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For the authors the most important thing is—will readers study their book? It was very pleasant for us when *Winning Endgame Technique* (in fact the first part of the present book) was deeply studied by grandmasters Boris Gelfand and Ognjen Cvitan. Then grandmasters Suat Atalik and Alex Yermolinsky also studied the book for a month (looking for mistakes!) and found much of interest for themselves. Particular thanks to grandmaster Alexei Kuzmin, trainer of the Qatar team, who discovered many important and interesting corrections in pawn endings. We still cannot guarantee there are no mistakes—but then again, generally speaking, anyone who considers themselves free from error makes more mistakes than others.

The present book is a direct continuation of *Winning Endgame Technique* and to some extent the second part in the sense that many themes, such as queen, knight and complex endings, were not dealt with in the previous book. However in some cases we have devoted a little more attention to methods of play in definite types of position, rather than concrete cases, which is a fault, on the whole, of all books on the endgame. For example the *Encyclopaedia of Chess Endings* gives replies only to some questions. We have tried to find more examples in which play conforms with general principles so that readers can begin to apply these methods in concrete practical situations. Of course, correlation of methods of play in typical positions and techniques is not always uniform, but the authors present their vision of practical endgame problems and are a long way from exhausting this theme.

It remains to thank our friend, master Oleg Stetsko, for help with the selection of practical examples.
1 Pawn Endings

Guru Grigoriev was right!

Readers might know that the greatest connoisseur of pawn studies was the Soviet master Nikolai Grigoriev, who achieved the impossible in his complicated pawn studies. In fact he once said: “Grandmasters do not like pawn endings because they simply don’t understand them”. The statement sounds paradoxical but the thought is topical even today. It seems that pawn endings are simple but the number of mistakes grandmasters have made over the years has in no way diminished. Since the publication of our first book quite a few interesting endgames have been played and quite a few instructive mistakes made.

The most characteristic and surprising mistakes are ... 

Premature resignation of a game

Yes, even today, this happens at grandmaster level.

In the following position Timman resigned and both players thought this to be in order, and appropriate comments appeared in ChessBase...

\[\text{Shirov-Timman}
\text{Wijk aan Zee, 1996}\]

But White does not win after 1...\(\text{d6} 2 \text{h4} \text{xc6} 3 \text{f5}! \text{d6} 4 \text{f6},\) when there are two ways to draw:

(a) 4...\(\text{d7} 5 \text{f3} \text{e8} 6 \text{e4} \text{c7} 7 \text{d5} \text{e8}! 8 \text{c6} (8 \text{e6} \text{f8})! 8...\text{d8},\) and he does not win the c7 pawn;

(b) 4...\(\text{c6} 5 \text{f3} \text{d7} 6 \text{e4} \text{d8},\) and the king holds the squares corresponding to a5, c5, e5-d7; a4, b4, c4, d4, e4-d8, e8; a6-e6.

Another surprising resignation followed in a game played two years later...
Although after 1...bxa5+ 2 âxa5 c5 3 âb5 âd6 it is a simple draw.

It is also possible to resign because of an incorrect calculation of an arising pawn ending.

Here Black resigned, reckoning that he would lose both of his doubled pawns, but after 1...âd7 2 âxe5 âe7 3 g6 âf8! 4 âxe6 âg7 5 âf5 âh6! 6 âf6 it all ends in a well known stalemate.

Here Black resigned, reckoning on the variation 1...âg2 2 âc5 h1=â 3 âxh1 âxh1 4 âd5 âg2 5 âe5, but he did not calculate to the end. 5...âf3 6 âxf5 âe3 and Black captures the c3 pawn.

Black resigned, forgetting that there was a last chance of saving the game by stalemate after 1...âc6 2 axb5+ âxb5 3 âd5 âa4!
After playing 1 \( \text{f2} \) Yudasin offered a draw, saying that this well-known position is in the books and is drawn! His experienced opponent, and international master, was shocked by his own 'ignorance' and accepted it there and then. However it ought to be well-known to everyone that after 1 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{e4} \) 2 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{f4} \) 3 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{f}3 \) 4 \( \text{f1} \) the triangulation e5-f5-e4 is winning. It just shows—don't believe everybody!!

Erroneous play in pawn endings

Another type of very common mistake—even strong grandmasters have many technical shortcomings.

After an arduous defence and transposition to a pawn ending White had the impression that an interesting chance had cropped up, and he took it.

1 \( \text{f5} \)??
But he did not reckon on the simple

1...\( \text{b4!} \) 2 \( \text{axb4+} \)
Losing simply is 2 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{d4} \) 3 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{c3} \) and the black pawn is faster than the white one.

2...\( \text{xb4} \) 3 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{xb3} \) 4 \( \text{xh6} \) \( \text{a5} \) 5 \( \text{xg5} \) \( \text{a4} \) 6 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{a3} \) 7 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{a2} \) 8 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{a1=\text{q}} \) 9 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{f6+} \) and he had to resign.

Correct was the more logical 1 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{a5} \) 2 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{a4} \) 3 \( \text{bxa4} \) \( \text{bxax4} \) 4 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{c4} \) 5 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{b3} \) 6 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xa3} \) 7 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{a2} \) 8 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{a3} \) and here the extra move 9 \( \text{h3!} \) makes a draw. Another way to the draw is 5 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 6 \( \text{h3!} \).

A lack of understanding of basic principles of play in pawn endings

Because of his weakened structure on the queen’s flank (doubled pawns) White has the inferior position, and the right way now was
1...hxg4 2 hxg4 e5 3 g5 d5! 4 cxd5 b5! 5 axb5 a4 6 g6 a3 7 d6! xd6 8 xg7 a2 etc. The only chance of a draw would be the difficult 4 d4+! xd4 5 g6 e5 6 cxd5 f4 (or 6...b5 7 d6! cxd6 8 axb5 a4 9 b6=) 7 c4 e4 8 xg7 xf5 9 f7 e5 10 e7, and a draw. But Black played

1...g5+? 2 fxg6 h4??

It was still a draw after 2...hxg4 3 xg4 xg6.

And Black resigned since after 7...d5 winning is 8 c5 b5 9 axb5 a4 10 bxc6, and in the resulting queen ending White has too many pawns.

**Ehlvest-Shirov**
**Vienna, 1996**

A simple position. White only needs to meet ...d5 with e3 and there is no problem. However Ehlvest played carelessly.

1 f4?? and after 1...e6 2 e3 d5 3 d3 f4! 4 gxf4 h4 5 e3 h3 6 gxh3 gxh3 7 f3 xd4 8 g3 e4 he had to resign.

In the following position we have another example of an incorrect pawn move.

**Schandorff-Speelman**
**Roskilde, 1998**

1 b4?? f6 2 h4 g6! and White resigned since after 3 g3 g5 4 f4 exf3 5 xf3 e5 6 f2 e4 7 e2 f5! 8 gxf5 xf5 thanks to the distant passed pawn Black wins easily. Correct was 1 g3! b4 (or 1...a5 2 a4 bxa4 3 bxa4 g6 4 h3 f6 5 h4 e6 6 g5 e5 7 h6 f6 8 g5+! g5 9 g7 with a draw) 2 h3 f5 3 gxf5 xf5 4 h4! g5+ 5 g3 f6 6 h3 g7 7 g3 h6 8 h3 h5 9 g3 a6 10 h3 g4+ 11 g3 g5, 12 g2 h4 13 h2 g3+ 14 fxg3+ g4 15 g2 a5 16 f2 h3 17 g4!, and a draw. Black lacks a single tempo move with the a-pawn.

**Plaskett-Rowson**
**Scotland, 1998**
Black evaluated the position poorly and sacrificed a pawn.

1...g4?? 2 fxg4 hxg5 3 f3 e5 4 c4 e4+ 5 xe4 xg4 6 b4 xh5 7 f5! h4 8 c5 a6 9 a4 h5 10 b5 axb5 11 axb5 g3 12 c6! bxc6 13 b6!, and Black resigned. After the correct 'passive' defence 1...g7!? 2 c4 h6 3 b4 hxg5 4 c5 g6 5 e5 h5 6 b5 f7 7 d6 g4 he would easily achieve a draw. But it looked all so simple—going directly for the h5 pawn.

Greenfeld-Golod
Israel, 1998

Correct play was the simple 1...f5! 2 xa7 (after 2 gx5 exf5 3 xa7, simply 3 g4 a4 f4 5 a5 g3) 2 e5 3 a4 e4 4 b6 fxg4 (4...f4??) 5 a5 g3! 6 fxg3 e3 7 a6 e2 8 a7 e1=## 9 a8=## b4+ 10 c7 d6+! with a transposition to a single, but easily winning, pawn ending.

In the game Black decided to 'press' the white king.

1...d6? 2 xa7 c6 but here followed 3 b8!! f5 4 a4 fxg4 (or 4 f4 5 a5 b5 6 b7! xa5 7 c6!) 5 a5 b5 6 b7! (Réti's typical manoeuvre) 6 xa5 7 c6 b4 8 d6 c4 9 xe6 d3 with a draw.

Ostenstad-Kuzmin
Biel, 1990

Only one winning move is left: 1...e3! 2 c4 d2 3 b5 c3 4 xb6 b4, with a typical finish, but there followed 1...d5?? and after 2 d3! draw.

Ignorance of typical methods of struggle. Typical breakthroughs.

Adams-Lutz
Wijk aan Zee, 1995

1 h5??
Correct was 1 bxa4 bxa4 2 g4! g6 3 gx5 gx5 4 d3! h5 5 c3! c5 6 c4 e4+ 7 fxe4 fxe4 8 xe4 xc4 9 e3 b3 10 d3 xa3 11 c3 with a draw.

1...b4! White resigned.
Overlooking stalemating defences

Hellers-Eingorn
Debrecen, 1992

Here easily winning is 1...\textipa{xa}4 2 \textipa{xf}6 (2 c6 fxe5 3 c7 \textipa{d}4+! 4 \textipa{c}5 \textipa{d}1) 2...\textipa{a}2 3 c6 \textipa{x}g2 4 c7 \textipa{c}2.
However Hellers saw that in the pawn ending he could force the win of a pawn and decided that this was sufficient.

1...\textipa{xc}5+? 2 \textipa{xc}5 fxe5 3 \textipa{d}5 \textipa{g}6 4 \textipa{xe}5 \textipa{g}5 5 \textipa{e}4 h5 6 \textipa{e}5 \textipa{h}4! 7 \textipa{xf}4 Drawn.
The Black king is stalemated!

Erroneous pawn advances

Indeed, this is a great mistake to make in pawn endings.

Karpov-Kasparov
Las Palmas, 1996

1 h4?
It is terribly dangerous to move the 'wrong' pawn—necessary was 1 \textipa{c}3 \textipa{d}5 2 \textipa{d}3 h5 3 b4! axb4 (3...a4 4 e4+ \textipa{d}6 5 h4 e5 6 \textipa{e}3 exf4+ 7 \textipa{xf}4 \textipa{e}6 8 \textipa{e}3 g5 9 f4=) 4 axb4 e5 5 e4+ \textipa{e}6 6 \textipa{e}3 exf4+ 7 \textipa{xf}4 g5+ (if 7...h4, then 8 \textipa{e}3 \textipa{f}4) 8 \textipa{e}3 \textipa{e}5 (8...f5 9 f4 g4 10 e5) 9 h4! \textipa{e}6 10 f4 with a draw.

1...\textipa{d}5 2 b4?
Another incorrect advance—it was necessary to play 2 e4+ \textipa{d}6 3 \textipa{e}3! (3 \textipa{d}4? e5+ 4 fxe5 fxe5+ 5 \textipa{d}3 \textipa{e}6 6 \textipa{c}3 h5 \textipa{g}5=) 3...e5 4 f5! \textipa{xf}5 5 exf5 \textipa{d}5 6 \textipa{d}3 a4 7 bx\textipa{a}4 bx\textipa{a}4 8 h5 h6 9 \textipa{c}3 e4 10 fxe4+ \textipa{xe}4 11 \textipa{b}4, and, though Black has an extra pawn in the queen ending, White has chances of a draw.

2...axb4 3 axb4

3...h6?
Now comes a mistake from the other side—after 3...e5! 4 e4+ \textipa{e}6 5 \textipa{e}3 \textipa{d}6! (5...\textipa{f}7? 6 f5!=) 6 f5 (if 6 fxe5+, then 6...f\textipa{e}5 7 \textipa{f}2 \textipa{e}6 8 \textipa{g}2 \textipa{f}6 9 \textipa{g}3 h6, and zugzwang) 6...\textipa{xf}5 7 exf5 \textipa{d}5 8 \textipa{d}3 h5 9 \textipa{e}3 \textipa{c}4 10 \textipa{e}4 \textipa{xb}4 11 \textipa{d}5 \textipa{c}3 12 \textipa{e}6 b4 13 \textipa{xf}6 b3 14 \textipa{g}7 b2 15 f6 b1=\textipa{w} 16 f7 \textipa{w}b7 17 \textipa{g}8 \textipa{xf}3, winning.

4 e4+ \textipa{d}6 5 \textipa{e}3 e5 6 f\textipa{e}5+ f\textipa{e}5 7 \textipa{f}2 \textipa{e}6 8 \textipa{g}2!
Weak was 8 .gf3 6f6 9 6f4 h5+ 10 6g3 g5, and Black wins, while now on 8...6f6 follows 9 6g3 h5 10 f4, and a draw.

Matlak-Tseshkovsky
Lubniewice, 1995

1 f4??
Any other move wins—simplest was 1 6h4 6f4 2 6h5 6e3 3 6g6 6xe2 4 f4 6e3 5 f5.
1...6e4 2 6g4 6d4!
White had reckoned only on 2...6e3 3 6f5 with a win, but now on 3 6f5 follows 3...6e3!, and after White moves this position is drawn!
3 6h5 6e4!
Again Black will not ‘buy’ 3...6e3? because of 4 f5 winning for White.
4 6g4 6d4 5 6f3 f5 6 6f2

6...6d5??
Correct was to force e2-e3 by 6...6e4! 7 e3 6d5 8 6e2 6c5! 9 6d2 6d6!, so that on 10 6d3 6d5

...it will be White’s move—after Black moves his position is lost, since he is forced to allow the White king to e5, and ...6c5 loses after e4.
7 6e3 6c4 8 6d2 6d4 9 e3+ 6c4 10 6c2!,
and Black resigned since White achieves the above-mentioned position with Black to move.

Drasko-Vratonjić
Ulcinj, 1997

1...f5!
A colossal defensive resource, though it was possible to hold the position even by simple defence, e.g. 1...6e6 2 6e4 (the assessment is not changed by 2 f4 f5 3 g5 h5=)
2...f5+ (the only move) 3 gxf5+ d6 4 f6 c5 5 e5 a5 6 a4 c6!=; or 2 c5 bxc5+ (losing is 2...b5 3 f4 a5 4 h4, 5 h5, 6 g5+--) 3 xc5 f5 4 gxf5+ xf5 5 b5 f4 6 a6 f3 7 xa7 xf2=.

White loses the thread of the game, starting to play on his weak flank. He should reconcile himself to a drawn result after 3 h4 c6 4 h5 d6 5 d3 c5 6 c3 a6 7 a4 a5 8 f3=.

3...c6 4 f4??

A very serious mistake. Without need White himself gives up the opportunity of exploiting the tempo and hands back the move to his opponent in a position of mutual zugzwang. It was still not too late to lead the game to a draw by 4 h4 h5 5 d3 c5 6 c3 a6 6 f3 a5 7 f4.

4...d6 5 d3 c5 6 c3 h5 7 b3 h4=+ 8 c3 h3 9 b3 a6 10 a5

The assessment of the position is not changed by 10 c3 a5 --.

10...bxa5 11 a4 cxe4 12 xa5 d4 13 xa6 e4 14 b5 xf5 White resigned.

A pawn ending which is quite difficult to evaluate. To gain victory Black needs to solve the problem on the queenside, where his opponent has the chance to create a passed pawn. This is achieved by 1...d7! 2 h4 c7 3 f3 c8 4 e4 b7 5 f3 a6 --. However in the game followed

1...g5? 2 f3 d5 3 c6 d6 4 e4??

The decisive mistake. The significance of a tempo in pawn endings is far higher than in any other. White should immediately exploit his opponent's mistake and himself break up Black's pawn chain. This is done by 4 h4! gxh4 5 g4 a6 6 bxa6 xc6 7 xh4 b6 8 g4 xa6 9 h4+-.

4...a6 5 bxa6 xc6 6 f3 b6 7 h4 gxh4 8 g4 xa6 9 xh4 b6 10 g4 c6 11 h4 d6 White resigned.

As a matter of fact, in their first book, the authors made several inaccuracies, which were corrected by grandmaster Alexei Kuzmin.

Sulipa-Gricak
Lvov, 1995

Kupreichik-Mikhalchishin
Lvov, 1988
1...\(\text{d}5\)

In their first book the authors placed a question mark against this move, pointing out a 'direct' path to a draw: 1...\(\text{f}6\) 2 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{g}6\) 3 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{h}5\) 4 \(\text{g}x\text{h}5+\) \(\text{f}x\text{h}5\) 5 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{g}4\) 6 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{g}5\) 7 \(\text{x}d\text{4}\) \(\text{x}f\text{5}\) 8 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{e}5\) 9 \(\text{b}6\) \(\text{d}6\) etc. However they did not reckon on one finesse to which A.Kuzmin drew attention: 3 \(\text{f}5+!\) (3 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{h}5\) 4 \(\text{f}5+\) \(\text{h}6=\)) 3...\(\text{g}5\)? (3 \(\text{f}6\), returning to the basic variation) 4 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{h}5\) 5 \(\text{f}6!\) \(\text{x}f\text{6}\) 6 \(\text{g}x\text{h}5\) \(\text{g}5\) 7 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{x}h\text{5}\) 8 \(\text{x}d\text{4}\) \(\text{g}5\) 9 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{f}6\) 10 \(\text{b}6\) \(\text{e}7\) 11 \(\text{x}a\text{6}\) \(\text{x}d\text{7}\) 12 \(\text{x}b\text{7}+-\). Thus Black’s attempt to simplify the position at once is mistaken.

2 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{e}4\)

A dubious move. Better, missed by the authors, is 2...\(\text{a}5\)! 3 \(\text{f}3\) (or 3 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{e}4\) 4 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{e}5\)) 3...\(\text{c}4\) 4 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{c}5\) (but not 4...\(\text{d}5\)? 5 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{c}5\) 6 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{h}x\text{g}5\) 7 \(\text{f}x\text{g}5\) \(\text{d}5\) 8 \(\text{g}6+-\)) 5 \(\text{d}3\) (5 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{d}6\) 6 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{e}6\) 7 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{d}5=\)) 5...\(\text{d}5\) 6 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{e}5\) 7 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{e}4\) 8 \(\text{f}6\) \(\text{d}3\) 9 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{e}3\) 10 \(\text{f}7\) \(\text{d}2\) 11 \(\text{f}8=\text{w}\) \(\text{d}1=\text{w}\) 12 \(\text{w}x\text{h}6+\) \(\text{f}3\), and in the resulting queen ending Black achieves a draw without trouble.

3 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{e}5\) 4 \(\text{e}2\)?

Much stronger is 4 \(\text{a}5\), but the authors mistakenly assumed that this was easily winning, giving the variation 4...\(\text{d}5\) (4...\(\text{h}5?\) 5 \(\text{g}x\text{h}5\) \(\text{g}5\) 7 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{x}d\text{4}-\text{c}5\)-\text{b}6\text{x}a6\text{-\text{b}7+-\}) 5 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{e}5(?\) 6 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}5\) 7 \(\text{f}6\) \(\text{e}6\) 8 \(\text{x}d\text{4}\) \(\text{x}f\text{6}\) 9 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{g}5\) 10 \(\text{b}6\) \(\text{x}g\text{4}\) 11 \(\text{a}6\) \(\text{h}5\) 12 \(\text{b}6\) \(\text{h}4\) 13 \(\text{a}6\) etc. Far more tenacious in the opinion of A.Kuzmin was 5...\(\text{d}6\) 6 \(\text{d}3\) (6 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{d}5\) 7 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{d}6\) 8 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{d}5\) =-) 6...\(\text{e}5\) 7 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{e}4\) 8 \(\text{f}6\) \(\text{d}3\) 9 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{e}3\) 10 \(\text{f}7\) \(\text{d}2\) 11 \(\text{f}8=\text{w}\) \(\text{d}1=\text{w}\) 12 \(\text{w}x\text{h}6+\) \(\text{f}3\).

In this queen ending White has some chances of a win but upon correct defence it should probably be drawn. For example: 13 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{w}\text{e}1+\) 14 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{g}4\), and it is not easy for White to improve his position.

4...\(\text{h}5?\)

Better is 4...\(\text{a}5\)! (4 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}5\) 6 \(\text{f}6\) \(\text{g}6\) 5 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}5\) 6 \(\text{f}4\) 7 \(\text{f}6\) 8 \(\text{f}7\) 9 \(\text{f}8=\text{w}\) \(\text{d}1=\text{w}\) =-

5 \(\text{g}x\text{h}5\) \(\text{x}f\text{5}\) 6 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{g}5\) 7 \(\text{x}d\text{4}\) \(\text{x}h\text{5}\) 8 \(\text{c}5\) Black resigned.

Now it is clear that best was an immediate 1...\(\text{a}5!\) 2 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{d}5\) 3 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{e}4\) 4 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{c}3\) 5 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{c}4\) 6 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{c}5\) 7 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{c}4\) 8 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{d}5\) with a draw, since on 1...\(\text{d}5\) could follow 2 \(\text{a}5\) ! (the same as on 1...\(\text{f}6\) 2 \(\text{f}2!\) \(\text{g}6\) 3 \(\text{f}5+\) \(\text{f}6!-4 \(\text{a}5!\)).

Vaganian-Portisch
Tilburg, 1992
A. Kuzmin also drew attention to this pawn ending. We present his more accurate analysis.

"The authors assessed this ending in White’s favour, giving 1 \( \text{Wd2} \) \( \text{c5(?-A.K.)} \) 2 \( \text{c3} \) g5 (2... \( \text{b5} \) 3 g3 g6 4 h3 h5 5 g4 h4 6 g5 \( \text{c5} \) 7 a3 \( \text{b5} \) 8 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{a4} \) 9 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{xa3} \) 10 f5 a5 11 fxg6 fxg6 12 e5+–) 3 g3 (?-A.K.) 3...g4 4 a3 h5 5 a4 a5 6 e5 \( \text{d5} \) 7 f5! \( \text{xe5} \) 8 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 9 \( \text{b5} \) +–. But the variation leaves a strange impression. Firstly let’s look at the final position.

After 9... \( \text{e6} \) (9... \( \text{g6} \)?) 10 \( \text{xa5} \) f5 it is not Black, but White who needs to think about saving the game: 11 \( \text{b6} \) (11 \( \text{b4} \) f4 12 a5 fxg3 13 hxg3 \( \text{d6} \)–+) 11 \( \text{b5} \) f4 12 gx\( \text{f4} \) h4 13 a5 g3 14 hxg3 h3!–+) 11...f4 12 a5 fxg3 (12...f3??) 13 hxg3 h4 14 a6 hxg3 15 a7 g2 16 a8=\( \text{g1} \) \( \text{g1} \)=f+ with a theoretically won queen ending.

Secondly, after 2...g5 White can also win directly by 3 fxg5 hxg5 4 a3 f6 5 a4 a5 6 h3 \( \text{d6} \) 7 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 8 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 9 \( \text{xa5} \).

Thirdly, on 1 \( \text{d2} \) correct is an immediate 1...g5 \( \Delta \) 2 g3 g4 3 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 4 a3 h5 5 a4 a5 6 e5 \( \text{d5} \) 7 \( \text{d2} \) (of course White is not obliged to give up the pawn by the move 7 f5?) 7...\( \text{d4} \) 8 \( \text{c2} \), sailing into a drawn harbour.

It remains only to see how the game ended (comments by the authors of the book).

1 h4? \( \text{c5?} \)

After 1...h5! White is in no position to create a passed pawn: 2 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c5} \) 3 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b5} \) 4 a3 \( \text{c5} \) 5 a4 a5 6 g3 g6 7 e5 \( \text{d5} \) 8 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{d4} \) 9 \( \text{c2} \) c3 10 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{d3} \)–. 2

h5 f6?

Making it easy for his opponent to create a passed pawn: 2... \( \text{d4} \) 3 e5 \( \text{c3} \) 4 f5 \( \text{b2} \) 5 e6 \( \text{xe6} \) 6 \( \text{xe6} \) c3 7 e7 c2 8 e8=\( \text{g1} \) \( \text{c1} \)=f+.

3 \( \text{e3} \) a5?

Once again after 3...c3 4 \( \text{d3} \) c2 5 \( \text{xc2} \) \( \text{d4} \) 6 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 7 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 8 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{g3} \) 9 \( \text{xa6} \) f5 10 a4 \( \text{g2} \) Black has the better queen ending.

4 a3 a4 5 e5! fx\( \text{e5} \) 6 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{d5} \) 7 e6 \( \text{xe6} \) 8 \( \text{d4} \) Black resigned.

Poor technique in transposing to a pawn ending

It is surprising but true that modern grandmasters experience great difficulties in transposing to a pawn ending. There are two factors—a poor knowledge of pawn endings and inability to switch from the factors of evaluation and play of complicated endings to the factors and methods typical for pawn endings.

This is a very great problem even for high-level grandmasters and here the authors simply must also name themselves.
Beliavsky-Sveshnikov
Novi Sad, 1979

How is it possible to lose here? very simply—by transposing to a pawn ending.

1...?? 1...c3, with a draw.
1...c3! Taking on e2 indeed leads to a draw. 2...f1 xe2+ 3...xe2 c2, and he had to resign since the king goes over to the white pawn on g3 while White's during this time goes to g6 after which Black wins by the well-known zugzwang.... g4!.

Kramnik-Lautier
Belgrade, 1995

Black should correctly transfer to a pawn ending and this is achieved by 1...xa4! 2 a3, and the position of the pawn on a3 gives Black the possibility of more quickly creating a passed pawn. But in the game there followed...

1...xd4+ 2 xd3 xd3+ 3 xd3 f6 4 c4 a6 5 f5!
It is necessary to clear a path for the king, otherwise the march of his h2 pawn will lead to nothing.
5...d6 6 xex6 xe6 7 d4 f5 8 d5 g5 9 e6! f5 10 e3 g4 11 h3+! g5 12 h4+! g6 13 h5+ g5 14 h6 g6 15 h7 xh7 16 xf5 g7 17 e6 Black resigned.

Adams-Lautier
Tilburg, 1996

White has an extra pawn and can win the position as he pleases. As he pleases? In the game followed...

1 h4? xe6+!, and the pawn ending with an extra pawn was drawn.
2 ed5 f6 3 exe6+ xe6 4 d4 d6 5 c3 c7 6 b4 cxb4+ 7 xb4 c6, and a draw.
Correct was 1 c5! or 1 b5.
Neither side can lose the rook ending. But White decides to try to win the pawn ending.

1 \( \text{dxd}\)? \( \text{cxd}\) 2 \( \text{exd}\) \( \text{c7}\) 3 \( \text{f3}\) c5 4 \( \text{e4} \) f6 5 \( \text{e5}\) e7 6 \( \text{f4}\) g5 7 \( \text{e4}\) d5 8 \( \text{c4}\) f3 9 b3 \( \text{d7}\) 10 \( \text{h3}\) h5, and he had to resign since on 11 \( \text{d3}\) follows 11...g4.

However, we should not think that classical players from the past handled analogous situations better.

Flohr-Vidmar
Nottingham, 1936

1...\( \text{c6}\)?
After the natural 1...\( \text{e7}\) Black has every chance of holding the slightly inferior isolated pawn.

2 \( \text{xc6}\) \( \text{c8}\) 3 \( \text{e5}\)?
Both players “drift” commented A. Alekhine. After 3 \( \text{e2}\) \( \text{xc6}\) 4 \( \text{xc6}\) bxc6 5 \( \text{b4}\) \( \text{e7}\) 6 \( \text{d3}\) \( \text{d6}\) 7 \( \text{d4}\) White has a typically winning position.

3...\( \text{bxc6}\)?
But here Black does not exploit his chance—better was 3... \( \text{xc6}\) 4 \( \text{xc6}\) (after 4 \( \text{xd5}\) \( \text{c2}\) and Black’s active rook compensates for the loss of a pawn) 4...\( \text{bxc6}\) 5 \( \text{b4}\) \( \text{e7}\) 6 \( \text{e2}\) \( \text{d6}\) 7 \( \text{d3}\) \( \text{c5}\) 8 \( \text{bxc5}\) \( \text{xc5}\) 9 \( \text{c3}\) \( \text{a5}\) reaching an equal position.

4 \( \text{e2}\) \( \text{e7}\) 5 \( \text{d3}\) \( \text{d6}\) 6 \( \text{a5}\) \( \text{a8}\) 7 \( \text{d4}\) \( \text{f5}\) 8 \( \text{b4}\) \( \text{b8}\) 9 a3 \( \text{a8}\)

10 \( \text{e4}\)!
A seemingly illogical move but Black has only one weakness on a6 and White exchanges his weak e3 pawn, activates his king and rook along the fifth rank and then sets about creating weaknesses for the opponent on the kingside.

10...\( \text{fxe4}\) 11 \( \text{fxe4}\) \( \text{dxe4}\) 12 \( \text{xe4}\) \( \text{a7}\) 13 \( \text{f4}\) h6 14 \( \text{h4}\) \( \text{e6}\) 15 \( \text{g4}\) \( \text{a8}\) 16 h5 g5
Or 16...gxh5+ 17 \( \text{e3}\) \( \text{g8}\) 18 g4+–.

17 \( \text{g3}\) \( \text{a7}\) 18 \( \text{c3}\)
Now the king transfers to the other flank.

18...\( \text{a8}\) 19 \( \text{e4}\) \( \text{a7}\) 20 \( \text{f5}\)!
Here Black has a choice: to allow the rook to e8 or the king to f5.
20...\texttt{d6} 21 \texttt{e8} c5 22 \texttt{d8+ c6} 
After 22...\texttt{c7} 23 \texttt{h8} it is time to resign.  
23 \texttt{c8+ b6} 24 \texttt{xc5} Black resigned.

We also certainly come across transitions which are backed up by splendid calculation.

\textit{Cruz-Seirawan}  
\textit{Moscow, 1994}
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\begin{itemize}
\item[1...\texttt{a5}+!]
\end{itemize}

The best solution, after 1...\texttt{h5} 2 \texttt{b4 \texttt{hxh2}} 3 c5 and White has strong compensation for the pawn.  
2 \texttt{b3 \texttt{xa2}} 3 \texttt{xa2 \texttt{d6}} 4 \texttt{b3 c5} 5 \texttt{c3 e5}

At first sight it seems that White has the advantage because of his passed pawn, but the most important factor in this ending is the paralysed white pawn chain on the kingside.  
6 \texttt{d3 f5} 7 \texttt{c3 e4} 8 \texttt{b3 h6!} 9 \texttt{e3 h5} 10 \texttt{b3 f4!}

Now follows a typical, well-calculated breakthrough.  
11 \texttt{gxf4 e3!} 12 \texttt{fxe3 h4} 13 \texttt{f5 d6!}

It is this which had to be foreseen—bad would have been 13...\texttt{g3}? 14 \texttt{hxg3 hxg3} 15 \texttt{f6 d6} 16 \texttt{c5+}.

14 \texttt{b4 e5} 15 \texttt{c5 xf5} 16 \texttt{c6 e6} 17 \texttt{c5 g3} 18 \texttt{hxg3 h3!}

\textit{Anastasian-Romanishin}  
\textit{Moscow, 1994}
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1...\texttt{c3!} 2 \texttt{xc3 dxc3} 3 a4 \texttt{b4} 4 a5 \texttt{xa5} 5 \texttt{xc3 b5} 6 \texttt{d3 b4!}

Black meets the white king's roundabout route with one of his own!  
7 \texttt{e3}  
Or 7 \texttt{e4 c3} 8 \texttt{xe5 d2}, catching up with the white pawns.  
7...\texttt{b3} 8 \texttt{exf4 exf4} 9 \texttt{e4 c2} 10 \texttt{f5 d3} 11 \texttt{xg5 e3} 12 \texttt{h4 xf3} 13 g5 \texttt{e2} Drawn.

\textit{Kuzmin-Petrosian}  
\textit{Moscow, 1979}
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1 \texttt{c5!}
The transfer to a pawn ending is forced, since after 1...bxc5 2 d3 and 3 c4 Black stands badly.

1...\( \text{\textit{\texttt{x}}} \text{c5} \) 2 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{x}}} \text{c5} \) bxc5 3 d3 e5 4 c4 f5 5 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{x}}} \text{c5} \) h5 6 b4 axb4 7 \( \text{\textit{\texttt{x}}} \text{xb4} \) f4 8 a5 e4 9 c3 e3 10 d3! Black resigned.

An analogous idea was not taken into account by Black when transposing to a pawn ending in the following game...

Finkel-Mikhalchishin
Belgrade, 1998

Winning easily is 1...e5! 2 c3 c7 and 3...d5, but Black wants to take the bull by the horns at once by 1...d5??

White is frightened by the pawn ending and after...

2 f4 c7

...he could quietly resign.

Meanwhile after 2 d1+ c6 3 xd7 xd7 4 d3! c6 (4...e6 5 d4 changes practically nothing) 5 d4 a6 (after 5...f4 6 e4 xc5 7 xf4 b4 8 e5 a3 9 f6 a2 10 g7 b1 11 h4! a5 12 h5 an endgame with an extra pawn for White is reached. Therefore Black rightly plays 7...d5 8 e3 e5 9 h4! a6 10 a3, with a draw) 6 a3! (bad is 6 c4 f4!, and the white king does not get to g7, while after a capture on a3 the king on c3 can do nothing since Black will have a tempo after ...a5; h3 a4; h4 a2; c2 a3!) 6...a5 7 c4 f4 8 d4 f3 9 e3 xc5 10 xf3 c4.

Ivanchuk-Kasimdzhanov
Elista, 1998

Here 1 d7 is quite simply winning. But Ivanchuk was reckoning on the pawn ending.

1 xe6 xe6 2 xe6 fxe6 3 xf8+ xf8 4 g2 and all of a sudden

4...a5!!

The only move—bad was 4...e7 5 f3 d7 6 f4 c6 7 g5 d5 8 f6 a5 because of 9 b3! with a win for White.

5 f3 f7 6 e4

Nothing is gained by 6 f4:

6...a4! 7 g4 hxg4 8 xg4 g8!!, creating the distant opposition. And if 6 b3, then 6...g5 7 e3 g6 8 e4 h6 9 d4 g6 10 c5 f5 11 hxg5 xg5, with a draw.

6...g5 7 d4 g6!

We must mention the erroneousness of the exchange on h4, e.g. 7...gxh4? 8 gxh4 g6 9 e4 a4 10 f4 h6 11 e3 g6 12 e4!, triangulating, and Black is forced to move away his king to h6, which gives White the opportunity of entering via f4.
8 c5 gxh4 9 gxh4 f5 10 b5 xe5 11 xa5 d4 and he had to agree a draw.

Pawn endings in the creative work of Robert Fischer

Each of the great champions has, besides his own style, also his own methods of play in the various stages of the chess game.

Thus, upon his ‘taste’ depends the arising various structures and according to his ‘taste’ his treatment of them. The transfer to a pawn ending is one of the instruments for realisation of an advantage or a method of defence. In Fischer’s case this ending is met more frequently than any other champion, and the authors were interested in how the great Fischer played them at these moments. The examples show quite a broad spectrum of quality of play.

Fischer-Letelier
Mar del Plata, 1959

White clearly has the better king but the asymmetrical structure gives Black the possibility to reply to the creation of a passed pawn on the king’s flank with the creation of a passed pawn of his own on the opposite side. Fischer continued to play for a win.

1 a4?
In principle, a serious mistake, though White’s plan is understandable—he places a pawn on a5 and, by sacrificing a pawn on the kingside, breaks through with his king to the pawn on a6. However it is not possible to win this position.

E. Mednis in his book How to beat Bobby Fischer assessed the position as a draw and did not criticise the move in the game. Nevertheless White has a path to victory and it consists of the move 1 g4!. In reply Black has the following continuations:

a) 1... d6 2 f5 gxf5 3 xf5 c4 4 bxc4 bxc4 5 e4 c3 6 d3 e5 7 xc3 f4 8 b4 xg4 9 a5 f5 10 xa6 e6 11 a4, and White is victorious;

b) 1... d6 2 f5 g5 3 a4! c6 (3... b4 4 a5 c6 5 f6+) 4 axb5+ axb5 5 e5 +–;

c) 1... a5 2 a4 b4 3 d3! (Why not 3 f5+ gxf5 4 gxh5+ d6 5 f6? Because of 6... c4! 7 bxc4 e6!, and for the time being White must think about saving himself) 3... d5

4 g5! e6 5 c4 f5 6 xc5 xf4 7 b5 xg5 8 xa5 f4 9 xb4 g5 10 a5, and White reaches a queen ending with a b-pawn—and every chance of a win. This
A variation was found by A. Belyavsky. But we return to the game:

1...$d6$ 2 $f5$??

Mednis passed over this move in silence. Fischer, apparently, noticed that as a result of the correct 2 $g3$ $e6$ 3 $a5$ $d6$ 4 $g4$ $e6$ 5 $f5+$ $xf5$ 6 $gx$5 $f6$ 7 $d5$ $c4$ 8 $bxc4$ $xc4$ 9 $xc4$ $xf5$ the Black king hurries back to c8.

2...$gxf5$+ 3 $xf5$

3 $d5$?

(!) Mednis. Why not 3...c4!, and White must resign at once.

4 $g4$ $d4$ 5 $g5$?

5 $axb5$ leads at once to a draw.

5...c4! 6 $bxc4$ b4 7 $c5$??

After 7 $g6$ White reaches a slightly inferior queen ending but with chances of a draw. Now however it’s all simple—7...b3, and it is time for White to resign.

The pawn ending, apparently so simple, is difficult in that on the transfer to it the players must calculate the changes that take place in the game by comparison with other aspects of the ending.

Here is another example.

Gligorić-Fischer
Candidates (t), Belgrade 1959

Here, leading to a draw is 1...$h5$! 2 $c5$ $xc5$, and whichever way White retakes there follows 3...$c8$ with a draw. But Fischer mistakenly played...

1...$h8$? 2 $xb5$?

Now Gligoric met mistake with mistake, wrongly transferring to a pawn ending. Winning was 2 $c7+$! $d6$ 3 $c6+$ $d7$ 4 $xb5$ $b8+$ 5 $b6$ $h8$ 6 $b7+$ $c8$ 7 $a6$ $h6+$ 8 $a7$.

2...$b8+$ 3 $a4$ $a8+$ 4 $b3$ $c8$! 5 $xc8$ $xc8$ 6 $c4$ $b8$!

Gligoric did not reckon in his previous calculations that White could not maintain the opposition, therefore it’s a draw.

With time Fischer managed to correct his shortcomings and his transfer to the endgame became immaculate.
Returning the exchange to win a pawn was also a recipe of Capablanca himself.

1...\texttt{bxc3+!} 2 \texttt{bxc3} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}}\texttt{xe5+} 3 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}}\texttt{d2} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}x\texttt{e1}} 4 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}xe1} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}}}d5} 5 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}}}\texttt{d2} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}}}c4}} 6 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h}}}}\texttt{h5} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{b}}}6} 7 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{c}}}c2} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}}5!} 8 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{h}}}\texttt{h6} \texttt{\texttt{f4}} 9 \texttt{\texttt{g}}\texttt{4} \texttt{a5} 10 \texttt{\texttt{bxa5}} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{a}}}\texttt{a5} 11 \texttt{\texttt{b}b2} \texttt{a4} 12 \texttt{\texttt{a}a3} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}\texttt{c3} 13 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}xa4} \texttt{d4} 14 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{b}}}\texttt{b4} \texttt{e3} and White resigned.

We also come across ignorance in transferring to a pawn ending by Fischer’s rivals.

Black should suffer a little in the rook ending by 1...\texttt{g5} 2 \texttt{d4} \texttt{b5} 3 \texttt{e2} \texttt{c5} 4 \texttt{f3} \texttt{g8} 5 \texttt{f4} \texttt{f8+} with the idea of breaking through on the second rank with the rook. But Bisguier decides to transfer to a pawn ending in which it requires incredibly accurate play to achieve a draw.

1...\texttt{d5?!} 2 \texttt{e2} \texttt{xd2+} No help is 2...\texttt{b5} 3 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}\texttt{d5} \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}\texttt{d5} 4 \texttt{e3} \texttt{a5} 5 \texttt{g5} \texttt{b4} 6 \texttt{g6} \texttt{\texttt{e}e6} 7 \texttt{\texttt{d}d4} +–.

3 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}\texttt{d2} \texttt{\texttt{d}d5} 4 \texttt{e3} \texttt{e5} 5 \texttt{f3}! Fischer ‘waits’ for the weakening of Black’s pawn structure—there is no win by 5 \texttt{\texttt{g5}} \texttt{f5} 6 \texttt{\texttt{d4}} \texttt{\texttt{x}g5} 7 \texttt{\texttt{x}xc4} \texttt{\texttt{f6}} etc.

5...\texttt{a5} If 5...\texttt{f6} 6 \texttt{\texttt{f}f4} \texttt{g6} 7 \texttt{e5} \texttt{g5} White goes not for the \texttt{c4} pawn but for the pawn on \texttt{b7}—8 \texttt{d6}! \texttt{\texttt{x}g4} 9 \texttt{c7} \texttt{\texttt{f}f3} 10 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}\texttt{bx7} \texttt{\texttt{e}e2} 11 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}\texttt{a7} \texttt{\texttt{d}d3} 12 \texttt{\texttt{b}b6} \texttt{c2} 13 \texttt{\texttt{c}c5}, and wins.

6 \texttt{e3} \texttt{a4} On 6...\texttt{b5} winning is 7 \texttt{g5} \texttt{b4} 8 \texttt{g6} \texttt{\texttt{f6}} 9 \texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}d4}}.
7 g5 ♕f5 8 ♕d4 ♕xg5 9 ♕xc4 ♕f4 10 ♕b4 ♕e3 11 ♕xa4 ♕d2

Off at last!
20...♕c2
20...♕d3 21 ♕b5 +-.
21 b4 Black resigned.

**Rossolimo-Fischer**
**USA (ch), 1962/63**

Black clearly has the more active king but the White g5 pawn paralyses Black's flank and it is impossible to win.

1...♕a4 2 ♕e2

The *Encyclopaedia* recommends 2 b3! a3 3 h3 b4 4 h4, and now Black must play 4...d5 5 exd5 ♕xd5 6 ♕d3 ♕c5 7 ♕e4 ♕d6 with a draw.
2...♕a3!?
The last try.
3 bxa3 ♕c3 4 ♕a4! bxa4 5 ♕e3 ♕b2 6 ♕d2 ♕xa2 7 ♕c2 a3 8 h3 And a draw.

**Some conclusions**

In the earliest stage of his career Robert Fischer had technical problems in playing pawn endings, and particularly when transposing to them. But by the beginning of the 60s he had already managed to eradicate these shortcomings and no longer had technical problems with pawn endgames.
Exercises:
Pawn Endings

1. How can White win the endgame?

2. How do you assess the position with White to move?

3. What plan must White adopt to realise his advantage?

4. What is correct 1...fxg4 or 1...hxg4?
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5 How does Black save the endgame? What is correct: \( \text{J}... \text{e}5 \) or \( \text{J}g5 \)?

6 Assess the outcome of playing the typical \( 1 \text{g}4 \)?

7 Should White resign?

8 What is correct: \( 1... \text{e}5 \) or \( \text{g}5 \)?

9 What is correct: \( 1... \text{g}4 \) or \( 1... \text{f}6 \)?

10 What is the simplest way for White to win?
How does White win?

Can White hold the position?

Can Black save himself?

White to move and win.

What is right 1...\textit{e}6 or 1...\textit{c}6 ?

Point out the right move for White.
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17 White wins.

18 What is correct: 1.\text{e}4, 1.\text{g}4 or 1.\text{g}8?\text{g}?

19 What is the right move for Black?

20 How does White make a draw?

21 What is correct: 1.\text{g}7 or 1.\text{h}5?

22 What is correct: 1.\text{a}5 or 1.axb5?
23. Find the right continuation for Black.

24. What is correct: 1 c4 or 1 b4?

25. How should White continue?

26. What is correct: 1...a3xb4 or 1...c4c4?
Exercises:
Transposition to a Pawn Ending

1. Can Black transpose to a pawn ending?

2. Can White transpose to a pawn ending?

3. Demonstrate a plan to realise the extra pawn.

4. How do you assess the endgame after 1 c5?
5. In whose favour is the pawn ending after 1...b5?

6. Is it worth White avoiding the transposition to a pawn ending?

7. Can I 0,d3 be played?

8. Which should Black prefer, the rook or the pawn ending?

9. Can Black transpose to a pawn ending?

10. In what way can White transpose to a pawn ending?
Is it possible to transpose to a pawn ending by 1...g5?

Find the right continuation for Black.

Find the right continuation for Black.

How can White save the game?

Can Black transpose to a pawn ending?

Find a winning plan for Black.
17
Can White transpose to a pawn ending?

18
Find the right continuation for Black.

19
How should Black realise his extra pawn?

20
How can Black hold a draw?

21
How does White transpose to a winning pawn endgame?

22
Find the right continuation for Black.
Due to their small radius of action knights and pawns have very definite features. M. Botvinnik described these features well by the very comprehensive and deep statement: "Knight endings are pawn endings". Indeed the method of playing knight endings is very close to those with pawns. Here also a space advantage, active position of the king, pawn structure are all significant. An important role is played by the presence of outside passed pawns. Often the zugzwang motive is exploited in the game. However, apart from the general principles characteristic for playing pawn endings, play in knight endings is complicated by the possibility of pursuing a knight with an enemy king. Apart from this, knight endings with limited pawn material have specific features associated with the possibility for the weaker side of sacrificing the knight to liquidate the opponent’s pawns and thereby achieve a draw. This feature creates significant difficulties in the realisation of a positional and material advantage.

Let us look at a few examples where there is a compact pawn mass.

Upon the central placement of pawns the pieces can have quite a broad range of activity. In the first position White has a positional advantage due to the active position of his king and the presence for Black of a weak backward pawn on b6.

**Fedotov-Arkhipov**
*Moscow, 1978*

```
1 f5 exf5 2 Qxf5 Qd4 3 Qd6
```

However the fact that there are only a few pawns on the board complicates White’s task.

An insufficiently deep penetration into the features of the position leads to Black’s defeat, practically without a struggle. However, analysis shows that Black has very considerable defensive resources, and to achieve a win White has to demonstrate very accurate play throughout.

Let us look at the possible course of events. The first part of White’s plan consists of the creation of a passed pawn and exploitation of the weakness of the b6 pawn.

```
1 f5 exf5 2 Qxf5 Qd4 3 Qd6
```

White carefully controls the b5 square, preventing the move
... b6-b5, e.g. 3 g7? c6 4 e6 xe6 5 xe6 b5, and the white pawns are exchanged. Also no good is 3 xxd4 cxd4 4 f7 d3 5 e6+ c7 6 e7 d2 7 e8= d1=, with a draw. Black, for his part, is obliged to control the e6 square. Now, for example, 3...c6 with the idea ... b6-b5, does not work because of 4 e6! xd6 5 e7, and the pawn cannot be stopped.

3...e6 4 b5 d4 5 c3 e6

6 d5

And so the first part of the plan is completed: White wins the b6 pawn, since the opponent's pieces are forced to control the passed e5 pawn. Also possible is 6 a4. However it is interesting that, with the knight on a4, tactical resources suddenly appear for Black which require precise attention from his opponent. For example: 6 b5 7 cxb5 c7. This trappy move was not possible with the knight on d5. Now, on the natural 8 xc5+ follows 8...e8! with a draw after 9 b6 d5+. However after 8 c3 White can return to the channels of the main variation, look at below. Also possible of course is 8 b6 d5+ 9 f7 c4 10 e6+ c6 11 c3! xc3 12 e7, and White should win. But 7...c7 is not obligatory and is given to illustrate Black's possibilities. Now his best counterchance lies in the formation of a passed c-pawn, since giving up the b6 pawn without a murmur leads quickly to defeat. And so...

6...b5! 7 cxb5 d4 8 c3

The realisation of the extra pawn requires accuracy. Black's hopes are linked to the win of the b-pawn and the subsequent sacrifice of the knight for the e-pawn. Since his king is already close to the b-pawn, any advance of this pawn must be backed up by accurate calculation.

The second part of White's plan lies in the win of the c-pawn while holding on to his own pawns. Let us see whether Black can hold the defence by the active advance 8...c4 or the passive move 8...e6.

I. 8...c4

On c4 the pawn supported the manoeuvres of the white knight but now Black is left without a base on d4 for his own knight which is also deprived of its defence. This creates a motive to carry out the threat of a breakthrough with the king to the c4 pawn, in combination with threats to advance the passed pawn.

But the direct approach of the king to the c-pawn does not achieve its objective. For example: 9 g5
\[ \text{c7 10 f4 b6 11 e4 xb5 with a draw.} \]

The solution lies in the creation of a zugzwang position where Black simultaneously controls the e6 and f5 squares, i.e. in this position it is necessary to hand over the move to Black. This is achieved by the endgame king manoeuvre, "triangulation", characteristic of pawn and indeed also of knight endgames. In the present case, along the g6, f7 and f6 squares. This method is actively exploited also later on.

9 f7 e6 10 g6 d4 11 f6

The objective is achieved! Now in the position shown in the previous diagram it is already Black to move.

11 e6 12 f5 c5 13 d5 d3 14 e6+ d6 15 e7 d7 16 e4

The c4 pawn is doomed.

Instead of 10...d4 there is no salvation in 10...e7, on which possible are both 11 f5 c5 12 d5+ f7 13 b6 e8 14 e6, and 11 d5+ e8 (11...d8 12 f7 c7 13 c3 d7 14 b6) 12 f6 d4 13 b6.

And so 8...c4 loses. But what if the pawn is left on c5?

II. 8...e6

Also here the immediate breakthrough with the king to the c-pawn is not successful. For example: 9 f5 d4+ 10 e4 e6 11 b6 c6 12 b7 d7 and ...c7. Therefore White first endeavours to provoke the advance of the pawn to c4, aiming to obtain the position in the previous diagram. The direct 9 e4 does not achieve its objective because of 9...c7!, and he has to go back, 10 c3, so as not to allow a draw in the variations 10 xc5+ e8! 11 b6 d5+ or 10 b6 d5+. It becomes clear that the manoeuvre e4 is good when the king is situated on f7 and cannot immediately be attacked. The solution to the position is again achieved by the triangulating king manoeuvre g6-f7-f6.

9 g6 e7

After 9...d8, preventing the move to f7, the king breaks through to the c-pawn: 10 f5 e7 11 e4 e6 12 d5 followed by f4+ and d5.

The continuation 9...c4 10 f5! leads to a position looked at under the analysis of the first variation. The continuation 9...d4 10 f7 e6 11 e4 is looked at below (see moves 11-13).

10 d5+ d7

On 10...e8 winning is 11 b6 d8 12 f6 d7 13 e6+.

11 f7 d4

Losing at once is 11...d8 12 f6 e6 13 b6+.

12 c3 e6 13 e4 d8+

The position arising after 13...c4 14 c3 d4 15 f6 is examined in the commentary to the continuation 8...c4. Also losing is 13...d4 because of 14 xc5+ c7 15 e6+.

14 f6 c4

Black already cannot hold on to the pawn on c5, since in the event of 14...e6 winning is 15 b6 d8 16 xc5+ c6 17 e7.
15 c3 e6 16 f5, and White wins by continuing as in the analysis to Variation I.

The difficulties also encountered by the defending side with a flank pawn formation are well demonstrated by the following example.

Kremenetsky-Razuvaev
Moscow, 1981

White has a material and positional advantage, but his chances are based on the formation of a passed pawn which is inevitably linked to exchanges and gives Black defensive resources.

1 e3 d5+ 2 d4 f4 3 g5+

More natural looks 3...fxg5 4 hxg5 h5 5 e5 g4, creating defensive possibilities after 6 g6 d3+ 7 e6 f4+, and also upon 6 f6 gxf6 7 gxf6 g6+ 8 e6 f4+ 9 d6 f5 10 f7 g6.

4 xf6+ xh4

After 4...gxf6 5 gxf6 the white pawns are very dangerous.

5 e4 h3 6 f6?

On 6 g6 h5 7 e5 White maintains the advantage, but now Black can momentarily exploit his own drawing resource, linked to a knight sacrifice to liquidate the pawns: 6...xg5! 7 fxg7 e6+ and 8...

How can he fight against the passed f6 pawn? Black cannot allow its further advance to f7 since, without support from the king, the knight will not be able to cope with it, e.g. 9...f8 10 f7 h5 11 c5 h6 12 f6 h7+ 13 e7 g7 14 d7. The transfer of the knight to this key point ends the struggle, since the f8 square is indefensible. This is a typical knight manoeuvre with a pawn one square from queening. And so the knight is forced to move to a passive position on h8. In contrast to the variation given after Black's 3rd move, Black's pieces now have no room for manoeuvre.

9...h8 10 d6 h5 11 e6 g6 12 e7
The black king has two squares at its disposal: h5 and h7. Black played 12...<h>h5

Why did he reject 12...<h>h7? Let us look at a possible continuation of the struggle. 12...<h>h7 13 <f>g7 <g>g8+ 14 <e>e8 <g>g8 15 <h>h6+ <h>h7 16 <g>g4 <h>h8 17 <e>e5 <g>g8 18 <e>e7, and there arises a well-known position from Chéron, presented in Y. Averbakh’s monograph Comprehensive Chess Endings (2nd edition, 1980). This position is won in the following way: 18...<h>h7 19 <f>f8 <h>h6 20 <g>g8 <g>g5 21 <e>e7 <f>f5 22 <d>d7 <g>g6 23 <f>f7 <g>g5 24 <e>e5 <f>f4 25 <g>g8 <e>e6 26 <f>f3+ and 27 <d>d4.

Instead of 14...<g>g8, there is no saving himself either by 14...<f>f4, or 14...<h>h4. For example: 14...<f>f4 14 <e>e5 <d>d5 16 <f>f7 <f>f6+ 17 <e>e7 <g>g8 18 <e>e6 <g>g7 19 <d>d7; or 14...<h>h4 15 <g>g5+ <h>h6 16 <f>f7 <g>g6 17 <f>f3 <g>g7 18 <e>e5 <f>f8 19 <e>e7 <h>h7 20 <d>d7 <h>h8 21 <f>f8 (21 <f>f6 <f>f8!) 21...<g>g5 22 <g>g6+.

After 12...<h>h5! the king at the necessary moment can attack the pawn from the rear. This method of defence is presented in the same book by Y. Averbakh in examples 470 and 471. For example:

(a) 13 <f>f7 <g>g6+ 14 <d>d6 (also insufficient is 14 <e>e8 because of 14...<g>g4 15 <d>d6 <e>e5!=) 14...<g>g4 15 <e>e5+ <f>f5 16 <f>f7 <f>f6=;

(b) 13 <d>d7 <g>g5 14 <e>e6 <g>g6.

In the game followed:

13 <e>e6 <g>g6 14 <e>e7 <h>h5 15 <e>e6 <g>g6 16 <f>f5 <g>g5

Great accuracy is required of Black. Simpler is 16...<h>h7, since White does not manage to reach Chéron’s position. For example:

(a) 17 <h>h4 <g>g8 18 <e>e7 <f>f7 19 <f>f3 <h>h6 20 <e>e5 <f>f5, defends successfully;

(b) 17 <e>e7 <h>h6 18 <c>c6 <g>g5 19 <e>e5 <f>f4 20 <f>f7 <g>g6 21 <d>d6 <h>h8! 22 <e>e7 <g>g6+ 23 <f>f7 <e>e5+ 24 <g>g7 <g>g4! (it is important to leave the file where the promotion of the pawn will take place!) 25 <c>c4 <c>c6 26 <g>g8 <d>d8.

17 <d>d4!

The knight heads for the key e5 square!

17...<h>h6 18 <f>f3 <g>g6
On 18...<h>h7 19 <e>e5 <g>g8 20 <e>e7 arises the above-mentioned Chéron position.

19 <d>d7 <h>h8 20 <e>e5 <g>g5 21 <e>e6

21...<h>h5?

Black cannot stand the tension and makes a mistake. With the only move 21...<f>f4! he holds the position. A. Kremenetsky intended the continuation 22 <f>f7 <g>g6 23 <d>d6 <h>h8 (on 23...<e>e5 winning is 24 <d>d5) 24 <e>e7 <g>g6+ 25 <f>f7 <e>e5+ 26 <g>g7 <g>g4 27 <c>c4, so as on 27...<c>c6! to offer a draw, while on the natural-looking 27...<f>f3? there is the beautiful win: 28 <h>h6! <g>g5 29 <g>g6 <f>f4 30 <d>d2! <g>g4 31 <e>e4 <f>f3 32 <d>d2+ <h>h4 33 <d>d3 <g>g5 34 <e>e5 (zugzwang!) and then 35 <f>f7.

22 <e>e7 Black resigned.

On 22...<h>h4 winning is 23 <f>f8 <g>g5 24 <g>g7 <f>f5 25 <d>d7.
The following example shows the possibilities of the weaker side, when he has compensation in the form of actively placed pieces.

**Gufeld-Grigorian**

*Daugavpils, 1979*

White has an extra pawn but Black has sufficient counterplay due to the active positions of his pieces. Now White should secure the elasticity of his pawn chain by 1 h3, retaining the possibility of the exchange gxf5 for an appropriate moment. However, there followed:

1 gxf5 gxf5 2 ctJf3 ctJf6

It is important to maintain the possibility of play in the centre and on the king's flank. Passive is 2...ctJd6 3 ctJd3 h6 4 ctJd4 with a win.

3 ctJd4

On 3 ctJd3 possible is 3...ctJd7 4 ctJd4 ctJc5+.

