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Introduction

I don’t want to spend too much time on biographical details, because this is a book about my games, so I will be content with a brief sketch.

I was born on 11th December 1969 in Madras, and learnt chess at the age of six from my mother. A year later I joined the Tal Chess club in Madras. A couple of years later I went to Manila when my father had an assignment there and got caught up in the Philippines chess fever resulting from the 1978 Karpov-Korchnoi World Championship match. Returning to India, my fascination for chess took off, but it was not until 1983 that I achieved a real breakthrough. In that year I won both the national Sub-Junior (under-16) and Junior (under-19) titles, and qualified for the (adult) national championship. The championship itself was held the following year, and I finished fourth. I had a real success in 1984, winning the Asian Junior Championship, which was held in Coimbatore, a victory which I repeated in 1985. It was also in 1985 that I gained my International Master title; at the time I was the youngest Asian ever to achieve this distinction. In 1986 I won the National Championship and became India’s youngest champion.

The following year, 1987, was special. After having played three times before in the World Junior Championship, finishing 10th, 5th and 7th, I finally won this title. In December of the same year I became the world’s youngest grandmaster (at that time) by making consecutive norms in New Delhi and Coimbatore (FIDE actually awarded the title in April 1988).

The next couple of years featured steady progress, but nothing really spectacular. Then, in July 1990, I broke through the 2600 barrier. In the same month, I qualified for the Candidates from the Manila Interzonal. The first round of the Candidates was held in January 1991, and I won my match against Dreev, but in the quarter-finals I lost narrowly to Karpov in a match that hinged on the final game. After this disappointment, I concentrated on tournament play with some success: I won outright at Reggio Emilia 1991/2 (ahead of Karpov and Kasparov) and in Moscow (November 1992). These successes pushed my rating up to 2700, and I became only the eighth person ever to reach this level.

The following year, 1993, was important because, after the formation of the PCA by Kasparov and Short, there were now two Candidates cycles. The
qualifying events for these were to be held in Biel during July (for the FIDE cycle) and in Groningen during December (for the PCA cycle). I was perhaps somewhat fortunate to qualify from Biel, but at Groningen I reached the PCA Candidates in more convincing style, finishing joint first in the qualifier.

In 1994 I was successful in the PCA cycle, defeating first Romanishin and then Adams to reach the Final of the Candidates. In the FIDE cycle my fortunes were mixed; in the first round I beat Yusupov (who then became my second!), but then I lost to Kamsky after having been two games up with three to play. Round about this time I was also quite successful in quickplay events, winning both the Amber tournament in Monaco and the PCA Grand Prix in Moscow (ahead of Kasparov).

In early 1995 I faced Kamsky in the Final of the PCA Candidates, and I managed to reverse the result of the previous FIDE match and gained the right to face Kasparov for the PCA World Championship in New York. As everybody knows, I started well but faded in the second half. However, losing this match was not the end of the world and in 1996 I was back on the tournament trail, finishing joint first with Kramnik at Dortmund and beating Kasparov in the Final of the Geneva Quickplay. However, the most important event of 1996 had nothing to do with chess: on June 27th I married Aruna in Madras.

So far, 1997 has been a very successful year. In April I finished joint first with Kramnik in the Category 19 tournament at Dos Hermanas and in May I became the first person to win the Amber tournament in Monaco twice. There followed a win in the Frankfurt Rapid, in which I defeated Karpov in the Final. The summer months saw a second place in Dortmund and outright first in Biel; in this latter event I received the prize for the most beautiful game (see Game 40). At the moment I am working hard preparing for a heavy schedule of tournaments in the first half of 1998, so I will sign off now and leave readers to enjoy the games.

Vishy Anand

Collado, Spain
October 1997
Game 1

V. Anand – V. Inkiov

Calcutta 1986

Sicilian, Richter-Rauzer

1 e4 c5
2  ♜f3 d6
3 d4 cxd4
4  ♜xd4  ♜f6
5  ♜c3  ♜c6
6  ♜g5 e6
7  ♗d2  ♘e7
8 0-0-0 0-0
9  ♘b3

In 1986 this move was in vogue thanks to the efforts of Mikhail Tal.

9 ... a5
10 a4 d5
11  ♘b5

A move first played in Tal-Sisniega, Taxco Interzonal 1985, even though Tal ascribes the move’s invention to Vitolinš. Tal won that game and scored an even greater success when he beat Korchnoi with it at the 1985 Montpellier Candidates Tournament. I figured that I could do worse than to follow in Tal’s footsteps.

11 ...  ♘b4

Sisniega played 11... ♘xe4 and Korchnoi 11...dxe4. 11... ♘b4 is another possibility; after 12 exd5 exd5 13 ♗f4, followed by exchanges on c3 and f6, both sides will end up with fractured pawn structures, but it will be difficult for Black to get at White’s c-pawns, whereas White will attack the d5-pawn. The move 11... ♘b4 had been played before, in Vitolinš-Inkiov, Jurmala 1985.

12  ♗he1 (D)

B

12 ... dxe4

After 12... ♗c7 13 e5  ♘e8 14 ♗d4! Black is in a bad way. Due to the weakness of the e6-pawn, Black can’t play ...f6 and his e8-knight is badly placed.

13 ♗xd8

Really the first new move of the game. Vitolinš played 13 ♘xe4 ♘xe4
14 ♗xd8 ♗xg5+ 15 ♗xg5 ♘xg5 16 h4, regaining the piece with an unclear position.
13 ... \textbf{exd8}
After 13...\textbf{exd8} 14 \textbf{Qxe4} \textbf{e7}
(14...\textbf{Qxe4} 15 \textbf{Qxd8} \textbf{Qxf2} 16 \textbf{Qd2}
is very promising for White; Black has no reasonable
defence to the threats of 17 \textbf{Qxa5} and 17 \textbf{Qe7}) 15 \textbf{Qxf6+}
\textbf{Qxf6} (15...\textbf{gxf6} 16 \textbf{Qh6} is similar to
the game) 16 \textbf{Qxf6} \textbf{gxf6} 17 \textbf{Qd6}
Black can play neither ...\textbf{b6} nor ...\textbf{e5},
and so has serious problems developing
his queenside.

14 \textbf{Qxe4} \textbf{bd5} (D)

15 \textbf{c4}
A positionally ugly move, but the
main thing is to exploit White's lead
in development. To this end, White
must keep the d-file open.

15 ... \textbf{Qc7}
15...\textbf{Qb4} occupies the 'hole' created
by White's previous move, but
then 16 \textbf{Qxd8+} \textbf{Qxd8} 17 \textbf{Qd1} \textbf{Qe7}
18 \textbf{Qd6} \textbf{e5} (18...\textbf{b6} 19 \textbf{Qe3}! also
nets a pawn) 19 \textbf{Qxc8} \textbf{Qxc8} 20 \textbf{Qxa5}
wins a pawn.

16 \textbf{Qxd8+} \textbf{Qxd8}

17 \textbf{Qd1}
Everything with tempo.

17 ... \textbf{Qe7} (D)

18 \textbf{Qxf6+}?!  
White retains the advantage after
this move, but Black could have put
up more resistance. It was probably
stronger to play 18 \textbf{Qd6}!. I would
not claim that this is a forced win
(Larsen once observed that all long
variations are wrong!), but Black is
definitely in real trouble:

1) 18...\textbf{b6} 19 \textbf{Qc6}! (not 19 \textbf{Qe3}
because now Black can reasonably
play 19...\textbf{Qxb5}! with a satisfactory
position after either 20 \textbf{cxb5} \textbf{Qd5}!
or 20 \textbf{axb5} transposing to line 2a below) 19...\textbf{Qb8} 20 \textbf{Qf4}! and White's
pieces occupy dominating positions.

2) 18...\textbf{Qxb5} and now there are
two possible lines:

2a) 19 \textbf{axb5} \textbf{b6} (best; 19...\textbf{a4} 20
\textbf{Qa5}! and 19...\textbf{h6} 20 \textbf{Qxf6} \textbf{Qxf6} 21
\textbf{Qc5} are more promising for White)
20 \textbf{Qe3} \textbf{a4} 21 \textbf{Qa1} \textbf{Qd5}! 22 \textbf{cxd5}
\[ \text{a}xd6 23 \text{dxe6 a}e7 24 \text{exf7+ b}xf7 \]
with fair compensation for the pawn.

2b) 19 \text{cxb5}! (this concedes the d5-square, but Black can’t make full use of it) 19...\text{b}6 20 \text{c}4 (20 \text{e}3 \text{d}5! as in line 1) 20...\text{b}8 21 \text{d}4 (intending \text{c}6) 21...\text{b}7 (21...\text{d}7 22 \text{e}5 is also good for White) 22 \text{xb6 a}xg2 23 \text{c}4! (although Black has the two bishops, the mass of pawns on the queenside is the most important factor in the position; 23 \text{d}7 is less accurate since after 23...\text{c}8+ 24 \text{b}1 \text{e}4+ things are getting quite messy) 23...\text{c}8 24 \text{b}3 (White only needs to play \text{b}2 and \text{xa}5 to decide the game with his queenside passed pawns; however, Black can try to win a pawn) 24...\text{d}5 25 \text{b}2! \text{xc}4 26 \text{c}1! (when I checked this position with Fritz, it said that Black was winning! Surprised, I looked to see why) 26...\text{c}5 (this is the reason, but after some thought I found a solution) 27 \text{xc}4 \text{xg}5 28 \text{c}8+ \text{f}8 29 \text{b}6! (Black is helpless) 29...\text{c}5 (after 29...\text{d}7 30 \text{b}7 \text{d}5 31 \text{c}6 Black has no defence to both 32 \text{e}7+ and 32 \text{d}8) 30 \text{b}7 \text{d}7 31 \text{b}5! and Black cannot meet the threat of 32 \text{d}8.

18 ... \text{gxf6}
19 \text{e}3 \text{xb}5
20 \text{axb}5 \text{f}5!

Black fights back. This gives his bishop some air and prevents White forcing the exchange of bishops by \text{c}5. 20...\text{e}5 is worse, as after 21 \text{c}5 \text{xc}5 22 \text{xc}5 \text{g}4 23 \text{d}5 \text{c}8 24 \text{b}3 Black’s queenside pawns are in trouble.

\[ 21 \text{c}5 \]
\[ \text{D} \]

The alternative 21 \text{f}4 ambitiously attempts to squash Black, but he can free himself by sacrificing a pawn: 21...\text{e}5! 22 \text{c}5 (22 \text{f}xe5?! \text{e}6 23 \text{d}2 a4 prevents White supporting his c4-pawn by b3, and then the c4-pawn itself is attacked by ...\text{b}4 and ...\text{c}8) 22...\text{f}6 (not 22...\text{xc}5?, when 23 \text{xc}5 gives White exactly what he wants) and now 23 \text{f}xe5 fails to 23...\text{g}5+ 24 \text{c}2 \text{e}6 and Black is doing well as White cannot hang on to all the pawns (for instance 25 \text{c}3 \text{c}8, followed by some combination of ...\text{a}4 and ...\text{b}6).

\[ 21 \text{... e}5? \]

The best defence was 21...\text{f}4! 22 \text{d}4, and now:

1) 22...\text{e}5 23 \text{xe}5! \text{xc}5 24 \text{d}8+ \text{f}8 25 \text{d}6 and White wins.
2) 22...a4 (by not allowing \( \text{Qa}4 \), Black gets some counterplay) and now:

2a) 23 \( \text{Qd}3 \text{a}d7 \) (23...f6? is very good for White after both 24 \( \text{Cc}5 \) and 24 \( \text{Qxf}4 \text{e}5 \) 25 \( \text{Qd}5 \) 24 \( \text{Qxf}4 \text{Cc}8 \) 25 \( \text{Cc}3 \text{e}8 \) and Black has sufficient counterplay.

2b) 23 \( \text{Qe}4 \text{f}5 \) (23...e5? 24 \( \text{Qxe}5 \text{e}6 \) 25 \( \text{Cc}5 \) 24 \( \text{Cc}5 \) and White retains some advantage.

3) 22...f6 (a solid and sensible defence; Black prepares ...e5 followed by ...\( \text{Qf}7 \)) 23 \( \text{Qa}4! \text{e}5 \) 24 \( \text{Cc}5 \text{f}7 \) 25 \( \text{Qxe}7 \text{xe}7 \) 26 \( \text{Qb}6 \text{b}8 \) with a slight advantage for White.

Thus 21...f4, while not equalizing, would have restricted White’s advantage. The importance of driving the bishop to d4 becomes clear after the text-move.

22 \( \text{Qd}7! \)

From this excellent square the knight virtually paralyses Black’s whole army. The game is already almost over.

22 ... \( \text{f}4 \)

Too late, as now the bishop need not block the d-file.

23 \( \text{Qb}6 \text{f}6 \)

24 \( \text{Cc}7! \)

Since 25 \( \text{Qb}6 \) is threatened, Black can no longer delay capturing the knight; the result is that White’s rook occupies the seventh rank.

24 ... \( \text{Qxd}7 \)

25 \( \text{Qxd}7 \text{c}5 \)

26 \( \text{Qd}6 \text{xd}6 \)

White also wins after 26...\( \text{Qxf}2 \) 27 \( \text{Qxb}7 \text{d}8 \) 28 \( \text{Qb}8! \) (not 28 c5? \( \text{Qxc}5 \) 29 \( \text{Qxc}5 \text{Cc}8 \)) 28...\( \text{Qxb}8 \) 29 \( \text{Qxb}8 \text{f}7 \) 30 \( \text{Cc}7 \) and the threat of 31 b6 forces Black to approach with his king, whereupon 31 \( \text{Qxa}5 \) gives White an overwhelming mass of passed pawns.

27 \( \text{Qxd}6 \) \( (D) \)

\[ \]

Black’s position is lost. The active rook, combined with White’s queenside pawn majority, guarantees a straightforward win.

27 ... \( \text{Qc}8 \)

28 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{a}4 \)

29 \( \text{Qb}2 \) \( \text{axb}3 \)

30 \( \text{Qxb}3 \) \( \text{Qf}7 \)

Just abandoning the b-pawn, but 30...f5 31 \( \text{Qd}7 \text{b}8 \) 32 c5 is also hopeless.

31 \( \text{Qd}7+ \) \( \text{Qe}6 \)

32 \( \text{Qxb}7 \) \( \text{e}4 \)

33 \( \text{Qa}7 \) \( \text{e}3 \)

34 fxe3 fxe3

35 \( \text{Qc}3 \) \( \text{Qd}8 \)
The 1987 World Junior Championship was a breakthrough for me. It was already my fourth World Junior Championship; I had played in every one since 1984, finishing 10th in my first appearance, 5th in 1985 and 7th in 1986, a fairly zigzagging pattern. I started the 1987 event in fairly good shape but I drew 3 out of my first 4 games, and at that point I didn’t imagine that I might win the tournament. However, the following game was a turning point.
Game 2

V. Anand – K. Ninov

World Junior Championship, Baguio City 1987
Sicilian, Kan

1 e4 c5
2 ∆f3 e6
3 d4 cxd4
4 ∆xd4 a6
5 ∆d3 ∆c5
6 ∆b3 ∆a7
7 ∆c3 ∆c6
8 ∆e2 d6
9 ∆e3 ∆xe3

11 g4!

I found this innovation over the board. Previously White had continued 11 0-0-0, but after 11...0-0 White either has to prepare this advance with ∆hgl, or play g4 as a pawn sacrifice. The idea behind the immediate g4 is quite simple: if you play it when g7 is undefended, then it isn’t a sacrifice.

11 ... b5

Black thought for a while, and then decided simply to proceed with his queenside counterplay. However, the tempo White saves by missing out ∆hgl is quite important, and he should have tried 11...∆xg4. After 12 ∆g3 ∆f6 13 ∆xg7 ∆g8 14 ∆h6 ∆d7 Black will play ...∆e7 and both sides will castle queenside. However, when Black castles queenside in the Sicilian, White is better unless there is some mitigating factor, which is not the case here. Indeed, after ∆e3 by White there is an awkward weakness on b6 and the d6-pawn itself may become vulnerable later.

12 0-0-0 0-0
13 g5 ∆e8

A poor square for the knight, but after 13...∆d7 14 ∆e2 Black has
immediate problems with his d6-pawn, due to the exchange of dark-squared bishops and White’s extra tempo. Usually White doesn’t go after d6 in a Sicilian, but that doesn’t mean you should forget about the possibility altogether!

After the text-move, there is no point to \( \text{Nh}g1 \), which would throw away the advantage gained as a result of White’s innovation, so White has to come up with an alternative attacking plan.

One possibility is h4-h5 followed by \( \text{Rd}g1 \). The arrangement with rooks on g1 and h1 is very desirable, because they will break through almost any kingside defence, but it is very time-consuming to set up. Unlike many similar positions in the Sicilian, Black’s queenside counterplay is rather slow here, which is the only reason White can consider this plan, but in the end I decided on a more conventional approach.

14 \( f4 \) \( b4 \)
15 \( \text{Qe}2 \)

15 \( \text{Qa}4 \) would be a more positional formula. White stops \( ...a5-a4 \) and threatens to invade on \( b6 \). After 15...\( \text{Nh}b8 \) White can continue 16 e5, in order to clear the \( c5 \)-square for the knight. However, I preferred to play for the attack, and for that the knight is needed on the kingside.

15 \( ... \) \( a5 \)
16 \( \text{Qbd}4 \) \( \text{Qxd}4 \)
17 \( \text{Qxd}4 \) \( (D) \)

White has the advantage. Normally in the Sicilian, Black’s thematic queenside pawn advance gains time because it hits minor pieces on \( b3 \) and \( c3 \), but here White has evacuated these squares quite quickly. Moreover, the knight on \( e8 \) is very badly placed for supporting the attack. Just about the only useful thing it can do is to shore up the kingside by \( ...g6 \) and \( ...\text{Qg}7 \).

\[ \text{B} \]

17 \( ... \) \( \text{wb}6 \)

At the time I felt that Black should have gone in for 17...\( a4 \), but now I don’t think so. The line that worried me was 18 \( \text{Cc}6 \) \( \text{Cc}7 \) 19 \( \text{Nxb}4 \) \( a3 \) (if Black doesn’t play this, then White plays \( a3 \) himself, followed by \( \text{Qb}1 \) and \( c3 \), and Black will never break through) 20 \( b3 \) (threatening to centralize with \( \text{Qd}4 \)) 20...\( \text{Cc}3 \) (after 20...\( \text{Nh}b8 \) 21 \( \text{Qa}6 \) \( \text{xa}6 \) 22 \( \text{xa}6 \), followed by \( \text{Cc}4 \), White’s queenside position is solid since the poorly placed knight on \( e8 \) cannot displace
White’s bishop), but in fact 21 \textit{we1! wb2+} 22 \textit{d2} is clearly better for White – Black has surprisingly little compensation for the pawn.

These were still the pre-computer days, when players were much more intuitive. Nowadays everybody goes home and checks everything with \textit{Fritz}. The use of computers has made people more sceptical and now they are more prone to go pawn-grabbing unless there is definite compensation.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{18 e5} \\
\text{19 Hh1 (D)}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{19 ... dxe5} \\
\text{Or 19...a4 (19...d8 20 f5! is similar) 20 f5! dxe5 (20...exf5 21 e6 is very good for White) 21 fxe6! (not 21 \textit{xe5 a5!}) 21...exd4 22 \textit{wh3 g6 (22...f5 23 \textit{xf5! gives White a winning attack) 23 exf7+ \textit{xf7 (23...\textit{h8 24 \textit{h6 \textit{g7 25 \textit{f6 wins) 24 \textit{xf7 \textit{xf7 25 \textit{wh7+ winning the black queen.}})}})}})}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{20 fxe5 d8? (D)}
\end{array}
\]

Allowing a pretty finish. 20...g6! was best, when White could continue 21 \textit{f5 \textit{xe3+ 22 \textit{xe3}} with a pleasant endgame – his knight could head for either f6 or d6. Still, Black has some chances by playing his knight to f5, and he should certainly have gone for this.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{21 \textit{xh7+! \textit{xh7}}}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{22 g6+}
\end{array}
\]

Once again Black suffers because of his miserable knight position. Here it prevents Black from playing 22...fxg6.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{22 ... g8}
\end{array}
\]

Or 22...\textit{xg6 23 \textit{d3+ (stopping ...\textit{h7) 23...f5 (23...\textit{h6 24 \textit{h3+ g5 25 g1+ f4 26 d6e1 with mate next move) 24 exf6+ with a decisive attack.}})}}}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{23 \textit{wh3 \textit{f6}}}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{23...fxg6 loses to 24 \textit{xf8+ \textit{xf8 25 \textit{xe6+.}})}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{24 exf6 (D)}
\end{array}
\]
It isn’t every day you see two attacking pawns on f6 and g6! When you get a position like this, you go away feeling very pleased and have a warm glow for the next few games.

24 ... fxg6
25 fxg7 1-0

Since 25...hxg7 26 Qxe6+ and 25...Bxf1 26 Wh8+ Qf7 27 Bxf1+ are decisive.

After this game, which was from round 5, there was a free day and the players went on an excursion. I still hadn’t broken free from the pack. The following day, however, saw another good result. I was facing Agdestein, who at 2565 was the highest-rated player in the tournament, although he was not the only grandmaster (Ivan Sokolov was also participating, although he was not very successful).

I prepared as well as I could because Agdestein is very unpredictable in the openings, and sat down hoping to play a good game.
Game 3
V. Anand – S. Agdestein
World Junior Championship, Baguio City 1987
Ruy Lopez

1 e4 c6
A provocative move. At the time it was felt that this move had little independent significance because so long as White knew he should play 2 d4, Black had nothing better than 2...e5, thereby transposing into standard king’s pawn openings. Subsequently it was discovered that Black could wind White up even more by playing 2...d6, but I don’t trust this for Black!

2 d4 f3 e5
3 d5 b5
4 a4 b5
5 b3 a5

Agdestein is fond of offbeat systems. I didn’t know much about this one, although it is popular amongst Norwegian players. I could only remember a game between Spassky and Taimanov (in fact from the 1955 USSR Championship, held in Moscow). Nevertheless, I was quite happy to see it on the board. White can play natural moves and there is not much risk even if he commits a slight inaccuracy – a pleasant situation when facing the top seed!

6 0-0 d6
7 d4 cxb3

8 axb3 c6
9 c3 b7

I recalled that Spassky had played 10 h4 in the above-mentioned game, with dxe5, f3 and d1 following in some order, and that later Spassky sacrificed a piece by means of cxb5.

10 h4 e7 (D)

11 dxe5! dxe5

If Black plays 11...fxe5, then White can strongly reply 12 f4, opening the position up while Black’s king is still stuck in the centre. However, taking back with the d-pawn retains control of g5, so that f4 can be met by ...exf4 followed by the fork...g5.

12 w f3
White avoids the exchange of queens as most of his chances lie in exploiting Black's poor development and centralized king.

12 ... \( \text{Wd7} \)

13 \( \text{Ad1} \) \( \text{We6} \)

By now I had worked out that this was indeed what had happened in the Spassky game, and that he now continued with 14 \( \text{Qe3} \). For a moment I wondered what Taimanov had played that allowed the sacrifice on b5, then I realized that it was 14...g5. After 15 \( \text{Qxb5! axb5} \) 16 \( \text{Wh5+ Wf7} \) (16...\( \text{Qg6} \) 17 \( \text{Qxg6 Wf7} \) 18 \( \text{xa8+ Qxa8} \) 19 \( \text{g4} \) also wins) 17 \( \text{xa8+ Qxa8} \) 18 \( \text{Qd8+ Qxd8} \) 19 \( \text{xf7} \) \( \text{gxf7} \) 20 \( \text{xf6} \) White had a winning position.

However, I was worried by the idea of 14...h5!?, intending ...\( \text{Wg4} \). I mulled over this for some time, but couldn't see an easy answer. If White plays 15 h3, then 15...g5 is now possible because White has no queen check on h5. If 15 \( \text{Qd5} \), then Black just castles queenside. It appeared to me that if White was going to play \( \text{Qd5} \), then it would be better to do it straight away, before Black had time to set up the threat of ...\( \text{Wg4} \).

14 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5} \)

If 14...0-0-0, then 15 c4 and White is already starting to make Black's king feel insecure.

15 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{Wf7} \)

16 c4?! (D)

A slight inaccuracy which gives Black the chance to sideline the knight on h4. 16 \( \text{Qf5} \) would have been more accurate, because White can play c4 at any time – Black can’t prevent it. Then 16...g6 17 \( \text{Qh6 Qxh6} \) 18 \( \text{Qxh6} \) 0-0-0 19 c4 \( \text{Qd7} \) would have led to a position in which White has an edge, since Black has no really constructive plan.

16 ... \( \text{Qe7} \)??

Black misses the opportunity he has been given. 16...g6! would have left the h4-knight misplaced. It is true that after 17 \( \text{We2 Qg7} \) 18 f4 0-0 19 f5, followed by \( \text{We4} \), White has a good centralized position and Black's bishops are hemmed in. However, after 18...0-0-0!? Black would have chances of putting his two bishops to work. The b7-bishop functions as a kind of 'Dragon' bishop, in that it makes it hard for White's attack down the a-file to strike home properly. Moreover, playing \( \text{cx b5} \) will
leave d5 hanging. White is certainly not worse, but Black would have far more counterplay than he obtains in the game.

17 \( \text{Qf5} \) (\( D \))

2) 19 c5! (even more forcing) 19...\( \text{xf5} \) (19...0-0 20 d6 wins a piece) 20 \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 21 \( \text{c8+} \) and after 21...\( \text{d8} \) 22 \( \text{xa6} \) or 21...\( \text{d8} \) 22 \( \text{xd8+} \) \( \text{xd8} \) 23 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e7} \) 24 \( \text{xa6} \) White wins a pawn while retaining a positional advantage.

The exchange of inaccuracies has favoured White, because Black’s inaccuracy is actually quite serious – his bishop doesn’t belong on e7 at all. Now White is clearly better.

17 ... \( \text{d8} \)

17...0-0 is impossible because of 18 \( \text{h6} \).

18 \( \text{e3} \) g6 (\( D \))

More or less forced, because otherwise Black lacks a constructive move. 18...0-0? still fails to 19 \( \text{h6} \) while after 18...\( \text{c8} \) White has a choice of promising lines:

1) 19 \( \text{ac1} \) 0-0 20 \( \text{xe7} \) (not 20 cxb5 \( \text{xf5} \) 21 \( \text{xf5} \) axb5 22 \( \text{xc7} \) \( \text{xd5} \) and Black escapes) 20...\( \text{xe7} \) 21 cxb5 \( \text{fe8} \) 22 b6 cxb6 23 \( \text{xb6} \) \( \text{d7} \) 24 \( \text{d3} \)! \( \text{b7} \) 25 d6 gives White a clear advantage.

19 \( \text{h6} \! \)

White could exchange on e7, but then Black’s king could castle or move to f7 and he would have fair defensive chances. White’s queenside majority is an asset, but it will not win the game by itself because the c-pawn is tied to the defence of d5. Instead, I wanted to keep Black’s king on e8, while I broke through on the c- and d-files.

19 ... \( \text{g7} \)

Intending ...f5, when the knight might be in trouble.

20 \( \text{g3} \)!

This move, introducing \( \text{df5} \) ideas, is not so strong as I imagined during the game. Sometimes, when you
have a good position, the temptation is just to play easy, comfortable moves and wait for the position to win itself. The correct move was 20 cxb5!, when 20...axb5 fails to 21 a7. During the game I rejected it because of 20...f5 21 bxa6 a8, with the threat of ...f4. However, with ten years’ hindsight I don’t see Black’s compensation for the two pawns. In particular, once White has played a7 the bishop on a8 will effectively be dead, since taking on d5 will always allow a combination involving the promotion of the a-pawn. One line is 22 h3! f4 23 d2 g5 24 g4 h5 25 xxe5 and wins.

It is worth noting that 20 h4 was playable. After 20...c8 we transpose into the game, but White has saved a couple of moves.

20

Threatening ...g5, so White’s next move is forced.

21 h4 d6 (D)

If Black attempts to play actively by 21...f5 22 g5! f4 then:

1) 23 c3 b4 24 d2 (24 f3 xg5 25 hxg5 e7 26 g4 xg5 27 xxe5 0-0! is unclear) 24...xg5 25 hxg5 e7 26 e1 f8! and Black has counterplay.

2) 23 h2!. A paradoxical move which nails down Black’s kingside. Now White simply threatens e1 followed by doubling or even g3 (meeting ...f3 by g4). However Black continues, his e5-pawn will come under fire and his king is trapped in the centre. The point of h2 is that after 23...xg5 24 hxg5 e7 White can defend the g5-pawn and maintain his kingside bind.

22 f3

Other moves are inferior, for example 22 c5? xg5 or 22 ac1 e4 23 f4 xh6! 24 xh6 xg3 25 fxg3. In this latter line White keeps a slight edge as the opposite-coloured bishops (which normally have a drawish influence) make Black’s defence a bit more difficult, when there are still a fair number of major pieces on the board. However, I thought that keeping the queens on offered even more.

The move f3 is mainly to preempt the threat of ...e4. Now that White has got the knight firmly entrenched on h6, he can proceed with ac1 followed by c5 and d6. The manoeuvre f3-g3-f3 may appear odd, but Black has also wasted time.
with the manoeuvres ...\textit{b}7-c8 and ...	extit{f}8-e7-d6.

22 \textit{e}7

Black would like to play ...\textit{f}8, but the immediate 22...\textit{f}8 allows 23 c5, because after 23...\textit{x}c5 24 \textit{x}c5 the rook on f8 is hanging. So Black returns to e7, still preventing c5 and getting ready to play ...\textit{f}8 next move. The net effect of both players' oscillations has been to add the moves h4 and ...	extit{c}8, which benefits White.

At this stage I felt that my position was very comfortable, but I had (and still have) a great deal of respect for Agdestein and I wasn't counting on victory yet.

23 \textit{ac}1

Retaining the option of either cxb5 or c5 followed by d6.

23 \textit{bxc}4

Agdestein finally decides to remove the cxb5 option.

24 \textit{bxc}4 \textit{f}8
25 c5 \textit{f}5
26 \textit{g}5 \textit{xg}5
27 \textit{hxg}5 \textit{we}7
28 \textit{we}3! (D)

White had a more complex alternative in 28 d6 \textit{xg}5 29 \textit{c}6+ \textit{d}7 (29...\textit{d}7 30 \textit{a}8\textit{! d}8 31 \textit{e}1 should win for White) 30 \textit{x}c7 \textit{xh}6 31 c6. This would also have been quite promising, as Black would have to return the piece for one pawn, still leaving White with a dangerous passed pawn. However, given that an effective, solid alternative existed, I preferred to play safe.
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In a way it is quite strange that White is not winning already, since Black's king is irrevocably trapped in the centre – not only can it not castle, but even f7 is denied to it. However, the reason is the knight on h6. It is of course doing a wonderful job, but when it comes to landing a killing blow in the centre, White is effectively a piece down.

28 ... \textit{f}4
29 \textit{wh}4 \textit{e}4
30 d6 \textit{we}5!

The best chance. After 30...cxd6 31 \textit{cx}d6 \textit{we}6 (31...\textit{we}5? 32 \textit{xc}8!) 32 \textit{c}7 e3 (32...\textit{a}d7 33 \textit{g}4) White can continue 33 fxe3 fxe3 (after 33...\textit{x}e3+ 34 \textit{h}1 there is no defence against 35 \textit{e}1) 34 \textit{c}4! \textit{f}2 35 \textit{xe}6+ \textit{xe}6 36 \textit{e}7+ \textit{f}8 37 \textit{xe}6 with an extra piece.

31 dxc7 \textit{xd}1+
32 \textit{xd}1 (D)
32 ... e3?

Black decides to counterattack, but now White’s win is fairly straightforward. Black’s only chance was 32...\textit{\texttt{dx}c7}, when we can see that it is not so easy for White because his knight is on h6. If it were on any normal square then, for example, \textit{\texttt{Qc}3 or \textit{\texttt{c}4}, heading for d5 or d6, would be decisive. Nevertheless, after 33 \textit{\texttt{Qg}4 (heading for f6) 33...\textit{\texttt{Qx}g4 34 \textit{\texttt{Wx}g4 \textit{\texttt{f}5 35 b}4}! (White needs to pause for this move; it strengthens c5 and indirectly supports \textit{\texttt{d}6; after}}}}

35 \textit{\texttt{We}2 \textit{\texttt{x}c5 36 \textit{\texttt{We}e}4+ \textit{\texttt{f}7 White’s attack has got a bit stuck} White has a large advantage. He intends \textit{\texttt{We}2 and \textit{\texttt{Qd}6, taking aim at e4 and a6, when Black’s exposed king causes continuing problems. If 35...e3, then 36 fxe3 fxe3 37 \textit{\texttt{We}e}4+ picks up the e3-pawn (37...\textit{\texttt{Le}5 38 \textit{\texttt{W}a}8+ \textit{\texttt{Le}7 39 \textit{\texttt{Wh}8 is even worse).}}}}}

\[
\begin{align*}
33 & \textit{\texttt{Qd}8+} & \textit{\texttt{Qe}7} \\
34 & \textit{\texttt{Qg}8+} & \textit{\texttt{Qx}g8} \\
35 & \textit{\texttt{Qx}g8!} & \textit{\texttt{Le}6} \\
\text{Or 35...e2} & 36 \textit{\texttt{Wx}h7+} & \textit{\texttt{Qe}6 37 \textit{\texttt{Le}8+ and wins.}}
\end{align*}
\]

36 \textit{\texttt{C8W}}

36 \textit{\texttt{Wx}h7+ \textit{\texttt{Qf}7 37 \textit{\texttt{Le}8+ \textit{\texttt{We}e}8 38 \textit{\texttt{C}8W+ \textit{\texttt{Qe}7 39 \textit{\texttt{W}b}7+ \textit{\texttt{Qd}8 40 \textit{\texttt{W}h}8+! is a prettier win, but I preferred the prosaic text.}}}}}

\[
\begin{align*}
36 & \text{...} & \textit{\texttt{Exf}2+} \\
37 & \textit{\texttt{Wxf}2!}
\end{align*}
\]

This game has been published in some magazines with the move 37 \textit{\texttt{Qxf}2, but that allows mate in two!!}

\[
\begin{align*}
37 & \text{...} & \textit{\texttt{Qxc}8} \\
38 & \textit{\texttt{Q}xc8} & \textit{\texttt{Qe}8 1-0}
\end{align*}
\]

This win over the top seed put me well on the way to becoming World Junior Champion. My run of wins continued with further victories over Klinger, Ivanchuk and Blatny, after which I was in clear first place, a position I held on to until the end of the tournament.

Winning the World Junior was my big breakthrough. Normally a player from India would have to waste a lot of time playing in mediocre open tournaments, gradually improving his Elo rating and hoping to get some invitations. However, the two factors of my World Junior title and my GM title, which I gained shortly after this event, enabled me to short-circuit the process. I got an invitation to a pleasant open tournament in Lugano (but after
my play there, I didn’t get invited again!). Then I was asked to be a commen-
tator at the World Cup event in Brussels (April 1988). In Brussels I was able
to meet some tournament organizers and this led to my first top-class invita-
tion — to Wijk aan Zee 1989.

I had a tough year in 1988, just after gaining my GM title. I lost about 40
rating points in two tournaments at Biel and Blackpool — I still don’t under-
stand why, although many GMs have told me that they had similar expe-
riences after gaining their title. I had a break after Biel and returned to active
play near the end of the year at the Thessaloniki Olympiad, making 8½
points out of 12 games. This score was sufficient to regain 10 of the Elo
points I had lost, but later I was surprised to discover that FIDE had not given
me any points at Thessaloniki. The reason, I found out, was that the Indian
team had arrived late, after the first round, and had therefore lost one match
by default. FIDE had counted this as a normal loss, thereby wiping out my
ten point gain from the rest of the event! Later on I had my ten points rein-
stated.

I then scored 6/9 at the GMA Open in Belgrade and subsequently I played
at Reggio Emilia, another good invitation resulting from my World Junior
success. This tournament started well with wins against Ivanchuk and Sax,
but after that I lost some games and finished on 4/9. However, this event was
very useful for me; it was the first time that I had played such a strong field.

My next event was the long-awaited trip to Wijk aan Zee. This was my first
really big event and I was thrilled to be there. I had a zigzag course in the
tournament. I won my first two games, just as at Reggio Emilia, then lost to
Tseshkovsky (who used to be a nemesis of sorts!). I also lost to Van der Wiel,
but then won against Ivan Sokolov. I was still on ‘+1’ when the following
game was played in the penultimate round.
Game 4

V. Anand – J. Benjamin

Wijk aan Zee 1989

Sicilian, Richter-Rauzer

1 e4 c5
2 d3 d6
3 d4 cxd4
4 cxd4 f6
5 c3 c6
6 g5 e6
7 d2 e7
8 0-0-0 0-0
9 b3

Two of the first four games in the book reach this position! I have done pretty well with this line so far.

9 ... b6

By the time this game was played it had become clear that 9...a5 wasn't that great a move.

10 f3 d8 (D)

There is an interesting story relating to this move. I used to get a lot of my theoretical information from Ivanchuk. For example, during the 1985 World Junior Championship in Sharjah he had shown me a tremendous idea in the Dragon, which turned an existing evaluation upside down; I was amazed (and thankful!) that he was so open and generous about showing his ideas to me. I would try to give him some titbit in return, but unfortunately my novelties were not that good!

At the Reggio Emilia event the month before Wijk aan Zee, there hadn't been much to do in the evenings, so one day I went to Chucky's room. By this time he had recovered from his first round loss to me and was on a respectable score. He was also feeling bored; we went out for a walk and then returned to his room. I asked him "Why does everybody play the Catalan – it seems such a boring opening." He replied that it was not boring at all and proceeded to show me an interesting idea. The introductory moves were 1 d4 d6 2 c4 e6 3 d5 c5 4 g3 e7 5 g2 0-0 6 c3 dxc4 7 e5 c5 8 dxc5 and
now Vassily said that 8...\textit{\texttt{wc}}7 was supposed to be a good move. He explained that after 9 \textit{\texttt{dx}}c4 \textit{\texttt{wxc}}5... \textit{\texttt{(D)}}
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...everybody plays 10 \textit{\texttt{wb}}3, but he had found a very strong idea: 10 b3!.

The point is that after 10...\textit{\texttt{dd}}8 White can play 11 \textit{\texttt{ea}}3 \textit{\texttt{xd}}1+ 12 \textit{\texttt{xd}}1 \textit{\texttt{wc}}7 13 \textit{\texttt{db}}5 trapping the queen. I was very impressed by this line, which I had never seen before. He explained that this was the reason why ...\textit{\texttt{wc}}7 was not good in this particular line of the Catalan, but was good in the similar lines in which Black plays ...\textit{\texttt{db}}4 and later retreats the bishop to e7 in response to a3.

The reason, of course, is that the pawn on a3 prevents the move \textit{\texttt{ea}}3. A nice idea, but apparently not much use to me as I didn’t play the Catalan. I hope Chucky will forgive me for revealing this piece of analysis!

Returning to the Benjamin game, at this time I didn’t really study the openings too deeply. I looked at all the theory, but didn’t really go beyond that. After 10...\textit{\texttt{dd}}8 I suddenly didn’t feel very happy with my position and couldn’t find a continuation I felt comfortable with. Then I suddenly brightened up, because I saw a little trick after 11 \textit{\texttt{db}}1.

\textbf{11 ... d5?! \textit{\texttt{(D)}}}

If Black plays 11...a6, then 12 \textit{\texttt{ea}}3 \textit{\texttt{wc}}7 13 \textit{\texttt{ff}}2 and White gains time owing to the threat of \textit{\texttt{bb}}6, so \textit{\texttt{bb}}1 is really to provoke ...a6. Later on it was discovered that this doesn’t really matter, because Black’s counterplay consists of ...a6, ...\textit{\texttt{dd}}7 and ...b5 in any case, but we didn’t know that in 1989!

After 11 \textit{\texttt{bb}}1 Benjamin looked surprised, because he didn’t understand the point of the move. Perhaps he was thinking ‘Vishy doesn’t know that Black’s threat is ...d5’. Anyhow, when he played ...d5 I checked my idea carefully, although there isn’t much choice because after anything else White is clearly worse.
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12 \( \text{Qxf6} \) \( \text{dxe4?} \)

Benjamin falls for it hook, line and sinker. He could still have bailed out by 12...\( \text{Qxf6} \) 13 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{Qxc3} \) 14 \( \text{Wxc3} \) \( \text{exd5} \), although after 15 \( \text{Wc5} \) or 15 \( \text{Qd3} \) White has some positional advantage. However, as he admitted after the game, he simply hadn’t seen the idea at all.

13 \( \text{Qxe7} \)

Not 13 \( \text{Qd4} \) \( \text{Qxd4} \) 14 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \text{e5}.

13 ...

14 \( \text{Qxd2! (D)} \)

After the game Benjamin said that he wanted to resign at this point, but decided to play a few more moves; however, I then started to play so badly that he couldn’t bring himself to resign any more.

15 \( \text{gx f3?} \)

Here’s the bad move. Later I realized that 15 \( \text{Qc4}! \) would have won on the spot. 15...

15 ... \( \text{Qf2} \) loses to 16 \( \text{Qe4} \), and after 15...

15 ... \( \text{Qc7} \) 16 \( \text{Qd6} \) \( \text{fxg2} \) 17 \( \text{Qxg2} \) \( \text{Wd8} \) 18 \( \text{Qg3} \) \( \text{We7} \) 19 \( \text{Qh1} \) all White’s pieces are active and his knights are going on a queenside rampage \( \text{(Qb5 or Qd5, coupled with Qd6)} \). The fact that White has a lost a pawn is irrelevant.

15 ...

16 \( \text{Qh4?! (D)} \)

Another mistake. 16 \( \text{Qa3} \) would have been much better, keeping control of key squares such as \text{c5 and d6}. In this case White should still win in the long run, although thanks to White’s previous error it is likely to be a laborious process.
16 ... \(\text{Ke6}\)
17 \(\text{Qde4}\)

White already has to take care: not 17 \(\text{Qc4}\)? \(\text{Qxc4}\) 18 \(\text{Qxc4 wb4}\).

17 ... \(\text{Qd4} (D)\)

\[\text{Diagram}\
\]

18 \(\text{Ag2}??\)

After this, the position becomes rather murky, although it is possible that White can still retain an advantage by accurate play. 18 \(\text{Af2}\) was a much safer way to prove that White is better.

18 ... \(\text{Qc8}\)

Suddenly I couldn’t find a line that worked for White. The threat is ...f5 followed by ...\(\text{Qxc3}\), and it isn’t easy to find a good defence. Finally I found a line that seemed to work for White but I was very nervous because Black has all his pieces aimed at White’s queenside.

19 \(\text{Qf2}\) f5!

20 \(\text{f4}\)

Not 20 \(\text{Qg5}\)? \(\text{Qxc3}\) 21 \(\text{Qxe6 wbxe6}\) \(\text{Qxe6}\) 22 \(\text{Qxd4}\) (22 bxc3? \(\text{wb6}\) and

Black wins) 22...exd4 23 bxc3 dxc3 24 \(\text{Qa1 wb2}\) (24...\(\text{wb6}\) 25 \(\text{Qb1 wb2}\)
26 \(\text{Qf1 wb2}\) 27 \(\text{Qc4+}\) followed by \(\text{Qxb7}\) wins for White) 25 \(\text{Qg1 wb2}\)
26 \(\text{Qb1 wd2}\) 27 a3 and Black is even slightly better.

20 ... fxe4
21 fxe5 \(\text{Qd4} (D)\)

\[\text{Diagram}\
\]

21 ... \(\text{Qc4}\)

21...\(\text{Qxd8}\)! would have made life much harder for White:

1) 22 \(\text{Qe2}\)? \(\text{Qxa2+}\) 23 \(\text{Qxa2 wb6}\) wins for Black.

2) 22 \(\text{Qhe1?! Qg4}\)! 23 \(\text{Qd2 wb6}\)!
24 \(\text{Qe3}\) (24 \(\text{Qxd4 Qxd4}\) 25 \(\text{Qxd4 wd2}\) favours Black) 24...\(\text{Qh4}\) 25 \(\text{Qf2}\)
with a draw by repetition.

3) 22 \(\text{Qd2}\)? \(\text{Qf5}\) (not 22...\(\text{Qb3}\)?
23 axb3 and White wins) 23 \(\text{Qe3}\)!
\(\text{Qg6}\) 24 \(\text{Qhd1}\) and, surprisingly, there is little Black can do to prevent \(\text{Qf1}\)
followed by taking on d4.

While 21...\(\text{Qd8}\) might not have been any better than the text-move against perfect play, 22 \(\text{Qd2}\)! and 23
\( \text{\#e3! aren't easy moves to find over the board.} \)

22 \( \text{\#h1? (D)} \)

Missing 22 \( \text{\#e2! \#a4} \) (Black’s sacrificial attempts fail, for example 22...\( \text{\#xb2+} \) 23 \( \text{\#xb2 \#xc2+} \) 24 \( \text{\#a1} \) \( \text{\#xe2} \) 25 \( \text{\#e1} \) or 22...\( \text{\#xc2} \) 23 \( \text{\#xd4} \) \( \text{\#c6} \) 24 \( \text{\#f4} \) and White wins in both cases) 23 b3! \( \text{\#xa2} \) (if 23...\( \text{\#xb3} \), then simply 24 axb3) 24 \( \text{\#xd4} \) and wins.

It would also have been good to play 23 b3!, which looks a bit paradoxical as Black has so many pieces ready to sacrifice on b3. However, after 23...\( \text{\#xb3} \) 24 axb3 \( \text{\#xb3}+ \) 25 \( \text{\#c1} \) White should win.

23 ... \( \text{\#g4} \)

If 23...\( \text{\#b3+} \) then 24 axb3 \( \text{\#xf2} \) 25 \( \text{\#d8+} \) \( \text{\#f7} \) 26 \( \text{\#f1} \) picks up the queen.

24 \( \text{\#d5} \) \( \text{\#c5} \)

25 \( \text{\#xb4} \) \( \text{\#xd1} \)

26 \( \text{\#xd1! (D)} \)

Not 26 \( \text{\#xd1?} \) \( \text{\#e2+} \) and Black wins, nor 26 \( \text{\#xe4} \) \( \text{\#b3+!} \) 27 \( \text{\#xd1} \) \( \text{\#xf2} \) 28 axb3 \( \text{\#xg2} \) 29 \( \text{\#e2} \) and only Black can be better.

After the text-move it suddenly dawned on me that I was completely winning. I had been struggling to contain Black’s queenside initiative for so many moves that the realization caught me by surprise!

22 ... \( \text{\#b4?} \)

Benjamin was in time-trouble by now, and commits another mistake. The best line was 22...\( \text{\#g4!} \) 23 \( \text{\#d2} \) (not 23 \( \text{\#xd4? \#xd4} \) 24 \( \text{\#xe4 \#xe4} \) 25 \( \text{\#xb6 \#xe1#} \) 23...\( \text{\#h6!} \) 24 \( \text{\#xe4} \) (or 24 \( \text{\#xd4 \#xd4} \) 25 \( \text{\#xd4 \#d2} \) 24...\( \text{\#e6} \) and Black has avoided losing a piece. Despite Black’s slight material advantage, I don’t think White is worse, since Black’s king is fairly exposed and his pieces disjointed.

23 \( \text{\#c1!} \)

26 ... \( \text{e3} \)

26...\( \text{\#xb4} \) loses to 27 \( \text{\#xe4} \).
27 \textit{hxe3} \textit{f5} \quad \text{Forced; 28...\textit{h8} fails to 29 \textit{c3}.}
28 \textit{d5+}

An important \textit{intermezzo}. 28 \textit{f3}
is a mistake because of 28...\textit{xb4} 29
\textit{xf5 \textit{g4+}.}
28 ... \textit{f8}

Before the last round I was in a tie for first place with Nikolić, Ribli and Sax. I had the feeling that a draw in the last round would be enough to maintain the \textit{status quo}, and indeed when my game with Douven ended in a draw my feeling turned out to be justified, as the other leaders also drew. Thus we ended up in a four-way tie for first. It was my first success in one of the world’s major international events.

In 1989, Bessel Kok, the chairman of SWIFT and a great chess benefactor, organized a Youth vs Veterans event in Cannes not long after Wijk aan Zee. It was held in conjunction with the annual Cannes Games Festival and was a very enjoyable event. The veterans were Tal, Spassky, Andersson, Csom and Larsen; the youth team consisted of Lautier, Renet, Adams, Mirallès and myself. As the only GM in the youth team, I was accommodated in an excellent hotel; indeed, the conditions at this event were the best I had experienced until then.
I met Misha Tal for the first time when I visited the World Cup tournament in Brussels in 1988. He was the most popular player by far, captivating everyone with his personality and his brilliant chess. This was my first game against my childhood hero and I was obviously quite excited.

1 c4 c5
2 ∇f3 ∇c6
3 ∇c3 ∇d4

How do you explain a move that violates the rule not to move the same piece twice in the opening? Well, I can’t really find a general principle that justifies it, but it does seem to work! One possible explanation is that when White recaptures on f3 with his queen, he has lost control of the important d4-square. Then Black can bring out his other knight via h6 and f5 to fight for d4.

In any case, 3...∇d4 is a provocative move which leads to a more unbalanced type of position than is usual in the Symmetrical English.

4 e3 ∇xf3+
5 ∇xf3 g6 (D)
6 b3

Or 6 d4 ∇g7 7 dxc5 (after 7 ∇d1 ∇f6 White will have to play d5 and then lose a tempo with e3-e4 in order to get his customary space advantage) and now:

1) 7...を考えa5 8 e4! ∇xc5 9 ∇d5! (stronger than 9 ∇d3 ∇xc3+ 10 bxc3 d6) with a slight advantage for White.

2) 7...∇xc3+!? 8 bxc3 ∇a5 9 e4 ∇xc5 10 ∇d3 d6. Normally Black should not give up his bishop like this in an ‘Indian structure’, but due to White’s doubled c-pawns this position should be compared with the Nimzo-Indian rather than the King’s Indian Defence. Admittedly Black has already played ...g6, but it’s not clear how White can exploit this.
6 ... \( \text{g7} \)
7 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{d6} \)
8 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{b8} \)
9 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{h6}?! \)

Two years later, I beat Karpov with 9...\( \text{Af6} \); the tactical justification is that 10 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{g4}! \) equalizes immediately. Actually, it is much more natural than 9...\( \text{Ah6} \). Whatever can be said about the objective merits of 3...\( \text{d4} \), I scored 2/2 against Tal and Karpov with it!

10 \( \text{d1} \) 0-0
11 0-0 \( \text{d7} \)

To support the ...\( b5 \) advance.

12 \( \text{a4} \)

After 12 \( \text{d4}?! \) Black’s plan of exerting pressure on \( d4 \) comes to fruition: 12...\( \text{xd4} \) 13 \( \text{exd4} \) \( \text{f5} \)! 14 \( \text{d5} \) (14 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{b5} \)! gives Black the edge) 14...\( \text{b5} \)! with good counterplay.

12 ... \( \text{c6} \)
13 \( \text{d4} \) \( \text{xg2} \)
14 \( \text{xg2} \) (\( D \))

After 14...\( \text{xd4} \) 15 \( \text{exd4} \) \( \text{f5} \) 16 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{a6} \) 17 \( \text{b1} \) the position is slightly better for White. He has a space advantage and a weak black e-pawn to play against. On the other hand, his pieces on the queenside are awkwardly placed.

15 \( \text{d3}?! \)

Tal later mentioned the possibility of 15 \( \text{d5} \)! and this move does seem to offer White a stable if minuscule edge. Black will hardly be able to achieve ...\( b5 \) and playing ...\( e7-e6 \) would create weak pawns on e6 and d6.

15 ... \( \text{xd4} \)
16 \( \text{exd4} \) \( \text{f5} \)

Now Black is fine.

17 \( \text{d5} \) (\( D \))

After 17 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{d5} \) 18 \( \text{c5} \) a5 Black is slightly better. White’s queenside pawns are crippled and the pawn on \( d4 \) is weak. White’s best line was probably 17 \( \text{d5}! \) \( \text{e6} \) 18 \( \text{e3} \), just playing for the exchange of knights and equality.
17 ... \textbf{wb6}

The reason why \textbf{wd3} was bad – b3 is undefended.

18 \textbf{qd1} \textbf{axb2}
19 \textbf{xb2} e5!

Now Black is justified in playing actively. The open f-file counts for more than Black’s slightly weak central pawns.

20 \textbf{dxe6}

Forced. If White doesn’t do this, Black can aim for ...e4-e3. Moreover, his knight can settle comfortably on d4.

20 ... \textbf{fxe6}
21 \textbf{ad1} \textbf{f6}

Preparing to double rooks on the f-file.

22 \textbf{d2} e5! (D)

23 \textbf{wd5+}

After 23 \textbf{qd1} \textbf{qd4} Black wins a pawn as White has to meet the threat of 24...\textbf{wc6+}.

23 ... \textbf{g7}
24 \textbf{wb5} \textbf{c7}

25 c5

There is no other defence against 25...\textbf{qd4}.

25 ... \textbf{xc5}
26 \textbf{xb7} \textbf{c7}
27 \textbf{d5} \textbf{b4}

Not 27...\textbf{xd5+?} 28 \textbf{xd5} \textbf{c2} and White can hang on with 29 \textbf{qc4}.

28 \textbf{fd1} \textbf{c5}

Exploiting the weakness of b3. 28...\textbf{qd4} is less clear after 29 \textbf{qc4} \textbf{c5} (not 29...\textbf{xb3}? 30 \textbf{xd6}) 30 \textbf{wa8}.

29 \textbf{wa8}

If 29 \textbf{qd3}? then 29...\textbf{e3+!} 30 \textbf{fxe3} \textbf{wd2+} winning the exchange.

29 ... \textbf{xb3}
30 \textbf{qd3} (D)

After 30 \textbf{xa7+} \textbf{f7} 31 \textbf{wa6} (31 \textbf{wa8} \textbf{c2} is similar, e.g. 32 \textbf{qd3} \textbf{wc3} 33 \textbf{xc2} \textbf{wc2} winning material) 31...\textbf{c2!} 32 \textbf{qd3} \textbf{xd2} 33 \textbf{xd2} \textbf{wd5+} 34 \textbf{g1} e4 White loses the pinned knight.

30 ... \textbf{c2}?!
30...\texttt{c7}! would have been brutally effective – Black simply maintains his a-pawn and threatens both \texttt{31...xa4} and \texttt{31...\texttt{d4}}.

\textbf{31 \texttt{e4}?!}

White could have made life harder by playing \texttt{31 \texttt{xax7}+ \texttt{f7} 32 \texttt{a5} (D) (32 \texttt{a8} \texttt{c3}! wins). I don’t know if Tal spent much time considering this apparently greedy continuation. I must admit that it was only after some time checking the position with Fritz that I began to realize that Black’s task was not so easy. Still, Black does have a way to win:

1c) \texttt{33 \texttt{b4}! \texttt{xb4} 34 \texttt{xb4} saves White.}

2) \texttt{32...b7+?! 33 \texttt{g1 \texttt{xd2} 34 \texttt{xd2} \texttt{d4} 35 \texttt{e1} and White avoids disaster.}

3) \texttt{32...\texttt{xd2} 33 \texttt{xd2} (33 \texttt{xd2} \texttt{b7}+ 34 \texttt{g1 \texttt{b1}+ 35 \texttt{g2 \texttt{e3}+ wins}) 33...\texttt{xa4} wins a pawn, but there is still a long way to go.}

4) \texttt{32...\texttt{e3}+! 33 \texttt{fex3 \texttt{xd3} 34 \texttt{xc2 \texttt{e4}+ 35 \texttt{g1} (35 \texttt{h3 \texttt{f5}! and there is no way to stop ...\texttt{h5#}) 35...\texttt{xe3+ 36 \texttt{g2 \texttt{f3}+ 37 \texttt{h3 \texttt{xd1 and White’s king is hopelessly exposed.}

\textbf{31 ... \texttt{c4}}

\textbf{32 \texttt{d5} \texttt{c3}}

Besides the extra pawn, the difference in strength of the knights can be seen.

\textbf{33 \texttt{b2} \texttt{d4}}

\textbf{34 \texttt{b7}+ \texttt{h6}}

\textbf{35 \texttt{b5} (D)}

\texttt{35 \texttt{g8} loses to 35...\texttt{c6+}.}

1) \texttt{32...e4}?! and now:

1a) \texttt{33 \texttt{xc2 \texttt{xc2} 34 \texttt{d2 \texttt{c6}} 35 \texttt{b4 \texttt{c3}! wins for Black.}

1b) \texttt{33 \texttt{f4 \texttt{f3}+ (33...\texttt{c5} 34 \texttt{d8} is unclear) 34 \texttt{g1 e3 looks strong, but after 35 \texttt{fex3 \texttt{xe3}+ 36 \texttt{h1} there is nothing clear-cut, for example 36...\texttt{f3}+ 37 \texttt{g1 \texttt{d4 38 \texttt{e1.}}}}}}}
36 $\textit{g1}$
Or 36 $\textit{fxe3}$ $\textit{c2}+$ 37 $\textit{h3}$ $\textit{h4}+$!
38 $\textit{gxh4}$ $\textit{f3}+$ 39 $\textit{g4}$ $\textit{g2}#$.  
36 ... $\textit{c2}$
37 $\textit{f1}$ $\textit{xd3}$
0-1
After 38 $\textit{d7}$ Black mates by 38...$\textit{xf2}+$!

I was very happy to win in Tal’s own style, although I recognized that his poor play in this game was due to illness. In fact, he withdrew from the tournament after the first half for medical treatment. Still, I am proud to have played at least one game against Misha Tal.
Game 6

V. Anand – B. Spassky
Youth vs Veterans, Cannes 1989
Ruy Lopez, Breyer

1 e4 e5

During the course of his career, Spassky has played just about every opening there is, but in recent years he has tended to stick to dual king pawn openings, so this was not a surprise.

2 \( \text{\textit{d}}f3 \) \( \text{\textit{d}}c6 \)
3 \( \text{\textit{d}}b5 \) a6
4 \( \text{\textit{d}}a4 \) \( \text{\textit{d}}f6 \)
5 0-0 \( \text{\textit{d}}e7 \)
6 \( \text{\textit{d}}e1 \) b5
7 \( \text{\textit{d}}b3 \) d6
8 c3 0-0
9 h3 \( \text{\textit{d}}b8 \)

The Breyer Defence, for decades Spassky’s main weapon against the Ruy Lopez.

10 d4 \( \text{\textit{d}}bd7 \)
11 c4

Round about this time there had been a modest revival in this old move. I felt that Spassky’s knowledge of the main lines would be much greater than mine, so I tried, with some difficulty, to find a relatively unexplored continuation. 11 c4 enjoyed popularity in the 1960s and was probably no surprise, but at least it didn’t have such a huge body of theory as 11 \( \text{\textit{d}}bd2 \).

11 ... c6
12 a3

This was an idea I came up with over the board. At the time I had no idea if it had ever been played before, but I have since found a couple of earlier games. The immediate 12 \( \text{\textit{d}}c3 \) is met by 12...b4.

12 ... bxc4!

The best reply. After 12...\( \text{\textit{d}}b7 \) 13 \( \text{\textit{d}}c3 \) I think White is slightly better, since White’s structure is a bit more comfortable in this type of ‘Old Indian’ position. Black can of course continue with ...\( \text{\textit{d}}c7 \), ...\( \text{\textit{d}}ac8 \) and so on, but White can gain more space with an eventual \( \text{\textit{d}}a2 \) and b4.

13 \( \text{\textit{d}}xc4 \) (D)
13 ... d5

Black is not worse after the text-move, but 13...\( \mathcal{D} \)xe4 would have equalized straight away:

1) 14 dxe5? d5 15 \( \mathcal{A} \)xd5 cxd5 16 \( \mathcal{W} \)xd5 \( \mathcal{A} \)b8 (16...\( \mathcal{D} \)xf2 may also be good for Black) 17 \( \mathcal{W} \)xe4 \( \mathcal{A} \)c5 18 \( \mathcal{W} \)e2 \( \mathcal{D} \)b3 19 \( \mathcal{A} \)a2 \( \mathcal{A} \)e6 and White loses the exchange by force.

2) 14 \( \mathcal{A} \)xe4 d5 with two possibilities:

2a) 15 \( \mathcal{D} \)xe5 (Spassky suggested this, but Black has an escape route) 15...dxe4 (not 15...\( \mathcal{D} \)xe5 16 \( \mathcal{A} \)xd5 cxd5 17 \( \mathcal{D} \)xe5 \( \mathcal{A} \)d6 18 \( \mathcal{E} \)e1 and White can be happy because, compared to the Marshall Attack, his piece development is easier as \( \mathcal{D} \)c3 is possible) 16 \( \mathcal{D} \)xc6 \( \mathcal{W} \)e8 17 \( \mathcal{A} \)d5 \( \mathcal{A} \)d6 18 \( \mathcal{D} \)e7+ \( \mathcal{W} \)xe7 19 \( \mathcal{A} \)xa8 \( \mathcal{D} \)b6 20 \( \mathcal{A} \)c6 \( \mathcal{A} \)c7 (the exposed bishop on c6 gives Black’s queen a free tempo on its way to h2) 21 \( \mathcal{D} \)c3 \( \mathcal{W} \)d6! (21...f5 22 \( \mathcal{W} \)b3+ \( \mathcal{A} \)h8 23 \( \mathcal{W} \)b4 is annoying for Black) 22 \( \mathcal{A} \)xe4 f5 23 \( \mathcal{A} \)f3 \( \mathcal{W} \)h2+ 24 \( \mathcal{A} \)f1 \( \mathcal{W} \)e8 25 g3 f4 and White is certainly not playing for the advantage – indeed, Black is probably slightly better.

2b) 15 \( \mathcal{A} \)e1 dxc4 16 \( \mathcal{W} \)e2 (after 16 dxe5 \( \mathcal{D} \)c5 the outposts at d3 and b3 give Black the edge) 16...\( \mathcal{E} \)e8 with equality, as Black’s weak pawns are balanced by his active pieces. In fact this had been played as long ago as 1971, in the game Hübner-Lengyel from Wijk aan Zee.

14 exd5

14 dxe5? \( \mathcal{D} \)xe4 transposes to line 1 of the previous note.

14 ... cxd5

15 \( \mathcal{A} \)a2 e4

16 \( \mathcal{D} \)e5 \( \mathcal{A} \)b7 (D)

Here I was quite happy, as it seemed to me that my pieces were well placed to exert pressure on d5. While there is some truth in this, Black has so many pieces available to defend d5 that the inconvenience is not serious.

17 \( \mathcal{C} \)c3 \( \mathcal{D} \)b6

By protecting d5, Black sets up various threats based on moving the f6-knight. The first is to expel the e5-knight by ...\( \mathcal{D} \)e8 followed by ...f6, in which case he would probably be better. The second is the simple ...\( \mathcal{D} \)fd7, when Black can exchange on e5 without having a knight attacked after dxe5. Hence White must react quickly.

