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In this book I will show you some fascinating new ideas that have been developed by modern grandmasters in the Old Indian Defence. Studying them will give you a very practical approach with Black after 1 d4. The main move order of our suggested repertoire is 1 d4 d6 2 c4, but then to navigate away from the classical Old Indian lines with ...bd7 and ...e5. The concept of this book is that on the one hand it offers a complete, independent repertoire for Black, and on the other hand King's Indian players may use our flexible move order to avoid some undesirable systems.

I have played a lot of these fresh lines myself. The biggest highlight was a win against Korchnoi in 2009. Among other grandmasters who are experts on this modern handling of the Old Indian, there are Vladimir Georgiev, Andrei Volokitin, Zahar Efimenko, Igor Glek and Anna Muzychuk. I had some interesting conversations and undertook some analysis on the opening with them, mostly during the Olympiad in Khanty-Mansiysk last year. I want to thank them all for sharing their opinions. I also did some analysis with Anatoly Karpov and Vladislav Tkachiev - not experts in this particular opening, but great players. I thank especially Anatoly Evgenyevich, who opposed me in a thematic blitz match with our opening, giving me the possibility to feel and benefit from his level of positional understanding.

Our repertoire will focus on active piece play, control of the centre, in particular the e4-square, and we have in store some surprises for unsuspecting opponents! Moreover, you won't be required to learn endless theory playing these lines. Why? Well, simply, sometimes there is not yet a lot of existing theory.

There are many unexplored paths in this opening, even within the critical lines. So this book contains a considerable amount of original analysis, with emphasis on the critical positions. Of course these ideas need to be tested further in practice and that's where you come in. I very much hope that these secret weapons will give the club player an excellent opening repertoire against 1 d4, and will also prove useful for aspiring masters or even grandmasters. Moreover, I hope you will learn from my experience with the New Old Indian and enjoy playing creative
chess in original positions as much as I do.

Finally, my thanks go to my co-author, Eduard Prokuronov, for all his invaluable help throughout the project.

Alexander Cherniaev,
London,
April 2011
Chapter One
Gheorghiu's 4...e4

1 d4 ∆f6 2 c4 d6 3 ∆c3 e5 4 ∆f3 e4!? 

This is quite an unusual defence, but one which gives Black immediate activity. Black plays aggressively from the start and tries to obtain a space advantage. His play will be in the centre and on the kingside.

In Belfort in 1988, the English Grandmaster Jonathan Speelman successfully employed 4...e4 against Kasparov who responded with 5 ∆g5. I have an excellent record with this line and have played it against grandmasters Victor Korchnoi, Simon Williams and Danny Gormally. I am now happy to bring to a wider audience my analysis and ideas in these lines.

In the 2009 Staunton Memorial Tournament in London, Korchnoi replied with 5 ∆d2, a move suggested by Geller who gave it an exclamation mark, but the resulting positions are far from clear and require more analysis. Williams and Gormally played 5 ∆g5, but after 5...w e7, one of Florin Gheorghiu’s ideas from the early 1970s, both were on unfamiliar ground and were unable to prove any advantage.

In general White has three kinds of strategy concerning the advanced pawn on e4:

a) To attack the pawn in every way possible, with both knights, w c2 and the undermining g4 – see Games 1, 2, 4 and 6.

b) To exchange the pawn with f2-f3, as we’ll see in Game 5.

c) To ignore it before finishing development, as White does in Games 3 and 7.

The first method allows a sharp bat-
tle to begin at an early stage in the opening, whereas the exchange of pawns leads to a nonstandard structure. Here the basic resource that Black has in the centre, ...c7-c5, can lead to a structure similar to the Sämisch Benoni, with the difference that White has a c-pawn instead of a g-pawn. Finally, the preservation of the pawn structure in centre usually results in White playing on the queen’s flank and Black on the king’s.

**Game 1**

Z.Gyimesi-A.Volokitin
German League 2005

1 d4 d6 2 c4 c6 3 ♞c3 e5 4 ♞f3 e4 5 ♞g5 ♛e7 6 ♛c2 ♞c6!? 

Black immediately attacks the d4-pawn. This interesting continuation leads to a sharp struggle linked with a pawn sacrifice. Black obtains some compensation for the pawn, although it’s questionable whether it’s quite enough.

**7 d5**

A critical advance, but in practice White has often preferred:

a) To exchange the central pawns is absolutely not dangerous for Black: 7 hxg4 hxg4 8 hxg4 ♛xe4 9 ♛d3 ♛c6 10 ♞c3 ♛e6 11 b3 0-0-0 and Black was ahead in development in F.De Andrs Gonalons-F.Ribeiro, San Sebastian 1996.

b) After 7 e3 Black is committed to playing 7...♕f5. Here White has a wide choice of moves, but most of them are not dangerous for Black:

   b1) The immediate 8 f3? is bad due to 8...♛xd4.

   b2) Another way to break through the e4-outpost is 8 g4 hxg4 9 ♛g2, which leads to mass exchanges on e4: 9...♕f5 10 hxg4 ♛xe4 11 ♛xe4 ♛xe4 12 ♛xe4 ♛xe4 13 ♛xe4 ♛d7 14 ♛f1 ♜f5 15 ♛c3 ♛e7 16 ♛d2 ♜f4 17 ♛e2 ♛h8 with an even position, V.Lazarev-M.Tratar, Trieste 2005.

   b3) 8 ♛h3 ♛d7 9 a3 ♛e7 10 ♛g5 (a time-wasting return, but White decided to attack the e4-pawn again, as it is not directly protected) 10...c6! 11 d5 ♛c8 12 dxc6 ♛xc6 13 b3 ♛h6 14 ♛h3 ♛g5 15 ♛b2 ♛e5 16 ♛d1 ♛g7 saw Black taking the upper hand in J.Lautier-B.Damljanovic, Spanish Team Championship 2004.

   b4) 8 h4 was Lautier’s next try, but 8...h6 9 ♛h3 ♛g5 10 ♛d5 ♛d8 11 ♛d2 ♛g7 12 0-0-0 ♛d7 13 ♛e2 ♛xd5 14 ♛xd5 ♛xd5 15 ♛xd4 ♛e3 16 ♛d3 ♛xd3 17 ♛xd3 ♛xd2+ 18 ♛xd2 0-0-0 gave Black

b5) 8 ∆d5 ∆xd5 9 cxd5 ategorias 10 dxc6 b6 11 h4 ∆g6 12 d5 ∆e7 13 ∆d2 0-0 14 ∆c3 ∆g4 15 ∆e2 ∆xe2 16 ∆xe2 ∆f6 and after exchanging the bishops, the d5-pawn became a target in P.Meister-J.Zwanzger, German League 2007.

b6) 8 d5 ∆b8 9 f3 allows White to gain an extra pawn by replacing Black’s e-pawn with his f-pawn.

However, the resulting structure is good for Black as both doubled e-pawns become a target: 9...∆bd7 10 ∆gxe4 (10 ∆b5 ∆c5 11 b4 ∆d3+ 12 ∆xd3 exd3 13 ∆a4 ∆d7 14 ∆xe7+ ∆d8 15 ∆b5 ∆xd5 16 e4 h6 is unclear) 10...∆xe4 11 fxe4 (or 11 ∆xe4 12 fxe4 11 g6 13 ∆d3 ∆g7 14 ∆d2 ∆h4+ 15 ∆g5 16 0-0-0 0-0 17 ∆df1 a5 which favoured Black in H.Mecking-R.Disconzi da Silva, Guarapuava 2006) 11...g6 12 ∆b5 ∆d8 13 ∆d2 (if 13 b4 a6 14 ∆c3 a5! 15 bxa5 ∆xa5 16 ∆e2 ∆g7 17 0-0 0-0 18 ∆b1 ∆a7 19 a4 ∆e8 20 ∆h1 ∆c5 and Black has slightly the better chances, V.Lazarev-A.Strikovic, Lisbon 2001) 13...∆h6!? 14 ∆d3 a6 15 ∆c3 ∆g4 with counterplay.

c) 7 ∆d5 leads to a forced continuation, where Black’s king loses castling rights, but White’s pieces are insufficiently developed: 7...∆xd4! 8 ∆a4+ ∆d7 9 ∆xc7+ ∆d8 10 ∆d1 ∆xc7 11 ∆xd4 h6 12 ∆h3 g5 and Black is better, Z.Mamedjarova-B.Savchenko, Gjovik 2008.

d) With 7 ∆e3 White prepares ∆d5 ideas, while keeping both the d4-pawn and g5-knight protected. Then 7...f5 8 ∆d5 ∆xd5 (better than 8...∆xd4 9 ∆xd4 10 cxd5 11 e3 when White is better, D.Rajkovcic-S.Saric, Kragujevac 2009) 9 cxd5 ∆d8 10 g4 ∆xg4 11 ∆xe4 (11 ∆xe4 c6 gives White an edge) 11...h6 12 ∆h4 13 ∆c1 14 ∆g2 h6 15 ∆xe7+ ∆xe7 15 ∆e4 f5 16 ∆c3 ∆f6 17 f4 c5 produced a roughly level game in V.Shishkin-N.Firman, Krakow 2007.

7...∆d4

8 ∆b1

Somewhat more critical than 8 ∆d1?! ∆f5 (avoiding the fiendish
8...\textit{we}5? 9 \textit{dx}xe4 \textit{dx}e4 10 f4 which favours White) 9 g4 (or 9 e3 h6 10 \textit{dh}3 g5 11 \textit{dg}1 \textit{dg}7 12 \textit{ge}2 0-0 13 \textit{dg}3 \textit{dh}4 and Black is better, M.Gavilan Diaz-A.Strikovic, Malaga 2009) 9...\textit{dh}4 10 \textit{wd}4 \textit{dx}xg4 11 \textit{w}xe4 (11 \textit{dx}xe4 \textit{de}5! gives Black good play) 11...\textit{df}5 12 \textit{w}xe7+ \textit{xe}7 with a slight advantage for Black.

8...\textit{e}3!

Instead 8...h6 9 \textit{dg}xe4 (or 9 e3 hxg5 10 exd4 g4 11 \textit{dg}5! \textit{df}5 12 g3 g6 13 \textit{wc}1 when White has slightly the better chances) 9...\textit{dx}e4 10 \textit{dx}e4 \textit{df}5 11 f3 doesn't give Black full compensation for the pawn.

\textbf{9 fxe3 \textit{df}5 10 e4 \textit{dh}4 11 \textit{af}4} 

In this critical position, White also has:

a) 11 \textit{af}3 \textit{dg}6 12 g3 \textit{dd}7 gives Black decent compensation thanks to his use of the e5-square.

b) The latest practice shows good results for White after 11 g3!? but the total number of games is very small and much more testing is required. Moreover, there are several possible improvements for Black after 11...\textit{dg}6 and now:
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b1) 12 \textit{dg}2 \textit{de}5 (another way of setting up the pieces deserves definite attention: 12...\textit{wd}8!? followed by ...\textit{de}7, ...\textit{c}6, with the idea of ...\textit{wb}6, and ...\textit{dg}4: for example, 13 0-0 \textit{de}7 14 \textit{wc}2 0-0 15 \textit{df}3 \textit{c}6 16 b3 \textit{dg}4, giving Black good play on the dark squares; ...\textit{df}6, ...\textit{we}8 and ...\textit{wb}6 may follow) 13 \textit{wc}2 g6 14 \textit{df}3 \textit{fd}7? 15 \textit{db}5! \textit{wd}8 16 \textit{dg}5 \textit{xf}3+ 17 \textit{ex}f3 \textit{wx}g5 18 \textit{xc}7+ with a large advantage for White, A.Moiseenko-Z.Jovanovic, European Championship, Rijeka 2010.

b2) 12 \textit{h}3 \textit{de}5 (12...\textit{hx}h3!? 13 \textit{dx}h3 \textit{de}5 deserved attention, keeping the possibility of long castling: for example, 14 \textit{wc}2 0-0-0 15 0-0 h5 16 \textit{dg}5 \textit{wd}7 17 \textit{df}2 \textit{de}7 18 \textit{wd}2 \textit{fg}4 would have been quite unclear) 13 \textit{xc}8 \textit{xc}8 14 \textit{wc}1 \textit{fd}7 15 \textit{dh}3 h6 16 b3 g6 17 \textit{de}3 a6 18 \textit{df}2 h5 19 h3 \textit{dh}6 20 \textit{hx}h6 \textit{ax}h6 21 \textit{wd}2 \textit{eh}8 22 0-0-0 h4 23 g4 \textit{ef}6 24 \textit{dd}3 \textit{dh}7 25 \textit{wf}4 gave White the better chances in E.Najer-P.Haba, German League 2009.

10
11...\textit{g}6

11...\textit{h}5 12 \textit{d}2 is a touch better for White.

12 \textit{e}3 \textit{h}6 13 \textit{f}3 \textit{xf}4!

Better than 13...\textit{h}5?!

14 \textit{c}1 \textit{d}7? (Better is 14 \textit{g}4! 15 \textit{x}h4 \textit{w}xh4+ 16 \textit{g}3 \textit{d}8 17 \textit{e}2 with advantage to White.)

14 \textit{exf}4 \textit{g}5!

Black must try to exploit White's temporarily-overextended position.

15 \textit{c}5!

Instead 15 \textit{d}3 \textit{gxf}4! 16 \textit{c}1 \textit{g}4! (if 16...\textit{g}8 17 \textit{xf}4 \textit{x}g2 18 0-0-0 \textit{g}4 19 \textit{d}2 \textit{d}7 20 \textit{b}5 and White has slightly the better chances) 17 \textit{xf}4 \textit{h}5 gives Black decent compensation.

15...\textit{a}6!

Correct, as 15...\textit{xf}4 16 \textit{b}5+ \textit{d}7 17 \textit{xd}7+ \textit{xd}7 18 \textit{c}xd6 \textit{c}xd6 19 \textit{c}1 \textit{g}4 20 0-0 would have been excellent for White.

16 \textit{d}3?

The best approach was 16 \textit{c}2! \textit{gxf}4 17 \textit{a}4+ when 17...\textit{d}7 (17...\textit{d}7 18 \textit{b}5 gives White the better chances too) 18 \textit{c}6 \textit{bxc}6 19 \textit{dxc}6 \textit{e}6 20 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}7 21 0-0 0-0 22 \textit{ae}1 favours White.

16...\textit{xf}4 17 \textit{w}c1 \textit{d}7?

Better is 17...\textit{g}4! 18 \textit{xf}4 \textit{h}5 19 \textit{cxd}6 \textit{cxd}6 20 h3 \textit{h}6 21 \textit{g}3 \textit{e}3 with compensation.

18 \textit{c}xd6 \textit{w}xd6 19 0-0 \textit{g}7 20 \textit{h}1 \textit{e}5 21 \textit{b}5+ \textit{e}7

22 \textit{w}xf4?

Returning the favour. Instead 22 \textit{e}2! \textit{xf}3 23 \textit{xf}3 \textit{e}5 24 \textit{a}4 gives White an edge.

22...\textit{axb}5 23 \textit{xe}5?

23 \textit{xb}5 would have been very unclear: for example, 23...\textit{g}6 24 \textit{w}c1 \textit{b}6 25 \textit{xc}7 \textit{a}5 26 \textit{d}6+ \textit{xd}6 27 \textit{d}1+ \textit{e}7 28 \textit{d}5+ \textit{xd}5 29 \textit{xd}5 \textit{e}6 30 \textit{d}2 \textit{c}8 with by now a slight advantage for Black.

23...\textit{xe}5 24 \textit{w}xf7+ \textit{d}8 25 \textit{xb}5 \textit{w}7 26 \textit{f}2 \textit{a}6!

Obtaining control over \textit{b}6.

27 \textit{d}6?

This breakthrough idea doesn’t work here, although after 27 \textit{ac}1! \textit{g}8 (White’s idea was to meet 27...\textit{xf}6? with 28 \textit{d}6!) 28 \textit{d}6 \textit{xd}6 Black was better in any case.
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27...exd6

Also possible was 27...cxd6!? 28 \[d1 \[d7 29 \[c3 ed6 30 \[d5 \[g5, and White's compensation is insufficient.
28 \[c1 \[d7 29 \[xd6 ed6 30 \[a7 \[c8! 31 \[a5 \[e8 32 \[h3 \[e5
to be worried by ideas of d4-d5.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\[d1} \\
\text{\[c1}
\end{array}
\]

Black has fully consolidated his position and went on to win.
33 \[a4 \[d7 34 \[a8+ \[c8 35 \[a4 \[xd1 36 \[xd1+ \[e7 37 \[d5 \[f4! 38
\[d4 \[f7 39 \[c5 \[e7 40 \[c3 \[f1+ 41 \[h2 \[f4+ 42 \[g1 \[d7 43 \[c4+ \[e7 44
\[f3 \[d1+ 45 \[f2 \[d2+ 46 \[g3 \[d6+ 47 \[h4 \[e6 48 \[c3 \[d4! 49 \[g4 \[e5 50
\[a3+ \[d7 51 \[e3 \[h5 52 \[f4 \[xg4 53 \[xg4 \[c4 0-1

7 g4

The most principled and also the sharpest continuation. Others:
a) 7 f3 also leads to very complex play, where Black generally has fair compensation after 7...\[c6 8 fxe4 (8 \[d5 \[e5 9 \[gxe4 \[xe4 10 \[xe4 \[g6 11
\[a4+ \[d7 12 \[b3 \[g7 13 \[xb7 \[c8 14 \[e3 0-0 15 \[e2 \[f5 16 0-0 \[b8 17
\[a6 \[xe4 18 fxe4 \[d7 19 \[f3 \[c5 20 \[a5 \[xb2 21 \[xb2 \[xb2 22 \[xa7 \[f8 gave Black a perfectly acceptable position in L.Pytlik-J.Vozda, correspondence 2003) 8...\[g6.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{D.Gormally-A.Cherniaev} \\
\text{London 2009}
\end{array}
\]

1 d4 \[f6 2 c4 d6 3 \[c3 e5 4 \[f3 e4 5 \[g5 \[e7 6 \[c2 \[f5

A less-risky approach than Volo-kitin's 6...\[c6!? It does still entail a pawn sacrifice, but Black no longer has

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{D.Game 2} \\
\text{D.Gormally-A.Cherniaev} \\
\text{London 2009}
\end{array}
\]

Black has sacrificed a pawn, but
keeps White’s centre under strong pressure. Now:

a1) 9 d5 će5 10 g3 c6 11 ěg2 ćxc4 12 dxc6 bxc6 13 ća4 će5 14 0-0 ćfd7 15 ěe3 ćd8 16 ćf3 ěe7 17 ěxe5 ěxe5 18 ěd4 ćd7 19 ěad1 ćb7 20 ěd5 ěd8 21 ćf4 ćb6 22 ěh1 ćxd4 23 ěxd4 ěd8 24 ěfd1 0-0 25 ěf3 ěxb2 26 ěxd6 ěxd6 27 ěxd6 ćb6 28 ćd1 ěe8 led to an approximately equal position in Sharpe-A.Cherniaev, British League 2007.

a2) 9 e3 0-0-0 10 a3 d5! 11 cxd5 ćxc4 12 ěf3 ěxc3 13 bxc3 ěxe4 14 ěd3 f5 15 0-0 g6 16 ěxe4 fxe4 17 ěd2 ěh6 18 ěe1 was A.Cherniaev-M.Cornette, Geneva 2006, and here 18...ćhe8 deserved attention, followed by ...ćh4 and ...ćd5-h5. That game made me realize that this whole variation had been rather underestimated.

a3) 9 ěd5? ěxd4! 10 ća4+ ćd7 11 ěxc7+ ěd8 is a little trap which has caught out a few players.

V.Vorotnikov, Moscow 1996) 12...ćxe4 13 ćd1 ćxb5 14 cxb5 ćxb5 15 ěxe4 ěxe4 16 ěe3 ěe5 17 ěd2 ěe7 18 ěa4 ěh4+ Black already had a decisive advantage in Glek-V.Zhuravliov, Blagoveschensk 1988.

b) 7 ěe3 leads to a more established pawn structure, where each opponent mostly plays on the flank where he has a space advantage: for example, 7...ćh6 8 ěh3 c6 9 ěd2 ćd7 10 ěf4 g5 11 ěfe2 d5 12 ěc5 ěa6! (12...ćg7 13 b4) 13 ěa3 ěc7 14 b4 h5 15 ěb1 h4 16 ěh3 ěh6 17 ěc1 ěe6 18 ća4 0-0 19 b5 ěg6 20 bxc6 bxc6 21 ěb4 ěh5 22 ěb3 ěa8! 23 ěa5 ěd8 with counterplay, N.Giffard-T.Manouck, Puteaux 1980.

7...ćg6!

To take the pawn either way is worse:

a) 7...ćxg4 8 ěgxe4 ěbd7 9 ěg2 c6 10 ěf4 ěxe4 11 ěxe4 ěf5 12 ěxd6+ ěxd6 13 ěxf5 ěxd4 14 0-0 g6 15 ěad1 with advantage for White, P.Haba-R.Lau, Austrian League 1998.

b) 7...ćxg4 8 ěgxe4 is also good for White.

Black wants to maintain his cramped e-pawn for as long as possible.

8 ěg2

After 8 ěd5 ěxd5 9 cxd5 ěd7 10 ěxc7 ěf6 11 ěc4 ěxg4 12 ěb5+ ěd8 13 ěg2 e3 Black had the better chances in Gonzalez Velez-V.Jansa, Benasque 1999.

8...ćc6

8...e3?! is an interesting but likely insufficient idea: 9 ća4+! c6 10 ěxe3
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gxg4 11 ♘f4 ♘f6 12 c5?! (12 d5 ♘d7 13 dxc6 ♘xc6 14 ♘d1 is also better for White), with the idea of 12...dxc5 13 d5 ♘d7 14 ♘xb8 with a decisive advantage for White.

11...dxc5 12 d5 ♘d7

In this critical position, White also has:

a) 9 d5 ♘e5 (not 9...♘d4?! 10 ♕d1!) 10 ♗xe4 (10 ♕a4+ leads to an approximately equal endgame after 10...♕d7 11 ♗xd7+ ♘xd7 12 ♗xe4 ♘xe4 13 ♔xe4, as in E.Gasanov-V.Varavin, Alushta 2001, and then 13...♕xg4 14 ♘g3 h5) 10...♘xe4 11 ♘xe4 (11 ♘xe4 ♘xg4 12 h3 was preferred in J.Lautier-B.Gulko, Horgen 1995, and here 12...♕e5?! requires testing: for example, 13 h4 h6 14 h5 ♘h7 15 ♘f4 0-0-0 is about equal) 11...♕xg4 12 h4 (after 12 ♕a4+ ♘d8!? White should take care about his own king and 13 ♕c2 ♕h4 14 e3 ♘e7 15 ♕e2 ♗xf2 16 ♕xf2 ♘xe4 led to a decisive advantage for Black in I.Kutsyk-V.Savon, Alushta 1999) 12...0-0-0 13 f3 ♘e5 14 h5 ♘xe4 15 ♕xe4 (A.Vaissier-S.Belkhodja, Meudon 1990) 15...♕d7 is about equal. Black will expand with ...f5 followed by ...♕e7-f6.

b) 9 ♗xe4 ♘xe4 10 ♘xe4 ♘xd4 11 ♕d3 (11 ♕a4+ ♕d7 12 ♕xd7+ was unhelpfully agreed drawn in A.Shariyazdanov-E.Dizdarevic, Pula 1999) 11...♘e6 12 ♘e3 ♕h4 13 h3 ♘e7 14 0-0-0 ♗g5 15 ♘xg5 ♕xg5+ 16 ♕d2 ♕xd2+ 17 ♘xd2 ♘xe4 18 ♘xe4 1/2-1/2 l.Farago-F.Gheorghiu, Baile Herculane 1982. Clearly Black has no problems here.

c) 9 ♕d5 deprives Black of castling rights, at the cost of a pawn, and leads to interesting and complex play.

9 e3

After 9...♘xd4 (worse is 9...♘xd5 10 cxd5 e3 because 11 ♕a4 ♕xg5 12 ♘xe3 ♕xg4 13 ♘f3 gives White the better chances) 10 ♕a4+ ♕d7 11 ♗xc7+ ♘d8 12 ♕d1 (preferable to 12 ♕xd7+ ♘xd7 13 ♘xa8 ♘c2+ 14 ♕d1 ♘xa1 15 ♘e3 ♘e7 16 ♘d2 ♘xa8 17 ♘xa1 h6 18 ♘h3 ♘xg4 with a decisive advantage for Black, W.Schmidt-T.Manouck, Bagneux 1981) 12...♗xc7! (12...♗xc7 13 ♕xd4 ♕c5 14 ♕xc5 dxc5 15 h4 favours...
White) 13 \( \text{Wxd4 \text{Wxg4}} \) 14 0-0 \( \text{\text{e7}} \) 15 \( \text{\text{e3}} \) \( \text{\text{d8}} \) (preparing to bring the king to safety via d7 and e8) 16 \( \text{\text{ad1}} \) b6 17 b4 \( \text{\text{d7}} \) 18 \( \text{\text{xe4}} \) \( \text{\text{xe4}} \) 19 f3 \( \text{\text{g6}} \) 20 fxe4 \( \text{\text{e8}} \) the situation is dynamically balanced. Black has successfully evacuated his king and wants to establish a blockade on e5, but White's long-range pieces still have some potential.

9...0-0-0

Here Black has some virtually-unexplored alternatives:

a) 9...

\( \text{\text{xdg4}} \) 10 \( \text{\text{gxe4}} \) f5 11 d5 \( \text{\text{d7}} \) 12 \( \text{\text{ec3}} \) (or 12 h3 \( \text{\text{xe3}} \) 13 \( \text{\text{xe3}} \) fxe4 14 \( \text{\text{xe4}} \) 0-0-0 15 \( \text{\text{g6}} \) hgx6 16 \( \text{\text{g6}} \) \( \text{\text{e7}} \) 17 \( \text{\text{xe7}} \) + \( \text{\text{xe7}} \) 18 \( \text{\text{g7}} \) which gave Black kingside pressure and compensation for the pawns in G.Kallai-W.Schmid, Lenk 1989) 12...\( \text{\text{e7}} \) 13 \( \text{\text{xe7}} \) (after 13 \( \text{\text{b3}} \) \( \text{\text{b8}} \) 14 d2 \( \text{\text{h4}} \) 15 0-0 0-0 16 h3 \( \text{\text{f6}} \) 17 \( \text{\text{xf6}} \) + \( \text{\text{xf6}} \) 18 d5 \( \text{\text{g5}} \) 19 f4 \( \text{\text{h4}} \) Black was better in V.Hort-A.Miltner, German League 1997) 13...\( \text{\text{xe7}} \) 14 d5 \( \text{\text{d7}} \) 15 h3 \( \text{\text{h6}} \) 16 d2 0-0 was played in J.Ovchinikova-V.Varavin, Perm 1997. In this position White continued with 17

f4?! but this favoured Black as the e3-pawn was weak after 17...\( \text{\text{h5}} \) 18 0-0 \( \text{\text{h8}} \) 19 \( \text{\text{c3}} \) \( \text{\text{a8}} \). Instead, White should have chosen 17 \( \text{\text{xf4}} \) \( \text{\text{f7}} \) 18 0-0-0, which would have given him an edge.

b) 9...d5!? with the idea of ...\( \text{\text{b4}} \) also requires more testing.

10 h4

This leads to interesting complications and there doesn’t seem to be anything better for White:

a) 10 \( \text{\text{gxe4}} \) is bad due to 10...d5! 11 \( \text{\text{xd5}} \) (not 11 \( \text{\text{xd5}} \) 12 \( \text{\text{xd5}} \) \( \text{\text{b4}} \) 13 \( \text{\text{a4}} \) \( \text{\text{xe4}} \) with a decisive advantage for Black, T.Braun-A.Miltner, Bad Wiessee 2002) 11...\( \text{\text{b4}} \) 12 \( \text{\text{b1}} \) \( \text{\text{bd5}} \) 13 \( \text{\text{xd5}} \) (White was also in some trouble after 13 f3 \( \text{\text{c3}} \) 14 bxc3 \( \text{\text{xe4}} \) 15 fxe4 \( \text{\text{h4}} \) in G.Borg-E.Dizdarevic, Internet (blitz) 2003) 13...\( \text{\text{xd5}} \) 14 f3 h5 15 g5 \( \text{\text{xe4}} \) 16 fxe4 \( \text{\text{g5}} \) was excellent for Black in P.Skalik-V.Varavin, Anapa 1991.

b) 10 a3 \( \text{\text{xdg4}} \) 11 \( \text{\text{gxe4}} \) f5 12 d5 \( \text{\text{h4}} \) 13 \( \text{\text{g3}} \) \( \text{\text{e8}} \) sees White fighting for equality.
10...h6

10...b4!? reaches another complicated position which seems at least okay for Black. The critical line is 11 \textit{wa}4 d3+ 12 \textit{xe}2 \textit{b}b8 13 h5, but after 13...\textit{x}xg4 14 \textit{x}xe4 \textit{xe}4 15 \textit{xe}4 f5 16 \textit{xd}3 fxe4+ 17 \textit{xe}2 \textit{f}f7 the safety of his king is a problem for White.

11 h5 hxg5 12 hxg6 \textit{hxh}1+ 13 \textit{x}xh1 b4 14 \textit{wa}4 d3+ 15 \textit{xe}2 \textit{xe}6 16 f3

The critical moment in the game. I spent much time here.

16...a6?!

Unfortunately not best. Instead 16...c5!? 17 \textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 18 fxe4 \textit{b}b4 19 \textit{d}d2 \textit{xc}4+ with complex play or the simple 16...fxg6 should have been preferred.

17 \textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 18 fxe4 \textit{xc}1+ 19 \textit{xc}1 \textit{wg}4+ 20 \textit{f}f3 \textit{g}3 21 b4

Instead 21 gxf7 g4 22 \textit{h}1 \textit{h}2+ 23 \textit{d}3 \textit{xb}2 24 \textit{c}2 gives White a small advantage.

21...g4 22 \textit{h}1 \textit{e}7 23 \textit{d}1 fxg6 24 \textit{g}1 \textit{xg}1 25 \textit{g}1 \textit{h}8 26 \textit{g}2 \textit{f}6

By now I was short of time, but in any case Black has no real chances to play for a win.

27 a4 \textit{h}2 28 \textit{f}1 \textit{g}5 29 \textit{f}2 \textit{h}4+ 30 \textit{f}1 \textit{g}5 31 \textit{f}2 \textit{h}4+ 32 \textit{f}1 ½-½

\textbf{Game 3}

\textit{T.Roussel Roozmon} – \textit{Z.Efimenko}

\textit{Montreal 2005}

1 d4 \textit{f}6 2 c4 d6 3 \textit{c}3 e5 4 \textit{f}3 e4 5 \textit{g}5 \textit{e}7

Now we will turn our attention to those lines where White does not go after the e4-pawn with 6 \textit{wc}2.
White secures some space on the kingside and ensures a comfortable retreat square for his knight, but on the other hand, this approach costs a tempo and is potentially weakening.

Before exploring 6 h4, we should mention too:

a) 6 g3 is another long-term strategic move and was recommended in NCO. After 6...h6 7 h3 Black has:

a1) After 7...g5 the knight on h3 is temporarily out of play, but the weakening of the black kingside may begin to tell: for example, 8 g2 f5 9 b3 c6 10 0-0 g7 11 f3 0-0 12 f2 exf3 13 exf3 a6 14 g4 e6 15 d5 c5 16 d1 cxd5 17 cxd5 d7 18 e1 d8 19 e3 e8 20 b4 a6 21 b3 slightly favours White, S. Savchenko-V. Zhuravliov, St Petersburg 1992.

a2) With 7...g6 Black keeps a solid position on the kingside, albeit without limiting the further movement of White's knight. After 8 g2 g7 9 0-0 0-0 10 f4 c6 11 f3 g5 12 fxе4!?(sacrificing a piece for just two pawns, but White also obtains a very strong pawn centre – this idea in the spirit of the Cochrane Gambit, 1 e4 e5 2 f3 f6 3 exе5 d6 4 xf7?) 12...gxе4 13 gxf4 h8 14 f5 g8 15 f4 h5 16 e3 f6 17 xh6 g5 18 e3 xh6 19 xh5 White had full compensation for the piece in B. Chatalbashev-Z. Jovanovic, Rijeka 2007.

a3) 7...f5 allows White an interesting manoeuvre in f4–g2!–e3 (recalling Nimzowitsch!), in order to pressure the d5-square: 8 f4 c6 9 g2 d5 10 e3 e6 11 g2 d7 12 a3 b5 13 b3 a6 14 0-0 c7 15 cb5 cb5 16 f3 was a touch better for White in M. Hrivnak-R. Hasangatin, Frydek Mistek 1997.

a4) The flexible 7...c6 might well be best.

\[ 
\]

\[ 
\]

Now:

a41) After 8 g2 the bishop takes the g2-square away from White's knight, so now it's sensible to play 8...f5 9 e3 g5 10 g1 (White should spend some tempi to return the knight to the action) 10...g7 11 g2 e2 a6 12 a3 (Vadim Milov has successfully played this position as White, but we believe the reason for his good results here is his high class, as objectively White hasn't any advantage here) 12...d5 13 cxd5 cxd5 14 d2 0-0 15 h3 e6 16 g4 e8 17 g3 d6 18 f3 exf3 19 xf3 c7 wasn't at all easy to assess in V. Milov-A. Zapata, Merida 2006.

a42) 8 f4 g6 (again, if 8...g5 9 g2 has the idea of e3) 9 h4 (now 9 g2 h3! is a very unusual way to exchange the light-squared bishops, but
it seems positionally desirable for Black, as he will put his pawns on light squares: 10 ɵe3 ₀xf1 11 ₀xf1 ₀g7 12 b3 0-0 13 ₀a3 a6 14 d5 c5 15 ₀b1 ₀bd7 16 b4 cxb4 17 ₀xb4 ₀fc8 and Black was better in R.Frombach-G.Schebler, Werther 2006) 9...₀g7 10 e3 (this kind of setup weakens the light squares) 10...₀a6 11 ₀g2 0-0 12 b3 ₀g4 13 ₀d2 ₀fe8 14 ₀a3 ₀d7 15 ₀c1 ₀c7 16 ₀c2 ₀ac8 17 ₀ce2 d5 18 ₀c3 g5 and Black is better, F.Cruz-D.Paunovic, La Roda 2009.

b) 6 ₀h3 c6 7 g3 h6 8 ₀f4 transposes to variation "a42'.

c) 6 f3 is another principled way to play. After 6...exf3 7 gxf3 White gets a strong pawn centre, but the kingside is somewhat weakened.

c21) The immediate 9...₀xh3?! is incorrect, in view of 10 ₀xh3 ₀xe4? 11 ₀xe4 ₀h4+ 12 ₀f2 ₀xd4 13 ₀xh3 ₀xd5 14 ₀xd5 ₀h4+ Black has the better chances, M.Ivanov-B.Heberla, Marianske Lazne 2009), and now:

c22) 9...0-0 10 ₀g5 c6 11 ₀d2 gives White a small advantage.

c23) 9...₀c6 10 ₀e3 ₀xh3! (now this seems correct) 11 ₀xh3 ₀xe4 12 ₀xe4 ₀h4+ 13 ₀f2 0-0 14 0-0 ₀ae8 and Black will regain his material with the upper hand.

d) 6 e3 h6 7 ₀h3 g6 (7...c6 8 f3 g6 9 ₀f2 0-0 10 ₀g7 11 ₀d3 0-0 12 ₀a6 13 ₀d2 ₀c7 14 ₀ae1 ₀e6 was about equal in C.Matamoros Franco-F.Ribeiro, Cienfuegos 1996) 8 ₀f4 c6 9 ₀e2 h5 (another thematic plan is...
9...\texttt{a}6 10 \texttt{b}1 \texttt{c}7 11 h4 \texttt{g}7 12 \texttt{b}4 a6 13 a4 \texttt{e}6 14 \texttt{dxe6} \texttt{xe6} 15 \texttt{b}2 d5 with mutual chances, D.Del Rey-R.Damaso, Santiago 1995) 10 h4 \texttt{h}6 11 \texttt{wc2} 0-0 12 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{a}6 13 a3 \texttt{c}7 14 \texttt{b}3 \texttt{e}8 15 \texttt{b}2 d5 16 a4 \texttt{xf4} 17 \texttt{gxf4} \texttt{g}4 gives Black a promising game, R.Biolek-V.Jansa, Czech League 2006.

Returning to 6 \texttt{h}4:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
9 & 6 & h6 & 6 & 6 & 6 \hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Black doesn’t have to push the knight and 6...\texttt{f}5?? 7 \texttt{g}3 c6 (7...h6 8 \texttt{h}3 c6 9 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{a}6 10 \texttt{a}4 \texttt{d}7 11 a3 \texttt{c}7 12 \texttt{g}2 \texttt{e}7 13 \texttt{e}3 a6 14 \texttt{c}2 d5 15 \texttt{a}4 gave White a pull in S.Conquest-J.Mercier, French League 1993) 8 \texttt{g}2 (or 8 \texttt{b}3 h6 9 \texttt{h}3 \texttt{d}7 10 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{e}7 11 \texttt{g}2 d5 12 cxd5 cxd5 13 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{c}6 14 e3 \texttt{d}8 which was drawn in B.Soos-H.Degenhardt, Hessen 1998) 8...h6 9 \texttt{h}3 \texttt{bd}7 10 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{g}6 11 e3 \texttt{g}7 12 a3 \texttt{b}6 13 b3 0-0 14 0-0 \texttt{fe}8 15 \texttt{b}2 d5 16 c5 \texttt{bd}7 17 b4 g5 18 hxg5 hxg5 19 \texttt{h}3 \texttt{h}6 20 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{g}7 gave Black good play in A.Galiano Martinez-P.Garre Murcia, Totana 2003.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
7 & 7 & \texttt{h}3 & 7 & 7 & 7 \hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

7...c6

This followed by \texttt{a}6-c7 is the most solid way to develop the queenside.

Black may also continue his development on kingside: 7...\texttt{g}6 8 \texttt{g}3 (8 e3 c6 9 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{a}6 10 b3 \texttt{c}7 was fine too for Black in C.Horvath-E.Dizdarevic, Pula 1998) 8...\texttt{g}7 9 \texttt{g}2 c6 10 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{f}5 11 \texttt{b}3 0-0 12 0-0-0 \texttt{a}6 13 f3 \texttt{exf}3 14 \texttt{xf}3 \texttt{h}5 15 \texttt{he}1 \texttt{c}7 16 \texttt{g}4 \texttt{xf}4 17 \texttt{xf}4 \texttt{c}8 18 d5 \texttt{c}5 19 \texttt{c}2 a5 with an even position, A.Gupta-B.Damljanovic, Kavala 2009.

8 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{a}6

Or 8...\texttt{h}5?? as played by Gheorghiu himself: 9 e3 \texttt{g}6 10 \texttt{e}2 \texttt{xf}4 11 \texttt{xf}4 \texttt{d}7 12 \texttt{g}4 \texttt{g}8 13 \texttt{xd}7+ \texttt{xd}7 14 \texttt{b}3 0-0-0 15 a4 g5 16 hxg5 hxg5 17 \texttt{fe}2 \texttt{g}7 18 a5 \texttt{h}8 19 \texttt{g}1 f5 with some advantage to Black in R.Douven-F.Gheorghiu, Amsterdam 1986.

9 e3 \texttt{f}5 10 \texttt{a}4 \texttt{d}7 11 0-0-0 \texttt{g}4!?

This helps White to develop his play. Black should simply continue his development with 11...\texttt{e}7 followed by ...\texttt{c}7 and ...0-0. Moreover, in the case
of 12 f3 he has an interesting reply in 12...g5!? 13 hgx5 (13 hxg5 hxg5 14 hxg5 exf3 exploits the knight's position on h3) 13...g4!? with complex play.

12 exd2 c7 13 g1!

With the idea of f2-f3 - a simple and effective approach.

13...a6?

Black should have acknowledged his error and returned with 13...f5.

14 f3 exf3 15 gxf3 e6 16 a5 b5 17 d5 f5 18 e4 h5 19 ge2 b4 20 a4 b8 21 dxc6 wxc6

22 exf5?

Black's position is very loose and 22 d4 would have led to a decisive advantage for White.

22...xf4 23 d4 b7 24 d3 xd3+ 25 xd3 e7 26 e1 f8 27 f6?

Missing 27 c5 dxc5 28 xe7, again with a decisive advantage for White.

27...xf6 28 f5 w6c6 29 wb1?

And here 29 xd6 have been quite unclear.

29...wc4 30 d6 b5 31 b6 axa5 32 xc4 xf5 33 d6 d8 34 d6 e7 35 d7 e6 36 e3 e5 37 c1 xe3

38 c8+ d8 39 cxd8+ xd8 40 xd8+ e8 0-1

---

**Game 4**

G.Kasparov-J.Speelman

Belfort 1988

1 d4 d6 2 c4 e5 3 d5 d6 4 g5 f5

With this move order Black can also consider 4...f5!? The text brings play back into our repertoire.

5 d3 f5

At first this seems more logical than the clumsy 5...e7, but now Black might encounter the immediate 6 g4 and his queenside is weakened in the event of an early wb3.

6 g4

A critical test. See Game 5 for White's other possibilities.

6...xf4

The main continuation. Other moves haven't given Black a fully satisfactory game:

a) 6...xg4 7 gxe4 and then:

a1) 7...e7 8 g2 h4?! activates
the bishop, but after 9 h3 \( \text{Qxf6} \) 10 \( \text{Qxf6+} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 11 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qd8} \) 12 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) Black was in full retreat and 13 \( \text{We3+} \) \( \text{Qf8} \) 14 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 15 0-0-0 gave White the better chances in A.Moiseenko-O.Romanishin, Alushta 2005.

a2) 7...\( \text{Qxe4?!} \) 8 \( \text{Qxe4} \) d5 9 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \) 10 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qa5+} \) 11 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) 12 h3 followed by 13 0-0 and 14 \( \text{Qc1} \) or perhaps 14 a4 and 15 b4 is good for White.

a3) 7...c6 is probably a bit stronger, albeit not enough to equalize: 8 h3 \( \text{Qf6} \) 9 \( \text{Qxf6+} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 10 e4 \( \text{Qg6} \) 11 h4 h6 12 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 13 h5 \( \text{Qh7} \) 14 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 15 0-0-0 was a touch better for White in D.Komarov-O.Romanishin, Saint Vincent 2000.

a4) 7...\( \text{Qc6} \) 8 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qe7} \)

9 \( \text{Qg3!} \) (the critical approach, whereas after 9 b4 \( \text{Qh4} \) 10 e3 0-0 11 a3 \( \text{Qe8} \) 12 0-0 \( \text{Qxe4} \) 13 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 14 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qxf2+} \) 15 \( \text{Qxf2} \) \( \text{Qxf2} \) 16 \( \text{Qxh7+} \) \( \text{Qxh7} \) 17 \( \text{Qh5+} \) \( \text{Qg8} \) 18 \( \text{Qxf2} \) \( \text{Qf6+} \) 19 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) 20 c5 dxc5 Black was better in A.Nozdrin-G.Glidzhan, Ufa 2007) 9...\( \text{Qg6} \) 10 h3 \( \text{Qf6} \) 11 e4 \( \text{Qd7} \) 12 \( \text{Qe3} \) a6 13 \( \text{Qe2} \) 0-0 14 0-0 h6 15 f4 left White clearly better in G.Kasparov-Allen & Overy, London (simul) 1993.

b) Perhaps taking with the knight isn’t so bad if followed up precisely, but 6...\( \text{Qg6?!} \) 7 \( \text{Qg2} \) is definitely good for White:

b1) 7...\( \text{Qxg4} \) 8 \( \text{Qgxe4} \) f5 9 \( \text{Qg5} \) c6 10 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 11 d5 c5 12 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) 13 \( \text{Qa4} \) with the initiative for White in C.Van Tilbury-D.Johansen, Bled Olympiad 2002.

b2) 7...c6 8 \( \text{Qgxe4} \) \( \text{Qxg4} \) 9 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) 10 \( \text{Qf4} \) f5 11 \( \text{Qc5} \) already with some advantage for White in P.Morais Pinto-H.Freitas, Brazil 1998.

b3) 7...\( \text{Qe7} \) 8 h4!? (instead 8 \( \text{Qc2} \) would take play back into Game 2) 8...h5 9 \( \text{gxh5} \) \( \text{Qxh5} \) 10 \( \text{Qf4} \) (or 10 \( \text{Qh3} \) \( \text{Qxh4} \) 11 \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 12 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 13 \( \text{Qxf6} \) \( \text{Qxg2} \) 14 \( \text{Qe3}! \), as in J.Bellon Lopez-J.Hodgson, Dos Hermanas 1992, and now 14...\( \text{Qxf2} \) 15 \( \text{Qxf2} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) with a slight advantage for White) 10...c6 11 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qa6} \) (again, if 11...d5 12 c5 \( \text{Qf5} \) 13 \( \text{Qd6} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 17 \( \text{Qxf8} \) \( \text{Qxf8} \) 18 \( \text{Qxf5} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) 19 \( \text{Qh3} \) and White is better,
The New Old Indian

M.Lomineishvili-V.Vorotnikov, Moscow 1996) 12 0-0-0 and if 12...0-0-0 then 13 c5! dxc5? 14 \( \text{h}3+ \) shows that both kings are not equally safe on the queenside.

7 \( \text{g}2 \)

This move prepares to bring the bishop to e4, but 7 \( \text{g}xe4 \) is the main line. We'll see this in Game 6 where the position arises from a 5 \( \text{d}2 \) move order.

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

7...\( \text{c}6! \?) is a good alternative: 8 \( \text{g}xe4 \text{xe}4 \) (8...\( \text{e}7 \) gives White the option of 9 \( \text{g}3! ? \)) 9 \( \text{xe}4 \) (for 9 \( \text{xe}4 \) see note ‘a’ to Black's 8th move in Game 6, below) 9...\( \text{g}6! \?) (this move was recommended by Kasparov in \( \text{BCO} \); instead 9...\( \text{wd}7 \) 10 \( \text{wb}3 \) \( \text{xb}8 \) 11 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 12 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 13 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 14 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 15 \( \text{d}3 \) \( f5 \) 16 \( \text{xg}4! \) \( \text{fxg}4 \) 17 \( \text{e}4 \) gave White an attack in \( \text{Y.Yakovich-A.Kharlov, Vladivostok 1994) \) 10 \( \text{wd}3 \) (if 10 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 10...\( f5 \) 11 \( h3 \) \( h5 \) 12 \( g2 \) \( g7 \) 13 \( d5?! \) \( xd4 \) 14 \( f4 \) \( w6 \) 15 \( xh5 \) \( gxh5 \) 16 \( xc6+ \) \( bx6 \) 17 \( w3 \) \( d7 \) 18 \( wxh5 \) \( ae8 \) with advantage for Black, J.Rudd-A.Cherniaev, Brighton 2011.

However, 7...\( c6 \) 8 \( \text{g}xe4 \) (or 8 \( \text{wb}3 \) \( \text{wb}6 \) 9 \( \text{g}xe4 \) \( xe4 \) 10 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{xb}3 \) 11 \( axb3 \) \( d7 \) 12 \( d2 \) \( a6 \) 13 \( a5! \) \( f6 \) 14 \( g1 \) \( c7 \) 15 \( c3 \) \( b6 \) 16 \( a1 \) \( e6 \) 17 \( d5 \) \( c6 \) 18 \( cxd5 \) \( f7 \) 19 \( h3+ \) \( d8 \) 20 \( g4 \) with a dangerous initiative in \( \text{L.Yurtaev-V.Zhuravliov, Leningrad 1989) \) 8...\( \text{e}7 \) (8...\( bd7 \?)! 9 \( \text{wd}3 \) is excellent for White) 9 \( \text{wb}3 \) \( xe4 \) (9...\( \text{wd}7 \) 10 \( \text{g}3 \) 0-0 11 \( h3 \) \( e6 \) 12 \( e4 \) \( wc7 \) 13 \( a4 \) \( a6 \) 14 0-0 \( \text{wb}6 \) 15 \( \text{xb}6 \) \( axb6 \) 16 \( b3 \) slightly favours White too, J.Brenninkmeijer-H.Ree, Amsterdam 1988) 10 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{wd}7 \) 11 \( \text{g}3 \) (with the idea of 12 \( h3 \) \( e6 \) 13 \( d5 \); instead 11 \( \text{g}3 \) 0-0 12 \( g1 \) \( f5 \) 13 \( h3 \) \( g6 \) 14 \( xf5 \) \( xf5 \) 15 \( \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{xe}6 \) 16 \( c5 \) \( b6 \) \( g5 \) \( f6 \) 18 \( \text{we}3 \) \( \text{xe}3 \) 19 \( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{xd}6 \) 20 \( \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{d}7 \) was okay for Black in \( \text{V.Eingorn-A.Suetin, Tallinn 1980) \) 11...\( \text{wc}7 \) 12 0-0 0-0 13 \( \text{f}4 \) was a touch better for White in \( \text{J.Pinter-C.McNab, Malta Olympiad 1980.} \)

8 \( \text{g}xe4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 9 \( \text{xe}4 \)

9...\( \text{c}6 \)
Here 9...c6 doesn’t give an equal game: 10 g1 (or the immediate 10 e3?) 10...d7 11 e3 left White clearly better in A.Lastin-N.Kurenkov, Moscow 2007.

10 d3! h5

Not 10...d7? 11 xh7!, netting an extra pawn.

11 Wh3

White opts to double his opponent’s pawns and create a hole on e6. This is by no means forced, however:

a) 11 g1 is well met by 11...g6 12 f4 d5!

b) 11 f4! g6 12 0-0-0 is simple and strong, giving White an edge after 12...a6 (12...d7!? may improve; then 13 wg3! df6 14 f3 has the idea of h2-h4 with a slight advantage for White) 13 h4! (or 13 xg6 hxg6 14 d5 h4 15 e3 wa5 16 b1 c8 17 g3 h5 18 e4 and White has slightly the better chances, J.Brenninkmeijer-A.Blees, Hilversum 1989), and now:

b1) 13...xh4 14 xg6 fxg6 15 we4+! f7 16 xd6 gives White a small advantage.

b2) 13...d7!? 14 h5 xe4 15 xe4 slightly favours White too.

b3) 13...d5 14 cxd5 b4 15 e3 cxd5? (not 15...xd5? 16 xd5 cxd5 17 h5 f5 18 e5 with a decisive advantage for White) 16 xg6 hxg6 17 a3 c6 18 f3 h5 19 e4! favours White, L.Polugaevsky-J.Hickl, European Team Championship, Haifa 1989.

11...g6

Black should avoid 11...h4? because of 12 g1. Then 12...0-0? runs into 13 g5! when White wins material.

12 xg6 fxg6 13 f4 0-0!?

Speelman wants to use the half-open f-file, but there was nothing wrong with the solid 13...d7.

14 e3

Probably a bit more precise was 14 g3 which doesn’t give Black the possibility of ...g6-g5, while retaining the option to advance with e2-e4.

Instead 14 we6+ h8 15 g3 a6 16 h4 f5 17 0-0-0 was about equal when L.Psakhis-J.Hickl, Dortmund 1989, was agreed drawn.
14...\textit{a}6

14...\textit{f}5!? 15 \textit{0-0-0} \textit{d}7 16 \textit{g}3 \textit{w}a5 17 \textit{e}4 \textit{f}7 isn’t at all easy to assess.

15 \textit{0-0-0} \textit{c}7 16 \textit{b}1 \textit{a}6 17 \textit{e}4?

Better is 17 \textit{a}1! with slight advantage for White, due to the idea of 17...\textit{b}5 18 \textit{c}5.

17...\textit{g}5! 18 \textit{g}3 \textit{w}e8! 19 \textit{a}1 \textit{g}6 20 \textit{w}g2 \textit{e}8 21 \textit{d}g1 \textit{b}5 22 \textit{c}5 dxc5 23 \textit{a}xc5 \textit{xc}5 24 dxc5 \textit{d}8 25 h4!?

Preparing \textit{d}6, since 34 \textit{d}6 would have been met by 34...\textit{w}h5! 35 \textit{d}d1 \textit{f}7!.

34...\textit{c}2! 35 \textit{d}h4

35...\textit{w}g6?

Black was frightened of nonexistent threats, but that’s quite understandable when one is low on time and up against Kasparov!

Instead after 35...\textit{w}f5 36 \textit{w}e7 \textit{g}8 37 \textit{e}4 \textit{w}g6 38 \textit{w}e6+ \textit{w}f7 39 \textit{x}c6 \textit{d}7 Black is consolidating and has good chances to realize his extra pawn, since if 40 \textit{w}xa6? then 40...\textit{g}4.

36 \textit{x}c6 \textit{f}5 37 \textit{f}4! \textit{xf}4 38 \textit{ex}f4 \textit{h}7 39 \textit{g}1 \textit{f}7 40 \textit{w}xa6 \textit{b}4! 41 \textit{w}c4 \textit{d}7! \textit{v}2/2

Here 42 \textit{w}xb4 \textit{x}e5 43 \textit{fx}e5 \textit{w}xe5 leads to an absolutely equal position.
\[ \text{g5 } \text{f5} \]

In this game we will examine the alternatives to Kasparov's 6 g4.

6 f3

An interesting move, which leads to complex play with mutual chances. Practice has seen a wide range of alternatives:

a) After 6 wxc2 Black can take play back into the realm of Game 2 with 6...we7, but he isn't forced to protect the pawn and has a couple of interesting alternatives:

a1) 6...h6!? forces the play: 7 gxe4 dxe4 8axed6+ axd6 10 wxf5 b4+ gives Black some initiative for the two pawns, which he will shortly regain. Now 11 a1 wbd4+ 12 wbd3 wxf2 13 we4+ we7 14 a3 w7f6 15 a4 wbd6 16 c5 we7 17 e3 a6 18 b5 0-0 19 axc6 bxc6 20 a2 f5 21 wbd3 wbd5 22 wb3 reached a roughly level position in H.Koneru-B.Roktima, Calicut 2003.

a2) After 6...wd7 7 e3 c6 8 d5 a6 9 gxe4 dxe4 10 cxe4 wxc8 11 d3 g6 12 we2 b4 13 f3 Black hadn’t enough for the pawn in T.Bosboom Lanchav-E.Kovalevskaya, Dresden 2004.

a3) 6...g6 avoids the possibility of edx6 in comparison with variation ‘a1’, although after 7 gxe4 dxe4 8 dxe4 we7 9 f3 dxe4 10 wxe4 wxe4 11 fxe4 g7 12 e3 c5 13 e5 cxd4 14 edx6 c6 15 c5 0-0, as in V.Arbakov-A.Lokasto, Moscow 1992, and then 16 b1 Black’s compensation is dubious.

a4) 6...g6! is the best possibility. The critical line runs 7 gxe4 (7 g3 b7 8 gxe4? dxe4 9 dxe4 is no good in view of 9...c6 10 d5 dxc8) 7...dxe4 8 dxe4 d5! (Black makes good use of the pin and exploits the poor position of the white king; 8...wh4 is also possible and leads to complex play) 9 wa4+ (after 9 cxd5 b4+ White loses the possibility to castle).