3...ctJe4 4 cb5 ctJd5

Further activity by 4...ctJd5?? ends in a sudden mate by 5 ctJd6!

5 cf3 ctJg4!

The activity of the opponent's pieces does not permit White to strengthen his position without exchanging pawns. But this allows Black drawing chances linked to the possibility of sacrificing the knight at an appropriate moment.

For example:

(a) 6 h3 cJh6 7 cd4 add6 8 cd5 9 cd4 cJf7+ 10 cd6 12 h4 cJe8+ 13 cd7 cJxe3! 14 ce6 ce7=;

(b) 6 e4+ ce5 7 exf5 cJxh2+ 8 cd3 cJf1+ 9 cd4 cJf6! 10 f6 cd7 11 cd7 ce3+ 12 cd5 ce4 and cd6=.

Probably the maximum that White can extract from the position is to organise a passed pawn by 6 h3 cJh6 7 cd4 cd6 8 e4.

The attempt to obtain two connected passed pawns, undertaken in the game, is met surprisingly by an energetic black counterattack, linked to the activity of the king.

6 cd4 cJxh2+ 7 cd3 cJf1+ 8 cd2 ce4!!

An apotheosis of the activity of the king! On 9 cdxf5 cJxe3! the white pawns are liquidated.

9 cdxf1 cJxe3 10 ce6 cd3 11 cg1 cg3 Draw!

The black king confidently ties the knight down to the f4 pawn and does not allow its own white colleague out of the cage. On 12 cd1 follows 12...h6! 13 cg1 h5 and then h4-h3-h2, stalemateing the king.

Now let us look at an example of playing knight endings with the presence of pawns on opposite flanks. In this case a decisive role is often played by the organisation and
energetic exploitation of a distant passed pawn.

Vladimirov-Novopashin
Volgodonsk, 1981

White’s advantage lies in the possibility of quickly creating a passed pawn while retaining a good coordination of pieces which allows him to support the advance of this pawn and at the same time to control Black’s activity on the kingside.

However the peculiarities of the position are such that great accuracy is required from both sides for the fulfilment of their plans. Now White can quickly organise the manoeuvre 1.d4 t.Ld5 2.c4 t.Lxf4 3.b5, but he prefers prophylaxis.

1.e3 g5?!

A hasty decision, facilitating White’s task. After 1...h6 2.h4 g5! Black’s defence is far easier.

2.fxg5 f4 3.c4 t.f5 4.b5 axb5 5.axb5 t.xg5 6.b6

Let us pay attention to the differences in the possibilities for the two sides. The passed b-pawn distracts the black knight whereas both white pieces can attack the passed pawn. Nevertheless Black can put up stubborn resistance by breaking through with his king to the g4 square—6...t.g4!. However he chooses another route-march for his king.

6...t.h5? 7.a5 t.d5 8.b7 t.b4+ 9.t.e2! t.a6 10.t.f3

And so White blockades the pawn and with a fine knight manoeuvre wins it.

10...t.b8 11.h4 t.e5 12.b3 t.c6 13.t.c5 t.f5 14.t.d3!

An important finesse! If 14.t.d7 Black holds on by 14...t.d4+ 15.t.f2 t.c6 16.b8=!! t.xb8 17.t.xb8 t.g4.

14...t.d4 15.t.f2 t.c6 16.t.b4!

17.t.f3 t.e5 18.t.d3 t.d6 19.t.xf4 t.c6 20.t.g5 t.xb7 21.t.h6 t.c6 22.t.xh7

This ending has theoretical significance. Will the black pieces succeed in neutralising the h-pawn?

22...t.e7 23.h5 t.c6 24.t.g7 t.d5 25.t.f6 t.g8+ 26.t.f7 t.h6+ 27.t.g7 t.f5+

On 27...t.g4 winning is 28.t.f2!!.

28.t.f6
An instructive position! The black knight can control the h-pawn from the g4 and f5 squares, therefore to advance it White must deflect the knight from these points. This task can be fulfilled by the knight from the e3 square: 28...\( \text{Kh6} \) 29 \( \text{Kf2!} \) \( \text{d6} \) 30 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{g8} \) 31 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{e7} \) 32 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 33 \( \text{e3} \).

Black chooses the best plan, endeavouring to break through with the king to the h-pawn and at the same time controlling the e3 square, and this attempt is rewarded.

28...\( \text{e4!} \) 29 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{d6} \) 30 \( \text{f2}+ \) \( \text{e5} \) 31 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{f5} \) 32 \( \text{d3}+ \) \( \text{e4} \) 33 \( \text{c1?} \) \( \text{f4} \) 34 \( \text{e2}+ \) \( \text{g4} \) 35 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e7}+ \) 36 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{f5} \) Drawn.

The king attacks the pawn and defends the knight, observing from the h6 square.

Is White’s advantage in the last diagram really insufficient for a win? No way! After the game E.Vladimirov demonstrated a clear way to realise the passed pawn. Instead of 29 \( \text{g5} \) he gave 29 \( \text{g6}!! \) as leading immediately to victory.

Now every move by Black loses:
(a) 29...\( \text{e7}+ \) 30 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f5} \) 31 \( \text{f2}+ \) \( \text{e5} \) 32 \( \text{g4}+ \) \( \text{e6} \) (32...\( \text{e4} \) 33 \( \text{e3}!!+ - \) 33 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{h4}+ \) (or 33...\( \text{e7}+ \)) 34 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{f5}+ \) 35 \( \text{f8}! \) Zugzwang! On any king move, winning is 36 \( \text{e3}! \) Leading to the same outcome is 30...\( \text{g8} \) 31 \( \text{f2}+ \) \( \text{e5} \) 32 \( \text{g4}+ \) \( \text{e6} \) 33 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{e7}+ \) 34 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{f5}+ \) 35 \( \text{f8}! \).

(b) 29...\( \text{h4}+ \) 30 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f3}+ \) (30...\( \text{f5} \) after 31 \( \text{f2} \) leads to Variation (a) above) 31 \( \text{f6}! \), and the h-pawn is unstoppable.

But to conclude White missed the win by playing 33 \( \text{c1}? \). After Black’s 32nd move there arises the position shown in the last diagram, but with White to move. With the tried and tested ‘triangulation’ king manoeuvre 33 \( \text{f6}! \) \( \text{h6} \) 34 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{f5}+ \) (34...\( \text{g4} \) 35 \( \text{f2}! \) 35 \( \text{g6} \) he hands the move over to his opponent and wins.

Returning to the position shown in the above diagram, it is useful to bring to mind a fragment from the game Botvinnik-Simagin (Moscow 1955), where, by exploiting his opponent’s inaccurate play, M.Botvinnik was able to save himself in a similar ending.

Botvinnik-Simagin
Moscow, 1955

A picture of a position, having an instructive character! White’s pieces are clearly fulfilling their functions: the king confidently squares up to the enemy knight, while the white knight remains triumphant on the d3 square.
Leading to a win here is 1...@f5 2 @f3 @g5 3 @h4+ @g4 4 @g6 @f3 5 @b4 @g5. However there followed:

1 ... @d2? 2 @b4 @f5 3 @c3!

With tempo the king draws closer to the centre of events and now if 3 ... @xe5 4 @xd2 he succeeds in containing the pawn.

3 ... @e4+ 4 @c3 @f5 5 @d3 @g4 6 @e5+ @f5 7 @d3 @g4 8 @e5+ @g3 9 @g6!

In contrast to the previous example White has this defensive resource, since the pawn finds itself one move further from the queening square.

9 ... @e6 10 @e3 @f8 11 @xf8 h4 12 @e6 h3 13 @g5 Drawn.

Let us look at some more examples of a struggle with pawns on different flanks.

Vasiukov-Timoschenko
Volgodonsk, 1981

1 @e4 @e8 2 @d6!

After 2 @xg5 @f2 White's task is more complicated.

2 ... @f8 3 @xc5 @f2 4 @d7+ @f7 5 @e5+ @f6

And so White creates a distant passed pawn. He combines its advance with fine manoeuvring of pieces, creating on the way threats to the g5 pawn.

6 @d5 @d1 7 c5 @c3+ 8 @c4 @e4 9 @d3! @e6 10 @d4 @f6 11 @e2 @e7 12 c6 @e6

On 12 ... @d6 winning is 13 @e4+.

13 @c5 @e7 14 @b6 @d6

How can he realise the extra pawn? Insufficient is the natural 15 @b7 @e8 16 @e4+ @e5 17 @xg5 @f4 18 @h7 @d6+! (for the present the g4 pawn is untouchable because of 18 ... @xg4 19 @f6+ @xf6 20 c7, and Black does not succeed in playing ... @e8 since the pawn queens with check) 19 @c7 @f7 (also possible is 19 ... @b5+ 20 @b6 @d6) 20 g5 @f5!=. On the g5 square the pawn becomes vulnerable.

However E.Vasyukov finds an elegant manoeuvre and wins the g5 pawn while the black knight occupies the d5 square—which is rather poor for the struggle against the c-pawn.

15 @h3! @d5+ 16 @b7 @e5 17 @xg5 @f4 18 @h7
In this lies the main point of the refined manoeuvre begun with the move 15 $\text{c3h3}$. In contrast to the position looked at in the previous note, the pawn remains on g4 with Black to move—and he is in zugzwang. On 18...$\text{c4}$ or 18...$\text{e5}$ follows 19 g5 $\text{f5}$ 20 $\text{f6}$ $\text{e7}$ 21 $\text{g5}$ $\text{xg5}$ 22 $\text{d5}$ $\text{f5}$ 23 $\text{c6}$ and 24 $\text{c8}=\text{w}$. This same manoeuvre wins on 18...$\text{e7}$—19 c7 $\text{xg4}$ 20 $\text{f6}$+ $\text{g5}$ 21 $\text{d5}$ On 18...$\text{g4}$ decisive is 19 $\text{f6}$+ $\text{xf6}$ 20 c7 $\text{e8}$ 21 c8=$\text{w}$.

In the game followed...
18...$\text{c3}$ 19 g5 $\text{f5}$ 20 c7 and Black resigned.
A very instructive ending to the game.

**Kochiev-Lerner**
**Beltsy, 1981**

The main thing is to organise a distant passed pawn and support its advance. The white knight is in no position to struggle against the whole of Black’s position.
4 $\text{e4}$ $\text{c5}$+ 5 $\text{f5}$ $\text{xb3}$ 6 $\text{b7}$
Alas, on 6 $\text{c6}$ follows 6...$\text{d4}$+.
6...$\text{d4}$+ 7 $\text{g5}$ $\text{xg5}$ $\text{e6}$+!
It is important to restrict the white knight; now it is deprived of the important c5 square.
8 $\text{f6}$ b3 9 $\text{d6}$ b2 10 $\text{xe6}$
$b1$=$\text{w}$ 11 $\text{f6}$ $\text{b6}$ White resigned.

Let us look at another interesting ending, demonstrating the importance of active defence.

**Nikolaevsky-Gufeld**
**Kiev, 1951**

After 1...$\text{a5}$ 2 b4 $\text{cxb4}$ 3 $\text{axb4}$
$\text{xc4}$ White gradually loses. However analysis shows that he is not exploiting his defensive possibilities. After 2 $\text{c1}$ g6 the first impression is that White gets into zugzwang since 3 $\text{e5}$ $\text{xg5}$ 4 $\text{d5}$ loses because of 4...$\text{f4}$! 5 b4 $\text{e3}$!!, and the pawn cannot be stopped. But nevertheless White finds a saving resource:
3 $\text{e2}$!! $\text{xb3}$ 4 $\text{g3}$+ $\text{h4}$ 5 $\text{f5}$+!
And Black is forced to reconcile himself to a draw, 5...\(\text{h5}\) 6 \(\text{g3+}\), since he would risk defeat after both 5...\(\text{h3}\) 6 \(\text{e7}\), and 5...\(\text{gxf5}\) 6 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{d4}\) 7 \(\text{e5!}\) \(\text{c6+}\) 8 \(\text{d6}\) \(\text{d8}\) 9 \(\text{d7}\).

With passed pawns on opposite flanks, as in pawn endings, the strongest side might win even without the participation of the king. An interesting example is from the game...

**Azmaiparashvili-Novopashin**  
*Volgodonsk, 1981*

![Diagram 1](image1)

1 a5 \(\text{f6}\) 2 f4 \(\text{g7}\) 3 f5 \(\text{g8}\) 4 \(\text{d3}\) \(\text{a6}\) 5 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{b4}\) 6 f6 c4 7 h6, and Black lost on time.

**Van der Sterren-Douven**  
*Netherlands, 1985*

![Diagram 2](image2)

A position which, despite its apparent simplicity, is quite insidious. Black's pawn weaknesses require due attention from him. The cardinal decision in the position is the exchange of knights, which requires accurate calculation. For example, after 1...\(\text{e6+}\) 2 \(\text{xe6}\) \(\text{xe6}\) 3 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{fxg5}\) 4 \(\text{hxg5}\) \(\text{d6}\) 5 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{e5}\) 6 f4+ \(\text{f5}\) 6 \(\text{f3}\) d4 the chances are even. In the game, however, there followed...

1...\(\text{h6}\)? 2 \(\text{h5}\) \(\text{gxh5}\)?

The only chance of saving the game remains with 2...\(\text{f7}\) 3 \(\text{hxg6+}\) \(\text{gxg6}\) 4 f3 \(\text{d7}\) 5 \(\text{f5}\) h5 6 \(\text{e7+}\) \(\text{f7}\), and White's advantage is not so tangible.

3 \(\text{f5+}\) \(\text{e6}\) 4 \(\text{gxh5}\) \(\text{e4}\) 5 f3 \(\text{c3}\) 6 e3 \(\text{e2+}\) 7 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{e5}\) 8 \(\text{hxh6}\) d4 9 \(\text{f7+}\) \(\text{e6}\) 10 \(\text{d8+}\) \(\text{d7}\) 11 exd4! and White won.

**Godena-Lalić**  
*Portoroz, 1998*

![Diagram 3](image3)

After 1...\(\text{d3!}\) 2 \(\text{b3}\) \(\text{d5}\) the black king cuts off the enemy knight from the centre.

3 \(\text{a5}\) \(\text{e4}\) 4 \(\text{c6}\) e5 5 h4

White presents his opponent with good chances. Correct was 5 b4! \(\text{d5}\) 6 b5 e4 7 \(\text{a7!}\) \(\text{c5}\) 8 \(\text{c8}\)
\[ \text{Polnareva-Akhsharumova} \\
\text{Moscow, 1984} \]

At first sight it seems that a complicated and long struggle is in prospect, but Black, exploiting the bad position of the white king, quickly achieves victory.

1 \text{e5} f5 2 \text{d7} f7 3 \text{c5} e7 4 \text{a6} d6 5 \text{b4} e5 6 \text{d3} d5 7 \text{b4+} e4 8 \text{a6} d3 9 \text{b4+} e2 10 \text{c6} f3 11 \text{e7} e1+ 12 \text{g1} \text{d3} 13 \text{xf5} \text{xf2} 14 \text{g2} e4 15 \text{d4+} \text{d3}! and White resigned.

In the next game, White has a material advantage but Black finds an interesting possibility to save himself.

\[ \text{Barlov-Abramović} \\
\text{Yugoslavia, 1989} \]

1... \text{e7+} 2 \text{f6} \text{e8} 3 \text{g5} h6+! 4 \text{h4} \text{f6} 4 \text{h6} \text{g4}. 4... \text{e4} 5 \text{g7} \text{e5} 6 \text{h5} \text{f6} 7 \text{h6} \text{d6} Drawn.

White is not able to break the blockade surrounding him.

\[ \text{Vyzhmanavin-Chiburdanidze} \\
\text{USSR (ch), 1984} \]

White has the advantage, but the limited amount of material left complicates the task. White’s plan is linked to a breakthrough with the king to the queen’s flank, since there is nothing in 1 \text{b6} \text{a5} 2 \text{d4} because of 2... \text{c6+}!.

1 \text{e3} \text{g6} 2 \text{d2} \text{g7} 3 \text{c2} \text{g6} 4 \text{b2} \text{e7}
He cannot wait any longer, the c4 pawn cannot be held. To exploit the remoteness of the white king, Black strives to simplify the position.

5 b6 f5 6 exf6 xf6 7 xc4 g6 8 c2 h4

In the pawn ending—8...e5 9 xe5 xe5—White gains victory by 10 d3 f4 11 c4 e5 12 c5 f3 13 c6 e4+ 14 d4 e3 15 c7 e2 16 c8=wh e1=wh 17 f6+ g2 18 e4+ xe4 19 xe4.

9 d3 f3 10 h3 g1 11 d2 e5 12 e3 xh3 13 c4

With this move White rejected Black’s offer of a draw. In fact, if 13...f4 White retains the advantage by 14 f3+ or 14 e4. Also other defences are no help.

13...g1 14 e4 h3 15 c5 d6 16 d3 e5 17 e4 e6 18 xe5 f2+ 19 e3!

19 d4 d6 20 c5+ e6 21 c6 d6 leads to a draw.

19...d1+ 20 d4 f2 21 c5 h1 22 c6 d6 23 e3 g3 24 c4 xc6 25 d2 d5 26 f3 h1

In this apparently arid desert a win can still be achieved due to the poor position of the black knight.

27 e4

But not 27 f1 because of 27...d4! 28 h2 d3 29 g2 e3 30 xh1 f2 with a draw.

27...e5 28 e3!
The last finesse: if 28 xg5, then 28...f2! 29 xf2 f4.

28 d5 29 f6+ e5 30 h5 Black resigned.

He loses the knight, without managing to capture the g4 pawn in return.

An instructive and complicated knight ending, where the advantage of one of the sides lies only in a slightly better structure, is encountered in the game...

Timman-Ree
Netherlands, 1984
Accurate calculation was required for the initiative-seeking 7⃣c8!. For example: 7...⃣b5 8 a4 ⃣c3 9⃣d3 ⃣xa4 10 ⃣xa7 ⃣b2 11 ⃣d4
e5+ 12 ⃣e4 ⃣d1 13 f3 ⃣f2+ 14⃣d5 ⃣d3 15 b5 ⃣f4+ 16 ⃣e4 ⃣xg2 17 ⃣c8, and White’s position is close to a win.

7...a6 8 ⃣c4 ⃣d5 9 ⃣d4 ⃣e5 10
g3 ⃣d7 11 f4 ⃣c6 12 ⃣e5

12⃣c7
Black chooses passive defence—and wrongly so. In his comments to this game Timman wrote that 12...⃣b5 13 ⃣b2 ⃣xb4 14 axb4
⃣xb4 15 ⃣xe6 a5 16 ⃣f7 a4 17⃣xa4 was losing. Considerably stronger, however, is 16...⃣b3! , after which 17 ⃣xg7 ⃣xb2 18 f5 a4
might lead to a queen ending with an h-pawn, where White’s chances of winning are problematical.

13 ⃣d6 ⃣d7 14 f5 ⃣xf5 15 ⃣xf5
With simple and convincing moves White has succeeded in increasing his advantage and placing Black in a zugzwang position.

15⃣e8 16 g4 ⃣f6 17 h3
17 ⃣xh6 ⃣c6 18 g5 ⃣d7 19 ⃣e6 is more quickly decisive.

17...h5 18 g5 ⃣h7 19 h4 ⃣f8 20⃣xg7 ⃣g6 21 ⃣f6
21 ⃣d5 is also sufficient to win.

White should continue 1 ⃣g2! h4
2 ⃣d4 ⃣e3 3 ⃣e6 ⃣e5 4 ⃣g5, and the outcome of the struggle is still not quite clear, since it is difficult for Black to advance both pawns to the third rank. But in the game followed...

Vuković-Eingorn
Belgrade 1987

1⃣d4 2⃣e3! 2⃣f5+ ⃣f2 3⃣g3
After 3⃣h4 g3+ 4 ⃣h1 the pawns are frozen but the poor position of the white king is decisive---4...
⃣e3 5 b6 ⃣f1 6 b7 ⃣g4 7 b8=⃣f2 mate.

3...h4 4⃣e4+ ⃣e3 5⃣d6
On 5⃣g5 g3+, with the following interesting variations:

(a) 6⃣g2 (6⃣h3 ⃣f4+ 7 ⃣xh4
g2) 6⃣f4 7⃣h3+ ⃣g4 8⃣g1
⃣f4+ (8...⃣e3+ 9 ⃣h1 h3? 10
⃣xh3=) 9 ⃣h1 h3 10 b6 h2 11 b7
⃣h3, and mate in two moves.

(b) 6⃣g1 ⃣f4 7⃣h3+ ⃣g4 8⃣g2 ⃣e3+ 9⃣g1 ⃣xh3 10 b6 ⃣g4
11 b7 \( \text{Ke5} \) 12 b8=\( \text{K} \) \( \text{Kf3}+ \) 13 \( \text{Kf1} \) g2+ 14 \( \text{Ke2} \) g1=\( \text{K} \) 15 \( \text{Kxf3} \) \( \text{g3}+ \).

5...\( \text{g3}+ \) 6 \( \text{Kg1} \)

Forced. If 6 \( \text{Kg2} \) \( \text{f4} \) 7 \( \text{g1} \) then 7...\( \text{f3} \) is decisive.

6...\( \text{h3} \) 7 \( \text{Kf5}+ \) \( \text{f4} \) 8 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{g4} \) 9 \( \text{Ke2} \)

The threat was 9...\( \text{h2} \) 10 \( \text{Khl} \) \( \text{h3} \). Now, however, on this could follow 11 \( \text{Kxg3} \) \( \text{xg3} \) 12 b6 with a draw. In order to achieve victory Black must broaden the range of activity for his knight.

9...\( \text{b6} \) 10 \( \text{Kfl} \) \( \text{c4} \) 11 \( \text{Kg1} \) \( \text{d2} \)

White resigned, without waiting for Black to promote to a queen in the variation 12 b6 \( \text{Kf3}+ \) 13 \( \text{Kf1} \) g2+ 14 \( \text{Kf2} \) g1=\( \text{K} \) 15 \( \text{Kxg1} \) h2.

The comparison between knight and pawn endings is borne out with the exploitation of zugzwang in the two following endgames.

Šajtar-Benkö
Budapest, 1954

Of course, according to Botvinnik, playing a knight endgame, is like playing a pawn ending. White's plan consists of advancing the first pawn with help of the king, after which Black gradually lands in zugzwang.

1 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 2 \( \text{g4}+ \) \( \text{g5} \) 3 \( \text{h3}+ \) \( \text{g6} \)

If 3...\( \text{h4} \), then 4 \( \text{f4} \) with the irresistible threat of 5 \( \text{f2} \) and 6 \( \text{g3} \) mate.

4 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{c4} \)

Attempting to create counterplay by means of an attack on the pawn.

5 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{e3} \) 6 \( \text{f4}+ \) \( \text{h6} \) 7 \( \text{g5}+ \) \( \text{g7} \) 8 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{f5} \) 9 \( \text{d5}! \)

Inferior was 9 \( \text{g6} \) in view of 9...\( \text{g3}+! \) 10 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e4}+ \) 11 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{g3}+ \), preventing White attacking the coordinated forces.

9...\( \text{g3}+ \)

On 9...\( \text{d6} \) or 9...\( \text{d4} \) would have followed 10 \( \text{e3}! \), and Black is forced into a worse position.

10 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{f1} \)

If 10...\( \text{e4} \) 11 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{d6} \) decisive is 12 \( \text{e7}! \).

11 \( \text{f4}! \)

The main principle of the endgame is not to rush! White restricts the activity of the black knight, which, in order to get into play, has to go to d2 or h2, and then the white king finds itself in a very favourable position—safe from the black knight along the diagonal.

11...\( \text{d2} \) 12 \( \text{e3}! \)

Still more restriction of the black knight.

12...\( \text{g6} \) 13 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{f1} \) 14 \( \text{h4}+ \) \( \text{g7} \) 15 \( \text{gd4} \) \( \text{h7} \)

15...\( \text{e3}+ \) 16 \( \text{h5} \).

16 \( \text{g6}+ \) \( \text{h6} \)

16...\( \text{g7} \) 17 \( \text{g5} \).

17 \( \text{f4}! \)

Zugzwang in action.

17...\( \text{d2} \) 18 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{g7} \)
18...\(\text{c4}\) 19 \(\text{f6}\).

19 \(\text{g4!}\)

Zugzwang in turn. It should be mentioned that White does not hurry with the advance of his reserve pawn, since this cuts off squares from the king.

19...\(\text{g8}\)

On a move of the knight follows 20 \(\text{g5}\), while on 19...\(\text{h6}\)—20 \(\text{g2}\) \(\text{g7}\) 21 \(\text{f4}\).

20 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{e4}\)+ 21 \(\text{f4}\)!

21 \(\text{h6}\) \(\text{f6}\).

21...\(\text{c5}\) 22 \(\text{f5}\)

Step by step White creates a very strong position, and Black must continually watch the threat of a king infiltration to \(f6\) or \(h6\).

22...\(\text{d3}\)+ 23 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{e5}\)

Black continually attacks the pawn and accuracy is required from White. Thus there is nothing in 24 \(g7\) \(h7\), after which the coordination of the white pieces is destroyed.

24 \(\text{g3}\)!

The knight crosses to \(h5\), after which the pawn pushes on to \(g7\).

24...\(\text{c4}\) 25 \(\text{h5}\) \(\text{e3}\)

25...\(\text{d6}\) 26 \(\text{h6}\) \(\text{e4}\) 27 \(\text{g5}\); 25...\(\text{e5}\) 26 \(\text{f5}\) and 27 \(g7\).

26 \(g7\) \(h7\)

26...\(\text{d5}\) 27 \(\text{h6}\); 26...\(\text{f7}\) 27 \(\text{h6}\) \(\text{xg4}\) 28 \(\text{h7}\).

27 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{d1}\) 28 \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{e3}\)+ 29 \(\text{g5}\)

White hands over the move to his opponent and at once places him in zugzwang. Black, apparently tired from a difficult defence, here made a mistake by playing 29...\(\text{g8}\)?, and after 30 \(\text{g6}\) resigned, since on 30...\(\text{xg4}\) follows 31 \(\text{f6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 32 \(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{h7}\) 33 \(\text{f7}\).

There was a chance for him to put up more stubborn resistance by...

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

In this case White wins in the following instructive way.

30 \(\text{f6}\) \(\text{g8}\)

30...\(\text{d6}\) 31 \(\text{e7}\) and then 32 \(\text{f8}\).

31 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{e5}\)+ 32 \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{c4}\) 33 \(\text{f6}\)

The familiar ‘triangulation’.

33...\(\text{h7}\) 34 \(\text{g3}\)!

A new reconstruction. Now bad is 34...\(\text{g8}\) because of 35 \(\text{f5}\) and 36 \(\text{e7}\), and also 34...\(\text{e3}\) because of 35 \(\text{f7}\)

34...\(\text{d6}\) 35 \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{e4}\)+

35...\(\text{e8}\)+ 36 \(\text{f7}\).

36 \(\text{f7}\) \(\text{g5}\) 37 \(\text{e7}\)! \(\text{e4}\)

37...\(\text{g8}\) 38 \(\text{f6}\) \(\text{e4}\)+ 39 \(\text{g6}\).

38 \(\text{f8}\) \(\text{f6}\) 39 \(\text{f7}\) \(\text{g8}\)

Black is on the final frontier.

40 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{h6}\)! 41 \(\text{f8}\) \(\text{g8}\) 42 \(\text{g6}\)+

And White wins.

It is interesting that precisely the same endgame was met in the following game.

Matulović-Uitumen
Palma de Mallorca, 1970

This ending also ended in victory for the stronger side and we present it without commentary since here
the same idea was utilised—only White probably defended in weaker fashion.

1...\( \text{b6} \) 2 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{d7} \) 3 \( \text{e}7 \) \( \text{f6}+4 \text{h4} \) g5+ 5 \( \text{g}3 \) g6 6 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 7 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}4+8 \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 9 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 10 \( \text{e}6 \) g4 11 \( \text{f}4+\text{g}5 \) 12 \( \text{e}6+\text{h}4 \) 13 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 14 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 15 \( \text{h}2 \) g5 16 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{e}3 \) 17 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 18 \( \text{g}2 \) g3 19 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{e}3 \) 20 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 21 \( \text{h}7 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 22 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{d}3 \) 23 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 24 \( \text{h}1 \) g2+ 25 \( \text{h}2 \) g4 26 \( \text{f}6 \) g3+ 27 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{h}3 \) White resigned.

What else can he do? He must give up a pawn—though it was still possible to attempt a breakthrough with the king to the d8 square, but then, with the king on e7, the knight from e5 goes to d3, and White is again in a blind alley.

6...\( \text{xe}7 \) 7 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 8 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{d}3 \) 9 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{e}1 \) 10 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 11 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}3 \) 12 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 13 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}5+\text{f}6 \) 14 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 15 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 16 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 17 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 18 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 19 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 20 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 21 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 22 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{g}6 \)?

It is interesting that in both examples the stronger side had doubled pawns on the g-file. But what will be the case if the pawns are situated on another file? To us it seems that the weaker side will make a draw only with pawns on the edge file, since then the king of the stronger side has no exit.

Van Wely-Adams
Groningen, 1997

Black must have the possibility, on \( \text{d}3 \), to reply.... \( \text{g}6 \), defending the f4 pawn.

23 \( \text{h}4 \)?
Correct was 23 \( \text{d}3! \) \( \text{c}4 \) 24 \( \text{h}4 \), obtaining a winning position. The transposition of moves gives Black the possibility of saving himself.

23...\( \text{gxh}4 \) 24 \( \text{e}6 \) h3! 25 \( \text{xf}4+\text{g}5 \) 26 \( \text{xh}3+\text{h}4 \) 27 \( \text{xf}2 \) \( \text{g}3 \!\)

The Black king breaks through to the white pawns and a draw is inevitable.

28 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{xf}3 \) 29 \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{d}4+\text{f}3 \) 30 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 31 \( \text{e}3 \) Drawn.

An interesting ending arose in the following game where despite, the approximate equality, the struggle was still not over.
Ivanchuk-Eingorn
USSR (ch), 1988

1 f3 h4 2 b5 a5 3 g1 d6

More active is 3...f4 provoking play such as 4 d5 b6+ 5 c6 a4 6 b6 xb6 7 xb6 g3 8 xa5 g2 9 e2 xf3 10 g1+ g2 11 e2 with a draw.

4 d4 c5 5 h3 e6+ 6 c4 c7 7 d5 b6 8 d6 xb6 9 f4 a4 10 e7 xa3 11 xf7 d4

Foreseeing 12 xg6 a4 13 f5 xf5 14 xf5 b2 15 g6 a3 16 g7 a2 17 g8= w a1= w, the rivals agreed to a draw.

Sveshnikov-Sokolov
Moscow, 1991

White has the advantage on account of his majority on the queenside and greater space, but the exploitation of this advantage requires filigree technique.

1 f3 d7

Neither now, nor later is there any possibility of 1...c5 since then 2 b5 a6 3 d6 e7 4 b7 d7, and the white king goes to the centre followed by a3 and b4.

2 f2 f5 3 e3 e7 4 b4 e5 5 a4 d6 6 d3 f6 7 c5+ e6

Better is 7 c7 8 c4 a6.

8 b5! d7 9 c4 c7

Bad is 9 e4 10 b4.

10 a5 a6!

The threat was a6, bxc6 and b5.

11 b6+

After 11 bxa6 follows 11 b8 a2 d5 and 13 a7.

11 b7 12 g3 h5?

He should not freeze his structure.

Correct is 12...d7.

13 h4! d7 14 f4!

Closing the way for the king.

14...xf4 15 xf4 f8 16 e2 g6 17 d4 xh4

After 17...xh4 18 xf5 g6 19 e7 Black is in zugzwang.

18 e6! c8

To defend against d8.

19 xg7 g6 20 xh5 Black resigned.

Sveshnikov-Sokolov
Moscow, 1991

Torre-Portisch
Toluca, 1982

Knight Endings 51
Knight Endings

The endgame appears very difficult for White but, with a pawn sacrifice, he activates his king.

1 b6! axb6 2 cxc4 b5 3 e3+ c5 4 f5!

Weaker is 4 g4 e6 5 e3 c7! 6 f6 d5, and the pawn ending is hopeless for White. With the sacrifice of yet another pawn White creates his own passed pawn, which is a principal factor in this endgame.

4...gxf5 5 h4 f4 6 g4 f5 7 h2 c6 8 h5 e5+ 9 e2 b4 10 h6 b3 11 h7 c6 12 f3 b2 13 d2 d4 14 f3 e3 15 b1+

Now Black cannot win the knight on b1 because after h7-h8, xh8, the king captures both black pawns. He has to try and go with the king to the h7 pawn.

15...d3 16 f2 e4 17 d2+ d5 18 e2 e6 19 d3 f6 20 c2 g7 21 f3 xh7 22 xb2 h6

It looks like White has some problems converting his passed d-pawn to a win, but really it is very simple.

1...g6 2 d4 f7 3 c5!

Speculating on a transfer to a winning pawn endgame, White clears the way for his pawn and king.

3...b6 4 d6 f6 5 d7 e7 6 e5 h5

Zugzwang—after 6...c4+ 7 d5 a5 (preventing c6) 8 g4 g5 9 e5 the white king penetrates one flank or another.

7 f4 c4 8 g5 e5 9 h4!

And because of zugzwang White wins yet another pawn. Black resigned.

Marić-Zaitseva

Tivat, 1995

It is interesting to compare this ending with the two following ones, where doubled pawns were successfully realised.

23 c2 h5 23 d2 g4 24 d4 e5 26 e2 f1 g5 26 f2 e4+ 29 g2 d2

And Black did not manage to realise his material advantage.
In many cases 4:3 on one flank is winning for the stronger side, but here it isn’t so clear.

1 4f3 f6
More or less necessary—White’s plan was 4d4, g2-g4 and f4-f5 creating a weakness on e6.

2 4e3
Playable was 2 4d4.

2...4b5 3 g3 4e8 4 4d3 4d7 5 4b4 fxe5?
Clearly better would be 5...4a7 6 4e3 4c6 7 4d3 4e7 with the idea 8...g5 and transfer of the king via f7-g6 to f5.

6 fxe5 4c7 7 4e3 4a7 8 4d3 4c6 9 h4 g6 10 4c5 4d8
Otherwise after h4-h5 Black’s structure would be completely blocked.

11 g4 h6 12 g5 hxg5 13 h+xg5 4c8 14 4d4 4c7 15 4d3 4b6 16 4d7+ 4c6 17 4f8 4c5 18 4d7+!
Rather dangerous was 18 4xg6 4f7 when the e5 pawn is quite weak.

18...4b5 19 4f8 4b4 20 4xg6!
Now is the time.
20...4f7 21 4f4 4xg5 22 4xd5!
Draw.

Alexandria-Marić
Tivat, 1995

Usually such endgames with a distant passed pawn give great winning chances.

1 4e5
Black has a compact pawn structure and White tries to create some weaknesses so he can penetrate with his king, taking advantage of the fact that Black must spend time to win the a-pawn.

1...f6 2 4c4 4b8 3 4e2 4a7 4 4e3 4xa6 5 4e4 4c7 6 4e3 4b5 7 4d5

7...4e6
The pawn endgame after 7...4c6
8 4xc7 4xc7 9 4d5 4d7 10 f4 4e7 11 f5 would be too dangerous for Black.

8 4xf6!
White has no other way of playing for the win.

8...gx6 9 4f5 4c5 10 f4
The direct approach was 10 4xf6 4e4+ 11 4g7 4xf2 12 4xh7 4c5 13 h4 4d5 14 h5 4e5 15 4g6 (15 h6 4g4 A 16...4xh6=) 15...4g4 16 4g5 4f6 17 h6 4e6 18 4g6 4e7 19 h7! gave White winning chances. But better would be 14...4e4 15 4g6 4g4 16 4g5 4e5 17 h6 4f7+ and 18...4xh6=.

10...4d3 11 g3 4c6 12 4xf6 4d6 13 f5
Or 13 4g7 4e6 14 4xh7 4f5 15 h4! 4f6! 16 h5 4f2! 17 h6 4g4=.
13...\( \text{c}5 \) 14 \( \text{h}3 \)
After 14 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 15 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 16 \( \text{x}h5 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 17 \( g4 \) \( f3 \) 18 \( \text{h}4 \) \( e5 \) the draw is obvious.
14...\( \text{d}7+ \) 15 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 16 \( g4 \) \( f6 \) 17 \( \text{h}4 \)
Or 17 \( \text{h}6 \) \( f4 \) 18 \( g7 \) \( e5 \) 19 \( f7 \) \( h5 \) 20 \( g5 \) \( e4 \) 21 \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 22 \( g7 \) \( f6 \) --.
17...\( \text{h}6+! \) 18 \( \text{x}h6 \) \( \text{g}4+ \) 19 \( \text{g}5 \) \( f6 \) 20 \( \text{g}6 \) \( d5 \) Drawn.

Sermek-Hulak
Slovenia, 1995

This is a very similar endgame to the previous one but here Black’s pawn structure is weaker.
If now 1...\( \text{d}5 \) 2 \( \text{d}1 \) with the idea 2...\( \text{x}a4? \) 3 \( \text{c}3 \) --.
1...\( \text{b}3 \) 2 \( \text{a}5 \)!
And here White is forced to sacrifice a piece—if 2 \( \text{d}1 \) then 2...\( \text{x}a4 \) 3 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 4 \( \text{d}4 \) \( c4 \).
2...\( \text{x}b2 \) 3 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 4 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{c}3 \) 5 \( \text{x}e4 \) \( \text{b}4 \)
If the black king tries to go for the white pawns by 5...\( \text{d}2 \) then White creates second passed pawn by 6 \( g4 \) \( e2 \) 7 \( f4 \) \( f2 \) 8 \( f5 \) ++.
6 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 7 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{xa}6 \) 8 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{b}6 \).
Or 8...\( \text{c}3 \) 9 \( \text{x}h7 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 10 \( f4 \) \( \text{x}g3 \) 11 \( \text{x}g6 \) ++.
9 \( \text{x}h7 \)

9...\( \text{c}6 \)?
The only chance was 9...\( g5 \)! 10 \( g4 \) (10 \( \text{g}6 \) \( g4 \) 11 \( \text{g}5 \) \( c6 \) 12 \( \text{x}g4 \) \( d6 \) =) 10...\( \text{c}6 \) 11 \( \text{g}6 \) \( d6 \) 12 \( \text{x}g5 \) \( e7 \) 13 \( \text{g}6 \) \( c3 \) 14 \( \text{h}7 \) (14 \( f4 \) \( d5 \) 15 \( f5 \) \( f8 \) =) 14...\( \text{f}6 \) 15 \( f4 \) \( e4 \) 16 \( \text{h}6 \) \( f7 \) with a probable draw. After the move in the game White’s task is easy.
10 \( \text{x}g6 \) \( d7 \) 11 \( g4 \) \( e6 \) 12 \( g5 \) \( d6 \) 13 \( \text{h}7 \) \( e4 \) 14 \( \text{g}6 \) \( f6 \) + 15 \( \text{h}8 \) \( e7 \) 16 \( f4 \) \( f8 \) 17 \( g7 \) + \( f7 \) 18 \( g4 \) \( g8 \) 19 \( g5 \) Black resigned.

Beliavsky-Tratar
Bled, 1996

White’s king is much more active than Black’s and this gives him chances to make progress.
1 \( \text{c}6 \) \( e7 \) 2 \( \text{c}7 \) \( a6 \) 3 \( \text{b}6 \) \( c5 \) 4 \( e6 \) \( b3 \) 5 \( \text{xa}4 \) \( d4 \) 6 \( \text{b}7 \) \( b5 \) 7 \( \text{b}6 \) \( c3 \)?
The way to the draw wasn't easy:
7...\(\text{axa3} 8\ \text{c6 b1} 9\ \text{c8+ f6} 10\ \text{xd6 c3} (10...d2 11 d7 g5 12 e6 f4 13 f6 b3 14 b7! xe4 15 d6 d4 16 d7 c6 17 a5! +--) 11 d7 g5 12 e6 f4 13 f6 a4 14 b5 xe4 15 d6 b6 16 c3+ d4 17 a4 d7+ 18 e7 b8=.
8 a4 xe4 9 a5 c5+ 10 c7
Wrong was 10 c6? e4 11 c4 d8! 12 d6 e3! 13 xe3 b7+.
10...a6+
After 10...e4 11 c4 f6 12 xd6 e3 (12...b7+ 13 c7 xa5 14 d6) 13 xe3 b7+ 14 c7 xa5 15 d6 xe6 16 d7 b7 17 d5.
11 c8! Once again 11 c6? was wrong, because of 11...e4 12 c4 b4+ = 11 b7 c5+.
11...e4
Or 11...b4 12 b7.
12 c4 b4
Or 12...f6 13 d7.
13 b7 xd5 14 a6 d7 15 a7 c7 16 b6+ d8 17 d5 a8 18 b8! d7 19 f6+ d8 20 xe4 d5 21 c5 d4 22 b7 d3 23 xd3 d7 24 c5+ d6 25 a4! c7 26 b6 Black resigned.

Black's task is to create yet another passed pawn. And so there followed...
1...fxg4 2 hxg4 h5
Now White has no time to win the d3 pawn.
3 g5+ g7!
The king must retreat, otherwise the white knight becomes highly active: 3...e6 4 d4+ d5 5 f3. On 5...c4 6 f5 gxf5 7 g6 c3 possible is 8 f4!. If 3...f5, then 4 e5.
4 d4 h4
Necessary in view of the threat of 5 f3.
5 f5 h3
After this White himself obtains a protected passed pawn.
6 f6+ f7
If 6...f8, then 7 f3 e4 8 xd3 xg5 9 h2 f7 10 e3 xf6 11 f4, and Black is obliged to let go of the h3 pawn.
7 f3 e6 8 d2 f5
The king hurries to support the h-pawn, while the f-pawn will be watched by the knight.
9 f7 d7
Of course not 9...e6 in view of 10 d4+.
10 xd3 f4 11 e2 g3
It seems it's all over. The knight f3 is doomed, whereas the white king is too far from the g6 pawn. But White finds a study-like idea.
12 e5 f8 13 d3 h2 14 f2 g2 15 h1
In this lies White's idea. After a few moves the players agreed a draw. The question arises whether Black could have won. Instead of 5...h3, played in the game, he had at his disposal the more effective move 5...d2!, pointed out by I. Zaitsev. After 6 f6+ f7 7 e2 (7 xd2 b3+!) 7...h3 8 f3 d4 9 d1 decisive is 9...f2+ 10 xd2 g4.
3 Rook Endings

Rook and pawn against rook

The most classical and primitive (though not for everyone) endgame which should not, it seems, present any particular problem for players of grandmaster rank. But John Nunn wrote an interesting book about these endings on the basis of computer analysis where he gave quite a few complicated positions. However in everyday practice it is much more simple and tragic (or more confusing). Knowledge of precise positions and methods of defence here have exceptional significance.

The edge pawns

The most frequent case—rook and pawn against rook.

People have already programmed computers for this type of ending, and so for the right method of play we should now turn to the Endgame CD!

Here are a couple of characteristic examples.

Emms-Riemersma
Gausdal, 1993

1...a1?
Correct is 1...a3! 2 g2 a2+ 3 f1 a4 4 h3+ c2 5 h2+ b1 6 h3 c2 7 e1 b2 8 a3 b4 9 d1 b2 10 d3 a3 11 d2+ b1, and the a3 pawn cannot be stopped.

2 g2?
But now White misses a draw by 2 g5! a4 3 g3 c2 4 g2 d3 5 g3 e4 6 g4 f5 7 b4 e5 8 g2 d5 9 h4 a3 10 h3! when White reaches a well-known position.

2...a4 3 f2 a3 4 b5+ a2
There was a quicker win by 4...\(\texttt{a4}!\)
5 \(\texttt{e2} \texttt{b1}!\) 6 \(\texttt{d5} \texttt{b2}\) 7 \(\texttt{d2+}\) \(\texttt{b3}\) 8 \(\texttt{d3+}\) \(\texttt{a4}\) 9 \(\texttt{d4+}\) \(\texttt{b4}\) 10 \(\texttt{d8}\) \(\texttt{a2}\) 7 \(\texttt{d3}\) \(\texttt{b3}\) White resigned.

Bagirov-Kraidman
Grieskirchen, 1998

1...\(\texttt{c5}\)?
Correct is 1...\(\texttt{g5}\), holding the draw as in the previous example.
2 \(\texttt{d4}\) \(\texttt{c1}\) 3 \(\texttt{f6+}\)?
Simpler is 3 a5 winning easily.
3...\(\texttt{g5}\) 4 \(\texttt{b6}\) \(\texttt{a1}\) 4 \(\texttt{a6}\)
4 \(\texttt{b4}\) led to a draw after 4...\(\texttt{f5}\), and the king rushes to c8.
4...\(\texttt{f5}\)?
Again he should go for the drawing mechanism 4...\(\texttt{f1}!\)? and check on the f-file.
5 a5 \(\texttt{d1+}\) 6 \(\texttt{c5}\) \(\texttt{a1}\) 7 \(\texttt{b5}\)
\(\texttt{e5}\)
On 7...\(\texttt{b1+}\) there is 8 \(\texttt{c6}\) \(\texttt{a1}\) 9 \(\texttt{b6}\) \(\texttt{b1+}\) 10 \(\texttt{c7}\) \(\texttt{a1}\) 11 \(\texttt{a8}\)
\(\texttt{e5}\) 12 a6 \(\texttt{d5}\) 13 \(\texttt{d8+}\) \(\texttt{c5}!\) 14 \(\texttt{d6}!\), winning.
8 \(\texttt{h6}!\) \(\texttt{d5}\) 9 \(\texttt{b6}\) \(\texttt{b1+}\) 10 \(\texttt{c7}\)
\(\texttt{c1+}\) 11 \(\texttt{b7}\) \(\texttt{b1+}\) 12 \(\texttt{b6}\) \(\texttt{h1}\) 13 \(\texttt{c6}\) \(\texttt{h7+}\) 14 \(\texttt{c7}\) \(\texttt{h1}\) 15 a6
\(\texttt{b1+}\) 16 \(\texttt{c8}\) \(\texttt{d6}\) 17 a7 Black resigned.

Tosić-Gyimesi
Yugoslavia, 1998

1 \(\texttt{a5}\)?
Simply driving back the king first by 1 \(\texttt{c5+}\) \(\texttt{b2}\) 2 \(\texttt{c8}\) \(\texttt{xh4}\) 3 \(\texttt{d2}\) draws.
1...\(\texttt{xh4}\) 2 \(\texttt{a8}\)
2 \(\texttt{a7}\) is also enough for a draw.
2...\(\texttt{b4}\) 3 \(\texttt{d1}\)?
The decisive mistake. 3 \(\texttt{c8+}\)!
\(\texttt{b2}\) 4 \(\texttt{d2}!\) \(\texttt{d4+}\) (4...\(\texttt{a3}\) 5 \(\texttt{c2}+!\))
5 \(\texttt{e3}\) \(\texttt{d5}\) 6 \(\texttt{b8}+!\) saves him.
3...\(\texttt{b2}\) 4 \(\texttt{d8}\) \(\texttt{a3}\) 5 \(\texttt{d2+}\) \(\texttt{b1}\) and White had to resign.

Herrera-Vasquez
Cuba, 1998

1...\(\texttt{a1}\)?
He can achieve a draw by any move except this, including even 1...\(\texttt{e7}\), but best of all is 1...\(\texttt{e8}!\).
2 a4 \(\texttt{f6}\) 3 \(\texttt{d6}\), Black resigned.
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Vyzhmanavin-Lerner
USSR (ch), 1984

1 \(\text{\textsc{d2}}\)?

There was a simple draw by 1 \(\text{\textsc{b2 \text{\textsc{g3}}}}\) 2 \(\text{\textsc{c2 \text{\textsc{d5}}}}\) 3 \(\text{\textsc{d2 \text{\textsc{a3}}}}\) 4 \(\text{\textsc{e2}}\) etc.

1...\(\text{\textsc{h2}}\)! 2 \(\text{\textsc{e2 \text{\textsc{a1}}}}\) and White resigned.

Vladimirov-Rashkovsky
Chelyabinsk, 1975

Simferopol, 1988, where the same mistake was repeated! 2 \(\text{\textsc{c6}}\)! \(\text{\textsc{g5}}\) 3 \(\text{\textsc{c8}}\)! \(\text{\textsc{h7}}\) 4 \(\text{\textsc{g8+}}\) leads to a draw. It is nearly always necessary to attack the king from behind, and not in front, because in the end the king will get the better of the rook.

2...\(\text{\textsc{h7}}\) 3 \(\text{\textsc{e1}}\)

In the above-mentioned game followed 3 \(\text{\textsc{h3 \text{\textsc{g5}}}}\) 4 \(\text{\textsc{e2 \text{\textsc{g4}}}}\) 5 \(\text{\textsc{h1 \text{\textsc{h3}}}}\) winning because of the poor position of the rook.

2...\(\text{\textsc{h4}}\) 3 \(\text{\textsc{e3}}\)??

Interestingly, this mistake is typical for grandmasters. A mirror image of this position was encountered in the game Dvoiris-Kovalev, Dvoiris-Kovalev, Simferopol, 1988, where the same mistake was repeated! 2 \(\text{\textsc{c6}}\)! \(\text{\textsc{g5}}\) 3 \(\text{\textsc{c8}}\)! \(\text{\textsc{h7}}\) 4 \(\text{\textsc{g8+}}\) leads to a draw. It is nearly always necessary to attack the king from behind, and not in front, because in the end the king will get the better of the rook.

2...\(\text{\textsc{h7}}\) 3 \(\text{\textsc{e1}}\)

In the above-mentioned game followed 3 \(\text{\textsc{h3 \text{\textsc{g5}}}}\) 4 \(\text{\textsc{e2 \text{\textsc{g4}}}}\) 5 \(\text{\textsc{h1 \text{\textsc{h3}}}}\) winning because of the poor position of the rook.

3...\(\text{\textsc{h3}}\) 4 \(\text{\textsc{h1 \text{\textsc{g5}}}}\) 5 \(\text{\textsc{e3 \text{\textsc{g4}}}}\) 6 \(\text{\textsc{f2}}\)

If 6 \(\text{\textsc{g1+ \text{\textsc{h4}}}}\) 7 \(\text{\textsc{h1}}\), then 7...\(\text{\textsc{a7}}\) followed by 8...\(\text{\textsc{a2}}\), 9...\(\text{\textsc{h2}}\) and then 10...\(\text{\textsc{h3}}\).

6...\(\text{\textsc{f7+}}\) 7 \(\text{\textsc{g1 \text{\textsc{a7}}}}\) White resigned.

Since after 8 \(\text{\textsc{h2}}\) there follows not 8...\(\text{\textsc{g3}}\)? 9 \(\text{\textsc{g2+}}\)!!, but 8...\(\text{\textsc{a1+}}\) 9 \(\text{\textsc{f2 \text{\textsc{b1}}}}\) with a decisive zugzwang.

Novikov-Lalić
Manila, 1992

It seems that it is not easy for Black to defend himself, but he finds his only saving resource:

1...\(\text{\textsc{h8}}\)! 2 \(\text{\textsc{b7 \text{\textsc{d5}}}}\) 3 \(\text{\textsc{g4}}\)

After 3 a6 \(\text{\textsc{c5}}\) 4 \(\text{\textsc{b1 \text{\textsc{h7}}}}\) the draw is inevitable.

3...\(\text{\textsc{c5}}\) 4 \(\text{\textsc{g7 \text{\textsc{h6}}}}\) 5 a6 \(\text{\textsc{b6+}}\) 6 \(\text{\textsc{a7 \text{\textsc{b1}}}}\) 7 \(\text{\textsc{b7 \text{\textsc{a1}}}}\) Drawn.
What system of defence should he choose: wait for the approach of the black king to the a4 pawn or adopt the more active method. It is clear that the second solution is more effective, but it requires accurate play.
1.\(\text{e}6+!\) \(\text{e}4\) 2.\(\text{g}6!\) \(\text{e}3\) 3.\(\text{g}4!\)
The main thing is to maintain contact with the opponent’s pawns.
3...a3 4.\(\text{g}3+\) \(\text{e}4\) 5.\(\text{b}3\) \(\text{a}2+\) 6 \(\text{g}3\)
Obviously it is better not to go to the first rank.
6...\(\text{d}4\) 7 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{a}1\) 8 \(\text{g}2\)
And the opponents agreed to a draw.

Euwe-Alekhine
*World Championship (m), 1937*

White is in a dilemma, whether to go forward or back, and the world champion does not ‘go for’ for the side.
1 \(\text{f}4?\)
Correct was 1 \(\text{f}6\), threatening a check from g4. If now 1...a3, then 2 \(\text{g}4+\) \(\text{d}5\) 3 \(\text{g}5!\) with a drawn pawn ending.
1...\(\text{e}8!\) 2 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}3\) 3 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{f}8+\)
Cutting off the king looks a deadly blow for White.
4 \(\text{g}3\) \(\text{c}3\) 5 \(\text{b}7\) \(\text{f}1\) 6 \(\text{b}8\)
After 6 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{a}1\) the position is lost.
6...\(\text{a}1\) 7 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{x}a2\) 8 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{h}2\) 9 \(\text{c}8+\) \(\text{b}2\) 10 \(\text{b}8+\) \(\text{c}1!\)
Clearly not 10...\(\text{a}1?\) because of 11 \(\text{a}8\) \(\text{h}3+\) 12 \(\text{d}2\) a3 13 \(\text{c}1\) with a draw.
11 \(\text{c}8+\) \(\text{b}1\) 12 \(\text{b}8+\) \(\text{b}2\) 13 \(\text{a}8\) \(\text{b}3+\) 14 \(\text{d}4\) a3 15 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{b}2\)
And in this theoretical position White resigned.

**Rook endings**

**Several pawns on one flank**

This type of ending is met quite often in practice. With various positions of the pawns on both sides in the majority of cases the weaker side should hold a draw even in those instances where his pawn structure is weakened.
1 h4?
Correct was 1 g4 hxg4 2 hxg4 and then 3 g5, shutting in the black king, whereas 1 f3 was also a possibility with the future transfer to another type of classical position, looked at in the next section.

1...g7 2 g5 h6 3 g4

Now the plan with f3 promises less since it is not clear how Black's position can be breached if White, after an exchange on f3, puts his own pawn on e5.

3...hxg4 4 f4 e5 5 f1 h5 6 f4 e6 7 e2 e5 8 e1!

White gains a tempo—on 8 d2 there is 8...f5.

8...h6?
Black has calculated the pawn ending clearly.
9 d2 f5! 10 c3
Rather better was 10 xxe4 xf2+ 11 c3, but even here there are no real chances of a win.

10...fxe4 11 fxe4 h5 12 d4 xe4

On 13 e5 correct is 13...h3!.

13...g4 14 e3
Clearly not 14...e5 f3.

14...h3!!
Only this leads to a draw.

14...h4? is no use due to 15 f5!.

15 f3 h2! 16 e3

After 16 g4 g2 17 g5 there is the only move 17...f3!!.

Bagirov-Berzinsh
Riga, 1998

16...g2 17 e2 h3 Drawn.

Madsen-Hansen
corr, 1974
The position to all intents and purposes concurs with the previous one, and here 1 \texttt{b4} \texttt{c6} 2 \texttt{g4} should be played. But White chooses another system of defence.

\begin{align*}
1 & \texttt{b4} \texttt{c6} 2 \texttt{a4} \texttt{g7} 3 \texttt{b4} \texttt{f1}+ 4 \texttt{e3} \\
\text{Here already no help is} & 4 \texttt{g4} h5 5 \texttt{h3} \texttt{e1} 6 \texttt{b5} \texttt{e4} --.
\end{align*}

4...\texttt{f5} 5 \texttt{e4}

After 5 \texttt{e4} g5 6 hxg5 hxg5 7 \texttt{b1} \texttt{g6} 8 \texttt{h1} \texttt{f2} 9 \texttt{e3} \texttt{a2} 10 g4 \texttt{a5} 11 \texttt{e4} \texttt{a4}+ 12 \texttt{f3} \texttt{f4}+ 13 \texttt{g3} \texttt{e4} Black wins a pawn.

5...h5! 6 \texttt{e2} g5! 7 hxg5 \texttt{g6} 8 \texttt{e3} \texttt{xg5} 9 \texttt{f2} \texttt{f5} 10 \texttt{e3}

After 10 \texttt{f4} the pawn ending is won.

10...\texttt{g7} 11 \texttt{b3}

Or 11 \texttt{f3} \texttt{g4}! 12 \texttt{f2} h4 13 gxh4 \texttt{hxh4} 14 \texttt{g3} \texttt{g4}+ 15 \texttt{f3} \texttt{f4}+ 16 \texttt{g3} \texttt{g5} 17 \texttt{e1} \texttt{f5} 18 \texttt{e4} \texttt{g6}!, and the king works his way round to d5. In a previous example the king also had the possibility of attacking the h-pawn in this way.

11...\texttt{h7} 12 \texttt{b5} h4! 13 gxh4 \texttt{exh4}

White resigned, since the pawn ending after 14 \texttt{a7} \texttt{xe5} 15 \texttt{xf7} \texttt{f4}+ is lost.

Huzman-Mikhalchishin

\textit{Lvov, 1985}

1 h4!

He cannot allow Black the possibility of playing ... \texttt{g6-g5}.

1...\texttt{b8}

After 1...\texttt{e5} follows 2 \texttt{g2} \texttt{c2} 3 \texttt{g4} \texttt{c1} 4 \texttt{g5}+ \texttt{f5} 5 \texttt{f7}+ \texttt{g4} 6 \texttt{f6} \texttt{xh4} 7 \texttt{xg6} winning.

2 \texttt{g2} \texttt{g8} 3 \texttt{g4} \texttt{g5} 4 \texttt{h5}

This is more accurate than 4 hxg5+ \texttt{xg5} 5 \texttt{g3} \texttt{e5} 6 \texttt{h6}+ with some chances of victory.

4...\texttt{a8} 5 \texttt{b7} \texttt{h8} 6 \texttt{f1}!

Now the king can proceed to the other side.

