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From the Author

A grandmaster annotates a game. He gives complicated variations, but does not always explain how they were found, or what ideas and laws are concealed behind them. This is understandable: experienced players sense certain things intuitively, and regard much as going without saying. But for a trainer it is the 'common truths' that are the most important.

One day I realised that I now no longer look at chess as I used to do, but with different eyes from when I was a practical player. No, I still value variations and precise analysis. Without them any general considerations become undefended and unproven, and are left hanging in the air. But I can no longer avoid seeking the essence of the position that is concealed behind the variations, the secret forces that direct the play. Moreover, not only the purely chess ideas and techniques, but also the rules of thinking, and the principles of the rational searching for and taking of decisions.

Training work attracted me at an early age. Gradually I gave up playing, without even managing to become a grandmaster (for a player with a rating of 2540 in the seventies, this was a quite realisable aim). I was immediately able to formulate the main principles, which form the basis of a system of preparation for young players. Here are some of these principles:

The all-round development of personality, and a battle not only with chess deficiencies, but also human ones.

Rejection of the concentration of efforts on the opening alone, which, alas is typical of our day; all-round preparation, and chess erudition.

Development of the strong aspects of play, and the creation of a personal style, with the definite elimination of weaknesses.

Maximum activity and independence, and a creative approach to any problems being solved.

Constant training, the solving of special exercises, aimed at developing necessary thinking skills.

Improvement in analytical mastery, in particular a thorough analysis of one's own games.

Competitiveness...

The correctness of theoretical views can only be checked in practice. The results came unexpectedly quickly. I began serious training work in 1972, and already in 1975 Valery Chekhov became world junior champion. Soon this title was also won by Artur Yusupov and Sergey Dolmatov, and Alyosha Dreev twice won the world 'cadet' championship.

The young players grew up, and became grandmasters. In 1986 Yusupov was a finalist in the candidates competition for the world championship. But I also did some work at this level even earlier. Four years of work with Nana Alexandria were crowned by her match against the women's world champion Maya Chiburdanidze, which ended in a draw. And subsequently Sergey Dolmatov, Alexei Dreev, Alexander Chernin and Vadim Zviagintsev also competed in the world championship candidates events.

The life of a trainer consists of continuous travels with his pupils: to training sessions, and competitions. We constantly studied and analysed something, and at times we obtained very interesting results. Our searchings and finds in the opening
and the middlegame are a separate theme. In this book I should like to acquaint the readers with the most interesting analyses, relating to positions with a small number of pieces (adjourned positions, endings and studies). To remember how these analyses were carried out, and to show what is hidden behind the variations found. After reading the book, you will, I hope, agree that it is impossible to become a good chess player without learning to analyse deeply and accurately. To see how attractively (although also not easily) the secrets of a position were deciphered. To learn the methods and techniques of analysis. And finally, to increase and consolidate your knowledge in the field of the endgame.

At the present time, high-ranking competitions have begun to be held under new regulations — now games are hardly ever adjourned. In view of this, the first part of the book, devoted to adjourned positions, may seem obsolete. Nevertheless, I have decided to leave it in its previous form (restricting myself only to purely chess corrections) for the following reasons:

1) Many of the principles of analysing adjourned positions, as described in the book, are essentially general principles of chess analysis. And without improvement in analysis, as already mentioned, it is impossible to become a genuine master.

2) The adjournment of games and their subsequent analysis is a large and very interesting part of the real life of a chess player, and we should not forget our history.

The book is aimed at players of high standard — many of the examples described are very difficult. But I think that the less skilled reader will also find it in it pages that are accessible and interesting to him.

For the development and consolidation of the thinking skills needed by a chess player, and also with the aim of soundly mastering and consolidating any material (not only in chess, but in chess especially!), training is essential, by solving exercises on the topic in question. The outstanding mathematician and teacher George Polya wrote: ‘The solving of problems is a practical skill, like swimming, skiing or playing the piano; it can be learned only by imitating a good example and by constantly practising’. It is hardly advisable to trustingly play through the book, variation by variation. It is far more useful and interesting to join actively in the analysis, find something yourself, and try to refute certain conclusions of the author. In this you will be helped by the tests for independent solving (in your head, without moving the pieces) or analysis (moving the pieces on the board), which are offered in the book. They are divided into ‘questions’ (signified by a letter ‘Q’ followed by the section of the book and the number of the question), replies to which constitute the subsequent text, and ‘exercises’ (signified by a letter ‘E’) with replies at the end of the book.

The boundary between problems for ‘solving’ and ‘analysis’ is, of course, arbitrary, and depends on the level of your mastery. It is useful first to try and solve exercises for analysis in your head — possibly you will successfully cope with this. But in difficult problems ‘for solving’ you should move the pieces on the board — in this way you will gain practice in analysis.

You will also encounter questions, the replies to which are almost impossible to calculate precisely, and can only be guessed. They are designed to develop your positional feeling, or intuition.

And the third part of the book describes another form of training, one that is comparatively little-known, although it is extremely effective — the playing of positions.

At the end of the book there are two thematic indexes. The first index groups positions by material. If you wish to delve into some particular type of endgame, you
will easily pick out all the endings of the given type.

The second index groups the exercises by the skills which they are designed to develop, by the type of problems to be solved. If you tend constantly to underestimate your opponent's resources, or if you are not always able to judge correctly who is favoured by an exchange, you will be able to try and solve, one after another, all the exercises from the corresponding section. The list of skills is, of course, incomplete, and should not be taken as a precise classification. This is merely a working instrument, which I use in classes.

From the moment when the first edition of this book was published, many years have passed. During this time interesting games have been played and instructive analyses have been made, with which I should like to acquaint the readers. The new edition gives me the opportunity to include fresh fragments and even entire chapters. In addition, colleagues have pointed out to me some two to three dozen analytical inaccuracies and mistakes. For a work in which there are no examples at all that have been copied from books by other authors, this number is trivially small, but even so it is pleasant to eliminate them.

With the appearance of computers, the life of an author has become much simpler. If you want to improve the text, correct commentaries, remove an unsuccessful example, or add another chapter – you switch on the computer, make the desired changes, and you have a new, improved version of the book. I have been constantly making such corrections over a period of many years, and the results of them are now before you.

Teaching is always a process with feedback. A trainer gives to his pupils, but also gains much from his contact with them, and constantly learns himself. This book would have been impossible without the active creative participation of my friends (the word 'pupil' is now somehow inappropriate) Artur Yusupov, Sergey Dolfmatov, Nana Alexandria and many others. They are the main heroes of the book, and effectively its co-authors. The friendship and joint work with them has comprised the main meaning of my life, and has made me happy. To all of them I am sincerely grateful.
Part One

The Analysis of Adjourned Positions

The gong has sounded – the game is adjourned. The secret moved is sealed, the clocks stopped, and the scoresheets concealed in the envelope. The adjourned position is now lodged in your thoughts and will not give you any peace until it is resumed.

Immediately a mass of problems arises. There is never sufficient time for analysis. Sometimes you again have to sit down at the board within two to three hours, and during the break you also have to find time to eat. With one hand you hold your fork, and with the other you move the pieces on your pocket set. It is not much easier even when there are special days set aside for adjournments. You have to prepare for your next few games, play them, and finally, simply relax. Can you find much time for the adjourned position? There is an eternal dilemma at a tournament: sleep or analysis.

A player is obliged to be able to analyse his adjourned games independently, but sometimes he also has to work in a team. Your friend or trainer joins in the study of the position, or perhaps you yourself perform the role of trainer. In team competitions it often happens that several people simultaneously take part in the analysis. Joint work must be well arranged.

During my years of playing and training work I have accumulated experience of solving both these ‘organisational’ problems, as well as creative, purely chess problems. I should now like to share this experience. After mastering the technique of analysis, and the principles of its organisation and implementation, you will be able to reduce to the minimum those unplanned losses and increasingly often enjoy unexpected gains during the resumption.
An Adjournment Session that Decided a Match

If a man will begin with certainties, he shall end in doubts; but if he will be content to begin with doubts, he shall end in certainties.

Francis Bacon

For the moment the standard of women's play is inferior to men's, but on the other hand the intensity of the struggle in women's competitions is very high, and short draws are extremely rare. Many games are adjourned, so that their trainers have a hard time of it. I came to realise this when I helped grandmaster Nana Alexandria in the Interzonal Tournament of 1979, in the Candidates Matches a year later, and finally, in the match for the world championship against Maya Chiburdanidze. As an example, in the quarter-final match Alexandria–Akhmylovskaya out of nine games no less than eight(!) were adjourned.

It is no secret that, in events at such high level, the players (male or female) rarely have only one helper. In the 1980 candidates semi-final match, those working with Nana, apart from the author of these lines, were Viktor Gavrikov and David Dzhanoev. Her opponent Marta Litinskaya was helped by the master players Zhelyandinov, Sher and Buturin. Towards the end of the match grandmaster Adrian Mikhalchishin was also summoned to help Litinskaya.

Ten games – the 'normal time' of the match – did not bring an advantage to either of the opponents: 5–5. Two additional games were stipulated. The first of these took an extremely tense course, and was of course adjourned.

Alexandria – Litinskaya
Women's Candidates Match
11th game, Vilnius 1980

There was no particular doubt about Litinskaya's sealed move.

41 ... \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Hb2!}}

Black cuts off the enemy king and intends \texttt{42...\texttt{Qd5}} with the threats of \texttt{43...\texttt{Qg2+}} or \texttt{43...\texttt{Qa8}} and \texttt{44...\texttt{Qfb8}}.

Q 1-1. Calculate 2 f5.*

* Remember that replies to tests signified by a letter 'Q' ('question') are given in the subsequent text. You are recommended to put the book to one side for the moment, to try and answer the question yourself, and only then to read further.
The attempt to play for a passed e-pawn does not succeed: 42 f5?! exf5 43 \( \text{exf5} \ \text{d5?!} \) (threatening 43...\( \text{exf2} \)) 44 e6 \( \text{exf6} \) 45 \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{b6} \) 46 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{f6} \). However, the position where Black is the exchange up, arising after 47 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{fxd6} \) 48 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{xd6} \) 49 \( \text{f3} \), is drawn, according to theory. As grandmaster Joel Lautier pointed out, the same drawn position also arises after 43...\( \text{g8?!} \) (instead of 43...\( \text{d5} \)) 44 \( \text{xg8+} \) \( \text{xg8} \) 45 e6 \( \text{xe6} \) 46 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{b6} \).

In the event of 42 \( \text{f7} \) Black does not play 42...\( \text{d5?!} \) because of 43 f5, and not 42...\( \text{e7?!} \) (hoping for 43 \( \text{xe6+?!} \) \( \text{c6} \)) 43 \( \text{e8}+! \), when the king has to return to b8, but 42...\( \text{f8} \), when the threat of \( \text{d7-c7} \) is highly unpleasant.

42 \( \text{e4}! \)

White prevents 42...\( \text{d5} \) (43 \( \text{xd5} \) exd5 44 e6), but in return allows ...h6–h5–h4.

42 ... h5!

Now 43 \( \text{h7} \) is not good in view of 43...\( \text{g8} \). After jointly looking at the natural continuation 43 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{h8} \) and establishing that White's position was preferable, although the opponent apparently has a draw, we split up to go and have a rest.

**Grandmaster Andrei Lilienthal recommended beginning the analysis of such positions by answering the question: Do I have a secure draw?**. Remembering this advice, I decided to check more carefully the variation 43 \( \text{f3} \) h4 44 gxh4. Obviously, 44...\( \text{xf4} \)? is not possible on account of 45 \( \text{g8+} \) \( \text{c7} \) 46 \( \text{c8+} \) \( \text{d7} \) (46...\( \text{b6} \) 47 \( \text{b8}+ \) and 48 \( \text{xb2} \)) 47 \( \text{c6+} \) \( \text{e7} \) 48 \( \text{e8} \) mate. But on the other hand there is 44...\( \text{b3} \), and only if 45 \( \text{g2} \) (or 45 \( \text{g2} \) 45...\( \text{x4} \). Now the black rook is defended and 46 \( \text{g8+} \) \( \text{c7} \) 47 \( \text{c8+} \) \( \text{b6} \) is no longer dangerous. Here White probably still has to fight for equality, since the black rooks are active, and in case of necessity the passed h-pawn can be stopped by the bishop from b1.

I wanted to find something more reliable. I returned to the start of the variation and soon discovered a rather unexpected, although also not difficult idea.

**Q 1-2. What is this idea?**

Since 43 \( \text{f3} \) does not force 43...\( \text{h8} \), it has no particular point.

43 \( \text{c6}! \)

White intends to weave a mating net by playing 44 \( \text{b5} \)!

Now after 43...h4 it is possible to force a draw: 44 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{xb5} \) (forced) 45 \( \text{xb5} \) hgx3 46 \( \text{xg3} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 47 \( \text{c6} \). If instead 43...\( \text{b6} \) (with the aim of preventing 44 \( \text{b5} \)), then 44 \( \text{b5} \), and the rook is trapped. However, after 44...h4 (44...\( \text{d5} \) 45 \( \text{h2} \) h4 46 g4?! \( \text{xf4} \) 47 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{c6} \) is also possible) 45 gxh4 \( \text{xf4} \) 46 h5 \( \text{h4} \) 47 \( \text{g8+} \) \( \text{a7} \) 48 \( \text{c8+} \) \( \text{b7} \) 49 \( \text{xb6} \) \( \text{xb6} \) it would seem that White cannot convert his pawn advantage.

This idea guarantees White against defeat, but, unfortunately, also does not promise any winning chances. Nevertheless, when from the opponent's 'headquarters' came a telephone call with the offer of a draw, the peace initiative was turned down. After all, Black might not have sealed the best move (before the resumption we seriously
studied, for example, 41...c5 followed by 42...d5 or 42...c7). In addition, up till
then in the match the advantage in adjournment analysis had been on our side, and we
realised that the rejection of the draw would assist the growth of uncertainty in the
opponent's camp.
When the game was resumed, the diagram
position was reached. After 43...c6 Litinskaya thought for several minutes...
43 ... h8??
It is clear that White's idea came as an
unpleasant surprise to the opponent. Tired
out by the lengthy and, as it turned out,
fruitless home analysis, at the board she
failed to see the mating threat. Litinskaya
was let down by the fact that against 43...f3
she and her trainers had prepared not
43...h4!, but the more modest 43...h8?!
(as Mikhailishin later explained, they
instinctively feared the passed h-pawn). In
the new situation Litinskaya aims for the
plan selected in analysis, but here it proves
to be a serious mistake.
44 h5 xh5
45 h6??
Black is 'groggy'. 45...h4 was essential, and
if 46 g4 f8. However, after 46 c6 hxg3
47 xg2! (but not 47 b7+ c8 48 a7
because of 48...h2) White has a signifi-
cant advantage.
46 d7! h4
47 g4 f8
48 f5 exf5
49 gxh5
And White soon won.

Such a failure at a decisive moment of the
match is difficult to endure even for a
hardened fighter. It was not surprising that
in the last game Alexandria (with Black)
gained an easy victory and won the match
7–5.

What conclusions can be drawn from this
story?
1. The quality of home analysis often has
   a decisive influence on the outcome of a
game and even of an entire event.
2. An unexpected idea, prepared for the
   resumption, may have a great practical
effect. When choosing between several
   roughly equivalent possibilities, con-
   sider which of them the opponent will
   least expect.
3. Before delving into a maze of varia-
   tions, you should look carefully for new
   possibilities for yourself and for the
   opponent in the very first moves. It is
   sometimes also worth returning to this
   examination during the course of subse-
   quent analysis. An omission in the initial
   moves usually proves much more seri-
   ous, and influences more strongly the
   outcome of the game, than an incom-
   pleteness somewhere at the end of a
   lengthy variation.

I should like also to draw the attention of the
readers (not at all through a desire to boast)
to a by no means accidental fact: the
decisive idea was not found during the
collective study of the adjourned position.
The important principle, associated with
this, of organising collective analysis, will be
discussed in the next chapter.
Don’t Hinder One Another!

In a dark room it is hard to catch a black cat,
especially if it is not there.
Confucius

Dolmatov – Petursson
European Junior Championship
Groningen 1978/79
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We began analysing 44 \text{a}3. We soon saw
that here things were difficult for White.
Then I tried a couple of times to switch to the
analysis of the rook ending, but did not
succeed. Sergey quickly found new chances
in the 44 \text{a}3 variation, and we began
checking them together. As a result, by the
resumption we had not in fact learned
anything about the rook ending, whereas
the other way had been analysed exactly,
as far as... a win for Black.
44 \text{a}3 \text{w}d4 45 \text{a}5 \text{d}d3 46 \text{x}d3 \text{c}xd3
47 \text{a}6 (47 \text{f}f2 \text{c}3 48 \text{e}3 \text{c}2 49 \text{e}4
\text{d}1 is also hopeless) 47...d2 48 a7 (48
\text{d}1 \text{e}3+).

The turn to move and the advantage are
with Black: his king is more securely
covered, and his pieces are more actively
placed. There were less than two hours to
go before the start of the resumption, and,
understandably, over dinner Dolmatov and I
were glued to our pocket sets.
We quickly established that it was only the
advance of the c-pawn that had to be
seriously feared. After 42...c5 43 a4 harm-
less is 43...\text{a}2 44 \text{d}d3! \text{x}f3+ 45 \text{x}f3
\text{a}4 46 \text{d}8!, when the black king is
unable to take part in the play. But how to
reply to 43...c4? Exchanging queens at d5
would seem dangerous, since the opponent
acquires two connected passed pawns.

48...d1\text{w}! 49 a8\text{w} (49 \text{x}d1 \text{x}d1 50
a8\text{w} \text{g}4+) 49...\text{e}1+ 50 \text{h}3 \text{h}1+ 51
\text{g}3 \text{d}g1!, and Black wins.
Q 1-3. Evaluate 48...\text{xa}7 (instead of
48...d1\text{w}).
We assumed that the capture of the pawn would throw away the win: 48...\(\text{w}\text{x}a7 49 \text{w}d3 \text{w}a2 50 \text{f}f3 \text{w}b2\) (or 50...\(\text{w}d6+\) 51 \text{w}d5 exd5 52 \text{e}e2 with a draw) 51 \text{e}e3! d1\(\text{w}\) 52 \text{w}d1 \text{w}xg2 53 \text{w}d8 with a drawn queen ending. However, later it transpired that here too Black wins with the cunning check 51...\(\text{w}b6+!\) (instead of 51...\(\text{f}1\)) 52 \text{f}f3 (52 \text{e}d2 \text{f}2+; 52 \text{e}e2 \text{g}1) 52...\(\text{w}c6+\) 53 \text{f}f2 \(\text{w}c1\). It is well known that long backwards piece moves are often overlooked by a player.

What would you have done in our place? Gone in for a precisely analysed, but losing continuation, in the hope of a mistake by the opponent, or played a rook ending about which nothing was known and which might also be hopeless?

Incidentally, later I nevertheless looked at the rook ending. After 42...\(c5 43 \text{a}4 \text{c}4 44 \text{w}d5!\) exd5 neither 45 \text{a}3 \text{d}4 46 a5 c3 47 a6 \text{d}3+! 48 \text{f}2 c2 nor 45 \text{b}5 \text{c}3 46 \text{c}5 d4 47 a5 c2 48 a6 \text{d}3+ 49 \text{f}2 \text{c}3 will do. 45 \text{b}7! is essential, when after 45...\(\text{f}8\) White gains an important tempo for the defence: 46 \text{c}7 \text{d}3+ 47 \text{f}2 c3 48 a5 d4 49 a6 \text{d}2+ 50 \text{f}3 \text{a}2 (50...\(\text{c}2\) 51 a7) 51 \text{e}4 or 51 a7.

45...\(\text{c}3!\) is more dangerous, but here too, by playing 46 e6, White can hold the position. 43 \text{w}d5 (instead of 43 a4) 43...exd5 44 \text{w}b7 also came into consideration.

Clearly we made irrational use of that short time which we had for analysis, by studying together only one of two possible branches. I should have asked Dolmatov to check independently the 44 \text{a}3 variation, when he would not have diverted me from the rook ending.

And how did Margeir Petursson cope with the analysis? Even worse than us, as it turned out. Fortunately for us, the Icelandic player had been helped (it would be more correct to say – hindered) by other participants in the tournament. **There can be no question of any normal analysis, when there are simultaneously several people sitting at the board.** Variations quickly flash by, with a mass of oversights being made, especially in the initial moves. The analysis quickly ends up somewhere far away, in positions which, though perhaps interesting, are unlikely to occur.

42...
43 \text{w}e3 \text{w}a4

It was not yet too late to revert to the plan of advancing the c-pawn: 43...\(\text{w}d5!\) 44 \text{f}3 c5.

44 \text{c}3 \text{w}d1

Black had aimed for this position, thinking it to be won. At the board Dolmatov easily discovered a simple defence that the opponent had overlooked.

45 \text{h}2! \text{e}2

And now it is possible to go into the drawn rook ending which we had examined in our analysis.

46 \text{c}1! \text{e}3
47 \text{c}1 \text{e}3
48 \text{d}8!

48...\(\text{c}5 49 \text{c}8 \text{c}3 50 \text{d}8 \text{c}4 51 \text{c}3+ \text{f}2 \text{c}1 53 \text{c}8 \text{c}2+. Draw

Alexandria – Litinskaya
Women’s Candidates Match
8th game, Vilnius 1980
In this rook ending, a cheerless one for White, the game was adjourned. Q 1-4. Which move should White seal?

The rook must immediately be taken to the defence of the d3 pawn.

41 \( \text{h}2 \)

This, the only possible move, was in fact sealed by Alexandria.

41 ... \( \text{x}e3 \)

42 \( \text{d}2 \)

The game continued 42...\( \text{x}g3+ \) 43 \( \text{f}2 \)

\( \text{g}4 \) (43...\( \text{h}3 \) 44 \( \text{g}2 \)) 44 \( b4 \). White wants to play \( \text{b}2 \) and then \( a3-a4-a5 \), when the activity on the queenside will provide reasonable compensation for the missing pawn. This variation does not require a detailed analysis – White’s plan is completely clear. The game later ended in a draw; its final position will be found in the exercises to the following chapter (p.20).

The following variation seems much more dangerous:

42 ... \( \text{e}1+! \)

43 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{b}1 \)

Black rejects the win of a pawn, but her rook penetrates into the enemy position, tying down White’s forces, which are obliged to confine themselves to passive defence. In rook endings the activity of the rook is a highly important criterion in evaluating the position and choosing a plan.

Now the black king would not be averse to breaking through on the g-file, and so the following moves are logical:

44 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}7 \)

45 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \)

46 \( \text{h}4 \)

46 \( \text{c}2 \) is also possible, not fearing 46...\( \text{d}1 \) in view of 47 \( \text{c}3 \).

I studied this position together with Viktor Gavrikov. Initially we looked at the most natural plan for strengthening Black’s position: 46...a6 47 \( \text{g}4 \) (47 a4? \( \text{a}1 \)) 47...b5 48 cxb5 (48...b4 was threatened) 48...axb5 49 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \). We had to spend a good deal of time on it. Practical players will know well how difficult it can be to analyse non-forcing variations of this type and to evaluate correctly the resulting positions. There is little joy here for White, but nevertheless with accurate defence the position can apparently be saved.

Then we discovered a different plan for Black – playing for zugzwang. It is not hard to deprive the king of the h4 square – it is sufficient to place the rook on h1. By successfully arranging the queenside pawns, Black can also parry the manœuvre \( \text{d}2-\text{c}2-\text{c}3-\text{b}3 \).

46 ... \( a5 \)

47 \( \text{g}4 \) \( b6 \)

The pawn should not be placed on a4: 47...a4? 48 \( \text{h}4 \) b6 49 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{h}1 \) 50 \( \text{c}2 \)

\( \text{d}1 \) 51 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}2 \) 52 b3 and White is alright. 47...\( \text{h}1 \) is also premature because of 48 b4!

48 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{c}1 \)

49 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{h}1 \)

Now 50 b4 loses to 50...\( \text{b}1 \) or 50...\( \text{a}1 \).

The point of Black’s plan lies in the variation 50 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{d}1 \) 51 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}2 \) 52 \( \text{b}3 \) a4! 53 \( \text{x}b6 \) \( \text{xd}3 \) 54 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 55 \( \text{xa}4 \) \( \text{e}3 \) (there is also 55...\( \text{b}3 \)). We studied this position for a long time, examined some
rather complicated variations, and in the end came to the conclusion that Black has excellent winning chances.

We also checked the attempt to defend passively: 50 captures 51 exchanges 52 .

Q 1-5. Why should this plan be rejected?

The following variation was found: 52... exchanges 53 gains 54
55 also loses 56 57 58 59 60 , and Black cannot win.

When during a joint analysis a player is considering a position, usually his partner suggests a move there and then, and this has to be responded to and a reply found quickly. As a result the analysis turns out to be rather superficial, and hidden subtleties can remain unnoticed.

But when a player is working on his own, he has the opportunity of choosing to study that continuation where, as intuition suggests to him, the solution may be concealed. He does not interfere with anyone if he stops to think, delves into variations that interest him, or, on the contrary, begins moving the pieces on the board.

I will describe the plan for organising collective analysis, which I consider to be the optimal.

It is advisable to begin the analysis with an exchange of first impressions about the position, and a joint preliminary checking of the ideas that result. Then it is essential to switch to an independent evaluation of the conclusions just reached, to seek new possibilities both for yourself, and for the opponent. It is useful once more to discuss the results together, then you can again work separately, and so on. Important discoveries, capable of significantly changing the direction of the analysis, should immediately be made known to everyone, whereas less critical variations should first be clarified and delved into independently, and only then made available for general discussion.

Now the black rook is tied to the b-file and therefore it is no longer possible to play
Traps Found in Analysis

I do not like a fatal outcome. I will never tire of life.

Vladimir Vysotsky

The objective evaluation of an adjourned position will often be unfavourable for us. We establish that with correct play the opponent is bound to convert his advantage (or save the game – in an inferior position). In such instances it is very important to help him to go wrong. Even a simple trap may succeed, if it comes as a surprise to the opponent. But if he sees through it, you should not be distressed. Perhaps the next time you will be luckier.

Romanishin – Dvoretsky
USSR Championship Semi-Final, Odessa 1972

48 \( \mathbb{W}h7+ \)

There could be no doubt that in reply to 48...\( \mathbb{C}e8 \) White would not grab the pawn (49 \( \mathbb{W}xh6? \mathbb{C}e2+ \) 50 \( \mathbb{C}g5 \mathbb{W}e3+ \) 51 \( \mathbb{C}g6 \mathbb{W}xg3+ \)), but would first play 49 \( \mathbb{W}g6+! \), in order after 49...\( \mathbb{C}d8(e7) \) 50 \( \mathbb{W}xh6 \mathbb{W}e2+ \) 51 \( \mathbb{C}g5 \mathbb{W}e3+ \) 52 \( \mathbb{C}g6 \mathbb{W}xg3+ \) to block with the queen at g5 with check. And if Black does not take the g3 pawn, then, as it is easy to see, the white king escapes from the pursuit, and the two extra pawns remain.

There was no point in going along to the resumption in order to check Romanishin’s technique in such a simple situation. If Black decided not to resign, he would have to find a continuation that promised at least some practical chance, however weak.

48... \( \mathbb{W}e8 \)
49 \( \mathbb{W}g6+! \)
50 \( \mathbb{W}xh6 \)
51 \( \mathbb{C}h5! \)

Black resigned. He would have also have had to capitulate after 51 \( \mathbb{W}f4! \), whereas in the event of 51 \( \mathbb{C}g5? \) the game would have unexpectedly ended in perpetual check: 51...\( \mathbb{W}d5+! \) 52 \( \mathbb{C}g6 \mathbb{W}f7+ \) or 52 \( \mathbb{C}g4 \mathbb{W}d1+ \).

The trap, of course, was a very naïve one, but there was no other chance. Besides, as Romanishin admitted after the game, he did not see what he was being lured into, which means that some probability, however slight, of the opponent making a mistake nevertheless existed.

Oleg Romanishin sealed the obvious check with his queen.
White sealed his move. The safest way to draw is 48 g4!, in order to answer 48...Cc2+ with 49 Kg3, and 48...f4 with 49 Kh8. Also possible is 48 Kg2 with the same idea—not to allow the king to be pushed back onto the 1st rank. But Dolmatov and I also studied carefully the less good move 48 c6, which was in fact sealed.

An opponent who is tired after a difficult game often does not see the strongest move. Therefore you should carefully analyse all possibilities, no worrying that, in the event of the correct move being sealed, your analysis will be in vain.

48 c6?! Cc2+
49 Ke1 Ke3
50 Ke1

Now 50...Cc5 51 c7 e4 suggests itself, but after 52 g4! (52 Kh8 is also possible) 52...Cc6 53 Kh8 Cc7 54 Kh6 White gains a draw without difficulty.

Things can be made more difficult for the opponent by setting a little trap.

50 ... Cd2+!

Q 1-6. Where should the king move? In replying to the question, try to imagine that you are in the same degree of time trouble as the young German player was. Dolmatov's opponent instinctively wanted to avoid the mating threats resulting from the opposition of the kings, but 51 Ke1 was the correct decision. After all, 51...g2 52 Kh1 Kg3 53 Kh8 would have led to an immediate draw.

51 Ke1? Cd6!
52 c7 Cd7!

If the rook moves, then the c7 pawn is captured with check, and meanwhile Black is planning simply to strengthen his position (...e5-e4, ...Kh2 etc.). White has to move his king onto the b-file, but from there it can no longer manage to return for the battle with the passed e-pawn.

53 Ke2 e4
54 Kh8

If 54 g4 there follows 54...Kh7! (or 54...Ke7!); weaker is 54...Kh4 55 g5!
54 ... $\textit{c}c7
55 \textit{x}xf6 \textit{g}7
56 \textit{c}c6?

White was obliged to try his last chance: 56 $\textit{c}c2!$ If 56... $\textit{e}xg3$? (56... $\textit{e}e2!$ wins), then 57 $\textit{c}e6!$ with a draw, e.g. 57... $\textit{g}2+ 58 \textit{d}1 \textit{g}1+ 59 \textit{c}2 \textit{f}3 60 \textit{d}2!$ (not allowing the advance of the e-pawn; now the point of 57 $\textit{c}e6!$ is clear), or 59... $\textit{e}e1$ (intending 60... $\textit{f}f2!$) 60 $\textit{f}h6!$ However, all this is well known in theory, Dolmatov and I had already studied rook endings, and he, of course, would not have fallen into the trap.

56 ... $\textit{x}g3$
57 $\textit{c}c3+$ $\textit{f}4$
58 $\textit{c}c8 \textit{d}3$

White resigns.

And now I should like to offer a few positions in which the reader himself has to try and complicate matters for the opponent, by setting him a trap.
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with the years, with the gaining of experience, the quality of analysis does not deteriorate, but improves. I know this from my own experience: work on adjourned positions becomes more sensible and more rational, fewer inaccuracies are committed, and even fewer superficial, premature judgements of the type ‘the rest is obvious’. Lev Polugayevsky

As we have already seen, the analysis of adjourned positions is not purely a chess problem, but a problem of chess and psychology. This is felt especially when either the position is too complicated for an exhaustive chess analysis, or else there is simply insufficient time for it. In such instances it is important to guess the most probable course of the coming play, and to concentrate your analytical efforts in this direction. After all, a mistake in the ‘main direction’ will definitely tell on the result of the game, whereas an omission in some side variation will not influence anything. The only thing is: how do you decide which variations are the main ones, and which are sidelines?

Q 1-7. What move would you have sealed in Machulsky’s place?

To draw, it is simplest for Black immediately (otherwise it will no longer be allowed) to exchange a pair of pawns on the kingside: 46...f6! 47 gxf6 Qxf6 48 h1. Now he needs to exchange pawns on the queenside, but not immediately: 48...b6? 49 h6+ e7 (49...g7 50 e5 50 e5 e6 in view of the spectacular breakthrough found by Ken Neat: 51 c4! dxc4 (51...xc4 52 xe6+ d7 53 xb6) 52 d5. Correct is 48...c6! 49 h8 (49 h6+ g7) 49...b6 50 f8+ e7 51 b8 bxa5 52 e5 a4 53 b7+ d8 followed by ...a4–a3.

If you are defending an inferior ending, try to exchange as many pawns as possible! The above plan of defence is fully in accordance with this principle.

I have to admit that Dolmatov and I hardly looked at 46...f6!, considering it to be unlikely, and concentrated on only one of the possible sealed moves – 46...c6. The opponent could have played ...f7–f6 a long time ago, but he had not done so. Considering (and quite justifiably) the position to be absolutely drawn, Anatoly Machulsky had been playing almost without thinking; he also sealed his secret move fairly quickly. Without particular necessity, players usually do not change the pattern of the position, the pawn structure, just before the adjournment. Why make a choice at the board between 46...f6, 46...b6 and 46...b5 (suppose it turns out that a pawn should not be
moved at all?), if, by playing 46...\textit{c}c6, one can retain all or nearly all of these possibilities and take a decision only after home analysis? This logic is normal and generally accepted, and it was very probable that this was what Black had been guided by.

46 \ldots \textit{c}c6?!  
47 \textit{e}e5!

It turns out that the position is not so inoffensive. White has two imperceptible, but weighty advantages. First, his king is closer to the centre. Second, White can attack the f7 pawn, the base of the opponent's pawn chain, whereas it is much more difficult for Black to approach the supporting b2 pawn. 48 \textit{f}f1 is threatened, then 49 \textit{f}f6+ \textit{g}g7 50 \textit{g}g6. Bad is 47...\textit{x}xg5? 48 \textit{g}g1+ and 49 \textit{g}g6 (or 49 \textit{f}f7). Only the advance of the b-pawn can give Black counterplay.

Let us first examine 47...b6. In our analysis Dolmatov and I found this variation:

48 \textit{f}f1! bx\textit{a}5 49 \textit{f}f6+ \textit{x}xg5 (49...\textit{x}xg7? 50 \textit{g}g6) 50 \textit{x}xf7 \textit{b}6 (if 50...a4, then 51 \textit{g}g7+ and 52 \textit{e}e7 is strong) 51 \textit{g}g7+ \textit{h}h4 52 \textit{g}g1! (52 \textit{g}g2 a4; 52 \textit{e}e7 \textit{xb}2 53 \textit{x}xe6 \textit{e}e2+) 52...\textit{xb}2 53 \textit{x}xe6 \textit{b}5 (after 53...\textit{c}c2 54 \textit{a}a1 \textit{xc}3 55 \textit{xa}5 Black loses due to the remoteness of his king) 54 \textit{c}c4! \textit{xc}4 55 \textit{d}d5 \textit{b}b3 56 \textit{d}d6 \textit{e}e3+ 57 \textit{d}d7! (only not 57 \textit{d}d5? \textit{d}d3+ 58 \textit{c}c6 c3 59 d7 c2 or 59 \textit{c}c1 \textit{g}g4 60 d7 \textit{f}f4 61 \textit{f}f7 \textit{e}e3) 57...\textit{c}c5 58 \textit{c}c1 a4 (58...\textit{g}g4 59 \textit{c}c7 \textit{f}f4 60 \textit{d}d7 59 \textit{c}c7 a3 60 \textit{d}d7 \textit{c}c3 61 d8\textit{c}c+ \textit{xd}8 62 \textit{xd}8 a2 63 \textit{d}d7 \textit{g}g4 64 \textit{d}d6 \textit{f}f4 65 \textit{d}d5 and wins.

Later grandmaster Grigory Kaidanov demonstrated the correct plan of defence, beginning with 51...\textit{h}h5! To us it seemed less accurate than 51...\textit{h}h4, since after 52 \textit{g}g1 \textit{xb}2 53 \textit{xe}6 \textit{c}c2 White, apart from 54 \textit{a}a1, can now also win more simply: 54 \textit{g}g3 \textit{h}h4 55 \textit{d}d3 a4 56 \textit{xd}x5 a3 57 \textit{c}c4 a2 58 \textit{h}h3. However, instead of 52...\textit{xb}2?, stronger is 52...a4! 53 \textit{a}a1 \textit{g}g6! 54 \textit{xa}4 \textit{f}f7 with a probable draw.

The fact that Dolmatov and I overlooked this defence was annoying, but excusable from the viewpoint of a practical player. After all, our objective was to find and analyse the possibilities for White which promised him the best chances of success. To determine the optimal defence for the opponent is also important, of course, but only to the extent to which it influences our choice, our decisions. In the given instance we all the same did not have anything better, and the search for a saving line for Black is, so to speak, his problem.

As for Machulsky, in his analysis he was simply obliged to find a forced draw (one senses that there is one, and Kaidanov's variation convincingly demonstrates it). But apparently he did not sense the danger that was threatening him.

47 \ldots b5?!  

It would hardly have been any better to play this a move earlier instead of 46...\textit{c}c6. To 46...b5 White would have replied 47 \textit{h}h1, and if, for example, 47...\textit{d}d8, then 48 \textit{h}h6+ \textit{g}g7 49 \textit{e}e5 \textit{b}8 (49...b4 50 \textit{c}xb4 \textit{b}8 51 \textit{f}f6 \textit{xb}4 52 \textit{g}g6) 50 \textit{f}f6 \textit{h}h8? 51 \textit{d}d6! \textit{h}h2 52 \textit{e}e7! \textit{xb}2 53 \textit{xf}7+ \textit{g}g6 54 \textit{f}f8!

48 \textit{f}f1 \textit{c}c7!

Black has parried the threat of 49 \textit{f}f6+, on which he now has 49...\textit{x}xg5. Completely bad was 48...\textit{b}4? 49 \textit{c}xb4 \textit{c}c4 50 \textit{b}5 \textit{a}4 (50...\textit{xb}5 51 \textit{a}1) 51 \textit{b}6! \textit{xa}5 52 \textit{d}d6 \textit{b}5 53 \textit{c}c7 \textit{xb}2 54 \textit{b}7.

49 \textit{d}d6 \textit{c}c8  

49...\textit{c}c4 50 \textit{f}f6+ \textit{g}g7 51 \textit{e}e5 \textit{b}4 52 \textit{g}g6 \textit{fx}g6 53 \textit{c}xb4 \textit{xb}4 54 \textit{f}f6 would have immediately led to a position, which in the game White would still have had to try and obtain.

50 \textit{f}f6+ \textit{g}g7  
51 \textit{f}f3!!

Pointless is 51 \textit{e}e5 \textit{h}h8!, when 52 \textit{g}g6?? is not possible because of 52...\textit{h}h5+. The subtle rook move creates the threat of 52 \textit{d}d7 (52...\textit{c}c4?? 53 \textit{b}3). It also has a
second aim – to reduce the strength of ...b5–b4, which Black is now bound to play.

51 ... b4!
52 cxb4 Bb8
53 Bb3! Bb5

54 b5 was threatened.
54 Bc5

Zugzwang! Black has to play his king to g6, making it easier for the opponent to carry out his main plan: f3–f6 and g5–g6.

54 ... g6
55 f3

If 55...Bxb4 there follows 56 Bf6+ Kg7 (56...Kxg5? loses to 57 Bxf7 Bxb2 58 Bxe6 followed by 59 Bf5+ and 60 Bxd5) 57 g6 fxg6 58 Bxe6 Bxb2 59 Bxa6. For the moment we will stop here and state with regret that it is difficult to say definitely whether it is a draw or a loss.

The second possibility occurred in the game.

55 ... Bb7
56 f6+ Kg5
57 b5! Bxb5

Of course, unattractive is 57...axb5 58 b4 followed by 59 f1 and a comparatively straightforward win.

58 Bxf7 Bxa5

The variation 58...Bxb2 59 Bxe6 has already been assessed as favouring White, in view of the threat of 60 Bf5+ and 61 Bxd5. But now Black is hoping for 59 Bxe6 Bb5 with an obvious draw.

59 Bg7+ Bh6
60 Bb7!!

This elegant resource should have been found by Machulsky when he took his decision on move 55 (or better still – in the course of his home analysis!) – then he would not have played 55...Bb7? The rook is now crippled (60...Ba4 61 b3). White wins both of the central pawns, and after them the game.

60...Bg5 61 Bxe6 f4 62 b4 Ba4 63 Bxd5 a5 64 b5 Be3 65 a7 Bxd4+ 66 Be5 a4 67 b6 B4 68 Ba5 Bd4 69 Bc7 Bc5 70 b6 Bd6 71 Bc1 Bc2 72 Bb7 Ba7 Bb2 73 a6 Bb2+ 74 Bb6 Bb2+ 75 Ba7 Ba2+ 76 Bb8 Bh2 77 Ba1. Black resigns.

Now it is clear that, good or bad, Black should have gone in for 55...Bxb4! 56 Bf6+ Kg7 57 g6 fxg6 58 Bxe6 Bxb2 59 Bxa6, and looked for a saving line here. Before the resumption Dolmatov assessed this position (and also his chances of winning in general) very optimistically on the basis of the following variations:
1) 59...g5 60 b6 a2 61 a6 g4 62 f4  
   a4 63 xg4 xd4+ 64 g5! f7  
   65 f5 e7 66 e5 a4 67 b7+ d8  
   68 a7;  
2) 59...a2 60 a7+ h6 61 a8 g7!  
   62 a6 a5 63 e6 a1 (63...g5 64 f5)  
   64 xd5 g5 65 e4 g4 66 d5!  

After the game I had the time to check the rook ending more carefully. It transpired that Black can gain a draw in both variations.  
In the first – by cutting off the king from the passed g-pawn: 60...f2! (instead of 60...a2?) 61 a6 g4 62 a7 a2, or 62 xd5 f7! (but not 62...g3? 63 b3 g2  
   64 g3+ f7 65 a7 a2 66 xg2 xa7  
   67 e2! and wins).  
In the second – by playing 63...a2!  
   (instead of 63...a1?; 63...a3! is even simpler) 64 xd5 g5! 65 e4 (65 c5 g4  
   66 b6 b2+ 67 a7 g3 68 e8 g2  
   69 e1 f7 70 d5 e2) 65...g4 66 f4  
   (66 d5 g3) 66...a4 67 xg4 xd4+  
   68 f5 d6! (a typical and very important procedure against a rook’s pawn: the white rook, tied to the defence of the pawn, cannot move from a8, and the  

king, if it approaches the pawn, will have no shelter against the horizontal checks: 69 e5 b6 70 d5 f6 71 c5 f5+  
   72 d4 f6! etc.  

When he adjourned the game, Machulsky was sure that he had an easy draw, and he did not bother to make a thorough analysis of the position. A zero in the tournament table was a just punishment for his careless analysis. Dolmatov’s point, and also the prize ‘for the best ending’ awarded to him at the closing ceremony, were a reward for his tenacious search for resources in a seemingly equal ending.  

**It is useful for a chess player to train himself into thinking that there is no such thing as an absolutely drawn or an absolutely hopeless position. He must learn both in analysis, and at the board, to seek and find the slightest practical chances, capable of changing the apparently completely determined course of the game.** However, we have already spoken about this in the preceding chapter.
A Study Generated by Mistake

In establishing a thinking procedure, one should proceed with the aim of possibly shortening the number and length of variations.
Benjamin Blumenfeld

Irrational thinking (both in the analysis of an adjourned position, and in calculating variations directly at the board) is in itself a serious mistake. The consequence is that time and effort are spent in vain, leading to purely chess oversights.

Dolmatov – Bareev
Sochi 1988

17

If Black should hurry with the pawn advance 41...a4, then 42 e7 $\text{f}7$ (42...a3 43 $\text{h}xb6$ 43 $\text{d}6$ g6! 44 $\text{b}2$ followed by 45 $\text{f}2+$ is unpleasant. So there was no doubt about his sealed move.

41 ... $\text{f}8$

How should White reply? Of course, 42 $\text{d}6$, renewing the threat of 43 e7+.
Q 1-9. Evaluate 42...$\text{d}8+$.

After 42...$\text{d}8+$ 43 $\text{e}5$! a4 44 $\text{xb}6$ a8 passive defence is hopeless: 45 $\text{b}2$? a3 46 $\text{a}2$ $\text{e}7$. The only correct continuation is 45 $\text{b}7$! a3 46 $\text{f}7+$ $\text{g}8$ (46...$\text{e}8$ 47 $\text{xg}7$) 47 $\text{f}1$ a2 48 $\text{e}7$, and with the black king cut off from the e-pawn, White’s position is not worse.

The best move is 42...$\text{e}8$! If now White harasses the rook – 43 $\text{c}7$? $\text{a}8$! 44 $\text{b}7$ $\text{d}8$ (and if 45 $\text{d}5$ there is 45...$\text{e}7$), then his king gets stuck somewhere to one side; Black gives up his passed pawns and decides the game on the kingside.

The more cunning 43 $\text{d}5$?! justifies itself in the event of 43...a4 44 $\text{c}7$ $\text{a}8$ 45 $\text{b}7$ $\text{a}5$ 46 $\text{xb}6$ $\text{xd}5$ 47 $\text{exd}5$ a3 48 $\text{c}7$ a2 49 d6 a1$\text{w}$ 50 d7+ $\text{e}7$ 51 d8$\text{w}$+ $\text{x}e6$ 52 $\text{d}6+$ $\text{f}7$ (52...$\text{f}5$ 53 $\text{f}4+$ $\text{g}6$ 54 $\text{e}4+$) 53 $\text{d}5+$ with perpetual check. However, Black has the subtle reply 43...$\text{a}8$! with the idea of 44 $\text{c}7$ $\text{e}7$!

43 $\text{f}5$! b5! 44 $\text{f}7$ (not 44 e7? in view of 44...$\text{b}6+$) 44...b4. Now White has to choose between 45 $\text{g}7$ and 45 $\text{e}7$+

A. 45 $\text{g}7$ $\text{b}6+$ 46 $\text{e}5$ b3. Now the obvious 47 $\text{f}6$ is pointless because of 47...$\text{d}8$. Take note of this position: it is very important that the e-pawn is pinned and is not able to advance either immediately, or after, say, 48 $\text{d}7+$ $\text{c}8$ 49 $\text{d}1$ (49 $\text{f}7$ $\text{xe}6$ 50 $\text{xe}6$ b2 51 $\text{d}1$ a4) 49...b2 50 $\text{b}1$ a4.

47 $\text{a}7$! b2 48 $\text{a}8+$ $\text{e}7$ 49 $\text{a}7+$ $\text{d}8$.

After 49...$\text{f}6$ 50 $\text{a}8+$ $\text{g}7$? 51 e7 b1$\text{w}$ 52 $\text{g}8+$! $\text{h}7$ 53 $\text{h}8+$! $\text{xh}8$ 54 $\text{e}8$+...
\( \text{Q} g7 55 \text{W} d7+! \) the black king cannot avoid perpetual check. This means that it must head to the other side.

50 \( \text{K} a8+ \text{K} c7 51 \text{e}7 \text{b}1 \text{W} 52 \text{e}8\text{W}. \)

Black begins, checks, and in all probability, soon gives mate. It is not worth continuing the analysis, if only out of sympathy for the white king, especially as in reserve there is another unstudied continuation.

(I should mention in parentheses that when later, in Moscow, Dolmatov showed me his game with Bareev, we checked this position and, strangely enough, did not find a mate. Even so, Sergey was correct to terminate the analysis here. First he had to look for a more reliable way to draw, and only if things were completely hopeless, again return here.)

B. 45 \( \text{K} e7+. \) I should mention, incidentally, that Black could not have avoided this check by transposing moves – 44...\( \text{K} b6+ 45 \text{Q} e5 \text{b}4 \) – in view of 46 \( \text{K} a7! \) Checks by the rook are threatened; 46...\( \text{K} b8 47 \text{K} xg7 \text{K} b5+ 48 \text{Q} f6 \) will not do, as the rook is no longer pinning the e-pawn. This means that all the same Black has to play 46...\( \text{K} b5+! 47 \text{Q} d6 \text{K} b8. \)

45...\( \text{Q} f8 46 \text{K} f7+ \text{Q} g8. \) Now passive defence – the attempt to halt the pawns by placing the rook in front of them – is doomed to failure: 47 \( \text{K} f1 \text{b}3 48 \text{e}7 \text{a}4 49 \text{K} b1 \text{K} a6 50 \text{Q} d7 \text{a}3! 51 \text{Q} x\text{b}3 \text{a}2 52 \text{K} a3 \text{K} x\text{a}3 53 \text{e}8\text{W}+ \text{Q} h7. \) The white pawn has queened first, but on the next move (or after the preliminary 54...\( \text{K} a7+ \)) a black queen will also appear on the board.

Let us try to bring the rook behind the black pawns – 47 \( \text{Q} f5, \) intending 48 \( \text{e}7 \) followed by the diverting move \( \text{K} b5. \)

\[ \text{Q} 1-10. \text{Can White save himself here?} \]

As in a good study, here at first sight it is not clear what, strictly speaking, the problem is. After all, if 47...\( \text{K} b3 \) there follows 48 \( \text{e}7 \text{a}4 (48...\text{b}2 49 \text{K} b5; 48...\text{Q} h7 49 \text{Q} f8) 49 \text{K} b5 \text{a}8 50 \text{K} a5. \) Surely the opponent will not allow the white pawn to queen with check! After all, before promoting, the black pawns still have to make several lengthy steps. But let us nevertheless check this: 50...\( \text{K} x\text{a}5 51 \text{e}8\text{W}+ \text{Q} h7. \) It turns out that all is not so simple. It is pointless attacking the rook – 52 \( \text{Q} d8 \text{K} a6+, \) and 52 \( \text{Q} b8 \) loses to 52...\( \text{a}3 53 \text{W} x\text{b}3 \text{a}2 54 \text{e}5 \text{K} a6+ \) and 55...\( \text{a}1\text{W}. \) Even so we find the correct plan: 52 \( \text{W} c6(c8)! \text{b}2 (52...\text{a}3 53 \text{e}5) 53 \text{W} c2! \text{a}3 54 \text{e}5+, \) and this fascinating battle ends in perpetual check.

It appears that everything is alright!
However, this last variation, in which the rock and pawns nearly overcame the white queen, put Dolmatov on his guard. And he found the true solution of the study — he realised that Black could after all win. Let us return to the last diagram. It turns out that, strangely enough, it is the other, less advanced pawn, that Black should be aiming to queen!

47...a4!! 48 e7 a3 49 b5. In the event of 49 a5 b3 50 xa3 both 50...b2 51 b3 xb3 and 50...f7 are decisive.

49...a8 50 a5. No better is 50 xb4 f7 (of course, not 50...a2? 51 a4) 51 e5 (51 b1 is met by the same reply) 51...e8! 52 h4 a6+.

50...xa5! 51 e8+ h7. A paradoxical situation: here the queen is completely powerless.

52 c6 a2 53 e5 a7! 54 c2+ g6.

Surely the adjourned position wasn’t lost?! It couldn’t be! Why in general should White stand worse with his active king and menacing pawn at e6? After thinking in this way, Dolmatov took a fresh look at the position and finally realised that the very first, seemingly so natural move 42 d6? was a mistake.

Of course, Sergey committed a bad methodological mistake. He should have immediately determined all the candidate moves. And if his attention was gripped by one of them, the most natural (this happens very often), then much earlier, after problems arose with 42 d6?, he should have stopped the analysis with-

out taking the variations to the end, and checked how obligatory they were, and whether there were not some other possibilities.

We should not regret that this was how he acted — then we would not have seen a pretty study. But Dolmatov had cause to regret — there was no time left for him to analyse the strongest continuation.

42 b1! b5

After making this move, Evgeny Bareev offered a draw, and Dolmatov accepted. He simply did not have time to readjust, and realise that now it was not him, but his opponent who was faced with achieving a draw. By playing 43 f1+, he should have set Bareev a problem, which I now invite the readers to solve.
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E 1-5. Where should the king move to?
I Choose a Plan that is not the Strongest!

Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?
That depends a good deal on where you want to get to.
Lewis Carroll

Zakharian – Dvoretsky
USSR Spartakiad, Riga 1975
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White's sealed move is obvious.

41 a5

The following variation looks forced: 41...a5 42 a4! (with the threats of 43 b4 or 43 a5) 42...d5! 43 e4 e3 44 fxe3 e4. Black has retained his extra pawn, and subsequently he will attack by advancing his kingside pawns. Unfortunately, in the process the position of his king will become less secure and the opponent will gain definite tactical counter-chances. Even so, objectively Black has every reason to hope for success.

We already know that the first moves of the analysis should be checked especially carefully. Do we (or the opponent) have any other, more promising possibilities? After looking at the position from this viewpoint, I quickly discovered that the natural move 41...a5 was not obligatory. Serious consideration should be given to 41...e3!?, the aim of which is not to allow the white rook onto the 1st rank and for Black himself to seize this important line.

Q 1-11. How should Black reply to 42 ?

I thought that 42 ? lost by force to 42...? 43 ?+ 44 ?. In fact this is merely a cunning false trail – White has a pretty defence (found by grandmaster S. Kindermann): 45 ?!! The rook ending arising after 45...? 46 ?+ 47 ?xe2 ?xb2+ 48 ?e3 ?xb5 49 ?xe6 is drawish, e.g. 49...?c5 (otherwise 50 ?e4) 50 ?d3 ?g6 (50...?h5 51 ?e7 intending ?b5 51 ?e7 ?f8 52 ?b7 ?c6 53 c4 ?g6 54 c5 ?e8 55 ?e4, and White's position is not worse.

42...?d1+ 43 ?xd1 ?xf2+ 44 ?h2 e2 does not work in view of 45 ?d3+. Also, nothing is achieved by 42...?xf2+ 43 ?h1 ?d8 (with the threat of 44...?f8; if 43...?d7 44 ?a4l) 44 ?a1! (but not 44 ?a4 ?g8l). Now 45 ?xf2 is threatened, and if 44...?f8 there follows 45 ?f3.

After 42...?b1+! 43 ?h2 the line 43...?xf2 44 ?xf2 ?d1 45 ?xe6 ?h1+ 46 ?g3 suggests itself, but if 46...?e4 there is the pretty defence 47 ?d4! However, by continuing 46...?h5!, Black retains a very dangerous attack.

43...?d1! is apparently stronger, e.g.: 44 ?xe3 ?h1+ 45 ?g3 ?g6+ 46 ?f3 ?h4! 47 ?xe5 (47 ?g3 ?g4+) 47...?d3+, or 44
fxe3 \( \text{h}1+ \) 45 \( \text{g}3 \text{e}4! \) 46 \( \text{g}4 \) (46 \( \text{f}2 \text{h}4+ \) 46 \( \text{xe}6 \text{h}5! \) 46...\( \text{xe}3+ \) 47 \( \text{e}1+ \) 48 \( \text{f}2 \text{e}4 \), and Black wins. White must choose between 42 fxe3 and 42 \( \text{xe}3 \).

1) 42 fxe3 \( \text{b}1+ \) 43 \( \text{h}2 \text{ d}1 \). Now the counterattack 44 \( \text{g}4? \) does not work in view of 44...\( \text{h}1+ \) 45 \( \text{g}3 \text{e}1+ \) 46 \( \text{f}3 \text{f}1+ \) 47 \( \text{e}4 \text{ f}4+ \) !

Does Black have any serious threats? Let us check 44 b6 \( \text{h}1+ \) 45 \( \text{g}3 \). Now 45...\( \text{e}4? \) is incorrect: 46 \( \text{g}4! \text{xe}3+ \) 47 \( \text{f}3 \text{e}1+ \) 48 \( \text{f}2 \text{e}4 \) 49 \( \text{f}6! \) and Black has to give perpetual check. He must deprive the queen of the g4 square, by playing 45...\( \text{h}5! \) Here are some possible variations:

46 b7 \( \text{e}4 \) 47 \( \text{f}2 \text{h}4+ \) 48 g3 \( \text{h}2+ \) (or 48...\( \text{h}2+ \) 49 \( \text{f}3 \text{e}4+ \) 50 \( \text{xe}4 \text{xe}2 \) 51 \( \text{b}8\text{g}2 \) \( \text{g}2+ \) with a rapid mate) 49 \( \text{f}1 \text{h}3+ \);

46 \( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{g}6+ \) 47 \( \text{f}2 \text{e}4! \);

46 \( \text{e}4 \text{h}+ \) (46...\( \text{c}1 \) is also strong, e.g. 47 \( \text{f}7 \) \( \text{g}6! \) 48 b7 \( \text{h}+ \) 49 \( \text{f}2 \text{g}1+ \) 50 \( \text{f}3 \text{h}3+! \) 47 \( \text{g}4 \) (47 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{g}1+ \) 48 \( \text{f}3 \text{h}3+! \) 49 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{g}3+ \) 50 \( \text{h}5 \text{g}2 \) 47...\( \text{e}1 \) 48 \( \text{f}3 \text{xe}4+ \) 49 \( \text{h}5 \) (49 \( \text{g}5 \text{c}1+ \) ) 49...\( \text{f}4 \).

The best defence is 44 \( \text{g}3 \) ! Black does not have time for 44...\( \text{xe}b5 \) in view of 45 \( \text{g}4 \). The attempt to attack e3 does not work: 44...\( \text{c}1 \) 45 b6 e4 46 b7 \( \text{e}1 \) 47 \( \text{b}8\text{e}2 \text{xe}2 \) 48 \( \text{xg}7+! \) \( \text{g}7 \) 49 \( \text{xe}5+ \).

There only remains 44...\( \text{h}1 \) ! 45 \( \text{d}7! \) \( \text{axb}5 \) 46 \( \text{d}3+ \) \( \text{xd}3 \) 47 \( \text{xd}3 \). However, after 47...\( \text{g}6! \) it is not easy for White to defend, since 48 \( \text{d}6 \) is strongly met by 48...\( \text{b}1! \)

2) 42 \( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{d}1+ \) 43 \( \text{h}2 \). Now nothing is given by either 43...\( \text{b}1? \) 44 \( \text{xe}5 \) or 43...\( \text{d}3? \) 44 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{axb}5 \) 45 \( \text{f}7! \) This means that 43...\( \text{axb}5 \) must be played.

White can take play into a rook ending in which, despite being a pawn down, he can hope for a draw: 44 \( \text{g}3! \) \( \text{h}5+ \) 45 \( \text{h}3 \text{h}3+ \) (weaker is 45...\( \text{g}6 \) 46 \( \text{b}7 \text{d}2 \) 47 \( \text{xb}5 \) \( \text{xf}2 \) 48 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{xb}2 \) 49 \( \text{c}4 \), but not 49 \( \text{xe}6? \) \( \text{xg}2+! \) 50 \( \text{xe}5 \text{xe}6 \) with winning chances for Black in the queen ending) 46 \( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{d}2 \) 47 \( \text{e}7 \text{f}2 \) 48 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{xb}2 \) 49 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{g}6 \).

Analysis showed that if, being afraid of the rook ending a pawn down, White does not hurry to exchange queens, he encounters much more difficult problems. Thus if 44 f3? Black has the very strong reply 44...\( \text{b}1! \), e.g. 45 b4 \( \text{h}5+ \) 46 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{g}6+ \) 47 \( \text{h}2 \text{b}2 \).

Q 1-12. How should Black reply to 44 \( \text{b}7 \)?

The refutation of this move was found by Yuri Balashov (the game was played in a team competition, and I showed my preliminary analysis to my team colleagues). Jumping ahead, I should mention that on the resumption it was this variation that occurred.

After completing my study of the adjourned position, I faced a dilemma: which path to chose, 41...\( \text{xb}5 \) or 41...e3? It was clear that the first continuation was objectively stronger, but it was not this one to which preference was given (as the reader will have guessed long ago, of course – from the chapter heading). Why?
First, 41...e3 could have been missed by my opponent in his analysis, and we already
known how important it is to use the effect of
surprise.
Second, after 41...axb5 the conversion of
the advantage was still very difficult, and
much time and effort would have had to be spent. Whereas 41...e3 had been analysed
in detail, and the slightest inaccuracy by my
opponent would enable him to be defeated
easily and quickly – by my home analysis.
A player who was more principled and
confident in his powers would possibly have
taken a different decision. It is pointless
arguing who is right here – there is no
simple answer. The choice depends on
your style of play and chess tastes, and
also on attendant circumstances con-
necting with your tournament position, the personality of your opponent, your
reserve of energy and so on. It is very
important to learn to weigh up objec-
tively or evaluate intuitively the whole
sum of competitive and psychological
factors. Then you will act in the way that
is the most uncomfortable for your
opponent and the safest for yourself,
and you will achieve results that on a
superficial glance may even seem not
altogether deserved.
And what happened on the resumption?

41       ..
        e3!?
42  wxe3
Zakharian thought for twenty minutes on
this move. This means that Black, as he had
hoped, had immediately managed to per-
plex his opponent.

42       ...
43  h2
44  b7?
45  e2
If 45 g4!? Black replies 45...wg6 46 we2
(46 wxe5 wxg4) 46...e4 47 xb5 b3 48
w5 wxg4 (48...f4 49 wg3) 49 wxe4+
wxg4 50 xe4 exd2+ 51 wg3 xb2 52
xe6 c2 53 c6 h5! followed by...
g6 and ...h6 with a won rook ending.

45       ...
45...e4 is also good, e.g. 46 wg1 wd5! 47
ff7 d1+ 48 h2 d2 49 wg4 we5+.

46  g3
47  xf4
48  xb5
A simple check shows that the black pawns
advance towards the queen's square
much more quickly than the opponent's.

49  g2
g5
50  f3
51  b4
52  b8
e5
53  b5
e4+
54  g2
f3+
This whole series of moves by Black was
planned at home. The outcome is now
clear.

55  h2
55...e3 56 wg3 g4! is also strong.

56  g3
57  h2
g2+
58  h3
h5
White resigns.

Zaid – Yusupov
Qualifying Tournament for the World
Junior Championship, Leningrad 1977
The sealed move. White’s position is difficult: his kingside pawns are broken, and Black has the advantage of the two bishops (in an open position this is indeed a serious advantage). However, as was shown by the brief (the game was resumed that same evening) joint analysis by Artur and myself, against accurate defence it is not easy for Black to convert his advantage — there are too few pawns remaining on the board.

43 b4!

Completely correct! When defending an inferior ending, one should aim for pawn exchanges. Now Black has to make a difficult choice between 43...e7 and 43..axb4.

After 43...e7 44 bxa5 bxa5 45 c5 d5 46 d3! there is no clear way of further strengthening Black’s position. 46...c3 47 e4 does not work. If 46...b2, then 47 e4 (47...d6? 48 b7+). In the event of 46...d6 47 e4+ e5 the ending with like-colour bishops after 48 xe6?! xe6 is probably won in view of the weakness of the white pawns. However, by playing 48 d2! (with the threat of 49 c4+), White drives back the enemy pieces. It is clear that in the 43...e7 variation Black must gear himself up for a lengthy manoeuvring battle, and initially without a clear plan.

A quite different situation arises after the exchange of pawns on b4.

43 ...

axb4

44 dxe7

Q 1-13. How should White continue?

In the event of any ‘normal’ move, 45 f2, for example, after 45...d6 the situation is much more favourable for Black than in the variations given above. If this position is assessed as lost for White (and this assessment is correct), one immediately has a strong desire to try 45 a5! bxa5 46 c5+. That is what should be played, if, of course, a calculation of the variations does not show a forced win for Black. Let us check!

46...d6. The ending with opposite-colour bishops results in a straightforward draw: 46...xc6 47 xc6 a1 48 f2 d6 49 e6 f6 50 e2 c5 51 d3, or 47...d6 48 e8 c5 49 f2 b4 50 xf7 a4 51 xe6 a3 52 d3 c3 53 e4 b2 54 f5 d8 55 e4 a2 56 xa2 xa2 57 e5 b3 58 c4 59 d7 d5! 60 e6 f6 61 e7 xe7 62 xe7 e4!

47 xa5 d5. White has exchanged another pair of pawns, but his knight is in danger. 48 c4+? c5 is not possible, of course, and also bad is 48 c4? c3! 49 xd5 xd5 50 b3 c4 51 c1 d2 52 e2 xe3+.

48 d3! c5 49 f2! The hasty 49 e4? is incorrect: 49...a8 50 b3+ b4 51 c1 c3 with an easy win.
Now, however, in reply to any natural move the counterblow e3–e4! saves White. For example: 49...c4 50 e4! a8 (50...e2 51 e5!) 51 c4, or 49...c3 50 e4! a8 51 b3+! b4 52 c1 d4+ 53 e2 c3 54 a2+ b3 55 c1+ b2 56 d2, or 49...d8 50 e4! a8 51 c4 (51 b3+ b4 52 d2! is also possible) 51...d4 52 e2 xe4 53 xe4 xe4 54 d6+, and the ending, as further analysis showed, is drawish.

Perhaps better practical chances of success are promised by 49...e5 50 e4 e6, but here too a draw is probable – there are too few pawns remaining on the board.

Thus 45 a5! was the correct move. But the resulting positions look extremely dangerous for White, and the further play demands great accuracy. Unless it is clearly recognised that White's position is hopeless after other, non-forcing continuations, it is not at all easy to decide on 45 a5!

Let us return to the problem of Black's choice between 43...axb4 and 43...e6?. The situation is rather similar to that in the Zakharian–Dvoretsky ending, wouldn't you agree?

Every trainer was once an over-the-board player, who used to take part (it is even better if, even if only rarely, he continues to take part) in tournaments. His own practical experience is a constant help in his training work; not only games, variations and analyses, but also memories of certain competitive situations, in which successful or incorrect decisions were taken. So that it is not hard to guess what advice I gave Yusupov during the adjournment. Artur agreed with me and, as it turned out, we were right.

45 f2? d6

Black's further plan is simple: after activating his forces as much as possible, he then advances his e-pawn in order to restrict the mobility of the opponent's pieces, and finally he breaks through with his king into the enemy position.

46 d3 c3
47 f1 f6
48 f2 e5!
49 d3 g3

In carrying out a strategic plan, it is important to find the best squares for your pieces. In our home analysis we established that it was at g3 that the dark-square bishop would be especially active.

50 c1 d5
51 d3 b3
52 e2 d5
53 f1 e5!
54 b4 b7

In the conversion of an advantage, extreme accuracy is always required. The incautious 54...e6?! would have given White counter-chances after 55 e4!

55 d3 e4
56 b1 c5
57 a2 a6+
58 g1 d3!
59 c3 xb1

As is well known, another good thing about two bishops is that one of them can always be exchanged at an appropriate moment.

60 xb1 c4
61 f1 d3
62 a3 xe3
63 c4+ d3
64 b2+ c3
65 d1+ d2
66 b2 e3
67 c4+ d3
68 b2+ c3

White resigns. An excellent textbook example of exploiting the strength of two bishops!
How Hard it is to Win a Won Position!

I then looked at the position without a pre-conceived opinion, and—oh joy!—I understood the secret of this endgame.

Mikhail Botvinnik

When preparing for the resumption of a game, we make a serious analysis, and then we suddenly realise what riches may be hidden in the most simple and apparently uninteresting positions. We discover that a successful defence is possible in any situation, even a very difficult one, and on the path to victory we have to overcome numerous barriers, and find deep moves that are sometimes the only ones possible. The truth found with difficulty in analysis usually affords considerable creative satisfaction.

Akhmylovskaya – Alexandria
Women’s Candidates Match
6th game, Kislovodsk 1980

![Chess Diagram]

The first impression is that Black has a great, and probably decisive positional advantage. Her pieces are much more active, and the pawns at d4 and h2 are weak.

Which move was sealed by Elena Akhmylovskaya? Of course, not 41 ♙c2? ♞xa3 and not 41 ♙c2? ♙c3+ 42 ♙a1 ♙d1+. Probably also not 41 ♙a2? — in this case the black knight goes to c3 with check.

It is also not difficult to refute 41 ♙c1? Black can immediately pick up the h2 pawn: 41...♗e3 42 ♙b4 ♙d1+ 43 ♙b2 ♙e2+ 44 ♙b3 ♙xh2. It is even more accurate to play for zugzwang: after 41...♗h7! any move by White worsens her position. For example, 42 ♙c2 ♙f1+ 43 ♙d2 ♙f2+ 44 ♙d3 (44 ♙c1 ♙g1+; 44 ♙d1 ♙e3+) 44...♖xh2, or 42 ♙b1 ♙f1+ 43 ♙d2 (43 ♙c2 ♙e3+ winning the queen) 43...♖f2+ 44 ♙c1 ♙g1+.

41 ♙a1

The only sensible move, but now the obvious 41...♕c3 leads to the win of the d4 pawn.

How can the opponent gain any counter-chances? Let us first examine 42 ♙b1.

Q 1-14. Work out the pawn ending where Black is a pawn up.

Immediately there is a slight disappointment—it turns out that after 42...♖xb1 43 ♖xb1 ♗xd4+ 44 ♙b2! ♖xb2+ 45 ♙xb2 the pawn ending is drawn: 45...♕g6 46 ♙c3 ♗f7 47 ♖b4 ♘e7 48 ♙c5 ♙d7 49 ♙b6 g5 50 h3 (50 h4 gxh4 is equivalent) 50...g4 51 h4 h5 52 ♙a5! ♙c7 53 ♙a6.

Let us try evaluating the queen ending. 44...♖d5 45 ♖f2 (or 45 ♖e2) 45...c5 46 ♙b2 c4 47 ♖e3 (or, with the queen at e2—
47 \( \text{c}3 \)). Without the help of her king Black cannot win, and it is not so easy to bring it into play, since this increases White’s chances of perpetual check. The conclusion: it is desirable for Black to avoid the exchange of knights.

Let us play 42...\( \text{b}5 \)! (instead of 42...\( \text{xb}1 \)), intending 43...\( \text{xd}4 \). Again we ask ourselves: whom does the exchange of queens favour? It turns out that after 43 \( \text{wd}2 \text{xd}2 44 \text{xd}2 \text{xd}4 45 \text{b}2 \) White has counter-chances thanks to the vulnerability of the c6 and e6 pawns and the remoteness of the enemy king from the centre of events.

On the other hand, when both the queens and the knights are on the board, it is extremely difficult to defend – Black can combine the advance of her c-pawn with threats to the king and the h2 pawn. Thus, to 43 \( \text{d}2 \) we reply 43...\( \text{c}4 \), and then play ...\( \text{xd}4 \), ...c6–c5 etc. Or 43 \( \text{a}2 \text{xd}4 44 \text{c}3 \text{a}6+ \) (44...\( \text{e}2+ \) is also possible) 45 \( \text{b}2 \text{b}5+ 46 \text{a}2 \text{c}5 \).

It is perhaps not worth analysing 42 \( \text{b}1 \) any further – we have found the strongest reply for Black and outlined the subsequent plan. In the implementation of this plan there do not appear to be any serious difficulties.

Here, incidentally, we should also mention that in the analysis of adjourned positions, apart from the calculation of specific variations it is also very important to draw some general, evaluating conclusions, for example, in the given instance, to consider the advisability of exchanging particular pieces.

Let us check 42 \( \text{b}4 \). In reply 42...\( \text{e}2 \) 43 \( \text{b}2 \text{xd}4 44 \text{c}4! \text{d}2+ 45 \text{c}2 \) is unconvincing, since White succeeds in coordinating her forces, threatening exchanges, and attacking the c6 and e6 pawns.

Much stronger is 42...\( \text{d}2 \) 43 \( \text{b}2 \text{d}1+! \) (also good, as pointed out by K.Remling, is 43...\( \text{xd}4 44 \text{b}1 \text{a}7+! 45 \text{a}3 \text{a}4 \), avoiding the exchange of queens that is favourable to White) 44 \( \text{b}1 \text{b}5! 45 \text{d}2 \text{a}4+ 46 \text{b}2 \text{xd}4 47 \text{c}3 \text{b}5+ and 48...\( \text{c}5 \). Roughly the same situation, favourable for us, is reached as in the 42 \( \text{b}1 \) variation.

But on the way it would seem that we have discovered the best arrangement of the white pieces – king at b2 and knight at c2. It can be obtained by playing 42 \( \text{b}3! \text{xd}4 43 \text{c}2 \).

Initially this plan of defence was also not taken too seriously. It would seem that Black only has to find a couple of accurate moves, and White’s resistance will be broken. Let us try!

43...\( \text{d}2 \) suggests itself, but where is the knight to move after 44 \( \text{b}2 \) ? The ‘active’ 44...\( \text{e}2 \) is harmless in view of 45 \( \text{c}4 \), and it is not clear how the c6 pawn can be defended.

44...\( \text{d}5 \) looks the most solid, covering the e6 pawn and threatening 45...\( \text{h}2 \). If 45 \( \text{h}4 \text{c}5 \), and White stands badly.

She must immediately create counter-threats: 45 \( \text{b}8+! \text{h}7 46 \text{d}6 \text{c}3+ (46...\( \text{h}2 47 \text{xe}6 \text{e}3 48 \text{c}6) 47 \text{c}1 \) (but not 47 \( \text{b}1? \text{b}3+ 48 \text{c}1 \text{c}3 with a decisive attack). If now 47...\( \text{e}3 \),
then 48 \( \text{d}2 \)! \( \text{xd}2+ \) 49 \( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{f}1+ \) (it will be remembered that the pawn ending after 49...\( \text{xc}2 \) is drawn) 50 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{xa}2 \) 51 \( \text{d}4 \). The pawn sacrifice 47...\( \text{c}5 \) 48 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{e}3 \) 49 \( \text{wa}2 \) \( \text{a}4 \) looks tempting, but it transpires that here too there is nothing decisive.

Now let us try 44...\( \text{b}5 \) (instead of 44...\( \text{d}5 \)). The e6 pawn is indirectly defended (45 \( \text{xe}6 \) ? \( \text{xc}2+! \)). If 45 \( \text{c}4 \) there follows 45...\( \text{xh}2 \) 46 \( \text{xc}6 \) \( \text{d}4 \), forcing a won pawn ending (for the first time exchanges have turned out to be in Black's favour!).

45 \( \text{h}4 \) is essential, intending 46 \( \text{c}4 \). In reply to 45...\( \text{xe}2 \) White can defend by 'terrorising' the black queen with the threat of exchanging: 46 \( \text{e}3 \) (not 46 \( \text{h}5 \)? \( \text{h}7 \)! 47 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{h}5 \) or 47 \( \text{b}1 \) c5! 48 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 46...\( \text{g}2 \) (46...\( \text{c}4 \) 47 \( \text{b}3 \)) 47 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{h}7 \) 48 \( \text{c}4 \), when 48...\( \text{xg}3 \) 49 \( \text{xc}6 \) is unconvincing, and White is now thinking about \( \text{h}4-\text{h}5 \).

Thus after 43...\( \text{d}2 \) simply playing to strengthen the position somehow did not work. Let us try 43...\( \text{g}1+ \) 44 \( \text{b}2 \). Again we will look at all the possible knight moves. 44...\( \text{d}1+ \) would be justified in the event of 45 \( \text{a}3 \), but the king can boldly move into the discovered check: 45 \( \text{c}1 \)!

There is also an interesting defence after 44...\( \text{e}2 \) 45 \( \text{c}4 \) (45 \( \text{xe}6 \)? \( \text{c}1+ \) and 46...\( \text{xc}2+! \)) 45...\( \text{h}2 \).

**Q 1-15. How should White continue?**

She is saved only by 46 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 47 \( \text{c}8+ \) \( \text{h}7 \) 48 \( \text{c}3 \)!

White faces more difficult problems after 44...\( \text{d}5 \).

---

**Q 1-16. How should White defend here?**

It turns out that the counterattack 45 \( \text{b}8+ \) \( \text{h}7 \) 46 \( \text{d}6 \), which worked with the black queen at \( \text{d}2 \), is unsuccessful here: 46...\( \text{a}6+ \) 47 \( \text{a}3 \) (47 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{c}3+! \)) 47...\( \text{a}5+ \) 48 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{b}5+ \) 49 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 50 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{d}3+ \) 51 \( \text{b}3 \) (51 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{c}4+ \)) 51...\( \text{a}6+ \) 52 \( \text{b}2 \) c5! The e6 pawn is immune and Black has returned to those happy, but alas, now half-forgotten times, when she could strengthen her position unhindered (...\( \text{b}6-\text{d}5 \), ...c5–c4 etc.).

No better is 45 \( \text{c}4 \)? \( \text{xa}2 \) 46 \( \text{xc}6 \) \( \text{e}3 \) or 45 \( \text{h}4 \) c5 with a decisive advantage for Black.

Moves such as 45 \( \text{b}7 \)! usually do not immediately catch the eye. White attacks the c6 and e6 pawns, and for the moment does not allow the enemy queen to go to \( \text{b}6 \). If 45...\( \text{h}2 \) there follows an already familiar variation: 46 \( \text{c}8+ \) \( \text{h}7 \) 47 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{e}3 \) 48 \( \text{xc}6 \).

It has to be admitted that for the moment the question regarding the best plan of converting the advantage remains open. Everywhere, by finding the only moves, White avoids a forced loss and sets us serious problems. This means that we must again and again delve into the variations already found, trying to find in them some resources.
that have not been taken into account. The author of these lines, together with Nana Alexandria's other helpers, devoted themselves to this for quite a long time, but without success. The reader already knows that a way out of such an impasse can also be sought by a different, often more effective method. It is very useful to cast off the burden of the variations, evaluations and opinions already found, and to look at the position with a fresh glance, to find a new, hitherto unconsidered idea. Such ideas are often discovered in the very first moves of the analysis.

When I finally tore myself away from the tiring calculation of variations, I suddenly realised that all Black's problems stemmed from the fact that her king was not participating in the play. It was for this reason that many endings with an extra pawn turned out to be unclear. So was it worth spending time on winning the not especially important d4 pawn, allowing White during this time to consolidate? The queen at d3 and knight at d5 are excellently placed, and Black must improve the placing of her only inactive piece — her king!

The most difficult thing was to reject 41...Cc3 and find the manoeuvre ...h7—g6—h5. The subsequent checking of variations was, as they say, a matter of technique.

41 ... h7!!

Apart from its objective strength, this move was also good in that it was bound to come as a surprise to the opponent.

42 Cb1

After 42 Cc2 g6 there is altogether no sensible continuation (43 Cb4 Wd1+ 44 Cc2 Wc2+).

42 ... g6!

Threatening ...g6—h5—g4—h3. If 43 wb8 there follows 43...Wxd4+ 44 Ca2 Cb4! with a decisive attack.

43 Wd2 Wxd2

Black agrees to the exchange of queens, since her king breaks through into the enemy position.

44 Cxd2 Cc5
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45 Cc4

No chances are offered by 45 b3 g4 46 Cc5 Cc7 or 45 b2 g4 46 b3 Cc7 47 Cc4 xh2 48 Cc5 xg3 49 Cxc6 h5 50 Cd6 Cxf4 51 d5 exd5 52 e6 Cxe6. The main variation of the analysis runs as follows: 45 h3 g5 46 fxg5 hxg5 47 b2 g4! 48 hxg4+ (48 h4 f4) 48...xg4 49 Cc2!? (also hopeless is 49 C1 Cc3 with the threats of 50...Cf2 or 50...e2 51 Cc2 Cc2, while 49 Cc3 leads to the main variation) 49...xg3 50 Cc3 Cg2? 51 Cc4 (if 51 b3 or 51 e2 Black wins by 51...f4) 51...Cf2! (the most accurate) 52 Cc5 (52 Cc3 Cc4+ 53 Cc4 e2) 52...e2 with an easy win, since White is not even able to sacrifice her knight for the f-pawn.

The position in the last diagram looks completely hopeless for White. Was it necessary to analyse it in such detail? But we already know how difficult it can sometimes be to convert even a very big advantage, and how much care and accuracy it requires. In order to be confident in
your evaluation of a position and to avoid complications on the resumption, you should continue analysing forcing variations as far as you can, until they lead to situations that are absolutely clear (or, on the contrary, completely unclear). What can result from the violation of this rule will be seen in the next chapter.

In selecting and perfecting the clearest and safest ways to our goal, we are effectively training a skill that is exceptionally important for every chess player – the technique of converting an advantage. A thoughtful attitude to the taking of decisions even in completely won positions, a striving to restrict the opponent’s counterplay as much as possible, constant attention to ‘trifles’ and ‘details’ – this is what distinguishes the games of all the players who are noted for their fine technique, such as Fischer, Karpov, Petrosian and Andersson.

45 ...  g4
46  a5  e7
47  b2

If 47 b7, then both 47...g5 and 47...h3 48 d8 xh2 49 xe6 xg3 50 xg7 g4 are possible.

47 ...  h3
48  c3  xh2
49  c4  xg3
50  c5  h5
51  d6

If 51 xc6 the simplest is 51...xc6 52 xc6 h4 53 d5 h3, and the black pawn queens with check.

51 ...  d5
51...h4 would also have won easily.

52  xe6  h4
53  xc6  xf4+
54  xf5  h3

White resigns

The positional considerations on which 41...h7!! was based are elementary. In the endgame the king should take an active part in the play; if we have some piece that is badly placed, its position must be urgently improved. We all know this perfectly well.

Why then did a group of experienced players take so long to discover the solution to the position? Apparently, we were all too influenced by ‘material’ – the winning of the d4 pawn after 41...c3 was just too attractive. And although in the given instance this plan proved faulty, generally speaking there is nothing criminal in a win of material which does not involve any positional concessions and only a minimal expenditure of time, and usually such tactics are sensible. That is also the case here: if in the initial position the black king had already been at h7, there would have been nothing wrong with 41...c3.

In every position various features operate simultaneously, and the recommendations stemming from them sometimes contradict one another. Often a correct choice can be made intuitively, relying on your positional sense. But by no means always is it possible to ‘guess’ the solution – sometimes you have to delve into analysis, and engage in a lengthy calculation of variations. Different players may reach one and the same conclusion in different ways – depending on their way of thinking, and their individual method of finding a move. We found the solution to the position 41...h7!! (as well as the best arrangement for the white pieces in reply to 41...c3? – 42 b3! and 43 c2!) after lengthy concrete analysis. It is possible that a player with a subtle positional sense could have guessed the correct way much more quickly and thereby saved himself a great deal of analytical work.

A player should not (as is sometimes done) set any priority of concrete over general, analysis over evaluation, logic over intuition, or vice versa. He should develop both contrary types of thinking, possess various methods of approach-
ing a position, and learn to combine them correctly in accordance with his capabilities, tastes and style of play.
An Incomplete Analysis

A draw may occur not only after the repetition of three moves, but also as the result of one weak move.

Saviely Tartakower

In the previous chapter we have already talked about the need to analyse ‘to the end’ all forcing variations, and to work out accurately the methods for converting an advantage in winning positions. The following example shows what difficulties can be encountered in the event of this principle being disregarded.

Georgadze – Yusupov
48th USSR Championship,
Vilnius 1980/81

42 $\text{g1}$

42 $\text{g1}$ is weaker in view of 42...$\text{d4+}$
43 $\text{h1}$ (43 $\text{h2}$ $\text{f4+}$ 44 $\text{h1}$ $\text{c1+}$ or
44...$\text{f1+}$) 43...$\text{e6}$! 44 $\text{b8+}$ (44 $\text{f1+}$ $\text{e7}$ with the threats of 45...$\text{d2}$ and
45...$\text{h4}$) 44...$\text{e8}$ 45 $\text{g3}$ $\text{g5}$, and White
has no defence against 46...$\text{f4}$!

42 ...

$\text{e6}$

In their analysis Tamaz Georgadze and his trainer Mikhail Podgaets mainly considered another plan, beginning with 42...$\text{f2}$. For the moment the bishop is immune, but after
43 $\text{b6}$ or 43 $\text{c5}$ it can be taken, e.g.
43 $\text{b6}$ $\text{xc2}$ 44 $\text{f5+}$ $\text{g8}$ 45 $\text{xc2}$
$\text{xb6}$ with a won queen ending. And
otherwise Black will threaten to take the
bishop, after playing 43...$\text{g6}$.

It is not possible to win a game simultaneously in several ways – you have to concentrate your efforts on one of them in particular. We chose a plan which seemed to us to be more reliable.

43 $\text{f1+}$
44 $\text{e7}$

The only move. White parries the threats of
44...$\text{g3}$ and 44...$\text{d2}$; now he intends to
bring his knight into play.

44 ...

$\text{e5}$!

44...$\text{d2}$ did not work in view of 45 $\text{c5+}$
$\text{f7}$ 46 $\text{c7+}$ $\text{f6}$ 47 $\text{c5}$! With the move
in the game, after taking away the important
$c5$ square from the opponent’s pieces,
Black renews the threat of ...\texttt{wd}2. For example, 45 \texttt{wa}7+ \texttt{wd}7 46 \texttt{wf}2 \texttt{wd}2 47 \texttt{wa}7+ \texttt{xf}8 48 \texttt{wa}8+ \texttt{e}8 49 \texttt{wb}3+ \texttt{g}8 and White is helpless. He also loses after 45 \texttt{b}6 \texttt{wd}2 46 \texttt{c}8+ \texttt{d}8 47 \texttt{b}6+ \texttt{xc}8 or 47 \texttt{f}8+ \texttt{e}8.