18 f3! \( \mathcal{E} \)c8

19 \( \mathcal{A} \)b3
White could have maintained some slight pressure by 19 \( \texttt{g5} \), as Spassky pointed out after the game. 19...\( \texttt{xa3?} \) 20 bxa3 \( \texttt{xc3} \) is bad after 21 \( \texttt{d2!} \) \( \texttt{c8} \) (21...\( \texttt{xa3} \) 22 \( \texttt{b4} \) favours White) 22 \( \texttt{a5!} \) with a very awkward pin.

19 ... \( \texttt{a8} \)
20 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{c7} \)

Black’s position is basically safe; for example he could have played 20...\( \texttt{exf3!} \) 21 \( \texttt{xf3} \) \( \texttt{c4} \) with equality, and indeed this would have been the natural way to make use of ...\( \texttt{a8} \), which protected the bishop.

21 \( \texttt{c1} \) \( \texttt{fd7} \)
22 \( \texttt{f4} \) \( \texttt{g5} \) (D)

\[ 
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & W & \\
\hline
\texttt{xg5} & 25 \texttt{fxe4} \texttt{dxe4} & 26 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{g6} \\
\texttt{g5} & 25 \texttt{fxe4} \texttt{dxe4} & 26 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{g6} \\
\texttt{xf4} & \texttt{dxe4} & \texttt{g5} \texttt{f4} \\
\texttt{e4} & \texttt{dxe4} & \texttt{g5} \texttt{f4} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Black had a good alternative in 24...\( \texttt{xe5} \) 25 dxe5 dxe4 and now:

1) 26 \( \texttt{d4} \) \( \texttt{d7!} \) (not 26...\( \texttt{e3} \) 27 \( \texttt{e2} \) attacking \( \texttt{b6} \) and \( \texttt{e3} \)) 27 \( \texttt{e6} \) (not 27 \( \texttt{xe4??} \) \( \texttt{xe4} \) and Black wins) 27...\( \texttt{e5} \) 28 \( \texttt{xf7+} \) \( \texttt{h8} \) 29 \( \texttt{d6} \) \( \texttt{cc8} \) and Black has dangerous kingside threats.

2) 26 \( \texttt{e6} \). During the game, I believed this was good for White, but Black simply continues 26...\( \texttt{c5+} \) 27 \( \texttt{h1} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 28 \( \texttt{xe6} \) \( \texttt{h8} \) and the position is just unclear.

The game continuation is also roughly equal.

25 \( \texttt{g4} \) \( \texttt{g4} \)

Black cannot get away with 25...\( \texttt{d2} \), when White must decide how to take on \( \texttt{f7} \):

1) 26 \( \texttt{xf7+} \) (obvious, but this is in fact an error) and now:

1a) 26...\( \texttt{xf7} \) 27 \( \texttt{xf7} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 28 \( \texttt{e6} \) \( \texttt{xd4}+ \) (28...\( \texttt{xf7} \) 29 \( \texttt{xb6} \) \texttt{e3} 30 \( \texttt{e4!} \) wins) 29 \( \texttt{h1} \) \( \texttt{xf7} \) 30 \( \texttt{cd1} \) and White is winning.

1b) 26...\( \texttt{h8} \) 27 \( \texttt{xd7} \) (not 27 \( \texttt{cd1?} \) \( \texttt{xe5} \) 28 dxe5 \( \texttt{xb2} \) and Black wins) 27...\( \texttt{xd4}+ \) 28 \( \texttt{h1} \) \( \texttt{xd7} \) with an unclear position.

2) 26 \( \texttt{xf7} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) (26...\( \texttt{xd4+} \) 27 \( \texttt{h1} \) \( \texttt{c5} \) 28 \( \texttt{cd1} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 29 \( \texttt{f1} \) wins, while after 26...\( \texttt{xb2} \) 27 \( \texttt{e6} \) Black is in considerable difficulties)
27 \( \text{Q}g5+ \text{Q}h8 \) (27...\( \text{Q}d5 \) 28 \( \text{Q}d1! \) with a clear extra pawn) 28 \( \text{Q}g3 \) and White is clearly better.

26 \( \text{Q}xg4 \) g6?

Black’s first step downhill. After 26...\( \text{Q}h8 \) 27 \( \text{Q}e3 \) f5 Black activates his kingside majority, which should provide enough counterplay to maintain the balance.

27 \( \text{Q}f2! \)

White now wins a pawn, although in view of the reduced material this does not necessarily guarantee winning the game.

27 ... \( \text{Q}e8 \)
28 d5 \( \text{Q}g7 \)
29 \( \text{Q}fxe4 \) \( \text{Q}xd5 \) (D)

At first I couldn’t believe this move; it looks as though White must win material after 30 \( \text{Q}xd5 \text{Q}xd5 \) 31 \( \text{Q}d6 \), as Black will end up being threatened with \( \text{Q}xd5 \) and \( \text{Q}e8+ \). However, Spassky had worked out a defence. After I had calmed down, I didn’t see any way to force a decisive material gain, so I just went for a pawn.

30 \( \text{Q}d6 \)

30 \( \text{Q}xd5 \) \( \text{Q}xd5 \) 31 \( \text{Q}d6 \) is answered by 31...\( \text{Q}xe1+ \) 32 \( \text{Q}xe1 \) \( \text{Q}c5 \), meeting both of White’s threats. It is easy to miss that the c3-knight is no longer protected twice and therefore b2-b4 is impossible. White can try 33 \( \text{Q}e7 \) \( \text{Q}e6 \) 34 \( \text{Q}xf7 \) \( \text{Q}f6 \) 35 \( \text{Q}xd7 \) \( \text{Q}xc3! \) 36 bxc3 \( \text{Q}xd7 \) 37 \( \text{Q}d6 \) \( \text{Q}e5 \), but although he has won a pawn, Black’s king becomes too active and he draws easily.

30 ... \( \text{Q}xe1+ \)
31 \( \text{Q}xe1 \) \( \text{Q}f6 \)
32 \( \text{Q}e7 \) \( \text{Q}c6 \)
33 \( \text{Q}xf7+ \) \( \text{Q}h6 \)
34 \( \text{Q}c4 \) \( \text{Q}e6 \)

Black has managed to get some counterplay; White’s f7-rook is surrounded and Black can activate his king via g5.

35 \( \text{Q}f2 \) \( \text{Q}g5 \)
36 \( \text{Q}c2 \) \( \text{Q}c6 \)
37 \( \text{Q}d2 \) h5 (D)
38 \( \text{\#b3?!} \)

This would have been the moment to settle for 38 \( \text{\#g7} \) \( \text{\#e5} \) (38...\( \text{\#e8} \)
39 \( \text{\#d4+!} \) \( \text{\#h6} \) 40 \( \text{\#h7+!} \) \( \text{\#xh7} \) 41
\( \text{\#g5+} \) leaves White a clear pawn up)
39 \( \text{\#a7} \) and White’s rook gets out of the trap! In fact this is quite awkward for Black as \( a6 \) is weak. Black’s mass of pieces appears menacing, but White has all the critical squares controlled. The sacrifice 39...\( \text{\#e4+} \) doesn’t work here: 40 \( \text{hxg4} \) \( \text{\#xg4+} \)
41 \( \text{\#g1} \) (but not 41 \( \text{\#g3?} \) h4+! 42
\( \text{\#h3} \) \( \text{\#e3+} \) 43 \( \text{\#f3+} \) \( \text{\#xf3} \) 44 \( \text{\#xf3} \)
\( \text{\#xf3+} \) and Black wins) 41...\( \text{\#e1+} \)
42 \( \text{\#f1} \) defends.

I thought that the text-move was even stronger, but I hadn’t really seen Black’s 39th move – in fact, I’m quite lucky that it doesn’t cause serious damage!

38 ... \( \text{\#e5} \)
39 \( \text{\#a7} \) \( \text{\#e4+!} \) \( (D) \)

40 \( \text{hxg4} \) \( \text{\#xg4+} \)
41 \( \text{\#f1} \) \( \text{\#e3+} \)
42 \( \text{\#g1} \) \( \text{\#xc2} \)
43 \( \text{\#xa6} \) \( \text{\#d7} \)
44 \( \text{\#xe6?} \)

Though this sets up the nice finish to follow, it is a mistake. Two knights can’t win by themselves and there aren’t that many pawns left! White should have played 44 \( \text{\#a5+!} \), followed by \( \text{\#d5-d2} \). By keeping the rooks on, White has much better chances of pushing the queenside pawns and in fact he still has excellent winning prospects.

44 ... \( \text{\#xe6} \) \( (D) \)

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  % Chessboard diagram
  % ... (actual diagram code)
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

45 \( \text{\#c5} \) \( \text{\#c4} \)
46 \( a4 \) \( \text{\#f4?} \)

One reason why I exchanged rooks earlier was the combination which now occurs, but in the interim I had realized that 46...\( \text{\#f5} \) prevents it: 47 \( a5 \) \( \text{\#b4} \) 48 \( b3 \) \( \text{\#f7} \) 49 \( \text{\#d3} \)
\( \text{\#xd3} \) (a forced move, as 49...\( \text{\#a6} \)
50 \( b4 \) \( \text{\#c4} \) 51 \( \text{\#b2} \) is good for
White) 50 a6 \( a8 \) 51 \( d5 \) \( e6 \) 52 \( c7+ \) \( d6 \) 53 \( x e8+ \) \( c6 \) and the king catches the a-pawn. Therefore White has to settle for 47 \( f2 \), but Black has good drawing chances.

47 \( a5 \)

Now we get to see an elegant finish – a lone knight dominating two minor pieces!

47 ... \( b4 \)
48 \( b3 \) \( f7 \)
49 \( d3+!! \)

Spassky had only seen 49 a6?? \( x a6 \) 50 \( x a6 \) \( x b3 \) and White has no winning chances since he has only one pawn left.

49 ... \( x d3 \)
50 a6 \( e8 \)

51 \( d5+ \) 1-0

After 51...\( e5 \) 52 \( e7 \) (D) the position deserves a diagram:

---

In Cannes I made the best score in the junior team, 6\( \frac{1}{2} \)/10, but the ‘Senior’ Andersson made the best score overall, with 7\( \frac{1}{2} \) points.

The next game is again from Wijk aan Zee, the year after my success in the 1989 event.
Game 7

M. Kuijf – V. Anand

Wijk aan Zee 1990

Ponziani Opening

1 e4 e5

Round about a month before I had beaten Kuijf in the tournament at Groningen. That game had been a Closed Sicilian, and at one stage it could have been very dangerous for me. This time I didn’t want the same ‘excitement’ so I decided to play more solidly. Hence my choice of first move.

2 ∞f3 ∞c6
3 c3

A real surprise.

3 ... ∞f6

I played this move instantly and while he was thinking about his reply I had to spend a few minutes trying to remember the name of the opening!

4 d4 ∞xe4
5 d5 ∞e7

I don’t really understand what Kuijf was aiming for with his choice of opening. It is harmless and only useful if White is aiming for a draw.

6 ∞xe5 ∞g6
7 ∞d3

However, this indicates that White is not aiming for a draw, towards which he could have made substantial progress by 7 ∞e2 ∞e7 8 ∞xe4 (8 ∞xg6?! hxg6 is a little better for Black) 8...∞xe5 9 ∞d2 (or alternatively 9 ∞xe5+).

7 ... ∞xe5

7...∞xf2? isn’t even a difficult trap: White wins by 8 ∞xg6 ∞xd1 9 ∞xf7+ ∞e7 10 ∞g5+ ∞d6 11 ∞c4+ ∞c5 12 ∞xd8.

8 ∞xe4 ∞c5
9 ∞h5 d6

10 ∞g5? (D)

10 h3 was a much better move, although even in this case Black can play for an advantage.

10 ... ∞g4!

Black can play 10...∞d7 11 0-0 ∞g4, with boring equality, but I had seen that the text-move is much
stronger. Technically, it may be a novelty, but I am reluctant to call it that. To my mind, novelties should be at least a little bit difficult to find. If you play the most obvious move and then discover that by an accident of history nobody has played it before, I am not sure that it deserves any special appellation.

11 \textbf{Wh}4?

Losing on the spot. The lines 11 \textbf{Wh}xh7 \textbf{W}xg5! and 11 \textbf{W}xg4 \textbf{O}xg4 12 \textbf{A}xd8 \textbf{O}xf2 13 \textbf{A}f1 \textbf{O}xe4 14 \textbf{A}xc7 \textbf{B}c8 15 \textbf{A}a5 b6 16 \textbf{A}b4 \textbf{A}xb4 17 cxb4 \textbf{B}c2 also offer White no hope. This leaves 11 \textbf{A}xd8 \textbf{A}xh5 12 \textbf{A}g5 (12 \textbf{A}xc7 \textbf{B}c8 13 \textbf{A}a5 b6 14 b4 \textbf{A}xf2+ 15 \textbf{A}xf2 bxa5 and 12 \textbf{A}h4 0-0 followed by 13...\textbf{B}ae8 are also very promising for Black) as the only realistic way for White to play on. Even here Black has a range of tempting options. He could simply play for the two bishops by 12...\textbf{A}g6 13 \textbf{O}d2 \textbf{O}d3+, but 13...f6 is probably stronger. Then 14 \textbf{A}f4 is impossible, 14 \textbf{A}h4 leaves the bishop shut out on the kingside and 14 \textbf{A}e3 allows Black to shatter White's pawns. Black could also consider 12...f6, with similar ideas.

11 ... \textbf{f}6

Now White has no reasonable continuation.

12 \textbf{A}c1

After 12 \textbf{A}d2 \textbf{B}e7 13 0-0 g5 White has the unpleasant choice between:

1) 14 \textbf{W}h6 \textbf{O}f7 15 \textbf{W}g7 \textbf{W}x e 4 16 \textbf{B}e1 \textbf{B}e2 17 b4 \textbf{B}b6 18 \textbf{B}e3 \textbf{B}e7 19 \textbf{B}xe2 (19 \textbf{B}d2 \textbf{W}d3) 19...\textbf{A}ag8 wins.

2) 14 \textbf{W}g3 f5 15 h3 (the only chance, or else...f4 traps the queen) 15...f4 16 \textbf{W}h2 \textbf{B}d7 and although material is even, White is playing a whole queen down for all practical purposes. After...0-0-0 and a subsequent...g4 the attack should overwhelm White.

If White retreats his bishop to e3 the lines are even simpler: 12 \textbf{A}e3 g5 13 \textbf{W}h6 (13 \textbf{W}g3 f5 14 f4 \textbf{O}xe3 15 fxe5 \textbf{A}f4 and Black wins) 13...\textbf{W}e7 14 0-0 \textbf{O}f7 15 \textbf{W}g7 0-0-0 16 \textbf{B}xc5 \textbf{B}dg8 17 \textbf{B}e1 \textbf{A}d7 and White loses his queen.

12 ... \textbf{W}e7 \textbf{(D)}

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

13 0-0

This is forced to meet the threat of...\textbf{O}d3+, because 13 f3 is met by 13...\textbf{O}xf3.

13 ... \textbf{g}5

14 \textbf{W}g3 \textbf{f}5
The threat is ...f4, so White resorts to desperation.

15  
15 h3 f4 16  
15  ...  
16  

This game was finished while some of the others were still in the opening; I spent ten minutes and my opponent a little under half an hour.

It was a nice miniature to play in the first round, but the rest of the tournament didn’t go as well as the year before. I lost in the second round to Nunn and continued unevenly throughout the event, finishing on 50%.

Shortly after Wijk aan Zee, I played an open tournament in Rome. This started well, but I lost a miniature to Miles in the penultimate round and finished with 6/9. Then I went back to India for some rest before travelling to the Zonal tournament in Qatar. I was by far the highest rated player, but even so I was happy to win the tournament convincingly. As a result of this and some other tournaments I gained quite a lot of rating points, and on the 1st July 1990 list I stood at 2610 – I had broken through the 2600 barrier. I took part in an open tournament in Manila, went back to India and then returned to Manila for the Interzonal. Based on my new rating I was certainly a potential qualifier, but in an Interzonal you cannot take anything for granted – an Interzonal is a tough tournament even for the top seeds.

My results in the Interzonal followed a fluctuating course: I won in the second round, lost in the third, won in the fourth and lost in the fifth. After a draw with Chandler in the sixth round, I faced the Icelandic grandmaster Margeir Petursson in round 7.
M. Petursson – V. Anand

Manila Interzonal 1990
Queen’s Pawn

1 d4 d6
2 c4 e5

This was part of my usual opening repertoire at the time. I liked 1...d6 because it is such a complete system in itself. If you play the Pirc then you have no reason to fear 2 e4, and 2  d3 can be met by 2...g4. Since then, however, White has found ways to keep some pressure. As a result I lost faith in the system and had to learn a decent defence to 1 d4.

3  c3 exd4
4  xd4  d6

An important finesse. If Black plays 4...c6, then 5 e3+ is a little annoying as 5...e7 6 d5 snares the two bishops.

5 g3  c6
6  d2 g6

White’s pieces are not badly placed – for example, the queen is quite useful on d2 if White intends to play b3 and b2. On the other hand, Black has gained a tempo because of  xd4 and  d2.

7  g2  g7
8  h3 0-0
9  f4

White is aiming to establish a grip on d5. He has played the opening accurately, for example by not playing b3 too early, which sometimes allows a tactical ...d5! by Black.

9 ... a5 (D)

This is designed to prevent White from easily developing his queen’s bishop, for if 10 b3, then 10...a4 11  b1 (11  xa4  e4 wins the exchange, while 11  b2 may be met by 11...a3 12  c1  f5 or 11...a5) 11...xb3 12 axb3  e8, followed by ...e5, with active play.

10 0-0  e8?!

A slight inaccuracy. 10...a4 was better, simply preventing b3.

11  e1?!

White misses his chance. 11 e4 was correct, and after 11...a4 12  b1
\( \text{De5} 13 \text{ b3} \) White has secured his queenside pawn structure. Of course the immediate 11 \( \text{Bb1} \) is answered by 11...\( \text{Af5} \).

11 ... \( \text{a4} \)
12 \( \text{Bb1} \) \( \text{Cd7!} \)

A good move. By the time White has played b3, Black has arranged to occupy active squares with his knights.

13 \( \text{b3} \) \( \text{axb3} \)
14 \( \text{axb3} \) \( (D) \)

the centre, whilst Black has open lines for his rooks and active squares for his knights. Chances are about equal.

16 ... \( \text{Af5!} \)

An important intermezzo.

17 \( \text{e4} \)
After 17 \( \text{De4} \) \( \text{a4} \), followed by 18...\( \text{Cc6} \), Black has excellent control over the long dark-square diagonal.

17 ... \( \text{De6!} \) \( (D) \)
Margeir had missed this tactic.

14 ... \( \text{Dce5!} \)
If 14...\( \text{Dde5?!} \) (intending to play 15...\( \text{Dd4} \)) then 15 \( \text{Db5!} \) is slightly better for White. It is the c6-knight which belongs on e5, so that the other one can occupy c5.

15 \( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{Cc5} \)
16 \( \text{b4?} \)
Premature, because with energetic play Black now gets the better position. After the correct 16 \( \text{Bb2} \)
\( \text{c6} \) we reach a position typical of the FianchettO King’s Indian. White has

18 \( \text{Dxe6} \)
Black’s play is tactically justified by the variation 18 \( \text{exf5} \) \( \text{Dd4} \) (attacking the queen and threatening 19...\( \text{Def3+} \)) 19 \( \text{We4} \) (19 \( \text{Wd1} \) \( \text{Def3+} \) 20 \( \text{Bxf3} \) \( \text{Bxe1+} \) 21 \( \text{Wxe1} \) \( \text{Dxf3+} \) and Black wins) 19...\( \text{gxf5!} \) (the queen is trapped) 20 \( \text{Wxb7} \) (20 \( \text{Wxe3} \) \( \text{Cc2} \) 20...\( \text{Bb8} \) with a clear advantage to Black as White must now give up his queen.

If 18 \( \text{Cc3} \), then 18...\( \text{g4} \) 19 \( \text{Dxe6} \) \( \text{Bxe6} \) and \( \text{f3} \) is very weak.
18 ... \( \textit{\&xe6} \)
Now Black is much better; his pieces are active and the c4-pawn is weak.

19 \( \textit{\&d5} \)
19 c5 dxc5 is very good for Black after 20 bxc5 \( \textit{\&d3} \) or 20 \( \textit{\&d1} \) \( \textit{\&f6} \).

19 ... b5!
Winning the c-pawn and forcing White to search for some sort of compensation.

20 \( \textit{\&b2} \) (D)
Not 20 cxb5? \( \textit{\&xd5} \) 21 exd5 \( \textit{\&f3} \) winning.

White. Note that 26 f4 can be met by 26 ... \( \textit{\&b6} \) + followed by 27 ... \( \textit{\&g4} \).

21 \( \textit{\&c3} \) \( \textit{\&xb2} \! \)
22 \( \textit{\&xb2} \) \( \textit{\&xc4} \! \)
Not 22 ... \( \textit{\&xc4} \) 23 \( \textit{\&a2} \) with an unclear position. After the text, Black has extremely active pieces and strong dark-squared pressure in return for his small sacrifice. The immediate threat is 23 ... \( \textit{\&d3} \).

23 \( \textit{\&e3} \) (D)
After 23 \( \textit{\&d1} \) \( \textit{\&f6} \) 24 \( \textit{\&d5} \) \( \textit{\&f3} \) + 25 \( \textit{\&xf3} \) \( \textit{\&xf3} \) White is pretty close to being lost.

20 ... \( \textit{\&a2} \! \)
I prefer this to the line 20 ... \( \textit{\&xc4} \) 21 \( \textit{\&xg7} \) \( \textit{\&xg7} \) 22 \( \textit{\&c3} \) + f6 23 \( \textit{\&f4} \) c6! (23 ... \( \textit{\&f7} \) 24 e5 \( \textit{\&xe5} \) 25 \( \textit{\&xa8} \) \( \textit{\&xa8} \) 26 \( \textit{\&e3} \) \( \textit{\&c8} \) intending ...c5 is unclear) 24 \( \textit{\&xe6} \) + \( \textit{\&xe6} \) 25 \( \textit{\&f1} \) \( \textit{\&e5} \). Here Black is a pawn up, but White has some compensation due to the weak queenside and the open 7th rank, which would enhance the strength of any rook penetration by

23 ... \( \textit{\&h6} ? \)
A really awful move whereby, in one stroke, Black throws away all his advantage. The problem was that I was so excited about the way all Black's pieces were working well together that I forgot White could still develop counterplay. The correct line was 23 ... \( \textit{\&g4} \) ! 24 \( \textit{\&f3} \) (24 \( \textit{\&e1} \) \( \textit{\&d4} \) 25 \( \textit{\&c1} \) \( \textit{\&f6} \) 26 \( \textit{\&d1} \) \( \textit{\&xb2} \) wins) 24 ... \( \textit{\&d4} \) 25 \( \textit{\&d2} \) c5, followed
by 26...\textit{\&}e5, and Black has a large advantage.

24 \textit{f}4!

More or less equalizing.

24 ... \textit{\&}g4
25 \textit{\&}f3 \textit{\&}g7
26 \textit{\&}d2

26 \textit{\&}b1?! was also possible.

26 ... \textit{\&}a8
27 \textit{h}3 \textit{\&}a1+ (D)

The tactics don’t work for Black after 27...\textit{\&}a7+ 28 \textit{\&}h1 \textit{\&}a1+ 29 \textit{\&}b1 \textit{\&}xc3 30 \textit{\&}c2! \textit{\&}a2 31 \textit{\&}xc3 \textit{\&}xc2 32 \textit{\&}xc2 \textit{\&}d3 33 \textit{hx}g4 \textit{\&}xc2 34 \textit{\&}c1 \textit{\&}xe4 35 \textit{\&}xc7 \textit{\&}xg2+ 36 \textit{\&}xg2 \textit{\&}e4 and the resulting rook ending is probably a draw in view of White’s active rook position. I was quite surprised that Black had nothing better in this line; with a King’s Indian bishop and a knight rampaging around, you expect something to work but in this case there was nothing.

\textbf{29 \textit{\&}xf1 \textit{\&}a3}

Once again White can hang on after 29...\textit{\&}a7+ 30 \textit{\&}h1 \textit{\&}e3 by 31 \textit{\&}c1! \textit{\&}c4 32 \textit{\&}a2 \textit{\&}b7 33 \textit{\&}d5!.

30 \textit{\&}f3 \textit{\&}f6
31 \textit{\&}e3 (D)

\begin{center}
\textbf{B}
\end{center}

\textbf{31 ... d5}

Black can regain the exchange by 31...\textit{\&}d5?! 32 \textit{\&}xd5 \textit{\&}xb2 33 \textit{\&}xb2 \textit{\&}xb2, but after 34 \textit{\&}xc7 Black is suffering, for example 34...\textit{\&}b8 35 \textit{\&}d3, 34...\textit{\&}c8 35 \textit{\&}xb5 \textit{\&}b8 36 \textit{\&}b3!, or 34...\textit{\&}d4 35 \textit{\&}xe8 \textit{\&}xe3+ 36 \textit{\&}g2 \textit{\&}d2 37 \textit{\&}xd6 \textit{\&}xb4 38 \textit{\&}xb5 and White is better in every line.

\textbf{32 \textit{\&}xd5}

White should avoid 32 e5 d4!, which gives Black a clear advantage after 33 \textit{\&}xd4 \textit{\&}xb2 34 \textit{ex}f6 \textit{\&}xe3 35 \textit{\&}xe3 \textit{\&}xf6. However, 32 \textit{\&}d1! \textit{\&}a7 33 e5 was a perfectly good alternative to the text; after 33...\textit{\&}e4 the position is unclear.

\textbf{32 ... \textit{\&}a1+}
33 \textit{\&}e1 \textit{\&}a7+! (D)
I could have forced a draw by 33...\(\texttt{\textit{\&}}\textit{xe4 34 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{xa1 \textit{\&}}\textit{xd2 35 \textit{\&}}\textit{xd2 \textit{\&}}\textit{xa1 36 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{xc7, but even though things had not gone according to plan, I was still hoping to win. Sometimes it is a mistake to play under the influence of your former advantage, but in this case Black's optimism proved justified.}

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

34 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{h2?}

Petursson returns the favour with this blunder. The alternatives were:

1) 34 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{h1?! \textit{\&}}\textit{xe4 35 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{a2 \textit{\&}}\textit{b7! is also bad for White.}

2) 34 \textit{\&}\textit{e3! \textit{\&}}\textit{xe3+ 35 \textit{\&}}\textit{xe3 \textit{\&}}\textit{xe4 36 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{c2 \textit{\&}}\textit{xg3 37 \textit{\&}}\textit{g2 \textit{\&}}\textit{d8 38 \textit{\&}}\textit{xc7 \textit{\&}}\textit{f5} with a near-certain draw. White has a nominal material advantage, but Black's pieces are well coordinated and White's pawns are disjointed, so he has no chance of putting it to use.

It often happens that a player who has fought back from a bad position with a long series of accurate defensive moves subconsciously relaxes just when his troubles appear to be over, and commits a further error. In this case time-trouble probably also played a part.

34 ... \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{xd5

35 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{a2 \textit{\&}}\textit{d4!

36 \textit{\&}\textit{xd4 \textit{\&}}\textit{xd4

Petursson had overlooked that there was no way to catch one of the minor pieces, even though they are temptingly lined up on the d-file. 37 \textit{\&}d1 fails to 37...\textit{\&}c3 and 37 \textit{\&}d2 to 37...\textit{\&}c3.

37 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{a5 \textit{\&}}\textit{c3

38 e5 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{b6

39 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{a3 \textit{\&}}\textit{d5

40 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{b3 (D)

40 ... \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{xb4!

Simplest. Now if 41 \textit{\&}xb4, then 41...\textit{\&}a5 42 \textit{\&}eb1 \textit{\&}xb4 43 \textit{\&}xb4 \textit{\&}b8, and 44...c5, when the connected passed pawns will romp home.

41 \text{\textit{\&}}\textit{d1 c5

42 \textit{\&}d7 \textit{\&}b8
43 g4    a5
44    c6
45    d4
46    d2
47 g3    b4
0-1

This game put me on +1, but although it put me in the right direction, it was a late winning streak in which I beat Lautier, Miles and M. Gurevich in consecutive rounds that made me a qualifier for the Candidates.

My next major event was the Novi Sad Olympiad towards the end of 1990. I have always enjoyed playing in Olympiads. Dubai 1986 and Manila 1992 were my favourites; in both cases the organizers went all-out to make the players feel comfortable. However, the Novi Sad Olympiad was also pleasant, despite the cold and dismal weather. In general I enjoyed playing events in the former Yugoslavia because of the great public interest, which always ensured a good turnout of spectators.

I started the Olympiad with a good win against Olafsson, but lost a rather silly game to Bouaziz in round 3. Later on things started to get better, and I was satisfied with my final score of 7½/12. The following eventful game was played in round 7.
Game 9

V. Anand – I. Morović Fernandez

Novi Sad Olympiad 1990

Sicilian, Maroczy Bind

1 e4 c5
2 ∆f3 ∆c6
3 d4 cxd4
4 ∆xd4 g6
5 c4 ∆g7
6 ∆e3 ∆f6
7 ∆c3 0-0
8 ∆e2 d6
9 0-0 ∆d7 (D)

10 ∆b1

I was just casting around for a logical move, and since Black intends to play ...∆c5, it seemed reasonable to prepare to meet it with b4. It perhaps looks a little odd to put the rook on b1 rather than c1 or (after ∆d2) d1, but in fact White often puts his rooks on b1 and c1 in this variation, in order to support a queenside pawn advance. Typically White continues ∆c1-b1 to play a2-a3. Black responds with ...∆b6-b4. White then plays ∆fc1 to support the c3-knight. Play then revolves around White’s ability to get a3 and b4 in, and Black’s ability to stop it. The idea behind the text-move is to save time by going to b1 directly.

10 ... ∆c5

When he played this anyway, I wondered what the idea was, as he seemed to be running into b4. Then I saw that after 11 b4 ∆e6 12 ∆xe6, he could play 12...fxe6! (12...∆xe6?! 13 ∆d5 is clearly better for White, to be followed by ∆d2, ∆d1 and possibly c5) 13 ∆b5 e5. However, 14 c5 would then give White a slight advantage, so this would have been a valid alternative to the text-move.
11 \( \text{Wd2} \)

A flexible alternative; White keeps open the possibility of b4 while developing his pieces.

11 ... \( \text{Qxd4} \)

Black decides to prevent b4 by playing ...a5. If immediately 11...a5, then 12 \( \text{Qdb5} \); the plan is f3, followed by \( \text{d}d5 \), and White will play b3, a3 and b4 at his leisure. Black’s c5-knight can eventually be kicked away, while the knight on b5 is there permanently. Hence Black’s decision to swap knights before advancing the a-pawn.

12 \( \text{Qxd4} \) a5

13 b3

White is aiming for an eventual b4, but the immediate 13 a3 allows 13...a4.

13 ... \( \text{Qxd4} \)

14 \( \text{Wxd4} \) (D)

is played, but normally only where Black is aiming for central and kingside play by ...\( \text{Qh}5 \) and ...f5 – it’s a completely different type of plan to that Black has adopted here. In this position ...b6 is an inaccurate move, which reduces Black’s options. His queen can no longer occupy b6 and in some lines where Black plays ...e5, it is useful to have ...\( \text{Qa6} \) defending the weak d6-pawn.

14...\( \text{Qd7} \) was probably better, although White has the interesting line 15 e5 \( \text{Qe6} \) 16 \( \text{We3} \) dxe5 17 \( \text{Qbd1} \)! and Black still faces difficulties (if 17...f6, then 18 \( \text{Qf3} \)).

15 \( \text{Qfe1} \)

Now White has a very comfortable position. He has a space advantage and Black has no chance of playing ...b5 or ...d5, the two breaks which normally give Black counterplay in the Maroczy Bind. Moreover ...a4 is no danger, as Black cannot back it up by ...\( \text{Wb6} \), so White can always reply b4.

The only question is how White arranges to play h4-h5 to step up the pressure on Black’s poorly defended kingside.

15 ... \( \text{Qb7} \)

16 \( \text{Qbd1} \)

The rook has done its duty on b1, inducing Black to weaken his queenside. Now the need is for play in the centre and in the changed circumstances White reacts by moving his rook to the half-open d-file.
16 ... f6
17 ∆g4
A nice move, activating White’s bishop. He doesn’t mind exchanging bishops, because in the Maroczy Bind White doesn’t need many minor pieces to prosecute his advantage. Black can normally hold a pure major-piece position, but even one pair of minor pieces can be enough for White to exploit his space advantage.

17 ... ∆c6
18 h4 ∇c7
19 ∇e3 (D)

19 h5!? is possible, but I didn’t want to commit my pawns to light squares too quickly; Black might still set up some sort of dark-squared blockade by continuing ...g7, ...g5 and ...h6.

20 h5
White can push his h-pawn without more ado, because ...g5 can always be met by h6, both creating a permanent danger to Black’s king and making f4 much stronger.

20 ... ∇f7 (D)
Now it is too late for 20...g7 as White can play 21 h6+ ∇h8 22 f4, preventing ...g5.

21 ∇d5
Preparing to step up the pressure on g6 by ∇f4. 21 hxg6 would be premature; Black can defend after 21...hxg6 22 ∇h6 ∇g7.

21 ... g5
22 h6
As intended. Now the g5-pawn is vulnerable to f4, and Black has to
look after e7, as the rook can always be driven away by \( \text{h5} \).

22 ... \( \text{h8} \)
23 a3

Black’s position on the kingside is creaking and now White inconveniences him further by resuming his queenside play.

23 ... \( \text{e6} \)
24 b4 \( \text{AXB4} \)
25 axb4 \( \text{exd5} \)
26 exd5?! A mistake, not because it doesn’t win but because 26 bxc5! was much simpler. If Black takes on c4 or e4, White obtains a tremendous passed pawn on d6, while after 26...d4 27 \( \text{Xxd4 dxc5} \) 28 \( \text{d6} \), followed by e5, Black’s king will come under a devastating attack.

26 ... \( \text{a4} \) (D)

Somehow this move had escaped my attention. White still has the advantage because of his powerful protected passed pawn, but of course I had spoilt my winning position.

27 bxc5? SEDUCED by beauty, I allowed myself to be distracted from the process of gaining a point! I had seen the winning move 27 \( \text{a1!} \), whereupon 27...\( \text{d7} \) 28 \( \text{xax4 xax4} \) 29 \( \text{e8+ f8} \) (29...\( \text{f8} \) 30 \( \text{e7} \) forces mate) 30 \( \text{xa4} \) is hopeless for Black, but I unwisely decided to ‘win’ in more flashy style.

27 ... \( \text{xdl} \)
28 c6 \( \text{e7!} \) (D)

White has a slight advantage after 29 \( \text{xd1 xe3} \) 30 fxe3 f5, but the pawns appeared so strong that I thought I could play on with a queen against two rooks and a bishop.

29 ... \( \text{xe1+} \)
30 \( \text{xe1} \) \( \text{xg4} \)
31 \( \text{b4?} \)

Another error. 31 \( \text{e4! h5} \) 32 \( \text{e6} \) wins the d-pawn (32...\( \text{d8?} \) 33 c7 wins) without allowing Black to
take the c4-pawn in return, which should be enough for a clear advantage.

31 ... ♕e2
32 ♗xd6 ♗xc4 (D)

37 d7 ♕xd7 38 ♗xd7 and wins) 35 c8♕+ (35 ♗xd5 ♘e8 36 ♗d8 is also effective) 35...♖xc8 36 ♗xc8+ ♘f8 37 ♗d7 ♘f7 38 ♗e7 wins.

2) 33...♕a8! 34 ♗e4 ♗a6! (a difficult move to see; after 34...♗xd5 35 ♗xd5 Black can’t immediately double rooks against the pawn, for example 35...♗c7 allows 36 ♗d6) 35 d6 ♗c8 36 ♗d5 ♗g8 37 d7 ♗xd7 38 cxd7 ♗d8 39 ♗e6 ♘f8 and Black draws.

33 ... ♗e8??

A time-trouble blunder. Black could force a draw by 33...♕af8! 34 ♗c6 ♗xd5 35 ♗xd5 ♘xc7 36 ♗d6 ♘cf7 37 ♗xb6.

34 ♗e6!

Grabbing my chance.

34 ... ♘ff8
35 ♗d8!

A pretty win.

35 ... ♘xc8
36 ♗e7 1-0

In April 1991 I played in a tournament held in Munich. While I very much liked the city, I have less happy memories of the chess. In fact, my greatest pleasure was the blitz tournament held at the end, which I won with 14/15, 2½ points ahead of the next player.

In round 1 I lost to Nunn, and in round 2 I was fortunate to defeat Zsuzsa Polgar. In round 3 I met Beliavsky, and the result was one of the few good games I played at Munich.
In our previous encounter (Linares 1991) I had built up a totally won position only to perpetrate a form of hara-kiri. I was very pleased to get revenge in this game!

1 d4 d6
2 e4 \textit{f6}
3 \textit{c3} g6
4 f4 \textit{g7}
5 \textit{f3} 0-0
6 \textit{e3} b6 (D)

committal. If the pawns eventually turn out to be weak, the weakness will probably be serious.

7 e5 \textit{g4}
8 \textit{g1} c5
9 h3

White avoids a little trap: 9 dxc5 bxc5 10 \textit{d5} \textit{b6} 11 \textit{xa8} loses to 11...\textit{b7} 12 \textit{d5} \textit{xb2}.

9 ... \textit{h6}
10 d5 \textit{b7} (D)

When I was studying this line from White’s point of view, I wondered why 6...b6 wasn’t a more popular reply. Black forces through ...c5, and if White is to try for an advantage he has to push all his pawns forward in the centre, which is very

I knew the theory, but at this point I decided to ignore it and just look at the position. It seemed to me that Black could play very natural moves. The point of this one is to play ...e6 and completely destroy White’s centre. After the resulting exchanges
Black may be left with a weak pawn (for example, on e6) but it doesn’t matter because Black has generated so much active play for his pieces. While the specific move 10...\( \text{b7} \) was thought up over the board, I had looked at these lines before and the ideas I had during this earlier analysis germinated into this ‘innovation’.

11 \( \text{Wd2} \)

After 11 \( \text{We2 a6} \) (11...a6 and 12...b5 is also possible) 12 \( \text{Wf2 xf1} \) 13 \( \text{Wxf1 f5} \) Black equalizes comfortably. If White tries to shut the h6-knight out by 11 g4, then Black plays 11...dxe5 12 fxe5 e6 13 \( \text{c4 exd5!} \) (13...b5 14 \( \text{xb5 exd5} \) 15 \( \text{xc5} \) favours White) 14 \( \text{xd5} \) with an unclear position. The knight on h6 is bad, but the e5-pawn is weak and g1-bishop is also oddly placed.

11 ...
12 \( \text{h2} \)

After 12 \( \text{f2 dxe5} \) 13 fxe5 e6 White doesn’t have time to castle long owing to 14 0-0-0 \( \text{h6} \). Hence the text-move.

12 ...
13 fxe5
14 0-0-0

Other moves are ineffective, e.g. 14 g4 \( \text{h4} \) is very bad for White, 14 d6 \( \text{d7} \) leaves e5 collapsing and finally 14 \( \text{c4 h6} \) (14...exd5 15 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{c6} \) and 14...b5 15 \( \text{xb5 exd5} \) 16 \( \text{d3} \) are also possible, in both cases with an unclear position) 15

\[ \text{f4 xf4} 16 \text{Wxf4 exd5} 17 0-0-0 \] 18 \( \text{e4 d7} \) leaves White without enough for the pawn.

14 ...
15 \( \text{xd5} \)
16 \( \text{c3} \) (D)

Underestimating Black’s initiative. If White had time for \( \text{c4} \) and \( \text{he1} \) then he would have a clear advantage, but Black’s counterplay is so fast that he has no time for the necessary consolidation, e.g. 16 \( \text{c4 cd4} \) 17 \( \text{xd4 cxd4} \) attacking the d5-knight and, when it moves, creating the possibility of ...

\( \text{e3} \).
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16 ...
17 \( \text{cd4} \)

17 cxd4 \( \text{xd5} \) 18 \( \text{b1 ad8} \) is very good for Black.

17 ...
18 \( \text{xf6} \)

18 cxd4
18 exf6 \( \text{xf3} \) 19 gxf3 \( \text{xf6} \) gives Black a safe extra pawn.

18 ...
19 \( \text{d5} \) (D)
19 ... c4!

Essential. If White could play ¤c4, then Black would be in some trouble. Now Black locks in the bishop on f1 and frees the c5-square for the manoeuvre ...¤c8-c5. All Black’s moves are very natural; he has the initiative and must make use of it before White completes his development, so he need only consider active moves.

20 ¤e2?

In the critical position White goes wrong. He should play 20 ¤b1, with the possible continuation 20...¤c8 21 d6 (21 ¤e2 ¤h6 22 ¤f4 ¤xf4 23 ¤xf4 ¤xd5 transposes to the game) and now Black can choose between 21...¤d7 and 21...b5. Black has a lot of trumps, not least of which is his lead in development. The position is unclear but I prefer Black.

20 .... ¤c8

21 ¤b1

21 g4 ¤e7 22 d6 ¤d5, threatening 23...c3, favours Black.

21 ... ¤h6

22 ¤f4

After 22 ¤c3 Black can also safely take the d5-pawn.

22 .... ¤xf4

23 ¤xf4 ¤xd5! (D)

24 h4?!

There is no way White can exploit the d-file pin, so he tries for a kingside attack. The alternatives were:

1) 24 ¤d4 c3 (24...¤g7 25 ¤b5! is bad, but 24...¤h4 25 ¤g4 ¤xd4 26 ¤xd4 ¤cd8 is a reasonable alternative for Black) 25 bxc3 ¤h4 26 ¤g4 ¤xd4 27 ¤xd4 ¤xg2 28 ¤g1 ¤xh3 29 ¤xc8 ¤xf4 30 ¤xf4 ¤xc8 is excellent for Black. He has two connected passed pawns for the exchange and White’s remaining pawns are weak.

2) 24 ¤d2 c3 (alternatively, after 24...¤c5 25 ¤hd1 ¤a8 Black keeps his extra pawn) 25 bxc3 ¤xc3 26 ¤hd1 ¤e3 and Black is clearly better.
3) 24 g4 ©g7 25 ©h6 ©e6 26 h4 c3 27 bxc3 (27 ©g5 c2+ 28 ©a1 cxd1©+ 29 ©xd1 ©xg5 and Black wins) 27...©e4+ 28 ©b2 ©c7 favours Black. White’s pawns are weak and his king exposed.

24 ... c3
25 bxc3 ©xc3
26 h5 ©e3!

Black’s attack is much faster than anything White can muster.

27 ©g5

27 ... ©c7
28 ©xh7 ©b3+!

0-1

After 27 hxg6 fxg6 28 ©h6 ©c7 Black defends h7 and White will be mated, while after 27 ©h6 ©xd1 28 hxg6 (28 ©g5 ©xa2+ forces mate) 28...©e4+ 29 ©a1 ©xg6 Black wins easily.

It is mate after 29 axb3 ©c2+ 30 ©a1 ©c3+ 31 ©b1 ©xb3+ 32 ©a1 ©c2#.

A few days after qualifying from the Manila Interzonal, I received an invitation to play in Linares (1991) from Señor Rentero. On my way to Linares (which was a couple of months before the Munich event mentioned above) I stopped off for a couple of days in Amsterdam. There I received the news that FIDE had made the pairings for the quarter-finals. Instead of the simple 1 vs 8, 2 vs 7, etc., they had changed the system such that anyone in the top half could be paired against anyone from the bottom half.

Karpov, Timman, Yusupov and Short were in the top half of the draw, with Gelfand, Ivanchuk, Korchnoi and myself in the bottom. I was paired against Karpov, who at that time was a formidable opponent. Just at that moment I was quite annoyed by this pairing, but later I took the view that you couldn’t become World Champion by avoiding people – you just have to take opponents as they come.

I was heartened by the fact that I beat Karpov quite easily in Linares after he misplayed a promising position. Between then and the match in August neither of us had produced any inspiring results. My own performance in Munich was not very satisfactory, while Karpov had drawn a match 2-2 with Agdestein.

In the first game of the match itself I played an insipid system; to be honest we (my second in this match was M. Gurevich) knew that it gave White nothing against best play, but we decided to try it anyway, because Karpov had failed to find the correct solution in a previous game. He got a bad position with an isolated pawn and suffered a lot, but defended very well and, indeed, outplayed me completely. However, he threw away all his good efforts by misplaying the ending.
In the second game I outplayed Karpov completely, but then went wrong and had to acquiesce to a draw. In the third game I could have mated him in a few moves, but somehow just didn't see it. Then I lost the fourth game. In both game two and game four I had played the Meran Defence, which I prepared especially for this match; I felt it was a dynamic opening and that Karpov wasn't particularly good against it. In games two and four I had played, after 1 d4 d5 2 c4 c6 3 Qf3 Qf6 4 Qc3 e6 5 e3 Bd7 6 Be2 d6 7 0-0 0-0 8 Qc2 dxc4 9 Bxc4, a plan involving ...a6. In game four Karpov had found a pretty good line against this system, so in game six I decided to switch to 9...We7, which also formed part of my preparation. I should add that game five was unfinished when the following game was played, but I was winning the adjourned position.
Game 11
A. Karpov – V. Anand
Candidates match (6), Brussels 1991
Semi-Slav

1 d4 d5
2 c4 c6
3 ∇f3 ∇f6
4 ∇c3 e6
5 e3 ∇bd7
6  wc2 ∇d6
7 ∇e2 0-0
8 0-0 dxc4
9 ∇xc4 ½e7
10 h3

In game eight he finally found the right recipe, which is to play 10 a3.
10 ... c5

In game four I had played 10...a6.
11 dxc5 ∇xc5
12 e4 (D)

To avoid the exchange of knights after ...∇e5, but it is not a very ambitious move.
13 ... ∇e5
14 ∇b3 ∇d7
15 ∇e3 (D)

15 ... ∇g6

15...∥fd8? is a loss of time; White continues 16 f4 ∇c6 17 e5 ∇xd4 18 ∇xd4 ∇c5 19 ∥ad1 (after 19 ∇xc5 ∥xc5+ 20 ∥f2 ∥xf2+ 21 ∥xf2 ∇e8 22 ∥d1 ∇c6 23 ∥fd2 ∥xd2 24 ∥xd2 ∇f8 Black should hold on) and now:

1) 19...∇c6? 20 exf6 ∥xd4 (White also wins after 20...∥xd4+ 21 ∥xd4 ∥c5 22 ∇e2!) 21 fxe7 ∥xe7 1+ 22 ∇h2 ∥xf1 23 ∥d3 ∇g1+ 24 ∇h1 and White is winning.

12 ... ∇d6
13 ∇d4
2) 19...\textit{Q}xd4+ 20 \textit{Q}xd4 \textit{Q}e8 21 \textit{Q}fd1 and White is clearly better. After the text-move Black has more or less equalized.

16 \textit{Q}ad1 \textit{Q}fd8
17 \textit{Q}f3 \textit{Q}c6
18 \textit{Q}fe1 \textit{Q}dc8

This looks a little odd, but I felt it was important to inconvenience White’s queen by playing a rook to c8. The a8-rook can’t go there because the a7-pawn is hanging, so it has to be this one. White must move his queen because 19...\textit{Q}xe4 is a threat.

19 \textit{W}b1 (D)

The rook returns now that White has been forced to block the d-file.

21 a3 \textit{Q}c5
22 \textit{Q}a4 \textit{Q}d6 (D)

Black is more or less committed to this piece sacrifice, as 22...\textit{Q}xa4 23 \textit{Q}xa4 would give White a slight advantage based on his two bishops. However, I had no objections as I felt that it was promising for Black.

23 \textit{Q}c3?

After this cop-out, Black’s pieces are more harmoniously placed. The critical line is 23 e5! \textit{Q}xf3 and now:

1) 24 exf6 (bad) 24...\textit{W}xf6 25 gxf3 \textit{Q}f4! and now:

1a) 26 \textit{Q}c3 \textit{W}g5+ 27 \textit{Q}h1 (27 \textit{Q}f1 \textit{W}b5+) 27...\textit{W}h5 28 \textit{Q}g2 \textit{Q}h4+ and wins.

1b) 26 \textit{Q}xf4 \textit{Q}xf4 also wins.

1c) 26 \textit{Q}b4 \textit{W}g5+ 27 \textit{Q}f1 \textit{W}b5+, followed by 28...a5, with a distinct plus for Black.

2) 24 exd6 (best) 24...\textit{W}xd6 25 gxf3 \textit{Q}h4 and now:
2a) 26 c3?! Qxf3+ 27 g2 Qh4+ 28 f1 (28 g1 Qc6 is dead lost) 28...Qa6+ 29 Qe2 Qc6 and Black should win.

2b) 26 e3? Qxf3+ wins.

2c) 26 Qe3 (D) and now:

2c1) 26...Qf4?! 27 d3! Qxf3+ 28 Qg2 Qh4+ (28...Qxd2 29 Qxd2 Qg5+ 30 Qf1 Qxd2 31 Qxd2 Qxd2 gives White an edge) 29 Qf1 Qh2 30 Qg5! (30 c3 Qd5 31 Qxd5 Qxd5 32 Qc5 is unclear) 30...Qxd3 31 Qxd3 Qg2+ 32 Qe2 Qg6 33 Qg3 favours White.

2c2) 26...Qc6 27 c3 Qxf3+ 28 Qf1 b5 with a final branch:

2c21) 29 Qxd8+ Qxd8 30 d1 Qd4 (30...Qd2+ 31 Qxd2 Qxd2 32 Qf3 defends, while 30...Qh4 31 Qxf6 gxf6 32 Qg3+ Qh8 33 Qc3 Qh1+ 34 Qe2 Qf5 35 Qd3 Qd4+ 36 Qd2 is at least equal for White) 31 Qxd4 Qxd4 32 Qc3 Qh1+ 33 Qe2 Qh5 34 Qf3 Qh2 35 Qc2 Qf4+ 36 Qe3 Qg2+ 37 Qxd4 Qd6+ 38 Qe4

wc6+ 39 Qe5 and this exciting line ends in a draw by perpetual check.

2c22) 29 Qc5 Qh2+ 30 Qe2 Qxc5 31 Qxd8+ Qxd8 32 Qxf6 gxf6 33 Qg1+ Qh8 34 Qxh2 Qc1 is unclear.

The conclusion is that White may be able to hold the balance by accepting the sacrifice, but it would have been very difficult for Karpov to find all this at the board!

23 ... Qc7 (D)

If we look at the total effect of the last five moves, White has played Qd2, Qb1 and a3, while Black has achieved ...Qc7. Thus White's queen and bishop have been pushed back, while Black has improved his queen position and now controls e5 – Black's manoeuvre can be counted a success.

Now Black is slightly better because he can expand on the queenside, while in the meantime White's pieces are only crawling back to their earlier positions.
24 \( \text{a}2 \)

It’s hard to say what this move is for. Perhaps he was worried that after ...\( \text{c}5 \), there might be a threat of ...\( \text{xf}2+ \) and ...\( \text{b}6+ \), but it’s only a guess.

24 ... \( a6 \)
25 \( \text{e}3 \) \( b5 \)

White’s 24th move is revealed as a mistake. It may have solved one problem, but now the bishop has to return in order to meet ...\( \text{b}7 \) by \( \text{c}2 \).

26 \( \text{b}3 \) \( b7 \)
27 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{e}7 \) \( (D) \)

I was very proud of this game, because I felt that I had outplayed Kar- pov in the manoeuvring phase of the game. The idea now is ...\( \text{d}7 \) followed by either ...\( \text{c}5 \) or ...\( \text{de}5 \) heading for c4.
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\textbf{28 \( \text{b}6 \) \( \text{d}c8 \)}
29 \( \text{d}4 \)

Now 29 e5 \( \text{xf}3 \) is good for Black, as 30 exf6 \( \text{xf}6 \) leads to variations similar to those in the note to White’s 23rd move, while 30 exd6 \( \text{xd}6 \) attacks the bishop on b6 so there is no win of a piece.

29 ... \( \text{d}7 \)
30 \( \text{cd}1 \)

Over the last few moves White has only been moving his pieces backwards and forwards, simply re- responding to Black’s various threats, while Black has gained space on the queenside and created an outpost at c4. Nevertheless, the symmetrical nature of the position exerts a drawish tendency. Black’s position is more comfortable and easier to play, but one cannot say more than that.

30 ... \( \text{ge}5 \)
31 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) \( (D) \)
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32 \( \text{e}2? \)

An error, overlooking the reply.

32 ... \( \text{h}4 \)
33 \( f4 \)

After 33 \( \text{c}3 \) Black continues
33 ...\( \text{f}3+ \) 34 \( \text{xf}3 \) \( \text{xh}3 \) 35 \( \text{d}3 \)
\( \text{h2+ 36 h1 f4+ 37 g1 c6,} \)
and the possibility of playing ...e5 and switching the rook to the kingside gives Black an easy win. The alternative 33 g3 is similar; then 33...f3+ 34 gxf3 xg3 35 g2 f4 doesn’t lead to a winning attack, but White’s pawn structure is significantly damaged.

The text-move is therefore forced, but it is a move White certainly doesn’t want to play with Black’s bishops pointing at the kingside.

33 ... c4
34 f2 c5
35 xc5 xc5 (D)

36 c1?
36 d4 was a better defence, when 36...xb2? loses to 37 f1 c4 38 xc4. However, Black can continue 36...ac8 with a clear advantage.

36 ... d2
37 d3 xe4?!

One of my weaknesses during this match was my inefficiency in converting technically winning positions. Too often I played moves which just maintained my advantage, instead of pressing it home forcefully. On the other hand, Kar- pov, although he only gained a large advantage twice, pushed it home both times, and this effectively decided the match.

Here 37...d8! 38 e3 xb3 39 xb3 xe4 would have been a much improved version of what happens in the game.

38 e3 a8
39 c1 h6
39...g6 would have been slightly more precise.

40 f1 f6
41 c3 h5 (D)

Black has a clear extra pawn, and despite White’s stern resistance, the win should only be a matter of time.

42 d6 5c6
43 xc6 xc6
44 f2 d7
45 \( \textit{\&d2} \) \textit{\&c5}

I decided not to try to find a middlegame win, but just to liquidate down to an ending.

46 \( \textit{\textbf{\&xc5}} \) \textit{\textbf{\&xc5}}
47 \( \textit{\textbf{\texttt{\&c2}}} \) \textit{\texttt{\&f8}}
48 \( \textit{\texttt{\&f2}} \) \textit{\texttt{\&e7}}
49 \( \textit{\texttt{\&e3}} \) \textit{\texttt{\&d7}}
50 \( \textit{\texttt{g3}} \) \textit{\texttt{\&f6}}
51 \( \textit{\texttt{\&d1}} \) \textit{\texttt{\&e8}} (D)

At some point I should play \( \ldots g5 \), so that if White plays \( h4 \), then Black can reply \( \ldots gxh4 \) followed by \( \ldots \textit{\texttt{\&g8}} \), when White has the possibility of a g-file penetration to worry about.

54 \( \textit{\&c4+?} \)

A real mistake. Again, it doesn’t give away Black’s advantage but it makes the win fairly complicated. In endings with bishop and knight each, exchanging dissimilar pieces (i.e. a bishop for a knight) has the effect of increasing the defender’s drawing chances. The superior side should therefore only exchange similar pieces.

55 \( \textit{\textbf{\&xc4}} \) \textit{\textbf{\&xc4}}

Now White has much better prospects of setting up a dark-squared blockade.

56 \( \textit{\texttt{\&d4}} \) \textit{\texttt{\&c5}} (D)

52 \( \textit{\texttt{\&c2}} \) \textit{\texttt{\&d6}}
53 \( \textit{\texttt{\&d3}} \) \textit{\texttt{\&b7}}

53..\( g5 \) would still be good, but this is the last chance as White now prevents it (of course, he could have played \( h4 \) earlier himself).

54 \( \textit{h4} \)

Now any attempt to prepare \( \ldots g5 \) will just lead to a lot of simplification.

57 \( \textit{a4} \)

At this point I decided to sit down and really calculate, because I could see that the win was no longer going to be trivial.

57 \( \ldots \) \textit{\texttt{e5}}

Over the next few moves Kar- pov’s resistance starts to weaken.

58 \( \textit{\&b4} \)
Already 58 fxe5 ♞xe5+ 59 ♙f2 was more accurate, when Black has a long way to go to create a passed pawn on the kingside.

58 ... ♞c6
59 axb5 axb5
60 ♙e2? (D)

This was White’s last chance to play 60 fxe5 ♞xe5+ 61 ♙f2.

Another bad move. White should have tried 61 ♙c3.

61 ... ♙e6
62 ♞a3 ♞c2

Now Black is winning.

63 fxe5 fxe5
64 ♞a6

The only line I needed to calculate was 64 ♞c3 ♞xc3+ 65 ♙xc3 ♙d6 66 b4 ♙e6 67 ♙d3 ♙f5 68 ♙e3 ♙g4 69 ♙f2 e4 70 ♙d1 ♙f5 71 ♙e3 ♙e5 72 ♙c3 g6 (but not 72...g5? 73 hgx5 hxg5 74 g4 and White escapes with a draw) 73 g4 g5 74 h5 ♙d7 and Black wins.

64 ... ♙d6
65 b4

65 ♞a7 ♞xb2 66 ♞xg7 b4 is also an easy win.

65 ... ♞c4
66 ♞a7 ♙d7
67 ♞a6+ ♙e7
68 ♞g6 ♙f7
69 ♞d6 ♙g4
70 ♞d5 ♙c2

0-1

As the knight is trapped after 71 ♙g1 ♙g2.

This game was finished after the conclusion of the fifth game; the two adjournments were played on the same day. Unfortunately, in the adjournment of the fifth game I first made a simple win rather complicated and then, when I needed to calculate a long forced line in order to win, I made a mistake that allowed him to gain a tempo. The game ended in a draw. Here Karpov’s experience also played a part. He had two lost positions (games five and six), but he concentrated all his efforts on finding resources in game five (where he had a better chance to save the game) and eventually managed to salvage a half-point.
I missed a forced win in the seventh game and then he won the eighth game to take the match. Certainly he defended very well in this match, but he didn't demonstrate the form which would have taken him to the world championship, and he subsequently lost to Short in the semi-finals.

The two matches I played in this Candidates cycle were virtually the first matches I had ever played. Before, I had only played a not especially serious four-game match with Levitt. When the next Candidates cycle came around, the experience of match play that I gained against Dreev and Karpov turned out to be very useful.

The 1991 Tilburg tournament was a double-round event. Prior to this tournament I had only played Kasparov once, the game ending in a draw. In the first cycle at Tilburg I lost, but gained my revenge in the game immediately following. I won again in Reggio Emilia (see Game 13) but, to date, that was the last I saw of a plus score against him!
This was quite a pleasing game. In fact, I hadn’t really bothered to prepare for this game – I decided that whatever I did, it would be inadequate. He’d played this line so many times I couldn’t hope to out-prepare him, so I preferred to concentrate on keeping a clear head for the game. Although the strategy worked well on this occasion, it would be easy to exaggerate its advantages!

1 e4 c5
2 d3 f3 d6
3 d4 cxd4
4 dxe4 f6
5 f3 c3 a6
6 f3 e4
7 d3 d6

I later discovered that Kasparov and Nikitin’s book on the Scheveningen gives ‘The position after 8 0-0 \textcolor{white}{\textit{b6}} 9 e3 \textcolor{white}{\textit{xb2}} 10 \textcolor{white}{\textit{db5}} axb5 11 \textcolor{white}{\textit{xb5}} a5 is interesting for analysis’, but during the game I wasn’t aware of this. At the board I was considering 8 0-0, and my analysis ran ‘8 0-0 \textcolor{white}{\textit{b6}} 9 e3 \textcolor{white}{\textit{xb2}} and there must be something strong.’ After I played 8 0-0, he instantly flashed out 8...\textcolor{white}{\textit{b6}} and I thought for a while, during which I saw that it was not so easy.

8 0-0 \textcolor{white}{\textit{b6}}
9 e3 \textcolor{white}{\textit{xb2}}

Here I realized that I had to sacrifice on b5, or else I would just be a pawn down for nothing.

10 \textcolor{white}{\textit{db5}} (D)
10 \textcolor{white}{\textit{d2}} g4 is clearly better for Black.
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10 ... a\textcolor{white}{\textit{xb5}}
11 \textcolor{white}{\textit{db5}} a5

The line which had convinced me to play 10 \textcolor{white}{\textit{db5}} was 11...\textcolor{white}{\textit{b4}} 12 \textcolor{white}{\textit{c7+}} d8 13 e\textcolor{white}{\textit{axa8}} a5 14 db6 \textcolor{white}{\textit{xb6}} 15 e\textcolor{white}{\textit{e1}} a7 16 a4 g4 17 a5 and White wins. However, Black can improve on this by 12...\textcolor{white}{\textit{e7!} 13}
\( \text{Qxa8 Wa5} \) which leads, just like the game, to a complex and unclear position.

Other moves are bad, for example 11...\( \text{Qd8?} \) 12 a3! (threatening 13 \( \text{Qd4} \)) 12...\( \text{Ma4} \) (12...d5 13 \( \text{Mb1 Wa2} \) 14 \( \text{Mb3!} \) followed by \( \text{Qc3} \)) 13 c4! and wins, or 11...\( \text{Mb8?} \) 12 \( \text{Mb1 Wxa2} \) 13 \( \text{Ma1 Wb2} \) 14 \( \text{Qd4 Wb4} \) 15 c3 trapping the queen.

12 \( \text{Mb1} \)

Better than 12 a4 \( \text{Xxb5} \) (12...d5 13 \( \text{Mb1 Wa2} \) 14 \( \text{Ma1} \) is a draw) 13 \( \text{Xxb5 Wc3} \), which is better for Black, e.g. 14 \( \text{Ma8 Qe7} \) 15 \( \text{We1 Wc7} \) and 16 b6 \( \text{Qxb6} \) 17 \( \text{Xxb6} \) fails because Black takes on b6 with check.

12 ... \( \text{Xxb5} \)

Not 12...\( \text{Wxa2?} \) 13 \( \text{Qc3 Wa3} \) 14 \( \text{Mb3} \) and Black does not get enough for the queen.

13 \( \text{Xxb2} \) \( \text{Xxb2} \) (D)

\[<Diagram>\]

16 ... \( \text{Qe7} \)

Alternatively:
1) 16...\( \text{Qd8} \) 17 \( \text{Wa5 Qfd7} \) 18 \( \text{Mb1} \) and now:
1a) 18...\( \text{Qc7} \) 19 \( \text{Mb5 Qb8} \) (White wins after 19...\( \text{Qc5?} \) 20 \( \text{Qe8} \)) 20 \( \text{Qxd7 Qxd7} \) 21 \( \text{Qd8} \) g6 (21...d5 22
\(f1\) dxe4 23 \(b3\) \(c5\) 24 \(c3\) is again winning) 22 \(h1!\) \(g7\) 23 \(e7\) \(c7\) 24 \(d1\) and White is clearly better.