6...\texttt{g8} 7 \texttt{e2} \texttt{a8} 8 \texttt{h6} \texttt{a1} 9 \texttt{h7} \texttt{h1} 10 \texttt{d2} \texttt{e5} 11 \texttt{c3} \texttt{h4} 12 \texttt{c4} \texttt{h2} 13 \texttt{c5} \texttt{h1} 14 \texttt{c6} \texttt{f6} 15 \texttt{d7}!

Making a future path for the king.

15...\texttt{h2} 16 \texttt{c7} \texttt{h1} 17 \texttt{d8}

Black resigned.

Beliavsky-Hodgson

\textit{Cacak, 1996}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chess_board.png}
\end{figure}

1 \texttt{f6}

Stronger would have been 1 h4! \texttt{g7} 2 \texttt{c6} f5 3 f3!, creating weaknesses in Black’s pawn structure.

1...\texttt{g7} 2 \texttt{f4} f5 3 \texttt{h3} \texttt{g6} 4 \texttt{g4} hxg4 5 hxg4 fxg4 6 \texttt{g3} e3!

Black’s only chance lies in the creation of doubled pawns in White’s position.

7 \texttt{xg4}+ \texttt{f5} 8 \texttt{f4}+ \texttt{g6} 9 \texttt{xe3} \texttt{b3} 10 \texttt{f2} \texttt{g5} 11 \texttt{f3} \texttt{a3}
After 11...\textcolor{red}{\textit{h}}b8 12 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}8+ 13 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}8+, adopting a frontal attack, secures Black a draw.

12 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f}}8 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{a}}1 13 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{a}}4+ 14 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{a}}5+ 15 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{a}}4+ 16 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{a}}5+ 17 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{b}}4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{a}}2?!

Again correct was 17...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}5! 18 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f}}3 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}8 19 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}8+ 20 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}3 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}8+ 21 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}3 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}8+ 22 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}8+ 23 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}1 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}8 24 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f}}2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{a}}4! with a draw.

18 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f}}2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}2 19 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}4 \textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}4?!

Rather better, though already insufficient, was 19...\textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}6.

20 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}5 \textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}5

If 20...\textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}3, then 21 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{b}}3! \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}8 22 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f}}5 \textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}4 23 \textcolor{black}{\textit{e}}4 with a win.

21 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{b}}5?

Correct is 21 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{g}}2+! \textcolor{blue}{\textit{h}}6 22 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{b}}5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}8 23 \textcolor{black}{\textit{e}}6 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}8 24 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{x}}e6 25 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}5! with a theoretically winning position.

21...\textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}6 22 \textcolor{black}{\textit{e}}6 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}8 23 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f}}3

23...\textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}7?

Missing the typical drawing mechanism 23...\textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}5 24 \textcolor{black}{\textit{e}}7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}8 25 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}3 \textcolor{black}{\textit{f}}4! 26 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}6 \textcolor{black}{\textit{f}}5.

24 \textcolor{black}{\textit{e}}7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}8 25 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}3 \textcolor{black}{\textit{f}}7 26 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}6 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{x}}e7 27 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{x}}e7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{x}}e7 28 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}5 Black resigned.

One extreme but typical case occurred in a practical position.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Szabó-Keres}

\textbf{Moscow, 1956}
\end{center}

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

Black has great problems and it is quite complicated to transpose into a drawn position with f and h-pawns.

1...\textcolor{black}{\textit{h}}6

If 1...\textcolor{black}{\textit{h}}5, then 2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{g}}5+ \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f}}5 3 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}6+, and there is no defence against 4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f}}6.

2 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{h}}7! \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}6 3 \textcolor{black}{\textit{h}}5!

Possible is 3 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{x}}h6 \textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}7 4 \textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}5 followed by 5 \textcolor{black}{\textit{f}}4 and \textcolor{black}{\textit{h}}4-\textcolor{black}{\textit{h}}5.

3...\textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}5 4 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{g}}7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{h}}4 5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{x}}g6 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}2+ 6 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f}}1 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{g}}3 7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{f}}6! \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}a2 8 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}1 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{h}}2! 9 \textcolor{black}{\textit{d}}1! \textcolor{black}{\textit{g}}2 10 \textcolor{black}{\textit{c}}1 \textcolor{black}{\textit{h}}2 11 \textcolor{black}{\textit{b}}1!

The king moves further away from its opponent.

11...\textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}2! 12 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{x}}h6 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{x}}f3 13 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}6 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{e}}4 14 \textcolor{black}{\textit{h}}6 \textcolor{black}{\textit{h}}2 15 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}5 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{d}}3 16 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g}}7 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{c}}3 17 \textcolor{black}{\textit{h}}7 \textcolor{black}{\textit{b}}3 18 \textcolor{blue}{\textit{b}}7+ Black resigned.

And here we see how difficult it is even for a class grandmaster to defend a classic position.
1 \textit{Cc5!}

Correctly preparing for h4-h5 in order to take on h5 with the rook.

1...\textit{C}a1 2 h5 \textit{C}g1+ 3 \textit{f}3 \textit{g}7 4 \textit{a}5 gxh5 5 \textit{hxh5} \textit{a}1 6 \textit{d}5 \textit{g}1

Not yet a mistake but more technical is 6...\textit{a}4, cutting off the white king.

7 \textit{d}6 \textit{h}7??

A serious mistake—correct was to attack the e3 pawn by 7...\textit{a}1 8 \textit{e}4 \textit{a}3 9 \textit{d}3 \textit{a}5 10 \textit{d}5 \textit{a}3 11 \textit{d}4 \textit{b}3 or 7...\textit{e}1 8 e4 \textit{f}1 9 \textit{g}3 \textit{g}1+ 10 \textit{h}3 \textit{f}1, and the rook does not have the f6 square.

8 e4! \textit{f}1+ 9 \textit{g}3 \textit{g}1+ 10 \textit{h}3 \textit{f}1 11 \textit{f}6! \textit{g}7 12 e5

Better than 14 \textit{b}6, played by Capablanca. White’s plan, with the rook on the 8th, is to to play f5-f6, and Black’s defence, with the white king on f2, is to play ...h6-h5.

14...\textit{b}3?

Correct is 14...\textit{e}3!, hindering f4-f5.

15 \textit{f}2?

Correct is 15 \textit{d}8! with the threat of f4-f5-f6, e.g. 15...\textit{b}2+ 16 \textit{g}3 \textit{b}3+ 17 \textit{h}4 \textit{e}3 18 \textit{e}8! and f4-f5.

15...\textit{a}3 16 \textit{d}7!

16 \textit{d}8 is bad because of 16...h5 17 g5 h4 18 \textit{d}7 \textit{g}6 19 \textit{d}6+ \textit{g}7 20 \textit{h}6 h3 21 f5 \textit{a}5 with a draw.

16...\textit{a}2+ 17 \textit{f}3 \textit{a}3+ 18 \textit{e}4 \textit{a}4+ 19 \textit{d}4!

This is the point of deploying the rook on the d-file. After 19 \textit{f}5 \textit{f}8!, according to an analysis by Kopaev, the game is drawn.

19...\textit{a}1 20 f5?

Correct now was to move aside with the rook 20 \textit{b}4! \textit{g}1 21 \textit{f}3 \textit{a}1 22 \textit{b}8 \textit{f}1+ (after 22...\textit{a}3+ 23 \textit{g}2 the king goes via g3 to h4) 23 \textit{e}3 \textit{e}1+ (23...\textit{g}1 24 f5! \textit{x}g4 25 f6+ \textit{h}7 26 e6!) 24 \textit{f}2 \textit{e}4 25 \textit{f}3 \textit{e}1 26 \textit{b}7! \textit{f}8 27 \textit{b}4 \textit{g}7 28 \textit{f}2 \textit{a}1 29 \textit{b}8 h5 30 g5 h4 31 \textit{f}3! h3 32 \textit{b}2 winning.

20...\textit{e}1+ 21 \textit{d}5 \textit{g}1?

This position is from the game Duras-Capablanca, New York 1913 (with colours reversed), and here 21...\textit{f}8! 22 \textit{d}6 \textit{a}1 gives a draw.

22 \textit{d}6 \textit{a}1 23 \textit{c}4 \textit{a}8 24 \textit{c}7 \textit{a}6+ 25 \textit{e}7 \textit{a}4 26 e6! fxe6

Or 26...\textit{x}g4 27 \textit{d}6 winning.

27 f6+ \textit{g}6 28 f7 \textit{f}4 29 \textit{f}3=\textit{w} \textit{xf}8 30 \textit{xf}8 e5 31 \textit{c}4 Black resigned.

Even with a very lucky author and a passed e-pawn it’s drawn!
Novikov-Beliavsky  
Graz, 1997

1...\textbf{c}7 2 \textbf{a}5 \textbf{e}6
He had to try the plan with the approach of the king via h6.
3 \textbf{e}5+ \textbf{f}6 4 \textbf{a}5 \textbf{g}7 5 h3 \textbf{h}6 6 \textbf{e}5 \textbf{c}2+ 7 \textbf{g}3 \textbf{h}5 8 \textbf{e}7 \textbf{h}6 9 \textbf{e}5 \textbf{c}3+ 10 \textbf{h}2 \textbf{c}1 11 g3!
After 11 \textbf{g}3? \textbf{f}1 12 \textbf{a}5 there is 12...g5! 13 \textbf{x}f5 e3 with a win.
Now, however, despite the ‘cut-off’ king from the first rank, Black does not succeed in improving his position.
11...\textbf{c}2+ 12 \textbf{g}1 \textbf{c}8 13 \textbf{g}2 \textbf{f}8
How else to promote ...g6-g5?
14 \textbf{f}2 g5 15 \textbf{e}3 g4 16 h4 \textbf{f}6 17 \textbf{f}2 \textbf{g}6 18 \textbf{x}e8 \textbf{a}6 19 \textbf{e}5 h5 20 \textbf{f}1 \textbf{f}6 21 \textbf{f}2 \textbf{a}3 22 \textbf{e}8 \textbf{a}5 23 \textbf{e}2 \textbf{f}7 24 \textbf{h}8 \textbf{e}6!?
But even the sacrifice of two pawns does not help.
25 \textbf{x}h5 \textbf{a}2+ 26 \textbf{e}3 \textbf{a}3 27 \textbf{f}2 \textbf{d}5 28 \textbf{x}f5+ \textbf{d}4 29 \textbf{e}5 e3+ 30 \textbf{f}1 \textbf{a}1+ 31 \textbf{g}2! \textbf{a}2+ 32 \textbf{g}1 \textbf{d}3 33 \textbf{f}5! \textbf{a}1+ 34 \textbf{g}2 e2 35 \textbf{f}6! and it’s a draw!

Rook endings of five pawns against four are a rarer formation, and the plan of the stronger side consists of creating a passed pawn on the d-file which promises him great chances of success.

Bagirov-Veingold  
Tallinn, 1981

1 \textbf{a}1
With the idea of defending the pawn and freeing the king.
1...\textbf{g}6 2 \textbf{f}1 \textbf{a}2
After 2...f5 3 \textbf{a}1 fxg4+ 4 hxg4 the e6 pawn would be too weak.
3 \textbf{e}4 \textbf{e}2 4 \textbf{e}5 \textbf{g}7 5 e4!
White’s plan is clear—after preparation to play d4-d5.
5...\textbf{g}6 6 \textbf{f}3! \textbf{e}3
If 6...\textbf{g}7, then 7 \textbf{d}6 and d4-d5, when 6...\textbf{h}2 is too late because of 7 d5 exd5 8 exd5 \textbf{x}h3 9 d6 \textbf{h}2 10 \textbf{d}1!.
7 d5! exd5 8 \textbf{d}4! \textbf{a}3 9 exd5 \textbf{f}6 10 \textbf{e}1!
Cutting off the king is more important than a pawn!
10...\textbf{x}f3 11 d6 \textbf{f}2 12 \textbf{c}5 \textbf{c}2+ 13 \textbf{b}6 \textbf{b}2+ 14 \textbf{c}7 \textbf{c}2+ 15 \textbf{d}8 \textbf{c}3 16 d7 \textbf{x}h3 17 \textbf{e}8 \textbf{d}3 18 \textbf{d}8= \textbf{x}d8 19 \textbf{x}d8 h3 20 \textbf{e}2 Black resigned.
Ehlvest-Polugaevsky
Hanninge, 1990

1 h3!
Preparing c5-c4 and g3-g4.
1...f5 2 h4!
It is necessary to fix the weaknesses and not allow ... g6-g5 and ...
h5-h4.
2...g5 3 e4
Unfavourable for White is 3 e3 e5!, and the d3 pawn is weak.
3...f4!? 4 g2 b2 5 f3 fxg3 6 fxg3 b3 7 e5 b4
Not allowing d3-d4.
8 e5 e5 9 c6+ g7 10 c4 b6 11 a4 f6 12 e6 e6 13 e3
There is no other plan for White.
13...f6 14 a1 b4+ 15 d5 b5+ 16 c4 b3 17 a6+ f7 18

In the game followed:
1...c2? 2 a4 a2
After 2...c3 3 e4 c4+ 4 d3 b4 5 a5 a4 6 f4 a3+ 7
c4 xg3 8 b6 g4 9 a6 xf4+ 10 b5 f5+ 11 c6 a5 12 b7
White wins.
3 e4 a3 4 a5 a4+ 5 d5 a3 6 c6 c3+
If Black takes the pawn 6...xf3, then after 7 b6 xg3 8 b7! a3

Complicated Rook Endings

It is interesting to see why grandmasters cannot hold slightly inferior positions in which the method of playing for a draw is well known.

Dautov-Alterman
Germany, 1998
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Dautov-Alterman
Germany, 1998

In such positions ‘standing still’ is not to be recommended: there are two active plans:
(a) Petrosian’s plan 1...f6!? and ...
g6-g5, creating a weakness on h4;
(b) leaving the pawns alone by 1...g2 2 f4 b2 3 a4 b4+ 4
e5 b3, and White does not succeed in advancing the a-pawn very far before the f3 and g3 pawns fall.
In the game followed:
1...c2? 2 a4 a2
After 2...c3 3 e4 c4+ 4
d3 b4 5 a5 a4 6 f4 a3+ 7
c4 xg3 8 b6 g4 9 a6 xf4+ 10 b5 f5+ 11 c6 a5 12 b7
White wins.
3 e4 a3 4 a5 a4+ 5 d5 a3 6 c6 c3+
If Black takes the pawn 6...xf3, then after 7 b6 xg3 8 b7! a3
(8...g5 9 a6 ♞a3 10 hxg5 +−) 9 a6 f6 10 a7 ♞xa7 11 ♞xa7 g5 12 ♞b1+ gxh4 13 ♞b6 ♞g6 14 ♞c5 ♞f5 15 ♞d4 ♞f4 16 ♞f1+ ♞g3 17 ♞e3, White wins, but also the move in the game does not save him.

7 ♞b7 ♞a3 8 f4 ♞a1 9 ♞a8 ♞f6 10 a6 ♞f5 11 ♞f8 ♞b1+ 12 ♞a7 f6 13 ♞b8 ♞e1 14 ♞b3!

An important reconstruction. The rook has two defensive functions: to defend the g3 pawn and control the b-file in order to free the king.

14...♘g4 15 ♞b6 ♞e6+ 16 ♞a5 ♞e7 17 ♞a3!

One more function: to support the a6 pawn.

17...g5 18 fxg5 fxg5 19 hxg5 ♞e5+ 20 ♞b6 ♞xg5 21 a7 ♞g8 22 ♞c3! ♞g6+ 23 ♞b7 ♞g7+ 24 ♞b8 Black resigned.

Material is nothing—activity (in view of the passed pawn) everything.

6...hxg3 7 hxg3 ♞xg3 8 a5 ♞g1 9 ♞a2

1...♘a3+?

In analogous situations where the pawn has not advanced to the fourth rank, it is correct to activate the king, but the rook gives a frontal check.

2 ♞e4 ♞e7 3 ♞d5 f5 4 ♞c5 h4?!

Again correct is 4...♗a8, preparing to meet 5 ♞b4 with 5...♗b8+.

5 ♞b4 ♞e3 6 a4!

Mikhalchishin-Eslon
Kecskemet, 1983

9...♗b1+?

Better at once 9...♗d6!, not allowing in the white king, while on 10 a6 ♞b1.

10 ♞c5 ♞b8 11 a6 g5 12 ♞c6 ♞f6?

In such positions it is useful to prepare to push away the white king. 12...♗e6 13 a7 ♞a8 14 ♞b7 ♞xa7+ 15 ♞xa7 ♞d5! with clear chances of a draw.

13 a7 ♞a8 14 ♞b7 ♞xa7 15 ♞xa7 ♗g4 16 ♞c6 ♗e5 17 ♞c5 g3 18 ♞c4 ♞f4 19 ♞d3 Black resigned.

Keller-Mikenas
corr, 1992
Black must lose because of the weakness of the e4 pawn.

1 a6! g6
After 1...h4 2 gxh4 a1+ 3 e2 a2+ 4 e3 a3+ 5 e4 xh3 6 f4! xh4 7 a8 h1 8 f8 and 9 a7 wins. In the event of passive defence by Black, White pushes his pawn up to a7, then the king goes to e5, the Black rook must keep watch from the a4 square. Then White plays f4 and, on ... h7, f5 with a win.

2 a8 f7 3 a7 g7 4 e1 h7 5 d1 g7 6 c1 h7 7 b1 a6 8 g4!
Determining the pawn formation on the flank.

8... hxg4 9 hxg4 g7 10 g5 h7 11 b2 g7 12 b3 h7 13 b4 g7 14 b5 a2 15 b6 b2 16 c6 c2+ 17 d6 a2 18 e8! x7 19 c7 and the pawn ending is easily won. Black resigned.

Lerner-Dorfman
Tashkent, 1980

5 d5 a3 6 a6 xf3?
This is a decisive mistake—after 6...f6 7 c6 xf3 8 b8 a3 9 b6+ f5 10 b7 g4 11 a7 x7 12 xa7 xg3 13 b4 f6! there is an easy draw by ...g6-g5.
7 b8 a3 8 b6 xg3 9 c6 a3 10 b7 g5 11 hxg5 h4 12 a7 h3 13 a6 a8 a8 14 xa8 h2 15 h6 f6 16 xh2 fxg5 17 f2!!
We advise paying attention to this move.

Konopka-Shcherbakov
Pardubice, 1996

Now the white king avoids being shouldered away and hurries over to the opponent’s pawn, therefore Black resigned.

1...g7?
Passive play—correct is 1...e6—or 1...a2 detaining the king on f6.

2 a5 a4+ 3 e5 a3 4 e4 a4+?
Simpler is 4...f6! 5 a6 e6 giving a draw.

This position resembles the previous one, but there are a number of important differences. Black has a
doubled pawn, and the greater number of pawns creates more prerequisites for a White victory.

1...f5

Worthy of attention is 1...e4!?, for the present maintaining the pawn on f7 so as to defend the king against checks from the flank.

2...\(\mathbf{e}8\) e4 3 h3 h5 4 h4 \(\mathbf{a}1\) + 5 \(\mathbf{e}2\) \(\mathbf{b}2\) + 6 \(\mathbf{f}1\) \(\mathbf{b}1\) + 7 \(\mathbf{g}2\) \(\mathbf{b}2\)
8 b4 \(\mathbf{b}1\) 9 b5 \(\mathbf{g}6\) 10 b6 \(\mathbf{h}7\) 11 f4! \(\mathbf{e}3\) + 12 \(\mathbf{f}3\) \(\mathbf{g}7\) 13 b7

On 13 \(\mathbf{f}4\) there is 13...\(\mathbf{f}6\)! with the idea ...\(\mathbf{f}1\).

13...\(\mathbf{b}4\) 14 \(\mathbf{e}2\) \(\mathbf{b}1\) 15 \(\mathbf{d}2\)
\(\mathbf{b}3\) 16 \(\mathbf{c}2\) \(\mathbf{b}5\) 17 \(\mathbf{c}3\) \(\mathbf{b}6\) 18 \(\mathbf{c}4\) \(\mathbf{b}1\) 19 \(\mathbf{c}5\) \(\mathbf{b}3\) 20 \(\mathbf{c}6\)
\(\mathbf{c}3\) + 21 \(\mathbf{d}7\)

Stronger is at once 21 \(\mathbf{b}5\) \(\mathbf{b}3\) + 22 \(\mathbf{c}5\) !.

21...\(\mathbf{d}3\) + 22 \(\mathbf{e}8\) !

After 22 \(\mathbf{x}e6\) \(\mathbf{x}e3\) + 23 \(\mathbf{x}f5\)
\(\mathbf{f}3\) + =.

22...\(\mathbf{b}3\) 23 \(\mathbf{e}7\) \(\mathbf{b}6\) 24 \(\mathbf{d}7\)
\(\mathbf{b}3\) 25 \(\mathbf{c}6\) \(\mathbf{c}3\) + 26 \(\mathbf{b}5\) \(\mathbf{b}3\) +
27 \(\mathbf{c}5\)! \(\mathbf{b}1\)

If 27...\(\mathbf{h}7\) winning is 28 \(\mathbf{c}6\)
\(\mathbf{c}3\) + 29 \(\mathbf{d}6\) \(\mathbf{d}3\) + 30 \(\mathbf{e}7\) \(\mathbf{b}3\) 31
\(\mathbf{f}6\) !.

28 \(\mathbf{c}6\)! \(\mathbf{c}1\) + 29 \(\mathbf{d}6\) \(\mathbf{b}1\) 30
\(\mathbf{x}e6\) \(\mathbf{b}5\) 31 \(\mathbf{d}8\) Black resigned.

Kozul-Nikolić

Sarajevo, 1993

1 a7

White sees no chance of going with his king to the queenside to help his a6 pawn. For this he has to sacrifice the f2 pawn.

1...\(\mathbf{e}5\)

Also not bad is 1...\(\mathbf{g}7\) with the idea of 2...f5 or 1...\(\mathbf{a}3\).

2 f3 \(\mathbf{a}3\) 3 \(\mathbf{f}2\) \(\mathbf{a}1\) 4 \(\mathbf{e}2\) \(\mathbf{f}6\) 5
f4 \(\mathbf{a}3\) !?

The simplest way to achieve a draw is 5...\(\mathbf{e}7\), and there is no way for the king to approach.
6 \( \text{d}2 \text{a}2+ \)
A move such as 6...\( \text{e}7 \) can always be made.
7 \( \text{c}3 \text{a}3 \) 8 \( \text{c}4 \text{a}5 \) 9 \( \text{b}4 \text{a}2 \) 10 \( \text{c}5 \text{a}1 \) 11 \( \text{c}6 \)
No use is 11 \( \text{h}8 \text{xa}7 \) 12 \( \text{xh}6+ \text{g}7 \) 13 \( \text{fxg}5 \text{a}5 \).
11...\( \text{a}2 \) 12 \( \text{c}5 \text{a}6 \) 13 \( \text{d}4 \text{a}4+ \) 14 \( \text{d}3 \text{a}3+ \) 15 \( \text{e}2 \text{a}5? \)
Completely losing his sense of danger—why not 15...\( \text{g}7 \)?
16 \( \text{h}8! \text{xa}7 \) 17 \( \text{xh}6+ \text{g}7 \) 18 \( \text{fxg}5 \text{a}3 \) 19 \( \text{f}3 \text{a}5 \) 20 \( \text{h}4 \text{b}5 \) 21 \( \text{f}6 \) Black resigned.

Yermolinsky-Seirawan

USA, 1997

In the game after 7...\( \text{g}6? \) 8 \( \text{h}8 \) Black resigned.
8 \( \text{d}2 \text{a}3 \) 9 \( \text{e}3 \text{a}5 \) 10 \( \text{xd}3 \text{a}4 \) 11 \( \text{c}3 \text{a}1 \) 12 \( \text{c}4 \text{a}2 \) 13 \( \text{c}5 \text{a}1 \) 14 \( \text{c}6 \text{c}1+ \) 15 \( \text{d}6 \)
Preparing to meet \( \text{e}5 \) with the move \( \text{a}5 \), but now he threatens to transpose to a pawn ending.
15...\( \text{a}1 \) 16 \( \text{c}8! \text{a}6+ \) 17 \( \text{c}6 \text{xa}7 \) 18 \( \text{xc}7+ \text{xc}7 \) 19 \( \text{xc}7 \)

Note an important fine point—the tempo \( \text{g}2-\text{g}3 \) is decisive. With the pawn on \( \text{g}3 \) it would be a draw.
19...\( \text{e}7 \) 20 \( \text{e}6 \text{e}6 \) 21 \( \text{c}5! \)
Destroying the opposition.
21...\( \text{f}6 \) 22 \( \text{d}5 \text{g}6 \) 23 \( \text{hxg}6 \text{xe}6 \) 24 \( \text{e}6 \), winning. But with the pawn on \( \text{g}3 \), 24...\( \text{h}5 \) 25 \( \text{xf}5 \) is stalemate.

Vujala-Smith
corr, 1993
1 g4!
Fixing the opponent’s weaknesses.
1...h6 2 g2 a3 3 h4 f6 4 h5! g7
Underlining White’s advantage.
4...e6 5 g5!
5 hxg6 fxg6
If 5...fxg6, then 6 c7 with the idea a7,
6 f3 f6
Better is 6...g7 7 f2 g6 8 e2 g7 9 f5 g6 10 d2 h5=.
7 g3 a4 8 d5! b4
Now the continuation 8...g7 9 f4 g6 10 d7! f5 11 d6+ g7
12 a6 a3+ 13 h4 a4 14 g5 leads to victory for White.
9 d8! a4
It is too late for 9...h5 10 gxh5+ xh5 because of 11 h8+ g6 12 g8+ followed by g4.
10 g8+! f7 11 a8 a1 12 f4
g7 13 a6 a2 14 f5! a1 15 f3 a3+ 16 e4 a4+ 17 d5 h5
There is also no salvation in 17...xg4 18 a7+ g8 19 b7 and then a6-a7+–.
18 gxh5 a5+ 19 e4 Black resigned.

Salov-Malaniuk
USSR (ch), 1988

2 b4 a5
At first sight 2...gxf3+ 3 xf3 g8 seems sufficient for a draw. Actually, in the variation 4 d4 xb5 (4...c5 is useless because of 5 d7) 5 d5+ c6 6 xf5 d6 7 g4 e6 8 f4 there arises a theoretical position where it is Black’s move—and consequently a draw—by 8...a8. But White plays the more refined 4 b3! (threatening 5 f4) 4...g4 5 d3 xb5 6 d5 c6 7 xf5 g8 8 g4 d6 9 f4 c6. The same position, but with White to move, 10 g5, and this is already a win.
3 b3 b6 4 f2 a8
Or 4...gxf3+ 5 xf3 g8 6 f4—Black does not stand his ground.
5 fxg4 fxg4 6 b4 f8+ 7 e2 e8+
In the variation 7...c5 8 xg4 xb5 there is 9 f4! e8+ 10 f3 c5 11 g4 g8 12 f6.
8 f2 h8+ 9 e2 e8+ 10 d3 c5 11 e4 d8+ 12 e3 xb5 13 xg4 c5 14 g6 d5 15 f4 f8 16 g4 e4 17 e6+ d5 18 h6! with an advantage that is quite easy to realise.

Guseinov-Beliavsky
Pula, 1997

1...b6
The sealed move. It is easy to calculate that on 1...xb5 Black does not have enough tempi to save himself.
White has a weakness on c4, but this is small and Black needs to create another.

1...h5! 2 gxf4
After 2 gxh5 gxh5 3 g3 c5 4 c3 follows 4...d7! with the threat ...c7 and ...d5.

2...g5+! 3 f3 h4
Now there is a weakness on h3.
4 d1
Preventing e6-e1 and h1.
5 c5 6 e1+ d7 6 e4 e5!
7 d4 c6
Now the king is included in the attack on the weak c4 pawn.
8 d3 c5 9 d1 f6! 10 d2 d6 11 c2 d4 12 c1 d3+ 13 g3+ h2 14 h2 c3+ 15 d1+ d3 16 c1 f3 17 d1+ f5 18 c1 f2+ 19 g1 f4 White resigned.

Mikhalchishin-Khmelnitsky
Sibenik, 1990

No help is 3 gxf4 f5.
3...b2+ 4 g1 fxg3 5 f6+
It is necessary at least to force back the black king.
5...g7 6 xe6 h2!
It is precisely this pawn which is important.
7 d6 xh4 8 xd5
After 8 g2 g4! 9 xd5 h4 follows h4-h3 and g3-g2.
8 e4+! e6 h4 10 h5 xd4 11 e7 f7 12 h7+ e8 13 g2 g4!
Zugzwang. 14 g1 g2. White resigned.

Mednis-Gurevich
New York, 1982

In this rather untypical position there is only one possibility for Black to save the game.
1...c5!! 2 b5
After 2 bxc5 d5 3 d3 c4 4 e3 e5! Black achieves a draw.
2...b4 3 b2! xh4 4 b6 h8 5 c4 d6 6 b5 d7!
It was still not too late to lose:
6 c8 7 d2+ e5 8 b7 b8 9 d7 e6 10 c6 with a win for White.
7 a6 a8+ 8 b7 a4!
Now if White plays 9 \( \text{d}2+ \), then Black has the possibility to transpose into a drawn pawn ending by 9\( \text{d}4 \).

9 \( \text{c}2! \) \( \text{c}4 \)

If 9...\( \text{d}6 \) 10 \( \text{d}2+ \) \( \text{d}4 \)? 11 \( \text{xd}4+ \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 12 \( \text{c}8 \), and White queens with check. 9...\( \text{a}5 \) 10 \( \text{d}2+ \) is also losing.

10 \( \text{d}2+ \) \( \text{e}6 \) 11 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{c}3 \)

12 \( \text{e}2+ \) \( \text{f}5 \) 13 \( \text{b}7 \)

If 13 \( \text{b}5 \), then Black achieves a draw by the manoeuvre 13...\( \text{a}3 \) 14 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{a}6 \)!

13...\( \text{b}4 \) 14 \( \text{h}2 \)

Nothing is changed by 14 \( \text{c}7= \).

14...\( \text{xb}7! \) 15 \( \text{xb}7 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 16 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{d}3 \) Drawn.

However at the end of the game analysis showed that in the position in the last diagram, 12 \( \text{c}2! \) deserved consideration. Now if 12...\( \text{a}3 \) (12...\( \text{c}4+ \) 13 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 14

Interesting methods of defence in rook endings

In defending this typical position, exceptionally important is the presence of the two white pawns—the g or h pawns do not win, the others do quite simply, by advancing them to the seventh rank. Knowledge of these types of position is extremely important in the different variations when transposing to a rook ending.

Chaunin-Friedman
Moscow, 1951
Here White can win easily by 1 $\textit{\text{hxg3!}}$ 2 $\textit{\text{h4!}}$, after which the f3 pawn goes to f7. However White decided that simpler was $1 \textit{\text{hxg3?}}$, keeping his pawns connected, but it turned out that after $1...\textit{\text{g4+}}! \ 2 \textit{\text{fxg4}}$ he cannot win even with an extra pawn.

Polugaevsky-Parma
Sochi, 1965

And here in a classic game Black resigned since he saw $1 \textit{\text{h6}}$, and thought there was no defence. However after $1...\textit{\text{g6!}}$ and $2...\textit{\text{h7!}}$ Black calmly makes a draw.

Shirov-Kramnik
Belgrade, 1999

Here, an analogous winning method is demonstrated by Shirov.

1 $\textit{\text{b6! \ cxb6}}$ 2 $\textit{\text{h8}}$ Black resigned.

Mokry-Pribyl
Olomouc, 1977

After $1...\textit{\text{h7?}} \ 2 \textit{\text{c6 \ a2}}$ 3 $\textit{\text{d8! \ xxa7}}$ 4 $\textit{\text{d7+ \ xxd7}}$ 5 $\textit{\text{xd7 \ g5}}$ 6 $\textit{\text{e6!}}$ Black resigned.

The method which helped White to win is typical of such positions. It is possible that Black did not even think about the fact that it was still possible to give up even a centre pawn.

On the correct defence—$1...\textit{\text{a1!}}$—the operation to transpose into a pawn ending is not achieved since after $2 \textit{\text{c6}}$ Black checks along the file until the king is forced away from the a-pawn. For example: $2...\textit{\text{c1+}} \ 3 \textit{\text{d6 \ d1+}}$ 4 $\textit{\text{e6 \ a1}}$ 5 $\textit{\text{d8}}$ (5 $\textit{\text{e8? \ a6+!}}$) 5...$\textit{\text{a6+}}$ 6 $\textit{\text{d6 \ xxa7}}$ 7 $\textit{\text{d7+ \ xxd7}}$ 8 $\textit{\text{xd7 \ f6!}}$ 9 $\textit{\text{d6 \ g5}}$! 10 $\textit{\text{hxg5+ \ xg5}}$ 11 $\textit{\text{d5 \ e3!}}$ 12 $\textit{\text{fxe3 \ g4}}$ with a draw.

The right method of defence was not found in the following game.
White was convinced that he would make a draw but, despite thinking about this position for more than an hour, he did not construct that 'fortress'. This perfectly appropriate example is of interest to the theory of rook endings.

The fact that the pawn stands on f6, and not on f7, is of no significance. Now simplest for White was 1 g3! hgf7 2 h3 g7 3 a8.

In the end Black reaches the following position. With White to move, Black wins a pawn: 1 h2 g3 etc. With Black to move, after 1...g3 2 h2 c3 Black wins in the same way as in the game Mokry-Pribyl. Then simplest is to give up the pawn at once—2 a8!

Here a mechanism like 2...e1 does not work, since there follows first 3 a3+! and only then 4 a2. There is also no win for Black after 2...c1 3 a3+ c3 4 a2 c2+ 5 xc2 xc2 6 f3 d3.

By comparison with the game Mokry-Pribyl this pawn ending is favourable for the stronger side. But in this case the weaker side achieves a draw: 7 f4 d4 8 f3 g5! 9 hxg5 fxg5 10 e5!.

Also here the sacrifice of a centre pawn saves him! 10...e5 11 e3 f5 12 f3 with a draw.

Black could play 12...g4—but then arises a theoretically drawn position—or else he must try to hand over the move to White which he will possibly succeed in doing.

But even in this case White achieves a draw after 1 g4! hxg4 2 g3. Therefore Black must take the pawn at once.

2...e4

Reaching the basic position of this ending.

It is of no significance at all what the move is here. It is necessary only to bear in mind that Black should not play ... g6-g5, since after the exchange of pawns, a second passed g or h-pawn will be created, which does not win.
The only path to victory is to create a passed f-pawn, but how can this be done? If Black manoeuvres with his king to the d4, c4 squares, etc, then White gives check along the file. But even here White needs to take care. For example, after 3 \( \text{c}8+ \text{d}4 4 \text{d}8+ \text{e}5 \) mistaken is 5 \( \text{e}8? \text{f}5 6 \text{a}8 g5 7 \text{a}5+ \text{g}6 8 \text{hxg}5 f5!.

After capturing on g5 Black manages to create a passed f-pawn, which wins. Instead of 5 \( \text{e}8? \) it is necessary to continue 5 \( \text{a}8! \)

Now the above-mentioned manoeuvre does not work: 5...g5 6 \text{hxg}5 f5 7 \text{a}6! h4 8 g6, and already Black has to think how to save himself.

On 5 \( \text{a}8 \) he will try to send the king to g7, so as then to play ...g6-g5: 5...\text{e}6 6 \text{a}6+ \text{f}7 7 \text{a}7+ \text{g}8 8 \text{a}8+ \text{g}7

On this follows a check on the rank—9 \( \text{a}7+ \), and after 9...\text{h}6 the manoeuvre 10 \( \text{a}6 \) prevents the advance ...g6-g5.

There is nothing else for Black, besides 10...f5. Possible then is 11 \( \text{a}7 \) g5 12 \( \text{a}6+ \text{g}7 \)

Now Black can choose two paths, each of which leads to a favourable result for him. Let us look first at the direct 13 \text{hxg}5 h4 14 \text{gxh}4 f4 15 h5 f3+ 16 \text{f}2 \text{h}1 17 h6+! \text{h}7 18 \text{a}7+ \text{g}6 19 h7 \text{hxh}7 20 \text{a}6+! \text{hxg}5 21 \text{xf}3 with a draw.

The second path also leads to his objective: 13 \( \text{a}7+ \text{f}6 14 \text{a}6+ \text{g}7 \). Black is at the crossroads.

After 14...\text{e}5 15 \text{hxg}5 h4 16 g6 he might even lose.

But 14...\text{f}7 15 \( \text{a}7+ \text{e}8 \) (15...\text{e}6 16 \text{hxg}5! h4 17 g6) 16 \text{a}8+ \text{d}7 17 \text{a}7+ \text{d}8 18 \text{a}8! with a draw since Black cannot go to the c-file with his king: 18...\text{c}7 19 \text{hxg}5.

We return to the game Holmov-Timoschenko.

Activity is more important than material

It has long been known that in rook endings activity is more important than material. This means maximum possible active deployment of the king and rook in coordination with one’s own passed pawns and in the struggle against the opponent’s pawns. And even the very idea of the priority of material will be fatal. Here are a few striking examples.
The black rook is hopelessly passive and White’s plan is to go with his king to h5, place the rook on b6 and break up the black pawns with the pawn march f4-f5-f6.

1 \( \text{g}4! \text{e}6 \\)

After 1...g6 winning is 2 \( \text{b}6+ \text{g}7 3 \text{f}5 \text{h}7 4 \text{f}4 \) and 5 \( \text{e}5. \\)

2 \( \text{f}5+ \text{e}5 3 \text{b}4! \text{g}6 \\)

On 3...\( \text{d}6 \) follows 4 \( \text{h}5. \\)

4 \( \text{fxg}6 \text{fxg}6 5 \text{b}6! \text{d}4 6 \text{xg}6 \text{xb}7 7 \text{xh}6 \\)

At a necessary moment the b7 pawn is given up in exchange for the win of a pawn on the opposite flank. This results in a theoretically winning position.

7...\( \text{g}7+ 8 \text{f}4 \text{f}7+ 9 \text{g}5 \text{e}5 \\)

10 \( \text{g}4 \text{h}8 11 \text{h}5 \text{f}7 12 \text{g}5 \text{f}5 13 \text{h}8 \) and Black resigned.

In the following position the white rook is firmly posted, but it is immobile and passive. Black finds a plan with a transposition to a pawn ending, exploiting the position of the rook on g4.

1...\( \text{c}1! 2 \text{f}3 \text{c}4 3 \text{e}3 \text{e}5! 4 \text{d}3 \text{a}4! \\)

Clearly not 4...\( \text{e}4+? \) because of 5 \( \text{xe}4. \\)

5 \( \text{e}3 \text{e}4 6 \text{g}3 \text{a}2 7 \text{g}4 \\)

Or 7 \( \text{h}4 \text{g}4 8 \text{h}5 \text{a}3+ 9 \text{f}2 \text{g}3 10 \text{g}3 \text{e}3 \) with a win.

7...\( \text{a}3+ 8 \text{f}2 \text{d}3 \) White resigned.

“Active positions of the pieces in rook endings are worth a pawn” —Smyslov. Here is a classic example.
1 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{xc3} \)+ 2 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{f3} \)?

Materialism in such positions is simply ruinous. This position sparked a great debate in 1998 in the magazine 64. Master Goldin maintained that 2...a6, intending to create a passed pawn with maximum speed, gave Black drawing chances. However after 3 g6 b5 4 axb5 axb5 5 \( \text{g5} \) b4 6 \( \text{f7} \)+ \( \text{g8} \) 7 \( \text{xf5} \) b3—master Barsky pointed out 7...\( \text{g3} \)+! 8 \( \text{h5} \)! (8 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{g4} \)! leads to a blind alley—8...b3 9 \( \text{xd5} \) b2 10 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{g7} \) 11 \( \text{xb2} \) \( \text{g6} \) 12 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{d6} \) 13 \( \text{c4} \)! \( \text{f6} \) 14 \( \text{g4} \) c6 15 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 16 \( \text{c5} \)+ \( \text{e6} \) 17 \( \text{e4} \), gradually driving back the black pieces) 8 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{g7} \) (8...\( \text{c6} \) 9 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{d6} \) 10 \( \text{a5} \)! \( \text{d8} \) 11 \( \text{b5} \)! with a win)

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\text{White} & \text{Black} \\
\text{f3} & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
& & & & & & & & & & & & \\
& & & & & & & & & & & & \\
& & & & & & & & & & & & \\
& & & & & & & & & & & & \\
& & & & & & & & & & & & \\
& & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\text{g3} & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

9 \( \text{d7} \)+ \( \text{f8} \) 10 d5! (but not 10 f5 b2 11 g7+ \( \text{g8} \) 12 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{c6} \)-+ 13 f6 b1=\( \text{w} \) with check!) 10...\( \text{e8} \) (after 10...b2 11 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{e8} \) 12 \( \text{e7} \)+ \( \text{d8} \) 13 g7 \( \text{g3} \) 14 \( \text{e1} \) White wins easily) 11 \( \text{h7} \) b2 12 \( \text{h8} \)+ \( \text{e7} \) 13 \( \text{b8} \) \( \text{c2} \) 14 \( \text{b7} \) \( \text{g2} \)-+ 15 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{c2} \) 16 d6! \( \text{xd6} \) 17 \( \text{f6} \), and White wins.

3 g6! \( \text{xf4} \)+ 4 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e4} \) 5 \( \text{f6} \)!

The f5 pawn protects the white king, but not the black one.

5...\( \text{g8} \) 6 \( \text{g7} \)+ \( \text{h8} \) 7 \( \text{xc7} \) \( \text{e8} \) 7 \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{e4} \) 8 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{f4} \)+ 9 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{g4} \) 10 g7+, etc. White won.

Lilienthal-Smyslov
Moscow, 1941

There followed:
1...\( \text{e4} \)! 2 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{f4} \)!!

By sacrificing a third pawn, Black creates cover against checks to his own king.

3 \( \text{exf4} \)

Or 3 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{a1} \)-+ 4 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{f3} \)+ 5 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{a2} \)-+ with perpetual check.

3...\( \text{f3} \) 4 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{a1} \)-+ with a draw four pawns down.

Kozlov-Mikhalschin
Vladikavkaz, 1978

1 \( \text{e4} \)!

A passed pawn in conjunction with a centralised king is worth two pawns. But where does the capture 1 \( \text{xb3} \) lead? After 1...\( \text{xc3} \) 2 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{h5} \) 3 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{g4} \)-+ with a further ...\( \text{g5} \) White is in a deplorable state.
1...\texttt{Exg3} 2 e5 \texttt{g6} 3 e6 \texttt{Ad3+}
After 3...\texttt{Exe3} 4 \texttt{Ad6} h5 5 \texttt{Ab8} h4
6 e7 the white pawn queens.
4 \texttt{e5} h5 5 \texttt{Ab8}!
5 e7 does not work because of
5...\texttt{f7}, but now this is a threat.
5...\texttt{Ee3+} 6 \texttt{d6} \texttt{f6} 7 \texttt{f8+} \texttt{g5}
8 e7 b2 9 \texttt{Ab8} \texttt{f6} 10 \texttt{f8+!} \texttt{g5}
11 \texttt{Ab8} Drawn.

Taimanov-Chekhov
Kishinev, 1976

There is a very clear path to the
draw.
1...a5!! 2 bxa5 \texttt{Ad4} 3 \texttt{Ab5} \texttt{Aa4}
4 \texttt{Ab3}
Or 4 \texttt{Ab6+} \texttt{e5} activating the
king.
4...\texttt{Exa5} 5 \texttt{f4} \texttt{Aa4+} 6 \texttt{Ab4}
\texttt{Exa3} 7 \texttt{Ab6+} \texttt{g7} 8 \texttt{Ae6} \texttt{Ab3} 9
\texttt{e3!} \texttt{Axe3!} 10 \texttt{xe3} \texttt{f7} 11 \texttt{d3}
\texttt{e7} 12 \texttt{d4} \texttt{d6} Drawn.

A classic activating of the king
was seen already in this game:

Owen-Morphy
London, 1858

1...\texttt{f7}!
After 1...\texttt{Ed3} 2 \texttt{Ec8+} \texttt{h7} 3 \texttt{Ee8}
White has great chances of a draw.
2 \texttt{Ee7+} \texttt{f6} 3 \texttt{Exb7} \texttt{Ed3} 4 \texttt{f2}
\texttt{Exd4} 5 \texttt{e3} e5 6 b6 \texttt{Ab4} 7 \texttt{Ab8}
\texttt{e7}!
Black chooses a plan to liquidate
White’s passed pawn. Inferior is
7...\texttt{b3+} 8 \texttt{d2} \texttt{e6} 9 \texttt{c2}, and it
is not clear how to win.
8 b7 \texttt{d7!} 9 \texttt{Eg8} \texttt{Exb7} 10 \texttt{Exg7+}
\texttt{c6} 11 \texttt{g6+} \texttt{c5} 12 \texttt{Exh6} \texttt{b3+}
13 \texttt{e2} e4
After the pawn sacrifice all
Black’s pieces have become more
active and his pawn further
advanced.
14 \texttt{Ah8} \texttt{d4} 15 \texttt{Ag8} \texttt{b2+} 16
\texttt{d1} \texttt{d3} White resigned.
Schlechter-Lasker

Berlin, 1910

The best defence is...

1...\( \text{h}4! \) 2 \( \text{c}5 \text{f}6 \) 3 \( \text{xa}5 \text{c}4! \)

\( 4 \text{a}6+ \text{e}5 \) 5 \( \text{a}5+ \text{f}6 \) 6 \( \text{a}2 \)

\( \text{e}5 \) 7 \( \text{b}2 \text{e}3+ \) 8 \( \text{g}2 \text{f}6 \) 9 \( \text{h}3 \text{c}6! \)

with a draw.

Kramnik-Beliavsky

Groningen, 1993

Correct was the natural 1 \( \text{b}8 \), activating the rook and not fearing 1...\( \text{g}3+ \) 2 \( \text{f}2 \text{xa}3 \), since the rook ending with the f-pawn is drawn. But White decides to defend the pawn and at a suitable moment to obtain counterplay with the help of the a-pawn. But this proves to be a decisive mistake.

1 \( \text{a}1? \text{g}3+ \) 2 \( \text{f}2 \text{g}4 \) 3 \( \text{b}1 \)

Here also he had to go back; counterplay with 3 \( \text{a}4 \) does not succeed because of 3...\( \text{h}3 \) 4 \( \text{a}5 \text{g}2+ \)

5 \( \text{f}1 \text{f}4 \) 6 \( \text{a}6 \text{f}3 \) 7 \( \text{a}7 \text{h}2 \), and it is time to resign.

3...\( \text{h}3 \) 4 \( \text{b}8 \text{g}2+ \) 5 \( \text{f}1 \text{d}2 \)

Quite possible is 5...\( \text{a}2 \), but Black wants to use the rook to cover against checks from the side, while he simply pays no attention to the a-pawn.

6 \( \text{g}1 \text{f}4 \) 7 \( \text{g}8+ \text{f}3 \) 8 \( \text{h}8 \text{d}1+/! \)

Black wants simply to promote the f-pawn to a queen. If now 10 \( \text{h}3 \), then 10...\( \text{f}3 \) 11 \( \text{h}8 \text{d}3! \)

13 \( \text{a}4 \text{e}2 \) 14 \( \text{f}8 \text{e}3! \)

15 \( \text{a}5 \text{e}7! \)

16 \( \text{f}2 \) with a win.

10 \( \text{a}4 \text{f}3 \) 11 \( \text{a}5 \text{f}1 \) 12 \( \text{a}6 \text{a}1 \) 13 \( \text{a}8 \)

After 13 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{f}2 \)

14 \( \text{g}8 \text{a}6 \)

15 \( \text{g}3 \text{f}6! \)

the win is straightforward.

13...\( \text{f}2 \) 14 \( \text{a}7 \text{a}6! \)

The right idea. Now on 15 \( \text{h}3 \)

\( \text{g}1 \) 16 \( \text{g}8+ \text{h}1 \)

17 \( \text{h}8 \text{a}3+ \) 18 \( \text{h}4 \text{g}2! \)

is reached a position from a classic study by Lasker, where Black wins by shouldering the white king to the seventh rank, while on 15 \( \text{b}8 \) follows 15...\( \text{a}7 \)

16 \( \text{b}1+ \text{e}2 \) 17 \( \text{b}2+ \text{e}3 \)

18 \( \text{b}8 \text{e}4 \)

19 \( \text{b}4+ \text{e}5 \)

20 \( \text{b}5+ \text{e}6 \)

21 \( \text{b}6+ \text{e}7 \)

22 \( \text{b}1 \text{a}3! \)

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

followed by the approach of the king.

15 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{h}2! \)

16 \( \text{b}8 \)
If 16 \( \texttt{xh2} \), then 16...\( \texttt{hxh6+} \) 17 \( \texttt{g3} \) \( \texttt{g1} \) 18 \( \texttt{f8} \) \( \texttt{g6+} \) 19 \( \texttt{h4} \) \( \texttt{a6} \), again reaching Lasker's study.

16...\( \texttt{xa7} \) 17 \( \texttt{bl}+ \) \( \texttt{e2} \) 18 \( \texttt{b2}+ \) \( \texttt{e3} \) 19 \( \texttt{b3}+ \) \( \texttt{e4} \) 20 \( \texttt{b4}+ \) \( \texttt{d3} \) 21 \( \texttt{bl} \) \( \texttt{f7} \)

Also good is 21...\( \texttt{e7} \) with the idea of 22...\( \texttt{e1}+ \).

22 \( \texttt{f1} \) \( \texttt{e2} \) 23 \( \texttt{xf2}+ \) \( \texttt{xf2} \)

White resigned.

Activating pieces also means activating the king to coordinate with a passed pawn.

**Smagin-Naumkin**  
**Moscow, 1983**

The endgame with f and h-pawns is drawn, but it is necessary to transpose to it at once!

1 \( \texttt{g4} \) \( \texttt{f7} \) 2 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{b4} \) 3 \( \texttt{h6} \) \( \texttt{b1} \)

Black reluctantly decides to give up a pawn—which he should have done earlier. But now, psychologically, he is not ready for defence.

4 \( \texttt{xa4} \) \( \texttt{g8} \) 5 \( \texttt{f5} \) \( \texttt{g1+} \)

Correct is 5...\( \texttt{h7} \).

6 \( \texttt{g4}! \) \( \texttt{a1} \) 7 \( \texttt{g6} \) \( \texttt{a2} \) 8 \( \texttt{f6} \) \( \texttt{a1} \) 9 \( \texttt{f7+} \) \( \texttt{f8} \) 10 \( \texttt{h7} \) \( \texttt{h1} \) 11 \( \texttt{f6} \) Black resigned.

**Bojković-Kakhiani**  
**Erevan, 1996**

Let's try to evaluate the position—White has an extra pawn, but Black has a strong passed pawn on g3 plus an active rook plus the possibility of activating his king—it is Black who is playing for the win.

1 \( \texttt{g2} \) \( \texttt{h3}! \)

Usually the rook is placed behind, but here Black does not allow 2 \( \texttt{c2} \) to be played because of 2...\( \texttt{h2} \) winning.

2 \( \texttt{g1} \) \( \texttt{d6} \) 3 \( \texttt{c2} \) \( \texttt{e5} \) 4 \( \texttt{d3} \) \( \texttt{g2}+! \)

If 4...\( \texttt{e4} \), then 5 \( \texttt{e5}! \) \( \texttt{xe5} \) 6 \( \texttt{e3} \) with equality.

5 \( \texttt{c4} \)?

Correct was 5 \( \texttt{e2} \) \( \texttt{g3} \) 6 \( \texttt{f2} \)

\( \texttt{b3} \) 7 \( \texttt{xg2} \) \( \texttt{xb2}+ \) 8 \( \texttt{f3} \) \( \texttt{b3}+ \) 9 \( \texttt{e2} \) \( \texttt{xa3} \) 10 \( \texttt{b1} \) with a draw.

5...\( \texttt{g3} \) 6 \( \texttt{c5} \) \( \texttt{xe4} \) 7 \( \texttt{b4} \) \( \texttt{d3}?! \)

Stronger is 7...\( \texttt{g6} \) with a win.

8 \( \texttt{b6} \)

Or 8 \( \texttt{b5} \) \( \texttt{g6} \) 9 \( \texttt{a4} \) \( \texttt{b6} \) 10 \( \texttt{d5} \) \( \texttt{e3} \) winning.

8...\( \texttt{g7} \) 9 \( \texttt{a4} \) \( \texttt{c4} \) 10 \( \texttt{b5} \) \( \texttt{b4} \) 11 \( \texttt{a5} \) \( \texttt{g6}+ \) 12 \( \texttt{xb7} \) \( \texttt{xa5} \) 13 \( \texttt{b6} \)

\( \texttt{xb6} \) 14 \( \texttt{c7} \) \( \texttt{g6} \) 15 \( \texttt{d7} \) \( \texttt{b4} \) 16 \( \texttt{e7} \) \( \texttt{c4} \) 17 \( \texttt{f7} \) \( \texttt{g3} \) White resigned.
White has a pawn more but Black has an active king and a far advanced passed pawn. White must play 1 \( \text{Le7} \) \( \text{c3} \) 2 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{a1} \) 3 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{a3} \) 4 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{e5} \) 5 \( \text{a6} \) \( \text{d4} \) 6 \( \text{a7} \) \( \text{d3} \) 7 \( \text{f4} \) 8 \( \text{d7} \) with a draw according to an analysis by Smyslov. However in the game he quickly played:

1 \( \text{a5+} \)? \( \text{e6}! \)
Sacrificing yet another one.

2 \( \text{a6+} \) \( \text{d5} \)
3 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{c3} \)
4 \( \text{h8} \)
5 \( \text{a3} \)
6 \( \text{h3} \)

After 6 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{g4} \) 7 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{e5} \) 8 \( \text{c8} \) 9 \( \text{a1} \) 10 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{f1} \) 11 \( \text{c6} \) 12 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{c4} \) 13 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{b4}! \), and he has to give up the f6 pawn.

6 \( \ldots \) \( \text{d7} \)
7 \( \text{g4} \)

Bad is 7 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{gxf4} \) 8 \( \text{gxf4} \) \( \text{c2} \) 9 \( \text{g4} \)
8 \( \text{c3} \) \(-\).

7 \( \ldots \) \( \text{a5}! \)

‘Building a bridge’—the main manoeuvre in rook endings.

8 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{c5} \)
9 \( \text{d8}+ \) \( \text{e3} \)
10 \( \text{d1} \)

No help is 10 \( \text{e8}+ \) \( \text{f2} \) 11 \( \text{a8} \) \( \text{c2} \) 12 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{gxf4} \) 13 \( \text{xf4} \) 14 \( \text{xc1} \) \( \text{xc1} \) 14 \( \text{g} \) \( \text{c4}+ \) 15 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{g3}! \) 16 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{h4} \) 17 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{h5} \) 18 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{g4} \) \(-\).

10 \( \ldots \) \( \text{c2} \) 11 \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{gxf4} \) 12 \( \text{gxf4} \) \( \text{d2} \)
13 \( \text{a1} \) 14 \( \text{xc1} \) \( \text{xc1}! \) 15 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{e3} \) 16 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{e4} \) 17 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 18 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{c6}+ \) 19 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{a6}! \)

Readers will ask—what has all this got to do with activating in a rook ending. This is what it has to do with it. White has the exchange for a pawn but Black threatens after \( \ldots \) \( \text{d7} \) to seize the initiative. So White decides to transpose to a rook ending a pawn down, but in the process activating all his remaining pieces.

1 \( \text{xc5}!! \) \( \text{xc5} \) 2 \( \text{xc5} \) \text{bxc5} 3 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{f6} \) 4 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{e6} \) 5 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 6 \( \text{c3}! \)

Now 7 \( \text{d1}+! \) is threatened followed by \( \text{c4} \).

6 \( \ldots \) \( \text{c4} \) 7 \( \text{b4}! \) \( \text{c7} \) 8 \( \text{d4}+ \) \( \text{e4} \) 9 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{c6} \) 10 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{c8} \) 11 \( \text{d7}! \)

With the threat of \( \text{c7} \).

11 \( \ldots \) \( \text{b8} \) 12 \( \text{c7}! \) \( \text{d3} \) 13 \( \text{c6}! \)

Here is the key move—defending the b6 pawn and keeping in his sights the c4 pawn, White wants to take on a4 and obtain connected passed pawns.

13 \( \ldots \) \( \text{f5} \) 14 \( \text{xa4} \) \( \text{c3} \) 15 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{g5} \) 16 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{f4} \) 17 \( \text{gxf4} \) \( \text{gxf4} \) 18 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{e4} \) 19 \( \text{b4}! \)
The last finesse—now on 19...c2 follows 20 ♘b3.
19...♗e2 20 a6 e3 21 a7 ♘f8 21 fxe3 Black resigned.

Van der Doel-Klovan
Gelsenkirchen, 1998

Each of White’s remaining pieces are clearly more active than his opponent’s. Therefore any delay by Black would be equivalent to death.
1...♗c8!!
Forcing the capture of the pawn, which allows Black, through the opening of the d-file, to invade the opponent’s position.
2 ♕xa6 ♖d8 3 ♖b6 ♖d2 4 ♖xb5 ♖xf2 5 a4 ♖g2 6 a5 f5+! 7 ♖xe5 f3 8 ♖b4 Drawn.

Smyslov-Epishin
Rostov, 1992

White has a distant passed pawn, but his cut-off king, indeed also the centralised black king, gives Black a decisive advantage.
1 ♖e7+ ♗d4 2 ♖e6?
Correct is 2 ♖f7!.
2...d5 3 ♖xh6 ♗e3 4 ♖f6
Also bad is 4 ♖e6+ ♖xf3 5 ♖e1 d4.
4...d4 5 ♖xf5 d3 6 ♖e5+ ♖xf3 7 ♖f5+ ♗e3 8 ♖e5+ ♖d4 9 ♖e8 d2 10 ♖d8+ ♗e3 11 ♖e8+ ♖f3 12 ♖f8+ ♗g4 White resigned.

There will be cases when it is necessary to sacrifice all one’s pawns for maximum coordination of all the pieces.