45 \texttt{g}3!

Again the only defence! The recurring theme of the entire ending is the fate of the white knight. Now Black has no time for the unhurried strengthening of his position, since in the event of 45...g5? or 45...\texttt{f}6? the knight immediately comes into play – 46 \texttt{b}6!

45 ... \texttt{d}8!

Now if 46 \texttt{b}6 there follows 46...\texttt{e}6!, forcing the exchange of queens and easily winning in the end: 47 \texttt{xd}6+ \texttt{xd}6 48 \texttt{c}4 \texttt{e}6 49 \texttt{d}3 \texttt{e}1+ or 49...\texttt{e}2. Meanwhile Black is intending to play 46...\texttt{e}6 47 \texttt{t}2 \texttt{d}2 48 \texttt{f}8+ \texttt{e}8. If 46 \texttt{g}1, then 46...\texttt{d}4+ 47 \texttt{h}1 g5 followed by ...\texttt{f}4 is decisive.

If White chooses 46 \texttt{t}2, then after 46...\texttt{f}6! the following variations arise:

(a) 47 \texttt{d}4+ \texttt{e}7 48 \texttt{a}7+ \texttt{f}8 49 \texttt{b}6+ \texttt{e}8 50 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{f}1+! (not 50...g5? 51 \texttt{c}5 \texttt{f}4 52 \texttt{x}f4+ \texttt{x}f4 53 \texttt{e}4 and there is nowhere for Black to break through) 51 \texttt{h}2 \texttt{e}2 with the threats of 52...\texttt{xc}2 and 52...\texttt{e}5;

(b) 47 \texttt{g}3 \texttt{e}6! (threatening 48...\texttt{e}1+ 49 \texttt{h}2 \texttt{e}5) 48 \texttt{h}2 \texttt{d}6 49 \texttt{h}1 (as a result of complicated manoeuvres the position in the previous diagram has again arisen, but this time with Black to move) 49...\texttt{e}6 50 \texttt{t}2 \texttt{d}2 and wins.

It seemed that a forced way to win had been found. The analysis was not easy, and had taken considerable time and effort. When we finished checking the variations, some 2–3 hours remained before the resumption of the game. In principle, before a resumption it is useful to relax – after all, some problems may have to be resolved at the board, and a clear head is more necessary than a couple of not very important clarifications found at the last moment. But in the given case we should have worked on for a few more minutes.

We did not consider seriously the consequences of the knight sacrifice (see the last diagram): 46 \texttt{xc}3 \texttt{xc}3 47 \texttt{xc}3, because we realised that the resulting position was won. But after the other, more critical continuations had been analysed, it was worth looking here too for a clear-cut plan for converting the advantage.

Q 1-17. What should Black play?

The most convincing way is 47...\texttt{c}5! 48 \texttt{g}3 (no better is 48 \texttt{d}3+ \texttt{e}7) 48...\texttt{g}5 49 a3 \texttt{e}3 50 \texttt{xe}3 \texttt{xe}3 51 b4 \texttt{c}3! After finding this variation Yusupov could have gone off to rest with a clear conscience, and I could have gone off to prepare an article about the adjourned position for a chess magazine.

Unfortunately, we succumbed to euphoria from the pretty ideas we had found. Indeed, does one often see the heavy pieces dancing in such tight circles and completely disorganising the opponent's defences as a result? One has to admire the manoeuvres of the black pieces in the main variation: ...\texttt{f}6–\texttt{e}6–\texttt{e}5–\texttt{e}6, ...\texttt{d}6–\texttt{f}6–\texttt{e}6–\texttt{d}6 and
...\textit{c}8-e7-d8-e7-f8. And all these really are the strongest moves!
Having noticed after the knight sacrifice the tempting 47...\textit{c}5, Yusupov did not bother looking at the position any further, deciding that if necessary he would work things out directly at the board.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
46 & \textit{xf}c3! \textit{bxc}3 \\
47 & \textit{xc}3
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Artur now saw that the intended 47...\textit{c}5? would not do because of 48 \textit{w}xg7! \textit{xc}2 49 \textit{w}g8+, 50 \textit{h}7+ and 51 \textit{xc}2. Evidently it was due to vexation that Black made a poor move.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
47 & \textit{d}5? \\
48 & \textit{g}3 \textit{e}6
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Here, by playing 49 a3! \textit{e}1+ 50 \textit{h}2 \textit{e}5 51 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 52 b4, Georgadze could have exchanged the queenside pawns. Subsequently White would have aimed for one of the following two positions.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
35 & \includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{diagram1}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

In endgame theory such positions are called ‘fortresses’. \textit{A fortress is an impregnable position, in which it is possible to limit oneself to passive defence and to wait, only occasionally parrying by accurate moves some attempts (anticipated beforehand) by the opponent to breach the defence. The construction of a fortress is one of the most important methods of defending in the endgame.}

Incidentally, do you remember the very first question in the book (Q 1-1, p.11)? In its solution we obtained a position where one side was the exchange up, about which it was said that, according to theory, it was drawn. And in fact, this position is merely a particular instance of the more universal drawn situation in the first of the diagrams just examined (it is reached if in it Black plays 1...g5 2 hxg5 \textit{hxg}5).

We saw another example of a fortress when we examined the Alexandria–Litinskaya ending (52 a4!! and 53 \textit{xa}3; cf. p.17), and we will subsequently return many times to this theme.

Black’s mistake was vexing for the added reason that before the resumption I reminded Yusupov about the need to avoid the exchange of the queenside pawns, so as not to allow the construction of a fortress.
And even so, Yusupov was unable to find a plan that allowed him to avoid the exchange, or perhaps during the adjournment session he simply forgot about this.

49  \textit{h}2?!  \textit{c}5
50  \textit{d}3?
Now was the last moment for the exchange of pawns: 50  \textit{a}3!  \textit{e}5  (50...\textit{x}c2?  51 \textit{d}3+)  51 \textit{xe}5  \textit{xe}5  52 \textit{b}4.
50  ...  \textit{e}5

51  \textit{xe}5  \textit{xe}5
52  \textit{c}4  \textit{e}3!
53 \textit{a}3 is now pointless, since if \textit{b}3--\textit{b}4 Black will always be able to reply ...\textit{a}5--\textit{a}4! White's position has again become lost.
53 \textit{a}4 \textit{e}7  54 \textit{h}4 \textit{d}6  55 \textit{g}3 \textit{c}5  56 \textit{h}3 \textit{b}4  57 \textit{g}4 \textit{x}b3  58 \textit{b}5 \textit{c}5  59 \textit{e}8 \textit{b}8  60 \textit{d}7 \textit{d}6  61 \textit{f}5 \textit{e}5  62 \textit{d}7 \textit{g}6
White resigns.
Give Me an Envelope, Please

Anyone can make a mistake, but only a madman sticks with his mistake.

Cicero

A chess player's successes depend not only on the quality of the moves he makes, but also on how well thought-out are other decisions he takes, such as the choice of opening variation, the declining of a draw offered by the opponent, deciding on the best moment to adjourn the game, and so on.

Let us suppose that the control move has already been made, but the time of the playing session has not yet expired. What should you do, adjourn the game or continue playing? Here are some important considerations, which should be taken into account when deciding whether to seal a move or continue playing at the board.

1. If you feel very tired, adjourn the game: each new move you make may prove to be a serious mistake.

2. If you have a completely won position, ask the arbiter for an envelope. Your opponent would have continued to resist, hoping for a chance mistake. He realises that in home analysis you will accurately work out the way to win, and will probably capitulate without resuming.

It is worthwhile doing exactly the same if your opponent is trying to win against you in a clearly drawn position. However, if in the process he may go too far, and if in pursuit of success he himself risks encountering difficulties, then why not give him this opportunity and play on a little longer?

3. If there is a wide choice of 'candidate moves', it is useful to adjourn the game at this point. You will know which move you have sealed, whereas your opponent will have to analyse all the possibilities, and carry out several times more work.

4. You can also make your opponent's home analysis more difficult by sealing a move which you sense will come as a surprise to him.

5. Suppose that your opponent's reply to your planned continuation is obvious, whereas on the next move you have a wide choice, and you will have to make a difficult decision. In such cases you should seal your planned move, deferring the taking of the decision to your home analysis.

On the other hand, if it is your opponent who faces a choice, then, in order to force him to take this decision at the board, you should make your move.

At times these recommendations may contradict one another. They must not be applied automatically — they are only a guide. Your skill in acting in such situations can be consolidated by remembering and evaluating your own experience of adjourning games, and by becoming familiar with the experiences of other players.

see next diagram
Romanishin – Dvoretsky
USSR Championship Semi-Final, Odessa 1972
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Here the game was finally adjourned. How it concluded, the reader already knows from the chapter ‘Traps found in analysis’ (p.18). Black’s defeat was a just punishment for his conceit. After a hard battle lasting five hours you should not be too optimistic regarding your ability to calculate accurately. It turns out that the pawn ending is drawn!

I saw that after 45...\textit{\&}e7! 46 \textit{\&}xe6+ \textit{\&}xe6 47 \textit{\&}g4 \textit{\&}f6 48 \textit{\&}f3! \textit{\&}f5! (48...\textit{\&}e5 49 g4 does not change anything) 49 g4+ \textit{\&}e5 50 \textit{\&}e3 \textit{\&}e7! White seizes the opposition and converts it using the basic method of exploiting the opposition – the by-pass: 50...\textit{\&}f6 51 \textit{\&}f4 \textit{\&}e6 52 \textit{\&}e4 \textit{\&}f6 53 \textit{\&}d5 (here it is – the by-pass!) 53...\textit{\&}f7! (53...h5 54 g5+ is also hopeless, as I definitely knew from theory) 54 \textit{\&}e5 \textit{\&}e7 (now Black takes the opposition, but it does not help him, since White has a tempo in reserve – a pawn move) 55 \textit{\&}f5 \textit{\&}f7 56 h5. It seemed that retreating the king to the 7th rank (instead of 48...\textit{\&}f5) would not change anything in view of 49 \textit{\&}f4 \textit{\&}f6 50 g4. What I didn’t grasp was that the opposition is necessary only when the pawn is at g4, and as long as it remains at g3 Black must, on the contrary, on no account take the opposition. Thus, 48...\textit{\&}e7! 49 \textit{\&}f4 (49 g4 \textit{\&}f7) 49...\textit{\&}e6 50 g4 \textit{\&}f6 with a draw.

It should be mentioned that 48...\textit{\&}f7? is incorrect, since, by playing 49 g4!, White gains the distant opposition, and then with the help of a by-pass he converts into the close opposition: 49...\textit{\&}e7 50 \textit{\&}e3! \textit{\&}f7 51 \textit{\&}d4! (by-pass) 51...\textit{\&}e6 52 \textit{\&}e4 \textit{\&}f6 53 \textit{\&}d5 (again by-pass) and so on.

However, apart from 48...\textit{\&}e7!, a draw also results from 48...\textit{\&}g6! 49 \textit{\&}f4 (49 \textit{\&}e4 \textit{\&}f6, but not 49...\textit{\&}h5? 50 \textit{\&}f4 \textit{\&}g6 51 \textit{\&}e5) 49...\textit{\&}h5 50 \textit{\&}e5 (50 \textit{\&}f5 – stalemate!) 50...\textit{\&}g4 51 \textit{\&}f6 \textit{\&}xg3 52 h5 \textit{\&}f4! 53 \textit{\&}g6 \textit{\&}e5 54 \textit{\&}xh6 \textit{\&}f6.

Meanwhile, it was also not essential to lose in the queen ending: instead of the 'natural' 45...\textit{\&}f6, stronger was 45...\textit{\&}f7!?
After this incident it became clear to me that the best move in a position may sometimes be an appeal to the arbiter: 'Give me an envelope, please - I want to adjourn the game.' This conclusion later came in useful to me on more than one occasion.

Andersson – Dvoretsky
Wijk aan Zee 1976

During a brief analysis (the game was to be resumed within two hours) I discovered to my horror that after 44...♘f7 45 hxg5 hxg5 White has an extremely dangerous plan: to play his king to b3 followed by ♘b5 and a4. The black king cannot launch a counterattack - it is not entitled to go further than the f-file due to the constant threat of ♘b5.

If the king is prevented from going to b3 by playing ...a5–a4, it will return to g3, after which the manoeuvre of the knight to b6 will lead to the win of one of the pawns, a4 or d6.

If the black king goes to meet its opposite number on the queenside, the g-pawn becomes vulnerable. By playing ♗c3–d5–f6–h7 White forces ...g5–g4, then returns with his knight to e3 or c3 and his king to g3, and wins easily. We see that as soon as even only one black pawn moves onto a 'bad' light square - a square of the colour of the bishop, the position immediately deteriorates sharply.

Thus the fortress set up by Black proves to be insecure. It remains to check one further attempt to defend by tactical means. Let us suppose that, when White plays ♖b3 and ♘b5, Black's king is at e7 and the bishop launches a counterattack: 1...♗h3. We calculate the variation 2 ♖a4 ♖f1 3 ♖xa5 ♖d3 4 ♖c3! ♖xc4 5 ♖b6. Black is even a pawn up, but it is not apparent what can be done against the advance of the passed a-pawn.

I would not venture to assert that after 44...♗f7 Black's position is lost, but the very serious difficulties facing him are now evident. In search of a defence I spent quite a long time looking at variation after variation, until finally I decided to listen to the advice of Mikhail Tal, who was taking part in the analysis, and switched to 44...gxa4+

Although Black's passed pawn looks weak, it nevertheless imparts a certain
sharpness to the position, and this is what you should be aiming for when you have a bishop battling against the opponent's knight. On the contrary, for the side with the knight it is usually advantageous to have a static situation, as in the 44...f7 variation. Fairly simple considerations, but they occurred to me, unfortunately, only after the reply had been determined by concrete analysis. Evidently the desire to sit it out in a secure fortress was just too strong.

Incidentally, the choice between 44...f7 and 44...gxh4+ is one of the possible types of exercises for development for intuition. Here it is practically impossible to calculate variations exactly, and on the basis of a brief evaluation and some general considerations you should try and 'guess' the solution. Then you should check the course of your thoughts with the answer, selecting those evaluative considerations which proved to be most important for the given position and which could have helped the correct conclusion to be drawn. **In order to learn to guess, you must constantly try guessing, and then evaluate the quality of your guesses.**

Let us now see what in fact happened during the resumption.

44 h4 g4
45 gxh4 f7
46 f3 f6

After lengthy consideration the Swedish grandmaster decided not to go in for the sharp main variation. In the event of 47 h5 there would have followed 47...h3! 48 e2 (48 d5+ g7 49 e3 d7 50 g4 xg4+ 51 fxg4 a4 52 g5 hxg5 53 xg5 f7 54 f5 e7 55 g6 e6 with a draw) 48...f1 49 c1 g7 50 h4 f6 51 g3 h5 52 h3 53 b3 a4 54 c1 h4 55 e2 g5 56 c3 d7 57 b5 f4 58 xd6 h3 59 b7 h2 60 g2 h1# (60...e3 could also be considered) 61 xh1 xh3 62 xc5 e8, and the activity of the black king compensates for the two missing pawns.

But by simple means, avoiding complications, it is not possible to breach Black's defences.

47 d5+ g7 48 g3 f7 49 e3 (49 f4 would also not have achieved anything) 49...f6 50 h4 g6 51 d1 a4 52 e3 (if 52 c3, then 52...c2 53 b5 xd3 54 xd6 f6) 52 d7 53 d5 g7 54 g3 f7 55 c3. Draw.
Comment on the conclusion of the game:
57 $\text{f}3$ $\text{e}7$ 58 $\text{f}4$ $\text{e}6$ 59 $\text{g}4$ $\text{f}6$ 60
$\text{f}3$ $\text{e}7$ 61 $\text{e}3$ $\text{f}7$ 62 $\text{d}4$ $\text{f}6$ 63
$\text{d}5$ $\text{e}7$ 64 $\text{e}5$ $\text{f}7$ 65 $\text{f}5$ $\text{g}7$ 66
$\text{e}6$ $\text{g}6$ 67 h5+ $\text{g}5$ 68 $\text{f}7$ $\text{x}g4$ 69
$\text{g}6$ $\text{f}4$ 70 $\text{x}h6$. Black resigns.
Even Grandmasters Make Mistakes

The mistakes are always there, waiting to be made.
Saviely Tartakower

The thought expressed in the chapter heading is a banal one. It is clear that even the leading players are not capable of faultlessly conducting all their games (perhaps one day computers will be able to do this?). However, you have to take strict responsibility for typical mistakes, made in standard situations – it is these that could have been avoided. I will give two examples from the same event, in which grandmasters suffered as a result of incorrect actions in a typical situation that we have just been examining – at the adjournment of the game.

Dolmatov – Dorfman
49th USSR Championship, Frunze 1981

41

The time control had already been reached. Dolmatov could have sealed the natural check at a7, analysed the position at home, and after the only reply 41...\(\text{\textit{\text{e5}}}\) made a choice between 42 d6, 42 e5 and 42 d4. But Sergey thought that at the board too he would easily be able to decide on the strongest continuation (remember: the same confidence let me down in my game with Romanishin, examined in the previous chapter).

41 \(\text{\textit{a7+}}\) \(\text{\textit{e8}}\)

Q 1-20. Which of the three moves is correct?

Usually Dolmatov copes excellently with such problems, but he should have taken account of the fatigue which had accumulated towards the end of the round, and which disrupted his normal thinking. If after 42 \(\text{\textit{a8+}}\) Black had been forced to return with his king to e7, it would have made sense to seal this move quickly and only at home decide how to proceed further, after 43 \(\text{\textit{a7+}}\) \(\text{\textit{e8}}\). But, unfortunately, it is not possible to repeat the position: 42 \(\text{\textit{a8+}}\) \(\text{\textit{fl}}\)! 43 \(\text{\textit{a7+}}\) \(\text{\textit{g6}}\). This means that the decision must be taken at the board.

Dolmatov was unable to calculate the variations exactly, and he sealed the most unfortunate move: 42 \(\text{\textit{e5}}\)? On returning to the hotel, we immediately established that after 42...\(\text{\textit{fxe5}}\) 43 \(\text{\textit{e4}}\) h5 44 \(\text{\textit{h7}}\) Black has an adequate defence: 44...\(\text{\textit{h4}}\)! That in fact is what happened on the resumption – a draw had to be agreed in view of 45 \(\text{\textit{xh5}}\) \(\text{\textit{gxh5}}\) 46 \(\text{\textit{f5}}\) \(\text{\textit{h4}}\).

White should have advanced his d-pawn.

42 d6! h5
43 \(\text{\textit{e7+!}}\) \(\text{\textit{d8}}\)
44 \text{Ke6}

Sergey rejected 42 d6! because at the board he failed to find the simple manoeuvre \text{a7\rightarrow7\rightarrow e6}. Iosif Dorfman, who had to spend many hours analysing the position, later stated that in the event of 42 \text{d4?!} Black's position would have remained difficult, but it would have been possible to hold it by 42...\text{d2+!} (not 42...\text{h5} 43 \text{h7} 43 \text{c5 e2} 43...\text{g2!} 44 \text{f3 h2}. After 42 d6!, on the other hand, there was no way of saving the game.

Very annoying! After all, that which I have described in the previous chapter had, of course, already been discussed with Dalmatov. Apparently the experience of other people is not always assimilated thoroughly - you also have to get your own fingers burnt.

39 \text{c4?} \quad \text{c5!}

With this excellent reply, found with his flag about to fall, Artur resolutely declined the draw offered by his opponent, who had quickly realised his mistake.

40 \text{xc5} \quad \text{xc5}

The time control was reached. If Psakhis had thought for even only a short time, he would probably have realised that he should seal his only move (a more obvious one is hard to imagine), since later on he would have to make a choice between several possibilities. However, he instantly took the rook. And Yusupov immediately replied, forcing his opponent to take a decision at the board.

41 \text{xc5} \quad \text{hx3}

Psakhis – Yusupov
49th USSR Championship, Frunze 1981

Q 1-21. Which path should White choose?

It is possible to answer this question, relying both on precise calculation, and on an evaluation of the position.

In analysis it was established that a forced draw results from 42 \text{xa7!} \text{g4} 43 \text{b3!} (or 42 \text{b3} \text{g4} 43 \text{xa7}). The knight at b3 covers the king against checks and defends the d4 pawn, also safeguarding the king. White intends to advance his passed a-pawn. There can follow 43...\text{h5} 44 \text{a4 h4}
45 a5 h3 46 a6 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}7}\) (46...h2? 47 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{b}}8}\)+ and 48 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{x}}h2+) 47 \text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{b}}6}\) (or 47 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{b}}7}\) 47...\(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}d4}\)! 48 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}d4}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}d4}\) 49 a7 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{a}}4+}\) 50 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{a}}1}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}1+}\) with perpetual check.

Weaker is 42 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{c}}6?!}\) \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{x}}g4}\) 43 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{x}}a7}\) (43 d5 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{x}}f5}\) 43...\(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}f5}\) (less good is 43...h5 44 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}5}\)). White has an unattractive choice between a difficult minor piece ending – 44 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{c}}5}\) \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{e}}6}\)! 45 d5 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{e}}2}\) 46 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}4!}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}2}\) 47 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{c}}8+}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}7}\) 48 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}5+}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}f5}\) 49 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}f5}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}6}\), and a queen ending that is also not easy – 44 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{e}}7+}\) \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{x}}e7}\) 45 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{x}}e7}\) \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{d}}5+}\) 46 b3 (46 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{a}}1}\) is no better) 46...g5! (46...h5? 47 a4! g5 48 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{c}}5}\) 47 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{c}}5}\) (or 47 a4 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}d4}\) with advantage) 47...\(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}g2+}\) (but not 47...\(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}c5}\) 48 dxc5 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}8}\) 49 a4) 48 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{b}}1}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{g}}1+}\) 49 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{b}}2}\) g4.

USSR Champion Lev Psakhis played brilliantly in Frunze and gained here his second successive title (jointly with Garry Kasparov). But on this occasion, under the influence of the unhappy last few minutes of the round, he failed to cope with his nerves and sealed a less good move.

42 d5?

Yusupov and I also thoroughly examined this possibility (as the reader knows, one should analyse not only the best moves).

42 ... \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{x}}g4}\)

Now White no longer has time to take the pawn – after 43 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{x}}a7}\) h5 Black wins easily.

43 d6

In analysis the first moves that come to mind are those which determine the position or force the play – attacks, captures, threats and exchanges. It is more difficult to find quiet moves, which do not involve direct threats. That was also the case here: initially we checked the exchange of queens 43...\(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}d4}\) 44 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}d4}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}d4}\). We found some rather curious variations. I think that it will be interesting for the reader to analyse independently the position arising after 45 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}6}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}f6}\) 46 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}a7}\) (46 d7 h5 47 d8\(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{w}}+}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}d8}\) 48 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}d8}\) h4, and the pawn cannot be stopped) 46...h5 47 b4 h4 48 b5.

\[\text{E 1-11}\]

Black to move

In the end it was established that the exchange of queens leads only to a draw, since the white king is able to rush across in time to deal with the h-pawn: 45 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{b}}3}\) h5 46 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}2}\)! (not 46 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}4}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{b}}6}\) 46...h4 47 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}3}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{x}}b2}\) 48 d7 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{f}}6}\) 49 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}4}\).

The attack on b2 is also premature. After 43...\(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{e}}2}\) 44 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}4}\) White intends 45 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}5}\), and in the event of 44...\(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}3}\) Black has to reckon with 45 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{e}}5}\).

The strongest move is the calm advance of the rook's pawn.

43 ... h5!

After 44 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}5}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}4!}\) or 44 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}4}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}4!}\) in the endgame Black is a dear tempo to the good compared with the immediate 43...\(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}4}\)? If 44 d7 he wins by 44...\(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}1}\) 45 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}8}\+) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}7}\), when White has no counterplay.

44 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{c}}6}\)

But now the attack on b2 gains in strength.

44 ... \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{e}}2}\)

45 \(\text{\textcolor{blue}{\text{b}}4}\)

45 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}4}\) \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}2}\) 46 d7 \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{h}}7}\) is hopeless for White.

45 ... \(\text{\textcolor{red}{\text{d}}3}\!\)
Black prevents the manoeuvre 46 e7+ h7 47 d5. If 46 e7+ h7 47 b8 the simplest is 47...c4+!

Here the analysis of both sides came to an end. Black subsequently allowed his opponent serious counter-chances, but after getting into time trouble, Psakhis did not exploit them.

46 c5 h7?!

46...d2! was stronger.

47 b4! d2

In making his previous move, Yusupov had prepared a blunder: 47...d4??, but at the last moment he noticed that after 48 xd4 xd4 49 d5! the d-pawn cannot be stopped.

Now White loses his b2 pawn, but in return his pieces gain control of the important d5 square and the situation becomes much sharper.

48 b3! xb2+
49 a4 e2

49...e5 was possibly stronger.

50 d5

50 d5 also came into consideration.

50...

50...

51 xf7?

51 d7 was essential. Against this Yusupov was intending 51 h5!, but after 52 d8 x d8 53 x d8 h3 54 f6! h2 55 fxe7 x e7 56 d4+ the outcome is still unclear. However, Psakhis had altogether no time left to work out such variations.

51...

52 b5 xd6

53 h5+?

53 d5 should have been tried.

53...

54 c4 a5

White lost on time.
Flippancy is Punished!

Moving the pieces flippantly, without delving deeply into the play, I was filled with the belief that the just cause (namely, my own) would prevail.

Siegbert Tarrasch

Chistyakov – Dvoretsky
Moscow Championship 1966

Romanovsky – Rabinovich
Leningrad 1924

1 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}5!} \textcolor{blue}{\text{x}g4+} 2 \textcolor{blue}{\text{f}6} \textcolor{blue}{\text{c}4} (otherwise 3 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}5}) 3 \textcolor{red}{\text{h}6!} (White loses after 3 \textcolor{red}{\text{b}2}? \textcolor{blue}{\text{c}2} and 4...\textcolor{blue}{\text{g}2}) 3...\textcolor{blue}{\text{g}4} (3...\textcolor{blue}{\text{c}6+} 4 \textcolor{blue}{\text{g}5}, then \textcolor{red}{\text{g}7} and \textcolor{red}{\text{f}6}) 4 \textcolor{red}{\text{x}g6} \textcolor{blue}{\text{c}6+} 5 \textcolor{red}{\text{g}7} \textcolor{blue}{\text{f}5} 6 \textcolor{red}{\text{e}3} – draw.

Many years later, two readers of my book, K.Reimling and B.Schmidt, rightly pointed out that after 3 \textcolor{red}{\text{b}2} \textcolor{blue}{\text{c}2}? 4 \textcolor{blue}{\text{a}3}! White saves the game. 3 \textcolor{red}{\text{b}2}? is nevertheless a poor move – in view of 3...\textcolor{blue}{\text{c}6+}! 4 \textcolor{blue}{\text{g}5} \textcolor{blue}{\text{c}2} and 5...\textcolor{blue}{\text{g}2+}. That is how mistakes are propagated: Averbakh used Romanovsky’s conclusions without reviewing them critically, and I copied Averbakh’s comments...

In his analysis my opponent had apparently not given any consideration to this position, and I obtained it soon after the game was resumed.

The diagram shows the adjourned position. White will most probably exchange on \textcolor{red}{d7}. Then he will place his rook on the 6th rank and attack the \textcolor{red}{f6} pawn with his king from \textcolor{red}{e7}. Analysis showed that this was a dangerous plan, and therefore I decided, without waiting for the arrival of the white king in my territory, to advance my \textcolor{red}{f}-pawn. Perhaps in this way it would be possible to ease the defence, by exchanging a pair of pawns. 

When there is very little material left on the board, positions that are well known in endgame theory can arise. You should look in a book and seek useful information there. In Yuri Averbakh’s reference work I discovered an ending which became my main guideline when the game was resumed.
41 \( \text{xd7} \)  \( \text{xd7} \)
42 \( \text{d2} \)  \( f5 \)
43 \( \text{d8} \)  \( \text{b5} \)
44 \( \text{d6}+ \)  \( \text{h5} \)
45 \( \text{e3} \)  \( \text{f4}+ \)
46 \( \text{f3} \)  \( \text{f1}! \)
47 \( \text{g4}+ \)  \( \text{fxg3} \)
48 \( \text{hxg3} \)  \( \text{h3} \)
49 \( \text{x} \text{a6} \)  \( \text{d7} \)
50 \( \text{e6} \)  \( \text{g4}+ \)
51 \( \text{e} \text{e3} \)  \( \text{c} \text{c8} \)

Obviously the only winning plan is to take the king to \( \text{f6} \), but it is then that the theoretical draw already familiar to us is reached (with colours reversed). At this point I had already mentally awarded myself a half point in the tournament table, and I stopped thinking about my moves.

52 \( \text{d8} \)  \( \text{e6} \)
53 \( \text{d4} \)  \( \text{c8} \)
54 \( \text{d3} \)  \( \text{f5}+ \)
55 \( \text{c4} \)  \( \text{e6}+ \)
56 \( \text{c5} \)  \( \text{c8} \)
57 \( \text{d6} \)  \( \text{f5} \)
58 \( \text{c} \text{c4} \)  \( \text{h3} \)
59 \( \text{e} \text{e5} \)  \( \text{d} \text{d7} \)
60 \( \text{f} \text{f} \text{f} \)  \( \text{h3} \)
61 \( \text{c} \text{c} \text{5} \)

After 61 \( \text{d} \text{d} \text{4} \) \( \text{c} \text{c} \text{8} \) 62 \( \text{d} \text{d} \text{5} \) the position from the Romanovsky-Rabinovich game would have been repeated exactly.

61  \( \ldots \)  \( \text{g} \text{g} \text{4} \)
62 \( \text{e} \text{x} \text{g} \text{5}+ \)  \( \text{f} \text{f} \)
63 \( \text{e} \text{e} \text{5} \)  \( \text{g} \text{g} \text{4} \)
64 \( \text{d} \text{d} \text{4} \)  \( \text{x} \text{g} \text{3}+? \)!

‘Theory’ had ended and it was time to begin thinking. But it was hard to stop after almost twenty ‘blitz’ moves.

The capture of the pawn could well have been delayed (64...\( \text{h} \text{h} \text{3}! \)).

65 \( \text{e} \text{e} \text{5} \)  \( \text{h} \text{h} \text{3} \)

The king is safe if it is in a corner, the colour of which is opposite to that of the bishop (in the given case – at \( \text{h} \text{8} \) or \( \text{a} \text{1} \)). So that in principle 65...\( \text{h} \text{h} \text{4} \) is desirable, but unfortunately after 66 \( \text{f} \text{f} \text{4} \) White wins.

Q 1-22. Where should the bishop move to?

66  \( \ldots \)  \( \text{d} \text{d} \text{7}?? \)

It was essential to move along the \( \text{d} \text{1}–\text{h} \text{5} \) diagonal: 66...\( \text{d} \text{d} \text{1}(\text{e} \text{e} \text{2})?! \), in order to keep control of the \( \text{f} \text{3} \) square.

67 \( \text{g} \text{g} \text{3}+ \)  \( \text{h} \text{2} \)
67...\( \text{h} \text{h} \text{4} \) 68 \( \text{g} \text{g} \text{7} \) \( \text{e} \text{e} \text{8} \) 69 \( \text{h} \text{h} \text{7}+ \) \( \text{h} \text{5} \) 70 \( \text{h} \text{8} \) – zugzwang.

68 \( \text{f} \text{f} \text{3} \)

I had overlooked this simple move, which in fact is not surprising, if from a serious game you switch to ‘blitz’. With the king shut in the ‘dangerous’ corner, White wins easily.

68  \( \ldots \)  \( \text{a} \text{a} \text{4} \)
69 \( \text{g} \text{g} \text{2}+ \)  \( \text{h} \text{3} \)
70 \( \text{g} \text{g} \text{3}+ \)  \( \text{h} \text{2} \)
71 \( \text{f} \text{f} \text{2} \)  \( \text{c} \text{c} \text{2} \)
72 \( \text{c} \text{c} \text{3} \)  \( \text{b} \text{b} \text{1} \)
73 \( \text{c} \text{c} \text{1} \)  \( \text{d} \text{3} \)
73...\( \text{a} \text{a} \text{2} \) 74 \( \text{c} \text{c} \text{2} \) \( \text{b} \text{b} \text{1} \) 75 \( \text{b} \text{b} \text{2} \).

Black resigns.

Every player has games or game fragments that are especially memorable to him. Normally these are fighting, tense encounters, involving original ideas, unusual dis-
coveries, or interesting circumstances of some kind, or which are of competitive importance. Usually such games are thoroughly studied, and the experience acquired has a significant influence on the player’s subsequent games.
I should like to present to the readers the second half of one such game of mine.

Dvoretsky – Filipowicz
Polanica Zdroj 1973

49

I thought that the adjourned position would be easily won, but analysis did not confirm this evaluation. I devoted most attention to the active move 41...c1d2! After 42 4xf7+ h8 (42...h6? 43 g4!) 43 f3 it is pointless attacking the bishop: 43...d3 44 e3 or 43...d1 44 c5. Essential is 43...h5!, creating the threats of 44...d3 45 e3? e1 mate and 44...d3+ 45 g2 c2. White must play 44 e3 d3 45 e2 d4 46 c1 xg3 47 f5.

Now 47...d3 is not good because of 48 g5 f4+ 49 d1, when the white king escapes from the checks.

47...gxf5 is tempting, having in mind the variations 48 exf5? e4 or 48 g5? g2+ 49 f2+ 50 g3 f4+ 51 h3 f3+ with perpetual check. However, White has a pleasant choice between 48 xf5 g2+ 49 f2+ 50 g3 x5 51 exf5 and 48 x8+ h7 49 xf5+ – in both cases he retains winning chances.

Evidently 47...xa4 48 f8+ h7! is better (but not 48...g7? 49 f6+ x8 50 h6!).

I was lucky: Black sealed a less good move.

41...xa4?
42 xf7+ h8
43 f5 d4
44 f6!

44 g4? is a mistake in view of 44...c5 45 d5 xf2 46 xf2 gxf5 47 xf5 d7!

If 44...c3 there would have followed 45 xd4 exd4 46 e5 d3 47 g4.

45 d5 xf2

45...a4 is more tenacious.

46 xf2 a4
47 e3 h6

If 47...a3 White was intending 48 g4! and only then 49 a7.

48 g7 a3
49 xg6

Threatening mate. 49...xd5 50 exd5 a2 is not possible on account of 51 f7.

49...h7
50 g7+ h8
51 g4?
The elementary 51 \( \texttt{a7!} \) \( \texttt{f8} \) 52 \( f7 \) did not satisfy me. I wanted to win with every comfort — retain my pawn at \( f6 \), without allowing a temporary blockade on the dark squares. In principle, a laudable desire, but unfortunately, anticipating a quick win, I relaxed and stopped checking variations carefully. But the inventive Andrzej Filipowicz did not lose heart, and in a difficult position he found a remarkable defensive resource. 

**Q 1-23. What did my opponent think up?**

Stalemate combinations occur in many studies. And hardly ever in practical games. Enjoy a rare spectacle.

51 ... \( \texttt{d7!} \)  
52 \( g5 \) \( \texttt{h} \) \( \texttt{xg5} \)  
53 \( \texttt{h} \) \( \texttt{xg5} \) \( a2! \)  
54 \( \texttt{xa2} \)  

Not 54 \( \texttt{g6?} \) \( \texttt{xf6}! \) 55 \( \texttt{gxf6} \) \( \texttt{xd5!} \)  
54 ... \( \texttt{xf6!} \)  

Now after 55 \( \texttt{gxf6} \) \( \texttt{d3!} \) the king cannot escape from the 'mad' rook. White is again obliged to get down to work.

55 \( \texttt{f7} \) \( \texttt{a8!} \)  
55...\( \texttt{h5?} \) would have lost immediately to 56 \( g6 \) \( \texttt{g7} \) 57 \( \texttt{f2} \) \( \texttt{e8} \) 58 \( \texttt{f8+} \) \( \texttt{g7} \) 59 \( \texttt{g8+} \) and 60 \( \texttt{f7} \).  
56 \( \texttt{xf6!} \)  

The only move! 56 \( \texttt{e6?} \) did not work: 56...\( \texttt{a3+} \) 57 \( \texttt{e2} \) \( \texttt{xe4} \) 58 \( g6 \) \( \texttt{g5!} \) 59 \( g7+ \) \( \texttt{g8} \). A draw would also have resulted from 56 \( \texttt{gxf6?} \) \( \texttt{a3+} \) 57 \( \texttt{e2} \) \( \texttt{xa2+} \) 58 \( \texttt{f3} \) \( \texttt{g8} \) 59 \( \texttt{g7+} \) (59 \( \texttt{e7} \) \( \texttt{a6} \) 59...\( \texttt{f8} \) 60 \( \texttt{g4} \) \( \texttt{f2} \) 61 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{f4} \) 62 \( \texttt{a7} \) \( \texttt{xe4} \) 63 \( \texttt{f5} \) \( \texttt{b4} \) 64 \( \texttt{e6} \) \( \texttt{b6+} \) or 64 \( \texttt{g6} \) \( \texttt{g4+} \).  
56 ... \( \texttt{a3+} \)  
57 \( \texttt{f2} \) \( \texttt{xa2+} \)  
58 \( \texttt{f3} \)  

White, as they say, has got away with a slight fright. The e5 pawn is lost. Deciding that the conversion of the two extra pawns would be a matter of straightforward technique, I once more relaxed and again stopped looking for accurate moves.

58 ... \( \texttt{a1} \) \( \texttt{g4} \) \( \texttt{g7} \)  
59 \( \texttt{f5} \) \( \texttt{g1} \)  
61 \( \texttt{g6+} \)  

The immediate 61 \( \texttt{a6} \) was stronger, since after 61...\( \texttt{f1+} \) 62 \( \texttt{xe5} \) \( \texttt{g1} \) the white king could have used the e6 square: 63 \( \texttt{f5} \) \( \texttt{f1+} \) 64 \( \texttt{e6} \) with an easy win. But it would have been best of all to adjourn the game now, sealing (but not making on the board) the move 61 \( \texttt{g6+} \). In home analysis it would not have been difficult to decide whether after 61...\( \texttt{f7} \) to move the rook to \( a6 \), or interpose a check at \( f6 \).  
61 ... \( \texttt{f7} \)  
62 \( \texttt{a6?} \) \( \texttt{f1+} \)  
63 \( \texttt{xe5} \) \( \texttt{g1?!} \)  

64 \( \texttt{f5?} \)  

I should have worked out the variation 64 \( \texttt{a7+} \) \( \texttt{g6} \) 65 \( \texttt{e6} \) \( \texttt{b1} \) 66 \( \texttt{e5} \) \( \texttt{b6+} \) 67 \( \texttt{e7} \), and if 67...\( \texttt{f5} \) 68 \( \texttt{f7} \), winning. But I decided to adjourn the game, assuming that it would be possible to repeat moves and only then choose the best plan for converting my advantage. Alas, the repetition of moves did not occur, and the possibility given above was no longer open to me. However, of what significance is all this? Is it
really difficult to win with two extra pawns? There was more than sufficient time for analysis, since by the schedule the next day was free.

The tournament organisers had organised for the guests a highly interesting excursion to Zemla Kłodzka – a picturesque mountain region of Poland, where the resort of Polanica Zdroj is situated. Had I realised what difficulties I would encounter in the analysis of the adjourned game, I would have remained in the hotel. Unfortunately, the entire game was conducted by me in a light-hearted way. I decided to go, as I was sure that in the bus, using my pocket set, I would quickly work out a way to win. On the excursion with every hour I became increasingly nervous, and paid increasingly less attention to the local sights – I simply could not find a win. By the evening, when we returned home, a solution had still not been found. On the other hand, after clambering about in the mountains I had contrived to get badly chilled, and my temperature began rising quickly. Before going to sleep I apparently managed to discover a winning plan.

By the morning my temperature was over the 39 degrees mark and I was no longer up to checking the analysis. Even so, I decided not to ask the tournament arbiter to postpone the morning adjournment session, since I decided that for my health the best thing would be to rid myself as soon as possible of the burden of the adjournment.

64  ...  \xf1+
65  @e5  @e1!

The rook does not return to g1, in order to avoid the variation given above. Evidently 65...@b1! was equally good.

66  g6+  @g7
67  @d5  @d1+
68  @e6  @g1!

After 68...@b1 there follows 69 e5 @xg6 70 @e7+, and if 70...@f5 71 e6 @b7+ 72 @f8 @f6 73 e7+. And 68...@xg6

69 @e7+ @g7 70 e5 @b1 71 @a7 @b6 72 e6 @b8 would have led to a well-known theoretical position, which I had in fact chosen as a reference-point.
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Nothing is achieved, of course, by either 1 @d7? @a8, or 1 @d7? @f6 2 e7 @f7. Also premature is 1 @a1? @b7+ 2 @d8 @b8+ 3 @c7 @b2 4 @f1 @a2! 5 e7 @a7+ with a draw, since the enemy rook succeeds just in time in beginning checks from the 'long side'.

To win White needs to lose a tempo – to give his opponent the move.

1 @d6+! @f6. 1...@g6 2 @a1; 1...@g8 2 @c7; 1...@f8 2 @d7 @e8 3 @a1 @e7+ 4 @d6 @b7 5 @a8+ @g7 6 @e7.

2 @d7! @g7 3 @e7! Zugzwang! If 3...@b1 White wins by 4 @a8!

Q 1-24. In what way does Black's natural king move worsen his position?

3...@g6 4 @a1! @b7+ 5 @d8 @b8+. 5...@f6 6 e7 @b8+ 7 @c7 @e8 8 @d6 @b8 9 @f1+ @g7 10 @c7 @a8 11 @a1!

6 @c7 @b2 7 @e1! This is the whole point. With his king at g7 Black would have had the reply ...@f8.

7...@c2+ 8 @d7 @d2+ 9 @e8 @a2 10 e7 and wins.
The cunning move 68...\( \text{g1} \)! forces the rook to abandon its good position on the 6th rank, since in the event of 69 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{e1} \) 70 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{e2} \) 71 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{e1} \) it is not apparent how White can strengthen his position further. However, I had seen this far in my analysis.

69 \( \text{a7+} \) \( \text{xg6} \)
70 \( \text{e5} \)

Q 1-25. Can Black save this position?

After making my move, I went cold (not the worst thing to do when you have a high temperature), on noticing a 'hole' in my analysis – 70...\( \text{e1} \)! Readers have already encountered this idea, although in a slightly different form (remember the note to White's 56th move of the game Schubert-Dolmatov from the chapter on traps, p.20). Here this leads to an immediate draw, e.g. 71 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{f5} \) 72 \( \text{f7+} \) \( \text{g6} \) 73 \( \text{e6} \) (73 \( \text{f6+} \) \( \text{g7} \) 74 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{a1} \) 73...\( \text{d1+} \) and then \( \text{a1} \), and the black rook seizes the 'long side'. If 71 \( \text{a5} \) there follows 71...\( \text{b1} \), and the white rook can no longer cover its king against checks. And if 71 \( \text{a8} \), then 71...\( \text{g7} \) 72 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{f7} \) or 72 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{a1} \). Fortunately, it all ended happily - my opponent missed his chance.

70 ... \( \text{b1} \)!
71 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{b67} \)!

The resistance would have been prolonged slightly by 71...\( \text{b8} \) 72 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{g7} \), obtaining the position in diagram 52, in which the white king has to describe a triangle: 73 \( \text{d6+} \) \( \text{f6} \) 74 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{g7} \) 75 \( \text{e7} \) etc.

72 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{b8} \)

No better is 72...\( \text{f5} \) 73 \( \text{a5+} \) \( \text{g6} \) 74 \( \text{a1} \), or 72...\( \text{g7} \) 73 \( \text{a8} \).

73 \( \text{a1} \) \( \text{b7} \)
74 \( \text{d8} \) \( \text{b8} \)
75 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{b2} \)
76 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{c2} \)
77 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{d2} \)
78 \( \text{e8} \)

Black resigns.

Thus the plan chosen by White proved to be faulty. Meanwhile, after the game Filipowicz remarked that in analysis he too had not seen how he could be defeated. On returning to Moscow, I apparently found the solution and gave it in my annotations to the game in the magazine Shakhmaty v SSSR. However, here too a dubious point was later discovered.

At one of the training sessions I showed this ending to Alexander Belyavsky. The Lvov grandmaster is a passionate and excellent analyser. It is only thanks to him that I can now demonstrate a reliable plan, leading (within thirty and a bit moves!) to a win in this 'easily won' position.
We now know that 66 g6+? will not do. 66 \textit{a}7+? also does not work: 66...\textit{g}6 67 \textit{d}5 \textit{xg}5 68 \textit{e}5 \textit{f}5! 69 \textit{f}7+ \textit{g}6 70 \textit{e}6 \textit{a}1. First the pawn has to be advanced to e5, and for this the rook has to be posted at f6.

66 \textit{f}6+! \textit{g}7 67 \textit{f}5 \textit{f}1+ 68 \textit{e}6 \textit{g}1 69 \textit{e}5. If now 69...\textit{xg}5, then White wins by exploiting the poor position of the black rook: 70 \textit{f}1 \textit{g}8 (70...\textit{g}6+ 71 \textit{e}7 \textit{a}6 72 \textit{g}1+; 70...\textit{h}5 71 \textit{d}6 \textit{g}5 72 \textit{a}1, but not 72 \textit{e}6? \textit{a}5 with a draw) 71 \textit{d}6! (after 71 \textit{f}6? \textit{g}7 72 \textit{e}6 Black is saved by stalemate: 72...\textit{f}8 73 \textit{a}1 \textit{f}7+!) 71...\textit{g}7 72 \textit{e}6 (72 \textit{a}1 is also strong) 72...\textit{a}7 73 \textit{e}7 \textit{a}6+ 74 \textit{e}5 \textit{a}8 75 \textit{f}6 \textit{a}6+ 76 \textit{g}5 \textit{a}6 77 \textit{g}6 followed by \textit{e}1 or \textit{f}6–d6–d8.

69...\textit{a}1! is more tenacious. Now nothing is achieved by the obvious switching of the rook to the d-file, e.g. 70 \textit{f}2 (70 \textit{f}7+ \textit{g}6 71 \textit{d}7 \textit{a}6+ comes to the same thing) 70...\textit{g}6 71 \textit{d}2 \textit{a}7! 72 \textit{d}7 \textit{a}6+ 73 \textit{e}7 (73 \textit{d}6 \textit{a}7) 73...\textit{xg}5 74 \textit{e}6 \textit{g}6 75 \textit{d}6 (75 \textit{d}1 \textit{a}7+) 75...\textit{a}8! with a well-known theoretical draw. There is no win by either 72 \textit{d}8 \textit{a}6+ 73 \textit{e}7 \textit{xg}5, or 72 \textit{d}6 \textit{xg}5 73 \textit{e}6 \textit{f}6 74 \textit{f}2+ \textit{g}7, or, finally, the attempt to play for zugzwang: 72 \textit{d}1 – here Black has the good reply 72...\textit{a}5!, not allowing 73 \textit{e}7.

Let us try advancing the pawn to e6.

70 \textit{d}6 (in the afore-mentioned commentary in the \textit{Shakhmaty v SSSR} magazine I considered 70 \textit{d}5) 70...\textit{d}1+. The game ends more quickly after 70...\textit{a}6+ 71 \textit{d}5 \textit{a}5+ 72 \textit{e}4 \textit{a}4+ 73 \textit{f}5 \textit{a}5 74 \textit{g}6+ \textit{f}7 75 \textit{d}6 \textit{e}7 (75...\textit{a}7 76 \textit{d}7+ \textit{xd}7 77 \textit{e}6+) 76 \textit{f}6, when the g-pawn alone is now sufficient for a win.

71 \textit{e}7 \textit{a}1 72 \textit{e}6 \textit{a}7+.

Now we will try to advance the e-pawn further. But first the king must take shelter against the checks.

73 \textit{d}6 \textit{a}6+ 74 \textit{e}5 \textit{a}5+ 75 \textit{f}4 \textit{e}4+ 76 \textit{f}5 \textit{a}5+. If 76...\textit{a}7, then 77 \textit{g}4 \textit{e}7 78 \textit{h}4! (an excellent ‘loss of a tempo'; nothing is achieved by 78...\textit{h}5 \textit{e}8 79 \textit{f}7+ \textit{g}8) 78...\textit{e}8 (78...\textit{a}7 79 \textit{f}4 and 80 \textit{e}4) 79 \textit{h}5 \textit{h}8+ (79...\textit{e}7 80 \textit{f}7+) 80 \textit{g}4 \textit{e}8 81 \textit{f}5 \textit{e}7 82 \textit{g}6.

77 \textit{g}4 \textit{e}5. If 77...\textit{a}4+ it is wrong to play 78 \textit{h}5? \textit{e}4 79 \textit{f}7+ \textit{g}8 80 \textit{e}7 \textit{f}8, or 79...\textit{g}6+ \textit{h}7 80 \textit{h}6+ \textit{g}8! 81 \textit{f}6 \textit{g}7 with a draw. Correct is 78 \textit{f}4 \textit{a}1 79 \textit{e}4 \textit{g}1+ 80 \textit{f}4 \textit{f}1+ 81 \textit{g}3 (81 \textit{e}5 is also possible) 81...\textit{f}8 82 \textit{e}7+ \textit{e}8 83 \textit{g}4, and the g-pawn cannot be stopped. If 77...\textit{a}7 or 77...\textit{a}1, then 78 \textit{f}4 is also decisive.

78 \textit{f}4 \textit{e}1 79 \textit{f}5 \textit{f}1+ 80 \textit{e}5 \textit{e}1+ 81 \textit{d}6 \textit{d}1+ 82 \textit{c}7 \textit{c}1+ 83 \textit{d}7 \textit{a}1 84 \textit{e}7. Only one step remains.

Meanwhile, in the position from the last diagram it is also possible to shelter from the checks in another way – by approaching the rook with the king.

73 \textit{d}8 \textit{a}8+ 74 \textit{c}7 \textit{a}7+ (otherwise White will immediately play his pawn to e7, thereby avoiding the tiring journey with his
king to the right flank and then back again)
75 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{a1} \) (75...\( \text{e7} \) 76 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{e7} \) 77 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{a6+} \) 78 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{e7+} \) 79 \( \text{d8} \) \( \text{a8+} \) 80 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{a7+} \) 81 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{e7} \) 82 \( \text{d5} \) etc.) 76 \( \text{f7+} \) \( \text{g6} \) 77 \( \text{d7f} \) (77 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{e1} \) 78 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{xg5} \) and 79...\( \text{f6} \), or 78 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{f5} \) with a draw) 77...\( \text{e1} \) 78 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{f7} \) 79 \( \text{g6+} \) \( \text{xg6} \) 80 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{f7} \) 81 \( \text{d8} \). Or 75...\( \text{a8} \) 76 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{e8} \) 77 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{f8} \) 78 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{e7} \) 79 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{f8} \) 80 \( \text{e4} \) (80 \( \text{g6?} \) \( \text{g8} \) 81 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{f6} \) 82 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{d8+} \) and 83...\( \text{xe6} \) 80...\( \text{f1} \) 81 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{e1+} \) 82 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 83 \( \text{f6+} \) \( \text{e7} \) 84 \( \text{f5} \) and wins.
78...\( \text{a7+} \) 85 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{a6+} \) 86 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{a5+} \) 87 \( \text{c6} \)! \( \text{a8} \) (87...\( \text{e5} \) 88 \( \text{d6} \); 87...\( \text{a6+} \) 88 \( \text{b7} \) 88 \( \text{f5!} \) Incorrect is 88 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{a6+} \) or 88 \( \text{d6?} \) \( \text{f7} \) 89 \( \text{d8} \) \( \text{a6+} \) 90 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{xe7} \)! However, White also wins by 88 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{f7} \) 89 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{e8} \) 90 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{a4} \) 91 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{e4} \) 92 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{xe5} \) 93 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 94 \( g6 \) \( \text{e8} \) 95 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{f8} \) 96 \( \text{f6} \) \( g8 \) 97 \( g7 \).
88...\( \text{a6+} \) (88...\( \text{g8} \) 89 \( g6 \) and 90 \( \text{e5} \) ) 89 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{a5+} \) 90 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{a4+} \) (90...\( \text{a8} \) 91 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{f7} \) 92 \( \text{g6+} \) \( \text{e8} \) 93 \( \text{e4} \) ) 91 \( \text{c5!} \) \( \text{a5+} \) 92 \( \text{b6!} \) \( \text{a8} \) 93 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{f7} \) 94 \( \text{g6+} \) \( \text{e8} \) 95 \( g7 \) \( \text{f7} \) 96 \( \text{e8\#} \).

Phew! None of this difficult work would have had to be done, if I had been more serious and self-disciplined during the game. However, the work was not altogether in vain, and it aided the development of my endgame education. Now, even if I am woken up in the middle of the night, I can immediately demonstrate the theoretical positions and ideas on which the analyses in this chapter are based.

E 1-12
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White to move
Is it Possible to be Excessively Serious?

As long as, like Ariadne's thread, forcing play winds through the labyrinth of variations, one has to move in that direction.

Igor Zaitsev

Early in 1982 a World Championship Zonal Tournament took place in Yerevan. The winner of it became the youngest participant, Artur Yusupov. He gained the first prize with a rapid (only 20 moves) and spectacular win with Black in the last round against grandmaster Viktor Kupreichik.

But before thinking about first place, he had to achieve his first goal: ensure his qualification for the Interzonal Tournament. For this it was very important to gain a win in an adjourned position against one of his rivals – Gennady Kuzmin.

Kuzmin – Yusupov
Zonal Tournament, Yerevan 1982
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Yusupov chose a good moment to adjourn the game. Firstly, it was possible that such a clear and convincing way of converting Black’s advantage would be found, that Kuzmin would have to resign without resuming. Secondly, apart from the sealed move 44...\textit{h}4+ his opponent would also have to analyse 44...\textit{e}1 (after which the only reply is 45 \textit{h}3).

44 \ldots \textit{h}4+
45 \textit{g}1

How should the exchange of rooks by 45...\textit{f}4 46 \textit{b}1 \textit{e}3 47 \textit{x}e3 \textit{xe}3 48 \textit{h}2 \textit{f}4 49 \textit{b}3l (with the idea of 50 \textit{f}3) be evaluated? It is not easy to give a definite reply. It is possible that subsequently White will have to sacrifice his knight. If in this case Black retains his g-pawn, he wins easily, of course. But according to theory the position with rook and g2 pawn against queen and h-pawn is a draw.

If Black wishes to exchange rooks, he can do this at any point. It is more logical to play for an attack.

45 \ldots \textit{e}1+
46 \textit{f}2 \textit{a}1

How should White parry the threat of 47...\textit{h}4+?

After 47 \textit{b}8+ \textit{h}7 48 \textit{f}8 Black has the very strong 48...\textit{e}7! If 47 \textit{f}3 there follows 47...\textit{a}2! (with the threat of 48...\textit{h}2), after which the following variations are possible:

48 \textit{bd}6 \textit{h}5! 49 \textit{ed}4 \textit{f}6+ 50 \textit{f}4 \textit{b}2; 48 \textit{e}6 \textit{h}5! 49 \textit{e}8+ (49 \textit{e}2 \textit{f}6+ 50 \textit{e}3 \textit{a}4! 51 \textit{x}h5 \textit{e}5+ 52 \textit{f}2 \textit{xh}5 53 \textit{h}3 \textit{h}4) 49...\textit{h}7 50 \textit{e}2 \textit{a}1 (weaker is 50...\textit{f}6+ 51 \textit{f}4 \textit{c}6+ 52 \textit{e}4) 51 \textit{g}3 \textit{g}4+ 52 \textit{f}2 \textit{h}4 53 \textit{e}2 \textit{f}5+ 54 \textit{f}3 \textit{b}1;

48 \textit{g}6 \textit{a}4 (but not 48...\textit{h}2 49 \textit{e}4 \textit{h}5+ 50 \textit{g}4 \textit{xg}2? 51 \textit{d}8+ \textit{h}7
52 \( \text{Qf6+! gxg6 53 \text{Ad7+}} \) 49 \( \text{We2 We7+}. \)
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It gradually became clear that it was not possible to breach the opponent’s defences by attacking only with queen and rook. After all, the white king is defended by three pieces. Not long before the zonal tournament Yusupov and I had analysed his adjourned game against Psakhis (cf. the chapter ‘Even grandmasters make mistakes’ p.49). There Black was able to gain an important tempo by the calm advance of his rook’s pawn. The experience of previous analyses, and associations with already known ideas often help when seeking a solution. Let us also try here (in the diagram position) the very same move.

47 ... \( \text{h5!} \)

Now the threat of ...\( \text{Wf4+} \) gains considerably in strength. In the majority of variations one and the same position arises: 48 \( \text{Af3} \) (48 \( \text{ Axe2 Wf4+ 49 Af3 Wc1; 48 e1 Wf4+ 49 Af3 Wd2+ 50 Ae2 Wc1} \) 48 ...\( \text{Wd4+ 49 Ae3 Wd2+ 50 Ae2 Wc1} \). There can follow: 51 \( \text{Ee8+ (51 Axe5 Wh5 Ef1+ 52 Ae3}\) \( \text{Aa3+; 51 Axe3 h4; 51 Ef5 Wg1+ 52 Ef3}\) \( \text{Aa3+ 53 Ef4 Wc1+) 51...Wh7 52 Axe5}\) \( \text{Aa2+ 53 Ae2 Wc5+ 54 Ee1 Wxe2}\) 55 \( \text{Af6+} \) (after 55 Exe2 Wh5 the white rook is pinned) 55...gxg6 56 Exe2 Whg1 or 56...\( \text{Wg6} \) with an easy win.

We would probably have restricted ourselves to this, had the game not been of such competitive significance. But qualifying for the Interzonal Tournament is an important matter, and on this occasion our approach to the analysis was ultra-serious. We decided to check all the defensive resources for the opponent and to extend the forcing variations as far as we could.

48 \( \text{ Ae4!} \)

The only way of not ending up in the position examined above.

48 ... \( \text{Wf6+} \)

49 \( \text{Af3} \) \( \text{Wb2+} \)

50 \( \text{Ee2!} \)

White finally avoids the variations familiar to us (50 \( \text{Ae2 Wc1} \).
50 ... \textit{\texttt{Wb1}}

51 \textit{\texttt{Ke3}}

But not 51 \textit{\texttt{Kf4?}} \textit{\texttt{We1+} 52 \texttt{Qf3 Qa3+} 53 \texttt{Ke3 Wf1+}.}

51 ... \textit{\texttt{We1+}}

52 \textit{\texttt{Qf3 Qa2}}

52...h4 is premature in view of 53 \textit{\texttt{Qg4}}.
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\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
a & b & c & d & e & f & g & h \\
\hline
1 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
2 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
3 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
4 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
5 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
6 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
7 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
8 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Black has tied down the opponent’s forces – White can only move a rook up and down the e-file. Shouldn’t the analysis finally be terminated? No, it is still too early; the winning plan must be worked out in detail.

53 \textit{\texttt{Ke5}} \textit{\texttt{Qg8}}

If 53...h4? White has 54 \textit{\texttt{Qg4}}. First we will bring up the king, place the pawn at g6, and only then play ...h5–h4 – then if \textit{\texttt{Qg4}} there will be the reply ...\textit{\texttt{Qxe2}}.

54 \textit{\texttt{Ke8+}} \textit{\texttt{Qh7}}

55 \textit{\texttt{Ke7}}

Q 1-26. How should Black continue?

The artless 55...\textit{\texttt{Qh6?!}} 56 \textit{\texttt{Qxe6+}} g6? runs into 57 \textit{\texttt{Qxg6+}}! Black must play for zugzwang.

55 ... \textit{\texttt{Kb2!}}

56 \textit{\texttt{Ke8}}

If 56 \textit{\texttt{Qxe5}} we were intending 56...\textit{\texttt{Qb3+}} 57 \textit{\texttt{Qe3 Wf1+}} 58 \textit{\texttt{Qg3 Wxe2?!}} 59 \textit{\texttt{Qxg7+}} \textit{\texttt{Qxg7}} 60 \textit{\texttt{Qxb3 Wf5+}}. This ending, as mentioned earlier, could be drawn, but for this the white pieces must occupy secure positions: rook at f3 and king at h2 or f2. Here, however, Black wins easily, e.g. 61 \textit{\texttt{Qf2 Qd4+}} 62 \textit{\texttt{Qe3 Qg6}} 63 \textit{\texttt{Qe2 h4!}} and if 64 \textit{\texttt{Qf3}} he has 64...\textit{\texttt{Qg1}}.

Subsequently K.Remling discovered a quicker way to win: 58...h4+! 59 \textit{\texttt{Qh2 Qb1}}, or 59 \textit{\texttt{Qxh4 Qxe3}} (59...\textit{\texttt{Wf2+}}) 60 \textit{\texttt{Qxe3 Wf2+}} 61 \textit{\texttt{Qg3 Wxe2}}.

56 ... \textit{\texttt{g6}}

57 \textit{\texttt{Qe7+}}

57 \textit{\texttt{Qe7+ Qh6}} 58 \textit{\texttt{Qh8+ Qg5}} is hopeless for White. If 57 \textit{\texttt{Qe6}} Black successfully concludes his plan: 57...h4! (with the threat of 58...\textit{\texttt{Wf1+}} 59 \textit{\texttt{Qg4 Wxg2+}}) 58 \textit{\texttt{Qg4 Qxe2}}! 59 \textit{\texttt{Qxe2 Qg3}} mate.

57 ... \textit{\texttt{Qh6}}

58 \textit{\texttt{Qe6}}

The final problem. There is no time for the planned 58...h4 in view of the familiar stroke 59 \textit{\texttt{Qxg6+}}!

58 ... \textit{\texttt{Wh1+}}

After this subtle maneuvre White’s defence collapses. 59 \textit{\texttt{Qf4 Wh1+}} 60 \textit{\texttt{Qg3 Qf2+}} is not possible. If 59 \textit{\texttt{Qf2}} Black wins by 59...\textit{\texttt{Qb1}}! 60 \textit{\texttt{Qg3}} (60 \textit{\texttt{Qf4 Wh4+}} 61 \textit{\texttt{Qg3 Wh2+}} 62 \textit{\texttt{Qf3 Wh1+}}) 60...\textit{\texttt{Wh1+}} 61 \textit{\texttt{Qf3}} h4. And if it were Black to move he would play 59...h4 60 \textit{\texttt{Qf4}} \textit{\texttt{Qd1+}} 61 \textit{\texttt{Qe2}} (61 \textit{\texttt{Qe2 Qf1+}}) 61...\textit{\texttt{Qxe2}} 62 \textit{\texttt{Qxe2}} g5 63 \textit{\texttt{Qe6 g4+}} 64 \textit{\texttt{Qe3 h3}} 65 \textit{\texttt{Qxh3 Qxh3}}, and the pawn queens.

In one of his articles Bent Larsen asserted that variations that are too long are never correct. Artur and I were concerned, understandably, about whether our twenty-move variation would stand the test during the resumption.

There was an unexpected outcome. Yusupov was informed that his opponent had resigned, without resuming the game.

How can Kuzmin’s decision be explained? It is possible that he mainly considered another sealed move (44...\textit{\texttt{Qe1}}), and there things were even worse for him than
after 44...\texttt{W\textbackslash h4+}. But it is more likely that Kuzmin, after judging his position to be objectively lost, believed that his opponent would conscientiously analyse the adjourned position and find a clear-cut way to win. In this he was right, although in principle one can hardly approve of his decision. No game has yet been saved by premature capitulation.

And what is the reply to the question posed in the heading? Did the position demand such painstaking analysis? It is probable that here various points of view are possible. When pondering over this, the readers will of course take into account not only the ‘resumption’ of the Kuzmin–Yusupov game, but also the experience of the studying and resuming of the adjourned positions examined in other chapters of the book.
The Benefit of ‘Abstract’ Knowledge

I decided that I did not like Max Kelada, even before I had seen him.

Somerset Maugham

Information derived from reference books on the endgame may be of considerable use in the analysis of adjourned games – we have already seen several examples of this. But endgame theory does not consist only of a collection of specific, accurately analysed positions. A highly important component of the theory comprises general rules, typical plans and evaluations, and characteristic playing procedures. **Specific information, if it is not processed and interpreted, merely overloads the mind, whereas general, systematic information enriches our understanding of the game.** A profound knowledge of general principles significantly simplifies the finding of a solution, both in the analysis of adjourned positions, and also directly at the board.

**Alexandria – Litinskaya**
Women’s Candidates Match, 4th game, Vilnius 1980

![Chess Board Diagram]

The diagram position shows the adjourned position (after Black’s obvious sealed move 41...\(\textit{R}c8-f8\)). At first sight it seems roughly equal, as the drawing tendencies of opposite-colour bishops are well known. However, a straightforward analysis shows that after 42 \(\textit{d}d2 \textit{f}f4\) White encounters serious difficulties, since her pawns are vulnerable, and the opponent’s pieces are very active. Here are some variations examined by Nana Alexandria and her trainers immediately on returning to the hotel after the game was adjourned.

43 \(\textit{c}c2 \textit{f}f7 44 \textit{f}f3 \textit{b}b6 45 \textit{e}e2 (45 a5 \textit{a}xa5 46 \textit{c}c5 \textit{b}b6 47 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xc}6)\) 45...\(\textit{xa}4 46 \textit{xe}5 \textit{xc}6\). Black is a pawn up and has quite good winning chances.

43 \(\textit{c}c2 \textit{f}f7 44 \textit{d}d5 \textit{b}b6! 45 \textit{a}a2 \textit{f}d4!\) and Black has an obvious advantage.

43 g5 h\(x\)g5 (stronger than 43...h5) 44 \(\textit{c}c2 \textit{f}f7 45 a5 (45 \textit{d}d5 \textit{b}b6) 45...g4, and it is not easy for White to hold the f2 point.

43 a5 \(\textit{c}c7!\) (weaker is 43...\(\textit{x}g4 44 \textit{d}d3)\) 44 \(\textit{d}d5 \textit{c}c3!\) (but not 44...\(\textit{x}g4? 45 \textit{d}d3 followed by 46 \(\textit{b}b3\) or 46 \(\textit{f}f3)\).

We split up and went to our own rooms, without in fact finding a reliable way to draw, and without deciding which plan of defence should be adopted. Now each person on their own had to seek a way of out a difficult position.

The time was already late. Usually I don’t analyse through the night, since with a fresh brain the following morning things always move more quickly and more effectively. On this occasion I nevertheless decided to work for another half hour or so before going to sleep. And I very soon arrived at the correct reply.
Of all the moves in the variations examined above, one might have doubts about any of them, apart from the first – 42 \( \text{c2.} \)

However, this natural move definitely did not appeal to me from the very start, back in the tournament hall, when Alexandria was filling in the envelope, and her opponent was preparing to insert her scoresheet in it. Analysing my feelings later, I realised that they were based on my knowledge of the nature of the play with opposite-colour bishops. In my time I had made a thorough study of this type of position.

If there are no other pieces on the board apart from the opposite-colour bishops and the kings, the weaker side should normally defend passively, aiming to set up a ‘fortress’ (the ideas of such endings will be described in more detail in the second part of the book).

On the contrary, when other pieces are present (especially in the middlegame), the main principle is activity, a striving for the initiative, even at the cost of material. After all, the presence on the board of opposite-colour bishops usually strengthens an attack, since the active bishop has no opponent.

According to this principle, the white rook should be aiming to break through into the enemy position to assist its passed pawn. But from the 2nd rank there is nowhere to break through, since the b2 square is guarded by the black bishop.

The idea of 42 \( \text{e1} \) came to mind. 42...\( \text{xf2?} \) 43 \( \text{xd4+} \) is not possible, and if 42...\( \text{c7} \) there can follow 43 \( \text{b1 xf2+} \) 44 \( \text{d1 b6} \) 45 a5! – at the cost of two pawns White activates her rook and gains sufficient counterplay. Unfortunately, it transpired that Black easily refutes this attempt by 42...\( \text{f4!} \). After 43 \( \text{c1} \) there follows 43...\( \text{xf2+} \) 44 \( \text{d1 b6} \), while if 43 a5, then simply 43...\( \text{xg4}. \)

Nevertheless, the idea of activating the rook seemed extremely attractive, and before going to sleep I was able to find the correct way of implementing it. 42 \( \text{g1! f4.} \) If 42...\( \text{c7} \) there follows 43 \( \text{b1}. \)

43 a5! It is essential to deprive the bishop of the important b6 square. Now Black has to choose between 43...\( \text{c7} \) and 43...\( \text{xg4}. \)

1) 43...\( \text{c7} \) 44 \( \text{h1!!} \) It is not often that we encounter an ending in which the king rushes at top speed from the centre into the corner! The decentralisation of the king violates a basic rule of endgame play, but this ‘crime’ has to be committed in order to ensure the activation of the rook. The hasty 44 \( \text{b1?} \) would have lost to 44...\( \text{e4!} \) 45 \( \text{b4 xf2+} \) 46 \( \text{h1 xc6} \) (with the threat of 47...\( \text{d5} \)) 47 \( \text{xe4 xe4} \) 48 \( \text{xe4+ b5}. \)

44...\( \text{xg4}. \) After 44...\( \text{xf2} \) 45 \( \text{b1 b2} \) (45...\( \text{b2} \) 46 \( \text{d1} \)) 46 \( \text{f1 f2} \) 47 \( \text{d1} \) there is no way that the two black pieces can control three open files. 45 \( \text{b1 e4}. \) Otherwise the c6 pawn will become dangerous.

46 \( \text{b4! h4+} \) 47 \( \text{g1 xf2+} \) (47...\( \text{e3} \) 48 \( \text{b7+} \)) 48 \( \text{f1}. \)

White’s next move will be 49 \( \text{xe4}. \) After the exchange of rooks Black will attack the rook’s pawn, and the only way to defend it will be by giving up the c6 pawn. The resulting situation was well known to me from an old analysis (cf. the exercise at the end of the chapter). The passed pawns will be stopped, even if the black king should succeed in crossing to the kingside.

______________________________

see next diagram
Q 1-27. What should White play?
The rock ending is, of course, hopeless. White also loses after 48 \( \textit{Exe4} \) \( \textit{Exe4} \) 49 \( \textit{Exe4} \) \( \textit{xa5} \), and 48 \( \textit{xa4} \) looks too passive. There only remains 48 \( \textit{b7} \) \( \textit{xc6} \) 49 \( \textit{xa7} \) \( \textit{b4} \) All morning I studied this position, but I was unable to establish how real White’s drawing chances were.

All the same, it is clear that 42 \( \textit{g1} \) is better than 42 \( \textit{d2} \) from the practical viewpoint (surprise effect, variations more cut and forcing), on aesthetic grounds, and also, perhaps, objectively. Even so, when we again got together for a joint analysis, a considerable time was spent on a variation suggested by Nana Alexandria: 42 \( \textit{d2} \) \( \textit{f4} \) 43 \( \textit{xc2} \) \( \textit{f7} \) 44 \( \textit{a5} \). She showed that after 44... \( \textit{Exg4} \) 45 \( \textit{d5} \) \( \textit{f4} \) 46 f3 \( \textit{g5} \)! Black retains excellent drawing chances. However, in the end it was established that by continuing 44...e4! 45 \( \textit{e1} \) \( \textit{Xg4} \) 46 f3 \( \textit{g5} \) Black gains a serious advantage.

Then we returned to the plan of 42 \( \textit{g1} \) and soon eliminated the last weak spot in it. Although the recurrent theme of the entire ending is the activation of the white rock, it turns out that in the diagram position (after 47... \( \textit{xe1} \)) it is necessary to forget for a moment about this principle and to play passively: 48 \( \textit{xa4} \)! (In such cases it is usually said that the exception to the rule merely confirms the rule itself.) If 48...a6, then 49 \( \textit{Exe4} \) \( \textit{Exe4} \) 50 \( \textit{Exe4} \) \( \textit{xa5} \) 51 \( \textit{d3} \) \( \textit{b6} \) 52 \( \textit{c7} \). After 48... \( \textit{xc6} \) there follows 49 \( \textit{xe4} \) (dangerous is 49 \( \textit{xe4} \) \( \textit{Exe4} \) 50 \( \textit{xe4} \) \( \textit{b5} \) 51 \( \textit{xe1} \) \( \textit{xa5} \)) 49... \( \textit{xe4} \) (49... \( \textit{b5} \) 50 \( \textit{c6+} \) 50 \( \textit{xe4} \) \( \textit{xa5} \) 51 \( \textit{e7} \) with a draw. There only remains 48... \( \textit{c3} \) 49 \( \textit{a6} \) \( \textit{xc6} \) 50 \( \textit{Exe4} \) \( \textit{Exe4} \) 51 \( \textit{xe4} \) \( \textit{d6} \) 52 \( \textit{g2} \) \( \textit{e5} \) 53 \( \textit{f3} \) \( \textit{f6} \). I invite the readers to check independently the variations 54 \( \textit{c6} \) \( \textit{g5} \) 55 \( \textit{e8} \) \( \textit{h4} \) (with the threat of 56... \( \textit{g5} \)) 56 \( \textit{g6} \) and 54 \( \textit{g4} \) \( \textit{g6} \) 55 \( \textit{c6} \) \( \textit{h5} \) 56 \( \textit{g3} \) (56 \( \textit{f3} \) \( \textit{g5} \) 57 \( \textit{e8} \) \( \textit{g4} \) 58 \( \textit{f4} \) \( \textit{d2} \) 59 \( \textit{e4} \) \( \textit{g5} \)) 56... \( \textit{e1} \) 57 \( \textit{g2} \)!
\( \texttt{e7} (57...g5 58 \texttt{e8}) 58 \texttt{f1}! \) Although a certain accuracy is required of White, a draw is nevertheless attainable.

The plan of defence chosen by us came as a complete surprise to Marta Litinskaya. She thought for a long time, and then played in the most harmless fashion.

\[ 42 \texttt{g1}!! \texttt{c7}?! \]
\[ 43 \texttt{xb}1 \texttt{xf2}+ \]
\[ 44 \texttt{h}1 \texttt{b}8 \]
\[ 44...\texttt{b}6 45 \texttt{a}5. \]
\[ 45 \texttt{d}1 \]

Analysis showed that after 45 \texttt{xb}7+ \texttt{xb}7 46 cxb7 the ending was drawn. Alexandria preferred a different way, trying to provoke her opponent into complications.

\[ 45 \ldots \texttt{d}8 \]
\[ 45...\texttt{c}8?! \] came into consideration, and if 46 \texttt{d}7 \texttt{b}1+ 47 \texttt{h}2 \texttt{g}1+.

\[ 46 \texttt{b}1 \texttt{b}8 \]
\[ 47 \texttt{d}1 \texttt{d}8 \]
\[ 48 \texttt{b}1 \texttt{Draw.} \]

Let us return once more to the question of the study of general chess laws, and playing procedures and methods. Any experienced player knows that when in the tournament hall he looks for the best move, calculates variations, or works out possibilities of attack and defence, he hardly ever remembers about the abstract principles operating in the given position. And only later, when thinking about the game, can he draw a correspondence between its concrete content and the laws which appeared during the play. Why then study general rules and principles, if when looking for a solution at the board we do not make direct use of them?

The point is that abstract knowledge both in chess, and in other walks of life, has a quite different purpose. It should not be used at all directly. A deep familiarity with general principles, procedures and methods enriches and sharpens our intuition. During a game this perception suggests to us moves which are in accordance with the laws operating in the position, as well as evaluations of the various possibilities, and helps us to guess where to seek a concrete solution.

That is what happened in the example in question. I did not remember directly the rules for playing positions with opposite-colour bishops, but intuitively I immediately began to have doubts about the natural move 42 \texttt{d}2, which was contrary in spirit to the rules that I had studied. And these doubts significantly facilitated the search for the best defence.
A Difficult Analysis

It is sufficient to deviate by even an inch from the only correct path at its very start, it is sufficient to go astir by even half a foot from this path, and the truth will become unattainable, won’t it?

Arthur Conan Doyle

Our remarks on adjourned positions are coming to an end. We have already seen a number of examples in which the analysis, although not easy, was fascinating, and enabled clear and pretty ways to our goal to be discovered. Alas, this happens by no means always. Frequently one has to engage in a lengthy and tiring clarifying of various small details, and analyse countless variations, as a result obtaining positions that are in no way clearer than the initial one. In such cases each of the opponents (whose opinions regarding the problems facing them usually differ) finds it hard to avoid mistakes in his analysis. Such instances are rarely described on the pages of chess publications — they contain too much that is unclear and confusing, and too little that is spectacular and advantageous for the author. But it is such an analysis that I should now like to describe, so that I would ask the readers to be patient.

Yusupov – Lputian
48th USSR Championship,
Vilnius 1980/81

Black’s rook is occupying the only open file, whereas White’s is passively placed. The activity of the rook is the main principle in the evaluation and playing of rook endings, so that Black’s positional advantage is very significant and may well prove sufficient for a win. White’s hopes of exploiting his far-advanced queenside pawns, by breaking through at some point to the black a6 and c6 pawns, look unrealisable. After all, almost nowhere has White the right to go into a pawn ending. For example, after 41 f3? ²e3 42 ²e1 Black wins not only by 42... ²f4, but also by 42... ²xe1+ 43 ²xe1 ²f4 and then ...g7–g5–g4. After the ex-
changes on g4 the black king will break through to the queenside pawns. This is a typical endgame procedure, known as ‘extending the bridgehead’.

Q 1:28. After briefly weighing up the variations, try to guess (to calculate accurately is practically impossible) which move White should select: 41 \( \text{d2} \) or 41 \( \text{d3} \).

41 \( \text{d2} \) f4

Black chooses the continuation that is the most unpleasant for his opponent. A considerable time was spent analysing another plan, which begins with 41...\( \text{f6} \). In reply White can immediately send his rook on a breakthrough to the enemy pawns: 42 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e3} \) 43 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{d3} \) 44 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 45 \( \text{c8} \) \( \text{xb4} \) 46 \( \text{xc6+} \) \( \text{e5} \) 47 \( \text{xa6} \). But this activity is premature and does not save White. A similar position (with the black pawn at f4 rather than f5, which, apparently, is not important) will be examined later.

It is better for the moment to wait: 42 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{e6} \) (but not 42...g5? 43 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 44 \( \text{f2} \) with a draw) 43 \( \text{b3} \) (not 43 \( \text{e3?} \) in view of 43...\( \text{xe3} \) 44 \( \text{xe3} \) f4) 43...g5, and only now to play 44 f3! There can follow 44...g4 45 fxg4 fxg4 46 hgx4 \( \text{g5} \) (46...\( \text{e4} \) 47 \( \text{f3+} \) \( \text{g7} \) 48 g5 and 49 \( \text{f6} \)) 47 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e4} \) (or 47...\( \text{xf4} \) 48 \( \text{e8} \) 48 \( \text{g1} \) (48...\( \text{f4} \) was threatened) 48...\( \text{xf4} \) (48...\( \text{f4} \) 49 \( \text{e3} \) 49 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 50 \( \text{c8} \) \( \text{xb4} \) 51 \( \text{xc6} \).

The white rook has after all penetrated into the opponent’s position. The series of more or less forced moves has ended, and one of the starting positions for further study has been reached. It would appear that White retains quite good chances of saving the game, e.g. 51...\( \text{c4} \) 52 \( \text{xa6} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 53 \( \text{b6} \) (or 53 \( \text{a8} \).

Of the possibilities that were rejected during the analysis, I should mention the following variation: 43 \( \text{f3?} \) (instead of 43 \( \text{b3} \) 43...\( \text{g5} \) 44 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{f4} \) 45 \( \text{b3} \) g5 46 \( \text{d3} \) g4 47 fxg4 fxg4 48 hgx4 (48 g3+ hxg3+ 49 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{e2+} \) 48...\( \text{g4} \) 49 \( \text{e4} \) (threatening 50...\( \text{f4} \) 50 \( \text{g1} \). Now, if he wishes, Black can obtain the diagram position (with the difference that his king will be at g4, not g5) by 50...\( \text{xd4} \) 51 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{xb4} \) 52 \( \text{xc6} \). However, stronger is 50...\( \text{f4} \) 51 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 52 \( \text{e5+} \) \( \text{f6} \) 53 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 54 \( \text{c8} \) \( \text{xb4} \) 55 \( \text{xc6+} \) \( \text{e5} \). After 56 \( \text{xa6} \) it transpires that, compared with the diagram position, White has made one extra move – \( \text{xa6} \), and Black has made two – \( \text{f5} \) and \( \text{e5} \). The difference is obviously in Black’s favour.

42 \( \text{f3!} \)

Passive defence is hopeless: 42 \( \text{d3?} \) \( \text{f5} \) 43 \( \text{d2} \) (43 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e3} \)) 43...g5 44 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{e6} \)
45 \(\text{d}2\) \(g4\) 46 \(\text{hx}g4+\) \(\text{e}xg4\) 47 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{f}5\)
48 \(\text{d}2\) \(f3\)! etc.

42 \ldots \text{e}3
43 \text{e}2 \text{f}5!
44 \text{f}2 \text{d}3
45 \text{e}5+! \text{f}6
46 \text{e}8

Now we can at last make a comparison between 41 \(\text{d}2\) and 41 \(\text{d}3\). After 41
\(\text{d}3\) \(f4!\) 42 \(\text{d}2\) (42 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{e}3\) 42...\(\text{f}5\) 43 \(\text{e}3\) 44 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{d}3\) 45 \(\text{e}5+\) \(\text{h}6\) 46 \(\text{e}8\)
the same position is reached as in the game, but the white king is still at \(f1\), not \(f2\).

This difference, which at first sight seems minimal, proves decisive, since at \(f1\) the
king is badly placed. Let us continue the variation: 46...\(\text{x}d4\) 47 \(\text{c}8\) \(\text{xb}4\) 48
\(\text{x}c6+\) \(\text{e}5\) 49 \(\text{xa}6\) (incidentally, remember
at this point what happened with us after
41 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{f}6\) 42 \(\text{f}3\)? \(\text{e}3\) 43 \(\text{e}2\) 49...\(\text{d}4!\) 50 \(c6\) (no better is 50 \(\text{c}6\) \(\text{e}4\)
51 \(\text{a}6\) \(\text{b}4\) 50...\(\text{e}3\) 51 \(\text{e}g1\) \(\text{c}4\) 52 \(\text{b}6\)
d4 53 \(\text{xb}5\) (53 \(\text{a}6\) \(\text{d}5\) 54 \(\text{a}7\) \(\text{d}5\) 55 \(\text{b}8\) \(\text{f}6\)
\(d1\) \(\text{h}2\) \(\text{f}2\) 53...\(\text{x}c6\) 54 \(\text{b}6\)
(after 54 \(\text{e}5+\) \(\text{d}2\) the win is simple)
54...\(\text{c}1+\) 55 \(\text{h}2\) \(d3\) 56 \(\text{e}6+\) \(\text{f}2\)
57 \(\text{d}6\) \(\text{e}2\) 58 \(\text{e}6+\) \(\text{d}1\) 59 \(\text{a}6\) \(\text{f}1\)
60 \(\text{g}1\) \(d2\). White is one tempo short; he
would have gained a draw, had he managed
to play \(\text{f}2\) and \(\text{c}6\).

Did you guess the move 41 \(\text{d}2!!\) ? If in so
doing the thought occurred to you that if
41...\(f4!\) it would be good to have the
possibility of immediately replying 42 \(\text{f}3\)
\(\text{e}3\) 43 \(\text{e}2\), then you have certainly
displayed a subtle positional feeling.

Now you will probably cope with the next
task without difficulty.

Q 1-29. How should White have continued, if Black had answered 41 \(\text{d}2\) with
41...\(g6\)?

The answer is clear: for the moment the d3
square is 'mined' (42 \(\text{d}3?\) \(f4!\) 43 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{f}5\)
etc.). Essential is 42 \(\text{d}1!!\) \(f4\) 43 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{e}3\) 44
\(\text{e}1\).