1b) 18...d5 19 exd5 exd5 20 \(f5\) \(c5\)+ 21 \(f1\) \(e7\) 22 \(xd7\) \(xd7\) 23 \(c7\) f6 24 \(d1\) d4 25 c3 also favours White.

2) 16...\(fd7\) 17 \(b1\) d5? (Black can transpose into the game by 17...\(e7\)) 18 \(xb6\) and White wins after 18...\(c5\)+ 19 \(f1\) d4 20 \(c4\) or 18...\(xb6\) 19 \(c7\).

17 \(b1\) (D)

Now that Black cannot castle, he finds it hard to coordinate his pieces.

19 \(h6\) (D)

The alternative is 19...\(g8\) 20 e5 dxe5 and now:

1) 21 \(hxh7\) with two lines:

1a) 21...\(h8\) 22 \(xb6\) \(xb6\) (if 22...\(e4\), then 23 \(b4\) \(e7\) 24 \(c4\) wins) 23 \(xf6\) \(xh7\) 24 \(xe5\) \(d5\) 25 c4 \(e7\) 26 a4 with the plan of \(c7\), c5-c6 and pushing the a-pawn forward to queen. Of course, matters are not so simple as this, but White has the advantage.

1b) 21...\(g4\)! 22 \(xb6\) \(h4\) 23 \(xe6+\) \(fxe6\) 24 \(g6+\) \(e7\) 25 \(g8\) \(xf4\) 26 \(f7+\) \(d8\) 27 \(xe6\) is unclear.

2) 21 \(xb6!\) e4 22 \(b4\) (22 \(b5\) \(d4+\) 23 \(f1\) \(xb6\) 24 \(xh7\) \(f8\) \(x4\) is unclear, but 22 \(xe6+\) \(fxe6\) 23 \(xe4\) should be slightly better for White) 22...exd3 23 \(xh7\) with advantage to White.
20 \textit{b5?}

Missing a stronger possibility: 20 g4! (while not winning, this gives White an advantage) 20...\textit{g8} (not 20...\textit{d4+?} 21 \textit{f1} \textit{c5} 22 \textit{b4}, nor 20...\textit{c5?} 21 e5 dxe5 22 g5 and White wins in both lines) 21 g5 \textit{g7} (21...\textit{d4+} 22 \textit{f1} \textit{f8} is possible, but still better for White) 22 \textit{h4} (D) (not 22 \textit{xh7??} \textit{d4+} 23 \textit{f1} \textit{h8} and Black wins) and now:

\[ \textbf{B} \]

1) 22...h6 23 \textit{f1} and now both 23...\textit{xh5} 24 \textit{xg5+} and 23...\textit{a4} 24 e5! dxe5 25 fxe5 favour White.

2) 22...\textit{a4} 23 \textit{h1} (23 \textit{b4} \textit{ac5} 24 \textit{xh7} \textit{f8} 25 \textit{h4} is also good for White since he has the e4-pawn well supported) 23...\textit{ac5} 24 g6+ (24 \textit{xh7} \textit{f8} 25 \textit{h4} \textit{h8} 26 \textit{g3} b6 is only slightly better for White) 24...\textit{f6} 25 \textit{gxe7} \textit{h8} 26 \textit{h6!} (now the manoeuvre \textit{g1-g8 will also introduce the possibility of \textit{xf8+}) 26...e5 (26...\textit{dxd3} 27 cxd3 \textit{f8} 28 e5 dxe5 29 fxe5 \textit{xe5} 30 \textit{g5+} \textit{f6} 31 \textit{c5+} \textit{d8} 32 \textit{d6+} \textit{d7} 33 \textit{g1} is very unpleasant for Black) 27 \textit{g1} (27 \textit{f1} \textit{f8} 28 fxe5 \textit{xe5} is less clear) 27...\textit{xf4} 28 \textit{g8} \textit{e6} 29 \textit{xf6+!} \textit{xf6} 30 \textit{h8} and wins.

3) 22...e5 23 \textit{h1} \textit{xf4} and now:

3a) 24 g6+ \textit{f6} 25 \textit{xh7} \textit{h8} 26 \textit{h5} \textit{e5!} 27 \textit{g5+} \textit{f6} 28 \textit{xb6} \textit{h7} 29 \textit{b5!} (29 \textit{e2} f3 30 \textit{xf3} \textit{xh2+} 31 \textit{g1} \textit{xc2} is not easy for White – Black’s pieces are very active) 29...\textit{h5} 30 \textit{xh5+} dxe5 31 \textit{g1} \textit{d7} 32 \textit{e7} (32 \textit{c5+} \textit{e8} 33 \textit{b5} \textit{bxb5} 34 \textit{xb5+} \textit{f8} 35 \textit{xb7} \textit{g7} is less clear as Black has counterplay with ...\textit{g1} or with his f-pawn) followed by either \textit{c5+} or \textit{g5}, with advantage to White.

3b) 24 e5! (also strong) and now:

3b1) 24...\textit{dxe5} 25 g6+ \textit{f6} 26 \textit{gxe7} \textit{h8} (26...\textit{f8} 27 \textit{h6} \textit{d5} 28 \textit{g1} \textit{h8} 29 \textit{g8} \textit{f5} 30 \textit{e8} 31 \textit{g5} \textit{g6} 32 \textit{xc6} 33 \textit{g5+} wins) 27 \textit{h5} (27 \textit{h6} \textit{d5} 28 \textit{g1} is also promising for White) 27...\textit{a4} (27...\textit{d5} 28 \textit{c4} \textit{e3} 29 \textit{xf7+} \textit{d6} 30 \textit{b6} is winning) 28 \textit{g1} \textit{d5} 29 \textit{c4} \textit{e6} 30 \textit{xe6}! \textit{xe6} 31 \textit{g8} and White should win.

3b2) 24...\textit{dxe5} 25 g6+ \textit{f6} (the line 25...\textit{e8} 26 \textit{gxe7} \textit{h8} 27 \textit{b5}!! \textit{a4} 28 \textit{xe5+} dxe5 29 \textit{g5} is decisive) 26 \textit{gxe7} \textit{h8} 27 \textit{h6}, again intending \textit{g1-g8}, and Black faces serious problems.

Kasparov pointed out many of these variations after the game. My
inaccuracy arose because I failed to appreciate that this was really a critical position in which White had to continue very precisely, and not just play natural-looking moves.

20 ... Hg8?! (D)

Missing a simple chance: after 20...e5! (not 20...Ac5? 21 e5 dxe5 22 fxe5 Aexe5 23 Whg5+ Ad6 24 Ad1+ Ad5 25 c4 and wins) 21 Af1 (after 21 f5 Ac5 Black has wrested control of some dark squares; 21 a4 Ac5 22 a5 Abd7 is also fine for Black) 21...Ag8 22 fxe5 Aexe5 23 Whxh7 Ag7 24 Wh4+ Af6 Black has regrouped his pieces with a solid position.

21 Ad1! e5?!

After 21...Ac5 White can gain the advantage:

1) 22 Axh6?! is inferior after 22...Ag6 23 Wh5! Aexe4! (23...Axh6 24 e5+ Ac7 25 exf6 Abd7 26 Whxh7 Axf6 27 g3 is slightly better for White) 24 Ad3 Ad5 and Black's active pieces provide him with sufficient counterplay.

2) 22 e5! dxe5 23 fxe5 Aexe5 24 We3 and now 24...Ad6 25 Wh4 Ad8 (25...Ad5 26 c4 wins for White) 26 Wh4+ f6 27 Whxh7+ Af8 28 Wh8+ Ae7 29 Wh7# is mate, so Black must play 24...Abd7 25 Axd7 Axd7 26 Axh7+ Axd7 27 Whx5 Ac6 28 g3, when White has fair winning prospects.

The best move is 21...Ag4! (D), which was Kasparov's original intention, but when he was about to play it, he saw a hole in his analysis. However, it appears that the move is playable after all:

1) 22 g3? e5! 23 a4 exf4 24 a5 fxg3 25 axb6 gxh2+ 26 Ah1 Ae5 favours Black – the h2-pawn is very strong.

2) 22 e5 dxe5 23 Wh3 Axf4 24 Wa3+ Ae8 (not 24...Ad8? 25 Wf8+ Ac7 26 Wd6+) 25 Wc5 Ad8 26 a4 and now:
2a) 26...f5? 27 f1 g5 (White wins after 27...xf1+ 28 xf1 as Black cannot defend against a5) 28 h4! is very good for White.

2b) 26...e4 27 f1! (now not 27 a5? f5 28 b4 d5 29 c4 e7 and Black is better) 27...g4! 28 h4! (28 a5 g5 29 f2 f6, intending 30 c4 a8, is slightly better for Black) and now Kasparov goes into some spectacular lines, but he missed 28...e3!, which looks fine for Black, e.g. 29 a5 (29 xe3 d5 is very good for Black) 29...e2! 30 e1 f6 31 c3 d8! with advantage to Black.

3) 22 e2!? (probably objectively best) 22...g8 and White may have nothing better than to repeat moves.

22 f5 (D)

22 ... c5?

It is now too late for this move. I was rather relieved when he didn’t play 22...d8!, after which White is still better, but the position remains complicated. The analysis runs 23 g4 c5 (23...g8 24 h3 is a simple win) 24 g5 xe4 (not 24...h8? 25 f6+) 25 xf6+ xf6 (Kasparov analysed this in excruciating detail and decided it favoured White; however, when you go for your best practical chance, you shouldn’t be too fussy!) 26 e3! (26 c4?! g8+ 27 f1 xf5 28 c5 d5 29 e3 b7 and 26 f1 g8+ 27 h1 g4! are less clear; Black has real counterplay in both cases) 26...bd5 (26...bd7 27 a7! c5 28 xd6! g8+ 29 f1 xd6 30 b6+ wins) 27 wb3 c7! (27...f4 28 c4 heading for c7) 28 c4 xb5 29 xb5 g8+ and Black can play on, but White has excellent winning chances.

Other 22nd moves are bad, for example 22...g4? 23 d2 d5 24 xd7 xd7 (24...xd7 25 b4+ and 24...xd7 25 e2 are also winning for White) 25 xd5 wins, or 22...a8 23 xd7! xd7 24 c6 g5 (24...xd6 25 xf6+ c7 26 xf7) 25 xh7 and White wins.

23 xd6!

Black’s position crumbles.

23 ... g5

23...xd6 loses to 24 xf6+ c7 25 xxe5+.

24 xh7

Now all the tactics work out for White.

24 ... xe4

Or 24...xd6 25 xg8 e3+ (25...xe4 26 xf7 and wins) 26
\( \text{\texttt{f1 xe4 (26...e7 27 f6+ xf6}} \\
28 \text{\texttt{d8+}} \text{\texttt{and 26...d7 27 xd7}} \\
\text{\texttt{bxd7 28 xf7 are decisive) 27}} \\
\text{\texttt{xf7 with too many passed pawns.}} \\
25 \text{\texttt{xb6 d8}} \\
25...\text{\texttt{e3+ 26 f1 g4 (26...d8}} \\
27 \text{\texttt{h4+) 27 f6+ f8 (27...d8 28}} \\
\text{\texttt{xf7) 28 e2 would be fatal for}} \\
\text{\texttt{Black.}} \\
26 \text{\texttt{d3 e3+}} \\
27 \text{\texttt{f1 (D)}} \\
27 \text{\texttt{... xb6}} \\
27...\text{\texttt{d2+ 28 e2 xb6 29 h4+}} \\
e8 (29...d7 30 xd2) 30 b5+ \\
d7 31 h8+ e7 32 xe5+ f8 \\
33 d6+ decides the game. \\
28 \text{\texttt{xe4 d4}} \\
29 c3 1-0 \\
31 xe4. \\

The result of this game was a pleasant surprise for me. At the time Kasparov already had a huge lead over the other players, but now I had visions of overhauling him. I already had a winning adjournment against Kamsky in the bag, then I won this game, and the following day I had a winning position against Karpov. However, I lost the game against Karpov and then I blundered into a mate in two in the Kamsky adjournment, so to win the tournament Kasparov didn’t have to do anything other than to watch my mistakes.
This game was played in the New Year tournament at Reggio Emilia, which at the time was the strongest tournament ever held and was the first to reach category 18. Nowadays this has become par for the course, but at that time it was something special.

What was also special about this event was that I was the only player in the tournament who didn’t speak Russian, the other nine participants all being from the Soviet Union (after the fifth round, they were from the former Soviet Union!) – the event was effectively the last Soviet Championship.

1 e4 e6

I chose this because I didn’t want to challenge Kasparov again in the Sicilian. He had already shown in Tilburg how well prepared he is for the Sicilian and I didn’t see the point of provoking him again.

2 d4 d5

3 \textit{d}d2

In Tilburg, he had started playing 3 exd5 and 4 \textit{f}f3 against the French and it was partly in the hope that he would repeat this insipid system that I chose the opening. 3 \textit{d}d2 was a bit of a surprise.

3 ... \textit{c}5

4 exd5 \textit{w}xd5

I had studied this line fairly extensively for the Dreev match.

5 dxc5

A very surprising move, which I had never seen before. It seemed quite unlike Kasparov to step out of theory into unknown territory.

5 ... \textit{x}xc5

6 \textit{g}f3 \textit{f}6 (D)

7 \textit{d}d3

Here I realized that he wanted to get the type of set-up that often arises in the Rubinstein French (i.e. 3...dxe4) – White castles long and
has attacking chances on the kingside, but Black has an extra centre pawn.

7 ... 0-0
8 \textit{\texttt{We2}}  \textit{\texttt{Qbd7}}

Better than 8...\textit{\texttt{Qc6}} 9 \textit{\texttt{Qe4}}  \textit{\texttt{Qe7}}
10 0-0, with an edge for White. Here it is better to have the knights connected, and in some lines with \textit{\texttt{Qe4}} and \textit{\texttt{Qxc5}}, Black can reply ...\textit{\texttt{Qxc5}} and hit the bishop on d3.

9 \textit{\texttt{Qe4}}  b6
10 \textit{\texttt{Qxc5}}  \textit{\texttt{Wxc5}} (D)

10...\textit{\texttt{Qxc5}} is also fine for Black, e.g. 11 \textit{\texttt{Qc4}}  \textit{\texttt{Wf5}} 12 \textit{\texttt{Qe3}}  \textit{\texttt{Ab7}} with equality. All Black’s pieces are in play and the advantage of the two bishops is purely academic.

11 \textit{\texttt{Qe3}}

White’s idea is to put the bishop on the long diagonal and aim for \textit{\texttt{Qe5}} followed by f4. If he could achieve this then he would have an advantage, but there just isn’t time for it. The quiet 11 0-0 may be better.

11 ... \textit{\texttt{Wc7}}
12 \textit{\texttt{Qd4}}  \textit{\texttt{Ab7}}
13 0-0-0

Thanks to the loss of time with \textit{\texttt{Qe3-d4}}, Black can safely meet 13 0-0 by 13...\textit{\texttt{Qc5}}. The exchange on f6 is not dangerous as White’s pieces are not active enough to achieve anything before Black plays ...\textit{\texttt{Qh8}} and ...\textit{\texttt{Qg8}}.

13 ...

\textit{\texttt{Qc5!}} (D)

14 \textit{\texttt{Qe5}}

After 14 \textit{\texttt{Qxf6}} Black has a range of satisfactory options. 14...\textit{\texttt{Qxd3+}}
15 \textit{\texttt{Qxd3}}  \textit{\texttt{Wf4+}} 16 \textit{\texttt{Qb1}}  \textit{\texttt{Wxf6}} is the simplest possibility, but Black can even play for the advantage with 14...\textit{\texttt{Wf4+}} (more accurate than the immediate 14...\textit{\texttt{Qxf6}} 15 \textit{\texttt{Qe3}}  \textit{\texttt{Qg7}}, although that is also playable) 15 \textit{\texttt{Qb1}}  \textit{\texttt{gxf6!}}? and the active queen on f4 immobilizes White’s queen, while the f6-pawn prevents \textit{\texttt{Qe5}}.

14 ...

\textit{\texttt{Qxd3+}}
15 \textit{\texttt{Qxd3?!}}
15 \(\text{wx}d3\) was better, leading to an unclear position after 15...\(\text{wc}6\) 16 \(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{gxf}6\) 17 \(\text{dd}4\).

15 ... \(\text{wc}4\)

16 \(\text{dd}4\)

Other moves are not very impressive:

1) 16 \(\text{bb}1?! \text{de}4\) 17 \(\text{ee}3\) \(\text{xe}2\) 18 \(\text{xe}2\) \(\text{xf}3\) 19 gxf3 \(\text{dd}5\) with a clear endgame advantage for Black.

2) 16 \(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{xf}4+\) 17 \(\text{bb}1\) \(\text{xf}6\) is at least equal for Black.

3) 16 \(\text{dd}2\) \(\text{g}4!\) (16...\(\text{xa}2\) 17 \(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{gxf}6\) 18 \(\text{g}4+\) \(\text{h}8\) 19 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{g}8\) 20 \(\text{xf}6+\) \(\text{g}7\) 21 \(\text{d}7\) is too dangerous for Black) 17 f3 \(\text{g}6\), threatening 18...\(\text{a}6\) or 18...\(\text{ac}8\), again with a comfortable position for Black.

16 ... \(\text{ee}4!\) (D)

I thought for some time about 16...\(\text{xa}2\)!. I couldn’t see anything definitely wrong with it, but it appeared more prudent to have the bishop on \(e4\), from where it could defend the kingside. After 16...\(\text{xa}2\) 17 \(\text{xf}6\) Black can play:

1) 17...\(\text{a}1+\) (this move is definitely too risky) 18 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{a}5+\) 19 b4 \(\text{xb}4+\) and now:

1a) 20 \(\text{c}1\) gxf6 21 \(\text{g}4+\) \(\text{h}8\) 22 \(\text{h}4\) (22 \(\text{h}3\) \(\text{a}5!\) is favourable for Black) 22...\(\text{g}8\) 23 \(\text{xf}6+\) \(\text{g}7\) 24 \(\text{g}3\) with a likely draw.

1b) 20 c3! \(\text{b}2+\) 21 \(\text{c}2\) gxf6 22 \(\text{g}4+\) \(\text{h}8\) 23 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{g}8\) 24 \(\text{xf}6+\) \(\text{g}7\) 25 \(\text{e}1!\) with a dangerous attack.

2) 17...\(\text{gxf}6\) 18 \(\text{b}3\) (I don’t see a direct try that works, so this sensible move seems best – it stops ...\(\text{a}1+\) and temporarily shuts out the queen; 18 \(\text{g}4+\) \(\text{h}8\) 19 \(\text{h}4\) \(\text{a}1+\) 20 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{a}5+\) and 18 \(\text{a}3\) \(\text{d}5\) 19 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{e}5!\) favour Black) 18...\(\text{a}4\) (after 18...\(\text{h}8\) 19 \(\text{g}4\) the enemy queen is totally isolated) 19 \(\text{d}4!\) \(\text{c}6\) 20 \(\text{hd}1\) is a hard position to evaluate, but White certainly has compensation.

![Chess Diagram]

17 \(\text{e}3\) \(\text{xa}2!\)

Not 17...\(\text{xe}2?!\) 18 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{g}2?\) 19 \(\text{g}1\) and White wins.

18 \(\text{xf}6\)

18 \(\text{xe}4\) doesn’t work because of 18...\(\text{a}1+\) 19 \(\text{d}2\) \(\text{xe}4+\) 20 \(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{h}1\) 21 \(\text{g}4\) f6 22 \(\text{e}6\) \(\text{f}7\) defending, for example 23 \(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{h}2\) 24 \(\text{g}7\) \(\text{xf}2+\) 25 \(\text{c}3\) \(\text{g}2\) and the attack collapses.

18 ... \(\text{g}6!\) (D)

I felt much more secure with my bishop placed on \textit{g}6, safeguarding
the kingside. 18...\textoblong{wa}1+?! is risky: after 19 \textoblong{d}2 \textoblong{x}xh1 20 \textoblong{xe}4 gxf6 21 \textoblong{gg}4+ \textoblong{h}8 22 \textoblong{h}4 \textoblong{wg}2 (22...\textoblong{gg}8 23 \textoblong{xf}6+ \textoblong{gg}7 24 \textoblong{gg}4 \textoblong{ag}8 25 \textoblong{df}3 wins) 23 \textoblong{gg}4 Black has to give up his queen.

2) 21 \textoblong{gg}3 \textoblong{xd}4 22 \textoblong{xe}6+ with a draw.

20 ... \textoblong{gf}6
21 \textoblong{h}5 \textoblong{xd}4
22 \textoblong{hx}g6 \textoblong{hx}g6
23 \textoblong{hh}3 \textoblong{f}5
24 \textoblong{hh}4 \textoblong{f}4! (D)

Kasparov had placed many of his hopes on 24 \textoblong{h}4, based on the line 24...\textoblong{f}6 25 \textoblong{we}3 \textoblong{fd}8 26 \textoblong{wh}3 \textoblong{f}8 27 \textoblong{hh}8+ \textoblong{e}7 28 \textoblong{wa}3+ \textoblong{d}7 29 \textoblong{dd}1+ \textoblong{cc}6 30 \textoblong{wa}4+. After 30...\textoblong{cc}7 (not 30...\textoblong{bb}7? 31 \textoblong{dd}7+ \textoblong{xd}7 32 \textoblong{xd}7+ \textoblong{aa}6 33 \textoblong{xa}8 and White wins) 31 \textoblong{xd}8! (31 \textoblong{dd}7+ \textoblong{xd}7 32 \textoblong{xa}8 \textoblong{xd}4 is unclear) 31...\textoblong{xd}8 32 \textoblong{xa}7+ \textoblong{cc}6 33 \textoblong{hh}3 \textoblong{dd}5 White has a dangerous attack for the pawn and can force a draw whenever he wants.

19 \textoblong{ha}3 \textoblong{wd}5

The point of Black’s play; White can’t defend his knight because 20 \textoblong{ee}5 is met by 20...\textoblong{f}6.

20 \textoblong{h}4?!

A risky try which I hadn’t really looked at – White could have settled for sterile equality with 20 \textoblong{ee}5 (20 \textoblong{we}5 is met by 20...\textoblong{x}g2! and not 20...\textoblong{gx}f6 21 \textoblong{xd}5 with excellent play for the pawn) 20...\textoblong{f}6 and now:

1) 21 \textoblong{dd}6?! \textoblong{fc}8! (21...\textoblong{xd}6 22 \textoblong{xe}6+ \textoblong{xe}6 23 \textoblong{xe}6 is equal, while 21...\textoblong{x}e8? 22 \textoblong{bb}5 \textoblong{a}6 23 \textoblong{cc}7 is good for White) 22 \textoblong{xe}6+ (22 \textoblong{c}3 \textoblong{xd}4 23 \textoblong{xe}6+ \textoblong{ff}7 24 \textoblong{we}7 \textoblong{xf}2 and Black wins) 22...\textoblong{xe}6 23 \textoblong{xe}6 \textoblong{xc}2+ 24 \textoblong{dd}1 \textoblong{cc}6 and Black will be a pawn up.

I had pinned my own hopes on 24...\textoblong{f}4!, keeping the queen in the centre. My queen functions like a Dragon bishop in preventing mate at h8. Kasparov is very good at long forcing lines, but it is the nature of
such lines that one cannot be absolutely certain about them. In this case he was just wrong.

25 \( \textit{Wf3?} \)

After the game Kasparov pointed out that 25 g3! would have given him excellent drawing chances, for example 25...\( \textit{Wac8} \) (25...e5 26 \( \textit{Wh8+} \) \( \textit{Wh7} \) 27 \( \textit{Wh8h7+} \) \( \textit{Whf6} \) 28 \( \textit{Wd1} \) \( \textit{Wb4} \) 29 \( \textit{Wg4} \) gives White at least a draw) 26 gxf4 (D) and now:
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1) 26...\( \textit{Wf6} \) (my intention during the game) 27 \( \textit{We5} \) (27 \( \textit{We3} \) \( \textit{Cc5} \) 28 \( \textit{Wh3} \) \( \textit{Wh4!} \) 29 \( \textit{Whxh4} \) \( \textit{Hh5} \) is also drawn) 27...\( \textit{We5} \) 28 fxe5 \( \textit{g5} \) 29 \( \textit{Hh5} \) \( \textit{fd8} \) with a near-certain draw.

2) 26...\( \textit{Cc5} \) 27 f5 \( \textit{Wf6} \) 28 fxg6 fxg6 29 \( \textit{Hh8+} \) \( \textit{Wh8} \) 30 \( \textit{We6+} \) \( \textit{Whg7} \) 31 \( \textit{We7+} \) (or 31 \( \textit{Wd7+} \) \( \textit{Whg8} \) with a repetition) 31...\( \textit{Hf7} \) 32 \( \textit{Wxf7+} \) \( \textit{Whf7}\) 33 \( \textit{Hxh8} \) draws.

The text-move is a mistake because it gives Black time to bring his rook into play and thereby gain a tempo by threatening mate on c2.

Kasparov should have abandoned his winning attempts and gone for the draw, but he decided to ‘fish’ for a move too long! After 25 \( \textit{Wf3?} \), the game followed his analysis but the position arising favours Black rather than White.

25 \( \textit{... Wac8} \)
26 \( \textit{Wxf4} \)

Not 26 \( \textit{Wh3} \) \( \textit{Wxf2!} \) 27 \( \textit{Hh8+} \) \( \textit{Whg7} \) and Black wins after 28 \( \textit{Wh6+} \) \( \textit{Wf6} \) or 28 \( \textit{Hh7+} \) \( \textit{Wf6} \) 29 c3 \( \textit{Wc3+} \).

26 \( \textit{... Wc5} \)
27 \( \textit{e3} \) \( \textit{Whg7} \) (D)

By now Black is slightly better.

28 \( \textit{Hh4} \)

Following the game I pointed out that 28 \( \textit{Hh4!} \) \( \textit{Wg5+} \) 29 \( \textit{Cc2} \) \( \textit{Wf5+} \) 30 \( \textit{Wxf5} \) might have been a better chance. However, 30...\( \textit{gx5} \) (after 30...\( \textit{exf5} \) 31 \( \textit{Hd4} \) it would be very hard for Black to win) 31 \( \textit{Ka4} \) \( \textit{Cc7} \) 32 \( \textit{Ha1} \) a5 33 b4 \( \textit{Hf8} \) 34 \( \textit{Ha3} \) \( \textit{Hh8} \) 35 bxa5 bxa5 36 \( \textit{Hxa5} \) \( \textit{Hh2} \) is still quite promising for Black.
During the game I felt happier with queens on than in a pure rook ending and so I was pleased to see the text-move.

28 ... \textit{We}e5  
29 g3 \textit{We}e1+  
30 \textit{Cc}2 \textit{Ecd}8  
31 \textit{Dd}4 \textit{We}5  

Now Black has secured his extra pawn.

32 \textit{Hhf}4 \textit{Wc}7  
33 \textit{We}3 e5  

Forcing an exchange of rooks without allowing the other rook to come to d4.

34 \textit{Xxd}8 \textit{Xxd}8  
35 \textit{Ee}4 (D)  

White’s plan is to cripple Black’s pawn majority, but it gives the f5-square to Black’s queen.

37 ... \textit{Wd}6  
38 f3 \textit{a}5  
39 \textit{We}2 \textit{We}6  
40 \textit{Wh}2 \textit{Wf}5  

Perhaps White could have put up more resistance, but the position should be won for Black.

41 \textit{Wg}3  
Or 41 \textit{Wh}6+ \textit{g}8 42 \textit{b}3 \textit{Ed}2 and wins.

41 ... \textit{Wd}7  
42 \textit{We}1 (D)  

\begin{center}
\textbf{B}
\end{center}  

35 ... \textit{Dd}5  
36 g4?!  

36 f4! would have been better, reducing the number of pawns and possibly exposing the black king to more checks.

36 ... \textit{b5}  
37 g5  

42 ... \textit{b4}!  
43 \textit{Exb}4  

Black also wins after 43 \textit{Exe}5 \textit{a}4+ 44 \textit{c}1 bxc! 45 bxc3 (45 \textit{Xxd}5 \textit{a}1+) 45...\textit{Wf}4+ 46 \textit{Ee}3 \textit{Ed}3, so the best chance was 43 b3, which avoids an instant catastrophe. After the text-move Black decides the game by a direct attack.

43 ... \textit{Wa}4+  

\begin{center}
\textbf{B}
\end{center}  

42 ... \textit{Dd}5  
36 g4?!  

36 f4! would have been better, reducing the number of pawns and possibly exposing the black king to more checks.

36 ... \textit{b5}  
37 g5  

42 ... \textit{b4}!  
43 \textit{Exb}4  

Black also wins after 43 \textit{Exe}5 \textit{a}4+ 44 \textit{c}1 bxc! 45 bxc3 (45 \textit{Xxd}5 \textit{a}1+) 45...\textit{Wf}4+ 46 \textit{Ee}3 \textit{Ed}3, so the best chance was 43 b3, which avoids an instant catastrophe. After the text-move Black decides the game by a direct attack.

43 ... \textit{Wa}4+
44 b3

The continuations 44 c1 axb4 45 Xxe5 d8 and 44 c3 c6+ 45 c4 axb4+ 46 cxb4 b5+ 47 c3 wxf3+ 48 c2 b3+ are equally hopeless for White.

44 ... w2+
45 c3

45 c1 loses to 45...axb4 46 xb4 w1+ 47 c2 d1+.

45 ... a4
46 bxa4 w3+
47 c2 wa4+
48 c3 wa3+
49 c2 d3

0-1

I started Reggio Emilia with my traditional two wins. In the next round I drew with Khalifman but lost in round 4, which allowed everybody to catch up with me. The rest of the tournament was a race between Kasparov, Gelfand and myself and in the end the three of us tied for first – my greatest success up to that point, and even today I would consider it one of my best results.
Game 14
V. Anand – E. Bareev
Dortmund 1992
French Defence

This was my best game from Dortmund 1992. I also won a nice game against Hüblner (see the following game), but I particularly like this one as it is a kind of model game for dark-squared play against the French.

1 e4 e6

Bareev’s favourite defence is the French. Although he has also experimented with other lines, all our encounters in which I was White have been French Defences.

2 d4 d5
3 قرب c3 4e5 4c6 5f4 6f3 7e3 8d2 9dxc5 10xc5 11f2 12d3 130-0

This is all fairly standard stuff in this opening. Black must develop play on the queenside, whilst White tries to play on the kingside.

14 4fd1 0-0

After 14...4a4 15 4xa4 bxa4 16 b3 Black isn’t doing too badly, but he

has a long evening ahead of him as White tries to exploit the d4-square and Black’s bad bishop. However, heading for an ending may be Black’s best chance once he has decided to play ...4b8 and ...4b4. My personal view is that if Black wants to keep the queens on, he should adopt the plan with ...b4, ...a5 and ...4a6.

15 4e2! 4d7

The option of ...4a4 has already gone, as now it would just be punching thin air.

16 4ed4 (D)

16...4bxd3

16...4e4 is bad in view of 17 4xe4 dxe4 18 4g5, but 16...a5 is a
possibility. From Black's point of view there is no advantage to this move, because White can just reply 17 b3 and Black has nothing better than 17...\(\text{Qbxd3}\) 18 cxd3 b4, transposing into the note to Black's 17th move. However, White can try to refute 16...a5 out of hand by 17 \(\text{Qxh7+!}\). During the game I looked at some of the following lines; the analysis is quite interesting, but the tree of variations is so large that I will only give the basic variations: 17...\(\text{Qxh7}\) 18 \(\text{Wh4+}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) 19 \(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{Kfc8}\) and now:

1) 20 \(\text{Wh5}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 21 \(\text{Qh1}\) (21 \(\text{Wh7+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 22 f5 exf5 23 \(\text{Qxf5?}\) \(\text{Qc3+!}\) mates) 21...\(\text{Qe4}\) 22 \(\text{Wh7+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 23 \(\text{Qxe4}\) dxe4 24 f5 \(\text{Qd5}\) (the knight comes back to aid the defence) 25 \(\text{Wh8+}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 26 \(\text{Wxg7}\) \(\text{Qd8}\) 27 fxe6 fxe6 28 \(\text{Wg8}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 29 \(\text{Wg5+}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 30 \(\text{Wg7+}\) \(\text{Qd8}\) is unclear.

2) 20 \(\text{Qh1?!}\) (D) and now there are three possible lines:

2a) 20...\(\text{Qc3}\)? 21 c3 \(\text{Qc2}\) 22 \(\text{Wh7+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 23 \(\text{Qxd3}\) \(\text{Qxa1}\) 24 \(\text{Wh8+}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 25 \(\text{Wxg7}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 26 f5 exf5 27 e6 \(\text{Qxe6}\) 28 \(\text{Qe3}\) winning.

2b) 20...\(\text{Qf8}\) 21 \(\text{Wh8+}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 22 \(\text{Wxg7}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) (22...\(\text{Qe8}\) loses to 23 f5, while 22...\(\text{Qd8}\) 23 \(\text{Wxf7}\) clearly favours White) 23 \(\text{Qdf3!!}\) (threatening 24 \(\text{Qh4};\) 23 a4 is less effective – the idea is to play \(\text{Qa3-h3}\), but 23...\(\text{Qe4}\) is quite an annoying reply) 23...\(\text{Qe4}\) (23...\(\text{Qxc2}\) 24 \(\text{Qac1}\) \(\text{Qe3}\) 25 \(\text{Qh4}\) with a crushing attack) 24 \(\text{Qxe4}\) dxe4 25 \(\text{Qh4!}\) \(\text{Qfc8}\) 26 \(\text{Wf6+}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 27 \(\text{Wh8+}\) \(\text{Qe7}\) 28 \(\text{Qg6+}\) \(\text{fxg6}\) 29 \(\text{Wg7+}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 30 \(\text{Qxd7}\) and White wins.

2c) 20...\(\text{Qe4!}\) (best) 21 \(\text{Wh7+}\) \(\text{Qf8}\) 22 \(\text{Wh8+}\) (22 \(\text{Qxe4}\) dxe4 23 \(\text{Qf5}\) exf5 24 \(\text{Qxd7}\) \(\text{Qh6}\) wins for Black) 22...\(\text{Qe7}\) 23 \(\text{Wxg7}\) (D) and now:

2c1) 23...\(\text{Qf2+}\) 24 \(\text{Qg1}\) \(\text{Qxd1}\) 25 \(\text{Wf6+}\) \(\text{Qe8}\) 26 \(\text{Qxd1}\) \(\text{Qxc2}\) (26...\(\text{Qc4}\) 27 c3 is hopeless) 27 \(\text{Qxf7}\) \(\text{Qc6}\) 28 f5 \(\text{Qc8}\) 29 \(\text{Wh8+}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) (29...\(\text{Qxf7}\) 30 f6 wins) 30 \(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{Qc7}\) 31 \(\text{Wh7+}\) \(\text{Qd7}\)
32 fxe6 \( \text{d}8 \) 33 \( \text{w}e7! \) and White ends up well ahead on material.

2c2) 23...\( \text{g}xg5 \) 24 fxg5 (if 24 \( \text{w}xg5+ \), then 24...\( \text{e}8 \)) 24...\( \text{g}8 \) 25 \( \text{w}f6+ \) and now 25...\( \text{e}8 \) 26 \( \text{f}1 \) \( \text{w}xd4 \) 27 \( \text{w}xf7+ \) \( \text{d}8 \) 28 \( \text{w}xg8+ \) is good for White, but 25...\( \text{f}8 \)! is unclear.

2c3) 23...\( \text{f}8 \)! (this defence appears to hold out for Black) 24 c3 (24 \( \text{e}xe4 \) dxe4 25 c3 \( \text{d}5 \)) 24...\( \text{f}2+ \) 25 \( \text{g}1 \) \( \text{x}d1 \) 26 \( \text{h}7 \) and now 26...\( \text{g}8 \) 27 \( \text{f}6+ \) \( \text{e}8 \) 28 \( \text{h}4 \) is probably a draw, while 26...\( \text{xc}3 \)!? 27 bxc3 \( \text{c}5 \) 28 \( \text{g}5+ \) \( \text{e}8 \) 29 \( \text{f}6+ \) \( \text{d}8 \) is unclear.

One can see why Bareev decided not to invest a lot of time in working through these variations and opted for the simpler text-move.

17 \( \text{c}xd3 \) \( \text{a}4 \)?

A serious error – Black shouldn’t allow White to fix the enemy pawns on light squares. Black should play either 17...\( b4 \) or 17...\( a5 \), which gives him chances of eventually activating his bishop at \( b5 \). After 17...\( a5 \) 18 \( b3 \), for example, White is just slightly better.

18 \( b4 \)! (**D**)

At first it seems that Black’s knight can reach a good square by...\( \text{a}4-\text{c}3 \), but in fact it is not very effective at \( c3 \) because it lacks adequate support. By contrast, White’s knights, after \( \text{b}3 \) and \( \text{fd}4 \), have well-supported and useful squares to land on at \( d4 \) and \( c5 \). Alternatively, White can use the fact that Black has no queenside counterplay to start kingside operations.

White can use the fact that Black has no queenside counterplay to start kingside operations.

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

18 ... \( \text{a}5 \)

19 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{fc}8 \)

20 \( \text{dc}1 \) axb4

21 axb4 \( \text{xc}1+ \)

After 21...\( \text{c}7 \) 22 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{xc}1+ \) 23 \( \text{xc}1 \) White retains a clear advantage. The position is very pleasant for White because it doesn’t matter whether he swaps rooks, queens, or both – his advantage persists in any case. The plan of \( h4-h5 \) followed by \( g4 \) and \( f5 \) is effective both in the middlegame and in the endgame.

22 \( \text{xc}1 \) \( \text{c}8 \)

23 \( \text{xc}8+ \) \( \text{ xc}8 \)

White could play for the exchange of queens, but keeping queens on the board allows him the option of starting an attack using his space advantage on the kingside.

24 \( \text{wc}2 \) \( \text{d}7 \)

25 \( \text{f}2 \) \( \text{f}8 \)
26 g4  
27 e8
27 g3!? might have been more precise – White’s king is safer on g3, and the king would not obstruct White’s kingside attack. I intended to bring the king to d2 to complete the domination of the a4-knight, but this is not necessary and in fact allows Black some slight counterplay.

During the game, I thought that exf6 and g5 was still premature, but it turns out to be possible for tactical reasons. Still, I prefer the game continuation; as yet there is no need to hurry. After the text-move White clearly threatens exf6 and g5, because ...fxg5 can be met by hxg5.

28 wB8

After 28...f7? White just continues with his plan by 29 exf6 gxf6 30 g5.

29 wC1 (D)

Now 29 exf6? gxf6 30 g5 allows 30...e5!.

27 ... f6
28 h4

White could have played more directly by 28 exf6 gxf6 29 g5 fxg5 30 d5 g6 (the attack on b4 and the threat to play ...e5 look awkward, but...) 31 wE2! (...White simply abandons the b-pawn) 31...wxb4 32 wH5+ d8 33 gxe6+ c8 34 wE5 wE1+ 35 wE2 wxe6 36 wxe6+ c7 37 wE5+ b6 38 f5 and Black’s pieces are practically powerless to stop the f-pawn.

When you have a grip such as White has in this game, it is not easy
30 \( \text{Ke2} \)
Imprecise. 30 \( \text{Kf2}! \), heading for g2 or g3, would have been more efficient.

30...
\( \text{Kf7} \)
31 \( \text{We3} \)
\( \text{Kf8} \)
After 31...\( \text{Cc3+} \) White has to take some care: 32 \( \text{Cd2} \) would allow a measure of counterplay by 32...\( \text{Wc7!} \) (but not 32...\( \text{Da2?} \) 33 \( \text{Cc2!} \) \( \text{Wc7} \) 34 \( \text{Ad4} \) and the a2-knight is trapped), but 32 \( \text{Kf1!} \) is very good for White after 32...\( \text{Wc7} \) 33 \( \text{We1} \) or 32...\( \text{Wc7} \) 33 f5.

32 f5
\( \text{We8} \)
33 g5 (D)
Not 33 exf6 gxf6 34 fxe6+?! \( \text{Kxe6} \) 35 \( \text{Kxe6} \) \( \text{We6} \) 36 \( \text{We6}+ \) \( \text{Kxe6} \) 37 \( \text{Kd4}+ \) \( \text{Kf5} \) 38 \( \text{Kxb5} \) \( \text{Kf4} \) with a likely draw. When you have such an advantage, simplifying everything just to win a pawn is insane. However, White could also have maintained the pressure by 33 \( \text{Kf1} \), stepping out of the way of some checks.

White has established complete dominance and should win without difficulty. On top of all his other advantages, he has an outside passed pawn.

41...
\( \text{Db6} \)
42 \( \text{Kxb5+} \)
\( \text{Kb8} \)
43 \( \text{Kd4} \)
\( \text{Wb5+} \)
44 \( \text{Kdf3} \)
\( \text{Ke8} \)
45 \( \text{Kf2} \)
\( \text{f4} \)
46 \( \text{We7} \)
Threatening 47 b5 \( \text{Kxb5} \) (or else \( \text{Kc6+} \)) 48 \( \text{Kc5} \).
46...
\( \text{Cc8} \)
47 \( \text{\#f6} \) \( \text{\#b7} \) If 52...\( \text{\#g7+} \), then 53 \( \text{\#f2} \).
48 \( \text{\#xf4} \) \( \text{\#h8} \) 53 \( \text{\#xf7}+ \) \( \text{\#b6} \)
49 \( \text{\#g5} \) \( \text{\#h6} \) 54 \( \text{\#f4} \) \( \text{\#e6} \)
50 \( \text{\#g3} \) \( \text{\#d6} \) 55 \( \text{\#h5} \) \( \text{\#b7} \)
51 \( \text{\#f3} \) \( \text{\#c6} \) 56 \( \text{\#f6}! \) 1-0
52 \( \text{\#gf7} \) \( \text{\#xf7} \) A neat finish.

Bareev subsequently recovered and had a very good tournament. The above game was played in round three. Over the next few rounds I had a number of sharp draws, including a very exciting one against Shirov, and then in round seven I faced Hübner.
Game 15

V. Anand – R. Hübner

Dortmund 1992

Petroff Defence

1 e4 e5
2 .gf3 .gf6

Round about this time I was very well prepared against the Petroff, because I had played the opening myself for many years, so I was quite happy with Hübner's choice. I had many interesting ideas stored up for White and was hoping that I would be able to use one of them.

3 d4  xe4
4  df3 d5
5  xe5  d7
6  xd7  xd7
7 0-0  h4
8  c4 0-0-0
9  c5  g6

An unusual move instead of the normal 9...g5. Hübner had played it once before, in 1983, but I had never seriously looked at it. One reason was that Hübner had annotated the earlier game in Informator, and had spent about two pages explaining why the move was really lousy!

For the moment I decided to continue as if Black had played 9...g5.

10  ce3  g7
11  g3

The earlier game, Timman-Hübner, Tilburg 1983, had gone 11  e2  f6 12 b4  h5 13 b5 and White gained the advantage, but presumably there was an improvement somewhere.

11 ...  f6

Perhaps this is the point behind 9...g6; with the pawn on g5 this retreat would not be possible.

12  e3 (D)

12 ...

h5?

Black should have attempted to make use of the fact that g5 is free by playing 12...g5!? Then White can try:

1) 13  xd5  h3+ (if 13... c6, then 14  g4+ wins) 14  g2 (14  h1  c6 15  g4+  e6 and Black wins) 14...c6 15  g4+ (15  xh3  xd5 leaves the king miserably placed)
15...\texttt{b}8 16 \texttt{w}xh3 \texttt{x}xd5 and Black is much better.

2) 13 \texttt{e}e2 \texttt{h}3 14 \texttt{e}e1 \texttt{e}6 is unclear.

3) 13 f4 and now:

3a) 13...\texttt{e}e6? 14 \texttt{d}xd5 wins.

3b) 13...\texttt{h}3+ (a difficult move to make; of course the knight is rather annoying for White, but it has no way out) 14 \texttt{g}2 \texttt{he}8 (14...h5? 15 f5! is very good for White) 15 \texttt{d}2 with an unclear and double-edged position.

3c) 13...\texttt{w}e6! 14 \texttt{e}e1 \texttt{e}4 15 \texttt{x}xe4 dxe4 16 d5 is another unclear line. Black can try to develop light-squared counterplay, while White can use his pawn-mass for attacking purposes.

The text-move is a clear mistake. I didn’t realize this immediately, because I was trying to imagine what this position would be like with the pawn on g5. Suddenly I noticed that \texttt{b}5 was very strong, precisely because with the pawn on g6 my bishop has access to f4.

13 \texttt{b}5! \texttt{h}3

After 13...a6 White continues 14 \texttt{xc}7! \texttt{xc}7 (14...\texttt{c}6 15 \texttt{a}8! and the knight escapes via b6) 15 \texttt{f}4+ \texttt{c}8 16 \texttt{e}5 \texttt{c}6 (16...\texttt{w}e6 is the same) 17 \texttt{x}g7 \texttt{hg}8 18 \texttt{e}5 f6 19 \texttt{f}4 g5 20 \texttt{e}3 with a safe extra pawn and an attack by b4-b5.

14 \texttt{xa}7+! \texttt{b}8
15 \texttt{b}5 \texttt{xf}1
16 \texttt{xf}1 (D)

I didn’t think long about this exchange sacrifice or even bother to calculate variations; it’s clear that without the black a-pawn, White’s own a-pawn can just run all the way through.

16 ... \texttt{he}8

More or less forced, to meet \texttt{f}4 by ...\texttt{e}7.

17 \texttt{a}4 \texttt{a}6
18 \texttt{b}4 \texttt{a}8

White wins after 18...\texttt{c}6 19 \texttt{a}5 f5 (...\texttt{a}6 is no longer possible because c7 is also attacked) 20 \texttt{f}4 \texttt{e}7 21 \texttt{xc}7 \texttt{xc}7 22 \texttt{b}5.

19 a4!

Intending to tuck in her majesty with a5-a6.

19 ... g5

Black even has to spend a tempo preventing \texttt{f}4+ before he can play ...c6.

20 a5 c6
21 \texttt{c}3 \texttt{xc}3
22 bxc3 (D)
Forcing the g-pawn forwards and so gaining f4 for the dark-squared bishop.

\[
\begin{align*}
26 & \ldots \quad g4 \\
27 & \text{f1} \quad d7 \\
28 & \text{d3} \quad e6 \\
29 & \text{f4} \quad f7 \\
\end{align*}
\]

I was tempted to toss in \( \text{b8} \), but it isn’t really necessary!

\[
\begin{align*}
30 & \text{c2} \quad f8 \\
31 & \text{e2+} \quad 1-0 \\
\end{align*}
\]

White finishes off by 31... \( \text{f6} \) 32 \( \text{e5+} \) \( \text{g6} \) 33 \( \text{e6+} \) \( \text{f6} \) (33... \( \text{g7} \) 34 \( \text{e5+} \) \( \text{g8} \) 35 \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{e8} \) 36 \( \text{h7+!} \) mates) 34 \( \text{xf5+} \) \( \text{g7} \) 35 \( \text{e5} \) and mate in three more moves.

A nice crisp win, though Black’s 12th move made it easy for me.

The above two games were my only two wins from Dortmund and I finished fourth with a score of 5/9 – not one of my most memorable results.

In July 1992 we had the GMA ‘farewell party’. The organization had fallen into difficult times and with the failure of the second World Cup cycle it was recognized that its tournament-organizing days were over. SWIFT sponsored a final rapid-play knock-out event held in Brussels. It was superbly organized.
This was the second game of a two-game mini-match. I had won the first game and so only needed a draw to go through to the next round.

1 e4 c5
2 d4 d5
3 dxe5 cxd4
4 e4 cxb2
5 a3
6 a4 c6
7 e2

I found this move a bit strange, but 7...\text{c}c6 would have transposed into one of the main lines of the Scheveningen and I suppose Sokolov wanted something a bit sharper.

8 0-0 \text{c}c5
9 \text{f}f3 \text{e}e7
10 g3 0-0
11 \text{g}g2

In a sense White has lost time with this bishop manoeuvre, but on the other hand the e4-pawn is well-defended and so the knight on c5 isn’t doing much. Moreover, Black cannot play ...b6 easily and ...\text{d}d7 is met by b4, so he is going to have a lot of trouble developing his queenside.

11 ... \text{w}c7

A very common tactic when the rook is on e8 and the f-file opens.

12 \text{e}e3
12 ... \text{b}b8
13 \text{f}4 \text{e}e8

Here I was about to play the standard plan g4-g5, when I noticed that it wasn’t really necessary as White can break through right away.

14 e5 dxe5

Forced, since 14...\text{fd}7 15 exd6 \text{xd}6 (or 15...\text{w}xd6 16 \text{b}4) 16 \text{db}5 wins.

15 fxe5 \text{fd}7 (D)
15...\text{w}xe5 loses to 16 \text{f}f4.
16 ...  \( \text{\textit{xf7}} \)

If Black tries to decline the sacrifice by 16...\( \text{\textit{xe5}} \) then 17 \( \text{\textit{f4}} \) \( \text{\textit{d6}} \) (17...\( \text{\textit{xf7}} \) 18 \( \text{\textit{h5+}} \) \( \text{\textit{f8}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{xe5}} \) wins) and now:

1) 18 \( \text{\textit{h1}} \) \( \text{\textit{cd7}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{xe7}} \) and after 19...\( \text{\textit{xe7}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{f3}} \) \( \text{\textit{xd1+}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{xd1}} \) \( \text{\textit{xf3}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{xb8}} \) \( \text{\textit{xf7}} \) or 19...\( \text{\textit{xe7}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{we2}} \) \( \text{\textit{c6}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{xc6}} \) \( \text{\textit{bxc6}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{xb8}} \) \( \text{\textit{xb8}} \) White has a positional advantage.

2) 18 \( \text{\textit{xe7}} \) ! (an even stronger move) 18...\( \text{\textit{xe7}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{db5}} \) \( \text{\textit{xd1+}} \) 20 \( \text{\textit{xd1}} \) \( \text{\textit{axb5}} \) (20...\( \text{\textit{cd7}} \) 21 \( \text{\textit{xe5}} \) \( \text{\textit{xe5}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{d8+}} \) \( \text{\textit{f7}} \) 23 \( \text{\textit{d6+}} \) wins) 21 \( \text{\textit{xe5}} \) \( \text{\textit{xa8}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{d6}} \) \( \text{\textit{d7}} \) 23 \( \text{\textit{xc5}} \) \( \text{\textit{xd1+}} \) 24 \( \text{\textit{xd1}} \) \( \text{\textit{xa4}} \) 25 \( \text{\textit{e3}} \) \( \text{\textit{a2}} \) 26 \( \text{\textit{d4}} \) with a winning endgame.

After the text-move the attack crashes home.

17 \( \text{\textit{h5+}} \) \( \text{\textit{f8}} \)
18 \( \text{\textit{f1+}} \) \( \text{\textit{f6}} \)
19 \( \text{\textit{exf6}} \) \( \text{\textit{xf6}} \)
20 \( \text{\textit{db5}} \) \( \text{\textit{axb5}} \)
21 \( \text{\textit{xb5}} \)
21 \( \text{\textit{xc5+}} \) \( \text{\textit{e7}} \) 22 \( \text{\textit{xb5}} \) also wins.
21 ... \( \text{\textit{d7}} \) (D)

22 \( \text{\textit{wxf7}} \)

A nice move. White can take the c5-knight with check in two different ways, but ignores it. White threatens 23 \( \text{\textit{xf6+}} \) \( \text{\textit{gxf6}} \) 24 \( \text{\textit{h6+}} \), so Black has to waste more time.

22 ... \( \text{\textit{we7}} \)
23 \( \text{\textit{xf6+}} \) \( \text{\textit{wxf6}} \)
24 \( \text{\textit{xc5+}} \) \( \text{\textit{e7}} \)
25 \( \text{\textit{h8+}} \) \( \text{\textit{f7}} \)
26 \( \text{\textit{d6+}} \) 1-0

I was eliminated by Adams in the semi-finals, so the above game was the highlight of the tournament for me.

In September I played a match with Ivanchuk in Linares. It was not part of any cycle, but simply a one-off event arranged by Rentero (the organizer of the Linares tournament) who wanted to hold an event in addition to the annual super-tournament. Ivanchuk and I were his first choice for the players, and we each had our own reasons for wanting to participate. Ivanchuk wanted to erase the memory of the loss to Yusupov in the Candidates quarter-finals in Brussels, and I wanted to keep my match experience going between world championship cycles. Subsequently, he organized two more matches: Ljubojević-Illescas and Lautier-Karpov.
V. Ivanchuk – V. Anand

Match (1), Linares 1992
Sicilian, Richter-Rauzer

1 e4 c5
2 d4 d6
3 dxe5
d6
5 6 c3
c6
6 7 d2 e6
8 0-0-0 h6

I had prepared this variation specially for the match. I hadn’t played it before so I could hardly imagine Ivanchuk having prepared it deeply. Nevertheless, Ivanchuk blitzed out his next few moves and in fact played the whole game at high speed!

9 e3 dxc4
10 dxc4 b5
11 f3

11 b1 is more promising. Ivanchuk played it in the fifth game of the match and gained the advantage, although the game finally ended in a draw.

11 12 a5
12 a3

A new and quite good move. 12 b1 was played in earlier games, while 12 f2 b4 13 e6 w5+ 14 e3 a5 is a popular variation for players who feel like an early dinner!

15 g4?!

Playing d5 is an option which is available to White at virtually every move. However, without any knights White can hardly expect to do anything against Black’s slightly weakened queenside, so playing d5 is an admission that White can no longer hope to gain the advantage.

The problem with Ivanchuk’s move is that he is soon forced to play d5 in any case, when the move g4 not only fails to benefit White but can even prove a weakening of his kingside.
After 15 h4 \( \text{b8} \) 16 \( \text{d}d5 \text{xd}2 17 \text{xf}6+ \text{gxf}6 18 \text{xd}2 f5 the consequences would not be so serious for White as \( h4 \) does much less damage to White’s kingside.

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

15...b4!? was an interesting alternative:

1) 16 \( \text{d}5 \text{xd}5 17 \text{exd}5 \text{b8} \) is unclear.

2) 16 axb4 \( \text{xb}4 17 \text{d}5 \text{xd}5 18 \text{exd}5 \text{xd}2 19 \text{xd}2 \text{d}7 \) with a roughly equal position.

3) 16 \( \text{a}2 \text{d}5 17 \text{axb}4 \text{c}7 \) with compensation for the pawn.

I wasn’t feeling quite awake at this point and so I played the ‘solid’ 15...\( \text{b}8 \).

16 \( \text{d}5 \text{xd}2 \) (\( D \))

At first glance \( \text{w} \) is better, or at least not worse, in view of \( \text{b}8 \)’s damaged pawn structure. However, \( \text{w} \) is actually seriously worse. If \( \text{w} \) could consolidate his kingside pawn structure by \( h3 \) then he would indeed be better, but just at the moment this is impossible.

17 \( \text{xf}6+ \)!

In conjunction with 15 g4 this is a terrible move. I suspect \( \text{a}8 \) hadn’t woken up either! He should have continued 17 \( \text{xd}2 \), but after 17...\( \text{xd}5 18 \text{exd}5 \text{d}7 \) Black is slightly better, because he has the ...f5 break, whereas \( \text{w} \) has no comparable play on the queenside.

After the text-move I was about to make the routine capture 17...\( \text{xf}6 \) (when \( \text{w} \) could perhaps be a little better after 18 \( \text{xd}2 \) \( \text{e}7 \) 19 \( h4 \)) when suddenly I noticed that 17...\( \text{gxf}6 \) might be a good move. After about ten minutes’ thought, I decided to play it.

17 ... \( \text{gxf}6!! \)

Now we were both wide awake!

18 \( \text{xd}2 \text{h}5! \) (\( D \))

Also after 19 \( \text{e}2 \text{h}x\text{g}4 20 \text{fxg}4 \text{h}3 \text{b}8 \) Black’s rook takes up residence
at a most inconvenient location for White.

19 ... h\(_x\)g4
20 fxg4 \(\mathbb{c}c_4!!\) (D)

Just in time to stop White setting up some sort of fortress on the kingside by h3 and \(\mathcal{g}g3\). Black’s ‘bad’ e7-bishop will protect his pawns while he forces pawn exchanges eventually leading to connected central passed pawns.

21 b3

After 21 \(\mathcal{x}xc_4\) bxc4 White again has no time to consolidate his kingside by 22 \(\mathcal{g}g3\) (and 23 h3) because of 22...c3. If 22 \(\mathcal{d}d_5\), then 22...\(\mathbb{b}b_5\) and again Black is better.

21 ... \(\mathcal{x}xf1\)
22 \(\mathbb{x}xf1\) \(\mathcal{h}h3\)

Black appears to have committed a whole list of positional sins: allowing doubled f-pawns, giving White an outside passed h-pawn and exchanging his ‘good’ bishop with ...\(\mathcal{c}c_4\); yet he is better. Paradoxical?

Yes, but this does not mean that the old positional rules have been suspended for the course of this game. Black’s play depends on two things. First of all, his long-term aim is to exchange his d-pawn for White’s e-pawn by ...d5 and to exchange his f6-pawn for White’s g-pawn (either by ...f5 or by forcing White to play g5). Then he will be left with two connected central passed pawns, supported by his king, whereas White will have pawns on c2 and h2 that aren’t going anywhere. Secondly, he can only put his plan into action because he has the initiative, and especially as the rook on h3 disrupts White’s whole position and leaves both g- and h-pawns vulnerable to attack. Had Black wasted even one move, White would have fortified his kingside and the old positional values would have reasserted themselves.

The text-move is more accurate than 22...\(\mathcal{d}d7\), not because of 23 \(\mathcal{f}f3\), when 23...\(\mathcal{h}h4\) 24 h3 \(\mathbb{h}h8\) wins a pawn, but owing to 23 g5!, which confuses the issue. Then after 23...fxg5 24 \(\mathcal{x}xf7\) Black’s overall plan has been disrupted, while 23...\(\mathcal{e}e6\) 24 gx\(_f6\) \(\mathcal{x}xf6\) 25 \(\mathcal{x}xd6+!\) \(\mathcal{h}xd6\) 26 \(\mathcal{x}xf6+\) \(\mathcal{e}e7\) 27 \(\mathcal{g}g5\), followed by h4, gives White plenty of counterplay.

23 \(\mathcal{e}e2\)

23 \(\mathcal{g}g1\) would have been a better chance, but Black maintains the
advantage by 23...\( \text{\underline{d}d7} \) 24 \( \text{\underline{d}d3} \) \( \text{\underline{h}h4!} \)
(24...\( \text{\underline{x}xd3} \) 25 cxd3 \( \text{\underline{h}h8} \) 26 \( \text{\underline{f}f3} \) d5
is unclear) 25 \( \text{\underline{g}g3} \) (25 h3 \( \text{\underline{b}h8} \) 26
\( \text{\underline{f}f3} \) f5! 27 \( \text{\underline{x}xf5} \) \( \text{\underline{x}h3} \) 28 \( \text{\underline{x}f7} \)
\( \text{\underline{x}d3} \) 29 cxd3 \( \text{\underline{h}h1} \) 30 \( \text{\underline{f}f1} \) \( \text{\underline{g}g5} \) wins
material, as in line 1 below) 25...\( \text{\underline{g}g8} \) 26 h3 \( \text{\underline{g}gh8} \) 27 \( \text{\underline{f}f3} \) f5!
and now White cannot maintain his fortress:

1) 28 \( \text{\underline{x}xf5} \) \( \text{\underline{x}h3} \) 29 \( \text{\underline{x}h3} \) \( \text{\underline{x}h3} \)
30 \( \text{\underline{f}f2} \) (30 \( \text{\underline{x}xf7} \)? \( \text{\underline{h}h1} \) 31 \( \text{\underline{f}f1} \) \( \text{\underline{g}g5} \)
32 \( \text{\underline{e}e1} \) \( \text{\underline{d}d2} \) is winning for Black)
30...\( \text{\underline{e}e6} \) and White’s pawns on e4
and g4 are so weak that he might
easily lose both of them.

2) 28 exf5 e4 29 \( \text{\underline{e}e3} \) (29 \( \text{\underline{c}c3} \)?
\( \text{\underline{f}f6} \) 29...d5 and Black has strong
pressure.

23 ... \( \text{\underline{d}d7} \)

24 \( \text{g}5 \) (D)

24 ... \( \text{\underline{e}e6} \)
Now this is good as White does
not have an exchange sacrifice (see
note to Black’s 22nd move).

25 gxf6 \( \text{\underline{x}xf6} \)

26 \( \text{\underline{d}d2} \)

26 \( \text{\underline{e}f2} \) makes no sense as after
26...\( \text{\underline{e}e7} \) White has to attend to his
attacked bishop.

26 ... \( \text{\underline{e}e7}! \)

Simplest and best. The alter-
natives 26...\( \text{\underline{h}h4} \) 27 \( \text{\underline{b}b4} \) and 26...\( \text{\underline{g}g8} \)
27 \( \text{\underline{e}f2} \) \( \text{\underline{e}e7} \) 28 \( \text{\underline{x}xf7} \) \( \text{\underline{g}g4} \) allow
White more counter-chances.

27 \( \text{\underline{e}e1} \) \( \text{f}6 \)

28 \( \text{\underline{g}g3} \)
White has finally defended the
weak h2-pawn, but Black has time
for ...d5.

28 ... \( \text{d}5 \)

28...\( \text{\underline{d}d8} \)? was also possible, al-
though in this case Black would
have to worry about 29 c4. I pre-
ferred to play ...d5 immediately.

29 exd5+ \( \text{\underline{x}xd5} \) (D)

30 \( \text{\underline{f}f5}! \)
A good defence, forcing Black to
lose some time.

30 ... \( \text{\underline{c}c6} \)
A forced move, as 30...\( \text{\underline{e}e6} \)? 31
\( \text{\underline{x}xe5} \) \( \text{\underline{e}e8} \) 32 \( \text{\underline{x}xf6}+ \) and 30...\( \text{\underline{b}b7} \)?
31 $\text{e}5 \text{f}6 \ (31...\text{fxe5} \ 32 \text{fxe5}+$
$\text{d}6 \ 33 \text{e}6+ \ \text{d}5 \ 34 \text{xe7 is no}
better) 32 \text{xf6+} \ \text{xf5} \ 33 \text{xe7}
would lead to a draw.

31 $\text{xf2}$?

31 $\text{f3}$! would have made life far
harder for Black as White threatens
both 32 $\text{xe5}$ and 32 $\text{c3+}$ followed
by 33 $\text{xe5}$. There would be nothing
better than 31 $\text{h7} \ 32 \text{c3+}
\text{b7}$ (not 32...$\text{d7} \ 33 \text{d2+} \ \text{d6} \ 34$
$\text{cd3} \ \text{b6} \ 35 \text{f2} \ \text{c6} \ 36 \text{c5}$), but
this would represent a success for
White. The black king belongs on
e6 and while the connected passed
pawns guarantee Black an advan-
tage, he would have a hard technical
task ahead.

After the text-move White has a
large disadvantage.

31 ... $\text{h6} \ (D)$

Not 31...$\text{d5} \ 32 \text{xf6} \ \text{xf6} \ 33$
$\text{xf6}$ and White has complicated
matters. The text-move prevents any
sacrifice on f6.

