; 10 S. Garcia-Gligorić, Havana 1969, 8/267; 11 Donner-Barczza, Havana 1967, 4/738.

**Yusupov – Wegner**  
*Hamburg 1991*

For the exchange Black has an extra pawn and a solid position. White's plan is a fairly typical one: try to cramp the enemy king as much as possible, and then with the help of zugzwang win one of the enemy pawns.

1 ... f5
2 f3 f4?!

He could defend with 2...f6, inviting the white king to c6.
3 gxf4
Yusupov proposes the odd move
3 g4, although after 3...hxg4 4 fxg4
\( \texttt{h4} \) Black is threatening
push the f-pawn to f2.

3 ... \( \texttt{hxg4} \)
4 \( \texttt{fxg4} \)

Yusupov prefers 4 \( \texttt{c2} \), although it is not clear how White should con­
tinue.

4 ... \( \texttt{g3} \)
5 \( \texttt{c2} \)
6 \( \texttt{g2} \)

After 6 \( \texttt{c4} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 7 \( \texttt{d5} \) \( \texttt{g5}! \) 8
\( \texttt{xd6} \) \( \texttt{f4} \) and then ...g5 Black gets
some active counterplay for the pawn.

6 ... \( \texttt{f6} \)
7 \( \texttt{c4} \)
8 \( \texttt{d5} \)
9 \( \texttt{c6} \)
10 \( \texttt{d7} \)
11 \( \texttt{e8} \)
12 \( \texttt{d8} \)

Although White is trying to pene­
trate with his king, he rejected 12
\( \texttt{f8} \) because of 12...d5+ 13 \( \texttt{g8} \) d4
14 \( \texttt{h7} \) g5 15 \( \texttt{h6} \) h4 16 \( \texttt{g5} \) d3
17 \( \texttt{g2} \) \( \texttt{e3} \).

12 ... \( \texttt{b4} \)
13 \( \texttt{c7} \)
14 \( \texttt{e6} \)
15 \( \texttt{d5} \)
16 \( \texttt{c2} \)

White has been forced to adopt a
new plan which involves exchang­
ing into a pawn ending.

16 ... \( \texttt{b4} \)
17 \( \texttt{b2} \)
18 \( \texttt{b5} \)

If White plays the immediate 18
f4 then 18...\( \texttt{e3} \)! draws.

18 ... \( \texttt{a3} \)
19 \( \texttt{a5} \)
20 \( \texttt{a4} \)
21 \( \texttt{c4} \)
22 \( \texttt{c3} \)
23 \( \texttt{b3} \) (D)

23 ... \( \texttt{c5} ? \)

At the crucial moment the black
bishop goes to the wrong square. In­
stead Black should play 23...\( \texttt{d2} \)
when after 24 \( \texttt{b2} \) \( \texttt{c1} \) 25 \( \texttt{c2} \) \( \texttt{a3} \)
White is getting nowhere. Instead 24
\( \texttt{xd6} \) is met by 24...\( \texttt{f4} \)! followed
by ...\( \texttt{g5} \) and ...\( \texttt{h4} \), and if White
plays 25 h4 the riposte 25...g5 cre­
ates a strong passed pawn.

24 \( \texttt{f4} ! \)

Alternatively 24...\( \texttt{g1} \) is met by
25 fxe5+ dxe5 26 \( \texttt{f3} \)+, and White
wins.

25 e5+ \( \texttt{dxe5} \)
Or 25...\( \texttt{c7} \) 26 exd6+ \( \texttt{xd6} \) 27
\( \texttt{b7} \)+, etc.

26 \( \texttt{xc5} \)
27 \( \texttt{d5} \)
28 h4! 1-0
10 Tactics in the Endgame

It is commonly believed that there is little scope for tactics in the endgame, which should be played in the style of Capablanca, calmly and gradually. However, there are some chess players who prefer to play tactically in the endgame, and they usually produce very original and exciting chess. A prominent representative of this style of play is Grandmaster Zurab Azmaiparashvili. Here is a striking example:

Azmaiparashvili – Temirbaev
Kuibyshev 1986

1 \(\text{Qxe5!}\)

Initiating a complex combination.

