The Ultimate King's Indian Attack

Improve your results by playing this powerful opening system

Angus Dunnington
Foreword

In 1997 it was time to print a new batch of my first book, How to Play the King’s Indian Attack (published in 1993), for a new generation of KIA fans. However, new ideas in some variations and recent developments in others led instead to The Ultimate King’s Indian Attack, which is an expanded, revised edition of the original.

An appreciation of the relevant plans in the opening and middlegame — and even the ending in some cases — is more important than learning countless, precise sequences of moves (which are susceptible to both fashion and ultimate refutation), and this book is designed to equip the reader with a thorough understanding of the KIA. Moreover, it is significant that the key strategies tend to be the same in both the modern and the earlier games, confirming the KIA as a sound, reliable and effective weapon which continues to pass the test of time.

I hope that new recruits to the KIA enjoy this rich system, and that seasoned devotees find food for thought in the new material and updates which, combined with the original examples, should provide the reader with a flexible, varied repertoire with the white pieces.

Angus Dunnington
November 1998
1 Introduction

Nowadays it is becoming increasingly difficult at any level of competitive chess to find opponents who know little or — even more rare — no opening theory. Practitioners of 1 d4 need to be acquainted with defences such as the King’s Indian, Grunfeld, Dutch, Benoni, Nimzo-Indian...

Similarly, 1 e4 players will have problems reaching a satisfactory middlegame if they fail to familiarise themselves with, amongst others, the popular Sicilian, French and Caro-Kann Defences. Moreover, each of these is often the opponent’s pet line.

Since even masters can take many months (perhaps years) studying the numerous variations of, for example, the Sicilian Defence, it seems logical to find an opening system for White which enables us to sit down at the board before battle commences without having to worry about what Black may play.

This book deals with arguably the most flexible of such systems: the King’s Indian Attack (KIA). The beauty of the opening is that White adopts the setup based on 2 f3, g3, g2, d3 and e4 practically regardless of Black’s play. (see diagram)

When playing the KIA the game will follow a course of White’s choosing, which should in turn furnish other advantages in the form of extra time on the clock and a ‘ready-made’ understanding of the positional and tactical nuances which the constraints of a time-limit may prevent the opponent from getting to grips with.

Apart from beginning with 1 d4 or 1 g3 (or even 1 d3), the KIA is also a powerful weapon in the hands of 1 e4 players. Therefore fans of 1 e4 openings such as the Ruy Lopez or Scotch need no longer waste their time learning separate lines against Black’s other defences, as this system is playable against all of them, the only exception being 1...d5, which rules out the KIA altogether.

We must also not forget the psychological victory of depriving our opponents the opportunity to show us their encyclopaedic theoretical knowledge of, say, the Caro-Kann when we reply to 1 e4 c6 with 2 d3 and spoil the party immediately (Chapter 4).

Those who play the King’s Indian Defence against 1 d4 are strongly advised to take up the same opening when playing White. If it is good with Black, then it must be even better with White! Chapter 7 shows
us that the first player can put the extra tempo to good effect.

Before moving on to a deeper discussion of the various aspects of the KIA and Black’s most popular ways of meeting it here are three games which should give the reader an idea of the different paths play might go down in this multi-purpose opening.

White’s Kingside Attack

As its name suggests the KIA regularly brings about middlegame positions in which White generates a kingside strike.

A bloodthirsty and illustrative example of this is the following game Bobby Fischer, the former World Champion, frequently used the KIA with success and here is what can happen if Black plays the French Defence and subsequently takes up White’s challenge of a kingside vs queenside attack.

Fischer-U. Geller
Netanya 1968

1 e4 e6 2 d3 d5 3 d2 (D)

![Diagram](image)

Black has a number of ways to try and create play from the diagram position. One is to go for an all-out attack on the queenside in order to counter White’s aggression on the other flank, as Black chooses here. This produces very brutal play from both sides. Readers are advised to follow the way in which White conducts his attack, as very similar ideas are used against other Black patterns of development in the French, namely the very popular b7-b6 and c8-b7 or f8-d6 and g8-e7.

It is also possible for Black to exchange in the centre with d5xe4 at certain stages, although this does not tend to cut across White’s plans (See Chapter 3).

3...c5 4 g3 d6 5 g2 e7 6 g3 0-0 7 0-0 c6 8 e1 wce7 9 e5 d7 10 w2 (D)

![Diagram](image)

Control of e5 is critical

10 ... b5

11 h4

A recurring theme in this particular variation — Black charges forward on the queenside and White endeavours to put as much force as possible into an attack against the opposing king.

11 ... a5

12 f1

Intending f1-h2-g4, or in some cases f1-e3 with sacrificial
possibilities on d5 (or f5) — especially when Black has played \( \text{Wd8-c7} \).

12 ... \( \text{Qd4??} \)

An interesting move which both prevents a future \( \text{Qf1-e3} \) and opens the c-file for Black’s major pieces. Note that White must capture the knight as the e-pawn is lost after 13 \( \text{Wd1} \) (not 13 \( \text{Wxe3} \) \( \text{Qxc2} \)).

13 \( \text{Qxd4} \) \( \text{exd4} \)

14 \( \text{Qf4} \)

White’s queen’s bishop almost always finds itself on f4 in such positions.

14 ... \( \text{Za6} \)

15 \( \text{Qh2}! \)

Tempting but inaccurate was 15 \( \text{Qxd5+} \) (with the idea of 15 \( \text{Qxd5} \) 16 \( \text{e6} \)). After 15 \( \text{Qb4}! \) White would be forced to play the passive 16 \( \text{Qe1} \) with equality since both 16 \( \text{Qe1} \) 15 \( \text{exd5} \) 17 \( \text{Qe6} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 18 \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 19 \( \text{Wxd7} \) \( \text{Qxe1} \) and 16 \( \text{Qe1} \) 15 \( \text{exd5} \) 17 \( \text{Qe6} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 18 \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{Wxf4} \) 19 \( \text{Wxd7} \) \( \text{Qxe6} \) 18 \( \text{Qxe6} \) 19 \( \text{Wxd7} \) \( \text{Wf3} \) 20 \( \text{Qh2} \) \( \text{Wxd1} \) win for Black.

15 ... \( \text{Qc6} \)

16 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qa6}? \)

Threatening to triple on the c-file, but imperative was 16 \( \text{Qb6} \) even if it would slow down Black’s build-up.

17 \( \text{Qxd5!} \) (D)

Fischer sees that this typical ‘sacrifice’ does indeed work this time.

17 ... \( \text{exd5} \)

White also stands clearly better after 17 \( \text{Qc5} \) 18 \( \text{Qe4} \) \( \text{Qc8} \) (not 18 \( \text{Qxe5} \) 19 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 20 \( \text{Qxe5} \) 19 \( \text{Qf3} \), hitting the d-pawn 18 \( \text{e6} \) \( \text{Wd8} \) Now 18 \( \text{Qxe6} \) is pointless as White’s queen is defended.

19 \( \text{exd7} \) \( \text{Qe6} \)

20 \( \text{Wg4}! \)

Cleverly keeping the initiative. Now 20 \( \text{Wxd7} \) 21 \( \text{Qe5} \) takes advantage of the pin Black puts himself in eg 21 \( \text{f6} \) 22 \( \text{Qxd4} \) or 21 \( \text{Qf6} \) 22 \( \text{Qx6+} \) Consequently Black must weaken his kingside in order to take White’s advanced d-pawn.

20 ... \( \text{f5} \)

21 \( \text{Qh5} \) \( \text{Wxd7} \)

22 \( \text{Qf3} \)

Black’s 20 \( \text{f5} \) has left a gaping hole at e5. His d4-pawn is also weak.

22 ... \( \text{g6} \)

23 \( \text{Qh6} \) \( \text{Qf6} \)

24 \( \text{Qxe6} \) \( \text{Wxe6} \) (D)

25 \( \text{Qe5}!! \)

There was another way to err here with the natural 25 \( \text{Qel} \), but Black could draw by 25 \( \text{Wxe1+} \) 26 \( \text{Qxe1} \) \( \text{Qg7+} \) 27 \( \text{Wg5} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) etc.
Instead White eliminates Black's king's bishop, thus gaining total command of the dark squares. Even after 25 moves it is White's control of the important e5-square which decides matters, this over-protection of e5 is an essential of such positions.

25 ...  
26  
27  
Black must avoid 27 28 29 30 .
28 h5!
Now 28 gxh5 loses to 29 .
28 ...

Queenside Expansion

Not surprisingly White will not always have the pleasure of delivering mate after a crushing kingside attack as some Black systems encourage the first player to concentrate on seizing an initiative in the centre or on the queenside instead.

In our next game, Croatian GM Cvitan, a former European Junior Champion, faces the KIA and finds himself under pressure on the queenside. He therefore turns to the kingside for counterplay, but we see that White is equally well-placed to defend as well as attack in this particular sector.

Steinert-Cvitan
Switzerland 1992

1  
1... c5
Inviting a transposition to a Sicilian Defence. White does eventually oblige, but in his own time and under his own conditions, such is the flexibility of this system.

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  

Against 29  White has 30 31 32 33  
30  
31  
32  

And Black resigned without waiting for either 33  or 33  Incidentally it is ironic that after 32  33  picks up the bishop which was the cause of Black's problems on move 16 (and which never moved again!)
This is a common move in Sicilian positions. Establishing a pawn on d4 would grant White a considerable space advantage, so in order to prevent this Black is provoked into playing his next move

6  

6 ... e5

Black takes his share of central territory in return for inhibiting his usually influential king’s bishop. White is now well placed to profit from the closing of the a1-h8 diagonal and he prepares to expand on the queenside with the b2-b4 push — highlighting another point behind 6 c3.

7  d3 &ge7
8  a3

Black has a choice here of either allowing White to carry through his plan or putting a stop to it with 8 a5 White meets 8 a5 with 9 a4! after which the lost tempo is a good investment because Black has a hole on b5 which White will use for a knight outpost, usually in conjunction with &f3-d2-c4. Since this is not to Black’s taste he elects to continue his development instead

8  ... 0-0
9  b4  h6

Preparing &c8-e6, which White would otherwise counter with &f3-g5

10  &bd2 &e6
11  &b1 b6
12  &b2 b5??

If Black continues passively White will simply play to open up the game with &d2-b3 and d3-d4, perhaps temporarily sacrificing his d-pawn if necessary. Consequently Catan essays to engineer some play to distract his opponent

13  &e1 a5
14  a4?! (D)

Guaranteeing that a white pawn will reach b5 and subsequently force Black to tread carefully on the queenside

14  ... cxb4
15  axb5 &a7
15  bxc3 16 bxc3 followed by &wd1-a4 not only leaves the black a-pawn susceptible to attack but also allows White’s queen’s rook to support his passed b-pawn

16  c4  g5

Black strives to build up pressure on the other flank

17  &f1

Heading for e3, from where the knight can observe both d5 and f5

17  ... &ac8
18  &c1!

Note that Black’s ostensibly dangerous a- and b-pawns cannot advance. Black first has to defend b4 before he can push with a4, and because of White’s strong grip on the light squares on the queenside this is by no means easy to organise

18  ... &g6
19  &e3 &ce7

Black’s only hope is to build up a kingside attack and throw everything at his opponent before White decisively increases his queenside advantage

20  &d2 &a7
21  &a1 (D)
Now the b-pawn is at last ready to march for promotion
35   \( \text{Wg5} \)
A token threat of h5-h4 before resigning
36   c5+   \( \text{Qh8} \)
37   c6   1-0
The Sicilian Defence is dealt with in Chapter 2

Positional Themes

Having seen White first mount a formidable kingside attack, then display resilience on this side of the board while simultaneously building up a winning advantage on the queenside, here is a game in which White not only controls both wings but also places his queen on a dominating central square.

This time Black meets the KIA with a reliable, positionally-orientated method of development which is perfectly suited to English super-GM Michael Adams’s style (Chapter 5). However even Adams has problems finding a plan.

Vaganian-Adams
Ter Apel 1992

1   \( \text{Qf3} \)   \( \text{Qf6} \) 2 g3 d5 3 \( \text{Qg2} \) e6 4 0-0 \( \text{Qg4} \) (D)

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

Threatening \( Qa1-a4 \) followed by \( Qd2-b3 \) Black acts quickly
21   \( ... \)   \( Qf4 \)
22   \( Qf1 \)
Calm play from White as 22 gxf4 exf4 23 \( Qe2 \) \( Qxa1 \) 24 \( Qxa1 \) a4 plays into Black’s hands
22   \( ... \)   \( f5 \)
23   \( exf5 \)   \( Qxf5 \)
24   \( Qxf5 \)   \( Qxf5 \)
25   \( gxf4 \)
White cannot permit the invading knight to remain in the heart of his position for too long so he puts the onus on Black to justify the sacrifice
25   \( ... \)   \( exf4 \)
26   \( Qa2 \)   \( g4 \)
27   \( Qb2 \)   \( Qxb2 \)
28   \( Qxb2 \)   \( Wh4 \)
29   \( Qe4 \)   \( Qg7 \)
Black continues energetically by aiming what is left of his army at the white king, but White’s faithful KIA bishop is ready to come to the rescue
30   \( Qg2! \)   \( f3 \)
31   \( Qf1 \)   \( a4 \)
Trying to confuse White ignores the diversionary tactics and consolidates his kingside
32   \( Qg3 \)   \( b3 \)
33   \( Wa1 \)   \( Qd7 \)
34   \( Wxa4 \)   \( h5 \)
35   \( Wxb3 \)
A solid system which immediately solves Black’s problem of where to put the queen’s bishop often a problem piece (a similar solution is to play $\text{Qf}5$ which is discussed in Chapter 6) Black can play for e7-e5 or settle for e7-e6, although in either case the quiet nature of Black’s development allows White to obtain a slight but persistent advantage

5 $\text{d3}$ $\text{Qbd7}$
6 $\text{Qbd2}$ e5
7 e4 $\text{dxe4}$
8 $\text{dxe4}$ $\text{Qe5}$
9 a4 0-0

9 a5 is an alternative worth consideration, when the potential weaknesses of Black’s a-pawn and the b6-square may prove to be lesser evils than the prospect of permitting White to advance with a4-a5

10 b3 $\text{Qh5}$

There is no reason why Black should voluntarily give up the two bishops

11 a5?!

The first step in a scheme designed to restrict Black’s possibilities on both sides of the board Tying his opponent down in this way will make it easier for White to embark upon active operations in the middlegame

11 ... $\text{Wc7}$
12 $\text{We2}$ b5

Denying White the use of the effective c4-square

13 $\text{Qb3}$ $\text{Qe7}$
14 g4

The time has come to take a kingside initiative hoping to close the queen’s bishop out of the game. The price White pays is the production of a weakness on f4 but her is compensated for this by an outpost herself on t5

14 ... $\text{g6}$

15 $\text{Qh4}$ $\text{Qc5}$
16 $\text{Qf5}$ $\text{Qe6}$

Not 16 $\text{Qxb3??}$ 17 $\text{cxb3}$ when the open c-file provides White with a firing line against Black’s c-pawn. Moreover Black’s queen’s knight has been given the assignment of keeping watch over f4

17 $\text{e3}$ $\text{Qab8(D)}$

18 c4

Now after 18 $\text{bxc4}$ $\text{Wxc4}$ the pressure against both a7 and c6 guarantees White a considerable advantage. Incidentally, exchanging his admittedly passive bishop for the irksome knight is not to be recommended 18 $\text{Qxf5}$ 19 $\text{exf5}$ and White’s light-squared bishop comes to life

18 ... $\text{Qf8}$

Preparing to drop the bishop back to f8

19 $\text{Qfc1}$ b4

The unpleasant threat of opening the c-file causes Black to close the queenside. Now Adams has the positional threat of c6-c5 followed by $\text{Qe6-d4}$

20 c5 $\text{Qf8}$
21 $\text{We4}$

White adds support to d4 and occupies the a2-g8 diagonal. He also introduces the option of attacking the stranded enemy b-pawn
21 ... $\text{Red}8$
22 $\text{Red}1$ $\text{h}5$

With no hope of play in any sector of the board Black attempts to undermine White's hold on the kingside.

23 $\text{g}5 (D)$

23 ...

$\text{Qd}5$

The obvious alternative is to retreat the attacked knight, but 23...-$\text{Qh}7$ 24 $\text{Qh}4!$ $\text{Qhxg}5$ 25 $\text{Qxg}6$ loses material due to 25...-$\text{fxg}6$ 26 $\text{Qxg}5$. This leads to 23...-$\text{Qe}8$ 24 $\text{Qh}4$ (threatening 25 $\text{Qxg}6$ $\text{fxg}6$ 26 $\text{Wx}e6+$) 24...-$\text{We}7$ with a miserable position (is 24...-$\text{Qh}7$ 25 $\text{Qxg}6$ $\text{Qxg}6$ possible?). Adams therefore goes for complications. Vaganian's last move took away one of his knight's supporters, which Black hopes to profit from.

24 $\text{exd}5!$ $\text{cx}d5$
25 $\text{Qxd}5$ $\text{Qxd}5$

Better is 25...-$\text{Qx}f5$ with a good game for White thanks to his dangerous queenside superiority.

Now Vaganian has ready a surprisingly strong move which nets him — at this level — a decisive advantage.

26 $\text{Qh}4! (D)$

Underlining the significance of 22...-$\text{h}5$. After 26...-$\text{Rdd}8$ 27 $\text{Qxg}6$ White will have two pieces for a rook, a mighty passed e-pawn and domination of the light squares. Again Adams tries to throw his opponent off balance.

Move Order

The reader is by now no doubt aware by now that it is a matter of taste which way White begins the KIA — either 1 $\text{Qb}3$ or 1 $\text{e}4$, depending on what other openings one feels comfortable (or uncomfortable) playing. Whichever the choice, transpositional possibilities abound.

This is particularly evident with the French and Sicilian Defences, and indeed many of the games which begin in one of these may well cross over into the other. Consequently, Sicilian games in which Black plays an early ...-$d7$-$d5$ are very closely linked to those in the French in which Black advances with ...-$c7$-$c5$. 
2 KIA vs Sicilian Defence

Not unlike the main line of the Sicilian Defence, Black has several continuations, depending on where the d- and e-pawns go. Regardless of the chosen pawn structure Black should post his king's bishop actively by way of a fianchetto. The most economical course is ...d7-d6 and ...Qg8-f6, waiting for White's reaction before deciding whether or not to claim more territory with ...e7-e5. White is ready to meet the ambitious ...f7-f5 with equally vigorous play, but because of the extra tempo the albeit obvious Qf3-e1 and f2-f4 could give Black problems.

Another idea for White is to expand on the queenside, keeping Black tied down in order to threaten an advantageous breakthrough in the centre. A space advantage on the queenside should also be enough to give White the better prospects in a queenless middlegame if Black seeks a queen trade by opening the d-file with ...d7-d5 and ...d5xe4, as in the game Loginov-Madl.

Some players prefer to develop the king's knight on e7 after ...e7-e6, when it can support the queen's knight and give the g7-bishop more freedom to facilitate the ...e5 push.

Black's other main approach is to combine ...e7-e6 and ...Qg8-e7 with ...d7-d5. This is similar to the French Defence and appears to be a popular choice. It is difficult to see why, however, because White has a distinct advantage which can easily assume more sizeable proportions. Exchanging on d5 gives White an initiative, while closing the centre with e4-e5 results in a position in which White has excellent kingside attacking chances.

A note on move order. The fact that the first two games begin with 1 Qf3 helps show that we can reach a Sicilian without opening 1 e4. Also, after 1 e4 c5 White does not have to play 2 d3, but can instead play 2 Qf3 and 3 d3. This has the advantage of perhaps committing Black to 2...e6 or 2...d6. Finally, 1 e4 c5 2 g3 d5 prevents White from adopting a KIA setup.

Fianchetto with ...d6

Smyslov-Botvinnik
USSR Ch 1955

1 Qf3 Qf6 2 g3 g6 3 Qg2 Qg7 4 0-0 0-0 5 d3 c5 6 e4

Although we have reached a Sicilian Defence, Black could still
transpose to a King's Indian Reversed with d7-d5 either here or on the next move

6 ...  
7 \( \text{Qd6} \)  
8 d6 (D)

Black develops naturally, for the moment settling for an c7-d6-e5 pawn formation. Often e7-e5 is played, either voluntarily or otherwise, depending on how badly White wants to build a powerful pawn centre with e2-c3 and d3-d4. This idea is considered in more detail in the next game.

8 a4

White gains space on the queenside and prepares \( \text{Qc4} \) (the immediate \( 8 \text{Qc4} \) invites the obvious and effective \( 8 \text{b5!} \))

8 c3 transposes to Barczay-Formos, Hungary 1968, when White countered queenside expansion with a central advance \( 8 \text{Bb8} \text{a4} \text{a6} \text{Wc2} \) (better than \( 10 \text{Le1 Qg4}, \) preventing \( 11 \text{d4} \))

10 b5 11 axb5 axb5 12 d4 with a slight edge to White. In the game Larsen-Gligoric, Vinkovci 1971, White dispensed with c2-c3 altogether and caused Black problems on both sides of the board by marching his wing pawns forward. The game actually went 7 Le1 d6 8 Qbd2, and after 8 Bb8 a4 b6 10 Qc4 Qh7 11 h4!? was a good try for initiative. There followed 11 Wc7 (11 d5 12 exd5 Qxd5 13 h5!) 12 Qd2 Qbd8 13 Wc1 d5 14 Qf4 (before trading off the dark-squared bishops Larsen first forces the enemy queen onto a white square) 14 Wc8 15 exd5 Qxd5 16 Qh6 Qf8 17 Qxg7 Qxg7 18 h5! Qf6 19 h6+ Qg8 20 Wf4 Qh5 21 Wd2 f6 22 a5! b5 23 a6! with a clear advantage to White.

8 ...  
9 Qc4  
10 a5  
11 Wc8  
12 b4

An active retreat. Black plans f7-f5

a) Smyslov-Ivkov, Palma Interzonal 1970, saw instead 8 Bb8 9 Qc4 Qxh4! a6 11 f4 b5 12 axb5 axb5 13 Qe3 Qe6 14 Qf5 c4 15 Qg4, when White's attack looked much more dangerous than Black's.

b) Black chose a dubious plan in the game Spraggett - Sunye Neto, Manila 1990. After 8 b6 9 Qc4 Qb7 10 Le1 Le8 11 c3 he played 11 Qxd7 (ruling out 12 d4 because of 12 exd4 13 exd4 Qxd4!), but 12 Qe3 Qxe5 13 Qxe5 dxe5? left Black susceptible to a4-a5 and a later Qe3-d5.

9 Qc4  
10 e4  
11 e5

Gaining more central territory before the f7-f5 thrust.

10 c3  
11 f3

One problem with Black's idea is that it is not difficult for White to correctly predict the moves. Consequently, Smyslov is ready to meet this rash - if consistent - push. Less ambitious but more accurate is 10 h6, preparing 11 Le6.

11 b4!

A clever pawn sacrifice which takes advantage of the opening of the a2-g8 diagonal.

Declining with 11 f4 is to be considered, when 12 bxc5 dxc5 13
16 a3  \( \text{Re7} \)

Black improves the position of his king's knight, as trying to hang onto his extra pawn with 16 \( \text{Wb6} \) allows 17 \( \text{Qg5} \)

17 axb4  axb4
18 a3  a6
19 a6!

White prefers to take the d-pawn. Although Black can defend along the rank by 19 a6, White then plays 20 axb7, when the useful manoeuvre \( \text{Qc7-a6-e5} \) is no longer possible because a6 is already occupied. Black prefers to defend energetically:

19 ...  a5
20 a3  a4
21 a3  a8
22 a5  a7

Capturing the a-pawn with the rook runs into difficulties because of (after 22 a6 a4) 23 d7 or 23 a6. However, 22 a6 a4 looks like an improvement on Botvinnik's choice. After 23 a6 a4 a6 a4 24 dxe5 White retains his advantage into the ending, but at least Black will not be subjected to the vicious onslaught which follows. The crucial factor is Black's weakened kingside. The king is without sufficient guard and his pawn cover leaves something to be desired, making him particularly vulnerable on the second rank. Hence his twenty-second move:

23 a5  a7
24 a5  a1

White has to strike while the iron is hot. Black is now pressured into relinquishing his rule of the vital a2-g8 diagonal, since 24 a2 a5 25 a6 a2 a6 a4 a6 a4 27 a6 a2 a6 a2 28 a4+ wins

24 ...  a5
25 a5
Another benefit of exchanging bishops is the White rook’s renewed posting on the f-file.

25 ... \texttt{\textit{Wxa4(D)}}

Kicking the knight with 25 h6 allows 26 \texttt{\textit{Bff6!}} when 26 \texttt{\textit{hxg5 27 Exg6+}} is decisive. After 27 \texttt{\textit{Bg7}} 28 \texttt{\textit{Exg7+}} \texttt{\textit{xg7}} 29 \texttt{\textit{Ed7+}} is enough. 27 \texttt{\textit{wh8}} 28 \texttt{\textit{wh6+}} 29 \texttt{\textit{Wh8 29 Ed6+}} \texttt{\textit{Wh8}} 30 \texttt{\textit{Wd6+}} and 27 \texttt{\textit{Ed8}} 28 \texttt{\textit{Wd8+}} 29 \texttt{\textit{Exf7}} 30 \texttt{\textit{Wd6+}} \texttt{\textit{We7}} 31 \texttt{\textit{Gg7+}} are also winning for White.

26 \texttt{\textit{Ed8+}}!

Now 26 \texttt{\textit{Exd8}} is not possible because of 27 \texttt{\textit{Wxa4}}, whilst 26 \texttt{\textit{Exg7}} loses to 27 \texttt{\textit{Wd6}} so Black goes along with White’s plan.

26 ... \texttt{\textit{He8}}

27 ... \texttt{\textit{Wf3!}}

Threatening 28 \texttt{\textit{Wf7+}} 29 \texttt{\textit{Wxh8}} mate. Black is able to parry this, but his position is beyond repair.

28 ... \texttt{\textit{Wc4}}

29 \texttt{\textit{Ad7}} 1-0

There is no way to survive.

28 \texttt{\textit{Bxf8}} 29 \texttt{\textit{Bxc7+}} 30 \texttt{\textit{Wxc7+}} 31 \texttt{\textit{Bxf8+}} 32 \texttt{\textit{gxf8+}} and 33 \texttt{\textit{Bxc7}} results in a completely won game for White.

\textbf{Loginov-Madl}

\textit{Budapest 1991}

1 \texttt{\textit{Qf3}} \texttt{\textit{Qf6}} 2 \texttt{\textit{g3 c5}} 3 \texttt{\textit{Qg2}} 4 \texttt{\textit{d6 c6}} 5 \texttt{\textit{d3 0-0 6 e4 d6}} 7 \texttt{\textit{c3}} 8 \texttt{\textit{bd2}} e5

Black gains space and increases her influence in the centre, particularly the d4-square. Having the knight on f6 (instead of e7) does inhibit the push of the f-pawn, but as we saw in the previous game, this course of action can sometimes rebound on Black. Another plan is to play d6-d5 at some point, after which White no longer has the option of replying e4-e5.

9 a3

Although 8 e5 rules out 9 d4 from White, it diminishes the power of Black’s dark-squared bishop, so now White can take advantage of this by making use of the fact that c3 also adds support to b4. 9 \texttt{\textit{He1}} would transpose to Yudasin-Mascarin, Manila Interzonal 1990, when after 9 \texttt{\textit{He8}} White, too, chose queenside action with 10 a3. There followed 10 b5 (intending 11 b4 a5!!) 11 a4 b4 12 \texttt{\textit{Qc4}} \texttt{\textit{Bb8}} 13 \texttt{\textit{h3 bxcs3}} 14 \texttt{\textit{Bxc3 d5}} 15 \texttt{\textit{exd5}} 16 \texttt{\textit{Wc2}} with an edge for White due to his well-placed queen’s knight and potential pressure against the two opposing centre pawns. Black went for complications 16 \texttt{\textit{Qxc3?}} 17 \texttt{\textit{Ahb2!}} (not 17 \texttt{\textit{Wxc3 e4}}) 17 e4 18 \texttt{\textit{dxe4}} 19 \texttt{\textit{Qxd4}} 20 \texttt{\textit{Bxc3 dxc3}} 21 \texttt{\textit{Ad1}}, with an unclear position which turned out in White’s favour a dozen moves later.

Madl elects to ignore White’s queenside aspirations, breaking out in the centre in an attempt to secure equality by exchanging queens.

9 ... \texttt{\textit{d5}}
10  b4
Waiting for Black to show her hand White would be left with weak pawns on c3 and d3 after 10 exd5? \( \text{Qxd5} \), which also frees Black’s position unnecessarily
10  ...  \( \text{dxe4} \)
11  \( \text{dxe4} \)  \( \text{Wd3} \)
Apparently winning a pawn but White has seen a little further
12  \( \text{Be2} \) \( (D) \)

Black has a couple of vulnerable points on a7 and c5 which leave her struggling for a draw. At the moment White cannot make the capture b4xc5 because of the pin on the b-file. However, White should be able to build up enough pressure on the c-pawn to force c5xb4, when the reply axb4 will allow him to attack the a-pawn along both the a-file and the g1-a7 diagonal.

The immediate threat, then, is 19 \( \text{Hd5} \), so Black temporarily prevents this while simultaneously clearing the way for a rook to come to the c-file
18  ...  \( \text{Be6} \)
19  \( \text{Be5} \)  \( \text{Wd5} \)
20  \( \text{Wxd5} \)  \( \text{He8} \)

Maintaining the pin on the b-file and thus preserving his c-pawn
21  \( \text{He2} \)  \( \text{Bb7} \)

White has rendered the pin useless by defending his bishop, but it is still not possible for him to win a pawn because of 22 \( \text{Wxe5} \) \( \text{Wxc5} \) 23 bxc5 \( \text{Be7} \). Also 22 \( \text{Wc1} \) \( \text{Wxb4} \) 23 axb4 h6! (not 23 \( \text{Wxe3} \) 24 \( \text{Wd8} \) \( \text{Bf8} \) 25 \( \text{Wh6} \) steers White’s attention to the defence of his c-pawn and away from \( \text{Be3} \). Consequently White activates his king. Note that Black has problems in utilizing her 4-3 kingside pawn majority because White is better placed to react
22  \( \text{Wf1} \)  \( \text{Wf6} \)
23  \( \text{Wf1} \)  \( \text{Wg7} \)
24  \( \text{Be1} \)  \( \text{h6} \)
25  \( \text{Be4} \)

White prepares to transfer another rook to attack the enemy c-pawn
25  ...  \( \text{Wce7} \)
Anticipating 26 \( \text{Wc4} \) which would now be met by 26 \( \text{Wxb4} \)
26  \( \text{Wc4} \)  \( \text{exb4} \)
Since this would have to be played anyway during the next
White's bishop defends f2 and e3 and he threatens simply to push his c-pawn. Black is much too slow in the race for promotion (note that after 36 \( \text{Qf3} \) 37 e5 \( \text{Qxf2} \) is even out of the question due to 38 c6+). Remember that Black more or less forced the ending herself by underestimating the power of White's 3-2 pawn majority on the queenside.

The question of move order is interesting here. In the game Yudasin-Mascarinas mentioned in the note to White's ninth move, White played for queenside expansion with a2-a3 only after the moves \( \text{Qe1} \) and \( \text{Qe8} \) had been interpolated (White actually played 7 \( \text{Qe1} \) Logmov's decision to dispense with the perhaps stereotyped rook move has the advantage of tempting the natural but evidently inadequate response of \( \text{d7-d5xe4} \) and \( \text{Qd8-d3} \).

Psakhis-Erdelyi
Lenk 1991

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{c5} \) 2 \( \text{Qf3} \) \( \text{e6} \) 3 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 4 \( g3 \) \( g6 \) 5 \( Qg2 \) \( Qg7 \) 6 0-0 \( Qge7 \) 7 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{d6} \) 8 \( \text{c3} \) \( e5 \) 9 \( \text{a3} \) \( a5 \)

A theoretical novelty. Usually, as we have hitherto seen, Black gets on with his own plans and allows White his queenside initiative. With a7-a5 Black gives the game a closed nature, but White can use the self-inflicted weakness on b5 as a home for his queen's knight, even if it costs a tempo.

10 \( \text{a4} \) \( h6 \)
11 \( \text{Qa3} \) \( g5?? \)

This is quite an ambitious pattern of development, if not a very good one, and readers should be aware of such a possibility when Black has not castled. Preferable is 11 0-0 12 \( \text{Qd2} \) \( Qe6 \) 13 \( \text{Qd4} \) when White stands slightly better.
12 \( \text{Qb5} \) \( \text{Qg6} \)
13 \( \text{Qd2} \)

Now if 13 0-0, 14 \( \text{Qc4} \) rounds up the black d-pawn, which Black’s next is designed to protect

13 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Qa6} \)
14 \( \text{Qc4} \) \( \text{Qce7} \)
15 \( \text{b4! (D)} \)

Black manages to tuck his king away before move 20!
20 \( \text{Qf5} \) \( \text{Qge7} \)
Not 20 \( \text{Qxf5?} \) 21 \( \text{exf5} \) \( \text{Qge7} \) 22 \( \text{Qxb7} \), winning for White
21 \( \text{Qxg7} \) \( \text{Qxg7} \)
22 \( \text{d4} \)

We see that White was correct to wait with this move, as now Black cannot afford to play 22 \( \text{exd4} \) and open the long diagonal on which his king stands. Consequently White can keep his pawn on d4 and maintain the tension
22 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Wb6} \)
23 \( \text{Qf1!} \)

Bringing the bishop to a potentially more active post and adding support to the queenside
23 \( \ldots \) \( \text{f6} \)

Black bolsters the dark squares around his king in particular the a1-h8 diagonal
24 \( \text{Wd2} \)

White is intent on refraining from committing himself in the centre, even though 24 \( \text{Qc1} \) offers good prospects of increasing his advantage if Black then chooses to block the c-file with 24 \( \text{Qc6} \). White plays 25 d5 \( \text{Qxb4} \) 26 \( \text{dxe6} \) \( \text{Qc6} \) 27 \( \text{Qxd6} \) \( \text{Qxd6} \) 28 \( \text{Wxd6} \) \( \text{Ed8} \) 29 \( \text{Wa3!} \). However, White stands much better anyway, and there is nothing wrong in improving his position and pressuring Black a little more
24 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Qc6} \)
25 \( \text{a5} \) \( \text{Wd8} \)
26 \( \text{Qc3} \)

White prefers to keep his useful queen’s bishop on the board rather than allow 26 d5 \( \text{Qxb4} \)
26 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Qg4} \)
27 \( \text{Wc1!} \)

Again Psakhis wants more 27 d5 \( \text{Qa7} \) 28 \( \text{Qa3} \) wins the exchange, but Black plays 28 \( f5 \) with the makings of a dangerous kingside
attack, even more potent with White’s king’s bishop missing.

27 ... We7

28 £b2

A quiet move with a decisive threat of 29 d5 £b8 30 £c7 £d7 31 £xb7. Thus Black surrenders his central stronghold.

28 ... exd4

29 £xd4 £e5

29...£xd4 30 £xd4 £a8 31 £f4 (threatening 32 fxg5 hxg5 33 £xg5+) is terrible for Black.

30 £a3!

White is commanding the game to such an extent that an effective assault will bring victory. Taking the exchange with £xa6 is not necessary at the moment and, in order to remove the possibility, Black must lose valuable time with the retreat which follows.

30 ... £a8

31 £f4 £f7

32 £f5!

Closing Black’s bishop out of the game and nailing down the e6-square. White is about to close in.

32 ... £e5

33 £e6+ £g8

34 £d5! (D)

34 ... £f7

35 £c7 £e8

36 £xe5 dxe5

37 £b5!

This way White forces a win of material for which Black will have no compensation.

37 ... £e7

38 £xe8 1-0

Black plays ...e6 and ...d5

Against the Closed Sicilian Black’s most common scheme of development is based on the setup ...£b8-c6, ...£g7-g6, ...£f8-g7, ...e7-e6 and ...£g8-e7. The system which we now move on to discuss is therefore a common choice with Sicilian players, although it can equally well arise from a French Defence move order.

Dvoretsky-Vulfs

USSR 1986

1 e4 c5 2 £f3 e6 3 d3 £c6 4 g3 d5 5 £bd2 g6 6 £g2 £g7 7 0-0 £ge7 (D)

8 exd5!? exd5
Black prefers to maintain his pawn centre because the alternative 8...\(\square\text{xd5}\) grants White a dangerous initiative. The game Csom-Ivkov, Ljubljana-Portorož 1973, arrived at a position almost identical to the one above, the only difference being the development of Black’s king’s knight on f6 instead of e7. Here, too. White played 8 exd5, when Black was obliged to recapture with the knight as 8...\(\text{exd5}\) 9 \(\text{e}1+\) is obviously not to be recommended. After 8...\(\text{exd5}\) the play went as follows: 9 \(\text{Qb3}\) b6 10 \(\text{c4!}\) \(\text{Dde7}\) 11 d4 \(\text{cxd4}\) 12 \(\text{Qfxd4}\) \(\text{Dd7}\) 13 \(\text{Qg5}\) f6 14 \(\text{e}3\) 0-0 15 \(\text{wc2}\) e5 16 \(\text{Qb5}\) \(\text{Qf5}\) 17 \(\text{Qad1}\) \(\text{Wf7}\) 18 \(\text{Qd2}\) \(\text{Qac8}\) 19 \(\text{Qd1}\) and Black was under pressure. 12...\(\text{Qb7}\), as in the game Laszlo-Paal, Debrecen 1997, is worse — 13 \(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{Wd7}\) 14 \(\text{Qb5}\) 0-0 15 \(\text{Wf3}\) f6 16 \(\text{Qad1}\) \(\text{Wf8}\) 17 \(\text{Qxd8}\) + \(\text{Wxd8}\) 18 \(\text{d1}\) \(\text{Wf8}\) and now 19 \(\text{Qxa7+}\) wins, e.g., 19...\(\text{Qb8}\) (19...\(\text{Qc7}\) 20 \(\text{Qb5}\)+ 20 \(\text{Qxc6+}\) \(\text{Qxc6}\) (20...\(\text{Qxc6}\) 21 \(\text{d7}\) \(\text{fxg5}\) 22 \(\text{Qxb7}\)+) 21 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Qxg2}\) 22 \(\text{Qxb6+}\) \(\text{b7}\) 23 \(\text{Qd7}\) \(\text{Wc8}\) 24 \(\text{Qc5}\).

9 \(\text{d4}\)!

With his opponent’s king still uncastled White sacrifices a pawn to undermine Black’s centre and develop some play on the dark squares. An alternative is 9 \(\text{Qb3}\), delaying the d3-d4 push until it is fully prepared.

9 ... \(\text{cxd4}\)

Better than 9...\(\text{Qxd4}!!\) 10 \(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{cxd4}\) (10...\(\text{cxd4}\) 11 \(\text{Qb3}\) is similar to the game, but the knight exchange leaves Black with fewer chances of counterplay) 11 \(\text{Qb3}\) with a clear plus for White. Black can also choose to be saddled with a backward pawn — 9...\(\text{c4}\) (D).

This is not as popular as the capture on d4. The weakness on d5 is almost permanently fixed, but it is the surviving d4-pawn which contributes to White’s advantage by monitoring the e5-square. Already a knight and a pawn guard over the critical square, and with the rook coming to the e-file and \(\text{Qc1-f4}\) in the pipeline White can look forward to a pleasant middlegame. Note that ...\(\text{f7-f6}\) covers e5 but creates another target on e6, and contesting the e-file means moving the e7-knight, which means neglecting the d5-pawn. Gormally-Zagorskis, Poli-\(\text{tiken}\) Cup 1998, continued 10 \(\text{c3}\) \(\text{Qf5}\) 11 \(\text{e}1\) 0-0 12 \(\text{Qf1}\) h6 13 h4 (if Black wants to play ...g6-g5 it will require some sort of concession and, as we know, \(\text{h2-h4}\) is useful in related positions) 13...\(\text{Qe8}\) 14 \(\text{Qf4}\) \(\text{Wd7}\) 15 \(\text{Qe5}\) and the significance of the e5-square came into play. After 15...\(\text{Qxe5}\) 16 \(\text{Qxe5}\) Black refused to part with a piece which might soon be needed for defensive purposes, forcing back the enemy bishop in the process. 16...\(\text{f6}\) 17 \(\text{Qf4}\) g5 18 \(\text{hxg5}\) \(\text{hxg5}\) 19 \(\text{Qd2}\). Then 19...\(\text{Qg4}\) invited the exchange of another pair of minor pieces, a trade which allowed White to carry out an unexpected attacking manoeuvre: 20 \(\text{Qf3}\) \(\text{Qxf3}\) 21 \(\text{Wxf3}\) g4 22 \(\text{Wh1}\) (D).
I should point out — not for the first time — what a difference the traditional h2-h4 and the subsequent exchange on g5 made to Black’s defensive task. 22 f5 23 Wh5 Wh8 24 g5 Wh6 25 Wh3 (here is another inconvenience for Black — finding a new post on e3 for the d2-knight hits d5, f5 and g4) 25 Wh8 26 Whg2 Wh7 27 Wh6 Wh6 28 Whh6 Wc7 29 Wh1 Whg7 30 Whh5. The invasion is decisive. 30 Whc7 31 Whg5 Whf7 32 Wh1 Whf8 33 Whxg7 Whxg7 34 Whf6 Whg8 (34 Whf7 35 Whh8+ Whg8 36 Whg6 Whg7 37 Whxh5+) 35 Whh5 Whc6 36 Whf5. Material is level but Black is without hope 1-0.

10 Whb3 Whb6

Black could also hang on to his front d-pawn by playing 10 g5, although 11 h3 Whxh3 12 Whxf3 gives White good compensation. His next moves will be We1 Whf4 (or Whg5) and Wad1.

11 Whg5

Dvoretsky himself gives 11 Whc4, intending Whd6-c5 — as a possible improvement. Then 11 d3 12 c3 Whf5 13 We1 0-0 14 Whh4 We6 15 Whxd3 is comfortable for White. Black should continue with his development and meet 11 Whd4 with 11 Whf5. After the planned 12 Whd6 0-0 13 Whfl Whf8 (or 13 Whf4 14 Whc5 Whc7 15 Whxh7 Wcxe7 16 Whxd4 Whxg2 17 Whxg2, favouring White).

14 Whc5 Whc7 15 Whxd4 White’s firm control of the d4-square helps him play against the isolated pawn.

The less incisive game move works out well but Black has better than his next in 11 0-0 12 Whxd4 Whf5, effectively neutralising White’s edge (e.g. 13 Whxf5 Whxf5 14 Whx5 Whx2) Note that the string of captures beginning with 12 Whxd4 favours White. 13 Whxe7 Whxe7 14 Whc5 Whc5 15 Whxg7 Whxg7 16 Whxal 11 ... Whf5

12 Whf1 Whf6

White seems prepared to go to any lengths in order to seize control of d4. As for Black, his stranded king is the source of his coming tactical problems.

13 ... Whd6

14 Whxd4 Whd4!

An imaginative positional sacrifice which tests the Black defences. 14 c3 was tempting, with the idea of 14 dxc3 15 Whxd5!, but 14 Whc4 cuts across White’s plan.

14 ... Whxe4

Or 14 Whxd4 15 Whc3 Whd6 16 a4, tying Black up.

15 Whxd4 Whd4

The best continuation, as 15 Whxd4 Whf6 leaves Black in a dismal position.

16 Whxd5! (D)
Superb Black's d-pawns have disappeared and he is under severe pressure on the two central files. (White should avoid 16 \( \text{W}x \text{d}4? \) \( \text{e} \text{d}4 \) 17 \( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{a} \) 22.)

16 ... 0-0!

White would also retain his initiative after the exchange of queens, e.g. 16 \( \text{W}x \text{d}1 \) 17 \( \text{a} \) 1 \( \text{h}5 \) (if 17 \( \text{d}7 \) 18 \( \text{f}4 \) creates a new and equally strong threats on the d-file) 18 \( a6 \) (even better than 18 \( a6 \) \( f6 \) 19 \( a6 \) \( f7 \) 20 \( f6 \) \( e8 \) 21 \( e1 \) \( d7 \) 22 \( f7 \)++) 18 \( f8 \) (it was also necessary for White to consider casting 18 0-0) 19 \( a6 \) \( f6 \) 20 \( h6 \) 21 \( d6 \) \( f7 \) 21 \( d7 \), when White will soon reap the benefits of his powerful bind.) 19 \( e3 \) White is winning because of the powerful threat of \( a6 \) \( c6 \) followed by \( a6 \) \( d3 \) and \( a6 \) 8+.

17 \( a6 \) \( f8 \) 5!

Again Black continues in the most accurate fashion. Two other tries are clearly inferior. White has the much better endgame after 17 \( a6 \) \( d1 \) 18 \( a6 \) \( a6 \) \( b6 \) 19 \( a6 \) \( e6 \) \( xg4 \) 20 \( xg4 \) \( xg4 \) 19 \( g2 \) is terrible for Black since his minor pieces are no match for White's raking bishop pair.

18 \( a6 \)

An interesting possibility is 18 \( d5 \) ?, when 18 \( a6 \) 20 \( e3 \) greatly favours the first player. Black is able to obtain good drawing chances, however, with 18 \( a6 \) \( d5 \) 19 \( a6 \) \( d5 \) 20 \( d1 \) \( f3 \) 21 \( d6 \) \( xg4 \) Another obvious-looking move is 18 \( e7 \), but Black has a route to equality in 18 \( xg4 \) 19 \( xg6 \) \( e6 \) 20 \( xg6 \) \( f8 \) followed by \( xg4 \). White's calm choice is in fact the only way to keep Black on the defensive.

18 ... \( xg5 \)

19 \( xd6 \) \( ac8 \)

20 \( c3 \) \( b5 \)!

Black loses a piece after 20 \( xg4 \) 21 \( a3 \) 5 22 \( h3 \), while the attempt to win a kingside pawn by first eliminating White's b-pawn is also unsatisfactory 20 \( h5 \) 21 \( h3 \) \( xh4 \) 22 \( xh4 \) \( xg4 \) 23 \( a3 \) \( c4 \) (on 23 \( f5 \) White replies 24 \( e6 \) 24 \( xh7 \) with a comfortable advantage.) \( a6 \) 8? is weak on account of 21 \( e5 \) \( f5 \) 22 \( e5 \) \( a6 \) 8!

21 \( a6 \) \( a6 \)

Not 21 \( a6 \) \( a6 \) 22 \( a6 \) \( f6+ \) (or 23 \( e7 \) 24 \( d7 \++) 24 \( e5+ \) \( g7 \) 25 \( d5+ \)

22 \( d2 \) \( d8 \)

White was threatening 23 \( e7 \), so Black decides to enter into an endgame in which his queen faces two active rooks. On 22 \( e6 \) White anyway plays 23 \( e7 \) with advantage, e.g. 23 \( e6 \) 24 \( e6 \) \( e5 \) 25 \( xh5 \) \( e5 \) 26 \( g2 \) \( f1 \) 27 \( g3 \) If Black brings his bishop back into the game by 22 \( e6 \) White should harass his opponent's queen with 23 \( e5 \) (note that here 23 \( e6 \) 24 \( e6 \) \( f8 \) does not trouble Black)

23 \( xg5 \)

24 \( f5 \)

25 \( f5 \)

White defends his b-pawn before embarking on a gradual kingside build-up.

25 ... \( h5 \)!

Correct defence, undermining White's attack. Now the suicidal 26 \( xh5 \) loses to 26 \( g5+ \) and 27 \( xh5 \)

26 \( h5 \)

27 \( e4 \)

28 \( a5 \)

29 \( g4 \)

Because White's rooks are more active than Black's queen 29 \( a5 \) is possible, when the exchange of
the remaining bishops makes the defensive task more difficult for Black

29 ... \( \text{Wg}5 \)
30 \( \text{Qg}2 \) \( \text{b6} \)
31 \( \text{We}2 \) \( \text{We}5 \)
32 \( \text{Qg}3 \)

White improves his position with each move, Black must sit and wait

32 ... \( \text{Wb}5 \)
33 \( \text{Edd}2 \) \( \text{Wg}5 \)
34 \( \text{Ee}3 \)

This move vacates the e2-square for the bishop and invites the rash advance 34 \( f5^? \) (threatening 35 \( f4^+ \)). Although 35 \( \text{Exe}6 \) meets with 35 \( \text{Wxd}2 \), 35 \( \text{Ed}4^+ \) gives White a distinct pull

34 ... \( \text{We}5 \)
35 \( \text{Ee}2 \) \( \text{Wc}6^? \)
Better is 35 \( \text{Wc}7^+ \) 36 \( \text{Qg}2 \) \( \text{Wc}6^+ \)
36 \( f3? \)

After nurturing his advantage so well White holds back, letting his opponent off the hook! The planned 36 \( f4^+ \) was called for, with good winning prospects. Perhaps White was afraid of 36 \( \text{Wh}1 \), but 37 \( \text{Ed}1^+ \) prevents any annoying checks

36 ... \( g5^! \)

With this advance Black guarantees a draw since White's potential kingside attack has been nullified. Now White tries a different approach, but his opponent is ready

37 \( \text{Ed}4 \) \( \text{Wc}7^+ \)
38 \( \text{Qg}2 \) \( \text{Wf}6 \)
39 \( \text{Ed}3 \) \( \text{Wc}5 \)
40 \( \text{Ee}4 \) \( \text{Wb}5 \)
41 \( \text{Ed}2 \) \( \text{We}5 \)
42 \( \text{Eee}2 \) \( \text{Wb}5 \)
43 \( \text{Ee}7 \) \( \text{Wc}5 \)
44 \( \text{Ed}4 \) \( \text{h}5 \)
45 \( \text{Eed}2 \)

With the idea of 46 \( \text{Ed}5^+ \) — White's only remaining winning attempt

45 ... \( \text{We}5^! \)

A half-hearted game in which Black defended very well right from the opening. Although White's tactical play was impressive. Dvoretsky's own suggested improvement of 11 \( \text{Qf}4 \) certainly makes the central exchange with 8 \( \text{Exd}5 \) a promising idea

Ciocaltea-Ilijin
Romana 1976

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{Qf}3 \) e6 3 d3 d5 4 \( \text{Qbd}2 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 5 g3 \( \text{g}6 \) 6 \( \text{Qg}2 \) \( \text{Qg}7 \) 7 0-0 \( \text{Qe}7 \) 8 \( \text{Qe}1 \)

This normal developing move retains the tension in the centre. White then has the choice of transposing to a standard KIA setup with the e4-e5 push (as in this case), or preparing a timely e4xd5

8 ... \( 0-0 \)
9 e5 (D)

White does not have to commit himself immediately. In fact keeping the options open puts the onus on Black to find the most appropriate setup

a) 9 c3

a1) 9 b6 10 e5 \( \text{Wc}7 \) 11 \( \text{We}2 \) g5
12 h3 \( \text{h}6 \) 13 \( \text{Qf}1 \) \( \text{Qg}6 \) 14 d4 (D) was seen in Iuldachev-Muragan, Asian Team Championship 1993
By bolstering the e5-pawn with d4 White is able to turn his attention to his opponent's kingside weakness created by g7-g5. After 14 a5 15 a6 17 w6c2 b4 19 bxc8 bxc8 22 hxg5 hxg5 23 dxc5 the black king lacked pawn cover. The game continued 23 w5 24 w6 cxb2 25 w5 h5 26 w7 (homing in on the critical f6-square) 26 e6 27 b2 e2 28 w7 f3 xf3 29 xf3 c4 30 g5 w5 31 b1 c3 (White's forces are ready for the final assault on the kingside, so Black is welcome to the other wing) 32 xf6+ w8 33 w5 w7 34 exf6 w8 35 w8+ w8 36 h6 1-0

a2) 9 d4 cuts across White's sneaky plan to erect the (c3-) d4-e5 pawn centre by occupying d4 with a black pawn. The most uncompromising way for White to try to maintain a pull is to push the e-pawn after the capture on d4 - 10 cxd4 (10 e4 gives Black the time to close the position in his favour with 10 e5, when both c4 and e4 are not available to White's knights) 10 cxd4 11 cxd4 cxd4 11 cxd4 leaves Black too passive 12 e5! (D)

We are following the game Damljanovic-Costa, Mitropa Cup 1991. In the diagram position Black's dark-squared bishop is trapped in enemy territory, enabling White to seek an advantage in the form of the bishop pair - even if this does involve a temporary pawn sacrifice 12 f6 13 w6 e5 14 cxd4 exd4 15 c2 w6 16 w6 h8 e8 17 c4 c7 18 wxc5 wxc5 19 bxc5 and White stood better

a3) 9 w7 was played in the game Ljubojevic-Hulak, Rovinj-Zagreb 1975. White obtained a threatening position after the moves...

b) 9 h4 is interesting. If given the opportunity White will send his h-pawn further in order to damage the pawn shield in front of the black king.

b1) 9 c7 10 h5 h6 11 b6 g6 12 c3 w7 13 a3 d4 14 cxd4 cxd4 15 e5! Mortensen-Agdestein, Espoo Zonal 1987 Black has
nothing to compensate for his structural weaknesses

h2) 9 e5 seems sensible. In Yagupov-Litvinov, Minsk 1996, White followed up 10 exd5 Qxd5 with 11 Qe4 Wc7 12 h5 Qg4 13 h6 with lasting pressure which eventually resulted in a successful mating attack. The more sober 11 c3 b6 12 Qc4 Zc8 13 Zb3 Zb7 14 Zg5 of Lau-S Loefler, German League 1989, is a safe way to a slight edge for White.

b3) 9 h6 is the most popular reply, preparing to answer h4-h5 with g6-g5. Then 10 e5 f5 11 exf6 Zxf6 12 Zbh2 is best, as 12 Qe5?? invites the liberating 12 Zxe5 13 Zxe5 Zf7 14 Zc1 e5, and 12 Zf1 Wd6! 13 Zc4 Zxh4 14 gxf6 Zxb2 15 Zbl Zc3 is clearly better for Black. Bologan-Lauter Chalkidiki 1992 reached the following position after (12 Qh2) 12 Zf7 13 Qg4 Wd6 (D)

b31) Bologan played 14 Qf3 but met with the reply 14 e5! The point is that White’s intended 15 Zxh6+?? runs into a deadly pin after 15 Zxh6 16 Zxh6 Qg4, so the game went 15 Zc3 Zc6 16 c4 Za8 and Black had it all the play.

b32) A year later in Oratovsky-Mariwald, Eclyr 1993, the talented Israeli came up with an effective alternative which had been overlooked or underestimated by the better known players, namely 14 Zb3!! Now the threat to the h6-pawn is genuine because there is no knight on f3 to be pinned 14 Zh7 15 c4! Zd7 16 Zb3 b6 17 d4 and Black’s position was beginning to look rather loose. It is understandable that Black did not want to hand over the traditionally useful e4-square and open the h1-a8 diagonal for the g2-bishop with 15/16 d4, but perhaps this is the only choice.

b4) 9 ...

10 Wc7

10 Zwe2

10 b6

Dvoretsky-Ublava, USSR 1979, saw Black play more energetically by throwing forward his queenside pawns, while White persevered with his kingside build-up 10 a5 11 a4 h6 12 Zf1 (consistent, although 12 a4 — slowing Black down on the queenside — comes into consideration) 12 a4 13 a3 b5 14 Zh1 b4 15 Zf4 Zh7 16 Zg4 Zg8 With an eye to limiting Black’s counterplay before entering into a more critical stage of his attack White played 17 c4! After 17 bxc3 18 bxc3 Za6 19 c4! dxc4 20 dxc4 Zab8 21 h5 Zbh8 (not 21 g5 22 Zxg5! hXg5 23 Zxg5+ Zh8 24 Zxe4) 22 Zxg6 fxg6 23 Zf6! White had found his way into his opponent’s camp and was well on the way to victory.