Things would have been more complicated
if Black had tried 41...\(\text{f}4!??\) 42 \(\text{d}3\) \(g6!\)
Then the obvious 43 \(\text{f}3+?\) leads after
43...\(g5\) 44 \(\text{d}3\) \(f4!\) 45 \(\text{d}2\) \(f5\) to that
very position which already we have firmly
resolved to avoid. This means that we must
allow the advance of the black pawns –
43 \(\text{d}2\) \(g5\) 44 \(\text{d}3\) \(g4\) and meet it with
45 \(\text{hx}g4\) \(\text{fx}g4\) 46 \(\text{g}3+!\), after which the
following variations are possible:
46...\(\text{hx}g3\) 47 \(\text{fx}g3+\) \(\text{g}5\) 47...\(\text{f}5\) 48 \(\text{f}2\)
\(\text{e}6\) 49 \(\text{e}3\) 48 \(\text{f}2\) \(\text{f}5\) 49 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{e}7\)
50 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{e}6\) (White appears to be in
zugzwang) 51 \(\text{f}1!!\), and if 51...\(\text{h}6\) the
move 52 \(\text{e}3\) is made with check.

46...\(\text{g}5\) 47 \(\text{gx}h4+\) \(\text{g}h4\) 48 \(\text{g}2\) \(48 \(\text{e}3\)\? \(\text{e}3\) 49 \(\text{f}e3\) \(\text{g}3\) and wins)
48...\(\text{g}5\) (if 48...\(\text{e}1\), then 49 \(\text{e}3\) is now
possible: 49...\(\text{e}3\) 50 \(\text{f}e3\) \(\text{g}3\) 51 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{d}4\)
52 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{e}3\) 53 \(\text{f}3\), and White succeeds in
luring the enemy king to \(h3\) – into a check by
the new queen from \(c6\) 49 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{e}2\)
50 \(\text{h}1!!\) \(\text{d}2\) 51 \(\text{h}8\) \(\text{d}4\) 52 \(\text{c}8\)
\(\text{xb}4\) 53 \(\text{xc}6\). A position, resembling that
which we obtained in the 41...\(\text{f}6\) vari-
ation, has been reached; it is only the
kingside pawns that are arranged slightly
differently (and perhaps more favourably
for White).

Now it is again time to return to that which
occurred in the game.

46 \ldots \(\text{d}2!!\)

This check is better given immediately,
rather than after the mutual elimination of
pawns. In the event of 46...\(\text{x}d4\) 47 \(\text{c}8\)
\(\text{xb}4\) 48 \(\text{xc}6+\) \(\text{e}5\) 49 \(\text{xa}6\) \(\text{b}2+\)
50 \(\text{e}1!!\) there is no time for 50...\(\text{xg}2\) in
view of 51 \(\text{a}8!\) \(\text{d}4\) 52 \(\text{c}6\) \(\text{c}2\) 53 \(\text{a}8\)
\(\text{c}5\) 54 \(\text{d}8!!\), while after 50...\(\text{d}4\) 51 \(\text{c}6\)
\(\text{e}3\) 52 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{d}3\) 53 \(\text{c}1\) White, by
attacking the rook, gains a very important
tempo. Thus, strangely enough, in this
ending the black rook is better placed on
the 4th rank than on the 2nd.
Now White has to choose where to retreat his king. The f1 square was rejected long ago. Of course, 47 $e1$ suggests itself. This is what Yusupov was intending to play, but a few hours before the resumption I discovered a variation which appeared to give Black a forced win.

47 $e1$ $\text{H} \times d4$ 48 $\text{Cc}8$ $\text{H} \times b4$ 49 $\text{H} \times c6+$ $e5$ 50 $\text{H} \times a6$ $d4$ 51 $c6$ (51 $\text{Cc}6$ $a4$ 52 $a6$ $b4$) 51...$e3$ 52 $d1$ $d3$. If now 53 $c1$, then 53...$d4$ followed by 54...$e2$ is decisive. If 53 $e1$ there also follows 53...$d4$, when 54 $b6$ $e3$ 55 $d1$ $d3$ is not possible, while if 54 $c7$, then after 54...$c4$ 55 $b6$ $c7$ 56 $b5$ $c1+$ 57 $f2$ $a1$ Black simply advances his d-pawn and then frees his king from imprisonment by ...$c1$. Such a position would be drawn if the a-pawn could be advanced one square forward, but alas, this is not possible.

After checking the variations, Yusupov agreed with me. And since after 47 $g1$ we did not see a forced loss, it was reluctantly decided to move the king away from the centre of events.

Q 1-30. Find the mistake in our reasoning.

Unfortunately, after 53 $e1$ $d4$ we overlooked the possibility of 54 $\text{H} a8!$ $\text{Cc}4$ 55 $\text{Cc}8$! Here White's pawns are now more dangerous than the opponent's, e.g. 55...$c2$ 56 $a6$ $c3$ 57 $d8$ and wins.

If 53...$c4$ (instead of 53...$d4$), then 54 $b6$ $d4$ 55 $b5$ $c6$ 56 $b6$ the a-pawn succeeds in reaching the 6th rank, guaranteeing White a draw.

As will be seen from what follows, the mistake that I made in the analysis could have cost Yusupov dearly. In such situations players have often reproached their seconds after the game. In my work as a trainer this has never happened. I am convinced that a player should steadfastly take upon himself the responsibility for all the decisions taken as regards choice of opening variation, and plan of action in the game or on the resumption, and himself check the quality of all the recommendations made to him. The trainer at a competition is a consultant, an adviser, but not an instructor. The player himself is concerned more than anyone about the fate of the game, and therefore he usually perceives the situation more deeply and subtly, and is more capable of sensing or guessing a weak point in the analysis than the most conscientious helper.

The players who I have trained have always understood and shared this principle. And as a result there have never been any mutual accusations, capable of disrupting the friendly contact which is so necessary for fruitful work together.

All this does not signify, of course, that the trainer himself, if he makes a mistake, should not feel guilty. On the contrary, in such cases he is obliged to thoroughly consider the reasons for the oversights committed, in order to avoid similar mistakes in the future.

47 $g1$?
48 $c8$ $d4$
48 $c8$ $b4$
50 \ldots \text{c4}

50...d4 also looks tempting. I will give the most important of the variations that were analysed at home.

51 \text{d6!} \text{a4} 52 \text{a6} d3 53 \text{f2!} \text{a1}
54 \text{xd3} \text{xa6} 55 \text{e2!} \text{c6} 56 \text{d7} g5
(56...\text{xc5} 57 \text{g7} \text{d5} 58 \text{g4} b4
59 \text{h4} with the threat of 60 \text{h5+} and
61 \text{xd5}) 57 \text{d3!} (weaker is 57 \text{g7}
\text{d4}) 57...\text{xc5} 58 \text{g7} \text{d6} 59 \text{d4!}
\text{c1} (59...\text{c4+} 60 \text{d3} \text{c5} 61 \text{g5+}
\text{b4} 62 \text{g4}) 60 \text{g5} \text{c6} 61 \text{g6+}
\text{c7} 62 \text{d3!} b4 63 \text{d2} \text{c6} 64 \text{g4} or
63...\text{c4} 64 \text{d3}, and White holds on.

Or 52...b4 53 \text{f2} \text{a2+} 54 \text{e1} b3
55 \text{b6} b2 56 a7 \text{xa7} 57 \text{xb2} \text{d5}
58 \text{d2} \text{xc5} 59 \text{b8!} \text{a2+} 60 \text{d3}
\text{g2} 61 \text{f8!}, and, as was shown by later
verification, White gains a draw.

51 \text{c6} \text{d4!}

We mainly reckoned with 51...\text{d6} 52 \text{b6}
\text{a4!} 53 \text{xb5} \text{xc6} and ascertained that
after 54 \text{b2!} \text{xa5} 55 \text{f2} \text{c5} 56 \text{e2}

White can hold the position, e.g. 56...\text{d4}
57 \text{d2+} \text{c3} 58 \text{d3+} \text{c4} 59 \text{d2} \text{a3}
(59...\text{c5} 60 \text{d1!}) 60 \text{c2+} \text{c3} 61 \text{a2}
d4 62 \text{a4+!} etc. The move in the game is
much more dangerous.

52 \text{a8}

After 52 \text{b6} d3 53 \text{f2} \text{d4} 54 \text{xb5}
\text{xc6} it would appear that White cannot
save the game.

52 \ldots \text{d6}
53 a6 \text{xc6}
54 \text{f1?}

For the a-pawn White will pick up one of the
opponent's two passed pawns. But it is
important to eliminate the b-pawn -- the one
that is further away from the white king and
therefore more dangerous. This could have
been done by 54 a7! \text{a4} 55 \text{c8+} \text{b7}
56 \text{b8+} \text{xa7} 57 \text{xb5}. I do not
guarantee that White can draw here, but
that is what he should have played.

54 \ldots \text{a4}?!

Up to this point Smbat Lputian had
conducted the ending exceptionally strongly,
but now he too begins to go wrong. He
could have kept his b-pawn: 54...\text{b6!}, and
if 55 a7 b4.

55 a7 \text{b6?}

Now the position again becomes drawn.
Meanwhile after 55...b4! it is not easy to
give White any good advice. In the event of
56 \text{b8} \text{xa7} 57 \text{xb4} \text{c5} he does not
have time to take up the defensive position
indicated in the note to Black's 51st move.

56 \text{b8+} \text{xa7}
57 \text{xb5} d3
58 \text{e1} \text{a2}
59 \text{h5} \text{g2}
60 \text{h4} g5
61 \text{g4} \text{g3}
62 \text{d2}

Draw.
Exercises for Analysis

Analysis is an excellent form of training; it develops efficiency, perseverance and stamina, which chess players really need no less than marathon runners.

Lev Polugayevsky

Even when dealing with a specific player, knowing his strength of play and mastery in the calculation of variations, it is not always possible to draw an accurate distinction between problems that he can solve without moving the pieces, and exercises for analysis. For the readers of this book – players of different experience and standards – such a boundary is even more arbitrary. Perhaps some of the exercises given earlier seemed difficult to you, and the reply to them had to be sought by moving the pieces on the board. There is nothing terrible in this, since on the other hand you will have tested your powers in the art of analysis. But for players of very high standard (not lower than the master level) it may possibly be interesting initially to try and solve in your head the first two positions given in this chapter.

Training in analysis (like any form of chess training) should be taken as seriously as possible. Imagine that you are analysing your adjourned game and that your entire tournament fate depends on the outcome of it. Do not be satisfied with the first conclusions drawn; again and again seek possibilities for your opponent, if everything turns out too successfully; or for yourself if, on the contrary, nothing good is found. Do not forget occasionally to go back and seek new ideas in the very first moves. Since the exercises are quite complicated and demand deep calculation, write down the variations you find so as not to forget them, and then you can compare your notes with the answer.

And the main thing: don’t give in, if things seems too difficult, and don’t be disheartened in the event of initial failures. You can learn to analyse well, only by constantly practising analysis.

Psakhis – Yusupov
48th USSR Championship,
Vilnius 1980/81
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In this position, one that is strategically difficult for Black, the game was adjourned, and White sealed his move.

42 \( \text{wa5} \) \( \text{bc7} \)

43 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{wc6} \)

Here Lev Psakhis decided not to change the pattern of the play and chose 44 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{b5} \) 45 \( \text{b4} \). Meanwhile, he could have gone in for the following forcing variation:
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44 <b>Na7</b>  <b>Nxc7</b>  
45 <b>Nf6</b>!  
Of course, not 45...<b>Nf8?</b> 46 <b>Na3</b>! <b>Ng8</b> 47 <b>Ne7</b>.  

46 <b>Nf7</b>+  <b>Nh8</b>  
47 <b>Ne7</b>!  
White does not allow his opponent to consolidate by 47...<b>Nd6</b> and 48...<b>Nf8</b>, and he also deprives the knight of the e2 square in the variation 47...<b>Nb6</b>+ 48 <b>Nf2</b> <b>Nf4</b>+ 49 <b>Ng3</b>. The exchange of queens 47 <b>Nxe8</b>+ 48 <b>Nxe8</b> would probably have led to a draw after 48...<b>d4</b>! and then 49...<b>Nc5</b> (or even 49...<b>Nf4</b>), followed, perhaps, by the pawn sacrifice 50...<b>g5</b> 51 <b>hxg6</b> <b>Ng7</b>.  

47 <b>...<br>b6</b>+  
48 <b>Nf2</b>  
Otherwise it is not possible to avoid the checks.  

48 <b>...<br>Nf4</b>+  
49 <b>Ng3</b>  
50 <b>hxg6</b>  
Of course, not 50 <b>Ne8</b>?! <b>Nf8</b>!  

During the adjournment session Black had to defend a difficult rook ending.  
E 1-16. Would he have been right to go in for this position (with him to move)?  
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Masculo – Yusupov  
World Junior Championship,  
Innsbruck 1977  
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E 1-15. Was Psakhis right not to go in for this position?  

After adjourning his game against the tournament leader Artur Yusupov in a
slightly inferior position, the young Brazilian player then defended excellently during the resumption. It is true that he had to spend rather a lot of time, but the resulting situation (see the diagram) did not appear dangerous, even for a player in time trouble. If 50...\texttt{d}a3, then 51 \texttt{c}c8 followed by 52 \texttt{c}c7+ is possible, while if 50...\texttt{d}d4 51 \texttt{e}e3 (51 \texttt{c}f3 is also good) 51...\texttt{e}e4+ 52 \texttt{f}f3 \texttt{e}e5 53 \texttt{f}f4 \texttt{d}d3+ 54 \texttt{g}g4. Finally, after 50...h5 there is 51 \texttt{d}d7+! \texttt{xd}d7 52 \texttt{xd}d3 \texttt{f}f6 53 \texttt{f}f4 h4 54 \texttt{e}e3, when the draw is obvious.

After lengthy reflection Yusupov made a waiting move, containing an excellent psychological trap.

50 ... h6!

White too could have waited: 51 \texttt{d}d6, but in time trouble one always wants to clarify the position as soon as possible. Especially since, while Yusupov was considering his move, his opponent had of course already worked out the above variation with the rook check at d7.

51 \texttt{d}d7+ \texttt{xd}d7
52 \texttt{xd}d3 \texttt{f}f6
53 \texttt{f}f4

Masculo did not grasp the difference between the positions of the pawn at h5 and h6 and instantly made the move that he had prepared in the event of 50...h5. It was this that Yusupov was counting on. It would have been simpler to retreat his knight to c3, so that after 53...\texttt{e}e8 it could occupy the excellent square e4. It is probable that he would also not have lost after 53 \texttt{e}e3 \texttt{h}h5! 54 \texttt{e}e4 \texttt{f}f6 55 \texttt{d}d5+ \texttt{g}g5 56 \texttt{e}e5. In the game a similar position was reached, but with the black knight at e8, where it does not interfere with the advance of the passed h-pawn.

53 ... \texttt{e}e8!

Threatening 54...\texttt{d}d6.

54 \texttt{e}e4?

As was pointed out by K. Müller, white could have saved the game by playing 54 \texttt{h}h5! \texttt{d}d6 55 \texttt{g}g3 \texttt{f}f6 56 \texttt{h}h5+.

54 ... \texttt{f}f6

It seems to be all over, but the resourceful Brazilian finds a way of continuing the struggle.

55 \texttt{d}d5+ \texttt{g}g5
56 \texttt{e}e5 h5
57 \texttt{f}f4

Here the game was again adjourned.

E 1-17. Analyse the position and work out in detail a way to win, in order to avoid any unpleasant surprises on the resumption.
Part Two

The Endgame

In the first part of the book we have already studied some complicated endings. Each time the aims of the analysis were purely practical. In a limited time we had to organise work on the adjourned position in the best way possible, prepare thoroughly for the coming resumption, and prepare surprises for the opponent. The main attention was given to competitive factors, to the problem of searching for and taking a decision. In stands to reason that each time we pointed out the endgame rules operating in the position, but this aspect nevertheless remained secondary.

Now it will all be the other way round. In analysing some specific endings, we will try in the first instance to expand and deepen our knowledge of endgame theory, only sometimes remembering about competitive factors (they should not be forgotten altogether – after all, this is a no less important aspect of the improvement of a player, than the study of ‘pure theory’).

This exposition certainly has no claims to be complete. My aim is to use a series of interesting examples to show just how fascinating and useful the analysis of endings can be, and how valuable, systematic information can be extracted from the concrete variations discovered.
The King Establishes a Record

In the middlegame the king is a mere ‘observer’,
in the endgame, on the other hand – one of ‘the principals’.
Aron Nimzowitsch

It is customary to begin a discussion about the rules of the endgame with the marked change in the role of the king. In the middlegame, fearing an attack, the king usually hides in the corner of the board behind its pawns and pieces. But in the endgame it becomes a strong fighting unit, quickly heads for the centre, and takes an active part in the battle.

In the first part of the book we have already encountered this very important endgame principle (remember, among others, the analysis of the Akhmylovskaya-Alexandria ending and the exercises in that chapter, p.33). Therefore here I will restrict myself to one specific situation, where the king arrives in time, although at first sight it has no chances of doing so.

Such a situation was first demonstrated by Richard Réti in his famous study: White \( \text{h8, c6} \); Black \( \text{a6, h5} \); White to play and draw. 1 \( \text{g7} \) h4 2 \( \text{f6} \) b6 (2...h3 3 \( \text{e7} \) 3 \( \text{e5} \) c6 (3...h3 4 \( \text{d6} \) 4 \( \text{f4} \), and the king has caught the pawn from which, apparently, it was hopelessly too far back.

Réti’s idea made a very strong impression on his contemporaries, and chess composers have created numerous studies on this theme. But gradually, from being a unique find, the idea has been transformed into a normal technique of using your own passed pawn when chasing an enemy pawn.

In the examples examined below the king manoeuvres are dictated by altogether different motives.

Makarychev – Lerner
47th USSR Championship, Minsk 1979

An unpleasant ending for Black. Konstantin Lerner was unable to gain a draw.
80...f5 81 \( \text{f7}+ \) g6 82 \( \text{f4} \) a5+ 83 \( \text{c6} \) a6+ 84 \( \text{b5} \) a8 85 \( \text{xc4} \) b8+ 86 \( \text{c6} \) f5 87 \( \text{c7} \) h8 88 \( \text{a4} \) e5 89 \( \text{a5}+ \) e4 90 c4 h7+ 91 \( \text{b6} \) h6+ 92 \( \text{b5} \) h8 93 \( \text{a6} \) d4 94 \( \text{d6}+ \) c3 95 c5 b8+ 96 \( \text{b6} \) Black resigns.

The black king was not in fact able to come into play. But where in principle should it have aimed for? It would be good to stand in front of the opponent’s passed pawn. However, after 80...f6 81 \( \text{xc4} \) e6 82 \( \text{c5} \) it is not apparent how to proceed further – the white rook is well placed on the 7th rank. Cutting off the king on a rank in such positions is often even more effective than cutting it off on a file.
A how a bit of theory. *The file, on which a central or bishop's pawn stands, divides the board into two unequal parts – short and long. The defending king should be on the short side, so that the rook can harass the enemy king from the long side. There should be a minimum of three vacant files between the rook and the pawn – only in this case does the pursuit of the opponent's king by the rook have chances of success.*

With regard to the given position this reasoning seems completely abstract – the black king appears doomed to remain on the long side. However, Sergey Dolmatov showed that the transference of the king to the opposite wing, which at first sight appears fantastic, can in fact be achieved.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
80 & \ldots & \text{f6}! \\
81 & \text{xc4} & \text{e5} \\
82 & \text{c5} \\
\end{array}
\]

Nothing is changed by 82 \text{c6} \text{b8}! (preventing 83 \text{b5}) 83 \text{c5} \text{e4}!!, and so on, as in the main variation.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
82 & \ldots & \text{e4}! \\
83 & \text{c4} & \text{d3} \\
84 & \text{d7}+ \\
84 & \text{b5} & \text{b8}+ \text{or} \text{d5} \text{d8}+ \text{is pointless.} \\
84 & \ldots & \text{c3} \\
85 & \text{d5} & \text{b4} \\
86 & \text{c5} & \text{b5} \\
87 & \text{c6} & \text{h8} \\
\end{array}
\]

87...\text{b6} is equally good. The aim has been achieved!

A serious analysis of such endings often gives interesting and instructive results, and helps in the remembering, clarifying or learning of important endgame ideas. As an example we will consider the position arising in this game after White's 85th move.

Let us check whether or not Black can draw here, by approaching with his king.

Q 2-1. Find replies to each of the three king moves.

If 85...\text{f5} White wins by cutting off the king horizontally: 86 \text{c6}!, and 85...\text{f7} also does not work in view of 86 \text{e4}! *In such positions the black rook, with the aim of preventing the advance of the pawn, pursues the white king with frontal checks. The black king must have the possibility of driving the enemy rook from the important e4 square (from where it defends the c4 pawn). From this point of view it is badly placed at f7 – better squares are f6 and f5. Let us examine 85...\text{f6} (intending 86...\text{e7}). Now after 86 \text{e4?} \text{b8}+ the frontal attack leads to a draw, since the black king is occupying the good f6 square. *For a rapid evaluation of such positions there exists a 'rule of five' (however, it has to be used with caution – there is a whole series of exceptions). If the sum of the number of the rank on which the pawn stands plus the number of files separating the black king from the pawn does not exceed five, the position is drawn, while if it is more than five the position is*
won. In the given case the pawn is on the 3rd rank, and the king is cut off by two files. 3+2=5, which means that the position should be a draw.

White should choose 86 \( \text{h}7 \), after which 86...\( \text{h}6 \) 87 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{a}5+ \) 88 \( \text{b}6 \) \( \text{a}1 \) 89 \( \text{c}4 \) is bad for Black.

Let us try Dolmatov’s plan of transferring the king to the other wing: 86...\( \text{e}5! \)? It works in the event of 87 \( \text{c}5? \) \( \text{e}4! \) 88 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{d}3 \) or 87 \( \text{e}6?! \) \( \text{h}8 \) 88 \( \text{c}4? \) \( \text{d}4 \) 89 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 90 \( \text{b}7 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 91 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{h}6 \) with a draw.

In this last variation White can nevertheless win by deferring for the moment the advance of his c-pawn: 88 \( \text{e}7! \) (instead of 88 \( \text{c}4? \) 88...\( \text{f}6 \) 89 \( \text{d}7 \) (89 \( \text{e}3!?) \) 89...\( \text{e}5 \) (89...\( \text{h}4 \) 90 \( \text{d}4 \) and 91 \( \text{c}4 \)) 90 \( \text{d}5+! \) \( \text{e}6 \) (90...\( \text{e}4 \) 91 \( \text{c}4 \)) 91 \( \text{d}6+! \) \( \text{e}5 \) (91...\( \text{e}7 \) 92 \( \text{d}7+ \) and 93 \( \text{c}4 \)) 92 \( \text{c}5! \) \( \text{a}8 \) 93 \( \text{b}6 \), and the move \( \text{c}3-\text{c}4 \) has at last been prepared. This variation, as reported by John Nunn, was found by a computer program, which is able to give an exact analysis of any position with five pieces on the board (and that means any ending with rook and pawn against rook).

However, White refutes the opponent’s idea much more simply, if he remembers about cutting off the king horizontally: 87 \( \text{c}6! \), e.g. 87...\( \text{b}8+ \) 88 \( \text{b}6 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 89 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{d}4 \) 90 \( \text{d}6+ \) and 91 \( \text{c}5 \).

Thus king moves do not save the game. However, it turns out that the position is nevertheless drawn, and 85...\( \text{b}8+! \), as played by Lerner, is the only correct move.

Q 2-2. At what point was the draw missed?

I will give the analysis made by the same computer.

86 \( \text{c}6 \) (86 \( \text{c}5? \) \( \text{f}5! \) 87 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{c}8+ \))

86...\( \text{f}5! \) Both 86...\( \text{c}8+? \) 87 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{d}8+ \) 88 \( \text{e}6 \) and 86...\( \text{f}6? \) 87 \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 88 \( \text{c}5! \) are hopeless.

87 \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{h}8! \) Again the only move! It is important to occupy the h-file. Black loses after 87...\( \text{g}8? \) 88 \( \text{h}4! \) \( \text{e}5 \) 89 \( \text{h}5+ \) and 90 \( \text{c}4 \), or 88...\( \text{g}7+ \) 89 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{g}6+ \) 90 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 91 \( \text{e}4 \). Also incorrect is 87...\( \text{b}3? \) 88 \( \text{d}6! \) \( \text{a}3 \) 89 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{a}5+ \) 90 \( \text{c}5! \) \( \text{a}8 \) 91 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{d}8+ \) 92 \( \text{c}6+ \) \( \text{f}6 \) 93 \( \text{c}7 \) and wins.

88 \( \text{a}4 \) (88 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}5! \) 89 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{h}4 \))

88...\( \text{e}6! \) (instead of 88...\( \text{e}5? \) 89 \( \text{a}5+ \) \( \text{e}4 \) 90 \( \text{c}4! \), as played in the game) 89 \( \text{c}4 \). If 89 \( \text{a}5 \), then 89...\( \text{h}4 \) 90 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{h}7+ \) 91 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{h}8 \).

89...\( \text{h}7+! \) (89...\( \text{h}4? \) 90 \( \text{a}6+ \) and 91 \( \text{c}5 \)) 90 \( \text{c}6(\text{b}6) \) \( \text{h}4! \) White is unable to strengthen his position.

In an analysis of the adjourned 9th game of the match for the women’s world championship Chiburdanidze—Alexandria (Borzhomi/Tbilisi 1981), in one of the variations an interesting ending with opposite-colour bishops was reached.

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

It is clear that White cannot get by without an exchange of pawns on the queenside. Let us check whether this can be carried out immediately.

\[
1 \quad a3 \quad bxa3
\]

White has a choice between 2 \( g4+ \) and 2 \( \text{xa}3 \).
2  g4+  h4
With opposite-colour bishops even two extra pawns are sometimes insufficient for a win, and therefore the immediate transference of the king to the queenside must also be considered.
2...g5 3 xa3 f4 4 b4 e5 5 a4 d6 6 b5 d5 7 f1 d6 8 g2. Black is in zugzwang; any move by her allows the opponent to strengthen her position. For example, 8...f2 9 a6 c7 10 b5 (zugzwang) 10...e3 11 h4 f2 12 h5 e3 13 f3 (again zugzwang) 13...d4 14 g5! fxg5 15 g4 (yet again zugzwang) 15...c5 16 f6 gx6 17 h6 f5 (17...f8 18 h7 g7 19 a7) 18 x5 d4 19 h7 b8 20 b6, then e4, and the king goes to pick up the enemy bishop for the h-pawn. The g5 pawn only gets as far as g3 – the white bishop stops it and defends its b-pawn along the same diagonal (a8–h1) – a very important factor in endings with opposite-colour bishops. But the black bishop was 'torn' along different diagonals – along one it was stopping the b-pawn, and on another it was trying to prevent the creation of a second passed pawn on the kingside. This was why Black time after time ended up in zugzwang.

We should also mention the winning plan for White in the variation in question, one which is typical of opposite-colour bishops. If the weaker side's king stops our passed pawn, we must create a second passed pawn on the other wing, for which we should be prepared to sacrifice one or more pawns.

If Black chooses 8...d2 (instead of 8...f2), then after 9 h4 e1 10 h5 d2 there can follow, for example, 11 c4 e3 12 d3 (only not 12 b5? e5 with a draw) 12...c1 13 d4 b2+ 14 c4 c1 15 b5 e3 16 d3 f2 17 g5! fxg5 18 f6 and wins.

3  xa3  xh3
After 4 e2? g3 5 b4 f4 followed by ...e5 and ...d6 the draw is obvious.
4  ...  xg4
5  b3  f4
6  c4  e5!
7  c5
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It appears that the b-pawn can no longer be stopped. But, as in the rook ending examined earlier, the black king, after completing a forced march through the enemy rear, succeeds in taking part in the defence.

7  ...  f2+
8  c6  d4!!
9  b1  c4
10  b5  b4
11  b6  a5
12  b7  g3
13  d3  h2

The position is drawn (14 d7 b6 15 c8 a7).

II

2  xa3  xg3
3  b4
3 b4 does not change anything.
Now, if Black tries to defend by the plan already familiar to us, the outcome is decided by the h-pawn that White has retained: 3...g5? 4 c4 f4 5 b4 e5 6 c5 f2+ 7 c6 d4 8 b1 c4 9 b5 b4 10 b6 a5 11 b7 g3 12 d3 h2 13 h4 g3 14 h5 f4 15 e2! (zugzwang) 15...e5 16 d7 b6 17 e7! xb7 18 f7.

On this occasion the king must move in the opposite direction. Amazingly enough, here too it arrives just in time to help the bishop combat the passed pawn.

3 ... h6!!

4 b5

Q 2-3. What would have happened after 4 c5?

After 4 c5 the direct 4...h7? would be a blunder in view of 5 b4 g8 6 c6 f8 7 d7! f2 8 b5 e3 9 c7! f4+ 10 b7! e7 11 b6 d8 12 a8.

4...f2+! is essential. After 5 c4, by driving the white king back one square, Black gains a highly important tempo for the defence and can now approach with her king: 5...h7. And after 5 d6 e1 White will subsequently have to waste several tempi on bringing her king back to her passed pawn.

4 ... h7

5 b4

The king cannot be cut off from the queenside: 5 c4 g6!, and for a draw it is now sufficient for Black to give up her bishop for the b-pawn.

5 ... d6!

Black loses after 5...g8? 6 c6 f8 7 d7! (see above), but 5...e1! is also quite possible (‘the pawn under fire’ is a typical defensive procedure in endings with opposite-colour bishops): 6 c5 g8 7 b5 f8 8 b6 (8 d6 e8 9 c7 g3+! 10 c8 f2) 8...e7 9 c6 (9 b7 g3 10 b6 b8) 9...d8 10 b7 f2! (the king cannot be allowed to go to a8, and so the white pawn is again ‘put under fire’) 11 a6 g3 (or 11...c8) 12 b7 (12 a7 f2) 12...b8 with a draw.

6 a5 g8

7 b5 f8

8 b6 e7

9 a6 d8

10 b7(a7) c5!

The draw is obvious.

It can be concluded that 1 a3? leads to a draw. But the initial position is won. Possible, for example, is 1 c2 g5 2 b1 h5 3 a3 bxa3 4 g4+! h4 5 xa3, and subsequently Black is not able to win a tempo by attacking the bishop with the king from d4. Even simpler is 1 f1 g5 2 g4 followed by 3 a3.

In chess, paradoxical ideas and pretty combinations do not always occur naturally. Frequently they work only as a result of mistakes made earlier, but it is hardly right to consider such creative searchings to be futile.
Evaluate 29 h4

Is 49 \( \mathcal{E} x e2 \) possible?
Commentaries Without Variations

A young man has the genius of activity, a mature one that for spending his powers wisely. The one’s strength lies in enterprise, the other’s in economy. He who wastes neither force nor opportunities is the victor.

Emanuel Lasker

To analyse – this signifies to find and check all the promising possibilities of both players. This book is devoted to analysis, and, understandably, it contains many concrete variations, perhaps even too many. But analysis is not an end in itself! If we are capable in a logical way, without sorting out countless variations, of correctly understanding the essence of the position, of picking out the ideas inherent in it, and of understanding the reasons for the errors committed, so much the better! As an illustration, I should like to show a game of mine, the analysis of which was purely logical, without variations.

Dvoretsky – Smyslov
USSR Championship First League, Odessa 1974

1 e4 e5
2 ∆f3 ∆c6
3 ∆b5 a6
4 ∆xc6 dxc6
5 0–0 ∆e7

In my preparations I had reckoned with the possibility of Vasily Smyslov choosing this variation. In the magazine The Chess Player I found the game Gheorghiu–Smyslov (Interzonal Tournament, Petropolis 1973), in which the former World Champion achieved an excellent position after 6 b3?! ∆g4 7 h3 ∆h5 8 ∆b2 f6 9 d3 ∆h6 10 ∆bd2 g5!

Commenting on this game, Florian Gheorghiu suggested that the natural move 6 d4 does not give White any advantage in view of 6...exd4 7 ∆xd4 ∆g4 8 ∆f4 ∆xf3 9 gxf3 ∆f6 10 ∆c3 ∆h5 11 ∆g3 ∆d8. To me this evaluation seemed dubious – after all, 12 ∆e3 ∆xg3 13 hxg3 ∆c5 14 ∆ad1 leads to a favourable ending for White. But could such an ending be won against Smyslov? Would not the mass exchanges made by White be regarded as a desire to avoid a struggle and make a quick draw? These are doubts typical of a young player. In taking the decision I was helped by the master (later a well-known grandmaster) Yuri Razuvaev.

“What I would like to know is, in what opening can you hope to gain better winning chances, than here? And why should it matter who thinks what about it?” – he asked.

6 d4 exd4
7 ∆xd4 ∆g4

7...∆f6 8 ∆xf6 ∆xf6 9 ∆f4 leads to an advantage for White.

8 ∆f4 ∆xf3
9 gxf3 ∆f6
10 ∆c3 ∆h5
11 ∆g3 ∆d8
12 ∆e3

Weaker is 12 ∆a7 ∆xg3 13 hxg3 ∆b4 with the threat of 14...∆c5.

12 ... ∆xg3
13 hxg3 ∆c5
14 ∆ad1 ∆xe3

In my preparations I had been intending simply to take the queen, but at the board I
first gave two checks, and perhaps, incorrectly.

15 \textit{\texttt{Exd8+}} \texttt{\texttt{Exd8}}
16 \textit{\texttt{Ed1+}}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\begin{scope}[scale=0.5]
\tikzset{every node/.style={scale=0.5}}
\draw[help lines] (0,0) grid (8,8);
\end{scope}
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\end{center}

Now Black has to solve two positional problems. The first is the choice of pawn structure. If the moving of the f2 pawn to e3 does not suit him, he can avoid this by 16...\texttt{Wd2}?! (He would not have had this resource, if White had taken the enemy queen two moves earlier.)

The second problem is where to put his king.

16 ... \texttt{Ec8}?

A serious positional mistake. The main events will develop in the centre and on the kingside, and it was there that the king should have been kept. After all, in the endgame it should take an active part in the play.

17 \texttt{fxe3} \texttt{g6}?

Another mistake, after which Black's position becomes hopeless. It made sense to put a brake on the e-pawn, by playing ...f7–f6. He could also have considered 17...\texttt{Ec5} 18 \texttt{Wf2} \texttt{Ed8}, in order, after exchanging rooks, to bring the king back into play. However, even then White would have stood considerably better.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{cc}
18 & e5 \textit{\texttt{Eg7}}
18...\texttt{Ec5} 19 \texttt{Ed2} \texttt{Ee8} 20 \texttt{f4} \texttt{f6} 21 \texttt{Ee4}.
19 & \texttt{f4} \texttt{f6}
20 & \texttt{exf6} \textit{\texttt{Exf6}}
21 & \texttt{e4} \texttt{h5}
22 & \texttt{Wg2} \textit{\texttt{Xc3}?!}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The exchange of the bishop makes it easier for White to convert his advantage.

23 \texttt{bxc3} \texttt{b5}
24 \texttt{e5} \texttt{a5}
25 \texttt{Wh3}!

The start of a decisive invasion by the white king. If Black’s king were in the centre he would still have been able to put up something of a defence, but now he has no chances. \textit{It is useful to note that in a pawn ending with the given pawn structure Black is unable to create a passed pawn on the queenside. After ...c6–c5 (with the idea of ...c5–c4, ...c7–c5, ...b5–b4 and ...a5–a4 etc.) White replies c3–c4!}

25 ... \texttt{b4}
26 \texttt{Wh4} \texttt{Ee8}
27 \texttt{Wg5} \texttt{Ee6}
28 \texttt{Wh6}

There is no defence against the manoeuvre \texttt{Wh6–g7–f7}. Black resigns.

The chess reasons for Black’s defeat are explained in the notes. The game provides quite a good textbook example on the theme ‘The role of the king in the endgame’. It is something else that is hard to understand. Why did the former World Champion Vasily Smyslov, a famed master of the endgame, play this ending so weakly? In such cases superficial commentators stare at the ceiling, and then fabricate standard explanations, such as 'tiredness' (however, the game was played in the first round), ‘underestimation of the opponent’, and so on. Of course, all this does not explain anything.

I found the solution a few months later, when in the 14th volume of \textit{Chess Informator} I discovered the earlier game Bednarski–
Smyslov (Olympiad, Skopje 1972). The first 11 moves in it were the same, but on the 12th move Jacek Bednarski moved his queen to another square.

12 \( \text{wa}4 \) \( \text{axg3} \) 13 \( \text{hxg3} \) \( \text{wb}4 \) 14 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{xa4} \) 15 \( \text{xd8+} \) \( \text{xd8} \) 16 \( \text{xa4} \) g6! 17 f4 b5 18 \( \text{c3} \) g7 19 \( \text{g2} \). If 19 e5 in his notes Smyslov gave the variation 19...f6 20 \( \text{xd1+} \) c8 21 e6 f5 22 \( \text{d7} \) xc3 23 bxc3 \( \text{e8} \) with equality.

19...e7?! (in Smyslov's opinion, 19...xc3 20 bxc3 e7! is more accurate) 20 e5 d8 21 \( \text{d1} \) xd1 22 \( \text{xd1} \) e6, and Black subsequently gained a draw.

It all became clear. In our game the former World Champion had followed the plan of defence, found and successfully employed by him against Bednarski. Alas, in the position there was an imperceptible, but very significant difference: the f2 pawn had moved to e3. As a result, all the ideas (...g7-g6, the king move in the variation to c8, and the exchange of bishop for knight) which there had been appropriate and good, in our game turned out to be bad, for the reason that after the exchange of the e5 pawn it was immediately replaced by a new e-pawn, which was now passed.

The conclusions regarding the dangers of routine thinking, and the uncritical following of familiar patterns, will, I think, be found independently by the reader.

And now about a continuation of this story, which occurred 22 years later. After a break of many years from tournament play, I took part in an open tournament which was held in the Spanish town of Terrassa, and to the surprise of everyone (and myself in particular) I emerged the winner. This was how my game against an experienced Cuban grandmaster developed.

Dvoretsky – Arencibia
Terrassa 1996

1 e4 e5
2 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{c6} \)
3 \( \text{b5} \) a6
4 \( \text{xc6} \) dxc6
5 \( \text{c3} \)

On this occasion I avoided the usual 5 0–0 – too much theory had accumulated in the intervening years.

Walter Arencibia was in an aggressive mood. He thought for a long time and finally made a move which greatly pleased me.

5 ... \( \text{e7}?! \)

6 d4

I immediately realised that it would be hard for my opponent to avoid the position from my game with Smyslov, which is favourable to White. Arencibia remembered about it slightly later than he should have done, and, of course, the thought that he had fallen into a line which was well familiar to his opponent did nothing to improve his mood.

6 ... exd4
7 \( \text{xd4} \) g4
8 \( \text{f4}! \) \( \text{xf3} \)
9 gxf3 \( \text{d8} \)
10 \( \text{e3} \) f6

The variation 10...\( \text{wb}4 \) 11 0–0 \( \text{c5} \)
12 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{xb2} \) 13 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{wa3} \) 14 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \) 15 \( \text{xc7} \) \( \text{d7} \) 16 \( \text{g3} \) followed by 17 \( \text{ad1} \) is favourable to White.

11 0–0 \( \text{h5} \)
12 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{xg3} \)
13 \( \text{hxg3} \) \( \text{e6} \)

The Cuban grandmaster decides to avoid the exchange of queens. However, in the middlegame, in my view, the problems facing Black are even more difficult than in the endgame. Smyslov's move 13...\( \text{wc5} \) is after all more reliable.

14 \( \text{ad1} \) \( \text{xd1} \)
15 \( \text{xd1} \) h5?!

And this is going too far! Black has no chances of creating an attack: his forces
are disunited, and against ...h5–h4 there is always the reply g3–g4. The 'normal'
15...e7 was better.

16  
17  

The only defence against the threat of 18 e5+.

18  

24  ...  c5
25  e2  b5?
26  b3  a5
27  x b7  e1+
28  g2  h4
29  b8+  h7
30  f6+  g6
31  gxh4  

Black resigns.

We have investigated both games in a logical way. An analysis of variations would hardly have made any significant change to our impression of the course of the play, or of the mistakes committed, and therefore we were able to manage perfectly well without it. But this does not often happen. Usually chess positions are much deeper and more interesting than they appear at first sight. You have to be very attentive and careful in your evaluations, in order to avoid superficial and non-objective conclusions.

19  e2!
The correct plan! At e4 the knight looks good, but that is all, whereas from d4 it will take control of the important e6 and f5 squares.

19  ...  e7
20  e4!  f8
21  d4  d7?!
22  d3  e8

If 22...d5 the simplest is 23 f5.

23  f4  g8
24  f5

There is nothing that Black can move. As often happens in such situations, he begins to 'twit', thereby himself hastening the outcome.

E 2-3

White to move
Mined Squares

Beautiful is everything that in any way links the diverse happenings on the chess board with the laws of nature.

Aron Nimzowitsch

Many difficult endings would be tenable, were it not necessary at some point to make extremely unfavourable moves (due to the absence of favourable, or at least, neutral moves). Zugzwang is a very important method of play in the endgame, and without its help it is not even possible to checkmate a lone king with a king and rook. Often zugzwang turns out to be mutual, which means that skilful play is required in order that at the necessary moment the turn to move should be with the opponent. In endgame theory, squares of mutual zugzwang are called corresponding squares. By examining the analyses in this and the next chapter, you can become acquainted with the basics of the theory of corresponding squares.

Sometimes in the correspondence there is only one pair of squares. We will call them 'mined'. When there are mined squares, you must not be the first to step onto such a square – otherwise you will be 'blown up', you will find yourself in zugzwang. For example, with white pawns at b5 and g4, and black pawns at c5 and g5, it is obvious that b6 and c4 are mined squares. The white king must move from b3 to c3 and back again, and the black king between b7 and c7.

Let us examine some more complicated examples of mined squares.

Petrosian – Dvoretsky
Moscow 1964

A simultaneous display with clocks, which the World Champion was giving in the Moscow Pioneers’ Palace, was coming to an end. Only the last game remained.

67 . . .    \textit{f3}

It is essential to parry the threat of g4–g5.

68  g3

Here the playing time expired, the game was adjourned, and it was handed over for analysis and adjudication to... the author of these lines. I awarded myself a win!

68 . . .    c6!

Black's plan is obvious: he must place his bishop at e8 and then take his king to e4.

69  h4    e8

70  g3
In the event of 70 g5 h5 71 f5 the manoeuvre of the bishop to g4 is decisive: 71...\textit{h7} (zugzwang) 72 \textit{g3} \textit{a4} 73 \textit{h4} (73 \textit{f4} also does not help) 73...\textit{d1} 74 \textit{g3} \textit{g4} 75 \textit{h4} \textit{g7}!, and White is forced to move one of his pawns, allowing the enemy king to wedge itself between them: 76 \textit{g6} \textit{h6} or 76 \textit{f6+} \textit{g6} 77 \textit{g3} \textit{e6} 78 \textit{h4} \textit{f7}. The zugzwang positions that arose in this variation were for the moment not mutual – Black had the possibility of waiting, thus giving his opponent the move.

70 \ldots \textit{f7}
71 \textit{h3}!

\textbf{Dolmatov – Yusupov}
Friendly game, Podolsk 1977

The key to the understanding of this position is the paradoxical conclusion regarding the correspondence of the c1 and f5 squares; it turns out that, with the knight at c1 and the bishop at f5, a position of mutual zugzwang arises.

Q 2-4. What is the point of White's last move?

It turns out that the h4 and e6 squares are mined. After 71 \textit{h4}?! \textit{e6} Black wins quickly: 72 \textit{g3} \textit{d5} 73 \textit{h4} \textit{e4} etc. 71 \textit{h3}! is much more cunning. The incautious reply 71...\textit{e6}? throws away the win, since after 72 \textit{h4}! it is now Black who is in zugzwang. He cannot play 72...\textit{g6} 73 \textit{f5+} or 72...\textit{d5}(e7) 73 \textit{g5} h5 74 \textit{f5} and 75 \textit{g6}, while if 72...\textit{f7} there follows 73 \textit{g3} \textit{e7} (73...\textit{d5} 74 \textit{g5} h5 75 \textit{f5} \textit{e5} 76 \textit{g6} \textit{e8} 77 \textit{h4}) 74 \textit{h4}!

\textit{f8} 75 \textit{g5} h5 76 \textit{f5} \textit{g7} 77 \textit{g6}.

But Black too, following the example of his opponent, can avoid the mined square.

71 \ldots \textit{e7}!
72 \textit{g3} \textit{d6}!
73 \textit{h4} \textit{e6}!
74 \textit{g3} \textit{d5}

Avoiding the zugzwang trap, the king breaks into the opponent’s position with decisive effect.
lost: 7 ♕ d3 ♕ xd3 8 ♕ xd3 ♕ xc5 9 ♕ e4 g4!
10 ♕ f5 ♕ d4 11 ♕ g6 ♕ e4 12 ♕ xh5 f5
13 ♕ g6 f4 14 h5 fxg3 15 h6 g2 16 h7 g1
17 h8 ♕ ♕ b6+ 18 ♕ g5 ♕ c5+ or 18 ♕ f7
♕ b7+, and Black soon forces the exchange
of queens.
In friendly (non-tournament) games the
players usually make their moves quite
quickly. Nevertheless, Dolmatov was able
to grasp the essence of the position and
find a way to draw.

1 ♕ e2!! ♕ xa2
If 1...♕ g6 2 ♕ g1!, and the knight breaks
out of the trap (2...♕ g4 is not possible). And
in the event of 1...♕ f5 the bishop is the first
to occupy the mined square and the knight
can calmly return – 2 ♕ c1! Now it is Black
who is in zugzwang: 2...♕ c8 3 ♕ d3, or
2...♕ b1 3 ♕ e2!! and it is not apparent how
he can win. Yusupov also worked out this
variation and so he decided to sacrifice his
bishop.

2 ♕ c4
The threat of 3 ♕ d4+ is highly unpleasant.
2 ... ♕ xb3+
3 ♕ xb3 ♕ xc5

Things would be difficult for White, were it
not for a pawn breakthrough.

4 g4! ♕ d5!
There is no time for a pawn capture – the
King must step inside the square of the h-
pawn. In this position the players agreed a
draw.

E 2-4
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Black to move

Q 2-5. How should the game end?
My First Analysis

A wise man begins from the end, a fool ends at the beginning.
Proverb

The diagram shows the adjourned position from a game between two first category players, played in one of the mass Moscow tournaments of 1966. Black resigned it without resuming, much to the surprise of his opponent (a good friend of mine), who did not see any clear way to win. Intrigued by the position, I spent many hours analysing it, until finally I discovered a very difficult winning method.
Black's first move is strictly forced.

1 ... ♖d7!

First of all, of course, the pawn ending was checked. Readers who have solved the exercises at the end of the preceding chapter will already know its evaluation: the variation 2 ♖xe5+? ♖xe5 3 ♖xe5 f6+ (3...♖e7? 4 f6+ ♖xf6+ 5 ♖f5) 4 ♖d5 ♖e8! leads to a draw.
Since the aim of this chapter is to make the acquaintance of various types of corresponding squares, we will examine one side variation, ending in a position, the solution of which involves 'triangulation' – a typical method of giving the opponent the move on corresponding squares. Let us play 4...♖d8? (instead of 4...♖e8!) 5 e5 fxe5 6 g5! ♖e7 (6...hxg5 7 f6) 7 gxh6 (7 g6?!) 7...gxh6 8 ♖xe5 ♖f7 9 f6 ♖f8.

I beg the forgiveness of those readers to whom this elementary position is well known, but it is useful to begin a discussion about corresponding squares with a simple case. Thus the obvious pairs of corresponding squares (i.e., squares of mutual zugzwang) are: e6–e8 and f5–f7. The e5 square borders on e6 and f5, while for Black the square that borders on the corresponding squares e8 and f7 is f8. By this standard reasoning we determine the correspondence of the squares e5–f8. It is now White
to move and it is he who is in zugzwang (10 e6 e8 or 10 f5 f7). However, he has a way of giving his opponent the move. Alongside e5 and f5 there are two completely equivalent squares e4 and f4, whereas alongside f8 and f7 Black has only one: e8 (or g8), the neighbouring square e7 (or g7) being taken away by the white pawn. We play 10 e4 e8 11 f4! Black has to reply 11... f8, but then White, after describing a triangle with his king, occupies the corresponding square 12 e5 and wins.

Since 2 xe5+? does not work, it means that the g-pawn must be advanced, otherwise after 2...f6 Black will gain a draw.

2 g5!

Q 2-6. What would you have preferred, to seal 1... d7 and adjourn the game, or make it on the board? And as White: would you play 2 g5 or seal it?

Situations involving the adjournment of the game have been discussed in the first part of the book. But it is always useful once again to have some practice in employing competitive procedures that are already known.

1... d7! should be made. After all, then White will have to choose between 2 xe5+ and 2 g5. For analysis at home this is not a problem, but at the board it is more difficult to calculate the variations accurately, and a mistake is quite probable. In turn, 2 g5! should definitely be sealed. Not in order to force the opponent to analyse additionally the 2 xe5+ variation (the analysis of the pawn ending will not take him too much time). After 2 g5 White is threatening 3 f6 or 3 gxh6 gxh6 4 xe5, and 2...hxg5 3 f6 is not possible, which means that there remains only one reply 2...f6!, after which White has to choose between 3 g6 and 3 gxh6. Such a choice is better deferred to home analysis. It is obvious that if 2 g5 is not sealed, also at the board Black will reply 2...f6, forcing his opponent to take a committing decision without home analysis. It makes sense for White to seal his next move – then he will only have to analyse one type of position, whereas his opponent will have to analyse two.

2 ... f6

Q 2-7. Which do you prefer – 3 g6 or 3 gx6?

This is again a question aimed at developing positional feeling, or intuition. 3 g6 has only one drawback, but a very serious one: any pawn ending will now be drawn. On the other hand, in addition to Black's weaknesses at f6 and h6 (the g7 pawn does not defend them too reliably) he also still has his weak g7 pawn. After 3 gx6, on the other hand, Black has one weakness less, but if his king can be shifted from d7 it can be pushed back further, and any pawn ending will be won.

Which factors are more weighty? The reply must be sensed, guessed – it is not so easy to calculate the variations accurately.

Let us first examine 3 gx6 gx6. After 4 c5+ xc5 5 xc5 c7 the draw is obvious. The only promising idea is to check with the knight at b8 and then, if necessary, sacrifice the knight. But this plan is not difficult to parry. With the knight at a6 Black has to meet the threats of b8+ and c5+, which means that his bishop must be at a7. With the knight at c6 the corresponding square is c7. From b4 the knight is aiming for a6 and c6 – it is obvious that the square corresponding to this is b6. Thus 4 b4 b6! 5 c4 (5 a6 a7!; 5 c6 c7! 6 c5 d6+...) 6 f12 6 d5 h4 7 c5 f2+ 8 b5 h4 9 e3 d6 10 g4 g5 11 b6 d7 12 c5 c7 13 d5 d7, and White has not achieved anything.

However, even if the knight were to reach b8, this would not bring White a win. After
4 \( \text{b}4 \) Black can also play 4...\( \text{f}2 \) (only not 4...\( \text{e}3 \)) – the e3 square is 'mined', and can be occupied only when the knight is at c6) 5 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{e}3 \)! It is very important to defend the h6 pawn in good time. Wrong is 5...\( \text{h}4 \)? 6 \( \text{b}8+ \) \( \text{c}8 \) 7 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 8 \( \text{c}5+ \) or 5...\( \text{g}1 \)? 6 \( \text{b}8+ \) \( \text{c}7 \) 7 \( \text{e}6! \) \( \text{x}b8 \) 8 \( \text{x}f6 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 9 \( \text{g}7 \) with the threats of 10 f6 and 10 \( \text{x}h6 \).

6 \( \text{b}8+ \) \( \text{c}7 \) 7 \( \text{e}6 \) \( \text{x}b8 \) 8 \( \text{x}f6 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 9 \( \text{x}e5 \) (9 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 10 f6 \( \text{e}6 \) 11 f7 \( \text{c}5 \) 12 \( \text{f}8=\text{w} \) \( \text{x}f8+ \) 13 \( \text{xf8} \) \( \text{f}6 \); 9 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{c}5+ \) 10 \( \text{e}8 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 11 f6 \( \text{e}6 \) 9...\( \text{d}7 \) 10 f6 (10 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{g}5+ \) 11 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 12 f6 \( \text{e}5 \) 13 f7 \( \text{e}7 \) 14 \( \text{x}h6 \) \( \text{f}6 \) with a draw) 10...\( \text{e}8 \) 11 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{d}2 \) 12 e5 \( \text{e}6 \) 13 e6 \( \text{c}1 \) 14 \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{x}b2 \)! (14...\( \text{d}2 \)? 15 e7+ \( \text{e}8 \) 16 f7+ \( \text{e}7 \) 17 \( \text{g}7 \) or 14...\( \text{e}8 \)? 15 f7+ \( \text{f}6 \) 16 e7+)) 15 f7 \( \text{c}3 \) 16 \( \text{x}h6 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 17 \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{c}3 \) 18 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 19 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 20 h7 \( \text{c}3 \) 21 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 22 \( \text{d}5 \).

\[ \text{e}5+! 25 \text{c}8 \text{f}6!, \text{and} 26 \text{f}8=\text{w}+ \text{x}f8 27 \text{d}7 \text{d}7 \text{does} \text{not} \text{help} \text{in} \text{view} \text{of} 27...\text{g}7! \]

We have ascertained that the exchange of pawns leads to a draw. In the course of the analysis we several times had to deal with corresponding squares. In practice it is usually the kings that manoeuvre on corresponding squares, but, of course, this is not obligatory. We have just seen examples of correspondence between knight and bishop, and also between the black bishop and the white king.

Let us now turn to an analysis of the strongest continuation.

\[ 3 \text{g}6! \text{e}7 \]

Black is in zugzwang – he immediately has to give way to the enemy king. Neither 3...\( \text{c}3 \)? 4 \( \text{c}5+ \) and 5 \( \text{e}6 \) nor 3...\( \text{e}3 \)? 4 \( \text{xe}5+! \) \( \text{fxe}5 \) 5 f6 is possible.

\[ 4 \text{c}6 \]

White transfers his knight to d5 and takes his king to e6. But what then?

\textbf{In situations, where one of the players has no active possibilities and is forced to wait, it is often not advisable to examine them move by move. A logical analysis should be done: decide which positions to aim for, and which to avoid, find ideas that are dangerous for the opponent, and so on.}

We immediately note the possibility of the knight sacrifice at f6. Let us play \( \text{xf}6, \) and after ...\( \text{gx}f6 \) – \( \text{xf}6, \) after which let us try selecting squares for Black's king and bishop, from which he can organise a defence. It is not hard to see that there are no such squares. The conclusion: the knight sacrifice on f6 for two pawns always wins, and Black must defend against it. This means that with the king at e6 and knight at d5, the black bishop must be at g5 or d8.

Let us now see what happens if the black king is driven into the corner of the board. With the king at h8 (and White's at f7) the win is elementary. For example, if the knight stands at e6, the g7 pawn can only be
defended by ...\texttt{\textit{e}8}, but then there follows \texttt{\textit{c}7} and \texttt{\textit{e}8}, threatening \texttt{\textit{x}g7} and \texttt{\textit{x}f6}.

Let us study the position with the king at \texttt{g8}.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{diagram}
\end{center}

We will operate using two ideas for White that are already familiar: the knight sacrifice and the driving of the enemy king to \texttt{h8}. 

\texttt{1 \textit{d7! \textit{c}1 2 \textit{e}7}.} If \texttt{2 \textit{a}3+} 3 \texttt{e6} there is no defence against 4 \texttt{xf6+}, or after \texttt{2 \textit{g5 3 e8} – against 4 \textit{e7+}.}

Let us move the knight to \texttt{d7}. It is easy to see that Black is unable to prevent it from being switched to \texttt{d5}. For example, with the bishop at \texttt{e3} White wins by \texttt{1 \textit{e7 \textit{g5} (1...\texttt{f2 2 \textit{xf6+} 2 \textit{b6}! and 3 \textit{d5}).}}

How do things stand with the knight at \texttt{e6}? Black must parry the threat of 2c7–d5 by the only move \texttt{1 \textit{d6!}} If now \texttt{2 \textit{d7 \textit{a}3}} 3 \texttt{c7}, then \texttt{3 \textit{f8}, and the king escapes from \texttt{g8}. And after 2 \texttt{d8 \textit{a}3 3 \textit{c6 \textit{d}6! (parrying the threat of \texttt{b8–d7}) it is not apparent how White can make any progress.}

We can draw a preliminary conclusion: pushing back the black king with a knight check from \texttt{e6} is ineffective, if the bishop can reach \texttt{d6} in time. Armed with this information, let us now go back a little.

If it is White to move, the win is elementary:

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1 \texttt{c7+ \textit{f}8 (1...\texttt{d6 2 \textit{f7}) 2 \textit{d7 \textit{c}1 3 \textit{e}6+ \textit{g}8 4 \textit{e}8 \textit{a}3 (the bishop has not managed to reach \texttt{d6} 5 \textit{c7 and 6 \textit{d5}.}}
\end{itemize}

But if it is Black to move, after \texttt{1...\textit{f}8! it is now no use playing 2 \texttt{c7 \textit{c}1 3 \textit{d7 \textit{a}3 4 \textit{e}6+ \textit{g}8 5 \textit{e}8 \textit{d}6!}}

White achieves his aim by regrouping his forces: 2 \texttt{b6! \textit{e}8 3 \texttt{d7 \textit{h}4 4 \textit{d}6!}

\textbf{Q 2-8. What happens after 4...\textit{e}1?}

The solution is simple, but elegant: 4...\texttt{e1 5 \textit{xf6+! \textit{gxf6} 6 \textit{e}6 with two threats: 7 \textit{g7} and 7 \textit{xf6}.}}

If instead 4...\texttt{g5}, then the manoeuvre of the knight to \texttt{e6} now wins: 5 \texttt{c5 \textit{f}8 (5...\texttt{c1 6 \textit{e}6 \textit{a}3+ 7 \textit{c7! \textit{f}8 8 \textit{c}8 \textit{e}7 9 \textit{c}7! \textit{d}6 10 \textit{d}8) 6 \textit{e}6+ \textit{g}8 7 \textit{e}7 \textit{c}1 8 \textit{c}7 etc.}}

Thus, when the bishop is at \texttt{g5} the position is lost. Let us now try keeping the bishop at \texttt{d8}. 

\texttt{\hfill see next diagram}
Gradually I came to realise that the position with the black king at g8 and the white knight at e6 could not be avoided. If there was no win here, then the entire ending was also drawn.

In endgame theory there is the concept of 'key squares'. This is the name given to squares, the seizure of which leads to the goal and decides the outcome. In the present case, as we have already established, the key squares for the white knight are d5 and d7, and hence also the dark squares from where it can go there (f8, c7, b8, b6, c5, b4, c3 and e3), and also e7. We can look for new key squares. One such square, strangely enough, is a4. With the knight at a4 the bishop is obliged to stand at d4. But then there follows e7, and because of zugzwang Black has to allow the knight to go to d5. However, the information obtained is not especially valuable: to the number of key squares only one new one has been added – b2.

Let us now see whether for each of the possible knight positions there is a corresponding square for the bishop. The correspondence e6–d6 and c6–d6 has already been established. The correspondence c8–
c5 is obvious. With the knight at b5 White is threatening \( \text{c7} \) or \( \text{c3} \), which means that the bishop must occupy a5. If the knight reaches c4, the threats of \( \text{e3-d5} \), \( \text{b6-d5} \) and \( \text{b2-a4} \) can be parried only from d4, while if \( \text{d3} \) Black must reply ... \( \text{a3} \).

We can similarly determine where the bishop should be when the knight is on dark squares. For example, with the knight at a5 Black must be ready to meet \( \text{c6} \) and \( \text{c4} \) with ... \( \text{d6} \) and ... \( \text{d4} \) respectively – this means that the place for the bishop is at c5.

The square corresponding to a7 is b4 (if \( \text{b5} \) there is ... \( \text{c5} \), if \( \text{c8} \) \( \text{c5} \), and if \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{d6} \)), that corresponding to d6 is b6, and so on.

Thus the play can develop roughly as follows: 1 \( \text{d8} \) \( \text{a3} \) 2 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{d6}! \) 3 \( \text{a7} \) \( \text{b4}! \) 4 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{a5}! \) 5 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{b6}! \) 6 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{d4}! \) 7 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{c5}! \) No progress is evident! It transpires that on the basis of the key squares already found by us, White is unable to break the correspondence in this favour. Only by discovering another key square – g4, can success finally be achieved.

Let us suppose that the knight has reached g4. The bishop has to guard the e3 square, so as not to allow the manoeuvre \( \text{e3-d5} \).

With the bishop at c5 White wins by 1 \( \text{d7}! \) \( \text{e6} \) (with the threat of \( \text{xf6} \)) 2... \( \text{e7} \) 3 \( \text{hxh}6 \) \( \text{gxh6} \) 4 \( \text{g7+} \). If the bishop is at g5, then after 1 \( \text{e7}! \) Black is in zugzwang. And with the bishop at c1 the goal is achieved by 1 \( \text{e7}! \) \( \text{g5} \) 2 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{e3} \) (after 2... \( \text{c1} \) the simplest is 3 \( \text{d1} \), when the bishop cannot reach d4, but also possible is 3 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{a3}+ \) 4 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{d6} \) 5 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{c5} \) 6 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{d4} \) 7 \( \text{e7} \) 3 \( \text{d3}! \) (3 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{c5+} \) 4 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{d4} \) 3... \( \text{d2} \) 4 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{c3} \) 5 \( \text{c5} \) and 6 \( \text{d7} \) followed by the transfer of the knight to d5.

In diagram 95 Black cannot prevent the manoeuvre of the knight to g4 – his bishop has to keep a watch on too many squares. 1 \( \text{d8} \) \( \text{a3} \) 2 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{d6}! \) 3 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{c5}! \) 4 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{d4}! \) 5 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{f2} \) 6 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g3} \) 7 \( \text{e7}! \) and Black is in zugzwang: 7... \( \text{f2} \) 8 \( \text{h2} \) and 9 \( \text{g4} \), or 7... \( \text{f4} \) 8 \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{c1} \) 9 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{a3} + \) 10 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{d6} \) 11 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{c5} \) 12 \( \text{a4}! \) etc.

The demonstration of the win proved to be very complicated. White is able to destroy the opponent’s defensive system, based on the occupation of corresponding squares, only by first going round the entire board with his knight. An article with an analysis of this ending, which appeared in the No.8 issue of Shakhmatny Bulletin for 1968, was my first publication.

E 2-5
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White to move

Find two winning plans
The Transition into a Pawn Endgame

The pawn endgame is a rather rare phenomenon in practice. Players avoid it. They don’t like it and don’t know it. It is no secret that pawn endings are ‘unknown territory’ even for many masters, right up to grandmasters and world champions.

Nikolai Grigoriev

Pawn endings are normally forcing in character, and can be calculated to the end. Therefore the transition into a pawn ending most often signifies the transformation of a practical position (superior or inferior) into a definite, precise one (won or drawn). A player must know how to force events at the appropriate moment, in particular by the exchange of the last pieces. Of course, in the process it is essential to calculate the variations accurately.

Taborov – Shur
USSR Junior Championship, Riga 1977

The minor piece ending favours White, who has an outside passed h-pawn, and in addition his bishop is stronger than the knight. The exchange on f4 must be checked – after all, if it works, then Black’s defensive problems will be immediately solved.

48 ...  hxf4!
49  gxf4  e6

Of course, not 49...e6? 50 e5! fxe5+ 51 h4, and the outside passed secures White a straightforward win.

50  h4!

The only try: White wants to take his king to g6 and only then advance his h-pawn. It is not possible to break through on the queenside: 50 h5 e7 51 d4 b6 52 b4 f7 53 a4 g6 54 a5 bxa5 55 bxe5 g5.

In the game Black played 50...e7?, showing that he had gone into the pawn ending without precise calculation. After 51 h5 f7 52 h6! he ended up in zugzwang. There followed 52...a5 53 a4 (or 53 h4 b5 54 a3) 53...e5 (53...b6 54 h4 came to the same thing) 54 h5! and Black resigned.

But the ending was not lost.

50 ...  d6!!
51  h4
51 h5 e5 52 g6 f5.

51 ...  e7!
52  h5  f7
53  h6  a5!
54  a3

54 a4 b6.
54 ...  b5

With the pawn at h3 in this position it would be possible to give the opponent the move,
by playing h3–h4. But here, thanks to the interposition of 50...d6!! White does not have a reserve tempo (55 h5? even loses to 55...e5! 56 h7 f5).

51 b4 (instead of 51 h4) is also not dangerous for Black: 51...e5 52 f3 (52 h4 xe4 53 h5 f5+ 54 h4 f4, or 54 h3? e5!) 52...d6! 53 g4 (53 h4 e7 54 g4 f7 55 h5 g7) 53...e5!

**Damjanovic – Dvoretsky**

Vilnius 1978
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42 f3
42 d4 exd4 43 cxd4 b4.
42...
c5
43 e3
If 43 d4 there follows 43...cxd4 44 cxd4 b4!, but not 44...exd4? 45 e5 f5 46 e6! xe6 47 e4 with a draw.
43...
b4
43...a4 is equally good.
44 d4
In the event of 44 cxb4 cxb4 45 d2 a4! (45...g5? 46 d4!) the march of the black king to e3 is decisive.
44...
cxd4+
45 cxd4 a4!
46 d3 b3
47 axb3 a3
48 c2 exd4
49 b4 d3+
White resigns.

**Dvoretsky – Nikitin**

Moscow 1970
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Q 2-10. Try calculating the variations yourself (It is Black to move).

Black wins in the pawn ending thanks to the threat of a pawn breakthrough.

38...
dxc3
39 bxc3
40...xg4
The first three moves could have been interchanged.

41...xg4
41...g6!?
Of course, not 41...c5?? 42 f5 b4 43 cxb4 cxb4 44 xe5 a4 45 d4, but possible was 41 f6 42 f3 c5 43 e3 a4! (after 43 b4? 44 cxb4 cxb4 45 d4 a4 the e5 pawn will be captured with check) 44 d4 exd4+! 45 cxd4 b4 46 d3 b3 47 axb3 a3 48 c2 cxd4 and wins.

White has available the good positional move 40 g4!, preparing the exchange of rooks by 41 e3. If 40...e4 there is both 41 d4, and 41 e3!? xd5 42 cxd5 f4+ 43 e2 f7 44 e6 with advantage. However, my attention immediately focused
on the exchanging combination beginning with 40 $\text{Q}f4+$. There remained only 5–7 minutes to the time control, and, understandably, I simply did not manage to calculate its consequences accurately.

40 $\text{Q}f4+?!$ $\text{gx}f4$
41 $\text{Q}xd6+$ $\text{Qf}5$
42 $\text{gx}f4$
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Q 2-11. Take a decision for Black.

A choice has to be made from three possibilities: 1) a pawn ending: 42...$\text{Qxf4}$ 43 $\text{Qxc6! bxc6}$ 44 $\text{Qc7}$; 2) a 'pure' ending with opposite colour-bishops, where he is two pawns down: 42...$\text{Qe}6$; 3) opposite-colour bishops with rooks, again with two extra pawns for White: 42...$\text{Qe}8$. The first two positions demand precise calculation and can be definitely evaluated. The third is a practical position.

My opponent did not bother calculating any variations and quickly chose 42...$\text{Qe}8$?! White successfully carried out a plan for converting his advantage, typical of such positions: he took his king to the queenside and created a passed pawn there by means of an exchange sacrifice.

43 $\text{Qe}3$ $\text{Qg}6$ 44 $\text{Qe}2$ $\text{Qg}2+$ 45 $\text{Qd}3$ $\text{Qb}2$
46 $\text{Qc}3$ $\text{Qa}2$ 47 $\text{Qb}4$ $\text{Qe}2$ 48 $\text{Qd}2$ $\text{Qg}2$
49 $\text{Qc}5$ $\text{Qg}1$ 50 $\text{b}4$ $\text{Qb}1$ 51 $\text{Qd}8$ $\text{Qe}4$ 52 $\text{Qf}8+$ $\text{Qg}4$ 53 $\text{Qc}3$ $\text{Qd}1$ 54 $\text{Qe}5$ $\text{Qd}7$ 55 $\text{Qg}8+$ $\text{Qf}3$ 56 $\text{Qg}5$ $\text{Qf}7$ 57 $\text{b}5$ $\text{axb}5$ 58 $\text{cx}b5$ $\text{Qd}3$ 59 $\text{Qb}6$ $\text{Qd}7$ 60 $\text{Qc}7$ $\text{Qe}4$ 61 $\text{Qe}5$ $\text{Qd}5$ 62 $\text{f}5$ $\text{Qe}4$ 63 $\text{f}6$ $\text{Qf}7$ 64 $\text{Qxe}4$ $\text{Qxe}4$ 65 $\text{Qxb}7$ $\text{Qd}5$ 66 $\text{a}6$. Black resigns.

I spent the few minutes before the time control on a calculation of the pawn ending.

42...$\text{Qxf4}$ 43 $\text{Qxc6}$ (43 $\text{Qc}7$? $\text{Qe}4$
44 $\text{Qxc6} (\text{f}5+)$ 43...$\text{bxc6}$ 44 $\text{Qc}7$ $\text{Qe}4$
(44...c5 also does not change anything)
45 $\text{Qxe}5$ $\text{Qxe}5$ 46 $\text{Qe}3$ (incorrect is 46 $\text{b}4$? $\text{Qd}4$ 47 $\text{b}5$ $\text{cx}b5$ 48 $\text{cx}b5$ $\text{Qc}5$ 49 $\text{b}6$ $\text{Qb}6$ with a draw) 46...c5 47 $\text{Qd}3$ $\text{Qf}5$
48 $\text{Qc}3$ $\text{e}5$ 49 $\text{b}4$ $\text{Qxb}4+$ 50 $\text{Qxb}4$ $\text{Qd}4!$
51 $\text{Qb}3$ $\text{Qe}5!$
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If 52 $\text{Qc}3$ there follows 52...$\text{Qe}4$, when 53 $\text{c}5$? is bad in view of 53...$\text{Qd}5$ 54 $\text{b}4$ $\text{Qd}6!$ 55 $\text{Qd}4$ $\text{Qe}5$ with a draw. White cannot manage without triangulation. The corresponding squares are c3–e4, b4–d4 and b3–e5.

52 $\text{Qa}4!$ $\text{Qe}4$ 53 $\text{a}3!$ $\text{e}5$ 54 $\text{b}3!$ It is the opponent's turn to move, and after 54...$\text{Qe}4$ 55 $\text{Qc}3$ Black ends up in zugzwang.

54...$\text{Qd}6$ 55 $\text{Qc}2!$ It is useful to avoid the mined c3 square. If 55 $\text{Qc}3$ there is 55...$\text{Qc}5$ 56 $\text{Qd}3$ $\text{b}4$. In the given case
after 57 \textit{d}d4 \textit{e}xa5 58 c5 White wins all the same, but if the position is shifted one rank down, this subtlety would be very significant.

55...\textit{c}6 56 \textit{d}3 \textit{c}5 57 \textit{c}3 \textit{d}6 58 \textit{d}4 \textit{c}6 59 c5 \textit{d}7 60 \textit{d}5 \textit{d}7 61 \textit{c}6+ \textit{c}8 62 \textit{c}4!, and after describing another triangle with his king, familiar to us from the previous chapter, White queens his pawn. Unfortunately, engrossed in calculating the pawn ending, I forgot about the ending with opposite-colour bishops. And mistakenly, since the drawing tendencies of such endings are well known. It was only a few years later that Nana Alexandria drew my attention to the fact that Black could have saved the game.

\begin{align*}
42 & \ldots \text{ \textit{e}6!} \\
43 & \textit{d}xe6 \\
43 \textit{d}4 \textit{e}4 or 43 \textit{d}8 \textit{f}4 is ineffective. \\
43 & \ldots \text{ \textit{f}e6} \\
44 & \textit{e}3 \text{ \textit{f}5} \\
45 & \textit{c}7 \text{ \textit{e}6} \\
46 & \textit{d}4 \text{ \textit{f}3!} \\
47 & \textit{c}5 \text{ \textit{d}1!}
\end{align*}

The pawn under fire': the attack by the bishop on the opponent's pawns is a very important defensive procedure when there are opposite-colour bishops.

\begin{align*}
48 & \textit{b}4 \text{ \textit{e}2!} \\
49 & \textit{b}5 \text{ \textit{f}1} \\
50 & \text{ \textit{e}5} \text{ \textit{e}2} \\
51 & \text{ \textit{c}3} \text{ \textit{f}1} \\
52 & \text{ \textit{b}xa6} \text{ \textit{b}xa6} \\
53 & \textit{f}5+
\end{align*}

Otherwise the position cannot be strengthened.

\begin{align*}
53 & \ldots \text{ \textit{x}f5} \\
54 & \textit{d}5 \text{ \textit{g}6!} \\
55 & \textit{c}5 \text{ \textit{f}7} \\
56 & \textit{d}6 \text{ \textit{e}8} \\
57 & \textit{f}6 \text{ \textit{g}2}
\end{align*}

White cannot win.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Gligoric – Grünfeld}

European Team Championship, Skara 1980
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\end{center}

In the game there followed 37...\textit{g}7 38 \textit{c}6 \textit{a}6 39 \textit{c}7+ \textit{h}6 40 \textit{d}6! \textit{e}2 41 \textit{d}7 \textit{d}8 42 \textit{h}3, and Black soon terminated his resistance. Of course, he could have put up a tougher defence. Thus he should have moved his king not to h6, but to f6, closer to the centre. And instead of 38...\textit{a}6, serious consideration should have been given to 38...\textit{f}5? Annotating the game in his book of best games published in Russian, Svetozar Gligoric condemned 37...\textit{g}7 and suggested instead the following variation.

\begin{align*}
37 & \ldots \text{ \textit{f}5} \\
38 & \textit{exf5} \text{ \textit{e}1+} \\
39 & \textit{xe1} \text{ \textit{xe1}+} \\
40 & \text{ \textit{f}1} \text{ \textit{xf1}+} \\
41 & \textit{g}2 \text{ \textit{xf1}}
\end{align*}

\begin{center}
see next diagram
\end{center}
Q 2-12. What should White play?

In the rock ending Black retains good drawing chances. After 42 \&xg6+ \&f7
43 \&xc6 (43 \&d6 \&e7) 43...\&xd5
44 \&c7+ it is important not to hurry with the attack on the b3 pawn: 44...\&g6? 45 \&xa7
\&d3 46 \&a6 \&xb3 47 a5 or 44...\&g8?
45 \&xa7 \&d3 46 \&b7 \&xb3 47 a5 b5
48 a6. Correct is 44...\&e6! 45 \&xa7 \&d6!
42 \&xf5! \&xf5
43 \&f3!
43 \&h3? does not work: 43...a6! (weaker is
43...\&f7 44 \&h4 \&f6 45 \&e5 a6 46 \&g4)
44 \&h4 b5 45 axb5 axb5 46 \&g5 b4! (but not
46...c4? 47 bx\&c4 bx\&c4? 48 \&f1 and
wins, or 47...b4 48 \&f6! \&f8 49 c5! b3
50 c6 \&e8 51 \&e6 \&d8 52 d6 b2 53 c7+
\&c8 54 d7+ \&xc7 55 \&e7 with advantage
to White in the queen ending) 47 \&xf5 (47
\&f6 \&f8 48 d6 \&e8 49 \&e6 c4 50 bx\&c4
b3) 47...c4 48 \&e4 (48 \&e6 \&f8!) 48...c3!
49 \&d3 \&f7 50 h3 (50 h4 \&f6 51 d6 \&e6
52 g4 is more tenacious) 50...\&f6 51 g4
hx\&g4 52 hxg4 \&e5, and Black wins. Note
the concluding position: passed pawns,
separated by two files, cannot even
defend each other (if, of course, they are
not very far advanced).

Gligoric, judging the pawn ending to be
drawn, continues the variation as follows:
49 \&e4 b5 50 a5 \&e6 51 g4 h4! 52 g5 c4
53 bx\&c4 bx\&c4 54 \&d4 \&f5 55 \&xc4 \&g5
56 \&c5 \&f4 57 \&b6 \&g3 58 \&xa6 \&xh3
59 \&b5 \&g2! 60 a6 h3 61 a7 h2 62 a8\&++
\&g1. However, White can play more
accurately.

49 g4!

Bad is 49...hx\&g4 50 hx\&g4 b5 51 a5 \&d5
(52 \&e4 was threatened) 52 g5 and the
white pawn queens with check. If 49...b5
White wins by 50 gx\&h5! (but not 50 axb5?
axb5 51 gx\&h5 \&e7, and also not 50 a5?
h4!, after which Gligoric’s variation is
reached) 50...c4 51 bx\&c4 bx\&a4 52 h6 or
51...bx\&c4 52 \&e4.

50 \&f6!
Also possible is 50 g5 b5 (50...e7 51 e5) 51 axb5 axb5 52 f6!

50 ... b5
51 axb5 axb5
52 g5 c4
53 bxc4 b4
53...bxc4 54 g6 c3 55 g7 c2 56 g8\W c1\W 57 d8+ and 58 c8+.

54 g6 b3
55 g7 b2
56 g8\W b1\W
57 d5+ c7
58 c5+ d8
59 a5+!

59 d4+ followed by 60 xh4 also wins, of course, but the check at a5 is simpler, since it forces the exchange of queens (59...e8 60 b5+, or 59...c8 60 f5+).

*Examples involving the transition into a pawn ending (and indeed, pawn endings in general) are excellent for training in the calculation of variations.* Here are two further exercises on this topic.
The Fortress

Annotations, particularly those by third parties, often promote the concept of the game in which the winner does everything right, while the loser does everything wrong. This is rare in practice, except when one player is much stronger than the other.

John Nunn

The construction of a fortress – an impregnable position, in which a player can restrict himself to passive defence – is one of the important methods of defence in the endgame. Certain types of fortress, mainly with a small amount of material, are well known in theory.
It is essential to remember these positions—they can act as saving beacons in difficult situations.

In the first part of the book we examined the Georgadze–Yusupov ending (p.39), in which Black gave his opponent a chance to set up an elementary fortress, and the latter did not exploit it.

Here is another, more recent example.

Sokolov – Yusupov
Candidates Match, 7th game, Riga 1986

By playing 38 \( \text{Nc2} \), White would have gradually converted his two-pawn advan-
tage, but Andrei Sokolov decided to win more quickly.

38 \( \text{Ec1?} \) \( \text{Nxe3} \)
39 \( \text{fxe3} \) \( \text{Exe3!} \)
With his flag about to fall, Yusupov had time to sense that only this piece sacrifice would leave him with any chances.

40 \( \text{Exc3} \)
But here, realising that after the planned 40...\( \text{Exd4} \) 41 \( \text{Nc4+} \) he would be unable to regain the piece, he made the reflex move 40...\( \text{Ee1+??} \) The time control was reached, White sealed 41 \( \text{Kh2} \), and Black, of course, resigned. Paradoxically, the exchange of rooks would have led to a draw.

40 ... \( \text{Exd4} \)
41 \( \text{Nc4+} \)
Of course, not 41 \( \text{Ec8+?} \) \( \text{Ee8+} \).
41 ... \( \text{Kh8} \)
41...\( \text{Ee6+} \) is equally good.

42 \( \text{Exe3} \) \( \text{Exe3+} \)
In the resulting ending it transpires that, despite White's extra knight, he is unable either to mate the enemy king, or coax it out of the corner. Of course, it is not hard to eliminate the h6 pawn (with the king at g6 and bishop at d5 – \( \text{Qf7+} \) and \( \text{Qh6+} \)), but what is he to do after that?
Q 2-13. How does Black defend against 1 \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \)?

He has to parry the threat of 2 \( \mathcal{Q}h7 \) and 3 \( \mathcal{Q}g8 \), after which his king ends up in a mating net.

1 \( \mathcal{Q}f6 \) \( \mathcal{Q}c1! \). If 2 \( \mathcal{Q}h7 \) there follows 2...\( gxf6 \) (not 2...\( \mathcal{x}g5? \) 3 \( \mathcal{Q}e4 \) and 4 \( \mathcal{Q}g8 \) 3 \( g6 \) \( \mathcal{Q}h6 \) or 3 \( gxf6 \) \( \mathcal{x}h7 \) (White does not have 4 \( g5 \)).

2 \( \mathcal{Q}h5 \) \( \mathcal{b}2 \) 3 \( \mathcal{Q}f4 \) \( \mathcal{a}3! \) Black defends against 4 \( \mathcal{Q}g6+ \) \( \mathcal{h}7 \) 5 \( \mathcal{f}8+ \) \( \mathcal{h}8 \) 6 \( \mathcal{h}7 \). White is unable to create any new, more serious threats.

If Yusupov had had even a few seconds more, he would undoubtedly have taken the correct decision. After all, at one of our training sessions we had discussed a similar ending.

Kremenetsky – Vulfson
Moscow 1977

\[ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} 
\hline
& a & b & c & d & e & f & g & h \\
\hline
1 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
2 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
3 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
4 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
5 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
6 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
7 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
8 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{array} \]

Not wishing to allow ...h5–h4, White played 49 \( g4? \) and, as is now already clear to us, threw away the win. He should have put his opponent in zugzwang, forcing ...g7–g5.

49 \( \mathcal{Q}e7! \) (49 \( \mathcal{Q}c2 \) \( \mathcal{g}8! \) is less accurate)

49...\( h4 \) (49...\( \mathcal{h}7 \) 50 \( \mathcal{c}2+ \) \( \mathcal{h}6 \) 51 \( g3 \)) 50

\( \mathcal{c}2 \) \( g5 \) (50...\( \mathcal{e}1 \) 51 \( \mathcal{g}1 \)). The aim has been achieved.

The subsequent plan, indicated by Vladimir Vulfson, looks as follows:
1) The knight is played to e4, after which ...\( \mathcal{e}1 \) is bad because of \( \mathcal{g}1 \).
2) \( g2–g4! \) Black takes the pawn en passant, and White captures on g3 with his knight or (after first playing \( \mathcal{g}2 \)) with his king.
3) The g5 pawn is attacked by the knight and the king.
4) The enemy king is driven back onto the 8th rank.
5) The g5 pawn is won. With the king at f8 White wins by \( \mathcal{g}6 \), \( \mathcal{b}3 \), then a knight check at e6 or h7 and the capture of the pawn. If the black king is at h8 – then \( \mathcal{g}6 \), \( \mathcal{b}3 \), \( \mathcal{f}7+ \), and the pawn is eliminated by a discovered check.
6) The h-pawn is advanced to the queening square.

Chernin – Petursson
World Junior Championship, Skien 1979

\[ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} 
\hline
& a & b & c & d & e & f & g & h \\
\hline
1 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
2 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
3 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
4 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
5 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
6 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
7 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
8 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{array} \]

The first phase of this very interesting ending is an excellent illustration of the terrible power of the two bishops in the endgame.

45 \( \mathcal{e}5!! \)
A deep, purely positional pawn sacrifice. 45 g4 suggests itself, but after 45...\textit{\dore 6} (45...\textit{\dorxf3?} 46 \textit{\dor e8} 46 \textit{\dole f2} \textit{\dore a5} the vulnerability of the a2 and f3 pawns gives Black counterplay. By exchanging rooks, White wants to restrict his opponent's activity.

45 \ldots \textit{\dore x e5?!} 
45...\textit{\dor c1+} 46 \textit{\dole f2} \textit{\dore a1} 47 \textit{\dore e2} was unpromising, but 45...\textit{\dorxf3} or 45...\textit{\dorexc3} came into consideration.

46 \textit{\dore xe5} \textit{\dor xf3} 
47 \textit{\dore b8} \textit{\dore a6} 
48 \textit{\dore c8!}

Weaker is 48 \textit{\dore c7} b5 49 \textit{\dore c8} b4! followed by 50...\textit{\dore d5}.

48 \ldots \textit{\dore d5} 
49 \textit{\dore a3} \textit{\dore c4+} 
50 \textit{\dore f2} \textit{\dore g6} 
51 \textit{\dore e3!}

Here too 51 \textit{\dore c7?} was premature because of 51...\textit{\dore e7!} and 52...\textit{\dore d5}.

51 \ldots \textit{\dore e7} 
52 \textit{\dore b7}

We can now estimate the true worth of Chernin's idea. Black, despite his material advantage, stands badly. The bishop pair controls the entire board, and the white king (in contrast to its black colleague) is very active.