1 ... \(\text{Qxb2}\)
2 \(\text{Qxd8+ Kxd8}\)
3 \(\text{Qc2!}\)

The point. The knight is trapped, and White emerges material up since 3...g3 fails against 4 fxg3 fxg3 5 \(\text{Qg4}\).

3 ... \(\text{Qf6}\)
4 \(\text{Qxg4 Qd4}\)
5 \(\text{Qh2! (D)}\)

This way the knight recovers the sacrificed piece by threatening \(\text{Qf3}\) and e5. Therefore Black is forced to abandon his knight.

Black goes for all or nothing, but if the black king stayed on f6 then White would threaten the f4-pawn with his king on f3.

5 ... \(\text{Qg7}\)
6 \(\text{Qf3 Qxf2}\)
7 \(\text{Qxb2 Qg6}\)
8 \(\text{Qc3 Qh5}\)

9 \(\text{Qc4 Qg4}\)
10 e5 \(\text{Qb6}\)
11 e6 \(\text{Qd8}\)
12 \(\text{Qd5 Qg3}\)
13 \(\text{Qe1!}\)
This knight retreat and transfer to the d3-square is decisive.

13 ... \( \text{Ke7} \)
14 \( \text{Cd3} \) 1-0

Here is another example:

Azmaiparashvili – Kupreichik
Kuibyshev 1986

Black has an excellent position to compensate for the exchange, with well-centralized pieces and a extra pawn. Azmaiparashvili’s decision looks suicidal:

1 \( \text{Bxc5!} \)!
2 \( \text{Bxc5} \) \( \text{Bxc5} \)
3 \( \text{Df1} \) \( \text{Df6} \)
4 \( \text{De2} \) \( \text{De6} \)
5 \( \text{Dd3} \) \( \text{Dd5} \)
6 \( \text{Ec3!} \) (D)

Only now does Azmaiparashvili’s idea become clear. Despite the extra pawn Black’s position is paradoxically very difficult, with the white b-pawn threatening to advance along with the threat of \( \text{Bd1+} \).

6 ... \( \text{C4} \)
7 \( \text{Db4} \) \( \text{Cc7} \)

If Black plays 7...c3 then the preliminary 8 \( \text{Bd1+} \), only then followed by 9 \( \text{Bxc3} \), ruins Black’s counterchances.

8 \( \text{Bd1+} \) \( \text{De4} \)
9 \( \text{Bb6} \) \( \text{Cc6} \)

After 9...\( \text{Cc8} \) White would play
10 \( \text{Bb7} \) \( \text{Bb8} \) 11 \( \text{Bd7} \) f5 12 \( \text{Bxa4!} \) c3
13 \( \text{Bb3} \) and the advance of the a-pawn is decisive.

10 \( \text{Bb5} \) \( \text{Cc8} \)
11 \( \text{Dd7!} \) \( \text{Bb8} \)

There is no stopping 12 \( \text{Cc7} \), so therefore Black tries to create tactical counterchances.

12 \( \text{Cc7} \)

After 12 \( \text{Bxf7} \) c3 13 \( \text{Cc7} \) \( \text{Dd3} \)
White does not manage to clean up the a4-pawn, and to create connected passed pawns.

12 ... \( \text{Dd3} \)
13 \( \text{Cc6!} \)

The only way to win; 13...\( \text{Dc8} \) fails to the simple 14 \( \text{Bxc4} \).

13 ... \( \text{F5} \)
14 \( \text{Bxa4} \) c3
15 \( \text{Bb5} \) g5

It takes Black a lot of time to create his own passed pawn.
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16 a4 f4
17 gxf4 gxf4
18 a5 e4
19 ♘b4!

By consolidating the b6-pawn, White has liberated his king to liquidate the black pawns.