11 Zf1

12 Zd4

12 h4 transposes to Dvoretsky-Khalifman, USSR 1987. Black eschewed completing his development and instead tried the unusual 12 Zd4?? 13 Zxd4 cxd4 14 Zf4 Zc6 14 (14 Zac8 15 Zac1 is better for White) 15 a3 Zd7 16 Zb2 Zac8, intending to challenge White’s e-pawn with f7-f6 White
happily waited for this imprudent break 17 \( \text{Qg}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) (or 17 \( \text{h}5 \) 18 \( \text{xf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 19 \( \text{exf}6 \) \( \text{wh}7 \) 20 \( \text{e}5^1 \) keeps White firmly in control of the all-important e5-square) 18 \( \text{exf}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 19 \( \text{xf}6^+ \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 20 \( \text{h}3^1 \) with a terrible game for Black

12 ... \( \text{ad}8 \)
13 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{d}4 (D) \)

Black would like to use d5 for one of his knights Another idea of d5-d4 is to be able to play c5-c4 without White closing the centre by d3-d4

14 \( \text{h}1^2 \) \( \text{b}4 \)
15 \( \text{wd}2! \)

A good dual-purpose move which prevents the planned 15 e4 and also adds power to White's grip on the dark squares around the enemy king

15 ... \( \text{ae}8 \)

On 15 \( \text{bd}5 \) White replies 16 \( \text{h}6 \) and Black must trade in his only defender of f6 and h6 Such an exchange would be disastrous for Black, especially since White's queen and knights are ready to pounce

16 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{ed}5 \)
17 \( \text{h}6^! \) \( \text{h}8 \)
18 \( \text{g}5^! \) \( \text{d}7 \)
19 \( \text{a}3 \) \( \text{ce}6 (D) \)

A brief study of the diagram position reveals that, although Black's pieces seem to be reasonably well posted, the failure to work up any notable queenside pressure has given White carte blanche on the kingside It is also important that the reader appreciates how White profited from inserting the move 17 \( \text{h}6^1 \) (forcing 17 \( \text{h}8 \)), rather than immediately playing the automatic 17 \( \text{g}5 \) Black's bishop may be safe on h8, but it no longer has any influence on the h6-square (unlike White's) Also the black king is now without the useful flight square in the corner These factors combine to give White a decisive advantage Quite often in those systems in which Black opts for the fianchetto of his king's bishop it appears that White is able to invade quite effortlessly. This game is no exception, with White playing standard KIA moves and subsequently finding himself in an overwhelming position

20 \( \text{f}6^! \)

Threatening to win a piece with 21 \( \text{h}6^+ \) Black's next is forced, as 20 \( \text{xf}6 \) 21 \( \text{exf}6 \) \( \text{h}8 \) 22 \( \text{wh}6 \) \( \text{g}8 \) 23 \( \text{g}5 \) is final Nor does 20 \( \text{h}5 \) put up any resistance 21 \( \text{wh}6 \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 22 \( \text{xf}6^+ \) \( \text{xf}6 \) 23 \( \text{exf}6 \) followed by 24 \( \text{w}g7 \) mate
20 ... \( \textit{Qxf6} \\
21 \textit{exf6} \textit{h5} \\
On 21...\textit{Wd8} comes 22 \textit{Wh6}! \( \textit{Qxf6} 23 \textit{Qg5!} \), unleashing the white bishop.
22 \( \textit{Qh6+}! \textit{g8} \\
Not 22...\textit{Wh7} 23 \textit{Qg5+} \textit{Qxh6} 24 \textit{Qxf7+} (better than 24 \textit{Qxe6+} — the king always makes better prey than the queen!) 24...\textit{Wh7} 25 \textit{Wh6+} \textit{Qg8} 26 \textit{Whxh8+} \textit{Qxf7} 27 \textit{Wg7} mate.
23 \( \textit{Qg5} \\
With the audacious threat of 24 \textit{Qh7} mate.
23 ... \( \textit{Qxf6} \\
If 23...\textit{Qxe8} (intending 24 \textit{Qh7+} \textit{Qe8}) White has 24 \textit{Qhx7+}! (threatening to win the queen with 25 \textit{Qxe6+}), or 24 \textit{Qxe6!}.
24 \( \textit{Qh7+} \textit{Qg7} \\
25 \( \textit{Qxf6} \textit{Qxf6} (D) \\

Black has defended quite cleverly to reach the above position. He hopes to simply drop the brave king back to g7 and force White to defend the stranded knight with g3-g4-g5, when Black will then use his extra pawn. However, White's play has been very logical so far, and he has, in fact, seen further than his opponent. The black king is benefit of defence on the dark squares and currently stands outside the fortress, so White should have something...

26 \( \textit{Qh5}!! \\
A wonderful move which nevertheless is the culmination of White's skilful play. Unfortunately for Black the only way to avoid 27 \textit{Wg5} mate leaves White the exchange up (26...\textit{Qxf5} and 26...\textit{Qxf5} both meet with 27 \textit{Wg5} mate). If Black ignores the proffered knight with 26...\textit{e5} he meets with a humiliating end after 27 \textit{Qg5+} \textit{Qe6} 28 \textit{Qg7+} \textit{Qd6} 29 \textit{Wxf6+} \textit{Qxe6} 30 \textit{Qe8} mate!

26 ... \( \textit{Qxf5} \\
27 \( \textit{Qxe8} \textit{Qg7} \\
28 \( \textit{Qae1} \textit{Qd8} \\
Apart from being ahead on material White also has a menacing initiative. Black's king, too, is still not completely safe. Black's last move hopes to hamper the harmony of White's rooks with ...\textit{Qd8}...\textit{c6}.

29 \textit{Wg5}! \( e4 \\
If 29...\textit{f6} 30 \textit{Qg8+!} \textit{Qxg8} 31 \textit{Wxg6+} \textit{Qg7} 32 \textit{Qxe8} mate, whilst the intended 29...\textit{Qde6} loses to 30 \textit{Qxe6!} \textit{Qxe6} 31 \textit{Qxe6}, when Black cannot defend against 32 \textit{Wxg6+}.

30 \textit{Qh8}!
Yet another 'sacrifice' with which to trouble Black's king. Now 30...\textit{Qhx8} 31 \textit{Qh6+} \textit{Qg8} 32 \textit{Qe8+} is mate, so Black struggles to survive with:

30 ... \( \textit{Qe6} \\
31 \( \textit{Wh6+} \textit{Qf6} \\
Once again the black king has been forced to run to f6, but this time there is no escape.

32 \textit{Qe8}! \( 1-0 \\
There is no defence to 33 \textit{Wh8+} \textit{Qg7} 34 \textit{Qg8}. Black loses a rook after 32...\textit{Qd8} 33 \textit{Wh8+} \textit{Qg7} 34 \textit{Qxd8} (still threatening \textit{Qg8}), retreating with 32...\textit{Qg7} allows 33 \textit{Wg5} mate. A fine example of how White can infiltrate the weaknesses around...
Black's king, particularly when Black fianchettoes his king's bishop.

When Black refrains from early castling White does best to avoid committing himself by e4-e5, and instead temporize with useful moves such as h2-h4 and c2-c3.

Yudasin-Jukic
Bern 1989

1 e4 c5 2 d3 e6 3 d3 dxe6 4 g3 d5 5 gbd2 g6 6 g2 g7 7 0-0 g7e7 8 c1 b6

More flexible than 8...b6-0-0. Since the move ...b6 occurs quite frequently in this variation it seems correct to play it immediately and await White's intentions. Interesting is 8...h6, hoping for the dubious 9 e5? g5! followed by ...e7-g6, surrounding White's e-pawn.

9 h4
For 9 c3 (and 9 exd5) see the next game.

9 ... h6

Otherwise White may push further with h4-h5, which Black no longer has to worry about because of the reply ...g6-g5.

10 c3 a5!

A good move, gaining space on the queenside (also threatening ...a5-a4) and preparing to flee from the dangerous h1-a8 diagonal. The latter could be fulfilled by ...a8-b8, but ...a8-a7 is potentially more active. Two similar alternatives:

a) The game Varavin-Moskalenko, Alushta 1994 saw the first outing of 10...dxe4. The idea is to dispense with the usual push of the a-pawn in favour of a quick posting of the queen's bishop on the soon to be opened f1-a6 diagonal.

After 11 dxe4 a6 White has a number of possibilities:

a1) 12 f1 e1f1 13 dx f1 is enough for a small but enduring edge.

a2) 12 dx f1?! is illogical and permits Black to take up the desired outpost with 12...d3.

a3) 12 a4?! was Varavin's choice. After 12...d3 13 d3 d3 b5 the game continued 14 a6 (14...d1 must be better as it keeps the queen closer to the unwelcome bishop on d3) 14...b8 15 e1 c4 16 d3d3 cxd3 17 f1 (17 f3 has been suggested) 17...b6 18 a3 e5 19 a3 b8 20 a4 d7c6 23 a5 b8 22 a4 d1 d7c6 23 a5 dx d3! White had finally sorted out the problem on d3 (22...d3 23 d4), though in view of Black's superior development after 22...0-0 the situation was far from clear.

a4) 12 h5! is aggressive and promising. Black must do something about the troublesome h-pawn:

a41) 12...gxh5 13 e5 (13 h4 d6) 13...g6 (13...0-0 runs into 14 h4, when the open h1-a8 diagonal rules out 14 g6) 14 a4 b7 15 d4 and White has a dangerous initiative.

a42) 12...g5 at least denies White easy access to the kingside. Then 13 e5 d7 14 a4 d3 15 c4 0-0 is unclear.

b) If Black essays the active 10...d6, then 11 a4!? is a tricky alternative to 11 f1. The capture 11...d3 runs into 12 exd5, when 12 exd5 and 12...d5 lose to 13 a6+ and 13 e5 respectively (on 12...b5 13 a6 maintains the winning position). Black's best, therefore, is 11...d7 or 11...d8, hoping that White's queen will be misplaced on a4.
White claims some space of his own and also fixes Black's queenside pawns

11 ... a4 (D)

In Benjamin-Eingorn, St John Open 1988, Black played 11...a6 After 12 exd5! he kept White's queen's knight out of c4 with 12 exd5, but White had no problem in finding another course 13 b3 0-0 14 d4 c4 (14 exd4 15 bxd4 is strategically losing for Black due to the isolated d-pawn and the weak-points at b5 and b6) 15 Bd2 and White stood much better Black had to bring his bishop back into the game with a c8-e6, while White simply opened up the queenside with a timely b2-b3 followed by putting pressure on Black's b-pawn

12 exd5!

An improvement over Ljubojevic-Kasparov Niksic 1983 where White allowed his opponent to effectively close the centre after 12 Bb3! d4! 13 exd4 exd4 14 d2? (imperative was 14 e5!) 14 e5! when Black already had a slight edge. Indeed Black quickly converted his space advantage into a

15 $\text{c1}$ (another try is 15 $\text{h5}$) 15 ... a6 16 a3 0-0 17 e1 f5 18 d4 f4! 19 f3 $\text{gxg3}$ 20 xg3 g5! 21 hxg5 $\text{gxg6}$ 22 g6 $\text{hxh6}$ 23 d4 e7 24 e4 $\text{d3}$1 (winning, as 25 xexe3 dxe3 26 f1 wgg5 27 dxe2 d4 is crushing) 25 b3 d4! 0-1 This game should be an important lesson — White must play either the space-gaining e4-e5 or generate pressure on the e-file by exd5 Thus 12 e5 is possible, with a view to concentrating on a kingside build-up. Black can expand on the queenside by 12 ... a6 13 d1 b5, but White's sound pawn structure and possibility of a kingside attack gives him an excellent game

12 ... exd5

12 ... exd5 13 d4 grants White a useful outpost

13 d4 b3! d4

Black does not want to be left with a fixed backward or isolated pawn on d5 after d3-d4 from White, so he pushes forward himself. However White is well placed to encroach upon the weaknesses in Black's camp. Note the power of the g2-bishop

14 exd4 exd4

15 f4 0-0

16 f5!

White is quite happy to make a couple of exchanges as he will then possess a group of harmoniously developed, active pieces compared with Black's scattered forces

16 ...$\text{e5}$

17 $\text{xe5}$

18 $\text{xe5}$ $\text{d6}$

19 $\text{e2}$

20 $\text{d2}$

White regroups his knight, observing the squares c4 and e4

20 ... e6 (D)
leaving Black in a hopeless state, with four weak pawns still to defend
25 \( \text{Wxe6+} \) \( \text{Wf7} \)
26 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Wb3} \)

Black strives for counterplay, but White now capitalises on the black queen’s sortie, also taking advantage of Black’s hanging rook and knight
27 \( \text{Cc4} \) \( \text{Wxa4} \)
28 \( \text{We6}+ \) \( \text{g7} \)
29 \( \text{Wb6}+ \) \( \text{d7} \)
30 \( \text{Cc5} \) \( \text{dd8} \)

On 30 \( \text{ff6} \) 31 \( \text{Cc5} \) Black finds his queen’s rook with no squares on the second rank — thanks in no small part to White’s all-powerful KIA bishop
31 \( \text{Cc7} \) \( \text{We8} \)

The queen unceremoniously returns to \( \text{e8} \) as White threatened 32 \( \text{Wxg6+} \) as well as 32 \( \text{Exe7+} \)
32 \( \text{We6} \) 1-0

White’s troublesome initiative persisted from 14 \( \text{cxd4} \) right through to the end of the game. The open lines and exchanging of key defensive pieces accentuated Black’s problems in protecting the numerous defects in his position.

If the point of Black’s delaying castling with \( \text{8. b6} \) is aimed partly at dissuading White from advancing his e-pawn then it is worth looking at the idea of preparing to push the pawn to \( \text{e5} \) with \( \text{9 c3} \). This game also features the relatively modern treatment of the variation involving the immediate capture on \( \text{d5} \).

Yurtaev-Gulko
Moscow Olympiad 1994

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 2 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{c5} \) 3 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{Cc6} \) 4 \( \text{g3} \)
\( \text{d5} \) 5 \( \text{bd2} \) \( \text{ge7} \) 6 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{g6} \) 7 0-0
\( \text{g7} \) 8 \( \text{Cce1} \) b6 9 c3
Apart from toying with effectively cutting the board in half with e4-e5, White has at his disposal another, quite different approach beginning with 9 exd5?! Note that this should be compared with Dvoretsky-Vulfov. Recapturing with the knight seems the better of the two options available to Black (9...\(\text{Wxd5}\) 10 \(\text{Qe5}\) is unpleasant).

a) 9 \(\text{Qxd5}\)

\[10 \text{d4}?? \] Opening the centre is more promising than the automatic 10 \(\text{Qc4}\). With his king still in the centre and the h1-a8 diagonal not yet properly defended, Black can easily run into trouble deciding which of these two potentially significant factors to address first.

a1) 10 0-0 11 c4 \(\text{Qde7}\) 12 dx5 bxc5 13 \(\text{Qe4}\) was only slightly worse for Black in S-B Hansen-Moskalenko, Copenhagen 1995.

a2) 10 cxd4 11 \(\text{Qb3}\) \(\text{Qb7}\) (tucking the king away seems to be more important) 11 0-0 12 \(\text{Qbd4}\) \(\text{Qxd4}\) 13 \(\text{Qxd4}\) \(\text{Qa6}\) 14 c3 and a draw was agreed in Psakhis-Dokhoian, Sochi 1988, though there is still plenty of play left in the position) 12 \(\text{Qfxd4}\) \(\text{Qxd4}\) 13 \(\text{Qxd4}\) (threatening 14 c4) 13 \(\text{xc8}\) 14 \(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{f7}\) (D)

There is always a danger that something like this might happen if one of the kings remains in the centre after key files and diagonals have opened. In fact, the diagram position has been seen more than once in international practice, and Black's correct response has been difficult to find over the board. For instance in Komlos-Moskalenko, Noyabrsk 1995, Black understandably answered with the automatic 14 \(\text{fxe6}\)? This is the natural reply that most players would come up with, as the unclear situation which results from the capture of the rook suggests that Black need not look for an alternative. However, despite the fact that the choice in the game seems to be the only move, the following entertaining line keeps Black in the game 14 \(\text{Qe7}\)!! This clever retreat leaves several pieces coming under attack and, by self-pinning his own knight Black creates a pin of his own on the d-file. After 15 \(\text{Qxb7}\) \(\text{fxe6}\) the pin should be enough to allow Black to hang on, e.g. 16 \(\text{xc3}\) (16 \(\text{Qxc8}\) \(\text{Qa6}\), with the threat of 17 \(\text{Qxf2}\), highlights White's problem on the d-file) 16 \(\text{xc4}\) 17 \(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{Qxd1}\) + 18 \(\text{Qxd1}\) \(\text{Qxb2}\) 19 \(\text{Qd8}\) + \(\text{Qf7}\) 20 \(\text{Qg5}\) + \(\text{Qg7}\) 21 \(\text{Qe6}\) + \(\text{Qf7}\) 22 \(\text{Qg5}\) + etc. The game continued (14 \(\text{fxe6}\)) 15 \(\text{Qxe6}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 16 \(\text{Qxg7}\) + \(\text{Wxg7}\) (16 \(\text{Qf7}\) was tried in Howell-Sohn, Bled 1995, when my good friend should have followed 17 \(\text{Qh6}\) \(\text{Qhd8}\) 18 \(\text{Wxc2}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) with 19 c4! \(\text{Qb4}\) 20 \(\text{Qxb7}\) \(\text{Qxb7}\) 21 \(\text{b3}\), with a clear advantage to White thanks to the two minor pieces ramped right in front of Black's king) 17 \(\text{Qxd5}\) \(\text{Qxd5}\) 18 \(\text{Qxd5}\) \(\text{Qd7}\) 19 \(\text{Qe5}\) + \(\text{Qf7}\) 20 \(\text{Qh6}\) \(\text{Qhg8}\) 21 \(\text{Qe1}\) (D)
White has a bishop and two pawns for the rook, his remaining pieces are active and he can look forward to hammering away at Black’s king for the rest of the game.

10 h4 h6 11 Qc4 0-0 12 Qc5 Qce7 13 d4 was Nevednichy’s subtle approach against Matveeva in Groningen 1993. One would expect Black’s extra moves (10 h6 and 11 0-0) to have worked in her favour, but the game quickly went downhill 13 exe4 14 Qxd4 Qc7 15 c4! Qxe5 16 cxd5 Qxd5 17 Qhx6 Qg7 18 Qxg7 Qxg7 19 h5! and the skirmish in the centre had resulted in Black’s kingside coming under too much pressure. In fact the end came after only five more moves 19 g5 20 Wg4 Qh6 21 Qxd5 exe5 22 Qf3+ Qxf5 23 Wxf5 Qae8 24 Wf6+. The central d3-d4 thrust certainly puts the onus on Black to find a route to a playble game, and delaying as in ‘a2’ merits further investigation.

Now let us see how play can develop when Black recaptures on d5 with the pawn.

b) 9 exe5 10 d4

b1) 10 0-0 11 dxc5 bxc5 12 Qxb3

with a further branch

b11) After 12 Wb6 13 c3 Black must play 13 c4 (e.g. 13 Qd8 14 Qe3 d4 15 cxd4 c4 16 d5 Qc7 17 Qf4! Wb6 18 Qfd2 cxb3 19 dxc6 Qxc6 20 Wxb3, Nevednichy-Roca, Manila Olympiad 1992), when Orlovsky-Kirakov, Vjen 1993, continued 14 Qbd4 Qxd4 15 Qxd4 Qxd4 16 cxd4 Qc6 17 b3 with a clear lead to White because of his uncontested dark-squared bishop.

b2) 10 exe5 11 Qb3 d3 aims to gain a little time on White’s queen, but 12 Wxd3 Qf5 13 Qd1 0-0 14 Qd4 favours White in view of the tremendous outpost on d4 and the blockaded isolated d-pawn in front of it. Regardless of how Black endeavours to disguise his weakness, it should remain with correct play Cyberowski-Kerec, EchU16 Zagan 1995 is typical 14 Qxd4 15 Qxd4 Qe4 16 Qg5! etc

b3) 10 c4 is more likely to crop up at club level. Again the (now backward) d5-pawn is susceptible to attack as the game progresses Black’s problem is that once a white knight lands on the inviting e5-square there is little choice but to take it (f7-f6 is too ugly), after which dxe5 both clears the way for White to target the d5-pawn and frees the dream d4-square for White’s pieces. In fact the immediate 11 Qe5 is possible because
11 \textit{Qxd4} meets with 12 \textit{Qxc4}, so 11 \textit{Qxe5} 12 \textit{dxe5} \textit{Qe6} 13 \textit{Qf3} followed by \textit{Qf3-d4} combined with a gradual build-up on the kingside is uncomfortable for Black.

9 ... \textit{Qb7}

One of several Others

a) 9 a5 and now

a1) 10 e5 \textit{Wc7} 11 \textit{We2} g5 12 \textit{Qxg5} \textit{wxg5} 13 \textit{Qe4}. Stanojlović-Jukic Jug Ch 1990. is unclear and requires accurate handling from Black. Compare with \textit{b} below.

a2) 10 a4 leads to play almost identical to Yudasin-Jukic after 10 \textit{a3}, but Vavarin-Zakharsiov, Smolensk 1991 saw Black introduce a new idea 10 ... \textit{d4} and now White found the most uncompromising answer in 11 \textit{cx4 cxd4} 12 e5\textit{D} (D)

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

As is demonstrated in the main game the stubborn push of White's e-pawn to e5 can be quite dangerous when Black has combined a kingside fianchetto with e7-e6 and the subsequent development of the king's knight on e7. In hoping to contest the often crucial e5-square Black has voluntarily created potential holes on f6 and d6, thus weakening the dark squares in general, so planting a pawn on e5 should always be considered by White. There followed 12 0-0 13 \textit{Qe4} 14 \textit{Qd5} 15 \textit{Qxe5} 16 \textit{Qf6+} \textit{Qxf6} 17 \textit{Qxa8} is a useful tactic to remember because it is a characteristic of this and related positions which serves to give White confidence when nulling over the pros and cons of e4-e5, meanwhile the opponent finds himself having to work it out once over the board. Now White opted for the immediate 14 \textit{Qf6+} \textit{Qxf6} 15 \textit{Qdee8} (14 \textit{Qh8} merits consideration, freeing g8 for the knight in order to challenge the intruder without having to surrender the dark-squared bishop) 15 \textit{Qxd5} 16 \textit{Qg5} \textit{Qd6} (not 16 \textit{Qxf6??} 17 \textit{Qd2}, when the pin is decisive) and now 17 \textit{Qd2} would have maintained the balance, with a very complicated struggle ahead. Instead of the check on f6 — which is natural but perhaps a little hasty — White can concentrate on occupying the f6-square with a piece. Again the price for this luxury is the faithful e5-pawn, but after 14 \textit{Qg5??} 15 \textit{Qxe5} 16 \textit{Qf6} 17 \textit{Qxf6} \textit{Qa7} 18 \textit{Qd2} White does have attractive compensation.

a3) 10 \textit{Qf1} is not really positive enough 10 \textit{dxe4} 11 \textit{dxe4} \textit{Qxd1} 12 \textit{Qxd1} a4 13 \textit{Qb1} 0-0 14 \textit{Qe4} gave White the more comfortable queenless middlegame in Domanov-Sokolov, Manila 1990 Declining the offered trade of queens by closing the centre with 10 ... \textit{d4} is less convenient for White, particularly with the knight now on f1.

b) 9 0-0 10 e5 \textit{Wc7} 11 \textit{We2} g5\textit{D} is a thematic continuation. In the game Gustafsson-Murugan, Gausdal 1991, White insisted on supporting the e5-pawn with his d-pawn after 12 \textit{Qh3} h6 13 \textit{Qg4} \textit{Qg6} 14 \textit{d4}, but this resulted only in providing Black with an entry point on the queenside.
after $14\text{ cxd4}$ $15\text{ cxd4} 5\text{b4}$ Consequently White should call his opponent's bluff and grab the g-pawn, which should really be quite an easy decision in view of the number of times White tends to rustle up activity by sacrificing his e-pawn $12\text{ e1xg5}$ $\text{wxe5}$ $13\text{ dxed4?} (D)$

This unlikely move is an important improvement on the odd $13\text{ f4?}$ $\text{wxe2}$ $14\text{ xe2 a6}$, which was already terrible for White in Hohem-Pedersen, Duisburg 1992 in the diagram position, from the game Kochetkov-Moskalenko, Alushta 1994. Both sides need to be very careful. It is true that Black's kingside clearly requires attention after the sacrifice of the g-pawn, though White must not assume that an attack against the enemy king is easy and without risk, while giving up the e-pawn reduces White's influence in the centre. The game continued $13\text{ g6}$ (not surprisingly the knight cannot be taken, e.g. $13\text{ dxed4?}$ $14\text{ f4}$ $\text{wxf6}$ $15\text{ xe4 e5}$ [White was threatening $16\text{ dxh7+}$ $\text{h8}$ $17\text{ xe4!}$ $\text{wxe6}$ $18\text{ w5}$ and White is winning]) $14\text{ dxh7+} (14\text{ f4}$ $\text{wxe7}$ $15\text{ of2} 15\text{ f2} 16\text{ of4}$ leaves White with a material advantage) $15\text{ f4}$ $\text{wxe7}$ $15\text{ f4}$ $\text{wxe7}$ $15\text{ f5}$ $16\text{ w5}$ $17\text{ wxe5}$ $18\text{ wxe5}$ $19\text{ f5}$ (intending simply $\text{h4-h5-h6}$ etc.) $19\text{ wxe7}$ $20\text{ w5}$ $20\text{ h5}$ $21\text{ g4}$ $21\text{ g4}$ $22\text{ wh6}$ loses to $22\text{ f5}$ $23\text{ wxe5}$ $23\text{ wh7}$ $24\text{ xh6}$, and $21\text{ wxe6}$ $22\text{ f5}$ $23\text{ dxed5}$ merely invites more of White's pieces into the fray) $22\text{ wh7}$ $23\text{ f5}$ $23\text{ wh7}$ $24\text{ xg8}$ $24\text{ xh6}$, and $21\text{ wxe6}$ $22\text{ f5}$ $23\text{ dxed5}$ merely invites more of White's pieces into the fray) $22\text{ wh7}$ $23\text{ f5}$ $23\text{ wh7}$ $24\text{ xg8}$ $24\text{ xh6}$, and $21\text{ wxe6}$ $22\text{ f5}$ $23\text{ dxed5}$ merely invites more of White's pieces into the fray) $22\text{ wh7}$ $23\text{ f5}$ $23\text{ wh7}$ $24\text{ xg8}$, which should have put Black firmly in the driving seat, White could have maintained the pressure by throwing more fuel on the fire with $24\text{ dxed7} (D)$

After $24\text{ dxed7}$ $25\text{ wh6}$ $26\text{ wxe7+}$ $\text{wxe7}$ $27\text{ dxed5+}$ $\text{h8}$ $28\text{ w1}$ $29\text{ wh6}$ $29\text{ wh6}$ $30\text{ dxed7}$ the material imbalance and the tired black king are the key factors in this scrappy position. Of course there could be improvements for both sides, but White cannot go wrong with the patient $14\text{ f4}$

c) $9\text{ a6} 10\text{ dxed5}$ $\text{exp5}$ virtually forces White to exploit the open lines by simply moving the attacked d-pawn out of the way $11\text{ dxed4?} (D)$
Now 11 cxd4 12 cxd4 Qxd4? is out of the question because the check on a4 picks up a piece. Consequently, the game Ri Bates-G Buckley Hampstead GM 1998, went 11 0-0, when White achieved a structural superiority on the queenside: 12 dxc5 bxc5 13 Qb3 c4 (13... Qb6 14 Qe3) 14 Qbd4 with a clear advantage to White thanks to the wonderful outpost on d4 and the weak d-pawn.

10 e5 g5 (D)

I would hope that I would consider nothing but 13 a3 in the diagram position, with an edge to White. Instead White chose 13 Qf1 in the game. While it is quite normal to drop the knight back to f1 in numerous lines of the KIA — even this one — it is important to remember that Black, too, is allowed some activity. Unfortunately, Mr Pruder never got the chance to hack away at his opponent’s weak dark squares on the kingside (with h2-h4-h5, Qf1-h2-g4, Qc1-g5 etc.) because the swift and decisive invasion on the other side of the board: 13 Qb4 (obviously) 14 Qe3 Qf5 15 Re2 Qa6 16 Qd2 Qxe3 17 fxe3 Qh6 18 Qb3 Qb5 19 Qe1 0-0 20 a3 Qa2! (D)

Gulko essays a familiar idea to unsettle his opponent and gang up on the e5-pawn before White gets the time to come to its rescue with d3-d4. Black usually pushes his g-pawn with his queen on c7 and White’s already committed to e2, planning to answer a subsequent Qf3xg5 with Qc7xe5. Consequently, in order to get the most out of this new position, White now looks to profit from the fact that his queen has yet to move. 10 Qd7 does nothing to stop White from executing his plan with 11 d4 cxd4 12 cxd4 but Pruder-S Ivanov, Leningrad 1989 is a good illustration of how not to play White’s side:

12 Qe8 (D)
As if proving the point to himself, when White finally does nudge his a-pawn forward he sets the stage for a witty culmination to a well played (by Black) game. A small investment of just one tempo on the queenside would have avoided embarrassment.

11 \( \text{Qxg5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \)
12 \( \text{Qd5} \) \( \text{Qg6} \)
12 \( \text{Qxf3}+? \) 13 \( \text{Wxh5} \) 0-0 14 \( \text{Wh5} \) helps White to a clear advantage.

13 \( \text{d4!} \)

Already structurally superior after Black’s provocative 10th move White sensibly aims to increase his positional lead. It would be easy but foolhardy to see the fall of the g5-pawn as the first stage of an early sacrificial stroke against the enemy king e.g. 13 \( \text{Qxh7} \) \( \text{Qxh7} \) 14 f6+ gxf6 and, once Black untangles, the extra piece will be more significant than the two pawns. The removal of Black’s g-pawn is nevertheless significant, for now Black will have difficulty finding a truly secure haven for his king, so White should be content to rely on his other plusses until later. At some point the opportunity to trouble the king should eventually present itself.

13 ... \( \text{h6} \)

Another masterly stroke which arises from White’s total appreciation of the position. Black, searching frantically for a place to hide his king (standing opposite White’s rook is far from ideal), will not find the kingside too inviting — hence White’s aggression on the other flank. Meanwhile the aforementioned line-up of pieces on the e-file leaves White with all the trumps.

15 ... \( \text{Qc6} \)
15 a5 has been suggested, though this short-term solution does leave Black with a fresh weakness on b6 as well as open to a future pawn-break with b2-b4.

16 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{Qxf4} \)
17 \( \text{Qxf4} \) \( \text{a6?!} \)

Moseev’s 17 c4 seems the lesser evil. Black’s main problem is his inferiority in all sectors of the board.

18 a5! \( \text{Wh7?} \)

Black’s plight goes from bad to worse — this often happens when one side finds himself under pressure at an early stage — since this drops a pawn. Finding a safe alternative, though, is not easy. 18 \( \text{Qxa5??} \) loses a piece to 19 b4.
and 18 bxa5 19 dxc5 is terrible for Black. This leaves 18 cxd4 19 axb6 axb6 20 cxd4 (20 ffl wC8) when Black is still on the board but the king continues to be a problem, e.g. 20 0-0? 21 wD2 wH7? 22 Lxa6 Lxa6 23 wD3+ wH8 24 wxa6 19 axb6 axb6

19 wxb6? 20 dxe5 wb7 21 wD5 is easy for White, but 19 cxd4 20 Lxd4 Lxd4 21 cxd4 needs checking 21 axb6 runs into 22 wh5! threatening both 23 Lxe6+ and 23 Lxd5. Then 22 wH8 23 Lac1 Lc8 (23 LAc4 24 Lxc4) 24 Lxc8+ wxc8 25 Lc1 puts Black in trouble, while 21 wxb6 22 Lxd5 succeeds in maintaining the pressure.

20 dxe5 bxe5
20 0-0 21 Lxb6 wxb6 22 wD2
21 wD5 (D)

Of course there is nothing wrong with 23 wxb5 Lxb5 24 Lxa8 Lxa8 25 We5 Perhaps Yurtsev was enjoying the game too much, which is good for us, because now we see what can be the long-term implications of g6-g5 if Black’s opening does not go according to plan.

23 ...
24 wab1 wC2
O r 24 Lxc3 25 Lxc3 Lxc3 26 Lxc1 Ld3 (26 Ld4 27 Lxd4 Lxd4 28 Lxa8) 27 Lb3 Tactics tend to favour the player in the driving seat.

25 Lxa6 Lxa6
26 wxb6 Lab8
27 Lbc1 wF5
28 wH4

After
28 ...
29 Lxc6 wxc6
comes
30 wF5 1-0(D)

The first sign of life from White’s queen is also decisive, and Yurtsev has done well to exploit the subtle differences in the position brought about by his opponent’s theoretical novelty on the 10th move. Black — apart from being a pawn down — has too many weaknesses.

21 ...
22 Lxc5 wB5
23 Lc3

As I said in the note to White’s 13th move, Black’s damaged kingside pawns mean that his king could prove to be a liability throughout the game. Remember that if one of the world’s most respected GMs has difficulty with the black pieces in this line, then mere mortals should definitely struggle.
3 KIA vs French Defence

1 e4 e6 2 d3 d5 3 Qd2 (D)

1 e4 players are bound to meet the French Defence quite often, and 2 d3 is an excellent way of steering the game into lesser-known channels

The ‘Long’ Variation

The standard variation is one in which Black decides to weather the storm and allow White an all-out kingside attack in return for counterplay on the other flank, and is characterised by the following sequence of moves

1 e4 e6 2 d3 d5 3 Qd2 c5 4 Qg3 Qc6 5 g3 Qf6 6 Qg2 Qe7 7 0-0 0-0 8 Qe1 (D)

This line offers play for both sides and an understanding of the respective attacking and defending themes is crucial, as they are relevant in more than just this variation. As a prelude to the coming kingside onslaught White will close the centre by pushing with e4–e5, subsequently chasing away Black’s f6-knight and, in fact, leaving Black with a distinct lack of minor piece protection for his king.

Since the advanced e-pawn is such an important part of White’s plans, it is imperative that White over-protect it in order to minimise the chance of Black essaying the undermining f7–f6. The queen’s knight can, after h2–h4, make the manoeuvres Qd2–f1–h2–g4 and Qd2–f1–e3. The latter is especially threatening when Black has played Qd8–c7 and White the usual Qc1–f4, as this introduces the possibility of playing Qe3xd5 followed by e5–e6. Leaving the h-pawn on the fourth rank helps support the
8    b5

Black wastes no time in setting his queenside pawn roller into action, the slower 8...Wc7 was discussed in the Introduction

9    e5    Qd7

Dropping the knight back to e8 is less popular — 9...Qe8 10 Qf1
a) One idea is to keep the c8-bishop defending the e6-pawn in order to act on the kingside —

Fischer-Miagmasuren
Sousse Interzonal 1967
(From previous diagram)

10 f5/f6 11 exf6 with a further branch
a1) Borik-Sonntag, German League 1996, continued 11 gxf6 12 h6 f7 13 e4? Qc7 14 cxd5 Qxd5 15 a3 Qb8 16 Qc1 with the better pawn structure for White
a2) 11 Qxf6 12 Qe3 Wd6 13 c4! puts pressure on Black's centre. In Dolsmatov-E.Meyer, Philadelphia 1991, White emerged with a slight advantage 13 Qc7 14 Qg4 e5 15 Qxf6+ gxf6 16 cxd5 Qxd5 17 Qd2 Qe6 18 Qe4 We7 19 Qh6 etc.

b) Less drastic is 10 h4 11 h4
Then
b1) 11 Qc7 12 Qh2 Qb5 13 Qd2 Qbd4 is another justification of 9...Qe8 Sveshnikov-Petrosian, USSR 1976, was unclear after 14 Qg5
b2) 11 a5 12 Qh2 a4 with
b21) 13 a3 bxa3 14 bxa3 Qc7 15 Qg5 Aa6 16 Qd2 Bb8 was balanced in McShane-Davies, 4NCL 1997
b22) In Musil-Velimirovic, Porto- roz 1975, White played 13 Qg5, when 13 a3 14 bxa3 Qd4 15 axb4 cxb4 offered Black some compensation for the pawn

10 Qf1    a5

11 h4    b4 (D)
12 \( \Bf4 \)

Some players prefer to bring the knight round to g4, reserving the option of concentrating on the dark squares by putting the bishop on g5 instead of f4. After 12 \( \Bh1h2 \) Black has

a) 12 \( \Bf6 \) 13 \( \Ba3 \) \( \Bf6 \) 14 \( \Bf4 \) f6 15 exf6 \( \Bxf6 \) 16 \( \Bb1 \) \( \Bd8 \) 17 \( \Bg4 \) clearly favoured White in Rajkovic-Jakimidis, Albena 1977.

b) 12 \( \Ba6 \) 13 \( \Bg4 \) (13 \( \Bf4 \) transposes to the note to Black's 12\textth\ move) 13 \( \Bf6 \) (the immediate 13 \( \Bd4 \) offers better chances to equalize) 14 \( \Bf5 \) \( \Bd4 \) and now in Chuchelov-Muir, Berlin 1998, White tried 15 \( \Bd2 \), hoping to improve on 15 \( \Bxd4 \) \( \Bxd4 \) 16 \( \Bwd2 \) \( \Bc8 \) 17 \( \Be2 \) \( \Bc6 \) 18 \( \Wf4 \) b3 19 \( \Bxb3 \) axb3 20 axb3 h5, which was unclear in Vaganian-Yusupov, Germany 1992. The point is to leave the queenside closed. After 15 \( \Bxf3 \) 16 \( \Bxf3 \) c4 17 d4 c3 18 bxc3 bxc3 19 \( \Bwe3 \) h8 20 \( \Bb1 \) \( \Bb2 \) 21 \( \Bxe7 \) \( \Bxe7 \) 22 \( \Bxe3 \) \( \Bxa2 \) 23 \( \Dc3 \) \( \Dh8 \) 24 \( \Bb6 \) a3 25 \( \Bb1 \) White had taken control of his opponent's sector of the board.

12 ... \( \Bf6 \)

Better is 12 \( \Ba6 \) 13 \( \Bh1h2 \)

a) 13 \( \Bf6 \) 14 \( \Bg5 \) \( \Bwe8 \) 15 c4 \( \Bb6 \) 16 cxd5 \( \Bxd5 \) 17 \( \Bd4 \) g6 18 \( \Bxd5 \) cxd5 19 \( \Bg4 \) \( \Bxd4 \) with chances for both sides, Ye-Matamoros, Bern 1995.

b) 13 \( \Bc8 \) is natural but has had little success.

b1) Martinovic-Schmitt, Dortmund 1988, went 14 \( \Bc1 \) a4 15 \( \Bf1 \) \( \Bd6 \) 16 \( \Bg5 \) \( \Bwe8 \) 17 \( \Bg4 \) a5 18 bxa3 \( \Bd4 \) 19 \( \Bf5 \) gxf6 20 \( \Bxf6 \) \( \Bxf6 \) 21 \( \Bh5 \) with a decisive advantage.

b2) 14 \( \Bh3 \) \( \Bd4 \) 15 \( \Bxd4 \) cxd4 (D)

28 \( \Bxf4 \) (28 \( \Bxf6 \) 29 \( \Bxf5 \) opens the g-file for White's rooks) 29 \( \Bxg4 \) g6 30 \( \Bxf8 \) \( \Bxf8 \) 31 \( \Bh6 \) \( \Bg7 \) 32 \( \Bxh5 \) \( \Bc7 \) 33 \( \Bc5 \) Instead of resigning Black now invited a nice finish 33 \( \Bxg6 \) 34 \( \Bxg6 \) \( \Bh2+ \) 35 \( \Bh2 \) \( \Bh8 \) 36 \( \Bxh2 \) \( \Bh8 \) 37 \( \Bxg2 \) \( \Bh6 \)
38 \text{xh6} \text{xh6} 39 \text{f4} \text{g7} 40 \text{h2}
\text{e7} 41 \text{h7+ f8} 42 \text{h8+ 1-0}

13 \text{a3!}

Fischer is happy to ‘waste’ a move on this side of the board because now Black no longer has the useful \text{a4-3} push at his disposal

13 \text{... hxa3}
14 \text{bxa3 a6}
15 \text{e3 a5}

Gheorghiu-Uhlmann, Sofia 1967, went instead 15 \text{d4} 16 \text{c4! b6} Rather than move his attacked rook, White trusted in his attacking opportunities and put his opponent under immediate pressure with 17 \text{cxd5}. After 17 \text{xa1} 18 \text{xa1}
\text{exd5} 19 \text{xd5} \text{xd3*} (19 \text{b6 is a big improvement) White played}
20 \text{e6†}. The game ended 20 \text{f6}
(20 \text{fxe6 21 c7 f6} 22 \text{e1 e8}
23 \text{xe6 threatens \text{xf6†} and \text{e7+})}
21 \text{xe7+ xe7} 22 \text{e5 g6} 23
\text{c6 b7} 24 \text{d6 e4} 25 \text{xe4†}
\text{xc6} 26 \text{xf8} 1-0 (26 \text{xf8 27}
\text{xf6} 28 \text{g4+}, or 27 \text{xe4}
28 \text{xf7†}) Mieses-Bersud’s move
15 \text{a5} takes the knight away from the centre (and further from the kingside), and Black will come to regret taking such a luxury

16 \text{h3!}

Dissuading Black from challenging the e5-pawn with \text{f7-f6}

16 \text{... d4}
17 \text{f1! (D)}

White shows his understanding of these positions with this retreat. Many players would use the g4-square for the knight, but then White’s queen would have difficulty when the time comes to swing over to the kingside

17 \text{... b6}
18 \text{g5 d5}
19 \text{d2}

Fischer does not want to exchange his queen’s bishop because his g5-knight is menacing enough to push Black into giving up his own dark-squared bishop. Keeping watch over the squares f6 and h6 is vital. Now 19 \text{h6} meets with 20
\text{exe6} 21 \text{xe6+ h8} 22 \text{xa5}
\text{xa5} 23 \text{xd5}, highlighting a drawback of 15 \text{a5}

19 \text{... xg5}
20 \text{xg5 d7}
21 \text{h5 e8}
22 \text{d2 c3}
23 \text{f6! (D)}

White launches the final attack, against which there seems to be no adequate defence. All of Black’s pieces — except his king! — stand helplessly by on the queenside

23 \text{... e8}

Acceptance of the ‘sacrifice’ brings no joy 23 \text{gxf6} 24 \text{exf6}
\text{h8} 25 \text{f3 d5} 25 \text{g8} 26
\text{e5†} threatens both \text{xd7} and
\( \text{\textit{KIA vs French Defence 45}} \)

\( \text{Qxf7+!} \) 26 \text{Qg5!} \text{Qxe6} 27 \text{Wh6} \\
\text{Wc7} 28 \text{Qf3!} \text{Qg8} 29 \text{Qxh7} \\
24 \text{Qe4!} \text{g6} \\
Black will have to play this move eventually. \\
25 \text{Wg5} \text{Qxe4} \\
26 \text{Qxe4} \text{e4} \\
27 \text{h5!} \\
White must strike while the iron is hot. \\
27 \ldots \text{exd3} \\
28 \text{Qh4!} \text{a7} \\
Hoping to defend along the second rank. Certainly not 28 \text{dxc2} 29 \text{hxg6} \text{c1=Q+} 30 \text{Qxc1} \text{Qxe1+} 31 \text{Qh2!} \text{fxg6} 32 \text{Qxh7!} \text{Qxh7} 33 \text{Wh4+} \text{Qg8} 34 \text{Wh8+} \text{Qf7} 35 \text{Qg7} \text{mate} \\
29 \text{Qg2!} \\
Now White can meet 29 \text{Wf8} with 30 \text{Qe4!} followed by breaking through the enemy's kingside with \text{hxg6} and \text{Qxg6}, whilst the challenge 29 \text{Qb7} cuts off the a7-rook allowing 30 \text{hxg6} \text{fxg6} 31 \text{Qxh7} \\
29 \ldots \text{dxc2} \\
30 \text{Wh6} \text{Wf8 (D)} \\
31 \text{Wh7+!} \text{1-0} \\
31 \text{Qxh7} 32 \text{hxg6+} \text{Qxg6} 33 \text{Qe4} \text{mate} \\

Black plays ...b6 \\

As we have seen, White's forces are perfectly posted to carry out a lethal kingside attack, so some black players may prefer to dispense with the advance of the queenside pawns and settle for the more circumspect b7-b6 and \text{Qc8-b7}. When Black delays kingside castling the b7-b6 strategy deters White from pushing e4-e5 prematurely, as the e-pawn may become a weakness and Black could take advantage of the closed centre by castling queenside and aiming for the g7-g5 thrust, undermining White's kingside defences and the protection of the all-important pawn. Consequently White often reacts by temporalising, waiting for Black to make a commitment before acting in the centre. A disadvantage of playing waiting moves in order to avoid coming under an early attack is that the opponent is given too much time and can simply strengthen his position. Here White manages to support his centre with e2-c3 and d3-d4.

Psakhis-D. Paunovic
Minsk 1986

1 \text{e4} \text{c5} 2 \text{Qf3} \text{e6} 3 \text{d3} \text{Qc6} 4 \text{g3} \\
\text{d5} 5 \text{Qbd2} \text{Qf6} 6 \text{Qg2} \text{b6} 7 \text{0-0} \\
\text{Qb7} 8 \text{e1} \text{Qe7 (D)} \\

9 \text{a3??}
With this useful move White wants to see where the Black king will go. He also retains the possibility of a favourable central exchange with e4xd5 9 We2 may transpose to normal lines with d4-e5, unless Black plays the critical 9...Db4 10 e5 Dxc2 11 exf6 Dxf6

a) The game Mark Tseitlin-Polovodin, USSR 1981, went 12 Kb1 Dxe1 13 Wxe1 La6 14 De5 0-0 15 Dfl Wc7 16 Dg4 De7 17 Df3 Dae8 when the position was unclear

b) In Kochnev-Legky, USSR 1984, White dispensed with 12 Kb1 m favour of 12 Df1?? Black played 12...Dxa1 (1f 12 Dxe1, 13 Wxe1 La6 14 We2 0-0 15 De3 is slightly better for White) 13 Df4 c4 14 Dd4 Dg3 15 axb3 cxb3 16 Dxb5+ Dd7 17 Dxb3 0-0 18 De3 and White stood a little better because of his active knights

9 ... Wc7
10 0-0-0 Dd7 12 d4 as in Hort-Lobron, Bad Kissang 1981, allows 12 g5 with a double-edged game Instead White should settle for a slight advantage after 11 Wxe2 Black does well to avoid 10 a5?? 11 d4! which favoured White in Knezevic-Jovicic, Yugoslavia 1975

Having played 10 c3 White can now support e5 with a pawn rather than the more usual Wd1-e2, Dd2-f1 and Lc1-f4 etc. The a3-pawn defends the b4-square, ready for the following exchange

12 ... cxd4
13 cxd4 Da5

In anticipation of a White kingside attack Black seeks active play down the c-file. With this in mind White could now play 14 Dbl?? followed by 15 Dc3, but instead Psakhis prefers to concentrate on kingside operations, judging that Black’s play on the queenside will not be too troubling

14 Df1
15 b4!

White must prevent Wc7-c2. The attempt to do this with 15 Dc3 is not promising as after 15 Dc4 16 Dg4 h5! 17 Dc3 Dxe3 18 Dxe3 Dc2 Black still achieves his goal. After the game move Black will have an unchallenged knight on c4 which, unfortunately, may serve to only hamper his major pieces and consequently not distract White from building up pressure on the other flank

15 ... Dc4
16 h4 b5

A necessary move if Black wants to open the queenside. The immediate 16 a5 meets with 17 b5!

17 Dg5

Wasting no time in beginning the attack

17 ... a5??

Black must look for counterplay, but chasing the dangerously hovering knight with 17 h6 would at least prevent White from hurling his queen into the heart of battle. However, in answer to 17 h6 White’s attacking chances by no means diminish after 18 Dh3 followed by Wg4
and $Q_d4$. Even 18 $Q_xf7\#? Q_xf7$ 19 $W_h5+$ may be worth a try, as the remaining cover around the black king could eventually be wiped away with the sacrifice $Q_xh6$

18 $W_h5!$ $Q_xg5$

White threatened both 19 $W_xf7+$ and 19 $W_xh7+$, so Black has no choice but to give up the 'minor exchange' of the two bishops. This has serious consequences — the black-squared bishop will be sorely missed once White has pin-pointed the weaknesses in Black's kingside

19 $Q_xg5$ $a_xb4$
20 $a_xb4$ $A_a4$
21 $b_h2! (D)$

$A_g5+$ and $Q_g4-f6+$ The king's bishop will also play a part in the attack with $A_g2-f1-d3$. Consequently Black sees time as a more important factor than material and, after strengthening his command of the a-file, brings his knight over to help defend

21 ... $A_c8$
22 $A_ab1$ $A_f8$
23 $W_g4!$

Making way for the h-pawn, in order to follow with $h_5$ and $A_f6$. Should Black now escape the pressure on the g-file with 23 $A_h8$, White obtains a winning attack 24 $h_5$ h6 25 $A_f6!$ gxf6 26 exf6

23 ... $W_e8$
24 $h_5$ $A_d7$
25 $h_6!$

White thematically forces a further weakening of the dark squares around his opponent's king

25 ... $g_6$
26 $W_h4$

Threatening simply 27 $Q_g4$, $A_g5-e7$ (depriving Black's king of the f8-square) and $Q_g4-f6$

26 ... $W_e8$
27 $A_e7$ $A_c8$
28 $Q_g4$ $f_5$

White threatened 29 $A_f6+$ $Q_xf6$
30 $W_xf6$ mating. Another way of preventing this — less drastic than the game — is 28 $W_h8$, but Black's days are still numbered

29 exf6 $W_f7$
30 $f_4$

Black also has problems after 30 $b_h2$, heading for g5 via f3

30 ... $A_b8$

The best defensive try, intending $A_b8-e6$. White's reaction is violent, giving his opponent no respite

31 $f_5!$ gxf5

Or 31 exf5 32 $b_h2!$ followed by $A_b3-g5$

32 $A_xd5! (D)$
A position worthy of a diagram! Black has five pieces on the queenside which are playing no part in the game whatsoever. Only the queen has come to the aid of the king. As for White, his pieces could hardly be better posted. Two pawns have even found their way into Black's kingside. It is not accidental that White is excellently and Black terribly placed. Moreover the diagram position has arisen from active, positionally orientated play from White who, unlike his opponent, has used the development of his pieces to maximum effect.

32 ... exd5

Accepting the other piece with 32 fxg4 does not help White brings an end to the game swiftly by
33 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{Bxe6}} \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Ba6}} 34 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Bf5+ Bf8}} (or 34 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Bd6 35 Bxe6+ Bf8 36 f7}}) 35 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Bf7+1 Bxg7}} 36 fxe7+ Bg8 37 Bxe6 mate.

33 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Bg5+}} Gg6
34 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Bxg6+ hxg6}}
35 f7+

White jettisons his two far-advanced pawns to continue the mating attack.

35 ... \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Bxf7}}
36 Bf7 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Bf7}}
37 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Bxh6+ Bxh6}}
38 \textcolor{blue}{\texttt{Bxh6+ Bxh6}}

9 ... h6?!

Not as useful as 9 Bc7 White has not yet committed himself with e4-e5, so the prospect of the thrust g7-g5 is still quite remote. Consequently Black has simply weakened his kingside.

a) In the game Geller-Bagirow, USSR Ch 1963, Black considered waiting moves unnecessary and played 9 0-0 Castling so early is
unwise, and after 10 e5 \(\text{Qxd7}\) 11 \(\text{Qf1}\) \(\text{Ec8}\) 12 h4 White was well in command. There followed 12 f6 13 exf6 \(\text{Qxf6}\) 14 d4! \(\text{Ec8}\) 15 \(\text{Qg5}\) exd4 16 cxd4 \(\text{Ca5}\) 17 b3 \(\text{Ca6}\) 18 \(\text{Qe3}\) with a nice position for White, whose control of e5 (after \(\text{Qe3-g4}\)) will secure a lasting advantage.

b) Black may also give the game a different character than the usual closed centre and flank attacks by relieving the tension with 9 dxe4. This happened in Petursson-Fehr, Bern 1991, which continued 10 dxe4 e5 11 \(\text{Qc4}\) \(\text{Wc7}\) (11 \(\text{Wxd1}\) 12 \(\text{Bxd1}\) \(\text{Qxe4}\) 13 \(\text{Qe1}\) is bad for Black) 12 \(\text{Qe3}\) \(\text{Ed8}\) 13 \(\text{Qd5}\) \(\text{Wb8}\) 14 \(\text{Qg5}\) \(\text{Ed6}\) 15 \(\text{Wa4}\) h6 16 \(\text{Qd2}\) 0-0 17 \(\text{Qh4}\)! when White had a powerful initiative. Surprisingly the Icelandic GM finished the game by an eventual breakthrough on the queenside 17 \(\text{Ec8}\) 18 h3 b5 19 \(\text{Qxe7-}\) \(\text{Qxe7}\) 20 \(\text{Wc2}\) \(\text{Ed8}\) 21 \(\text{Qe3}\) e4 22 b4 \(\text{Wc7}\) 23 a4 a6 24 axb5 axb5 25 \(\text{Qa5}\) \(\text{Wd7}\) 26 \(\text{Qc5}\) \(\text{Ed2}\) 27 \(\text{Wc1}\) \(\text{Ec8}\) 28 \(\text{Qa7}\) \(\text{Wd8}\) 29 \(\text{Qxe7}\) 1-0

10 a3 a5
11 exd5 exd5
12 \(\text{Qh4}\)!

White could fix his opponent’s queenside with 12 a4, but Black has compensation in his space advantage. The energetic game move is more in the spirit of the KIA.

12 ... 0-0
13 \(\text{Qf5}\) \(\text{Ec8}\)
14 \(\text{Wd3}\) \(\text{Wc7}\)
15 \(\text{Qf1}\) \(\text{Qe5}\)
16 \(\text{Wf4!}\) \(\text{Qd8}\) (D)

Black defends both the queen and the king’s knight (in case of \(\text{Qh6+}\)), but now Hodgson opens up the black kingside and gains an enduring bind with a piece sacrifice.

If 25 \(\text{Qg8}\) Black gets mated after 26 \(\text{Wg4+}\) \(\text{Qh7}\) 27 \(\text{Qg7}\), threatening 28 \(\text{Wh5+}\) \(\text{Qg8}\) 29 \(\text{Wh8}\) mate.

26 \(\text{Qg7!}\) \(\text{Qh7}\)
Black ends up a piece down after
26  \( \text{Qd8} \) 27  \( \text{xf6} \) (27  \( \text{xf6} \) 28  \( \text{Wh8} \) and 29  \( \text{xf6} \))
27  \( \text{xe6} \)! 1-0
If 27  \( \text{Wx6} \) 28  \( \text{Qxg7} \) and 29  \( \text{Qxe6} \) Black’s queen is also lost after
27  \( \text{Qd8} \) 28  \( \text{Qd6} \), and in answer
to 28  \( \text{f8} \) White can choose be-
tween 29  \( \text{Qe7} \) or 29  \( \text{Wh6} \)?

