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+  check
++ double check
# checkmate
!! brilliant move
! good move
!? interesting move
?! dubious move
? bad move
?? blunder
Ch championship
Cht team championship
Wch world championship
Ct candidates event
IZ interzonal event
Z zonal event
OL olympiad
Wcht world team championship
Ech European championship
Echt European team championship
ECC European Clubs Cup
WCup World Cup
jr junior event
wom women's event
mem memorial event
rpd rapidplay game
sim game from simultaneous display
corr. correspondence game
adv advanced chess (man + machine)
1-0 the game ends in a win for White
½-½ the game ends in a draw
0-1 the game ends in a win for Black
(n) nth match game
(D) see next diagram
Foreword

A conversation I once had with the great Mikhail Tal, after we had both triumphed in the 1974 Soviet Championship, made a strong impression on me. "Sasha," he said, "you calculate variations excellently, but you really must work on your intuition."

At the time I did not pay much attention to this as young people do not readily reflect on philosophical matters, and the word 'intuition' seemed to me then to be of a far too deeply philosophical nature. It was only a lot later that I began to think about the main problem in chess, namely that of choosing the right move, especially in critical positions.

Vishy Anand once expressed an interesting opinion on the subject: "Intuition is the first move I think of." Sure enough, but on what criteria does this move enter our head in the first place? Naturally, this comes from our knowledge of chess and previous experience. In an uncomplicated position, we play automatically, but in a complex or critical one, we sometimes have to find a solution through deep analysis of variations. Very often, however, our calculations cannot go sufficiently deep, and we must make a decision based on other factors.

Various grandmasters have written on the subject of intuition in chess, including Tal, Gufeld, Suetin and the great chess coach Dvoretsky. Here we have attempted to construct an approximate categorization of intuitive decisions, but we were not, of course, able to include all possible scenarios at the first attempt. However, we believe that the reader will benefit from our ideas and will form his or her own conclusions. So that the reader has as much food for thought as possible, we have included a large number of practical examples. In particular cases we have given multi-variation annotations to verify the correctness of the intuitive decisions taken, while in other instances we have tried to explain the nature of these decisions verbally.

Alexander Beliavsky
Introduction

Intuitive Decisions

Speaking of intuition in chess first and foremost brings to mind Mikhail Tal of the 1960s and his semi-correct sacrifices. One also recalls Capablanca, whose decisions at the board were often made without having calculated any variations, and were instead based on positional formulae understood only by him.

The Russian Scientist Ivan Pavlov defined intuition as being able to see the final point of a given path in complete obscurity, chosen essentially through the foundation of the experience of the individual.

It appears that three types of intuitive decision exist in chess:

• Combinative
• Positional
• Psychological (the prediction of your opponent’s plans and consequently taking preventative measures against them; this can, to a certain extent, be described as a sense of danger)

When one of the co-authors was Karpov’s trainer in his matches against Kasparov, he time and time again heard Karpov explain such things as “Here I felt that he would sacrifice the exchange, either before or after preparation – today he fell straight into it.”

In the history of chess there have been several players who often took decisions simply through intuition, or who used their intuition very extensively in their decision-making process; such players include Capablanca, Tal, Smyslov, Petrosian, Spassky, Stein, Kramnik and Anand. Those who could support their intuitive choices with precise calculation were simply the greatest. First and foremost was the ability to ‘sense’ the best move in every concrete position; this meant that they would tend to find the best continuation without spending a lot of time on the clock. Naturally, this approach can lead to the occasional two-move blunder, but for such great players as in the above list, the frequency of these mistakes remains very low.

What is Intuition?

The technical definition of intuition is as follows:

“Intuition: In philosophy, the power of obtaining knowledge that cannot be acquired either by inference or observation, by reason or experience. As such, intuition is thought of as an original, independent source of knowledge, since it is designed to account for just those kinds of knowledge that other sources do not provide. Knowledge of
necessary truths and of moral principles is sometimes explained in this way.” (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*).

But what do grandmasters themselves think of this?

Anand simply says that “Intuition, is the first move I see in the position”, a short description, and one exclusively from his point of view. It is immediately finding and understanding the essence of the position and automatically seeing the move in your mind’s eye. This very simple formula was also characteristic of the great Jose Raul Capablanca. Grandmaster Kostić told of how he and a group of players at the Manhattan Chess Club had been involved in a lengthy analysis of a particular position. They had come to the conclusion that the move $\text{\&}e5$ was strongest. Capablanca then came over to the board, and after short reflection said that $\text{\&}e5$ was best, and went off to play bridge. Astonished, the players got down to study the move and after a couple of hours came to the conclusion that Capablanca was indeed right!

The well-known psychologist and grandmaster Helmut Pfleger regards intuition to be something that cannot be substantiated rationally, and is in effect, a feeling: “Intuition in chess (but not only in chess) is either a conscious or a subconscious process, as a result of which an individual, without prolonged deliberation, reaches a conclusion, which he himself is unable to explain. In this way, in certain positions Capablanca and Petrosian simply did not need to think; they either knew or sensed what to do. In art, this is known as a ‘moment of inspiration’, and shows what cannot be created through calculation alone. Without intuition, analysis alone cannot produce results; the difference between a computer and a human lies in the fact that having worked through the assorted branches of variations, the former generates a numerical/material evaluation, whereas the latter forms a feeling for the position.”

Here is the opinion of Genna Sosonko: “Behind the word ‘intuition’ lies our subconscious experience or knowledge of games and ideas, either our own, or those of others. When I showed my games to the great Semion Furman, he asked, ‘Where did you get that idea from?’ to which I replied ‘I thought it up myself’; Semion then said, ‘No, you must have seen this before’. Indeed, intuition is the knowledge we have formed in our minds on a purely subconscious level. Among the greatest chess-players this moulding of information occurs very rapidly, and I cannot conceive that a person who has just learnt chess could have developed a sense of intuition. I never calculate many variations, but regularly sense the moment when it is necessary to stop playing on auto-pilot and work out a few critical lines.

“In my opinion, developing one’s intuition is a straightforward task – it is a matter of further study of the most diverse games (especially the classics); for it is only among the most gifted that intuition develops much more rapidly.”
Vladimir Kramnik’s opinion is interesting: “Intuition is the immediate awareness of the position, but this is difficult to explain logically. Intuition in a sense depends on knowledge; the more you accumulate, the better your intuition becomes. But on the whole, natural talent plays the biggest part. Good intuition is the first sign of chess talent. Simply speaking, you may like some positions, and dislike others, some positions you have faith in, whereas others you do not trust at all – this is what constitutes intuitive judgement. In a favourable position, intuition plays a less significant role, whereas in blitz, it is the most important thing. I myself am an intuitive player; my whole game is based on intuition. I simply reject certain variations or do not calculate them to the end, because I sense that they are incorrect. Capablanca and Anand are examples of great intuitive players, whereas Kasparov is first and foremost a calculator; for him intuition does not feature highly in the decision-making process.”

The well-known Russian psychologist Dr Malkin (who worked at the Soviet centre for Cosmonaut Preparation) carried out his own investigation into intuition in chess, and came to the following conclusions. Firstly, experience shows that in unclear positions, grandmasters examine no more than three or four moves; all other continuations are discarded, for they lie outside the zone that intuition permits us to consider. The second observation was that the higher a player’s rating, the less he actually calculates! Top players simply eliminate moves that they don’t intend to calculate! Lasker also noted this: “The greater the mastery, the greater the restrictions. Undoubtedly, it is this that distinguishes a strong player – when there are multiple possibilities, he rejects concrete calculation and uses his intuition to find the right move.” (Nonetheless, once found, he will check this move with concrete analysis as a safety measure).

Polish grandmaster Wlodzimierz Schmidt described intuition as ‘subconscious knowledge’. Again, one could spend hours deliberating how to interpret this, but the fact of the matter is that understanding in some people develops much more quickly than in others.

Botvinnik considered Capablanca to be the greatest player of all time because of his intuitive play.

Here are the thoughts of Boris Gelfand: “Intuition is what reveals itself in crucial positions, where neither a clear-cut plan nor a forcing continuation exists. However, intuition becomes apparent first of all in one’s initial evaluation of the position and in one’s choice of move. For Kasparov, the first assessment of the position and consequently chosen moves are often mistaken; he instead reaches the correct decisions by means of enormous analytical effort. On the other hand, the first positional evaluation of the great intuitive player Boris Spassky almost always proves correct. It is possible to develop one’s intuition through careful
study of all aspects of chess. For example, to begin with Kamsky simply did not have the ability to find correct moves in critical situations, but towards the end of his brief career he had managed to develop this quality.”

The scientist V. Smilg thought, “If there were clear and precise rules for conducting a game of chess, then the game would without doubt lose its captivating quality. Distinctive peculiarities of chess lie in the fundamentally non-formulaic principles to which the game is played. It is also the impossibility of being able to evaluate a position in a rigid, unyielding fashion (according to the great mathematician Liebnitz, it is impossible to formalize chess thought), especially when we are referring to one that is dynamically rich. The absence of clear-cut criteria for accurately conducting a game of chess is conducive to the fact that creativity in master play and intuition both bear an indissoluble connection with one another. Both for chess-players, and for those in academic study, the root of success is founded on the ability to think intuitively. The ability to open one’s mind to this way of thinking, and to break it down into its constituent elements, remains one of the great unsolved problems.”

We end with Vasily Smyslov’s take on the subject: “In my games I depend not only on my experience, knowledge and analytical ability, but most of all on my intuition, for it is this ‘feeling’ for the position that enables us to evaluate it accurately and profoundly, as burns brightly the flame striving for the fight ahead.”
Mikhail Tal possessed the most interesting combinative intuitive thinking in chess, made stronger by his outstanding ability to calculate variations. In this chapter we shall take a look at several examples of his play and that of a number of other players who have followed in his footsteps. First, let’s hear some comments by the man himself on the subject of intuition and risk.

Tal on Intuition

“Very often the decisive argument for or against a particular continuation is ‘It’s good; I just know it is.’

“When similar decisions are carried out frequently, we speak of a player with an intuitive style. It must straight away be noted that this mysterious intuition manifests itself in different ways. Whereas one player may have a well-developed sense of intuition, another may not always be able to find the quickest and surest route for the attack, but in compensation remarkably foresees and averts the smallest signs of potential danger. Another player, on the other hand, may just intuitively visualize how and where his pieces will be best placed.”

Tal on Risk

“...what exactly is risk in chess? Does a player knowingly take risks? If we somehow identify the concept of knowledge with scientific procedure, and the notion of intuition with the realms of creativity, then it is, by analogy, possible to unite risk with sport. It is even possible to remind ourselves of the saying ‘He who dares, wins’. I would also like to add that, in my opinion, a player takes a risk in earnest only when he is aware of exactly what he risking [although it seems to us that risk does indeed fall within the field of intuition – authors’ note].

“A player gives up a piece for the attack in a situation where it was also possible for him not to have sacrificed at all. Is he taking a risk? Undoubtedly, for the attack may be beaten off, and the opponent’s extra piece would then prove decisive. Let’s take this a little further – a player accepts a sacrificed piece (although it was equally possible to have declined it) in the hope of holding off the forthcoming attack. Does this constitute a risk? Without doubt, for the attack may prove irresistible. So who exactly is taking the greater risk? There is just no way of determining this.”

Examples of Tal’s intuitive play were apparent not only in attacking the king during the middlegame, but also in the endgame:
1 \(\text{e}xc5!\) \text{cxd5} 2 \text{d}d4
It is impossible to calculate this ending to a conclusion, but Tal had decided that it promised excellent winning chances.

2...\text{e}e7 3 \text{xe}d5 \text{d}d7 4 \text{b}4!
Preparing c4.

4...\text{e}e8 5 c6+ \text{c}8 6 c4 \text{bxc}4 7 \text{xc}4 \text{e}2 (D)

8 b5 \text{e}c2+ 9 \text{d}5 \text{a}a2 10 \text{c}3 \text{xg}2
11 b6 \text{f}2 12 b7+ \text{c}7 13 \text{x}f6 1-0

Naturally, the kind of solutions we expect from Tal can be found in the next game.

1...e3!?
For Tal, the initiative was more important than material.

2 \text{h}xg4 f4! 3 \text{d}d5 \text{xe}d5 4 \text{cxd}5
\text{exf}2+ 5 \text{xf}2 \text{fxg}3++ 6 \text{g}1 \text{xg}4 7
\text{dxc}6 \text{h}3
Now the white king falls under an attack from all the black pieces.

8 e4 \text{f}2 9 \text{xf}2 \text{gxf}2 10 \text{xf}2
\text{bxc}6 11 \text{e}e2 \text{h}4+ 12 \text{g}3 \text{d}d6
Black’s attack is worth the material.
1 \( \text{xf7+?! xf7} \) 2 \( \text{xf7 xf7} \) 3 \( \text{wb3+ ff8} \) 4 \( \text{ac1} \)

"I think that, generally speaking, sacrifices such as this do not require concrete analysis, for it is sufficient to glance at the resulting position in order to convince oneself of their correctness" (Tal).

4...a6?

4...wb6 is much better, although even here 5 \( \text{bb5 ae8} \) 6 \( \text{wc4!} \) assures White of an attack.

5 \( \text{fd1 wa5} \) 6 \( \text{wc4!} \)

Directed against the freeing move \( \text{...b5} \).

6...\( \text{wf5} \) 7 \( \text{h3!} \) \( \text{ae8!} \) 8 \( \text{dd5 we6} \) 9 \( \text{wb4 b5} \)

If 9...\( \text{ae5} \), then 10 \( \text{ac4!} \).

10 \( \text{ec6!} \) \( \text{wf7} \) 11 \( \text{ec7 xc7} \) 12 \( \text{xc7 we6} \) 13 \( \text{dc1!} \) \( \text{b6} \) 14 \( \text{xe7!} \)

\( \text{d5} \) 15 \( \text{xe6+ xb4} \) 16 \( \text{d6+ 1-0} \)

2...\( \text{wb6+!} \) 3 \( \text{e3 wb8!} \) is a disaster for White. However, we again see Tal sacrificing a piece for the initiative, which incidentally Black is forced to accept.

1...\( \text{exd5} \) 2 \( \text{exd5 gg4} \)

The critical continuation is 2...\( \text{bb8} \) or 2...\( \text{aa7} \). In this case, after 3 \( \text{axb4 bb7} \) 4 \( \text{c4} \) a very interesting position arises; Black has a piece for two pawns, but an extremely restricted position. At the same time, storm clouds may potentially gather around the black king after \( \text{ec3} \), \( \text{g4} \), etc. Intuition told Tal that the position would promise him excellent chances.

It was also essential to consider the numerous possibilities for Black to aim to reach a playable position by not trying to retain the extra material. After 2...\( \text{bb7} \) 3 \( \text{dxc6 xc6} \) 4 \( \text{xe7!} \) White wins, while 2...\( \text{bxa3} \) 3 \( \text{dxc6 axb2} \) 4 \( \text{c3} \) leaves White clearly better. Following 2...\( \text{xd5} \) 3 \( \text{wd5 bxa3} \) 4 \( \text{c3!!} \)

(4 \( \text{bxa3} \) is also possible) it will not be easy for Black to defend his kingside.

Zaichik found another means of defence – forcing the white queen off the long diagonal.

3 \( \text{wg3} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 4 \( \text{xg4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 5 \( \text{wh3 d5??} \)

Zaichik probably did not like the position occurring after 5...\( \text{bxa3} \) 6 \( \text{c3!} \) \( \text{g6} \) (6...\( \text{h6??} \) loses immediately to 7 \( \text{xf6 xf6} \) 8 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{b3} \), but after 7...\( \text{fe8} \) (not 7...\( \text{d5} \) because of 8 \( \text{xg6!} \)) White still needs to find a way of continuing the pressure. Now, however, Black is deprived of his vital queenside counterplay.

6 \( \text{a4!} \)

...and this is why!

Tal – Zaichik

Tbilisi 1988
6...\textbf{f}e8 7 \textbf{h}1
Removing the king from the g1-a7 diagonal is useful from all points of view. In particular, after 7 \textbf{f}3 \textbf{d}6 White is unable to grab a pawn by 8 \textbf{x}e8+ \textbf{x}e8 9 \textbf{x}a6?? because of 9...\textbf{b}6+.

7...\textbf{a}5 8 \textbf{f}3 \textbf{d}6 9 c4! (D)

By opening the c-file, Tal initiates play on both sides of the board, for which his opponent is unprepared.

9...\textbf{x}c3
9...\textbf{d}xc4 10 \textbf{xc}4 clearly favours White, while 9...\textbf{e}7? is very bad due to 10 \textbf{c}5!.

10 \textbf{xc}3
Just look at that wonderful bishop-pair!

10...\textbf{xe}1 11 \textbf{xe}1 \textbf{b}4
It was on this move that Black had pinned his hopes, but unfortunately, a refutation is waiting.

12 \textbf{xf}6!
What does the loss of an exchange mean, compared to a pair of raking bishops? Emotion aside, it must be noted that this sacrifice demanded intricate calculation many moves deep.

12...\textbf{xe}1 (D)

How does White now continue the attack?
13 \textbf{g}4 does not achieve anything if Black replies 13...g6 14 f5 \textbf{d}6 15 \textbf{g}5 h6!.

13 \textbf{x}h7+ demands careful analysis: 13...\textbf{x}h7 14 \textbf{h}5+ \textbf{g}8 15 \textbf{g}5 \textbf{f}8 (forced) 16 \textbf{x}g7+ \textbf{e}8 17 \textbf{g}8+ \textbf{d}7 18 \textbf{xa}8 \textbf{xf}4 (there is nothing better) 19 \textbf{c}5+ \textbf{d}6 (19...\textbf{c}7 20 \textbf{b}7+ \textbf{d}6 21 \textbf{e}7+!! costs Black his queen) 20 \textbf{f}8+ \textbf{c}7 21 \textbf{e}6+! fxe6 22 \textbf{d}8+ and White wins the black queen. So, why did White not play 13 \textbf{x}h7+? It seems that there is an additional resource which saves the game – 13...\textbf{f}8! (in chess, you do not have to take everything your opponent offers!) and after 14 \textbf{g}4 \textbf{gx}f6 15 \textbf{g}8+ \textbf{e}7 16 \textbf{xa}8 \textbf{xf}4 Black has everything in order. But Tal being Tal, and having seen all this, chose the only available path to victory:

13 \textbf{h}5! \textbf{gx}f6

Having carefully examined the analysis in the notes to Black’s last move it should be clear that after 13...h6 14 \textbf{g}4 g6 15 \textbf{x}g6! fxg6 16 \textbf{x}g6+ \textbf{f}8 17 \textbf{x}h6+ \textbf{e}8 (17...\textbf{g}8? 18 \textbf{h}8+ \textbf{f}7 19 \textbf{g}7+) 18 \textbf{h}8+ \textbf{d}7
19 \(\text{W}x\text{a}8 \text{W}x\text{f}4\) (19...\(\text{W}b6\) 20 \(\text{Q}d4!\)) 20 \(\text{Q}c5+\) White wins.

14 \(\text{W}x\text{h}7+ \text{Q}f8\) 15 \(\text{W}h8+ \text{e}7\) 16 \(\text{W}x\text{a}8\)

A mighty battle with a mass of the most treacherous variations has led to a clear advantage for White, who essentially has two extra pawns. However, realizing this advantage still demands care and accuracy. Tal goes about the task in impeccable fashion.

16...\(\text{Q}f2!\) 17 \(\text{Q}b5!\)

After 17 g3?! \(\text{Q}a7\) Black would create the counter-threat of ...\(\text{W}b6\).

17...\(\text{Q}d4\) 18 \(\text{W}e8+ \text{d}6\) 19 \(\text{W}f8+ \text{e}6\)

Not 19...\(\text{W}e7\) 20 \(\text{W}x\text{e}7+ \text{xe}7\) 21 \(\text{Q}x\text{a}5\).

20 \(\text{Q}c5+ \text{f}5\) (D)

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image.png}
\end{center}

21 \(\text{Q}d7+!\)

Accuracy is required. Note that 21 \(\text{Q}d3+ \text{xf4} 22 \text{h}6+? \text{e}5\) gives Black defensive chances.

21...\(\text{Q}e6\)

Here 21...\(\text{Q}xf4 22 \text{h}6+ \text{e}5 23 \text{Q}d3+ \text{d}6 24 \text{W}xf6+\) leaves Black with no chances whatsoever.

22 \(\text{W}x\text{f7} \text{xe}5 23 \text{xe}6+ \text{xf}4\)

If 23...\(\text{Q}g6\) then 24 \(\text{Q}e8+\).

24 \(\text{W}x\text{f6}+ \text{e}3\) 25 \(\text{W}g5+ \text{d}3\) 26 \(\text{e}6 \text{c}4 27 \text{f}4+\)

The immediate 27 \(\text{W}c1+\) is even simpler.

27...\(\text{Q}d4\) 28 \(\text{W}c1+ \text{b}4\) 29 \(\text{W}x\text{c}5+ \text{x}c5\) 30 \(\text{b}3\)

It's all over! Here Black could have resigned with a clear conscience, but he carried on for several more moves through inertia.

30...\(\text{Q}d6\) 31 \(\text{Q}c8 \text{e}5\) 32 \(\text{g}3 \text{e}4\)

33 \(\text{g}2 \text{c}5 34 \text{b}7 \text{b}4 35 \text{h}4 \text{c}3\)

36 \(\text{h}3 \text{e}1 37 \text{g}4 \text{e}5 38 \text{g}5 \text{d}4 39\)

\(\text{a}6 \text{b}4 40 \text{g}4 \text{e}4 41 \text{g}6 \text{f}8 42\)

\(\text{g}5 1-0\)

\begin{center}
\text{Tal – Speelman}
\text{Subotica 12 1987}
\end{center}

1 \(\text{e}5! \text{W}x\text{d}4 2 \text{c}3 \text{W}d8 3 \text{Q}f3 \text{Q}e8\)

Black prepares to defend the kingside. However, 3...\(\text{Q}c5\) is better, upon which Tal intended 4 \(\text{Q}d1 \text{W}e7 5 \text{g}4\) and \(\text{g}5\).

4 \(\text{g}4 \text{b}5\)

Capturing on \(\text{g}4\) is simply terrifying.

5 \(\text{g}5 \text{hx}g5 6 \text{Q}x\text{g}5 \text{Q}a6\)
The attack now gains speed.
7 \( \text{W}f3 \) b4 8 \( \text{W}h3 \) g6 9 \( \text{A}xg6! \) bxc3
10 \( \text{A}xf7 \) \( \text{W}d2 \) + 11 \( \text{A}f1 \) \( \text{A}xf7 \) 12
\( \text{A}xf7+ \) \( \text{g}7 \) 13 \( \text{A}g1 \)
White has an unstoppable attack.

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Tal – Sveshnikov} \\
\text{USSR Ch (Moscow) 1973}
\end{array}
\]

Black literally is not allowed a single tempo to complete his development.
1 \( \text{A}xf7! \) \( \text{A}xf7 \) 2 \( \text{A}xe6+ \) \( \text{f}8 \)
After 2...\( \text{A}xe6? \) 3 \( \text{W}c4+ \) \( \text{A}d5 \) 4
\( \text{A}xd5 \) White wins immediately.
3 0-0
White has only two pawns for the piece, but he also has a strong attack, while Black's pieces completely lack coordination.
3...\( \text{W}c8 \) 4 \( \text{A}xd7 \)
Black's previous move had active defence in mind, for example after 4
e5? \( \text{W}c6 \).
4...\( \text{A}xd7 \) 5 \( \text{A}d1 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 6 \( \text{A}d5 \)
With the threat of 7 \( \text{A}xb6 \).
6 \( \text{W}f3 \) is less effective, since after 6...\( \text{A}e8 \), Black has ideas like ...\( \text{A}e5 \).
6...\( \text{W}b7 \) 7 e5!

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Tal – Velimirović} \\
\text{USSR-Yugoslavia (Tallinn) 1979}
\end{array}
\]

1 \( \text{A}xf7!\)??
Tal had been planning this risky move for a while. If 1 \( \text{A}b5 \) then White has nothing after 1...\( \text{A}xd5 \).
1...\( \text{W}xe7 \) 2 \( \text{A}f3 \) \( \text{A}xd5 \)
In the event of 2...\( \text{A}xf3 \) 3 e4!? White obtains a strong centre.
3 \( \text{f}xe4 \) \( \text{A}xc3 \) 4 \( \text{A}xc3 \)
Not 4 \( \text{A}xf5?! \) \( \text{A}xd1 \), when there is no time to play e5 due to the hanging bishop on b2.
4...\( \text{W}xe4 \) 5 \( \text{W}h5+ \) \( \text{A}e6 \)
After 5...\( \text{A}g8 \) 6 \( \text{A}xf6 \) \( \text{g}x\text{f}6 \) 7 \( \text{A}xf6 \) the black king comes under a fearsome attack.
6 \( \text{W}h3+ \) \( \text{A}d6 \) (D)
Opening up the position for active operations.

1...e5

Worse is 1...exf5 2 Qd5 Wd8 3 Qxf5 with an obvious advantage to White.

2 Qd5 Wd8 3 f6!?

Typical Tal – never a step backwards, only forward!

3...exd4

After 3...Qxf6 4 Qxf6+ gxf6 5 Qf5 the black kingside is very weak.

4 Wxd4!

This straightforward continuation is better than 4 fxg7?! Qxg7.

4...Qc6 5 Wh4 Qg3

Bringing the knight to the defence does not help: 5...Qe5?! 6 Qg5! Qg6
7 fxg7 Qxg7 8 Wh6.

6 Wxg3 Wxd5 7 Qf3 Qc4 8 Qh6! g6 9 b3! Qc3 10 Wh4 Qb7

Now White has a forced win.

11 Qxf8 Qxf8 12 Wh7 Qxf6 13 Wh8+ Qe7 14 Qae1+ Qd6 15 Qg7 Qd5 16 Wxf7 Qd8 17 Wxg6+ Qc5 18 Qe4 b5 19 Qd1 1-0

Black resigned in view of the terrible threat of 20 b4+.

“In my memory, Tal was the only player who did not calculate long variations – instead, he simply saw the resulting positions” (Garry Kasparov).

After each game Tal would pour out variations, which he had presumably calculated during the game. However, Rafael Vaganian once joked that these were all variations thought up by him after the game had finished, since they simply supported the evaluation of each resulting position, which he had indeed seen.
Tal’s Descendants

Of all of today’s grandmasters, Shirov is the closest of all to Tal himself. They often worked together as well. They are drawn together not only by their place of birth and having studied together but also through the intuitive relationship with their choice of move. In the first instance, risk occupies an important place for both players, and this can only be defined intuitively by means of an analogy. This is the so-called Canadian ice-hockey style – to launch the puck into the opposing team’s half, and then having all the players fight for it, and come what may. This can also apply in chess – the players concentrate their pieces in a particular area of the board, most frequently the kingside, and then combine all their collective power against the enemy king, taking little notice of what is happening on the rest of the board.

That although Black does not then stand badly, White would dictate the play after 3 a4 and 4 a5. Also, his sole source of play, ...g5-g4, would hardly be effective due to the weakening of his own king position. For Shirov, it was in any event better for the opposing king to be weakened, and he played...

1...\textit{Qxe4?!} 2 \textit{fxe4} \textit{Wg4} 3 \textit{h3}?

Straightaway a weak reply. 3 \textit{Wh3}! is correct, when 3...\textit{Wg6} is bad due to 4 \textit{Wh1} \textit{Qe2} 5 \textit{Qxd4} \textit{Qxf1} 6 \textit{Qxf1} \textit{Qxe4} 7 \textit{Qxa7}, when White has a powerful bishop-pair. Shirov intended 3...f3 4 \textit{Wxg4} \textit{Qxg4} 5 \textit{h3} \textit{Qh5} 6 \textit{Qh1} \textit{Qxe4} 7 \textit{Qf2} d3 8 \textit{Qd1} \textit{Qxc4} 9 \textit{Qxd3} Qc4 with good drawing chances, for White is playing without the bishop on h1.

3...\textit{Wg5!} 4 \textit{Qh1}

After 4 \textit{Qh2} f3! 5 \textit{Qxf3} \textit{Qxf3} 6 \textit{Qxf3} \textit{Wd2+} 7 \textit{Qh1} \textit{Qxf3} 8 \textit{Wxf3} Qf8 Black holds the advantage. However, this was without doubt the lesser evil. 4...\textit{Wh4!} 5 \textit{Qg1} (D)

Again 5 \textit{Qh2} is bad due to 5...f3.

\hspace{1cm} B

\hspace{0.5cm} Korchnoi – Shirov

\hspace{0.5cm} Madrid 1996

The natural continuation here would be 1...\textit{Cc7} 2 \textit{Qxd4} \textit{Qd7}. Shirov thought

After the text-move, Black could repeat with 5...\textit{Wg5}, but does he have anything better?
5...\textit{\textbf{xf6!!}}

Yes! Note that 5...\textit{\textbf{xe5}} is bad due to
6 \textit{\textbf{xd4}} \textit{\textbf{g5}} 7 \textit{\textbf{xf2!}}.

6 \textit{\textbf{xd4}} \textit{\textbf{g6}} 7 \textit{\textbf{h1}?}

This move is the decisive mistake – better is 7 \textit{\textbf{wd3 g5!}} 8 \textit{\textbf{f3}} but even in this case it is still clear that White stands badly.

7...\textit{\textbf{xg2}}! 8 \textit{\textbf{xd2}} \textit{\textbf{xe4}} 9 \textit{\textbf{g1 e2+}}
10 \textit{\textbf{h1}} \textit{\textbf{g6}} 11 \textit{\textbf{f2 e4+}} 0-1

\begin{center}
\textbf{Shirov – Rublevsky}
\textit{Montecatini Terme 2000}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{W}
\end{center}

1 \textit{\textbf{c5?! dxc5}}

It was not obligatory to accept the pawn sacrifice. After 1...\textit{\textbf{f6}} 2 \textit{\textbf{cxd6}}
\textit{\textbf{xd6}} 3 \textit{\textbf{b3+ h8}} 4 \textit{\textbf{d5}} White holds a small advantage.

2 \textit{\textbf{d5 d6}}

2...\textit{\textbf{xd5?!}} is bad due to 3 \textit{\textbf{exd5 d6}}
4 \textit{\textbf{xe5 xe5}} 5 \textit{\textbf{d6! xd6}} 6 \textit{\textbf{wd3}} with a decisive advantage.

3 \textit{\textbf{g3?!}}

White simply plays on a pawn down. Instead, both 3 \textit{\textbf{b6 b5}} and 3 \textit{\textbf{h5 f6}} 4 \textit{\textbf{xf6+ xf6}} 5 \textit{\textbf{xe5 b5}} give Black excellent play.

3...\textit{\textbf{b5}} 4 \textit{\textbf{h5 f6}}

4...\textit{\textbf{xf1}} is unacceptable in view of
5 \textit{\textbf{xe5 e6}} 6 \textit{\textbf{xe7+ xe7}} 7 \textit{\textbf{d6}}
with advantage to White.

5 \textit{\textbf{f4?!}}

Played in the style of the previous game – after 5 \textit{\textbf{xf6+ xf6}} 6 \textit{\textbf{xe5 xf1+ 7 xf1 e6}}
Black has no problems.

5...\textit{\textbf{g6}} 6 \textit{\textbf{h6 ad8}} 7 \textit{\textbf{xf6+ xf6}} 8
\textit{\textbf{xh6 xh6}} 9 \textit{\textbf{f1 f8?}}

The surprising idea 9...\textit{\textbf{g5!}} is best; then Shirov gave 10 \textit{\textbf{wh3 xf1}} 11
\textit{\textbf{xe5}} as unclear.

10 \textit{\textbf{c1 xf1}} 11 \textit{\textbf{xe5 e6}} 12 \textit{\textbf{xf1}}
\textit{\textbf{exf5}} 13 \textit{\textbf{b3+ c4}} 14 \textit{\textbf{xc4+ g7}} 15
\textit{\textbf{c7+}} 1-0

\begin{center}
\textbf{Shirov – Gelfand}
\textit{Dos Hermanas 1996}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{W}
\end{center}

\begin{itemize}
\item The game continued:
\item 1 \textit{\textbf{f5!}} \textit{\textbf{c8}}
\item Encouraging all the following sacrifices. 1...\textit{\textbf{b4}} 2 \textit{\textbf{xf6 gxf6}} 3 \textit{\textbf{f1}} \textit{\textbf{g8!}}
\item is interesting.
\item 2 \textit{\textbf{xe5 d6}} 3 \textit{\textbf{f4 g5}} 4 \textit{\textbf{c5!}}
\item Pretty, but the calculation required is not so deep.
\item 4...\textit{\textbf{xf4}} 5 \textit{\textbf{h4 xc5}} 6 \textit{\textbf{xf6+ g8}}
\end{itemize}
Shirov had foreseen the position and felt that he would be able to give perpetual check in one way or another, but sensed that there must be something better.

7 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Wxc5} \) 8 e5 \( \text{Qb7?} \)

The correct defence is 8...\( \text{Qd7} \) 9 \( \text{Wf5} \) \( \text{Ee8!} \) 10 \( \text{Wh7+} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 11 \( \text{Wxh6+} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 12 \( \text{Wg5+} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 13 \( \text{Wh6+} \) with a draw.

9 \( \text{Wxh6} \) f5 10 exf6 \( \text{Af7} \)

10...\( \text{Wc7} \) loses to 11 \( \text{Wg5+} \) \( \text{Qh8} \) 12 \( \text{Ae1} \).

11 \( \text{Af1! Ee8} \)

Here White should have played 12 \( \text{Qh7+} \) \( \text{Qxh7} \) 13 \( \text{Wg6+} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 14 \( \text{Wxh7} \) \( \text{Qxg2+} \) 15 \( \text{Qxg2} \) \( \text{Wc6+} \) 16 \( \text{Af3} \) \( \text{Wxf6} \) 17 \( \text{Qe4} \) (this was missed by Shirov in his analysis at the board) 17...\( \text{Wg7+} \) 18 \( \text{Wxg7+} \) \( \text{Qxg7} \) 19 \( \text{Wxf4} \), with a large advantage.

10...\( \text{Qxg3+!} \)

The third, and decisive, piece sacrifice.

11 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Wxe3+} \) 12 \( \text{Wf3} \) \( \text{Wxd2} \) 13 \( \text{Wa8+} \)

If White plays 13 \( \text{Wh3} \), then after 13...\( \text{g4} \) 14 \( \text{Wg8+} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 15 \( \text{Wh1} \) \( \text{We3+} \) 16 \( \text{Qh2} \) \( \text{Wxe2+} \) 17 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Wf5+} \) 18 \( \text{Qg1} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) White is defenceless against the advance of the black pawns.

13...\( \text{g7} \) 14 \( \text{Qxh3} \) \( \text{Wxe2} \) 15 \( \text{Nd5} \) \( \text{Qg6?!} \)

15...\( \text{Wf2!} \) is more accurate, winning at once.

16 \( \text{Wd4?!} \) f4 17 \( \text{Qg1} \) f5 0-1
Shirov's style of play is also shared by Judit Polgar.

For the piece Black has two pawns and the powerful central pawn wedge (d5, e4, e6 and f5). Not content with just this, Polgar proceeds to give up a rook.

1...\textit{xc}3! 2 \textit{x}xc3 \textit{bxc}3 3 \textit{c}c2?

Here Karpov should have inserted 3 \textit{fxe}4 \textit{fxe}4 before playing 4 \textit{c}c2, when after 4...\textit{d}d3! 5 \textit{f}f1 \textit{xd}4 + 6 \textit{h}1 \textit{f}3! 7 \textit{e}2 \textit{xe}2 8 \textit{xe}2 e5 Black has sufficient compensation. Here Judit planned to transfer her king to f6 and advance the pawn to g4.

3...\textit{e}5?

Better is 3...\textit{xd}4+! 4 \textit{d}xd4 e5 5 \textit{h}1 \textit{exd}4 with an advantage.

4 \textit{e}e3 \textit{xd}4 5 \textit{f}5 \textit{c}5 6 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 7 \textit{b}4 \textit{c}4!

The only move, since 7...\textit{b}6? loses to 8 \textit{b}3+.

8 \textit{b}b3 \textit{d}3! 9 \textit{xc}4+ \textit{xc}4 10 \textit{f}1 \textit{e}6!?

Also interesting is 10...\textit{a}6!? 11 \textit{fxe}4 \textit{fxe}4 c2 13 \textit{ee}1 \textit{xd}1 with a draw.

11 \textit{dx}4d2 12 \textit{b}5 \textit{c}5 13 \textit{xc}4+ \textit{xc}4 14 \textit{ex}f5 \textit{dxe}1 \textit{g}+ 15 \textit{xe}1 \textit{f}7

The rook ending is equal and the game soon finished in a draw.

Velimirović is another great intuitive combative player.

1 \textit{xe}7+! \textit{xe}7 2 \textit{g}4+ \textit{h}8

It is possible that 2...\textit{h}7 is slightly better.

3 \textit{g}5! \textit{d}4 4 \textit{e}1!

This prophylactic move had to be seen in advance. 4 \textit{f}6+ is bad in view of 4...\textit{xf}6 5 \textit{h}5+ \textit{g}8 6 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{g}7, when the black queen joins in the defence.

4...\textit{xe}5?

The only chance is 4...\textit{xe}3! 5 \textit{h}4+ \textit{g}8 6 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}4 7 \textit{g}3+ \textit{g}6 8 \textit{xe}3, with just a small advantage to White.

5 \textit{h}4+ \textit{g}6 6 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}4 7 \textit{xe}4 \textit{g}6 8 \textit{g}4 \textit{e}3+? 9 \textit{h}1 \textit{e}8 10 \textit{f}6 and White won shortly.
1 ǎxf7+!? ǎxf7 2 a5 ǎbd7 3 ǎc4+ ǎe8

The other way out is bad: 3... ǎg6? 4 ǎh4+ ǎh5 5 ǎe2+ ǎxh4 6 ǎe3 and mate next move.

4 ǎg5 ǎf8 5 ǎd1 ǎd7

5... ǎd6! is a better defence, when 6 ǎe3 h6 7 ǎxd6 hxg5 8 ǎb5 ǎe7 9 ǎxc6 ǎe6 10 ǎc3 ǎxe4 11 ǎxe5 bxc6 12 ǎc7+ ǎf7 13 ǎxa8 leads to a complicated game.

6 ǎe3?!

6 ǎb5! is better, in view of the next note.

6... ǎc8?

6...h6! 7 ǎb5! ǎb8 defends; e.g., 8 ǎd6+ ǎxd6 9 ǎf7+ ǎd8 10 ǎxg7 ǎe8!.

7 ǎf7+ ǎd8 8 ǎa4!

Threatening ǎb6.

8...c5 9 ǎxc5! ǎxc5 10 ǎxg7 ǎg6

11 ǎxc5 ǎh5 12 ǎe7+! ǎc7 13 ǎd6+! ǎc6 14 ǎf7 ǎb5 15 a6! bxa6

16 ǎd5+ ǎb6 17 c4 ǎc6 18 ǎa5+ ǎb7 19 ǎc5 ǎac8 20 b4 ǎhd8 21 ǎf7!

with a won position for White.

Velimirović – Rajković
Skopje 1971

1 h4!! ǎg4

After 1... ǎxc4 2 h5 ǎxf7 3 ǎg5 ǎf6 4 hxg6 White has a dangerous attack.

2 h5! gxh5

Now on 2... ǎxc4 there is 3 hxg6 h5 4 ǎd3 ǎb6 5 ǎxh5+! ǎxh5 6 ǎf5 with decisive threats.

3 ǎe2 ǎd7 4 ǎg5 h6 5 ǎxg4 ǎxg4

6 ǎd3!

Already concrete calculation is coming into force.

6...hxg5 7 ǎg6 h4 8 ǎe4 ǎxf7 9 ǎxg5 ǎg3+ 10 ǎf1 ǎxf4+ 11 ǎxf4

ǎxf4+ 12 ǎe2 ǎg4+ 13 ǎe1 ǎg3+ 14 ǎd1 ǎg4+ 15 ǎc1 ǎf4+ 16 ǎb1

Black resigned a few moves later.
Simple decisions that do not demand accurate calculation are founded first and foremost on material factors – for example, the creation of a far-advanced passed pawn, a lot of material in return for a queen or an irreparable weakness of a particular square.

A chess-player evaluates the development of events as follows: ‘this should be good for me because for my sacrificed material I have such and such threats...’

It is time for White to resign.

**Movshovich – A. Zaitsev**
*Leningrad 1967*

1...\(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{axf4}}}}\) 2 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{axd8}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{axf3}}}}\) 3 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{gxf3}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{axd8}}}}\) 4 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{g2}}}}\)

After 4 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{d5}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{e5}}}}\) 5 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{e2}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{g6}}}}\) Black has a strong attack on the dark squares.

4...\(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{f4}}}}\) 5 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{d5}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xd4}}}}\) 6 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{e4}}}}\) c5 7 b4 b6 8 bxc5 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xc5}}}}\)

Here followed a queen sacrifice:
1...\(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xe4}}}}\) 2 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xd8}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{exd8}}}}\) 3 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{g4}}}}\)

After 3 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xe4}}}}\), 3...\(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{d4}}}}\) 4 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{d3}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{b3}}}}\) wins, as there is no defence to ...c1\(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{w}}}}\).

3...\(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{d4}}}}\) 4 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{g2}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{c6}}}}\) 5 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{we3}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{e6}}}}\) 6 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{we5}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{d1}}}}\) 7 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xe6}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xe6}}}}\) 8 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{wb8+}}}}\) \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xd8}}}}\) 9 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{wc8}}}}\) c1\(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{w}}}}\)

In the following position, Black decided on an exchange sacrifice.

1...b4! 2 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xb8}}}}\) bxc3 3 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{a7}}}}\) cxb2 4 \(\text{\textsf{\textit{\textsc{xc3}}}}\) d5!
Lengyel – Geller
Beverwijk 1965

Opening up a path for his lightsquared bishop. 4...\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}a5 is worse due to 5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{R}}}}}a3 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}b5 6 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}}b3.

5 exd5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}f5 6 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}}h5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}xd5 7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{R}}}}}c5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}c7
8 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}}b7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}e6 9 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{R}}}}}b5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}d3! 10 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{R}}}}}d5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}xf1!

Black holds a decisive advantage.
11 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{R}}}}}xd8 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{R}}}}}xd8 0-1

Agrest – Radziewicz
Stockholm Rilton Cup 1999/00

1...\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}}xg5! 2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}xf8+ \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{R}}}}}xf8

For the queen, Black has a rook and bishop along with weak squares in the opponent’s camp.

Karpov – Adianto
Bali 2000

1 \textcolor{red}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}}xb8! \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}xb8 2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{R}}}}}xe4 f5 3 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}xc4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{R}}}}}d8 4 d7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}a6 5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{R}}}}}xc5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}e2 6 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}c1 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}f7 7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{R}}}}}d5+ \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}f6 8 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}e1 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}d3 9 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}ed1

The long forcing variation 9 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}e6+ \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}g5 10 h4+ \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}g4 11 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}c4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}d2 12 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}e2+ \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}h3 13 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}f1+ \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}g4 14 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}c4+ f4
15 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}e5 h6 16 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}g2 is more clear-cut, but Karpov carries on playing by intuition.

9...\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{W}}}}}e2 10 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}c6 g6 11 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}e1 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}d2 12 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}cd1 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}c2 13 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}d6+ \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}g7 14 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbf{Q}}}}}e8 1-0
White has two powerful bishops and the black king will have to go to the queenside – without any particular analysis it is clear that White has a very dangerous attack.

4...\(\text{wb6}\) 5 \(\text{a3}\) 0-0-0 6 \(\text{wf3}\) \(\text{d5}\) 7 a5 \(\text{b7}\) 8 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{c7}\)

8...\(\text{f6}\) is an alternative defence, although the knight is a long way from the queenside and after 9 \(\text{f4}\) White threatens \(\text{c1+}\). Intuitively it should be clear, however, that in giving up the pawns on e6 and f7 Black is releasing the white bishops ‘into the wild’.

9 \(\text{wxf7}\) \(\text{he8}\) 10 \(\text{e7}\) \(\text{xb2}\)?

This mistake loses at once. Black should instead try 10...\(\text{d5}\) 11 \(\text{xe6+}\) \(\text{b8}\) (11...\(\text{d7}\)? 12 \(\text{xd5}\) 12 \(\text{d6+}\), when the outcome of the game remains unclear.

11 \(\text{xd8}\) \(\text{xd8}\) 12 \(\text{b1!}\) 1-0

---

**Tiviakov – Yakovich**  
*St Vincent 2000*

The sacrifices in this attack are standard, uncomplicated and do not require any particular analysis.

1 \(\text{d4!}\) \(\text{g6}\)

It is clear that after 1...\(\text{fxe4}\) 2 \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{c7}\) 3 \(\text{d4}\) White gains a decisive attack.

2 \(\text{xf5}\) \(\text{xf5}\) 3 \(\text{d4}\)

White has a very strong attack.

---

**Alavkin – Nechaev**  
*Russia 2000*

1 \(\text{c6!}\) \(\text{c7}\) 2 \(\text{xd6}\) \(\text{xc6}\) 3 \(\text{xd4!}\)

\(\text{cxd4}\) 4 \(\text{xb4}\)

---

**Ftačnik – Lukacs**  
*Hamburg 1998*

1 \(\text{dxc4!}\)

This exchange sacrifice divides the black forces into several disconnected units: in one lies the king, devoid of
An unclear position would arise in the event of 1...\texttt{\textit{xe}g5} \texttt{\textit{x}d1}+ 2 \texttt{\textit{x}d1} \texttt{\textit{c}d5} 3 \texttt{\textit{x}d5} \texttt{hxg5}.

1...\texttt{\textit{gxf4}} 2 \texttt{\textit{fxe7}} \texttt{\textit{e}e8} 3 \texttt{\textit{d}d7} \texttt{\textit{g}g7} 4 \texttt{\textit{ad}1} \texttt{\textit{ac}7} 5 \texttt{\textit{gxf4}} \texttt{\textit{wh7}} 6 \texttt{\textit{h}h1}!

Here we see a precisely worked-out attack.