Pelletier-Rozentalis
Erevan, 1996

1...g4!!
Inferior is 1...f4 2 gxf4 gxf4 3 ♖xb4 e3 4 fxe3 fxe3 5 ♖a4 ♖b2 6 b4! ♖e4 7 ♖a8 ♖d3 8 ♖a3+ ♖d2 9 ♖a1!=.
2 ♖xb4 f4! 3 ♖a4 ♖b2 4 gxf4 g3! 5 fxg3 e3 6 f5 ♖e4 7 f6 ♖f3 8 ♖a1 ♖g2! 9 f7 e2+ 10 ♖e1 ♖e3 White resigned.

The rule of the two weaknesses—the possibility of transferring an
attack from one weakness to another until the time comes that the opponent cannot defend all his weaknesses—is an exceptionally universal one.

Even here the two weaknesses on a6 and c6 would not mean anything were White not to have chances of organising another weakness on the other flank.

1 h5! gxh5
If 1...g5, then after 2 e4 the king breaks through to the black pawns.

2 hxh5 g8 3 h4!
Weak is 3 xh6? xg4 4 xf6 g3+ and the endgame is drawn, while the passivity of the rook is provisional upon the arrival of the white king to the defence.

3...d7 4 e4 e6 5 f3 h8 6 h5 h7 7 g3 f7 8 a5! a7 9 h4 f7 10 h5 g7 11 f5 h7 12 c5 c7 13 a4! g7
After 13...b7 14 xxc6 axb4 15 xxf6 White wins easily.

14 b5 axb5 15 axb5 b7 16 bxc6 c7 17 c1 c8 18 c7 f7 19 c6 g7 20 h4 f7 21 g3 Black resigned.

Black clearly has the more active king and rook, and the method of realising the advantage lies in the creation of two weaknesses and attack on them.

1...e5
Less logical is 1...g4, and White can avoid the drawn pawn ending. 2 f4 xfx4 3 xf4 f5 4 e3 gxh3 5 gxh3 c5 6 a4 b6 7 b3 a5 8 f3 d4 9 cxd4! exd4 10 h4 g6 11 g3 e4 12 g4=. It is equally a draw after 9 c4.

2 b3
More principled is 2 g4 g6 3 b3 f5 4 g3 f4 5 f3 c5 

2...g4! 3 f1
3 g3? loses at once because of 3...f5. The attempt 3 hxg4!? deserves attention, but even then 3 xg4 4 g3 b5 5 b4 g6 6 a3 h6 with the idea 7...h3 leads to a winning position for Black.

3...gxh3 4 gxh3 h4 5 f3 b5 6 e2?
A decisive mistake. Better is 6 b4 g5 7 g3 f5 8 f3+ g6 9 g3 f5 intending 10...g4 

6...g5 7 f2 a5 8 g3
If 8 g3 e4 9 f2 b4 --.

8...c5 9 g2
If 9 a3, then 9...a4 10 e2 axb3 11 cxb3 h8 with the idea 12...a8++.

9...b4 10 cxb4 axb4 11 f3 h8 12 f1 a8 13 a1 e4++ 14 f2 f5 15 e2 h8 16 h1 h4!

It was still not too late to let the win slip. 16...g4? 17 h4.

17 g1 xh3 18 xg5 h2 19 d1 xe3 20 g3+ d4 White resigned.

Typical mistakes in rook endings

In rook endings there are a great many typical methods of play, but also, naturally, also a great many typical mistakes. We acquaint you with the most typical of these.

Making Passive

Ilivitsky-Taimanov
USSR, 1955

1 f3?
He should play 1 h4!, boxing in the black king.

1...g5! 2 g3 g6 3 c2?
Again White sticks to waiting tactics. The correct path was 3 d6+! f6 4 h4! gxh4 5 xh4 xxa2 (5...xf3 6 a6=) 6 f4 a4 7 f5+ g7 8 d7, maintaining equality, Levenfish.

3...f6 4 h2?

This was the last time White had the possibility of activating his rook: 4 c6! xa2 5 h4! gxh4 6 xh4 with equality.

4...h5! 5 c2
Now there is already no saving himself:
(a) 5 h4 hxg4 6 hxg5 f5++;
(b) 5 gxh5+ xh5 6 h4 g4 7 f2 f5 8 f4 a4 9 xf5 g3++;
(c) 5 gxh5 xh5 6 c2 f5 7 d2 f4+ 8 g2 h4 intending ...c3, a7-a5-a4-a3, c3-cl-b1-b2++;
(d) 5 h4 hxg4 6 xg4 f5+ 7 g3 g4 8 f2 h5 9 f1 a4! 10 xg4+ 11 f3 xh4! 12 c1 g5 13 a3 a4 14 c3 f6 15 b3 a5++., Levenfish.

Vaganian-Schlosser
Germany, 1994

1...b7?
An analogous mistake. He should activate his forces at once by 1...h5!

2 g4! g7 3 e2 e7+ 4 f3 c7 5 h4 h6?! 6 g3 c3+ 7 f3 c7 8 f4 b7 9 h5 b4+ 10 g3 gxh5
If 10...b3 White gains the advantage by 11 hxg6 fxg6 12 f4 followed by a5-a6, f4-f5 ±.
11 gxh5 Ab7 12 g4 Ab1 13 f4
After 13 Axa7 Black activates himself by 13...Ag1+ followed by Ag5.
13...Ab7 14 f5 Ae7 15 a4 Ac7
16 g4 Ad7 17 Ab6 Ab7 18 a5 Ac7 19 f5 Ac4+ 20 g3 Ac5 21 Af4 Ac4+ 22 Ae5 Ac5+
Worthy of attention is 22...Ah4!? (Schlosser) 23 Axa7 Axh5 24 a6 Ah1 25 Ab7 Ae1+ 26 Ad6 Aa1 27 a7 Af6.
23 Ae4 Ac4 24 Ad5 Ah4 25 f6+ Ah7 26 Axa7 Ahxh5 27 Ac6 Ag6?
Better is 27...Af5!=, Schlosser.
28 a6 Aa5
White wins also in the event of Aa1 29 Ad7 Aa1 30 Ab6.
29 Ab6 Aa1 30 Ad7 Ab1+ 31 Ac7 Axf6 32 Ad5!! Ac1+ 33 Ab6 Ag6 34 a7 Ac8 35 Aa5 h5 36 a8=A Axa8 37 Axa8 Af5 38 Ac5 Ae4 39 Aa6 Af4
On 39...f5 winning is 40 Aa4 with the idea of Ae5+–.
40 Ah8! f5 41 Ad5!
41 Aa5? would be a mistake because of 41...Af4 with a draw.
41...Af3 42 Aa8+ Af3 43 Ad4 f4
44 Ad3 h4 45 Ah8 Ag3 46 Ae2 Ag2 47 Ag8+ Ah1 48 Af3 Black resigned.

Grünberg-Brunner
Germany, 1992

1...Af5 2 h4 Aa5 3 Ac4 Af5 4 Ac4 Ag6 5 Aa7 g5 6 hxg5 fxg5 7 h4 8 Aa8+ Ab7 9 Ag8 Ac6 10 Ac6+?
A mistake. He should activate the king by 10 Ae4!.
10...Ad5 11 Ab6 Ae5?
Now Black meets mistake with mistake. Activity of the king is the main thing in rook endings. Black maintains the advantage by Shouldering the opponent’s king with 11...Ad4! Now however it’s a draw.
12 Ac3 Af4 13 Ab4+ Ag3 14 Ag4+ Af2 15 Ad2 Drawn.

Abramović-Nikolić
Igalo, 1994
The only chance for him was 12 "e4! f6 13 d4 g6 14 c3 h5 15 xxb2 xxb2 16 xb2 xh4 17 c3 g3 18 d4 xf3 19 e5! with a probable draw. Now, however, Black has no difficulty realising his advantage.

12 ... b5+ 13 h6 f6 14 h5 b3 15 h7 b8 16 f4 b3 17 g8 b5 18 h6 g6 19 f5+ f6 20 h8 b3 21 g8 b7 22 h8 g5 White resigned.

Marić-McNab
Hastings, 1995

1 ... a5 2 h2?
Correct was 2 f3! a4 3 g3 a1 4 f5! xf5 (if 4 ... g5 5 a6+ xf5 6 a5+ with a draw) 5 xf7+ e5 6 e7+ d4 7 a7 a3 8 f4 a2 9 a8 with equality.

2 ... f3! 3 a6+ f5 4 xa5+ g4! 5 g2 xf4 6 a7 xh4 +-. Analysis.

Technically weak play in rook endings

In the following position White, of course, has a winning position but it is not so easy as it seems at first sight.

Vaulin-Voikhovsky
Russia, 1997

1 e4? a3+ 2 g2 fxe4 3 f4 e5 4 xg4 d4 5 g8 e3 6 d8 e2 7 b8
The a-file is inaccessible.

7...\textit{a}2 8 \textit{b}1 e3 9 g3 \textit{a}8 10 b2+ d3 11 b3+ d2 12 b2+ c3 13 b7 e8 White resigned.

Krasenkov-Iskusnik
Russia, 1996

1...f5? After the simple 1...\textit{f}4 there is an easy draw. 2 c6 e6 3 \textit{c}2+-.

A narrow spectrum of noticing the opponent's threats
(one threat he sees, the other not)

Kozul-Mikhailchishin
Bled, 1996

Black saw only one threat 1 f5+ and prepared to repulse it by
1...b3+ 2 g2 b2+ 3 f1 b3

with an easy draw and therefore played
1...a2?,
But he did not reckon on
2 h4!,
after which White has a winning endgame, whereas he could have made a draw by 1...b1! 2 h4 g1+ 3 h3 h1+ or 1...b8!, preparing against h3-h4.

Materialism instead of activation

Schmittdiel-Mikhailchishin
Berne, 1994

1 \textit{d}1?
He should think about the liquidation of his opponent's activity (restricting the mobility of the pawns) by 1 \textit{a}5! f8 2 g3 e7 3 f3 d7 4 e3 c6 5 d4 with excellent chances of a draw.

1...f8 2 xd6 a5 3 g3?
White's only chance was to struggle against the a-pawn by activating his c-pawn: 3 c5! e7 4 d5! a4 5 c6 a3 6 c7 a2 7 d1, with a draw—clearly better is 4...e6! with chances of victory. Now, however...

3...a4 4 f3 a3 5 d1 e7 6 e3 a2 7 d1 b6 8 d4 a4 9 f4 h5 10 g4 h4 11 g5 g6 and White resigned.
Mikhalchishin-Stangl
Dortmund, 1992

1...\(\text{d3?}\)
A technically incorrect attack—necessary was 1...\(\text{d1}\)+ 2 \(\text{g2}\) \(\text{a1}\)
3 \(\text{a7}\) \(\text{xa3}\) 4 \(\text{b5}\) a5=.

2 \(\text{a4}\) a5 3 \(\text{bxa5}\) \(\text{d4}\) 4 a6 \(\text{xa4}\) 5
\(\text{a7}\) \(\text{h6}\) 6 \(\text{f1}\) g5
Also no help is 6...\(\text{a2}\) 7 \(\text{e1}\), and the king goes to b1.

7 \(\text{e2}\) \(\text{a3}\) 8 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{g6}\) 9 \(\text{c2}\)
gxh4 10 gxh4 \(\text{f5}\) 11 \(\text{b2}\) \(\text{a6}\)
12 \(\text{b3}\) \(\text{a1}\) 13 \(\text{c7}\)!

Preventing 13...\(\text{g4}\) because of 14 \(\text{c4}\)+ and 15 \(\text{a4}\).

13...\(\text{a6}\) 14 \(\text{b4}\) and Black
resigned.

A well known drawing mechanism without the b2 pawn—the rook goes to the sixth rank (f6) and upon the approach of the king to b5 begins an endless checking sequence. But in the game there followed...

1...\(\text{b4}\)? 2 \(\text{c7}\) \(\text{a4}\) 3 \(\text{c8+}\)?
For what reason? Why not 3 \(\text{c6}\)
\(\text{hxh7}\) 4 \(\text{xb2}\), winning easily.

3...\(\text{hxh7}\) 4 \(\text{c6}\) \(\text{b4}\)?
After 4...\(\text{g7}\) 5 \(\text{xb2}\) \(\text{f7}\) 6 \(\text{b3}\)
\(\text{a1}\) 7 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{e7}\) 8 \(\text{b5}\) \(\text{d7}\)—
draw.

5 a7 \(\text{a4}\) 6 \(\text{c7}\) \(\text{g6}\) 7 \(\text{xb2}\) \(\text{f6}\)
8 \(\text{b3}\) \(\text{a1}\) 9 \(\text{b4}\) \(\text{e6}\) 10 \(\text{b5}\)
\(\text{d6}\) 11 \(\text{c6+}\) \(\text{d5}\) 12 \(\text{a6}\) \(\text{b1}\+)
13 \(\text{a5}\) \(\text{c5}\) 14 \(\text{c6+}\)! and Black
could resign.

Ignorance of typical drawing mechanisms

Ivanchuk-Lautier
Horgen, 1996

1...\(\text{b2}\)?
Occupying the b2 square, which is needed for the king—correct is 1...\(\text{c2}\)! , and Black has no difficulties. Now, however, he lacks a tempo.

2 h5 a2 3 \(\text{g2}\) \(\text{c3}\) 4 \(\text{g3}\) \(\text{b3}\) 5
\(\text{f4}\) \(\text{b1}\) 6 \(\text{f5}\) a1=\(\text{w}\) 7 \(\text{xa1}\) \(\text{xa1}\) 8
\(\text{g6}\) \(\text{c4}\)

8...hxg6 9 fxg6 \(\text{c4}\) 10 \(\text{f2}\)! +- 9 \(\text{f6}\) hxg6 10 \(\text{f7}\)! Black resigned.
Typical Rook Endings

In the endings it is difficult to find anything new—everything has already been played. But among various positions resembling one another it is still possible to find great differences and great similarities at one and the same time.

Our attention was attracted to the ending from the game

Hübner-J. Polgár
Dortmund, 1996

Here Black resigned.

1...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f8}

After 1...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}b4} Hübner gave the following variation: 2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a6} (also winning is 2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g7} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}b6} 3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}e4} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a6} 4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}c7} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}d8} 5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}c5} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a4}+ 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}d5} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g4} 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}d6} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}xg5} 8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a5}+-) 2...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f7} 3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f6}+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g7} 4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}e6} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}b5} 5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f4} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a5} (5...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}b4}+ 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}e5} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}b5}+ 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}d6} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}xg5} 8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f7}+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g8} 9 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a7} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g1} 10 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a8}+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g7} 11 e7+-) 6 e7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a8} 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}e5} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a5}+ 8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}d6} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a6}+ 9 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}c5} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a5}+ 10 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}c6} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a8}

11 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f8}!! \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}xf8} 12 exf8=\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}w}+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}xf8} 13 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}d6} with a won pawn ending.

2 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}a6} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f7} 3 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f6}+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g7} 4 e6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}d1} 5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f7}+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g8} 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}e4} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g1} 7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f3} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}e1}+

After 7...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g7} 8 e7 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}e1} 9 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}e3} an easily winning pawn endgame is again reached: 9...\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}xe3}+ 10 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}xe3} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f7} 11 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}e4} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}e8}! 12 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}d5} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}d7} 13 e8=\textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}w}!, etc.

8 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}d5} \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g7} 9 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}f7}+ \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}g8} 10 \textit{\textcolor{red}{\texttt{\textbullet}}d6}, and Black wins.

This reminds me of a very similar endgame that I had a year earlier.

Barle-Mikhalchishin
Slovenia, 1995
There followed:
1...g4+ 2 hxg4 hxg4+ 3 e3
After 3 f2 b2+ 4 f1 arises a position which is very similar to the previous one, with the following variations: 4...e4 5 c4+ e3 6 c3+ d4 7 a3 b4 (7...c2?!) 8 f2 e4 9 a2 e3+ 9 e2 e4 10 c2 d4, again threatening a transfer to a winning pawn endgame.

3...b2 4 c8 g2 5 f8+ e6 6 e4
After 6 e8+ f6 7 f8+ e7 8 f5 e6 Black wins easily.
6...xg3 7 f8+ f6 8 xe5
White reckoned on 8...e3+? 9 xg7 9 a8 (9 f1 g6 10 xe5 f3 --) 9..f3 10 a6 f6, and then the black king goes to g6 and g5, winning.
9...f3 10 e8 g5 11 h8 f7 12 e3 g3 White resigned.

A similar endgame was analysed a very long time ago.

Filipov-Kopatsny
USSR, 1968

There followed:
1 e5?
If 1 b6 a5+ 2 d6 xg5 3 e5 g1 4 d7 (4 b7+ f8, and there is no win) 4 d1+ 5 d6 e1 6 e6
f6 obtaining a draw. Correct is 1 e5! e7+ 2 f4 a7 3 b6 c7 4 f6+ g7 5 e5 reaching an easily winning position, known from the previous examples.

1...d7!
The only chance—the threat was 2 e6, followed by e5, d5 and d7.
2 e4 d1 3 b7+ e6 4 b6+ e7!
To achieve a draw it is necessary to give up yet another pawn.
5 xg6 e1+ 6 f4 f1+ 7 g3 g1+!
In the game 7...e1 8 f6 e4 9 f4! was played, with a win.
8 f2 g4!.
And according to an analysis by M.Yudovich—it's a draw.

More complicated variations with the addition of the h-pawns are met in the game

Akopian-Almási
Ljubljana, 1995

There followed:
1...f4
Inferior is 1...h1, since after 2 a4 he cannot play 2...h2? 3 g1.
2 c2
After 2 g3 hxg3 3 hgx3 g4 4 e2 f5 5 g2 b3 6 f2 d3 7
\[ \text{\( g2 \) e3 the threat of \( d2 \) is unstoppable.} \]

2...\( \text{\( \text{\( g5 \)} \)} \]

On 2...\( \text{\( \text{\( h1 \)} \)} \) Almasi gave 3 \( \text{\( \text{\( g3+ \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( hxg3+ \)} \)} \) 4 \( \text{\( \text{\( hxg3+ \)} \)} \) 5 \( \text{\( \text{\( c5 \)} \)} \) (5 \( \text{\( \text{\( c4 \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( \text{\( h2+ \)} \)} \)} \) 6 \( \text{\( \text{\( g1 \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( \text{\( e2 \)} \)} \)} \) 7 \( \text{\( \text{\( e5 \)} \)} \) 8 \( \text{\( \text{\( h2 \)} \)} \) (8 \( \text{\( \text{\( \text{\( f2 \)} \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( \text{\( f3+ \)} \)} \)} \) 9 \( \text{\( \text{\( \text{\( e2 \)} \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( \text{\( f5! \)} \)} \)} \) -, but this position is not winning—for example, 8...\( \text{\( \text{\( e2+ \)} \)} \) 9 \( \text{\( \text{\( g1 \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( e3 \)} \)} \) 10 \( \text{\( \text{\( f1 \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( f2+ \)} \)} \) 11 \( \text{\( \text{\( g1 \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( f3 \)} \)} \) 12 \( \text{\( \text{\( \text{\( h2! \)} \)} \)} \]

3 \( \text{\( \text{\( c5+ \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( g4 \)} \) 4 \( \text{\( \text{\( c2 \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( b3! \)} \)} \)

Preventing \( g2-g3 \).

5 \( \text{\( \text{\( e1 \)} \) \( \text{\( h3 \)} \) 6 \( \text{\( \text{\( a2 \)} \)} \)

Weaker is 6 \( \text{\( \text{\( gxh3+ \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( \text{\( xh3! \)} \)} \)} \) -.

6...\( \text{\( \text{\( b1! \)} \) 7 \( \text{\( \text{\( f2 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( h1 \)} \)} \) 8 \( \text{\( \text{\( e2 \)} \)} \)

Bad is 8 \( \text{\( \text{\( a4 \)} \) \( \text{\( f4 \)} \) 9 \( \text{\( g3+ \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( f5! \)} \)} \) -.

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

But not 8...\( \text{\( \text{\( \text{\( xh2? \)} \)} \) 9 \( \text{\( \text{\( xe4+ \)} \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( f5 \)} \)} \)

because of 10 \( \text{\( \text{\( g3! \)} \)} \)

9 \( \text{\( \text{\( g3+ \)} \) 10 \( \text{\( \text{\( e3 \)} \) \( \text{\( c1 \)} \)} \)

There is nothing in 10...\( \text{\( \text{\( g1 \)} \) 11 \( \text{\( a2 \)} \) \( \text{\( g2 \)} \) 12 \( \text{\( a5+ \)} \) \( \text{\( f6 \)} \) 13 \( \text{\( xe4 \)} \)

\( \text{\( \text{\( \text{\( \text{\( xh2! \)} \)} \)} \) 14 \( \text{\( \text{\( f3 \)} \)} \)

11 \( \text{\( \text{\( a2 \)} \) \( \text{\( c3+ \)} \) 12 \( \text{\( \text{\( e2 \)} \) \( \text{\( d4 \)} \) 13 \( \text{\( d2+ \)} \) \( \text{\( e5 \)} \) 14 \( \text{\( a2 \)} \)

14...\( \text{\( \text{\( g4? \)} \)

After the correct 14...\( \text{\( \text{\( f5 \)} \) 15 \( \text{\( f2 \)} \)

\( \text{\( \text{\( g4 \)} \), it seems that there is an irresistible threat of \( d3 \), e3 and \( d2 \) transferring to a winning pawn ending—however the pawn ending is drawn, and, secondly, with the white king on \( e2 \) there is no other plan besides the sacrifice of the rook

on \( g3 \), which also, however, leads to a draw.

15 \( \text{\( \text{\( a5+ \)} \) 16 \( \text{\( a4+ \)} \) \( \text{\( c4 \)} \) 17 \( \text{\( xc4+! \)} \)

The transfer to a pawn ending is here the simplest way to a draw.

17...\( \text{\( \text{\( xe4 \)} \) 18 \( \text{\( e3 \)} \) \( \text{\( d5 \)} \) 19 \( \text{\( e2 \)} \)

\( \text{\( d4 \) 20 \( \text{\( d2 \)} \) e3+ \) 21 \( \text{\( e2 \)} \) \( \text{\( e4 \)} \) 21 \( \text{\( \text{\( c1 \)} \) \( \text{\( f3 \)} \) 22 \( \text{\( f1 \)} \) e2+ \) 23 \( \text{\( e1 \) with a draw.}

Both of the young grandmasters played rather inaccurately, and particularly White who allowed his opponent to advance with threats against the \( g \) and \( h \)-pawn. The right way to achieve counterplay had already been shown in old games.

\text{\textbf{Tiets-Forsberg}}

\textit{16th World corr.ch. 1985-91}

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

1...\( \text{\( \text{\( d5 \)} \) 2 \( \text{\( f6 \) e4+ \) 3 \( \text{\( e3 \) \( \text{\( b3+ \)} \) 4 \( \text{\( f2 \)} \) \( \text{\( \text{\( b2+ \)} \) 5 \( \text{\( f1 \)} \)

This passivity is forced, since after 5 \( \text{\( \text{\( g3 \)} \) h4+! \) 6 \( \text{\( h3 \) e3 \) the pawn cannot be stopped.

5...\( \text{\( \text{\( d4 \)} \) 6 \( \text{\( g6 \) \( \text{\( d3 \)} \)

After 6...\( \text{\( \text{\( e3? \)} \) 7 \( \text{\( g3+ \)} \) \( \text{\( d2 \)} \) 8 \( \text{\( f2! \)} \) \( \text{\( b8 \)} \) 9 \( \text{\( a3 \)} \) \( \text{\( f8+ \)} \) 10 \( \text{\( g3 \) e3 \) 11 \( \text{\( a2+ \) it is very difficult for the king to escape the checks.

7 \( \text{\( \text{\( d6+ \)} \) \( \text{\( e3 \)} \) 8 \( \text{\( d1 \) \( \text{\( f2+ \)} \) 9 \( \text{\( g1 \)} \)

\( \text{\( \text{\( d2 \)} \) 10 \( \text{\( \text{\( e1+ \)} \) \( \text{\( d3 \)} \) 11 \( \text{\( f1 \) e3 \) 12 \( \text{\( a1 \) \( \text{\( f2+ \)} \) 13 \( \text{\( g1 \) \( \text{\( b2 \)} \) 14 \( \text{\( f1 \)} \)

\( \text{\( d2 \) 15 \( \text{\( g3 \)} \)

Rook Endings 91
Here Black has several different plans:

(a) 15...\(\text{c}2\) 16 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{d}3\) 17 \(\text{a}3+\) \(\text{d}2\) (after 17...\(\text{e}4\) 18 \(\text{a}5\) \(\text{f}3\) 19 \(\text{f}5+\) \(\text{xg}3\) 20 \(\text{hxh}5\) with a draw)

18 \(\text{a}1\) \(\text{b}2\) 19 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{e}2\) 20 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{d}2\) 21 \(\text{g}4\) \(\text{d}3+\) 22 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{h}2\) 23 \(\text{a}3+\) and a draw was agreed.

(b) 15...\(\text{d}3\), and now

(b1) 16 \(\text{g}1\)? \(\text{e}4\) 17 \(\text{a}8\) \(\text{b}1+\)

18 \(\text{g}2\) e2 --;

(b2) 16 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{e}4\) 17 \(\text{a}8\) \(\text{f}3\) 18 \(\text{f}8+\) \(\text{xg}3\) 19 \(\text{e}8\) \(\text{f}2+\) 20 \(\text{e}1\)

\(\text{f}3\) 21 \(\text{f}8\) \(\text{g}2\) 22 \(\text{e}8\) \(\text{f}3\) 23 \(\text{h}4\), and the win is not easy;

(c) 16...\(\text{h}4\)!, and, for example, 17 \(\text{gxh}4\) \(\text{d}3\) 18 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{e}4\) 19 \(\text{h}5\) \(\text{b}8\)

20 \(\text{h}6\) \(\text{g}8+\) 21 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{f}3\) 22 \(\text{a}3!\),

and White maintains equality.

An analogous ending is ...

\begin{figure}
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\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chiburdanidze-galiamova}
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White defended in the following way:

1 \(\text{e}7\) \(\text{d}3\) 2 \(\text{g}4!\)

An attempt to create very quickly a passed pawn on the king's flank.

2...\(\text{d}8\)

After 2...\(\text{d}4\) 3 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{d}8\) 4 \(\text{a}7!\)

the position is analogous to the game.

3 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{f}8+\) 4 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{f}4\)

After 4...\(\text{e}2\) 5 \(\text{d}7+\) \(\text{e}1\) 6 \(\text{d}6\)

\(\text{f}2+\) 7 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{f}8\) 8 \(\text{h}3\) the threat to
take on \(\text{h}6\) saves White.

7 \(\text{a}7!\)

Transposing the game to a well known position with a rook attack from the long side.

5...\(\text{e}2\) 6 \(\text{a}2+\) \(\text{d}1\) 7 \(\text{a}1+\) Draw.

The correct plan of defence for this class of position was demonstrated in the game
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\section*{Chiburdanidze-Galliamova}

\textit{Groningen, 1997}
10 e6+ ♕f6!
Not 10...♕e7 11 ♗c7+ ♕f8 12 ♗c8+ ♕e7 13 ♗g8 +–.
11 g5+ ♕e7!
Again not 11...♕f5? 12 ♗c5+ ♕xe6 13 ♗c7 g6 14 ♗xh6 +– or 11...hxg5 12 hxg5 ♕e7 13 ♗g6 +–.
12 ♗c7+ ♕f8 13 ♗e8+ ♕e7 14 ♗c6
After 14 ♗g8 hxg5 15 hxg5 ♕xe6 16 ♗xg7+ ♕f8 draws.
14...♕f8 15 ♖b6 ♕e7 16 ♖b7+ ♕f8 17 ♖f7 ♔g8 18 ♕e7 ♕f8 19 g6 ♖xh6 gxh6!
Clearly not 19...♕xe7? 20 hxg7 ♕e5+ 21 ♕g4 +–.
20 ♕f7+ ♕e8 21 ♕e6 ♕e7 22 ♕xh6 ♕e5+! and a draw.

Trabattoni-Barlov
La Valetta, 1979

1...♖b7!
The main task is to drive off the rook from the sixth rank and cover the king against checks along the f-file. Then follow preparations for the advance of the e5 pawn.
2 ♖a6 ♖f7 3 ♖a5
Another possibility would have been 3 ♖a4 ♖f6! 4 ♖b4 ♖a6 5 ♖c4 e4! 6 ♖c5+ ♖g4 7 ♖g5+ ♖h3 8 ♖f1 ♖f6+ 9 ♕e2 ♖f3!, winning.
3...♖g4?!
An interesting plan, but better looks 3...♖f6 4 ♖b5 ♖a6 5 ♖c5 ♖e4! 6 ♖c4+ ♖d3 followed by ...♖f6 and the advance of the a5 pawn.
4 ♕g2 ♖d7 5 ♖xe5 ♖d2+ 6 ♕g1 ♘h3 7 ♖g5?
White sees a defensive idea, but his execution of it is inaccurate. After 7 ♖e6! ♖g2+ 8 ♕h1 ♖xg3 9 ♖xg6! Black can give up trying to win.
7...♖g2 8 ♕h1 ♕f2!! 9 ♕g1 ♖f6!
Now, however, it's zugzwang.
10 ♖a5 ♖f3 11 g4 ♖g3+ 12 ♕h1 ♖xg4 White resigned.

Bogoljubow-Rubinstein
London, 1922

Rubinstein is considered the 'king' of rook endings, but his play in the following ending leaves us profoundly bewildered.

1...g6?
Correct is 1...g5!, transposing to the position in Barle-Mikhalchishin.

2 ♖b8 ♖a2?
Clearly better is 2...♖a3+, gaining some tempi.

3 ♖f8 ♕g7 4 ♖e8 ♕f7 5 ♖b8 ♖h2
What is he doing? He can't take the pawn!
6 ♖c8 ♖a2 7 h4 ♖a7? 8 ♖f4 ♖f6 9 ♖f8+ ♕g7
And a draw was agreed. Rubinstein's worst endgame!
The fact that matters are not quite so simple is shown by the game

**Fischer-Geller**

**Curacao, 1962**

1 g5+?!

An extraordinarily crucial decision—it would be simpler to wait with 1 c7 or 1 b5.

1...hxg5 2 hxg5+ g6 3 e7 e3 4 f2?

Not to this side—it was necessary to exchange the g5 pawn for the e6 pawn and not stick the king’s head out. Therefore 4 h2! e5 5 h3 leads to a draw.

4...e5 5 f3 f5+ 6 e3

After 6 e4 f7! 7 xe6+ xg5 the win is easy.

6...e5 7 e4 xg5 8 e8?

Preferable is 8 a7! h5 9 a1 with the idea after 9 g2 to play 10 e5 g5 11 e4 though 11 g4 wins. The general idea to win with the g and e-pawns consists of giving up one pawn and transposing to a theoretically winning endgame.

8 g1! 9 f3 f1+ 10 g3 f5 11 b8 g5 12 e8 f6 13 f8+ e6 14 e8+ d5 15 a8 f7 16 g4 e7?

When the rook is placed behind, then-half the business is done.

16 a5+ e6 17 a6+ f7 18 f3 e6 19 a8 e4 20 e3 g5 21

**Ha1 g6 22 Hb1 He5 23 d4 Hf6 24 He1?**

Stronger was 24 f1+.

24...a5! 25 xe4?!

Again stronger is 25 f1.

25...f5! 26 e8 g4! 27 e3 g3!

And in this theoretical endgame White resigned.

The last game did not answer several questions of defending the endgame with the e and g-pawns. In modern chess there is one more very interesting example.

**Balashov-Ulibin**

**Uzhgorod, 1988**

1 f8

The preliminary 1 f2 does not threaten 2 e5 because of 2...a5 3 e4 f5.

1...a2+ 2 f3 a3+ 3 f2 a2+ 4 e3 a3+ 5 d4 a4+!

Not 5...xg3?? 6 e5+.

6 d5 a5+ 7 c6 a6+ 8 b5 a3! 9 f5+

On 9 e5 a3 10 e8 f5 11 g4+ xg4 12 c5 f5 draws.

9...g6! 10 g4 e3 11 e5 e4 12 c6 xg4 13 f6+ g7 14 d7 a4

A drawn ending is reached with the weaker side’s king on the kingside.
15 \( \text{Ec6} \) \( \text{Ec8} \) 16 \( \text{Ec8} \) \( \text{Ec7} \) 17 \( \text{Ec7} \) \( \text{Ec8}+ \) Drawn.

How many roads lead to Rome?

We have already repeatedly said that in the endgame there are usually two paths (moves)—right and wrong. But at times the number of paths is surprisingly greater and it is exceptionally difficult to find the right one.

Beliavsky-Azmaiparashvili
Portoroz, 1997

The black king has six(!) possible moves, but only one(!) leads to a draw.

(a) 1...\( \text{f6} \) (f4) loses because of 2 \( \text{Ec6} \) \( \text{Ec6} \) (he cannot draw by taking on f5) 3 \( \text{f6} \) winning easily;

(b) 1...\( \text{f2} \) 2 \( \text{Ec1} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 3 \( \text{a6} \) \( \text{f8} \) 4 \( \text{a7} \) \( \text{Ec3} \) (a very important moment to cut off the king) 5...\( \text{e2} \) 6 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{d2} \) 7 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{c2} \) 8 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{b2} \) 9 \( \text{Ec6} \) \( \text{b3} \) 10 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{b4} \) 11 \( \text{d6} \) (shouldering away the king and preparing to set up a mating net) 11...\( \text{f5} \) 12 \( \text{Ec1} \) \( \text{b6} \) 13 \( \text{b1+} \) \( \text{a6} \) 14 \( \text{c7} \) ! \( \text{xa7} \) 15 \( \text{c6} \), and White wins;

(c) 1...\( \text{d2} \) ? 2 \( \text{Ec5} \) \( \text{d3} \) 3 \( \text{a6} \) ! \( \text{xa6} \) 4 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{d4} \) 5 \( \text{Ec6} \), and Black resigned, the rook ending is easily winning and described in every book on rook endings;

(d) 1...\( \text{d3} \) ! (this was the only possible continuation) 2 \( \text{Ec1} \) (after 2 \( \text{Ec5} \) \( \text{d4} \) 3 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{c4} \) the rook is continually hounded) 2...\( \text{e2} \) 3 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{c3} \) 4 \( \text{a4} \) (there is nothing else) 4...\( \text{xf5} \) 5 \( \text{a6} \) \( \text{f8} \) 6 \( \text{a7} \) \( \text{Ec8} \) 7 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{d3} \) (similar to variation (b), but the cut-off king has proceeded one rank further which is of decisive significance) 8 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{c3} \) 9 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{b3} \) 10 \( \text{Ec1} \) \( \text{b4} \) 11 \( \text{Ec6} \) \( \text{c5} \)

(After 11...\( \text{b5} \) ? 12 \( \text{d6} \) a position is reached from variation (b), while exerting control over the d6 square is the key to evaluating the position) 12 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{b6} \) 13 \( \text{Ec1} \) \( \text{c5} \)! (the point) 14 \( \text{Ec7} \) \( \text{h8} \)!, and a theoretical draw has arisen.

Ward-Baburin
Isle of Man, 1997

Ward-Baburin
Isle of Man, 1997
White has an extra pawn but White's cut-off king plus the strong passed e4 pawn and centralised Black king means that it is only Black who can play for the win. Baburin assessed the position as winning for Black. Let's have a look.

(a) 1 \text{b}2 \text{c}7! 2 \text{b}3 \text{e}5 3 \text{c}2 \text{d}7! 4 \text{c}3 e3 5 \text{f}6 \text{e}4 6 \text{g}2 \text{c}7+ 7 \text{b}2 \text{f}7 8 \text{c}2 \text{x}f6 9 \text{g}3 (On 9 \text{d}1, 9...\text{d}3 is unpleasant. Instead, without the h2 pawn, White saves himself by means of the stalemate 10 \text{d}2=!) 9...\text{e}6+ 10 \text{b}2 \text{f}7 11 \text{h}4 \text{a}6 12 \text{c}1 \text{a}1+ 13 \text{b}2 \text{h}1 14 \text{h}5 \text{x}h5 15 \text{c}1+ \text{h}1+ 16 \text{b}2 \text{d}2 White resigned.

(b) 1 \text{f}6 \text{d}e5 2 \text{f}2 \text{f}7 3 \text{b}3 e3 4 \text{f}1 \text{e}4 5 \text{c}2 e2 6 \text{g}1 \text{e}3, and there is no apparent defence against \text{xf}7 or \text{f}2;

(c) 1 \text{b}2 \text{c}7 2 \text{b}5 e3 3 \text{b}3 (on 3 \text{f}6 there is 3...e2 4 \text{b}1 \text{a}7+, and an exchange of rooks) 3...\text{e}7 4 \text{d}3 (if 4 \text{f}6, then 4...e2!) 4...\text{c}5 5 \text{d}1 \text{c}4, and again there is the threat of 6...a2;

(d) 1 \text{h}4! (logical, it is necessary to urge the passed pawn on) 1...\text{e}5 2 \text{h}5 \text{x}f5 (after 2...\text{f}4 3 \text{h}6 e3 4 \text{h}2 \text{h}7 5 \text{f}6 \text{g}3 6 \text{f}7 Black cannot win) 3 \text{h}6 \text{h}7 4 \text{h}2 e3 (On 4...\text{g}6 there is 5 \text{h}4 e3 6 \text{e}4) 5 \text{b}2 \text{f}4 6 \text{c}2 \text{g}3 7 \text{h}5 e2 8 \text{d}2 \text{f}2 9 \text{h}2+ with a clear and uncomplicated draw.

Nevertheless material is material.

There was a wide choice for White in the following game.

Branicki-Šefc
Prague, 1955

Here there are several ideas for White to realise his enormous material advantage, but only one of them leads to its objective.

(a) 1 \text{a}6 \text{d}1 2 \text{g}4+ \text{f}6 3 \text{d}7 \text{g}7 4 \text{a}7 \text{f}6 5 \text{g}3 \text{e}5! (shouldering away the white king, now after 6 \text{d}8=\text{e}7 \text{f}7 \text{g}8 a well known draw is reached) 6 \text{f}3 \text{d}3+ 7 \text{e}2 \text{d}4 8 \text{e}3 \text{d}1 9 \text{b}7 \text{f}6! (on 9...\text{d}6 there is 10 \text{g}5 \text{f}5 11 \text{g}6!) 10 \text{e}4 \text{e}1+ and now after 11 \text{d}5 \text{d}1+ 12 \text{c}6 \text{e}7 there is no defence against 13...\text{d}6=!, capturing the d7 pawn. This is how the game went.

(b) 1 \text{g}4+ \text{g}6 2 \text{d}7 \text{g}7 3 \text{b}7 \text{g}6 4 \text{a}7 \text{h}6 5 \text{g}5+ \text{g}6 6 \text{g}4 \text{d}4+ 7 \text{f}3 \text{g}5, and a draw;

(c) 1 \text{d}7! \text{x}d7 2 \text{g}4+ \text{e}5 3 \text{g}5 and after 4 \text{f}6 a well known theoretically winning position is obtained.

And now a few examples on the theme of choosing the best continuation. The solutions are given at the end of the book.
How the “one-legged” Viktor Lvovich tested the youngsters in the endgame

Viktor Korchnoi’s play has always been characterised by the highest class and technique. Before the start of the Berne tournament and his match with Lucas Brunner, the veteran broke his foot and the organisers offered to postpone the match but to their greatest surprise the ‘patient’ had not even thought about refusing to play! From chess history it is a well-known paradoxical fact that grandmasters with broken limbs play very strongly! We mention just two examples—Jan Timman, with a broken foot, won brilliantly at the super-tournament in London 1983, while Alexander Beliavsky, with a broken hand, won the board one prize at the Thessaloniki Olympiad in 1984! Incidentally, both breakages were sustained playing football. It was rather unusual to see the active Korchnoi sitting motionless for all his games and only at the end with difficulty moving away on crutches. But he played splendidly, gaining particular success in a couple of rook endings.

Brunner-Korchnoi

Berne, 1996
There followed 1 d2?
Correct was 1 d7 f6 2 g1 e2 3 h3, and it is difficult for Black to carry out his plan.
1...h7 2 g2?
Here it was still not too late to return to 2 d7!.
2...g6 3 fxg6+?
The last chance was 3 f6 g5 4 f3 a4 5 e2 g4+ 6 f2 e4 7 f2+ and 8 f4 with some chances of holding the game. Now a 3:2 endgame is reached, which it seems is practically winning for Black.
3...xg6!
This is stronger than taking with the pawn, since the passed e5 pawn must be supported by the f-pawn.
4 a2 h5!
Threatening to create a weakness on g3 for White after h5-h4.
5 h4 b4 6 a8 b2+ 7 f3
After 7 h3...

is obtained practically an identical copy of the famous game, Smyslov-Gligoric, Warsaw 1947, (only with White to move and the black pawn on e4). There the very instructive continuation was 8 e8 e2 9 e7 f5 10 e6+ g7 11 a6 (If 11 e7+, then 11...f6 12 h7 g6 13 a7 f2 --) 11...f2 12 e6 f7 13 xe5 f6 14 e8 d2! (zugzwang) 15 f8+ (after 15 h8 e3 16 e8+ e2 17 e3 follows 17...f4! 18 gxf4 d3!) 15...e5 16 e8+ d4 17 d8+ e3 18 f8 f2! 19 xf5+ g1, and White cannot defend against mate.

Well, now we return to the game.
7...f5 8 h8
If 8 a3, then 8 d2! (with the threat of 9 d3+! 10 xd3 e4+ 11 e3 xd3 12 xd3 g4) 9 e3 d4 10 a6 b4 11 f3 b3+ 12 f2 e4 with the unpleasant threat of...f5-g4
8...e4+ 9 e3 b3+ 10 f2 g4 11 g8+ h3!

Usually such an approach of the king leads to a decisive outcome.
12 g5
There were rather more chances remaining with the preliminary 12 g7, when Black can choose between 12...f5 and 12...f3+ 13 e2 xg3 14 xf7 xh4.
12...f3+ 13 e2 f6! 14 g6
On 14 xh5 Korchnoi intended to play 14...xg3 15 h6 g4 16 h5 f5 17 h8 g5 18 h6 g6 19 h7 h3, obtaining two connected pawns.
14...f5 15 g5 g2 16 e1 f2!
17 g8
If 17 d1, then 17...f1! and e4-e3-e2.
17...e3 18 g7
Or 18 \textit{g}5 f4 19 gxf4+ \textit{f}3 20 \textit{g}1 \textit{e}2+ 21 \textit{d}1 \textit{a}2 22 \textit{f}1 \textit{e}4 23 \textit{g}1 \textit{d}3 –+.  
18...f4! 19 gxf4 \textit{f}3 20 \textit{c}7 
For 20 \textit{g}1 see above. 
20...\textit{a}2 White resigned.

Korchnoi-Kengis  
Berne Cup, 1996

At first sight the endgame looks completely drawn—only the passed a-pawn is potentially stronger than the passed c-pawn. Now Black can calmly transfer his king to d6, but he decides to display activity on the king's flank, since White obviously intends to move his king over to the a3 pawn. 

1...g5 2 hxg5 hxg5 3 \textit{f}3 \textit{a}4 
It is always useful to cut off the enemy king.  
4 \textit{e}2 \textit{g}7  
Again it is worth trying to go to d6, though here White can prevent this by 4...\textit{f}8 5 \textit{e}3 while on 5...\textit{d}4 6 \textit{d}3 \textit{c}4 7 \textit{d}2 \textit{e}7 8 \textit{c}3 \textit{a}4.  
5 \textit{c}3 f6(?) 
The authors would prefer 5...c5!? 6 \textit{d}2 \textit{f}6 7 \textit{c}2 c4 8 \textit{b}2 \textit{e}5 =, but Kengis probably feared 6 \textit{xc}5.  
6 \textit{d}2 c5?!  
Again preferable is 6...\textit{f}7 7 \textit{c}2 (7 \textit{e}3 f5 8 \textit{c}2 f4 =) 7...\textit{e}7 8 \textit{b}3 \textit{a}6 9 a4 \textit{d}6.  

7 \textit{c}2 c4?!  
The question is where is the pawn best placed—on c4 or on c5.  
We throw in the variation 7...\textit{f}7 8 \textit{b}3 \textit{a}5 9 \textit{e}3 f5 10 \textit{c}4 \textit{f}6 11 \textit{d}5 f4 12 \textit{g}xf4 \textit{g}xf4 13 \textit{c}3 \textit{f}5 14 \textit{f}3 \textit{g}5 15 \textit{c}6 \textit{h}4 16 \textit{b}6 \textit{a}8 17 \textit{xc}5 \textit{g}3, and White should not win.  
8 \textit{d}2  

8...\textit{g}6?!  
After 8...\textit{f}7 9 \textit{e}3 \textit{e}6 10 \textit{d}4 \textit{d}6 11 g4 (11 \textit{f}3 c3!=) 11...\textit{e}6 12 \textit{c}5 \textit{e}5 13 \textit{b}5 \textit{a}8 14 a4 \textit{d}5 Black has his own counter-chances.  
9 \textit{e}3 \textit{f}5 10 \textit{d}4 \textit{g}4 11 \textit{c}5! \textit{h}3?!  
It is not quite clear where to go with the black king. Better looks 11...\textit{a}8 12 \textit{xc}4 f5 13 \textit{b}3 \textit{b}8+ 14 \textit{a}2 \textit{e}8 15 \textit{c}2 \textit{a}8, and it is very difficult for White to find a winning plan.  
12 \textit{b}5 \textit{a}8 13 a4! \textit{g}2?  
After 13...f5! 14 a5 \textit{b}8+ 15 \textit{xc}4 \textit{b}2 16 a6 \textit{xf}2 17 \textit{a}3 \textit{c}2+ and 18...\textit{c}8 Black holds the draw.  
If 15 \textit{c}6, then 15...\textit{b}2 16 a6 \textit{a}2! 17 \textit{b}7 \textit{xf}2 18 \textit{a}3 \textit{b}2+ 19 \textit{c}6 c3 20 \textit{a}1 c2 21 a7 \textit{b}1.  
14 f4! \textit{h}3 15 fxg5 fxg5 16 a5 g4 17 a6 \textit{h}2 18 \textit{a}3 \textit{h}3 19 \textit{xc}4 \textit{c}8+ 20 \textit{b}5 \textit{b}8+ 21 \textit{c}6 \textit{c}8+
22 \( \textcolor{blue}{b7} \textcolor{black}{h8} \) 23 a7 \( \textcolor{black}{h7}+ \) 24 \( \textcolor{blue}{b6} \) \( \textcolor{black}{h8} \)

It looks like Black has defended himself—White cannot queen since then a drawn ending arises because of the distant white king. However Korchnoi finds a path to victory.

25 \( \textcolor{blue}{c6} \textcolor{black}{f8} \) 26 \( \textcolor{blue}{b3}! \textcolor{black}{f6}+ \) 27 \( \textcolor{blue}{b5} \textcolor{black}{f8} \) 28 \( \textcolor{blue}{a5} \textcolor{black}{a8} \) 29 \( \textcolor{blue}{a6} \textcolor{black}{f8} \) 30 \( \textcolor{blue}{b8} \textcolor{black}{f1} \) 31 a8=\( \textcolor{blue}{w} \) \( \textcolor{black}{a1}+ \) 32 \( \textcolor{blue}{b5} \) \( \textcolor{black}{xa8} \) 33 \( \textcolor{black}{xa8} \) \( \textcolor{blue}{xg3} \) 34 \( \textcolor{blue}{c4} \) Black resigned.

The young grandmasters made a surprising number of mistakes as Korchnoi demonstrated by clear-cut play.
Exercises: Rook Endings

1. Demonstrate the correct plan of defence for Black.

2. What is correct: 1... $f4$ or 1...$a4$ ?

3. What is correct: 1...$g4$ or 1...$a4$ ?

4. Evaluate the position and find the right plan of defence for Black.
5. Find the right method of defence for White.

6. What is correct: 1. c6 or 1. c6?

7. Find the right plan for White to realise his advantage.

8. Find an accurate order of moves for White.

9. Find the right continuation for Black.

10. Find the right continuation for White.
11 What plan should White choose?

12 How should White conduct the defence?

13 What continuation should White choose?

14 Choose the correct continuation for Black.

15 Find the right continuation for White.

16 What is correct: 1 d5 or 1 d1?
What is the best way for White to achieve a draw?

How does White win? What is White's winning plan with an exactly calculated variation?

What is correct: 1...\texttt{Axh4} or 1...\texttt{g1+}?

How does Black defend?
White to play and win.

What is correct: 1...a8=\(\text{=}\) or 1...\(b7\)?

What is correct: 1...\(e3\) or 1...\(xf3\)?

White to move. How does he win?

What is correct: 1...\(e3\) or 1...\(h3\)?

What is the winning move: 1...\(g2\) or 1...\(a1\)?
106 Rook Endings

29

How does Black win?

31

Can Black save the game?

30

How does White win: 1 h6 or 1 @g4?

32

Can White make a draw?

33

What must Black do to draw?

34

What gives chances of a win: a) 1 @xa4 or b) 1 d7?
Threatened by 1...\text{g}3, how can White make a draw? Calculate the variations.

How can Black make a draw?

White to play and win.

Where is the clear draw for Black?

How does Black make a draw?

How did Black play?
How does White win the game?  Can Black make a draw?

Point out a winning plan for Black.
4 Shouldering: the struggle of the kings

A reciprocal attack by a piece is not usually restricted by either time or, more so, by space. However, when we find ourselves talking about kings then the situation is cardinally changed—the king can neither attack, nor, more so, capture the enemy king. Every king creates around itself some strong squares in which can enter any enemy piece, except the king, of course—this feature makes its biggest impression in pawn endings.

Manukovsky-Pustovalov
Rosija, 1992

1...\textit{\texttt{f}4}!
Only so. 1...\textit{\texttt{x}f}3 2 \textit{\texttt{f}5} leads to a draw.
After the text \textbf{Black resigned}.
The mixture of shouldering and zugzwang is indeed deadly.

Or yet another classic study by Maizelis.
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Also possible is double shouldering.

Zinar
1984

1 \textit{\texttt{e}6}! \textit{\texttt{c}3} 2 \textit{\texttt{d}5}! \textit{\texttt{b}4} 3 \textit{\texttt{c}6} \textit{\texttt{a}5} 4 \textit{\texttt{b}7} wins.
However, it is possible to define shouldering, particularly in pawn endings, as a form of zugzwang.

Mikhalchishin-Azmajparashvili  
Tbilisi, 1980

It is obvious that White is struggling for the draw, and the question is whether Black’s king will succeed in getting back. There followed

1.\texttt{xf7} a1=\texttt{w} 2.\texttt{xal} \texttt{xal} 3.\texttt{f5}!  
It is dangerous to advance the other pawn. 3.\texttt{b5} \texttt{c4} 4.\texttt{b6} \texttt{d5} 5.\texttt{b7} \texttt{b1}, and White has problems.

3.\texttt{c4}!  
If 3...\texttt{xb4}, then 4.\texttt{f6} \texttt{c5} 5.\texttt{g7}, and there is no defence against f6-f7.

4.\texttt{e6}!  
Here is the shouldering—king against king, shoulder to shoulder. There is nothing else—if 4.\texttt{f6}, then 4...\texttt{d5} 5.\texttt{g7} \texttt{e6} 6.\texttt{f7} \texttt{a7} etc.

4...\texttt{e1}+  
If 4...\texttt{a6}+, then 5.\texttt{e5!}—the king goes to the other side, but the main thing is not to allow in the enemy king.

5.\texttt{d6}! \texttt{f1} 6.\texttt{e6} \texttt{e1}+ and he had to agree a draw.

This idea was expressed simply brilliantly in one study.

### L.Mitrofanov

1.\texttt{d7}!  
Bad is 1.\texttt{f7}+ \texttt{e4}! 2.\texttt{e7}+ \texttt{d5} 3.\texttt{d7}+ \texttt{e6} 4.\texttt{d8} \texttt{c5}+ and 5...\texttt{d5}.

1...\texttt{e4} 2.\texttt{g4}!  
The only move—if 2.\texttt{g6}, then 2...\texttt{c6}+ 3.\texttt{g7} \texttt{c7} with a win.

2...\texttt{c4}! 2.\texttt{xzd2} \texttt{e3}+ 4.\texttt{g5} \texttt{xd2} 5.\texttt{h4} \texttt{e3} 6.\texttt{h5} \texttt{c5}+ 7.\texttt{g4}!!  
This move was made before, but nearer to the opponent’s king it secures a draw, while the ‘more active’ 7.\texttt{g6} loses because of 7...\texttt{f4} 8.\texttt{h6} \texttt{c6}+ 9.\texttt{g7} \texttt{g5} 10.\texttt{h7} \texttt{c7}+ 11.\texttt{g8} \texttt{g6} 12.\texttt{h8=}:\texttt{zh} \texttt{f6}.

Sometimes even the greats make mistakes in the endgame.

### Alekhine-Bogoljubow  
World Championship (m) 1929
1...\(\text{g4??}\)
Forgetting about the shouldering.
1...\(\text{e4}\) 2 \(\text{b7}\) f5 3 b8=\(\text{\textregistered}\) \(\text{xb8}\) 4
\(\text{xb8}\) f4 5 d8+ d3 6 f8 e3 7 d5 f3 would draw.

\[\begin{align*}
2 & \text{b7 f5} \ 3 \text{ b8=\(\text{\textregistered}\)} \text{xb8} \ 4 \text{xb8 f4} \\
5 & \text{d5 f3} \ 6 \text{d4 f2} \ 7 \text{f8 g3} \ 8 \text e3 \text{ and Black resigned.}
\end{align*}\]
5 Complex Endings

Playing to exploit a pawn majority on the flank

One of the most important factors in the endgame is the possibility of creating a passed pawn—and in the majority of cases this is formed from a majority, i.e. from a pawn advantage of two against one or three pawns against two. From this follows that the majority is the precursor of forming a passed pawn and in itself is an important positional factor in the endgame. The fewer the pieces, the more important this factor, and the greater the role it plays in the position.

Playing to exploit the passed pawn in the endgame is the most extreme case of the majority.

Portisch-Ribli  
Skelleftea, 1989

1 \textit{\textcolor{red}{w}d1} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{c}c7} 2 \textit{g3} h5 3 h4+ b4 4 \textit{w}d7! a5 5 \textit{h}h2 f6 6 \textit{d}d4 \textit{e}e4 7 \textit{xf6}! \textit{\textcolor{red}{x}g3}+ 8 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{x}g3} gxf6 9 c6 \textit{w}e5+ 10 \textit{f}f3 f5 11 \textit{f}f7 12 \textit{b}b7+ Black resigned.

A classical example.

Botvinnik-Rabinovich  
Leningrad, 1934

The presence of open lines and White’s pawn advantage on the queen’s flank determines his superiority. Among his tasks now is to create a passed pawn.

1 a3 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{b}b7} 2 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{b}b2} \textit{\textcolor{red}{g}g6} 3 b4 \textit{\textcolor{red}{f}f8} 4 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{f}f2} \textit{\textcolor{red}{e}e7} 5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{e}e3} \textit{\textcolor{red}{d}d7} 6 \textit{\textcolor{red}{e}e2} \textit{\textcolor{blue}{c}c7} 7 \textit{b}b5 \textit{\textcolor{red}{b}b8}

After 7...a6 8 a4 axb5 9 axb5 White controls the a-file and invades the opponent’s camp.

8 a4 f6
8...\textit{\textcolor{blue}{b}b6} follows 9 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{d}d2}.
9 a5
More accurate is 9 f4!.
9...e5 10 \textit{\textcolor{blue}{d}d2} \textit{\textcolor{red}{f}f7} 11 f4! exf4+ 12 \textit{\textcolor{red}{x}f4} \textit{\textcolor{red}{e}e8} 13 \textit{\textcolor{red}{f}f3} \textit{\textcolor{red}{e}e6}
After 13...\( \text{bxc4} \) winning is 14 \( \text{cxe5}+ \text{b8} \) 16 \text{c6} \text{dxc6} 17 \text{c1} \text{c1} with the idea of \text{e1}.

14 \text{c6} g5+ 15 \text{f3} \text{f8} 16 \text{d5} \text{d8} 17 \text{e3} \text{c8}

The pawn ending is hopeless.

18 \text{a}2 \text{b}7 19 \text{d}2 \text{e}8+

On 19...\text{c8} follows 20 \text{d3} with the sequel \text{e}3-\text{d}2-\text{c}3, \text{h}3-\text{h}xg5, a5-a6, \text{d}3-\text{h}3.

20 \text{f}2 \text{d}8 21 g4 \text{c}8 22 \text{d}3 \text{f}8 23 \text{e}3 \text{f}5 24 \text{gxf5} \text{xf5}+ 25 \text{g}3

White's position is winning due to the threats \text{b}5-\text{b}6, a5-a6.

Botvinnik-Kan

USSR, 1955

From what we have said before it follows that White needs to exchange as many pieces as possible. And he sets about realising this plan.

1 \text{d}4! \text{f}5 2 \text{e}2! \text{g}5 3 \text{xe}4 \text{xe}4 4 \text{d}2 \text{xd}2 5 \text{xd}2!

The king must head towards the majority.

5...\text{h}6 6 e4 \text{f}4+ 7 \text{e}1 \text{f}xe4 8 \text{xe}4 c5 9 \text{c}3 a4??!

Stronger is 9...\text{a}6.

10 \text{b}xa4 \text{b}6 11 \text{e}2 \text{d}7

On 11...\text{b}1 would have followed 12 \text{e}5.

12 \text{d}3 \text{b}1 13 \text{e}1 \text{b}6 14 \text{c}2!

Now White needs to defend the b1 square.

14...\text{ad}6 15 \text{e}4 \text{b}6 16 a3!

It is better to give up the pawn on the third rank—prophylaxis!

16...\text{g}6 17 a5! \text{g}8

There is no saving himself by 17...\text{bxa5} 18 \text{xa5} \text{a}6 19 \text{d}2 \text{xd}2 20 \text{xd}2 \text{xa3}(!) 21 \text{e}5 with a decisive advantage for White. The rest is forced.