19 ... ♗e2
20 a6 e3
21 a7 ♗f8
22 fxe3 1-0

Najdorf – Gheorghiu
Moscow 1967

Black is a piece up, but how can he win? The game actually finished in a draw after a threefold repetition with:

6 ... ♗g8

According to GM Tony Miles in ECE Black is winning after 6...h5! 7 ♘h3 (not 7 ♘g5? due to 7...♗xe5! and the white king is in a mating net) 7...♗h6 (7...g5 leads to the same) 8 ♘h4 g5+ (8...f6 looks strong – editor’s note) 9 fxg5+ ♗g6 10 ♘b5! (bad is 10 h3 f6!! 11 gxh6 ♘xe5! and once again White is getting mated) 10...♗e1 11 ♘xb2 ♗e4+ (Miles considers the position winning after 11...♗xe5, but 12 h3 ♘xg5 13 g4 f5 14 ♘b4! fxg4 15 hxg4 hxg4 16 ♘xg4 leads to a well-known drawn position) 12 ♘h3 ♘xe5 13 ♗g2 ♘xg5 14 ♘f3 and in the resulting endgame of rook and two against rook and three White has good drawing chances.
Solutions to the Exercises

Pawn Endgames

P1

1 e4

1 g4? c5 2 g5 (2 f4 d6 3 g5 e7 4 h6 e5 =) 2...d6 3 e4 e7 4 e5 f7 ½-½ Jansa-W. Watson.

1 ... c5
2 e5 b5
3 axb6 xb6
4 g4 c7

4...a5 5 g5 a4 6 d4 e5+ 7 c3! +- using a well known idea of Nimzowitsch.

5 g5 d7
6 f6 e8
7 g7! +- With a draw.

P2

Black is winning.

1 ... c7
2 c3

2 c4 b6 3 cxd5 cxd5 4 c2 a5! +-.

2 ... b6!
3 exb4 b5
4 c3 a4

and Black wins.

P3

1 h5!

1 d2? h5 2 e3 c4 0-1 Trojan-Bertok.

P4

1 ... g4!

1...f4? 2 e4 (2 c4? g4! ++) 2...xc5 3 f5 d4 4 xg5 e3 5 g4! (typically refusing the capture) 1-0 Lücke-T. Heinatz.

2 e5 gxh3
3 gxh3 xe5 with a draw.

P5

1 ... xe6!

1...g5? 2 f3 g4? (but White is still winning after 2...xc6 3 e4:
3...d6 4 f5 g4 5 g5 e6 6 xh5 g3 7 f3 or 3...g4 4 xe5 h4 5 f4 ++) 3 g3 xc6 4 h4 e4 5 g3 1-0 Kulgin-Gapanovich.

2 h4 d5
3 xh5 e4
4 g6 d3
5 xg7 e2 =
P6

1 h5!
1 h3? h5! 2 g3 fxg3 3 hxg3 e6 4 f4 xd6 5 g5 e6 6
xh5 f5 7 h6 f6 8 a4 a5 h5 9 f3 h4 e6 10
g5 g7 11 f5 h6 12
e5 xh5 13 d5 g5 14 c5
f5 15 b5 e6 17 xa5 d7 and
the black king reaches the c8-square
in time to force the draw.
1 ... e6
2 h3 xd6
3 g4 e5
4 g5 e4
5 f6 h6
Or 5 ... e3 6 f5 h6 7 e5! win-
ning.
6 a4 a5
7 g6 1-0

P7

1 d4!
1 d5 b4 2 d4 b3 3 f4 c2
or 1 e5 c4 2 f6 d3 3 xg6
e4! are both drawn.
1 ... c6
2 e5 c5
3 f4 +-.

P8

1 a4!!
1 c3 a5 2 c2 b4 3 a4 a1! +-.
1 ... bxa4
1 ... b4? a5 +-.
2 e1 =.

P9

1 g4!
1 e7 f5! 2 f7 (or 2 e6 d3 3
f4 e2 4 xf5 f2 5 g4 g3 =)
2... d3 3 xg7 f4!! 4 xh7 e2 5
g4 xf2 6 g5 f3 7 g6 g3! 1/2-1/2
Kalinichev-Schulz.
1 ... d3
2 e7 f6
3 f7 e2
4 f4! f3
5 f5 g3
6 xg7 +-

P10

Yes.
1 ... g4!
2 hxg4 h4!
3 g5!
3 c5? e3 4 d3 h3 +-.
3 ... e3
4 d3 h3
5 gxh3 f3
6 g6 e2
7 g7 e1
8 g8 h+ e3+
9 e2 h2+

With a draw.