Konstantinopolsky-Banas
Correspondence 1985

1 e4 c5 2  \( \text{Qf3} \) e6 3 d3  \( \text{c6} \) 4 g3
d5
Remember that if Black holds
back the d-pawn then the game
would keep its Sicilian character,
now we transpose to a French
Defence
5  \( \text{Qbd2} \)  \( \text{Qf6} \)
6  \( \text{Qg2} \)  \( \text{Qe7} \)
7 0-0  \( \text{b6} \)
8  \( \text{Ke1} \)  \( \text{b7} \)
9  e5 (D)

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

10  \( \text{Qf1} \)
10 c4!? is an interesting alterna-
tive, after which White aims to win
control of e4 to use as a knight out-
push Curt Hansen-Kasparov, Malta
Olympiad 1980, went instead 10  \( \text{h4} \)
\( \text{Wc7} \) 11  \( \text{We2} \) h6 12  \( \text{Qf1} \) 0-0 0-0 13
\( \text{Qh2} \)  \( \text{Edg8} \) (an improvement over
13  \( \text{gb8} \), which was seen in Byru-
sas-Petrosian, Buenos Aires Olym-
piad 1978, when 14  \( \text{Qf4} \)  \( \text{Gg8} \) 15
\( \text{Qg4} \)  \( \text{Qf8} \) 16  \( \text{c3} \)  \( \text{Qd7} \) 17  \( \text{a3} \) b5 18
b4 gave White a slight advantage
due to his successful space-gaming
initiative on the queenside) 14  \( \text{Qg4} \)
\( \text{Qf8} \) 15  \( \text{Qf4} \) g5 16 hgx5  \( \text{hxg5} \) 17
\( \text{Qd2} \)  \( \text{Wh5} \) 18  \( \text{c3} \)  \( \text{Qg6} \) 19  \( \text{b4} \) c4 20
\( \text{d4} \)  \( \text{Qgh8} \) 21  \( \text{a4} \) \( \text{a5} \) and Black had a
comfortable game.

The idea behind 10  \( \text{Qf1} \) is to de-
defend the e-pawn with  \( \text{Qc1-f4} \) rather
than  \( \text{Wd1-e2} \). Consequently White
is able to develop the queen on d2,
making Black’s  \( \text{g7-g5} \) break more
difficult to realise

10  ...
\( \text{Wc7} \)

In Schlenker-Raicevic, Linz 1980,
Black opted for 10  \( \text{g5}\)!, leading to
a remarkably complicated battle.
There followed 11  \( \text{Qe3} \) h5
(11  \( \text{Qxd5} \) 12  \( \text{Qxe5} \)  \( \text{Qxe5} \) 13
\( \text{Qxd5} \) favours White, nor does
hitting White’s knights give Black
any joy 11  \( \text{d4} \) 12  \( \text{Qc4} \) g4 13  \( \text{Qg5} \)
— intending  \( \text{Qg5-e4} \) — 13  \( \text{Qxg5} \)
14  \( \text{Qd6} \) 12  \( \text{c4} \)  \( \text{Qd4} \) (12  \( \text{g4} \) 13
\( \text{Qxd5} \)  \( \text{exd5} \) 14  \( \text{Qd2} \) is excellent for
White) 13  \( \text{Qd5} \)  \( \text{exd5} \) 14  \( \text{cxd5} \) g4 (if
14  \( \text{Qb4} \) 15  \( \text{d6} \)  \( \text{Qf8} \) 16  \( \text{Qxg5} \) 15
\( \text{dx6} \)  \( \text{Qxe6} \) 16  \( \text{Qf6} \) 17  \( \text{Qxd4} \)
\( \text{Qxg2} \) (taking the knight with
17  \( \text{cxd4} \) is still very good for
White — 18  \( \text{Qxe6} \)  \( \text{Qxe6} \) 18
\( \text{Qxe6} \)  \( \text{Qf3} \) 19  \( \text{Qxd1} \) \( \text{Qxd1} \)
20  \( \text{Qc6} \)  \( \text{Wh7} \) (or 20  \( \text{Qf3} \) 21  \( \text{Qxe7} \+)
\( \text{Qf8} \) 22  \( \text{Qxd7} \)  \( \text{Qxe6} \) 23  \( \text{Qc7} \) with a
dangerous initiative) 21  \( \text{Qg5} \) \( \text{f3} \)

White shows that he is happy to
follow a more traditional path than
wanting with 9  \( \text{c3} \) or 9  \( \text{a3} \). From this
point on the game revolves around
the e5-square, which White will
over-protect
9  ...
\( \text{Qd7} \)
22 \(\texttt{\text{c}xe7} \texttt{\text{f7}}\) 23 \(\texttt{\text{h}4}\), and White had the much better game

11 \(\texttt{\text{c}f4}\) 0-0-0

The tempting 11 \(\texttt{g5}\) does not work out well for Black here, as 12 \(\texttt{\text{x}g5} \texttt{\text{x}xe5}\) 13 \(\texttt{\text{h}5}\) gives White a clear advantage

12 \(\texttt{\text{h}4}\) \(\texttt{\text{h}6}\)
13 \(\texttt{\text{d}2}\) \(\texttt{\text{d}g8}\)
14 \(\texttt{\text{h}5}\)!

A good move. White will not be able to prevent a kingside breakthrough, so he keeps Black temporarily at bay by saddling him with a weak h-pawn after the following advance

14 ... \(\texttt{g5}\)
15 \(\texttt{\text{x}g6}\) \(\texttt{\text{x}g6}\)

Better than 15 \(\texttt{\text{f}xg6}\) 16 \(\texttt{\text{x}h6}\), when Black's g-file will be blocked and the e-pawn a weakness. In this variation Black finds it easier to have an open g-file and push the h-pawn up the board rather than the other way round, because the h5-h4 thrust threatens to dismantle the white king's pawn cover

16 \(\texttt{\text{e}3}\)!

Preparing a pseudo-sacrifice on d5

16 ... \(\texttt{h5}\) \((D)\)

Black judges the threat to be harmless and subsequently continues with his offensive. Indeed avoiding White's next with 16 \(\texttt{\text{f}8}\) or 16 \(\texttt{\text{d}8}\) leaves Black with a passive position. Challenging the knight is also a faulty plan 16 \(\texttt{\text{d}4}\) 17 \(\texttt{\text{c}4}\) \(\texttt{b5}\) 18 \(\texttt{\text{d}6+}\) \(\texttt{\text{x}d6}\) 19 \(\texttt{\text{e}6}\) \(\texttt{\text{b}6}\) 20 \(\texttt{c3}\) opens up the queenside and gives White a dangerous initiative

17 \(\texttt{\text{x}d5}\)!

This pseudo-sacrifice occurs quite often in this line, and the reader should become acquainted with the idea. White clears the e-file for his rook and distracts Black's attention from his kingside attack by putting him on the defensive

17 ... \(\texttt{\text{e}x d5}\) 18 \(\texttt{\text{e}6}\) \(\texttt{\text{d}8}\)

Black prefers to keep his king's bishop on the board so that he can maintain at least some observation of the dark squares on the kingside. Exchanging this piece by 18 \(\texttt{\text{d}6}\) would merely strengthen White's grip on e5. g5 and (more importantly) h4

19 \(\texttt{\text{e}x d7}\+) \(\texttt{\text{w}x d7}\)
20 \(\texttt{\text{a}xe7}\)??

Accentuating the point made in the last note. White considers the enemy bishop to be such an important piece that he is prepared to sacrifice the exchange in order to eliminate it. Now 20 \(\texttt{\text{dxe7}}\) permits White to win back the exchange in favourable circumstances with 21 \(\texttt{\text{e}5}\), although White's activity and raking bishops anyway confer him excellent compensation after the queen recapture

20 ... \(\texttt{\text{w}x e7}\) 21 \(\texttt{\text{h}3+}\) \(\texttt{\text{g}4}\)

A practical choice, as 21 \(\texttt{\text{d}8}\) 22 \(\texttt{\text{e}1}\) \(\texttt{\text{f}8}\) (not 22 \(\texttt{\text{f}6}\) 23 \(\texttt{\text{g}5}\)) 23 \(\texttt{\text{h}4}\) leaves Black with two rooks that are no match for the menacing white minor pieces. Note also that his king would be left living
dangerously in the centre, cut off on both sides by White's rook and bishops
22 \text{He}1 \text{Wd}7
23 \text{We}5?!\text{ }

Konstantinovsky misses his chance to take a clear advantage with 23 d4\text{'}, when 23 \text{Hxg}3+ 24 Hxg3 \text{Wxh}3 25 \text{Wf}4 \text{Wd}7 26 \text{He}5\text{!} \text{Hxe}5 27 \text{Wxe}5 threatens both 28 \text{Wb}8 mate and 28 \text{Wxh}8+ Black now punishes this inaccuracy by playing a pawn to d4 himself, subsequently opening the long diagonal for his hitherto lifeless bishop
23 \ldots \text{Hxe}5
24 \text{Hxe}5 d4!\text{ }
25 \text{Wf}2! \text{Hd}8!\text{ }

Both sides succeed in finding difficult moves Again the appealing 25 \text{Hxg}3+? fails 26 \text{fxg}3 \text{Wxh}3 27 \text{He}8+ \text{Hd}7 28 \text{Wc}7+ \text{Hc}6 29 \text{Hxh}8 Approaching from another angle with 25 \text{Wc}6 also proves unsuccessful, since 26 \text{f}3! \text{Wxf}3 27 \text{He}8+ \text{Hd}7 (27 \text{He}6 28 \text{Wxe}8 mate) 28 \text{Wf}7+ \text{Hc}6 29 \text{Wg}2 wins the black queen
26 \text{Hg}5+ \text{Hc}8
27 \text{He}7 (D)

queen's bishop no longer defends the g-pawn, making 32 \text{Wxg}3+ possible. Even 30 \text{Wf}7+ does not help White 30 \text{Hc}6 31 \text{Hxh}6 \text{Wxg}3+ 32 \text{Hf}1 \text{Wf}3+ 33 \text{He}1 \text{Wh}1+ 34 \text{Hd}2 \text{Wg}2+ still draws because the retreat 35 \text{Wf}2 leaves the bishop unprotected
28 \text{Hxb}7!

Removing Black's remaining bishop and ensuring a won game thanks to the power of White's queen and bishops
28 \ldots \text{Wxb}7
28 \text{Hxb}7 loses the queen to 29 \text{Wg}3 (29 \text{Wxg}2+ 30 \text{Hxg}2 \text{Hxg}5 31 \text{Wf}7+ picks up the greedy rook)
29 \text{f}3! \text{f}5
30 \text{fxg}4 \text{hxg}4
31 \text{Wf}5!\text{ }

Taking advantage of Black's exposed king to force the rook off the h-file. If now 31 \text{Hxh}3 Black loses immediately to 32 \text{Wf}6+ \text{He}7 33 \text{He}4 mate
31 \ldots \text{Hf}8
32 \text{Hg}2 \text{Hd}7
33 \text{Hf}4 \text{Hd}8
33 resigns is an alternative worth consideration. The rest is easy for White
34 \text{Wb}8+ \text{He}7
35 \text{Hg}5+ \text{He}7
36 \text{Wf}5 \text{Hg}6
37 \text{He}7 \text{He}7

Or 37 \text{He}8 38 \text{Wf}6+ \text{He}7 39 \text{Wf}7+ \text{He}6 40 \text{Hg}5+ \text{He}5 41 \text{Wxd}7
38 \text{Hh}4 \text{Hf}8
39 \text{Hd}5 \text{Wh}5
40 \text{He}7 \text{He}4\text{!}

One finish might be 40 \text{He}8 41 \text{He}7+ \text{He}6 42 \text{Hf}6+ \text{He}7 43 \text{Wg}6+ \text{He}8 44 \text{Hf}6 mate. Remember that Black castled queenside!

Now for a classic example of how not to play the KIA Black reacts to
her opponent's passive, stereotyped play by castling queenside and ruthlessly attacking the enemy king.

Trojanska-Jovanovic
Women's Olympiad
Oberhausen 1966

1 e4 e6 2 d3 d5 3 Qd2 Qf6 4 Qg3 c5 5 g3 b6 6 Qg2 Qb7 7 e5
Qd7 8 0-0 Qc6 9 Qe1 Qe7 (D)

10 c3?

Too passive. In the above games in which White played an early c2-c3, the e4-e5 push followed only at White's convenience — usually once Black had committed his king. In this game, however, apart from no longer having to worry about White advantageously playing e4xd5, Black already has a target in White's e-pawn. Consequently White's best continuation in the diagram position is 10 c4! The game Jadoul-Kruszynski, Copenhagen 1988, continued 10 d4 11 h4 (also possible is GM Keene's suggestion 11 Qe4, e.g. 11 Qxe5 12 Qxe5 Qxe5 13 Qxe5) 11 Qc7 12 Qe4!
Qxe5 13 Qxe5 Qxe5 14 Qf4 0-0 15 Wh5 f6 16 Qg5! fxg5 17 Qxe5
Wd7 18 hxg5 Qxg2 19 Qxg2 with a big advantage to White.

pressure on the h-file forced Black to enter into a very passive and inferior ending with 19 Qe8 20
Qxe8 Qfxe8 21 f4

10 ... Qc7

11 Qe2

Unfortunately for White defending the e-pawn with 11 d4 does not work. Black can play 11 cxd4 12
exd4 Qb4 13 Qe3 Qc2 14 We1
Qg6 followed by Qd4-c2

11 ... Qg5!

Undermining White's hold on e5 and preparing a kingside attack

12 h3 0-0-0

Due to the imprecise move order things have not gone well for White. Instead of the usual territorial advantage on the kingside, she is about to face a vigorous offensive on that flank.

13 d4

Jovanovic-Ranniku, Yugoslavia vs USSR 1964, saw White try 13 Qf1. After 13 Qd8 14 a3 h5
White prevented g5-g4 by playing 15 g4 first. Black reacted energetically 15 hxg4 16 hxg4 Qa6 17
Qg3 Qh4! with a crushing attack, as 18 Qxh4 gxh4 19 Qf1 Qxe5 is much better for Black. The game move at least justifies 10 c3, but White is not putting any pressure on Black's queenside Black, on the other hand, embarks on a plan to open up the h-file.

13 ...

14 Qb3 Qd8

15 Qh2 c4

16 Qd2 g4

17 hxg4

17 h4 keeps the kingside temporarily closed. Then Black may eventually break through with
Qd7-f5-g6 followed by sacrificing on h4.

17 ...

h4! (D)
Being a pawn down is irrelevant if Black wants to invade

18 \( \text{Qd}f1 \) \( \text{Wd}8 \)

Heading for the kingside

19 \( \text{b}3 \) \( \text{a}6 \)
20 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{Wf}8 \)
21 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{b}7 \)
22 \( \text{Qf}4 \) \( \text{hxg}3 \)
23 \( \text{xg}3 \) \( \text{Wh}6 \)
24 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{g}5 \)

Faced with the strong threat of \( \text{Qg}5-\text{f}4 \) White sacrifices

25 \( \text{Qxc}4 \) \( \text{dxc}4 \)
26 \( \text{Wxc}4 \) \( \text{Qf}4 \)

Intending 27 \( \text{Qc}6 \) \( \text{Qg}3 \) 28 \( \text{Qxb}7+ \) \( \text{Qxb}7 \) winning

27 \( \text{Qf}1 \) \( \text{b}8! \)
28 \( \text{Qc}6 \)

Or 28 \( \text{Qxf}4 \) \( \text{Wxf}4 \) 29 \( \text{Qxc}6 \)
\( \text{exg}4+ \)
28 \( ... \) \( \text{Wh}1++! \)

0-1 (D)

This push of the c-pawn is the idea behind replacing \( \text{Qb}1-\text{d}2 \) with \( \text{Wd}1-\text{e}2 \) in the main line. By leaving the knight on b1 White intends to develop it more actively on c3, where it will team up with the c4-pawn to hit the d5-pawn. Moreover, with the queen supporting the e5-pawn White might get the opportunity to develop his king’s rook more actively on the d-file if Black has tried to release the tension with the central exchange \( \text{d}5-\text{xc}4 \) Another point of planting the pawn on c4 is to deny Black the use of the d5-square for his pieces after \( \text{d}5-\text{d}4 \), whereas White will still have access to the crucial e4-square. Finally the c4-pawn tends to hold back Black’s traditional queenside pawn-storm. The downside to
White's setup with the queen on e2 and pawn on c4 is the potential weakness of the d4-square, which can no longer be defended by a pawn and is therefore susceptible to attack at any moment. However, modern practitioners of Qe2 have shown that this is not a problem, hence the revival of this line. In fact an automatic Qc6-d4 can easily backfire. In the diagram position Black has more than one way of dealing with the challenge in the centre.

9 ... d4

Closing the centre is a popular reply at all levels. However, despite the fact that fixing the pawns has serious long-term positional implications, I doubt that most players sufficiently appreciate this when pushing the d-pawn. A surprising number of IMs and GMs have suffered with Black here due to a lack of decent counterplay. With an obvious space advantage on the kingside White's plan of attacking the king is rather easy to execute, but Black will find it problematic generating a queenside counter because of the barrier on c4. Moreover, the true merits of occupying d4 are now irrelevant because a pawn stands in the way — there is no need for White to worry about such a possibility. As we know, the e5-pawn effectively cuts the board in two, limiting Black's defensive resources by covering f6 (and d6) and severely limiting breathing space, but eliminating it with f7-f6 could prove more detrimental than beneficial, and attempts to capture the pawn — which tends to be immune anyway, for one reason or other — meet with textbook over-protection. Of course these factors do not mean that Black is losing, but the committal, restrictive nature of 9 d4 has prompted today's practical players to search for more uncompromising alternatives.

a) 9 dxc4 10 dxc4 (D)

Removing the d-pawns presents Black with the prospect of distracting White from matters on the kingside by threatening to land a knight on d4 (or even d3) or — given the chance — staging an invasion on the d-file. White, too, can toy with the idea of playing on the only available open file. The d6-square, for instance, is perhaps even more inviting than d3 is for Black because the e5-pawn supports a takeover by a knight via e4 or b5 (note that White's queen's knight has more options on b1 than d2).

Let us take a look at a few examples.

a1) 10 We7 is a natural move because it attacks the e5-pawn and leaves d8 free for a rook, but posting the queen on the h2-b8 diagonal can be risky. 11 Ef4 Qxd4 Black strikes first, the point being that after 12 Qxd4 cxd4 White cannot bring his remaining knight out to e3. The new interesting feature of the position brought about by the exchange of knights is the significance...
of the pawns on c4 and d4. It is not important that the d4-pawn is passed because there are too many pieces on the board, but it is effectively isolated and consequently vulnerable. Meanwhile the c4-pawn still covers d5. Fagarasi-Groszpeter, Gyula 1998 continued 13 h4! (see White's 15th and 18th) 13 ... d8 14 d2 (the knight is heading for e4, note that achieving this would be difficult with the pawn on c2) 14 f8 15 h5 (by bringing the rook to the d-file Black also vacated the f8-square for the knight — which in turn has made way for the light-squared bishop — to hit both f4 and e5 from g6) 15 d7 16 c4 c6 17 d1 d7 18 f6+!?

(F)

A familiar motif with the bishop and queen lined up on the h2-b8 diagonal! 18 gx6 19 exf6 d6 20 wg4+ d6 21 hxg6 (White's h-pawn is incredibly useful in these lines!) 21 hxg6 and now White went in for the kill with 22 h6 xg2 23 xg2 wc6+ 24 f3 xc4 25 d2 with the not very subtle plan of keeping the black king company with h6-g7 followed by mating down the h-file. Unfortunately for Fagarasi the experienced GM found a clever defence involving the doubling of queen and rook on b5 and d5 respectively, spoiling the fun (just in the nick of time) with h5 Sc5-h5 Had White noticed the blockade on h5 he might have settled for 22 xxd4 winning a safe pawn, e.g. 22 e5 (22 xg2 23 xg2 changes nothing) 23 xc6 xc6 24 xd7 24 xxe5 and Black's king is still in danger.

A2) 10 b6 Rather than hurry a knight to d4 Black plans to preface the jump into White's half of the board with his own bishop fianchetto on the long diagonal, hoping to ease the defensive task by trading light-squared bishops along with a pair of knights.

11 c3 b7 12 f4 d4 13 dxd4 xg2 14 xg2 cxd4 15 b5 and now in Balashov-Beckhus, Munster 1993, Black tried to shake off White's grip on d6 and the attack on the d-pawn with 15 g5 undermining the support of the e5-pawn. After 16 c1 d3 17 wxd3 xe5 18 we4 d3 19 e3 xxb2 20 wc2 f6 21 xab1 ec8 22 xxb2 xxb2 23 wc2 xc4 24 ug1 a6 25 d4 b5 26 f3 f6 Black had collected a rook and two pawns for the two minor pieces and, although there are obvious weaknesses in front of the black king, the game is evenly balanced. Black's idea deserves further tests, even if it does appear to be positionally suspect.

A22) 11 d1 defends d4 and gives Black something to worry about on the d-file. In Sepp-Voon, Estonia Ch 1996 Black addressed the pin on the d7-knight immediately and nudged his queen to 'safety' 11 wc7 12 c3 a6 13 f4 b7 14 d5! (F)
bud any plans White may have had of a quick occupation of the d-file after what could be seen as a premature exchange on e4. More importantly, perhaps, is Black’s influence on e4 — the longer Black is able to come up with constructive moves and operate behind the centre pawns, the longer White must try to engineer an initiative without the use of his favourite e4-square.

As for White, he is not in too much of a rush because there is no danger of coming under a rapid queenside counter thanks to the awkward knight on b6 slowing things down. White’s extra space offers more room for manoeuvre, and herein lies his advantage — at some point Black will have to make some kind of concession in the centre.

The following examples help illustrate some of the ideas available to both sides. You will notice that White’s basic pattern of development is the same, it is just a matter of what happens to the queen’s knight and the king’s rook. Of course some of this will be determined by Black’s play, which tends to involve finding a role for the queen’s bishop in readiness for an eventual capture on c4, action with g3-d3 or queenside expansion with a7-a5 (or a combination of these).

b1) 10 a4 (White’s dark-squared bishop, of course, belongs on f4) 10 d7 11 h4 (and pushing the h-pawn at least a couple of squares always comes in handy) 11 d4 12 cxd4 cxd4 13 d2 c6 is an understandable continuation from Black’s point of view. Trading White’s excellent light-squared bishop its notoriously poor counterpart is certainly a desirable deal for
the defender. The price is the sitting target on d4. Bronstein-Dzindzichashvili, USSR Ch 1972 saw Black’s efforts to defend the d-pawn lead to his early resignation 14 \_d1 \_d4 15 \_b3 dxc4 16 dxc4 and the pawn comes under attack. Weighing up the pros and cons of \_e6-d4 is not easy for Black, particularly when this thematic move promises to solve short-term problems 16 \_c5 17 \_xc6 bxc6 18 \_xc5 \_xc5 19 \_e3 d3 20 \_g4 \_e7 21 \_g5 1-0.

b2) With 10 \_d1 White is effectively looking to prevent the knight coming to d4, or at least moving the rook into position just in case. In Zhang Zhong-Chuah Heng Meng, Asian Teams 1998, Black found a reasonably constructive series of waiting moves. There followed 10 a6 11 h4 \_c7 12 \_f4 \_d8 intending to meet the preferred 13 \_c3 with a well-timed 13 \_d4, when 14 \_xd4 exd4 leaves the knight without a decent square as b5 and e4 are covered. This leaves White’s game choice 13 \_bd2 \_d7 14 \_f1 \_e8 (D)

![Diagram](image)

Black has been rewarded for his sensible treatment of the opening with a level of flexibility that is hard to find in what can be an uncomfortable variation for the second player. By refusing to be drawn into making a decision in the centre after 9 c4 and subsequently threatening to jump into d4 rather than blindly doing so, Black has been able to organize his forces in such a way that he has a certain amount of influence in the centre and is ready to act on the queenside. It is only on the other wing that there may be cause for concern, but this is inevitable in this line. With no relaxing of tension in the centre White needs to keep watch across the board when conducting the kingside attack. The game continued 15 b3 a5 16 \_e3 (compare the position after 16 a4 with ‘b3’ below, where White’s queen’s knight finds a productive outpost on b5) 16 a4 17 \_g4 and now Black could have considered 17 dxc4 18 dxc4 \_xd1+ 19 \_xd1 \_d8 which keeps White busy wondering what to do about the only open file, the d4-square and his queenside pawns. Instead the diagram position arose after 17 \_h8 18 h5 axb3 19 axb3 \_xa1 20 \_xa1 dxc4 21 dxc4 (D).

![Diagram](image)

There is no doubting White’s dangerous looking domination of the kingside, but the exchange on b3
and the subsequent trade on the a-file have undermined Black’s ability to drum up counterplay. By holding back with axb3 (only Black can decide what happens to the queenside pawns as b3xa4 is out of the question) Black could have denied his opponent an extra potential entry point. With most of White’s army read to pounce on his king, he finally released his knight 21 Qxd4 22 Qxd4 Bxd4 (22 cxd4 at least breaks the symmetry at a time when the d-pawn will definitely need watching over, giving Black time to alleviate the pressure by contesting bishops on the long h1-a8 diagonal) 23 h6 g6 24 a3 e8 25 f3? d3 26 a7 (by now Black must have been regretting his 18th move) 26 xb3 27 xb7 d8 28 h2! (cruel) 28 b6 (in a lost position Black kindly sets up an instant win) 29 xe7 1-0.

b3) 10 h4 a5 19 Black wastes no time getting to work on the queenside, in the hope of infiltrating enemy lines. At first glance White’s reply seems antipositional 11 a4 (D)

Fixing the queenside pawns in this way deprives Black of any pawn breaks, and the permanent weakening of the b4-square is preferable to allowing a5-a4, which gives Black too much space. Over on the kingside, on the other hand, we see that White enjoys the usual freedom, so Black needs to use his pieces well if he is to create enough of a diversion. In fact with the correct plan Black should be able to limit his opponent to prevent an attack on his king with a well timed opening of the d-file. Djurhuus-Ostenstad. Asker 1997 saw mass exchanges on the open file - 11 Qd7 12 Qc3 Bb4 13 Qd1 Qc6 (bringing the bishop to c6 is definitely a good plan) 14 h5 h6 15 b3 wc7 16 a4 Qd8 17 Bb5 We8 18 Qh2 dxec 19 dxec 19 bxc4 19 bxc4 (19 bxc4 avoids the trade of major pieces but leaves White with weak pawns on a4 and d3) 19 a4 20 Qxg2 20 Qxg2 Qxd1 21 Qxd1 Qd8 22 Qg4 Qxd1 23 Qxd1 We8 24 f3 Qc6 25 Qe3 Qd8 26 Qxd8+ Qxd8 27 Qf2 Qd7 28 f4 (D)

This kind of ending is what Black can expect to find himself in if White meets a4-a5 with a2-a4 and is subsequently content with the (considerable) extra space on the kingside. Black’s position is solid but cramped, making the draw far
from automatic. In fact in the game White advanced his g-pawn, sent the knight from f2-d4, put his king on e4 and then won by giving up a knight for two pawns.

b4) Finally, this is what happens when White fails to give Black's queenside play the respect it deserves. 10 b3 a5 11 Ab2? (11 a4 is necessary) 11... a4 12 a3 Ad7 13 Ac2 Da5 14 Dd2 Ac6 15 f4 Ad7 16 Aa3 Ad8 (D)

Now White can post his dark-squared bishop on f4 as usual or choose another pattern of development which concentrates more on the centre now that Black's knight is tucked away on f8.

c1) Kindermann-Raupp, German League 1981 took the conventional path 13 h5 (if White intends to put the bishop on f4 he should rule out Df8-g6) 13... Ad7 14 h6 g6 15 Af4 and the knight was beginning to look misplaced on f8. Conscious of his odd kingside Black tried to compensate in another sector of the board with the inevitable 15 Aa4, but once again the newly arrived d4-pawn had strayed too far. There followed 16... Axh4 17 h5 Cc3 18... h8 18 h4! dc4 19 dc4 Ag2 20 Ag2 Ac6+ 21 Ac1 d3 22 Ae4 Ae4 23 Aa4 Ad7 24 Ad6 Ad8
25 b4! (White has time to support his enormous knight — the d-pawn is not going anywhere) 25 f6 26 c5 with a decisive lead

c2) 13 b3 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wd7}} 14 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Ab2}} was Bronstein's experiment against Plaskett in the strong Oviedo rapidplay 1993. White tempts d5-d4, after which White is free to generate the kingside attack without the inconvenience of active defence down the d-file. Of course he would then prefer to have the bishop on f4, but everything has its price. In fact during the next few moves both players placed a pawn on d4 14 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Rad8}} 15 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Ad1}} a6 16 d4 (D)

Such a standoff in the centre is uncommon in these lines, though the pawn structure soon becomes more familiar 16 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Da5}} 17 dxc5 bxc5 18 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Gg5}} d4 and Black finally obliged. However, the absence of a white pawn on the d-file should keep White on his toes. As it was a long-term piece sacrifice led to a complex struggle after 19 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Dxe4}} h6 White turned down the simple 20 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Af3}} (followed by h4-h5 and returning the bishop to the c1-h6 diagonal) in favour of 20 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wh5}}!

\textcolor{red}{\textbf{hXg5}} 21 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{hxg5}} g6 22 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wh4}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Xxe4}} 23 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Xxe4}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Dh7}} 24 f4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Af8}} 25 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Gg2}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Gg7}} 26 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Ah1}} with pressure down the h-file.

d) 9 f6 is a pretty drastic reaction seen more frequently at club level. It is true that 10 exf6 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Dxf6}} 11 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Cc3}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Xd4}} 12 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wd1}} gams time and profits from the hole on d4, but this is not as serious as the backward e-pawn, the hole on e5 (neglected by Black's queen's knight) and — to some extent — the e4-square (see 'd2') 12 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Dxf3+}} 13 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{xf5}} (D)

\begin{center}
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Black has little to show for the weaknesses in his position, for example

d1) 13 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Dxc4}} 14 dxc4 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Dd7}}, Fuchs-Espig, Berlin 1968, begins a clever manoeuvre which homes in on the d4-square. However, this is not enough to prevent White from obtaining the better game 15 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{We2}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{We5}} 16 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Le4}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Dc6}} 17 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Lf4}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{We8}} (defending against 18 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Wh5}} — by now Black must have realized that White's big lead on the kingside allows him to virtually ignore the knight once it arrives on d4) 18 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Gb5}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Dd4}} 19 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Xd4}} \textcolor{red}{\textbf{cxd4}} 20 \textcolor{red}{\textbf{Le5}} etc.
d2) 13 d4 at least keeps the e-pawn company (sort of). In Sale-
Suszkin. Bled 1996, White made full use of the e4-square. 14 \textit{De}4 e5 15
\textit{De}1 \textit{Wc}7 16 \textit{Dd}2 \textit{Df}5 17 a3 \textit{Dxe}4
18 \textit{Dxe}4 \textit{Dxe}4 19 \textit{Dxe}4 \textit{Df}5 20
\textit{We}2 \textit{Dd}6 21 b4 with a good game
10 \textit{h}4 (D)

\begin{center}
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Black resigned without waiting for the end. One possible finish is
29 \textit{exxd}5+ \textit{Dxe}5 30 \textit{Dae}1+ \textit{Dd}6 31
\textit{Dxe}6 mate.

b) 10 \textit{Wc}7 11 \textit{Df}4 b6 12 \textit{Dbd}2
\textit{Df}7 13 \textit{Dae}1 \textit{Dae}8 Hracek-Rasik,
Karvina 1989. Black's compact completion of development seems
too good to be true. White shows the way — 14 \textit{Dae}4! (D)

\begin{center}
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In the diagram position Black
must decide on a sensible course of action. Otherwise he is in danger of
being blown away.
10 ... \textit{Dh}8

A tricky move. Others.

a) 10 a6 11 \textit{Df}4 \textit{Db}8 begins an early queenside expansion. Note
that the e4-pawn slows Black considerably. Bronstein-Kelly, Hastings
1995 is a model game. 12 \textit{Dh}2
\textit{Da}5 13 \textit{Dd}2 b5 14 b3 \textit{Df}7 15 \textit{Dh}3
\textit{bxc}4 16 \textit{Dxc}4 \textit{Dc}6 17 \textit{Dg}4 \textit{Da}8 18
\textit{Df}3 \textit{Df}4 19 \textit{Dg}5. Having a band of enemy pieces gathering
in front of your king is disconcerting on a good
way extremely worrying when sitting opposite Bronstein. Kelly puts
his faith in the b6-file. 19 \textit{Wb}6 20
\textit{Dg}2 \textit{Df}2 21 \textit{Dd}1 \textit{Dac}5 22 \textit{Dc}4 g6
23 \textit{Df}3 \textit{Wc}7 and now the energetic
veteran moved in for the kill with
24 \textit{Dh}6+ \textit{Dg}7 25 \textit{Dhx}7 \textit{Dcx}5 26
\textit{Dxe}6+ \textit{Dxf}7 27 \textit{Dxe}5+ \textit{Dxe}6 28
\textit{Dd}5+ \textit{Dxd}5 (D)

Only by over-protecting the e5-pawn can White then mockingly
leave it en prise! If you fail to become acquainted with the number
of situations in which it is possible to tease Black in this way, then you
will miss out on a great posting for your knight(s). 14 \textit{Dcx}e5. Fortunately
for us, Black jumps at the chance to remove the annoying
pawn and, to his credit he has
checked the implications reasonably well. Hracek has seen further — 15 
\( \text{\$xe}5 \text{\$xe}5 \text{\$h}5 \)! Sometimes White regains the pawn by clearing the e-file with \( \text{\$a}4\text{\$xe}5 \), but this form of attack is very effective indeed because the queen is worryingly close to Black’s king. Blocking his fourth rank with 16 \( \text{f}5 \) loses to 17 \( \text{\$xe}5 \text{\$xe}5 \text{\$g}5 \) (note that by leaving the e-file White’s queen has introduced this extra possibility of a discovered attack), so Black’s next is forced 16 \( \text{f}6 \) 17 \( \text{\$g}5 \text{\$fxe}5 \) 18 \( \text{\$xe}5 \text{\$wd}7 \) 19 \( \text{\$hxg}5 \text{\$xg}2 \) 20 \( \text{\$xg}2 \) (D).

\[\text{Diagram} B\]

The smoke has cleared (almost) and White is well ahead. He even continues to be in control of the e5-square, thanks to the wonders of overprotection! I would guess that Black calculated beyond this point before initiating the long, complex sequence which followed the capture of the e5-pawn. His next few moves are designed to distract White from the h-file — 20 \( \text{g}6 \)? for example loses on the spot to 21 \( \text{\$xh}7+ \text{\$xh}7 \) 22 \( \text{\$h}1+ \text{\$g}8 \) 23 \( \text{\$h}8+ \text{\$f}7 \) 24 \( \text{\$h}7+ \text{\$g}8 \) 25 \( \text{\$g}7+ \text{\$h}8 \text{\$h}1 \text{mate} \). Thus he played 20 \( \text{\$c}6+ \) 21 \( \text{\$e}4 \text{\$f}5 \) and now Black threatens to take on e5 and g5, while 22 \( \text{\$h}1 \) fails to 22 \( \text{h}6 \). Ironically it is the f-file which proves to be Black’s undoing. The game continued 22 \( \text{f}4 \) (threatening 23 \g4 \text{\$f}7 [23 \text{\$ff}8 24 \text{\$h}1] 24 \text{\$h}1 \text{\$g}6 \text{\$xxg}6 \) etc.) 22 \( \text{\$xg}5 \) (the point) 23 \text{\$fxg}5 \text{\$xxe}5? 24 \( \text{\$f}7+ \text{\$h}8 \) 25 \( \text{\$f}8 \) mates, but it seems that Rask had seen even this 23 \( \text{g}6 \) 24 \( \text{\$h}6 \text{\$xe}5 \text{\$f}7 \) but not this! White is winning. After 25 \( \text{\$xf}7 \) 26 \( \text{\$xh}7+ \text{\$f}8 \) 27 \( \text{\$h}8+ \text{\$e}7 \) 28 \( \text{\$xe}5 \) White went on to pick up the g6-pawn and the game.

\( \text{Diagram} B \)

\( \text{c) } 10 \text{\$f}6 \text{\$xf}6 \text{\$xf}6 \text{\$e}5 \text{\$e}5 \text{\$d}2 \text{\$d}5 \text{\$d}4 \text{Mencinger-Donk, Groningen 1994} \)

White benefits from the central pawn configuration being fixed. He has the e4-square, a grip on the light squares and on the h1-a8 diagonal, and the c4-pawn covers d5.

11 \( \text{\$f}4 \) \text{\$f}6

This is the idea behind the puzzling 10 \( \text{\$h}8 \) White’s usual answer to the challenge by the f-pawn is to take on \text{\$f}6, after which the occupation of e4 and/or e5 is enough for an advantage. Here Black intends to recapture with the g-pawn (12 \text{\$xf}6 \text{\$gx}f6?), for 13 \( \text{\$xe}6 \) is no longer check, which means Black has time for the nasty 13 \( \text{\$d}5 \). Consequently White has to settle for another game-plan and leave the e5-pawn in place, but with several pieces eager to support it, this should be a pleasant option.

12 \( \text{\$d}2 \) \text{\$e}8

Preparing to activate the queen on \( \text{g}6 \) or \text{h}5 and vacating \text{d}8 in order to facilitate a second push of the f-pawn. The game would assume a different character with an exchange of pawns — 12 \text{\$xe}5 and White gains a clear advantage regardless of which minor piece he decides to keep on the board.
a) 13 \( \text{Nxe5} \)
   a1) 13 \( \text{Nxex5} \) 14 \( \text{Nxex5} \) \( \text{Nxe5} \) 15 \( \text{Nxex5} \) \( \text{Nxd6} \) 16 \( \text{We2} \) The knight will be busier than the dark-squared bishop and we do not have to compare the monster on g2 with piece on c8
   a2) 13 \( \text{Nxf5} \) needs to be checked because it shakes the grip on c5 14 \( \text{Nf4} \) e5 15 \( \text{Ng5} \) h6 16 \( \text{Nxe7} \) \( \text{Nxe7} \) 17 \( \text{Nae1} \) and, apart from lagging behind in development, Black is tied to the backward e-pawn and can do nothing about his opponent's control of e4
   b) 13 \( \text{Nxex5} \) \( \text{Ncxe5} \) 14 \( \text{Nxex5} \) \( \text{Nf5} \) (14 \( \text{Nxe5} \) is a1) 15 \( \text{Nh3} \)
   13 \( \text{Nh3} \)
   White too, is happy to close the position still further, so he helps Black make up his mind
   13 ... \( \text{f5} \) (D)

An interesting situation has arisen. If one of the ideas in the \( \text{We2} \) line is to win control of the crucial e4-square while denying Black an outpost of his own with an early e2-c4, then employing the same spoiling tactics with a pawn on f5 must be seen as some sort of mini victory for Black. The crux of the matter is whether or not White's trademark setup is sufficiently flexible to deal with the changed pawn structure and subsequently provide White with an alternative way of maintaining a lead
   14 \( \text{Ng5} \) \( \text{Nd8} \)
   Now we see why Black chose to put his queen on e8 before fixing the pawn on f5
   15 \( \text{Ng2} \) h6
   16 \( \text{Nh3} \) \( \text{Ng8} \)!
   In view of what happens in the game it is better for Black to avoid the crippling of his pawns and move the knight out of the firing line, e.g. 16 \( \text{Nxe7} \) 17 h5 \( \text{Nf6} \) 18 \( \text{Nh3} \) \( \text{Nbc6} \), although 19 \( \text{Nf5} \) does keep Black in a bind
   17 \( \text{Nxc6} \)!
   \( \text{bxc6} \) (D)

Perhaps Black underestimated this exchange. White's light-squared bishop is such an important piece in the KIA that it is easy for both players not to notice those occasions when the biggest contribution requires an exit from the game. However in this particular case the locked pawns introduce possibilities not normally associated with these lines, and giving up a certain influence on the light squares is worth the permanent damage to Black's queenside pawns. It is not as if the c8-bishop will suddenly spring into the game — with pawns stuck on c6
and c6, combined with the rock solid pawn on c4, the bishop is miserable.

18... h5!

A necessary part of White’s strategy is to contain any irritating counterplay. The trade on c6 has left Black with little hope of mounting a queenside offensive — only the lonely a-pawn can move — and with the advance of the ever faithful h-pawn White prevents the march of a united front of enemy foot soldiers. Now g7-g5 runs into hxg6, when White is perfectly safe on the g-file and Black is not on the h-file. Consequently White is free to organize a kingside attack, but he does need to manoeuvre accurately. Black’s defence is afforded some kind of solidity just from the closed nature of the position.

18... f6
19 g2 d7
20 h1 a5?

A show of aggression when 20... w67 followed by bringing the desperate bishop (via e8) to f7 would have been more appropriate.

21 g1

White begins to regroup

21... w7

Again Black should consider

21 w7 22 adf3 e8
22 df3 e8
23 wc2 wd7
24 ed2 a7
25 ad2 we8
26 af4 xa7
27 eael

According to Dolmatov White is winning. It is just a matter of improving the pieces to their optimum.

27... wh7
28 wdl! (D)

In answer to 28 gg5? White has 29 wh4 because the h5-pawn is defended.

29 xg5 xg5
29 hxg5? 30 xg6+ xg6 31 hxg6 w66 32 eh5 wins for White
30 b3!

Let us not forget that Black has structural problems on the queenside, too. His latest worry is the prospect of w1-c1-a3, hitting the defenceless c5-pawn

30... w7
31 wc1 w8
32 b3!

Finally threatening to break through with g3-g4

32... d7??

Despite having just come from there, perhaps 32 wh7 is safer, intending 33 g4 fxg4 34 fxg4 g5 35 hxg6 xg6 when one rook defends along the second rank and the other gives White something to worry about on the g-file. Of course White does not have to commit himself immediately, which is probably why Black was reluctant to return the knight to h7, but after the text he is even less adequately equipped to deal with the coming push.

33 g4! fxg4
34 f4 a4
35 g5! hxg5
36 xg6+ eh7
37 xg5 axb3
38 axb3 xg6
Or 38 a2+ 39 g3 wb8 40 wfg
39 hXg6 + xg6
40 wd1! (D)

White’s use of the queen has been remarkable. This piece has been a major influence throughout the game, combining prophylaxis with threats. Yet it has moved only five times in total, venturing no further than e2 and c2! The amusing and decisive point to the final contribution from the queen is that after 40 xg5 White’s king gets a taste of the action, stepping forward with 41 g3 to threaten the deadly 42 wg4 mate

40 ... a2+
41 g3 h8
42 rh8 wh8
43 rh1 1-0

Now a look at Black’s early alternatives in the we2 line

Glebek-Granda Zuniga
Wijk aan Zee 1997

1 e4 e6 2 d3

More in keeping with the KIA repertoire. The immediate 2 we2 can transpose to normal lines but has the potential to confuse opponents. If you intend including we2 in your armoury it is worth investigating the move order:

a) 2 e7 Putting the queen on the e-file at the earliest opportunity is aimed at 2 d5, when 3 exd5 forces Black to take back with the queen. The text unpins the e6-pawn. In Vasukov-Volkov, Moscow 1995, Black tried to exploit the early development of White’s queen 3 g3 d5 4 dxe4 dxe4 5 dxe4 b6 6 df3 a6 7 c4 (D)

The early skirmish has virtually forced White to weaken the d4-square, but the veteran GM and KIA expert demonstrates that this is not a problem for White as long as he is open-minded 7 df6 8 fc3

b) 2 df6 is a provocative choice borrowed from the Alekhine Defence 3 e5

b1) 3 ed5 4 df3 d6 5 d4 de7 6 b4 b6 7 df3 d5 8 wd1 (D)
The transformation has continued, steering us to a French. Both sides have wasted moves, resulting in White gaining a tempo Ehvest-Vagaman, Novgorod 1995, went 8...a6 (8 c5 9 c3 c6 10 c3 c6 11 h5) 9 b3 d4 10 d4 d4 11 c5 d4 12 c5 d4 13 h5 h6 14 d2 c6 15 f4 f4 16 0-0 with White having a territorial advantage that is typical of these lines.

b2: 3 c3 c3 a6 b6 5 f3 h7 6 g3 is a typical example of Vagaman’s originality Vasukov-Vagaman, USSR Ch 1980 is one of those games in which the Armenian causes his own downfall — 6 h5 7 d4 c5 8 dxc5 dxc5 9 e3 d6 10 c3 d5 11 d5 12 0-0-0 and Black was way too far behind in development.

c) 2 c5 3 f3 c6 4 g3 should normally lead us back to familiar ground Sepp-Makovetsky, Novgorod 1995, took a more individual course after 4 d6 5 g2 e5 6 c3 g5 (D)

It is vital not to be unsettled by opponent’s who mistakenly view White’s kingside fianchetto as unambitious and consequently try a bit of intimidation with such a cheeky assault.

The game went 7 d3 h6 8 h4 g4 9 b8 h5 10 f3 It is nice to see Black being punished by sensible play and a strike against his over-extended pawns Now 10 gxh3 12 bxh3 12 f5 favours White, while 10 h6 11 dxc6 12 fxe4 13 e4 g6 14 f3 15 e4 16 f8 a pawn up

2 3 e2 f5
4 b6
4 c6 15 c6 16 e4 17 c6 18 f6 19 g3

a) Giel Visser, Netherlands 1997, is typical 5 g3 dxe4 6 dxe4 e5 7 g2 c6 8 0-0 0-0 9 h3 (improving on 9 d2 b6) 9 e6 (also possible are 9 b6 and 9 h6 — remember to compare this with Belkhodja-Crouch) 10 c3 d5 11 d2 b6 (better is 12 d7 d4 with an edge to White) and now White put his queen to good use with 12 b5 13 dxe5 bxe5 14 d5 15 dxc6 (15 bxc6 16 bxc6 17 c6 18 e5) Trading queens left Black clearly worse, so he should have limited White to a slight advantage after 16 g6 17 h4 f6 18 g3

b) More recently White has done well with the uncompromising 5
e51, which was first played in
Yudasin-Komarov, Reggio Emilia
1997 5 \text{cxd7} 6 g3 (D)

With his c-pawn obstructed by the
knight Black’s options are limited

b1) 6 f6 is the thematic response, contesting the centre early before
has managed to consolidate his grip
on e5. After 7 exf6 \text{exf6} the simple
8 \text{g2} (White should resist hitting
the e-pawn since 8 \text{h3} e5 9 \text{exc8 wxc8
\text{dd4}} 10 \text{dxe5 \text{d4}} 11 \text{dd1 \text{f5
backfires}) 8 \text{d6 9 d4 0-0 10 0-0
favours White, who has more space
and the better pawn structure

b2) It is significant that Komarov
assessed ‘b1’ as being good for
White — hence his choice in
the game — 6 b6 Again White ob-
tains the better game by concentrat-
ing on his opponent’s rather
crippled kingside. The game went 7
\text{g2 b7 8 0-0 c7 9 h4 a5
(without play on the queenside
Black has nothing at all) 10 \text{e1 a4
11 a3 h5 12 h5 \text{e5 13 \text{c5 xd2 xd6
14 \text{e3 wd7 15 b1f and White
was threatening to challenge on the
queenside
5 e5 \text{d7
5 \text{g8 is not as negative as it
seems, as the knight is being sent —
in anticipation of c2-c4 from White
— to attack the d4-square. In the

game Psakhis-Skomorokhin, Vienna
1996, White chose not to be too
ambitious and instead was content
with a slight edge 6 g3 c5 7 \text{g2
\text{c6 8 0-0 dge7 9 c4 \text{f5 10 \text{c3
dc4 (D)

11 \text{xd4
a) After 11 \text{d4 12 wd1 b7
13 \text{xd5 cxd5 White is not troubled
by the knight on d4, and has a com-
fortable lead after 14 f4 or 14 \text{e3
Black is behind in development and
has a weak d5-pawn
b) Consequently Black chose
11 \text{xd4 12 \text{b1 b7 13 \text{d2
\text{e7 14 \text{xd5 \text{xd5 15 \text{xd5 \text{xd5
16 \text{e4?!}, when 16 \text{exe4 17 dxe4
forces the knight to h6 and leaves
the d4-pawn stranded. Instead
16 \text{d8 17 f3 0-0 18 \text{d2 wd7
19 \text{c1 gave White an edge
6 g3 e5
7 \text{g2 c7
8 b4 (D)

\text{\texts
Always be alert to the possibility of \( \text{g7-g5} \). Fortunately, the h-pawn is an integral part of White’s opening and middlegame strategy anyway and can be pushed almost automatically.

8 \[ \ldots \] \( \text{Qe6} \)

9 \( \text{c4} \)

In view of what Black has in mind, I would suggest that 9 \( \text{d4} \) is preferable — see Psakhis-Smirin.

9 \[ \ldots \] \( \text{dxc4} \)

10 \( \text{dxc4} \) \( \text{b7} \)

11 0-0 \( \text{wc7} \)

No prizes for guessing where Black intends to put his king. In any case, the e5-pawn is as unwelcome as usual in Black’s half of the board, and White enjoys the luxury of being able to give his knight a more aggressive posting than the traditional d2.

12 \( \text{Qf4} \) \( \text{d8} \)

Before castling queenside Black sends his knight over to the kingside on a mission to chase or capture White’s dark-squared bishop. The immediate 12 0-0-0 invites 13 \( \text{Qc3} \) a6 14 \( \text{Qd5}^? \) which looks very dangerous, while even 14 \( \text{Qad1} \) is already difficult for the defender.

13 \( \text{He1!} \) (D)

The exact order of White’s moves is important here. Obviously the black knight is about to land on g6 to hit the bishop, but White has only one way of dealing with this which guarantees him the better game. For example, the first choice, 13 \( \text{h5} \), does not have the desired effect, for after 13 \( \text{h6} \) White cannot prevent \( \text{g7-g5} \).

13 \[ \ldots \] \( \text{Qg6} \)

14 \( \text{Qd2!} \)

Over-protecting the e-pawn released the bishop from defensive duty, leaving White free to evict the knight at his convenience. White has calculated that the bishop will not be a liability on the d-file once Black has castled long:

14 \[ \ldots \] 0-0-0

The coast is clear — for the moment at least — now that White’s bishop has been forced to retreat. Addressing the threat on the kingside by occupying the h5-square with his own pawn does not solve Black’s problems, e.g. 14 \( \text{h5} \) 15 \( \text{Qa3} \) a6 16 \( \text{Qc2} \) followed by a2-a3 and b2-b4, when Black’s king will have trouble finding a safe haven.

15 \( \text{Qc3}! \)

White shows that he has confidence in his position, believing that he will get the better of a complex struggle. Given his territorial superiority in a relatively safe pawn structure, this is hardly a brave decision. The alternative is to propose a series of exchanges from which White emerges with a safe lead. This is initiated by hitting the knight — 15 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{Qxe5}^? \) (15 \( \text{Qf8} \) 16 \( \text{Qc3} \) a6 leads back to the game) 16 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) (16 \( \text{Qxe5} \) 17 \( \text{Qxc6} \)) 17 \( \text{Qxb7}+ \) \( \text{Qxb7} \) 18 \( \text{Qf4} \) (18 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{Qxe5} \) 19 \( \text{Qc3} \) \( \text{Qf6} \) is not so clear) 18 \( \text{Qe6} \) (18 \( \text{Qd6} \) 19 \( \text{Qc3}^? \)) 19 \( \text{Qxe5} \) \( \text{fxe5} \) 20 \( \text{Qc3} \) and White has an edge due to his superior minor piece and the potential targets in Black’s pawn.
structure, though he should be careful not to let Black in on the d-file
15 ... a6
15 \(\text{Q}gx\text{e}5\) here runs into 16 \(\text{Q}xe5\) \(\text{Q}xe5\) 17 \(\text{Q}b5\)
16 h5!
Perfect timing
16 ... \(\text{Q}f8\)
Necessary. Taking on e5 still works out in White’s favour, e.g.
16 \(\text{Q}gx\text{e}5\) 17 \(\text{Q}xe5\) \(\text{Q}xe5\) 18 \(\text{Q}xb7+\) \(\text{Q}xb7\) (18 \(\text{Q}xb7\) 19 \(\text{Q}f4\)
19 \(\text{Q}xe5\) \(\text{Q}xd2\) 20 \(\text{Q}xg7\) \(\text{Q}f8\) 21 \(\text{Q}e4\) followed by removing the h7-pawn, after which White’s passed h-pawn is unleashed
17 \(\text{Q}f4\) h6 (D)

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

Despite Black’s efforts to evict the bishop, it has returned to its favourite spot, adding weight to White’s claim on the d6-square. In order to achieve this, White has had to advance his h-pawn, which in turn opens the door for Black to finally drum up some counterplay with g7-g5, the thematic thrust has been working for since deciding to castle queenside development completed, and well aware of Black’s coming kingside strike. White has no time to waste.
18 \(\text{Q}e4\) g5
19 \(\text{Q}d6+!\) \(\text{Q}xd6\)

20 \(\text{exd6}\)
White’s most important in the KIA is rewarded with another starring role. If it is annoying for Black on e5, think of the damage it can cause on d6! Black is about to suffer on the dark squares
20 ... \(\text{Q}d7\)
21 \(\text{Q}e5\)
21 \(\text{Q}e5\) is also possible, with a clear advantage to White. With the text, White wishes to keep his flexible knight for use in generating an attack on the queenside, where Black’s king cover looks susceptible to a pawn-break
21 ... \(\text{Q}g8\)
21 \(\text{Q}xe5?\) 22 \(\text{Q}xe5\) \(\text{Q}e8\) 23 \(\text{Q}xb7+\) \(\text{Q}xb7\) 24 \(\text{Q}b3+\) etc
22 \(\text{Q}f6\) g4
23 \(\text{Q}d2\) \(\text{Q}d4\)
Black fights for survival, hoping to limit the power of White’s assault by eliminating a couple of key pieces. In fact, the eventual pruning open of the queenside is inevitable, e.g. 23 \(\text{Q}e8\) 24 \(\text{b}4\) and Black will be unable to keep lines of entry closed. Of course, White can break through only by giving up a pawn or two
24 \(\text{Q}xd4\) \(\text{Q}xd4\)
25 \(\text{Q}xg2\) \(\text{exd}4\)
26 c5! \(\text{Q}b7+\)
27 \(\text{Q}g1\) bxc5 (D)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{W} \\
\end{array}
\]
The only important feature of the diagram position is the the safety of the kings Black's is in much danger, whereas the white king is tucked away. Nevertheless this situation could quickly change with just one lapse (\( g8-g5xh5-h1 \ mate is unlikely but still there). As is always the case the aggressor needs to maintain the momentum. Here the pawns on a6 and e5 are what is left of Black's defensive shield.

28 \( \text{De}4 \)

28 b4! is much stronger because the text is not really necessary whereas Black's next is useful White's only objective is to open a line down which to invade, leaving Black with the unenviable decision of which one. The text gives Black valuable time.

28 ... \( \text{Dd7} \)

29 \( \text{Ec6} \)

30 b4!

The correct path, but perhaps White is too late for the full point.

30 ... \( \text{Cxb4} \)

31 \( \text{Ec7} \)

32 \( \text{Wxb5+} \)

33 \( \text{Bb1} (D) \)

The mating attack continues even after the disappearance of most of White's army! Black's king is in danger of being trapped by the eager rooks.