6...\texttt{\textit{x}d7} 7 \texttt{\textit{g}g1}+ \texttt{\textit{h}h8} 8 \texttt{\textit{f}f6} \texttt{\textit{d}d5} 9 \texttt{\textit{g}g7}+ \texttt{\textit{h}h8} 10 \texttt{\textit{x}f7}+ \texttt{\textit{g}g8} 11 \texttt{\textit{g}g7}+ \texttt{\textit{h}h8} 12 \texttt{\textit{e}e4} \texttt{\textit{d}d7} 13 \texttt{\textit{h}h5} \texttt{\textit{d}d1}+ 14 \texttt{\textit{g}g1}+ \texttt{\textit{h}h7} 15 \texttt{\textit{g}g6}+ \texttt{\textit{g}g8} 16 \texttt{\textit{x}d1} 1-0

---

\textbf{Trifunović – Pomar}
\textit{Palma de Mallorca 1966}

1...\texttt{\textit{dxc3}}! 2 \texttt{\textit{x}d8} \texttt{\textit{axd8}} 3 \texttt{\textit{bxc3}}
\texttt{\textit{ad}1}+ 4 \texttt{\textit{b}b2} \texttt{\textit{d}d6}! 5 \texttt{\textit{w}f5} \texttt{\textit{ee}1} 6
\texttt{\textit{wc}8}+ \texttt{\textit{x}g7} 0-1

---

\textbf{Ledić – Chiburdanidze}
\textit{Vinkovci 1982}

1...\texttt{\textit{xd}d5}! 2 \texttt{\textit{w}xd5} \texttt{\textit{e}e8} 3 \texttt{\textit{a}a7}  
Black wins after 3 \texttt{\textit{d}d2} \texttt{\textit{e}e7} 4 \texttt{\textit{f}f2} \texttt{\textit{h}h4}+ 5 \texttt{\textit{g}g1} \texttt{\textit{x}e3}.

3...\texttt{\textit{xe}e2}!

The position after 3...\texttt{\textit{a}a8} 4 \texttt{\textit{a}xa4} bxc4 5 \texttt{\textit{a}a}d4 is equal.

4 \texttt{\textit{a}xb8} \texttt{\textit{xb}8} 5 \texttt{\textit{f}e}1  
But not 5 \texttt{\textit{a}e1} \texttt{\textit{b}b6}+ 6 \texttt{\textit{h}h1} \texttt{\textit{f}f2}!
with a winning position for Black.

5...\texttt{\textit{w}a7}+ 6 \texttt{\textit{h}h1} \texttt{\textit{w}f2} 7 \texttt{\textit{w}a8}+ \texttt{\textit{f}f8}  
8 \texttt{\textit{x}e}2 \texttt{\textit{xe}2} 9 \texttt{\textit{b}b1} \texttt{\textit{d}d2}!

Black is preparing to advance the d-pawn.

10 \texttt{\textit{w}e}8?
10...\textit{B}c6 is better, but after 10...d5!
11\textit{W}xb5 \textit{A}d6 12\textit{W}e8+ \textit{A}g7 13\textit{W}e1
\textit{W}f4 Black holds the initiative.
10...b4 11\textit{A}g1 d5 12 h4 \textit{W}d4+
Black has a decisive advantage.

Uncomplicated intuitive decisions are often distinguished by our opponent’s lack of active play, and for the most part we should see only our own initiative developing.

8...\textit{Q}xg2 9 \textit{Q}xg2 \textit{A}h8 10 \textit{W}d2
\textit{A}xh2+ 11 \textit{A}g1 \textit{A}h4!
Planning an attack along the g-file.
12 \textit{A}e1
12 \textit{A}f3 is met by 12...\textit{A}g8+ 13 \textit{Q}f1
\textit{W}f4! 14 \textit{Q}e2 \textit{A}g4! 15 \textit{A}xg4 \textit{W}xf2+, reaching a won ending.
12...\textit{A}g8 13 \textit{A}e3 \textit{A}xe3 14 \textit{W}xe3
\textit{A}h3
Black is winning.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{B.png}
\caption{Augustin – Nunn
Moscow Echt 1977}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{W.png}
\caption{Ljubojević – Vukić
Yugoslav Ch (Novi Sad) 1975}
\end{figure}

1...\textit{Q}xd5! 2 \textit{Q}xd8 \textit{Q}f4 3 \textit{A}g5 \textit{Q}h5
4 \textit{A}xf4 \textit{Q}xf4 5 \textit{A}h1 \textit{A}e6!
Piece development is the priority; in particular the a8-rook needs to be brought into play. The materialistic 5...\textit{Q}xg2? allows White to turn the game in his favour by 6 \textit{Q}xg2 \textit{A}h3+ 7
\textit{A}h1 \textit{Q}xf1 8 \textit{W}xf1 0-0-0 9 \textit{W}e2 and 10
\textit{A}g1.
6 \textit{A}f3 \textit{A}h4!
Preventing \textit{A}g4 and vacating h8 for the other rook.
7 \textit{A}g1 \textit{A}e7 8 \textit{A}g2!?
How else can White defend against ...	extit{Q}ah8?

1 axb6! \textit{W}xd7 2 \textit{Q}c5 \textit{W}d8 3 b7 \textit{A}b8
4 f4 f6 5 \textit{Q}f2
The black rook is tied to the b7-pawn and the activation of White’s king should decide the outcome of the game. Furthermore, the d4-knight does not have any clear function.
5...\textit{Q}xe5 6 \textit{Q}xe5 \textit{A}f7 7 g4 \textit{Q}c7 8 \textit{Q}e3
\textit{A}b5 9 \textit{A}f3 \textit{A}a3 10 \textit{W}d3!
This is an essential prophylactic move, for the rook would break loose after 10 \textit{W}xc6? \textit{Q}c4+ 11 \textit{A}d4 \textit{A}a5
and ...\textit{Q}xb7.
10...\textit{Q}d8+ 11 \textit{A}c3 \textit{Q}b5+ 12 \textit{Q}b4
\textit{Q}d4 13 \textit{A}e4!
The black knight will not remain on d4 for long.
13...d8 14...c4!
14...a5 is bad due to 14...b3+ 15
xb3 xb7.
14...b5 15 xc6 c7 16 b4
d5+ 17 xd5 exd5 18 c3! 1-0

Typical attacks in the Sicilian
Some openings have their own typical methods of attack. For example, it is possible to say that some sacrifices are typical and can be executed in many cases in an intuitive way. In the Open Sicilian there are frequently sacrifices on e6, f5, d5 and b5. Some practical examples follow.

![Chess Diagram]

Velimirović – Ivanović
Nikšić 1978

1...f5!! exf5 2 d5 d8 3 exf5
As the threat was 4 f6, and after 3...f6,
4 d4! creates irresistible threats.
4 g6!?
Opening up Black’s king, but modern theory regards 4 d4! as best.
4...fxg6 5 fxg6 h6 6 c4 h8 7 d4!

The bishop is extremely strong on d4.
7...f8 8 c7 c5 9 xa8 e6 10
e2 xa8 11 h5 g8 12 xc5!
Starting an attack on the enemy king.
12...dxc5 13 f5 d5 14 f6! d8
The fact that 14...gxf6 is no good shows us that chess is indeed a tragedy of one tempo!
15 f7+ h8 16 h4! a5 17 e1!
a4 18 xd8! xd8 19 e8 g5+ 20
b1
White won shortly.

The main idea of such sacrifices is to exploit White’s development advantage and Black’s shortage of space.

![Chess Diagram]

Sulskis – Izoria
Ohrid Ech 2001

1...f5! exf5 2 d5 b7 3 exf5
As usual in such cases, White has strong pressure in the centre for the sacrificed piece and Black has problems with his development.
3...e5 4 f4 xf5
Trying to slow down White’s initiative.
5 fxe5 dxe5 6 £h6!  
Bringing White’s last piece into the game.
6...£e4 7 £xe7 £xe7 8 £c5!  
This small piece of tactics leaves the black king forever stranded in the centre.
8...£e6 9 £e3 £d5 10 £h5! £d8  
11 £xd5! £xd5 12 £f3 £xa2 13 £xe5+ £e6 14 £xg7 1-0

1 £d5! exd5 2 exd5+ £d8 3 £g5 £d7  
3...£c8 is bad in view of 4 £xf6+ gxf6 5 £h5 with a lasting initiative.
4 £e2 £e8 5 c3!  
A typical move: it is useful to open the c-file.
5...b3 6 £c6! £xc6 7 dx6 £e5 8 £a3!  
The white rook enters the game via b3.
8...d5 9 £xb3 £e6 10 £xf6 gxf6  
11 £xd5 £xc6 12 £g4+ £d7
12...£d8 loses to 13 £f3.

13 £xd7+ £xd7 14 £b7+ £c7 15 £g2 £ad8  
Even in the endgame Black has problems.
16 £h3+ £d6 17 £d1+ £c5 18 b4+ £c4 19 £f1+ £b3 20 £xc7 £xd1 21 £xc6 £xa4 22 £g2!

White has obtained a winning endgame.

Next we see a very typical case with the opening of the g-file.

Although this position arose from a Pirc, the structure is that of an Open Sicilian.
1 h5! £xh5 2 £xh5! gxh5 3 £d5!  
Transferring the queen to the kingside.
3...£c8 4 £xh5 £g7 5 e5 £e8 6 £h3!  
Preparing £d3 and preventing the defence...f5.
6...h6 7 £d3 £b4 8 £e4 e6 9 f5! £xc3 10 f6! £b5 11 £g3 1-0
A powerful attack.
3 Combinative Intuitive Decisions

The major distinguishing factor of combinative sacrifices is an attack on the opponent’s king. Material is sacrificed and threats are created, but at that point it is not possible to foresee any direct path to victory. In our opinion, there are three fundamental types of these sacrifices:

a) piece sacrifices with the intention of ‘rooting out’ the enemy king;

b) pawn sacrifices;

c) queen sacrifices.

The second of these categories is the most complex because in this instance more complicated positional factors come into play, both before making the sacrifice, and during its calculation.

Piece Sacrifices against the Enemy King

Usually in such situations one player has a lead in development while the other is unable to use his material advantage straight away. Here it is the weakness of the king position that proves the crucial factor.

1 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xc6+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xc6 2 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe6+ fxe6 3 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe6+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}e7 4 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xc6+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}f7 5 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}e1 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}f8

White wins after 5...\textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}d6 6 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}f3+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}f6 7 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}b3+. This variation finishes cleanly and would be difficult to miscalculate. Once we have seen this line, it is clear that White is in no way worse, and is assured of an attack.

6 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}e6+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}e8 7 d5!?

7 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}g5! \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}f7 8 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}c6+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}f8 9 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe7+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe7 10 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}f6+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}e8 11 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe7+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe7 12 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}c6+ wins by force.

7...\textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}d7 8 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}e5!

After 8 d6 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe6 9 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe6 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}f7 10 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}g5 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}d7 11 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe7+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe7 12 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe7 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}c8, White stands worse, despite having two pawns for the exchange.

8...\textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}d8 9 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xf8 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xf8 10 d6! \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}f7

White wins after both 10...\textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}g7 11 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}d5 and 10...\textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}c8 11 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}e8+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe8 12 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}xe8+ \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}b7 13 d7.

11 \textsf{\texttt{\textit{w}}}e4! (D)
In spite of his extra piece, Black has no prospects of disentangling himself.
11...\(\text{d7} 12 \text{f6} 13 \text{b5+ xd6 14 wb4+!}\)
A vital move, for 14...xf8?? loses to 14...\(\text{e1+!}\).
14...\(\text{c6} 15 \text{xf8 xf8 16 xf8}\)
and White won.

---

**Makarychev – Vaganian**  
*Tbilisi 1973*

1...\(\text{b4} 2 \text{xb4 c4 3 de3 xe2 4 xe2 d4+ 5 e1 he8}\)
White is unable to castle, has disconnected pieces, and no prospects of completing his development even with the extra piece.

---

**Fedorov – Kobaliya**  
*Russian Clubs Cup (Maikop) 1998*

1 \(\text{dxe7!!}\)
A stunning move, and one entirely in the style of Fedorov – three pieces en prise! However, in the new FIDE rules it is clearly laid out: ‘Only one piece can be taken each move’.

1...\(\text{xg7}\)
For the time being, the choice is simple. 1...\(\text{bxc3}\) is met by 2 \(\text{h5}\) followed by \(\text{h3}\), against which Black is defenceless.

2 \(\text{h5 g8}\) 3 \(\text{xe6}\!\)
Tremendous! How else can one describe such a move?

3...\(\text{bxc3}\)?
It is easy to see that 3...\(\text{fxe6}\) is bad due to 4 g6, but Black’s decision to let the kamikaze bishop remain alive turns out to be mistaken.

3...\(\text{xe6}\!) is correct, when after 4 \(\text{d5 d8}\) White has a choice between 5 \(\text{b6}\) and 5 f4 with compensation for
the two sacrificed pieces. A fantastic piece of inspiration!

4 $\mathcal{Q}xf7$!

Yet another crucial move! The threat of $5 \text{g}6$ forces Black into the following awkward move.

4...$\mathcal{W}a5$ 5 $\mathcal{H}h3$!

The final subtlety (not $5 \text{g}6$? due to $5...\mathcal{Q}b3+$). The rest is straightforward.

5...$\mathcal{Q}f8$ 6 $\mathcal{W}f3$ $\mathcal{Q}e5$ 7 $\mathcal{Q}d5+$! $\mathcal{Q}g7$ 8 $\mathcal{W}f7+$! 1-0

White’s long-dormant dark-squared bishop will deliver the final blow after 8...$\mathcal{Q}xf7$ 9 $\mathcal{W}xf7+$ $\mathcal{Q}h8$ 10 $\mathcal{Q}d4+$.

White has detected the main weakness in Black’s position.

7...$\mathcal{Q}f8$ 8 $\mathcal{Q}h6$ $\text{x}e5$ 9 $\text{dxe}5$ $\mathcal{Q}f7$ 10 $\mathcal{Q}xf8+$ $\mathcal{Q}xf8$ 11 $\mathcal{W}f3$ 1-0

The next few examples feature sacrifices to prise the king out of its ‘shell’.

1 $\mathcal{Q}b3$! c4

Accepting the sacrifice appears logical.

2 $\mathcal{Q}xc4$ $\text{dxc}4$ 3 $\mathcal{Q}bd2$ $\mathcal{W}a6$ 4 $\mathcal{Q}e4$

The initial impression is that the piece has only been sacrificed for a pawn, but Black is seriously behind in development and White’s game unfolds all by itself.

4...$\mathcal{Q}d8$ 5 $\mathcal{Q}d6+ \mathcal{Q}e7$ 6 $\mathcal{Q}g5+$ $f6$ 7 $\mathcal{Q}h4$! ($D$)

1...e5!!

The start of an explosive opening of the position, after which the white king will surely feel uncomfortable on $g3$.

2 $\text{fxe}5$ $\mathcal{Q}dxe5$ 3 $\text{dxe}5$ $\mathcal{Q}h4$+

Such a move must be seen to be believed!
4 \( \text{Wh}4 \text{xf}3! \) (D)

5 \( \text{Wh}f1 \text{wb}4+ \) 6 \( \text{Wf}4 \text{we}7+ \) 7 \( \text{Wg}5 \text{we}6! \)

Now there is no defence to the threat of mate.
8 \( \text{Wf}5 \text{xf}5 \) 9 \( \text{Wf}4 \text{xe}5 \)

Black has a material advantage and the position of the white king is, as you might expect, hopeless.

king, the result is not clear – Black is a piece up after all.
6 \( \text{Wxg}7 \text{xf}3 \) 7 \text{gxf}3 \( \text{Wf}6 \) 8 \( \text{We}2! \)

(D)

8...\( \text{Wa}5+ \) 9 \( \text{Ad}2 \text{d}d5 \) 10 e4! \( \text{Ag}5 \)
11 exd5+ cxd5 12 f4 1-0

Vaganian – Dementiev
Sevastopol 1971

1 \( \text{xf}7+! \text{xf}7 \) 2 dxe5 \( \text{We}7 \) 3 \( \text{Wc}2 \)
\( \text{Wb}6 \) 4 e6+ \( \text{Wxe}6 \) 5 \( \text{Wg}6+ \text{xf}6? \)
5...\( \text{Wf}6 \) is much better, when despite the precarious position of the black

Tukmakov – Yurtaev
Riga 1988

1...\( h4! \)

This move not only changes the course of the game but is also vital.
The inferior 1...\( \text{h}7 \) allows White to secure an advantage by 2 bxc6 bxc6 3 \( \text{xc}6 \text{Wc}8 \) 4 \( \text{Wd}5! \).
2 \text{exf}6 hxg3+ 3 \text{Wh}1
After 3 \( \text{Q}xg3 \text{ Q}xf6 4 \text{ B}f3 \text{ B}xe1 5 \text{ Q}xe1 \text{ Q}c5+ 6 \text{ Q}f2 \text{ B}f5 7 \text{ Q}c1 \text{ Q}e8 \)
Black has an unrelenting attack.

3...\( \text{B}xf6 4 \text{ B}xe8+ \text{ B}xe8 5 \text{ B}f3 \text{ B}f5! \)
The decisive move – there is no defence to the numerous threats (...d3, ...
...e3 or ...
...h5).

6 \( \text{B}f1 \text{ e}3 0-1 \)

\[ W \]

**Svidler – Malaniuk**

*Russian Clubs Cup (Maikop) 1998*

1 f4!
Black’s **double** protection of f4 turns out not to prevent this thrust.

1...gxf4 2 \( \text{B}xf4 \text{ h}8 3 \text{ B}f2! \)
The knight continues to stand in the gates of Troy! But it must now be taken.

3...\( \text{exf}4 4 \text{ B}xf4 \text{ h}7 5 \text{ e}5 \text{ h}4 6 \text{ e}6! \text{ fxe}6 \)
After 6...\( \text{xf}2+ 7 \text{ Q}xf2 \) White still has the other rook to swing into **the attack**, while Black will miss his dark-squared bishop.

7 \( \text{Q}g4+ \text{ Q}g5 8 \text{ Q}xd6 \text{ exd}5 9 \text{ B}f3! \)
Here the black queen must guard the f7-square (for example, 9...
...e3 is bad due to 10 \( \text{e}5+! \)) and the a8-rook will not manage to enter the game. Together with the fact that the a6-knight is locked out of play, we can see that the odds are stacked firmly in White’s favour.

9...\( \text{Q}f8 10 \text{ B}xf8+ \text{ B}xf8 11 \text{ Q}xd5 \text{ Q}e6 12 \text{ Q}e1 \text{ Q}c6 \)
12...\( \text{xd}5 13 \text{ Q}c3+ \) does not change anything.

13 \( \text{Q}c3+ \)
The immediate 13 \( \text{Q}g3 \), not allowing the black queen the g7-square, is even more accurate.

13...\( \text{g}8 14 \text{ Q}g3 \text{ Q}xd5 15 \text{ exd}5 \text{ Q}c7 16 \text{ d}6 \text{ Q}g7 17 \text{ h}2 \)
In the words of Svidler, this is a ‘sado-

distic’ move, highlighting the absolute helplessness of Black’s position.

17...c4?
The **final** mistake. After 17...
...\( \text{h}8 \) the simplest win would be 18 \( \text{B}e1 \).

18 \( \text{h}4 1-0 \)

\[ W \]

**Smyslov – Kotov**

*Moscow 1948*

1 \( \text{B}f5! \)
A standard sacrifice, but nothing here is forced. Smyslov wrote that here it is
necessary to rely on general principles, and not calculate variations.

1...gxf5 2 gxf5 Qc7 3 Kg1 Qe8
On 3...Kh8, 4 Qxh6! Qxh6 5 Kg6 is decisive.

4 Kg6 Qf7 5 Abg1 Qg8 6 Axf6
Qf8 7 Kh7 Qe7 8 Wh5! Qd6
8...Qc8 is met by the powerful blow 9 Kg5! fxg5 10 Axc5+ Qd6 11 Qf4+
Qe7 12 f6+.

9 Qf4+ Qe5 10 Axc5+ fxe5 11 f6!
Axf6 12 Qxe5+ Qc6 13 Axc7 and White won.

White strong threats. Therefore the immediate 2...Qd8! is better; for example,
3 Qg1 Qe8 4 Axc7+! Qxg7 (4...Qxg7? loses to 5 f6) 5 Wh6+ Qg8 6 e5! f6 7
fxe6 Qc7 8 exd7 Axd4! 9 dxe8Q
Qxe8 10 Axd4 fxe5 with a complicated game.

3 Kg1 Qd8
3...Qg8 4 fxe6 Aexe6 may be better. Then 5 Kg5!? or 5 e5 offers White at-
tacking chances.

4 e5! dxe5
4...Qe8 loses to 5 Kg5!.

5 Axc7! Qg8
After 5...Qxg7 6 Axc6+ Qh8 7 Kg5
Ae7 8 fxe6 White has powerful threats.

6 Axc8+ Qxc8 7 Kg5 Ae7 8 Qe4
Qd5 9 f6 Qb6 10 Ae5! Qxc5 11
Wxh7+ 1-0

Mitkov – Rublevsky
Neum ECC 2000

1 Axf3!? Qxf3?!

Now the open g-file provides White with attacking chances. The critical line is 1...Qb6! 2 Kg3 Qe8 (Burgess); e.g., 3 Qce2 Qxb2 4 Qf1 with very sharp play.

2 gxf3 Qh8

2...Axd4 is a serious alternative, although 3 Axd4 e5 4 Kg1! Qd8 5 Axb6!
We7 (5...Qxb6 is bad due to 6 Axc7+ Axc7 7 Qg5+ Qh8 8 Qxf6+ Qg8 9
Qd5 with the initiative) 6 Ae3 gives

1 f4!

"A sacrifice from the realms of intuition. Usually when a player makes a sacrifice such as this he is guided by definite positional principles. In the current position, the white pieces are

Kupreichik – Yusupov
Minsk 1982
almost optimally placed, with the exception of the a1-rook, but alas, it is rare that a double-edged combination occurs without some sort of structural weakness. Is the combination correct? Answering this is no easy task.” (Kupreichik).

Not, of course, 1...\( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xh6+} ? \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xh6} 2 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xh6} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g4}, when Black wins.

**1...\text{\textit{gxf5}}**

Black has great faith in his defensive resources. Other defences were also possible:

a) 1...\( \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf4} 2 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf4} \text{\textit{exf4}} 3 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xg6} \) with an attack.

b) 1...\text{\textit{exf4}} and now:

b1) 2 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf4} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf4} 3 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf4} gxf5 4 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf5} \text{\textit{gxf5}} 5 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xf5} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g7} 6 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f1} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{e5}! 7 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xe5} \text{\textit{dxe5}} 8 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xe5} with compensation for the sacrificed material.

b2) 2...\text{\textit{Q}} \text{xg6}! is stronger: 2...\text{\textit{fxg6}} 3 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xf4} gxf5 4 \text{\textit{exf5}} (if 4 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xf5}? then 4...\text{\textit{Q}} \text{g7}! 5 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf6} \text{\textit{W}} \text{xf6} 6 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xf6} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf6} 7 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf6} \text{\textit{g7}}! 8 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{af1} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{e7} with advantage to Black) 4...\text{\textit{Q}} \text{h5} 5 \text{\textit{W}} \text{f3}! and White has the initiative.

2...\text{\textit{fxe5}} \text{\textit{dxe5}}!?

The alternatives are:

a) 2...\text{\textit{Q}} \text{xe4} 3 \text{\textit{dxe4}} \text{\textit{W}} \text{xe4} 4 \text{\textit{exd6}}! \text{\textit{fxe4}} (4...\text{\textit{Q}} \text{d7} 5 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xf5} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g7} 6 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xg7} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xg7} 7 \text{\textit{W}} \text{c3}! \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g8} 8 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{af1}! gives White an attack) 5 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f6}! 6 \text{\textit{h5}} 6 \text{\textit{d7}} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xd7} 7 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xd7} \text{\textit{c4}} 8 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xb7} with an advantage for White.

b) 2...\text{\textit{Q}} \text{g4}! is the critical defence: 3 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf5} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xe5} (if 3...\text{\textit{dxe5}} then 4 \text{\textit{h3}}!) 4 \text{\textit{W}} \text{f2}! \text{\textit{d7}}! (4...\text{\textit{g5}} loses to 5 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xe5}! \text{\textit{dxe5}} 6 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{hx6}+) 5 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xe5} (5 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{ae1}, with ideas of \text{\textit{g3}}-\text{g3}, is an aggressive option for White) 5...\text{\textit{dxe5}} and now 6 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xh6+? \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xh6}} 7 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xf7+} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{h8} 8 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f6}

loses to 8...\text{\textit{Q}} \text{e3+} and 9...\text{\textit{Q}} \text{e7}, so White should choose 6 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{d6}!?, when 6...\text{\textit{W}} \text{e7} looks roughly level.

3 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf5} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf4} 4 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf4}! \text{\textit{exf4}} 5 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf4} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf5} 6 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf5} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{g7} 7 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f1} \text{\textit{c4}}!

A devious trap. White holds the advantage after 7...\text{\textit{W}} \text{d7} 8 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf6}! \text{\textit{W}} \text{xf5} 9 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf5} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf6} 10 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf6}.

8 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xh5}!

8...\text{\textit{Q}} \text{e5}? is bad due to 8...\text{\textit{W}} \text{b6}+! 9 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{h1} \text{\textit{W}} \text{xb5}!.

8...\text{\textit{Q}} \text{b6}+

Now 9 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f2}? \text{\textit{Q}} \text{ac8} 10 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf6} \text{\textit{W}} \text{xf6} 11 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xf6} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf6} 12 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xf6} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xc4} 13 \text{\textit{dxc4}} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xe4} 14 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xe6} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xc4} 15 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{b6} would have won easily.

---

Romanishin – Petrosian

**USSR Ch (Erevan) 1975**

1 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{d5}! \text{\textit{exd5}} 2 \text{\textit{exd5}}

Many annotators have recommended 2 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{f5} as a better winning attempt, but in fact Black can defend by 2...\text{\textit{dxe4}}! 3 \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xe7+} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{xe7} 4 \text{\textit{W}} \text{d4} \text{\textit{d5}}! 5 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xf6} \text{\textit{d4}}!, eliminating the threats on the a1-h8 diagonal.

2...\text{\textit{Q}} \text{xd4} 3 \text{\textit{W}} \text{xd4} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{de8} 4 \text{\textit{f5}} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{d8} 5 \text{\textit{W}} \text{h4} \text{\textit{Q}} \text{e5}!!
A counter-sacrifice in order to plug the gaps. 5...\(\text{dxe}4\) is bad owing to 6 \(\text{wxh7+}\) with a standard mate.

6 \(\text{wh6 }\text{wc7}\)?

6...\(\text{dg4}\)! 7 \(\text{wf4 }\text{df6}\) is correct, with a probable draw.

7 \(\text{g3 }\text{c8}\) 8 \(\text{xe5 }\text{dxe5}\) 9 \(\text{fxg6}\)

fxg6 10 \(\text{dxe6 }\text{g4}\) 11 \(\text{h5 }\text{f6}\) 12 \(\text{d2 }\text{f4}\) 13 d6! \(\text{g7}\) 14 d7 \(\text{b7}\) 15 \(\text{xf4}\) ! 1-0

\(\text{wc4+ }13 \text{xc4 }\text{bxc4}\) 14 \(\text{f3 }\text{h7}\) 15 \(\text{xc6}\) and White wins.

b) 5...\(\text{hxg6}\) 6 \(\text{xg6+ }\text{fxg6}\) 7 \(\text{wg6+ }\text{h8}\) 8 \(\text{g5 }\text{hxe5}\) (after 8...\(\text{dxe5}\) White replies 9 \(\text{f6+ }\text{g8}\) 10 \(\text{d8}\)

\(\text{e2}\) 11 \(\text{b2 }\text{c4+}\) 12 \(\text{a1 }\text{e5}\) 13 \(\text{xe5 }\text{dxe5}\) 14 h7+ \(\text{g7}\) 15 \(\text{xf8}\) with unstoppable threats) 9 \(\text{c2}\)! \(\text{dxe5}\) 10

\(\text{f6+ }\text{g8}\) 11 h7+ \(\text{wh7}\) 12 \(\text{dxe7}\)

\(\text{g7}\)! 13 \(\text{g5}\)! \(\text{dxe7}\) 14 \(\text{h5+ }\text{g8}\)

15 \(\text{d8+ }\text{f8}\) 16 \(\text{xe5}\) is winning for White.

Krasenkov – Yanovsky

\(\text{Hastings 1993/4}\)

1 \(\text{h6+}\) g6 2 g5! \(\text{dxe5}\)

2...h5 is bad because of the simple 3

g6, but 2...\(\text{e6}\)! is correct. Krasenkov

wrote that he was unable to calculate everything, but was nonetheless con-

vinced of the correctness of the attack.

For example, 3 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{g6}\) 4 \(\text{dxe5}\)

\(\text{e3}\) or 4...\(\text{hxh6}\) 5 \(\text{e6}\) \(\text{xe3}\) 6

\(\text{b2}\) \(\text{g1}\)? 7 \(\text{dxe5}\) 8 \(\text{f8}\) 8 \(\text{xc1}\)

\(\text{f6}\) 9 \(\text{e5}\) with a decisive advantage

for White) 5 \(\text{h6}\) and now Black is in

trouble:

a) 5...\(\text{e2}\) 6 \(\text{g6}\) 7 \(\text{a2}\)!

\(\text{e5}\) 8 \(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 9 \(\text{b6}\) \(\text{h8}\) 10

\(\text{xf7}\) \(\text{g6}\) 11 \(\text{c2}\) \(\text{e4}\) 12 \(\text{d3}\)

\(\text{c4}\) 13 \(\text{xc4}\) \(\text{bxc4}\) 14 \(\text{f3}\) \(\text{h7}\) 15

\(\text{xc6}\) and White wins.

\text{Velimirović – Vasiukov}

\(\text{USSR-Yugoslovakia (Tbilisi) 1973}\)

1 a4! b4 2 \(\text{d5}\) exf4 3 c3!!

The most important thing is to open

up more lines. 3 e5? is unsuccessful in

view of 3...0-0-0 4 c3 \(\text{dxe5}\) 5 \(\text{xb4}\)

\(\text{xd5}\) with an advantage to Black.

3...b3

3...\(\text{xc3}\) is bad due to 4 \(\text{xc1}\) with an

attack.
4 e5! 0-0-0 5 ♖xb3 ♕b8 6 ♕b4! ♗d7 7 ♘xb7 ♘xb7 8 ♘d5+ ♘a8
Or 8...♗c6 9 e6 fxe6 10 ♖b6+ ♘xd5 11 ♘ad1+, etc.
9 ♕b6+
and White wins.

Pawn Sacrifices

A pawn can be sacrificed in order to open files and diagonals, to weaken the king position, to keep the king in the centre or to aid the development of one’s own pieces with the purpose of centralization and attack. It is normally impossible to calculate the consequences of a pawn sacrifice, but as Bronstein once said, a pawn can always be given up for unclear threats when you already have a lead in development.

1...♕h4+! 2 ♕h1
The knight is immune: 2 gxh4 ♕xe4 3 ♘xe4 ♖g6+ followed by 4...♕xf2 and the e4-rook hangs.

2...♕xe4 3 ♘xe4 ♖xf2 4 ♖xf2 ♖xd5!
This move is the combination’s raison d’être.

5 ♕e2
Giving up the queen also fails: 5 ♖xf8+ ♕xf8 6 ♘ae2 ♖d1+ 7 ♘e1 ♕f3+ with mate.

5...♕xe4+! 6 ♕g1!
In principle, such a move can easily be overlooked from afar, but in the current position Black readily resigns himself to the fact that an elegant mate will not be possible.

6...♕f3+ 7 ♕g2 ♖c6 0-1

Velimirović – Kholmov
USSR-Yugoslavia (Odessa) 1975

A critical moment. It appears that Black has successfully solved his opening problems and now threatens the unpleasant 1...♕f4. True, the black position has one significant drawback – his weak centre pawns. Taking this into account, White initiates tactical operations, the basis of which lies in a far from obvious intuitive pawn sacrifice.

1 c4 ♖xb2 2 ♘xg6 hxg6 3 cxd5 ♕xa1 4 dxe6 ♕xa2
Black must not play 4...bxc6 because of 5 \textit{W}c2 with the double threats of 6 \textit{W}xc5 and 6 \textit{Q}c3.

Black has a more than adequate material advantage, but his pieces lack coordination and cannot readily halt White’s initiative.

5 \textit{Q}e5 \textit{W}d5 6 \textit{W}c2 \textit{A}d4 7 \textit{Q}xg6 \\
\textit{A}e8 8 \textit{Ad}1 \textit{W}f5?!

A second critical moment. Black’s mistake lies in the fact that he has voluntarily taken his queen away from the centre and allowed the exchange of minor pieces, the result of which is the removal of the centralized d4-bishop from the game.

It was essential to continue 8...bxc6 with the idea of ...c5 and ...\textit{A}b7. For example, 9 \textit{O}e5 \textit{A}b7 10 \textit{W}g6 \textit{A}xe5 gives Black too much for the queen. The following beautiful variation is also possible: 9 \textit{A}h4 \textit{W}f5! 10 \textit{W}xc6 \textit{A}b7! 11 \textit{W}xb7 \textit{W}xg6 and 12 \textit{Ad}4 is not possible due to 12...\textit{Ab}8.

9 \textit{W}b3 \textit{W}xg6 10 \textit{Ad}4 bxc6 11 h3 \\
\textit{W}f5 (D)

An inaccuracy; 11...\textit{A}a6 is preferable.

White sets about the task of preparing a storm of the black kingside.

13...\textit{E}e7 14 \textit{Q}d6 \textit{E}f7 15 \textit{W}g3 \textit{A}b7 16 \textit{A}e5 \textit{W}h7 17 \textit{Q}c4 \textit{Q}d5 18 \textit{Q}d6 \\
\textit{A}d7 19 f4?

White continues his attack by direct means. However, 19 \textit{A}h2! is a much more logical move, keeping the king more secure against possible counter-attacks.

19...c4 20 \textit{A}h2 \textit{Ab}8

The rook enters the game rather late, but in time to create counterthreats against the white king.

21 f5?!

21 \textit{E}g6 is a better try, attempting to block out the black queen.

21...\textit{E}b3! 22 \textit{W}f4 \textit{A}xg2! 23 \textit{h}4 \textit{A}h3 24 \textit{W}xc4 \textit{A}xg4?!

Black overlooks a clear-cut win by 24...\textit{W}xf5! 25 \textit{A}xf5 \textit{E}d2+ 26 \textit{A}h1 \\
\textit{Ab}1+ 27 \textit{E}g1 \textit{E}g2+ and instead makes a fatal blunder.

25 \textit{W}c8+ 1-0

In the above game White strove to force sharp play on his opponent right from the very first moves, although in the opening he did not manage to achieve the desired result. His determination to attack was crowned with success. By sacrificing the exchange, he seized the initiative. White step-by-step lined up his pieces against the enemy king. To be precise, he achieved an advantage in that decisive area of the board, although he then overplayed his hand. Despite its errors, this game is remarkable in that it represents the attack as the consequence of a prolonged and successful development of the initiative.
1 d5!?
This decision is founded on a profound feeling for ‘the tempo’ in chess – after 1 0-0-0 a6 2 e4 e5 3 wxe4 dxe4 4 fxe4 5 d5 White has no advantage.
1...wxb2 2 0-0 wxc3 3 dxe6 e5 4 exf7+ wxf7 (D)
Black did not have the courage to go for 4...wxf7 5 g6+ xg6 6 wxc3 xe4 7 fe1, when it is unclear how White can strengthen his position.

5 Hab1
White immediately attacks his opponent’s weaknesses. An alternative course is 5 a1+ e7 6 e3, again with an attack.
5...e7 6 xxb7 w5 7 b8! d8 8 b3 w4 9 e1 w7 10 e5 e8 11 g4 g6?
11...wxc4! is a much better defence.
12 e5 wxc4 13 g5?
White should continue his attack with 13 d7!.
13...gxf5 14 gxf6 w4+
The game ended a few moves later in a draw.

1 h5! xh5 2 g5 e2 3 xe2 h5
On 3...h6? comes 4 xh6!.
4 w2! e7 5 f4 g8 6 g3 d8 7 df1!
Preparing an attack along the f-file.
7...w8 8 e5! dxe5 9 fxe5 g4?
After 9...d5! 10 w2 xe5 11 f3, White has fair compensation.
10 e4! xe6 11 xh5! gxh5 12 xh5 g7 13 w3
White has a decisive attack.
5 exf5 gxf5 6 We3! a6?
6...a4! is correct, when 7 h4!? and
7 Wf4!? are both possible. However,
best of all is 7 bc1!, with the idea of
playing fc4.
7 Wg5+ Wh8 8 Bd1 Bg8 9 Wf4
We7 10 cc6! (D)

This either wins material or takes
control of the seventh rank.
10...Bg4 11 Bxg4 Bxc6 12 Bd6!
Be8
Here the simplest continuation is
13 Bdx6 Bxe6 14 We5+! Wg7 15
Bxb8, with an easily won position.

Gheorghiu – Stein
Mar del Plata 1965
1...\texttt{c5!} 2 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{xd5} 3 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{d8} 4 \texttt{e4} bxc6 5 \texttt{xe2} \texttt{a6}
For the pawn Black has two powerful bishops that cover the whole board.
The battle is soon over.
6 \texttt{e3} \texttt{d5!} 7 f4 \texttt{ad8} 8 \texttt{xc5} \texttt{xc5} 9 b4 \texttt{b6} 10 \texttt{f1} \texttt{d2!} 0-1

Karpov – Seirawan
Tilburg 1983

1 \texttt{e5} \texttt{h6} 2 f3!
Taking control of the all-important e4-square. White’s compensation lies in the fact that the black king will not find a refuge on either flank.

2...b5
Both 2...\texttt{xd4} 3 \texttt{c3} followed by 4 \texttt{xd7} and 2...\texttt{xe5} 3 dxe5 followed by 4 \texttt{xh6} hopeless for Black.

3 g4! \texttt{g8} 4 \texttt{he1} \texttt{b6} 5 b3 \texttt{d6}
Now 5...\texttt{xd4} is met by 6 \texttt{xf7}!.

6 f4!
Simply strengthening his position.
6...\texttt{fd7} 7 f5 \texttt{xe5} 8 dxe5 \texttt{c5} 9 fxe6 fxe6 10 \texttt{e3!} \texttt{xe5} 11 \texttt{xb6}?
Karpov forces an advantageous ending, but misses 11 \texttt{d3}!, which wins on the spot.

11...\texttt{xe2} 12 \texttt{xe2} axb6 13 \texttt{xe6+} \texttt{f7} 14 \texttt{xc6} \texttt{g8}
Black has managed to activate his position at the cost of a pawn, but Karpo
remains accurate.

15 \texttt{f1+} \texttt{g8} 16 \texttt{f5} \texttt{d1+} 17 \texttt{b2} \texttt{g1} 18 \texttt{xb5} \texttt{xg4} 19 \texttt{xb6} g6?
19...\texttt{f7} is definitely a better possibility.
20 \texttt{b8+} \texttt{xb8} 21 \texttt{xa8} \texttt{g7} 22 \texttt{a4} \texttt{e4} 23 \texttt{a5}
and White won.

Razuvaev – A. Zaitsev
Moscow 1967

1...d5!! 2 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{xd5} 3 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{e6} 4 \texttt{e5}
After 4 \texttt{b2} Black would continue 4...\texttt{d8}, preparing to attack the d4-pawn.

4...\texttt{h3} 5 \texttt{b2} \texttt{ad8} 6 \texttt{d2} e6 7 \texttt{e4} \texttt{xd4} 8 \texttt{exd4} \texttt{xd4}!
Now Black begins an accurately calculated sequence.

9 \texttt{xd4} \texttt{xd4} 10 \texttt{xd4} e5 11 \texttt{d5} \texttt{exd4} 12 f4
12 \texttt{xd4} is very unpleasantly met by 12...\texttt{g2}!.
12...\textit{f}e8+ 13 \textit{f}2 \textit{d}3!  
Vacating the dark squares so as to attack the white king.
14 \textit{a}e1 \textit{c}5+ 15 \textit{a}e3 \textit{x}d5 16 \textit{x}d5 \textit{x}e3 17 \textit{w}xe3 \textit{w}c2+ 18 \textit{e}1 0-1

10...\textit{d}xc7 is also adequate.
11 \textit{e}e5 \textit{c}6 12 \textit{x}h7+! \textit{x}h7 13 \textit{f}4?!  
Ljubojević gambles on his opponent failing to thread his way through a mass of complications in time-trouble. 13 \textit{x}g7 is objectively preferable, and draws.

13...\textit{f}6?  
After 13...\textit{d}xe5 14 \textit{h}4+ \textit{g}8 15 \textit{w}xe5, both 15...\textit{d}7! and 15...\textit{f}5! are very good for Black.
14 \textit{h}4+ \textit{g}8 15 \textit{w}h3 \textit{d}8 16 \textit{d}4! \textit{b}6 17 \textit{d}xe6 \textit{d}xe6 18 \textit{w}xe6+ \textit{f}7 19 \textit{w}e4  
Now Andersson missed 19...\textit{w}xa2!, the only move to hold the draw.

\textbf{Ljubojević – Andersson  
Wijk aan Zee 1976}

1 \textit{e}5!? \textit{d}xe5 2 \textit{f}xe5 \textit{d}xe5 3 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}6 4 \textit{d}d1!  
This simple developing move contains only the minor threat of 5 \textit{b}3, but the centralized white pieces are impressively placed.
4...\textit{w}b8  
4...\textit{d}ad8 is also viable.
5 \textit{d}d3!  
A multi-purpose move – the rook can be used along the third rank, while also retaining the option of doubling on the d-file.
5...\textit{e}e8 6 \textit{e}e4 \textit{c}7 7 \textit{c}c3! \textit{c}6 8 \textit{xe}7 \textit{xd}4  
Not 8...\textit{xc}7? 9 \textit{f}6+! \textit{h}8 10 \textit{xc}7 \textit{xc}7 11 \textit{xd}7 \textit{xd}4 12 \textit{xc}7 with a large advantage to White.
9 \textit{d}3! \textit{a}7 10 \textit{c}5 \textit{b}5

\textbf{Bronstein – Lein  
USSR Ch (Leningrad) 1971}

1 \textit{e}5! \textit{d}xe5 2 \textit{h}4 \textit{g}6 3 \textit{h}6!?  
This was Bronstein’s idea; White simply threatens to advance the h-pawn. Black has several moves in which to organize a defence or counter-attack, however...
3...f5 4 \textit{h}4 \textit{xb}3+ 5 axb3 f4 6 \textit{e}e4?!
6 \( \text{d}2 \) (Golubev) is more logical.  
6...\text{f}xe3 7 h5 \text{xf}2 8 \text{d}3!  
White is not provoked.  
8...\text{f}8?!  
8...\text{a}5! is a far better move.  
9 \text{xf}2 \text{exf}2 10 \text{hxg}6 \text{xb}6 11  
\text{gxh}6 \text{we}7?  
Here it was necessary for Black to play 11...\text{d}7, but fortune favours the bold.  
12 \text{gxh}7+ \text{wh}7 13 \text{g}3+ \text{f}7 14  
\text{xf}2+ \text{e}8 15 \text{f}6 \text{f}7 16 \text{h}8+  
\text{d}7 17 h7  
and White soon won.

Queen Sacrifices

A queen sacrifice is always a major event; in return for the most powerful piece there should be correspondingly serious threats. Not surprisingly, if this is associated with an attack on the king, then in this instance the coordination between the attacking pieces must be exceptionally strong.

It would be impossible to work out all the probable continuations at the board; this combination is an intuitive one, and for this reason it is difficult to bring oneself to make such a decision.

2 \text{xh}2  
2 \text{xf}4 is not possible in view of 2...\text{xc}2+ and neither is 2 \text{gx}4 acceptable due to 2...\text{f}4+ 3 \text{xf}4 (3  
\text{d}4 \text{f}2+ 4 \text{c}3 \text{c}5#) 3...\text{xc}2+. 2  
\text{xe}5 loses to 2...\text{f}3++.  
2...\text{f}3++ 3 \text{d}4  
On first examination of the critical variations, Black initially intended to play 3...c5+ 4 \text{xc}6 \text{bx}6 (?; we should point out that 4...b5! is very good for Black), but did not like the position after 5 \text{d}3! \text{ex}d3 6 \text{hx}6! \text{xb}2 7  
\text{xd}6 \text{xd}1 8 \text{xd}1 with unclear play. He therefore opted for a much more interesting continuation:  
3...\text{g}7!! (D)  
After this move a study-like position arises which merits a special diagram.

![Chess Diagram]

Polugaevsky – Nezhmetdinov  
Sochi 1958

1...\text{xf}4!!  

White is a whole queen up, but on the other hand his king is very close to being in a mating-net. A peculiar feature of this position is that Black’s
principal threats are set up with so-called ‘quiet’ moves. In particular, Black currently threatens 4...b5! followed by 5...\textbf{c}ec6#. Moreover, Black also has the threat of 4...c5+ 5 dxc6 bxc6 followed by 6...c5#.