Now 9...b5! is the key move, giving Black a tempo to take the knight. The rook in the corner will fall, but after 10 wxb5+ c6 11 wb7 dxe4 12 wxa8 White’s development is nonexistent and 12...b4+ 13 a2 xd2+ 14 xd2 wxd4+ 15 e1 wb2 16 a1 wb4+ 17
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\[ d2 \text{ e3 18 } fxe3 0-0 \text{ saw him being crushed in A.Goldin-J.Hodgson, Las Vegas 1995.} \]

b) \[ 6 \text{ e3 h6 7 } \text{g3} \text{ c6 (the exchange } 7...\text{hxg3 8 gxh3 c6 looks in White's favour, improving his bishop and giving him the possibility of play down the g-file) 8 } \text{f4 a6 9 } \text{e2 g6 10 f3 g7 11 0-0 e7 12 a3 0-0 with reasonable play for Black in a complex position, C.Carlsen-J.Speelman, Stockholm 1987.} \]

c) \[ 6 \text{ h4 h6 7 } \text{g3} \text{ c6 8 } \text{h3} \text{ (the exchange 7... } \text{hxg3 8 gxh3 c6 looks in White's favour, improving his bishop and giving him the possibility of play down the g-file) 8 } \text{f4 a6 10 } \text{e2 } \text{wd7} \text{ sees Black having correctly placed his pieces and after 11 d5 0-0 12 } \text{g1 in T.Bosboom Lanchava-R.Van Dijken, Dutch League 1998, with 12... } \text{g4 he could have seized the upper hand.} \]

d) \[ 6 \text{ g3 h6 7 } \text{g3} \text{ c6 8 } \text{f4 (8 e3 g5! restricted the knight in D.Quinn-J.Hodgson, East Kilbridge 1996) 8... } \text{e7} \text{ (8...a6 9 e3 b5 may look quite active, but 10 } \text{wb3 was slightly better for White in G.Kovacs-A.Czebe, Hungarian League 2008) 9 e3 } \text{a6 10 } \text{e2 } \text{wd7} \text{ sees Black having correctly placed his pieces and after 11 d5 0-0 12 } \text{g1 in T.Bosboom Lanchava-R.Van Dijken, Dutch League 1998, with 12... } \text{g4 he could have seized the upper hand.} \]

e) \[ 6 \text{ wb3!? is a rare positional continuation, but White wants to exploit the downside to Black's... } \text{f5.} \]

After 6...\text{c6} (if 6...\text{wc8 7 } \text{g4!} 7 \text{ e3 h6 (or 7... } \text{wd7 8 d5 } \text{d8 9 } \text{wc2 when White has the better chances, T.Salo-K.Skold, Stockholm 1960) 8 } \text{h3 } \text{wc8} \text{ (8... } \text{wd7! looks more exact) 9 } \text{f4 } \text{e7} \text{ 10 } \text{e2 0-0 11 0-0 } \text{e8 12 f3 } \text{f8 13 } \text{fd5 } \text{xd5 14 cxd5 } \text{exf3 15 } \text{xf3 a5 16 } \text{wa4 b6 17 e4 } \text{d7 18 } \text{wc2 } \text{g6 19 } \text{f4 } \text{g7 (V.Inkiov-V.Jansa, Gausdal 1988) 20 } \text{ad1 White is slightly better since he controls the centre and the knight on a5 is out of play.} \]

\[ 6... \text{exf3 7 } \text{gxf3} \]

A double-edged continuation. White creates a strong centre and will win a tempo by attacking Black's bishop with e2-e4, but does weaken his kingside. Alternatives:

a) \[ 7 \text{ exf3 e7 8 } \text{d3 (8 } \text{ge4 } \text{c6 9 } \text{e3 0-0 10 } \text{d3 } \text{e8 11 } \text{f2 } \text{g6 is about equal, F.Benko-B.Wexler, Buenos Aires 1954) 8... } \text{xd3 9 } \text{xd3 c6 10 0-0 d5 11 c5 b6 12 b4 h6 13 } \text{h3 a5 14 } \text{a4 } \text{bd7 15 } \text{f4 axb4 16 } \text{xb4 } \text{xb6 17 } \text{cxb6 } \text{xb6 18 } \text{f6e1 } \text{a7 with mutual chances in J.Delemarre-J.Van der Wiel, Wijk aan Zee 1995.} \]

26
b) 7 \( \text{cxd3} \) c5! (aiming for a Benoni structure where White will be vulnerable down the e-file is correct; instead 7...\( \text{cxd3} \) 8 e3 \( \text{e}7 \) 9 d3 \( \text{g4} \) 10 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 11 \( \text{xe1} \) \( \text{xf3} \) 12 \( \text{xe3} \) 0-0 13 h4 g6 14 \( \text{d2} \) d5 15 cxd5 \( \text{xd5} \) 16 \( \text{f2} \) cxd4 17 exd4 \( \text{xf3} \) 18 a3 \( \text{xe3} \) 19 axb4 \( \text{xe3} \) 20 \( \text{d4}+ \) 21 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{ad8} \) was better for Black in R.Irzhavanov-J.Hodgson, Mosc ow Olympiad 1994.

\[ \text{7...c5?} \]

Again this is the key move in the fight for the centre.

Instead 7...\( \text{e}7 \) is a little meek and 8 e4 \( \text{g6} \) 9 \( \text{g1} \) 0-0 10 \( \text{e}3 \) c5 11 d5 led to a slight advantage for White in B.Gulko-A.Haik, Paris 1986.

\[ \text{8 d5} \]

Gulko plays in the manner of his earlier game with Haik.

After 8 dxc5 the principled continuation is 8...h6 9 \( \text{h3} \) (or 9 e4 \( \text{xd7} \) 10 \( \text{h3} \) dxc5 when Black is okay), and now:

a) 9...\( \text{fd7} \) 10 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 11 e4 \( \text{e}6 \) 12 f4 \( \text{c6} \) 13 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{c8} \) 14 a3 g6 15 \( \text{e}2 \) a6 16 \( \text{c2} \) f5 17 0-0-0 and White is better, M.Meyer-T.Nyback, German League 2003.

b) 9...\( \text{c8} \) 10 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 11 e4 gives White the better chances too.

c) Thus Black should sacrifice: 9...\( \text{c6} \)! 10 cxd6 \( \text{xd6} \) 11 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{c5} \) (not 11...\( \text{xf4} \) 12 \( \text{xd8}+ \) \( \text{xd8} \) 13 \( \text{xf4} \) \( \text{b4} \) 14 \( \text{d1} \) which is excellent for White) 12 \( \text{xd8}+ \) \( \text{xd8} \) when he seems to have full compensation for the pawn.

\[ \text{8...g6!} \]

Correctly arranging the bishops in comparison with Haik’s ...\( \text{g6} \) and ...

\[ \text{9 e4 \( \text{c8} \) 10 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 11 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{bd7} \) 12 \( \text{f4} \) 0-0 13 \( \text{g1} \)!!} \]

This move doesn’t prevent ...\( \text{g4} \) for long, so correct was 13 0-0-0 \( \text{e8} \) 14 \( \text{d3} \) with mutual chances.

\[ \text{13...a6 14 a4 \( \text{e8} \) 15 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f8} \) 16 \( \text{g3} \)
Preparing a retreat square for the dark-squared bishop. Instead 16 0-0-0 \(g4\) gives Black reasonable play in this complex position.

16...\(\text{g}4\) 17 \(\text{g}1\) \(h6\) 18 \(\text{h}3\)

After 18 \(\text{f}3\) advancing with 18...\(f5\) also works well.

18...\(f5\)

Black has excellent play both in the centre and on the queen’s flank.

19 0-0-0 \(\text{xc}3\) 20 \(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{fxe}4\) 21 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{f}6\) 22 \(f5!\)?

Otherwise after 22 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{f}5\) White is strategically lost.

22...\(\text{xf}5\) 23 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{h}7\) 24 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{e}7\) 25 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{e}5\) 26 \(\text{e}1\) \(b5!\) 27 \(\text{cxb}5!\) \(\text{axb}5\) 28 \(\text{xb}5\) \(\text{eb}8\) 29 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{xb}5\) 30 \(\text{axb}5\) \(\text{xd}5\)

31 \(\text{b}1\) \(\text{xf}4\) 32 \(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{xf}4\) 33 \(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{e}6\)

Black has a decisive advantage in the endgame.

34 \(\text{f}2\) \(d5\) 35 \(b4\) \(d4\) 36 \(\text{bxc}5\) \(\text{dxe}3\) 37 \(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{xc}5\) 38 \(\text{c}2\) \(d7\) 39 \(\text{c}7\) \(b8\) 40 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{b6}\) 41 \(\text{c}6\) \(\text{g}7\) 42 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{f}7\) 43 \(\text{xb}6\) \(\text{xb}6\) 44 \(\text{c}3\) \(d7\) 45 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{c}4\) 46 \(\text{b}3\) \(e3\) 47 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{d6}\) 48 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{xb}5+\) 49 \(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{f}6\) 50 \(\text{b}4\) \(\text{e}5\) 51 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{d}3\) 52

\(\text{a}4\) \(\text{c}4\) 53 \(\text{b}4\) \(\text{d}5\) 54 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{f}5\) 55 \(\text{a}5\) \(g5\) 56 \(\text{b}5\) \(h5\) 57 \(\text{a}5\) \(\text{e}4\) 58 \(\text{a}4+\) \(\text{e}5\) 59 \(\text{a}5\) \(g4\) 60 \(\text{b}5\) \(h4\) 61 \(\text{a}5\)

61...\(\text{d}6\)

White has resisted well, but here 61...\(g3+\) was the fastest way to win.

62 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{e}4\) 63 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{f}4\) 64 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{e}3\) 65 \(\text{a}3+\) \(\text{e}2\) 66 \(\text{a}5\) \(\text{c}3+\) 67 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{e}1\) 68 \(\text{a}1+\) \(\text{d}2\) 69 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{e}4+\) 70 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{g}5\)

71 \(\text{a}5\) \(\text{c}4+\) 72 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{h}3+\) 73 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{f}4+\) 74 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{h}3+\) 75 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{d}3\) 76 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{e}2\) 77 \(\text{a}2+\) \(\text{e}3\) 78 \(\text{a}3+\) \(\text{d}3\)

Wisely avoiding 78...\(\text{f}4??\) 79 \(\text{a}xh3!\) \(g\text{xh}3+\) 80 \(\text{a}h1\) which only leads to a draw.

79 \(\text{a}7\) \(\text{e}4+\) 80 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{d}3+\) 81 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{f}4+\) 82 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{f}3\) 83 \(\text{f}7\) \(\text{a}4\) 84 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{d}5\) 85 \(\text{f}8\) \(g3\) 86 \(\text{hxg}3\) \(\text{hxg}3\) 87 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{g}4\) 0-1

---

**Game 6**

V.Laznicka-S.Movsesian

Ostrava 2007

1 \(d4\) \(\text{f}6\) 2 \(c4\) \(d6\) 3 \(\text{c}3\) \(e5\) 4 \(\text{f}3\) \(e4\) 5 \(\text{d}2\)
This move was recommended by Efim Geller in his classic book on the King’s Indian. The knight is less active here than on g5 and blocks the dark-squared bishop, but White hopes to come under less pressure, especially on the kingside, than in the lines we’ve considered thus far.

We should also mention that 5 *g*1 is occasionally seen, but of course White can’t pretend to claim an edge with this retreat: for example, 5...*f*5 6 *g*5 *b*d7 7 e3 h6 8 *x*f6 *x*f6 9 *g*e2 c6 10 *g*3 *g*6 11 *e*2 h5 12 h4 a6 13 *f*f1 d5 14 cxd5 cxd5 15 *d*d2 *e*e7 16 *b*b3 b5 was slightly better for Black in D.Sands-A.Cherniaev, London 2009.

5...*f*f5

For Black’s other options see the next game.

6 *g*4

This principled continuation will often transpose to the variation 5 *g*5 *f*f5 6 *g*4, but there are some differences, as we’ll see.

There are also some important alternatives:

a) 6 *b*b3!? is another principled challenge, aiming to exploit the early development of Black’s bishop. White wants to disrupt Black, who should protect both the b7- and e4-pawns, but then it is impossible to build the pawn chain with ...c6 and ...d5. The only route to a relatively satisfactory game for Black we could find is narrow and has not yet been seen in practice. Here Black has:

   a1) After 6...*b*c6? 7 e3 *b*b8 (7...*a*a5? 8 *b*b5+ loses a piece) 8 g3! Black has no direct protection for the pawn on e4 and any tricks he might try don’t help: for instance, 8...h5 (8...d5?) gives Black nothing after 9 cxd5 *b*b4 10 *c*c4 *d*d6 11 a3 *a*a6 12 *a*a4+ *f*f8 13 b4 *a*a8 14 h3 which left White clearly better in A.Aleksandrov-V.Varavin, St Petersburg 2000) 9 *g*g2 h4 10 *d*dxe4 *dxe4 11 *dxe4 *d*d7 12 *f*f6+ *w*xf6 13 *x*x6+ *d*d8 14 *g*g2 *g*g4 was played in R.Bairachny-V.Varavin, Tula 2001, and here White had to find a way to protect his light squares with 15 0-0 *f*f3 16 *x*xf3 *w*xf3 17 *w*d1 when Black would have had no real compensation for the pawn.

   a2) 6...*w*w8! 7 g3 (again, the most principled – White threatens to simply eat a pawn; instead 7 e3 was given by Palliser in *Play 1 d4!, but then he didn’t mention 7...*e*e7 when 8 g3 c5 9 d5 transposes to variation ‘a21’, below) 7...c5 8 d5 *e*e7 (8...*b*bd7? leaves the bishop on f5 temporarily unprotected, so White can simply pick up the pawn
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with 9 \( \text{wc}2 \), and now:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a21) White may try to avoid } \ldots \text{e4-e3 ideas with 9 e3 when Black can’t protect the pawn, so he should try to blast open the position: for example, } 9...\text{h5!} \\
10 \text{g2 h4} 11 \text{dxe4 xe4} 12 \text{dxe4 d7} 13 0-0 \text{e5} 14 f4?! \text{xe4} 15 \text{axe4 hxg3} 16 \text{fxe5 wh3} 17 \text{wc2 gxh2+} 18 \text{f2 h5 is quite unclear. }
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a22) 9 g2 e3!} 10 \text{fxe3 g6} 11 \text{e4 \text{bd7} 12 \text{h3 wc7} 13 \text{wc2 0-0} 14 \text{f3 \text{ae8} followed by } \ldots \text{d8, } \ldots \text{b8 and } \ldots \text{a5 gives Black acceptable game. Nevertheless, in general Black’s position in this line seems to hang by a thread, so the black player should either study this line quite deeply or prefer to avoid it with the } 5...\text{e7} \text{ of Game 7.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{b) 6 g3 combines development with an attack on the e4-pawn with } \text{g2 and probably \text{wc2}. This idea is quite dangerous even without starting with } 6 \text{ wb3. That said, after 6...c6 Black has the idea of } \ldots \text{d6-d5 and now a queen on e7 will protect both the b7- and e4-pawns.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{After 7 d5 (Black has little to worry about if he is allowed to build the pawn chain: } 7 \text{g2 d5 8 0-0 e7 9 cxd5 cxd5 10 f3 exf3} 11 \text{xf3 c6} 12 \text{e5 e6 13 g5 0-0} 14 \text{xc6 bxc6} 15 \text{wd3 wd7} 16 \text{ac1 ab8} 17 \text{c2 fe8 with an even position, A.Otto-H.Huss, German League 1996) 7...e7 (it seems better for Black to be ready to sacrifice the pawn with } \ldots \text{e4-e3 than to hold it; in the latter case his development is delayed and his possibilities are limited, as shown by } 7...\text{bd7} 8 \text{g2 wc7} 9 \text{wc2 c5} 10 0-0 \text{g6} 11 \text{d3 e3} 12 \text{wd1 exf2+} 13 \text{xf2 c4} 14 \text{xe4 xe4 15 f4 c5} 16 \text{a5 with advantage to White) 8 g2 cxd5} 9 \text{cxd5 e3!} 10 \text{fxe3 bd7} 11 0-0 \text{g6} 12 \text{f3} 0-0 13 \text{h4 e5 followed by } \ldots \text{wd7 and } \ldots \text{d8-b6 Black has decent compensation in a complex positional struggle.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{c) Following 6 e3 g6!? (or } 6...c5 7 \text{e2 c6?!} 8 \text{g4!? cxd4} 9 \text{exd4 g6} 10 \text{g5 e3!} 11 \text{fxe3 d7} 12 \text{f3 h6!} 13 \text{gxh6 xh6 with decent compensation in V.Murashko-V.Varavin, Alushta 2001) 7 \text{e2 h5} 8 \text{b4 (this leads to interesting}
\end{array}
\]
opposite-flank play; instead 8 \( \text{W}b3 \)? \( \text{W}c8 \) 9 \( \text{f}3 \) requires testing) 8...\( \text{g}7 \) 9 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{b}d7 \) 10 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{h}4 \) 11 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 12 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 13 \( \text{W}b3 \) \( a6 \) 14 \( c5 \) dxc5 15 dxc axb5 16 \( \text{xb}5+ \) \( c6 \) 17 \( \text{c}4 \) 0-0 18 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 19 \( \text{c}2 \) \( g5 \) 20 \( \text{f}d1 \) \( d7 \) 21 \( \text{f}1 \) \( e5 \) 22 \( \text{c}4 \) Black had established a model attacking set-up in J.Dorffman-D.Andreikin, Internet (blitz) 2006.

He now broke through with the decisive 22...\( \text{f}h3 \), with the point that 23 \( \text{gxh}3 \) \( \text{g}f3+ \) 24 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{x}c4 \) 25 \( \text{x}c4 \) \( \text{w}e5 \) threatens mate on h2 and the knight on c3.

d) 6 \( \text{b}3 \) \( h6 \) (or 6...c6 7 \( \text{g}5 \) \( e7 \) 8 \( e3 \) \( \text{bd}7 \) 9 \( \text{e}2 \) \( a5 \) 10 \( \text{c}1 \) \( g6 \) 11 \( \text{f}4 \) a4 12 \( \text{d}2 \) \( a5 \) 13 \( a3 \) \( h6 \) 14 0-0 0-0 15 \( g3 \) \( \text{fe}8 \) 16 f4 \( \text{xf}3 \) 17 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{g}f8 \) with an even game in C.Crouch-C.McNab, Oxford 1998) 7 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{bd}7 \) 8 \( \text{f}4 \) \( g5 \) 9 \( \text{h}2 \) and now the simple 9...\( \text{g}7 \) leads to equal play, but the experimental 9...e3?! didn’t give Black enough play after 10 \( f3 \) \( \text{we}7 \) 11 \( \text{w}c1 \) 0-0 0-12 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 13 \( \text{g}1 \) \( g6 \) 14 \( \text{x}c3 \) \( g7 \) 15 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 16 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{w}d8 \) 17 \( \text{w}d2 \) in G.Kamsky-D.Andreikin, Internet (blitz) 2007.

e) 6 \( \text{c}2 \) c6 7 \( \text{f}3 \) (otherwise, 7 \( \text{dxe}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 8 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{w}h4 \) 9 \( \text{xd}6+ \) \( \text{xd}6 \) 10 \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{b}4+ \) 11 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{xd}2+ \) 12 \( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{xd}4+ \) 13 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{xb}2 \) 14 \( \text{we}4+ \) \( \text{f}8 \) 15 \( \text{d}1 \) \( \text{c}3+ \) 16 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{a}6 \) was slightly better for Black in A.Dubinsky-V.Yurkov, Moscow 1963, while 7 \( g4 \) \( g6 \) 8 e3 \( \text{x}g4 \) 9 \( \text{dxe}4 \) \( d5 \) 10 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{cxd}5 \) 11 \( \text{a}4+ \) \( \text{c}6 \) 12 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{w}d7 \) 13 \( h3 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 14 \( g3 \) \( d6 \) 15 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) 16 \( \text{b}6 \) was pretty unclear but agreed drawn in l.Rogers-R.Keene, Manila 1979) 7...d5 8 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{cxd}5 \) 9 e3 \( \text{c}6 \) 10 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 11 0-0 \( g6 \) 12 \( \text{fxe}4 \) \( \text{dxe}4 \) 13 \( \text{dxe}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 14 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( a6 \) 15 \( \text{xc}6+ \) \( \text{xc}6 \) 16 \( \text{w}b3 \) \( \text{w}7 \) gives Black good activity and play for the pawn, R.Shocron-B.Wexler, Buenos Aires 1958.

Finally, we can return to 6 \( g4 \):

6...\( \text{x}g4 \)

Black pursues an independent approach. Instead 6...\( \text{x}g4 \) 7 \( \text{dxe}4 \) would transpose to note ‘a’ to Black’s 6th move in Game 4.

e) 6 \( \text{dxe}4 \)

Here we can see one significant difference between 5 \( \text{d}2 \) and 5 \( \text{g}5 \):
after 7 $\text{g}2$ Black has the typical resource 7...e3! 8 fxe3 c6 with good long-term compensation.

**7...$\text{dxe4}$ 8 $\text{dxe4}$**

**8...$\text{e7}$**

Natural enough, but there are alternatives, of which 'a' may even be Black's most accurate move order:

a) 8...$\text{c6}$!? 9 $\text{g}2$ (or 9 d5 $\text{e}5$ 10 $\text{de}4$ $\text{e7}$ 11 f4 $\text{h}4+$ 12 $\text{d}1$ $\text{g}6$ 13 $\text{xg7}$ $\text{w}e7$ 14 $\text{wd4}$ 0-0-0 with reasonable play for Black in this complex position, E.Vegh-N.Davies, Budapest 1987) 9...$\text{e7}$ and now:

a1) 10 $\text{f}4$ 0-0 11 $\text{d}2$ $\text{e}8$ 12 0-0-0 f5 13 $\text{g}5$ $\text{xg5}$ 14 $\text{xg5}$ $\text{wd7}$ 15 f3 $\text{h}5$ 16 $\text{de}1$ d5 17 $\text{e}3$ dxc4 18 $\text{b}1$ $\text{ab}8$ 19 $\text{hg1}$ b5 20 f4 a5 was better for Black in M.Bojchev-A.Asenov, Pleven 2004.

a2) 10 h3 $\text{d}7$ 11 b3 f5 12 $\text{c}3$ $\text{h}4$! (a multipurpose move, opening a route for the queen, targeting the f2-pawn and thus complicating White's bid to go long) 13 $\text{g}1$ 0-0 14 $\text{b}2$ $\text{b}8$ with a slight plus for Black in Sa.Williams-A.Cherniaev, British League 2011.

a3) 10 $\text{e}3$ 0-0 11 $\text{wd2}$ $\text{f}5$ 12 $\text{c}3$ $\text{h}4$ 13 0-0 $\text{wd7}$ 14 $\text{h}1$ $\text{ae8}$ 15 $\text{g}1$ $\text{g}6$ 16 $\text{af}1$ $\text{e}7$ 17 $\text{g}5$ $\text{f}5$! with complex play, V.Salov-J.Speelman, Brussels 1988.

a4) 10 d5 $\text{e}5$ 11 $\text{b}3$ 0-0 12 $\text{xb7}$ $\text{xc4}$ 13 h3 $\text{d}7$ 14 $\text{b}3$ $\text{e}5$ 15 $\text{g}1$ f5 16 $\text{d}2$ $\text{f}6$ 17 $\text{b}1$ $\text{e}8$ 18 $\text{f}1$ $\text{c}8$ 19 $\text{a}3$ $\text{ab}8$ 20 $\text{g}3$ $\text{c}4$ and Black was better in N.Rebaudo-B.Herbst, correspondence 1997.

a5) 10 $\text{g}3$!? 0-0 11 $\text{wd3}$ (perhaps not best; instead 11 $\text{e}3$ a5 12 $\text{g}1$ $\text{h}4$ led to an early draw in R.Cifuentes Parada-E.Fernandez Romero, Dos Hermanas 2005) 11...$\text{e}8$ 12 $\text{d}2$ $\text{f}6$ 13 $\text{c}3$ a5 is slightly better for Black.

b) In the case of 8...c6 9 $\text{b}3$ $\text{wd7}$ a strong idea is 10 $\text{g}1$.

Now if Black continues his development with 10...$\text{a}6$? then 11 $\text{w}3$! leads to the loss of material after 11...$\text{e}7$ (or 11...0-0-0 12 $\text{xg4}$ $\text{wxg4}$ 13 $\text{h}3$) 12 $\text{xd6}$ $\text{wxg6}$ 13 $\text{xg4}$.

c) 8...d5!? 9 $\text{c}3$ (9 $\text{cx} d5$ $\text{wx} d5$ 10 $\text{g}2$ $\text{b}4+$ 11 $\text{f}1$ $\text{d}7$ 12 $\text{b}3$ $\text{c}6$ 13 $\text{e}3$ $\text{e}6$ 14 $\text{wd}3$ $\text{d}5$ 15 a3 $\text{e}7$ 16 $\text{h}4$
f5 gave Black a perfectly acceptable position in D.Poldauf-J.Vesely, Prague 1989) 9...dxc4 10 w4a+ and now:

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_board}
\caption{Chess board diagram}
\end{figure}

\begin{itemize}
\item [c1)] 10...c6! 11 wxc4 e6 12 wd3 a6 13 a3 wh4 gives Black a solid position with good piece play, and after 14 e4 d8 15 w3 e7 16 g2 0-0 17 0-0 c4 18 d1 b3 19 e1 d6 20 e5 b8 he was definitely for choice in E.Wilen-T.Miettinen, Vantaa 2007.
\item [c2)] The 10...d7 11 wxc4 d6 12 g1 b6 13 wd3 h5? 14 b5+ wd7 15 wh5 of G.Grigorov-M.Nikolov, Teteven 2004, demonstrates why Black must always keep an eye on his light-squared bishop as the centre opens up.
\item [c3)] 10...d7 11 wxc4 c6 12 wb5 was a touch better for White in A.Lein-G.Lisitsin, Riga 1968.
\item [d)] 8...f5 9 g2 c6 10 wb3 xxe4?! 11 xxe4 wb6 12 we3 e7 13 d2 left White clearly better in L.Szabo-V.Pirc, Budapest 1965.
\item [e)] 8...wd7 9 g2 c6 10 h3 f5 11 g3 g6 12 e4 with a slight advantage for White in H.Wirthensohn-W.Schmid, San Bernadino 1982.
\end{itemize}

9 g1

Otherwise, 9 b3 c6 10 g2 0-0 11 b2 a5 (or 11...f5 12 c3 e8 13 d5 e5 14 0-0 g6 15 h3 h5 16 f4 f6 17 w2 d2 h4 and Black has the better chances, J.Yrjola-N.Murshed, Yerevan Olympiad 1996) 12 g3 e8 13 h3 d7 14 0-0 f8 was drawn in L.Portisch-L.Schmid, Oberhausen 1961, while 9 g2 c6 transposes to note 'a' to Black's 8th move, above.

9...f5 10 g3 g6 11 g2!

A strong novelty. Instead 11 e4 h4 12 we2 0-0 13 e3 we7 14 h3 a6 had been good for Black in L.Portisch-J.Hickl, Panormo 2001.

11...c6 12 e4 h4 13 e3 0-0 14 g4 xg3 15 xg3 d5 16 h4 dxe4 17 xe4 d7 18 h5 a5+ 19 d2 xh5 20 h1

As a result of the tactical complications resulting from his novelty, White has won a queen for rook, piece and pawn. Later Black had difficulties due to his queenside weaknesses, although Movsesian eventually managed to hold by defending actively:

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chess_board_2}
\caption{Chess board diagram}
\end{figure}

20...ae8 21 xh5 xe4+ 22 f1 xh5
23...\textit{f}e1 24...\textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 25...\textit{f}4 \textit{g}6
26...\textit{b}4 \textit{c}8 27...\textit{e}7 \textit{h}6 28...\textit{d}5 \textit{cxd}5 29
\textit{cxd}5 \textit{c}2 30...\textit{d}6 \textit{c}5 31...\textit{g}4 \textit{c}1+ 32
\textit{e}2...\textit{d}3+ 33...\textit{d}2 \textit{c}2+ 34...\textit{e}3 \textit{e}2+ 35
\textit{f}3...\textit{e}6 36...\textit{d}4 \textit{e}4+ 37...\textit{g}3...\textit{d}7
38...\textit{w}xa7 \textit{c}6 39...\textit{b}4 \textit{g}6+ 40...\textit{f}4...\textit{h}5 41
\textit{b}5 \textit{g}4+ 42...\textit{e}3 \textit{e}4+ 43...\textit{d}2...\textit{d}5 44
\textit{w}a8+ ...\textit{h}7 45...\textit{c}8 \textit{d}4+ 46...\textit{e}3 \textit{e}4+ 47
\textit{d}2...\textit{d}4+ 48...\textit{e}2...\textit{e}4+ 49...\textit{f}1
\textit{c}4+ 50...\textit{g}2...\textit{g}4+ 51...\textit{h}2...\textit{xb}5 52
\textit{w}xb7 \textit{e}5 53...\textit{f}3 \textit{c}6 54...\textit{w}xc6...\textit{xc}6 55
\textit{fxg}4...\textit{hxg}4 56...\textit{g}6 57...\textit{a}4...\textit{f}5 58...\textit{e}5
\textit{d}8...\textit{xd}8 60...\textit{xd}8...\textit{d}7 61...\textit{a}6
\textit{c}8 \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}

\textbf{Game 7}
\textit{V.Korchnoi-A.Cherniaev}
\textit{London 2009}

1...\textit{d}4 \textit{f}6 2...\textit{c}4 \textit{d}6 3...\textit{c}3...\textit{e}5 4...\textit{f}3...\textit{e}4 5
...\textit{d}2

Now we will examine Black’s alternatives to 5...\textit{f}5.

5...\textit{w}e7

There’s also 5...\textit{e}3!? an interesting if perhaps not wholly sufficient pawn
sacrifice designed to disrupt White’s otherwise harmonious development. After the reply 6...\textit{fxe}3 Black has a choice of continuations, although in general his attention is often on the dark squares:

a) 6...c5 7...g3...h5 8...\textit{f}3...h4 9...\textit{d}xe4
\textit{xe}4 10...\textit{gx}h4...\textit{g}4 11...\textit{g}2...\textit{w}xh4+ 12
...\textit{d}2...\textit{cxd}4 13...\textit{exd}4...\textit{f}2 14...\textit{g}1 sees
Black regaining the exchange, but he was still a pawn down for insufficient compensation in N.Konovalov-I.Glek, Moscow 2006.

b) 6...\textit{d}5 7...g3...h5 8...\textit{f}3...h4 9...\textit{d}xe4
\textit{xe}4 10...\textit{d}xe4...\textit{d}xe4 11...\textit{w}a4+...\textit{d}7 12
...\textit{c}2...\textit{hx}h4 13...\textit{gx}h4...\textit{hx}h4+ 14...\textit{d}1...\textit{c}6
15...\textit{d}2 and again Black’s compensation is dubious, M.Petr-D.Sutkovic, Pula 2007.

c) 6...\textit{g}6 7...g3 (more challenging than 7...\textit{e}4...\textit{g}7 8...\textit{f}3 0-0 9...\textit{g}5...h6 10...\textit{xf}6
\textit{w}xf6 11...\textit{e}3...\textit{c}5! 12...\textit{d}5...\textit{d}8 13...\textit{e}2
\textit{g}4 with thematic dark-square play for Black in S.Sergienko-S.Shamugia,
Voronezh (2003) 7...\textit{g}7 8...\textit{g}2 0-0 9 0-0
\textit{e}8 10...\textit{d}e4...\textit{d}xe4 11...\textit{d}e4...\textit{d}7 12
...\textit{g}2...\textit{f}6 13...\textit{e}4...\textit{f}4...\textit{h}5 15...\textit{w}d2
\textit{we}7 16...\textit{ad}1 and White was slightly better in A.Graf-I.Glek, Dresden 2006.

6...\textit{b}3

White prefers to start solving his development problems by freeing the dark-squared bishop, though we should note that \textit{b}3 is not an ideal square for the knight (recalling Tar­rasch). Others:

a) 6...\textit{e}3 is the most common con­nexion.
Now:

a1) 6...f5 7 e2 h5 8 b4 g6 9 a4
g7 10 b5 0-0 11 a5 c5 12 bxc6 bxc6 13
a3 c5 14 b3 a6 15 0-0 and White is slightly better, A.Riazantsev-O.Maksimov, Moscow 2006.

a2) 6...c6?! 7 f5 e3 8 f3 d5 9 cxd5
cxd5 10 fxe4 dxe4 11 b5+ bd7 12
f3 g6 13 xf6! xf6 14 d5 wd6 15
c7+ d8 16 cxa8 with a decisive ad-
vantage for White in N.Popov-M.Maksi-
mov, Kuibyshev 1981.

a3) 6...g6 7 e2 h5!? (after 7...g7
the immediate 8 g4?! has not been seen
in practice, but deserves serious atten-
tion) 8 f3 (or 8 wa4+ c6 9 0-0
cxd5 10 cxd5 d7 11 dxc6 xc6 12 b5 d5 13
0-0 wc7 14 wb3 d7 15 f3 f5 16 xc6
bxc6 17 fxe4 fxe4 18 dxe4 dxe4 19
we6+ e7 20 wxg6+ d8 21 wxe4
which was quite unclear in A.Shkstopo-
rov-V.Varavin, Krasnodar 1991) 8...exf3 9
xf3 g7 10 0-0 0-0 11 we1 c5 12 wh4
c6 13 d2 f5 14 e1 de4 15 dxe4
xh4 16 dxe4 xe4 17 df4 g8 and
Black was better in P.Taalsma-A.Cherniaev, Bury St. Edmunds 2008.

b) 6 wc2!? f5 (instead 6...e3?! 7
f3 wc3 8 0-0 we7 9 ag5 favours
White somewhat, W.Martz-B.Parham,
Chicago 1973) 7 f3 c6 8 fxe4 g6 9 e3
0-0-0 gives Black decent practical com-
ensation, but objectively it may not be

Indeed, after 10 a3 de8 (10...d5 11
cxd5 cxd5 12 cxd5 xd5 13 d3 h5
14 d3 we8 15 d2 d6 16 0-0-0 de8
17 c3 e7 18 g4 h3 19 gb2 xf3 20
xh3 left White clearly better in
I.Kashdan-O.Chajes, Chicago 1926) 11
d3 g4 12 c3 h5 13 0-0 h4 14 d5
wd8 15 d4 h7 16 h3 h6 17 d2 g5
18 d5 g4 19 hxg4 xg4 20 e5 xd3
21 xxd3 b8 22 wf5 White was con-
solidating his advantage in J.Donner-

c) 6 g3 has almost never been seen
in practice and, like 6 wc2, requires
more testing. Here White has in mind a
simple and effective plan of g2, 0-0,
f3 and, after...exf3, xf3 with a prom-
ising position. Here 6...c6 7 g2 (or 7
wc2!? e3 8 fxe3 xe3 9 f3 we7 10
g2 g6 11 0-0 ag7 12 e4 when White
has slightly the better chances) 7...d5 8 cxd5 (8 0-0 e6 would have been quite unclear) 8...cxd5 9 b3 w(d8 10 g5 e7 11 0-0 0-0 12 f3 exf3 13 exf3 c6 14 xf6 xf6 15 f4 a5 16 edx5 a4 17 xf6+ xf6 18 c5 edx4 resulted in an even position in K.Miton-O.Romanishin, Heviz 2010.

Returning to 6 b3:

6...c6

Logical but a little stereotyped.

Instead 6...h6!? preventing g5 deserves attention. After 7 f4 (7 g3 a5 8 g2 f5 9 e3 bd7 10 h3 d5 11 c5 c6 12 a4 b5 13 cxb6 wb4+ 14 d2 xb6 15 xb6 wb6 16 wc2 d6 17 0-0 0-0 18 b3 fb8 gave Black a perfectly acceptable position in J.Candela Perez-L.Galego, La Coruna 1996) 7...g6 8 e3 g7 9 e2 0-0 10 wc2 e8 11 0-0-0 a6 12 b1 c6 13 a3 d7 14 h4 ab8 15 d5 wd8 16 xf6+ xf6 17 g4 we7 18 f3 b5 19 cxb5 exf3 20 xf3 xb5 Black enjoyed excellent play in V.Iotov-P.Garcia Castro, Vilagarcia de Arousa 2006.

7 g5 f5 8 e3 bd7

9 h4!? Preventing Black's counterplay with ...h6 and ...g5. Korchnoi thought for about 20 minutes over this move.

Instead 9 e2 h6!? (9...wd8 10 g4 g6 11 h4 h6 12 f4 d5 13 d2 was a touch better for White in A.Graf-E.Dizdarevic, Skopje 2002) 10 h4 g5 11 g3 g7 requires practical testing, but I would have been happy enough here.

9...h6 10 f4 wd8 11 e2

With the thematic idea of g2-g4, which Black hurries to stop.

11...h5 12 d5 c5 13 d2 a6 14 a4?!

The standard reaction, but 14 b1! with the idea of d1-c2, attacking the e4-pawn, was critical. Black seems to have nothing better than to seek some compensation in lines like 14...we7 15 d1 g6 16 c2 e5 17 0-0 (calm, and likely stronger than both 17 a4+ b5 and 17 cxe4 xe4 18 xe4 xc4 19 xc4 xe4) 17...g7, but whether it would have been sufficient, and against such a renowned materialist as Korchnoi...
Now after 15 \( \text{b1!?} \) Black has direct way to protect his pawn in 15...0-0-0 16 \( \text{d1} \) g6 17 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{e8} \), although 18 b4 would then give White an attack.

15...\( \text{b8} \)

There was no need to hurry to help Black get rid of his weak pawn.

16 \( \text{g5!?} \) deserved attention: for example, 16...g6 17 f3 (17 \( \text{d1!?} \) \( \text{g7} \) 18 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{e5} \) 19 0-0-0 0-0 20 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 21 f3 also gives White an edge) 17...exf3 (or 17...\( \text{e5!?} \) 18 \( \text{f4} \) 18 gxf3 with advantage to White.

16...\( \text{exf3} \) 17 gxf3 \( \text{e5} \) 18 e4

Now if 18 \( \text{g5} \) Black should be okay after 18...\( \text{c7!?} \). 30 \( \text{e1} \)

18...\( \text{c8}! \)

A good move, which allows Black to arrange the coordination of his pieces.

19 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{c7} \) 20 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{h7} \)

Back again, and once more the strongest move.

21 \( \text{f4} \) g6 22 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 23 \( \text{d2}?! \) 0-0 24 \( \text{hg1} \) \( \text{e8} \) 25 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{e7} \) 26 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h8} \) 27 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{g4} \) 28 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{hxg4} \) \( \text{hxg4} \)

30...\( \text{b5}! \)

A strong pawn sacrifice, played on both tactical and strategical grounds.

31 axb5 axb5 32 \( \text{xb5} \) \( \text{f6} \) 33 \( \text{ge2} \)

In the case of 33 e5 Black has the resource 33...\( \text{d5}! \) leading to unclear complications, and this was the tactical grounds for his 30th move. Then 34 exd6 (if 34 cxd5 \( \text{d7} \) 34...\( \text{d7} \) 35 \( \text{e8}+ \) (or 35 \( \text{ge2} \) \( \text{e2}+ \) 36 \( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{b6} \) 35...\( \text{e8} \) 36 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{e2}+ \) 37 \( \text{xe2} \) \( \text{e6}+ \) 38 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{b4} \) would have been quite unclear. 33...\( \text{h5} \) 34 e5 dxe5 35 fxe5 \( \text{xb5}! \)

Breaking through on the most reinforced point.

36 cxb5 c4 37 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 38 d6 \( \text{xb5} \) 39 \( \text{h2}?! \) g3

Preferable is 39...\( \text{d8} \).

40 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{d8} \) 41 \( \text{e4}? \)

An impulsive move, especially considering that the time control had been reached.

Better would have been 41 \( \text{d4} \), maintaining mutual chances.

41...\( \text{xd6}+ \) 42 \( \text{d4} \)

37
Or 42 exd6 ♞xc3+ 43 ♞xc3 ♞b3+ 44 ♞d4 ♞f6 with a decisive advantage.

42...♞c6 43 ♞ee4 ♞h7

Black has a near-winning advantage, but the position is still complex.

44 ♞d7

Instead 44 ♞xc4 ♞xc4 45 ♞xc4 (or 45 ♞xc4 ♞xb2+) 45...♞xe5 results in a decisive advantage for Black.

44...♞a6 45 ♞a7 ♞d5+ 46 ♞d4 ♞a5+ 47 ♞e2 ♞xa7 48 ♞xa7 ♞b5 49 ♞b6 ♞a4 50 ♞d4

Black wins too after 50 ♞f3 ♞d1+ 51 ♞g2 ♞c2+ 52 ♞f3 ♞d3+.

50...♞a1! 51 ♞g4 ♞xe5 52 ♞xc4 ♞xb2+ 53 ♞d3 ♞b7 54 ♞e4 ♞b1+ 55 ♞d2 ♞g7 56 ♞e3 g2?!

Time-trouble for the second time in this game! Better was 56...♗b2+.

57 ♞g4 ♞f6?

Again not the best. I should have found 57...♗b2+ 58 ♞c2 ♞b7 with a decisive advantage.

58 ♞xg2 ♞e4+ 59 ♞e2 ♞c3+ 0-1

Here White overstepped the time limit. After 60 ♞f3? ♞b7 Black has a decisive attack, but 60 ♞f2! would have led to a draw.

**Summary**

After 4 ♞f3 e4!? White has to choose between 5 ♞g5 and 5 ♞d2. 5 ♞g5 is the more active choice, but after the 5...♗e7 of Games 1-3 (5...♗f5 is also possible, but 6 g4! should give White a small advantage) in some lines this knight comes under attack and White loses time.

We believe that Geller’s 5 ♞d2 is a deeper and more promising continuation, even though the knight is temporarily in the way of White’s other pieces. Black has to choose between 5...♗e7 and 5...♗f5. Both moves have their plusses and minuses. In the case of 5...♗e7 Black is yet to demonstrate a route to equality against both 6 ♞c2 and 6 g3, whereas the more popular 6 e3 and 6 ♞b3 don’t seem especially promising for White. Likewise, White has often met 5...♗f5 with 6 g4, but we believe the chances here are mutual. More critical is 6 ♞b3, as we saw in the notes to Game 5, although perhaps we have managed to show the right path for Black there.

Overall, the whole variation with 4 ♞f3 e4 contains a lot of unexplored possibilities and often leads to a complex strategical struggle. Black has a space advantage in the centre and on the kingside, as well as the possibility of active play. Indeed, ambitious black players shouldn’t ask for more from the opening stage!
Chapter Two

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 d6 3 ♗c3 e5

without 4 ♘f3

1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 d6 3 ♗c3 e5

White's main move here is very much 4 ♘f3, but he does have a number of not entirely illogical alternatives. With 4 d5 White advances and tries to play a closed position. Black will play on the dark squares and will have counter-chances on both sides of the board. We will study three games of great interest from a strategical point of view, all won by Akopian as Black. These games are good examples of Black's dark-square strategy, but also show that Akopian's work was not easy; the resulting positions after 4 d5 are complex and both sides have their chances.

Instead 4 e4, and also 4 ♗g5, gives Black a tempo after 4...exd4 5 ♗xd4 ♗c6. The evergreen game Polugaevsky-Nezhmetdinov (Game 11) was in this very line. Here we can look into the historical roots of the opening, as the chess teacher of Rashid Nezhmetdinov was Fedor Dus-Chotimirsky, who himself was the pupil of Mikhail Chigorin. Chigorin was the pioneer of the 1 d4 ♘f6 2 c4 d6 line, which became the prototype for all Old Indian schemes.

The Old Indian, like many openings, has its exchange variation, 4 dxe5 dxe5 5 ♗xd8+ ♘xd8. Theory's opinion on this line has changed over the years. Originally Spassky and others preferred White, but many grandmasters believe in the soundness of Black's position and recent games show that he has
many winning chances. I have undertaken a thorough study of this position and will show how to make best use of Black’s resources in Game 12.

Finally, the 4 e3 of Games 13 and 14 is a quiet but commonly-played continuation. Subsequently White may vary his development scheme with 4 d3 and 4 e2, or 4 f3 and 4 e2 (called the Dus-Chotimirsky Variation), or he may even play g3, 4 g2 and 4 e2. Black has nothing to fear in any case, however, with a complex strategical fight usually ensuing.

Game 8
P.Varga-V.Akopian
French League 2002

1 d4 4f6 2 c4 d6 3 c3 e5 4 d5

The popularity of this continuation has varied over the years. White closes the centre, gaining some space on the queenside. On the other hand, White loses a tempo and 4 d5 defines the position in the centre, allowing Black to counter on the dark squares.

4... 4bd7
Black can also consider Dizdarevic’s 4... 4f5!? when 5 f3 e4 transposes to the Janowski Variation – see note ‘b’ to White’s 5th move in Game 21.

5 e4
Other options are:

a) 5 b4?! a5! breaks up White’s structure.

b) After 5 4f3 a5 6 e4 4c5 7 4d2, the knight on d2 protects the e4-pawn. This manoeuvre is widely used in the Indian Defences in general, especially when the c4-square is free, so the knight can continue its journey. Here, however, this is a bit of an awkward set-up for White: for example, 7... 4e7 8 4e2 0-0 9 g4?! (White should be careful when creating dark-square weaknesses in such a structure) 9... 4e8 10 4f1 4g5 11 4e3 4xe3 12 4xe3 4h4 13 4f3 4d7 14 4e2 c6 15 0-0-0 a4 16 4b1 4d8 17 4c1 4a5 18 h4 4b3! saw Black seizing the upper hand in D.Zimmerman-A.Cherniaev, Dortmund 2010.
c) 5 g3 is generally solid, but it isn’t exactly harmonious now that White has closed the centre. Here we believe 5...a5! is the most precise continuation, securing the c5-square for Black’s knight.

After 6 g2 c5 7 e4 c6 8 g2 cxd5 9 cxd5 d7 (9...b5?) 10 f3 b5 11 e3 b4 12 b1 b5 13 c1 fd7 14 g1 xf1 15 xf1 e7 16 d3 c8 17 xxc5 xxc5 18 d2 0-0 Black was better in L.Polugaeovsky-A.Lutikov, Rostov on Don 1954.

Taking control of the g4-square to prepare e2 and probably g2-g4. This has its logic, but there is a wide array of alternatives:

a) 7 e2 e7 and then:

a1) 8 e3 g4 9 xxc5 dxc5 10 d3 d6 11 h3 f6 12 0-0-0 h5 13 g3 g6 14 d2 g7 15 xh1 f5 with complex play in S.Booth-A.Zapata, Los Angeles 1991.

a2) 8 xf3 transposes to variation ‘b’.

a3) 8 h3 might land up transposing to our main game.

a4) 8 f3 0-0 9 g2 e8 10 g3 g6 11 0-0 g7 12 e2 f5 13 f4 exf4
\( \text{The New Old Indian} \)

\[ \text{\texttt{\textbackslash x}f4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f6 \text{gave Black good and thematic counterplay in A.Ferreira-C.Fernandes, Portugal 1992.}} \]

\[ \text{b) 7 \texttt{\textbackslash d}f3 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e7 8 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e2 0-0 sees both sides developing along classical lines.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Now:}
\end{array}
\end{array} \]

\[ \text{b1) 9 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e3 \texttt{\textbackslash b}6 10 \texttt{\textbackslash h}3 \text{transposes to the notes to White's 10th move in our main game.}} \]

\[ \text{b2) 9 \texttt{\textbackslash d}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e8 10 \texttt{\textbackslash b}3 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 11 \texttt{\textbackslash x}c5 \texttt{\textbackslash x}c5 12 0-0 \texttt{\textbackslash d}d6 13 \texttt{\textbackslash f}4 \texttt{\textbackslash e}x\texttt{f}4 14 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f4 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f4 15 \texttt{\textbackslash w}f4 \texttt{\textbackslash w}g5 16 \texttt{\textbackslash a}f1 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7 17 \texttt{\textbackslash d}3 \texttt{\textbackslash w}e5 \text{gave Black a comfortable dark-square blockade in M.Aaron-M.Bertok, Stockholm 1962.}} \]

\[ \text{b3) 9 \texttt{\textbackslash h}3 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7 10 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e3 \texttt{\textbackslash b}6 11 0-0 \text{transposes to variation 'b5'.}} \]

\[ \text{b4) 9 \texttt{\textbackslash a}3 \texttt{\textbackslash a}4 10 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e3 \texttt{\textbackslash b}3 11 \texttt{\textbackslash d}d1 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7 12 \texttt{\textbackslash d}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d2 13 \texttt{\textbackslash w}x\texttt{d}2 \texttt{\textbackslash b}6 14 \texttt{\textbackslash f}3 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e8 15 \texttt{\textbackslash c}1 \texttt{\textbackslash g}6 \text{saw Black clamping down on the queenside before preparing counterplay with ...f5 in G.Kuzmin-D.Mertens, Pardubice 2005.}} \]

\[ \text{b5) 9 0-0 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7 10 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e3 \texttt{\textbackslash b}6 11 \texttt{\textbackslash h}3 \texttt{\textbackslash e}8 \text{sees Black continuing in Czech Benoni style: 12...g6 is next up followed by ...\texttt{\textbackslash g}5 and/or ...f5.}} \]

\[ \text{c) With 7 \texttt{\textbackslash d}ge2 White plans to place his knight on g3, but this gives Black the additional possibility of ...h5-h4. Indeed, we quite like the idea of 7...\texttt{\textbackslash e}e7 (or 7...g6 8 \texttt{\textbackslash g}3 \texttt{\textbackslash h}5 9 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e2 \texttt{\textbackslash g}7 10 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7 11 0-0 \texttt{\textbackslash h}4 12 \texttt{\textbackslash h}1 \texttt{\textbackslash w}b8 13 \texttt{\textbackslash f}3 \texttt{\textbackslash w}a7 14 \texttt{\textbackslash f}2 \texttt{\textbackslash h}5 15 \texttt{\textbackslash x}h4 \texttt{\textbackslash h}6 16 \texttt{\textbackslash g}4 \texttt{\textbackslash f}4 17 \texttt{\textbackslash h}1 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7 18 \texttt{\textbackslash a}d1 \texttt{\textbackslash f}6 19 \texttt{\textbackslash g}3 \texttt{\textbackslash f}7 20 \texttt{\textbackslash d}3 \texttt{\textbackslash a}h8 with a dangerous initiative down the h-file and on the dark squares in G.Kleiser-Z.Kozul, Graz 2009) 8 \texttt{\textbackslash g}3 \texttt{\textbackslash g}6 9 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e2 \texttt{\textbackslash h}5!} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{White has:}
\end{array}
\end{array} \]

\[ \text{c1) 10 \texttt{\textbackslash h}3 \texttt{\textbackslash h}4 11 \texttt{\textbackslash f}1 \texttt{\textbackslash h}5 \text{gives Black easy counterplay on the kingside.}} \]

\[ \text{c2) 10 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 \texttt{\textbackslash h}4 11 \texttt{\textbackslash f}1 \texttt{\textbackslash h}5 12 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e7 \texttt{\textbackslash w}e7 13 \texttt{\textbackslash g}3 \texttt{\textbackslash d}7 14 \texttt{\textbackslash e}e3 \texttt{\textbackslash w}g5 15 \texttt{\textbackslash w}d2 0-0-0 16 0-0-0 \texttt{\textbackslash f}5 17 \texttt{\textbackslash e}x\texttt{f}5 \texttt{\textbackslash g}xf5 18 \texttt{\textbackslash g}2 \texttt{\textbackslash w}d2+ 19 \texttt{\textbackslash w}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash h}3 20 \texttt{\textbackslash h}4 \texttt{\textbackslash f}4 21 \texttt{\textbackslash f}3 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e2 22 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e2 \texttt{\textbackslash e}8 and Black is better, E.Kiss-S.Blaho, Hungarian League 2002.}} \]

\[ \text{c3) 10 0-0 \texttt{\textbackslash f}d7 11 \texttt{\textbackslash f}4 \texttt{\textbackslash e}x\texttt{f}4 12 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f4 \texttt{\textbackslash g}5 13 \texttt{\textbackslash w}d2 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f4 14 \texttt{\textbackslash w}f4 \texttt{\textbackslash e}5 15 \texttt{\textbackslash a}3 \texttt{\textbackslash a}4 was pretty comfortable for Black in G.Pali-I.Vuko\textbackslash n, Balatonlelle 2005. White should not be in such a hurry to weaken his dark squares and queenside.} \]
d) The preventive 7 b3 cuts out ideas of ...a5-a4, but is time-wasting and allows Black to create play on the kingside first: 7...e7 8 e2 0-0 9 f3 e8 followed by ...f5 with active play for Black.

e) 7 e3 e7 (7...g4!??) 8 f3 b6 9 e2 (instead 9 h3 0-0 transposes back to Varga-Akopian, while 9 xc5 bxc5 is quite a radical exchange and after 10 b5 0-0 11 a4 h5 12 d2 f5 13 f3 g5 14 exf5 xf5 15 e4 xe4 16 xe4 f4 17 d3 e7 18 g3 e4 19 fxe4 xe4+ 20 f2 f8+ 21 g2 e3 Black was better in K.Litvinov-N.Lortkipanidze, Kallithea 2008) 9...g4 10 d2 0-0 11 h3 f6 12 0-0-0 d7 13 e3 b8 (13...a4!? was quite tempting too) 14 a4 c6 15 d2 cxd5 16 exd5 e8 17 g4 c7 18 b5 a7 a6 19 b3 b4 20 b1 f5 gave Black a dangerous initiative in A.Savidis-M.Krasenkow, Kavala 2001.