52 \ldots \textit{\dore a5} 
53 \textit{\dore d4} \textit{\dore e6} 
54 \textit{\dore c7} \textit{\dore c8} 
55 \textit{\dore e5} \textit{\dore g7} 
56 \textit{\dore d8} \textit{\dore h3} 
57 \textit{\dore e4} \textit{\dore e6} 
58 \textit{\dore d3}

Here the game was adjourned.

In the adjourned position I was able to find a clear plan of playing for zugzwang, which Chernin then gradually implemented throughout the two-hour morning adjournment session. First the kingside pawns must be advanced as far as possible.

58 \ldots \textit{\dore h3} 
59 \textit{\dore e2} \textit{\dore e6} 
60 \textit{\dore b3}

If 60...h6, then, by playing g4--g5 at a convenient moment, White obtains a powerful passed h-pawn.

61 \textit{\dore a6} \textit{\dore e6} 
62 \textit{\dore e2} \textit{\dore b3} 
63 \textit{\dore g5} \textit{\dore e6} 
64 \textit{\dore h4} \textit{\dore h3} 
65 \textit{\dore h5} \textit{\dore e6} 
66 \textit{\dore d3} \textit{\dore g4} 
67 \textit{\dore h6+} \textit{\dore g8} 
68 \textit{\dore c7} \textit{\dore f3}

If 68...\textit{\dore e6} the plan was 69 \textit{\dore f6} \textit{\dore b3} 70 \textit{\dore a6} \textit{\dore e6} 71 a4 \textit{\dore g4} (71...\textit{\dore f8?} 72 \textit{\dore g6}; 71...\textit{\dore h8?} 72 \textit{\dore xc8} \textit{\dore xc8} 73 \textit{\dore xf7}) 72 \textit{\dore c4}, and the same position is reached as in the game.

69 \textit{\dore c4} \textit{\dore g4} 

At the World Junior Championship I was Artur Yusupov's second, but on occasions I also helped Sasha Chernin. (Later I was his trainer for several years, and helped him develop from an ordinary master into a strong grandmaster, and a participant in the world championship candidates event.)

70 \textit{\dore a4?!}

White could probably have managed without this move, but in the analysis it seemed
useful, since in certain variations it prevents ...b6–b5 and ...\( \text{c}6-\text{a}7-\text{b}5 \). But the fantastic defensive idea, which Black now acquired, simply did not occur either to Chernin, or to me, or to Anatoly Bykhovsky, Chernin's second at the championship.

70 ... \( \text{d}1 \)
71 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{h}5 \)
72 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{g}4 \)
73 \( \text{c}4 \)

Here the game was again adjourned. However, we had reached this position on our board before the start of the morning adjournment session. After 73...\( \text{h}5 \) 74 \( \text{d}5 \) that zugzwang position, for which White has been playing, is reached: 74...\( \text{g}6 \) 75 \( \text{b}7 \) or 74...\( \text{f}8 \) 75 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 76 \( \text{f}5 \).

Expecting Black to capitulate, we did not bother looking seriously at the adjourned position. A serious mistake! You should get into the way of thinking, that there are no absolutely won, and also no absolutely drawn positions. Margeir Petursson and his second, grandmaster Gudmundur Sigurjonsson, had prepared an extremely unpleasant surprise.

73 ... \( \text{h}5 \)
74 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{g}6 \)
75 \( \text{b}7 \) \( \text{c}2!! \)

Q 2-14. Does White win after the capture of the knight?

If 76 \( \text{xc}8 \), then 76...\( \text{xa}4 \) 77 \( \text{xb}6 \) \( \text{b}3 \) 78 \( \text{xa}5 \) \( \text{c}4 \). How can White convert his piece advantage? If 79 \( \text{g}6 \)? there follows 79...\( \text{fxg}6 \)!, and after the exchange of bishops an elementary theoretical fortress is reached. The bishop can be driven off the a2–g8 diagonal, but then it will be excellently placed at h5, again preventing g5–g6. Chernin took a practical decision: to continue manoeuvring, not changing the position, with the aim of reaching another time control and again adjourning the position. And during this time, I on my pocket set looked for winning chances. And I soon realised that the piece can after all be captured. White has the following plan for taking the enemy fortress:

1) Seize control of the a2–g8 diagonal. 79 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{b}3 \) 80 \( \text{b}7 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 81 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{d}3 \).

2) Play the bishop to g7, in order to immobilise the enemy king. 82 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 83 \( \text{e}7 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 84 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 85 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{h}5 \).

3) Occupy f5 with the bishop and take the king to f4 to create a zugzwang position. 86 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 87 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 88 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 89 \( \text{f}5! \) (of course, not 89 \( \text{fxg}6?? \) \( \text{fxg}6 \), again with an elementary drawing fortress) 89...\( \text{h}5 \) 90 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 91 \( \text{e}4! \) \( \text{h}5 \) 92 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{d}1 \). The bishop is forced to abandon the convenient squares h5 and g6, since after 92...\( \text{g}6 \) 93 \( \text{g}4 \) Black is in zugzwang.

4) A pawn sacrifice, prepared by all the preceding manoeuvres: now Black has to take on g6 with his h-pawn. 93 \( \text{g}6! \) \( \text{hxg}6 \) 94 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{b}3 \).

5) Return the bishop to the a2–g8 diagonal, forcing the exchange of bishops (otherwise the f7 pawn cannot be defended). 95 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{h}7 \) 96 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 97 \( \text{xd}5 \).

The rest is no longer difficult, e.g. 97...\( \text{g}5 \) 98 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 99 \( \text{e}5 \) f6+ 100 \( \text{e}4 \) f5+
101 \(\text{\textit{c}}\text{e}5 \text{g}4 \ 102 \text{\textit{f}}\text{f}4 \text{\textit{h}}7 \ 103 \text{\textit{x}}\text{f}5 \text{g}3 \ 104 \text{\textit{g}}\text{g}5 \text{g}2 \ 105 \text{\textit{d}}\text{d}4.

White's winning plan is rather instructive – it uses two typical procedures that are usually employed against an enemy fortress: zugzwang and a pawn breakthrough.

Let us return to the game.

76 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}6 \text{\textit{d}}3
77 \text{\textit{c}}\text{d}7 \text{\textit{c}}2
78 \text{\textit{e}}\text{e}8 \text{\textit{b}}3
79 \text{\textit{d}}\text{d}7 \text{\textit{c}}2
80 \text{\textit{e}}\text{e}5 \text{\textit{d}}1
81 \text{\textit{d}}\text{d}4 \text{\textit{b}}3
82 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}3 \text{\textit{e}}6

Why not 82...\text{\textit{d}}\text{d}1? Evidently Black was concerned about 83 \text{\textit{b}}\text{b}2 (with the threat of 84 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}3 and 85 \text{\textit{x}}\text{c}8). Yet after 83...\text{\textit{f}}\text{f}3! 84 \text{\textit{x}}\text{c}8 (84 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}3 \text{\textit{b}}7) 84...\text{\textit{c}}\text{c}6 85 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}3 \text{\textit{b}}5 the queenside pawns would have been exchanged. Perhaps Petursson knew that the resulting position was won for White, and therefore he exploited an opportunity to change the pattern of the game?

83 \text{\textit{d}}\text{xe}6

Chernin accepted the invitation and transposed into a favourable bishop against knight ending, fearing quite reasonably that subsequently such an opportunity might not present itself.

83 ... \text{\textit{f}}\text{xe}6
84 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}4 \text{\textit{f}}7
85 \text{\textit{d}}\text{b}5 \text{\textit{g}}6
86 \text{\textit{a}}\text{xb}6

Q 2-15. Calculate the exchange on b6.

By this point both players were terribly tired. They were no longer trying to calculate variations, but were acting intuitively. Although in principle the calculation here is not too difficult. The pawn ending is won for White.

86...\text{\textit{d}}\text{d}xb6 87 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}xb6 \text{e}5 88 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}5 \text{\textit{g}}\text{g}5 (88...e4 89 \text{\textit{b}}\text{b}4 \text{\textit{g}}\text{g}5 90 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}3 \text{\textit{f}}4 91 \text{\textit{d}}\text{d}2) 89 \text{\textit{d}}\text{d}4 \text{\textit{f}}4 90 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}3! (but not 90 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}5? \text{\textit{e}}4 91 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}3 \text{\textit{e}}3 92 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}6 \text{\textit{g}}\text{g}3! 93 \text{\textit{d}}\text{d}3 \text{\textit{f}}2 94 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}7 \text{\textit{e}}2 95 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}8\text{\textit{w}} \text{\textit{e}}1\text{\textit{w}}) 90...\text{\textit{g}}\text{g}3 (90...e4 91 \text{\textit{d}}\text{d}2; 90...\text{\textit{f}}\text{f}3 91 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}5 \text{\textit{e}}4 92 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}6) 91 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}5 \text{\textit{e}}4 92 \text{\textit{d}}\text{d}4! \text{\textit{f}}4 93 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}6 \text{\textit{e}}3 94 \text{\textit{d}}\text{d}3! \text{\textit{f}}3 95 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}7 \text{\textit{e}}2 96 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}8\text{\textit{w}}+.

86 ... \text{\textit{g}}\text{g}5
87 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}5?

A blunder (87 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}5 was correct), which Black did not exploit. Now 87...\text{\textit{d}}\text{d}xb6! 88 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}5 \text{e}5 would have led to a draw.

87 ... \text{\textit{f}}6?
88 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}5 \text{e}5
89 \text{\textit{b}}\text{b}5 \text{\textit{e}}6
90 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}6 \text{e}4
91 \text{\textit{a}}\text{a}5 \text{\textit{d}}7+
92 \text{\textit{c}}\text{c}7! \text{\textit{d}}5+
93 \text{\textit{b}}\text{b}7

Black resigns.
How many events! A subtle pawn sacrifice, and a demonstration of the strength of the two bishops. Then a pretty defence by Black and an interesting plan for taking a fortress. Finally, a minor piece ending and an instructive pawn ending.

In the following example we encounter a quite different type of fortress.

Tseshkovsky - Tukmakov
Zonal Tournament, Yerevan 1982
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Q 2-16. It is Black to move. How would you have continued?

Black’s positional advantage is unquestioned. The idea of ...f7–f6, as chosen by him, looks natural and logical. After the exchange on f6 he will strengthen his position by ...g6–g5, ...e5–e4 etc., gaining excellent winning chances.

However, Vitaly Tseshkovsky finds an opportunity to set up a fortress.

46 ... f6?!

47 f4!

It is essential for White to retain his pawn at g5. So long as it is alive, the enemy king remains cut off in the upper part of the board. The knight alone, without the support of its king, is hardly capable of helping its passed e-pawn or of winning the opponent’s pawns.

47 ... d7!

Q 2-17. What should White play?

What does Black want? Evidently, 48...exf4 49 gxf4 fxg5 50 fxg5 e5 with two threats: 51...xc4 and 51...f7. The prophylactic move 48 b3! would have guaranteed the immunity of the c4 pawn, and the g5 pawn could have been defended by the king: 51 g3. Black would also not have achieved anything with 48...fxg5 49 fxg5 e4 50 f2 e5 51 e3 f7 (or 51...f3) 52 f4! e3 53 d1. In this case a draw would have become inevitable.

48 h3? exf4

49 gxf4!

White could have retained material equality by 49 gxf6+ xf6 50 xf4, but after 50...g5 Black’s positional advantage would most probably have proved enough for a win. In order to retain his pawn at g5, Tseshkovsky parts with his c4 pawn, since its loss does not yet decide the fate of the fortress he has constructed.

49 ... fxg5

50 fxg5 e5

51 g3

51 b3? f3.

51 ... xc4
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Now Vladimir Tukmakov succeeds in breaching his opponent’s defences, whereas with accurate defence the game could still have been saved. Here are some possible variations:

52 \( \text{d}3 \text{e}3 \text{f}5+ \) 54 \( \text{f}4 \) (54 \( \text{h}3? \text{d}4 55 \text{d}3 \text{f}3 \)) 54...\( \text{d}4 \) 55 \( \text{d}3 \text{h}4 \) 56 \( \text{f}1! \) (but not 56 \( \text{g}4? \text{h}3! \) 57 \( \text{x}h3 \text{f}3 58 \text{g}4 \text{e}5+ \)) 56...\( \text{h}3 \) (there is nothing better) 57 \( \text{x}h3 \text{xb}5 \) 58 \( \text{e}3 \). If the knight wants to attack the g5 pawn, the white king will break through more quickly on the queenside, and the black king cannot be transferred there because of the weakness of the g6 pawn.

52 \( \text{e}4 \) (this move is evidently even more reliable than 52 \( \text{d}3 \)) 52...\( \text{e}3 \) 53 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{d}1 \) 54 \( \text{d}3 \text{h}4 \) 55 \( \text{c}4! \) (55 \( \text{e}2? \text{c}3 \) 56 \( \text{c}4 \text{h}3 \) 57 \( \text{g}3 \text{e}4+ \) 55...\( \text{h}7 \) (55...\( \text{h}3 \) 56 \( \text{g}3; \) 55...\( \text{c}3 \) 56 \( \text{g}4 \) 56 \( \text{f}3! \), and Black has not achieved anything.

52 ... \( \text{h}4! \) 53 \( \text{d}3 \)

53 \( \text{e}4 \) also does not help in view of 53...\( \text{h}3 \) 54 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{d}2 \) 55 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{b}1 \) 56 \( \text{x}h3 \text{c}3 \) 57 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{xb}5 \) 58 \( \text{f}4 \text{a}3! \) (intending ...\( \text{b}6-\text{b}5 \) or ...\( \text{a}3-\text{c}4-\text{e}5-\text{f}7 \) - White is clearly too late in taking his king to the queenside.

53 ... \( \text{h}3 \) 54 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{h}2?! \)

54...\( \text{d}2! \) 55 \( \text{x}h3 \text{f}3 \) was much stronger. In making the move in the game, Tukmakov was hoping for 55 \( \text{x}h2 \text{e}5 \) 56 \( \text{e}2 \text{f}7 \), but White has a more tenacious defence.

55 \( \text{e}4! \) \( \text{a}3 \) 56 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 57 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{c}3 \)

57...\( \text{a}3! \)?

\( \text{d}4 \) 58 \( \text{f}3? \)

58 \( \text{f}4! \) would have set the opponent much more difficult problems. Of course, 58...\( \text{x}e4? \) is not possible: 59 \( \text{x}e4 \text{f}7 \) 60 \( \text{d}4 \text{e}7 \) 61 \( \text{c}4 \text{d}7 \) 62 \( \text{b}5 \text{c}7 \) 63 \( \text{e}6 \). Let us analyse the variations arising after 58...\( \text{b}5 \) 59 \( \text{e}3 \).

59...\( \text{x}d1+? \) is incorrect: 60 \( \text{d}2 \text{f}2 \) 61 \( \text{g}2 \text{g}4 \) 62 \( \text{c}3 \text{e}5 \) 63 \( \text{b}4 \text{f}7 \) 64 \( \text{xb}5 \text{g}5 \) 65 \( \text{c}6 \text{f}7 \) 66 \( \text{h}3 \) and 67 \( \text{e}6 \).

59...\( \text{b}4 \) 60 \( \text{d}4 \). Now 60...\( \text{x}e2+ \) is tempting, hoping for 61 \( \text{c}4 \text{f}4 \) 62 \( \text{b}4 \text{h}3 \) 63 \( \text{b}5 \text{x}g5 \) 64 \( \text{g}2 \text{f}6 \). But White replies 61 \( \text{e}3 \), not fearing either 61...\( \text{g}3 \) 62 \( \text{c}2 \), or 61...\( \text{g}1 \) 62 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{b}3 \) 63 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 64 \( \text{c}2 \text{e}2 \) 65 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 66 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 67 \( \text{c}4! \text{f}4 \) 68 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 69 \( \text{d}4 \text{g}5 \) 70 \( \text{d}5 \text{f}7 \) 71 \( \text{e}6 \).

60...\( \text{a}4! \) is stronger, e.g. 61 \( \text{b}1 \text{b}3 \) 62 \( \text{c}4 \text{b}2 \), or 61 \( \text{c}2 \text{c}5 \) 62 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{b}3 \)

63 \( \text{b}3 \text{e}4 \) 64 \( \text{b}5 \text{g}5 \) 65 \( \text{c}6 \text{f}7 \) and 66...\( \text{f}6 \).

After 61 \( \text{c}4 \) Black has a final problem to solve. Incorrect is 61...\( \text{c}5? \) 62 \( \text{b}1! \text{d}7 \) 63 \( \text{b}4 \text{e}5 \) 64 \( \text{b}5 \text{f}7 \) 65 \( \text{c}6 \) or 62...\( \text{b}3 \) 63 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 64 \( \text{c}6 \text{a}4 \) 65 \( \text{d}6 \).

He must play 61...\( \text{b}3! \) 62 \( \text{b}4 \text{c}5 \) 63 \( \text{b}1 \)

\( \text{b}2 \) (also possible is 63...\( \text{d}7 \) 64 \( \text{b}5 \text{e}5 \) 65 \( \text{c}6 \text{f}6 \) 66...\( \text{f}6 \)
65 \( \text{b6} \) \( \text{f7} \) 66 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{e7} \) 67 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{b2} \) 68 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{f3} \) 69 \( \text{xg6} \) \( \text{dxg5} \) 64 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{b3} \) 65 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{d2} \) 66 \( \text{c2} \) \( \text{b1} \) 67 \( \text{xb1} \) \( \text{xb1} \) 68 \( \text{xd6} \) \( \text{c2} \) 69 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{f3} \) 70 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{dxg5} \) 71 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{f7} \).

In these variations it is not at all hard to go astray, which means that White would have had some practical drawing chances.

\[ \text{58} \ldots \text{f7!} \]

Threatening to transpose into a pawn ending: 59...\( \text{xe4} \) 60 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 61 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 62 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{c7} \) 63 \( \text{b4} \) \( \text{b8} \!) (avoiding the mined square b7) 64 \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{a7} \).

\[ \text{59} \text{c2} \]

With the king at f4 White would have played 59 \( \text{f3} \).

\[ \text{59} \ldots \text{b5} \]

\[ \text{60} \text{b3} \text{a4} \]

\[ \text{61} \text{e3} \text{c5} \]

\[ \text{62} \text{c2} \text{b4} \]

\[ \text{63} \text{d4} \text{b3} \]

\[ \text{64} \text{b1} \text{d7} \]

\[ \text{65} \text{c3} \text{e5} \]

\[ \text{66} \text{xb3} \text{f3} \]

At last the g5 pawn falls, and the black king gains the opportunity to come into play. The rest is a matter of technique.

\[ \text{67} \text{c3} \text{xg5} \]

\[ \text{68} \text{d4} \text{f6} \]

\[ \text{69} \text{e3} \text{h3} \]

\[ \text{70} \text{f3} \text{g5} \]

\[ \text{71} \text{d3} \text{f4} \]

\[ \text{72} \text{c4} \text{h5} \]

\[ \text{73} \text{b5} \text{f6} \]

\[ \text{74} \text{c4} \text{h4} \]

\[ \text{75} \text{f4} \text{h5+} \]

\[ \text{76} \text{e4} \text{g3} \]

\[ \text{77} \text{d3} \text{f6+} \]

\[ \text{78} \text{e3} \text{g5} \]

White resigns.

The best way of opposing an enemy fortress is not to allow its construction. Let us return to the initial position. The basis of White's defence was his g5 pawn; it was only because of it that the black king remained out of play. Black should have separated the f2 and g5 pawns, and only then played ...\( \text{f7-f6} \).

\[ \text{46} \text{e4!} \text{47} \text{h3} \text{f6} \text{exf3+} \text{48} \text{xf3} \text{f6} \]

\[ \text{49} \text{f4} \text{d7} \text{leads to the type of position for which Black has been aiming from the very start. He plays ...\( \text{e5} \), then ...\( \text{f7} \), and his king comes into play, ensuring a decisive positional advantage.} \]

\[ \text{47} \text{f6} \text{48} \text{h4} \text{f5!} \text{White was threatening to simplify the position by 49} \text{g4. Premature is 48} \ldots \text{d3?} \text{49} \text{f3} \text{e5} \text{50} \text{gx6+} \text{(but not 50} \text{xe4?} \text{f5}) \text{50} \ldots \text{xf6} \text{51} \text{xe4} \text{xc4} \text{52} \text{f4 or 52} \text{g4 with a draw.} \]

\[ \text{49} \text{h3} \text{.} \]

\[ \text{125} \]

\[ \text{49} \ldots \text{d7!} \text{49} \ldots \text{d3} \text{50} \text{f4} \text{b2 suggests itself, when bad is 51} \text{b3?} \text{e3} \text{52} \text{g2} \text{e2} \text{53} \text{f2} \text{d3+} \text{54} \text{xe2} \text{c1+}. \text{But after 51} \text{g2!} \text{xc4} \text{52} \text{f2 we again see the familiar construction of a fortress. Black's king is out of play, and his knight alone will be unable to do anything, despite his extra passed} \text{e4 pawn. For example, 52} \ldots \text{a3} \text{53} \text{a4} \text{b1} \text{54} \text{b3!} \text{c3} \text{55} \text{c4 etc.} \]

Analysis showed that Tseshkovsky's idea of constructing a fortress was correct. He only lost because of subsequent mistakes. "It is not enough to be a good player, you must also play well" (Tarrasch).
Instead of 50...\(\text{b2}\), 50...h4!? looks more promising, with these variations: 51 \(\text{xh4}\) \(\text{xf2}\) 52 g4 e3 53 \(\text{g3 fxa4}\) (threatening 54...\(\text{h1+}\)) 54 \(\text{g2 h3}\); 51 gxf4 \(\text{xf4+}\) 52 \(\text{g3 e2+}\) 53 \(\text{f2 d4}\) 54 \(\text{b1 f3}\) 55 \(\text{g3 d2}\) 56 \(\text{a2 e3}\); 51 \(\text{b1 f2+}\) 52 \(\text{g2 h3+}\) 53 \(\text{xf2 e3+}\). However, by playing 51 \(\text{h2}\)! White parries the immediate threats and can hope to save the game. 50 \(\text{d1 e5}\) 51 \(\text{e2 f8! Zugzwang!}\)

This is not surprising — after all, White’s defensive front is now stretched. The g5 and f2 pawns, which the king must cover, are too far apart, and the c4 pawn is still vulnerable. After 52 \(\text{g2}\) Black wins by 52...\(\text{f7}\), and if 52 \(\text{h4}\) 52...\(\text{d3}\) 53 \(\text{f4 c1}\) and 54...\(\text{e3}\). Bad is 52 \(\text{f1 f3}\), while after 52 \(\text{d1 xc4}\) 53 \(\text{f4}\) Black wins by 53...\(\text{xf3}\) 54 \(\text{xf3 d3!} 55 \text{h2(h4) 55...c2 and 56...d4.}\)

Krejčík – Perlis
1906

What is the simplest way for Black to convert his advantage? He decided to carry out an exchanging combination.

1 \(\ldots\) \(\text{xa5!}\)
2 \(\text{xaxa5}\) \(\text{xa5+}\)
3 \(\text{xa5}\) \(\text{a8}\)
4 \(\text{xa8}\) \(\text{xa8}\)

Perlins overlooks a clever defensive idea for White. Interposing the check 4...\(\text{b4+}\) would have prevented the construction of a fortress and ensured a straightforward win: 5 \(\text{xb4 xa8}\) 6 \(\text{c4}\) (6 \(\text{c5 gxf3}\) 7 gxf3 f5 8 b4 fxe4 9 fxe4 \(\text{xe4!}\) 6 fxg4 hxg4 7 g3 \(\text{c7}\) 8 \(\text{b5 c4}\) 6...\(\text{gxf3}\) 7 gxf3 f5 8 b4 f4 9 b5 (9 \(\text{c5 c4}\) 9...\(\text{d6}\).
5 \(\text{b4!}\)

E 2-8
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Can Black convert his advantage of an extra bishop?
The Reward for Tenacious Defence

Defence demands great courage and great self-control.
Emanuel Lasker

Experts who study swimming reckon that, in a great number of instances, people drown not due to the action of objective, physical laws (after all, water pushes them up to the surface), but for purely psychological reasons. In a dangerous situation an inexperienced swimmer becomes frightened, loses his composure, begins to flap about, makes frantic and unnecessary movements, gets water in his mouth... Retaining your self-control in such cases means saving your life! Something similar also often occurs in chess.

Arhason – Dolmatov
Sochi 1988
128

Jon Arhason sealed his 41st move. There is no doubt about the evaluation of the adjourned position: White has a great advantage. He does not have to hurry, but can manoeuvre about and choose a con-venient moment for the decisive breakthrough. Black lacks any counterplay. In such situations a player often loses heart, and a sense of hopelessness arises. He either makes a few moves for the sake of appearances, merely awaiting an appropriate moment to resign the game, or, on the contrary, goes in for the first reckless venture that comes his way, on the principle 'Better a horrible end, than horror without end!'. But in fact it is by no means essential to 'drown'. You must fight in any situation, even the most desperate – otherwise you will not enjoy any great success. 'If the opponent all the time encounters new obstacles, if you hinder his every step forward, his attention begins to waver and weaken, and the probability of a mistake increases' (Keres).

The optimism of the defender can also be based on an understanding of a serious psychological problem, which usually confronts a player who is trying to convert his advantage. As a rule, it is not possible to break a tenacious resistance by operating with purely technical means. At some point you definitely have to exert yourself, calculate variations exactly, and seek a concrete way to win. Lulled by the favourable course taken by the game and by the absence of countercances for the opponent, and aiming for the gradual strengthening of his own position, a player can easily miss an appropriate moment, or avoid concrete calculations or carry them out care-
lessly, and as a result — let the win slip out of his hands.
But how should Black arrange his defence in this adjourned position? Initially at least some reference-points are necessary: he must consider the active attempts for White and evaluate his possible replies.
It is probable that, in addition to the positional pluses that he already has, White would not be averse also to seizing control of the c-file. Let us make two successive moves for him — \( \square b3 \) and \( \square c1 \). The further strengthening of the position by \( \square e5, \square c5 \) etc. will most probably lead to a win. This means that to \( 41 \ \square d3 \) we reply \( 41... \square c8! \)
In the event of the rooks being exchanged \( 42 \ \square c1 \square xc1 \) Black is not losing — the threat of his king invading via f5 will restrict the opponent's activity.
If \( 41 \ \square c1 \) (with the threat of \( 42 \ \square d3 \)) the only defence is \( 41... \square b5 \) (41... \( \square c8? \) 42 \( \square b7+ \) is not possible). The rook ending after \( 42 \ \square d3 \ \square xd3 \) 43 \( \square xd3 \) a4 44 \( \square c5 \) a3 can be held without difficulty.
After \( 41 \ \square b3 \) Black cannot play \( 41...a4? \) in view of \( 42 \ \square c5 \) followed by \( 43 \ \square d3 \), after which he will not be able to reply \( 43... \square c8 \) (his b4 pawn is under attack), and the change in the structure by \( 43...b3 \) 44 \( a3 \) favours White — a path for his king into the enemy position is opened. This means that correct is \( 41... \square a8! \) 42 \( \square c1 \ \square b5! \) (42...a4? 43 \( \square c5 \) and 44 \( \square d3 \)) 43 \( \square c5 \) a4 44 \( \square x b5 \) (44 \( \square c1 \ \square c4 \)) 44...axb3 45 axb3 \( \square a1 \) (intending 46...\( \square g1 \)) with a drawn rook ending.
Thus we have not discovered a direct way for White to win. So far so good! Now let us suppose that he begins manoeuvring with his pieces, avoiding for the moment doing anything concrete. Does Black have at least some program for improving his position? It turns out that he has! By playing \( ...\ \square e7, ...\ \square b6, ...\ \square b5 \) and \( ...a5—a4 \), he will significantly restrict the opponent's active possibilities and will be entitled to hope to hold the fortress-like position that he has constructed.
\( 41 \ \square c1 \)
A very sensible sealed move. After all, if he wishes White can again return to the adjourned position by repeating moves.
\( 41... \) \( \square b5! \)
\( 42 \ \square e1 \) \( \square d7 \)
\( 43 \ \square e3?! \)
Arnason decided not to force events. But now, by following the plan outlined above, Black strengthens his position, and subsequently the Icelandic player is unable to breach the defence. In Dolmatov's opinion, it was at this point that White missed a win, which could have been achieved only by a lengthy and complicated forcing variation (to which we will return later). This shows how difficult it can be, when holding an advantage, to switch from manoeuvring to the concrete finishing-off of the opponent, if even in adjournment analysis a grandmaster was unable to solve this problem!
\( 43... \) \( \square e7! \)
\( 44 \ \square f2 \) \( \square b6 \)
\( 45 \ \square c1 \) \( \square c6 \)
After the planned \( 45...\ \square b5 \) there would have followed \( 46 \ \square b3 \) a4 47 \( \square d2 \), when \( 47...\ \square c6? \) is bad because of \( 48 \ \square c5! \)
Black, it is true, can transfer his bishop to f5, but the white rook breaks through on the c-file.
\( 46 \ \square e3 \) \( \square c8 \)
\( 47 \ \square d2 \) \( \square b5 \)
\( 48 \ a3 \)
In order to make at least some progress, White exchanges a pair of pawns, which in principle is usually advantageous to the side who is having to defend.
\( 48... \) \( bxa3 \)
\( 49 \ bxa3 \)

see next diagram
Q 2-18. What should Black play?

To answer this question one must, as always, first understand what the opponent is intending to do.

49 ... a4!

Black's last pawn occupies a square of the same color as his bishop. A violation of a well-known positional principle? Yes, but at the same time it follows another one, which is less well known. When the majority of the pawns are badly placed (on squares of the color of the bishop), if some pawn gets stuck on a square of the opposite color, it is this pawn that often becomes a target for attack by the opponent. Were White to play a3-a4, it would no longer be possible to save the a5 pawn. This last move is therefore forced. 'In for a penny, in for a pound'.

50 \text{b}1 \text{c}6
51 \text{b}6 \text{f}6

The white rook has no invasion squares either on the b-file, or on the a-file (after 52 \text{a}6 \text{c}7). The a4 pawn can be won only at the cost of exchanging the minor pieces, but then the rook ending turns out to be drawn.

52 \text{e}3 \text{f}5
53 \text{f}3 \text{f}6

54 g4 hxg4+
55 \text{x}g4 \text{c}7

Black is in zugzwang and is forced to allow the enemy rook into his position, but after the pawn exchanges this is no longer so terrible.

56 \text{a}6

Before invading with his rook, Armasan wants to set his opponent another couple of questions.

56 ... \text{c}8
57 \text{b}4 \text{a}8

Black cannot give up his central pawn: after 57 ... \text{d}7? 58 \text{x}d5+ \text{f}7 both 59 \text{b}4 and 59 \text{b}7 are strong.

58 \text{d}3

If 58 \text{a}6 there follows 58 ... \text{b}7 59 \text{xa}4 \text{c}3, intending 60 ... \text{c}8!

58 ... \text{c}6!

Of course, the opponent cannot be allowed to shut in the bishop by 59 \text{e}5.

59 \text{c}5 \text{c}7
60 \text{b}8 \text{e}7
61 \text{f}8+ \text{f}1!

61 ... \text{g}7? would have lost to 62 \text{c}8 followed by \text{g}5. On the other hand, after the exchange of rooks 62 \textxf7+ \textxf7 63 \text{g}5 \text{b}5 the invasion of the king at g5 no longer leads to a win.

62 \text{d}8 \text{b}5
63 \text{d}6 \text{e}7
64 \text{b}6 \text{e}2+
65 \text{g}3 \text{d}1

The game continued for a long time yet. Dolmatov defended just as accurately and in the end he deservedly gained a draw. But now let us again return to the adjourned position and take back the neutral move 43 \text{e}3?! In his home analysis Dolmatov found a paradoxical winning plan for White, involving the exchange of his fine knight for the helpless black bishop. But first the white king needs to be activated.

43 \text{c}2! \text{e}7. We already know that 43 ... a4 44 \text{d}2 and 45 \text{d}3 followed by \text{c}1 is bad for Black.
44 \(\text{Qc}3\) \(\text{c}8\). Nothing is changed by 44...
\(\text{Qc}6\) 45 \(\text{Qxd}7\) \(\text{Qxd}7\) 46 \(\text{Qa}4\) \(\text{c}6\) 47 \(\text{e}2\).
45 \(\text{e}2!\) \(\text{c}6\) 46 \(\text{Qxd}7!\) Now is the time! Otherwise Black will avoid the exchange by 46...
\(\text{e}8!\)
46...
\(\text{Qxd}7\) 47 \(\text{a}4\) \(\text{c}4!\) 48 \(\text{d}2\) b3+!
49 \(\text{a}3\) a4+ (weaker is 49...
\(\text{c}6\) 50 a4)
50 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{c}6\). If Black keeps his king in the centre by 50...
\(\text{d}6\), then after 51 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{d}7\) 52 b3 \(\text{a}xb3\) 53 \(\text{a}xb3\) \(\text{c}1\) 54 \(\text{b}4\) White simply advances his king and his b-pawn.
Black must counter this plan.
51 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{b}5\).

Q 2-19. What should White play?

To Armas's credit, he reached this position in his analysis and correctly judged that after 52 b3 \(\text{a}xb3\) 53 \(\text{a}xb3\) \(\text{c}2\) and 54...
\(\text{g}2\) the activity of the black pieces would most probably prevent White from converting his extra pawn. The same evaluation would have applied in the event of 51 b3 (instead of 51 \(\text{d}3\)) 51...
\(\text{axb}3\) 52 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{b}5\) 53 a3 \(\text{c}1\) 54 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{g}1\). Dolmatov had looked more deeply into the position.
52 \(\text{e}3!\) \(\text{xd}4\) 53 b3! Now the black rook does not manage to attack the g3 pawn, and after 53...
\(\text{a}xb3\) 54 \(\text{a}xb3\) \(\text{d}1\) 55 \(\text{xe}6\)
White wins easily. However, the pawn ending has to be checked.
First let us calculate the direct variation: 53...
\(\text{a}xb3\) 54 \(\text{a}xb3\) \(\text{e}4\) 55 \(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{dxe}4\) 56 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{b}4\) 57 \(\text{c}2\) e3 58 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{b}3\) 59 \(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{c}3\) 60 \(\text{e}4\) \(\text{d}2\) 61 \(\text{e}5\) \(\text{e}3\) 62 \(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{d}3\) 63 f5! \(\text{g}x\text{f}5\) 64 \(\text{g}x\text{e}5\) \(\text{g}3\)
65 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{f}3\) 66 \(\text{g}x\text{h}5\) 67 \(\text{g}6\) \(\text{g}6\). 'Chess is the tragedy of one tempo'.
Let us try defending more cunningly.
53...
\(\text{e}4\) 54 \(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{dxe}4\) 55 \(\text{b}2\). Of course, not 55 bxa4+? \(\text{c}4\) 56 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{d}3\) 57 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{d}2\) 58 \(\text{a}5\) e3 with a draw.
55...
\(\text{a}3+!\) If 55...
\(\text{c}5\) White now wins by 56 bxa4 \(\text{d}4\) 57 a5! e3 58 \(\text{c}2\) or 57...
\(\text{d}3\) 58 \(\text{c}1\) \(\text{e}2\) 59 a6.
Black's last move is a clever trap. 56 \(\text{c}3\) ?
\(\text{c}5\) leads to a position of mutual zugzwang.
What should White play now? 57 b4+ \(\text{b}5\) will not do. 57 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{d}4\) (another position of mutual zugzwang) 58 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{c}3\) 59 \(\text{e}3\)
\(\text{b}2\) 60 b4 \(\text{xa}2\) leads to a queen ending that is not too pleasant for Black, but is probably defensible. Interesting is 57 \(\text{c}2!\)
\(\text{d}5\) (not 57...
\(\text{d}4\) ? 58 \(\text{d}2\) 58 \(\text{d}1\) e5! 59 \(\text{fxe}5\) (nothing is changed by 59 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{ex}4\) 60 \(\text{gf}4\) \(\text{d}4\)) 59...
\(\text{xe}5\) 60 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{d}4\) 61 \(\text{d}2\) e3+ 62 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{c}3\) 63 \(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{b}2\) 64 \(\text{d}2\) (again White can obtain a queen ending by 64 b4) 64...
\(\text{xa}2\) 65 \(\text{c}2\) \(\text{a}1\) 66 b4 g5! 67 hgx5 h4 68 g6 h3 69 g7 h2 70 \(\text{g}8\) \(\text{h}1\).
Such a position can be won, only by approaching with the queen 'by a staircase': 71 \(\text{g}7+\) \(\text{a}2\) 72 \(\text{f}7+\) \(\text{a}1\)
73 \(\text{f}6+\) and so on. But the 'and so on' does not happen – the d5 square is controlled by the black queen and on this step the staircase breaks down.
And yet the pawn ending is won for White. He merely needs to avoid the mined c3 square: 56 \(\text{c}2!!\) In reply to 56...
\(\text{c}5\) both 57 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{d}5\) (57...
\(\text{e}3\) 58 \(\text{d}3\) \(\text{b}4\)
59 \(\text{xe}3\) \(\text{c}3\) 60 b4!) 58 b4 e5 59 \(\text{fxe}5\) \(\text{xe}5\) 60 \(\text{c}4\)!, and 57 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{d}5\) 58 \(\text{e}2!\)
\(\text{d}4\) 59 \(\text{d}2\) e3+ (59...
\(\text{e}5\) 60 \(\text{fxe}5\) \(\text{xe}5\)
Oleg Romanishin would have liked very much to advance his pawn to h5. After 40 h4 \( \text{c}4 \) 41 \( \text{c}4 \) \( g7 \) (but not 41...h5? 42 \( \text{f}3 \), acquiring a very dangerous passed h-pawn) he is just one tempo short. If he had time to play 42 h5 and 43 \( \text{d}3 \), Black would be unable to defend against the threat of 44 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 45 e4!, but he does not have this tempo: 42 h5 \( \text{b}2+ \) leads to the loss of a pawn, and 42 \( \text{d}3 \) h5 to that which occurred in the game.

\[
\begin{align*}
40 & \ldots \quad \text{g7} \\
41 & \text{c3} \quad \text{c4} \\
42 & \text{f3} \quad \text{g6}!
\end{align*}
\]

The sealed move. Now if h3–h4 there is always the reply ...h6–h5. Home analysis showed that it would be very difficult to breach the fortress constructed by Black. Over the next few moves White manœuvre, checking on the opponent’s system of defence, and only then does he begin preparing a breakthrough.

\[
\begin{align*}
43 & \text{d1} \quad \text{e8} \\
44 & \text{c6} \quad \text{c6} \\
45 & \text{h4} \quad \text{h5}! \\
46 & \text{g5} \quad \text{b7} \\
47 & \text{b4} \quad \text{c6} \\
48 & \text{e2} \quad \text{d7} \\
49 & \text{f4} \quad \text{c6} \\
50 & \text{f3} \quad \text{d1} \quad \text{h1} \\
51 & \text{g5} \quad \text{g7} \\
52 & \text{d8} \quad \text{g6} \\
53 & \text{f3} \quad \text{d2} \\
54 & \text{e2} \quad \text{c4} \\
55 & \text{c7} \quad \text{d7} \\
56 & \text{d8} \quad \text{c6} \\
57 & \text{e2} \quad \text{c7} \\
58 & \text{d7}.
\end{align*}
\]

Q 2-20. What should Black play?

Here things are perhaps even worse for Black than in the preceding example. The two bishops in such a position are a very serious advantage. What is White threatening in particular? Obviously, \( \text{d}3 \) followed by \text{e}3–\text{e}4. The \text{e}3–\text{e}4 break must be prevented.

\[
\begin{align*}
36 & \ldots \quad \text{g6}! \\
37 & \text{d3} \quad \text{f5} \\
38 & \text{gxf5} \quad \text{gxf5} \\
39 & \text{d6}
\end{align*}
\]

If 39 h4 Black would have replied 39...\( \text{a}5 \), intending 40...\( \text{c}4 \) with the unpleasant threat of ...\( \text{b}2+ \).

\[
\begin{align*}
39 & \ldots \quad \text{a5} \\
40 & \text{f4}
\end{align*}
\]

Q 2-21. Which way gives White the best winning chances?
The win of a pawn: 59 ♞xc4 dxc4 60 ♞xb6 c3! leads to a drawn ending with opposite-colour bishops. It is obvious that the breakthrough plan must involve the sacrifice of the bishop at b6.

In the event of 59 ♞f3 ♞c6 60 ♞xb6 ♞xb6 61 ♞c5 Black faces a problem: which minor piece should he retain?

The bishop ending after 61...♗xa4 62 ♞xb6 f4 63 exf4 ♘f5 turns out to be lost in view of 64 ♞xd5! (after 64 ♞xh5 ♘xf4 65 ♞f7 ♘g4 66 h5 ♘g5 67 ♞c5 ♞d1 Black can still count on a draw) 64...♘xf4 65 ♞c4! ♘g4 66 d5 ♞xh4 67 d6 ♞d7 (68 ♞b5 was threatened) 68 ♞c7 ♘g4 69 ♞a6 and 70 ♞c8.

However, by retaining his knight, Black gains a draw: 61...♘xa4+! 62 ♞xc6 ♞c3 63 ♞xd5 f4! (weaker is 63...♗d1 64 e4 fxe4 65 ♞xe4+! 64 exf4 ♘f5 65 ♞c3 ♘xf4 66 ♞xc6 ♘g3.

Romanishin found another breakthrough idea, more dangerous for his opponent, which, I have to admit, Dolmatov and I underestimated in our analysis.

59 ♞xb6!! ♘xb6
60 a5 ♘c4
61 ♞a6!

This is the whole point! There is no win after 61 ♞xc4 dxc4 62 ♞xc4 ♞c8 63 ♞d5 (63 ♞b5 ♞f6 64 a6 ♘e6 65 ♞b6 ♞xa6 66 ♞xa6 ♞d5 with a draw) 63...♗f6 64 ♞c6 ♘e7 65 d5 (65 ♞c7 ♘e6!) 65...♘d8 etc.

61 ...
62 a7
63 ♞c5

There is the terrible threat of ♞e2–d1–a4–c6. This plan cannot be prevented. This means that Black, after picking up the e3 pawn with his knight, must urgently advance his f-pawn. But since he will have to give up his bishop (there is no time for the exchange of bishops), this must be done at a8, where for the moment the white bishop will block its own pawn.

63 ...
64 ♞d1 ♚xe3
65 ♞a4 f4
66 ♞c6 f3!
67 ♞xa8 f2
68 ♞xd5 f1♗
69 a8♗

The situation has changed radically. Now, from logical play aimed at maintaining his fortress, Black has to switch to the calculation of complicated variations, to play 'move by move'. For the majority of players such a switching is very difficult – it is here that irreparable mistakes are usually made. But Dolmatov copes excellently with the problems facing him.

69 ... ♜c1+
70 ♞d6 ♜f5+

The exchange of minor pieces 70...♕xd5? would be justified after 71 ♜xd5 ♜f4+. However, by interposing the check 71 ♜e8+ White would retain his extra pawn and gradually win the queen ending.

The attempt to escape with the king from the danger zone was tempting: 70...♕f5? The refutation is by no means obvious: 71 ♞e6+! ♜f4 72 ♜a5!

71 ♜d7 ♜e3!!

A difficult move! Dolmatov chose it by the
method of elimination – after deciding that everything else was bad. It was very easy to reject 71...\(\text{\&}x d4?\) – because of 72 \(\text{\&}e8+.\) 71...\(\text{\&}f4?\) also loses in view of 72 \(\text{\&}e8+\) \(\text{\&}g7\) 73 \(\text{\&}g8+\) \(\text{\&}h6\) 74 \(\text{\&}f8+\).

Things are more complicated after 71...\(\text{\&}x h4!?\) In this case White could have played to shut the knight out of the game by 72 \(\text{\&}g8+\) \(\text{\&}f5\) 73 \(\text{\&}e6+\) \(\text{\&}g5\) 74 \(\text{\&}e4\). He is threatening \(d4-d5-d6\), and 74...\(\text{\&}f4\) 75 \(\text{\&}g8+\) is not possible. However, after the subtle move 74...\(\text{\&}a1!\) suggested by grandmaster Adianto, the outcome remains unclear. For example: 75 \(d5\) \(\text{\&}a7+\) 76 \(\text{\&}e8\) \(\text{\&}b8+\) 77 \(\text{\&}f7\) \(\text{\&}f4+\) (77...\(\text{\&}c7?\) 78 \(\text{\&}e7+\) \(\text{\&}x e7+\) 79 \(\text{\&}x e7\) \(\text{\&}f4\) 80 \(d6\) 78 \(\text{\&}g7\) \(\text{\&}c7+\) (weaker is 78...\(\text{\&}f5+\) 79 \(\text{\&}f5\) \(\text{\&}x f5\) 80 \(\text{\&}e7+\) and 81 \(\text{\&}d6\) 79 \(\text{\&}h8\) \(\text{\&}d8+\), and the king cannot escape from the checks (if 80 \(\text{\&}g8+\) there is 80...\(\text{\&}g6+1\).

It is doubtful whether 73 \(\text{\&}f7+\) (instead of 73 \(\text{\&}e6+\)) is any stronger: 73...\(\text{\&}g4\) (but not 73...\(\text{\&}g5?\) 74 \(\text{\&}g7+\) \(\text{\&}g6\) 75 \(\text{\&}e4\) 74 \(\text{\&}e6+\) \(\text{\&}g3\) 75 \(\text{\&}x h5\) \(\text{\&}f4\) (75...\(\text{\&}f3\)) with excellent drawing chances for Black.

72 \(\text{\&}g8+\) \(\text{\&}g7\)
73 \(\text{\&}f7+\) \(\text{\&}h7\)
74 \(\text{\&}f6\) \(\text{\&}e8+\)

75 \(\text{\&}c7\) \(\text{\&}a4\)

In this position the game was again adjourned. Black has avoided a forced loss, but his position is still difficult, and he constantly has to seek tactical resources to prevent the advance of the d-pawn. On the resumption Dolmatov played extremely accurately and in the end gained a draw. I will give the conclusion of the game without a detailed analysis – it would demand too much effort and would take up too much space.

76 \(\text{\&}e4+\) \(\text{\&}g8\) 77 \(\text{\&}e5\) \(\text{\&}c4+\) 78 \(\text{\&}d7\) \(\text{\&}a4+\) 79 \(\text{\&}d8\) \(\text{\&}b4!\) 80 \(\text{\&}d5+\) \(\text{\&}h7\) 81 \(\text{\&}c8\) \(\text{\&}c3+\) 82 \(\text{\&}b8\) \(\text{\&}b4+\) 83 \(\text{\&}b7\) \(\text{\&}f8+\) 84 \(\text{\&}c8\) \(\text{\&}b4+\) 85 \(\text{\&}a7\) \(\text{\&}a4+\) 86 \(\text{\&}b6\) \(\text{\&}b4+\) 87 \(\text{\&}c6\) \(\text{\&}a4+\) 88 \(\text{\&}d6\) \(\text{\&}b4+\) 89 \(\text{\&}h7\) \(\text{\&}c4\) 90 \(\text{\&}d5\) \(\text{\&}a4+!\) Before picking up the h4 pawn, it is important to drive the white king further away.

91 \(\text{\&}c7\) \(\text{\&}a5+\) 92 \(\text{\&}c6\) \(\text{\&}a4+\) 93 \(\text{\&}b6\) \(\text{\&}b4+\) 94 \(\text{\&}c7\) \(\text{\&}a5+\) 95 \(\text{\&}c8\) \(\text{\&}b4+\) 96 \(\text{\&}b7\) \(\text{\&}x h4\) 97 \(\text{\&}c7\) \(\text{\&}f6!\) 98 \(\text{\&}xf6\) \(\text{\&}e8+\) 99 \(\text{\&}d8\) \(\text{\&}f6\) 100 \(\text{\&}d6\) \(\text{\&}g6\) 101 \(\text{\&}e7\) \(\text{\&}f5\) 102 \(\text{\&}g6\) \(\text{\&}e5\) 103 \(\text{\&}c4\) \(\text{\&}f5\) 104 \(\text{\&}e6+\) \(\text{\&}e5\) 105 \(\text{\&}f7\) \(\text{\&}h4\) 106 \(\text{\&}e6\) \(\text{\&}h3\) 107 \(\text{\&}x h3\) \(\text{\&}g8+\) 108 \(\text{\&}d7\) \(\text{\&}f6+\) 109 \(\text{\&}c6\) \(\text{\&}d4.\) Draw.
The Principle of Two Weaknesses

Play on both wings is my favourite strategy.
Alexander Alekhine

In 1973 I became champion of Moscow. It was a battle towards the finish with a grandmaster, who at that point had the same number of points as myself, that proved decisive. In a complicated strategic struggle I managed to outplay my opponent. The game was adjourned, and White sealed his 42nd move.

Lein – Dvoretsky
Moscow Championship 1973
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Black is a healthy pawn to the good, and in addition he has the advantage of the two bishops. It seems that the win should be a matter of straightforward technique. At any event, that is what I assumed when the game was adjourned. Analysis, alas, caused this evaluation to be revised – for a long time I was unable to find a convincing plan, leading to a win. The ending illustrates excellently the topic of one of the chapters from the first part of the book: ‘How difficult it is to win a won position!’.

There was no doubt about White’s sealed move, nor about my reply.

42 \textsf{g4} \textsf{a2}
Now 43 \textsf{f3}? \textsf{a1}+ 44 \textsf{g2} \textsf{b5} is completely bad, but 43 \textsf{f5}?! has to be seriously considered.

For some reason in the first instance I considered a tactical idea: 43...\textsf{h2}+!? 44 \textsf{g2}! \textsf{xf5} 45 \textsf{gx5} \textsf{f4} 46 \textsf{f3} (46 \textsf{xd5}?? \textsf{e3}) 46...\textsf{d2} 47 \textsf{xd2} (bad is 47 \textsf{c3} \textsf{e5}) 47...\textsf{xd2}. However, I was not sure if the bishop ending was won, and here I terminated my analysis. Indeed, after 48 \textsf{d4} \textsf{f7} 49 \textsf{e2} \textsf{g5} 50 \textsf{d3} \textsf{f6} (50...h5? 51 \textsf{e5} \textsf{f6} 52 \textsf{d4}) 51 \textsf{f2} \textsf{e5} 52 \textsf{h4} g6 53 fxg6+ \textsf{xg6} 54 \textsf{f2} it is not apparent how to break into the opponent’s position – White’s dark-square bishop and pawns, arranged on squares of the opposite colour, create a barrier in the path of my king that is hard to surmount. (A similar ending, which occurred in a game Sveshnikov–Dolmatov, will be found in the chapter on like-colour bishops – p. 147).

Another possibility available to Black is to transpose into a rook ending by 43...\textsf{xf5}?! 44 \textsf{gx5} (44 \textsf{xd5}? \textsf{a1}+) 44...\textsf{a5} (with the positional threat of 45...\textsf{e5}) 45 \textsf{d4} \textsf{c5}! (now, before the white king has reached e3) 46 \textsf{f2} \textsf{xd4}+ 47 \textsf{xd4} \textsf{b5} 48 \textsf{b4} \textsf{f7} 49 \textsf{e3}.

\underline{see next diagram}
Q 2-22. What should Black play?

To be honest, here I made a serious mistake in my analysis, as a result of which I could have lost a very important half point. I had planned 49...\( \text{Qf6} \) 50 \( \text{Qf4} \) h5 51 h4 b6. White is in zugzwang and has to give up a second pawn. Alas, later Illya Smirin rightly pointed out that after 52 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) 53 \( \text{Qe3} \) Black is unable to convert his material advantage in view of the tragic-comic position of his rook, shut in at b5. He also fails to win by 51...\( \text{Qb6} \) (instead of 51...b6) 52 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qxb4} + \) 53 \( \text{Qg3} \) b6 54 \( \text{Qh3} \) \( \text{Qb3} + \) 55 \( \text{Qg2} \).

Eighteen years later the position after 43 \( \text{Qf5} \) was given as an analytical exercise at a chess school for talented young players, which I organised together with grandmaster Yusupov. Two pupils at our school, Vadim Zviagintsev and Maxim Boguslavsky, established that the rook ending is after all won. Instead of 49...\( \text{Qf6} \) Black should play 49...\( \text{Qe7} \)! Then 50 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) 51 h4 h5 leads to the zugzwang position already familiar to us, but with the pawn at b7. After 52 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) 53 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) the rook comes into play via b6. And if 50 \( \text{Qf3} \), then 50...\( \text{Qd6} \) 51 \( \text{Qf4} \) (51 \( \text{Qg4} \) \( \text{Qe5} \) 52 \( \text{Qxg7} \) \( \text{Qxb4} \) is also hopeless) 51...\( \text{Qb6} \) intending ...\( \text{Qb6} - \text{c6} - \text{c4} \).

As we see, although 43 \( \text{Qf5} \)!? should objectively have lost, it would have set Black difficult problems. But it turns out that the way to win was even more difficult after the quiet continuation chosen by my opponent.

43 \( \text{Qg2} \)!?

For the next few moves Anatoly Lein has a clear program of action. He will take his king to f3, then, by playing \( \text{Qg3} \) or \( \text{Qf2} - \text{e3} - \text{f4} \), he will offer the advantageous exchange of dark-square bishops, and if Black avoids the exchange he will post his bishop at e5. Then all White's pieces will be ideally placed, the d5 pawn will remain securely blockaded, and in addition, all the time Black will have to reckon with the threat of \( \text{Qf5} \).

And how can I strengthen my position? It stands to reason that, if I were able to transfer my bishop to e4, the game would be decided. But can this be achieved, when the threat of \( \text{Qf5} \) is a constant problem for Black?

Initially I pinned my hopes on the variation 43...h5 44 gxh5 \( \text{Qe8} \) (intending 45...\( \text{Qxh5} \), then ...\( \text{Qg6} \) and ...\( \text{Qe4} \) 45 \( \text{Qe6} \) (45 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qc5} \)) 45...\( \text{Qf1} \)! 46 \( \text{Qxd5} \) \( \text{Qe7} \), but I did not find anything convincing after 45 \( \text{Qg1} \) \( \text{Qxh5} \) 46 \( \text{Qf5} \).

I also considered 43...\( \text{Qc5} \) 44 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qe8} \) (44...\( \text{Qb5} \) 45 \( \text{Qxb5} \) \( \text{Qxf2} + \) 46 \( \text{Qg3} \)) 45 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qg6} \), but the rook ending arising after 46 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) 47 \( \text{gxh5} \) \( \text{Qxe3} \) 48 \( \text{Qxe3} \) is most probably drawn.

It was only after studying these and many other variations that I finally discovered the correct plan.

43 ... \( \text{Qc5} \)

44 \( \text{Qf3} \)

If 44 \( \text{Qg3} \) there can follow 44...\( \text{Qe8} \) 45 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 46 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) 47 \( \text{gxh5} \) \( \text{Qxe3} \) 48 \( \text{Qxe3} \) \( \text{Qf7} \).

44 ... h5!!
Here my opponent thought for a long time. It became evident that he was not prepared for this turn of events. Now 45 gxh5 ∇xh3 is clearly bad for White. After 45 ∇g3 I had planned the waiting move 45...∇h7, and if 46 ∇f4 or 46 ∇e5, then, as in the game, 46...h4!

45 ∇e3 h4!

Black has fixed the h3 pawn and it has become a real weakness: 46...∇h2 is threatened (the king has been deprived of the g3 square). If White moves his bishop from e3, he has to reckon with ...∇b5!, since this bishop cannot be taken in view of mate by the rook at f2.

Q 2-23. And if 46 ∇f5?

The tactical justification of Black's plan is the variation 46 ∇f5 ∇h2! 47 ∇xc5 ∇xh3+ 48 ∇e2 ∇b5 49 ∇e3 (or 49 ∇e3 ∇h2+) 49...∇h2+.

46 ∇c3 ∇b6

In the event of 46...b6?! White gains counterplay by 47 b4! ∇xb4 48 ∇c7 ∇a4 49 ∇f5 (but not 49 ∇e6? ∇d1+ 50 ∇f4 ∇d6+).

47 ∇f5?!

White nevertheless overlooks his opponent's tactical idea. More tenacious was 47 ∇e2 (after which I was intending 47...∇d8) or 47 ∇c2.

47 ... ∇h2!

And again 48 ∇xb6? ∇xh3+ is bad for White.

48 ∇e7+ ∇f7

49 ∇xd5 ∇xh3+

The game is decided! The position has been opened up and the two bishops can finally demonstrate their real power.

50 ∇f4 ∇d8!

51 ∇c1 ∇c6

52 ∇b6

52 ∇d1 ∇e6!

52 ... ∇f3+

Of course, 52...∇xb6 53 ∇xb6 ∇xb3

54 ∇c4 ∇f6! 55 g5+ ∇g6 56 ∇e5+ ∇h5 was also possible.

53 ∇e5 ∇g5

54 ∇c3?

White resigns.

What was the strategic basis of Black's winning plan, and what positional considerations could have helped it to be discovered at the board?

When defending, your opponent tries to securely protect his weaknesses. In the broad sense of the word, a weakness in his position may be not only a vulnerable pawn or a badly placed piece, but also, for example, an invasion square which needs to be covered, or an enemy passed pawn which has to be blockaded.

With skilful defence it is usually not too difficult to hold one weakness. In such cases the correct strategy for the stronger side always consists in searching for, or creating in the opponent's position, a second weakness. By attacking the second weakness, and then if necessary again switching the attack to the first, we weaken and finally break the opponent's defences.

Have a look at how great masters of the endgame convert an advantage. You will
see that at some point they almost invariably open a 'second front'.
In the ending just examined White initially had only to solve the problem of the passed d5 pawn. For the battle against it his pieces were excellently placed, and direct play by Black aimed at exploiting the passed pawn could not, of course, prove successful. By the advance of his pawn to h4 he was able to fix a second weakness in the opponent's position – the h3 pawn. White's position immediately became critical.
Twin Endings

Chess theory is nothing more than a mirage produced by chess theoreticians – it is merely a record, that collects and perpetuates the creative heritage of their contemporaries.

Rudolf Spielmann

Ilyinsky – Dvoretsky
Alma Ata 1976
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41 ... ♗d3!
42 b5
If 42 ♗xe7, then 42...♗xa3 43 ♗xd6 ♗b2!
44 ♗e7 a3, winning thanks to the fact that the pawn queens with check.

42 ... ♗xa3
43 b6 ♗b2
44 ♗a7 a3
45 b7 a2
46 b8♗ ♗a1♗+

As a result of the combination Black has won a pawn and he retains excellent chances of success.

47 ♗g2 ♗e5
48 ♗xa1 ♗xa1
49 ♗b4 ♗e5
50 ♗c4 e6
51 dxe6 ♗xe6
52 ♗c6
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Q 2-24. How should Black proceed?

My opponent obviously wants to advance his b-pawn. In order to demonstrate the superiority of his position, Black had to find and calculate a rather lengthy, although straightforward (in view of the almost complete absence of side variations) combination.

38 ... ♗b1+
39 ♗g2 a4
40 b4 ♗e4+

It is essential to lure the king onto the first rank.

41 ♗g1
Bad is 41 f3 ♗e2+ and 42...♗xf3. If 41 ♗h3 there follows 41...h5 or 41...g5, launching an attack on the king with a limited force.

52 ... g5!
Why does Black advance this particular pawn, instead of trying to queen his passed pawn? I will explain the motives by which I was guided.

White can combat the passed d-pawn with his queen and king. If he manages to play h2–h4, there will be no pawn weaknesses in his position and the win for Black will be made more difficult. Therefore it seemed useful to me to fix the backward h-pawn. Black wants to combine the advance of his passed pawn with the creation of threats on the kingside by ...h7–h5–h4.

It is impossible to demonstrate the correctness of my decision with concrete variations. It stems from a general evaluation of the position, from the principle of two weaknesses. At any event, the further course of the game confirmed the correctness of Black’s idea.

53 h3?!

White should not have weakened his pawns. He was afraid of 53...g4, but there was evidently no need for this.

53 ... h5
54 wff3 wh6
55 wa8 wff6
56 wff8+ wh7
57 wa8 wff5
58 wa7 d5

Black has consolidated and now wants to advance his passed pawn. Note that the white king cannot move to the centre to combat it, because of the vulnerability of his h-pawn.

59 wh2 wg6
60 wff4? h4!

Exploiting the fact that 61 gxf4 is not possible in view of 61...wff4+, Black weakens still further the opponent’s kingside.

61 wff6
62 we3 hxg3+
63 ffxg3 wfb2+
64 wh1+ wff5+
65 wh1 wff3+

Black's d-pawn has not in fact advanced any further, but on the other hand he has achieved success on the kingside. White resigns.

Many years later Maxim Boguslavsky, a pupil of the Dvoretsky–Yusupov school, happened to reach almost exactly the same ending.

Boguslavsky – Shumilin
Moscow Junior Championship 1990
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Black should have continued 46...wff1+ 47 wh2 h5! 48 d4 wff7, but the young player with Black, in contrast to Maxim Boguslavsky, did not know the ending of the Ilyinsky–Dvoretsky game.

46 ... wff7?
47 g4! f5?!
48 gxf5 gx5
49 wff3

A weak f5 pawn has been created in the opponent's position. It was on this weakness that Maxim based his subsequent play.

49...wff7+ 50 wff3 wff4 51 wff2 f4?! 52 wff3 wff7+ 53 wff1 wff1+ 54 wff2 wff7+ 55 wh3 wff7+ 56 wh4 wff7+ 57 wff4 wff5+ 58 wh3 wff8? A mistake which accelerates Black’s defeat, but even after
58...\textsf{\texttt{\textcolor{black}{\texttt{f5+}}}} 59 \textsf{\texttt{g2} g5+ 60 f1} or 58...h5
59 \textsf{\texttt{e4+ h8} 60 e6} White has a winning position.
59 \textsf{\texttt{a8+ h7} 60 b7+ h8 61 f7 b5.}

In the event of 61...h5, 62 f3?! is inaccurate in view of the elegant defence pointed out by Ken Neat: 62...\textsf{\texttt{h4+}} 63 \textsf{\texttt{g2} (63 xh4 – stalemate) 63...g5+, and the white king is driven back. Correct is 62 d7!, securely covering the king and preparing the advance of the passed pawn.}
62 \textsf{\texttt{g6} d7+ 63 h4 e7+ 64 h5.}
Black resigns. It is curious that in this ending too it was not the passed d-pawn that decided the outcome.

After returning from the Spanish town of Linares from a major international tournament, grandmaster Yusupov told me that there too roughly the same queen ending had occurred. We found this game and set up the pieces...

Gelfand – M.Gurevich
Linares 1991

140

The black pawn moved to f5 long before the queen ending, on the very first move in fact (the opening was a Dutch Defence). I, understandably, very much wanted to confirm that the method of play with ...g6–g5 given above was the only correct one, and that with the pawn formation here it would be hard for Black to convert his advantage. However, it transpired that the position of the pawn at f5 has its plusses for Black, and fairly serious ones. In particular – control of e4. After 47 h4 d4 White does not have 48 d3, while if 48 f1 there follows 48...\textsf{\texttt{e4} and 49...d3. It is easy to understand why Boris Gelfand immediately took control of this important central square. However, in so doing he had to weaken his 2nd rank.}

47 f3 d4
48 f2 c5
49 b2

If 49 d3 b4, aiming for b2, while after 49 e2 c4+ 50 d3 a2+ White, unfortunately, cannot exchange queens on d2 – the black d-pawn has not yet finally lost contact with its king.

49 ... f6
50 e2 c4+
51 d2
g6

Gelfand has nevertheless managed to block the pawn with his king, but even this does not help.

51 ... g5!
52 a3 e6

Unexpectedly White has ended up in zugzwang. His king is guarding the invasion squares on the e-file (53 d1 e3 54 xe3+ dxe3 55 e2 f4), only at a3 can his queen keep control of e3 and a2, and the advance of any of his pawns will merely weaken his kingside.

53 b4 e3+ 54 c2 f2+ 55 c1 g1+ 56 c2 xh2+ 57 d3 xg3 58 e7+ h6. White resigns.

White’s defence can be improved. Probably at some point he should have advanced his pawn to f4. Looking through my old games, I discovered that I had once played a similar ending for the weaker side.
Dvoretsky – Tukmakov
35th USSR Championship, Kharkov 1967
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such a situation that I wanted to avoid when I played 52...g5! in my game with Ilyinsky.

46  ...  \textcolor{red}{w}d5
47  \textcolor{red}{w}d3  g5

How else can any progress be made?

48  fxg5+  \textcolor{red}{w}xg5
49  \textcolor{red}{w}d2+  \textcolor{red}{g}6
50  \textcolor{red}{w}f4

It has become clear that with correct play the game should end in a draw.

50...\textcolor{red}{w}d7  51  \textcolor{red}{e}e2  (51 \textcolor{red}{e}e5! was stronger)
51...\textcolor{red}{b}b5+  52  \textcolor{red}{f}f2  \textcolor{red}{b}b2+  53  \textcolor{red}{f}f3  \textcolor{red}{b}b3+  
54  \textcolor{red}{f}f2  \textcolor{red}{a}a2+  55  \textcolor{red}{f}f3  \textcolor{red}{a}a8+  56  \textcolor{red}{f}f2  \textcolor{red}{d}d5  
57  g4. Also good was 57 \textcolor{red}{b}b8!?, intending 58 \textcolor{red}{e}e8+.

57...\textcolor{red}{h}h6  58  \textcolor{red}{g}g3  d3  59  \textcolor{red}{f}f2  (threatening to exchange queens at f5)  59...\textcolor{red}{w}a2+  
60  \textcolor{red}{g}g3  (of course, not 60 \textcolor{red}{e}e3? \textcolor{red}{w}e2+  
61  \textcolor{red}{d}d4  \textcolor{red}{e}e4+!)  60...\textcolor{red}{w}e6  61  \textcolor{red}{g}xf5+  \textcolor{red}{w}xf5  
62  \textcolor{red}{d}d6+  \textcolor{red}{h}h5  63  \textcolor{red}{d}d4  \textcolor{red}{g}g6  64  \textcolor{red}{d}d6+  
\textcolor{red}{f}f7  65  \textcolor{red}{c}c7+  \textcolor{red}{e}e6  66  \textcolor{red}{c}c6+  \textcolor{red}{e}e5  
67  \textcolor{red}{x}xh6?? What did I need this pawn for?
After the obvious 67 \textcolor{red}{c}c5+ (67 \textcolor{red}{c}c3+ is also good) 67...\textcolor{red}{e}e4  68  \textcolor{red}{b}b4+  \textcolor{red}{e}e3  
69  \textcolor{red}{e}e1+ \textcolor{red}{d}d4  70  \textcolor{red}{b}b4+ a draw would have become inevitable.

67...\textcolor{red}{e}e4  68  \textcolor{red}{h}h4+? More tenacious was 68 \textcolor{red}{c}c6+ \textcolor{red}{e}e3 69 \textcolor{red}{w}e8+ \textcolor{red}{d}d2 70 \textcolor{red}{h}h4.

68...\textcolor{red}{e}e3  69  \textcolor{red}{w}e7+ \textcolor{red}{d}d2 70 \textcolor{red}{h}h4 \textcolor{red}{d}d1. Here the game was adjourned. White sealed 71 \textcolor{red}{e}e8, but then resigned without resuming.
Defence by Frontal Attack

As Olafsson showed me, White can win... It's hard to believe. I stayed up all night analyzing, finally convincing myself and, incidentally, learning a lot about Rook and Pawn endings in the process.

Bobby Fischer

In the preceding chapters we have become acquainted with the most general procedures and methods of endgame play, such as zugzwang, the fortress, the principle of two weaknesses, and others. The study of endgame theory can also be approached differently, in a more traditional way: by working on endings of a particular type (mainly with a definite balance of material) and picking out the specific rules, evaluations and procedures that are typical of them. Both approaches are suitable, and both should be used, as they complement each other. This will achieve the greatest effect.

It is perhaps especially important to be well versed in the theory of rook endings. After all, a good half of all the endings that occur in practice are with rooks. It stands to reason that here we will only touch on a small part of the complicated and widely developed theory of rook endings.

Akopian – Orekhov
Moscow 1973

41 \$f7 g3+

The only defence against mate. White is now faced with a difficult choice. By playing 42 \$h3, he forces his opponent to give up the exchange, while 42 \$xg3 \$e4 leads to a rook ending where he has a material advantage. Both possibilities look tempting. The calculation of the first variation does not relate to our theme, and therefore it is offered as an independent exercise.

E 2-9. Evaluate White’s choice in the game of 42 \$h3.

Here we will analyse the rook ending.

42 \$xg3 \$e4
43 \$f6+ \$h5
44 \$xe6 \$xd3
45 \$e3 \$a4
Regarding $45...\text{\textit{\textup{\textsc{d}xc2}}}$ $46 \text{\textit{\textsc{d}xa3}}$ it is best to look into any reference book on the endgame. There you will read that such a position is won if the h-pawn has not crossed the demarcation line (with the pawn at h6 or h5 it is a draw). The winning plan can be described as follows: the king goes to h6 – the enemy king has to position itself at f7 and the rook cuts it off on the g-file. Then the white king escapes from the rook's file via h5 (this is why it is important that the pawn should not be too advanced), clearing the way for the h-pawn to advance. Carrying out this plan, however, is rather more difficult than describing it. But for the practical player it is not essential to remember all the analyses, all the variations. It is far more important to know the basic ideas and evaluations, and in case of necessity you can look up the exact solution in a book or find it for yourself at the board.

$46 \text{\textit{\textsc{cx}}e3 \text{\textit{\textsc{h}}h5}}$

But in the event of $46 \text{\textit{\textsc{d}x}}d3$? Black gains a draw by $46...\text{\textit{\textsc{g}g4+}}$ $47 \text{\textit{\textsc{f}}f3}$ ($47 \text{\textit{\textsc{f}}f2}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{xh4}}}$ $48 \text{\textit{\textsc{g}g3}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{h}h2+}}$ $49 \text{\textit{\textsc{g}g2}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{xg2+}}}$ $50 \text{\textit{\textsc{xg2}}}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{g}g4}}$ $47...\text{\textit{\textsc{xh4}}}$ $48 \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e3}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{g}g5}$ $49 \text{\textit{\textsc{d}d5+}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{f}f6}}$ $50 \text{\textit{\textsc{d}d3}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{e}e6}}$ $51 \text{\textit{\textsc{c}c4}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{h}h8}}$ $52 \text{\textit{\textsc{c}c3}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{c}c8}}$.}

Here it is, the defence by frontal attack. The rook, by placing itself in front of the pawn, prevents it from advancing.

$53 \text{\textit{\textsc{d}d2}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{e}}e5}}$. The black king must be at e6 or e5. Incorrect is $53...\text{\textit{\textsc{e}e7?}}$ $54 \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b4}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{b}b8+}}$ $55 \text{\textit{\textsc{a}a5}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{c}c8}}$ $56 \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b5}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{b}b8+}}$ $57 \text{\textit{\textsc{a}a6}$ (the best square for the white king) $57...\text{\textit{\textsc{c}c8}$ $58 \text{\textit{\textsc{d}d4}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{e}e6}}$ $59 \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b7}$ and wins. The black king was unable to attack the enemy rook in time.

$54 \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b4}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{b}b8+}}$ $55 \text{\textit{\textsc{a}a5}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{c}c8}}$! (but not $55...\text{\textit{\textsc{a}a8+}}$? $56 \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b6}$ and wins) $56 \text{\textit{\textsc{b}b5}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{b}b8+}}$ $57 \text{\textit{\textsc{a}a6}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{c}c8}$ and the draw has become obvious. When the white king breaks off contact with its pawn, it is unable to drive away the rook, since it is separated from the white pawn by three clear ranks. When the distance is less (if the pawn has crossed the middle of the board) the defence by the frontal attack is completely ineffective.

In the first chapter of this part of the book, the 'rule of five' was mentioned. Remember: if the number of the rank on which the pawn stands plus the number of files separating the black king from the pawn does not exceed five, the position is drawn; if the sum is more than five the position is won. Remember also that this rule must be used with caution: there are a number of exceptions, so that it may help in the evaluation of a position, or it may, on the contrary, merely confuse you. The most important exception is this: when the white pawn is at b4 and the black king is at e6 (or e5), cut off from it by two files. Although $4+2=6$, the position is nevertheless drawn.

$46...\text{\textit{\textsc{d}d4}}$!

Black loses after $46...\text{\textit{\textsc{g}g4+}}$ $47 \text{\textit{\textsc{f}f2}}$! $\text{\textit{\textsc{xh4}}$ $48 \text{\textit{\textsc{g}g3}}$, when his king is cut off too far from the pawn. No better is $47...\text{\textit{\textsc{xh4}}$ $48 \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e5}}$! (in such positions the horizontal cutting-off of the king is usually even more dangerous than the vertical) $48...\text{\textit{\textsc{g}g5}$ $(48...\text{\textit{\textsc{g}g3}$ $49 \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e4+}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{h}h3}}$ $50 \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e3}$) $49 \text{\textit{\textsc{xg5}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{gxg5}}$ $50 \text{\textit{\textsc{e}e3}$ $\text{\textit{\textsc{f}f5}}$ $51 \text{\textit{\textsc{d}d4}}$.}
Does Black, who is two pawns down, really have any chances? But remember Tarrasch: 'All rook endings are drawn'.

A. 47 $\text{f}3$ $\text{hxh}4$ 48 $\text{f}2$ $\text{g}4!$ Bad is 48... $\text{d}4?$. 49 $\text{e}3$ $\text{d}8$ 50 $\text{d}4$ or 48... $\text{g}5?$. 49 $\text{e}3$ $\text{h}8$ 50 $\text{d}4$ and wins: $4 + 2 = 6$.

49 $\text{e}3$. Nothing is achieved by 49 $\text{f}8$ $\text{h}7$ 50 $\text{e}3$ $\text{e}7+$ 51 $\text{d}2$ $\text{d}7$, or 49 $\text{d}4$ $\text{h}8$ 50 $\text{f}7$ $\text{e}8!$ or 50... $\text{h}3!$.

49... $\text{h}8$ 50 $\text{f}4+$. After 50 $\text{f}1$ $\text{e}8+$ 51 $\text{d}2$ $\text{d}8$ the position is drawn, because $3 + 2 = 5$.

50... $\text{g}5$ 51 $\text{d}4$. But now $4 + 2 = 6$ and White seems to win, e.g., 51... $\text{d}8$ 52 $\text{f}1$ $\text{g}6$ 53 $\text{d}3$ $\text{g}5$ 54 $\text{c}4$ $\text{c}8+$ 55 $\text{b}5$ $\text{d}8$ 56 $\text{c}5$ $\text{c}8+$ 57 $\text{b}6!$. $\text{d}8$ 58 $\text{d}1$ $\text{f}6$ 59 $\text{c}7$ $\text{d}5$ 60 $\text{c}6$.

Never use the 'rule of five' in situations that are not yet clarified. After White's 51st move his pieces are insecurely placed, and this factor changes the evaluation:

51... $\text{e}8+$! 52 $\text{e}4$ $\text{d}8$ 53 $\text{e}6$! (horizontal cut-off; 53... $\text{f}6$ or 53... $\text{f}5$ was threatened) 53... $\text{f}5$ 54 $\text{c}6$ $\text{e}8+$ 55 $\text{d}3$ $\text{e}6$!, and the black king breaks across the e-file.

B. 47 $\text{f}3$ $\text{hxh}4!$ (47... $\text{hxh}4$? 48 $\text{e}4+$) 48 $\text{e}8$ (48... $\text{e}6$ $\text{g}5$ 49 $\text{e}3$ $\text{f}5$ 50 $\text{e}8$ $\text{h}7$ 51 $\text{d}4$ $\text{h}3+$! 52 $\text{d}2$ $\text{f}6)$ 48... $\text{g}6$ 49 $\text{e}3$ (49 $\text{f}8$ $\text{g}7$ 50 $\text{f}5$ $\text{g}6$ or 50 $\text{f}4$ $\text{xf}4+$ 51 $\text{xf}4$ $\text{f}6$) 49... $\text{f}7$ 50 $\text{e}5$ (50 $\text{e}4$ $\text{xe}4+$) 50... $\text{f}6$ 51 $\text{d}4$ $\text{h}8$ 52 $\text{e}4$ $\text{a}8$, again with a draw.

C. 47 $\text{f}2$ $\text{hxh}4!$ (47... $\text{hxh}4$? 48 $\text{g}3$) 48 $\text{e}4+$ (48 $\text{f}3$ $\text{g}4$ or 48... $\text{d}8$ 49 $\text{e}3$ $\text{g}4$) 48... $\text{xe}4$ 49 $\text{dxe}4$ $\text{g}5$ 50 $\text{e}3$ $\text{f}6$ 51 $\text{d}4$ $\text{e}6$.

It would appear that Dr. Tarrasch's aphorism is triumphant in this ending. That is what I thought until grandmaster Alexander Belyavsky took an interest in the position. He found a paradoxical solution: it turns out that the diagram position is one of mutual zugzwang! It is simply necessary to give Black the move.

47 $\text{e}5$!! $\text{g}6$

48 $\text{e}6+$ $\text{h}5$

Hopeless is 48... $\text{f}7$ 49 $\text{e}3$ $\text{g}6$ 50 $\text{f}3$ $\text{h}5$ 51 $\text{f}2$ or 48... $\text{f}5$ 49 $\text{e}3$ $\text{g}4+$ 50 $\text{h}3$ $\text{g}1$ 51 $\text{f}3+$ $\text{e}5$ 52 $\text{h}5$.

49 $\text{e}3$

What should Black do? 49... $\text{hxh}4$ 50 $\text{e}5+$ is not possible, and also bad is 49... $\text{g}6$ 50 $\text{f}3$ $\text{h}5$ 51 $\text{f}2$ followed by $\text{e}3$ and $\text{d}3$–$\text{d}4$. The variation 49... $\text{g}4+$ 50 $\text{f}2$ $\text{hxh}4$ 51 $\text{g}3$! or 50... $\text{hxh}4$ 51 $\text{e}5$! has already been considered.

49...

50 $\text{g}1$ $\text{c}8+$

If 50... $\text{hxh}4$, then 51 $\text{e}6$! (threatening mate) 51... $\text{d}4+$ 52 $\text{e}3$ $\text{d}8$ 53 $\text{d}4$ $\text{g}5$ 54 $\text{e}4$.

51 $\text{e}5$ $\text{e}8+$

51... $\text{hxh}4$ 52 $\text{d}4$ $\text{e}8+$ 53 $\text{f}4$ $\text{f}8+$ 54 $\text{e}4$ $\text{e}8+$ (54... $\text{g}5$ 55 $\text{e}3$) 55 $\text{d}3$

$\text{d}8$ 56 $\text{f}3$ or 56 $\text{e}5$.

52 $\text{d}4$ $\text{d}8+$

53 $\text{c}3$ $\text{c}8+$

54 $\text{d}2$ $\text{hxh}4$

55 $\text{e}5$!

John Nunn has shown that the seemingly equivalent 55 $\text{d}4$? throws away the win:

55... $\text{g}5$! 56 $\text{d}3$ $\text{d}6$ 57 $\text{f}7$ 58 $\text{d}4$

$\text{e}8$, and the black king breaks across the
e-file. Or 56 $\text{f}3$ (everything seems to be in order: 4+2=6) 56...$\text{a}8$! 57 $\text{f}7$ (57 $\text{d}3$
$\text{a}3+$ 58 $\text{e}4$ $\text{xf}3$) 57...$\text{a}3+$, separating the white king from the pawn.

55 ... $\text{g}4$
56 d4
56 $\text{e}3+$ is more accurate.

56 ... $\text{f}4$
57 $\text{d}3$ $\text{d}8$
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61 $\text{c}5$ $\text{a}5+$
62 $\text{b}4$ $\text{a}8$
63 $\text{e}6+$

63...$\text{f}5$ 64 $\text{d}5$.
64 $\text{c}5$ $\text{c}8+$
65 $\text{c}6$
And White wins.

Many years later, when looking through the book Winning Endgame Technique by Alexander Belyavsky and Adrian Mikhalchishin, I came across an episode which evoked sad thoughts.

Belyavsky – Kupreichik
Yugoslavia 1992

Although the sum (4 + 1 = 5) seems to promise Black hopes of saving the game, his position is lost due to his king being cut off horizontally (remember that the black king should be on the 5th or 6th rank).

58 $\text{c}4+$

If 58 $\text{h}5$ there follows 58...$\text{g}4$, not allowing 59 $\text{d}5$. 58 $\text{e}6$? $\text{f}5$ 59 $\text{c}6$ is premature in view of 59...$\text{a}8$! 60 $\text{c}4$
$\text{a}4+$ 61 $\text{c}5$ $\text{a}5+$ 62 $\text{b}4$ $\text{a}8$, when the win is no longer there.

58 ... $\text{c}8+$
58...$\text{a}8$ 59 $\text{e}6$ $\text{a}4+$ (59...$\text{f}5$ 60 $\text{d}5$) 60 $\text{c}5$ $\text{a}5+$ 61 $\text{b}4$ $\text{a}8$ 62 $\text{d}5$. The flank checks have proved ineffective, since the distance between the rook and the pawn is too short – only two files.

59 $\text{c}5$ $\text{a}8$
59...$\text{d}8$ 60 $\text{c}6$ $\text{e}4$ 61 $\text{e}6+$ $\text{f}5$ 62 $\text{d}5$.
60 $\text{c}6$ $\text{a}4+$

A familiar situation, wouldn’t you agree? Belyavsky was presented with an opportunity to use in practice his old analysis. Had he played 74 $\text{d}5+$, he would most probably have gained a draw. I doubt whether Viktor Kupreichik had studied the previous edition of my book, and to find at the board the subtle and only way to win, involving giving the opponent the move, is hardly possible. However, in the game there followed 74 $\text{d}2$? $\text{f}5$ 75 $\text{x}5$ $\text{e}3+$ 76 $\text{e}2+$
$\text{e}4$ 77 $\text{g}4$ $\text{d}5$ 78 $\text{f}8$ $\text{d}4$ 79 $\text{e}8+$ $\text{d}3$
80 $\text{a}8$ $\text{e}1$, and White resigned.
Belyavsky's memory had evidently betrayed him. Yet the essence of the position did not consist in analytical variations (they, of course, are forgotten quickly), but in a vivid idea, which one would have expected to be firmly engraved in his memory. It is here that people have an advantage over computers, for which 'pattern recognition' is still a topical and very difficult problem. Alas, sometimes it proves sufficiently complicated even for the human mind.
Rook against Pawns

When you throw stones into the water, look at the circles they create, otherwise it will be a pure waste of time.

Kozma Prutkov

If in a rook ending one of the players has a far-advanced passed pawn, the opponent often has to give up his rook for it, and then advance his own pawn (or pawns) as quickly as possible. Extremely sharp situations arise, where the outcome may depend on a single tempo.

It will be much easier to calculate variations if you study the procedures typical of such endings. The analysis of a position, which could have arisen in a game against Yuri Balashov from the 1967 USSR Spartakiad, proved very useful in its time for my education.

What will White do? Perhaps \( \text{d}b6-\text{b7} \) and \( \text{a7-a8\text{\protect\text{`}}}} \) ? No, in this case the king will certainly not manage to get back in time to combat the black pawn. **In such situations every tempo counts: it is desirable to keep the king as close as possible to the opposite wing and to force the opponent to give up his rook for the pawn as soon as possible.**

White's main threat is 2 \( \text{d}b5! \) followed by \( \text{c}c6+ \) and \( \text{a}a6. \) If 1...\( \text{d}f5? \) there also follows 2 \( \text{d}b5! \) \( \text{a}a1 \) (2...\( \text{e}xa7 \) 3 \( \text{e}xa7 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 4 \( \text{c}c4 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 5 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{f}3 \) 6 \( \text{d}d3 \) \( \text{g}3 \) 7 \( \text{f}7+ \) and 8 \( \text{e}e2 \) 3 \( \text{c}c5+! \) \( \text{f}f4 \) 4 \( \text{c}c4+ \) and 5 \( \text{a}a4 \) or 3...\( \text{f}f6 \) 4 \( \text{c}c6+ \) and 5 \( \text{a}a6. \)

**The interference manoeuvre carried out by White in all these variations is a very important procedure in such endings.** Black constantly has to reckon with the threat of interference.

To parry the threat, let us hide the king behind the pawn: 1...\( \text{h}h5. \) In principle this move is not very desirable for Black — it would be better to keep his king on the f-file, so that it could subsequently 'shoulder-charge' the white king away from his pawn. But there would not appear to be any choice.