33 \( \text{De5} \)

33 f5! does enough to save the draw, e.g. 34 \( \text{Exb4} \) \( \text{Gb6} \), when Black threatens to undermine the c7-rook by removing the defender on d6. Therefore White has nothing better than 35 \( \text{Ec6} \) \( \text{Gb7} \) 36 \( \text{Ec7}+ \) with a repetition of moves.

34 \( \text{Ec5}! \)

Not 34 \( \text{Exb4?} \) \( \text{Exd6}! \)

34 ... \( \text{Gb3}? \)

Losing. There is such a thin line between one result and another (I speak from experience!), and in this case Black could have saved the game with 34 \( \text{Gb3+} \), e.g. 35 \( \text{Gg2} \) (35 \( \text{Gf1} \) \( \text{Exd6} \) 36 \( \text{Gxd6} \) \( \text{Gd2} \), or 35 \( \text{Gh1} \) \( \text{Gf7} \) 36 \( \text{Exb4} \) \( \text{Ec8} \) and White's own king is no longer immune) 35 \( \text{Gf1} \) 36 \( \text{Exb4} \) \( \text{Ge1+} \) 37 \( \text{Gf1} \) \( \text{Gd3} \)

35 \( \text{Exb5+} \)

36 \( \text{Gf3}! \)

37 \( \text{Gf1} \)

38 \( \text{Gb6+} \)

Or 38 \( \text{Gf5} \) 39 \( \text{Gb7} \)

39 \( \text{Gb7+} \)

39 \( \text{Gh4} \) 40 \( \text{Gh5} \)

40 \( \text{Gb6+} \)

41 \( \text{Gb2}! \)

1-0

Black Plays ...\( \text{Gb6} \) and ...\( \text{Ge7} \)

Black has also tried keeping watch over the critical e5-square by developing the king's bishop on d6. In combination with \( \text{Gb8-g6} \) this would be asking for trouble as White has the dangerous threat of advancing e4-e5 to fork the two minor pieces. Consequently e7 is a good square for the knight, when a future \( \text{Gb7-g6} \) adds further
pressure to e5. To this end, there is also the possibility of f7-f6.

Mortensen-U. Nielsen
Vesle 1994

1 e4 c5 2 d3 e6 3 d3 d5 4 g3 d5 5 b5 d6 6 g2 g6 7 0-0 8 e1 w7

For 8 c7 see Yudassin-Luther, below. With the text Black brings a third piece to monitor e5. Another way to do this is with 8 f6. The slight weakening of e6 and the a2-g8 diagonal is not too serious, although in some cases Black would prefer to return the pawn to f7.

a) 9 exd5 exd5 10 d4? aims to create a target in the shape of the isolated or backward d5-pawn. Black must also keep an eye on the e6-square. Taking on d4 (or allowing d4xc5) cedes the d4-square and the d-file, so 10 c4 is virtually forced, after which Bancod-Szabo, Lenk 1993, continued 11 b3 cxb3 12 axb3 g4 13 f1 w6 14 c3 a8 15 d3 with only a slight edge to White due to Black's pawn formation.

b) More in keeping with this variation is 9 c3

b1) 9 w7 10 d4? cxd4 11 cxd4 12 e5 fxe5 13 dxe5 c5 14 b3 b6 15 a3 d6 16 d4 worked out well for White in the game Zolincrowicz-Haba, Pardubice 1994.

b2) 9 d7 10 a3 a5?! (for 10 w7 11 w2 see the note to White's 10th move) 11 d4 cxd4 12 exd5 (D)

Initiating a central skirmish with d3-d4 does seem to be an effective treatment of this position. The pawn on f6 is not really appropriate any more.

We are following Ljubojevic-De la Villa Garcia, Pamplona 1996. Now 12 dxc3?? loses to 13 d4 and 12 d5 13 d4 14 cxd4 15 d8 16 d6 17 d7, with a pull for White in a risk-free position. While Black stands only a little worse in these lines it is logical to avoid any potential suffering caused by nudging the f-pawn forward. It is worth trying to complete development without creating unnecessary weaknesses, defending e5 with a pawn only after White has spent time increasing his own influence on the key square.

9 c3

10 a3

Preparing typical queenside expansion. 10 w2 continues the fight for e5. Then after 10 f6 11 a3 Black has a choice.

a) 11 e8 12 b4 b6 13 d4! (D)

This position arose in Fischer-DiCamillo, East Orange 1957. Black's solid line of pawns lacks flexibility, restricting the defender to a waiting game, and when the challenge does come White will inevitably enjoy more space in which to operate.
This move is becoming a familiar feature. Despite his prophylactic approach, Black is still busy trying to cover the small but noticeable cracks in his position.

b11) Best now is 16 cxd4 17 Qxd4 dxe4 (17 e5? 18 Qxd7 Wxd7 19 Qb5 highlights the significance of the b5-square, but 17 Qc5?? is playable) 18 Wxe4 Qf8 when Black is passive but not badly off. Once again the f6-pawn is more of a hindrance than a help.

b12) Instead of the practical 16 cxd4 the game Komlakovsky-Dumitrache, Bucharest 1995, saw Black mistake the diagram position for the beginning of a complex middlegame from which he could steal the initiative. Unfortunately, in his ambitious assessment of the subsequent battle, Black failed to appreciate the consequences of withdrawing the support of the d5-pawn 16 e5 17 Qxd7 Wxd7 18 dxc5 Qxc5 19 Qd1! Qg4 (19 Qxa4 invites trouble on the a-file, e.g. 20 Qxd5 b6 21 b4!) 20 Qxd5 Qxa3 21 Qxa3 and now Black resorted to the unsettling 21 Qh4, but after the calm 22 Qd4 Wh3 23 gxh3 exe4 24 Qxe4 Whxh4 25 f3 the ‘attack’ had fizzled out and he was back to the reality of being a pawn down for nothing.

b2) 12 Qae8 13 Qb1 dxe4 14 dxe4 e5 15 Qa3 Qa7 16 Qd1 Qe6 17 Qd2 Qec8 18 Qac4 with an easy game for White, Lagrottera-Kievitz, Forli 1992. Black has nothing to show for the holes on b5 and d5, prompting White to accentuate his opponent’s trouble on the light squares — 18 Qd8 19 Qe3 Qb6 20 Qdc4 Qxc4 21 Qxc4 Qc8 22 Qf3! Qe7 23 Qxd8 Qxd8 24 Qg4 etc.
c) 11 aac8 is Zapata-Lautier, Novi Sad Olympiad 1990. White played the odd 12 b3?!, when 12 wb6 forced the knight back to d2. Lautier offers 12 b4 b5 with equality, which seems like a reasonable evaluation, though 13 exd5 exd5 14 bxc5 axc5 15 c4 puts the onus on Black to prove that — yet again — White cannot make too much of the permanent weakness on e6

10 ... b5
10 aac8? 11 we2 f6 transposes to 'c' in the note to White's 10th move

11 d4!? (D)

![Chess Diagram]

It is imperative that White injects some venom into his game before Black simply takes over the queenside. KIA players tend to be guilty of playing too quietly in the late opening/early middlegame stage, when really there is plenty of scope for White to profit from his flexible setup by pushing one or more of his centre pawns. Here White is happy to accept an isolated d-pawn in return for more space and, ironically, a grip on the queenside. The point is that with the aggressive 10 b5 Black neglected the c5-square, and now White can seek to exploit this important feature because two of his pawns are ready to clamp down on the potential entry point. Also worth consideration are 11 ef2 f6 12 d4 and 11 b4?

11 ... cxd4
12 cxd4 dxe4
13 aexe4 aed5

The price that White has had to pay for his extra territory and planned occupation of c5 is the surrender of the d5-square. From this safe haven directly in front of the isolated pawn Black's knight keeps watch across a sizeable section of the playing arena, forcing White to pay particular attention before embarking on any plans which involve making irrevocable positional concessions. One factor which does favour White is the location of the black bishops, getting in the way on the d-file so that at least Black is unable to exert uncomfortable pressure on the d-pawn — an inconvenience which often proves too much of a distraction in IQP situations.

14 aed2 afd8
15 aec1 aee8
16 b4

Mortensen decides that it is still correct to persevere with the original tempting strategy of creating an outpost behind enemy lines. Of course it was necessary to weigh up the consequences of planting the pawn on b4 — c3 and c4 suddenly become targets for Black's pieces, as does the b-pawn itself after a timely a7-a5. It is crucial now that White make the most of his pluses in order to put his opponent under maximum pressure and thus prevent an unfortunate reversal of roles.

16 ... wb6
17 aexe5 (D)
White has managed to win the first serious battle of the game, something which brings with it an important psychological significance. Note that the d4-pawn — which has thus far been perfectly safe from attack on the d-file — supports e5 as well as c5. Combined with the king’s rook and knight this gives White control of e5 and the kingside to add to his ostensibly iron grip with the queen’s rook and knight on the other wing. Being contained on both sides of the board is not a pleasant prospect and, believing that his impressive knight on d5 is not getting the action it deserves, Black endeavours to break out with a perfectly natural move.

17 ... a5?

At first glance it is difficult to appreciate why this is a mistake. I would guess that most titled players would suggest this thrust if asked to find Black’s best continuation in the diagram position. The b4-pawn is attacked (and subsequently the far-flung knight is being undermined), White’s attention is drawn away from the kingside (where Black, you will notice, does not have too many defenders) and Black even has a rook ready to get to work on the a-file. Surprisingly White is better equipped to deal with this challenge on his queenside, and the answer is to be found on the other side of the board.

18 bxa5 Qxa5

Notice that the capture on a5 has drawn the knight far, far away from the kingside. It soon becomes clear that with the calm 17 e7 or 17 f8 Black would have remained uncomfortably cramped but would have been much better prepared to deal with a kingside strike.

19 Ng5!

Not having to be concerned about threats to his d-pawn or a liberating pawn break gives White the luxury of being able to switch his attack from one area to another. Setting up camp on c5 was not necessarily directed at generating queenside play — the e6-pawn is suddenly under intense scrutiny.

19 ... h6

Forcing the issue by challenging White to enter a new, brutal phase of the game by sacrificing on e6, as the outcome is by no means clear. Anyway, the text has more appeal than the alternatives:

a) 19 e7 20 Qxe6 fxe6 21 xe6 Fa7 (21 Fa6 22 xdx5) 22 xa5 Fa5 (22 xc5 23 xdx8 xe8 24 xc5) 23 xdx5 xd5 24 xe7

b) 19 f8 20 Qxe6 fxe6 21 xe6 d6 (21 Fa7 22 xe8! xe8 23 xdx5 h8 24 xa8) 22 xe8 xe8 23 xdx5 h8 24 d7

c) The only way to prevent the sacrifice on e6 is by removing one of the knights — 19 xc5 20 xxc5 Fe7 21 Fc2 g6 22 e4 with a clear advantage.

20 Qxe6 fxe6

21 xe6 (D)
will be hanging on e8.) 26 \textit{xf6} \\
25 \textit{xf6} 27 \textit{xc8}+ \\
26 \textit{xd8} \textit{xd8} 27 \textit{h5} \\
Making way — finally — for the queen to deliver the killer blow. \\
27 \textit{xa3} \\
28 \textit{g4}+ \textit{h7} \\
Otherwise White pins the queen. \\
29 \textit{xf7} \\
29...\textit{xc1} 30 \textit{g6}+ \\
30 \textit{xc8} \\
31 \textit{h5}+ \textit{g7} \\
32 \textit{h8} 1-0 \\
\textbf{Yudasin-Luther} \\
\textbf{Leningrad 1989} \\

1 e4 e6 2 d3 d5 3 d2 c5 4 \textit{gf3} \\
\textit{d6} 5 g3 \textit{d6} 6 \textit{g2} \textit{ge7} \\
The drawback of Black’s setup is that he is restricted somewhat in flexibility of development, and the lack of influence on e4 in turn gives White more choice of how to continue. \\
7 0-0 0-0 \\
8 \textit{e1} \\

Also possible is 8 \textit{h4} followed by 9 f4, as in the game Dolmatov-Lautier, below. \\
8 \textit{e7} \\
Black does not want to be troubled by a future e4-e5 push, and from c7 the king’s bishop may more safely observe e5. \\
9 \textit{c3} \\

Another alternative is 9 exd5 exd5 10 c3, although this would restrict White’s choices and unleash the black queen’s bishop. In the game Kaidanov-Motwani, Dublin 1991, White advanced both his wing pawns as far as they could go: 9 \textit{h4}!? e5 10 exd5 \textit{xd5} 11 \textit{c4} \\
\textit{g4} 12 c3 \textit{b6} 13 \textit{c2} \textit{e8} 14
\[ \text{KIA vs French Defence 77} \]

\[ \text{Qe3 Qd7 15 a4 h6 16 a5 Qc8 17 a6 b6 18 h5 with an unclear position.} \]

Such a policy as Kaidanov's always runs the risk of wasting four or five moves, after which Black may simply ignore the far-flung pawns and concentrate on play in the centre. Note that 9 e5? Qg6 rounds up the e-pawn.

9 ... d4!? Less ambitious alternatives are 9...b6 and 9...f6.

10 Qb3 b6

10...Qb6? is not at all in keeping with the spirit of the variation, since the bishop will have made several moves to reach this poor square.

11 e5

White does not relish being in a cramped position resulting from ...e6-e5.

11 ... \[ \text{Qb8} \]

The rook must vacate the h1-a8 diagonal.

12 cxd4 cxd4

13 Qg5

13 h4 comes to mind, intending h4-h5 and perhaps even h5-h6. After 13...Qg6 White could continue 14 h5 Qgxh5 15 Qbxd4, or try the more brutal 14 Qg5 with the idea of 15 Wh5.

13 ... \[ \text{He8!} \]

13...Qb7 at once loses the d-pawn after 14 Qxe7 and 15 Qbxd4.

14 Qc1 \[ \text{Qb7} \]

15 Qe4!?

An interesting 'waste' of a tempo, putting so much pressure on the enemy d-pawn that Black must create a hole on c5 in order to keep it. White also has a worthy - and probably better - alternative in 15 g4, providing a home for the queen's bishop on the h2-b8 diagonal after a subsequent Qc1-f4, over-protecting the e-pawn.

15 ... b5

16 Qc1 h6! (D)

Now 17 Qxe7 Qxe7 18 Qc5 Qc8 (or 18...a8) is slightly better for Black, as is 17 Qd2 Qg6 18 Qc5 Qc8 19 Qa6 Qxa6 20 Qxc6 Qb7. White therefore throws down the gauntlet and leaves his bishop on g5.

17 Qc5!?

The passive 17...Qc8 falls in with White's plans: 18 Qh4! followed by bringing the queen to f4 or queenside expansion with a2-a3 and b2-b4 is better for White. Incidentally White need not fear 18...g5 as 19 Qxg5 hxg5 20 Qxg5 gives him an advantage.

18 Qa6!?

White continues to follow the complicated course. Unwise would be 18 Qxe7 Qxe7 19 Qa6 Qc8 20 Qxc7 Qxc7, leaving all of Black's forces wonderfully placed.

18 ... hgx5

A risky capture, perhaps, but more promising than 18...Qc8 19 Qxc7 Qxc7 20 Qd2, when White has a clear advantage thanks to his potentially active and unchallenged dark-squared bishop.

19 Qxg5 g6!
Otherwise 20 \( \text{Wh}5 \) signals the end.

20 \( \text{Wg}4 \) (D)

The game is now reaching boiling point. 20 \( \text{Qxb}8 \) would be the first of a sequence of exchanges decisively favourable to White after 20...\( \text{Whb}8 \) 21 \( \text{Wf}3 \) \( \text{Qxc}5 \) 22 \( \text{Wxa}8 \) \( \text{Qxd}3 \) 23 \( \text{Qxc}7 \) \( \text{Wxa}8 \) 24 \( \text{Qxe}8 \) \( \text{Qx}1 \) 25 \( \text{Qxa}7 \). However, 21...\( \text{Qb}8 \) should help hold Black's game together, although 22 \( \text{Wg}4 \)?? does maintain the pressure. This line could be White's best try for advantage, as in the diagram position Black seems to have a saving resource.

20 ... \( \text{Qxe}5 \)!

The bishop returns to the kingside. After 20...\( \text{Qg}7 \) White has a number of interesting ways to continue: 21 \( \text{Wf}4 \) \( \text{Qf}8 \) 22 \( \text{Qxc}7 \) \( \text{Wxc}7 \) 23 \( \text{Wxf}7 \)!! \( \text{Qxf}7 \) 24 \( \text{Qxe}6+ \) \( \text{Qg}8 \) 25 \( \text{Qxc}7 \) looks good, and 22 \( \text{Qxb}8 \) \( \text{Wxb}8 \) 23 \( \text{Qxe}6+ \) \( \text{Qf}6+ \) \( \text{Qg}8 \) 25 \( \text{Qxc}6+ \) \( \text{Qxe}6 \) 26 \( \text{Qxe}6+ \) \( \text{Qxe}6 \) 27 \( \text{Qxe}6+ \) \( \text{Qh}8 \) 28 \( \text{Wh}6+ \) \( \text{Qg}8 \) 29 \( \text{Qxe}6+ \) and 30 \( \text{Qxc}6 \) gives White an armada of pawns and an initiative for the piece.

21 \( \text{Wh}3 \)

White is in danger of trying too hard with 21 \( \text{Qxe}5 \), since 21...\( \text{Qxe}5 \) 22 \( \text{Wh}3 \) \( \text{Qxg}2 \) 23 \( \text{Wh}7+ \) \( \text{Qf}8 \) 24 \( \text{Wh}8+ \) (24 \( \text{Wh}6+ \) is the last chance to draw) 24...\( \text{Qg}8 \) 25 \( \text{Wxe}5 \) \( \text{Qc}8 \) wins for Black.

21 ... \( \text{Qg}7 \)

21...\( \text{Qf}8 \) could be asking for trouble after 22 \( \text{f}4! \) \( \text{Qg}7 \) 23 \( \text{Qxe}6! \) \( \text{Wh}6! \) 24 \( \text{Qc}5 \).

22 \( \text{Qxb}8 \) \( \text{Wxb}8 \)

23 \( \text{Qxe}6 \)

White once again powers into his opponent's position, but Black is ready.

23 ... \( \text{fx}e6! \)

24 \( \text{Qxe}6+ \)

Not 24 \( \text{Wh}7+ \) \( \text{Qf}8 \) 25 \( \text{Qe}6+ \) \( \text{Qf}7 \) 26 \( \text{Wxg}7+ \) \( \text{Qxe}6 \) 27 \( \text{Qh}3+ \) \( \text{Qd}6 \) 28 \( \text{Qf}6+ \) \( \text{Qc}7 \), when Black has escaped.

24 ... \( \text{Qh}8 \)

25 \( \text{Wh}3+ \) \( \text{Qe}8-\text{Qh}4 \)

A fitting result to a good spirited and entertaining game.

Dolmatov-Lautier
Poland 1991

1 \text{e}4 \text{c}5 2 \text{Qf}3 \text{e}6 3 \text{d}3 \text{Qc}6 4 g\text{g}3 d\text{d}5 5 \text{Qbd}2 \text{Qd}6 6 \text{Qg}2 \text{Qge}7 7 0-0 0-0 8 \text{Qh}4!?

White adopts the hostile plan of pushing the f-pawn which Fischer used to great effect in a crushing victory over Ivkov in 1966 (see below).

8 ... \text{b}6

Much attention has been given to alternatives recently.

a) 8...\text{b}5 begins the queenside counter even before White has touched his f-pawn! Its first outing at international level was in the game Nevednichy-Saltaev, Tiraspol 1994. Play went 9 \text{f}4 \text{c}4 10 \text{e}5 \text{Qc}5+ 11 \text{Qh}1 \text{Qa}6?! (better is 11...\text{cxd}3 12 \text{cxd}3 \text{Qa}6 though I would not say that having the pawn on b5 has helped Black) 12 \text{dxc}4 \text{bxc}4 (12...\text{dxc}4?! hands White the
e4-square on a plate and leaves the bishop on a6 with little future) 13 c3 $b6 14 $h5 (D)

White has good prospects on the kingside, which is just as well considering the progress Black has made on the other flank. After 14...g6 15 $g5 $d8 16 $d3 the threat of $g5-h6 followed by $h3-g5 forced 16...$f5 17 $xf5 $xf5 18 $h6 $e7, when 19 $e1 should have been answered by 19...d4!? with a complex struggle ahead, e.g. 20 $xd4 $xd4 21 $e3 $xb2 22 $ab1 $c3. Instead 19...$c8 20 $e3! $c7 (20...$xb2? 21 $c5! $xc5 22 $g5) 21 $ad1 $f8 22 $c5! $xc5 (22...$f6 23 $xf6 $xf6 24 $xe8+ $xe8 25 $g5 hits d5) 23 $g5 $e6 (23...$f6 24 $xd5+! $xd5 25 $xf6 $xel+ [or 25...$dd8 26 $xd8 $xd8 27 $e7] 26 $xe1 $d8 27 $e7) should have led to a nice win for White due to 24 $xh7 $e7 (24...$f6 25 $xf6+ $xf6 26 $h7+ 25 $f6+ $xf6 26 $xf6 etc.

Black can also prepare to meet f2-f4 with his own f-pawn:

b) 8...$e7 9 f4

b1) 9...$f6 makes sure that Black has e5 covered, so White does best to turn his attention to the light squares. A.David-Rodgaard, Moscow Olympiad 1994, is typical: 10 exd5 exd5 11 $e1 b6 12 c3 $d7 13 $b3 $b7 14 d4! c4 15 $d2 $e8 16 $f1 b5 17 $e3 and, apart from fixing the black pawn on d5, White had engineered a situation in which the knight serves a purpose on h4. The g2-bishop is free to exert pressure on the long diagonal while the knights monitor the f5-square. Luxembourg’s top player now switched to the queenside: 17...$d8 18 a4 a6 19 b3 (D)

Black’s position is beginning to crack... 19...$b8 20 axb5 axb5 21 $a3 $f7 22 $xe7 $xe7 23 $h5 $e6 24 $xc4 $xc4 25 $xa7! g6 26 $xb7 $xb7 27 $xd5 $xf5 28 $xb7 $xf4 29 $xf4 $xb7 30 $xf5 and White was close to winning.

b2) 9...f5. Black arrests the march of White’s f-pawn. Of course this leaves a hole on e5 but Black does intend to defend this weakness, and at least White’s knight on h4 now looks rather pointless. In Yagupov-Samarin, Briansk 1995, Black adopted an interesting setup: 10 exd5 exd5 11 c3 $d6 (this is the point of dropping the bishop back to c7) 12 $e1 $d4 13 c4 $d7 14 $f1 $ae8 (D)
Black has earned himself some territory, he has a reasonable guard over the e5-square and he is ready to contest the only open file on the board. White has available only one course of action — queenside expansion 15 atsbyd2 byd8 16 a3 b6 17 b4 with a balanced game. Black's queen seems awkwardly placed on d6, but the position holds together.

c) 8 atsbyd7 is similar to 'b2'. Again Black intends to erect a barrier on the f-file, this time opting for simple development and a more natural posting for the queen. 9 f4 f5 10 exd5 (closing the position with 10 e5 is illogical — opening the e-file means that White can aim his pieces at e5 and c6) 10 atsbyd3 (11 atsbye1 atsbye8 12 a3 atsbyf7 is an equalizing line worth remembering) 11 atsbyb6 (D)

We see on the kingside that White chose to bring his queen's knight to f3, leaving the other stuck on h4. Assuming that Black will swing his queen's rook over to e8 in order to contest the e-file (and defend e5), the c7-knight will need to clear the way. Dropping back to c8 is a bit negative, while coming to g6 invites immediate capture by the h4-knight, resulting in an ugly g7-g6-f5 pawn formation in front of Black's king. The knight might also prove useful should White launch a kingside offensive. A Rodriguez-Milos, Villa Gesell 1996, continued 12 c3 atsbye8 13 atsbye1 d4 14 atsbyg5+? (14 c4 is the thematic response, but White is happy to keep the game open). Now Milos decided against the obvious move, 14 h6??, probably because he believed his high-rated opponent would have too dangerous an attack after 15 atsbyh5 byhxg5 16 byfxg5. However, 16 atsbye5 17 g6 atsbyxg6 18 atsbyxg6 gatsbyf3+ 19 atsbyxf3 atsbyxe1+ 20 atsbyf2 atsbye8 21 atsbyd5+ atsbye6 forces White to take a draw with 22 atsbyh8+ gatsbyf7 23 atsbyh5 gatsbyg8 24 atsbyh8+ gatsbyf7 25 atsbyh5, e.g. 25 atsbyxh5 26 atsbye5+. Instead of putting the question to the knight Black played the defensive 14 g6 15 atsbyd2 atsbyd8?? (Black had to bite the bullet with 15 h6 16 atsbyg5 atsbyxb2) 16 exd4 exd4 17 b4+ atsbyb8 18 atsbyb3+ with a clear advantage to White after 19 atsbye1 or first 19 a4 a6 20 atsbye1

9 atsbyf4 atsbye4

Black opens the a6-f1 diagonal so that he can attack White's king's rook and make it awkward for White to support his f-pawn.

10 atsbye4 atsbya6

11 atsbye1 (D)
11 ... $a7

In the aforementioned game, Fischer-Ivkov, Santa Monica 1966, Black instead tried 11 $c4 (with the idea of 12 e5 $c5+ 13 $h1 $c3 14 $xc3 $e8) The rest of this fine game is worth a mention 12 $c5 $a5 (better is 12 $e8, when 13 e5 is met by 13 $b8) 13 e5 (now the threat of 14 $xa8 forces the attacked bishop to leave the important b8-h2 diagonal and consequently lose its influence on the e5-square) 13 $c5+ 14 $h1 $d5 15 $e4 $b7 16 $h5† (White should not consider $e4xc5 because a kingside attack holds excellent prospects of netting the full point) 16 $e7 17 g4† $xe4 18 $xe4 (the powerful knight has been replaced by a powerful bishop†) 18 $g6 19 $h6 $d5 20 f5 $e8 (threatening $f8, but White is too quick) 21 $xg6 $xg6 22 $xg6† (winning) 22 $hxg6 23 $xg6+ $f8 24 $f1+) 22 $d7 23 $f4 and Black did not survive until move 30

12 $c3

Another new idea is to try to do without $c2-$c3. It is not clear which is the lesser evil — giving away d3 or d4. In Bologan-Horvath, Vienna 1996 White could have returned to the main game after 12 e5 $d7 with 13 $c3, but he chose to experiment with the more aggressive 13 $h5, when Black really has no choice but to jump into d4 immediately and not worry about the queen's rook 13 $d4 (D)

Without this move Black would be letting his opponent steal a tempo. Now 14 $xa8 $xc2 15 $e4 $g6 16 $d1 $xa1 17 $df3 $b5 18 $h3 is clearly better for White, but the simple 14 $xa8 15 $d1 $b7 is not at all what White is looking for. Considering Black's 16th move, Bologan must have weighed up the consequences of the knight's arrival on d4 and decided that it was nothing to worry about 14 $e4 $e5 15 $h3 (not 15 c3 $g6 16 $g4 $xh4 17 $xh4 {17 $xh4 $e2+ 18 $g2 $e1} 17 $f5 18 $xa8 $xa8 19 $e4 $c6 20 $d2 $b7, e.g. 21 $h5 $d8) 15 $d8 16 $e3 $e2+ 17 $f2 (White knew that his king would suffer only temporary inconvenience) 17 $xc1 18 $xc1 $f6 19 $xf6 $xf6 20 $g1 $g6 21 $h3 $e5 22 $xe5 $xe5 23 $c2 $c7 24 $b3+ $h8 25 $g5 $d6 26 $e6† and White should have had a slight pull

12 ... $d3

Lerner-Dolmatov, Kharkov 1985, went 12 $d7 13 $e5 $d8
(13...\texttt{d3}) 14 \texttt{Wh5} f5 15 exf6 \texttt{xf6} 16 \texttt{Qe4} with a clear advantage to White. Black then blundered with 16...\texttt{h6}? allowing 17 \texttt{Wh6}! Seeing Dolmatov having success on the white side of this line several years later suggests that he got something from this lesson.

13 e5 \texttt{Wd7}

A way of attempting to justify sending the bishop to d3 is 13...b5?! followed by ...c5-c4, ...\texttt{d6-c5}+ and ...\texttt{Qe7-d5}. White's next move prevents Black from reverting to this idea.

14 \texttt{Qe4!} \texttt{Ad8}
15 \texttt{Wg4} \texttt{Axe4}?! 

White's menacing positions in the KIA often tempt Black into surrendering potentially useful pieces for ostensibly more powerful ones. Such simplification tends to favour White; allowing the knight to remain on c4 is preferable, parrying the threat of 16 \texttt{Qf6}+ and 17 \texttt{Qxd7} with 15...\texttt{Sh8}.

16 \texttt{Axe4} \texttt{Qg6}
17 \texttt{Qf3}

Preparing to jump into g5 at the right moment.

17 ... \texttt{Qce7}

Black brings another piece over to the kingside. Unfortunately for Lautier his bishop still waits for an opportunity to play a part in the game.

18 \texttt{Qe2}!

A grandmasterly dual-purpose move. The bishop vacates the e4-square — around which White makes his operations — in anticipation of \texttt{Qf3-g5-e4}. Another, equally important reason behind \texttt{Qe2} is that it covers a4. An example of how Black could use this square as an entry point is 18 \texttt{h4}?! \texttt{Qf5} 19 h5 \texttt{Qge7}, threatening the unpleasant ...\texttt{Wd7-a4}.

20 ... \texttt{Qh6}

Offered a difficult choice between this and 20...\texttt{h6}. Black decides against the complications which result from hitting the knight: 20...\texttt{h6} 21 \texttt{Qxe5}! \texttt{Qxe5}! 22 \texttt{Wxf5} g6 23 \texttt{We4} \texttt{Axe6} 24 fxe6 \texttt{Qxe5} 25 \texttt{Qxe5} 26 \texttt{Qxe5} \texttt{Qe8} 27 \texttt{Qxe8+} \texttt{We8} 28 \texttt{Qf2}!, and White's rook and two bishops make too strong a team for the lone queen.

20...\texttt{Qh6} seems passive, but Black wins time to make a queenside challenge. However, the positioning of the respective forces indicates that White is in no hurry to break into his opponent's kingside.

21 \texttt{h4} b5
22 \texttt{Qh2} b4
23 \texttt{We2} \texttt{Qf5}
24 \texttt{h5} \texttt{Qf8}
25 \texttt{Qe4}! \texttt{Wc6}
26 g4 \texttt{Qe7}

Black can do nothing but wait for the charge.

27 \texttt{h6}!

Underlining the vulnerability of Black's f6-square. Note that the area around Black's king is the part of the board on which the action takes
place, yet the black pieces have no significant influence there.

27 ...  \( \text{d7} \)
28 \( \text{hxg7} \)  \( \text{hxg7} \)
29 \( \text{g3!} \)

Threatening simply to invade down the h-file.

29 ...  \( \text{g6} \)
30 \( \text{e3?} \)

This permits Black to strike out in the centre and activate his pieces with a sacrifice that breaks White’s grip. White should keep the chains in place by 30 g5, and only then continue with his plan to transfer to the h-file.

30 ...  \( \text{bxc3} \)
31 \( \text{bxc3} \)  \( \text{dxe5!} \)

\( (D) \)

```
32 \( \text{fxe5} \)  \( \text{xe5+} \)
33 \( \text{h3!} \)  \( f5! \)
```

If 30 g5 had been played instead of 30 \( \text{e3} \) the sacrifice would be much less potent because now White would be able to play 34 \( \text{gxf6+} \).

34 \( \text{g3} \)  \( \text{h8} \)
35 \( \text{h5} \)  \( \text{xc3?} \)

35...\( \text{g8??} \) is an interesting alternative, when Black has pressure down the g-file. It is understandable that Black seeks to regain material, but he risks returning the initiative.

36 \( \text{g5!} \)  \( \text{b8} \)
37 \( \text{ab1} \)  \( \text{xe1} \)
38 \( \text{xe1} \)  \( c4 \)
39 \( \text{f6+} \)  \( \text{g8} \)
40 \( \text{c3!} \)

White’s minor pieces are too powerful. The game ended:

40 ...  \( \text{c7} \)
41 \( \text{f1} \)  \( \text{c5} \)
42 \( \text{d2!} \)

After the scare caused by 30 \( \text{e3?} \) White is once again in command. The immediate threat is  \( \text{h6} \), but all of White’s pieces are aimed at the enemy king. It is impossible for Black to defend.

42 ...  \( \text{e7} \)
43 \( \text{xf5!} \)  \( \text{h4+} \)

Or 43...\( \text{exf5} \) 44 \( \text{xf5+} \)  \( \text{g8} \) 45 \( \text{d5+} \)  \( \text{e6} \) 46 \( \text{f6+} \).

44 \( \text{g2} \)  \( \text{h8} \)
45 \( \text{xe6+!} \)  \( \text{e7} \)
46 \( \text{d4+} \)  \( 1-0 \)

Black cannot escape the crossfire: 46...\( \text{xe6} \) 47 \( \text{g7+} \)  \( \text{e5} \) 48 \( \text{c3+} \).

Black Plays an Early ...dxe4

Finally, a game in which Black follows a recommendation given in several books about the French Defence — the immediate central pawn exchange. It is true that White’s advantage is slight, but the positions are very similar to others which arise from the KIA, and White tends to have more attractive squares for his pieces.

\text{Belkhodja-Crouch}
\text{Capelle la Grande 1991}

1 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e6} \) 2 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 3 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{f6} \) 4 \( \text{g3} \)

Perhaps a more accurate move order is 4 \( \text{gf3} \), when 4...\( \text{dxe4} \) 5 \( \text{dxe4} \) Black’s automatic and premature capture gives White the opportunity to develop his king’s bishop on \( \text{d3} \). The game Ree-Pederson,
Groningen 1965/66, continued

5 \( \text{\#c}5 \text{\#d}6 \text{\#d}3 \text{\#b}6 7 \text{\#e}2 \text{\#b}7 8 \)
0-0 \( \text{\#bd}7 9 \text{\#c}3 \text{\#e}7 10 \text{\#e}5 \text{\#d}5 11 \)
\( \text{\#e}4 \text{\#c}5 12 \text{\#g}5! \) and Black was in
trouble

4 ... \( \text{\#dxe}4 \)
5 \( \text{\#dxe}4 \text{\#d}6 \)
6 \( \text{\#g}2 \text{\#c}5 \)
7 \( \text{\#gf}3 \text{\#e}5 \) \( \text{(D)} \)

White has a nagging edge which
he hopes to make more tangible by
trading off into an ending. Until
then, he also has a grip on the light
squares and a pull on the kingside
thanks to the availability of the
f5-square

8 0-0 0-0
9 \( \text{c}3 \text{a}5! \)

It is imperative that Black prevent
White’s intended space-gaining
b2-b4 advance

10 \( \text{\#e}2 \)
Defending the e-pawn in prepara-
tion for \( \text{\#d}2-\text{c}4 \)

10 ... \( \text{\#d}6?! \)
11 \( \text{\#g}5?! \)

White returns the favour by replying
to Black’s strange tenth move
with an equally useless one. It
seems from what happens later that
White trying to tempt \( \text{h}7-\text{h}6 \) More
fitting is 11 \( \text{a}4 \) or 11 \( \text{h}3 \)

11 ... \( \text{\#g}4 \)
12 \( \text{\#c}4 \text{\#h}5 \)
13 \( \text{\#f}3 \text{\#e}8 \)
14 \( \text{\#g}5 \text{\#h}6 \)
15 \( \text{\#e}3 \)

White calculates that the tempo
spent in enticing \( \text{h}7-\text{h}6 \) will prove
to be a worthy investment when a
knight arrives on f5, as hitting the

knight with \( \text{g}7-\text{g}6 \) would then lose
the h6-pawn

15 ... \( \text{\#f}8 \)
16 \( \text{\#ad}1 \text{\#c}8 \)
17 \( \text{a}4 \text{\#e}6 \)
18 \( \text{b}3 \text{\#ad}8 \text{(D)} \)

Black’s active rook is soon to be
"evicted"

25 ... \( \text{\#e}8 \)
26 \( \text{\#f}2 \text{f}6 \)
Providing the queen’s bishop with
route back into the game

27 \( \text{\#e}2 \text{\#d}8 \)
28 \( \text{\#f}2 \)

Although White has played the
entire game without making any
particularly serious threats, his positional handling has been excellent Black has also fared well, but he still finds himself defending weak squares on d5 and f5

28 ...  $\Delta f7$
29 $\Delta fe3$  $\Delta e5$
30 $\Delta d5!$

White takes advantage of a tactic to further his positional superiority. Now 30 $\Delta xf2$ 31 $\Delta xf2$  $\Delta xd5$? 32 exd5 wins a pawn for White because 32 $\Delta xd5$ fails to 33 $\Delta e6+$ and $\Delta xd5$

30 ...  $\Delta xf2$
31 $\Delta xf2$  $\Delta f8$
32 $\Delta ce3$  $\Delta e7$
33 c4  $\Delta g8$

Exchanging on d5 will leave White with a strong pawn there whichever way he recaptures. The point of Black’s move is to defend the h6-pawn (which White tempted forward as early as the fourteenth move!) against a possible $\Delta e3-f5$

34 $\Delta e2$

Keeping guard over d3 in anticipation of Black’s next

34 ...  $\Delta e6$
35 $\Delta b6$  $\Delta e7$

36 c5!? (D)

An interesting winning try. White sacrifices a pawn in return for pressure against Black’s a- and b-pawns. If Black declines White will anyway attack the a-pawn with $\Delta e3-c4$

36 ...  $\Delta xb3$
37 $\Delta b1$  $\Delta a2$
38 $\Delta b2$  $\Delta e6$
39 $\Delta xe6$  $\Delta xe6$
40 $\Delta bc4$

Winning back his pawn with a decisive advantage. White has a dominating position

40 ...  $\Delta e7$
41 $\Delta xb7$  f5

Black endeavours to break White’s grip, but this does not change the final outcome

42 exf5+ $\Delta xf5$ 43 $\Delta xf5$  $\Delta xf5$ 44 $\Delta xa5$ e4 45 $\Delta xe4+$ $\Delta xe4$ 46 $\Delta xc6$ $\Delta a8$ 47 $\Delta a7$ $\Delta d5$ 48 e6 $\Delta d6$ 49 $\Delta d7$ $\Delta e5$ 50 a5 $\Delta c8$ 51 $\Delta xc8$ $\Delta xc8$ 52 c7 $\Delta b5$ 53 $\Delta f3$ $\Delta xa5$ 54 $\Delta g4$

1-0

A textbook-like positional display from the French IM, showing the reader how calm, controlled methods can be used against Black’s equalising attempt
4 KIA vs Caro-Kann Defence

1 e4 c6 2 d3 (D)

Before looking at the more popular ways of meeting 2 d3, it must be noted that Black has an uncompromising line which threatens to take the initiative should White continue in a stereotyped fashion:

2 ... d5
3 Qd2 dxe4
4 dxe4 e5
5 Qg3 Qc5

Black ignores the threat to his e-pawn because he intends to meet 6 Qxe5 with 6...Qxf2+ (defending with 5...Qc7 grants White a commanding position after 6 Qc4 — also possible is 6 Qc4 — 6...Qd7 7 a4 Qg6 8 Qd3). If White dare not take up the challenge Black can develop his pieces freely, so the only way to strive for an advantage is to follow GM Raymond Keene's advice and strike immediately:

6 Qxe5! Qxf2+
7 Qxf2 Qd4+
8 Qe1 Qxe5
9 Qc4! (D)

The point. It is true that White can no longer castle, but Black is very weak on the dark squares now that he has given White the advantage of the two bishops, and the unpleasant threat of Qc4-d6+ more or less forces Black's hand:

9 ... Qxe4+
10 Qe2
Now 10...\textit{\texttt{W}}xg2 11 \textit{\texttt{Q}}d6+ \textit{\texttt{Q}}f8 12 \\
\textit{\texttt{Q}}f1 \textit{\texttt{E}}e6 13 \textit{\texttt{Q}}xf7! wins due to 13...
\textit{\texttt{Q}}xf7 14 \textit{\texttt{W}}d8 mate. This leads us to 10...
\textit{\texttt{W}}e6 11 \textit{\texttt{Q}}d6+ \textit{\texttt{Q}}e7 12 \\
\textit{\texttt{Q}}xc8+ \textit{\texttt{W}}xc8 13 \textit{\texttt{W}}d4! with a tremendous position for White.

An interesting alternative is 10 \\
\textit{\texttt{Q}}f2, when a future \textit{\texttt{E}}e1 will cause 
Black problems.

Black has two main continuations 
against 2 d3, distinguished by where 
the king's bishop will go. One idea 
is to follow White's example and 
support the centre with a kingside 
 fianchetto, following up with 
...e7-e5 and ...\textit{\texttt{Q}}g8-e7 or simply 
developing with ...\textit{\texttt{Q}}g8-f6 and omitting 
the e-pawn. Karpov once opted 
for ...e7-e5, ...\textit{\texttt{Q}}g8-f6 and ...
\textit{\texttt{Q}}f8-e8 as in Anand-
Malaniuk. A less ambitious policy 
which solid opponents may prefer 
involve holding back the e-pawn 
altogether and making the central 
exchange ...d5xe4. The resulting 
symmetrical pawn structure works 
out in White's favour as the extra 
move and territorial superiority 
afford White the better game.

\textbf{Black Fianchettoes Kingside}

Wojtkiewicz-Bronstein
\textit{Polamce Zdroj} 1988

1 e4 c6 2 d3 d5 3 \textit{\texttt{Q}}d2 g6 4 \textit{\texttt{Q}}g3 \\
\textit{\texttt{g}}7 5 g3 e5 6 \textit{\texttt{Q}}g2 \textit{\texttt{Q}}e7

By playing ...e7-e5 and ...\textit{\texttt{Q}}g8-e7 
Black takes a share of the central 
territory and puts a stop to White's 
space-gaining e4-e5 push.

7 0-0 0-0 (D)

8 \textit{\texttt{E}}e1

A popular continuation for White 
is to play h2-b4 here or on the next 
move to take advantage of Black's 
decision to voluntarily close his 
king's bishop's long a1-h8 diagonal. 
Yermolinsky-Tukmakov, Sverdlovsk 
1987, continued 8 b4 a5 9 
\textit{\texttt{W}}xa5 \textit{\texttt{W}}xa5 10 \textit{\texttt{Q}}b2 d4 11 a4 
(better than 11 \textit{\texttt{W}}c1?!, which was 
played in Short-Miles, Wijk aan Zee 
1987 — after 11...\textit{\texttt{Q}}d7 12 \textit{\texttt{Q}}b3 
\textit{\texttt{W}}a4! Black had used White's 
 omission of a2-a4 to steal the advan-
tage.) 11...\textit{\texttt{W}}c7 12 c3 \textit{dxc3} 13 
\textit{\texttt{Q}}xc3 c5 14 \textit{\texttt{Q}}c4 \textit{\texttt{Q}}ec6 15 \textit{\texttt{W}}b3 
\textit{\texttt{Q}}a6 16 \textit{\texttt{Q}}b6 with a slight pull for 
White. In the game Maier-Muse, 
West Germany 1987, White (after 8 
b4 a5) ignored the threat to his 
b-pawn and hit the black e-pawn 
with 9 \textit{\texttt{Q}}b2!!?. For some reason 
Black decided against the obvious 
and punishing 9...\textit{\texttt{Q}}xb4, going for 
the safer 9...\textit{\texttt{Q}}d7 10 a3 \textit{\texttt{W}}c7 11 d4 
\textit{\texttt{Q}}xd4 12 \textit{\texttt{Q}}xd4 \textit{\texttt{Q}}xd4 13 \textit{\texttt{Q}}xd4 
with a roughly equal position. The 
continuation 8 c3 \textit{\texttt{Q}}d7 9 b4 
is discussed in Stein-Hort. It is purely 
a matter of taste whether or not 
White goes for immediate 
expansion on the queenside or — as 
happens in this game — continue 
with central development, threat-
ening to win the e-pawn after first
exchanging on d5. I would prefer the text

8 ... d4

Black closes the centre. After 8...Qd7 White might return to the idea mentioned in the last note by playing 9 b4, or opt to fight for the h1-a8 diagonal with 9 cxd5!? (see Gelman-Lastin, below)

9 Qc4!? b5

Bronstein answers White’s provocative play by accepting the invitation to march his pawns down the board. White cannot take the e-pawn now because after 10 Qxe5 f6 wins a piece

10 Qxd2 c5
11 a4!

Part of the plan. White gave away a couple of moves in order to lure the enemy pawns forward and subsequently take control of the c4-square

11 ... b4
12 Qc4 Qd7
13 Qfd2

Clearing the way for the f-pawn now that Black’s counterplay on the other wing has been nipped in the bud

13 ... Qb6
14 f4!

White begins to attack on the kingside

14 ... f6

Black bolsters his e-pawn, waiting until the time is right before playing e5xg4

15 e1 Qb8

Another preparatory move which is quite common in the KIA. Black moves his rook out of the firing line of White’s king’s bishop in anticipation of the coming e5xg4

16 Qf3 Qc4
17 dxe4 (D)

White must have judged the exchange of his well-posted knight as not detrimental to his game. Furthermore the newly-arrived c4-pawn will help blockade the queenside

17 ... exf4
18 gxf4 Qg4

Preventing the useful knight manoeuvre Qf3-e1-d3

19 b3 Ne8

Bronstein gives White something to think about by intending to attack the e-pawn

20 b3 Nh5
21 Wh3

Escaping the pin and defending the e-pawn

21 ... Qc8
22 Ad2 Ab7
23 Aae1 Bae7

Black has organised his forces well considering his difficulties in the transition between opening and middlegame. Nevertheless, White still has an initiative and, because Black had to bring pieces to cover the kingside, a better game on both sides of the board (Black’s queenside pawns are permanently weak)

24 e5!!

A speculative advance which aims to break into Black’s camp. Now 24 fxe5 25 Afxe5 Afxe5 26 fxe5 Axe5 27 Axe5 Axe5 28 Nh6 gives White excellent compensation for
the sacrificed pawn, e.g. 28 \( \text{Ke}2 \)
29 \( \text{Wg}3 \) \( \text{Ke}8 \) 30 \( \text{Qd}5+ \) \( \text{Kh}8 \) 31 \( \text{Bf}7 \)
Alternatively 24 \( \text{Qxf3} \) 25 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( \text{fxe5} \) 26 \( \text{f5}+? \) leaves Black very weak on the light squares, not forgetting White’s much superior pieces. Therefore Bronstein prefers to keep his position as stable as possible.

24 ... \( \text{Qb}6 \)
25 \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{Qxf6} \)
26 \( \text{Qxe7} \) \( \text{Qxe7} \)
27 \( \text{Ke}1 \)

White considers that he can exchange all the rooks and still retain good attacking chances.

27 ... \( \text{Qxe1}+ \)
28 \( \text{Qxe1} \) \( \text{Wf}7 \)
29 \( \text{Bf}3 \)

White has good enough command of the light squares even without his king’s bishop. Black’s problem now is his weak c-pawn, as White is about to realize the plan of transferring a knight to d3. Remember that Black interfered with this sortie with his 18th move.

29 ... \( \text{Bf3} \)
30 \( \text{Wxf3} \) \( \text{(D)} \)

Improving the position of the queen and preparing to defend the c-pawn with a less powerful piece.

31 \( \text{Qd}3 \) \( \text{Qe}7 \)
32 \( \text{Qe}5 \) \( \text{a}6 \)
33 \( \text{Wb}7 \) \( \text{Qc}8 \)
34 \( \text{Qg}2 \) \( \text{Qg}7 \)
35 \( \text{a}5 \) \( \text{g}5 \)

Black tries to break out of his restraints, so White decides it is time to offer a trade of queens.

36 \( \text{Wf}5 \) \( \text{Wf}5 \)
37 \( \text{Qd}3 \) \( \text{Qxd}5+ \)
38 \( \text{exd}5 \) \( \text{h}6 \)

Or 38 \( \text{gxf4} \) 39 \( \text{Qxf4} \), with the idea of \( \text{Qf4} \)-c7-b6. Consequently, Black prefers to keep the bishop locked out.

39 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{Qg}6 \)
40 \( \text{fxg5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \)
40 \( \text{Bxg5} \) leaves the c-pawn undefended.

41 \( \text{Qg}4 \) 1-0

Black resigned because either the c-pawn or the g-pawn (perhaps even both) will fall. One threat is 42 \( \text{Qe}5+ \).

Now an example of a much different treatment of this variation.

Gelman-Lastin
Russian Junior Championship 1996

1 e4 c6 2 d3 d5 3 Qd2 g6 4 g3 Qg7 5 Qg2 e5 6 Qf3 Qe7 7 0-0 0-0 8 Qe1 Qd7

For 8 \( \text{d}4 \) see the preceding game. Wojtkiewicz-Bronstein. Alternative moves are:

a) 8 \( \text{f}6 \) defends the e5-pawn but cannot be as good as the text. Ker-
tesz-Heinbuch, Bonn 1995, continued 9 b3 d4 (Black pushes now that the thematic \( c2 \)-c3 is no longer playable) 10 a4 a5 11 Qc4 c5 12 \( \text{Qh}4 \) and White threatened the kingside thrust \( f2-f4 \) without the
prospect of Black carrying out the usual queenside expansion Consequently Black hit out with 12 g5 13 0xf5 0xf5 14 exf5 xf5, resulting in a slight edge to White after 15 0xb7 0a7 16 0g2 0a6 17 0f3 0e6 18 0c6 with a grip on the light squares, better pawn structure and the constant threat of f2-f4

b) 8 0c7 covers e5 while keeping Black's options open

b1) 9 0e2 steps up the pressure on the e5-pawn. Now after 9 d4 it is a matter of which queen, if any, is the better placed. Black should not allow his queen to be exposed on the c-file following c2-c3xd4, while the white queen might see more action on c2 or b3. Otherwise Black simply brings another piece to the rescue with 9 0d7, which was seen in Floegel-Bobzin, German League 1994. There followed 10 exd5 exd5 (10 0xd5 11 0e4 favours White) 11 c4, and now pressing on with 11 d4 as in the main game loses a pawn to 12 0xd4 due to the pin on the e-file. Instead 11 dxc4 12 0xc4 0xc6 13 0d2 f6 14 0ac1 0b8 15 d4? temporarily sacrificed a pawn in order to open the position, and Black was punished for weakening his kingside after 15 exd4 16 b4 0de5 17 0dxe5 0xe5 18 0xd4

b2) 9 e3

b21) 9 a5 is aimed at dissuading White from taking a claim to the queenside with b2-b4. Although the 10 b4 is indeed a viable reply — see the note to White's 9th move, There is also a slower, creeping form of expansion available to White. 10 b3 b6 11 0c2 0d8 12 0b2 0a6 13 d4 0d7 14 a3 with an edge. It is worth remembering what now happened in Oil-Wells, Antwerp 1996, where Black played 15 0ac8, walking into a pin after 16 0h3 White should be on the lookout for this possibility

b22) The main idea of tucking the queen on c7 is to facilitate the occupation of the d-file after an early pawn exchange in the centre. 9 dxe4 10 dxe4 0d8 11 0c2 (D)

Although there is nothing terribly wrong with this simplistic plan, which is seen most often at club level, Black can look forward to no more than a cramped, defensive position requiring a certain amount of manouevring. Despite the fact that most of the pieces stand on the same squares, White's extra move and superior knights (the e7-knight is misplaced) afford him persistent pressure. In fact many players experience difficulty addressing the weak spot upon which much of the middlegame struggle is based — the d6-square. In Gluenke-Bilek, German League 1983, the experienced Bilek skillfully limited his opponent to a narrow lead 11 0d7 12 a4 0f8 13 0c4 0e6 14 0b1 f6 15 b3 0c8 16 0a3 0d7 17 0ad1 Nevertheless White's game is so much easier to conduct, as he can clamp down on the key d6-square with natural developing moves, and there
is always the chance that Black is not up to the task of defending while simultaneously avoiding dangerous passivity.

9 exd5!

The "" is given because the capture gives the variation a more lively flavour. However, the traditional 9 b4 is fine 9...a5 (Black cannot really afford to ignore the pawn, e.g. 9...b6 10 a3 c6 11 c3 dxc3 12 a3 c6 13 c3 f6 14 d4 with an obvious advantage to White, Bronstein-Saify, Tallinn 1973). Now in Damjanovic-Kosic, Novi Sad 1995 White came up with a worthy alternative to b4xa5, which has been virtually an automatic choice when these two pawns come into contact. Instead he essayed 10 c3! (D)

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

Wanting to keep a pawn on b4 is sensible. Given the opportunity White will hit Black's centre with a timely d3-d4 or e4xd5, which is why Kosic elected to undermine his opponent's influence on the d4-square 10 axb4 cxb4 11 c3 c3 12 c3 a6 12 dxe4 13 dxe4 b5 14 c3 c3 15 c3 dxe4 drives the bishop back, though 16 c4 followed by c1-c3 and Ke1-c1 to monitor the backward c-pawn and the c5-square is more pleasant for White 13 a4 c7 14 b5 dxe4 15 c5 e4 16 h3 f3 17 f3 cxb5 18 axb5 e6 19 f1 and Black had to be careful on the light squares. In fact he eventually came unstuck on the a2-f7 diagonal 9...exd5 10 c4 (D)

This refreshing approach is another example of the efficacy of a change of pace in some of the quieter lines of the KIA. That this aggressive treatment of the position has taken until the mid-1990s to be "noticed" is interesting. Some KIA practitioners tend to stick too rigidly to the tried and tested lines, and it is not really surprising to see that this enterprising game was played in the Russian junior championships. For an appreciation of White's opening strategy it is not necessary to carry out a close inspection of the diagram position. The KIA is not considered to be too dangerous a weapon against the solid Caro-Kann Defence, due in no small part to the erection of the c6-d5 barrier which serves to lessen the influence of White's bishop on the long h1-a8 diagonal. Gelman's uncompromising challenge on Black's pawn centre is designed to force open the diagonal, thus presenting the
fianchettoed bishop with a view of Black’s queenside. As we saw above in ‘b1’ in the note to Black’s 8th move, 10 dxc4 11 Qxc4 puts the black centre under considerable strain, e.g. 11 Qc6 12 Qe3 followed by d3-d4, or 11 f6 12 d4 — in either case White is better placed to exploit the removal of the centre pawns and the subsequent open lines. Hence Black’s next

10 ... d4
11 b4!

Natural and best. White’s queenside majority must make its presence felt if the change to the layout of pawns in the centre is to have any positive affect. Ironically, White has the luxury of experience to help him in the right direction, for we have found ourselves in a reversed Modern Benoni in which the extra tempo proves rather useful. Black, too, is not without attacking chances on the kingside, and the talented junior shows us how to drum up dangerous counterplay.

11 ... h6

Black makes no secret of his intention to concentrate his efforts on his own pawn majority. At the moment he is tied down to the defence of the e5-pawn, so the first phase of the strategy is to post the knight on g6. Another path to an interesting game begins on the other wing — 11 a5!? after which 12 a3 exb4 13 axb4 Qe8 seems to help Black, which leaves 12 b5 momentarily relinquishing White’s hold on c5. Bangiev evaluates 12 f6 13 a3 Qe8 14 c5 as slightly better for White. The d6-square beckons and 12 f6 opened the a2-g8 diagonal.