Returning to 7 h3:

7...e7

8 e3

A notable idea is 8 ge2 d7!? preparing queenside counterplay, while sidestepping the possibility of 8...0-0 9 g4. Here 9 g4 c6 10 g3 cxd5 11 exd5 h6 12 f5 xf5 13 exf5 c8 14 e3 xf7 15 0-0-0 g5 led to an unbalanced but even position in M.Sawadkuhi-W.Daniel, Bad Zwischenahn 2003.

8...0-0 9 f3 b6

10 g4

This move is a necessary component of White’s plan.

10 e2 is also possible, although this position is more likely to come about if White plays e2 earlier. Here:

a) 10...h8 11 g4 g8 12 0-0-0 g6 13 dg1 f5 14 gxf5 gxf5 15 h4 f4? 16 xc5 bxc5 17 f1! and White is better, G.Kuzmin-V.Liberzon, USSR 1970.

b) 10...g6 11 g4 e8 12 0-0-0 g7 13 dg1 also gives White the easier game.

c) 10...d7!? 11 g4 a4, by analogy with the game, deserves serious attention.

10...d7 11 0-0-0 a4!

An excellent move. Black plays on the flank where he is stronger.
12 e2

The preventive 12 a3 deserved attention, although then White would always have had to bear in mind the possibility of ...b3-d4.

12...a3 13 b3 a6 14 e1 c6

15 dxc6

Pushing the pawns with 15 g5!? e8 16 h4 allows 16...f5! 17 exf5 xf5 18 d2 c5 which would have been quite unclear.

15...xc6 16 f3 d7

Now this knight finds a good role, but it's still hard for Black to break-through on the queenside.

17 d2 ac5 18 c2 e6 19 d5

xd5 20 cxd5 d4!? A double-edged pawn sacrifice. Also possible was 20...f4!? with mutual chances.

21 xd4 exd4 22 xd4 f6 23 b1 xd4 24 xd4 g5

Black has sacrificed a pawn and obtained some compensation due to his control over the dark squares.

25 h4 f4 26 d2 g3 27 h5 fc8 28 h6 g6 29 hgh1 wh4 30 g5 f6 31 g4

The precise 31 b5! would have given White the upper hand.

31...wh2 32 f4 a5 33 gg1? ac5

Now Black gets control over the c-file as the advantage quickly changes hands.

34 g4 c1+! 35 xc1 xd2 36 e6+ f8 37 xc8+ e7 38 xf6+ xf6

Akopian has realized that his active queen, supported by its favourite partner, a knight, will determine the outcome.

39 c2 e3 40 f1 c5 41 e5+ dxe5 42 fxe5+ xe5 43 d1 e4 44 a1 f2 45 f1 wd4+ 46 b1 e4 47 e1 f6 48 g2 f2 49 c2 wb2+ 0-1
1 d4  f6 2 c4 d6 3  c3 e5 4 d5  bd7 5 e4  c5 6  d3

A natural-enough move. White protects the e4-pawn and develops a piece.

6...a5

Again we see this typical move to support the knight’s position on c5. Akopian has correctly evaluated his knight higher than White’s light-squared bishop.

7  ge2

A player who likes their light-squared bishop might prefer 7  c2, but after 7...e7 8  f3 (or 8  ge2, transposing to note ‘b’ to White’s 8th move, below) 8...0-0 9 h3 (9  e3!? 9...c6 10 0-0 cxd5 11 cxd5 b5 Black had sufficient counterplay in J.Horvath-B.Molnar, Hungarian League 2008.

Instead 7  e3  e7 8 f3 allows 8...h5!? an idea we’ll see much more of in the following notes. Black prepares dark-square play after ...g5 and 9  ge2  g5 10 f2  f4 11  xf4  xf4 gave her reasonable play in this complex position in M.Voiska-E.Kovalevskaya, Istanbul 2003.

7...e7

If the immediate 7...h5 then 8 h3  e7 9 g4!? could be an issue.

8 0-0

Routine development, but White doesn’t have to commit his king just yet:

a) 8 h3 has the idea of g4 and  g3 followed by obtaining an initiative on the kingside. Black should likely respond by making the exchange after all to free a square for his other knight: 8...xd3+!? (8...0-0 9 g4 c6 10  g3 cxd5 11 cxd5  xd3+ 12  xd3  d7 13  f5  c5 14  g3 a4 15  f1 b6 16  g2 g6 17  h6  e8 wasn’t at all easy to assess in B.Glenne-J.Sundell, Trondheim 2004) 9  xd3  d7 10  g3 0-0 11  h6  f6 12 h4  h8 13  g5  c5 leads to complex, roughly-balanced play.

b) 8  c2 prepares to meet 8...0-0
and 8...\( \text{cxd7} \) with 9 \( \text{g3} \). Black should counter with 8...\( \text{h5} \)!, again facilitating ...\( \text{g5} \) whilst cutting across White’s plans.

Now:

b1) 9 \( \text{e3} \text{g5} \) 10 \( \text{wd2} \text{h6} \) 11 \( \text{h4} \text{xe3} \) 12 \( \text{wxe3} \text{f6} \) 13 0-0-0 \( \text{dxf4} \) 14 \( \text{h2} \text{xe2+} \) 15 \( \text{xe2} \text{h5} \) 16 f3 \( \text{wh6} \) leaves White with a potentially bad bishop for the endgame, E.Mendez Ataria-S.Schweber, Buenos Aires 1993.

b2) 9 \( \text{g3} \text{xg3} \) 10 \( \text{hxg3} \text{g5} \) 11 \( \text{wh5} \text{xc1} \) 12 \( \text{xc1} \text{d7} \) 13 \( \text{wh4} \text{wxdh4} \) 14 \( \text{wh4} \text{e7} \) 15 \( \text{wd2} \text{h6} \) 16 b3 \( \text{ab8} \) (with the idea of ...\( \text{b5} \)) 17 a4 \( \text{mb8} \) prepares ...f5 with a slight advantage for Black, J.Bolbochan-C.Guimard, Mar del Plata 1936.

b3) For 9 0-0 0-0 see note ‘a’ to White’s 9th move in our main game.

8...0-0

An interesting alternative is the immediate 8...\( \text{h5} \)? with the idea of ...\( \text{g5} \). Moreover, as Black has not castled yet, he has possibilities of some action on the kingside: for example, 9 \( \text{g3} \text{xg3} \) (or 9...\( \text{dxf4} \) 10 \( \text{xf4} \text{exf4} \) 11 \( \text{h5} \text{g5} \) with complex play) 10 \( \text{hxg3} \text{h5} \) followed by ...\( \text{h4} \) with counterplay on the kingside.

9 \( \text{g3} \)

Preventing ideas of ...\( \text{h5} \) once and for all. Alternatively:

a) 9 \( \text{c2} \text{h5} \) 10 f4 (if 10 f3 \( \text{g5} \)) 10...\( \text{exf4} \) 11 \( \text{xf4} \text{xf4} \) 12 \( \text{xf4} \text{f6} \)? is quite unclear, whereas 12...\( \text{g5} \) 13 \( \text{wh5} \text{xf4} \) 14 \( \text{xf4} \text{g6} \) 15 \( \text{wh6} \text{we7} \) 16 \( \text{af1} \text{d7} \) was about even in H.Ertl-C.Althoff, Ruhrgebiet 1999.

b) 9 \( \text{e3} \text{fd7} \) 10 \( \text{wd2} \text{h6} \) and Black will force through the thematic exchange of dark-squared bishops.

9...\( \text{e8} \)

Akopian can’t move his knight to \( \text{h5} \), but is still determined to unravel with ...\( \text{g5} \).

10 \( \text{e3} \text{g5} \) 11 \( \text{wd2} \text{xe3} \) 12 \( \text{wxe3} \text{f6} \)

Returning the knight to the centre, rather than hurry to break with ...f5.

13 \( \text{c2} \text{d7} \) 14 \( \text{h3} \text{e8} \) 15 f4?!

White was not committed to this potentially-weakening break.

If 15 \( \text{f5} \) then 15...\( \text{h5} \) would have
been fine for Black, but 15 b3!? deserved attention, preparing queenside play with a3 and b4.

15...exf4 16 exf4 e5 17 af1 We7

Now Black has good play against the pawn on e4.

18 Wd4?!

Better would have been 18 af3 with mutual chances.

18...Af5 19 h2 We5 20 Wxe5 Axe5 21 fxe5 Axf5 22 exf5 Aae8

The endgame is clearly better for Black as he has full control over the only open file and over the dark squares. Even getting rid of his bad bishop didn’t enable Sabel to hold the position.

23 g4 h6 24 Af2 Ag8 25 Ae2 Af8 26 Ae1 Wf6 27 Axe4 Ad4 28 Af4 Wh8 29 Axe5 We5 30 Ad4 Wh5 31 Wxe5 Bxe5 32 Bb5 Bxf2 33 Bxf2 Axe5 34 Ad1 Ad4 35 Bb5 Af6 36 Ad3 Bxe3 37 Bxe3 Axf5 38 Ad5 Axe3 39 Axe3 Aa6 40 Ad6 Bc7 41 Ad2 Bb8 42 Bb1 Ac7 43 Ad4 Cd5 44 Bb2 Ae4 45 Axe4 Bxe4 46 Ad7 Ad7 47 Ae4 Bc3 48 Ag5 Ae5 49 Ae7 Bb6 50 Ad3 0-1

7 Ae3

Consistent development, but White might also try:

a) 7 Ag5 is no good again in view of 7...Af7 8 Wd2? Axg5.

b) 7 Ad3 Ae7 8 Ag2 Ad6 9 Ac2 Ag5 10 Ab3 Axh3 11 Axc1 Ab6 12 Aa1 Ad7 13 b3 0-0 14 0-0 Ac8 15 f4 Ag4 16 fixe5 dxe5 17 Ac1 Bh5 18 We1 Ad6 with an even position, W.Zoller-W.Schmidt, German League 2004.

c) With 7 g3 Ae7 8 Ac3 White wishes to exchange the light-squared bishops, which is desirable for him from a positional point of view. How-
ever, after 8...0-0 9 ¿e3 ¿fd7! 10 ¿e2 ¿g5 11 ¿f2 ¿f6! 12 0-0 ¿h6 13 ¿g2 ¿e3 it is Black who has made a positionally desirable exchange of bishops.

d) 7 a3 ¿e7 8 ¿b1 ¿d7 9 b4 axb4 10 axb4 is quite ambitious and after 10...¿a4 11 ¿c2 ¿xc3 12 ¿xc3 ¿a2 13 ¿b2 ¿h5 14 ¿e2 ¿g5 15 g3 f5 16 exf5 ¿xf5 17 ¿a1 ¿xa1+ 18 ¿xa1 ¿a8 19 g4 ¿h4+ Black was better in F.Maher-A.Othman, Dubai 1996.

e) 7 b3 prepares queenside play with a3 and b4, but costs a tempo. After 7...¿e7 8 ¿e3 0-0 9 a3 (White is ready to advance on the queenside, but his kingside pieces are still in their initial places; instead 9 ¿e2 ¿h5 10 g4?! runs into 10...¿h4+) 9...¿e8 Black has the standard plan of ...¿g5 and ...f5, battling for the initiative.

7...¿e7

An alternative is 7...c6!? prioritizing queenside play ahead of the standard kingside development.

After 8 ¿e2 a4!? 9 ¿c1 (the knight temporarily takes up an awkward position, but this is required to complete White’s development with ¿e2 and 0-0; instead 9 ¿xc5 ¿xc5 10 ¿xa4 ¿xd5 11 ¿xd5 b5 12 ¿ac3 ¿a6 gives Black the bishop-pair and some initiative in return for the pawn, although it’s hard to say whether it is definitely enough compensation) 9...¿xd5 10 ¿xd5 ¿a5 Black has opened the c-file, but the pawn structure and his lack of development may not allow him to profit from it. Now:

![Chess Diagram]

a) 11 ¿b5+ ¿d7 12 ¿xd7+ ¿fxd7 13 0-0 b5 leads to an approximately equal position.

b) 11 ¿d2 ¿d7 12 ¿e2 ¿e7 13 0-0 0-0 14 ¿d3 ¿xd3 15 ¿xd3 ¿f8 16 ¿fc1 ¿d8! 17 ¿f2 ¿a3 18 ¿ab1 ¿b4 19 ¿xa3 ¿xa3 20 ¿b3 ¿a5 was all very thematic and gave Black good play on the queenside in H.Werner-F.Stimpel, Bad Wiessee 2003.

c) With 11 ¿d3 ¿xd3+ 12 ¿xd3 White has exchanged the strong black knight and has some advantage in the centre, but this has taken time and 12...¿e7 13 0-0 0-0 14 ¿e1 ¿d7 15 a3 ¿fc8 16 ¿f2 (threatening 16 ¿b6)
16...\(d8\) 17 \(\text{bfc}1\) \(\text{e}8\) with the idea of \(\text{d7-c5}\) wasn't at all easy to assess in A.Vaisser-L.Comas Fabrego, New York 1998.

8 \(\text{wd}2\)

The plan with castling on opposite sides is one of the most ambitious and promises a sharp battle.

8...\(h6!\)?

Black prepares ...\(g5\), but there are two principled alternatives:

a) 8...\(h5\) 9 0-0-0 (after 9 \(\text{ge}2\) h6 10 g3 \(\text{g}5\) 11 h4 \(\text{xe}3\) 12 \(\text{xe}3\) g6 13 \(\text{g}2\) \(\text{e}7\) 14 b3 \(\text{d}7\) 15 0-0-0 f5 Black is better, A.Raetsky-V.Zhelnin, St Petersburg 1999) 9...\(h6\) (the immediate 9...\(a4!\)? 10 g3 c6 11 f4 exf4 12 \(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{wa}5\) of L.Zsinka-S.Gross, Budapest 1993, also deserves further attention) 10 g3 and now:

a1) 10...\(d7\) 11 \(\text{e}2\) g5 12 f4 g4 13 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{xe}3\) 14 h4 g3 15 h5 \(\text{f}6\) 16 \(\text{hf}1\) \(\text{e}7\) 17 fxe5 \(\text{xe}5\) 18 \(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{hx}5\) 19 e5 \(\text{g}4\) 20 \(\text{df}1\) and White is better, Z.Varga-A.Meszaros, Szeged 1993.

a2) 10...\(f6\) 11 \(\text{b}1\) \(\text{fd}7\) 12 f4 \(\text{f}6\)

13 \(\text{f}3\) b6 14 f5 \(\text{e}7\) 15 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{f}6\) 16 h3 \(\text{b}7\) 17 g4 \(\text{wd}7\) 18 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{c}8\) 19 h4 c6 20 g5 favoured White in C.Ward-P.Wallace, British League 2005.

a3) 10...\(\text{a}4!\) 11 \(\text{h}3\) a3 12 b3 0-0 is the right way to go and promises Black decent prospects of long-term counterplay: for example, 13 \(\text{xc}8\) \(\text{xc}8\) 14 \(\text{ge}2\) f5 15 exf5 \(\text{xf}5\) 16 \(\text{hf}1\) \(\text{f}7\) 17 g4 \(\text{df}4\) 18 \(\text{xf}4\) exf4 19 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{f}6\) 20 \(\text{fe}1\) \(\text{wd}7\) left his pieces quite well placed, with the a-pawn a definite nuisance in F.Elsness-Y.Shulman, Stockholm 1998.

b) The most natural method is 8...0-0 9 0-0-0 (9 \(\text{ge}2\) is another option followed by \(\text{e}2\)-g3 or even \(\text{e}2\)-c1-d3, exchanging Black's active knight: for example, 9...\(\text{e}8\) 10 \(\text{g}3\) h6 11 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{g}5\) 12 0-0 \(\text{xe}3+\) 13 \(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{g}5\) 14 f4 exf4 15 \(\text{xf}4\) \(\text{d}7\) with the idea of ...\(\text{e}5\), which is unclear, likely about even)

9...\(\text{e}8\) (the advance ...f5 is Black's best plan; instead 9...\(h6\) would transpose to our main game, while 9...\(\text{fd}7\) has the idea of ...c6, ...\(a4\) and ...\(\text{wa}5\), but
after 10 g4 a4 11 \textit{\textbf{ge2}} a3 12 b3 c6 13 \textit{\textbf{g3 wa5}} 14 \textit{\textbf{f5}} White was better in U.Boensh-E.Heyken, German League 1991), but here 10 g3! sees White going for an expansion on the kingside which will be started by h2-h4.

After 10...f5 11 exf5 \textit{\textbf{x}f5} 12 h4 a4 13 g4 \textit{\textbf{d7}} 14 \textit{\textbf{e2}}? White protects the pawn on f3 in order to develop his knight as soon as possible. Then 14...\textit{\textbf{x}h}4 15 \textit{\textbf{h}3}! \textit{\textbf{e7}} 16 \textit{\textbf{f}2} gives him some initiative and later on White will double his rooks on the h-file.

\textbf{9 0-0-0}

An important alternative is 9 \textit{\textbf{ge2}} \textit{\textbf{h}7}! (holding back on castling and

\textbf{9...0-0 10 0-0-0 \textit{\textbf{h}7} 11 g4 \textit{\textbf{g}5} 12 \textit{\textbf{b}1} \textit{\textbf{d}7} 13 \textit{\textbf{h}4}! \textit{\textbf{x}h}4 14 \textit{\textbf{x}h}6 \textit{\textbf{g}5} 15 \textit{\textbf{x}g}5 \textit{\textbf{wx}g}5 16 \textit{\textbf{we}1} left White better in A.Sinadinovic-S.Vratonjic, Belgrade 1989), and now:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[a)] 10 \textit{\textbf{c}1} \textit{\textbf{g}5} 11 \textit{\textbf{gx}g}5 \textit{\textbf{wx}g}5 12 \textit{\textbf{wx}g}5 \textit{\textbf{hx}g}5 13 \textit{\textbf{d}3} \textit{\textbf{xd}3+} 14 \textit{\textbf{xd}3} \textit{\textbf{f}6} 15 \textit{\textbf{f}2} \textit{\textbf{e}7} 16 \textit{\textbf{b}5} c6 17 \textit{\textbf{c}3} \textit{\textbf{d}7} with an even game, T.Kovacs-V.Ianov, Aggtelek 2000.
  \item[b)] 10 g3 f5 11 \textit{\textbf{g}2} fxe4 12 \textit{\textbf{xc}5} dxc5 13 \textit{\textbf{xe}4} \textit{\textbf{g}5} 14 \textit{\textbf{c}3} 0-0 15 0-0 \textit{\textbf{f}7} 16 \textit{\textbf{ae}1} \textit{\textbf{d}6} 17 \textit{\textbf{we}2} \textit{\textbf{f}5} 18 \textit{\textbf{f}2} \textit{\textbf{d}6} 19 \textit{\textbf{d}3} \textit{\textbf{d}4} 20 \textit{\textbf{d}1} \textit{\textbf{e}8} and Black is better, C.Schroeder-W.Schmidt, Plau am See 2001.
  \item[c)] 10 g4 \textit{\textbf{g}5} 11 \textit{\textbf{g}3} \textit{\textbf{f}8} 12 0-0-0 \textit{\textbf{xe}3} 13 \textit{\textbf{xe}3} \textit{\textbf{w}5} 14 \textit{\textbf{d}2} \textit{\textbf{g}6} 15 \textit{\textbf{f}5} \textit{\textbf{xf}5} 16 \textit{\textbf{gx}f}5 \textit{\textbf{h}4} 17 \textit{\textbf{e}2} \textit{\textbf{w}e}3+ 18 \textit{\textbf{e}3} was slightly better for Black in T.Balogh-S.Movsesian, Slovakian League 1995.
\end{itemize}

\textbf{9...0-0}

Akopian doesn’t fear White’s play on the kingside. Black doesn’t have to commit his king just yet, but this may well be the best plan:
1 d4 ½f6 2 c4 d6 3 ½c3 e5 without 4 ½f3

a) 9...¾d7 10 g3 a4 11 ½b1 ½b8 is, however, taking things a little too far and 12 ¾h3 ½a7 13 ¾xd7+ ½fxd7 14 ½b5 ½b6 15 ½e2 0-0 16 g4 c6 17 ½a3 ½a6 18 ½g3 gave White the better chances in A.Miles-A.Mestel, Esbjerg 1984.

b) 9...¾h7 echoes Black's play after 9 ½ge2. Here 10 g3 (10 ½b1 ½g5 11 g4 ½xe3 12 ½xe3 ½h4 13 ½e2 h5 14 f4 exf4 15 ½xf4 ½g5 16 ¾h3 ½xf4 17 ½xf4 hxg4 saw Black seizing the upper hand in K.Thorsteins-A.Zapata, New York 1989) 10...f5 (or 10...b6 11 h4 f5 when 12 exf5 ½xf5 13 g4 ½g6 14 h5 ½f7 15 ¾h3 ½g5 16 ½xg5 ½xg5 17 ½xg5 ½xg5 was pretty solid for Black in U.Boensh-R.Knaak, Nordhausen 1986) 11 h4 0-0 12 ½b1 (12 ¾h3 b6 13 exf5! ½xf5 14 ½xf5 ½xf5 15 ½c2 is a better plan and 15...½d7 16 g4 ½f7 17 ½d2 left White clearly in control in L.Alburt-A.Zapata, Subotica 1987; here we can see White definitely benefiting from the delay in developing his king's knight) 12...b6 13 ½d3 f4 14 ½f2 fxg3 15 ½xg3 ½f6 16 ½f2 led to equal chances in A.Tashkhodzhaev-A.Goldin, Tashkent 1986.

c) 9...½d7 10 g3 a4 (or 10...½g5 11 f4 ½f6 12 ½f3 g6 13 h4 a4 14 h5 ½g8 15 hxg6 ½xg6 and White has the better chances, C.Ward-T.Casper, German League 1996) 11 ½b1 0-0 12 h4 c6 13 g4 ½a5 14 ½ge2 ½b6 15 ½g3 cxd5 16 ½xd5 ½xd5 17 cxd5 ½xd2 18 ½xd2 slightly favours White, A.Moiseenko-Z.Kozul, Warsaw 2005.

d) 9...¾h5!? transposes to note 'a' to Black's 8th move, above.

10 h4

White can also begin with 10 ½b1 ½h7 before going 11 g4. Now:

a) 11...½g5 12 h4 ½xe3 13 ½xe3 ½d7 14 ½ge2 ½a4 15 ½xa4 ½xa4 16 ½d2 ½b8 17 g5 h5 18 f4 favours White, M.Petursson-H.Westerinen, Espoo 1989.

b) 11...½e8 12 h4 ½f8 13 g5 h5 14 ¾h3 ½fd7 15 ½ge2 g6 16 ½c1 ½f8 17 ½d3 left White clearly better in the earlier M.Petursson-V.Malaniuk, Moscow 1987.

c) Thus Black should cut across White's plans and 11...¾h4!? seems okay for him.

10...½e8 11 g3 f5

This allows White to gain tempi for g4-g5 after the exchange on f5. Thus Black might wait for a better moment to play ...f5: for example, with 11...a4!?. Then 12 ½b1 f5 13 exf5 ½xf5+ and 12 ½ge2 f5 13 exf5 ½xf5 14 g4?! ¾h7 are good for Black, so White would likely prefer the thematic exchange, 12 ¾h3.
12 exf5  \textit{xf}5 13 g4 g6 14 g5 h5!

Of course, Black wants to avoid opening files on the kingside, although now the dark-squared bishop becomes locked in.

Instead after 14...hxg5?! 15 hgx Black keeps the pawn on g5 under pressure, but after f3-f4 it will be protected and likely Black’s king will become too exposed: for instance, 15...a4 16 f4 a3 17 b3 exf4 18 xc5 dxc5 19 f3 with the idea of e5 and h3-e6 with some attack.

15 xc5 dxc5 16 d3 xd3 17 xd3

17...xf4?!

Black has an interesting but not wholly correct idea in mind.

A good alternative was 17...d6 and if 18 e4, intending to exchange a pair of knights, thereby leaving Black with a bad bishop, then 18...f5! 19 f6+ xf6 20 xf5 e7 21 xe5 d7 which seems to give Black enough compensation.

18 ce2?

Now Black can realize his idea. Stronger and more logical (continuing development, connecting the rooks) was to play with the other knight: 18 g2! xh4 19 f4 and White has the better chances.

18...xh4! 19 xh4

Now 19 f4 is not possible as the rooks are not connected.

19...xg5+ 20 f4 xh4

Black has won two pawns and returned his bishop to the action. Admittedly his king is not safe, but White’s king will soon be under fire too.

21 f3 exf4 22 h1 g5 23 g6 h6 24 e6+ h8 25 xh5 a6 26 e5 f6 27 g5

Not 27 xf4? d6 28 d2 g8 29 h4 f7 with a decisive advantage for Black due to the loose rook on h4.

27...g8 28 xf4

Now both knights are rather pinned. Indeed, White’s pieces are in unstable positions and his king is badly placed.

28...d6 29 fe6 f1+ 30 c2 e8!

With a near-decisive advantage for Black. The queen works on both flanks, with the ideas of...xh5 and...a4+.
1 d4 ♞f6 2 c4 d6 3 ♞c3 e5 without 4 ♞f3

31 ♞h2 ♞xc4 32 ♞xc7 ♞e3+ 33 ♞d3 ♞xd5 34 ♞xb7 ♞b4+ 35 ♞e2 ♞f5 36 ♞e4 ♞b5+ 37 ♞d2 ♞d5+ 38 ♞e3

38...♞xg5!

Even stronger than the hardly-shabby 38...♞xg5+ 39 ♞xg5 ♞d3+.

39 ♞xg5 ♞xg5+ 40 ♞f3

White's king has avoided the direct threats, but Black has obtained a decisive material advantage.

40...♗d7 41 ♗g2 ♗d5 42 ♘h1 ♘e3 43 ♘h7+ ♘f7 44 ♗f2+ ♘f6 45 ♘h5+ ♘g8 46 ♘f3 ♘d4 47 ♘a8+ ♘f7 48 ♘f3 ♘g6 49 ♘h2 ♘d1+ 50 ♘xd1 ♘xd1 51 b3 ♘f5 52 ♘g2 ♘e4 53 ♘f1 ♘d3 54 ♘e1 ♘e3 55 ♘d2+ ♘c3 56 ♘e2 ♘d4 57 ♘d3+ ♘b2 58 ♘d2+ ♘a3 59 ♘d3 g5 0-1

**Game 11**
L.Polugaevsky- R.Nezhmetdinov
Sochi 1958

1 d4 ♞f6 2 c4 d6 3 ♞c3 e5 4 e4

This line was an early favourite of Polugaevsky's. White goes in for a space advantage, but places his pieces on some awkward squares. He also loses time with his queen.

Instead 4 ♗g5 gives Black a tempo in the same way: 4...exd4 5 ♘xd4 ♘e7 (better than 5...♕c6 6 ♘d2 – here this is a more comfortable withdrawal than in the analogous position after 4 e4 – 6...♕e6 7 e4 h6 8 ♘e3 ♘e5 9 b3 ♘eg4 10 ♘d4 c5 11 ♘xf6 ♘xf6 12 ♘ge2 g6 13 g3 ♘g7 14 ♘g2 0-0 15 ♘d1 when White is slightly better, J.Lautier-A.Romero Holmes, Pamplona 1992), and now:

![Chess diagram](image)

a) After 6 e3 0-0 7 ♘f3 ♘c6 8 ♘d2 h6 9 ♘h4 Black has no problems equalizing on the basis of a timely ...♕e4. Perhaps the most precise is 9...a5!? , obtaining additional possibilities on the queenside (...♗b4, ...♕d7-c5 and ...a4-a3), while waiting for White's next move, so as to meet 10 ♘d3 with 10...♕g4 and 10 ♘e2 with 10...♕f5: for example, 10 ♘e2 ♘f5 11 0-0 ♘e4 with a good game for Black.

b) 6 e4 0-0 7 ♘f3 ♘c6 8 ♘d2 h6 9 ♘f4 ♘e8 10 ♘e2 ♘f8 11 ♘d3 ♘d7 12

53
0-0 0-0 13 \textit{c5} 13 \textit{b1} g5 14 \textit{e3} \textit{g7} 15 \textit{d2} a5 16 \textit{d1} b6 17 \textit{b3} \textit{e6} 18 a4 \textit{xc3} 19 bxc3 \textit{wf6} gave Black a perfectly acceptable position in L.Degerman-N.Davies, Gausdal 1994.

c) 6 \textit{f3} \textit{c6} 7 \textit{d2} h6 8 \textit{f4} \textit{f5} 9 e3 \textit{wd7} 10 \textit{e2} \textit{e4} 11 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 12 0-0 g5! 13 \textit{g3} h5 sees Black seizing the initiative on the kingside.

4...\textit{exd4} 5 \textit{xd4}

5...\textit{c6}

Also possible is 5...g6 which transpose to Azmaiparashvili's favourite line 1...d6 2 c4 g6 3 e4 e5 4 \textit{c3} exd4 5 \textit{xd4} \textit{f6}. After 6 \textit{g5} \textit{bd7} (instead 6...\textit{g7} 7 e5! \textit{we7} 8 \textit{d5} dxe5 9 \textit{wh4} \textit{xd5} 10 \textit{xe7} \textit{xe7} 11 c5 favours White, H.Stefansson-C.Hansen, Moscow 1989) White has:

a) 7 \textit{ge2} \textit{g7} 8 \textit{g3} h6 9 \textit{e3} 0-0 10 \textit{wd2} \textit{h7} 11 \textit{e2} \textit{e8} 12 h4 \textit{c5} 13 h5 g5 14 0-0-0 \textit{h7} 15 f3 \textit{we7} 16 \textit{d4} \textit{wf8} 17 f4 \textit{de6} 18 e5 \textit{g8} wasn't at all easy to assess in P.Glavina Rossi-Z.Azmaiparashvili, Cala Galdana 1994.

b) 7 0-0-0 h6 8 \textit{f4} \textit{g7} 9 \textit{wd2} g5 10 \textit{e3} \textit{g4} 11 \textit{e2} \textit{xe3} 12 \textit{exe3} \textit{c5} gave Black good play on the dark squares in G.Bagaturov-J.Nogueiras Santiago, Biel 1993.

c) 7 \textit{d2} h6 8 \textit{e3} \textit{g7} 9 \textit{e2} \textit{e5} 10 0-0-0 \textit{e6} 11 c5 dxc5 12 \textit{xc5} \textit{xd2+} 13 \textit{xd2} \textit{fd7} 14 \textit{e3} \textit{c4} 15 \textit{xc4} \textit{xc4} 16 \textit{f3} \textit{xc3} 17 bxc3 0-0-0 with an even position, A.Aleksandrov-Z.Azmaiparashvili, Shenyang 2000.

d) 7 f4 h6 8 \textit{h4} \textit{g7} 9 e5 dxe5 10 fxe5 c5 11 \textit{wd1} \textit{we7} 12 \textit{e2} \textit{xe5} 13 \textit{d5} \textit{wd8} 14 \textit{f3} was M.Sher-Z.Azmaiparashvili, Volgodonsk 1983, and here 14...g5 15 \textit{xe5} \textit{xd5} leads to an advantage for Black.

6 \textit{d2}

Perhaps 6 \textit{d1}! is a better retreat, not that this is exactly impressive for White after 6...\textit{g6}, leading to:

a) 7 \textit{e2} \textit{g7} 8 \textit{f3} 0-0 9 0-0 \textit{e8} 10 \textit{c2} \textit{b4} 11 \textit{b1} \textit{e7} 12 \textit{d2} c6 13 a3 \textit{a6} 14 \textit{c2} \textit{c5} 15 \textit{f3} h6 16 b4 \textit{e6} 17 \textit{b2} \textit{g5} and Black has slightly the better chances, L.Santa Torres-B.Lalic, Manila Olympiad 1992.

b) 7 \textit{f3} \textit{g7} 8 \textit{e3} 0-0 9 \textit{e2} \textit{e8} 10 \textit{d2} \textit{d7} 11 0-0 \textit{c5} 12 \textit{c1} b6 13
1 d4 \textit{\textdagger}f6 2 c4 d6 3 \textit{\textdagger}c3 e5 without 4 \textit{\textdagger}f3

\textit{\textdagger}xe1 \textit{\textdagger}b7 14 \textit{\textdagger}f1 \textit{\textdagger}xc3 15 \textit{\textdagger}xc3 \textit{\textdagger}xe4 16 \textit{\textdagger}xe4 \textit{\textdagger}xe4 17 \textit{\textdagger}h6 \textit{\textdagger}xe1 18 \textit{\textdagger}xe1 \textit{\textdagger}e5 and Black was better in E.De Hulster-R.Hartoch, Haarlem 1995.

c) 7 f3 \textit{\textdagger}g7 8 \textit{\textdagger}e3 \textit{\textdagger}e6 9 \textit{\textdagger}wd2 \textit{\textdagger}e5 10 b3 a5 11 \textit{\textdagger}c1 \textit{\textdagger}fd7 and in the case of 12 \textit{\textdagger}ge2 White should reckon with 12....\textit{\textdagger}xc4?!, as occurred in O.Peraza-L.Vadasz, Havana 1967.

d) 7 \textit{\textdagger}ge2 \textit{\textdagger}g7 8 f3 \textit{\textdagger}d7 9 \textit{\textdagger}e3 0-0 10 \textit{\textdagger}wd2 \textit{\textdagger}b6 followed by ...f5 appears slightly better for Black.

e) 7 \textit{\textdagger}d3!? \textit{\textdagger}g7 8 \textit{\textdagger}ge2 0-0 9 0-0 (or 9 \textit{\textdagger}c2 \textit{\textdagger}e6 10 b3 a6 preparing ...b5) 9....\textit{\textdagger}d7 with the idea of ...\textit{\textdagger}c5 gives Black a perfectly acceptable position, such as after 10 f3 \textit{\textdagger}c5 11 \textit{\textdagger}c2 \textit{\textdagger}e6 12 b3 a5.

6...\textit{\textdagger}g6

7 \textit{\textdagger}b3

Black has also done well against the alternatives, including:

a) 7 \textit{\textdagger}d3 \textit{\textdagger}g7 8 \textit{\textdagger}ge2 0-0 9 0-0 \textit{\textdagger}d7! (again we see this strong regrouping) 10 b3 \textit{\textdagger}c5 11 \textit{\textdagger}b2 f5 12 \textit{\textdagger}b1 \textit{\textdagger}f6 13 exf5 \textit{\textdagger}xf5 14 \textit{\textdagger}g3 \textit{\textdagger}d4 15 \textit{\textdagger}wd4 \textit{\textdagger}xd4 16 \textit{\textdagger}xf5 \textit{\textdagger}xf5 17 \textit{\textdagger}ad1

\textit{\textdagger}xg3 18 hxg3 \textit{\textdagger}ae8 gives Black a promising game, P.Harikrishna-V.Akobian, Wijk aan Zee 2010.

b) 7 g3 \textit{\textdagger}g7 8 \textit{\textdagger}g2 0-0 9 \textit{\textdagger}ge2 a5 10 0-0 \textit{\textdagger}e8 11 \textit{\textdagger}wc2 \textit{\textdagger}b4 12 \textit{\textdagger}d1 a4 13 a3 \textit{\textdagger}c6 14 \textit{\textdagger}wc2 \textit{\textdagger}d7 15 \textit{\textdagger}e3 \textit{\textdagger}g4 16 \textit{\textdagger}f4 \textit{\textdagger}a5 and Black is better L.Aronin-V.Zagorovsky, Leningrad 1947.

7....\textit{\textdagger}g7 8 \textit{\textdagger}b2 0-0

9 \textit{\textdagger}d3

Instead 9 f3?! \textit{\textdagger}e6 10 \textit{\textdagger}d1 \textit{\textdagger}h5 11 \textit{\textdagger}d3 f5 isn't at all easy to assess, but possibly White should go in for this, as he faces problems in the game and 9 \textit{\textdagger}ge2 \textit{\textdagger}e8 10 f3 a6 11 g3 \textit{\textdagger}d7 12 \textit{\textdagger}g2 b5 also leads to a slight advantage for Black.

After the text move, Black, who has better development, should fight for the initiative, otherwise White, who has a strong centre, will have comfortable play after finishing his development.

9....\textit{\textdagger}g4!

Promising, although another good way is 9....\textit{\textdagger}d7 followed by ...\textit{\textdagger}c5 and ...f5.
10 \( \text{Qg}2 \)

White wants to improve in comparison with the earlier game Alatortsev-Boleslavsky, where Black obtained a dangerous initiative, but Polugaevsky soon comes under a real tsunami.

10 \( \text{Qf}3 \) allows 10...\( \text{Qg}e5 \) 11 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) (11 \( \text{Qe}2 \) loses a tempo and allows Black to realize his plan: 11...\( \text{Qxf}3+ \) 12 \( \text{Qxf}3 \) \( \text{Qd}4 \) 13 \( \text{Qd}1 \) \( \text{Qf}5 \) and Black had the better chances in V.Alatortsev-I.Boleslavsky, Moscow 1950) 11...\( \text{dx}e5 \) (seizing the important d4-square) 12 0-0 \( \text{Qe}6 \) 13 \( \text{had}1 \) \( \text{Wh}4 \) 14 \( \text{Qd}5 \) \( \text{Qac}8 \) 15 \( \text{We}1 \) \( \text{Qfd}8 \) 16 \( \text{Qf}4 \) \( \text{Qxe}1 \) 17 \( \text{Qdx}e1 \) \( \text{ex}f4 \) 18 \( \text{Qxg}7 \) \( \text{Qxg}7 \) 19 \( \text{Qxf}4 \) \( \text{Qe}5 \) and Black is better, M.Wubben-J.De la Villa Garcia, Andorra 2003.

10...\( \text{Wh}4 \)

Another interesting and active option is 10...\( \text{Qc}e5 \) 11 \( \text{Qc}2 \) \( \text{Qh}6 \) (or even 11...\( \text{Wh}4!? \)) 12 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{Wh}4+ \) 13 \( \text{Qg}3 \) \( \text{Qxh}2 \) 14 \( \text{Qe}2 \) \( \text{Qhf}3+ \) 15 \( \text{Qxf}3 \) \( \text{Qxh}1+ \) 16 \( \text{Qxh}1 \) \( \text{Qxf}3+ \) 17 \( \text{Qd}1 \) \( \text{Qx}d2 \) 18 \( \text{Qxd}2 \) \( \text{Qg}7 \) 19 \( \text{Qxg}7 \) \( \text{Qxg}7 \) 20 \( \text{Qhg}3 \) \( \text{Qg}4 \) 21 \( \text{Qc}3 \) c6 22 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{Qfe}8 \) with an even position, T.Reilly-C.McNab, London 1993.

However, 10...\( \text{Qge}5 \) was not logical here in view of 11 \( \text{Qc}2 \) followed by \( \text{f}2-\text{f}4 \).

11 \( \text{Qg}3?! \)

The knight has now moved twice and only to reach a bad square. Indeed, it will probably have to move again before too long.

White didn’t like to weaken the light squares with 11 g3, but objectively this was the best chance. Here 11...\( \text{Wd}8 \) would have been slightly better for Black, whereas 11...\( \text{Qce}5?! \) 12 \( \text{gxh}4 \) \( \text{Qf}3+ \) 13 \( \text{Qd}1 \) \( \text{Qxf}2+ \) 14 \( \text{Qc}2 \) \( \text{Qxd}2 \) 15 \( \text{Qxd}2 \) \( \text{Qh}1+ \) 16 \( \text{Qxh}1 \) slightly favours White, as pointed out by Emms.

11...\( \text{Qge}5 \)

Black prepares \( ...\text{f}5 \), but this preparation was unnecessary. Indeed, the immediate 11...\( \text{f}5! \) was strong. Some annotators said that this would have been met by 12 \( \text{f}4 \) (12 \( \text{ex}f5 \) \( \text{Qh}6 \) sees Black taking the upper hand), but then 12...\( \text{Qd}4! \) follows, whereas 12...\( \text{Qxh}2 \) gives nothing due to 13 \( \text{Qe}2 \).

12 0-0

The best defence was 12 \( \text{Qe}2 \) \( \text{Qh}6 \)
13 \( \texttt{wd1 f5} \) 14 \( \texttt{exf5 gxf5} \) 15 0-0 and if 15...f4 then 16 \( \texttt{wd5+ wh8} \) 17 \( \texttt{we4} \).

12...f5!

12...\( \texttt{dg4} \) was the obvious continuation when after 13 \( \texttt{h3 dxf2} \) it looks like Black is simply winning a pawn, but the queen sacrifice 14 \( \texttt{wxg2! ad4} \) 15 \( \texttt{wxg4 exg4} \) 16 \( \texttt{dxg4 c5} \) 17 \( \texttt{exe2 xex2+} \) 18 \( \texttt{exe2} \) f5 19 \( \texttt{xf4 wh6} \) 20 \( \texttt{af1} \) wasn't at all easy to assess.

13 \( \texttt{f3 h6} \)

Preparing a pawn attack with ...f4 followed by ...g5-g4.

14 \( \texttt{wd1 f4} \) 15 \( \texttt{ge2 g5} \) 16 \( \texttt{d5 g4} \) 17 \( \texttt{g3!} \)

White had clearly pinned his hopes on this move.

17...\( \texttt{fxg3} \) 18 \( \texttt{hxg3 wh3} \) 19 \( \texttt{f4 e6!} \)

Somewhat stronger than 19...\( \texttt{gf3+?} \)

20 \( \texttt{gf2} \) \( \texttt{wh2+} \) 21 \( \texttt{he3} \) when there would have been nothing left for Black's attack.

20 \( \texttt{c2} \)

Instead 20 \( \texttt{fxe5?} \) would have failed to 20...\( \texttt{xd5} \) 21 \( \texttt{exd5 e3+} \), while in the case of 20 \( \texttt{b1} \) Black has no combination as in the game, but after 20...\( \texttt{xd5} \) 21 \( \texttt{xd5+ f7} \) his attacking possibilities would still have been dangerous.

20...\( \texttt{xf7} \) 21 \( \texttt{f2} \) \( \texttt{wh2}+ \) 22 \( \texttt{e3} \) \( \texttt{xd5} \) 23 \( \texttt{cxd5 b4} \) 24 \( \texttt{h1} \)

24...\( \texttt{xf4!!} \)

A brilliant queen sacrifice.

25 \( \texttt{xbh2} \) \( \texttt{xf3+} \) 26 \( \texttt{xd4 g7} \)

Here 26...\( \texttt{c5+} \) 27 \( \texttt{dxc6 b5}! \) was another way to win: 28 \( \texttt{d3} \) \( \texttt{exc6+} \) 29 \( \texttt{c3} \) \( \texttt{g7+} \) 30 \( \texttt{d2} \) \( \texttt{xd3+} \) 31 \( \texttt{e1} \) \( \texttt{xb2} \) with a decisive advantage for Black.

27 \( \texttt{a4?} \)

More persistent was 27 \( \texttt{g1} \), although after 27...\( \texttt{e3} \) 28 \( \texttt{e2} \) \( \texttt{f3} \) 29 \( \texttt{g1} \) \( \texttt{ed3+} \) 30 \( \texttt{c4} \) \( \texttt{xb2+} \) 31 \( \texttt{xb4} \)

\( \texttt{xc3+} \) 32 \( \texttt{a3} \) \( \texttt{b5} \) 33 \( \texttt{wd4} \) \( \texttt{xd4} \) 34 \( \texttt{xf3} \)

\( \texttt{xc3} \) 35 \( \texttt{b4} \) \( \texttt{c4+} \) 36 \( \texttt{b3} \) \( \texttt{xa1} \) 37 \( \texttt{g5} \)
g3 Black has a decisive advantage.
Likewise, 27 d3 d6+ 28 e5 dxe5+ 29 c4 xxb2+ 30 xxb4 xc3+ 31 a3 xd1 32 xd1 xg3 leads to a winning advantage for Black.
27...c5+ 28 dxc6 bxc6

29 d3 d6+ 30 c4 d5+ 31 exd5
cxd5+ 32 b5 d8+ 33 c6+ 0-1
An incredibly beautiful game.

Game 12
V.Epishin-V.Vorotnikov
St. Petersburg 1997

1 d4 f6 2 c4 d6 3 c3 e5 4 dxe5 dxe5
5 wxd8+ xd8

This basic endgame structure is well known to be good for Black. Black’s position is solid and his piece coordination is good, as the pawn exchange in the centre has allowed Black equal space and freed the f8-bishop. Moreover, the pawn at c4 limits the scope of White’s light-squared bishop, weakens the dark squares and presents a potential target for attack.

This particular brand of exchange variation is reasonably considered fairly safe for Black, although despite this it has been played often enough. There are two types of player who apply this exchange as White: first are those who hope for drawish simplification against a stronger opponent, and second are the strong players who like to play the resulting simple positions, searching for winning chances with minimal risk. Among grandmasters this exchange has often been applied by the Russian Vladimir Epishin and the Scot Jonathan Rowson.

6 f3
Not just an attack on the e5-pawn, but also preparation for g1.

6 g5 is also very popular, but much more harmless. White is forcing the mobilization of Black’s queenside and after 6...e6 (6...d7 is also good: for example, 7 0-0-0 c6 8 xf6+ gxf6 9 g3 b4 10 e4 f5 11 f6 e7 12 xd7 xd7 13 f3 e6 14 xe5 d6 15 d3 xc4 with an even position, V.Moskalenko-V.Kozlov, Riga 1988)
0-0-0 \( c8 \) Black has no difficulties and will easily finish his development.

Following 8 \( f3 \) (if 8 e3 \( fd7 \)) 8...\( c5 \) 9 \( xf6 \) \( gxf6 \) 10 e3 \( d7 \) 11 g3 a5 12 \( h4 \) \( b4 \) 13 \( c2 \) \( c5 \) 14 f3 c6 15 \( e2 \) \( c7 \) 16 \( h1 \) \( h8 \) 17 \( e4 \) b5 Black's instructive play left him somewhat for choice in T.Roussel Roozmon-E.Bacrot, Montreal 2009.

Instead 6 e4 weakens the dark squares, especially d4, and after 6...\( b4 \) 7 \( d2 \) \( e6 \) 8 0-0-0 \( bd7 \) 9 f3 c6 10 \( b1 \) a5 11 b3 \( e7 \) 12 \( d3 \) \( c5 \) 13 \( c2 \) \( h8 \) 14 \( ge2 \) a4 Black has slightly the better chances.

6...\( fd7 \)!

Played with the idea of ...f7-f6, strengthening the centre and limiting White's dark-squared bishop.

After the natural 6...\( bd7 \) the most dangerous plan is 7 \( g1 \)! followed by g2-g4, as has been successfully applied by both Epishin and Rowson.

7 g4?!

This blast prepares to undermine Black's pawn structure and brings the king's rook and bishop into the action.

Moreover, this plan is White's best hope for an advantage. In other cases often some combination of ...c6, ...\( c7 \), ...a5, ...\( a6 \) and ...f6 gives Black a good game. For example:

a) 7 b3 was recommended by Geller. Then 7...f6 (or 7...c6 8 \( b2 \) f6 9 g4) 8 \( b2 \) c6 9 0-0-0 a5 10 g4 transposes to our main game.

b) 7 \( d2 \) was played by Spassky and recommended in BCO2. Following 7...f6 (the most precise; 7...c6 allows White to realize his plan: 8 g4 a5 9 g5 \( a6 \) 10 h4 \( ac5 \) 11 \( e3 \) f5!?) 12 gxf6 gxf6 13 0-0-0 gives White a small advantage, B.Spassky-F.Gheorghiu, Siegen Olympiad 1970) 8 0-0-0 (the immediate 8 g4? loses a pawn after 8...\( b6 \), attacking both c4 and g4) 8...c6 9 g4 (after 9 \( g1 \) Black is in time to create counterplay: 9...\( c7 \) 10 \( b6 \) 11 b3 a5 12 \( g3 \) \( e6 \) 13 \( h3 \) \( d7 \) 14 \( h4 \) g6 15 \( a3+ \) 16 \( b1 \) \( c5 \) with an even position in K.Szromba-V.Sergeev, Polanica Zdroj 2001) 9...\( b6 \) Black is very solid and White needs to try to exploit his lead in development.
A principled continuation is 10 \( \text{Qxe5!} \), but after 10...\( \text{fxe5!} \) (10...\( \text{e8} \) 11 c5! \( \text{xc5} \) 12 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{e7} \) 13 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{c4} \) 14 \( \text{e1!} \) \( \text{d7} \) 15 \( \text{e4} \) slightly favours White, S.Tatai-I.Hausner, Balatonbereny 1982) 11 \( \text{g5+} \) 12 \( \text{d8+} \) \( \text{f7} \) 13 c5 h6 14 \( \text{cxb6} \) \( \text{d7} \) 15 \( \text{h4} \) g5 16 \( \text{g3} \) axb6 Black has the strong idea of ...\( \text{e7} \), catching the rook.

c) 7 \( \text{e3} \) is another logical try, having in mind the same plan of g2-g4. After 7...c6 8 0-0-0 f6 9 g4 (9 g3 \( \text{c7} \) 10 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 11 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 12 \( \text{xc8} \) \( \text{xc8} \) leads to drawish simplification) 9...\( \text{c7} \) White might try:

c1) 10 h4?! \( \text{b6} \) 11 \( \text{xb6+} \) axb6 12 g5 \( \text{e6} \) 13 gxf6 gxf6 14 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{b4} \) 15 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{f5+} \) 16 e4 \( \text{g6} \) 17 a3 \( \text{c5} \) 18 \( \text{h2} \) \( \text{g8} \) 19 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{h5} \) 20 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d7} \) and Black is better, A.Tolush-A.Lutikov, Leningrad 1955.

c2) 10 g5 \( \text{b6} \) 11 gxf6 gxf6 12 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{e6} \) 13 \( \text{ce4} \) \( \text{d8d7} \) 14 b3 a5 15 a4 \( \text{g8} \) 16 h4 h6 17 g3 \( \text{c5} \) 18 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 19 \( \text{h3} \) f5 20 \( \text{hg1} \) \( \text{af8} \) leads to an approximately equal position, S.Yuferov-B.Gelfand, Belarus 1983.

c3) 10 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{a6} \) 11 h4 \( \text{dc5} \) 12 g5 \( \text{e6} \) 13 b3 \( \text{g8} \) 14 gxf6 gxf6 15 \( \text{xc8} \) \( \text{xc8} \) 16 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 17 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 18 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 19 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{c5} \) was agreed drawn which was a definite success for Black in S.Gligoric-F.Garcia Orus, The Hague 1966.

d) 7 g3 is the quiet continuation. It is not too dangerous, but should not be underestimated either. After 7...f6 White might try:

\[ \text{d1) The plan of exchanging light-squared bishops on the h3-c8 diagonal doesn't work:} \]
\[ 8 \text{h3} \text{b4} 9 \text{d2} \text{b6} 10 \text{xc8} \text{xc8} 11 \text{b3} \text{a5} 12 \text{d1} \text{a5} 13 \text{e4} \text{c6} 14 \text{a4} \text{e7} 15 \text{c3} \text{d7} 16 0-0 \text{a6} 17 \text{d5} \text{f5} \text{and Black is better, G.Sanjib-E.Ubilava, New Delhi 2008.} \]

\[ \text{d2) 8 \text{e3} \text{c6} 9 \text{h3} \text{c7} 10 0-0 \text{c5} 11 \text{xc5} \text{xc5} 12 \text{xc8} \text{xc8} 13 \text{fd1} \text{a5} 14 \text{b3} \text{ba6} 15 \text{d2} \text{a4} \text{and again Black is better, A.Zirngibl-O.Neikirkh, Kienbaum 1958.} \]

\[ \text{d3) 8 \text{g2} \text{c6} 9 \text{e3} \text{the most subtle approach, as applied by Malaniuk; instead} \text{9 0-0 c7} 10 \text{e3} \text{a5} 11 \text{d4} \text{a6} 12 \text{d2} \text{dc5} 13 \text{c3} \text{e6} 14 \text{b3} \text{e7} \]
15 ∆c1 ∆hd8 was equal and drawn in M.Vidmar-A.Bozic, Ljubljana 1947) 9...a5 (if 9...∆c7 10 ∆d2 White has the idea of ∆de4 and probably f2-f4) 10 ∆a4 (or 10 0-0 ∆c7 11 ∆fd1 ∆c5 with rough equality) 10...∆a6 is unclear.

e) 7 e3 is absolutely harmless: 7...f6 8 ∆e2 c6 9 0-0 a5 10 ∆d1 ∆a6 11 ∆d2 ∆c7 12 ∆de4 ∆dc5 13 ∆d2 ∆xe4 14 ∆xe4 ∆c5 15 ∆xc5 ∆xc5 with an even position in M.Bobotsov-F.Gheorghiu, Bucharest 1971.

f) The aggressive swoop 7 ∆g5 is an interesting try to create some complications and exploit Black’s inability to castle, but objectively it shouldn’t give White any advantage. After 7...∆e8 8 f4 ∆b4 9 ∆d2 exf4 10 0-0-0 (if 10 g3 h6 11 ∆f3 fxg3 12 hxg3 ∆b6 13 ∆b5 ∆xd2+ 14 ∆xd2 ∆a6 15 ∆g2 c6 16 ∆d4 ∆e7 17 ∆f3 ∆d8 and Black is better, J.Lautner-L.Mazi, Aschach 2002) Black has:

f1) 10...h6 11 ∆f3 ∆c5?! 12 e3! and Black’s inability to castle began to tell in O.Romanishin-A.Valdes Castillo, Cienfuegos 1977.

f2) 10...∆c5 is correct and if now 11 e3 then 11...f6 12 ∆f3 ∆xc3 13 ∆xc3 fxe3. Here in comparison to Romanishin’s game, Black’s king has a safe square on f7 and the g7-pawn is not under attack.

Returning to the critical 7 g4:

7...c6

8 b3

White protects the c4-pawn and prepares to finish his queenside development by ∆b2 and 0-0-0. Others:

a) The immediate 8 g5 is also in the spirit of White’s plan. A possible continuation is 8...∆c7 (worse is 8...∆b4 9 ∆d2 a5 10 a3 ∆d6 11 ∆e4 ∆c7 12 ∆c3 ∆e7 13 h4 with the initiative for White in L.Christiansen-N.Mursed, New York 1989) 9 ∆d2 ∆a6 10 0-0-0 f5! (if Black tries to avoid moving his f-pawn, White will put pressure on the e5-pawn with ∆e4 and ∆c3) 11 gxf6 gxf6 12 ∆g1 ∆dc5 13 b3 ∆e6.