White replies 2 \( \text{d}b6, \) intending 3 \( \text{c}c8. \) Let us now analyse Black's possibilities.

2...\( \text{g}4 \) is totally bad because of 3 \( \text{c}c5+ \) and 4 \( \text{a}a5 \) (again interference). The same idea is also decisive after 2...\( \text{d}d4+ \) 3 \( \text{a}a5 \) \( \text{b}b1 \) 4 \( \text{c}c4! \)

Q 2-25. What happens after 2...\( \text{h}4 \) ?

In reply to 2...\( \text{h}4 \) one would like to employ another procedure that is typical of such situations: the diversion of the rook — 3 \( \text{c}c4+ \) \( \text{x}c4 \) 4 \( \text{a}a8\text{\protect\text{`}}}. \) But are you sure that the game can be won after 4...\( \text{f}f4 \) ? Look
in a reference book on the endgame. There it is said that a rook and pawn (not on a rook's file) can successfully defend against a queen, if the pawn is on its initial square (on the 7th rank). But if the pawn has moved, White gradually breaks into the opponent's rear and wins. This is true for any pawn, apart from a knight's pawn. But with a knight's pawn, as it turns out, a draw can be gained, even if it is at g5. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, in such cases it is not essential to remember concrete variations—it is sufficient merely to learn the basic evaluations and conclusions.

Thus, diversion does not lead to a win. But here too the idea of interference can be used: 3 b5! a4 4 c4+ and 5 a4.

All that remains is 2 a1, after which there follows 3 b8! (but not 3 c5? xa7; on the 5th rank the rook is badly placed, and in addition it is in the way of the white king). Now it is all the same whether Black takes on a7, driving the white king further away, or forces the opponent to waste a tempo on a7-a8, but with the king at b6—there is no difference as regards winning or losing a tempo.

3 xa7 4 xa7 g4 5 b6 g3 6 g8! (6 c5? g4!) 6 h4 7 c5 h3 8 d4 g2 9 e3 h2 10 e2. The white king just manages to stop the pawn.

But is it not possible to hinder its approach? Let us try 5 h4 (instead of 5 g3)
6 c5 g3 7 d4 f2. If 8 d3?, then 8 g3 9 f8+ e11, continuing to 'shoulder-charge' the white king.

However, the black king could have been pushed back one step with the help a typical procedure—interposing a check to gain a tempo: 8 f8+ e2 9 g8! f3 and only now 10 d3 g3 11 f8+ g2 12 e2.

Incidentally, apart from 8 f8+, there is also an easy win by 8 e4! g3 9 c2+. But after 8 f8+ e2 9 e4? (instead of 9 g8!) Black saves himself by a standard defensive resource in such endings—the promotion of his pawn to a knight: 9 g3 10 a8 g2 11 a2+ f1 12 f3 g1+! 13 e3 h3 14 b2 g1! (but not 14 g5?). Only with a rook's pawn does promotion to a knight not save the game: the knight is lost due to zugzwang.

It will not now cause us any difficulty to calculate the variation 4 g4 5 b6 f3 6 f8+ (again interposing a check to gain a tempo) 6 e3 7 g8! f4 8 c5 g4 9 d4 f3 10 d3 g3 11 f8+ g2 12 e2.

So, is the initial position lost for Black? No, he has another resource which we have not yet considered.

1 ... a1!

All the same it is not possible to manage without this move.

2 b6 b1+!

Black must first drive the white king as far away as possible, and only then advance his own passed pawn.

3 c6 a1

4 b7

In principle, Black has achieved his aim and 4 f5 leads to a draw. But we will take the idea to its logical end.

4 ... b1+

5 c8 a1

6 b8 f5

The draw is now obvious. 6 h5 is also possible, but only not 6 g4?? in view of 7 c5! g3 8 a8 f a8+ 9 xa8 g2 10 c1 and 11 g1. On no account should Black allow his king to be cut off from the pawn along the 5th rank.

Let us once again remember the ideas and procedures which we have learned or repeated in the course of this not too complicated analysis:

1. Interference;
2. Diversion;
3. Evaluation of positions with queen against rook and pawn;
4. ‘Shoulder-charge’;
5. Interposing a check to gain a tempo;
6. Promotion of the pawn to a knight;
7. Driving back the king with a series of checks;
8. Cutting off the king from its passed pawn along the 5th rank.

Quite a lot! In principle, it is for such a combination of concrete analysis and methodological interpretation of its results that a player (and especially a trainer) should be constantly aiming. In this case, work on chess becomes especially productive, promoting a rapid increase in knowledge and mastery.

Smagin – Bronstein
Moscow Championship 1982

The analysis of the ending proved difficult and very interesting. David Bronstein did indeed defend splendidly, but, as it transpired, the actions of his opponent were, unfortunately, not up to the mark.

Q 2-26. How should Black defend?

The primitive 1...b2? 2. a1 b3 3. g5 does not leave Black any chance at all. He must halt the pawns, if only for the moment.

1. ... H8!
2. Hg3?

The king heads for h4, in order to set the pawns in motion. As we will see later, this natural move throws away the win.

2. ... b2
3. b1?!

Here too the opponent could have been set far more serious problems. The subsequent events develop by force.

3. ... b3
4. H4 a8!

4...c8! was equally good. To halt the advance of two connected passed pawns, a rook is best placed to the rear of them, behind the more advanced pawn. The rook has fulfilled its objective at h8, and it now heads for the 1st rank, to h1.

The situation is diametrically opposed to the previous one. After winning the rook, there is no question of Black winning the game. It is extremely difficult even to achieve a draw – White’s passed pawns are very dangerous.

In the game Black managed to save the draw. The ending was published in the 33rd volume of Chess Informator without any commentary – with only exclamation marks attached to Black’s moves.
5 h6 a1 6 xb2+ xb2 also does not win, for example:
1) 7 g5 h1+! 8 g4 c3 9 f5 d4 10 g6 h5+! A typical interposed check, enabling a pawn to be captured with impunity. However, Black also does not lose after 10...xh6 11 g7 h5+ 12 f4 h1! 2) 7 h5 c3 (bad is 7...h1+? 8 g6 c3 9 g5 d4 10 h7! e5 11 g6 f6 12 g7) 8 g5 d4 9 h7 (9 g6 e5) 9...h1+ 10 g6 e5 11 g7 f5 12 g6 g5 with a draw. While restraining the more advanced pawn with the rook, it is important for the king to manage to attach itself to the other pawn.

5 ... a1
6 xb2+
7 g4

The variation 7 h6 h1+ was considered above, while if 7 g6 there follows 7...g1+, tying down all White’s forces. We see now that at h4 the king is badly placed.

7 ... h1!

7...c3 is also possible, but after 8 h6 or 8 g6 it is then essential to play 8...h1, not allowing the second pawn onto the 6th rank.

8 g6 c3
9 g5 d4
10 g7

The variation 10 f6 xh5! 11 g7 h6+ 12 f5 h5+ 13 f4 h1! is already familiar to us. A draw also results from 10 h6 e5 11 h7 (11 g7? g1+ and 12 f5) 11...g1+ 12 h6 h1+ (or immediately 12 f5) 13 g7 f5.

10 ... e5!
11 g6 g1+
12 f7

12 h7 f6 13 h6 f7. 12...

12...f5? 13 h6.

13 e7

13 e8 g1 14 h6 f6 15 f6 a1.

13 ... g1
14 h6 g6!
15 f7 f6+

16 e8 e6+
17 d8 d6+
18 c8

18...g6 and 19...f6.
18 ... c6+

Draw.
The position in the last diagram is indeed drawn. An improvement in White's play should be sought earlier. We find a new idea: 3 h1! (instead of 3 b1?!).

Q 2-27. What should Black do now?

After the natural 3...a3? White wins by 4 h6! xh6 5 xh6 b1 6 a6+. There is the same tactical stroke in reply to 3...b3? or 3...b4?

If 3...c8 there follows 4 b1 b3 5 g5 c1 6 xb2+ xb2. The same position is reached as in the game, except that the white king is at g3 instead of h4. This factor decisively changes the evaluation of the position. After 7 g6! Black has no defence: 1) 7...g1+ 8 f4 c3 9 f5 with the threat of 10 h6; 2) 7...h1 8 f4! (8 g4? c3 reduces to that which occurred in the game) 8...xh5 (8...c3 9 g7) 9 g7 h4+ 10 f3 h3+ 11 g2; 3) 7...c3 8 f2(g2)! c2+ (9 g7 was
threatened) 9 \( \text{f5} \) \( c1 \) 10 g7 \( g1 \) 11 h6.
Even so, the defensive resources are not yet exhausted. Before forcing events on the
queenside, Black can lure the white king
onto the fatal square h4.
3...\( \text{h6} \)!! By blocking the h-pawn, Black is
now threatening to play 4...\( \text{b3} \).
4 \( \text{f4} \) (4 \( \text{h4} \) \( c6 \) or 4...\( \text{b3} \)) 4...\( \text{b3} \)
5 \( b1 \). If 5 \( \text{g5} \) \( c6 \) 6 \( b1 \) there follows
6...\( \text{c5} \)!, first driving the king with checks
to h4, and only then playing ...\( c1 \).
5...\( \text{h8} \)!! The defence by frontal attack is
prepared, with the aim of driving the king to
h4.
6 \( \text{f5} \) \( f8+ \) 7 \( g5 \) (7 \( e5 \) \( g8 \)
7...\( g8+ \) 8 \( h4 \) \( c8 \)! (only now!), and
Black has managed to reach a position from
the game, the draw in which has already
been established.
It should be mentioned that 3...\( \text{h7} \)??
(instead of 3...\( \text{h6} \)!!) is a serious inaccuracy. After 4 \( \text{f4} \)! Black no longer has the
reply 4...\( \text{b3} \) on account of 5 h6! Also
unsuitable is 4...\( c7 \) 5 \( b1 \) \( c4+ \) 6 \( f5 
(6 \( g5 \) \( c5+ \) 7 \( h4 \)?? \( b3 \)) 6...\( c5+ 
7 \( f6 \)!! (7 \( e6 \)?? \( b3 \) 8 h6 \( c6 \)!!) 7...\( c6+ 
8 \( e5 \) \( c5+ \) 9 \( d6 \) or 8...\( b3 \) 9 g5 and
wins. There only remains 4...\( h8 \)??, but
then 5 \( f5 \)! (5 \( e5 \)?? \( h6 \)!!; 5 \( g5 \) \( g6+ \)
6 \( h4 \)?? \( c8 \)) 5...\( f8+ \) 6 \( e5 \)! (6 \( g6 
\( g8+ \); 6 \( e6 \) \( g8 \) 7 h6? \( g6+ \) and
8...\( xh6 \)) 6...\( g6 \) (6...\( e8+ \) 7 \( f6 \)!) 7 h6!
\( xg4 \) 8 h7 \( g5+ \) 9 \( f6 \) \( h5 \) 10 \( xh5 
b1\)!! 11 h8\( \text{#} \), and it is unlikely that Black
has perpetual check.

Let us go back one move, to the very start of
the ending. Note that, by playing 2 \( \text{f4} \)!!
(instead of 2 \( \text{g3} \)??) 2...\( b2 \) 3 \( \text{h1} \)!! \( f8+ 
4 \( e5 \) White transposes into the variation
that we have just considered, which ends in
a position where he is a rook up. It should
have been verified exactly whether or not
White can avoid perpetual check, but, as it
turns out, this is not so significant. There is a
much simpler solution.

By interposing this check, White worsens
the position of the opponent's king.
3...\( b2 \)
4 h6! \( xh6 \)
5 \( xh6 \) \( b1\)!!
The same idea could also have been
implemented slightly differently: 2 \( b1! 
\text{a3} \) 3 \( \text{h1} \)!!

E 2-10
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Black to move

E 2-11
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Black to move
A Great Master of the Endgame

I have always thought it a matter of honour for every male chess player to enjoy the smile of the Lady luck!

Mikhail Tal

The Swedish grandmaster Ulf Andersson is rightly regarded as one of the most skilful experts on the endgame. Sometimes, on a brief acquaintance with the endings played by Andersson, one gains the impression that the outcome was largely decided by his opponents’ mistakes. But it will be remembered that, in their time, that was how many commentators explained the success of the spectacular combinative assaults of Mikhail Tal. Only after a careful analysis did it become clear that his opponents’ mistakes were caused by the enormous diversity and difficulty of the problems with which Tal confronted them. I think that it is a similar matter with Andersson’s endgame successes. Although outwardly unpretentious, his play in endings is subtle and profound, and it is not at all easy to guess his plans and call them into question.

In the first part of the book, in the chapter devoted to the timely adjourning of a game, it was described how in home analysis the author of these lines managed with great difficulty to solve an intricate problem, set him by Andersson. We will now examine the last few moves of another game by the Swedish grandmaster and will try to decipher the ideas and variations that remained off-stage.

Van der Wiel – Andersson
Interzonal Tournament, Moscow 1982
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49 ...  
50 b5

In the pawn ending Black is just in time to give mate: 50 h5+? g4 (or 50...gxg4) 51 edx5 exd5 52 b5 e2! 53 d2 f3 54 e1 d4 55 b6 e3 56 b7 d3 57 b8d2.

50 ...  
51 b6  
51...b5 52 h6 xb6 53 d3.
52 h6  
53 f6+  
54 e6

White is hoping for 54...d5? 55 b7 e2 56 b8e1 57 wb3+.

138
54 ... \( \text{\textit{d}}2+! \)
55 \( \text{\textit{b}}3 \) \( \text{\textit{d}}5 \)
56 \( \text{\textit{b}}7? \)

As shown by John Van der Wiel, 56 \( \text{\textit{c}}4! \) e2 57 \( \text{\textit{x}}d5 \) e1\( \text{\textit{w}} \) 58 \( \text{\textit{c}}6 \) was more tenacious.

56 ... e2

White resigned, since after 57 \( \text{\textit{b}}8\text{\textit{w}} \) e1\( \text{\textit{w}} \) he does not have a single check, and the white king is helpless against the attack by the opponent's heavy pieces.

Frankly speaking, when I was following the game in the tournament hall, I was convinced that the position was completely drawn and that Van der Wiel, who in time trouble obviously overlooked the interposed check 54...\( \text{\textit{d}}2+ \), had found virtually the only way to lose (precisely the sort of impression that was mentioned at the start of the chapter). And it was only by a more careful analysis that I was able to establish that things were by no means so simple.

We will begin the analysis from the end and try to determine whether or not White had a certain draw, and at what point the Dutch player finally missed it.

The position with rook against queen will not be considered. It is clear that, even if it suddenly turned out to be drawn (which is very hard to believe), we would be able to ascertain and demonstrate this fact only by analysing a great number of variations. Let us try to find a more convincing way to our goal.

Let us try 54 \( \text{\textit{b}}7 \) (instead of 54 \( \text{\textit{a}}6 \)). Andersson was intending to reply 54...e2 (of course, not 54...\( \text{\textit{x}}b7? \) 55 \( \text{\textit{d}}3 \) or 55 \( \text{\textit{d}}1 \) with an obvious draw) 55 \( \text{\textit{b}}8\text{\textit{w}} \) e1\( \text{\textit{w}} \). Although White is the first to begin attacking the opponent's king, his checks quickly run out: 56 \( \text{\textit{w}}b3+ \) \( \text{\textit{g}}2! \) 57 \( \text{\textit{w}}f3+ \) \( \text{\textit{g}}1 \), after which a decisive initiative passes to Black. No better is 56 \( \text{\textit{d}}6 \) \( \text{\textit{e}}2+ \) 57 \( \text{\textit{c}}3 \) \( \text{\textit{f}}3+ \) and 58...\( \text{\textit{b}}7 \).

Incidentally, now we can appreciate fully the subtlety of 53...\( \text{\textit{g}}3 \) If instead of this Black had played 53...\( \text{\textit{e}}4? \), then White would have gained a draw by 54 \( \text{\textit{b}}7 \) \( \text{\textit{x}}b7 \) (54...e2 55 \( \text{\textit{b}}6\text{\textit{w}} \) e1\( \text{\textit{w}} \) 56 \( \text{\textit{a}}8+ \) 55 \( \text{\textit{d}}1 \).

Once White is able to place his king in front of the e-pawns, according to theory he has an easy draw even without the g4 pawn.

Thus 54 \( \text{\textit{b}}7 \) would not have saved White. Let us go back one more move and verify: perhaps the check on f6 was superfluous? 53 \( \text{\textit{b}}7 \) e2! (53...\( \text{\textit{x}}b7? \) 54 \( \text{\textit{d}}1 \) 54 \( \text{\textit{b}}8\text{\textit{w}} \) (54 \( \text{\textit{h}}1 \) \( \text{\textit{x}}b7 \) and White has no defence) 54...e1\( \text{\textit{w}} \) 55 \( \text{\textit{f}}8+ \) (we already know what happens after 55 \( \text{\textit{f}}6+ \) \( \text{\textit{g}}3 \) 55...\( \text{\textit{g}}3 \) 56 \( \text{\textit{a}}3+ \) \( \text{\textit{f}}2! \) 57 \( \text{\textit{w}}5+ \) (57 \( \text{\textit{h}}2+ \) \( \text{\textit{g}}1 \); 57 \( \text{\textit{f}}6+ \) \( \text{\textit{g}}2 \)) 57...\( \text{\textit{d}}4 \). The black rook has had to move into a pin, but this has done little to ease White's position. For example, after 58 \( \text{\textit{d}}6 \) \( \text{\textit{e}}2+ \) 59 \( \text{\textit{b}}1 \) \( \text{\textit{x}}g4 \) 60 \( \text{\textit{x}}d4 \) \( \text{\textit{xd}}4 \) it is not easy to hold the queen ending. [Alas, as Ken Neat has rightly pointed out, this last variation is unconvincing. By continuing 59 \( \text{\textit{c}}3! \) (instead of 59 \( \text{\textit{b}}1 \)) 59...\( \text{\textit{e}}3+ \) 60 \( \text{\textit{b}}2 \) White saves the game.]

And yet Van der Wiel had a more clear-cut way to draw. He should not have been in a hurry to move his rook from h2, from where it was restraining the passed e3 pawn.
In Edmar Mednis's excellent book *Practical Endgame Lessons* one of the important principles of endgame play is expressed amazingly simply: 'Passed pawns must be pushed'. According to this principle, 52 g5! must be tried.

In the event of 52...\(\text{\&}xg5\) 53 b7! \(\text{\&}xb7\) 54 \(\text{\&}d3\) \(\text{\&}b3+\) 55 \(\text{\&}e4\) or 54...\(\text{\&}f4\) 55 \(\text{\&}h4+\) the draw is obvious. Let us try 52...\(\text{\&}g3\) 53 \(\text{\&}h6\) e5 (53...\(\text{\&}d2+\) 54 \(\text{\&}b3!\) \(\text{\&}d6\) 55 b7).

We have already seen this position, only with the pawn at g4. It turns out that the shifting of the pawn to g5 changes things a great deal.

54 b7! e2 55 b8\(\text{\&}\) e1\(\text{\&}\) 56 \(\text{\&}b3+\) \(\text{\&}f2\).

Now White can calmly go into the variation 57 \(\text{\&}d4\) 58 \(\text{\&}d6\) (or 58 \(\text{\&}h4\)) – the unpleasant queen ending no longer arises. But even more convincing is 57 \(\text{\&}h2+\) \(\text{\&}g1\) 58 \(\text{\&}h1+!\) \(\text{\&}xh1\) 59 \(\text{\&}h3+\) \(\text{\&}g1\) 60 \(\text{\&}xd7\).

After 52 g5! Black can play more cunningly: 52...\(\text{\&}f3!\)?, hoping for 53 \(\text{\&}h6\) e5 54 \(\text{\&}f6+\) \(\text{\&}g2!\) 55 b7? (55 \(\text{\&}e6\), and if 55...\(\text{\&}d5\) 56 \(\text{\&}g6\) 55...e2 56 b8\(\text{\&}\) e1\(\text{\&}\) 57 \(\text{\&}a8+\) e4.

However, White finds a new resource: 56 \(\text{\&}h4!!\) (incidentally, this could also have been played a move earlier) 56...e2 57 \(\text{\&}e4\) \(\text{\&}f2\) 58 \(\text{\&}xe6\) e1\(\text{\&}\) (58...\(\text{\&}d6\) 59 \(\text{\&}e7\) e1\(\text{\&}\) 60 \(\text{\&}xe1\) \(\text{\&}xe1\) 61 b7 \(\text{\&}b6\) 62 \(\text{\&}d3\) and 63 \(\text{\&}e4\), or 59...\(\text{\&}xb6\) 60 \(\text{\&}f7+\) \(\text{\&}e1\) 61 \(\text{\&}e6\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 62 g6 with a draw) 59 \(\text{\&}xe1\) \(\text{\&}xe1\) 60 \(\text{\&}c3\) \(\text{\&}b7\) 61 \(\text{\&}d4\) \(\text{\&}xb6\) 62 \(\text{\&}e5\), and the king succeeds in coming to the aid of the g5 pawn.

Thus the ending was after all drawn. But we now understand how difficult it was for Van der Wiel, when short of time, to find a way out of the net, cunningly woven for him in this apparently quite simple position by the great endgame master Ulf Andersson.
The Strongest Piece is the Rook!

It's the little quirks like this that could make life difficult for a chess machine.

Bobby Fischer

Belyavsky – Dolmatov
47th USSR Championship, Minsk 1979

If 39 bxc4 Black would most probably have replied 39...b8!

39 ... c8!

Threatening 40...xc4 41 bxc4 b3 42 axb3 a3.

40 d3 a3!

Black has seized the initiative. He is threatening both ...c1—a1, and ...c3xb3. Here the game was adjourned, and Alexander Belyavsky sealed his move after prolonged thought.

Q 2-28. In whose favour is this position? How should Black proceed?

In the endgame a rook is sometimes not weaker, but stronger than two minor pieces. This occurs when it breaks into the opponent's position and sets about winning material there, or when a passed pawn can be created, tying down the opponent's pieces.

This, it would seem, is not such an instance. 38...h8 suggests itself, but after 39 f2! axb3 (39...hxh2 40 bxa4) 40 axb3 xh2 41 e4 White has an obvious advantage. Dolmatov found a fantastic possibility, radically changing the evaluation of the position.

38 ... c4!!

39 xxc4

During our home analysis, Dolmatov and I established that White has a clear-cut way to draw, based on the idea of a fortress. 41 f2! c1. After 41...c3 42 e3 the move 42...xb3? does not work: 43 d1!, and the rook is trapped (43...b2 44 xb2 b3 45 b1!), while if 42...c1, then 43 d2 a1 44 c2 xa2 45 d3. 42 h4!! It is important to move the pawn off the 2nd rank, out of range of the rook.
42...æa1. A draw results from 42...f5 43 æxf5 æa1 (43...æc3+ 44 ðf4 æxb3 45 ðd1!) 44 ðd3 ëxa2 45 ðxb4 ëb2 46 ëc2.

43 ëc4 ëxa2 44 ëd3 ëf2+. The ending where Black is the exchange up: 44...ëd2 45 ëxb4 a2 46 ëxa2 is drawn. With the pawn at h2, 44...ëhx2 45 ëxb4 a2 would have won.

45 ëxf2 a2 46 ëxb4 a1=í 47 ëd3. White continues ëf4, ëd5 and ëg2, reaching a fortress. Black is unable to create mating threats or to attack the g3 pawn with his king and queen. If desired, the b3 pawn can even be given up.

In the first part of the book, devoted to the analysis of adjourned games, it was mentioned several times that, when preparing for the resumption of a game, it is essential to study thoroughly not only the opponent's strongest sealed move, but also other possible continuations. In the given case – 41 ëf4 and 41 ëe3.

41 ëf4?! ëc3! (41...ëc1? 42 ëd5). Now White's only chance is to set up the same fortress as after 41 ëf2!

42 h4 ëxb3 43 axb3 a2 44 ëc4 a1=í 45 ëg2. Black has retained his b4 pawn, and this means that, in contrast to the previous variation, White can no longer give up his b3 pawn. This makes the defence much more difficult, but nevertheless here too we were unable to find a winning plan.

However, it is quite probable that at the adjournment the opponent did not notice the idea of a fortress, and then he would most probably have sealed 41 ëe3. From the standpoint of the battle of the two pieces against the rook, this move is the most accurate: after 41...ëc3 there follows 42 ëf2! ëxb3 43 ëd1!, while if 41...ëc1, then 42 ëf4! ëa1 43 ëd5. And that is how it turned out.

41 ëe3?! ëc1
42 ëf4 ëa1
42...ëc3!? came into consideration, intending 43 ëd2 ëxb3 44 ëc2 ëb2 45 ëd3 b3!! But in reply White could have reverted to the idea of a fortress with two minor pieces against a queen.

43 ëd5 ëa2
44 ëxb4 ëxh2
45 ëe2

159

Now Black does not have a queen, but only a rook for two minor pieces (true, in addition he has the dangerous a3 pawn). Surprisingly, White faces far more difficult problems than in the 41 ëf2 and 41 ëf4 variations. Surely a rook is not stronger than a queen?

45...

ëh3!

It is important to drive the king further away from the queenside. Less accurate is 45...ëh1 46 ëd2, when if 46...ëa1 White has 47 ëc2, while if 46...ëb1 47 ëc3, intending subsequently to attack the a-pawn with his king or to advance his passed pawn. But if here 46 ëf3, then 47...ëh1 (threatening 47...ëb1) is now strong: 47 ëd3 ëa1 and 48...a2, since 48 ëc2 ëb1 does not help.

46 ëf2

f5!

Weaker is 46...ëh1 47 ëf1 ëh2+ 48 ëg2 ëh8 49 ëa2 ëc8 50 ëe4, when White controls all the invasion squares. The move
played deprives the bishop of the e4 square (in the variation 47 \( \Delta f1 \) \( \Delta h2+ \) 48 \( \Delta g2 \) \( \Delta h8 \) 49 \( \Delta a2 \) \( \Delta c8 \)) and creates the positional threat of ...f5–f4.

47 \( \Delta a2 \) \( f4 \)
48 gx\( f4 \) \( \Delta x b3 \)
49 \( \Delta c4 \) \( \Delta h3! \)

In this position we terminated our home analysis. Black has a clear advantage, but the outcome would have remained unclear, if White had taken his king to the queenside: 50 \( \Delta e2! \) \( \Delta g6 \) 51 \( \Delta d5 \), intending \( \Delta d2 \), \( \Delta c3 \) (or \( \Delta b4 \)), \( \Delta c2 \) etc. Instead of this Belyavsky chooses a poor plan: he tries for some reason to evict the rook from the 3rd rank. As a result, the white king is stuck on the kingside, and with some precise and pretty rook manoeuvres Dolmatov shatters the opponent’s defences.

50 \( \Delta f1? \) \( \Delta h2+ \)
51 \( \Delta g2 \) \( \Delta f6 \)
52 \( \Delta g3 \) \( \Delta h5! \)
53 \( \Delta f1 \)
53 \( \Delta f13 \) is more tenacious.
53 ... \( \Delta c5! \)
54 \( \Delta d3 \) \( \Delta d5 \)
55 \( \Delta a6 \) \( \Delta d2! \)
56 \( \Delta c4 \) \( \Delta d4 \)

On the next move the king comes into play: 57...\( \Delta f5! \) White resigns.

After Dolmatov’s thunderous endgame symphony, let us now look at a quieter, ‘chamber’ ending.

Here the two pieces are obviously stronger than the rook. But is White’s advantage sufficient for a win?

In contrast to the previous one, this adjourned position should not be analysed by a direct study of variations. The main plans that White can choose for converting his advantage must be determined, the degree of danger of each of these plans assessed, and reliable replies found.

1) One of the possible plans was tried by Capablanca, who once reached a similar ending.

Capablanca – Em. Lasker
St Petersburg 1914
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73 g5 hxg5 74 hxg5 fxg5 75 Qxg5+ Qg8 76 Qe6. Now the g7 pawn can only be defended by tactical means.

76...Qd1! 77 Qe4 (77 Qxg7 Qxd4+) 77...Qf7. If 78 Qxg7 Laske was intending 78...Qe1+ 79 Qd5 Qf1!! Capablanca played 78 Qg5+ and 22 moves later the game ended in a draw.

Obviously in the adjourned position too it is possible to successfully counter the b2–b4 plan by tactical means, by pestering the enemy bishop with the rook.

2) By playing a3–a4, Qd5 and Qf4, White creates the threat of Qc7. Black easily parries it by ...Qh7! But before occupying h7 with the rook, it is necessary, by attacking the white pawns, to force the king back, otherwise the pawn ending may be lost.

3) White can try to play Qc7 with his king at a4. Black keeps his king at c6 and his rook on the 4th rank, and at the appropriate moment he plays ...b6–b5+.

4) The breakthrough by the white king in the centre. Verification showed that this plan also does not lead to a win. It was this one that Oleg Romanishin carried out during the resumption of the game, so that we will see Black's system of defence... within 40 moves.

42 Qf4 (the sealed move) 42...Qh3. Of course, not 42...Qg2?? 43 Qf2, and the rook is trapped.

43 Qf5 Qg3 44 Qf4 Qg2 45 Qe5 Qc6 46 Qe3 Qe2 47 Qd5 Qc2 48 Qe3 Qe2.

I was not afraid of the appearance of the white king at e6, but 'out of spite' I nevertheless decided to prevent this for as long as possible.

49 Qg4 Qc2 50 Qc3 Qe2 51 Qf6 Qd6 52 Qd5 Qc6 53 Qf4 Qe3 54 Qe5 (54 Qd2!) 54...Qe1 55 Qf6 Qf1 56 Qc3 Qd6 57 Qe4 Qf2 58 Qd5 Qc6 59 Qe5 Qe2+ 60 Qf5 Qb7 61 Qf4 Qf2 62 Qe4 Qc6 63 Qe5 Qd7. If the rook moves along the f-file, there follows 64 Qd5 and 65 Qe6, and if along the 2nd rank, then immediately 64 Qe6.

64 Qd3 Qf3 65 Qe4 Qh3 66 Qf4 Qh1 67 Qe5 Qh4 68 Qf5 Qc6 69 Qf6! Qh2 70 Qe6. The king has finally reached the square for which it has so long been aiming.

70...Qc2 71 Qc3 Qf2 72 Qd3 Qf1 73 Qe5+ Qc7 74 Qf7 Qd1! 75 Qe5+ Qb7 76 a4. It was time to make a pawn move, otherwise Black would soon have remembered about the 'fifty move rule'.

76...Qd2 77 Qd6+ Qc6 78 Qf5 Qd1 79 Qe7+ Qb7.

This position was carefully studied when preparing for the resumption. I should have liked to have the rook at d2, but I assumed that I might possibly not be able to place it on the ideal square (as in fact happened) and I looked at the position with the rook at d1. It is useful during analysis to test the safety margin of the position, by allowing the opponent the maximum possible. Then on the resumption you will not have to fear any surprises.

Now White has to choose between 80 Qd5 followed by Qc7, and 80 Qd6, intending Qd7 and Qe7–c6–d8+. 
80  \( \text{\textgreek{d}}5 \)

If 80 \( \text{\textgreek{d}}6 \) I had prepared 80...\( \text{\textgreek{d}}2 \) 81 \( \text{\textgreek{d}}7 \)
\( \text{\textgreek{x}}b2 \) 82 \( \text{\textgreek{c}}6 \) \( \text{\textgreek{c}}2 \) 83 \( \text{\textgreek{d}}8+ \) \( \text{\textgreek{a}}6 \) 84 \( \text{\textgreek{c}}6 \)
\( \text{\textgreek{x}}c4 \) 85 \( \text{\textgreek{e}}6 \) \( \text{\textgreek{g}}4 \), when White has only perpetual check, only not 85...\( \text{\textgreek{x}}a4?? \)
86 \( \text{\textgreek{b}}8! \) with unavoidable mate.

80  .
81  \( \text{\textgreek{c}}7 \)  \( \text{\textgreek{e}}1+ \)
82  \( \text{\textgreek{f}}5 \)  \( \text{\textgreek{c}}1 \)
83  \( \text{\textgreek{b}}3 \)  \( \text{\textgreek{b}}1 \)
84  \( \text{\textgreek{x}}b6 \)  \( \text{\textgreek{x}}b3 \)
85  \( \text{\textgreek{d}}8 \)

After 85 \( \text{\textgreek{x}}a5 \) \( \text{\textgreek{a}}3 \) pointless is 86 \( \text{\textgreek{c}}3 \)
\( \text{\textgreek{b}}7 \) with the threat of 87...\( \text{\textgreek{a}}6 \). But if 86 \( \text{\textgreek{b}}6 \), then 86...\( \text{\textgreek{b}}7 \) is now bad in view of 87 \( \text{\textgreek{d}}7! \) \( \text{\textgreek{c}}6 \) 88 \( \text{\textgreek{e}}6 \) and 89 \( \text{\textgreek{e}}5+ \).

Correct is 86...\( \text{\textgreek{d}}3 \) 87 \( \text{\textgreek{e}}5 \) \( \text{\textgreek{e}}3+ \) 88 \( \text{\textgreek{f}}4 \)
\( \text{\textgreek{d}}3 \), tying down White's pieces after 89...\( \text{\textgreek{d}}4+ \).

After 85 \( \text{\textgreek{e}}6 \) it is incorrect to play 85...\( \text{\textgreek{a}}3? \)
on account of 86 \( \text{\textgreek{d}}8! \) \( \text{\textgreek{x}}a4 \) 87 \( \text{\textgreek{e}}7+ \)
\( \text{\textgreek{b}}7 \) 88 \( \text{\textgreek{d}}5 \), and White retains winning chances. A draw results from 85...\( \text{\textgreek{b}}4! \)
(attacking the c4 pawn) 86 \( \text{\textgreek{x}}b4+ \) \text{\textgreek{xb}}4
87 \( \text{\textgreek{x}}a5 \) b3 88 \( \text{\textgreek{c}}3 \) \( \text{\textgreek{c}}5 \) 89 a5 \( \text{\textgreek{c}}4 \).

85  .

As already mentioned, 85...\( \text{\textgreek{a}}3? \) 86 \( \text{\textgreek{e}}6! \)
is weaker. Now 86...\( \text{\textgreek{x}}d5+ \) is threatened, and if 86 \( \text{\textgreek{e}}6 \) there follows 86...\( \text{\textgreek{d}}4 \).

86  \( \text{\textgreek{x}}a5 \)  \( \text{\textgreek{d}}5+ \)

Draw.
Like-Colour Bishops

By no means all obvious moves, that seem to go without saying, are correct.

David Bronstein

One of the fundamental principles of positional play says: arrange your pawns on squares of the opposite colour to your bishop (with a light-square bishop, place your pawns on dark squares, and with a dark-square bishop – vice versa).

Sveshnikov – Kasparov
47th USSR Championship, Minsk 1979

There followed 34 \( \text{e}2 \text{c}5 \). Q 2-29. Evaluate the pawn ending.

After the exchange of bishops Black attacks the queenside pawns with his king, and then, by employing a standard idea: 'extending the bridgehead', he clears the way for his king to the opposite wing.

35 \( \text{xc}5? \text{xc}5 \) 36 \( \text{d}3 \text{b}4 \) 37 \( \text{c}2 \text{a}3 \) 38 \( \text{b}1 \text{a}5 \) 39 \( \text{a}1 \text{a}4! \) 40 \( \text{b}x\text{a}4 \text{c}a4 \) 41 \( \text{b}1 \text{b}4 \) 41...\( \text{a}3 \text{a}3 \)
42 \( \text{a}1 \text{b}4 \) 43 \( \text{b}1 \text{b}3 \). All this occurred in the game, and White resigned.

Evgeny Sveshnikov should have avoided the exchange of bishops. After 35 \( \text{e}1! \text{e}4 \) 36 \( \text{a}5 \) it is not apparent how Black can strengthen his position. And if 35...\( \text{b}4 \) (hoping for 36 \( \text{d}2? \text{e}4 \) 37 \( \text{e}1 \) 38 \( \text{d}2 \text{d}4 \) 39 \( \text{e}1 \text{e}3 \) with zugzwang or 39 \( \text{c}1 \text{c}3 \) 40 \( \text{e}3 \text{e}1! \)), then simply 36 \( \text{f}3! \) with a draw.

Strangely enough, the natural move 33...\( \text{g}6 \) was bad. Manoeuvring with the pieces alone in such situations often does not prove successful. The weakness of pawns fixed on squares of the colour of the bishop can sometimes be disclosed only by attacking them with our own pawns. And for this some of our pawns must remain on squares of the same colour.

Kasparov should have given his opponent the move, by making a waiting move with his bishop.

\begin{align*}
33 & \ldots \text{a}5! \\
34 & \text{e}2
\end{align*}

34 \( \text{a}3!? \) followed by \( \text{b}3-\text{b}4 \) comes into consideration, but even then, by combining
the possibilities of ...f7–f6 and ...a6–a5, Black can play for a win.

34 ... e4
35 c5 f6!

Undermining the white pawns!

36 exf6 gxf6

Black subsequently places his bishop at c7 (or after 37 d6 – at b6) and his king at f5, and plays ...e6–e5, with a great and probably decisive advantage.

Sveshnikov – Dolmatov
Zonal Tournament, Yerevan 1982
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The king cannot be allowed to go to a4, as then, by playing b2–b3 and c4, White will gain control of b5. Dangerous is 45...c8 46 c6 e6 47 a4 a6 48 b5 c8 49 c4+ xe5 50 b5.

46 c3

Q 2-30. How should Black defend now?

In such cases the decision is usually taken by the method of elimination. We choose the correct move, without calculating it in detail, after we have convinced ourselves that all other possibilities are unsatisfactory. Dolmatov always solves such problems quickly and confidently. After thinking for just a few minutes, he made the only saving move.

46 ... f8!!

Let us follow his logic. The position after 46...d7? (or 46...e8?) 47 c4 followed by g2 and d5 has already been assessed as unsatisfactory. At any event, if possible it is better not to go in for it.

46...f1? loses to 47 b4! axb4+ (otherwise after the exchange of pawns on a5 the white king will gain the important c5 square) 48 xb4, and there is no defence against 49 c4.
Bad is 46...\( \text{eb}\)8? 47 b4! axb4+ 48 \( \text{xb}\)4 \( \text{d}\)7 49 e6 and 50 \( \text{b}\)5. For the same reason 46...\( \text{d}\)7? does not work.
Finally, after 46...\( \text{d}\)8? the king is too far away from the important square... g8: 47 \( \text{c}\)4 \( \text{c}\)6 48 \( \text{g}\)8! (with the threat of 49 \( \text{c}\)4) 48...\( \text{b}\)5 49 \( \text{b}\)4, and the king breaks through at c4 or d5.
But after 46...\( \text{f}\)8!! 47 \( \text{c}\)4 \( \text{c}\)6 the bishop no longer has the g8 square. If 48 \( \text{a}\)2 there follows 48...\( \text{e}\)7 49 \( \text{c}\)4 \( \text{e}\)6.

47 b4

Usually in such cases, grandmasters are not in a hurry to change the pattern of the play, but continue manoeuvring, hoping to confuse the opponent. However, Black's precise actions had, apparently, already dispelled Sveshnikov's hopes. Even so he should have tried one more positional trap: 47 ...\( \text{e}\)6 \( \text{e}\)7 48 \( \text{c}\)8?? (more cunning than 48 \( \text{f}\)5 \( \text{a}\)6! 49 \( \text{d}\)4 \( \text{b}\)7!). Now the artless 48...\( \text{d}\)8? 49 \( \text{f}\)5 \( \text{e}\)7 leads Black into serious and possibly insurmountable difficulties after 50 \( \text{d}\)4 \( \text{a}\)6 (50...\( \text{c}\)6 51 \( \text{e}\)4 and 52 \( \text{d}\)5) 51 \( \text{e}\)3 \( \text{b}\)7 52 \( \text{f}\)2 with the very dangerous threat of \( \text{g}\)3-g4.
The threat of the king march to g4 must be met by the timely transference of the bishop to d5: 48...\( \text{f}\)1!! 49 \( \text{d}\)4 \( \text{g}\)2 50 \( \text{e}\)3 \( \text{d}\)5!, and if 51 \( \text{f}\)2 there is now 51...\( \text{e}\)6.

47 ...\( \text{ax}\)b4+
48 \( \text{xb}\)4 \( \text{d}\)7
49 \( \text{b}\)3

49 e6 \( \text{e}\)8 50 \( \text{c}\)4 \( \text{e}\)7 51 \( \text{d}\)4 \( \text{d}\)6 would also not have achieved anything.

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

The b5 square can be won for the king only by playing \( \text{a}\)4, but then the black king attacks the e5 pawn.

50 \( \text{a}\)4 \( \text{g}\)4
51 \( \text{c}\)6 \( \text{e}\)6

Of course, not 51...\( \text{e}\)2?? 52 \( \text{d}\)5 and 53 \( \text{c}\)4.

52 \( \text{b}\)5 \( \text{xe}\)5
53 \( \text{xb}\)6 \( \text{d}\)1
54 h3

54 ... \( \text{g}\)4
55 h\( \text{xg}\)4 \( \text{g}\)x4
56 a4 \( \text{g}\)5
57 a5 \( \text{e}\)2

Draw.
Opposite-Colour Bishops

Nowhere does logic of thought reveal itself so clearly as in the concluding stage of the game.

Vasily Smyslov

Every player has positions in which he feels especially confident. For a long time such a ‘hobby’ for me were endings with opposite-colour bishops. In the process of studying them I was able to pick out several laws that apply in the majority of such endings. A knowledge of these laws significantly helped me (and, of course, my pupils) to find the way in specific endings with which we were confronted.

With opposite-colour bishops one hardly ever encounters the usual picture in other types of endings, when passed pawns are in a race to queen. Here the calculation of variations plays a strictly subordinate role, and the main thing becomes strategic thinking, a battle of plans. The basic theme of such positions is the fortress. The weaker side nearly always seeks an arrangement of his forces, such that everything is securely defended and blockaded and he can calmly wait. The stronger side should recognize in advance the arrangement of pieces and pawns planned by the opponent and try to frustrate its implementation, or else look for a plan that will destroy the system of defence set up by the opponent.

It should be mentioned that this logic is applicable only to ‘pure’ opposite-colour bishop positions. If, apart from the bishops, there are also other pieces on the board, the approach to the position should normally be diametrically opposite. On this topic it is useful to remember the Alexandria-Litinskaya ending from the first part of the book (p.64).

When analysing examples in this and the following chapter, we will meet the battle of plans typical of endings with opposite-colour bishops and the most important procedures in such a battle.

Bellon – Minic
Olympiad, Siegen 1970
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The diagram shows the adjourned position, where White sealed his 41st move. After home analysis the players agreed a draw, without resuming. Black’s positional advantage seemed to Minic to be insufficient for a win. Judging by the commentary in Informator, he was convinced by the following variation: 41 \( \texttt{Qd8} \) \( \texttt{Qc6} \) 42 \( \texttt{Qc7} \) \( \texttt{Qf5} \) 43 \( \texttt{Qd8} \) \( \texttt{Qg4} \) 44 \( \texttt{Qe7} \) a5 45 bxa5 \( \texttt{Qf5} \) 46 a6 \( \texttt{Qe4} \) 47 a7 \( \texttt{Qd4} \) 48 a8\( \texttt{Q} \) \( \texttt{Qxa8} \) 49 c6 \( \texttt{Qxc6} \) 50 \( \texttt{Qd6} \). The a3 pawn is now securely defended and the draw is obvious.
Q 2-31. Was the agreement to a draw justified? How should the adjourned position be evaluated?

It is surprising that, even in home analysis, the two players and their team colleagues who were helping them failed to unravel this, generally speaking, not too complicated position. In fact its evaluation depends on the sealed move. After 41 \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \)! White loses. Let us examine the resulting situation more carefully.

\textit{White's king is blocking the enemy passed pawn, and his bishop is ensuring the defence of his own pawns. This is the basic system of defence in such endings, and usually the most reliable. Attempts to win the game in such cases always involve creating a second passed pawn, usually by a pawn break.}

In the variation examined above the ...\texttt{a6-a5} break did not lead to the creation of a second passed pawn and therefore proved worthless. Let us try acting differently. To start with we will simply pick up the \texttt{a3} pawn, since the bishop is unable to defend it. Then the threat of the ...\texttt{a6-a5} break will become more serious.

42 \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d3}} \) 44 \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c2}} \) 45 \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b3}} \) 46 \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xa3}} \) 47 \( \text{\texttt{a5}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b3}} \).

After eliminating the pawn, the king returns to the opposite wing. Now Black wants to play ...\texttt{a6-a5} in a situation where the opponent will be unable to take on \texttt{a5} with his bishop. But taking with the pawn will give Black a second passed pawn.

48 \( \text{\texttt{e3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{c4}} \) 49 \( \text{\texttt{f2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d3}} \) 50 \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e4}} \) 51 \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{f5}} \) 52 \( \text{\texttt{d8}} \).

52...\texttt{f4}! Zugzwang! The white bishop is torn in two: on one diagonal it is defending the \texttt{g5} pawn, and on the other it is controlling the \texttt{a5} square. In the event of 53 \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) \( \text{\texttt{xg5}} \) Black takes his king to \texttt{d3} and plays ...\texttt{g6-g5-g4-g3+}. Then \( \text{\texttt{xg3}} \) allows the decisive ...\texttt{a6-a5}, while if \( \text{\texttt{xg3}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e2}} \).

After 53 \( \text{\texttt{e7}} \) \texttt{a5!} 54 \texttt{bxa5} \texttt{b4} a second passed pawn is finally obtained. Black again takes his king to the queenside and wins the bishop for the \texttt{b}-pawn. White has no counterplay, since on the \texttt{a8-h1} diagonal alone the black bishop fulfils all its work: it defends its own \texttt{f3} pawn and stops both of the opponent's passed pawns. The \textit{principle of one diagonal} is very important with opposite-colour bishops.

53 \( \text{\texttt{f1}} \) \( \text{\texttt{e3}} \) 54 \( \text{\texttt{c7}} \) \texttt{a5!} 55 \texttt{xa5} (55 \texttt{bxa5} \texttt{b4}) 55...\texttt{d5} followed by 56...\texttt{c4}+ and 57...\texttt{f2}+.

\textit{The drawing tendencies of endings with opposite-colour bishops are well known, and sometimes it is possible to save the game even when two or three pawns down. However, here the number of pawns does not play a particular role: any nuance of the position, even the most insignificant at first sight, may prove far more important than material. Therefore, when there are opposite-}
colour bishops, pawns are boldly sacrificed for the sake even of seemingly very modest positional gains.

In the ending in question White is hindered by... his protected passed pawn at c5: it blocks the important a7–g1 diagonal.

41 c6!!
Bellon could have saved the game, only by sealing this move, which gives up a pawn. In fact it was almost certainly not sealed, as otherwise after the game it would have become known and would have been reflected in the commentary. At any event, the agreement to a draw was obviously premature – Minic should have first seen what the opponent’s sealed move was.

41 ... Hxc6
42 Hc7! A typical defensive procedure: attacking the enemy pawns with the bishop. It is advantageous for White either to tie the king to the pawn, or to force the pawn to advance onto a square of the colour of its bishop, where according to the general principles of strategy it is less well placed.

But when there are opposite-colour bishops, contrary to the general rule, the weaker side’s pawns should be placed on squares of the colour of their bishop - there they can be reliably defended.

43 ... f3
Forced, if Black wants to pick up the a3 pawn.

44 Hd8 Hc2
45 Hc7 Hb3
46 Hc7 Hxa3
47 Ha5 Hb3
48 He3 Hd4
49 Hf2 Hc3
50 Hc7 He4
51 Hb6 Hd5
52 Hc7 Hf5
53 Hd8

We have reached the same position as in the last diagram, but without the c5 pawn.

Now nothing is achieved by 53...a5 54 Hxe5 Hxg5, since the passed pawns are easily blockaded on the dark squares. If at the time White had not forced the f-pawn to advance, then with the pawn at f4 this position would, of course, have been lost.

53 ... Hf4
54 Hf1! Now if 54...He3 White has 55 Hb6+ – it was for the sake of this check that the c-pawn was sacrificed.

54 ... Hc4+
55 Hf2

Now after 55...Hd3 neither 56 He1? Hg3! 57 Hc7+ Hg2, nor 56 Hg1? He3! 57 Hb6+ He2 and 57...a5 is possible. However, there is 56 Hc7+, exploiting the fact that the f3 pawn is not defended by the bishop (56...Hxg5 57 Hxf3). If 55...He2 there follows 56 Hg1! He3 57 Hb6+ (the e2 square is occupied). And if the bishop goes to g2, White plays He1!

In the examination of this ending almost all of the important principles of my theory of endings with opposite-colour bishops were mentioned. During the analysis of the following examples we will constantly have to make use of them.

Polner – Chigorin
St Petersburg, 1881
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In the first instance Black must create a second passed pawn.

1 ... b5!
2 axb5 axb5
3 cxb5

If 3 d3 there follows 3...b4! 4 c2 f6 5 b3 g5 (5...f4! followed by 6 e5 is simpler) 6 d1 h4 7 g2 d6! (zugzwang, since the white bishop is controlling the important squares b3 and g4 along different diagonals) 8 b3 (8 g1 h3 with the threat of 9 g2) 8 g4, and the king breaks through on the queenside.

3 ... d7?

Although Black is a pawn down, he could have won easily with 3...c4! 4 b6 d6 5 b7 c5, followed by picking up the bishop for the c-pawn. Note how splendidly placed the black bishop is: it defends its own pawn and restrains three (!) enemy pawns along the one b8-h2 diagonal.

4 d3 c7
5 f1 b6

There followed 6 g2? a5 7 f3 b4 8 b6 c4 9 b7 c3 10 d3 b3 and Black won. White did not exploit his opponent’s mistake. He should have changed the roles of his pieces: stopped the g-pawn with his bishop and gone with his king to the queenside. In this case Black’s only winning try is to take his king to the kingside, in order to win the bishop for the g-pawn. But then the black bishop can be diverted from the c-pawn, since it is defending it and restraining the enemy pawns along different diagonals. After the correct 3...c4! White would not have had time to regroup his forces, but after Black’s mistake this became perfectly possible.

6 e3! a5
7 d2 c4
8 c2

Simpler is 8 d6! with an immediate draw.

8 ... xb5
9 g2 c5
10 f3 d4

11 h1 e3
12 d6! xd6
13 c3

A good textbook example of the principle of one diagonal!

Vidmar – Spielmann
St Petersburg 1909
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Q 2-32. What should Black play?

Rudolf Spielmann found the only possibility of creating winning chances.

35 ... h3!

Emanuel Lasker, annotating this game in the tournament book, writes: ‘A stroke of genius. Black fixes the pawn at h2, and uses this almost imperceptible weakness to work out a winning combination’.

Black’s decision is fully in accordance with the principle of two weaknesses. It is not difficult for White to stop the a-pawn, and if he were to have time to play h2–h4, the draw would become obvious. But now Black intends ...g6–g5 and ...f7–g6–h5–g4–f3, attacking a second weakness – the h2 pawn.

Both Lasker, and the Soviet master Ilya Rabinovich, who analysed this ending in his book on the endgame, considered White’s
position to be hopeless. But look at the position soberly, remember the drawing tendencies of endings with opposite-colour bishops, and you will immediately have doubts about this evaluation. As we will now see, Milan Vidmar could have gained a draw, and in various ways.

Usually the most reliable system of defence is to block the enemy pawn with the king and to defend your own pawns with the bishop. Let us try carrying out this plan.

36 \( \text{d}4 \) 37 \( \text{f}6 \) (36...\( \text{b}5 \) 37 \( \text{c}4 \) 37 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 38 \( \text{b}4 \)). If now 38...\( \text{d}7 \), then 39 \( \text{h}4+ \) \( \text{g}4 \) 40 \( \text{d}6 \), and White has set up the planned fortress. And if 38...\( \text{g}4 \) the most accurate is 39 \( \text{d}6 \) 41 \( \text{f}1 \) (39...\( \text{h}8 \) 40 \( \text{f}4 \! ) \( \text{x}a4 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 41 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{x}h2 \) 42 \( \text{g}4+ \) \( \text{g}2 \) 43 \( \text{g}5 \).

Vidmar decided to wait for the moment.

36 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{g}5 \)
37 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \)

Here there followed two ‘active’ moves: 38 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 39 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{g}4 \), after which things did indeed become bad for White. The game concluded 40 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 41 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{f}1 \) 42 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 43 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{a}3 \) 44 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{a}2 \) 45 \( \text{g}4+ \) \( \text{e}4 \) 46 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{bxc}6 \) 47 \( \text{a}1 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 48 \( \text{h}7 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 49 \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{d}3 \) 50 \( \text{xg}5 \) \( \text{c}3 \), and White resigned.

In those cases when the passed pawn is restrained by the bishop, the usual winning plan is to break through with the king to the aid of the passed pawn. White should have fought against this plan. But on the contrary, with 39 \( \text{f}6 \)? he opened the way for the opponent’s king to the queenside.

When there are opposite-colour bishops you should not play move by move, but should ‘build’ a position – construct a system of defence which the opponent will be unable to breach.

The white king should have defended the h2 pawn and at the same time not allowed the enemy king across to the queenside. Rabinovich in the afore-mentioned book (which on the whole is very substantial and interesting) considered the correct plan of defence, but, unfortunately, he made several mistakes in his analysis.

38 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{h}5 \)
39 \( \text{e}4! \) \( \text{g}4 \)
40 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{f}1 \)

40...\( \text{f}5 \) 41 \( \text{d}4 \).

Q 2-33. Work out the consequences of 41 \( \text{e}7 \).

The natural move 41 \( \text{e}7 \)? (attacking the enemy pawns is usually the correct strategy when there are opposite-colour bishops) leads to defeat in view of 41...\( \text{h}3 \) 42 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{xh}2 \! ) .

1) 43 \( \text{x}f1 \) \( \text{xg}3 \) 44 \( \text{xg}5 \) \( \text{a}3 \) 45 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{a}2 \) 46 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{f}3 \) 47 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 48 \( \text{f}1 \) (48 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{h}4 \) ) 48...\( \text{e}3 \) 49 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{d}3 \) 50 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{c}4 \) or 50...\( \text{c}2 \);

2) 43 \( \text{xg}5 \) \( \text{a}3 \) 44 \( \text{c}4 \) (44 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{a}2 \) 45 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{c}4 \) does not change anything) 44...\( \text{xc}4 \) 45 \( \text{e}7 \! ) \( \text{a}2 \) 46 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 47 \( \text{h}8 \) \( \text{h}3 \) 48 \( \text{a}1 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 49 \( \text{g}7 \).

__________

see next diagram
Can Black break through with his king to his passed pawn? The answer to this question is given by the game Euwe–Yanofsky (Groningen 1946), in which exactly the same position was reached with colours reversed. The former World Champion won as follows:

49...h5 50 a8h b5 51 a8g b4 52 a8h a3!! 53 a8g (53 a8e1 a5 and 54...a4) 53...h4! 54 gxh4 a4, and after 55 a8e1 a3 the king breaks through to the queenside.

White must play more accurately.

41 a8f
42 a8e
43 a8g1

Rabinovich, in order to demonstrate that this position (which he obtains via the inaccurate move order 41 a8e?) is also won, gives the following variation: 43...b5 44 a8f8 (44 a8xg5? a8g4 and 45...a8f3, taking the king to the queenside) 44...a8g6 45 a8e7 a8g4 46 a8f2 a8f5 47 a8e2 a8e6 48 a8xg5 a8d5.

But first, if this variation is continued, it transpires that in it Black achieves little: 49 a8d2 a8c4 50 a8f6 a3 51 a8c1 a8b3 52 a8g7 (or 52 a8g4) 52...a2 (52...a8d3 53 a8f6 a8c4 54 a8b1) 53 a8xc4 bxc4 54 a8d2 with a draw.

Second, the black king need not have been allowed to gain a tempo by attacking the bishop. For example, 45 a8b4 (instead of 45 a8e7) 45...a8g4 46 a8f2 a8f5 47 a8e3 a8e6 48 a8d4 (or 48 a8d2).

Black is also unable to clear a way for his king to the queenside as in the Euwe–Yanofsky ending: 45 a8b4 h5 46 a8f8 h4 47 gxh4 a8xh4 48 a8f2 (48 a8e7!) 48...a8h3 49 a8e7 g4 50 a8d6! a8h7 51 a8g1 g3 52 h8xg3 a8g4 53 a8f2 a8f5 54 a8e3 a8e6 55 a8f8 a8d5 56 a8d2 a8c4 57 a8g7 a3 58 a8c1.

E 2-16
Black to move

Can he win?
What Remained Off-Stage

The problems of victory are more agreeable than those of defeat, but they are no less difficult.

Winston Churchill

Steinberg – Dvoretzky
Minsk 1965
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This was the first game that I played as a candidate master. Chess then seemed to me to be a simple and understandable game. When the time control had already passed, I did not want to adjourn the game – I had no doubt that I would easily convert my material advantage at the board. That is what in fact happened. The win did not provoke any strong emotions, since it seemed natural and logical – after all, Black was a pawn up.

A few years later, when studying the theory of the endgame, I decided to analyse this ending. To my great astonishment I realised that it was far more deep and complicated than it had seemed. On the way to victory, as it turned out, Black had to avoid temptations (about which at the board he, of course, did not even suspect), and take the only correct decisions. Yes, the optimism of youth is a great strength, capable sometimes of compensating for a lack of knowledge and experience.

Black must break through with his king into the opponent’s position. He cannot get through on the queenside – White keeps his king at b3 and plays \( b1-a2-b1 \). This means that he must go to g7, then eliminate the g5 pawn in some way or other and invade on the dark squares. In which particular way, we will decide later, since we do not know where at that moment the white pieces will be.

42 \( \ldots \) \( \text{d}7 \)
43 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}8 \)
44 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{f}8 \)
45 \( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{g}7 \)
46 \( \text{a}4 \)
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Now it is time to take a decision. Black can play 46...f6, 46...h6 or 46...\textit{axg}5, and he can also make any of these moves after first exchanging on f5. Altogether six different variations.

In the game I took the correct decision intuitively, without any calculation. In the course of subsequent analysis I came to the conclusion that all the remaining continuations would have led to a draw. And it was only many years later that an amateur player, after carefully checking the analysis, showed me a second way to win.

Q 2-34. Try to guess where it is that Black has a win.

First let us check the exchange on f5. It does not look altogether logical – White recaptures with his e-pawn, getting rid of his weakness at e4.

1) 46...\textit{gx}f5 47 exf5! \textit{ax}g5 48 \textit{ex}a3 \textit{f}f6 49 \textit{d}b2. The standard 49 \textit{d}e8 ('pauns under fire' – a typical defensive procedure when there are opposite-colour bishops) does not work here in view of 49...\textit{d}f4! 50 \textit{d}b3 \textit{d}g5 51 \textit{c}c2 \textit{d}xg4 52 \textit{d}x\textit{f}7 (52 \textit{d}d3 \textit{f}6) 52...\textit{h}5 53 \textit{d}d3 \textit{d}f4 54 \textit{d}e2 \textit{h}3 55 \textit{d}e3+!

49...\textit{e}5 (weaker is 49...\textit{h}5 50 \textit{g}xh5 \textit{d}xf5 51 \textit{d}e8 \textit{f}6 52 \textit{c}c3 \textit{e}4 53 \textit{g}6+ 50 \textit{c}c3 (50 \textit{d}e8? \textit{d}f4 51 \textit{d}x\textit{f}7 \textit{d}xg4 52 \textit{c}c2 \textit{h}5) 50...\textit{d}f4 51 \textit{d}d1 \textit{e}3 52 \textit{d}c2 \textit{d}f6 53 \textit{d}b3 \textit{h}6 54 \textit{d}c2 \textit{d}g7 55 \textit{d}b3 \textit{d}d3 56 \textit{d}f3 (or 56 \textit{d}c2+) 56...\textit{d}d2 57 \textit{d}f4 \textit{e}3 58 \textit{d}c2 \textit{d}f4 59 \textit{d}d1 \textit{h}5 (there is nothing else) 60 \textit{g}xh5 \textit{d}xf5 61 \textit{d}c2 \textit{d}e4 62 \textit{d}d2 \textit{f}5. In the event of 62...\textit{d}d4 63 \textit{d}e2! \textit{e}5 64 \textit{d}xe6 \textit{f}xe6 65 \textit{d}f1 \textit{d}5 66 \textit{c}xd5 \textit{e}xd5 a well-known drawn position arises: when the black pawns end up at c4 and d4, it will be sufficient for White to keep his king at c2 and play \textit{f}f1–\textit{e}2–\textit{f}1.

63 \textit{e}1 \textit{f}4 64 \textit{d}f2 \textit{d}d4+ 65 \textit{d}f1 (65 \textit{g}2? \textit{d}d3) 65...\textit{f}3 66 \textit{h}6 \textit{d}3 67 \textit{d}xf3 \textit{d}xc4 68 \textit{e}2 and 69 \textit{d}d1 with a draw.

2) 46...\textit{gx}f5 47 exf5! \textit{h}6 48 \textit{g}xh6+ \textit{\textit{d}x}h6 49 \textit{d}e8 \textit{f}6 50 \textit{d}b3 \textit{d}g5 51 \textit{h}5 \textit{d}f4 52 \textit{a}2 \textit{d}e4 53 \textit{e}8 \textit{d}d4 54 \textit{b}5 \textit{c}3 55 \textit{e}6 \textit{d}3 56 \textit{b}5 \textit{d}d4 57 \textit{d}b3 \textit{d}e5 58 \textit{e}8 etc. White has set up a basic defensive position: he is blocking the opponent's passed pawn with his king and defending his own pawns with his bishop. White adheres to the same system of defence in all the variations involving ...\textit{f}7–\textit{f}6 or ...\textit{h}7–\textit{h}6. The question, as usual, is whether Black can create a second passed pawn. In the given case this is obviously not possible.

3) 46...\textit{gx}f5 47 exf5! \textit{f}6 48 \textit{g}xh6+ \textit{\textit{d}x}h6 (48...\textit{d}xh6 does not change anything) 49 \textit{d}e8 \textit{h}6 50 \textit{b}3 \textit{d}g5 51 \textit{h}5 \textit{d}f4 52 \textit{a}2 \textit{e}4 53 \textit{d}e8! \textit{d}d4 54 \textit{\textit{d}b}5 with the same draw as in the previous variation. Thus the exchange on f5 throws away the win.

4) 46...\textit{h}6 47 \textit{g}xh6+ \textit{\textit{d}x}h6 48 \textit{f}xg6 \textit{d}xg6 (48...\textit{d}xg6 also does not win) 49 \textit{d}e8 \textit{g}7 (49...\textit{d}f6 50 \textit{b}3 \textit{e}5 51 \textit{d}xe6 \textit{f}xe6 52 \textit{\textit{d}d}7 with an easy draw) 50 \textit{b}3 \textit{f}6 51 \textit{\textit{d}d}7 \textit{h}6 52 \textit{a}2 \textit{g}5 53 \textit{\textit{d}b}3 \textit{f}4 54 \textit{a}5 \textit{e}5 55 \textit{\textit{d}d}7! (the e-pawn is not particularly needed by White – it is more important to defend the c4 pawn securely) 55...\textit{xe}4 56 \textit{\textit{d}e}8! (not only 56 \textit{\textit{d}e}2? \textit{\textit{d}d}4 57 \textit{b}5 \textit{e}3 58 \textit{\textit{d}d}6 \textit{d}b4 59 \textit{\textit{d}d}5 \textit{h}6! 60 \textit{a}6 \textit{f}8 61 \textit{d}b5 \textit{e}5! 62 \textit{d}xe6 \textit{d}5) 56...\textit{d}d4 57 \textit{\textit{d}d}6, and again Black is not able to breach his opponent's defences.

5) 46...\textit{f}6! 47 \textit{g}xh6+ \textit{\textit{d}x}h6 48 \textit{f}xg6 \textit{\textit{d}x}g6 (48...\textit{d}xg6 is equally good) 49 \textit{d}e8 \textit{h}6 50 \textit{\textit{d}b}3 \textit{d}g5 51 \textit{\textit{d}a}2 \textit{g}4 52 \textit{d}xg6 \textit{f}4 53 \textit{\textit{d}b}3 \textit{\textit{d}e}3 54 \textit{\textit{d}f}5. The crucial difference between this variation and the previous ones is that now White has no right to give up his e4 pawn and he is forced to defend his weakness at c4 not with his bishop, but with his king.

54...\textit{d}d2! Incorrect is 54...\textit{d}d4 55 \textit{\textit{d}g}6 \textit{\textit{d}f}4? In view of 56 \textit{\textit{d}a}3! (not 56 \textit{\textit{d}f}5? \textit{\textit{d}e}5! 57 \textit{\textit{d}g}6 \textit{a}2) 56...\textit{d}xf4 57 \textit{\textit{d}b}2 \textit{\textit{d}d}3 58 \textit{e}5+ or 57...\textit{d}e5+ 58 \textit{\textit{d}c}2 with an obvious draw.
55 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{b2} \) 56 \( \text{f5} \) (56 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{d3} \) 57 \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{e5}! \)) 56...\( \text{e5}! \) 57 \( \text{xa3} \) (otherwise 58...\( \text{d3} \) and 59...\( \text{a2} \)) 57...\( \text{c3} \) 58 \( \text{a2} \) \( \text{xc4} \) 59 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{d3} \) and White, in order not to allow the c-pawn to queen, has to give up his e4 pawn.

46 ... \( \text{xg5}! \)

This move, which was made in the game, leads to the goal in an equally simple (or complicated?) way and equally forcing as 46...f6!

But now there is a new problem. In the variation 47 \( \text{xa3} \) h5 (47...\( \text{f6}! \)?), 48 gxh5 gxh5 49 \( \text{b2} \) f6 50 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 51 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f4} \) is hopeless for White, but 48 fxg6! has to be reckoned with.
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What should Black play?

In the game White exchanged immediately on g6.

47 \( \text{fxg6} \) \( \text{fxg6}! \)

The only reply (although certainly the most natural). Unsuitable was 47...hxg6?

48 \( \text{xa3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 49 \( \text{e8}! \) or 47...\( \text{gxg6} \)?

48 \( \text{xa3} \) \( \text{e3} \) 49 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{g5} \) 50 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{f4} \) 51 \( \text{f5} \) h6 52 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 53 \( \text{d3} \).

48 \( \text{xa3} \)

A new problem. Should Black play 48...h5 (otherwise White can prevent this by 49 \( \text{d1} \)) or advance his king, winning the e4 pawn?

Let us see what could have happened after 48...h5 49 gxh5 gxh5 50 \( \text{b2} \).

For the moment the advance of the h-pawn is not dangerous. If 50...h4 there follows not 51 \( \text{d7} \) \( \text{f6} \) 52 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 53 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f4} \)

54 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{g3} \), but 51 \( \text{c3} \) h3 (51...\( \text{f6} \)) 52 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 53 \( \text{e2} \) 52 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{f6} \)

53 \( \text{g4}! \) h2 54 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 55 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f4} \)

56 \( \text{e2} \) with an obvious draw.

50...\( \text{f6}! \) 51 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 52 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f4} \)

53 \( \text{e2} \). It is clear that if the white king reaches h1, the position will become completely drawn. Therefore White happily gives up his e4 pawn, and Black does not pay any attention to it.

53...\( \text{g3} \) 54 \( \text{e8} \) (54 \( \text{f1} \) \( \text{e3} \)) 54...h4

55 \( \text{h5} \) h3 (55...\( \text{g2} \) 56 \( \text{f3}+ \) \( \text{g1} \)

57 \( \text{g4} \)) 56 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 57 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{h4} \)

58 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{g5} \).
Zugzwang: White loses after both 59 \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{g}2 \), and 59 \( \text{h}1 \) \( \text{h}2 \) 60 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{g}1 \). He is forced to sacrifice a pawn.

59 e5! dxe5 60 \( \text{e}4! \) \( \text{f}4 \) 61 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \).
Now 62 \( \text{h}1 \)? \( \text{g}3 \) 63 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{h}2 \) 64 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{g}1 \) is bad for White. He has to give up a third(!) pawn.

62 d6! exd6 63 \( \text{d}5 \). And it transpires that, by giving up the pawns that were in his way, White has finally set up a secure fortress. Black’s king cannot break through either on the kingside (63...\( \text{g}3 \) 64 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{h}2 \) 65 \( \text{f}1 \)), or on the queenside, where it is met by the white king at b3.

It only proved possible to save the position, because the bishop restrained all the enemy pawns along the single diagonal h1-a8. This would not have happened in the event of the hasty 60 d6? (instead of 60 \( \text{e}4! \)) 60...\( \text{f}4 \)! The e-pawn advances to e4 and White’s position immediately becomes lost, e.g. 61 dxe7 (61 d7 e6 is no better) 61...\( \text{e}7 \) 62 \( \text{h}1 \) e4 63 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \) (the simplest) 64 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{d}4 \) (zugzwang) 65 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{g}3 \) or 65 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{e}3 \) and 66...\( \text{d}3 \).

48 ... \( \text{f}6! \)
Again Black managed to guess the correct decision. It is not a matter of winning the e4 pawn, but of the need to block the white king’s path to the kingside.

49 \( \text{d}1 \)
Just in case, Mikhail Steinberg does not allow ...h7–h5. No better was 49 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 50 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 51 \( \text{d}7 \) e5! 52 dxe6 \( \text{e}7 \) and 53...\( \text{x}g4 \).

49 ... \( \text{e}5 \)
50 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{xe}4 \)
51 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{e}3 \)

Now Black has to create a passed g-pawn. But first he needs to drive the enemy king as far away as possible (to the a-file!), while keeping his own at e3. With the aid of zugzwang this problem is solved comparatively simply.

52 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{f}6+ \)
53 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{d}4! \)
A far-sighted move! From here the bishop deprives the white king of the important square... f2!

54 \( \text{b}3 \)
Bad is 54 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}3 \).

54 ... \( \text{d}3! \)
55 \( \text{f}3 \)
If 55 \( \text{c}2+ \), then 55...\( \text{d}2 \) 56 \( \text{e}4 \) h5 with a straightforward win.

55 ... \( \text{d}2 \)
Another zugzwang position. The white king is forced onto the a-file.
56  a4  e3
57  d1  h5!
58  gxh5  g5

White resigned in view of 59  b3  f4  60  c2  g4  61  d3  g3  62  e2  g2  (63  f2 is not possible).
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Black to move
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White to move
An Amazing Coincidence

He to whom the present is the only thing that is present, knows nothing of the age in which he lives.

Oscar Wilde

After his victory at the international tournament in Sochi in 1988, Dolmatov as usual showed me the games he had played. Several of them, including the one with international master Milan Drasko from Yugoslavia, were adjourned, and Sergey had to carry out a serious analysis of the adjourned positions. The ending reached against Drasko seemed familiar to me. Returning home, I opened the book with the collected articles of Nikolai Dmitrievich Grigoriev. And I ascertained that his analysis of an extract from the game Sultan Khan-Tartakower, played in 1931, was indeed almost completely identical to Dolmatov's analysis. An amazing and extremely rare coincidence!

Chess players of the older generation are sometimes in the habit of idealising the past. Their views are expressed by the famous lines of Lermontov: ‘Yes, there were people in our time, not like the present-day generation’. But young players, by contrast, sometimes relate disdainfully to the classical heritage. It seems to them that history began from the day that they were born: everything that came before belonged to the stone age. I have always taken an ironic attitude to debates about how the champions of the past would have fared against those from the present – all the same it will not be possible to check this. But now we have an opportunity to stage an unusual correspondence competition – to compare two analyses of effectively one and the same position, carried out independently of each other with an interval of more than half a century. And we will see that a classic endgame analyst, and a modern young grandmaster, were both up to the mark. First I invite you to make the acquaintance of the primary source – an extract from Grigoriev’s article ‘Under the analysis microscope’.

‘I don’t know if the readers have lingered over the 5th game of the Sultan Khan-Tartakower match (1931). If not, if they have not paid much attention to this game, then it is a pity. All of it is worth studying, especially the endgame. But if this endgame has caught the interest of the readers, they will, of course, remember without difficulty the following position:

Here Black played 48...\texttt{\texttt{\$}}c8, which entailed the loss of a pawn: 49 bxa5 bxa5 50 \texttt{\texttt{\$}}c5+ \texttt{\texttt{\$}}b6 51 d4! \texttt{\texttt{\$}}c6 52 \texttt{\texttt{\$}}d3 and 53 \texttt{\texttt{\$}}f4.
Tartakower attached a question mark to his move 48...c8, and in his commentary suggests that Black should have played 48...AXB4+ 49 BXB4 E8. But what would have happened then and how would the game have ended? Instead of a reply to this legitimate curiosity, the commentator restricts himself to the sentence: 'In this case the variations are very unclear'.

But which variations, and why unclear? The entire comment takes up precisely three lines and does not disclose the essence of the position. But meanwhile it is evident that in this position the knight is clearly more mobile and stronger than the bishop, which is forced to defend its pawns and is extremely cramped by them. It is hard to believe that under such circumstances it was not possible to demonstrate White's positional superiority. What else is needed for the possibility of such a demonstration? No, the note to Black's 48th move definitely demands amplification. I will attempt to do this, hoping that the author of the commentary will not bear a grudge. I will attempt not only to give variations, but also to make them clear. So, let us continue.

48 ... axB4+
49 BxB4 E8
For the moment all is well with Black, and his weak e6 and g6 pawns are not in danger: if 50 A4d4 there follows 50...d7 (or 50...f7) 51 A6e2 e8 52 A4f4 f7. White's first objective is to expand his possible range of operations, for which he needs to eliminate the b6 pawn.

50 a5! bxa5+
Bad is 50...Bb5? 51 axb6, when Black cannot take on d3 due to the loss of his bishop, while after 51...Bxb6 52 Bc5 Bc6 53 d4 he loses a pawn.

51 Bxa5
White has in fact advantageously expanded the bridgehead of operations: his knight gains new squares, in particular c5 (a very important square), and his king gains the prospect of advancing on the queenside, a prospect with which Black has to reckon.

51 ... Bb6
52 B3f1!
Not 52...d7 in view of 53 Bc5 Bc8 54 d4 Bc6 55 A5e5 c7 56 Bb5, and White wins (56...d7+ 57 Axd7 Axd7 58 Bb6).

53 Bc5 Bc6
54 d4 Bb6
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White's achievements are modest, especially as it is now him to move. But be patient, and it will become clear that White wins here, even if he begins.

55 B4a4+ Bc6
After 55...Bc6 56 Bc5 the solution is fairly simple. For example: 56...Bc6 57 A5e3 Bg8 58 Be2! a4 59 A6d6 Bb4 60 A7 Bc4 61 Bf8, and White picks up the bishop and easily queens one of his pawns.

56 Bc5 Bb7
57 Bc5+
But not 57 Bb5? Bf8+, and after 58...Bxa4 the draw is obvious.

57 ...
Bc7
Black would prefer to take the direct, rather than the diagonal opposition, but he cannot do this for a very valid and interesting reason: 57...Ba7 58 Bb5 (threatening 59 Bc6) 58...Be8+ 59 Bb4! Bf7 60 A5
\( \text{g8 61 b5, and the white king again reaches b5, this time not only threatening to invade, but also invading the enemy position.} \)

Here there are two ways available for White to exploit his positional advantage. The more direct is as follows: 58 \( \text{d}3 \text{e}8 59 \text{f}4 \text{f}7 60 \text{b}5 \text{b}7 61 \text{c}5 \text{c}7 62 \text{d}3 \text{e}8 63 \text{b}4. \) In this position only bishop moves are acceptable for Black, since if \( 63... \text{d}7? \) White penetrates with his king to \( b6, \) then transfers his knight to \( c5, \) and wins easily, with complete command of the enemy camp.

Thus, there only remain bishop moves: either \( 63... \text{a}4 \) or \( 63... \text{f}7 \) (as will soon become evident, \( 63... \text{d}7 \) is much worse).

If \( 63... \text{a}4 \) there follows \( 64 \text{a}6+ \text{b}7 65 \text{d}6! \) and White wins, e.g. \( 65... \text{xa}6 66 \text{xe}6 \text{b}5 (66... \text{e}8 \) is unavailing on account of \( 67 \text{e}7 \text{a}4 68 \text{f}7! 67 \text{f}7! \) (but not \( 67 \text{xd}5 \text{b}3+ 68 \text{d}6 \text{c}4! etc.) \( 67... \text{c}4 68 \text{xe}6 \text{xd}4 69 \text{f}6! \text{e}8 70 \text{e}6 \) and \( 71 \text{g}6. \) \( 66... \text{b}6 \) (instead of \( 66... \text{b}5 \) also does not save Black: \( 67 \text{f}7! \text{c}7 68 \text{xe}6 \text{d}8 69 \text{f}7 \text{e}8+ 70 \text{g}7, \) and White wins in view of \( 71 \text{g}6 \) followed by \( 72 \text{h}7. \)

However, the best defence is offered not by \( 63... \text{a}4, \) but by \( 63... \text{f}7(!) \) with this continuation: \( 64 \text{a}6+ \text{b}7 \) (at the given moment, as also earlier, the king cannot move to \( d7, \) allowing the white king to go to \( b6) 65 \text{d}6! \text{xe}6 66 \text{e}7 \text{g}8! \) (with the aim of drawing away the opponent's king from the pawns) \( 67 \text{f}8 \text{b}5 68 \text{g}8 \text{c}4 69 \text{f}7 \text{xd}4 70 \text{xe}6 \text{c}5 71 \text{f}6 \text{d}4 72 \text{e}6 \text{d}3 73 \text{e}7 \text{d}2 74 \text{e}8 \text{f}1 \text{d}1 \). As a result White obtains a queen ending with an extra pawn, which promises him winning chances, and Black drawing chances (present-day theory does not give grounds for a more definite assertion). Even so, this is a small achievement. The other alternative for White in the position from the last diagram is much more intricate, but also much more decisive.

\[ 58 \text{b}5! \]

Only three moves later will it become understandable why White does not immediately play his king to \( a6. \)

\[ 58... \text{e}8+ \]
\[ 59 \text{a}6 \text{f}7 \]
\[ 60 \text{b}7 \]

From here the knight attacks the especially important squares, and in particular \( d6. \)

\[ 60... \text{e}8(!!) \]
\[ 61 \text{a}7!! \]
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Had White hastened on his 58th move to play $\text{a6}$, it would have been him to move in this position and he would have been unable to achieve anything (for example, $61\text{ c6} \text{ a4} or 61\text{ a6}\text{ b5+}$).

But now it is Black to move, and he does not have a great deal of choice. He has only two possibilities that do not cause obvious damage: 61...$\text{f7}$ and 61...$\text{c6}$. Indeed, bishop moves along the long diagonal lose quickly. After 61...$\text{c6}$ (and also after the move of the bishop to $\text{b5}$ or $\text{a4}$) White wins by $62\text{ c5} \text{ d7} 63\text{ xd7} \text{ xd7} 64\text{ b7}$ etc.; if 61...$\text{d7}$ there also follows $62\text{ c5}$, and after $62\text{ c8} 63\text{ a8}$! wherever the black king moves White wins by $64\text{ b8}$.

What else can Black do in the diagram position? His king must defend the $\text{b6}$ square (otherwise $62\text{ b6}$ and $63\text{ c5}$ wins), and 61...$\text{c6}$ leads to the following finish: $62\text{ b8!}\text{ b6}$ (neither $62...\text{d7}$ $63\text{ c5!}$ nor $62...\text{d7} 63\text{ d6}$ is possible, and the bishop sacrifice also does not work, e.g. $62...\text{b5} 63\text{ d6+a4} 64\text{ d8e8 c4 65 c7xd4 66 d6 e3 67 xe6 d4 68 d6 d3 69 d5 etc.}$) $63\text{ c8 f7}$ (after other bishop moves, $64\text{ c5}$ is immediately decisive, while if $63...\text{c6}$, then $64\text{ d6 d7+ 65 d8 etc.}$) $64\text{ d6 g8} 65\text{ d7 a5 66 e7 b4 67 f8 c3 68 b5+!}\text{ c4 69 xg8 and wins}$.

The king can calmly return – its raid deep into the opponent’s rear has played its part; it has allowed the knight to be transferred to $\text{b7}$, and from there with a leap to $\text{d6}$ the knight has cramped the bishop even further.

This is the best! Totally bad is $64...\text{c7}$ $65\text{ b5}$, and if $65...\text{d7} 66\text{ b6}$, while if $65...\text{h7} 66\text{ e8+}$ and 67...$\text{f6}$.

Completely paralysing the bishop. True, the less ‘study-like’ move $66\text{ h6}$ is no less effective. Well, this is merely an ‘ending’ and not a study, and ‘duals’ here are admissible.

The final stage is approaching. The kings enter into single combat.

White avoids the opposition; what is he aiming for? Well, if only to avoid giving his opponent any chances. After $68\text{ a7 c6}$ $69\text{ b8 b5}$ White penetrates with his king into the enemy rear, but Black does the same.

Hopeless for Black is $68...\text{d7} 69\text{ b6 e7 70 c7 f8 71 d7 g7 72 xe6 xh8 73 d7}$, and the advance of the e-pawn wins.

Can Black now congratulate himself on his success? He has the opposition, and there is nowhere for White to break through.

This self-banishment is forced. After $71...\text{d7}$ the invasion of the white king via $\text{b6}$ is obvious and crushing.

And further explanation is unnecessary... On the whole, an ending that is extremely rich in content, instructive and valuable.’

Now let us turn to Dolmatov’s ending. Obviously there is no sense in repeating the variations just considered. I will comment only on those points where either the position or the analysis of Grigoriev and Dolmatov diverges.
41 h4
A good sealed move, restricting the opponent’s possibilities. After other continuations White would additionally have had to reckon with 41...g5 and if h2–h4 – ...g5xh4.

41 ... g6

After 41...g5 42 hxg5 hxg5 43 g4 the g5 pawn is doomed, while if 41...b7 Drasko was afraid of 42 h5, then g3–g4, the manoeuvre of the king to f4, and g4–g5. However, Dolmatov had in mind a quite different plan. He was intending to play c3 and g3–g4–g5. If after the exchange of pawns Black replies ...g7–g6, then things reduce to the main variation of the analysis. But with the pawn at g7 (and king at b7) White wins by 1 g6! xg6 2 xg6 bxa5 3 bxa5 c6 4 d4. The win is more complicated in the interesting variation 4 d4?! b5 5 xg7 xa5 6 e6 b4 7 e7 a5 8 e8 c8 xe8 9 xe8 a4 10 c7 a3 11 xd5+ b3 12 c3 (a position of mutual zugzwang, but it only arises with Black to move) 12...b4 13 a2+ b3 14 c1+ b2 15 c4 xc1 16 b3.

42 c3

In such situations it is not customary to hurry with the conversion of the advantage – all the same the opponent is doomed to complete passivity. His king must guard the b6 pawn, and his bishop the e6 pawn. The exchange of pawns on a5, as well as ...b6–b5, opens a way for the white king into the enemy position. Dolmatov plans to fix the situation on the kingside and then to exchange all the pawns on the queenside, in order to clear the way for his king.

42 ... b7
43 g4 c7
44 g5 hxg5 b7
45 hxg5 c7
46 b3 b7
47 a3 g8
48 b3 xb6
49 a4 f7
50 c5 e8+
51 b3 f7
52 a3 a5

Black is in zugzwang and is forced to fall in with his opponent's wishes. Bad is 53...b5 54 b7 or 53...g8 54 a4 f7 55 d7+ c6 56 f6 b6 57 d4.

54 b3 c6
54...b5 55 b7.

55 d4 xb4
56 xb4 b6

Thus the position has completely coincided with Grigoriev's (as can be seen by glancing at the corresponding diagram from his article).

57 a4+ c6
58 a5 b7
59 c5+ c7

Here, perhaps, Dolmatov is able to amplify somewhat Grigoriev's analysis. Let us examine 59...c6.
It is White to move, everything is simple: 60 a6 c7 61 b7!, and then as in the main variation. But let us suppose that in this position it is Black to move. (Dolmatov did not study the ending move by move – he picked out the key positions that could arise, and examined them with both sides to move. In principle, that is how such static endgame positions should be analysed. Remember the chapter ‘My first analysis’, p. 90).

Once again 60...c7 61 b5! e8+ 62 a6 takes play into the main variation, but there is a more tenacious defence: 60...g8!

Now 61 a6 f7 62 b7 e8 63 d6 d7 64 a7 c7 65 b7 e8 leads to the position of mutual zugzwang, the key one of the entire endgame, with White to move. Can he avoid this and transpose into the main variations of the analysis? Yes, Dolmatov found such a possibility.