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

36 ... $\text{h7}$
37 $\text{g3} \ \text{c5}$

Black doesn’t even have to push
the pawns immediately. He can play
to improve the position of his pieces,
or try to exchange a pair of rooks to
reduce the chances of a blockade.

38 $\text{a2} \ \text{d7}$
39 $\text{c3} \ \text{cc7}$
39...$\text{d1}?$ 40 $\text{f2} \ \text{xf2} \ 41 \text{xc8}$
$\text{d4}$ doesn’t mate after 42 $\text{c3}$.

40 $\text{h4} \ \text{d1}$
41 $\text{f2} \ \text{d6}$
42 $\text{g3} \ \text{e4}$!

After all the fuss about Black’s
connected passed pawns, he gives
one of them up! However, it does win the exchange.

43 \text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{H}}}xe4+} \\
43 \text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{H}g1}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{H}xg1}}} 44 \text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{Q}}}xg1} f5 wins easily.

43 \text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{Q}e5}}}

44 \text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{H}xe5+}}} \text{Or 44 c3 \textit{\textbf{\textit{H}d2+}} 45 \textit{\textbf{\textit{Q}b1}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{H}xf2}} winning.}

44 \text{\ldots} \text{fxe5} \\
45 \text{\textit{\textbf{\textit{Q}b2}}} \textit{\textbf{\textit{H}d2}} \text{0-1}

This match was an important point in my career as I gained a great deal of confidence as a result of beating Ivanchuk 5-3. He was the first really strong opponent I had beaten in a match and I took this as a promising sign for the next world championship cycle.

In November I took part in a very strong (and enjoyable) tournament in Moscow. I think it was only the second tournament to reach category 18, although this had been achieved by having only eight players. I lost the first game to Gelfand after allowing myself to be swindled in a favourable position, and after losing the first game in a seven-round event I couldn’t really expect that I would win. However, Moscow turned out to be one of my more successful tournaments. I scored 4½ out of my remaining six games and shared first place with Gelfand. The following game is from the second round and was the first step towards recovering from my first-round defeat.
Game 18
V. Anand – G. Kamsky
Alekhine Memorial, Moscow 1992
Ruy Lopez, Worrall Attack

1 e4 e5
2 d4 f6
3 c5 b6
4 a4 d6
5 0-0 d7
6 d2

I played this move because I had beaten Kamsky with the same move the previous year in Tilburg, and I just decided to repeat it.

6 ... b5
7 d3 b3 0-0
8 a3 c3 d6
9 d4 g4
10 d1 exd4
11 cxd4 d5
12 e5 e4
13 a4 (D)

A couple of months before Short’s semi-final Candidates match vs Karpov (which was in April 1992), he asked if I would like to come to Athens to work with him. This visit was just a one-off arrangement and I wasn’t Nigel’s second. We analysed the d2 Ruy Lopez during the week I stayed there, but I had no part in some of the other openings Nigel played in the Karpov match.

A strange coincidence occurred in the Linares tournament shortly before the Short-Karpov match. I played the Queen’s Gambit Accepted against Karpov, tried out something very unusual and drew without any difficulty. I had no idea that Nigel had prepared the QGA for Karpov until Nigel revealed the fact after my game!

13 ... b8

One of the points of 13 a4 is the line Short showed against Karpov: 13...bxa4 14 dxa4 b4 15 h3 h5 16 d3 g6 17 e3 b8 18 a2! This last move is one of the discoveries we made during our analytical week in Athens: it is much more important to eliminate the knight on b4 than the one on e4. The reason is that
the knight on e4 is only potentially threatening (e.g. if Black plays ...c5 and ...cxd4) while the knight on b4 is critical, as it stops White invading on c6.

Kamsky, not surprisingly, does not repeat the line that led to a loss for Karpov.

14 axb5 axb5
15 h3 $\he5
16 $\he3 (D)

Supporting the weak third rank and the c6-knight in particular. 17...$\he8 was an alternative.

18 $\he3 $\he4

After 18...$\he3 19 $\hx5 White has a small advantage.

19 $\he7 $\he5

Again the correct choice. After 19...$\he6 (19...$\hx5? loses after 20 $\hx5 $\he7 21 $\hx5) White replies simply 20 $\he2 and Black has to deal with the threats of 21 $\hx5, 21 $\hx5 and 21 $\hx5 (20...$\hx5 fails to 21 $\hx5!)

20 $\hx5 $\hx5
21 $\hx5?! (D)

I intended the exchange sacrifice given in the next note, but I had miscalculated one variation, so the solid 21 $\hx1 would have been better.

16 ...

Not 16...$\he5 17 $\he5 $\he5 18 $\he3 $\he4 19 g4, winning the d5-pawn.

17 $\he1

17 $\he3 would have been interesting, e.g. 17...$\he4!? (17...$\hx5 18 bxc3 b4 19 c4 dxc4 20 $\hx5 is unclear) 18 $\he4 $\he5 (18...$\he6!? is also possible) and now both 19 $\hx5 $\hx5 20 $\hx5 $\he2 and 19 $\he3 $\hx5 20 bxc3 $\he2 21 $\hx5 $\hx5 are unclear.

17 ...

$\he6

21 ...

$\he4?

21...$\hx6! was the right move:

1) 22 $\he8? $\hx4 23 $\hx8 $\hx8 24 $\he8 $\hx8 and Black wins, but not 24...$\he7? 25 $\hx4 $\he2

\[ \text{\( Qxd5+ \) \( Qxd5 \) \( 27 \) \( Qxd5 \) \( Qc4 \) \( 28 \) \( Qc6! \) winning.} \]

2) \( 22 \) \( Qxd5 \) \( Qxd4! \) (this is the move I had missed; after \( 22...Qxa7 \) \( 23 \) \( Qxa7 \) White has good compensation for the exchange) \( 23 \) \( Qd3 \) \( Qxf3+ \) \( 24 \) \( gxf3 Qxh3 \) and Black is better.

3) \( 22 \) \( Qd3 \) \( Qxf3 \) (22...\( Qxa7 \) \( 23 \) \( Qxa7 \) wins the d-pawn and is promising for White) \( 23 \) \( Qxf3 \) \( Qxd4 \) \( 24 \) \( Qxd5 \) \( Qxd5 \) \( 25 \) \( Qxd5 \) \( c6 \) \( 26 \) \( Qd1 \) (26 \( Qe4 \) is also equal) \( 26...Qf4 \) \( 27 \) \( Qxd4 \) \( Qxe5 \) leads to a draw.

\( 22 \) \( Qxd5! \)

This gives White a large advantage in every line.

\( 22 \ldots \) \( Qxd5 \)
\( 23 \) \( We4 \) (D)

\[ \]

\( 23 \ldots \) \( Qxf3?! \)

Now White is winning. Black could still have continued the fight by \( 23...Qe7! \) \( 24 \) \( Qxf3 Qg6 \) \( 25 \) \( Qe3 Qxf3 \) \( 26 \) \( Qxf3 Qxd4 \) \( 27 \) \( Qxc7 Qxe5 \), but now either \( 28 \) \( Qxf7 Qxf3+ \) \( 29 \) \( Qxf3+ Qc4 \) \( 30 \) \( Mc3 \) or \( 28 \) \( Qxf7+ \)

\[ \text{\( \phi h8 \) \( 29 \) \( We3 \) \( Wxe3 \) \( 30 \) \( fxe3 \) gives White a clear extra pawn.} \]

\( 24 \) \( Qxf3 \) \( Qxe5 \)
\( 25 \) \( dxe5 \) \( Qb4 \) (D)

\[ \]

\( 26 \) \( We3?! \)

After the game Gelfand pointed out a much simpler (and quicker!) win by \( 26 \) \( Qa8! Qbb8 \) (or \( 26...Qc6 \) \( 27 \) \( e6 \)) \( 27 \) \( Qxb8 Qxb8 \) \( 28 \) \( Qa8! \).

\( 26 \ldots \) \( Qc8 \)

Or \( 26...Qd3 \) \( 27 \) \( Qxf7+ Qxf7 \) \( 28 \) \( Qa8+ Qf8 \) \( 29 \) \( Qxf8+ Qxf8 \) \( 30 \) \( Qc5+ \) and White wins.

\( 27 \) \( We4 \)

Once again missing an easier win, this time by \( 27 \) \( e6 fxe6 \) \( 28 \) \( Qc1 \), for example \( 28...Qf7 \) \( 29 \) \( Qxb6 \), \( 28...Qa6 \) \( 29 \) \( Qxb6 \) \( cxb6 \) \( 30 \) \( Qxc8 Qxc8 \) \( 31 \) \( Qxe6+ \) or \( 28...Qd5 \) \( 29 \) \( Qxd5 exd5 \) \( 30 \) \( Qxc7 \).

\( 27 \ldots \) \( Qa6 \)

After \( 27...Qc6 \) \( 28 \) \( Qa8 Qxa8 \) \( 29 \) \( Qxa8 Qxa8 \) \( 30 \) \( e6 fxe6 \) \( 31 \) \( Qxe6+ \) \( Qh8 \) \( 32 \) \( Qd5 \) White wins material.

\( 28 \) \( Qd5 \) \( c6 \)
On 28...\texttt{c}c5, 29 \texttt{b}b4 \texttt{d}d7 30 \texttt{a}a8 finishes Black off.

29 \texttt{e}e3 \texttt{b}b7

More or less forced, because after 29...c5 White’s bishop is absolutely dominant, but now White has a forced win.

30 \texttt{x}xf7+ \texttt{b}bxf7
31 \texttt{h}7xa6 \texttt{x}f2
32 e6 (D)
32 ... \texttt{x}xb2
33 e7 \texttt{e}e8
34 \texttt{a}a8 \texttt{b}1+
35 \texttt{h}2

White must still be careful. After 35 \texttt{x}xb1? Black would slip out by 35...\texttt{x}xa8 36 \texttt{e}6+ \texttt{h}8 37 \texttt{f}1 h6 38 \texttt{d}7 \texttt{g}8.

B

35 ... \texttt{c}7+
36 g3 \texttt{b}2+
37 \texttt{g}1 \texttt{d}7
38 \texttt{x}e8+ 1-0

Since 38...\texttt{x}e8 39 \texttt{e}6+ \texttt{h}8 40 \texttt{f}1 leaves Black defenceless.
Game 19

V. Anand – V. Ivanchuk

Linares 1993

Petroff Defence

1 e4 e5
2 ∆f3 ∆f6
3 d4 ∆xe4
4 ∆d3 d5
5 ∆xe5 ∆d7
6 ∆xd7 ∆xd7
7 0-0 ∆h4
8 c4 0-0-0
9 c5 g5
10 ∆c3 ∆g7
11 g3 ∆h3
12 ∆xe4 dxe4
13 ∆xe4 ∆b5 (D)

new idea that I had been waiting to use.

14 ∆g2!

After 14 ∆xg5 ∆xd4 15 ∆g2 ∆f5 16 ∆b3 c6 17 ∆e3 ∆xf1 18 ∆xf1, Black can continue 18...∆hd8! 19 ∆a3 ∆d1 20 ∆xa7 ∆xf1+ 21 ∆xf1 ∆d1 22 ∆a8+ ∆c7 23 ∆d2 ∆xc5 24 ∆a5+ b6 25 ∆a7+ ∆d6 26 ∆xb6 ∆b5 27 ∆c7+ ∆e6 28 ∆c8+ ∆e7 with a draw.

14 ... ∆f5

Ivanchuk looked surprised, because it was well known that 15 d5 is bad, but this was not White’s idea.

15 ∆e3! (D)

15 ∆b3 c6 leads nowhere.

This position had been reached umpteen times before the game and the path to equality for Black had been more or less worked out after 14 ∆b3 and 14 ∆xg5, but I had a
16 $\text{fxf1}$

White intends $\text{wa4}$ followed by $\text{d1-d3}$, swinging the major pieces into the queenside attack. 16 $\text{xf1?!}$ is inferior as the king is exposed on f1.

16 ... $\text{He8}$

Black has several alternatives:

1) 16...$\text{xd4}$ (the tactics don’t work for Black) 17 $\text{xd4 we4}$ 18 $\text{hxh8 xd1}$ 19 $\text{xd1}$ with too much for the queen.

2) 16...$\text{xd4}$ 17 $\text{xd4 de8}$ 18 $\text{wh5 xd4}$ 19 $\text{h3}$ wins the queen.

3) 16...$\text{wd7}$ 17 $\text{wb3 de8}$ 18 $\text{d1}$, intending d5, with a strong initiative.

4) 16...c6 17 $\text{wa4 h5}$ 18 $\text{xa7 xd4}$ 19 $\text{hd1 h8}$ 20 $\text{xd4}$ 1-0 Kharlov-T. Christensen, Nørresundby Open 1993 was an abrupt finish.

5) 16...$\text{b8}$ 17 $\text{wa4 c6}$ 18 $\text{d1}$ $\text{d7}$ 19 $\text{d3 h8}$ 20 $\text{Ha3}$, Zarnicki-Howell, Capablanca Memorial, Matanzas 1993, with fine compensation for White.

Ivanchuk’s move is good and allows him to develop counterplay against d4.

17 $\text{wa4}$ $\text{b8}$

White wins after 17...$\text{xe3}$ 18 $\text{fxe3 we4}$ (18...$\text{f3}$ 19 $\text{H1}$) 19 $\text{wb3}$! (not 19 $\text{H1}$ $\text{xd4}$ and White’s queen is threatened) 19...$\text{xe8}$ (19...$\text{xd4}$ 20 $\text{g2}$ also wins) 20 $\text{e1}$ $\text{xd4}$ 21 $\text{g2 e3+ 22 he1}$ and Black’s position collapses.

18 $\text{d1}$ (D)

White’s plan is to use the bishop on f1 to support $\text{d3-a3}$, and then to swing the bishop back to g2.

18 ... $\text{c6}$

After 18...$\text{xe3}$ 19 $\text{fxe3 we4}$ (the line 19...$\text{f3}$ 20 $\text{d3}$ is similar) 20 $\text{d3}$ White consolidates his extra pawn.

19 $\text{d3}$

19 $\text{g2}$ is premature since after 19...$\text{e7}$! 20 $\text{d5 cxd5}$ 21 $\text{c6 d4}$ the position is unclear.

19 ... $\text{we4}$

20 $\text{Ha3}$

In view of Black’s improvement at move 21, an interesting alternative here is 20 $\text{d1}$?!, intending either $\text{g2}$ followed by d5, or simply b4, a4 and b5. The queen on d1 overprotects d4, preventing a counter-sacrifice by Black on that square.

20 ... $\text{a6}$

21 $\text{d3}$ (D)

After 21 $\text{xa6 xd4}$! Black gains enough counterplay to hold the balance: 22 $\text{xd4 xd4}$ (22...$\text{xd4}$ is
also viable) 23 \( \text{g}f1 \text{c}xc5 \) (but not 23...
\( \text{g}xb2? \)
24 \( \text{a}7+ \text{c}7 \) 25 \( \text{b}3 \)
and wins) 24 \( \text{a}8+ \text{c}7 \) 25 \( \text{a}5+ \text{b}6 \) 26 \( \text{x}g5 \text{e}5! \) and the pressure
on f2 gives Black enough for the pawn.

21 ...) \( \text{w}g4? \)

This move loses because it leaves the c6-square weak. During the game, I realized that 21...
\( \text{d}5! \) probably
saves Black:

1) 22 \( \text{c}4 \text{e}4 \) will be a repetition.

2) 22 \( \text{b}3?! \text{xd}4 \) and now:

2a) 23 \( \text{x}b7+? \text{xb}7 \) 24 \( \text{x}a6+ \text{b}8 \) 25 \( \text{x}b6+ \text{c}8 \) 26 \( \text{a}7 \) (after 26
\( \text{f}5+ \text{d}7 \) 27 \( \text{xd}7+ \text{xd}7 \) 28
\( \text{xd}4 \text{xd}4 \) White has no perpetual
check) 26...
\( \text{d}7 \) 27 \( \text{a}8+ \text{c}7 \) 28
\( \text{xe}8 \text{xe}3 \) and Black wins.

2b) 23 \( \text{xa}6 \text{e}7! \) 24 \( \text{d}3 \) (24
\( \text{xd}4 \text{xd}4 \) 25 \( \text{xc}6? \) \( \text{d}1+ \) 26
\( \text{g}2 \text{xb}3 \) wins) 24...
\( \text{e}4 \) 25 \( \text{b}3 \)
\( \text{d}7 \) and White’s attack runs out of
steam.

2c) 23 \( \text{xd}4 \) \( \text{e}1+ \) (23...
\( \text{x}d4 \) 24 \( \text{xb7}+ \text{xb}7 \) 25 \( \text{xa}6+ \text{b}8 \) 26
\( \text{b}6+ \text{a}8 \) 27 \( \text{xc}6+ \text{b}8 \) leads to
perpetual check) 24 \( \text{f}1 \text{xd}4 \) 25
\( \text{xb7+} \) (25 \( \text{xc}6? \) \( \text{xf}1+ \) 26 \( \text{xf}1 \)
\( \text{d}1+ \) 27 \( \text{g}2 \) loses after 27...
\( \text{xb}3 \) 25...
\( \text{xb}7 \) 26 \( \text{xa}6+ \text{c}7 \) (26...
\( \text{b}8 \)
27 \( \text{b}6+ \) is a draw) 27 \( \text{a}5+ \) \( \text{d}7 \)
28 \( \text{xe}1 \text{xc}5 \) and Black is slightly
better.

3) 22 \( \text{xa}6 \) \( \text{xd}4 \) 23 \( \text{xb}7 \) (23
\( \text{b}3 \) is line 2b above) 23...
\( \text{xc}5!! \)
\( \text{D} \) (an amazing defence that I spotted
while waiting for his reply; not 23...
\( \text{xe}3 \) 24 \( \text{a}7+ \text{c}7 \) 25 \( \text{a}6\) nor
23...
\( \text{xb}7 \) 24 \( \text{b}4+ \text{c}8 \) 25
\( \text{a}7 \) winning) and now:

3a) 24 \( \text{b}3? \text{d}1+ \) 25 \( \text{g}2 \text{xe}3! \)
26 \( \text{a}8+ \) (or 26 \( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{d}2+ \) 27
\( \text{h}3 \)
\( \text{h}5+ \) and wins) 26...
\( \text{c}7 \) 27 \( \text{a}5+
\( \text{d}7 \) 28 \( \text{xe}3 \) \( \text{e}2+ \) 29
\( \text{h}3 \)
\( \text{f}1+ \) 30
\( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{f}5+ \) and Black mates.

3b) 24 \( \text{a}8+ \text{c}7 \) 25 \( \text{a}5+ \text{xb}7 \)
26 \( \text{xc}5 \) \( \text{d}1+ \) 27 \( \text{g}2 \text{d}5+ \) and
White cannot gain the advantage:
3b1) 28 f3? £e2+ 29 £h3 £e6+ and Black wins.
3b2) 28 £f3 £a8 29 £b4+ (29 £b6+ £c8 and White is lost because of the doomed rook on f3) 29...£c8 is unclear, but White cannot have the advantage.
3b3) 28 £h3 £f5+ is a draw.
3b4) 28 £g1 £d1+ is also a draw.

3c) 24 £xc6 (best) 24...£d1+ 25 £g2 £xa4 26 £xa4 £xe3 27 fxe3 £d2+ 28 £f3 (28 £h3 £xb2 is just a draw) 28...£xb2 with slight winning chances for White. A subsequent game Gi. Hernandez-Howell, Capablanca Memorial, Matanzas 1993 ended in a draw. It’s certainly possible to repeat this and try to play for a win in the ending, but White’s advantage isn’t that great.

22 £b3! £xd4? (D)

This loses immediately, but the alternatives are not much better:
1) 22...£d7 23 £xa6 (not 23 £b4? £xe3 24 fxe3 £f3 and Black wins) 23...£xd4 24 £xc6 £d1+ 25 £g2 £xb3 26 £xd7 and wins.
2) 22...£e7 is relatively best, but after 23 £b4!, threatening both 24 £xa6 and 24 d5, White has a clear advantage in any case.

Because 28...£c8 29 £c6+ £xc6 30 £xc6+ £a7 31 £xe8 £d1+ 32 £g2 £xe3 33 £xe3 leaves White three pawns ahead.

Gurevich and I had the final position on the board during our work in 1991 — an unusual experience for me! I consider myself reasonably well-prepared, but to have worked out the whole game in advance is rare. It is also quite unusual to catch Ivanchuk out in opening preparation. Several players later asked me: “Gee, you out-prepared Ivanchuk?”

If it hadn’t been for the following game, which I played a couple of days later, I would have considered this my best game from Linares 1993.
Game 20
B. Gelfand – V. Anand
Linares 1993
Queen's Gambit Accepted

1 d4 d5
2 c4 dxc4
3 e4 c5
4 d5 cxd5
5 Qc3 b5

I had prepared this line for my match against Ivanchuk the previous year, when I was analysing with Wolff, but as Ivanchuk played 1 e4 throughout the match, I had to wait a year before it came up. During the interim I had realized there were some holes in the earlier analysis, but I hadn't really looked at it thoroughly, so to some extent the specific line played in this game was improvisation at the board.

6 Qf4 Wa5
7 e5 Qe4
8 Qe2 Qa6!
9 f3

After 9 a3 Qb7 10 f3 Qxc3 11 Qxc3 Qc7! Black is slightly better because the d5-pawn is weak.

9 ... Qb4! (D)

In the second round I played 9...Qxc3 10 Qxc3 Qf5 against Beliavsky, but he responded very accurately: 11 g4 Qg6 12 a4! and White gained the advantage. In my earlier analysis I had considered 9...Qb4,

10 fxe4 Qd3+
11 Qd2 g6!! (D)

I played this and got up from the board. Gelfand sank into lengthy thought, during which time he seems to have convinced himself that he was completely lost. This is an
exaggeration, but I think that Black is already slightly better. White’s best lines lead to positions in which Black has something like two pawns and a dangerous attack for the piece.

11...\text{\&}f2?! 12 \text{\&}e1 \text{\&}xh1 is completely wrong. The knight will be trapped after 13 g3 and Black has surrendered all his pressure.

After the text-move Black’s immediate compensation lies in the paralysing effect of his knight. However, in the longer term Black may play ...\text{\&}g7 and ...\text{\&}xe5, when the queenside pawn-mass, supported by the g7-bishop, will become extremely dangerous, especially as White’s king will be floating around in the centre.

2) 12 d6 exd6 (12...e6!? is interesting, taking away the d5-square; Black plans ...\text{\&}g7 and ...\text{\&}b7 with great play, but maybe the d6-pawn improves White’s prospects slightly) 13 a4 and now:

2a) 13...\text{\&}xf4 (this was our post-mortem analysis, but there is a hole in it!) 14 \text{\&}xf4 \text{\&}h6 15 g3 dxe5 16 \text{\&}c2! (the line 16 axb5 \text{\&}d8+ 17 \text{\&}c2 \text{\&}xd1+ 18 \text{\&}xd1 exf4 favours Black) 16...exf4 (16...b4 17 \text{\&}d6! is good for White) 17 \text{\&}d6! (the flaw; after 17 \text{\&}d5 0-0! 18 \text{\&}xa8 b4 Black has more than enough compensation) with an unclear position. One possible line is 17...\text{\&}e6 18 \text{\&}c6+ \text{\&}e7 19 \text{\&}xc5+ \text{\&}f6 20 \text{\&}d4+ with a draw by perpetual check.

2b) 13...b4 14 \text{\&}d5 \text{\&}g7 15 \text{\&}f6+ (15 exd6 0-0 is unclear) 15...\text{\&}xf6 16 exf6 \text{\&}e6 intending ...0-0-0. Admittedly this is all a bit speculative, but Black has real compensation.

Both line 2b and 12...e6 offer Black good chances against 12 d6.

3) 12 g3 \text{\&}g7 13 \text{\&}g2 \text{\&}xe5 and Black continues with his plan.

4) 12 \text{\&}e3 \text{\&}g7 13 g3 (13 \text{\&}c1? \text{\&}xf4 14 \text{\&}xf4 \text{\&}xe5+ 15 \text{\&}xe5 g5! leads to mate in six more moves by 16 d6 f6+ 17 \text{\&}d5 e6+ 18 \text{\&}xc5 \text{\&}b6+ 19 \text{\&}b4 a5+ 20 \text{\&}a3 \text{\&}c5+) 13...\text{\&}xe5 and again Black has good play. He will continue with ...0-0 and possibly ...f5.

5) 12 \text{\&}g3 \text{\&}h6+ 13 \text{\&}c2 b4! (13...\text{\&}b4 is met by 14 \text{\&}b1! with
advantage to White, and not 14 \( \text{Hb}1? \text{Wb}3+! \) 15 axb3 \( \text{Qb}4# \) regaining the piece.

6) 12 \( \text{Cc}2 \) can be met by 12...b4 or 12...\( \text{g}7 \) 13 \( \text{b}1 \) 0-0, intending ...
\( \text{b}8 \) and ...
\( \text{b}4 \).
12 ...
\( \text{g}7 \)
13 \( \text{bxc}4 \)
\( \text{x}f4 \)
14 \( \text{Qxf}4? \)
14 \( \text{cxb}5 \) \( \text{xe}5 \) 15 \( \text{Wb}3 \) \( \text{xe}2 \) 16 \( \text{xe}2 \) 0-0 is excellent for Black, but the text-move loses even more rapidly.

14 ...
\( \text{xe}5 \)
15 \( \text{Qe}2 \)
\( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{(D)} \)
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16 \( \text{Wa}4+ \)
White also loses after 16 \( \text{Cc}1 \)
\( \text{bxc}3+ \) 17 \( \text{Qxc}3 \) \( \text{f}4+ \) or 16 \( \text{Wb}3 \)
\( \text{bxc}3+ \) 17 \( \text{Qxc}3 \) \( \text{b}8 \).
16 ...
\( \text{Wxa}4 \)
17 \( \text{Qxa}4 \)
\( \text{xa}1 \)
18 \( \text{Qxc}5 \)
0-0!

I thought about 18...f5, trying to break up his pawn-chain, but then I realized that after 19 \( \text{Qf}4 \), the arrival

of a knight on e6 would only complicate the winning process.
19 \( \text{Qd}3 \)
\( \text{a}5 \)
Black has a decisive material advantage, but White still has some potential counterplay with his central pawns, so the technical phase is still quite interesting.
20 \( \text{g}3 \)
\( \text{g}7 \)
White must try to make something of his pawn-mass, but Black will strike with both a left hook (...
\( \text{a}6 \) and a right hook (...
\( \text{h}6 \)).
21 \( \text{g}2 \)
\( \text{a}6! \)
22 \( \text{c}5 \)
22 \( \text{Cc}1 \) \( \text{ac}8 \) 23 \( \text{c}5 \) will be a transposition.
22 ...
\( \text{ac}8 \)
23 \( \text{c}6 \)
\( \text{fd}8 \)
Threatening 24...
\( \text{xd}3 \) 25 \( \text{xd}3 \)
\( \text{xc}6 \).
24 \( \text{Cc}1 \)
\( \text{h}6+ \)
25 \( \text{Qef}4 \)
25 \( \text{Qdf}4 \) e5 26 \( \text{h}3 \) f5! wins for Black.
25 ...
\( \text{xd}3 \)
26 \( \text{xd}3 \)
\( \text{e}5 \)
27 \( \text{Cc}4 \)
Again, if 27 \( \text{h}3 \) then Black replies 27...
\( \text{f}5 \).
27 ...
\( \text{exf}4 \)
28 \( \text{He}1 \)
\( \text{fxg}3 \)
Black still has to be careful; if White could obtain three connected passed pawns then his counterplay could prove troublesome. For this reason 28...
\( \text{f}6? \) is inferior since after 29 \( \text{f}1! \) g5 (29...
\( \text{fxg}3 \) 30 \( \text{xf}6 \) 30
h4 Black will have to be extremely careful.

29 e5

Now 29 hxg3 f6 leads to the blockade of the pawns.

29 ...  

Here the bishop is well-placed to hold back the pawns.

29 ...  

30 ...  

31 ...  

Such little finesses make life easier. After 31...\( \text{h}2 \) White could play 32 d6.

32 ...  

32...g5 was also good.

33 ...  

Now White cannot play 33 d6 because his rook is blocking the long diagonal.

33 ...  

34 ...  

35 ...  

36 ...  

37 ...  

This move wins tactically.

38 ...  

Or 38 d6 ...e5+ 39 ...e5 ...e5 40 ...d7 h5! 41 c7 ...f8 42 ...d5 (42 ...e8 ...xd6+) 42...f4 (or 42... ...xd6 43 ...xd6 g4 and after 44 ...e7, with the threat of 45 ...e8, Black wins by 44... ...a8!!) winning as 43 ...e8 ...xe8 44 d7 fails to 44... ...e5+ 45 ...d4 ...e4+ 46 ...xe4 ...xc7.

38 ...  

39 d6  

40 ...e5  

0-1

I was extremely proud of this game and Gelfand was very sporting; he said that he didn’t mind losing such a game and that I would have good chances to win both the best game and best novelty prizes in Informator (in fact I won neither!).

The following game was played in the penultimate round (round 12). I was on +3 and having a very good tournament by any standards, but after eight rounds I had been on +4, sharing the lead with Kasparov. However, Kasparov was on even better form and beat both myself and Karpov to take the lead; he went on to win the tournament in very convincing style.
Game 21
V. Anand – E. Bareev
Linares 1993
French Defence

1 e4 e6
2 d4 d5
3 ¤c3 dxc6
4 e5 ¤fd7
5 f4 c5
6 ¤f3 a6
7 e3 b5

I’m not sure what the point of delaying ...¤c6 is (the same idea was played in Kamsky-Ivanchuk, Tilburg 1992). I just responded with natural moves.

8 ¤d2 ¤e7

The Kamsky-Ivanchuk game continued 8...¤b7 9 ¤d3 b4 10 ¤d1 ¤c6 11 0-0 cxd4 12 cxd4 ¤e7 13 h3 0-0 14 h3 g6 15 ¤f2 and was also won by White.

9 ¤d3 g6

This is really asking a bit too much of Black’s position. Of course the position is somewhat closed but Black cannot completely neglect his development.

10 0-0 ¤b7

Forcing Black to commit himself. If White is allowed to play c3 then, having reinforced his centre he will be free to play ¤f2 followed by either g4 or ¤g4 as appropriate.

11 ...
12 cxd4 ¥c5 (D)

13 b4!

A similar idea to White’s 18th move in Game 14. White locks the queenside pawn structure and increases his dark-square control on that side of the board, too.

13 ...
14 ¥a4

13...¤xd3 14 cxd3 ¤c6 15 ¥b1 is clearly better for White (see Game 14 for a similar type of position), while after 13...¤e4 14 ¥e1, followed by a4, Black’s queenside is undermined.

Bareev chooses the best plan, which is to manoeuvre his knight to c4.
14 c3 \( \mathbb{b}6! \\
15 \mathbb{f}2?! \\
Probably not the most accurate; as we will see, it allows Black a good chance at move 17. It would have been better to play 15 \( \mathbb{b}2 \mathbb{c}4 16 \mathbb{xc}4 \text{dxc}4 17 \mathbb{c}2, \) followed by \text{a}4, effectively gaining a tempo over the note to White’s 17th move.

15 \ldots \quad \mathbb{c}7 \\
16 \mathbb{b}2 \quad \mathbb{c}4 \\
17 \mathbb{e}2?! (D) \\
Even here 17 \( \mathbb{xc}4 \) would be better, for example 17...\text{dxc}4 18 \mathbb{e}2 \mathbb{c}6 19 \text{a}4 \mathbb{xd}4 20 \mathbb{xd}4, followed by \mathbb{e}3 and \mathbb{f}3, with a slight edge for White.

17 \ldots \quad \mathbb{c}6? \\
A grave error after which Black’s position declines dramatically. It is essential to hold up \text{a}4 and 17...\mathbb{a}3! seems to do the job for a few moves. After 18 \( \mathbb{c}2 \) Black just returns to \text{c}4 (not 18...\mathbb{xc}3? 19 \mathbb{d}4), while after 18 \( \mathbb{ac}1 \) Black just continues his development by 18...\mathbb{d}7 19 \( \mathbb{b}3 \mathbb{b}6 20 \mathbb{a}5 \mathbb{bc}4, \) and White’s queenside play has been stymied. White’s problem here is the poorly placed knight on \text{b}2; in the game White manages to swap it off for the well-placed \text{c}4-knight.

The blockading move \ldots\mathbb{a}3! is rather unusual and I had simply missed the possibility.

18 \text{a}4 \\
Now White has a distinct advantage.

18 \ldots \quad \mathbb{xd}4 \\
19 \mathbb{xd}4 (D) \\
A loss of tempo when Black can ill afford it. 19...0-0 was a better chance, although White has various lines that preserve his advantage:

1) 20 \text{a}5 \mathbb{xb}2 (20...f6!? 21 \text{exf}6 \mathbb{xf}6 22 \mathbb{xe}6+ \mathbb{g}7 gives Black some counterplay for the pawn) 21 \mathbb{xb}2 \text{f}5 although here it would be hard to make progress.
2) 20 axb5 axb5 21 ∆xc4 dxc4 22 ∆e4 with an edge.

3) 20 ∆d1 (perhaps the strongest line; White preserves his knight for the kingside attack) 20...bxa4 (otherwise White plays a5, and then feeds his knight to the kingside) 21 ∆f2! f6 (21...c6 22 ∆g4 is even more dangerous) 22 exf6 ∆xf6 23 ∆xf6 ∆xf6 24 ∆g4 with advantage. Note that 24...∆xf4 loses to 25 ∆xe6+ ∆h8 26 ∆xf4 ∆xf4 27 ∆f1 ∆d6 28 ∆f7, with decisive threats.

20 axb5 axb5
21 ∆xa8+

The correct move-order. After 21 ∆xc4 dxc4 22 ∆e4? Black is not forced to exchange as he can just play 22...0-0.

21 ... ∆xa8 (D)

22 ∆xc4! bxc4

Forced, as 22...dxc4 23 ∆e4 0-0 (23...∆xe4 24 ∆xe4 0-0 25 ∆a1 is similar) 24 ∆a1 wins; this may seem a strong evaluation but I don’t see any hope for Black. Although in terms of structure Black has the ‘good’ bishop, in fact his bishop has no squares at all. White can penetrate down the a-file and Black will soon lose the pawns on b5 and c4. It’s an unusual case, but here White’s ‘bad’ bishop is far better than Black’s ‘good’ bishop, which is severely restricted by White’s pawn chains.

23 ∆c2 ∆c6
24 ∆e3

Here White doesn’t have a decisive entry on the a-file, but he has both a middlegame advantage (attack on the kingside) and an endgame advantage (protected passed b-pawn).

The move played prepares a strong reply in case Black castles.

24 ... 0-0 (D)

After 24...∆d7 White just continues 25 g4, followed by f5.

25 f5! exf5
After 25...\(a_8\) 26 \(f6 \ f8\) White can either start an attack with 27 h4 or simply seal Black’s bishop in by g4-g5, continuing with both an extra piece and an extra king!

\[
26 \ f5 (D)
\]

Now White has the possibility of e6, opening up the kingside. Once again we can see that White’s bishops are much more effective than Black’s.

\[
26 \ldots \ d8
\]

Or 26...\(a_8\) (26...gxf5?? loses the queen after 27 \(g3+ \ h8\) 28 e6+) and now 27 e6 gxf5 28 exf7+ \(f7\) 29 \(h6 \ f8\) is not conclusive, so White should play 27 \(g4\), followed by e6, much as in the game.

\[
27 \ g4!
\]

To help with e6. The bishop has no more work to do on the b1-h7 diagonal.

\[
27 \ldots \ g5
28 \ e2 \ h5 (D)
\]

Black was almost in zugzwang:
1) 28...\(d7\) 29 e6 wins.
2) 28...\(e7\) 29 \(c5\) picks up the exchange.
3) 28...\(e8\) 29 e6 (the simplest) 29...f6 (now that the rook has left f8 White can meet 29...f5 by 30 \(xf5\) gxf5 31 \(xf5\) winning) 30 g3, followed by h4, and wins.

\[
29 \ xh5 \ xh5
30 \ xh5 \ e8
\]

Or 30...\(e7\) 31 h4! winning after 31...\(xh4\) 32 \(f4\) or 31...\(d2\) 32 \(f3\).

\[
31 \ f6! \quad 1-0
\]

The end might be 31...\(d2\) 32 e6 \(e3+\) 33 \(h1\) fxe6 34 \(g6+\).


This win put me in joint second place with Karpov on +4 – it was an exceptionally good result.
At the Madrid tournament in June I started with five draws. No matter what I did I would either have to defend a worse position and hang on for a draw, or not be able to break through. At this point there was an article in the tournament bulletin, which said that I was “on vacation”. It infuriated me. I don’t know if there was any connection, but I won my last four games and finished in joint first place. The following game was the second of the series.
Game 22
V. Anand – F. Izeta

Madrid 1993
Pirc Defence

1 e4 d6
2 d4 ∆f6
3 ∆c3 c6

I was happy with this line as it gave me the chance to play something really sharp.

4 f3!? e5
5 ∆e3 ∆e7
6 √xd2 0-0
7 0-0-0 b5
8 g4 exd4

8...b4 9 ∆ce2 exd4 10 ∆xd4 c5 11 ∆f5! gives White a good attack, while after 8...a5!? 9 ∆b1 b4 10 ∆ce2 ∆e6 11 ∆c1 c5 12 d5 ∆d7 13 ∆ge2, followed by ∆g3, White is also slightly better.

9 √xd4?!

The right recapture. You shouldn’t take with the queen if Black still has the option of ...∆c6, but in all the lines with ...c6, taking with the queen is the normal capture. The logic is the same as in the Sicilian after 1 e4 c5 2 ∆f3 ∆c6 3 d4 cxd4 4 ∆xd4; Black mustn’t play ...∆xd4 too early, as the queen occupies a dominating post in the centre.

After 9 ∆xd4 Black could continue 9...b4 10 ∆ce2 c5, and grabbing a pawn by 11 ∆xf6? ∆xf6 12 √xd6 √a5 would give Black excellent compensation.

9 ... ∆e6
10 g5 (D)

10 ... ∆e8

For a time I was worried about 10...c5, but it turns out that White can gain the advantage by an accurate sequence of moves: 11 √d3! (not 11 √d2 b4 12 gxf6 bxc3 13 √xc3 ∆xf6 and Black is a little better) 11...c4 (11...c4 12 √d2 favours White) 12 √e2! (12 √d4 ∆c6 13 gxf6 ∆xd4 14 fxe7 √xe7 15 ∆xd4 is risky as ...b4 and ...c3 might rip open the white king position before his minor pieces can come into play) 12...∆e8 13 ∆xb5 and White stands
very well, since 13...\( \text{Axg5} \) may be met by 14 f4 and 15 e5.

11 f4 \( \text{wa5} \)
12 a3 f5?

Black had two better lines:
1) 12...c5!? 13 \( \text{Wd2} \) b4 and now:
   1a) 14 \( \text{Ad5} \) \( \text{Ax} \text{xd5} \) 15 exd5 (15 \( \text{Wxd5} \) bxa3! is good for Black) and after 15...\( \text{Ad7} \) or 15...\( \text{Ad8} \) Black has good counterplay.

   1b) 14 \( \text{Ab1} \) ! \( \text{Ac6} \) 15 \( \text{Af3} \) \( \text{Ab8} \) 16 f5! \( \text{Aa2} \)! (16...\( \text{Ad7} \) 17 \( \text{Ac4} \) bxa3 18 \( \text{Axa3} \) with advantage to White) 17 b3! \( \text{Ax} \text{xb1} \) 18 \( \text{Exb1} \) bxa3 (18...\( \text{Wxa3} \) 19 \( \text{Ac4} \) \( \text{Aa5} \) 20 \( \text{Wd3} \) is also good for White) 19 \( \text{Wxa5} \) \( \text{Axa5} \) 20 \( \text{Aa2} \) and White has the two bishops and a structural advantage.

2) 12...f6 13 h4 \( \text{Ac7} \) is rather unclear.

After the game Izeta explained that he did not like 12...f6 because White is not obliged to take on f6, but can play 13 h4 (as in line 2 above). He therefore preferred 12...f5, because he thought that it would force 13 gxf6; otherwise White would be left with a backward f-pawn and not much chance of an attack. However, this argument is flawed because after the exchange on f5 Black cannot maintain his bishop on that square, and once it has gone, the white queen can occupy the powerful central square e4, ready for moves such as \( \text{Ad3} \) and f5.

13 exf5! \( \text{Ax} \text{xf5} \)
14 \( \text{Ag} \text{ge2} \)

Now White has a definite advantage.

14 ... \( \text{Ac7} \)
15 \( \text{Ag3} \) ! \( \text{Ag4} \) (D)

If 15...\( \text{Ae6} \), then 16 \( \text{Wd2} \) \( \text{Ag} \text{4} \) 17 \( \text{Ae1} \) followed by \( \text{Ad3} \) with a promising attacking position.

16 \( \text{Ad3} ! \)

Although this is not bad, White misses the most efficient continuation, 16 \( \text{We4} \) !:

1) 16...\( \text{Ax} \text{xd1} \) 17 \( \text{Ad3} \) g6 18 f5! (18 \( \text{We7} \) is also good) 18...\( \text{Af3} \) 19 \( \text{We7} \) ! \( \text{Ee8} \) (19...\( \text{Ef7} \) 20 \( \text{Wd8}+ \) \( \text{Ff8} \) 21 \( \text{Wxd6} \) \( \text{Exh1} \) 22 fxg6 wins) 20 \( \text{Wxd6} \) \( \text{Exe3} \) 21 fxg6 with a decisive attack.

2) 16...\( \text{Ee8} \) 17 \( \text{Ad3} \) g6 18 f5 \( \text{Ax} \text{d1} \) (18...\( \text{Axg5} \) 19 \( \text{Wxg4} \) \( \text{Exe3}+ \) 20 \( \text{Bb1} \) is hopeless) 19 fxg6! (19 \( \text{Ax} \text{d1} \) \( \text{Axg5} \) is unclear; Black will win a piece, but meanwhile White will get in fxg6) 19...\( \text{Ff8} \) (19...\( \text{Axg5} \) 20 gxh7+ \( \text{Wh8} \) 21 \( \text{Wd4}+ \) \( \text{Exe5} \) 22 \( \text{Axg5} \) wins) 20 gxh7+ \( \text{Wh8} \) (20...\( \text{Ag7} \) 21
h8\(\texttt{\#}\) + \(\texttt{\#}\) xh8 22 \(\texttt{\#}\) h7+ 21 \(\texttt{\#}\) d4 + \(\texttt{\#}\) g7 22 \(\texttt{\#}\) xg7+ \(\texttt{\#}\) xg7 23 \(\texttt{\#}\) g6+ \(\texttt{\#}\) f8 24 \(\texttt{\#}\) f6#.

16 ... \(\texttt{\#}\) d5 (D)

16...\(\texttt{\#}\) xd1 17 \(\texttt{\#}\) e4 transposes into the preceding note.

17 \(\texttt{\#}\) f5!

Of course White cannot play 17 \(\texttt{\#}\) de1 c5 18 \(\texttt{\#}\) e5 \(\texttt{\#}\) c6 and his queen is trapped, but I always intended to sacrifice the exchange here.

17 ... \(\texttt{\#}\) xd1

18 \(\texttt{\#}\) xd1 (D)

This is again a slight inaccuracy. The alternatives are:

1) 18 \(\texttt{\#}\) xd1? \(\texttt{\#}\) b6 19 \(\texttt{\#}\) e5 (19 \(\texttt{\#}\) f4 \(\texttt{\#}\) e6! 20 \(\texttt{\#}\) e5 \(\texttt{\#}\) xe3+! and Black wins) 19...\(\texttt{\#}\) d6 20 \(\texttt{\#}\) xd6 (20 \(\texttt{\#}\) xb6 \(\texttt{\#}\) xe5 is lost for White) 20...\(\texttt{\#}\) xe3+ 21 \(\texttt{\#}\) b1 \(\texttt{\#}\) e8 22 \(\texttt{\#}\) d8 (22 \(\texttt{\#}\) b4 \(\texttt{\#}\) xg5 is winning) 22...\(\texttt{\#}\) f6! 23 \(\texttt{\#}\) c7 \(\texttt{\#}\) xg5 24 \(\texttt{\#}\) b7 \(\texttt{\#}\) bd7 25 \(\texttt{\#}\) xc6 and Black has a clear advantage.

2) 18 f6! \(\texttt{\#}\) xf6! (18...gx6 19 \(\texttt{\#}\) f5 and 18...\(\texttt{\#}\) xf6 19 gx6 \(\texttt{\#}\) xf6 20 \(\texttt{\#}\) xd1 are hopeless for Black) 19 gx6 \(\texttt{\#}\) xf6 20 \(\texttt{\#}\) f4 \(\texttt{\#}\) xc3 21 \(\texttt{\#}\) xd1 and White has an extremely strong attack.

18 ... \(\texttt{\#}\) d6?  
Black should have tried 18...c5! 19 \(\texttt{\#}\) g4 (19 \(\texttt{\#}\) h4 c4 20 f6 cxd3 21 fxe7 \(\texttt{\#}\) e8 22 \(\texttt{\#}\) f5 \(\texttt{\#}\) a4! is unclear) 19...c4 and now:

1) 20 \(\texttt{\#}\) h5? cxd3 21 g6 h6 22 \(\texttt{\#}\) xh6 \(\texttt{\#}\) a4! 23 \(\texttt{\#}\) e3 \(\texttt{\#}\) h4 24 \(\texttt{\#}\) xg7 \(\texttt{\#}\) xh5 (24...\(\texttt{\#}\) xg7?? 25 f6+! wins for White) 25 \(\texttt{\#}\) xh5 \(\texttt{\#}\) g5! and Black wins.

2) 20 \(\texttt{\#}\) e2 (it is not very attractive to have to retreat the bishop, but White retains a very dangerous attack) 20...\(\texttt{\#}\) d6 (20...\(\texttt{\#}\) h8 21 f6 gx6 22 \(\texttt{\#}\) f5 \(\texttt{\#}\) c6 23 g6 wins) 21 f6 g6 22 h4 and the position is still very difficult for Black.

19 \(\texttt{\#}\) h4  
Now White’s attack is decisive.

19 ... \(\texttt{\#}\) e8  
Alternatively, 19...\(\texttt{\#}\) d7 20 f6 g6 21 \(\texttt{\#}\) h6 \(\texttt{\#}\) f7 22 \(\texttt{\#}\) xg6 hxg6 23
$\text{Wxg6+ } \text{f8} 24 \text{f5} \text{ and White's attack breaks through.}$

20 $\text{d4 } \text{c7}$

20...c5 loses immediately after 21 $\text{g7! } \text{xg7} 22 \text{f6.}$

21 f6 (D)

21 ... gxf6

After 21...g6 the most convincing line is 22 $\text{e1!} \ (22 \text{xe6 } \text{xg6} 23 \text{f7+ } \text{xf7} 24 \text{h7+ } \text{g7 is less convincing)} \text{ and now:}$

1) 22...$\text{f7} 23 \text{e3 } \text{e6} 24 \text{gf5!}$ wins.

2) 22...c5 23 $\text{xe6 } \text{xg6} \text{ (White also wins after 23...cxd4 } 24 \text{e7 } \text{xe7} 25 \text{xe7 } \text{h4} 26 \text{xf8+ } 24 \text{f7+ } \text{xf7} 25 \text{h7+ } \text{g7} 26 \text{xe7#}.$

22 gxf6 $\text{f7}$

23 $\text{g1 } \text{h8}$

24 $\text{xh7! } \text{h7}$

25 $\text{f7+ } \text{g7}$

26 $\text{xg7+ } 1-0$

As 26...$\text{xg7} 27 \text{f5+ } \text{f8} 28 \text{h7 leads to mate.}$

The summer of 1993 was Interzonal time again. I started with two draws, and the following game was played in the third round.
Game 23

V. Anand – L. Ftačnik

Biel Interzonal 1993

Sicilian, Najdorf

1 e4 c5
2 d4 d6
3 c4 cxd4
4 cxd4 f6
5 c3 a6
6 e3

I had quite a few interesting ideas in the e3 line against the Najdorf, but this is a very difficult and complex variation to analyse. It has taken many years for theory to converge on what are now considered ‘main lines’. The positions are so tricky that you can never be sure that your ideas are correct; the advantage is that your opponent has the same problem!

6 … e6
7 f3 b5
8 g4 h6
9 w.d2 a.b7

This game showed for the first time that 9...b7 is just a mistake with this move-order. Black has to play 9...bd7, when we reach the main line (after 10 0-0-0 a.b7). In this case White would have no time for 10 h4 because of 10...b4 11 cce2 d5, and White cannot push his e-pawn since the e5-square is covered.

10 h4

Here Ftačnik thought for some time and realized that the attempt to transpose to the main line with 10...bd7 is bad after 11 g1, with the immediate threat of g5-g6.

10 … b4 (D)

After 10...e7 11 0-0-0 White is slightly better because Black has been forced to spend a tempo on ...a7, which he can normally avoid in this system.

11 cce2 d5

11...e5 12 xb4! gives White a clear advantage after 12...d7 13 b3 d5 14 c5 or 12...c7 13 a4+ bd7 14 f5.

12 e5 fd7
13 f4!

We have reached a kind of super-French position, but in the French Black would not weaken his pawn structure by playing ...h6.

13 ... d5
14 g2! (D)

Better than 14 g3 e7 – the knight might go to f4 later.

e6 proves fatal) 19...e5 20 xd5 xd5 21 c6 c7 22 xd5 winning.

3) 15...e4 16 xe4 dxe4 17 f5 xe5 18 fxe6 c4 (18...f3 19 exf7+ xf7 20 xf3 exf3 21 xd8 xd8 22 xd8 fxe2 23 d7+ wins) and now both 19 e1 xe3 20 f2 fxe6 21 xe3 and 19 exf7+ xf7 20 e1 xe3 21 f2+ g8 22 xe3 are promising for White.

4) 15...b6 16 g5 h5 17 g6! fxg6 18 h3 with a strong attack.

16 g5!

White has the advantage, but he mustn’t waste too much time!

16 ... h5 (D)

Black is distinctly worse after 16...hxg5 17 hgx5 g8 18 g6! or 16...g6 17 h5! gxh5 18 xh5.

17 f5!

The best way to soften up the e6-square. After 17 g6 fxg6 18 h3 f8 or 17 b1 b6 18 g6 fxg6 19 h3 f8 the situation is less clear.
None of this was home preparation. I had been working on the English Attack with Patrick Wolff, and he mentioned that 9...\texttt{\texttt{d}b7} is bad because of 10 \texttt{h}4, and we left it at that. However, all White's moves appear perfectly natural, so it was not difficult to play. In such messy and complex positions, I think it is better not to calculate too much – the tree of variations can get enormously dense. I prefer to wait to see what my opponent plays, and that immediately removes a large percentage of possible branches.

\[17 \text{ ...} \texttt{\texttt{d}xe5}\ (D)\]

Forced, as 17...exf5 loses to 18 \texttt{\texttt{d}xf5} \texttt{\texttt{d}xe5} 19 \texttt{\texttt{d}xg7+}.

\[18 \texttt{\texttt{d}f4!}\]

18 fxe6! \texttt{\texttt{d}c4} (18...fxe6? 19 \texttt{\texttt{d}f4} wins) 19 exf7+ is also strong, e.g.:

1) 19...\texttt{\texttt{d}d7} (Ftačnik) 20 \texttt{\texttt{d}h3+} \texttt{\texttt{d}c7} 21 \texttt{\texttt{d}f4+} wins.

2) 19...\texttt{\texttt{d}xf7} 20 \texttt{\texttt{w}e1} \texttt{\texttt{e}e8} (the line 20...\texttt{\texttt{d}xe3} 21 \texttt{\texttt{w}f2+} \texttt{\texttt{d}g8} 22 \texttt{\texttt{w}xe3} is also good for White) 21 \texttt{\texttt{d}f5} (21 \texttt{\texttt{d}f4} \texttt{\texttt{d}g8} is less clear) 21...\texttt{\texttt{c}c8} (21...\texttt{\texttt{d}xe3} 22 \texttt{\texttt{d}xe3} and d5 hangs) 22 \texttt{\texttt{d}d4} \texttt{\texttt{d}xg5+} (or else White has a very strong attack in any case) 23 \texttt{\texttt{h}xg5} \texttt{\texttt{w}xg5+} 24 \texttt{\texttt{b}b1} \texttt{\texttt{w}xg2} 25 \texttt{\texttt{g}g1} with a decisive attack.

3) 19...\texttt{\texttt{f}f8} 20 \texttt{\texttt{w}e1} \texttt{\texttt{a}a5} (White wins the queen after 20...\texttt{\texttt{d}xe3} 21 \texttt{\texttt{d}f4} \texttt{\texttt{d}xg2} 22 \texttt{\texttt{f}e6+}) 21 \texttt{\texttt{b}b1} \texttt{\texttt{d}xe3} 22 \texttt{\texttt{f}f4} (D) with the two possibilities:

\[3a) 22...\texttt{\texttt{d}xg2} 23 \texttt{\texttt{d}g6+} \texttt{\texttt{w}f7} 24 \texttt{\texttt{w}xe7+} \texttt{\texttt{d}xg6} 25 \texttt{\texttt{h}h1!} \texttt{\texttt{d}xh4} (the lines 25...\texttt{\texttt{d}he8} 26 \texttt{\texttt{w}f7+} \texttt{\texttt{d}h7} 27 \texttt{\texttt{w}xh5+} \texttt{\texttt{d}g8} 28 \texttt{\texttt{g}6} and 25...\texttt{\texttt{h}f8} 26 \texttt{\texttt{d}xf8} \texttt{\texttt{d}xf8} 27 \texttt{\texttt{w}f8} are no better) 26 \texttt{\texttt{w}f7+} \texttt{\texttt{d}h7} (26...\texttt{\texttt{d}xg5} 27 \texttt{\texttt{g}1+}) 27 \texttt{\texttt{w}xh5+} \texttt{\texttt{d}g8} 28 \texttt{\texttt{w}f7+} \texttt{\texttt{d}h7} 29 \texttt{\texttt{h}1} mating.

3b) 22...\texttt{\texttt{d}xd1} 23 \texttt{\texttt{d}g6+} \texttt{\texttt{d}xf7} 24 \texttt{\texttt{w}xe7+} \texttt{\texttt{d}xg6} (24...\texttt{\texttt{d}g8} 25 \texttt{\texttt{d}f5} \texttt{\texttt{h}7} 26 \texttt{\texttt{f}1} \texttt{\texttt{c}c3}+ 27 \texttt{\texttt{b}xc3} \texttt{\texttt{b}xc3} 28 \texttt{\texttt{w}f8+} \texttt{\texttt{d}xf8} 29 \texttt{\texttt{d}f8#}) 25 \texttt{\texttt{d}d6+} with a final branch:
3b1) 25...\textit{\texttt{\(\text{h7}\)}} 26 \textit{\texttt{\(\text{g6+ \text{g8}\)}} (or 26...\textit{\texttt{\(\text{h6}\)}} 27 \textit{\texttt{\(\text{f5#}\)}}) 27 \textit{\texttt{\(\text{xd5+ \text{x5}\)}} 28 \textit{\texttt{\(\text{x5f8}\)}} 29 \textit{\texttt{\(\text{f7\#}\)}}.

3b2) 25...\textit{\texttt{\(\text{f7}\)}} 26 \textit{\texttt{\(\text{g6+ \text{g8}\)}} (mate is also inevitable after 26...\textit{\texttt{\(\text{e8}\)}} 27 \textit{\texttt{\(\text{f5}\)}}) 27 \textit{\texttt{\(\text{xd5+ \text{x5}\)}} 28 \textit{\texttt{\(\text{x5f8}\)}} 29 \textit{\texttt{\(\text{f7\#}\)}}.

18 \textit{\texttt{\(\text{xc4}\)}}

18...\textit{\texttt{exf5}} 19 \textit{\texttt{xf5}} is clearly very good for White.

19 \textit{\texttt{we2 (D)}}

\begin{center}
\textbf{B}
\end{center}

\textbf{19 \ldots \textit{\texttt{wa5}}}

Going for queenside counterplay. The alternative is 19...e5:

1) 20 \textit{\texttt{x5d5}} and now:

1a) 20...\textit{\texttt{exe3}} 21 \textit{\texttt{xc6!}} (21 \textit{\texttt{wx3}} \textit{\texttt{xd5}} 22 \textit{\texttt{xc6 xg2}} 23 \textit{\texttt{xd8 xh1}} 24 \textit{\texttt{exe5}} transposes to the unclear line 1b below) 21...\textit{\texttt{g2}} (21...\textit{\texttt{xc6}} 22 \textit{\texttt{f6+ gxf6}} 23 \textit{\texttt{xc6+ f8}} 24 \textit{\texttt{x8d8 xd8}} 25 \textit{\texttt{wx3}} also wins) 22 \textit{\texttt{d8 xd8}} 23 \textit{\texttt{exe7}} winning.

1b) 20...\textit{\texttt{xd5}} and now:

1b1) 21 \textit{\texttt{db3 exe3!}} (21...\textit{\texttt{xb3+}} 22 axb3 \textit{\texttt{wa5}} 23 bxc4 \textit{\texttt{wxg2}} 24 \textit{\texttt{exe2}} \textit{\texttt{wa1+}} 25 \textit{\texttt{d2 xd8+}} 26 \textit{\texttt{e2}} \textit{\texttt{wb2}} 27 \textit{\texttt{x6+ f8}} 28 \textit{\texttt{xd8+ xc5+ g8}} 30 \textit{\texttt{e8+ wins}} for White) 22 \textit{\texttt{exe3}} \textit{\texttt{xb3+}} 23 axb3 \textit{\texttt{exe2}} 24 \textit{\texttt{x8d8+ xd8}} favours Black.

1b2) 21 \textit{\texttt{xc6 xg2}} (21...\textit{\texttt{exe3}} 22 \textit{\texttt{x8d5 wc7}} 23 \textit{\texttt{exe3}} and White wins) 22 \textit{\texttt{exe3}} (22 \textit{\texttt{x8d8+ xd8}} 23 \textit{\texttt{exe8 xxe3}} 24 \textit{\texttt{e1 xd8}} 25 \textit{\texttt{exe3}} \textit{\texttt{xe4}} is also unclear) 22...\textit{\texttt{exe3!}} (not 22...\textit{\texttt{xh1?}} 23 \textit{\texttt{xc5}}) 23 \textit{\texttt{exe3 xh1}} 24 \textit{\texttt{xh5 (24 \textit{\texttt{xf7 xf7}} \textit{\texttt{f7}} \textit{\texttt{h1}} \textit{\texttt{is again unclear}}) 24...\textit{\texttt{f6!}} (24...\textit{\texttt{xd8}} 25 \textit{\texttt{xd8+ xd8}} 26 \textit{\texttt{b8+ d7}} 27 \textit{\texttt{wxh8 g6}} 28 \textit{\texttt{wh7!}} should win for White) and the position remains unclear.

2) 20 f6!? \textit{\texttt{gxf6}} 21 \textit{\texttt{xd5 xd5}} (21...\textit{\texttt{exe3}} 22 \textit{\texttt{xc6 xd5}} 23 \textit{\texttt{exe3 xd8}} 24 \textit{\texttt{gxf6 xfe6}} 25 \textit{\texttt{wc4}} and White wins) 22 \textit{\texttt{f5 exe3}} 23 \textit{\texttt{exe3}} with advantage to White.

3) 20 \textit{\texttt{xc6! xxc6}} 21 \textit{\texttt{xd5}} (21 \textit{\texttt{wc4 dxc4}} 22 \textit{\texttt{xc6+ f8}} 23 \textit{\texttt{xd8+ xd8}} 24 \textit{\texttt{d5 d7}} is good for Black) 21...\textit{\texttt{wa5}} 22 \textit{\texttt{exe7!}} (after 22 \textit{\texttt{exe7}} \textit{\texttt{wa2}} 23 \textit{\texttt{c7+ f8}} 24 \textit{\texttt{exe7+ xe7}} or 22 \textit{\texttt{xc4 ab5}} 23 \textit{\texttt{xb5 ab5}} 24 \textit{\texttt{exe7 d7}} 25 \textit{\texttt{a8 wa8}} 26 \textit{\texttt{d5 wa2}} Black has the advantage) and now:

3a) 22 \textit{\texttt{ab5}} 23 \textit{\texttt{c6+ xc6}} (or 23...\textit{\texttt{f8}} 24 \textit{\texttt{xc5 wa2}} 25 \textit{\texttt{c8+!}} and mates) 24 \textit{\texttt{xc4 xh1}} 25 \textit{\texttt{xc5 f3}} 26 \textit{\texttt{g6! f8}} 27 \textit{\texttt{gxf7+ fx7}} 28 \textit{\texttt{c6}} and wins.

3b) 22...\textit{\texttt{exe2}} 23 \textit{\texttt{wc4! ab3+}} (23...\textit{\texttt{xh1}} 24 \textit{\texttt{xc5}} transposes to
line 3a) 24 cxb3 and White is winning.

3c) 22...\textit{ixa}2 23 \textit{xc}6+ \textit{f}8 24 \textit{g}6+ \textit{g}8 25 \textit{xc}4 \textit{xc}4 26 \textit{xa}8! wins for White.

\textbf{20 \textit{b}1 \textit{xb}2 (D)}

The alternatives are winning for White:

1) 20...	extit{a}4 21 fxe6 \textit{xc}xb2 22 exf7+ \textit{xf}7 23 \textit{d}2 with a decisive attack, for example 23...	extit{xd}1 24 \textit{xd}1 \textit{c}3+ 25 \textit{xc}3 \textit{bxc}3 26 \textit{e}6+ \textit{f}8 27 \textit{xd}5!.

2) 20...\textit{e}5 21 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xe}3 (White wins after 21...\textit{exd}4 22 \textit{xd}4 \textit{xd}5 23 \textit{xd}5) 22 \textit{xe}3 \textit{xd}5 23 \textit{xd}5 \textit{exd}4 24 \textit{xd}4! \textit{c}8 25 f6 finishes Black.

\textbf{21 fxe6!!}

White should just ignore everything, except mate itself, and just hack away. I was on the verge of playing the really amazing move 21 \textit{b}3!?, if only because it eliminates all threats to White’s king. After

\textbf{2a) 23...\textit{e}4 24 \textit{xe}4 \textit{dxe}4 25 \textit{w}c4+ \textit{e}8 26 \textit{de}6 \textit{c}8 27 \textit{g}7+ \textit{f}8 28 \textit{g}6+ \textit{xg}7 29 \textit{d}4+ leads to mate.}

\textbf{2b) 23...\textit{a}4 24 \textit{d}2 \textit{c}3+ 25 \textit{xc}3 \textit{bxc}3 26 \textit{e}6+ \textit{e}8 27 \textit{xd}5
\( \text{\textbf{Axd5 28 \textit{Axd5 \textbf{b4+ 29 \textit{b3 winning.}}}} \)

2c) 23...\textit{Af8 24 \textit{Axd5 winning.}}

3) 21...\textit{f6e6 22 \textit{dxe6! (22 \textit{xb2 \textit{a4+ 23 \textit{c1 \textit{c3 is less clear-cut}}}}}}

22...\textit{xd1} 23 \textit{d7 g7+ f7 24 \textit{xd1 with a decisive attack.}}

22 \textit{xb2! a4+}

23 \textit{c1 b3 (D)}

23...\textit{c3} 24 \textit{d3 \textit{xa2 25 exf7 wins as Black has no real threats.}}

24 \textit{xb3!}

Not 24 \textit{cb3? \textit{a3+ 25 \textit{c2 \textit{c7+ 26 \textit{b1 \textit{c3+ and Black wins.}}}}}}

24 ... a3+

25 b1 c3+

Or 25...\textit{c3 26 d4.}

26 a1 wa4

Black's compensation is inadequate.