18 a4! \text{f}8 19 \text{e}2 \text{bxa5} 20 \text{d}3 \text{d}8 21 \text{e}4 \text{c}6+ 22 \text{e}2 \text{b}6 23 \text{e}1! \text{c}1 24 g3 \text{h}xg3 25 \text{fxg3} \text{h}8

26 h4 \text{gxh4} 27 \text{gxh4} \text{b}2 28 \text{d}2 \text{d}4 29 \text{f}3 \text{b}2 30 \text{g}5 \text{f}8+ 31 \text{f}4 \text{g}8 32 \text{f}5 \text{d}4 33 \text{h}5 \text{e}6 34 \text{h}6 \text{d}7 35 \text{g}4 \text{e}6 36 \text{f}4 \text{b}8 37 \text{e}4+! \text{f}7 38 \text{e}7+ \text{g}8 39 \text{f}5 with a win.

Vukić-Pietzsch

Sarajevo, 1967
to exchange off, thus increasing the significance of the majority factor.

10 \( \text{d4 f6 11 f4 e7 12 b4 b6 13} \)
\( \text{d3 c8 14 c3 e5 15 fxe5 fxe5} \)
16 \( \text{d5 e6 17 a4 a6} \)
17...\( \text{f8?!} \) would create more problems for White.

18 a5 b5 19 c5!! \( \text{xc5 20 bxc5} \)
\( \text{e5 15 fxe5 fxe5} \)
16 \( \text{d5 e6 17 a4 a6} \)

And here it was still not too late to escape with a draw by 20...b4+! 21 \( \text{xb4 d7=}. \)

21 cxb5 axb5 22 h4! Black resigned.

\( \text{Martinović-Yudasin} \)
\( \text{Krynica, 1998} \)

Whose majority is better—White’s or Black’s? After 1 \( \text{e2 d6 2 d3 e4+} \) problems with the b3 pawn appear for White. Best was 1 \( \text{f4 d6 2 f3} \) with equality. In the game, however, there followed

1 g4?
He should only play on his weak flank when it is possible to create weaknesses for his opponent.

1...\( \text{d6 2 gxf5+ gxf5 3 c5 bxc5 4 bxc5 b5 5 c6 f4 6 c2 d6 7} \)
\( \text{e2 xc6 8 d3 d5} \)

And Black has a winning endgame.

1 f5!
The d4 pawn is well blockaded and White has a serious advantage on the king’s flank.

1...\( \text{f8?} \)
Correct is 1...\( \text{e8 2 h4 xe2 3} \)
\( \text{xex2 d6 4 h5 e5!}, \) defending the black king.

2 h4 \( \text{e8 3 h5 xe2 4 xe2 d5} \)
Better is 4...\( \text{d6 5 f6 gxf6 6 gxf6} \)
\( \text{e5 7 h6+ g8 8 g7!} \) with the idea h5-h6-h7.

5 f6 gxf6 6 gxf6 \( \text{g8 7 h6 b4 8} \)
\( \text{b3! e6 9 f3 d5 10 f2 axb3} \)
11 axb3 \( \text{xb3 12 g7 f8 13 h6} \)
with a winning position for White.

\( \text{Georgiev-Khalifman} \)
\( \text{Pardubice, 1994} \)

\( \text{Kovacević-Tosić} \)
\( \text{Belgrade, 1998} \)
Against doubled pawns, the natural strategy is to exploit the majority on the other flank.

1 h3! a4 2 f3 d7 3 xd7 xd7 4 g4 hxg4 5 hxg4 b5 6 b3!
Black cannot create a passed pawn.

6...axb3 7 axb3 e8 8 h4
Preparing f4-f5.

8...f7 9 e4 g5 10 f3 xf4 11 xf4 f8 12 d2 h8 13 g5 f7 14 h6! g6 15 f3 f4 16 h7 c6 17 g5+ e7 18 e4 c4 19 bxc4 d3 20 g5 Black resigned.

Psakhis-Bonsch
Trnava, 1988

1 f1!
The main trump in White’s position is the pawn majority on the queen’s flank. Psakhis exploits this advantage very instructively.

1...c8 2 e2 d7 3 d1! f8 4 c2 g6 5 c3 g7 6 a3! f8 7 b4 cxb4 8 axb4 b6 9 b3!
White has in effect an extra piece: his king actively supports the pawns on the queen’s flank.

9...e8 10 b2 d7 11 d4 c8 12 e3 e7 13 a8! c6
Black is forced to exchange queens and the remainder becomes a matter of technique.

14 xc6 xc6 15 d3 g7 16 a4! f8

On 16...xe5 decisive is 17 xe5 xe5 18 a5, and if 16...xe5, then 17 b5 axb5 18 cxb5 d4 19 bxc6.

17 c5+ e8 18 d6 f6 19 xf6 xf6 20 c5 e5 21 xa6 e4 22 b5 e5 23 c5 d4 24 xd4! xd4 25 b3 d7 26 c5 h5 27 g4 hxg4 28 hxg4 g5 29 c4 e3 30 d3 and Black resigned.

If 30...e6 winning is 31 b6!; while on 30...c8—31 c6 b6 32 b4 and 33 d5.

The following game serves as an example of a bad majority (i.e. a case when the majority can become an object of undermining and attack).

Kan-Keres
Moscow, 1952

1 a5!
Trying to create a weakness.

2 xd8 xd8 3 d1 d5 4 d5+ xd5 5 c4?
Creating a bad majority.

5...e4 6 xd8 xd8 7 d1 c7 8 f1 d6 9 f4 e5 10 g3 b1 11 a4 exf4 12 gxf4 e6 13... f2 f5 14 e3 h5! 15 f3
If 15 h4 e4!, zugzwang.

15...h4! 16 e3 e6 17 g4+
If 17 f3 f5 18 g2 f6 19 h2 e4! and Black has a decisive advantage.
White has a pawn majority on the queen’s flank, therefore he can boldly improve the positions of his pieces which only increases his positional advantage.

1 c4! ∆xg2 2 ∆xd7 ∆xd7 3 ∆xd7 ∆xd7 4 ∆xg2 ∆c6+ 5 ∆g1 f5 6 ∆b6!! ∆e4 7 b4 e5 8 b5 f4 9 gxf4 exf4 10 bxa6 bxa6 11 ∆xax6 ∆e1+ 12 ∆g2 and White has a decisive advantage.

Hübner-Spassky
Candidates (m), 1985

White’s extra pawn on the king’s flank proves a decisive factor.

Mutual Majorities

Each side has his majority, and the main problem is how to limit mobility from the opponent’s side.

With level pawns, if one of the rivals has a majority on one flank,
then for the other it is the opposite—this is a fact. But often it will happen that one majority is better than the other, then we speak of a qualitative majority.

Karpov-Yusupov
Dortmund, 1997

1 \( \diamondsuit c4! \)
It is necessary to keep in his sights the opponent’s weaknesses—White’s plan consists of an exchange of queens and advance of pawns on the king’s flank.

1...\( \diamondsuit d7 \) 2 \( b3 \) \( f5 \) 3 \( \diamondsuit f1 \)
Also good is 3 \( g4 \) \( g6 \) (3...\( \text{fxg4} \) 4 \( \text{hxg4} \) \( \text{wxf3} \) 5 \( \text{wxf5} \) 4 \( \text{gxf5} \) \( \text{gxg5} \) 5 \( \text{wxc3} \)±.

3...\( \text{g7} \) 4 \( f3 \) \( \text{e7} \) 5 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{e6} \) 6 \( \text{wxc3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 7 \( \text{f2}? \)
The king will be needed on the other side.

7...\( \text{d7} \) 8 \( g4 \) \( \text{c6}?! \)
Better really is 8...\( \text{fxg4} \) 9 \( \text{hxg4} \)±.

9 \( \text{e5}! \)
Now the knight ending is hopeless.

9...\( \text{xe5} \) 10 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{d5} \) 11 \( \text{c4} \)
fxg4 12 \( \text{xb6}?! \) \( \text{xc6} \) 13 \( \text{c4} \) gxf3 14 \( \text{xa5} \) \( \text{d5} \) 15 \( \text{fxf3} \) g5 16 \( \text{c4} \)
h5 17 \( \text{d2}?! \) \( \text{xe5} \) 18 e4 \( \text{e8} \) 19 \( \text{e3} \)
\( \text{d7} \) 20 \( \text{c4} + \) \( \text{f6} \) 21 \( \text{f2}?! \) \( \text{a6} \) 22 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{b4} \) 23 h4! \( \text{c6} \) 24 a5 \( \text{b4} \) 25 \( \text{d2}?! ±.

Yates-Alekhine
The Hague, 1921

A classical position—White loses it without a struggle.

1 \( g3? \)
Incorrect prophylaxis!

1...\( \text{f7} \) 2 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{f6} \) 3 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{e8}!! \)
A terrible move. For Black the bishop is more important—so it will stand firm on the c8 square.

4 \( a4? \)
Here it is worth playing 4 \( f4?! \) \( \text{exf3} \) 5 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{d2}± \) 6 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{h2} \) 7 \( b5 \) with counterplay.

4...\( \text{g5} \) 5 \( b5 \) \( f4 \) 6 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{d2} \) 7 \( \text{gxf4} \)
\( \text{gxg4} \) 8 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{b2} \) 9 \( \text{e2} \)

After 9 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{g4} \) 10 \( \text{d6} + \) \( \text{e7} \)
11 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{f3} \) 12 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{b1} + \) 13 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{e3} +! \) 14 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d1} + \) 15 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{xd4} \)
16 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{xd5} - + \).

9...\( \text{e5} \) 10 \( c6 \) \( \text{bxc6} \) 11 \( \text{e6} \) 12 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{b1} \) 13 \( \text{c5} + \) \( \text{d4} \) 14 \( \text{c2} \)
e3 15 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f3} \) 16 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{g4} \) 17 \( \text{d6} + \) \( \text{e5} \) 18 \( h3 \) \( \text{h5} \) ! White resigned.

But correct prophylaxis was possible:

(a) 1 \( f4 \)! (intending \( \text{g1-f2-e3} \))
\( \text{d2} \) 2 \( c5 \) \( \text{f7} \) 3 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 4 \( \text{xc4} \)
\( \text{e6} \) 5 \( b5 \) \( \text{d5} \) 6 \( c6 \) \( \text{bxc6} \) 7 \( \text{bxc6} = \);

(b) 1 \( f3 \)! (to create a weakness on e4) 1...\( \text{e3} \) 2 \( f4 \)!
\( \text{d4} \) 3 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 4 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{c4} \) 5 \( \text{xc4} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 6 \( e7 \) with a drawn ending.
1 g4!
Advancing on the other side—but here it is important to force back and restrict the black pieces.
1...a6 2 g5 e8 3 a4 a7 4 h4 b7
Better is 4...f8!?
5 d3
Now it is important to control the d-file.
5...c5 6 d1 d7 7 ed1!
Tactics. If 7...e5 there is 8 f5±.
7...g6 8 e2!
Typical.
8...xd3 9 xd3 b5 10 cxb5 axb5 11 d7 f8 12 a5 c6 13 b7 b4 14 b8 c5 15 g3 Black resigned.

A classic example of exploitation of a pawn superiority on the queen’s flank is presented by the following position from a modern tournament.

Here Black has a pawn superiority on the queen’s flank, typical for the Grünfeld Defence, and therefore White should keep as many pieces as possible so as to maintain the tension.
11 \( \text{a}a1 \)

Other moves are also no help: 11 \( \text{wb}3 \text{c}xa2! \) or 11 a3 \( \text{a}a4 \).

11...a5 12 \( \text{wb}3 \text{xb}3 13 \text{AXB}3 \text{g}5 14 \text{g}3 \text{a}4 \)！

In complicated endings are usually to be found complicated plans (many stages), various pieces and asymmetrical formations. Therefore it is necessary to penetrate deeply into the position, taking care over the exchange of pieces.

**Balashov-Korchnoi**

_USSR (ch), 1969_

\[
\begin{array}{c}
11 \text{xb}3 \\
11 \text{g}3 \\
11 \text{a}4
\end{array}
\]

White seems to have a very centralised position and a solid pawn formation, but Korchnoi begins to undermine the white structure.

1...\( \text{f}8 \)！2 \( \text{d}2 \text{f}6 3 \text{f}1 \)

White wants to exchange rooks to neutralise the pressure.

3...\( \text{d}8 \)！4 \( \text{f}2 \text{c}7 \)

Increasing the pressure on the centre—improving the position of the bishop.

5 \( \text{f}1 \text{b}6! 6 \text{d}2 \text{xe}5 7 \text{xe}5 \text{f}7 8 \text{e}2 \text{d}6 9 \text{c}3 \text{c}4+! 10 \text{e}1 \text{xf}1! \)

A surprising exchange of the strong bishop, but now it is more important to create a passed pawn.

11 \( \text{xf}1 \text{e}5 12 \text{g}2 \text{e}4! \)

Not 12...\text{exf}4 because of 13 \( \text{f}2 \).

13 \( \text{e}2 \text{d}5 14 \text{e}5 \text{c}7! \)

An exchange of strong pieces.

15 \( \text{xe}7 \text{xe}7 \)

But now the weakness of the b2 and g3 pawns is felt.

16 \( \text{f}1 \text{b}7 17 \text{c}3 \text{b}5! 18 \text{c}4 \text{c}4 19 \text{e}2 \text{b}3! 20 \text{e}3 \text{d}4+! \)

A blow!

21 \( \text{xe}4 \text{dx}c3 22 \text{bc}3 \text{xa}3 23 \text{g}4 \text{hx}g4 24 \text{g}2 \text{b}3! \text{White resigned.} \)

**Mikhailchishin-Beliavsky**

_Moscow, 1981_

\[
1 \text{c}5! \text{d}5
\]

If 1...\( \text{d}2 \), then 2 \( \text{f}! \text{xa}2 3 \text{xe}6 \text{fx}e6 4 \text{xc}4 \) with material advantage.

2 \( \text{f}3 \text{e}8 3 \text{a}4 \text{e}6 4 \text{e}4 \)

White’s cunning manoeuvre has cut off Black’s play along the d-file and restricted Black’s setup with an ideal structure f3-e4. Only now does his king make an appearance in the centre.

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

The knight is best placed on a blockading square.
6...f5 7 e3 fxe4 8 fxe4 f8 9 b1!

Now he has time to improve the position of his rook—the threat is b1-b5-a5.

9...d7 10 d4 e7 11 b4 d8

If 11...d6, then 12 e5+ e7 13 a4!, taking from the knight its last good outpost on b6.

12 xc4! h3+ 13 clld5+ clxd5 14 exd5 xg2 15 ef7!

Pawns are equal but the activity of each of White’s pieces is clearly greater—this is also a typical case of domination.

15...d7 16 b8! f3 17 gg8 g6 18 d6+! xd6 19 gg7+ f8 20 ff7+ Black resigned.

Fantastic technique in a complicated endgame was demonstrated by Ivanchuk in the following game.

Dao Thien Hai-Ivanchuk
Moscow, 1994

At first sight it seems incredible that Black should be playing for a win—White has a pawn majority on the queen’s flank. First of all Black improves his structure on the king’s flank and thereby restricts the opponent’s pieces.

1...f6! 2 e3 f7 3 d1

It is very difficult for White to improve his position, therefore he resorts to such unnatural manoeuvres. But 3 h4 deserved serious attention.

3 e5 4 e2 g5! 5 c1 e6

With each move Black improves the positions of his pieces—the same cannot be said of White.

6 c3 f5 7 a3 c6! 8 b4 d4 9 d5?! (12)

White did not think that his opponent would so readily part with his bishop, therefore better was 9 d2.

9 xb5! 10 cb5 f6 11 c4 c3!

Preparing the d4 square for the knight, while preventing a3-a4 or c1-d2.

12 f1 d4 13 f3 f4!

A decision by a grandmaster of extra class—weakening the white squares rather too much, but in return restricting to the maximum the white king and bishop c1.

14 f2 h5 15 g3

If White waits, then Black proceeds with ...g7-g5-g4 and then...f6-g5-h4 with the threat of...g4xf3 and...h4-h3.

15 g5 16 g2 c2!

Surprisingly, after the knight move many threats appear—for example, not possible is 17 b3 because of 17...e1+—this is a
consequence of the restricting manoeuvre ...f5-f4

17 gxf3 gxf3

One cannot leave out the tactical element—it has been well known since the time of Capablanca that to achieve the maximum one must transpose positional factors into tactical ones.

18 xg3

If 18 bxg3, then 18...xc1 19 xg3 d3+ 20 f2 g4+ 21 xg4! Precisely this—the main thing is to break through to the h2 pawn.

24 fxg4+ hgxg4

Beginning a very important stage—activating the white king.

20...xc3 21 xg4 exg4 22 g5 hxg5 23 hxg5 a2 24 xe4!

Not everyone would pay attention to such ‘trifles’ as the b6 pawn.

28 axb6 axb6 29 xg3+ and White resigned.

Here is a very complicated realisation with pawns on just one flank.

Romanishin-Nunn

Debrecen, 1992

4 xg5 e6 5 g4 f6 6 xg2 e5 7 f4 e7 8 h4 c4 9 d7 f6 10 f4

Black already has some trouble—White activates his phalanx to the utmost.

10...c5 11 d6 g7 12 xf2 a5 13 d3 b5 14 xg3

Now that the rook defends the third rank, White improves the position of his king.

14...c7 15 b6 b5 16 e3 b2 17 f3 a1 18 d1 c3 19 c1 b3 20 e4!

11 g3 h6 2 xf4 sh7 3 xd2 ec6

Stronger is 3...ec5 and 4...h5.

Nezhmetdinov-Romanovsky

Moscow, 1957
What plan should White choose?

1 g4!!

With the intention of playing further f2-f4 and e4-e5, gaining ground, therefore Black's reply is forced.

1...hxg3 2 hxg3 f8 3 h2 e6 4 f4 b5 5 g1 g6

White has threats along the g-file, therefore Black is forced to weaken himself.

6 h6+ g7 7 g4 f6

How otherwise to deny the knight access to e5? If 7...f6, then 8 e5 and 9 f5 with a strong attack.

8 f5!

Reminiscent of the play in a famous Lasker-Capablanca game.

8...g5 9 gf1 c5 10 e5! xf5

On 10...fxe5 White plays 11 x5+ h7 12 x8! x8 13 fxg6+ xg6 14 f6+ h7 15 h6+ with decisive threats.

11 exf6+ f8

On 11...xf6 there is 12 xf6 x6 13 h4.

12 e5! b4 13 d5 xc2

More stubborn was 13...f7.

14 f7 e6 15 d7+ Black resigned.

Lputian-Tukmakov
Moscow, 1983

1 cc3!

Clearly not 1 a4 because of 1...b4, and the black knight jumps to freedom.

1...e6 2 e5 g5 3 g3 g7 4 f3 h6 5 h4!

Such moves are always unpleasant. White latches on to the weakness and wants to 'occupy' it. If 5...f6, then 6 h5 f7 7 d3 with the idea d4, though Black can of course defend himself for a long time.

5...g4 6 e1!

It turns out that the knight is heading for the f4 square.

6...d6 7 xd6 xd6 8 c4 h5 9 e2

The exchange of bishops has not eased Black's position very much.

9...b8 10 c5 h6 11 d3 d7 12 a5 a6 13 g3 b6 14 b4!

By covering the file, White prevents the activation of the black rook.

14...e6+ 15 f1 g7

If the passive 15...b8, then 16 d3 b6 17 f4 b5 18 xb5 axb5 19 e2 a6 20 d5! with a winning knight endgame. Now however any capture is quite good.

16 xa6 e8

If 16...e4, then 17 d3 e5 18 f4! f3 19 xh5+ f8 20 a8+ e7 21 e8+!!, exploiting the tactics.

17 d5 c5 18 c6 e6 19 c4 b8 20 a4 b2 21 f4 b1+

The rook ending is hopeless, since the king simply goes to his passed pawn.

22 e2 f6 23 xh5+ e5 24 xg4

And Black soon resigned.
Salov-Khalifman
Candidates (m) 1994

White has a majority plus a space advantage.

1 h4! f6 2 h5
 Spoiling Black’s majority.

2...a6 3 c3 d5 4 d5+ d8 5 b3 b5!?
 Without this move Black would not have any real counterplay.

6 cxb5 axb5 7 b4! g4 8 a3! c8

After 8...xh5 9 d6+ attacking the g7 pawn.

9 d7+! c7 10 g6 xh5
 Or 10...xg6 11 xg4 d5 12 f5 +.

11 cxe5! fxe5 12 c5 g5
 After 12...xg4 13 d6+ xg6 14 xg6 the pawn ending is simply lost.

13 d6 b6 14 f6 e2 15 g6

Exploiting a space advantage...

Nezhmetdinov-Luik
USSR 1950

White has the advantage on the king’s flank plus a more active deployment of pieces—there followed 1 b4!

With the threat of 2 c5, whereas 1...xb4? is impossible because of 2 a8+ f8 3 c5.

1...e8 2 c5 f7 3 g6+!
 Completely cramping the opponent—not possible is 3...hxg6 4 fxg6+ xg6 5 dxe5+.

3...hxg6 4 fxg6+ f8 5 h5 xc5
 Already he has to allow White to create a passed pawn.

6 xc5 c7 7 a8 xc5 8 h6!
 Here also an advantage on the king’s flank expresses itself in a tactical form.

8...gxh6 9 h4 c6 10 f5 e6

White plans to go with his king to h5, therefore he places his rook to hold up the b-pawn.

11 h5 12 g3 b4 13 h4 b3 14 xh5 b2 15 h6 g8 16 xb2
 And as Black is in zugzwang, he resigned.
An entertaining endgame motive was produced in the game

Vaganian-Smirin
USSR (ch), 1988

1 c6 is striking with the intention of winning in the variation 1...\(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xb4 2 c7 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)b6 3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)c4. But Black plays 1...\(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xb6! 2 c7 (or 2 b5 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d6 3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g2 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)f8 with equality) 2...\(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d6! 3 c8=\(\text{\texttt{a}}\)\(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xc8 4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xc8 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xb4, and is in no danger. The game, however, went

1 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g2

Surprisingly for White, Black is saved by a piece sacrifice.

1...\(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xc5!? 2 bxc5 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xc5 3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d4 4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)c6 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g7 5 h4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)c5 6 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d6 7 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)f3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e7 8 h5 gxh5 9 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)f2 f5 10 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)f6 11 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e5 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d6 12 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d7+ \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e7 13 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)b5 h4

The draw is obvious.

Neverov-Dreev
Lvov, 1985

It seems that there is no hint of danger in White’s position, but...

1 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d2 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e5 2 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)c6 3 f4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d3! 4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e3 e5 5 fxe5 fxe5 6 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)h4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)f6 7 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e6 8 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)h4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)f6 9 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g3 a5 10 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g1 a6 11 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e3

Black’s two doubled pawns successfully counter White’s three thanks to the excellent position of the knight on d3, while the passed e5 pawn has become dangerous, since the white king cannot get over to the e-file.

11...\(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e6 12 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)h4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)h1 13 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d7 14 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d1 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)b4 15 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)c3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)c6 16 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)h4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e2 17 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)f2 e4 18 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g5 e3 19 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xg5 20 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e2 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)f3 21 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g1 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d1 22 h3 h5 23 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xg6 hxg4 24 hxg4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xg4 25 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g5 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d1 26 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)f5 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d4 27 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e6 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)b4 28 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e1 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xa2 29 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)xa5 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)c1 30 b4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)g4 31 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d6 e2

White resigned.

Space plus control of an open line.

Botvinnik-Balashov
Hastings, 1967

1 a4 f6 2 a5

White increases his space advantage and thereby drives back the black pieces.

2...\(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d8 3 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)c8 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)f7 4 e4 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d7 5 b5 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e7 6 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d2 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)d6 7 \(\text{\texttt{a}}\)e8 b6 8 a6!

Now not only is there a weak a7 pawn but, when the opportunity
presents itself, also the manoeuvre a8-b8-b7.
8...c5 9 e3 e7 10 h3 d6
11 e8 e7 12 e5+! d7 12 g8!
There is no sense in winning a pawn at the cost of exchanging rooks.
12...f5 13 xg7+ d8 14 g8+
d7 15 h8 e7 16 d4 c2+ 17
d3 a2 18 a8+ Black resigned.

There is no sense in winning a pawn at the cost of exchanging rooks.
12...f5 13 xg7+ d8 14 g8+
d7 15 h8 e7 16 d4 c2+ 17
d3 a2 18 a8+ Black resigned.

White’s plan is simple—to push the pawn to a6 and still further hamper the opponent, while in the event of an exchange on a5 the c5 pawn will be very weak.
1 c1! f5+ 2 d3 e8 3 a4
d7 4 b3 h4 5 g3 f5 6 a5
d8 7 a6 c7 8 bd2
The knight has done its business and now transfers to the other flank.
8...b8 9 f6! h6 10 de4
c7 11 e8+ d7 12 xf6+ xf6
13 xf6+ c7 14 h3 f5 16 g4
Now it is time to expand on the other flank.
16...hxg4 17 hxg4 e7 18 e4
b8 19 ae1 g8 20 h4 c7 21
e3 d7 22 f3 c7 23 d6 f5
24 gxf5 gxf5
Somewhat better is 24...exf5.
25 g5 d7 26 g3 e7 27 h4!

The invasion of the king is decisive—this is more accurate than xex7 and c8+.
27...g6+ 28 h5 e7 29 xex7
e7 30 g6! Black resigned.

Playing to exploit a weakness.

Korchnoi-Pinter
Reggio Emilia, 1987/88

1 e2!
Hurrying to activate his pieces would be punished: 1 b3 c5; 1
e3 e5.
1...c8 2 c3 g6 3 b4 c7 4
f4 h8
The threat was 5 d5.
5 a5 d6 6 b1 e5 7 h3 d7 8
h4
Gradually occupying space.
8...h5 9 e3 e5 10 c2 e7 11
d4! d6
On 11...d8+ White had prepared 12 d5+! (12 xe5 f6 mate) 12...e6 13 e3.
12 d2 d7 13 c3+ c7 14
db2 d6 15 a6
Securing a bridge-head for an invasion along the b-file.
15...dc7 16 db3 d7 17 d1+
e7 18 d3 d8 19 db1 dc8
20 b7 db6 21 f4 db6
A mistake in a difficult position.
He should not lose control of the e5 point.
The threat was 23 \( \text{fxf} \).

Leading to complications was 25 \( \text{c6b6?} \) \( \text{exb7} \) 26 \( \text{f5}+ \) \( \text{gxf5} \) 27 \( \text{exf5}+ \) \( \text{xf5} \) 28 \( \text{fl}+ \) \( \text{g4} \).

\( \text{Black resigned.} \)

**Weaknesses in the endgame and their exploitation**

The presence of weaknesses in the pawn structure is a great minus, and the correct technical exploitation of them is the most important factor in realising an advantage.

**Topalov-Beliavsky**

*Linares, 1995*

Black has two passed pawns but at the same time these are serious weaknesses which need looking after.

1 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{g3} \)

Bad is 1... \( \text{g5} \) because of 2 \( \text{f6} \)!

2 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{f4} \) 3 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{g5} \) 4 \( \text{e7}+ \)

Inferior is 4 \( \text{g8} \) \( \text{c5}+ \) with the idea of ...\( \text{c5-f5} \)

4... \( \text{c8} \) 5 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{c5} \) 6 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{a5} \) 7 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{f5} \) 8 \( \text{c5}! \)

White activates his pieces to the maximum and also the passed pawn, and in the process threatens to enter with the king on b5.

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

He must activate at the cost of a pawn.

9 \( \text{exg5}+ \) \( \text{c6} \) 10 \( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 11 \( \text{a7} \) \( \text{f3}+ \) 12 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{f4}+ \) 13 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 15 \( \text{xa5}+ \)

Connected pawns in the majority of cases win against a single pawn.

15... \( \text{d4} \) 16 \( \text{a8} \) \( \text{e5} \) 17 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{f6} \)

If 17... \( \text{c5} \), then 18 \( \text{b8}! \), cutting off the king.

18 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{e4} \) 19 \( \text{b4} \) \( \text{e3} \) 20 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{f1} \)

Or 20... \( \text{f5} \) 21 \( \text{a6} \) \( \text{e5} \) 22 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xex5} \) 23 \( \text{a7} \), and in the queen ending White wins the enemy queen.

21 \( \text{d8}+ \) \( \text{e4} \) 22 \( \text{a6} \) \( \text{a1} \) 23 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{e2} \) 24 \( \text{e8}+ \) \( \text{d3} \) 25 \( \text{b4} \) \( \text{d2} \) 26 \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{e1=\#} \) 27 \( \text{xel} \) \( \text{xe1} \)

28 \( \text{b6}! \)

A typical means of advancing the b-pawn to queen—the only way to victory.

28... \( \text{d2} \) 29 \( \text{a7} \) Black resigned.

As in rook endings a single weakness will usually be defensible, to achieve victory it will often be necessary to create a second weakness.
All Black's pieces are forced to protect the b7 pawn, while White must create a weakness in the opponent's camp. To the question—where?—the reply is simple—on the g6 square!

1 h4! @f7 2 h5 @g7 3 @g2 @e7 4 @b6 @f7 5 @d5 @fd7 6 @b5 @e7 7 @g3 @ed7 8 @f4 @c2 9 @g5! @xf2 10 hxg6 hxg6 11 @xg6 @f8 12 @b3 @f7 13 @f6 f4 14 e4 @b2 15 e5 f3 16 e6 f2 17 @c4! Black resigned.

Commentary here is superfluous since White's play was direct and logical.

Play in equal positions

In equal positions first and foremost the task is to create weaknesses in the opponent's camp. This is usually achieved through the greater activity of one's pieces, which, with the help of an attack, force a weakening of the pawn structure.

1 g4! @d5 2 @c2 g6 3 @g3 @e7?!
The first dubious manoeuvre—better is 3...@d6 4 @e4 @e7 4 @e4 @d8 5 g5!
Beginning a weakening of Black's position.

5...fxg5 6 @xg5 h6 7 @e4 @f7
But not 7...@e6? because of 8 @c3

8 @c5 @d6 9 @e4 @e7 10 @c3
@e6 11 @g2 g5?!
Another weakening—better is 11...@c6

12 @e4 @d6 13 @e2 @c4 14 @g3 @e6 15 @f3!
With the threat to go to h5

15...@d5 16 @g4 @xe4 17 @xe4 @f7 18 @h5 b6?!
Stronger is 18...@f5 19 @xd6 @xd6 20 @xh6 g4, but White rightly plays 19 @g3 @f6 20 f4.

19 @g6 @f8 20 @c3 @h8+ 21
@h7 @f7 22 @g8 @e7 23 @f3 h5 24
@g7 g4 25 fxg4 hxg4 26 @g6 a5 27
@h5 @d5 28 @d2 axb4 29 @xb4
@xb4 30 axb4 @c6 31 @xg4 @b5
32 @f5 @xb4 33 @g6 @d8 34 @f6
+-.
Endings with a pawn sacrifice

In principle, a material advantage in the endgame is the main factor, but it can happen that other factors, particularly the presence of a passed pawn, are decisive.

Rublevsky-Shariazdinov
Elista, 1996

1 a5! 1h4 2 d5 a6 3 c7!
The threat is b4-b5.
3...d8 4 e8!
If 4 xxa6? bxa6 5 b7 e5! with the idea 6 d2=.
4...h7 5 g2
5 xd6? e7 would be bad materialism.
5...g5
On 5...e6 there is 6 h4!.
6 f7!
Zugzwang!
6...e7 7 c7 d8 8 xa6!
Now that the g5 square is inaccessible to the bishop.
8...bxa6 9 c4 g7 10 a6 d5
11 exd5 e7 12 c8 xb4 13 a6 c5 14 f3 f6 15 d6! h5 16 e4 d4 17 d5 f7 18 f5 f6 19 c6! Black resigned.

Barlov-Seirawan
Zagreb, 1987

Though Black is a pawn down, the American grandmaster tries to exploit the active positions of his pieces and does this, as we shall see, successfully.

1...f4 2 gxf4 gxf4 3 c4 d3 4 a1 h5 5 h4 f5 6 a8 g4
Black obviously does not rush to capture the white pawns, for the time being improving the position of his king.

7 g8+ xh4 8 g6 xd5 9 f3 d4 10 g1 c5 11 e2 b4 12 f3 c5 13 e2 e4+ 14 f3 d5 15 d2 e8 16 d1 g5 17 b1 d4 18 d2 f5 19 h1 h8 20 e4 b4 21 g1 h4
Slowly the black pawns crawl along to their queening squares.

22 g5+ e6 23 g6+ f7 24 g1 d3 25 xf4 d2 26 e3 d8 27 e2 e8 28 f3 h3 29 h1 d8 30 d1
If 30 f2 Black has 30...h2 31 xh2 d1= 32 xd1 d2=.
30...a8 31 e2 h2 32 f2
If 32 xh2?, then 32...d1= 33 xd1 a1+ and 34...a2=.
32...e8 33 e4 d8 34 f2 c5 35 d1 g1=.
Chekhov-Karsa
Lvov, 1983

1 b5! cxb5 2 a6 c4 3 xc4 bxc4 4 dc3 xc5

Also bad is 4...b4 5 d5 a5 because of 6 c7! and 7 a7!, deciding the game.

5 xc5 xc5 6 a7 a8 7 d5 c3! 8 xc3!

Black returns the pawn and White must not fall for 8 xb6? xa7! 9 xa7 c2 10 a1 b3 with a draw.

8...b3 9 a6 d4 10 d5 c6 11 xb6! xa7 12 a6! Black loses a piece, therefore he resigned.

Shirov-Van Wely
Amsterdam, 1995

1 f2 e5 2 d2 a4 3 f1 b6 4 c2 c4 5 e3 b3 6 g4 h4 7 g5 e6 8 g2 h3 9 h4 b3 10 xh3 c4 11 ed2 d8 12 f4 d1 13 e4 xb2

The strategy is completed and the game transposes to tactical channels.

14 g1 d3 15 f1 xc3 16 f5! c2 17 f6 e8 18 xe5 xe5 19 xe5 xa3 20 e8+ h7 21 f8 b3 22 f3 a4 23 e5 e4 24 xf7 g4+ 25 f2 xf7 26 xf7+ g8 27 g7+ f8 28 xg6 f4+ 29 e1 e4+ 30 d2 c4+ 31 xc4 xc4 32 h6 Black resigned.

Domination is a superiority in the functional activity of each piece. In the endgame this increases many times over.

Morozevich-Balashov
Novgorod, 1997

1 h4! e6 2 w6 h5

There is no other apparent defence against g4.

3 d5 w2

Defending against e7+ and xg6.

4 e7+ f8 5 c8! w4+ 6 g1 w4

If 6...g8, then 7 d6.
7 \( \textit{e7} + \textit{g8} \) 8 \( \textit{d6} \) \( \textit{d1} + \) 9 \( \textit{g2} \) \\
\( \textit{f4} + \)  \\
The last chance. 
10 \( \textit{h2}! \) \( \textit{e2} \) 11 \( \textit{xf7} + \) \( \textit{h8} \) 12 \\
\( \textit{e8} + \) \( \textit{h7} \) 13 \( \textit{d7} + \) \( \textit{h8} \) 14 \( \textit{c8} + \) \\
\( \textit{h7} \) 15 \( \textit{b7} + \) \( \textit{h8} \) \\

Or 15...\( \textit{h6} \) 16 \( \textit{f7} + \) \( \textit{g7} \) 17 \\
\( \textit{g5} + \). 
16 \( \textit{b8} \) \( \textit{h7} \) 17 \( \textit{xa7} \) \( \textit{g8} \) 18 \\
\( \textit{f7} + \) \( \textit{h8} \) 19 \( \textit{f6} + \) \( \textit{h7} \) 20 \( \textit{g2}! \) \\
Black resigned.
6 Defence in the Ending

A complicated, important and exceptionally large theme. We can touch upon it only partially.

Playing for stalemate

How strange it is that this method, for example, rather frequent in pawn endings with an extra pawn, is seldom met in its purest form.

Beliavsky-Gelfand
Belgrade, 1997

Fercec-Cvitan
Zadar, 1995

The threat is ...\h3-h2 and then g2+, so
1 \f3!! g2+ 2 \xg2 \xf3+ 3 \xf2 Drawn.

1...\xg2? 2 \xg3!! \wxg3 3 \h6 \g8 4 \h8+ \f7 5 \e8 Drawn.

Exploitation of a lucky chance

Gelfand-Lautier
Belgrade, 1997
Here winning are 1 $\text{Ec1}$ or 1 $\text{Ed2}$, but Gelfand decides to play more simply.  
1 $\text{Ec5}$??,
Now 1...b4! is winning. However after...
1...$\text{Ec4}$? 2 $\text{Ed2}$ Black resigned.

Shirov-Lautier  
Belgrade, 1997

Thinking a long way ahead, Lautier went for the variation
1 $\text{Exe4}$ $\text{Exe4}$ 2 $\text{f6}$  
Reckoning on 2...$\text{Ee3}$ 3 $\text{h4}$ $\text{h6}$ (3...$\text{f5}$ 4 $\text{Exh5}$ $\text{Exe6}$ 5 $\text{g6}$)  
4 $\text{Exh5}$ $\text{f8}$ 5 $\text{g6}$ d5 6 h4 d4 7 $\text{a5}$ d3 8 h5 $\text{Ee3}$ 9 $\text{c6}$ with a win.  
However there followed  
2...$\text{Exf6}$!! 3 $\text{Exf6}$ d5 4 $\text{h4}$ d4 5 $\text{Exh5}$ $\text{f3}$! 6 $\text{g5}$  
Or 6 $\text{b3}$ g3 7 $\text{hxg3}$ $\text{Exg3}$ 8 $\text{g5}$ $\text{f3}$ 9 $\text{f5}$ d3 10 $\text{c3}$ $\text{Ee2}$ 11 $\text{e5}$ d2 12 $\text{xd2}$ $\text{Exd2}$ 13 $\text{d5}$ $\text{c2}$, reaching the pawns.  
6...d3 7 $\text{c3}$ c4! 8 $\text{f5}$ $\text{e3}$ 9 $\text{Exg4}$ d2 10 $\text{Exd2}$ $\text{Exd2}$  
And a drawn ending with a c-pawn is reached.

Difficult practical defence  
in the ending

Beliavsky-Mikhalchishin  
USSR (ch), 1984

Black has two pawn weaknesses on e6 and b7 (For the present Black is coping with defending them) and a rather worse deployment of pieces. The question is—how can he improve his position? Correct is 1...g5!, commencing play on the king’s flank, but Black played 1...e5?!  
It is not usually worth moving a weakling.
2 $\text{f3}$ $\text{d5}$ 3 $\text{a4}$ $\text{e8}$?!
Too intricate—simpler is 3...$\text{d6}$!  
4 $\text{b6}$ $\text{d5}$ 5 $\text{e4}$ $\text{f6}$+! with a draw.  
4 $\text{c3}$+ $\text{e6}$ 5 $\text{e2}$ $\text{d6}$ 6 $\text{b4}$ $\text{d7}$  
Black wants to defend the b7 pawn with his king, though also not bad is 6...$\text{Ec7}$  
7 $\text{b6}$ $\text{c7}$?!
Very strong was 7...$\text{f6}$!, and then 8...g5 and 9...$\text{h6}$, obtaining counterplay.  
8 $\text{d5}$+ $\text{d7}$ 9 $\text{b3}$ $\text{h5}$!!
This is only a weakness—better was the transfer of the rook via f8, c8 to c6. The text just weakens the g6 square.

10 ²e3 ²c7 11 ²c4! ²d7!!

After 11...²xc4 12 bxc4 the rook proceeds to g6 and then to g5.

12 ²b4

If 12 ²xe5, then 12...²e7! 13 f4 ²f7 with a draw, while the pawn ending after 12 ²xd6 ²xd6 13 ²xd6 ²xd6 14 ²e3 ²c5 15 g4 b6! was also drawn.

12...e4! 13 ²xd6 exf3+ 14 ²xf3 ²xd6 15 ²e4 b6!

Completely equalising by exchanging the important a5 pawn.

16 ²c4+ ²d7 17 b4 bxa5 18 bxa5 ²c6! and drawn.

A quite rare means of defence is without pawns—against a central pawn and bishop he succeeds in constructing an impregnable fortress.

Gretarson-Magerramov

Groningen, 1993

1 ²c4 h4!

Cutting down pawn material is always useful for the defence!

2 ²d3 hxg3 3 hxg3 ²d8 4 ²e3 ²g5 5 ²f3 ²e8 6 ²d6 ²d7 7 ²e5 ²e8 8 ²g2 ²d7 9 ²f3 ²e8 10 ²e2 ²d7 11 ²d3 ²d8 12 ²c4 ²b6 13 f3 ²f2 and White cannot improve his position. Therefore it's a draw.

Rozentalis-Christiansen

Groningen, 1992

1 f4

He should try 1 g4 ²b1 2 g5, preparing an attack on the h7 pawn.

1...²d6 2 ²f2 ²e7!

Not allowing the white king into the centre.

3 ²f3 h5 4 a6!? ²g4!?

An interesting decision—the exchange of bishops weakens the d5 pawn.

5 ²e4 ²f5!

Seeing the idea through to the end!

6 ²f3 ²g4 7 ²e4 ²f5 8 axb7 ²xb7 9 ²c6+ ²e7 10 ²xf5 ²xf5 11 ²e3 ²xb2 12 ²d4 ²xh2 13 ²e5 ²e2+ 14 ²xf5 ²e3 15 ²c7+ ²d6 16 ²xa7 ²xg3 17 ²xf7 ²xd5

In endings with same-colour bishops very often an extra passed pawn ‘will not run’.
An interesting rook ending—
Black must play exceptionally
accurately in order to hold the
position.
19 h7 d6!
The king must come closer at any
price.
20 f6 h3!
But now he needs to advance his
pawn.
21 h6!? d7 22 h8 h1 23 f5
h4 24 f7 h3 25 f6 h2 26 h6 c7
27 h3!?
White wants to transfer his rook
to the second rank, and then, with
the rook on e2, try to enter with his
king. But Black too activates his
king.
27 ... d6! 28 d3+ e5 29 d2
f4 Drawn.
Black heads for the h2 pawn and
then plays f1.

During defence, mistakes due to
tiredness from protracted defence
can occur.

In the following game, over the
course of the last 50 moves, with the
same correlation of forces, White
had stubbornly tried to improve the
positions of his pieces and pawns,
while Black defended technically
and cooly.

Gurevich-Andersson
Leningrad, 1987

1 g5
Finally White goes over to the
attack.
1...hxg5 2 fxg5 d7 3 e4
b3+ 4 h4 f8 5 e7+ h8 6
f4 h7

Leading to a quick defeat. It
seems to us that at the very last mo-
moment Black could still surprisingly
save himself, in a truly fantastic
way, by playing 6...h7!! Now 7
f5+ g6 8 xf8 leads to an im-
mediate draw in view of 8...g3+
(xh3+) 9 xg3 stalemate!. Meanwhile
Black threatens after
7...g6 to bring the game down to a
drawn queen ending, therefore it is
necessary to accept the knight sacri-
fice: 7 xf8 c4+! (but not
7... b4+? 8 h5 nor 7...a4+? 8
g3 a3+ 9 g4! a4+ 10 f4
d1+ 11 f3, and White wins) 8
g3 d3+! (again avoiding a crafty
pitfall: 8...c3+ 9 f3 e5+ 10
g4 xe7 11 g6+! mating) 9 f3
(On 9 g4 e4+ 10 f4 xe7
White lands his queen in a poor po-
sition—11 g6+ already does not
lead to mate. On 9 g2 follows
9...e2+, while 9 f4? is impos-
sible because of 9...f1+) 9...d6+
10 \( \text{g}4 \text{b}4+! \) (this is the point of Black’s idea: he refrains from the immediate capture of the knight—in view of 11 \( g6 \)—and with a correct intermediate check disrupts the coordination of White’s pieces) 11 \( \text{h}5 \text{xe}7 \) 12 \( \text{f}5+ \text{g}8 \) 13 \( \text{c}8+ \text{f}7 \) with a drawn queen ending.

You should always take the opportunity to spoil the opponent’s pawn structure.

White has two extra pawns and, it seems, an easily winning position. But...

1...h3!! 2 gxh3?

How could he not take a third pawn? Correct was 2 g4 \( \text{d}2 \) 3 \( \text{d}4! \text{xe}4 \) 4 \( \text{exe}4 \text{xc}3 \) 5 \( \text{g}3 \), and by defending the f3 pawn with the rook White then wins the h3 pawn.

2...\( \text{d}2 \) 3 \( \text{d}3 \text{xc}3 \) 4 \( \text{d}4 \text{c}6 \)
5 \( \text{e}3 \text{b}3 \) 6 \( \text{d}5 \text{c}5 \) 7 \( \text{b}5 \text{e}6+ \) 8 \( \text{f}2 \text{b}7 \) 9 h4 \( \text{d}6 \) 10 \( \text{d}7 \text{f}6 \) 11 \( \text{g}4 \text{e}8 \) 12 h5 g5!

The pawn must hold two white pawns.

13 \( \text{d}8 \text{d}6 \) 14 \( \text{e}3 \)

The last chance would have been 14 \( \text{h}8+ \text{g}7 \) 15 \( \text{a}8 \text{h}6 \) 16 \( \text{a}5 \text{e}8 \) 17 \( \text{g}3 \) followed by h2-h4.

14...\( \text{f}5+ \) 15 \( \text{e}4 \text{h}4 \) 16 \( \text{e}5 \text{f}4! \) 17 \( \text{d}3 \text{g}7 \)

Black has blockaded everything excellently—therefore it’s a draw.
The isolated pawn is a weakness, but this weakness is felt in different ways. The strategy everywhere is similar—blockade by utilising strong blockading pieces or direct attack on the isolani itself.

We begin with the simplest example—a pawn ending.

Ehlvest-Rausis
Riga, 1995

1...b6 2 a4 c5 3 f3 d6 4 a5 bxa5 5 bxa5 c6 6 e5 c5

After 6...b5 7 xd5 xa5 8 c5 White also wins.

7 f6 c4 8 xg6 d3 9 e4
Black resigned.

Yurtaev-Temirbaev
Elista, 1998

Here the b6 point is firmly defended and White does not succeed in penetrating via the c5 square.

1 h4 h5! 2 a4 e6 3 a5 d6 4 a6 e6 5 e4

Sooner or later it is necessary to try and exploit the slightly better position of the king, but this is insufficient.

5...dxe4 6 fxe4 fxe4 7 xe4 g6 8 f4 f6 9 g3 b5 10 g4 hxg4 11 xg4 e6 12 f4 f6 13 e4 e6 Drawn.
1. a5!
Weaker is 1... h5 2 b4! f6 3 h3 g5 4 fxg5 fxg5 5 e3 e5 6 dxe5 xe5 7 d3 d5 8 e3 c4 9 e4 with a draw.

2 b3 a4! 3 bxa4 bxa4 4 h3
After 4 g4 g5! White is badly placed, while on 4 c3 there is 4... e4 5 b4 xd4 6 xa4 c4! 7 a5 f6 8 b6 e5, and the queen ending is easily won since Black manages to exchange queens.

4... h5 5 h4 f6 6 c3 c4 7 c4 f5! 8 c5 e3 9 b4 f3 10 c5! xg3 11 d6 xf4 12 xe6 g3, and Black just as easily won the queen ending.

Rausis-Faragó
Germany, 1996

1 f5! a6 2 f4
It is important to exploit his majority on the flank.

2... g8 3 h5 f6 4 f3 b7 5 g6 e7
Bad is 5... c8 6 g5 g4 7 g3 xh5 8 gxf6 xg6 9 fxg7 with a winning position.

6 g5 e4 7 xe4!
The knight here is undoubtedly stronger than the bishop.

... dxe4+ 8 e3 d5 9 b4 axb4 10 axb4 f7 11 f5 f8 12 g3!
... b3 13 xe4 f7 14 e5 hxg5 15 fxg5 c2 16 g6+ g8 17 f4 b1 18 g5 d3 19 f5 f8 20 d4 c4 21 h6 gxh6 22 xh6 a2 23 g5 g7 24 f5+ and White won.

Panno-Donner
Palma de Mallorca, 1967

1 b5 2 f3 ec5 3 f2 e6 4 c3 c7 5 a4
The problem is that while for Black there is no active plan—for White there is.

5... e6 6 b4 e8 7 e2 d6 8 b3
There appears the first threat of a3-a4.

8... f5 9 h4!
Now already arises a real threat to exchange the dark-squared bishop,
after which all Black’s weaknesses, riveted on white squares, will be exposed.

9...\(\text{e}5\) 10 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{d}7\)
After 10...\(\text{d}4\) 11 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{d}6\) 12 \(\text{xd}6\!\) \(\text{xd}6\) 13 \(\text{e}8\) \(\text{e}7\) 14 \(\text{f}4\)!
\(\text{f}7\) 15 \(\text{xf}7\) White wins in the pawn ending.

11 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{b}5\)?
Better in fact was 11...\(\text{f}6\) conceding the d5 pawn.

12 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{c}5\) 13 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{d}6\) 14 \(\text{g}4\)!
also no help is 14...\(\text{e}6\) 15 \(\text{gx}h5\) \(\text{gx}h5\), since he cannot hold the two weaknesses on f5 and h5.

15 \(\text{fx}g4\) \(\text{e}6\) 16 \(\text{h}5\) \(\text{c}7\) 17 \(\text{hx}g6\)
Black resigned.

Szabó-Penrose
Bath, 1973

Two parts of the plan have been completed, White goes over to the third.

7...\(\text{d}8\) 8 \(\text{c}3\)+ \(\text{b}7\) 9 \(\text{g}4\)! \(\text{d}6\)
10 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{a}5\) 11 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{f}7\) 12 \(\text{f}5\)! \(\text{d}8\) 13 \(\text{c}2\)!
A prophylactic move, eliminating the threat of \(\text{d}6\)-c6.

13...\(\text{d}7\) 14 \(\text{g}5\)! \(\text{hx}g5\) 15 \(\text{hx}g5\)
\(\text{fx}g5\) 16 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{d}6\) 17 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{g}6\) 18 \(\text{fx}g6\) \(\text{g}6\) 19 \(\text{d}5\)+ Black resigned.

Nikolić-Portisch
Ter Apel, 1996

White plan consists of three parts:
(a) transfer of the king to \(\text{d}4\);
(b) transfer of the bishop to \(\text{f}3\);
(c) transfer of the rook to the eighth rank and an advance of the pawns on king's flank.

1 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{a}6\) 2 \(\text{b}4\) \(\text{d}7\) 3 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{e}7\)
Or 3...\(\text{d}4\)+ 4 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{c}7\)+
(4...\(\text{xd}4\) 5 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{xa}2\) 6 \(\text{c}4\)!+!
with a winning pawn ending) 5 \(\text{b}4\)
\(\text{xa}2\) 6 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{c}1\) 7 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{b}1\) 8 \(\text{b}2\), winning.

4 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}8\) 5 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{c}7\) 6 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{b}6\)
7 \(\text{b}3\)

1 \(\text{c}2\)!
A very important prophylactic move—the \(\text{a}2\) and \(\text{f}2\) pawns are the main target for Black's counterplay and therefore ought to be defended to the maximum.

1...\(\text{e}4\) 2 \(\text{e}5\)
In these kinds of positions blocking the isolated pawn is not so important—the main thing is to attack it, as Bent Larsen said about such situations!

2...\(\text{b}7\) 3 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{b}8\) 4 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{e}7\) 5
\(\text{g}4\) \(\text{f}6\) 6 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{g}6\) 7 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{h}5\)
As the defender is supposed to do, Black tries to exchange pawns.

8 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{e}8\) 9 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{c}7\) 10 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{d}4\)
Black has to sacrifice a pawn, since 10...\(\text{d}6\) 11 \(\text{c}6\)+ \(\text{xe}5\) 12 \(\text{f}4\)+ leads to mate.
11 exd4 e6 12 a5 xg5 13 xg6+ f6 14 f4 and Black with a clear conscience can resign.

Magerramov-Kohlmeyer
Bad Worishofen, 1993

An instructive example of the struggle of two knights against two bishops, with rooks on the board, this being a rare case of the complete superiority of the knights.

1 a4
As Nimzowitsch said, weaknesses do not tell unless they are attacked!
1...d6 2 ac1 ec8 3 xc8+
Also 3 f3!? deserves attention —Magerramov.
3...xc8 4 b5 xd8 5 d4!
Worse is 5 xb6?! g4 6 xd5 b8 with strong counterplay.
5...d6 6 f3 d7 7 c3 h5 8 f2 f8 9 e2 c8
Upon 9...e7 10 d3 e8 11 c1 nothing good awaits the black king in the centre.
10 b4! axb4 11 axb4 a6 12 b5
Fixing a second weakness on b6.
12...b7 13 a1 f6 14 d3 d7
The only move. If 15...e7? 16 a7 d7 17 xb7! xb7 18 xd5+ White wins.
15 a4 d8 16 c1
Successfully combining threats along the a and c-files.

16...c7 17 c6 f6 18 f4
With the threat of d4, h3, g4 etc.
18...f7 19 d4 e6 20 h3 h7
21 c3!
Play over the whole board!
21...d7 22 g4 hxg4 23 hxg4 d6?!
More stubborn is 23...h7 24 xd5 d7, in spite of 25 f5+! gx5 26 gxf5+ xf5 27 e7+ e6 28 c7 xc7 29 xc7+ e7 30 xd5+ d6 31 f6!±, Magerramov.
24 a4 c7 25 h1! g7 26 c3 d7 27 h6 g7
If 27...xc6 28 bxc6 d6 29 xg6 White also wins.
28 xd5 d7 29 f5+
Black resigned in view of 29...gx5 30 xf6 mate.

A case of an isolated pawn with bishops was given in the book Winning Endgame Technique. Bishop against knight is also a very well known endgame, and the side with the isolated pawn has to maintain the equilibrium.

Very interesting also is the case of rook endings with an isolated pawn for one of the sides.

Bareev-Farag6
Rome, 1990
1...h5?
He should immediately take measures on the queen's flank by 1...a5, though after 2 g4 White still maintains the advantage.

2 b4 e6 3 d4 f6 4 h4 f5 5 f3
g6
If 5...g5 6 hxg5 fxg5 7 f8 g6 8 e5 there is no defence against 9 e6.

6 a4! f7 7 a5 e6 8 a6!
The weakness on a7 is now permanent.

8...d6 9 b5 e6 10 g3 g6 11 e8+! d6 12 f8 e6 13 c8 d6 14 c6+ e7 15 g4 f7 16 gxh5 gxh5 17 c8
Now it will be very difficult to hold on at once to the three weaknesses on a7, d5 and h5.

17...e6 18 e8+ d6
If 18...f7, then 19 b8 and 20 b7.

19 h8 c7 20 d8+ e6 21 xd5 f5 22 e4 and Black can resign.
8 Rook and bishop against rook and knight

In general the line-up of rook plus bishop is rather stronger than rook and knight (to a large extent this depends on the structure), but a few grandmasters, for example Evgeny Sveshnikov, think the reverse. Rook and knight is stronger when there are fixed weaknesses or, for example, when there are doubled pawns.

We look at a few cases of the advantage of rook and knight, since with this line-up the methods of play are more complicated.

Sakaev-Novikov
Moscow, 1998

1 d2 b4 2 a4!
There is no sense in White opening the a-file—but here it is possible to open the b-file.
2...bxa3 3 bxa3 b7 4 c3 f8
5 c5 b5 6 b3!

White begins a plan associated with an attack on the a5 pawn or the forcing of the advance ...a5-a4.

6 e7 7 a1 d6
After 7 d7 8 a4 b4 9 xa5 xa4 10 xa4 xa4 11 b4 and then 12 c5 White wins the d5 pawn.

8 a4 b7 9 xa5 c7+ 10 d2 d7 11 b3 c4 12 a5 c6
No help is 12...a4 13 a6 winning.

13 a6 b4 14 a5 a8 15 c3 b8 16 b3 e8 17 d3 c7 18 c5 b6 19 b1+ a7 20 d2!
Preparing an exchange of rooks—technically the simplest way to win.

20...c6 21 b3 e7 22 e3 with an easily winning position.

Mikhailov-Volchok
corr, 1995
Black has a majority on the king's flank, but the knight has to carry out an unpleasant defensive function and, in addition, the pawns are hemmed by their white counterparts.

1 g5! $d5 2 $g1 $c6 3 $c2 $f5 4 $h1!

With the interesting threat, after 4...hxg5, of 5 $xg7! $xg7 6 $h6+.

4...$d7 5 $d3 $b5 6 gxh6 gxh6 7 $xh6 $f6 8 $g5 $h7 9 $h2!

Again prophylaxis—utilising the rook to the utmost.

9...e5 10 $c4 $e6 11 a4 $b8 12 $e2 f6 13 $h6 $g8 14 $c5 $f8 15 $b6 Black resigned.

Alterman-Chemin
Beersheva, 1992

If we remove a pair of pieces from the board, then White is better. With the interchanging of threats the advantage lies with Black.

1 $g1 $c3 2 $e1 $g4 3 e4 $f6 4 h3 $e5 5 $f1+ $e7 6 $e1 h5!

Improving his position!

7 $e2 h4 8 $e1 $g6 9 $f2 $f6 10 $e3 $c1 11 $f3+ $f4 12 g3 $hxg3 13 $xg3 $h1 14 a4 $b1! 15 $c3 $e5 16 a5 $a1 17 $c5+ $d6 18 $b5 $a3 19 $g3 $c6 20 $b6+ $c7 21 $g4 $xa5 22 $b4 $d3 23 $d4 $e5 24 $h5 g4! ++.

Milov-Pelletier
Biel, 1997

1...g5! 2 a4 $a3 3 $a6?

Better is 3 $b5 $a1+ 4 $h2 $g6+.

3...$a1 4 $g2 $g6 5 $b5 $h4+ 6 $h2 $xf3+ 7 $g2 $h4+ 8 $h2 e5! 9 $c6 f5 10 f3 $a3 11 $a7 $xf3+ 12 $g2 $d4 13 $d5+ $h8 14 a5 e4 15 a6 e3 16 $c4 f4! 17 h4 f3+ 18 $h3 e2! White resigned.