(See following diagram)

Here with the idea of ...∆d8 and ...∆g8 Black can maintain rough equality.
b) 8 \( \text{Re3} \) f6 9 0-0-0 \( \text{Cf7} \) transposes to note 'c' to White's 7th move, above.

c) 8 h4 f6 9 g5 \( \text{Cc5} \) 10 h5 \( \text{Re6} \) 11 b3 \( \text{Bbd7} \) 12 h6 f5 13 \( \text{Kh3} \) a5 14 \( \text{Re3} \) g6 15 0-0-0 \( \text{Cc7} \) 16 \( \text{Re5} \) \( \text{Re5} \) 17 \( \text{Ff4} \) \( \text{Dd7} \) 18 \( \text{Exd7}+ \) \( \text{Exd7} \) 19 \( \text{Exe5} \) \( \text{Aa3}+ \) 20 \( \text{Ac2} \) \( \text{He8} \) 21 \( \text{Af6} \) \( \text{Cf7} \) 22 e3 a4! and White hadn't enough for the exchange in D.Bronstein-A.Fuderer, Kiev 1959.

8...f6 9 \( \text{Ab2} \)

What if 9 g5 here? Then 9...\( \text{Cc7} \) 10 \( \text{Ab2} \) \( \text{Cc5} \) 11 gxf6 gxf6 12 \( \text{Gg1} \) \( \text{Re6} \) 13 0-0-0 \( \text{Bba6} \) reaches a position which can be compared with the similar one after 8 g5 (variation 'a', above), where White's bishop is still on d2.

The comparison is clearly in Black's favour: White's queenside pawns are immobilized (there's no \( \text{Bb2} \) to protect the b3-pawn and so facilitate the idea of a3 and b4), the weakening of the c1-h6 diagonal can be exploited with ...\( \text{Kh6}+ \), and e2-e3 will weaken the d3-square, thereby inviting ...\( \text{Aa4} \) and ...\( \text{Cc5} \).

9...a5

Not just securing space on the queenside, but also having in mind the idea of ...a5-a4 at an appropriate moment.

Instead 9...\( \text{Cc7} \) is unnecessary, but 9...\( \text{Cc5} \) is enough for equality, having in mind the setup considered, above, after 9 g5.

10 0-0-0 \( \text{Cc7} \) 11 g5 \( \text{Cc5} \)

12 \( \text{Gg1} \)

Instead 12 h4 has not been seen in practice yet, but the idea of h5-h6, as well as probably \( \text{Kh3} \), is a logical plan to destroy Black's pawn chain (g7-f6-e5). However, it does give Black the tempi required to finish his development and create counterplay, with
1 d4 \( \Delta f6 \) 2 c4 d6 3 \( \Delta c3 \) e5 without 4 \( \Delta f3 \)

12...\( \Delta ba6 \) (12...a4 13 b4 a3 14 \( \Delta a1 \) \( \Delta cd7 \) 15 \( \Delta e4 \) \( \Delta xb4 \) runs into 16 gxf6 gxf6 17 \( \Delta xf6! \)) 13 h5 \( \Delta e7 \) 14 h6 g6 15 gxf6 \( \Delta xf6 \).

From a structural point of view White has achieved his goal here, but it's problematic to take control over the critical e4-square. A tactical idea is 16 \( \Delta xe5! \) (if 16 \( \Delta d2 \) then 16...\( \Delta f5 \)), but 16...\( \Delta b4! \) leads to interesting complications: 17 \( \Delta xg6! \) \( \Delta g8! \) 18 \( \Delta e5 \) a4! 19 \( \Delta xa4 \) \( \Delta e4! \) and by the sacrifice of three pawns, Black has maximized the power of his pieces. Apart from 20.\( \Delta xf2 \), he threatens 20...b5. The 'quiet' opening has led to an extremely unclear situation! Indeed, this line represents the brightest demonstration of the strategic and tactical ideas for both sides.

12...\( \Delta f5 \)

It is not the suitable moment for 12...a4?! in view of tactical ideas on the e5-square: 13 b4 a3 14 \( \Delta a1 \) \( \Delta cd7 \) (or 14...\( \Delta a4 \) 15 gxf6 gxf6 16 \( \Delta xe5! \)) 15 gxf6 gxf6 16 \( \Delta e4 \) \( \Delta xb4 \) 17 \( \Delta xf6! \) is again rather annoying for Black.

13 \( \Delta g3 \)

With the idea of \( \Delta h3 \). This is the correct idea from a positional point of view, but again it costs a tempo.

13...\( \Delta bd7 \)

Probably now was the right moment for 13...a4! 14 b4 a3 15 \( \Delta a1 \) \( \Delta cd7 \), leading to complex play.

14 \( \Delta h4 \) \( \Delta e6 \) 15 gxf6

15...\( \Delta xf6! \)

A concrete approach.

Instead if 15...gxf6 then 16 \( \Delta h3 \) begins to exploit Black's light-square weaknesses.

16 \( \Delta h3 \) \( \Delta e8 \) 17 \( \Delta xe6 \) \( \Delta xe6 \) 18 \( \Delta f3 \) h6

19 \( \Delta g6 \)

White tries to fix some weaknesses
in Black's camp in a bid to maintain the pressure.
19...\( \text{c8} \) 20 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 21 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{g8} \) 22 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{e8} \) 23 \( \text{f3} \) e4 24 \( \text{f5} \) b6

White has kept up some pressure, but Black has enough resources to hold.
25 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{cd7} \) 26 e3 \( \text{c7} \) 27 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{d6} \) 28 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 29 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{ee8} \) 30 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{e6} \) 31 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{ee8} \) 32 h4 \( \text{e5} \) 33 \( \text{xe5+} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 34 h5 \( \text{f3} \) 35 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{e5} \) 36 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{d8} \) 37 \( \text{xd8} \) \( \text{xd8} \) 38 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 39 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{xh5} \) 40 \( \text{f7} \) g5 41 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{h2} \) 42 \( \text{d3} \) g4 43 \( \text{f4} \) g3 44 \( \text{xe4} \) gxf2 45 \( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{xf2+} \) 46 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{xa2} \) \( \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} \)

Game 13
R.Dzindzichashvili-I.Sokolov
New York 1996

1 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 2 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 3 \( \text{c3} \) e5 4 e3
This quiet and solid continuation is usually chosen by players who do not aspire to theoretical discussions in complex opening lines and prefer to transfer the game into the middlegame. White's play reminds one of the manner in which Black often plays against the King's Indian Attack, such as with 1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{f3} \) e6 3 d3 d5.
4...\( \text{bd7} \)
4...\( \text{e7!} \) can be suggested as an alternative, recalling Chigorin's variation of the French Defence, 1 e4 e6 2 \( \text{e2} \).
Now White's possibilities of development are limited (5 \( \text{d3} \) is impossible), and Black's b8-knight may find a different route into the game than via d7. In particular against a g3, \( \text{g2} \) and \( \text{e2} \) set-up Black can try to play ...c6, ...a5 and ...\( \text{a6} \), as was played in a similar situation in M.Kobalia-A.Cherniaev, Wijk aan Zee 1998.

Here White has three ways to develop his kingside: \( \text{f3} \) and \( \text{e2} \), \( \text{d3} \) and \( \text{e2} \), or g3, \( \text{g2} \) and \( \text{e2} \).
5 \( \text{d3} \)
Alternatively:
a) For 5 g3 see the next game.
b) 5 \( \text{f3} \) deprives White of the possibility of f2-f4 and after 5...g6 he has tried:
a) 6 b3 \( \text{g7} \) 7 dxe5 \( \text{xe5} \) 8 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 9 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 10 \( \text{b2} \) 0-0 11 0-0 a5
with the idea of ...c5 is about equal.

b) 6 g3 g7 7 g2 0-0 8 0-0 c6 9 b3
e4 10 g5 d5 11 cxd5 cxd5 12 f3 exf3
13 xf3 h6 14 dh3 db6 with an even
position, G.Bartha-W.Uhmann, Prague
1954.

c) 6 e2 g7 7 0-0 0-0 reaches a
typical situation for the aforemen-
tioned King's Indian Attack or Sicilian
lines, here with colours reversed and an
extra tempo for White.

Now 8 b4 is the fastest way to cre-
ate queenside play (if White plays qui-
etly, then Black has the plan of ...e5-e4
followed by obtaining a kingside initia-
tive, just like Fischer used to do in the
King's Indian Attack: for example, 8
w2 e8 9 b3 w7 10 b2 e4 11 cd2
e8 12 b4 h5 13 b5 h4 14 wae1 ef5 15
wd1 e8h7 16 f3 g5 17 f4 gh7 18
w3 w7d1 19 ed1 e6 20 d5 g5 with
mutual chances in B.Sarmiento Al-
fonso-A.Strikovic, Mesa 1992), but after
8...a5 9 b5 (9 bxa5 axa5 10 a4 we8 11
a3 exd4 12 exd4 b6 13 db5 we4
gives Black a promising game) 9...we8
10 a4 exd4 11 exd4 db6 12 db2 (12
w3 e6 13 ed2 wd7 has the idea of
...d4 and 14 h3 xh3! will likely lead
to a draw by perpetual check) 12...we6
13 ed2 fd7 the weak pawns on d4
and c4 give Black good play, such as
after 14 ce4 d5.

5...g6 6 ge2

6 ef3 is less consistent, as White
loses the possibility to push the f-pawn.
After 6...g7 7 0-0 0-0 we have:

a) 8 d5 c5 9 c2 e4 10 d4 a5 11
h3 we8 12 d2 h5 13 w2 ef4 14
exf4 xd4 is unclear.

b) 8 e1 we8 9 w2 exd4 10 exd4
xe1+ 11 xe1 c5 12 d5 we5 13 e2
f5 14 wb3 w7 with an even game.

c) 8 wc2 we8 9 dd2 exd4! 10 exd4
c5 is slightly better for Black.

Practice has also seen the immediate
6 f4, but after 6...g7 (or 6...we7 7
g2 e4 8 b1 c6 9 w2 db6 10 b3
e5 11 a4 with mutual chances in
F.Dus Chotimirsky-J.Mieses, St Peters-
burg 1909) 7 w3 0-0 8 0-0 we8 9 w2
w7 10 g5 exd4 11 exd4 g4 Black
prepared to invade the resulting hole
on e3 in S.Schmidt Schaeffer-M.Shvartz,
German League 2009.

6...\textit{g7} 7 0-0

Instead after 7 \textit{c2} 0-0 8 b3, 8...c5!? deserves attention, utilizing the temporarily-weakened long diagonal. For example:

a) 9 0-0 \textit{cxd4} 10 \textit{exd4} \textit{g4} 11 d5 f5 with excellent play for Black.

b) 9 dxc5 allows Black to create a dangerous initiative after 9...e4 10 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 11 \textit{wxe4} \textit{xc5} 12 \textit{wd5} \textit{a5} (as well as 13...\textit{xc3}, Black threatens 13...\textit{xb3}) 13 \textit{b2} \textit{f5} 14 0-0 \textit{f3}.

c) 9 dxe5 \textit{xe5} (with the idea of breaking with ...d6-d5) 10 e4 \textit{e8} 11 f3 \textit{h5} followed by ...f5 gives Black the initiative.

d) 9 d5 e4 10 \textit{xe4} \textit{xe4} 11 \textit{wxe4} b5! 12 cxb5 a6 with good compensation for the pawn.

7...0-0

8 b4

White chooses to start some action on the left-hand side of the board, thus leaving the right flank for Black's counterplay. Alternatively:

a) White might further his development with the aim of playing in the centre: 8 \textit{w2} \textit{h5} (8...\textit{e8} 9 \textit{d2} c6 leads to an approximately equal position) 9 f3 (9 f4?! f5 10 \textit{fxe5} dxe5 11 c5 \textit{h8} 12 \textit{d2} c6 13 \textit{c4} \textit{df6} is better for Black) 9...f5 10 \textit{d2} c6 11 b4 \textit{exd4} 12 \textit{exd4} c5 13 bxc5 dxc5 14 d5 \textit{e5} is unclear.

b) 8 f4 c6 and then:

b1) 9 f5 \textit{e8} 10 \textit{g3} d5 gives Black slightly the better chances.

b2) 9 b4?! \textit{e8} 10 \textit{b1} \textit{b6} 11 \textit{fxe5} dxe5 12 c5? \textit{exd4} 13 \textit{xd4} \textit{g4}! already gives Black a decisive advantage.

b3) 9 \textit{fxe5} dxe5 10 d5 \textit{c5} 11 \textit{c2} cxd5 12 cxd5 e4 is quite unclear.

c) 8 b3 \textit{e8} (or the initially more-restrained 8...b6 9 f4 \textit{b7} 10 \textit{g3} \textit{exd4} 11 \textit{exd4} \textit{h5} 12 \textit{ce2} \textit{xg3} 13 h\textit{g3} \textit{c5} 14 \textit{b1} \textit{xd3} 15 \textit{wd3} \textit{c8} and Black was better in F.Filipov-B.Markov, Sofia 1945) 9 \textit{b2} \textit{exd4} 10 \textit{exd4} d5 11 \textit{a3} dxc4 12 bxc4 c5 gives Black a promising game.

b) 8d5 \textit{c5}, leading to:

d1) 9 \textit{c2} \textit{h5} 10 e4 f5 isn't at all easy to assess.
d2) 9 ∆g3 ∆xd3 10 w xd3 ∆g4 11 e4 f5 is unclear.

d3) 9 e4 ∆xd3 10 w xd3 ∆h5 11 ∆e3 (after 11 f4 f5 12 ∆e3 fxe4 Black is better) 11...a6 12 a4 f5 13 exf5 gxf5 14 f3 w f6 is slightly better for Black.

The tactical aim is to prepare ...e5-e4, avoiding the pawn being attacked by ∆g3. While at the moment White's development seems slightly better, the first thing we should notice when estimating the chances in this opposite-side play is 'where are the kings?' They are on Black's side of the board, so Black's play may potentially be the more dangerous, as checkmate is, of course, always the biggest threat.

A quieter but also quite valid approach is 9...c6.

10 h3

Aimed against ...h4-h3, but this creates a target for attack with ...g5-g4. Still, after 10 w c2 h4 it's not clear White has anything better than 11 h3, reaching the next note.

10...h4 11 w b3

If 11 w c2, obtaining control over the e4-square, then 11...c6 with the idea of ...w e7 and ...e4, thereby avoiding 11...w e7 12 d d5.

11...e4 12 c c2 w f8

Black is ready to push ...g5-g4.

13 d5
White has no real target on the queenside, so he has to try to attack the e4-pawn with \textit{Ad}1-d4.

13...g5 14 \textit{Ad}1 \textit{Ag6} 15 \textit{Ad}4 g4

This seems like the critical moment. Sokolov opts to win the exchange. Instead 22...f5 23 \textit{Ax}e5 \textit{Ax}e5 24 f4 wasn’t at all easy to assess, but 22...h3! 23 \textit{Ah}6 would have left Black with some advantage thanks to his active queen and passed h-pawn.

16 \textit{Gxe4}

White has destroyed an important central pawn, but his kingside is in danger. Indeed, Black has good attacking prospects.

16...\textit{Gxh3} 17 \textit{Gxf6+} \textit{Gxf6} 18 \textit{Ge4} \textit{Ge5}!

The only move, but this was probably underestimated by White in his preliminary calculations.

19 \textit{Axe5} dxe5 20 f3 hXg2 21 \textit{Axg2} \textit{Gg5+} 22 \textit{Gf2}

22...\textit{Gf5}

This position also may arise from the Fianchetto Variation of the King’s Indian and was the subject of a discussion in the 1954 World Championship match between Botvinnik and Smyslov. With White, Smyslov liked to play the Closed Sicilian and here White’s set-up reminds us of how Black often plays
against that opening.

8 a4

This rare continuation was recommended by Botvinnik as an alternative to the plan of b3 and a3. White’s idea is to grab space on the queenside and prevent Black’s possible counterplay with ...a6, ...b8 and ...b5.

Practice has also seen:

a) 8 0-0 e8 9 b3 and now:

a1) 9...h5 10 dxe5! dxe5 11 a3 h4?! was strongly met by the unexpected 12 gxh4! with advantage for White in V.Kovacevic-J.Mukic, Yugoslavia 1988.

a2) 9...e4 10 c2 e7 11 g4! (White wants to annihilate the strong e4-pawn at any cost) 11...xg4 12 xe4 and White has slightly the better chances, as pointed out by Kovacevic.

a3) 9...c6 is the main theoretical continuation and offers Black good chances to equalize.

Here 10 a3 (or 10 c2 exd4 11 cxd4 c5 12 b2 e7 13 cxd1 a5 14 h3 h5 15 f4 e4 16 xe4 xe4 17 f3 a4 with an even position, A.Kosten-J.Gallagher, French League 2002)

10...exd4 (10...f8 looks a bit passive and then 11 c2 a5 12 b2 e4 13 a3! d5 14 cxd5 cxd5 15 f3 blows up Black’s pawn chain in the centre) 11 cxd4 (11 exd4 b6! 12 a1 d5 13 c5 bd7 14 b4 e4 is slightly better for Black) 11...c5 12 c2 (this is rather similar to a line of the Fianchetto King’s Indian, but there the pawn is on e4; in either case the bishop is rather useless on a3) 12...a5 13 ad1 e7 14 h3 h5 15 fxe1 a4 16 b2 axb3 17 axb3 f4 reached a roughly level position in U.Andersson-R.Dzindzichashvili, Buenos Aires Olympiad 1978.

b) The immediate 8 b3 e8 9 a3 was Botvinnik’s choice in the match to prevent ...c7-c6. After 9...b8 10 0-0 a6 11 dxe5 (if 11 c1 why not 11...b5! grabbing the initiative on the queenside; then 12 d5 bxc4 13 bxc4 exd4 14 exd4 xd5 15 cxd5 b6 gives Black reasonable play in this complex position) 11...xex5 12 c5 d5!? (improving over 12...dxc5 13 xc5 b6 14 xd8 xd8 15 d4 e8 16 e4 b7 17 f4 when White was better in M.Botvinnik-V.Smyslov, World Championship (Game 16), Moscow 1954) 13 d4 c6 14 xc6 bxc6 15 c1 h5 the position isn’t at all easy to assess.

8...e8

Also possible is 8...a5 9 b3 e8 10 0-0 e4 11 f4 c6 12 f3 g5!? with unclear play in L.Bruzon Bautista-J.Rohl Montes, Merida 2005.

9 a5 a6 10 0-0 h5!

It’s useful in this structure to probe White’s weaknesses on the kingside.
11 h4
White defines the pawn structure.
Instead 11 e4 exd4 12 \( \text{Qxd4 Qg4} \) 13 f3 Qge5 14 b3 Qc5 leads to complex play, but 11 h3 seems safer.
11...\( \text{Wxh4} \)
White's idea was to meet 11...e4 with 12 \( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{We7} \) 13 f4 when h2-h4 is useful to support the knight's position.

12 e4
This move creates a Fianchetto King's Indian structure, but h2-h4 and a4-a5 are not typical for it.
Instead 12 \( \text{Wc2} \) deserved attention when 12...c6 would have been quite unclear.

12...exd4 13 \( \text{Qxd4 c5} \) 14 \( \text{de2 Qe5} \) 15 b3 \( \text{Wc7} \)
Showing that the pawn on a5 is a weakness.
16 Qg5 Qc6 17 f4 Qe6 18 Wd3
Black might have met 18 \( \text{Wd2} \) with 18...\( \text{Qh7}! \), targeting the key bishop.
18...\( \text{Qb4} \) 19 \( \text{Wd2 Qh7} \) 20 \( \text{Qxe6 Qxe6} \) 21 Qf4 Qf6

22 Qa4
This is somewhat artificial. More natural was 22 f3 with the idea of Qh3.
22...Qg4 23 Qd5 Qxd5 24 exd5?!
Instead 24 cxd5 Qee8 25 Qc4 with the idea of b4 would have allowed White to justify his Qa4 idea.
24...Qe7 25 Qg5 Qee8 26 Qf3 Wd7 27 Qd1?!
White should return the rook to play with 27 Qa2.
27...Qf6 28 Qxf6
It is necessary to try to equalize. After 28 f3 Qh7 29 Qf4? Wh3 a killer check on d4 is inevitable, while after 28 Wf4 Qe4 29 Qa2 Qxg5 30 Wxg5 Qe5 31 Wd2 Wh3 Black is better.
28...Qxf6 29 Wf4
Summary

The most dangerous of White's deviations after 1 d4 ∆f6 2 c4 d6 3 ∆c3 e5 is 4 ∆e5 which tends to lead to strategically complex play. I have played a series of blitz games against it facing no lesser player than Anatoly Karpov who interprets it ingeniously. My feeling is that objectively Black is not worse, but he should play subtly, energetically and creatively.

The exchange 4 dxes has a harmless reputation, but White's most principled plan, namely g4, followed by g5, b3, ∆b2 and probably h4-h5-h6 to break through the main diagonal, can lead to sharp and complex play, and should not be underestimated. White's two other options, 4 e4 and 4 e3, are totally harmless from a theoretical point of view, but it's still useful for black players to be familiar with these lines as they are seen quite often in practice.
Chapter Three
Preventing e2-e4 with ...dıf5

1 d4 dıf6 2 c4 d6 3 ɗf3 g6 4 ɗc3 ɗf5

An unusual but logical continuation which has gained some popularity in recent times mainly thanks to the efforts of the Ukrainian Grandmasters Volokitin and Efimenko, as well as Morozevich. With this move Black indicates he wants to play either a King’s Indian or Old Indian without allowing White the space-gaining e2-e4. Black controls the critical central square e4 while developing a piece. On the other hand, the bishop’s position, and therefore control over e4, is not stable and the queen’s flank (the b7-pawn) is weakened. In general this continuation seems quite playable as an alternative to usual King’s Indian schemes.

This system has some surprise value and is in fact not so easy to counter with White. Several logical set-ups yield him little or no edge, which is why quite a few strong players have used it to play for a win as Black. White’s main possibilities are to:

a) Continue his kingside development with 5 g3 (Game 15).

b) Retake control over the e4-square immediately with 5 ɗh4 (or 5 ɗg5 or even 5 ɗd2), as we’ll see in Game 16.

c) Exploit the queenside weakness with 5 ɗb3, the subject of Game 17. GM Zahar Efimenko, a leading expert on the ...dıf5 variation, as we have noted, considers this the most dangerous option for White.

d) Employ a central strategy, with the 5 d5 followed by ɗf3-d4 of Game 18.

After 3 ɗf3 g6, White can also fi-
anchetto with 4 g3 when 4...g7 5 g2 0-0 6 0-0 c6 7 c3 f5 brings us directly to a line of the Fianchetto King’s Indian.

Again Black tries to clamp down on the e4-square and we’ll see this related idea in action in Games 19 and 20. Likewise, after 1 d4 f6 2 c4 d6 3 c3 the idea to prevent White from playing the space-grabbing 4 e4 with 3...f5 is also playable. It is called the ‘Janowski Indian Defence’ and was introduced by David Janowski in the 1920’s (Alekhine-Janowski, New York 1924), although it did not gain much popularity then or since. However, it was a favourite of Mikhail Tal’s during the 1960’s and 1970’s, when he used it as a way of avoiding the Sämisch and the Four Pawns Attack in the King’s Indian. Several other grandmasters have employed the opening multiple times too, including Bent Larsen, Florin Gheorghiu, and Kamran Shirazi. We’ll take a look in Games 21 and 22, as an alternative to the 3...e5 of the last two chapters.

The main idea. Black wants to place his light-squared bishop directly on the important e4-square. This allows him to keep good control over the central squares. Moreover, an exchange of pair of pieces is favourable for Black, who has a bit less space, so his remaining pieces will find it easier to take up comfortable positions.

1 d3 f6 2 c4 d6 3 d4 g6 4 c3 f5 5 g3

A solid continuation. White simply continues his kingside development.

5...e4

The main continuation, but there are alternatives:

a) 6 d2 avoids any doubling of White’s pawns, after which 6...g7 7 g2 c6 (7...xc3!? 8 xc3 e4 also deserves attention: for example, 9 c1
d5 10 0-0 c6 11 cxd5 w xd5 12 a3 0-0 13
e3 cxd7 14 w e2 d6 and Black is better,
M.Savon-V.Komliakov, Tula 2001) 8 0-0
0-0 9 c1 w b6 10 b3 cxd2 11 w xd2
d7 12 h3 f6 led to an approximately
equal position in G.Kamsky-
A.Morozevich, Almaty (blitz) 2008.

b) 6 d2 keeps control over the e4-
square at the cost of doubled pawns.
After 6...c3 7 bxc3 c5! Black will ob-
tain effective pressure against d4.

No lesser game than M.Carlsen-
A.Volokitin, Cap d'Agde (rapid) 2006,
continued 8 g2 (or 8 w b3 c8 9 g2
c6 10 dxc5 dxc5 11 w b5 when White
uses his queen as an avant-guard to
attack to the black pawns, but after
11...g7 12 b2 0-0 13 0-0 d8 14
c3 b6! 15 a8a? d7 the queen was
trapped in C.Cacco-M.Scalcione, Cre-
mona 2005) 8...c6 9 b3 g7 10 0-0
0-0 11 e3 a5 12 dxa5 wxa5 13
xb7 a8b8 14 f3 w xc3 15 c1 w a5
16 dxc5 dxc5 17 w d2 w xd2 18 xd2
b2 and Black was better.

c) 6 h4 c3 7 bxc3 e4 (better
than 7...d7 8 g2 c8 9 b1 c6 10
0-0 g7 11 e4 0-0 12 g5 with advan-
tage for White in D.Sutkovic-
D.Milanovic, Zupanja 2007) 8 f3 c6 9
f4 g7 (or 9...e5 10 h3 e7 11 g2
d7 12 xd7+ xd7 with complex
play, H.Tikkanen-K.Enigl, Schwarzach
2008) 10 e3 0-0 and this complex
position is acceptable for Black: for ex-
ample, 11 b1 (or 11 w d2 b6 12 d3 b7
13 0-0 e5 14 f4 exf4 15 xf4 c5 16 g5
w c7 17 h6 c6 18 f5 which was
agreed drawn after 18...gx5 19 xg7
xg7 20 g5+ h8 21 b6+ in
G.Balazs-D.Antok, Hungarian League
2009) 11...b6 12 d3 e5 13 0-0 d7 14
c5 dxc5 15 dxc5 w e7 16 b3 c6 17
g2 a5 18 b4 f8 19 b5 a5b5
20 w b5 w e6 and Black retained some
useful positional trumps in C.Marzano-
J.Ivanov, Montecatini Terme 2003.

d) 6 w b3 c3 7 bxc3 (if 7 w c3
with the idea of ...c5) 7...e4 8
h3 g7 9 0-0 b6 also looks good for
Black thanks to his better structure.

For example, 10 a4 (10 b4+ c6 11
b2 0-0 12 e4 e5 was okay for Black in
V.Alexandrov-V.Georgiev, Dupnica
1998) 10...c6 11 c5 dxc5 12 dxc5 w.d5
13 wxd5 xdx5 14 ed1 ed8 and Black is better, P.Benkovic-D.Milanovic, Vrnjačka Banja 2005.

e) 6 g2 xc3 7 bxc3 e4 8 0-0 g7 9 h3 (instead 9 f4 0-0 10 c1 e8 11 h6 e5 12 a4 c6 13 d1 e7
14 xg7 xg7 15 a5 b6 16 axb6 cxb6 17 f1 a5 18 d2 b7 19 b2 ac8 was quite unclear in A.Cantore-V.Georgiev, Turin 2000)
9...0-0 10 g5 c6 11 w.d3 e5 with a good game for Black in A.Karpov-A.Cherniaev, Cairo (blitz) 2010, where one of your co-
authors managed to make a draw against the former World Champion.

f) 6 d5!? is interesting – White avoids the exchange of knights, having in mind to trade his knight instead for
the bishop on f5. Now:

f1) The immediate 6...c6 is a bit hasty: 7 e3 w.a5+ 8 d2 g7 9 f3 dxd2 10 xdx2 w.db6 11 xf5 gxf5 12 c3 d5 13 w.d3 e6 14 e4 gave White
the better chances in A.Veingold-J.Ivanov, San Fernando 2003.

f2) 6...g7 7 g2 (or 7 w.b3 b6 8
g2 c5 9 e3 d7 10 g5 xg5 11
xa8 cxd4 12 f5 xfx5 13 xg5 d7
when Black is better, N.Milchev-
E.Mollov, Plovdiv 2004) 7...c6 8 e3
w.a5+! (this allows Black to exploit
White’s lack of development, leading to
interesting complications) 9 d2 xdx4
10 g4 xf2! 11 xf2 xe3+ 12 xe3
xg4 and Black had more than enough
for the piece in N.Straub-M.Van Leeu-
wen, German League 2009.

Returning to 6 xe4:

7 h3
Again, the most principled con-
tinuation.

7 g2 is a more simple approach and one which doesn’t promise too
much for White after 7...g7 8 0-0 0-0
and then:

a) 9 b3 c5 10 b2 c6 11 wd2 xf3
12 xf3 xdx4 13 xdx4 cxd4 14 xc6
bxc6 15 wxd4 c5 16 w.c3 a5 17 e4 a4
was drawn in A.Miles-R.Dzindzichash-

b) 9 e1 xg2 10 xg2 c5 11 d5
d7 12 a4 a6 13 a5 b5 14 axb6 xb6
15...\texttt{f8} 16 b3 a5 17 e3 \texttt{b4} gave Black good Benko-like pressure in L.Ortega-O.Romanishin, Arco 1999.

c) 9 d2 c5 10 c3 c6 11 d5 cxc3 12 bxc3 a5 13 d2 xg2 14 xg2 \texttt{d7} 15 a4 e6 16 \texttt{b1} b6 leads to an approximately equal position, N.Pushkov-K.Shirazi, Cappelle la Grande 2002.

d) 9 e3 d7 10 \texttt{d2} (or 10 \texttt{b3} c5 11 dxc5 \texttt{xc5} 12 \texttt{xc5} dxc5 13 h4 xg2 14 xg2 \texttt{b6} with full equality in A.Korobov-N.Jakupovic, Mureck 1998) 10...c5 11 \texttt{ad1} \texttt{c7} 12 \texttt{h6} (instead 12 dxc5 \texttt{xc5} 13 \texttt{h6} \texttt{fd8} 14 xg7 xg7 15 h4 \texttt{d7} 16 \texttt{e3} \texttt{f6} 17 b3 \texttt{a5} was roughly equal in M.Maki Uuro-Z.Efimenko, Saint Vincent 2005) 12...\texttt{xf3} 13 \texttt{xf3} cxd4 14 xg7 xg7 15 xxd4+ e5 16 b3 g5 17 g2 a5 with equal chances, J.Czakon-A.Volokitin, Lublin 2009.

\textbf{15...d5!}

If Black simply continues his development with 15...\texttt{g7} 8 0-0 0-0 then 9 d5! with the idea of \texttt{g5} gives White the upper hand, as practice has shown after 9...\texttt{xf3} 10 exf3:

a) 10...c5 11 e1 a6 12 g5 f6 13 \texttt{d2} c7 14 f4 b5 15 b3 \texttt{b8} 16 \texttt{ac1} and White has slightly the better chances, E.Gleizerov-I.Glek, Krasnoyarsk 2003.

b) 10...c6 11 e1 d7 12 f4 \texttt{f6} 13 f5 cxd5 14 cxd5 \texttt{d7} 15 \texttt{d3} \texttt{fe8} 16 \texttt{d2} \texttt{f8} 17 \texttt{e2} was excellent for White in L.Christiansen-K.Shirazi, Estes Park 1986.

c) 10...d7 11 e1 c5 12 b1 a5 13 b3 e8 14 g5! h6 (14...\texttt{f6} 15 e3 e5 16 dxe6 \texttt{xe6} 17 f4 also slightly favours White) 15 e3 e5 16 dxe6 \texttt{xe6} 17 f4 \texttt{f6} 18 \texttt{d5} b6 19 f5 is a touch better for White.

\textbf{8 0-0 \texttt{xf3}}

Black can also employ the move order 8...dxc4 when 9 \texttt{a4+} c6 10 \texttt{xc4} \texttt{xf3} 11 exf3 reaches the notes to White's 10th, below.

\textbf{9 exf3}

\textbf{9...dxc4}

Independent souls may wish to investigate 9...\texttt{c6}!? Certainly 10 \texttt{b3 xd4} 11 \texttt{xb7 g7} 12 e3 \texttt{xf3}+ 13
\[ \text{Game 16} \]

\text{Y. Yakovich - E. Ubilava}

\text{Santo Antonio 2001}

16 f4? h6 17 \( \text{h4} \) g5! 18 fxg5 hxg5 19 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{h6} \) 20 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{f8} \) 21 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{e8} \) 22 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{g4} \) 23 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{d8} \) 24 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{g5} \) 25 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 26 \( \text{xe7} \) \( \text{g8} \) 27 h3 \( \text{h6} \) 28 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 0-1

10 \text{a6!}

A loss of tempo. Correct is 10 \text{a4}! c6 11 \text{xc4} when Black has:

a) 11...\text{d7} runs into 12 \text{d5} \text{b6} 13 \text{wc3}.

b) 11...\text{g7} 12 \text{g5} \text{xd4} 13 \text{e2} \text{e5} 14 \text{d2} \text{c7?} 15 \text{f1} e5 16 \text{d1} f6 17 \text{xe5+}! \text{fxe5} 18 \text{d8} \text{f7} 19 \text{d6} b6 20 \text{g5} and 1-0 was a complete disaster for Black in G. Fahnenschmidt - I. Stohl, German League 1993.

c) 11...\text{a6!}? seems the best way to hold, although 12 \text{g5} h6 13 \text{f4} \text{g7} still gives White chances for an edge.

10...\text{d7} 11 \text{a4} c6 12 \text{xc4} \text{b6} 13 \text{e2} \text{g7} 14 \text{g5} \text{d5} 15 \text{ad1} \text{wd6}

Black is at least okay here thanks to his control of the d5-square, but after White's misguided next it didn't take Volokitin long to whip up a decisive attack down the h-file!
\textbf{The New Old Indian}

$\text{d}2 \text{exf}4$ led to complex play in D.Komarov-G.Grimberg, Massy 1993.

b) $5 \text{g}5 \text{d}7 6 \text{e}4 \text{e}5 7 \text{d}5 \text{a}5!$ again sees Black switching his approach to the dark squares.

After the active $8 \text{d}3$ (or $8 \text{f}4 \text{exf}4\text{\,}9 \text{xf}4 \text{g}7 10 \text{d}2 0-0 11 \text{d}3 \text{a}6 12 0-0 \text{c}5 13 \text{c}2 \text{g}4 14 \text{f}3 \text{e}7 15 \text{ae}1 \text{ae}8 16 \text{g}5 \text{f}6 17 \text{f}4 \text{b}6 18 \text{h}3 \text{e}5 19 \text{xe}5 \text{dxe}5 20 \text{e}3 \text{b}7$ with the idea of ...$\text{d}6$ and ...$f5$, with an even position in R.Palliser-N.Davies, Swansea 2006) $8...\text{a}6 9 0-0 \text{g}7 10 \text{h}3 \text{h}5! 11 \text{e}1 \text{f}4 12 \text{xf}4 \text{exf}4 13 \text{f}3 \text{e}7 14 \text{d}2 \text{e}5 15 \text{e}2 \text{c}5 16 \text{c}2 \text{g}5 17 \text{ed}4 \text{h}5$ matters were rather unclear in Z.Kozul-A.Volokitin, Murska Sobota 2006.

$5...\text{d}7$

The most reasonable retreat. With this withdrawal Black doesn’t really lose a tempo, as the knight will return from $\text{h}4$ sooner or later. Instead:

a) $5...\text{g}4$ provokes $\text{h}2-\text{h}3$, but this is favourable for White: for example, $6 \text{h}3 \text{d}7 7 \text{f}3 \text{g}7 8 \text{e}4$ is a good version of the King’s Indian line with $6 \text{h}3,$ since $0-0$ is more useful than ...$\text{d}7$.

b) $5...\text{c}8 6 \text{e}4$ leads to usual King’s Indian lines if the knight returns to $\text{f}3$, but White is not committed to that and so Black’s ...$\text{f}5$ hasn’t brought him any benefit here.

$6 \text{e}4$

The consistent continuation.

Practice has also seen $6 \text{g}3 \text{e}5$ (also possible is $6...\text{g}7 7 \text{g}2 \text{c}6 8 0-0 0-0 9 \text{e}4 \text{e}5 10 \text{d}5 \text{d}4$ with mutual chances) $7 \text{f}3$ (or $7 \text{g}2 \text{c}6 8 \text{d}5 \text{e}7 9 0-0 \text{g}7 10 \text{e}4 0-0 11 \text{h}3 \text{h}6 12 \text{h}2 \text{h}7 13 \text{e}3 \text{g}5 14 \text{f}3 \text{f}5$ with an even position, T.Roussel Roozmon-A.Moiseenko, Montreal 2008) $7...\text{c}6 8 \text{g}2 \text{g}7 9 0-0 0-0$ with the extra move $\text{d}7$ in comparison to a normal line of the Fianchetto King’s Indian. Following $10 \text{e}1$ (if $10 \text{d}5 \text{e}7$) $10...\text{h}6$ (or the Pannoesque $10...\text{b}8!?$ with the idea of ...$\text{a}6$ and ...$\text{b}5$) $11 \text{d}5 \text{e}7 12 \text{b}1 \text{a}5 13 \text{b}3$ (White has to prepare $\text{b}4$) $13...\text{h}7 14 \text{a}3 \text{f}5 15 \text{b}4 \text{axb}4 16 \text{axb}4 \text{g}5$ Black had good attacking chances on the kingside in D.Shapiro-P.Blatny, Philadelphia 1994.
Instead after 6 ∆f3 Black can play either 6...g7 or 6...f5, repeating moves. After the former, 7 e4 (or 7 ∆f4 0-0 8 ∆d2 c5 9 d5 b5 10 cxb5 a6 11 ∆xa6 ∆xa6 12 e4 ∆b6 with Benko-like counterplay) 7...e5 8 dxe5 (8 ∆e2 transposes to note 'a' to Black's 6th move, below) 8...dxe5 9 ∆xe5 ∆fe4 10 ∆xe4 ∆xe5 leads to an approximately equal position.

6...e5!?

The way we like, but Black also has:

a) 6...g7 7 e2 e5 8 ∆f3 0-0 reaches a position very similar to the main line King's Indian, although the extra move ...d7 gives the position some specifics.

Here:

a1) 9 ∆e3!? ∆g4 10 ∆g5 f6 11 h4 ∆c6 12 dxe5 dxe5 13 ∆d5+ is possible because of the inclusion of ...d7. After 13...h8 14 0-0-0! ∆e8 15 ∆xd8!? ∆xd8 16 ∆xd8 ∆xd8 17 b5 ∆xb5 18 cxb5 ∆e6 19 ∆d1 White has an edge with his bishop-pair.

a2) 9 dxe5 dxe5 10 ∆xe5 ∆xe4 11 ∆xe4 ∆xe5 12 ∆g5 ∆e8 13 f6+ ∆xf6 14 ∆xf6 a5!? 15 0-0 ∆a6 16 ∆c3 ∆d6 is unclear.

a3) 9 d5 a5 10 0-0 ∆a6 11 ∆d2 ∆c5 12 b3 ∆h6 13 ∆c2 ∆e8 14 ∆f3 ∆xc1 15 ∆xc1 f5 16 ∆d2 f4 17 a3 g5 with complex play in O.Stork-M.Jonker, Arnhem 1990.

a4) After 9 0-0 ∆c6 10 d5 e7 White has to find a plan where the bishop is badly placed on d7, but with 11 ∆e1 (11 ∆d2?! a5 is about equal; here the bishop on d7 is good, as shown by 12 a3? a4!) 11...∆e8 (usually Black has to avoid weakening moves on the queenside, because this is White's territory: 11...c6 12 ∆d3 h5?! 13 g1 ∆e8?! 14 f3 ∆b6 15 ∆d2 ∆ac8 16 c5! and the queenside belonged to White in B.Gelfand-P.Wolff, New York 1989) 12 ∆e3 f5 13 f3 f4 (13...∆f6?! 14 c5 ∆f7 looks quite natural too, but then 15 ∆b3! is rather awkward) 14 ∆f2 h5 15 c5 dxc5 16 ∆xc5 ∆d6, as in D.Gurevich-V.Georgiev, Mermaid Beach 1998, and then 17 a4 White manages to prove a small advantage.

b) After 6...c5 7 d5
Black has the extra move ...\(d7\) in a Benoni set-up, but this is not a big achievement, because in many lines the knight belongs on this square. After 7...e6 (perhaps Black should try 7...\(g7\) 8 \(f3\) 0-0 9 \(h3\) \(a6\) 8 \(f3\) exd5 9 exd5! (better than 9 cxd5 \(g7\) 10 \(d3\) 0-0 11 0-0 b5!? with reasonable play for Black in this complex position) 9...\(g7\) 10 h3! (if 10 \(d3\) 0-0 11 0-0 \(g4\) 10...0-0 11 \(d3\) again the extra move ...\(d7\) can only be a problem for Black.

7 \(f3\)

7...exd4

In the case of 7...\(c6\) 8 d5 \(e7\) the most principled way is 9 c5! \(g7\) 10 cxd6 (10 \(b3\) \(b8\) 11 cxd6 cxd6 12 \(b5\) 0-0 13 \(a4\) \(g4\) 14 \(d2\) also gives White an edge, L.Psakhis-P.Wolff, New York 1992) 10...cxd6 11 \(d2\) 0-0 12 \(e2\) \(e8\) 13 \(a4\) \(f5\) 14 \(c4\) \(xe4\) 15 \(xe4\) \(f5\) (15...\(f5\)!? 16 \(f3\) \(f6\) 17 cxd6 \(xe4\) 18 \(xe4\) \(xd5\) 19 0-0 \(b6+\) 20 \(h1\) \(e4\) 21 \(c4+\) \(e6\)!? was suggested by Polugaevsky) 16 0-0 \(d4\) 17 \(e3\) \(f5\) 18 \(g3\) \(e8\) 19 \(xd4\) exd4 20 \(b3\) \(c7\) 21 \(xf5\) gxf5 22 \(ad1\) with a slight advantage for White in L.Alburt-K.Shirazi, Los Angeles 1987.

8 \(xd4\) \(g7\) 9 \(e2\)

An alternative is 9 f3 0-0 10 \(e3\) \(c6\) 11 \(d2\) a6!? when Black prepares to start queenside counterplay in the case of 0-0-0. Here:

a) 12 0-0-0 \(b8\) with the idea of ...b5 when Black has decent attacking chances.

b) 12 \(e2!\) switches to a quieter set-up. Now ...a6 seems not especially necessary in comparison with the main game, although 12...\(h5\) 13 0-0 \(f4\) is still similar enough to it.

9...0-0 10 0-0

This position is similar to the King's Indian line, 1 d4 \(f6\) 2 c4 \(g6\) 3 \(c3\) \(g7\) 4 e4 d6 5 \(f3\) 0-0 6 \(e2\) e5 7 0-0 exd4 8 \(xd4\). In this case the extra move ...\(d7\) favours Black, because it is usually played in that line, which was popularized by grandmasters Glek, Miles and others.

10...\(e8\)

Or 10...\(c6\) 11 \(e3\) and then:

a) 11...\(xd4\) 12 \(xd4\) \(c6\) 13 b4 b6
14...\text{Re1 Re8} 15 f3 \text{Cd7} 16 \text{Cd5} and White has slightly the better chances.

b) 11...\text{We7} 12 f3 \text{Rae8} 13 \text{Wd2 Cxd4} 14 \text{Cxd4 Cc6} 15 \text{Rac1 Ch5} 16 \text{Cxg7 Cxg7} 17 b4 b6 18 \text{Cd5} gives White a small advantage.

c) 11...\text{Re8} transposes to our main game.

d) 11...a6 12 \text{Cxc6} (12 \text{Wd2!? Re8} 13 f3 might be a better plan) 12...\text{Cxc6} (or 12...\text{bxc6?!}) 13 \text{Wd2 Re8} 14 f3 \text{c5} 15 \text{Rad1 Bb8} 13 f3 and White had a small edge because of his space advantage in A.Beliavsky-O.Romanishin, lvov 2000, although here we can recommend the following set-up for Black: 13...\text{Cd7?!} 14 \text{Cc2 a5} 15 \text{Rad1 b6} 16 \text{Cd5 Cc5} with the idea of ...\text{Wd7}, ...\text{Rae8} and ...f5.

11 f3 \text{Cc6}

Instead 11...\text{Ch5} 12 g4! \text{Cf6} (not 12...\text{Ce5?} 13 f4) 13 \text{Ce3 Cc6} 14 \text{Wd2} gives White better chances of an edge.

That game continued 21 hxg6 hxg6 22 g4 axb3 23 axb3 and here 23...\text{Ra3?!} deserved attention with the idea of ...\text{Bxb3}. If now 24 \text{Cd5?} then 24...\text{Cxd5} 25 cxd5 \text{Cxd5}!

b) 12 \text{Cc2 Ch5!} (this is now better timed than a move earlier) 13 g4 (White wants to push the knight back immediately, but there are some tactical issues) 13...\text{Ce5!} (better than 13...\text{Cf6} 14 \text{Gg5} h6 15 \text{Cg4} g5 16 \text{Gg3 Ce5} 17 \text{Wd2} which slightly favours White) 14 \text{Cf2} (instead 14 \text{Cd5 Cxh2+!} or 14 gxh5 \text{Cxh2+!} leads to perpetual check) 14...\text{Cf4} (now Black's pieces dominate the dark squares) 15 \text{Cf1 Ce7} (with the idea of ...g5 and ...\text{Ce6}) 16 \text{Ce3 b6} 17 \text{Wd2 g5} 18 h4 \text{Ce6} with reasonable play for Black in this complex position, D.Zagorskis-J.Bielczyk, Hlohovec 1994.

\textbf{Preventing e2-e4 with ...f5}

12 \text{Ce3}

Natural, but practice has also seen:

a) 12 \text{Cxc6 bxc6!} gives Black control over the key d5-square. This pawn structure was discussed in Nimzo-witsch's classic \textit{My System} and here 13 \text{Gg5 Wb8} 14 \text{Wd2 c5} 15 \text{Rac1 Cc6} 16 b3 a5! 17 \text{Cd1 Wb4} 18 \text{Ce1 Cd7} 19 h4 \text{Cb6} 20 h5 a4 was a perfect demonstration of Nimzowitsch's ideas in M.Medic-D.Sutkovic, Zadar 2009.
12...\textit{h}5!

This is the main idea here. Black obtains control over the dark squares.

13 \textit{wd}2 \textit{f}4

13...\textit{f}5 would be premature due to 14 \textit{xc}6 \textit{bxc}6 15 c5!.

14 \textit{fd}1

Or 14 \textit{xc}6 \textit{xe}2+ 15 \textit{xe}2 \textit{bxc}6 16 \textit{ad}1 \textit{e}6 17 \textit{b}3 c5 18 \textit{f}4 \textit{c}8 with rough equality in M.Cebalo-R.Loncar, Croatian Team Championship 1995.

14...\textit{xd}4

The right exchange. Instead if 14...\textit{xe}2+ 15 \textit{dxe}2 \textit{e}5 16 \textit{b}3 a6 17 \textit{ac}1 b5 18 c5 and White is slightly better, I.Jelen-V.Srebomic, Ljubljana 2007.

15 \textit{xd}4 \textit{g}5 16 \textit{f}1 \textit{xd}4+ 17 \textit{xd}4

The exchange of bishops has shown that the dark squares in White's camp are somewhat weakened, although on the other hand he has a strong outpost on d5 for his knight.

17...\textit{c}6 18 \textit{b}4 \textit{b}6 19 \textit{ac}1 a5 20 a3 \textit{axb}4 21 \textit{axb}4 \textit{h}5

The sharpest possibility was 21...\textit{f}5!? 22 c5 \textit{bxc}5 23 \textit{bxc}5 \textit{fxe}4 24 \textit{cxd}6 \textit{exf}3 which would have been pretty unclear.

22 \textit{h}1 \textit{h}4

23 \textit{xa}1 \textit{h}7?!

A loss of time. More in the spirit of the position was 23...\textit{e}6 24 \textit{wf}2 \textit{h}3!? 25 g3 \textit{xa}1 26 \textit{xa}1 \textit{f}6, grappling with the weaknesses in White's camp.

24 \textit{d}5! \textit{xd}5 25 \textit{cxd}5 \textit{h}5 26 \textit{wc}3 \textit{xa}1 27 \textit{xa}1 \textit{e}5 28 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 29 \textit{a}7 \textit{e}7 30 \textit{g}1

Now White has some pressure in the endgame, but Black has enough resources to hold.

30...\textit{f}5 31 \textit{e}5 \textit{xe}5 32 \textit{xc}7+ \textit{h}6 33 \textit{c}6 \textit{f}4 34 \textit{xb}6 \textit{xd}5 35 \textit{b}5 \textit{g}5 36 \textit{c}4 \textit{c}3 37 \textit{xe}5 \textit{dxe}5 38 \textit{f}2 \textit{f}6 39 \textit{e}3 \textit{a}4 40 \textit{d}3 \textit{b}6
The endgame is drawish, but Black should still be careful.

41 \( \text{Ag}8 \) \( \text{Be}7 \) 42 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{hxg}3 \) 43 \( \text{hxg}3 \) \( \text{Af}6 \) 44 \( \text{Ab}3 \) \( \text{Be}7 \) 45 \( \text{Ac}4 \) \( \text{Af}6 \) 46 \( \text{Ab}5 \) \( \text{Be}7 \) 47 \( \text{Ac}6 \) \( \text{Ad}6 \) 48 \( \text{Ae}8 \) \( \text{Ad}5 \) 49 \( \text{Ac}4 \) \( \text{Ee}4 \) 50 \( \text{fxe}4 \) \( \text{Af}6 \) 51 \( \text{Axg}6 \) \( \text{fxe}4 \) 52 \( \text{Ad}4 \) \( \text{Ee}3 \) 53 \( \text{Ad}3 \) \( \text{Ah}5 \) 54 \( \text{Gg}4 \) \( \text{Af}4 \) 55 \( \text{Axe}3 \) \( \text{Ad}5+ \) 56 \( \text{Ae}4 \) \( \text{Ax}b4 \) 57 \( \text{Ac}4 \) \( \text{Ac}6 \) 58 \( \text{Gg}5 \) \( \text{Ae}5 \) 59 \( \text{Ab}3 \) \( \text{Ag}6 \) 60 \( \text{Af}5 \) \( \text{Ah}4+ \) 61 \( \text{Ae}6 \) \( \text{Ac}5 \) 62 \( \text{Ad}1 \) \( \text{Ad}5 \) 63 \( \text{Af}3+ \) \( \text{Ad}4 \) 64 \( \text{Ab}7 \) \( \text{Ae}3 \) 65 \( \text{Ae}8 \) \( \text{Af}4 \) 66 \( \text{Ae}6 \) \( \text{Ag}3 \) 67 \( \text{Ad}7 \) \( \text{Af}4 \) 68 \( \text{Ac}6 \) \( \text{Ag}4 \) 69 \( \text{Aa}4 \) \( \text{Gg}3 \) 70 \( \text{Ad}1 \) \( \text{Ae}4 \) 71 \( \text{Ae}2 \) \( \text{Ae}3 \) 72 \( \text{Ag}4 \) \( \text{Af}4 \) 73 \( \text{Ah}5 \) \( \text{Af}4 \) 74 \( \text{Ad}1 \) \( \text{Ag}3 \) 75 \( \text{Gg}7 \) \( \text{Af}4 \) ½-½

**Game 17**

*S.Skembris-O.Romanishin*

Bratto 2002

1 \( \text{Af}3 \) \( \text{Af}6 \) 2 \( \text{Cc}4 \) \( \text{Cd}6 \) 3 \( \text{Dd}4 \) \( \text{Gg}6 \) 4 \( \text{Cc}3 \) \( \text{Af}5 \) 5 \( \text{Bb}3 \)

A logical way to exploit the weakening of Black's queenside.

5...\( \text{Cc}8 \)

The alternative is 5...\( \text{b}6!? \). This weakens the long diagonal and looks rather unnatural, but the expert on this line, the Bulgarian GM Vladimir Georgiev, believes that Black has good counterchances.

White can play:

a) 6 \( \text{Ag}5!? \) again has the idea of e2-e4 and then 6...\( \text{Cc}6 \) 7 \( \text{Ee}4 \) 8 \( \text{Ad}7 \) 8 \( \text{Ff}3 \) e5 leads to complex play.

b) With 6 \( \text{Cf}5!? \) \( \text{Ag}7 \) 7 \( \text{Ee}4 \) White wants to play a real gambit. Accepting the sacrifice yields White some compensation for the pawn, although after 7...\( \text{Axe}4 \) 8 \( \text{Axe}4 \) \( \text{Axe}4 \) 9 \( \text{Ag}5 \) \( \text{Dd}5 \) 10 \( \text{Oxe}4 \) \( \text{Dxe}4 \) 11 \( \text{Ae}3 \) \( \text{Cc}6 \) he is yet to prove the correctness of his sacrifice.

c) 6 \( \text{Gg}3 \) \( \text{Cc}6 \) 7 \( \text{Dd}5 \) \( \text{Aa}5 \) 8 \( \text{Bc}1 \) c5 9 \( \text{Dxc}6 \) \( \text{Dxc}6 \) 10 \( \text{Gg}2 \) \( \text{Gg}7 \) 11 0-0 0-0 12 \( \text{Ah}4 \) \( \text{Dd}7 \) 13 \( \text{Bb}3 \) \( \text{De}4 \) 14 \( \text{Axe}4 \) \( \text{Dxc}3 \) 15 \( \text{Ah}6 \) \( \text{De}8 \) 16 \( \text{Ac}1 \) \( \text{Db}2 \) 17 \( \text{Ab}1 \) \( \text{Af}6 \) 18 \( \text{Gg}2 \) \( \text{Cc}8 \) 19 \( \text{Bd}2 \) \( \text{De}5 \) with an even position, A.Timman-I.Glek, Haarlem 2007.