27 \textit{d3 b4}

28 c1 b8 (D)

Other lines are also hopeless:

1) 28...\textit{xd1} 29 \textit{xd1 \textit{f6e6 30 \textit{xe6 d7 31 \textit{d4 winning.}}}}
31 \( \text{We}3+ \) \( \text{Cc}5 \)
32 \( \text{Ad}3 \) \( \text{Wxc}2 \)
\( \text{d}d4 33 \text{Ax}d4 \text{Wxc}2 34 \text{Ax}c5+ \text{Aa}8 35 \text{Ax}b7+ \text{Ax}b7 36 \text{Dd}7+ \text{Cc}8 \)
37 \( \text{Wd}3 \) wins.
33 \( \text{Ax}c3 \) \( \text{Ax}c3+ \)
34 \( \text{Wxc}3 \) \( \text{Wxc}3+ \)
35 \( \text{Wxc}3 \) \( \text{Ax}c3 \)
36 \( \text{ex}f7 \) \( \text{Af}8 \)

37 \( \text{g}6 \) 1-0

I spent only about 30-35 minutes on this game. Afterwards, I was very proud of my cold-bloodedness during the game; I hadn’t prepared it at home, but even so I played the critical and best moves with very little effort. This game won me the prestigious Best Game Prize in *Informator*.

The following game was played in the very next round, and was part of my best streak of the event.
Game 24
L. Oll – V. Anand
Biel Interzonal 1993
Slav Defence

1 d4 d5
2 c4 c6
3 △f3 △f6
4 △c3 a6

I played this simply because it was fashionable.

5 e3 b5
6 b3

I don’t think this is the most dangerous system for Black as his reply is quite straightforward: he just takes his bishop outside the pawn chain to g4, swaps it off and then plays ...e6. It is difficult for White to make anything of his two bishops.

6 ... △g4
7 h3

More recently, the refinement 7 仑c2 has been introduced. White doesn’t mind the exchange on f3, and by playing very precisely he may gain a slight advantage.

7 ... △xf3
8 仑xf3 e6

The alternative is the sharp line 8...bxc4 9 bxc4 e5, but I didn’t see the need for such extreme measures. In particular, I didn’t like the idea of opening the position by exchanging on c4. White has no particular threats on the queenside, so there seems no reason for Black to clarify the pawn structure.

9 仑d2
9 cxd5 cxd5 10 仑d3 仑c6 is equal.
9 ... △b4! (D)

10 仑d1
10 a3 △xc3 11 △xc3 bxc4 12 bxc4 △e4 13 △c1 △xc3 14 △xc3 仑a5 15 仑d2 is certainly not better for White.

10 ... 0-0
11 仑e2

After 11 cxd5 (11 仑d3 dxc4 12 bxc4 c5! is also fine for Black) 11...cxd5 12 a4 bxa4 13 △xa4 (13 △xa4 a5 is also comfortable for Black) 13...仑c6 14 △xb4 △xb4 15 仑e2 仑d6 the position is level.
11 ... bxc4
12 bxc4 c5!

At this point I felt that I had equalized completely.

13 dxc5?

After this error White is struggling. The alternatives are:

1) 13 0-0 cxd4 14 Qxd5 Qxd5 15 cxd5 Qxd2 16 Wxd2 dxe3 17 Wxe3 exd5 18 Qf3 and now 18...Qc6 19 Rad1 Qe7 20 Rfe1 Qe8 21 Qxd5 Qxd5 22 Wxe8+ Wxe8 23 Qxe8+ Qxe8 24 Qxd5 is a dead draw, while 18...d4!, followed by ...Qa7-d7, is a possible way for Black to play for the advantage.

2) 13 cxd5 (the soundest line) 13...cx(d4 14 exd4 Qxc3 (14...Qxd5 15 Qxd5 Qxd2+ 16 Wxd2 exd5 17 0-0 is a little better for White) 15 Qxc3 Qxd5 with equality. Even though White has an isolated pawn, the two bishops and the potentially weak pawn on a6 will ensure that he is not worse.

13 ... d4! (D)

14 exd4

Forced, as 14 Qa4 Wa5 favours Black, while 14 Qe4? Qxe4 15 Qxb4 dxe3 is just lost for White.

14 ...
15 Wc2
15 Bc1 Bd8 prevents castling and is very awkward for White.

15 ...
16 0-0 (D)

16 ...

16 Wc5

16...Qad8 was also good, for example 17 Rad1 Wc5 18 Qd3 Qxc5 or 17 Bd1 Wc5 18 Qd3 (18 Qf3 Qxd2!) 18...Qd4 19 Wb2 Qxc5 with a clear advantage to Black in either case.

17 Wa4

Alternatively:

1) 17 Rfe1 Rad8 18 Qf3 (18 Rad1 Qd4 is also good for Black) 18...Qd4! (not 18...Qxd2 19 Wxd2 Qxc3 20 Qxe5) 19 Qxe5 Qxc2 20 Bd1 Qxd2 21 Qxd2 Qxc3 and Black wins.
2) 17 hae1 ad8 (the simple 17...wxxc5 is also good) 18 f3 d4
19 xe5 xc2 20 db1 xd2 21 xe2 d4 22 xd2 xf3+ 23 gxf3 c8 with a clear endgame advantage.

3) 17 d1! is relatively best, but Black retains the advantage after 17...ad8 or 17...d4.

17 ... ad8
18 e1 d4 (D)

19 wxb4
19 d3 xc3 20 xc3 f3+ 21 gxf3 xc3 is winning for Black, while after 19 d1 xc5, intending ...f5-g3, White has a miserable position.

19 ... e2+
20 xe2?!

Losing quickly. The last chance was 20 h1 d3 (20...e4 21 xe4 wxa1 22 d6) 21 d1 xc3 22 xc3 xc3, when Black is much better although the passed c-pawns offer some hope of counterplay.

20 ... wxa1
21 c3 wc1!
22 wa5 wf4
23 wxa6 xa8
24 xd6 xc4

0-1

As White will soon lose the c5-pawn.

In the fifth round I won against Khalifman, and was in joint first place. Then I lost recklessly against Gelfand; had I defended well I could have held the position, but I was careless and suddenly it was all over. This put me on +2, below the level necessary for qualifying. I tried very hard to improve my score but despite reaching a number of winning positions I failed to score the full point in any of them. I had given up hope when I met Korchnoi in round 12. In this game Korchnoi completely outplayed me and I felt a huge weight off my shoulders. It was suddenly clear that I wasn’t going to qualify and I felt enormously relieved at the lifting of the burden. Then Korchnoi started to have difficulty winning and I began to regain my interest in drawing the game. Korchnoi gradually went completely awry and even lost the game. Suddenly I had moved from absolutely nowhere to having a theoretical chance of qualifying.

A win in the last round would have guaranteed qualification, but I could only draw with Epishin. Then it required five different games to have the
right result for me to qualify. In the end everything worked out perfectly: all
the people with worse tie-breaks than me finished level with me on +3 and all
the people with better tie-breaks ended up on +2. It wasn’t very convincing,
but at least I had reached the Candidates again.

The following game is from the final of the European Clubs Cup, in which
I was playing for Lyons. Curiously, the only French player in the Lyons team
was Lautier. Michael had a horrible event: he lost all three games (of which
this was the first). He then went on to Groningen for the PCA Qualifier and
almost lost the first game there. However, he salvaged a draw and, typically
for Michael, then went on to win the tournament!
Game 25
M. Adams – V. Anand
European Clubs Cup Final, Hilversum 1993
Sicilian, Kan

1 e4 c5
2  d3 e6
3  f3

While White gains some advantages with this move-order, it allows Black to adopt a system in which ...f6 is delayed.

3 ... a6
4  d4 cxd4
5  xd4 d6
6  f4 b5
7  d3 b7

Thanks to the omission of ...f6, Black is able to accelerate his queenside development.

8 0-0

One advantage of Black’s system is that 8 f3?! doesn’t really work when Black hasn’t played ...f6 since g4-g5 threatens nothing! The game Anand-Wojtkiewicz, Manila Olympiad 1992 continued 8...d7 9  e3 c8 10 g4 c5 11 g5 e7 12 b3 a4 13 xa4 bxa4 14 d2 d5 and Black was slightly better. If White wants to adopt the f3 and g4-g5 system then he shouldn’t play 2 d3.

8 ... f6

Now that White has effectively abandoned the f3 system (because the advance of the g-pawn doesn’t fit in with kingside castling) I decided to play ...f6. Black can still tinker with his move-order by 8...d7!?, but after 9 h1 (not 9 f5? b6!) he probably has nothing better than 9...g6.

9 a3

Meeting Black’s threat to the e-pawn, but after this loss of tempo Black has no problems.

9 ... bd7
10  h1 e7 (D)

10...c8 and 10...g6 are playable alternatives.

11 b4?!

This plan can be effective, but only when Black’s knight has been
developed to c6. Here Black has a ready counter in the form of ...\( \text{c8} \) and ...\( \text{b6-c4} \).

11 ... 0-0
12 \( \text{b2} \) \( \text{c8}! \)
13 \( \text{e2} \)

Preparing e5, which Black meets by providing the f6-knight with a well-supported square on d5.

13 ... \( \text{b6}! (D) \)

\( \text{Wh5}+ \text{g8} \) 24 \( \text{xf7}+ \text{h8} \) 25 \( \text{f6 e4} \) (25 ... \( \text{xg2}+ \) 26 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{c6}+ \) 27 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{e4} \) 28 \( \text{h6}! \) and White wins) 26 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{f2}+ \) 27 \( \text{xf2} \) \( \text{gxh6} \) (27 ... \( \text{g8} \) 28 \( \text{h5}! \) g6 29 \( \text{h4} \) wins) with a likely draw.

1c) 19 ... \( \text{d7} \) 20 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{xg5} \) 21 \( \text{xg5} \) \( \text{f8} \) 22 \( \text{f4} \) is unclear.

2) 18 ... \( \text{d5}! \) 19 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) is fine for Black.

14 ... \( \text{dxe5} \)
15 \( \text{fxe5} \) \( \text{f7}! (D) \)

Not 15 ... \( \text{xd4}?? \) 16 \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 17 \( \text{a4} \!) (17 \( \text{d1}! \) \( \text{h4}! \) 18 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) favours Black) 17 ... \( \text{d8} \) 18 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 19 \( \text{xb6} \) \( \text{xb6} \) 20 \( \text{h5} \) f5 21 \( \text{g5}+ \) \( \text{h8} \) 22 \( \text{f6}+ \) \( \text{g8} \) 23 \( \text{xf5} \) and White wins.

16 \( \text{xd5} \)

I spent a long time on the alternatives, but I eventually decided that they were not worrying for Black:

1) 16 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{fxe6} \) 17 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{f5}! \) (17 ... \( \text{g6} \) 18 \( \text{xe6} \) \( \text{hxg6} \) 19 \( \text{g6}+ \) \( \text{h8} \) 20 \( \text{h6}+ \) \( \text{g8} \) 21 \( \text{xe6}+ \) is
only dangerous for Black) 18 \textit{xf5} g6! 19 \textit{g5} \textit{xg5} 20 \textit{gxg6} \textit{c7!} would be winning for Black.

2) 16 \textit{e4} and now:

2a) 16...\textit{a4}?! 17 \textit{h5} with a further branch:

2a1) 17...h6?! 18 \textit{c1} with very dangerous threats.

2a2) 17...\textit{xb2}?! 18 \textit{g5}! (18 \textit{f6+} \textit{xf6} 19 \textit{exf6} \textit{xd3} wins for Black) 18...h6 (D) and now:

2a21) 19 \textit{xf7} \textit{xf4} 20 \textit{xg7+ xg7} 21 \textit{gxe6+ g8} 22 \textit{hxh6 xg2+} 23 \textit{g1 xd4+} 24 \textit{xd4 bxd3} 25 \textit{cxd3 d5} is unclear.

2a22) 19 \textit{h7+ h8} 20 \textit{xf7+ xf7} 21 \textit{f1} \textit{f4} 22 \textit{xf4} \textit{hxh7} and Black defends.

2a23) 19 \textit{xf7} \textit{xf7} (but not 19...\textit{e8} 20 \textit{g6} and now 20...\textit{d7} 21 \textit{gh6+ gh6} 22 \textit{f7+ xf7} 23 \textit{xf7 f4} 24 \textit{xf4 g5} 25 \textit{g6+ g7} 26 \textit{xe6+} wins for White) 20 \textit{xf7+ h8} 21 \textit{xe6 g8} 22 \textit{g6 xd3} with a murky position.

2a3) 17...g6! 18 \textit{h6} \textit{xb2} 19 \textit{f3 c4!} 20 \textit{xf4} (20 \textit{xf4 cxe4} 21 \textit{cxg6 d3} 22 cxd3 \textit{g5} with a clear advantage for Black) 20...\textit{c4} 21 \textit{cxd3 xxe4} and Black has the same type of advantage as in the game.

2b) 16...\textit{c4}! (even stronger than line 2a3 above) 17 \textit{h5} (17 \textit{xc4 xxc4} followed by...\textit{a8} gives Black strong pressure) 17...h6! (17...g6 18 \textit{h6 xb2} is line 2a3) 18 \textit{c1 c4}! with a large advantage for Black.

16...\textit{xd5} (D)

Now Black has a safe advantage. The exchange of knights has extinguished White's hopes of a successful kingside attack, and his position is structurally much worse.

17 \textit{ae1 c4} (D)

18 \textit{f3}

The sacrifice 18 \textit{h7+? h7} 19 \textit{h5+ g8} is not dangerous:

1) 20 \textit{f3} g6 21 \textit{g3 g7} 22 \textit{f1} (22 \textit{f5+ exf5} 23 e6+ \textit{f6} 24 e7
\(\text{wd6} 25 \text{exf8w+ xfx8 consolidating the extra material}) 22...\text{we8} 23 \text{xf6 th8} 24 \text{g5 d7 and Black wins.}

2) 20 \text{e3!} forces accurate defence:

2a) 20...g6? 21 \text{g3 we8} (the line 21...\text{xf1} 22 \text{g6+ also draws) 22 xf7 (22 \text{f6 g7} 22...\text{xf7} 23 \text{g6+ xg6} 24 \text{xg6+ h8 with a draw.}

2b) 20...d5? 21 \text{h3 h6} 22 \text{f6! with a dangerous attack.}

2c) 20...\text{xf1!} 21 \text{h3 xg2+!} 22 \text{g2 d5+ 23 g1 f5! (utilizing the pin) 24 h7+ f7} 25 \text{g3} (25 \text{h5+ g6} 26 \text{h7+ e8} 27 \text{xg6+ d7 and the king escapes) 25...e8 26 xc7 is hopeless for White.}

18 ... \text{xd3}

19 \text{cxd3} (D)

\[
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} 
\hline  
B & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\]

19 ... \text{d5?}

A clear error. Black has too many pieces wanting to occupy d5, but whereas the queen does not have a good alternative post, the knight would also be well-placed on a4. Therefore the correct arrangement is queen on d5 and knight on a4, which Black could have achieved by either 19...\text{d5!} or 19...\text{a4!}, with a distinct advantage.

20 \text{d2!}

Now I realized my error. I considered 20...a5!? 21 bxa5 b4, but after 22 \text{a1} I decided that the complete dissolution of the queenside would not help Black’s winning chances. However, this line might have been objectively best in that Black would preserve a slight edge.

20 ... \text{a8}

Perhaps 20...\text{b6!? is best, reverting to the correct plan, although this would be psychologically difficult to play.}

21 \text{d4} \text{g5}

22 \text{f2} (D)

\[
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} 
\hline  
B & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\]

22 ... \text{h4}

23 \text{g3}
This may prove to be weakening in the future, but one cannot pretend that it is a serious matter.

23 ... \textit{A}g5
24 h4 \textit{A}h6
25 \textit{A}h2 \textit{A}c8
26 \textit{A}c1?? (D)

But this is a serious mistake. 26 \textit{A}e4? is also bad after 26...f5! 27 exf6 (27 \textit{A}e2 \textit{W}d7 should also win for Black, because 28...f4 is a threat) 27...\textit{A}xf6, but 26 \textit{A}b3! is the correct move. White has a good outpost on c5 and this compensates for Black's theoretical structural advantage; the position would be roughly equal.

is only slightly better for Black) 30 \textit{A}h3 \textit{A}xf1 31 \textit{A}xf1 and White has defensive chances.

2) 28...\textit{A}g4+ 29 \textit{A}g2 (forced, as 29 \textit{A}g1 \textit{W}xd3 wins) 29...\textit{W}xd3 (not 29...\textit{A}xf2? 30 \textit{A}xd8 \textit{A}xd3 31 \textit{A}c8! defending) 30 \textit{W}f3 and again the win for Black is not guaranteed.

The text-move plays for a trap, but if Black avoids this the game is over.

28 ...

\textit{A}xf1!

Avoiding 28...\textit{W}xd4?? 29 \textit{W}xf7+ \textit{A}xf7 30 \textit{A}c8+ \textit{f}8 31 \textit{W}xf8#.

29 \textit{A}xf1 \textit{W}d5! (D)

26 ...

\textit{A}xc1!

27 \textit{A}xc1 \textit{A}e3

28 \textit{A}h3?

28 \textit{A}c6! was the best chance:

1) 28...\textit{W}xd3 29 \textit{W}f3! (not 29 \textit{W}xf7+ \textit{A}xf7 30 \textit{A}e7+ \textit{W}f8! nor 29 \textit{A}e7+ \textit{W}h8 30 \textit{W}xf7 \textit{A}xf1+, as Black wins in both cases) 29...\textit{W}d2+(29...\textit{A}xf1+ 30 \textit{A}xf1 \textit{W}xf3 31 \textit{A}xf3

A dream position for Black. White has several weak pawns, an exposed king and passively placed pieces. Black only needs to bring his rook into play and White will start shedding pawns.

30 g4 g6
31 \textit{A}e1 \textit{A}c8
32 \textit{A}f3 \textit{A}c3
33 g5 \textit{f}8
34  \( \text{He3} \)  \( \text{Hxa3} \)  \( \text{c4} \)  \( \text{c4} \)  
35  \( \text{d4} \)  \( \text{He3} \)  \( \text{a3} \)  
36  \( \text{Hxe3} \)  \( \text{Hxb4} \)  
37  \( \text{g3} \)  \( \text{a5} \)  
38  \( \text{f4} \)  \( \text{a4} \)  

The finish might be 41 \( \text{He4} \)  a2 42 \( \text{a8}+ \)  \( \text{f8} \).

I haven’t played much club chess, the total being the one year I played for Lyons. That year was quite pleasant because I just turned out for the big matches. However, I wasn’t especially excited by club chess, so I wasn’t too disappointed when the club just folded up – at least I didn’t have to resign from the team! I might play for a club again in the future, but there is no immediate prospect of this.

The next game is from the PCA Qualifier event held in Groningen during December 1993.
Game 26

V. Anand – A. Beliavsky

PCA Qualifier, Groningen 1993

Sicilian, Najdorf

1 e4 c5
2 \(\text{\&}f3\) d6
3 d4 cxd4
4 \(\text{\&}xd4\) \(\text{\&}f6\)
5 \(\text{\&}c3\) a6

Round about this time Beliavsky had started playing the Najdorf and it was quite clear why – he had been one of Kasparov’s seconds for his match against Short. Since Short was one of the players who popularized 6 \(\text{\&}e3\), they must have looked at it very deeply. Unfortunately, I didn’t have anything else against the Najdorf, so I decided to play it in any case.

6 \(\text{\&}e3\) e6
7 f3 b5
8 g4 h6
9 \(\text{\&}d2\) \(\text{\&}bd7\)

Beliavsky doesn’t repeat Ftačnik’s imprecise move-order – see Game 23.

10 0-0-0 \(\text{\&}b7\)
11 h4 b4
12 \(\text{\&}ce2\) d5

The big question was whether to play 13 \(\text{\&}h3\) or 13 \(\text{\&}g3\). The former seemed rather foolhardy, as it involves various pawn sacrifices. However, when we had the position after 12...d5 on the board, I just decided to gamble.

13 \(\text{\&}h3\)!

White is committed because quiet play doesn’t work, for example 13 exd5 \(\text{\&}xd5\) 14 \(\text{\&}f4\) \(\text{\&}xe3\) 15 \(\text{\&}xe3\) \(\text{\&}b6\) 16 \(\text{\&}c4\) 0-0-0 17 \(\text{\&}d3\) \(\text{\&}c7\) was slightly better for Black in Sax-Anand, Philadelphia 1986.

13 ... dxe4
14 g5 (D)

14 ... hgx5

Beliavsky played all these moves more or less instantaneously. The text-move is the best move-order, as after 14...exf3 the reply 15 gxf6! fxe2 16 \(\text{\&}xe2\) is very dangerous for Black, for example 16...\(\text{\&}xh1\) 17
\( \text{x} \text{xe} 6 \) or 16...\( \text{w} \text{xf} 6 \) 17 \( \text{h} \text{h} 1 \). Preparation for a World Championship match needs to be extremely thorough – one must not only take the existing theory a little bit further, but in fact almost reinvent the lines you expect to use since it must withstand several months of scrutiny by a team of grandmasters. I had noticed this little detail when I looked at the line, but didn’t expect that players such as Kasparov and Beliavsky would have missed something like this when preparing for a world championship match!

15 \( \text{h} \text{xg} 5 \) \( \text{exf} 3 \)
16 \( \text{d} \text{f} 4 \)

Now 16 \( \text{g} \text{xf} 6 \) \( \text{fxe} 2 \) 17 \( \text{w} \text{xe} 2 \) \( \text{w} \text{xf} 6 \) 18 \( \text{h} \text{hf} 1 \) \( \text{we} 5 ! \) is fine for Black, as the bishop on h3 is hanging.

16 \( \text{d} \text{g} 3 \) is a major alternative, but in this book I am avoiding getting embroiled in opening theory.

16 ... \( \text{d} \text{e} 4 \)
17 \( \text{w} \text{e} 1 \) (D)

This was all theory and I was wondering when his novelty was going to appear.

17 ... \( \text{f} 2 \)

This was it, but it became clear the following year that it was not best.

The alternative 17...\( \text{d} \text{xg} 5 ? \) is bad: 18 \( \text{d} \text{xe} 6 ! \) \( \text{fxe} 6 \) 19 \( \text{d} \text{xe} 6 ! \) (19 \( \text{d} \text{xe} 6 \) is also possible: 19...\( \text{d} \text{xe} 6 \) 20 \( \text{d} \text{h} 8 \) \( \text{w} \text{f} 6 \) 21 \( \text{d} \text{d} 6 ! \) 0-0-0 22 \( \text{d} \text{xe} 6 \) \( \text{h} \text{e} 8 \) 23 \( \text{d} \text{xb} 4 \) \( \text{f} 2 \) 24 \( \text{d} \text{c} 4 + \) \( \text{d} \text{b} 8 \) 25 \( \text{d} \text{c} 7 + \) \( \text{d} \text{a} 8 \) 26 \( \text{d} \text{xa} 6 + \) 1-0 Romero Holmes-Tukmakov, Wijk aan Zee 1991) 19...\( \text{d} \text{xe} 6 \) 20 \( \text{d} \text{xe} 6 \) \( \text{d} \text{h} 1 \) 21 \( \text{w} \text{h} 1 \) \( \text{d} \text{f} 6 \) (21...\( \text{w} \text{a} 5 \) 22 \( \text{d} \text{xd} 7 + \) \( \text{d} \text{f} 7 \) 23 \( \text{w} \text{h} 2 \) is clearly winning for White) 22 \( \text{d} \text{d} 8 + \) \( \text{d} \text{d} 8 \) 23 \( \text{w} \text{g} 1 \) and White has a clear advantage.

After my success in the Beliavsky game, I continued playing the line as I felt that if I had won against Kasparov’s preparation, it must be good for White. However, the following year I played the variation once too often and Ljubojević brilliantly refuted White’s play by 17...\( \text{d} \text{xh} 3 ! \) 18 \( \text{d} \text{xe} 3 \) \( \text{e} 5 \) 19 \( \text{d} \text{b} 3 \) (19 \( \text{d} \text{f} 5 ? \) \( \text{w} \text{a} 5 \) 20 \( \text{d} \text{b} 1 \) \( \text{d} \text{d} 5 \) 21 \( \text{a} 3 \) \( \text{d} \text{b} 8 \), threatening 22...\( \text{d} \text{c} 3 + , \) and 19 \( \text{d} \text{xf} 3 ? \) \( \text{w} \text{a} 5 \) 20 \( \text{d} \text{b} 1 \) \( \text{d} \text{c} 3 + \) 21 \( \text{b} \text{xc} 3 \) \( \text{d} \text{xf} 3 \) are both very good for Black) 19...\( \text{a} 5 \) with a clear advantage for Black, Anand-Ljubojević, Sicilian theme tournament, Buenos Aires 1994. I won this game anyway, but only due to Ljubo’s blunders in time pressure. At the present time the line remains unplayable for White.
Actually the Ljubo near-disaster was the result of a lapse of memory on my part. Ljubo had come to Groningen and after the Beliavsky game he mentioned 17...\textit{hxh3!} to me, but later I imagined that it was Van Wely who suggested it. I therefore felt it was safe to play the line against Ljubo several months later, but not surprisingly Ljubo was baffled as to why I had played the line against him when he had already told me the refutation.

These days I note down not only the ideas, but also who told them to me!

18 \textit{xf2} \textit{wxg5}

Not 18...\textit{xf2?} and White has a pleasant choice:

1) 19 \textit{xe6} fxe6 (19...\textit{hxh1?} 20 \textit{xf7+}! \textit{xf7} 21 \textit{we6#}) 20 \textit{dxe6 we7} 21 \textit{hxh8} \textit{xd1} 22 \textit{g6} winning.

2) 19 \textit{dxe6} fxe6 20 \textit{we6}+ \textit{d8} 22 \textit{xd7+} \textit{xd7} 23 \textit{wb6}+ \textit{e7} 24 \textit{g6}+ is also decisive.

19 \textit{e3} \textit{wh4}

After 17...f2 I was of course worried about my preparation, as if this was indeed part of Kasparov's world championship preparation, then I could expect that it would be very well analysed. However, this move really surprised me, because I saw that I could reply 20 \textit{dxe6}. The more I looked at it, the better it seemed, and it appears that the Kasparov team must have overlooked something in their analysis.

19...\textit{we7} 20 \textit{dxe6} \textit{hxh3} 21 \textit{dxd7+} \textit{g7} 22 \textit{hxh3} was a possible alternative, with an unclear position.

20 \textit{dxe6}! (D)

Not 20 \textit{we2} \textit{g3}!.

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

20 ... \textit{we1}!

Beliavsky played this move very quickly. The alternative is 20...\textit{fxe6} 21 \textit{e6} \textit{hxh1} (21...\textit{we1} 22 \textit{dxd7+}\textit{f7} 23 \textit{e6+}! should win for White after 23...\textit{f6} 24 \textit{d4}+ \textit{g5} 25 \textit{hxe1} \textit{xf4} 26 \textit{f1}+ \textit{g5} 27 \textit{f5+} or 23...\textit{e8} 24 \textit{hxe1} 22 \textit{dxd7+}\textit{f7} (22...\textit{d8} 23 \textit{b6}+ \textit{e7} 24 \textit{wb4}+ and 22...\textit{e7} 23 \textit{wb4}+ are hopeless for Black) and now:

1) 23 \textit{hxh1} \textit{hxh1} 24 \textit{hxh1} \textit{c5} 25 \textit{d1} \textit{d8} is unclear.

2) 23 \textit{e6}+ and now:

2a) 23...\textit{f6} 24 \textit{d4}+ \textit{g5} 25 \textit{e3} \textit{xd1}+ (25...\textit{h2} 26 \textit{d5}+ \textit{h5} 27 \textit{xg7}! \textit{xd1}+ 28 \textit{xd1}
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26 \text{\textbf{H}xe1!}

After 22 \text{\textbf{A}b6+?! \textbf{e}7! 23 \textbf{Q}f5+ (23 \text{\textbf{H}xe1 \textbf{Q}xb6 wins for Black) 23...\textbf{Q}f6 (not 23...\textbf{Q}e8 24 \text{\textbf{H}xe1 \textbf{Q}xb6 25 \textbf{Q}g2 and White retains some advantage) 24 \textbf{Q}d4+ \textbf{Q}g5 25 \text{\textbf{H}xe1 \textbf{Q}h3 26 \textbf{Q}xh3+ \textbf{Q}xf5 27 \textbf{H}hf1+ \textbf{Q}g6 28 \textbf{Q}g1+ the position resolves to perpetual check.}}}}

22 \text{...} \text{\textbf{H}xh3}

23 \text{\textbf{Q}xh3} \text{\textbf{Q}xg7}

24 \text{\textbf{Q}g5! (D)}

Now I was really happy – White is going to get Black’s last kingside pawn and as a result can play for a win at absolutely no risk. Did Beliaovsky miss that 24...\textbf{Q}xg5 is met by 25 \textbf{Q}b6+?

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\text{B} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

24 \text{...} \text{\textbf{Q}e8? (D)}

Not the best square for the king.

The alternatives are:

1) 24...\textbf{Q}xg5?? 25 \textbf{Q}b6+ \textbf{e}8 26 \textbf{Q}e8#.

2) 24...\textbf{Q}e7?? 25 \textbf{Q}xe4 \textbf{Q}xe4 26 \textbf{Q}g5+ wins.
3) 24...\(\text{c5}\) 25 \(\text{xf7}\) + \(\text{c7}\) 26 \(\text{f4}\) + \(\text{b6}\) 27 \(\text{e6}\) + is clearly better for White.

4) 24...\(\text{c8}\)! 25 \(\text{xf7}\) a5 was the correct choice, with just a minimal advantage for White. Black should draw but White can still poke around for a few moves.

25 \(\text{xf7}\)!

Now I felt that I was going to win this game. Black is in considerable difficulties.

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

Here the alternatives make grim reading:

1) 25...\(\text{c8}\)? 26 \(\text{d6}\) + \(\text{d6}\) 27 \(\text{xd6}\) wins.

2) 25...\(\text{xf7}\) 26 \(\text{xd7}\) + is also hopeless for Black.

3) 25...\(\text{f8}\) 26 \(\text{g5}\) \(\text{df6}\) 27 \(\text{xe4}\) \(\text{xe4}\) 28 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{e7}\) 29 \(\text{f4}\) \(\text{f6}\) 30 \(\text{d6}\) \(\text{g8}\) 31 \(\text{xb4}\) \(\text{c6}\) 32 \(\text{g4}\) with excellent winning chances for White, much as occurs in the game.

4) 25...\(\text{df6}\) 26 \(\text{d6}\) + \(\text{d6}\) 27 \(\text{xd6}\) and White has a clear plus.

26 \(\text{d6}\) + ! \(\text{d6}\)

27 \(\text{xd6}\) \(\text{f8}\)?! (D)

Or:

1) 27...\(\text{f7}\)? 28 \(\text{d4}\) \(\text{e8}\) (White wins after 28...\(\text{f3}\) 29 \(\text{d7}\) + ) 29 \(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{xe5}\) (or 29...\(\text{xe5}\) 30 \(\text{xe5}\) \(\text{xe5}\) 31 \(\text{d7}\) + ) 30 \(\text{d7}\) + \(\text{f6}\) 31 \(\text{f1}\) + ! \(\text{e6}\) 32 \(\text{xb7}\) and wins.

2) 27...\(\text{f3}\)? 28 \(\text{e2}\) is very good for White.

3) 27...\(\text{d8}\)! (probably Black’s best chance) 28 \(\text{b6}\) gives White a distinct advantage.

28 \(\text{h6}\)!

Very strong. If White can exchange bishops and win the b-pawn, then Black will be facing defeat, since Black’s king will be too far away to defend the queenside. 28 \(\text{d4}\)? is less accurate on account of 28...\(\text{e8}\).

28 ... \(\text{xe6}\)$+$

28...\(\text{e8}\) loses to 29 \(\text{f6}\) + \(\text{g8}\) 30 \(\text{g1}\) \(\text{e7}\) 31 \(\text{b6}\).
29 $\textit{b}xh6$  $\textit{d}f7$
30 $\textit{b}b6$  $\textit{d}d5$
31 $\textit{x}xb4$  $\textit{c}c8$

31...a5 might have made things slightly more difficult, but would not fundamentally change the position.

32 $\textit{b}b6$  a5
32...c6 33 $\textit{x}xc6$ $\textit{x}xc6$ 34 $\textit{d}d2$
is a simple win.

33 a4! (D)

Not 33 $\textit{b}b5$? $\textit{xa}2$ 34 b3 a4 35 $\textit{b}b2$ axb3 36 $\textit{xb}3$ $\textit{xb}3$ drawing.

33 ...  $\textit{c}c6$
34 b3  $\textit{d}d7$?!  

Once again Black could have dragged the game out by defending more accurately with 34...$\textit{d}d8$, but in view of White’s material advantage and Black’s poorly placed king, White should win in the long run. I was just going to play quietly with 35 $\textit{b}b2$, but White still has to break Black’s resistance.

35 $\textit{b}b2$  $\textit{c}c5$

35...$\textit{d}d8$ 36 $\textit{f}6+$ drives the king even further away.

36 $\textit{b}b8+$  $\textit{g}g7$
37 $\textit{b}b7$  $\textit{c}c8$

Or 37...$\textit{f}5$ (Black also loses after 37...$\textit{d}d5$ 38 $\textit{e}e7$ and 37...$\textit{c}c6$
38 $\textit{c}c7$) 38 c4 $\textit{f}6$ 39 $\textit{b}b5$ $\textit{e}e5$ 40 $\textit{c}c3$ $\textit{d}7$ 41 $\textit{d}d4$ and the queenside pawns will decide.

38 $\textit{b}b5$  1-0

The importance of this game, which was played in round five, cannot be overestimated; it was the encounter which put me on the road to qualification for the PCA Candidates. Before it, Beliavsky was on +4 and I was on +2. This win propelled me towards the lead while Beliavsky, who had managed a fantastic start, subsequently collapsed and failed to qualify. The following game was played the round after the Beliavsky game.
Game 27

J. Benjamin – V. Anand

PCA Qualifier, Groningen 1993
Sicilian, Richter-Rauzer

1 e4 c5
2 Qf3 d6
3 d4 cxd4
4 Qxd4 Qf6
5 Qc3 Qc6
6 Qg5 e6
7 Qd2 Qe7
8 0-0-0 0-0
9 Qb3 Qb6

I had prepared the Classical Sicilian to be my main defence for this tournament, and in view of Game 4 in this book, it was ironic that we entered the same variation, but with colours reversed.

10 f3 Qd8
11 Qb1 (D)

An interesting move which forces White to decide how he is going to prevent ...d5.

12 Qxf6!

When Benjamin took on f6 I just couldn’t believe it – I hadn’t considered this move at all, believing that nobody would voluntarily give up the dark-squared bishop! However, it is a reasonable move; in return for surrendering an important minor piece, White gains time to push his kingside pawns. There are a number of alternatives, for example 12 Qb5, 12 Qf4 or 12 h4, but we will leave the relative merits of these to a book on opening theory.

12 ... Qxf6
13 g4 g6

This is a critical moment for Black. There is an argument for 13...g5, for example 14 h4 h6 15 hxg5 hxg5 16 Qh5 Qe7, followed by ...Qe5-g6, dominating the dark squares on the kingside. However, this involves a certain amount of risk, as if the position opens up, the exposed state of Black’s king may be more important than control of a few dark squares.

Black can continue with 13...a6!? 14 g5 Qe7, but after 15 f4 White
probably has a slight advantage. I preferred the text-move because it seemed to me that Black’s queenside attack, supported by the bishop on the long diagonal, would be very dangerous. I still hadn’t taken Benjamin’s idea seriously, but the next few moves show that it is not so easy for Black.

14 h4 a6
15 g5!

Now 15 h5?! would be bad, as 15...g5! 16 h6 wxe7 seizes the dark squares without opening the h-file.

15 ... g7
16 h5 b5
17 hxg6 hxg6 (D)

The text-move threatens 19 f5, which would win as Black cannot reply 19...exf5 because of 20 d5. Thus Black is forced to drive the knight away from c3.

18 ... b4
19 a4! (D)

A very comfortable square for the knight, blocking Black’s queenside attack. 19 e2 a5! would be much weaker.

18 f4!

After 18 d3 e5 19 f4 dxd3! (not 19...c4 20 xc4 wxc4 21 wxc4 with a dangerous attack) 20 cxd3 (20 wxd3 b4! 21 e2 a5 is similar) 20...b4 21 e2 a5 the position is unclear, with both sides having attacking chances.

19 ... h8

After 19...e5 20 fxe5! (20 c4 exf4 21 wxf4 e5 22 d5 b7 is unclear) 20...dxe5 (both 20...dxe5 21 d3 and 20...dxe5 21 c4! favour White) 21 xb4 Black has insufficient compensation, but at least he doesn’t have to worry about his king! In fact this drastic remedy might be necessary; I just hadn’t realized how critical my position was.

20 h2

This is one way to build up on the h-file, but it was also very dangerous
to play 20 \textit{d3}!?, followed by \textit{h4}, \textit{h2} and \textit{h1}.

The queen on h2 is not only effective down the h-file; in some lines it can act along the h2-b8 diagonal, for example by f5 followed by \textit{ac5}.

20 ... \textit{f8} (D)

Time to get the king out! The alternatives are:

1) 20...e5? 21 f5 gxf5 22 \textit{w7}+ \textit{f8} 23 exf5 and White wins.

2) 20...\textit{d7} 21 \textit{d3} \textit{e7}? (the best move is 21...\textit{f8}, transposing to the following note) 22 \textit{h3} \textit{f8} 23 \textit{h7}! \textit{g8} 24 f5!? (24 \textit{r7} \textit{r7} 25 \textit{h8}+ \textit{f8} 26 \textit{h7} is less clear after 26...\textit{e7}) and now:

2a) 24...\textit{e5} 25 \textit{xf7}+ \textit{xf7} 26 \textit{w7}+ \textit{g7} 27 \textit{fxg6}+ \textit{f8} 28 \textit{d3} with a decisive attack.

2b) 24...\textit{xa4} 25 \textit{r7} \textit{r7} 26 \textit{h8}+ \textit{f8} 27 \textit{h7} \textit{e8} 28 f6 forcing mate.

2c) 24...\textit{xf5} 25 \textit{ac5} \textit{c8} 26 \textit{xg7} \textit{xg7} 27 \textit{h8}+ \textit{f8} 28 \textit{h7} winning for White.

21 \textit{h3} e5

21...\textit{d7} was also possible, for example 22 \textit{h3} (22 f5 \textit{exf5} 23 \textit{ac5} is unclear) 22...\textit{e7}! 23 \textit{w2} (23 \textit{h7} \textit{h8} 24 \textit{f2} \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2} Landenbergue-Georges, Swiss Team Championship 1994) 23...e5! (23...\textit{f8} 24 \textit{h7} \textit{e7} 25 \textit{h2} and 23...\textit{a5} 24 \textit{f5} \textit{xa4} 25 f6+ \textit{xf6} 26 gxf6+ \textit{xf6} 27 \textit{w3} \textit{xb3} 28 \textit{f3}+! are good for White) 24 \textit{h7} \textit{h8} with an unclear position.

22 f5

22 \textit{h3} \textit{exf4} 23 \textit{xf4} \textit{e5} is fine for Black.

22 ... \textit{gxf5}

23 \textit{h3}! \textit{e7}?! (D)

23...f4? 24 \textit{h7}! and 23...\textit{xe4} 24 \textit{h7} \textit{e6} 25 \textit{xg7} win for White, but 23...\textit{e7}! 24 \textit{h7} \textit{g8} was a better defence.

24 \textit{h8}+

A critical moment. At first sight 24 \textit{h7} appears very dangerous, but Black can defend:
1) 24...\(\Box g8\)? 25 \(\Box xg7\) \(\Box xg7\) 26 \(\Box h8+\) \(\Box f8\) 27 \(\Box h7\) \(\Box e6\) 28 exf5 \(\Box dc8\) 29 \(\Box c3\) bxc3 30 fxe6! and wins.

2) 24...\(\Box g6\)! 25 \(\Box xg7\) \(\Box xg7\) 26 \(\Box h6+\) \(\Box g8\) and now Black is better. The continuation might be 27 \(\Box e2\) \(\Box w7\) 28 \(\Box h5\) \(\Box f8\) 29 \(\Box xg6\) \(\Box xh6\) 30 \(\Box xh6\) fxg6 31 \(\Box xg6+\) \(\Box h7\) with a winning ending.

24 ...
\(\Box g8\)
Not 24...\(\Box xh8?\) 25 \(\Box xh8+\) \(\Box g8\) 26 \(\Box h7\) transposing to line 1 of the previous note.

25 \(\Box xg8+!\)
After 25 \(\Box w7\) \(\Box xh8\) 26 \(\Box xh8\) \(\Box e7!\) the attack peter's out.

25 ...
\(\Box xg8\)

26 \(\Box h7+\)
\(\Box f8\)

27 exf5 \((D)\)

27 ...
\(\Box xf5!\)

27...\(\Box e7!?\) is possible, but White is slightly better after 28 f6 \(\Box xf6\) 29 gxf6 \(\Box xf6\) 30 \(\Box h3\).

28 \(\Box xf5\)
\(\Box c6\)

29 g6! \(\Box b7\)
30 \(\Box h7?!\)

Later on, the computer Deep Blue suggested 30 \(\Box g5!\). Black's best appears to be 30...\(\Box c8\) 31 \(\Box g2\) \(\Box bc7\) (31...e4? 32 \(\Box a5\) really does win) 32 \(\Box xc6\) \(\Box xc6\) 33 \(\Box d3\) d5! White is better, but his minor pieces are not well placed and so Black might be able to generate a lot of counterplay.

Coincidentally, Benjamin later ended up working for the Deep Blue team in their matches against Kasparov.

30 ...
\(\Box xa4\) \((D)\)

31 \(\Box g5?!\)

Here is White's last chance to force a clear-cut draw, for example:

1) 31 \(\Box c4\) d5 (31...\(\Box d7\) 32 \(\Box h5\) is unclear, but 31...\(\Box dd7\) 32 \(\Box f3\) is probably good for White) 32 \(\Box c5\) \(\Box c6\) 33 \(\Box xb7\) \(\Box xb7\) 34 \(\Box xa6\) \(\Box d7\) leads to a drawn ending.

2) 31 \(\Box xg7\) \(\Box xg7\) 32 gxf7 and now:
2a) 32...\textit{xf7}? 33 \textit{g5+ \textit{h7} 34 \textit{d3+ wins for White.}
2b) 32...\textit{f8}? 33 \textit{g4+ \textit{xf7} 34 \textit{c4+ \textit{f6} 35 \textit{f3+ is also winning.}
2c) 32...\textit{f8} 33 \textit{g5 \textit{d7} (not 33...\textit{bb8 34 \textit{c4 d5 35 \textit{g8+ \textit{e7 36 \textit{g7 \textit{f8 37 \textit{c5 and Black loses) 34 \textit{c4 d5 35 \textit{g8+ \textit{e7 36 \textit{g5+ \textit{xf7 37 \textit{h5+ \textit{g8 38 \textit{g5+ draws.}
2d) 32...\textit{d7 33 \textit{g5+ \textit{xf7} 34 \textit{c5 dxc5 (34...\textit{e7? 35 \textit{h5+) 35 \textit{c4+ with perpetual check.
31 ... \textit{e8
White still has an amazing number of attacking possibilities, but Black seems to be able to hold out with accurate defence. Here he must avoid 31...\textit{c8 32 \textit{xg7 \textit{xg7 33 \textit{gxf7+ \textit{xf7} 34 \textit{f5+ and 31...\textit{e8 32 \textit{xg7 \textit{xg7 33 \textit{gxf7+ \textit{xf7} 34 \textit{c4+, with a win for White in either case.
32 \textit{xa6 (D)

After 32 \textit{g2!? (32 \textit{a5 \textit{c7 33 \textit{c6? f6 wins for Black) Black again must be very careful:

1) 32...\textit{e7 33 \textit{h5 wins.
2) 32...\textit{c7? 33 \textit{xg7 \textit{xg7 34 \textit{xf7+ \textit{xf7} 35 \textit{d5+ also wins.
3) 32...\textit{e4? 33 \textit{xg7 \textit{xg7 34 \textit{xf7+ \textit{xf7} 35 \textit{d5+ gaining material.
4) 32...\textit{d5! 33 \textit{c5 \textit{e7! defends.
32 ... \textit{e7! (D)

33 \textit{d3
Threatening to win by 34 \textit{xg7 \textit{xg7 35 \textit{gxf7+ \textit{xf7} 36 \textit{g6+.
33 ... \textit{e4!
34 \textit{b5
White has nothing better, for example:
1) 34 \textit{xe4 \textit{xe4 35 \textit{xf7 \textit{e1+ 36 \textit{c1 \textit{xc1+! 37 \textit{xc1 \textit{e5 defends.
2) 34 \textit{c4 d5 35 \textit{xd5 \textit{e5 36 \textit{gxf7 \textit{xg5 37 fxe8\textit{w+ \textit{xe8 wins for Black.
3) 34 \textit{xg7 \textit{xg7 35 \textit{gxf7+ \textit{xf7 36 \textit{c4+ d5 37 \textit{xd5+ \textit{xd5 38 \textit{xd5+ \textit{f8 with good winning chances for Black.
34 ... $\text{He5!}$
Forcing the following liquidation.
35 $\text{gxf7}$ $\text{Hxg5}$
36 $\text{fxe8}$+$ $\text{Hxe8}$
37 $\text{Axe8}$ $\text{Hg1+!}$
38 $\text{Cc1}$ $\text{Hxe8}$ (D)

39 $a4??$
A blunder caused by time-trouble.
White had to try 39 $c3$ (getting rid of the c-pawn to release the king)
39...$\text{bxc3}$ (39...$b3$? 40 $\text{axb3}$ $\text{Af6}$ 41 $\text{Cc2}$ $\text{Ag5}$ 42 $\text{De2}$ $\text{He1}$ is ingenious, but leads to less than nothing after 43 $\text{Hh2}$!) 40 $\text{bxc3}$ $\text{Cc3}$ 41 $\text{Cc2}$ $\text{Af6}$, when Black is clearly better, but the reduced material gives White some drawing chances.

39 ... $\text{bxa3}$
40 $\text{bxa3}$ $\text{Cc3!}$
With total paralysis.
41 $\text{Hh4}$ $d5$
0-1

This game gave me the clear lead and, unlike at Biel, I reached the necessary score very comfortably.

At the beginning of 1994 I played my first-round match in the FIDE Candidates cycle against Artur Yusupov, which I won 4½-2½. In the draw for the second-round matches I was paired against Gata Kamsky. Before the match took place, Gata and I participated in the Linares tournament and we met in the very first round. In view of the forthcoming match, the game had more importance than a normal tournament game. In fact we were to spend a lot of time with each other in the following years...
Game 28
V. Anand – G. Kamsky
Linares 1994
Sicilian, Najdorf

1 e4 c5
2 d4 cxd4
3 e4 d6
4 cxd4 e6
5 c3 a6

At the time Kamsky played many openings, but I wasn’t sure whether he had really studied them or whether he gave priority to being difficult to prepare for. Later it became clear that he does study a lot and understands a lot of different openings, but not too well! I often encountered holes in his repertoire.

6 e3 e5
7 b3 e6
8 f3 e7

The thematic Sicilian thrust 8...d5 does not equalize here: 9 exd5 cxd5 10 ef4 xf4 11 c4 b4+ 12 ef2 e6 13 xd8+ xd8 14 d1+ gives White an advantageous ending.

9 w2 bd7
10 g4 h6

10...b5 is less accurate as White may continue 11 a4! b4 12 d5 xd5 13 exd5, when 13...b6 fails to 14 a5! bxd5 15 g5 xe3 16 gxf6 xf6 17 fxe7 xe7 18 xf6 and White wins a piece.

11 h4 b5 (D)

12 g1

This idea, which came to me over the board, is borrowed from the game against Ftáčnik (Game 23). Although the position is completely different, the idea is the same – White saves a tempo by missing out 0-0-0 and uses it to push through g5 as quickly as possible.

12... b4
12...b6!? 13 g5 h5 14 h5 g3 fd7 is another possible continuation.

13 a4

Later it turned out that 12 g1 had been played before, only to be followed up by the weak 13 e2?, when 13...a5 14 g5 h5 gave Black
a fine position in Los-De Boer, Groningen Open 1990.

13 ... d5 (D)

13...a5 14 g5 hxg5 15 hxg5 \(\text{\(\mathcal{h}5\)}\) is unclear.

14 g5 d4

It is hard to judge how the disappearance of the h-pawns affects the position. After 14...hxg5 15 hxg5 d4 16 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{h}d4\)}\)}\) (16 gxf6 dxe3 17 wxe3 \(\text{\(\mathcal{h}x f6\)}\) and now White has to play 18 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{h}d3\)}\)}\) in order to castle; the resulting position is unclear) Black can try:

1) 16...\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}b3\)}\)}\) 17 gxf6 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}f6\)}\)}\) 18 axb3 exd4 19 0-0-0 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{e}5\)}\)}\) with the same position as in the game, minus the h-pawns. Certainly the h-file is bad for Black if he castles, but in some other lines it is useful. Still, 20 f4 looks good for White anyway after 20...\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{f}3\)}\)}\) 21 w\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{g}2\)}\)}\) \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}g1\)}\)}\) 22 w\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}g1\)}\)}\) (here 22 e5 allows 22...\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}e5\)}\)}\) 23 fxe5 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{h}3\)}\)}\) and the knight escapes) and I think White has great long-term compensation.

2) 16...\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}e4\)}\)}\) 17 fxe4 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}b3\)}\)}\) 18 axb3 exd4 (here the interpolation of ...hxg5 favours Black – compare the note to Black’s 15th move in the game) 19 0-0-0 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{e}5\)}\)}\) is unclear.

15 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}d4!\)}\)}\)

Not 15 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{f}2?\)}\)}\) \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{h}5\)}\)}\) and Black is better.

15 ...

16 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}b3\)}\)}\) (D)

After 15...\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}e4\)}\)}\) 16 fxe4 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}b3\)}\)}\) 17 axb3 (not 17 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{b}6\)}\)}\) \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}b6\)}\)}\) and Black has no problems) 17...exd4 18 w\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}d4\)}\)}\) hxg5 19 0-0-0! (19 hxg5 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}g5\)}\)}\) 20 w\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}g7\)}\)}\) \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{h}4+\)}\)}\) 21 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{e}2\)}\)}\) \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{f}6\)}\)}\) 22 w\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{g}3\)}\)}\) is unclear) White seems to have a pleasant edge, for example after 19...\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}h4\)}\)}\) both 20 w\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}g7\)}\)}\) \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{f}6\)}\)}\) 21 w\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{g}8+\)}\)}\) \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{e}7\)}\)}\) 22 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}d7+\)}\)}\) \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}d7\)}\)}\) 23 w\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}f7+\)}\)}\) and the simple 20 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{c}4\)}\)}\) are very good for White.

16 gxf6

16 axb3 \(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}e4\)}\)}\) 17 fxe4 is also promising, transposing into the note to Black’s 15th move.

16 ...

\(\text{\(\text{\(\mathcal{x}f6\)}\)}\)
16...\text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}}}a4? 17 fxe7 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}}}xe7 18 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{f}}}}}f2 is good for White.
17 axb3 exd4
18 0-0-0

Now White threatens simply f4 and e5, with an overwhelming position, so Black has to take countermeasures.

18 ... \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}e5} (D)

The critical line as 18...\text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}h4}}? 19 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}xd4}, 18...0-0 19 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}xh6} and 18...\text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}a5} 19 f4 (followed by e5) are all very good for White.

19 f4!!
The most forcing continuation. The alternatives are:

1) 19 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{g}}}g2 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}h4}} 20 f4 0-0! is not very dangerous for Black.

2) 19 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}g2 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}g6} 20 h5 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}f4} 21 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}g4 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e}}}e5} 22 \text{\texttt{\texttt{e}}}c5 0-0 23 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}f5 with an edge for White.

3) 19 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{e}}}e2}, intending 20 f4, is also promising as 19...d3 may be met by 20 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}e3!.

19 ... \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}f3}

20 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}g2 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}g1}
21 e5 0-0

After 21...\text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}h4}} 22 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}xg7 \text{\texttt{\texttt{f}}}f8 23 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}xg1, followed by \text{\texttt{\texttt{g}}}g2, \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}xd4}, etc., White has an enormous attack.

22 \text{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}d3!

White wants to take on g1 with his rook, so as to tie Black down to the defence of g7. After 22 exf6 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}xf6} 23 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}xg1 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}xf4+ 24 \text{\texttt{\texttt{b}}}b1 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}xh4 White is not as well placed to attack Black’s king as after 22 \text{\texttt{\texttt{d}}}d3.

22 ... \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}e5}}!

White wins after 22...\text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}h4}} 23 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}g1}} g6 (or 23...g5 24 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}h3!) 24 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}g6}} \text{\texttt{\texttt{h}}}h8 25 \text{\texttt{\texttt{h}}}h7! \text{\texttt{\texttt{g}}}g5 26 fxg5 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}h7} 27 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}e4+ \text{\texttt{\texttt{h}}}h8 28 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}h4 \text{\texttt{\texttt{g}}}g8 29 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}xh6, followed by \text{\texttt{\texttt{h}}}h1 or g6.

23 fxe5 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}xh4
24 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}g1}} (D)

24 ... \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}f4+

The ending after 24...\text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}g5+} 25 \text{\texttt{\texttt{w}}}xg5 hxd5 26 \text{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{\texttt{x}}}g5}} is favourable for White.

25 \text{\texttt{\texttt{b}}}b1!
25 \textit{\texttt{W}}d2 was also possible, but the text is more incisive.

25 \ldots \textit{\texttt{W}}xe5 \textit{(D)}

In this position Black has a rook and three pawns for a bishop and a knight, and there is no obvious way for White’s attack to break through, so it might appear favourable for Black. However, it turns out that the most important factor is the initiative. White can keep harassing Black before he can coordinate his rooks.

26 \textit{\texttt{Q}}c5! \textit{\texttt{H}}a7

Black could have removed the danger to his king by jettisoning a couple of pawns: 26...\textit{\texttt{H}}ad8 (26...\textit{\texttt{H}}fd8 27 \textit{\texttt{Q}}d7 \textit{\texttt{W}}g5 28 \textit{\texttt{W}}h1! is also very good for White) 27 \textit{\texttt{Q}}xa6 and now:

1) 27...\textit{\texttt{A}}fe8 28 \textit{\texttt{Q}}xb4 g5 29 \textit{\texttt{A}}f1 (not 29 \textit{\texttt{Q}}c6?? \textit{\texttt{W}}e1+ mating), followed by \textit{\texttt{Q}}c6.

2) 27...\textit{\texttt{H}}a8 28 \textit{\texttt{Q}}xb4, followed by \textit{\texttt{Q}}c6 and b4-b5, when White should win.

Threatening 28 \textit{\texttt{W}}xh6.

27 \ldots \textit{\texttt{W}}e3

Or 27...\textit{\texttt{H}}h8 (27...\textit{\texttt{W}}e8 28 \textit{\texttt{Q}}d7 \textit{\texttt{W}}e3 29 \textit{\texttt{Q}}f6+ wins) 28 \textit{\texttt{Q}}d7 \textit{\texttt{W}}e3 29 \textit{\texttt{Q}}xf8! \textit{\texttt{W}}xg1+ 30 \textit{\texttt{Q}}a2 (the threat is 31 \textit{\texttt{W}}c8) 30...g6 31 \textit{\texttt{W}}c5 \textit{\texttt{H}}a8 32 \textit{\texttt{W}}e5+ \textit{\texttt{Q}}g8 33 \textit{\texttt{Q}}xg6 fxg6 34 \textit{\texttt{W}}d5+ and wins.

28 \textit{\texttt{H}}g2 \textit{\texttt{H}}h8
29 \textit{\texttt{W}}e2 \textit{\texttt{W}}g1+
30 \textit{\texttt{Q}}a2 \textit{(D)}

Now the threat is 31 \textit{\texttt{W}}e8 \textit{\texttt{Q}}g8 32 \textit{\texttt{H}}xf8+ \textit{\texttt{Q}}xf8 33 \textit{\texttt{W}}d6+ mating. Black has still not been able to coordinate his pieces and, indeed, in order to meet White’s threat he is obliged to retract his 26th move.

30 \ldots \textit{\texttt{H}}aa8

Now White aims to transfer his knight to e5, when the weakness of f7 will tell.

31 \textit{\texttt{Q}}d7 \textit{\texttt{H}}ac8

Black loses after 31...\textit{\texttt{H}}fc8 32 \textit{\texttt{W}}f3 or 31...\textit{\texttt{H}}fd8 32 \textit{\texttt{Q}}e5.

32 \textit{\texttt{W}}f3 \textit{f}5
After 32...\[\text{h}e8 33 \text{f}e5 the f7-square is fatally weak.

33 \text{xf}8 \text{c}c5 (D)

Or 33...\[\text{xf}8 34 \text{b}7 and White’s initiative is too strong. The text-move is a dangerous try, but White has a good reply ready.

34 \text{g}6+!

The simplest method, although 34 \text{xf}5 \text{xf}5 35 \text{xf}5 \text{f}1 (35...g5 36 \text{e}7 and 35...\text{g}8 36 \text{g}6! also win for White) 36 \text{g}6+ \text{h}7 37 \text{h}4+!

would also have been effective.

34 ... \text{w}xg6

After 34...\text{h}7 White prevents the mate by 35 \text{e}5.

35 \text{e}1 \text{f}6
36 \text{a}8+ \text{h}7
37 \text{c}4

White’s attack is too strong.

37 ... \text{c}6
38 \text{g}8+ \text{g}6
39 \text{g}1+ \text{g}4 1-0

As 39...\text{h}5 40 \text{e}2+ \text{h}4 41 \text{d}5 leads to mate.

Although the above game was a good start, the rest of the tournament didn’t go so well – I barely made 50%, which amounted to a fairly lousy result. The following game was the only other high spot – but it was quite pleasant!
Game 29

V. Anand – J. Polgar

Linares 1994

Sicilian, Najdorf

1 e4 c5
2 ∆f3 e6
3 d4 cxd4
4 ∆xd4 ∆f6
5 ∆c3 d6

Giving White the chance to play a Scheveningen, but I decided to transpose into the English Attack.

6 ∆e3 a6
7 f3 ∆bd7

I was surprised that she chose the ...∆bd7 system, because an earlier game of Kasparov had seemed to show that White could gain a strong initiative. However, Judit comes up with an improvement.

8 g4 h6
9 ∆g1 b5!

Better than 9...∆b6?! , when the continuation 10 a3 ∆e5 11 ∆f2 ∆c7 12 f4 0-0-0 13 ∆xc4 ∆xc4 14 ∆f3 e5 15 0-0-0 ∆xf5 16 gxf5 d5 17 fxe5 ∆xe4 18 ∆g4 was very good for White in Kasparov-Kamsky, Linares 1993.

10 h4 ∆b6

10...g6 has been played before, so this is the innovation.

11 g5 ∆fd7!

After 11...hxg5 12 hxg5 0-0-0 13 ∆xe3 16 g6, with the idea 13...h2 14 gxf7+
14 0-0-0  
15  
16 f4 (D)

16 ...  

After 16...Cc8 White also plays 17 Wg4, with the plan of eliminating the dangerous knight by Cxc4.
17 Wg4!

Once again White’s priority is to eliminate the knight. Black’s queenside play appears dangerous, but she cannot land a ...Cx b2 blow before the knight is swapped off.

Note that 17 Cb3 Cc7 is inferior, since next move 18...Cg7 really will threaten to take on b2.

17 ... 0-0-0?

This allows an unusual combination, so 17...Cc8 would have been better:

1) 18 Cxe6? Cxb2 is good for Black.

2) 18 Cxc4 Cxc4 19 Cxe6! fxe6 (19...Cxc3 20 Cxc3 fxe6 21 Wxe6+ Cd8 22 Cd4 Ch2 23 Kh1! with advantage to White) 20 Wxe6+ Cd8 21 Cd4 is unclear.

3) 18 Cb3!? Wc7 19 Cxc4 Wxc4 (19...bxc4 20 Cd4 and Black’s centralized king is a ready target) 20 Da5 Cc7 21 Cxb7 Wxb7 22 Cd4 leading to a double-edged position.

18 Cxc4 bxc4 (D)

19 Cxe6!

While this sacrifice is perfectly normal when Black’s king is still on e8, it is unusual when Black has already castled queenside. However, here White is not aiming for a direct attack but for positional compensation.

19 ... fxe6
20 Wxe6 Cb8

After 20...Cg7 (the continuation 20...d5 21 Cxd5 is also favourable for White) 21Cd4! Cxd4 22 Cd4 Wb6 23 Cgd1! Black will shed some more pawns (note that 23...Ch1?? fails to 24 Cxc4+).

21 Wxg6!
Gaining a third pawn for the piece. Unless Black develops counterplay quickly the passed g-pawn will decide the game.

21 ... \textit{Hh3 (D)}
21...\textit{Qc5?} loses to 22 \textit{Xxc5 \textit{Xxc5}}
23 \textit{Wf6!}.

22 \textit{Qb1!}

The most straightforward way to nullify Black’s threat of ...\textit{Xxc3}. Instead, for example, 22 \textit{Qd4? \textit{Xxc3!}}
23 \textit{Xxc3 \textit{Wa2}} would allow unnecessary complications. 22 \textit{Wf5 \textit{Xf5}}
23 \textit{Exf5 \textit{Af3}} 24 \textit{Gf1} is playable, but more complicated after 24...\textit{Gg7!}
25 \textit{Ge2} (25 \textit{Ff6 \textit{Xf6}} 26 \textit{Gxf6 \textit{Af6}} with just an edge for White) 25...\textit{Cc8!}
26 \textit{Qd4 \textit{Ee8}}. White is still better, but if Black returns the piece, then the ending would be difficult, so I preferred to keep the queens on.

22 ... \textit{Hf3}

White wins after 22...\textit{Xxc3} 23 \textit{Qe1}.

23 \textit{Qd4}

23 \textit{Gf1!} would have been more precise – there was no need to give up one of the pawns.

23 ... \textit{Xf4}
24 \textit{Wh7! (D)}

24 ...