It is very important to control the moment of exchanging rooks or minor pieces, which can often alter the assessment of the position. At times, with pawns on different flanks, the knight can even prove to be the stronger piece, though usually this is the more long-range bishop.

Gausel-Agdestein
Reykjavik, 1996
Not only are White’s chances not better, but Black simply has a clear advantage.

1...\( \texttt{\#e4!} \)
A surprising exchange of rooks.

2 \( \texttt{\#xe4} \texttt{\#xe4} \) 3 \( \texttt{\#c2} \texttt{\#c3} \) 4 g4 \( \texttt{\#d6} \)
It was also possible at once to fix the opponent’s queenside pawn structure by 4...\( \texttt{\#b5!} \) 5 a4 \( \texttt{\#d6} \).

5 \( \texttt{\#e1} \texttt{\#c5} \) 6 \( \texttt{\#d2} \texttt{\#b5} \) 7 a4 \( \texttt{\#c7} \)
8 \( \texttt{\#c3} \texttt{\#d5+} \) 9 \( \texttt{\#b2} \texttt{\#b4} \) 10 g5 b5
11 axb5 cxb5 12 \( \texttt{\#e4} \texttt{\#c3} \) 13 \( \texttt{\#c6} \)
White wants to obtain counter-chances by doing away with the black f7-pawn.

13...\( \texttt{\#d1+} \) 14 \( \texttt{\#a2} \texttt{\#xf2} \) 15 \( \texttt{\#e8} \texttt{\#d3} \) 16 \( \texttt{\#xf7} \texttt{\#e5!} \)
Now the knight dominates the bishop, while the king transfers to the other flank.

17 \( \texttt{\#e8} \texttt{\#c5} \) 18 \( \texttt{\#b2} \texttt{\#b4!} \) 19 \( \texttt{\#c2} \texttt{\#d5} \) 20 h5 gxh5 21 \( \texttt{\#xh5} \texttt{\#e4} \) 22 \( \texttt{\#d2} \texttt{\#g6} \) 23 \( \texttt{\#d1} \texttt{\#f5} \) 24 \( \texttt{\#e2} \texttt{\#xg5} \)
25 \( \texttt{\#f2} \texttt{\#h4} \) 26 \( \texttt{\#g2} \texttt{\#d3} \) 27 \( \texttt{\#xe2} \texttt{\#c5} \) 28 \( \texttt{\#d1} \texttt{\#g5!} \) 29 \( \texttt{\#g3} \texttt{\#f6} \) 30 \( \texttt{\#g4} \texttt{\#e5} \) 31 \( \texttt{\#c2} \texttt{\#xb3!} \) 32 \( \texttt{\#xb3} \texttt{\#e4} \)
White resigned.

Genba-Irzhanyov
Russia, 1998

Sometimes chessplayers themselves do not know how to exploit the possibilities of their own pieces.

1 \( \texttt{\#xa6?} \)
Driving the bishop to a passive position. He should play 1 a4! \( \texttt{\#a8} \) 2 b5, creating a passed pawn.

1...\( \texttt{\#a8} \) 2 b5 \( \texttt{\#d7} \) 3 \( \texttt{\#a4?} \)
Better really was to leave the pawn and activate the bishop by 3 \( \texttt{\#b7} \).

3...\( \texttt{\#c5} \) 4 \( \texttt{\#a3} \texttt{\#f6} \)
Now the black king enters the game with decisive effect.

5 g2 e7 6 f3 d4! 7 e2 d6 8 d2 c7 9 h4 b6 10 d1 f8 11 e2 d8! 12 f3 d3+ 13 d1 a4!

Nobody wants the bishop on a6!

14 d2 b2 15 a4 c4 16 d1 d2 17 b3 h5 18 a5+ xa5 White resigned.

With a struggle on one flank the advantage of knight over bishop in conjunction with some other pieces can be very great.

Lastin-Alferenko
Moscow, 1998

1 f5+ g6 2 g8+ f6 3 e3! c5 4 d5+ e6 5 e8+ d6 6 d8+ c6 7 c8+ b5?!

Obviously better was 7...d6, though even here after 8 c7 Black has serious problems.

8 c7!

After this move everything becomes clear.

8...c4 9 xf7 a2 10 f3! d4 11 f6 h4 12 gxh4 e7 13 h5 a6 14 g8! g5 15 g3 f4 16 g6 Black resigned.

Kamsky-Cvitan
Palma de Mallorca, 1989

1 d5+ g6 2 g8+ f6 3 e3! c5 4 d5+ e6 5 e8+ d6 6 d8+ c6 7 c8+ b5?!

Gulko-Sveshnikov
Volgodonsk, 1983

1 f3 c7 2 b5 f6 3 c5 e7 4 d3 f6 5 b4!

Guaranteeing the centralisation of his king.

5...d7 6 e4 d5 7 b7+ f8?

Slightly better is 7...g8.

8 f4! exf4 9 xf4 e5+ 10 f3 f5 11 e4 a5 12 xg6+ g8 13 f4! Black resigned.
Activity of the pieces always comes before material advantage.

1 \( \text{b7} \) \( \text{xa2} \) 2 \( \text{xb6} \) \( \text{g7} \) 3 \( \text{b7}+ \) \( \text{h6} \) 4 \( \text{e7} \)

White tries to limit the activity of the black knight.

4...\( \text{b2} \) 5 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{b1} \) 6 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{b2} \) 7 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 8 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f6}! \)

Again trying to control the e4 square.

9 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 10 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 11 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{h4}+ \) 12 \( \text{xg4} \) \( \text{g5}! \)

The transfer to the rook ending is lost: 12...\( \text{xe4} \) 13 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 14 \( \text{xe4} \)

Finally the knight achieves its objective—the pawn is not enough but the activity of the scattered pieces is sufficient to achieve a draw.

15 \( \text{d5}+ \) \( \text{g6} \) 16 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{d2} \) 17 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 18 \( \text{d5}+ \) \( \text{f6} \) 19 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{xh2}+ \)

20 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{xh2} \) 21 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{e3}+ \) 22 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f2} \) 23 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{f4} \) Drawn.

However you cannot always manage to achieve such coordination with a rook and knight. Very often a rook and bishop compliment each other splendidly.

Karpov-Hort
Tilburg, 1979

Preventing both \( \ldots .f7-f5 \), and also \( \text{e8-d6-f5} \)

2...\( \text{d8} \) 3 \( \text{b4} \) \( \text{e7}+ \) 4 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{axb4} \) 5 \( \text{xb4} \) \( \text{c7} \) 6 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{f6} \) 7 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 8 \( \text{a1}! \)

With the threat of 9 \( \text{a6} \) \( \text{bxa6} \) 10 \( \text{xa6} \) attacking the c6 pawn.

8...\( \text{b8} \) 9 \( \text{h4}! \)

The knight has gone over to the opposite flank. There he can attack on the other side.

9...\( \text{a6} \) 10 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{b8} \) 11 \( \text{f3} \)

12 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{e8} \) 13 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{e7} \) 14 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{b8} \) 15 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{a6} \) 16 \( \text{b1} \)

17 \( \text{a8} \) 18 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{e7} \) 19 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{g6} \) 19 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{x6} \) 20 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{b8} \) 21 \( \text{f6}! \)

Black's weaknesses start to crystallise.

22...\( \text{a6} \) 23 \( \text{g5!} \)

The passed pawn comes first!

23...\( \text{hxe5} \) 24 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{xa5} \) 25 \( \text{h7} \) \( \text{d8} \)

26 \( \text{xf7} \) 25 \( \text{ch5} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 28 \( \text{b7} \) \( \text{x6} \) 29 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{h8} \) 30 \( \text{e4} \) and White has a winning ending.

Balashov-Vaganian
USSR (ch), 1972

1 \( \text{c2}! \)

White plans to reconstruct with his king on d4 and knight on e3. Now Black should go over to counterplay by 1...\( \text{b5} \) 2 \( \text{b4} \) \( \text{e6} \)

3 \( \text{d4} \) \( f6 \) with a tenable position.
1...\textit{e}6? 2 \textit{e}4! \textit{f}5+ 3 \textit{d}4 \textit{x}c2?

Vaganian makes the mistaken decision to play a rook ending, though even after 3...\textit{e}6 4 \textit{e}3 \textit{c}5 5 f5 \textit{xf}5 6 \textit{x}c4 \textit{c}6 7 \textit{e}3 \textit{e}6 8 c4 things are not easy for him.

4 \textit{x}c2 \textit{c}5 5 \textit{e}2+ \textit{f}6 6 \textit{e}8!

Now it would be a mistake to transfer to a pawn ending: 6 \textit{e}5? \textit{xe}5 7 fxe5+ \textit{f}5 8 \textit{xc}4 \textit{g}4! 9 \textit{b}5 \textit{yg}3 10 \textit{xb}6 \textit{yh}4 11 \textit{xb}7 \textit{g}3 12 c4 h4, and Black is quicker.

6...\textit{b}5 7 \textit{e}2 \textit{c}5 8 a4 \textit{g}6 9 \textit{e}8 \textit{c}7

Now White needs to find a plan to play for a win, and Balashov discovers a splendid transfer of the rook to b5, where the rook attacks the b6 pawn and does not allow the king to penetrate to the fifth rank.

10 \textit{e}5 \textit{c}6 11 \textit{b}5? \textit{e}6 12 \textit{e}4 \textit{f}6 13 f5 g5 14 \textit{d}5 gxh4 15 gxh4 \textit{e}7 16 \textit{e}5!

Provoking ...f7-f6, so taking this square away from the opponent’s king.

16...f6+ 17 \textit{d}4 \textit{c}8 18 \textit{b}5 \textit{c}6 16 a5! \textit{bxa}5 17 \textit{xb}7+ \textit{f}8 18 \textit{d}5!

All White’s pieces are active, and Black’s passive.

18...\textit{c}8 19 \textit{b}5 \textit{e}8 20 \textit{xc}4 \textit{e}4+ 21 \textit{d}5 \textit{hx}4 21 \textit{xa}5 \textit{g}7 23 b4 \textit{h}1 24 b5 h4 25 c4 h3 26 \textit{a}2 h2 27 \textit{c}5 \textit{f}7 28 \textit{e}2 Black resigned.

Tal-Balashov

USSR, 1974

1 a4!

Depriving Black of the possibility of ...a5-a4.

1...\textit{b}6 2 \textit{d}2!

Now White improves the position of the knight, whereas Black’s following activation assumes an unreal character.

2...\textit{e}5 3 f3 \textit{f}8

Or 3...\textit{d}4 4 \textit{e}2 and 5 \textit{e}4, and if Black does not exchange rooks, then 6 \textit{h}1 and 7 h4.

4 \textit{e}4 \textit{c}7 5 \textit{h}1!

It is necessary to open the h-file, whereas the d-file has no significance.

5...\textit{f}4+ 6 \textit{e}2 \textit{d}7 7 h4 gxh4 8 \textit{hx}4 \textit{e}7 9 \textit{f}2!

Now the best place for the knight will be d3.

9...\textit{d}8 10 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}5 11 \textit{h}1 e5?!

A vain attempt to obtain activity with a pawn sacrifice.

12 \textit{d}1 \textit{e}6 13 \textit{f}2!
White again wants to exchange rooks, but Black is forced to avoid this exchange.
13...\(\text{c}d4\) 14 \(\text{g}e4\) \(\text{f}4\) 15 \(\text{c}3!\)
White’s main objective is the b6 pawn.
15...\(\text{g}5\) 16 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{d}8\) 17 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{f}7\) 18 \(\text{c}3!\)
It is necessary to drive the black rook away from the important d4 square.
18...\(\text{e}7?\)
Better is 18...\(\text{g}5!\), which was the only chance.
19 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{e}4\) 20 \(\text{e}3!\) \(\text{d}7\) 21 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{f}6\) 22 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{g}7\) 23 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{f}6\) 24 \(\text{e}6+\)
Black resigned.

The following ending serves as yet another example where the knight is stronger than a bishop when there are rooks on the board.

Pelletier-Arencibia
Ubeda, 1998

In order to maintain the balance Black must activate his rooks along the d-file and then subsequently attack White’s king’s flank.
1 \(h3\) \(\text{e}5\) 2 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{ab}8\)
Already Black does not succeed in organising counterplay along the d-file because of the exchange of a pair of rooks, which is in White’s favour.
3 \(b3\) \(\text{g}7\) 4 \(\text{a}6\) \(\text{bc}8?!\)
He should defend by 4...\(\text{b}7\) 5 \(\text{c}7\) \(\text{c}7\), though after 6 \(b4\) (but not 6 \(\text{xe}6?\) in view of 6...\(\text{b}2\)) and Black has no counterplay.
5 \(\text{c}5!\)
The best way to exchange after which the white knight appears on c5.
5...\(\text{exc}5\) 6 \(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{b}8\) 7 \(\text{b}4\)
Also here an exchange on e6 was not possible because of 7...\(\text{c}8\).
7...\(\text{f}6\) 8 \(\text{a}5!\)
The rook not only cuts off the black king along the fifth rank, but also improves its own position: its objective—the b7 square.
8...\(\text{ed}5\)
Hoping for 9 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{d}6\) 10 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 11 \(\text{xd}6\) \(\text{xd}6\) 12 \(\text{b}7\) a5 with probable equality.
9 \(a4\)
Now already the above-mentioned variation is threatened, because at the end White has b4-b5.
9...\(\text{ae}7\)
On the more tenacious 9...\(\text{g}7\) White intended to play 10 \(\text{b}3!\) \(\text{ed}7\) (the exchange of heavy pieces leads to a quick win for White: 10...\(\text{xax}5\) 11 \(\text{xax}5\) a6 12 \(\text{c}6\) \(\text{c}7\) 13 b5 axb5 14 a5! etc) 11 \(\text{d}4\) \(\text{d}6\) 12 \(\text{c}6\) \(\text{c}7\) 13 \(\text{a}6\) with the future march of the king to a4 and b4-b5 and the win of the a7 pawn. On the other side of the board Black does not get anything.
10 \(\text{b}5\) \(\text{d}6\) 11 \(\text{b}7+\) \(\text{ae}8\) 12 \(\text{e}4?!\)
Probably, sufficient for the win is 12 \(\text{a}6\) \(\text{g}5\) 13 g4 h5 14 gxh5 \(\text{xh}5\) 15 \(\text{xax}7\), but simplest was 12 \(\text{d}3\) a5 13 b5.
12...\(\text{e}7\) 13 \(\text{xax}7\) \(\text{e}5\)
Or 13...\(f5\) 14 \(\text{c}3\).
14 ♘a8+ ♘d7 15 ♘a7+ ♘e8

If the Black king stepped to d8, then 16 ♘f2 ♘xb4 17 ♘xf7 would decide.

16 ♘d3 ♘xb4?

It would be better to play the rook ending after 16...f5 17 ♘c5 ♘xc5 18 bxc5 ♘xc5 19 ♘xh7 g5 (19...♖a5 20 ♘h4), though 20 ♘a7 was sufficient for victory because of the very bad black king.

16...♘xf6+ ♗d8 17 ♗d7+ ♗c8 18 ♗xf6 ♘xf6 19 h5 20 ♗d7! ♗d5 21 ♗c4 ♘a5 22 ♗c5 also loses.

20 g4! ♗f3 21 ♗e2 ♘xh3 22 ♘xh7 ♘xh7

After 22...♖g3 23 ♗f2 the black rook is in a 'hole'.

23 ♘xh7 ♗d7 24 ♗d3 ♗e7 25 ♗g5 ♗d6 26 ♗f3 and Black resigned.

Adams-Almási
Dortmund, 1998

1 ♗d5! ♘xd5 2 exd5

White is obliged to transfer to an ending where for him the knight c6 controls all the important squares around itself, while even the dark-squared bishop, controlling the long diagonal, will feel redundant.

2...g6 3 ♗ab1 ♗g7 4 c4 ♗c3 5 ♗ec1 ♗f6 6 ♗f1 ♗e4 7 g3 ♗g5 8 ♗c2 ♗ae8 9 ♗b5!

For the present beginning an attack on the black pawns.

9...a5 10 ♗c6 ♗g7 11 ♗xa5 ♘a8 12 ♘b5 ♗f6 13 ♗a2 ♗c3 14 ♘c6 ♘xc4 15 a5

The a-pawn, supported by the knight c6, can only be stopped at the cost of material loss.

15...♖xa6 16 ♘c2 ♘xc6 17 dxc6 ♘xa5 18 ♘b7 ♗a1+ 19 ♗g2 ♗a5 20 ♗a7!

And Black resigned, since there is no defence against the manoeuvre ♘c2-b2-b7.

The knight is particularly strong in attacking various weaknesses, whereas a bishop is incapable of defending light and dark squares.

Van Laatum-Mikhalchishin
Eeklo, 1991

1...♗f5

There was another, and perhaps more unpleasant plan for White: 1...f5!? followed by 2...♗f6, 3...f4 and 4...♗f5.

2 ♗g2

After 2 ♗d5 ♘xg3 3 ♗e4 ♗g4 4 ♘xf5 gxh5 it is not easy to defend the endgame.

2...♗e3

Interesting was 2...♗d4 with the same plan ...f7-f5-f4.

3 ♗a2 f6!?
A new idea: ...g6-g5-g4 and ...

4 \text{\textit{e6}} f5

After 4...g5 White brings the bishop into the defence by 5 hxg5 hxg5 6 \text{h3}.

5 d4 \text{\textit{f6}} 6 d5?

This pawn should be 'discarded' by playing 6 \text{\textit{c8}} and 7 \text{\textit{b7}}, transferring the bishop to the long diagonal.

6...\text{\textit{c4}}!

Now the knight shows itself in all its splendour.

7 \text{\textit{c8}} \text{\textit{d6}} 8 \text{\textit{d7}} \text{\textit{d3}} 9 \text{\textit{e6}} \text{\textit{e4}} 10 \text{\textit{g2}} g5

There was also another plan: 10...\text{\textit{f3}} and 11...\text{\textit{f2}}.

11 hxg5+ \text{\textit{xg5}} 12 \text{\textit{f7}} \text{\textit{g4}} 13 \text{\textit{e6 \textit{e3}}}

Avoiding the trap 13...\text{\textit{xg3}}? 14 \text{\textit{xf5}}+!.

14 \text{\textit{c8}} \text{\textit{c3}} 15 \text{\textit{e6}} \text{\textit{d3}} 16 \text{\textit{f7}}?

It was necessary to give up the d5 pawn, if only by the move 16 \text{\textit{c8}} followed by 17 \text{\textit{a6}}.

16...\text{\textit{g5}}! White resigned.
9 Rook and two pawns against rook and knight (many pawns)

It would seem that having more pieces should confer an automatic advantage, but the knight has such limited mobility in a battle with pawns that quite frequently nothing can be done with it.

Mikhalchishin-Sveshnikov
USSR (ch), 1978

1...a3!
Bad is 2...bxax3? 3 bxax3 a4 4 d6+! a4 5 bxax3 bxax3 6 c3 with a win.

1...b5 2 d4?
After 2 bxa3 bxax3 3 d2 a3 4 d4 a4 5 bxax3 bxax3 6 b1! a2 7 c3+ b3 8 axa2 the pawn ending is won.

2...a3!

3 bxax3 bxax3 4 c3 a2! 6 c2 c4

After sacrificing a pawn, the black king rushes over to the opponent's pawns, it seems without success...

7 d6+ d5 8 f5 e4 9 xg7 f4 10 h3 g3 11 f5+ xh3 12 xh6 h4!

But this is the point—and typical for the struggle of the knight against pawns—there is no defence against g5, therefore a draw.

Smagin-Mikhalchishin
Moscow, 1989

1 b4?!
Clearly Black wants to attack the pawns, but stronger seems 1...h6, though it is not usually recommended to play on the side where the opponent is stronger.

2 a3 d3 g5 e6 4 d2 c5

After 4...e3+ 5 g4 e5+ 6 f4 d3 7 xax3 xax3+ 8 e4
Rook and two pawns against rook and knight

1. \( \text{Qxb2} \) 2. \( \text{Qd4} \) the white king threatens to break through to the pawns on the queen’s flank.

5. \( \text{Qg4} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 6. \( \text{Qd7+} \) \( \text{Qg8} \)

After 6...\( \text{Qc7} \) 7 \( \text{Qd6} \) there is equality on the board.

7 \( \text{h5} \), and a draw was agreed, since the threats \( \text{Qd8} \), h5-h6 give White sufficient play.

Black has two plans of play—the best one was the plan to advance the passed pawn. 1...\( \text{Qd1} \)!? 2 \( \text{Qc5} \) (2 \( \text{Qa2} \) d4! 3 \( \text{Qxa6} \) \( \text{Qd2+} \) =) 2...d4 3 \( \text{Qxa6?!} \) d3 4 \( \text{Qf6} \) h5 5 \( \text{Qd6} \) \( \text{Qd2+} \) with distinct counterplay. But Black decides to exchange pawns on the queen’s flank, which is clearly weaker.

1...\( \text{a5?!} \) 2 \( \text{Qg7?!} \)

But White decides to play for mating threats, whereas after the correct 2 \( \text{Qd2}! \) Black would encounter serious difficulties.

2...\( \text{Qb1} \) 3 \( \text{h3+} \)

If now 3 \( \text{Qd2} \), then after 3...\( \text{Qf4} \) 4 \( \text{De6+} \) \( \text{Qe3} \) 5 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qb2+} \) 6 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qxb3} \) 7 \( \text{Qxa5} \) \( \text{Qe4+} \) 8 \( \text{Qg4} \) \( \text{Qb2} \) 9 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{Qg2+} \) 10 \( \text{Qh5} \) \( \text{Qg3} \) Black eliminates White’s last pawn.

3...\( \text{Qh4} \) 4 \( \text{Qd2} \) g4! 5 \( \text{Qf5+} \) \( \text{Qg5} \) 6 \( \text{hxg4} \)

Or 6 \( \text{Qd4} \) g\( \text{xh3} \)+ 7 \( \text{Qxh3} \) \( \text{Qf4} \).

6...\( \text{Qxb3} \) 7 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxg4} \) 8 \( \text{Qxh6+} \) \( \text{Qf4} \) Drawn.

Korchnoi-Ljubojević
Bath, 1973

1...\( \text{Qb1?!} \)

After the correct 1...\( \text{Qf8} \) 2 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qb1} \) Black is in no way worse, whereas now problems start to appear with the f7 pawn.

2 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 3 \( \text{Qb7} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 4 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 5 \( \text{Qxf7} \) \( \text{Qc1} \) 6 \( \text{Qxh6} \) \( \text{Qc2+} \) 7 \( \text{Qf3} \) b2 8 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qe2+} \) 9 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qh2} \) 10 g5+ \( \text{Qe6} \) 11 \( \text{Qb6+} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 12 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 13 \( \text{Qxb2} \) \( \text{Qxh4} \) 14 \( \text{Qb7} \) \( \text{Qf4} \) 15 \( \text{Qd3} \) Black resigned.

Hertneck-Narciso
Berlin, 1998
Here Black is three clear pawns ahead, but after 1 \( \text{e5!} \) with the idea of \( \text{f4-e4} \) and then \( \text{c2} \) serious problems arise for Black, since he cannot create a passed pawn. But in the game there followed...

1 \( \text{f4?} \) \( \text{f7!} \) 2 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{g6} \) 3 \( \text{xd4?!} \)

A primitive decision, more interesting is 3 \( \text{e6!?} \) or 3 \( \text{h2!} \).

3...\( \text{xd4} \) 4 \( \text{xd4} \) \( \text{g5} \) 5 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{h4} \) 6 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{g3} \) 7 \( \text{e4+} \) \( \text{hx3} \) 8 \( \text{g5+} \) \( \text{g4} \) 9 \( \text{hx7} \) \( \text{f3} \) 10 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{f4} \) 11 \( \text{f8} \) \( \text{g5} \) 12 \( \text{e6+} \) \( \text{f5} \) 13 \( \text{d8} \)

13...\( \text{g4!} \)

By sacrificing yet another pawn, Black diverts the opponent’s king.

14 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{g3} \) 15 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{g2} \) 16 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{e4} \) 17 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{d3} \) Drawn.

Romanishin-Markowski
Polanica Zdroj, 1993

1 \( \text{e5!} \) \( \text{dxe5} \)?

Also not winning is 1...\( \text{d4} \) 2 \( \text{exd6} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 3 \( \text{h4!} \) \( \text{gxh4} \) 4 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{d4} \) 5 \( \text{d7} \!) with a draw. But necessary was 1...\( \text{e4!} \) 2 \( \text{exd6} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 3 \( \text{dxe6} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 4 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{f5!} \) 5 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{h6!} \) (against \( \text{h2-h4} \), so as to have \( \text{g5-g4} \)) 6 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 7 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{f5} \) 8 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{g7} \) with an easy win.

2 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{d4} \) 5 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{f6} \) 4 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{c6} \) 4 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{d4} \) 5 \( \text{c8}! \)

This is the idea—to take out the knight—now it's a draw.
10 Two minor pieces against a rook

Endings with an uneven alignment of forces are some of the most complicated in chess—and also comparatively little investigated. Among them can be included endings where a rook struggles against two minor pieces.

In the middlegame, particularly in positions bearing a closed character, two minor pieces will be stronger than a rook even where there is a deficit in pawns. However, in endings where the rook has room for action, the situation often depends on the arrangement of the pawns. Thus, when there is a distant passed pawn on the board, the rook can prove to be stronger than two pieces. However with a balanced pawn formation the situation may be reversed.

When playing such endings, it is very important for the side having the minor pieces to put right their coordination, and then the field of activity of the minor pieces may be sufficient to struggle successfully against a rook.

According to the generally held opinion, in standard situations with two pieces one can count on having an advantage. But rooks are not without their own chances too, particularly when there is a passed pawn on the board. However, first and foremost, as we go over to a study of positions of this type, we will turn our attention to the possibilities of the defending side. In terms of defensive resources the defender should strive for an exchange of pawns, bearing in mind the possibility of transferring to a theoretically drawn ending, exploiting the standard methods of: (a) from the rook’s side—sacrificing the exchange; (b) from the minor pieces’ side—sacrificing a piece.

Let’s look at some possibilities in positions where the rook is playing against passed pawns. The rook’s specific characteristics depend on lengthening lines of communication. The broader they are, the more chances the long-range rook has in its struggle against the less mobile minor pieces, and it is even possible to think about playing for a win. You see, whereas the minor pieces are riveted to the blockade of a passed pawn, the rook can be utilised also on another flank to organise new objects of attack.

To counteract the rook, one of the postulates of play for the side having the minor pieces is to put right their interaction while controlling the opponent’s passed pawn. But the various plans of activity of the forces on the board produce play of a complicated character, and the exploitation of one’s resources is not always successful even where highly rated chessplayers are concerned.

Naturally, the outcome of the struggle in great part depends on the arrangement of the pawns: the more
compact they are, the shorter the communications of the rook, and naturally the narrower their possibilities.

Beliavsky-Miles
Thessaloniki (ol), 1984

Despite the far advanced passed pawn, supported by all Black's forces, the chances of White's pieces are higher. They firmly blockade the pawn, while the quite narrow range of activity between the flanks allows White to fight for the creation of a passed pawn of his own.

1...c2 h1?!  
If 1...g5? 2 d1+ a3 3 c3 the passive rook is unable to prevent the win of the c4 pawn: 3...c1 4 e3 and 5 xc4.

Therefore Black activates his rook, attacking a pawn. But this is inaccurate: on the f-file the rook is in the sphere of activity of the king. Therefore stronger is 1...g1, defending the g6 pawn and riveting the white pieces to the passed c-pawn. Here, after 2 d1+ a3 no good is 3 c3 h1 or 3 e3 g2 4 e4 b3. But also on the active 3 f4 g3! the rook succeeds in standing up to the pieces. For example: 4 e3 f3 5 d5 c3+ 6 e2 h3 7 e3 (7 xg6? h2+) 7...h2+ 8 d3 (after 8 f3 Black forces a draw: 8...xc2! 9 xc2 b2) 8...b2, and Black prevents White from putting right the coordination of his pieces.

2 d1+ a3 3 e2 h1

There is no saving the pawn: 3...g1 4 e3 c3 5 f2 g5 6 f4.

4 xg6 h2+ 5 e3 b4 6 f4 c3 7 e3

White has won a pawn without losing control of the opponent's passed pawn.

7...b3 8 d3 b2 9 e4

It is useful to pay attention to the interaction of the white pieces—now the time for White's passed pawn has come.

9...c1 10 f4 h8 11 b5 b8

After 11...c2 12 a4 Black loses a pawn and cannot derive any benefit from the temporarily uncoordinated white pieces: 12...d2 13 xc2 a8 14 c6! or 12...a8 13 b3! a3 14 xc2 d2? 15 c4+.

12 d3 d2

Or 12 e8+ 13 d4 d2 14 c4+

13 c4+ d1 14 f3 h8 15 e4 e1 16 a3 d1 17 f5

And White, maintaining the blockade of the opponent's passed pawn, realised his own one.

Morovic-Yusupov
Tunis, 1985
In this example the sphere of activity of the rook is quite broad, and this means the more possibilities it has. In fact, despite material equality, the advantage is on the side of the rook. It is necessary only to create a distant passed pawn, while not forgetting to prevent it being blockaded by the minor pieces. This is achieved by the advance of the pawn pair after the preparatory \( \ldots f5 \).

But in the game there followed....

1...g4?,

Breaking the coordination of the pawn pair, which allows White to blockade it with the move 2 \( \text{el}! \), without upsetting the coordination of his own pieces. However he is deflected from a direct attack on the d4 pawn.

2 \( \text{h}6?! \text{e}6! 

No expense spared for creating a passed pawn.

3 \( \text{c}5+? 

It was still not too late to return to the blockading plan—3 \( \text{f}4 \text{h}5 \text{g}3! \text{f}5 \text{h}4. \) The bishop controls the e1-h4 diagonal, while the king has nowhere to go along the light squares, since on any \( \ldots \text{f}3 \) there is \( \text{e}1+. \) Moreover, also possible is the energetic 3 \( \text{f}2!?, \) taking aim at the d4 pawn.

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

Now already the creation of the passed pawn cannot be prevented, whereas 6 \( \text{f}4! \text{e}4 \text{g}3 \text{f}3 \text{e}1+ \) would have set up a solid blockade.

6...h5! 7 \( \text{x}d4 \text{e}4 \text{c}5 

8...\( \text{d}6 \) was threatened.

8...h4 9 \( \text{e}2 \text{a}5 

More energetic was 9...g3 10 \( \text{hx}g3 \text{hx}g3 \text{b}4 11 \text{c}8, \) imposing an original zugzwang on White: 12 a3 \( \text{e}613 \text{e}1 \text{f}614 \text{d}2 \text{d}5, \) and the king penetrates to the weakened queen’s flank.

10 \( \text{f}2+ \text{d}511 \text{b}4 \text{g}312 \text{hx}g3 \text{hx}g313 \text{d}3 

Also after 3 \( \text{g}4 \text{e}4 \text{e}3 \text{ax}b415 \text{xb}4 \text{h}6 \) the passed pawn must decide the game.

13 \( \text{ax}b4 

It was also possible to win the exchange: 13...\( \text{e}414 \text{b}xa5 \text{g}215 \text{a}6 \text{g}1=\text{w}16 \text{x}g1 \text{c}2+17 \text{d}1 \text{xd}318 \text{a}7 \text{xa}219 \text{c}1 \text{b}420 \text{b}1 \text{b}321 \text{f}2 \text{c}422 \text{e}3 \text{c}3 (A.Yusupov), but Black prefers to retain the passed g-pawn.

14 \( \text{e}3 \text{c}2+15 \text{d}1 \text{c}316 

\text{e}2 \text{e}417 \text{c}5+ \text{f}518 \text{d}3 \text{e}419 \text{c}5+ \text{d}520 \text{d}3 \text{c}2+21 \text{d}1 \text{h}2! 

Now the g-pawn cannot be stopped.

22 \( \text{g}1 \text{h}123 \text{f}4+ \text{e}424 

\text{e}2 \text{f}3 \text{White resigned.} 

In the context of defensive possibilities and technical realisation of a distant passed pawn, we present a classical example from the praxis of Yuri Razuvaev.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Razuvaev-Kirov}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textit{Sofia, 1981}
\end{center}

With such a specific arrangement of pawns on the king’s flank, the bishop itself can resist the rook
when there are no pawns on the queen's flank. It goes without saying that here the king of the weaker side should be close to the pawns. Therefore to achieve a draw it is enough for Black to sacrifice the knight for the passed a-pawn. He should also avoid any unnecessary weakening of the position. White should take this into account and organise offensive action. Black has succeeded in constructing a defence: his minor pieces are well coordinated, preventing the advance of the passed pawn and preparing a break on the king's flank. In addition the bishop does not allow in the rook since on $\text{b7}$ he can cover up by $\text{e7}$. Here, however, Black needlessly weakens his king's flank with the move

1...h6?

...and creates objects for attack, thus increasing the attacking possibilities of the rook. Now, as well as the h6 pawn, it is possible to add the invasion point f5, which can be created by undermining the g6 pawn with h2-h4-h5. After 1...$\text{d6}$ 2 h3 (more accurate than 2 $\text{g2}$, on which Black quickly organises an attack on the passed pawn by 2...$\text{e5}$ 3 h3 $\text{d7}$ and $\text{c5}$) Black has two possible plans of defence:

(A) Active—2...$\text{a5}$ (preparing the attack a4 after transferring the knight to c5) 3 $\text{g2}$ $\text{c6}$ 4 $\text{e5}$ $\text{b7}$ 5 $\text{e8}$ $\text{c5}$ 6 $\text{h8}$ $\text{d4}$ 7 $\text{xh7}$ $\text{c5}$ 8 h4 $\text{xa4}$ 9 h5 gxh5 10 gxh5 $\text{g5}$, and Black, after giving up his bishop for the h-pawn, reaches a theoretically drawn ending 'rook against knight'.

(B) Passive—2...$\text{e6}$ 3 $\text{g2}$ $\text{d6}$ 4 $\text{g3}$ (White presently controls the 5th rank in order to prevent the move ...h7-h5 exchanging a pair of pawns) 4...$\text{e6}$ 5 h4 $\text{d6}$ 6 h5 $\text{e6}$ 7 $\text{b7}$ $\text{e7}$ 8 $\text{f4}$ $\text{d6}$ 9 $\text{e4}$ $\text{e6}$. Now the king cannot break through to the c4 square without loss: 10 $\text{d3}$ $\text{e5}$+ 11 $\text{c3}$ $\text{xg4}$ 12 $\text{hxg4}$ $\text{xg4}$ 13 $\text{c4}$ (or 13 a5 $\text{e5}$ 14 a6 $\text{c6}$) 13...$\text{e5}$+ 14 $\text{b5}$ $\text{d8}$. Upon the attempt to proceed to c4 via the b3 square it is necessary to reckon with the threat of ...$\text{a5}$. The rook's intended penetration to the 8th rank by 10 $\text{c7}$ $\text{d6}$ 11 $\text{c8}$? $\text{d8}$ ends in its capture.

Also nothing is offered by 10 $\text{b5}$ $\text{d8}$.

2 $\text{g2}$ $\text{f6}$?

As before, Black senses no danger and breaks the coordination of his pieces since now the position of the bishop is limited by the blockading function of the knight. Better was 2...$\text{d6}$ 3 $\text{b7}$ $\text{c7}$ with the idea ...$\text{c6}$-a5.

3 $\text{c5}$ $\text{a5}$ 4 $\text{f3}$ $\text{e6}$ 5 $\text{e4}$ $\text{b6}$ 6 $\text{c8}$ $\text{f6}$ 7 h4 $\text{e6}$

8 h5

It is important to fix the weak pawn. Too hasty is 8 $\text{h8}$ $\text{b7}$ 9 $\text{xh6}$ $\text{c5}$ 10 $\text{f3}$ $\text{f7}$ 11 h5 gxh5 12 $\text{xb6}$ $\text{gxh4}$+ 13 $\text{xg4}$ $\text{xa4}$ with a drawn ending. Now, however, in the event of 8...gxh5, 9 $\text{h8}$ is unpleasant.

8...$\text{f7}$ 9 $\text{d5}$ gxh5 10 gxh5 $\text{f6}$ 11 $\text{b8}$ $\text{e3}$ 12 $\text{e4}$ $\text{d2}$ 13 $\text{b2}$ $\text{e1}$ 14 $\text{e2}$ $\text{b4}$ 15 $\text{g2}$ $\text{f7}$
The weakness of the h6 pawn is self-evident. Combining an attack on it and the knight, White breaks the coordination of the opponent’s pieces. On 15...f8 follows 16 g6 f7 17 a6, and the a-pawn starts to move.

16 g6 d2 17 d6! g5 18 d5!

An ideal square for the rook.

18 c6 19 a5 e6 20 a6 e3

Trying to blockade the a-pawn on the final frontier, but the mechanism of breaking the coordination of the pieces again comes into operation.

21 b5 g1 22 b1 f2 23 b2 c5 24 b7 a7 25 h7

And White wins the h-pawn and the game. A very fine ending!

And here is an example where pieces blockade the passed pawn from more distant ‘remote-control’ squares.

Karpov-Kasparov

*World Championship (m), 1985*

While no additional objects of attack have been created on the king’s flank, the advance of the pawns to vulnerable squares is premature. More logical was the exchange of the f-pawn after 3...g6, which forces the white king to remain far away from his pieces and increases the scope of the rook.

4 c3 f6

Also here, stronger is 4...g6.

5 b4

The pawn structure on the king’s flank is stabilised, and Black intends to attack White’s pawn weaknesses. We look at Black’s possibilities on the basis of comments made by G. Kasparov in his 1987 book *Two Matches*.

5...f7?!

Here the king does nothing, since there are no prospects for it in the centre. Much more accurate was 5...h7. In this case the method of defence applied by Karpov in the game would place White under threat of defeat. For example: 6 c3 b8 7 b4? b5! 8 g4 b8. A zugzwang position has been reached and White is forced to allow the rook into his camp: 9 d3 d8+ 10 c2 hxg4 11 hxg4 d4 12 xa3 a4 13 b3 xg4 14 c1 g3+ 15 c3 f3 16 c2 xf5 17 d3. A simple evaluation of such a position is not possible, but in practice Black would have excellent chances. But after 7 b4! White holds on: 7...b5 8 g4 b8 9 d3! a8 10 a2 a4 11 b4 h6 12 d2, and the fortress cannot be breached.

6 c3 b8 7 a2 b5 8 g4 b8

At first sight there is no basic difference from the above-mentioned zugzwang position, but...

9 d3 d8+ 10 c4 d1 11 xa3 a1 12 b3 h1

Not 12...h4? 13 c1.
13 gxh5 \textit{exh}3 + 14 \textit{dc}3

This is where the position of the black king tells: after 14...exh5 de4 the f5 pawn is inviolable.

14...\textit{xf}3

But now he cannot, without loss, cope with the h-pawn.

15 \textit{ec}1! \textit{xf}5 16 h6 \textit{g}6

Right up to the draw there remains the sacrifice of a piece for two pawns. On 16...g5 this is achieved by 17 de4 \textit{g}6 18 h7 ef3 (18...exh7 19 xf6+) 19 dc4 \textit{h}3 20 dxf6.

17 de4 \textit{h}5 18 \textit{b}2

And the f6 pawn is lost, since on 18...f5 follows 19 h7. \textit{Drawn}.

If, together with the rook, there are no passed pawns then roles are reversed. It remains only for the rook to counteract the opponent's attempts to create his own passed pawn. But none the less the defender's resources are quite substantial.

\textbf{Short-Kasparov}
\textit{Belgrade, 1989}

In this position Black's chances can only be linked to the creation of a passed g-pawn. Therefore he endeavours to win the h2 pawn. However to do this it is necessary to break through the line of demarcation—the 3rd rank—which the rook allows only 'in exchange' for a counterattack behind enemy lines. All this is not easy. Let us look at the possibilities of the two sides based on G.Kasparov's analysis.

1 \textit{g}3 \textit{d}5+ 2 \textit{f}2 \textit{f}5

The king moves closer to the h2 pawn.

3 ef3+ gf4 4 \textit{g}3+ \textit{h}4 5 \textit{f}3

White strives to activate his king, since he cannot hold on by the passive 5 \textit{b}3 \textit{f}4 with the threat ...\textit{d}3+. Now 5...\textit{xb}4 is not possible because of 6 \textit{g}4+.

5...\textit{f}6?!

Stronger is 5...\textit{d}7!, keeping under threat b6, while on 6 \textit{e}4 the knight manages to attack the h2 pawn: 6...\textit{f}6+! 7 \textit{e}5 \textit{g}4+ 8 \textit{d}6 \textit{b}5 9 \textit{g}2 \textit{e}3, and the black king draws closer to the h2 pawn.

6 \textit{g}2 \textit{h}5 7 \textit{e}3 \textit{f}4+ 8 \textit{g}1 \textit{g}4

Now, with the white king driven back, Black puts right the interaction of his king and pieces.

9 \textit{g}3+ \textit{f}5 10 ef3 \textit{g}4

Not letting out the king, since in the event of 10...\textit{e}4 11 \textit{f}2 \textit{d}3+ 12 \textit{g}3 \textit{xb}4 13 \textit{f}8 White again activates his forces.

11 \textit{e}3 \textit{d}5?

Again insufficient is 11...\textit{d}3 because of the activating of the rook—12 \textit{e}7! (12 \textit{g}2? \textit{f}4+ 13 \textit{e}7 \textit{c}6 in Black's favour) 12...\textit{xb}2 13 \textit{f}7! \textit{g}6 14 \textit{f}8 \textit{d}3 15 \textit{g}2 \textit{xb}4 16 \textit{f}4.

12 \textit{b}3 \textit{f}4 13 \textit{f}2

Only the b3 and g3 squares remain accessible to the rook, but now he should encircle the king. However, on 13 \textit{g}6? \textit{e}3 14 \textit{f}2 \textit{d}1+ 15 \textit{e}1 \textit{a}4 16 \textit{a}3 \textit{xb}2 17 \textit{a}2 \textit{d}3+ 18 \textit{d}2 \textit{b}5 White loses a pawn without compensation.

13...\textit{f}6 14 \textit{a}3 \textit{e}4+ 15 \textit{g}2 \textit{e}2
The manoeuvre 15...\( \text{d2} \) 16 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c4} \) 17 \( \text{c1}! \) \( \text{x} \) \( \text{xb2} \) 18 \( \text{c8} \) allows the rook to escape to freedom.

16 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{f1}+ \) 17 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{c4} \) 18 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{g5} \) 19 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 20 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{e4}?! \)

The a6 pawn is indirectly defended: 21 \( \text{xa6}?? \) \( \text{h3}+ \) 22 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{d3}+ \), but this move, losing time, also allows the rook to escape to freedom. Stronger was 20...\( \text{f3}+ \) 21 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{e5} \) 22 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{c4} \).

21 \( \text{f2}! \) \( \text{b7} \)

22 \( \text{d3}?! \)

White misses his chance to activate the rook by 22 \( \text{a5}! \), threatening to exchange the b-pawn with tempo—22...\( \text{e4}+ \) 23 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{d6} \) 24 \( \text{c5} \), and, it seems, maintaining the equilibrium.

22...\( \text{h3}+ \) 23 \( \text{e1}?! \)

After moving the king further away from the h2 pawn the game already cannot be saved since now Black cuts it off from this pawn. Necessary was 23 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{c6} \) 24 \( \text{c3} \).

23...\( \text{c6}! \) 24 \( \text{d4}+ \) \( \text{f3} \) 25 \( \text{d3}+ \) \( \text{e4} \) 26 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{f4} \) 27 \( \text{a3} \)

More tenacious is 27 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{b5} \) 28 \( \text{c8} \), though after 28...\( \text{f3} \) 29 \( \text{f8}+ \) \( \text{g2} \) 30 \( \text{g8} \) \( \text{f2}! \) White also loses the h2 pawn.

27...\( \text{b5} \) 28 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g5} \) 29 \( \text{c8} \) \( \text{e3}! \) 30 \( \text{h8} \) \( \text{f3} \) 31 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e2}+ \) 32

\( \text{c2} \) \( \text{xh2} \) 33 \( \text{h2} \) \( \text{g3} \) and Black won.

One more example from the classics.

\( \text{Réti-Bogoljubow} \)

\( \text{Bad Kissingen, 1928} \)

1...\( \text{b6} \)

For the side having the rook it is very important to create a distant passed pawn quickly.

2 \( \text{axb6} \) \( \text{xb6} \) 3 \( \text{e2} \)

A loss of tempo. He should quickly put right the coordination of his pieces, combining an attack on the e5 pawn with detention of the a-pawn. For example: 3 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{b5} \) (3...\( \text{b4} \) 4 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 5 \( \text{c6} \) tending \( \text{d5} \) and \( \text{d2} \) 4 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c5} \) 5 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{f7} \) 6 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{e6} \) 7 \( \text{d3} \) and 8 \( \text{c4} \).

3...\( \text{b4} \) 4 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f7} \) 5 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{b1} \) 6 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 7 \( \text{g3} \)

This threat is a sham, since it has a tactical refutation.

It is useful to stop the pawn as soon as possible. For this purpose the blockading move 7 \( \text{d8} \) is appropriate.

7...\( \text{c1}! \) 8 \( \text{a5} \)

8 \( \text{xe5} \) is no good in view of

8...\( \text{c3}+ \) 9 \( \text{f4} \) \( g5+ \) 10 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xg3}+ \).
Two minor pieces against a rook

8...d5 a5 11 d3 a4 10 e3 e1 a3 12 e2 a4 13 d2 b3

14 b4

At last White manages to put right the coordination of his pieces and blockade the passed pawn. Trying to obtain additional objects of attack, Black organises pawn pressure on the king’s flank, supported by the active rook.

14...h5 15 f8 g5 16 h3 c3 17 d2 b3 18 e2 b2 19 d2 b1
20 e2 c1 21 d2 f1 22 c5 f4 23 d3 f7 24 e3 d7+ 25 e2 g7

26 g4?

This superficially active move, pursuing the objective of blockade, turns out to be the decisive mistake. White creates in his position a weak h3 pawn, which the rook can attack, exploiting the fact that White’s minor pieces are tied down to the threatened advance of the a-pawn. After 26 a3 g4 27 hXg4 Xg4 28 f3 g8 29 c5 White defends himself successfully.

26...h4! 27 c1?

The only move was 27 d2! so as to meet 27...c7 with 28 d3, and 27...b7 with 28 b4.

27 c7 28 d3 b7 29 xg5 b3+ 30 c4 xh3

And so the main idea of attacking with the rook is seen in a clear light:

Black has two distant passed pawns and the opponent’s pieces are in no state to contain them without material loss.

31 b4 a3! 32 xxa3 xxa3 33 xh4 e3 34 c4 xe4+ and soon White resigned.

Let’s look at yet another example, illustrating the strength of the rook in conjunction with an outside passed pawn.

Miles-Van der Sterren,
Wijk-aan-Zee, 1984

Material advantage is on White’s side. He has a passed pawn, harmonious deployment of pieces and can reckon on playing for a win. However the strength of the passed pawn in conjunction with an active rook is such that Black’s counter-resources prove sufficient to obtain full equality. For a start he ties the minor pieces down with the threat to advance the a-pawn.

1...a3 2 d3 a5 3 a2 g7 4 c3 f6 5 f3 b5

The rook transfers to an active position. Weaker is 5...g5?!—6 e5+ f5 7 d4+ g6 8 e6 f6 9 b4 a8 10 c6, with advantage to White.

6 e5+ c7 7 d4 b2 8 d5 f2 9 c2 e2 10 b4
White hopes to realise his material advantage and therefore rejects the draw after 10 \( \text{dxa3} \text{xe5} \).

10...d7 11 \( \text{d4} \) g5

We are acquainted, from the previous examples, with the method of exploiting a 'quality advantage' (in the words of A. Nimzowitsch).

12 h3 h5 13 g4?!  
As shown by the endings previously looked at—this is a risky weakening of the position. However White plays for the win and does not want to reconcile himself to the 'drawing zugzwang': 13 \( \text{d2+} \) g2+ 15 \( \text{f5} \) d2 etc.

13...h4 14 c4

Analysis shows that in fact he already has to worry about maintaining equality. For example, in Black's favour is 15 \( \text{d5} \) e3!? (sufficient for a draw is 15...c1, but White is striving for more) 16 \( \text{c5+} \) e7 17 \( \text{c6+} \) f8! 18 \( \text{c4} \) e2 19 \( \text{b4} \) b2 20 \( \text{a2} \) [20 c5! \( \triangle \) 20...h2? (20...e7!) 21 \( \text{d6} \) xh3 22 \( \text{d5} \) h1 23 e6 e1 24 e7 xxe7 25 xxe7 h3 26 f5+--! 20...h2 etc or 15 e6 e7! (but not 15...d6?—16 c2 h1 17 cxa3 xh3 18 b5+ e7 19 a7 and 20 c8+, and White has the advantage) 16 c2 h1 17 cxa3 xh3 18 b5 g3 etc.

It seems he should reconcile himself to a draw by playing 15 \( \text{c2} \! \) h1 16 cxa3 xh3 17 c2! g3 18 e3=.

15...d1 16 e4 d2 17 c4 b2 18 a2 h2 19 f5 xh3 20 xg5 h1

An inaccuracy. Far stronger is 20...h2 with the threat of 21...xa2 and 22...h3. White cannot at the same time hold the two distant passed pawns (there you are, don't you recall the move 13 g4?!). For example: 21 f5 f2+ 22 g6 xa2 23 xa2 e7, and one of the pawns queens; or 21 f4 f2+ 22 e3 c2 23 d5 h3 24 b4 b2 25 d3 a2 (or) 25...h2), with a decisive advantage.

21 f6 h3 22 c3 e1 23 e6 d8 24 d5 h2 25 g5 f1+ 26 e6 c1 27 a2 h1= 28 xh1 xh1 29 g6 g1?  
Having achieved a winning position, Black makes a mistake—and victory escapes him. After 29...e8! White's passed pawns are neutralised. For example: 30 f6 f1+ 31 e6 f8 32 d6 f2 33 e6 d2+! etc. or 30 g7 h6+ 31 d5 f7 32 c4 h3, with a winning ending.
30 \( \text{f7} \) \( \text{f1}+ \) 31 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{g1} \) 32 \( \text{f7} \) \( \text{f1}+ \) 33 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{g1} \) Drawn.

The opportunity for the side having the rook to create a distant passed pawn quite often appears as a leit-motif of the struggle.

Novikov-Kaidanov
Vilnius, 1984

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

Black immediately exploits the break in coordination of the opponent's pieces. In view of the threat 2...\( \text{xc3} \) White is forced to allow the creation of a passed pawn.

2 \( \text{c6} \) a3 3 \( \text{d4} \)

The piece sacrifice 3 bxa3 \( \text{xc3} \) 4 a4 does not work because of 4...a6!

3...\( \text{c5!} \) 4 \( \text{f3} \)

The knight cannot move: 4 \( \text{c2} \) axb2, or 4 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{xb5} \).

4...a2 5 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{xb5} \) 6 \( \text{a1} \)?

He cannot hope to hold the position with passive defence. Stronger is 6 \( \text{e4} \) with the idea of transferring the king to c4. For example: 6...\( \text{h5} \) (on 6...\( \text{f7} \) possible is the prophylactic 7 \( \text{g4} \) followed by 8 \( \text{d4} \) 7 h4 g5 8 hgx5 (dangerous is 8 \( \text{xf6} \) because of 8...gxh4 9 gxh4 \( \text{f7} \) 10 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{hxh}4 \), with the creation of a second distant passed pawn, while 10 \( \text{d8} \) loses after 10...\( \text{c5} \) 8...fxg5 9 fxg5 (also possible is 9 b3 with the threat of 10 \( \text{b4} \), but risky is 9 f5?! because of 9...\( \text{h2} \) 10 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{f7} \) followed by the creation of a passed h-pawn) 9...\( \text{exg5} \) 10 \( \text{f4} \) and then b2-b3. By reducing the number of pawns, White can count on holding the position.

6...\( \text{f7} \) 7 \( \text{e3} \)

Why not to e4?

7...\( \text{e6} \) 8 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{d5} \) 9 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 10 \( \text{b3} \)

Allowing a tactical solution to the position. As seen from the previous examples, the exchange sacrifice does not achieve its objective after 10 b4, but in this case the breakthrough with the king decides—10...\( \text{c4} \) 11 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{d4}+ \) etc.

10...\( \text{xc3}+ \) 11 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{e4} \)

Black has reached a technically won endgame, since White's king is riveted to the a2 pawn and the knight will not succeed in containing the pawn break on the king's flank. We present the main variation: 12 g5 \( \text{xf4} \) 13 gxg6 \( \text{xg6} \) 14 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{e4}! \) 15 \( \text{c2} \) f5 16 \( \text{a3} \) f4 17 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{d3} \) 18 \( \text{e5}+ \) \( \text{e2} \) 19 \( \text{xa2} \) f3 20 \( \text{xg3} \) \( \text{xf3} \) 21 \( \text{a3} \) h5, and White is lacking one tempo to save himself. With the pawn placed on b4 it would be drawn.

The game ended in the following way:

12 f5 \( \text{f4} \) 13 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{g4} \) 14 \( \text{c2} \) h3 15 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{h2} \) 16 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{g3} \) 17 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{g4} \) 18 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 19 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{f4} \) 20 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{g5} \) 21 \( \text{d6} \) h5 22 \( \text{e4}+ \) \( \text{f4}! \) 23 \( \text{xh6} \) h4 24 \( \text{d5}+ \) \( \text{f3} \) and White resigned.

Let's look at a more complicated example of the creation and realisation of an outside passed pawn.
White has a material advantage, but the presence of a weak pawn on a2 and the lack of cooperation between his pieces allows the opponent to count on creating a distant passed pawn. The position bears a concrete character and in the event of a premature fixing of the weak pawns, similar to the previous examples, White will manage to put right the coordination of his pieces and prevent the invasion of the rook. For example: 1...a3 2 cfx4 l:c8 3 c:e2.

However Black breaks through to the a2 pawn in a tactical way.

1...c4!! 2 a:c4

After 2 bxc4 b:b8 Black organises the advance of the passed b-pawn: 3 c:f2 b3 4 a3 (or 4 axb3 a3 5 a:d1 a:b3 etc) 4..b2 5 a:b1 a:b3 6 a:e2 a:c3 7 c:e4 a:c4 8 c:d2 c:c1.

2...c8

In the event of 3 c:f2? there is the threat of an exchange sacrifice together with a pawn break—3...a:c4! 4 bxc4 b3 5 axb3 a3.

3 a:d3 a3! 4 a:e3

The most tenacious continuation. The attempt to place the knight at once loses quickly. For example: 4 e4 c3 5 e:e2 a:b3 6 c:c4 b2 7 c:d3 b3; or 4 c:f2 c1 5 e:e4 a:a1 6 c:d3 a:a2 7 a:b4 (White should also lose in the event of 7 h4 f:2!) 7...a:b2 8 a:d3 f5 9 e:e3 (on 9 axf5 winning are both 9...a:b2, and 9...f:f6) 9...f:f6 10 c:f4 f:2+ 11 e:e3 a:b2 12 a:c4 g:5 13 a:f7 g:4 14 e:6 a:xg3, and each of the passed pawns will cost a piece.

4...c1 5 c:f4 a:a1 6 c:d5 a:a2 7 a:b4 a:b2 8 c:e2 a:h3 9 f:f2

Not allowing the rook to assist with the advance of the a-pawn, which would have been the case after 9 f:f3 a:h1 10 c:c4 a:a1 (otherwise White can blockade the a3 pawn by 11 a:a2 and 12 b4) 11 c:c2 a:a2 12 a:b4 a:b2 etc. However Black finds a new resource.

9...f5!

In the event of 9...a:h1 White successfully solves the problem of restricting the rook by 10 f:f1 a:h2+ 11 a:g2 a:h8 12 a:a2 a:c8 13 e:e4. Now however the threat of the break...f5-f4 is irresistible. On 10 f:f1 follows 10...a:h2+ 11 a:g2 a:h8, and the rook breaks through on the queen’s flank.

10 a:a2 f4 11 gxf4 a:b3 12 a:c4 a:h3! 13 f:f1

Black is preparing a breakthrough with his king, whereas White cannot force the rook from the 3rd rank without material loss. For example: 13 a:g2 a:e3 14 f:f2 e:e4 etc.

13...a:h2+ 14 a:g2 f:f6 15 a:g3 a:h5 16 f:f1 a:e5 17 a:d3 a:d5 18 a:a6 a:d2 19 a:c4 a:d4 White resigned.

An analogous idea of an ultra-sharp breakthrough was exploited by Kramnik against Ivanchuk.
164 Two minor pieces against a rook

Ivanchuk-Kramnik
Linares, 1998

1...c4!! 2 bxc4
On 2 dxc4 follows 2...d2+ and 3...xc2 and 4...xa2, and Black has a passed pawn. However it is impossible to avoid the loss of a pawn.

2...b8 3 c5 b2 4 c6 e7 5 xg6+ d6 6 e5 xa2 7 c4+ c7
After 7...xc6 8 xf5 there is no threat of 8...xc2 because of 9 xc2 a2 10 a5+ and 11 b3.

8 g3 a1 9 xa3 xa3 10 h4 Drawn.

In positions where the side having the rook cannot actively support the passed pawn, the minor pieces frequently prove to be stronger than the rook. Therefore an important task for the defender is to ensure the activity of the rook and king.

With a small number of pawns a good defensive resource is served by the possibility of an exchange sacrifice with the elimination of all the pawns or with a transfer to a position which, although without pieces, is still a theoretical draw.

Tavadian-Tseshkovsky
Irkutsk, 1983

To realise his material advantage White should adjust the coordination of his pieces in such a way that the threat to advance the f-pawn hampers the activity of the rook and king and wins the pawns on the queen's flank. Together with this it is important to firmly blockade these pawns.

1 c6 d3+ 2 f2 g5
Black would readily exchange the b-pawn for the f-pawn, but 2...f4 does not work because of 3 d4 b4 4 e2+ f5 5 xb4.