61 d3 f7 62 f4 c7 (62...b7 63 b5 c7 64 c5, and Black is in zugzwang) 63 b5 b7 (or 63...e8+ 64 a6 f7 65 c3 c6 66 c5, and again Black is in zugzwang) 64 d3 e8+ 65 a5 f7 66 c5+ c7 (66...c6 67 a6) 67 b5! and then as in the main variation. A curious merry-go-round!

60 b5! e8+

61 a6 f7
62 a7?!

A less precise move order than that given by Grigoriev: 62 b7! e8 63 a7. But it should be taken into account that Dolmatov was analysing at a tournament and the time he had to check his analysis was very limited, whereas Nikolai Dmitrievich was working in the quiet of his study and did not need to hurry.

62...

62...c6 was more tenacious. In this case Dolmatov was intending to go into the variation 63 b7 b5 (63...g8 64 d6; 63...e8 64 d6 d7 65 b8 b6 66 b7 and 67 c5) 64 d6+ b4 65 xf7 c4 66 b6! xd4 67 c6 e3 68 d6 d4 69 xe6 d3 70 d6 d4 71 e6 d2 72 e6 d1 73 e7 f3+ 74 xg6 wc6 75 e8. The queen ending is won, taking account of the black king’s poor position in the centre of the board, but, of course, it would have been better not to allow the opponent such a defensive possibility.

63 b7!
64 d6

This is what the battle has been for – it is important to shut the enemy bishop in the corner of the board. The remainder is now much simpler.

64...
65 a6 g8
66 a5 h7
67 f7 g8
68 h6 h7
69 a6! c7
70 b5 b7
71 c5 c7
72 f7 g8
73 d6 h7
74 e8+

Black resigns.

It is easy to see that the entire concluding part of the game followed the analysis of Grigoriev and Dolmatov, and the final positions also coincided.
Aerobatics

I, for example, do not remember anything resembling the ending that occurred in the Vaganian-Dolmatov game. The young Moscow grandmaster found such a fantastic idea of creating a position of mutual zugzwang with his opponent to move, that certain grandmasters still look at it and are unable to understand it!

Mikhail Tal

Vaganian – Dolmatov
Zonal Tournament, Yerevan 1982

The diagram shows the adjourned position of this game from the last round. Black stands worse, but he should not lose. His objective is to prevent the opponent’s knight from entering his position and not to allow his king to be driven from c6.

50 \texttt{a}b3 \texttt{e}3
51 \texttt{a}a1 \texttt{g}5
52 \texttt{c}c2 \texttt{d}2!

It is essential to keep control of b4 and e3.

53 \texttt{d}d3 \texttt{g}5
54 \texttt{c}c3

In the event of 54 \texttt{b}b4+ \texttt{c}c5 55 \texttt{d}d5 (55 \texttt{c}c3?? \texttt{d}d2+) Black would have replied 55...\texttt{d}d8 followed by 56...b5. The move made by Rafael Vaganian is rather dangerous. He is threatening 55 \texttt{b}b4+ \texttt{c}c5 56 \texttt{d}d3+ and 57 \texttt{c}c4, and if 54...\texttt{c}c5 there follows 55 \texttt{e}1! Therefore Dolmatov immediately clarifies the situation on the queen-side.

54 ... b5!
55 a5

After 55 \texttt{b}b4+ \texttt{b}6 56 \texttt{d}d5+ \texttt{a}5 57 a\texttt{xb}5 \texttt{xb}5 White has no advantage.

55 ... \texttt{e}7
56 f4?! 56 \texttt{b}4+ \texttt{xb}4+ 57 \texttt{xb}4 f6 58 a6 \texttt{b}6 59 a7 \texttt{xa}7 60 \texttt{xb}5 \texttt{b}7 would have led to a drawn pawn ending. White does not have anything better and he should have reconciled himself to a draw. But Vaganian’s tournament position demanded only a win. The Yerevan grandmaster decided to take a risk, but his planned operation was accurately suppressed.

56 ... exf4
57 \texttt{d}d4+ \texttt{c}5!
58 a6?

Now was the last moment when White could have quickly concluded the game peacefully: 58 \texttt{b}b3+ \texttt{c}6 59 \texttt{d}4+. ‘Losing objectivity – this almost certainly signifies ruining the game’ (David Bronstein).

58 ... b4+
59 \texttt{b}3 \texttt{b}6
60 a7 \texttt{b}7
61 \texttt{c}6 \texttt{f}8!
62 \texttt{d}8+
Otherwise Black would have simply strengthened his position by ...f7–f6 and ...g6–g5.

62 ... $xa7
63 $xf7
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The roles have been reversed: White is a pawn down and must now try and gain a draw. His objective does not look too difficult, since Black’s pawns are on squares of the colour of his bishop. But from this point Dolmatov begins demonstrating endgame aerobatics, and he completely out-plays Vaganian.

63 ... $b8!!
A fantastic move! Let us try and decipher it. Black’s first objective is to consolidate his kingside by ...$e7 and ...g6–g5, after which his opponent will constantly have to reckon with ...g5–g4. Here 63...$e7? is not possible in view of 64 $e5 with the threats of 65 $c6+ and 65 $xg6, so Dolmatov first wants to bring up his king.

After 63...$b7? White saves himself by 64 $d8+ $c8 65 $e6 $d6 66 e5! $xe5 67 $xb4, while if 63...$c6? there follows 64 $e5 with the threats of 65 $xg6 and 65 $d7+. Black’s only chance is a piece sacrifice. But where can he move his king after 64...g5 65 $d7+? 65...$b5? 66 $xf8 g4 67 $e6 f3 68 $d4+ and 69 $xf3 will not do. He also loses after 65...$e6? 66 $xf8 g4 67 $e6! f3 68 $xg3 $xh3 69 $c5+ $c6 70 $d3 and 71 $e2, while if 65...$a5(a7) 66 $xf8 g4 67 $e5!, and the pawns queen simultaneously.

By playing 63...$b8!! Black prepares in the variation with the piece sacrifice to occupy c8, the ideal square for his king – here it does not come under check by the knight and it also halts the advance of the e-pawn: 64 $e5 g5! 65 $d7+ (65 $c6+ $c7 66 $xb4? $xb4 67 $xb4 $g4; 65 $g6 $e5 66 $c4 $c7 67 $xc5? b3 68 $e7 b2 69 $d5+ $d7 70 $c3 $g4 71 $d4 $g3 and 72...f3) 65...$c8! 66 $xf8? $g4, and White loses.

Later analysis showed that, apart from 63...$b8, another move was also possible: 63...$a6!? Well, a practical game is not a study, and here the uniqueness of the solution is not always strictly observed. The position arising after 63...$a6 64 $e5 g5 65 $g6 $c5 66 $c4 $b6! (66...$a5 67 $xc5 b3 68 $e5 does not work) 67 $e5 $d6 68 $f3 $e7 69 $d4 will be discussed later – you will find it on the following diagram.

64 $b4
Q 2-35. What should Black play?

64...$e7? 65 $e5 still will not do. The obvious 64...$c7? is refuted by 65 $g5! $d7 (65...$d6 66 e5) 66 $c1! with the threats of 67 $xh4 and 67 $e5+.

64 ... $c8!
Now White is no longer able to prevent the consolidation of the kingside: ...$e7 and ...g6–g5.

65 $g5 $e7
66 $e6 $g5
67 $d4

Black has successfully solved the first problem. Now he needs to break into the opponent’s position with his king. But via which squares? White will cover the e5 square by placing his knight at f3. If Black
takes his king to h5 in order to prepare ...g5–g4, White easily parries the threat by retreating his knight to h2.

The only promising idea is to march the king to a5 with the threat of breaking through via a4. By retreating his king to b3, White will open a way into his position via c5. But does not the black king move too far away from the passed e-pawn? However, if the pawn advances, but does not manage to get through to the queening square, the black king will acquire new possibilities on the kingside.

Dolmatov successfully carried out his plan and was able to win, but his opponent did not exploit all his defensive resources. In annotating the conclusion of the game, I initially will not point out where White could have played more strongly.

Q 2-36. As you play through the next few moves, try discovering these moments yourself.

67 ... c7
68 d5 f8
69 d4 c7!!

Again Dolmatov demonstrates a profound insight into the secrets of the position. He sees that a position of mutual zugzwang will soon arise, and he loses a tempo in advance, so that in this position it will be his opponent to move.

70 f3 e7
71 d4 b6

Here is this position! Let us suppose that it is Black to move. After 72 a5 White does not play 73 c6+ a4 74 xe7 g4!, but simply 73 c3! c5(f6) 74 d6 or 73...d6 74 e5. If immediately 72...f6, then 73 e5! xe5 (73...e7 74 f5 f8 75 e6) 74 f3. After losing one of his pawns, Black can no longer hope to win, e.g. 74...d6 75 xg5 a5 76 b3 b5 77 f3 e7 78 d4+.

72 f5
72 f3 a5 73 b3 b5 is completely bad.

72 ... f8
73 d4 a5
74 b3 g7!
75 e5

75 f3 f6 76 e5 e7 77 d4 b6 would have come to the same thing, while if 75 c6+ b5 76 xb4 Black does not play 76...g4? 77 d3 (77 hxg4? f3 78 gxh3 h3 79 d3 d4) 77...f3 78 gxh3 gxh3 79 f2, but simply 76...c5! 77 c2 f6!, and the opponent is in zugzwang.

75 ... f8
76 e6 b6

Having forced the advance of the e-pawn, Black takes his king to the opposite wing, where it is now not possible to erect a
reliable barrier in its path (as was easily done with the pawn at e4). When conceiving his plan some ten moves earlier, Dolmatov calculated that he did not have to fear the loss of his bishop: 77 \( \text{b}5 \text{ c}5 \) 78 e7 \( \text{e}7 \text{x}e7 \) 79 \( \text{d}e7 \text{d}4 \) 80 \( \text{b}5 \text{e}4 \) 81 \( \text{d}6+ \text{e}3 \) 82 \( \text{e}b4 \text{f}2 \) 83 \( \text{e}4+ \text{x}g2 \) 84 \( \text{x}g5 \text{f}3 \). White was just one tempo short.

\[
\begin{align*}
77 & \text{c}4 & \text{c}7 \\
78 & \text{f}5 & \text{d}8 \\
\end{align*}
\]

The king again proceeds along the eighth rank, but where to?

\[
\begin{align*}
79 & \text{b}3 & \text{e}8 \\
80 & \text{c}4 & \text{e}7 \\
81 & \text{d}4 & \text{f}8 \\
82 & \text{f}3 & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Why did Vaganian avoid the natural 82 \( \text{f}5 \) ? He saw the pawn breakthrough prepared by his opponent: 82...g4! 83 \( \text{hxg}4 \text{f}3 \) 84 \( \text{g}x\text{f}3 \text{h}3 \) 85 \( \text{g}3 \text{g}7 \) (or first 85...h2) and the three white pawns are unable to prevent the invasion of the enemy king. The fates of pieces, like the fates of people, can change radically in the course of one game. At the very start of this ending the knight was clearly stronger than the bishop, but the concluding position of this last variation demonstrates the complete triumph of the bishop over the knight.

\[
\begin{align*}
82 & \ldots & \text{g}7 \\
83 & \text{d}2 & \text{f}6 \\
84 & \text{d}5 & \text{f}5 \\
85 & \text{b}3 & \text{g}4 \\
86 & \text{d}4+ & \text{g}5 \\
87 & \text{hxg}4 & \text{b}3! \\
\end{align*}
\]

White resigns.

Now let us try and improve White’s defence.
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\[
\text{\begin{center} (Position after 70...\text{e}7) \end{center}}
\]

After 71 \( \text{d}4 \text{b}6 \) the position of mutual zugzwang, the key one of the entire ending, is reached with White to move. Grandmaster Grigory Kaidanov established that White can avoid it by playing 71 \( \text{e}5! \text{b}6 \) 72 \( \text{g}6 \). Now 72...\text{a}5? does not work: 73 \( \text{xe}7 \text{g}4 \) (73...\text{a}4 74 \( \text{d}5 \) 74 \( \text{c}6+ \) \( \text{a}4 \) 75 \( \text{xb}4 \text{f}3 \) 76 \( \text{gxf}3 \text{g}3 \) 77 \( \text{d}5 \text{g}2 \) 78 \( \text{c}3 \) and 79 \( \text{e}2 \). If 72...\text{d}6, then 73 \( \text{e}5 \text{c}5 \) 74 \( \text{e}6 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 75 \( \text{e}7 \) (75 \( \text{e}5+ \) is also possible) 75...\text{d}7 76 \( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{b}3 \) 77 \( \text{e}5+ \) \( \text{xe}7 \) 78 \( \text{d}3 \) 4 g 79 \( \text{d}4 \) 83 \( \text{gxf}3 \text{g}x\text{h}3 \) 81 \( \text{c}3 \) h2 82 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 83 \( \text{x}b3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 84 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{f}4 \) 85 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{xf}3 \) 86 \( \text{e}1 \) or 86 \( \text{h}1 \) with a draw.

There only remains 72...\text{c}5. After 73 \( \text{e}5! \text{d}6 \) 74 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 75 \( \text{d}4 \) the same position of mutual zugzwang is reached, but this time with Black to move. And now we will examine the position that occurred in the game after Dolmatov had forced the e-pawn to advance.

\[
\begin{center}
\text{see next diagram}
\end{center}
\]
By playing 76 e6? White made the important d6 and f6 squares available to the opponent’s king, thereby making it more difficult for himself to defend. But how otherwise can he defend against the manoeuvre of the king to g6? The knight is unable simultaneously to control f5 and prevent ...g5–g4.

It turns out that White must be prepared to change the roles of his pieces: to block the b-pawn with his knight and take his king to the centre.

76 e6 e7 77 d4 b6 78 c4 c7 79 d3 d7 80 e4 e8 81 b3 c5 82 f5! What can Black do now? His only plan is to transfer his bishop to e3 and then make the diverting sacrifice ...g5–g4.

82 d8 a1 83 c5 b6 84 b3 e3 comes to the same thing.

83 e8 84 b3 d7 85 d4! After 85 e4 c6 bad is 86 d4+ c5 87 e6+ c4 88 xd8 b3, and otherwise the black king cannot be prevented from breaking through at a4.

85 b6. 85 c7 is pointless in view of 86 e4 b6 87 d3!, but not 87 d5? g4! 88 hxg4 b3! 89 xb3 f3 90 gxh3 h3. 86 b3 e3 87 a5 e8! Black should break through when the knight is at b3, and so he gives his opponent the move.

88 b3 e7 89 a5 d7 90 b3 g4!
91 xg4 e6. If now 92 xh4, then 92 xe5 93 g4 d5 94 h4 (or 94 f3) 94 c4 95 a5+ (95 a1 c3) 95 b5 96 b3 a4 97 a1 d4 98 c2 b3 and wins.

However, by playing 92 a5! White prevents the capture of the e5 pawn (because of 93 c6+) and nevertheless gains a draw.

Thus the position was drawn. But, as we have seen, it was extremely difficult for Vaganian to find the saving path – he was set too many difficult problems by his opponent.

In the 1982 Zonal Tournament grandmaster Dolmatov just as skillfully conducted several endings (one of them – against Evgeny Sveshnikov – will be found in the chapter devoted to like-colour bishops, p. 147). In the playing of endings of a concrete, calculating character, Sergey achieved supreme mastery. This was assisted by training work, aimed at improving the depth and accuracy of calculation. A considerable place in this work was assigned to the solving and playing of studies. The following, third part of the book will describe the employment of study composition for the training of a chess player.
Exercises for Analysis

From even the hottest fire in the fireplace of knowledge there will remain only a handful of cold ash, if alongside there are not the caring hands of a stoker-teacher and a sufficient quantity of log-problems.

Viktor Shatalov

The examples offered in this chapter are arranged in order of increasing difficulty. Whereas the first few exercises may be solved in your head, without moving the pieces, the last few will certainly require serious analytical work.

E 2-21

White to move

E 2-22

196

E 2-23

197

White to move
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E 2-24
198

White to move

E 2-26
200

White to move

E 2-25
199

Black to move

E 2-27
201

White to move
Can he save the game?
E 2-28
202
White to move
Can he save the game?

E 2-30
204
White to move
Does 56 h5 win?

E 2-29
203
White to move
How should Black defend?

E 2-31
205
White to move
Black to move

How should the game end?
Many chess players like solving studies. It is pleasant to test your powers, and to seek the only way, unusual and pretty, to the goal. Not only pleasant, but also useful!

I do not know who was responsible for the well-known aphorism: 'There are no correct studies, but only studies that have not yet been refuted'. Alas, there is some truth in this. I constantly use studies for training, and, unfortunately, in some of them a flaw is discovered — a refutation or a secondary solution. At times the discoveries at our sessions have themselves been interesting and instructive — some of these are described in this part of the book. But it would not have been worth beginning this discussion, merely for the sake of demonstrating studies that have been made extinct. With their help I will talk about the use of study composition in the training process, and about the skills that can be developed by solving studies.
Let Training Commence!

You must train day and night and learn to take rapid decisions. Training is part of my normal life, strengthening the spirit.

Mamato Musasi

I. Zevcrs
1922
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5 \text{g}2+ \text{f}1 6 \text{g}1+! \text{x}g1, stalemate.
Eleven-year-old candidate master Alyosha Dreev wanted to win (after all, White is a rook up) and he found a winning move.

1 \text{g}3!

Neither of the pawns can be moved, and 1...\text{g}1 2 \text{c}5 is also bad. And if 1...\text{e}1 there can follow 2 \text{f}3 \text{d}1 3 \text{h}1+ \text{c}2
4 \text{x}e3 \text{b}2 5 \text{c}5 or 2...\text{e}2 3 \text{h}1+ \text{d}2
4 \text{b}4+ \text{c}2 5 \text{x}e2 \text{b}2 6 \text{d}2.
The following study was called into question many years later by another eleven-year-old candidate master, Sasha Ryazantsev. Incidentally, I hope that the chess future awaiting Sasha is no less bright than that of Alyosha, who has long been a strong grandmaster and a member of the Russian Olympiad team, and has participated in a candidates match for the world championship.

V. Neidze
1957
209

Let us set up the position on a board. You can also try and solve it from the diagram, but it is better if there are pieces in front of you, and not pictures.
Incidentally, what is the goal of the study? I hardly ever answer this question. After all, during a game no one will suggest whether you should be playing for a win or seeking a way to draw. And in training exercises it is important to create an atmosphere which is close to an actual game – then the maximum benefit will be achieved from the work done. Hence – pieces on the board, hence – the absence of a goal, and, most important, seriousness and concentration.
The composer of the study thought that White should achieve a draw by 1 \text{f}7+ \text{g}1 2 \text{f}6 \text{x}f6 3 \text{a}7 \text{e}2 4 \text{xa}2 \text{e}1\text{w}
1 \textcolor{red}{\textit{g6!}}

White loses after 1 \textit{\textbf{xd5? c2 2 \textcolor{blue}{g6 \textbf{e6.}}}}

If 1 \textit{\textbf{f6? or 1 \textbf{f1? Black has the decisive 1...\textcolor{blue}{h7.}}}}

1 ... \textcolor{red}{\textit{d7!}}

Not 1...\textcolor{blue}{\textit{e6? 2 f6 or 1...g6? 2 h6.}}

Q 3-1. Find two ways of gaining a draw.

The composer of the study had in mind, of course, a spectacular way.

2 \textit{\textbf{xd5 \textcolor{blue}{f8+}}}
3 \textit{\textbf{h6! c2}}
4 \textit{\textbf{g5!}}

Threatening 5 \textit{\textbf{g1, and 4...c1\textcolor{red}{\textit{\textbf{w}}}} leads to stalemate.}

4 ... \textit{\textbf{c1\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}}}!}
5 \textit{\textbf{g1! \textcolor{blue}{c2}}}
6 \textit{\textbf{g2 \textcolor{blue}{c3}}}
7 \textit{\textbf{g3 \textcolor{blue}{c4}}}
8 \textit{\textbf{g4 \textcolor{blue}{c5}}}
9 \textit{\textbf{g8+! \textcolor{blue}{xg8}}}

Stalemate.

Sasha checked the consequences of the 'normal' move 2 \textit{\textbf{f1}}. The black pawns have to make several moves before they can queen, and in that time White succeeds in creating mating threats against the opponent's king.

2 \textit{\textbf{f1? d4}}
3 \textit{\textbf{h6! c2}}

3...\textcolor{red}{\textit{e5+}} 4 \textit{\textbf{f6(f5) c2? 5 \textcolor{blue}{xe5}} d3 does not work because of 6 \textit{\textbf{f6 \textcolor{blue}{h7}}} (6...d2 7 \textit{\textbf{g6}}) 7 \textit{\textbf{g5 d8 \textbf{f7+ \textbf{g8}} 9 \textbf{g6, and White wins.}}}

4 \textit{\textbf{h7 d3}}
5 \textit{\textbf{h6}}

The immediate 5 \textit{\textbf{a1}} is also good.

5 ... \textcolor{red}{\textit{f6!}}

The only defence: 5...d2? 6 \textit{\textbf{a1}} leads to unavoidable mate.

6 \textit{\textbf{a1}}

Black has to force a draw by 6...\textcolor{red}{\textit{g4+}} (but not 6...\textit{e8?? 7 \textcolor{blue}{g6l}}) 7 \textit{\textbf{g6 \textcolor{blue}{e5+}} 8 \textit{\textbf{h6 \textbf{f7(g4+ or 6...\textit{g8+ 7 \textbf{hxg8+w+ \textbf{xg8}} 8 \textbf{g6 \textbf{f8}} 9 \textbf{f6 \textbf{e8}} 10 \textbf{e6 \textbf{f8.}}}}}}

A study, in which a refutation or secondary solution is found, ceases to exist. It is a pity if in the process a pretty idea is lost. But what can be done – offer defective positions?

Here are another couple of examples that I had to remove from my list of exercises.

I. Fritz

1973
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1 \textit{\textbf{g6 suggests itself, but then 1...\textcolor{blue}{d2}}}
2 \textit{\textbf{d5 \textcolor{blue}{e3}} 3 \textit{\textbf{d6 \textbf{f4}} 4 \textbf{d7 \textit{g3 5 \textcolor{blue}{e8 \textbf{f8}} with unavoidable mate.}}}

Q 3-2. What did the composer intend, and where is the flaw in his idea?

1 \textit{\textbf{a2! \textcolor{red}{\textit{d2}}}}
2 \textit{\textbf{d5 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e3}}}}
3 \textit{\textbf{d6}}

The composer's variation was 3...\textit{f4 4 \textbf{d7 \textit{g3 5 \textcolor{blue}{g8! \textbf{xg8}} 6 \textbf{d8w \textbf{xd8, stalemate.}}}}}

Instead of 4...\textit{g3, stronger is 4...\textit{d8 5 \textit{\textbf{xh2 \textbf{xd7, when the white king risks becoming stuck in the dangerous corner (remember the Chistyakov-Dvoretsky ending from the first part of the book, p. 52). But it is not worth analysing this branch, since Black can win by force by playing differently on the 3rd move.}}}}
The rook is trapped, and the position is drawn.
Unfortunately, White can also manage without the combination: 6 \( \text{\#h3!} \) (instead of 6 \( \text{\#f3!} \)) 6...\( \text{\#xh5} \) (6...\( \text{\#h1} + \) 7 \( \text{\#h2} \) or 7 \( \text{\#g2} \) \( \text{\#xh5} \) 8 \( \text{\#e2+} \) 7 \( \text{\#e2+} \) and 8 \( \text{\#h2} \) (or immediately 7 \( \text{\#h2} \)).
But the finding of a defect does not always prevent us from using a study as an exercise.

A. Wotawa
1949
212

The composer's idea is original and elegant:

1 \( \text{g3!} \) a5
2 \( \text{\#g2!} \) a4
3 \( \text{\#f3!!} \) a3
4 \( \text{\#h3!} \) \( \text{\#xh3} \)
5 \( \text{g4} \)

However, all those who tried to solve this position, chose a different, simpler way: 1 \( \text{\#f4} \) \( \text{\#xh6} \) 2 \( \text{\#f3} \) a5 3 \( \text{g4} \) a4 4 \( \text{\#e4!} \) with the threat of 5 \( \text{\#f5} \).
For a study, such a second solution is completely unacceptable, but for an exercise it is admissible – after all, it is clear-cut and in itself interesting.
Sometimes the saving of a study (even if
not as a study, but at least as an exercise) is helped by an additional question, correcting the assignment.

V. Volkov
1986
213

Q 3-3. Can White win?

If 1 ♕a7? (with the threat of 2 ♖b8+) there is the simple reply 1...♕f6, so therefore White must advance his pawn.

1 g7 ♕g8
2 ♕a7

Nothing is achieved by 2 ♖c2 ♕e8 3 ♖c8+ ♘d8. But now, in the opinion of the composer, White wins: 2...♕e8 (2...♕xg7 3 ♖b8+ ♘c7 4 ♖c8 mate; 2...♕c7 3 ♖c2+ ♘d8 4 ♖c8 mate) 3 ♖b8+ ♘f7 (3...♗d8 4 ♖b7 ♘f6 5 ♘h5+ ♘d8 6 ♖b8+) 4 ♘e6+! ♘xe6 5 ♖xg8 ♘f7 6 ♖e8!

Sergey Dolmatov found a simple defence, enabling Black to save the game.

2 ... ♘f8!

The answer to the exercise is now clear: the position is drawn.

What was the common feature of all the studies we have examined? We have not engaged in a tiring analysis of variations. The difficulty consisted in finding a para-
doxical and pretty idea. Such exercises provide training in combinative vision and imagination. Studies are very useful for this aim, since they almost always contain a 'charm' that is unexpected and hard to find. Often a player, even if he is an excellent tactician, sees only his own possibilities and constantly underestimates the opponent's counterplay. For him one can specially select studies where the emphasis is not on finding combinations for yourself, but in the timely appreciation of unexpected resources for the opponent.

D. Makhadzade
1966
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White must pick up the a3 pawn with his bishop. Will the black king reach the queenside in time?

1 ♗b2!! ♖xh5
1...axb2 2 ♗c2 ♖xh5 3 a4.

2 ♗xa3 ♗g6
3 ♗b4! ♗f6
4 ♗a4 ♗e6
5 a5
Black is now hindered by his own pawn.

5 ... ♗d5
6 a6 ♗c6
7 ♗a5
This was the point of White's 3rd move – the enemy king is cut off from the passed pawn. Q 3-4. Does 1 \( \text{e}7 \) win?

In considering the natural move 1 \( \text{e}7! \), we are obliged to see the reply 1...\( \text{d}6! \) 2 \( \text{e} \times \text{x}6 \) \( \text{x} \times \text{h}5 \), and after 3 \( \text{a} \times \text{a}3 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 4 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 5 a4 \( \text{e}6 \) 6 a5 \( \text{d}7 \) the king reaches the saving corner in time. But to see does not mean to be afraid! The capture of the a3 pawn can be temporarily postponed.

3 \( \text{c}2! \) \( \text{g}6 \) 4 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \) 5 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 6 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 7 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 8 \( \text{c}6 \). White forces the enemy king back and only then picks up the black pawn with his bishop.

M. Liburkin
1940
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The best that White can do for the moment is to eliminate the enemy knight.

1 \( \text{f}6+ \) \( \text{b}7 \)

Bad is 1...\( \text{a}7 \)? 2 \( \text{c}6+ \) or 1...\( \text{c}7 \)? 2 \( \text{a}6+ \).

2 \( \text{x} \times \text{h}8 \)

Q 3-5. How should Black defend?

The composer assumed that Black was obliged to restore material equality, by pinning the knight with his queen from a8. But the queen is badly placed there, and White is able to exploit this factor in spectacular style.

2...\( \text{a}4+ \) 3 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{a}8 \) 4 \( \text{a}6+ \) \( \text{a}7 \)
5 \( \text{g}7+ \) \( \text{x} \times \text{b}8 \) 6 \( \text{x} \times \text{e}5+ \) \( \text{a}7 \) 7 \( \text{a}5! \)
Black is in zugzwang! 7...\( \text{e}4 \) is met by 8 \( \text{d}3 \) + and 7...\( \text{c}6 \) (e8) by 8 \( \text{b}5 + \). In the event of 7...\( \text{f}8 \) (h8) White wins the queen by 8 \( \text{e}2+ \) \( \text{b}7 \) (8...\( \text{b}8 \) 9 \( \text{b}6+ \) \( \text{c}8 \)
10 \( \text{g}4+ \) ) 9 \( \text{f}3+ \) and 10 \( \text{a}8 + \) . Finally, after 7...\( \text{g}1 \) the black bishop becomes vulnerable: 8 \( \text{e}2+ \) \( \text{b}8 \) 9 \( \text{e}5+ \) \( \text{a}7 \)
10 \( \text{a}1+ \) and 11 \( \text{x} \times \text{g}1 \) . There only remain moves with the h-pawn.

7...\( \text{h}6 \) 8 \( \text{c}8+ \) \( \text{b}8 \) 9 \( \text{d}8! \) It is again zugzwang, completely analogous to the previous one. The rest is now clear.

9...\( \text{h}5 \) 10 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{a}7 \) 11 \( \text{a}5 \) h4 12 \( \text{c}8+ \)
\( \text{b}8 \) 13 \( \text{d}8 \) \( \text{g}1 \) 14 \( \text{g}4+ \) (14 \( \text{f}5+ \) or 14 \( \text{e}6+ \) is also possible) 14...\( \text{a}7 \)
15 \( \text{a}5+ \) \( \text{b}8 \) 16 \( \text{e}5+ \) \( \text{a}7 \) 17 \( \text{a}1+ \)
\( \text{x} \times \text{g}1 \) and White easily converts his extra piece.

The queen is too powerful a piece for it to be condemned to vegetating passively in the corner of the board. It can be deployed much more effectively.

2 \( \ldots \) \( \text{b}4+! \)
3 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \)

From here the queen not only attacks the knight, but also threatens to give perpetual check after 4...\( \text{h}6+ \) or 4...\( \text{e}6+ \).

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

5 \( \text{g}8 \) \( \text{h}6+ \) 6 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{f}4+ \) 7 \( \text{h}5 \) \( \text{f}5+ \)
8 \( \text{g}5 \) is unavailing, since after 8...\( \text{x} \times \text{g}5 \)
9 \( \text{x} \times \text{g}5 \) \( \text{a}7 \) (c7) Black regains the piece.

5 \( \ldots \) \( \text{a}7 \)!

The knight is attacked, and if it moves to a6 where it is defended by the bishop, the bishop will no longer be able to help its king to hide from perpetual check. 6 \( \text{c}8 \) also achieves nothing, since the queen loses control of the important f6 square. The draw is now obvious.
Up till now we have been considering comparatively simple examples. The following study by one of the great chess composers Henrik Kasparian is far more complicated.

H. Kasparian
1961/62
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4...e3 5 a6! (5 c8 wxc8 6 xc8 e2 with a draw) 5...c6!! (Black loses after both 5...xc7? 6 a7 e2 7 d8! e1 w 8 h4+, and 5...e2? 6 xc4 e1 w 7 c5+! g3 8 c8 w! 6 b5 e2! 7 xc6 e1 w 8 c5+ (8 c8 w d2+ and 9...xd6) 8...g3 9 c8 w e5+ 10 b3 xc5 and Black saves the draw.

Less good is 5...e2 6 xc4 e1 w 7 c8 w or 5...c1 6 c8 w xc8 7 xc8 e2 8 c5+.

Black cannot promote to a queen because of mate.

We would have had the right to cut short the calculation after 8 c8!, since with the help of a computer it has been established that two bishops always win against a knight. The second possibility 3 b2 was considered by the composer of the study to be incorrect. Let us check!

Q 3-6. Does 3 c7 win, and does 3 b2 win?

First of all you have to avoid a deep false trail, which is common to both variations. 3 c7 c4+ 4 b2? (or 3 b2 c4 4 c7?)
Here Kasparian cuts short the variation. In fact the fascinating battle continues.

7 \( \texttt{\&a6!!} \)

Incorrect is 7 c8? \( \texttt{\&xc8} 8 \texttt{\&xc8 e2} \) or 7 \( \texttt{\&b8? \&f2} 8 \texttt{\&a6 \&c6} 9 \texttt{\&b5 \&c5}. 

7 ... \( \texttt{\&c6!!} \)

Bad is 7...e2? 8 \( \texttt{\&xc4 e1} \) 9 c8? or 7...\( \texttt{\&xc7?} \) 8 \( \texttt{\&b8 e2} 9 \texttt{\&xc7+ \&f3} 10 \texttt{\&a5! \&f2} 11 \texttt{\&d8!} 

8 \( \texttt{\&b5!} \) e2!

9 \( \texttt{\&b8!!} \)

Of course, not 9 \( \texttt{\&xe2? \&xc7} 10 \texttt{\&b8 \&f2.} \)
In the event of 9 \( \texttt{\&xc6? e1} \) 10 c8? \( \texttt{\&b4} \) the dark-square bishop is lost.

9 ... \( \texttt{\&f2} \)

Neither 9...e1 10 c8\texttt{\&b4+} nor 9...\( \texttt{\&xc7} 10 \texttt{\&xc7+ \&f3} 11 \texttt{\&a5! \&f2} 12 \texttt{\&d8!} \) is any help.

10 \( \texttt{\&xc6} \) e1\texttt{\&w}

11 c8\texttt{\&w}

And White wins.

By the rules of study composition a second solution is never allowed. A pity! – here it would merely have made Kasparian's composition more attractive.

Now I should like to draw your attention to another interesting study. An examination of it revealed that the composer's solution does not work, but another way to the goal was found, also very difficult and pretty.

G. Zakhodyakin
1962

Q 3-7. What should White play?

We will begin with a variation which Gleb Zakhodyakin considered to be a deep false trail.

1 \( \texttt{\&c2+!} \) \texttt{\&b3}

2 \( \texttt{\&d4+} \) \texttt{\&c3!}

After 2...\( \texttt{\&c4? 3 \&f3!} \) all White's problems are now behind him.

3 \( \texttt{\&b5+} \) \texttt{\&d2!}

3...\( \texttt{\&c4 4 \&d6+ \&d5} \) 5 \texttt{\&e1 \&xd6 6 \&f3! \&b6 7 \texttt{\&e2 \&c4 8 \&b1} \) is not dangerous for White.

4 \( \texttt{\&xd7+} \) \texttt{\&e2}

In this position the composer terminated his analysis, since White is unable to stop the enemy pawn. However, the defensive resources are not exhausted.

5 \( \texttt{\&d4+} \) \texttt{\&f2}

6 \( \texttt{\&f3!!} \) \texttt{\&b1}\texttt{\&w}

7 \( \texttt{\&f4!} \)

The next move will be 8 \( \texttt{\&d2+} \) with the intention of setting in motion a well-known perpetual check mechanism (\texttt{\&f3–h2–f3}). Black cannot win.
Now let us consider 1 \( \mathcal{E}e1?! \) \( \mathcal{D}e5+! \) (with the threat of ...\( \mathcal{D}d3-c1 \)). The composer had in mind the spectacular 2 \( \mathcal{S}h3!! \) \( \mathcal{D}d3 \) 3 \( \mathcal{K}g1 \) \( \mathcal{D}c1 \) 4 \( \mathcal{C}c2+ \) \( \mathcal{F}b3 \) (4...\( \mathcal{W}a4 \) 5 \( \mathcal{G}g4 \) 5 \( \mathcal{X}xb4!! \) \( b1\mathcal{W} \) (5...\( \mathcal{X}xb4 \) 6 \( \mathcal{G}g8 \) \( \mathcal{F}b3 \) 7 \( \mathcal{G}g1 \)) 6 \( \mathcal{D}d3!! \), when White wins the pinned knight at c1, achieving a drawing material balance. Alas, this idea can be refuted.

2 \( \mathcal{S}h3! \) \( \mathcal{F}f3! \) 3 \( \mathcal{D}d1 \) \( \mathcal{D}d4! \) The knight is arrested at a1 and White has no defence against 4...\( \mathcal{W}a2 \).

White to move
Find two ways to win
Deep Calculation

One of the important (if not the most important) qualities of a chess master is the ability to calculate variations accurately. For those young players who do not feel very confident in this respect, it is useful to solve studies.

Mikhail Botvinnik

In order to solve the studies by Kasprian and Zakhodyakin that we have just examined, what are especially needed are inventiveness and an ability to find counterchances for the opponent. But also required are discipline of thinking, attentiveness and patience, and an ability to fix clearly the resulting positions in your mind. All these qualities, which are extremely important for a chess player, can be developed by systematic practice in the solving of specially selected studies, involving the deep and extensive calculation of variations.

O. Tabidze
1955
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The composer devised the following plan: exchange the kingside pawns, and then, after the fall of the a2 pawn, shut the black king in the corner by c2. At this point the knight should be sufficiently close to the b3 square.

1 f5! h4 2 g7! (the initial moves cannot be transposed: 1 f7? e4!) 2...h3 3 g5 h2 4 f3+ e4. It is not hard to check that in the event of 4...c3 5 xh2 b2 White wins by both 6 f6, and 6 f3 xa2 7 d2.

5 xh2 xf5 6 f1! (approaching the b3 square) 6...e4 7 g6 (of course, not 7 d2+? d3 8 b1 c2 9 a3+ b2)

7...d3 8 f5 c2 (8...e2 9 h2 d3 10 f3 e3 11 e5 also does not help)

9 e4 b2 10 d3 xa2 11 c2 a1 12 d2. White has managed to prevent 12...a2. The rest was known many centuries ago.

12...a2 13 f3 a1 14 d4 a2 15 e2 a1 16 c1 a2 17 b3 mate. But there is also another plan: to retain the f-pawn and queen it.

1 g6! e4

2 h6!

Weaker is 2 g7 h4! 3 xh4 xf4 4 f6 e4 5 f5 d5!, when there does not appear to be a win. Compared with the composer’s variation, here the knight is less well placed.

2 ... h4

3 g5!

3 xh4? xf4 4 g6 e4.

3 ... h3

4 e5 h2

Black also loses after 4...d4 5 f3+ c3

185
6 f5 b2 7 f6 xa2 8 f7 h2 9 xh2 b2 10 f8 a2 11 b4+ c2 12 a3 b1 13 f3 a1 14 d2+.
5 g4 h1
5...h1 6 f5 g3 7 f6.
6 f2+ d4
7 xh1 c3
8 f5 b2
9 f6
Simpler is 9 f2 xa2 10 d3 b3 11 f6 c3 12 f7 a2 13 f8 a1 f6+.
9 ... xa2
10 f7 b2
11 f8 a2
12 b4+ c2
13 d4 b1
14 d1+ b2
15 f2 a1
16 d3+ a2
17 a4+ b1
18 b3+
And mate next move.

An. Kuznetsov, B. Sakharov
1959/60
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Q 3-8. Can White win?

Pawn endings, as already mentioned, usually demand a detailed calculation of variations. We will carefully check every attempt by White to play for a win.

1 g3 h6 2 g2 g7 3 f2 f6 4 e3 e5 5 d3 d5! (5...d6 6 e3 d5! is also possible) 6 exd5 xd5 7 e4+ e5 8 e3 d6! Black loses after 8...e6? 9 d4 d6 (9...d6 10 d5!) 10 e5+ e6 11 e4 e7 12 d5 d7 13 e6+ e8, and now - triangulation, with which we are well familiar: 14 e4 d8 15 d4! d8 16 d5!
9 d4 e6 10 e5 f5! 11 d5 - stalemate!
1 h2 g3+! (but not 1...h4? 2 g3+ and wins) 2 xg3 g4 3 f4 h4 4 e5 g5+ 5 f5 g3 6 xg5 xg5 7 xg4 f2 8 e4 e3 9 f5 f3 with a draw.
1 g1!

After 1...h4 2 f2 d6 3 e3 Black is in zugzwang.

2 f1

Now 2...g4? 3 e3 is bad for Black. The composer’s variation was: 2...g4 3 e1! (3 e3? g5 4 e2 f6 5 d2 e5 6 d3 d6) 3...g5 4 d2 f4 5 d3 e5 6 e3 g5 (6...d6 7 d3 f6 8 d4 e6 9 e3! g5 10 e5! dxe5+ 11 c5) 7 d3 d6!? (7...d5 8 exd5 xd5 9 e4+ e5 10 e3 e6 11 d4 and 12 e5) 8 e3 d5 (8...f6 9 d4 e6 10 e3) 9 exd5 xd5 10 d3 e5 11 e3! (11 e4? f4! 12 d4 - stalemate) 11...f5 12 d4!, and White, having avoided all the stalemate traps, wins.

But the defence can be improved.

2...
h6!!

Black’s strategic aim is to retain two reserve tempi: ...g5–g4 and ...g6–g5.

3 e1 g7
4 d2 f6
5 d3(e3) d6
5...e5 6 e3(d3) d6 7 d3(e3) f6! comes to the same thing.

6 d4 e6
7 e3 g4

Black has preserved his last reserve tempo.
...\textit{g6–g5}, and therefore \textit{8 e5 does not work}: \textit{8...dxe5+ 9 \textit{c5? \textit{f5} 10 \textit{d5 g5}. It can be concluded that the ending is drawn.}

In the following ending, which at first sight is not too complicated, it is unlikely that you will be able to work things out without moving the pieces on the board. This is an exercise more for analysis than calculation.

\textbf{V. Tyavlovsky}  
\textit{1967 223}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node at (0,0) {\texttt{a} \texttt{b} \texttt{c} \texttt{d} \texttt{e} \texttt{f} \texttt{g} \texttt{h}};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

\begin{itemize}
\item \texttt{1 \textit{e3!}}
\end{itemize}

This obligatory introductory move by White forces his opponent to make a very difficult choice.

\textbf{Q 3-9. Select the candidate moves and try to make a decision.}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{A. 1...\textit{b2}. It is not easy to foresee that after 2 \textit{e4? \textit{e5 3 \textit{f4 \textit{c6! 4 \textit{g4 \textit{b4 5 \textit{xh4 (hoping for 5...\textit{c2? 6 c6 b1\texttt{w} 7 c7) 5...\textit{c1! White ends up in zugzwang. For example, 6 \textit{f5 \textit{c2 7 c6 \textit{d4! and wins (but not 7...\texttt{b1\texttt{w} 8 c7 \texttt{b4+ 9 \textit{h5!) or 6 \textit{g4 \textit{d2! (not 6...\textit{c2? 7 c6 b1\texttt{w} 8 c7 \textit{e3+ 9 \textit{f3) 7 \textit{b1 (7...\textit{d3! was threatened) 7...\textit{d3! 8 c6 \textit{e5+ 9 \textit{f4 \textit{xc6, then 10...\textit{b4 and 11...\textit{c1. White is saved by an interposed check: 2 \textit{f3+! \textit{c1 3 \textit{e4 \textit{e5 4 \textit{f4. After 4...\textit{c6 5 \textit{g4 \textit{b4 6 \textit{xh4 the familiar zugzwang position is reached, but with Black to move. It turns out that here the zugzwang is mutual. 6...\textit{c2 7 c6 b1\texttt{w} 8 c7 is unavailing. If 6...\textit{d1 there follows 7 \textit{b1 (also possible is 7 \textit{f5 \textit{d2 8 \textit{b1 or 7...\textit{c2 8 c6 \textit{d4 9 \textit{g4+) 7...\textit{d2 8 \textit{g5! \textit{c1 9 \textit{f5! \textit{c2 10 c6 b1\texttt{w} 11 c7 with a draw. The attempt by Black to attack the c-pawn with his king also proves unsuccessful. Here too things end in a position of mutual zugzwang: 4...h3 5 \textit{g3 \textit{d2 6 \textit{b1! \textit{e3 7 \textit{xh3 \textit{d4 8 \textit{g3 \textit{xc5 9 \textit{f2 \textit{d4 10 \textit{e2 \textit{c3 11 \textit{e1! (but not 11 \textit{d1? \textit{c4 with zugzwang for White) 11...\textit{c4 12 \textit{d1, and here it is Black who is in zugzwang.}

\item \textbf{B. 1...\textit{h3}. In the event of 2 \textit{xh3? \textit{b2 3 \textit{f5 \textit{e7 4 \textit{e4 \textit{c6 5 \textit{f3 \textit{b4 the white king does not manage to reach a safe square. It is tempting to interpose the check 2 \textit{f3+?!, hoping for 2...\textit{c1? 3 \textit{f2! b2 4 \textit{e4 \textit{e5 5 \textit{g3 \textit{c6 6 \textit{xh3 \textit{b4 7 \textit{h4(h2). However, on this occasion the king goes to the other side: 2...\textit{e1! 3 \textit{e4 \textit{e5! 4 \textit{d4 (4 \textit{f4 \textit{d3+!) 4...\textit{f3+! 5 \textit{c3 (5 \textit{xf3 b2 6 \textit{e4 h2) 5...\textit{f2 6 c6 h2 7 c7 \texttt{h1 8 c8\texttt{w} \texttt{c1+.}

2 \textit{e4!! \textit{e5 3 \textit{f2 b2 4 \textit{g3 \textit{c6 5 \textit{c3 \textit{b4 6 \textit{h2! (after 6 \textit{h4? \textit{c1! the familiar zugzwang position is reached with White to move) 6...\textit{c1 7 \textit{h1 (7 \textit{f5 \textit{c2 8 c6 is also possible) 7...\textit{c2 8 c6 \texttt{b1\texttt{w} 9 c7 \textit{d2+ 10 \textit{h2, and again White defends successfully. The composer assumed that these pretty and difficult variations exhausted the position. But have all Black’s resources been taken into account?}

\textit{One of the principles of calculating variations states: determine all the can-}
didate moves in the position, and then check them. After all, a continuation that you have overlooked may in fact prove to be the best. It stands to reason that it is not always worth following this rule directly. Sometimes it is only after delving into a calculation that we begin to realise that some move is worthwhile. But usually it is useful to determine the candidate moves immediately.

Why not, to begin with, stop the c-pawn with the knight? If 1...\( \text{c7} \) White plays 2 \( \text{f3} + \) \( \text{c1} \) (2...\( \text{c2} \) 3 \( \text{c6} \) 3 \( \text{f4} \) b2 4 \( \text{f4} \), transposing into an advantageous branch of variation A. But the check at f3 can be prevented.

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

2 \( \text{c6} \)

Bad is 2 \( \text{d5} \) b2 3 \( \text{d4} \) h3 4 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{g4} + \) 5 \( \text{g3} \) h2 6 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{h1} + \) or immediately 6...\( \text{f2} \). And after 2 \( \text{e4} \) b2 the position of mutual zugzwang, basic to this ending, is reached with White to move: 3 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{c6} \) 4 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{b4} \) 5 \( \text{xh4} \) \( \text{c1} \) etc.

2 ... \( \text{b2} \)

3 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{b1} + \)

Grandmaster Grigory Kaidanov pointed out a shorter path to the goal: 3...\( \text{c4} + \) 4 \( \text{f4} \) (4 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 5 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{b5} + \); 4 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{d6} \) 5 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{x6} + \) 4...\( \text{b1} \) 5 \( \text{c8} + \) \( \text{c1} + \), and White loses his queen.

4 \( \text{c8} + \) \( \text{d3} + \)

5 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{g3} + \)

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

5...\( \text{g6} + ? \) 6 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{g3} + \) 7 \( \text{g4} + \).

6 \( \text{e4} \)

6 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{g4} + \).

6 ... \( \text{xg2} + \)

7 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{h3} \)

The queen ending is completely hopeless for White in view of the poor position of his king.

It is not hard to correct the study. It is sufficient to drop the first move \( (1 \text{e7}) \), and to change the colours of the pieces and the assignment. But will not then the false trails be more interesting than the solution?

In all of the following three exercises you have to answer one and the same question: what should be the outcome?

E 3-3
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White to move

E 3-4
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White to move
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White to move
Studies by Grandmasters

A considerable role in the development of my analytical ability was played by an early interest in study composition.

Vasily Smyslov

The first grandmasters to compose excellent studies were Oldrich Duras and Richard Réti. In our day those attracted by this include Vasily Smyslov, Jan Timman and John Nunn. And Pal Benko has become one of the best study composers in the world.

Unfortunately, neither the author of these lines, nor any of his pupils, have displayed any ability in chess composition. We can merely admire the works of others, try to solve and sometimes refute them, but not compose. Even so, both Yusupov and Dolmatov have on one occasion performed – no, not as composers, but at least as co-composers of a study.

I once gave Dolmatov the following exercise:

L. Kubbel
1925
227

The solution is not difficult: 1 ♕f6+! (1 ♕f6+? ♕c6 2 b7 a3 3 ♕c8 a2; 1 b7? a3 2 ♕f8+ ♔e7!) 1...♕c6 (1...♕e7 2 ♕g6+ ♔f7 3 ♕e5+ and 4 ♕c4) 2 b7 a3 3 ♕e6 ♕d5 4 ♕d4!

Dolmatov did not think for long and found a quite different way to win.

1 ♔b7!!

Amazingly marking time in such a sharp situation.

1...
2 ♕f6+ ♔d8

If 2...♕e6 (2...♕d6 3 ♕e4+ and 4 ♕c3), then 3 ♕e4 a2 4 ♕c5+ ♕d5 5 ♕b3 ♕c4 6 ♕a1 ♕c3 7 ♕c6(a6) ♕b2 8 b7 ♕xa1 9 ♕c5(a5) ♕b2 10 b8♕ ♕c2 11 ♕h2+ ♕b1 12 ♕b4 a1♕ 13 ♕b3.

3 ♕c6 a2
4 ♕h8+ ♔e7
5 b8♕ ♕e7
6 ♕e8+ ♔xf6
7 ♕h8+ Of course, the secondary solution is prettier than the main one. Essentially it is Kubbel’s solution that has become the secondary one. It is not hard to remove, if in the initial position the knight is moved from h7 to h5. The result is a little, but elegant study, the composition of which rightly belongs to Dolmatov.

In composition it is customary to camouflage the main idea behind some introductory play. My old friend (from the Moscow Pioneers’ Palace) and study composer Boris Ryvkin amplified Dolmatov’s idea with
some interesting variations involving a knight sacrifice. The result was a new, collective study, which later was awarded 4th honourable mention in a competition organised by the magazine *Shakhmaty v SSSR* in 1986.

S. Dolmatov, B. Ryvkin
1986
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1. **b6**

Now the black knight needs to reach d6, and White must prevent this.

1. \( \ldots \) \( \text{e}8 \)
2. \( \text{e}7+! \) \( \text{d}7! \)
3. \( \text{xe}8! \)

Not 3 \( \text{b}5? \) a4! 4 \( \text{a}7 \) a3! 5 \( \text{xa}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
6 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{c}8 \).

3. \( \ldots \) a4
4. \( \text{b}7!! \) a3
5. \( \text{f}6+ \)

And so on as in the previous study.

II

1. \( \ldots \) f5
2. \( \text{c}5+ \) d5
3. \( \text{e}4! \)

This knight sacrifice is the only way of taking control of the d6 square. 3 \( \text{c}7? \) \( \text{d}6 \)
leads to a draw, e.g. 4 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{xe}4! \) 5 b7 \( \text{c}5 \).

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

After 3..\( \text{xe}4 \) 4 \( \text{c}7 \) the pawn queens.

4. \( \text{b}7 \) \( \text{c}6+ \)
5. \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{b}4 \)

Totally bad is 5...a4 6 \( \text{c}3+ \) \( \text{c}5 \) 7 \( \text{xa}4+ \).
6. \( \text{f}6+ \)

The new knight sacrifice at e5 planned by White is the quickest way to win.

6. \( \ldots \) \( \text{c}5 \)
7. \( \text{d}7+ \) \( \text{d}5 \)
8. \( \text{e}5! \) \( \text{a}6+ \)

8...\( \text{xe}5 \) 9 \( \text{b}6 \).

9. \( \text{b}6 \) \( \text{b}8 \)
10. \( \text{a}7 \)

A similar story occurred with Artur Yusupov. When solving a study by Josif Krikheli, he discovered a pretty idea that had not been foreseen by the composer. Krikheli used this find for a new composition.

I. Krikheli, A. Yusupov
1982
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1. \( \text{d}2 \) e1\( \text{w}+! \)
2. \( \text{xe}1 \) h2
3. \( \text{d}5! \) \( \text{xd}5 \)
4  cxc4+  g3!
4...g5 5  xf5+; 4...e3 5  h6.
5  g6+  h3
6  f2!  h1w
7  g3+!  h2!
Taking the rook leads to stalemate: 7...xg3
8  h4+!
8  g6!
The most accurate! Totally bad is 8  g8? w a1 or 8  g7? f6. If 8  gg4?! there follows 8...f4! 9  xf4  h3. By sacrificing his knight, Black prevents his opponent from playing for stalemate and retains the advantage. But can it be converted?
(As Ken Neat has shown, the position is drawn: 10  g8! w2+ 11  f3 w2+ 12  xf5 w3+ 13  f4 wxg8 14  h5+  g2 15  g5=+)
8  ...
8  h3
White was threatening 9  h6+! If 8...f4 9  xf4  h3 there follows simply 10  xf5.
9  g3+!
Black has to choose between stalemate and a repetition of moves.
This study was awarded a commendation in a competition organised by the magazine Shakhmaty v SSSR in 1982.

I should like to draw your attention to two further studies, composed by grandmasters. In the first of them you have to find two ways to win, and in the second — two ways to draw.
Study Ideas in Practice

This ending showed me that study ideas are extremely necessary to the practical chess player. Without them he will occasionally think dogmatically, overlooking the interesting, paradoxical possibilities that occur in a game.

Henrikh Kasparian

In an attempt to draw the attention of practical players to studies, it is pointed out that endings, well known in study composition, sometimes occur in tournament games. Indeed, study composers have made a substantial contribution to the theory of many sections of the endgame. But, after you have completely familiarised yourself with this part of the book, I hope you will agree with me that this is not the only benefit, and not even the main one, that can be gained by solving studies. A direct overlap with study composition does indeed occur in tournament play, although rather rarely. I should now like to describe one such instance.

I. Zaitsev – Dvoretsky
Moscow Championship 1973

63 \( \text{\textbf{\textit{\textit{xh2}}} \)

After 63 a7 e3 a position of mutual zugzwang arises. If it were Black to move, he would be unable to advance his pawn to e2. But it is White’s turn to move and he has to play 64 \( \text{\textit{xh2 e1}} + 65 \text{\textit{g3 e2}} \). This position is reached in the game. White is not saved by taking his rook to the side of his pawn (which would draw with the pawn at a7): 63 \( \text{\textit{e8 e3 64 \textit{e6 f2 65 \textit{f6+ e1 66 \textit{d6 e2 67 \textit{h2 f2 68 \textit{f6+ e3 69 \textit{e6+ d2 70 \textit{d6+ c3}}, and the pawn promotes to a queen.}}}} \)

63 ... e3

64 \( \text{\textit{g3}} \)

After 64 \( \text{\textit{h3 e1}} 65 \text{\textit{e8 e2 66 \textit{e6}} \)

Black wins by 66...\( \text{\textit{a1! 67 \textit{g2 d2}} \). And with the white king at g3 there is also another way: 66...\( \text{\textit{d1 67 \textit{d6+ d2}}, since the pawn queens with check.

64 ... \( \text{\textit{e1}} \)

65 a7 e2

I was planning to transfer my rook to the 7th rank, from where it would help my king to escape from e1. Igor Zaitsev tries to prevent this plan.

66 \( \text{\textit{g4 a4+}} \)

I spent some time trying to evaluate the sharp position arising after 66...\( \text{\textit{a5 67 \textit{h4 e5 68 b8 f2 69 a8吃到! (it is doubtful whether the white king can avoid mate), but then I decided to play more safely.}} \)

67 \( \text{\textit{h5 a6!}} \)

It turns out that White is in zugzwang!
Q 3-10. Suggest a way to win after 68 \( \text{g}5 \).

After 68 \( \text{g}5 \) I was intending the following forcing variation: 68...\( \text{f}2 \) 69 \( \text{f}8+ \text{g}3 \) 70 \( \text{e}8 \text{a}5+ \text{h}6 \text{f}3 \) (now it is clear why this idea would not work with the king at \( h5 \) – the black king would have been driven by checks to \( h3 \) and would have been unable then to defend its pawn) 72 \( \text{f}8+ \text{g}4 \) 73 \( \text{g}8+ \text{h}4 \) 74 \( \text{e}8 \text{a}6+ \text{g}7 \text{x}a7+ \text{f}6 \text{a}2 \text{e}3! \text{g}4 \) 78 \( \text{e}5 \text{b}2(2c2)! \) (only not 78...\( \text{d}2? \) 79 \( \text{e}4 \text{d}2 \)!) (but now it is White who is in zugzwang) 80 \( \text{e}5 \text{d}8! \) 81 \( \text{f}6 \text{f}8+ \) 82 \( \text{e}7 \text{f}2 \) 83 \( \text{e}6 \text{f}4 \) and wins.

68 \( \text{g}4 \)

But now Black carries out his plan of transferring his rook to the 7th rank.

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

69 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{g}7 \)

70 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{h}7 \)

Here there are now various ways to win.

71 \( \text{e}6 \) \( \text{b}7 \)

72 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{e}7+ \)

73 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{d}1 \)

74 \( \text{x}e7 \) \( \text{e}1\text{w}+ \)

And White soon resigned.

The culminating point of the ending was undoubtedly the zugzwang after Black’s 67th move, involving the idea of forcing the white king into a check from the 7th rank. Was it easy to find this idea at the board? In fact it was not difficult – by analogy with a classic study by Emanuel Lasker, which was well known to me, which demonstrated the same idea of forcing the king into a check. Various versions of this study are to be found in chess literature, so I would ask you not to criticise me for my choice of one of them.

Em. Lasker

1890

1 \( \text{b}8 \) \( \text{b}2+ \) 2 \( \text{a}8 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 3 \( \text{h}6+ \) \( \text{a}5 \)

4 \( \text{b}7 \) \( \text{b}2+ \) 5 \( \text{a}7 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 6 \( \text{h}5+ \) \( \text{a}4 \)

7 \( \text{b}7 \) \( \text{b}2+ \) 8 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 9 \( \text{h}4+ \) \( \text{a}3 \)

10 \( \text{b}6 \) \( \text{b}2+ \) 11 \( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 12 \( \text{h}3+ \)

\( \text{a}2 \) 13 \( \text{x}h2 \).

A closer forerunner also existed, but I learned about it only a few months after my game with Zaitsev.
1 ♗c8! The natural 1 ♗c7? is wrong in view of 1... ♖d1!, when Black saves the draw, e.g. 2 ♖xa5 ♖d6 3 ♖g5+ ♖h7 4 ♖g7+ ♖xh6 5 ♖xe7 ♕a6. But now if 1... ♖d1 White wins by 2 ♖a7!

1...a4 2 ♖d7 a3 3 ♖xe7 a2 4 ♖a7! ♖h8 5 h7! (a position already familiar to us has arisen) 5... ♖xh7 6 ♖e8+ ♗g6 7 e7 ♗h5 8 ♖a3 ♗h4 9 ♖a5! As we see, the solution of the study diverges slightly from the course of the game, although the idea is absolutely the same. Incidentally, there is also a divergence in the winning method in the event of the transfer of the rook to the 2nd rank. Keres gives the variation 8... ♗g5 (instead of 8... ♗h4) 9 ♖g3+ ♗f4 10 ♖g2 ♗f3 11 ♖b2 (I played 11 ♖h2 ♗e3 12 ♖b2 ♗e4 13 ♖e2+) 11... ♗e3 12 ♖d7 ♖d1+ 13 ♗c7 ♖c1+ 14 ♖b7 ♗a1 15 ♖e8++. 9... ♖g4 10 ♗f7 ♖f1+ 11 ♖g6 ♖e1 12 ♖a4+ ♖h3 13 ♖h1+ 14 ♖g5 ♖g1+ 15 ♖h5 ♖e1 16 ♖a3+ ♖g2 17 ♖xa2+ ♖f3 18 ♖a7 ♖e6! 19 ♖g5 ♖e4 20 ♖f7c7! ♖e5 21 ♖d7! ♖e4 22 ♖d1! ♖f3 23 ♖f1+ ♖e2 24 ♖f7 ♖e3 25 ♖f5 and wins.
I should like to warn you against a common mistake. When practising the calculation of variations, do not attempt in any position to see everything to the end. Chess is a fundamentally inexact game. It is not often that a position can be completely exhausted by calculation — usually it is not possible to get by without evaluation too. Time for thought during a game is always limited, and there are many problems facing us — this means that we have to act in the most economical way. Our objective is not to calculate variations as deeply as possible, but to take the optimal decision. Calculate the minimum (I emphasise — minimum!) chain of moves, necessary and sufficient for taking the correct decision. Unnecessarily deep calculation leads to fatigue and time trouble, and as a consequence — to inevitable errors.

Skill in avoiding the calculation of variations, not required for the taking of a decision, is just as important as the ability to calculate deeply and accurately. As a matter of fact, this skill is a highly important component of the technique of calculation.

How does the practical player reason? 1 \( \text{g7+} \) \( \text{b1} \) is pointless, and in the event of 1 \( \text{hxh2?} \) c1 \( \text{h} \) Black will soon promote his a-pawn too. This means that there remains only one possibility of continuing the struggle.

1 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{b2!} \)
2 \( \text{g7+} \) \( \text{b1} \)
3 \( \text{a1+!} \) \( \text{xa1} \)

By the method of elimination we have established three obligatory moves. Now we can shut the king in the corner by one of two ways: 4 \( \text{xc2} \) or 4 \( \text{c1} \). There was absolutely no need to make a choice between them beforehand. This is a new problem — we only need to solve it now, when we have the position in front of us.

Note that after 4 \( \text{xc2?} \) f4! White is in
zugzwang. This means that we again have the right to make our move, without looking far ahead.

4 \( \boxtimes c1! \) \( \boxtimes e5 \)

Now we have to choose 5 h6 \( \boxtimes f4+6 \boxtimes xc2 \) \( \boxtimes xh6 \) 7 d6. It is not too difficult to discover that White time after time ends up in zugzwang: 7...\( \boxtimes f4 \) 8 d7 \( \boxtimes g5 \) 9 f4 \( \boxtimes d8 \) 10 \( \boxtimes c1 \) \( \boxtimes a5 \) 11 \( \boxtimes c2 \) \( \boxtimes c7! \) 12 f3 \( \boxtimes b6 \) 13 \( \boxtimes c1 \) \( \boxtimes a5 \) 14 \( \boxtimes c2 \) \( \boxtimes c7 \) 15 \( \boxtimes c1 \) \( \boxtimes xf4+ \) 16 \( \boxtimes c2 \) \( \boxtimes g5 \) 17 f4 \( \boxtimes d8 \) 18 \( \boxtimes c1 \) \( \boxtimes a5 \) 19 \( \boxtimes c2 \) \( \boxtimes c7 \).

When then can he do? A flicker of hope is provided by the idea of forcing ...f7–f6, since the f6 pawn will hinder the bishop’s manoeuvres.

5 \( f4! \) \( \boxtimes d6! \)

Bad is 5...\( \boxtimes xf4+6 \boxtimes xc2 \) f6 7 f3, when Black is in zugzwang.

6 \( \boxtimes xc2 \)

Of course, not 6 f3? \( \boxtimes c7! \) Reserve tempi must be preserved!

6 ... \( \boxtimes xf4 \)

7 f3 \( f6 \)

The goal is achieved!

---

Up till now it was not necessary to decide which pawn should be sacrificed here – 8 d6 or 8 h6. Unfortunately, the composer of the study discounted the fact that both possibilities are good enough to draw: 8 d6 \( \boxtimes xd6 \) 9 h6 \( \boxtimes f8 \) 10 h7 \( \boxtimes g7 \) 11 f4! (only not 11 \( \boxtimes c1? \) f4 12 \( \boxtimes c2 \) f5 13 \( \boxtimes c1 \) \( \boxtimes h8 \) 14 \( \boxtimes c2 \) \( \boxtimes b2! \)), or 8 h6 \( \boxtimes xh6 \) 9 d6 \( \boxtimes f8 \) 10 d7 \( \boxtimes e7 \) 11 \( \boxtimes c1! \) (of course, not 11 f4? \( \boxtimes d8 \) 12 \( \boxtimes c1 \) \( \boxtimes a5 \) 13 \( \boxtimes c2 \) \( \boxtimes c7 \).

But what if it had suddenly transpired that both possibilities on the eighth move lose? Well, that would mean that the initial position was lost. After all, we accurately checked all alternative attempts and found the only moves by the method of elimination.

Although, of course, somewhere along the way we could have made a mistake – overlooked or evaluated incorrectly some possibility. In studies, such a danger has to be constantly reckoned with – they are full of cunning ideas and unexpected resources. Therefore studies are an excellent testing ground for training in the method of elimination. One cannot get by without this procedure for taking a decision, but it should be used with extreme caution.

We have discussed how a player would act if the position from Vlasak's study had occurred with him in a tournament game. In trying to work out a study immediately from beginning to end, we are effectively training another, significantly less expedient algorithm for taking a decision. Therefore it is perhaps even harmful to try and solve studies in which, when making the first move, it is not necessary (sometimes almost impossible) to anticipate all the subsequent events. On the other hand, a very good form of training is the playing of such studies.

The trainer (knowing the solution) takes the black pieces. Clocks are used. Time is allotted depending on the standard of the player and the complexity of the study. Play begins, and one after another White has to solve the problems facing him. It is all as in a practical game: the player himself decides which moves can be made quickly, in order
to stay within the time limit, and where it is necessary to delve into the position, and calculate variations deeply and accurately. Such training, if it is carried out seriously, is very useful not only for developing imagination and calculating ability, but also for cultivating the habit of rational decision-making, and the sensible expenditure of time. Of course, it is important to use high-quality exercises (this applies not only to studies and not only to positions for playing). I spend a lot of time supplementing my trainer’s card index – looking for the most clear-cut and vivid exercises and carefully checking them.

But what if you work independently, without a trainer? This is not a disaster – studies can also be played on your own. Set up the initial position on a board. Don’t limit your time (after all, you don’t know the complexity of the study), but record it after each move. Later analyse where and why you spent too much time, and where, perhaps, you took a decision too hastily. Cover the page of the book or magazine (so as not to see it accidentally) with a sheet of paper with a small hole. Start the clock, consider your move, make it, record the time, and check through the hole whether you have played correctly. If everything is in order, make the reply on the board and continue thinking.

We will analyse two studies which Dolmatov played against me.

A. Sarychev
1973
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There is only one way to defend against mate.

1  ♘g3+!  ♗a4!
2  ♘xe4

In reply Black eliminates the g5 pawn.

2  ...  ♘d2+
3  ♗xc2  ♘xg5+
4  ♘d3  ♘d2+

Where should the king move? The composer of the study had in mind the variation 5 ♗c4 d5+! 6 ♘xd5 ♘c2+ 7 ♗d3 ♘d2+ 8 ♗c3 ♘xh6 9 ♘g6 ♘xd5 (9... ♘f4 10 ♘a6+ ♘b5 11 ♘c4+ ♘c5 12 ♘h4 mate) 10 ♗c4! ♘a5 11 ♘g3! ♘f8 12 ♘a3+! ♘xa3 13 ♘h5 mate. Dolmatov played differently.

5 ♗c3 ♘xh6
6 ♘h3

Now 6... ♘g5 7 ♘h5 is bad for Black.

6  ...  ♘f4

There quickly followed 7 ♘h5? d5! 8 ♘xd5 ♘b5 with a drawn ending.

Immediately after the ‘game’, Sergey, who was upset by his failure, showed that his idea was correct, although it needed to be implemented more accurately.

7 ♘f3! ♘h6
The bishop is lost and White wins.

R. Tavariani
1970
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The playing of this study led to an unexpected outcome for me.

1 leck6!

In the event of 1 \( \text{f}4 \)? \( \text{f}7! \) 2 \( \text{h}7 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 3 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 4 \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{xg}6 \) 5 \( \text{f}xg6 \) \( \text{xg}6 \) the draw is obvious.

1  ... \( \text{f7}! \)

2  \( \text{d7}+ \) \( \text{h}4 \)

2...\( \text{g}3 \) 3 \( \text{f}5 \) and 4 \( \text{e}6 \).

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

Of course, not 3 \( \text{f}5 \)? \( \text{g}5 \) or 3 \( \text{f}5? \) \( \text{g}3 \).

3  ... \( \text{h}5 \)

Q 3-11. What should White play?

After calculating the variation planned by the author of the study: 4 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{h}4 \) 5 \( \text{h}7? \) \( \text{g}4 \) (incidentally, 5...c3 6 bxc3 \( \text{g}4 \) 7 f5 \( \text{g}5 \) is also possible) 6 f5 \( \text{g}5 \) 7 \( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{xg}6 \) 8 fxe6 \( \text{g}6 \) 9 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{xf6} \) 10 \( \text{c}3 \), Dolmatov established that it leads not to a win, but to a simple draw: 10...a4! 11 \( \text{xc}4 \) a3! 12 bxa3 \( \text{xe}6 \).

4  \( \text{c}2! \) \( \text{g}6 \)

5  \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{xf6} \)

6  \( \text{d}4 \)

It is hard to offer Black any good advice. If 6...\( \text{g}8 \) there follows 7 \( \text{b}5 \) c3 8 \( \text{x}c3 \), and 8...\( \text{f}5 \) is not possible in view of 9 \( \text{c}4! \) \( \text{h}7 \) 10 \( \text{d}3+ \). But otherwise White will play his bishop to c2 and then attack the a-pawn with his king.

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

Now 7 \( \text{e}5? \) is unavailing: 7...c3! 8 bxc3 \( \text{b}3 \) 9 \( \text{e}6 \) a4 10 f5+ \( \text{g}7 \). After 7 \( \text{b}5? \) c3! 8 \( \text{d}3+ \) \( \text{h}5! \) 9 \( \text{x}c3 \) (9 bxc3 a4 10 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \) also does not win) 9...\( \text{g}4 \) 10 f5 the f-pawn, which has been forced to step forward, has become much weaker, and the plan which worked with the pawn at f4 now no longer proves successful: 10...\( \text{g}5 \) 11 \( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 12 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 13 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 14 \( \text{b}6 \) a4 15 \( \text{a}5 \) d7 16 \( \text{x}a4 \) \( \text{xf}5 \).

7  \( \text{c}5! \)

It is easy to check that neither 7...c3 8 bxc3 \( \text{b}3 \) 9 \( \text{b}5 \) a4 10 \( \text{b}4 \) followed by 11 \( \text{xa}4 \), nor 7...\( \text{f}6 \) 8 \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 9 \( \text{xa}5 \) promises Black any drawing chances.
Reciprocal Playing

We are faced with a curious psychological situation: when solving a study, we must play the strongest moves for both sides, whereas in a practical game each of the opponents, naturally, plays only for himself.

Yakov Vladimirov

Why should not two players play a study between themselves, without the participation of a trainer? They each do some training, and gain both pleasure and benefit from such an encounter.

But in a study the players are not equivalent. White usually has the more interesting problems to solve. With correct play he always achieves success. The opponent may have a feeling of being doomed. He knows that, however hard he tries, the result will most probably not be in his favour.

Only studies that are rich in content with a lengthy and double-edged battle are suitable for joint playing. Or those in which it has been possible to improve and amplify the composer's solution.

S. Kinch
1923
240

1 a5!!
xd6!
The capture of the bishop leads to mate:
1... xc5 2 c4 or 1... xc5 2 b7.
2 xd6 c6
Of course, not 2... d4? 3 c7+ b6
4 xb6+ xb6 5 h7.
3 e2!
Nothing is achieved by 3 f8? d4 4 g7
g7 5 hxg7 e7 6 e2 g8! and
7...b4 with a draw.

In the composer's opinion, after 3 e2 White wins in view of the variation 3...d8
4 d4! xd4 5 e5 c6 6 c3+! b5
7 h7. However, Alyosha Dreev came to the conclusion that the position is drawn – Black’s defence can be improved. I carefully checked the young player's analysis and was only able to amplify it, but not refute it.

3 ... d8!
4 h7 f7
5 e5

Now Black has to guard a whole complex of squares against the invasion of the enemy knight: g5, h6, d6, d8, e5, and in some cases h8.

5 ... b5!
5...d8? is weaker in view of 6 d4 b6
7 f5 and 8 h6(d6).

6 f4!
The most dangerous continuation. Dreev considered 6 c3+ c6 (6...c4? 7 e4
with the threats of 8 d6+ and 8 g5)
7 e4 c7! 8 g7 f4! 9 e2 d5
10 f3 e5 with a draw.

Black defends in similar fashion after
6...c6! 7...f5 c7! 8...f6 f4!

6...d8!

If 6...c6(c4), then 7...e6! d5 8...g5 or 7...e3 8...d8+ is immediately decisive. Also bad is 6...c5? 7...f6! and 8...e6.

7...e6

A draw results from 7...g6 c6 8...g7 (threatening 9...e5+) 8...c7! 9...f6 (9...h8 g5) 9...d5 10...h8 e5!
The king can be brought up, but in this case too Black defends successfully: 7...g2 c6 8...g3 d7 9...g7 c7 10...g4 e5! (incorrect is 10...xf4? 11...xf4 c6 e6 12...g4 a5 13...f4 a4 14...g4 a3 15...f4 a2 16...g4, when Black will soon lose because of zugzwang) 11...xe5...xe5+ 12...f5 e7 13...f6 e8. Then he can simply advance his a-pawn and at the required moment play...h8!

7...e7

7...h4? 8...d4+ and 9...f5.

8...d4+ c5!

Bad is 8...c4? 9...f5 f8 10...d6!

9...f3

9...f5 f8; 9...g7 d5 10...f5 g5.

9...d5

10...g7 e6

10...a5 is also good.

11...e5

Otherwise 11...f6.

11...

But not 11...f6? 12...xf6.

12...xf8...xe5

By a series of accurate moves Black has maintained the balance.

White has some other tempting ways of playing for a win, but they are unsuccessful.

3...d5? d4! 4...e7. The bishop ending is lost: 4...xe7? 5...xe7 b5 (5...e3 6...d7 d4 7...e2 b5 8...d3) 6...e2 (not immediately 6...f8 e3 7...d4 8...e2 c4) 6...b2 7...f8 c1 8...b9...d3 etc.

4...b5! is essential (intending 5...e5; not 4...e5? 5...xe5...xe5 6...c6+)

5...xc6 xc6 6...f8 e3 7...h7 d4 8...e2 d5 9...d3 h8! (9...a5 10...h6 h8!) 10...b4 e6(e5) 11...c3...f5 12...f8 g6 or 5...f5 h8! 6...f8...e5 7...g7 f7 with a draw.

3...e2? d4! 4...d3 h8 5...d5 b5! (incorrect is 5...e5+? 6...xe5...xe5 7...e4 b2 8...f5 followed by...f6, or 7...h8 8...f4 and 9...g6) 6...e4 a5. White cannot win, e.g. 7...f8...d8 8...g7 f7.

It can be concluded that the ending is drawn. It is perhaps 3...e2! that sets Black the most difficult problems.

In this example the two players are of equal status. During the tactical skirmish it is not possible to guess the end result. In practice White has serious winning chances – the defence is very difficult. It is quite a good exercise for reciprocal playing. It can also be played alone (with Black) – to provide training in defence.

E. Janosi

1977
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Q 3-12. Calculate 2...xh3.
The knight is lost, but the ending with rook against pawn is drawn.

2 $\text{h}xh3? \text{Cc7}+ 3 \text{Be5} \text{Xxe8} 4 \text{h}xh7 b5 5 
\text{e}7 \text{Cc6}! 6 \text{Xxe8} b4 7 \text{Ed5} b3 8 \text{e}3+ 
\text{Cc2} 9 \text{Cxc4} b2 10 \text{e}2+ \text{Cc1} (10... \text{Cc1} 
11 \text{Cc3} b1=+ is also possible) 11 \text{b}3 
\text{a}1 12 \text{Xxb2} – stalemate.

2 \text{Xxb5? \text{Cc2} is also incorrect.}

2 $\text{f}f4+$ $\text{a}5
3 \text{Cc5}!! \text{Cc8}!

3... \text{Cc3} loses to 4 \text{f}f3, and other knight 
moves are not possible on account of mate. 
Bad is 3... \text{g}g2? 4 \text{f}f2 (threatening 5 
\text{a}2+ \text{b}4 6 \text{b}2+) 4... \text{Cc7} 5 \text{Xg2} 
\text{Xxe8} 6 \text{Cc2} followed by 7 \text{Cc8} \text{Cc7} 8 
\text{a}8. The knight is lost, and this time the 
ending with rook against pawn is won.

4 \text{Cc6}!

It is important to prevent 4... \text{h}7.

4 $\text{Cc6}!! \text{Ca6}!

After 4... \text{a}6? 5 \text{Cc4! Black is in zugzwang.}

5 \text{f}6!

Any other move would have spoiled some-
thing in White’s set-up. Unfortunately, the 
king move is also not without its drawbacks.

5 ... \text{Cc8}!

6 \text{h}h4!

\text{Zugzwang!}

6 ... \text{a}6

7 \text{Cc4}!

In the composer’s opinion, with this the 
solution of the study concludes (7... \text{Cc8} 8 
\text{Xxb5}). Alas, this is not so.

7 ... \text{a}7!!

8 \text{Xxb7} \text{Cd6}

And Black gains a draw.

As an exercise for reciprocal playing, this 
example appeals to me less than the 
previous one. White has to solve more 
difficult problems than his opponent. He 
calculates lengthy variations, finds a subtle 
plan for domination and zugzwang, but at 
the last minute the net woven by him is torn 
and he ends up with nothing. Unfair!
Exactly as in a Study

'Here is a study for you to solve', said my good-natured opponent with a smile, making a knight move. 'And here is a study in reply', I countered.

Alexander Kotov

It can happen in a practical game that there is exactly the same sort of accurate and forcing play, as in a study. The main role is played by concrete calculation, and evaluation becomes secondary. Fragments of such games can be used as exercises for solving or playing. The aim of the training will be the same as in solving or playing studies – the development of imagination and improvement in the calculation of variations.

Ivanchuk – Dreev
Training game, Novogorsk 1983
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2  ♕h3+
After 2 ♕f3 ♕e4 or 2...♕d7 Black has an obvious advantage. Remember the chapter 'The strongest piece is the rook!' (p. 141).

2  ...  gxh3
3  ♕xe7  ♕e4!
4  ♕d6
Black was threatening 4...h2 5 ♕g2 d3 6 ♕g5 h1♕+ 7 ♕xh1 ♔f3.

4  ...  ♕d3
Otherwise 5 ♕e2. Weaker is 4...♕d5 5 ♕g3 ♕c5 6 ♕e5!
5  ♕e5!
5...♕c2 cannot be allowed.

Q 3-13. What should Black play?

In the game Black failed to solve the problem, played inaccurately, and threw away the win.
Premature is 5...h2? 6 ♕xh2 ♕c2 7 ♕e1
d3 (7...\textit{xb}3 8 \textit{d}2 or 8 \textit{e}5) 8 \textit{f}4 a5 9 \textit{d}2. First he must strengthen his position to the maximum on the queenside \textit{(a very important principle of endgame technique is 'do not hurry!')}. In so doing he must not allow b3–b4! Incorrect, for example, is 5...b5? 6 b4! \textit{c}4 7 \textit{f}3! d3 8 \textit{e}3 \textit{xb}4 9 \textit{xd}3 \textit{b}3 10 \textit{e}3 (but not 10 \textit{d}2 b4 11 \textit{c}1 \textit{a}2!, then 12...b3 and ...a6–a5–a4–a3) 10...h2 (otherwise 11 \textit{f}3) 11 \textit{h}xh2 \textit{xb}2 12 \textit{d}4(d3) with a draw.

5 \ldots a5!

6 \textit{c}3

6 \textit{f}1 is of equal merit. White loses immediately after 6 \textit{g}3? \textit{e}3.

6 \ldots b5

6...b6 7 \textit{f}2 b5 is also possible, but 6...h2? is still incorrect: 7 \textit{h}xh2 \textit{c}2 8 \textit{c}7 (or 8 \textit{e}4 d3 9 \textit{f}4) 8...d3 9 \textit{a}5.

7 \textit{f}2 b4!

8 \textit{f}1

Even worse is 8 \textit{f}3 h2 9 \textit{h}xh2 \textit{c}2.

8 \ldots h2!

Only now, when all the useful moves on the queenside have already been made, does Black take decisive action.

9 \textit{x}h2 \textit{c}2

10 \textit{e}1 \textit{xb}3!

Here there is a dual solution: 10...\textit{xb}2! 11 \textit{c}7 a4! 12 \textit{b}xa4 \textit{xc}2! is also strong. On the other hand, 10...d3? would be a blunder: 11 \textit{f}4 \textit{xb}3 (11...\textit{xb}2 12 \textit{d}2 \textit{xb}3 13 \textit{xd}3 a4 14 \textit{d}6! a3 15 \textit{d}2) 12 \textit{d}2 \textit{xb}2 13 \textit{xd}3 b3 14 \textit{c}4! a4 (14...\textit{a}2 15 \textit{c}1!) 15 \textit{b}4 a3 16 \textit{c}1+!

11 \textit{c}7

11 \textit{d}2 \textit{xb}2 followed by ...b4–b3, ...\textit{a}2 and ...a5–a4–a3.

11 \ldots a4

Of course, not 11...\textit{xb}2? 12 \textit{xa}5 b3 13 \textit{b}6! \textit{c}3 14 \textit{d}1 b2 15 \textit{xd}4+ \textit{xd}4 16 \textit{c}2.

12 \textit{d}6 \textit{xb}2!

13 \textit{xb}4 \textit{c}2!

White is helpless against 14...d3 and 15...a3.

For many years, Chess Yearbooks were published in the USSR, describing the chess events of the preceding year. When looking through one of them, I noticed the following ending.

Blekhtsin – Khodos
Leningrad 1958
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A tense battle ended 20 moves later in a draw, and in the opinion of the commentator the play of both opponents was the best. The analysis did not contain too many complicated analytical variations – for taking the correct decisions only accuracy of calculation was required. Therefore the position seemed to me to be quite suitable for reciprocal playing.

On checking, I discovered that at one point White could have played more strongly and won. But this did not concern me. After all, this also happens in a practical game – a player finds, one after another, the only moves enabling him to prolong the resistance, but even so he is unable to save the game (or he saves it, thanks to a mistake by the opponent, tired by trying to overcome a tenacious defence).

A new improvement, this time for Black, appeared during a training session in which
Alyosha Dreev played one of the sides. He found a spectacular and completely unexpected way to draw. His find proved very opportune – now the chances of the two sides again became equal, and the exercise was made richer and more interesting.

41 ... \( \text{\textit{xf4}} \)!

This exchange enables Black to exploit his only counter-chance – the advance of his d-pawn. White cannot reply 42 b7? because of 42...\( \text{\textit{g8}} \). Of course, 41...\( \text{\textit{g8}} \) would have lost to 42 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) (or 42 \( \text{\textit{f2}} \)).

42 \( \text{\textit{gx4}} \) \( \text{\textit{d3}} \)!

Much weaker was 42...\( \text{\textit{d8}} \) 43 \( \text{\textit{c5}} \).

43 \( \text{\textit{xc3}} \)!

Incorrect was 43 b7? \( \text{\textit{g8}} \) and 44...d2. A draw results from 43 \( \text{\textit{xb2}} \) \( \text{\textit{a4}} \) 44 \( \text{\textit{xb1}} \) \( \text{\textit{xb6}} \) 45 \( \text{\textit{xe6}} \) d2 46 \( \text{\textit{xd6}} \) \( \text{\textit{e6}} \) 47 \( \text{\textit{xd2}} \) \( \text{\textit{xa6}} \), but White rightly tries for more.

43 ... \( \text{\textit{xc3}} \)

44 \( \text{\textit{d2}}! \)

If 44...\( \text{\textit{b3}} \) White replies 45 \( \text{\textit{b4}} \), intending the variation 45...d2 46 \( \text{\textit{e2}} \) \( \text{\textit{e3}} \) 47 \( \text{\textit{xd2}} \) \( \text{\textit{e6}} \) 48 b7 \( \text{\textit{xb6}} \) 49 \( \text{\textit{c6}} \) \( \text{\textit{xb7}} \) 50 \( \text{\textit{d8}} \). Instead of 47...\( \text{\textit{e6}} \) Grandmaster Boris Gelfand suggested trying 47...\( \text{\textit{e8}} \) 48 b7 h5, after which White no longer has time to win the rook. But he nevertheless wins by continuing 49 a4! h4 (49...\( \text{\textit{xb8}} \) 50 \( \text{\textit{c6}} \); 49...\( \text{\textit{e6}} \) 50 \( \text{\textit{a6}} \)!) 50 a5 h3 51 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) h2 52 \( \text{\textit{f2}} \) or 51...\( \text{\textit{d8}} \) 52 \( \text{\textit{c2}} \)(c3).