4 \textbf{a}4

White defends against Black’s first threat, but is unable to prevent the second. Let us now take a look at the other defensive possibilities available to White, the most effective of which are those that either distract or disturb one of Black’s most important attacking pieces – the f3-rook.

a) 4 \textbf{g}1 \textbf{g}xg3! (as will become clear, this capture is important for the endgames that are liable to arise) 5 \textbf{e}e2 \textbf{f}3 6 \textbf{g}1 \textbf{e}d3+ 7 \textbf{c}4 (if 7 e5, then Black continues 7...\textbf{x}e5+ 8 \textbf{c}4 \textbf{f}4+ 9 \textbf{d}4 \textbf{x}d4+ 10 \textbf{c}3 \textbf{d}5+ 11 \textbf{d}2 \textbf{f}4+ 12 \textbf{e}2 \textbf{e}8+ 13 \textbf{f}1 \textbf{e}3+, destroying the white position) 7...\textbf{x}b2+ 8 \textbf{b}4 \textbf{c}3+ 9 \textbf{a}3 b5!! 10 \textbf{d}4?? (if 10 b4 then 10...a5!) 10...\textbf{x}d4 11 \textbf{x}f3 \textbf{c}3! 12 b4 \textbf{c}4+ 13 \textbf{b}3 \textbf{x}a1 14 \textbf{g}5 g3 and Black should win.

b) 4 \textbf{d}3 is an attempt to cut off the f3-rook. However, after 4...\textbf{e}x\textbf{d}3+ 5 \textbf{c}4 \textbf{e}b2+ 6 \textbf{b}4 \textbf{x}d1 7 \textbf{x}d1 \textbf{e}8 Black has two extra pawns and a continuing attack (for example, 8 \textbf{d}h1 \textbf{x}e4+ and now 9 \textbf{a}3 b5 or 9 \textbf{a}5 \textbf{f}e3 and 10...\textbf{c}3+).

c) 4 \textbf{f}2 is another unsuccessful attempt to deflect the f3-rook. 4...\textbf{xf}2 5 \textbf{e}3 (otherwise the rook would return to f3) 5...\textbf{f}3+ 6 \textbf{d}2 \textbf{h}6+ is sufficient for a strong attack, but 4...c5+! 5 dxc6 \textbf{e}d3+ wins most directly: 6 \textbf{c}4 (or 6 e5 \textbf{x}e5+ 7 \textbf{e}4 \textbf{xf}2#) 6...b5+! 7 \textbf{xb}5 \textbf{b}8+ 8 \textbf{a}4 (8 \textbf{a}5 \textbf{xc}6+ 9 \textbf{a}4 \textbf{b}4+ 10 \textbf{a}3 \textbf{xb}2#) 8...\textbf{xb}2+ 9 \textbf{a}3 \textbf{xd}1 and Black makes decisive material gains.

d) 4 \textbf{c}3! \textbf{g}xg3! (threatening to play 5...a6!!), when the only way to prevent 6...\textbf{c}ec6++ 7 \textbf{c}4 \textbf{xc}3+ 8 \textbf{xc}3 b5# is to play 6 a4, whereupon 6...c5+ 7 dxc6 bxc6 creates the unstoppable threat of 8...c5# and then:

d1) 5 \textbf{e}2 transposes to line ‘a’.

d2) 5 \textbf{e}1 \textbf{xc}2+ 6 \textbf{b}2 \textbf{d}3#.

d3) 5 \textbf{e}5 \textbf{b}3d3! (this threatens 6...\textbf{c}6++ 7 \textbf{c}4 \textbf{xb}2+ 8 \textbf{b}5 a6#) and now (D):
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d31) 6 \textbf{b}1 \textbf{c}6++ 7 \textbf{c}4 \textbf{xb}2+ 8 \textbf{x}b2 \textbf{xc}3+ 9 \textbf{b}5 \textbf{c}5+ 10 \textbf{a}4 \textbf{a}5#.

d32) After a bishop retreat Black still wins by means of quiet moves: 6 \textbf{a}3 b5! 7 \textbf{xb}5 \textbf{c}6+ 8 \textbf{c}4 \textbf{a}5#.

d33) 6 \textbf{c}1 is met by 6...b5! 7 \textbf{e}3 \textbf{b}2!! with mate next move.

d34) On 6 \textbf{c}1 comes 6...b5! 7 \textbf{e}3 \textbf{b}4!! 8 \textbf{xb}5 \textbf{xc}2+ 9 \textbf{e}3 \textbf{xe}3.

d35) 6 \textbf{e}3 \textbf{xd}3+ 7 \textbf{e}5 (if 7 \textbf{c}4 then 7...\textbf{xb}2+ 8 \textbf{b}4 \textbf{xc}3+ and 9...\textbf{xd}1) 7...\textbf{e}5+ 8 \textbf{c}4 (8 \textbf{e}4
threat of 3 e2 is rather unpleasant. However, Kasparov finds a magnifi-
cent idea.

1...\texttt{e7}!! 2 \texttt{c4} \texttt{xc4} 3 \texttt{xc4} \texttt{xc4}

Black does not have complete material parity for the queen, but his con-
trol of the dark squares decides the game.

4 \texttt{wd3} \texttt{ac8} 5 \texttt{e1} \texttt{f4} 6 \texttt{e4}

\texttt{xe4} 7 \texttt{fxe4}

On 7 \texttt{xe4} there is 7...\texttt{h8}!.

7...g5 8 a3 bxa3 9 \texttt{wa6} \texttt{d8} 10
\texttt{wb6} g4 11 c4 g3 12 c5 g2!

A clean kill.

13 \texttt{xd6+} \texttt{xd6} 14 \texttt{wc7+} \texttt{sf6} 15
\texttt{xd6+} \texttt{g7} 0-1

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

Rodin – Belozerov

Russia 1998

1 \texttt{xf7+} \texttt{xf7} 2 \texttt{xf6+} \texttt{e8}

There is no escape on the kingside either:

2...\texttt{g7} 3 \texttt{f7+} \texttt{h6} 4 \texttt{e7}
\texttt{wd8} 5 \texttt{f6}.

3 \texttt{f8+} \texttt{d7} 4 \texttt{f7+} 1-0

If Black plays 4...\texttt{xc6} then 5 \texttt{c8+}
costs him not only his own knight, but also his queen. After 4...\texttt{e6} it's mate
in one: 5 \texttt{e7}.

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

Shirov – Kasparov

\textit{Tilburg 1997}

It is now bad for Black to play
1...\texttt{xd5} because of 2 \texttt{xb4}, when the
1 \(\text{Wxa8!} \text{Qxa8} \ 2 \text{Exa8} \text{Nh6}\)

In order to generate some sort of counterplay.

3 \(\text{Qd}3 \text{We7} \ 4 \text{Qxb7} \text{Qd7}\)

After the exchange of bishops, White has the simple plan of advancing the c4-pawn.

5 \(\text{Exe8+} \text{Exe8} \ 6 \text{Qd5!}\)

Controlling the maximum amount of squares.

6...\(\text{Wd6} \ 7 \text{b}7\)

The prophylactic 7 h4 also deserves attention.

7...g5 8 h4! gxh4 9 \(\text{Qxh4} \text{Qd7} \ 10 \text{Qef3 f4} \ 11 \text{Qe4 fxg3} \ 12 \text{fxg3} \text{Qe3+} \ 13 \text{g2 Qg4} \ 14 \text{Exh7+} \text{Qg8} \ 15 \text{Qb7}\)

Black can safely resign – the threat of \(\text{Qg6}\) followed by \(\text{Qd5+}\) wins.

In the following position, White decided to invest some material in order to activate his pieces.

1 \(\text{Wxd5}\)!

Sakaev thought that 1 \(\text{Wb2}\) was harmless since after 1...\(\text{Qxd6} \ 2 \text{Qxd6} \text{Wxd6} \ 3 \text{Qxb5} \text{Qc6} \ 4 \text{Qd4} \text{Wb7}\) Black has no problems. Changing the material balance of the position leads to an alteration in the style of play, but not, apparently, to the evaluation of the position.

1...\(\text{exd5} \ 2 \text{Qxf5} \text{Qe8??}\)

Straightaway an inaccuracy. Black should prefer 2...\(\text{Wd7!} \ 3 \text{Exd5} \text{f6} \ 4 \text{h3} \) (4 \(\text{Qe7}\) is bad owing to 4...\(\text{Qfe8!}\))

4...\(\text{Qfe8} \ 5 \text{Qe7+}\! \text{Qf7} \ 6 \text{Qc5!}\) and even though \(\text{Qc7}\) is not threatened immediately, Black’s position is not easy to play.

3 \(\text{Qf7+ Qf8}\)!

Better is 3...\(\text{Qh8} \ 4 \text{Qxd5} \text{Wd7}\) although after 5 h3 and 6 \(\text{Qc5}\) Black’s position is unenviable.

4 \(\text{Qxd5} \text{Wd7} \ 5 \text{h3 a6} \ 6 \text{Qh5!}\)

This is White’s idea.

6...f6

Not 6...h6? because of 7 \(\text{Qxh6!!} \text{gxh6} \ 8 \text{Qxh6#}\).

7 \(\text{Qxh7 Qd8} \ 8 \text{Qe3 Qe8} \ 9 \text{Qec8} \ 10 \text{Qb6 Qd8} \ 11 \text{Qxe8+ Qxe8} \ 12 \text{d7 Qd8} \ 13 \text{h5 g5} \ 14 \text{Qe3 Qg7} \ 15 \text{h4!} \ 16 \text{Qg6 1-0}\).
This is what Botvinnik had to say about Capablanca: “Capablanca’s phenomenal system for searching for the right move at such a young age, when he calculated variations at an amazing speed, made him unbeatable. In an unclear position, he would use intuition within his system for finding the correct move”.

Kotov wrote that “intuition aids the decision-making process in dynamic or unclear positions, thus saving on vital resources such as time and energy. Intuition must, however, be developed within oneself.” On the other hand, Smyslov loved to say that intuition is significantly more important than knowledge!

The following position is an example of how Bronstein used his intuition to defend against Tal.

One’s first impression is that Black has problems. White has three pawns for the piece, and the black king has nowhere safe to go. However, Bronstein discovered a fantastic defensive resource:

1...\textit{e}7! 2 \textit{a}7+ \textit{f}6! 3 \textit{e}4!? \textit{d}1+ 4 \textit{h}2 \textit{e}4 5 \textit{x}c3+ \textit{e}5 6 \textit{f}4

If 6 \textit{f}4, then 6...\textit{x}h6+ 7 \textit{g}3 \textit{g}4+ gives Black a decisive advantage.

Bronstein himself said “I usually play by intuition – not just because I prefer to play in this way, but also because I save a store of energy for working out complex variations at critical moments during the game. For a human to calculate variations effectively on every move is, in my opinion, just not possible – this is a job for a machine. It is only after play has ended that we can talk about what worried us during the game itself by passing it off with long variations. But whether you believe these variations is up to you!”
We are already familiar with examples of intuitive sacrifices, but these were cases in which they were justified by the state of affairs on the board. In other words, we were convinced of the correctness of these decisions beforehand, either through our own personal experience, or by studying that of the top grandmasters.

However, an intuitive sacrifice has another side to it, namely when it appears as a distinctive method of attack.

But just what is an intuitive sacrifice? It is the giving up of material, not backed up by concrete analysis and granting the attacking side an attack or a prolonged initiative. As a rule, after a sacrifice has occurred, the game takes on a sharp, energetic character that demands greater care and vision from both players. Therefore an intuitive sacrifice requires a player to conduct the game in a manner not familiar to him, when the bridges are burnt, and there is no time for quiet positional manoeuvring and regrouping.

In chess literature it is possible to find numerous examples of absorbing and bewildering sacrifices that lead to immense complications and contain a definite amount of risk. Moreover, sacrifices such as this occur not only in the middlegame, but also in the opening. When annotating completed games, some masters label such sacrifices as incorrect or even foolhardy, whereas other players will resolutely try to justify them. There is nothing remarkable in this, for an intuitive sacrifice reflects the two conflicting sides to chess – the analytical and the practical. Sometimes through home analysis we may manage to refute a particular sacrifice whereas in practical play it may prove irresistible.

Successful intuitive sacrifices always bring a chess-player an enormous creative satisfaction, and leave an indelible impression in his memory. The concept of positional intuition is very broad, and incorporates the following:

a) intuitive exchange sacrifices for control of the centre, for blockading the opponent’s pieces, for possession of the bishop-pair, for piece coordination, etc.;

b) intuitive piece sacrifices for two pawns and seizing space and/or possession of the centre;

c) intuitive queen sacrifices for positional compensation;

d) intuitive pawn sacrifices for gaining control of squares of a particular colour and/or for ‘eternal’ control of a particular square;

e) intuition in exchanging;

f) problems in coordinating rooks on the back rank;

b) mysterious rook moves;

g) Makogonov’s principle of the worst-placed piece;

h) The correlation between analysis, intuition and mistakes in intuitive judgement.

We shall devote a chapter to each of these major topics.
5 Exchange Sacrifices

Positional exchange sacrifices constitute a very complex positional device, which demands a well-developed feel for the initiative. They are usually aimed at the activation of one’s pieces and pawns, as well as bringing out their power and exploiting weaknesses in the opponent’s position. Of course, there is also a simpler version of the exchange sacrifice, one which is directed at attacking the enemy king using, for example, the weakness of a particular colour complex of squares, but we will not be touching upon this subject here. In this chapter we shall investigate several different kinds of intuitive exchange sacrifices.

Sacrificing for Centralization

Piece coordination in the centre of the board creates possibilities for seizing space, constricting the opponent’s pieces, and switching to an attack on the king. The following diagram features an example.

1...d5! 2 dxe5 Qxe5 3 Qxe5 Qxe5 4 Qf3

A riskier continuation was chosen in Hübner-Beliavsky, Tilburg 1986: 4 f4 Qc5+ 5 Wh2 Qxe4! 6 Qxe4 dxe4 7 Qe3 Qxe3 8 Qxe3 Qd5! and White had to give back the exchange for after 9 Qxe4? would come 9...Qxc3! 10

\[ Wxd8+ Nxd8 11 Ne3 Ne2!,\] winning for Black.

4...Qxe4! 5 Qxe4 Qxe4 6 Qb2 Qg7 7 Qc2 Wh6 8 b4

8 Qac1 would be very unpleasantly met by 8...b4.

After White’s text-move, however, 8...Qxc3 is risky in view of 9 Ne3. Although Black does not having any forcing continuation, he does have an extra pawn and active play in return for the exchange. So how should he continue? He proceeds positionally and simply improves the position of his pieces.

8...c5! 9 bxc5 Qxc5 10 Ne2 Nc8 11 Nae1 Qe4

It is clear that the c3-pawn represents White’s main weakness.

12 Wd3 Wb6 13 Qd4 h5!
Black solves the weakness of his back rank and improves the position of his king.

14  \( \mathcal{A} \mathcal{a} 1 \mathcal{A} \mathcal{c} 4! \) (D)

15  \( \mathcal{A} \mathcal{c} 2? \)
15  \( \mathcal{A} \mathcal{b} 1 \) is better, defending against ...b4.
15...\( \mathcal{W} \mathcal{c} 7! \)
Attacking the c3-pawn further.
16  \( \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{e} 3 \mathcal{A} \mathcal{c} 5 \) 17  \( \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{d} 1 \mathcal{A} \mathcal{f} 6 \) 18  \( \mathcal{A} \mathcal{b} 2 \)
\( \mathcal{W} \mathcal{c} 6 \)
Preparing an attack along the h1-a8 diagonal, given the opportunity. Generally speaking, the b7-bishop is Black's weakest piece, and it is difficult to bring it into the game.
19  \( \mathcal{A} \mathcal{a} 3 \mathcal{A} \mathcal{c} 4 \) 20  \( \mathcal{A} \mathcal{b} 4 \mathcal{W} \mathcal{g} 7 \) 21  \( \mathcal{A} \mathcal{a} 3 \)
On 21  \( \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{e} 3 \) the long diagonal comes into play: 21...\( \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{c} 3! \) 22  \( \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{c} 4 \) dxc4.
21...\( \mathcal{W} \mathcal{c} 7! \) 22  \( \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{e} 3 \) a5! 23  \( \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{d} 5 \)
\( \mathcal{A} \mathcal{d} 5 \) 24  \( \mathcal{W} \mathcal{d} 5 \) axb4 25  \( \mathcal{A} \mathcal{e} 4 \mathcal{A} \mathcal{e} 4 \) 26  \( \mathcal{A} \mathcal{e} 4 \) bxc3 27  \( \mathcal{W} \mathcal{d} 1 \) \( \mathcal{W} \mathcal{c} 5 \) 28  \( \mathcal{W} \mathcal{c} 1 \)
\( \mathcal{A} g 5 ! \) 29  \( \mathcal{W} \mathcal{a} 1 \) f6! 0-1
There is no defence against the advance of the c-pawn.

The greatest master of the intuitive positional exchange sacrifice was world champion Tigran Petrosian. This is his opinion on the subject: "The main difficulty of these sacrifices is the psychological prejudice when it comes to giving up a rook for a minor piece. The second problem is that the exchange is often given up under incorrect circumstances. For example, in my game against Reshevsky I was by no means forced to sacrifice the exchange and soon found myself in a difficult position. Therefore in such situations it is essential to foresee beforehand how the course of the game will develop, and then take the necessary measures." Petrosian loved to sacrifice with the purpose of setting up a blockade.

**Sacrificing for Blockade**

As defined by Nimzowitsch, the blockade is an independent strategic mechanism with the aim of activating one's pieces under the cover of the opponent's pawns and to create pressure on the enemy position both in the centre, and on the flanks.

Reshevsky – Petrosian
Zurich Ct 1953
Here we go back to Petrosian: “Having studied the position I became aware of that fact that Black has no active play while White threatens either to advance his pawns and create weaknesses on the kingside or to play \( \text{xf3 followed by d5} \). When, after prolonged thought, I found the correct move I became more positive, for as far as the idea is simple, it should also be correct.”

1...\( \text{xe6} \) 2 a4 \( \text{e7}! \)

Black carries out his plan of blockading on d5. 2...b4? is worse due to 3 d5 \( \text{xe6} \) 4 \( \text{xe6} \) and 5 \( \text{xc4} \), destroying Black’s position.

3 \( \text{xe6 fxe6} \) 4 \( \text{f1 d5} \) 5 \( \text{f3 d3} \) (D)

\[ W \]

6 \( \text{xd3} \)

Returning the exchange is essential for otherwise Black would prepare the advance of his queenside pawns.

6...\( \text{cx}d3 \) 7 \( \text{xd3} \) b4 8 \( \text{xb4} \)

After 8 c4 \( \text{b6} \) Black would capture on a4 and have two passed pawns.

8...\( \text{axb4} \) 9 a5 \( \text{a8} \) 10 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{c6} \) 11 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{c7} \) 12 a6 \( \text{b6} \) 13 \( \text{d2} \) b3 14 \( \text{c4} \) h6 15 h3 b2 16 \( \text{b1} \) h8 17 \( \text{e1} \) 1/2-1/2

**Sacrificing to Restrict Your Opponent**

Space is a very important positional factor, and after an exchange sacrifice the scope of the rooks often becomes markedly less than that of the minor pieces.

![Diagram](image)

**Movsesian – I. Sokolov**  
*Batumi Echt 1999*

1 \( \text{ed1!} \)

For pawns such as these you do not even need to think about sacrificing the exchange – the pawns will without doubt constrict the black pieces.

1...\( \text{xd5} \) 2 \( \text{cxd5} \) \( \text{e6} \) 3 d6! \( \text{b7} \) 4 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{d7} \) 5 \( \text{d5} \) b5 6 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{c8} \) 7 \( \text{c3!} \)

Defending against ...c4, which would now be met by b4.

7...a5 8 \( \text{xa5} \) \( \text{a7} \) 9 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c8} \) 10 a4! c4

After 10...bxa4 11 bxa4 White’s a-pawn would be very strong.

11 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 12 axb5 cxb5 13 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{a2+} \) 14 \( \text{h3} \) b2 15 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{b3} \) 16 b6

White has an easily won position.
To Gain the Bishop-Pair

Two bishops usually control a great many squares and this can make it exceptionally difficult for the opponent to coordinate his pieces.

14 b3 0-0 15 c4 $\text{Ec}8$ 16 $\text{Bb}1$ $\text{Wb}4$
17 $\text{Bd}2$ $\text{Bx}c4$ 18 $\text{Bxb}4$ $\text{Bxb}4$ 19 $\text{Bc}4$
$\text{Bb}6$ 20 $\text{Cc}4$ $\text{Cc}6$

Simplification has not made things any easier; White has absolutely no play whatsoever.
21 $\text{Be}3$ $\text{d}5$ 22 $\text{f}4$ $\text{Bb}4$ 23 $\text{C}d3$ $\text{f}8$
24 $\text{Cc}2$ $\text{d}6$ 25 $\text{He}2$ $\text{f}7$ 26 $\text{Cc}2$ $\text{e}8$
27 $\text{d}2$ $\text{Bb}6$ 28 $\text{Ec}1$ $\text{d}7$ 29 $\text{e}3$ $\text{f}6$
30 $\text{f}3$ $\text{e}5$ 0-1

To Gain Control Over Squares of a Certain Colour

Smagin also introduced into practice yet another variation on the intuitive exchange sacrifice – this time, for control of a specific colour complex of squares. In such positions it is easier to activate one’s pieces on the weakened squares while initiating an attack using both pieces and pawns via the squares of the opposite colour, and often on the king itself.

1...$\text{c}c3$!?

This is a very standard Sicilian sacrifice, though 1...$\text{a}5$ 2 $\text{f}4$ $\text{xc}3$ is the modern preference.
2 $\text{xc}3$

After 2 bxc3 Black can expect play against White’s weak pawns.
2...$\text{ex}e$4 3 $\text{We}3$ $\text{Bx}g$5 4 $\text{Bx}g$5 $\text{Bb}6$
5 $\text{Cc}4$ $\text{e}6$ 6 $\text{gg}3$ $\text{g}6$!

The bishop may come onto the long diagonal, but the most important thing is to defend the kingside.
7 $\text{b}3$ $\text{e}7$ 8 $\text{h}4$ $\text{h}5$!

Stifling White’s play as much as possible.
9 $\text{he}1$ $\text{Bb}4$! 10 $\text{We}3$ $\text{a}5$! 11 $\text{g}3$?

Going into an endgame with 11 $\text{d}4$ was certainly better.
11...a4 12 $\text{c}3$ $\text{a}5$ 13 $\text{Cc}2$ a3!
Breaking down the queenside.
At the time this was simply a bolt from the blue.
1...\textit{h8}!!
2 \textit{xf8} \textit{xf8} 3 \textit{d4} \textit{c4} 4 \textit{g5} 
\textit{fd7} 5 \textit{h3} \textit{e6} 6 \textit{b1} \textit{e5} 7 \textit{f4}?! 
White tries to create some play but overlooks his opponent’s tactical reply.

7...\textit{f3}! 8 \textit{xf3} 
Rather better is 8 \textit{we3} \textit{xd4} 9 
\textit{xd4}! with double-edged play.
8...\textit{xc3} 9 \textit{bxc3} 
9 \textit{xc3} is bad due to 9...\textit{xa2}+ 10 
\textit{xa2} \textit{xc3} 11 \textit{bxc3} \textit{c8}! with an attack.
9...\textit{d5}! 10 \textit{c1} \textit{a4} 11 \textit{exd5}! 
A good defence.
11...\textit{xa2}+! 12 \textit{a1} 
After 12 \textit{xa2} \textit{xc3}+! 13 \textit{b3} 
\textit{c5} Black’s attack is decisive.
12...\textit{c5} 13 \textit{dxe6} \textit{xc3} 14 \textit{d4}? 
With the correct 14 \textit{e7}! \textit{e6} 15 
\textit{d8}+ \textit{g7} 16 \textit{e8}+ \textit{h8} 17 \textit{xc8} 
White could have saved the game.
14...\textit{xe6}! 15 \textit{xe6} \textit{fxe6} 16 \textit{a4} 
\textit{xa4} 17 \textit{c4} \textit{d8} 18 \textit{a2} \textit{wb4} 19 \textit{e1} 
\textit{d3} 20 \textit{xe6} \textit{c3}+ 0-1

Black strengthens his initiative with gain of material.
9 \textit{e2} \textit{c4} 10 \textit{g3} \textit{d4} 11 \textit{fe2} 
\textit{fxe4} 12 \textit{xe4} \textit{g7} 13 \textit{g5}? 
The modest 13 \textit{g3} is correct, even though Black still holds the advantage.
13...\textit{e3}! 
After this, White cannot avoid the loss of material.
14 \textit{xb7} \textit{xg5} 15 \textit{e4} \textit{d5} 16 
\textit{xe6} \textit{xb7} 
White can resign.

\section*{Closing Lines}

A standard motivation for an exchange sacrifice is to close open lines, gain a passed pawn and restrict the activity of
the enemy rooks. We shall examine one of the classics of the genre:

B

Liublinisky – Botvinnik
Moscow Ch 1943

1...\(\mathcal{Q}\)d4!
This sacrifice must not be delayed. It is only possible providing Black retains a rook for attacking purposes, straightens out his pawn-structure, obtains a passed pawn and the reserved nature of the position deprives the white rooks of activity. Under these conditions Black’s advantage will tell.

2 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e2
It is possibly better to take with the bishop and transfer the knight to d3.

2...\(\mathcal{Q}\)c8 3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd4 cxd4 4 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f2 c5 5 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f1 f5 6 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d7 7 \(\mathcal{Q}\)ad1
After 7 exf5 gxf5 Black is able to create connected passed pawns. However, this was White’s best option all the same.

7...f4! 8 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f2 g5 9 g4
How else to defend against ...g4?

9...fxg3 10 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xg3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)h3 11 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f2 h5 12 \(\mathcal{Q}\)fd2 h4 13 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f2 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f8 14 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)f4 15 \(\mathcal{Q}\)h1 \(\mathcal{Q}\)h7 16 \(\mathcal{Q}\)g1 \(\mathcal{Q}\)d8 17 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e2 \(\mathcal{W}\)f7 18 \(\mathcal{W}\)d1

18 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e1 is unpleasantly answered by 18...g4.

18...\(\mathcal{W}\)h5 19 \(\mathcal{Q}\)e3 \(\mathcal{W}\)xf3+ 20 \(\mathcal{W}\)xf3 \(\mathcal{E}\)xf3 21 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xg5 \(\mathcal{E}\)xd3
and Black won.

The Exchange Sacrifice on c3

In the mid-1960s, the exchange sacrifice on c3 became a very well-known aspect of intuitive positional play.

The exchange sacrifice on c3 (c6) is an important strategic device and occurs most frequently in the Sicilian Dragon and the English Opening. The idea behind the sacrifice is to demolish the opponent’s queenside pawn-structure and to weaken his centre, in particular the e4-pawn.

B

Kholmov – Tal
Riga 1968

1...\(\mathcal{E}\)xc3! 2 bxc3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xe3 3 \(\mathcal{Q}\)xd7 \(\mathcal{E}\)xc3 4 \(\mathcal{W}\)g4
If 4 \(\mathcal{W}\)a6, then 4...\(\mathcal{Q}\)xb3+ 5 axb3 \(\mathcal{W}\)xd7 6 \(\mathcal{E}\)d3 \(\mathcal{E}\)c8 7 f6 is a possible continuation.
4...h5! 5 \( \text{wxh5 wxd7} \) (D)

5...\( \text{\Deltaxb3} \).

6 \( \text{\Deltaxa5 wa4} \) 7 \( \text{\Deltab3 \Deltac8!} \) 8 f6
\( \text{\Deltaxa2+} \) 9 \( \text{\Deltad2 we4} \) 10 \( \text{\Deltac1 wxg2+} \) 11
\( \text{\text{we}2 \text{wd5+} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}} \)

The exchange sacrifice on c3 is also in the repertoire of the 13th world champion.

7...d5!? is very interesting.
8 \( \text{\text{wxd6 \text{Be}8} \) 9 \( \text{\text{xe7 \text{exe7} 10 \text{\Deltad8+ \text{g7} 11 \text{\Deltad5 \text{d1}}} \text{!}}} \)

Black has a large endgame advantage.

\[ \text{Pikula – Nemet} \]
\[ \text{Baden (Switzerland) 1997} \]

1...\( \text{\text{\Deltaxc3!} 2 bxc3 \text{wc7} 3 h3 d5!} \)
Black opens up the game with maximum effect.
4 \( \text{\text{d3 dxec4} 5 fxe4 a5! 6 g4 a4 7 \text{\text{c1 wxc3} 8 \text{\text{d2 wce6} 9 we2 0-0}} \) (D) \)

\[ \text{Topalov – Kasparov} \]
\[ \text{Leon adv (3) 1998} \]

1...\( \text{\text{\Deltaxc3!} 2 bxc3 \text{\text{a4} 3 \text{\Deltag3 \\text{a5} 4 \text{\text{xe6} wxe6} 5 \text{\text{d4} \Deltaxc3+} 6 \text{\text{\Deltax}}}} \)

White tries to return the exchange under the best possible conditions.
6...\( \text{\text{\Deltaxc3} 7 \text{\text{c4 we7}} \)

Black has no need for the h-pawn.
10 \( \text{\text{gxh5} \text{\text{c5} 11 \text{\text{de1} \text{c8} 12 \text{\text{b4 \text{\Deltad3} 13 \text{\text{xe7 \text{xc1!} 14 \text{\text{xc1 \text{d1}}}}}}}} \)
1...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}xc3!} 2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}wd2} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}we5!} 3 bxc3
After 3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}xc3} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}xc3} 4 bxc3 g5! 5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}h5!} f6 Black has a clear advantage.
3...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{
ac4}}} 4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}h6}
4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}d4} is no better as 4...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}xd4} 5 cxd4 e5! gives Black a powerful position.
4...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}f8} 5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}g4} a5!
Black has a decisive advantage.

15 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}hg1} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}c3} 16 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}b1} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}f4} 17 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}h2} a3
0-1

\textit{Makarychev – Svidler}
\textit{Russian Ch (Elista) 1995}

1...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}xc3!} 2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}wd2} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}we5!} 3 bxc3
The quickest way to win.
9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}xd8} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}xd8} 10 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}we3} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}xf5} 11 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}xe5} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}f8}
Black is winning.

\textit{Movsesian – Kasparov}
\textit{Sarajevo 2000}

1...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}xc3!}
Kasparov said that sacrifices such as this do not demand any calculation, and that by allowing it Movsesian showed that he did not understand the position well.
2 bxc3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}c7} 3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}e2} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}e7} 4 g5 0-0 5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}h4} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}a4!}
This is better than 5...d5, for after 6 h5 White continues his attack.
6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}c1}
Carrying on the attack with 6 h5 is a great deal better.
6...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}e5} 7 h5 d5!
Opening the position at the right time.
8 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}h2} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}d6} 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}h3} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textbar}}xd3} 10 cxd3 b4!
A materialistic approach is inappropriate: after 10...\(\text{Qxc3+} 11 \text{Qxc3} \text{Wxc3} 12 \text{Bb2}\) White is in no danger.

11 \text{cxb4} \text{Qc8} 12 \text{Qa1} \text{dxe4} 13 \text{fxe4} (D)

Worse is 13 \text{dxe4} \text{Qe5+} 14 \text{Qd4} \text{Qxd4+} 15 \text{Qxd4} \text{Wxc1+} with mate.

13...\text{Qxe4}!

A decisive opening of the position.

14 \text{g6} \text{Qxh1} 15 \text{Wxh1} \text{Qxb4} 16 \text{gxf7+} \text{Qf8}

16...\text{Wxf7} also wins.

17 \text{Wg2} \text{Qb8} 18 \text{Qb2} \text{Qxb2} 19 \text{Qd4} \text{Qxd1} 20 \text{Qxe6+} \text{Qxf7} 0-1

A. Horvath – J. Horvath
Hungary 1998

1...\text{Qxc3!} 2 \text{bxc3} \text{Wxa3} 3 \text{c4}

White now has weak points on g3 and f2.

4 \text{Qh2} \text{h4!} 5 \text{gxh4} \text{dxe5} 0-1

Here we see a more complex positional example occurring deep into the middlegame.

Hübner – Anand
Dortmund 1996

1...\text{Qxc3!} 2 \text{bxc3} \text{Wxa3} 3 \text{c4}

3 \text{Qe2} is bad since 3...\text{Qc8} wins a second pawn.

3...\text{bxc4} 4 \text{Qxc4} \text{Qxe4} 5 \text{Qd3} \text{Wa4}

6 \text{Qb3} (D)

After 6 \text{Qb3} \text{Qd7} White loses the f5-pawn.
6...\(\mathbb{W}xc4\) 7 \(\mathbb{A}xb7\) \(\mathbb{W}xc2\) 8 \(\mathbb{A}g1\) \(\mathbb{A}g5\) 9 \(\mathbb{A}db1\) \(\mathbb{A}f4\)!

Black's pieces close in on the king.
10 \(\mathbb{A}1b3\) \(d5\) 11 \(\mathbb{A}f3\) \(\mathbb{A}c8\) 12 \(\mathbb{A}xf7\) 
\(\mathbb{A}g5\) 13 \(\mathbb{A}xf4\) \(exf4\) 
13...\(\mathbb{A}xf7\) is also good.
14 \(\mathbb{A}e7\) \(f3!\) 0-1

---

**Betko – Stohl**
*Olomouc 1998*

1...\(\mathbb{A}xc3\)! 2 \(\mathbb{W}xc3\) \(\mathbb{W}xc3\) 3 \(\mathbb{B}xc3\) 
\(\mathbb{A}c8\) 4 \(\mathbb{A}e2b2\) \(a5\) 5 \(\mathbb{A}a3\) \(\mathbb{A}f6\) 6 \(\mathbb{A}f4\) \(\mathbb{A}e8\) 7 
\(\mathbb{A}g5\) \(a4\) 8 \(\mathbb{A}a2\) \(\mathbb{A}c6\) 9 \(\mathbb{A}d3\) \(\mathbb{A}f6\) 10 
\(\mathbb{A}xc6\) \(\mathbb{A}xc6\) 11 \(\mathbb{A}d4\) \(h5\) 12 \(\mathbb{A}c1\) \(\mathbb{A}f8\) 
13 \(\mathbb{A}d2\) \(\mathbb{A}a8\) 14 \(\mathbb{A}b4\) \(\mathbb{A}a5\) 15 \(\mathbb{A}e3\) \(e6\) 16 \(\mathbb{A}c4\) \(\mathbb{A}d7\) 17 \(\mathbb{A}c3\) \(f6\) 18 \(\mathbb{A}b1\) \(\mathbb{A}g5\) 19 
\(\mathbb{A}c2\) \(\mathbb{A}xe3+\) 20 \(\mathbb{A}xe3\) \(\mathbb{A}e7\) 21 \(\mathbb{A}f2\) 
\(\mathbb{A}c5\) 22 \(\mathbb{A}bb1\) \(\mathbb{A}d7\) 1/2-1/2

Sacrifices on c3/c6 are not automatically correct – occasionally the compensation received proves insufficient.

---

**Zviagintsev – Ivanchuk**
*Elista 1998*

The exchange sacrifice on c3 can also succeed when it leads to an endgame.
1...fxe3?! 2 bxc3 wxc7
2...e4 is met by 3 f5!, when
3...wxc7 4 axc4 wxc4 5 d2 c5 6
wgl leaves White better, but Black
should prefer 3...e6!, with counter-
play.
3 axxe6! wxc3+ 4 wfl fxe6 5 g2
wcl
A serious inaccuracy; 5...b5! is cor-
rect, with active play.
6 a4!
Black’s b7-pawn is now very weak.
6...xf8 7 wg4 d5 8 c3!
White plays yet another strong pro-
phylactic move.
8...c5 9 axc5 f4 10 w5+! g6
11 wh3 wxc5 12 cl g1 wcl 13 wxc1
wxc5 14 w1 xg5 15 wgl! wxc3 16
wxg5 wxg5 17 c1! wf3+ 18 g1
wg4+ 19 fl
White won after a few more moves.

The exchange sacrifice on c6 oc-
curs a lot more rarely than on c3. The
reason lies in opening strategy and the
fact that positions where Black has a
semi-open c-file occur so often.

1 wxc6! wxc6
1...bxc6 2 e5 w6 3 xc6.
2 d4 w5 3 xf5 wxf5 4 xe7
a6 5 axa6 c3 6 ac1 wc6 7
e5 wc8 8 xc6!
The bishops simply ‘slice up’ the
black rooks.
8...d8 9 e7 ed6 10 e1 w6 11
axa6 exa6 12 eb7 ed6 13 ecx7
White has a considerable advantage.

The Exchange Sacrifice on
e3/e6

The aim of this sacrifice is to damage
the opponent’s pawn-structure and to
generate threats against the king. De-
fending against this sacrifice often
proves exceptionally difficult.
1...\(\text{\texttt{\textit{\text{\texttt{x}}}}}{\text{\texttt{e}}}{\text{\texttt{x}}}{\text{\texttt{e}}}3\) 2 \(\text{\texttt{f}}{\text{\texttt{x}}}3\) \(\text{\texttt{e}}{\text{\texttt{x}}}{\text{\texttt{e}}}3\) 3 \(\text{\texttt{d}}{\text{\texttt{a}}}{\text{\texttt{a}}}{\text{\texttt{a}}}{\text{\texttt{a}}}2\) \(\text{\texttt{c}}{\text{\texttt{c}}}{\text{\texttt{x}}}1\) 4 \(\text{\texttt{d}}{\text{\texttt{x}}}1\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}{\text{\texttt{x}}}4!!\) 5 \(\text{\texttt{w}}{\text{\texttt{x}}}a4\) \(\text{\texttt{w}}{\text{\texttt{x}}}e3{+}\) 6 \(\text{\texttt{h}}1\) \(\text{\texttt{e}}e4?\)

6...\(\text{\texttt{d}}{\text{\texttt{x}}}d4!\) favours Black.

7 \(\text{\texttt{d}}f5?\)

Returning the favour. 7 \(\text{\texttt{w}}e8{+}\) ! \(\text{\texttt{d}}f8\) 8 \(\text{\texttt{d}}e6!\) \(\text{\texttt{f}}{\text{\texttt{x}}}e6\) 9 \(\text{\texttt{d}}x{\text{\texttt{x}}}e6\) 10 \(\text{\texttt{d}}f2+\) 11 \(\text{\texttt{h}}h2\) \(\text{\texttt{w}}e5{+}\) 9 \(\text{\texttt{d}}g3\) \(\text{\texttt{d}}e4\) 10 \(\text{\texttt{w}}b3\) \(\text{\texttt{f}}f2\) 11 \(\text{\texttt{d}}d3\) \(\text{\texttt{h}}5!\)

Black holds a decisive advantage.

1 \(\text{\texttt{w}}x{\text{\texttt{e}}}6!!\) \(\text{\texttt{f}}{\text{\texttt{x}}}e6\) 2 \(\text{\texttt{w}}e2\) \(\text{\texttt{e}}5\)

2...\(\text{\texttt{d}}f8\) is strongly met by 3 \(\text{\texttt{d}}e5\) and the further advance of the h-pawn.

3 \(\text{\texttt{c}}c4{+}\) \(\text{\texttt{h}}h8\) 4 \(\text{\texttt{d}}x{\text{\texttt{x}}}e5\) \(\text{\texttt{w}}c7\) 5 \(\text{\texttt{d}}f7!\)

6...\(\text{\texttt{d}}e5\) is stronger, although 7 \(\text{\texttt{d}}x{\text{\texttt{x}}}5\) \(\text{\texttt{d}}x{\text{\texttt{x}}}5\) 8 \(\text{\texttt{h}}d1\) gives White an undisputed advantage.

7 \(\text{\texttt{w}}e4!\) \(\text{\texttt{w}}a5\) 8 \(\text{\texttt{d}}e1\) \(\text{\texttt{w}}d5\) 9 \(\text{\texttt{w}}h4\) \(\text{\texttt{a}}x{\text{\texttt{f}}}7\)

There is no other defence against the threat of \(\text{\texttt{d}}x{\text{\texttt{g}}}6\), but this also fails to save the game.
10 ♗e5!
White has a decisive advantage.

Orel – Licina
Slovenian Ch (Bled) 1996

1 ♘xe6! fxe6 2 ♗g5 ♗d5 3 ♘xe6 ♖d6 4 ♗h3!
Clearly there is no point in exchanging the e6-knight.
4...b5 5 ♖e2 a5 6 ♖d2 a4 7 ♖e1 ♗f6 8 ♖h6 ♖h8 9 g4!
The decisive advance.
9...♗g8 10 g5 ♖h8 11 ♗g4!
Preparing to push the h-pawn.
11...♗ab8 12 h4 ♖b6 13 h5 ♖bb8
14 ♖e4 1-0

Multi-Purpose Exchange Sacrifices

These are more difficult to categorize accurately. The main problem is intuitively evaluating the consequences of the sacrifice and whether the activity of the lesser pieces surpasses the potential usefulness of the opposing rooks.

The extra exchange cannot make itself felt, since Black’s pieces lack coordination.

9 0-0 ♖d2 10 ♖f3?!
10 ♖b1! threatening ♖c4 (Nunn) is good for White.
10...♗a7 11 ♗d7 ♗d8?
11...♗a8! is best, since 12 ♗7b6?! ♖a3! (Nunn) is good for Black, while
it is hard for White to prove an advantage with other moves.

12 $\text{Qxf8}$ $\text{Qxf8}$ 13 $b5! \text{Wxa3}$ 14 $\text{Wf5!}$
$\text{Qe8}$ 15 $\text{Qc4}$ $\text{Qc2}$ 16 $\text{Wxh7}$ $\text{Qxc4}$ 17 $\text{Wg8+ Qd7}$ 18 $\text{Qb6+}$
White has a decisive advantage.

10 $\text{Qg5 h6}$
This is an attempt to throw White off course. However, even after the superior 10...$\text{Qf8!}$ 11 $\text{Qd1}$ $\text{Qd7}$ 12 $\text{Wc7}$ Black is in a bad way.

11 $\text{Qh4 Qg6?}$
11...$\text{Qf8!}$ is necessary, even though 12 $\text{Qd4}$ $\text{Qd7}$ 13 $\text{Wb4!}$ $\text{Qc6}$ 14 $\text{Qxc6}$ $\text{bxc6}$ 15 $\text{Qd1}$ gives White the advantage.

12 $\text{Qg1 Qf8}$ 13 $\text{Wb4 Qg7}$ 14 $\text{Qe2}$
$b5$ 15 $\text{axb5 Qd7}$ 16 $\text{Qf4}$ $\text{Wf7}$ 17 $\text{Qc1!}$
$\text{Qb7}$ 18 $\text{bxa6 Qxf3}$ 19 $\text{gxf3 Qda7}$
Here the simplest of all is 20 $\text{Qc6}$ $\text{Wd7}$ 21 $\text{Qd6}$, when White wins.

Sacrificing the Exchange for a Central Pawn-Chain

1 $\text{h3! Qxf2?}$
Rather than playing for material gain, Black should attempt to occupying the dark squares by 1...$\text{Qe5!}$.

2 $\text{Qxf2 Qxf2+}$ 3 $\text{Wxf2 Qxc4}$ 4 $\text{Qg3}$
f6?!

After 4...0-0 5 $\text{Qh6}$ g6 6 $\text{Qd1!}$ White’s initiative is worth the pawn and exchange sacrificed. Black has enormous problems in development, but he had to try 4...g6 5 $\text{Qh6}$ f6.

5 $\text{Wxg7 Qc5+}$ 6 $\text{Qh1}$ $\text{Qf8}$ 7 $\text{Qg4}$
$\text{Wf7}$ 8 $e5!$

This opens up the position and brings all the pieces into play – White threatens $\text{Qe4}$.

8...$\text{Qg8}$ 9 $\text{Qc4 f5}$
9...$\text{Qxe5}$ 10 $\text{Qxe5}$ fxe5 11 $\text{Qe4}$ $\text{Wc7}$ is bad due to 12 $b3!$ and 13 $\text{a3}$.

1 $\text{Cd5! Qxd5?}$
Kasparov should have sensed that a sacrifice such as this should never be taken. Holding firm by 1...$\text{Qec8!}$ 2 $\text{Qxe5 Qxc4}$ is clearly superior.

2 $\text{exd5 Qg6}$
Evidently Kasparov hoped that after ...e4 he would have good play. However, the white pawns are very strong.

3 c5 e4 4 Ĥe2 Ĥe5 5 Ïd7! Ïg5?
5...e3! 6 f1 f7 7 Ïg4! Ïxg4 8 hxg4 gives White only a small endgame advantage.

6 Ïg1 e3 7 d6 Ïg3 8 Ïxb7 Ïe6
White defends against this transparent threat without difficulty.

9 Ïh2! 1-0

Sturua – Djuric
Biel 1991

1 Ïb3! Ïxb3 2 axb3 Ïxa1 3 Ïxa1 f6
After 3...ãc8 White develops an initiative with 4 Ïf4 Ïd8 5 Ïg5!.

4 Ïf4 Ïd8 5 Ïd2 g5 6 Ïxd6!
The beginning of a wonderful combination.

6...Ïxd6 7 Ïe4 Ïb6 8 Ïxc5
Threatening d6.

8...ßd6 9 Ïe6!
Threatening both Ïc7 and c5.

9...ßd7
9...ßb7 10 Ïc7 Ïa6 loses to 11 Ïxa6! Ïxa6 12 Ïxa8 Ïxa8 13 d6!.

10 Ïc7 Ïb8 11 Ïxa6 Ïb6 12 Ïc7 Ïxb3 13 Ïh3 a6 14 Ïe8!
This picks up some more material and gives White a winning position.

Mikhailchishin – Beliavsky
Lvov 1981

1 bxc4! Ïxc1 2 Ïxc1
For the exchange White has a pawn, the bishop-pair and a certain amount of pressure on the centre, although this has yet to take shape.

2...ãc8
2...dxc4? 3 d5! Ïxd5 4 Ïd1 gives White a winning advantage.

3 Ïd2 b5!!
An interesting decision. By sacrificing a pawn, Black hopes to eliminate White’s play in the centre of the board. White was threatening 4 cxd5 Ïxd5 5 Ïxf6 gxf6 6 e4 Ïc4 7 Ïd1 followed by d5.

4 cxb5 Ïe7 5 Ïe5 Ïb6 6 Ïb1 Ïf5
7 Ïb3 Ïfd8 8 h3 h6 9 Ïxf6 Ïxf6 10 Ïa3 Ïb6 11 Ïa6! Ïb8 12 g4 Ïg6 13 f4
White has a decisive positional advantage.
This type of exchange sacrifice was also seen in the games of the great players of the past.

Olafsson – Fischer

Portorož IZ 1958

White plays a similar sacrifice to that in the previous example.

1 \text{c}c2 \text{b}b4 2 \text{b}xc4! \text{xc}2 3 \text{x}c2 \text{d}xc4 4 \text{b}b5! \text{b}4 5 \text{c}7 \text{xd}2 6 \text{xe}6 \text{e}6 7 \text{xc}4! \text{e}8 8 \text{xd}2

It wasn’t a problem to calculate up to this point. The problem was to assess intuitively that although White has just one pawn for the exchange, Black faces serious problems.

8...\text{e}e4 9 \text{d}3 \text{xg}3 10 \text{hxg}3 \text{f}6 11 \text{e}4 \text{c}8 12 \text{b}3 \text{d}7 13 \text{d}1

Creating the new threat of d5.

13...\text{e}8 14 \text{f}4 \text{h}7 15 \text{e}5 \text{f}5 16 g4!

White improves his pawn-structure with the endgame in mind.

16...\text{x}e5 17 \text{d}xe5 \text{f}7 18 \text{f}5 \text{c}7 19 \text{d}6!

After 19 \text{x}e6+? \text{xe}6 20 \text{f}xe6 the white pawns are too weak.

19...\text{e}5 20 \text{xe}6+ \text{f}8 21 \text{b}3 \text{e}5 22 \text{x}h6 \text{e}3 23 \text{g}6!

Black resigned a few moves later.