3 b4
White does not find a clear-cut plan to attack the b-pawn. As a result there still remains an interesting struggle for tempo, leading to a decisive increase in material advantage. As R.Tavadian pointed out, there was a win here with the brilliant manoeuvre 3 d4! f4! (3...b4 does not work because of 4 e6+ f5 5 c5 xc3 6 bxc3 bxc3 7 e4 c2 8 g3+ and 9 e2+) 4 e2 e3+ (above all 4...b4 does not work because of 5 d2 etc) 5 f1! d3 (he cannot
play 5...\texttt{Be7}? because of 6 \texttt{Bd}2 \texttt{Bg}3 7 \texttt{Bf}5+ or 5...\texttt{Be}8 6 \texttt{Bf}2 \texttt{Bb}8? 7 \texttt{Bd}2 \texttt{Bd}5 8 \texttt{Bc}6+) 6 \texttt{Bf}2, and an elegant ‘dance’ of the king along the ‘triangulation’ e2-f1-f2, typical for pawn endings, culminating in the win of the b-pawn.

3...\texttt{Bd}7 4 \texttt{Be}3 \texttt{Bf}5 5 f4?

It was still not too late to return to the above-mentioned plan. However White’s careless advance of the f-pawn removes his control of the e4 square, allowing the rook to develop great activity with support from the king. In effect the material advantage is now devalued.

5...\texttt{Bh}7 6 \texttt{Be}5 \texttt{Bd}7 7 \texttt{Be}3 \texttt{Bd}7 9 \texttt{Ba}2 \texttt{Bd}3+! 10 \texttt{Bf}2 \texttt{Bb}3

The white king is cut off along the 1st-3rd ranks, and when the opportunity presents itself an advance of the b-pawn is threatened. The chances of the two sides are even.

11 \texttt{Bd}2 \texttt{Bd}3 12 \texttt{Bc}2 \texttt{Bf}3 13 \texttt{Ba}4! 14 \texttt{Ba}6 \texttt{Bd}5 15 \texttt{Bc}7+ \texttt{Bc}6 16 \texttt{Bd}6 \texttt{Bd}5 17 \texttt{Bg}5 \texttt{Bg}3 18 \texttt{Bc}3 \texttt{Bg}2+ 19 \texttt{Bc}1 \texttt{Bf}2 20 \texttt{Bd}2 \texttt{Bb}4 21 \texttt{Bxb}4 \texttt{Bxf}4 and the game soon ended in a draw.

Here is a good illustration of the failure to exploit one’s chances.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Miles-Adorjan} \\
\textit{Wijk-aan-Zee, 1984}
\end{center}

Superficially the impression is that Black’s advantage is of a decisive character. However analysis shows that, even though the d5 and g7 pawns are doomed, his defensive resources are in no way exhausted.

1 \texttt{Bg}2 \texttt{Gg}8 2 \texttt{Gg}5?

In such endings it is very important to activate the rook. This is achieved by 2 \texttt{Gg}5 \texttt{Be}4 3 f5 \texttt{Bxf}5 (if 3...f6 4 \texttt{Gg}6 \texttt{Bxd}5 5 \texttt{Gg}4 the chances are already on White’s side) 4 f6! \texttt{Bxf}6 5 \texttt{Bxb}5 \texttt{Bxg}7 6 \texttt{Bb}6!, with the idea of 6...d5 7 \texttt{Bg}5. The position is simplified and White obtains definite counterplay, associated with the possibility of creating a distant passed pawn on the queen’s flank.

2...\texttt{Bd}4 3 \texttt{Bg}3 \texttt{Bxd}5 4 \texttt{Bf}6?.

White again misses the opportunity to activate the rook, though in a less favourable light. Correct was 4 f5 \texttt{Bxf}7 5 \texttt{Bg}4 \texttt{Bf}6! (5...\texttt{Bf}3 looks tempting on account of 6 \texttt{Bd}4 f6+ 7 \texttt{Bh}4 \texttt{Bd}7, winning the f5 pawn, however, by playing 6 \texttt{Bg}3!, White is forced to repeat the position: 6...\texttt{Be}4 7 \texttt{Bf}4, since it is dangerous for the bishop to leave the b1-h7 diagonal because of the threat f5-f6) 6 \texttt{Bg}1 \texttt{Bc}6 7 \texttt{Bh}4! (it is useful to hold the check to the king in reserve: after 7 \texttt{Bf}4+ \texttt{Bh}6 it is not easy for White to hold the position, for example: 8 \texttt{Bd}1 \texttt{Bd}5 9 \texttt{Bg}3 \texttt{Bg}5, or 8 \texttt{Be}1 \texttt{Bh}5 9 \texttt{Bg}1 \texttt{Bd}5, with advantage to Black; nevertheless possibilities of resistance were offered by 8 \texttt{Bh}4! \texttt{Bh}5 9 \texttt{Bg}3!, but not 9 \texttt{Bg}7?? \texttt{Bd}5+–) 7...\texttt{Be}4+ 8 \texttt{Bf}4 \texttt{Bh}6 9 \texttt{Bg}8, and with an active rook White can successfully defend himself.

4...\texttt{Be}7 5 \texttt{Bc}3 \texttt{Bf}5+ 6 \texttt{Bg}5 \texttt{Bxg}7 7 \texttt{Bc}8 \texttt{Bd}4 8 \texttt{Bd}8 \texttt{Be}6+ 9 \texttt{Bg}4 \texttt{Bc}6 10 \texttt{Bb}8 \texttt{Bd}4 11 f5?
Now also the f-pawn is lost. We mention that on 11 \( \text{d}8 \) Black regroups his pieces by 11...\( \text{f}3+ \) 12 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{e}4 \) followed by 13...\( \text{f}5 \), and the d-pawn quickly advances.

11...\( \text{f}6 \) 12 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 13 \( \text{h}5 \)
Belated activity by the passed pawn.

13...\( \text{e}3+ \) 14 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 15 \( \text{d}8 \) \( \text{d}4 \)
16 \( \text{d}6+ \) \( \text{e}5 \) 17 \( \text{f}6+ \) 18 \( \text{h}3 \)
\( \text{xf}6 \) 19 \( \text{xh}6 \) \( \text{d}3 \) 20 \( \text{h}5+ \) \( \text{f}5 \)
White resigned.

Let's look at an example where the minor pieces have to hold back an onslaught by an active rook when there is relative material equality.

Keres-Szabó
Candidates (t), Zürich, 1953

The initiative lays with Black: his rook is very active, whereas the knights are far away from each other and, what is no less important, they have no support points. Besides this White needs to reckon with the possibility of a transfer to a pawn ending. White's main task is quickly to put right the coordination of his knights. Let us proceed with P.Keres' logical and beautiful filigree manoeuvre which solved the problem of the defence.

1...\( \text{f}8 \) 2 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 3 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 4 \( \text{c}5 \)
And so the coordination of the knights is put right. They defend one another and therefore are unassailable.

4...\( \text{f}5 \) 5 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 6 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 7 \( \text{d}7+ \) \( \text{e}6 \)
His hopes of driving away the knight from the a6 pawn are unreal. Stronger is 7...\( \text{g}5 \), trying to keep back the king and create a passed f-pawn.

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

The knights have regrouped and again are unassailable.

8...\( \text{e}5 \) 9 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{b}3+ \)
Worth considering is 9...\( \text{f}4+ \), but even in this case the king is not obliged to step back. For example: 10 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{f}5+ \) 11 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{b}3 \) 12 \( \text{d}7+ \) (weaker is 12 \( \text{c}4 \) because of 12...\( \text{d}5 \) 13 \( \text{bd}6 \) \( \text{f}3! \) 14 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{xf}3 \), and the knights are "hobbling", while Black is able to create a passed pawn) 12...\( \text{d}5 \) 13 \( \text{dc}5 \) \( \text{f}3 \) 14 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{xf}3 \) 15 \( \text{xa}6 \), with a probable draw.

10 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{c}3 \) 11 \( \text{c}5! \)
A tactical solution to the problems of defence—typical for such endings. White exchanges pieces and transposes the game to a drawn pawn ending.
11...\textit{c}xc5 12 \textit{d}d7+ \textit{d}d6 13 \textit{c}xc5 \textit{c}xc5 14 \textit{g}g5 \textit{b}b5 15 \textit{h}h6
And the game was drawn after a few moves.

With the pawns placed on one flank the task of the defending side still remains quite complicated.

Miles-Kindermann
Bath, 1983

Black has the advantage, since he has the possibility of creating a passed pawn. But the small number of pawns gives White a defensive resource—at an appropriate moment to sacrifice his bishop and obtain a theoretically drawn position.

1.\textit{e}6 2 \textit{c}c3

The best practical chance! In the event of 2 \textit{c}c7 \textit{c}c2+ 3 \textit{b}b6 (after 3 \textit{b}b5 \textit{f}4 4 \textit{d}d8 \textit{hx}2 White loses a pawn, since he cannot play 5 \textit{x}g5 because of 5...\textit{h}5) Black plays not 3...\textit{f}4—4 \textit{d}d8 \textit{hx}2 5 \textit{x}g5 with possibilities of defence, but first of all 3...\textit{h}6, with the idea 4...\textit{f}4 5 \textit{h}4 \textit{gx}4 6 \textit{xf}4 \textit{h}3—+

2...\textit{hx}2 3 \textit{d}d5+ \textit{e}7 4 \textit{d}d4 \textit{f}6 5 \textit{e}3+ \textit{g}6 6 \textit{e}1 \textit{f}4+ 7 \textit{d}d4 \textit{h}5

A speedy advance of the distant passed pawn should lead to a win for Black.

8 \textit{e}5 \textit{h}4 9 \textit{e}4+ \textit{f}7?
Carelessness, after which White saves the game with a surprising tactical blow. The natural continuation appears to be 9...\textit{h}6, and the h-pawn swiftly advances. For example: 10 \textit{f}6 \textit{h}3 11 \textit{b}4 \textit{e}2 12 \textit{g}6 \textit{e}6!, or 10 \textit{f}5 \textit{g}2 11 \textit{b}4 \textit{h}3 12 \textit{f}6 \textit{e}2—in both cases with an easy win.

10 \textit{x}xh4!!
Now it all comes down to a theoretically drawn ending.

10...\textit{gx}h4
The situation is not changed by 10...\textit{hx}h4 11 \textit{f}5 \textit{h}6 12 \textit{x}g5 \textit{f}6 13 \textit{f}5 and 14 \textit{xf}4, with a draw.

11 \textit{xf}4 \textit{g}2 12 \textit{f}5
White would have replied with this move also after 11...\textit{h}1. There followed:

12...\textit{f}6 13 \textit{h}3 \textit{g}1 14 \textit{g}4 \textit{b}1 15 \textit{h}3 \textit{b}4+ 16 \textit{e}3 \textit{e}5 17 \textit{g}4 \textit{b}3+ 18 \textit{f}2 \textit{f}4 19 \textit{g}2 \textit{b}2+ 20 \textit{h}3, and Black soon convinced himself of the futility of playing for a win.
When there are pawns on one flank for both sides, the rook can successfully contend with the minor pieces.

Dan-Pytel  
Austria, 1978

Material advantage is on White's side, but the inevitability of pawn exchanges when pawns are advanced, gives the defender the possibility of exploiting the exchange sacrifice motive to reach a theoretically drawn position.

1...f6!
The more active 1...f5 creates too much space for the bishop's activities.

2 g4 a3
One of the most important elements is playing for the restriction of the king's movements.

3 f2 h6 4 h4 b3 5 h5
White plans the transfer of the bishop to d4 and organises the break g4-g5.

5...b4 6 g3 b3 7 d4 d3 8 b2 b3 9 c1 c3 10 d2 c2
More principled is 10...d3, holding the third rank and preventing White's coming manoeuvre.

11 e3 c3 12 f2 a3 13 e4 a4
Now defence by the rook moves on to the fourth rank.

14 f3 b4 15 d5 a4 16 f7 b4 17 e2 b7 18 c4 d7
The king breaks through in the centre, and Black changes the rook's horizontal resistance to a vertical one.

19 f3 e7 20 d5 e7! 21 c5 e8 22 e4 c8 23 d4 e8 24 e3
Black has prepared against the breakthrough g4-g5. For example: 24 g5 fxg5 25 fxg5 d8! 26 e3 g8, defending against 27 gxh6. Now in the event of 27 gxh6 gxh6 or 27 g6 Black is ready to sacrifice the exchange for the dark-squared bishop, reaching a theoretically drawn position.

24...e7 25 c5 d7 26 f5 d5!
In preventing the attempted breakthrough of the king to the d5 square, Black once again includes the rook for defence along the rank.

27 d4 a5 28 e4 b5 29 e6
White can attempt to break through with the king, by playing 29 d7. Here are some sample variations: (a) 29...a5?! 30 b6 a6 31 c5 a5 32 d5 h7 33 d6 h8 34 d4±; (b) 29...b7 30 c6 e7 31 d5 d7 32 e6 b7 33 c5 b1 34 d7 c1 35 f8±; (c) 29...b1! 30 c5 c1 31 f8 g8 32 a3 a1 33 e6+ h7 34 c5 c1, and Black succeeds in defending himself.

29...a5 30 c4 a3 31 e6
As before 31 g5 fxg5 32 fxg5 does not work in view of 32...h3 33 gxh6 h4+ 34 e3 xd4! with a draw.

31...a5 32 d7 a2 33 g5
Reconciling himself to the inevitable draw. On 33 d5 the balance is maintained by 33...d2.

33...fxg5 34 fxg5 a6
Also possible is 34...\textit{h}2 35 \textit{gxh}6 \textit{h}4+ 36 \textit{e}3 \textit{xd}4 37 \textit{xd}4 \textit{gxh}6 with a draw. 
35 \textit{g}6 \textit{d}6
Drawn.

On 36 \textit{g}4 there follows 36...\textit{xd}4+!

\textbf{Ponomariov-Plaskett}
\textit{Hastings, 1999}

The well-known Scotch ending with two white minor pieces against a black rook. The game smoothly transferred to this drawn position, there only remains to make a solid move before the time control...

1...\textit{a}2?
In accordance with his active style.

2 \textit{xd}5 \textit{d}2
2...\textit{xd}5 3 \textit{b}4+.

3 \textit{e}4 \textit{e}6
Despite the win of the pawn, as before it is not apparent how White wins.

4 \textit{h}4 \textit{d}6 5 \textit{f}5 \textit{e}2 6 \textit{f}3 \textit{e}8
7 \textit{g}6 \textit{e}7 8 \textit{c}1 \textit{e}1 9 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}7
10 \textit{e}4 \textit{e}8 11 \textit{h}5

Not an obvious decision. It was possible all the same to exchange on \textit{g}5, attach himself to the black pawns, place the bishop on \textit{f}5, the knight on \textit{e}4, and try to run with the king to \textit{f}6 or \textit{h}6. However it should not be enough to win.

11...\textit{e}7 12 \textit{b}4 \textit{e}8 13 \textit{g}6
\textit{b}8 14 \textit{d}3
It is difficult to reach the \textit{h}6 pawn, since Black does not allow the white king admission to \textit{f}5. All his hopes lay in ‘humanitarian aid from the West’.

14...\textit{d}5 15 \textit{e}2 \textit{d}4 16 \textit{d}2 \textit{f}3?
He can’t keep himself waiting!

17 \textit{e}1 \textit{b}2+ 18 \textit{c}2 \textit{e}5 19 \textit{e}3 \textit{b}3+ 20 \textit{d}3 \textit{c}3 21 \textit{e}1
\textit{c}1 22 \textit{x}3+
And White won shortly.

Changing the material balance (obtaining a position with rook and pawns against two minor pieces) is very often exploited by chessplayers of the highest rank.

\textbf{Petrosian-Tal}
\textit{Moscow, 1964}

1...\textit{xe}3!? 2 \textit{xb}7 \textit{xd}1 3 \textit{xd}1 \textit{ad}8 4 \textit{c}3 \textit{xd}1+ 5 \textit{xd}1 \textit{d}8 6 \textit{f}3 \textit{xd}2
For the two pieces Black has not quite enough material, but activating the rook gives Black sufficient play.

7 \textit{f}1 \textit{a}5 8 \textit{e}2 \textit{e}5! 9 \textit{a}4 \textit{d}4!
After creating his passed pawn, Black can rivet White’s forces to the struggle against it.

10 \texttt{xd4} exd4 11 \texttt{e1} \texttt{a2} 12 g4 \texttt{f8} 13 f4 \texttt{e7} 14 \texttt{f2} \texttt{a1+} 15 \texttt{d1} \texttt{a2} 16 h4 f6 17 h5 \texttt{e6} 17 \texttt{d3} g6 18 hxg6 hxg6 19 \texttt{e2} \texttt{c2} 20 \texttt{d1} \texttt{c3} 21 \texttt{d2} g5

And Black quietly held the draw.

\textbf{Beliavsky-Geller}  
\textit{Erevan, 1975}

1\ldots\texttt{b4}!

Black stands to win the a2 pawn, and White finds himself faced with problems beyond his control. Now 2 \texttt{d2} does not work because of 2\ldots\texttt{b2}. Therefore White has to confine his bishop to passivity.

2 \texttt{d3} \texttt{a4} 3 \texttt{b1} g5!

A pawn advantage on the flank is only real when its exploitation gets under way.

4 \texttt{e2} \texttt{g7} 5 \texttt{d2} f5 6 \texttt{d3} \texttt{f4} 7 \texttt{e2}

After 7 f3 \texttt{h4} 8 h3 h5 and 9\ldots\texttt{g4} a weakness arises for White on g2.

7\ldots\texttt{h4} 8 h3 \texttt{a4}

And a draw was agreed.

\textbf{Formanek-Mikhalchishin}  
\textit{Hastings, 1985}

1\ldots\texttt{xb3}! 2 \texttt{xe7}! \texttt{xc1}! 3 \texttt{xf8+}

There is nothing else for White.

3\ldots\texttt{xf8} 4 \texttt{xc1} \texttt{xa2}

Black has a rook and two edge-pawns for two pieces. To win it is sufficient for him to exchange the bishop.

5 \texttt{g5} f6! 6 \texttt{e4}

After 6 \texttt{hxh7+} \texttt{f7} 7 \texttt{xf6} \texttt{xc3} 8 \texttt{xc3} \texttt{xf6} the edge pawn must decide the outcome of the game.

6\ldots\texttt{f5} 7 \texttt{f6} \texttt{a7}! 8 \texttt{h7+} \texttt{h7} 9 \texttt{b4+} \texttt{c5}! 10 \texttt{xc5+} \texttt{bxc5} 11
Again there has been a transformation of the advantage. This time the game passes on to a rook ending with positional advantage for Black.

\[ \text{\textit{Two minor pieces against a rook 171}} \]
11 Rook against knight and pawn

The rook is a little stronger than a knight, and it would seem that with pawns on one flank the knight, in view of its capacity to jump, could compete with a stronger piece. However, practice shows that in this type of position the knight is even weaker than the bishop in the struggle against a rook.

Faragó-Csom
Budapest, 1984

1 h3!
Black is in a ‘little zugzwang’ and he is forced to let out the white king.
1...d6 2 c7 e4 3 a7 f6 4 g3 g4 5 f4 f6 6 e5 g4+ 7 e6 f4
Bad is 7...g5 8 xf5 gxh4 9 a6+ g7 10 g5 e3 11 a2, and White attacks the pawns.
8 f7 h7 9 a5! e3 10 f6! h6
There is no saving himself by 10...f5 11 xf5! gxf5 12 xf5 g7 13 xf4 f6 14 g3+... or 10...xg2 11 g5 f3 12 a2 and then 13 f2, winning the f3 pawn, and then also those on g6 and h5.
11 a8 g4+ 12 f7 h7 13 a7! h6 14 f8!
Avoiding 14 g8 f6+ 15 h8 g5!
14...f6 15 h7 g4 16 g7!
Black resigned.

We don’t need to talk about a big alignment of forces, when miniatures provide brilliant examples...

Romanishin-Rodriguez
Moscow, 1985

Is it possible, perhaps, for a grandmaster to lose this position? As it turns out, yes—it is possible!
1...h5
Simpler is 1...g7 and 2...f5, creating a typical drawn setup.
2 e4 g5+ 3 f4 e6+ 4 e3 g5
Now, however, after 4...\( \text{\textit{Q}}g7 \) 5 \( \text{\textit{Q}}e4 \text{\textit{Q}}f5 \) 6 \( \text{\textit{Q}}f4 \) and 7 \( \text{\textit{Q}}a6+ \) weakening the g5 square where the white king will infiltrate.

5 h4 \( \text{\textit{Q}}e6? \)
Black loses his nerve. After the correct 5...\( \text{\textit{Q}}f7 \) 6 \( \text{\textit{Q}}f4 \text{\textit{Q}}h6 \) 7 \( \text{\textit{Q}}a6+ \text{\textit{Q}}g7 \) 8 \( \text{\textit{Q}}e5 \text{\textit{Q}}g4+ \) 9 \( \text{\textit{Q}}e6 \text{\textit{Q}}g5! \) it is still a draw. Now, however, a rook against pawn ending is reached.

6 \( \text{\textit{Q}}e4 \) g5 7 \( \text{\textit{Q}}f5+ \) \( \text{\textit{Q}}g6 \) 8 \( \text{\textit{Q}}e5 \text{\textit{Q}}gxh4 \) 9 \( \text{\textit{Q}}xe6 \) h3 10 \( \text{\textit{Q}}e5 \) h2 11 \( \text{\textit{Q}}f1 \) \( \text{\textit{Q}}g5 \) 12 \( \text{\textit{Q}}h1 \) \( \text{\textit{Q}}g4 \) 13 \( \text{\textit{Q}}xh2 \) h4 14 \( \text{\textit{Q}}g2+ \) \( \text{\textit{Q}}f3 \) 15 \( \text{\textit{Q}}a2 \) Black resigned.

---

Hulak-Beliavsky
Bled, 1998

Defence in such positions is not easy and requires, in the first instance, an understanding of the best distribution of the functions between his pieces. Therefore White should place his knight on h3 and wait for the black king. Instead of this he decides to post his knight on g3, which proves to be incorrect.

1 \( \text{\textit{Q}}e2 \text{\textit{Q}}a1 \) 2 \( \text{\textit{Q}}g3 \) \( \text{\textit{Q}}e5 \) 3 \( \text{\textit{Q}}g2 \text{\textit{Q}}a4 \) 4 f4+?

Too active, but, you know, this is not a rook ending. He should prefer 4 \( \text{\textit{Q}}f3 \).

4...\( \text{\textit{Q}}d5 \) 5 \( \text{\textit{Q}}f3 \) f6! 6 g5?

When defending one should reduce the amount of remaining material, therefore he should prefer 6 h5!.

6...f5 7 h5 \( \text{\textit{Q}}a3 \) 8 h6
White intends to attack the h7 pawn.

8...\( \text{\textit{Q}}c4 \) 9 \( \text{\textit{Q}}e2 \text{\textit{Q}}b3 \) 10 \( \text{\textit{Q}}h1 \)
Trying to provide a covering detachment for the black king.

10...\( \text{\textit{Q}}b2 \) 11 \( \text{\textit{Q}}f3 \text{\textit{Q}}d3 \) 12 \( \text{\textit{Q}}f2+ \)
\( \text{\textit{Q}}d2 \) 13 e4 \( \text{\textit{Q}}b3+ \) 14 \( \text{\textit{Q}}g2 \) fxe4 15 \( \text{\textit{Q}}xe4+ \) \( \text{\textit{Q}}e3 \) 16 \( \text{\textit{Q}}c5 \)
After 16 \( \text{\textit{Q}}f6 \) \( \text{\textit{Q}}xf4 \) 17 \( \text{\textit{Q}}xh7 \) Black plays 17...\( \text{\textit{Q}}b8! \) followed by h8, and all the white pawns are attacked.

16...\( \text{\textit{Q}}b4 \) 17 \( \text{\textit{Q}}g3 \) \( \text{\textit{Q}}xf4 \) 18 \( \text{\textit{Q}}d7 \)
\( \text{\textit{Q}}f3+ \) 19 \( \text{\textit{Q}}g4 \text{\textit{Q}}f1! \) 20 \( \text{\textit{Q}}f6 \text{\textit{Q}}g1+ \) 21 \( \text{\textit{Q}}h3 \) \( \text{\textit{Q}}f3 \) White resigned.

Incidentally, Vidmar lost the same classical endgame against Alekhine.

---

Salov-Kamsky
Buenos Aires, 1994

1...\( \text{\textit{Q}}h7! \)
A correct transfer of the knight to g6 in order to defend the h4 pawn and attack the e5 point.

2 \( \text{\textit{Q}}h3 \)
After 2 g5 \( \text{\textit{Q}}xg5 \) 3 \( \text{\textit{Q}}xh4 \) the knight all the same goes to h7!
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2...\( \text{Qf8} \) 3 \( \text{Ke4} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 4 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 5
\( \text{Qg4} \) \( \text{Qh7} \) 6 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 7 \( \text{Ke3} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 8
\( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 9 \( \text{Qc5} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 10 \( \text{Qb6} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 11
\( \text{Qc6} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 12 \( \text{Qd6} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) 13 \( \text{Ke2} \)
\( \text{Qf8} \) 14 \( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 15 \( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{Qg7} \) and
White cannot break Black’s defence, therefore draw.

It is well known that with pawns on one flank the knight is rather stronger than a bishop. But against a rook the knight proves very weak, since it often cannot escape from the pursuit of a more mobile rook.

Beliavsky-Short
Linares, 1995

1 \( \text{Kc3}! \)
Inferior is 1 \( \text{Ke3} \) \( \text{g5} \) with the threat of \( ...\text{f5-f4} \).

1...e4 2 b6 d2
Forced.

3 \( \text{Ke2 ext3+} \) 4 \( \text{Qixt3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \)
If 4...\( \text{Qe4} \), then 5 \( \text{Qb3} \)!

5 \( \text{Qxf5} \) \( \text{Qe4} \) 6 \( \text{Ke5} \) \( \text{Qg3}+ \) 7
\( \text{Qxd2} \) \( \text{g5} \)

After 7...\( \text{Qxb6} \) 8 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{g5} \) 9 \( \text{hxg5} \)
\( \text{hxg5} \) 10 \( \text{Qxg5} \) \( \text{Qf1+} \) White plays 11
\( \text{Qd3} \) followed by \( \text{Qg2} \) and \( \text{Qe2} \).

8 \( \text{hxg5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \) 9 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{g4} \)
On 9...\( \text{Qxb6} \) again follows 10
\( \text{Qxg5} \) \( \text{Qf1} \) 11 \( \text{Qg2} \).

10 \( \text{Qe6+} \) \( \text{Qb7} \) 11 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qf5} \) 12
\( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{Qe3}+ \) 13 \( \text{Qc5} \) Black resigned.

Beliavsky-Kupreichik
Budva, 1995

1...\( \text{Qe6} \)?
Despite all the suffering, he should allow 1...\( \text{Qxe3} \) 2 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 3
\( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 4 \( \text{Qe5} \) or 3...\( \text{Qf1+} \) 4 \( \text{Qf2} \)
\( \text{Qh2} \) 5 \( \text{Qf5} \) followed by 6 \( \text{Qf2-g3} \).

2 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qd5} \) 3 \( \text{Qb5+} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 4 \( \text{Qg5} \)
\( \text{Qxe3} \) 5 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qd5} \) 6 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{e3} \) 7 \( \text{Qf3} \)
\( \text{Qd6} \) 8 \( \text{Qf8} \) \( \text{e5} \) 9 \( \text{Qa8} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 10
\( \text{Qa5}! \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 11 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 12 \( \text{Qa6}+ \)
Black resigned.

Suba-Chiburdanidze
Dortmund, 1983

One of the few positions where, with equal pawns, the knight can hold the position against a rook.

1...\( \text{Qh5} \) 2 \( \text{Qa4} \)
On 2...\(a6\) there is 2...\(f5\), while on 2 \(h3\) \(e4\) 3 \(a5+g5\) 4 \(g4+fxg3\) 5 \(e5d6!\) 6 \(hxg5f7\) with a draw.

2...\(g4\) 3 \(g1f5\) 4 \(f2g3!\)
Of course not 4...\(xh4?\) because of 5 \(g3!\).
5 \(b4\)
If 5 \(a6\), then 5...\(g5!\) 6 \(hxg5e4\) and 7...\(g5\) with a drawn setup.
5...\(f5\) 6 \(e4g5\) 7 \(hxg5xg5\) 8 \(e5g4\) 9 \(e8h4\)
Also possible is 9...\(d4\).
10 \(g8+\) \(f5\) 11 \(e2\) \(g6!\) 12 \(d3e5+!\) 13 \(d4f3!\) and a draw!

Stein-Bobotsov
Moscow, 1967

1...\(f5\) 2 \(d4b5\) 3 \(axb5axb5\) 4 \(d5e4!\)
Activity!
5 \(xb5d3+\) 6 \(e2f3+\) 7 \(d2f2\)
8 \(e2d4\) 9 \(b8c4\) 10 \(f1d4\) 11 \(b7\)
In the event of 11 \(b4c4\) 12 \(b5c5\) 13 \(b6d4\) Black holds on.
11...\(c4\) 12 \(e2d4\) 13 \(d7+e4!\)
The only, but sufficient, move.
14 \(b7d4\) Drawn.

A.Petrosian-Rashkovsky
Minsk, 1976

Is there a basis for Black to play for a win? To this question the grandmaster himself answered in the affirmative and to start with went after one of the pawns. There followed:

1...\(d3\) 2 \(e4\) \(a3\) 3 \(f2\) \(h3!\)
Black suggests that his opponent leaves the \(g\)-pawn. His argument appears to be 4 \(g2\) \(h4\) 5 \(e3\) \(xg4+!\) 6 \(xg4\) \(xg4\) with a win.
The Erevan grandmaster agrees with the evidence and tries to organise a defence with an equal number of pawns.

4 \(e2\) \(g3\) 5 \(f2\) \(xg4\) 6 \(f3\) \(h4\) 7 \(e3\) \(h3+\) 8 \(d4\) \(a3\) 9 \(c4\) \(a6\) 10 \(d3\) \(g4\) 11 \(e2\)
On 11...\(g3\) there is the reply 12 \(e3\), and it is not apparent how he can improve his position. Rashkovsky in fact allows the second argument, the essence of which consists of transferring the turn to move to his opponent.

11...\(a2+!\) 12 \(e3\) \(a3+\) 13 \(d4\)
14 \(e6\) 15 \(f4\) \(a3+\) 16 \(d4\) \(b3\) 17 \(e2\) \(f8!\) 18 \(e3\)
19 \(f2\) 20 \(h1+\) \(h2!\) 21
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\[ \text{f2} \text{ g2} 22 \text{ f4} \text{ xf2} 23 \text{ exf5} \text{ xf8!} \]

And here is the last argument, bearing in mind that the ending has assumed a study-like character.

24 \text{ g5} \text{ e3}

On 24 \text{ e5} Black would have proceeded on the other side—24...

25 \text{ f6} \text{ e4} White resigned.

Chernin-Georgiev
Dortmund, 1991

![Chess diagram]

The defence, even with play on one flank and an extra pawn, isn’t easy. Here the most unpleasant thing is zugzwang.

1 \text{ b6}! \text{ b2}!?

Or 1...

2 \text{ d8+} \text{ e6} 3 \text{ d4}

Now White’s idea is to hunt for the runaway knight.

3...

4 \text{ f6} 4 \text{ e4} h5

After 4...

5 \text{ d4} \text{ d5} White wins by 5...

6 \text{ d5} \text{ d7} 7 \text{ e3}! \text{ f2+}

8 \text{ e5} \text{ f6} 9 \text{ f3} \text{ h1} 10 \text{ f4} 11 \text{ g4} \text{ g6} 12 \text{ f1} h5+ 13 \text{ f3} and the knight is caught.

5 \text{ e3}! \text{ e5}

Or 5...

The zugzwang also plays an important role in the next example. The extra pawn on the other flank is usually lost after a few moves.

Adorjan-Morozevich
Alushta, 1994

![Chess diagram]

6 \text{ h4}! \text{ g5} 7 \text{ hxg5} h4 8 \text{ xh4}

And Black resigned because of 8...

9 \text{ d1+} 9 \text{ d2} \text{ f2} 10 \text{ g6} \text{ f6} 11 \text{ f4}.

Now two very similar positions with just one small difference—the white pawn.
Sokolov-Khalifman  
Minsk, 1986

Black played
1...g5
...trying to activate his king. The game continued
2 f3 f5 3 a1 g5 4 a5+ e5+ 5 e4 h4
Black tries a counterattack on White's pawn, but he hasn't enough time.
6 f5 h3 7 a2 d7
7...f3 doesn't work because of 8 a3! g2 9 xf3 xf3 h4+.
8 a7 Black resigned.

Dokhoian-Shirov  
Klaipeda, 1988

A knight is generally more useful than a bishop when the pawns are all on one flank, but against a rook the knight has a more difficult time.

Horváth-Sherzer  
Brno, 1993

The game continued
1 e4?!  
This is not the most exact way to win—more direct would be 1 f4
3 a5 f7 4 f3 g6 5 e3 h5 6 a6+ g7 7 e4 f4 8 f3

Another good possibility was 8 a2 f6 9 h4 g6 10 h5 f4 11 g4 and after a check the king obtains the very important f5 square.

8...h5 9 g4 f4 10 g3 d2 11 e6

Another method would be 11 d6, 12 d2 and 13 h5.

11...d4 12 e4 b5 13 h5 d6 14 e7+ Black resigned.

Two instructive and I would even say amazing endings played by an international master from Argentina against experienced grandmasters.

Sorin-Alterman
Erevan, 1996

White threatened to play g5-g3-c3 and, after capturing the b2 pawn, winning the well-known ending of rook against knight with three pawns on the flank. But Alterman finds an elegant way to save the game.

1...e3! 2 xb2 d5 3 c2

If 3 g3?, then 3...f6, and the rook is in a trap after 4...h6.

3...xf4 4 d2 f6 5 g8 f7 6 g3 h5!

Activity comes first!

7 e3 h4 8 f3 xg2 9 f2 h3 10 g3 e1 11 c3 g2 12 xh3 f4+ 13 h4 f6 14 a3 g6+ 15 h5 f4 16 h4

There is nothing in 16 h6 d5, followed by the advance of the f-pawn.

16...g6 17 e5 18 h4 f4 19 a6+ g7 20 f3 f7 21 a5 f6 22 a6+ f7 Drawn.

Zaichik-Sorin
Erevan, 1996

For the exchange White has three pawns and an easily winning position—for example:

1 g6 a6 2 f5 b6 3 f6+! xf6 4 h6+ f7 5 h7 xg6+ 6 h5 g8 7 hxg8=+ g8 8 g6.

But Zaichik did not see this plan and chose another one.

1 f5 f6+ 2 e4 a6 3 g5 a1 4 f5

Not bad was 4 f5 a4+ 5 f3 a3+ 6 f4 a4+ 7 g3 a3+ 8 h4 a4+ 9 g4, and there is no defence against f5-f6+ and g5-g6.

4 a2 5 g6 h6!

The threat was 6 g5 and then 7 h5-h6.

6 d7 6 g4 led to roughly the same thing.

6 a5+ 7 f6 a6+ 8 f7 a7 9 e7 a5 10 e5
Better really was 10 \( \text{Qf6} \), preparing the return of the king.

10...\( \text{Ka7+} \) 11 \( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{Ka6+} \) 12 \( \text{Qf7} \) \( \text{Ka7+} \) 13 \( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{Ka6+} \) 14 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qxh5} \) 15 \( g7 \) \( \text{Qa8} \) 16 \( \text{Qg4} \)

There is nothing in 16 \( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{Qh6} \).

16...\( \text{Qa5+}! \)

Now Black’s main task is to keep the king as far away as possible from the f4 pawn.

17 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qa4+} \) 18 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qa3+} \) 19 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qa2+} \) 20 \( \text{Qf3} \)

If the white king heads towards the rook, then at a necessary moment follows \( \text{Qa8} \), \( \text{Qf6} \) \( \text{g6} \), \( g8=\text{Q} \) \( \text{Qxg8} \), \( \text{Qxg8} \) \( \text{Qf5} \), and a draw.

20...\( \text{Qa3+} \) 21 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qa8} \) 22 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{g6} \) 23 \( g8=\text{Q}+ \) \( \text{Qxg8} \) 24 \( \text{Qe7+} \) \( \text{Qf7} \) 25 \( \text{Qxg8} \) \( \text{Qxg8} \) 26 \( \text{Qe4} \)

26...\( \text{Qf8}! \)

A clear-cut move—and a draw!

In the following position White has good compensation for the exchange, but he should immediately start building a fortress for his king.

Martinović-Mikhalchishin
Igalo, 1994

1 \( \text{b5?} \)

Nothing is gained by 1 \( \text{Qf1}! \) \( \text{Qxb4} \) 2 \( \text{Qg2} \).

1...\( \text{Qd5} \) 2 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qe4} \) 3 \( \text{Qd6+} \)

There is no saving himself by 3 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qf3} \).

3...\( \text{Qf3} \) 4 \( \text{Qd1} \)

In the event of 4 \( \text{Qe8} \) \( \text{Qb1+} \) 5 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qxb5} \) 6 \( \text{Qxf6} \) after 6...\( \text{h5} \) with the idea of 7...\( \text{Qf5} \) Black has a decisive advantage.

4...\( \text{Qxf2} \)

4...\( \text{Qxf2?} \) 5 \( \text{Qe4+} \) \( \text{Qf3} \) is mistaken because of 6 \( \text{Qxf6} \) \( \text{Qxb5} \) 7 \( \text{Qxh7} \).

5 \( \text{Qc1} \)

The result is not changed by 5 \( \text{Qe8} \) \( \text{Qxg3} \).

5...\( \text{Qa2!} \) 6 \( \text{b6} \)

Or 6 \( \text{Qe8} \) \( f5 \) 7 \( \text{Qf6} \) \( h6 \).

6...\( \text{Qa8} \) 7 \( \text{Qc2} \) \( \text{Qb8} \) 8 \( \text{b7} \) \( \text{Qxg3} \) 9 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qxh4} \) 10 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 11 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( h5 \)

White resigned.
In queen endgames the main principles are slightly different from other endings. And, to be precise, though material advantage (for example, a pawn) naturally has great significance, much more important is a passed pawn. Thus the main principles can be placed in the following order:

(a) Passed pawns
(b) Activity (approach) of the king
(c) Activity of the queen
(d) Combinational exploitation of various factors

Passed Pawns

Mikhalchishin-Gufeld
Nikolaev, 1981

There followed:
1 g6+! ♕g7
If 1...♕xg6, then 2 ♕g5+ with perpetual check or 1...fxg6 2 ♕e7+ with the same result.

2 gxf7 ♕e2+ 3 ♕c1 ♕xf7 4 h5!
White must exploit his chance to the utmost—the passed h-pawn is also ready to be exchanged for the b5 pawn.

4...♕c4+ 5 ♕d2!
Inferior is 5 ♕b1 b4, and after the advance of the b-pawn the white king is threatened with mate. White does not fear the transfer to a pawn ending.

5...♕c6 6 ♕h8!
White wants to advance the h-pawn further.

6...♕d5+ 7 ♕c1 ♕c4+ 8 ♕b2 ♕d4+ 9 ♕b3!
Meeting the pawn half-way!

9...♕a4+ 10 ♕b2 ♕b4+ 11 ♕a2 ♕d2+ 12 ♕b3 ♕d3+ 13 ♕b4 ♕d4+ 14 ♕a5 ♕a4+ 15 ♕b6
The white king is up in the ‘clouds’ and Black reconciles himself to a draw.

Ed.Lasker-Marshall
New York, 1923
A difficult struggle with a passed pawn hoping to queen but with the king unable to get over to help it.

1...\textit{\texttt{e2}} 2 \textit{\texttt{c1}} g5?!

Striving to create counterplay. However 2...\textit{\texttt{e5}} deserved the preference, intending to transfer the king to the queen’s flank with an exchange of the h7 and g6 pawns for the pawn on a5.

3 a5 f4 4 \textit{\texttt{f1}} \texttt{a2} 5 \textit{\texttt{b5}}! \textit{\texttt{g6}} 6 \textit{\texttt{b6+ h5}} 7 a6 g4 8 a7 g3 9 fxg3 fxg3 10 \textit{\texttt{c5+ g6}} 11 \textit{\texttt{d6+ f7}} 12 \textit{\texttt{f4 e6}} 13 \textit{\texttt{e3+ d7}} 14 \textit{\texttt{f1! a6+ 15 e1 e8}} 16 \textit{\texttt{xg3 xa7}} 17 \textit{\texttt{g8+ b7}} 18 \textit{\texttt{hxh7+}} and 19 \textit{\texttt{xa7+}}.

Again not 7 \textit{\texttt{xg6}}? in view of 7...\textit{\texttt{h2+}}!. It is important to activate his king via the g5 square.

7...\textit{\texttt{a2}} 8 \textit{\texttt{g5 f2}}

No help is 8...\textit{\texttt{f7}} 9 \textit{\texttt{f6}}!.

9 \textit{\texttt{f4 b6}} 10 \textit{\texttt{f7+ c8}} 11 \textit{\texttt{xe5}}

Black can resign since 11...\textit{\texttt{e3+}} 12 \textit{\texttt{hxh5 xf3+}} is no use because of 13 \textit{\texttt{g4+}}.

Activity (approach) of the king

One of the most important factors in queen endings.

Ribli-Hertneck
Dortmund, 1986

1 \textit{\texttt{d3!}}

Defending against ...\textit{\texttt{c2+}} and preparing a4, therefore Black decides on a pawn sacrifice with the aim of activating his forces.

1...\textit{\texttt{f6}} 2 \textit{\texttt{xd5 c2+}} 3 \textit{\texttt{h3 c1}}

Chances of saving the game remained with 3...\textit{\texttt{f2+}}! 3 f4 \textit{\texttt{f1+ 4 g2 d1.}}

4 \textit{\texttt{d4+ e6}}

Not possible is 4...\textit{\texttt{f7}} because of 5 \textit{\texttt{f4+}}, nor 4...\textit{\texttt{g5}} because of 5 \textit{\texttt{e5+}}.

5 \textit{\texttt{e4+ d7}} 6 \textit{\texttt{h4 d2 7 e5!}}

1 h3 h5
Otherwise White will play g3-g4 obtaining real winning chances.

2 \textit{\texttt{d7+ f6}} 3 \textit{\texttt{e8 a6}}?

The only defence was 3...\textit{\texttt{g7}} 4 \textit{\texttt{e7+ h8}} 5 \textit{\texttt{f8 h7}} 6 \textit{\texttt{f7+ h6}} 7 \textit{\texttt{g8 b2}} and White must return to the plan with g3-g4, creating a passed e-pawn.

4 \textit{\texttt{f8+ e6}} 5 \textit{\texttt{f3!}}

Suddenly there has appeared the idea of penetrating to the king’s flank with the white king—very typical in fact.

5...\textit{\texttt{a4}} 6 \textit{\texttt{g8 f6}} 7 \textit{\texttt{d8+ e6}} 8 \textit{\texttt{d4!}}
And Black resigned because there is no defence against $\mathcal{W}f4-g5$. For example 8...$\mathcal{W}a2$ 9 $\mathcal{W}g7$ or 8...$\mathcal{W}c2$ 9 e4!.

Mikhalchishin-Nestorovich
Budva, 1994

1...$\mathcal{W}e7$?
In queen endings the king must either be ultra-safe or ultra-active! Better here would be 1...$\mathcal{W}a3$! cutting off the white king.

2 e5 $\mathcal{W}b6$
If 2...$\mathcal{W}a3$ then 3 $\mathcal{W}d6+$ $\mathcal{W}e8$ 4 e6+-.

3 $\mathcal{W}f3$ $\mathcal{W}c7$ 4 $\mathcal{W}f4$ $\mathcal{W}b6$ 5 $\mathcal{W}g5$ $\mathcal{W}e8$ 6 $\mathcal{W}h6$! Black resigned.

Rittner-Bernstein
corr, 1968

1 $\mathcal{W}c3$! $\mathcal{W}c5$+ 2 $\mathcal{W}c4$ $\mathcal{W}e3$+ 3 $\mathcal{W}b4$ $\mathcal{W}d2$+ 4 $\mathcal{W}c5$ $\mathcal{W}a5$+ 5 $\mathcal{W}d4$ $\mathcal{W}d2$+ 6 $\mathcal{W}e5$ $\mathcal{W}d8$ 7 $\mathcal{W}d4$ $\mathcal{W}h8$+ 8 $\mathcal{W}e4$ $\mathcal{W}h1$+ 9 $\mathcal{W}d3$ $\mathcal{W}f3$+ 10 $\mathcal{W}d2$ $\mathcal{W}g2$+ 11 $\mathcal{W}c1$ $\mathcal{W}f1$+ 12 $\mathcal{W}b2$ $\mathcal{W}b5$ 13 $\mathcal{W}d8$ Black resigned.

Høi-Mikhalchishin
Budapest, 1989

The king usually approaches its own pawn, but very often it also heads towards the opponent's king to create mating threats.

1 $\mathcal{W}f8$+ $\mathcal{W}g6$ 2 $\mathcal{W}g8$+ $\mathcal{W}f5$ 3 $\mathcal{W}h7$+ $\mathcal{W}e5$ 4 $\mathcal{W}e7$+ $\mathcal{W}d4$ 5 $\mathcal{W}d8$+ $\mathcal{W}e3$ 6 $\mathcal{W}e7$+ $\mathcal{W}f2$ 7 $\mathcal{W}a7$+ $\mathcal{W}f1$ 8 $\mathcal{W}g1$+

As a result of the approach of the black king White has had to misplace his queen.

8...$\mathcal{W}e2$ 9 $\mathcal{W}d4$ c2 10 $\mathcal{W}g4$ $\mathcal{W}d3$ 11 $\mathcal{W}g3$+ $\mathcal{W}d2$ 12 $\mathcal{W}f4$+ $\mathcal{W}c3$ 13 $\mathcal{W}c1$ $\mathcal{W}d6$+ 14 $\mathcal{W}h3$ $\mathcal{W}d3$+ 15 g3 $\mathcal{W}d7$+ 16 g4 $\mathcal{W}d4$!

The black queen is centralised to the utmost, there is no threat of perpetual check, and the march of the a6 pawn is decisive.

17 $\mathcal{W}g3$ $\mathcal{W}e5$+ 18 $\mathcal{W}h3$ a5! 19 a4 $\mathcal{W}b3$ 20 $\mathcal{W}g2$ $\mathcal{W}b2$ 21 $\mathcal{W}e3$+ $\mathcal{W}a2$ White resigned.
The active position of the queen

This allows the king to be utilised in the struggle against enemy pawns.

Gufeld-Minev
Sofia, 1967

The white queen controls the position and attacks all Black’s weaknesses. It is only necessary to include the king.

1 @f1 f5 2 h4 @c7 3 @e2 @b6 4 @f7+ @h6 5 b3 @d6 6 @c4 @h7 7 @e1 @b6 8 @b5 @c7 9 @d2 @e5 10 @c2 @a1 11 @xc5 @a2+ 12 @c3 @xf2 13 @c7+ @g8 14 @d4 @b2+

If 14...@d2+, then 15 @e5 @xe3+ 16 @f6 with a decisive invasion.

15 @c3 @f2 16 @xa5 @xg3 17 @d8+ @h7 18 a5 @e1 19 @b6 f4 20 @c7 @g8 21 a6! @d2+

After 21...@xe3+ 22 @e5 one advanced passed pawn is quicker than two.

22 @e5 @b2+ 23 @e6 @xb3+ 24 @f6 @b2+ 25 @e5 Black resigned.

Marshall-Alekhine
Bradley Beach, 1929

1...@a6+! 2 @g2 @d6
In the first instance Black blockades the opponent’s pawn.
3 @d4 @g8 4 @c4 @f7
It turns out that the white d5 pawn can be attacked by the king.
5 @b5 @d8 6 f4 @c7 7 @f3 @c3+ 8 @g4
Clearly not 8 @e4 @b4+!—the pawns in this formation usually win for Black.

8...@e7 9 @b6 h5+! 10 @xh5 @h3+ 11 @g5 @g2+ 12 @f5 @xd5+ 13 @g6 @d6+! 14 @xd6 @xd6 15 f5 a4 16 @xg7 a3 and Black won.

Keres-Aronin
Moscow, 1951

In the following position, who stands better? He who has the further advanced pawn or he who advances it further? Let us see.
1...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}6?}
Better is 1...h5 or 1...e4, trying somehow to exploit his pawn majority on the king’s flank.

2 g3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d1+ 3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g}}}g2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d7 4 h4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b}}}b7+ 5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h}}}h2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d7 6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}}}f8! h5?
A decisive mistake. Correct is 5...f5, endeavouring to advance his pawn.

7 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g}}}g8+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}}}f5 8 c5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d4 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c}}}c8+! \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}}e4 10 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g}}}g2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d3 11 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a}}}a6+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d2 12 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d6
Also not bad is 12 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{w}}}xf6.

12...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}}e2 13 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{x}}}xd4 exd4 14 c6 d3 15 c7 d2 16 c8=\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d1=\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{w}}}d8 17 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}}e6+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d3 18 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}}}f8+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}}e2 19 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}}e7+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d3 20 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{w}}}xa7 and White won easily.

Romanovsky-Ståhlberg
\textit{Moscow, 1935}

\textbf{1 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{w}}}d5!}
After this centralisation White threatens to transfer his king to e4, therefore Black must hurry with his counterattack.

1...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b}}}b2+ 2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}}e3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c}}}c1+ 3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}}e4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{w}}}e1+ 4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}}}f5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{x}}}g3 5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{x}}}c5+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g}}}g8 6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c}}}c4+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h}}}h8 7 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{w}}}g4!
With the threat to exchange White obtains the g6 square for his king.

7...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}}e1 8 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g}}}g6! \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c}}}c1 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d7 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g}}}g1+ 10 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}}}f7 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h}}}h7 11 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}}}f5+ g6 12 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d7 Black resigned.

Combinational exploitation of various factors in queen endings

\textbf{Ballon-Mikhalchishin}
\textit{Berne, 1995}

\textbf{Black has a protected passed pawn plus a much better pawn structure.}

\textbf{1...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{w}}}f5! 2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g}}}g1 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{w}}}d3!}
By speculating on a transfer to a winning pawn ending, Black threatens to advance his passed pawn.

3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}}}f4 c3 4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g}}}g4!
White wants to put the black king in a box, but it boldly ploughs on.

4...f5! 5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h}}}h5+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}}e6 6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}}e8+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d}}}d5
7 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e}}}e5+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c}}}c4 8 d5 c2 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f}}}f4+ \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b}}}b3 10 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h}}}h2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c}}}c4 White resigned.

Botvinnik-Donner
\textit{Noordwijk, 1965}
Black has the better structure, and therefore White’s only chance lies in the creation of a passed a-pawn, which will be quicker than the passed h-pawn.

1 \( \mathcal{d}^7 + \mathcal{g}^8 \) 2 \( \mathcal{c}^8 + \mathcal{h}^7 \) 3 \( \mathcal{w}^a^6 \mathcal{g}^5 + 4 \mathcal{f}^1 \mathcal{x}^h^5 5 \mathcal{w}^d^3 + ! \mathcal{g}^8 \\
\)
A trap—after 5...\( \mathcal{g}^6 ? 6 \mathcal{w}^e^4 ! \) the pawn ending is winning for White.

6 a4 \( \mathcal{h}^1 + 7 \mathcal{e}^2 \mathcal{h}^5 8 \mathcal{w}^d^5 + \mathcal{h}^8 9 \mathcal{w}^d^1 ! \\
\)
Typical—by speculating on the transfer to a pawn ending, White forces back the opponent’s queen.

9...\( \mathcal{h}^2 ? \)
Better is 9...\( \mathcal{h}^4 \), though even then White’s position is preferable.

10 b4 \( \mathcal{h}^4 11 \mathcal{f}^1 ! \)
The queen is trapped!

11...g5 12 a5 \( \mathcal{b}^a^5 13 \mathcal{b}^a^5 \mathcal{g}^4 14 \mathcal{a}^6 \) Black resigned.

Korolev-Palm

corr, 1980

Thanks to his far advanced passed c-pawn and strong queen position on d6, White has a slight advantage.

1...\( \mathcal{b}^2 ? ! \)
On 1...g5 there would have followed 2 \( \mathcal{d}^3 \mathcal{f}^6 3 \mathcal{d}^4 + \mathcal{f}^7 4 \mathcal{h}^2 \mathcal{c}^7 5 \mathcal{g}^1 \) with a slight advantage. Stronger is 1...\( \mathcal{e}^4 ! \), centralising the queen with chances of a draw.

2 c5 e5
On 2...\( \mathcal{w}^a^3 \) would have followed 3 \( \mathcal{c}^7 + \mathcal{f}^6 4 \mathcal{c}^6 \mathcal{c}^1 + 5 \mathcal{h}^2 \mathcal{e}^5 6 \mathcal{w}^d^6 \), leading to a position occurring in the game.

3 \( \mathcal{c}^7 + \mathcal{e}^6 4 \mathcal{d}^6 + \mathcal{f}^7 5 \mathcal{c}^6 \)
The pawn is already on c6 and there is no apparent perpetual check.

5...\( \mathcal{c}^1 + 6 \mathcal{h}^2 \mathcal{f}^4 + 7 \mathcal{g}^1 \mathcal{e}^3 + 8 \mathcal{f}^1 \mathcal{f}^4 + 9 \mathcal{e}^2 \mathcal{e}^4 + 10 \mathcal{d}^2 \)
The king will boldly go behind enemy lines, the pawn already has no significance.

10...\( \mathcal{f}^4 + 11 \mathcal{c}^2 \mathcal{e}^4 + 12 \mathcal{b}^2 \!
\mathcal{x}^g^2 + 13 \mathcal{c}^3 \mathcal{a}^2 14 \mathcal{d}^7 + \mathcal{f}^6 15 \mathcal{c}^7 \)
White has achieved his objective—a pawn on c7. Now he needs to shelter his king from the checks.

15...\( \mathcal{w}^a^3 + 16 \mathcal{c}^4 \mathcal{c}^1 + 17 \mathcal{b}^4 \mathcal{e}^1 + 18 \mathcal{c}^5 \mathcal{a}^5 + 19 \mathcal{c}^4 \)
Of course, not possible is 19 \( \mathcal{c}^6 ? \) because of 19...\( \mathcal{w}^b^5 + \) with a perpetual check.

19...\( \mathcal{a}^2 + 20 \mathcal{b}^4 \mathcal{b}^2 + 21 \mathcal{a}^5 \mathcal{a}^3 + 22 \mathcal{b}^6 \mathcal{e}^3 + 23 \mathcal{b}^7 \mathcal{b}^3 + 24 \mathcal{c}^8 \mathcal{b}^4 25 \mathcal{d}^5 \) Black resigned, since the c7 pawn will inevitably go on to queen.

Karpov-Timman

Buenos Aires, 1980

White has problems since the Black king is in play while White’s
is placed far from the scene of action.

1...b6 2 \textit{\texttt{Wh}}h7

If White had sacrificed a pawn to create a passed pawn by 2 h4, then Timman gave the variation 2...gxh4 3 g5 h3 4 g6 h2 5 \textit{\texttt{Ne}}3+ \textit{\texttt{Ff}}3 6 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}5+ \textit{\texttt{Ff}}2 7 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}2+ \textit{\texttt{Ee}}2 8 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}4+ \textit{\texttt{Gg}}2 9 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}5+ \textit{\texttt{Hh}}3! 10 \textit{\texttt{Hh}}6+ \textit{\texttt{Gg}}4 11 g7 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}1+ 12 \textit{\texttt{Aa}}2 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}5+ 13 b3 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}2+ followed by 14...h1=\textit{\texttt{W}}.

2...\textit{\texttt{Dd}}4

The exchange of the a7 pawn for that on h3 favours Black.

3 \textit{\texttt{Hh}}6 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}1+ 4 \textit{\texttt{Aa}}2 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}5+ 5 \textit{\texttt{Aa}}1 a5 6 \textit{\texttt{Hh}}7 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}4 7 \textit{\texttt{Hh}}6 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}1+ 8 \textit{\texttt{Aa}}2 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}5+ 9 \textit{\texttt{Aa}}1 b5

Threatening a mating attack after ...b5-b4-b3.

10 h4 gxh4 11 g5 b4 12 axb4 axb4 13 b3

After 13 g6 b3! 14 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}3+ \textit{\texttt{Gg}}4 15 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}1+ \textit{\texttt{Hh}}5! Black wins.

13...\textit{\texttt{Ee}}5+ 14 \textit{\texttt{Aa}}2 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}2+ 15 \textit{\texttt{Bb}}1 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}3 White resigned.

\textbf{Yusupov-Gerusel}

\textit{\texttt{M}}oscow, 1981

Despite the material equilibrium, Black has problems in connection with the excellent positions of White’s king and queen.

1 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}6+ \textit{\texttt{Ff}}8 2 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}6 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}2+ 3 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}4 \textit{\texttt{Aa}}2?

Correct is 3...\textit{\texttt{Bb}}2 4 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}5+ \textit{\texttt{Ee}}7 5 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}5+ \textit{\texttt{Ee}}6 6 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}6+ \textit{\texttt{Ee}}7 7 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}4+ \textit{\texttt{Dd}}6 8 f4, and all the same White has a dangerous passed pawn.

4 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}8 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}7 5 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}7 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}8 6 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}6!

Fantastic domination by the white pieces, leading to a winning pawn ending.

6...\textit{\texttt{Bb}}2 7 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}5 Black resigned.

\textbf{Marosi-Yudasin}

\textit{\texttt{B}}udapest, 1982

1...\textit{\texttt{Dd}}5!

This centralisation is better than simply playing to eliminate White’s pawns.

2 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}8+ \textit{\texttt{Hh}}7 3 \textit{\texttt{Bb}}8 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}7

He should not give the opponent counter-chances after 3...\textit{\texttt{Xf}}5 4 \textit{\texttt{Xa}}7 \textit{\texttt{Bb}}1+ 5 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}2 \textit{\texttt{Xb}}2 6 \textit{\texttt{Xf}}7.