12 a4

The impatient 12 a3 prepares to open the a3-f8 diagonal but runs into 12 a6, so the text supports b5 and defends the bishop once it comes to a3. However, 12 b5!? looks as good as Gelman’s move, as the threat of actively developing the bishop gives Black more to think about.

12 ... g5!?

Freeing g6, from where the knight both protects e5 and covers f4 and h4 — two squares which could prove significant in the event of an all-out attack. Also possible is 12 f5 13 a3 Qe8 14 b5 when White has the better chances, having made more progress on the queenside. It is true that the f-pawn will play a part in Black’s offensive, but for the moment he is happy to leave the rook where it is, for in certain circumstances he can leave it hanging on f8.

13 a3 Qg6 (D)

Consistent Premature is 13 g4 14 Qh4 f5 15 b5, which is awkward for Black. Faced with the inevitable march of Black’s f-pawn, White must now choose between two courses of action — opening the a3-f8 diagonal or sending his knight to d6.
14 Qe4

The knight heads to d6 while it can. The other option, 14 b5!? favours White after 14 Qe8 15 Qe4.
but White was probably not content with the following variation —
14 g4! 15 Exf8 Exf8 16 Dh4
Qxh4 17 gxh4 Nh4 18 a5 Kg6 19
a6 Bb8 with a messy position
14
15  
I prefer 14 g4, when 15 f6 f5
16 Qd6 produces a position with
chances for both sides. Black's plan
in the game is to break through on
the f-file, which is one of the rea-
sons why he left the rook in place.
15 Qd6 e4?!
This turns out to be a faulty — if
tempting — continuation, suggest-
ing that the previous note (14 g4)
is the way to hold the balance, or
perhaps 15 g4 now
16 dxe4 fxe4
17 Qxd4
17 Qxe4 is tidy and strong. The
following variation is typical of how
play might continue: 17 d3 18 Qc1
Qd5 19 Qxe5 Qxe5 20 Qb2! Qg4
(20 Qf3+ 21 Qxf3 Qxb2 22 Qb1
followed by Qbl-b3xd3) 21 Qd2
Qf3+ 22 Qxf3 Qxf3 23 Qxg7 and
Black does not have time for
23 Qd7 in view of 24 Qxh6 Qh3
25 Qxg5+
17 ...
18 Qxe8
White does not have the time for
18 c5? Qd3
18 ...
Qf6 (D)

The battle has reached boiling
point. Black is committed to going
forward. For his part, White must be
prepared to put up with these com-
lications when he upsets the bal-
ance in the centre with the capture
on d5
19 Qd6
Interesting is 19 Qxe4? Qxf2+
20 Qh1 Qxg8 21 Qxb7 (21 Qe6
Qf7 22 Qd5 is also good for White)
21 Qxe8 22 Qd5+ Qh7 23 Qe6
19 ...
20 Qh1 Qd3
21 Qxe4 Qxd4
21 Qxd4 22 Qxd4 Qf2+ 23 Qg1
Qxd1 24 Qxd1 Qxd1 25 Qxd4
22 Qxd3
After 22 Qd1 Qe3! 23 Qxe3
Qd2+ 24 Qg1 Qxd1 25 Qxd1
Qxe3+ 26 Qh1 White is in control
in the ending
22 ...
Qxa1(D)

The position is complex and
neither king is immune from attack,
yet after White's next move
23 h4

the players agreed a draw! It is
possible that the early detour from
better chartered waters and the
ensuing complications caused both
sides to use up most of their time.
Anyway, (23 h4) 23 gxh4? loses to
24 \( \text{Bg}4 \), but Black has 23...\( \text{Ad}8 \)! 24 \( \text{hxg}5 \) \( \text{hxg}5 \) 25 \( \text{Re}6 \) \( \text{Ef}6 \) and the game goes on. Had White not been too concerned about giving his king some breathing space he might have found 23 \( \text{Rf}6 \), when Black's king needs attention, e.g. 23...\( \text{Rf}6 \) 24 \( \text{Rxf}6 \) \( \text{Wxf}6 \) 25 \( \text{Wd}5+ \) \( \text{Rh}8 \) for 25...\( \text{Rf}8 \) 26 \( \text{Rf}5 \) \( \text{Rd}8 \) 27 \( \text{b}5+ \) [after so much promise the b-pawn finally contributes!] 27...\( \text{Rc}8 \) 28 \( \text{Rd}6+ \) 26 \( \text{Rf}7+ \) \( \text{Rg}7 \) 27 \( \text{Rxb}7 \). 23...\( \text{Rf}5 \) is forced. Then 24 \( \text{Rx}e5 \)!? \( \text{Rx}e5 \) 25 \( \text{Wd}5+ \) \( \text{Rh}7 \) 26 \( \text{Wxe}5 \) gives White three active minor pieces for two rooks.

Stein-Hort
Los Angeles 1968

1 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 2 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 3 \( \text{Qd}2 \) \( \text{g}6 \) 4 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{Ag}7 \) 5 \( \text{Ag}2 \) \( \text{e}5 \) 6 \( \text{Qg}3 \) \( \text{Qe}7 \)

6...\( \text{Qh}6 \)?! neglects the centre and was rightly punished in Rubi-Barcza, Budapest 1971. The game continued 7 0-0 0-0 8 \( \text{exd}5 \)! (Stein-Barcza, Caracas 1970, went 8 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 9 \( \text{Qb}3 \) \( \text{dxe}4 \) 10 \( \text{dxe}4 \) \( \text{Wxd}1 \) 11 \( \text{Rxd}1 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 12 \( \text{Qf}1 \) \( \text{f}7 \) 13 \( \text{Qe}3 \) \( \text{Qg}4 \) 14 \( \text{Qg}2 \) \( \text{Qd}7 \) 15 h3 \( \text{Qe}6 \)! 16 \( \text{Qbd}4 \)!! \( \text{exd}4 \) 17 \( \text{Qxd}4 \) f5 18 \( \text{Qxe}6 \) \( \text{Qxa}1 \) 19 \( \text{Qxf}8 \) \( \text{Qxf}8 \) 20 \( \text{Qxa}1 \) \( \text{fxe}4 \) 21 a4! with a clear plus for White) 8...\( \text{exd}5 \) 9 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 10 \( \text{exd}5 \) \( \text{Wxd}5 \) 11 \( \text{Qc}4 \) \( \text{We}6 \) 12 \( \text{Qxh}6 \)! \( \text{Qxh}6 \) 13 \( \text{Qxe}5 \)! \( \text{Qxe}5 \) 14 \( \text{Qe}1 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 15 \( \text{f}4 \) and White had a very active game.

7 \( \text{b}0 \) \( \text{b}0 \) 8 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{Qd}7 \) 9 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 10 \( \text{Qb}2 \) \( \text{Qb}7 \) 11 \( \text{Qe}1 \) \( \text{Qe}8 \) 12 \( \text{Qh}3 \) (D)

Over the last few moves White has been indirectly attacking the \( \text{e}5 \)-pawn. Black now decides to offer a sacrifice rather than remain on the defensive.

A good choice. After 14 \( \text{Qxd}7 \) \( \text{Wxd}7 \) 15 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) \( \text{Qxe}5 \) 16 \( \text{Qxe}5 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) 17 \( \text{Qxe}8+ \) \( \text{Qxe}8 \) Black would have excellent compensation for the pawn by playing against White's light-square weaknesses. The game continuation, however, helps White maintain an advantage by granting him a dangerous pawn majority on the queenside.

14 ... \( \text{d}4 \)

Not 14...\( \text{dxc}4 \)? 15 \( \text{Qxc}4 \) when Black's weak \( \text{c} \)-pawn will cause him serious strategical problems.

15 \( \text{Qc}1 \) \( \text{f}5 \)

Black must also attempt to roll his pawns down the board.

16 \( \text{Qg}2 \) \( \text{Qf}6 \)

Denying White access to \( \text{e}6 \), e.g. 16...\( \text{Wd}6 \)? 17 \( \text{Wb}3 \) \( \text{Wc}6 \) 18 \( \text{Qg}5 \)!

17 \( \text{c}5 \)!

Helped by the threat to win material with 18 \( \text{c}6 \)! (18...\( \text{Qxe}6 \) 19 \( \text{b}5 \) White forces either a supported passed pawn or a favourable opening up of the position.

17 ... \( \text{h}5 \)

The lesser evil, as 17...\( \text{bxc}5 \) 18 \( \text{bxc}5 \) \( \text{d}5 \) (not 18...\( \text{dxc}5 \) 19 \( \text{Qb}3 \) \( \text{Qc}6 \) gives Black another unpleasant choice — to relinquish the bishop pair or allow \( \text{Qc}4 \)-\( \text{d}6 \) (note that 19...\( \text{Qc}8 \) is met by 20 \( \text{Qxd}4 \))
when 20...exd4 loses the now undefended rook on e8).
18  ëb3
Intending an occupation of a5 in the near future.
18  ...  ëd5
19  a4!
Now after 19...bxa4 20 ëa5 White will follow up the recapture of the front a-pawn with an attack on its remaining partner on a7. Black opts to saddle himself with a weak b-pawn instead.
19  ...  a6
20  ëa5  ëc6
Black thematically blocks the path of the passed pawn, but perhaps better was 20...ëg7, with a great game for White.
21  axb5
Also good is 21 ëxe5! ëxe5 22 ëxd5+ ëxd5 23 ëb3 ëxb4 24 ëa3!, but Stein's way of playing the combination is more pleasing.
21  ...  axb5
22  ëxe5!! (D)

White's brave c-pawn marches on.

24  ...  ëf7
25  ëxe8+  ëxe8
26  ëb7!
Threatening to win the exchange with ëb7-d6.
26  ...  ëe5
27  ëxd5  ëxd5
28  ëc5  ëf7
28...êe6 29 ëc7 is crushing, e.g.
29...êc8 30 ëe2.
29  ëf3  g6?!  
Ambitious, although after the better 29...êa6 30 ëxb5 ëc7 31 ëb4 White is winning.
30  c7!  g4
Because of Black's 29th.
30...êe7 allows 31 ëxf5. Now Black does succeed in winning the c-pawn, but White has switched his attentions to a kingside attack.
31  ëd1  ëc7
32  ëd2  ëb6
32...êe5 offers more hope of prolonging the game. Now White goes on the warpath.
33  ëxb5  ëxd3
Against 33...êxb7 the best reply is 34 ëxb4!, not 34 ëxb4?? ëb3! with a draw! Now, despite being in time-trouble, White skilfully paves his way through the complications to emerge with a won game.
34  ëd6  ëd7
35  ëg5+  ëh8
36  ëf6+  ëg8
37  ëg5+  ëh8
38  ëxe8!  ëxe8
39  ëxf5
Unfortunately for Black, Stein's last defends against 39...êe1+ 40 ëg2 ëf2+.
39  ...  ëe5
40  ëxb6  ëf3+
41  ëg2!
96 KIA vs Caro-Kann Defence

Even now White must be careful
--- 41 \( \text{f1??} \) \( \text{e1} \) + 42 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{wg1} \) mate
41 ... \( \text{wa8} \)
Black could resign here
42 \( \text{wf6} \) + \( \text{g8} \)
43 \( \text{we6} \) + \( \text{h8} \)
Or 43 \( \text{wb8} \) 44 \( \text{a3} \) + \( \text{wa3} \) 45 \( \text{b8} \) + \( \text{g7} \) 46 \( \text{g8} \) mate
44 \( \text{wc6} \)
1-0

Fischer-Ibrahimoglu
Siegen Olympiad 1970

1 e4 e6 2 d3 d5 3 \( \text{d2} \) g6 4 \( \text{gf3} \) 
5 g7 5 g3 \( \text{f6} \)
Instead of spending time with
5 e5 and 6 \( \text{e7} \) Black develops
simply. This plan is less ambitious
than forming a pawn centre, and
White is guaranteed a slight edge
6 \( \text{g2} \) 0-0
7 0-0 \( \text{g4} (D) \)

Black develops his problem piece
The alternative 7 \( \text{dx}e4 \) transposes
to the next game
8 h3
Also possible is 8 \( \text{e1} \), as Black’s
last move intends to concede the
bishop pair anyway
8 ... \( \text{xf3} \)
9 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{bd7} \)

10 \( \text{we2} \) \( \text{dxe4} \)
11 \( \text{dx}e4 \) \( \text{wc7} \)
White was threatening 12 e5 fol-
lowed by 13 e6, opening the e-file
and weakening Black’s light
squares
12 a4
This is the first stage of a plan de-
gigned to attack Black’s queenside
White gains space and prepares to
either tie Black down to the defence
of the a-pawn or force positional
concessions
12 ... \( \text{ad8} \)
13 \( \text{b3} \) b6
Black had to do something about
Fischer’s next move 13 a5 leaves
the queenside pawns weak and sus-
cetable to attack from now until the
endgame 13 a6 is also a somewhat
unattractive move to make, as 14
a5\( ^1 \) eyes the hole on b6 and fixes
the queenside. Were Black to eventu-
ally play b7-b5, White could then
capture en passant with a5xb6, thus
saddling Black with a very weak
a-pawn
14 \( \text{c3} \) e5
After this advance White’s pieces
are denied the use of d4 and his
queen’s bishop no longer pressures
b6. Black can also avoid the split-
ting of his queenside pawns.
Nevertheless, one of the Golden
Rules of chess — which is often not
fully appreciated — advises that
“every pawn move automatically
creates a weakness.” In this case the
new hole on b5 helps White stay on
top
15 a5 e5
Black prevents a future f2-f4 and
e4-e5
16 \( \text{d2} \) \( \text{e8} \! \)
Heading for c7 to defend the
white squares on the queenside
17 axb6 axb6 (D)
28 \( \text{b8!} \)

Fischer crowns his accurate positional punishment of Black’s fourteenth move with the threat of 29 \( \text{xd7} \text{xd7} \) 30 \( \text{xd7} \text{xd7} \) 31 \( \text{xb6} \) Thus Black is forced into a horribly passive position

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

Unfortunately for Black 28 \( \text{f6} \) allows 29 \( \text{c6} \text{b8} \) 30 \( \text{a7} \) with pressure on the seventh rank

29 \( \text{a8} \text{d6} \)

30 \( \text{d1!} \)

Highlighting the power of White’s pieces His rook — helped by the king’s bishop — is the master of the queenside, his queen enjoys great freedom of movement and now even the remaining bishop is about to play its part It is important to note that White’s last move does not permit his opponent to retrieve the pressure with 30 \( \text{a7} \) as 31 \( \text{a7} \text{a7} \) 32 \( \text{xd6} \) wins a piece In the meantime the black pieces are huddled together on the queenside, so he sets about unravelling them

30 ... \( \text{c6} \)

31 \( \text{d2!} \text{h5} \)

Vacating \( \text{h7} \) for the king Not 31 \( \text{b8?} \) 32 \( \text{h6}+ \text{g8} \) 33 \( \text{xc6} \)

31 \( \text{xc6} \) 34 \( \text{xb8}+ \text{xb8} \) 35 \( \text{d8}+ \), or 32 \( \text{d6} \) 33 \( \text{g5}+ \text{e6} \) 34 \( \text{xb8} \) and 35 \( \text{c4+} \)

32 \( \text{h6}+ \text{h7} \)

33 \( \text{g5} \)

Threatening 34 \( \text{f6} \)

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

34 \( \text{xb8} \text{xb8} \)

35 \( \text{f6!} \)

White’s invasion is almost complete He still has three active pieces compared with Black’s spectators

35 ... \( \text{c6} \)

Not 35 \( \text{d7?} \) 36 \( \text{xd7} \text{xd7} \)

36 \( \text{d5} \text{a7} \)
If 36 $\text{Qd8}$ 37 $\text{Qxd8} \text{Wxd8}$ 38 $\text{Wxf7+}$

37 $\text{Qe8!}$

The winning move. Black's position is overloaded

37 ... $\text{Qg8}$

38 $\text{Qxf7+}$ $\text{Qxf7}$

39 $\text{Wxd6}$ 1-0

Balashov-Tisdall
Reykjavik 1989

1 e4 c6 2 d3 d5 3 $\text{Qd2}$ g6 4 $\text{Qf3}$

A committal but solid continuation. White no longer has to worry about his opponent creating complications in the near future after this simplifying central exchange

6 $\text{dx e4}$ $\text{Qf6}$

7 $\text{Qg2}$ 0-0

8 0-0 $\text{Qa6}$ ($D$)

Caro-Kann players often have problems developing the queenside minor pieces when faced with the KIA, particularly the queen's bishop (in the previous game Black traded it off at the earliest opportunity). This drawback and the symmetrical nature of the pawn structure give White a persistent and safe advantage. The game Bagirov-Scherbakov, Budapest 1989, continued 8 $\text{Qbd7}$ 9 e5 $\text{Qd5}$ 10 $\text{exd5}$, disrupting Black's pawns. After

10 $\text{fxe6}$ 11 $\text{We2}$ $\text{Wf8}$ 12 $\text{Qg5}$

(White loses his queen after 12 $\text{Wxe6} 7 2 \text{Qe5}$) 12 $\text{Qe7}$ 13 $\text{Qf3}$

e5 14 $\text{Wc4} e4$ 15 $\text{Wxe4} \text{Qf6}$ 16 $\text{Wb4}$

$\text{Qf6}$ 17 $\text{Qe1}$ $\text{Qxg5}$ 18 $\text{Qxg5}$ White was well on top

9 $\text{Wc2}$

9 e5 was seen in Stein-Portisch, Moscow 1967, with White retaining a slight pull in the middlegame after 9 $\text{Qd5}$ 10 $\text{Qb3} Qg4$ 11 $\text{We2} Wc8$

12 $\text{Qe1} \text{Qac7}$ 13 $\text{Qd2}$ $\text{f6}$ 14 $\text{exf6}$

$\text{Qxf6}$ 15 $c3 \text{Qf7}$ 16 $\text{Wc4} Qf5$ 17

$\text{Wc4} \text{Qb6}$ 18 $\text{Wf1} \text{Qa4}$ 19 $\text{Qc1} \text{Qd7}$

20 $\text{Qe5} \text{Qxe5}$ 21 $\text{Qxe5}$ Balashov prefers to wait for Black to show his hand before pushing the e-pawn

9 ... $\text{Wf5}$

10 e5

Black may have been toying with the idea of transferring his queen over to the kingside with $\text{Wd5}$-$b5$, so this must have helped White decide to make this space-gaining move. The attacked knight will now be chased across the board to join its passive partner

10 ... $\text{Qd5}$

The best square $\text{Qe8}$ looks ugly and 10 $\text{Qd7} e6$ saddles Black with a weak e-pawn

11 $\text{Qb3}$ $\text{Wc7}$

12 e4

Staking a claim to central territory and simultaneously putting the question to the knight. Now 12 $\text{Qdb4}$ a3 wins for White, so Black's next is forced

12 ... $\text{Qb6}$

13 $\text{Qf4}$

White introduces the threat of 14 e6 by lining the bishop up with the enemy queen

13 ... $\text{Qe6}$

Usefully blocking while developing Black also threatens the c-pawn and prepares to bring a rook to the d-file
14 \textit{Bac1} \textit{Bad8}
15 \textit{Bbd4}

Now that White’s forces are harmoniously placed he adds pressure to the e6-square. If he is allowed a timely \textit{Bxe6} then Black will be left with a couple of weak e-pawns and no promise of freeing his king’s bishop with \textit{f7-f6}
15 ... \textit{Bgb4}

Inviting the thrust e5-e6, although with a more active game than a few moves ago Black would no longer be troubled so much by this push. Because Black has a somewhat cramped position White elects to take an advantage in the form of the bishop pair more space and excellent chances of engineering a kingside attack.
16 \textit{h3} \textit{Bxf3}

Such an exchange helps relieve the pressure on the defender and is better than dropping the bishop back to c8 whence it would have a future with few prospects
17 \textit{Bxf3} \textit{e6}
18 \textit{Bb3} \textit{h6}
19 \textit{h4}

All three of White’s minor pieces are ready to begin action on the kingside. As for Black, his knights are at the moment lacking any significant influence on the game, and if he does not act quickly in the centre or on the queenside, then White will be left to build up threats against the black king.
19 ... \textit{Bgb4}

Black correctly begins his diversionary tactics. The immediate threat is to jump in with \textit{Bb4-d3} which explains White’s next
20 \textit{Bc3} \textit{e5}

Improving his position further. Suddenly the queen’s knight is heading (via c6) for d4
21 \textit{Bc1} \textit{Bd7}

22 \textit{a3}

It is true that White seems to be helping the knight’s invasion, but with the queen tied to the defence of the a-pawn it is not possible to pressurize the black h-pawn and concentrate fire-power on the kingside.
22 ... \textit{Bce6}
23 \textit{Bwe3} \textit{Bd4} (D)

Black has accomplished his aim. Even 24 \textit{Bxh6}\textsuperscript{9} is now ruled out thanks to 24 \textit{Bxf5}. We have reached the point of the game in which White must accelerate the pace or relinquish his initiative. Balashov is up to the task.
24 \textit{g4!}

Unlike many openings, the KIA offers White a very good opportunity of troubling the enemy king (especially with such a pawn advance), often without fear of a dangerous counter-attack in another sector of the board. Apart from intending h4-h5 White’s aggressive move also deprives Black the use of the f5-square.
24 ... \textit{Bfh7}

In view of what follows it may have been a good idea to play 24 \textit{Bxf3+}, although White would still be able to use e4 for his king’s bishop. But exchanging knights is a difficult decision to arrive at when
one considers the number of moves Black invested to establish the outpost on d4.

25 Qd2

White prepares to transfer his knight to e4, ignoring its ostensibly powerful counterpart.

25 ... Axe8

Black’s weak f6-square needs covering, so in anticipation of the arrival of a knight on e4 Black releases his queen from the defence of the c-pawn.

26 Qe4 Wd8

The first strike. Moving the king not only loses the h-pawn, but leaves the knight firmly entrenched in the black camp, hence his choice.

27 ... Axf6

28 exf6 h5

With all of Black’s pieces on the queenside, a successful breakthrough from White is inevitable if Black follows a sit and wait policy.

29 gxh5 Wxh6

30 Axe5 Wxh4

31 hxg6+ fxg6 (D)

32 Wh6

A wonderful move with which White secures victory. The queen clears the way for the queen’s rook to come to the h-file.

32 ... Wg4

33 A.h3+ Sg8

34 Wh6 1-0

This time the white queen makes the final threat — that of 35 Wh8+ Qf7 36 Qh7 mate. Unfortunately for Black there is no adequate defence.

Ljubojevic-Karpov
Amsterdam 1988

1 e4 c6 2 d3 e5!? 3 Qd2 d6 4 Qg3 d6

When Black refrains from playing an early ...d7-d5 the lack of tension in the centre makes it easier for both sides to concentrate on development. White usually takes advantage of this by gaining space on the queenside.

5 e3 g5

Developing the bishop on e7 is also possible, but not as active as the fianchetto.

6 Qg2 Qg7

7 0-0 0-0

8 a4 Ab7

9 a5! A.e8

10 b4 A.h8

11 A.b2 (D)

Black is in danger of being overrun on the queenside, so the ex-World Champion grants White the a-file in return for development of the queen’s bishop and a future challenge with ...Ab8-a8.
12 axb6
The only way for White to play for an advantage. Against other moves Black continues ...a7-a6, ...\( \text{c8-b7} \) and ...c6-c5 or ...d6-d5.

12 ... axb6
13 \( \text{a7} \) \( \text{b7} \)
14 c4 \( \text{c7} \)
15 \( \text{wb3} \) \( \text{a8} \)
16 \( \text{xa8} \) \( \text{xa8} \)
17 \( \text{xa1} \) d5?! 

Understandably Black must have felt uncomfortably cramped, but a preparatory move such as 17...h6 was better if Black wanted to break out with ...d6-d5.

18 exd5 exd5
19 \( \text{g5!} \) \( \text{d6} \)

If 19...h6 White can secure a safe advantage after 20 exd5 hxg5 21 d6 \( \text{xd6} \) 22 \( \text{xa8} \), or enter into complications with 20 \( \text{xf7!} \) \( \text{xf7} \) 21 exd5 \( \text{d6} \) (or 21...\( \text{f8} \) 22 d6!), followed by \( \text{xa8} \) 22 \( \text{e4} \).

20 exd5 \( \text{xd5} \)
Not 20...\( \text{xd5?} \) 21 \( \text{xa8} \) \( \text{xa8} \) 22 \( \text{xd5} \) with a won game for White.

21 \( \text{e4!} \) \( \text{c6} \)
22 \( \text{e3! (D)} \)

22 ... \( \text{xb3} \)
23 \( \text{xc6} \) h6
24 \( \text{a3!} \) hxg5
25 \( \text{xb3} \)

In many variations of the KIA White's build-up of pressure results in his winning the bishop pair. Once this is achieved White's initiative should then be sufficient to extract further gains. Black's task now is to transfer his bishop from g7 to the vulnerable queenside.

25 ... \( \text{f8} \)
26 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{e6} \)
27 \( \text{b5} \) \( \text{g7} \)
28 h3 \( \text{e7} \)
29 \( \text{e3} \)

Ljubojevic frees his rook from the defence of the b-pawn so as to regain control of the a-file.

29 ... \( \text{d6} \)
30 \( \text{a3} \) \( \text{b8} \)
31 \( \text{a8} \) \( \text{e7} \)
32 \( \text{d2!} \)

Intending 33 \( \text{c4} \), hitting the g-pawn and threatening 34 \text{xb6} \text{xb6} 35 \text{xb8}. Apart from being in a terrible position Black was also quite short of time.

32 ... \( \text{e4} \)
33 d4 \( \text{c7} \)
34 \( \text{e8} \) \( \text{f8} \)
35 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{h7} \)
Not 35...\( \text{e6} \) 36 d5.
36 \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{f8} \)
37 b5 (D)
1-0
Black lost on time here, but a brief examination of the position shows us that White is winning.

Black Plays ...\textbf{d6}

In the following game Black does not fianchetto his king’s bishop but supports his central advances in another fashion.

Anand-Malaniuk
Frunze 1987

1 e4 c6 2 d3 d5 3 \textbf{d2} e5 4 \textbf{g3} \textbf{d6} (D)

By adopting a more classical approach Black not only saves a tempo by leaving out ...g7-g6 but also keeps watch over the queenside (this is sometimes difficult with the bishop on g7 being blocked in by the e5-pawn).

5 ... \textbf{g6}

5 \textbf{e2} is worth consideration, and does have the merit of bypassing Black’s possibility mentioned in the next note because of the indirect threat to the e-pawn. Ljubojevic-Bouaziz, Szirak Interzonal 1987, continued 5...\textbf{e7} g3 \textbf{f6} 7 \textbf{g2} 0-0 8 0-0 \textbf{dxe4} 9 \textbf{dxe4} \textbf{d7} 10 \textbf{xc4} with a minuscule edge to White.

5 ... \textbf{f6}

An ambitious continuation is 5...\textbf{e7}, intending a quick strike with ...f7-f5. Not surprisingly this may prove to be a somewhat hopeful plan, and after 6 \textbf{g2} 0-0 7 0-0 f5 White should follow fundamental principles and react immediately by hitting back in the centre with 8 c4!, e.g. 8...\textbf{dxe4} 9 \textbf{dxe4} \textbf{d6} 10 a3 \textbf{f4} 11 b4 when White’s initiative on the queenside and pressure against the black e-pawn outweigh Black’s progress on the kingside.

In the game Schuyler-Song, Chicago 1989, Black gave the game another character by pushing his f-pawn only one square, but White obtained a better game: 7...\textbf{e6} 8 a3 \textbf{e6} 9 \textbf{e1} \textbf{d7} 10 \textbf{d4!} \textbf{g4} 11 c4! \textbf{exd4} 12 \textbf{cx5} c5 13 \textbf{b3} \textbf{g6} 14 \textbf{xe4} and White eventually broke through with e4-e5.

6 \textbf{g2} 0-0
7 0-0 \textbf{e8}

The most popular home for the rook. Black experimented with 7...\textbf{w7}!? in Howell-Wells, Swansea 1987, preferring to use the d-file for the rook. There followed 8 \textbf{e1} \textbf{e6} 9 c3! (this makes d3 a target and invites...\textbf{d8}. 9 h3 is preferable, when 9...\textbf{d8} 10 \textbf{e2} \textbf{bd7} allows 11 \textbf{g5}) 9...\textbf{b6} 10 \textbf{e2} \textbf{bd7} 11 \textbf{h3} \textbf{b6} 12 \textbf{d4} \textbf{f3} 13 \textbf{f1} \textbf{d5} 14 \textbf{f5} \textbf{xf5} 15 \textbf{exf5} e4! and White found himself on the defensive. In fact mass exchanges did not loosen Black’s grip on the game: 16 \textbf{dxe4} \textbf{dxe4} 17 \textbf{dxe} 2 \textbf{d3} 18 \textbf{d1} c3! 19 \textbf{xe3} \textbf{c5} 20 \textbf{e2} (not 20 \textbf{f3} \textbf{c4} 21 \textbf{dxc1} 21 \textbf{dxc1} \textbf{dxc2} 20...\textbf{d3} 21 \textbf{f3} \textbf{e3} 22 \textbf{xc3} \textbf{d3} 23 \textbf{d4} \textbf{d4} 24 \textbf{dxe4} \textbf{d6} 25 \textbf{e2} \textbf{dxe1} 26 \textbf{dxe1} \textbf{d2} 27 \textbf{c2} \textbf{d8} 28 \textbf{d2} \textbf{d2} 29 \textbf{d2} \textbf{d2} 30 \textbf{c2} \textbf{c3} and Black went on to win.

8 \textbf{h3}

Once again Black will have difficulties developing his queen’s bishop.

8 ... a5

A sensible move, as Black seems to do best looking to the queenside for play. Concentrating on the kingside with 8...əbd7 9 əe1 əf8 is also possible, although the plan of b2-b3 and əc1-b2 still leaves White slightly better.

9 əe1 dxe4

Without doubt the safest choice at Black’s disposal, aiming for equality by producing a symmetrical pawn structure. This is undoubtedly an improvement on 9...əa6, as in Sax-Martin, Hastings 1983/84, which saw White seize a safe advantage with 10 d4! dxe4 11 əxe5.

10 dxe4 əc5

11 c3?! An inaccuracy which Black immediately profits from. Better is 11 a4, preventing the following cramping advance.

11 ... a4! (D)

This move is not at all rare in several variations of this opening. White adds support to the e-pawn and threatens to put the knight on g4, whence further pressure will be added to f6 and h6 (and the e-pawn). If Black exchanges on g4 White then has an extra g-pawn (after h×g4) with which to throw at the enemy king’s pawn cover.

17 ... əe6

18 əe3 əed8!

Black takes over the d-file thanks to the fact that White is tied to the defence of his weak a2-pawn (19 a3 əb3!!).

19 əxd8 əxd8

20 əg4
Removing the irritating a-pawn is too dangerous 20 ∞xc5 ∞xc5 21 ∞xa4 ∞d2 hits both f2 and b2
20 ... ∞xg4
21 hxg4 b5
White's kingside attack lacks punch, so Black continues to improve his queenside. All this was made possible because of White's slip on move eleven
22 g5 hxg5
23 ∞xg5 f6
24 ∞e3 ∞d7!
White must keep the queens on the board or stand worse in an ending, so this clever move undermines Anand's defence of the e-pawn by threatening ∞d7-d3
25 ∞f1 ∞f7
26 e4
Better than the positionally suicidal 26 a3 ∞b3. This way White should eventually win back his pawn, leaving the c6- and a4-pawns as potential targets
26 ... bxe4
27 ∞xc5 ∞xc5
28 a3 ∞h7
Black vacates the a2-g8 diagonal in anticipation of White capturing on c4
29 ∞c1 ∞g6
Since it takes time for White to recoup his slight material loss, Black shifts his attentions to creating his opponent problems on the other flank
30 ∞g2
Black threatened 30 ∞xf5 followed by 31 ∞xg3+, so White promptly unpins his f2-pawn
30 ... ∞g5
31 ∞xc4 ∞d2 (D)

Ostensibly the killing blow, but Anand manages to stay in the game by giving up his queen for a rook and bishop
32 ∞xe6! ∞xc2
33 ∞xc2 ∞d4
34 ∞xc6 ∞d2
This time the black queen invades and threatens the f-pawn. Preventing this with 35 ∞xd4 gives Black a dangerous passed pawn after 35 exd4, so how does White survive?
35 ∞c7!
White's rook, bishop and knight work just as harmoniously as the black queen and bishop. Anand's threat is 36 ∞xg7+ ∞h8 37 ∞g8+ ∞h7 38 ∞g7+ Malaniuk gets in a few checks of his own, but there is nothing more
35...∞xf2+ 36 ∞h3 ∞f1+ 37 ∞g4 ∞d1+ 38 ∞h1+ 39 ∞g4 ∞xe4+ 40 ∞h3 ∞h1+ 41 ∞g4 ∞d1+ 42 ∞h4 ∞h1+ 43 ∞g4 ∞e4+ 44 ∞h3 ∞h1+ ½-½
5 Black plays \ldots d5 and \ldots \&g4

This system arises most commonly after the following sequence of moves:

1 \&f3 d5 2 g3 c6 3 \&g2 \&g4 (D)

The \&g4 variation is very popular with players of all levels. So often a piece with which Black has problems, the queen's bishop immediately finds a home, allowing Black the option of establishing a solid pawn centre with e6 without closing the bishop out of play.

When Black erects the c6-d5-e6 pawn wall, the king's knight usually comes to f6 and the bishop to e7, and after furthering his development Black might attempt to push forward with e6-e5. Using the same pawn structure, Black can also play \&f3-d6 and \&g8-e7, when the idea is that the freedom of the f-pawn should compensate for no longer attacking the e4-square.

White almost always hits the queen's bishop with h2-h3, giving Black the choice of whether or not to surrender the bishop pair. Generally this is only a good idea if the resulting simplification decreases White's attacking potential. It is better to preserve the tension and retreat to h5. Having said this, it is surprising how many masters make the mistake of voluntarily exchanging on f3. In general, White's space advantage and attacking possibilities give him a good game, and Black's position also lacks flexibility.

A more aggressive course of action for Black is the early advance e7-e5, taking a claim for a share of the space in the centre. White is then able to put pressure on the e-pawn, and the f5-square is available for the king's knight. This sometimes leads to Black simplifying by dxe4 or relieving the pressure on e5 by taking on f3, both of which are to White's advantage.

Another important feature of the \&g4 variation is Black's pin on the d1-h5 diagonal. Because the KIA centres around White pushing with e2-e4, a dual-purpose move here is \&e1. This is a good square, as not only does White escape the
pin, releasing the king’s knight to pressure e5 and, in the case of e7-e5 from Black, threatening \( \text{\text{Q}}f3\text{-}h4\text{-}f5, \) but also the queen helps support the advance of the e-pawn.

**White Plays an Early e4**

**Biyiasas-Vasiukov**

*Hastings 1978/79*

1 \( \text{\text{Q}}f3 \text{\text{Q}}f6 \text{2} \text{g3} \text{d5} \text{3} \text{\text{Q}}g2 \text{c6} \text{4} \text{0-0} \text{\text{Q}}g4 \text{5} \text{d3} \text{c6} \text{6} \text{\text{Q}}bd2 \text{\text{Q}}bd7 (D)\)

7 e4

White can also put the question to the bishop here with 7 h3. This should transpose to the game, but a surprising number of players exchange on \( f3 \) Vasyukov-Trufinovic, USSR vs Yugoslavia 1963 continued 7 h3 \( \text{\text{Q}}x\text{f3} \) 8 \( \text{\text{Q}}x\text{f3} \text{c5} \text{9} \text{\text{Q}}e1 \text{0-0} \text{10} \text{e4} \text{dxe}4 \text{11} \text{dxe}4 \text{e5} \text{12} \text{\text{Q}}g5 \text{h6} \text{13} \text{\text{Q}}d2 \text{\text{Q}}e8 \text{14} \text{\text{Q}}d1 \text{\text{Q}}e7 \text{15} \text{\text{Q}}h4! with a good game for White. In the game Kogan-Serrawan, USA 1985, the American GM voluntarily gave White the bishop pair after 1 \( \text{\text{Q}}f3 \text{d5} \text{2} \text{g3} \text{c6} \text{3} \text{\text{Q}}g2 \text{\text{Q}}g4 \text{4} 0-0 \text{e6} \text{5} \text{d3} \text{\text{Q}}x\text{f3} \) The idea here is that the recapture \( \text{\text{Q}}x\text{f3} \) is not possible, but after \( 6 \text{\text{Q}}x\text{f3} \text{\text{Q}}f6 \text{7} \text{\text{Q}}d2 \text{\text{Q}}bd7 \text{8} \text{e4} \text{\text{Q}}c5 \text{9} \text{\text{Q}}e2 \text{dxe}4, \text{10} \text{\text{Q}}x\text{e4} \) (instead of 10 dxe4) would have given White the advantage.

7 ... \( \text{\text{Q}}e7 \)

8 \( \text{\text{Q}}e1 \)

An alternative is 8 \( \text{\text{Q}}e1 \). Then, after the moves 8 ... 0-0 9 h3 \( \text{\text{Q}}h5 \) we reach an important position. Continuing as in our main game with 10 e5 leaves White a little awkwardly placed after 10 \( \text{\text{Q}}e8 \) 11 \( \text{\text{Q}}h2 \text{\text{Q}}b6 \), so Gutman-Farago, Brussels 1986, went 10 \( \text{\text{Q}}h1 \text{\text{Q}}e8 \text{11} \text{\text{Q}}g1 \text{\text{Q}}c7 \text{12} \text{\text{Q}}d3 \text{dxe}4 \text{13} \text{dxe}4 \text{e5} \text{14} \text{\text{Q}}a5 \text{f4} \) with a slight advantage to White. The game Karasev-Klovran, Podolsk 1990 saw some interesting manoeuvring. Instead of 10 e5, White played 10 \( \text{\text{Q}}h2 \text{e5} \text{11} \text{\text{Q}}d3 \text{dxe}4 \text{12} \text{dxe}4 \text{\text{Q}}e8 \text{13} \text{\text{Q}}c1 \) (an excellent move which — like Gutman’s 14 \( \text{\text{Q}}a5 \) — highlights the usefulness of placing the queen on \( e1 \), now 13 \( f6 \) is met by 14 \( \text{\text{Q}}b3+ \) and 15 \( \text{\text{Q}}x\text{b7} \), while 13 \( \text{\text{Q}}c7 \) prevents the desired plan of \( \text{\text{Q}}e8-c7-e6 \) 13 \( \text{\text{Q}}d6 \text{14} \text{\text{Q}}e3 \text{\text{Q}}b6 \text{15} \text{\text{Q}}e2 \) with the better game, thanks to Black’s knight on \( d6 \) The rest of the game is entertaining 15 \( \text{\text{Q}}d8 \text{16} \text{\text{Q}}g4 \text{f6} \text{17} \text{h3} \text{\text{Q}}f7 \text{18} \text{\text{Q}}h4 \text{\text{Q}}f8 \text{19} \text{\text{Q}}d1 \text{\text{Q}}b5 \text{20} \text{\text{Q}}xd1 \text{dxe}4 \text{21} \text{\text{Q}}x\text{f6+} \text{gx}f6 \text{22} \text{\text{Q}}g4+ \text{\text{Q}}g7 \text{23} \text{\text{Q}}x\text{d7} \text{\text{Q}}d8 \text{24} \text{\text{Q}}e7 \text{\text{Q}}d1+ \text{25} \text{\text{Q}}h2 \text{\text{Q}}d4 \) (in return for the pawn Black has a bind, but White has seen further. Note that 25 \( \text{\text{Q}}x\text{f2} \text{26} \text{\text{Q}}e3 \text{\text{Q}}e2 \text{27} \text{\text{Q}}xd1 \text{\text{Q}}xd1 \text{28} \text{\text{Q}}x\text{b7} \) helps White) 26 \( \text{\text{Q}}a3 \text{\text{Q}}x\text{a}3 \text{27} \text{\text{Q}}xc5 \text{\text{Q}}x\text{c}5 \text{forced, e.g. 27} \text{\text{Q}}a5 \text{28} \text{b4} \text{\text{Q}}xa2 \text{29} \text{\text{Q}}x\text{d8+} \text{\text{Q}}f8 \text{30} \text{\text{Q}}x\text{f8} \text{mate} \) 28 \( \text{\text{Q}}x\text{c5} \text{\text{Q}}x\text{a}2 \text{29} \text{\text{Q}}f5 \text{\text{Q}}x\text{c}2 \text{30} \text{\text{Q}}e7+ \text{\text{Q}}f8 \text{31} \text{\text{Q}}d6 \text{\text{Q}}e8 \text{32} \text{\text{Q}}e8 \text{\text{Q}}f8 \text{33} \text{\text{Q}}x\text{f6} \text{c5} \text{34} \text{\text{Q}}xe5+ \text{\text{Q}}f7 \text{35} \text{\text{Q}}b8 \text{1-0}\)

8 ... 0-0

9 h3 \( \text{\text{Q}}h5 \)

10 e5 \( \text{\text{Q}}e8 (D) \)
This is the type of position White was aiming for with 8 \( \text{Be1} \). Unlike French Defence-related positions Black has his queen’s bishop outside his pawns, but the cost of this luxury is a delay in beginning the thematic queenside attack White, meanwhile, is able to play in the classic KIA style.

11 \( \text{Bf1} \) \( \text{Cc7} \)

A similar position arose in the game Todorcevic-Lukacs, Rome 1988. After 1 \( \text{Df3} \) d5 2 g3 \( \text{Df6} \) 3 \( \text{Ag2} \) c6 4 d3 \( \text{Ag4} \) 5 \( \text{Dbd2} \) (a clever move order which guarantees to keep a knight on f3 should Black decide to give up the two bishops) 5 e6 6 0-0 \( \text{Ce7} \) 7 h3 \( \text{Ah5} \) 8 e4 0-0 9 \( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{Bbd7} \) 10 \( \text{Dc1} \) a5 11 e5 \( \text{Cec8} \) 12 \( \text{Df1} \) \( \text{Cc7} \). White played 13 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{Ag6} \) 14 \( \text{Ag3} \) h6 15 \( \text{Wf4} \) b5 16 \( \text{Wd2} \) c5 17 g5! with considerable pressure on the kingside.

12 \( \text{Dh2} \) a5
13 \( \text{Af4} \) a4
14 \( \text{Wd2} \)

Also to be considered is 14 a3 to prevent any weakening of the dark squares.

14 ... a3
15 b3 \( \text{Gb5?} \)

Black has little time for such a provocative move. Better is 15 c5 followed by b5-b4 and only then \( \text{Cc7-b5} \).

16 c4! \( \text{Ec7} \)
17 h4 \( \text{Fxh3} \)

White threatened to win by 18 g4 and 19 h5, but preserving the bishop with 17 \( \text{Ag6} \) may have been a lesser evil.

18 \( \text{Dxf3} \) \( \text{Da6} \)
19 \( \text{Ded1} \) \( \text{Db4} \)
20 \( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{Wc5} \)
21 \( \text{Wac1} \) d4?? (D)

Consistent with Black’s plan of dark-square pressure. Now, instead of 22 \( \text{Dxd4?} \) allowing 22 \( \text{Dxe5} \), White prepares to infiltrate on the kingside and subsequently force either g7-g6 or h7-h6.

22 \( \text{Wc2} \) \( \text{Cc3} \)
23 \( \text{Ag5} \) \( \text{g6} \)
24 \( \text{h5} \)

A typical pawn thrust in this opening, serving to open the h-file when the time is right.

24 ... \( \text{Dae5} \)
25 \( \text{Wg4} \) \( \text{Df8} \)
26 \( \text{Wh4} \) \( \text{Df8} \)
27 \( \text{De4} \)!

With this move White shows that, despite exchanging his dominant knight for its passive counterpart, the attack will proceed unhindered. Indeed Black can only try to regroup and wait for the invasion.

27 ... \( \text{Dxe4} \)
28 \( \text{a}x\text{e}4 \) \( \text{a}b4 \)
29 \( \text{f}g2! \)
Clearing the way for the White rooks to join in the attack
29 … \( \text{w}d8 \)
30 \( \text{w}g4 \) \( \text{a}a5 \)
31 \( \text{h}x\text{g}6 \) \( \text{f}x\text{g}6 \)

An even more immediate end would result from 31 \( \text{h}x\text{g}6 \) as White could simply double on the h-file. The move played puts up more resistance, but Black’s position is by now far from evasive.

32 \( \text{a}h1 \) \( \text{w}d7 \)
33 \( \text{a}h6 \) \( \text{e}7 \)
34 \( \text{a}c1 \) \( \text{b}g7 \)
35 \( \text{a}g5! \) \( \text{(D)} \)

35 … \( \text{a}x\text{e}5 \)
The best try, as 35 \( \text{a}e7 \) fails to 36 \( \text{a}f6 \) \( \text{a}x\text{f}6 \) 37 \( \text{e}x\text{f}6 \) \( \text{a}f7 \) when White breaks through with 38 \( \text{a}x\text{g}6! \) \( \text{a}x\text{g}6 \) 39 \( \text{w}x\text{g}6+! \)
36 \( \text{a}f6 \) \( \text{a}a5 \)
37 \( \text{a}x\text{g}7 \) \( \text{w}x\text{g}7 \)
38 \( \text{a}x\text{h}7! \)
Forcing decisive material gain
38 … \( \text{a}x\text{h}7 \)
39 \( \text{w}x\text{e}6+ \) \( \text{f}h8 \)
The ending which would result after 39 \( \text{w}f7 \) 40 \( \text{w}x\text{f}7+ \) \( \text{w}x\text{f}7 \) 41 \( \text{a}x\text{h}7+ \) \( \text{a}f6 \) 42 \( \text{a}x\text{b}7 \) is hopeless for Black (e.g. 42 \( \text{c}5 \) 43 \( \text{a}b6+ \))

40 \( \text{a}x\text{g}6 \) \( \text{w}e7 \)
Or 40 \( \text{b}f6 \) 41 \( \text{h}h8+! \)
41 \( \text{w}e8+ \) \( \text{h}h8 \)
Black’s queenside play came to naught.

Korchnoi-Flear
Lugano 1986

1 \( \text{d}f3 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 2 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 3 \( \text{a}g2 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 4
0-0 \( \text{a}g4 \) 5 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 6 \( \text{w}e1 ? \) \( \text{(D)} \)

There is nothing wrong in playing this standard move so early
6 … \( \text{b}f7 \)
7 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{d}x\text{e}4 \)
8 \( \text{d}x\text{e}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \)
9 \( \text{a}b\text{d}2 \) \( \text{c}5 \)
10 \( \text{c}4 \)
Korchnoi takes advantage of the extra move caused by Black’s \( \text{e}7-\text{e}6 \) followed by \( \text{e}6-\text{e}5 \) Now, thanks to 6 \( \text{w}e1 \), White threatens 11 \( \text{w}x\text{e}5 \)
10 … \( \text{w}e7 \)
11 \( \text{a}e3 \) \( \text{h}5 ! ? \)
The English GM tries to revitalise his game by introducing a theoretical novelty 11 \( \text{a}e6 \) 12 \( \text{d}f5 \) is clearly bad for Black, so giving up the bishop pair with 11 \( \text{a}x\text{e}6 \) 12 \( \text{w}x\text{e}6 \) is the lesser evil, with an advantage to White. The game now takes on an unusual character for this variation, and the reader would be well advised to see how former
World Championship challenger Viktor Korchnoi shows us the KIA is indeed aptly named — wherever Black's king hides!

12 a3! 0-0-0 (D)

Faced with the dismal prospect of 23 bxc6 24 ab1 ab7, Black decides to complicate matters.

24 xd4 exd4
25 cxb7 xh3! (D)

13 b4 d6
Better than 13 ab6 14 a4 and 15 a5
14 h4! g6
Black would like to attack with 14 g5, but this gives away the f5-square
15 c4 h7
Intending h7-g5 to eye the weak h3-square
16 h3 e6
17 wc3! b8
18 db1 c7
19 db2 g5
20 h2 f6
21 wc2 e8
A dual-purpose move which both bolsters the king's position and makes way for the attacking manoeuvre g5-e6-d4. Another possibility is 21 xd1 22 xd1 xd8
23 xd8+ xd8, but 24 c5 grants White more space and a slight advantage on both sides of the board.

Korchnoi now goes on the offensive

22 b5!? de6
23 bxc6 d4?!
Or 35 \( \text{exd5} \) 36 \( \text{Qxb6} \), e.g. 36 \( \text{Wxb6} \) 37 \( \text{Wxb6} \) a6 38 \( \text{Qxd5} \) 36 \( \text{Qd6!} \) \( \text{Wa3} \) 37 \( \text{Wc2?} \) 1-0

Black cannot safely escape the threat of 38 \( \text{Wc8+} \). If 37 \text{a6} 38 \( \text{Wc8+} \) \( \text{Qxc8} \) 39 \( \text{Qxc8+} \) \( \text{Qxc8} \) (39 \( \text{Qa7} \) 40 \( \text{b8=Q} \) mate) 40 \( \text{bxc8=Q} \) \( \text{Qa7} \) 41 \( \text{Wb7} \) mate

White Employment a Queenside Fianchetto

Spiridonov-Shamkovich

Tbilisi 1970

1 \( \text{d4} \) d5 2 g3 c6 3 d3

Once again, in anticipation of the \( \text{g4} \) variation, White chooses to support his knight on \text{f3} with 3 d3 and 4 \( \text{Qbd2} \) before posting the bishop on \text{g2}

3 \( \text{...} \) \( \text{Qg4} \)
4 \( \text{Qbd2} \) \( \text{Qf6} \)
5 \( \text{Qg2} \) e6
6 h3 \( \text{Qh5} \)

Exchanging with 6 \( \text{Qxf3} \) is even less advisable now, thanks to White’s move order.

7 0-0 \( \text{Qe7} \)

Black can also play 7 \( \text{Qd6} \) with the aim of a future push with e6-e5. This plan will be examined later.

8 b3 (D)

Treating the variation in this manner, with two fianchettoed bishops, is a very attractive plan. White completes his development and pressurizes Black down the long a1-h8 diagonal. His pieces are well coordinated and are ready for action in any sector of the board.

8 ... 0-0
9 \( \text{Qb2} \) \( \text{Qbd7} \)

Hubner-I. Farago, Wijk aan Zee 1988 went 9 \text{a5} 10 \text{a4} \( \text{Qbd7} \) 11 e3!. After 11 \text{h6} 12 \text{We2} \( \text{Qc5} \) 13 \text{g4} \( \text{Qg6} \) 14 \( \text{Qe5} \) \( \text{Qh7} \) 15 \text{f4} \text{White had an excellent position. The idea of holding back the e-pawn is interesting.

10 \text{e4} \text{a5}

A logical continuation which Black often uses in \( \text{g4} \) and \( \text{f5} \) systems. It is a matter of taste whether White answers \text{a7-a5} with a2-a4 or a2-a3, although the former is generally more popular. Black will endeavour to open up the queenside with the plan of \text{b7-b5} and \text{b5xa4}, meeting \( \text{Qxa1xa4} \) with \( \text{Qd7-b6/c5} \) followed by \text{a5-a4}, or \text{b5xa4} with play on the b-file and against White's a-pawn. Circumstances will dictate White's choice of approach. In this particular game, White has calculated precisely that the placing of his opponent's pieces could embarrass Black should the latter persevere with the standard queenside attack against 11 \text{a3}

11 \text{a3} \text{Wb6}

In Spiridonov-Hennings, Orebro 1966, Black developed with 11 \( \text{Qc5} \) 12 \text{We2} \text{Wc7} \). After 13 \text{g4} \( \text{Qg6} \) 14 \( \text{Qe5} \) \text{dxe4} 15 \text{dxe4} \( \text{Qd7} \) 16 \text{f4} \text{f6} 17 \( \text{Qxg6} \) \text{hxg6} 18 \text{e5} \text{White stood much better.

12 \text{We2} \text{a4?}
Although this is the usual method of battering White's queenside, it falls into Spiridonov's trap. A better — albeit slower — continuation would be 12 \( \text{Wa6} \) with the idea of 13 e4 dxe4\(^1\)? followed by 14 \( \text{Afd8} \)

13 b4

It would be wrong to allow \( \text{a4xb3} \), leaving White with a weak a-pawn. Black's pawn structure, on the other hand, would be very solid, and this fact, combined with pressure on the a-file, would give Black the advantage.

13 ... \( \text{e5?} \)

All according to plan, but it is White who has the more stable position.

14 exd5 \( \text{exd5??} \)

Instead 14 \( \text{Qxd5} \) is met by the natural 15 \( \text{Qxe4} \) with a White advantage, since Black's aggression has resulted in producing weaknesses in his own camp. However, in recapturing with the pawn, Shamkovich has grossly underestimated the potential power of White's minor pieces.

15 \( \text{Wxe7?!} \) \( \text{Xxe8} \)

Winning the queen, but at what cost?

16 \( \text{Axf6!} \) \( \text{Xxe7} \)

Not 16 \( \text{Qxf6??} \) 17 \( \text{Wxc5} \)

17 \( \text{Axe7} (D) \)

In return for his queen White has a rook, bishop and knight. The next step is to use his domination of the dark squares to create unchallengeable outposts for his strongest pieces.

17 ... \( \text{Wc7} \)

18 \( \text{Axe1} \) \( \text{f6} \)

A dual-purpose move which both adds to Black's limited claim to the dark squares and prepares to defend the d-pawn with \( \text{Bh5-f7} \)

19 \( \text{bxc5} \) \( \text{Bxc5} \)

20 \( \text{Axd4} \) \( \text{Afd7} \)

21 \( \text{Af5!} \) \( \text{Wd7} \)

22 \( \text{Bxc5} \) \( \text{Wxb5} \)

23 \( \text{Bb4!} \)

A wonderful square for the bishop. Black's problem is that there is precious little for his queen to attack, while White's harmonious pieces, aided by his control of the dark squares, remain flexible.

23 ... \( \text{Be8} \)

24 c4!

White uses his other bishop to challenge the enemy pawns.

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

25 \( \text{Axe8?} \) \( \text{Wxe8} \)

26 \( \text{exd5+} \) \( \text{We5} \)

27 \( \text{Axd1!} (D) \)

A simple but effective plan. After the forced exchange of his bishop, Black will have the hopeless task of blockading the d-pawn with his lone
queen, so White prepares for the push
27... \textit{Exd}5
28 \textit{Ee}4 \textit{Wd}4
29 \textit{Exd}5+ \textit{Wx}d5
30 \textit{Ee}3 \textit{Wd}4
31 \textit{Ec}2 \textit{Wb}2
32 \textit{Ed}2 \textit{Wb}1+
33 \textit{Wh}2 1-0

An interesting game which shows how well White’s pieces work together in this opening. Despite playing normal, even thematic moves on the queenside, Black suddenly found himself in a terrible position. White’s move order in the above game was designed to answer an eventual \textit{Exf}3 with \textit{Exd}2xf3, rather than have to recapture with the bishop. Readers who may want to couple this idea with the plan of fianchettoing the queen’s bishop should avoid the following trap. Rubli-Geller, Budapest 1973 saw an important idea after the opening moves 1 \textit{Ee}3 \textit{Ee}6 2 \textit{g}3 \textit{d}5 3 \textit{Eg}2 \textit{e}6 4 \textit{b}3 \textit{Eg}4 5 \textit{Ee}2 \textit{Ex}b7 6 \textit{d}3 \textit{e}6 7 \textit{Ex}d2 \textit{Ec}7. White automatically hit the bishop with 8 \textit{h}3?". Black played 8 \textit{Exf}3? when White’s only way to play for an advantage is 9 \textit{Exf}3 as after 9 \textit{Exf}3? White can take advantage of White’s uncastled king with 9... \textit{Ea}3+ 10 \textit{Ea}x3 \textit{Wc}5+ with equality.