Petrosian – Shishmanovsky

Kiev 1957

1 \text{b}5! \text{a}6 2 \text{xd}6 \text{xf}1 3 \text{xf}1

Although White is not threatening anything, Black simply has no satisfactory continuation.

3...\text{f}6 4 \text{xe}5 \text{xe}5 5 \text{xf}5 \text{c}4 6 \text{c}2! 1-0

Opening Lines against the Enemy King

Hartston – Mariotti

Skopje OL 1972
1...h5! 2 ♖f3 h4! 3 ♖xf4 ♖xh4 4 g×h4 ♕xh4

Here we see an early exchange sacrifice in return for piece activity. Before the white rooks can come into play, Black’s pieces will be able to bring the game to a conclusion.

5 d4

What else?

5...♕xd4 6 ♕e2 ♕xc3+! 7 ♕xc3 d6 8 0-0 g5!

Black cannot allow White to play f4.

9 ♕e3 f6 10 ♕g3 ♕h7 11 ♖f3 ♖ge7
12 ♕e1 ♖g6 13 ♕e3 ♕e7! 14 c4 b6 15 c5?!

Trying to open lines one way or another.

15...bxc5 16 c3 ♖f4 17 ♕g4 ♕xg4
18 ♕xg4 ♕h8 19 h4 ♕g8!

Black has a winning advantage.

b) The c-pawn is very dangerous; and

c) The bishop controls the b-file, through which the remaining black rook will come into play.

3 ♕e1 ♕xb8 4 ♕c1

4 f3 is no better due to 4...♕d3 5 e4 ♕c3!.

4...♕xa4 5 f3 ♕c2! 6 e4 h6!

Securing the back rank and preparing to bring out the rook.

7 exd5 cxd5 8 ♕e5 ♕b5 9 ♕f4 ♕g6! (D)

Black is preparing to advance the c-pawn.

10 ♕h3

After 10 ♕d2 ♕a3 11 ♕e3 ♕b2! 12 ♕xa3 ♕xd2 13 ♕xa7 c3 the pawn will promote.

10...♕b2! 11 ♕ae1

Definitely not 11 ♕xd5? ♕c2 12 g4 ♕f2+ 13 ♕h1 ♕e4! 14 ♕f1 ♕xf3+ 15 ♕xf3 ♕xh2#.

11...♕xa2 12 g4 ♕a5 13 g5 h5 14 ♕xe3 ♕b4 15 ♕e5 c3 16 ♕xd5 c2 17 ♕c5

17 ♕c1 also fails to defend after 17...♕b1! 18 ♕ee1 ♕xe1+!.

17...♕d2 18 ♕xd6 ♕xe3+! 0-1
6 Piece Sacrifices for Two Pawns

In closed positions such as those that often arise from the Ruy Lopez or King’s Indian, Black occasionally manages to demolish his opponent’s centre by sacrificing a piece for two pawns. After this, the black pawns occupy the centre and compensate for the opponent’s material advantage while at the same time restricting the movement of the enemy pieces.

8 \(\text{b2} \text{bxb2} 9 \text{xb2 d5} 10 \text{c1} \text{d4} 11 \text{d1} \text{d6} 12 \text{c2} \text{ac8} 13 \text{g5} \text{e5} 14 \text{h4 f4!}

Black has absolutely nothing against a transition to a won ending.

15 \text{g4} \text{xf5} 16 \text{hxg5} \text{c7} 17 \text{d1} \text{d3} 18 \text{c3} \text{e5} 19 \text{f3 e3!} 20 \text{xd3 e2}

Black has a winning endgame.

\[\text{Geller – Eingorn}
\text{USSR Ch (Riga) 1985}\]

1...\text{xe4!!} 2 \text{xe4 f5} 3 \text{c2} \text{e4} 4 \text{d4} \text{xd5} 5 \text{e2} \text{xc3} 6 \text{xc3} \text{xc3} 7 \text{b1} \text{e5!}

By sacrificing a piece Black has completely destroyed the white centre and now creates a central pawn avalanche. White is completely unable to develop any sort of piece activity or counterplay.

\[\text{Tal – Ghitescu}
\text{Miskolc 1963}\]

1 \text{xc5!} \text{dxc5} 2 \text{xe5} \text{c8} 3 \text{f4}

\text{e7} 4 \text{c4!} \text{g7} 5 \text{f3}

A somewhat hasty retreat. White should prefer 5 \text{ad1} \text{d6} 6 \text{d3}, when Black is unable to create counterplay.
5...bxc4 6 bxc4 ♗d6 7 e5 ♕xc4 8 ♗c3 ♖b5 9 ♏ad1 ♏ad8 10 d6 ♕xd6
11 exd6 ♗b7 12 ♕e5 ♕d7 13 ♖h5 ♕xe5 14 fxe5 ♕h8 15 ♕f4
White has a decisive advantage.

Tal admitted that he got the idea for this sacrifice from the following famous game:

Bronstein – Rojahn
Moscow OL 1956

1 e4 e5 2 ♕f3 ♗c6 3 ♕c4 ♖f6 4 ♘g5 d5 5 exd5 ♙a5 6 d3 h6 7 ♕f3 e4 8 dxe4!? ♕xc4 9 ♗d4 ♕b6 10 c4 (D)

This is one of the most celebrated intuitive sacrifices in the history of chess. Bronstein has sacrificed a piece in return for two pawns and a strong centre. In such situations, it is often best for the side with the extra piece to sacrifice the piece back for the two pawns. To this end, Black should now continue 10...c6 11 c5 ♕bxd5 12 exd5 ♗xd5, with a good game thanks to the two bishops. However...

10...c5? 11 ♗d3 ♕g4 12 ♘bd2 ♖e7 13 0-0 0-0 14 ♕e5 ♕h5 15 b3 ♘bd7 16 ♗b2 ♕xe5 17 ♕xe5 ♕d7

18 ♘c3 ♕f6 19 ♕ae1 ♕xc3 20 ♕xc3 ♗f6 21 e5!
Not leaving the long diagonal. Instead, 21 ♗h3 is met by 21...♗b2! 22 ♘b1 ♘e2.

21...♖f5 22 f4 ♘g6 23 ♘e4 ♕ab8 24 ♗f3 ♘h7 25 g4 ♕g6 26 f5 ♗b6 27 ♗g3 f6 28 e6 ♘e5 29 h4 ♘h8 30 g5 ♕bc8 31 ♘h1 ♖d8 32 g6 ♘xg6 33 fxg6
The bishop leaves the board, and with it any hope of saving the game for Black.

Kharlov – Tseshkovsky
Rostov 1993

1...♘xd5 2 exd5 ♘xd5 3 c4?
A counter-sacrifice of the queen, but one that has not been calculated to the end. 3 ♕ac1 is stronger, although 3...f5 gives Black active play.

3...♕xe3 4 ♖xe3 e4 5 ♗dxe4 ♖d4 6 ♖xd4 ♗xd4 7 ♗f6+ ♕g7 8 ♗xe8+ ♖xe8 9 ♖xe8 ♖xe8 10 ♗e2 ♘c4 11 ♘xc4 ♖e7 12 ♖f1 ♖e3 0-1

However, not all attempts are successful:
1...\(\text{\texttt{bxd5}}\)?? 2 \(\text{exd5}\) \(\text{\texttt{bxd5}}\)
In the current position this sacrifice looks more like a bluff, but White must nonetheless play very accurately.
3 \(\text{\texttt{e4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{wa8}}\)
On 3...\(\text{\texttt{c3}}\) would come 4 \(\text{\texttt{xc3}}\)!
\(\text{bxc3}\) 5 \(\text{\texttt{xib7}}\) \(\text{cxd2}\) 6 \(\text{\texttt{d1}}\) with the advantage.
4 \(\text{\texttt{xd5}}\)!
It is hard to give up such a bishop, but the d5-knight was very dangerous.
4...\(\text{\texttt{xd5}}\) 5 \(\text{\texttt{de4}}\)!
White threatens \(\text{\texttt{f6+}}\).
5...\(\text{\texttt{e6}}\)
5...\(\text{\texttt{g7}}\) loses to 6 \(\text{\texttt{ed1}}\).
6 \(\text{\texttt{c7}}\) \(\text{\texttt{c6}}\) 7 \(\text{\texttt{e2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{f5}}\)
More resistance is offered by 7...d5,
though after 8 \(\text{\texttt{c5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xc5}}\) 9 \(\text{\texttt{xc5}}\) White still has an advantage.
8 \(\text{\texttt{c1}}\)!
It is necessary to play both logically and energetically, and not the pseudo-active 8 \(\text{\texttt{x5?}}\) \(\text{gxf5}\) 9 \(\text{\texttt{h5}}\), after which 9...\(\text{\texttt{e8}}\) 10 \(\text{\texttt{xf5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{g6}}\) is strong,
and beats off the attack.
Now, 8...fxc4 is decisively met by 9 \(\text{\texttt{g4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{e8}}\) 10 \(\text{\texttt{1xc6}}\).

8...\(\text{\texttt{g7}}\)
Here the simplest of all would be 9 \(\text{\texttt{c4}}\) d5 10 \(\text{\texttt{xa6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xa6}}\) 11 \(\text{\texttt{c5}}\).

The intuitive destruction of the opponent’s centre occurs extremely often in the French Defence.

Movsesian – M. Gurevich
Sarajevo 2000

1...\(\text{\texttt{fxd4}}\)?? 2 \(\text{\texttt{cxd4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xe5}}\) 3 g5 \(\text{\texttt{c5}}\)!
Black favours the immediate attack on f2, rather than giving a pointless check on b4.
4 0-0 \(\text{\texttt{xf3}}\) + 5 \(\text{\texttt{xf3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{b4}}\)!
It appears that the white kingside pawns are ready to fall like ripe fruit.
6 \(\text{\texttt{e1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{hx4}}\) 7 \(\text{\texttt{g2}}\)
At the cost of a pawn, White attempts to construct a defence.
7...\(\text{\texttt{b4}}\) 8 \(\text{\texttt{d3}}\) 0-0-0 9 a3 \(\text{\texttt{b6}}\) 10 \(\text{\texttt{b4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{d4}}\) 11 \(\text{\texttt{e3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{b8}}\) 12 \(\text{\texttt{f3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{xe3}}\)
13 \(\text{\texttt{fxe3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{h8}}\) 14 \(\text{\texttt{g3+}}\) e5 15 \(\text{\texttt{h7}}\)?
White should go in for 15 \(\text{\texttt{ac1}}\) d4
16 \(\text{\texttt{c5}}\) \(\text{\texttt{c6}}\) with a complicated game.
15...d4 16 \(\text{\texttt{e4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{h8}}\)! 17 \(\text{\texttt{gx6}}\) \(\text{\texttt{gf6}}\)
18 \(\text{\texttt{f3}}\) \(\text{\texttt{df8}}\) 19 \(\text{\texttt{exd4}}\) \(\text{\texttt{h3}}\) 20 \(\text{\texttt{d1}}\) \(\text{\texttt{f5}}\)!
21 \(\text{\texttt{d2}}\) \(\text{\texttt{f8}}\) 22 \(\text{\texttt{f4}}\)?
In a difficult position White defends badly. Better is 22 \( \text{d}d5 \text{w}d6 \) 23 \( \text{c}c4 \) \( f4 \).

22...\( \text{fxe}4 \) 23 \( \text{d}xh3 \) \( \text{d}xh3 \) 24 \( \text{w}h2 \) \( \text{w}xd4+ \) 25 \( \text{w}h1 \) \( e3 \) 0-1

8...\( \text{exd}4 \) 9 \( \text{d}x\text{d}4 \) \( \text{d}d5 \) 10 \( \text{xe}6 \)
\( \text{xh}2+ \) 11 \( \text{xh}2 \) \( \text{w}c7+ \) 12 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{f}6 \)
13 \( \text{d}d6 \) 1-0

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

**Nevednichy – Gligorić**  
*Yugoslavia 2000*

1...\( \text{d}4\text{xd}5?! \) 2 \( \text{exd}5 \) \( \text{d}x\text{d}5 \) 3 \( \text{e}4! \)  
White sacrifices the exchange to seize the central light squares.

3...\( \text{e}6 \) 4 \( \text{d}d3 \) \( \text{xb}4 \) 5 \( \text{d}d2 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 6 \( \text{c}e5 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 7 \( \text{dxe}6+ \) \( \text{fxe}6 \) (D)

**Diagram**

8 \( \text{xd}4! \)  
White's counterplay enables him to regain the initiative.

Here Black is prepared to sacrifice a piece in return for a pawn-centre that restricts the movement of the opponent's pieces.

1...\( \text{c}6! \) 2 \( \text{exf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 3 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 4 \( \text{w}d2 \)  
A much quieter plan is 4 \( \text{e}2 \) 0-0 5 0-0 \( \text{e}8 \) 6 \( \text{d}2 \) \( b5 \) 7 \( a3 \) \( a5 \) 8 \( \text{d}d4 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 9 \( \text{ae}1 \) \( b4 \) 10 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{e}4 \) with a powerful position for Black (Morozevich).

4...0-0 5 0-0 \( b5 \) 6 \( \text{e}5 \) \( b4 \) 7 \( \text{e}2 \)  
\( \text{w}a5 \) 8 \( \text{b}1 \)

After 8 \( \text{xc}4 \) dxc4 9 \( \text{w}xd6 \) \( \text{xa}2 \) 10 \( \text{xb}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \) the game is very unclear.

8...\( \text{xe}5! \)

Eliminating White's most active piece.

9 \( \text{fxe}5 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 10 \( \text{e}1 \) \( c3! \) 11 \( b3 \) \( c2+ \) 12 \( \text{xc}2 \) \( \text{xa}2+ \) 13 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{a}3+ \) 14 \( \text{c}2 \)  
\( \text{f}5 \) 15 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{c}5+ \) 16 \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{a}2+ \) 0-1
7 Queen Sacrifices

We identify an intuitive queen sacrifice as one where there is insufficient material compensation and no direct threats exist. The difficulty of playing with an inadequate balance of forces lies in the fact that even if it is more or less possible to demonstrate compensation, then it is significantly more difficult to anticipate the development of events on the board.

Mikhailchishin – Pavasović

*Nova Gorica 1999*

Although the first part of the game has definite theoretical significance, we will not be looking at this here (see page 149 for some discussion of this opening line). We will begin our detailed analysis of the position from the point where the queen was sacrificed.

1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 Cc3 Cc6 4 e3 Cf6 5 
Cd3 Cbd7 6 wC2 Cc6 7 e4 Cxe4 8 
Cxe4 dxe4 9 wxe4 e5 10 dxe5 0-0 11 
exd6 Be8 12 wxe8+ wxe8+ 13 Ce3

(D)

For the queen White has a rook, bishop and pawn but also has problems with his development and king safety. However, I maintain that the d6-pawn is White’s main weapon as it will restrain the black pieces for much of the game. In my opinion White should have a good game, although according to Sveshnikov, the advantage lies with Black.

13...b5? 

A novelty. The game Mikhailchishin-Flear, Mexico U-26 Wch 1980 continued 13...Ce5 14 0-0-0 Cxf3 15 
xg3 g6 16 d3 wE5 17 wh1 g6 18 
f4! wF6 19 f5! (a pawn sacrifice to 
eliminate the blockading d7-bishop) 19...b6 20 Cc2 wH4 21 Cc1 c5 22 
Cg5 wF2 23 fxg6 hxg6 24 Cdf1 wD4 
25 Ce7 a5 26 h4! (the decisive pawn 
advance, attacking g6) 26...Cg4 27 
Cf6 wC4 28 h5! gh5? 29 d7 with a 
decisive advantage for White.

The text-move is more dangerous, as the white king may come under attack.

14 0-0-0 

14 Cxb5? is bad due to 14...Cb7 15 
0-0-0Cc8 with counterplay, but 14 
Cd1!? deserves consideration.

14...Cf6
14...\textit{b}b6 is no better in view of 15 c5 \textit{d}d5 16 \textit{d}d2.

15 \textit{d}d4!

A difficult move. It is necessary to remove the blockaders of the d6-pawn. 15 \textit{d}d3 can be met by 15...\textit{e}e6 16 c5 \textit{xa}2 17 \textit{he}1 \textit{wd}8 18 \textit{d}d4 \textit{wa}5, and 15 \textit{b}b1 by 15...\textit{e}e6 16 c5 \textit{d}d5 17 \textit{d}d2 \textit{f}5+ 18 \textit{a}1 \textit{e}4 followed by 19...\textit{wa}4.

15...\textit{e}e6 16 \textit{xf}6? !

Also interesting is 16 c5!? \textit{xa}2 17 \textit{d}d3 and 18 \textit{he}1. 

16...\textit{gxf}6 (D)

This strong prophylactic move prepares the exchange of bishops, which further increases the significance of the d6-pawn.

20...\textit{wa}5

20...\textit{wd}7 21 \textit{d}d3 is also no improvement for Black.

21 \textit{b}3! \textit{wd}8

What else is there to do?

22 \textit{c}4 \textit{e}4+ 23 \textit{a}1 \textit{wd}7 24 \textit{f}3 \textit{f}5 25 \textit{d}d4 \textit{e}8 26 \textit{he}1 \textit{e}5

Trying to cover the hole on e7 one way or another.

27 \textit{x}e5 \textit{fxe}5 28 \textit{xf}5 \textit{xf}5 29 \textit{d}d1 \textit{wd}7 30 \textit{b}5! 1-0

Since White had forced open a path for the d6-pawn.

17 c5!

It is clear that a protected passed pawn is doubly strong, while who needs the a2-pawn?

17...b4?

Also unsatisfactory is 17...\textit{xa}2 18 \textit{d}3 \textit{d}5 19 \textit{he}1 \textit{wd}8 20 \textit{e}4!.

18 \textit{b}1!

Not 18 \textit{d}d3 \textit{xa}2 19 \textit{he}1 \textit{wd}8 20 \textit{d}d4 \textit{wa}5.

18...\textit{wd}8

After 18...b3 19 a3 \textit{f}5+ 20 \textit{d}d3 \textit{x}d3+ 21 \textit{xd}3 \textit{e}4 22 \textit{hd}1 White has a large advantage.

19 \textit{d}d4 \textit{d}5 20 \textit{c}1!

Najdorf – Ragozin

Saltsjöbaden T7 1948

1...\textit{xe}4! 2 \textit{xf}6+ \textit{xf}6 3 \textit{xd}8 \textit{fx}d8 4 \textit{d}2 \textit{e}4!

At first sight it appears that Black has no compensation for the queen. However, the white pieces are totally unable to achieve coordination.

5 \textit{e}3 \textit{d}6! 6 \textit{c}1 \textit{f}5 7 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}5!
Preparing the very unpleasant ...e5.
8 \text{c}4 \text{xc}4 9 \text{xc}4 e5 10 \text{g}5
The only way to hold back Black's initiative is 10 \text{xc}6 bxc6 11 \text{xe}5 but Black still holds the advantage.
10...	ext{d}d1+ 11 \text{h}2 h6 12 \text{c}1 \text{d}7
13 \text{e}3 e4 14 \text{e}1 \text{ad}8 15 \text{c}5
\text{e}5+ 16 g3
16 \text{g}1 is strongly answered by 16...\text{d}2.
16...	ext{d}2 17 \text{c}2 \text{f}xg3+! 18 \text{g}2
\text{e}5
18...\text{xf}2 is also good, but it is better to play carefully.
19 \text{f}1 \text{xc}2
19...	ext{d}1 is even stronger, keeping the rooks on the board.
20 \text{xc}2 \text{d}1+ 21 \text{e}2 \text{b}1 22 \text{b}4
\text{b}2 23 \text{d}1 \text{b}1+ 24 \text{d}2 \text{f}6 25
\text{xa}7 \text{e}5 26 \text{a}4
The first queen move since arriving on a3.
26...\text{f}3+ 27 \text{e}2 \text{g}1+ 0-1

Next we shall examine a famous sacrifice of a queen for just two minor pieces.

\textbf{1 \text{xf}6!}

The strategic basis of this sacrifice lies in both Black's backward development, and in the dark-square weaknesses around his king.
1...	ext{e}2+!

The best move. By drawing the white knight away from the centre, Black wins an important tempo with which to organize a defence. 1...	ext{xb}3 does not work due to 2 axb3! \text{xa}1 3 \text{xe}7 \text{a}5 4 \text{h}6 \text{d}8 5 \text{d}5!.
2 \text{xe}2 \text{xf}6 3 \text{c}3 \text{e}8

Before us we have a typical example of an intuitive sacrifice, at the forefront of which intuition and imagination are instantly recognizable and allow us to appreciate the wealth and beauty of creativity in chess more profoundly. Straight after the game, commentary appeared in the press demonstrating the incorrectness of the sacrifice. Criticizing Black's last move, 3...d5! was suggested, believing it to lead to a black advantage. It is beyond doubt that this move is logically motivated.

It is equally beyond doubt that the move actually played also has a specific purpose. Perhaps if Chernikov had chosen 3...d5 instead of 3...\text{e}8 and still lost, then analysis would have appeared all the same demonstrating that 3...\text{e}8 was the best move.

In any case, Nezhmetdinov wished that he could have played this position again, this time against one of those people believing Black to be better. All the more so, as they had only reckoned on 4 \text{xd}5 whereas Nezhmetdinov had intended to play the surprising 4

\textbf{Nezhmetdinov – Chernikov}
\textit{USSR 1962}
\[ \text{\texttt{Queen Sacrifices}} \]

\[ \text{\texttt{d4!}} \]. Moreover, during our calculations we came to the conclusion that 4 \texttt{cxd5} leads to a position where Black’s game is far more difficult than White’s.

4 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{cxd5 \texttt{e6}}} \texttt{5 \texttt{\texttt{d4}}} \texttt{\texttt{g7}}} \texttt{6 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{ad1 d6}}} 7 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d3}}} \texttt{d7} 8 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f3}}} (D) \]

![](image)

The rook also focuses in on the critical \texttt{f6}-square. The position hinges on one thing — whether White manages to break through on this square.

8...\texttt{\texttt{b5}} 9 \texttt{\texttt{c3}} \texttt{\texttt{d8}} 10 \texttt{\texttt{xg6! \texttt{\texttt{e2}}} \texttt{\texttt{e2}}}

After 10...\texttt{xf1} White wins by 11 \texttt{\texttt{g4+ \texttt{g8}}} 12 \texttt{\texttt{xe6}}.

11 \texttt{\texttt{xh7+! \texttt{g8}}}

If Black takes the knight then White finishes the game with the following attractive attack: 11...\texttt{\texttt{xh7}} 12 \texttt{\texttt{xf7+ \texttt{h6}}} 13 \texttt{\texttt{xe6 \texttt{xf1}}} 14 \texttt{\texttt{d2+ g5}} 15 \texttt{\texttt{f5 \texttt{h8}}} (15...\texttt{\texttt{g8}} 16 \texttt{\texttt{f6+ \texttt{h5}}} 17 \texttt{\texttt{g4+ \texttt{h4}}} 18\texttt{ \texttt{h6#}}) 16 \texttt{\texttt{h4!}]

12 \texttt{\texttt{h3 \texttt{e5}}}

White was threatening \texttt{\texttt{g5}} with a devastating position.

13 \texttt{\texttt{f4! \texttt{xf1}}} 14 \texttt{\texttt{xf1 \texttt{c8}}} 15 \texttt{\texttt{d4!}}

A bishop like this should not be exchanged for a mere rook.

15...\texttt{\texttt{b5}} 16 \texttt{\texttt{g5 \texttt{c7}}} 17 \texttt{\texttt{xf7+ \texttt{xf7}}} 18 \texttt{\texttt{h8+! \texttt{xh8}}} 19 \texttt{\texttt{xf7+ \texttt{h7}}} 20 \texttt{\texttt{xh8 \texttt{\texttt{e4}}} 21 \texttt{\texttt{c6 \texttt{xf4+}}} 22 \texttt{\texttt{e2}}

1-0

![](image)

\texttt{Bönsch — Gufeld}

telex 1978

1...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d3+!}!} 2 \texttt{\texttt{b4}}}}}

Taking the queen is bad: 2 \texttt{\texttt{xd3 \texttt{exd3}}} 3 \texttt{\texttt{xc1 \texttt{dxc2}}} 4 \texttt{\texttt{d6 \texttt{d3}}} and the c2-pawn will decide the game.

2...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xe3 \texttt{f3+ \texttt{e6}}}! 4 \texttt{\texttt{d6 \texttt{e7}}} 5 \texttt{\texttt{g4}}}}

After 5 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xe4} \texttt{\texttt{xb3}}}} all White’s pawns are weak.

5...\texttt{\texttt{a5}} 6 \texttt{\texttt{c2 \texttt{h5}}}! 7 \texttt{\texttt{d4 \texttt{d4}}} 8 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d4 \texttt{hxg4}}} 9 \texttt{\texttt{hxg4 \texttt{h4}}} 10 \texttt{\texttt{xe4 \texttt{f5}}} 11 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d6 \texttt{h3}}} 12 \texttt{\texttt{f3 \texttt{e6}}} 13 \texttt{\texttt{f2 \texttt{c7}}} and Black won.
8 Pawn Sacrifices

These sacrifices, as mentioned earlier, are very difficult to assess, due to the lack of immediate threats. Usually one element is quite obvious, but the problem is how to develop and exploit it.

Attacking on the Dark (or Light) Squares

This subject is particularly relevant in the case of opposite-coloured bishops when the opponent is not only unable to contend with the enemy bishop but is also powerless to take part in the defense of his own weaknesses.

1...d4!! 2 exd4
It was better to decline the sacrifice and continue 2...e4, but Korchnoi is renowned for not believing in intuitive pawn sacrifices and he instinctively takes anything on offer.

2...e8+ 3 f1
After 3 e2 b4+ 4 c3 f5 5 b2 xc3+ 6 xc3 c8 the threat of 7 c2 is unpleasant.

3...a5 4 d1 b4 5 c1 d7 6 a3
It is clear that 6 xb7? is bad due to 6...xc3 7 xc3 b5+, forking the king and bishop.

6...xc3 7 xc3 d5! 8 xd5
Not 8 c5 b5+! with an easy win for Black.

8...xd5 9 a4!?
Fighting for the light squares.

9...ae8!
A very determined move. Black exchanges his passive rook for White’s active one, while now the difference in the respective bishops becomes clear – White’s has no prospects whatsoever.

10 f3 xc3 11 xc3 e3! 12 a1
Or 12 d2 xf3+!! 13 xf3 g1 h3, and Black wins thanks to his light-square domination.

12...xb3 13 f2 xa4!
Black’s light-square initiative has reaped rewards on precisely those squares!

14 e1 f6 15 wc1 c6 16 ff4 h5
17 h4 a3 18 g3 a2 19 c3 ff7!
20 ff5 cc7+ 0-1
PAWN SACRIFICES

Kamsky – Kasparov
Manila OL 1992

1...\(\text{f4!}\)

In such positions this pawn sacrifice simply suggests itself. Even without calculating any variations, one can sense that the opening of the g7-bishop’s diagonal is worth a pawn.

2 \(\text{c2}\) b5 3 \(\text{f2}\) \(\text{d7}\) 4 \(\text{ge2}\) b4 5 \(\text{a4}\) a5! 6 \(\text{xf4}\)

White has tried his utmost to avoid exchanging the f4-knight, but to endure its presence on this square indefinitely is too much.

6...exf4 7 \(\text{xf4}\) \(\text{e5}\) 8 0-0-0 \(\text{c4}\) 9 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{xe3}\) 10 \(\text{xe3}\) (D)

Black won shortly.

Eliskases – Stein
Mar del Plata 1966

1...\(\text{d4!}\) 2 \(\text{xd4}\)

It is probably better to decline the pawn sacrifice and play to exchange the knight by 2 \(\text{ce2}\!)?.

2...\(\text{xd4}\) 3 \(\text{ce2}\) d3! 4 \(\text{xd3}\) b5!

 Attacking on all fronts.

5 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{f5}\)!!

Targeting the main weakness – the e4-pawn.

6 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{xe4}\)!! 7 \(\text{ge2}\)

If White accepts the sacrifice, then Black generates irresistible threats: 7 fxe4 \(\text{xe4}\) 8 \(\text{ge2}\) \(\text{wa5}\).+.

7...\(\text{b7}\) 8 \(\text{d5}\) \(\text{xd5}\) 9 \(\text{xd5}\) \(\text{xd5}\)

Black won shortly.
White has sacrificed a pawn in return for dark-square weaknesses around the black king, but how to exploit this is not straightforward.

1 \( \text{\textit{d}} \text{e}5 \text{\textit{e}}6 \text{\textit{c}}4 \text{\textit{b}}6 \)

Lputian decides to capture everything, but it is also possible to use the knight to defend.

3 \( \text{\textit{w}} \text{e}1 \text{\textit{d}} \text{bxc}4 \text{\textit{w}} \text{c}3! \text{\textit{f}}6 \)

4...\( \text{\textit{d}} \text{xe}5 \) loses to 5 \( \text{\textit{w}} \text{xe}5 \).

5 \( \text{\textit{a}} \text{f}e1! \text{\textit{a}} \text{c}8 \)

5...\( \text{\textit{f}} \text{xe}5 \) is met by 6 \( \text{\textit{a}} \text{xe}5! \) breaking through to g7.

6 \( \text{\textit{a}} \text{d}a1 \text{\textit{w}} \text{b}6 \) 7 \( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}7! \text{\textit{w}} \text{b}2 \) 8 \( \text{\textit{w}} \text{d}3 \text{\textit{a}} \text{f}7 \) 9 \( \text{\textit{a}} \text{c}2 \text{\textit{a}} \text{a}3? \)

9...\( \text{\textit{w}} \text{b}5! \) 10 \( \text{\textit{a}} \text{d}e1 \text{\textit{c}} \text{c}6 \) leads to unclear play.

10 \( \text{\textit{w}} \text{d}4 \)

All the time threatening a blow on f6.

10...\( \text{\textit{w}} \text{d}6 \) 11 \( \text{\textit{w}} \text{a}1 \text{\textit{w}} \text{a}6 \) 12 \( \text{\textit{a}} \text{xe}7! \)

Now White crashes through on the dark squares all the same.

12...\( \text{\textit{a}} \text{xe}7 \) 13 \( \text{\textit{a}} \text{xf}6+ \text{\textit{h}} \text{h}8 \) 14 \( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}7+ \text{\textit{e}}5 \) 15 \( \text{\textit{a}} \text{xe}5 \text{\textit{g}} \text{g}8 \)

15...\( \text{\textit{w}} \text{f}6 \) fails to 16 \( \text{\textit{d}} \text{xg}6+ \).

16 \( \text{\textit{c}} \text{c}6! \) 1-0

In some cases we see a combination of a weak complex of squares and an exposed king.

1 \( \text{\textit{a}} \text{xd}7 \)

White goes for the pawn, for after 1 0-0 Black replies 1...\( \text{\textit{c}} \text{c}4 \) with an excellent game.

1...\( \text{\textit{w}} \text{xd}7 \) 2 \( \text{\textit{d}} \text{xc}5 \text{\textit{b}} \text{xc}5 \) 3 \( \text{\textit{a}} \text{xc}5 \text{\textit{w}} \text{h}3! \)

In the words of Igor Zaitsev, Black’s threat along the f1-h3 diagonal is a ‘wild boar’.

4 \( \text{\textit{w}} \text{d}3 \)

Possibly 4 \( \text{\textit{w}} \text{d}4 \) is better.

4...\( \text{\textit{a}} \text{ac}8 \) 5 \( \text{\textit{a}} \text{xc}8 \)

5 \( \text{\textit{b}} \text{b}4 \) is unpleasantly met by 5...\( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}4! \).

5...\( \text{\textit{a}} \text{xc}8 \) 6 \( \text{\textit{w}} \text{b}5? \)

The only chance was to play 6 \( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}2! \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}4 \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}1 \), bringing the rook into play.

6...\( \text{\textit{a}} \text{c}6 \) 7 \( \text{\textit{w}} \text{d}3 \text{\textit{a}} \text{a}4! \)

Cutting off the white king’s exit to d2.

8 \( \text{\textit{w}} \text{e}3 \) \( \text{\textit{h}} \text{h}6! \) 9 \( \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}4 \text{\textit{w}} \text{g}2 \) 10 \( \text{\textit{f}} \text{f}1 \text{\textit{d}} \text{d}7! \)

Such a mobile bishop: ...\( \text{\textit{h}} \text{h}3 \) is now threatened.
11 \( \text{Qf3} \)
On 11 \( f3 \) comes 11...\( \text{h3} \) 12 \( \text{g1} \)
\( \text{xc1+!} \) 13 \( \text{xc1} \) \( \text{g1}+ \), winning.
11...\( \text{d4!} \) 12 \( \text{f4} \) \( g5 \) 13 \( \text{xg5} \)
After 13 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{e8} \) White is running
seriously short of moves.
13...\( \text{hxg5} \) 14 \( \text{xg5}+ \) \( \text{f8} \) 15 \( \text{h6+} \)
\( \text{e8} \) 16 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 17 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{wh2} \) 18
\( \text{b8+} \) \( \text{e7} \) 19 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c2+} \)
White resigned a few moves later.

A typical pawn sacrifice in the
King's Indian Defence

\[ \text{Gheorghiu - Kasparov} \]
\text{Thessaloniki OL 1988} \]

1...\( \text{e4!} \) 2 \( \text{xh5} \) \( \text{xh5} \) 3 \( \text{fxe4} \) \( \text{f4}! \) 4
\( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{g4!} \)
Provoking a weakening of the g3-
square. Usually such sacrifices in-
volve the activation of the g7-bishop
together with a blockading strategy.
5 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 6 0-0-0 \( \text{e5} \) 7 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{f6} \)
8 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{g3!} \)
Now the play will take place on the
dark squares.
9 \( \text{xg3} \) \( \text{xg3} \) 10 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{ac8} \) 11 \( \text{e2} \)
\( \text{g6} \) 12 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{xc1+} \) 13 \( \text{xc1} \)
If 13 \( \text{xc1} \) then 13...\( \text{xh3}! \).

\[ \text{Miroshnichenko - Ovseevich} \]
\text{Donetsk Z 1997} \]

1 g4!
This move has the aim of not just
securing the strong central position of
the white knight, but also restricts
Black's counterplay through the ...f5
break.
1...\( \text{xb2} \) 2 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{d8} \) 3 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{xa2} \)
4 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{b6} \) 5 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{a1+} \) 6 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{a7} \)
Black attempts to exchange White's
most active piece, though the knight
will become an even stronger attack-
ing piece.
7 \text{x}a7 \text{xe}7 8 \text{xc}2! \text{wd}4 9 \text{f}5 \text{wb}4 10 \text{d}6! (D)

The powerful knight controls the centre, and now White just needs to launch an attack on the kingside.
5...\text{wh}4 6 \text{we}2 \text{xf}8 7 \text{ff}1 (D)

White’s play has created a powerful central passed pawn, which makes Black’s game difficult.
10...\text{g}6 11 \text{e}7+ \text{g}7 12 \text{c}6! \text{d}2 13 \text{d}7 \text{g}5 14 \text{d}5 \text{e}8 15 \text{f}6 \text{h}5 16 \text{c}8 \text{b}6? 17 \text{e}8+
White is much better.

Two excellent prophylactic moves, preventing ...\text{wh}3 after \text{g}3 by White.
7...\text{ac}8 8 \text{g}3 \text{g}5 9 \text{h}4 \text{wh}6 10 \text{g}4 \text{g}5 11 \text{hxg}5 \text{wh}5 12 \text{h}5 \text{g}6 13 \text{g}5! \text{h}6 14 \text{fxh}6! \text{xg}5 15 \text{h}5 1-0

\text{Boleslavsky} – \text{Lisitsyn}
\text{USSR Ch (Leningrad) 1956}

In this position White has just sacrificed a pawn.
1 \text{c}3 \text{b}3 2 \text{xc}4 \text{xc}4 3 \text{g}5 \text{e}6 4 \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 5 \text{d}5

\text{Pilnik} – \text{Geller}
\text{Gothenburg IZ 1955}

1...\text{e}4! 2 \text{xf}6 \text{xf}6 3 \text{f}xe4 \text{f}4!
This sacrifice is typical in King’s Indian positions (for Black) and Modern Benoni positions (for White). A
knight in the centre is much more significant than the sacrificed pawn.

4 \(\text{Hf2} \text{c5} 5 \text{Hd1} \text{h4} 6 \text{d1} \text{f7} 7 \text{c2} \text{g5} 8 \text{c3} \text{Haf8!} 9 \text{h3} (D) 9 \text{xa4} \text{is met by 9...g4.}

\[\text{White has a huge advantage.}\]

9...h5 10 \(\text{e2} \text{g4!} 11 \text{xf4} \text{xf4} 12 \text{xf4} \text{xf4} 13 \text{g3} \text{f3+} 14 \text{f2} \text{w+xh3} 15 \text{gxf4} \text{g3+!} 16 \text{xf3} \text{g2+} 17 \text{xf2} \text{w+h2} 0-1

\[\text{Botvinnik – Pomar} \]
\[\text{Varna OL 1962}\]

1 \(\text{Hfc1!}\)

White’s plan consists of taking control of d5 by playing c4.

1...f5

If 1...b5, then 2 a4! a6 3 \(\text{d1} \text{Hd1} \text{gives Black problems defending along the d- and a-files.}\)

2 \text{c4} \text{fxc4} 3 \text{c3} \text{f5}

After 3...\(\text{xc4}\) comes 4 \(\text{d1} \text{d5} 5 \text{b3} \text{b5} 6 \text{bxc4} \text{bxc4} 7 \text{g5!} \text{f6} 8 \text{xf6} \text{xf6} 9 \text{c2}, \text{when Black has no compensation for the piece.}\)

4 \(\text{xe4} \text{xe3}\)

If 4...\(\text{d4}\), then 5 \text{c5!} d5 6 \text{g5} \text{f7} 7 \text{f4! with an attack.}\)

5 \(\text{wxe3} \text{h6} 6 \text{d1} \text{fd8}\)

Not 6...\(\text{xc4}\) due to 7 \(\text{ac1}\) with a pin.

7 \(\text{ac1} \text{ac8} 8 \text{b3} \text{b6} 9 \text{c3!} \text{we7}\)

If 9...\(\text{h7}\) then 10 \(\text{e4!}\) followed by \(\text{b5}, \text{w3}\) and h4-h5; Black has no chances in this position.

10 \(\text{d5} \text{h7} 11 \text{xe6} \text{we6} 12 \text{d3} \text{ac7} 13 \text{ed1} \text{f7}\)
To offset the attack on d6, Black starts an attack down the f-file. However, his light squares are already too weak.

14  e4  f8  15  d5  g4  16  d3  e7  17  xd6

White has a decisive advantage.

To Activate One's Pieces

In these instances the player who has sacrificed the pawn obtains strong squares for his pieces in the centre of the board, which then transforms into an attack on the enemy king.

1  d5!  exd5  2  xd5  xd5  3  cxd5  xd5

Here it was possible to work out the variation 3... xd5 4  e5  xf3  5  xc7  xe2  6  d8+  d8  7  xd8  xd8  8  e1 winning the e2-bishop since if it moves there is 9  e8#.

4  e1  f8  5  e5  d6  6  bc1  c6

6...  d8 puts up stubborn resistance although White has the initiative after 7  xd6  xd6  8  e5!.  

7  a1  d7  8  h4!  g5  9  ed1  c7  10  d2  e7  (D)

11  d7!  xd7  12  xd7  b4

12...  f8  13  d5  d8  14  e5 gives White the advantage.

13  ed1  a5?

13...  a8 is a better defence.

14  e3!  xg2  15  xb4  1-0

A. Sokolov – Li Zunian
Biel IZ 1985

Kramnik – Vaganian
Horgen 1995

1  c5  bxc5  2  c4  e7  3  dxc5  xc5

4  b4  d6  5  b2

The initiative is more important than material here – 5  b6  axb6  6  xa8  c5 gives Black excellent play.
5...\(\text{\&}c7\) 6 \(\text{\&}f d1\) c5 7 bxc5 \(\text{\&}x c5\) 8 \(\text{\&}a c1\) \(\text{\&}e 7\) 9 \(\text{\&}b5\)!

All the white pieces are active, and the queen threatens to penetrate to b7.

9...\(\text{\&}b 6\) 10 a4 \(\text{\&}c 5\) 11 \(\text{\&}d 4!\)

Exchanging off Black's only active piece!

11...\(\text{\&}x d 4\)

11...\(\text{\&}d 7\) is bad due to 12 \(\text{\&}x g 7!\), when White wins.

12 \(\text{\&}x d 4\) a6 13 \(\text{\&}b 6\) \(\text{\&}a 7\) 14 \(\text{\&}d 6\) \(\text{\&}d 7\) 15 \(\text{\&}c 8!!\)

This exchange highlights Black's problem with the b8-knight.

15...\(\text{\&}x c 8\) 16 \(\text{\&}x c 8\) \(\text{\&}a 3\) 17 \(\text{\&}x e 6+\) \(\text{\&}f 8\) 18 \(\text{\&}x f 5+\) \(\text{\&}e 8\) 19 \(\text{\&}e 6+\) \(\text{\&}d 8\) 20 \(\text{\&}b 6+\) \(\text{\&}e 8\) 21 \(\text{\&}d 6+\) 1-0

---

3...b4 4 \(\text{\&}a d 1\) \(\text{\&}c 4\)

4...\(\text{\&}c 5\) seems to offer greater resistance, but after 5 \(\text{\&}e 5\) \(\text{\&}c 6\) 6 \(\text{\&}g 3\) bxc3 7 \(\text{\&}h 6\) White has a very strong attack.

5 \(\text{\&}d 3\) \(\text{\&}c 6\) 6 \(\text{\&}e 4\) \(\text{\&}d 5\) 7 \(\text{\&}e 5\) f5 8 \(\text{\&}g 3\) \(\text{\&}f 7\) 9 \(\text{\&}d 2!\)

An excellent plan. White re-routes the knight to the weakened squares d4 and e5.

9...\(\text{\&}b 7\) 10 \(\text{\&}f 3\) \(\text{\&}c 5\) 11 \(\text{\&}d 4\) \(\text{\&}b 6?\)

11...\(\text{\&}b 7\) is much better. Now we see a short combination in the style of Capablanca.

12 \(\text{\&}x f 5!\) exf5 13 \(\text{\&}c 4\) \(\text{\&}f 6\) 14 \(\text{\&}c 7\) 1-0

**Breaking down a blockade**

Here we see an attempt, using typical pawn sacrifices, to break through a firm blockade.

---

1 h5! \(\text{\&}x f 3\) 2 \(\text{\&}x f 3\)

Not, of course, 2 \(\text{\&}x f 3?\), when the white pawns on d4, f3 and h5 become weaknesses.

2...\(\text{\&}x d 4\) 3 \(\text{\&}f 4\)

What does White have for the pawn? The bishop-pair, two centralized rooks and the threat of h6.

---

1 g4! fxg4 2 \(\text{\&} f 6!\)

Threatening a bishop sacrifice on g6.

2...\(\text{\&}x f 6\) 3 exf6 \(\text{\&}c 7\) 4 \(\text{\&} g 2\)

Bringing the queen into play and sacrificing yet another pawn.
4...gxh3 5 \w g5 \w f7 6 e4 \w f8?! 
Black should prefer 6...dxe4 7 \a xe4 \e d8, since after 8 \w xb5 \a d5 9 \a xd5 \w xd5! 10 f7+ \w f8 White is struggling to draw.

7 e5 \w h8 8 \w h1 \g g8 9 a3 a5 10 \a c2 \w e8 11 \w f4 \w f7 12 \w h4 \a d7

White has a draw by simply repeating the position but instead plays for the win. To achieve this he needs to break the blockade.

13 \w f4!? \a e6?

The energetic 13...b4 is necessary.

14 \w f1! \w b8 15 \a d1 b4 16 axb4 axb4 17 exb4 \w b4 18 \g g4!

Lifting the blockade through exchanges.

18...\w b7 19 \a xe6 \w xe6 20 \w h6 \w f7 21 \a a1 \w c8 22 \w e3! \g g8 23 \w f3 \w e6 24 \a a8+ \w f8 25 \w a3! \w xa8 26 \w xa8+ \w f7 27 \w a7+ \w e8 28 \w xh7

White has a decisive advantage.

Bronstein – Beliavsky
USSR Ch (Erevan) 1975

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 \a c3 dxe4 4 \a xe4 \a f5 5 \a c5 \w b6 6 g4! \g g6 7 f4 e6 8 \w e2 \a e7 9 h4! h5 10 f5! exf5 11 g5! (D)

An interesting idea. The pawn sacrifice cuts off the black bishop, which will scarcely be able to return to play.

11...\a d7 12 \b b3 \w c7 13 \a h3 0-0-0

It was perhaps better first to give check on g3, and only then to castle.

14 \w f4 \a d6 15 \w h2 \a f8 16 0-0-0 \a e6 17 \a xd6 \a xd6 18 \a c4 \a e7 19 \a f4 \a xf4 20 \w xf4 \a dd8 21 \w xc7+!

Even in the endgame White continues to play against the g6-bishop.

21...\w xc7 22 c3 \a he8 23 \w c5 \w c8 24 \a d3 \a d6 25 \a b3 \a e3 26 \w f4 \a de8 27 \a hg1 \a 8e7 28 \a df1 \a e4 29 \a d1 \a d6 30 \a f3 c5 31 dxc5+ \a xc5 32 \a g2 \a d3 33 \a f4 \a d8 34 \a d1 \a ed7 35 \a xd7 \a xd7 36 \a d1!

By exchanging rooks, White increases his advantage in the quality of the remaining active pieces.

36...\a xd1+ 37 \a xd1 \a d6 38 \w c2 a5 39 a4 \w b6 40 \a d3 \c 7 41 \a d4 \a c8 42 b4!

White has a won ending.