\textit{D5?}

Black’s best chance was 24...\textit{Cc5}
25 \textit{G6 \textit{Xe4}} 26 \textit{G7 \textit{Xg7}} 27 \textit{Xg7}
\textit{Xc3+} 28 \textit{Xc3} (28 \textit{Bxc3 Qe4 leads to an unclear position}) 28...\textit{Wd5} 29 \textit{Cc1}, although I think that White has a clear advantage. His king is ultra-safe, while Black’s is very weak. Opposite-coloured bishops only begin to exert their drawish tendency once the major pieces have been exchanged, but here all the major pieces are still on the board so Black is going to come under a very strong attack.

After the text-move White wins comfortably.

25 \textit{G6 \textit{Cc5}}

Now 25...\textit{Dxe4} 26 \textit{G7 \textit{Xg7}} is ineffective and White wins easily by
continuing 27 \( \text{Bxg7} \) \( \text{c6} \) 28 \( \text{h6} \) \\
\( \text{c7} \) 29 \( \text{b6} \).
26 \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{xc5} \)
Or 26...\( \text{xc5} \) 27 \( g7 \) \( \text{f6} \) 28 \( g8 \) \\
\( \text{Xg8} \) (28...\( \text{Xg8} \) 29 \( \text{Xg8} \) 29 \( \text{Xg8}+ \) \( \text{Xg8} \) 30 \( \text{Xg8}+ \) \( \text{a7} \) 31 \( \text{exd5} \) with \\
a simple win.
27 \( g7 \) \( \text{a7} \)
28 \( g8 \) \\
28 \( \text{Xxd5} \) was also very good.
28 ... \( \text{Xg8} \)
29 \( \text{Xg8} \) \( \text{xe4} \)
30 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{xe4} \)
31 \( \text{g7} \) \( \text{c5} \)
32 \( \text{ge1} \) \( \text{f4} \)
33 \( \text{e7} \) \( \text{b6} \)
34 \( \text{g5} \) \( c3 \)
35 \( b3 \) \( \text{b4} \)
36 \( \text{c7} \) \( \text{e4} \)
36...\( \text{b6} \) 37 \( \text{xc3} \).

37 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{b8} \) (\( D \))

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

38 \( \text{d8}+ \) \( \text{a7} \)
39 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{xa3} \)
1-0

White mates in five: 40 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{xb7} \) 41 \( \text{d7}+ \) \( \text{c6} \) 42 \( \text{c7}+ \) \( \text{b5} \) \\
43 \( \text{d5}+ \) \( \text{b4} \) 44 \( \text{b6}# \).
Game 30
V. Anand – G. Kamsky
PCA Candidates (3), Las Palmas 1995
Ruy Lopez, Arkhangelsk

1 e4 e5
2 d4 f3 d6
3 c5 b5
4 a4 f6
5 0-0 b5
6 b3 b7

Kamsky plays a lot of different openings, and here he decides to play the Arkhangelsk. However, this was no surprise; he played it in the 1994 FIDE Candidates match in Sanghi Nagar, which I lost, and subsequently played it against Short in their PCA Candidates match.

7 4e1 c5
8 c3 d6
9 d4 b6
10 e3 0-0

Not 10...e5xe4? 11 d5 and White wins a piece.

11 ebd2 h6
12 h3

I was following the game Short-Kamsky, PCA Candidates (6), Linares 1994, which continued 12...d7 13 a3 e7 14 a2 h8 15 b4 and was eventually won by Black. I had prepared some new ideas in this game, but in fact Kamsky was the first to vary.

12 ... wb8!? (D)

This looks an odd move, but Black is trying to batter down d4 by ...wa7. The problem is that it allows White to play d5.

13 d5! e7
The tactical variation 13...xe3 14 dxc6 xxd2 15 cxb7 xe1 16 bxa8+ xf2+ 17 xf2 xa8 18 d2 xe4+ 19 xe4 xe4 20 d5! leads to an ending in which White has a slight advantage. Gata played 13...e7 very quickly so he obviously didn’t believe this line.

14 xb6 cxb6
15 c2!

After 15 a4 bxa4 16 xa4 d8 Black has a satisfactory position.

15 ... d7
A critical moment. One of the points of 12...\textit{wb}8 (as opposed to the similar line 12...\textit{We}e8 13 d5 \textit{Qe}7 14 \textit{x}xb6 cxb6 15 \textit{Cc}2 \textit{Qd}7) is that by leaving the rook on f8 Black sets up the immediate threat of ...\textit{f}5. It is also helpful for Black that his queen defends d6, since after ...\textit{f}5 a white knight might easily come to e4.

I decided that it is imperative to stop ...\textit{f}5, and to this end I was able to use the negative side of ...\textit{wb}8, namely that on b8 the queen does not exert a latent influence on the d8-h4 diagonal.

16 \textit{Qh}4! \textit{Wd}8 (D)

16...\textit{f}5 is bad in view of 17 \textit{Q}xf5 \textit{Q}xf5 18 exf5 \textit{Q}xd5 19 \textit{Qe}4, so Gata decides simply to return the queen to d8. However, this in itself shows that White’s strategy was correct.

17 \textit{Qf}3! (D)

A difficult choice as 18 \textit{Q}f5 \textit{Q}xf5 19 exf5 \textit{Q}f6 was also tempting. After, for example, 20 \textit{Q}e4 \textit{Q}c8 21 f3 \textit{Q}c5 22 \textit{Q}e3 \textit{Q}g7, White has cemented everything but the position becomes rather closed and I wasn’t sure that I would be able to break through on the kingside later.

The text-move is more complicated, but promises a larger advantage if everything works out. One factor in the decision was that at this
point of the match I was a point down and badly needed a win.

Now, however, 22...\(\texttt{Qe7} \ 23 \texttt{Qg3}\) leaves both knights ideally posted.

\[\texttt{23 \ Qxe3}\]

Black is in a very bad way because it is almost impossible to defend f5.

\[\texttt{23 ... Hf4 (D)}\]

After 23...\(\texttt{Hf6} \ 24 \texttt{Wh5} \texttt{Hf7} \ 25 \texttt{We2}\), threatening 26 \(\texttt{Qg4}\), White also has a clear advantage.

\[\texttt{18 \ldots}\ \texttt{f5}\]

After 18...\(\texttt{Qg7} \ 19 \texttt{Qe3}\) White again prevents ...f5.

\[\texttt{19 exf5 Qxf5}\]

\[\texttt{20 Qh2!}\]

A key move, with the idea of re-grouping the knight via g4. White intends using all the light squares and the weakness of the b1-h7 diagonal. Black is unable to mount a counter-attack against d5 quickly enough to deflect White from his plan.

\[\texttt{20 \ldots}\ \texttt{Wh6}\]

After 20...\(\texttt{Qe7}\)? 21 \(\texttt{Qe3}\) White consolidates his grip.

\[\texttt{21 Qg4 Wh7}\]

The queen comes across to support the weakened kingside.

\[\texttt{22 Qge3!}\]

After 22 \(\texttt{Qfe3}\ \texttt{Qe7}\) the knight on g4 has nowhere to go.

\[\texttt{22 \ldots}\ \texttt{Qxe3}\]

\[\texttt{24 a4!!}\]

White would like to occupy f5, but neither 24 \(\texttt{Qf5}\ \texttt{Hf8}\) 25 \(\texttt{Qe6+}\ \texttt{Qh8}\) nor 24 \(\texttt{g3}\ \texttt{Hf6}\) 25 \(\texttt{Qf5}\ \texttt{Haf8}\) is really good for White. However, 24 \(\texttt{Qf5}\ \texttt{Hf6}\) 25 \(\texttt{Qg3!}\) was a good alternative to the text-move, with ideas of \(\texttt{Qh5/Qe4}\) and \(\texttt{Wh5}\).

\[\texttt{24 \ldots}\ \texttt{Haf8}\]

The point of White’s play is that if one pair of rooks can be exchanged, then the occupation of f5 will be permanent, e.g. 24...\(\texttt{bxa4}\) (24...\(\texttt{b4}\) 25 \(\texttt{g3}\) \(\texttt{Hf8}\) 26 \(\texttt{cxb4}\) is just a clear extra pawn) 25 \(\texttt{Hxa4}\) and now:
1) 25...\textit{h}af8 26 \textit{x}xf4 \textit{x}xf4 (both 26...\textit{g}xf4 27 \textit{\varnothing}f5 \textit{w}f6 28 \textit{w}h5 and 26...\textit{e}xf4 27 \textit{\varnothing}f5 \textit{w}f6 28 \textit{\varnothing}e6 are also excellent for White) 27 \textit{\varnothing}f5! and Black has no defence against g3.

2) 25...\textit{\textsc{x}}xa4 26 \textit{\textsc{x}}xa4 b5 27 \textit{\textsc{c}}c2 \textit{\textsc{f}}f6 28 b3 when White has control of \textit{f}5 and can continue with \textit{c}4.

Gata decides simply to abandon a queenside pawn.

\textbf{25 axb5 a5}

Forced, because Black cannot allow White to create a passed pawn on \textit{a}6, for example 25...\textit{\textsc{x}}xf2 26 \textit{\textsc{b}}xa6 \textit{\textsc{a}}a8 27 \textit{\textsc{f}}f1 \textit{\textsc{f}}f7 28 \textit{\textsc{e}}e1 forcing exchanges.

\textbf{26 \textit{\textsc{f}}f1 \textit{\textsc{c}}c8 27 \textit{\textsc{g}}3 (D)}

I decided that it was time to stop ...	extit{\textsc{c}}c5, but it would have been safer to play 28 \textit{\textsc{e}}e4! \textit{\textsc{c}}c5 29 \textit{\textsc{g}}2, defending the slightly weak kingside. After 29...\textit{e}4 30 \textit{\textsc{c}}c4! White starts to exploit Black's weak pawns.

\textbf{28 \ldots e4!}

A good try, activating the knight and creating some kingside counterplay. One of Kamsky's strengths is that once he realizes his position is critical, he doesn't hesitate to make the necessary sacrifices to stir up complications. Here one wasted tempo would be too late: if White could play \textit{\textsc{e}}e4, Black's position would be hopeless.

\textbf{29 \textit{\textsc{a}}xe4 \textit{\textsc{d}}e5 (D)}

After 29...\textit{\textsc{w}}xc3 30 \textit{\textsc{b}}xa5 \textit{\textsc{b}}xa5 31 \textit{\textsc{f}}f5! White wins, e.g. 31...\textit{\textsc{x}}xf5 32 \textit{\textsc{x}}xf5 \textit{\textsc{xf}}5 33 \textit{\textsc{c}}c1 or 31...\textit{\textsc{f}}f6 32 \textit{\textsc{h}}5 \textit{\textsc{h}}7 33 \textit{\textsc{f}}4.

\textbf{27 \ldots \textit{\textsc{h}}4f7}

After 27...\textit{\textsc{f}}f6 White can win with the complicated 28 \textit{\textsc{g}}xf4 \textit{\textsc{g}}xf4+ 29 \textit{\textsc{h}}2 \textit{\textsc{f}}xe3 30 \textit{\textsc{f}}xe3! \textit{\textsc{w}}g5 31 \textit{\textsc{a}}a4! or the simple 28 \textit{\textsc{h}}h2!, which just leaves the rook trapped.

\textbf{28 b4}

\textbf{30 \textit{\textsc{g}}2 axb4}

After 30...\textit{\textsc{f}}f3+ 31 \textit{\textsc{h}}1 \textit{\textsc{g}}4 32 \textit{\textsc{b}}xa5 \textit{\textsc{g}}xh3 33 \textit{\textsc{a}}xf3 \textit{\textsc{a}}xf3 34 axb6
\[ \text{xf2 35 xf2 xf2 36 a8! Black's counterplay comes to an end.} \]

31 \text{cxb4} \ 32 \text{xf3}

Necessary; White can’t continue with this knight stuck in the middle of his position.

32 \ldots \text{xf3}

33 \text{a8} \text{xh3}

33\ldots w7 34 wa1!, threatening 35 a7, is hopeless for Black.

34 \text{xf3} \text{xa8}

Despite the inaccuracy committed at move 28, White retains a large advantage.

35 \text{c1} \text{f8 (D)}

35...w2 is met by 36 c2.

The ending after 39...wa8 40 xb6 \\
wa5 41 w2 wd2 42 axd2 is winning for White.

40 \text{xb6} \text{d4}

41 \text{b8} \text{xb4}

Or 41...wa5 42 b2+ we5 (the line 42...f6 43 f8! we5 44 xe5 \\
dxe5 45 xf6 xf6 46 b6 c6 47 \\
ed3 e7 48 c4 also wins) 43 \\
xe5+ dxe5 44 ed3 and the b5-pawn advances.

42 ed3 h5

43 b6

Not 43 wh5? we1+ 44 h2 \\
xf2+ 45 g2 xg2+! 46 xg2 \\
w2+ 47 f1 wc1+ 48 e2 wc4+ \\
with perpetual check.

43 \ldots \text{h4 (D)}

43...ab5 loses instantly after 44 \\
f5+!.

36 \text{e2} \text{d7}

37 \text{c7} \text{f7}

38 \text{b7} \text{a1+}

39 \text{g1}

After 39 h2 w6 Black will develop more counterplay than in the game.

39 \ldots \text{g7}

44 g4

This pawn is very important since it shuts Black’s bishop out of the game. It may appear weakening, but Black cannot exploit this because of
White's dangerous passed pawn and the fact that Black's king is also exposed.

44 ... \( \text{b}5 \\
45 \text{d}1 \\

From the practical point of view, 45 \text{f}5+ \text{h}7 46 \text{d}1 would be better as it cuts out some tactical ideas by Black, but White has not gone wrong yet.

45 ... \( \text{b}2 \\
46 \text{f}5+ \text{x}5 \\
46...\text{h}7 loses to 47 \text{d}4 \text{xd}4 48 \text{d}4 \text{a}6 49 \text{e}6 \text{b}7 50 \text{g}5+. \\
47 \text{x}5 \text{e}2 \\
48 \text{a}4?! \\

Unnecessarily complicating matters. After 48 \text{e}1! h3 49 \text{e}8 White would win comfortably.

48 ... \( \text{f}3! (D) \\

A brilliant resource, which forces White to play very accurately. After 48...\text{b}1+ 49 \text{h}2 \text{xf}5 50 \text{d}4+ \text{f}7 51 \text{b}7 White wins far more easily.

49 \text{d}7+ \\
49 f6+ is simply met by 49...\text{xf}6. \\
49 ... \( \text{h}6 \\
Incredibly, there is no mate for White.

50 \text{e}6+ \( \text{h}5 (D) \\

51 \text{e}8+! \\
An important finesse, which forces Black to block the g4-square with his king. After 51 \text{e}1 \text{d}4 the position would be a draw.

51 ... \( \text{g}4 \\
52 \text{e}1 \\
Now everything is under control again.

52 ... \( \text{x}5 \\
53 \text{e}8 \( \text{f}3 \\
53...\text{xb}6 fails to 54 \text{d}1+ \text{f}3 55 \text{e}4+ while 53...\text{xf}5 opens the position up and allows White to resume his attack by 54 \text{f}8+ \text{g}6 55 \text{e}8+ \text{g}7 56 \text{h}2!, when Black is helpless.

54 f6 \\
There are just too many pawns.
54 ... \( \text{h5} \)

54...\( \text{xf6} \) allows 55 \( \text{e6+} \) exchanging queens.

55 f7 \( \text{d4} \) (D)

56 \( \text{e4} \)

This interference move finishes Black's resistance.

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

56...\( \text{xe4} \) 57 f8\( \text{w} \).

57 b7 \( \text{xe4} \)

58 \( \text{xe4} \)

58 \( \text{d1+} \) \( \text{f3} \) 59 b8\( \text{w} \) \( \text{xd1} \) 60 f8\( \text{w} \) is much more elegant; White loses all his original pieces but he has produced two queens.

1-0

Gata had seen enough. 58...\( \text{a1+} \) 59 \( \text{h2} \) \( \text{f6} \) 60 \( \text{h3} \) would be a possible finish.

After this struggle, which equalized the scores, there was a series of five draws in which I gradually gained the initiative. In game seven I gained a decisive advantage, but although I failed to convert this into a win it was nevertheless an important game because it dented his main opening as Black – the Flohr-Zaitsev line of the Ruy Lopez. The drawing run was finally broken in the following game.
Game 31

V. Anand – G. Kamsky

PCA Candidates (9), Las Palmas 1995
Ruy Lopez, Flohr-Zaitsev

1 e4 e5
2 ćf3 ćc6
3 ćb5 a6
4 ća4 ćf6
5 0-0 će7
6 će1 b5
7 ćb3 d6
8 c3 0-0
9 h3 će8
10 d4 ćb7
11 ćbd2 ćf8
12 a4 h6
13 ćc2 exd4
14 cxd4 ćb4
15 ćb1 ćd7 (D)

An unexpected and rather unusual move. In game seven he had played the more normal 15...c5.

16 b3!

I hadn’t prepared anything especially against 15...ćd7, although I knew all the theory. Since Kamsky must have carefully prepared this line, I decided to try to find a continuation which would take the game out of theory and after a time I noticed the move 16 b3 (16 e5 and 16 ća3 had been tried before). While there is some risk in leaving the known paths, I had spent so much time on the Flohr-Zaitsev that I felt confident in my general understanding of this type of position.

16 b3 is quite a difficult move to make if you are used to the standard theme of swinging the rook over to the kingside via a3, but blocking the third rank doesn’t mean that I am abandoning the rook to its fate. It can later have an influence along the a-file, but for this White needs to delay axb5 until it is really effective.

16 ... g6

If 16...c5, then 17 ćb2 and White prevents the usual re-deployment of the bishop by ...ćg6 and ....ćg7.

17 ćb2! (D)

The earlier game Van der Wiel-Karpov, Amsterdam 1991 continued
17 axb5 \( \text{w} \)xb5 18 d5 c6 19 \( \text{Q} \)b2 \( \text{Q} \)h5 20 dxc6 \( \text{Q} \)xc6 with an unclear position. However, in this example White played axb5 too soon; it is a useful threat and shouldn’t be executed too early.

The structure is now very similar to the Benoni Defence. White’s dream is to achieve the push e4-e5 under favourable circumstances. Obviously not 20 \( \text{Q} \)xb4?! cxb4 21 \( \text{w} \)b2 \( \text{Q} \)c3 with very active play.

\[ \]

20 ... \( \text{w} \)e7

Preparing ...\( \text{Q} \)d7.

21 \( \text{f} \)f1 (D)

Now 21 \( \text{w} \)b2 is not especially effective because Black can reply 21...\( \text{Q} \)h5.

\[ \]

17 ... \( \text{Q} \)g7
18 \( \text{w} \)c1!

This is really the new idea: White intends to play \( \text{Q} \)c3 and \( \text{w} \)b2, building up pressure on the long diagonal. Van der Wiel had analysed 18 d5 c6, which is satisfactory for Black, but the alternative 18 \( \text{Q} \)c3 c5 19 axb5 (not 19 d5? \( \text{Q} \)xe4 20 \( \text{Q} \)xg7 \( \text{Q} \)xd2 and Black wins) 19...axb5 20 \( \text{R} \)xa8 \( \text{Q} \)xa8 21 \( \text{Q} \)xb4 cxb4 22 \( \text{d} \)d3 also merited attention.

18 ... \( \text{Q} \)ac8

White gains the advantage after either 18...d5 19 e5 \( \text{Q} \)e4 20 \( \text{Q} \)xe4 dxe4 21 \( \text{Q} \)xe4 \( \text{Q} \)xe4 22 \( \text{Q} \)xe4 \( \text{Q} \)ac8 or 18...c5 19 e5 dxe5 20 dxe5.

19 \( \text{Q} \)c3 c5
20 d5

\[ \]

21 ... \( \text{Q} \)h7??

Black changes his plan and decides to retreat the knight to h7 instead. 21...\( \text{Q} \)d7 would have been better, although White has a slight advantage after 22 axb5! (22 \( \text{Q} \)xg7 \( \text{Q} \)xg7 23 \( \text{Q} \)e3 h5 followed by ...\( \text{Q} \)e5 is safer for Black) 22...axb5 23 \( \text{R} \)a7 \( \text{Q} \)xc3 24 \( \text{Q} \)xc3 \( \text{Q} \)b8! (24...\( \text{Q} \)b6 25 \( \text{w} \)c1 \( \text{Q} \)h7 26 e5 \( \text{Q} \)a8 27 exd6 \( \text{w} \)xe1 28 \( \text{w} \)f4! \( \text{Q} \)xd5 29 \( \text{Q} \)xf7+ \( \text{Q} \)g8 30 \( \text{Q} \)xg6 wins for White) 25 \( \text{w} \)d2 \( \text{Q} \)g7. This line again emphasizes the point
that White should delay axb5 until it results in a concrete gain.

22 $\text{hxg7} \text{hxg7} \\
23 $\text{Ge3! (D)}$

1b) 24 $\text{wc3+}$ (also very strong)
24...$\text{Wf6}$ (24...$\text{h7}$ 25 $\text{Qxg5+}$ $\text{Wxg5}$
26 $\text{Qg4}$ and the f6-square is a horrible weakness) 25 $\text{Wxf6+}$ $\text{Qxf6}$
26 $\text{Qxg5}$ $\text{hxg5}$ 27 axb5 axb5 28 $\text{Qa5}$
with a very promising ending for White.

2) 23...$\text{Wf6}$ 24 $\text{Qg4!}$ $\text{Wxa1}$ 25 $\text{Wxh6+}$ $\text{Qg8}$ 26 e5! (D) and now:

2a) 26...$\text{Wc3}$ 27 $\text{Qxg6}$ (not 27 $\text{Qg5}$? $\text{Wxe1+}$ 28 $\text{Qh2}$ $\text{Wxe5+}$ 29
$\text{Qxe5}$ $\text{Qxg5}$ 30 $\text{Qxg6}$ f6 and Black defends) 27...$\text{fxg6}$ 28 $\text{Qf6+!}$ $\text{Qxf6}$
29 $\text{Wxg6+}$ $\text{Qf8}$ 30 $\text{Wxf6+}$ $\text{Qg8}$ 31
$\text{Qe4!}$ winning for White.

2b) 26...$\text{dxex5}$ 27 $\text{Qg5}$ $\text{Qc7}$ 28
$\text{Qxh7}$ also wins.

2c) 26...$\text{Qxd5}$ 27 $\text{Qxg6}$ $\text{Wxe1+}$
28 $\text{Qxe1}$ $\text{fxg6}$ 29 $\text{Wxg6+}$ $\text{Qh8}$ 30
$\text{Qh6}$ $\text{Qf8}$ 31 $\text{Qf7+}$ $\text{Qxf7}$ 32 $\text{Wxf7}$
with a clear advantage for White.

2d) 26...$\text{Qxe5}$ 27 $\text{Qgxe5!}$ (not 27 $\text{Qxe5}$? $\text{dxex5}$! 28 $\text{Qg5}$ $\text{Qxb1+}$ 29
$\text{Qh2}$ $\text{Wf5}$) 27...$\text{dxex5}$ 28 $\text{Qxg6}$ $\text{Wxe1+}$
29 $\text{Qxe1}$ $\text{fxg6}$ 30 $\text{Wxg6+}$ strongly

Threatening $\text{Qg4}$.

23 ...

h5

This weakens the kingside but the alternative defences also favour White:

1) 23...$\text{Qg5}$ and now:

1a) 24 $\text{Qxg5}$ $\text{hxg5}$ (24...$\text{Wxg5}$ 25
axb5 axb5 26 f4! is very promising for White) 25 axb5 axb5 26 $\text{Qa5}$!
$\text{Wc7}$ 27 $\text{Qa7}$ when Black is in trouble:

1a1) 27...$\text{Wb6}$ 28 $\text{Qf5+}$ $\text{gxf5}$ 29
$\text{Wxg5+}$ $\text{Qf8}$ 30 $\text{Wh6+}$ $\text{Qe7}$ (30...$\text{Qg8}$
31 $\text{Qe3}$ f4 32 e5 wins) 31 e5! with a winning attack.

1a2) 27...$\text{Qa8}$ 28 $\text{Qf5+!}$ $\text{gxf5}$
(White also wins after 28...$\text{Qf6}$ 29
$\text{Qxb7}$ $\text{Wxb7}$ 30 $\text{Qxd6}$) 29 $\text{Wxg5+}$
$\text{Qf8}$ 30 $\text{Qh6+}$ $\text{Qe7}$ 31 e5! $\text{Qd8}$ 32
exd6! $\text{Qxe1+}$ 33 $\text{Qh2}$ is an attractive finish.
favours White. The queen and passed pawns are far more effective than Black’s scattered forces.

24 \text{Wd2}!?

White starts to play against the knight on b4. One idea is to play \text{Qd4} at some stage, and if \text{...exd4} then \text{Wxd4+} and \text{Wxb4}.

24 \ldots \text{Qg8}

Simply stepping off the dangerous long diagonal. After 24...\text{Wf6} 25 \text{Ha3 bxa4} 26 \text{Hxa4} or 24...\text{bxa4}!? 25 \text{Hxa4} White has a positional advantage, while 24...\text{Qf6} meets with the tactical refutation 25 axb5 axb5 26 \text{Qf5+}! \text{gxf5} 27 \text{Wg5+} \text{Qh8} 28 \text{e5} and now:

1) 28...\text{Qh7} 29 \text{Wxh5} f6 30 \text{Qxf5} \text{Qxd5} 31 \text{Qh4}! \text{Wf7} 32 \text{Qg6+} \text{Qg7} 33 e6 \text{Qxe6} 34 \text{Qxe6} \text{Qxe6} 35 \text{Qxe6} \text{Wxe6} 36 \text{Ha7+}, winning.

2) 28...\text{dxe5} 29 \text{Hxe5} \text{Wd6} 30 \text{Wh6+} \text{Qg8} 31 \text{Qxf5} \text{Qe4} 32 \text{Qg5+} \text{Qxg5} 33 \text{Wxd6} with a decisive material advantage.

25 axb5 axb5 (D)

\text{26 Qd1}!!

I spent a long time on this move, because if White delays then Black can play \text{...Ha8} and relieve the pressure. My main problem against Kamsky has always been messing up winning positions (as in the Sanghi Nagar match), so I put a special effort into being precise.

The point of the move is both to prevent \text{...Qg5} and to prepare \text{Qc3}, striking at the weak b5-pawn. It turns out that to save the pawn Black has to retreat his knight from b4, but then his most active piece disappears.

26 \ldots \text{Qa6}

Or 26...\text{Ha8} (26...\text{Qf6} 27 \text{Qc3} is very awkward for Black) 27 \text{Hxa8} \text{Hxa8} 28 \text{Qc3} \text{Wd7} 29 e5 \text{dxe5} 30 \text{Qxe5} \text{Wd6} 31 \text{Wf4} \text{Wf6} 32 \text{Wxf6} \text{Qxf6} 33 \text{d6} with a clear endgame advantage for White.

27 \text{Qc3} \text{b4} (D)

28 \text{Qb5}
28 \( \Box a4 \)!, followed by \( \Box b6-c4 \), is also very strong.
28 ... \( \Box c7 \)
After 28...\( \Box b8 \) 29 \( \Box f4 \) \( \Box d8 \) 30 \( \Box d3 \) White again consolidates his positional advantage.
29 \( \Box d3 \) \( \Box x b 5 \)
30 \( \Box x b 5 \) \( \Box d 8 \)
31 \( \Box c 4 \)!
Most Benoni players would have fainted by this point! White has a dream position: the bishop on c4 supports \( d5 \) in preparation for e4-e5, Black’s minor pieces are ineffective and his kingside is weak.
31 ... \( \Box f 6 \) (D)
Trying to bring the knight back into play.

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{W} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{B} \\
\text{34 ... \( \Box c 7 \)}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

There is no defence: 34...\( \Box d 7 \) (if 34...\( \Box a 8 \), then 35 e5 \( \Box h 7 \) 36 \( \Box g 3 \) puts Black’s position under intolerable pressure) 35 e5 \( \Box e 8 \) (35...\( \Box d 5 \)
36 \( \Box x d 5 \) and 35...dxe5 36 \( \Box x e 5 \)
\( \Box d c 7 \) 37 d6 also win for White) 36 e6 \( \Box d c 7 \) 37 exf7+ \( \Box f 7 \) 38 \( \Box e 6 \) wins for White.
35 \( \Box a 6 \)! \( \Box b 8 \)
Or 35...\( \Box d d 7 \) 36 \( \Box x b 7 \) \( \Box x b 7 \) 37 \( \Box a 8+ \) \( \Box h 7 \) 38 \( \Box f 4 \) \( \Box g 8 \) 39 e5 dxe5
40 \( \Box x e 5 \)!, followed by \( \Box e e 8 \).
36 e5!
The thematic breakthrough comes just when Black’s pieces are tied up and unable to meet the new threats generated by this move.

36 ... \( \mathbb{Q}e8 \)

Forced, as 36...\( \text{dxe}5 \) 37 \( \text{d6} \) \( \mathbb{Q}d7 \) 38 \( \mathbb{Q}xe5 \) and 36...\( \mathbb{Q}xd5 \) 37 \( \text{exd}6 \) are hopeless.

37 \( \mathbb{X}xb7 \) \( \mathbb{X}xb7 \)

38 \( \mathbb{X}xb7 \) \( \mathbb{X}xb7 \)

39 \( \mathbb{W}d8 \) \( \mathbb{W}f8 \)

40 \( \mathbb{A}a1! \)

40 \( \text{e}6 \) is less accurate as Black can still resist by 40...\( \text{fxe}6 \) 41 \( \mathbb{X}xe6 \) (41 \( \text{dxe}6 \) \( \mathbb{W}e7 \) 41...\( \mathbb{Q}g7 \) 42 \( \mathbb{W}x8+ \) \( \mathbb{Q}xf8 \) 43 \( \mathbb{A}xg6 \) \( \text{c}4 \)).

40 ... \( \mathbb{Q}c7 \)

41 \( \mathbb{W}d7 \) \( \mathbb{W}b8 \)

White can win more easily after 41...\( \mathbb{W}e8 \) 42 \( \mathbb{W}c6! \) \( \mathbb{W}xc6 \) 43 \( \text{dxc}6 \) \( \mathbb{X}b6 \) 44 \( \text{exd}6 \) or 41...\( \text{dxe}5 \) 42 \( \text{d6} \) \( \mathbb{W}e8 \) 43 \( \text{dxc}7! \) \( \mathbb{W}xd7 \) 44 \( \mathbb{A}a8+ \) \( \mathbb{Q}g7 \) 45 \( \text{c}8\mathbb{W} \).

42 \( \mathbb{W}xd6 \) \( \text{c}4 \)

The only chance.

43 \( \text{bxc}4 \) \( \mathbb{B}3 \) (\( D \))

44 \( \mathbb{A}b1 \)

I thought for some time about this move in order to find a clear-cut win. In fact 44 \( \mathbb{Q}g5 \) \( \text{b}2 \) 45 \( \mathbb{A}b1 \) \( \mathbb{A}a7 \) would also have won, but White needs to find 46 \( \mathbb{A}h2! \) (after 46 \( \mathbb{X}xb7 \) \( \mathbb{X}xb7 \) 47 \( \mathbb{W}d8+ \) \( \mathbb{Q}e8! \) 48 \( \mathbb{W}xe8+ \) \( \mathbb{Q}g7 \) Black is saved because White’s king is too exposed) 46...\( \mathbb{A}a1 \) 47 \( \mathbb{X}xb7 \) \( \mathbb{W}xb7 \) 48 \( \mathbb{W}d8+ \) \( \mathbb{Q}g7 \) (or 48...\( \mathbb{Q}e8 \) 49 \( \mathbb{W}xe8+ \) \( \mathbb{Q}g7 \) 50 \( \mathbb{W}xf7+ \) \( \mathbb{Q}h6 \) 51 \( \mathbb{W}f8+! \) \( \mathbb{X}g5 \) 52 \( \text{h}4+ \) \( \mathbb{Q}g4 \) 53 \( \mathbb{W}f3+ \) \( \mathbb{X}h4 \) 54 \( \mathbb{W}f4\#) 49 \( \mathbb{W}f6+ \) \( \mathbb{Q}h6 \) 50 \( \mathbb{X}xf7+ \) \( \mathbb{Q}h7 \) 51 \( \mathbb{W}h8\#).  

44 ... \( \text{b}2 \)

45 \( \mathbb{W}c5! \) (\( D \))

The idea is to bring the queen back to \( d4 \). Then Black’s pieces will be tied down to defending the \( b2 \)-pawn, and White can exploit his central pawns.

45 ... \( \mathbb{Q}b3 \)

45...\( \mathbb{A}a7 \) 46 \( \mathbb{W}d4 \) \( \mathbb{Q}a2 \) leaves Black equally pinned down, when White wins by 47 \( \mathbb{Q}g5 \) followed by 48 \( \text{e}6 \).
White could also win by 47 e6 c3 48 exf7+ xxf7 49 g5+ c7 50 d6+ (but not 50 e1+ d7 51 g7+ c8 52 d6! xc4! and the fight continues as 53 e8+ loses to 53...b7!) 50...d7 (50...d8 51 f7+ d7 52 e5+) 51 g7+! xd6 52 e4+.

47 ... c3
48 f4! f6
Or 48...c1+ (48...f8 49 xb2) 49 xc1 (49 h2 is also winning) 49...bxc1+ 50 xc1 with three extra pawns.

49 exf6 d5
50 f7+ 1-0
Game 32

V. Anand – G. Kamsky

PCA Candidates (11), Las Palmas 1995
Sicilian, Najdorf

1 e4 c5
2 c3 d6
3 d4 cxd4
4 cxd4 f6
5 c3 a6

I had held the 10th game with Black fairly easily, so Gata was getting a bit desperate; hence his choice of the Najdorf.
6 e3 e6
7 e2 e7
8 f4 c6
9 d2 d4
10 xd4 0-0
11 0-0-0 a5? (D)

A serious mistake, all the more surprising in that similar positions arise in the Richter-Rauzer, an opening with which Kamsky is very familiar.

11...b5 or 11...c7 would have been better.
12 b6! xb6
13 xxb6

A dream position for White, especially in view of the match situation (I needed one point from the last two games to win). White has a clear endgame advantage and can press hard for the win without the slightest risk of losing.

13 ... e8

Black also has a poor position after 13...d7 (13...d7 drops a pawn to 14 c7 while 13...e5 14 f5 does not help Black) 14 e5 dxe5 (14...e8 15 c5! with a decisive advantage) 15 fxe5 d5 16 xd5 exd5 17 f3 c8 18 xd5 (18 e3 f5 19 c3 d4 20 xd4 c5 21 xb7 c7 is less clear, for example 22 xa6 a8) 18...f5 19 b3 g5+ 20 b1. White seems to keep his pawn and though Black has a temporary initiative, White should be able to weather it.

14 e5!
Immobilizing the knight on e8.

14 ... d5
After 14...f6 15 \( \texttt{\text{Af3!}} \) (15 exf6 \( \texttt{\text{Ax}} \texttt{xf6} \) 16 \( \texttt{\text{De}} \texttt{e4} \)) is also good for White. White has strong pressure. 14...dxe5 15 fxe5 f6 16 \( \texttt{\text{Af}}} \texttt{f3} \) is similar.

\[ \text{15 } f5! \text{(D)} \]

The most forceful method. After 15 \( \texttt{\text{Ag4}} \) g6!, followed by ...\( \texttt{\text{Dg7,}} \) Black has better defensive chances.

\[ \text{15 } \ldots \text{ d7} \]

Or:

1) 15...exf5 16 \( \texttt{\text{Dx}} \texttt{xd5} \) \( \texttt{\text{Ag5+}} \) 17 \( \texttt{\text{Db1}} \) \( \texttt{\text{Ce6}} \) 18 \( \texttt{\text{Ff3}} \), followed by h4, and White stands very well because of the e8-knight.

2) 15...\( \texttt{\text{Ag5+}} \) 16 \( \texttt{\text{Db1}} \) \( \texttt{\text{Ff4!}} \) 17 \( \texttt{\text{Dd4!}} \) (17 \( \texttt{\text{Cc5 xe5}} \) 18 \( \texttt{\text{Fxf8 Bxf8}} \) is only slightly better for White) 17...b5 (17...\( \texttt{\text{Dc7}} \) 18 g3 \( \texttt{\text{Gg5}} \) 19 f6! is similar) 18 \( \texttt{\text{Df1}} \) \( \texttt{\text{Gg5}} \) 19 f6 with a large advantage.

\[ \text{16 } \texttt{\text{Ag4!}} \text{(D)} \]

White must be accurate. After 16 fxe6 fxe6 17 \( \texttt{\text{Ag4}} \) \( \texttt{\text{Cc8,}} \) followed by ...g6 and ...\( \texttt{\text{Dg7,}} \) Black might wriggle out.

\[ \text{16 } \ldots \text{ c8?} \]

After this Black is in dire trouble. The alternatives were:

1) 16...\( \texttt{\text{Cc8?}} \) 17 f6! \( \texttt{\text{Gxf6}} \) (17...\( \texttt{\text{Cc5}} \) 18 \( \texttt{\text{Dxd5 gxf6}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\text{exf6}} \) and 17...\( \texttt{\text{Dd8}} \) 18 \( \texttt{\text{Dxd5 are also winning}} \) 18 \( \texttt{\text{Dxd5}} \) \( \texttt{\text{Dd8}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\text{Dxd8 exd5}} \) (19...\( \texttt{\text{Dxd8}} \) 20 \( \texttt{\text{Dxb6}} \) 20 \( \texttt{\text{Dxd7 Dxd8}} \) 21 e6 winning either a clear pawn or the exchange for a pawn.

2) 16...\( \texttt{\text{Bb4!}} \) 17 fxe6 \( \texttt{\text{Axe6}} \) 18 \( \texttt{\text{Dxd5!}} \) (18 \( \texttt{\text{Ff3 xc3}} \) 19 bxc3 \( \texttt{\text{Cc8}} \) 20 \( \texttt{\text{Dxd5 Dxd5}} \) 21 \( \texttt{\text{Dxd5 Dc7}} \) is not clear) 18...\( \texttt{\text{Dxg4}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\text{Dd4}} \) winning a pawn.

3) 16...\( \texttt{\text{Ag5+}} \) 17 \( \texttt{\text{Db1 Cc8}} \) (after 17...exf5 18 \( \texttt{\text{Ff3 xc6}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\text{Dxd5}} \)) the e8-knight is again a serious handicap. 18 fxe6 \( \texttt{\text{Axe6}} \) (or 18...\( \texttt{\text{Fxe6}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\text{Dxd5 and wins}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\text{Ff3 with a clear advantage to White.}} \)

4) 16...exf5 is most simply met by 17 \( \texttt{\text{Ff3!}} \) as in line 3 above. 17 \( \texttt{\text{Dxd5?!}} \) is less clear after 17...\( \texttt{\text{Aag5+}} \) 18 \( \texttt{\text{Ce3 f4!}} \) (18...\( \texttt{\text{Fxf4}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\text{Axe5}} \) and 18...\( \texttt{\text{Dxe3+}} \) 19 \( \texttt{\text{Dxe3 Ae6}} \) 20 \( \texttt{\text{Fxf5}} \)
should win for White) 19 \( \textsc{c}e7+ \) (19 \( \textsc{a}xd7 \textsc{f}xe3 \) 20 \( \textsc{d}d3 \textsc{d}d8 \) is unclear) 19...\( \textsc{h}h8 \) (19...\( \textsc{x}e7 \) 20 \( \textsc{a}xd7 \textsc{f}xe3 \) 21 \( \textsc{x}e7 \) strongly favours White) 20 \( \textsc{a}xd7 \textsc{f}xe3 \), although 21 \( \textsc{a}d5 \) retains some advantage for White.

17 \( \textsc{h}h1! \)  a5
18 \( \textsc{a}a4! \) (D)

From here the knight can move to c5 or b6, as appropriate.

18 ...  f6

There is no good move, for example 18...exf5 19 \( \textsc{x}f5 \textsc{e}e6 \) 20 \( \textsc{c}c5 \) or 18...\( \textsc{a}a6 \) 19 \( \textsc{e}e2 \textsc{a}a8 \) 20 \( \textsc{e}e3 \) and Black has serious problems in either case. The text-move is more complex, but White's advantage persists.

19 fxe6  fxe5
20 \( \textsc{c}c3 \)

The knight has achieved its task and now heads for the excellent square d5. Round about here I was suddenly worried that I had allowed the position to become unnecessarily complicated, but this was only nerves due to the exceptional importance of the game – in fact White has everything under control.

20 ...  \( \textsc{g}5+ \)

If 20...\( \textsc{x}f1 \) 21 \( \textsc{x}f1 \textsc{f}f6 \), White has a nice win: 22 \( \textsc{f}6!! \textsc{x}f6 \) (or 22...gx6 23 \( \textsc{x}d5 \textsc{f}8 \) 24 \( \textsc{x}e7! \)) 23 \( \textsc{a}xd5 \) a4 24 \( \textsc{c}c7 \) picking up material.

21 \( \textsc{b}1 \) (D)

21 ...  \( \textsc{f}6 \)

Or 21...\( \textsc{x}f1 \) 22 \( \textsc{x}f1 \textsc{f}6 \) (after 22...\( \textsc{a}6 \) White has the pleasant choice between 23 \( \textsc{d}d5 \) and 23 e7 \( \textsc{f}6 \) 24 \( \textsc{x}c8 \textsc{x}b6 \) 25 \( \textsc{d}d5 \)) 23 \( \textsc{x}f6 \) (23 \( \textsc{h}h3 \) d4 24 \( \textsc{b}5 \textsc{d}5 \) is less effective) 23...\( \textsc{x}f6 \) 24 \( \textsc{x}d5 \) h5 25 \( \textsc{h}h3 \) e4 26 \( \textsc{c}c7 \textsc{b}8 \) 27 \( \textsc{a}7 \) e3 28 \( \textsc{c}1 \) and wins.

22 \( \textsc{d}d5 \)  \( \textsc{x}g4 \)
22...\( \textsc{d}d5 \) 23 \( \textsc{x}f8+ \textsc{f}8 \) 24 \( \textsc{x}d5 \) is a simple win.

23 \( \textsc{x}f8+ \)

This wins the exchange and leads to a technically winning ending. 23
e7 would have had a similar result:
23...\textit{xe}8 (23...\textit{xf}1 24 e8\textit{w}+ \textit{f}8 25 \textit{wh}5) 24 \textit{dc}7 \textit{dh}2 25 \textit{dxe}8 \textit{dx}7 26 \textit{dh}1 \textit{dg}4 (26...\textit{dg}4 27 \textit{dc}7) 27 \textit{dc}7 \textit{dc}8 28 \textit{dd}e1 \textit{dd}8 29 \textit{dx}e5 \textit{dx}c7 30 \textit{dx}c7 \textit{dx}c7 31 \textit{dx}h2.
\begin{itemize}
\item 23 ... \textit{xf}8
\item 24 \textit{dc}7
\end{itemize}
Not 24 \textit{dc}5+ \textit{g}8 25 \textit{dc}7 \textit{b}6!.
\begin{itemize}
\item 24 ... \textit{aa}6
\item On 24...\textit{bb}8, 25 \textit{dc}5+ \textit{g}8 26 \textit{aa}7 traps the rook.
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item 25 \textit{dc}5+!
\item A necessary intermediate check.
\item 25 ... \textit{g}8
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item 25...\textit{e}7?? allows mate in one.
\item 26 \textit{dx}a6 \textit{xe}6
\item 26...bxa6 27 e7 \textit{f}7 28 \textit{dd}8 also leaves White the exchange up.
\item 27 \textit{dc}7 \textit{f}5
\item 28 h3 \textit{f}6
\item Or 28...\textit{ee}3 29 \textit{xe}3 \textit{xe}3 30 g4 \textit{g}6 31 \textit{ee}6 and White wins another pawn.
\item 29 g4! (D)
\end{itemize}
Of course the position is winning for White as Black doesn’t even have a pawn for the exchange, but this forcing sequence of moves gives Black no chance to develop counterplay.
\begin{itemize}
\item 29 ... \textit{ee}4
\item 29...\textit{g}6 30 \textit{ee}6 \textit{h}4 31 \textit{bb}6 is no better.
\item 30 \textit{ee}6 \textit{h}4
\item Or 30...\textit{ff}4 31 \textit{bb}6.
\item 31 \textit{g}5! \textit{dd}5
\item 32 \textit{ff}1 \textit{h}6
\item 33 \textit{gx}h6 \textit{gxh}6
\item 34 \textit{ff}8+ \textit{h}7 (D)
\end{itemize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{35 \textit{dd}6!} \textit{bb}4
\item The alternatives are 35...\textit{ff}6 36 \textit{cc}5 \textit{gg}6 37 \textit{xb}7 and 35...\textit{gg}2 36 \textit{exe}5 \textit{hx}3 37 \textit{ff}4 \textit{xf}4 38 \textit{xf}4 \textit{gg}5 39 \textit{ff}7+ \textit{g}6 40 \textit{xb}7. In both cases White gains another pawn.
\item 36 \textit{exe}5 \textit{xc}2+
\end{itemize}
White wins easily after 36...\textit{xc}2
\begin{itemize}
\item 37 \textit{ff}4 \textit{dd}3 38 \textit{hx}h4 \textit{d}4+ 39 \textit{cc}1 \textit{exe}6, simplifying the position.
37  \( \text{c1} \)  \( \text{e4} \)
38  \( \text{f4} \)  \( \text{d3+} \)

Otherwise Black is mated on h8.
39  \( \text{xd3} \)  \( \text{xd3} \)
40  \( \text{h8+} \)

White could have taken the pawn by 40 \( \text{f7+} \)  \( \text{g6} \)  41 \( \text{xb7} \), but forcing the exchange of bishops leaves White with a trivial technical task.
40  \( ... \)  \( \text{g6} \)
41  \( \text{f4!} \)  \( \text{g5} \)
42  \( \text{xg5} \)  \( \text{xg5} \)
43  \( \text{d2} \)  \( \text{b5} \)
44  \( \text{a8} \)  \( \text{a6} \)
45  \( \text{c8} \)  \( \text{h4} \)
46  \( \text{c5} \)  \( \text{a4} \)
47  \( \text{a5} \)  \( \text{h5} \)  (D)
48  \( \text{e3} \)

Of course it doesn’t really matter, but 48 \( \text{e1!} \) was a little more accurate in that 48...\( \text{d3?} \)  49 \( \text{xa4+} \)  \( \text{xh3} \) loses the bishop after 50 \( \text{a3} \).

...and I had won the right to challenge Kasparov.

My success in this match was mainly due to not underestimating Kasparov’s fighting qualities. Already in Sanghi Nagar I had him beaten, but I just didn’t finish the job. This time I was more careful in winning positions and didn’t relax until the match was actually over.

In the Riga tournament during May I finished second. My play was very convincing, apart from the loss to Kasparov in the Evans Gambit, and I felt on form. This was the first time that I encountered Kasparov after becoming the challenger and although I lost the individual game, I was happy with my performance. Both the tournament and the city were very pleasant, so I had every reason to be in a good mood as I started my preparations for the World Championship match.
Game 33
V. Anand – J. Timman
Tal Memorial, Riga 1995
Ruy Lopez, Worrall Attack

1 e4 e5  
2 ∆f3 ∆c6  
3 ∆b5 a6  
4 ∆a4 ∆f6  
5 0-0 ∆e7  
6 ∆e2

9...∆g4 as being premature. Tiviakov, who is an expert on this line, is of the same opinion.

10 ... ∆h5?! (D)
10...∆xf3 11 ∆xf3 ∆a5 12 ∆c2 c5 is probably the lesser evil.

11 d3

White could already play 11 g4, but given that Black didn’t take on f3 last move, he is hardly going to do so now.

11 ... ∆a5  
12 ∆c2 c5  
13 ∆bd2 ∆d7

Now 14 ∆f1 can be answered by 14...∆xf3 15 ∆xf3 ∆g5, so it is time to break the pin.

14 g4! ∆g6
15 \( \textcolor{red}{\text{ \textit{\textbf{f1}}} \text{ }} \)

White has opted for a very solid formation in the centre and will conduct all his play on the kingside.

15 ... \( \textcolor{blue}{\text{ \textit{\textbf{b6}}} \text{ }} \)

Black has many possibilities, but White retains a slight advantage in any case, for example after 15...h6 16 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g3}}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g5}}} \) 17 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{dxe5}}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{hxg5}}} \) 18 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f5}}} \)

In this line the pawn on g5 doesn’t really block White’s kingside play because he can often continue with h4, meeting ...gxh4 by g5 and regaining the pawn on h4 at his leisure.

Black’s best idea may be 15...\( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c6}}} \) 16 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g3}}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xe8}}} \) 17 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{dxe5}}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{dxe5}}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f8}}} \), heading for e6, when the slight weakness of f4 might be relevant later.

16 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g3}}} \) \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c6}}} \) (\( D \))


17 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{d5}}} \! \)

A very awkward knight. If Black ever plays ...\( \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xg5}}} \), White will take back with the g-pawn, opening the g-file for his attack.

17 ... \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e8}}} \)!


18 \( h4! \)

This threatens 19 \( \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{dxe7+}}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{xe7}}} \) 20 h5, so now Black is forced to take. Black can, it is true, win a pawn, but White’s attacking chances more than compensate.

18 ... \( \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf5}}} \)

After 18...f6 19 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b3+}}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f7}}} \) (not 19...d5? 20 exd5 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{dxe5}}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c4}}} \) winning for White, and 19...\( \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{h8}}} \) 20 h5 gives White a clear advantage) 20 \( \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf7+}}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf7}}} \) 21 g5 White has excellent attacking prospects.

19 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{gxf5}}} \) (\( D \))


19 ... \( \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d5}}} \)!

Black could have transposed into the game by 19...\( \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xh4}}} \) 20 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{h1}}} \) (20 \( \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{xh4}}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{xh4}}} \) 21 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g2}}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e7}}} \) 22 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{h1}}} \) is also feasible) 20...d5. This move-order would have been more accurate, as it denies White the opportunity mentioned in the next note.

20 \( \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{h1}}} \)!

Not bad in itself, but Black’s previous move gave White an additional
option which he didn’t exploit: 20 \( \text{Q} \text{g}5 \) (not 20 \( h5 \) \( h6 \) 21 \( \text{Q}h2 \) \( \text{Q}g5 \) 22 \( \text{H}g1 \) \( f6 \) and Black sets up a blockade) 20...\( h6 \) (otherwise White proceeds with his attack without sacrificing a pawn) 21 \( \text{W}h5 \)! \( hxg5 \) 22 \( hxg5 \) \( \text{D}d6 \) (22...\( \text{W}d6 \) 23 \( \text{Q}g2 \) \( g6 \) 24 \( \text{W}h4 \) \( gxf5 \) 25 \( \text{H}h1 \) winning) 23 \( g6 \) \( fxg6 \) (23...\( \text{D}f8 \) 24 \( \text{Q}g5 \) \( fxg6 \) 25 \( fxg6 \) and Black is lost) 24 \( fxg6 \) \( \text{D}e7 \) (24...\( \text{W}f6 \) 25 \( \text{Q}g5 \) \( \text{W}e6 \) 26 \( exd5 \) \( \text{D}xd5 \) 27 \( \text{b}3 \) with a decisive attack) 25 \( \text{W}h7+ \) \( \text{f}8 \) 26 \( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{D}f5 \) 27 \( \text{g}7+ \) followed by mate.

20 ... \( \text{Q}xh4 \)

21 \( \text{H}g1 \) (\( D \))

21 \( \text{Q}xh4 \) \( \text{W}xh4+ \) 22 \( \text{Q}g2 \) \( d4 \) is less clear.

21 ... \( \text{Qf}6 \)

White’s attacking chances along the open kingside files offer very good compensation for the pawn. In addition, White’s bishops are very effective; the one on c1 is ready for a sacrifice on h6, while the c2-bishop can go to b3 and in the long run will play an important role in exploiting Black’s weak light squares.

22 \( \text{Q}h2 \) \( g6 \)
23 \( \text{W}f3 \) \( dxe4 \)

If 23...\( d4 \), White plays simply 24 \( \text{Q}g4 \).

24 \( dxe4 \) \( d7 \)
25 \( \text{W}h3! \) \( \text{W}e7 \)

After 25...\( c4 \) 26 \( \text{Q}e3 \), followed by \( \text{H}ad1 \), the combined pressure on \( d7 \) from \( d1 \) and \( h3 \) would be very awkward.

26 \( \text{Q}e3 \) \( g7 \)
27 \( \text{Q}g4 \) \( f6 \)

27...\( gxf5 \)? loses immediately after 28 \( \text{Q}h6+ \) \( \text{h}8 \) 29 \( \text{Q}x\text{f5} \).

28 \( \text{Q}xf6+ \! \)

If 28 \( \text{Q}g5 \)?, then Black escapes from the pin by 28...\( \text{D}x\text{g4} \) 29 \( \text{H}x\text{g4} \) \( f6 \).

28 ... \( \text{W}x\text{f6} \) (\( D \))

After 28...\( \text{Q}xf6 \) 29 \( \text{Q}g2 \), followed by \( \text{H}ag1 \) and \( \text{h}2 \), White has an enormous attack.
29 \( \texttt{g3} \)?

The obvious 29 \( \texttt{xc5} \)! would have been the logical culmination of White's play. This not only regains the pawn, but also prevents \( \ldots c4 \), which imprisons the c2-bishop. After 29...g5 30 \( \texttt{e3} \) h6 31 \( \texttt{g2} \) \( \texttt{w7} \) 32 \( \texttt{b3} \) Black's position would come under steadily increasing pressure.

After the careless text-move Black gains a new lease of life.

29 \( \ldots \) \( \texttt{d7} \)!

30 \( \texttt{h2} \)

Now 30 \( \texttt{xc5} \)? is impossible because of 30...\( \texttt{xf5} \) 31 exf5 \( \texttt{w6} \)

30 \( \ldots \) c4

31 \( \texttt{h1} \) (D)

31 \( \ldots \) h6

More or less forced to prevent \( \texttt{g5} \). If Black tries to keep the pawn then 31...\( \texttt{ad8} \) 32 \( \texttt{g1} \) h5 33 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{c6} \) 34 \( \texttt{h4} \) f6 (34...\( \texttt{ff8} \) 35 f6 wins) 35 \( \texttt{e3} \) g5 36 \( \texttt{xh5} \) and White is very much better.

32 \( \texttt{xh6} \) \( \texttt{xh6} \)

33 \( \texttt{wh6} \) \( \texttt{ad8} \)

Not 33...\( \texttt{wh8} \)? 34 \( \texttt{xh8} + \) \( \texttt{xh8} \) 35 f6 \( \texttt{c6} \) 36 \( \texttt{g2} + \) \( \texttt{g8} \) 37 \( \texttt{gh3} \), winning.

34 \( \texttt{g2} \) \( \texttt{g7} \)

35 \( \texttt{we3} \) \( \texttt{d6} \)

White still has a clear advantage, but he cannot win by playing solely on the kingside. The next move starts the opening of the queenside with the aim of activating the c2-bishop.

36 b3! \( \texttt{c8} \) (D)

37 bxc4 bxc4

After this the bishop can become active at a4, denying critical squares to Black's pieces. The alternative was 37...\( \texttt{xc4} \), but then the bishop becomes active on b3 instead and White can gradually step up the pressure, much as in the game:

1) 38 \( \texttt{b3} \) \( \texttt{c7} \) 39 \( \texttt{g5} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 40 \( \texttt{wh6} \) \( \texttt{g7} \) is not entirely clear.

2) 38 \( \texttt{a7} \)! \( \texttt{f6} \) (38...\( \texttt{c8} \) 39 \( \texttt{b7} \) \( \texttt{c5} \) 40 \( \texttt{b3} \), etc.) 39 \( \texttt{b3} \) \( \texttt{c8} \) 40 fxg6 \( \texttt{d6} \) 41 \( \texttt{xf7} + \) \( \texttt{xf7} \) 42
Now White threatens a gradual penetration on the queenside by $wa3$, $a4$ and $c5$. Then $c4$ will be attacked and White will also be threatening $c7$. Timman decides that there is no real defence against this plan, and so goes for desperate counterplay. The result is only to accelerate his loss.

41 ... $f6$?!  
42 $fxg6$ $d2$  
42...$dxg6$? loses after 43 $xg6$ $xg6+$ 44 $g3$.

43 $b1$ $f8$ ($D$)  
43...$e2$ loses to 44 $b6$, but Black might have lasted longer with 43...$f8$. However, after 44 $g4$ $xg6$ 45 $b4+$ $h8 46$ $c5$ the win is just a matter of time.

44 $h1$! $g7$  
45 $xf6$ $-0$

In view of 45...$xf6$ (45...$xc2$ 46 $f7$ and 45...$f8$ 46 $h7+$ are also catastrophic) 46 $h7+$ $f8$ 47 $g7+$.

40 $f3$

Just at this moment White can switch his rooks to $f3$ and $g3$, since 40...$gxg5+$ loses to 41 $f3$! $g6$ (or 41...$g6$ 42 $f4$+ 43 $h2$) 42 $xf5$. This will eventually cause $f7$ to come under strong pressure.

40 ... $cd8$
41 $h8$
The months leading up to the Kasparov match were a very exciting time, with winning the World Championship a real possibility. I had been competing in the FIDE and PCA cycles for roughly two years and there had been many tense and exciting moments. When I finally reached the Kasparov match there was a feeling of anticlimax, as if I was already spent from the earlier efforts. I had the feeling that, having played so many matches, I was fairly exposed because I had already shown most of my best ideas trying to reach the world championship itself. The champion can be much better prepared, as he only has to play when and where he chooses and can just wait to see how the cycle develops. Of course, every challenger says much the same thing!

Certainly, I would have preferred seven or eight months to prepare for Kasparov instead of just under six. Moreover, I had agreed to play tournaments in Monaco, Riga and Moscow (these were arranged before I knew I would play Kasparov) which ate into the possible preparation time. However, it was perhaps no bad thing that I played in these events, as six months is a long time to sit analysing without any tournament activity, although it did mean that my preparation only really began in May, and the first game eventually started on September 11th.

I had to assemble a team in a hurry, and it was a unique experience suddenly going from having at most two seconds to having four. These were Ubilava, who had been with me since the beginning of the cycle; Yusupov, who had already helped me earlier in the Kamsky match; Wolff, who had been my second in the Ivanchuk match (see Game 17), and Speelman, who was completely new. I had worked with Ubilava and Yusupov before, and was very happy with them. I felt that Patrick Wolff would be a help as he is very well organized and has great experience against the Sicilian. Speelman had been Short’s second in his match against Kasparov and I felt that he might be able to offer me some insight into world championship chess.

It was amazing how much more you could accomplish with such help, but it was also much more confusing comparing the results of one person’s analysis with another’s. Trying to get everybody to work together in the most efficient manner was a major task in itself. You can’t have all five people analysing on one board – it’s just too many heads and hands. On the other hand, splitting into groups analysing the same position often leads to the groups heading off in entirely different directions and then it can be hard to decide which line you are actually going to play. Thanks to the information explosion, the amount of material you have to deal with is gigantic. Facing
Kasparov, analysis of the Sicilian was a priority, but this is one of the largest of all opening complexes. I had decided that my main defence to 1 e4 would be 1...e5, and this was also an enormous amount of work. Kasparov had shown that he was prepared to play openings other than the Ruy Lopez, so we had to spend some time on the Evans Gambit, Scotch and Irregular Open Games. He also plays 1 d4 regularly, so one can imagine the amount of work we had to do.

With hindsight, and given that we were new to the job, I think that we did a reasonably good job with our preparation. I am sure that we would do better next time, based on our experience in 1995. Still, this was an area where Kasparov had an advantage due to his vast experience preparing for world championship matches. His preparation was able to survive the close scrutiny of a world championship match while mine took some heavy blows.

It was exciting finally to be given the chance to play against Kasparov for the world championship, but I look back on it now with a fair amount of disillusionment. The organization of the match verged on the ludicrous. First the venue for the match was changed from Cologne to New York without consulting or even informing me! I was still preparing for Cologne and making hotel reservations there when it was known within the PCA that New York would be the venue. I should perhaps explain that under the PCA system you are left largely to make all your own arrangements for the match, so a switch of venue is quite an inconvenience. Then, in late July or August, Bob Rice suddenly called to announce that the prize fund had been reduced from $1.5 million to $1.35 million. And so on. The only response from the PCA to the various problems regarding the organization of the match was “We are doing our best, but...”. I didn’t find this argument particularly convincing. I had to try to shut myself away from all these other problems to concentrate on the chess, but I didn’t have total success. At some level, it kept bothering me.

They tended to take the most optimistic interpretation of any good news. On the other hand, bad news would be parcelled out bit by bit in small doses, so that you would not realize the full import straight away. If it hadn’t been for Frederic Friedel, who was in charge of player relations for the PCA, I probably wouldn’t have been kept informed at all. A few days before the match we were suddenly told that we had to write a daily column for USA Today. Towards the end I completely lost interest in this and produced just the barest minimum – deep notes along the lines of “He played the Sicilian.”

The dealings with the PCA leading up to the match were thoroughly depressing and, by the time I got to New York, I was just sick of the whole
thing. This was not a factor in my defeat but my inability to deal with it and take it in my stride was! Kasparov put up with a lot during his 1984 match against Karpov. I have a much better idea now of how one should just develop a thick hide in these matters. Nevertheless, a positive consequence of the whole affair was that when it was over, I was quite happy to forget about both it and the events leading up to it.
Game 34
V. Anand – G. Kasparov

PCA World Championship, New York (9) 1995
Sicilian, Scheveningen

1 e4

The World Championship had begun with eight draws. The absolute record, 17 consecutive draws, still belongs to Karpov vs Kasparov from Moscow 1984/5. However, in 1995 the next six games had five decisive results!

1 ... c5
2  d3 d6
3  d4 cxd4
4  xd4  f6
5  c3 a6
6  e2

This had become one of the main battlegrounds of the match. Neither player wanted to blink first, so another Classical Scheveningen appeared on the board.

6 ... e6
7  0-0  e7
8  a4  c6
9  e3 0-0
10 f4  c7
11  h1  e8
12  f3 (D)

Our discussion of the Scheveningen continues into my fifth White. I had tried 12  d2 in the first game and then 12  d3 three times. In games five and seven Garry had managed to find a solution to 12  d3, so it was time to switch variations.

12 ...  

Kasparov had played 12...b8 consistently in the matches against Karpov, but then switched to this move against Van der Wiel in Amsterdam 1987. I can’t really say that I was surprised by ...  d7, because I had studied the Van der Wiel game, but it wasn’t uppermost in my mind. I was waiting for 12...b8 and was ready to whip out 13 g4, when this move was played. I had to search my memory to remember what we had found in the Van der Wiel game.

13  b3  a5
14 \( \text{Qxa5} \)  \( \text{Wxa5} \)  
15 \( \text{Wd3} \)  \( \text{Hd8} \)  
16 \( \text{Hfd1!} \)  

Almost all the interesting games in this line were played by Van der Wiel, against Polugaevsky and Kasparov himself. Van der Wiel’s notes were a good starting point for my own analysis. We had prepared both 16 g4 (Van der Wiel-Polugaevsky, Haninge 1989) and the text-move, which was a recommendation of Van der Wiel (a third move, 16 \( \text{Wd2} \), was played in Van der Wiel-Kasparov). My decision to prefer 16 \( \text{Hfd1} \) was made at the board.