P11

1... h2! (1... hxh4 2 f2 g5 3
g3 f5 4 e3 =) 2 f2 h1 3 g3
f1 0-1 Tringov-Stein, Amsterdam
1964.

P12

1... f4! 2 gxf4+ d6!! 3 a5 g3 4 a6
c7 5 e2 d3+! and Black wins.

P13

a) 1... e5? 2 c3 g4 (2... e4 3
d2 e5 4 a4 d4 5 a5 c5 6 c3
b5 7 d4 ++) 3 d2 f3 4 e1
e4 (4... g2 5 e2! e4 6 a4 e3 7 f3
and wins) 5 a4 ¿d4 6 f3! 1-0 Tal-Rukavina, Sochi 1973.

b) 1...¿e4! 2 a4 ¿f3 3 a5 ¿xf2 4 a6 f3 5 a7 ¿g1 6 a8¿ f2 draw – Tal.

P14

If you paid careful attention to the Ree-Ftačnik game then you will have easily found the following: 1...g5! 2 hxg5 (or 2 gxh5 gxh4 and Black wins easily after 3 h6 ¿f7! or 3 f4 h3 4 ¿f3 exf4) 2...h4 3 ¿e3 (3 f4 h3 4 f5+ ¿e7 5 ¿f3 e4+ is no better) 3...¿f7 4 ¿f2 ¿g6 5 ¿g2 ¿xg5 6 ¿h3 (Black was threatening 6...e4!) 6...¿f4 7 ¿hxh4 ¿xf3 8 g5 e4 and White resigned in the game Barrera-Schatzle, Argentina 1975. After both sides queen, Black will exchange on g8, after which the black king picks up the white pawns on the queenside.

**Exchanging into Pawn Endgames**

E1

In the game Furman-Zhukhovitsky Black played 1...¿c5 2 ¿e2 but then he could not make progress.

However, there was a way to win:

1 ... ¿xd4
2 ¿xd4 g5!
3 ¿xc4
3 fxg5+ ¿xg5 4 ¿xc4 f4 –+
3 ... g4!
4 ¿e5 h5
5 ¿b6 h4
Black is winning easily.

E2

1 ¿hxh7! ¿xh7
2 ¿d7 ¿a8
3 e7 ¿a7+
4 ¿e6 ¿a8
5 ¿f7 ¿a7
6 ¿f8 ¿a8+
7 e8¿ ¿xe8+
8 ¿xe8 –=

E3

1 b5!
1 ¿xg4? fxg4 2 b5 ¿d5 3 c6 bxc6 4 bxc6 ¿xc6 5 ¿xd4 ¿b5 6 ¿c3 ¿c5! 7 ¿d3 ¿d5 8 ¿e3 ¿c4 0-1 Ricardi-G.Garcia.

1 ... ¿xf4
2 gxf4+ ¿d5
3 c6 bxc6
4 bxc6 ¿xc6
5 ¿xd4 ¿d6
6 a4 a5 =

E4

1 ¿xf7!
1 ¿f3? b5! 2 g6 fxg6! 3 ¿xe6 a5 4 ¿e5 d3 5 ¿e4 ¿c3 6 ¿e3 d2 7 ¿e2 a4 0-1 Rozentalis-Smagin.

1 ... ¿xf7
2 ¿xf7 d3
3 g6 d2
4 g7 d1¿
5 g8¿ ¿d5+
6 ¿f8 ¿xg8+
7 ¿xg8 h5

7...¿d5 8 ¿f7 ¿e5 9 ¿e7 b5 10 f4+ ¿xf4 11 ¿d6 =.

8 f4 ¿d5
9 ¿f7 ¿e4
10 ¿e6 =
E5
This is the correct move. Instead in the game Piskov-Dvoirys there followed 1 b6? c3 2 dxc4? a5 —.

1 ... axb5
2 dxe2 d5
3 exd5 exd5
4 ... c6
5 ... c6
6 ... b3
7 ... d4
8 ... e7
9 ... e8
10 f4+!
11 g7+!
12 ... g8+ mate.