Bologan – Ye Jiangchuan
Beijing 2000

1 e5! \a xe5 2 f4 \a d6
After 2...\textwxd4 3 \textwxd4 \textbxd6 4 h5
d4 5 \textbxe4 dxe4 6 \textwxe2 the d4-bishop
is very strong.
3 g5 e5 4 fxe5 \textwxe5 5 g6!
White has gained a great deal of
time and now opens up the black king.
5...\textbxd6
After 5...hxg6 6 h5 gxh5 7 \textbxd5 g6
(if 7...\textf6 then 8 \texta7+! \textbxa7 9 \textbxd1
with a winning advantage) 8 \textw2g2 \textg7
9 \textxe6! fxg6 10 \textwxe6 White has a
very strong attack.
6 \textxf7+ \textwxf7 7 \textwxf1 \textbxd7
Taking the pawn is risky: 7...\textw5 8
\texte2 \textwxe4 9 \textf3 \textf6 10 \textxe5 \textxe5
11 \textd4 \texte7 12 \textxg7 with a danger-
ous attack.
8 \textf3 \textf6 9 \textg5 \textc4
After 9...\texth6 10 \textxf6! gx\textf6 11 \texth7!
Black has problems.
10 \textxh7+ \textg8 11 \textw2! \textw8 12
\textxf6! gx\textf6 13 \textd4! \textc6 14 \textf2 \textw8
15 \textd3 \textd7 16 \textw5 \texte7 17 \texth7
\textc8 18 \texth5 \textf7 19 \textg6 1-0

To activate one's pieces and
seize the initiative

Kramnik – Svidler
Dortmund 1998

1 h3!
An exceptionally energetic move.
1...exd4
1...\textf6 2 fxe5 \textxe4+ 3 \texte3 gives
White the advantage.
2 h\textxg4 g5!?
Black desperately seeks counter-
play. 2...d3 3 \textc3 is good for White.
3 g3! \textxg4 4 e5!
White has sacrificed a pawn in re-
turn for a powerful centre and to lock
the g7-bishop out of the game. A very deep piece of analysis by Kramnik.
4...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}xe2}}\) 5 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xe2}}\text{\textit{\textbf{f}c8}}}\) 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}ad1}}\)
Stronger than 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}ac1}}\). \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc1}}}\) 7 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc1}}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{gxf4}}}\) 8 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xf4}}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}6}}\).
6...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}c3}}\) 7 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}d3}}\)!
Blocking the rook’s scope and preparing to advance his pawns.
7...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}ac8}}\) 8 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}d6}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}5}}\)
Or 8...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xd}3}}\) 9 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xd}3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}c3+}}}\) 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xd}4}}\)
\(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}xg3}}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}7}}\), when White wins.
9 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc}3!}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc}3}}\) 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}e6}}\)!
The decisive breakthrough.
10...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{xf}8}}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}7+}}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}e8}}\) 12 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}xf7+}}}\) 1-0

5...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}f3!}}\) 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}e3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}f6}}\) 7 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}d7}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}f8}}\)
7...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{bd}8}}\) is bad due to 8 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}3}}\).
8 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{h}ed3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xd}7}}\) 9 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{exc7}}\text{\textit{\textbf{e}e8}}}\) 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}e4}}\)
\(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}f3}}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}d4+}}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}8}}\) 12 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}5}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}5}}\)!
12...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}f6}}\) is met by 13 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}d2}}\).
13 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}xf3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{cxd4}}}\) 14 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc8}}}\) 15 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xd}4}}\)
15 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}5}}\) is even better.
15...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}6}}\)
After 15...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{c}c7}}\) 16 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}d8}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}8}}\) 17 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{b}b5}}\)
Black has problems.
16 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xa}7}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}xg4}}\)
Now 17 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}d7}}\) and 18 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}d6}}\) would have given White a large advantage.

---

\(\text{\textit{\textbf{Botvinnik – Kan}}}\)
\(\text{\textit{\textbf{USSR Ch (Moscow) 1952}}}\)

\text{\textit{\textbf{1 e5!}}} \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}c5}}\) 2 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}d2}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xe5}}}\) 3 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xc6}}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{dxc6}}\text{\textit{\textbf{e}e1}}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}f5}}\)
In return for the pawn, White controls the open file and dominates the centre.
5 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}4}}\)
Continuing to play for the attack by 5 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}f4}}\) is also not bad; e.g., 5...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{bd}8}}\) 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}d5}}\), while after 5...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}c5}}\) 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}e4}}\) the white queen will emerge onto the long diagonal.

---

\(\text{\textit{\textbf{Botvinnik – Boleslavsky}}}\)
\(\text{\textit{\textbf{Sverdlovsk 1943}}}\)

1 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{we}2!?}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}xd3}}\) 2 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{cxd3}}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xb}3}}\) 3 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}e3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{w}b4}}\) 4 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xb}3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{xb}3}}\) 5 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}a5!}}\)
White does not take any notice of irrelevanciess such as the a7-pawn, and transfers the rook to the kingside.
5...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{we}6}}\) 6 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}d4}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}d8}}\) 7 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{af}5}}\)
The threat of a sacrifice on f6 has emerged.
7...\(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}d7}}\) 8 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}g4}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{e}e5}}\) 9 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{g}g3}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{f}6}}\) 10 \(\text{\textit{\textbf{d}d5}}\) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{a}6}}\)? (D)
Boleslavsky should have intuitively sensed the correct defensive plan for
Black, namely the advance of his queenside pawns with 10...a5.

Now 22 \( \text{g2} \) offers White winning chances.

11 \( \text{Wh3} \) \( \text{Ze8} \) 12 \( \text{g4!} \)
Weaknesses are there to be attacked.
12...\( \text{h6} \) 13 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{Cc8} \) 14 \( \text{Cc3} \) a5 15 h4 b5 16 \( \text{Wh3!} \)
White threatens 17 \( \text{g5} \).
16...\( \text{f7?} \)! (D)
The only defence against White’s plan of doubling rooks after playing g5 was 16...\( \text{h7!} \).

1 \( \text{f5!} \) \( \text{gxf5} \) 2 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{fxe4} \) 3 \( \text{dxe4} \)
Here White has a simple plan to develop his initiative: \( \text{Wh5} \), \( \text{h6} \) and \( \text{f5} \), when after an exchange on f5 comes \( \text{exf5} \) and the g2-bishop enters the game.
3...\( \text{f6} \) 4 \( \text{f5!} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 5 \( \text{exf5} \) \( \text{h8} \)
Whatever the cost, it was necessary to play 5...d5 here – also intuition.
6 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 7 \( \text{xd5} \)
Now the light squares are very weak, and the g7-bishop is sealed out of the game.
7...\( \text{b6} \) 8 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 9 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{d5} \)
This central thrust comes too late to help Black.
10 \( \text{cxd5} \) c4+ 11 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{f6} \) 12 \( \text{f3} \)
\( \text{d6} \) 13 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{h4} \) 14 \( \text{b3!} \) c3 15 \( \text{a3} \)
\( \text{c2} \) 16 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{h6} \) 17 \( \text{h5!} \) c1\( \text{w} \) 18 \( \text{xcl} \) \( \text{xcl} \) 19 \( \text{xc1} \) \( \text{a5} \) 20 \( \text{f7} \) 1-0
9 Exchanging as an Intuitive Decision

Botvinnik defined the model for chess for a computer as a ‘generalized exchange’. This is a very interesting observation, and past masters have also noted that weak players are recognized first and foremost for their inability to exchange correctly (that is to say, they exchange their well-placed pieces for the opponent’s badly-placed ones, and do not swap their bad pieces for their opponent’s good ones).

Siegbert Tarrasch, the great chess instructor, observed that we should not take so much notice of which pieces disappear from the board, but rather think about those that remain (the masters of these exchanges were Rubinstein and Smyslov). This is absolutely correct, but one of the conditions for verifying the soundness of an exchange is that we try to swap our weak pieces for our opponent’s strong ones. This simple principle works by design in the majority of cases providing that no tactical themes are present.

Let us look at practical play and how a grandmaster thinks in comparable positions when he is confronted by the question ‘What to exchange, and what not to exchange?’ We begin with three examples from the games of Vassily Smyslov.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Smyslov – Letelier} \\
\text{Venice 1950}
\end{array}
\]

1 \textit{xf5!} exf5 2 exf6 \textit{xf6} 3 \textit{ab1}

The beginning of a systematic assault on Black’s pawn weaknesses. Black has acquired dark-square weaknesses as a result of White exchanging the bishop for the f5-knight and the weakness of d5 will become more appreciable, although the c3-bishop is not particularly strong.

3...h6 4 \textit{b5!} \textit{e6} 5 \textit{eb1} \textit{ff7} 6 \textit{e1!}

The knight now heads for the weakened squares.

6...f4 7 f3 g5 8 \textit{d3} \textit{h7} 9 \textit{e1!}

Now back to the fight for the e5-square.

9...\textit{f6} 10 \textit{c5}

Threatening \textit{b4}. 

10...\textit{Ec}8 11 \textit{Qb}4 \textit{Qxb}4

After 11...\textit{Qe}7 12 \textit{a}6 \textit{bxa}6 13 \textit{Qxa}6 White retains a large advantage.

12 \textit{Qxe}6! \textit{Qxe}6 13 \textit{Qxc}8 \textit{Qc}6 14 \textit{a}6! \textit{bxa}6 15 \textit{Qc}7+ \textit{Qg}6 16 \textit{Qd}7 \textit{Qc}7 17 \textit{b}4 \textit{Qf}5 18 \textit{Qxd}5

The d-pawn gives White a decisive advantage.

21 \textit{Qd}3 \textit{d}4 22 \textit{e}5+ \textit{Qg}6 23 \textit{f}4! \textit{Qd}5 24 \textit{g}4!

White has a decisive advantage.

\begin{center}
Smyslov – Tal

\textit{USSR Ch (Moscow) 1969}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textit{Bad Wörishofen senior Wch 1991}
\end{center}

1 \textit{Qe}5 \textit{Qxe}2 2 \textit{Qxe}2 \textit{Qxe}5 3 \textit{Qxe}5 \textit{Qfd}8 4 \textit{Qad}1! \textit{Qac}8 5 \textit{Qxf}6! \textit{Qxf}6 6 \textit{Qxd}5 \textit{Qxd}5 7 \textit{Qe}4 \textit{Qwd}8

7...\textit{Wc}5 is unpleasantly met by 8 \textit{Qc}2, threatening b4.

8 \textit{Qxd}5 \textit{Qxd}5

If 8...\textit{Wxd}5 then 9 \textit{Wc}2 \textit{f}5 10 \textit{Qg}5 \textit{h}6 11 \textit{Qd}1 with the better game for White.

9 \textit{Qxc}5 \textit{Qxc}5 10 \textit{Qd}1 \textit{Wc}8 11 \textit{b}4 \textit{Qb}5

The weakness of the d5-pawn is appreciable, but it is not easy for White to win.

12 \textit{Wg}4! \textit{We}6 13 \textit{Wf}4 \textit{h}6 14 \textit{a}4 \textit{Qb}6 15 \textit{Wd}4 \textit{a}6 16 \textit{Qc}5 \textit{Qh}7 17 \textit{b}5 \textit{axb}5 18 \textit{axb}5 \textit{Qd}6 19 \textit{e}4! \textit{b}6 20 \textit{Wd}4 \textit{Wd}7

Even the greatest players are not always able to determine which pieces should be exchanged, and which should be preserved. Here Black has to decide whether to allow his bishop to be exchanged. The correct continuation is 1...\textit{Qfd}8! 2 \textit{Qxf}5 \textit{gxf}5 followed by bringing the king towards the centre. However, Tal did not appreciate this and played...

1...\textit{Qc}6?

Now Smyslov demonstrated his feeling for the position.

2 \textit{Qxc}6 \textit{bxc}6 3 \textit{Qf}3 \textit{f}6

The aggressive 3...\textit{Qg}4 can be met by 4 \textit{Qe}5! \textit{Qxe}2 5 \textit{Qe}1 \textit{a}6 6 \textit{Qd}7 \textit{Qfe}8 7 \textit{Qxc}5 with the advantage.

4 \textit{Qd}2 \textit{Qfd}8 5 \textit{Qe}4 \textit{c}4 6 \textit{Qc}5 \textit{Qf}5 7 \textit{f}3!

Initiating the fight for the light squares, although this requires temporarily conceding the open file.
7...c2 8 exd8+ exd8 9 f2 f7 10 b4 f5 11 e1 e5 12 b7! d7 13 a5 c5 14 bxc5 d5 15 b7

15 e4 is worse in view of 15...xc5 16 b7 c7 17 d6+ e7 18 xf5+ gxf5 19 exf5 b7!

15...d7 16 d6+ e7 17 g4 e6 18 b1 c7 19 b7

and White confidently converted his advantage into victory (the remainder of this game is not relevant to our discussion).

I therefore arrived at the following move...

1 xf6! gxf6 2 d1 b8 3 d3 g8 4 g3 b4 5 d2 xc4 6 xc4 g4 7 f4 h5!

What else is there to do? Black tries to create a weakness in White’s position, and White in turn does not allow himself to be provoked. Which piece is not in the game? The king! What is its role? To defend the g3-pawn.

8 d2 h4 9 e2 hxg3 10 hxg3 g6 11 f3 h6 12 a3 h2 13 c3! 1-0

Just look at the bishop on e7 – what did it accomplish during the game?

White has a lead in development, and I began searching for a plan to exploit this. The first thing that comes to mind is to bring the inactive rook into the game by 1 d1, but then 1...d7! 2 xe7 xe7 followed by 3 h8 and 4 b6 gives Black an excellent game. I then considered 1 e5, but after 1...d7! 2 xe7 xe5 3 xc5? d7! White loses material. It then became clear to me that Black wants to exchange bishops, and that his most important piece is the knight!

1 a3!

It is essential to remove the knight before it jumps to d5, and then to make use of the greater scope of the g2-knight as compared to the g7-bishop.

1 a7 2 x7 wxe7 3 c4 c6 4 ac1 w6 5 f4!

White creates a dark-square pawn-barrier to keep the black bishop out of the game.
5...h6 6 e1 d8 7 f3 g7 8 f2
White would now be happy with 8...gxf4 9 exf4 but other players might prefer to avoid this by playing 8 h1 or 8 f2.

8...d6 9 fxg5 hxg5 10 e4!
It is in White's interest to open the position – his pieces are much better centralized.

10...c7 11 exf5 exf5 12 c2 f8 13 c4+ h7 14 e2 b5 15 c5 b8 16 g2 b6 17 c2 f8
After 17...xd4 18 xd4 xd4 19 xf5! Black has serious problems.

18 e5 g8
Now 18...xd4 is met by 19 xf5! xf5 20 xg5+! xg5 21 xf5 xf5 22 h4 g7 23 hxg5 f2+ 24 xf2 xf2 25 xf2 with an easily won pawn ending for White.

19 e1 f4!? 20 e4! g6 21 g4 h6 22 f3 g6
and here 23 xg6+! xg6 24 xg5 wins immediately.

A typical example of an intuitive move played automatically. It does not take long to realize that taking control of the dark squares, especially e5, is vital.

1...xf4
On 1...e7 comes 2 e5! and on 1...e5 simply 2 b3 b4 3 g5 xh4 4 xh4 with an endgame advantage for White.

2 xf4 c8 3 f3 e7 4 g3
Or 6...xb2 7 ab1 xa2 8 xb7 h8 9 w3!! with an attack.

7 w3 h5 8 w3! g4 9 a3 xb2 10 ab1 wa3 11 xf7!!
White is winning.

Lautier – Karpov
Biel 1997

1 xf4!

Topalov – Adams
Sarajevo 2000

Here we see an example of incorrect understanding in exchanging pieces at the highest level.

1 xd5?
This bishop absolutely must not be exchanged. White should prefer 1 d3, though after 1...h6 followed by ...a7-g7 (Nunn), Black is fine. Note
that Black should not allow the exchange of queens.

1...cxd5 2 d2 f4!

Black needs to open lines for his rooks – a correct intuitive decision.

3 xf4 xf4 4 gxf4 a7 5 h1 e7 6 g1+ h8 7 f1 e4 8 g2 xf3+ 9 xf3 e1 10 h1 e4 11 d2 exf4+

with a won ending for Black.

It was much better to muddy the waters with 4...d4. Although there is the threat to win the exchange after 5 e2, b3 and c2, Black’s chances would be better than in the game.

5 h4! e6 6 hxg5 hxg5 7 g4 c6 8 d4!

The exchange of bishops is favourable to White, for the black king is now hopelessly weak. White’s intuitive play and dynamic pawn sacrifice are enough to win the game.

8...xd4 9 xd4 c2+ 10 a1 xg2 11 f6+ f8 12 xd6+ e7 13 d1! g7 14 h5+ f8 15 a2! g4 16 fxg4 f2 17 d8+ e8 18 d6+ e7 19 c1! g8 20 c8+ h7 21 g5! 1-0

Topalov – Gelfand
Bugojno ECC 1999

1...0-0?

One of the world’s greatest players here fails to appreciate just how unpleasant and dangerous the white knight is. It was correct to exchange it off by 1...xc3! 2 xc3 xc3 3 xc3 f6!. After 4 c1 d7! Black threatens to exchange the major pieces, after which White would have a difficult endgame. White therefore should intuitively avoid the illusory control of the c-file and initiate play on the kingside through 4 e3! and 5 f4!

2 d5 f8 3 x4 x4 4 e3!

Movsesian – Haba
Czech Ch (Zlin) 1998

1...f5

This allows an elegant and practically forced transition to an endgame that is difficult for Black. On the other hand, however, it is unclear exactly where and how Black can generate counterplay.
2 \text{xf}5 \text{exf}5 3 \text{xf}7 \text{xf}7 4 \text{e}6 \text{xe}6 5 \text{xe}6 \text{g}5 6 \text{We}3 \text{g}8 7 \text{h}1 \text{gxf}4 8 \text{Wxf}4 \text{Wxf}4 9 \text{gxf}4 \text{h}4 10 \text{Ee}5 \text{Efg}7 11 \text{d}2! 

It seems that White had worked out beforehand that the knight must head for f3 with the idea of exchanging a pair of rooks on g1.

11...Eg4 12 Ef1 Eg2 13 Ee3 Ed8 14 Ef1 Eg1+ 15 Exg1 Ef8 16 Exd5 Ec7 17 Eh3 b6 18 Ee2 Ee6 19 Ee3 Eh6 20 Ef2 Ee6 21 Ed7 Eh6 22 Ef7 Eh2 23 Ef5 Eh6 24 Ef7 a6 25 Eg4 Eh1 26 Ee3 1-0

Exchanging a fianchettoed bishop for a knight on c3/c6, doubling the opponent's pawns

Although the bishop and knight are pieces of roughly equal value, their exchange usually leads to either imbalanced structures or some inequality between the remaining bishop and knight on the board. The exchange on c3 is standard in the Nimzo-Indian and particularly in the Winawer Variation of the French Defence. However, the exchange of a fianchettoed bishop on c3 (or c6) has other features; on the one hand, the opponent acquires weak doubled c-pawns, while one the other, the kingside is weakened. All the same, the chief factor is whether the c1- (or c8-) bishop can make use of the long diagonal. Here is a classic example.

![Chess Diagram 1]

Ulybin – I. Gurevich
Santiago jr Wch 1990

White has no problems after 1 Ef3+ Ee6 2 Ed4+ Ed7 3 Eb3 but intuitively it seemed that the rook ending offered him good winning chances.

1 Exe7+? Exd4 2 Exe6 Ec4 3 Exg6 Eb3 4 Exa6 Exb2 5 Ef4

Black wins after 5 Ed6 Exc5 6 g6 b3 7 g7 Ec8 8 Exd5 Eg8 9 Eg5 Ea2.

5...Ec3 6 Eb6 d4 7 g6 b3 8 g7 Eg8 9 Eg6 b2 10 Eg1 Exg7

and Black won.

![Chess Diagram 2]

Petrosian – Schmidt
Skopje OL 1972

1 Exc6+ bxc6 2 Ec1! h6 3 Ef3 Eh3 4 Eg1! (D)

A remarkably original strategy from Petrosian: White plays without castling and Black’s weakness on c6 takes on a much greater significance.
4...\textit{g}4 5 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}5 6 \textit{xd}5 cxd5 7 \textit{b}3 \textit{w}d6 8 f3 \textit{d}7 9 d4! \textit{b}8 10 \textit{f}2 h5 11 \textit{f}4 e5 12 dxe5 \textit{x}e5 13 \textit{e}3 f6 14 \textit{x}a7 0-0 15 \textit{ac}1

with a decisive advantage to White.

This is one of the treasured strategic ideas of Tigran Petrosian – the exchange of bishop for a knight and the subsequent creation of weaknesses.

5 \textit{w}d2 \textit{g}7 6 \textit{d}1 \textit{gh}5 7 \textit{x}xh5 \textit{x}h5 8 \textit{f}2 \textit{d}7 9 \textit{e}1 \textit{af}8! 10 \textit{e}3 \textit{w}f6 11 \textit{h}2 \textit{w}h6 12 g3 \textit{f}6 13 \textit{g}1 \textit{fg}6 14 \textit{g}2 \textit{xf}4!

This piece sacrifice, simple by Tal’s standards, gives Black a decisive attack.

15 gxf4 \textit{w}xf4+ 16 \textit{g}1 \textit{w}f3 17 \textit{w}f2 \textit{wx}h3 18 \textit{b}1 f4 19 \textit{b}2 f3 0-1

\textbf{Topalov – Adams}

\textit{Dortmund 1996}

1...\textit{xc}3+! 2 bxc3 \textit{gf}6 3 f3 \textit{w}a5 4 \textit{wb}3 0-0-0 5 \textit{e}2 \textit{dg}8!

This very strong manoeuvre reveals Black’s plan – an attack on the kingside.

6 \textit{b}1 \textit{c}7 7 \textit{e}3 \textit{b}8 8 \textit{c}2 g5 9 0-0 \textit{g}6 10 \textit{b}2!? \textit{a}8!

Apart from prophylaxis, this move has another function. Black will defend the b7-pawn with the h8-rook, avoiding any weakening pawn moves on the queenside.

11 \textit{fb}1 \textit{b}8 12 \textit{h}1 h5 13 \textit{w}d2 g4 14 \textit{w}c2

This queen move shows that White has no definite game plan.

\textbf{Timman – Tal}

\textit{Tallinn 1973}

1...\textit{xc}3! 2 bxc3 \textit{df}6 3 \textit{e}3 \textit{wh}8 4 h3 \textit{g}8

Black’s plan is simple: to concentrate his major pieces on the kingside with a further shift to a decisive attack.
14...gxf3 15 gxf3 \( \varepsilon \)e5 16 f4 \( \varepsilon \)c8!

\((D)\)

17 \( \varepsilon \)f1 \( \varepsilon \)xc4! 18 \( \varepsilon \)xc4 \( \varepsilon \)h3

Black wins a pawn, an advantage which eventually proved decisive.

Bronstein – Petrosian

Amsterdam Ct 1956

1...\( \varepsilon \)xc3! 2 bxc3 \( \varepsilon \)f6 3 a4 \( \varepsilon \)h8 4
\( \varepsilon \)f2 \( \varepsilon \)g8 5 \( \varepsilon \)h1 \( \varepsilon \)e8 6 \( \varepsilon \)g1 \( \varepsilon \)g6 7
\( \varepsilon \)d2 \( \varepsilon \)d7 8 g3 \( \varepsilon \)ae8 9 a5 \( \varepsilon \)e7 10

Nogueiras – Browne

Linares (Mexico) 1998

1 \( \varepsilon \)c6+! bxc6 2 \( \varepsilon \)xd8+ \( \varepsilon \)xd8 3

\( \varepsilon \)e4!

Preventing 3...\( \varepsilon \)e4 and bringing the dark-squared bishop to life.

3...\( \varepsilon \)e6 4 b3 \( \varepsilon \)e8 5 0-0 \( \varepsilon \)f8 6 exf5

\( \varepsilon \)xf5

After 6...\( \varepsilon \)xf5 7 \( \varepsilon \)e4 \( \varepsilon \)d6 8 \( \varepsilon \)2c3

White also holds the advantage.

7 f4! e4 8 \( \varepsilon \)d1 \( \varepsilon \)f7 9 \( \varepsilon \)e3 a6 10 h3

\( \varepsilon \)g8 11 \( \varepsilon \)f2 h5 12 \( \varepsilon \)d4 \( \varepsilon \)d7 13 \( \varepsilon \)a4

\( \varepsilon \)f8 14 \( \varepsilon \)e2 h4 15 \( \varepsilon \)g1 \( \varepsilon \)f6 16 \( \varepsilon \)c5!

Vitally exchanging off the only piece defending the dark squares.

16...\( \varepsilon \)h7

In the event of 16...\( \varepsilon \)g7 or 16...\( \varepsilon \)h6

the h4-pawn is lost.

17 \( \varepsilon \)xf8 \( \varepsilon \)xf8 18 \( \varepsilon \)c5 \( \varepsilon \)c8 19
\( \varepsilon \)ad1 \( \varepsilon \)e7 20 gxh4! \( \varepsilon \)f7 21 \( \varepsilon \)d4!

\( \varepsilon \)xh4 22 \( \varepsilon \)xc6 \( \varepsilon \)xh3 23 \( \varepsilon \)e5+ \( \varepsilon \)e8

24 \( \varepsilon \)g7

White went on to win.
10 Which Rook?

An eternal positional problem is where to develop the rooks along the back rank.

This exceptionally important positional difficulty was also observed by Tarrasch. In the majority of cases the grandmaster decides intuitively how to position his rooks and, not surprisingly with such an approach (for there is no other), even the greatest have difficulties. There exist two types of problem in arranging the rooks:

a) which rook should be placed on a particular square;

b) how to place the rooks in anticipation of future developments.

The first problem is more associated with determining on which side of the board play will develop, while the second is more general and is connected with establishing the direction of the opponent’s play.

In the following example, even Karpov made the wrong choice.

1 h3

1...h3! was correct, not allowing Black play against the a4-pawn. The game could continue 1...g8 2 b5 g5 3 xd7 xd7 4 xa5 a8 5 dxc5 xc5 6 b3, with an extra pawn for White.

1...g8 2 b5 a8

Kasparov suggested 2...g5!? with interesting play.

Kasparov – I. Sokolov
Sarajevo 1999

3 d3 g5 4 xd7 xd7 5 dxc5 xa4 6 d4

On 6 c6 xc6 7 wa6 there is the simple reply 7...b8. Also unclear is 6 a1 c6 7 xa5 f4 8 xf4 gxf4 with strong counterplay.

6...e8 7 c6 xe6 8 xe6 xc6 9 xa5 xc1 10 xc1 g7

and Black had consolidated his position.

In the majority of such cases the ‘Soviet School of Chess’ considered the ‘castled’ rook to be already developed and that it is the other rook that should be moved to the centre. Certain chess coaches have expressed this even more emphatically by saying that it is the rook furthest away that should be brought to the centre. To be precise,
they advocated that the rooks be placed on d1 and e1, and not c1 and d1 although in a closed centre this could also mean that b1 and c1 is the best choice. All comparable circumstances are decided on the basis of one’s knowledge and intuition.

So which rook should be brought to d1? It ought to be the queen’s rook, but Byrne did not like the pin on his e2-knight and possibly in the forcing line 1 Ḍad1 Ḍe4 2 Ḍxe4 dxe4 3 Ḍxe4 Ḍxd2 4 Ḍxd2 Ḍc4 5 Ḍxa8 Ḍxd2 6 Ḍd1 Ḍc4 he had missed 7 Ḍc6 Ḍxa3 8 Ḍxe8 Ḍxe2 9 Ḍd7. However, Fischer indicated 1..._wc8!!, when Black is at least OK.

1 Ḍfd1?
This leaves the f2-square weak.

1..._Đd3 2 wc2
After 2 Ḍd4 or 2 Ḍf4 the reply 2..._Đe4 is unpleasant.

2..._Đxf2! 3 _Đxf2 _Đg4+ 4 _Đg1 _Đxe3 5 _Đd2 _Đxg2!
It was this move that Byrne had underestimated, having only looked at capturing on d1. Once this bishop is removed, White is defenceless on the light squares.

6 _Đxg2 d4! (D)

7 _Đxd4 _Đb7+ 8 _Đf1 _Đd7! 0-1
White resigned in view of 9 _Đf2 _Đh3+ 10 _Đg1 _Đe1+!! 11 _Đxe1 _Đxd4 with mate on g2.

Svidler – Ivanchuk
Dortmund 1998

1 _Đed1!
Only a great player could sense that the a1-rook is prepared for a different role.

1..._Đc6?!
The question is how to defend the d6-pawn. After 1...\( \text{b}1 \text{c} \) e6 the continuation 2 \( \text{c} \) xf6 \( \text{c} \) xf6 3 \( \text{c} \) xd6 \( \text{c} \) xd6 4 \( \text{c} \) xf6 \( \text{c} \) d7 would be too risky for White. However, he has many other options. For example, 2 \( \text{c} \) d2 or 2 \( \text{c} \) e3 with the idea of f4.

2 \( \text{b}4! \) \( \text{c} \) a4
2...\( \text{c} \) e6 is bad due to 3 \( h \) 4, when Black is tied up.

3 \( \text{b}3! \)
3...\( \text{c} \) e6
After 3...\( \text{c} \) xc3 4 \( \text{c} \) xf7! \( \text{c} \) xf3 5 \( \text{c} \) xd8 \( \text{c} \) b3 (5...\( \text{c} \) xg3 6 \( \text{c} \) h6#!) 6 axb3 \( \text{c} \) c3
7 \( \text{c} \) d3 White has a material advantage.

4 \( \text{c} \) c4! (D)
Svidler later admitted that he was ashamed of this move. After 8 \( \text{c} \) h6+ \( \text{c} \) g8 9 \( \text{c} \) xf5 \( \text{c} \) xe4 we would arrive at the position in the game, which Ivanchuk could now have avoided.

8...\( \text{c} \) xe4 9 \( \text{c} \) h6+ \( \text{c} \) g8??
Black saw 9...\( \text{c} \) xh6 10 \( \text{c} \) xh6 \( \text{c} \) g5 11 \( \text{c} \) f5 \( \text{c} \) b6 but instead chose a losing continuation.

10 \( \text{c} \) xc4! 1-0
Ivanchuk resigned due to 10...\( \text{c} \) xc4 11 \( \text{c} \) xd5 \( \text{c} \) g5! (11...\( \text{c} \) xd5 12 \( \text{c} \) xe7+ \( \text{c} \) xe7 13 \( \text{c} \) g4+) 12 \( \text{c} \) xd8 \( \text{c} \) xd8 13 \( \text{c} \) xg5 \( \text{c} \) xg5 14 \( \text{c} \) h5 f6 15 \( \text{c} \) h6, when White is indeed winning. However, it was also possible to have tested his opponent’s analysis.

White continues to play very forcefully.

4...\( \text{c} \) xe4
After 4...\( \text{c} \) b2 White has 5 cxb5 axb5
6 \( \text{c} \) xe6 fxe6 7 \( \text{c} \) dc1 with a large advantage.

5 \( \text{c} \) xa4 bxa4 6 \( \text{c} \) ac1 d5
After 6...\( \text{c} \) b5 White would have many interesting ideas, such as 7 \( \text{c} \) hf5
gxf5 8 \( \text{c} \) xf5 \( \text{c} \) g8 9 \( \text{c} \) xc6 or 7 \( \text{c} \) xc6
\( \text{c} \) xc6 8 \( \text{c} \) xf6 \( \text{c} \) xf6 9 \( \text{c} \) d3.
7 \( \text{c} \) hf5! gxf5 8 \( \text{c} \) xf5?

Alatortsev – Capablanca
Moscow 1935

White should create a weakness on b6 by 1 \( \text{c} \) ab1 and 2 a5, and this would offset Black’s control of the c-file. However, he went for the maximum and played...

1 \( \text{c} \) fb1? \( \text{c} \) fc8 2 h3
2 a5 can be met by 2...\( \text{c} \) b5! with the advantage.
2...a6! 3 \textit{Wa3 }\textit{Cc2 }4 \textit{Wd6?}
Better is 4 \textit{Ra2}, exchanging a pair of rooks.
4...\textit{Exf2! }5 \textit{Wg3 }\textit{Re2 }0-1

\textbf{Yusupov – Van der Wiel}
\textit{Lucerne OL 1982}

1 \textit{Af6!}
Only this rook, for the other one may prove useful on the queenside, while the attacking plan of \textit{Af1-e3} is infeasible because Black can transfer his knight to d5.

1...\textit{Cb4 }2 \textit{Ah6 }\textit{Cc8 }3 \textit{Ab5 }\textit{Cc6 }4 \textit{Ax6 }\textit{Ea6 }5 \textit{Ab1! (D)}

\textbf{Larsen – Tal}
\textit{Leningrad IZ 1973}

White threatens \textit{e4} and \textit{Ea4}, so a rook must therefore be brought to d8, but which one? Tal decided to play on the kingside and chose...

1...\textit{Ad8! }2 \textit{Ag1 }e5 3 \textit{Exd4 }\textit{Exd4 }4 \textit{Wc4 }\textit{Wh5 }5 \textit{Wa4 }\textit{Fe8 }6 \textit{Exa7 }\textit{Ed6!}

White has captured a pawn, but now Black’s major pieces rain down on the white king.

5 ...\textit{Wd5?!}

Here 5...\textit{Cb4?} is not possible because of 6 \textit{Ebx4 }\textit{Exb4 }7 \textit{Af6+ }\textit{Fh8 }8 \textit{We4}. The best move is 5...\textit{Cc8}.

6 \textit{Wf4 }\textit{We8}
There is no other defence against \textit{Af6+}.

7 \textit{Ab3 }\textit{Cc8 }8 \textit{h4! }\textit{Cc7 }9 \textit{Af3}
This is logical but, true to his own style, Tal suggested 9 \textit{d5!! }\textit{Exd5 }10 \textit{Exd5 }\textit{Wxd5 }11 \textit{Ff6+ }\textit{Exf6 }12 \textit{Wxf6 }\textit{We5 }13 \textit{Cc3!} with mate to follow.

9...\textit{Ef8 }10 \textit{Af8 }\textit{Wxf8 }11 \textit{d5!}
White has secured a winning position.
A quiet move, preparing to block on e5.
11 cxb6  
\[ \text{W} \text{xe5} 12 \text{e}4 \text{Wxg3}+ 13 \text{Wh1} \text{Wh4+} 14 \text{Wg2} \text{Wh5}+ 15 \text{Wf1} \text{Wh3+} 16 \text{We2} \text{Wg2}+ 17 \text{Wd1} \text{Wxf3}+ 18 \text{Wc1} \text{Wf2} 0-1 \]

What more can be said, if even the great Capablanca himself experienced difficulties in placing his rooks?

White can still salvage a draw by 2 \text{Wxd6} \text{Wxf3} 3 \text{Wxf6}.
2...\text{Wxd1} 3 \text{Wxe5} \text{Wd2}! 
This is the difference – mate on e1 is now threatened and White has no time to take on f6.

The calm defence to Black’s threats is 1 \text{Be}c1. However, Capablanca played 1 \text{Wac1}? and after 1...\text{Wxc2}! 2 \text{Wxc2} \text{Wxf4} 3 \text{g3} \text{Wf5} he was a pawn down.

White had gone in for a forcing line with a temporary piece sacrifice, but now the wrong rook was brought to d1.
1 \text{Wfd1}? \text{Wg4} 2 \text{Wg3}?
1...\texttt{Kad8}?

Black should play 1...\texttt{Kd8} followed by 2...d6, 3...a6 and 4...\texttt{Ac8} with an excellent game. Most likely at the time the Hedgehog structure was viewed with disapproval, this evaluation only changing around the beginning the 1980s. Instead Black aims for active play with ...f5, but this only weakens his position.

2 \texttt{Kad1} \texttt{Wh7} 3 f3 \texttt{De8} 4 \texttt{Ad2} f5 5
\texttt{Kfd1} a6 6 \texttt{Ad3} \texttt{Af6} 7 e5 \texttt{De7} 8 \texttt{f2}
\texttt{Ef7} 9 \texttt{Wd2} \texttt{Ab4} 10 a3 \texttt{Af8} 11 \texttt{De2!}
\texttt{Cc7} 12 \texttt{f4}

White has a large positional advantage.
11 Mysterious Quiet Moves

In this short chapter we shall focus especially on ‘mysterious’ rook moves.

**Intuitive prophylaxis**
This is a special type of prophylaxis consisting of moving a rook onto a closed file in anticipation of it opening up in the distant future.

![Chess Board](image)

**Bronstein – Furman**
*USSR Ch (Moscow) 1948*

Not only defending b3, but also preparing the advance b4.
1...\(\text{xd}8\) 2 \(\text{f}d1\) \(\text{d}6\) 3 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{h}8\)!
3...a5!? is better.
4 \(\text{f}1\) (D)

![Chess Board](image)

**Bronstein – Petrosian**
*Moscow 1967*

1 \(\text{ac}1\)!
With the idea of meeting 1...g4 by 2 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{xd}4\) 3 cxd4 and 4 \(\text{b}3\).
1...\(\text{d}5\) 2 \(\text{h}4\) 3 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{xf}4\) gxf4 4 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{f}8\) 5 \(\text{b}5\) e7
and here it was necessary to play 6 \(\text{e}5\) with advantage.

In the next position, White chose a surprising square for his queen’s rook.
1 \(\text{ab}1\)!

![Chess Board](image)

4...\(\text{wd}8\)
4...\(\text{d}8\) is ineffective due to 5 \(\text{b}4\) c4
6 \(\text{e}5\) with a large plus.
After the text-move, White should play 5 $\text{H}xd5$, with a huge advantage.

4...$\text{H}d2+ 5 \text{H}f3 \text{H}xa2 6 \text{H}h7+$ and 7 $\text{H}c7$ also favours White.
5 a4 $\text{H}g7 6 \text{H}h4! \text{c}3$
White wins after 6...$\text{H}xf5+ 7 \text{e}2$ $\text{H}c5 8 \text{d}2$ and 9 $\text{c}3$.
7 $\text{H}c4 \text{H}d2+ 8 \text{e}3 \text{H}a2 9 \text{H}c7+$
$\text{H}h6 10 \text{H}xa7 \text{g}5 11 \text{d}3$
White won shortly.

Chernin – Alterman
Beersheba 1992

1 $\text{H}h1!$
Why did White choose this move?
To counter Black’s threat 1...$\text{H}xg3+ 2$ h$xg3$ $\text{H}g8$ and ...$\text{H}g5$, attacking the f5-pawn and defending h5.

1...b5
Black immediately seeks counterplay, but 1...$\text{H}e5$ is more appealing.
2 $\text{cxb5} \text{H}xg3+ 3 \text{hxg3} \text{H}xd5$ 4 $\text{H}xh5$
(D)

Chernin – Smejkal
Altensteig 1991

1 $\text{H}a1!$
Freeing the bishop from the need to protect the a3-pawn.
1...$\text{H}f8 2 \text{a}2!$
Yet another mysterious rook move. This defends the bishop once more against every eventuality.
2...$\text{H}bd5$ 3 $\text{c}1 \text{H}d7 4 \text{f}1 \text{f}7 5$
$\text{e}2 \text{e}7 6 \text{c}6 \text{e}8 7 \text{ac}2!$
The rook returns to the game.
7...$\text{d}8 8 \text{c}4 \text{b}5 9 \text{xb}6 \text{xb}6$
$\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$
However, 10 $\text{H}c6 \text{a}6 11 \text{H}h4 \text{h}6$
12 $\text{H}cc4!$ gives White a won position.

We now examine rook moves with the preparatory goal of either carrying
out one’s plan, or meeting the opponent’s counterplay.

\[
\text{Sadler – Korchnoi} \\
\text{Arnhem 1999}
\]

This is what Sadler wrote on the subject: “I was aware that Black was soon going to play ...d5, but after c5, bxc5 and dxc5 I couldn’t find a way of stopping Black from achieving ...e5. I therefore began to consider the other capture after ...d5, c5 bxc5, viz. bxc5.”

1 \textbf{\textit{b1}}

This is a very useful move. After bxc5 the b-file will be open.

1...a6 2 \textit{d2} d5 3 c5 bxc5 4 bxc5 \textit{w7}

4...e5 looks natural, but White wins after 5 dxe5 \textit{x}xe5 6 \textit{a4!} d4!? 7 \textit{b6} \textit{fg4} 8 h3 \textit{h4} 9 g3 \textit{wh6} 10 \textit{xa8} \textit{wd2} 11 \textit{xd2}! \textit{xa8} 12 \textit{xe5} \textit{xe5} 13 \textit{c1}.

5 \textit{da2}!

Prophylaxis against the possibility of ...e5.

5...\textit{c6}?

5...\textit{b8}!? 6 \textit{b4} \textit{c6} is better, attempting to exchange the irritating knight.

6 \textit{b4} \textit{b5} 7 \textit{xb5} axb5 8 \textit{e2} \textit{h6} 9 \textit{bd1}! \textit{eb8} 10 \textit{b1} \textit{h5}? 11 \textit{c3} \textit{a5} 12 \textit{cxd5}!

White has a huge advantage.
12 Improving the Worst-Placed Piece

The late GM Makogonov (one of Garry Kasparov’s first trainers) was a strong positional player and formulated some useful general principles. The most famous of these is that, in balanced positions, when neither side has any direct threats or concrete plan, it is necessary either to relocate your worst piece to its best square, or to exchange it off. Some players did this instinctively. Botvinnik said that Fischer always exchanged his opponent’s strongest piece and that he himself never had bad pieces—he simply exchanged them off.

1 \( \text{d}2! \text{h}8?! \)

The critical line is 1...\( \text{w}x\text{d}6 \) 2 \( \text{e}e4 \text{w}e7 \) 3 \( \text{d}d6 \text{c}6 \) 4 \( \text{f}f5 \text{w}e8 \) 5 \( \text{c}c2! \), intending \( \text{c}d2 \), finding a role for the last inactive piece. White will have an excellent position.

2 \( \text{w}b3! \text{c}d8 \) 3 \( \text{x}f7 \text{w}x\text{d}6 \) 4 \( \text{c}c4 \text{w}c7 \) 5 \( \text{g}g6 (D) \)

White has sacrificed a pawn and is now in possession of a powerful passed pawn. But how can he exploit it? With the exception of the b3-knight, all the white pieces are active, and the question remains of how this piece can be improved. Its best square is f5—and to reach this requires another pawn sacrifice.

5...\( \text{b}8? \)

Black should try 5...\( e4! \) 6 \( \text{x}e4 \text{x}e4 \) 7 \( fxe4. \)

6 \( \text{w}e3 \)

White has a big advantage.
All of the white pieces are well-positioned, although the b3-knight is displaying less activity than the other pieces. The problem is deciding where to relocate it. Although the natural square is d4, the other knight belongs there, and this is also the best square for the bishop. So we must find another square, and that square is e3.

1...\( \text{Qd}2! \) \( \text{Qd}e4 \) 2 e4 \( \text{Qd}5 \) 3 \( \text{Qb}5 \) a6 4 \( \text{Qa}5 \) \( \text{Qe}6 \) 5 \( \text{Qb}6 \) \( \text{Qd}6 \) 6 c3 \( \text{Qf}4 \) 7 \( \text{Qf}1 \) \( \text{Qg}4 \) 8 \( \text{Qg}3! \) (D)

8...\( \text{Qe}3 \) is also possible.

8...\( \text{Qf}8 \) 9 \( \text{Qxe}8 \) \( \text{Qxe}8 \) 10 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{Qf}6 \)
11 \( \text{Qc}7 \) b5 12 \( \text{Qxf}7+! \)

White wins a pawn.

Which white piece is currently inactive? The c1-bishop, and its best square is e5.

1 \( \text{Qf}4! \) \( \text{Qa}6 \) 2 \( \text{Qe}5 \) \( \text{Qf}8 \)
Now 3 \( \text{Qd}e1! \) wins.

White’s pieces are currently well placed, but the c3-knight can still be improved and h5 is its best square.
1 \( \text{c}e2 \) c4 2 \( \text{g}g3 \) cxb3 3 \( \text{w}xb3 \) c4 4 \( \text{h}h5 \) \( \text{w}xb3 \) 5 axb3 \( \text{b}bc8 \) 6 \( \text{xf6} \) exf6 7 \( \text{E}e6 \) b6

Which piece is worst placed now? The d1-rook, and it shall go to c6.
8 \( \text{Ac1} \) \( \text{Ab7} \) 9 \( \text{Ac6} \)
White won shortly.

White is winning.

\[ \text{Morozевич – Shirov}
\]
\[ \text{Sarajevo 1999} \]

The g2-bishop is White’s weakest placed piece, and its best square is c4.
1 \( \text{Af1} \) \( \text{Ad8} \) 2 \( \text{Ac4} \) \( \text{Af8} \) 3 \( \text{Ad5}! \)
\( \text{exd5} \) 4 exd5 \( \text{b4}?! \) 5 dxc6 \( \text{xd1+} \) 6 \( \text{xc4} \) 7 b3 \( \text{b4} \) (D)

8 a3 \( \text{w}a5 \) 9 cxb7 \( \text{d7} \) 10 \( \text{Ec6} \)

Here White’s worst piece is the f3-bishop, and White sets about improving it.
1 d6! cxd6
1...\( \text{xc3} \) loses to 2 dxc7 \( \text{c5} \) 3 \( \text{xd8} \) \( \text{xd8} \) 4 \( \text{xc3} \)!
2 \( \text{d2}! \) \( \text{we6} \) 3 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{w}g4 \) 4 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{g7} \) 5 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{c8} \) (D)

Now the weakest piece is the queen.
6 \( \text{wa2}! \) \( \text{wf5} \) 7 \( \text{Ec3} \) f6 8 \( \text{Ef3} \) \( \text{Wg4} \) 9 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{Ee8} \) 10 \( \text{Wa7} \) \( \text{Ee7} \) 11 \( \text{Cc7} \)
White won shortly.
Mikhailchishin – Psakhis
USSR Ch (Frunze) 1981

1  \( \mathcal{d} \mathcal{d} 2! \)
By threatening to take on g6, White prepares the transfer of his knight to its best square – e5. White can defend along the weakened long diagonal by playing f3.

1... \( \mathcal{f} \mathcal{f} 8 \) 2 \( \mathcal{c} \mathcal{c} 4 \) b5 3 \( \mathcal{e} \mathcal{e} 5 \) \( \mathcal{d} \mathcal{d} 6 \)
Now 4 \( \mathcal{c} \mathcal{c} 5 \) (with \( \mathcal{w} \mathcal{c} 3 \) to follow) gives White a big advantage.

I. Ivanov – Benjamin
USA Ch (Jacksonville) 1990

As sometimes happens in the King’s Indian, the dark-squared bishop finds its normal diagonals blocked. Its place is now on b6, so...

1... \( \mathcal{d} \mathcal{d} 8!! \) 2 \( \mathcal{w} \mathcal{e} 2 \) c6 3 \( \mathcal{d} \mathcal{d} 1 \) \( \mathcal{c} \mathcal{c} 7 \) 4 h4?
Better is 4 \( \mathcal{d} \mathcal{d} 3!? \).