Jansa-Keene
Aarhus 1983

1 \textit{g}3 \textit{Ee}6 2 \textit{Exf}3 \textit{d}5 3 \textit{Eg}2 \textit{e}6 4 \textit{Wg}4 5 \textit{b}3

Here Jansa makes use of a move order designed to prevent an early \textit{e}7-\textit{e}5 from Black.
5... \textit{Exb}7
6 \textit{Ec}b2 \textit{e}6
7 \textit{d}3 \textit{Ed}6

8 \textit{Ebd}2 0-0
9 \textit{We}1

The immediate 9 \textit{e}4 is also possible, when 9... \textit{dx}e4 10 \textit{dx}e4 \textit{Ec}5? is interesting, taking advantage of the pin.
9... \textit{e}5

Losing a tempo compared with lines in which the Black e-pawn reaches this square in one move. Black’s compensation lies in his being able to properly organise his position before the push.

10 \textit{e}4 \textit{Ec}8

11 \textit{h}3

More recently some players have been throwing in 11 \textit{a}3? a5 before 12 \textit{h}3 \textit{a}5 13 \textit{Eh}4. How much of a difference this makes depends on Black’s reply.

a) 13 \textit{Exf}8 14 \textit{Ex}d5 \textit{Exd}5 (14 \textit{cx}d5 15 \textit{c}4) 15 \textit{c}4 is even better for White than Spraggett-Chernin, below.

b) 13 \textit{Ee}5 14 \textit{Exf}5 \textit{Ec}7 15 \textit{f}4 (15 \textit{Exh}1) 15 \textit{Exf}4 16 \textit{gxf}4 \textit{dx}e4 17 \textit{dx}e4 follows the same path as the main game, but the extra moves of the a-pawns mean that White can try 17 \textit{dx}e4 because Black’s bishop cannot come to a5 here (see note to White’s 16th move).

c) 13 \textit{Ec}8? has not been seen in top competition since Podgaets-Belavsky, Kiev 1973, though it is
the kind of move one would expect to see at club level. After 14 f4 exf4
15 gxf4 dxe4 16 dxe4 Qf6 17 e5
Qc5+ 18 @h1 @c7 19 @f5 the
c7-rook was not helping matters on the
kingside, and 19 g6 20 @h6+
@h8 21 Wh4 Qd5 22 e6+ was already winning for White
d) 13 @c7 14 @f5 @c5 15 @h1
@ad8 16 @f3 b5 17 @g4 @g8 18
@c3!@ @a8 19 g4 @g6 20 a4
Damjanovic-Dreev, Tilburg 1994
White has an edge
e) 13 @c5 14 @h1 @f8 15 f4
exf4 (15 dxe4) 16 gxf4 dxe4, and
now in Damjanovic-Hodgson, Belgrade 1993, White rejected
the known 17 dxe4 @d4 18 @xd4
@d4 19 e5 @g6 20 @f2 @xf2 21
@xf2 @d5 22 @c4 with an edge, as
in Bjarnason-Mednis, Reykjavik
1982, in favour of the new 17 @xe4
@xe4 18 dxe4 f6 19 @g3 @g6
Then 20 @ad1 @c7 21 b4 @xb4 22
@xb4 @b6 (not 22 @xb4? 23
@g3+) 23 @xg6 hxg6 24 e4 leaves
Black facing the bishop pair and
struggling to breathe. Instead White
chose 20 f5 @h5 21 e5 with the
makings of an attack
11 ...
12 @h4! (D)

![Diagram](image)

With his development completed
White undertakes action on the
kingside. The diagram position has
arisen — by different routes — often
in international chess. White has
a choice of plans. In Spraggett-
Chernin, Paris 1989, Black played
12 @h8, hoping to meet the aggressive
13 f4 with 13 dxe4 14 dxe4
exf4 15 gxf4 @g61 White, however,
elected to fight for light square
control by opening up the centre
with 13 exd5!@ Qxd5 (White’s KIA
bishop would have command of the
long h1-a8 diagonal after 13 exd5
14 c4!) 14 Qd3! Qd7 15 c4!@ @b4
16 Qe4 White has more control
and stands better. The game continued
16 @c7 17 @ad1! @ad8
(not 17 @xa2 18 d4! exd4 19
@b1! @b4 20 @xd4 when, for the
sacrificed pawn, White has a horde
of pieces ready to attack the
opposing king!) 18 a3! Qc2 (White’s
d-pawn is also poisoned, as after
18 @xd3 19 b4 traps the knight),
and now 19 @d2! Qd4 20 @xd4
exd4 21 Wh5 was necessary,
preserving White’s advantage
12 ...
13 ...
14 f4!
White voluntarily places his
centre under fire so as to open up lines
against Black’s king
14 ...
15 exf4
dxe4
Akopian prefers the solid
15 @g6
16 Qxe4!
In answer to 16 dxe4 Black can
turn the tables with 16 @a51 Qd7
@g3 @g6
16 ...
17 dxe4
Jansa gives 17 $\text{Qxg7}$ as an adventurous alternative. Black’s best is 17 $\text{Qf6}$, when 18 $\text{Qxe8}$ is a mistake on account of 18 $\text{Qxe8} 19 \text{Wc3} f6 (20 \text{Wxc5?? $\text{Qb6}$}) Instead 18 $\text{Qxf6}! $\text{Qxe1}$ 19 $\text{Qxd8} $\text{Qxa1}$ 20 $\text{Qxa1}$ $\text{Qxd8} 21 $\text{Qxh5}$ results in a position in which Black has some compensation for the pawn deficit. The game move is not so hazardous, and guarantees a powerful initiative even after Black’s most accurate defence.

17 ... $\text{Qe6}$!

The only move Attempting to cut off White’s queen’s bishop with 17 $\text{f6}$ does not work, e.g. 18 $\text{Wh4} $\text{Qg6} 19 $\text{Qad1} $\text{Wc8} 20 $\text{Qxg7}$

18 $\text{Wg3} $\text{Qg6}$

Akopian gives 18 $\text{f6} 19 $\text{Qh1}$ as clearly better for White, while 19 $\text{Wh4} $\text{Qg6} 20 $\text{Qad1} $\text{Wb8}$ (or 20 $\text{Wc8} 21 $\text{Qad6} 21 $\text{Qd7} $\text{Qxf5} 22 \text{exf5} $\text{Qxf4} 23 $\text{Qxg7+} $\text{Qxg7}$ is one possible way for Black to lose

19 $\text{Qad1} (D)$

19 ... $\text{Qxf4}!$?

Jansa’s own suggestion, 19 $\text{Wb8}$, has been waiting a long time to be tested at the top level. It was eventually given an outing in Akopian-Ionov, El Vendrell 1996 but, unfortunately for Black. Akopian had carried out a thorough investigation of this variation 20 $\text{Wc3}$! (Jansa gave the line 20 $\text{Qxg7} $\text{Qxg7} 21 $\text{Wc3} f6 22 $\text{Wxf6} $\text{Qh5} 23 $\text{Wg8} $\text{Qf7} 24 $\text{Wc3} — Akopian’s move still threatens destruction on the long diagonal, and he has not yet finished with his knight) 20 $\text{Qxf4}$ (20 $\text{f6} 21 $\text{Qd7}$ is decisive) 21 $\text{Wxf4}$ (not 21 $\text{Qxg7} $\text{Qe5} 21 $\text{Wxf4} 22 $\text{Qf1}$ (again the tempting 22 $\text{Qxg7}$ helps Black, e.g. 22 $\text{Wd8} 23 $\text{Qf1}$ $\text{Wd2}$ and the battle continues) 22 $\text{f6}$! 22 $\text{Wc7} 23 $\text{Qxg7}$ wins for White, while 22 $\text{Wg5} 23 $\text{h4}$ $\text{Wg4}$ [23 $\text{Wh5} 24 $\text{Qf3} 24 $\text{Qh6+}$ is nice] 23 $\text{Wxf4} $\text{Qxf4} 24 $\text{Wf3}$ and the game had a fitting end 24 $\text{Qxg2}$ (24 $\text{Qxf5}$ at least denies White his picturesque finishing theme) 25 $\text{Qh6+} $\text{Qh8}$ (or 25 $\text{Qf8} 26 $\text{Qa3+} $\text{Qe7} 27 $\text{Qxg2}$ and one pin prevents another) 26 $\text{Wxf6}$! (D)

26 $\text{Qg8}$ (I hope you all saw 26 $\text{gxf6}$? 27 $\text{Qxf6}$ mate) 27 $\text{Wf2}$ $\text{Qe8} 28 $\text{Wf6} $\text{Qg8} 29 $\text{Wc2} $\text{Qe8} 30 $\text{Qxg2} $\text{Qxe4} 31 $\text{Wf6}+ $\text{Qg8} 32 $\text{Wc3} $\text{Qe2}+ 33 $\text{Qg3} 1-0

20 $\text{Wxf4}?!$

Against Keene’s 19 $\text{Qxf4}$, which Akopian believes is Black’s only
move, the Armenian star had prepared the improvement 20 \( \text{Rxd8} \) \( \text{Qxe2} + \) 21 \( \text{Kf2} \) \( \text{Rg3} + \) 22 \( \text{Qxe2} \) \( \text{Rxd8} \) 23 \( \text{Qxg3} \) with a clear advantage to White.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{20} \quad \ldots \\
\text{Qxh4}
\end{array}
\]

Note 20 \( \text{Wxd1} ? \) 21 \( \text{Wxc7} \) \( \text{Wxc2} \) 22 \( \text{Qxg7} \) \( \text{Qxf5} \) 23 \( \text{Qxf5} \) with a won game for White.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{21} \quad \text{Rxd8} \\
\text{22} \quad \text{Rxd1} \\
\text{23} \quad \text{Qd1} \\
\text{24} \quad \text{Qc3}
\end{array}
\]

Preventing an invasion on d2

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{24} \quad \ldots \\
\text{f6}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{25} \quad \text{Qf2} \\
\text{26} \quad \text{exf5}
\end{array}
\]

and White's bishops are stronger than a rook.

Black Plays \ldots \text{Qd6 and} \ldots \text{Qe7}

The plan of developing the king's bishop on d6 and the knight on e7 is designed to keep out of harm's way, enabling Black to attack on the queenside.

Lazic-Dizdar
Yugoslav Ch 1990

1 \( \text{Qf3} \) d5 2 g3 \( \text{Qg4} \) 3 \( \text{Qg2} \) c6 4 0-0 \( \text{Qd7} \) 5 d3 e6 6 \( \text{Qbd2} \) \( \text{Qd6} \) 7 \( \text{We1} \)

White does not have to move his queen away from the d1-h5 diagonal although he must subsequently be prepared to meet \( \text{Qd7-e5} \) at some point, when Black intends to exchange a couple of minor pieces. The game Damjanovic-Kosic, Yugoslav Ch 1990, proceeded in this manner. White played 7 e4 \( \text{Qe7} \) 8 h3 \( \text{Qh5} \) 9 \( \text{Qb3} \) After 9 \( \text{Qe5} \) 10 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Qxf3} \) 11 \( \text{Qxf3} \) \( \text{Qxf3} \) 12 \( \text{Qxf3} \) 0-0 13 \( \text{Qg2} \) dxe4 14 dxe4 e5 15 \( \text{Qd1} \) \( \text{Wc7} \) 16 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qad8} \) 17 \( \text{We2} \)

\( \text{Qc8} \) 18 a4 \( \text{Qe7} \) 19 a5 White had a slight edge.

The double fianchetto is also possible — 7 b3 \( \text{Qe7} \) 8 \( \text{Qb2} \) 0-0 9 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{Qh5} \) 10 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{D} \)

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

A standard position. White is content to bring out his pieces. Black is solid. Of course if he makes the mistake of trying for no more for too long, Black runs the risk of being pushed off the board. Some players who are attracted to the \( \text{Qg4} \) variation have difficulty knowing when to step up a gear or which plan to undertake when the time does come. Here are a few sample lines:

a) 10 \( \text{Qc8} \) 11 \( \text{We1} \) c5 12 \( \text{Qh4} \) \( \text{Wb6} \) 13 \( \text{Qe3} \), Portisch-Ivkov, Amsterdam 1970, is slightly better for White, e.g. 13 \( \text{d4} \) 14 \( \text{We1} \) f6 15 \( \text{f4} \), or 13 \( \text{f6} \) 14 \( \text{f4} \)

b) With 10 \( \text{a5} \) 11 a3 b5 Black, anticipating the coming attack on his king, gets to work on the queenside. In Kengis-Smagin, USSR 1988, White wasted no time, either 12 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{Qg6} \) 13 e5 \( \text{Qc7} \) 14 \( \text{We2} \) c5 15 \( \text{Qe1} \) a4 16 f4 \( \text{Qa6} \) \( \text{D} \)

For the moment White is losing the pawn race, but he has the advantage of attacking the king, leaving his opponent with less room for error.
White should now have played 17 h4! when we see the idea behind Black's 16th move 17 f5 18 exf6 Qxf6 19 h5 Qe8 with a complex struggle ahead.

c) 10 c5 11 Wc1 Qc6 12 Qh2 (12 Qh4!??) 12 Qd4? We are following Ljubojevic-Van der Wiel, Amsterdam 1991 Black sends his knight in to make his own threat, or at least induce a weakening of the dark squares in White's camp. The drawback is the neglection of the d5-pawn 13 Qxd4 exd4 14 exd5 exd5 15 Qxd5 Wc7 (15 Qe8 16 Qe4) 16 Qc4 Qae8 17 Wd2 Qe2 18 Wg5 when 18 Qf6 would have given Black enough for the pawn.

Let us return to 7 Wc1

7 ... Qd7 (D)

b) 10 Qh2 prepares the same push of the f-pawn while denying Black the chance to exchange a pair of knights Black, too, has a say in what happens to the centre pawns.

b1) 10 e5 challenges White to go ahead as planned in Damljanovic-Smagin, Yugoslavia 1992. White changed his mind and played the inconsistent 11 Qb3 Qg6 12 Wc2, when 12 f5 saw Black stave off the claim for the centre Damljanovic must have been impressed with Black's aggressive plan for he tried it himself against Vujadinovic a year later in Cetinje. This time, instead of the timid 11 Qb3 White did play 11 f4, and after 11 exf4 12 gxf4 dxe4 13 dxe4 f6 14 Qc4 Qc7 15 a4 Qg6 16 Qe3 Qe8 Vujadinovic's proposed 17 Wf2 (17 a5??) leaves the game well balanced. White has more space and his two centre pawns cover key squares, but note that these pawns are susceptible to attack if White is not careful.
and Black's minor pieces are also reasonably placed

b2) 10 \( \text{Qh}8 \) is a less committal approach 11 e4 f5 (covering e5 and providing the h5-bishop with an escape/regroup route) 12 \( \text{Qh1} \) a5 13 \( \text{Qd}f3 \) c5 (D)

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

Cvitan-Lalic, Pula 1994 The pawn race is now under way. Although White can do nothing to halt the armada of black pawns on the queenside perhaps his provocative play during the next few moves does not quite work. 14 b3 a4 15 \( \text{Qb}2 \) a3 16 \( \text{Qc}3 \) d4 17 \( \text{Qd}2 \) and luring Black's pawns forward with the bishop has to some extent closed the queenside so that White can turn to the other wing for the usual storm on the king. However one key pawn break still remains 17 \( \text{Qc}6 \) 18 g4 \( \text{Qf}7 \) 19 f5 (relinquishing the e5-square to three black pieces seems unnecessary while White has other constructive moves available) 19 \( \text{Qc}7 \) 20 \( \text{Qc}1 \) exf5 21 gxf5 b5 22 \( \text{Qg}4 \) c4 23 \( \text{Qg}1 \) \( \text{Qac}8 \) with chances for both sides. The increasing pressure on the c-file should be enough to distract White from his brutal plans on the g-file

10 \( \text{Qx}f3 \) \( \text{Qb}6 \)
11 \( \text{Qh}1 \) a5

12 \( \text{Qd}2 \) a4
13 \( \text{Qb}1 \) a3

Of course White could have played 13 a3 to prevent the following weakening of the dark squares on the queenside, but Lalic judges that the advanced a-pawn may prove to be more of a liability than an asset if Black overplays his hand

14 b3 \( \text{Qh}4 \)
15 \( \text{Qe}2 \) \( \text{Qc}3 \)
16 b4!

An excellent move which aims to prevent Black from taking control of the queenside

16 ... \( \text{Qa}4 \)
Not 16 \( \text{Qxb}4 \)? 17 c3
17 \( \text{Qb}3! \)
18 \( \text{Qxb}2 \) \( \text{axb}2 \)
19 a3 \( \text{Qc}8 \)
20 \( \text{Qb}1! \) (D)

\[ \text{Diagram} \]

White is about to safely take the b2-pawn, leaving Black with no compensation

Damiljanovic-C.Hansen
New York Open 1987

1 g3 d5 2 \( \text{Qf}3 \) \( \text{Qf}6 \) 3 \( \text{Qg}2 \) c6 4
0-0 \( \text{Qg}4 \) 5 d3 \( \text{Qbd}7 \) 6 \( \text{Qbd}2 \)

GM. Lev Gutman is fond of the immediate 6 \( \text{Qc}1 \) The game
Gutman-Smejkal, West Germany 1987 saw White maintain the usual slight advantage after 6 e5 7 e4 dxe4 (better than 7 d4? 8 c3! c5 9 d3) 8 dxe4 e5 9 b2 0-0 10 h3 d6 11 e4 c4 12 c7 12 a4 f8 13 d2 c3 14 b5 15 b5 c5 Two years later in Gutman-Rogers, Moscow Open 1989, Black deviated from 8 e7 with the premature 8 c3 There followed 9 d2 e5 10 d2 d8 11 c4 c7 12 d2 d8 13 e3 e6 14 b3 b6 15 a4 d8 16 f2 f8 17 d1 b5 18 g2 g7 19 a5 d8 20 c4 e7. When 21 c3 (followed by b3-b4) would have left White considerably better. Instead Gutman played the faulty 21 b4?, allowing 21 bxe2 22 c2 cxb4 23 d1 d8 24 a5 e5 (D)

8 e4 dxe4
For 8 d6 see the next main game
9 dxe4 c5
Kramnik and other top players have used 9 c5 with success. How White continues depends on where he wants to develop the queen’s bishop.

a) 10 b3 0-0 11 b2 c7 and now in Vagaman-Kramnik, Novgorod 1995, the KIA specialist was rather impatient with 12 c4?!, giving rise to a Reti position which does not promise White anything special 12 a5 13 a3 d8 14 b2 e8 15 c3 f6 16 b4 (otherwise White experiences problems on the d-file, e.g. 16 d4 f5) 17 d6 and Kramnik was already doing fine. Instead of the premature and committal thrust of the c-pawn White could have secured an edge with 12 a3 a5 13 d1 e8 14 d4 b4.

b) 10 d1 prepares a different setup on the queenside. Then 10 0-0 11 c4 (11 d4 e8 12 f5 c8 is level) 11 e7, with another decision regarding the merits of b7-b5.

b1) 12 a4 c6 13 d2 c7 14 c3 c3 c5 15 c3 guarantees White a pull without weakening the queenside pawns. In Gutman-Smejkal, German League 1987, Black hit out anyway with 15 b5, but after 16 a5 b5 he was vulnerable on d5 and a5.

b2) 12 d2 ignores the “threat” by bringing a third piece to attack a5, a square that Black will be unable to adequately defend if he kicks the knight out of c4. G Mohr-Kragelj, Portoroz 1996, saw White’s experiment tested 12 c6 13 d4 b5 14 a5 b8 15 c3 c5 16 c8 with a balanced game. It is not clear how
White can profit from holding back the a-pawn, though b7-b5 has not been a great success, either, as White's knight is just as happy on f5.

10 \textit{We1}

Moving the queen to release the knight from the pin is almost automatic with the bishop on h5, so much so that there has been no need to look for alternatives. However, in Cvitan-Howell, Liechtenstein 1994, White posted his queen more actively. After 10 a4 0-0 Cvitan played 11 \textit{We2} b5 12 \textit{Wc4} (D)

\begin{center}
\textbf{Diagram 5}
\end{center}

In fact the queen was busy enough to enable White to gradually trade pieces until he reached an ending in which this superior, dominating piece was the decisive factor. The game continued 12 \textit{Af8} 13 \textit{Dh4} \textit{Dc5} 14 \textit{Db3} \textit{Df7} 15 \textit{Dxc5} \textit{Dxc5} 16 \textit{De3} \textit{De6} 17 \textit{Df3} 18 \textit{Dxf3} \textit{Dc7} 19 \textit{Dd1} b6 20 \textit{Dd2} \textit{Da8} 21 \textit{Da1} \textit{Dx2} 22 \textit{Dxd2} \textit{Dc5} 23 \textit{Dxc5} \textit{Dxc5} 24 \textit{a5} \textit{Dxe6} 25 \textit{b4} bxa5 26 bxa5 and now 26 \textit{Da5} 27 \textit{Wxc6} is much better for White due to his increased influence in the centre, so Black accepted a very cramped position with 26 \textit{Dd8} 27 \textit{Dxd8}+ \textit{Exd8} 28 \textit{Wc5} f6, hoping that the symmetrical pawn structure would give him drawing chances.

The rest of the game highlights the difference between the two queens — 29 \textit{Dd2} \textit{Dxe6} 30 \textit{Wa4} 31 \textit{Dc7} 32 \textit{Db5} 33 \textit{Dxe5}+ \textit{Wxe5} 34 \textit{Wa8} 35 \textit{a6} (D)

34 \textit{Wa7} 35 \textit{h4} \textit{Dd8} 36 \textit{h5} h6 37 \textit{c4} \textit{Dd1}+ 38 \textit{Wg2} \textit{Wf7} 39 \textit{Wg7}+ \textit{Wc8} 40 \textit{c5} (the net closes in)

40 \textit{Wa4} 41 \textit{f3} \textit{Wd7} 42 \textit{Wa8} \textit{Wd2} 43 \textit{Wb3} \textit{Dd7}+ 44 \textit{Wh4} 1-0. This game is a good advert for the plan of \textit{Wd1}-e2-c4 (remember to rule out b7-b5 with the space gaining a2-a4). All other things being equal, White has a small advantage which is deceptive dangerous if the queen is properly used to help contain Black while simultaneously contributing to the gradual accumulation and subsequent exploitation of territory, then accurate defence is required.

10 ... \textit{Dxf3}

In the game Kindermann-Gelfand, Munich 1991, Black did not worry about a possible \textit{Df3}-h4 from White, preferring to keep his bishop pair for a little longer 10 0-0 11 \textit{Dc4} \textit{De8} 12 \textit{a4} \textit{Wc7} 13 \textit{Dh4} \textit{Df8} 14 \textit{Dg5} with a more active position for White. The automatic 14 \textit{h6} is simply met by 15 \textit{Dd2} \textit{Dc5} 16 \textit{g4} \textit{Dg6} 17 \textit{Dxg6} \textit{fxg6} 18 \textit{f4}, while
14 b5 weakens the d5-square after
15 axb5 cxb5 16 De3 Best for
Black is 14 Ag6 15 h6 16
Lxf6 xf6 17 Ag6 hg6 18 h4,
when White has a miniscule edge
11 oxf3

The recapture with the bishop is
better here as White wants to deploy
his remaining knight on c4, hence it
will pressure the squares a5, b6, d6
and e5
11 ... 0-0
12 a4

An important and common move,
fighting for space on the queenside
and aiming to secure an outpost on
c4 for the knight. Now a future
b7-b5 from Black gives White the
a-file after a4xb5 and, assuming
Black in turn takes back with the c-
pawn further weakens the
d5-square
12 ... Wc7
13 Wc2 a5
14 Dc4 De8

Beginning one of Black’s more
desirable manoeuvres (Df6-e8-
c7-e6), but at the cost of structural
weaknesses on the queenside. The
alternative 14 Db6 would force
White to switch his attention to the
kingside after 15 De3 g6 16 h4,
with the usual slight advantage
15 Dd2 b6
16 Ag4! (D)

Redeploying the bishop on another
diagonal
16 ... Dc7
17 Ag2 De6
18 e3 g6
19 Ah6 fxe8
20 h4 f6
21 Ad1 Df8
22 h5! Keep an eye on White’s h-pawn
22 ... Aad8
23 Ac1 Hxal
24 Hxd1 Hd8
25 Bh1!

It is often very useful for White in
these positions to exchange one pair
of rooks keep the other on the
board. In this way White can attack
on the kingside without the possibility
of a dangerous counter from
Black down the d-file. Here Black’s
coming invasion is aimed at relieving
the pressure rather than producing
threats
25 ... Wd7
26 Wf3 Wd3

A forced concession Black must
enter into a disadvantageous end-
game rather than sit back and let
White dictate matters. If 26 We7
27 Ae3! eyes Black’s weak b-pawn
whilst at the same time keeping a
threatening stance on the kingside.
Even worse for Black is 26 Wf7?,
e.g. 27 hxg6 hxg6 28 De5! fxe5
29 Ah3+! Ag7 30 Ah6+
27 Wxd3 Hxd3

White has a much better game
Now 28 Ad1 is a good move, in-
tending to take up residence on the
a2-g8 diagonal, but White brings his
king to the centre instead
28 Sf1 Hd8
29 Ae2 f7
30 f3??

Another slight inaccuracy, al-
though White is still well on top.
Better was 30 f4 or 30 Ae3
30 ... \textit{Qg7} 31 \textit{h6} \textit{Qe8!} 32 \textit{Qxe3!} \textit{Qxe3} 33 \textit{Qxe3} \textit{Qd6!}

A clever way of distracting White’s attention from Black’s weak queenside. If now 34 \textit{Qxb6?} \textit{Qb8} is good for Black. Instead White creates a passed pawn in order to maintain his initiative.

34 \textit{Qxd6+} \textit{Qxd6} 35 b4 \textit{axb4}

Otherwise White will invade down the b-file, e.g. 35 \textit{Qd8} 36 bxa5 bxa5 37 \textit{Qb1} when Black’s a- and c-pawns would make easy targets for White.

36 \textit{cxh4} \textit{Qd4} 37 \textit{Qb1} \textit{Qe7} 38 a5! b5

Leaving White with a b-pawn to worry about.

39 f4

White wants to reach the time control. The more direct 39 a6 was better.

39 ... \textit{Qd7} 40 \textit{Qb3} \textit{Qb8} 41 \textit{Qc8!}

Threatening 42 a6.

41 ... \textit{Qd8} 42 \textit{Qe6!} \textit{Qa6} 43 \textit{Qg8!} (D)

White’s middlegame pressure on the kingside — particularly the advance h4-h5-h6 — also served another purpose, as Black will now have to contend with another outside passed pawn. Note that 43 \textit{Qd3} c5! is unclear.

The game concluded

43 ... \textit{Qxb4} 44 \textit{Qxh7} \textit{Qc2+} 45 \textit{Qf2} \textit{Qd2+} 46 \textit{Qg1} \textit{Qd1+} 47 \textit{Qg2} \textit{Qd2+} 48 \textit{Qh3} \textit{Qc7}

The rook and pawn ending resulting from 48 \textit{Qd1} 49 \textit{Qb2} \textit{Qh1+} 50 \textit{Qg2} \textit{Qxh6} 51 \textit{Qxe2} \textit{Qxh7} 52 \textit{fxe5} \textit{fxe5} 53 \textit{Qxc6} is very good for White.

49 \textit{fxe5} \textit{fxe5} 50 \textit{Qb2} \textit{Qd7} 51 \textit{Qg8} \textit{Qd4} 52 h7 \textit{Qxh7+} 53 \textit{Qxh7} c5 54 \textit{Qxg6} c4 55 \textit{Qf7} c3 56 \textit{Qb1} \textit{Qb7} 57 g4 1-0.

\textit{Vaganian-Torre}

\textit{Moscow Olympiad 1994}

1 \textit{Qf3} d5 2 g3 c6 3 \textit{Qg2} \textit{Qg4} 4 d3 \textit{Qd7} 5 0-0 \textit{Qg6} 6 \textit{Qbd2} e5 7 e4 \textit{Qd6} 8 h3 \textit{Qh5} 9 exd5??

A fairly recent idea.

9 ... \textit{cx}d5

10 c4 (D)
Not unlike Gelman-Lastin, White prefers to undermine Black’s ostensibly solid centre and clear the long diagonal for his bishop rather than engage in a slow, manoeuvrering game. After a subsequent c4xd5 he can accentuate the pressure on the queenside by bringing the queen out to b3, which also lifts the pin on the d1-h5 diagonal and might leave Black’s light-squared bishop without a role. Black might elect to fix the d-pawns with 10 d4, when White has still achieved his goal of drastically increasing the scope of the g2-bishop.

10 d4 11 We2 0-0 12 g4 g6 13 h4 with a grip on the light squares, King-Norwood, German League 1994

11 cxd5 12 Wb3

Black will be too busy keeping his own queenside intact to find time to hit the d3-pawn. Ideally, White would like to profit from his hypermodern pattern of development by offering to open the position still further with d3-d4 at some stage. In the meantime, White should resist the temptation to grab the b7-pawn with his queen until it is completely safe. In an earlier game, Hodgson-De la Villa Garcia, Dos Hermanas 1992, White first hit the bishop with 12 Qc4!? Ac7, then played 13 Wb3 with the idea of taking on e5 to leave the d5-knight unprotected. After 13 Qb6 14 g5! We8 (14 f6?? 15 Qxe5++) 15 Acl (15 Aae1 also looks good, e.g. 15 Qxc4 16 Wxc4 Ee8 17 Wb4 Axf3 18 Axf3 f6 19 Ad5+ Wh8 20 Ae3) 15 Qxc4 16 Wxc4 Ee8 17 Wh4 Ah4 Ab6 18 Wd5 the b7-pawn was still hanging, and White had succeeded in retaining the initiative.

12 ... Qf6

For the moment, Black need not worry about his b-pawn. The alternative is to drop the knight back to b6, which denies White the useful c4-square for his knight. When White switches to Plan B 12 Qb6 13 Qe4, and now 13 Qc5 loses a pawn to 14 Qxc5 Qxc5 15 Qxe5, so Black must retreat another piece 13 A7 (13 Ac7 14 Ag5) 14 a4 Ab8 (14 Ah8 15 a5 f5, Vaganian-Khalifman, Eupen 1994, is only slightly worse for Black but at least keeps White on his toes, while the odd 14 Wb5? has been suggested) 15 a5 Qc8 16 d4! (D)

Perfect timing. Clearing away the last two centre pawns is sure to give White dangerous attacking chances thanks to his more active pieces, while the d-pawn could cause havoc if allowed to advance unchecked. In M. Ivanov-Kharitonov, Moscow 1995, White dominated — 16 Axg3 17 Axf3 Qxd6 (17 exd4?? 18 Axf4 Eb8 19 Wxb7) 18 Axd1 Ac7 (18 Qxe4 19 Axc4 Wc7 20 Ae3 exd4 21 Axd4 Afd6 22 Ag2 gives Black nothing to compensate for ceding the bishop pair) 19 Qc3 (19 Qe3 Qf5 20 d5 Axc3 21 Wxe3 Ab4 22 d6 Wd8 23 Ag4 Af6 24
\( \text{KIA Black plays } \textit{d5 and } \text{Ng4 123} \)

\( \text{Qxf6+ Whxf6 25 d7 illustrates the potential of the d-pawn if White chooses another path.} \) 19 \( \text{Kf8 (or} \text{19 exd4 20 Qd5 Whd8 21 Kh4) 20 Qd5 Whd8 21 Kxe5 Oxe5 22 Kg2 (22 Oxe7+ Whxe7 23 Kh4) 22 Kh8 (22 Oe4 23 Kf1) 23 Ke3 and now Black's best hope is 23 Qc6 24 Wa4 a6 25 Kb6 with an enviable defensive task ahead, but he buckled under pressure with 23 a6 24 b6 Whd7 25 a7 Whc8 26 Qxd6, losing the exchange (27 Qb6) and with it the game. It is interesting that in his notes to the game Ivanov is surprised at either his opponent's apparent ignorance of Vaganian's model games with this line or, otherwise, a strong player's willingness to take it on.} \)

13 Qc4!

13 Qc4 wastes a wonderful opportunity to make life difficult for Black. In Norwood-Adams, British Ch 1989, the symmetry resulting from the trade of knights in the centre produced instant equality — 13 Qxe4 14 dxe4 Qc5 15 Qd5 \( \text{Qxf3 16 Kxf3 Wh6 17 Kg2 Kf6 18 Qc3 Qf8 19 Qc4 Qd3 etc. As I mentioned earlier White should be wary of taking the b7-pawn. Here, for instance 13 Whxg7? is too inconvenient after 13 Qc5 14 Qb5 Qb8 15 Qc4 Kg6 16 Qe1 Qc8, when Black has enough play for the pawn.} \)

13 ... Qc7

The text was a new move at the time, attempting to improve on 13 Qc5 14 Wa3 (D)

This powerful move is by no means easy to find or expect at the board, and it is sure to come as an unpleasant surprise for the defender. Rather than being open to attack on the a3-f8 diagonal the queen is quite menacing.

\( \text{B} \)

\( \text{a) If Epishin's fate against Vaganian in Moscow 1996 is anything to go by, mere mortals should tread carefully if they wish to use this variant of the Ng4 line 14 Qc8 15 Qxd6 Whd6 16 Kxe3 b6 17 Qxe5 Qxd5 (17 Whxe5 18 d4) 18 d4 Qxe3 19 fx3 and White was a safe pawn to the good with a nasty pin.} \)

\( \text{b) In another episode from Lautier with Vaganian, Black simply parted with his e-pawn in return for some drawing chances. Vaganian-Kaidanov, Glendale 1994 saw Black rewarded with a little short-term activity and a firm blockade on the d-file, but White is rarely limited to a single plan when there are several pieces remaining on the board. 14 Qxf3 15 Qxf3 Qe7 16 Qxe5 Qd7 17 Qc3 Qc8 18 We1! (there is no point being stubborn with 18 Whd4? in view of 18 Qc5 19 Qf4 Qxe5 20 Qxe5 Qxd3 21 Qxb7 Qd4 22 Qg5 h6 23 Qf4 Qc2, when Black enjoys much more play than he deserves.) 18 Qc5 19 Qxd7 Whd7 20 Kg2 b6 (20 Whd3? 21 Qxb7 Qc8 22 Qc3) 21 Qg5 Qf5 22 Qd2 Qd4 23 Qe3 Qd8 24 Qad1 Qd7 25 Qe1 Qfd8 and although White's extra pawn does not amount to much at the moment it remains a constant worry to Black, who faces the prospect of a long defence.} \)
14 $e3!  
14 $xb7 $e5 is still not advisable, but with $e5 now covered White finally threatens to capture the b-pawn
14 ... b6  
15 $ff1 $e8?! (D)

The most sensible looking moves are not necessarily the best. It is natural to remove the rook from the firing line of White’s bishop now that Vaganian’s plan has been accomplished and the long diagonal is clear. However, in view of what happens in the game perhaps Black should have first turned to his other rook, for after 15 $e8 he defends the c5-square with enough pieces to answer the thematic 16 d4 with 16 e4, when 17 gfe5 is not available to White
16 d4!

It is fitting that White is able to turn the screw by giving his weak pawn a taste of the action. Again we have an example of the removal of pawns in the centre working to the benefit of the fianchettoed bishop, which is one of the reasons the variations based on the solid c6-d5 centre have a deserved reputation for their reliability. Taking on d4 or permitting d4xe5 could prove embarrassing for Black’s queen after $a1-d1, but the c-pawn cannot step out of the challenge immediately as 16 e4 17 gfe5 highlights the new hole on c6 and undermines the defence of the c-pawn. Consequently Black is forced to make a concession in order to keep the d-file closed
16 ... $xf3  
17 $xf3 e4

Even if c6 is no longer threatened by an enemy knight Black should avoid 17 exd4 18 $xd4 with a clear advantage to the bishop pair
18 $g2 $e8

18 a6! must be an improvement. Apart from keeping the queen out of b5, which is a surprisingly effective post, Black can then entertain the possibility of b6-b5, giving his bishop some freedom and making b6 available for a future $d7-b6-d5 etc. This is certainly preferable to the cramped conditions Black is experiencing now, so (18 a6) 19 a4 followed by bringing the queen’s rook to c1 or d1 is practically the only way to stay on top
19 $ac1

19 $b5!? is worth considering
19 ... h6?!

Black is not sure which of his problems requires the most attention so he settles for a standard safety move, giving the king some air and ruling out a the pinning $e3-g5 for good. Meanwhile, over on the queenside and to some extent in the centre, Black is vulnerable on the light squares. Moreover letting the bishop go to force through 17 e4 means that this problem will persist, and White’s g2-bishop is eager to make its presence felt. Others are 19 $xd5 20 $dd6 $xd6 21 $xc8 $xc8 22 $xd5 and 19 a6 20 a4 $e7 (or 20 ... h6 21 $ed1 to threaten
support the e5-square, connecting the rooks in the process

24 a5!

White skillfully holds back the d-pawn until its advance achieves the maximum effect. His consistent follow-up to the previous moves guarantees further progress on the queenside while he waits

24 ... bxa5
25 bxa5 We6
26 d5 Wf5
27 g4! (D)

White commands the light squares even without his bishop. The d-pawn contributes to the bind by guarding the key squares c5 and e5, leaving Black almost lost for a move that does not open the floodgates. He would like to defend the d5-square with 20 Df8 but this neglects e5 and thus invites 21 De5, homing in on c6

20 ... Db8
21 a4 Dc7
22 De1 Db8
23 b4 We7

Having suffered the minor humiliation of seeing his opponent help himself to three useful, menacing moves free of charge, Torre knows that White is ready to graduate to a more aggressive phase of the game. Side-stepping Dc4-e5 and anticipating the inevitable d4-d5, he brings his queen to

From this point on White should focus exclusively on the d-pawn. If it is to embark on a victory march it is imperative that Black’s blockaders are eliminated. White’s extra space and bishop pair afford him the luxury of being able to conduct his mission without the inconvenience of dealing with counterplay

27 ... Wg6
28 d6 De8
29 a6 Wf6
30 Wf5!? Wx5
31 gx5 Wxe8
32 Da5 De5
33 Db7 Cc8
34 Dxc8 Cxc8
35 Ed4 2ed7
36 exf6!
White has enough pieces to do the job. The game ended
36 ... gxf6
37 hxg4 hxg4
38 dxe3
39 fxe3
40 xg4
41 d5f5
42 d5f4
43 d5f3
44 d5f2 45 d5d1 46 d5d2 47 d5c1 48 d5c2 49 d5d3

Black Plays a Premature ... dxf3

Botvinnik-Szilagyi
Amsterdam 1966

1 g3 d5 2 d4 c6 3 d4 g2 4 d5 d7 5 h3 dxf3?! As usual in such positions this exchange is not to be recommended, so the retreat 5 ... h5 is best
6 dxf3 e5? (D)

Thus far Kasparov has had little chance to make any threatening gestures of his own because his bishop has been too busy. Now his kingside is under fire. However, once he manages to unravel, the bishop pair should be significant. There followed 12 xg2 xg2 13 c3 xg3 14 d4 xg6 15 h4 (White is making progress) 15 e5 16 xg3 exd4 17 xxd4 0-0-0 and now Deep Blue evaluates 18 0-0 xg5 19 xg5 xhe8 20 xg3 xg5 21 xg5 xg5 22 xg3 xxd4 23 xxd4 as better for White. In general White should be patient after the early capture on f3. As long as he keeps his position in order he can look forward to his light-squared bishop operating unchallenged once the game opens up. Note also that the text neglects the squares d5 and f5

7 xg3 xg3 8 dxe4

Otherwise White may open up the position later with c4xd5 and c2-c4
9  dxe4  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d5}}} \)  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e5}}} \)
10  0-0  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e7}}} \)
11  c3!  0-0?!

Necessary was 11 \( a5 \), after which White would be better placed, thanks to his bishop pair and white-square control. Now White is able to increase his advantage by expanding on the queenside — often a good idea in such positions.

12  b4  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{b6}}} \)
13  a4!

Claiming more space and indirectly preparing \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c4}}} \) by putting a pawn on \( b5 \) before Black does.

13  ...  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d8}}} \)
14  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c2}}} \)
15  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e2}}}! \) (D)

Chess masters often remark that "good positions play themselves." Botvinnik's conduct of the rest of the game should help to explain this maxim.

16  b5  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e8}}} \)
17  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c4}}} \)
18  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g5}}}! \)

Not surprisingly, the harmonious development of the White pieces facilitates such a tactic. Now 18 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xg5}}} \) 19 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xd6}}} \) followed by \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c4}}} \) leaves Black in dire straits, whilst after 18 \( \text{\textit{\textbf{f6}}} \) White can avoid exchanging his knight and instead play \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e3}}} \)-\( d5 \) Black is therefore obliged to enhance the power of White's king's bishop with his next move.

18  ...  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{f6}}} \)
19  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{e3}}} \)
20  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xc4}}}+ \)
21  \( a5 \)
22  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d1}}} \)
23  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{a2}}}! \)

The main purpose of this move is to prevent \( \text{\textit{\textbf{f8}}} \)-\( c8 \). The queen will also take over the defense of the a-pawn now that the rooks are about to be exchanged.

23  ...  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d1}}}+ \)
24  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xd1}}} \)
25  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{d8}}} \)
26  \( a6! \)
27  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{g2}}} \) (D)

When White's king's bishop finds itself on \( f3 \) (usually as a result of \( \text{\textit{\textbf{xf3}}} \) from Black) it is important to remember that the stereotyped retreat to \( g2 \) is not necessarily the best course. In this case the \( a2 \)-\( g8 \) diagonal holds the most promise for the bishop. The reader will notice from other games in this chapter that the \( h3 \)-\( e8 \) diagonal is also occasionally used.

15  ...  \( \text{\textit{\textbf{c5}}} \)

Although it does not give away material, Black's blunder allows his opponent a free hand positionally.
The removal of the rooks has in no way helped Black, who is powerless to defend against an invasion on the white squares. Botvinnik’s next plan is to reverse the present line-up on the a2-g8 diagonal in order to tie down the potentially troublesome knight. The fact that he can first improve his king’s position is indicative of Black’s passivity. Indeed Black is effectively in a lost position.

\begin{align*}
27 & \ldots & \text{Almost toying with Black.} \\
28 & \text{We2} & \text{Wd7} \\
29 & \text{We3} & \text{Wg6} \\
30 & \text{Wc4} & \text{Ge7} \\
31 & \text{Wf7} & \text{Wh7} \\
32 & \text{We4} & \text{Wd6} \\
33 & \text{h4} & \text{Wd1} \\
34 & \text{We8} & \text{We8}
\end{align*}

Threatening to highlight his total command of the white squares with h4-h5, \( \text{We4-f7-g6+} \) and mate. Black’s next is tantamount to resignation.

\begin{align*}
34 & \ldots & \text{f5} \\
35 & \text{exf5} & \text{xf5} \\
36 & \text{Wg8+} & \text{Wh8} \\
37 & \text{Wf7+} & 1-0
\end{align*}

Note that 5...\( \text{Wxf3} \) and 6...e5 (rather than 6...e6) created considerable white-squared weaknesses in the Black camp. Botvinnik concentrated on these until the end.
6 Black plays ...d5 and ...

1. e4 d5  2. g3 f6  3. g2 c6  4. d4 f5 (D)

The ...f5 system is similar to ...g4 in that Black avoids blocking in his queen's bishop and develops it on the kingside. Unlike the previous chapter, however, Black is not so well placed to push with e5 because there is no pressure against White's king's knight. The c6-d5-e6 pawn centre is therefore the best setup, and this also acts to reduce the range of White's king's bishop.

Once again White has the e1 plan at his disposal to force through e2-e4. This has the advantage of leaving a rook on f1, which often works out to be an important factor when White is ready to build up a dangerous kingside attack by throwing forward his f-pawn (there is even a form of attack in which White plays Qg1-h1 and if1-g1, followed by advancing the g-pawn).

When White prefers a more positional game, then e1-e1 is okay, but with the queen's bishop still on c1 White should be careful if Black has not yet played ...Qb8-d7, as the open d-file may mean that multiple exchanges on e4 leave the rook having to cover both e4 and d1. Another reason why Black should not be too hasty with ...Qb8-d7 is that an e4-e5 push from White before Black has castled will chase the king's knight to an unsuitable square.

Since this variation is based around the development of Black's queen's bishop, it is advisable to create a retreat square on h7 in readiness for White's e2-e4 with the move ...h7-h6. The h7-square is a good place for the bishop, forcing White to be careful about the c2- and d3-squares.

White has a basic choice of what to do with his own queen's bishop: spend time on an early fianchetto, delay it, or even do without this form of development altogether. The former scheme invites Black to seek counterplay on the queenside with ...a7-a5, threatening the
annoying a5-a4. It is worth noting here a surprisingly common mistake which occurred in Ledger-Levitt, London 1990 (D)

![Chess Diagram]

In the diagram position White seized upon his opponent’s careless move order with 9 e4!, the point being 9 dxe4 10 dxe4 Qxe4 11 Qxg7 breaks up Black’s kingside. Thus Black had to move his bishop, and White had saved himself the preparatory Qd1-e1! Note that Qb8-d7 instead of a7-a5 allows the same response Black should avoid also 1 Qf3 d5 2 g3 c6 3 Qg2 Qf5 4 d3 h6 5 Qbd2 Qf6 6 0-0 e6 7 b3 Qe7 8 Qb2 0-0 9 We1!

An alternative but less accurate way of achieving the e2-e4 push is by playing 9 We1! However the idea of Qd1-e1, e2-e4 and We1-e2 (or e2-e3, Qd1-e2 and e3-e4) leaves the rook more usefully placed on the f-file, as White will eventually push his f-pawn. It is also important that White keep the e1-square clear so that it will be possible if necessary to play Qf3-e1, both unleashing the f-pawn and defending the c-pawn.

![Chess Diagram]

10 ... Qh7

In general, White has a good game against this variation because Black’s ostensibly powerful queen’s bishop gets locked out of the action, and White seems to find it too easy to develop a dangerous initiative on the kingside.

White Fianchettoes Queenside

Polugayevsky-Addison
Palma Interzonal 1970

1 Qf3 d5 2 g3 c6 3 Qg2 Qf5 4 d3 h6 5 Qbd2 Qf6 6 0-0 e6 7 b3 Qe7 8 Qb2 0-0 9 We1!

As usual Black must begin active operations on the queenside in order to distract White’s attention from the other flank. With his last move Black threatens to cause White problems by continuing with a4-a3 or by a well-tuned exchange on b3. Polugayevsky-Platnic, Skopje 1971, followed another path when Black decided to open the d-
file with 10 dxe4 This worked to White's advantage 11 dxe4 Qa6
(Vukic-Miles, Novi Sad 1975, continued 11 Qbd7 12 We2 Wc7 13
e5 Qd5 14 Qd4 Qd8, when 15 a3 followed by Qf1 would have fa-
voured White) 12 We2 Qc5 13 Qe5 Wc7 14 Qh1 Qd8 15 f4 Qe8 16
Qa1 Qd6 17 Wf3 Qa6 (17 Qd7 18 Qd3 and 17 Qc8 18 Wc3! are
both bad for Black) 18 a3 Qf6? (White would also be better after
18 Qb5 19 b4 c5 20 c4 Qd4 21 b5 Qb8) 19 g4! and Black is in danger
of being overrun.
11 a4
This is usually the best reaction to a7-a5, as 11 a3 invites a future
a5-a4 which could turn out well for Black
11 ...
Qa6
Again Black aims to pressure his opponent's queenside with
Qa6-b4 Korchnoi-Reshevsky, Amsterdam (match) 1968, saw in-
stead 11 Qbd7 12 We2 Wb6 13 e5 Qe8 14 Qh3! with a slight advan-
tage to White. After 14 Qc7 15
Qh1 Qae8 16 Qh4 f6 17 Qxf6
Qxf6 18 Qxf6 Qxf6 Black had suc-
ceded in eliminating White's pow-
erful e-pawn, but 19 f4 Wc5 20
Qd3 still left White better thanks to
his renewed control of the
e5-square. Bringing the other knight
to d7 with 11 Qfd7 leads to Vukic-
Buljovicc, below.
12 We2
A similar position would arise af-
after 12 e5 Qd7 13 We2 Qb4 14
Qe1 In the game Vladimir-
Kharitonov, USSR 1977, White de-
veloped a kingside attack after
14 Wb6 15 Qh1 Wa6 16 f4 Qf6
17 Qf3 c5 18 g4
12 ... Qb4
12 Qc7?! was seen in Dannevig-
Gretarsson Gausdal 1994 I don't
really see the point of putting the
knight here, and indeed in the game
Black failed to make an impact after
13 Qe5 Qd4 14 Qa1 Qc7 15 Wh1
Qd8 when both players 'wasted' a
move — 16 Qb1 Qa6 17 f4 Now
Black sought to avoid being on the
wrong side of a kingside attack by ex-
changing some heavy pieces
17 dxe4 18 dxe4 Qxd1 19 Qxd1
Qd8 20 Qxd8+ Qxd8 (D)

However, hopes of a draw were
soon dashed 21 Qxd3 Qe7 22 Qxd2
Qd7 23 Qc4 Qf6? (23 Qab4 gives
the knight something to do at last,
after which Black is cramped — the
light-squared bishop is locked out
—but reasonably solid) 24 Qd2!
Qxb2 25 Qxg2 26 Qxg2 Suddenly Black is
about to part with a valuable pawn
25 b6 (25 Qb4 26 Qxa5) 26
Qxb6 Qxb6 27 Qxg2 Qg6 28 Qc4
Qf2 29 Qd2 Qxd2 30 Qxd2 Qb4
31 Qc4 Qxc2 32 Qxa5 and White went on to convert the pawn
13 Qe1 Qd7
In Quintos-Spridonov, Cienfue-
gos 1972, Black unwisely underes-
timated White's kingside attacking
chances. The game went 13 Wb6?!!
14 Qh1 Qf8 15 c5! Qd7 16 f4
Qa6 17 g4! Qe8 18 Qf2 Qf8 19
Qg3 c5 20 f5, and Black was in
trouble Also possible is 13 dxe4, although this gives White use of c4 for his queen’s knight Addison’s move is designed to lure the white e-pawn forward whence it will be challenged with f7-f6

14 f4 \[f6\]
15 e5 \[e7\]
16 g4

With his queenside under no immediate pressure White may now go on the offensive

16 ...
17 \[h4\]

Tucking the king safely in the corner is always a good idea in positions of this nature

17 ...
18 f6? (D)

Perhaps this is a natural reaction when faced with a potential pawn storm, although counter-attacking on the queenside was called for. Gligoric has recommended 17 b5, while Kotov preferred 17 c5 followed by \[wc7\] (to defend the b-pawn), d5-d4 and \[b4-d5\] in both cases White has the better practical chances since he is attacking the king. An important feature of the KIA which the reader should bear in mind is that positions arise frequently which have White attacking on the kingside and Black on the queenside. Not surprisingly, therefore, this makes White’s task easier as inaccurate defence on Black’s part will have more serious consequences.

Returning to the diagram position we see that play revolves — as is often the case — around the e5-square White’s firm grip accentuates his advantage

18 \[df3\] fx e5
19 \[xe5\] \[xe5\]
20 \[xe5\] c5
21 \[d1\]

A prophylactic measure designed to give Black second thoughts about pushing with c5-c4 (which could have been the answer to 21 \[d3\]) to open up the queen’s bishop’s h7-b1 diagonal

21 ...
22 \[f3\] \[e5\]
23 \[xe5\]

It is generally indicative that things have gone well for White when he has a host of pieces ready to occupy the e5-square

23 ...
24 \[e3!\]

Preparing to continue his kingside attack with 25 g5

24 ...
25 \[d1\] \[f8\]
26 h4! \[h8\]
27 \[g3\] \[a6\]

Indirectly defending the e-pawn

28 g5 \[b6\]
29 \[h3?\] \[w7?\]

Exchanging with \[xe5\] \[xf7\] would have at least relieved some of the pressure which White has built up. Now Polugayevsky cleverly turns his initiative and positional advantage into a won game.

29 ...
30 \[xh6+\] \[xh6\]
31 \[g6+\] \[xg6\]
32 \[xe6! (D)\]
The point — White wins a pawn and activates his rook (also pinning the $\text{\textit{f}}6$) before recapturing on g6. Now $32 \text{\textit{x}}f4$ $33 \text{\textit{x}}e7 \text{\textit{x}}xg3$ $34 \text{\textit{x}}xh8$ is mate, so Black complicates things by throwing another piece into the fray.

$32 \ldots$  
$33 \text{\textit{xf}}4!$  

The only try as both $33 \text{\textit{xf}}4$ $34 \text{\textit{xe}}7$ and $33 \text{\textit{xe}}6$ $34 \text{\textit{wh}}6+$ are final.

$34 \text{\textit{xe}}4$  
$35 \text{\textit{wh}}6+$  

Not $35 \text{\textit{g}}8$ $36 \text{\textit{e}}6+$.

$36 \text{\textit{w}}f6+$  
$37 \text{\textit{d}}8+$  
$38 \text{\textit{wb}}6$  
$39 \text{\textit{xb}}7+$  
$40 \text{\textit{xf}}6+$  
$41 \text{\textit{wh}}7$ mate.

It is evident that Black must be careful in this variation White's over-protection of $e5$ gave him a positional advantage which made the execution of an attack quite easy.

Vukic-Buljovec  
Novi Sad 1975

1 $\text{\textit{d}}3$ $d5$ 2 $g3$ $c6$ 3 $\text{\textit{g}}2$ $\text{\textit{f}}6$ 4 $b3$  

Playing an early $b2$-$b3$ has the advantage of keeping Black guessing as to what White will do with the centre pawns.

4 $\ldots$  
5 $\text{\textit{b}}2$  
6 $0-0$  
7 $d3$  
8 $\text{\textit{bd}}2$  
9 $\text{\textit{we}}1$  
10 $e4$  
11 $a4$

Despite a different move order we have the same position at this point as in the previous game. Here Black decides to hold back the development of his queen's knight rather than play $\text{\textit{b}}8$-$a6$-$b4$. Instead he intends to advance his $c$-pawn after White has played $e4$-$e5$.

11 $\ldots$  
12 $\text{\textit{fd}}7$  
11 $c5$? is premature because White still has the possibility of $e4$-$xd5$. Indeed in the game Vukic-Chekho, Banja Luka 1976, Black followed up 11 $c5$ 12 $\text{\textit{e}}5$ with another mistake 12 $\text{\textit{fd}}7$? (12 $\text{\textit{bd}}7$ 13 $f$4 is better for White) 13 $\text{\textit{xd}}7$ $\text{\textit{xd}}7$ 14 $\text{\textit{exd}}5$ $\text{\textit{exd}}5$ 15 $\text{\textit{xd}}5$ 16 $\text{\textit{wh}}6$ 17 $\text{\textit{c}}6$. 18 $\text{\textit{wh}}4$, and White had safely won a pawn.

12 $\text{\textit{we}}2$  
Vacating $e1$ for the knight.

12 $\ldots$  
13 $\text{\textit{f}}6$  
Black continues with his plan, which White is happy to go along with.

13 $e5$!  
White should preserve his queen's bishop for future attacking purposes unless an exchange helps him.