E6

1 f4+!
The pawn endgame that arises from 1 ... exf4 2 h4+! g6 (2 ... h4 allows 3 g8+ g7 4 h5+ h6 5 f6 6 g5+! xg5 6 f8 mate) 5 g5+! xg5 6 h8 mate.

1 ... exf4
2 ... gxf4 2 h4+! g6 (2 ... h4 allows 3 g8+ g7 4 h5+ h6 5 f6 6 g5+! xg5 6 f8 mate) 5 g5+! xg5 6 h8 mate.

E7

No, in view of the following line:
1 ... exf4 2 ... gxf4
3 ... gxf4
4 ... xg6
5 ... d6
6 ... f3
And the pawn ending is won.

E8

No. White's best move is the zwischenzug:
1 ... d6+
After 1 d3 dxd3 2 exd3 hxg4 3 hxg4 g5! 4 ... f6+ intending ... f6+ 4 gxf6 5 d4 b5 6 d3 g5 7 d5 f5 8 f6 9 ... e3 e6 10 ... f3 xd6 11 ... f6 and a draw was agreed in the game Glek-Dautov.

E9

1 d1! e6
1 ... c4 2 e1+ d5 3 xex5+ xe5 4 g5 e4 5 f6! winning.
2 e1+ d5
3 ... c4+!
4 xex6+ xe6
5 ... f6
6 ... e6
7 e3!
The capture of the e5-pawn is forced.
E10

1 ... ♝d5!

The immediate 1...exd5? loses to
2 ♝h3! ♝d5 3 ♝xe5+ ♝xe5 4 ♝xe5
5 ♝xe5 ♝h4 5 ♝d5 6 ♝h5 ♝c4 7 ♝h4
1-0 Vaulin-Groszpeter.

2 ♝f3

Not 2 e6? ♝xg3.

2 ... ♝xe5 =

Rook Endgames

R1

1 ♝g4!

1 ♝g7?? ♝b1 2 ♝f2 (2 ♝h2 b4 3
♩xb5 b3 4 ♝b5 ♝c3 5 ♝b8 ♝c1 6
♩c8+ ♝b2 7 ♝b8 ♝c3 =) 2...b4 3
♩xb5 b3 4 ♝b5 b2 5 ♝g2 ♝c3 6
♩c5+ ♝b3 7 ♝c8 ♝c1 0-1 Polugaevsky-Korchnoi, Tilburg 1985.

1 ... ♝e3+

2 ♝xg5 ♝xf3

3 ♝f5 ♝h4

4 ♝e5 ♝f3

5 ♝d5 =

R2

1 ♝a2!

1 ♝b8? c3+ 2 ♝a2 ♝d1! 3 ♝d8+
♩c1 4 ♝h8 c2 5 ♝h2 ♝d8 0-1 Matsukevich-Lein.

1 ... c3

2 ♝h4 =

R3

1 ... g3+!

1...♩c6? 2 ♝e4 ♝d6 3 ♝f4 ♝e6
4 ♝g5 ♝h1 5 ♝a6+ ♝f7 6 ♝h6 1-0
Ubilava-Matulović.

2 ♝e3 ♝b6!

3 ♝g7 ♝c6

4 ♝f3 ♝d6

5 ♝xg3 ♝h1

6 ♝f4 ♝e6

7 ♝g5 ♝g1+

With a draw.

R4

1 ... ♝f5!

2 ♝a8

2 ♝b3 g3 3 ♝b4 g2 4 ♝g6 ♝f4+
followed by ...♩g4 ++.

2 ... ♝g3

3 ♝a6 ♝f6!

4 ♝a7 ♝f7

0-1

R5

1 ♝g4 e3

2 ♝a3! e2

3 ♝a1 ♝g2

4 ♝e1 ♝h2

5 ♝a1 =

R6

1 ♝b1!

1 ♝d3? ♝e1 2 ♝d2 ♝e6 3 ♝b1 g5
4 ♝h1+ ♝g6 5 ♝g1 ♝e5! 6 ♝d3 ♝f5
7 ♝f1+ ♝g4 8 ♝g1+ ♝f3 = Tal-Zaitsev.

1 ... ♝g5

2 ♝d3 ♝e5

3 ♝d4 ♝e8

4 ♝h1+

With a draw.