Apart from 45...d2, Black also has 45...\( \text{\textit{b2}} \) 46 \( \text{\textit{e3}} \) \( \text{\textit{e2}} \) 47 \( \text{\textit{xd3}} \) \( \text{\textit{e8}} \) 48 b7 h5. Now 49 a4? no longer works: 49...h4 50 a5 (50 \( \text{\textit{c4}} \) \( \text{\textit{b8}} \) 50...h3, and the knight is deprived of the important d3 square. On the other hand, the white king is slightly more active than in the previous variation and it succeeds in supporting its pawns: 49 \( \text{\textit{c4}} \) \( \text{\textit{e6}} \) (49...h4 50 \( \text{\textit{c5}} \) h3 51 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) h2 52 \( \text{\textit{f2}} \); 49...\( \text{\textit{b8}} \) 50 \( \text{\textit{c6}} \) \( \text{\textit{xb7}} \) 51 \( \text{\textit{d8}} \) \( \text{\textit{g6}} \) 52 \( \text{\textit{xb7}} \) h4 53 \( \text{\textit{c5}} \) h3 54 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) h2 55 \( \text{\textit{f2}} \) 50 \( \text{\textit{c5}} \)!) (50 \( \text{\textit{a6}} \)?) \( \text{\textit{d6}} \) 51 \( \text{\textit{b8}}w+ \) \( \text{\textit{xb8}} \) 52 \( \text{\textit{xb8}} \) h4) 50...\( \text{\textit{d7}} \) 51 \( \text{\textit{b6}} \) h4 52 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \) h3 53 a4! h2

54 \( \text{\textit{f2}} \) and wins. The hasty 53 \( \text{\textit{f2}} \)? would turn out to be a serious mistake in view of 53...\( \text{\textit{e3}} \) 54 \( \text{\textit{b6}} \) \( \text{\textit{b3}} \)+ 55 \( \text{\textit{a7}} \) \( \text{\textit{xa3}} \)+ 56 \( \text{\textit{b7}} \) \( \text{\textit{b3}} \)+ 57 \( \text{\textit{a8}} \) \( \text{\textit{xb8}} \)+ 58 \( \text{\textit{xb8}} \) h2 and ...\( \text{\textit{d6}} \)–\( \text{\textit{d5}} \)–\( \text{\textit{d4}} \)–\( \text{\textit{e3}} \) with a draw.

45 \( \text{\textit{e2}} \) \( \text{\textit{d3}} \)!

The consequences of the variation 45...\( \text{\textit{b3}} \)+ 46 \( \text{\textit{b4}} \) \( \text{\textit{e3}} \)+ 47 \( \text{\textit{xd2}} \) \( \text{\textit{e8}} \) 48 b7 or 47...\( \text{\textit{e6}} \) 48 b7 \( \text{\textit{b6}} \) 49 \( \text{\textit{c6}} \) are already known to us.

46 \( \text{\textit{d1}} \) \( \text{\textit{d7}} \)

The b-pawn has been stopped and White has to bring up his neighbouring pawn to help. During this time Black will advance his passed h-pawn. Who will be quicker?

47 a4

47 \( \text{\textit{c5}} \) \( \text{\textit{d8}} \) 48 a4 transposes.

47 ... h5!

Black loses after 47...\( \text{\textit{e7}} \)+ 48 \( \text{\textit{c5}} \) \( \text{\textit{d8}} \) 49 a5 \( \text{\textit{b8}} \) (49...\( \text{\textit{d6}} \) 50 \( \text{\textit{b7}} \)+) 50 b7 \( \text{\textit{d6}} \) 51 a6.

48 \( \text{\textit{c5}} \)

Here too it is possible to transpose moves: 48 a5 h4 49 \( \text{\textit{c5}} \), since after 49...h3 50 \( \text{\textit{xd7}} \) h2 51 a7 h1w+ 52 \( \text{\textit{xd2}} \) the position is drawn (pointed out by Ken Neat).

48 ... \( \text{\textit{d8}} \)

49 b7

49 a5 h4 50 b7 is of equal merit.

49 ... h4

50 a5

50 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \)? \( \text{\textit{b8}} \).

50 ... h3

51 \( \text{\textit{d3}} \)!

\hline

\textit{see next diagram}

\hline
The decisive moment! As we will see shortly, the ‘automatic’ 51...h2 leads to a difficult queen ending for Black.

51 ... ♕xd3!!
The discovery by Alyosha Dreev!

52 ♖b8 ♗h2
It is paradoxical but true – the queen is unable to eliminate the h2 pawn with impunity.

53 ♕h8 ♕b3!
54 ♕xd2 ♕b1

White cannot win.

Now let us see what should have happened after the continuation chosen by Herman Khodos in the game.

51...h2? 52 ♕f2 ♕g8! 53 a6! Unfortunately, White in fact played the weaker

53 ♕xd2?! ♕g2 54 ♕e3 ♕xf2 55 ♕xf2? (55 ♕b8 ♕xf3+ 56 ♕e2!) 55...h1♕ 56 ♕b8 ♕h2+ 57 ♕e3 ♕g1+ 58 ♕e2 ♕g2+ 59 ♕d3 ♕xf3+, and soon the players agreed a draw. Instead of 58 ♕e2, more cunning was 58 ♕d3??, hoping for 58...♕d1+? 59 ♕c4 with advantage. A typical defensive procedure in queen endings is the diagonal check: 58 ♕d3 ♕f1+!, and if 59 ♕d4 ♕a1+ and 60...♕xa5.

53...♕g1+ (53...♕g2 54 ♕b8 ♕xf2 55 ♕a7+ and 56 ♕xf2, with a two-pawn advantage) 54 ♕xd2 ♕g2 55 ♕e3 ♕xf2 56 ♕b8. A draw results from 56 ♕xf2? h1♕ 57 ♕b8 ♕h2+.

56...♕xf3+. If 56...h1♕, then first 57 ♕b7+!, defending all his pawns, and only then 58 ♕xf2.

57 ♕e2! h1♕ 58 ♕b7+ and 59 ♕xf3. White retains his extra pawn at a6 and is close to a win.

For the practical player it is extremely important to learn to sense the turning points of a game, when it is no longer possible to restrict himself to a general evaluation of the position and approximate calculation, but it is essential to concentrate, delve deeply into the position, and find and calculate accurately the only way that leads to success. As we can see from this last example, training in the playing of exercises can help in developing this skill.
The ‘Brilliance and Poverty’ of Studies

If you should be asked: which is more useful, the sun or the moon?, reply: the moon. Since the sun shines during the day, when all the same it is light, whereas the moon shines at night.

Kozma Prutkov

By solving or playing studies, we train our imagination and our ability to decipher the opponent’s ideas, as well as the calculation of variations and the rapid taking of decisions by the method of elimination. Some studies expand our understanding of the endgame. But now let us talk about that which studies cannot give us, and how they differ from exercises taken from practical games.

Operations carried out at the board can pursue the most varied aims. The strengthening of our position or the weakening of the enemy position, prophylaxis, traps, sharpening of the play, improving of the pawn structure, and many, many others. Such aims do not occur in studies. The range of evaluations in them is also extremely restricted. There are only three categorical evaluations: win, draw, loss. The enormous wealth of half-tones, of intermediate evaluations, is absent. Those such as a better, worse, or roughly equal position, or a risky, promising, dubious, or practically expedient continuation... In this sense a chess game is much more difficult and much richer in content than study composition, although those ideas which can be expressed in studies are usually expressed there more fully and more vividly than in practical games.

*In studies there is an absence of positional evaluation* (I first heard this thought from Mikhail Botvinnik). Hence the conclusion: you can and should, by solving studies, train your imagination and calculation. But to develop your positional understanding in this way is not possible. Moreover, even for improvement in tactical, calculating play you should not restrict yourself to studies alone. It is also useful to test your powers in finding ‘inexact combinations’, with an interlacing of calculation and evaluation, in which chess is so rich.

We will examine a rather complicated practical ending, which is quite suitable for reciprocal playing (if you are working on your own, you can play it with Black). Allot yourself as much time as possible: at least an hour. Then compare this ending with the studies and you will easily notice the fundamental differences that have just been mentioned.

J. Miles – Alexandria
Interzonal Tournament
Rio de Janeiro 1979
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The adjourned position, White to move. Grandmaster Tony Miles had not yet arrived from his own Interzonal Tournament, which was taking place in Riga, and so was unable to help his wife. It was not surprising that our analysis proved to be better.

42 \( \text{\textit{\textit{\textbullet}}\text{\textit{\textbullet}}} \text{e}2\!\!\)! Hopeless is 42 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}}\text{d}d1\? \text{\textit{\textbullet}}\text{b}2\) followed by ...\( \text{\textbullet}\text{a}8\) or ...\( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}8\). In the event of 42 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}}\text{e}1\? \) Black makes a useful move on the kingside, and after 43 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}2\) \( \text{\textbullet}b1\)+ 44 \( \text{\textbullet}d1\) it transpires that, compared with the game, White has simply lost a tempo.

For the practical player such a comparison of the moves 42 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}}\text{e}2\) and 42 \( \text{\textit{\textbullet}}\text{e}1\) is quite sufficient (\textit{incidentally, \textit{\textit{\textbullet}}\text{comparison} is one of the important procedures for \textit{taking decisions} \textit{\textbullet}}, in order quickly to give preference to one of them. But a study composer would require more exact evidence of the fact that the loss of a tempo changes the evaluation of the position.

42 ... \( \text{\textbullet}\text{b}1\!\!\)! 43 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}2\) was threatened. 42...\( \text{\textbullet}\text{a}7\? \) 43 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}2\) \( \text{\textbullet}a8\) did not promise Black any winning chances in view of the unpromising positions of her rooks. By contrast, the white rook at d2 is excellently placed.

43 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}1\) \( \text{\textbullet}x\text{a}1\)

44 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{xa}1\)

Q 3-14. What should Black play?

The candidate moves are 44...f5, 44...g5 and 44...h8.

44...f5 45 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}3\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{f}7\) 46 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}3\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{e}6\) 47 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{b}2\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{e}5\) 48 f3 (48 \( \text{\textbullet}x\text{a}2\? \text{\textbullet}x\text{a}2\) 49 \( \text{\textbullet}x\text{a}2\) \( \text{\textbullet}x\text{e}4\) followed by 50...\( \text{\textbullet}d3\) and wins) 48...g5 (49 \( \text{\textbullet}x\text{a}2\) was threatened) 49 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}1\!\!\!+\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}5\) (49...\( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}4\) 50 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}4\!) 50 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{a}1\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{a}7\) (otherwise 51 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}7\) 51 h4 or 51 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}4\), and White gains a draw without difficulty.

44...g5. Black prepares to go into a pawn ending. Were you able to find and work out this plan? 45 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}3\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{g}7\) 46 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}3\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{f}6\) 47 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{b}2\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{f}5\) 48 f3! g4 (48...\( \text{\textbullet}\text{e}8\) 49 e4+

\( \text{\textbullet}\text{f}4\) 50 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{xa}2\) 49 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{xa}2\) \( \text{\textbullet}xa2+\) 50 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{xa}2\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{xf}3\) 51 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{xf}3\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{g}5\) 52 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{b}3\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{h}4\) 53 e4! \( \text{\textbullet}\text{g}5\) (53...\( \text{\textbullet}\text{h}3\) 54 e5! h5 55 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}4\) h4 56 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}4\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{h}2\) 57 f4) 54 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}4\) \( \text{\textbullet}f4\) 55 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}5\) with a draw.

44 ... \( \text{\textbullet}\text{f}8\)!

A difficult move!

45 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}3\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{e}7\)

46 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}3\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}6\)

47 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{b}2\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}5\!\!\!\)

Less good is 47...\( \text{\textbullet}\text{e}5\) 48 f3 or 47...\( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}5\) 48 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}1\!\!\+\).

I should mention that in all variations we consider only one plan of defence for White: the march of her king to the queenside, in order either to eliminate the a2 pawn, or to free the rook by placing the king on a1. Any other strategy is rejected on purely positional grounds (it has already been mentioned several times that the main principle in the evaluation and playing of rock endings is the activity of the rook). For the practical player such a general evaluation is quite sufficient, whereas a study composer has no right to reject some continuation merely because of the passivity of a rook -- he needs something more tangible.

Now, of course, White cannot play 48 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{xa}2\? \text{\textbullet}xa2+\) 49 \( \text{\textbullet}xa2\) \( \text{\textbullet}c4\). Essential is 48 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}1\!\!\!+\) followed by 49 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{a}1\). But here Jana Miles made a positional blunder -- she missed an opportunity to activate her rook. By leaving it at a1, White lost any chance of saving the draw.

The game concluded: 48 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{b}3?? \) g5 49 h3 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{a}6\) 50 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}1\!\!\!+\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}5\) 51 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{a}1\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{e}4\) 52 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}3\) h5 53 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}2\) h4 54 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}2\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}5\) (54...\( \text{\textbullet}\text{a}3\!\!\!\), intending ...f7-f5 and ...g5-g4) 55 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}3\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}5\) 56 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{b}3\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{b}5\) 57 g4 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}5\) 58 f4 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{d}5\) 59 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{xf}5\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{e}4\) 60 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{b}2\) \( \text{\textbullet}xe3\) 61 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{e}1\!\!\!\) \( \text{\textbullet}f2\). White resigns.

48 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{c}1\!\!\!+\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{b}4\)

49 \( \text{\textbullet}\text{a}1\) \( \text{\textbullet}\text{a}7\)!
The best eight moves for both sides have led to a position, in which it is no easier than in the initial one to give an accurate evaluation. Black retains winning chances, but White can defend. For the moment nothing more definite can be said. In studies such a lack of clarity in evaluation is, of course, impossible.

White must now choose a plan of defence. In the course of our home analysis, Nana and I spent a long time studying different variations, but did not in fact reach any definite conclusions. However, we also did not consider this to be so significant. It was more important to disclose as fully as possible the ideas hidden in the position, and the resources for both sides. Here are some of the variations that we found.

A. 50 \( c8 \) \( b3! \) 51 g4 \( d7! \) 52 \( b8+ c3 \) 53 \( x a2 \) (otherwise 53... \( d3 \)) 53... \( d2+ \) 54 \( a3(b1) \) \( xf2 \) 55 h4 (after 55 \( b7 \) Black can choose between 55... \( d3 \), 55... \( g5 \) and 55... \( x h2 \) 56 \( x f7 \) \( g5 \) 55... \( g2 \) (if 55... \( d3 \) Black has to reckon with 56 \( g8 \) or 56 \( h8 \) 56 \( g5 \) \( g4 \) 57 \( b7 \) \( x h4 \) 58 \( x f7 \) \( g6 \) or 56 \( b7 \) \( x g4 \) 57 \( x f7 \) \( h5 \) 58 \( d7 \) \( g6 \) 59 \( d6 \) \( x h4 \) 60 \( x g6 \) \( e4(g4) \) and 61...h4. Black would appear to have a decisive advantage. But instead of 51 g4, 51 e4 \( d7 \) 52 \( b8+ c3 \) 53 f4 is probably better.

B. 50 \( d1 \) \( c3! \) 51 g4 \( b7 \) with roughly the same play as in the preceding variation.

C. 50 g4 \( b3 \) 51 \( d1 \) \( c7 \). Then 52... \( c3 \) is good, tying down White's forces.

D. 50 e4! \( b3 \) 51 f4 (51 e5!?; 51 \( e1! \)) 51... \( d7 \) 52 e5 \( d2 \) (52... \( d4 \) 53 \( f1 \); 52... \( d3 \) 53 \( e1 \) \( g6 \) 54 \( g4 \) \( f3 \) 55 f5! \( xf5 \) 56 \( xf5 \) \( f5 \) 57 e6 \( fxe6 \) 58 \( e6+ \)) 53 \( e1! \) \( f2 \) (53... \( x g2 ? \) 54 \( f5 \); 53... \( g6 ? \) 54 \( g4 \) \( f2 \) 55 \( f5 \) \( f5 \) 54 \( e3+ \) \( c4 \) 55 \( g3 \) \( d5 \). If desired, White can force...f7–f6 in the variation 56 h4 h5 57 \( a3 \) \( e6 \) 58 \( a6+ \) \( f5 \) 59 \( a7 \) \( g6 \) 60 \( a6+ \), but here too for the moment the outcome is unclear.

Instead of 54 \( e3+ \) there is also the immediate 54 g3. After 54... \( a3! \) incorrect is 55 h4? \( g6 \) (55... \( h5 ? \) 56 \( f5 ! \) \( f5 \) 57 e6 \( fxe6 \) 58 \( e3+ \) and 59 \( e6 \)) 56 h4 \( x g5 \) (56... \( x g3 ? \) 57 \( x g6 \) \( h x g6 \) 58 \( f5 \) \( g5 \) 59 \( e6 \) \( fxe6 \) 60 \( f6+ \) (stalemate!)) 57 f5 \( x f5 \) 58 e6 \( fxe6 \) 59 \( e3+ \) \( c4 \) 60 \( x e6 \) \( g5 \). But can Black strengthen her position after the passive 55 \( c1 \) or 55 \( d1 \)?
Exercises for Analysis

A combination must be sound. An unsound combination is no combination at all. It is merely an attempt, an error, a failure, a nonentity. But a combination must not only be correct, it must satisfy other conditions. Therefore, besides the art of discovering and creating combinations there is also an art or science of criticism of combinations.

Emanuel Lasker

I offer several studies, in each of which the main variation of the solution is indicated. Check it, and where necessary provide explanatory comments. Find the defect in the composer’s idea (refutation or secondary solution), which is present in every example. Such work resembles the analysis of games you have played.
E 3-8. 1 c7 ♕d6+ 2 ♕b5 a6+ 3 ♕c5 ♕xd3 4 ♕b4 a5+ 5 ♕c4 ♕d1 6 ♕b3 ♕c1 7 a3 h4 8 c8♕ ♕xc8 – stalemate.

E 3-9. 1 g7 ♕a1+ 2 ♕h2 ♕a8 3 ♕g6 ♕c5 4 ♕f8 ♕xf8 5 g8♕ ♕d6+ 6 ♕h1 ♕xg8 – stalemate.

E 3-10. 1 ♕g3 ♕c7+ 2 ♕h3 ♕g3 3 ♕b3 ♕xh4 4 g4+ ♕xg5 5 ♕d2.

E 3-11. 1 ♕c1 e4 2 e8♕ ♕xe8 3 ♕xg3 e3 4 ♕f4 exd2+ 5 ♕xd2 ♕e5 6 c4.

E 3-12. 1 ♕b3 ♕g7 2 ♕c3 ♕e1 3 ♕c4 ♕xh8 4 ♕e2 ♕g7 5 ♕d2 ♕g2 6 ♕f1 ♕f6 7 ♕e2 ♕e5 8 ♕f2 ♕d4 9 ♕g1 ♕e3 10 ♕h2 ♕f2 11 ♕xg2 ♕xg2 – stalemate.

E 3-13. 1 ♕d4 b3 2 ♕xb3 ♕f3 3 ♕a1 ♕f1+ 4 ♕c2 ♕xa1 5 ♕b3 a2 6 ♕h4 ♕g2 7 ♕g5 ♕h3 8 ♕h6 ♕g4 9 ♕g7.

E 3-14. 1 ♕a2 b3 2 e6 bxa2 3 e7 ♕d7 4 ♕e2 ♕e8 5 exf8♕+ ♕xf8 6 ♕g6+ hxg6 7 hxg6 ♕h8 8 ♕h2 ♕g8 9 ♕e2.
E 3-15. 1 h5 gxh5 2 e5 fxe5 3 ∘xc5 ∘xc5 4 d4 ∘d6 5 dxe5 ∘b8 6 f5 ∘b5 7 f6.

E 3-16. 1 ∘a4+ ∘b3 2 ∘xa5 ∘h7+ 3 ∘a6 ∘d5 4 ∘xd5 ∘c7 5 ∘b8+ ∘c4 6 ∘bd8 c1caffold 7 ∘b6 ∘b4 8 ∘b5+ ∘c4 9 ∘bd5.

E 3-17. 1 ∘d1 ∘ce3 2 ∘xe1 ∘xe1+ 3 ∘f2 ∘ge3 4 ∘b2 ∘f5 5 ∘a2 ∘f4 6 g3+ ∘g4 7 ∘b2 ∘h3 8 ∘d2 ∘h2 9 ∘a2 ∘h3 10 ∘d2 ∘g4 11 ∘a2 ∘f5 12 ∘b2 ∘e5 13 ∘a2 ∘d4 14 ∘a4+ ∘c5 15 ∘a2 ∘c4 16 ∘b2 ∘c3 17 ∘a2 ∘b4 18 ∘b2+ ∘a4 19 ∘a2+ ∘b3 20 ∘d2.

E 3-18. 1 ∘e8 d3 2 a3 d2 3 ∘c7+ ∘a7 4 ∘b5+ ∘b6 5 ∘c3 ∘c6 6 ∘d8.

E 3-19. 1 ∘b8 ∘c4 2 ∘xc8 ∘xc8 3 g6 b3 4 gxh7 b2 5 hxg8 scaffold b1 scaffold 6 h7.

E 3-20. 1 ∘e4 ∘c8 2 ∘h3 ∘b2+ 3 ∘g5 ∘f5 4 ∘h1+ ∘d2 5 ∘h2+ ∘c3 6 ∘c2+ ∘b4 7 ∘xf5 exf5 8 ∘b7 ∘c3 9 ∘c5 ∘c4 10 ∘c1 ∘d4 11 ∘h4.

E 3-21. 1 ∘g5+ ∘h2 2 ∘d6+ ∘h1 3 ∘b4 ∘d5+ 4 ∘xd5 d2 5 ∘xd2 ∘xf5 6 g8 scaffold ∘e7+ 7 ∘e6 ∘xg8 8 ∘f3.
Solutions to Exercises


It is clear that White has seen the variation 57...<br>58...<br>59 e7 and wins.<br>57 ...<br>58 ...<br>59 ...<br>60 e7 ...<br>61 would have been decisive.<br>58 ...<br>59 ...<br>60 ...<br>61 <br>62 ...<br>63 ...<br>64 ...<br>65 ...<br>


Black's position is completely hopeless, but he managed to set a clever trap.<br>30 ...<br>After the natural reply 31 ...<br>32 ...<br>33 ...<br>34 ...<br>

Yusupov saw through his opponent's idea, chose 31 ...<br>and won easily: 31...<br>32 ...<br>33 ...<br>34 ...


There followed 1 ...<br>2 ...<br>and a draw was agreed in view of 2 ...<br>3 ...<br>4 ...

Marta Litinskaya had a possibility that was more dangerous to her opponent.<br>1 ...<br>White would have had to find the only defence:<br>2 ...<br>3 ...<br>But not 3 ...<br>4 ...<br>and Black wins. However, Nana Alexandria saw this variation during the game.


51...h3? 52 ...<br>Now after 52 ...<br>

the bishop takes control of f3, an important square for future 'forks'. Also incorrect was the game continuation 52 ...<br>53 ...<br>54 ...<br>55 ...<br>56 ...<br>57 ...<br>58 ...<br>59 ...

One only route for the knight would have enabled White to gain a draw:

52 ...<br>53 ...<br>54 ...<br>55 ...

E 1-5. Dolmatov – Bareev (Sochi 1988).

* An asterisk signifies that the position was reached in analysis, but not in the game itself.
43 ... \( \text{Ke8!} \)
44 \( \text{Kf7} \) \( \text{Ke8!} \)

44... \( \text{Kd8!} \) is equally good.

45 \( \text{Kxg7} \) \( \text{Kc3} \)

The rook can also be moved to the 1st or 2nd rank. Now \( \text{Kg6} \) will always be answered by a check from the rear.

Bad is 44... \( \text{b4?} \) 45 \( \text{Kxg7} \) \( \text{Kf8} \) 46 \( \text{Kf6} \) \( \text{Kb6} \) 47 \( \text{Kd7} \) \( \text{Kg8} \) 48 \( \text{Kd8+ Kh7} \) 49 \( \text{Kf7} \), or 45... \( \text{Kb6} \) 46 \( \text{Kf6} \) \( \text{Kd8} \) 47 \( \text{Kxg7} \) (47 \( \text{Kd7+} \) is also strong, only not 47 \( \text{Kg8+?} \) \( \text{Kc7} \) 48 \( \text{Kf7} \) \( \text{Kxe6} \) 49 \( \text{Kxe6 b3} \) 47... \( \text{b3} \) 48 \( \text{Kf7} \). Black loses if he moves his king to the other side, but it is not so easy to calculate this variation exactly.

43... \( \text{Kg8?} \) 44 \( \text{e7} \) (threatening 45 \( \text{Kd1} \) \( \text{Kh7} \) 46 \( \text{Kd8} \) 44... \( \text{b4} \) 45 \( \text{Kg6!} \) (again 46 \( \text{Kd1} \) is threatened) 45... \( \text{Kb6+} \) 46 \( \text{Kd7} \) \( \text{Kb7}+ \) 47 \( \text{Kd6} \) \( \text{Kb8} \) 48 \( \text{e5!} \) \( \text{b3} \) 49 \( \text{e6} \). Now 50 \( \text{Kf8+} \) \( \text{Kxf8} \) 51 \( \text{exf8} \) \( \text{Kf8} \) 52 \( \text{Kd7} \) \( \text{b2} \) 53 \( \text{e7+} \) and 54 \( \text{e5} \) is threatened. Neither 49... \( \text{Kc7} \) 50 \( \text{Kf8} \) nor 49... \( \text{b2} \) 50 \( \text{Kb1} \) and 51 \( \text{Kxb2} \) is any help. There only remains 49... \( \text{g5} \), hoping for 50 \( \text{Kf8+?} \) \( \text{Kxf8} \) 51 \( \text{exf8} \) \( \text{Kf8} \) 52 \( \text{Kd7} \) \( \text{b2} \) 53 \( \text{e7+} \) \( \text{Kg7} \) 54 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{b1} \), but White wins easily by 50 \( \text{Kc7!} \) \( \text{Ka8} \) 51 \( \text{Kd1} \).

E 1-6. Romanishin – Yusupov (47th USSR Championship, Minsk 1979).*

Black must play for mate.

55 ...
56 \( \text{a7} \)
56... \( \text{Kf3}! \)

But not 56... \( \text{Kf3?} \) 57 \( \text{Kc6} \) \( \text{Kf3} \) 58 \( \text{Ke8} \) \( \text{Kb8} \) \( \text{Kb8} \) 57 \( \text{Kb8} \) \( \text{Kb2!} \) 57... \( \text{Kb2} \) 58 \( \text{b3?} \) \( \text{Kb3} \).

After 57... \( \text{Kd2?} \) White would have been able to defend: 58 \( \text{Kb3!} \) \( \text{Kxd8} \) 59 \( \text{Kb8} \) \( \text{Kd2} \) 60 \( \text{Kf8+} \) \( \text{Kxg3} \) 61 \( \text{Kf3+!} \) \( \text{Kxf3} \) 62 \( \text{a8} \) \( \text{Kf3} \) 62 \( \text{a8} \) 63 \( \text{Kg3} \) \( \text{Kg3} \) 64 \( \text{Kd3} \) \( \text{Kd3} \) with a draw.

58 ... \( \text{Kb3} \) 58... \( \text{Kb3} \) or 58... \( \text{Kb1} \) would not have changed anything.

58 ...
58... \( \text{Kg3} \)

White is powerless against the threats of

59... \( \text{Ke1} \) mate and 59... \( \text{Kd2} \) mate.


By playing 39... \( \text{f4?} \) Black missed a win. The game concluded: 40 \( \text{Kf8} \) \( \text{Kd5} \) 41 \( \text{Kf3!} \)

Draw agreed in view of 41... \( \text{Kxf3} \) 42 \( \text{Kf7+} \) \( \text{Kg4} \) 43 \( \text{Kd7+} \).

39... \( \text{c3?} \) is unconvincing: 40 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{dxc3} \) 41 \( \text{Kb1} \).

If 39... \( \text{Kd5} \), then 40 \( \text{dxc4?} \) \( \text{bxc4} \) 41 \( \text{Kxc4} \) \( \text{d3} \) will not do, but there is the simple 40 \( \text{Kd2} \).

Black must include his king in the attack.

39 ...
40 \( \text{Kf8} \)

Totally bad is 40 \( \text{dxc4?} \) \( \text{Kd3} \) 41 \( \text{Kg1} \) \( \text{Kg2} \) 42 \( \text{Kf1} \) \( \text{Kf2} \).

40 ...
40 ... \( \text{Kf6} \)

White’s position is critical. 41... \( \text{Kf3} \) is threatened. However, it is not at all easy to demonstrate a win.

41 \( \text{Kg1} \).

An interesting defensive idea was suggested by Joël Lautier: 41 \( \text{Kc5?!} \) \( \text{Kd3} \) (after 41... \( \text{Kd5} \) 42 \( \text{f3+} \) \( \text{Kd3} \) 43 \( \text{Kf7!} \) White even wins, while 42... \( \text{Kd5} \) 43 \( \text{Kxd5} \) \( \text{Kd2} \) leads to a drawn ending) 42 \( \text{f3} \) with the idea of 43 \( \text{Kd4} \). Black nevertheless wins by continuing 42... \( \text{cxg3} \) 43 \( \text{cxd3} \) \( \text{Kb3} \) 44 \( \text{Kxc6} \) (44 \( \text{Kxf5+} \) \( \text{Kh2} \)
does not help) 44...\[\text{Qxd3+} \text{Qe3+} 45 \text{Qe1 We3+} 46 \text{Qf1} (46 \text{Qd1} d3 47 \text{Qxh6+ Qg2})
46...\text{Qxh2} 47 \text{Qxh6+ Qxg3} 48 \text{Qd6+ f4} 49 \text{Qe4+ Qxf3} 50 \text{Qxg5+ Qg3}.
41...\text{Qh3}. 41...\text{Qf3}? is no less strong, e.g.
42 \text{bxc3 dx} 43 \text{Qf1 f4} 44 \text{Qxf4 gxf4} 45 \text{Qg7+}, and now either 45...\text{Qh3}
46 \text{Qe3?} b4! 47 axb4 a3 48 \text{Qg2 Qxg2}
49 \text{Qxg2+ Qh4}, or simply 45...\text{Qh5!} with the threat of 46...\text{Qg6+}.
42 \text{Qf1 b4}! 42...\text{Qg2?!} does not work:
43 \text{Qg7 b4} 44 axb4! (44 dxc4? b3 45 cxb3
\text{Qxf1} 46 \text{Qxf1 d3}) 44...c3 45 bxc3 a3
46 cxd4 \text{Qxf1} (46...a2 47 d5!) 47 \text{Qxf1 a2}
48 \text{Qa7!} (but not 48 d5? \text{Qa6} 49 \text{Qa1}
\text{Qa4}) 48...\text{Qd5} 49 \text{Qe2} \text{Qg2} 50 \text{Qd2}.
43 dxc4. Interesting is 43 axb4 c3 44 bxc3
a3 45 cxd4 a2 46 d5 \text{Qxd5} 47 \text{Qg7} \text{Qa8!}
(threatening 47...\text{Qc6}) 48 b5 (48 \text{Qe3} f4)
48...a1 \text{Qw} 49 \text{Qxa1} \text{Qd5} and wins.
43...\text{Qh5!} (intending 44...\text{Qe4}). Also possible
is 43...b3 44 cxb3 \text{Qg2} (with the threat of
45...\text{Qxf1} 46 \text{Qxf1 d3}) 45 \text{Qc5 axb3}.
44 f3 (44 \text{Qh8 Qe2!}) 44...\text{bxa3} 45 \text{bxa3}
\text{Qxf3}, and Black has a decisive advantage.

Neither 44 \text{Qc7? Qb6}, nor 44 \text{Qa8? Qe7}
45 \text{Qe8 Qf5} (or 45...\text{Qd7}) achieves any-
thing. Dolmatov decided the outcome with an
elegant combination.
44 \text{Qb7!} \text{Qb6}
44...\text{Qe6} 45 \text{Qxd5 Qxd4+} 46 \text{Qe4 Qe6}
47 \text{Qe5}.
45 \text{Qxd5!} \text{Qxd5}
45...\text{Qxd5} 46 \text{Qxd5 Qxd5} 47 \text{Qe4}.
46 \text{Qe4}.
Now 46...\text{Qb6} 47 \text{Qxd5} is bad, while if
46...\text{Qf6+} White wins by 47 \text{Qe5}!
The game concluded: 46...\text{Qd7} 47 \text{Qxd5}
\text{f5+} 48 \text{gxf6+ \text{Qxf6} 49 \text{Qc4 g5} 50 \text{f5}}
\text{Qg4 51 \text{Qe6 g3} 52 \text{Qf3} (52 \text{Qxd7? g2} 53 \text{Qe8}
\text{Qxd4+})} 52...\text{Qb6} 53 \text{Qf7+ Qg5 54 Qg7+}
\text{Qh6} (54...\text{Qf6} 55 \text{Qg6+ Qe7} 56 \text{f6+ \text{Qxe6}}
57 \text{f7+}) 55 \text{Qg4 Qd5 56 \text{Qxg3 Qe7}
57 \text{Qe4 Qb6 58 b3 Qb8 59 d5. Black}
resigns.

White is threatening to attack the d4 pawn by
\text{Qb3}. Black must seek counterplay.
28 ... \text{Qb6!}
Now after 29 \text{Qb3} Black has 29...\text{Qb5}. If
29 a4, then not 29...a5? (in view of 30 \text{Qb3}
or 30 bxa5+), but 29...\text{Qd6!} 30 \text{Qxd4 Qxd4}
31 \text{Qxd4 a5!}
The game went 29 \text{g4 Qe3} 30 \text{Qxd4 Qxd4}
31 \text{Qxd4 Qxg4+}. Black has maintained
material equality – three pawns for a knight.
And although his position is still markedly
worse, he has the right to hope for a draw,
in view of the small number of pawns remaining
on the board.
32 \text{Qg3 (32 \text{Qf3?!})} 32...\text{h5} (32...\text{Qe5}
33 \text{Qf5 \text{Qb5!} came into consideration)
33 \text{Qc4+ Qc7 34 Qf5?! (34 \text{Qf4! was}
stronger) 34...g6 35 \text{Qf3 Qxe3 36 Qxe3}
\text{Qd6} 37 \text{Qf4 f6} 38 \text{Qe4 b6}, and soon the
players agreed a draw.
The reader will of course have noticed that
all of the last four exercises the solution
involved energetic actions by the king. We
encountered this technique while examin-
ing the Akhmylovskaya–Alexandria ending.
By immediately analysing a few more
examples on the same theme, you can
consolidate anew the knowledge gained,
and develop your skill in using the tech-
nique in question.

E 1-10. Chiburdanidze – Watson (Brus-
se 1987).
Black lost the game with 60...\text{Qe7??} If he had
retained the distant opposition by
60...\text{f7?}, the position would have re-
mained drawn.
But before this the Women’s World Champ-
ion missed a win by playing 57 \text{Qf3??}
Both 57 \text{g4!} and 57 \text{Qe3!} would have won.
Looking through a magazine, where this
ending was printed without any commentary, I immediately noticed the mistakes made by the two players. I am sure that the readers too will cope no less easily with this problem – it was not in vain that we studied the ending to the game Romanishin–Dvoretsky.


48 ... h3!
49 b6 h2
50 b7 h1
51 b8 w+ h7

Black is threatening 52...wxa+ 53 b3 wb2+ and 54...wxb8. If 52 w7 or 52 c5 he wins by 52...wd5+ 53 b1 wb3+ 54 c1 g5 mate. Finally, if the queen retreats down the b-file, the knight is lost, e.g. 52 wb5 wa1+ 53 b3 wb2(b3)+ 54 a4 wd4+ and 55 wa7.

A strong false trail (using the terminology of chess composers) is 48...fd8? It would be justified after 49 cc6? h3 50 xd8 h2 51 b6 (51 d7 h1 and 52...wd5+) 51...h1 52 b7 wd5+ 53 b2 wd4+! and 54...wb6 (but not 53...wd6 54 cc6).

However, White saves the game with 49 cc8!! when two variations are possible: 1) 49...h3 50 b6 xb6 51 xb6 52 52f6 52d5 (or 53 dd7+) 53...e8 54 xf6+ cd8 55 cd4; 2) 49...e8 50 b6 (weaker is 50 f6 g5! 51 d7 h3 52 b6 h2 53 b7 h1 54 b8 wb5 cd5+ 50...xb6 51 cd6 e8 52 a4! (52 f6? g5) 52...h3 53 a5 h2 54 a6 h1 55 a7, and the extra queen does not provide a win.

E 1-12. Knezevic – Dubinsky (Moscow 1973).*

The most natural move is 1 cd4, and this is what White should play, were it not for stalemate! 1 cd4? g4! 2 h4 (2 h4 2 hxg4 cd4 3 cd6+ cf5) 2...xa6!!

Nevertheless, transferring the king to the queenside is the correct plan, only it must be carried out more accurately.

1 cd3!

(1 cd2 is also good). For those who wish to be convinced that White wins, I will give some sample variations.

1...h4 (1...g4 2 h4; 1...xa3+ 2 cd4 cd4 3 cd5+ and 4 a5) 2 gxh4! gxh4 3 cd4 cd4 4 cd4 cd4 5 cd6!? (5 cd5 is also strong) 5...f5 6 cd6 cd4+ 7 cd4+ cd3 8 cd3+ h2 9 cd3 cd1+ 10 cd5 cd8 11 a7 cd1 12 cd6 cd6 13 cd7 cd4+ 14 cd6 cd8 15 cd5! cd1 16 cd4, and the king picks up the h4 pawn.

An additional puzzle: would 14 cd6 (instead of cd4) have thrown away the win?
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No, it would not! After 14 cd6 cd7 15 cd7 cd3 it is essential immediately to restrict the mobility of the black king: 16 cd7 cd7 17 cd5 h3 18 ef4 cd1 19 cd2 h2 20 cd7 or, if you like playing ‘cat and mouse’, 20 cd3. On the other hand, the natural move 16 cd5? would be a serious mistake in view of 16...g2 17 ef4 h3 18 cd4 cd1 19 cd4 cd3, or 17 cd7+ cd2 18 cd7 cd3 19 cd4 cd3 20 cd3 cd2! (20...h2? 21 cd7+ cd3 22 cd2) 21 cd2 (21 cd7+ cd3) 21...h2 22 cd7+ cd1.
Black sealed his move. The clearest way to draw involves transposing into a type of opposite-colour bishop ending with which we are already familiar.

49 ... e4!
50 Qd4+
50 Qg5+ does not change anything.
50 ... exd4
51 Qxd4 e3+!
52 c3
d2
53 f4 d1
54 h5 e2
55 g5 f7!
56 g6 cannot be allowed.
56 h4 d1
57 g5 e6!
58 g6 f5
However, Black's position also proved defensible after the waiting move 49...c2?! sealed by Kovacevic, and he gained a draw.

It is not worth winning a second pawn at the cost of allowing the exchange of rooks. After 44...d4? 45 f3 Qxe3+ (45...dxe3 46 Qxe4 e2 47 Qd1) 46 Qxe3 dxe3 the ending is most probably drawn.
Undermining the opponent's pawn chain is much stronger.

44 ... g5!!
After 45 fxg5 Qxg4 or 45 f3 gxf4 46 exf4 Qd6 Black increases his material advantage, while keeping the rooks on.
The game concluded: 45 c3 Qd4 46 Qd3 Qb6 47 Qc2 gxf4 48 Qxa3 Qxe3+ 49 Qxe3 fxe3! (in this version the rooks can now be exchanged) 50 a4 h6 51 h4 Qf8 52 g5 hxg5 53 hxg5 Qe7 54 Qh7 e5 55 g6 fxg6 56 Qxg6 e4 57 a5 Qc5. White resigns.

White does not achieve anything with the by-pass by his king: 54 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 55 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 56 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 57 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 58 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}4 \) (58...e4 is also possible) 59 \( \text{cx}d4 \) \( \text{ex}d4 \) 60 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \). He must try f3–f4 or c2–c4.

The first of these can be calculated without difficulty. 54 f4 e4 55 c4 (if 55 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 56 \( \text{c}4 \) there follows 56...e3! 57 \( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{dxc}4 \), but not 56...\( \text{dxc}4 \) 57 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 58 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 59 \( \text{xe}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 60 f5 and wins) 55...\( \text{dxc}4 \) 56 \( \text{xe}4 \) (56 \( \text{d}4 \) e3! 56...\( \text{g}8 \) 57 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{f}8 \) 58 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 59 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 60 f5 h5 61 \( \text{gx}h5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \), and the draw is obvious.

54 \( \text{d}3! \) \( \text{g}8 \)
55 \( \text{c}4 \)

Now both 55...\( \text{d}4 \) 56 f4 and 55...\( \text{dxc}4+ \) 56 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 57 \( \text{e}7 \) 58 \( \text{xe}5 \) are bad for Black, but he finds a saving resource.

55 ... \( \text{e}4+!! \)
56 \( \text{fxe}4 \) \( \text{dxc}4+ \)
57 \( \text{xc}4 \) \( \text{f}8 \)
58 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{e}7 \)

Now the advance of the e-pawn leads only to stalemate, but the attempt to by-pass with the king from the left must also be checked.

59 \( \text{c}6 \)

If 59 \( \text{c}5 \) Black replies 59...\( \text{d}7! \), but not 59...\( \text{e}6? \) 60 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 61 \( \text{c}7 \) when he ends up in zugzwang: 61...\( \text{f}6 \) 62 \( \text{d}6; \) 61...\( \text{e}6 \) 62 \( \text{d}8; \) 61...\( \text{e}8 \) 62 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 63 \( \text{e}6 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 64 \( \text{e}5. \)

59 ... \( \text{e}6! \)
60 \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{e}7 \)
61 \( \text{e}5 \)

To seize the opposition White has to waste his very important reserve tempo, after which he can no longer win.

61 ... \( \text{e}8! \)
62 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{d}8 \)
63 \( \text{e}6 \) \( \text{e}8 \)

The conclusion: Lev Psakhis was completely right. He did not see all these variations, but he intuitively avoided forcing events, retained a positional advantage, and gradually converted it into a win.

E 1-16. Dvoretsky — Ivanchuk (USSR Championship First League, Minsk 1976).*

It stands to reason that 47...\( \text{g}2?? \) will not do because of 48 \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{g}1\# \) 49 \( \text{h}6+ \). Black also loses after 47...\( \text{g}5? \) 48 \( \text{h}6+ \) (but not 48 a7? \( \text{g}2 \) 49 \( \text{a}8\# \) 50 \( \text{h}6+ \) \( \text{g}3 \)), 48...\( \text{g}4 \) 49 a7 (not 49 \( \text{h}1? \) \( \text{g}2 \) 50 \( \text{a}1 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 51 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{c}8! \)) 49...\( \text{g}8 \) (49...\( \text{g}2 \) 50 \( \text{a}8\# \) 51 \( \text{c}8+ \)), and now either 50 \( \text{g}6+ \) \( \text{g}xg6 \) 51 \( \text{a}8\# \) 52 \( \text{c}8+ \) \( \text{g}3 \) (52...\( \text{h}4 \) 53 \( \text{h}8+ \) 54 \( \text{c}7+ \) etc., or 50 \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{a}8 \) (50...\( \text{e}8+ \) 51 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{a}8 \) 52 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 53 \( \text{b}7 \) 51 \( \text{e}6+ \) \( \text{h}3 \) 52 \( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 53 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{c}8 \) 54 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{h}2 \) 55 \( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{h}8 \) (or 55...\( \text{a}8 \) 56 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{g}1\# \) 57 \( \text{a}1 \) \( \text{g}1 \) 58 \( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{c}8 \) and wins.

Usually in rook endings, as was pointed out long ago by Tarrasch, the rook should be placed behind a passed pawn — your own, in order to support its advance, or the opponent’s, in order to stop it in the best way. We have already placed the rook behind the black pawn; now let us try transferring it to the rear of the a-pawn.

47...\( \text{f}1 \) (47...\( \text{f}2 \) is of equal merit) 48 \( \text{h}6+ \) \( \text{g}5 \) (48...\( \text{g}4 \) 49 \( \text{g}6+ \) and 50 \( \text{d}5) \) 49 \( \text{h}7 \) \( \text{a}1 \) 50 \( \text{g}7+ \) \( \text{h}4 \) 51 a7 (51 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{xa}6 \) 52 \( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{a}5+ \) and 53...\( \text{g}5 \)) 51...\( \text{h}3 \) 52 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{g}2 \) 53 \( \text{c}6 \) \( \text{a}3 \), and White cannot strengthen his position. 54 \( \text{b}7 \) \( \text{xb}3+ \) is not possible, while after 54 \( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{xa}7 \) the rook cannot be taken, since the black pawn queens with check; 55 \( \text{g}xg2 \) \( \text{g}xg2 \) is also insufficient for a win.

Even so, 47...\( \text{f}1? \) does not save the game — it is merely a false trail. White’s play can be improved by an unexpected rook manoeuvre: 48 \( \text{h}6+ \) \( \text{g}5 \) 49 \( \text{h}8\# \) \( \text{a}1 \) 50 \( \text{a}8\# \). He is threatening 51 a7. 50...\( \text{g}2 \) is met by 51 \( \text{g}8+ \), while if 50...\( \text{g}4 \) 51 a7 \( \text{g}2 \) 52 \( \text{g}8(\text{h}8)+ \) and 53 \( \text{a}8\# \). If instead 50...\( \text{f}6 \), then 51 \( \text{g}8 \) \( \text{xa}6 \) 52 \( \text{d}5! \) and wins.
Only a rook move 'against the rules' – to the 8th rank, enables Black to save the game.

47 ... $\text{h}8!!
48 $\text{h}6+$ $\text{g}4!!
48...$\text{g}5? leads to the loss of a decisive tempo: 49 $\text{h}7$ $\text{g}4$ 50 $\text{g}7+$ $\text{h}3$
51 $\text{d}5$ $\text{c}8$ 52 a7 $\text{g}2$ 53 $\text{d}6$ $\text{h}2$
54 $\text{d}7$ and 55 $\text{c}6$, and White wins.

49 $\text{g}6+$ $\text{h}3$
50 $\text{d}5$ $\text{c}8$!
51 $\text{d}6$ $\text{g}2$
52 $\text{d}7$

Black has to go into the ending with queen against knight and pawn which arises by force.

57 ... $\text{h}4$
57...$\text{g}4$ is equally good.

58 $\text{a}6+$ $\text{g}4$
59 $\text{x}g7!$ $\text{h}3$!

Of course, not 59...$\text{x}g7$? 60 $\text{f}6$. Also bad is 59...$\text{f}6$? 60 $\text{x}f6$ – the white knight is better placed at g7 than at e8.

60 $\text{x}e8$ $\text{h}2$
61 $\text{f}6$ $\text{h}1$#
62 $\text{f}7$ $\text{h}5+$!

Incorrect is 62...$\text{h}8$? (or 62...$\text{h}6$?)
63 $\text{f}6+$ $\text{g}5$ 64 $\text{f}8$# $\text{xf}8$ 65 $\text{h}7$+.

Also, nothing is achieved by 62...$\text{a}1$+?
63 $\text{e}6$ $\text{a}6+$ 64 $\text{e}7$ $\text{a}3+$ 65 $\text{f}6$! $\text{f}8$
66 $\text{g}7$ with the threat of 67 $\text{e}6$.

Now Black must: (a) stop the f-pawn; (b) not allow the knight onto a square from which it controls the pawn's queening square; (c) gain time for the approach of his king. A difficult, but realisable problem.

63 $\text{f}6$ $\text{g}5+$
64 $\text{e}6$ $\text{f}5+$
65 $\text{e}7$


White's only chance is the sacrifice of his knight at g7. This cannot be prevented, and

52 ... $\text{b}8$!

The white rook is not on the 7th rank, so that 53 a7 $\text{a}8$ leads to a draw. The immediate 52...$\text{a}8$? would have lost to 53 $\text{c}7$.

53 $\text{c}6$ $\text{xb}3$
54 a7 $\text{a}3$
55 $\text{b}7$ $\text{b}3+$
56 $\text{b}6$ $\text{xb}6+$
57 $\text{xb}6$ $\text{g}1$#
58 a8$\text{w}$

The queen ending is drawn – the king cannot hide from the checks.

65 ... $\text{e}5+$!

After 65...$\text{c}5+$ 66 $\text{f}6$!, in order to avoid the manœuvre $\text{e}8$–g7–e6 Black has to
repeat moves: 66...♔g5+ 67 ♕e6 ♕f5+ and after 68 ♕e7 nevertheless give a check from e5.

66 ♕d8!
Bad is 66 ♕f8 ♕g5 67 ♕g8 ♕e6 68 ♕g7 (if 68 ♕c7 or 68 ♕g7 Black wins by 68...♕c4) 68...♕g6+ 69 ♕f8 ♕h7 with the threat of 70...♕g6.

66 ... ♕g5+!
The king must be forced to take away the d7 square from its knight. The hasty 66...♕c5? would not do in view of 67 ♕f6+ and 68 ♕d7.

67 ♕d7 ♕c5!
68 ♕d6
Black has achieved his aim – the knight is now as far away as possible from 8. However, White did not have any choice. After 68 ♕c7 or 68 ♕g7 Black wins by 68...♕f8, while if 68 ♕f6+, then 68...♕f5 69 ♕h7 ♕d5+ 70 ♕e7 ♕e6+ 71 ♕f8 ♕g6.

68 ... ♕f2!
69 ♕e7 ♕e3+
70 ♕d7
Nothing is changed by 70 ♕f8 ♕g5 71 ♕g8 ♕e6 or 70 ♕f6 ♕g5+ 71 ♕e6 ♕f4.

70 ... ♕f4
71 ♕e8 ♕e5+
72 ♕f8
72 ♕d7 ♕f6 73 ♕e8 ♕e6+ 74 ♕f8 ♕g5.

72 ... ♕g5
Of course, not 72...♕xd6?? 73 ♕g8(7) with a draw.

73 ♕g8 ♕e6
74 ♕g7 ♕g6+
75 ♕h8 ♕xd6
And Black wins.

Now about how the adjournment session proceeded. After 62...♕h5+ there followed 63 ♕e6 ♕f5+ 64 ♕e7 ♕c5+.

Why? After all, this last check is inaccurate! Nevertheless I advised Artur to play this on purely practical grounds. There was no risk involved – after the best reply 65 ♕f6 Black can return to the same position by giving a check at g5. But the opponent might also choose 65 ♕d6, and then there follows 65...♕e5+, when the process of converting the advantage is speeded up, and Black is able to save time and effort (when there is a severe tournament schedule, this should not be disregarded). Besides, suppose that in the interval between moves 66 and 71 a mistake had crept into our home analysis (with a limited time between the round and the resumption, there is never a 100% certainty that the analysis is error-free). Some may find Black's decision unappealing, but I should like remind them that chess is not only an art, but also a sport, and a struggle for victory both in an individual game, and in an entire event. When fighting for victory, it is not sensible to disregard 'trifles' such as husbanding your strength, playing more safely, and so on.

65 ♕d6?! ♕e5+ 66 ♕f8 ♕g5 67 ♕g8 ♕e6 68 ♕h7 ♕g6+ 69 ♕h8 ♕xd6 70 ♕h7 ♕g6+ 71 ♕h8 ♕f6+ 72 ♕g8 ♕g6 73 ♕f8 ♕e6+ 74 ♕h8 ♕h3+. White resigns.

Both players were suffering from the same optical illusion: they thought that after 29 h4 it was not possible to take on h4 – the white rook would eliminate both pawns. But this is not so – the black king comes to their aid in time.

29 ... h4? gxf4!
30 ♕h5 f6!
31 ♕xh4
31 ... ♕g6
The next move will be 32...♕xd6. White faces a difficult struggle for a draw.
The game went: 29...♕g7? 30 hgx5 ♕xg5!
31 ♕xg5 hxg5 32 c4 ♕xd6 33 ♕d2 ♕e5
34 ♕e3 a6 35 a3 b5 36 cxb5 axb5 37 b3 ♕d5. Draw.
advance of the f-pawn does not succeed, e.g. 45 \( \text{Bb}6? \text{Bxb}4 \text{ 46 f5 gxf5 47 gxf5} \) (threatening 48 \( \text{Bb}7+ \text{Ke}8 49 \text{Kf6} \) 47...\( \text{Bd}4! \) 48 \( \text{Bxb}5 \) (48 \( \text{Bb}7+ \text{Ke}7 \) 48...\( \text{f6}+?! \) 49 exf6+ \( \text{Ke}7 \) 50 \( \text{Bb}7+ \text{Ke}8 \), and the position is drawn in spite of White’s two extra pawns. Or 45 f5? \text{gxf5} 46 \text{gxf5} \text{Bxb}4 (46...\( \text{Be}4!?) \) 47 \( \text{f6}+ \text{Ke}8 \) 48 \( \text{Bb}6 \) \text{Bb}1 49 \( \text{Bb}8+ \text{Ke}7 \) with a draw.

Matters are decided by a king manoeuvre, resembling the one with which I concluded my game against Smyslov.

45 \( \text{Bf6!!} \) \text{Bxb}4

46 \( \text{Kh}6! \)

There is no satisfactory defence against the threat of 47 \( \text{g}7 \). If 46...\( \text{Ke}8 \), then 47 \( \text{e}6 \).

The game concluded: 46...\( \text{e}8 \) 47 \( \text{g}7 \) \text{g}5 48 \( \text{f5} \) \text{Bxh4} 49 \( \text{Bxh7} \) \text{Be}4 50 \( \text{e}6 \) \text{g}4 51 \( \text{Bf}6 \). Black resigns.


The initial desire – to take the opposition – proves wrong in view of a pawn breakthrough: 1...\( \text{d}7? \) 2 \( \text{e}5 \text{fxe5} 3 \text{g}5 \text{hxg5} 4 \text{f6!} \text{e}8 5 \text{fxg7} \text{f}7 6 \text{h}6 \text{g}4 7 \text{e}4. Mutual zugzwang! With White to move it would be a draw, but it is now Black’s turn to move, and he loses after 7...\( \text{g}8 8 \text{f}5 \) with the threats of 9 \( \text{g}6 \) and 9 \( \text{g}x \text{g}4 \).

Then, perhaps 1...\( \text{e}7 \) No, this too is a mistake. The e7 square is mined, and it can be occupied only after White plays \( e4-e5 \).

1...\( \text{e}7? \) 2 \( \text{e}5! \text{fxe5} 3 \text{exe5} \text{f}7 4 \text{f6!} \text{gxf6+} 5 \text{e}5 \), and White’s seizure of the opposition decides the outcome.

1 ... \( \text{e}8! \)

2 \( \text{e}6 \) \( \text{f}8 \)

3 \( \text{e}5 \)

In the variation 3 \( \text{g}5 \text{hxg5} 4 \text{h}6 \text{gxh6} 5 \text{xf6} \text{g}4 6 \text{e}5 \text{g}3 7 \text{e}6 \text{g}2 8 \text{e}7+ \text{e}8 9 \text{e}6 \text{g}1 \text{w} \) White is one tempo short.

3 ... \( \text{fxe5} \)

4 \( \text{exe5} \) \( \text{e}7! \)

The position is drawn.
E 2-5. H. Neustadt (1898)
The composer's solution of the study involves playing for the opposition.
1 \textit{d}4 \textit{c}6
2 \textit{c}4 \textit{d}6
3 \textit{b}5!

The opposition can be exploited only by means of a by-pass. Here the by-pass looks risky, but it nevertheless proves possible, taking into account the variation 3...\textit{e}5 4 \textit{c}6 \textit{f}4 (4...\textit{h}5 5 \textit{gxh}5 \textit{xf}5 6 \textit{d}5) 5 \textit{d}6 \textit{xg}4 6 \textit{e}6.
3 ... \textit{d}5!
4 \textit{b}6!

White can again seize the opposition, by making use of his reserve tempo \textit{h}4–\textit{h}5, but first he needs to lure the enemy king into a bad position – as far away as possible from the g4 pawn.
4 ... \textit{d}6
5 \textit{b}7 \textit{d}7

Now is the time!
6 \textit{h}5! \textit{d}6
7 \textit{e}8

A new by-pass.
7 ... \textit{e}5
8 \textit{d}7 \textit{f}4
9 \textit{e}6

In 1968, practising the calculation of variations (for this aim, pawn endings are very useful), I discovered a second solution to the study, based on quite different logic.

The d5 square is a key one (with White's king at d5 and Black's at d7, h4–h5 wins).

Incidentally, with the white pawn already at h5 the occupation of d5 is no longer decisive, since the key squares are those on the 6th rank: c6, d6 and e6. The conclusion: a change in the pawn structure usually leads also to a change in the system of key squares peculiar to the position, and also, however, to the system of corresponding squares.

With the white king at f4 Black has to reckon with the threat of g4–g5. It can be parried by placing the king at e7 (but not f7, since then the white king occupies the key square d5).

We immediately obtain two pairs of corresponding squares: f4–e7 and e4–d6. Next to them White has two equivalent squares: f3 and e3, but Black has only one — d7. The winning mechanism becomes clear — triangulation!
1 \textit{f}4!

The immediate 1 \textit{f}3 is possible, but not 1 \textit{e}3? \textit{e}5! 2 \textit{f}3 h5 3 \textit{g}3 \textit{e}4, and White is in zugzwang.

1 ... \textit{e}7
2 \textit{f}3 \textit{d}7
3 \textit{e}3! \textit{d}6

3...\textit{e}7 4 \textit{f}4! \textit{f}7 5 \textit{e}4 \textit{e}7 6 \textit{d}5 \textit{d}7 7 \textit{h}5.

4 \textit{e}4! \textit{c}6
5 \textit{f}4 \textit{d}6
6 \textit{g}5


It is dangerous to delay the transition into a pawn ending. If 1...\textit{f}4? there follows 2 \textit{c}2+! (but not 2 \textit{e}2 \textit{xd}7 3 \textit{xd}7? \textit{xd}7 4 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}7! 5 \textit{xe}4 \textit{e}6) 2...\textit{xd}7.

3 \textit{c}5 \textit{g}8 4 \textit{e}2, and White has the advantage in the rook ending.

1 ... \textit{xd}7!
2 \textit{xd}7

2 \textit{c}2+ \textit{d}6 3 \textit{c}5 \textit{e}6 4 \textit{c}6+ \textit{d}6 is not dangerous for Black.

2 ... \textit{xd}7
3 \textit{f}4! \textit{g}4!

Bad is 3...\textit{gx}f4? 4 \textit{f}3 \textit{e}6 5 \textit{xf}4 \textit{f}6 6 \textit{g}3, when White creates an outside passed pawn.

4 \textit{g}3! \textit{gxh}3!!

4...\textit{hxg}3+? loses after 5 \textit{gx} \textit{gx} 3 \textit{g}3 6 \textit{hxh}3 \textit{e}6 7 \textit{h}4 \textit{d}5 8 \textit{h}5! (there is a pair of mined squares: g5–e4) 8...\textit{d}4 9 \textit{g}6! \textit{e}4 10 \textit{g}5.

5 \textit{gxh}4 \textit{e}6
6 \textit{g}3 \textit{f}6
7 \textit{h}5

Or 7 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}6 with a draw.
7 ... $g7
8 $xh3 $h7
9 $g3 $g7

The squares h4 and h6 are mined. White has no win, since bad is 10 $f3 $h6 11 $e3? $xh5 12 $d4 $h4! 13 $d5 $g3 14 $e5 $g4.

E 2-7. Nedeljkovic – Zatulovskaya (Women's Olympiad, Split 1963).*

52 ... $xh3!
53 $xe3 $b6
54 $d3 $a5
55 $c4 $xa4
56 $c5 $b3
57 $xc6 $c4
58 $d6 $d4
59 $e6 $e3
60 $xf6
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If 61 $g6 the simplest is 61...$xf3
62 $xg5 $xe4 63 $f6 $d4 64 $g5 $e4.
Also possible is 61...$g3 62 $xg5 $hxh3
63 $f5 (63 $f4 $g3l) 63...$g3 64 $g5 $h3
65 $g6 $h2 66 $g7 $h1 67 $g8+$ $xf3.

61 ... $g3
62 $xe5 $xh3
63 $f4 $xg4

The position is drawn – the pawns queen simultaneously.

The pawn palisade prevents Black’s king from taking part in the play. He has to operate with his bishop alone.

Let us first see what happened in the game. 5...$g3 6 $b2 $c6 7 $c2 $f7 8 $d2 $d7
9 $e2 $e6 10 $e1 $c4 11 $d2 $e7
12 $e2 $e6 13 $f1 $f5 14 $e2 $xe4
15 $xe4 $f6 16 $e1 (of course, not 16 $f3? $g4+ 17 $xg3 $e2). Soon the players agreed a draw.

The fortress constructed by White could have been destroyed. 5...$g3? was a mistake. As in the Chernin–Petursson ending, the plan for storming the fortress is based on zugzwang.

60 ... $f4!!
The crux of the ending, which Black had to foresee when deciding the question of the exchange of the last pieces. 60...$xf3? loses to 61 $xe6! $g3 62 $f5 $xh3
63 e5 $g3 64 $e6 $h3 65 $h2 66 $e8+$ $h1
67 $e3+! $h2 68 $e5+, when the exchange of queens is inevitable.

61 $e6

Hopeless is 10 $fxg4 $hxg4 11 $e2 $f5 12 $xf5
$f6 or 12...$e4.

10 ... $f5!
11 $f2 $f6

see next diagram
This is the zugzwang position that should have been found by Black. 12 fxg4 hxg4 is still bad. If 12 g2, then 12...fxe4 13 fxe4 e2. Finally, 12 e2 is met by 12...fxe4 13 dxe4 d3+ 14 exd3 xf3 15 e3 xe4. ‘Sometimes one little chink in a pawn barrier is sufficient for the position to collapse’ (V.Hort, V.Jansa).


42 h3?
43 cxd3
44 h2

The immediate 44...h5 is also possible.

45 d7
46 h7+ g4!

In the game Black went wrong: 46 g6?, and after 47 h8 c6 48 g8+ h5 49 h3! h6 50 xg2 he was forced to resign.

47 h8
48 h5

49 h6 g5

White cannot strengthen his position.

E 2-10. Dolmatov – Kupreichik (47th USSR Championship, Minsk 1979).*
The most natural moves do not win:

59...xg2? 60 h5 b7 61 f5 c7 62 h6 d7 63 h7 h2 64 g6 e7 65 g7 g2+ 66 h8 with a draw, but not 66 h6? f7 67 h8=+ f6.

59...b7? 60 h5 c7 61 h6! d7 62 h7 b8 63 g5 e7 64 g6.

It is necessary to interpose a check:

59...
60 g5

Nothing is changed by 60 e5 xg2. Equally hopeless is 60 g3 f1 (or 60...g8).

60...
61 f2+!

61...
62 g5
63 h5
64 h6
65 g6
66 g7
67 h8
68 h7
69 g8

Or 69...a2 70 h8+ f6.

E 2-11. Ferry – Villeneuve (French Championship 1985).*

1...
2 c5
2 b7 e8 and 3...e5; 2 c3 e5.

2...

Incorrect is 2...e5? 3 b3 xxc5 4 b4 c1 5 b5 e5 6 b7.

3 d3

If 3 b7 or 3 c6, then 3...e5.

3...
4 c4 e6
5 b5
5 c6 ♖d6 6 ♖b5 ♖e5+ or 6...♖e1.

5 ... ♖d7
6 ♖c6+ ♖c8

And Black wins easily, e.g. 7 ♖a6 ♖e1 8 ♖b5 ♖c1 9 ♖a6 ♖b8 10 ♖b5 ♖c2.
The hasty 1...♖e8? throws away the win:
2 ♖d3 (2 ♖c3 is also possible) 2...♖d8+ 3 ♖c3 ♖e4 4 ♖b4 ♖e5 5 ♖c5l (5 ♖c5l is bad in view of 5...♖d1l) 5...♖c8+ 6 ♖b5 ♖d6 7 ♖b7 and 8 ♖b6.

Tarrasch's famous rule states: 'Place your rook to the rear of a passed pawn, irrespective of whether it is yours or the opponent's'.

According to this rule the black rook should not be allowed to the rear of the a-pawn: 54 ♖g3? ♖b3 and 55...♖a3 with a draw. White has to choose between 54 ♖e3 followed by ♖a3, and 54 a5, intending ♖a4. The second possibility looks more attractive (it is advantageous to advance the pawn as far as possible), the question is whether or not it can be refuted.

54 a5 ♖b3 (54...♖a7 55 ♖a4 is hopeless) 55 ♖e4 ♖x3 56 a6. Things appear to be bad for Black.

overlooked the splendid reply 56...♖e6!! It transpires that 57 a7? is not possible in view of 57...g5+! 58 ♖h5 ♕f7 with inevitable mate. I had to agree to a draw after 57 g5 fxg5+ 58 ♖xg5 ♕f8.

It follows that White should have chosen the more modest continuation.

54 ♖e3! ♖a7
55 ♖a3 ♖a5!

There is no need to ask here whether White's advantage is sufficient for a win. By the method of elimination it has been established that all the same he has nothing better.

E 2-13. (A position reached in one of the lines of analysis of the Dvoretsky–Kupreichik ending just examined).

Where should the king go? Or more precisely, where shouldn't it go?
1...♖f7? is most easily rejected. After 2 ♖b4 there is no defense against 3 ♖c5. If 1...♖e7 or 1...♖d7, then after 2 ♖b4 Black has 2...♖d6, e.g. 3 ♖c4 ♖c6 4 ♖b3 ♖b1+ 5 ♖a3 ♖e1 and there is no win.

But how should Black reply to 2 ♖a6? Obviously, 2...♖e1. Here a difference can be noticed: with the king at ♖d7 White wins by 3 ♖c5 ♖e4 4 ♖d6+! and 5 ♖d4.

1 ... ♖e7!!

The only saving move. After 2 ♖b4 ♖d6 or 2 ♖a6 ♖e1 Black gains a draw.


37 ... g5!
38 fxg5 hxg5

The one pawn at g5 restrains two enemy pawns. Black retains real winning chances. But in the game he did not play this. Why? White's previous move was a blunder: 37 g4? (instead of the correct 37 h4). I did not react to my opponent's mistake and continued the plan outlined earlier of an offensive on the queenside. This is the explanation, but, of course, not a justifica-
tion. A player must be extremely attentive and make use of any chance, even one that turns up accidentally. The game concluded: 37...a4? 38 h4 a3 39 c2 b4 (39...f4!?) 40 cb4+ xb4 41 g6! d5 42 g5 c4 43 b1 d4 44 a1 e4 45 f5. Draw.

Using zugzwang, Black wants to break through with his bishop or king into the opponent's position: White must prevent this. The main pair of squares of mutual zugzwang for the bishops are f2–f6. As is easily established, the squares f2–f8 and d2–f8 also correspond to one another.

59 c1!! f8
59...g7 60 e3.
60 d2!
60 e3? e7 61 f2 f6.
60 ... e7 61 e1 d8
62 g3! f6
63 f2

By choosing each time the corresponding square for his bishop, White gains a draw. This system of defence was pointed out by Yusupov.

Now let us see what happened in the game.
59 d2? (also bad is 59 g3? f8
60 h3 e7 61 f2 f6) 59...f8!
60 e1 (60 e3 e7 61 f2 f6)
60...g7 61 c3 (61 f2 f6) 61...f6
62 g3 (62 b2 h4). Now nothing is achieved by 62...h4+ 63 f3 when all the invasion squares are covered. The simplest way to win was 62...e7 63 d2 (63 h3 h4 or 63 b2 h4+ 64 f3 e1) 63...h4+ 64 f3 f1 65 e3 h4.
62...b3?! 63 a1 g7 64 b2 f8
65 c1 e7 (Black reverts to the correct plan) 66 d2 h4+ 67 f3 (67 h3 f2 68 c3 e3 69 g3 c1) 67...f6
68 e3 h4 69 f2+ h3 70 e3 h4
71 d2 h2 72 c3 g1 73 d2 f2
74 c1 f1! 75 b2 e1 (75...h4 76 c3 e1 was also good) 76 a1 (76 e3 g2, winning the f-pawn) 76...d2 77 g3 e2 78 h4 xf4 79 h5 d2 80 g6 f4. White resigns.

E 2-16. Botvinnik – Gligoric (Olympiad, Tel Aviv 1964).*
White loses quickly after 60 c2 c1! (zugzwang) 61 a4(d1) d4 62 g5 (otherwise Black will play his bishop to g5) 62...hxg5 63 h6 d3 64 h7 b2.
In his notes to the game Mikhail Botvinnik claims that 60 a4! leads to a draw in view of 60...c1 61 c2! d4 62 g5! hxg5 63 h6 b2 64 h7. However, Black can play more accurately. He needs to advance his king immediately – before the bishop has occupied c2.

60 a4 d4!
Threatening b4–e7–g5.
61 g5 hxg5
62 h6 g4+
The only way! A draw results from 62...d3?
63 b5+ or 62...c3? 63 c2! g4+
64 e2 g3 65 h7.
63 xg4
63 e2 e4.
63 ... c3!
64 b5 a4!
But not 64...c5 65 d3 a4? 66 f3 a3 67 b1.
65 f3 a3
66 h7 c5
The a-pawn promotes to a queen.

It is not possible to put White in zugzwang. The only plan that promises chances of success is the usual one in such positions – a pawn breakthrough on the queenside with the aim of creating a second passed pawn. If Black prepares the breakthrough with the help of his king, the white bishop has time to take control of b5. For example, 1...d2 2 g4 d3 3 e2+ c3 4 g2 b4
5 h1 a5 6...g4 a6 7 bxa6...xa6 8 d7
and 9...b5 with an obvious draw.

The manoeuvre of the bishop to b8 must be
tried.

1 ... f6
2 g4 d8
3 e2 c7
4 g4 b8
5 h5!

5 d1! is equally good, but 5 e2? would
be a serious mistake: 5...a5 6 bxa6 a7!
(zugzwang) 7 h5 b5 8 cxb5 c4 followed by
...c4-c3 and ...d2 (remember the prin-
ciple of one diagonal).

5 ... a5
6 bxa6 b5!

6...a7 7 a8.

7 cxb5 a7
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8 b6!!

Remember: nuances of the position are
more important than pawns! White frees the
b5 square for his bishop. He loses after the
automatic 8...e2? b6! 9 c4 d4:

a) 10 a2 c4 11 xf2 d3+ 12 f3
(12 e1 c3) 12...c3 13 b3 c2 14 xc2+
xc2 15 e4 c3 16 f5 c4 17 c6 c5;

b) 10 e2 c4 11 xf2 c3 12 e1 (12 d1
d3+ 13 f3 c2 — see the previous
variation) 12...e3 13 d1 d3 14 e2+
c2 and 15...b2.

8 ...
9 e2
10 b5!
11 e2!

11 xf2? c4+ 12 f3 c3.

11 ...
12 ...
12 b5? b3.

12 ...
13 f3
c3
14 e4
d2
15 d3
c5
16 b1
c2
17 xc2
c2
18 f5
d3
19 e6
c4
20 a7

E 2-18. Steinberg – Dvoretsky (Minsk
1965)*

Black has a choice between 48...hxg4 (with
the threat of 49...g3), picking up then a
second pawn, 48...fxg6 with one extra
pawn, and finally, 48...h4 – here after
49 gxf7 White retains material equality.

In endings with opposite-colour bishops,
extra pawns influence only weakly the
evaluation of the position. That is also the
case here – 48...hxg4? is a bad move,
leading to a quick draw: 49 d1 g3 50 f3
fxg6 (or 50...fxg6) 51 b3 f6 52 c2
e5 53 d3 f4 54 g2 f6 55 e2, and White has set up an impregnable
fortress.

Calculating 48...fxg6?! is not at all easy. The
variation is analysed in the game com-
mentary.

But with equal material, Black wins quickly.

48 ...
49 gxf7

49 b2 h3 50 d1 fxg6 51 c3 f6
52 d3 e5 53 f4 54 e2 g3, and
White is in zugzwang.

49 ...

xf7
50 e5!?
The variation 50 b2 f6 51 c3 e5 52 d3 h3 53 d1 f4 is very simple.
50 ... c1+!!
But not 50...dxe5? 51 c2.
51 a2
51 b3 h3.
51 ... g6!
And White is clearly too late. An excellent example of the principle 'positional nuances are more important than material'.


23 ... h4!
The stronger side's pawns should occupy squares of the colour of the opponent's bishop! Black prevents White from consolidating his position by 22 h4 and intends 24...f6 followed by ...g7–g5 and ...f5–f4.
The game concluded: 24 a5 b5 a6 f6 26 d1 b8 27 a5 g5 28 d2 b4 29 a4 b3 30 a3 b2 31 c3 f4! White resigns.

White does not win by either 40 c4? h6 41 f5 (41 e4 xf4 42 xh7 xh2) 41...e3, or 40 h3? h5! (40...h6? 41 g8) 41 h4 h6 42 f5 (42 f7 xh4 43 xh5 g3) 42...e3 and 43...f2.

40 h4!!
If now 40...h6, then 41 e4(g8) xh4 42 xh7 followed by xh4, and the white king goes to the kingside.

40 ... h5
41 x3 f5
42 x4!
Weaker is 42 xh5 xe7, and if 43 g6?, then 43...xh5 44 xf5 g3 with a draw.
42 ... e7
43 xd4 xh4
44 x5!
Black can resign, which he did after 44... f2 45 c6 h4 46 xf5 h3 47 g6 g3 48 f5 d6 49 f6 e5 50 f7 e7 51 c7.

1 h3? is hopeless: 1...f4 2 h4 xex4 3 xhx5 d4 4 g5 c3 or 4...a4.
1 f3! h4
1...g6 2 g3.
2 e5! dxe5
3 d6 e4+
After 3...f6 4 g4 e6 5 xh4 xd6 White saves himself by 6 g4! e6 7 g5! We are already familiar with this defensive idea from the Dvoretsky–Nikitin ending in the chapter on transposing into a pawn endgame (p. 97).

4 xex4 f6
5 d5! h3
6 c6 h2
7 d7 h1+ 
8 c7
Black cannot win.

E 2-22. Yusupov – Ionov (Podolsk 1977).* On the queenside there is a pawn breakthrough (a2–a4 and then c4–c5), but before carrying it out White must divert the black king as far away as possible from the queenside.

In his time the first world champion Wilhelm Steinitz expressed a paradoxical idea: pawns are best placed on their initial squares. In the endgame it is useful to have a choice between advancing a pawn one square or two. It is especially important to have such a choice in pawn endings, where we often encounter situations of mutual zugzwang.
The careless 51 a3? throws away the win. Black in turn goes wrong if he replies 51...f7? After 52 f5 e7 (otherwise 53 e6) 53 g6 f6 54 a4 a position of mutual zugzwang, the basic one of this endgame, is reached. Here it is Black to move and he loses: 54...g5 c5! – see the main variation. In it White wins by a single tempo, and therefore it is clear that with the king at f8 the pawn breakthrough no longer works.
The correct defence is 51...\(\text{e7!}\) 52 \(\text{g5}\) (52 \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{f7!}\)) 52...\(\text{f8!}\) 53 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{g8}\) 54 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{f8}\). Now the breakthrough does not work, and it is not possible to give Black the move – the position is drawn.

51 \(\text{f4!}\) \(\text{e7}\)

In the event of 51...\(\text{g6}\) 52 \(\text{h6}\) \(\text{g5+}\), White wins by 53 \(\text{e3!}\) \(\text{g6}\) 54 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{hx6}\) 55 \(\text{c5!}\) \(\text{bxc5}\) (55...\(\text{dxc5}\) 56 \(\text{a5}\) \(\text{bxa5}\) 57 \(\text{b6}\) \(\text{cxb6}\) 58 \(\text{d6}\) 56 \(\text{a5}\) \(\text{c4}\) 57 \(\text{a6}\) \(\text{bxa6}\) 58 \(\text{bxa6}\) \(\text{c3}\) 59 \(\text{a7}\) \(\text{c2}\) 60 \(\text{d2}\). The king at \(\text{e3}\) was ideally placed – in one move it could stop either of Black's passed pawns.

52 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{f8}\)

If 52...\(\text{f7}\), then 53 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{e7}\) 54 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{f8}\) 55 \(\text{a4}\) \(\text{g8}\) 56 \(\text{c5!}\)

53 \(\text{g6}\) \(\text{g8}\)
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After occupying \(\text{g6}\) with his king, White can chose to move his pawn one square or two, depending on the position of the enemy king.

62 \(\text{h6}\) \(\text{a3}\)
63 \(\text{h7}\) \(\text{a2}\)
64 \(\text{d8}\) \(\text{wx}\) \(\text{a2}\)
65 \(\text{h8}\) \(\text{a1}\)

(Analysis by Yusupov and Dvoretsky).


Bad are both 1 \(\text{f2?}\) \(\text{xe5}\), and 1 \(\text{h6?}\) \(\text{e3}\) 2 \(\text{h7}\) (2 \(\text{e6}\) \(\text{f2}\); 2 \(\text{b7}\) \(\text{xb7}\) 2...2 3 \(\text{hx8}\) \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{w}\) \(\text{h6+}\) \(\text{e2}\), when the checks come to an end.

1 \(\text{e6!}\) \(\text{fxe6}\)
2 \(\text{h6}\) \(\text{e3}\)
3 \(\text{b7!}\)

3 \(\text{h7?}\) loses after 3...2 4 \(\text{h8}\) \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{w}\) \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{h6+}\) \(\text{w}\) \(\text{c3+}\) \(\text{d4}\) 5...\(\text{d3}\) 6 \(\text{wxe6}\) \(\text{w}\) \(\text{e1+}\) ! 7 \(\text{f4}\) (7 \(\text{g4}\) \(\text{f3+}\) ! 8 \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{g4+}\)) 7...\(\text{we3+}\) 8 \(\text{e5}\) \(\text{wd4+}\) 9 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{d5+}\).

3 ... \(\text{xb7}\)

3...2 4 \(\text{b6}\) \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{w}\) \(\text{f5}\) \(\text{b6+}\), and 5...\(\text{d3}\)? is not possible because of 6 \(\text{w}\) \(\text{b5+}\).

4 \(\text{h7}\) \(\text{f2}\)
5 \(\text{h8}\) \(\text{f1}\)

Now both 6 \(\text{h6+}\) \(\text{d3}\) 7 \(\text{wxe6}\) and 6 \(\text{w}\) \(\text{e5+}\) \(\text{e4}\) 7 \(\text{w}\) \(\text{c5+}\) are sufficient for a draw.

A player is obliged to see all intermediate moves!


It appears that White simply does not have time to win the bishop for the c-pawn. But the alternative 58 \(\text{g7}\) is also cheerless – it will be hard to oppose Black's plan of taking his king to the queenside. The conclusion of the game confirmed this evaluation.

58 \(\text{g7}\) \(\text{f6!}\) 59 \(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{d4}\) (threatening 60...\(\text{d3}\) etc.) 60 \(\text{c5}\) \(\text{xc5}\) 61 \(\text{f6}\). In the event of the more tenacious 61 \(\text{g7}\) ! \(\text{d3}\) 62 \(\text{exe6}\) it is hopeless to play 62...\(\text{e3}\) 63 \(\text{d8}\) \(\text{c4}\) 64 \(\text{c6}\) or 62...\(\text{e4}\) 63 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{e4}\) (63...\(\text{f2}\) 64 \(\text{exe4}\) 64 \(\text{xf3}\) \(\text{xa4}\) 65 \(\text{d2}\) \(\text{b4}\) 66 \(\text{e2}\) with a draw. As shown by K. Müller, Black wins by 62...\(\text{e7}\) 63 \(\text{f2}\) \(\text{e4}\) 64 \(\text{c7}\) \(\text{h4}\) 65 \(\text{f1}\) \(\text{d4}\) 66 \(\text{b5}\) \(\text{d4}\) 67 \(\text{c6}\) \(\text{d6}\) \(\text{b4}\) 68 \(\text{d5}\) \(\text{f6}\) 69 \(\text{f2}\) \(\text{a4}\) 70 \(\text{xf3}\) \(\text{b3}\).
61...d4 62 d7 d5 63 e1 d4 64 d2 c4 65 b8 c5 66 d7+ b4 67 b8 xa4 68 c6 b6 69 e5 f2 70 e2 b3 71 f3 a4 72 d2+ b4. White resigns.

In difficult positions even the seemingly most desperate attempts should not be rejected. In the resulting forcing play White may perhaps lose, but also perhaps not. It is essential to check the variations carefully.

58 c5! g3
59 c6 h4
60 c7 xc7
61 xc7 h3
62 d5+ d4

If 62...e4, then 63 f6+, intending h5–g3.

63 e7! h2
63...e4 does not achieve anything after 64 g1!

64 f5+ c4
65 g3 b4
66 f2 xa4
67 xf3 b3
68 g2 a4
69 e2

The knight has arrived just in time: if 69...a3 there follows 70 c1+. The following moves are well known in endgame theory.

69 ... b2
70 f4! c3!!

70...a3 71 d3+.

71 e2+? is incorrect: 71...d2! (but not 71...b2? 72 f4) 72 d4 a3 73 b3+ c2, and Black wins.

71 ... b3
72 f4! a3
73 d3


42 f6 suggests itself, intending 43...g5 and with the following drawing variation in mind: 43 c5 a3 44 b2 a5 45 c2 e7. However, after 43 b2!! and only then 44 c5 Black is unable to stop the pawn. In reply to 42...e7, again 43 b2!! is decisive.

Black also ends up in a difficult position after 42...a3 43 b2 a8(a7) 44 b3. His king is cut off from the passed pawn, whereas the white king is supporting its advance.

In the event of 42...e3, 43 b2 is now too late on account of 43...e5. On the other hand, 43 c5! is strong; 43...a3 (43...e5? 44 c6) 44 d7+ f6 45 c6, and White should win.

By the method of elimination I arrived at the only correct move.

42 ... e5!!

This temporary pawn sacrifice seems risky, but in fact it is fairly logical – Black is aiming to activate his kingside pawn majority as soon as possible. He is not afraid of either 43 fxe5 e6, or 43 d5 f2+! 44 c3 exf4 45 xf5+ e6 46 xf4 xh2.

43 c5 a3!

There is no time for 43...exf4? in view of 44 c6.
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44 b2?!
dangerous move 44 c6!, found by grandmaster Joël Lautier. Black does not have time for 44...exf4 or 44...e4 in view of the threat of 45 c7 #a8 46 d8. Lautier gave these variations:

44...#a5 45 b3 #c5 46 c2.
44...#a6 45 d6 (again threatening 46 c7) 45...#a5 46 exe5 #exe5 47 b3 #e7 (47...g5 48 b4 e2 49 b5) 48 d7+ #f6 49 b4 #e2 50 c7 #c2 51 b5 with an easy win.

However, Black can defend more tenaciously:

44...#a8!? 45 d7! (nothing is achieved by either 45 fx5 #e6 46 b3 #c8 47 c2 #exe5 48 b4 d6 49 b5 b8+ 50 #a6 #c7, or 45 b3 exe4 46 fx4 #c8 47 c2 #e6) 45...#e6 46 #xg7 exe4 (after 46...#c8 47 c7 h5 48 #c3 the black rook is really too passively placed: 48...e4 49 d6 50 #g5 #xc7 51 #xf5, or 48...exe4 49 #f4 #d5 50 #b4 #c6 51 c4 #b7 52 d5 b6 53 #c7 47 #d7+! #c6 50 #d8 #a2+ 51 b3 #xc7 52 #xa2 #xd8 53 #b3) 49 #xh7 #xf4 50 d3, and it would seem that White should win.

44...#a7! 45 b3! (a draw results from 45 fx5 #e6 46 b3 #c7 47 c2 #d5 or 46 #d6+ #xe5 47 d7 #a6 48 c7 #c6+ and 49...g5) 45...e4! (but not 45...#e6? 46 b4 e4 47 b5 #a3 48 #c2, and not 45...#c7? 46 c2 exe4 47 #f4 #e7 48 #b4 #d8 49 #c5) 46 #c4 #e7! 47 #b5 #a3 48 d7+ (48 #c2 #d8; 48 c7 #c3 49 b6 #b3+ 50 #a7 #c3 51 #b7 #b3+ 52 #c8 e3 53 #d5 g6 54 #e5+ #f7) 48...#e6 49 #xg7 e3 50 #g8 #c3 51 #e6+ #d6 52 b4 #xc6 53 #exe3 #c2, and the game should most probably end in a draw.