13 $\ldots$  
14 $\text{\textit{e}}1$

A thematic and sound retreat. The more active looking 14 $\text{\textit{xd}}4$ helps Black accelerate his queenside play.

14 $\text{\textit{b}}6$ 15 $f$4 $c5$ 16 $\text{\textit{b}}4$ $c4$+

14 $\ldots$  
15 $c5$
Black prepares to bring his knight to c6 to better observe the centre and put the d4-square under more pressure. This is a good plan because White had to withdraw support of d4 in order to free his f-pawn

15 f4  
16 Wh1  
17 c6

Black chooses a faulty plan which he will not get the time to realise. After d4 he hopes to place his remaining knight on c6. However, 20 Qb6 would have led to a balanced game after 21 Kh3 h6 followed by Wc7-c6, threatening the a4-pawn and occupying White’s weakened h1-a8 diagonal

21 g4!

White sets his pawn-roller in motion

21 ...  
22 Qxh4!

The white knights are the superior pieces in this position, and Black will be too busy trying to hold his kingside together to profit from his grip on the dark squares

22 ...  
23 g5!

White’s attack is beginning to look very dangerous

23 ...  
24 Wh5! (D)

A look at the diagram position reveals a sorry lack of pieces which can come to the aid of Black’s king
Of course 24...gxf4?? now would be suicidal as White is ready to bring a rook to the g-file 25 Qf6! Qxf6 (25 gxf6 26 Qg1 mate) 26 exf6 Qd7 27 fxg7 Qxg7 28 Qg1+ Qf6 29 Qg5 mate. Nor does 24...f6?? offer a chance of survival as 25 exf6 Qxf6 26 fxg5 will soon lead to White playing g5-g6

24 ... Qd7
25 Qf3 Ke8
25...f6? is met by 26 fxg5 Qxe5 27 Qg6

26 Qexg5 Qxg5
27 Qxg5 Qf8

Black has succeeded in defending as well as possible, but White has two rooks in reserve which guarantee victory

28 Qf3! Qg6
29 Qg1 Qf8
30 Qxf7! Wxf7
31 Qxg6 1-0

32 f5 is coming, and the black king cannot run away with 31...Qe7 because of 32...Qg5+

After Black failed to capitalise on the imprecise 17 c4? he was subjected to a classic kingside attack typical of this variation.

White plays an early e4

In the following games White dispenses with a queenside fianchetto and works for quicker action in the centre. This may not be the type of line for those players who like to develop their pieces, but the time saved could prove useful to White.

Vaganian-Sveshnikov
Sochi 1980

1 d3 d5 2 g3 Qf6 3 Qg2 c6 4 0-0 Qf5 5 d3 e6 6 Qbd2

An unusual development of the queen's bishop was seen in Powell-Peters, USA 1976 White tried the provocative and original 6 Qf4?? and Black gamely countered by preparing g7-g5. The game continued 6...h6 7 Qbd2 Qbd7 8 Qe1 g5?? 9 e4! with a complicated battle which turned out in White's favour after 9...dxe4? (better is 9...Qg6 10 Qxe3 Qg7, when it is Black who has a strong bishop on the a1-h8 diagonal) 10 dxe4 Qg4 10...Qg6 11 Qe3 Qxe4 12 Qxe4 Qxe4 13 Qd4!, or 11 Qxe4 12 Qxe4 Qxe4 13 Qxa7 Qxg3 14 Qd4! 11 Qe3

6 ... Qe7
7...Qe7

Black exchanged on e4 in Reshevsky-Smyslov, USSR vs Rest of the World 1970. There followed (8 dxe4) 9 dxe4 Qh7 10 Qe2 Qbd7 11 e5 (it is too late to change plans and go for a queenside fianchetto as Black can aim at the e-pawn) 11 b3! Qc5 12 Qb2 Qxe4 13 Qxe6 Qxf3 14 Qxe7 Qxe2 15 Qxd8 Qxd8, so 12 e5 is forced, but 12 Qx5 favours Black) 11 Qd5 12 Qe4 Qc5 13 Qxc5 Qxe5 14 Qd2 Qc7 (not 14 Qxc2 15 Qc4!) 15 a3 0-0 Now White should have played 16 Qh1! followed by f2-f4, when Black is under pressure.
White clears the way for the charge of the f-pawn. This active strategy is more suitable here because White is able to use the time it would have taken to play b2-b3 and a3-b4 to throw his kingside pawns forward. In Frog-Sveshnikov, Elista 1995, White sorted out his queen and rook first. There followed 9... 0-0 10. a3 e5 and only now did Mr. Frog jump into e5, but he had in mind a new, provocative approach involving neither a kingside pawn offensive nor a queenside fianchetto. 11... e5 d3 b7 12. a3 x7 13. x3 f8 14. f3 19 (D)

At first glance this may seem like a somewhat foolish play. White's kingside pawns are going nowhere and his bishop is about to be forced back. Not the most positive start to the middlegame. However, there is a long-term, positional foundation upon which this strategy is based. After Black's next move, the bishop could be vulnerable on the d-file. 15. c5 16. h4. And here we see the point, although we might need to look closely. Control of the f5-square is not exactly a match-winner, but without any similar weaknesses in his camp (note the three queenside which are yet to move) White can claim some kind of advantage. Moreover, even though Black's bishop is shut out of the game on h7, exchanging it removes his only influence over f5, after which the light squares in front of the king grow weaker. 16. d7 17. f3. Another piece is heading for f5. Now 17... f5 18. exf5 19. h5 e7 20. x5 f5 21. g4 is unclear. Instead, Black played 17. d8 18. g4 c7 19. f5 (19 f5??) 19... g6, which is not as silly as it looks (19... f5 20. x5 is a little better for White), and in fact 20. h3 e6 21. e3 c5 (21. dxe4 22. dxe4 d4 23. x4 exd4 24. ad1 with an edge to White) 22. xex6 exe6 23. c4 dxe4 24. dxe4 opened the d-file for the exchange of major pieces and a level ending.

For another, less subtle plan, see Gutman-Leinov, below. Vaganian hopes that leaving the queen on e1 will prove useful since the subsequent advance of the f- and g-pawns will provide an entry to the kingside by opening the e1-h4 diagonal.

9... e5 10. d7

Not 10. x7 11. e5 when Black's knight lacks a good square.

11. f4 12. h1 a5

Black reacts with an assault of his own.

13. g4 a4?!

Consistent but not correct. Better was 13. dxe4 14. dxe4 c5, limiting White to a slight edge.

14. f5 a3

15. b3 e8

16. h1 exf5

17. wxf5 wa5

18. edx5 exd5

19. wg3 hb4

20. df3 wh8 (D)
White threatened 21 \( \textbf{\text{A}}xh6 \) Also insufficient is 20 \( \textbf{\text{A}}xh6 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}g6 \) 22 \( \textbf{\text{H}}h4 \), e.g. 22 g\( \textbf{x} \)h6 23 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{x}g6 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{x}g6 \) 24 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{x}g6+ \) \( \textbf{\text{H}}h8 \) 25 \( \textbf{\text{A}}f7 \)

A cursory glance at the diagram position suggests that Black's dark square control gives him a comfortable game. A closer inspection, however, tells another story. White's kingside pawn charge has accomplished more than Black's efforts on the queenside, and Vaganian now endeavors to strip away his opponent's defences.

21 f6
22 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf6} \)
23 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf6} \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}h5 \)

Accepting the sacrifice does not help. 22 g\( \textbf{x} \)h6 23 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xe}5 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}e7 \) (or 23 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xe}5 \) 24 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xe}5 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}c3 \) 25 d\( \textbf{\text{A}} \)4) 24 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf6} \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}g8 \) 25 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{h}4 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xe}5 \) 26 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf6} \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}g7 \) 27 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf7}+ \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf7} \) 28 f\( \textbf{\text{A}} \)6
29 \( \textbf{\text{A}}g5 \) ! \( \textbf{\text{A}}g6 \)
30 \( \textbf{\text{A}}xh6 \)?? 25 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf7} \) mate, or 24 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf7} \)? 25 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf7}+ \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}g8 \) 26 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf6} \)
25 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf7} \)
26 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf7} \)!

White sacrifices a piece to break into his opponent's kingside
26 ... \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf7} \) 27 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf7} \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}f8 \) 28 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{b}f\) 1 \( \textbf{\text{A}}c5 \) 29 \( \textbf{\text{d}}4 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}d6 \)

Not 29 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf8} \) 30 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf8} \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf8} \) 31 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf8}+ \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf8} \) 32 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf8}+ \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf8} \) 33 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{x}d5 \)
30 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf7}+! \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xf7} \) 31 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{h}5+ \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{h}5 \) 32 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xe}8+ \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{h}7 \) 33 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{x}d5 \)

The KIA bishop comes into play, threatening two deadly checks.
33 ... \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{h}3 \)
34 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{e}4+ \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{h}6 \) 35 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{g}1 \) 1-0

Black cannot defend against the threat of \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{g}6+ \) without suffering a decisive loss of material.

Gutman-Leinov
Israel 1980

1 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{f}3 \) d5 2 g\( \textbf{\text{A}} \)3 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{f}6 \) 3 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{g}2 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{f}5 \) 4 0-0 c6

Also possible is 4 e6 5 d3 h6 6 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{bd}2 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{c}7 \) 7 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{e}1 \) 0-0 8 e4 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{h}7 \) 9 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{e}2 \) c5?; when Black has dispensed with c7-c6 in readiness for a quick queenside assault.

Plachetka-Yusupov, Lucerne Olympiad 1982, continued 10 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{b}2 \) c4! 12 bx\( \textbf{\text{A}} \)4 (12 exd5 exd5) and 12 dxc4 dxe4 13 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{e}5 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{d}4 \) 14 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{d}1 \) e3! are both very good for Black) 12 dxe4 13 dxc4 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{c}7 \) with a comfortable game for Black. However, 10 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{e}5 \) is more likely to highlight the deficiency of the c7-c5 idea (which does go against the solid nature of the \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{f}5 \) lines).

After 10 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{e}5 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{c}6 \) 11 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xc}6 \) leaves Black with potentially weak doubled pawns and 10 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{bd}7 \) 11 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xd}7 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{xd}7 \) 12 e5 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{e}8 \) 13 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{f}3 \) \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{c}7 \) 14 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{f}4 \) gives White the advantage thanks to his over-protection of the e5-pawn and good prospects of a kingside attack.

5 d3 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{h}6 \)
6 \( \textbf{\text{A}}\text{bd}2 \) e6
If White intends to put his queen on e2 then this method of forcing through c2-c4 is fine. Of course the interesting try which was successful for White in the previous game is equally possible:

7    ...    Qe7
8    We2    0-0
9    e4    Qh7
10    Wh4?!

Introducing a seemingly blunt but effective attacking plan of playing Qg1 and pushing the g-pawn

10    ...    Qbd7

Too passive. A vigorous queenside counter-attack is called for such as 10    a5! 11 e5 Qfd7 12 Qg1 c5! 13 Qf1 Qc7 14 g4 Qc6 15 Qf4 Qd4! 16 Qxd4 cxd4 with enough pressure to at least distract White from his kingside mission

11    e5    Qe8
12    Qg1    Qc7

Supporting the e-pawn in preparation for a challenge against White's advanced e-pawn with f7-f6. White anticipates this thrust

13    g4!    f6
14    exf6    Qxf6
15    Qf1    We7
16    g5! (D)

A temporary pawn sacrifice which enables White to further open the g-file for his rook

16    ...    hXg5
17    Wh3    Qf5
18    Qxg5    Qxg5
19    Qxg5    Wh7
20    Qxf5    Wh5

Black underestimates the danger he faces on the g-file. Recapturing with the pawn is an improvement, and after 20 exf5 21 Qg3 Qae8, White's best is to take a slight endgame advantage with 22 Wh5 Qe6 23 Wh7+ Wh7 24 Qae1

Now White can keep the position sufficiently closed to maintain dangerous threats against the black king, without the worry of his opponent having counterplay down the e-file

21    f4    d4
22    Qg3    Wh5+
23    Qg2    Wh7
24    Qe4?!  

It is natural that White would like to occupy the newly available e4-square with his knight, although 24 Qg1 causes Black more immediate problems

24    ...    e5
25    f5?    Qxf5

The pawn must be removed as the threat of f5-f6 is difficult to prevent

26    Wh6    Wh7
27 \textit{\text{H}}\text{ag}1 \textit{\text{O}}\text{e}8! \\
The most accurate defensive resource. The alternative 27 \textit{\text{O}}\text{e}6 results in an even better game for White after 28 \textit{\text{E}}\text{g}6! \textit{\text{O}}\text{df}8 29 \textit{\text{H}}\text{g}4 28 \textit{\text{E}}\text{g}5! \\
Intending to triple on the g-file with \textit{\text{W}}\text{e}2-g2 \\
28 \ldots \textit{\text{O}}\text{df}6 \\
If Black escapes the pin on the g-file with 28 \textit{\text{W}}\text{f}8 White makes another 29 \textit{\text{E}}\text{x}g7! \textit{\text{E}}\text{x}g7 30 \textit{\text{W}}\text{g}2 \textit{\text{W}}\text{g}8 31 \textit{\text{H}}\text{x}g7+ \textit{\text{H}}\text{x}g7 32 \textit{\text{H}}\text{h}3 \textit{\text{O}}\text{e}8 33 \textit{\text{W}}\text{g}4 White is clearly much better, but Black is surviving \\
29 \textit{\text{W}}\text{g}2 \textit{\text{O}}\text{xe}4 \\
30 \textit{\text{d}}\text{x}e4 \textit{\text{W}}\text{d}7 \\
31 \textit{\text{W}}\text{g}3! \\
We will soon see why this clever move is preferable to 31 \textit{\text{F}}\text{xe}5 \textit{\text{O}}\text{c}7 32 \textit{\text{E}}\text{g}5 \textit{\text{O}}\text{e}6 33 \textit{\text{H}}\text{g}6 \textit{\text{E}}\text{e}8 with good drawing chances for Black \\
31 \ldots \textit{\text{W}}\text{e}7 \\
32 \textit{\text{W}}\text{b}3! (D) \\

\textit{\text{B}} \\

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

Gutman uses his queen to full effect. Thanks to this second pin the threat is 33 \textit{\text{E}}\text{x}g7+? \textit{\text{O}}\text{g}7 34 \textit{\text{E}}\text{x}g7+ \textit{\text{W}}\text{f}8 35 \textit{\text{E}}\text{f}7+ 32 \ldots \textit{\text{W}}\text{f}8 \\
There is no escape the other way \\
32 \textit{\text{H}}\text{h}8 33 \textit{\text{E}}\text{x}g7! \textit{\text{E}}\text{x}g7 34 \textit{\text{W}}\text{h}3+ \textit{\text{W}}\text{g}8 35 \textit{\text{H}}\text{h}5+ threatening 36 \textit{\text{H}}\text{h}8+ 33 \textit{\text{H}}\text{h}5! \textit{\text{W}}\text{g}8 \\
Accepting the poisonous bishop with 33 \textit{\text{g}}\text{x}h6 allows 34 \textit{\text{H}}\text{x}h6 \textit{\text{W}}\text{d}7 \\
35 \textit{\text{W}}\text{b}4+ (35 \textit{\text{E}}\text{c}7 36 \textit{\text{H}}\text{h}8+ \textit{\text{F}}\text{f}7 37 \textit{\text{H}}\text{h}7+ \textit{\text{H}}\text{f}8 38 \textit{\text{H}}\text{f}1+ and \textit{\text{E}}\text{x}e7) 34 \textit{\text{E}}\text{x}g7! \\
White is ready to make the final breakthrough \\
34 \ldots \textit{\text{E}}\text{x}g7 \\
35 \textit{\text{W}}\text{h}3 \textit{\text{H}}\text{f}8 \\
Or 35 \textit{\text{E}}\text{f}4 36 \textit{\text{H}}\text{h}8+ \textit{\text{F}}\text{f}7 37 \textit{\text{W}}\text{h}7! \\
36 \textit{\text{H}}\text{h}8+ \textit{\text{F}}\text{f}7 \\
37 \textit{\text{E}}\text{x}g7+! \textit{\text{E}}\text{g}7 \\
38 \textit{\text{W}}\text{h}7+ \textit{\text{F}}\text{f}6 \\
39 \textit{\text{W}}\text{f}5+ 1-0 \\
39 \textit{\text{E}}\text{g}7 40 \textit{\text{H}}\text{h}7+ \textit{\text{E}}\text{g}8 41 \textit{\text{E}}\text{g}6+ \\
White announced his intentions of attacking down the g-file as early as his tenth move. Instead of immediately instigating a thematic queenside counter Black rather unwise elected to try and match his opponent on the kingside \\
In the following game Black delays castling in order to speed up the generation of a queenside attack

\textbf{Smyslov-Miles} \\
\textit{England 1975} \\
1 \textit{\text{E}}\text{f}3 \textit{\text{E}}\text{f}6 2 \textit{\text{g}}3 \textit{\text{d}}5 3 \textit{\text{E}}\text{g}2 \textit{\text{c}}6 4 \textit{\text{0-0 \textit{\text{E}}f}5 5 \textit{\text{d}}3 \textit{\text{h}}6 6 \textit{\text{E}}\text{bd}2 \textit{\text{e}}6 7 \textit{\text{W}}\text{e}1 \textit{\text{E}}\text{e}7 8 \textit{\text{E}}\text{e}4 \textit{\text{H}}\text{h}7 9 \textit{\text{W}}\text{e}2 \textit{\text{W}}\text{e}7?? \\
An interesting if not completely sound continuation. Black delays castling and looks to the queenside for activity in anticipation of Smyslov closing the centre with e4-e5. Keene-Zuidema, England 1972, saw Black adopt a policy of castling kingside and then pushing his f- and g-pawns forward. That game went 9 0-0 10 \textit{\text{E}}\text{fd}7 11 \textit{\text{E}}\text{e}1 \textit{\text{c}}5 12 \textit{\text{E}}\text{f}1 \textit{\text{E}}\text{c}6 13 \textit{\text{h}}4 \textit{\text{E}}\text{c}8 14 \textit{\text{E}}\text{f}4 \textit{\text{E}}\text{e}8 15 \textit{\text{E}}\text{h}2 \textit{\text{f}}5?? (15 \textit{\text{E}}\text{f}8!? is sensible) 16 \textit{\text{c}}4?? (Keene gives 16 \textit{\text{h}}5 as an improvement, although it is difficult to see that Black's next will be more useful than weakening)
16. g5 17. e3 d4 18. c1 g4 19. d2 dxe5 (19. cxe5 20. b3! threatens both xfb7 and xh6!) 20. xxc6 dxc6 21. wxe6+ g7 22. b3 and White stands slightly better.

10. e5 f7
11. xe1 c5
12. e4 (D)

White must take care not to succumb to a queenside pawn avalanche, especially with Black’s queen’s bishop sitting on the b1-h7 diagonal. It is true that the d-pawn is now a weakness, but if Black manages to get c5-c4 in the pawn will be weaker still after c4xd3, and d3xc4 from White opens the diagonal still further and makes c2 a target. Establishing a pawn on c4 helps form a good blockade which is designed to keep Black albeit temporarily at bay while White builds up an attack on the kingside.

12. ... d4
13. f1 c6
14. d2 Preventing c6-b4
14. ... b8
15. g4 b5

Another idea is 15. a6 to meet c4xb5 with a6xb5, after which Black will play for c5-c4. However, Black appreciates the importance of a quick counter to White’s kingside build-up:

16. exb5 xb5
17. h3 a5
18. g3 0-0

Black needs both rooks to continue with his queenside attack, and his king is no safer in the centre than it is on g8.

19. g5! hxg5
20. xg5 f8
20. xg5 21 xg5 cxe5 22 xh7 xh7 23 w4+ b8 (23 g6 24 wc6!) 24 f4 is good for White.

21. xe7 x7
22. ac1!

The threat of cxd4 forces the black queen to vacate c7.

22. ... wd8
23. g5 g6
24. h4 a4

Active play from both sides. Nevertheless White’s assortment of pieces on the kingside makes his attack considerably easier to conduct.

25. bxa4 b2
26. w3 a2
27. h3 a3
28. h5! xd3
29. wg2!

From here the queen can oversee events without obstructing the minor pieces.

29. ... bb3(D)
29 \( \text{Axe}g3 \) does not alleviate Black's problems. 30 \( \text{Aw}g3 \) \( \text{Axe}h5 \)
31 \( \text{Axe}e6 \) fxe6 32 \( \text{Axe}e6+ \) \( \text{Axe}h7 \) 33 \( \text{Aw}e3 \) Instead Black continues down the path of counter-attack, hoping for 30 hgx6 \( \text{Axe}g6 \) with dangerous compensation for the sacrificed piece.

30 \( \text{Axe}e6 \)!

Uncompromising and best, resulting in simplifications which are very favourable for White.

30 ... fxe6
31 \( \text{Axe}e6+ \) \( \text{Axe}f7 \)
32 \( \text{Axe}f7+ \) \( \text{Axe}f7 \)
33 e6+ \( \text{Axe}g8 \)
34 exd7 \( \text{Wxd}7 \)
35 \( \text{Axe}4 \)

Threatening 36 \( \text{Axe}c5 \) and 36 \( \text{Axe}f6 \!
35 ... \( \text{Wh}3! \)
36 \( \text{Axe}c5! \)

Not falling for the trap by 36 \( \text{Axe}c5? \) \( \text{Axe}g3! \)
36 ... \( \text{Wx}g2+ \)
37 \( \text{Axe}g2 \) \( \text{Hb}7 \)
38 \( \text{Axe}g5! \) \( \text{He}3 \)

Black cannot defend his d-pawn, knight and back rank simultaneously (White threatened 39 \( \text{He}c8+1 \)
39 \( \text{Axe}d5! \) \( \text{He}8 \)
Of course not 39 \( \text{Axe}d5?? \) 40 \( \text{He}8 \)
40 \( \text{Axe}d4 \)

And White eventually converted his material advantage into the full point 1-0.

Smyslov’s handling of the attack, under pressure from Miles’s energetic retaliation, is a good example of how one can generate threats on the kingside — even when facing an adversary who recognises that quiet play is no answer to White’s build-up.
immediately. Now the bishop is free to choose a post on its original diagonal. Most players are likely to react in a more stereotyped fashion. In Badea-Cozianu, Romanian Ch 1997, Black was not interested in venturing from his pre-determined route. White came up with a novel knight manoeuvre to complement the advance of his kingside pawns 6 h6 7 e4 d5 8 d3 e7 9 d2 f6 10 f4 0-0 11 d5 b5 12 c1 g4 13 c7 11 g4 (D)

and now 19 d8 20 b6 g8 21 f3 g8 22 e5 e7 23 d5 g6 24 g4 is unclear. White clearly has compensation for the exchange
7 e4 dxe4
8 dxe4

Unless White is content to exchange a pair of minor pieces he must now either nudge his queen to e1 or open the g1-a7 diagonal for Black's other bishop. As the whole point of 6 f3 is to push the f-pawn. White selects the second option
9 f3

Consistent. However, 9 e5 borrows a theme from the f4 move, but here the early central exchange means that White can use the c4-square for his knight. Black is not ready for 9 b6 in view of 10 a4, so after 9 e5 10 c4 d6 11 White can consider driving the knight to e3 to hit the bishop and eye f5 or, alternatively, post the queen on c3 to pressure the e5-pawn and concentrate on the queenside. Remember that the f-pawn is still ready for launch at any time
9 ...
10 e2
11 d1 (D)

The time that White saved with his queen has been spent on sending the knight to e3, supporting f5 and just one step away from g4. Meanwhile the other knight bolsters the stronghold on e4. This is an important factor. The recommended recipe when faced with an attack on the wing (particularly the kingside) is a swift counter in the centre, and in the diagram position White is well prepared to meet such a challenge 13 d8 14 f5 d4 15 g4 d4 16 xg4 and White was making progress on the kingside. The thematic 16 c5 17 d3 exf5 18 exf5 d5 19 d5 d6 20 d2 is comfortable for White, so Black settled for 16 d7 when Badea pressed forward 17 f6 18 d6 19 gxf6 19 Wh4

Despite the symmetrical nature of the pawn layout the position is not
clear. White is already threatening to burst out with f3-f4 and \( \text{Qd2-b3/f3} \), exploiting Black’s classical development by harassing the bishops. Consequently Black endeavours to strike the first blow.

11... \( \text{h5!?} \)

Maybe a little too direct for most people, this aggressive response makes sense from a positional and psychological point of view. White was hoping that his king would spend much of the game tucked safely away in the corner, watching while Black’s comes face to face with his own marching pawns. After the natural 11... \( 0-0 \) 12 \( \text{Qb3 Qb6} \) 13 \( \text{Qd1-d2} \) followed by \( \text{Qd2-c4} \), White has an edge on both sides of the board thanks to the threat of f3-f4.

12... \( \text{h3} \) 13... \( \text{h4} \) 14... \( \text{Qb3} \) 15... \( \text{Qc3}!? \)

Thinking only of his f-pawn, White is in automatic mode. Better is 15... \( \text{Qbd2} \) followed by 16... \( \text{Qc4} \), keeping an eye on e5 in readiness for f3-f4 and introducing the possibility of \( \text{Qc4-e3-f5} \).

15... \( \text{We7} \)

Preparing for the inevitable f3-f4, Black simply focuses his forces on the centre. The first square which comes to mind is the one directly in front of the soon to be isolated e-pawn.

16 f4... \( \text{exf4} \) 17... \( \text{Qxf4} \) 18... \( \text{Qxb3} \) 19... \( \text{Qxe5}! \)

Forced because Black was threatening to take absolute control of the e5-square with 19... \( \text{Qf6-d7} \)

19... \( \text{We5} \) 20... \( \text{We5} \) 21... \( \text{e5} \) 22... \( \text{Qd7} \)

with an unclear position. With a little more patience and flexibility, White could have made something from his opening experiment. It certainly throws Black off balance and forces him to think for himself, and the prospect of facing an early pawn advance can be uncomfortable for Black.
7 King's Indian Defence Reversed

1 ♜f3 c5 2 g3 d5 3 ♛g2 ♛c6 4 ♟e6 (D)

Flanketto System

Hickl-Lev
Bern Zonal 1990

1 g3 c5 2 ♛g2 ♛c6 3 e4 g6 4 d3 ♛g7 5 ♛f3 ♛f6 6 0-0 0-0 7 c3 d5
(D)

When Black pushes with both c7–c5 and d7–d5 the adversaries reverse roles and White is playing a King's Indian Defence with an extra tempo. Of course, White should be happy to go along with this, especially as the King's Indian is such a reputable defence. Nevertheless, Black often volunteers to allow White this luxury, and the most popular choice is to flanketto the king's bishop, as in the first three games. The other three see Black adopting versions of the Classical Variation.

With this move Black adopts the popular flanketto system which is used by White against the King's Indian Defence. Not surprisingly the extra tempo helps White here, but Black's setup is logical and gives a reasonable game. The more conservative 7...d6 would transpose to the Sicilian Defence.

8 ♖bd2 e5
Alternatives

a) Plachetka-Príbyl, Czechoslovakia 1974 saw an attempt to cramp White with 8 d4. After 9 cxd4 cxd4 10 a4 e5 11 Qc4 White stood better and on 11 Qe8 he used the extra tempo to undertake a queenside offensive with 12 b4! Such a push can be excellent for White, and the reader should be on the lookout for this active possibility in related positions, particularly when Black has ambitiously advanced his central pawns.

b) 8 g4?! is not a good plan for Black, either Lutkov-Bagirov, Alma-Ata 1969 continued 9 exd5 Qxd5 10 h3 Qd7 11 ©b3 b6 12 d4!, when White’s firm control of the centre left him much better.

9 ©e1

Expansion on the queenside is another plan available to White.

a) Petrosian-Teschner, Stockholm Interzonal 1962, continued 9 a3, aiming to advance the b-pawn. Of course Black can prevent b2-b4 with 9 a5, but White then happily gives back a tempo with 10 a4, leaving Black’s queenside weak (particularly the squares b5 and b6). Consequently the game went (after 9 a3) 9 h6 10 b4 cxb4 11 axb4 b5 12 ©a3 ©e8 13 ©e2 ©g4 14 ©b3, when White had a slight pull on the queenside.

b) Popovic-Kirov, Wroclaw 1979, continued instead 9 a4 h6 10 a5© dxe4 (10 ©xa5? 11 ©xe5) 11 dxe4 ©e6 12 ©e2 ©c7 13 a6! b6, when White eventually made use of b7 by playing ©c4-d6-b7.

9 ... h6

Black often makes this precautionary move in order to deny his opponent the use of the g5-square, as a future ©c1-g5 or ©f3-g5 could undermine Black’s control of d5.

The space-gaining 9 d4 transposes to the game Yap-Bany, Hungary 1986. White immediately sought an initiative on the queenside with 10 cxd4 cxd4 11 ©c4 ©e8 12 ©b3 ©d6 13 ©g5 ©f6 14 ©xf6 ©xf6 15 ©xd6 ©xd6 16 ©c1 Black has problems completing his development, and the passive 16 ©b8 was answered by the thematic 17 ©d5! ©f6 18 b4!, when 18 ©xb4 19 ©xe5 left Black with a weak d-pawn and a passive game.

10 a4

An almost automatic reaction in many variations. White intends to use c4 as a useful post for his queen’s knight, so it is necessary to put a stop to a harassing b7-b5 from Black.

10 ... ©e8

Bringing more support to his e-pawn, which is about to come under pressure from White’s pieces after the following central exchange.

11 exd5 ©xd5
12 ©c4 (D)

Although Black enjoys a space advantage his chances of finding a constructive plan are somewhat limited. One policy is to calmly wait and see how White will continue, making sure not to make any
structural weaknesses. However, White’s game is a little easier to play. He has a definite, albeit minuscule pull on both sides of the board, and his king’s bishop — unlike Black’s — resides on an open diagonal.

12 ... $\text{Q}_b6$? 

An interesting alternative to 12 $\text{Q}_f5$, as in Wade-Browne, Hastings 1972/73. Rather than give White a choice of operations Black challenges his opponent’s formidable knight, forcing either a retreat or a relieving exchange.

13 $\text{Q}_e3$

White wisely keeps his piece, consequently retaining the tension.

13 ... $\text{Q}_a5$

Black seeks to effectively neutralise White’s conventional grip of c4, but at the cost of granting the first player another outpost.

14 $\text{W}_c2$ c4
15 $\text{d}_xc4$ $\text{Q}_bxc4$
16 $\text{Q}_d1$ $\text{W}_c7$
17 $\text{Q}_d5$ $\text{W}_b8$

In return for the relinquishing of c4, which now belongs to a black knight, White has command of the d-file and an unchallenged knight on d5. It will also become apparent that White continues to have a mild initiative on both sides of the board, and Hicken now steps up the pace.

18 $\text{Q}_h4$ $\text{Q}_h7$

With his pieces over on the queenside, Black realises that White’s last move did indeed threaten to shatter his kingside with the sacrifice $\text{Q}_h4\times g6$ but now the f7-pawn is left undefended, and White cleverly uses a timely queenside expansion to shift his queen to the a2-g8 diagonal.

19 b4 $\text{Q}_c6$
20 $\text{W}_a2$ $\text{Q}_d6$

Despite the attempts to curtail his queenside aggression White has nevertheless succeeded in making tremendous progress on that flank. Moreover the versatile queen’s knight — which soon found a good home after being evicted from c4 — is ready to jump into c7, winning the exchange. Thus Black is reduced to giving up his useful light-squared bishop leaving yet another mighty white piece to oversee on d5.

26 ... $\text{Q}_e6$
27 $\text{W}_c2$ $\text{Q}_xd5$
28 $\text{Q}_xd5$ $\text{W}_d8$
29 c4 $\text{W}_b6$

Black takes the proffered pawn and hopes for the best, a good decision in view of the threatened push c4-c5.
30 c5 \textcolor{red}{\textit{We7}}
31 \textcolor{red}{\textit{eac}}\textcolor{red}{\textit{1}} \textcolor{red}{\textit{b3}}

Unfortunately for Black 31 \textit{eac8}
32 \textit{Wb1}, or 31 \textit{eac8} 32 \textit{Wb3}
leaves his position overloaded
32 \textbf{f4!}

For the invested pawn White has a commanding position with a powerful grip on the white squares. He now threatens \textit{f4-f5} aiming at the weak \textit{g6-pawn}
32 \ldots \textit{f5}

Preventing the aforementioned advance and also removing the \textit{f-pawn} from the line of fire of White’s bishop, enabling \textit{c8-c7} to be played
33 \textit{We4}

It is interesting to look at the movements of the white queen thus far. Persistent pressure on both the \textit{b1-h7} and \textit{a2-g8} diagonals has reaped considerable rewards
33 \ldots \textit{e7}
34 \textit{La7} \textit{f8}
35 \textit{We6} \textit{La6 (D)}

\begin{center}
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Black develops his rook on his third rank in order to defend the \textit{g6-pawn}. Since this is the pawn which is holding Black’s position together, White manages to remove it by blocking the path of the defending rook

36 \textbf{c6!} \textit{xc6}
37 \textit{xe6} \textit{bxc6}
38 \textit{axg6+} \textit{hxg6}
39 \textit{wxg6+} \textit{h8}
40 \textit{xf5} \textit{xf7}

With his kingside crumbling Black puts his hopes in a rook and pawn ending
41 \textit{wxg7+} \textit{wxg7}
42 \textit{dxe7} \textit{eg7}
43 \textit{exe5} \textit{ec8}
44 \textit{ec5!}

Not 44 \textit{xa5} c5 Instead White gives himself time to bring his king over to the queenside, as Black cannot defend both his \textit{a-} and \textit{c-} pawns simultaneously. White’s kingside pawns have remarried intact and will be able to help each other advance. As will be seen this factor gives White a decisive advantage

44 \ldots \textit{f6}
45 \textit{e2} \textit{e6}
46 \textit{e3} \textit{d6}
47 \textit{xa5} \textit{c5}

Black’s only hope lies in pushing his \textit{c-pawn}, so White first monitors the queenside before turning his attention to the other wing
48 \textit{d3} \textit{d5}
49 \textit{a7}

White heads for the weak \textit{h-pawn}, inviting Black to make his own, less dangerous, invasion
49 \ldots \textit{h8}
50 \textit{c3} \textit{e8}
51 \textit{d7+!}

White takes advantage of the fact that the black king is obliged to stay with the \textit{c-pawn}, making a stop en route to \textit{h7} which forces Black to lose time
51 \ldots \textit{c6}
52 \textit{h7} \textit{e3+}
53 \textit{d2} \textit{a3}
54 \textit{hxh6+} \textit{c5}
55 \textit{f3}
The capture of the h-pawn has opened the door for White’s pawns to begin the race to the eighth rank

55 ... \( \text{xa}2+ \)
56 \( \text{xc}3 \) \( \text{xa}3+ \)
57 \( \text{xb}2 \) \( \text{xa}4 \)
58 \( \text{h}3 \)
Preparation g3-g4.

58 ... \( \text{xe}4 \)
59 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{xf}4 \)
60 \( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{e}4 \)

Or 60 \( \text{xe}6 \) 61 \( \text{g}5 \), when Black has no way of stopping all three white pawns.

61 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{f}2+ \)
62 \( \text{c}1 \) \( \text{d}3 \)
63 \( \text{h}8 \) \( \text{f}1+ \)
64 \( \text{b}2 \) \( \text{f}2+ \)
65 \( \text{a}3 \)

The white king no longer needs to block the opposing pawn.

65 ... \( \text{c}4 \)
66 \( \text{g}6! \) 1-0

Black went to considerable lengths to stop White’s queenside play in the bud, failed, and then saw his kingside succumb to an attack.

Weinstein-Westerinen
Budapest 1976

1 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 2 g3 g6 3 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{g}7 \) 4
0-0 0-0 5 d3 d5

Black chooses a more ambitious continuation than the Symmetrical Variation.

6 \( \text{bd}2 \) c5

Apart from the alternative 6 \( \text{e}6 \) (see Chapter 8), Black has occasionally tried 6 d4 in this position, but the advance appears somewhat illogical as it hands over the e4-square to White’s queen’s knight. The game Hug-Wahls, Bern Zonal 1990, saw White immediately accept the positional gift with 7 \( \text{e}4 \) c5 8 a4 \( \text{d}5 \) 9 \( \text{fd}2 \) After

9 \( \text{e}6 \) 10 e4 Black was obliged to play 10 dxe3 (otherwise White has gained too much time), when 11 fxe3 \( \text{b}6 \) 12 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 13 \( \text{d}4 \) left White much better.

7 e4 \( \text{c}6 \)
8 c3 \( \text{h}6 \)

A common move, simply planning to develop the queen’s bishop on e6 without having to be concerned about a future annoying \( \text{f}3 \)-g5.

9 \( \text{e}1 \)

An option worth considering is 9 exd5, avoiding lines in which Black plays \( \text{d}5 \times \text{e}4 \)

9 ... \( \text{e}6 \) (D)


Black decides to do without e7-e5. It is a matter of taste whether Black makes the central pawn exchange \( \text{d}5 \times \text{e}4 \) or allows White to play e4xd5, although this game does suggest that the former plan at least offers Black more stability. 9 dxe4 occurred in Jansa-Formtos, Athens 1969, when 10 dxe4 \( \text{e}6 \) 11 \( \text{e}2 \) \( \text{d}7 \) (intending 12 \( \text{c}4 \) b5+? 13 \( \text{d}3 \) b4) would have given Black a reasonable game. Instead Black played the less circumspect 11 \( \text{a}5+? \), resulting in a good game for White after 12 a4 \( \text{d}8 \) 13 \( \text{b}5 \)
10... exd5

Also possible is 10 e5 Qa7 11 d4 cxd4 12 cxd4 — White has an advantage in the centre and on the kingside, but this may be offset by Black's queenside chances and play on the c-file.

10... Qxd5

Weinstein offers 10 Qxd5 as an improvement, yet a move such as 11 We2 leaves White slightly better as Black's king's knight is poorly placed on f6.

11 Qh3! b6

12 d4!

The idea of c4xd5 followed by Qxd2-b3 and d3-d4 is strategically desirable for White. Black often has to defend the c-pawn with b7-b6, thus enhancing the power of White's king's bishop, and either a knight or a bolstered pawn on d4 will help White dictate matters in the centre and subsequently the kingside.

12... c4

Better than 12 cxd5 13 Qfxd4 Qxd4 14 Qxd4 with a superb position for the first player. With the game move Black hopes to keep the game blocked until he can undermine White's queen's pawn with the advance b6-b5-b4. Although Black is susceptible to an attack on the kingside or on the white squares, his queen's bishop is at the moment acting as overseer.

13 Qbd2 Ae8

13 b5 weakens the c5-square, which White can use immediately by playing 14 Qe4 and then Qc5. Now White makes a very promising positional exchange sacrifice.

14 Axe6!

Not 14 Qxc4? Qxc3! 15 bxc3 Qxc4, although a sound but cautious move is 14 Qf1, when White has only a minuscule edge.

Without any pawn breaks to open up the position for his major pieces, Black must wait to put his material advantage to use. Meanwhile White has command of the light squares and a few weak black pawns to aim at White's most accurate continuation now is 15 We2!, threatening 16 Wxe6+. Then, after 15 Wd7 16 Qxc4 Black does not have the possibility mentioned in the note to his next move. 15 We2 e5 16 dxe5 b5 17 We4 is also very good for White, whose compensation for the exchange consists of a pawn, a solid position, white-square control and excellent kingside attacking prospects.

However, White chooses a more hazardous follow-up to his sacrifice:

15 Qxc4!?? Qxd4??

GM Westernin is not a player to shirk complications, but 15 b5 deserves consideration here. White could then persevere in swashbuckling style with 16 Qxc5 Qxe5 17 Qxe5 Qxe5 18 dxe5 Qxc3! 19 Wxd8 Qxd8 20 bxc3, resulting in an ending in which his two bishops cannot get the better of an active rook 20 Qd1+ 21 Qf1 Bxc3 22 Bb2 Qxa1 23 Qxa1 Rb1 24 Bb5
\[ \text{\textcopyright 150 King's Indian Defence Reversed} \]

\[ \text{\textcircled{Z}xa2 25 \textcircled{Z}d4 with equality. Consequently 15 b5 16 \textcircled{Z}c3 is best when the position is unclear, so White is better trying 15 \textcolor{red}{\textit{We2}} as suggested above.} \]

\[ 16 \text{\textit{Qxd4}} \text{\textit{Exe4}} \]

\[ 17 \text{\textit{Wd3?!}} \]

The tempting 17 \textit{Qxe6} permits 17 \textit{Qxe3}, when White has no more than a draw 18 \textit{Qxd8? Qxd1 19 Qd5+ Wh8 20 Qxc4 Qxd8 puts Black in the driving seat, but 18 \textit{Qxd8 Qxd8 19 Qxd8 Qe2+ 20 Wh1 Qxc1+ 21 Qxc1 Qxc1 draws.} \]

Tricky is (17 \textit{Qxe6 Qxc3}) 18 Wh1 All of Black’s pieces are attacked, yet amazingly 18 \textit{Wc8} 19 \textit{Qxf8 Qe2+ 20 Wh2 Qxc1+ 21 Qxc1 Qxc1 22 Wh1 Wh1 is completely drawn.

\[ 17 \ldots \text{\textit{Hc8??}} \]

The losing move. It was imperative that Black should keep battling in order to have any chance of survival. Once again 17 \textit{Qxc3} suggests itself. Play might continue 18 \textit{Wxc4+ Wxd4 19 Wxe6+ Wh7 20 bxc3 Wxc3 (20 Wxf2 21 Wh4 Qxc3 22 Wh3 wins for White) 21 Whb1 Wc2 22 We4 Wxf2+ 23 Wh1.} \]

When Black is much worse but still in the game. Perhaps best is 17 \textit{Qxd4 18 cxd4 Wh7}, even though White stands considerably better.

\[ 18 \text{\textit{Qxe6}} \text{\textit{Qxc3}} \]

Now this resource is insufficient. Similarly, 18 \textit{Qd4} meets with 19 \textit{Wxg6+ Wh1+ 20 Wh1 Qxh7 21 Qxh6! Wxh1 22 Qxg7 and Black gets mated.} \]

\[ 19 \text{\textit{Qxd8}} \text{\textit{Hxfd8}} \]

\[ 20 \text{\textit{We3}} 1-0 \]

Black does not have enough material for the queen. A wild game, but the tactics after the positional sacrifice were in White’s favour.

\[ \text{\textcopyright Dunnington-Gutman} \]

\[ \text{\textcopyright Krumbach 1991} \]

\[ 1 \text{\textit{Qf3}} \text{\textit{Qf6}} 2 g3 g6 3 \textit{g2} 4 \textit{g7} 4 \textit{0-0} 0-0 5 d3 d5 6 \textit{Qbd2} e5 7 e4 \textit{Qc6} 8 c3 \textit{dxe4} \]

A logical choice. Black immediately clarifies matters in the centre and can now concentrate on completing his development.

\[ 9 \text{\textit{dxe4}} \text{\textit{h6}} (D) \]

\[ \text{\textcopyright W} \]

Once again Black prefers to use the e6-square as a home for the queen’s bishop, but unlike the previous game he does not give White the option of playing e4xd5.

Others:

a) The plan of b7-b6 followed by a7-c6 is also possible, as in Knezevic-Bertok, Yugoslavia 1977. The game went 9 b6 10 Wh2 Wh7 11 Wh1 Wh7 12 Wh1 Wh7 13 Wh1 Wh7 14 Wh1 Wh7 15 c4 with a good game for White as Black’s minor pieces on the queenside are sorely missed on the other wing.

b) In Cuderman-Suvalic, Yugoslavia 1961. Black solved the problem of where to put the queen’s bishop by exchanging it after 9 Wh4 10 Wh3 Whx3, but 11 Whx3 Wh5 12 Wh3 Whf7 13 Wh4 Wh7 13 f4 left White with a useful space advantage as well as the two bishops.
10 \( \text{We2} \) \( \text{Le6} \)
11 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{Wa5} \)

Simple development, intending to bring a rook to d8. White will attempt to keep the queenside and the centre under control and build up pressure on the kingside. In practice, it is not easy for Black to keep his pieces out of the way of the marching enemy pawns. The alternative 11 \( \text{Wb6} \) would transpose after 12 \( \text{Qe1} \) to Petrosian-Reshevsky, Zurich Candidates 1953, which continued 12 \( \text{Ea} \) 13 \( \text{Wh2} \) \( \text{Ch7} \) 14 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{Da5} \) 15 \( \text{Qe3} \) \( \text{Qd7} \) 16 \( \text{Qc1} \) \( \text{Wc7} \) 17 \( \text{Qf1} \) b6 18 \( \text{Qe3} \). Although a draw was agreed a dozen moves later, White has a slight initiative at this stage. Note that White does best to drop his knight back to e1 when preparing to push the f-pawn. This is because the weak d3-square must be supported in readiness for Black's occupation of the d-file. One example of how White's eagerness to start a kingside attack can lead to a dangerous neglect of the queenside is (after 11 h3) 11 \( \text{Wb6} \) 12 \( \text{Qh4} \) 13 \( \text{Qad8} \) 14 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{Qd3} \), when 14 \( \text{Wxd3} \) c4+ wins for Black. From e1 the king's knight also has access to the often useful c2-square.

12 \( \text{Qe1} \) \( \text{Qf8} \)
13 \( \text{f4} \) c4!? (D)

An interesting move typical of GM Gutman. Accepting the pawn with 14 \( \text{Qxc4} \) is not wise in view of 14 \( \text{Wa6} \) 15 \( h3 \) \( \text{Dxa5} \) when the pin is uncomfortable. Now we see the idea behind 11 \( \text{Wa5} \) after pushing with c5-c4 Black further covers his fourth rank. This presents White with certain problems if he wishes to throw forward his kingside pawns before Black generates sufficient counterplay on the queenside. Of course, White may simply settle for central play with c4-e5 followed by \( \text{Qd2-e4} \) and \( \text{Cc1-e3} \), but such a plan does not put Black under as much immediate pressure as the more ambitious game choice.

14 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{Ac8} \)
15 \( \text{Wh1} \)

Tucking the king in the corner, away from any annoying checks from the black queen.

15 \( \ldots \) \( \text{g5} \)!

Black reacts to the vigorous offensive by positional means. Consequently Black will use the e5-square as an outpost for a blockading knight, thus keeping White's pawn-roller at bay, meanwhile he hopes to take an initiative on the queenside.

16 \( \text{f5} \)

The white pawns must remain united. After 16 \( \text{fxg5} \) Black has an excellent position.

16 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Ad7} \)
17 \( \text{Qd3} \) \( \text{De5} \)
18 \( \text{Qd4} \)

In return for relinquishing the important e5-square White has received a similarly attractive outpost on d4 for his own knight.

18 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Cc6} \)
19 \( \text{Qe2}(D) \)
White will now complete his development with \( \text{\( \text{c}1\text{-d2} \)\}}, perhaps intending to gain space on the queenside with \( \text{b2-b4} \) followed by \( \text{a2-a4} \). Another idea is to transfer the queen’s bishop to \( \text{g3} \) in order to pressurize the e5-knight and thus invite \( \text{\( \text{f6-d7} \)\}}, after which White is free to play \( \text{\( \text{c}2\text{-e3} \)\}} because his e-pawn is sufficiently defended. Black also has to consider White’s playing \( \text{\( \text{c}2\text{-b4} \)\}} at some stage, threatening a timely \( \text{\( \text{b4xc6} \)\}}, so he decides to utilize his development advantage to cut across White’s plans.

19 \( \text{\( \text{d}3 \)\}}

20 \( \text{\( \text{xe6} \)\}}

21 \( \text{\( \text{e5?} \)\}}

White seizes the opportunity to make this desired central advance, which in turn permits another black knight to observe the weak f4-square. Perhaps this is too big a price to pay, and White should instead play 21 \( \text{\( \text{d}4 \)\}} or 21 \( \text{\( \text{e}3 \)\}} (21 \text{\( \text{xb2} \)\}} 22 \text{\( \text{b4} \)\}}

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

22 \( \text{\( \text{d}5 \)\}}

23 \( \text{\( \text{e}6 \)\}}

23 \( \text{\( \text{xd}4 \)\}}

Black judges that he has good enough control of the dark squares to enable the exchange of his king’s bishop for White’s strong knight.

24 \( \text{\( \text{xf7}+ \)\}}

25 \( \text{\( \text{e}4 \)\}}

26 \( \text{\( \text{xf4} \)\}}

27 \( \text{\( \text{gxf4} \)\}}

Using the enemy pawn as protection rather than potentially exposing the king, e.g. 24 \( \text{\( \text{xf7} \)\}} 25 \text{\( \text{exd4} \)\}} 26 \text{\( \text{xf4} \)\}} 27 \text{\( \text{xc4}+ \)\}}

The exchange sacrifice has kept White in the game, thanks to his traditionally powerful bishop and his potentially troublesome pawns. Meanwhile it is not so easy for Black to successfully defend his \( e- \) and \( f- \) pawns. Nevertheless White’s compensation should only be sufficient to draw with best play, suggesting that his twenty-first move was indeed a little too ambitious.

It is important to mention here that both sides — particularly White — had just a few minutes left in which to reach the time control at move forty.

28 \( \text{\( \text{el} \)\}}

29 \( \text{\( \text{d}5 \)\}}

30 \( \text{\( \text{d}1 \)\}}

After 29 \( \text{\( \text{xb2} \)\}} \text{White draws with} 30 \text{\( \text{e}5 \)\}} \text{, threatening} 31 \text{\( \text{h}8+ \)\}} \text{\( \text{xf7} \)\}} 32 \text{\( \text{h7}+ \)\}} \text{etc.}

31 \( \text{\( \text{d}1 \)\}}

32 \( \text{\( \text{h}6 \)\}}

Black continues to play safe. Now 31 \( \text{\( g5 \)\}} \text{is useless because the black queen defends the h6-pawn, so that} 31 \text{\( \text{xf5} \)\}} 32 \text{\( \text{h5} \)\}} \text{\( \text{gxe5} \)\}} \text{is possible.

31 \( \text{\( \text{xc4} \)\}}

32 \( \text{\( \text{c7} \)\}}

33 \( \text{\( \text{xf5} \)\}}

34 \( \text{\( \text{f6} \)\}}
32 \( \text{We}2 \) \( \text{Wd}6 \)
33 \( \text{h}4 \)
White maintains the pressure before his opponent manages to fully consolidate
33 \( \ldots \) \( \text{hxg}5 \)
35 \( \text{Wh}5! \)
Black suddenly finds himself on the defensive
35 \( \ldots \) \( \text{g}8 \)
Not 35 \( \text{xf}5 \) 36 \( \text{Wh}8+ \) \( \text{xf}7 \) 37 \( \text{Wh}7+ \) when Black must play the awful 37 \( \text{xf}6 \)
36 \( \text{Ke}1! \) \( \text{Wf}6 \)
37 \( \text{hxg}5 \) \( \text{Wx}5 \)
37 \( \text{Wxb}2 \) runs into 38 \( \text{f}6 \)
38 \( \text{Le}4 \) (D)
Forcing Black to simplify into a rook and pawn ending which is good for White

all the winning chances Passive play from Black gives White a free hand, so Gutman opts for active defence
41 \( \ldots \) \( \text{Cc}7 \)
42 \( \text{g}2 \) \( \text{Cc}2+ \)
43 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{Cc}b2 \)
44 \( \text{xf}4 \) \( \text{f}2+ \)
45 \( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{g}6 \)
46 \( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{xa}2 \)
47 \( \text{e}6+ \) \( \text{f}7 \)
48 \( \text{g}6+ \) \( \text{g}7 \)
49 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{f}2+ \)
50 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{b}2 \)
51 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{f}2+ \)
52 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{b}2 \)
53 \( \text{e}7+! \)
White's d-pawn will secure victory The game finished
53 \( \ldots \) \( \text{yg}6 \) 54 \( \text{xe}6 \) \( \text{g}5 \) 55 \( \text{d}6 \)
\( \text{xf}4 \) 56 \( \text{d}7 \) \( \text{Ed}2 \) 57 \( \text{f}7 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 58 \( \text{e}8 \)
\( \text{b}4 \) 59 \( \text{d}8=\text{W} \) \( \text{xd}8+ \) 60 \( \text{xd}8 \) a5 61
\( \text{Cec}7 \) b3 62 \( \text{c}6 \) a4 63 \( \text{Ab}7! \) 1-0
For example, 63 \( \text{Ed}3 \) 64 \( \text{b}5 \) a3
65 \( \text{a}4 \) a2 66 \( \text{xb}3+ \) \( \text{Ed}2 \) 67 \( \text{Ba}3 \)
An exciting game which features the possibilities available to both sides and should also serve as a warning to those players who are prone to overplay the kingside pawn advance

Classical Variation

In the second half of this chapter we look at typical situations in which Black does not fianchetto his king's bishop

Vladimirov-Voskanian
USSR 1977

1 \( \text{Af}3 \) e5 2 g3 d5 3 \( \text{Ag}2 \) \( \text{Ec}6 \) 4
0-0 e5 5 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{Ef}6 \)
Black played 5 \( \text{Ge}7 \) in the game P Nikolic-Raicevic, Belgrade 1988 Although this is a sound system for White against the King's
Indian Defence, it does not seem to be very good here. The game continued 6 \( \text{d} \text{d}2 \text{g}6 7 \text{e}4 \text{d}4 8 \text{a}4 \text{c}7 9 \text{c}4 \text{d}5 10 \text{h}4 \text{g}4 11 \text{d}e1 \text{d}7 12 \text{f}d2 \text{h}3 13 \text{h}5 \text{d}h4, \) when White calmly refutes Black's play with 14 \( \text{h}1 \) f5 15 gxf4 \( \text{x}h4 16 \text{e}2 \text{x}f1 17 \text{x}f1 \text{xf}2 18 \text{xf}2 \text{fxe}4+ 19 \text{g}1 \text{e}3 20 \text{e}4 \text{f}4 21 \text{g}2 \text{a}8 22 \text{dx}c5 \text{c}8 23 \text{d}e3 \text{dxe}3 24 \text{d}e3 \) One idea behind 5 \( \text{d}g\text{e}7 \) is that it avoids the system which White uses in this game.

6 \( \text{g}5!? \) (D)

---

An interesting alternative to 6 \( \text{d}d2, \) and a tempo up on a line which Black uses in the King's Indian Defence. White's plan is quite simple to eliminate the f6-knight and fight for control of the white squares, particularly d5 and f5

6 ... \( \text{e}7 \\
7 \text{d}fd2 \\
Also playable is 7 \( \text{x}f6 \text{x}f6 8 \text{d}fd2, \) but 8 \( \text{e}4? \) may cause White unnecessary problems

7 ... \( \text{d}7 \\
7 \text{d}g8 \) was Vladimirov's own recommendation after this game. The idea was tested more recently at international level in Franco-Gomez Esteban, Canet 1994. After 8 \( \text{cxe}7 \\
\text{fxe}7 9 \text{c}4 \text{d}4 \text{Franco followed Vladimirov's advice still further and hit the c5-pawn with 10 \( \text{d}e4? \) when the forced 10 b6 allowed White to steer the game into reversed Benko territory 11 b4 (D).