4... \( \mathcal{w} \mathcal{e} 7 \) 5 g3 \( \mathcal{g} \mathcal{g} 7 \) 6 \( \mathcal{f} \mathcal{f} 3 \) a4 7 h5 \( \mathcal{a} \mathcal{a} 5 \) 8 \( \mathcal{c} \mathcal{c} 1 \) \( \mathcal{w} \mathcal{d} 7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{f} \mathcal{f} \mathcal{d} 1 \) \( \mathcal{a} \mathcal{e} 8 \) 10 \( \mathcal{g} \mathcal{g} 2 \) f5!

with advantage to Black.

Boylan – Yanyariov
St Petersburg 1995

The a1-rook will be able to find its way into the game, but what can be done with the c3-knight?

1 \( \mathcal{d} \mathcal{d} 5! \) \( \mathcal{b} \mathcal{b} 8 \)
After 1...cxd5 2 \( \mathcal{a} \mathcal{a} 8+ \) \( \mathcal{w} \mathcal{e} 8 \) 3 \( \mathcal{x} \mathcal{f} 6 \) \( \mathcal{e} \mathcal{f} 6 \) 4 \( \mathcal{x} \mathcal{d} 5+ \) White holds the advantage.

2 \( \mathcal{b} \mathcal{b} 4 \) c5
After 2...d5 3 c3 the c5- and e5-squares are weak, and the knight will quickly find its way there.

3 \( \mathcal{c} \mathcal{c} 6 \) \( \mathcal{x} \mathcal{c} 6 \) 4 \( \mathcal{x} \mathcal{c} 6 \) \( \mathcal{a} \mathcal{x} 1+ \) 5 \( \mathcal{a} \mathcal{x} 1 \) \( \mathcal{w} \mathcal{f} 8 \)

After 5...\( \mathcal{a} \mathcal{x} b 2 \) 6 \( \mathcal{a} \mathcal{c} 1 \) \( \mathcal{b} \mathcal{b} 8 \) 7 \( \mathcal{e} 8+ \) \( \mathcal{w} \mathcal{e} 8 \) 8 \( \mathcal{e} \mathcal{e} 8 \) \( \mathcal{a} \mathcal{x} 8 \) 9 h3 White wins easily.
6 b3 h6 7 \(\text{\textit{c}e3}\) g4 8 \(\text{\textit{f}f4}\) e5 9 \(\text{\textit{e}e4}\) g5 10 \(\text{\textit{g}g3}\) b4 11 c4 with a technically won position for White.

1 g4!! Bringing the bishop into the game while also undermining the e4-knight.
1...fxg4 2 xe4! dxex4 3 h4 xe5
Or 3...xa7 4 xa7 f5 5 g3! intending \(\text{\textit{f}f7}\).
4 dxex5 xe5 5 \(\text{\textit{f}f1}\) g8 (D)

Bronstein – Botvinnik
Moscow Wch (22) 1951

The e1-bishop is currently not participating in the game. Therefore...

White’s dark-squared bishop now strikes the final blow.
6 g3! g7 7 xg8+ 1-0
There are situations where a particular objective can be carried out by two different means, for instance either by attacking a certain point or occupying a specific square. But chess is a game where, in the majority of cases, one approach will be correct while the other will present your opponent with counterchances. A practical suggestion for such a situation is to try to avoid giving your opponent counterplay by getting rid of all the possible tactical themes.

The game continued...

1...\textit{f4}! 2 \textit{c5+ xxc5} 3 \textit{xc5 d5!}

Clearly White had only reckoned on 3...\textit{c7}, which loses to 4 \textit{a6+ b8 5 f5!}.

4 \textit{xb6 xc4} 5 \textit{xc4 xb6} 6 \textit{xf7 h3} 7 c3 g5 8 d5 bxc3 9 bxc3 c5

Black has managed to set up a blockade.

White should have played 1 \textit{b3!} f6 (1...\textit{f4} 2 \textit{e4 xe4} 3 \textit{xe4+ a7} 4 \textit{xe5} 2 \textit{c5+ (2 e4 is also good)} 2...\textit{xc5} 3 \textit{xc5 c7} 4 \textit{a6+ b8 5 f5}, when the threat of 6 a7+! will bring about the destruction of Black’s position.

‘Intuitive’ centralization – and various disadvantages of intuitive decisions

In grandmaster games it is sometimes possible to see ‘pseudo-intuitive’ decisions. For example, premature castling and ‘automatic’ rook moves towards
the centre. Nevertheless, chess is a concrete game and the position often requires such a decision.

Here is an example:

\[3...e5 4 \text{d}d5 \text{d}d6 5 \text{d}xc5 \text{d}xc5 6 \text{c}4 \text{d}xd3 7 \text{d}xd3 \text{d}d8 8 \text{c}5\]

Bronstein considered 8 \text{f}d1 better.

\[8...\text{c}6 9 \text{f}d1 \text{e}6 10 \text{d}2 \text{d}7\]

The position is now balanced.

\[1 \text{d}d2?\]

Here are Bronstein’s comments:

“Here I made a ‘logical’ and ‘positional’ move rather than calculating 1 \text{d}f4! \text{h}7 2 e5 e6 3 \text{d}d3?! \text{e}8 4 h4, when it is unclear how Black is to defend g6.”

\[1...\text{h}7 2 \text{d}d3 b5 3 \text{f}4? (D)\]

“A good move made at the wrong time almost always turns out to be bad!” (Bronstein). 3 e5! is correct.

\[B\]

\[1 \text{xd}4?!\]

Kasparov stated “This is the first time in my life that I calculated a variation 18 moves deep!”.

\[1...\text{cxd}4?\]

Black dashes into an abyss of complications.

Following 1...\text{b}6! 2 \text{b}3 \text{xd}5! 3 \text{xd}6+ \text{xd}6 4 \text{d}2 \text{d}8 5 \text{ed}1 \text{c}4 6 \text{c}1 \text{c}7 and the subsequent exchange of rooks it will be very difficult for White to save the game. As Nimzowitsch advised, “If you can’t calculate the variations to the end, try to find a positional solution”.

\[W\]

\[Kasparov – Topalov\]

\[Wijk aan Zee 2000\]

\[Moscow Wch (2) 1951\]
2 $Ee7+! \&b6 3 \$xd4+ \$xa5 4 b4+ \$a4 5 \$c3
5 \$a7! \$xd5 6 \$xa6! \$xa6 7 \$b2 is even stronger.
5...\$xd5 6 \$a7 \$b7 7 \$xb7 \$c4
8 \$xf6 \$xa3 9 \$xa6+ \$xb4 10 c3+ \$xc3 11 \$a1+ \$d2 12 \$b2+ \$d1
13 \$f1!! \$d2 14 \$d7!
As claimed by Kasparov, he had seen all of this in advance.
14...\$xd7 15 \$xc4 bxc4 16 \$xh8
and White won.

\[Diagram 1\]

Szabo – Tal
Moscow 1963

1 $d1?!
This is what Laszlo Szabo thought on the subject: “Intuition is essential in order to play well, and to be able to play excellently you need to be able to calculate well too. I have lost many points when I have ended my calculation too early and relied upon my intuition. The move 1 f6!? suggests itself, and I had first examined 1...exf6 2 b4 \$xc4 3 \$ac1 \$xd5. My analysis stopped here, but my intuition should have forced me to continue 4 exd5!

\[Diagram 2\]

Vink – Riemersma
Dutch Cht 2000

1 $d1?
White should play 1 $xf6 $xf6 2 e5 $g7 3 $d5, with an advantage.
1...\$b4! 2 $xf6 $xf6 3 e5 dxe5 4 fxe5 $g7 5 $d5 $xb2
The difference is that the black queen is now in play.
The relationship between calculation and intuition
The greatest problem is to know how deep you need to calculate (when to ‘switch on’ your intuition to come to a decision) and when it is possible to ‘trust’ your intuition completely and take a break from heavy analysis.

Dvoretsky’s advice for complicated positions is well known – when you calculate a variation with several preliminary captures or exchanges, it is first necessary to judge whether these are in fact logical, then work through the sequence of moves and only at this point start analysing variations. We are interested in a greater issue, namely how to come to an intuitive decision at the point when your analysis cannot go any deeper and a decision must be taken.

Korchnoi – Kasparov
*Debrecen Echt 1992*

For about half an hour Kasparov analysed the main line discussed below, but could not evaluate (or sense) its consequences. He eventually continued 1...g4? 2 fxg4 hxc4 3 hxg4 hxg4 4 hxg4 f6, when 5 f5! cxd5 6 e6 cxb4 7 f3 would have put him in a difficult position.

The variation he had analysed for half an hour was 1...a6 2 c3 f6 3 c4 g4! 4 b6 g3! 5 xg8 (D). Kasparov wrote “before becoming absorbed in in-depth variations it was first necessary to relax and examine the ‘battlefield’ in a calm, thoughtful frame of mind.”

The decision would then arrive all by itself: 5...cxd5!!. White now has the following options:

a) 6 c5 h4 7 hxc3 xg3 8 xg3 with a powerful attack along the dark squares.

b) 6 h xg3 fxg3 7 xg3 e3! 8 b3 f4! 9 f2 (9 c4 d5! 10 exd5 g8!) 9...h3++ 10 gxh3 g5 11 h2 h4 again with a strong attack.

This choice between the move played in the game and the variation not played shows that often a line is needed that offers slightly worse play. This variation can then be rejected,
and we instead focus on the continuation in which, at the critical moment, a correct solution cannot be found. However, through the inner logic of the position it is essential to choose this very continuation.

The game continued 1...\(\text{\textit{f6}}\)? 2 \(e5\) \(\text{\textit{e4}}\) 3 \(\text{\textit{b4}}\) \(\text{\textit{x4}}\) 4 \(\text{\textit{xd4}}\) \(\text{\textit{b6}}\) 5 \(\text{\textit{c2}}\) \(\text{\textit{c8}}\) 6 \(\text{\textit{ab1}}\) \(\text{\textit{a7}}\) 7 \(\text{\textit{d3}}\) with a clear positional advantage for White.

Polgar was unable to work out the line 1...0-0-0! 2 \(\text{\textit{xg4}}\) (2 \(\text{\textit{b4}}\) \(\text{\textit{b6}}\) favours Black) 2...\(\text{\textit{hxg4}}\) 3 \(\text{\textit{e3}}\) (\(D\)) and assessed the position to be worse.

However, she did not appreciate that it was specifically at this point that it was necessary to find 3...\(\text{\textit{dxe4}}\)! 4 \(\text{\textit{xc5}}\) \(\text{\textit{d3}}\) 5 \(\text{\textit{f2}}\) \(\text{\textit{dh3!!}}\) (for example, 6 \(\text{\textit{d4? e3}}!\) 7 \(\text{\textit{xe3}}\) \(\text{\textit{xh2}}\) with a decisive attack). The option chosen in the game should simply have been eliminated through intuition.

Intuition should suggest here the correctness of the choice between 1 \(\text{\textit{xe6}}\) and 1 \(\text{\textit{h3}}\) and it is therefore essential to sense the consequences of:

1 \(\text{\textit{xe6}}\) \(b6!\)

1...\(\text{\textit{fxe6}}\) is bad due to 2 \(\text{\textit{xe6+}}\) \(\text{\textit{h8}}\) 3 \(\text{\textit{xd5}}\).

2 \(\text{\textit{xf7}}\)

After 2 \(\text{\textit{xe6}}\) \(\text{\textit{fxe6}}\) 3 \(\text{\textit{xe6+}}\) \(\text{\textit{xf7}}\) 4 \(\text{\textit{xd5}}\) \(\text{\textit{hxg5}}\) Black has the advantage.

2...\(\text{\textit{xf7}}\) 3 \(\text{\textit{e2}}\)

Here Black has an effective counterblow, which exploits the position of the white queen and rook.

3...\(\text{\textit{xc3!!}}\) 4 \(\text{\textit{bxc3}}\) \(\text{\textit{xc3}}\) 5 \(\text{\textit{xc6}}\) \(\text{\textit{xc6}}\) 6 \(\text{\textit{b2}}\) \(\text{\textit{de8!}}\)

with a winning position for Black.
Intuition should have been used to evaluate the danger in the placement of the queen on e2 and the rook on e6 and find play after 1 \( \text{Wh3} \) h6 2 \( \text{Qf3} \) g5 3 \( \text{hxg5} \) hxg5 4 \( \text{hxg5} \) \( \text{Fe8} \) 5 \( \text{e4} \) and 6 \( \text{h4} \).

![Chessboard image]

3 \( \text{xf8+} \) \( \text{xf8} \) 4 \( \text{f1+} \) \( \text{g8} \) 4...\( \text{e8} \) is bad since after 5 \( \text{f2} \) the black king will not find shelter.

5 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{e6} \) 6 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{d7} \) 7 \( \text{g6!} \) 7 \( \text{e4} \) is interesting, but hardly sufficient.

7...\( \text{hxg6} \) 8 \( \text{hxg6} \) \( \text{hxg6} \) 9 \( \text{g6+} \) \( \text{h8} \) (D)

You get the feeling that there should be something decisive here, but when analysing the position from afar I could only see 10 \( \text{h6+} \) \( \text{g8} \) 11 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{f7} \) 12 \( \text{g5+} \) (in fact, 12 \( \text{e4} \), intending \( \text{f5} \), wins) 12...\( \text{f8} \) 13 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{g8} \) 14 \( \text{f6+} \) \( \text{f7} \) with a draw, and after 10 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{g8} \) I only saw 11 \( \text{h6+} \) \( \text{h7} \) and had missed 11 \( \text{h5+!} \) \( \text{h7} \) 12 \( \text{f7} \). My feeling was that the position was winning but I just didn’t trust my intuition!

In the game I chose the straightforward:

1 \( \text{ae1} \) g6 2 \( \text{w2} \)

If your intuition tells you to play e4, then play it! 2 e4 fxe4 3 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{f5} \) 4 d5 (or 4 \( \text{e5} \)) favours White.

2...\( \text{g7} \) 3 \( \text{h4} \)

3 \( \text{g3} \), with the idea of 4 c5, is OK.

3...d5 4 g4! b6? (D)
4...h6 is better.

5 e4!!
This was the product of intuition.
5...dxe4
5...fxe4 6 Qg5 gives White a fearsome attack.
6 Qxe4! Qg8 7 gxf5 Qxf5 8 Qg5 Qh8 9 Qxf5 Qxf5 10 Qxf5 gxf5 11 Qh1! (D)

Again the result of positional intuition. It would seem that the weak f5-pawn must be attacked, but the black king is an even bigger weakness. White intends Qg1.

11...b5 12 d5!
A double blow, threatening Qd4+ while also creating a passed pawn.

12...Qg7 13 d6! bxc4 14 Qe6 Qxc3
15 d7 Qd3 16 d8Q Qxd8 17 Qxd8 Qd2 18 Qe6 c5 19 Qg3 1-0
A triumph for positional intuition!

Svidler – Leko
Linares 1999

Black needs to bring his a8-rook into the game, and without any real analysis it is clear that 1...Qxb2 is risky; e.g., 2 h3 Qxd2 3 Qxe5 Qxe5 4 Qc2! and Black must give up his queen.

Black must decide where the rook should go – calculation aside, it seems that e8 is the right square, firstly in order to defend the knight, and secondly to exchange rooks should the opportunity arise. The variation is simple: 1...Qae8 2 Qe4 Qg6 3 Qf6 Qxf5 4 Qxf5 (4 Qxe8+ Qg6 5 Qxf5 Qxf5 6 Qd6+ Qg6) 4...Qd8 and only White will experience difficulties, due to his kingside pawn-structure. However, the game continued:

1...Qad8? 2 h3! Qxb2 3 Qc4 Qxc4 4 Qxg4+ Qg6
4...Qh8 is much better.
Here it was crucial to sense that the rook needed to be exchanged: 3...e3xa3 4 e3xa3 bxa3 5 f1 e8+ 6 d2 b8 7 a1 b2+ with satisfactory play. 4 e1f1 a5 5 e1f1 e8+ 6 b3 e8 7 c3 f6 8 b5
Black can resign.

Gufeld – Espig
Leipzig 1980

Black threatens to return the bishop to the defence on g6, thus beating off the attack. The e4-bishop must therefore be eliminated – but how to do this? Interference is the answer, and there are two options.

1 f5! 2 h6 e6 3 xe7 xc2 4 f6 xg2 with a win for Black. This variation is confirmed by analysis, so intuition leaves only:

1 f5! 2 xf5
Not 1...exf5 2 h6.
2 xf5 3 d6!! xd6
3...e4? 4 h3 h4 5 xf5 xh5
6 xe7+ h7 7 xh5#
4 xg7+ xg7 ½–½
White will give perpetual check with his queen.
Averbakh – Tal

USSR Ch (Riga) 1958

1...\(\mathcal{Q}xe4!!\)?

This move was the subject of a considerable difference of opinion at the time, and subsequent analysis also failed to produce much consensus. Having glanced at the position, Petrosian and Krogius smiled cynically, and at the end of the game greatly dismissed White’s play, believing the sacrifice to be unsound. Bronstein looked upon the decision somewhat differently; in the championship bulletin he wrote: “From a strategic point of view Black’s position seems difficult. Tal attached both an exclamation mark and a question mark to his move 1...\(\mathcal{Q}xe4\). I cannot fail to append double exclamation marks to this move. In situations such as this it is not as important whether the sacrifice is sound, as it is bring about a dramatic change in the course of the game, for Averbakh is a player with a distinctive positional style.” ...

“A position of this kind contains a great many possibilities and in practical play the chances favour the player who best adjusts to the resulting position and calculates variations faster, and with greater accuracy.”

2 \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) \(\mathcal{Q}f5\) 3 \(\mathcal{Q}fd2\) \(\mathcal{Q}xd5\) 4 \(\mathcal{Q}xd6\)?

After this serious error, Black wins his piece back and secures a material plus. The majority of commentators came to the conclusion that the sacrifice was unsound, and that the position should have favoured White.

“It is interesting to note that Lilienthal deemed Black’s sacrifice to be incorrect, while Tal thought that after 4 \(\mathcal{Q}g3\) [which is the strongest move] the chances would have been equal.” – Bronstein.

But what would then have happened?

Tal intended to play 4...\(\mathcal{Q}e7\), when after 5 \(\mathcal{Q}b5\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) 6 \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe4\) 7 \(\mathcal{Q}xe8\) \(\mathcal{Q}xe8\) 8 \(\mathcal{Q}xd6\) \(\mathcal{Q}c6\) 9 \(\mathcal{Q}g3\) c4 Black has a pawn and a queenside initiative for the exchange. Naturally, the position that Tal was aiming for is not to everyone’s taste. In fact, 5 \(\mathcal{Q}f3\) is a far better option for White, and questions the soundness of Black’s play. However, it a different thing to study the position in peaceful surroundings, moving the pieces around the board and having as much time as you need to think. In this way it is possible to elaborate, to find the correct response to a risky move and to back up your findings with concrete analysis. However, it is a completely different thing to make a decision under the tension of a tournament game where your thinking time is strictly limited and your opponent is sitting opposite you, a human being with all his strengths and weaknesses. In these complex and
unclear positions, whoever is stronger will in the end be successful. So it seems that it is necessary to assess the crucial decisions, the consequences of which cannot be worked out precisely in a tournament game.

Euwe attempted to prove that Tal’s combination was not bluff by his analysis of 4...\(\text{h}6\). He analysed lines such as 5 \(\text{d}3\)? \(\text{b}4\) 6 \text{e}1 \(\text{xd}3\) 7 \(\text{xd}3\) d5, 5 \(\text{d}3\)? \(\text{b}4\) 6 \(\text{xd}6\) (not 6 \(\text{f}3\)? \(\text{c}2\)) 6...\(\text{xe}4\) and 5 f4? \(\text{g}7\), which are extremely good for Black, but failed to consider 5 \(\text{b}5\)!, when it remains hard to prove Black’s case. Recently, Marović suggested 4...\(\text{b}4\)!?.

4...\(\text{f}6\)! 5 \(\text{f}3\)

Averbakh seeks salvation in opposite-coloured bishops, but the endgame is still far away and Black secures a dangerous initiative.

5...\(\text{xe}4\) 6 \(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{xe}4\) 7 \(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{xd}6\) 8 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{e}7\) 9 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{ae}8\) 10 \(\text{ad}1\) \(\text{d}4\) 11 a4 b6 12 b3 (D)

12...\(\text{e}5\)!

The rook is excellently placed here and can be transferred to the kingside for attacking purposes.

13 \(\text{d}2\) h5 14 \(\text{e}2\)

White tries to simplify the position through exchanges, but this does not ease his defence.

14...\(\text{xe}2\) 15 \(\text{xe}2\) h4 16 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{f}4\) 17 g3 \(\text{f}6\) 18 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{d}8\) 19 \(\text{g}4\) \(\text{xf}2!\) 20 \(\text{e}2\)

White gives up a pawn for attacking chances, but a surprise awaits.

20...\(\text{d}2!\) 21 \(\text{e}8+\) \(\text{g}7\) 22 \(\text{gxh}4\) \(\text{d}4\) 23 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{d}3!\) 24 \(\text{g}2\)

In the event of 24 \(\text{e}5+\) \(\text{h}7\) 25 \(\text{f}6\) Black wins by 25...\(\text{d}5+\) 26 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{xg}2+\) 27 \(\text{xg}2\) \(\text{d}4+\).

24...\(\text{d}1!\) 0-1

The endgame arising after 25 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{xb}5\) 26 axb5 \(\text{xf}1+\) 27 \(\text{xf}1\) \(\text{xh}4\) is hopeless for White.

**Intuitive choices in critical positions**

\[\text{W}\]

\[\text{B}\]

Shirov – J. Polgar
Erevan OL 1996

Here White has a choice between a combinative line and a positional one.

1 \(\text{xd}5\)

This is the combinative option. The alternative is to go for an endgame by 1 a3 \(\text{xc}3\) 2 \(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{xc}3\) 3 bxc3 \(\text{g}8\).

Although the sacrifice is attractive,
calculating it does not seem possible. It is making the choice that is the real difficulty, for after the game it seemed that the ending after 4 \( \text{d}3 \) and 5 \( \text{h}g1 \) with the idea of breaking through on g7 is difficult for Black.

1...\text{exd5} 2 \text{e6} \text{b7}!

Shirov had calculated 2...\text{xa2}? 3 \text{exf7+ \text{d}8} 4 \text{c3 gxf6} 5 \text{xb8 \text{a}1+ 6 \text{c}2 \text{a}4 7 \text{d}2, winning.

3 \text{exf7+}

The alternative 3 \text{fxg7} \text{g8} also does not help White.

3...\text{xf7} 4 \text{fxg7} (D)

4 \text{g6+ hgx6} 5 \text{d}3 \text{h6} 6 \text{h}g1 \text{xa2} 7 \text{xg6+ \text{g}8 8 \text{c}3 \text{f}8! is simply bad for White.

4...\text{xe8} 5 \text{g6+ \text{xg7}!}

Not 5...hxg6 6 \text{d}3 \text{b}6 7 \text{f}4+ \text{xg7} 8 \text{xb4.}

6 \text{gxh7+ \text{h}8 7 \text{g}1}

Now 7...\text{d}8 would give Black the advantage.
14 Intuition and Risk

The three main elements of play which define a chess-player’s success are knowledge, intuition and risk. Risk is never one-sided; a comment by Ver- linsky comes to mind: ‘I once made a move after which we both stood badly’. A player who sacrifices a piece when there was no obligation to do so is risking defeat, for the attack may be beaten off; on the other hand, the opponent also takes a risk in deciding whether the sacrifice should be accepted. The question is just who’s risk is greater! There are no means with which to decide this. Tal intuitively determined the level of risk that he took, but intuition of other players manifests itself in various ways. Some players have a highly developed sense of intuition (Kupreichik, Tal, Velimirović, Planinc), others have a sense of danger (Petrosian, Karpov, Capablanca), while the third kind of player simply anticipates intuitively how and where the pieces and pawns will be best positioned (Fischer, Capablanca, Spassky, Kramnik, Anand). Tal, as a general rule, divided chess-players into two groups – the ‘calculators’ (Tal, Bronstein, Polugaevsky), and those who seldom analysed but possessed a well developed ability to overview and evaluate the position (Botvinnik, Smyslov). The respective thinking mechanism of both players is different, but what is interesting is that they often both arrive at the same conclusion.

Botvinnik always insisted that Capablanca had a certain remarkable formula for playing chess. We are not sure exactly what Botvinnik had in mind, but for us it is obvious; to begin with Capa endeavoured to exchange one of his bishops so that he knew on which squares his pawns should be, he then swapped off a rook and the problem of deciding which rook should go to d1 would disappear, after this it remained for him to exchange a knight, so that he would not need to rack his brains deciding which knight should control the weak square in the centre. This is of course, an exaggeration, but the components of such strategy in Capablanca’s play are overlooked.

“Variations are interesting if they reveal the beauty of chess; they are useless when they cross the boundary of what an individual can reasonably calculate, and they are harmful when used as a substitute for study and explanation for those positions where the outcome is decided by intuition and fantasy and it is not possible for a human being to work out the variations effectively. This is a job for a computer, and we can only tell of our fears by passing them off with lengthy
variations. I myself play intuitively so as to preserve energy for analysing variations at critical positions.” (Bronstein).

Botvinnik possessed poor intuition; this was confirmed by the fact that he used to lose the first game of a match. He could not play ‘off the cuff’; he needed serious and thorough preparation and a rational understanding of his tasks or of his opponent. Spassky remembers how Botvinnik prepared for his game with Fischer – for a long time he gloomily studied his games and one morning announced joyfully “I’ve got it! He plays like a young Bogoljubow!”

Possibly this move escaped White’s field of vision – the double check does not achieve anything, and the attack is easily repulsed.

3 \( \text{\texttt{\text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}}}}} \text{\texttt{\text{\texttt{g}}}}7++ \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}}}x7 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}}}}}5+ \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}}}}}6 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}}}}}h4 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e}}}}6 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}}}3 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f}}}}}6 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f}}}}}7 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}}}}}3 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f}}}}}4 (D)

After the exchange of queens, the game quickly comes to a conclusion.

8 \( \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{xf}}}}}f4 \text{\texttt{x}}f4 9 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}}}}xg6 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}}}}}xg6 10 \text{\texttt{\texttt{b}}}}4 \text{\texttt{\texttt{e}}}b8 11 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{a}}}}}a}}4 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e}}}e}6 12 \text{\texttt{\texttt{c}}}c3 \text{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}d8 13 \text{\texttt{g}}3 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}}d4 14 \text{\texttt{\texttt{g}}}xg2 \text{\texttt{\texttt{b}}}b8 15 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{b}}}}}b3 a5 16 \text{\texttt{\texttt{e}}}xa5

0-1

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

\[
\text{B} \\
\end{array}
\]

Makarychev – Krasenkov

\[
\text{Moscow Tal mem 1992}
\]

White has a choice between two intuitive options: the positional 1 \( \text{\texttt{c}}c1 \) and the combinative 1 \( \text{\texttt{c}}c5 \text{\texttt{e}}e8 2 \text{\texttt{c}}xd5.

1 \( \text{\texttt{c}}c1 \)

1 \( \text{\texttt{c}}c5 \text{\texttt{e}}e8 2 \text{\texttt{c}}xd5 \text{\texttt{c}}xd5! (2...\text{\texttt{c}}xd5? \text{\texttt{c}}f6+ \text{\texttt{g}}7 4 \text{\texttt{xe}}8 \text{\texttt{c}}e8 gives White an attack) 3 \text{\texttt{f}}6+ \text{\texttt{g}}7 4 \text{\texttt{f}}xe8+ \text{\texttt{h}}8 \text{\texttt{h}}8 and now Makarychev considered 5 \( \text{\texttt{f}}8 \text{\texttt{e}}6! 6 \text{\texttt{g}}7+ \text{\texttt{g}}8 7 \text{\texttt{f}}6+ \text{\texttt{x}}g7 8 \text{\texttt{c}}xd5 \text{\texttt{c}}xd5, \text{when Black should hold out. However, 5 \text{\texttt{d}}6!! is stronger.}

In intuitive calculation such moves
can only be found when a player decides to go for such an option.

1...f5! 2 \(\text{\textit{d2}}\)

Interesting is 2 \(\text{\textit{c5 e7}}\) 3 \(\text{\textit{a1 xe1+}}\) 4 \(\text{\textit{xe1}}\) with the idea of moving onto the long diagonal.

2...\(\text{\textit{f4}}\) 3 \(\text{\textit{f3 e6}}\) (\(D\))

The game is roughly level. One possibility is 4 \(\text{\textit{xe6!? xe6}}\) 5 \(\text{\textit{e1 wd5}}\) 6 \(\text{\textit{a1}}\) with unclear play.

1 \(\text{\textit{he1?}}\)

Excessive centralization. 1 \(\text{\textit{hf1}}\) and 1 \(\text{\textit{g3}}\) are more logical.

1...\(\text{\textit{b8!}}\)

This is more logical than the illusory centralization with 1...\(\text{\textit{d8}}\) 2 c4! bxc3 3 \(\text{\textit{wc3 xc3}}\) \(\text{\textit{xc3}}\) 4 \(\text{\textit{xc3 b7}}\).

2 \(\text{\textit{c1 d8}}\)

2...\(\text{\textit{wc7}}\) is also not bad, freeing the path for the a-pawn.

3 \(\text{\textit{a7}}\)

3 h3 is strongly met by 3...d5.

3...\(\text{\textit{b7}}\) 4 \(\text{\textit{g1 g4}}\) 5 \(\text{\textit{b3 a4}}\) 6 \(\text{\textit{c1 exf4}}\) 7 \(\text{\textit{xf4}}\)

On 7 \(\text{\textit{d4}}\) the unexpected hop of the knight 7...\(\text{\textit{h5!}}\) 8 h3 \(\text{\textit{e6}}\) 9 \(\text{\textit{xe6}}\) fxe6 10 \(\text{\textit{c4 d7}}\) 11 \(\text{\textit{xa6 bb8}}\) gives Black the initiative.

7...\(\text{\textit{e6}}\) 8 \(\text{\textit{d4?}}\)

8 \(\text{\textit{cd1 g4}}\) 9 \(\text{\textit{d4}}\) maintains dynamic equality.
8...\textit{\textbf{xb5}}! 9 \textit{\textbf{wd2}}?

Panic! Better is 9 \textit{\textbf{cd1}}! \textit{\textbf{g4}}! 10 \textit{\textbf{xb5 axb5}} 11 \textit{\textbf{xc1 g5}} 12 \textit{\textbf{g3 xc1}} 13 \textit{\textbf{xc1 c8}} although Black still holds the initiative.

9...\textit{\textbf{g4}}! 10 \textit{\textbf{c4}}?

Here relatively the best option was 10 \textit{\textbf{xb5 axb5}} 11 a3 \textit{\textbf{bxa3}} 12 \textit{\textbf{bxa3 g5}} 13 \textit{\textbf{wb4 xb4}} 14 axb4 \textit{\textbf{xc1}} 15 \textit{\textbf{xc1 xh2}} and although Black has an advantage, White's position is still defensible.

10...\textit{\textbf{bxc3}} 11 \textit{\textbf{bxc3 xb3+}} 12 axb3 \textit{\textbf{xb3}} 0-1

\textbf{Intuitive searches for counterplay}

There are situations where ordinary play would lead to a clear advantage for your opponent – in these situations it is essential to change the course of the game, as it is often undesirable for the opponent.

4 \textit{\textbf{xb3}} is worse in view of 4...\textit{\textbf{xf1}}

5 \textit{\textbf{xf1 wd8}}! 6 \textit{\textbf{b6 xf2}} 7 \textit{\textbf{xf2 e4}}!, when Black has the initiative.

4...\textit{\textbf{xf6}} 5 \textit{\textbf{xb6 h6}}!

All Black's pieces are involved in the attack and his being a rook down is of no great importance.

6 \textit{\textbf{h2}}

On 6 \textit{\textbf{wd3}} or 6 \textit{\textbf{xb3}} there is the reply 6...\textit{\textbf{c5}}.

6...\textit{\textbf{e3+}} 7 \textit{\textbf{h1 xf1}} 8 \textit{\textbf{xf1}}?!

Better is 8 \textit{\textbf{xf1 f2}} 9 \textit{\textbf{g2}} with a defensible position.

8...\textit{\textbf{g7}} 9 \textit{\textbf{g3}}

After 9 \textit{\textbf{we2 xg3+}} 10 \textit{\textbf{g2 xg3}} \textit{\textbf{wxe3}}

11 \textit{\textbf{g2}} h5!, intending ...\textit{\textbf{g4}}, the game is unclear.

9...\textit{\textbf{wh6!}} 10 \textit{\textbf{d3 g5!!}} 11 \textit{\textbf{xe3 g4}} 12 \textit{\textbf{wd2}}

Now 12...\textit{\textbf{wh5!!}} wins for Black. However, the game continued...

12...\textit{\textbf{e4?}} 13 \textit{\textbf{d7}}

White has winning chances.

\textbf{Stanec – Sutowsky}

\textit{\textbf{Pula Z 2000}}

1...\textit{\textbf{xc5?!}}

1...\textit{\textbf{bxc5}} 2 \textit{\textbf{h4}} gives White a clear advantage.

2 \textit{\textbf{xb6 xe4}} 3 \textit{\textbf{xa8 h3!}} 4 \textit{\textbf{e1}}

\textbf{Yusupov – Anand}

\textit{\textbf{Dortmund 1997}}

1...\textit{\textbf{c4!}} 2 \textit{\textbf{f3 b8}} 3 \textit{\textbf{xa5 c3!}} 4 \textit{\textbf{bxc3}}?
4 b3 is better. Then the active reply 4...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.d3 is ineffective in view of 5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}.f2! \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{R}}}.d5 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.xd5 exd5 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.a7. However, 4...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.c7 is excellent, as the c3-pawn provides Black with tremendous compensation.

4...b3!

Another pawn sacrifice, although the b-pawn is evidently more dangerous.

5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{B}}}.b1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.d3 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.xb3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.xe3+ 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}.f1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.c5 8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.b5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.d8 9 c4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.d3! 10 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.e8+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.g7 0-1

White has no defence to Black’s threats.

that the bishop must be brought to the defence, and that the c-file must be closed.

5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{B}}}.c5! \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{R}}}.h7!

Renewing Black’s threat of playing ...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.a4.

6 exf5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.xf5 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}.c4 e4!

Although a pawn down, Black holds the initiative.

8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.e3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.h5 9 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.g3 exf3 10 gxf3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}.h4 11 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{R}}}.d2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.c2!

This is why Black played ...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.c8.

12 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.e2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.xd5 13 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.d4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.g6 14 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.g4!

White has managed to secure his position.

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\draw (0,0) -- (1,0) -- (1,1) -- (0,1) -- cycle;
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Kramnik – Anand
Dortmund 2000
\end{center}

\begin{center}
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Yusupov – Fritz
Frankfurt (shuffle chess) 2000
\end{center}

1...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.c8!

It seems that Black’s rook stands excellently on the a-file. However, Anand felt that it was necessary to fight for the c-file, for the queen on c3 and knight on c4 would be very unpleasant for Black.

2 cxd6 cxd6 3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.b4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.g5! 4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.xd6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{R}}}.f6

Bringing the awkward threat ...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.a4 into the picture. Kramnik therefore felt

1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.h3?

This stereotyped blockade allows Black a decisive advantage. Instead, the intuitive plan of 1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{K}}}.f5!, 2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.f3 and 3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{K}}}.h5 gives White a serious advantage.

1...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.g8 2 g5 d5!

This is the weak spot – e4.

3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.e3 d4 4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.f3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.d8 5 c4? \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.c7 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{N}}}.f6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.c7 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{K}}}.d1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{Q}}}.e6 8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{W}}}.f3 d3 0-1
15 Intuition in the Endgame

Intuitive endgame solutions are connected first and foremost with a feeling for choosing the right move. As compared to the middlegame, in the endgame we typically have only one or two options, and we must therefore not choose a third or fourth. It is essential always to decide on the correct solution, as any other continuation brings the risk of defeat or throwing away chances of victory. There are also significantly fewer tactical chances, but there are exceptions.

1...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Hg}}}}3!? 2 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{H}}}}xc2 f4 3 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Cc}}}}3 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Gg}}}}2+ 4 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Dd}}}}3

Moving backwards is risky: 4 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Ff}}}}1 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Dd}}}}2 5 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Ff}}}}2 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Ff}}}}5.

4...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Ff}}}}5 5 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Cc}}}}8 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Gg}}}}3+ 6 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Cc}}}}4 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Aa}}}}3 7 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Bb}}}}2 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Ma}}}}2 8 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{Cc}}}

If 8 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Bb}}}}3 then 8...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Xx}}}}xb2+! 9 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{Xx}}b}2 f3 10 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{Cc}}}2 g3 and the pawns cannot be stopped.

8...\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Fe}}}}4 9 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Bb}}}}3 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Me}}}}2 10 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{Me}}8} f3 11 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{Xxe}}6} g3!

White’s bishop is out of the way, and the black pawns march on...

12 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{Ff}}}6 g2 13 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{Gg}}6} f2 0-1

\textbf{Bertok – Bronstein}
\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Zagreb}} 1965}}

\textbf{Anand – Shirov}
\textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Leon adv}} 2000}}

1 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Dd}}}}xg5!?

The other option was 1 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Dd}}}}xg5 hxg5 2 \textit{\textbf{\textbf{Dd}}}xg5 followed by \textit{\textbf{\textbf{\textbf{Dd}}}}xf7 and the advance of the h-pawn. Making the
choice between the two sacrifices certainly demands exceptional intuition.

1...hxg5 2 hxg5 4xb3 3 h4 4a1 4 cl 4 b3 5 e3 4 a5 6 g5 4 c4 7 1-0

In view of 7...b3 8 h5 b2 9 4xb2 4xb2+ 10 4e2 4a4 11 h6.

The sacrifice of two pieces for a rook and pawn(s)

A typical intuitive endgame device is the giving up of two pieces for a rook and pawns. In the middlegame the advantage usually lies with the two pieces, but in the endgame it is more often the other way around.

Tkachenko – Ilyin
USSR 1971

1... 4xe4! 2 4xe4 4a5 3 bxa5 4xe4 4 4a3+?

White does not wish to defend passively and allow the rook access to the seventh rank, but with the loss of the c3-pawn his chances are reduced to nil.

4... 4d7 5 4f1 4xf3 6 gxf3 4c8 7 axb6 axb6 8 4e2 4xc3 9 4e7 4c1+ 10 4g2 4b1 (D)

Preparing to advance the b-pawn.

Kramnik – Ivanchuk
Dortmund 1995

1 4h3! fxe5

After 1... 4h7 2 4xf7 4xf7 3 e4 4e7 4 d5 Black collapses, while 1...f5 is strongly met by 2 e4 4e7 3 d5.

2 4xe6+ 4f7 3 4xc8 4xc8 4 dxe5 4b6 5 4dd4 4e6 6 f4

White has a superb group of central pawns, and the creation of a powerful
passed pawn is simply a matter of time.

6...f7 7 e4 g6 8 f2 e7 9 c1 a5 10 c5 a4 11 b4 d7 12 c1 c6 13 e3 d7 14 bc4 b8 15 h4 h5 16 g1 h8 17 c2 e6 18 gc1 b8 19 c5 e7 20 1c2 d7 (D)

Kholmov – Kasparov

Daugavpils 1978

Correct was 1...g6! 2 h1 f5! followed by ...d5 creating a impregnable barrier. However, Kasparov played instead...

1...g5?

The rule is that you should not attack on the part of the board where you stand weaker.

2 h1 f5 3 h5 d6 4 f3 e6 5 g4 e4 6 e1 f7 7 e2 d8 8 e1 d5 9 g3 d7 10 e4 e7+ 11 d3 d7

After an exchange of rooks, h6 followed by d5 and the entrance of the white king is decisive.

12 h6 d8 13 h7 h8 14 h2 e7 15 d5! cxd5 16 d4

with a decisive opening for the white king.

Pawn sacrifices in the endgame

The compensation received for a pawn in the form of either piece activity, possession of an open file or clearing the path for a passed pawn generally has no less meaning in the endgame than in the middlegame.
1 $\mathcal{A}c5! \mathcal{A}xc5+ 2 \mathcal{A}xc5 exf4 3 \mathcal{B}f3 \mathcal{A}d7$

Preparing the exchange of rooks.

4 $\mathcal{A}d3! \mathcal{H}ac8 5 \mathcal{H}c1 g5 6 \mathcal{H}c7 \mathcal{A}xc7 7 \mathcal{H}xc7 \mathcal{A}a4 8 \mathcal{G}g4!$

Activating the king.

8...h6 9 $\mathcal{A}xb7 \mathcal{A}d7 10 \mathcal{A}b4 \mathcal{A}d1+$

Creating a weakness.

11 $\mathcal{F}f5 \mathcal{G}g7 12 h4!$

Sacrificing the exchange for an advantageous endgame

Anand possesses the ability to sacrifice the exchange for position, which is also a standard method of playing, especially in the endgame. He is clearly familiar with Petrosian’s favourite strategic device, as we see in the following example.

1 $\mathcal{E}xh4!! \mathcal{W}xh4 2 \mathcal{W}xh4 \mathcal{G}xh4 3 \mathcal{D}b6 \mathcal{B}b8 4 \mathcal{F}f4 \mathcal{F}f5 5 d5!$

Black should try 5...h6 or 5...\mathcal{D}d8.

6 $\mathcal{G}f1!$

A quiet and useful prophylactic developing move so that after g4 \mathcal{D}d4 the back rank is not weak, and there are no checks.

6...h6

On 6...h5 comes 7 f3, preparing g4.

7 h3 \mathcal{E}e4 8 $\mathcal{A}h2 cxd5 9 g4 \mathcal{E}xc4 10 \mathcal{G}xc4 dxc4 11 \mathcal{M}e1! (D)$

Winning a tempo in order to activate the rook.

11...\mathcal{E}e6 12 gxf5 $\mathcal{A}xf5 13 \mathcal{A}xd6 \mathcal{A}xh3+ 14 \mathcal{G}g1 \mathcal{D}d8 15 \mathcal{E}e8+! \mathcal{X}xe8 16 \mathcal{A}xe8
White has reached an endgame in which Black’s three pawns are not sufficient compensation for the lost piece.

Not 6 b5? \( \text{cd8} \) when Black can achieve a draw.

\( 6...e4 \)

After 6...\( \text{cd8} \) 7 c6 \( \text{d6} \) 8 f5+ \( \text{xf5} \) 9 c7 \( \text{xc8} \) 10 \( \text{e7}+ \) White wins.

7 \( \text{d4} \) f5 8 g4! \( \text{g7} \) 9 \( \text{e3} \) fxg4 10 \( \text{d6}+ \) f7 11 \( \text{f5} \) e3 12 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{xe8} \) e2 14 \( \text{f6}+! \) 1-0

14...\( \text{e7} \) 15 f5!.

**Intuition as a means of avoiding errors**

Intuitive decisions are very often necessary for transition from one type of endgame to another. Of course, in the majority of cases exchanges can be assessed by analysis and your intuition should first and foremost warn against failure. This is to some degree a kind of prophylactic intuition.

**B**

Volzhin – Yandemirov
Volgograd 1994

1...\( \text{xd2} \) 2 \( \text{xd2} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 3 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{d4}+ \) 4 \( \text{h1} \) a6!

Black’s plan is clear – the advance of his queenside pawns. White should strive to avoid this.

5 f5 gxf5 6 exf5 \( \text{d5} \) 7 \( \text{f3} \)
It is essential to exchange a pair of bishops.

7...\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}x\texttt{f}}3 8 \texttt{\texttt{x}}x\texttt{f}3 b5 9 g4 b4 10 \texttt{\texttt{g}}2 a5 11 \texttt{\texttt{d}}d3 a4 12 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c4

Returning the exchange does not save White; e.g., 12 \texttt{\texttt{x}}x\texttt{d}4 cxd4 13 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c4 b3 14 axb3 a3 15 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c1 d3 16 \texttt{\texttt{f}}2 d2 17 \texttt{\texttt{a}}a1 \texttt{\texttt{d}}d8 18 \texttt{\texttt{d}}d1 a2 with a won ending for Black.

12...b3! 13 axb3 a3 14 \texttt{\texttt{x}}x\texttt{d}4

14 b4 is a better defensive try for White.

14...cxd4 15 \texttt{\texttt{d}}d1 d3 16 \texttt{\texttt{f}}2 d2 17 \texttt{\texttt{e}}2 \texttt{\texttt{e}}8+! 18 \texttt{\texttt{f}}2 a2 0-1

Erwich – Bertholee

Amsterdam 2000

1...\texttt{\texttt{w}}x\texttt{a}4! 2 \texttt{\texttt{d}}b5 \texttt{\texttt{w}}c4! 3 \texttt{\texttt{w}}xc4 dxc4 4 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c7+

4 \texttt{\texttt{a}}c1 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c8 5 \texttt{\texttt{a}}d1 \texttt{\texttt{e}}7 6 \texttt{\texttt{a}}a3 is somewhat better, but Black holds the advantage.

4...\texttt{\texttt{a}}d7 5 \texttt{\texttt{x}}x\texttt{a}8 \texttt{\texttt{x}}x\texttt{a}8 (D)

Black has just a pawn for the exchange, but he also has a queenside majority, a weak point on d4 to attack, and the possibility to penetrate with the king. Even without any concrete analysis, all of this adds up to an advantage for Black.

6 \texttt{\texttt{a}}d1 \texttt{\texttt{c}}6 7 \texttt{\texttt{a}}d2 b5 8 \texttt{\texttt{a}}f2 a4 9 \texttt{\texttt{a}}f3 \texttt{\texttt{d}}5 10 g3 b4 11 h3 a3! 12 bxa3 b3 13 g4 c3 14 gxf5 cxd2 15 fxe6 fxe6 16 \texttt{\texttt{e}}2 \texttt{\texttt{c}}4 17 \texttt{\texttt{x}}x\texttt{d}2 b2 18 \texttt{\texttt{x}}e1 \texttt{\texttt{x}}a3

and Black won.

Adams – Lautier

Tilburg 1996

White has an extra pawn and a won position. The simplest way to end the game is by either 1 \texttt{\texttt{b}}5 or 1 c5, but Adams decided to create the additional threat of \texttt{\texttt{g}}5+ and played 1 h4??, not
sensing that the pawn ending might in fact be drawn. After 1...\eb6+ 2 \eb5 \ef6! 3 \exe6+ \exe6 4 \ed4 \ed6 5 \ec3 \ec7 6 \b4 axb4+ 7 \xb4 \ec6, White discovered that he had no way to win.