R7

1 ... ♝c5

1...♩b3? 2 ♝h5 ♝c5 3 ♝b7 ♝xg3
4 ♝b5+ = Scheeren-Van der Sterren.
2 \[ \text{R8} \]

1 ... \[ \text{\=e5!} \]
1...\[ \text{\=c5}\] 2 \[ \text{\=b7} \] \[ \text{\=xa5} \] 3 \[ \text{\=xh7} \]
\[ \text{\=d5} \] 4 \[ \text{\=e7} \] \[ \text{\=d6} \] 5 \[ \text{\=e4} \] \[ \text{\=d7} \] 6 \[ \text{\=h3} \]
\[ \text{\=a3} \] 7 \[ \text{\=e3} \] \[ \text{\=a5} \] 8 \[ \text{\=f3} \] \[ \text{\=f5} \] +9 \[ \text{\=g4} \]
\[ \text{\=a3} \] 7 \[ \text{\=e3} \] \[ \text{\=a5} \] 8 \[ \text{\=f3} \] \[ \text{\=f5} \] +9 \[ \text{\=g4} \]
+- Schneider-Romanishin.

2 \[ \text{\=a6} \]
3 \[ \text{\=h3} \] \[ \text{\=f4} = \]

2 \[ \text{\=d6} \]

\[ \text{\=d7} \] \[ \text{\=e5}! \] 3 \[ \text{\=xb5} \] \[ \text{\=b6} =. \]

2 ... \[ \text{\=f6} \]
3 \[ \text{\=xb5} \]
4 \[ \text{\=e7} \]
5 \[ \text{\=h7} \]

R9

1 ... \[ \text{\=e2}+! \]
1...\[ \text{\=d8}\] 2 \[ \text{\=xb5} \] \[ \text{\=e8} \] +3 \[ \text{\=d6} \]
\[ \text{\=f6} \] 4 \[ \text{\=xb7} \] \[ \text{\=e1} \] 5 \[ \text{\=c6} \] +- Sokolov-Ivanović.

3 \[ \text{bxc5} \]
4 \[ \text{\=e6} \]
5 \[ \text{\=d4} \] \[ \text{\=c6} \]
6 \[ \text{\=f4} \]