16 ...  \( \text{Cc6} \)  

After 16...e5 White simply plays 17 f5.

17 \( \text{b4} \)  \( \text{Wc7} \)  
18 \( \text{b5} \)  \( \text{Dd7} \)  (D)  

Not 18...axb5? 19 axb5 \( \text{Dd7} \) 20 \( \text{Qa4} \) with advantage to White.

I was surprised that he was prepared to go down this line so blithely but later it turned out that there was a good reason: an earlier game Cuijpers-De Boer, Dutch Championship 1988 had continued 19 \( \text{Dc2} \)  \( \text{Cc8} \)  20 bxa6 bxa6 21 \( \text{Wxa6} \)  \( \text{Ha8} \)  22 \( \text{Wd3} \)  \( \text{Hxa4} \)  23 \( \text{Hxa4} \)  \( \text{xa4} \) with equality. It was lucky I didn’t know about this game, or I might have abandoned the whole line!

19 \( \text{Hab1!} \)  

Clearly stronger than 19 \( \text{Dc2} \).

19 ...  \( \text{axb5} \)  (D)  

After 19...\( \text{Cc8} \)  20 e5 dxe5 21 fxe5 \( \text{Wxe5} \)  (21...\( \text{Dd5} \)  22 \( \text{Hxd5} \) exd5 23 \( \text{Dxd5} \) \( \text{Wxe5} \) 24 \( \text{Df4} \) is also good for White) 22 \( \text{Dd4} \)  \( \text{Cc7} \)  23 \( \text{xf6} \) (after 23 b6 \( \text{Wb8} \)  24 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \)  25 \( \text{Wxd7} \) \( \text{Hc7} \) Black will regain the piece) 23...\( \text{xf6} \) 24 \( \text{Wxd7} \) White will create dangerous passed pawns as Black hasn’t exchanged the a-pawns.

20 \( \text{Qxb5!} \)  

20 axb5 \( \text{Cc8} \) offers White less than the previous note, now that the a-pawns have gone: 21 \( \text{Dd4} \) \( \text{Wxc2} \).
22 \( \text{Q}b6 \) (after 22 \( \text{W}xc2 \) \( \text{H}xc2 \) 23 \( \text{Q}b6 \) White's compensation for the pawn is nebulous) 22...\( \text{W}xd3 \) 23 \( \text{H}xd3 \) \( \text{Cc}7 \) 24 e5 dxe5 25 fxe5 \( \text{Q}d5 \) 26 \( \text{Q}xd5 \) exd5 27 \( \text{Q}xd5 \) \( \text{Q}f5 \)! 28 \( \text{Q}xc7 \) \( \text{Q}xd3 \) 29 \( \text{Q}xe8 \) (or 29 \( \text{Q}d1 \) \( \text{Q}d8 \) ) 29...\( \text{Q}xb1 \) 30 \( \text{Q}d6 \) \( \text{Q}xd6 \) (or 30...\( \text{Q}d3 \)) 31 exd6 \( \text{Q}f5 \) with a draw.

20 ... \( \text{Q}xb5 \)

This surprised me since I was expecting 20...\( \text{W}a5 \) 21 \( \text{Q}xd6 \) (anything else allows Black to play ...\( \text{Q}c6 \) with a fine position) 21...\( \text{Q}xa4 \) 22 \( \text{Q}b6 \) (22 e5 \( \text{Q}xd6 \) 23 exd6 \( \text{Q}d5 \) 24 \( \text{Q}xd5 \) \( \text{H}xd6 \) 25 \( \text{W}a3 \) \( \text{H}xd5 \) 26 \( \text{H}xd5 \) exd5 is, if anything, slightly better for Black) 22...\( \text{H}xd6 \) and now:

1) 23 \( \text{W}xd6 \) \( \text{Q}xd6 \) 24 \( \text{Q}xa5 \) \( \text{Q}xf4 \) (24...\( \text{Q}xc2 \) loses to 25 e5) 25 \( \text{Q}xb7 \) \( \text{Q}xc2 \) 26 \( \text{Q}d8 \) \( \text{H}xd8 \) 27 \( \text{Q}xd8 \) \( \text{Q}xe4 \)! (27...\( \text{Q}xe4 \) 28 \( \text{Q}c7 \) gives White more chances) 28 \( \text{Q}b4 \) \( \text{Q}xf3 \) 29 \( \text{Q}xf4 \) \( \text{Q}d5 \) 30 \( \text{Q}xf6 \) \( \text{gx}f6 \) 31 \( \text{Q}xf6 \) is a draw.

2) 23 \( \text{Q}xa5! \) \( \text{Q}xd3 \) 24 cxd3 \( \text{Q}xd1 \) and in the resulting ending White keeps a slight advantage due to his two bishops and Black's weak b-pawn.

21 \( \text{W}xb5 \)

21 \( \text{Q}xb5 \)!? may be even stronger than the game continuation, e.g. 21...\( \text{Q}d7 \) (21...\( \text{Q}c8 \) 22 \( \text{Q}db1 \) \( \text{W}xc2 \) 23 \( \text{W}xc2 \) \( \text{H}xc2 \) 24 \( \text{Q}xb7 \) definitely favours White; note that 24...d5? loses to 25 e5) 22 \( \text{Q}db1 \) \( \text{Q}c5 \) 23 \( \text{W}c4 \) with a clear edge for White.

21 ... \( \text{Q}a8 \)

22 c4 \( \text{e}5 \) (D)
27 \( \text{Nd5} \) \( \text{Qxd5??} \)
An inexplicable mistake. Black should just wait and make a useful move on the kingside, e.g. 27...h5. Then if White plays 28 c5, Black can reply 28...\( \text{Wc6} \) or 28...\( \text{Hec8} \). If White retreats the bishop from b6, then Black can safely take the exchange since White needs the b6-bishop to support the advance of the pawns. White remains with the better position but has to find a way to break through.

28 \( \text{exd5} \)
White is clearly better and, moreover, his position is very easy to play: he just has to push his pawns.

28 ... \( \text{Wg6} \) \( (D) \)

31...\( \text{Wg3} \) 32 \( \text{Wxb7} \) \( \text{Hg5} \) 33 \( \text{Hg1} \) is hopeless for Black.
After the text-move I just had to calculate a little to be sure of victory.

32 \( \text{Hg1!} \)  e3
33 d6 \( \text{Hg3} \)
34 \( \text{Wxb7} \)
The simplest, although 34 \( \text{Hh2} \) is also good.

34 ... \( \text{We6} \) \( (D) \)

29 c5 e4
30 \( \text{He2} \) \( \text{He5} \)
After 30...\( \text{He7} \) 31 d6 \( \text{Hf6} \) 32 d7 \( \text{Hf8} \) Black threatens ...\( \text{He5} \) with some counterplay, but 33 \( \text{He7} \)! kills any potential black activity.

31 \( \text{Wd7!} \) \( \text{Hg5} \) \( (D) \)

35 \( \text{Hh2!} \)
At first I intended to continue 35 \( \text{Hf1} \), but then I saw Kasparov’s trap:
35...\textit{b}b8! 36 \textit{w}xb8 \textit{d}xh3+ 37 \textit{g}1 \textit{w}e5 and, amazingly, Black forces a draw. I then saw that 35 \textit{d}d1 \textit{b}b8 36 \textit{d}d5 would lead to a win, but the text-move is even easier, because 35...\textit{e}8 may be answered by the simple 36 d7.

This gave me my first win in a world championship match and my first win against Kasparov (in a tournament game) since Reggio Emilia 1991/2. I was ecstatic. Needless to say, the rest of the week was a cold shower.

I think one of my main problems was that I had no idea how tense you could become in such a match. Although I had gained a lot of match experience during the cycles, I had no idea what it was like to play a world championship match; it is genuinely different to lesser matches. Looking back at the 11th and 13th games, I didn’t need four seconds to tell me what I did wrong in these games – I just blundered.

Kasparov’s play was far from exemplary during the match, but he didn’t make any real blunders. This shows that he was able to keep his nerves under much better control, which could, of course, be a function of his much greater world championship experience. If there is a next time, I believe I would be much better prepared to cope with the pressure of the match.

I had noticed that a number of players had been badly affected by match defeats. Andrei Sokolov’s loss to Karpov sent his career into a tailspin. Likewise Hjartarson against Karpov. After my defeat by Kasparov, I gave some thought as to how to get my career back on track. The memory of the chess world can be very short-lived – you can become a nobody within a year if you don’t back your reputation up by good results. I was still strongly motivated to stay at the top, but I understood that waiting for the next Candidates wouldn’t be enough – I would have to keep making good results in the intervening period.

After the match, my first event was the tournament at Wijk aan Zee, which was Heaven compared to the New York match. You could just go to Wijk aan Zee, everybody understands chess and is enthusiastic about chess; you can just play chess and need not be distracted by changes of venues and prize-funds and 101 other things. I felt happy in this event, despite the bitterly cold weather, and I played reasonably well. One of my targets was to regain my appetite for chess and to this end I decided to vary my openings. In some games I played 1 d4, and in others I adopted very sharp lines – all to keep my interest and motivation alive. The following game shows one of these opening experiments.
Game 35
V. Anand – B. Gelfand
Wijk aan Zee 1996
Sicilian, Grand Prix Attack

1 e4 c5

Gelfand is a very straightforward player who doesn’t vary his openings much – with Black against 1 e4 he likes to play the Najdorf. I had noticed that he makes no effort to avoid the Grand Prix Attack and had shown some vulnerability against this line. For example, in his Candidates match against Short at Brussels 1991, he lost a game against the Grand Prix Attack and for the rest of the match abandoned the Sicilian. Later, however, Gelfand beat Sax when the Hungarian Grandmaster tried to repeat Short’s success. In view of these games, I knew that I couldn’t really catch Gelfand by surprise with the Grand Prix Attack, but I did have one new idea to try out...

2 ²c3 d6
3 f4 g6
4 ²f3 ²g7
5 ²c4 ²c6
6 d3 e6
7 0-0 ²ge7
8 ²we1! h6

Not 8...d5? 9 exd5 exd5 10 ²xd5!, while after 8...0-0 9 f5!! exf5 10 ²h4! White has an automatic kingside attack.

9 ²b3 a6 (D)

After 9...²d4 (9...0-0 10 ²h4 is slightly better for White) 10 ²xd4 cxd4 11 ²e2 0-0 12 ²h1 f5 13 ²g1 ²h8 14 ²f3 ²d7 15 ²d2 ²c8 16 ²g3 fxe4 17 dxe4 d5 18 exd5 exd5 White had the advantage in the game Topalov-Van Wely, Wijk aan Zee 1996.

10 e5?!

... and this is it!

After 10 a4 ²b8 11 ²g3 ²d4?! (11...b5!? may be better) 12 ²xd4 cxd4 13 ²e2 b5 14 axb5 axb5 15 ²f2! ²b6 16 f5 exf5 17 exf5 gxf5, which was played in Anand-Gelfand, Reggio Emilia 1991/2, White could have gained the advantage.
by continuing 18 Qf4, but clearly Gelfand was not going to repeat the whole variation.

The idea of this type of pawn sacrifice, which occurs relatively often in the Closed Sicilian and Grand Prix Attack, is simply to fight for the dark squares.

10 ... Qf5

If Black plays 10...d5, then 11 Wf2 b6 12 Ad2 Qa5 (12...0-0?! 13 Qe2 Qb7 14 a4 is good for White; a5 is a threat as c5 is weak) 13 Qe2 Qxb3 14 axb3 favours White, who will play b4 or d4 and exploit the absence of Black's dark-squared bishop from the queenside.

If 10...dxe5 11 fxe5 Qxe5 (11...g5 12 Qe4 g4 13 Qd6+ Qf8 14 Qg5! with a winning attack for White) 12 Qxe5 Wd4+ 13 Qh1 (not 13 Qe3 Wxe5 14 Wf2? Wxe3! 15 Wxe3 Axd4) 13...Wxe5, then 14 Qe4 (14 Wf2 is also possible) 14...0-0 (14...f5 15 Qf4 Qxb2 16 Qd6+ and 14...Wc7 15 Qf4 e5 16 Qxf7+! are also very good for White) 15 Qh6 f5 16 Qf4 (even stronger than 16 Qxg7 Qxg7 17 Qg5) 16...Qxb2 17 Qb1 Wd4 18 Qg5 and White wins.

The move Gelfand played is the best.

11 Qh1!

11 Qe4 would be premature, as Black could take on e5.

11 ... Qfd4 (D)

After 11...0-0 White could play 12 Qe4, since if Black takes the pawn on e5 then White has g4 followed by Qxh6 at the end. Also 11...Qcd4 12 Qd2 (since the pressure on e5 has been lifted, White doesn't have to play Qe4 immediately) and 11...d5 12 Qe2 (or 12 Wf2) would give White a slight advantage.

12 Qe4

I spent a long time thinking about 12 Qxd4 cxd4 13 Qe4 dxe5 14 Wg3 (14 fxe5 is met by 14...Qxe5 and not 14...Qxe5? 15 Wg3! g5 16 Qf4!, winning) with the point that 14...Qe5? 15 Wg3! g5 16 Qf4 allows 15 f5! exf5 16 Qh6! (16 Wxg6 Qh8 17 Qxf7 Qe7!) 16...Qe7! 17 Qg5! fxe4 18 Wf4 with a clear advantage for White, e.g. 18...Qf5 19 Qxf5 Wb6 20 Qf6!. However, I just couldn't find anything against 14...Qe7! 15 fxe5 Qxe5 16 Qf4 Qxf4 17 Qxf4 f5! (17...0-0 18 Wf6! is too dangerous) 18 Wxg6+ Qd8 19 Qg3 (19 Qc5 Qe8!) 19...Wg5!. Although Black needs to play a whole
string of ‘only’ moves, I didn’t doubt that Boris would find the correct path. In the end I settled for the more modest text-move, but this has the defect that Black can gain time against White’s rook.

12 ... \( \text{Qxf3} \)
12...dxe5 13 \( \text{Qxe5!} \) is promising for White.

13 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( (D) \)
Not 13 \( \text{Qxd6+? \text{Qxd6}} \) and Black wins.

\[ \text{Board image showing move diagrams.} \]

2) 16...\( \text{Qxh6} \) 17 \( \text{Qf6+ \text{Qg7}} \) 18 \( \text{Qxe5 \text{Qd4}} \) 19 \( \text{Qg3!} \) with a very dangerous attack.

After other 15th moves, White just plays \( \text{f4} \) and \( \text{g3} \), with a very strong attack.

16 \( \text{Qg3} \)
16 \( \text{Qxc5} \) 0-0 17 \( \text{We4 \text{Qe7}} \) regains the pawn, but White’s attack has gone.

16 ... \( 0-0 \) \( (D) \)

Once again the correct move. Instead, for example, 16...f5 (16...b6 17 \( \text{Qf4! \text{Wc7}} \) 18 \( \text{Qae1} \) and 16...\( \text{Qg8} \) 17 \( \text{Qxc5} \) also favour White) 17 \( \text{Qxc5} \) (17 \( \text{Qf4 \text{Qc7!}} \)?) 17...\( \text{We7} \) 18 d4 \( \text{Cc6} \) 19 c3 is good for White.

... 13 \( 0-0 \)
13 ... \( \text{dxe5} \)
14 \( \text{fxe5 Qxe5} \)

After 14...\( \text{Qxe5} \) White can choose between two favourable lines: 15 \( \text{Qf2} \) and 15 \( \text{Qxc5 \text{Qxh2}} \) 16 \( \text{Qxe6!} \).

15 \( \text{Qf1} \) \( g5! \)
Boris immediately found this forced move. 15...0-0 loses to 16 \( \text{Qxh6!} \) and now:

1) 16...\( \text{Qxd3} \) 17 \( \text{Qe3 \text{Qxb2}} \) 18 \( \text{Qxg7 \text{Qxg7}} \) 19 \( \text{Qxc5 f5} \) 20 \( \text{Qe5+ \text{Qh7}} \) 21 \( \text{Qg3 \text{Qf6}} \) 22 \( \text{Qxf6 \text{Qxf6}} \) 23 \( \text{Qab1 trapping the knight.} \)

17 \( \text{Qxg5?!} \)
I didn’t think much about this piece sacrifice, since it seemed to be the natural follow-up to White’s earlier plan. I just checked that Black had no obvious defence, and then played it. While this may appear reckless, it fitted in with my ambition to play
interesting chess during the tournament.

With best play Black can survive, so it is probable that White should look for an improvement earlier. Still, Black has to walk a tightrope for several moves, no easy task in such a complex position.

17 \( \text{a}x\text{c}5 \) is not dangerous for Black and he can equalize comfortably by 17...b6 18 \( \text{a}e4 \text{b}7 \).

17 ... h\( \text{x}g5 \)

18 \( \text{a}x\text{g}5 \) (D)

Threatening 19 \( \text{w}h4 \).

18 ... \( \text{a}g6 \)

Best. After 18...\( \text{w}d4 \) (18...b5 19 \( \text{a}e1 \text{g}6 \) 20 \( \text{a}xf7! \) is good for White) 19 \( \text{w}h3! \text{e}8 \) 20 \( \text{a}e1 \text{e}7 \) 21 \( \text{e}e4 \) White’s attack is dangerous, for example 21...\( \text{w}xb2 \) (21...\( \text{w}d6 \) 22 \( \text{e}e3 \), intending \( \text{g}3 \), also poses problems for Black) 22 d4! c4 23 \( \text{a}a4 \) (so that Black doesn’t get a pawn on b3, though even 23 dxe5 cxb3 24 \( \text{w}h7+ \text{f}8 \) 25 \( \text{e}f4! \) looks good) 23...\( \text{w}xa2 \) 24 dxe5 \( \text{w}xa4 \) 25 \( \text{w}h7+ \text{f}8 \) 26 \( \text{e}f4 \) and White wins.

19 \( \text{a}e1! \) (D)

Not 19 \( \text{w}g4? \text{d}4 \) 20 \( \text{w}h5 \text{w}h4 \) and the attack collapses.

I had seen up to here when I sacrificed the piece and thought that Black would have a tough job defending the position, but in fact he can hold on.

19 ... \( \text{w}e7 \)

A critical moment. The alternatives are:

1) 19...c4? 20 \( \text{a}xc4 \) b5 21 \( \text{a}b3 \) is pointless as 21...\( \text{b}7? \) loses to 22 \( \text{e}xe6! \).

2) 19...\( \text{h}6 \) 20 \( \text{a}xf7 \) \( \text{xf}7 \) 21 \( \text{w}xg6+ \) wins.

3) 19...\( \text{xb}2 \) (Black can just about hang on after this move) and now:

3a) 20 \( \text{e}xe6 \) \( \text{xe}6 \) 21 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{g}7\! \) defends.

3b) 20 \( \text{xe}6! \) \( \text{e}5 \) (20...\( \text{fxe}6 \) 21 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{xf}1\!+ \) 22 \( \text{xf}1 \) \( \text{xe}6 \) 23 \( \text{w}xg6+ \) and White may have no
more than perpetual check) 21 \(\text{ax}e5\) 
\(\text{fxe}6\) 22 \(\text{exe}1\) \(\text{gg}7\) and Black is slightly better.

3c) 20 \(\text{Exf}7!\) \(\text{Exf}7\) 21 \(\text{Wxg}6+\) 
\(\text{gg}7\) 22 \(\text{exe}6+\) \(\text{exe}6\) 23 \(\text{Wxe}6+\) 
\(\text{hh}8\) 24 \(\text{exe}3\) \(\text{hh}7\) (24...\(\text{Wg}8\) loses after 
25 \(\text{hh}3+\) \(\text{hh}7\) 26 \(\text{Whxh}7+\) \(\text{Whxh}7\) 
27 \(\text{ff}3\)) 25 \(\text{ff}7\) (D) leading to a final branch:

3c1) 25...\(\text{hh}4\) 26 \(\text{hh}3\) \(\text{Wg}5\) 27 
\(\text{Whxh}4+\) \(\text{Whxh}4\) 28 \(\text{ff}3\) wins.

3c2) 25...\(\text{gg}7\) 26 \(\text{Wxg}7!\) \(\text{Wxg}7\) 27 
\(\text{hh}3+\) \(\text{hh}7\) 28 \(\text{Wxe}5+\) \(\text{gg}8\) 29 \(\text{gg}3+\) 
\(\text{ff}8\) 30 \(\text{Wf}4+\) \(\text{ff}7\) 31 \(\text{Wh}6+\) \(\text{ee}8\) 
(31...\(\text{ee}7\) 32 \(\text{ee}3+\) \(\text{dd}7\) 33 \(\text{Wdd}6+\)) 32 
\(\text{gg}8+\) \(\text{ee}7\) 33 \(\text{Wee}3+\) \(\text{dd}7\) 34 \(\text{Wxd}8+\) 
with a winning ending.

3c3) 25...\(\text{hh}5!\) 26 \(\text{axb}7\) (26 \(\text{Wb}3\) 
\(\text{Wg}5\) 27 \(\text{Whxh}5+\) \(\text{Whxh}5\) 28 \(\text{ff}3\) \(\text{ee}8\) 
wins for Black) 26...\(\text{gg}7\) is unclear. 
White has three pawns for the piece 
but Black has enough pieces in play 
to defend his king.

4) 19...\(\text{ff}6!?\) (D) (this may also 
enable Black to draw) and now:

4a) 20 \(\text{Exf}7?\) \(\text{Exf}7\) is unsound.

4b) 20 \(\text{ee}4?\) \(\text{eh}4\) solves all 
Black’s problems.

4c) 20 \(\text{Wf}5?!\) \(\text{gg}7\) repulses White, 
but not 20...\(\text{xf}5?\) 21 \(\text{Exf}7\) \(\text{Exf}7\) 22 
\(\text{Wxg}6+\) \(\text{hh}8\) 23 \(\text{Exf}7\) \(\text{Wf}8\) 24 \(\text{ee}8\) 
\(\text{Wxe}8\) 25 \(\text{Wh}6\).

4d) 20 \(\text{Wh}6!\) ? \(\text{Wh}6\) (20...\(\text{Wh}6!\) 
21 \(\text{Wxg}6\) wins) 21 \(\text{Exe}6\) \(\text{Wh}7!\) (not 
21...\(\text{fxe}6?\) 22 \(\text{Wxg}6+, \) nor 21...\(\text{Wb}8?!\) 
22 \(\text{Exf}8\) \(\text{Wxg}3\) 23 \(\text{Wxg}3\) with excel- 

tent winning chances for White) and now:

4d1) 22 \(\text{ff}4?!\) \(\text{hh}7\) (22...\(\text{gg}7?\) 
23 \(\text{Wh}5\) wins for White) and Black 
has some advantage after 23 \(\text{dd}5\) 
\(\text{eh}4\) or 23 \(\text{Wf}3+\) \(\text{hh}4\).

4d2) 22 \(\text{Exf}8\) \(\text{Exf}8\) 23 \(\text{Wf}3\) \(\text{gg}7\) 
24 \(\text{dd}5\) \(\text{ee}5\) 25 \(\text{Wh}4\) is unclear. White 
will gain three pawns for the knight, 
but Black’s king is not in danger.

4d3) 22 \(\text{ff}7\) (with the threat 23 
\(\text{Wxg}6+\)) 22...\(\text{gg}7\) 23 \(\text{dd}5\) \(\text{ee}2!\) 
(23...\(\text{Wg}5\) 24 \(\text{Exf}6\) \(\text{Wh}3\) 25 \(\text{Wh}5\) 
wins while 23...\(\text{eh}4\) 24 \(\text{Exe}7\) \(\text{gg}3\) 
25 \(\text{ff}5+\) \(\text{hh}7\) 26 \(\text{Exg}3\) is a very
favourable endgame for White) 24 \( \texttt{Ke1 Kh4 25 Kxe2 Kxg3 26 hxg3} \) and in view of White's broken kingside pawns, Black has no problems.

4e) 20 \( \texttt{Qxe6 fxe6} \) and now:

4e1) 21 \( \texttt{Kxe6 g7!} \) (certainly not 21...\( \texttt{Kxe6} \) 22 \( \texttt{Wxg6+ Kh8} \) 23 \( \texttt{Wh6+ Kg8} \) 24 \( \texttt{Kxe6+} \) winning for White)
22 \( \texttt{Kd6 We7} \) 23 \( \texttt{h4 We5} \) and Black wins.

4e2) 21 \( \texttt{Wxg6+ Kg7} \) 22 \( \texttt{Kxe6+} \) \( \texttt{Kxe6} \) 23 \( \texttt{Wxe6+ Kh8} \) and White has a perpetual check although possibly not more.

20 \( \texttt{Kf5!!} \) (D)

Defending the knight on g5 so that White can play \( \texttt{Wxh3} \).

20 ... \( \texttt{Kf6} \)

The main alternative is 20...\( \texttt{Kh6} \) (20...\( \texttt{exf5?} \) loses to 21 \( \texttt{Kxe7 Qxe7} \) 22 \( \texttt{Wxh4 Kd8} \) 23 \( \texttt{Wxh5} \)) and now:

1) 21 \( \texttt{Qxe6?!} \) \( \texttt{Kxe6} \) 22 \( \texttt{Kxe6} \) (22 \( \texttt{Kxe6 fxe6} \) 23 \( \texttt{Wxg6+ Wg7} \) defends)
22...\( \texttt{fxe6} \) 23 \( \texttt{Wxg6+ Wg7} \) 24 \( \texttt{Wxe6+ Kh7} \) is unclear.

2) 21 \( \texttt{Qxf7?!} \) and now:

2a) 21...\( \texttt{Kg7} \) 22 \( \texttt{Qe5!} \) and Black is helpless:

2a1) 22...\( \texttt{exf5} \) 23 \( \texttt{Wxg6+ Kh8} \) 24 \( \texttt{Wxh6+} \) mates.

2a2) 22...\( \texttt{fxg5?!} \) 23 \( \texttt{Wxg6+} \) wins after 23...\( \texttt{Kh8} \) 24 \( \texttt{Wxf5} \) or 23...\( \texttt{Kf8} \) 24 \( \texttt{Wxf5+} \) ! \( \texttt{exf5} \) 25 \( \texttt{Qg6+} \).

2a3) 22...\( \texttt{Kf6} \) 23 \( \texttt{Kf3!} \) (threatening \( \texttt{Kef1} \)) wins.

2b) 21...\( \texttt{Kxf7} \) 22 \( \texttt{Wxg6+ Kg7} \) (or 22...\( \texttt{Kg7} \) 23 \( \texttt{Wxh6} \) 23 \( \texttt{Kxe6 Kxe6} \) 24 \( \texttt{Kxe6 Kf8} \) 25 \( \texttt{Kg5!} \) (threatening mate in one) 25...\( \texttt{Kh8} \) (25...\( \texttt{Wf6} \) 26 \( \texttt{Kxf6} \) – isn’t that a nice pair of pins?)
26 \( \texttt{Kh5+ Kh6} \) 27 \( \texttt{Kxh6+ Kh7} \) 28 \( \texttt{Wg1 Wg7} \) 29 \( \texttt{Kxh7+ Wxh7} \) 30 \( \texttt{Wg5} \) should be winning for White.

2c) 21...\( \texttt{Kh7!} \) (Gelfand’s suggestion) is unclear after 22 \( \texttt{Kxh6 Kh6} \) or 22 \( \texttt{Qg5+ Kxg5} \) 23 \( \texttt{Kxg5 Wf7} \) 24 h6.

3) 21 \( \texttt{h4} \) (D) and Black seems to have no adequate defence against the threat of h5:
3a) 21...g7 22 h5 hxg5 23 hxg5 h8 (23...w6 24 hxg6 h8+ 25 g1 wins a pawn with a good position) 24 hxg6+ f8 (24...fxg6? 25 w6+ wins) 25 g5 and again White has a clear pawn more.

3b) 21...h8 22 h5 exf5 (the line 22...xg5 23 xg5 is very good for White) 23 x7 x7 24 x7+ x7 25 x7 g7 26 w5 and White wins.

3c) 21...xg5 22 xg5 g7 23 h5 is line 3a.

3d) 21...c4!? 22 x4 b5 23 b3 (D) 23 d5 a7 24 h5 c7! is less clear-cut) and now:

3d1) 23...h8 24 h5 exf5 25 x7 x7 26 x7+ x7 27 x7 and White wins.

3d2) 23...b7 24 h5 b4 (White also wins after 24...exf5 25 x7 x7 26 x7+ h7 27 xh6) 25 hxg6 exf5 26 x7+ x7 27 gxf7+ f8 (or 27...g7 28 e8) 28 e6 is winning for White.

3d3) 23...w4 24 x7! g7 25 e4 e7 26 d6 x6f5 27 x5 and again White wins.

21 x6 (D)

21...fxe6??

Up to here Black has found the correct defence time after time, but now he goes down without a fight. 21...e8! was the right defence:

1) 22 e1 was my original intention. During the post-mortem we agreed that after 22...x6 23 x6 w6 24 x6 White has enough compensation. Later Gelfand sent me an e-mail pointing out that 22...h4! is very good for Black.

2) 22 f3 h4 (22...h4 23 g4+ g6 24 f3 is a likely draw, but not 22...e5? 23 x7! h4 24 x5 x6 25 x6 x6 26 w1 a8 27 f6 and White wins) 23 x7 x7 24 x7+ x7 25 c7+ e6 26 x6 x6 27 x6+ e7 28 xa8 xe6 29 b6 and the ending slightly favours Black.
3) 22 $\mathcal{N}f1 \mathcal{N}xe6 (22...fxe6 23 $\mathcal{W}xg6+ \mathcal{N}g7 24 \mathcal{W}f6! $\mathcal{W}xf6 25 $\mathcal{W}xe8+ $\mathcal{W}f8 26 $\mathcal{N}xe6+ $\mathcal{N}xe6 27 $\mathcal{W}xe6+$ $\mathcal{W}f7 28 $\mathcal{W}b6$ is unclear) 23 $\mathcal{N}xe6$ fxe6 24 $\mathcal{W}xg6+ \mathcal{N}g7$ 25 $\mathcal{N}f3$ $\mathcal{W}f8$ with advantage for Black.

4) 22 $\mathcal{N}e4! \mathcal{N}xe6$ 23 $\mathcal{N}xe6$ fxe6 24 $\mathcal{W}xg6+ \mathcal{N}g7$ and after 25 $\mathcal{N}f3$ or 25 $\mathcal{N}h5$ $\mathcal{W}f6$ 26 $\mathcal{W}xf6$ $\mathcal{N}xf6$ 27 $\mathcal{N}xe5$ White still should be able to make a draw owing to the reduced material. However, whatever winning chances there are lie with Black.

22 $\mathcal{N}xe6!$ (D)

A deadly blow. Not 22 $\mathcal{N}xe6+?$ $\mathcal{N}xe6$ 23 $\mathcal{N}xe6 \mathcal{W}g7$! and Black is better, nor 22 $\mathcal{W}xg6+?$ $\mathcal{W}g7$ (however, 22...$\mathcal{N}g7$? 23 $\mathcal{N}xe6$ wins for White) 23 $\mathcal{W}h5$ leading only to a draw.

22 ...

$\mathcal{N}g7$

Or 22...$\mathcal{N}xe6$ 23 $\mathcal{W}xg6+$ $\mathcal{N}g7$ (if 23...$\mathcal{N}g7$, then 24 $\mathcal{N}xe6+$) 24 $\mathcal{N}xe6+$ $\mathcal{W}f7$ (24...$\mathcal{W}h8$ 25 $\mathcal{N}h5+$ mates) 25 $\mathcal{W}xf7+$ $\mathcal{W}f8$ 26 $\mathcal{W}xf6$ and White wins.

23 $\mathcal{N}xe7+$ $\mathcal{N}xe7$

24 $\mathcal{W}xf8$ $\mathcal{W}xf8$

White’s large excess of pawns would be enough to win in any case, but in fact Black doesn’t even get a chance to bring his queenside pieces into play.

25 h4! 1-0

In view of 25...$\mathcal{W}h7$ 26 h5 $\mathcal{N}e7$ 27 $\mathcal{W}f3$ $\mathcal{N}f5$ 28 $\mathcal{W}xb7$.

The Wijk aan Zee tournament went well in general, although the failed brilliancy against Sokolov was an unnecessary loss. At first I thought that my loss to Topalov was also unnecessary, but it turned out later that he had seen much more than I had. In the last round I beat Tiviakov in a game lasting 107 moves, gaining revenge for a loss I had suffered against him in 1989. In fact I have only lost once to him at a normal time-limit, but he has written about it so often that most people think I have a huge negative score against him! My score of 8/13 was sufficient for second place behind Ivanchuk.

In April I participated in the annual Amber tournament in Monaco, which consists of a mixture of blindfold and rapid games. At the start I played a number of difficult opponents, but in these early rounds managed $1^{1/2}-1/2$ against Karpov and Lautier and 2-0 against Nikolić. However, Kramnik had
raced into the lead and I was never able to catch up with him. Half-way through I had a bad patch with six draws and two losses from eight games (I was even a bit lucky to achieve this meagre total). Finally I came to the end of the bad patch, beat Xie Jun 2-0 and then met Judit in the following round. In the blindfold game she had the advantage but then played some strange moves and after a hard fight I won. Then we met in the rapid game.
Game 36
V. Anand – J. Polgar
5th Amber Rapid, Monte Carlo 1996
Pirc Defence

1 e4
My win in the earlier blindfold game had been tiring – after getting a position where she could barely move a piece, I allowed myself to be swindled and had to win the game several times. Surely the rapid game (with my eyes open!) would be more relaxing?

1 ... g6
I didn’t expect ...g6 and was quite surprised that she played it.

2 d4 \( \mathcal{A} \)g7
3 \( \mathcal{A} \)c3 d6
4 \( \mathcal{A} \)e3 c6
5 \( \mathcal{W} \)d2 b5
6 f4

I couldn’t really remember what to play here, but in a rapid game you shouldn’t worry too much about minor details. By now the exertions of the first game had faded away, at the prospect of a good hackfest! Somehow, I couldn’t bring myself to be solid, especially after three wins in a row.

6 ... \( \mathcal{A} \)f6
7 \( \mathcal{A} \)d3
Not 7 e5? b4!.

7 ... e5
8 \( \mathcal{A} \)f3 exd4

Now 17 \( \mathcal{A} \)e2 \( \mathcal{A} \)f8 18 \( \mathcal{A} \)fe1 leads to a horribly passive position, and 18...\( \mathcal{A} \)g4 intending 19...\( \mathcal{A} \)c3 would
be very unpleasant. Therefore, I decided to throw caution to the winds and swing my queen over.

17 f5 Hfe8
18 Wf4 Qe5 (D)

18...h6!? is also possible: after 19 fxg6 fxg6 20 Hc2! (direct attempts like 20 Hc4+ don't work) the position is quite messy.

Understandably, Judit tries something else.

with ...hxg6, since 25...fxg6? loses to 26 Hc3!, but he has outfoxed himself, since that mighty b7-bishop is now staring at f3!) 26 Qf5 gxf5 27 Hxf5 Qd7! (now this works since Black can meet Hg1 with ...Hxf3+) and I suspect that Black is already winning.

24 exf6? is also bad as Black can reply 24...Hxe1 25 fxg6 (25 fxg7 cxd3) 25...fxg6!.

![Chessboard diagram](image)

19 Wh4 Wd8
20 He3 Hxf3
21 gxf3 Wb6
22 Hf4

To meet ...d5 with e5. Nevertheless, Black must play ...d5 as otherwise White would have time for Hc2-g2.

22 ... d5
23 e5 c4
24 fxg6 (D)

Not 24 bxc4? dxc4 25 fxg6 hxg6! (by including the exchange on c4, White has forced Black to recapture

24 ... hxg6 (D)

24...fxg6! is better:

1) 25 bxc4 Qd7 is clearly good for Black.

2) 25 exf6 Hxf6 26 Hxe7 Hxe7! (26...Hxe7? 27 Hg5) is slightly better for Black.

3) 25 Qf5!. We thought in the post-mortem that Black was better after 24...fxg6, but later I found this move, which, while not as promising as in the game, still offers White good chances. Besides, White doesn't have much of a choice at this point. I am
not sure how to assess the position aside from the usual cop-out of unclear! One possible continuation is 25...gx\textit{f}5 26 \textit{xf}5! h6 (26...\textit{c}8 27 \textit{xf}6!) 27 \textit{g}1 with messy complications.

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

29 ... \textit{f}8
Or 29...\textit{x}g7 30 \textit{h}6+! \textit{h}8 31 \textit{e}3+ \textit{g}8 32 \textit{g}5+ \textit{f}8 33 \textit{x}b6 picking up the queen.

30 \textit{w}h6 \textit{e}2 (D)

31 \textit{bxc}4!!

I am very proud of this move, which was the main reason why I selected this game. Basically, I quickly rejected 31 \textit{g}6+ followed by 32 \textit{xf}6 because of 32...\textit{xf}3+. Judit had gone much further in this line, but I couldn’t be bothered – I wanted something cleaner. Black’s pieces are perfectly placed; indeed the only piece which can be better placed is the e8-rook (aside from the black king, of course!). I noticed \textit{g}2+ followed by \textit{xe}2 and I also saw \textit{bxc}4 in connection with the move \textit{c}5 disturbing the black queen. Suddenly I realized that the \textit{d}3-pawn could not move! Bingo!

After 31 \textit{g}6+ \textit{e}7 32 \textit{xf}6 Black may play:
1) 32...\(\text{\textsc{h}}\text{xf}3+) (I had only seen this) 33 \text{\textsc{h}}\text{xf}3 \text{\textsc{h}}\text{xe}1+ 34 \text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}2 \text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}1+ 35 \text{\textsc{h}}\text{h}3 \text{\textsc{w}}\text{xf}6. I stopped here – I was convinced I was winning and didn’t want to waste my time making this work.

2) 32...\text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}8! (full marks to Judit for noticing this move!) and now I am indebted to \textit{Fritz4} for the reply 33 \text{\textsc{d}}\text{d}6+! \text{\textsc{w}}\text{xd}6 34 \text{\textsc{h}}\text{xd}3! (the only way – White needed to jettison his f4-bishop in order to cover f3 and to lure the enemy queen to d6, from where it no longer eyes the g1-square) 34...\text{\textsc{w}}\text{xf}6 35 \text{\textsc{w}}\text{xf}6+ \text{\textsc{xf}}6 36 \text{\textsc{xe}}\text{e}2 \text{c}3! and Black is certainly not worse here.

White can also try 31 \text{\textsc{cxd}}3, with the same idea as in the game, but then Black can limp on with 31...\text{\textsc{e}}7.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
31 & ... \\
\hline
32 & \text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}2+ \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

After 31...\text{\textsc{e}}7 32 \text{\textsc{h}}\text{xd}3! \text{\textsc{xf}}2 White has:

1) 33 \text{\textsc{xf}}2 \text{\textsc{xf}}2 34 \text{\textsc{xf}}7+ \text{\textsc{xf}}7 35 \text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}6+ (35 \text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}6+ \text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}8!) 35...\text{\textsc{e}}7 (35...\text{\textsc{e}}6 36 \text{\textsc{f}}\text{f}5+ \text{\textsc{e}}7 37 \text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}7+ \text{\textsc{d}}8 38 \text{\textsc{c}}\text{c}7#) 36 \text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}7+ \text{\textsc{e}}6.

2) 33 \text{\textsc{xf}}7+! \text{\textsc{xf}}7 34 \text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}6+ \text{\textsc{e}}7 (34...\text{\textsc{e}}6 35 \text{\textsc{xf}}2 is winning for White) 35 \text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}7+ and now either 35...\text{\textsc{d}}8 36 \text{\textsc{xf}}2 \text{\textsc{e}}1+ (36...\text{\textsc{g}}8 37 \text{\textsc{c}}\text{c}7+! \text{\textsc{xc}}7 38 \text{\textsc{xf}}6+ is decisive) 37 \text{\textsc{g}}2, or 35...\text{\textsc{e}}6 36 \text{\textsc{e}}1+ \text{\textsc{e}}4 (36...\text{\textsc{e}}4 37 \text{\textsc{xe}}4 is winning) 37 \text{\textsc{xe}}4, winning for White in both cases.

32 \text{\textsc{g}}\text{g}2+

She had missed this one. Now I win the house.

1-0

Topalov was easily the most successful tournament player in 1996, finishing either first or joint first in Amsterdam, Novgorod, Leon, Madrid, Vienna and Dos Hermanas. I had already lost two games against him in 1996, so I was looking forward to stopping the sequence.
Game 37
V. Anand – V. Topalov
Dortmund 1996
Sicilian, Scheveningen

1 e4 c5
2 d4 e6
3 e3 a6

A slightly unusual move-order, but both of us seemed to have decided that the game was going to be a e2 Scheveningen regardless of the move-order! The comment in Game 25 about this being an inflexible move-order for White only applies if White is going to play the aggressive f4 and f3 system. You can play the solid e2 line against almost anything.

4 d4 cxd4
5 exd4 c6
6 e2 d6
7 0-0 f6
8 e3 e7
9 f4 0-0
10 a4 c7
11 h1 e8

A position on which I had done a lot of work for the Kasparov match. Although I wasn’t so successful in the match itself, the analysis paid off over the succeeding months. At the time this game was played, I was still far ahead of other grandmasters in my understanding of this line. Later on they caught up with me, but not before I had notched up several wins.

12 f3 a5 (D)

13 g4!
Kasparov played 13 g1 against Topalov a month earlier at Dos Hermanas, but I decided to be less subtle. That game continued 13...f8 14 e1 b8 15 h3 d7 16 h2 c6 17 d1 xd4 18 xd4 b5 19 axb5 axb5 20 e5 with an edge for White.

13 ... d7
13 ... c4 14 c1 e5 15 f5 exf4 16 g5 is good for White.

14 g2

This move reflects one of my discoveries: that when Black plays ...d7 voluntarily, it may not be
necessary to play g5. Of course, you may want to play g5 in the end for attacking purposes, but White can time it much better. One point behind leaving the pawn on g4 is that an early g5 can be met by ...g6 followed by ...e5. If the pawn is still on g4 it is much easier for White to meet this manoeuvre by the piece sacrifice $\text{Q_f5}$, opening the g-file after ...gx$f5$ gx$f5$.

14 ... $\text{Q_f8}$

Black has a range of possible plans; for example he could continue 14...b6, but again White plays $\text{Q_e1}$, $\text{Q_d1}$ and any other useful moves he can find before pushing the g-pawn.

15 $\text{Q_e1}$ b6

After 15...$\text{Q_c4}$, White plays 16 $\text{Q_c1}$ intending b3 and $\text{Q_b2}$.

16 $\text{Q_d1}$ $\text{Q_b7 (D)}$

Black defends the $\text{h7}$-square by ...g6, ...$\text{Q_g7}$ and ...$\text{Q_f8}$ White again makes use of the position of the pawn on g4 by playing f5, since then ...exf5 can be met by gx$f5$.

17 ... $\text{Q_c6}$

After 17...$\text{Q_c4}$ 18 $\text{Q_c1}$ g6 19 $\text{Q_d3}$ White proceeds with his kingside attack.

18 $\text{Q_de2!}$

White must make time for this move as 18 $\text{Q_f3}$ lets Black free his position by 18...$\text{Q_xd4}$ 19 $\text{Q_xd4}$ e5 20 $\text{Q_h3}$ h6.

18 ... $\text{Q_b4}$

19 $\text{Q_d2 (D)}$

19 $\text{Q_h4}$

White’s plan is to move the e3-bishop out of the way (possibly to g1) and then to play $\text{Q_d3}$-h3. After

If 19...d5, then 20 e5 f6 21 exf6 $\text{Q_xf6}$ 22 $\text{Q_d4}$ gives White a positional advantage. The text-move aims to provoke g5. This looks odd unless you have read the earlier discussion about the merits of withholding g5!

20 g5 $\text{f6 (D)}$
After 20...g6 21 \textit{f3} \textit{c8} 22 \textit{h3} h5 23 \textit{g3} a deadly sacrifice on h5 is looming, while 20...h6!? 21 \textit{w}f2 (21 \textit{d}d4!? hxg5 22 fxg5 \textit{e}e5 23 \textit{df}2 is also possible) 21...hxg5 22 fxg5 \textit{e}e5 23 g6! fxg6 24 \textit{xb}6 favours White.

If Black continues quietly by 20...\textit{c}c8, White plays 21 \textit{g}1 followed by \textit{f}3-h3.

21 \textit{d}d4!

Returning to exert pressure on the new weakness at e6.

21 ... \textit{fxg5} 

After 21...\textit{c}6 22 gxf6! Black runs into problems:

1) 22...\textit{xf}6 23 \textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6 24 e5 \textit{g}4 25 \textit{g}1 \textit{a}5 26 \textit{b}3 \textit{xg}2+ 27 \textit{xg}2 \textit{h}6 28 \textit{e}4 with a clear endgame advantage.

2) 22...\textit{xf}6 23 e5 (23 \textit{xc}6 \textit{xc}6 24 e5 \textit{xg}2+ 25 \textit{xg}2 \textit{d}7 is only equal) 23...\textit{d}5 24 \textit{xd}8 \textit{xd}8 25 \textit{xd}5 \textit{xd}5 (25...\textit{exd}5 26 e6! \textit{xe}6 27 \textit{xe}6 \textit{xe}6 28 \textit{xb}6 is very pleasant for White) 26 \textit{xd}5 exd5 and now both 27 \textit{f}3!? and 27 e6 \textit{xe}6 28 \textit{xe}6 \textit{xe}6 29 \textit{xb}6 give White some advantage.

22 \textit{fxg}5 \textit{c}6

23 \textit{df}2! \textit{c}8

After 23...\textit{xd}4 24 \textit{xd}4 \textit{e}5 Black has finally occupied the e5-square, but it's a bit late for this to matter: White continues 25 \textit{xe}5 dxe5 26 \textit{f}7 with an excellent position.

24 \textit{ce}2!

In order to make sure that White can maintain a knight on d4.

24 ... \textit{c}5

After 24...\textit{de}5? White can choose between the quiet 25 b3 and the sharp 25 \textit{xe}6 \textit{xe}6 26 \textit{xf}8+ \textit{xf}8 27 \textit{xf}8+ \textit{xf}8 28 \textit{f}4 \textit{ee}8 29 \textit{d}5, with some advantage for White in either case.

25 \textit{xc}6 \textit{xc}6

26 \textit{d}4 (D)

26 ... \textit{d}7
I don’t think either of us looked at 26...\( \text{a4} \) for more than one second. In such a position you just know that Black cannot afford to go pawn-grabbing. White would continue 27 \( \text{f3} \) (threatening 28 \( \text{h3} \); 27 b4 e5 is less clear) and now:

1) 27...e5 28 \( \text{h3} \) h6 29 \( \text{h5}! \) and White’s attack is very strong.

2) 27...\( \text{c7} \) 28 b4! and now:
  2a) 28...\( \text{b7} \) 29 \( \text{xe6!} \) \( \text{xe6} \) 30 g6 and White is winning.
  2b) 28...\( \text{d7} \) 29 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{e5} \) 30 g6!! \( \text{xe6} \) (30...\( \text{h4} \) 31 \( \text{xe6+} \)) 31 \( \text{xd8} \) \( \text{xd8} \) 32 \( \text{xe6} \) and wins.
  2c) 28...e5 29 bxc5 exd4 30 cxb6 is the critical line. White has the advantage but the game is far from over.

27 e5!

The point of Black’s previous move is to set up latent threats along the c8-h3 diagonal; for example 27 \( \text{f3} \) e5 28 \( \text{f5} \) g6 29 \( \text{h3} \) h5! refutes the attack. The text-move effectively counters this plan.

27 ... \( \text{dxe5} \)

After 27...d5 28 \( \text{f3} \), followed by \( \text{h3} \), White has an immense attack.

28 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{c6} \)

After 28...\( \text{c7} \) (28...\( \text{d6} \) 29 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c7} \) 30 \( \text{fd1} \) and wins) White continues his attack by 29 g6 h6 30 \( \text{g5} \). It looks slow, but White will gradually use his greater firepower on the kingside: 30...\( \text{e7} \) (30...\( \text{c6} \) 31 \( \text{f7} \) 31 \( \text{f7}! \) \( \text{c6} \) 32 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} + \) 33 \( \text{g1} \) \( \text{f8} \) 34 \( \text{h7} \) \( \text{xa4} \) 35 b4 \( \text{a3} \) (35...\( \text{xc2} \) 36 \( \text{xf8} \) wins) 36 \( \text{xh6}! \) and the long-awaited sacrifice on h6 finishes Black.

29 \( \text{xe5} \) \( \text{g2+} \)

30 \( \text{xg2} \) (D)

The threat is 31 \( \text{g4} \) followed by 32 \( \text{f6} \).

30 ...

\( \text{c7} \)

White’s preponderance on the kingside is simply too great:

1) 30...\( \text{e7} \) 31 \( \text{g4}! \) and now:
  1a) 31...\( \text{h8} \) 32 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) (if 32...\( \text{xf6} \), then 33 \( \text{g6} \) 33 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf6} \) (33...\( \text{g6} \) 34 \( \text{g5} \) 34 \( \text{xf6} \) and the white attack is decisive.
  1b) 31...\( \text{d5} \) 32 \( \text{f6}+ \) \( \text{xf6} \) 33 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{c7} \) 34 a5! and White is winning, for example 34...\( \text{bxa5} \) 35 \( \text{f7}+ \) \( \text{xf7} \) 36 \( \text{xf7} \) \( \text{xf7} \) 37 \( \text{f2}+ \) picks up a piece.

2) 30...\( \text{d5} \) 31 \( \text{g6} \) h6 32 \( \text{xh6}! \) \( \text{gxh6} \) (32...\( \text{xe5} \) 33 \( \text{c1} \) mates) 33 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 34 g7 \( \text{yg2+} \) 35 \( \text{yg2} \) \( \text{xc2+} \) 36 \( \text{h1} \) \( \text{yg7} \) 37 \( \text{yh6+} \) wins.
31 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{h8} \)

White also wins after 31...e5 32 \( \text{f6}+ \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 33 \( \text{gxf6}+ \) \( \text{h8} \) 34 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 35 \( \text{h6} \) or 31...\( \text{d5} \) 32 \( \text{f6}+ \) \( \text{gxf6} \) 33 \( \text{gxf6}+ \) \( \text{g7} \) 34 \( \text{h6} \).

32 \( \text{wh3}! \)

Threatening 33 g6 followed by a sacrifice on h6.

32 ...

\( \text{wd5} \)

The continuation 32...g6 33 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 34 \( \text{c3}+ \) \( \text{g7} \) 35 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{e4} \) 36 \( \text{c6} \) is decisive.

33 g6 \( \text{h6} \) (D)

34 \( \text{exh6}! \)

White has more than one good continuation, but this is the most convincing. After 34 \( \text{exh6} \) \( \text{g6} \) 35 \( \text{exh6}! \) (not 35 \( g7+? \) \( \text{xg7} \) 36 \( \text{h6} \) \( \text{g8} \), but 35 \( \text{xf8}+ \) \( \text{xf8} \) 36 \( g7+ \) \( \text{g8} \) 37 \( \text{xf8}+ \) \( \text{g8} \) 38 \( \text{exh6}+ \))

35 \( \text{g7+}! \)

35 \( \text{exh6} \) (35 \( \text{xf8}+? \) \( \text{xf8} \) 36 \( g7+ \) \( \text{xg7} \) 37 \( \text{wh6+} \) \( \text{f7} \) 35...\( \text{exh6} \) 36 \( \text{wh6+} \) \( \text{g8} \) which transposes to the last note. The order of moves in the game rules out the possibility of...

35 ...

\( \text{wh7} \)

Or 35...\( \text{xf7} \) 36 \( \text{xf8}+ \) \( \text{xf8} \) 37 \( \text{wh6+} \) \( \text{g8} \) 38 \( \text{ef6+} \) \( \text{f7} \) 39 \( \text{wh7} \).

36 \( \text{exh6} \)

Threatening 37 \( \text{f7++} \) \( \text{g8} \) 38 \( \text{wh8} \);

36 ...

\( \text{g6} \)

37 \( \text{whxh6} \)

Or 37...\( \text{wh7} \) 38 \( \text{wh3} \) \( \text{exh6} \) 39 \( \text{f6} \) \( \text{g8} \) 40 \( \text{wh6} \) with further material gains to follow.

38 \( \text{f6} \) 1-0

38...\( \text{g8} \) 39 \( \text{wh6+} \) \( \text{h7} \) 40 \( \text{f6+} \) \( \text{h8} \) 41 \( \text{h4+} \) \( \text{h7} \) 42 \( \text{d4+} \) \( \text{h8} \) 43 \( \text{f7} \) wins at least another piece.

This was almost a model game, but it is not easy to appreciate unless you are familiar with all the intricacies of the Scheveningen.

Towards the end of the year I competed in a very strong double-round event in Las Palmas. The other players were Kasparov, Karpov, Topalov, Kramnik and Ivanchuk. I started with two draws, but in the third round my tournament came alive with the following game.
Game 38

V. Anand – V. Ivanchuk

Las Palmas 1996

Ruy Lopez

This game was played on my birthday. The tournament had begun slowly, with only one decisive result in the first two rounds and there had been a lot of whining amongst the public and press about it. This seems a bit unjustified, given the fighting spirit that prevails these days, but perhaps chess fans are right to worry that chess will revert back to the 17-move draws prevalent in the 1980s.

1 e4 e5

If anyone doesn’t know already, Ivanchuk plays everything. In fact I expected this, but of course couldn’t be sure!

2 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \)

3 \( \text{Qb5} \) a6

4 \( \text{Qa4} \) \( \text{Qf6} \)

5 0-0 \( \text{Qc5} \)

Ivanchuk had already played this move twice during 1996. 5...b5 6 \( \text{Qb3} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) was all the rage in 1995, but by this time it had been superseded by the text-move.

6 \( \text{Qxe5} \)

6 c3 b5 7 d4 bxa4 8 dxc5 \( \text{Qxe4} \) 9 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 10 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qb7} \) was played in Short-Ivanchuk, Novgorod 1996, which ended in a draw. Somehow I didn’t feel like repeating this line.

6 ... \( \text{Qxe5} \)

7 d4 \( \text{Qxe4} \)

8 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qe7} \)

9 \( \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qg6} \)

10 c4 0-0

11 \( \text{Qc3} \) d6

If 11...c6, intending 12...b5, then 12 d5 is slightly better for White.

12 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qh4} \)

For some reason, this had escaped my attention; the point is that 13 g3 is met by 13...c6 (this actually happened in Smirin-Izeta, Las Palmas 1993). After the text-move I thought for a long time, because if Black drives the knight back with ...c6 then he has solved all his opening problems. Then I saw the exchange sacrifice, but I consumed a lot of time before taking the plunge. I didn’t want to concede equality too easily on my birthday, but the possibility of just being an exchange down was sobering. Finally I decided that Black wouldn’t be able to break White’s bind.

13 \( \text{Wh5}! \)

An innovation.

13 ... c6 \( \text{(D)} \)

13...\( \text{Qe6}!? \) is an alternative since 14 \( \text{Qf4} ? \) \( \text{Qxc4} \) 15 \( \text{Qxg6} \) fails to
15...\textit{\textbf{x}xf2+}. Therefore White is better advised to play 14 \textit{\textbf{c}c2}.

14 \textit{\textbf{H}xh4}!

Consistent. Otherwise Black is just better.

14 ... \textit{\textbf{W}xh4}

Not 14...\textit{\textbf{Q}xh4}? 15 \textit{\textbf{g}g5} with the lines:

1) 15...\textit{\textbf{W}a5} 16 \textit{\textbf{Q}e7+} \textit{\textbf{h}8} 17 \textit{\textbf{c}c2} \textit{\textbf{h}6} (17...\textit{\textbf{Q}g6} 18 \textit{\textbf{Q}xg6} \textit{\textbf{fxg6}} 19 \textit{\textbf{Q}xg6+} and 17...\textit{\textbf{Q}f5} 18 \textit{\textbf{Q}xf5} \textit{\textbf{xf5}} 19 \textit{\textbf{Q}f6}! are also hopeless for Black) 18 \textit{\textbf{W}xh6+}! \textit{\textbf{gxh6}} 19 \textit{\textbf{Q}f6#}.

2) 15...\textit{\textbf{f}6} 16 \textit{\textbf{Q}xh4}! \textit{\textbf{c}xd5} 17 \textit{\textbf{W}xd5+} \textit{\textbf{h}8} 18 \textit{\textbf{g}g3} with excellent compensation for the exchange.

15 \textit{\textbf{W}xh4} \textit{\textbf{Q}xh4}

16 \textit{\textbf{Q}b6} \textit{\textbf{B}b8}

Trying to keep the material. Black can bail out by playing 16...\textit{\textbf{Q}f5}, but the two bishops give White a slight edge.

17 \textit{\textbf{Q}f4} \textit{\textbf{Q}f5}

Not 17...\textit{\textbf{d}d8}? 18 \textit{\textbf{g}g5}.

18 d5

Establishing the bind. 18 \textit{\textbf{H}e1}?
\textit{\textbf{Q}xd4} 19 \textit{\textbf{Q}xd6} \textit{\textbf{e}e6} 20 \textit{\textbf{Q}xb8} \textit{\textbf{xb8}} is even slightly better for Black.

18 ... \textit{\textbf{H}e8} (D)

After 18...\textit{\textbf{c}xd5} 19 \textit{\textbf{c}xd5} \textit{\textbf{d}d8} 20 \textit{\textbf{H}e1} \textit{\textbf{f}f8} 21 \textit{\textbf{h}3} \textit{\textbf{Q}e7} 22 g4! Black still has to find a way to untangle.

19 \textit{\textbf{Q}f1}

White would like to play 19 g4, but this is impossible because of the reply 19...\textit{\textbf{H}e4}. The text-move, however, threatens 20 g4 because White can meet 19...\textit{\textbf{H}e4} by 20 \textit{\textbf{H}e1}!. Other methods of preparing g4 are less effective:

1) 19 \textit{\textbf{h}3} \textit{\textbf{h}5}! (19...\textit{\textbf{H}e5} 20 \textit{\textbf{d}d1} and 19...\textit{\textbf{e}e2} 20 g4 \textit{\textbf{Q}xb2} 21 \textit{\textbf{B}b3} \textit{\textbf{d}d4} 22 \textit{\textbf{Q}xd6} \textit{\textbf{Q}xb3} 23 axb3 \textit{\textbf{Q}b3} 24 c5! favour White) 20 \textit{\textbf{Q}f1} \textit{\textbf{H}e4}! and White no longer has the move \textit{\textbf{H}e1}.

2) 19 f3? (this stops 19...\textit{\textbf{H}e4} and threatens g4, but there is another problem) 19...\textit{\textbf{e}e2}! 20 g4 \textit{\textbf{Q}d4} 21 \textit{\textbf{Q}f1} \textit{\textbf{Q}xb2} 22 \textit{\textbf{Q}xd6} \textit{\textbf{Q}xf3} 23 \textit{\textbf{Q}xb8}
\( \text{xg4} \) and there is no defence to mate!

It is hardly necessary to mention that the greedy 19 dxc6 bxc6 20 \( \text{gxh} \) releases the bind and gives Black the advantage after 20...\( \text{e} \).

19 ... \( \text{h} \)?

Up to here Black has defended well, but after this move he gets in serious trouble. The idea of relieving the back rank in order to prevent \( \text{e} \) in response to ...\( \text{e} \) is correct, but he has chosen the wrong pawn move. The alternatives are:

1) 19...\( \text{e} \)? 20 \( \text{e} \) is good for White.

2) 19...f6 20 h3 \( \text{e} \) 21 \( \text{d} \) c5 22 \( \text{x} \) fxe5 \( \text{xe} \) 23 g4 \( \text{d} \) (23...\( \text{e} \) 24 \( \text{d} \) , followed by \( \text{b} \), and White will win at least a pawn) 24 f4! is very good for White, since Black’s queenside pieces are still immobilized. If Black continues 24...exf4, then 25 \( \text{e} \) followed by \( \text{e} \) wins a piece.

3) 19...h5!? and now:

3a) 20 dxc6 (White can always bail out this way) 20...bxc6 21 \( \text{x} \) x6 \( \text{xb} \) 6 (better than 21...\( \text{e} \) 22 \( \text{d} \) d5 or 21...\( \text{d} \) 22 c5!) 22 \( \text{x} \) xe8 \( \text{xb} \) and Black should be fine.

3b) 20 \( \text{d} \) \( \text{e} \) is very unpleasant for White.

3c) 20 \( \text{e} \) + 21 \( \text{xe} \) f6 is a risky line for White.

20 h3

Now Black is in difficulties.

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

20...\( \text{d} \) 21 g4 \( \text{h} \) 22 c5 is good for White.

21 \( \text{h} \)

Black’s problem is that...h6 has not prevented White’s g4, as 19...h5 would have done.

21 ... cxd5 (D)

22 g4

White’s threat is not so much 23 gxf5 as 23 \( \text{c} \). Black is obliged to surrender material in the hope of obtaining three pawns for a piece.

22 ... \( \text{xc} \) 4

23 \( \text{xc} \) d4

24 \( \text{e} \)

This intermezzo does the trick - White succeeds in exchanging rooks. After 24 \( \text{d} \) \( \text{e} \) ! (but not 24...b5 25 \( \text{c} \) \( \text{h} \) 4 26 \( \text{x} \) d6 \( \text{b} \) 7 27 \( \text{g} \) threatening both mate and the h4-knight) 25 gxf5 \( \text{xf} \) Black avoids the rook-swap.

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

Or 24...\( \text{d} \) 25 \( \text{e} \) + \( \text{h} \) 26 \( \text{xd} \) a8 27 \( \text{e} \) 5 b5 (27...\( \text{c} \) 28
\( \mathcal{f}c2 + f5 \) 29 \( f4! \) is hopeless; the threat is 30 \( \mathcal{h}xc8 \), and if Black exchanges on e5 the passed pawn will decide) 28 \( \mathcal{d}d1 \) \( \mathcal{c}c6 \) 29 \( \mathcal{c}c2+ f5 \) 30 \( \mathcal{h}xc8 \) \( \mathcal{h}xc8 \) 31 \( \mathcal{x}xf5+g6 \) 32 \( \mathcal{h}xe8 \) 33 \( \mathcal{e}xa6 \) b4 34 \( \mathcal{e}e2 \) and the minor-piece ending is won for White.

25 \( \mathcal{g}xf5 \) \( \mathcal{xf}5 \)
26 \( \mathcal{a}xd6 \) \( \mathcal{h}h3+ \)
27 \( \mathcal{g}1 \) \( \mathcal{d}8 \)
28 \( \mathcal{e}e8+ \) \( \mathcal{h}xe8 \)
29 \( \mathcal{a}xe8 \) \( \mathcal{e}6 \)

Black has three pawns for the bishop, but the pawns are far back and Black has only one passed pawn, so White should win, although care is required.

30 \( a4! \) \( g5 \)
31 \( a5 \)

Now there is only the kingside to worry about.