6 \( \text{Gg}3 \)

The most popular continuation. Alternatives are:

a) With 6 \( \text{Hh}3 \) White wants to obtain a space advantage on the kingside and
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in the centre. However, this is quite ambitious and 6...\text{g7} 7 \text{g4} \text{d7} 8 \text{e4} h5!? (more vigorous than 8...0-0 when 9 \text{e3} \text{c6} 10 \text{e2} a5 11 \text{wd1} a4 12 \text{wd2} a3 13 b3 \text{b4} 14 e5 \text{e8} 15 \text{e4} c5 16 dxc5 \text{c6} 17 \text{wb4} \text{xe4} 18 cxd6 exd6 19 0-0 dxe5 20 \text{c5} was excellent for White in P.Eljanov-A.Volokitin, Russian Team Championship 2008) 9 g5 \text{h7} 10 \text{e2} c5 11 d5 0-0 12 \text{g2} \text{a6} 13 0-0-0 \text{c7} 14 e5 b5 15 cxb5 \text{xb5} 16 \text{dxe4} \text{b8} 17 a4 a6 left Black better in M.De Verdier-O.Jakobsen, Borup 2008.

b) 6 \text{f4} is a rather simple development which doesn't trouble Black: 6...\text{g7} 7 h3 0-0 8 e3 c5 9 d5 \text{a6} 10 \text{e2} \text{b4} 11 0-0 \text{c2} 12 \text{w3} a6 13 \text{ac1} \text{d3} 14 \text{fd1} \text{xe2} 15 \text{xe2} b5 and Black is better, J.Wendt-V.Baklan, Ohrid 2009.

c) 6 \text{h4} is a new version of a familiar motif.

After 6...\text{d7} 7 e4 e5 (or 7...\text{c6} 8 \text{wd1} e5 9 d5 \text{d4} 10 \text{e3} \text{g7} 11 \text{xd4} exd4 12 \text{xd4} 0-0 13 \text{wd2} \text{xe4} 14 \text{xe4} \text{e8} 15 \text{d3} f5 and Black was better in S.Rautanen-A.Muzychuk, Novi Sad 2009) 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 \text{f3} \text{c6} 10 \text{d5} \text{g7} 11 \text{d3} \text{g4} 12 \text{g5} \text{d7} 13 \text{wa3} \text{xf3} 14 \text{xf3} h6 15 \text{e3} \text{wd8} 16 f4 \text{exf4} 17 \text{xf4} \text{ce5} the position was about equal in K.Lahno-I.Kurnosov, Satka 2008.

6...\text{g7} 7 \text{g2} \text{d8}

Threatening 8 \text{h4}.

7...\text{c6}

Black can also block the long diagonal with 7...c6, but then 8 0-0 0-0 9 \text{h4} or 9 \text{e1} is slightly better for White because of his space advantage.

8 \text{d5}

After 8 0-0 0-0 9 \text{d1} a5 10 \text{g5} \text{e8} (or 10...\text{e4} 11 \text{xe4} \text{xe4} 12 \text{we3} \text{xf3} 13 \text{xf3} e5 14 dxe5 \text{xe5} and Black was okay in V.Epishin-V.Nevednichy, Nova Gorica 2006) 11 \text{ac1} h6 12 \text{xf6} \text{xf6} 13 e3 \text{g7} 14 \text{d2} e5 Black was left trying to realize the power of the two bishops in L.Ostrowski-E.Kengis, Suwalki 1999.

8...\text{d8}

This is not a very attractive position for the knight, but it's not as bad as it looks.
Instead Joe Gallagher believes that $8...\Box b8$ deserves no less attention, although practice with this move has been very small: for example, $9 \Box e3$ (or $9 \Box h4 \Box d7$ $10 e4$ $0-0$ $11 0-0$ $\Box a6$ $12 \Box c2$ $e6$ $13 \Box d2$ $c6$ with an even position, V.Malaniuk-D.Shilin, Odessa 2005) $9...0-0$ $10 \Box c1$ $\Box a6$ $11 0-0$ $c5$ $12 \Box fe1$ $\Box c7$ $13 \Box g5$ $h6$ $14 \Box d2$ $\Box e4$ $15 \Box xe4$ $\Box xe4$ $16 \Box e3$ $\Box xf3$ $17 \Box xf3$ $\Box d7$ $18 \Box c3$ and White was perhaps slightly better in L.Ftacnik-A.Collinson, British League 2000.

$9 0-0 0-0$

**10 $\Box e1$**

White wants to avoid the exchange of his fianchettoed bishop, but this is by no means compulsory:

a) $10 \Box e3$ with the idea of $c5$ and $\Box ac1$ allows Black a choice:

a1) $10...\Box e4$ $11 \Box xe4$ $\Box xe4$ $12 c5$ $e6$ $13 dxe6$ $\Box xe6$ $14 cxd6$ $\Box xd6$ $15 \Box ac1$ $\Box d8$ $16 \Box fd1$ $\Box e7$ $17 \Box b4$ $\Box c6$ $18 b3$ $\Box fd8$ slightly favours White, L.Psakhis-E.Dizdarevic, New Delhi 2000.

a2) $10...c5$? $11 a4$ $\Box e4$ $12 \Box xe4$ $\Box xe4$ $13 \Box d2$ $e5$ with reasonable counterplay in this complex position.

b) $10 \Box d2$

10...$c5$ (or 10...$\Box e4$ $11 \Box xe4$ $\Box xe4$)

$11 \Box fe1$ ($11 \Box ae1$ was suggested by Karpov during some analysis; the idea is to follow up with $\Box h4$, $e4$ and $f4$, when White's rooks are correctly placed, but 11...$\Box e4$? $12 \Box xe4$ $\Box xe4$ keeps the situation fairly unclear) $11...\Box h3$ $12 \Box h1$ $h6$ $13 \Box c2$ $e5$ $14 e4$ $b6$ $15 \Box d3$ $\Box b7$ $16 \Box ab1$ $\Box d7$ $17 \Box h4$ $\Box fe8$ $18 \Box f3$ $\Box g4$ $19 a3$ $\Box e7$ $20 \Box xg4$ $\Box xg4$ $21 \Box f3$ $\Box xf3$ $22 \Box xf3$ $\Box h7$ with an even position in A.Khalifman-V.Teshkovsky, Sochi 2005.

c) $10 \Box e1$ $c6$ $11 \Box d3$ $\Box h3$ $12 \Box xh3$ $\Box xh3$ $13 f3$ $\Box c8$ $14 e4$ $b6$ $15 \Box g5$ $h6$ $16 \Box e3$ $\Box b7$ and with the knight returning to the action, Black had no prob-

10...e4!

This is the typical manoeuvre here in order to obtain a hold on the e4-square.

11 dx e4 dx e4 12 We3

Black should meet 12 g5 with 12...f6?! 13 d2 c5, with prospects to expand on either flank. Instead 12.e5 13 c5 Wd7 (13...dxc5? may improve; after 14 We7 We8 15 xxc5 c6 16 dxc6 xxc6 17 Wac1 Oe6 18 We3 Wd7 Black appeared to be okay in P.Nielsen-O.Romanishin, European Championship, Aix-les-Bains 2011) 14 Wxe5 Wxe5 15 Wxe4 dxc5 16 g2 prepares the movement of White's central pawns, as otherwise Black's knight would take up a comfortable position on d6. After 16...b6 17 f4 Wg7 18 e4 White has slightly the better chances.

12 f5

This was fairly forced and now the pawn structure reminds one of the Leningrad Dutch, although the position of some of the pieces, especially the bishop on e4, is unusual.

Instead 12...xf3?! 13 xf3 e5 14 dxe6 Ox e6 15 Wd1 gives White a small advantage, as his unopposed light-squared bishop on the long diagonal is very strong.

13 Wh3

White wants to avoid the exchange of bishops, but this plan is too slow to really trouble Black. Alternatives are:

a) 13 g5?! Wxg2 14 Wxg2 h6 is pretty comfortable for Black.

b) 13 d4 Wxg2 14 Wxg2 Wxe8 with the idea of ...e5 is also fine for Black.

c) In the case of 13 Wb3, 13...e5 deserves attention, as after 14 dxe6 Oxe6 15 c5 Black can play 15...d5 with a good game.

13...e6

Starting to blast from the other hand.

Instead 13...c6?! has not been seen in practice, but also deserves attention. If 14 g5 then 14...cxd5 15 cxd5 Oxd5 16 Wxe7 Wc6 with the idea of ...Wxe8.

14 Wb3

Instead 14 d4?! with the idea of
f2-f3 is refuted by 14...exd5 15 f3 f4! when Black is better, while 14 d1 is an unexplored path, but Black hardly has any problems in this line: for example, 14...c6? (14...exd5 15 cxd5 d7 leads to an approximately equal position) 15 dxe6 (15 dxc6 dxc6 16 g5 isn’t at all easy to assess) 15...dxe6 16 g5 dxc4 17 xe4 fxe4 18 dxe6 c5 19 b3 c2 20 d2 c3 21 b1 is unclear.

14...c6!

It is obvious that Black has solved his opening problems.

15 dxe6

If 15 dxc6?! dxc6 with complex play, likely favourable to Black.

15...dxe6

The knight has emerged from passivity. However, 15...dxe6? 16 g5 d7 17 dxe4 dxe4 (17...fxe4 18 e3 is excellent too for White) 18 e3 would have given White the better chances.

16 e3 d5

The best move. Instead 16...xf3 17 exf3 d4 18 d1 c5 fights for equality, but Black can aim for more.

17 cxd5

Romanishin had actually reached this position in an earlier game, where 17 d2 dxe4 18 c4 d5 19 g2 f4? corrupted White’s kingside, with a good game for Black in M.Krasenkow-O.Romanishin, Cutro 1999.

17...d5 18 c2 d8

19 ad1

19 ed1 d7 20 d2 a5! 21 ad1 a4 sees Black taking the upper hand, due to the weak pawns on a2 and b2.

19...a5

19...d7! looks more logical, again with the idea of ...a5-a4.

20 b3 c3 21 c3c3 c3 22 d2 f6

Black is still a little better, but White is able to hold.

23 g2 e8 24 h4 a5 25 g5 xg2 26 xg2 xg2 27 xe6 x6 27 xg2 a4 28 e3 axb3 29 axb3 ½-½

Game 18
J.Gustafsson-J.Hickl
German League 2004

1 d4 f6 2 c4 d6 3 f3 g6 4 c3 f5
5 d5

White grasps a space advantage and releases the d4-square for his knight. This plan costs two tempi, but the f5-bishop will have to retreat, thereby leaving the e4-square in White's hands. John Cox recommended this ambitious if logical approach in *Starting Out: 1 d4*, but didn't consider that Black should hit back in the centre with ...e5, which is his best approach, as we'll see.

White also has several less-common continuations, none of which are dangerous for Black:

a) 5 h3

This is an original move with the idea to drive away Black's bishop with g2-g4. However, practice shows that Black has no problems after the thematic 5...e4 6 fxe4 (or 6 dxe3 c6 7 d5 dxe5 8 fxe5 h6) 7 fxe5 dxe5 8 dxe5 (9 fxe5 e5) 10 b3 (or 10 e3 c6 11 e4 0-0 with good compensation in R.Webster-O.Jakobsen, Gibraltar 2008) 6...fxe4 7 g5 (if 7 fxe5 c6 8 d5 b5 with rough equality) 7...f5 8 e4 d6 9 e3 (9 fxe5 e5) 10 f4 0-0 with good compensation in Z.Kozul-E.Dizdarevic, Solin/Split 2000) 11 c5 12 b3 c6 13 bxc6 bxc6 14 dxc6 f6 15 e3 b6 16 0-0 which was drawn in A.Yegiazarian-A.Minasian, Yerevan 2006)

b) 5 e3 g7 6 d3 (this exchange is logical from the point of view of placing White's central pawns on light squares, e4 and d5; instead 6 f3 e5 7 d5 c5 8 b3 e5 9 dxc5 dxc5 10 b2 c6 11 d5 exd1 12 bxd1 e4! sees Black grab the initiative in the centre, A.Yegiazarian-A.Minasian, Yerevan 2006) 6...cxd3
\( \text{\textit{Preventing e2-e4 with ...f5}} \)

The game E.Fomichenko-V.Tseshkovsky, Krasnodar 1999, continued 13 \( f4 \) \( g4 \) 14 \( f3 \) \( d4+ \) 15 \( h1 \) \( d6 \) 16 \( g5 \) \( d7 \) 17 \( h3 \) \( xc3 \) 18 \( hxg4 \) h6 19 \( exf5 \) hgx5 20 bxc3 gxf5 21 gxf5 g4 and the complications had resulted in a promising position for Black.

c) 5 \( g4 \) \( g7 \) 6 e3 (otherwise, 6 \( d2 \) h6 7 h3 \( e4 \) 8 \( xe4 \) \( xe4 \) is about equal, while 6 \( b3 \) transposes to note 'b' to White's 6th move in the previous game) 6...\( h5! \) (6...\( e4 \) 7 \( xe4 \) \( xe4 \) also reaches a level game) 7 \( g5 \) h6 8 \( h4 \) g5 9 \( d2 \) \( d7 \) 10 \( e2 \) c5!? leads to complex play with mutual chances.

d) 5 \( g5 \) \( g7 \) 6 e3 (instead 6 \( d2 \) h6 7 \( h4 \) g5 8 \( g3 \) \( h5 \) 9 e3 \( xg3 \) 10 \( hxg3 \) c5 11 d5 \( b6 \) 12 \( c1 \) \( d7 \) 13 e4 \( g6 \) 14 \( f4 \) f5 15 \( d3 \) fxe4 16 \( dxe4 \) 0-0-0 17 \( d2 \) \( xe4 \) 18 \( xe4 \) \( b4 \) 19 \( d3 \) \( b6 \) saw Black taking the upper hand in F.Doettling-M.Krasenkow, German League 2000) 6...\( e4 \) 7 \( xe4 \) (if 7 \( h4 \) \( xc3 \) 8 bxc3 c5 with rough equality, M.Foisor-S.Peeters, Charleroi 2006) 7...\( xe4 \) is again pretty comfortable for Black.

For example, 8 \( d3 \) (or 8 \( e2 \) c5 9 0-0 h6 10 \( h4 \) cxd4 11 \( d4 \) \( c6 \) 12 f3 \( d4 \) 13 exd4 \( f5 \) 14 \( d2 \) 0-0 15 \( f1 \) \( d8 \) 16 \( f1 \) a5 17 b3 \( c7 \) 18 \( ad1 \) e5 19 dxe5 dxe5 20 \( d6 \) \( xd6 \) 21 \( d6 \) \( f8 \) 22 \( d5 \) e4 with equal chances in P.Cramling-I.Glek, Mulheim 2010) 8...\( xd3 \) 9 \( xd3 \) c5!? (again this is the most challenging approach; instead 9...\( c6 \) 10 0-0 \( d7 \) 11 \( ad1 \) h6 12 \( h4 \) 0-0 13 \( d5 \) \( b4 \) 14 \( d2 \) a5 was about equal in E.Kuligin-D.Andreikin, Sochi 2007) 10 0-0 \( c6 \) 11 \( ab1 \) 0-0 12 d5 \( b4 \) 13 \( b3 \) \( b8 \) 14 a3 \( a6 \) 15 \( c2 \) \( d7 \) 16 b4 cxb4 17 axb4 \( f8 \) 18 \( wa2 \) \( c3 ! \) 19 b5 \( c5 \) 20 \( f1 \) \( g7 \) 21 \( d4 \) \( a8 \) 22 f3 a5 and Black was better in P.Sinkovics-P.Blatny, Vienna 1996.
Returning to 5 d5:

5...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g7}} 6 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{d4}}

6 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{d2}} is less consistent with White’s previous move and after 6...e5 (or 6...0-0 7 e4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{d7}} 8 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e2}} e6 9 0-0 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e8}} 10 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e1}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{a6}} 11 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{f3}} c6 with counterplay, R.Loetscher-J.Adler, Swiss League 2007) 7 e4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{d7}} 8 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e2}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{a6}} 9 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{b1}} c5 a complex manoeuvring struggle ensues along King’s Indian lines.

6...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d7}} 7 e4

7...e5

Perhaps 7...0-0!? 8 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e2}} e5 is a more flexible realization of the same idea. For example:

a) 9 dx\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}6 fxe6 10 0-0 e5 11 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{c2}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e6}} 12 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{g5}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{bd7}} 13 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{wd2}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{h8}} 14 f3 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{g8}} 15 b4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{f7}} 16 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{d5}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{f8}} 17 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{fd1}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e6}} 18 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf6}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf6}} 19 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e3}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{d7}} 20 b5 c5 21 bxc6 bxc6 22 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{ab1}} c5 was about equal in B.Gelfand-A.Morozevich, Monte Carlo (rapid) 2006.

b) 9 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{b3}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e8}} 10 h4 f5 11 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{g5}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{f6}} 12 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{wc2}} h6 13 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf6}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf6}} 14 0-0-0 a5 15 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{d2}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{a6}} 16 a3 h5 17 f3 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{c5}} 18 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{df1}} f4 19 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{b1}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e7}} 20 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{a2}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{f6}} 21 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{c3}} a4 22 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{b5}} c6 and Black was better in L.Poliakoff-C.Rosenfield, USA 2000.

c) 9 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{c2}} transposes to our main game.

8 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{c2}}

Instead 8 dx\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}}6 fxe6 9 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e2}} 0-0 transposes to the last note, but 8 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{b3}}!? 0-0 9 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{g5}} deserved attention, preventing Black’s idea of ...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e8}} and ...f5.

8...0-0 9 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e2}} a5 10 g4

Excitable play, as White has not yet finished his development.

The solid 10 0-0 was about equal, although the knight on c2 is not too well placed here.

10...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a6}} 11 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{h4}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{c5}} 12 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{f3}} c6 13 h5

Instead 13 g5!? \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e8}} (13...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h5}} is too ambitious: 14 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{hxh5}} gxh5 15 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{e3}} gives White a small advantage) 14 h5 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{c7}} prepares ...b5 with mutual chances.

13...\textcolor{red}{\textbf{cxd5}} 14 c\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xd5}} b5

Both opponents play on their flank, but White’s attack is not supported by sufficient development.

15 g5?! \textcolor{red}{\textbf{xh5}}!

White had clearly underestimated this idea.

16 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{xh5}} b4
The key follow-up.

17 \texttt{\textbf{de}2 \textbf{xe}4 18 \textbf{f}3 \textbf{dx}g5}

Thus Black obtains three pawns for the piece and gains the initiative.

19 \texttt{\textbf{g}2 \textbf{f}5 20 \textbf{f}4 \textbf{ex}f4 21 \textbf{cd}4}

Not 21 \texttt{\textbf{xf}4? \textbf{e}8+} with a near-decisive advantage for Black.

21...\texttt{\textbf{wb}6 22 \textbf{xf}4}

Black would have been doing very well too after 22 \texttt{\textbf{e}6 \textbf{f}3 23 \textbf{dxg}5 \textbf{fxg}2 24 \textbf{g}1 \textbf{f}4.}

22...\texttt{ae8}

This creates irresistible threats and Hickl should really have gone on to win, despite Gustafsson's best attempts to resist.

23 \texttt{\textbf{f}1 \textbf{e}4 24 \textbf{wd}3 \textbf{c}8 25 \textbf{we}3 \textbf{c}5 26 \textbf{e}6 \textbf{axe}6 27 \textbf{dx}e6 \textbf{axe}6 28 \textbf{axe}4 \textbf{exe}3 29 \textbf{axe}3 \textbf{exe}4 30 \textbf{b}6 \textbf{fe}8 31 \textbf{g}1 \textbf{xb}2 32 \textbf{hd}1 \textbf{a}4 33 \textbf{f}3 a3 34 \textbf{d}4 \textbf{f}4 35 \texttt{\textbf{f}2 \textbf{xd}4+ 36 \textbf{xd}4 \textbf{xd}4 37 \textbf{xd}4 \textbf{e}4 38 \textbf{hd}1 \textbf{g}7 39 \texttt{\textbf{f}3 \textbf{h}5 40 \textbf{c}2 \textbf{mc}4 41 \texttt{\textbf{e}3 \textbf{ac}3 42 \textbf{xd}6 \textbf{b}3 43 \textbf{axb}3 \textbf{xb}3 44 \texttt{\textbf{a}6 \textbf{h}4 45 \texttt{\textbf{f}2 \textbf{mc}3 46 \textbf{d}5 \textbf{g}3 47 \texttt{\textbf{e}3 \textbf{f}4 48 \texttt{\textbf{dc}4 \textbf{h}3 49 \textbf{xa}3 \textbf{xa}3 50 \texttt{\textbf{xa}3 \textbf{g}5 51 \texttt{\textbf{c}4 \textbf{f}6 52 \texttt{\textbf{d}2 \textbf{g}4 53 \texttt{\textbf{f}1 \textbf{e}5 54 \textbf{d}2 \textbf{f}5 55 \texttt{\textbf{g}1}}

55...\texttt{\textbf{f}3??}

Proof that it's never too late to resign!

The text is a terrible mistake, whereas the calm 55...\texttt{\textbf{g}3 56 \texttt{\textbf{f}1 \textbf{g}4 57 \texttt{\textbf{d}2 \textbf{f}3 58 \texttt{\textbf{e}4 \textbf{f}4 59 \texttt{\textbf{d}2 \textbf{f}2+ 60 \texttt{\textbf{f}1 \textbf{e}3 61 \texttt{\textbf{c}4+ \textbf{d}3 62 \texttt{\textbf{e}5+ \textbf{e}4 63 \texttt{\textbf{g}4 \textbf{h}2 would have seen Black converting his decisive advantage.}

56 \texttt{\textbf{f}1 \textbf{f}4 57 \texttt{\textbf{f}2 \textbf{h}2 58 \texttt{\textbf{g}3 \textbf{h}4-\textbf{h}4}

An interesting game. Though Black missed a victory in the endgame, he played very well in the opening and middlegame stages.

\textbf{Game 19}

\textbf{R. Wojtaszek-L. McShane}

Stockholm 2010

1 \texttt{\textbf{d}4 \texttt{\textbf{f}6 2 \textbf{c}4 \textbf{d}6 3 \texttt{\textbf{f}3 \textbf{g}6 4 \textbf{g}3 \textbf{g}7 5 \texttt{\textbf{g}2 0-0 6 0-0 \textbf{c}6 7 \texttt{\textbf{c}3 \textbf{f}5}}

First played at grandmaster level by Smyslov in his 1957 World Championship match against Botvinnik. Black plays in a similar manner to our last four games, aiming to clamp down on the e4-square and follow up with \texttt{\textbf{e}4.}

8 \texttt{\textbf{h}4}

The most common continuation. 'As White should not allow \texttt{\textbf{e}4, and moves such as 8 \texttt{\textbf{d}2 or 8 \texttt{\textbf{e}1 are less forced, this move is obvious.' -- Botvinnik. Not everyone agrees these days, and for White's other options see the next game.

8...\texttt{\textbf{e}6}
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9 d5

Grabbing space, otherwise Black will play ...d5 himself:

a) 9 b3?! d5! gives Black good counterplay. For example:

a1) 10 c5 b6 11 b4 a5 12 dxa4 bxa4 13 d2 b5 14 e4 c4 15 e1 axb4 16 xxb4 cxc5 and Black had won a pawn in P.Sinprayoon-E.Torre, Auckland 1977.

a2) 10 d3 a6 11 c5 c8! (with the idea of ...e5) 12 f4 g4 13 f3 f6 14 c1 e5 gives Black a promising game.

a3) 10 cxd5 cxd5 11 b2 c6 reaches a nearly symmetric and equal position, where the exchange of light-square bishops, with ...d7 and ...h3, is desirable for Black from a positional point of view: for example, 12 c1 (or 12 e3 d7 13 d2 c8 14 c1 h3 15 xh3 xh3 16 f3 h6, targeting the weak pawn on e3 and after 17 d1 c8 18 g2 e5 Black had realized all his strategic aims in A.Denker-E.Torre, Lone Pine 1975) 12 c8 13 e3 (instead 13 d4 b6 14 c3 h6 15 e3 d7 16 f4 both protects the pawn on e3 and prevents ...e5, but this creates additional light-square weaknesses on the kingside; after 16 h3 17 e2 xg2 18 xg2 g7 19 f3 e4 Black was better in C.Mengual Bolo-S.Garcia Martinez, Cullera 2003) 13 d7 14 e1 h3 15 a4 xg2 16 xg2 b6 with an even position, Z.Beil-I.Nemet, Reggio Emilia 1991.

b) 9 d3 d5! 10 cxd5 (10 c5 b6 11 cxb6 axb6 12 f4 c8 13 f5 b5 14 b4 e4 gives Black good play) 10 cxd5 reaches another symmetrical structure, where there are no objective reasons for White to obtain the upper hand:

b1) 11 c3 c6 12 f4 e4 13 dxe4 f5 14 f6+ xf6 15 d2 wb6 with equal chances.

b2) 11 f4 c6 12 f5 c8 with an even game.

b3) 11 b5 d7 12 f3 c6 13 e5 c7 is about equal too.

b4) 11 d2 c6 12 e3 a6 13 fc1 c8 14 a4 e4 15 c5 e5! (the culmination of the knights' battle for the critical central squares) 16 dxe5
\( \text{\&xc5} \) reached a roughly level game in R.Vaganian-I.Smirin, Odessa 1989.

c) 9 \( \text{\&b3} \) doesn’t give White anything after 9...\( \text{\&b6} \), while for 9...\( \text{\&c7} \) see note ‘c2’ to White’s 8th move in the next game.

9...\( \text{\&xd5} \)

Black can also wait with this exchange: for example, 9...\( \text{\&d7} \) 10 \( \text{\&e3} \) \( \text{\&a6} \) 11 \( \text{\&f3} \) \( \text{\&xd5} \) 12 \( \text{\&xd5} \) transposes back to the main game.

10 \( \text{\&xd5} \) \( \text{\&d7} \)

In general, the main area of Black’s activity here is the queenside, while for White it is the centre.

11 \( \text{\&e3} \)

White has also tried:

a) With 11 \( \text{h3} \) White wants to prepare an ideal set-up with e4 and \( \text{\&e3} \), but this is too slow: 11...\( \text{\&c8}! \) 12 \( \text{\&h2} \) b5 13 a3 a5 14 e4 \( \text{\&a6} \) 15 \( \text{\&e3} \) b4 16 \( \text{\&e2} \) \( \text{\&c5} \) sees Black creating good counterplay on the queenside.

b) The immediate 11 e4 gives Black a promising game after 11...\( \text{\&a6} \) 12 \( \text{\&e3} \) (or 12 \( \text{\&b1} \) \( \text{\&c8} \) 13 h3 b5 14 \( \text{\&e2} \) \( \text{\&c7} \) 15 a3 a5 with the idea of ...b4 and

...e6) 12...\( \text{\&g4}! \) 13 \( \text{\&d4} \) \( \text{\&xd4} \) 14 \( \text{\&xd4} \) \( \text{\&b6}! ? \) 15 \( \text{\&d2} \) \( \text{\&e5} \).

c) 11 \( \text{\&b3} \) \( \text{\&c7} \) 12 \( \text{\&d2} \) \( \text{\&a6} \) 13 \( \text{\&a3} \) (White tries to avoid both ...\( \text{\&c5} \), which can now be met by b2-b4, and ...b5) 13...\( \text{\&c5} \) 14 \( \text{\&xc5} \) \( \text{\&xc5} \) 15 b4 \( \text{\&a4} \) again gave Black good play in R.Mascarinas-M.Fuller, Brisbane 1979.

d) 11 \( \text{\&b1} \) a5! 12 b4 axb4 13 \( \text{\&xb4} \) \( \text{\&a5} \) 14 \( \text{\&b3} \) \( \text{\&a6} \) 15 \( \text{\&d2} \) \( \text{\&f8} \) with a slight advantage for Black.

e) 11 \( \text{\&d2} \) a5 12 \( \text{\&f3} \) \( \text{\&a6} \) 13 \( \text{\&d4} \) \( \text{\&b6} \) 14 e3 \( \text{\&f8} \) and Black has slightly the better chances.

11...\( \text{\&a6}! \)

Better than 11...b5 12 a3 (12 \( \text{\&d4} \) b4 13 \( \text{\&e4} \) \( \text{\&xe4} \) 14 \( \text{xg7} \) \( \text{xg7} \) 15 \( \text{\&xe4} \) \( \text{\&b6} \) is about equal) 12...a5 13 \( \text{\&f3} \) \( \text{\&a6} \) 14 \( \text{\&d4} \) \( \text{\&g4} \) 15 \( \text{\&f4} \) \( \text{\&b6} \) 16 \( \text{\&c6} \) which slightly favours White.

12 \( \text{\&f3} \)

Instead 12 \( \text{\&d4} \) with the idea of e4 was Botvinnik’s original plan. After 12...\( \text{\&a5} \) White has:

a) 13 \( \text{\&e1} \) \( \text{\&c5} \) 14 e4 \( \text{\&b4}! ? \) has the idea of ...\( \text{\&g4} \), exchanging the dark- squared bishops and exploiting White’s
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dark-square weaknesses. If 15 $\text{Wd}2$? then 15...$\text{Qxe}4$.

b) 13 e4 $\text{Qc}7$ 14 $\text{Qe}1$ e5 15 dxe6 $\text{Qxe}6$ leads to an approximately equal position.

c) 13 a3 $\text{Qc}7$ 14 b4 $\text{Wa}6$ 15 $\text{Qe}1$ $\text{Qb}5$ 16 $\text{Qxb}5$ $\text{Wxb}5$ 17 e4 $\text{Wf}c8$ 18 $\text{Wd}2$ $\text{Wd}4$ 19 e5 $\text{Qc}2$ and Black is better, E.Swoboda-A.Duer, Vienna 1979.

Likewise, 12 $\text{Qc}1$ $\text{Wa}5$ 13 a3 $\text{Wf}c8$ 14 $\text{Qd}4$ $\text{Qc}7$ 15 e4 $\text{Qb}5$ gives Black good play.

**12...$\text{Wa}5$**

Black emerged slightly for choice after 12...$\text{Qc}5$!? 13 $\text{Qd}4$ $\text{Wa}5$ 14 $\text{Qb}1$ $\text{Qa}4$ 15 $\text{Qd}2$ $\text{Wf}c8$ 16 b4 $\text{Qxc}3$ 17 $\text{bxa}5$ $\text{Qxd}1$ 18 $\text{Qb}3$ $\text{Qc}2$ 19 $\text{Qb}2$ $\text{Qac}8$ in C.Bauer-J.Degraeve, Belfort 2002.

**13 $\text{Qd}4$**

After 13 a3 $\text{Qc}7$ 14 b4 $\text{Wa}6$ 15 $\text{Qd}4$ $\text{Qb}5$ 16 $\text{Qxb}5$ $\text{Qxb}5$ 17 $\text{Qe}1$ $\text{Qa}4$ 18 $\text{Wd}2$ $\text{Qac}8$ 19 e4 $\text{Qc}2$ Black had slightly the better chances in O.Romanishin-G.Kuzmin, Kherson 1989.

**13...$\text{Wf}c8$ 14 $\text{Qb}3$ $\text{Qd}8$ 15 $\text{h}3$**

Instead 15 $\text{Qd}4$ $\text{Qg}4$ 16 $\text{Qxg}7$ $\text{Qxg}7$ 17 $\text{Wd}4+$ $\text{Qg}8$ 18 $\text{Wf}c1$ $\text{Qc}5$ 19 $\text{Qd}2$ $\text{Wb}6$ 20 $\text{h}3$ $\text{Qf}6$ led to an equal position in J.Demina-A.Borsuk, Podolsk 1990.

So, White has a space advantage, but does this mean that his chances are better?

**15...$\text{Qe}8$**

Releasing the d7-square for the knight. Black can also consider:

a) 15...$\text{Qc}4$ 16 $\text{Wd}2$ $\text{Qe}8$ (after 16...$\text{Wc}7$ 17 $\text{Qfd}1$ $\text{Qc}8$ 18 $\text{Qd}4$ $\text{b}5$ 19 e4 $\text{b}4$ 20 $\text{Qe}2$ White is better, E.Pursiainen-M.Nouro, Jyvaskyla 2008) 17 $\text{Wf}c1$ $\text{Qd}7$ 18 $\text{Qd}4$ $\text{Qcc}8$ 19 $\text{Qab}1$ $\text{Qac}5$ 20 $\text{Qh}2$ $\text{Qf}6$ with an even position, M.Kapelan-D.Sahovic, Vrsac 1979.

b) 15...$\text{Qc}7$!? with the idea of ...$\text{Qb}5$.

**16 $\text{Qd}4$**

16 $\text{Wd}2$ $\text{Qd}7$ 17 $\text{f}4$ $\text{Qb}6$ 18 $\text{Qa}5$ $\text{Qc}4$ 19 $\text{Qxc}4$ $\text{Qxc}4$ 20 $\text{Wf}c1$ $\text{Wa}5$ gave Black good play on the queenside in A.Shendur-V.Moskalenko, Yalta 1996.

**16...$\text{Qd}7$ 17 $\text{Qxg}7$ $\text{Qxg}7$ 18 $\text{Wd}4+$ $\text{Qg}8$ 19 $\text{Qac}1$ $\text{Wb}6$**

Black will have fair chances in the endgame as he has no weaknesses and White's space advantage will count for less after the forthcoming exchanges.
but quite reasonable nonetheless: the f5-bishop will be driven back by e2-e4 and the knight can find a better position on d3. Though 8 dxe1 is played less frequently than 8 dxe4, Kasparov, Karpov and Topalov are among the players who have employed it, while Avrukh recently recommended it in his Grandmaster Repertoire work.

Instead quiet moves are met by 8...e4, which usually allows Black to equalize comfortably:

a) 8 b3 dxe4 9 b2 (or 9 dxe4 dxe4 10 b2 a5 11 d2 a4!? 12 e3 d5 13 d.fd1 e.a6 14 c3 c7 15 h3 e.e8 with the idea of ...d6, controlling some key central squares) 9...xc3 (9...d7 10 dxe4 dxe4 11 d2 a6 is about equal) 10 x.c3 d7 11 e3 f6 12 h4 g4 13 d3 d5 reaches a roughly level game.

b) 8 d.e1 e.e4 and then:

b1) 9 dxe4 dxe4 10 h3 xf3 11 exf3 gives White the bishop-pair at the cost of some defects in his pawn structure. Then 11...d7 12 g5 e8 13 d2 b6 14 b3 c5 15 e3 e6 with the
idea of ...cxd4 and ...d5 leads to an approximately equal position.

b2) After 9 \h4 \xc3 10 bxc3 \e6 the doubled pawns are Black’s natural targets: 11 \xd3 \f7 12 \f3 \a5 13 \g5 \c5? (an interesting possibility to utilize the weakness of not only c4, but also the c3-pawn) 14 dxc5 \xc3 15 \xe6 fxe6 isn’t at all easy to assess.

b3) 9 \d2 \xc3 10 bxc3 \c7 with the idea of ...c5 is unclear.

b4) 9 \b3 \xc3 10 bxc3 (if 10 \xc3 \c5 11 \e3 \c6 12 \d2 \b6 13 \ed1 \fe8 and Black has slightly the better chances)

Now:

c1) After 9 \e1, in comparison to 8 \e1, the inclusion of \b3 and ...\c7 gives White no benefit: 9...e5 10 e4 \d7 11 d5 \a6 12 \d3 \fc8 13 h3 cxd5 14 cxd5 b6 15 \e3 \c5 16 \d1 \b7 17 \c1 a5 18 \e1 \xd3 19 \xd3 b5 with an even position, J.Zarkovic-D.Sahovic, Cetinje 1992.

c2) 9 \h4 by analogy should be compared to 8 \h4. Here 9...\e6 10 d5 cxd5 11 \xd5 \xd5 12 cxd5 \d7 13 \e3 \a6 14 \fc1 \c5 15 \c2 a5 leads to an approximately equal position.

c3) 9 \f4 has the idea of c4-c5, preventing ...e7-e5. Then 9...\bd7 10 c5 \h5 leads to rough equality.

c4) 9 \g5 \bd7 10 \fd1 h6 11 \d2 a5 12 \ac1 \e6 13 \e1 a4 and here too the awkward position of the queen
on b3 begins to tell: for example, 14 \( \text{wb}4 \text{ wb}6 \) 15 \( \text{wx}b6 \) \( \text{dx}b6 \), leaving the pawn on c4 weak.

c5) 9 \( \text{xe}1 \) e5 10 e4 \( \text{g}4 \) 11 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{bd}7 \) 12 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{ex}d4 \) 13 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{fe}8 \) 14 \( \text{e}6 \) 15 \( \text{wc}2 \) a6 with the idea of ...b5

Returning to 8 \( \text{ae}1 \):

\[
\text{8...e5}
\]

An alternative plan is 8...\( \text{wc}8 \) with the idea of ...h3: for example, 9 e4 \( \text{h}3 \) 10 \( \text{we}2 \) (Avrukh prefers 10 \( \text{hx}3 \) \( \text{wx}h3 \) 11 \( \text{f}3 \) when 11...c5!? 12 d5 \( \text{fd}7 \) deserves attention) 10...a6 11 \( \text{d}3 \) (11 \( \text{e}5 \)!? requires testing) 11...\( \text{xe}2 \) 12 \( \text{xe}2 \) b5 13 c5 \( \text{dx}c5 \) 14 \( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{fd}7 \) 15 \( \text{xd}7 \) \( \text{xd}7 \) 16 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{wb}7 \) 17 f3 \( \text{ac}8 \) 18 \( \text{ac}1 \) \( \text{fe}8 \) 19 \( \text{fd}1 \) e6 20 \( \text{db}1 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 21 \( \text{wh}2 \) e5 with an even position in V.Tkachiev-L.McShane, Khanty Mansiysk Olympiad 2010.

\[
\text{9 d5}
\]

9 e4 \( \text{g}4 \) leads White into trouble: 10 \( \text{wd}3 \) (or 10 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{ex}d4 \) 11 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \) with the same idea, ...\( \text{d}5 \)?) 10...\( \text{ex}d4 \) 11 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 12 \( \text{f}3 \) (if 12 \( \text{wd}3 \) \( \text{bd}7 \) with the idea of ...\( \text{e}5 \)) 12...\( \text{d}5 \)!

\( \text{wd}3 \) \( \text{xc}3 \) with advantage for Black.

\[
\text{9...cxd5}
\]

Delaying this exchange hardly gives Black any profit, although practice has also seen 9...a5 when 10 \( \text{h}3 \) (Black should also be ready to encounter 10 e4 \( \text{d}7 \) 11 \( \text{dx}c6 \)?) 10...\( \text{cxd}5 \) 11 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 12 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 13 a4 (if 13 \( \text{d}3 \) b5 14 a4 b4 15 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{h}5 \) with the idea of ...f5) 13...\( \text{c}5 \) (13...\( \text{wc}8 \)?) 14 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{wc}4 \) 14 \( \text{xd}3 \) b6 15 \( \text{h}2 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 16 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{ex}f4 \) 17 \( \text{xf}4 \) \( \text{sc}8 \) 18 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{a}6 \) led to complex play in L.Javakhishvili-L.McShane, Moscow 2010.

\[
\text{10 cxd5}
\]

Instead 10 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{cxd}5 \) 11 \( \text{cxd}5 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 12 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 13 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 14 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 15 \( \text{xc}2 \) \( \text{f}5 \) would have been quite unclear.

\[
\text{10...a6!}
\]

Again this is the right development. Black has also tried to secure the c5-square for the knight with 10...a5, but 11 e4 (or 11 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 12 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 13 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 14 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 15 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 16 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 17 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{xc}4 \) 18 \( \text{dx}d6 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 19 \( \text{a}7 \) \( \text{b}8 \) 20 \( \text{xa}5 \) and White is bet-
The New Old Indian

Zllincic-I.Khmelniker, Budapest 2004) 11...\(\text{d7}\) 12 a4! (not 12 \(\text{d3}\) b5) 12...\(\text{a6}\) 13 \(\text{d3}\) slightly favours White.

11 e4

Instead 11 \(\text{d3}\) provokes Black into playing ...e4, which weakens the d4-square, but there is no rose without a thorn – Black will receive the useful e5-square in return. Indeed, 11...e4 12 \(\text{e1}\) \(\text{d7}\) 13 \(\text{c2}\) \(\text{fe8}\) 14 a4 \(\text{h3}\) 15 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{e5}\), attacking the pawn on d5 and with the idea of ...\(\text{h5}\), resulted in mutual chances in M.Chiburdanidze-M.Klinova, Dresden Olympiad 2008.

11...\(\text{d7}\) 12 \(\text{d3}\)

If White prevents Black’s queenside play with 12 a4 then Black can switch to the other flank: 12...\(\text{e8}\) 13 \(\text{d3}\) f5 14 f4 \(\text{b4}\) 15 \(\text{f2}\) a5 16 exf5 \(\text{xf5}\) 17 \(\text{e2}\) \(\text{c2}\) saw Black taking the upper hand in K.Hulak-D.Sahovic, Pula 1984.

12...\(\text{c8}\)

A more precise approach is to immediately get Black’s queenside play under way with 12...\(\text{b5}\)? Then 13 a3 \(\text{b8}\)! (this idea is not considered by Avrukh; less precise is 13...\(\text{b6}\) as the queenside comes under pressure after 14 \(\text{e3}\) \(\text{b7}\) 15 \(\text{e2}\) b4 16 axb4 \(\text{xb4}\) 17 \(\text{xb4}\) \(\text{xb4}\) 18 \(\text{xa7}\) 14 b4 (or 14 \(\text{e2}\) b4 with rough equality) 14...\(\text{c8}\) 15 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{c4}\) is unclear.

However, 12...\(\text{e7}\)?! is a loss of time and the queen will be missed on the queenside: 13 a4 \(\text{fc8}\) 14 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{c5}\) 15 \(\text{xc5}\) \(\text{xc5}\) 16 a5 \(\text{d8}\) 17 \(\text{b3}\) \(\text{g4}\) 18 h3 \(\text{h6}\) 19 \(\text{axh6}\) \(\text{gxh6}\) 20 \(\text{xb7}\) left White doing pretty well in G.Kasparov-M.Adams, New York (rapid) 1995.

13 \(\text{b3}\)

Now 13 a4 probably gives White an edge in view of \(\text{b5}\) ideas, as the a7-pawn is unprotected: for example, 13...\(\text{c7}\) (or 13...\(\text{e8}\) 14 \(\text{b3}\) b6 15 \(\text{b5}\)) 14 \(\text{b5}\) and White has slightly the better chances.

13...\(\text{c7}\) 14 \(\text{d1}\)

Instead 14 \(\text{e3}\) b6 15 f3 \(\text{c5}\) 16 \(\text{c4}\) \(\text{b7}\) 17 \(\text{xc5}\) bxc5 18 b3 a5 19 \(\text{fc1}\) \(\text{e8}\) 20 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{c7}\) is about equal, J.Grau Ribas-A.5hikalov, correspondence 2000.

14...\(\text{b6}\) 15 a4 \(\text{c5}\)

Black has achieved a fully satisfactory position.
16  \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Wa3 xxd3}}}

Again, the idea behind this variation is that by playing ...\textit{\textcolor{red}{f5}}, Black prevents White from immediately playing the space-grabbing 4 \textit{\textbf{e4}}.

4 \textit{\textbf{f3}}

The most common choice, preparing to move the e-pawn to e4. Alternatives will be seen in the next game.

4... \textit{\textbf{e5}}

5 \textit{\textbf{e4}}

This can also be delayed:

a) After 5 \textit{\textbf{dxe5}} \textit{\textbf{dxe5}} 6 \textit{\textbf{Wxd8+ xd8}} as usual Black is fine in this ending. Following 7 \textit{\textbf{e4}} (or 7 \textit{\textbf{g5}} c6 8 0-0-0 \textit{\textbf{g7}} 9 g3 \textit{\textbf{e6}} 10 b3 \textit{\textbf{c5}}! 11 \textit{\textbf{e4}} \textit{\textbf{a6}} which gives Black a perfectly acceptable position) 7... \textit{\textbf{e6}} 8 \textit{\textbf{e3}} c6 9 0-0-0 \textit{\textbf{c7}} Black will usually try to exchange the dark-squared bishops in order to obtain dark-square outposts for his knights. For example:

a1) 10 \textit{\textbf{g4}} \textit{\textbf{d6}} 11 \textit{\textbf{g5}} \textit{\textbf{h5}} 12 \textit{\textbf{a4}} \\
    \textit{\textbf{e7}} gives Black a promising game.

a2) 10 \textit{\textbf{d3}} \textit{\textbf{bd7}} 11 \textit{\textbf{b1}} a6 prepares counterplay with ...\textit{\textbf{b5}}.

a3) 10 \textit{\textbf{e2}} \textit{\textbf{b4}} 11 \textit{\textbf{c2}} \textit{\textbf{a6}} 12 \textit{\textbf{g4}} \\
    \textit{\textbf{c5}} 13 \textit{\textbf{xc5}} \textit{\textbf{xc5}} 14 \textit{\textbf{h4}} \textit{\textbf{ad8}} 15

\textit{\textbf{Game 21}}

\textit{\textbf{M.Suba-V.Georgiev}}

\textit{\textbf{Balaguer 1997}}

1 d4 \textit{\textbf{f6}} 2 c4 d6 3 \textit{\textbf{c3}} \textit{\textbf{f5}}
The New Old Indian

\[ \text{dxd8 dxd8 16 } \text{h3 a5 17 } \text{f2 fd7} 18 \text{b3 f6} \text{ and Black is better, F.Hanssen-R.Van Berkel, Dutch League 1993.} \]

a4) 10 \text{b1 a6 11 g3 c5 12 xc5 xcxd1 13 h3 ad8 14 f2 d1+ 15 cxd1 d8 16 c1 a5 17 e2 b5 18 e3 b4 and again Black is better, Y.Nikitin-E.Vasiukov, Alma-Ata 1968.}

a5) 10 g3 bd7 11 h3 c5 12 xc5 xc5 13 g5 h6 14 xe6+ xe6 15 h3 g5 16 g2 e6 was drawn in D.llic-G.Kosanovic, Kladovo 1989.

b) With 5 d5 White hopes to follow through with 6 e4, but 5...e4! is the nail which destroys White’s pawn chain.

b1) 6 \text{d4 g6 7 h3 a6 8 fxe4 b4 9 d1 a5 10 f2 e7 11 g3 d7 12 g2 f6 13 d2 h5 14 b1 e5 15 a3 a6 16 d3 h4 with decent counterplay for Black in M.Van der Werf-V.Georgiev, Andorra 1997.}

b2) 6 g5 e7 7 g4!? d7 (keeping the option to sacrifice on g4) 8 e3 exf3 9 exf3 0-0 10 d2 c6 11 g5 e8 12 d3 a6 13 f4 ec7 14 f3 b4 with mutual chances.

b3) 6 e3 e7 7 d2 h5!? (Black prevents g2-g4 and undertakes aggressive action on the kingside) 8 g3 bd7 9 c2 g6 10 fxe4 h4! 11 g2 g4 and Black is better, M.Lacrosse-Z.Bratanov, Montpellier 2003.

b4) After 6 \text{b3} Black can sacrifice the pawn, as after 6...bd7 7 xb7 e7 followed by ...0-0 his superior development gives him full compensation.

b5) 6 g4 xg4! forces a draw: 7 fxg4 (not 7 f4 exf3 8 xf3 d7 9 e4 g6 10 h3 h5 11 e2 e7 12 0-0-0 f6 with advantage to Black) 7...h4+ 8 d2 e3+ (Black can’t deviate: 8...xg4? 9 h3 is very good for White) 9 xe3 g5+ 10 f2 h4+ 11 g2 xg4+ 12 f2 h4+ with a draw in A.Wojtkiewicz-A.Shabalov, Bonn 1994.

If Black wishes to avoid the forced draw in variation ‘b5’, he might meet 5 d5 with 5...h5!? 6 g3 e7 7 e4 c8 which is unexplored and not at all easy to assess.

5...exd4

b) With 5 d5 White hopes to follow through with 6 e4, but 5...e4! is the nail which destroys White’s pawn chain.

b1) 6 \text{d4 g6 7 h3 a6 8 fxe4 b4 9 d1 a5 10 f2 e7 11 g3 d7 12 g2 f6 13 d2 h5 14 b1 e5 15 a3 a6 16 d3 h4 with decent counterplay for Black in M.Van der Werf-V.Georgiev, Andorra 1997.}

b2) 6 g5 e7 7 g4!? d7 (keeping the option to sacrifice on g4) 8 e3 exf3 9 exf3 0-0 10 d2 c6 11 g5 e8 12 d3 a6 13 f4 ec7 14 f3 b4 with mutual chances.

b3) 6 e3 e7 7 d2 h5!? (Black prevents g2-g4 and undertakes aggressive action on the kingside) 8 g3 bd7 9 c2 g6 10 fxe4 h4! 11 g2 g4 and Black is better, M.Lacrosse-Z.Bratanov, Montpellier 2003.

b4) After 6 \text{b3} Black can sacrifice the pawn, as after 6...bd7 7 xb7 e7 followed by ...0-0 his superior development gives him full compensation.

b5) 6 g4 xg4! forces a draw: 7 fxg4 (not 7 f4 exf3 8 xf3 d7 9 e4 g6 10 h3 h5 11 e2 e7 12 0-0-0 f6 with advantage to Black) 7...h4+ 8 d2 e3+ (Black can’t deviate: 8...xg4? 9 h3 is very good for White) 9 xe3 g5+ 10 f2 h4+ 11 g2 xg4+ 12 f2 h4+ with a draw in A.Wojtkiewicz-A.Shabalov, Bonn 1994.

If Black wishes to avoid the forced draw in variation ‘b5’, he might meet 5 d5 with 5...h5!? 6 g3 e7 7 e4 c8 which is unexplored and not at all easy to assess.

5...exd4
a) After 6 d5 g6 7 wxd4 e7 8 xe7 xe7 9 g5 c6 10 wd2 h6 11 c3 0-0 12 h3 a8 Black had the superior development and was ready to play ...d7 and ...f5 in H.Schussler-R.Keene, Skara 1980, where 13 0-0-0? walked into the hugely-destructive blow 13...xe4!.

b) 6 c2 d7 (if Black is happy to allow the exchange of his light-squared bishop, he might try 6...e6!? 7 c4 c5 8 xe6 fxe6 9 c2 c6 when after ...e5 and ...d4 the knight will strengthen Black's position, but due to his light-square weaknesses and 'bad' remaining bishop, Black's position is not perfect; perhaps instead of ...e6-e5 he might thus consider ...d6-d5 ideas) 7 xd4 c6 and now:

b1) 8 xc6 bxc6 9 c8 d5 (exploiting White's lack of development and dark-square weaknesses) 10 exd5 cxd5 11 c2 c5 and Black has slightly the better chances.

b2) 8 e3 we7 9 g2 d5! (another situation where this break works) 10 cxd5 cxd5 11 c2? wxe3 12 c2? b4+ and 0-1 was the miniature R.Gross-L.Christiansen, Lone Pine 1973.

b3) 8 g2 g6 9 e3 g7 10 0-0 0-0 11 c3 unexpectedly transposes to a line of the Sämisch King's Indian when the exchange ...e5xd4 happens.

7 e3

Another natural deployment, but again by no means forced:

a) 7 f4 g6 8 e3 c6 9 d3 g4 10 d2 b4 11 b1 g7 wasn't at all easy to assess in L.Portisch-L.Christiansen, Szirak 1987.

b) 7 b3 and then:
b1) 7...c6 8 b2 d5 9 cxd5 cxd5 10 \\xd5 \xexd5 11 exd5 \wxd5 12 \wxd5 \\xd5 13 0-0-0 with a slight advantage for White in Lin Weiguo-T.Imanaliev, Frunze 1989.

b2) 7...c6 8 \xd2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.

b3) 7...g6!? 8 b2 c6 9 \xd2 \g7 10 \ge2 0-0 11 \g3 \d7 12 \e2 h5 and Black has slightly better chances.

c) 7 \d5 \c6 sees White trying to keep a grip on the position, while Black will play around d5, aiming for counterplay on the dark squares:

b) 7...c6 8 \w2 a5 9 b2 g6 10 \xd3 \g7 11 \ge2 \d7 12 0-0 0-0 13 \lad1 \c5 was quite unclear in M.Lacrosse-M.Benoit, Le Touquet 1992.
Again it helps to explore the alternatives to further our understanding of both sides' typical aims in this structure:

a) 8 b3 \(g7\) 9 \(ge2\) 0-0 10 \(wd2\) \(c6\) (10...a5 11 \(d4\) \(c6\) 12 \(e2\) \(e8\) 13 0-0 \(d7\) was fine for Black in T.Paunovic-S.Martinovic, Belgrade 2004) 11 \(f4\) a5 12 \(d1\) \(d7\) 13 \(e2\) \(c5\) 14 0-0 a4 15 \(xc5\) \(xc5\) 16 \(xd8\) \(fxd8\) 17 \(xa4\) \(d4\) 18 \(h1\) \(b4\) 19 \(xe6\) \(xe6\) 20 f4 \(xa2\) and Black is better, C.Navrotescu-K.Shirazi, French League 2006.

b) 8 \(d1\)

A slow method of development.

If White is ready to exchange his light-squared bishop for Black's knight, he might try 9 \(d3\) \(bd7\) 10 \(ge2\) \(e5\) 11 b3 when 11...c6 12 0-0 0-0 13 \(f4\) d5 14 \(xd5\) \(xd5\) 15 exd5 \(xd5\) 16 \(fxd5\) \(xd5\) 17 \(xd5\) \(xd5\) 18 \(e4\) \(xd2\) led to drawish simplification in De G.Boer-G.Ligterink, Amsterdam 1987.

Black may also use his temporarily superior development to break with
10...c6!? 11 \( \text{dxe}_2 \) d5 and after 12 cxd5 cxd5 13 exd5 \( \text{e}_x d_5 \) 14 \( \text{e}_x d_5 \) \( \text{e}_x d_5 \) 15 \( \text{e}_x d_5 \) \( \text{e}_x d_5 \) 16 \( \text{e}_x d_1 \) \( \text{e}_2 \) 17 \( \text{e}_4 \) \( \text{e}_8 \) 18 \( \text{e}_2 \) \( \text{e}_8 \) 19 \( \text{f}_2 \) \( \text{c}_6 \) 20 \( \text{c}_x c_6 \) \( \text{e}_x c_6 \) a draw was agreed in M.Kaposztas-G.Moehring, Trnava 1988.