With normal play, this endgame is an inevitable draw. However, flawed intuition suggested to White that a pawn endgame might be winning for whoever manages to create a passed pawn. However, White failed to take into account the activity of the black king.

1 \ed4?? \xd4 2 cxd4 \g6 3 \f3 \f5 4 \e3 \e6 5 \e4 f5+ 6 \f4 g5+ 7 \e3 \d5!

Not giving in to provocation!
8 f3 \c4 9 \b3+ \d5! 10 \h3 \h5 0-1

As we have already noted, intuition in the endgame is most frequently encountered in the form of eliminating one or two standard continuations in each position.

With correct play, rook endings provide ample drawing opportunities for the weaker side. Here the standard cutting-off move 1 \xf6! and moving the king to c4 automatically suggests itself, with a draw. On 1...\xd6 there is the reply 2 \f5 but Ivanchuk chose the other option (tactics), which proves to be incorrect.

1 \h3? \d4
White had reckoned on 1...gxh3 2 \h4.
2 \f2 \h4 (D)

This typical blow can be played without thinking.
3 hxg4 hxg3 4 Kg2 fxg4 5 d2 
  c6 6 c3 h5
White can resign.

Iliushin – Naumann
Erevan jr Wch 1999

There are two possibilities here:
  a) to attack the black pawns by 1 a4;
  b) to bring the king into the game with 1 Kg2.

The second of these should have been played automatically, but White actually chose 1 a4? Bb6 2 a5 Kg6 3 g5 h6 and then resigned.

Estrin – A. Zaitsev
Moscow 1963

1...Kg3+! 2 Kg3 Kd5 3 f2 h1+!
Black’s idea is simple – to divert the king by sacrificing the knight in the corner, and using his own king to eliminate the white pawns on the queenside.

4 Kg1 d4 5 xh1 c3 6 Kg1
6 b4 loses to 6...d2.
6...xb3 7 f4 (D)

B

Now 7...xa3 wins easily.

Pinski – Iliushin
Erevan jr Wch 1999

Intuition tells us that the black king should be placed in front of the pawns.
(and not behind them, because White will then be able to give check). Next ...\textsuperscript{a}2+ will push the white king to its back rank. This, combined with mating threats, should win the game easily. However, anti-intuition triumphed and rashly Black pushed the pawns forward.

1...e4? 2 a6 d4??

It was still not too late to transfer the king to d4.

3 \textsuperscript{f}f7+ \textsuperscript{g}e5 4 \textsuperscript{g}e7+ \textsuperscript{h}d5?

Black now decides to transfer his king to the queenside.

5 \textsuperscript{d}d7+ \textsuperscript{c}c5 6 a7 \textsuperscript{a}a2+ 7 \textsuperscript{c}c1 d3
8 \textsuperscript{b}b1 \textsuperscript{a}a6 9 \textsuperscript{c}c1 \textsuperscript{a}a5 10 \textsuperscript{d}d2 \textsuperscript{a}a2+
11 \textsuperscript{e}e3 \textsuperscript{c}c6 12 \textsuperscript{d}d8 \textsuperscript{x}xa7 13 \textsuperscript{e}e4
1/2-1/2

Resigning in a drawn position indicates intuition switching itself off at the most critical moment.

This example demonstrates the huge advantage in intuitive thinking of an experienced grandmaster over a younger one. Black should have simply sensed that the passage of the white king to the b6-pawn must be obstructed by the combined use of king and rook:

1...\textsuperscript{f}f6! 2 \textsuperscript{e}e4 \textsuperscript{e}e6 3 \textsuperscript{d}d4 \textsuperscript{b}b2 4 \textsuperscript{c}c5
\textsuperscript{c}c2+, etc.

Instead of this, it seemed to Black that the best way of achieving this was to attack the f2-pawn.

1...\textsuperscript{b}b2?

Without thinking Bronstein now played...

2 \textsuperscript{e}e4!

He sensed that it was either now or never.

2...\textsuperscript{x}xf2 3 \textsuperscript{c}c7 \textsuperscript{b}b2 4 b7 \textsuperscript{f}f6 5
\textsuperscript{d}d5 \textsuperscript{f}f5

5...g5 6 hxg5+ \textsuperscript{x}xg5 7 \textsuperscript{x}xf7 \textsuperscript{g}g4 8
\textsuperscript{g}g7+ does not help Black.

6 \textsuperscript{x}xf7+ \textsuperscript{g}g4 7 \textsuperscript{g}g7 \textsuperscript{x}xg3 8 \textsuperscript{x}xg6+
\textsuperscript{x}h4 9 \textsuperscript{c}c6 \textsuperscript{h}h3 10 \textsuperscript{g}g5!
10 \textsuperscript{c}c7 also wins.

10...\textsuperscript{b}b7 11 \textsuperscript{xb}7 h4 12 \textsuperscript{c}c6 \textsuperscript{h}h2
13 \textsuperscript{d}d5 h3 14 \textsuperscript{e}e4 1-0

This is a striking example of a lack of feeling for the endgame. Here Black

\textbf{Bronstein – Romanishin}

\textit{USSR Ch (Erevan) 1975}

\textbf{Sax – Tseshkovsky}

\textit{Rovinj/Zagreb 1975}
resigned, believing that 1...\textit{h}7 2 \textit{f}7 \textit{c}8 3 \textit{d}7 is losing. In actual fact after 3...\textit{a}8 the position is a theoretical draw.

In the previous two examples, one of the players did not know a theoretical position. There are also cases where players failed to recognize stalemating patterns.

In the following diagram Black resigned, unaware of the typical defence 1...\texttt{c}6 2 axb5+ \texttt{xb}5 3 \texttt{d}5 \texttt{a}4! 4 \texttt{x}c4 stalemate!

\textbf{Natapov – Zhuravliov}

\textit{Moscow 1994}
16 Psychological Factors

It seems to us that these can be divided into the following sections:

a) decisions related to choice of opening (opening intuition);

b) decisions associated with the style of play of your opponent, and the choice of plan or move that will be unpleasant for him;

c) bluff (a player is aware that his move is weak, or else has no idea whether it is good or bad, but hopes that his opponent will not be able to adjust to the change in situation).

When preparing for each game, a player will study the opening repertoire of his opponent. Similarly, his adversary will be doing exactly the same thing and who succeeds will be determined by whoever can figure out the weakest point in his opponent’s repertoire or discover the way in which he prepares for the given game or match. There are a great many examples of psychological decisions correctly made. One example from the recent past is Kasparov’s choice of the Dragon Sicilian against Anand, which assured him of victory in the 1995 PCA World Championship match. Various factors play their part in the decision-making process, for every top grandmaster works hard on the opening and has his own favourite lines. In this way it is possible to figure out what your opponent has prepared for you, and in return plan a surprise for him. Before his 1983 match with Kasparov, co-author Beliavsky said “I feel that the way to beat Kasparov is in the Scheveningen. However, at the moment I do not have the energy to play the Sicilian. I shall play 1 d4.” This was a mistake, and the match was lost.

Sensing weaknesses in your opponent’s game is of great importance. Kramnik’s strategy in his BGN world championship match against Kasparov (London 2000) can be seen as brilliant: ‘I will exchange queens in any position, as I am able to hold a slightly worse position’. Kramnik felt that the weakest part of Kasparov game was the endgame, for he approaches it as he does the middlegame, that is to say with an analytical approach, and this can lead to inaccuracies.

Psychological decisions of a rather different kind were employed, for example, by Larsen. Here is his commentary to his game against Flohr in Copenhagen 1961, where he chose the Benoni: “I consider structures such as this to be a means of forcing oneself to play aggressively”.

Widely celebrated is Tony Miles’s famous psychological ploy against Anatoly Karpov. Miles had been very unsuccessful against Karpov, having
only a stack of losses and several
draws. Playing Black in the European
Team Championship at Skara in 1980
he decided on the ‘awful’ 1 e4 a6?!. 
Can you imagine the reaction of a fe-
rocious Karpov: a player that had lost
almost all his games against him is
now playing something ridiculous –
surely he should be punished in under
20 moves! Karpov, in one of the few
cases in his career, lost control of the
position, got confused, and lost. This
was possibly the most painful defeat of
his career. This is without doubt a strik-
ing example of a psychological ploy in
a difficult situation (from Miles’s
point of view before the game).

There are two approaches to find-
ing the right move in a complex posi-
tion; these are clearly articulated by
two famous grandmasters:

Portisch: “The best decisions in
chess are always those that are sup-
ported by accurate calculation.” We
think that both Rubinstein and Ale-
khine would have agreed with this ob-
ervation.

Bronstein: “The best move seen at
first glance should not be analysed ex-
tensively; it simply must be a good
move.”

Very often we encounter decisions
aimed at reaching positions that are
either unpleasant for our opponent, or
those that he does not play well. This
approach gained popularity through
the great Emanuel Lasker. When play-
ing against the solid Tarrasch he aimed
to sharpen the play, while against Jan-
owski he preferred an endgame. Smys-
lov played in the same way against
opponents of a combinative style: he
simplified to an endgame with many
pieces still on the board. In theory,
such options are only available to
players with a universal style because
for them it is easier to modify their
own play in line with their opponent.
In the history of chess Lasker, Smys-
lov, and Spassky are such players.

Let us quote Krogius:

“The huge significance intuition has
in chess cannot be doubted. Examples
of immediate understanding of the es-
sence of the position, which bring
about the basis for rapid, accurate de-
cisions are well known. Intuition is
typically connected with the moment
of finding the right solution (or choice
of move), but intuitive ways of think-
ing are manifest also in the phase of
acquainting oneself with the position.
This intuitive understanding, this abil-
ity to assess the position right away
after your opponent has moved, has
enormous practical significance. It
tends to point out to the player the
main requirements and threats that
must be taken into consideration be-
fore analysing variations.

“Inadequate (or sluggish) familiar-
ization with the position leads to gross
blunders and obvious mistakes. From
here it follows that intuition and pro-
phylaxis are related.”

**Bluff**

‘Bluff’ includes those decisions where
a correct reply would mean trouble for
the bluffker, while after a hesitant reply
he will have chances of victory. We
shall also use the term ‘bluff’ in a more general sense to describe the situation where a player knowingly risks playing a move when he has no idea whether it is good or bad, and is relying on the intuitive feeling that the opponent will have difficulty finding a good reply.

Bluff is often used during time-trouble, in worse positions, and in situations where the play is drawn-out. Timing is extremely important – the moment at which it is necessary to change the course of the game. Sometimes a player has a feeling that playing logically leads simply to a worse position or gives no chances to win. Of course, sometimes the price is too high for such decisions. Bent Larsen, who was famous for his successful bluffing, explained that if he played normally he would make three draws from three games, but if he took risks at certain moments, on one occasion he would be punished, but twice his opponents would be bluffed. So it is worth trying! Here is a typical example:

White has an extra pawn and a won position, and so Black tries his last chance.

1...h5!

Here Larsen saw that 2 g3 hxg4 3 hxg4 c4 4 b3 d6 5 e2 wins, but Petrosian played 2 g5 and after 2...h4!
3 g1 e5 4 fx e5 c3 e5 5 f2 xe5 6 e4 g7 7 b3 f7 8 g6 the game would have reached a drawn pawn ending after 8...e5 and 9...xg6.

When a player feels that he is losing a positional battle, he often senses that if he continues to play ‘normally’, then the course of the game will inevitably lead to his defeat. In such situations it is essential to sense the moment when the course of the struggle can be altered by sacrificing something, even though correct play from the opponent will all the same lead to one’s defeat. However, the opponent is very often unprepared for the change in the dynamics of the position and fails to react in the most appropriate way.

Petrosian – Larsen
San Antonio 1972

Tarrasch – Em. Lasker
Düsseldorf Wch (2) 1908
1...g4?! (1)
Lasker wrote: “Against Janowski this would be a decisive mistake, but against Dr Tarrasch it is the best move!” Let us elaborate— at the time Janowski was a better attacker than anyone else, whereas Tarrasch was considered the best positional player. Black’s position is very difficult, and with normal play, is undoubtedly lost. Therefore Lasker’s decision was justified.

2 \textit{\textbullet} xg7 \textit{\textbullet} xf2 3 \textit{\textbullet} xf2 (?)
Stronger is 3 \textit{\textbullet} d4! with a fearsome attack.

3...xg7 4 \textit{\textbullet} f5+ \textit{\textbullet} h8 5 \textit{\textbullet} d4+ f6 6 \textit{\textbullet} xa7 \textit{\textbullet} f8
with an unclear position, which Lasker eventually won.

The main problem facing the bluff is choosing the best moment to change the course of events.

$\textbf{W}$

\textbf{Kasparov – Anand}
\textit{New York PCA Wch (14) 1995}

White has lost the fight for the e4-square and with normal play can only expect a difficult game. Kasparov therefore sharply changes the course of the game:

1 \textit{\textbullet} e5?! \textit{\textbullet} e6?
Clearly better is 1...fxe5 2 fxe5 \textit{\textbullet} e4
3 \textit{\textbullet} xd8 \textit{\textbullet} xd8 4 g4 hgx4 5 \textit{\textbullet} xg4 \textit{\textbullet} h6
6 \textit{\textbullet} xf5 gxf5 7 \textit{\textbullet} c2 \textit{\textbullet} h7 with advantage to Black.

2 g4! hxg4 3 \textit{\textbullet} xg4 \textit{\textbullet} g7?!
Again, 3...\textit{\textbullet} e4 is better.

4 \textit{\textbullet} c7! \textit{\textbullet} e4 5 \textit{\textbullet} e3!
5 \textit{\textbullet} xa7? is inadequate owing to 5...\textit{\textbullet} a8!!.
5...\h3?!  
5...\d7?! deserved attention.  
6 \g1 g5  
6...f5 would be met by 7 \h5! with an attack.  
7 \g4! \xg4 8 \wxg4 \wxg4 9 \xg4 \d6 10 \f2! \h5 11 \b7 \e4 12 f5!  
\xg4 13 \xg4 \c8 14 \d7 \c2? 15 \xd5 1-0

Here is what Bronstein wrote on the subject: “Modern parlance attaches the following meaning to the word bluff: ‘a fabrication, a deception, with the aim of intimidating’. In the theory of mathematically-based games this is a scientific term, but in practice, in a game with clashing interests it is an essential mechanism and an element of strategy. Von Neumann and Morgenstein, the originators of mathematical theory in sport, demonstrate that ‘bluff’ creates an element of uncertainty – its aim is to awaken in the opponent a deceptive impression of the true balance of power and to divert him from the most favourable plan of action.”

Here is an example – in four games in his 1960 world championship match against Botvinnik, Tal (as Black) employed the following bluff: 1 d4 \f6 2 c4 e6 3 \c3 \b4 4 a3 \xc3+ 5 bxc3 \e4 (D).

After 6 \c2 f5 (this occurred in two of the games) 7 f3 \h4+ 8 g3 \xg3 9 hxg3 \xh1 10 \h3 Black has problems with his queen, and analysis showed that White is even winning. However, not once during the match did Botvinnik risk going in for this line, and all four games were subsequently drawn. The bluff had proved totally justified. This is a good example of psychological bluff.

Here is another example from Tal’s games:

Tal – Filip  
Portorož IZ 1958

White has overplayed his position and strategically has a very dubious position. Therefore, with the time-control looming Tal changes the character of the game dramatically:

1 \xh6!? gxh6 2 \xe5 \e7 3 \d4 \xd4 4 cxd4 \h7 5 \d1

The position has now become unclear.
In your opponent’s time-trouble bluff is quite often used — he expects a ‘normal’ continuation, but a ‘stupid’ one which changes the course of events can often lead him to blunder. In practice, a bad move can even turn out to be ‘best’!

Salov – Nogueiras
Brussels WCup 1988

and there is no way to continue the attack.

2 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}xb2 a2 3 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}b1 xg2+ 4 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}f1 d3 5 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}xd3

and White has defended.

Galliamova – Rublevsky
St Petersburg 1996

Here 1...\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}f3 would lead to a draw, but taking into account his opponent’s time-trouble, Black played:

1...\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}g6??(!) 2 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}xb5
2 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}d2! wins.

2...\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}e2 3 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}b6 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}e4 4 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}h4?

After the correct 4 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}e5 White would win. But now the opposite happens:

4...\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{D}}}}xf2 5 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}d4 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{D}}}}d3+ 6 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}g1 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}e1+
7 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}h2 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{D}}}}xb4 0-1

In the following position, 1 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}xb2 is met by 1...\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}a2, but White chose...

1 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{D}}}}xg6!?

The only chance of sharpening the play.

1...\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}xg6?

Black could have taken the queen without risk: 1...\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{W}}}}xe2 2 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{D}}}}xf7+ \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{D}}}}g7!

Averbakh – Spassky
USSR Ch playoff
(Leningrad) (3) 1956

1...\textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{D}}}}c6!?

Otherwise Black has no counterplay whatsoever.

2 dxc6 bxc6 3 \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{D}}}}h4?!

Stronger is 3 a5 followed by \textbf{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textit{D}}}}a4.
3...\textit{We8} 4 \textit{hxg6 hxg6} 5 \textit{Wg4 Ab8} 6 \textit{d1 Ee6} 7 \textit{Aa3 Ad4} 8 \textit{Ah3 Wf7}! Black starts to generate threats.

9 \textit{Cc3 Afe8} 10 \textit{Ah3h2 Wc4}?
The preliminary 10...\textit{Ab7}! was correct, defending the seventh rank.

11 \textit{Axe6} 12 \textit{Axd4}?
White wins after 12 \textit{Ah8+ Axc8} 13 \textit{Ah8+} 14 \textit{Ah7+ Axc8} 15 \textit{Wf6+ \textit{Axe6}} 16 \textit{Ah8+ Axf7} 17 \textit{Ah7+ Ae8} 18 \textit{Af6+ Ad7} 19 \textit{Af6+ \textit{Ac8}} 20 \textit{Ad7+}!.

12...\textit{Axe6} 13 \textit{Af5 We6} 14 \textit{Wxe6+ Axe6} 15 \textit{Cc3 d5} 16 \textit{f3 Bb3} 17 \textit{Ah3 c4} 18 \textit{Af2 Ag6} 19 \textit{Ag1 d4} 20 \textit{Aa5 Af8} 21 \textit{Gg4 Ad6} 22 \textit{Ae2 Ad7} 23 \textit{g6 Bd7} 24 \textit{Ae1}?

24 \textit{Ad7} intending \textit{Af6} is more active.

24...\textit{Cc5} 25 \textit{Ag4 A7} 26 \textit{Aa5 c3}!
Black has seized the initiative.

\textit{Wf7+ Ah6} 6 \textit{Wf8+} Black has serious problems. But White was unable to work this out in the time available.

2...\textit{f4}! 3 \textit{Wd8+ Ag7} 4 \textit{Wd7+ Ah6} 5 \textit{gxh4} 0-1

\begin{center}
\textbf{Bannik – Petrosian}
\textit{USSR Ch (Moscow) 1957}
\end{center}

Black has just captured on c3 and White now faces a difficult decision. 1 \textit{Ah6} 2 \textit{Ah6} (1...\textit{Ah4}? is bad due to 2 \textit{bxc3 Axc6+} 3 \textit{b1 Axc6} 4 \textit{exf5 Axf5} 5 \textit{Axf5} 6 \textit{Wf6+ with an attack) 2 \textit{exf5 Axd1} 3 \textit{Af6 e5} 4 \textit{Af5 Ae4} 5 \textit{Ag7+! Axf8} 6 \textit{Ae6+!} 7 \textit{fxe6} 7 \textit{Ae8+ Axf7} 8 \textit{Ah6+ Axc8} 9 \textit{Axf7 Axf7} 10 \textit{Ah7+ Axc8} 11 \textit{Ag5 Axf2} gives Black drawing chances.

White therefore played the risky:

1 \textit{Axe6}!!
The game continued:

1...\textit{Wc4}?

Correct was 1...\textit{Bxe6} 2 \textit{Wxe6 Bxd1} 3 \textit{Bxf7} (after 3 \textit{Bxf7+ Ad8} 4 \textit{Ah5 Ad7} White’s attack is over) 3...\textit{Bxf7} 4 \textit{Bxf7+ Ad7} 5 \textit{Be7+ Axc6} 6 \textit{Bc4+ Bb6} 7 \textit{Bd4+ Bc5} 8 \textit{Bxd1 Bxg2} and White maintains an initiative, although

\begin{center}
\textbf{Beliavsky – Adams}
\textit{Dortmund 1998}
\end{center}

In White’s time-trouble, Mickey tried the following bluff:

1...\textit{h4}?! 2 \textit{Bxh4}??

An automatic move; after 2 \textit{Bxa5 hxg3} 3 \textit{Bxc6 gxf2} 4 \textit{Bxd5+ Bh7} 5
it is hardly sufficient to win – the chances lie with Black.

2 axg6 e2+

Petrosian had intended to continue 2...wxh4? but now saw that 3 c7+ d8 4 xc3 gives White a decisive attack. 2...xh4!? is interesting.

3 b1 c8? 4 g7+ f8 5 xe7+ xg7 6 f5 f4 7 xf4 xf4 8 xe8 1-0

The queen has nowhere to retreat. 1 wd3 is well answered by 1...c4! 2 wd4 b3 3 xf6 xf6 4 xf6 xa1 5 xh8 b3 with a large advantage for Black. White therefore tried to muddy the waters as much as possible by a queen sacrifice:

1 bxc5 xb5 2 xb5+ c6 3 xd6 d3

3...c4? is bad due to 4 xc4 dxc4 5 xa8 xa8 6 xf6.

4 ab1

Black would win after 4 xa8 xa8 5 xf6 xc5.

4...xc5 5 b5!

The materialistic 5 xf7? loses to 5...we7.

5...e6 6 c4!

Opening up the board. After 6 fc1 a4! 7 d4 xd4 8 cxd4+ ac4 Black wins.

6...xc4 7 e4+ xe4!
Returning material at the right time is the most important thing in such positions.

8 \text{\textsf{axd8}} \text{\textsf{a2}} 9 \text{\textsf{f6}} \text{\textsf{axb1}} 10 \text{\textsf{axh8}} \text{\textsf{xh8}}?

An automatic move made in time-trouble. 10...\text{\textsf{d2}}! wins.

11 \text{\textsf{xb1}}

and White held the draw.

3...\text{\textsf{f8}}! 4 \text{\textsf{h2}} \text{\textsf{g7}} 5 \text{\textsf{e3}} \text{\textsf{c5}} 6 \text{\textsf{e1}}?

Here the bluff 6 \text{\textsf{xh5}} should have been played, but one has to be psychologically ready to make such a decision.

6...\text{\textsf{c6}} 7 \text{\textsf{xc6}} \text{\textsf{xc6}} 8 \text{\textsf{h4}} \text{\textsf{d7}} 9 \text{\textsf{ef3}} \text{\textsf{b5}} 10 \text{\textsf{axb5}} axb5 11 \text{\textsf{b4}} \text{\textsf{d3}}!

and Black seized the initiative.

**Mikhailchishin – Taborov**

*Daugavpils 1978*

1 e4 c5 2 \text{\textsf{f3}} d6 3 d4 \text{\textsf{cxd4}} 4 \text{\textsf{xd4}} \text{\textsf{d6}} 5 \text{\textsf{c3}} e6 6 \text{\textsf{f4}} \text{\textsf{e7}} 7 \text{\textsf{f3}} \text{\textsf{c6}} 8 \text{\textsf{e3}} \text{\textsf{c7}} 9 \text{\textsf{d3}} a6 10 0-0 0-0 11 \text{\textsf{ae1}} \text{\textsf{d7}} 12 \text{\textsf{h1}}

12 \text{\textsf{g3}} is a more accurate continuation.

12...\text{\textsf{b5}} 13 \text{\textsf{g4}} \text{\textsf{xd4}} 14 \text{\textsf{xd4}} \text{\textsf{c6}}

15 \text{\textsf{g5}} \text{\textsf{d7}} 16 \text{\textsf{d5}} \text{\textsf{d8}} 17 \text{\textsf{h5}}?

I was much more concerned about 17 \text{\textsf{xe3}}. However, after 17...e5 18 \text{\textsf{c3}} exf4 19 \text{\textsf{xf4}} \text{\textsf{xe5}} 20 \text{\textsf{g1}} f6 21 gxf6 \text{\textsf{xf6}} Black is safe (as demonstrated by Kasparov and Nikitin); for example, 22 \text{\textsf{f5}} g6 23 \text{\textsf{b4}}? \text{\textsf{g7}}!.

17...\text{\textsf{exd5}} (D)

18 \text{\textsf{f3}}
This is a tempting and interesting idea, but not entirely correct. 18 \( \text{e}3 \) also fails to give White an adequate attack. However, in our opinion 18 e5 (Kasparov, Nikitin) 18...g6 19 \( \text{Wh}6 \) dxe5 20 \( \text{Xxe}5 \) leads to equality:

a) 20...\( \text{c}5 \)? is apparently solid, but loses in spectacular fashion: 21 \( \text{f}3 \) f5 22 \( \text{g}7+!! \) (this queen sacrifice was pointed out by Burgess; in their monograph Sicilian: ...e6 and ...d6 Systems, Kasparov and Nikitin analysed instead 22 \( \text{h}3(?) \) \( \text{f}7 \), when White has no more than a draw) 22...\( \text{xg}7 \) 23 \( \text{e}7++ \) \( \text{g}8 \) 24 \( \text{g}7+ \) \( \text{h}8 \) 25 \( \text{h}3 \) forces mate.

b) 20...\( \text{Xxe}5 \)! is best. After 21 \( \text{xe}5 \) f6 22 \( \text{Xxg}6 \) d4+ 23 \( \text{g}1 \), Black should avoid 23...\( \text{xf}7 \)!! 24 \( \text{xf}7+ \) \( \text{xf}7 \) 25 \( \text{Xxh}7+ \) \( \text{e}6 \) 26 \( \text{Wh}3+ \) \( \text{d}5 \) 27 \( \text{Xxd}4 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 28 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{d}5 \) (28...\( \text{c}7 \) 29 \( \text{Wh}7+ \) with a strong attack for White) 29 gxf6 \( \text{xf}6 \) 30 \( \text{x}f6 \) \( \text{x}f6 \) 31 \( \text{Xxd}5+ \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 32 \( \text{xf}3+ \), and prefer instead 23...hxg6 (Nunn), with an instant draw.

Therefore, the sacrifice on move 17 is sufficient to draw.

18...\( \text{e}5 \)! 19 fxe5 g6 (D)

20 \( \text{Wh}7+ \)

Pretty, and at the same time forced.

20...\( \text{Xxh}7 \) 21 \( \text{h}3+ \) \( \text{g}8 \) 22 \text{exd6}

f6 23 e5 \( \text{Xxd}6! \)

This turns out to be the correct decision. Kasparov and Nikitin claimed that 23...fxe5(?) wins by force, but in fact White still has resources:

a) 24 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 25 gxf6 \( \text{xf}6 \) 26 \( \text{h}6 \) d4+ 27 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{f}1+ \)!! with a decisive advantage to Black.

b) 24 dxe7! \( \text{exe}7 \) 25 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{g}7 \) and now:

It was this quiet move that Black had underestimated.

24...\( \text{f}7 \) 25 \( \text{h}6! \) (D)

Yet another strong move. 25 \( \text{xe}6 \) is weaker since after 25...\( \text{e}8 \), 26 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{d}7 \) gives Black a decisive advantage,
while Black also wins relatively easily after 26 \( \text{\textit{d}3} \) \( \text{\textit{c}8} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{h}4} \) \( \text{\textit{c}5} \) 28 g6 \( \text{\textit{x}d4} \).

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

25...\( \text{\textit{c}5}?! \)

In *Informator*, various monographs, and other publications the incorrect 25...\( \text{\textit{e}8} \) was suggested in this position with the exact same drawing sequence but in *Shakhmatny Biuletin* (no. 11, 1978) 25...\( \text{\textit{e}5} \) was recommended. 25...\( \text{\textit{a}5} \) is tempting, attacking the rook and intending 26...\( \text{\textit{e}8} \). If 26 c3, then 26...\( \text{\textit{e}8} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{x}e8} \) \( \text{\textit{x}e8} \) 28 \( \text{\textit{x}g6} \) \( \text{\textit{f}8} \) 29 \( \text{\textit{h}6} \) \( \text{\textit{x}f6} \) 30 \( \text{\textit{x}f6} \) \( \text{\textit{a}4} \) with the threat of ...\( \text{\textit{d}1} \) (31 b3 \( \text{\textit{a}3} \)!) gives Black good winning prospects. However, after 26 b4! \( \text{\textit{xb4}} \) (26...\( \text{\textit{x}b4} \) 27 \( \text{\textit{x}g6} \) \( \text{\textit{f}8} \) 28 \( \text{\textit{h}6} \) 27 c3 \( \text{\textit{b}2} \) 27...\( \text{\textit{x}d4} \) 28 \( \text{\textit{cxd4} \text{\textit{e}8} \) 29 \( \text{\textit{c}1} \)!) or 27...\( \text{\textit{xc3} \text{\textit{d}4+ \text{\textit{g}1 \text{\textit{d}xc3} \text{\textit{x}g6+ \text{\textit{f}8} \text{\textit{h}6 \text{\textit{c}7} \text{\textit{g}6 \text{\textit{g}8} \text{\textit{e}6 \text{\textit{c}5+ \text{\textit{f}1 \text{\textit{f}7+} \text{\textit{g}6+ \text{\textit{f}8} \text{\textit{h}6 it is not clear how Black can avoid repeating moves.

However, the cold-blooded 25...\( \text{\textit{f}8} \) should win for Black; e.g., 26 \( \text{\textit{x}g6+ \text{\textit{h}8} \text{\textit{e7} \text{\textit{e8} 28 \text{\textit{f}5 \text{\textit{c}8} \text{\textit{1/2-1/2}}} \text{\textit{B}} \)

27...\( \text{\textit{g}8 \text{\textit{g}8} \text{\textit{g}6+ 28 \text{\textit{x}c5 \text{\textit{d}4+ only gives Black winning chances. 28...\text{\textit{h}8 \text{\textit{h}8} \text{\textit{g}8 \text{\textit{g}8 30 \text{\textit{g}6+ \text{\textit{1/2-1/2}}} \text{\textit{B}} \)

**Positional bluff**

Positional bluff occurs less frequently. A typical case is a deliberate worsening of your own pawn-structure with the aim of changing an unfavourable
trend, which would otherwise continue through ‘normal’ play.

Now it is White’s turn to bluff, but Larsen has everything worked out – against a bluff, precise analysis is the only answer!

9...fxe5 10 w×g3+ w×g4!
This had to be seen in advance.
11 w×xg4+ h×h8 12 g×g5 w×d2 13 c×c7 w×f2+ 14 h×h2 w×g2+
Black went on to win.

Looked at from a strategic point of view Black’s position is very dubious. Larsen therefore initiates a complicated and risky plan, which involves a serious weakening of his own king position.

1...g5?!
This totally anti-positional flank operation has the chief aim of eliminating White’s pressure on the central d5-pawn.

2 w×g3
Clearly White must not take on g5 due to the double attack after ...d4.

2...g4 3 d×d4?
A routine move. 3 w×e5 is better as after 3...d4!? 4 c×c6 b×c6 5 exd4 w×g5 Black’s threats are only illusory.

3...d×d4 4 exd4 w×g5 5 0-0!?
Taimanov sacrifices the exchange so as not to lose the right to castle after ...w×e8+.

5...h×c1 6 h×c1 w×e6 7 h3 g×h3 8 w×e5 f6 9 w×e4!?  

Black stands badly and decided to play:

1...w×e3!?
Karpov reacted apprehensively:

2 w×e5
The challenge should be accepted: 2 f×e3 d×e3 3 h×b6 a×b6 4 h×e3 with a decisive advantage.

2...h×c2 3 h×c6?  
Another mistake – you can see the effect the bluff has had on Karpov. 3 a5 is better.

3...h×a1 4 h×a1 w×a8! 5 h×e1 e5 6 h×e5 w×f7 7 a5 h×b3 8 w×cb4 w×a8! 9 h×e8 h×e8 10 h×h2 w×f7!  
and Black managed to draw.
A Sense of Danger

Here is how GM Velimirović described Petrosian’s sense of danger: “Petrosian sees my threat and takes countermeasures well before I begin preparing it. When I am ready to make the threat real, it just seems pointless.”

8...\(\text{a}x\text{e}5\) 9 dxe5 \(\text{w}x\text{e}5\) 10 \(\text{w}x\text{a}7\) d4!

Korchnoi had not taken this move into consideration.

11 f4 \(\text{w}f6\) 12 \(\text{d}d1\) \(\text{d}d8!\) 13 \(\text{e}e2\) c5 14 exd4 c4!

Tactically, Petrosian was simply magnificent.

15 \(\text{x}x\text{e}8\) \(\text{x}x\text{e}8\) 16 \(\text{f}f1\) \(\text{e}e1\) 17 \(\text{w}a3\) \(\text{e}e4\) 18 d5 \(\text{d}d2\)

White resigned a few moves later.

Korchnoi – Petrosian
Moscow Alekhine mem 1971

1...\(\text{h}8!\)?

It was joked that the king is preparing to punch a hole in the kingside, but an interesting manoeuvre is being prepared.

2 \(\text{a}c1\)

2 e4 is premature due to 2...dxe4 3 \(\text{d}x\text{e}4\) \(\text{d}x\text{e}4\) 4 \(\text{f}x\text{e}7\) \(\text{w}x\text{e}7\) 5 \(\text{e}x\text{e}4\) \(\text{f}f6\) and 6...c5.

2...\(\text{e}e8!\) 3 \(\text{f}x\text{e}7\) \(\text{w}x\text{e}7\) 4 cxd5 exd5 5 \(\text{w}a4!?\)

5 e4 is stronger, despite the fact that White acquires an isolated pawn.

5...\(\text{d}d6\) 6 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{a}e8!\) 7 \(\text{e}e1\) f5 8 \(\text{e}e5!?\)

A risky decision, though Black had ideas of ...a5 followed by ...g5 starting a kingside attack.

Anand – Kasparov
Frankfurt rapid 1998

1 b3

Restricting the knight, after which White’s advantage in the centre and Black’s kingside weaknesses will tell.

1...e6 2 \(\text{d}e2\) \(\text{c}8\) 3 \(\text{d}d4\) b5 4 \(\text{d}d1\) \(\text{g}8\) 5 \(\text{e}3\) a5 6 0-0-0!

It is not easy to get at the white king, while at the same time the black king will not find a safe place on either flank.

6...a4 7 \(\text{b}1\) axb3 8 cxb3 \(\text{a}8\) 9 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{a}6\) 10 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{f}8\) 11 \(\text{b}4\) \(\text{a}8\) 12 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{e}7\) 13 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{c}8\) 14 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{b}7\) 15 \(\text{d}c2\) f6 16 \(\text{d}a4\) h4 17 g3 g4
18 f4 \textit{Q}f3 19 \textit{Q}xf3 gxf3 20 f5 hxg3 21 hxg3 \textit{Q}xg3 22 \textit{Q}h2! (D)

Ensuring the invasion of the white pieces into Black’s position.

22...\textit{Q}g5 23 \textit{Q}e1 \textit{Q}g7 24 \textit{Q}h5+ \textit{Q}f7 25 \textit{Q}xf3 1-0

Black did not wish to prolong his suffering.

1...f5?

1...\textit{Q}c5! is correct, to exchange off the weakest piece. After 2 \textit{Q}f5 \textit{Q}c7 3 \textit{Q}a5 \textit{Q}xb3 4 axb3 \textit{Q}a7 5 \textit{Q}b4 \textit{Q}f6 Black calmly holds the dark squares and improves his position.

2 \textit{Q}g1!!

With a double threat.

2...\textit{Q}h7

2...\textit{Q}f6 is bad due to 3 f4! exf4 4 \textit{Q}d4, when the light squares in Black’s position begin to creak.

3 \textit{Q}h5 \textit{Q}c5 4 f4 exf4 5 \textit{Q}d4 \textit{Q}g6! 6 \textit{Q}h2 \textit{Q}f6 7 \textit{Q}xf5+ \textit{Q}xf5 8 \textit{Q}xf5 \textit{Q}xf5 9 \textit{Q}h1 \textit{Q}h8 10 \textit{Q}xg5+! \textit{Q}xg5 11 \textit{Q}xf4

White’s material advantage is sufficient to win.

1...\textit{Q}ae8?

Played without any sense of danger. 1...\textit{Q}ad8 is better, but it is logical to play in the centre: 1...d5 2 \textit{Q}d3 \textit{Q}c5 3 exd5 \textit{Q}xd5 4 d6 \textit{Q}xd6 5 \textit{Q}xd6 c5 6 \textit{Q}g4 g6 7 \textit{Q}h4 f5 8 \textit{Q}fd1 \textit{Q}ad8 with a complicated game.

2 \textit{Q}d3! c5 3 \textit{Q}b5! (D)
3...\texttt{\underline{\textbf{c6}}}

After 3...\texttt{\underline{\textbf{d}}6 4 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{x}}d7 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{xd7}}} 5 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{g3}}}}}
g6 6 f5 White's attack is very dangerous.

4 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{x}}c6 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{xc6}}} 5 c4 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{d}}8}
5...\texttt{\underline{\textbf{f6}} is bad due to 6 e5 dxe5 7 fxe5 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{c7}}} 8 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{c3}}} with the advantage.
6 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{f1}} \texttt{\underline{\textbf{f8}}} 7 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{f3}}} \texttt{\underline{\textbf{c7}}} 8 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{g3}}}}
\texttt{\underline{\textbf{f6}}}

After 8...g6, 9 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{h3}}} is very awkward.
9 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{c3}}} a6 10 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{h3}}}
10 f5 is also interesting.
10...\texttt{\underline{\textbf{c6}}} 11 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{g3}}}! \texttt{\underline{\textbf{h8}}} 12 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{e1}}} \texttt{\underline{\textbf{c8}}}
13 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{e3}}}!

A typical attacking manoeuvre.
13...\texttt{\underline{\textbf{g8}}} 14 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{d1}}}! \texttt{\underline{\textbf{d7}}} 15 f5 e5 16 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{c3}}} \texttt{\underline{\textbf{d8}}} 17 \texttt{\underline{\textbf{d5}}}

White has a decisive advantage.
Opening intuition is not only apparent in the feeling for opening positions but also in sensing what is ‘new’ in determining the direction of opening discovery and being aware of the soundness of a particular course. I (A.M.) for a long time searched for a system to play against the Semi-Slav and noticed that GMs Kupreichik and Knežević were very successful with the following system:

1 d4 d5 2 c4 c6 3 f3 f6 4 c3 e6 5 e3 bd7 6 w2 c6 7 e4 dxe4 8 xe4 xe4 9 xe4 e5 10 dxe5 (D)

I opened a book by Pachman and saw that 10... dx5 11 dx5 wa5+ 12 ad2 wx5 was said to lead to equality, while 10...0-0 was claimed to be even stronger: 11 ad3 f5 12 exf6(??) ae8 13 f7+ xf7 14 a5+ af8 15 ed6+ ex6 16 wx6 ae5 and White loses his queen. These variations may well be convincing but I had the feeling that the reality was somewhat different and began searching. I found some answers quite quickly. The first case was in Mikhalchishin-Sveshnikov, Ashkhabad 1978. The renowned Semi-Slav specialist chose 10... dx5, to which I replied 11 c5! and after 11...f5 12 we2 wa5+ 13 ad2 wx5 14 ace3 Black lost a piece. The second line is more problematic; after 10...0-0 I have successfully tried the queen sacrifice 11 exd6! xe8 12 wx8+ wx8+ 13 ec3 in two games (see the game Mikhalchishin-Pavasović, which was analysed earlier in the book, for a detailed discussion) and believe that my opening intuition worked well, and that the position favours White.

However, this feeling for the position does not always work. Here is a very unsuccessful example:

Mikhalchishin – Zaichik
Tbilisi 1976

1 d4 ef6 2 c4 g6 3 hc3 ag7 4 e4 d5 5 f4 0-0 6 f3 c5 7 d5 e6 8 dxe6 fxe6 9 e5?! dx5 10 wxd8 edx8 (D)

Here I sank into thought – it seemed to me that 11 fxe5 eg4 12 ag5 f8 13 ae7 gives White the advantage, but then I spotted that Black has the simple 12... ed7!, when the e5-pawn
last game in the Karpov-Kasparov matches in Moscow 1985 and in Seville 1987. In the first instance Karpov needed to win and purposefully went in for a sharp line in the Scheveningen, which Kasparov simply knew better (although recent practice in this line shows a large advantage for White!) and Karpov was unsuccessful.

In analogous circumstances in Seville, Kasparov displayed a much more cunning approach (this time with Kasparov needing the win). Kasparov chose what was for him an uncharacteristic opening set-up with White and transferred the weight of the struggle to a drawn-out middlegame. Karpov expected more concrete play from his opponent and proved to be unprepared for this type of struggle, and ended up losing.

Kramnik’s opening strategy in his match with Kasparov is the most recent example of such a decision. Kramnik, having worked with Kasparov for some time and having played more than twenty games against him, understood that the weakest point in his play was the endgame. He therefore employed a strategy of exchanging queens in the opening, which led to him winning the match.

A common problem, which we shall now discuss, occurs in the last round of a tournament where some players are simply unable to handle critical games. Very interesting is Tigran Petrosian’s observation, who also did not like having to play for a win in the last round: “How is it possible to solve the problem in the last round when you
failed to solve it in all the previous ones?"

**Vasily Ivanchuk on opening intuition**

"I am one of those players for whom repeated use of a particular opening system does not lead to an intuitive understanding of the subtleties of the position. For me this feeling comes in new, fresh positions [Authors’ comment: Vasily often looks upwards; this was taught to him by Lembit Oll. Then irrespective of colour, he gets a kind of objective view on the position, which he uses at a particular moment.]. Here are my thoughts during the opening of a game against Karpov:

Karpov – Ivanchuk

*Monaco Amber rpd 2000*

1 d4 Qf6 2 c4 e6 3 Qc3 Qb4 4 Qc2 0-0 5 a3 Qxc3+ 6 Qxc3 b6 7 Qg5 Qb7 8 f3 h6 9 Qh4 d5 10 e3 Qbd7 11 cxd5 Qxd5 12 Qxd8 Qxc3 13 Qh4 Qd5 14 Qf2 (D)

"Black has superb development in this position whereas White has the definite advantage of the bishop-pair. For me, development is more important than anything else. What is Black to do here? After 14...Qac8 with the idea of meeting 15 Qb5 with 15...c6 16 Qa4 b5 followed by ...c5, but then I realized that 15 Qe2 is good for White. I then saw that ...c5 must be prepared, and came up with the outwardly illogical retreat of the knight away from the centre: 14...Qe7!. The game continued 15 Qb5 c6 16 Qa4 Qfd8! 17 Qe2 c5 18 Qxd7 Qxd7 19 dxc5 and here 19...bxc5 20 Qc1 Qad8 21 e4 Qd2 22 Qxc5 Qc6 23 b4 Qa6 would have given Black excellent play and many threats."

"Here is another example of my thoughts, this time in the Grünfeld: 1 d4 Qf6 2 c4 g6 3 Qc3 d5 4 cxd5 Qxd5 5 e4 Qxc3 6 bxc3 c5 7 Qe4 Qg7 8 Qe2 0-0 9 0-0 Qc6 10 Qe3 Qg4 11 f3 Qa5 12 Qxf7+ Qxf7 13 fxg4 Qxf1+ 14 Qxf1 (D)."
not like this. White’s plan is to play e5 and g5 in order to ‘bury’ the g7-bishop and putting the queen on d6 just encourages this. Here I came up with 14...cxd4 15 cxd4 e5! (D) and by playing this against Kiril Georgiev at Reggio Emilia 1989/90, I managed to win.

```
1
W
```

“For twenty moves I spent just five minutes, whereas he spent two hours! After 16 d5 c4 17 f2 f6 18 g1 f8 19 e1 h6! I managed to solve the main problem in this line – activating the dark-squared bishop. I didn’t continue to play this variation and simply forgot about it. It was only in 1999 that this variation made a return to the very top in the game Kramnik-Kasparov, Linares 1999, which went 17 d3 xe3+ 18 xe3 h4 19 h3 h6 20 d3 f8+ 21 g1 f2+ 22 h1 e3! 23 c4 h5! 24 xb5 f2 25 e8+ f8 26 e6+ h8 27 d6 xe2 28 xe5+ g7 29 e8+ f8 30 d7 d3 31 e5 h6+. The game ended in a draw and my variation became the main line in the Classical Exchange Grünfeld, but it did not end there. It seemed to me that it shouldn’t be so clear, and in Ivanchuk-Shirov, Tallinn Keres mem rpd 2000 I found the move 16 g1!; the game continued 16...exd4 17 c4 c6 18 c4c8 19 f3 d1+ 20 xg1 c2 21 d8+ g7 22 d7+ g8 23 g5 and I had gained the advantage! My previous experience had provided new insights!”

A positional pawn sacrifice as an opening strategy

Generally speaking, a pawn sacrifice in the opening is usually in return for a lead in development. This is the typical strategy of the gambit school of play – in return for the sacrificed material (a pawn), the King’s Gambit and Evans Gambit have the aim of gaining a lead in development and seizing the initiative and so creating threats. Of course, intuition is also a large factor here.

After resting idle during from the 1920s to the 1980s, this strategy has taken on a new popularity and it is now worth recalling the revival of the King’s Gambit. However, the intuitive sacrifice of a pawn in the opening for a somewhat different plan became popular in the mid-1970s due to the efforts of GM Romanishin and later those of Garry Kasparov, who had also taken up this way of playing. Here, the pawn was sacrificed not for an attack on the king, but rather for control of the centre. This is a very modern and complex way of playing.

The following position provides an example.