31 ... \( \mathcal{g}7 \)
32 \( \mathcal{a}a4 \) \( \mathcal{g}6 \)
33 \( \mathcal{d}d1 \)

After 33 \( \mathcal{c}c2+ \) \( \mathcal{f}5 \) 34 \( \mathcal{d}d1 \) \( \mathcal{e}4 \) Black's bishop takes up its optimum square.

33 ... \( \mathcal{d}5 \)
34 \( \mathcal{c}2+ \) \( \mathcal{f}6 \)
35 \( \mathcal{c}7 \)

Stopping 35...h5 because of the reply 36 \( \mathcal{d}8+ \).

35 ... \( \mathcal{e}6 \)
36 \( \mathcal{h}7 \)

Now White prevents ...f5. Black is gradually running out of active moves, when it will be time for the white king to advance.

36 ... \( \mathcal{f}3 \)
37 \( \mathcal{h}2 \) (D)

37 ... \( \mathcal{d}5 \)
38 \( \mathcal{c}2! \)

Not 38 \( \mathcal{g}3? \) \( \mathcal{e}4 \). It is still too early to allow the exchange of bishops.

38 ... \( \mathcal{e}4 \)
39 \( \mathcal{d}1 \) \( \mathcal{d}4 \)
40 \( \mathcal{e}2 \) \( \mathcal{d}3 \)
41 \( \mathcal{b}6+ \)

The two bishops form an effective team.

41 ... \( \mathcal{d}5 \)
42 \( \mathcal{d}1 \) \( f5 \)
43 \( \mathcal{g}3 \) \( \mathcal{e}5 \)
44 \( \mathcal{c}5 \) \( \mathcal{f}6 \)
45 \( \mathcal{h}5 \) \( f4+ \)

Or 45...\( \mathcal{g}7 \) 46 \( \mathcal{d}4+ \) \( \mathcal{h}7 \) 47 \( \mathcal{f}7 \), followed by \( \mathcal{d}5 \), and one of Black's queenside pawns falls.

46 \( \mathcal{h}2 \) 1-0

The pawns are blockaded and White will soon win one by either \( \mathcal{f}3 \) or \( \mathcal{f}8 \).
In round 6 I slid back to 50% after a horrible loss to Kramnik in which I failed to put up any resistance. I spent the evening disgusted with my play and decided to adopt an uncompromising style the next day against Karpov. The result was my best game of the tournament.

1 \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \)

There was no way I could face a boring Caro-Kann and trying to deal with an improvement on move 45 leading to a difficult ending, etc. I felt that it would be better to go down in style than to do something like that. Now, how does a move like 1 \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) allow me to get interesting positions? Well, to be honest, 1 \( \text{\texttt{f3}} \) can lead to positions even more boring than after 1 e4 c6, but at least they would be unfamiliar boring positions!

1 \( ... \) d5
2 d4 e6
3 c4 dxc4
4 e4

I played this without hesitation as I wanted to liven things up immediately.

4 \( ... \) b5
5 a4 c6

6 axb5 cxb5
7 b3

He had already started thinking a lot and I knew that he wasn’t familiar with this opening – not that there is a great deal of theory on it.

7 \( ... \) \( \text{\texttt{b7}} \)
8 bxc4 \( \text{\texttt{xe4}} \)
9 cxb5 \( \text{\texttt{f6}} \)
10 e2

10 \( \text{\texttt{d3}} \) has been played more frequently.

10 \( ... \) \( \text{\texttt{e7}} \)
11 0-0 0-0 \( (D) \)

12 \( \text{\texttt{c3}} \)

The game Lutz-P.Schlosser, Berlin 1989 continued 12 \( \text{\texttt{bd2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{b7}} \) 13 \( \text{\texttt{c4}} \) a6 14 b6 \( \text{\texttt{c6}} \) 15 \( \text{\texttt{d2}} \) \( \text{\texttt{d5}} \)
with an obscure position – it isn’t clear whether the b6-pawn will be weak or strong. Developing the b1-knight to c3 appears more natural as it exerts some influence over the important d5-square.

12 ... \&b7
13 \&xe5 a6

After 13...\&b4 14 \&b2 \&xc3 (or 14...a6 15 \&f3) 15 \&xc3 a6 (15...\&d5 16 \&f3 is also a little better for White) 16 \&f3! (better than 16 \&a5 \&d5! 17 \&f3 \&xb5 and White cannot profit from the b-file line-up) White has an edge.

14 \&f3 (D)

After 16 \&b3 axb5 17 \&xa8 \&xa8 18 \&xb5 White has an edge, but facing Karpov’s defensive skills I preferred to aim for a large advantage!

16 ... \&b6
17 \&e2!!

I decided that the bishop had nothing more to do on f3 and the best plan was to relocate it to d3.

17 ... axb5

There is no choice; both 17...a5 and 17...f6 18 \&e3! a5 19 \&d3 \&d7 20 \&f3 would leave White with a very strong passed b-pawn.

18 \&xb5 \&c7
19 \&f4 \&d6
20 \&d3 \&a6 (D)

After 20...\&c6 21 \&b3, the white pieces are ominously aimed at the black kingside.

14 ... \&d5

Karpov finds the safest solution, leaving himself with only a slight disadvantage. Black can also try 14...\&xf3 15 \&xf3 \&xd4 16 \&xa8 \&xc3 17 \&f4, when again White has a slight edge.

15 \&xd5 exd5
16 \&b1!

21 \&xh7+!

Here, I spent a few seconds looking at 21 \&xd5, which leaves White with a clear extra pawn, but as I mentioned earlier I couldn’t face a
long, technical game. In many lines Black can exchange on e5, leaving a position with 4 vs 3 on one side. Depending on which pieces are left, this might or might not be a win, but the game would certainly continue for a long time. Then I saw $\mathcal{A}xh7+$ and didn’t waste any more time on $\mathcal{A}xd5$. I spent some time analysing the sacrifice, and didn’t see a defence for Black. By now I was too excited to analyse and decided that I would simply play it. Karpov had hardly any time left and I was sure he wouldn’t find a defence.

Perhaps this decision was somewhat reckless but I wasn’t punished for it – indeed, I was rewarded with a nice win.

21 ... $\mathcal{D}xh7$
22 $\mathcal{W}h5+$ $\mathcal{G}g8$
23 $\mathcal{B}b3$ (D)

alternatives that would have offered Black more defensive chances, although White retains a very dangerous attack in every line. Certainly it would be a monumental task to defend this position over the board, especially taking into account Black’s time shortage.

The alternatives are:

1) 23...$\mathcal{C}c8$ 24 $\mathcal{G}g3$ and now:

1a) 24...$\mathcal{A}a3$ (this move was suggested by a New in Chess reader, Maarten de Zeeuw) (D) with a further branch:

```
23 ... $\mathcal{A}xe5$?
```

After this error there is no saving Black’s position. There were two

1a1) 25 $\mathcal{A}xg7+$ $\mathcal{A}xg7$ 26 $\mathcal{A}h6+$ $\mathcal{F}f6$ 27 $\mathcal{A}e1$ $\mathcal{G}g8$ 28 $\mathcal{W}h4+$ (28 $\mathcal{G}g6$
$\mathcal{A}xg6$ 29 $\mathcal{W}h4+$ $\mathcal{F}f5$ 30 $\mathcal{W}h5+$ is perpetual check, while 28 f4 is unclear, but could also be a draw) 28...$\mathcal{E}e6$ 29
$\mathcal{G}g4+$ $\mathcal{D}d7$ 30 $\mathcal{F}f6+$ $\mathcal{C}c6$ 31 $\mathcal{C}c1+$
$\mathcal{B}b7$ 32 $\mathcal{A}xc7+$ $\mathcal{C}xc7$ looks unclear.

1a2) 25 f3 $\mathcal{W}e7$ and White has various attacking ideas:

1a21) 26 $\mathcal{H}h6$ $\mathcal{A}xe5$ 27 dxe5 g6
28 $\mathcal{A}xf8$ $\mathcal{W}a7+$ 29 $\mathcal{H}h1$ $\mathcal{A}a1$ 30
\[ \text{xg6+ fxg6 31 \text{wxg6+ leads to a draw}.} \]

1a22) 26 \text{g5 f6 (26...\text{we6 27 h3}) 27 g6 \text{we8 and White has no effective way to proceed.}}

1a23) 26 \text{c1! \text{w6 27 h6 (27 g5 xe5 28 xf6 xf6 29 xd5 d3 is a likely draw) 27...xe5 (if Black allows White to take on g7 then White should have the advantage) 28 dxe5 \text{b6+ 29 h1 g6 30 xf8 c3 31 \text{w6 xc1+ 32 xc1 and White wins.}}}

1b) 24...\text{we7 (D) and now:}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chess_diagram.png}
\caption{Chess board diagram}
\end{figure}

1b1) 25 \text{g5 and now Black should play 25...f6 26 g6 we8, with an unclear position, rather than 25...we6, when 26 h3 \text{hx3 27 gxh3 f6 28 g6 fxg5 29 h8+ f7 30 xf8 xf8 31 f4 g4 32 h5+ is very promising for White.}}

1b2) 25 \text{h6! xe5 26 dxe5 g6 27 e6! xe6 (27...xe6 28 xf8 wins material) 28 we5 f6 29 xg6+ and White wins.}

2) 23...f6! 24 h3 fxe5 (24...xe5 25 dxe5 transposes to the game) 25 dxe5 \text{c4! (25...xf4 26 e6 \text{f8 27 wh8+ e7 28 wg7+ xe6 29 xe1+ xe4 30 h6+ forces mate)} and now:

2a) 26 \text{w7+ f7 27 e6+ f6 (27...xe6 28 e1+! wins for White and 27...e8 28 \text{g6+ d8 29 g5+ c8 30 c1 is clearly better for White) with another fork:

2a1) 28 h6+? gh6 29 \text{wh6+ f5 (29...e7 30 g5+ mates) 30 g4+ e4 31 e1+ we2! (31...d3 32 \text{g6+ d4 33 xd6 probably favours White, but is extremely messy; I didn’t bother to analyse this line deeply as the strength of 31...we2! made it irrelevant) 32 xe2+ xe2 33 xd6 a1+ 34 g2 f1+ 35 g3 f3+ 36 h4 h3+ and Black wins.}}

2a2) 28 g5+ xe6 29 e1+ d7 (not 29...e5 30 xe5+ d6 31 e1 c6 32 \text{g6+ c7 33 wg7+ b6 34 b1+ b5 35 hb3 winning for White) 30 \text{wg7+ c6 31 c3 d7 32 xe4+ xc4 with an unclear position. White has a lot of pawns on the kingside, but since Black’s king is now safe he can activate his pieces.}}

2b) 26 e1! (cutting off the enemy king’s escape route) 26...\text{xf4 27 wh7+ f7 28 exd6 and now:

2b1) 28...e8 29 h5+ g6 30 e7+!! xe7 (30...f6 31 \text{f3! is an unexpected win) 31 \text{h7+ f6}
(31...\textit{f8} 32 \textit{dxe7}+ \textit{e8} 33 \textit{w}xg6+ \textit{xe7} 34 \textit{h}7+ mates) 32 \textit{w}xe7+ \textit{f}5 33 \textit{w}f8+ \textit{e}5 34 \textit{e}3+ with a decisive advantage for White.

2b2) 28...\textit{c6} 29 \textit{f}3 \textit{xf}3 30 \textit{gf}f3 \textit{c}4 31 \textit{h}1. White has the advantage because of his d-pawn and persisting attack, but this was Black's best chance.

\textbf{24 \textit{h}3 \textit{f}6}  
\textbf{25 \textit{dxe5} \textit{w}e7}  
\textbf{25...\textit{c}4 26 \textit{e}1 \textit{xf}4 27 \textit{h}7+ \textit{f}7 28 e6+ \textit{e}8 29 g6+ is also no help for Black.}  
\textbf{26 \textit{h}7+ \textit{f}7}  
\textbf{27 \textit{g}3 (D)}

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

\begin{center}
\textbf{28 \textit{x}g7}
\end{center}

From now on, the game pretty much plays itself - there are several ways to win on every move! One alternative is 28 exf6! gxf6 (the lines 28...\textit{x}xf6 29 \textit{g}7 \textit{w}e6 30 \textit{h}5+ \textit{f}7 31 \textit{x}xf7 \textit{w}xf7 32 \textit{e}1+ and 28...\textit{w}xf6 29 \textit{e}1+ are also terminal) 29 \textit{e}3 \textit{w}xe3 30 fxe3 \textit{xf}1 31 \textit{d}6 and White will have a decisive material advantage.

\textbf{28 ... \textit{w}e6}  
\textbf{29 exf6 \textit{c}6}  
\textbf{30 \textit{a}1 \textit{d}8}  
\textbf{31 h4}

To clear the back rank - it's always nice to have time for such details.

\textbf{31 ... \textit{b}7}  
\textbf{31...\textit{d}4 loses to 32 \textit{c}7+ \textit{c}8 33 \textit{a}5.}  
\textbf{32 \textit{c}1 \textit{a}6}  
\textbf{33 \textit{a}1}

Again, there are other routes to victory, e.g. 33 \textit{c}7+ \textit{c}8 34 \textit{b}6.

\textbf{33 ... \textit{b}7}  
\textbf{34 \textit{d}1 \textit{a}6}  
\textbf{35 \textit{b}1! \textit{xf}6}  
\textbf{36 \textit{g}5 \textit{c}8}  

\textbf{1-0}

Karpov lost on time while in the act of playing 36...\textit{c}8. The reply 37 \textit{b}6 wins on the spot.

Winning this game gave me a 6-3 score against Karpov in decisive games.

My other games ended in draws and my score of +1 was sufficient for outright second place behind Kasparov.

Finally, here is an effort of which I am very proud, from the Credit Suisse chess festival in Biel (July-August 1997).
At the opening ceremony the previous day, the chess players had to play a match against representatives from the Swiss Skiing Federation. Each participant from the A and B tournaments had to play two moves and if they didn’t mate the skiers within 24 moves, then the skiers won. The chess players chose the Scandinavian. To my great surprise, this is exactly what happened in my first round game!

1 e4 d5

I don’t recall Joël ever having played this before, but he hadn’t competed at all since Monaco in April, so I assumed this was an opening he had prepared during the intervening three months.

2 exd5  

I decided to test him in this critical variation.

6 ...  

7  

The variations with 7  leave White with a slight edge, but I remembered that 7  and 8 g4 gave Black more problems.

7 ... e6

8 g4 g6

9 h4 bd7! (D)

Joël chooses the best line. After 9...b4 10 d2 e4 11 f3! White gained some advantage in Campora-Curt Hansen, Palma de Mallorca 1989 and it was after this game that people started to look at 9...bd7 more seriously.
10 \( \Box xd7 \) \( \Box xd7 \)
11 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{e4} \)
12 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{g2} \)

A nice finesse – if White plays \( \text{g3} \), then Black will gain a tempo with a later \( \text{d6} \). However, if the game continuation is correct, then Black will have to abandon his finesse and play 12...\( \text{d5} \). Then 13 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 14 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{c7} \) 15 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 16 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{f4?} \) 17 0-0-0 0-0-0 18 \( \text{xh7} \) won a pawn for White in Ochoa de Echagüen-Denker, New York Open 1989, but of course this was not forced.

13 \( \text{xe3!} \)

I had wanted to play 13 \( \text{g3} \), which gives White a slight edge despite the fact that Black can play 13...\( \text{d6} \), but a fresh look at a position during a game can often turn up better moves than those found during home preparation!

13 ... \( \text{b6} \)

After 13...\( \text{b5} \) 14 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{b4} \) 15 \( \text{e4} \) Black will have to play 13...\( \text{xe4} \) sooner or later, when White will be better due to his two bishops. Understandably, Joël didn’t want to resign himself to an inferior position with few prospects of counterplay.

14 \( \text{d3!} \)

This move, which I found at the board, was the reason I decided to go for 13 \( \text{xe3} \) instead of 13 \( \text{g3} \).

14 \( \text{b3?!} \) is inferior after 14...\( \text{c5!} \), when Black has good counterplay.

14 ... \( \text{d5} \) (D)

The obvious reply, attacking c3 and e3.

15 \( \text{f3!} \)

This remarkably calm move is the point behind White’s play. He is willing to jettison a few pawns and/or the exchange in order to snare the bishop on \text{g2}. When the bishop is finally trapped, Black will probably end up with a rook and two pawns for two minor pieces. Owing to the lack of open files, the minor pieces will be very much more at home in the resulting position than the rooks and this, coupled with White’s lead in development, will almost inevitably give him a clear advantage.

In C. Bauer-Prié, French Championship 1996, the continuation 15 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{xc3} \) 16 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 17 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{a4} \) 18 \( \text{e2} \) \( \text{b5} \) 19 \( \text{h6} \) 0-0-0 was fine for Black.

15 ... \( \text{b4} \) (D)

After 15...\( \text{xc3} \) 16 \( \text{xc3} \) \( \text{xc3}+ \)
17 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 18 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{xf3} \) 19
\( \text{xf3} \) or 15...\( \text{dxe3} \) 16 \( \text{xe3 wb6} \) 17 \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{h3} \) 18 \( \text{b1} \) a position of the type mentioned above is reached; White holds the advantage in both cases.

If 19...\( \text{d4} \), then 20 \( \text{g3 w6} \) 21 \( \text{a3! xh5+} \) (21...\( \text{xa3} \) 22 \( \text{e4!} \) also wins) 22 \( \text{xg2 g3+} \) 23 \( \text{f1} \) is winning for White.

16 \( \text{f2!} \) \( \text{xc3} \)

The above comment also applies to the line 16...\( \text{dxc3} \) 17 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{dxc3} \) 18 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 19 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{xe3} \) 20 \( \text{xe3} \).

17 \( \text{bxc3} \) \( \text{xc3} \)

18 \( \text{b1} \) \( \text{xd4} \)

White wins after 18...\( \text{xf3} \) 19 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{xd4} \) 20 \( \text{xb7} \) 0-0 21 \( \text{e4} \).

19 \( \text{xb7} \) \( \text{xd8} \) \( \text{(D)} \)

The other critical variation runs 19...\( \text{h3} \) 20 \( \text{xf7!} \) (I stopped here, but Joël saw two moves further!) 20...c5 (Black simply protects his queen and threatens 21...\( \text{xf7} \); if instead 20...\( \text{dxe3} \), then 21 \( \text{xe3 wb6} \) 22 \( \text{f4} \) is very good for White) 21 \( \text{f5!! dxe3} \) 22 \( \text{xe3 wb2} \) 23 \( \text{xc5} \) 0-0 24 \( \text{g3!} \) winning, as Black will be lucky to get a single extra pawn.

After the text-move, I saw the possibility of \( \text{g6} \) but then I realized that it didn’t work immediately because Black could run with his king, e.g. 20 \( \text{g6 xd1} \) 21 \( \text{xe6+ f8} \) 22 \( \text{a3+} \) (or 22 \( \text{xf7+ g8} \) 22...\( \text{e7} \) 23 \( \text{xe7+ g8} \), and the attack fails.

Then I saw the possibility of inserting \( \text{h6} \) at the start of the combination, when a later...\( \text{g8} \) could be met by \( \text{g7+} \). Suddenly, all that remained was to check the details...

20 \( \text{h6!! gxh6?} \)

This gave me a chance for a really beautiful finish. Black could still fight on with 20...\( \text{dxe3} \), but Joël hadn’t seen the idea behind \( \text{h6} \)! The analysis runs:

1) 20...\( \text{g6} \) 21 \( \text{xg6! xd1} \) 22 \( \text{xe6+ f8} \) 23 \( \text{xf7+ g8} \) 24 \( \text{g7+ f8} \) 25 \( \text{a3+} \) followed by mate.
2) 20...\(\texttt{\textit{D}}\)xe3 (absolutely the only move that doesn’t lose by force) 21 \(\texttt{\textit{D}}\)xe3 \(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)e5 22 hxg7 \(\texttt{\textit{B}}\)g8 and now 23 \(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)c1! threatening \(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)a3 and \(\texttt{\textit{D}}\)xg2 is strong (not 23 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)h6 \(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)h2!).

21 \(\texttt{\textit{G}}\)g6!! (D)

![Chess Diagram]

1) 21...\(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)xe3+ 22 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)xe3 fxg6 23 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)c5 wins.

2) 21...\(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)f6 22 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)xf7+ \(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)xf7 23 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)xf7 \(\texttt{\textit{D}}\)xe3 24 \(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)xd8+! (24 \(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)e2 \(\texttt{\textit{D}}\)d1+ 25 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)xg2 \(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)xf7 is less clear, although White remains much better after 26 \(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)e4) 24...\(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)xd8 25 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)xe3 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)h3 26 \(\texttt{\textit{D}}\)xa7 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)e8 27 \(\texttt{\textit{B}}\)xh7 and Black loses several pawns, followed by his bishop!

3) The key variation is 21...\(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)xd1 22 \(\texttt{\textit{B}}\)xe6+ \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)f8 23 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)xh6+ \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)g8 24 \(\texttt{\textit{D}}\)xf7#.

22 \(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)xd4 \(\texttt{\textit{W}}\)xd4
23 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)d3!

There is no need to bother with 23 \(\texttt{\textit{B}}\)xe6 \(\texttt{\textit{B}}\)d7 when the text-move wins effortlessly.

23 ... \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)d8
24 \(\texttt{\textit{B}}\)xd8+ \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)xd8
25 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)d3! 1-0

Because after 25...\(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)h1 26 \(\texttt{\textit{A}}\)b2 \(\texttt{\textit{B}}\)e8 27 \(\texttt{\textit{B}}\)f6 Black will soon be in zugzwang and have to surrender at least a piece.

1996 and 1997 have been extremely successful years for me. I’ve not only had good and consistent results, but have also produced a lot of beautiful games. I am enjoying myself immensely playing chess and hope that my current form augurs well for a renewed attempt at gaining the title of World Champion.
Combinations

A. Hamed – V. Anand
Thessaloniki Olympiad 1984

Although White’s king is in an awkward situation, for the moment the bishop on g2 is providing an adequate defence. How did Black press home his attack?

V. Tukmakov – V. Anand
Delhi 1986

White’s bishop is horribly placed and Black is effectively a piece up on the rest of the board, but does he have anything better than simply exchanging on f2?
Ja. Gil – V. Anand  
*World Junior Championship, Gausdal 1986*

White chose to meet the attack on his queen by 31 \( \text{d}2 \) (31 \( \text{we}2 \) would have been a better chance). How did Black finish the game at a stroke?

J. Gdanski – V. Anand  
*World Junior Championship, Baguio City 1987*

Although Black’s protected passed pawn on a2 is very dangerous, White has an extra pawn and threatens to start eliminating the queenside pawns by \( \text{d}4+ \) and \( \text{xb}3 \). How did Black make use of his advanced pawns? Note that it is not Black’s first move but his fourth which is the difficult one!

J. Levitt – V. Anand  
*Match (3), London 1987*

White is threatening to make further progress on the queenside with 29 \( \text{cc}6 \). How did Black pre-empt this with a kingside strike?
Black has just played 14...\(\mathcal{D}\)\(f6-d5\), preparing to answer 15 b5 by 15...\(\mathcal{D}\)xc3 followed by 16...\(\mathcal{A}\)xb5. What is the flaw in this plan which allowed White to score a quick win?

This was a lucky escape for Anand. White has sacrificed a piece for an enormous attack, and now he could have won by 35 \(\mathbb{W}h6+\ \mathcal{G}g8\) 36 \(\mathbb{H}e6\), when there is no answer to the threat of 37 \(\mathbb{W}g5+\ \mathcal{G}f8\) 38 \(\mathbb{H}f6\). Instead, he rushed in with 35 \(\mathbb{H}e6\), but Black replied ... what?

Anand had gone into this ending deliberately, even though his king is now far away from the action. Is the position a win?
After 44...\texttt{Ec3}, confining White’s king, Black has good drawing prospects, for example 45 \texttt{Cd6 Ec7} 46 \texttt{Cxf7} (46 \texttt{Cf5 Ec1}) 46...\texttt{Cxc6} 47 \texttt{h6} \texttt{Cd4} 48 \texttt{h7} \texttt{Cd5} 49 \texttt{h8W} \texttt{Cxd4} 50 \texttt{Cxd4} 51 \texttt{Ce7} \texttt{Cd3} 52 \texttt{Ce5+ Ec2}. However, Black was impatient to attack the b2-pawn and played 44...\texttt{Ec7}. Why was this a mistake?

Black has a formidable line-up along the g-file, but White is threatening to force exchanges by \texttt{f1}. How did Black make use of the aggressively posted rook on g2?

Ivanchuk now played the serious error 17 \texttt{Cf1}? (instead 17 \texttt{Ff4} would have been very good for White). How did Black then win?
Material is equal, but White has several threats. If Black does not have something special, then he will be in big trouble. What did Anand play?

The position seems to be rather awkward for White as his king is in serious danger. Not only does the possibility of a back-rank mate mean that White’s queen has restricted mobility, but Black is also threatening to win the h2-pawn, after which his own h-pawn will become very dangerous. If White defends it by 42 \( \text{Wg1} \), then 42...\( \text{Ag2} \) will drive the queen away. Can you see a clear-cut way for White to save the game?

White would like to advance his pawn, but at the moment this would leave his rook undefended. Is 51 \( \text{Cc2}+ \) followed by 52 b6 the right way to proceed?
White has an extra pawn, but he will have to work hard to exploit it. However, the Dutch grandmaster made the awful blunder 27...\texttt{Wd7??}. Why was this so bad?

Black has an advantage, but it appears that considerable work will be needed to win. Anand made it look easy by winning a vital pawn. How?

16...\texttt{Rd8} 17 \texttt{Wf3} and 16...\texttt{Re8} 17 \texttt{f4} are winning for White, so Salov decided to give up the exchange by 16...\texttt{d6}. What happened next?

A truly chaotic position. Black can reach a favourable ending by playing 29...\texttt{Wxg5} 30 \texttt{Wxg5} \texttt{Rxg5} 31 \texttt{Rxf1} \texttt{bxd3}, but how did Anand win far more convincingly?
In this position one might expect protracted strategic manoeuvring by White, but Anand was able to utilize his queenside pressure to launch an explosive combination. How?

In return for the sacrificed pawn, White has a large lead in development. How did he use it to launch a deadly attack? The detailed variations are quite complex, but the main point is to get the basic idea right!

White’s king is very exposed, but he has a knight ready to hop into d6. How did Black win material?
White is a pawn up and he is attacking Black’s rook, but even so Anand found a combination leaving him with a clear advantage. What was it?

White’s h-file attack is certainly dangerous, but Black’s queen has just leapt into White’s position and is attacking the b2-rook and c3-pawn. How did White proceed with his attack?

White has very strong threats on the kingside in return for the piece, but first of all he has to deal with the attack on his rook. Which move is correct: 42 f6 or 42 h6?
White has a slight advantage as Black’s e-pawn is slightly weak and his bishop is more active than the enemy knight. On the other hand, Black’s doubled rooks on the d-file could be useful. Adams now continued with 31...\textit{f7}. Why was this a mistake?
Material is equal, but White has a dangerous passed pawn. How did Anand utilize this pawn to win the game?

Despite material equality, White is winning due to the imprisoned bishop on h2. What is the most efficient method of finishing the game?

White is already a pawn up, but Black will gain a little counterplay if he has time for ...\texttt{Qc5}, attacking b3 and opening the d-file. How did Anand finish the game vigorously?

In this innocuous-looking position, White found a way to win a pawn. How?
1) 
42...\(\texttt{\&d1!}\) 
Threatening to win the queen with 43...\(\texttt{\&f2+}\) and thus forcing White’s reply.

43 \(\texttt{\&a2}\) \(\texttt{\&a1!}\) 
A neat way to eliminate the defensive rook and so gain access to \(f2\).

44 \(\texttt{\&b2}\)

44 \(\texttt{\&xa1}\) \(\texttt{\&f2+}\) 45 \(\texttt{\&xf2}\) \(\texttt{\&xf2}\) is hopeless as White will lose the e-pawn immediately.

44...\(\texttt{\&xb2}\) 45 \(\texttt{\&xb2}\) \(\texttt{\&b1}\) 46 \(\texttt{\&e2}\) \(\texttt{\&a3}\) 47 \(\texttt{\&f1}\) \(\texttt{\&a2}\) 0-1

2) 
26...\(\texttt{\&d3!}\) 
This is much stronger than taking on \(f2\). Black ends up in the same type of position, but with an extra pawn.

27 \(\texttt{\&e2}\)

This is forced because 27 \(\texttt{\&xe3}\) \(\texttt{\&a1+}\) 28 \(\texttt{\&g2}\) \(\texttt{\&e1+}\) and 27 \(\texttt{\&xd3}\) \(\texttt{\&xf2}\) 28 \(\texttt{\&h1}\) \(e2\) are dead lost for White.

27...\(\texttt{\&xf2}\) 28 \(\texttt{\&xf2}\) \(\texttt{\&e2}\) 29 \(\texttt{\&f1}\) \(\texttt{\&g7}\)

Not only has Black won an important pawn, but his king has a clear run into the heart of White’s position.

30 \(\texttt{\&b5}\) \(\texttt{\&f6}\) 31 \(\texttt{c5}\) \(\texttt{\&xc5}\) 32 \(\texttt{\&xf2}\) \(\texttt{\&e5}\) 0-1

White will soon lose the d5-pawn, when he will be two pawns down for nothing.

3)

31...\(\texttt{\&f3+}\) 0-1

A typical combination. After 32 \(\texttt{\&xf3}\) \(\texttt{\&g5+}\) Black wins material.

4)

28...\(\texttt{\&xg3}\)

A surprising but strong combination based on the immobility of the e2-bishop.

29 \(\texttt{\&xg3}\) \(\texttt{\&h3}\) 30 \(\texttt{\&d1}\)

White is unable to defend because his bishop gets in the way wherever it moves. The alternatives are:

1) 30 \(\texttt{\&bc6}\) \(\texttt{\&xg3+}\) 31 \(\texttt{\&h1}\) \(\texttt{\&g8}\)

32 \(\texttt{\&f1}\) \(g4\) 33 \(\texttt{\&d2}\) \(\texttt{\&h3+}\) 34 \(\texttt{\&g1}\) \(g3\) and wins.

2) 30 \(\texttt{\&f1}\) \(\texttt{\&xg3+}\) 31 \(\texttt{\&h1}\) \(\texttt{\&g4}\)

32 \(\texttt{\&xf8+}\) \(\texttt{\&xf8}\), again winning.

3) 30 \(\texttt{\&f1}\) \(\texttt{\&xg3+}\) 31 \(\texttt{\&g2}\) (31 \(\texttt{\&g2}\) and 31 \(\texttt{\&h1}\) lose to 31...\(\texttt{\&g4}\))

31...\(\texttt{\&xe3}\) 32 \(\texttt{\&h2}\) \(\texttt{\&xb3}\).

30...\(\texttt{\&d7}\)

White no longer defends \(f1\) and so Black can win a whole rook.

31 \(\texttt{\&g2}\) \(\texttt{\&xg2+}\) 32 \(\texttt{\&xg2}\) \(\texttt{\&xb6}\)

33 \(\texttt{\&a5}\) \(\texttt{\&ae8}\) 34 \(\texttt{\&c5}\) \(\texttt{\&xc5}\) 35 \(\texttt{\&xc5}\) \(\texttt{\&c4}\) 36 \(\texttt{\&xc4}\) \(\texttt{\&xc4}\) \(\texttt{\&bxc5}\) \(\texttt{\&c4}\) 36 \(\texttt{\&xc4}\) 37 \(\texttt{\&c6}\) \(\texttt{\&c8}\) 38 \(\texttt{\&a4}\) 3 0-1
5)

48...\(\text{a}3\)!

The only possibility, but the game is not over yet.

49 \(\text{d}4+\)

Or 49 \(\text{h}1 \text{d}6+ 50 \text{d}4+ \text{x}d4+ 51 \text{c}xd4 \text{x}b2\) and the pawns are too dangerous, e.g. 52 \(\text{c}4 \text{a}1!\) 53 \(\text{x}c1 \text{b}2\) or 52 \(\text{h}6+ \text{f}7 53 \text{x}h7+ \text{g}6 54 \text{a}7 \text{c}1\).

49...\(\text{e}5 50 \text{xb}3 \text{xb}2 51 \text{h}1\)

White takes aim at Black's last pawn.

51...\(\text{a}3!\)

Of course 51...\(\text{a}1\) followed by \(\text{x}h7\), is a draw.

52 \(\text{a}1\)

After 52 \(\text{c}2 \text{xb}3 53 \text{xb}3 \text{a}1\) 54 \(\text{xa}1 \text{xa}1\) the h-pawn decides as the white king cannot reach h1 (55 \(\text{c}2 \text{xe}4 56 \text{d}2 \text{f}3 57 \text{e}1 \text{g}2\).

52...\(\text{x}c3+ 53 \text{d}2 \text{xa}1\)

The simplest solution. Now there is no question of a rook's pawn and wrong bishop draw.

54 \(\text{xa}1 \text{a}3 55 \text{c}2 \text{h}5 56 \text{b}2 \text{a}8 57 \text{f}4+ \text{xe}4 58 \text{e}1+ \text{xf}4 59 \text{a}1 \text{h}4 60 \text{e}7 \text{h}8 61 \text{xa}2 0-1\)

6)

After 15 \(\text{b}5 \text{xc}3\) White played 16 \(\text{wd}3!\), threatening mate on h7. This interpolation defends the b5-pawn with gain of tempo, and so wins a piece. The finish was 16...\(\text{g}6 17 \text{xc}3 \text{wc}7 18 \text{bxa}6 \text{a}5 19 \text{xa}5 1-0\).

7)

Finding the winning line (without moving the pieces!) is a good test of your powers of visualization. It is long but absolutely forced.

53...\(\text{c}5\)

After 53...\(\text{d}5 54 \text{b}6+ \text{c}5 55 \text{xa}4+ \text{c}4 56 \text{g}5 \text{b}3 57 \text{f}5 \text{xa}4 58 \text{e}5\), White's king is just in time to win the game.

54 \(\text{a}3 \text{d}5\)

The best chance. White can no longer win the a-pawn, so Black can ultimately play his king round to b3.

55 \(\text{g}4 \text{e}4 56 \text{c}4 \text{d}4 57 \text{f}3 \text{c}5 58 \text{e}3 \text{b}4 59 \text{d}3!\)

This knight sacrifice leads to a winning ending of \(\text{w}6\) vs \(\text{w}6\).

59...\(\text{xa}3 60 \text{c}5 \text{b}2\)

Or 60...\(\text{b}3\) (60...\(\text{b}4 61 \text{c}6 \text{a}3 62 \text{c}2\) 61 \(\text{c}6 \text{a}3 62 \text{c}7 \text{a}2 63 \text{c}8 \text{a}1\) \(\text{w}64 \text{c}4+ \text{a}3 65 \text{a}6+ \text{b}2 66 \text{b}5+ \text{c}1\), winning as in the game.

61 \(\text{c}6 \text{a}3 62 \text{c}7 \text{a}2 63 \text{c}8 \text{a}1 \text{w}64 \text{c}2+ \text{a}3 65 \text{c}5+ \text{a}2 66 \text{c}4+ \text{a}3 67 \text{a}6+ \text{b}2 68 \text{b}6+ \text{c}1 69 \text{c}5+ \text{b}2 70 \text{b}4+ 1-0\)

After 70...\(\text{a}2 71 \text{c}2\) Black is mated.

8)

After 35...\(\text{xe}6\) White resigned immediately, due to 36 \(\text{fxe}6 \text{e}4#\).

9)

Black had overlooked a tactical point and White won by 45 \(\text{c}7+ \text{d}7 46 \text{d}6 \text{xc}7 47 \text{e}8+ \text{d}7 48\)
\( \text{\textcopyright xg7 e7 49 f2 f6 50 h6 g6 51 f5 1-0.} \)

10)

33...\text{\textcopyright g3}!

Sometimes the best move is not a spectacular combination but a simple liquidation to an ending. At first sight Black has not obtained very much from his position, but a closer inspection shows that the penetration of a rook into the heart of White’s position has fatal consequences.

34 \text{\textcopyright xg3} \text{\textcopyright e2}

The pawns on a2, c3, d3 and f3 are all vulnerable to attack and in this blocked position White’s bishop is unable to develop any activity.

35 \text{\textcopyright h2 e3} 36 \text{\textcopyright xg8+ \textcopyright xg8 37 d4}

A desperate attempt to bring the bishop to life.

37...f4

Black shuts the bishop out completely.

38 \text{\textcopyright xe5} \text{\textcopyright xe5} 39 g1+ h7 40 \text{\textcopyright f1}

Or 40 g5 \text{\textcopyright f7} 41 xh5+ g7 42 \text{\textcopyright f5} \text{\textcopyright xc3} and the pawns will fall one by one.

40...\text{\textcopyright xc3} 41 \text{\textcopyright f2} \text{\textcopyright f7} 42 g2 b5 43 \text{\textcopyright f1} b4 0-1

12)

48...\text{\textcopyright f3+} 49 g2 \text{\textcopyright h4+!}

An unusual case in which a knight forks another knight.

50 \text{\textcopyright xg3}

Or 50 \text{\textcopyright xh4} \text{\textcopyright xd5+} 51 f3 (51 \text{\textcopyright xg3} \text{\textcopyright gxh4+} wins a whole rook)

51...\text{\textcopyright xc3} 52 \text{\textcopyright g6+} h7 and Black’s material advantage is decisive. Thus White has to surrender a piece.

50...\text{\textcopyright xf5+} 51 \text{\textcopyright h2 e7}

Defending the rook and thus unpinnning the bishop.

52 e4 \text{\textcopyright e2}

The rest is easy.

53 \text{\textcopyright xc8+} \text{\textcopyright xc8} 54 g3 \text{\textcopyright xh5} 55 \text{\textcopyright d8} b6 56 f4 bxa5 57 bxa5 g7 58 e5 f7 59 fxg5 hxg5 60 exd6 \text{\textcopyright xd6 0-1}

13)

Definitely not!

51 \text{\textcopyright g2}!

Avoiding Black’s cunning trap, 51 \text{\textcopyright c2+} f3 52 b6? \text{\textcopyright h3+!!} forcing a draw by stalemate. White would have to return by 52 \text{\textcopyright c6} or 52 \text{\textcopyright c5}, but of course this loses time.

51...\text{\textcopyright f5} 52 \text{\textcopyright c2+} \text{\textcopyright d1} 53 \text{\textcopyright c1+}

Again White must take care. 53 \text{\textcopyright d2+} e1 54 b6? again runs into a stalemate after 54...\text{\textcopyright f3+} 55 g1 \text{\textcopyright g2+}.

53...\text{\textcopyright e2} 54 b6

Now the pawn can safely advance. Black’s one check on f3 is harmless.

54...\text{\textcopyright b5} 55 \text{\textcopyright c7} \text{\textcopyright e5} 56 \text{\textcopyright c2+} \text{\textcopyright d1} 57 \text{\textcopyright c1+} e2 58 \text{\textcopyright b1} 1-0
14) White continued:
42 \( \text{Wg1} \text{Gg2} \) 43 a5!
Not 43 \( \text{Wxg2? hhxg2+} \) 44 \( \text{Gxg2} \) \( \text{Gg5} \) 45 h3 \( \text{Gf4} \) 46 a5 \( \text{Gb8} \) 47 a6 \( \text{Gc7} \) 48 \( \text{Gf1} \text{Gg3} \) 49 \( \text{Gf2} \text{Gxh3} \) 50 \( \text{Gf3} \text{Gb8!} \) 51 a7 \( \text{Gxa7} \) 52 \( \text{Gf4} \) and one way to win is the attractive manoeuvre 52...\( \text{Gxe3+!} \) 53 \( \text{Gf5} \text{Gg5} \). Paradoxically, White needs to preserve the black pawn on h3 to set up a stalemate.

43 \( \text{Wb1+} \text{Gg7} \) 44 a5 \( \text{Gxh2+} \) 45 \( \text{Gg1} \) may also draw, but it is certainly a less forcing line than the text-move and offers more chances to go wrong, for example 45...\( \text{Gg2+} \) 46 \( \text{Gh1} \text{Gxg4} \) 47 a6? (47 \( \text{Wb7+} \text{Gg6} \) 48 \( \text{Wc8} \) is correct) 47...h2 48 a7 \( \text{Gg1+} \) 49 \( \text{Wxg1+} \text{hxg1} \text{W+} \) 50 \( \text{Gxg1} \) \( \text{Gd4+} \) and wins.

43...\( \text{Gxg1} \) 44 \( \text{Wxg1} \)

Now White only needs to give up his g-pawn with g5 and his a-pawn with a7 to force a draw, but he has to make sure that Black cannot win by meeting g5 with ...f5.

44...\( \text{Gg7} \)

After 44...\( \text{Gg5} \) 45 a6 \( \text{Gd4+} \) 46 \( \text{Gh1} \text{Gf4} \) 47 g5, to be followed by 48 a7, Black is forced to stalemate White.

45 a6 \( \text{Gb8} \) 46 \( \text{Gh1} \text{Gg8} \) 47 \( \text{Gg1} \) 47 g5 f5 48 g6 f4 49 g7 f3 50 a7 would also draw.

47...\( \text{Gf8} \) 48 \( \text{Gh1} \text{Ge8} \) 49 g5 f5 50 g6 f4 51 g7 \( \text{Gf7} \) 52 g8\( \text{W+} \) \( \text{Gxg8} \) 53 a7 \( \text{Gxa7} \) 1/2-1/2

15) The game finished 28 \( \text{Gxf4+!} \) 1-0 since 28...\( \text{exf4} \) 29 \( \text{Wf6+} \) forces mate and 28...\( \text{Gg7} \) 29 \( \text{Wd1} \) leaves Black two pawns down with a bad position.

16)

17 \( \text{Ad2} \)
A surprise. White ignores the exchange and, making use of the fact that d6 is now blocked, traps the black queen instead!

17...\( \text{Wc5} \) 18 \( \text{Cc1} \text{Wxc1} \) 19 \( \text{Xc1} \) \( \text{Ad7} \) 20 \( \text{Ah6} \text{Wfe8} \) 21 \( \text{Wf3} \) 1-0

17)

33...\( \text{Wc5} \! \)
This creates an awkward double threat: 34...\( \text{Gf6} \), trapping the queen, and simply 34...\( \text{Wxe3+} \).

34 \( \text{Ad4} \)
This rescues the queen, but at the cost of giving up the e5-pawn.

34...\( \text{Gf6} \) 35 \( \text{Wf3} \text{Wxe5} \)
Not only has Black won a pawn, but he also retains a large positional advantage.

36 \( \text{Ad1} \text{Gg8} \) 37 \( \text{Wf4} \text{Wd5} \) 38 \( \text{Ma1} \) e5 39 \( \text{Wf5} \text{Ac4} \)
Further material loss is now inevitable.

40 b3 exd4! 0-1
As 41 \( \text{Wxd5} \text{Cc2+} \) 42 \( \text{Af3} \text{Gxd5} \) wins a piece.

18)

29...\( \text{Gxh3} \! \)
A very surprising move. Ignoring the attacked rook, Black takes a pawn which is defended three times!

30 \textit{\&}xh3

The other lines lead to crushing material loss, e.g. 30 gxf5 \textit{\&}g4+ 31 \textit{\&}f2 \textit{\&}g2+ 32 \textit{\&}e1 \textit{\&}xh1+, 30 \textit{\&}xh3 \textit{\&}xg4+ 31 \textit{\&}g3 \textit{\&}xd1+ or 30 \textit{\&}xh3 \textit{\&}xg4+ 31 \textit{\&}h2 \textit{\&}f3+.

30...\textit{\&}e1+ 31 \textit{\&}g2 \textit{\&}e2+ 32 \textit{\&}g3 \textit{\&}f3+

32...\textit{\&}xg5 33 \textit{\&}xh7+ \textit{\&}f7 would have been even more devastating, but the move played is more than sufficient.

33 \textit{\&}xf3 \textit{\&}xf3+ 34 \textit{\&}h2

34 \textit{\&}h4 g5+ 35 \textit{\&}h5 \textit{\&}f7+ 36 \textit{\&}xg5 \textit{\&}f6+ 37 \textit{\&}h5 \textit{\&}h6#.

34...\textit{\&}xg4+ 35 \textit{\&}g1 \textit{\&}xd1+ 36 \textit{\&}g2 \textit{\&}e2+ 37 \textit{\&}g3 \textit{\&}f2+ 38 \textit{\&}xg4 h5+ 39 \textit{\&}g5 \textit{\&}f6# (0-1)

19)

32 \textit{\&}xb6!

Hedgehogs are not normally run over like this!

32...\textit{\&}xb6 33 \textit{\&}a5 \textit{\&}a7 34 c5 dxc5 35 bxc5 \textit{\&}c8

White also wins after 35...\textit{\&}xc5 36 \textit{\&}xc5 \textit{\&}fd7 37 \textit{\&}xd7 \textit{\&}xd7 38 \textit{\&}xb6 or 35...\textit{\&}fd7 36 cxb6 \textit{\&}xb6 37 \textit{\&}g3.

36 c6 \textit{\&}b6

36...\textit{\&}b6 37 \textit{\&}b1 is similar.

37 \textit{\&}b1 \textit{\&}xb1 38 \textit{\&}xb1 1-0

This unusual sacrifice traps the black king in the centre long enough for the active white pieces to mount a lethal attack.

14...\textit{\&}xd8 15 \textit{\&}xc5 \textit{\&}d7

Or 15...\textit{\&}e7 16 \textit{\&}d3 f5 (16...\textit{\&}f6 17 \textit{\&}b5+ leads to mate) 17 \textit{\&}xe7 \textit{\&}xe7 18 \textit{\&}xf5! \textit{\&}b6 (18...\textit{\&}xf5 19 \textit{\&}d6+ mates, while 18...\textit{\&}b4 19 \textit{\&}xh7 gives White an enormous attack for almost no sacrifice) 19 \textit{\&}c3! \textit{\&}f8 20 \textit{\&}e4 e5 (or else 21 \textit{\&}e5) 21 \textit{\&}xe5 \textit{\&}e6 22 \textit{\&}a3+ \textit{\&}g8 23 \textit{\&}e7 \textit{\&}f8 24 \textit{\&}f3 (threatening 25 \textit{\&}d7) with a winning attack.

16 \textit{\&}d3 \textit{\&}b5

After 16...\textit{\&}a4 White has a very attractive win by 17 \textit{\&}d4! (17 \textit{\&}d6 \textit{\&}f6!) 17...\textit{\&}e7 (17...\textit{\&}c8 18 \textit{\&}c6! mates and 17...f5 also loses to 18 \textit{\&}c6) 18 \textit{\&}c6!! \textit{\&}xc6 (18...\textit{\&}xc5 19 \textit{\&}d8+ \textit{\&}xd8 20 \textit{\&}xd8#) 19 \textit{\&}xc6+ \textit{\&}f8 20 \textit{\&}d8+ \textit{\&}xd8 21 \textit{\&}xd8#.

If Black tries 16...\textit{\&}b5, then 17 \textit{\&}d6 wins.

17 c4 \textit{\&}xc5

17...\textit{\&}a4 18 \textit{\&}e5 \textit{\&}f6 19 \textit{\&}xd7 0-0-0 20 \textit{\&}xb7+ \textit{\&}c7 (20...\textit{\&}xb7 21 \textit{\&}b1+ mates) allows a beautiful mating continuation: 21 \textit{\&}d6+ \textit{\&}xb7 22 \textit{\&}b1+ \textit{\&}a8 23 \textit{\&}b5! \textit{\&}c8 24 \textit{\&}d3! \textit{\&}c6 25 \textit{\&}f3 \textit{\&}a6 (25...\textit{\&}hc8 26 \textit{\&}xc6+ \textit{\&}xc6 27 \textit{\&}b8#) 26 \textit{\&}a5 \textit{\&}b8 27 \textit{\&}xc6+ \textit{\&}xc6 28 \textit{\&}xe7#.

18 \textit{\&}xd7+ \textit{\&}f8 19 \textit{\&}xb7

Not 19 \textit{\&}xb7 \textit{\&}c6 20 \textit{\&}c6 g6 and Black escapes.

19...g6
After 19...\( \text{Ac}8 \), White finishes by
20 \( \text{Ac}6! \) \( \text{Wxc}6 \) 21 \( \text{Wxc}6 \) (21 \( \text{Ax}d8 \)? 
\( \text{Ax}d8 \)) 21...\( \text{Ax}c6 \) 22 \( \text{Ax}d8+ \) \( \text{Ke}7 \) 23 
\( \text{Ax}h8 \) with a clear extra piece.
20 \( \text{Wxa}8 \) \( \text{Gg}7 \) 1-0
Black is too much material down after 21 \( \text{Ax}d8 \) \( \text{Wxc}4 \) 22 \( \text{Qd}2 \).

21)
29...\( \text{Axe}5! \) 30 fxe5
After 30 \( \text{Qd}6 \) \( \text{We}7 \) 31 \( \text{Ax}d5 \) (or
31 fxe5 \( \text{Wxh}4+ \) 32 \( \text{Gg}1 \) \( \text{Ac}2! \) 33 
\( \text{Wxc}2 \) \( \text{Wh}1+ \) 34 \( \text{Qf}2 \) \( \text{Gg}2+ \) winning
the queen) 31...\( \text{Wxh}4+ \) 32 \( \text{Gg}2 \) \( \text{Gg}6 
33 \( \text{Ad}4 \) \( \text{Cc}1 \) Black has a winning at-
tack.
30...\( \text{Af}3 \) 31 \( \text{Wd}3 
31 \( \text{Wf}2 \) \( \text{Ax}d1 \) 32 \( \text{Qd}6 \) \( \text{Cc}7 \) 33 
\( \text{Qxc}8 \) \( \text{Wxc}8 \) is similar to the game:
Black has an extra pawn and a large
positional advantage.
31...\( \text{Ax}d1 \) 32 \( \text{Qd}6 \) \( \text{Cc}2! \)
The key point.
33 \( \text{We}2 \) \( \text{Cc}7 \) 34 \( \text{Qxc}8 \) \( \text{Wxc}8 
White's king is exposed and his
pawns are weak, making Black's task
straightforward.
35 \( \text{Gb}6 \) \( \text{Cc}5 \) 36 \( \text{Cc}4 \) \( \text{Gb}1 \) 37 \( \text{Gb}2 
\( \text{Ad}3 \) 38 \( \text{Qd}6 \) \( \text{Cc}3 \) 0-1
White is losing more material.

22)
44...\( \text{Gf}3! \)
Threatening both 45...\( \text{Gg}4+ \) and
45...\( \text{h}4 \). Note that the alternatives
44...\( \text{Qf}3+? \) 45 \( \text{Gxf}3 \) \( \text{Gxf}3 \) 46 \( \text{Wg}5 
and 44...\( \text{h}4 \) 45 \( \text{Qxf}1 \) \( \text{hxg}3+ \) 46 \( \text{Gh}1 
\( \text{Wxa}5 \) 47 \( \text{We}1 \) are unsound.

45 \( \text{Qe}2 
45 \( \text{gxf}3 \) \( \text{Qxf}3+ \) costs White his 
queen.
45...\( \text{Gg}4+ 
Once again, there are various alter-
natives which fail, for example
45...\( \text{Cc}4? \) 46 \( \text{Cc}4+, \) 45...\( \text{Xb}3 \) 46 
\( \text{Wd}5+ \) and 45...\( \text{Xg}3 \) 46 \( \text{Xg}3 \) \( \text{Cc}4+ 
47 \( \text{Wf}4 \) \( \text{h}4+ \) 48 \( \text{Gg}4 \) \( \text{Qe}5+ \) 49 \( \text{Qxh}4 
Black can play 45...\( \text{h}4 \), but it only
draws after 46 \( \text{gxf}3 \) \( \text{Qxf}3+ \) 47 \( \text{Qf}3 
\( \text{Wxg}3+ \) 48 \( \text{Qh}1 \) \( \text{Wxh}3+ \) 49 \( \text{Gg}1 
\( \text{Wxf}3 \) 50 \( \text{Wd}8+ \).
46 \( \text{hxg}4 \) \( \text{Xg}3 \) 47 \( \text{Qh}1? 
47 \( \text{Gg}1 \) would have been a better
chance, but 47...\( \text{Wc}5+ \) 48 \( \text{Qh}1 \) \( \text{Xb}3 
gives Black excellent winning pros-
pects, for example 49 \( \text{Wa}2 \) \( \text{Cc}1+ \) 50 
\( \text{Qh}2 \) \( \text{Cc}7+ \) 51 \( \text{Qh}1 \) \( \text{Wf}7 
47...\( \text{hxg}4 
Thanks to the position of the king
on \( \text{h}1 \), Black has greater attacking
possibilities down the \( \text{h} \)-file.
48 \( \text{Xb}4 \) \( \text{Qh}7! \) 49 \( \text{Cc}4 \) \( \text{We}7 \) 50 
\( \text{Wd}5 \) \( \text{Cc}3 \) 51 \( \text{Xg}4 \) \( \text{Wh}4+ \) 52 \( \text{Sh}3 
\( \text{We}1+ \) 53 \( \text{Sh}2 \) \( \text{Gg}3+ \) 0-1

23)
42 \( \text{Af}6! 
42 \( \text{f}6 \) is certainly tempting, but
Black can reply 42...\( \text{Ce}3! \) 43 fxe3 
(43 \( \text{hxg}4 \) is also met by 43...\( \text{Wc}3 \)
43...\( \text{Cc}3 \) 44 \( \text{Wxc}3 \) (44 \( \text{Wf}1 \) \( \text{Wxe}3+ \) 
44...\( \text{dx}c3 \) 45 \( \text{hxg}4 \) c2 (the bishop on
\( g7 \) may not be well placed if White
cannot actually give mate) 46 \( \text{Cc}7 
\( \text{Al}+ \) 47 \( \text{Qf}2 \) c1\( \text{W} \) 48 \( \text{Xc}1 \) \( \text{Xc}1 
with a drawn ending.
42...\(f8\)
42...\(\text{\#d2} 43 \text{\#g7+} f8 44 \text{\#e7+}
wins White’s queen.
43 hxg4 \(w2d2 44 w2d2\)
Not 44 \(wxc4? \text{\#a1+} 45 \text{\#h2}
\(w6+h 46 \text{\#g3} w4f4+ 47 \text{\#h3} \text{\#h1#}\).
44...\(\text{\#xd2} 45 \text{\#d7} \text{\#a5} 46 f3 \text{\#c4}
47 g5 \text{\#a1+} 48 \text{\#h2} \text{\#a6} 49 \text{\#c7}
49 g4 would have been simpler as
Black’s pawns cannot move at the moment.
49...\(\text{\#e3} 50 \text{\#g7+} \text{\#g8} 51 \text{\#xe5}
d3 52 \text{\#c3}\)
White must not try to be too
clever: 52 f6 d2 53 g6 hxg6 54 f7+
\(f8 55 \text{\#f4} g5! 56 \text{\#xe3} w6+h 57
\text{\#g3} d1w 58 \text{\#c5+} \text{\#d6} would be
embarrassing for White.
52...\(\text{\#d2} 53 \text{\#xd2} \text{\#f1+} 54 \text{\#h3}
\text{\#xd2} 55 f6\)
White wins this ending fairly
easily thanks to the poor position of
Black’s knight.
55...\(\text{\#a1} 56 \text{\#g4} \text{\#g1} 57 \text{\#g3}
\text{\#h1} 58 \text{\#f4} \text{\#h4+} 59 \text{\#f5} \text{\#a4} 60
\text{\#g7+} f8 61 \text{\#xh7} 1-0

24)
23 \(\text{\#xa2}\!\)
The first sacrifice defuses Black’s
counterplay...
23...\(\text{\#xa2} 24 \text{\#xh7!}\)
...and the second breaks through
on the kingside.
24...\(\text{\#xh7} 25 \text{\#xg6+} f8 26
\text{\#xh7} \text{\#xh7} 27 \text{\#xh7}\)
The liquidation has left White with
a large advantage. Black’s king is
permanently exposed while White has
sufficient pawns nearby to be
relatively safe. White must try to
bring his knight up to support his
queen.

27...\(\text{\#g8}\)
After 27...\(\text{\#xa4} 28 \text{\#g4 w1a+} 29
\text{\#f2} \text{\#a2+} 30 \text{\#g1} w7f7 31 \text{\#h8+}
\text{\#e7} 32 \text{\#xe5+} \text{\#f8} 33 \text{\#xa5} \text{White}
has enough material to win, while
27...\(\text{\#a1+} 28 \text{\#d1} \text{\#a4} 29 \text{\#e3}
\text{\#a1+} 30 \text{\#f2} gives White a decisive
attack.
28 \(\text{\#h4} \text{\#d7} 29 \text{\#g4} \text{\#b3} 30
\text{\#h6+} \text{\#e7} 31 \text{\#xc6} \text{\#b1+} 32 \text{\#f2}
\text{\#b2+}\)
The alternative was 32...\(\text{\#b6+} 33
\text{\#xb6} \text{\#xb6} 34 \text{\#b5} \text{\#c8} 35 \text{\#xe5}
\text{\#d6} 36 f4 \text{\#xc3} 37 g4, although this
ending should be a win, for example
37...\(\text{\#c5} 38 g5 \text{\#d4} 39 g6 \text{\#xe4} 40
g7 \text{\#c8} 41 \text{\#d3+!} \text{\#d4} 42 \text{\#h7}
\text{\#xa4} 43 \text{\#d7}, followed by \(\text{\#f8}\).
33 \(\text{\#e2} \text{\#b8} 34 \text{\#xe5!} \text{\#xe5} 35
\text{\#xc5+} \text{\#e6} 36 \text{\#d5+} \text{\#f6} 37 \text{\#d6+}
\text{\#f7} 38 \text{\#xe5} \text{\#b6+} 39 \text{\#d4} \text{\#xd4+}
40 \text{\#cxd4} \text{\#b4} 41 \text{\#b5!} \text{\#xd4}\)
Or 41...\(\text{\#xb5} 42 \text{\#xb5} \text{\#e7} 43
\text{\#e3},
42 \(\text{\#e3} \text{\#b4} 43 \text{\#g4} \text{\#e6} 44 \text{\#g5}
\text{\#b3+} 45 \text{\#f4} \text{\#b4}\)
45...\(\text{\#xb5} 46 \text{\#xb5} a4 47 b6 \text{\#d7}
48 g6 a3 49 b7 \text{\#c7} 50 g7 will pro-
mote with check.
46 \(\text{\#c6} \text{\#d6} 47 \text{\#d5} \text{\#b1} 48 \text{\#f5}
\text{\#e7} 49 f4 \text{\#a1} 50 \text{\#g6} \text{\#a4} 51
\text{\#g7} \text{\#a1} 52 f5 \text{\#f1} 53 f6+ \text{\#d6} 54
\text{\#g6} 1-0
25)
32 \( \text{Qd5!} \)
Cutting off Black's defence of the d4-rook. Adams should have reconciled himself to the loss of the exchange and played 32...\( \text{Qxd5} \) 33 cxd5 exd5 34 \( \text{Qe5} \), although even here White would retain a large advantage. However, Black decided to defend his rook diagonally...
\( 32...\text{Qg7!? 33 Qe5} \)
...only to have the defence cut off again! There was an equally good alternative solution by 33 \( \text{Qxe6+ h8} \) 34 \( \text{Qxf5} \).
\( 33...\text{Qxd5 34 cxd5 cxd5 35 g4!} \)
Opening up more lines for the rooks makes the win easy.
\( 35...\text{Qe7 36 Qxe6 fxe4 37 Qh4 Qd7 38 Qbe1 Qf8 39 f5 1-0} \)
After 39...\( \text{Qxf5} \) 40 \( \text{Qf6+ Qf7} \) 41 \( \text{Qxf5} \) 42 \( \text{Qd8+ Qf7} \) 43 \( \text{Qe7+} \)
Black loses his queen.

26)
By far the simplest solution is 42 \( \text{Qf6+!} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \) 43 \( \text{Qg4+ 1-0} \), as White will be a clear rook up.

27)
56 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Qc5} \) 57 \( \text{d7} \)
Winning a piece, after which the remaining task is purely technical.
\( 57...\text{Qe6 58 d8Q Qxd8 59 Qxd8} \) \( \text{g5 60 Qd7} \)
A neat echo of the earlier combination. The exchange of rooks makes the task simpler.

60...\( \text{Qxd7 61 Qf6+ Qg6 62 Qxd7} \) \( \text{Qf7 63 Qd2 Qe6 64 Qb6 h5 65 h4} \) \( \text{f4 66 hxg5 Qf5 67 Qc4 Qxg5 68} \) \( \text{Qd6 e3+ 69 fxe3 h4 70 Qe4+} \) \( \text{Qg4} \) 71 \( \text{Qe2 Qf5} \) 72 \( \text{Qg2 1-0} \)

28)
22 \( \text{Qb5! axb5} \)
22...\( \text{e5} \) (22...\( \text{Qxb2} \) 23 \( \text{Qd6} \) costs Black his queen) 23 \( \text{Qh4 Qf6} \) 24 \( \text{Qc3} \) is relatively best, but now the win is much simpler for White as he can just drop his knight in on d5.
\( 23 Qxg7 Qxg7 24 Qh6+ \)
Cleaning up the kingside before trapping the bishop by taking back on b5.
\( 24...\text{Qg8} 25 \text{Qxh7+ Qf8} 26 \text{Qh8+ Qe7} 27 \text{Qh4+ g5} \)
27...\( \text{Qf8} \) 28 axb5 leaves White well ahead on material, position and attack!
\( 28 \text{Qxg5+ f6} \)
28...\( \text{Qf6} \)
29 \( \text{Qf3} \) is deadly.
\( 29 \text{Qh7+ Qd6} 30 \text{Qd2+ Qc7} 31 \)
\( \text{Qxb5 1-0} \)
31...\( \text{Qxe4} 32 \text{Qxe4} \) \( \text{Qxe4} \) 33 \( \text{Qc1+} \) \( \text{Qb8} \) 34 \( \text{Qxd7} \) is devastating.

29)
45 \( \text{Qxe6 1-0} \), since 45...\( \text{Qxe6} \) allows mate, while 45...\( \text{fxe6} \) 46 \( \text{Qxh7} \) \( \text{Qxh7} \) 47 \( \text{Qh1} \) wins the bishop in perfect safety.

30)
14 \( \text{Qxd4! Qxg2} \)
15 \( \text{Qf5 We6} \)
16 \( \text{Qg5} \)
Defending the knight on f5 with gain of tempo.

16...\Ee8 17 \dxg2 \h6 18 \g4 \df6 19 \f3

The extra pawn has been consolidated and, as a bonus, the bishop on b2 has been activated. The rest is straightforward.

19...\e4 20 dxe4 \exe4 21 \fd1 \h7 22 bxc5 bxc5 23 \d5 \gf6 24 \xf6 \xf6 25 \xc5 \ab8 26 \d1 \b2 27 \d4 \e7 28 \b5 1-0
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Symbols

+ Check
++ Double check
# Mate
! Good move
!! Excellent move
? Bad move
?? Blunder
!? Interesting move
?! Dubious move
1-0 White wins
0-1 Black wins
½-½ Draw
(n) nth match game
(D) Diagram follows
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