---

As a recent Benko convert I like this uncompromising plan, which puts Black on the defensive after

11 \( \text{cxb}4 12 \text{a}3 \text{bxa}3 13 \text{wa}4 0-0 14 \text{wa}3 \text{h}8 15 \text{d}d2, \) when White had compensation for the pawn

8 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) \\
9 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{dxe}4 \) \\
This simplifying exchange makes White's task of dominating d5 easier, so 9 \( \text{d}4 \) is worth consideration, after which 10 \( \text{d}e2 \text{d}7 \) is roughly equal, but 10 \( \text{d}f6 \text{d}f6 \) 11 \( \text{d}d5 \) is better for White

10 \( \text{d}f6!? \) \( \text{d}f6 \) \\
11 \( \text{dxe}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) \\
12 \( \text{d}5 \) \( \text{d}8 \) \\
Taking the knight usually heightens Black's problems in this type of position, e.g. 12 \( \text{d}x\text{d}5 13 \text{ex}d5 \text{d}b4 14 \text{d}e4 \) with a very good position for White

14 \( \text{d}c4 \) \( \text{b}5 \) \\
15 \( \text{ce}3 \) (D)
It is easy to see from the diagram that White has appreciated the positional aspects of the \( \varepsilon_2g3 \) idea much better than his opponent. The \( d5 \)-square is a gaping hole in Black's half of the board, and White even has good chances of seizing \( f5 \). As is often the case Black has a territorial advantage on the queenside, but White has such a commanding hold that this will not generate enough compensation for the second player.

14. ... \( \varepsilon_b8 \)
15. \( c3 \) \( c4 \)
16. \( a4 \)

White spends a move on keeping Black further at bay.

16. ... \( a6 \)
17. \( \varepsilon_h5 \)

Menacingly taking up position near the black king White also wants to take advantage of Black's awkward development by moving a rook to the d-file.

17. ... \( f6 \)
18. \( \varepsilon_fd1 \) \( \varepsilon_d7 \)

Black wisely moves his queen out of the line of fire of the opposing rook (White threatened 19 \( \varepsilon_xf6+ \) and 20 \( \varepsilon_xd7 \)) With his next move White seeks to either exchange Black's good bishop or increase the scope of his own. Whatever course Black chooses, White will accentuate his grip on \( f5 \).

19. \( \varepsilon_h3 \) \( \varepsilon_f7 \)
20. \( \varepsilon_e2 \) \( \varepsilon_b6 \)
21. \( \varepsilon_d5 \)

Threatening 22 \( \varepsilon_xd6 \)
21. ... \( \varepsilon_c5 \) \( D \)

22. \( \varepsilon_xf6+! \) \( D \)

It was only a matter of time until White converted his overwhelming positional advantage into material gain or a decisive initiative Black must accept the sacrifice as 22 \( \varepsilon_h8 \) 23 \( \varepsilon_d7 \) is final.

22. ... \( gxf6 \)
23. \( \varepsilon_d7! \) \( \varepsilon_b6 \)
23. \( \varepsilon_xd7 \) 24 \( \varepsilon_h6+ \) \( \varepsilon_g7 \) 25 \( \varepsilon_xd7 \) \( \varepsilon_h6 \) 26 \( \varepsilonxc6 \) wins for White.
24. \( a5! \)

A necessary finesse, as 24 \( \varepsilon_h6+ \) \( \varepsilon_g7 \) 25 \( \varepsilon_h5 \) \( \varepsilon_e7 \) is difficult to meet.

24. ... \( \varepsilon_xa5 \)
25. \( \varepsilon_h6+ \) \( \varepsilon_g7 \)
26. \( \varepsilon_h5 \) \( \varepsilon_b7 \)
27. \( \varepsilon_f5+ \) \( \varepsilon_h8 \)
28. \( \varepsilon_h6 \) \( \varepsilon_g8 \)
29. \( \varepsilon_d6! \)

White severs the \( b6-f6 \) lifeline (29 \( \varepsilon_xd6 \) 30 \( \varepsilon_xf6+ \) leads to mate next move). Consequently Black must part with his queen.

29. ... \( \varepsilon_xf2+ \)
30. \( \varepsilon_g2 \) \( \varepsilon_g6 \)
31. \( \varepsilon_xb6 \) \( \varepsilon_xb6 \)
32. \( \varepsilon_d6 \) \( \varepsilon_b8 \)
33 $\text{xf5!}$
White's positional superiority combines with a material advantage to produce a won game. The new threat is 34 $\text{xf7+1} \text{xf7} 35 \text{hxh7 mate}$

33 ... $\text{eg7}$
34 $\text{xxg6}$ $\text{xxg6}$
35 $\text{wh3}$ $\text{db3}$
36 $\text{xa6}$ $\text{gg8}$
37 $\text{wh6}$ $\text{a6} \text{(D)}$

38 $\text{xb6!}$
Often the quickest route to victory after winning a queen is to engineer a situation in which one can sacrifice it back to force almost immediate resignation

38 ... $\text{ah6}$
39 $\text{xb8+}$ $\text{g7}$
40 $\text{f5+}$ $\text{g6}$
41 $\text{gg8+}$ $\text{1-0}$
41 $\text{f7}$ 42 $\text{h6+}$ leaves White a rook up, and 41 $\text{h5}$ allows 42 $\text{g4 mate}$

The following game provides us with a taste of the plans available to both sides when White elects to go down the main KID lines with an extra tempo

Piket-Timman
Dutch Championship 1996

1 $\text{db3}$ e5 2 g3 $\text{c6} 3 \text{g2} \text{f6} 4 \text{0-0} e5

With this order of moves Black avoids a reversed Grunfeld by clamping down on d4

5 $\text{d3}$ d5
6 $\text{da3}$

In the space of a decade $\text{db8-a6}$ has established itself as a fashionable main line in the KID, so it merits attention with an extra tempo in the KIA. Piket is the first player — at the top level at least — to use it. Knights on the rim are not always dim, and on a3 the knight has access to c4 once the d5-pawn has been exchanged or advanced, as well as b5 in some cases. 6 $\text{b5}$ is another standard move. If Black wishes to avoid being simply a tempo down he can try 6 $\text{d6+?}$ In the Classical proper White’s bishop is already on e2 when Black plays $\text{db8-d7}$, so with roles reversed Black now hopes to benefit from being a move down. Moreover, with the knight committed to d2 White can no longer apply pressure to the d5-pawn with $\text{db1-c3}$

7 e4 puts the question to the d5-pawn

a) 7 d4 met with the theoretical novelty 8 $\text{b4+}$ in Yurtayev-Dokhoian, EuCup Moscow 1990. Black voluntarily weakened a couple of dark squares on the kingside because, being a tempo down, he still had the option of castling long. The game continued 8 $\text{g6} 9 \text{d4} \text{c7} 10 \text{a4} \text{e6} 11 \text{b3} \text{d7} 12 \text{h6} \text{we7} (12 \text{g5} 13 \text{f5} \text{xf5} 14 \text{exf5} \text{we7} 15 \text{wh5} 13 \text{f3} \text{(D)}$
Again Black should not try to trap the bishop, e.g. 13 g5?! 14 \( \text{xf5} \) \( \text{xf5} \) 15 exf5 \( \text{Wf6} \) 16 \( \text{xc6} \) bxc6 (16 \( \text{xc6} \) 17 \( \text{Bxg5} \) 17 \( \text{h5} \) \( \text{g8} \) 18 g4 and the plan has backfired. Instead Black forced back the bishop with the simple 13 \( \text{h8} \) 14 \( \text{d2} \) when 14 0-0-0 (14 h5??) 15 \( \text{g4} \) \( \text{d1} \) 16 \( \text{xc6} \) \( \text{xc6} \) 17 \( \text{b1} \) f5 18 f3 \( \text{d8} \) 19 \( \text{xd2} \) 20 \( \text{e7} \) was roughly level.

(b) 7 \( \text{dxe4} \) hands over the valuable d5-square on a plate 8 \( \text{dxe4} \) 0-0 9 c3 (but White defends d4) 9 \( \text{g4} \) 10 h3 \( \text{xh3} \) 11 \( \text{xf3} \) \( \text{e8} \) 12 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{f8} \) 13 \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{e7} \) 14 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{w6} \) 15 \( \text{e3} \) \( \text{xd7} \) 16 \( \text{d5} \) with an undisputed lead, Todorcevic-Milovanovic, Pula 1990.

Returning to the position after 6 \( \text{dxa3} \) (D)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
6 & \ldots & \text{e7} \\
7 & e4 & \text{d4} \\
\end{array}
\]

It is natural that Black wishes to close the centre and eliminate the possibility of White using the extra move to advantageously open the position. Piket suggests 7 \( \text{e6} \) 8 \( \text{d4} \)

Remember that the knight could have arrived here via d2, e.g. 6 \( \text{bd2} \) \( \text{e7} \) 7 e4 d4 8 \( \text{xc4} \) 8 \( \text{we7} \)

Protecting e5 with 8 \( \text{d7} \) locks in the c8-bishop and gives the game a slightly different flavour. After 9 a4 0-0 the continuation 10 \( \text{d1} \) \( \text{b6} \) 11 b3 \( \text{e6} \) 12 \( \text{f4} \) was only equal in Fischer-Harrow, Milwaukee 1957. Much better is 10 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{w7} \) 11 \( \text{d2} \), e.g. 11 \( \text{g5} \) 12 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{exf4} \) 13 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{h6} \) 14 \( \text{h4} \)

9 \( \text{a}4 \) \( \text{e6} \)

Keeping his options open as far as the whereabouts of the king is concerned is an important feature of Black's opening play in these lines. There is nothing strategically wrong with 9 0-0, but it does nothing to force White to carefully consider the implications of the reversed roles. At least Timman's choice keeps White on his toes. I suppose it is a matter of taste — Black is either content to give away a move in the well chartered lines, or he can try to unsettle his opponent by threatening to turn the loss into something positive, introducing possibilities which are not normally encountered.

10 \( \text{d1} \)

Before White had wasted time with 10 b3, which permits Black to expand on the kingside with an early thrust of the g-pawn, e.g. 10 \( \text{d7} \) 11 \( \text{d1} \) g5?? 12 f4 \( \text{xf4} \) 13 \( \text{xf4} \) 0-0-0, when the game Todorcevic-Ivanovic, Yugoslavia
1990, highlighted what Black should be aiming for when he clears the way to castle queenside. White did not want to see a series of black pieces use the e5-square, but after 14 f5 \texttt{\textbackslash x}c4 15 bxc4 \texttt{\textbackslash d}g8 16 \texttt{\textbackslash h}1 h5 he was already under pressure.

10 \ldots \texttt{\textbackslash d}7

White need not be afraid of 10...\texttt{\textbackslash x}c4 11 dxc4 because this frees the useful d3-square for his knight, which in turn supports the f2-f4 break. Piket offers the uncompromising 10...h5!, which is designed to meet 11 f4 with the consistent 11...h4. Consequently his suggestion of 11 h4!? looks best.

11 f4 f6?

Unfortunately for Black this does not work out according to plan because it permits White to punish him for leaving the king in the centre with a familiar \texttt{\textbackslash K}1 theme. Attacking the c4-knight with a second piece is the correct course, e.g. 11...\texttt{\textbackslash b}6 12 b3 (12 dxb6 axb6 13 \texttt{\textbackslash d}2 is unclear, although Black should probably castle short now) 12...f6 13 f5 \texttt{\textbackslash f}7 14 h4. If Black did look at this variation it will not have been for too long, as the text is the logical follow-up to the previous moves.

12 \texttt{\textbackslash h}3! (D)

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}[scale=0.5]
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It is possible that Piket deliberately chose this 'modest' opening in the hope that Timman would be too ambitious. What is certain is the coming exchange of Black's good bishop, after which White will dominate the light squares. If only Black had castled kingside.

12 \ldots \texttt{\textbackslash x}h3

Piket gives 12...\texttt{\textbackslash f}7? 13 \texttt{\textbackslash w}g4! g6 (13...\texttt{\textbackslash g}8 14 \texttt{\textbackslash w}xd7+ \texttt{\textbackslash x}d7 15 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d7+ \texttt{\textbackslash x}d7 16 fxe5 \texttt{\textbackslash x}c4 17 \texttt{\textbackslash e}f6 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f6 18 dxc4 \texttt{\textbackslash e}8 19 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d3 b6 offers Black some compensation for the pawn) 14 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d7+ \texttt{\textbackslash x}d7 15 \texttt{\textbackslash x}d7+ \texttt{\textbackslash x}d7 16 fxe5 \texttt{\textbackslash x}c4 17 \texttt{\textbackslash e}f6.

13 \texttt{\textbackslash w}h5+ g6

14 \texttt{\textbackslash w}xh3 \texttt{\textbackslash b}6

15 fxe5!

Apart from fixing Black's pawns White wants to open the f-file in order to infiltrate on f7. A mistake is 15 \texttt{\textbackslash x}b6 axb6 16 fxe5 \texttt{\textbackslash x}xe5, when Black is ready to assume the advantage with...\texttt{\textbackslash w}c7-d7.

15 \ldots fxe5

Forced, which is not good news for Black in view of the dominating white queen. 15...\texttt{\textbackslash x}e5 is no improvement on the game, e.g. 16 \texttt{\textbackslash x}e5 fxe5 (16...\texttt{\textbackslash w}xe5 17 \texttt{\textbackslash f}4 \texttt{\textbackslash w}h5 18 \texttt{\textbackslash w}xh5 gxh5 19 \texttt{\textbackslash g}2) 17 \texttt{\textbackslash w}e6!.

16 \texttt{\textbackslash w}e6

The queen can travel from one side of the board to the other as long White continues to dominate the light squares. Suddenly f7 looks very vulnerable.

16 \ldots \texttt{\textbackslash x}c4

17 \texttt{\textbackslash w}xh4!

17 \texttt{\textbackslash w}f7+ is tempting but not quite as good as the text. In fact the check connects the black rooks. After 17...\texttt{\textbackslash d}7 White should play 18 dxc4!, when 18...\texttt{\textbackslash a}8 19 \texttt{\textbackslash w}d5+ \texttt{\textbackslash d}6 20 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f8 \texttt{\textbackslash x}f8 21 \texttt{\textbackslash d}3
followed by lodging the bishop on h6 still keeps White on top.

17 ... 0-0-0 (D)

23...\text{x}f7!? makes sense, intending to meet 24 \text{d}d2 with 24...\text{d}d7 and 25...\text{e}e6.

24 \text{d}d2 \text{xc}4
25 \text{e}e4 \text{d}d7
26 \text{f}f1 (D)

17...\text{d}g8 is pointless because after 18 \text{f}f3 0-0-0 19 \text{h}h6 Black must anyway surrender the f-file.

18 \text{h}h6?

The '?' is from Piket himself, who offers the variation 18 \text{f}f3! (threatening 19 \text{g}g5 etc.) 18...h6 19 \text{e}e6+ \text{b}b8 20 \text{x}g6 h5 21 \text{g}g5! with a clear advantage.

18 ... \text{d}g8!

Now the bishop is a liability because Black threatens to trap it with ...g6-g5. Consequently White attempts to justify its posting, though this does result in him losing his grip on the f7-square, and with it much of his lead.

19 \text{h}h7 \text{d}d8
20 \text{g}g7 \text{x}g7
20...\text{f}f8 21 b4 is unclear. It makes sense for Black to seek exchanges and head for a slightly worse ending rather than allow White to rekindle an initiative on a second front.

21 \text{x}g7 \text{e}e8
22 \text{f}f3 \text{d}d6
23 \text{h}h6 \text{f}f7

Despite the gradual removal of pieces we see that the key features of the opening remain even into the ending. This is just the kind of position White should have in mind once he has pushed his f-pawn. The centre pawns are still fixed, there is still only one open file — which White continues to rule — and a white knight stands on c4. In order to make these pluses tell White must keep focused, as must Black, of course.

26 ... \text{e}e6
27 \text{h}4

The obvious 27 \text{f}f7+ \text{e}e7 28 \text{e}e7+ \text{x}e7 29 \text{a}a5 wins a safe pawn, e.g. 29...b6 30 \text{c}c6+ \text{f}f6 31 \text{d}d7 g5 32 h4 gxh4 33 gxh4 \text{g}g6 34 \text{d}d2 \text{h}5 35 \text{e}e1.

27 ... \text{c}7
28 \text{h}5 \text{e}7
28...gxh5 29 \text{f}f5 leaves Black with weaknesses on e5, h5 and h7.
29 \text{g}g2 \text{b}6
160 King’s Indian Defence Reversed

30 hxg6 hxg6
31.ad2 a6
Piket gives 31...Hh8 32 b4 Hd6
By now both players were short of time, which is evident from the rest of the game.
32 b4 Hb8
33.Hh1?
33.bxc5 Hxc5 (33...bxc5 34.Hh1)
34.g5+ Hd7 35.Bf7+ Be8 36.He7
(36.Bf6) 36...Hxa4 37.Bxe5 Bxe5
38.Bxe5 Bb7 39.He7+ Ha8 40.f6
is promising for White, as is 33.Hh1
33...b5
34.Hh7+ Hf6
35.axb5 axb5
36.Bb2 Ha8?
36.Bd6 37.bxc5 Hxc5 38.Ed1 (38.Ke7 He8) 38...He8
37.Ed1 Ha2?
38.Bf2! g5
39.Bg4+ Hg6
40.He7 Hc2
40.Ha6 41.bxc5 Hc6 42.Ba5!
and 40.Bg7 41.Hc7 Hc2 42
Hxe5+ don’t help
41.Hxe6+ Hg7
41.Bh5 42.Bh3 with mate on h6, or 41.Bf7 42.Bf6+ Hc7 43.Bf2
42.He7+ Hf8
43.Hc7 Hxd2+
44.Bh3 and Black resigned in view of 44.Bh3 Hxd3 (44...cxb4 45
Hxe5) 45.Hxc5 1-0

Botvinnik-Pomar
Varna Olympiad 1962

1 g3 d5 2 Bd3 c5 3 Bg2 De6 4
d3 e5 5 0-0 (D)

5...Bd6
Aiming for a kind of reversed
Samisch variation Lazic-Racevic,
Yugoslav Ch 1991, followed a similar
course with 5 f6 The game
continued 6 e4 (also possible is 6
4 d4 7 c3 with a reversed Benoni)
6...Hg7 7 Bd3 He6 8 Hh4 d4 9
De2 g5 10 Hxf5? Hxf5 11 Hxf5
Hd5+ (accepting the pawn with
11 Hxf5 was better, when White
will try to open up the position) 12
Hxd5 Hxd5 13 g4 Hg5 14 gxh5
Hxh5 15 Da4 exf4 16 Bxf5+ Bh7
(for his sacrificed exchange Black
has a slight bind and a potential
kingside attack) 17 Bh7+ Bh8 18
Bb1 Bf8 19 Be4 Do5 20 Dg2
Df7 21 Hd2 Hh8 22 Bh7 Hxf5 23
Hxe7+ (not 23 Hxf7?? Bh3+ 24
Bf1 Bxh2+ 25 Hf1 Hh1+ 26 Be2
f3 mate) 23...Bxe7 24>Bel+ (now
the white king has an escape route)
24>Bd8 25 Bxf7 Bh3+ 26 Bg1
Bxh2+ 27 Bf1 Bh3+ 28 Be2
Bxh2+ 29 Bf1 Bh3+ 30 Be1 Bxe1+ 31 Bxe1 Hc6 32 Bf1 (White must
open up the position for his bishop)
32...Bb6 33 Bc7 Be6 34 Bd2 e4 35
cxb4 Hxc4 36 Hxb6+ and White
won
6 e4
d4
7 Bbd2
Ge7
8 c4
White wants to close the centre before advancing on the kingside. Bad for Black would be 8...dxc3 9 bxc3 with an active position for White. In the game Anic-Gugumus, French League 1991, White adopted another plan 8...Qc4 c7 9 a4 h6 10 c3 g5 11 exd4 cxd4 12 Qe1 Qe6 13 b3 Qd7 14 a3 0-0 15 b4 with advantage.

8 3h4 f6
9 f4 e6
10 gxf4 exf4
11 e5! (D)

White sacrifices a pawn for a powerful outpost on e4 and a positional bind. As for Black, his extra pawn on e5 merely deprives him of a useful square for his pieces.

12 fxe5 fxe5
13 Qf5 Qf7
14 Qe4 0-0-0
15 Kg4!

Threatening an unpleasant discovered check with 16 f6+

15...Qh8
16 Wxg7

It is not at all dangerous for White to open the g-file in front of his king, since Black’s pieces are too badly placed to undertake active operations. Indeed it is White who will attack on the kingside.

16...Qh5
17 Qf2

Preventing 17...Qe2
17...b6
18 Qd2 Qd8
19 Wf6 Qc8
20 Qg6!

Cleverly forcing a blocking of the g-file.

20...Qxg6
21 fxg6 Qe7
22 Wf7 Qd8
23 Wf5 Qh4
24 Kg3 Qe7
25 Wh3 Qxg6(D)

Having fulfilled its job as overseer, White’s knight now clears the path for the king’s bishop, eliminates Black’s bishop and facilitates the invasion of the rooks into Black’s position—all in one stroke.

26 Qf6! Qxf6
27 Qxh6 We7
28 Qa1 Qf4
29 Qxf4! exf4
30 Qxf4+ 1-0
30...Qa8 31 WC8 mate
Here too, the reader must be on the lookout for similarities with — and transpositional possibilities to — other lines. When White opens the game with 1 \( \text{d}f3 \), 2 \( \text{g}3 \) and 3 \( \text{g}2 \), Black can give the game a Queen's Indian flavour with \( \text{b}7-\text{b}6 \) and \( \text{c}8-\text{b}7 \). Combine this with an early \( \text{e}7-\text{e}6 \) and \( \text{d}7-\text{d}5 \) and we could eventually arrive at a French Defence position. The same can be said of 1 \( \text{d}f3 \) \( \text{d}f6 \) 2 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{b}5 \). The other games in this chapter deal with hybrid positions which are only rarely encountered.

Benko-Bisguier

Stockholm Interzonal 1962

1 \( \text{d}f3 \) \( \text{d}f6 \) 2 \( \text{g}3 \) d5 3 \( \text{g}2 \) e6 4 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 5 d3 0-0 6 \( \text{b}d2 \) b6 7 e4

\( D \)

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

Making the central exchange with d5xe4 can also be played in Queen's Indian positions. It has the advantage of increasing the scope of Black's queen's bishop and — in the event of e4-e5 from White — securing a useful outpost on d5 for the king's knight. However, White's space advantage usually allows him freer movement of his pieces and thus eases the task of attacking the black king. 7 dxe4 8 dxe4 \( \text{b}7 \) transposes to Rogers-Dutreeuw, Novi Sad Olympiad 1990. The game continued 9 e5 \( \text{d}5 \) 10 a3 (Black would stand better after 10 c4? \( \text{d}4 \), but now White is indeed threatening to hit the knight — hence Black's next) 10 b5 11 \( \text{w}e2 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 12 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{e}8 \) 13 \( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{f}8 \) (instead of surrendering his dark-square bishop Black prefers to use it as a defender) 14 \( \text{d}d4 \) a6 15 \( \text{w}g4 \) c5 16 \( \text{f}f3 \) \( \text{w}c7 \) 17 \( \text{x}d1 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 18 \( \text{f}e1 \) (completing his development and indirectly defending the e-pawn), as 18 \( \text{x}e5 \) 19 \( \text{x}e5 \) \( \text{w}e5 \) 20 \( \text{x}e5 \) \( \text{w}c7 \) 21 \( \text{x}b7 \) \( \text{x}b7 \) gives Black problems down the h1-a8 diagonal) 18 c4 19 \( \text{d}4 \)? (this allows Black to play 19 \( \text{x}e5 \) 20 \( \text{x}e5 \) \( \text{w}e5 \), e.g. 21 \( \text{xf6+} \) \( \text{x}f6 \), or 21 \( \text{x}d5 \) exd5 22 \( \text{xf6+} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 23 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{xf1+} \) 19 c3? 20 b3 a5 (now White gets a second chance).
21 \( \text{Qf6} + \text{Qxf6} 22 \text{exf6} \text{Nd8} 23 \text{fxg7} \text{Qe7} \) (Black hopes to use the enemy pawn as a shield for his king, but White's queen's rook is too strong) 24 \( \text{Wh3} \text{Qf6} 25 \text{Qf4} \text{e5} 26 \text{Qxf6} \text{Qe8} 27 \text{Wh5} \text{exf4} 28 \text{Qg5} \\ 1-0 \\
8 \text{e5} \text{Qd7} \\
9 \text{He1} \text{He8} \\
Black should play 9 \text{c5} followed by \text{Qb8-c6} rather than concentrate on defensive measures at such an early stage of the game:

10 \text{Qf1} \text{Qf8} \\
11 \text{h4} \text{Qbd7} \\
12 \text{Qh2} \text{c5} \\
13 \text{h5} \text{h6} (D) \\

The position after 13 \text{h6} greatly resembles KIA vs French Defence games. An important difference is Black's lack of pressure on the queenside, whereas White has his usual prospects of a kingside attack.

14 \text{Qg4} \text{Qh7} \\
15 \text{Qh2}! \\
Aiming to keep Black's pieces from the g5-square with f2-f4:

15 \ldots \text{Qd8} \\
16 \text{f4} \text{Qb8} \\
At last Black begins to play on the queenside but there are not enough pieces with which to cause White problems.

17 \text{Qd2} \text{b5} \\
18 \text{Qf2} \text{d4}?? \\
Very often in such positions it can be suicidal for Black to give his opponent full control of the e4-square. This move is no exception. More consistent is 18 \text{a5} with a view to rolling the queenside pawns down the board, although White would still retain quite an advantage.

19 \text{Qxb7} \text{Qxb7} \\
20 \text{Wh3} \text{Qd7} \\
21 \text{a4}! (D) \\

White strikes while Black's queenside is bereft of support. Black now has to choose between 21 \text{a6} 22 \text{axb5} \text{AXB5} when the opening of the queenside favours White, or the game move:

21 \ldots \text{b4} \\
22 \text{b3} \\
After this move it is the kingside which will become the main battleground, so both sides set about regrouping their forces to maximum effect. White prepares to pounce. Black must do his best to be ready:

22 \ldots \text{Qd5} \\
23 \text{He2} \text{Qd7} \\
24 \text{Qae1} \text{Qb6} \\
25 \text{Qe4} \text{Qd7} \\
26 \text{Wg4} \text{Qd5} \\
27 \text{Hf1} \text{f8}
28 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{wb6 (D)} \)

As a result of the shadow-boxing Black's knight has journeyed from f8 to d5 and has subsequently been replaced by the bishop — in turn clearing the second rank for the rook White — who has had a strategical won game since move nineteen — has made richer gains, and his next move threatens a winning breakthrough with \( f4-f5 \)

29 \( \text{h4!} \) \( f5 \)

Creating weaknesses, but Black had little choice

30 \( \text{exf6} \) \( \text{xh6} \)

31 \( \text{xg6} \) \( \text{xh6} \)

32 \( \text{w6} \) \( \text{wb8} \)

33 \( \text{fe1} \) \( \text{de7} \)

34 \( \text{f5} \) \( \text{exf5} \)

Not 34 e5 35 \( \text{xh6} \)

35 \( \text{xh6} \) \( \text{xh6} \)

36 \( \text{xh6} \) \( \text{xh6} \)

37 \( \text{h4} \)

White has kept his winning advantage even after the exchanges

The game concluded

37 ... \( \text{f8} \)

38 \( \text{xh6}+ \) \( \text{xh6} \)

39 \( \text{g7}+ \) \( \text{g8} \)

40 \( \text{f4} \) \( \text{wb7} \)

41 \( \text{h6}+ \) \( \text{h8} \)

42 \( \text{f7}+ \) \( \text{g8} \)

43 \( \text{g5} \) \( \text{wc7} \)

44 \( \text{e5}! \)

Clever moves such as this make winning that much easier. Now 44 \( \text{xe5} \) loses the queen to 45 \( \text{f7}+\text{h8} \) 46 \( \text{xf8}+\text{g8} \) 47 \( \text{f7}+\) Instead, Black waits for his opponent to show him the win

44 ... \( \text{we8} \)

45 \( \text{xf6} \) \( \text{we1+} \)

Or 45 \( \text{wg6} \) 46 hxg6 \( \text{xf6} \) 47 \( \text{c6} \), when Black's king is embarrassingly trapped, leaving White free to win at will

46 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{e2+} \)

47 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{f1+} \)

48 \( \text{h4} \) \( \text{h1+} \)

49 \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{i-0} \)

As one way of playing the KIA involves developing the kingside pieces before disclosing one's intentions and embarking on a specific structural strategy, Black, too, is free to open in a number of ways Spoilt for choice, Black occasionally goes too solid

Damjanic-Cvetkovic
Yugoslav Ch 1991

1 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{d5} \) 2 \( \text{g2} \) \( \text{xf6} \) 3 \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{g6} \) 4 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 5 0-0 0-0 6 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c6 (D)} \)

Perhaps this setup is somewhat too conservative as White can freely
expand on the queenside. More active is 6...c5 which transposes to the King's Indian Defence with colours reversed. Another possibility is 6...Cc6 followed by e7-e5

7...Cbd2 Cbd7
8...b4!

Gaining space on the queenside and depriving Black of the c5-square

8...e5
9.e4 dxe4
10.dxe4 a5
11.Wc2 Wc7
12.a4 Bb8
13.Bd1 Bb6
14.Bb3!

In symmetrical positions White can often utilise the extra tempo to take the initiative. In this case White's pawn on b4 (as opposed to its counterpart on b7) is significant enough to give him the better game

14...axb4
15.a5! Cc4
16.cxb4 Bd6
17.Bb2 Bb5
18.h3! (D)

With Black's queen's knight attacking the d4-square White does not want to allow Cc8-g4xf3

18...Cd7

19...Wd6
20.Wc4 Cb8
21.ha1 Bb6
22.Wc5! Bb8!

Exchanging queens does not alleviate Black's problems

23.Wc2 Bxb3

Black eliminates a potentially troublesome piece and makes way for his other knight to come to e6 and observe d4

24.Wxb3 Be6
25.Bxb5!

Black was threatening to jump into d4. Now, in return for his king's bishop, White will have the d5-square for his rook, attacking Black's weak pawns

25...cxb5
26.h5 Wc7
27.Wc1 Wf7
28.Bxe5

White chooses to take the e-pawn as the b-pawn will be the more difficult to defend

28...Wxe5
29.Bxe5 Wf6
30.g2 Bc8
31.Bxc8 Bxc8
32.Wd3!

Not good is 32.Bxb5 Bc3! 33.Wd1 Bxf3 34.Wxf3 Bxf3+ 35.Bxf3 Bd4+ and 36.Bxb5

32...Cc4
33.Bxb5!? Bc3
34.e5! (D)
34 \( \text{Wd1} \) transposes to the previous note. White's choice vacates e4, thus assisting the king on its journey to the queenside.

34 ... \( \text{Wxf3}+ \)
35 \( \text{Kxf3} \)
36 \( \text{Kxf3} \)
37 \( \text{Ke4} \)
38 \( \text{Kd5} \)
39 \( \text{Ke5} \)
40 \( \text{Ke6} \)
41 \( \text{Ke5} \)
42 \( \text{Kd6} \)

Black can draw after 42 ... \( \text{Kb6} \) because White's king is too far away from his pawns.

42 ... \( \text{Kb5}+ \)
43 \( \text{Kd7}! \)

White finds the correct continuation, heading for the b-pawn while simultaneously cutting off Black's king.

43 ... \( \text{Kd4} \)
44 \( \text{Kc7} \)
45 \( \text{b5} \)
46 \( \text{b6} \)
47 \( \text{a6} \)

Petrosian-Donner
Santa Monica 1966

6 \( \text{Bbd2} \) 0-0
7 \( \text{e4} \) c5?!

White can profit from this ambitious claim to the centre, so better is 7 dxe4, or maintaining the tension with 7 \( \text{Bc6} \) (7 c6 transposes to the Caro-Kann Defence). Instead Botvinnik-Pachman, Leipzig Olympiad 1960, went 7 d4 8 a4 f6 9 \( \text{Bh4} \) \( \text{Ke6} \) 10 f4 \( \text{Kd7} \) 11 f5 \( \text{Kf7} \) 12 fxg6 hxg6 13 \( \text{Kg3} \) with a clear advantage to White.

8 \( \text{exd5} \)
9 \( \text{Kb3}! \)

Rather than play the normal 9 \( \text{Bc4} \) \( \text{Kc6} \) White punishes his opponent's move order by attacking the c-pawn.

9 ... \( \text{Kd7} \)

9 b6 is not possible as it opens the long h1-a8 diagonal, which Black sets about clearing.

10 \( \text{Kxe1} \)
11 \( \text{Kfd2}! \)
12 \( \text{Ka5}! \)
13 \( \text{Bc6} \)

Black's intended 12 b6 loses to 13 \( \text{Bc6} \).

13 \( \text{Bae4} \) \( \text{Kc7} \)

White is better after 13 b6 14 \( \text{Bd6} \) \( \text{Kc6} \) 15 a4, meeting 15 \( \text{Bc7} \) with 16 \( \text{Kb5} \).

14 \( \text{Kd4!} \) (D)

Pachman's variation
Again 14 b6 15 Qd6 a6 16 a4 is good for White (as in the last note) Black does have an active plan in 14 b5 15 Qd6 a6 16 a4 f5, but 17 axb5 fxe4 18 Qxa6+ is crushing. This leaves 16 b4 with a slight edge for White thanks to the c4-square.

15 0-0

Threatening a future Qc3-b5 and watching over d5

15 ... d7
16 a4 c6

Tempting White into what he anyway intended, and thus effectively losing a tempo 16 Qd4 or 16 c4f8 are less compromising

17 Qb5 Qxb5
18 axb5 cxc4
19 dxc4 b6 (D)

On studying the diagram position we see that White has reaped several benefits from his imaginative knight manoeuvres: Black’s a-pawn is a chronic weakness against which Petrosian can build up pressure at will: White’s king’s bishop is excellently placed, and the absence of its black counterpart accentuates the domination of the white squares — notably the long diagonal.

20 c3 Ke8
21 Ka6 Ke7

Black gets ready to defend his a-pawn

22 wa4 Ke8
23 Qd5!

Or 23 Qd8 24 Qg5 Qd7 25 Qc6 when Black’s position is over-loaded
24 Qxe6!

Now Black will either lose his a-pawn or have to spoil his pawn structure. Against a positional player of Petrosian’s calibre perhaps the former is the lesser evil, but Donner is in material mood

24 ... fxe6
25 wd1! Qd8
26 Qg4

White has more than one target to aim at

26 ... Ke8
27 h4! Ke7
28 h5 gxh5
29 Wh5 Ke8
30 Wh4 Ke6

Petrosian suggested 30 Qf5 followed by h7-h5

31 Ae3 Qg6
32 We4 Qf8
33 Aa1

The queen’s rook has no further role to play on the a-file

33 ... A6
34 Ad1 A5g7
35 Ad2 A5f8
36 Ad7 A5d7
37 Wh4+ A5f7
38 Wh3 A5f6

Otherwise Black loses a pawn

Now 39 Wh5 is the most accurate continuation, threatening 40 Qg5+ and 41 Qh6+

39 Af1 Wh8
40 Wh4+ Kg7
41 Kh6+ Kg8
42 Ax8

Without his bishop Black will have problems defending the e5-pawn. Recapturing with the queen does not help, e.g. 42 Wh8
43 \( \text{g}4+ \text{f}7 \) 44 \( \text{h}5+ \text{f}6 \) 45 \( \text{e}1 \)

42 ... \( \text{x}f8 \)
43 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{f}7 \)
44 \( \text{xe}5 \) \( \text{g}6 \)
45 \( \text{g}2! \)
46 \( \text{e}4! \)

Apart from being a pawn down, Black has other weak pawns and no shelter for his king. The game finished:

46 ... \( \text{e}8 \)
47 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \)
48 \( \text{h}5+ \) \( \text{d}8 \)
49 \( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{e}8 \)

White threatened 50 \( \text{b}8 \) mate
50 \( \text{e}4 \)

Threatening 51 \( \text{a}8+ \) \( \text{c}7 \) 52 \( \text{x}a7+ \)
50 ... \( \text{h}8 \)
51 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{f}7 \)

To defend the e-pawn with \( \text{d}7-e7 \)
52 \( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{e}7 \)
53 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{d}6 \)
54 \( \text{e}8+ \) \( \text{d}8 \)

If 54 \( \text{c}7 \) 55 \( \text{a}8 \) wins
55 \( \text{h}6 \)

Black resigned as 55 \( \text{d}7 \) 56 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{c}7 \) (the e-pawn must be defended) 57 \( \text{a}8+ \) \( \text{c}7 \) 58 \( \text{a}8 \) leads to mate 1-0.

Hillarp Persson-Hector
Gothenberg 1997

1 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \)!

Another uncompromising reply to White's opening move is 1 \( \text{f}5 \) which invites a direct transposition to the Dutch Defence after \( \text{d}2-d4 \). There is also 2 \( \text{e}4 \), though you can guarantee that Black will be well prepared for this. Fortunately for KIA fans the fianchetto is possible here, too: 2 \( \text{g}3 \) \( \text{f}6 \) 3 \( \text{g}2 \) and now it is time for Black to select the variation

a) 3 ... \( \text{g}6 \) 4 0-0 \( \text{g}7 \) 5 \( \text{d}3 \) 0-0 6 \( \text{e}4 \) (D)

White exploits the opening of the \( \text{a}2-g8 \) diagonal resulting from 1 \( \text{f}5 \).

The point is that the preparatory \( \text{d}1-d2 \) is not necessary because the e-pawn is immune — 6 \( \text{fxe}4 \) 7 \( \text{dxe}4 \) \( \text{dxe}4 \) 8 \( \text{d}5 \) etc. Consequently White both saves a tempo and affords himself more flexibility in terms of queenside development.

6 \( \text{d}6 \) with:

a1) 7 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{fxe}4 \) 7 \( \text{c}6 \) 8 \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) 9 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 10 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 11 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{e}5 \) was even in Rashkovsky-Bareev, Moscow 1989; 8 \( \text{dxe}4 \) 9 \( \text{h}3 \) \( \text{b}7 \) 10 \( \text{c}3 \) Barczay-Zsu Polgar, Lillafured 1989, the game is balanced.

a2) 7 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 8 \( \text{xf}5 \) \( \text{xf}5 \) (8 \( \text{xf}5 \) 9 \( \text{b}3 \) picks up the \( b7 \)-pawn) 9 \( \text{d}3+ \) \( \text{e}6 \), e.g. 10 \( \text{e}1 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 11 \( \text{d}3 \) \( \text{h}7 \) 12 \( \text{b}4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 13 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{e}5 \) with an interesting position, Martin-Karolyi, Oakham 1993.

b) 3 \( \text{e}6 \) 4 0-0 \( \text{e}7 \) 5 \( \text{d}3 \) 0-0 6 \( \text{d}2 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 7 \( \text{e}4 \) \( \text{xe}4 \) 8 \( \text{dxe}4 \) 9 \( \text{e}3 \) \( \text{e}8 \) is pretty standard stuff.

Vassler-Ochoa, Palma de Mallorca 1989, continued 10 \( \text{h}4 \) \( \text{c}6 \) 11 \( \text{c}4 \) \( \text{h}5 \) 12 \( \text{wh}5 \) \( \text{xh}5 \) 13 \( \text{f}5 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 14 a4 \( \text{f}6 \) 15 \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{e}6 \) 16 \( \text{b}4 \) (D).
The pawn structure is typical for this variation, with the e4-pawn playing an important role. Without any effective pawn breaks available, White stands slightly better thanks to his advanced, mobile queenside pawns. Although the KIA setup does not exactly scare Black, it does have the bonus of steering the game away from the traditional Dutch positions which see Black obtaining counterplay by concentrating on the vulnerable e4-square (after d2-d4). By choosing to erect a centre based on d3 and e4 (instead of c4 and d4), White gives his opponent less to bite on in return for a little less space.

2  g3
Keeping a KIA flavour 2 e4 and 2 d4 are more direct
2  ...  e5
3  d3  d5
4  $g2 (D)

In the Pirc proper Black has excellent prospects to outplay his opponent in the quiet lines and to gain dangerous counter-attacking chances in the aggressive ones. Here White’s extra tempo comes in handy in both the positional and tactical variations. Note that the diagram can also arise after 1 $f3 d5 2 g3 $c6 3 $g2 e5
4  ...

As is often the case when the roles are reversed, Black reacts to a modest opening with a particularly ambitious variation. Here are a few examples of what can happen:

a) 4 $g4 5 h3 $h5 6 0-0 ($5?) is a similar attempt to launch an early offensive. Passive play from White is exactly what Black is hoping for, so it is imperative that White strikes quickly while his development lead still matters. In Andersson–Romanishin, Cienfuegos 1977, White provided model play — 7 c4! e4 8 $h4 dxe4 9 $xh5 cxd3 10 g4 $g6 and now 11 $xe4 would have left White well on top.

b) 4 $e7 usually leads to ‘c’, but here Black still has plans for his f-pawn. 5 0-0 $e6 6 c3 f5, Norwood–Sherzer, Prestwich 1990, went 7 $a4 (7 e4!? dxe4 8 $xe4 $xd1 9 $xd1 $xe4 10 $fd2 is interesting) 7 $d7 $b4 e4 9 $b5 $xf3 10 $xc6 $xc6 11 $xc6+ $bxc6 12 $xf3 with an edge to White in the queenless middlegame thanks to his superior pawn structure, upon which the next phase of the game concentrated — 12 $f6 13 $xd2 $b8 14 $h3 c5 15 $e3 $d7 16 c4 $d4 17 $f4 $d6, when 18 $xd6 $xd6 19 $fb1 was necessary.

c) 4 $f6 is the reliable, sober option 5 0-0 $e7 6 c3 and now:

  c1) 6 0-0 7 $bd2 $e8 8 $xc2 $e6 9 b4 $d7 10 $a5 $d3
c5 (11 \( \text{axb3?} \) 12 cxb3 opens the a-file for White as well as helping him prise open the g2-a8 diagonal with c3-c4) 12 \( \text{exa5} \text{wa5} \) 13 c4 with the better game for White, Dzindzichashvili-Kortchnoi, Tilburg 1985

c2) 6 a5 As a rule it is better to prevent queenside expansion 7 \( \text{db2} \) 0-0 8 e4 with a further branch

c21) 8 \text{dxe4} 9 dxe4 \text{c5} 10 \text{wc2 e6} 11 \text{g5 g4} 12 \text{c4 h6} 13 \text{df3 d7} 14 \text{e3 e6} 15 \text{d1} (D)

Busy work from the knights has given White control of d5 and f5. Beim-Lengyel Budapest GM 1994

c22) 8 \text{e8} maintains the tension in the centre Beim-Klovans, Groningen 1991, continued 9 \text{wc2 f8} 10 b3 b6 11 exd5 \text{exd5} 12 \text{e1} \text{b7} 13 a3 f6 14 \text{b2 d7} 15 \text{a4 d8} 16 b4 (finally) 16 axb4 17 axb4 \text{w7} 18 b5 \text{a5} 19 \text{c4!?} \text{a8} 19 \text{c4?} 20 dc4 \text{e7} 21 \text{xex5 etc.) Black's play here is worth remembering.}

Returning to 4 f5, White does best to prepare the most active counter. For once c2-e4 is not really appropriate, but as a strike at Black's broad centre is clearly the correct recipe (otherwise Black has too much space), we are happy to give the c-pawn a try for a change

5 0-0 \text{f6} 6 \text{e4!} \text{dx4}

Now White needs to spend time regaining the pawn, enabling Black to continue his development 6 d4, on the other hand, gives White the opportunity to capitalize on his extra move (e.g. 7 e3)

7 \text{wa4} \text{d6} 7 \text{xc3 8 dxe5}

8 \text{wc4} \text{we7} 9 \text{dxc3?}

A new move, improving on one of Hector's games from ten years earlier In Bjarnason-Hector, Gausdal zt 1987. White wasted too much time with his queen 9 a3\text{e6} 10 \text{wc2 a5} 11 b3 c4? 12 \text{d2 cd4} 13 \text{wd1 a4} 14 bxax exd3 15 exd3 0-0 16 \text{b2 cc5} with compensation for the pawn

9 \text{...} \text{e6} 10 \text{wb5} (D)

By disputing the centre White has been able to cut a path through to his opponent's weak point on b7. In fact White's influence on the h1-a8 diagonal is enough to dissuade Black from defending, e.g. 10 \text{wb8} 11 dxe5, or 10 0-0-0 11 dxe5
However, queens taking pawns on b2/b7 tend to suffer some degree of harassment for their 'greed', which is something both sides need to consider now.

10  ...  0-0
11  \textit{\textbf{\textit{W}}x\textit{\textbf{b7}}}

White accepts the challenge 'See a pawn, grab a pawn' is not always the best policy, but Hillarp Persson is happy to soak up a bit of punishment in return for even a modest material gain. Of course White has checked that the queen has a route back to safety, and that Black will not obtain more than a pawn's worth of compensation.

11  ...  \textit{\textbf{\textit{D}}b4}
12  \textit{\textbf{\textit{W}}b5}  \textit{\textbf{\textit{K}}ab8}
13  \textit{\textbf{\textit{W}}a4}  \textit{\textbf{\textit{h6}}}

Only by restricting his opponent's forces to their own half of the board can Black hope to generate sufficient activity.

14  \textit{\textbf{\textit{A}}d2}  \textit{\textbf{\textit{A}}d7}
15  \textit{\textbf{\textit{W}}d1} (D)

The excursion over White's queen returns to base. There is no doubt that Black has play for the pawn whether it is enough is another matter. The pawns on e5 and f5 look impressive but in order to step up a gear Black must commit himself. Perhaps the most important feature of the diagram position is White's perfectly sound pawn structure. Thanks to the minimum number of pawn moves there are no weaknesses in the white camp, and the only way to damage the ideal Dragon formation is with vigorous play — something which comes easy to Hector.

15  ...  \textit{\textbf{\textit{W}}e8}

For the moment the h3-square seems like the most inviting point of entry, which requires sending the queen to h5 (from where h2 also comes under fire) White's next anticipates this.

16  \textit{\textbf{\textit{Q}}el}  \textit{\textbf{\textit{e4}}?}

Much better than 16 f4 17 \textit{\textbf{\textit{Q}}e4} or 16 \textit{\textbf{\textit{W}}h5} f1 \textit{\textbf{\textit{e3}}}

17  \textit{\textbf{\textit{dxe4}}}  \textit{\textbf{\textit{fxe4}}}
18  \textit{\textbf{\textit{Q}}e3}  \textit{\textbf{\textit{W}}h5}

Already a pawn down, Black is obviously not worried about throwing more fuel on the fire if it means creating inroads into White's kingside.

19  \textit{\textbf{\textit{Q}}xe4}  \textit{\textbf{\textit{g}g4}}
20  \textit{\textbf{\textit{h}4}}

Not 20 \textit{\textbf{\textit{d}f3}?} \textit{\textbf{\textit{x}}f3} — one of the points behind opening the f-file.

20  ...  \textit{\textbf{\textit{Q}}xe3}
21  \textit{\textbf{\textit{fxe3}}}  \textit{\textbf{\textit{x}}f1+}
22  \textit{\textbf{\textit{Q}}xf1}?  \textit{\textbf{\textit{W}}e5}
22  ...  \textit{\textbf{\textit{W}}f7+}

Ideally Black does not want to put his queen on the a2-g8 diagonal while White's bishop is just a step away from d5, but the text defends the d7-bishop so that the other is free to move. The rest of the game illustrates how White can adapt to a new situation after an assault against his kingside fianchetto.

23  \textit{\textbf{\textit{g}g1}}  \textit{\textbf{\textit{Le5}}}
24  \textit{\textbf{\textit{a}3}!}  \textit{\textbf{\textit{Qd5}} (D)}
White has six pawns to Black's four, but his extra pawns are isolated and doubled, and both b2 and e3 are under attack. Time to unravel.

25 \( \text{cxd3!} \)

25 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{cxb2} \) 26 \( \text{cge5} \) does not work, as 26 \( \text{hxg5} \) 27 \( \text{f1xg5} \) \( \text{fxe3} \)

28 \( \text{f6x7} \) \( \text{fxd1} \) 29 \( \text{hxd1} \) runs into

29 \( \text{e4!} \)

25 \( \ldots \) \( \text{bxc2} \)

26 \( \text{cxe3?} \)

Not 26 \( \text{cxb1?} \) \( \text{cxe3} \) 27 \( \text{cxb2} \)

\( \text{cxe2} \) 28 \( \text{cxe2} \) \( \text{cxe6} \) or 26 \( \text{cxb1} \)

26 \( \ldots \) \( \text{cxe3?!} \)

26 \( \text{cxb2} \) 27 \( \text{cge5} \) \( \text{hxg5} \) 28 \( \text{hxd5} \)

\( \text{c6} \) 29 \( \text{cxe6} \) \( \text{wxe6} \) 30 \( \text{wh5+} \) \( \text{c7} \)

31 \( \text{wxd5} \) is very good for White.

The e-pawns form a defensive shield for the king, which is much safer than Black's. Note that

31 \( \text{cxe2} \) simply loses the rook to

32 \( \text{wh5+} \)

27 \( \text{wd4!} \)

White has everything worked out.

27 \( \ldots \) \( \text{c2} \)

28 \( \text{wa7} \) \( \text{xb2} \)

29 \( \text{wh1} \) \( \text{wc4?!} \)

29 \( \text{we7} \) 30 \( \text{wc5} \) (30 \( \text{we7??} \))

30 \( \text{we6+} \) 31 \( \text{e5} \) \( \text{g4} \) 32 \( \text{h5+} \)

and 29 \( \text{we8} \) 30 \( \text{wc7} \) \( \text{c3} \) 31 \( \text{wc3} \)

32 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{xf1} \) 33 \( \text{wc4+} \) are both difficult for Black, while the text is even worse.

Bilek-Tal

Moscow 1967

1 \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 2 \( \text{g3} \) \( \text{b5?!} \) (D)

If this seems bizarre it is worth mentioning that Spassky was adventurous enough to play it against
Petrosian in their 1966 World Championship match! Petrosian immediately struck on the queenside with 3 a4, but after 3 ... b4 4 d3 \( \text{\&} b7 \) 5 e4 d6 6 \( \text{\&} g2 \) \( \text{\&} bd7 \) 7 0-0 e6 8 a5 \( \text{\&} b8 \) 9 \( \text{\&} bd2 \) \( \text{\&} e7 \) 10 \( \text{\&} c4 \) 0-0 11 \( \text{\&} e1 \) a6 12 \( \text{\&} f4 \) \( \text{\&} a8 \) 13 \( \text{\&} e2 \) \( \text{\&} e8 \) Black had the upper hand. Although 13 e5 improves, it seems better to keep a2-a4 in reserve.

3 \( \text{\&} g2 \) \( \text{\&} b7 \)
4 0-0 e6
5 d3

A direct course is 5 c3 c5 6 \( \text{\&} b3 \) when 6 \( \text{\&} b6 \) keeps White's edge to a minimum, while 6 \( \text{\&} c6 \) is doubtful because of 7 d3 d6 8 \( \text{\&} g5 \) \( \text{\&} e7 \) 9 \( \text{\&} f4 \) \( \text{\&} xg2 \) 10 \( \text{\&} xg2 \) a6 11 \( \text{\&} x f6 \) \( \text{\&} x f6 \) 12 a4 with advantage to White, Gutman-Grunfeld, Israel 1985.

5 ...
6 \( \text{\&} b d2 \) \( \text{\&} e7 \)
7 e4 0-0
7 dxe4 8 \( \text{\&} g5 \) favours White
8 \( \text{\&} e2 \) c5
9 \( \text{\&} e1 \) \( \text{\&} e6 \)
10 c3

The reader may notice — and by now will not be surprised — that it is possible for White to transpose to a French Defence line here with 10 e5. However, Bilek prefers to punish Black's provocative move order, planning to use the f5-square and the e-file.

10 ...
11 exd5 exd5
12 d4 \( \text{\&} b6 \)
13 dxc5 \( \text{\&} x c5 \)
14 \( \text{\&} b3 \) \( \text{\&} e 8 \)
15 \( \text{\&} c2 \) d4

Opening the long diagonal for his favourite bishop, and avoiding

15 \( \text{\&} f 8 \) 16 \( \text{\&} c 3 \)
16 \( \text{\&} f 5 \) !
17 \( \text{\&} x e 1 \) \( \text{\&} e 8 \)
18 \( \text{\&} f 3 ? \)

White follows Black's lead and enters into complications, effectively playing into Tal's hands. However, 18 \( \text{\&} f 4 \) ensures the safe capture of the black d-pawn.

18 ...
19 \( \text{\&} g 5 \) \( \text{\&} e 4 \)
20 \( \text{\&} e 1 \) \( \text{\&} e 7 \) (D)

![Diagram](image)

21 \( \text{\&} x e 7 \)
21 ... g6!
22 \( \text{\&} h 3 \) dxc3!

The winning move. After mass exchanges this pawn would decide, e.g. 23 \( \text{\&} x d 6 \) \( \text{\&} x f 2 + \) 24 \( \text{\&} h 1 \) \( \text{\&} x e 1 + \) 25 \( \text{\&} x e 1 \) \( \text{\&} f 2 + \) 26 \( \text{\&} g 1 \) \( \text{\&} x h 3 + \) 27 \( \text{\&} f 1 \) \( \text{\&} x g 2 + \) 28 \( \text{\&} x g 2 \) cxb2! 29 \( \text{\&} d 2 \) \( \text{\&} d 8 \)!

23 \( \text{\&} x e 4 \) cxb2!
23 ... \( \text{\&} e 8 \) Not 23 \( \text{\&} x e 4 \) 24 \( \text{\&} g 5 \)

24 \( \text{\&} e 1 \) \( \text{\&} x e 7 \)
25 \( \text{\&} h 1 \) a4
26 \( \text{\&} b 4 \) \( \text{\&} x f 3 \)
27 \( \text{\&} x f 3 \) \( \text{\&} e 2 \)
28 \( \text{\&} f 1 \) \( \text{\&} f 2 \)!
29 \( \text{\&} c 8 + \) \( \text{\&} g 7 \)
30 \textit{\textbf{\textit{c3+}}} \textit{f6} \textit{0-1}

An important lesson with which to end! White was thrown off balance by his opponent's second move and subsequently let himself get drawn into a web of tactics. Preferable is 5 c3, mentioned above, or at any rate a more level-headed approach than Bilek's. Transposition into the French Defence variation is also a good idea, and in my opinion the best, since we are then back onto familiar ground.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolmatov-Lautier</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunnington-Gutman</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvoretsky-Vul'fson</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer-U.Geller</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer-Ibrahimoglu</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer-Miagmasuren</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelman-Lastin</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glek-Granda Zuniga</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutman-Leinov</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.Hernandez-R.Espinosa</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickl-Lev</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillarp Persson-Hector</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgson-Seirawan</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansa-Keene</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantinopolsky-Banas</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korchnoi-Flear</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazic-Dizdar</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loginov-Madl</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljubojevic-Karpov</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortensen-U.Nielsen</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrosian-Donner</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piket-Timman</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polugayevsky-Addison</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psakhis-Erdelyi</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psakhis-D.Paunovic</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psakhis-Smirin</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyslov-Botvinnik</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyslov-Miles</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiridonov-Shamkovich</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Index of Games

Stein-Hort 94
Steinert-Cvitan 10
Troianska-Jovanovic 53
Vaganian-Adams 12
Vaganian-Sveshnikov 135
Vaganian-Torre 121
Vladimirov-Voskanian 153
Vukic-Buljovic 133
Weinstein-Westerinen 148
Wojtkiewicz-Bronstein 87
Yudasin-Jukic 31
Yudasin-Luther 76
Yurtachev-Gulko 33