11 \( \text{dxe}_2 \) d7 12 \( \text{f}_4 \) \( \text{c}_5 \) 13 \( \text{e}_2 \) a5 14 \( \text{b}_5 \) \( \text{d}_7 \) 15 0-0 \( \text{e}_7 \) 16 \( \text{e}_8 \) \( \text{f}_1 \) b6 17 \( \text{b}_1 \) f5!

Black has achieved a fully satisfactory game and Georgiev went on to triumph in thematic style:

18 \( \text{d}_5 \) \( \text{e}_5 \) 19 exd5 \( \text{x}_b_5 \) 20 cxb5 \( \text{x}_e_8 \) 21 \( \text{c}_4 \) \( \text{w}_f_6 \) 22 \( \text{e}_c_1 \) \( \text{e}_7 \) 23 \( \text{f}_2 \) \( \text{f}_6 \) 24 \( \text{e}_c_5 \) \( \text{b}_x c_5 \) 25 \( \text{e}_1 \) \( \text{d}_4 + \) 26 \( \text{h}_1 \) \( \text{e}_3 \) 27 \( \text{w}_d_3 \) \( \text{w}_g_5 \) 28 \( \text{e}_2 \) \( \text{e}_5 \) 29 \( \text{g}_3 \) \( \text{f}_4 \) 30 g4 \( \text{w}_h_4 \) 31 \( \text{e}_f_1 \) \( \text{w}_h_3 \) 32 \( \text{e}_e_1 \) \( \text{e}_a_8 \) 33 \( \text{w}_c_2 \) \( \text{w}_h_4 \) 34 \( \text{e}_2 \) \( \text{e}_8 e_7 \) 35 \( \text{w}_c_3 \) \( \text{w}_h_3 \) 36 \( \text{g}_2 \) \( \text{d}_4 \) 37 \( \text{x}_a_5 \) \( \text{x}_e_3 \) 38 \( \text{w}_d_2 \) \( \text{x}_f_3 \) 39 \( \text{w}_d_1 \) \( \text{f}_3 \) 0-1

\section*{Game 22}
\textit{G.Andruet-M.Benoit}
Val Maubuee 1990

1 \( \text{d}_4 \) \( \text{f}_6 \) 2 c4 d6 3 \( \text{c}_3 \) \( \text{f}_5 \)

4 \( \text{g}_3 \)

Alekhine’s choice and still the most challenging option against the Jaworski-Indian. As well as the 4 \( \text{f}_3 \) of the previous game, White has also tried:

a) 4 \( \text{f}_3 \) and now with 4...g6 Black transposes to the first four games of this chapter. He can also consider 4...h6!? preparing to retreat the bishop to h7 if necessary, keeping the pressure on the central square e4. Here 5 \( g_3 \) (if 5 d5 with the idea of \( \text{d}_d_4 \) then 5...e5 6 dxex6 \( \text{e}_x e_6 \) 7 \( \text{e}_d_4 \) \( \text{d}_7 \) 8 \( \text{g}_3 \) \( \text{c}_6 \) 9 \( \text{g}_2 \) g6 10 b3 \( \text{g}_7 \) 11 \( \text{b}_2 \) 0-0 12 0-0 \( \text{e}_8 \) 13 \( \text{e}_3 \) is about equal) 5...\( \text{c}_8 \) 6 \( \text{g}_2 \) \( \text{b}_d_7 \) 7 0-0 e5 8 e4 \( \text{h}_7 \) 9 \( \text{e}_1 \) \( \text{e}_7 \) 10 b3 0-0 11 \( \text{b}_2 \) \( \text{e}_8 \) 12 \( \text{d}_2 \) c6 13 \( \text{e}_a_1 \) \( \text{c}_7 \) 14 \( \text{d}_5 ? ! \) \( \text{c}_5 \) reached a roughly level game in J.Rodriguez Gonzales-M.Tal, Halle 1974.

b) 4 \( \text{g}_5 \) \( \text{b}_d_7 \) and now:

b1) 5 \( \text{f}_3 \) h6 6 \( \text{h}_4 \) e5 7 e4 \( \text{h}_7 \) 8 d5 reaches a familiar structure. Yes, the bishop on h7 is not overly useful in this structure, but on the other hand, White’s dark-squared bishop will have to retreat too, as he doesn’t want to exchange it. Here 8...\( \text{e}_7 \) 9 \( \text{f}_2 \) 0-0 10 \( \text{d}_3 \) \( \text{e}_8 \) 11 \( \text{g}_2 \) f5 12 exf5 \( \text{x}_f_5 \) 13 \( \text{e}_4 \) \( \text{h}_4 \) saw Black activating his bishop with rough equality in J.Hebert-D.Allan, Calgary 1975.

b2) 5 e3 is absolutely non-ambitious and 5...h6 6 \( \text{h}_4 \) e6 7 \( \text{d}_3 \) \( \text{x}_d_3 \) 8 \( \text{x}_d_3 \) \( \text{e}_7 \) 9 \( \text{f}_3 \) c6 10 0-0 0-0 leads to an approximately equal position.

b3) 5 \( \text{f}_3 \) somehow reminds one of the Capablanca Variation, 1 \( \text{d}_4 \) \( \text{f}_6 \) 2
\( \text{d}3 \text{ } \text{d}6 \text{ } 3 \text{ } \text{c}3 \text{ } \text{f}5 \) (see the first game of the next chapter).

The difference is that White has played c2-c4 and Black has an additional tempo, which allows him to create dangerous dark-square counterplay: 5...h6 6 \text{h}4 (or 6 \text{f}4 \text{c}5 7 \text{d}5 \text{g}5 8 \text{g}3 \text{w}a5 9 \text{d}2 \text{g}7 10 \text{e}4 \text{xe}4 11 \text{c}xe4 \text{xe}4 12 \text{we}2 \text{xb}2 13 \text{d}1 \text{c}2 which was better for Black in H.Mueller-M.Stichlberger, Finkenstein 1992) 6...g5 7 \text{g}3 \text{c}5! followed by ...\text{wb}6 (or ...\text{wa}5) and ...\text{g}7 sees Black starting action on the queenside, while the bishop is out of play on g3.

c) As always 4 \text{wb}3 should be taken into account when Black leaves his b7-pawn unprotected. Now 4...\text{c}6 attacks the d4-pawn while preparing ...a5 with the idea of ...\text{b}4, and after 5 \text{e}3 (or 5 \text{f}3 a5 6 \text{d}5 \text{b}4 7 \text{d}4 \text{d}7 8 \text{e}4 \text{e}5 which is unclear) 5...a5 6 a3 \text{we}8 7 \text{f}3 \text{e}5 8 \text{d}5 \text{b}8 9 \text{h}4 \text{g}6 10 \text{xxg}6 \text{hxg}6 11 \text{wc}2 \text{bd}7 12 \text{bb}1 \text{c}6 13 \text{e}4 \text{e}7 14 \text{e}2 \text{d}8 15 0-0 \text{b}6 16 \text{h}1 \text{d}4 17 \text{f}4 \text{h}5 18 \text{hxh}5 \text{hxh}5 19 \text{e}2 \text{b}6 20 \text{f}5 \text{wd}8 complex play had arisen in R.Levit-

H.Multhopp, Chicago 1990.

d) The gambit continuation 4 \text{e}4?! isn't entirely sound, but should not be underestimated. After 4...\text{xe}4 5 \text{xe}4 \text{xe}4 6 \text{f}3 \text{d}5 7 \text{wb}3 (7 \text{d}3 \text{f}6 8 \text{g}5 \text{e}6 9 0-0-0 \text{c}6 10 \text{e}2 \text{e}7 11 \text{g}4 \text{bd}7 12 \text{f}4 \text{xc}4 13 \text{xc}4 \text{d}5 14 \text{e}5 \text{xe}5 15 \text{dxe}5 \text{wc}7 with the idea of ...0-0-0 was excellent for Black in A.Berube-Y.Poliquin, Quebec 2004), probably Black's strongest move is 7...\text{e}5!, although this has not yet been seen in practice.

Indeed, 8 \text{wb}7 \text{d}7 9 \text{dxe}5 (and not 9 \text{wd}5? \text{b}4+) 9...\text{c}5 10 \text{h}3 0-0 sees Black grabbing the upper hand.

Returning to 4 \text{g}3:

4...\text{e}5

This is the classic Old Indian plan of confronting the pawn at d4, but the bishop's position on f5 is not perfect here.

It would be thematic and ideal if Black could play 4...\text{e}4, but this is is met by 5 \text{wd}3 \text{d}5 6 \text{cxd}5 (or 6 \text{g}2 \text{d}6 7 \text{wd}1 \text{xc}4 8 \text{e}4 which gives White an edge) 6...\text{xc}3 7 \text{xf}5 \text{xd}5 8 a3 which
is somewhat better for White as he has more control of the centre, C.Nogly-V.Georgiev, Hamburg 1999.

Another option is to try the King's Indian set-up, 4...c6!? 5 Ng2 g6. Then:

a) 6 f3 Ng7 7 h4 (7 0-0 0-0 takes play back into Games 19 and 20) 7...e6 8 d5 a6 11 h3 c8 12 h2 cxd5 13 cxd5 c4 14 d1 c5 15 a2 f6 and Black has excellent queenside play, L.Jakobetz-A.Nadassy, Hungarian League 2003.

b) After 6 e4 Black is going to be a tempo down on a normal Fianchetto King's Indian, but this doesn't have to be fatal for him. Indeed, the creative 6...e6 7 b3 g7 8 d7 0-0 0-0 c8 10 f3 a6 prepared counterplay with ...h3 and ...b5 in G.Lighterink-A.Mestel, Marbella 1982, and after 11 a4 a5 12 e3 a6 13 c1 c7 14 d2 c8 15 h3 e5! 16 f4 exd4 17 d4 c5 18 e2 a8 Black had a good position, with pressure against e4 and b3.

**5 Ng2**

Instead 5 d5 c6 6 Ng2 a5 7 e4 Ng4 8 f3 c8 9 e3 0-0 10 d2 a6 11 d2 b5 led to complex play, acceptable enough for Black in S.Volkov-A.Potapov, Internet 2006, while 5 f3 c6!? (after 5...bd7 6 g2 c6 7 0-0 e7 8 h4 g6 9 xg6 hxg6 10 e3 0-0 11 b3 White is slightly better with his bishops, A.Graf-S.Martinovic, German League 2004) 6 d5 (6 g2 transposes to the note to White's 6th move in our main game) 6...b8 7 g2 e7 8 0-0 0-0 9 h4 d7 10 c2 c8 is quite unclear and requires practical testing. 5...c6

Not 5...exd4? 6 xb7! dx3 7 xa8 with a decisive advantage for White.

6 d5

White also has 6 f3 when 6...exd4 (6...d7 7 d5 b4? is badly misguided on account of 8 0-0 c2 9 e4) 7 d4 d4 8 xd4 c6 9 0-0 e7 slightly favours him.

6...b4 7 e4 g4 8 f3 d7

Returning to the bishop's initial square with 8...c8 seems less logical and 9 c2 c6 10 dxe2 e7 11 e3 c5 (11...c6?!) 12 b1 (12 dxc6 bx6 13 0-0-0 is a touch better for White) 12...0-0 13 0-0 c8 (a typical manoeuvre with the idea of ...e7-g5, ...g6, ...g7 and ...f5) 14 b4 gave White an edge in G.Flear-J.Ivanov, Elgoibar 2004.

9 c2 c6 2xe2

An alternative was 9...c5 when 10 dxc6 dxc6 11 e3 e7 12 0-0 0-0 13 d2 a6 had the idea of ...a5 and ...b5 in J.Piket-I.Sokolov, Amsterdam 1996, although now the prophylactic 14 b3! would have given White an edge.
10 \textit{\texttt{Wxe2 \textit{\texttt{e7 11 f4}}}}

The more solid option was 11 0-0 0-0 12 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{e3}} followed by queenside play with b4 and c5, although the situation isn’t so clear after 12...c6.

11...c6

11...exf4!? 12 gxf4 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{tg4}} with the idea of ...\texttt{\textit{\texttt{d7}} and ...\texttt{h4+ deserved definite attention.}}

12 f5?!

Instead of removing the central tension, it would have been better to increase it and 12 c5!? would have been a good idea.

12...cxd5 13 cxd5 h5 14 h4 g6 15 0-0 gxf5 16 exf5 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{LtJg4}}

Black has excellent prospects.

17 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{f3 \textit{\texttt{Wb6+ 18 \texttt{h1 \textit{\texttt{Cc8 19 \textit{\texttt{e4 \textit{\texttt{b5 20 \textit{\texttt{we1 f6?}}}}}}}}}}}}}}

The threat of f5-f6 could have been simply ignored and after 20...\texttt{\textit{\texttt{Cc2}} Black would have retained the initiative.

21 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{Bb3 \textit{\texttt{Wa6 22 \textit{\texttt{e3 \textit{\texttt{Cc4?}}}}}}}}

Black should have prepared a retreat for his queen with 22...b6, whereas now he rather collapses.

23 a4 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{xa4 24 \textit{\texttt{Ba3 \textit{\texttt{Xe3 25 \textit{\texttt{Wxe3}}}}}}}}

26 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{xa3 \textit{\texttt{xb6 27 \textit{\texttt{xb6 axb6 28 \textit{\texttt{a8+ 1-0}}}}}}}}}

\textbf{Summary}

After 1 d4 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{f6 2 c4 d6 3 Cf3}} Black can choose either a King’s Indian (when White’s choice is limited due to the knight already being on f3) or Old Indian set-up, but we recommend 3...g6 4 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{C3 f5. White has a lot of possibilities here, including 5 \textit{\texttt{Wb3}} when the main line is 5...\texttt{Cc8 (Georgiev’s 5...b6 also deserves further attention) 6 g3 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{g7 7 0-0 0-0 8 d5 \textit{\texttt{d8. Black’s setup seems clumsy, but White hasn’t shown a clear route to an advantage. Instead 5 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{h4 drives back the bishop and returns the game to King’s Indian types of position, but Black should be okay here too, especially if he goes in for an early central exchange with ...e5xd4.}}}}}}}}}}

Smyslov’s set-up of ...c6 and ...\texttt{\textit{\texttt{f5 is also good against the Fianchetto King’s Indian, which we reach via 3 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{f3 g6 4 g3. One way or another White will drive back the bishop and gain control of the centre, but Black is in time to create sufficient queenside counterplay. Again complex play results with chances for both sides to play creatively.}}}}}}

After 1 d4 \texttt{\textit{\texttt{f6 2 c4 d6 3 \textit{\texttt{C3}} Black may try Janowski’s 3...\texttt{f5 as an alternative to 3...e5. Complex play results from 4 f3 e5 when Black’s early lead in development promises him enough counterplay, but Alekhine’s 4 g3 is a tough nut to crack and seems to give White slightly the better chances.}}}}
Chapter Four
2 \( \text{d}f3 \text{d}6 \) without 3 c4

1 d4 \( \text{d}f6 \) 2 \( \text{d}f3 \text{d}6 \\

After 2 c4, 2 \( \text{d}f3 \) is White's most common choice and against 2...d6 he has a number of options instead of 3 c4. A natural continuation corresponding to the opening principles (piece development and the struggle for the centre) is 3 \( \text{c}c3 \). White plans e2-e4 when the game will transpose into the Pirc Defence. Black has a number of options after 3 \( \text{c}c3 \), but we will focus on 3...\( \text{f}5! \), which is in the spirit of our repertoire as it directly prevents e2-e4. This defence was first played by the Cuban chess genius José Raúl Capablanca. It offers Black a number of fighting resources and often leads to complex positions where Black is fighting for the full point, as we'll see in Game 23.

3 g3 may lead to the Fianchetto King’s Indian, but there is an independent approach where White doesn't follow up with c2-c4 – see Games 24 and 25. Finally, 3 \( \text{f}4 \), the London System, is rarely seen in grandmaster practice, but is quite popular at club level and so will be the focus of Game 26.

Game 23
M.Hebden-M.Adams
British Championship,
Hove 1997

1 d4 \( \text{d}f6 \) 2 \( \text{d}f3 \text{d}6 \) 3 \( \text{c}c3 \\
Hebden likes to meet 2...g6 with 3 \( \text{c}c3 \), the so-called Barry Attack, so it's no surprise to see him trying to force through e2-e4 here.
3...\textbf{xf5}?

One of two possible ways to prevent White’s plan. It was first played by the young Capablanca in 1912.

The other way, $3...d5$, is also possible, but then White has an extra tempo ($\textbf{f3}$) over the Veresov ($1 \text{d4} \textbf{f6} 2 \text{c3} \text{d5} 3 \text{g5}$).

\textbf{4 g5}

The strongest continuation, with the idea of $\textbf{xf6}$ and e2-e4. The other possibilities are less dangerous for Black:

a) $4 \text{h4}$ banishes the bishop and makes e2-e4 inevitable, but comes at the cost of the knight leaving the centre:

a1) $4...\textbf{g6}$ was played in the pioneering game where $5 \text{xb6} \text{h6} 6 \text{e4} \text{e5} 7 \text{dxe5} \text{dxe5} 8 \text{xd8+} \text{xd8} 9 \text{g5} \text{d7} 10 0-0-0 \text{c6} 11 \text{c4} \text{e8} 12 \text{f3} \text{b6} 13 \text{b3} \text{fd7} 14 \text{a3} \text{e7} 15 \text{e3} \text{c5} 16 \text{g5} \text{f6} 17 \text{d2} \text{e7} 18 \text{h3} \text{f8} 19 \text{e2} \text{e6}$ led to an even position in C.Jaffe-J.Capablanca, New York 1912.

a2) It’s better for Black to keep the bishop, $4...\text{d7}$. Now after $5 \text{e4} \text{e5} 6 \text{f3}$ play will often transpose to some open games with the extra move $...\text{d7}$, which is good for Black, but White doesn’t have to push his e-pawn:

\begin{itemize}
  \item a21) $5 \text{g3} \text{e5} 6 \text{dxe5} \text{dxe5} 7 \text{g2} \text{c6} 8 \text{e4} \text{a6} 9 \text{e2} \text{c5} 10 \text{d1} 0-0 11 \text{e3} \text{c7} 12 \text{c3} \text{a5} 13 \text{xf5} \text{e8} 14 \text{h4} \text{e6}$ was quite unclear in H.Karner-M.Tal, Tallinn 1985.
  \item a22) $5 \text{g5} \text{c5} 6 \text{e3} \text{wa5} 7 \text{wd2} \text{c6}$ $8 \text{d5} \text{b4} 9 \text{xf6} \text{exf6} 10 \text{e2} \text{f5}$ and Black is better, Z.Azmaiparashvili-A.Lutikov, Kutaisi 1978.
  \item a23) $5 \text{f3} \text{g6} 6 \text{e4} \text{g7} 7 \text{h3} 0-0 8 \text{e5} \text{e8} 9 \text{f4} \text{c5} 10 \text{dxc5} \text{dxc5} 11 \text{wd2} \text{wa5} 12 \text{e2} \text{c7} 13 0-0 \text{e6} 14 \text{a3} \text{c4}$ with the idea of $...\text{c6}$, pressuring the weak pawn on e5, led to mutual chances in B.Andonov-T.Paehtz, Nordhausen 1987.
  \item a24) $5 \text{e4} \text{e5} 6 \text{f3} \text{c6}$ ($6...\text{exd4}?! 7 \text{xd4} \text{g6}$ is another good option) $7 \text{d5}$ ($7 \text{e2} \text{exd4} 8 \text{xd4} \text{g6}$ is a good Philidor with the extra $...\text{d7}$: for example, $9 \text{e3} \text{g7} 10 \text{f3} 0-0 11 \text{wd2} \text{e8} 12 0-0-0 \text{a6} 13 \text{g4} \text{b5} 14 \text{xc6} \text{xc6} 15 \text{h6} \text{h8} 16 \text{he1} \text{b4} 17 \text{b1} \text{a5} 18$}
\end{itemize}
\[ c4 \text{ d7 19 g5 wb8 20 e3 e5 21 e2 a4 left Black attacking in V.Bhat-B.Lopez, Lindsborg 2004) 7...e7 8 0-0 0-0 is the Steinitz Variation of the Ruy Lopez with an extra tempo for Black in comparison to 1 e4 e5 2 \text{ f3 c6 3 b5 d6 4 d4 d7 5 c3 f6 6 0-0 e7.} \]

b) 4 g3 is a solid continuation with which White finishes his development before starting action in the centre.

After 4...c6 (alternatively, 4...c6 5 d5 \text{ b4 6 d4 d7 7 e4 c5 8 \text{ f3 g4 9 g2 g6 10 h3 xf3 11 xf3 g7 12 0-0 0-0 13 g2 d7 14 g5 b8 15 we2 xe8 16 a3 a6 gave Black reasonable play in this complex position, R.Libbeau-V.Milov, Biel Olympiad 2002, and the immediate 4...h6! also deserves attention, preventing g5 and preparing a retreat square on h7; then 5 g2 c6 transposes to 4...c6 whilst bypassing the next variation) 5 g2 (instead 5 h4!? \text{ c8 6 e4 g6 7 h3 g7 8 e3 0-0 9 g2 bd7 10 0-0 e5 11 a4 b6 12 wd2 b7 13 h6d1 xe8 14 h2 we7 15 f3 a6 16 fe1 b5 wasn't at all easy to assess in M.Rohde-J.Fedorowicz, Estes Park 1987) 5...h6 6 0-0 h7 7 e1 (or 7 b3 bd7 8 e1 d5 9 e5 e6 10 b2 b4 11 a3 a5 12 b4 c7 13 a4 0-0 14 c5 xc5 15 dxc5 wb8 with a slight advantage for Black, J.Plachetka-K.Spragget, Vienna 1986) 7...d5 Black again prevents e2-e4.

Now:

b1) 8 d2 e6 9 e4 e7 10 e5 fd7 with complex play.

b2) 8 f4 bd7 9 d2 g5!? requires testing, but looks quite pleasant for Black.

b3) 8 e5 bd7 9 f4 e6 10 e3 e7 and Black is fine.

c) 4 e3 is a solid continuation, but not enough to fight for the advantage. After 4...g6 5 \text{ d3 (if 5 e2 g7 6 h4 d7 7 e4 e5 8 f3 c6 with a good game for Black as White has lost two tempi) 5...xd3 6 cxd3 (or 6 xd3 db7 7 b3 g7 8 b2 c5 9 0-0 0-0 10 h3 c8 11 fe1 a6 with an excellent game for Black in J.Grabhorst-V.Epishin, Dresden 2007) 6...c6 7 wb3 wb6 8 wc2 g7 9 0-0 0-0 10 h3 a6 11 a3 c5 12 d5 c7 13 e4 b5 14 xb5 xb5 15 d2 ac8 16 c3 c4 Black's}
queenside counterplay was well under way in A. Lein-M. Rohde, New York 1988.

d) 4 h3 is another try to beat back the bishop, but after 4...h6 (providing a retreat square) 5 g4 (too optimistic; 5 e3 was more solid by analogy with 4 e3) 5...h7 6 g2 bd7 7 g5 xe4 8 h4 xc3 9 bxc3 e5 10 b1 e4 11 f1 we7 12 a4 0-0-0 13 a5 we6 14 a6 b6 15 d2 e7 Black is better, J. Pribyl-M. Tal, Sochi 1984.

e) 4 f4 is less dangerous than 4 g5 as it doesn’t create any direct threats. After 4...bd7 5 h4 (5 e3 c6 6 d3 xd3 7 wxd3 wc7 8 h3 g6 9 0-0 g7 10 e4 0-0 11 fe1 e5 is about equal) 5 g6 6 xf6 hxg6 7 e4 e5 8 e3 c6 9 e2 e7 10 0-0 (10 a4?) Black has:

Finally, we return to 4 g5:

4...bd7

Best. Instead after 4...e4 (Black plays to save his bishop) 5 xe4 xe4 6 d2 g6 7 e4 d5 8 c3 9 d3 dx4 10 xe4 d7 11 wf3 a5 12 h4 White was better in M. Hebden-A. Collinson, British League 2008.

5 h4

The consistent continuation. Having deprived the bishop of the possibility to withdraw, White seizes the bishop-pair. Others:

a) 5 e3 h6 6 h4 (or 6 xf6 xf6 7 d3 xd3 8 wxd3 c6 9 e4 e6 10 0-0 e7 11 fe1 0-0 12 xe2 d5 13 e5 d7 14 c3 c5 15 f4 wb6 16 xe2 fc8 17 h4 cxd4 18 cxd4 a6 19 xa6 bxa6 20 d3 a5 which gives Black a promising endgame, A. Roy-I. Ivanov, Quebec 1988) 6...c6 7 d3 xd3 8 wxd3 (after 8 cxd3 g6 9 e4 g7 10 0-0-0 Black’s position is pretty solid) 8...d5 9 e4? dxe4 10 xe4 xe4 11 xe4 wa5+ 12 c3 g5 13 g3 f5 14 we6 f4 and Black won a piece in J. Augustin-M. Manik, Czech League 2005.
b) The immediate 5 d5 is less precise in comparison with 7 d5 in the notes to White's 7th move, below, and after 5...c6 6 dxc6 (if 6 h4 then 6...e4!) 6...bxc6 7 d4 g6 8 xc6 b6 9 d4 xb2 10 db5 c8 11 b1 xc2 12 xc2 xc2 13 c1 a6 Black was better in M.Fenollar Jorda-D.Uribe Arteaga, Cullera 2007.

c) 5 d2 e5 6 dxe5 dxe5 7 e4 g6 8 xc4 xc4 9 xc4 b4 with an even game.

d) 5 g3 h6 6 f4 c6 is slightly better for Black.

5...g6 6 xe6

Logical and consistent once again. Instead 6 g3 c6 7 g2 a5 8 d2 e5 gives Black easy counterplay, while 6 e3 c6 reaches a roughly level game.

6...hxg6

We have now reached the main tabiya of the Capablanca Variation.

7 e4

The obvious and most common continuation, consistent with opening principles: fast development and control over the centre.

7 d5 is another principled move, preventing Black's kingside development. White halts the movement of the e7-pawn, as this would lead to the destruction of Black's kingside pawn structure after dxe6, so the bishop on f8 is temporarily freezed out of play. The full sequence starting from 4 g5 to this move seems very logical, but it was first played by Tony Miles in 1993 when the whole variation was already 80 years old! Moreover, there are still very few games on this line, which seems critical to the whole variation.

Now:

a) One plan is 7...c5 (recommended by Prié) with the idea of ...e5 and ...xe6. This allows Black to un-freeze his kingside, but leads to a semi-open position where the bishop-pair gives White an edge: 8 e4 (now Black should reckon with 9 b5+) 8...e5 9 dxe6 xe6 10 e3 c6 11 f3 ('I still prefer White with his bishops and aggressive options' – Palliser) 11...a5 12 0-0-0 is a touch better for White, whereas 12 c4 g5 wasn't so easy to assess in P.Moulin-A.Defize, Brussels 1986.

b) With 7...c6! Black tries to undermine the nail on d5 which is holding down his position. After 8 e4 a5 (alternatively, 8 c8 e2 cxd5 10 exd5 a5 11 0-0 xc3?! – the thematic idea of sacrificing the exchange is executed too directly – 12 d2 xd5 13 f3 7b6 14 bxc3 c4 15 w2 favoured White in M.Hebden-Y.Zhou, British
Championship, Torquay 2009, while 8...\textit{c5} 9 \textit{w}f3 \textit{e}5 10 dxe6 \textit{xe}6 11 \textit{e}3 transposes to variation ‘a’) 9 \textit{d}2 (instead 9 \textit{d}2 \textit{c}8 10 \textit{d}3 cxd5 11 \textit{xd}5 \textit{w}c5 is unclear), we have:

b1) Practice has never seen it, but probably this is the best moment to try 9...\textit{c}5!? with the idea of ...\textit{e}5. After 10 f3 (10 a3 is met by 10...\textit{b}6 and 10 0-0-0 \textit{e}5 11 dxe6 \textit{xe}6 12 \textit{e}3 \textit{b}5 also gives Black counterplay) 10...\textit{e}5 11 dxe6 (better is 11 \textit{b}1!? with the idea of b4, dxc6 and \textit{b}5, clamping down on d5) 11...\textit{xe}6 12 \textit{e}3 d5 (12...\textit{b}5?) 13 exd5 0-0-0 Black has active counterplay.

b2) With 9...\textit{a}6!? Black keeps the possibility of going long and waits for White’s 0-0-0 to play ...\textit{c}5 and ...\textit{e}5: for example, 10 0-0-0 \textit{c}5 (10...\textit{c}8 transposes to variation ‘b3’) 11 f3 \textit{e}5 with complex play.

b3) 9...\textit{c}8 sees Black planning to undermine the knight on c3, which protects the d5-pawn, with ...b5-b4 or even ...\textit{xc}3. On the other hand, he loses the possibility of long castling. After 10 0-0-0 (worse is 10 dxc6 \textit{xc}6

11 \textit{b}5?, as in C.Fegan-A.Cherniaev, London 2009, and now Black should play 11...\textit{xe}4 12 \textit{xe}4 \textit{xb}5 when he is simply a pawn up) Black has:

b31) 10...\textit{c}5 11 \textit{b}1 \textit{e}5 (or 11...\textit{b}5 12 dxc6 \textit{b}4 13 \textit{x}f6 gxf6 14 \textit{d}5 \textit{xe}4 15 \textit{e}2 \textit{f}5 16 \textit{c}7 \textit{xc}7 17 \textit{f}3 when White is better, A.Miles-S.Robovic, Münster 1993) 12 dxe6 \textit{xe}6 13 \textit{e}3 \textit{b}5 (13...\textit{g}4?! 14 \textit{c}4 \textit{xe}3 15 \textit{xe}3 is excellent for White) 14 f3 \textit{e}7 15 g4 slightly favours White with his bishop-pair and extra space.

b32) 10...\textit{a}6!? 11 \textit{b}1 (maybe 11 \textit{a}3!? is better) 11...\textit{cxd}5 (11...\textit{b}5 also deserves consideration, but after 12 a3 it’s bad to sacrifice the exchange when the pawn is on \textit{b}5, because after 12...\textit{xc}5 13 \textit{ex}d5 \textit{xc}3 14 \textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 15 \textit{xc}3 \textit{xc}3 16 \textit{xc}3 Black’s structure is not safe in view of c3-c4) 12 exd5 \textit{xc}3?! 13 \textit{xf}6 gxf6 14 \textit{xc}3 \textit{xc}3 15 \textit{xc}3 \textit{c}5 16 \textit{f}3 \textit{f}5 and Black’s much better pawn structure and domination over the dark squares supplies full compensation for the exchange.

Before returning to 7 \textit{e}4, we should
note that 7 e3 c6 with the idea of ...\( \text{w}a5 \) is not dangerous for Black.

7...e5

Black can also consider the modest alternatives:

a) 7...e6 and then:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{11 f3 a6 12 exd5 cxd5 13 } \text{d3 } \text{w}a5 14 \\
\text{e2 } \text{xd2 15 } \text{xd2 d6 16 h3 e7 17 }
\end{array}
\]

\( \text{\#de1 a5 14 } \text{Je2 } \text{b5 with the idea of } \text{\#b6 leads to an approximately equal position, S.Desbonnes-E.Prie, France 1993.} \)

a2) 8 f4 e7 9 \( \text{w}f3 d5 10 e5 \text{g8 11 }
\]

\( \text{\#xe7 } \text{\#xe7 12 0-0-0 a6 13 h4 c5 14 }
\]

\( \text{dxc5 } \text{\#xc5 15 h5 w}b6 16 \text{d3 gxh5 17 }
\]

\( \text{\#xh5 0-0-0 with equal chances, A.Ornstein-E.Lobron, New York 1987.} \)

a3) 8 \( \text{w}f3!? c6 9 0-0-0 is likely White’s best set-up and 9...w5 10 h4
\]

\( \text{e7 11 } \text{b1 0-0-0 12 g4 w}d8 13 \text{e3 e8 14 w}g3 d5 15 e5 w}d8 16 g5 \text{c7 17 e2 c5 18 c4 left him clearly better in J.Johansson-A.Ornstein, Norrköping 1988.} \)

b) 7...c6!? 8 e3 (8 d5 transposes to variation ‘b’ to White’s 7th move, above) 8...w5 9 f3 e5 10 w2 e7 11

0-0-0 exd4 12 \( \text{xd4 b5 13 } \text{b1 b4 14 }
\]

\( \text{e2 } \text{b6 15 c1 c5 16 } \text{b3 w}a4 17 e5 \\
\text{cxd4 18 exf6 } \text{xf6 19 e1+ f8 20 }
\]

\( \text{\#xd4 h5! saw the rook nicely entering the game with the initiative for Black in M.Hebden-C.Hanley, Halifax (rapid) 2003.} \)

8 w2

This position remains pretty unexplored. Here practice has also seen 8 g3

\( \text{c6 9 } \text{e3 w}a5 10 g2 \text{b6 11 0-0 } \text{c4 12 c1 e7 13 e2 exd4 14 xd4}
\]

when White has slightly the better chances, V.Malaniuk-A.Fedorov, St Petersburg 1994, while after 8 f4 e7 9

\( \text{g3 c6 10 dxe5 dxe5 11 w}f3 \text{h5 12 h4 }
\]

\( \text{exf4 13 gxf4 f6 14 0-0-0 w}c7 15 \text{h3 0-0-0 16 g4 fxg5 Black was better in R.Kholmov-Y.Balashov, Sochi 1973.} \)

8...e7 9 a4 c6 10 e2 0-0 11 e3 exd4!

This solution is based on concrete calculation.

12 \( \text{xd4}
\)

Better is 12 \( \text{xd4}, although after

\( 12...e8 13 0-0 f8 (pressuring e4) 14 \\
\text{f3 w}c7 15 wad1 d5!?, intending } \text{\#d6,
Black should be okay.

12...d5

A standard reaction, but this was probably underestimated by White.

13 exd5 c5 14 Wd2 A xe3 15 fxe3

Instead 15 Wxe3 A e8 16 Wd2 cxd5 17 0-0 was about equal.

15...cxd5 16 A xdx5?

Now White comes under pressure.

Better was 16 0-0.

16...A xdx5 17 Wxd5 W h4+ 18 g3 W b4+

19 W f2

This was necessary, as 19 c3 Wxb2 would have been unpleasant.

19...A f6 20 Wd4 A e7

Black has a dangerous initiative for the pawn.

21 Ahd1 A e4+ 22 A f3?!

If 22 A g1 A ad8 23 Wxa7 W f6 24 A f1 Wxb2 when Black is attacking.

22...A fe8 23 A d3 A g5+ 24 A g2 W e6 25 W f4 W c6+ 26 e4 A xe4 27 W f3 A e5 28 A e1 f5

The outpost on e4 provides Black with a pleasant game, but it’s hard to breakthrough and Hebden manages to survive.

1 d4 A f6 2 A f3 d6 3 g3

A flexible method. First White finishes his kingside development and only then will he undertake some action in the centre.

3...g6

A thematic alternative is 3...A f5!?, although experience with this line has been surprisingly small. After 4 A g2 W c8 (instead 4...c6 5 0-0 h6 6 c4 e6 7 A c3 A bd7 8 d5 cxd5 9 cxd5 e5 10 A d2 A e7 11 e4 A g4 12 f3 was pretty good for White in A.Yusupov-S.Sitanggang, Yerevan Olympiad 1996) 5 c4 (or 5 0-0 g6 6 A e1 A g7 7 A bd2 d5 8 c4 c6 9 b3 0-0 10 A a3 A e8 11 e3 A bd7 12 W e2 W d8 13 A b2 W a5 14 a3 A e4 which reached a roughly level position in M.Pavlovic-N.Sedlak, Vrnjacka Banja 2005) 5...g6 6 A c3 A g7 7 b3 (7 W b3 c6 8 A h4 A d7 9 e4 0-0 10 h3 e5 11 d5 A a6 12 A e3 c5 13 g4 A c7 14 f4 exf4 15 A xf4 A fe8 was also about even in T.Glimbrant-H.Tikkanen, Kungsof 2009) 7...0-0 8 0-0 c6 9 A b2 A a6 10 A e1 A e4 11 A h4 A xc3 12 A xc3 A h3 Black was pretty comfortably-placed in Su.Polgar-B.Gulko, Biel 1987.

4 A g2 A g7 5 0-0 0-0
Here we will study those lines where White doesn’t follow up with c2-c4, transposing to the Fianchetto King’s Indian line of Games 19 and 20.

6 b3

White wants to complete the development of his queen’s flank too before playing in the centre. Alternatively:

a) 6  \( \triangle c3 \) is the subject of the next game.

b) 6  \( \triangle e1 \) hopes to force through e2-e4. Black should respond actively with 6...c5!? leading to:

b1) 7  dxc5  dxc5  8  \( \triangle xd8 \triangle xd8 \) 9  c3  \( \triangle d5 \) 10  \( \triangle d1 \triangle c6 \) 11  \( \triangle g5 \) e6 12  \( \triangle e4 \) b6 13  \( \triangle x f8 \) 14  \( \triangle a3 \) h6 15  \( \triangle f6+ \triangle x f6 \) 16  \( \triangle x f6 \triangle a6 \) 17  c4  \( \triangle x f6 \) 18  \( \triangle x c6 \triangle ac8 \) 19  \( \triangle g2 \) \( \triangle fd8 \) with an even position, J.Nogueiras Santiago-V.Ivanchuk, Moscow 1990.

b2) 7  c3  cxd4  8  cxd4  \( \triangle b6 \) 9  \( \triangle c3 \triangle c6 \) 10  e4  \( \triangle g4 \) begins to undermine White’s centre.

b3) 7  e4  cxd4  8  \( \triangle x d4 \triangle c6 \) 9  \( \triangle e2 \triangle b8 \) 10  a4  b6 gives Black a promising game.

b4) 7  d5  b5  8  e4 (or 8  a4  bxa4  9  \( \triangle c3 \triangle b7 \) 10  e4  \( \triangle bd7 \) 11  \( \triangle x a4 \triangle b6 \) 12  \( \triangle a3 \triangle e8 \) 13  \( \triangle f4 \) h6 14  \( \triangle d2 \triangle fd7 \) 15  \( \triangle a1 \) a6 16  \( \triangle f1 \triangle c8 \) 17  \( \triangle a2 \) g5 18  \( \triangle e3 \triangle d4 \) 19  \( \triangle b3 \) \( \triangle e5 \) 20  \( \triangle d2 \) e6 which wasn’t at all easy to assess in I.Efimov-V.Kotronias, Corfu 1991) 8...\( \triangle b7 \) 9  c4 (if 9  a4  a6 10  \( \triangle a3 \triangle bd7 \) 11  \( \triangle f1 \triangle b6 \) and Black has control over the critical c4-square, enabling him to go ...c4 and ...\( \triangle c5 \), as well as probably ...e6) 9...\( \triangle x c4 \) 10  \( \triangle fd2 \triangle fd7 \) 11  \( \triangle x c4 \triangle e5 \) 12  \( \triangle ba3 \triangle bd7 \) 13  \( \triangle e3 \triangle a6 \) (a typical Benko Gambit structure has been reached) 14  \( \triangle f1 \triangle a5 \) 15  \( \triangle g2 \) \( \triangle ab8 \) 16  \( \triangle e2 \triangle d3 \) 17  \( \triangle x d3 \triangle x d3 \) 18  \( \triangle ec4 \triangle x c4 \) 19  \( \triangle x c4 \) \( \triangle a6 \) 20  \( \triangle c2 \) \( \triangle b4 \) with advantage for Black in O.Panno-J.Polgar, Aruba 1992.

6...c5

Again, Black immediately starts play in the centre, exploiting White’s sluggishness and the temporary weakness of the long dark-square diagonal.

7  \( \triangle b2 \)

Consistent and likely best. Instead:

a) 7  d5 is impossible due to 7...\( \triangle e4 \).

b) If 7  c4 then 7...e5!? with a good game for Black.
c) 7 dxc5 e4 8 c3 (or 8 d4 dxc5 9 
\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{dxe4}}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{cxd4}}}} 10 b2 d6 when Black has slightly the better chances) 8...dxc5 9 
\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{wc2}}}} d6 (but not 9...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{xf5}}}}? 10 g4) 10 b2 (10 e4 c6 is again slightly better for Black) 10...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{f5}}} 11 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{wc1}}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{wb6}}} gives Black a perfectly acceptable position.}

d) 7 e3 c6 8 b2 cxd4 9 exd4 d5 10 e5 f5 11 e1 c8 12 a3 w7 c7 13 c4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{xfd8}}} 14 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{we2}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{wa5}}}} left Black quite actively placed in B.Raedeker-F.Thannhausser, correspondence 1999.}

e) 7 c3 cxd4 8 c6 9 b2 wa5 10 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{bd2}}} d5 11 a3 g4 12 h3 xf3 13 xf3 ac8 14 ac1 e4 15 wd3 e6 16 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{fd1}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{b6}}}} 17 e3 a5 18 b4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{dc4}}}} and Black is better, J.Vach-M.Vychodiš, Czech League 2001.

\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{7...cxd4}}} 8 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{xd4}}} 
Instead 8 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{xd4}}} c6 9 b2 d5 transposes to note 'a' to White's 9th move, below. 
\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{8...d5!}}} }

Black loses a tempo, but the centre is the most important factor here.

\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{9 c4}}} 
Challenging for the centre, but White also has:

\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{a) 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{df3}}} c6}}} and then: 

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chess_diagram.png}
\caption{Chess Diagram}
\end{figure}

a1) 10 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{bd2}}} f5 11 c4 dxc4 12 dxc4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{wc7}}} 13 a1 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{ac8}}} 14 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{we1}}} h6 15 d1 dxd1 16 wdx1 e8 17 wa1 b5 18 c5 c4 gives Black a promising game, A.Rumiantsev-M.Erdogdu, St Petersburg 2006.}

a2) 10 c4 dxc4 11 bxc4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{wb6}}} 12 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{wb3}}}} a5 13 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{xb6}}} \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{axb6}}}} 14 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{bd2}}} e6 15 a1 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{ac8}}} 16 e5 g4 17 xg4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{xb2}}} 18 c2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{d4}}}} was better for Black in M.Taimanov-P.Cramling, London 1996.}

a3) 10 a3 f5 11 c4 e4 12 cxd5 (or 12 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{wd2}}} dxc4 13 dxc4 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{wd2}}} 14 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{fxd2}}} xg2 15 xg2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{fd8}}} 16 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{fd1}}} ac8 with equal chances, M.Taimanov- L.Polugaevsky, USSR Championship, Moscow 1976) 12...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{xd5}}} 13 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{xd5}}} c5 14 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{xg7}}} xg7 15 fc1 db4 16 
\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{d4}}} xf3 17 xf3 d4 18 g2 xf3 19 xf3 b5 with an even position, A.Kharitonov-V.Chekhov, Vilnius 1978.}

b) After 9 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{\textsc{d2}}}?! Black can advance his e-pawn: 9...e5 10 d4f3 (10 b5 a6 11 a3 e8 leaves Black superior in the centre) 10...e4 11 d4 e3! 12 fxe3 g4
13 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 14 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{c}6 \) gives Black slightly the better chances.

c) 9 \( \text{a}3 \) prepares c2-c4, but after 9...e5 10 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}4 \)! (conceding the d4-square, but usefully seizing some space in the centre and on the king's flank) 11 \( \text{d}4 \) Black has quite a pleasant choice:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C3) 9...e5}
\end{array}
\]
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c1) 11...e3!? was once recommended by Malaniuk. Then 12 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 13 \( \text{c}4 \) is quite unclear.

c2) 11...h5 12 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{h}4 \) might well be playable too, although 13 \( \text{dc}2 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 14 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 15 \( \text{d}2 \) dxc4 16 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 17 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{xd}2 \) 18 \( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{fd}8 \) 19 \( \text{e}1 \) a5 20 \( \text{e}3 \) slightly favoured White in G.Zaichik-E.Gufeld, Tbilisi 1979.

C3) 11...\( \text{c}6 \) is the most natural response, exchanging the strong knight on d4: 12 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 13 \( \text{xd}4 \)? (or 13 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 14 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 15 \( \text{ab}1 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 16 \( \text{h}3 \) d4 17 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{xa}3 \) 18 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 19 \( \text{xf}8 \) \( \text{xf}8 \) 20 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) and Black is better, H.Danielsen-Deep Blue, Copenhagen 1993) 13...\( \text{e}6 \) 14 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{a}5 \) 15 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{b}6 \) leads to an approximately equal position.

d) 9 \( \text{e}3 \) is absolutely harmless: for example, 9...\( \text{g}4 \) (9...e5 is also good) 10 \( \text{f}3 \) (10 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 11 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 12 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 13 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{ac}8 \) 14 a3 \( \text{c}5 \) gave Black the initiative in J.Lechtynsky-J.Bielczyk, Ceske Budejovice 1995) 10...\( \text{c}6 \) 11 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 12 \( \text{bd}2 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 13 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 14 \( \text{c}4 \) dxc4 15 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 16 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 17 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 18 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 19 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{ad}8 \) and Black is better, J.Rukavina-D.Barlov, Zurich 1983.

10 \( \text{c}2 \)

Black wants to build a strong pawn centre.

Instead 10 \( \text{f}3 \) e4 11 \( \text{d}4 \) dxc4 12 bxc4 \( \text{c}6 \) leads to a solid position for Black: for example, 13 \( \text{xc}6 \) (if 13 \( \text{e}8 \) 14 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{g}4 \) with rough equality, although the light squares may become weak in White's camp) 13...bxc6 14 \( \text{c}3 \) (or 14 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 15 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 16 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 17 \( \text{ac}1 \) \( \text{xa}4 \) 18 \( \text{xa}4 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 19 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{ad}8 \) with equal chances, A.Strikovic-N.Ristic, Vrnjacka Banja 1998) 14...\( \text{b}6 \) 15 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 16 \( \text{ad}1 \) \( \text{xb}3 \) 17 axb3 \( \text{b}8 \) with the better end-

White has also tried 10 b5, but 10...a6 11 d5 a3 d4 12 c5 c6 13 c4 w7 14 b6 b8 15 x8 x8 c8 16 a3 e4 17 d2 b5 18 f3 e3 19 c6 e4 dxe4 20 fxe4 d3 favoured Black in Z.Basagic-T.Markowski, Ohrid 2001.

10...d4!?

Black opts to keep his pawn centre.

The alternative is 10...dxc4 11 bxc4 c6 when White has some pressure down the long diagonals, but his queenside pawn structure is rather weak. Moreover, Black can finish his development with ease and his pieces are harmoniously placed. Here:

a) 12 e3 e6 13 c3 c8 and Black has slightly the better chances, Z.Sturua-M.Pavlovic, Biel 1996.

b) 12 xc6 bxc6 13 xd8 xd8 14 xe5 e8 15 f4 e4 16 xg7 xg7 with good compensation for the pawn.

c) 12 d2 e6 13 e3 h6 14 xc6 bxc6 15 xe5 h3 16 g2 e8 17 f3 xd1 18 fx14 g4 with an even position, R.Ibrahimov-V.Georgiev, Saint Vincent 2002.

d) 12 c3 e6 13 d5 c8 14 c3 g4 15 xg4 xg4 is about equal, R.Zysk-A.Sznapik, Dortmund 1984.

11 b4

A thematic Benoni-style expansion, but White also has:

a) 11 f4 blows up the centre, but many weaknesses remain in White's camp. Following 11...c6 12 x5 g4 13 xd4 b6 (13...e3? is met by 14 c6! which gives White the better chances) 14 xc6 bxc6 15 d2 d8 Black has good compensation thanks to the rather nasty pin.

b) 11 e3 is the more principled attempt to undermine Black's centre. After 11...d3 12 e1 e4 13 f3 Black has:

b1) 13...c6 14 xe4 g4 15 xg7 xg7 16 d2 b6 17 xd3 d8 18 c3+ f6 19 c5 b4 20 c2 favours White, M.Sebenik-M.Hebden, Liverpool 2007.

b2) 13...g4! is very interesting, but ultimately perhaps not overly promising: for example, 14 xg7 xe3 15 c1 xf1 16 xf8 d4+ 17 xf1 e4
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18 c3 xf8 19 xd3 xd3+ 20 e2 with the idea of c3 leaves White clearly better.

b3) 13...exf3! 14 xf3 h3 15 f2 c6 16 xd3 e7 with decent compensation for the pawn thanks to Black’s pressure down the e-file and safer king.

11...c6 12 d2

After 12 b5 a5 13 d2 e6! 14 c5 d5 Black has secured his advantage in the centre.

12...g4

13 h3

Instead 13 f3 is an unsuccessful provocation after 13...f5, while 13 e4 runs into 13...xe2! 14 xe2 d3 15 xf6+ xf6 16 e4 dxc2.

13...e6

This is the safest continuation, as shown by:

a) 13...d3?! 14 hxg4 dxc2 15 xc2 xb4 16 c6 17 g5 d7 18 e4 with the bishop-pair and an excellent centralized knight for White.

b) 13...xe2 14 xe2 d3 15 e3! (White wants to keep the b-pawn, sup-

posing that the c2-pawn will fall soon or later; instead 15 d1 dxc2 16 xc2 xb4 17 b3 c6 18 xb7 xd2 19 fd1 xe2 20 e1 xc4 21 xc6 results in equal chances) 15...dxc2 16 b5 d4 17 xb7 b8 18 g2 and White has slightly better chances, as his connected passed pawns are dangerous.

14 e3?

Now Black’s d3-pawn becomes a real pest, but quite likely some of the damage had already been done, as after 14 b5 a5 Black would have had good pressure against the weak pawn on c4.

14...d3! 15 a3 xb4 16 xe5

This is not a very successful exchange of pawns.

16 c6 17 c3 a6

Instead 17...e7! with the idea of...fd8, defending the passed pawn, came into consideration. Then 18 b3 (18 b5 fd8 is slightly better for Black.) 18...fd8 gives Black a perfectly acceptable position.

18 b3 e7 19 b2 fd8 20 ad1 d7 21 b3
21...\(\text{\textit{g}}\)e8

21...\(\text{\textit{f}}\)8!? would have been an unusual blow! After 22 c5 (if 22 \(\text{\textit{xf}}\)6 \(\text{\textit{xa}}\)3 or 22 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)1 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)8) 22...\(\text{\textit{xb}}\)3 23 \(\text{\textit{axb}}\)3 (23 \(\text{\textit{xf}}\)6 \(\text{\textit{xc}}\)5 sees Black taking the upper hand) 23...\(\text{\textit{e}}\)4 24 b4 a5 Black blows up White's pawn chain on the queenside, and here 24...\(\text{\textit{xc}}\)3 25 \(\text{\textit{xc}}\)3 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)7 also gives Black good play.

22 \(\text{\textit{axg}}\)7 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)7 23 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)4 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)5 24 \(\text{\textit{xe}}\)6 \(\text{\textit{xe}}\)6 25 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)3

25 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)5 is strongly met by 25...\(\text{\textit{xd}}\)5!, eliminating the key defensive piece. After 26 \(\text{\textit{cx}}\)5 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)3+ 27 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)2 \(\text{\textit{xd}}\)5 Black has the advantage with nasty threats on the long diagonal.

25...\(\text{\textit{ad}}\)8 26 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)2 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)5

26...\(\text{\textit{f}}\)5!? was again interesting.

27 e4

If 27 f4 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)6 28 \(\text{\textit{fd}}\)1 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)6 29 e4 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)5+ 30 \(\text{\textit{h}}\)2 \(\text{\textit{cd}}\)4 when Black has better chances with annoying pressure in the centre.

27...\(\text{\textit{f}}\)3+ 28 \(\text{\textit{xf}}\)3 \(\text{\textit{xf}}\)3

Black firmly keeps his strong pawn on d3, dividing White's position in two.

29 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)1 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)6 30 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)3

30...\(\text{\textit{g}}\)5?!

30...\(\text{\textit{d}}\)4! was the logical blow. Then 31 \(\text{\textit{xd}}\)3 \(\text{\textit{h}}\)5 32 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)2 (or 32 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)4 \(\text{\textit{a}}\)5 33 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)2 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)5!) 32...\(\text{\textit{f}}\)5 would have been excellent for Black.

31 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)1!

Now White has some defensive resources.

31...\(\text{\textit{hx}}\)3+ 32 \(\text{\textit{h}}\)2 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)4 33 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)3 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)5 34 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)2

White has lost a pawn, but he has consolidated his king's position.

34...\(\text{\textit{d}}\)4 35 \(\text{\textit{xb}}\)7

After 35 f4 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)6 36 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)5 \(\text{\textit{xd}}\)5! (this strong centralized knight has to be eliminated) 37 \(\text{\textit{ex}}\)5 \(\text{\textit{xf}}\)4+ 38 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)1 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)2+ 39 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)2 \(\text{\textit{g}}\)5 40 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)2 \(\text{\textit{xd}}\)3 \(\text{\textit{f}}\)5 Black has good compensation, because White's king is not at all safe.

35...\(\text{\textit{xc}}\)4 36 \(\text{\textit{xd}}\)3 \(\text{\textit{dc}}\)8 37 \(\text{\textit{we}}\)7 \(\text{\textit{h}}\)6 38 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)8+ \(\text{\textit{h}}\)7 39 \(\text{\textit{xc}}\)8 \(\text{\textit{xc}}\)8 40 \(\text{\textit{wf}}\)6

Now Black has completely lost his advantage.

40...\(\text{\textit{b}}\)4 41 \(\text{\textit{d}}\)3 \(\text{\textit{b}}\)8 42 \(\text{\textit{wf}}\)4 \(\text{\textit{c}}\)4

43 \(\text{\textit{e}}\)3?!

43 \(\text{\textit{xb}}\)8! \(\text{\textit{xd}}\)3 44 \(\text{\textit{we}}\)5 would have
reached a roughly level game, leaving a draw likely, but now Kurajica is outplayed all over again.

43...\texttt{b2}

Black's pieces begin to dominate the board once again.

44 $\texttt{Wd6 wc8 45 Wd3 We6 46 He2 Hb4 47 He3 a5!}$

Pushing the pawn as far as possible is a good strategy in this type of position.

48 $\texttt{We2 a4 49 f4? a3!}$

This is the point! Now Black's initiative is overwhelming.