4 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}4 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}6 5 g4

White’s only chance to change the course of the struggle is to open up the position of the opponent’s king.

5...a5 6 h4 b5 7 g5 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}4 8 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}3 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}4! 9 gxh6 gxh6 10 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}7 \textit{\texttt{Xf}}5 11 \textit{\texttt{Xa}}5 \textit{\texttt{Bb}}1+ 12 \textit{\texttt{Gg}}2 \textit{\texttt{Xb}}2

As a result of the exchange of blows Black’s positional advantage has been transformed into a material one.

13 \textit{\texttt{Cc}}7 b4! 14 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}1 \textit{\texttt{Bb}}1+ 15 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}2 \textit{\texttt{Ee}}4+ 16 \textit{\texttt{Dd}}2 \textit{\texttt{Ff}}5 17 \textit{\texttt{Bb}}6
On 17 \textit{g3} Black achieves his objective after 17...\textit{d5+} 18 \textit{c2} \textit{c4+} 19 \textit{b2} \textit{c3+!} 20 \textit{xc3} \textit{bxc3+} 21 \textit{xc3} \textit{g6} followed by \ldots \textit{h5} and \ldots \textit{xh4}.

17...\textit{f4} 18 \textit{d3} \textit{xh4}
Further comment is unnecessary.
19 \textit{e3} \textit{f6} 20 \textit{a7} \textit{b3} 21 \textit{c5} \textit{g6} 22 \textit{f8} \textit{xf2} 23 \textit{g8+} \textit{h5} White resigned.

Sometimes a complicated method has to be adopted to create a passed pawn.
1 \textit{h6!} \textit{c4+}
1...\textit{hxh6} 2 \textit{c8+} and 3 \textit{xc6} winning.
2 \textit{f3} \textit{xa6} 3 \textit{e5!} \textit{a3+} 4 \textit{g2} \textit{xb4} 5 \textit{exf6} \textit{gxh6} 6 \textit{c8+} \textit{h7} 7 \textit{d7+} \textit{g6} 8 \textit{g7+} \textit{h5} 9 \textit{f7} \textit{e4+}

\textbf{Mikhalchishin-Cvetkovi\v{c}}
\textit{Trnava, 1988}

10 \textit{h2} \textit{f4+} 11 \textit{g1} \textit{c1+} 12 \textit{g2}!
As a result of the ‘triangulation dance’ Black has no more checks, and so he resigned the game.
Exercises:
Various Endings

1. Indicate White's winning plan.

2. Find the right continuation for Black.

3. Find a plan to realise White's extra pawn.

4. Can White win?
5. What is right: 1...b1 or 1...e6?

6. How does Black defend after 1 dxa5?

7. How does Black continue?

8. How does Black realise his extra pawn?

9. Can Black make a draw?

10. How does Black defend?
11 Find the right line for Black.

12 What is White’s winning plan?

13 White to move. What should be the result of the game?

14 Demonstrate a plan to realise the extra pawn.

15 Point out the correct plan of defence.

16 Can White win by 1 g3 hxg3 2 h4, creating a passed pawn?
Solutions to Exercises

PAWN ENDINGS

1

1 ♞f2 ♞f5 2 ♞f3 ♞e5 3 g4 hxg4+ 4 ♞xg4 ♞e4 5 h5 f5+ 6 ♞h3! f4 7 h6 f3 8 h7 f2 9 ♞g2 1-0, Botvinnik.

2

White has a winning position, but in the game he lost.
1 ♞e3?? (1 a4 ♞d6 2 a5 ♞xd5 3 a6! ++) 1... ♞d6 2 ♞e4 c4 3 a4 c3 4 ♞d3 ♞xd5, 0-1, Guliev-Tukmakov, Nikolaev, 1993.

3

(a) 1 gxf5? gxf5 2 ♞e2 ♞e7 3 ♞d3 h5 4 ♞xd4 h4, ½-½, Yermolinsky-Ivanov, USA (ch) 1996
(b) 1 g5! ♞f7 2 ♞e2 ♞g7 (2... ♞e7 3 ♞d3 ♞e6 4 ♞xd4 ♞d7 5 ♞c4 ♞d8 6 e6 ♞e7 7 ♞d3! ♞xe6 8 ♞d4 ++) 3 e6! (3... ♞e2 h5=) 3... ♞f8 4 ♞e2 ♞e8 5 ♞d3 ♞e7 6 ♞c4 ♞xe6 7 ♞xd4 +-

4

1...hxg4?—Black thought that he could achieve a draw as he pleased, but correct was 1...fxg4 2 fxg4 hxg4 3 h5 ♞e5 4 ♞g3. But suddenly there followed 2 f4!! ♞c4 3 h5 d4 4 h6 d3 4 h7 g3+ 5 ♞xg3 d2 6 h8=♛

d1=♛ 7 ♛c8+ and a queen ending was reached with an ♞-f pawn for White, Janvarev-Schcherbakov, Moscow, 1994.

5

(a) 1...g6? 2 ♞e4 ♞d6 3 h5 g5 4 ♞f5 b5 5 cxb5 ♞d5 6 b6 ♞c6 7 ♞e4 ♞xb6 8 ♞d3, 1-0, Dreev-Anastasian, Tbilisi, 1989;
(b) 1... ♞f6! 2 ♞e4 (2 h5 g6 3 a4 g5=) 2... ♞e6 3 h5 ♞f6 4 ♞f4 g6 5 ♞e4 gxh5=.

6

1 g4! hxg4 2 h5 ♞e6 3 a3! g3 4 ♞e2! (4 ♞f3? f5!) 4... ♞f7 5 ♞f3 ♞g7 6 ♞xg3 ♞h7 7 ♞g4 ♞h6 8 ♞f5 ♞g7 (8... ♞xh5 9 ♞xf6++) 9 e5! fxe5 10 ♞xg5 +-, Evreinov.

7

White resigned (?) because he did not see 1 ♞f5 ♞xc4 (1... ♞b4 2 c5) 2 h4! ♞b4 3 ♞g6 ♞xa4 4 ♞xh5 ♞b3 5 ♞g6, with a draw. The ♞f pawn helps White.

8

(a) 1... ♞e5? 2 h3!! (2 h4? ♞f5 3 ♞g3 ♞g6=) 2... ♞f5 3 h4 ♞e5 4 ♞g4 ♞e4 5 h5 f5+ 6 ♞h3! ♞e3 7
h6, 1-0, Padievsky-Latinov, Sofia, 1973;
(b) 1...g5! 2 e4 g4 (2...f5+?
3 f3 !+-) 3 e5 f5 4 h3+ g5 5 h4
g4 6 h5 f4=.

9

(a) 1...g4? 2 e3! f4+ (2...gxh3 3
f2) 3 e2! gxh3 4 f2 f5 5
g1 e5 6 h2 d4 7 xh3 c4
8 xh4 xb4 9 g4, 1-0,
Rufenacht-Orseth, corr, 1996;
(b) 1...f6! 2 e3 e5 3 f4+
gxf4 4 f3 d5 5 xf4 c4 6
xf5 xb4 7 g4 c5, and the
king hurries to f8.

10

1 c4!! cxd4 (1...dxc4 2 dxc5 bxc5
3 e2 --) 2 cxd5 b5 3 e2 b4 4
a4! e5 5 h5 e4 6 d6 b3 7 d2,
1-0, Degraeve-Hansen, Germany,
1998.

11

(a) 1 f4? g6=, Ilyin-Zhenevsky-
Botvinnik, Leningrad, 1938;
(b) 1 f3! g6 (1...e7 2 f4 e6
3 g3) 2 hxg6+ xg6 3 f4 h5 4 g3
+-.

12

Yes, 1...c5!! 2 g2 cxd4 3 exd4
exd4 4 f3 f2 e7 5 e2 e6=,

13

(a) 1 e6? 2 c5 f5 3 h3 fxg4 4
hxg4 d4 5 xxd4 d6 6 f5, 1-0,
Nimzowitsch-Chigorin, Carlsbad,
1907;
(b) 1 c6 2 h4 2 h3 d6 3 h4
c6 4 h5 (4 g5 fxg5 5 fxg5 hxg5 5
h5 g4 6 h6 g3 7 e3 d4+ 9 f3
d3=) 4...d6 5 g5 fxg5 6 fxg5 e6!
7 g6 f6 8 d5 g7=. 2...d6 3
h5 e6! 4 c5 f5 5 g5 hxg5 5 h6
f7! 7 fxg5 f4=.

14

Yes, but not by 1 axb4 a3 2 c3
xb4+ 3 b3 d5, and White re-
signed, Sofia Polgár-Smyslov, Lon-
don, 1996, but 1 c4!!, creating an
impregnable fortress.

15

1 h6! (1 c6 f5 2 d5 f4 3 a4
g3=, Filipescu-Citron, Romania,
1955) 1...hxh6 2 c6 g5 3 d5
f5 4 a4 f4 5 e4 +; 1...gxh6 2 a4
f5 3 a5 f4 4 a6 f3 5 a7 f2 6 a8=qh
f1=q 7 g8+! +-.

16

(a) 1 d3? d4+! 2 cxd4 d5 3 b5
c4, 0-1, Havsky-Yuferov;
(b) 1 d2 d4 2 c4 d3 3 c5 d5 4
a5=.

17

1 e6! (1 g6 g3 2 f5 f3=)
1...h3 2 f5! h4 (2...g6+ 3
g5! +) 3 c4! g5 4 c5 g4 5 f4 g3
6 f3 h3 7 c6 g2 8 c7 +, Hoch,
1972.

18

(a) 1 e4 2 fx4 g4 3 xf7! g3 4
f6 g2 4 e8 g1= 5 f7 +;
(b) 1...g4 2 fxg4 e4 3 g5 e3 4
xf7 e2 5 g6 +;
(c) 1...g8 2 f6 g4!! 3 fxg4 e4 4
g5 e3 5 g6 e2 6 gxf7 h7 7 f8=q
e1=q 8 f7=!! stalemate.
19

1...\( \text{\&}e2 \)! (1...\( \text{\&}f2 \) 2 \( \text{\&}e5 \) \( \Rightarrow \) ) 2 h6 \( \text{\&}d3 \)\( = \).

20

(a) 1 \( \text{\&}c5 \)? a4 2 h6 a3 3 g7 a2 4 h7 a1=\( \text{\&} \) 5 g8=\( \text{\&} \) \( \text{\&}c1 \)\(+\)}, 0-1, Wells-Hector, Oxford, 1999;

(b) 1 \( \text{\&}f4 \)!\( = \).

21

(a) 1...\( \text{\&}h5 \)? 2 b4 \( \text{\&}xh4 \) 3 b5 g5 4 a5 g4 5 b6 axb6 6 axb6 g3 7 \( \text{\&}f3 \)!\( +; \)

(b) 1...\( \text{\&}g7 \)!\( = \), Uhlmann-Robatsch, Marienbad, 1965.

22

1...axb5? (after the correct 1...a5! Black holds. On h3-h4 he replies ...
\( \text{\&} \)h6-h5, while on g2-g4 forced is ...
\( \text{\&} \)g6-g5!) 2 axb5 \( \text{\&}d7 \) 3 \( \text{\&}f1 \) \( \text{\&}e7 \) 4 h4 h5 5 \( \text{\&}e4 \) \( \text{\&}d7 \) 6 \( \text{\&}d4 \) \( \text{\&}c7 \) 7 \( \text{\&}c4 \) \( \text{\&}d7 \) 8 \( \text{\&}b4 \) \( \text{\&}c7 \) (matters are not changed by 8...
\( \text{\&}c8 \) 9 \( \text{\&}a5 \) (9 c6) 9...\( \text{\&}c7 \) 10 g3!) 9 \( \text{\&}a5 \) \( \text{\&}c8 \) 10 \( \text{\&}b6 \) e5 11 fxe5 fxe5 12 \( \text{\&}a5 \)! 1-0, Speelman-Saltaev, Las Palmas, 1998.

23

1...\( \text{\&}b5 \)? (1...\( \text{\&}h5 \)! 2 f3 [2 h3 \( \text{\&}b5 \) 3 g4 hxg4 4 hxg4 \( \text{\&}c6 \) 5 g5 fxg5 6 fxg5 \( \text{\&}d6 \)\( = \)] 2...\( \text{\&}b5 \) 3 g4 hxg4! 4 hxg4 \( \text{\&}c6 \) 5 h4 \( \text{\&}d6 \)\( = \) 2 g4 \( \text{\&}c6 \) 3 g5 e5+ 4 fxe5 fxg5 5 f3 h5 6 \( \text{\&}c4 \),

Here White resigned, calculating a variation with a necessary exchange on f6 However, correct is not to take the pawn.

1 \( \text{\&}f5 \) \( \text{\&}xc4 \) 2 h4! \( \text{\&}b4 \) 3 \( \text{\&}g6 \) \( \text{\&}xa4 \) 4 \( \text{\&}xh5 \) \( \text{\&}b3 \) 5 \( \text{\&}g6 \), and the pawns queen at the same time, while the f6 pawn ‘helps’ White, Klovan-Elistratov, Moscow, 1963.

24

1 c4? led to defeat. White should give preference to 1 b4! cxb4 2 cxb4 \( \text{\&}f7 \) 3 b5 \( \text{\&}e7 \) 4 g3 \( \text{\&}f7 \) 5 \( \text{\&}d6 \) \( \text{\&}f6 \) 6 \( \text{\&}c7 \) \( \text{\&}e7 \) 7 \( \text{\&}b7 \) \( \text{\&}d7 \) 8 \( \text{\&}xa7 \) \( \text{\&}c7 \) 9 g4! e5 10 gxl5 gxh5 11 \( \text{\&}a8 \) e4 12 a7, and a draw.

The game ended 1...\( \text{\&}f7 \) 2 \( \text{\&}d6 \) \( \text{\&}f6 \) 3 \( \text{\&}c6 \) \( \text{\&}e7 \)! 4 \( \text{\&}b7 \) \( \text{\&}d7 \) 5 \( \text{\&}xa7 \) \( \text{\&}c7 \) 6 \( \text{\&}a8 \) e5 7 g4 hxg4 8 h5 gxh5 9 b4 cxb4 10 c5 b3 11 a7 b2 12 cxb6 \( \text{\&}xb6 \) 13 \( \text{\&}b8 \) b1=\( \text{\&} \) 14 a8=\( \text{\&} \) \( \text{\&}h7 \)! 0-1, Mortensen-Plueg, Hamburg, 1997.

25

26

(a) 1...\( \text{\&}xb4 \) 2 a6 \( \text{\&}c3 \) 3 \( \text{\&}e1 \) ! \( \text{\&}d3 \) 4 a7 f2+ 5 \( \text{\&}f1 \) e2+ 6 \( \text{\&}xf2 \) \( \text{\&}d2 \) 7 a8=\( \text{\&} \) \( \text{\&}e1=\text{+} \) 8 \( \text{\&}g2 \) \( \text{\&}xh4 \)=, Papendieck-Geiger, Austria, 1998.

(b) 1...\( \text{\&}c4 \)! 2 a6 \( \text{\&}d3 \) 3 \( \text{\&}e1 \) e2 4 a7 \( \text{\&}e3 \) \( \text{+} \)
TRANSPOSITION TO A PAWN ENDING

1

No,
1...\(\text{d}e5??\)
1...\(\text{d}d6\) 2 \(g5\) (2 \(h4\) \(\text{d}e4\) 2...\(fxg5\)
3 \(\text{x}g5\) \(c4+\) 4 \(bxc4\) \(\text{xc}4\) 5 \(\text{f}f3\)
\(\text{d}e3\) 6 \(g4\) \(\text{g}2=\)
2 \(\text{x}e5\) \(\text{fxe}5\)
2...\(\text{xe}5\) 3 \(h4\) \(f4\) 4 \(h5\) \(g5\) 5
\(\text{c}2\) \(\text{h}6\) 6 \(\text{b}2\) \(g5\) 7 \(g3\) \(\text{h}6\) 8
\(a4\) \(\text{bx}a3\) 9 \(\text{xa}3\) \(\Delta\) \(\text{a}3\)-\(b2\)-\(c2\)-\(d3\)
b3-\(b4\) +-
3 \(g5\) \(e4+\) 4 \(\text{e}2!\) \(\text{e}5\)
4...\(d3\) 5 \(\text{d}d1\) +-;
5 \(h4\) \(\text{f}5\) 6 \(g4+\) \(\text{f}4\) 7 \(g6\) \(d3+\) 8
\(\text{d}1\) \(e3\) 9 \(g7\), 1-0, Ivanov-Sagalchik, Kramatorsk, 1989.

2

No. 1 \(\text{x}f7+??\) \(\text{x}f7\) 2 \(\text{f}f3\) \(\text{f}6\) 3
\(\text{e}4\) \(g5!\) (3...\(g5\) 4 \(\text{x}d4\) \(\text{g}4\) 5
\(\text{e}5!=\)) 4 \(b5\) \(d3\) 5 \(\text{xd}3\) \(\text{e}5\) 6 \(\text{c}4\)
g4 7 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{e}4\) 8 \(\text{c}6\) \(\text{d}4!!\), 0-1,

Instead 1 \(\text{c}4\) \(\text{d}7\) 2 \(\text{f}2\) \(d3\) 3
\(\text{e}1\) \(d2+\) 4 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{f}6\) 5 \(\text{c}5\) \(\text{d}3\) 6
\(\text{a}5\) draws.

3

1...\(\text{x}d5\) 2 \(\text{a}2\) \(\text{g}6\) 3 \(\text{f}2\) \(f5\) 4
\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{xd}2\) 5 \(\text{xd}2\) \(\text{g}5\) 6 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{g}4\)
7 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{f}4!\) 0-1, Balashov-Tiviakov, St.Petersburg, 1993.

4

1 \(\text{c}5!\) \(\text{x}c5\) (1...\(\text{b}c5\) 2 \(\text{d}3\) \(\Delta\)
\(\text{axa}5\)+) 2 \(\text{xc}5\) \(\text{bxc}5\) 3 \(\text{d}3\) \(e5\) 4
\(\text{c}4\) \(f5\) 5 \(\text{xc}5\) \(h5\) 6 \(b4\) \(a\text{xb}4\) 7
\(\text{xb}4\) \(f4\) 8 \(a5\) \(e4\) 9 \(\text{c}3\) \(e3\) 10 \(\text{d}3\),
1-0, Kuzmin-Petrosian, USSR, 1971.

5

After 1...\(b5?\) 2 \(\text{xb}5\) \(\text{xb}5\) 3
\(\text{axb}5+\) \(\text{xb}5\) 4 \(e4\) \(\text{c}6\) 5 \(e5!\) \(\text{fx}e5\) 6
\(g5\) \(\text{hxg}5\) 7 \(f6!\), Black had to resign,

6

No, it is not worth it. 1 \(\text{g}2?\) (1
\(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{xf}6\) 2 \(b5!\) \(\text{f}5\) 3 \(\text{d}4\) +-)
1...\(\text{e}5\) 2 \(\text{f}3\) \(b5=\), Adams-Xie Jun,

7

No. 1 \(\text{d}3??\) (1 \(\text{f}4=\)) 1...\(\text{e}5\)
2 \(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{xe}5\) 3 \(\text{g}5\) \(b5\)! 0-1, Bronstein-Timman, Tallinn, 1973.

8

(a) 1...\(\text{c}5!\), transposing to a
drawn rook ending;
(b) 1...\(\text{f}8?\) 2 \(\text{xd}6\) \(\text{xd}6\) 3 \(\text{c}5\)
\(\text{c}7\) 4 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 5 \(\text{xd}6\) \(\text{xd}6\) 6
\(\text{d}4\) \(\text{e}6\) 7 \(\text{c}5\) \(h5\) 8 \(g5\) \(f5\) 9
\(\text{xd}5\) \(g4\) 10 \(e5\) \(\text{xe}4\) 11 \(f5\),
1-0, Ricardi-Sorin, Buenos Aires,
1995.

9

No, he cannot.
1...\(\text{g}xd7?\)
1...\(\text{f}4!\)
2 \(\text{xd}7+\) \(\text{xd}7\) 3 \(\text{xd}7+\) \(\text{d}d7\) 4
\(f4!\) \(g4\)
4...\(\text{gx}f4\) 5 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 6 \(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{f}6\)
7 \(g3\) +-;
5 \(g3\) \(\text{gxh}3\) 6 \(\text{gxh}4\) \(\text{e}6\) 7 \(g3\)
\(\text{f}6\) 8 \(h5!\) \(g7\) 9 \(\text{hx}h3\) \(\text{h}7\) 10
\(\text{h}4\) \(h6\) 11 \(b3!\), 1-0, Estrin-Gusev, Moscow, 1963.
10

(a) 1...Bg5? 2 Bf5 Bf6 3 Bxe3 Bxe6 4 Bxe6 Bxe6 5 Bxe4 +–, Petrosian-Larsen, San Antonio, 1972;
(b) 1...Be5 2 Be3 Bxg6=

11

1...g5? (1...Be6!? 2 Bxd5 Bxd5 3 g4! (a typical breakthrough) 3...gxh4 4 gxh5 Bxe6 5Bg2 Bf5 6 f4!, Black resigned, Deak-Horvath, Hungary, 1994.

There followed 1...c4+?? 2 Bxc4+ Bxc4 3 Bxd3+, 1-0, Tal-Suetin, Sochi, 1973.
Correct was 1...Bf4! =.

12

1...d5? (1...h6 2 Bxb6+ Bxe5 3 Bxc6 Bxe1 4 B4 Bxe3 5 B5 Bd3=) 2 Bxd5 Bxd5 3 Bxa3! (going round the flank) 3...c5 4 Bxa4 g6 5 h4 h5 (5...g5 6 hxg5 hxg5 7 g4 ++) 6 g3 Bc6 7 b4! (7 Bb4? B5 8 B5? Bc5 9 Bc6 Bb4 ++) 7...Bc7 8 Bb5 Bb7 9 Ba4 Bc6 10 Bc3! Bb7 11 Bd4 Bc6 12 Bxe4 Bb5 13 Bd4 Bxb4 14 e4, 1-0, Ryumin-Ilyin-Zhenevsky, USSR (ch), 1931.

13

1...Bxg2+? (1...hxg2 –++) 2 Bxg2? hxg2 3 Bxg2 a5, 0-1, Valvo-Levitt, Chicago, 1992;
Necessary was 2 Bxh3! Bxg4 3 Bxg4 a5 4 Bf5! Bc6 5 e5 a4 6 e6 a3 7 Bg6=.

14

1...Bxf2? (1...Bxg2! Bc2+ 2 Bxf2 Bxf2+ 3 Bxf2 Bxg5 4 Bg3=) 1...c2+ 2 Bc2 Bc5+ 3 Bb3 Bxe3+ 4 Bxe3 Bxf3+ 5 Bxf3 Bxe2 6 Bxe2 Bg6 7 Bd3 Bf5 8 Bd4 a5, 0-1, Almasi-Portisch, Budapest, 1994.

15

1...f4! 2 Be3 Bg5 3 Bxf4 Bxf4 4 Bxf4+ Bxf4 5 Bb4 Bb6 –+, Szelaig-Pinski, Poland, 1997.

No, it is not possible.
1 Bf6+? Bxf6 2 Bxb8+ Bxb8 3 exf6 g5! 4 Bf4 Bg8 5 fxg5 Bh7 –+, Adorjan-Chernin, Budapest, 1995.

16

1...f4! 2 Be3 Bg5 3 Bxf4 Bxf4 4 Bxf4+ Bxf4 5 Bb4 Bb6 –+, Szelaig-Pinski, Poland, 1997.

17

(a) 1...h5? 2 Bb4 Bxb2 3 c5=, Cruz-Seirawan, Moscow, 1994;
(b) 1...a5+! 2 Ba3 Bxa2 3 Bxa2 Bb6 4 Bb3 c5 5 Bc3 e5 6 Bd3 f5 7 Bc4 e4 (7...h5 8 Bb3 f4 9 Bc3 f3 10 Bd3 Bb4 –+) 8 Bb3 h5 9 Bc3 f4! 10 Bxf4 e3! 11 Bxe3 h4 12 f5 Bd6!! (12...g3? 13 Bxg3 hxg3 14 f6 f6 15 c5=+) 13 Bb4 Be5! 14 c5 Bxf5 15 c6 Bd6 16 c5 g3 17 hxg3 h3! 18 Bb6 h2 19 c7 Bd7!, and the pawn queens with check!

18

(a) 1...Bxe4? 2 fxex4 Bd6 3 e5+! Bc5 4 Bc7=, Mestel-Chekov, Tjentiste, 1975;
(b) 1...Bd6 2 Bxa7 Bc5 3 Bc6 Bf1 –. 
20

(a) 1...c4? 2 xc4 dxc4 3 e4 b5 4 f4 c5 5 g4 b5 6 e5! fxe5 7 f5!! c5 8 g5 +-, Heinig-Liebert, DDR, 1979;
(b) 1...d4+! 2 exd4 d6=.

21

1 xb6! xb6 2 axb6 axb6 3 f2 e6 4 e3 d5 5 c4+ c5 6 g4 b5 7 f5 gxf5 8 gxf5 d6 9 xe4, Solozhenkin-Anchesi, Reggio Emilia, 1998.

22

1...e5? 2 xd6+! xd6 3 f4 d5 4 b5! axb5 5 a6 c6 6 xe4 b4 7 f4, 1-0, Larsen-Uhlmann, Las Palmas, 1971. 1...b5!=.
ROOK ENDINGS

1

In the game followed 1...\( \text{h}a1 \)? 2 \( \text{h}d5+ \text{f}e6 \) (On 2...\( \text{f}c6 \) follows 3 \( \text{g}g5+ \) ) 3 \( \text{h}d4! \text{f}f1 4 \text{e}e4+ \text{f}d7 5 \text{h}xa4, 1-0, Gurevich-Rechlis, Israel, 1989.

He should play 1...\( \text{h}f4! \) 2 \( \text{g}g7 \text{h}g4+ 3 \text{f}f6 \text{h}f4+ 4 \text{g}g6 \text{e}e6 5 \text{a}a6+ \text{e}e7 6 \text{a}a7+ \text{f}e6 7 \text{g}g7 \text{g}g4+ 8 \text{f}f8 \text{d}d6! 9 \text{e}e8 \text{h}e4+ 10 \text{d}d8 \text{f}f4 11 \text{a}a6+ \text{c}c5 12 \text{e}e7 \text{xf7}+! 13 \text{e}e7 \text{xf7} \text{b}b4 with a draw.

2

(a) 1 \( \text{h}d6? \text{e}e3 2 \text{h}e6+ \text{f}f2 3 \text{h}d6 \text{e}e2 4 \text{h}e6+ \text{d}d1 5 \text{g}g5 \text{d}2 6 \text{f}f4 \text{h}a2, 0-1, Topalov-Kasparov, Geneva, 1995;
(b) 1 \( \text{h}e8+! \text{f}f3 2 \text{h}h8+ \text{e}e2 3 \text{h}e8+ \text{d}d1 4 \text{h}a8 \text{d}2 5 \text{a}7=.

3

(a) 1...\( \text{f}f4? \) 2 \( \text{h}h4 \text{a}a2+ 3 \text{g}g1 \text{c}c2 4 \text{h}h5 \text{h}c5 5 \text{h}h6 \text{h}h5 6 \text{h}h7 \text{f}5 7 \text{a}a7, \frac{1}{2}=\frac{1}{2}, \) Leko-Akopian, Ubeda, 1997;
(b) 1...\( \text{a}a4 2 \text{h}h4 \text{a}a2+ 3 \text{g}g3 \text{a}a3 4 \text{h}h5 \text{a}a1 5 \text{h}h7 \text{a}a2 6 \text{g}g2 \text{g}g5, \) and the f-pawn advances.

4

(a) 1...\( \text{e}e7 2 \text{h}e6+ \text{f}f7! 3 \text{h}xd6 \text{h}d4 4 \text{g}g3 \text{e}e7 5 \text{h}e6+ \text{f}f7 6 \text{h}e5 \text{f}f6 7 \text{h}h5 \text{g}g6=;
(b) 1...\( \text{e}e7 2 \text{h}e6+ \text{d}d7? 3 \text{f}f6 \text{e}e7 4 \text{h}h5 \text{c}c3 5 \text{h}h4 \text{b}b3 6 \text{h}h5 \text{a}a3 7 \text{h}h6 \text{a}a8 8 \text{h}h8 9 \text{h}h5 \text{f}f6 10 \text{g}g3 \text{g}g7 11 \text{g}g4 \text{g}g6 12 \text{h}h1 \text{f}f6 13 \text{f}f4 \text{g}g6 14 \text{e}e4 \text{f}f6 15 \text{d}d4 \text{g}g7 (15...\( \text{e}e7 16 \text{c}c4 \text{d}d7 17 \text{a}a1!++) 16 \text{c}c4 \text{c}c8+ 17 \text{b}b5 \text{h}h8 18 \text{b}b6 \text{c}c5 19 \text{h}h5 \text{c}c8 20 \text{h}h6 +, \) Lesiège-Ivanov, Bermuda, 1995.

5

(a) 1 \( \text{b}b6?? \text{a}4 2 \text{h}h3 \text{h}xg4 3 \text{h}xf6 \text{e}h4++, 0-1, Gulko-Gurevich, Parsippany, 1996;
(b) 1 \( \text{c}c4 \text{h}h4 2 \text{e}e6=.

6

1 \( \text{c}c6! \) (1 \( \text{c}c7? \text{e}5 2 \text{f}xe5 \text{f}xe5 3 \text{b}b6 \text{e}4 4 \text{h}h7+ \text{f}f6! 5 \text{h}h8 \text{e}e7 6 \text{h}h8 \text{f}f6 7 \text{h}h6 \text{f}f6 8 \text{h}h5 \text{g}g7=, \) Short-Topalov, Novgorod, 1996) 1...\( \text{e}e5 2 \text{f}xe5 \text{f}xe5 3 \text{d}d5 \text{f}f6 (3...\( \text{e}e4 4 \text{h}h4++) 4 \text{c}c6 e4 5 \text{f}f2+ \text{e}e7 6 \text{e}e2 \text{d}d1++ 7 \text{h}xe4 \text{d}d6 8 \text{c}c2+-.

7

Correct was 1...\( \text{h}h8! 2 \text{c}c3 4 \text{h}h6=.

In the game followed 1...\( \text{b}b8? \) 2 \( \text{b}b3 \text{h}xb3 \) After 2...\( \text{h}c8 3 \text{c}c3 \text{d}d4 4 \text{h}h7+ \text{f}f6 Black holds the rook ending without problems. 3 \( \text{a}xh3 \text{f}f6 4 \text{g}g1 \text{e}e5 5 \text{f}f2 \text{e}e4 6 \text{e}e2 \text{d}d4 7 \text{d}d2 \text{a}a5 (7...\( \text{e}e4=) 8 \text{e}e2 \text{e}e5 9 \text{d}d2 \text{e}e4? (9...\( \text{c}c5=) 10 \text{c}c3+ \text{e}e5 11 \text{e}e3 \text{c}c6 12 \text{a}a4 \text{b}b5 13 \text{h}h3 \text{h}h6 14 \text{h}h4 \text{c}c6 15 \text{c}c4 1-0, \) Kupreichik-Zheliandinov, Gomel, 1968.

8

1 \( \text{f}f6 \text{g}g8 (1...\( \text{e}e8 2 \text{e}e6++\) ) 2 \text{g}g4+ \text{f}f8 3 \text{a}a4 \text{d}d8? (3...\( \text{g}g8 4 \text{a}a8+ \text{f}f7 5 \text{f}f8 \text{b}b1 6 \text{h}h7+ \text{g}g8 7 \text{h}h7 \text{f}f1+ 8 \text{e}e6 \text{h}h1, \) with a theoretical draw) 4 \text{a}a7? (4 \( \text{h}h4! \text{g}g8 5 \text{e}e7 \text{d}d5 6 \text{g}g4+ \text{h}h7 7 \text{xf}f7++) 4...\( \text{b}b8? (4...\( \text{g}g8 5 \text{h}h7 \text{f}f1 6 \text{h}h7, \) again draws) 5 \text{h}h7+ \text{g}g8 6 \text{h}h7+ \text{g}g8 7 \text{f}f7 8 \text{e}e6 \text{h}h6 8 \text{a}a7
Ab8 9 Ah7 Ag8 10 Ag7+ 1-0, Kirov-Kosić, Informator 59.

1 Ab7!! (1 Ag6 Ag3+ $ 2 ... Ab3)
1...Abxb5 2 Ag6 Ag8 3 h6 Aa1 4 Ab8+ 1-0, Levenfish-Lisitsin, Moscow, 1936.

1 f5!! — a typical breakthrough —1...exf5 2 e6! fxe6 3 Agg6 $ h5=.

The game continued 1 Agf6? Agb5
2 Aa1 a4 3 f5 exf5 4 e6 fxe6 5 Agxg6 f6 6 h5 f3 7 h6 e5! 8 Ae1 (8 Ag5 Ag7 9 Ah1 f2 $) 8...Axe5+ Agc4 10 Ae1 a2 11 h7 Aga8 (11...Ahxh7? 12 Aexh7 Ab3 13 Af1= or 11...f2 12 Af1 Ad3 13 Aa1!) 12 Agg7 (12 Aa1 f2 13 Axa2 Axa2 14 h8=Ag Aga6! $) 12...f2 13 Ae1 Agb3 14 Af1 a1=Ag 15 Axa1 Axa1 16 h8=Ag Agg1+ 0-1, Lasker-Levenfish, Moscow, 1935.

1 Agb6? (1 Ae3! Ae8 2 Agc6 $+)
1...e4 2 b5 Ae8 3 Ae7 e3 4 Ah1 e2
5 Ae1 AExh6 6 b6 Agg5 7 b7 Agg4!, 1/2-1/2, Bologan-Kramnik, Germany, 1994.

1 h7? (1 Ae8 Af7 2 Agc3 Agf2 3 Ad3 Ad7+ 4 Agc2 e2 5 Afxh8+ Ae1 6 Af6=; 1 Af8??) 1...Af7!, 0-1, Lautier-Yermolinsky, Tilburg, 1993.

(a) 1 g5? fxg5 2 hxg5 h4 3 d6 Aa2+! 4 Agf3 h3 5 Agg3 h2 6 Aa8+ Ag7 7 Ah8 Axd6 8 Aexh2 a4 ...
(b) 1 d6? Ag7! 2 b5 Ag6 3 d7+ Ag7 4 Ad6 Ad8 5 Agf6 Agd7 6 Agf7 Ae6 7 Aexh7 Ab3 8 Ab7 Ab2!
9 b6 e4 10 h3 b8 e3 11 f1 f6 12 h4 g7 13 g4 h7 14 h5 gxh5 15 gxh5 g7 16 b7+ h8 17 h6 g8
18 g7+ h8 19 b1! 20 e2 b2! 21 xe3 b3+ 22 d4 d4+ =, Yudasin-Kramnik, Candidates (m), 1994;
(b) 1 c8! g7 2 b6 b3 3 d6 +–.

19

(a) 1...xh4? 2 xg5 c3 3 d5!! d3 4 c1 h1+ 5 b2 h2! (5...e3 6 c2 h2+ 7 d1! d3 8 e5 =) 6 d8, Draw, Dreev-
Beliaevsky, Odessa, 1989;
(b) 1 xg1+ 2 e2 (2 d2 g2+ 3 e1 g4 4 f1 h2! 5 xg4 c3 6 g1 a2 d4–d3 –+) 2...d3+ 3
d2 g2+ 4 d1 g4 5 h5 c3 6 c8+ d4 7 h6 h2 c3 9 c8+ f3 10 h8 g3 11 h7 h4!, and
there is no defence against the march of the g4 pawn.

20

1 f6! c6+ 2 e5 c8 (2...c5 3 d6 c8 4 e1+) 3 g6!! h7 4 c6! a8 5 f6 a6, Cvitan.

21

1 g6+ f6 2 f8 e5 3 f6!! (3 f7? a1=) 3 xf6 4 f7! e6 (4...f6+ 5 g4 f6 6 g5 ++) 5
xg7 f1 6 a7 +–, Bayer-Polasek, Luxemburg, 1986.

22

1...a5! (1...g7? 2 a5 f6 3
f4 e6 4 e4! h5 5 f4! f6 6
g3 g5 7 a4=, Holmov-Hasin,
Minsk, 1962) 2 f4 g7 3 e4 h5
4 d4 h4 5 c4 h3 6 b4 h5 7
a1 h2 8 h1 f6 9 a5 f5 10 a6
h7=–.

23

1 c4 a4+ 2 b3 a3+ 3 c2
b3 4 b2! +–, Salwe.

24

(a) 1...e3? 2 g3 a1 3 e8! (3
a7? g1+ 4 h2 f2=) 3...g4 4
f4 x6 5 d8+! c5 6 g5, 1–0,
Ulibin-Nevednichy, USSR, 1986;
(b) 1...fx3!! 2 a7 a3=, Gelfand.

25

(a) 1 h3? 2 g3 +–, Bykova-
Rubzova, m, 1958;
(b) 1 h1! 2 g4 h3 3 xh3
gx7!, stalemate.

26

(a) 1 a8=g8 x8 2 x8 f5
h8 g4 h3 5 d4 g3 6
c3 g2=, Dammes-Sosonko,
Leningrad, 1963;
(b) 1 b7! f7+ 2 a6! f6+
(2...f8 3 b5! h3 4 a3! ++) 3
b5 f8 4 a8= w x8 5 x8
f5 6 c4 h3 7 d3 +–.

27

(a) 1 f4? c4 2 e5 d3! 3
f6 e4 4 g7 a8 5 h7 f5 6 g6
f5=, Gutman-Tseitin, Riga, 1976;
(b) 1 g4 c4 2 h5 d5 3 g6
++.

28

(a) 1 g2? f6 f3 3 g6 a5 4
f7, ½–½, Morovic-Agdestein,
Havana, 1998;
(b) 1 a1+ 2 d2 g1 3 g6
g3!! Δ 4...g2 –+.
29
(a) 1...f5? 2 h4! a6 3 e3 e4+ (3...a5 4 e4 f4 5 gxf4 exf4 6 e5) 4 fxe4 fxe4+ 5 c6e4 cxc4+ 6 cxc4 cxc4 7 e5=, Wirthensohn-Mikalchishin, Lenk, 1998;
(b) 1...h4! 2 gxf4 f5 3 e4 a6 4 h5 (4 b3 bxc4 5 bxb6 e4+) 4...gxf5 5 h4 a5 ++.

30
(a) 1 h6? c3 2 c4 c3 3 c4 c3 h8 3 c7 h8 a6 4 c6 h3! 6 c7 h3+ 7 g6 c3 8 c4=, Piket-Sokolov, Dortmund, 1995;
(b) 1 c4! d3 2 g6 e2 3 g5 c1+! 4 llxc1 c1+ 5 g7+.

31
(a) 1...b3? 2 g7+! h8 3 g7 b7 c7b4 4 g6, 1-0, Salov-Yudasin, St.Petersburg, 1997;
(b) 1...d3+! 2 c4 d3 3 b6 d3b4 4 e5 b4d4+ 5 e7 c4 6 c7 g7 7 e6 a8 8 d6 f8 9 d7 c7=.

32
Only 1 c3! makes a draw.
(a) 1...gxf4 2 a3+ d5 3 a2 e4 4 h5 f3 5 c3+ e2 6 c2+ d3 7 h2=;
(b) 1...d3+! 2 cxd3 e4 4 g5 c5 f3 5 f5+ g6 6 e4+ 7 g2=.

33
(a) 1...a1? 2 c8 a7 3 c7+! cxc7 4 cxc7 h7 5 d7, 1-0, Benkő-Gereben, Budapest, 1951;
(b) 1...d1+! 2 e6 a1 3 d8 cxa7 4 d7+ cxd7 5 xd7 h7=.

34
(a) 1 c4?! e3+ 2 d8 f5! 3 gxf5 f6 4 a6 fxf5 5 c7 g4 6 d7 c7 d6 xd7+ 8 xd7 d3=, Olafsson-Tal, Portorož, 1958;
(b) 1 d7 e3+ 2 d8 a3 3 a8!++.

35
(a) 1 c1+! g3 2 c2 f6 3 c4+ g2 4 c5 e5 f5 h7+ 5 f4 e4 6 c6+ g7 7 e6 f8 8 c6+ g7+.
(b) 1...c6! f3 2 d5 c5 3 d6+ e4 4 e5! d7 5 f5 c4 6 xf4 gxf4 7 g3 cxd6 8 xd6 e5 9 h5=.

36
(a) 1 e8? 2 c4 d6+ 3 g6 d7 4 c6 c5 5 c6 b5 6 c5 a5 c5 7 g5 c4 8 c5 a4 9 c5 a1 10 g7=;
(b) 1...a3!! 2 c5 d8 3 h3 c5 4 f6 c8 5 g5 h3=.

37
1 1 c2! e6 2 c3!! a3 3 f7 xf7 4 e3+ d5 5 xf7 a2 6 a3 1-0, Konstantinopolsky-Fridman, Lvov, 1940.

38
(a) 1 c1? 2 c5 g1 3 g5 xg5 4 f5! f3 5 f6, 1-0, Zaitsev-Hübner, Busum, 1969;
(b) 1...\texttt{h}b4! 2 f5 \texttt{h}b1 3 \texttt{h}h5 \texttt{g}g1 4 \texttt{g}g6 \texttt{x}xg4+ 5 \texttt{x}xf6 \texttt{g}g1=, Larsen.

40

1...d3!! 2 cxd3 (2 \texttt{x}xe4 dxc2) 2...c4!! 3 bxc4 c2 4 \texttt{x}xf4 c1=\texttt{w}+ 5 \texttt{x}e4 \texttt{d}1!, 0-1, Munios-Salazar, Dubai, 1986.

41

(a) 1 \texttt{f}f2? b5 2 axb5 (2 a5 \texttt{a}a3!!=) 2...axb5 3 \texttt{e}e2 \texttt{a}a3!! 4 \texttt{d}d2 b4 5 \texttt{c}c2 \texttt{c}c8+=! 6 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{h}h8, Draw, Levy-Peev, Cienfuegos, 1973.

(b) 1 \texttt{h}h4+! \texttt{x}xb3 2 a5 +=.

42

(a) 1...\texttt{b}b7? 2 \texttt{g}g4! \texttt{e}e8 (2...\texttt{a}a4 \texttt{b}b8 4 \texttt{f}f4 \texttt{e}e8 5 \texttt{d}d7+ ++) 4 \texttt{c}c4 \texttt{b}b8 4 \texttt{c}c7 b3 5 \texttt{x}xg7 \texttt{f}f8 \texttt{f}f7+ \texttt{g}g8 7 \texttt{d}d7 b2 8 \texttt{f}f1 \texttt{g}g7 \texttt{b}b1! \texttt{b}b6+ 10 \texttt{e}e7 \texttt{b}b7 11 \texttt{e}e1 1-0, Gelfand-Lerner, Norilsk, 1986

(b) 1...\texttt{f}f2! 2 \texttt{x}xg7 \texttt{e}e2+ 3 \texttt{d} b3 4 \texttt{b}b7 b2 5 g4 \texttt{c}c8 6 \texttt{b}b d7=.

43

It seems that White has successfully completed a difficult defence and Black must agree a draw after 1...a3 2 \texttt{g}g6 \texttt{g}g1+ 3 \texttt{h}h6 \texttt{h}h1 with a perpetual check or 1...\texttt{f}f1 \texttt{x}xb7 \texttt{f}f8 3 \texttt{a}a7. But, as it turns out, there is a third possibility. There followed the disheartening 1...\texttt{b}b6!!, and, playing on through inertia, 2 \texttt{g}g6 \texttt{c}c5+ 3 \texttt{f}f5 cxd4 \texttt{x}xd5 dxe3, White acknowledge defeat, Lopyshnoi-Dreev, Maikol 1998.
VARIous

1

(a) 1... b3? c8! 2 d6+ (2 xc5 c6 3 d3 d4+ =) 2... e6 3 e4 c6 4 gxf4 d4+ 5 c3 xf3 6 xc5 f5 7 fxe5 xe5 8 d3 xc4! 9 xc4 g4=, Sale-Mikhalchishin, Sibenik, 1990;
(b) 1 d2! b6 2 d3 d7 3 c3 e6 4 b3 b8 5 gxf4 c6 6 xc5 f5 7 d3 d4+ 8 c3 xf3 9 fxe5 xh2 10 c5 +-. 

2

(a) 1... xg2! 2 axb5 e6 3 xf7 xf7 4 xg2 e6 5 f3 d5 6 b6 c6 7 b7 xb7 8 e4 g4 +-.; (b) 1... d3? 2 axb5 e7 3 c8+ d7=, Van der Wiel - Larsen, Brussels, 1987.

3

1 g4!! (1 f2 f6 2 f4 g7 3 g4 hgx4 4 xg4 xc4!) 1... xg4 2 f4 f6 (2... f6 3 e5+! xex5 4 xex5 dxe5 5 e4, and the pawn ending is won) 3 e5+ dxe5 4 cxe5 d6 5 xg6 xd5+ 6 cxd5 c4 7 e4 cxb3 8 e5, 1-0, Razuvaev-Ostojić, Berlin, 1988.

4

(a) 1 c3? c7 2 c5 g2 3 d4 c6 4 e4 b5! 5 f3 c4 6 xg2 d5 7 f4 e4! intending ... f5, f6=, Kudrin-Cebalo, Berne, 1988;
(b) 1 a5!! g2 2 b6 b8 3 c6 c8 4 d6 +-. 

5

(a) 1... e6? 2 e4! d3 f5 +-, Vukić-Vujosević, Vrnjacka Banja, 1998;
(b) 1... b1=.

6

1 xa5 b2! 2 c4! (2 b4 a3=) 2... xa5 3 b4 b6!! 4 a5 f2 5 a6 (5 b5 a3=) 5... a7 6 b5 c3=, Par a-Gligorić, Bled, 1961.

7

1... g5+! 2 hxg5 h4 3 c6 g6+ 4 e4 h3 -- Markowski-Gdanski, Ksiaz, 1998.

8

He should choose 1... f6! 2 f8+ h5 3 g7 h6 +-. In the game White played 1... f5? 2 e7! d2+ 3 g3 e1+ 4 h3 h1+ 5 g3 g1+ 6 h3 f4 7 f8+ h5 8 xf4, 1/2-1/2, Mikhalchishin-Kavčić, Slovenia, 1997.

9

(a) 1... c2? 2 xh5 xh5 xh5 3 f1+ 4 h4 h1+ 5 h3 +-, Polugaevsky-Bronstein, Tallinn, 1964;
(b) 1... f5! =.

10

1... xexe? (1... fxe 2 xh5 xa5=) 2 g3+! f7 (2... xg3+ 3
11

1...c8? 2 g4 and 3 d1=, Ehlvest-Topalov, Novgorod, 1994
1...c7! 2 e7+ c6 3 e8+ c5 4 f8+ d4 --.

12

1 h7! xh7+ 2 g6 h4 3 f5+ d6 4 h6 h1 5 f7+ c7 6 g5 d6 7 f7 h8 8 g7 a8 9 f6! (9 f8=) a8+ 10 a8 c6 5 e5=) 9...e5 10 h7 a7 11 g6, 1-0, Krumpachnik-Maksimenko, Ptuj, 1998.

13

1 xe5 xe5 2 g3, Black resigned, But he could have saved himself by 2...g6! 3 xe5 h5 and after 4...f4—draw.

14

The game continued 1 xf5+? exf5 2 xf5 xh6 3 e6 a8 4 d6 c6 5 c7 a8! Black’s only chance, which White underestimated. Losing is 5...xe7 6 xb7 xh5 7 xa6 c6 8 xb5 +-. 6 c5 xh5 7 b6 g4 8 xa6 f3 9 xb5 xe3 10 b6 xb4!, \(1/2-1/2\), Chiburdanidze-Marić, Belgrade, 1996.

But better is 1 c2 a8 (1...xh6 2 d1 c6 3 g5+ h7 4 h6 \(\Delta h5 \) --) 2 e4!! dxe4 (2...fxe4 3 d1 xh6 4 g4 c6 5 g5+ h7 6 xe6 --) 3 b3 d5 4 xd5 e5 5 d6! (5 g5? b8! 6 e5 c6+ 7 xd5 xb4+ 8 e6 c6 9 d5 a5=) 5...xh6 (5...f6 6 xf5 xh5 7 g5 --) 6 xf5 xh5 7 e6 e3 8 f4! e2 9 d2 f8+ 10 xd5 g4 11 c6 f3 12 d5 f2 13 b7! --.

15

(a) 1...e5? 2 xxc6 exd4 3 exd4 d3+ 4 f4 d1 5 e4 g6 6 d5 e1+ 7 e3 g7 8 d6 d1 9 f4, and at last he resigned. Osterman-Mikhalchishin, Bled, 1995;
(b) 1...e6! 2 xxc6 d8! with the idea d8-a5-e1 with a sufficient defence.

16

No, because of 2...a4!! 3 e2 (3 h5 xb3 4 h6 xc2 5 h7 b3+ 6 e2 g2 --) 3...xb3 4 d3 xe2+ 5 xe2 d1+!!, 0-1, Timman-Salov, Amsterdam, 1991.
1 Alatortsev-Chekhover, USSR, 1937:
(a) 1 ... $b5? $xa7 2 $xa7 $xf2=;
(b) 1 ... $d5? $f1 2 $c6 $xa7! 3 $xa7 $xf2=;
(c) 1 ... $c5! $c8+ (1 ... $xa7 2 $xa7 $xf2 3 $d4 +-) 2 $b6 $e8 3 $c6! (3 $b7 $e7+ =) 3 ... $f1
(3 ... $h8 4 $b7 $h7+ 5 $b6 $h8 6 $c2 +-) 4 $b7 $e7+ 5 $b6 $e8 6 $c2! $g2 7 $b7 $e7+ 8 $b8!
$e8+9 $c8.

2 Karner-Renter, USSR, 1955:
(a) 1 ...$h2? 2 $h4 $h5 (2 ... $f2 3 $f3+-) 3 $a5+! $g4 4 $g5+ $h3 5 $h5 $a2 6 $h6 $a6 7 $h7, 1-0
(b) 1 ...$h5? 2 $xf3 $h2 3 $g1 $xh3 4 $g2 +-.
(c) 1 ...$g5!! 2 $xf3 $h2 3 $h4+ $g4=.

3 Cuartas-Zuidema, Skopje, 1972:
(a) 1 ...$f3? 2 $c7 $f2 3 $d2 $d4 4 $b2+-.
(b) 1 ...$e1? 2 $c7 $f3 3 $d8+ $e7 4 $b7+-.
(c) 1 ...$c1! 2 $c7 $c4!! 3 $d5 $e7 4 $b7 $e6 5 $b5 $d7 6 $d5+ $e6=, Karpov.
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Gurevich-Rechlis 101
Guseinov-Beliavsky 70
Gutman-Tsetlin 105
Havsky-Yuferov 27
Hector-Speelman 9
Heinig-Liebert 33
Hellers-Eingorn 12
Herrera-Vasquez 57
Hertneck-Narciso 151
Hoch 28
Hoi-Mikhalchishin 182
Holmov-Hasin 104
Holmov-Timoschenko 74
Horváth-Sherzer 177
Hübner-Ptáčník 127
Hübner-Polgár 89
Hübner-Spassky 116
Hulak-Beliavsky 173
Huzman-Mikhalchishin 61
Ilincíć-Abramović 52
Illivitsky-Taimanov 84
Ilyin-Zhenevsky-Botvinnik 27
Ioselianii-Onischuk 107
Ivanchuk-Eingorn 51
Ivanchuk-Kasimdzhanov 20
Ivanchuk-Kramnik 164
Ivanchuk-Lautier 88
Ivanov-Sagalchik 30
Janarev-Schcherbakov 25
Kamsky-Karpov 59
Kamsky-Cvitan 144
Kan-Keres 115
Karpov-Hort 145
Karpov-Kasparov 12
Karpov-Kasparov 157
Karpov-Timman 185
Karpov-Yudasin 103
Karpov-Yusupov 117
Kasparov-Andersson 127
Kasparov-Short 103
Keller-Mikenas 66
Keres-Aronin 183
Keres-Mikenas 107
Keres-Szabó 166
Kirov-Kosić 102
Klovan-Eistratov 29
Kochiev-Lerner 43
Konopka-Shcherbakov 67
Konstantinopolsky-Fridman 107
Korchnoi-Kengis 99
Korchnoi-Ljubojević 151
Korchnoi-Pinter 125
Korolev-Palm 185
Kovacević-Tosić 114
Kozakov-Asparuhov 27
Kozlov-Mikhalchishin 77
Kozul-Mikhalchishin 87
Kozul-Nikolić 68
Kramnik-Beliavsky 79
Kramnik-Lautier 17
Krasenk0-Iksunik 87
Kremenetsky-Razuvaev 37
Krupachnik-Maksimenko 190
Krupachnik-Polak 8
Kudrin-Cebalo 188
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kupreichik-Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupreichik-Zheliandinov</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuzmin-Petrosian</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuzmin-Petrosian</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen-Browne</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen-Uhlmann</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lastin-Cvitan</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasker-Levenfish</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasker-Marshall</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lautier-Yermolinsky</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lein-Suetin</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekó-Akopian</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lerner-Dorfman</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesiege-Ivanov</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levenfish-Lisitsin</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy-Peev</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilienthal-Smyslov</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljubojević-Ivanchuk</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardy-Fischer</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopyshnoi-Dreev</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lputian-Tukmakov</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macieja-Grabarczak</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madsen-Hansen</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magerramov-Kohlmeyer</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukovsky-Pustovalov</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marić-McNab</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marić-Zaitseva</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marković-Ivanović</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markowski-Gdanski</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marosi-Yudasin</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall-Alekhine</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinović-Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinović-Yudasin</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matlak-Tsekhovsky</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matulovic-Utunen</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mednis-Gurevich</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mestel-Chekhov</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhailov-Volchok</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Azmaiparashvili</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Beliavsky</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Cvetković</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Eslon</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Gufeld</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Kavčić</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Khmelnitsky</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Nestorovich</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Stangel</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Savchenko</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhalchishin-Sveshnikov</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles-Adorjan</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles-Kindermann</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles-Van der Sterren</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milov-Pelletier</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitrofanov</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokry-Pribyl</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morovic-Agdestein</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morovic-Yusupov</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morozevich-Balashov</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortensen-Plueg</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munios-Salazar</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natapov-Schuravlov</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neverov-Dreev</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nezhmetdinov-Luik</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nezhmetdinov-Romanovsky</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolaevsky-Gufeld</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolić-Frāčnik</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolić-Movsesian</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolić-Portisch</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimzowitsch-Chigorin</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novikov-Beliavsky</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novikov-Kaidanov</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novikov-Lalić</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olafsson-Tal</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oll-Benjamin</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostenstad-Kuzmin</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osterman-Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen-Morphy</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padevsky-Latov</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannon-Donner</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papendieck-Geiger</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma-Gligorić</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelletier-Arencibia</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelletier-Rozentalis</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelling-Miles</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permiakov-Petkevich</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrov-Larsen</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrov-Rashkovsky</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrov-Tal</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piempuu-Lancava</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piket-Sokolov</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaskett-Rowson</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polgár-Smyslov</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polnareva-Akhsharumova</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polugaevsky-Bronstein</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polugaevsky-Parma</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponomariov-Plaskett</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portisch-Kramnik</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portisch-Pietzsch</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portisch-Ribli</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psakhis-Bönsch</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rausis-Faragó</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razuvaev-Kirov</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razuvaev-Ostojic</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renet-Olafsson</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reti-Bogoljubow</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribli-Hertneck</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribli-Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardi-Sorin</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rittner-Bernstein</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanishin-Markowski</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanishin-Nunn</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanishin-Rodriguez</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanovsky-Stahlberg</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossolimo-Fischer</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozentalis-Christiansen</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rublevsky-Shariazadinov</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufenacht-Orseth</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryumin-Ilyin-Zhenevsky</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajtar-Benko</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakaev-Novikov</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale-Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salov-Kamsky</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salov-Khalifman</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salov-Malaniuk</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salov-Yudasin</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salwe</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schandorff-Speelman</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlechter-Lasker</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmittdiel-Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermek-Hulak</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiroy-Kramnik</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiroy-Lautier</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiroy-Morozevich</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiroy-Timman</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiroy-Van Wely</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Kasparov</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Topalov</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smagin-Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smagin-Naumkin</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyslov-Epishin</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokolov-Khalifman</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solozhenkin-Anchesi</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorin-Alterman</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speelman-Saltæv</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stein-Bobotsov</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suba-Chiburdanidze</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulipa-Gricak</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sveshnikov-Sokolov</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svidler-Lobron</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabo-Keres</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabo-Penrose</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szelaig-Pinsk</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taimanov-Chekhover</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taimanov-Gligoric</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal-Balashov</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal-Suetin</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavadian-Tseshkovsky</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiets-Forsberg</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikhomirova-Morozova</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timman-Ree</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timman-Salov</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timman-Van Wely</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toothill-Heemsoth</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topalov-Beliavsky</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topalov-Kasparov</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaganian-Portisch</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaganian-Schlosser</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaganian-Smirin</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valvo-Levitt</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Doel-Klovan</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Sterren-Douven</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Wil-Larsen</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Laatum-Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Wely-Adams</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasiliuk-Timoschenko</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaulin-Volkovskiy</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir-Novopashin</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir-Rashkovsky</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vujala-Smith</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vukic-Pietzsch</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vukic-Vujosevic</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vukovic-Eingorn</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyzhanavich-Chiburdanidze</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyzhanavich-Lerner</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward-Baburin</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells-Hector</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirthensohn-Mikhalchishin</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yates-Alekline</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yermolinsky-Ivanov</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yermolinsky-Seirawan</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yudasin-Kramnik</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yudasin-Osno</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yurtiev-Temirbaev</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusupov-Gerusel</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaitsev-Hilbner</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaichik-Sorin</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinar</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zotkin-Kudrin</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>