44 ... #a5!

Weaker is 44...#a7 45 #d5! exe4 46 fx4 #e6 (46...g6 47 b3) 47 #d6+! #e7 48 b3(c3) with advantage to White. But now after 45 #d5 exf4 46 #f4 #e6 47 #d6+ #e7 White does not have time to support the c5 pawn with his king. And in the event of 47 #e5+ #f6, 48 b3 is pointless in view of 48...g5!, while if 48 c6 both 48...#a7 and 48...#xe5 lead to a draw. There only remains 48 h4, but then 48...#a4 49 b3 #xf4 50 c6 #xe5 (perhaps Black also does not lose after 50...#f1 51 #c5 #b1+ 52 #c4 #b8 53 c7 #c8 54 #d5 #g6! followed by 55...#h5) 51 c7 #xh4 52 c8# #g4, and Black should gain a draw. Let us see how the game concluded.

45 c6 #b5+ 46 #a3 #c5 47 #d6 e4! 48 #b4 #c1 49 #d7+ (49 #b5 e3) 49...#f6 50 #d6+ #e7 51 #d7+ #f6 52 #d6+ #e7 53 #d7+. Draw.


Black wins easily with his pawn at h7. With the support of his king he advances his f-pawn to the second rank, and then in the resulting position of mutual zugzwang the decisive role is played by the possibility of choosing between a single- and double-move of the h7 pawn. But if Black's rook's pawn has already moved from its initial square, such positions are usually drawn. The winning plan given
above no longer works, e.g. 61 \( g3 \ f4+ 62 \ f3 \ f5 \ 63 \ e2 \ e4 64 \ f2 \ f3 \) (or 64...h5 65 \ e2 \ f3+ 66 \ f2 \ f4 67 \ f1!) 65 \ e1! \ e3 66 \ f1 \ h5 (66...f2 67 \ e3 67 \ e1 \ f2+ 68 \ f1 \ f3 69 \ h3! We see the correspondence between the square on the first rank to which the king should move, and the h-pawn. With the pawn at h6 or h4 the king should go to e1, and with the pawn at h5 it should go to f1.

The only idea, capable in such cases of bringing Black success, was in fact carried out in the game.

61 \( g3 \) h5! 62 \( f3 \) (as will become clear from what follows, if 62 \( g2 \) Black should play 62...\( f4! \), while if 62 \( f2 \) \( g4! \) 63 \( e3 \) \( h3 \) or 63 \( g2 \) h4) 62...h4 63 \( g2 \) \( g4! \) 64 \( f2 \) \( f4 \) 65 \( e2 \) \( e4 \).
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66 \( f2 \) \( d3!! \) (a very pretty by-pass, first found by the well-known expert on pawn endings Ilya Maizelis) 67 \( f3 \) \( h3! \) White resigned in view of 68 \( f4 \) \( e2 \) 69 \( xf5 \) \( f3! \) (a 'shoulder-charge') or 68 \( f2 \) \( d2 \) 69 \( f3 \) (69 \( f1 \) \( e3 \) 69...\( e1 \). Maizelis also examined the initial position of this ending, and judged it to be won. I succeeded in refuting this conclusion.

(Many years later in one of the American chess magazines I came across an interesting article by grandmaster Benko. It turned out that in Rio de Janeiro he had been Sunye Neto's second. In his analysis of the adjourned position Rafael Vaganian did not find the way to save the game for White, whereas Pal Benko, a well-known study composer, found it. So that the priority in refuting Maizelis's conclusion belongs to Benko.)

Note that after Black's 65th move a position of mutual zugzwang was reached. Had it been him to move, he would have been unable to win. From this we can draw a general conclusion about the corresponding squares in this ending. If the black king appears on the fourth rank with the pawn at h4 or h6, in reply the white king must take the opposition. With the pawn at h5, on the other hand, the opposition must not be taken.

This means that neither 61 \( g2? \) \( g4! \) nor 61 \( f2? \) \( f4! \) will do. What happens after 61 \( g3? \) we have already seen.

61 \( e2! \) \( g4 \)

After 61...\( f4 \) 62 \( f2 \) White is alright — he has taken the opposition with the pawn at h6. There can follow 62...h5 63 \( e2 \) \( e4 \) 64 \( f2 \) h4 (with the pawn at h5, the by-pass 64...\( d3 \) does not work) 65 \( e2 \) with a draw. If 61...h5, then 62 \( e3 \) or 62 \( f1 \).

62 \( e3! \) h5
62...h3 63 \( f4 \).
63 \( f2 \)

With the pawn at h5, White has succeeded in conceding the opposition to his opponent.

63 ... \( f4 \)
64 \( e2 \) \( e4 \)
65 \( f2 \) h4
66 \( e2 \)

The aim is achieved: in this position of mutual zugzwang it is Black to move.
E 2-27. Monin – Faibisovich (Leningrad 1965).”

It seems incredible that great subtleties can be concealed in such a seemingly simple position. However, the analysis of it proved to be one of the most complicated that I have ever done. The main difficulty resulted from a lack of clear reference-points – positions by which one could be guided during analysis. It would seem that I did nevertheless manage to discover these, but by no means straight away. Even now I do not see any clear system in the variations given below – everything rests on concrete analytical subtleties. I would not be surprised if some attentive reader discovers a ‘hole’ in the author’s arguments.

However, the initial steps in the study of the position are arrived at comparatively easily. 1 a6? (or 1 c3?) is completely bad in view of 1...e5 and 2...xe6. If 1 g6? Black wins by 1...g4! 2 e2 e5 3 f3 xe6 4 g3 f6! (a very important tempo!) and 5...g5. This means that White has to choose between 1 b1 and 1 h7. The second move is good in that it creates the concrete threat of 2 c2 g4 3 f5, whereas with the bishop at b1, 2 c2 is no longer a threat in view of 2...g4. On the other hand, in some cases the e6 pawn can be defended by a2.

Let us look at things in more detail. In reply to 1 b1!, nothing is achieved by 1...e3? 2 f5! f4 (2...g4 3 c2) 3 d3 with the threat of 4 c2. However, 1...c5!! is very strong.

It is important to deprive the white king of the f2 square, which tells, for example, in the variation 2 h7 g4 3 e2 e5 (with the idea of ...xe6), and 4 f2 is not possible. If 2 c2 Black wins by 2...g4, and if 2 a2 with 2...g4 3 e2 e4 followed by g4–g3 and ...f4–g4–h3. 2 e2 e5 3 a2 is slightly more cunning, hoping for the hasty 3...f4? 4 d2! g4 5 e5 (5...e5 6 d5) 6 c4 g3 7 f1. But Black plays 3...e4! 4 b1+ f4 5 a2 g4 6 d3 g3 7 e2 g4! and wins (but, of course, not 7...g2? 8 e1! g1= 9 e6=, which allows White to gain a draw).

Apart from 1...c5!!, Black has another way of strengthening his position that is also not obvious: 1...a3! The b2 pawn is defended – this tells in the variation 2 h7 e5 3 c2 xe6 4 b3 g4. Note should be made of the instructive zugzwang position that arises after 2 e2 e5 3 a2 f4!
If 4 ạ.b1 there follows 4...ạ.c5! (from the analysis of 1...ạ.c5 we know that the march of his king to the b2 pawn saves White only when his bishop is at a2). If 4 ạ.f2 Black again wins by 4...ạ.c5+ 5 ạ.e2 ạ.g4 or 5 ạ.g2 ạ.e3 6 ạ.g3 ạ.d2 7 ạ.g4 ạ.e7 (while the pawn stands at g5, the bishop is able to defend it, while restraining the e6 pawn along the same diagonal). The immediate 4 ạ.d2 is also bad: 4...g4 5 ạ.c2 ạ.g3 6 ạ.d5 ạ.e5 7 ạ.g2 ạ.xe6 – here it is again important that the b2 pawn is defended by the bishop.

Of course, it will have long since become clear to the reader that on the first move the bishop should be placed at h7. Even so, the analysis done was not in vain – the ideas we have found will repeatedly come in useful.

1 ạ.h7!! ạ.c3!

The only possibility of playing for a win.

2 ạ.c2 g4 3 ạ.f5 was threatened, and 1...ạ.e5? 2 ạ.c2 g4 3 ạ.d3 or 1...g4? 2 ạ.e2 ạ.e5 3 ạ.f2 ạ.xe6 4 ạ.g3 would have led to an immediate draw.

2 ạ.b1

If 2...ạ.d6 White replies 3 ạ.g6 or 3 ạ.f5, not fearing 3...g4? in view of 4 ạ.e2 ạ.d4 5 ạ.b1 ạ.e5 6 ạ.a2, and nothing can prevent the king from going to g2, which, with the pawn having incautiously left the g5 square, leads to an obvious draw. Black should play ...g5–g4 only when there is a complete certainty that it leads by force to a win.

But after the inaccurate 3 ạ.h7? ạ.c5! White ends up in zugzwang. I will explain why it is zugzwang here. A won position that is already familiar to us arises after 4 ạ.b1 ạ.d4! Bad is 4 ạ.f5 g4! 5 ạ.e2 ạ.d4 6 ạ.b1 (6 ạ.f2 ạ.e5+ and 7...ạ.xf5) 6...ạ.e5 7 ạ.a2 ạ.f4 (7...ạ.e4!?) 8 ạ.d3 (the black king was threatening to go to h2) 8...g3 9 ạ.e2 ạ.g4! And if 4 ạ.g6 Black wins by 4...g4! 5 ạ.e2 ạ.c4! 6 ạ.f1 (6 ạ.b1 ạ.d5 7 ạ.a2+ ạ.e4 8 ạ.d2 ạ.g3 9 ạ.e2 ạ.f4 10 ạ.f1 ạ.f3 11 ạ.d5+ ạ.g4 12 ạ.a2 ạ.h3) 6...ạ.d5 7 ạ.g2 ạ.xe6 8 ạ.g3 ạ.f6 and 9...ạ.g5.

2...

3 ạ.h7!

The consequences of 3 ạ.g6? g4! and 3 ạ.f5? g4! are already known. But with the bishop at h7 the advance of the g-pawn is not dangerous: 3...g4? 4 ạ.e2 ạ.c4 5 ạ.f1 ạ.d5 6 ạ.g2 ạ.xe6 (6...ạ.d6 7 ạ.e7) 7 ạ.g3.

3...

4 ạ.b1 ạ.b4!

Zugzwang! For the moment the bishop has to remain at b1, so as not to allow the enemy king to go to a2. The white king is deprived of the convenient square d2 and it is forced to move away from the b2 pawn, which gives the black king time to move in the opposite direction, to the centre and to the kingside.

5 ạ.e2 ạ.c4

6 ạ.f3

White has to change his system of defence – since 6 ạ.d1 ạ.d5 7 ạ.a2+ (7 ạ.c2 g4) 7...ạ.d4! 8 ạ.b1 ạ.c5! or 8...ạ.a3! leads to positions that are know to us from the analysis of the 1 ạ.b1?! variation.

6...

7 ạ.a2+ ạ.e5

Objectively stronger is 7...ạ.d4 8 ạ.b1 ạ.e7! (or 8...ạ.e5 9 ạ.a2 ạ.e7!), when
White is in zugzwang. I deliberately indicate a slightly less accurate continuation, in order to demonstrate some further latent subtleties, which otherwise could remain unnoticed.

8 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \)
9 \( \text{f}3 \)

And here is the final zugzwang, for which Black has been aiming. His king now breaks through either on the queenside, or on the kingside.

14 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{e}4! \)
But not 14...\( \text{f}4? \) 15 \( \text{d}2! \) with a draw.
15 \( \text{b}1+ \) \( \text{f}4 \)
16 \( \text{a}2 \) \( \text{g}4 \)
17 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{g}3 \)
18 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{g}4! \)

Let us first see what happened in the game.
76 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 77 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \) (zugzwang: 78 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{e}7 \) is not possible) 78 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}4 \).
Now Black gradually pushes back the enemy king and breaks through to the white pawns.
79 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 80 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{b}6+ \) 81 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{d}4 \)
82 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}3 \) 83 \( \text{e}7 \) \( \text{d}2 \) 84 \( \text{b}4+ \) \( \text{d}1 \)
85 \( \text{c}3 \). If 85 \( \text{e}7 \), then 85...\( \text{e}1 \), stealing through via f1–g1–h2 to h3, in order to attack the h4 pawn.
85...\( \text{d}8 \) 86 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{e}2 \) 87 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{e}3 \)
88 \( \text{c}5+ \) \( \text{e}4 \) 89 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{c}7 \) 90 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
91 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 92 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{e}3 \) 93 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{d}2 \)
94 \( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{e}1+ \) 95 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{f}3 \) 96 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{e}2 \).
White resigns.

Heikki Westerinen lost because he was forced to make way for the opponent's king. Was it not possible to avoid zugzwanzg? With the bishop at g3 the corresponding square for the white bishop is g5, but when Black begins transferring his bishop to d6, White should return to the rear with his bishop.

76 \( \text{e}7! \)

76 \( \text{f}6! \) is also possible, and if 76...\( \text{e}1?! \), then 77 \( \text{d}8! \) (only not 77 \( \text{e}7? \) \( \text{a}5 \) 78 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{d}8 \)). However, the immediate 76 \( \text{d}8? \) is incorrect: 76...\( \text{g}1! \) 77 \( \text{f}6 \) (77 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{c}5 \); 77 \( \text{c}7 \) \( \text{h}2 \) and 78...\( \text{g}3 \)) 77...\( \text{h}2 \) 78 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{g}3 \), and White is in zugzwang.

Now 76...\( \text{g}1 \) is no longer dangerous.

9...\( \text{d}4! \)
10 \( \text{b}1 \) \( \text{d}5 \)
11 \( \text{a}2+ \) \( \text{e}5 \)

The aim has been achieved. Whereas on the fifth move, on account of zugzwang, the white king was forced to move away from the b2 pawn, now for the same reason it has to step back from the g5 pawn, allowing the opponent a decisive tempo for improving the position of his bishop.

12 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{c}5+ \)
13 \( \text{f}3 \)

If 13 \( \text{d}3 \) Black wins by 13...\( \text{g}4 \).
13...\( \text{f}5 \)
77 \textchi_8! \textnht_2 78 \textnht_6 \textht_3 79 \textht_5, and it is Black to move in this zugzwang position. In the event of 76...\textwht_6 White must play 77 \textht_5\texti, intending 78 \textwht_4 (bad, of course, is 77 \textnht_d8? \textnht_3 78 \textht_5 \textht_d5). And if 76...\textnht_b6 there follows 77 \textnht_b4! \textht_c7 78 \textnht_d2 \textnht_d6 79 \textnht_e3 \textnht_e7 80 \textnht_f2 \textnht_d8 81 \textnht_e1 etc.

One gains the impression that this method of defence would have enabled White to save the game. But on one occasion the German grandmaster Philipp Schloesser asked me whether Black could take his king to the opponent's rear by a long way round, by-passing the king at d3. I checked this plan with Artur Yusupov, and we came to the conclusion: yes, he can!

\begin{align*}
76 & \ldots \textht_g3 \\
77 & \textht_g5 \textht_c5 \\
78 & \textht_c3
\end{align*}

Weaker is 78 \textht_e7+ \textht_c6! 79 \textht_g5 \textht_d5.

\begin{align*}
78 & \ldots \textht_e1+ \\
79 & \textht_d3 \textht_f2! \\
80 & \textht_e7+ \\
80 & \textht_c3 \textht_d5 81 \textht_d3 \textht_g3.
\end{align*}

80

In this position it is important for Black to have his bishop on the g1–a7 diagonal, to prevent \textht_d4.

\begin{align*}
81 & \textht_f6 \textht_b4 \\
82 & \textht_e7+ \textht_b3 \\
83 & \textht_f6 \textht_b6!
\end{align*}

83...\textht_a2? is incorrect: 84 \textht_c4 \textht_b1 85 \textht_d5 \textht_c2 86 \textht_e6 \textht_d3 87 \textht_f7 \textht_e4 88 \textht_xg6 \textht_xf4 89 \textht_xh5 with a draw, and so Black plays for zugzwang. White is obliged to lift his control of b2 (if 84 \textht_c3, then 84...\textht_d8 85 \textht_e1 \textht_b2).

\begin{align*}
84 & \textht_g5 \textht_b2 \\
85 & \textht_c4
\end{align*}

Passive defence is completely hopeless – as in the game, the black king breaks through along the first rank to the opponent's pawns.

\begin{align*}
85 & \ldots \textht_c2 \\
86 & \textht_d5 \textht_d3
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
87 & \textht_e6 \textht_e4 \\
88 & \textht_f6 \textht_f3 \\
89 & \textht_xg6 \textht_g4 \\
90 & \textht_e7
\end{align*}

Black's plan is close to fruition. He needs to obtain the zugzwang position with the bishops at g5 and g3, with his opponent to move.

\begin{align*}
90 & \ldots \textht_e3 \\
91 & \textht_d6 \\
91 & \textht_g5 \textht_d2! 92 \textht_h6 \textht_e1 93 \textht_g5 \textht_g3. \\
91 & \ldots \textht_g1!
\end{align*}

Threatening \textht_h2–g3.

\begin{align*}
92 & \textht_e7 \\
93 & \textht_g5 \textht_g3
\end{align*}

White is in zugzwang. The same winning method can also be carried out slightly differently: 90...\textht_g1 91 \textht_g5 (91 \textht_f6 \textht_h2 92 \textht_g5 \textht_g3) 91...\textht_e3! 92 \textht_h6 \textht_f2 93 \textht_g5 \textht_g3.

Not long before this book was published, a letter arrived at the editorial office of the magazine 64 – Shakhmatnoe Obozrenie from A.Buayekhovich, a player from the Moscow Region. He rightly pointed out that Black can carry out the by-passing march of his king in a more convenient way – by first luring the white bishop to e1.

76 \textht_e7! \textht_d4! 77 \textht_b4 (77 \textht_g5 \textht_c5 and
78...\textit{d6}; 77 \textit{d8 \textit{g}1!}) 77...\textit{b6} 78 \textit{c3 \textit{c}5!} Zugzwang! As we already know, with the black bishop at \textit{g}1 White must play his bishop to \textit{f}8 or \textit{g}7, while to ...\textit{d6} he must reply \textit{d2} or \textit{e3}. Alas, now he is not able to retain all these possibilities.

79 \textit{e1 \textit{g}1} 80 \textit{g}3 \textit{c}5 81 \textit{e1 \textit{b}5} (but not 81...\textit{h}2? 82 \textit{f2+ \textit{b}4} 83 \textit{e}3 \textit{c}3 84 \textit{f3 \textit{d}2} 85 \textit{e}3+ \textit{d}3 86 \textit{b}6, or 85...\textit{e}1 86 \textit{g}2 \textit{e}2 87 \textit{c}1 with a draw) 82 \textit{c}3 \textit{e}3 83 \textit{g}3 \textit{b}6 (again zugzwang) 84 \textit{d}3 \textit{g}1! (more accurate than 84...\textit{b}4 85 \textit{e}1+ \textit{b}3 86 \textit{c}3) 85 \textit{e}1 \textit{c}5 86 \textit{g}3 (86 \textit{a}5 \textit{h}2 87 \textit{e}3 \textit{g}3 88 \textit{d}8 \textit{c}4) 86...\textit{b}4 87 \textit{e}1+ \textit{b}3 88 \textit{g}3 (here 88...\textit{c}3 is no longer possible on account of 88...\textit{h}2 89 \textit{e}5 \textit{g}3) 88...\textit{b}2 89 \textit{d}2 \textit{b}6 etc. It can be concluded that the bishop ending is after all won.

E 2-29. Saunina – Semina (Sverdlovsk 1987).

At this point the game was adjourned (for not the first time). The outcome depends upon whether or not the white king can succeed in attacking and eliminating the enemy pawns. As was shown by an analysis carried out by Svetlana Semina together with the author of these lines, Black can successfully oppose the invasion of the king. The main variation of our analysis occurred when the game was resumed.

91 \textit{d5+}

No better is 91 \textit{d7+ \textit{f}8} 92 \textit{d6 \textit{d}1+}! (not 92...\textit{d4+?} 93 \textit{e6 \textit{f}4} 94 \textit{d8+ \textit{g}7} 95 \textit{f6+}) 93 \textit{e6 \textit{g}4+}

91...\textit{f8}

But not 91...\textit{e7}? 92 \textit{e5+ \textit{xe}5 93 \textit{fxe}5 \textit{e}6 94 \textit{c7 \textit{xe}5} (94...\textit{e}7 95 \textit{e}6) 95 \textit{d7} and White wins the pawn ending.

92 \textit{d6} \textit{a6+}

92...\textit{a3+?} is bad because of 93 \textit{c5+}

93 \textit{e5}

93... \textit{e}7+!

In order to prevent the invasion of the king, 93...\textit{e}7 seems to be necessary, but then White wins by 94 \textit{c5+!} (not immediately 94 \textit{f5? \textit{a}1+ 95 \textit{d}4 \textit{a}5+) 94...\textit{d7} 95 \textit{f5 \textit{x}5 96 \textit{c}5+! \textit{e}7 97 \textit{c}5. Also unsuitable is 93...\textit{a1+?} 94 \textit{e}6 \textit{e}1+ 95 \textit{e}5.

94 \textit{f6}

If 94 \textit{e4} Black saves the game by 94...\textit{b2+!} 95 \textit{d4} (95 \textit{e}6 \textit{b}6+) 95...\textit{b5+}.

94... \textit{e}7+

95 \textit{c}6 \textit{e}6+!!

Draw.

Let us suppose that White had managed to find all these variations in her analysis. Then she would possibly have chosen different tactics, more dangerous from the practical point of view – not making an immediate assault, but first manoeuvring, endeavouring to get the opponent away from her home analysis and only then seeking an appropriate moment for invasion. With this aim 92 \textit{c5+?} (instead of 92 \textit{d6}) 92...\textit{f}7 93 \textit{c}7, for example, was good. So that, generally speaking, it is not sufficient for Black to find in analysis a chain of forcing variations – the study of the position should
be continued. But, in view of the limited size of the book, we will place here if not a line, then at least three dots...


56 h5!

This pawn breakthrough leads to a win. In the game Black resigned after 56...a5? 57 b5. But the main variation is, of course, 56...gxh5. I will give (with some corrections) the analysis of Ratinr Kholmov.

56...g6
57...d2!

Completely bad is 57...a1? 58 g4 (58 c2 d1 59 d4+ is simpler – Ken Neat) 58...d1 59 e5+! g4 60 g7 d8 61 f8.

58 f5!
58...d7+? 58...xa6? d8 with the threat of 59...g8.

58...d8!

Other attempts are refuted more quickly:
58...f4 59 g7 e2 60 g3!! xg3 61 d6+;
58...h4 59 g7 d7+ 60 xa6 xg7 61 xg7 h3 62 d6 e3 63 f5;
58...e3 59 xe3 d7+ 60 xa6 e4 61 g7 d8 62 c5 g8 63 g3+ and
64 xh5.

59 g7 e8

60 e4

60 d4 is incorrect: 60...e3!, and after either capture – 61...e4.

60...e3

61 h6!

A draw results from 61 e7? xg7! 62 xg7 h4! 63 f5 h3 64 e5 (64 xe3 h2) 64...e2 (64...e4 65 xe3 xe5 66 xa6 f4 67 f1 f3 is also possible) 65 d4+ e4 66 xe2 xe5 67 g1 d5 (or 67...h2 68 f3+ d5) 68 xh3 c4.

61...xg7+

Hopeless is 61...e2 62 xg8 e1 63 f6 g1+ (63...e3+ 64 c5) 64 b7!

62 xg7 h4

In the event of 62...e2 63 c3 h4 there can follow 64 f5 h3 65 d4+ (or 65 e1 h2 66 g3) 65...f2 66 xe2 h2 67 g3! xg3 68 e5+.

63 f7!!

Black has no defence: 63...g4 64 e5++; 63...f4 64 h6++; 63...e4 64 f6 h3 65 g5+. A chain of variations that is quite difficult to calculate!

We have seen several times that at the very start of an analysis it is important to disclose all the candidate moves for both sides. In this way mistakes can often be avoided, or one’s work significantly shortened.

Grandmaster Dolmatov discovered that by playing 57 b7!! White wins quickly. If 57...d2 there is now 58 c7!, not
allowing the rook to go to d8 (the variation 58...h4 59 g6 h3 60 g7 h2 61 g8\w h1\w 62 g4+ is, of course, completely hopeless). And if 57...\x02a1, then 58 \x02f5! e3 59 \x02xe3 \x02e4 60 g6! The rook does not in fact succeed in joining the battle against the g-pawn – all the lines are controlled by the white pieces.

E 2-31. Dvoretsky – Moiseev (Moscow Championship, 1973).*

The advantage is with White: he can create a passed pawn on the queenside, whereas the opponent can hardly do the same on the other side of the board. However, to find a concrete way to win is not easy.

34 c4+? bxc4+ 35 \x02c3 is premature in view of 35...f5! 36 gx5 exf5 37 f4 h5 38 a3? \x02e4! 39 a4 (39 \x02xc4 \x02f3) 39...\x02d5! and thanks to his reserve tempo ...f7–f6 Black even wins. Therefore instead of 38 a3? White should play 38 a4! f6 39 a5 a6 with equality.

34 \x02e3?! \x02e5 is pointless, since after 35 f4+? \x02d5 Black plays ...e6–e5 and creates a passed pawn.

No better is the 'cunning' 34 \x02d2?, aiming to give the opponent the move (34...\x02d6 35 \x02e2 \x02c6 36 \x02e3 \x02d5 37 \x02d3), and hoping for success in sharp variations such as 34...\x02e5 35 \x02e3 f5 36 gx5 f5 37 c4 bxc4 38 d4 e5+ 39 \x02xc4 \x02e6 40 g4 f5 41 b5. The reply 34...f5! dispels all White's illusions: 35 gx5 exf5 (threatening 36...f4) 36 f4 \x02e4.

For a long time I thought that White could win by 34 a4!? Indeed, after 34...bxa4? 35 c4+ \x02e5 36 \x02c3 he soon attacks the a4 pawn with his king, and Black's counterplay on the kingside is clearly too late: 36...f5 37 f4+ \x02f6 38 gx5 \x02x5 39 c5! f6 (39...e5 40 c6 \x02e6 41 fx5) 40 b5 \x02e7 41 \x02b4 \x02d7 42 \x02xa4 f6 (42...\x02c7 43 \x02a5 \x02b7 44 c6+) 43 \x02a5 \x02c7 44 \x02a6 \x02b8 45 c6 and 46 c7+.

And if 34...a6 there follows 35 a5 f5 (35...e5? 36 c4+ bxc4+ 37 \x02c3) 36 gx5 exf5 37 f4.

Here I considered 37...h5 38 \x02d2! \x02c4 (38...\x02e4 39 c4!) 39 \x02c2 f6 40 \x02b2! \x02d3 (or 40...\x02d5) 41 \x02b3 followed by 41 c4.

Grandmaster Joël Lautier rightly pointed out that with this pawn structure Black can save the game if he preserves his reserve tempo ...f7–f6 to the last moment. With this aim he should retreat with his king: 38...\x02d6! (instead of 38...\x02c4), e.g. 39 \x02e2 \x02c6 40 \x02e3 \x02d7(c7)! (but not 40...\x02d6?) 41 \x02d4, and not 40...\x02d5? 41 \x02d3 \x02c6 42 c4) 41 \x02d3 \x02c7(d7)! 42 \x02d4 \x02d6! 43 c4 bxc4 44 \x02xc4 \x02c6 45 b5+ axb5+ 46 \x02b4 f6 47 a6 \x02b6 with a draw. It is even simpler to play 37...\x02c6! immediately: 38 c4 (38 \x02d4 \x02d6) 38...bxc4+ 39 \x02xc4 h5 40 b5+ axb5+ 41 \x02b4 f6.

The only way to win was found by Sergey Dolmatov.

34 a3!! a6

No better is 34...f5 35 gx5 exf5 36 f4! h5 37 a4! (of course, not 37 c4+? bxc4+ 38 \x02c3 \x02e4! 39 a4 \x02d5!, and it is Black who wins) 37...bxa4 38 c4+.

35 c4+! bxc4+

36 \x02c3 f5
37 gx)f5 exf5
38 f4 h5
39 a4 f6
40 a5

Black has been the first to run out of reserve tempi.


As in the Kholmov–Spassky ending, complicated calculations can be avoided if the following idea is found:

1 ... d5!

Threatening 2...e4!

2 a3 b3 g6!!

3 fxg6 hxg6

4 a)xd5 f5

White cannot improve his position – on the board is an impregnable fortress.
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Does Black have another way to draw? Yes, he does, but you will certainly not be able to calculate it at the board, without moving the pieces – a thorough analysis is required.

A. 1...d5 2 e3 b3 e4? Neither 2...e5f5?

3 a)xd5 will do, nor 2...d4+? 3 e4 f6 4 e7f7! (preventing 4...g6) 4...d3 (4...h6 5 f4!) 5 a)xd3 e4 6 a4 d5 (6 e2? e4)

6...exf5 (6...g3 7 e3 a)c3 a)xh3 8 e2, intending c4–f1) 7 e3 g6 8 c4 (8...e6 cannot be allowed) 8...g5 9 e4 h6 10 d5 g5 11 c6 h6 12 d5 g5 13 e6, and White wins. The only correct move is 2...g6!!

3 a4f4. 3...xf5 comes to the same thing: 4 a)xd5 g6 (4...g6 5 exf4; 4...g5 5 exf4+ and 6 f5) 5 b7f7 (5 e4+? e6 6 c6 g5, but not 6...f5? 7 e8 f6 8 xg6!).

4 a)xd5 xf5. Black is hoping for 5 xf7? g5 or 5 e4+? e6 followed by 6...f5, 7...f6 and 8...g5.

5 b7f7 e6 6 c8f+ d5 7 f5f4(g4)! It is essential to force ...g7–g6. Pointless is 7 d7d6 8 a4? f5, when the exchange of the f4 pawn is unavoidable.

7...g6 8 d7 (8 c8 f6 9 d7 is also possible) 8...f6. Hopeless is 8...f5 9 e8 g5 10 fxg5 e5 11 d7! f4+ 12 e2 e6 13 f5. In the event of 8...d6 9 a4 e6 10 b3+ f5 11 d5 the same position is reached as a few moves earlier. But it is now Black to move, and he is in zugzwang.

9 c8f8! (9 e8f7 g5 10 f5 g4 or 10 f7f+ d6 11 f5 e5 12 e6 g4!) 9...g5 (9...f5 10 d7 and 11 e8) 10 f5 e5 11 d7f7!

(11 e6f7 g4!) 11...d6 (11...g4 12 h4 xg4 h3 13 e6; 11...d5 12 e6+ e5 13 c8, and Black is in zugzwang) 12 e6 g4 (12...e5 13 c8) 13 e4f3 e6

14 e5 16 b7 followed by 17 g4, and White wins.

B. 1...f6f6? 2 e4 e5. Bad is 2...g6?

3 c5 (3 fxg6? xg6 4 d5+ g5 5 xd6 f4) 3...xf5 (3...e7 4 fxg4 4 a)c6 e4 5 f4. But now 3...g6 is threatened – for this reason the waiting moves 3 a3 or 3 b1 will not do. In the variation 3 c5 f4 4 a)d6 f6 5 e6 g3, as is not hard to see, White is just one tempo short – the breakthrough of the white king is successful only with the black king at f6.

3 e4f4! g6! Black cannot get by without this move. After 3...f6 4 c6 g5 5 d7 all the same 5...g6! is necessary, since he
loses after 5...\texttt{e6}? 6 \texttt{d5! \texttt{g5} (6...\texttt{e7} 7 \texttt{a4 \texttt{f6}} 8 \texttt{c2 \texttt{e7}} 9 \texttt{c6 or 8...\texttt{g5} 9 \texttt{xd6 \texttt{f4}} 10 \texttt{e7} 7 \texttt{xd6 \texttt{f4}} 8 \texttt{e7} f6 9 \texttt{f7 \texttt{g3} 10 \texttt{xdg7 \texttt{hxh3}} 11 \texttt{xf6 \texttt{g3} 12 \texttt{xe5 h3 13 f4 h2 14 \texttt{c6}.}

4 \texttt{fxg6 \texttt{xi6} 5 \texttt{e8 \texttt{f6} 6 \texttt{d5! (passive defence will not do): 6...\texttt{e7? 7 \texttt{c6! f5 8 \texttt{a4} 7 \texttt{xf7 \texttt{f4} 8 \texttt{h5. After 8 \texttt{xd6 e4! 9 fxe4 \texttt{xe4 the position is drawn, e.g. 10 \texttt{e6 (10 \texttt{g6+ \texttt{d4!} 10...\texttt{d4! (it is not hard to see that attempts to keep the king closer to the pawns leads to a loss; the shortest path to the safe corner leads via the opposite wing!}}) 11 \texttt{f5 \texttt{c5} 12 \texttt{g5 \texttt{d6} 13 \texttt{hxh4 \texttt{e7} (a very important tempo! 14 \texttt{a2 \texttt{f8}(f6).}

8...\texttt{e3! (of course, not 8...\texttt{g3? 9 \texttt{xd6} 9 \texttt{xd6} (9 \texttt{g4 \texttt{f4} 9...\texttt{e4 10 \texttt{e5? (10 fxe4 \texttt{xe4 with a draw) 10...\texttt{fxe3 11 \texttt{e8.}}

\newpage
\begin{center}
\textbf{E 2-33. Yusupov – Vasilenko (School Children's Spartakiad 1976).}
\end{center}

After 58...\texttt{e5? 59 \texttt{b6! Black is in zugzwang. Any move of his king, apart from 59...\texttt{g7, loses to 60 \texttt{e6 and 61 \texttt{xe5, but at g7 the king is badly placed and is driven by force onto the h-file. (In the game this position was reached by 58...\texttt{g7? 59 \texttt{b6! \texttt{e5}.}

60 \texttt{b5! (not immediately 60 \texttt{b7+? \texttt{f8!}) 60...\texttt{d6 61 \texttt{c5! \texttt{b8} 62 \texttt{d7+ \texttt{h6 (the aim is achieved!) 63 \texttt{d8 \texttt{c7} 64 \texttt{c8 \texttt{e5} 65 \texttt{g8 \texttt{h7 (if 65...\texttt{h5 both 66 \texttt{xg3 \texttt{xg3} 67 \texttt{g3 \texttt{h6 68 \texttt{f4 \texttt{g7 69 \texttt{e3 \texttt{f7} 70 \texttt{d4 \texttt{e7} 71 \texttt{c5 and 66 \texttt{g6 \texttt{h4} 67 \texttt{g2 \texttt{h5 68 \texttt{h3 are good} 66 \texttt{g6 \texttt{h8} 67 \texttt{e2. Black resigns, since after the arrival of the white king at f7 he is again in zugzwang.}

A much more tenacious defence is possible.

58 ...\texttt{e7!}

Black wants to play 59...\texttt{d6} – after all, the exchange on d6 leads to a drawn pawn ending.

59 \texttt{e6+ \texttt{f7}

60 \texttt{b6 \texttt{e5}

A zugzwang position already familiar to us has been reached, but with White to move. It is not so easy to give the opponent the move: if 61 \texttt{c6 or 61 \texttt{a6 there is 61...\texttt{b8}, while after 61 \texttt{g2 Black has the reply 61...\texttt{f4.}}

61 \texttt{e3!}

Black has the same problems as in the game (61...\texttt{f8 62 \texttt{e6;} 61...\texttt{g7 62 \texttt{b5! \texttt{d6} 63 \texttt{c5 \texttt{b8} 64 \texttt{f7} etc.). But the g3 pawn is now attacked and therefore he has a new defensive resource – playing his bishop to f2.

61 ... \texttt{c3!}

62 \texttt{b5 \texttt{e1}

63 \texttt{f3 \texttt{f2}
After driving the bishop onto another diagonal, White can now prepare the e4–e5 breakthrough.

If 71...\(\text{f}2\), then 72 \(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{e}1\) 73 \(\text{c}6\), transposing into the main variation. Switching the bishop also does not help: 72...\(\text{a}7\) 73 \(\text{g}4\) (with the threat of 74 \(\text{f}6\)) 73...\(\text{b}8\) 74 \(\text{e}4\), then 75 \(\text{g}6\) and 76 \(\text{b}6\); the \(\text{b}8\)–\(\text{h}2\) diagonal proves to be too short.

72 \(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{f}7\)

After 72...\(\text{c}3\)+ 73 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{e}1\) Black loses his bishop: 74 \(\text{e}6\).

And White wins (analysis by Yusupov).

\begin{Verbatim}
E 3-1. V. Sereda (1971).
The composer’s solution:

1 \(\text{h}3!\) \(\text{f}2\)
1...\(\text{xa}2\) 2 \(\text{xh}1\) \(\text{b}3\) 3 \(\text{c}1!\)
\end{Verbatim}

With a simple stalemate trap: 4 \(\text{d}5?\) \(\text{c}4+!\)

4 \(\text{b}5!\) \(\text{xa}2\)
5 \(\text{b}4\) \(\text{b}1\)
6 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{a}1\)
7 \(\text{h}2\)

A second solution:

1 \(\text{e}3!\) \(\text{xa}2\)
2 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{b}3\)
3 \(\text{xd}2\) \(\text{g}3\)
Black loses immediately after 3...\(\text{c}3\) 4 \(\text{d}4!\) \(\text{xd}2\) 5 \(\text{d}5\).

4 \(\text{d}4\)
4 \(\text{b}5?\) \(\text{c}3\).

4... \(\text{e}4\)
5 \(\text{e}2!\)

The composer considered only 5 \(\text{d}1?\) \(\text{c}4!\) 6 \(\text{d}5\) (6 \(\text{b}6\) \(\text{d}5\), intending 7...\(\text{f}2\)) 6...\(\text{c}5\), and White cannot win.

5... \(\text{d}6\)
5...\(\text{c}3\) 6 \(\text{e}3\) 5...\(\text{f}6\) 6 \(\text{b}5\).

6 \(\text{e}6\)

The composer’s solution:

1 \(\text{g}7!\) \(\text{c}8+\)
1...\(\text{a}2\) 2 \(\text{b}2\) merely shortens the winning path for White.

2 \(\text{c}7!!\)

In the event of 2 \(\text{b}1?\) \(\text{xf}6\) it is obviously a draw. By diverting the rook from the 8th rank, White wants to win a vitally important tempo: 2...\(\text{xc}7+\) 3 \(\text{b}1\) \(\text{c}8\) 4 \(\text{f}7\).

2... \(\text{a}2\)
3 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{b}8+\)
4 \(\text{b}7!\) \(\text{a}1\)
If 4...\(\text{a}8\) White wins by 5 \(\text{g}8\) \(\text{a}8+\) 6 \(\text{g}7+.\)

5 \(\text{xa}1\) \(\text{a}8+\)
6 \(\text{a}7!\)

The defensive resources are almost exhausted. White only has to avoid a last, rather naive stalemate trap: 6...\(\text{xa}7+\) 7 \(\text{b}2\) \(\text{g}7\) 8 \(\text{f}7\) \(\text{h}6\) 9 \(\text{g}8\) !
Unfortunately, White has another, quicker way to win, pointed out by Dolmatov.

1 f7!

Creating the terrible threat of $\text{R}e8$, which is immediately decisive after
1...exg6 or 1...a2 2 $\text{b}2$ exb8+ 3 $\text{xa}2$ exg6.

1 ... $\text{c}8+$

2 $\text{d}2$!

This simple move is easy to overlook—after all, one instinctively does not want to move the king away from the passed pawn. But White does not have anything else: 2 $\text{b}1$? $\text{x}g6$ 3 $\text{e}8$ a2+ 4 $\text{xa}2$ $\text{c}2+$ 5 $\text{b}3$ $\text{xf}7$, or 2 $\text{c}7$? a2 3 $\text{b}2$ $\text{a}8$ (or
3...$\text{b}8+$ 4 $\text{b}7$ $\text{a}8$).

2 ... $\text{d}8+$

3 $\text{e}2$ $\text{xg}6$

3...a2 4 g7.

4 $\text{e}8$ a2

5 $\text{f}8$ $\text{w}$

E 3-3. V. Halberstadt (1930).

The composer had in mind 1 $\text{b}2$ $\text{x}f3$
2 $\text{c}1$ $\text{f}4$ 3 $\text{c}2$ (3 $\text{d}2$ $\text{e}5!$) 3...$\text{g}5$
(3...$\text{e}5?$ 4 $\text{c}4+$! 4 $\text{d}3$ $\text{f}6$ 5 $\text{d}4$
$\text{e}6$ 6 $\text{c}5$.
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As it is said, 'a chain is no stronger than its weakest link'. White does in fact have a win, only he needs to act more straightforwardly.

1 $\text{b}3(b2)$ $\text{x}f3$
2 $\text{c}2$ $\text{e}2$

Also bad is 2...$\text{f}4$ 3 $\text{d}3$ $\text{g}5$ 4 $\text{d}4$.

3 $\text{c}4$ $\text{c}8$

4 $\text{c}3$ $\text{f}3$

5 $\text{d}4$ $\text{f}4$

6 $\text{d}5$

E 3-4. E. Pogosyants (1981).*

1 $\text{f}xg6$

Serious consideration should be given to
Dolmatov's suggestion of 1 $\text{f}d7$?, when
1...$\text{h}6$? is bad: 2 $\text{f}6+$ $\text{h}8$ 3 $\text{w}d8$. The
only defence is 1...$\text{a}4$! 2 $\text{xa}4$ (2 $\text{f}xg6+$
$\text{h}8$! leads merely to a transposition of
moves, since 3 $\text{gx}g7+$ does not work:
3...$\text{xg}8$ 4 $\text{xa}4$ e1$\text{w}+$ 2...e1$\text{w}$ 3 $\text{fx}g6$.

Now 3...$\text{gx}g6$? 4 $\text{c}2+$ is not possible, and
3...$\text{gx}g8$? also loses: 4 $\text{c}4+$ $\text{h}8$ 5 $\text{c}8$
$\text{d}8$! 6 $\text{xd}8$! (not 6 $\text{wd}8$? $\text{xe}5+$
7 $\text{f}7+$ $\text{e}8$ with a draw) 6...$\text{xe}5$
(6...$\text{xe}5$ 7 $\text{d}7+$) 7 $\text{h}3+$ and mates.

But 3...$\text{h}8$! leads to a forced draw: 4 $\text{f}7$
$\text{xe}5$ (4...$\text{f}2+$? 5 $\text{f}6$) 5 $\text{e}8$ $\text{d}8$
6 $\text{wd}8$ $\text{d}5+$ 7 $\text{wd}5$ $\text{x}d5$ 8 $\text{e}7$.

1 ... $\text{h}8$!

Of course, not 1...$\text{xg}8$? 2 $\text{wd}5+$ $\text{h}8$
3 $\text{gx}g7+$ $\text{xg}7$ 4 $\text{f}7$.

2 $\text{f}7$

But the final position of the variation is
drawn: 6...$\text{c}8$! 7 $\text{xc}8$ $\text{d}7$ 8 $\text{b}6$
$\text{xc}8$ 9 $\text{c}5$—stalemate.
Now 2...\text{\textuml{8}e6+} 3 \text{\textuml{8}x}e6 \text{\textuml{8}e}1 does not work in view of 4 \text{\textuml{8}f3}! with the threats of 5 \text{\textuml{8}x}h5+ and 5 \text{\textuml{8}f}8.

The main variation of the study consists of a brilliant exchange of blows: 2...\text{\textuml{8}h}6 3 \text{\textuml{8}x}h6 \text{\textuml{8}e}6+! 4 \text{\textuml{8}x}e6 (4 \text{\textuml{8}f}8 \text{\textuml{8}c}8+) 4...\text{\textuml{8}e}5+ 5 \text{\textuml{8}f}7! \text{\textuml{8}e}7+ 6 \text{\textuml{8}f}8! (as Ken Neat has pointed out, White also wins by 6 \text{\textuml{8}x}e7 \text{\textuml{8}e}1+ 7 \text{\textuml{8}d}7! \text{\textuml{8}x}h6 8 \text{\textuml{8}d}4+ \text{\textuml{8}g}8 9 \text{\textuml{8}c}4+ \text{\textuml{8}h}8 10 \text{\textuml{8}f}4! \text{\textuml{8}d}1+ 11 \text{\textuml{8}e}7 \text{\textuml{8}e}2+ 12 \text{\textuml{8}f}8) 6...\text{\textuml{8}e}8+ (6...\text{\textuml{8}e}1 7 \text{\textuml{8}d}8!) 7 \text{\textuml{8}x}e8 \text{\textuml{8}e}1+ 8 \text{\textuml{8}e}2+ 9 \text{\textuml{8}f}8 \text{\textuml{8}f}3+ 10 \text{\textuml{8}f}7+ \text{\textuml{8}x}f7+ 11 \text{\textuml{8}g}7, and White wins.

However, Dolmatov discovered a defence that the composer had not envisaged.

\begin{center}
2 \ldots \text{\textuml{8}h}7!!
\end{center}

3 \text{\textuml{8}h}6 \text{\textuml{8}c}8.

3 \ldots \text{\textuml{8}h}5+

4 \text{\textuml{8}g}6

4 \text{\textuml{8}f}8 \text{\textuml{8}x}h7.

4 \ldots \text{\textuml{8}f}3+

We have solved this study of Ernest Pogosyants, beginning from the third move. But the initial position of it is shown in the following diagram.

Nothing is achieved by 1 \text{\textuml{8}g}8+? \text{\textuml{8}h}7 2 \text{\textuml{8}x}g6+ \text{\textuml{8}h}8! The composer considered the only correct moves to be 1 \text{\textuml{8}g}4+ \text{\textuml{8}x}g4 2 \text{\textuml{8}g}8+ \text{\textuml{8}h}7, leading to the position already familiar to us, in which, as we have established, White does not have a win. But he can play more strongly.

1 \text{\textuml{8}f}6! \text{\textuml{8}x}e7+ (1...\text{\textuml{8}a}4+ 2 \text{\textuml{8}f}7 \text{\textuml{8}a}2+ 3 \text{\textuml{8}d}5) 2 \text{\textuml{8}x}e7 \text{\textuml{8}e}1 3 \text{\textuml{8}g}4+ \text{\textuml{8}h}7 4 \text{\textuml{8}f}7, and Black has no defence (pointed out by Andrei Gutov).

E 3-5. V.Chekhover (1950).

Let us begin the analysis directly with the main variation of the study – it vividly illustrates the ideas of both sides.

1 \text{\textuml{8}b}6?!

The black king is obliged to block this pawn (otherwise the white pawns will quickly queen), after which the white king rushes to the aid of its pawns. It should immediately be pointed out that it is not possible to transpose moves: 1 \text{\textuml{8}b}2? \text{\textuml{8}g}5 2 \text{\textuml{8}b}6 in view of 2...\text{\textuml{8}d}3! 3 \text{\textuml{8}x}b3 \text{\textuml{8}a}4! 4 \text{\textuml{8}c}6 \text{\textuml{8}d}2! 5 \text{\textuml{8}c}2 \text{\textuml{8}g}3 6 \text{\textuml{8}d}6 \text{\textuml{8}g}2 7 \text{\textuml{8}b}7+ \text{\textuml{8}b}8 8 \text{\textuml{8}d}7 \text{\textuml{8}d}1+ 9 \text{\textuml{8}x}d1 \text{\textuml{8}g}1+.

\begin{center}
1 \ldots \text{\textuml{8}b}7!
2 \text{\textuml{8}b}2 \text{\textuml{8}g}5
3 \text{\textuml{8}x}b3 \text{\textuml{8}g}4
\end{center}
6 ...  \textcolor{red}{\textit{a8!!}}

The composer only considers 6...b8 7 d6 g1=\textit{w} 8 d7 with a draw. The king is better placed at a8 than at b8, since now the c-pawn is not able to advance with check.

7 d6 g1=\textit{w}
8 d7 \textit{f1+}

The direct 8...g5+? 9 \textcolor{red}{\textit{a6}} \textit{d5} is incorrect in view of 10 c7.

9 \textcolor{red}{\textit{a5}}

No better is 9 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c5}} \textit{f8+} 10 \textcolor{red}{\textit{b5}} (10 \textit{xd4} \textit{b4+} or 10... \textit{d6+}; 10 \textit{d5} \textit{d8} 11 \textit{d6} \textit{xb6} 12 \textit{e7} \textit{c7} 10... \textit{d6} (or 10... \textit{d8}) – see the main variation.

9 ... \textit{f5+}
10 \textcolor{red}{\textit{a6}} \textit{d3+!}
11 \textcolor{red}{\textit{a5}} \textit{a3+!}
12 \textcolor{red}{\textit{b5}} \textit{d6!}
13 \textcolor{red}{\textit{a6}} \textit{b8!}

It all becomes clear: 14 c7+ \textit{xc7} 15 bxc7+ \textcolor{red}{\textit{xc7}}, and the black d-pawn queens.

Let us examine what happens, if on the first move White advances another pawn. In the event of 1 c6 the white king will subsequently have to go to c5 and Black acquires the discovered check ...d4–d3+. Here is a sample variation: 1... \textcolor{red}{\textit{c7}} 2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{b2}} g5 3 \textit{xb3} g4 4 \textcolor{red}{\textit{c4}} g3 5 \textit{c5} g2 6 b6+ \textit{b8} 7 d6 g1=\textit{w} 8 d7 d3+! 9 \textit{b5} g5+ (also good is 9...\textit{b1+} 10 \textit{c5} \textit{c1+} 11 \textit{b5} \textit{b2+} 12 \textit{c5} \textit{a3+} 13 \textit{b5} \textit{d6} or 13 \textit{d5} \textit{a5+}) 10 \textit{c4}, and now the simplest is 10...a8!, although there are, of course, also other ways to win. Or 6 d6+ \textit{d8} 7 b6 (7 \textit{b6} g1=\textit{w} 8 \textit{b7} \textit{g8!}) 7...g1=\textit{w} 8 b7 d3+ 9 \textit{c4} \textit{c1+} 10 \textit{d4} \textit{b2+}, intending 11...\textit{e8!}

It remains to check 1 d6 \textcolor{red}{\textit{d7}}! 2 \textcolor{red}{\textit{b2}} g5 3 \textit{xb3} g4 4 \textit{c4} g3 5 \textit{d5}. Here Vitaly Chekhov makes a strange mistake, suggesting as the refutation 5...d3?? (the question marks, of course, are mine) 6 c6+ \textit{d8} 7 b6 d2 8 b7 d1=\textit{w+}. Instead of 7 b6??, much stronger is 7 \textcolor{red}{\textit{e6!}} g2 (7...d2 8 c7+ \textit{c8} 9 d7+ \textit{xc7} 10 b6+) 8 c7+ \textit{c8} 9 b6! g1=\textit{w} 10 d7+ \textit{b7} 11 c8=\textit{w+}, and it is White who wins.

5...g2! 6 c6+ \textcolor{red}{\textit{e8!!}} The same idea as in the 1 d6 variation. After the routine 6...\textit{d8}? 7 b6 g1=\textit{w} 8 b7 the position is drawn.

7 b6 g1=\textit{w} 8 b7 \textit{b1} 9 \textit{xd4} \textit{b6+} 10 \textit{d5}(e5) \textcolor{red}{\textit{f7!!}}, and again the outcome becomes obvious.

It can be concluded that there is no solution to the study – White cannot gain a draw. This analysis was carried out by me together with grandmaster Vadim Zviagintsev.

E 3-6. O.Duras (1903).

1 \textit{d2+} \textit{e7}
2 \textit{d6!!} \textit{c3}
2...\textit{xd6} 3 \textit{c8} \textit{c3}+! 4 \textit{d8}
3 \textit{c6!!} \textit{xc6}
4 \textit{a7}

The secondary solution is essentially only a different way of putting into effect the same plan of Duras, involving a rook sacrifice. Alas, from the standpoint of the strict criteria of composition, such a variation is inadmissible, and it rules out the study.

Black has woven a mating net. In the grandmaster's opinion, White is obliged to break it up by sacrificing his queen. In so doing, 1 \( \text{Qxg3?} \) is incorrect: 1...fxg3 2 \( \text{exh4+ Qg5} \) 3 \( \text{Qg4+ Kh5} \) (threatening both 4...\( \text{Rxb2} \), and 4...\( \text{Qe3+} \)) 4 \( \text{Qd4} \)
\( \text{Qd1+!} \) 5 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{f5} \) 6 \( \text{Qxg3} \) \( \text{Qxd4} \) 7 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qe3+} \) followed by 8...\( \text{Qf4} \).

1 \( \text{Qxh4+!} \) \( \text{Qxh4} \)
2 \( \text{Qxh4+} \) \( \text{Qg5} \)
3 \( \text{Qg4+} \) \( \text{Qf5} \)

After 3...\( \text{Qh5} \) White has to go in for a position where he is the exchange down: 4 \( \text{Qxf6!} \) \( \text{Qe3+} \) 5 \( \text{Qf2} \) \( \text{Qxg4+} \) 6 \( \text{fxg4+} \) \( \text{Qxg4} \) 7 \( \text{Qe1} \). It would appear to be drawn.

4 \( \text{Qd4!!} \)

The only saving move. 4 \( \text{Qa3?} \) \( \text{Qe3+} \) is hopeless.

4...
5 \( \text{Qe4+} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \)
6 \( \text{fxe4+} \) \( \text{Qxg4} \)
7 \( \text{Qxd5} \)

Safer, however, is the calm king move, suggested by Sergey Dolmatov.

1 \( \text{Qg1!!} \) \( \text{Qe3} \)

Other attempts also do not achieve anything:
1...\( \text{Qd1+} \) 2 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( \text{Qxf1+} \) 3 \( \text{Qxf1} \) \( \text{Qe3+} \) 4 \( \text{Qg1} \) \( \text{Qg5} \) 5 \( \text{Qd4(c1)} \); 1...\( \text{Qxb2} \) 2 \( \text{Qe6!} \) \( \text{Qb1+} \) 3 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{Qe3+} \) 4 \( \text{Qxe3!} \)

2 \( \text{Qxh4+} \) \( \text{Qxh4} \)
3 \( \text{Qxh4+} \) \( \text{Qg5} \)

After 3...\( \text{Qg6} \) the same reply is possible.

4 \( \text{Qxf6+!} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \)
5 \( \text{Qxf4+} \)


Now in the event of 2 \( \text{Qb7} \) Black wins by either 2...\( \text{Qb6+} \) 3 \( \text{Qxa7} \) \( \text{Qc6} \), or 2...\( \text{Qd7} \) 3 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{h4} \) 4 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{h3} \) 5 \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{h2} \) 6 \( \text{Qb8} \) \( \text{Qc7} \) \( \text{Qwb1+} \) 8 \( \text{Qa8} \) \( \text{Qxe4+} \) 9 \( \text{Qb8} \) \( \text{Qxd6} \). But contrary to the opinion of the composer, moving the king to b5 also does not save White.

2 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qb6+} \)
3 \( \text{Qc5} \) \( \text{Qb1} \)


There is no solution to the study.

1 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{Qa8} \)
2 \( \text{Qg6} \) \( \text{Qc5} \)

Similarly 2...\( \text{Qd6} \) is equally good.

3 \( \text{Qf8} \) \( \text{Qa1+} \)
4 \( \text{Qh2} \) \( \text{Qg1} \)

E 3-10. E. Paoli (1949).

1 \( \text{Qg3}! \)

1 \( \text{g3?} \) is incorrect: 1...\( \text{Qg4} \) 2 \( \text{Qe2} \) \( \text{Qb6+} \) 3 \( \text{Qg2} \) \( \text{c7} \), when if 4 \( \text{Qf4} \) both 4...\( \text{Qd6} \) and 4...\( \text{xf4} \) 5 \( \text{gx4} \) \( \text{xf4} \) 6 \( \text{Qh3} \) \( \text{Qf5}! \) 7 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{Qe6} \) are possible.

1...
2 \( \text{Qh3} \) \( \text{Qg3}! \)

Now, apart from 3 \( \text{Qb3!} \), another knight route also wins.

3 \( \text{Qd3!} \) \( \text{Qxh4} \)
4 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qf2} \)
4...\( \text{Qxg5} \) 5 \( \text{Qf3+} \) 4...\( \text{Qxg5} \) 5 \( \text{g4+} \) or 5 \( \text{Qf7} \).
5 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qg3}! \)
6 \( \text{Qd4!} \) \( \text{Qf2} \)

6...\( \text{Qf4} \) 7 \( \text{g4+} \).

7 \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{Qg3} \)
8 \( \text{Qg7+} \)

Pointed out by Sergey Dolmatov.


The winning method planned by the composers is highly elegant.

1 \( \text{Qc1!} \) \( \text{e4!} \) Black loses after 1...\( \text{Qe2+} \) 2 \( \text{Qxe2} \) \( \text{Qg1+} \) 3 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Qb6} \) 4 \( \text{d4!} \) (4 \( \text{d3?} \)
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\text{E 3-12. E. Janosi (1975).}

This study is flawed at the very start: Black has a way to win.

1  \text{b3}

1 \text{b3} \text{c1+ 2 b2 xb3 3 xb3 g2;}

1 \text{c4 e5! 2 b3 g7.}

1 . . . \text{e5!}

2 \text{c3 xf3!}

(But not 2...g7? 3 d4 xf3+ 4 e4.) If now 3 f7 g7, but otherwise Black does not allow the knight out of the trap, while at the same time retaining his f-pawn.

1...g7? throws away the win. The subsequent development of events is, on the whole, understandable. I should only like to mention the subtle move 3 c4!!, preparing the pinning of the opponent's minor pieces. The routine 3 d5? is refuted by 3...xh8 4 d4 g7 5 e5 g2 followed by ...g6-g5.

\text{E 3-13. T. Gorgiev (1962).}

1 \text{d4!}

1 \text{c5? f3 2 e5 b3.}

1 . . . b3

A draw results from 1...f1+ 2 c2 a2 3 b3 b1 4 e5 g2 5 c1 (simpler is 5 a1, intending 6 b2 and 7 b3) 5...a1 6 xaxa1 7 d3 a4 8 b3 a3+ 9 c4 c3+ 10 d4.

2 xb3 f3

After 3 a1! the win of the knight allows White to successfully attack the a-pawn. The capture of the bishop leads to stalemate: 2...xg3 4 b1 g2 5 c2 a2+ 6 a1. But a different, more prosaic plan of defense, is no weaker.

3 a5! a2

3...xg3 4 b1 g2 5 c4 a2+ 6 a1 and 7 b2.

4 e5

But not 4 b2? a3 5 a1 xaxa5.

5 . . . f5

6 b2 xexe5

6 c4

6 b3 is also possible.

5 ... e4

6...e2+ 7 a1 and 8 b2.

7 a3 e2+

8 a1 g2

9 c2

9 ... c4.

10 c3


1 \text{a2}

Bad is 1 e6? g6! (with the threat of 2...xexe6)

2 e2 b3.

1 . . . b3

1...wh8 2 g6 hxg6 3 e6.

2 e6! bxa2

3 e7

Now 3...d7? is unsatisfactory: 4 e2 w6 5 h6! gxh6 6 h5!, while 3...d7? allows White to create a perpetual threat of...
stalemate. But Black has a winning possibility, overlooked by the composer.

3 ... \( \textcolor{red}{\text{Q}} \text{e6!} \)

First let us examine the composer’s solution.

1 \( \text{h5! gxh5.} \) Not 1...\( \text{\texttt{xf4}} \) 2 ...\( \text{xc5} \) with the threats of 3 ...\( \text{xa7} \) and 3 hgx6 followed by 4 \( \text{f8.} \) If 1...\( \text{b5} \) White wins by 2 hgx6 \( \text{xf4} \) (2...\( \text{c6} \) 3 ...\( \text{h4!} \) \( \text{xb7} \) 4 \( \text{xf6} \))

3 ...\( \text{g2} \) \( \text{c6} \) 4 ...\( \text{e3!} \) \( \text{d6} \) 5 ...\( \text{h6!} \)

2 \( \text{e5!} \) The transposition of moves 2 ...\( \text{xc5?} \) \( \text{xc5+} \) 3 ...\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 4 ...\( \text{e5} \) is refuted by 4...\( \text{b8!} \) 5 ...\( \text{c4} \) 6 ...\( \text{xe5} \) 7 ...\( \text{b4} \) 8 ...\( \text{d5} \) ...\( \text{c5} \) 5 ...\( \text{b5} \) 6 ...\( \text{f6} \) 7 ...\( \text{c6} \) 8 ...\( \text{d5+} \) ...\( \text{c7} \) 8 ...\( \text{d6+} \) ...\( \text{d8} \) 9 ...\( \text{c4} \) ...\( \text{exf5} \) 10 ...\( \text{c5} \) 11 ...\( \text{e7+} \) ...\( \text{e8!} \) when it is Black who wins.

2...\( \text{xe5} \) 3 ...\( \text{xc5!} \) \( \text{xc5+!} \) Hopeless is 3...\( \text{b8} \) 4 ...\( \text{xe5} \) ...\( \text{xe5} \) 5 ...\( \text{xa7} \) ...\( \text{b4} \) 6 ...\( \text{c4} \),

4 ...\( \text{d4!} \) ...\( \text{d6} \) 5 ...\( \text{xe5!} \) (5 ...\( \text{xe5} \) ...\( \text{b8} \) 6 ...\( \text{d5} \) ...\( \text{b5} \))

5 ...\( \text{b6} \) 6 ...\( \text{f5} \) ...\( \text{b5} \) 7 ...\( \text{f6!} \) A pretty breakthrough!

But it is also possible to break through in a different, simpler way.

1 ...\( \text{f5!} \) \( \text{gxf5} \)

2 ...\( \text{exf5} \) \( \text{b5} \)

If 2...\( \text{exf5} \) or 2...\( \text{e5} \), then 3 ...\( \text{h5!} \) ...\( \text{b5} \) 4 ...\( \text{h4} \) \( \text{c6} \) 5 ...\( \text{f6} \).

3 ...\( \text{f6} \) ...\( \text{c6} \)

4 ...\( \text{e7} \) ...\( \text{d7} \)

5 ...\( \text{g2} \)

With his next move White captures the c5 pawn with his bishop and wins easily.

And here is a third (I am not sure that it is the last) variation of the breakthrough:

1 ...\( \text{e5!} \) \( \text{f6} \)

2 ...\( \text{exf5} \) ...\( \text{xe5} \)

3 ...\( \text{g2} \)

Threatening 4 ...\( \text{g3!} \).

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

If 3...\( \text{c7} \) White wins by 4 ...\( \text{xc5!} \) ...\( \text{b8} \) 5 ...\( \text{f2} \) ...\( \text{b5} \) 6 ...\( \text{g3} \) 7 ...\( \text{d4} \) 8 ...\( \text{c6} \) 9 ...\( \text{e5} \).

4 ...\( \text{g3!} \) ...\( \text{d5} \)

5 ...\( \text{c3} \) ...\( \text{b5} \)

6 ...\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{cxd4} \)


1 ...\( \text{a4+} \)

1 ...\( \text{xc2?} \) ...\( \text{xc2} \) 2 ...\( \text{b6} \) ...\( \text{b3!} \) 3 ...\( \text{c5} \) ...\( \text{a3} \).

1 ...\( \text{f7} \) ...\( \text{b3} \)

2 ...\( \text{xa5} \) ...\( \text{h7+!} \)

3 ...\( \text{a6} \) ...\( \text{d5!} \)

A pretty diversion of the rook from the a-file, from where it wanted to go to a1. Black is threatening not only 4...\( \text{c1} \), but also 4...\( \text{c7} \+)

4 ...\( \text{xd5!} \)

If 4 ...\( \text{b5+?} \) Black wins by both 4...\( \text{b4+} \) 5 ...\( \text{a5} \) ...\( \text{c7!} \) 6 ...\( \text{b4+} \) ...\( \text{c3} \), and 4...\( \text{a4} \),

5 ...\( \text{xd5} \), ...\( \text{h6+!!} \) (5...\( \text{c7} \) 6 ...\( \text{ad8!} \) ...\( \text{c1} \),

7 ...\( \text{b6!} \) 5...\( \text{xd5?} \) 6 ...\( \text{c8} \) ...\( \text{h2} \) 7 ...\( \text{b5} \)

8 ...\( \text{b7} \) (6 ...\( \text{a5} \) 7 ...\( \text{d5} \) ...\( \text{c8} \) ...\( \text{c6} \) 6...\( \text{xd5} \)

7 ...\( \text{c8} \) ...\( \text{h2} \).

4 ...\( \text{c7!} \)

Now, apart the composers’ 5 ...\( \text{b8+} \) ...\( \text{c4} \)

6 ...\( \text{b8!!} \) (6 ...\( \text{b5?} \) ...\( \text{c1} \) 7 ...\( \text{b6} \) ...\( \text{f4} \))

6...\( \text{c1} \) 7 ...\( \text{b6!} \), White has a second way to draw.

5 ...\( \text{b6} \)
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White's moves can also be transposed.

6 ... c4
7 aa5! d4
7...w4? 8 a4+.
8 d5+

E 3-17. H. Kasparian (1951).

1 d1!

Only this rook! The seemingly equivalent 1 b1? loses to 1...gd3! 2 xd3 exd3 3 xe1 d2.

1 ... c3
After 1...ge3? things immediately end in perpetual check: 2 d6+ f5 (2...f7? 3 b7+ e8 4 h6) 3 b5+ f4 4 f6+.

2 xe1!!

Here the attempt to give perpetual check does not succeed: 2 d6+ h5! 3 h8+ (3 b5+ g5) 3...g5 4 h6 h3! 5 df6 d2! This variation occurred in the training playing of the study, in which Alexander Chernin played White against me.

2 ... xe1+
3 f2 ge3
3...ee3? 4 g8+.
4 b2

How can Black strengthen his position? Obviously, he cannot get by without the help of his king. First he tries his chances on the kingside.

4 ... f5
5 a2 f4

Threatening 6...b1.

6 g3+! g4
7 b2 h3
8 d2!!

Black was threatening 8...xg3!, e.g. 8 c2? xg3! 9 xe1 g1+ 10 f2 g3+! 11 d1 xc2 12 xc2 g3 and wins.

8 ... h2?

A serious mistake - not in the study, but in the recording of its solution. Black should have immediately taken his king to the queenside, since now White can force a draw by 9 g4! h3 10 g5 g4 11 g6 f4 12 g7.

9 a2? h3
10 d2! g4
11 a2 f5
12 b2 e5
13 a2 d4
14 a4+ c5
14...c3? 15 a3+ d2 16 a2+
15 a2 c4!
16 b2!

16 c2+? d3 is completely bad. In the event of 16 d2? b3! White is in zugzwang (17 g4 c3 18 a2 d4 19 g5 e5 and the king catches the pawn).

Black achieves nothing with 16...c3
17 a2 b4 18 b2+! (18 d2? b3; 18 c2? a3! 19 d2 b3) 18...a4
19 a2+! (White is unable to force a draw by 19 g4 in view of 19...a3 20 d2 b3 21 g5 c3 22 a2 d3! 23 a3+ d4) 19...b3 20 d2.

In reply to 16...d3 Kasparian gives the following variation: 17 b3+ d2 18 b2+ c1 19 a2 b1 20 d2 a1 21 c2. But Black can play more strongly.

17 b3+ d4!
18 ... \textit{Ka1}
19 \textit{Bb4+} \textit{Cc5}

It is a pity, but White’s positional draw did not succeed.


The two quiet moves at the very start of the solution create a strong impression, of course. But what is the point of them, and how essential are they?

After 1 \textit{Be8} d3 (1...c3 2 ...c7+ a7 3 b5+ and 4 xd4; 1...a7 2 d6 c3 3 b5+ 2 a3! Black is forced to advance his d-pawn: 2...d2 (2...d7 does not change anything in view of 3 d6 d2 4 b5+ 3 a7 4 b5+ b6 5 c3, and the king is unable to help its pawns (5...c5 6 e4+).

In the event of 1 Be6 d3 2 a3 Black can play more strongly: 2...a7! 3 c7 b6 etc. But is it not possible to manage without the quiet move 2 a3? Let us check.

1 Be8(e6) d3
2 a7
3 c7+
4 b6
5 c3 b5+, and Black wins.
6 ... a6
Now 7 a7? will not do: 4 ... a5! (4...b5? 5 d6 d2 6 e5) 5 d6 (5 a3 c4) 5...d2 6 c3 b4. However, White can defend more strongly.

4 c3
Threatening 5...c5.
5 a3!
But not 5 a4? a5.

5 ... a4!
6 b1!
7 a4!
8 c3 c3+
9 b5 9 a3+
8 b5 b5
9 ... d2
10 a6 d1
11 a7


After the simple-minded 1 xg8? xg8 2 g6 b3 3 g7 b2 4 bxh8 b1 is the queen ending drawn? – probably only a computer can give an exact reply to this question. But from the practical standpoint this is completely unimportant, since White has a clever possibility of avoiding all the complexities of the queen ending, by interposing 1 b8!, luring the enemy king to c4, where it comes under check by a queen from g8.

But it has to be verified whether or not Black can exploit his opponent’s slight delay and change the pattern of the play by 1...xh6! 2 gxh6 (weaker is 2 xex7 f5+) 2...c6.

After 3 c8! b5 3...d3 4 d7; 3 b6 4 d6 a5 5 b8+ b7+ 6 d7 a7 7 b7 4 d6 d4 5 d5 f5 6 b8+ a4 7 b5! xh6 8 b4 b3 9 f4 (or 9 b4) Black’s king and knight end up on opposite sides of the board, and the knight will certainly soon be lost.

We have not managed to refute the study. Let us now check whether there is a second solution.

1 g6!
xg6

The variation 2 xg8? b3 3 b8 (3 xg6 hxg6 4 h7 b2) 3...c4 4 d6 c3 5 g7 c4 6 xh7 f5 7 g6 xh6 leads to a draw. However, White can interpose an extremely unpleasant check.

2 c8+

Now any move by Black’s king decisively worsens his position in the variation 3 xg8 b3 4 xg6! hxg6 5 h7. If 2...d4 3 xg8 f4+, then simply 4 f5.

2 ... b5
3 xg8 f4+
4 e5 d3+
5 d4

And White wins easily.
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1 \( \text{\#e4!} \)
2 \( \text{\#b3? \#d2 2 \#c4 \#b5!} \)

1 ... \( \text{\#c8!} \)

In the event of 1...\( \text{\#b5} \) the direct 2 \( \text{\#h3?} \) is premature in view of 2...\( \text{\#f5} \) 3 \( \text{\#h1+ \#f1}. \)

Correct is 2 \( \text{\#b3! \#a4 (2...\#e2 3 \#b1 \#d2 4 \#b3+ \#e3 5 \#xc1; 2...\#a6 3 \#b1 \#d2 4 \#b3+ \#e3 5 \#xc1 \#xe4 6 \#c5+), and only now 3 \#h3 \#b2+ (3...\#f5 4 \#h1+ \#d2 5 \#c4+!) 4 \#xe6. \)

2 \( \text{\#h3 \#b2+} \)

2...\( \text{\#f5} \) 3 \( \text{\#h1+ \#d2 4 \#b3+}. \)

3 \( \text{\#g5} \) \( \text{\#f5} \)

4 \( \text{\#h1+} \) \( \text{\#d2} \)

Now let us return to the composer’s solution.

5 \( \text{\#h2+ \#c3} \) 6 \( \text{\#c2+ \#b4} \) 7 \( \text{\#xf5 exf5} \)
8 \( \text{\#b7!} \) \( \text{\#c3} \) 9 \( \text{\#c5!} \) \( \text{\#c4} \) (9...\#f4 10 \#e4)
10 \( \text{\#c1! An important subtlety! The hasty} \)
10 \( \text{\#a4? throws away the win: 10...\#a6!} \)
11 \( \text{\#xc3 \#b3 12 \#c1 \#b2} \) or 11 \( \text{\#xc3+ \#b4} \) 12 \( \text{\#c6 \#b5}. \)

Also incorrect is 10 \( \text{\#h5? f4! 11 \#e4 \#f5}, \) while if 10 \( \text{\#f4?} \) there follows 10...\( \text{\#b4}. \)

10...\( \text{\#d4}. \) If 10...\( \text{\#b4}, \) then 11 \( \text{\#h5}, \) and Black is in zugzwang (11...\#f4 12 \#e4; 11...\#c4 12 \#a4; 11...\#d2 12 \#d3+).

11 \( \text{\#h4!} \) Black has no defence against 12 \#a4. The seemingly equivalent 11 \#h5?! is less accurate in view of 11...\#f4! 12 \#a4 \#f3 13 \#xc3 \#f2 14 \#e2+ \#e3 15 \#g3 \#g3 16 \#h4 \#d7! (not allowing 17 \#h3, and intending 17...\#g2 and 18...\#b5). Even so, as was pointed out by W. Sanderse, after 17 \#h1! \#b5 (or 17...\#g2 18 \#c2) 18 \#c3+ \#g2 19 \#c2 \#xh1 20 \#f2 the endgame with bishop against rook is lost for Black, since his king is shut in a corner of the same colour as his bishop.


1 \( \text{\#g5+!} \)

1 \( \text{g8}\#? \) \( \text{d2 2 \#g5+ \#h2 3 \#d6+ \#h1} \)
4 \( \text{\#h3} \) does not win in view of 4...\( \text{\#d5+!} \)

1 ... \( \text{\#h2} \)

2 \( \text{\#d6+} \) \( \text{\#h1!} \)

Weaker is 2...\( \text{\#g1? 3 \#h3+ \#f1 4 g8}\# \)
\( \text{\#d5+! 5 \#xd5 d2 6 \#f2! \#xf2 7 \#g3+ \#e2 (7...\#f1! 8 \#d3+ 8 \#g4+)} \)

3 \( \text{\#b4} \)

Futile is 3 \( g8\# \) \( d2 4 \#h3 \#d5! or 3 \#h3 \#a6! 4 \#d5 \#e3+. \)

Before analysing any further the composer’s idea, I will point out a simpler way to win, found by Dolmatov.

5 \( \text{\#xf5} \) \text{exf5}
6 \( \text{\#c4} \) \text{\#c3}
7 \( \text{\#b6} \) \text{\#b7}

At a6 or e6 the bishop comes under a knight fork: 8 \( \text{\#a4} \) \( \#b3 9 \#b5+. \)

8 \( \text{\#a4+} \) \text{\#b4}
9 \( \text{\#h4+!} \) \text{\#a3}
10 \( \text{\#xb2} \) \text{\#xb2}
11 \( \text{\#b4+} \)

---

see next diagram
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3...\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}f4+? 4 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}e5, and 3...\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}d5+?!; as we already know, leads to a surprising outcome -- with material completely equal. Black has to give up both of his knights. And yet there is a defence!

3 \ldots \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}e3!

The knight takes control of the important d5 and f5 squares.

4 \textcolor{red}{f6} \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}d5+
5 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}e5 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}h5
6 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}e6

6 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}d2 \textcolor{red}{g8} 7 \textcolor{red}{f4} \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xg7 or 7 f7 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xf7
8 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xf7 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}xg7.

Now 3...\textcolor{red}{\textbullet}a6? no longer helps in view of the interference 4 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}f6 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}c4 5 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}e6. Bad is

4 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}f6 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}c4 5 \textcolor{red}{\textbullet}e6.
Appendix

Index by Material

One of the ways of working on chess is to study typical positions, and in particular, positions characterised by a certain material balance. Such an approach is especially important for mastering the endgame (although it is also applicable to positions with a large number of pieces). This index will help you to find appropriate examples in the book.

The figures signify diagram numbers. Subsequent diagrams, relating to the same game, are not indicated (if, of course, the material balance on the board has not changed – but then the next diagram will find its way into another section of the index). If in the analysis of a position, various material balances are obtained, then the number of the corresponding diagram will figure simultaneously in several sections of the index.

Now about the terms used in the index.

What is understood by an endgame is a position in which at least one of the sides has not more than one piece (not counting the king and the pawns).

In simple positions each of the players has not less than two pieces. But at the same time one type of piece is missing – either queens, or rooks, or minor pieces. Thus we can distinguish six types of simple positions:

1) rooks and minor pieces in combat (the most common material balance);
2) minor pieces in combat;
3) endings with four rooks;
4) queens and minor pieces;
5) heavy pieces (queens and rooks) in combat;
6) unusual material balance (unequal material).

All remaining positions are considered to be from the middlegame.

Endgame

Pawn: 25, 37, 40, 70, 80, 86, 88, 90, 96, 97, 98, 100, 103, 105, 106, 121, 124, 130, 163, 195, 196, 200, 205, 222, 226, 240


Knight: 25, 28, 72, 224, 228, 242

Like-colour bishops: 61, 132, 134, 163, 164, 166, 167, 202, 212, 239, 240, 255

Opposite-colour bishops: 12, 24, 63, 64, 76, 100, 168, 170, 171, 174, 175, 176, 183, 201

Bishop against knight: 14, 38, 43, 86, 89, 97, 106, 121, 122, 132, 133, 184, 188, 190, 198, 223, 250

Rook against pawns: 147, 148, 151, 152, 241, 248


Rook against minor piece: 1, 34, 35, 36, 46, 47, 113, 114, 142, 208, 209, 210, 219, 241, 244, 253, 259

Rook against two minor pieces: 157, 160, 161, 204, 216, 242, 253, 259

Queen: 3, 8, 25, 37, 43, 70, 137, 139, 140, 141, 203, 223, 245, 251

Queen against pieces or pawns: 19, 57, 73, 112, 147, 158, 195, 218, 226, 236, 245, 247

Extra piece: 116, 117, 120, 132, 197, 208, 209, 211, 216, 218, 249, 251, 252
Simple positions
Four rooks: 246
Rooks and minor pieces: 1, 11, 12, 29, 31, 32, 49, 60, 64, 72, 81, 98, 99, 102, 115, 118, 128, 134, 142, 182, 213, 231, 238, 244
Minor pieces: 23, 63, 118, 131, 240, 252, 261
Queens and minor pieces: 25, 30, 43, 69, 133, 215
Queens and rooks: 3, 18, 21, 153
Like-colour bishops: 2, 11, 102, 142, 240
Opposite-colour bishops: 60, 64, 100, 182, 213, 215, 238
Bishop against knight: 29, 30, 31, 42, 49, 69, 81, 82, 128, 133, 231
Two bishops against two knights or bishop and knight: 23, 49, 63, 69, 99, 118, 131, 134
Exchange advantage: 1, 34, 219, 241, 256, 260
Two minor pieces for a rook: 33
Extra piece: 32, 126, 215, 257, 261
Queen against other pieces: 57, 231, 240, 254, 256
Unusual balance of material: 211, 218, 225, 229

Index of Exercises by Thinking Skills and Types of Problems to be Solved

Do you want to find your way confidently in various situations, arising on the board, and to develop the skills necessary for taking correct decisions? A sound way to make progress is training in the field that interests you. This thematic index will help you to choose appropriate exercises. Many exercises can be used for various aims and therefore they appear simultaneously in several sections of the index.

Imagination, combinative vision
Questions: 1-15, 1-23, 2-8, 2-9, 2-23, 2-28, 3-1, 3-7
Exercises: 1-6, 1-8, 1-12, 2-29, 2-32, 3-4, 3-6, 3-7, 3-15, 3-16

Taking account of the opponent’s resources
Questions: 1-1, 1-5, 1-6, 1-8, 1-11, 1-26, 2-6, 2-35, 3-2, 3-6, 3-7, 3-9
Exercises: 1-11, 1-12, 1-16, 2-1, 2-12, 2-25, 2-27, 3-14

Deep or multi-variational analysis
Questions: 1-3, 1-8, 1-10, 1-11, 1-18, 1-30, 2-10, 2-11, 2-12, 2-14, 2-15, 2-19, 2-21, 2-24, 2-33, 3-6, 3-7, 3-8, 3-10, 3-12, 3-14
Exercises: 1-11, 1-15, 1-16, 1-17, 2-2, 2-6, 2-7, 2-9, 2-10, 2-11, 2-16, 2-17, 2-18, 2-21, 2-22, 2-23, 2-24, 2-26, 2-31, 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, 3-5, 3-13, 3-15, 3-18, 3-19, 3-21
Candidate moves
Questions: 1-10, 1-16, 1-27, 1-30, 2-19, 2-25, 2-27, 3-3, 3-6, 3-9, 3-14
Exercises: 1-16, 2-10, 2-11, 2-19, 2-23, 2-30, 2-31, 2-32, 3-4, 3-5, 3-7, 3-10, 3-12, 3-19, 3-21

Method of elimination
Questions: 1-4, 1-6, 1-8, 1-29, 2-30, 2-35, 3-11, 3-14
Exercises: 2-4, 2-12, 2-13, 2-25, 2-26, 2-27

Comparison
Questions: 1-10, 1-24, 1-28, 2-22, 2-27
Exercises: 3-2, 3-5

Intermediate moves
Questions: 1-12, 2-3, 2-24, 3-4
Exercises: 1-1, 2-10, 2-17, 2-23, 3-2, 3-9

Traps
Questions: 1-23, 2-4
Exercises: 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4

Defence
Exercises: 1-1, 1-2, 1-5, 1-9, 2-6, 2-7, 2-15, 2-24, 2-29, 2-32, 3-7, 3-18, 3-21

Arrangement of the pieces, manoeuvres, regrouping
Questions: 1-2, 1-4, 1-9, 1-20, 1-21, 1-22, 2-1, 3-5, 3-11
Exercises: 1-3, 1-5, 1-6, 1-7, 1-9, 1-16, 2-1, 2-3, 2-5, 2-12, 2-27, 2-28, 3-6, 3-8, 3-10, 3-16

Play with the pawns, pawn structure
Questions: 1-7, 1-13, 1-19, 2-5, 2-7, 2-16, 2-18, 2-20, 2-29, 2-34, 3-8, 3-13
Exercises: 1-14, 2-1, 2-6, 2-14, 2-18, 2-19, 2-20, 2-22, 2-25, 3-15

Exchanges
Questions: 1-12, 1-14, 1-17, 1-18, 2-10, 2-11, 2-12, 2-15, 2-19, 2-29
Exercises: 1-13, 1-14, 1-15, 2-2, 2-6, 2-7

Prophylaxis
Questions: 1-25, 2-3, 2-13, 2-16, 2-17, 2-18, 2-20, 2-26, 2-27, 2-32, 3-13
Exercises: 2-19, 2-20, 2-30

Strategic thinking, planning
Questions: 1-21, 2-14, 2-29, 2-31, 2-32, 2-33
Exercises: 1-10, 1-17, 2-5, 2-8, 2-15, 2-17, 2-22, 2-26, 2-27, 2-28, 2-33

The technique of converting an advantage
Questions: 1-17, 1-20, 1-26, 2-12, 2-16, 2-22, 3-13
Exercises: 1-7, 1-12, 1-14, 1-15, 1-17, 2-3, 2-12, 2-14, 2-19, 2-22, 2-30, 3-19

Intuition, positional feeling
Questions: 1-7, 1-13, 1-19, 1-21, 1-28, 2-7, 2-11, 2-16, 2-34
Exercises: 2-18

Analysis
Questions: 1-19, 1-28, 2-2, 2-34, 2-36, 3-6, 3-9
Exercises: 1-16, 1-17, 2-27, 2-28, 2-29, 2-30, 2-32, 2-33, 3-4, 3-17, 3-20
Index of Players and Analysts

(numbers refer to pages)

Afanasiev 219
Akopian 128, 226
Alexandria 11, 15, 33, 64, 79, 207, 215
Akhmylovskaya 33
Andersson 45, 138
Arencibia 85
Arnason 113
Balashov 133
Bareev 25, 215
Bazlov 253
Bellon 149
Belyavsky 131, 141
Blekhtsin 204
Boguslavsky 125
Botvinnik 228
Bronstein 135
Capablanca 143
Chekhov 246
Chernin 105
Chiburdanidze 79, 217
Chigorin 151
Chistyakov 52
Damjanovic 97
Dorfm an 48
Drasko 165
Dreev 203
Dubinsky 218
Duras 247
Ermenkov 230
Euwe 154
Faibisovich 235
Ferry 226
Filipowicz 54
Földi 228
Frias 230
Fritz 178
Gelfand 126
Georgadze 39
Gligoric 99, 228
Gorchakov 217
Gorgiev 249
Grigoriev 161
Grünfeld 99
Gurevich, M. 126
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I nov 230
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