50 $\texttt{We1 Wh3+ 51 Hg1 Hb2 52 He2 He6 53 Wc3 $\texttt{ad4!}$ 0-1}

\textbf{Game 25}

C.Bauer-V.Ivanchuk

European Club Cup, Neum 2000

1 d4 $\texttt{gf6}$ 2 $\texttt{f3}$ d6 3 g3 g6 4 $\texttt{gg2}$ $\texttt{g7}$ 5 0-0 0-0 6 $\texttt{c3}$

White wants to play e2-e4 and so transpose to the Fianchetto Pirc, which might be unfamiliar to some King's Indian players.

6...$\texttt{c6?}$

Black welcomes the Pirc at this precise moment.

An independent alternative is 6...d5?, giving up a tempo in a nearly symmetrical position where the c3-knight is not ideally placed. Here:

a) 7 $\texttt{He1 f5}$ 8 $\texttt{hf4}$ $\texttt{g4}$ 9 $\texttt{g5}$ c6 10 $\texttt{Wd2}$ $\texttt{bd7}$ 11 f3 $\texttt{e6}$ 12 e4 with a roughly even position in V.Ivanchuk-V.Topalov, Monte Carlo (blindfold) 1997. With 12...dxe4!? 13 $\texttt{fxe4}$ $\texttt{db6}$ 14 b3 $\texttt{g4}$ Black might have attacked the pawn on d4, leaving White a bit overextended.

b) 7 $\texttt{He4}$ c6 8 $\texttt{Wd2}$ $\texttt{e8}$ 9 $\texttt{h6}$ $\texttt{bd7}$ 10 $\texttt{xg7}$ $\texttt{xg7}$ 11 $\texttt{Mad1}$ $\texttt{Wb6}$ 12 b3 e5 with an even position, L.Gofshtein-A.Fishbein, Tel Aviv 1992.

c) 7 $\texttt{He3!}$? c6 8 h3 $\texttt{bd7}$ 9 $\texttt{Wd2}$ $\texttt{e8}$ 10 $\texttt{Mad1}$ b5 with reasonable play for Black in this complex position.

d) 7 $\texttt{g5}$ c6 8 $\texttt{He1}$ $\texttt{f5}$ 9 $\texttt{hf4}$ $\texttt{e6}$ 10 e4 $\texttt{Qxe4}$ 11 $\texttt{Qxe4}$ dxe4 12 $\texttt{Hxe4}$ h6 13 $\texttt{Hxh6}$ $\texttt{xf6}$ 14 $\texttt{xg6}$ $\texttt{d7}$ 15 $\texttt{xf8}$ $\texttt{xf8}$ 16 $\texttt{Hh4}$ $\texttt{g7}$ 17 c3 $\texttt{f6}$ 18 $\texttt{Wb2}$ 19 $\texttt{Hh3}$ $\texttt{xh3}$ 20 $\texttt{Hxh3}$ a5 and Black is better, U.Weber-A.Bandza, German League 1995.

e) 7 $\texttt{He5}$ c6 8 e4 is the most natural try to utilize White's advantage in development, but this leads only to simplification as White cannot hold his advantage in the centre (instead 8 $\texttt{xf4}$ $\texttt{Hh5}$ 9 $\texttt{e3}$ $\texttt{d7}$ 10 f4 $\texttt{xe5}$ 11 dxe5 $\texttt{f6}$ doesn't create any problems for Black):
7 d5

Lurching forward, but White also has:

a) Black's point is that 7 e4 is a good version of Pirc for him, as White has not yet played h3 and his knight is committed to f3 (it goes to e2 in the main line of the Fianchetto Pirc). Here 7...g4 (7...e5 is also enough to equalize: for example, 8 dxe5 dxe5 9 g5 wxd1 10 axd1 g4 weak d4 11 ad2 xf3 12 xf3 ad4 13 g2 c6 with equal chances, O.Dzuban-G.Titov, USSR Team Championship 1991) 8 h3 (or 8 e3 wc8 9 wd3 h3 10 ad1 xg2 11 xg2 a6 12 fe1 g4 13 c1 e5 with an even game, S.Sale-M.Muse, Porec 1998) 8...xf3 9 xf3 e5 10 d5 (10 dxe5 xe5 11 g2 e8 12 d5 ed7 with the idea ...c5 is about equal) 10...d4 11 g2 c6 12 dxc6 bxc6 13 e2 e6 14 c3 d8 15 wd2 (instead 15 b3 wa5 16 ab2 fd8 17 e2 c5 18 c3 b4 19 a3 d4 20 we1 wc7 21 e2 xe4 gives Black good compensation, R.Kholmov-A.Lutikov, Moscow 1972) 15...wc7 16 b3 fd8 17 ab2 d5 18 exd5 cxd5 19 a4 xe4 20 xe4 dxe4 21 we2 f5 and Black was better (Perez Perez-V.Smyslov, Dortmund 1961).

b) 7 h3 is too slow, as 7...e5 8 e4 allows Black the equalizing combination 8...exd4 9 xxd4 xe4! 10 xc6 xc3 11 xdx8 xdx1 12 xb7 xb2.

c) 7 xf4 is usually worthless in such positions, as ...e5 will come sooner of later. Here:

   c1) 7...g4 8 wd2 xf3 9 xf3 e5 10 xc6 exf4 11 xc7 xe7 12 g2 fxg3 13 hxg3 xb2 14 ab1 b6 reaches a roughly level game.

   c2) 7...d7!? with the idea of ...e5 leads to more complex middlegame positions: for example, 8 wd2 e5 9 g5 f6 10 h6 (the exchange of the fianchettoed bishop is not dangerous for Black because of his healthy pawn structure) 10...b6 11 xg7 xg7 12 h3 f5 13 dxe5 dxe5 with a strong central pawn formation for Black, U.Andersson-A.Zapata, Yerevan Olympiad 1996.

Note too that 7 g5 is, of course, met by 7...h6! with rough equality.
7...\textit{a5}

The most common approach. In the Fianchetto King's Indian the knight at least attacks c4 from a5, but here it makes less sense. That said, it is not so easy for White to profit from the knight being on the edge of the board.

7...\textit{b4}! is a provocative alternative. Then 8 e4 e6 9 h3 (if 9 a3 \textit{a6}) 9...a5 secures the retreat to a6 against b2-b4 and 10 \textit{e3} \textit{e8} 11 a3 \textit{a6} 12 \textit{e1} exd5 13 exd5 \textit{f5} 14 \textit{d4} \textit{e4}! 15 \textit{x}xe4 \textit{x}xe4 16 c3 \textit{a}c5 17 a4 \textit{e7} 18 \textit{b}3 \textit{xb}3 19 \textit{xb}3 \textit{we}8 20 \textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 21 \textit{d}2 b6 was about even in U.Boensch-L.Vogt, Halle 1981.

8 h3!?

Perhaps the best, as we can see by comparing:

a) 8 e4 c6 (8...\textit{g}4 9 h3 \textit{xf}3 10 \textit{xf}3 c6 11 a4! with the idea of \textit{a}2 and b3 is a known strategy in the Pirc Defence) 9 \textit{e}1 (if 9 \textit{e}2 \textit{g}4 10 \textit{d}1 \textit{wc}8 and Black has slightly the better chances) 9...\textit{d}7 10 a4 \textit{c}8 11 dxc6 \textit{xc}6 12 \textit{d}5 \textit{c}4 13 c3 \textit{e}8 14 \textit{d}4 \textit{xd}5 15 exd5 \textit{d}7 16 \textit{a}2 \textit{wb}6 gave Black good counterplay in R.Ekstroem-C.Bauer, Bled Olympiad 2002,

b) 8 \textit{b}1 \textit{d}7 (preparation for ...c6, as the immediate 8...c6?! can be strongly met by 9 b4 \textit{c}4 10 dxc6 which is excellent for White) 9 e4 (9 b3!? deserves attention: for example, 9...c6 10 \textit{b}2 \textit{xd}5 11 \textit{xd}5 cxd5 12 \textit{x}g7 \textit{x}g7 13 \textit{xd}5 \textit{c}6 reaches a roughly level game) 9...c6 10 b3 (this limits the knight, but also weakens White’s queenside; instead 10 \textit{e}1?! \textit{c}8 leads to an approximately equal position) 10...cxd5 11 exd5 (with the of idea \textit{e}3-d4, obtaining the initiative; instead 11 \textit{xd}5? \textit{xe}4 12 \textit{we}1 e6 13 \textit{we}4 \textit{c}6! 14 c4 exd5 15 cxd5 \textit{b}5! is good for Black) 11...\textit{c}8 12 \textit{d}2 b5! 13 a3 \textit{e}8! (this is a very important prophylactic move) 14 h3 a6 15 \textit{d}4 \textit{wb}6 followed by ...e5 gave Black good play in O.Romanishin-V.Beim, Linz 1997.

c) 8 \textit{d}4?! c6! gives Black the initiative, as pointed out by Stohl.

d) Exchanging the knight on the edge of the board with 8 \textit{d}4 \textit{d}7 9 \textit{b}3 cannot yield anything for White.
Indeed, 9...c6 10 ∆xa5 ∇xa5 11 ∆d2 ∇b6 12 ∆b1 cxd5 13 ∆xd5 ∆xd5 14 ∆xd5 ∆c6 15 ∆e3 ∇a5 16 ∆b3 d5 17 ∇d2 ∇xd2 18 ∆xd2 a5 19 c3 a4 20 a2 a3 21 b3 e5 led to a slight advantage for Black in R.Hartoch-V.Smyslov, Amsterdam 1994.

8...c6 9 e4

9...d7

Black wants to keep the tension for a while. 9...cxd5 is also playable: for example, 10 exd5 (or 10 ∆xd5 d7 11 ∇e1 ∇c8 12 c3 ∆xd5 13 exd5 ∆c4 14 a4 ∇e8 15 ∆d2 ∆a5 16 ∆f1 e6 with an even game, O.Romanishin-V.Beim, Groningen 1990) 10...d7 11 a4 ∇c8 12 ∇e1 ∇e8 13 ∆d4 a6 is about equal.

10 ∇e2?!

Better is 10 a4, maintaining a roughly level game.

10...cxd5 11 exd5 ∇c8

Now Black has pressure down the c-file.

12 ∆d1 ∇e8 13 ∆d4

13 a4?! is met by a counterblow in the centre: 13...e5 14 dxe6 ∇xe6 15 ∇b5 ∇c4 16 ∇g5 gives Black a promising game, but 16 ∇b4? d5 would be even worse for White.

13...∇b6 14 a4 a6 15 ∇a2 h5

It is not so easy for White to finish his development.

16 ∇d3

Perhaps the radical 16 ∇e3?! ∇c4 17 ∇c1 was worth trying.

16...∇c5 17 ∇e3

Or here 17 ∇g5! with the idea of 17...h7 18 ∇e3 ∇c4 19 ∇c1.

17...∇b4?!

17...c4! was stronger according to Bauer. Then 18 ∇e6 is not so frightening because of the counterattacking move 18...cxb2!. After 19 ∇xc5 (if 19 ∇xb2 ∇xc3 20 ∇xc3 ∇xc3 21 ∇d4 ∇cc8 22 ∇xg7 ∇xg7 23 a5 ∇b5) 19...∆xd3 20 ∇xd3 ∇xc5 21 d6 ∅f5 22 ∆d1 exd6 23 ∇xb7 (not 23 ∇xd6? ∇xe3 24 fxe3 ∇e8 with a decisive advantage for Black) 23...c8d8 24 ∇xa6 ∇hxh3 25 ∇b5 ∇f8 26 a5 White has some compensation for the pawn.

18 ∇ce2 ∇c4 19 c3 ∇b6 20 ∇c1 ∇c5 21 ∇f4
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In the case of 21 b4?! hcc8 it would be difficult to expel the knight from c4.
21...de5 22 we2 wc7 23 ee3 ec4 24 eb3 exf3 25 xc5 xd1 26 xd7 xd7 27 wxd1

The position is about equal.
27...de5 28 a5 b8 29 ef1
Or 29 ed3 wc4 30 eb4 with an even game.
29...eh6 30 ed3 wc4 31 eb4 wc5 32 ea1 ec8

White had a threat of 33 axa6.
33 we2

33...f5?!
Black wants to change the drawish course of the game, but only manages to weaken himself.
34 eg2 f4? 35 gxf4 exf4 36 we4

Suddenly Black's kingside is under attack and he has no comfortable way to protect his bishop.
36...eh6

Instead 36...ef8 37 ed3 wc4 38 wxc4 exf4 39 ea4 would have cost a piece, while 36...g5 would have opened an important diagonal, which White could exploit after 37 ed3!.

A simple, active and effective method, firstly played by Nimzowitsch in 1907. Black immediately drives back the bishop. Experience with this move is still quite small, partly as there are a lot of alternatives, but we believe that it most closely corresponds with the repertoire offered in this book.

Those who want to immerse them-
selves in the thicket of chess theory should consider 3...g6, transposing to 1 d4 \(\text{f}3 \text{g}6 \text{f}4 \text{d}6\), starting with a couple of bright Bronstein games: 4 h3 (prophylaxis against ...\(\text{g}5\)) 4...c5 5 e3 \(\text{g}7\) (or 5...\(\text{b}6\) 6 \(\text{bd}2 \text{xb}2\) 7 \(\text{c}4 \text{g}7\) 8 \(\text{b}1 \text{c}3\) \(\text{f}3\) 0-0 0-0 10 dx\(\text{c}5\) dx\(\text{c}5\) 11 \(\text{c}7 \text{fd}7\) 12 \(\text{g}5 \text{w}6\) 13 \(\text{de}4 \text{w}6\) 14 \(\text{g}3 \text{b}6\) 15 \(\text{b}5 \text{d}5\) 16 \(\text{wd}5 \text{d}5\) 17 \(\text{fd}1 \text{b}4\) 18 \(\text{c}4 \text{h}6\) 19 \(\text{xf}7 \text{b}5\) 20 \(\text{xb}4 \text{xc}4\) 21 \(\text{xb}8 \text{xb}8\) 22 \(\text{xb}8 \text{f}5\) 23 \(\text{e}5 \text{xf}7\) 24 \(\text{xc}7 \text{c}8\) 26 e\(\text{4}\) \(\text{xc}5\) 27 \(\text{exf}5 \text{a}5\) with an even position in I.Bondarevsky-D.Bronstein, Moscow 1951) 6 c3 0-0 7 \(\text{e}2 \text{b}6\) 8 \(\text{bd}2 \text{a}6\) 9 \(\text{xa}6 \text{xa}6\) 10 0-0 \(\text{wd}7\) 11 \(\text{we}2 \text{c}7\) 12 dx\(\text{c}5\) bx\(\text{c}5\) 13 e4 e5 14 \(\text{e}3 \text{ab}8\) 15 b3 \(\text{c}6\) 16 \(\text{w}c4 \text{d}7\) 17 \(\text{h}2 \text{b}6\) 18 \(\text{wd}3\) d5 19 f3 \(\text{bd}8\) 20 \(\text{wc}2\) f5 and Black was better in I.Bondarevsky-D.Bronstein, Leningrad 1963.

4 \(\text{d}2\)

\(\text{The main response. Others:}\)

a) 4 \(\text{c}1\) is not logical if White is looking for more than a draw. Here 4...g6 5 e4 \(\text{g}7\) 6 c3 0-0 7 \(\text{e}2 \text{c}6\) 8 \(\text{bd}2\) e5 is about equal, P.Zabyshtran-V.Sergeev, Karvina 2006.

b) 4 \(\text{g}5\) is not too logical either because after 4...h6 5 \(\text{h}4\) g5 6 \(\text{g}3\) White is simply losing time, not to mention an important bishop. Here 6...\(\text{g}7\) 7 e3 c5 (by analogy with our approach against 3 \(\text{g}5\), which we’ll see in the first game of the next chapter, 7...e6 is also good) 8 c3 \(\text{xc}3\) 9 h\(\text{x}g3\) \(\text{wb}6\) 10 \(\text{wc}1\) \(\text{f}5\) (or 10...\(\text{c}6\) 11 \(\text{bd}2 \text{f}5\) 12 \(\text{c}4 \text{w}7\) 13 a4 \(\text{c}8\) 14 \(\text{d}1\) d5 15 \(\text{a}3 \text{c}4\) 16 \(\text{d}2 \text{a}5\) 17 \(\text{e}2\) e6 18 0-0 0-0 and Black is better, J.Lopez Martinez-L.Sanchez Silva, Catalunya 1996) 11 \(\text{bd}2 \text{d}7\) gives Black a perfectly acceptable position.

c) 4 \(\text{g}3\) gives Black the bishop-pair: 4...g6 5 c3 \(\text{g}7\) 6 e3 0-0 7 \(\text{e}2 \text{e}5\) 8 dxe5 \(\text{dg}3\) 9 hxg3 dx\(\text{e}5\) 10 \(\text{xd}8 \text{xd}8\) 11 \(\text{c}4\) h6 12 a4 \(\text{d}7\) 13 \(\text{bd}2\) a5 14 \(\text{e}2 \text{c}5\) 15 \(\text{b}3 \text{e}4\) 16 \(\text{fd}2 \text{d}6\) 17 \(\text{d}3\) b6 18 e4 \(\text{e}6\) and Black is better, T.Bree-V.Kupreichik, Münster 1995.

\(\text{4...g6}\)

\(\text{The most logical response for a King’s Indian player, but Black has some alternatives:}\)

a) 4...\(\text{g}4?!\) was an interesting interpretation by the first British Grandmaster. Black exploits the impossibility of \(\text{bd}2\) in order to double White’s pawns and after 5 h3 \(\text{fxf}3\) 6 exf3 g6 7 \(\text{e}2 \text{g}7\) 8 c3 \(\text{d}7\) 9 f4 \(\text{hf}6\) 10 \(\text{wc}2\) c5 11 dx\(\text{c}5\) \(\text{xc}5\) 12 \(\text{b}5+\) w8 13 0-0 \(\text{c}8\) 14 \(\text{e}2\) e6 15 \(\text{e}3 \text{d}5\) 16 \(\text{f}3 \text{xe}3\) 17 fxe3 b5 18 \(\text{wd}2 \text{wb}6\) he was better in Y.Sazonov-A.Miles, Agios Nikolaos 1995.
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b) 4...f5 is in the spirit of the Dutch Defence.

Here 5 c4 (after 5 e4 fxe4 6 Qg5 Qf6 7 f3 Qc6 8 d5 Qxd5 9 fxe4 Qf6 10 Qc3 h6 White didn’t have quite enough compensation in E.Prang-V.Kupreichik, Münster 1994) 5...g6 6 Qc3 Qg7 7 e4 0-0 8 exf5 Qxf5 9 h3 Qd7 10 Qe3 Qh8 11 Qd2 We8 12 0-0-0 is a touch better for White, M.Glienke-M.Quinteros, Hanover 1983.

c) 4...Qf6 was played in the pioneering game, E.Cohn-A.Nimzowitsch, Ostend 1907. White’s bishop is hardly all that better placed on d2 than c1, and 5 c4 (instead 5 g3 Qbd7 6 Qg2 e5 7 0-0 Qe7 8 c4 Qe6 9 Qc3 0-0 10 e4 a6 11 d5 Qxd5 12 cxd5 b5 13 b4 Qb6 14 a4 Qd7 15 axb5 axb5 16 Wb3 Qc4 gave Black good play in K.Wesseln-T.Syed, Oldenburg 2000) 5...Qbd7 6 Qc3 (6 Qc3 e5 7 Qg5 transposes to the classical Old Indian) 6...e6 7 e3 d5 8 c5 Qe4 9 Qd3 f5 10 b4 g6 11 Qb2 Qg7 12 Qc3 0-0 13 Qc2 c6 14 Qe2 We7 15 0-0 e5 saw Nimzowitsch reaching an unclear position.

5 c4

Another principled option is 5 e4 which leads to an original Pirc-type position: 5...Qg7 6 Qc3 (6 c4 transposes to note ‘a’ to White’s 6th move, below) 6...c5! with complex play.

5...Qg7

6 Qc3

Protecting the pawn on d4 and preparing to exchange Black’s fianchettoed bishop. White also has:

a) In the case of 6 Qc3 0-0 (6...c5 7 d5 reaches an unusual Benoni-type position) 7 e4 Qg4 8 Qe2 e5 the knight may find a good role on f4.

b) 6 e4 c5 7 Qc3 (if 7 Qe3 Qg4 8 Qe2 Qc6 attacking the critical d4-square) 7...cxd4 8 Qxd4 (or 8 Qxd4 Qf6 with the idea of ...0-0 and ...Qc6) 8...0-0 with a good game for Black.

6...0-0 7 g3

The diagonal is the most promising position for the light-squared bishop.

Instead after 7 e3 Qd7 8 Qe2 f5!? (going in for a Leningrad Dutch structure, but here the bishop on c3 is well placed; instead the more thematic
8...e5 9 .bd2 7e7 leads to a good game for Black) 9 d5 df6 Black concentrates his pieces on the king's flank (9...hf6 followed by ...e5 was again more solid), but 10 bd2 c5 11 0-0 e8 12 a3 h6 13 b4 b6 14 d3 g5 15 c2 g7 16 fe1 h5 17 f1 fe8 18 bxc5 bxc5 19 ab1 g4 20 3d2 f6 21 e4 was excellent for White in R.Appel-D.Flores, Vlissingen 2007.

7...d7 8 d5 hf6 9 g2 c5 10 bd2 a5

![Chessboard Diagram]

Mikhail Golubev, a well-known expert on the King's Indian, has reached a good King's Indian-type of position.

11 0-0 e5 12 dxe6 xe6 13 d4 d7 14 c2 e8 15 b3 h5

Black searches for an object to attack and so provokes a weakness in White's kingside.

16 h3 c8 17 h2 h4 18 g4 h6!?

Adding fuel to the fire. Instead 18..c6 was simple and good.

19 e3

Taking up the challenge.

19 2f3, intending to win the h4-pawn, was not good in view of ...xg4 ideas, such as 19...e4 20 b2 (or 20 xh4 xg4) 20...xg4!, but the prophylactic 19 h1!? deserved attention.

19...xg4?! 20 hxg4 xg4+ 21 h1

Better was 21 g1 when Black has to prove whether his sacrifice was correct. If 21...xe3 by analogy with the game, then after 22 d5 e5 23 fxe3 g4+ White can simply play 24 g2 h3 25 e4!.

21...xe3 22 d5

With the idea of 23 xg6+, but Black can now force a draw.

22...e5 23 xf7+ h7 24 fxe3 h3+ 25 g1 g3+ ½-½

Summary

Completing the repertoire for Black against 1 d4 is one of the key sections of any chessplayer's preparation. In this chapter we explored White's most common deviations after 1 d4 f6 2 f3 d6. Against each of them we suggested the line we believe is the best or the most interesting amongst numerous Black options. Some lines we suggested for Black are not the most common and may surprise your opponent, such as 1 d4 f6 2 f3 d6 3 f4 h5!? against the London System.

The Capablanca Variation, 1 d4 f6 2 f3 d6 3 c3 f5!!, is an interesting, independent option for Black if he wants to avoid the Pirc. It has been known for 100 years, but is still badly unexplored. We hope that our analysis will lead to further exploration of this interesting variation.
Chapter Five
White’s Other Second Moves

1. d4 \textit{f}6

Here we will examine the remaining deviations after 1. d4 \textit{f}6 in order to complete our repertoire against 1 d4. The Trompowsky Attack is a popular alternative to the more common 2 c4 and 2 \textit{f}3 lines. By playing 2 \textit{g}5 White avoids much opening theory and prepares to inflict doubled pawns upon Black. This is not a lethal threat, but we advocate 2...\textit{e}6, so that the queen can recapture if White plays \textit{xf}6. The Torre approach, 3 \textit{f}3, will be seen in Games 27 and 28, while the more critical 3 e4 c5!? is considered in Game 29.

With 2 \textit{c}3 \textit{d}5 3 \textit{g}5 the Richter-Veresov Attack comes about. Here too we like an early 3...\textit{c}5!?, which gives Black an active game, as Games 30 and 31 will demonstrate. Finally, the gambits 3 e4 and 3 \textit{f}3 followed by e2-e4 are considered in Game 32. The Blackmar-Diemer Gambit is an aggressive opening which Black should be ready for, though its soundness continues to be the subject of much debate.

\textbf{Game 27}
\textbf{K.Mueller-M.Wahls}
\textbf{German Championship, Dudweiler 1996}

1. d4 \textit{f}6 2 \textit{g}5

Note that 2 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}6 3 \textit{g}5 \textit{bd}7 and then the common sequence 4 \textit{bd}2 \textit{h}6 5 \textit{h}4 \textit{g}5 6 \textit{g}3 \textit{h}5 7 \textit{e}3 \textit{g}7 8 \textit{c}3 \textit{e}6 9 \textit{d}3 is another move order which leads to the same position.

2...\textit{e}6

The only alternative to 2...\textit{e}4 if
Black wishes to avoid the doubling of his pawns.

3 \( \text{d}f3 \text{ h}6! \\
\) Immediately putting the question to the bishop. Now White must retreat, as Mueller does, or exchange, as we’ll see in the next game.

4 \( \text{h}4 \text{ d}6 \)

Now it’s time to introduce an Old Indian element to Black’s play.

5 \( \text{b}d2 \)

The most common continuation. Others:

a) 5 e3 \( \text{b}d7 \) is usually just another route into our main game, but White can try 6 \( \text{d}3! \) (6 \( \text{bd}2 \) is the transposition), with the idea of 6...g5 7 \( \text{g}3 \text{ h}5 8 \text{fd}2 \), trying to exploit the light-square weaknesses on the kingside. Black should, however, be okay after 8...\( \text{d}f6 \), while 8...xg3 9 hxg3 \( \text{g}7 10 \text{c}3 \text{ a}6! \) 11 g4 c5 12 e4 \( \text{e}7 13 \text{bd}2 \text{ d}5 14 \text{g}3 \text{ f}6 \) covered the kingside and supplied full equality in P.Martynov-R.Palliser, Finnish League 2011.

b) 5 c3 \( \text{bd}7 \) (Black should hold back on 5...g5?! 6 \( \text{g}3 \text{ h}5 \) because of 7 e4 \( \text{g}7 8 \text{fd}2! \text{xg}3 9 \text{hxg}3 \text{c}6 10 \text{a}3 0-0 11 \text{d}3 \) which leaves his kingside a little sensitive) 6 \( \text{bd}2 \) transposes to the notes to White’s 6th move in our main game.

c) In the long term it’s better for White to avoid 5 c4 because his dark-squared bishop will be exchanged and his pawns are better placed on dark squares. After 5...g5 6 \( \text{g}3 \text{ h}5 7 \text{e}3 \text{g}7 8 \text{c}3 \text{d}7 \) practice has seen:

c1) 9 \( \text{e}2 \) has the idea of \( \text{d}2 \) and \( \text{f}3 \), taking control of the long light-square diagonal, but 9...xg3 10 hxg3 \( \text{e}7 11 \text{c}2 \text{ b}6 12 \text{d}3 \text{ b}7 13 0-0-0 0-0 0-0 14 \text{a}4 \text{b}8 15 \text{e}4 \text{d}5! 16 \text{xd}5 \text{f}6 \) leads to mutual chances.

c2) 9 \( \text{c}2 \text{e}7 10 0-0-0 \text{b}6 11 \text{e}2 \text{d}7 12 \text{d}2 \text{xg}3 13 \text{hxg}3 0-0-0 0-0 14 \text{de}4 \text{c}5 15 \text{g}4 \text{b}8 \) prepared ...\( \text{c}8 \), targeting the weak pawn on c4 in L.Karsa-P.Dely, Hungarian League 1991.

c3) 9 \( \text{d}3 \text{e}7 10 \text{c}2 \) (or 10 \( \text{d}2 \text{fd}6 11 \text{e}2 \text{xg}3 12 \text{hxg}3 \text{c}5 13 \text{dxc}5 \text{dxc}5 14 \text{f}3 0-0 15 \text{e}2 \text{b}8 16 0-0 \text{b}6 17 \text{ad}1 \text{d}8 18 \text{e}4 \text{d}7 \) with an even
position, P.Harikrishna-A.Iljin, Mainz (rapid) 2007) 10...\( \text{d4f6} \) 11 0-0-0 \( \text{d7} \) 12 \( \text{he1} \) \( \text{dxg3} \) 13 \( \text{hxg3} \) g4 14 \( \text{d2} \) c5 (Black start to fight for the main dark-square diagonal) 15 \( \text{de4} \) 0-0-0 16 \( \text{wb3} \) \( \text{b8} \) 17 f4! gxf3 18 gxf3 h5 19 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 20 \( \text{ae4} \) (White, on the other hand, enjoys control over the main light-square diagonal) 20...\( \text{c8} \) 21 f4 cxd4 22 \( \text{xd4} \) h4 gives Black a promising game. J.Mihailovs-E.Prokuronov, Moscow 2003.

d) 5 \( \text{c3} \) g5 6 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h5} \)

7 e4 (this is the most natural central set-up, but the downside is that the d4-square may become a target; that said, 7 e3 is no panacea for White and 7...\( \text{g7} \) 8 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{g3} \) 9 \( \text{hxg3} \) \( \text{d7} \) 10 \( \text{f3} \) a6 11 g4 d5 12 e4 0-0 13 0-0-0 c5 14 dxc5 d4 15 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{e5} \) 16 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{a5} \) 17 \( \text{b6} \) d3 already resulted in a decisive advantage for Black in T.Petersen-J.Rowson, Torshavn 2000) 7...\( \text{g7} \) 8 \( \text{c4} \) (or 8 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c6} \) 9 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 10 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 11 0-0-0 \( \text{g4} \) 12 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{f6} \) 13 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 14 \( \text{d5} \), as in K.Griazov-E.Prokuronov, Arkhangelsk 2002, when

14...gxf3 15 g4 \( \text{f4} \) 16 dxc6 bxc6 would have been better for Black) 8...a6 9 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{g3} \) 10 hxg3 b5 11 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{b7} \) 12 \( \text{f3} \) c5 13 dxc5 dxc5 14 \( \text{xd8} \) + \( \text{xd8} \) with a slight advantage for Black, D.Summermatter-M.Wahls, Lucerne 1989.

e) With 5 h3 White protects his bishop from exchange.

Black's plan is to finish his development (...\( \text{e7} \) and ...0-0), and to play in the centre and on the queenside (with ...c5 and perhaps ...b5): for example, 5...\( \text{bd7} \) 6 \( \text{bd2} \) \( \text{e7} \) 7 e3 0-0 8 c3 (after 8 \( \text{d3} \) c5 9 c3 b6 10 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{b7} \) 11 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{c8} \) 12 g4 cxd4 13 exd4 \( \text{d5} \) 14 \( \text{d3} \) f5 15 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{c7} \) 16 gxf5 exf5 17 0-0-0 \( \text{wc8} \) 18 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{h8} \) 19 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{f6} \) 20 \( \text{he1} \) \( \text{e4} \) Black had the better chances in K.Griazov-E.Prokuronov, Arkhangelsk 2003) 8...\( \text{b8} \) 9 \( \text{c2} \) b5 10 \( \text{e2} \) c5 11 0-0 a6 12 \( \text{fd1} \) \( \text{wc7} \) 13 \( \text{ac1} \) \( \text{b7} \) 14 a4 \( \text{fc8} \) was about equal in R.Bellin-V.Epishin, Gibraltar 2003.

Returning to the main line, 5 \( \text{bd2} \): 5...\( \text{bd7} \) 6 e3

Instead 6 c3 g5 7 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{h5} \) 8 e4 is White's most principled set-up, but he
has failed to trouble Black after 8...g7:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
9. \text{c4 a6 10 a4 We7 11 0-0 f8}
12. \text{e1 g6 13 f1 xg3 14 hxg3 h5}
15. \text{e3 g4 16 f5 Wf8 17 xg7+ xg7}
18. \text{d2 Wh6 with the idea of ...h4 left}
\end{array}
\]

White doing well on the kingside in \(\text{C.Marzano-S.Drazic, Milan 1992.}\)

b) 9 \text{c4 We7 10 fd2 xg3 11 hxg3 b6 12 e3 b7 13 c4 c6 14 a4 d5 15 exd5 cxd5 16 d3 f5 17 a5 0-0 18}
\text{e2 d6 19 0-0 g4 and again Black is better, P.Juergens-M.Bezold, Passau 1996.}\n
c) 9 \text{b3 g4 10 g1 0-0 11 d3 xg3 12 hxg3 c5 13 e2 cxd4 14 cxd4 e5 with mutual chances.}\n
d) 9 \text{d3 e5? sees Black trying to cut through the main diagonal. The pressure on d4 can be strengthened by}
\text{...g5-g4, and 10 dxes (or 10 wc2 g4 11 h4 b6 12 dxes xes 13 0-0-0 wg5)}
\text{10...xg3 11 hxg3 g4 12 d4 xe5 gives Black reasonable play in this complex position.}\n
6...g5 7 g3 h5

Again, Black hunts down the dark-squared bishop.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
8. \text{d3}
\end{array}
\]

The most natural, but quite often White hasn't made this move: for example, 8 c3 g7 9 a4 (this makes long castling unsuitable for both players; instead 9 e2 We7 10 c2 b6 11 b5+ d7 12 xd7+ xd7 13 a4 a5 14 c4 0-0 15 0-0 c8 16 c5 xg3 17 hxg3 e7 18 cxd6 cxd6 19 c4 d7 20 b3 d5 favoured Black in J.Fries Nielsen-C.Hoi, Gladsaxe 1979) 9...e7 10 a5 a6 11 c2 f5 12 c4 df6 13 b3 g4 14 f1 gf6 15 d3 f7 16 h4 g6 17 hxg5 hxg5 18 d3 d6 h6 19 f3 g4 20 f4 d5 gave Black good play in X.Lopez Sanchez-A.Cherniaev, Manresa 1997.

8...g7 9 c3

Two other strategies are worth noting:

a) 9 f1 f5 10 d3d2 df6 11 h3 xg3 12 xg3 We7 13 e4 0-0 14 c3 fxe4 15 dxe4 d5 16 h5 f4 (16...e5?) 17 xf4 xf4 18 We2 f7 19 g3 f5 20 d2 was seen in A.Summerscale-E.Prie, Orange 1993, when after 20...e5? Black would have had a strong bishop-pair as compensa-
tion for the exchange.

b) 9 g1 xg3 10 hxg3 w7 11 e2 f6 12 c3 d7 13 de4 xe4 14 xe4 c6 15 d3 0-0-0 16 w2 f5 17 0-0-0 e5 and Black is better, J.Jonczyk-Y.Novikov, Koszalin 1997.

9...w7

Black will continue his development with ...b6 and ...b7 or ...d6(b6) and ...d7, keeping castling options open for as long as possible, as the king is not totally safe on either flank.

10 w2

Again there are alternatives:

a) 10 g1 forces the exchange and after 10...xg3 11 hxg3 White will be happy if he can take control of the position with e2, g4 and g3. Black should oppose that plan with 11...f6 when White might try:

a1) 12 f3 g4 13 d1 d7 14 e2 h5 15 c2 0-0-0 16 0-0-0 b8 17 h2 c5 18 dh1 cxd4 19 exd4 e5 with a slight advantage for Black.

a2) 12 c2 d7 13 e2 0-0-0 14 0-0-0 b8 15 b1 g4 16 df1 c5 17 c1 f5 18 d1 e5 and Black has the better chances, C.Gokhale-R.Ramesh, Dubai 2001.

a3) 12 e4 d7 13 xf6+ xf6 14 w2 0-0-0 15 0-0-0 b8 16 g4 c8 17 e2 c5 was quite unclear in D.Kovaljov-S.Ionov, Paide 1999.

b) After 10 w2 Black may try 10...xg3 (also possible is 10...b6! with the idea of ...d7 and ...0-0-0 by analogy with our main game) 11 hxg3 g4 as the most natural retreat for the knight, g1-e2, is temporarily blocked, but on h4 the knight will be out of play.

c) 10 0-0-0 11 e1 xg3 12 fxg3 c5 13 c2 b6 14 w2 b7 15 f2 f5 16 af1 d5 17 e1 f6 gave Black a perfectly acceptable position in N.Dzagnidze-N.Bojovic, Antalya 2002.

10...b6 11 0-0-0

Instead 11 a4 again makes long castling unsafe for both sides and 11...d7 12 a5 d5 gives Black reasonable play in this complex position.

In general the ideal scenario for Black in this variation is when both kings are castled on the same flank, and the main battlefield is the centre
and opposite flank. Then after opening
the game the power of Black's bishops
can be shown. White, on the other
hand, would prefer to castle and attack
on opposite flanks, when he may have
the better chances because of his ad-
vantage in terms of central control.

11...d7 12 e4 Ac8!?  
This leads to sharp play with mu-
tual chances. Black prepares ...c5, but
deprives himself of the possibility of
...0-0-0. 

12...0-0-0 was more solid. A possible
continuation could be 13 b1 b8 14
b3 g4 15 fd2 Hf8 (with the idea of
...f5; 15...xg3 16 hxg3 h5 is a decent
alternative) 16 de1 e5 which gives
Black promising play with the idea of
...f4.

13 d5 e5 14 f1 f5 15 exf5 xd5 16 f6
hxg6 17 g6+ f8 18 b3 e6 19
xb7 a5 20 d2 b6 21 e1 wa2

22 b1?

Unnecessary. Instead 22 xe5! would have kept this sharp battle very
much raging, since if 22...dxe5? 23
xe5 e6 the game could finish with a
good counterplay.

22...fd5 23 e4 e7 24 xd6

This breakthrough is much less
dangerous than the one on e5 would
have been.

24...cxd6 25 xb6 c6 26 c2 d5 27
a3 a4 28 d1 e6 29 e3 f7 30
xe2 xhd8 31 e1 d7 32 d4 xf6 33
db5 c5 34 xa4 d5 35 b3 f8 36
d1 f4 37 xf4 xf4+ 38 b1 d5 39
g3 g4!

Black has a decisive advantage, al-
though White managed to resist for a
long time:

40 e1 f5+ 41 c2 f6 42 d2 b8
43 a4 a6 44 b3 xb5 45 xb5
xb5 46 xb5 xb5 47 b2 d4 48 e4
e6 49 f3+ g8 50 a8+ h7 51
f4+ h8 52 a8+ g8 53 a4 f1
54 a8 e1 55 c2 h7 56 f3 a1
57 cxd4 exd4 58 d3 h8 59 f5 a8
60 f3 d5 61 d1 a2+ 62 c1 xf2
63 h5 h7 64 g4 e1+ 65 d1 f2
66 g4 g1+ 67 d1 xh2 68 xd4
xd4 69 d3+ g8 70 xd4 xh1+ 71
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Thus an unbalanced position arises where White has a strong centre in return for the bishop-pair.

6 \texttt{c3}

Instead White may try a set-up with \texttt{d3}, \texttt{d2} and \texttt{c2-d3} in various move orders. The plan of \ldots g5 followed by advancing the kingside pawns, combined with the development of the queenside and long castling, is also good there for Black, as the following examples show:

a) 6 \texttt{d3} \texttt{c6} 7 c3 (7 0-0 g5 8 c3 \texttt{d7} 9 \texttt{b2} 0-0-0 is unclear) 7...g5! and now:

a1) 8 \texttt{b3} g4 9 \texttt{fxd2} h5 prepares to deploy the bishop to the c1-h6 diagonal.

a2) 8 h3 doesn’t prevent Black’s plan and Black is actively placed after 8...h5 9 h4 g4 10 \texttt{g5} \texttt{h6}.

a3) 8 \texttt{bd2} g4 9 \texttt{g1} h5 10 \texttt{b3} \texttt{h6} 11 \texttt{c4} e5 (or 11...h4?!? , hoping for 12 \texttt{e2}? h3! 13 g3 \texttt{f3} when Black wins material) 12 dxe5 (if 12 d5 \texttt{e7} and Black has slightly the better chances) 12...\texttt{xe5} 13 \texttt{xe5} dxe5 14 \texttt{e2} h4 15 \texttt{d1} c6 16 a4 \texttt{g5}! 17 \texttt{c4} h3 18 g3 \texttt{f3} 19 \texttt{g1} 0-0 was excellent for Black in I.lvanov-W.Browne, US Championship 1989.

b) 6 \texttt{bd2} g5 with another divide:

b1) 7 c3 g4 8 \texttt{g1} h5 9 \texttt{d3} \texttt{c6} transposes to variation ‘a3’.

b2) 7 h3 \texttt{c6} 8 c3 \texttt{d7} 9 \texttt{d3} h5 gives Black an acceptable position.

b3) 7 e5 \texttt{g7} 8 \texttt{c4} \texttt{c6} 9 h3 \texttt{e7} 10 c3 \texttt{d7} 11 \texttt{e2} h5 12 exd6 cxd6 13 d5 exd5 14 \texttt{xd5} \texttt{e6} 15 \texttt{b5} 0-0-0 and Black is slightly better in this complex position, C.Merino Araguas-J.Jezek, correspondence 1996.
c) 6 c3 c6 7 bd2 g5 8 d3 is another route into variation 'a3'.

d) 6 e5 is a somewhat more radical approach, but after 6...dxe5 7 dxe5 wf4 the pawn on e5 will become a target for Black following ...c6 and probably ...g5-g4: for example, 8 bd2 (or 8 c3 c6 9 g3 we4+ 10 e2 xe2+ 11 xe2 g5 with the idea of ...g4 and ...g7 when the e5-pawn is under some pressure) 8...g5 9 g3 (of 9 e2 g4) 9...b4 and the most harmonious method of development for White, which includes 0-0-0, is broken.

6...g5?

It's important for Black to find a good role for his dark-squared bishop, which has no counterpart. The text enables it to be actively deployed to g7 or even h6.

Another approach is 6...d7 7 wd2 a6 (a well-known trap is 7...c6 8 0-0-0 e5 9 dxe5 dxe5? 10 b5! with a decisive advantage for White) 8 0-0-0 wd8 with reasonable play for Black and a complex manoeuvring struggle ahead.

Aiming to open the position, but White can also try:

a) 7 h3 tries to prevent Black becoming active on the c1-h6 diagonal after ...g4 and ...h5. However, with 7...g7 Black presses instead on the main diagonal and 8 wd2 (or 8 c4 c6 9 d5 e5 10 xe5 xe5 11 0-0 h5 12 b5 d8 when despite the loss of castling rights, Black has good chances: he has no weaknesses and there are prospects of attack with ...g5-g4, J.Speelman-A.Karpov, Roquebrune (blitz) 1992) 8...c6 9 0-0-0 (9 b5 we7 10 c3 f5 11 d3 a6 12 a3 d7 13 0-0-0 0-0-0 14 d5 fxe4 15 xe4 exd5 16 xd5 he8 gave Black good play in C.Hauke-C.Pfrommer, Hockenheim 1994) 9...d7 is very comfortable for him.

Black will finish his development by going long and has a long-term edge because of the potential of his bishop-pair after the opening of the centre. For example:

a1) 10 e2 0-0-0 11 b1 g6 12 g3 b8 13 c3 f5 with a slight advantage for Black.
a2) 10 \( \text{c4} \) 0-0-0 11 \( \text{he1} \) h5 and again Black has slightly the better chances.

a3) 10 \( \text{b1} \) (prophylaxis against ...h5 and ...\( \text{h6} \) 0-0-0 11 \( \text{b5} \) a6 12 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) (White has reduced the pressure on d4 with this exchange, but now Black’s bishop-pair might later become very strong) 13 \( \text{he1} \) \( \text{he8} \) 14 \( \text{g6} \) 15 d5 exd5 16 exd5 \( \text{d7} \) 17 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 18 \( \text{xe3} \) \( \text{f6} \) was slightly better for Black with the bishop-pair in F.Alvarado Ascanio-P.Lezcano Jaen, Madrid 2000.

b) 7 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{e7} \) 8 c3 \( \text{g7} \) 9 \( \text{d3} \) a6 10 \( \text{a3} \) 0-0 11 0-0 b5 12 \( \text{c2} \) c5 with mutual chances.

c) 7 \( \text{b5}+ \) \( \text{d7} \) 8 0-0 a6 9 e5 (E.Meduna-J.Stocek, Turnov 1996) 9...\( \text{g7} \) with reasonable play for Black in this complex position.

7...\( \text{e7} \) 8 \( \text{b5}+ \)

Instead 8 \( \text{d3} \) allows Black to comfortably finish the development of his queenside and to put White’s centre under pressure (with ...\( \text{c6} \), ...\( \text{g7} \) and ...g5-g4). After 8...\( \text{g7} \) 9 \( \text{e2} \) (or 9 exd6 cxd6 10 0-0 0-0 11 \( \text{e1} \) f5 12 \( \text{c4} \) g4 and Black is better, D.lsonzo-R.Kasimdzhanov, Halle 1995) 9...\( \text{c6} \) White has tried:

a) 10 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{d7} \) 11 0-0-0 g4 12 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 13 \( \text{d2} \) dxe5 14 dxe5 \( \text{g5} \) 15 \( \text{b1} \) 0-0-0 16 \( \text{e1} \) h5 favours Black, J.Nilssen-F.Berend, Moscow Olympiad 1994.

b) 10 0-0-0 g4 11 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 12 \( \text{xg4} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 13 f4 h5 14 \( \text{g3} \) f6 15 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d7} \) and White still has to prove whether he has enough compensation for the pawn.

c) 10 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 11 0-0-0 0-0-0 12 \( \text{e1} \) d5 13 \( \text{e3} \) g4 14 \( \text{g1} \) h5 15 f4 \( \text{xf3} \) 16 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{h6} \) 17 f4 \( \text{h4} \) saw White’s kingside coming under pressure in L.Santa-A.Rivera, Ciego de Avila 1997.

A more radical idea is 8 h4!? when 8...g4 9 \( \text{d2} \) h5 10 f4 \( \text{xf3} \) 11 \( \text{xf3} \) d7 isn’t at all easy to assess, although Black should be okay and will again complete his development with ...\( \text{c6} \), ...\( \text{h6} \) and ...0-0-0.

8...\( \text{d7} \) 9 0-0

The king can also go the other way: 9 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{g7} \) 10 0-0-0 \( \text{c6} \) 11 \( \text{e1} \) 0-0-0 is unclear.

9...d5

Black avoids any possibility of d4-d5, but strategically it’s not useful to close position since he has the bishop-pair.

9...\( \text{c6}?! \) 10 exd6 cxd6? 11 d5 was well worth avoiding, but it was possible to maintain the pressure with 9...\( \text{g7} \)
10 We2 Qc6 when 11 Kd1 (if 11 fe1 g4 12 Qxc6 Qxc6 13 Qd2 dxe5 14 dxe5 0-0-0 and Black has slightly the better chances) 11...g4 12 Qe1 h5 would have been quite unclear.

10...d3

The start of an overly-ambitious plan. Instead:

a) 10 a4 was recommended by Korchnoi, starting to push the pawns in the expectation that Black will go long. Then 10...Qc6 11 Qe1 0-0-0 12 Qxc6 Qxc6 13 d3 with the idea of b2-b4 leads to mutual chances.

b) 10 Qxd7+ Qxd7 11 Qb5 Qb6 12 Qe1 a6 13 Qc3 Wb4 14 Qb1 Wc4 was okay for Black in J.Brousek-J.Vaassen, correspondence 2001.

c) 10 Qe2 Qc6 11 a3 Qg7 12 b4 a6 13 Wd3 0-0 14 Qd1 f6 15 exf6 Wxf6 16 c3 g4 17 Qd2 e5 and Black is better, A.Vaisser-L.Comas Fabrego, Escaldes 1998.

10...Qc6 11 Qb5?

Better is 11 Qe2 when 11...b4 leads to an approximately equal position.

11...0-0-0 12 c3 h5 13 a4 Pb8 14 b4 Qg7 15 Qa3 Qdf8 16 We2 g4 17 Qd2 f6 18 exf6?! Qxf6 19 b5

19...Qa5

Rejecting 19...Qxd4! 20 cxd4 Qxd4 21 Qb3 Qxa1 22 Qxa1 e5 with some advantage for Black.

20 f4 Qg7?!

And here 20...Qc8! with the idea of ...c5 was a better approach.

21 Qc2 Le7 22 Qe3 g3?

Another strange decision from Karpov. Instead 22...Qd6 23 f5 e5 24 Qxd5 exd4 25 c4 would only have led to a slight advantage for White.

23 h3 Qd6 24 f5 Qh6 25 Qae1 a6?

Black weakens himself. He hopes for 26 bxa6 b6!, but why not simply 25...b6?

26 Qf3! Le8?!

If 26...exf5 then 27 Qh4!, but 26...b6 with the idea of ...Qa7 again deserved attention.

27 Wd2! Qd8? 28 bxa6 b6 29 Qe5 Qc8 30 fx6 Qxe6 31 Qf5 Qg8 32 Qh6

After 32 Qxd6? Qxd6 33 Wf4 White has the better chances.
32...\textit{g7} 33 \textit{f5} \textit{g8} 34 \textit{h6?} \textit{g7} 35 \textit{hf7} \textit{f8} 36 \textit{xd6} \textit{xd6} 37 \textit{xf8} \textit{xf8} 38 \textit{f1} \textit{f6} 39 \textit{e3} \textit{h4} 40 \textit{f3} \textit{c4!} 41 \textit{g5} \textit{xa6}

42 \textit{a5!?} \textit{h6?}

Black should simply grab the pawn with 42...\textit{bxa5!}, as on a close look White’s threats are not as dangerous as they seem at first.

43 \textit{wh6}?

Instead 43 \textit{axb6} \textit{xb6} 44 \textit{d8+} \textit{c8} 45 \textit{f5} \textit{d6} 46 \textit{xc8} \textit{xc8} 47 \textit{xd5} \textit{e3+} 48 \textit{h1} \textit{xc3} 49 \textit{e5} would have been excellent for White.

43...\textit{hx6} 44 \textit{axb6} \textit{cxb6} 45 \textit{g5} \textit{b5!} 46 \textit{f8+} \textit{a7} 47 \textit{f1} \textit{½-½}

Here Black might have continued and 47...\textit{a3?!} 48 \textit{f3} \textit{c6} leads to mutual chances in the unbalanced endgame.

This is the critical and most popular choice by White.

3...\textit{c5}?

The most direct and concrete response.

‘By advancing his c-pawn and freeing his queen at such an early stage, Black shows that he is keen to fight for the initiative. The resulting play tends to be quite dynamic and often revolves around whether Black’s dark-square play fully compensates for whatever concessions he has made.’ – Palliser.

Black also hasn’t spoilt his pawn structure, such as after 2...\textit{c5} 3 \textit{xf6} \textit{gxf6}, while if here 3...\textit{h6} 4 \textit{xf6} \textit{xf6} then White is not committed to going into the Torre lines of the last game by playing 5 \textit{f3}, but may keep his f-pawn free and usually selects either 5 \textit{c3} or 5 \textit{c3}.

4 \textit{e5}

The critical response. White should play aggressively if he wants to fight for the advantage, although practice has also seen:

a) 4 \textit{d5} is another principled re-
response and one which leads to a Benoni-type structure. After 4...d6 White has tried:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a1)} & 5 \text{b5+ } \text{bd7 6 dxe6 fxe6 7 e5} \\
& 8 \text{f3 a6 9 } \text{xd7+ } \text{xd7 10 } \text{c3} \\
& 11 \text{e2 } \text{d6 12 0-0-0 b5 with mutual chances.} \\
\text{a2)} & 5 \text{c4 } \text{e7 with the idea of} \\
& ...\text{xd5 or ... } \text{xe4 demonstrates that} \\
& \text{the bishop is not always so well placed} \\
& \text{on g5.} \\
\text{a3)} & 5 \text{c3 a6!? (or 5...e7 6 b5+} \\
& \text{d7 7 dxe6 fxe6 with reasonable play} \\
& \text{for Black in this complex position,} \\
& \text{A.Moiseenko-Y.Kruppa, Alushta 2004) 6} \\
& \text{a4 (or 6 f4 e7 7 f3 0-0 8 dxe6 } \\
& \text{exe6 9 f5 c8 10 e2 } \text{bd7 11 0-0 b5 12} \\
& \text{a4 } \text{b7 13 axb5 axb5 14 } \text{xa8 } \\
& \text{xa8 15 } \text{xb5 } \text{xe4 with rough equality,} \\
& \text{S.Conquest-P.Szekely, Athens 1997) } \\
& 6...e7 7 f3 0-0 8 c4 } \text{xd5 9 exd5} \\
& \text{exg5 10 dxe6 } \text{exe6 11 } \text{exe6 fxe6 12} \\
& \text{exg5 } \text{exg5 13 } \text{xd6 } \text{xg2 with ad-} \\
& \text{vantage for Black.} \\
\text{b) } & 4 \text{f3 cxd4 5 } \text{xd4 is like a Sicilian} \\
& \text{where White has played the strange move } \text{g5. After} \\
& 5...\text{h6 6 xf6} \\
& \text{xf6 7 c3 } \text{c5 8 f3 } \text{c6 Black has} \\
& \text{slightly the better chances.} \\
\text{c) } & 4 \text{c3 } \text{cxd4 } 5 \text{cxd4 } \text{b4+} \\
& 6 \text{c3 (if 6 } \text{d2 } \text{b6, while 6 } \text{d2? loses a} \\
& \text{pawn after 6... } \text{xd2+ 7 } \text{xd2 } \text{xe4) 6...c7 7} \\
& \text{e5 } \text{e4 is pleasant for Black.} \\
\text{d) } & 4 \text{xf6 (a hardly justified ex-} \\
& \text{change) 4...xf6 5 e5 } \text{g6 6 dxc5 } \text{c6 7} \\
& \text{f3 } \text{xc5 8 c3 0-0 9 } \text{d3 } \text{h5 10 } \text{e4} \\
& \text{f6 with the superior development for} \\
& \text{Black, P.Hidalgo Begines-D.Escobar} \\
& \text{Dominguez, Dos Hermanas 2005.} \\
4...\text{h6}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{5 } \text{c1} \\
\text{This unexpected return is the best} \\
\text{and most common response. Here the} \\
\text{bishop is away from the clutches of} \\
\text{the black knight and also keeps b2 usefully} \\
\text{protected in the event of any ... } \text{b6} \\
\text{ideas. Otherwise:} \\
\text{a) After 5 } \text{d2 e4 White should} \\
\text{give up his bishop (or lose one more} \\
\text{tempo) when 6 } \text{d3 } \text{xd2 7 } \text{xd2 cxd4} \\
& 8 \text{f4 } \text{c6 9 } \text{gf3 d5 sees the structure} \\
& \text{from Nimzowitsch’s variation of} \\
& \text{the French Defence arise, where White sac-} \\
& \text{rifices the d4-pawn. After 10 a3 } \text{c5 11}
\end{align*}
\]
The New Old Indian

b4 \( \text{\texttt{b3} d7} \) 13 0-0 a6 14 \( \text{\texttt{e1}} \) 0-0 15 \( \text{\texttt{h1 c8}} \) 16 g4 f6 17 \( \text{\texttt{g3 fxe5}} \) 18 fxe5 g5 Black is better, N.Povah-A.Cherniaev, Portsmouth 2003.

b) 5 \( \text{\texttt{e3 d5}} \)

6 \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) (if 6 c4 \( \text{\texttt{e3}} \) 7 fxe3 cxd4 8 exd4 \( \text{\texttt{h4}} \) and White's king is in danger) 6...\( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) (or 6...cxd4 7 \( \text{\texttt{xd4 c6}} \) when the bishop has made a lot of moves, but still not found a safe position) 7 c4 \( \text{\texttt{xe3}} \) 8 fxe3 d6 (the inevitable break in the centre will open up Black's bishops and expose White's weaknesses) 9 \( \text{\texttt{c3 cxd4}} \) 10 exd4 dxe5 11 d5 exd5 12 cxd5 \( \text{\texttt{d4}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{xd4 h4}} \) 14 g3 \( \text{\texttt{h4}} \) is excellent for Black.

c) 5 \( \text{\texttt{xf6}} \) is hard to recommend, as after 5...gxf6 White has not only given up the bishop-pair, but his centre will quickly be destroyed. After 6 \( \text{\texttt{f3 cxd4}} \) 7 exf6 (7 \( \text{\texttt{xd4 c6}} \) loses the e5-pawn in view of ...\( \text{\texttt{a5}} \) next up) 7...\( \text{\texttt{xf6}} \) 8 \( \text{\texttt{bd2! d5}} \) 9 \( \text{\texttt{b5+ c6}} \) 10 \( \text{\texttt{e2 g7}} \) 11 0-0 0-0 12 \( \text{\texttt{fe1 e8}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{b3 e5}} \) 14 \( \text{\texttt{fxd4 xd4}} \) 15 \( \text{\texttt{xd4 d8}} \) 16 \( \text{\texttt{f3 e4}} \) 17 \( \text{\texttt{d2 xb2}} \) 18 \( \text{\texttt{ab1 xc2}} \) White had no compensation in T.Rahman-A.Dunnington, Scarborough 1999.

d) 5 \( \text{\texttt{h4}} \) is a bit more sharp, but also good for Black. After 5...g5 6 \( \text{\texttt{g3}} \) (if 6 exf6 gxf4 7 d5 \( \text{\texttt{xf6}} \) 8 \( \text{\texttt{c3 g7}} \) and Black's dark-squared bishop, which has no counterpart, is very powerful) 6...\( \text{\texttt{e4}} \) White's centre becomes a target and his dark-square weaknesses in general begin to tell.