and White wins.
## Index of Games and Composers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer(s)</th>
<th>Games Number</th>
<th>Composer(s)</th>
<th>Games Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adorjan-Tseshkovsky</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Chiburdanidze-</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agzamov-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaprindashvili</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhailchishin</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Chigorin-Tarrasch</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksandria-Savereide</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Cvitan-Eingorn</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreev-Demin</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Czerniak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres-Vilela</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mikhailchishin</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averbakh</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Dawidow-Wojtkiewicz</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azmaiaparashvili-Elolan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Diaz-Rodriguez,A</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azmaiaparashvili-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diesen-Dolmatov</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupreichik</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Dizdarević-Kovačević</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azmaiaparashvili-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dobias</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temirbaev</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Dorfman-Anikaev</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balashov-Salov</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Dorfman-Kholmov</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bareev-Polgar,J</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Dragušević-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrera-Schatzle</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Aleksandria</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barsov-Brunner</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Duchamp</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliavsky-Foiyer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Eingorn-Mikhailchishin</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliavsky-Gurevich,M</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Ermenkov-Castro</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliavsky-Ivanović</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Ernst-Stohl</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliavsky-Karpov</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Euwe-Alekhine</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliavsky-Kotronias</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Filipenko-Scherbakov</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliavsky-Kupreichik</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Fischer-Larsen</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliavsky-Lobron</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Flear,G-Chandler</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliavsky-Yusupov</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Furman-Zhukovitsky</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belkadi-Pachman</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Garcia,G-Vladimirov</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belov-Savon</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Gavrikov-Kharitonov</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin-Tseshkovsky</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Gelfand-Karpov</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berman</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Gelfand-Salov</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briedis-Timoshenko</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Gelfand-Timman</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodsky-Magerramov</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Geller-Fischer</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronstein-Romanishin</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Geller-Mikhailchishin</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronstein-Tukmakov</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Geller-Novikov</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunner-Hulak</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Geller-Stein</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capablanca-Lasker,Ed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Georgadze,T-Gulko</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capablanca-Lasker,Em</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Georgiev,Ki-Ljubojević</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cekro,E-Todorović</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Ghitescu-Rajković</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler-Karpov</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Glek-Dautov</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaunin-Friedman</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Gligorić-Szabo</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chekhlov-Katišonok</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Goldin-Malishauskas</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chekhov-Eingorn</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Golombek-Keres</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chernin-Mikhailchishin</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Guliev-Tukmakov</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiburdanidze-Flear,G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gulko-Romanishin</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurevich,M-Adorian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Gurgenidze-Petrosian,T</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanssen-Nimzowitsch</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hort-Bertok</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horvath,Ju-Horvath,S</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hübner-Pfleger</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansa-Watson,W</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kalinichev-Schulz</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpov-Beliavsky</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Karpov-Knaak</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpov-Polugaevsky</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kasparov-Short</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaunas-Mordvinov</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Khasin-Filipenko</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharlov-Ernst</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Khivitsky-Vasiukov</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kholmov-Rašik</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Kozlov-Mikhailchishin</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krom-Baburin</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Larsen-Torre</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korchnoi-Barcza</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Levenfish-Botvinnik</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupreichik-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ljubojević-Spassky</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuznetsov</td>
<td></td>
<td>Magerramov-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levenfish-Botvinnik</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Magerramov-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levenfish-Botvinnik</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Magerramov-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lfälle-Heinatz,T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Maksimovich</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makarychev</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Majorov-Legky</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamadzic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martinez-Cobo</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matanović-Uhlmann</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game/Composers</td>
<td>Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsukevich-Lein</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Anikaev</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Bareev</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Basin</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Buturin</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Chernin</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czerwonski</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holzmann</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Kluger</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Losev</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles-Gheorghiu</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles-Polugaevsky</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitrofanov</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnatsakanian-Kluger</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnatsakanian-Vogt</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najdorf-Gheorghiu</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nei-Averbakh</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenashev-Lputian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijboer-Peebu</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolić-P</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolić-P-Vaganian</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novikov-Gavrikov</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novikov-V</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novikov-Oll</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olafsson-Ivanchuk</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekarek-Petrosian,A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrovics,A-Monin</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrovics,T-Benko</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piket-Tukmakov</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piskov-Dvoirs</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaskett-Zak</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polgar,G-Barcza</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polgar,J-Spassky</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polgar,Zsu-Larsen</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polugaevsky-Korchnoi</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polugaevsky-Mecking</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popchev-Cvitan</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portisch-Pritchett</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pritchett-Beliavsky</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pytel,B-Hoidarova</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radulov-Beliavsky</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ree-Ftačnik</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardi,P-Garcia,G</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers-Shirov</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanishin-Balashov</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanishin-Dvoretsky</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanishin-Gipslis</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanishin-Razuvaev</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozentalis-Nijboer</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozentalis-Smagin</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ružele-Gelfand</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saidy-Fischer</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salov-Short</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanz-Polgar,Zsu</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sax-Hecht</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheeren-</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider-Romanish</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider, D-Pytel</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider-Romanish</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirov-Akopian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Vaganian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skolov-Ivanović</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spassky-Beliavsky</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speelman-Chandler</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ståhlberg-Pine</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoltz-Nimzowitsch</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suetin-Stein</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabo-Korenski</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal-Bronstein</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal-Rukavina</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal-Zaitsev</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timman-Nikolić,P</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timman-Romanish</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timman-Sveshnikov</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomaszewski-K</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wojtkiewicz</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troger-Bertok</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vainer-Gelfand</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valsecni</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velimirović-Marija</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Wiel-Seirawan</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Riemsdijk-Brendel</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vavour-Groszpeter</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velimirvić-Marija</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vespelovsky-Varavin</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuksonalić-Petrovich</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyshmanavin-Smyslov</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wojtkiewicz-</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalfiman</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolff-Browne</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakovich-Iktis</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakovich-Savchenko</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanofsky,D-Fischer</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yurtay-Serper</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusupov-Ljuboević</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusupov-Timman</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusupov-Wegner</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaichik-Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaja,I-Ermolinsky</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>