1 c3!
Tactical defence.
11...\textit{e}8
11...\textit{w}xd5 is met by 12 \textit{x}c4!.
12 \textit{w}c2 \textit{e}6e5 13 \textit{x}e5 \textit{w}xe5 14 \textit{x}c4!
The decisive combination.
14...\textit{b}xc4 15 \textit{w}xc4 \textit{f}f8 16 \textit{c}c7
\textit{a}7 17 \textit{g}8+ \textit{e}7 18 \textit{d}5+ 1-0

Romanishin – Tukmakov
\textit{USSR Ch (Tbilisi) 1978}

Rather than recapturing the pawn, White turns his play into a real gambit.
1...dxc3 2 \textit{d}xc3 d6 3 exd6 \textit{c}xd6?!
However odd it might look, 3...cxd6 is better.
4 \textit{f}4 b5 5 \textit{b}3 \textit{c}4 6 \textit{d}5 \textit{d}6 7 \textit{g}5 \textit{d}7
After 7...f6 8 \textit{h}4 Black will suffer due to his exposed king.
8 \textit{e}4! (D)

Romanishin – Geller
\textit{USSR Ch (Erevan) 1975}

1 \textit{f}f1! \textit{b}xd5 2 \textit{g}3 \textit{c}7
After 2...\textit{g}6 3 \textit{h}6 \textit{e}8 4 \textit{f}5! the white attack is very dangerous.
3 a4!
The correct strategy is to create pressure on both flanks.
3...\textit{b}xa4 4 \textit{x}a4 \textit{b}8 5 b4!
In return for the pawn, White has the bishop-pair and strong pressure.
Overall, the position is balanced.
5...\textit{e}8 6 \textit{e}3 \textit{b}5 7 \textit{c}2! \textit{c}8
After 7...\textit{x}c3 8 \textit{a}7 \textit{c}8 9 \textit{f}5 the black rook is captured.
8 \textit{x}a6 \textit{c}3 9 \textit{a}8 \textit{c}7 10 \textit{d}5 \textit{f}6?
10...\textit{d}4 is correct, with chances to equalize.

Improving the coordination of all his pieces. This is an extremely instructive example.
8...\textit{f}6 9 \textit{f}4 \textit{x}f4 10 \textit{x}f4 \textit{d}8 11 \textit{e}2!
11 $\textsf{xf8}+$ $\textsf{xf8}$

After 11...$\textsf{xf8}$ 12 $\textsf{xb5}$ $\textsf{xc2}$ 13 $\textsf{a1}$, Black's defence isn't easy.

12 $\textsf{a7+}$ $\textsf{xc7}$ 13 $\textsf{xb5}$ $\textsf{g8}$
14 $\textsf{a1}$ $\textsf{d5}$ 15 $\textsf{a7+}$ $\textsf{c4}$ 16 $\textsf{b8!}$ $\textsf{d4}$
17 $\textsf{g5}$ $\textsf{h7}$ 18 $\textsf{e7}$ $\textsf{d3}$ 19 $\textsf{xf8}$
$\textsf{xf8}$ 20 $\textsf{a8}$

Black resigned a few moves later.

10 $\textsf{bxa6}$ $\textsf{xa6}$ 11 $\textsf{xa6}$ $\textsf{bxa6}$ 12 $\textsf{c5}$!
The passed pawn is extremely dangerous.

12...$\textsf{c2}$ 13 $\textsf{c6}$ $\textsf{a5}$ 14 $\textsf{e1}$!
Coordinating all the pieces.

14...$\textsf{a4}$ 15 $\textsf{e4}$ $\textsf{c3}$ 16 $\textsf{e3!}$ $\textsf{a1+}$
17 $\textsf{g2}$ $\textsf{f6}$ 18 $\textsf{b4}$ $\textsf{a1}$ 19 $\textsf{c7}$ $\textsf{g6}$ 20
$\textsf{b7}$ $\textsf{a2}$ 21 $\textsf{d3!}$ 1-0

---

**Romanishin – Ornstein**

_Erevan 1976_

Black's position looks solid, but White can develop his play easily.

1 $\textsf{c3}$ $\textsf{e5}$
1...0-0 is bad in view of 2 $\textsf{e5!}$, exploiting the dark squares.

2 $\textsf{g2}$ 0-0 3 0-0 $\textsf{c6}$ 4 $\textsf{a4!}$
Preventing ...$\textsf{b4}$.

4...$\textsf{d6}$ 5 $\textsf{b4}$ $\textsf{a6}$ 6 $\textsf{b5}$ $\textsf{d4}$
What else? 6...$\textsf{d8}$ is very strongly met by 7 $\textsf{f4!}$, playing on both flanks.

7 $\textsf{xd4}$ $\textsf{exd4}$ 8 $\textsf{xd4}$ $\textsf{xe2}$ 9 $\textsf{xd6}$ $\textsf{e6}$

Black tries to escape by returning the pawn.

---

**Sosonko – Romanishin**

_Amsterdam 1973_

1...$\textsf{e5}$! 2 $\textsf{dxe5}$?
White has to go in for 2 $\textsf{d5}$ $\textsf{a5}$ 3 $\textsf{c2}$ $\textsf{xd5}$ 4 $\textsf{xe4}$, although Black retains the initiative.

2...$\textsf{xex5}$ 3 $\textsf{xe4}$ $\textsf{e6}$ 4 $\textsf{a4}$ $\textsf{d3+}$
5 $\textsf{xd3}$ $\textsf{xd3}$ 6 $\textsf{d1}$
It looks as if Black's sacrifice wasn't sound, but...

6...$\textsf{b5}$! 7 $\textsf{xd3}$ $\textsf{bxa4}$ 8 $\textsf{c5}$ $\textsf{c4}$
Not materialism; the bishop must keep the white king in the centre.

9 $\textsf{d6}$ $\textsf{b5}$ 10 $\textsf{d2}$ $\textsf{fd8}$ 11 $\textsf{b7}$
$\textsf{db8}$ 12 $\textsf{c5}$ $\textsf{f8}$

White can resign.
Every chess-player naturally strives to solve problems over the board in a logical manner, or better still, through precise analysis resulting from a particular plan or manoeuvre. This is characteristic of a person solving life’s everyday problems, but, as in other aspects of life, in chess there exists a multitude of situations that lie outside the boundary of normal rational concepts.

Take the following example:

2...b4 3 a2 a3 4 bxc4 xc1 5 xc1 xc4

A completely unbalanced position has arisen, where the chances can hardly be assessed through rational argument – and one is also unlikely to find the answer through analysis of variations. However, intuition suggests that the play develops to Black’s advantage.

6 exd5 e4 7 e2 xc2 8 xd4 bc8 9 h3 e3 10 d6 wd2! 11 cd3 xe2

11...cd7 12 xf4 ec6 also deserved attention.

12 d7 xxd7 13 wd7 d2 14 e1 e2 15 g1!

Not 15 a5 because of 15...fd8! followed by 16...cc3!.

15...a5 16 g3?
16 wb5 is better, with equality.

16...wh6 17 xf2 wc6 18 xc6 xc6 19 zb1 xc4 20 xb7 xa4 21 xe1 xa3 22 cd7 a4

To the end of the game, which later ended in a draw, play assumed an irregular and tense nature where Black possibly failed to make use of his chances.

Hardly anyone can question the role intuition plays in creativity in chess – for it is certain that in many complex positions even an experienced player must play through intuition. But this, of course, involves a strategic risk (I
ask you not to confuse this with tactical risk, for through accurate play the opponent could produce a forced refutation – unless, of course, you wish to embark on adventures!).

First of all, nobody is incapable of coming up with a faulty plan. Intuitive decisions sometimes turn out to be unattainable dreams, while now and then they prove to be remarkably profound and correct. In established chess literature, the question of intuition has up to now been explored rather less than in many other spheres of creativity, whether artistic or scientific. The renowned French physicist Louis de Broglie wrote: “Science, intrinsically logical in its foundations and methods, can bring about much greater advancement by sudden dangerous leaps of faith when abilities such as imagination, intuition, and ingenuity show themselves, free from the heavy gaze of serious discussion”.

In adopting intuitive solutions there exists a different ‘dimension’ of time – intuitive decisions are, to some extent, reflex actions. They come into play during the most critical and complex moments of the game, where one is unable to get by with either analysis or logic alone. This is generally when the part of the game demanding decisive action is looming, such as venturing to sacrifice a piece, shifting from defence over to attack, etc.

The idea of preparation should generally be accompanied by a resolute force of the positive, expressive variety. Only logical discussion demands a great expenditure of energy, and this is the place usually occupied by extensive experience and knowledge. The analysis of variations always demands considerable effort, and the more complex the analysis, the greater the tension experienced by the participant. As a rule, in such a distinctive device as this, the ‘high voltage’ period will arise as if unnoticed, when the decision-making process will be overrun by intuition and creative fantasy (concepts identical to one another).

Frequently, as the fast-moving game comes to an end, those of a more confrontational nature will be heard to ask how one could arrive at such a crazy idea. The brief reply “by accident” will come back just as often. Not having the slightest doubt in the sincerity of such an answer (I myself have employed such an instinct) I have, as a rule, noticed that this ‘good fortune’ carries with it a wholly external character. It is believed that it is here above all that the individual’s unused subconscious resources reveal themselves. This in turn leads to activity that cannot be explained verbally. Having tested all recognized means (such as logic and analysis) as the fundamental building-blocks, limits will be reached, and intuition takes effect. As if you are looking in a mirror, it will reflect the very heart of your chess understanding.

The following solution by White in the 8th game from the 1986 world championship match made a strong impression on me.

The following diagram shows the position resulting after Black’s 21st
move. It seems that 1 \( \mathcal{A}xf8 \mathcal{A}xf8 \) 2
\( \mathcal{O}d4 \mathcal{W}e7 \) is self-evident, after which
play runs along calmer lines where, it
must be said, it is hard to say whether
White will be able to exploit his mini-
mal advantage. Kasparov, however,
unexpectedly went for a continuation
sharpening play to the utmost:

1 \( \mathcal{A}b5! ? \)

I was a live spectator at this game,
and the immediate effect of this attack-
ing thrust was astonishing. Not only
numerous onlookers, but also some
grandmasters, thought that Kasparov
had simply made an oversight in the
heat of the battle. To tell the truth, I
was one of them. I recall that Dorf-
man, Kasparov’s ashen-faced second,
exclaimed “That’s it! He’s missed
something! Has he got any compen-
sation for the pawn?”

But no, this was not an oversight
but a conscious, albeit risky, decision.
Such a complicated manoeuvre would
hardly stand up to precise analysis,
and Kasparov would of course have
calculated some concrete variations,
but in the end decided to trust his intu-
ition by taking into account not just
purely chess factors but also that his
opponent was short of time. Perhaps
Kasparov’s plan was not the strongest,
but over the board it proved to be cor-
rect.

1...\( \mathcal{O}g7 \) 2 \( \mathcal{A}xg7 \mathcal{A}xg7 \) 3 \( \mathcal{M}d6 \mathcal{W}b3! \)
4 \( \mathcal{A}xg7 \mathcal{W}xb5 \) 5 \( \mathcal{O}f5 \)
5 \( \mathcal{O}h5 \) is met by 5...\( \mathcal{O}f3 +! \).
5...\( \mathcal{M}ad8 \)

Despite the time shortage, Karpov
by no means made this move straight
away. Was he aware that by playing ei-
ther 5...\( \mathcal{M}ae8 \) 6 \( \mathcal{W}g5 \mathcal{F}6 \) 7 \( \mathcal{M}xf6 \mathcal{M}xf6 \) 8
\( \mathcal{O}h6+ \mathcal{O}g7 \) 9 \( \mathcal{W}xf6+ \mathcal{O}xh6 \) 10 \( \mathcal{F}4 \)
\( \mathcal{O}f3 +! \) or 5...\( \mathcal{F}6 \), he could have secured
a draw?

Nevertheless, by resolutely pursu-
ing his plan, believing that White’s at-
tacking potential was insufficient and
that Black’s material advantage should
prove decisive, Karpov unintentionally
misplaced his sense of danger.

It seems that this intuitive decision
was made in a typical outburst, where
complex chess problems merge with
psychological factors.

The game continued:
6 \( \mathcal{M}f6! ? \mathcal{A}d2?! \)
Here 6...\( \mathcal{O}h8 \) offered better pros-
pects.
7 \( \mathcal{W}g5 \mathcal{W}xb2? \)
The decisive mistake. It was by now
vital to play 7...\( \mathcal{O}h8 \).
8 \( \mathcal{H}h1 \mathcal{O}h8? \) 9 \( \mathcal{A}d4! \mathcal{X}xd4 \) 10
\( \mathcal{W}xe5 \) 1-0

Intuition is one of the most valuable
qualities of thinking in chess. The piece
sacrifice in the next game was also an
intuitive one, and in actual fact it was pleasing that I was then convinced that it was correct.

1...\text{Qxd4}!

This move, which I had seen quite quickly, was nevertheless made with some indecision. This game was played in the last round in the semi-finals of the Soviet Championship, and a loss would have prevented me from progressing to the final. However, this continuation appealed to me so much that I disregarded all sporting nervousness.

2 \text{Bxd4 Qg2}!

The point of Black’s combination. Using the disharmony of the white pieces and certain nuances of the position (the undefended knight on a4), the black pieces turn their attention to the white king.

3 \text{Qe2}!

After 3 \text{Qxg2 Qg4+ 4 f1 Qxd4 5 Qe2! Qe4! 6 f3 Qxd1+ 7 Qxd1 Qxa4 8 Qxc6 Qxc6 9 Qxc6 Qc8} Black has a winning position. The lesser evil was to play 3 Qe2 Qxd4 4 Qxg2 Qxc3 5 Qxd7 Qxd7 6 bxc3! Qd2 7 Qf3 Qc8 and although Black is better, to exploit his advantage is far from easy.

3...Qg4 4 f3?

This loses by force. More resilient is 4 Qe5, against which I had prepared 4...Qh3+ 5 Qg3 Qf3 6 Qf1 Qxd1 7 Qxd1 Qxd1 8 Qd3! Qxd3! 9 Qxd3 Qd8 10 Qc5 Qd5 11 b4 a5 12 a3 axb4 13 axb4 Qd4. The endgame is definitely in Black’s favour, but realizing this advantage will be an arduous task. Honestly speaking, by the way events were developing, I relied on precise analysis more and more.

I would like to deliberate at this moment. Evidently, intuition is not even momentarily separated from calculation and logical assessment of the position. In fact, in the complex processes of thought, there occurs a continuous exchange of dominating factors and it is very likely that intuition comes into play rather more rarely.

4...Qxf3+ 5 Qf2 Qxd1 6 Qc5

6 Qxd1 poses more problems; indeed, 6...Qxd1? 7 Qh6 f6 8 Qc4+ Qh8 9 Qf7 Qg8 10 Qxe7! holds some danger for Black. However, after 6...f6?! 7 Qxf6 exf6 8 Qc4+ Qxc4 9 Qxc4+ Qg7 10 Qxd8 Qxd8 11 Qe3 f5! Black should win. Authors’ note: 6...Qxa4! is strong.

6...f6 7 Qxf6

Or 7 Qh6 Qh4+ 8 Qf1 Qxh6 9 Qxd1 Qxh2!.

7...exf6 8 Qc4+ Qg7 9 Qe6+ Qh6 10 Qxf6 Qd2+ 11 Qe3 Qe2+ 12 Qe2 Qxe2+ 13 Qf4 Qxh2+ 14 Qe4 Qe2+ 15 Qf4 Qf2+ 16 Qe5 Qxb2+ 17 Qd4 Qe8+ 18 Qd6 Qb8+ 19 Qe5 Qe5+ 20
An intuitive piece sacrifice – the subsequent play develops 'without rhyme or reason'.

2 hxg3 hxg5 3 f4 axb5!
On 3...exf4 would come 4 c6!.

4 axb5 exf4 5 bxh5
On 5...gxh5 6 xg5+ e6 7 c3+

5...xg3 6 xg7+ xg7 7 c3+

g8 f8 h5 f4 h5 9 f2 fxe4 10 fxe8+
xh8 11 bxh3

Black now gains an undisputed advantage. White should play 11 d7

f4 12 e6+ xe6 13 dxe6 d5 14

we5 c6 15 e7 f7 16 b5 with an unclear game.

11...xf5 12 xf3 xd5 13 xd3 we5

14 d1 d5

Black has three pawns for the piece and the precarious position of the white king gives him the advantage.

15 f2 c6 16 f1 f8 17 h5 d4 18

f3 b2 19 b5 d4 20 xh3

xf2+ 21 h1 f5 22 bxc6 bxc6 23

b3 g5 24 h3 g3 25 b8+ g7

26 we5+ h6 27 we6 f3+ 28 h2

f2+ 29 h1 xc5 30 f1 e2 31

f7 d1+ 32 f1 c2 33 f7 d1+

34 f1 d3+ 35 h2 g5 36 c8

g3+ 37 h1 h5 0-1

In taking important decisions it is hardly possible to rely on intuition alone. Playing through intuition, just like relying on logical thought, has both its advantages and disadvantages. Its experimental nature always resembles playing with fire, and is characteristic of youth and inexperience. On the other hand, it can be a warning to more venerable players – a gradual loss, as combinative vision and avoiding
intuitive decisions constitutes suppressing a player’s talent. This leads to routine play: using experience without searching for original ideas leads to dryness and stagnation of one’s creativity. A time comes when a player begins to lose his daring, his ability to overcome large obstacles. I have noticed that intuitive play demands an enormous energy of thought, and it is here that it lies with youth, full of strength and greater possibilities.

**Positional instinct**

It is likely that this expression entered the chess-player’s vocabulary earlier than the more universal word ‘intuition’. Essentially, it is accepted that these concepts are perfectly satisfactory, but so astutely has our chess terminology taken shape that here a common discrepancy has emerged. In opposition to intuition and its eternal associate risk, positional insight is usually linked to nuances and at the same time safe, predominantly positional plans.

Thus, positional insight implies an assortment of specific answers with which we can unearth a successful plan. It may help us to find the key to gaining an advantage, for in many situations where storm clouds are gathering over our position, we can, with its help, successfully find the path to safety.

In the following diagram, Smyslov has a piece for three pawns. However, considering the black pawns are situated along the g-file, it is evident that the material balance favours White.

But how is this to be realized? Should he play for the attack, or to bring about an endgame with 1  \textit{We6}+? Smyslov chose the second option, which, alas, proved to be mistaken. After 1...\textit{Wxe6} 2  \textit{Exe6}  \textit{ef7} 3  \textit{Efe1}  \textit{Efe8} 4  \textit{Exe8}  \textit{Exe8} 5  \textit{Exe8} (after 5  \textit{Ed1}  \textit{Ee3} 6  \textit{f2}  \textit{Nh3}! Black is over the worst) 5...\textit{Exe8} 6  \textit{Ec3}  \textit{Ed7} 7  \textit{a5}  \textit{Ed8} 8  \textit{b4}  \textit{b6} Black constructed a fortress, which White was unable to breach. Returning to the starting position, we noticed that the correct plan for exploiting his advantage consisted of creating an attack on the kingside; for example, 1  \textit{Wg2}!  \textit{Efe8} 2  \textit{h3}  \textit{a5} 3  \textit{Ee5}!, etc.

So why then did positional intuition, so characteristic of Smyslov, abandon him in this instance? It is thought that fear prompted him towards an endgame, for it is this stage of the game that he always played with particular finesse. It is in the endgame that all of his strength and talent unfold; however, during the course of time it is this very aspect that, paradoxically, could perhaps have become his Achilles’
Heel. Herein lies the moral: never become obsessed about even your finest attributes and qualities. Here it is somewhat easier to give advice than it is to set a good example.

While not outwardly astounding, White’s moves in the next game are instructive, and covered with a profound feeling of the depth of the position.

4 $\text{a}5!$ $\text{f}b8$ 5 $\text{c}4$ $\text{c}6$ 6 $\text{d}e1$ $\text{b}4$
7 $\text{d}1!$

A quiet, but decisive, move. On the other hand, the direct 7 $\text{d}3$ would be met by 7...$\text{a}4$, whereas now the c5-pawn is doomed.

7...$\text{b}7$ 8 f3 $\text{d}8$ 9 $\text{d}3$ g5 10 $\text{b}3!$ $\text{f}8$ 11 $\text{x}c5$ $\text{x}c5$ 12 $\text{x}c5$

and White overcame Black’s resistance to win in another 31 moves.

Here we see some examples of using positional intuition to deal with the problems of defending or gaining counterplay.

The game continued:
1 $\text{f}c1!$

An impressive move. By preparing a queenside assault, White defends the important c3-square in advance and deprives Black of the option of playing ...$\text{a}4$ with tempo. In contrast, the unimaginative 1 $\text{f}d1$ offers little.

1...$\text{b}7$
2 $\text{f}1$ $\text{d}5$

2...$\text{c}e6$ is more accurate, although after 3 $\text{e}5$ $\text{a}4$ 4 $\text{b}5$ $\text{x}b5+$ 5 $\text{x}b5$ $\text{f}c8$ 6 $\text{d}3$ White has the better chances.

3 $\text{b}5!$ $\text{d}7$?
3...$\text{ac}8$ offers greater resistance.

Ravinsky – Smyslov
USSR Ch (Moscow) 1944

White has a space advantage, and the time has come for Black to decide whether to maintain a prolonged, passive defence of the queenside, or whether to begin immediate counterplay in this part of the board.

1...c5!

This move has several advantages and disadvantages. It is hardly possible to weigh up all that follows in the usual rational manner, i.e. through
logic and calculation. It would appear that, in making this decision, Smyslov relied first and foremost on his intuition.

2 dxc5 axa4 3 wxa4 bxc5 4 xf1 wb6 5 b5 e4!

The point of Black’s combination. By sacrificing a pawn, Black, not unreasonably, puts his faith in a kingside counterattack.

6 h3(?)

White was presumably taken aback by the sudden change of events. Humbly allowing the black pawn to reach c3 is equivalent to disaster. Naturally, to unravel the web of forcing variations in this position was far from easy. For example, after 6 axc4 g4, 7 xf1 d3 8 xdx3 xc1 gives Black dangerous threats. White has similar difficulties in the event of 7 c2 d7; for example, 8 h3 xf2 9 xf2 c5 10 ee2 wc7 with the double threat to both g3 and c4. However, according to Smyslov White could have defended against the immediate threats by playing 6 axc4 g4 7 e2! xc4 8 wxc4 c5 9 wc2 xb5 10 h3. Nevertheless, by no means everyone can work out all of this in such situations.

6...c3 7 wb3 c5 8 c2 d2! 9 xxd2

After 9 xdx2 xf2+ 10 g2 xe1 11 xf3 e3 12 e2 xe2+! 13 xe2 c2 Black’s c-pawn will promote to a queen.

9...cxd10 e2 xf2+ 11 g2 xc3! 12 wdd1 e3 13 xdx2 wdd4 14 we1 xe4 15 xe4 xe4+ 16 h2 wdd4 17 eg2 ec1 18 we2 wa1 19 xe3 xfl 20 g4 e1 21 e2 0-1

This leads us to the conclusion that positional intuition is the most significant expression of the process of logical thought.

Smyslov – Florian
Budapest-Moscow 1949

In an attempt to develop an initiative on the kingside, White played...

1 g5!

Black was now confronted with a choice – either to accept the sacrifice of a piece and in doing so exposing his king to attack, or resign himself to a somewhat inferior position after 1...xg5 2 xg5. It must be said that the decision was far from straightforward. Nonetheless, before beginning calculations the sensitive device that is intuition should have alerted a sense of caution and prompted Black to go for the latter option, despite it giving him an objectively worse position. However, there is the concept of temptation, which so often features not only in our daily lives, but also over the chessboard. This can be all the more relevant when, having analysed the
position, the player cannot see a direct refutation.

All the same, Black chose to accept the challenge:

1...\(\square x e 3\) 2 \(\mathbb{W} x h 7 + \mathbb{S} f 6\) 3 \(b x c 3\)

It appears that this position presents the greatest distress for Black, but it is by no means of an intuitive nature. In this position it is accurate play that takes precedence and Black has a choice of taking either piece.

3...\(\mathbb{S} x g 5\)

Unfortunately, 3...\(\mathbb{E} e 2\) is bad here due to 4 \(f 4! \mathbb{H} f 8\) (or 4...\(\mathbb{W} c 7\) 5 \(d 6 \mathbb{W} d 7\) 6 \(\mathbb{A} e 1 \mathbb{A} x e 1\) 7 \(\mathbb{A} e 1 \mathbb{A} e 8\) 8 \(\mathbb{E} e 7\) \(\mathbb{E} x e 7\) 9 \(\mathbb{W} h 8 #\) 5 \(\mathbb{W} h 6 + \mathbb{A} e 8\) 6 \(\mathbb{A} e 1 \mathbb{A} d 3\) 7 \(\mathbb{W} h 4 + \mathbb{E} e 7\) 8 \(\mathbb{E} e 4 + \mathbb{S} f 8\) 9 \(d 6 \mathbb{G} g 7\) 10 \(f 5 !\), when Black has no defence to the threats of 11 \(f 6 +\) and 12 \(\mathbb{W} h 6 +\).

4 \(\mathbb{W} g 7\)

It would seem that Black had overlooked this ‘quiet’ move in his analysis. The black king is now unable to escape from the mating-net.

4...\(\mathbb{E} e 4\)

4...\(\mathbb{E} x e 2\) 5 \(f 4 + \mathbb{S} g 4\) 6 \(h 3 +\).

5 \(f 4 + \mathbb{E} x f 4\) 6 \(\mathbb{E} x f 4 \mathbb{E} x f 4\) 7 \(\mathbb{E} f 1 +\) \(\mathbb{E} e 3\)

Or: 7...\(\mathbb{G} g 5\) 8 \(h 4 +\); 7...\(\mathbb{E} e 4\) 8 \(\mathbb{A} c 4 !.\)

8 \(\mathbb{E} e 5 + \mathbb{D} d 2\) 9 \(\mathbb{A} c 4 \mathbb{W} x a 3\) 10 \(\mathbb{E} f 2 +\)

1-0

In this example it is not merely the role that accurate analysis (as well as inaccurate analysis!) in making a crucial decision that is evident, but also the close links it shares with intuitive solutions. In trusting analysis, it is not unusual for a player to lose his feeling for the position. In certain positions the disadvantages of combinative vision are manifest, while in others external factors gradually get in the way (in the example given, the temptation to win material), with sporting temperament being the most frequent.

The higher the professional standard of the player, the more interesting and varied his range of intuitive techniques become, and it is specifically material such as this that a young player will benefit from studying.

There now follow several examples involving a dynamic breakthrough in the centre. We shall focus on various techniques employed by Paul Keres.

Keres – Simagin

USSR Ch (Moscow) 1951

1 \(c 5 !\)

By seizing the most favourable moment to open up the centre, Keres increases his initiative.

1...\(\mathbb{D} x c 5\)

1...\(d 5\) 2 \(\mathbb{A} e 4 e 2\) \(\mathbb{A} c 8\) 3 \(b 4\) gives Black a prospectless position.

2 \(\mathbb{D} x c 5\) \(e 5\) 3 \(\mathbb{A} x e 5\) \(\mathbb{D} x e 5\) 4 \(\mathbb{A} x e 5\) \(\mathbb{D} c 6\) 5 \(\mathbb{X} x f 6 !\)

This is the most effective path to victory. By sacrificing the exchange,
White opens up lines for an attack on the king.

5...\texttt{\textit{\textsc{\textit{\textbullet}}}}x\texttt{\textit{\textit{\textbullet}}}e4

5...\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xf6 6 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e5 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g6 7 \texttt{\textit{\textit{\textbullet}}}xc6 \texttt{\textit{\textit{\textbullet}}}xc6 8 \texttt{\textit{\textit{\textbullet}}}d7 is bad for Black.

6 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xg7+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xg7 7 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}d4+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f6 8 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xe4
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}af8 9 h4 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h8 10 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e7 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f5 11 f4
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g6 12 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h2 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f7 13 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e8+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g7 14
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e4 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g4 15 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}d5 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}d7 16 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e5! h6 17
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xf7 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xf7 18 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f8+! \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xf8 19 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xf6+
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g8 20 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g6+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h8 21 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f6+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g8 22
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h5 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}d1 23 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g6+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h8 24 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e8+ 1-0

In his youth Keres became highly adept in the practice of negotiating fierce tournament encounters. It was in the process of improvisation that he often intuitively sought out solutions, which then became universally recognized means of conducting a chess battle.

In the following game, not for the first time, Keres employed a typical plan for breaking through in the centre.

\texttt{\textbullet} xe4

This continuation is now a typical device in positions such as this. This brings to mind, for example, Polugaevsky-Tal, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1969: 1 d4 d5 2 c4 e6 3 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}c3 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f6 4 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f3 c5 5
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}cx5 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}x5 6 e4 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xc3 7 bx\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}c3 exd4 8
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xd4 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}b4+ 9 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}d2 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xd2+ 10 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xd2
0-0 11 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}c4 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}c6 12 0-0 b6 13 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}ad1
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}b7 14 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}fe1 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}c8 15 d5! \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}a5 16 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}d3
exd5 17 e5! \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}c4 18 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f4 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}b2 19
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xh7+ with a winning attack.

2...\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}d7

The alternative is 2...\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e4, after which the following variation is possible: 3 e6! fxe6 4 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xe4 dxe4 5 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g5
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}c3! 6 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xe6+ (in the event of 6
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xh7+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f8 7 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xe6+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e7 8 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h4+
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f6 White’s attack may run out of steam) 6...\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f8 7 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f1 (less convincing are 7 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f4+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e7 8 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f7+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f6 and 7
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xh7+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e8 8 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h5+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e7 9 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f7+
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}d6 – play has become unclear in both cases). Now both 8 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f4+ followed by \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f7+ and \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xb7 as well as 8
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xc8 are threatened, with excellent prospects for White.

3 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g5 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f8

This leads to a quick finish. A much livelier struggle arises after 3...h6 4 e6! hgx5 5 exf7+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xf7 6 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e7+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g8
(after 6...\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g6 7 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}d4 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}c3 8 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}c2+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h5
9 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}d1+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h6 {9...g4 10 h3} 10 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e1 e3! Black loses his queen) 7 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xg5! \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}c3 8
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h3 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f6 (after 8...\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f8 9 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e3 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}a1+ 10
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h2 or 8...\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}c5 9 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}e1 e5! Black’s position is hopeless) 9 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xh5+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xh5 10
\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xd5+ \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h8 11 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xd7 with serious winning chances for White (Keres).

4 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xh7 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}xh7

After 4...\texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}g6 5 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}h5 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f4 6 \texttt{\textit{\textbullet}}f5
Black has a lost position.
5 \text{h}3 \text{c}6 \text{c}1 6 \text{x}h7+ \text{f}8 7 \text{e}3 \text{d}4 \\
8 \text{h}8+ \text{e}7 9 \text{x}g7 \text{f}8 \\
White also wins after 9...\text{d}5 10 \text{f}6+ \text{d}7 (10...\text{e}8 11 \text{e}6!) 11 \text{x}d5, \\
etc. \\
10 \text{f}6+ \text{e}8 11 \text{e}6 1-0 \\

In his subsequent play Keres repeatedly employed a similar device for opening up the centre.

\begin{center}
\textit{Keres – Spassky} \\
\textit{Riga Ct (8) 1965}
\end{center}

1 \text{d}5! \\
As the reader may realize, Keres did not only notice possibilities such as this when the opportunity arose, but he also had them well prepared in advance. \\
1...\text{f}7 \\
White wins after 1...\text{ex}d5 2 \text{c}xd5 \text{c}xd5 3 \text{c}4 \text{c}6 (if 3...\text{exe}3 then 4 \text{e}1) 4 \text{c}xd5 \text{c}xd5 5 \text{c}8+ \text{f}7 6 \text{b}7. \\
2 \text{e}4 \text{c}5 3 \text{b}2 \text{f}4 4 \text{e}5 \text{h}5 5 \text{g}1 \text{g}6 6 \text{g}4 \text{d}8 7 \text{d}3 \text{g}8 8 \text{f}2 1-0 \\

Finally, we have another brilliant example of Keres’s improvisation.

\begin{center}
\textit{Keres – Smyslov} \\
The Hague/Moscow Wch 1948
\end{center}

1 \text{c}5?! \\
Regarding this decision, Keres commented: “The consequences of this continuation had to be assessed accurately, for Black now has the possibility of breaking up the position by playing ...\text{e}5. It is clear that after this move nothing will remain of White’s proud centre.” \\
1...\text{b}4 2 \text{b}2 \text{e}5 3 \text{g}5! \text{e}7 4 \text{f}4! \\
(D)

\begin{center}
\textit{B}
\end{center}

White’s fundamental idea involves an attack on the kingside, with the f7-square rapidly coming under fire. \\
4...\text{ex}d4 5 \text{f}5 \text{xe}5?
After this move White’s attack rapidly decides the game. It was later discovered that 5...\textit{\texttt{wx}}\texttt{xc}5! was essential, giving Black enough counter-chances; for example, 6 e5! \textit{\texttt{wx}}\texttt{xe}5! (but not 6...\textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xe}5 7 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xd}4! or 6...\textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xe}5 7 fxg6) 7 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xd}4 \textit{\texttt{wx}}\texttt{xd}4+! 8 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xd}4 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xd}4+ 9 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{h}1 \textit{\texttt{f}}\texttt{f}6 and Black is holding the position. All the same, to this day White’s extravagant over-the-board play demands admiration.

\textbf{6 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{h}3 h5}

6...h6 7 f6! hxg5 (7...\textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xf}6 8 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xf}6 hxg5 9 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xd}4!) 8 fxg7 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{hg}7 9 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xd}4+ is also bad for Black.

\textbf{7 f6 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{h}6 8 fxe7 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xe}5 9 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{f}3! f6 10 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xd}4 \textit{\texttt{d}}\texttt{d}7 11 h4 1-0}

An armoury of well-refined and deeply understood devices is an important element of a chess-player’s strength in practical play. We end with an example of a piece sacrifice to destroy the opponent’s pawn-centre (see following diagram).

\textbf{1...\textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xb}5! 2 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xd}5 \textit{\texttt{b}}\texttt{xd}5 3 b4!?}
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19 Test Your Intuition

1) Is 1 \( \text{Nbxc5} \) a good choice?

3) How should Black continue his attack?

2) Would you consider 1 \( \text{Nxf6} \)?

4) Can you find Black’s best move at first sight?
5) Where would you intuitively seek an advantage: after 1 â1 or 1 gxh5?

8) Which would be your choice: 1...âxf4 or 1...âxh3?

6) What does intuition suggest: 1 Ñe6 or 1 hxg5?

9) What is correct: 1 â1 or 1 Ñe1?

7) Can Black eliminate White’s initiative?

10) Would you play the sacrifice 1 Ñdf5?
11) How would you defend: 1 \( \text{Qd2} \) or 1 \( \text{We2} \)?

14) Is 1...\( \text{Qxg3} \) best?

12) What is your choice: 1 \( \text{Qd5} \) or 1 \( \text{Qd5} \)?

15) What is your choice: 1 \( \text{Qxg6} \) or 1 \( \text{Qg4} \)?

13) Is 1 \( \text{Qh6+} \) correct?

16) Find the worst piece in White’s position and try to improve it.
17) How should Black continue?

20) Would you sacrifice a pawn with 1...g5?

18) Can Black sacrifice a piece by 1...Nxh3+?

21) How can White improve his position?

19) What is your choice: 1...g5 or 1...Nh5?

22) What is your choice: 1 Nh8 or 1 Nh6?
Solutions

1) Yes, it is. 1 ♘xc5! dxc5 2 ♘xe5 ♗g8 (2...♕d6 3 ♗a1 and 4 e5) 3 ♗b8! ♙e6 4 ♙f5 ♙e7 5 ♘xh6! ♘exd5 6 cxd5 ♘xh6 7 ♗f8+ ♗g7 8 ♘xc5 -- Spassky-Penrose, Palma de Mallorca 1971. Amsterdam 1996, White should play 1 gxh5 ♘xh5 2 ♘xf7! ♘xf7 3 ♘xf7 ♘xf7 4 ♘xg6+ ♙f8 5 ♘h6+! ♙g7 6 ♘g6!, winning. It is necessary to believe that at the end of the forced line you can find something like 6 ♘g6!.

2) Certainly: 1 ♗xf6! ♗xf6 (after the alternative 1...gx6 2 ♘h5 ♘g7 3 ♙e4 ♙e5 4 ♙f4 ♘h8 5 ♙xe5 fxe5 6 ♘f1! f5 7 g4! White has an attack) 2 ♙e4 ♘d8 3 ♙xd6 ♘g5 4 ♘d2 b6 (Spassky-Larsen, USSR-RoW (Belgrade) 1970) 5 ♘xg6 ♘xg6 6 e4 gives White a big advantage.

3) 1...♘xg2! 2 ♘xg2 f3+ 3 ♘h1 ♘f4 4 ♙e2 ♘h4! 5 ♘g5 ♘ah8 6 ♘xf3 e4 7 ♗g3 ♘hx2+ 8 ♗xg1 ♘xg3+ 9 fxg3 exf3 0-1 C. Horvath-Gažik, Leiner 1996.

4) 1...♗f4!! 2 ♘xf4 h4 3 ♘e3 h3 4 ♘g1 ♘e4 5 a4 ♘ba4 6 ♘xc4 ♘f3 7 ♘d3 ♘g2 0-1 Rogulj-Groszpeter, Gleis-dorf 1996.

5) Rather than 1 ♘b1? h4 2 ♘e3 ♙e8 3 ♘e4 ♘c7 4 ♘c6 ♘d5, which led to unclear play in the game Short-Kasparov, 1...♗xf4? loses to 2 ♘c4 ♘b1 3 ♙a4! ♙g5 4 ♘b4, Ublava-Izeta, Benasque 2001. Instead, 1...♘xh3! 2 ♙a4 g5 3 ♘c5 ♘h8 4 fxg5 fxg5 yields equality.

6) 1 ♙e6? ♘xe6 2 dxe6 ♘xc4 3 ♘xc4 gxe4 4 ♘xe4 ♘b8 5 ♙a2 ♘b2! gives Black a decisive attack, Krasenkow-Radjabov, Dos Hermanas 2001. White should prefer 1 hxg5 ♘xg5 2 ♘c3!, trying to attack the strongest point in the black position - the e5-pawn.

7) Yes: 1...♕xd2 2 ♘xd2 ♘xc5 3 ♘e4 ♘e3 4 ♘f6+ ♘g7 5 ♘c4 ♘dd8 6 ♘g4 ♘b6 7 ♘f2? ♘xf2 8 ♘xf2 ♘e3 0-1 Suetin-Korchnoi, Leningrad 1967.

8) Not 1 ♘b1? ♘h6 2 ♘c2 ♘b5! 3 h3 ♘e5 with an advantage for Black, Pirc-Petrosian, USSR-Yugoslavia (Leningrad) 1957. Instead, 1 ♘fe1! ♘h6 2 ♘c2 ♘b5 3 a4! leads to unclear play.
10)  
The sacrifice is correct: 1 \textflashing f5! exf5 2 \textnil d5 \textframed d8 3 exf5 \textflashing c4 4 \textflashing c1! \textflashing d4 (4...\textframed xB2 5 \textframed h5 \textframed d4+ 6 \textflashing h1 \textframed d3 7 c3 \textframing g7 8 g6! gives White a strong attack) 5 f6 \textflashing e2+ 6 \textflashing h1 \textflashing f8 7 \textframed d3! and Black is in trouble, Romero-Delchev, Valencia 2001.

11)  
After 1 \textframing d2?! \textframing f7 2 \textframed b3 bxc3+ 3 bxc3 \textframing b8 4 \textframed e3 h6 5 \textflashing he1 \textframing c8 6 c4 \textframing b6! Black held the initiative in Keres-Petrosian, USSR Ch (Moscow) 1950. Instead, after 1 \textframing e2! \textframed d8 (or 1...\textframing f7 2 \textframing g5!) 2 \textframing xe7 \textframing a5 3 \textframed xd7 bxc3 4 \textframing d1! Black has no attack.

12)  
Not 1 \textframing d5? \textframing he8!, with unclear play. The most important piece is the b7-bishop. Therefore: 1 \textframing d5! b4 2 \textframing xb7+ \textframing xb7 3 \textframing d5! exd5 (3...\textframing f8 4 \textframed h5!) 4 exd5 \textframed d7 5 \textframing c6! \textframing xa2? 6 \textframing xb4+ \textframing c7 7 \textframing xe7 \textframing b8 8 \textframing a3 with an advantage for White, Stein-Tal, Moscow 1961.

13)  
Yes, it is. 1 \textframing h6+! \textframing gh6 2 \textframing xf6 \textframing xb3 (after 2...\textframing c4 3 \textframing g4+ \textframing g6 4 \textframing xc4+ bxc4 5 \textframing xd8 \textframing xd8 6 \textframed d7 Black is in trouble) 3 \textframing g4+! \textframing g7 4 \textframing xd8+ \textframing xd8 5 \textframing xd8 \textframed xd8 6 axb3 \textframing h8 7 \textframing d1 \textframing e8 8 \textframing h5 \textframing f8 9 \textframed d6! wins for White, Stein-Rodriguez Gonzales, Havana OL 1966.

14)  
Yes: 1...\textframing xg3 2 \textframing xg3 \textframing f4 3 \textframed d2 \textframing g7 4 \textframing f2 (or 4 \textframing f2 \textframing h8 5 \textframing fe1 \textframing g8 6 \textframing h2 \textframing h7+ 7 \textframing g1 \textframing cg8) 4...\textframing f6! 5 \textframing g1 \textframing h4 6 \textframing e3 \textframing xg3 with a decisive attack for Black, Vaganian-Stein, USSR Ch (Riga) 1970.

15)  
Not 1 \textframing xg6? \textframing hxg6 2 \textframing xf6 \textframing f8! with equality, Khalifman-Hjartarson, Reykjavik WCup 1991. Instead, White could have won with 1 \textframing g4! \textframing xg4 2 \textframed d5+! \textframing h8 3 \textframing f7.

16)  
The d2-knight! 1 \textframing bc1 h5 2 \textframing b1! \textframing c8 3 \textframing c3 \textframing e7 4 \textframing b5! a6 5 \textframing c3 bxa5 6 \textframing xa5 favours White, Khalifman-Romanishin, Ischia 1996.

17)  
1...\textframing ef4! 2 gxf4 \textframing exf4 3 \textframing c1 h3 4 \textframing h1 \textframing e6! 5 \textframing d2 \textframing ad8 6 \textframing f1 \textframing d7 7 \textframing e1 \textframing ed8 8 e5 \textframing d5 9 \textframing a4 \textframing xd2 10 \textframing xd2 \textframing b3 with a decisive attack for Black, Rivas-Khalifman, Dos Hermanas 1993.

18)  
Yes: 1...\textframing xh3+! 2 gxf3 \textframing g5 3 \textframing h1 \textframing xh3 4 dxe5 \textframing xe5 5 \textframing d4? (5 \textframing g4 is stronger) 5...\textframing g8 6 \textframing g4 \textframing h4 7 \textframing fh2 \textframing xd4 8 \textframing xd4+ \textframing g7 9 \textframing e2 \textframing e8! 10 \textframing xe8+ \textframing xe8 11 \textframing f1 h5 and Black is winning, A.Sokolov-Spassky, Montpellier Ct 1985.

19)  
Not 1...\textframing g5? 2 \textframing e3 \textframing c7 3 \textframing ad1 \textframing e8 4 \textframing d4 h5 5 \textframing xg5! h6 6 \textframing d2 b4 7 \textframing b1 \textframing d5 8 \textframing g4 h5 9 \textframing g5! \textframing c5 10 b3!, when White is winning, Spassky-Tal, USSR Ch (Baku) 1961. Black should
play 1...\(\text{\#}h5\)! 2 \(\text{\#}e3\) \(\text{\#}xc3\) 3 \(\text{\#}xc3\) \(\text{\#}xc3\) 4 bxc3 \(\text{\#}c7\) with equality.

20) 1...g5! is correct. 2 \(\text{\#}xc4\) dxc4 3 \(\text{\#}xc4\) g4 4 \(\text{\#}e1\) (4 \(\text{\#}xc8\) \(\text{\#}xc8\) 5 \(\text{\#}e1\) \(\text{\#}xf2\)! 6 \(\text{\#}xf2\) \(\text{\#}xd4\) with an attack) 4...\(\text{\#}h4\) 5 \(\text{\#}d3\) \(\text{\#}xf2\)! 6 \(\text{\#}xc8\) \(\text{\#}xc8\) 7 \(\text{\#}f1\) g3 8 hxg3 \(\text{\#}h1+\) 9 \(\text{\#}xf2\) \(\text{\#}g2+\) 10 \(\text{\#}e1\) \(\text{\#}d5\) 11 \(\text{\#}b2\) \(\text{\#}c2\) and Black wins, Aleksandrov-Oral, Prague (2) 2000.

21) 1 g4! \(\text{\#}g7\) 2 0-0 \(\text{\#}c8\) 3 a4! (playing on both wings) 3...0-0 (3...\(\text{\#}xb4\) is wrong due to 4 \(\text{\#}e4\)! \(\text{\#}xd2\) 5 \(\text{\#}d6+\) with an attack on f7) 4 \(\text{\#}b5\)! \(\text{\#}xb5\) 5 axb5 leads to an advantage for White, Morozevich-Milos, New Delhi FIDE 2000.

22) Not 1 \(\text{\#}h8?\) \(\text{\#}b2\)! 2 h4 \(\text{\#}e5\) 3 \(\text{\#}h7\) \(\text{\#}f5+\) 4 \(\text{\#}h8\) d2! 5 \(\text{\#}xd2\) \(\text{\#}h5+\) 6 \(\text{\#}g8\) \(\text{\#}xh4\) 7 \(\text{\#}f7\) \(\text{\#}h5+\) 8 \(\text{\#}e7\) \(\text{\#}g6\) 9 \(\text{\#}c3\) \(\text{\#}c6\)! 10 \(\text{\#}f8\) \(\text{\#}f5+\) 11 \(\text{\#}e7\) \(\text{\#}h7\) 12 \(\text{\#}f8\) \(\text{\#}d7\)!, when Black wins, Blauert-Mikalnishin, Berne 1995. Instead of this, White should continue 1 \(\text{\#}h6\)! \(\text{\#}g1\) 2 h4! \(\text{\#}e1\) 3 \(g8\text{\#}\) d2 with equality.
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Intuition is central to all chess decision-making, and an understanding of its role is vital in improving one's game. Players who try to calculate everything to a finish often lose themselves in a maze of variations, while those who use intuition to the full will save both time and energy for the key moments of the game.

This book, the first devoted to the role of intuition in chess, explains how to allow your intuition to reach its full potential and provides guidance on distinguishing between positions in which one should rely heavily on intuition and those where one ought to be more analytical.

The two authors, both top-level authors and players, have drawn examples from modern practice and from the classics, with especial emphasis on players whose intuition has been legendary, such as Mikhail Tal. The authors devote particular attention to the role of intuition in sacrifices, whether for attacking, defensive or positional purposes.
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