Now:

d1) 7 c3 doesn't help to strengthen White's centre as he can't recapture on d4 with the pawn in view of ...\( \text{\texttt{b4}} \): 7...\( \text{\texttt{xd4}} \) 8 \( \text{\texttt{xd4 xg3}} \) 9 hxg3 \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) 10 \( \text{\texttt{e3 b6}} \) 11 \( \text{\texttt{d3 c7}} \) 12 f4 \( \text{\texttt{b7}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{f3 0-0}} \) 0-0 14 \( \text{\texttt{bd2 d6}} \) 15 \( \text{\texttt{g5}} \) dxe5 and Black is better, N.Povah-J.Rowson, British League 1997.

d2) 7 \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) deprives White of the possibility of protecting the e5-pawn with f2-f4 and the knight itself isn't a good protector in view of ...g5-g4 ideas: for example, 7...\( \text{\texttt{xd4}} \) 8 \( \text{\texttt{xd4 xg3}} \) 9 hxg3 \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) 10 \( \text{\texttt{e4 w6}} \) and now White has no suitable protection for the pawn on b2.

d3) 7 \( \text{\texttt{d2 xg3}} \) 8 hxg3 cxd4 9 f4 (if
9 \( \text{Wg4} \) \( \text{Cc6} \) 10 \( \text{Qgf3} \) \( \text{Ng7} \) and Black is better) 9...d6 10 \( \text{Qgf3} \) (or 10 \( \text{Qe4} \) dxe5 11 fxg5 \( \text{Ng7} \) 12 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Cc6} \) 13 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Nd7} \) and White has no compensation for the pawn) 10...\( \text{Ng7} \) 11 \( \text{Cc4} \) dxe5 12 fxe5 \( \text{Cc6} \) 13 \( \text{Nd3} \) g4 14 0-0 0-0 15 \( \text{Qh2} \) b5 with by now a decisive advantage for Black. 5...\( \text{Qd5} \) 5...\( \text{Nh7} \)! is an interesting alternative, employed by Bologan and other Moldavian players. This is a very unusual and strange-looking retreat, but quite reasonable as the knight is safe on the kingside from White's pawn pushes:

![Chess Diagram](image_url)

**a)** 6 d5 (the most common response) 6...d6 7 \( \text{Cc3} \) exd5 8 \( \text{Wxd5} \) \( \text{Cc6} \) 9 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Wc7}! \) (Bologan's improvement; other options give White an edge) 10 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 11 \( \text{We4} \) d5 12 \( \text{We2} \) a6 13 \( \text{Qxc6}+ \) \( \text{Wxc6} \) 14 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qe7} \) 15 0-0 g5 16 \( \text{Qd2} \) g4 17 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qg5} \) was promising for Black in M.Szymanski-V.Bologan, Warsaw 2005.  

**b)** 6 c3 reminds one of the 2 c3 Sicilian with Black's knight on h7, not d5, but curiously it seems not so bad for him, as the knight can often be exchanged via g5: for example, 6...\( \text{Cc6} \) 7 \( \text{Qf3} \) cxd4 8 cxd4 d6 9 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Nd7} \) 10 \( \text{Cc3} \) dxe5 11 dxe5 a6 12 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{Qg5} \) was quite comfortable for Black in S.Drazic-J.Lopez Martinez, El Sauzal 2007.  

**c)** 6 dxc5 is a less-explored idea. Here 6...\( \text{Cc6} \) (White's point is that 6...\( \text{Qxc5} \) is met by 7 \( \text{Wg4} \) 7 \( \text{Cc3} \) (7 \( \text{Qf3} \) allows Black to exchange his bad knight: 7...\( \text{Qg5} \) 8 \( \text{Qxg5} \) hxg5 9 \( \text{Qe3} \) b6 10 cxb6 axb6 11 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qb4} \) gave Black sufficient counterplay in A.Smirnov-V.Iordachescu, Sochi 2008) 7...\( \text{Qxe5} \) 8 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Cc6} \) 9 \( \text{Qb5} \) (or 9 \( \text{Qd6}!?) \) 9...e5 10 \( \text{Qe3} \) is an unexplored line, probably critical to the assessment of 5...\( \text{Nh7} \).

6 c4  
The nearest analogy for this variation is 1 e4 c5 2 c3 \( \text{Qf6} \) 3 e5 \( \text{Qd5} \) 4 d4 e6 5 c4. The inclusion of ...h7-h6 is generally good for Black as it controls g5-square, but in some particular situations the weakening of the kingside may tell.  

Instead after 6 dxc5 \( \text{Qxc5} \) 7 \( \text{Wg4} \)
6...b6

6...e7 is a virtually unexplored alternative, which may deserve attention. Black's knight stays in touch with the kingside, thereby neutralizing any \textit{g4} ideas. After 7 dx5 (7 d5 d6 isn't at all easy to assess) 7...g6 (after 7...bc6 8 f3 g6 9 e3 gxe5 10 dxe5 gxe5 11 c3 White has a slight advantage according to Wells) 8 f4 (or 8 f3 xc5 with an even game) 8...xc5 9 f3 d6 10 d3 h4 11 xh4 xh4+ 12 g3 e7 13 g4 0-0 14 c3 c6 Black was better in L.Krysa-A.De Dovitiis, Villa Martelli 2008.

7 dx5

Again the most challenging approach. Others:

a) 7 d5 d6! breaks up White's centre with easy play for Black: 8 exd6 xd6 9 f3 (9 c3 0-0 10 d3 exd5 11 xd5 a6 12 ge2 g4 was excellent for Black in G.Zilahi-N.Tavoularis, Budapest 2004) 9...exd5 10 cxd5 0-0 11 c3 d7 12 h6 f6 13 e3 e8 14 d2 g4 15 0-0-0 e4 16 xe4 xe4 and Black was attacking in A.Kinsman-L.Gofshtein, Paris 1996.

b) 7 f3 cxd4 8 xd4 (8 xd4 c6 9 e4 d5 gives Black a perfectly acceptable position, I.Danilov-B.Itkis, Predeal 2006) 8...d5 9 exd6 xd6 10 c3 0-0 leads to an approximately equal position.

c) 7 a4 (with the idea of a5) 7...d5 8 exd6 xd6 (avoiding 8...xd6 b4!) 9 f3 (if 9 a5 6d7) 9...xd4 10 xd4 c6 isn't at all easy to assess.

7...xc5

8 g4

White explores the weaknesses on the kingside, but there is an element of risk here, as the queen is the only developed white piece at the moment.

The more solid option is 8 f3 d5 9 exd6 xd6 10 xd6 (10 d2 e5 11 c3
White's Other Second Moves


$\text{White's Other Second Moves}$

(\text{White})

..f5 is unclear) 10...\text{x}d6 11 \text{c}3 \text{c}6
12 \text{d}2 \text{e}5 with an even game, while
8 \text{c}3 \text{c}6 9 \text{e}4 \text{b}4+ 10 \text{d}2 \text{h}4 11
\text{e}2 \text{x}d2+ 12 \text{x}d2 \text{d}4 13 \text{d}f3 \text{c}5
14 0-0-0 a5 15 h4 a4 16 \text{e}3 \text{x}e3+ 17
\text{f}xe3 \text{a}5 was excellent for Black in
L.Winants-V.lordachescu, Kusadasi 2006.

8...f8!?  
At the cost of castling rights, Black protects his kingside and keeps his advantage in development.

Instead 8...g6 creates a weakness and 9 \text{f}3 \text{c}6 10 \text{c}3 d6 11 exd6
\text{x}d6 12 c5 \text{x}c5 13 \text{b}5 e5 14 \text{g}3
\text{d}6 15 0-0 gave White decent play for his pawn due to those kingside weaknesses in P.Wells-Z.Efimenko, Hastings 2003/04, while 8...\text{f}8 avoids creating a weakness, but fails to equalize after 9
\text{f}3 \text{c}6 10 \text{c}3 d6 11 \text{f}4 (Palliser).

9 \text{c}3  
Wells in his classic book on Trompowsky recommended 9 a3!? when
9...\text{c}6 10 \text{f}3 reaches the critical position to assess for his idea.

Our analysis, together with Igal\text{a}) 10...\text{c}7 is the line given by Wells. It doesn't promise Black a fully satisfactory game and after 11 \text{e}4 d5 12 exd6
\text{x}d6 13 \text{c}3 a6 14 b4 White is better, N.Povah-L.Wu, British League 2002.

b) 10...a5 preventing b2-b4 is more interesting. The main line of our analysis runs 11 \text{c}3 d6 (the position is similar to the game, but with the inclusion of a3 and ...a5) 12 \text{e}4 (but this was not good without a3 and ...a5 in view of \text{b}4+) 12...\text{d}4 13 \text{b}1 \text{c}2+ 14 \text{d}1
\text{d}4 15 \text{x}c5 dxc5 16 \text{x}d4 cxd4 17 b3 which slightly favours White.

c) 10...d6!? leads to interesting complications after 11 b4 \text{xe}5! 12 \text{xe}5 \text{f}6 when there is a non-standard situation where the chances could be estimated as nearly equal: for example, 13 \text{d}3 \text{xa}1 14 \text{x}c5 \text{d}7 15
\text{d}2 \text{x}c5 16 \text{d}1 \text{d}7 with reasonable play for Black in this complex position.

d) 10...d5! is probably the clearest way to reach a fully satisfactory game. After 11 \text{c}3 (11 b4 \text{e}7 12 cxd5
\text{x}d5
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13 c3 cxe5 14 d5 xg4 15 xe7 xxe7 is also better for Black) 11...dxc4 12 e2 d4 13 xd4 xd4 14 w e4 xc3+ 15 bxc3 w d5 Black even has a slight advantage.

Instead if White develops his kingside with 9 f3 c6 10 e2 d6 11 w g3 then Black will equalize with exchanges after 11...dxe5 12 x e5 x e5 13 w x e5 w d4.

9...c6

Or 9...d5 10 exd6?! (this allows Black to activate his pieces; instead 10 f3 deserves attention: for example, 10...c6 11 d2 d7 12 e2 dxc4 13 e4 with compensation) 10...c6 11 d2 e5 12 w h5 d4 13 d3 x d6 14 0-0-0 e6 and Black is better, G.Pitl-B.Savchenko, Dresden 2007.

10 f3

Alternatively, 10 f4 g5 (10...d5?!) 11 e3 (not 11 g3?? h5 with the idea of ...h4) 11...xe3 12 fxe3 w c7 13 f3 (or 13 c5 d5 14 xd5 exd5 15 0-0-0 w x e5 16 f3 e7 17 e2 b6 and Black is better, E.Brondum-W.Rosen, Halle 2004) 13.d5 (13...xe5 14 w d4 gives White compensation) 14 e2 xe5 15 w d4 xf3+ 16 xf3 e5 is quite unclear.

10...d6

Again 10...d5 is possible too and 11 d2 d7 12 e2 c8 13 0-0 e7 14 a3 xc4 15 xc4 dx c4 16 e4 d5 17 xc5 xc5 18 b4 xb4 19 axb4 xc5 20 xa7 c6 reached a roughly level game in C.Natsidis-Z.Ksieski, Leutersdorf 2007.

11 f4 g5?!

A less logical idea is to release the tension in the centre: 11...dxe5 12 x e5 w f6 (if 12...w d4 13 w g3 g5 14 e3 xe5 15 w xe5 xe5 16 xc5+ g7 17 d4 and White is better, J.Vigus-L.Williams, British League 1998) 13 0-0-0 (13 xc6 e5!) 13...g5 14 xc6 xf4+ 15 xf4 gxf4 16 e4 xf2 17 xf2 bxc6 leads to an approximately equal position.

Meanwhile another interesting and aggressive idea is 11...h5! 12 w g3 h4 13 w g4 b4 14 e2 d7, winning the e5-pawn as after 15 exd6? x f6 16 w g5 h5 the queen is trapped.

12 g3
This loses control over the e1-a5 diagonal.

Probably better was to give up the e5-pawn, although 12 d2 dxe5 13 h4 f5 14 Wh5 g7 15 hxg5 hxg5 16 Whxh8+ Whxh8 17 Whxh8 Whxh8 18 Whg5 still gives Black good play.

12...h5

12...b4!? deserved attention, followed by ...a4 and ...a5: for example, 13 c1 a4 14 a3 xc3+ 15 bxc3 a5 with advantage for Black.

13 Whxg5 Whxg5 14 Whg5 h4

Winning a tempo and gaining space.

15 Whf4 dxe5 16 Wh3

White is agreeing to the weakening of his pawn structure after the exchange of bishops to protect the d4-square.

16...xh3 17 fxe3 Wh7 18 0-0-0 Whd7

The knight is coming into play. The endgame is slightly better for Black, mainly because of his strong central pawn triangle.

19 Wh3

White allows an exchange of the g2-pawn for h4. This strengthens Black's position, but White hopes on counterplay with the resulting passed h-pawn.

Instead 19 a3 a5 20 Wha4 deserved attention.

19...Wg8 20 Whf3 Whxg2 21 Whh4

Or 21 Whg1 h3!?

21...Wg8 22 Whf3 Whc5 23 h4 e4 24 Whg5 f5 25 Whg1 Whd7 26 Whh3

White could push his passed pawn, but it would not change the assessment: 26 h5 Whc5 27 Whc2 a5 28 h6 Whg6 29 h7 Whh8 and Black has the better chances.

26...Wh5 27 Whf4 a5 28 Whc2 Whc6 29 Whg5 Whf7 30 Whg8 Whg8

31 Whh2!?

Relatively best was to prevent the rook's invasion on g3 by 31 h5 Whh6 32 Whg6+ Whf6, slightly better for Black though this would have been.

31...Whg3 32 h5 Whh6 33 Whd2 Whd7 34 Whg6+ Whf6 35 Whc1 Whg1+ 36 Whf2?

Again allowing a further invasion by the rook, now decisively so.

36...Whc1 37 Whg2 Whc2 38 Whd1 e5 39 Whf1 a4 40 Whh4 Whf8 41 Whg6 Whg6 42 a3 f4 43
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\[ \text{x}f4 \text{exf}4 44 \text{~g}6+ \text{~f}7 45 \text{x}h6 \text{f}3 46 \text{x}f3 \text{exf}3 47 \text{e}1 \text{g}7 48 \text{h}8 \text{e}2+ 49 \text{f}1 \text{f}5 0-1 \]

Game 30
M.Van der Werf-D.Jakovenko
European Club Cup, Saint Vincent 2005

1 d4 \text{f}6 2 \text{c}3 d5 3 \text{g}5

The Veresov Opening (also known as the Richter-Veresov Attack). This opening looks like a mirrored Ruy Lopez, but of course, since the d-pawn is protected from the start by the queen, the dynamics of play are quite different. White’s plans typically include rapid queenside castling, as well as an early f2-f3 and e2-e4 pawn push. Indeed, the German master Kurt Richter, after whom the opening is half-named, usually continued 4 f3, hoping to build up a large pawn centre. The Soviet player Gavril Veresov, on the other hand, usually played 4 \text{xf}6, damaging Black’s pawn structure. The opening has never been very popular at the top level, but various prominent players have employed it occasionally.

Instead 3 \text{f}4 is like a reversed Giuoco Piano, only worse because White is creating a weakness on b2 by developing his queen’s bishop so early:
3...\text{f}5 (3...c5 4 e3 e6 5 \text{f}3 a6 6 \text{e}2 \text{c}6 7 0-0 \text{e}7 8 \text{e}5 0-0 9 \text{xc}6 \text{bx}c6 10 \text{a}4 \text{cx}d4 11 \text{ex}d4 a5 12 \text{e}1 \text{a}6 reached a roughly level game in K.Chernyshov-S.Himanshu, New Delhi 2006) 4 \text{f}3 \text{e}6 5 e3 \text{b}4 6 \text{d}3 (or 6 a3 \text{xc}3+ 7 \text{bx}c3 \text{e}4 8 \text{wb}1 \text{b}6 9 \text{c}4 \text{g}5 10 \text{g}3 h5 with reasonable play for Black in this complex position, A.Bely-A.Ivanov, Kharkov 2003) 6...\text{xd}3 7 \text{w}xd3 (if 7 \text{cx}d3 0-0 8 0-0 \text{h}5 with rough equality, A.Georgiou-H.Velasquez, Thessaloniki 1988) 7...a6 8 0-0-0 0-0 9 \text{e}5 c5 10 g4? \text{c}4 11 \text{we}2 \text{xc}3 12 \text{bx}c3 \text{e}4 13 \text{we}1 \text{f}6 14 \text{f}3 \text{wa}5 with advantage for Black in B.Lyons-M.Quinn, Bunratty 2007.

3...c5?!

This is one of Black’s most challenging approaches against the Veresov.
Comparisons with the Chigorin Defence of the Queens Gambit (1 d4 d5 2 c4 c6 3 f3 g4 or 2 f3 c6) are obvious. The extra tempo is surprisingly hard for White to use in a productive way. In this game we will consider those lines where White opts for a relatively closed set-up (mainly with e2-e3), while the sharper options (mainly with e2-e4) are the subject of the next game.

4...xf6

Damaging Black's structure, but White also has:

a) 4 e3 without the exchange on f6 is seen in practice quite often. However, it seems not in the spirit of the 2 Qc3 opening – the position reminds one of a Queen's Pawn Game where the queen's knight is a little misplaced, obstructing the c-pawn. After 4...c6 White has tried:

a1) 5 b5 cxd4 6 exd4 g4 7 f3 d7 8 ge2 e6 9 0-0 d6 10 w2d2 0-0 11 ada1 ac8 12 h1 a6 13 d3 db4 and Black is better, B.Borysiak-E.Sveshnikov, Warsaw 2005.

a2) 5 dxc5 e6 6 f3 xc5 7 a3 xe7 8 d3 h6 9 h4 0-0 10 0-0 b6 11 d4 b7 12 f4 c8 13 cb5 e8 14 g3 xd4 15 xd4 f6 16 e2 d6 17 ada1 we7 18 c3 fd8 and Black has slightly the better chances, I.Miladinovic-R.Ruck, Murska Sobota 2008.

a3) 5 f3 g4 6 xe2 (instead 6 dxc5 e6 7 da4 xf3 8 xf3 wa5+ 9 c3 b5! 10 cxb6 axb6 11 wb3 wxa4 12 wa4 xa4 13 b5 ac4 was excellent for Black in A.Roizman-E.Rodin, correspondence 1987) 6...e6 7 0-0 (or 7 h3 xf3 8 xf3 cxd4 9 exd4 wb6 10 0-0 xd4 and Black is better) 7...e7 (avoiding 7...cxd4 8 exd4 xf3 9 xf3 wb6 10 xf6 gxf6 11 xd5!) 8 e5 xe2 9 xe2 xe5 10 dxe5 d7 11 xe7 xe7 12 f4 0-0 with the idea of ...f6 gives Black a promising game.

b) 4 f3 e4 and then:

b1) 5 f4 f6!? 6 e3 wa5 gives Black active counterplay.

b2) 5 e3 xg5 6 xg5 e6 7 f3 c6 8 b5 a6 9 xc6+ bxc6 10 0-0 d6 11 a4 cxd4 12 exd4 0-0 gave Black good play with the bishop-pair in I.Derjabin-O.Boguslavsky, Dnipropetrovsk 2002.

b3) 5 dxc5 xc3 6 bxc3 f6 7 c1 e5 again with advantage for Black.

b4) 5 h4 wa5 and Black has the better chances.

b5) 5 d2 cxd4 6 xd4 xd2 7 xd2 e5 8 b3 d4 9 d4 (9 d1 c6 10 e3 a5 11 exd4 a4 is excellent for Black) 9...a5 10 e3 a4 11 c1 wb6 12 b1 f5 and Black is better.

4...xf6 5 e3 c6
A less explored but promising alternative is 5...cxd4 6 exd4 h5!?., preventing Wh5 and facilitating the idea of ...h6+: for example, 7 e2 h4 8 f3 e6 9 We2 c6 10 xdx5 cxd4 11 We4 e5 (11...Wb6 also gives Black a promising game) 12 xdx7? (12 b3 isn’t at all easy to assess) 12...xd7 13 Wxb7 Wb8 14 We4 xdx2 with advantage for Black in T.Navinsek-B.Avrukh, Ljubljana 1998.

However, 5...e6 is less flexible as in some sidelines Black loses options like ...g4 or ...e7-e5, although most often it just transposes to the main game after 6 Wh5 c6.

6 Wh5
The most principled approach. The main purpose of the exchange on f6 was to create this comfortable base for the queen, where it creates pressure on the kingside and now also attacks the pawn on d5. Again the alternatives are less challenging:

a) 6 dxc5 e6 7 f3 (otherwise, 7 Wh5 transposes to note ‘c’ to White’s 7th move in our main game, while 7 Qe2 xdx5 8 g3 h5 9 h4 Qe5 10 g2 Wb6 11 a4 a5+ 12 c3 Qe7 13 b4 Wc7 14 b2 d7 15 a4 a5 16 0-0 axb4 17 cxb4 Wxb4 18 Qf4 Wc3 was very good for Black in S.Smagin-J.Dorfman, Ivano Frankovsk 1982) 7...xc5 8 a2 (if 8 b3 f5 9 0-0 a6 and Black has slightly the better chances) 8...d7 9 0-0 c5 10 e4 Qxf3+ 11 Qxf3 d4 12 Qe2 Wb6 13 Qb1 Qb5 14 b4 Qe7 15 Wd2 0-0-0 16 Qc1 Qb8 17 Qf4 Qc8 was slightly better for Black in J.Kucera-J.Hudecek, Slovakian League 1995.

b) 6 a5 e6 and then:

b1) 7 Qe2 a7 8 0-0 a6 9 xdx6 xc6 10 a4 f5 gives Black a perfectly acceptable position.

b2) 7 e4 dxe4 8 d5 a6 9 xdx6+ bxc6 10 dxe6 xe6 11 Wxd8+ xd8 12 Qxe4 f5 gives Black a promising game.

b3) 7 Wf3 d7 8 0-0-0 cxd4 9 exd4 Qd6 10 Qge2 a6 isn’t so easy to assess.

b4) 7 Qf3 d7 8 0-0 (if 8 e4 dxe4 9 Qxe4 Wa5+ 10 Wd2 Wxb5 11 Qxf6+ Qe7 12 dxc5 Wxb2 13 Qd1 Qg7 14 0-0 Qxf6 15 Wxd7+ Qf8 and Black is better, H.Nouri-E.Ghaem Maghami, Cebu City 2007) 8...a6 (or 8...cxd4 9 exd4 Qd6 10
\[ \text{White's Other Second Moves} \]

\[ \text{We2 a6 with a slight advantage for Black) 9 \text{\textguillemotleft}\text{x6} \text{x}6 \text{10 dxc5 (after 10 \text{\textguillemotleft}e1 \text{\textguillemotright}b6 11 \text{\textguillemotright}b1 0-0-0 12 dxc5 \text{x}5 13 \text{\textguillemotleft}d4 h5 Black has slightly the better chances) 10...\text{x}c5 11 \text{\textguillemotleft}d4 f5 is about equal.} \]

\[ \text{c) 6 \text{\textguillemotleft}f3 \text{\textguillemotright}g4 (6...\text{\textguillemotleft}xd4 7 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 \text{\textguillemotright}g4 8 \text{\textguillemotleft}e2 e6 9 0-0 \text{\textguillemotright}g8 10 \text{\textguillemotleft}e1 \text{\textguillemotright}e7 with the idea of ...f5 and ...\text{\textguillemotright}f6 also gives Black a perfectly acceptable position) 7 \text{\textguillemotleft}e2 e6 8 0-0 \text{\textguillemotright}c8 9 dxc5 \text{x}c5 10 \text{\textguillemotleft}d4 \text{\textguillemotright}xe2 11 \text{\textguillemotleft}cxe2 f5 12 \text{\textguillemotleft}xc6 \text{\textguillemotright}xc6 with reasonable play for Black in this complex position, E.Mensch-S.Zagrebelny, Metz 2002.} \]

\[ \text{d) 6 \text{\textguillemotleft}ge2 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 7 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 e5 8 \text{\textguillemotright}d2 \text{\textguillemotleft}e6 9 0-0-0 \text{\textguillemotright}a5 10 g3 0-0-0 11 \text{\textguillemotright}b1 h5 is better for Black.} \]

\[ \text{e) 6 g3 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 7 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 h5!? is unclear according to Shereshevsky.} \]

6...\text{\textguillemotleft}e6

\[ \text{7 0-0-0} \]

\[ \text{Should White try a plan with short castling, then his weaknesses on the queenside will begin to tell: 7 \text{\textguillemotleft}ge2 \text{\textguillemotright}d7 8 g3 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 9 \text{\textguillemotleft}xe4 \text{\textguillemotright}b6 10 \text{\textguillemotleft}h3 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 11 \text{\textguillemotright}xd5 \text{\textguillemotright}xb2 and Black has the better chances or 7 \text{\textguillemotleft}f3 \text{\textguillemotright}d7 8 0-0-0 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 9 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 10 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 \text{\textguillemotright}c8 which is slightly better for Black.} \]

\[ \text{Instead 7 dxc5 \text{\textguillemotright}xc5 gives White a few options:} \]

\[ \text{a) 8 \text{\textguillemotleft}b5 a6 9 \text{\textguillemotright}a4 f5! with the idea of ...\text{\textguillemotright}f6 when Black is better.} \]

\[ \text{b) 8 \text{\textguillemotleft}d3 \text{\textguillemotright}d7 9 \text{\textguillemotright}ge2 f5 again gives Black a promising game with ...\text{\textguillemotright}f6 next up.} \]

\[ \text{c) 8 0-0-0 \text{\textguillemotright}e7 9 \text{\textguillemotright}ge2 (9 \text{\textguillemotleft}b5 \text{\textguillemotright}d7 10 \text{\textguillemotright}ge2 a6 gives Black good play) 9...f5 (9...a6 10 \text{\textguillemotright}f4 \text{\textguillemotright}d7 11 \text{\textguillemotright}xd5 \text{\textguillemotright}xd5 12 \text{\textguillemotright}d5 \text{\textguillemotright}e5 13 \text{\textguillemotright}xe5+ \text{\textguillemotright}xe5 14 \text{\textguillemotright}c7+ \text{\textguillemotright}f6 15 \text{\textguillemotright}xa8 \text{\textguillemotright}xa8 16 h3 \text{\textguillemotleft}c6 17 \text{\textguillemotleft}h2 \text{\textguillemotright}g8 and Black is better, N.Ryahi-N.Nguyen, Esfahan 2005) 10 \text{\textguillemotleft}f4 \text{\textguillemotright}d6 is unclear.} \]

7...\text{\textguillemotright}d7

Black has some good alternatives:

\[ \text{a) 7...f5 8 f4 c4 (8...\text{\textguillemotright}xd4!? 9 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 \text{\textguillemotleft}b4 is another approach) 9 g4?! (too adventurous) 9...\text{\textguillemotright}xf4 10 e4 \text{\textguillemotleft}e7 11 f5 \text{\textguillemotright}xf5 12 \text{\textguillemotright}d5 \text{\textguillemotright}d6 13 \text{\textguillemotleft}e1 a6 and Black has the better chances, R.Knaak-V.Georgiev, German League 1999.} \]

\[ \text{b) 7...\text{\textguillemotright}xd4!? 8 \text{\textguillemotright}xd4 \text{\textguillemotleft}b4 9 \text{\textguillemotleft}ge2} \]
\( \Delta d7 10 f4 \textbf{\Delta} e7 (10...f5!?) 11 g4 fxg4 12 f5 h6 with the idea of \ldots \textbf{\Delta} g5+ looks excellent for Black) 11 \textbf{\Delta} b5 (11 f5 0-0-0 12 g3 \textbf{\Delta} a5 was drawn in L.Aronian-M.Sibenik, Paris 1994) 11...\textbf{\Delta} c8 12 f5 \textbf{\Delta} d8 13 g3 a6 14 \textbf{\Delta} bc3 \textbf{\Delta} a5 15 \textbf{\Delta} d3 \textbf{\Delta} c4 gave Black a perfectly acceptable position in F.Berkes-A.Timofeev, Oropesa del Mar 1999.

8 \textbf{\Delta} ge2

8...f5

Thematically clamping down on the e4-square and increasing the dark-squared bishop’s scope, but Black can also first go 8...cxd4 9 exd4 fxg4 10...\textbf{\Delta} xg4 with a plus for Black.

9...\textbf{\Delta} f6 10 \textbf{\Delta} g2 \textbf{\Delta} e7 11 f4 0-0-0 14 \textbf{\Delta} f3 \textbf{\Delta} h6+ 16 \textbf{\Delta} b1 \textbf{\Delta} c4 he still doesn’t achieve an easy game.

14...\textbf{\Delta} f6 15 \textbf{\Delta} b1 \textbf{\Delta} d6 16 \textbf{\Delta} f3 \textbf{\Delta} dg8 17 \textbf{\Delta} xg8+

Not 17 \textbf{\Delta} h3? \textbf{\Delta} xg1 18 \textbf{\Delta} xg1 \textbf{\Delta} xd4 with a decisive advantage for Black.

17...\textbf{\Delta} xg8 18 \textbf{\Delta} h3 \textbf{\Delta} e7 19 \textbf{\Delta} xh5 \textbf{\Delta} h8 20 \textbf{\Delta} f3 \textbf{\Delta} h6 21 \textbf{\Delta} g2 \textbf{\Delta} g6

22 a3

After 22 \textbf{\Delta} f1 \textbf{\Delta} h4 23 \textbf{\Delta} f2 \textbf{\Delta} xg2 24 \textbf{\Delta} xg2 \textbf{\Delta} xh2 25 \textbf{\Delta} xh2 \textbf{\Delta} xh2 Black has slightly the better chances.

22...\textbf{\Delta} xf4 23 \textbf{\Delta} xf4 \textbf{\Delta} xf4 24 \textbf{\Delta} xf4 \textbf{\Delta} xf4 25 h3 \textbf{\Delta} g8 26 \textbf{\Delta} f1?

Better was 26 \textbf{\Delta} e2 \textbf{\Delta} d6 27 \textbf{\Delta} f3 \textbf{\Delta} h8 28 \textbf{\Delta} h1 \textbf{\Delta} h4 29 c3 when White has good chances to hold.

26...f5! 27 \textbf{\Delta} e2 \textbf{\Delta} e3 28 \textbf{\Delta} c1 \textbf{\Delta} g1 29
Or 29...\texttt{e}e2 \texttt{a}xd1 30 \texttt{a}xd1 \texttt{a}xd4 with a decisive advantage for Black.

29...\texttt{h}h1 30 \texttt{g}g3 \texttt{h}h2 31 \texttt{h}h5 \texttt{e}e8 32 \texttt{g}g7 \texttt{f}f7 33 \texttt{e}e1 \texttt{d}d2 34 \texttt{e}e2 \texttt{h}h1 0-1

**Game 31**

M.Hebden-V.Milov

Isle of Man 1995

1 d4 \texttt{d}5 2 \texttt{c}c3 \texttt{f}f6 3 \texttt{g}g5 c5

In this game we will look at White's sharper options.

4 \texttt{xf}6

Consistent, but it's also useful to have seen:

- a) 4 e4 is a dubious gambit line:
  4...\texttt{xe}4 5 \texttt{xe}4 \texttt{dxe}4 6 d5 (6 dxc5 \texttt{a}a5+ 7 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{xc}5 8 0-0-0 \texttt{c}c6 9 \texttt{e}e3 \texttt{e}e5 10 \texttt{f}f4 \texttt{d}d6 is slightly better for Black) 6...h6!? (it's useful to define the dark-squared bishop's position before starting to exploit the dark-square weaknesses on the queenside; after 6...\texttt{b}b6 7 \texttt{e}e2! \texttt{g}6 8 \texttt{b}b1 \texttt{g}7 9 \texttt{c}c3 \texttt{f}5 10 \texttt{f}f4 \texttt{d}d7 11 d6 exd6 12 \texttt{b}b5 a6 13 \texttt{d}d5 \texttt{a}a5+ 14 b4 cxb4 15 \texttt{a}xd6 White is attacking) 7 \texttt{h}h4 (or 7 \texttt{f}f4 \texttt{d}d7 8 c3 \texttt{b}b6 and Black is better) 7...\texttt{b}b6 8 \texttt{e}e2 g5 9 \texttt{g}g3 \texttt{g}g7 10 \texttt{b}b1 f5 with a decisive advantage for Black.
- b) After 4 dxc5 d4 5 \texttt{xf}6 \texttt{exf}6!? (5...\texttt{gxf}6 transposes to the notes to White's 5th move, below) 6 \texttt{e}e4 \texttt{f}5, in comparison with the Chigorin line 1 d4 d5 2 c4 \texttt{c}c6 3 \texttt{f}f3 \texttt{g}g4 4 \texttt{c}c3 dxc4?! 5 d5 \texttt{xf}3 6 \texttt{exf}3 \texttt{e}e5 7 \texttt{f}f4 White has an extra tempo (Black has not played ...\texttt{b}b8-c6 yet), but this extra tempo is surprisingly not enough even to equalize: for example, 7 \texttt{d}d6+ (not 7 \texttt{g}g3 \texttt{xc}5 8 \texttt{xf}5? \texttt{a}a5+ with a decisive advantage for Black) 7...\texttt{d}d6 8 cxd6 \texttt{e}e5 sees Black taking the upper hand.

4...\texttt{gxf}6 5 e4

The sharpest line.

Instead 5 dxc5 d4 6 \texttt{e}e4 \texttt{d}d5 7 \texttt{d}d2 (or 7 \texttt{g}g3 \texttt{xc}5 8 \texttt{d}d2 \texttt{h}5 with the initiative) 7...\texttt{xc}5 8 \texttt{gf}3 \texttt{c}c6 9 a3 (9 \texttt{c}c1 \texttt{e}e6 10 a3 \texttt{d}d8 is better for Black) 9...\texttt{e}e6 10 g3 \texttt{d}d8 11 \texttt{g}g2 \texttt{b}b6 12 \texttt{b}b3 a5 favours Black.

5...\texttt{dxe}4
6 d5

White wants to play a real gambit and now play resembles the Albin Counter-Gambit.

The more common continuation is 6 dxc5 and after 6...f5 White has a choice:

a) 7 b5+ d7 8 ge2 c6 9 wd2 e6 10 0-0 g8! 11 ad1 xc5 and White had almost no compensation for the pawn in I.Miladinovic-S.Smagin, Montreal 2000.

b) 7 h5 g7 8 c4 0-0 9 h3 h6 10 0-0 e6 11 ad1 e7 with the idea of ...xc5 and Black has the better chances.

c) 7 xd8+ xd8 8 0-0-0 (if 8 d1+ d7 9 c4 e6 10 g4 fxg4 11 xe4 e7 12 e2 c6 13 2g3 f5 with a large advantage for Black, M.Vasilev-M.Krasenkow, Kavala 2001) 8 d7 (it's hard to believe that White has full compensation here) 9 f3 (or 9 b5 g8 10 ge2 c8 11 hg1 e6 12 b4 xb5 13 xxb5 a5 and Black is better, R.Belis-A.Le Bideau, correspondence 2006) 9 g7 10 ge2 (10 b5 a6 11 d4 c7 is excellent for Black) 10 exf3 11 gxf3 g8 12 d4 e6 gives Black a perfectly acceptable position.

6...f5 7 h5?!

This seems logical: White takes up an advanced post on the kingside and prepares to go long. The reason why this plan fails is that White is under threat by a queen exchange with ...wb6-h6+.

To continue the kingside development with 7 c4 gives Black a tempo for ...d7-e5: for example, 7...a6 8 a4 g7 9 ge2 d7 10 0-0 e5 with comfortable play for Black.

Instead playing in the centre with 7 f3 is not logical in view of White's lack of development and 7...w6 8 b1 g7 9 b5+ d7 10 fxe4 fxe4 11 ge2 0-0 sees Black taking the upper hand.

7...g7

The immediate 7...wb6 is also good. After 8 b5+ (8 0-0-0 wh6+ is Black's idea) 8...d7 it's dangerous for White to grab the pawn with 9 wxf5 a6 10 xd7+ xd7 as then Black's long-range pieces develop rapid activity.

8 ge2
Now in the case of 8 ♕b5+ Black simply plays 8...♕f8 9 ♙h3 ♚d6 10 ♙e2 ♚h6 11 ♙g5 ♙xh5 12 ♙xh5 ♙d7 13 ♙d1 (or 13 ♙xf7 ♙f6 with a decisive advantage for Black) 13...♕xc3+ 14 ♙xc3 ♙f6 15 ♙e2 ♙g8 16 ♙h3 ♙xg2 with some advantage, Z.Mestrovic-D.Sermek, Tucepi 1996.

8...♕b6 9 0-0-0 ♙h6+ 10 ♙xh6 ♙xh6+ 11 ♙b1 ♙d7 12 ♙g3

The queens have come off and White seems to have no compensation for the pawn. Likewise, 12 d6 ♙f6 13 ♙f4 ♙xf4 15 ♙xe4 ♙e6 leads to a big advantage for Black and 12 ♙b5 ♙f8 13 ♙d6 ♙f6! is also better for Black.

12...♕f6 13 ♙f4 ♙e6 14 ♙b5+ ♙f8 15 ♙he1

Neither 15 d6 ♙xf6 16 ♙xd6 ♙e7 17 ♙d1 (if 17 ♙d1 ♙e6) 17...f4 nor 15 ♙d3 ♙e6 seems like a route to salvation.

15...♕g8

Black is clearly better.

16 ♙f1

Instead 16 d6 ♙e6!? with some advantage for Black or 16 ♙e2 a6 17 ♙d3 f4 when he definitely has the initiative.

16...f4

The alternative 16...a6 17 ♙d3 ♙xg2 18 ♙xe3 ♙xe3 19 ♙xe3 ♙xh2 was also good.

17 g3 ♙h3 18 ♙e2

After 18 gxf4 ♙xf1 19 ♙xf1 ♙xf4 20 ♙d6 ♙g2 Black again has the better chances.

18...♕h5 19 d6

If 19 ♙xf4 ♙xf4 20 gxf4 ♙xf1 21 ♙xf1 ♙xf4 and despite the opposite-coloured bishops, Black has good winning chances as the pawn on e3 is very dangerous.

19...e6

20 gxf4

If 20 g4 ♙f6 21 ♙g1 ♙xg4 (21...♕g2?) 22 fxg4 ♙xg4 and Black's pawns are worth much more than a piece.

20...♕xf1 21 ♙xf1 ♙xf4 22 ♙c3 a6 23 ♙d3 f5 24 ♙fe1 ♙g2 25 ♙g1 ♙d8 26 ♙c4 ♙f7 27 ♙a4 ♙f4 28 ♙d7 ♙e7 29 a5 ♙d6 30 ♙a4 ♙h4 31 ♙xg8 ♙xg8 32 ♙f4 ♙f3 33 ♙a2 ♙d2 34 ♙b3 ♙xd7 35 ♙e1 ♙xc4 36 bxc4 ♙xf4 37 ♙xc5+ ♙d6 38 ♙d3 e5 39 ♙b1 ♙c7 40 ♙b3 ♙xh2 0-1
The New Old Indian

Game 32
Lin Weiguo-M. Wahls
Adelaide 1988

1 d4 ∆f6 2 ∆c3

With 2 f3 White wants to reach the main line of the Blackmar-Diemer Gambit, while avoiding the Hubsch Gambit (see below). After 2...d5 (other possibilities are 2...c5 3 d5 d6 4 e4 g6, or 2...d6 for Pirc players when after 3 e4, 3...e5 deserves attention) 3 e4 c5!? (the most ambitious option; Black could also simply play 3...e6 with an excellent French Defence prospect, since the move f3 does not seem particularly useful, while 3...dxe4 4 ∆c3 reaches the main line of the Blackmar-Diemer Gambit) 4 e5 (for 4 ∆c3 see the main game) 4...∆g8 (also possible is 4...∆fd7 5 c3 ∆c6 6 f4 e6; this French-type of position is good for Black and most often occurs when White avoids the Alekhine with 1 e4 ∆f6 2 d3 d5 3 e5 ∆fd7 4 d4, etc) 5 f4 play transposes to the unusual Caro-Kann line 1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 e5 c5 4 f4. In comparison to the French-type positions above, the queen’s bishop will be able to get out and the king’s knight can use the route ...∆e7-f5 to put pressure on d4.

2...d5 3 f3

The same idea as with 2 f3.

Instead 3 e4 ∆xe4 is called the Hubsch Gambit (3...dxe4 4 f3 is the main line of the Blackmar-Diemer Gambit again), and after 4 ∆xe4 dxe4 White has tried:

a) 5 f3 e5! 6 ∆e3 exd4 7 ∆xd4 ∆c6 8 ∆b5 ∆f5 is excellent for Black.

b) 5 ∆f4 (White wants to take his opponent out of all known theory) 5...e6 (logical development) 6 ∆e2 c5 7 c3?! ∆c6 8 ∆a4 ∆d7 9 dxc5 ∆xc5 10 ∆xe4 ∆b6 11 0-0-0 ∆xf2 and Black simply netted a pawn in D.Zimbeck-S. Atalik, Burbank 2005.

c) 5 ∆e3 ∆d7 6 c3 e6 7 ∆c4 ∆f6 8 ∆c2 ∆d7 9 f3 ∆c6 10 fxe4 ∆xe4 11 ∆e2 c6 12 ∆g5 ∆g6 13 f3 ∆e7 14 ∆e5 ∆d7 15 ∆xe7 ∆xe7 16 0-0 ∆xe5 17 ∆xe5 0-0 and Black is better, C.Blaauw-J. Van Mil, Groningen 1994.

d) 5 c3 e5 6 ∆c4 exd4 7 ∆e2 was seen in E.Diemer-F. Heger, Ketsch 1978, and after 7...d3 8 ∆g3 ∆c6 9 ∆xe4 ∆e5 Black is again better.

e) 5 ∆c4 has been the most popular choice for White. Here and later Black has a lot of alternatives, but we consider only the line we believe is the best: 5...∆c6 6 c3 (almost obligatory; after 6 ∆e3 e5 7 d5 ∆a5 8 ∆e2 c6 9 c4...
7 d5 \(\text{e}7\) 8 f3 (recommended by Serper as White's best course; instead 8 \(\text{wa}4+\) is met by 8 ... \(\text{d}7\) 9 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{f}5\) 10 \(\text{xb}7\) \(\text{ab}8\) 11 \(\text{wa}6\) e3 when Black is better, L.Faber-J.Rehder, correspondence 2002) 8 ... \(\text{g}6\) 9 \(\text{e}2\) exf3 10 \(\text{xf}3\) \(\text{d}6\) 11 0-0 0-0 (Black has finished his development with a solid position) 12 \(\text{g}5\) h6 13 \(\text{e}4\) f5 14 \(\text{xd}6\) cxd6 15 \(\text{h}5\) \(\text{h}7\) 16 \(\text{e}3\) f4 17 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{g}5\) somewhat favoured Black in P.Alessandri-W.Helmers, Val Thorens 2008.

3...c5!

If 3 ... \(\text{f}5\) then after 4 e4 dxe4 White gets what he wants – a line of the Blackmar-Diemer Gambit while avoiding the Hubsch.

4 e4

Alternatively:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a)} & \quad 4 \text{e}3 \text{c}6 5 \text{b}5 \text{e}6 6 \text{g}e2 \text{d}7 7 \\
\text{b)} & \quad 4 \text{dxc5} \text{d}4 \text{is again a good reversed Chigorin for Black. The extra move f2-f3 may not help White and 5 \(\text{e}4\) (5 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{wa}5+\) 6 c3 \(\text{b}5\) sees Black taking the upper hand) 5 ... \(\text{xe}4\) 6 fxe4 e5 7 b4 a5 gives Black good play.}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
4...\text{cxd4} 5 \text{xd4} \text{c}6 6 \text{b}5 \text{d}7 7 \text{xc6} \text{xc6} \\
8 \text{e}5
\end{align*}\]

A principled but hardly satisfactory continuation.

Maybe White should try to equalize with 8 exd5 \(\text{xd}5\) 9 \(\text{ge}2\) (not 9 \(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xd}5\) 10 \(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xd}5\) 9 ... \(\text{e}6\) 10 \(\text{xd}5\) (if 10 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{xc}3\) 11 \(\text{xc}3\) \(\text{h}4+\) 12 \text{g}3 \(\text{a}4\) with a slight advantage for Black) 10 ... \(\text{xd}5\) 11 \(\text{xd}5\) \(\text{xd}5\) 12 b3 with the idea of \(\text{c}4\) and \(\text{b}2\), and an even game.

\[\begin{align*}
8...\text{d}7 9 \text{e}6
\end{align*}\]

Again there are alternatives:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a)} & \quad \text{Perhaps relatively best is 9 \text{f}4, although 9 ... \text{e}6 10 \text{f}3 \text{c}5 11 \text{d}3 \text{b}6 12 \text{d}1 \text{b}4+ 13 \text{c}3 \text{e}4+ 14 \text{xe}4}
\end{align*}\]
dxe4 15 \( \text{\&}d4 \text{\&}xd4 16 \text{cxd4} \text{\&}b6 \) was slightly better for Black in S. Warkentin-O. Korneev, Le Touquet 1993.

b) 9 \( \text{\&}g5 \text{\&}b6 \) forces the exchange of queens, with the better ending for Black due to the bishop-pair. Indeed, 10 \( \text{\&}xb6 \text{axb6!} \) (or 10...\( \text{\&}xb6 11 \text{\&}ge2 f6 \)) 11 \( \text{\&}f4 \) g5 gives Black a promising game.

c) 9 \( \text{\&}e3 \) e6 10 \( \text{\&}ge2 \) (10 b4 with the idea of b5 weakens the c4-square and 10...\( \text{\&}b6 \) is better for Black) 10...\( \text{\&}c5 \) 11 \( \text{\&}f4 \) g5 12 \( \text{\&}xg5 \text{\&}xg5 \) 13 \( \text{\&}xg5 \text{\&}g8 \) 14 h4 \( \text{\&}xe5 \) with a slight plus for Black.

d) 9 \( \text{\&}xd5? \text{\&}b6 \) loses the knight.

9...\( fxe6 \) 10.f4

After 10 \( \text{\&}f4 \text{\&}b6 \) 11 \( \text{\&}xb6 \text{axb6} \) 12 \( \text{\&}ge2 \) e5 Black has the better chances once again, T. Ellenbroek-H. Plasman, Enschede 1998.

10...\( \text{\&}b6 \)

Instead 10...e5 11 \( fxe5 \) e6 12 \( \text{\&}f3 \text{\&}c5 \) 13 \( \text{\&}g4 \text{\&}e7 \) (13...0-0 14 \( \text{\&}h6 \text{\&}e7 \) 15 0-0-0 \( \text{\&}f5 \) 16 \( \text{\&}g3 \) is quite unclear) 14 \( \text{\&}g5 \text{\&}f7 \) 15 0-0-0 0-0 16 \( \text{\&}e2 \text{\&}g6 \) results in mutual chances, but simple and good was 10...\( \text{\&}f6! \) with the idea of ...g6, ...\( \text{\&}g7 \) and ...0-0.

11 \( \text{\&}e3 \)?

This sacrifice of two pawns is not correct. Instead 11 \( \text{\&}f3 \) keeps complex play, but Black's chances are still slightly preferable after 11...\( \text{\&}g8! \) with the idea of ...g6.

11...\( \text{\&}xb2 \) 12 \( \text{\&}b1 \text{\&}xc2 \) 13 \( \text{\&}ge2 \) e5 14 \( \text{\&}xe5 \) e6 15 0-0

White was probably hoping for something like 15 \( \text{\&}g4 \), but it would have been met by 15...\( \text{\&}g6 \).

15...\( \text{\&}c5 \) 16 \( \text{\&}f4 \text{\&}f5 \)

16...\( \text{\&}f8! \) 17 \( \text{\&}g3 \text{\&}xf1+ \) 18 \( \text{\&}xf1 \) \( \text{\&}d3 \) was even more convincing.

17 \( \text{\&}g3 \text{\&}xe3+ \) 18 \( \text{\&}xe3 \text{\&}xe5 \) 19 \( \text{\&}d2 \text{\&}f6 \) 20 \( \text{\&}fe1 \text{\&}d6 \) 21 \( \text{\&}d4 \) 0-0 22 \( \text{\&}xe6 \text{\&}c5 \) 23 \( \text{\&}h1 \text{\&}ad8 \) 24 \( \text{\&}c1 \text{\&}e4 \) 25 \( \text{\&}e3 \text{\&}xc3 \) 26 \( \text{\&}xe4 \text{\&}xc1+ \) 27 \( \text{\&}xc1 \text{\&}xe4 \) 28 \( \text{\&}xe6 \text{\&}b5 \) 29 \( \text{\&}xd8 \) e3 30 \( \text{\&}xe3 \text{\&}f1+ \) 31 \( \text{\&}g1 \text{\&}xg1+ \) 32 \( \text{\&}xg1 \) \( \text{\&}c6 \) 0-1

**Summary**

The active but sound lines recommended in this chapter complete our proposed repertoire against 1 d4. Black appears to be in good shape when White allows 3 e4 c5 in the Trompowsky, although much remains to be explored there. Instead a Torre-like approach gives Black an easy game, while the Veresov is unsurprisingly rare at grandmaster level, partly because of the active riposte 3...c5.

---

**158**
Index of Variations

1 d4 .df6 and now:

A: 2 c4
B: 2 Others

A) 2 c4 d6 3 .c3
   3 .f3 g6
   4 .c3 .f5
       5 g3 – 73
       5 .h4 – 77
       5 .b3 – 83
       5 d5 – 87
   4 g3 .g7 5 .g2 0-0 6 0-0 c6 7
       .c3 .f5
       8 .h4 – 91
       8 .e1 – 95
3...e5
   3...f5
       4 f3 – 99
       4 g3 – 104
4 .f3
   4 d5 .bd7 5 e4 .c5
       6 .c2 – 40
       6 .d3 – 45
       6 f3 – 47
   4 e4 – 53
   4 dxe5 – 58
   4 e3 .bd7
       5 .d3 – 64
       5 g3 – 68
4...e4 5 .g5
   5 .d2
       5...f5 – 28
       5...e7 – 34
   5...e7
       5...f5
       6 g4 – 20
       6 f3 – 24
6 .c2
   6 h4 – 16
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B) 2 .f3
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       3 .f3 h6
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           5 e4 – 153
       3 f3 – 156
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   3 .f4 – 126
3...g6 4 .g2 .g7 5 0-0 0-0
   6 b3 – 115
   6 .c3 – 122
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The Old Indian Defence is considered to be a sound way for Black to meet 1 d4. Some might argue that it is steady rather than spectacular, but is this reputation totally deserved? Grandmaster Alexander Cherniaev disagrees, and in this book he has re-examined this ancient opening and the result is a “new” Old Indian. In this modern interpretation, he has introduced ambitious and aggressive ways for Black to play in the main lines. He constructs an improved version of a repertoire he has himself utilized with great success against grandmaster opposition. Using illustrative games, he studies the fundamental tactical and positional ideas for both sides, and also covers what to do if White avoids the Old Indian. This book tells you everything you need to know about playing the New Old Indian.

- A Grandmaster’s repertoire against 1 d4
- Full of new ideas and critical analysis
- Illustrative games highlight key ideas

Alexander Cherniaev is a Russian Grandmaster, journalist and author. He's a very experienced player and has enjoyed numerous tournament successes, including winning the silver medal at the Moscow Championship and competing in the prestigious Hastings Premier Tournament.

Eduard Prokuronov is a FIDE Master and a many-time Champion of the Arkhangelsk region of Russia.