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SECTION 1

Introduction

2 f4 was resurrected from the archives by Bent Larsen in 1964. He used it with tremendous success and since then it has found a growing number of converts. These already include Grandmasters Antoshin, Miles and Westerinen and International Masters Day, Hebden, Hodgson, Kosten and Plaskett.

2 f4 can lead to a fierce attack on Black’s king or it can be combined with purely positional ideas. It does not concede Black a central pawn majority which happens in variations based on 2 Qf3 and 3 d4; Black gets fewer counterchances.

2 f4 has never been very popular and relatively little is known about it as yet. It is not necessary for White to learn reams of analysis before he can play it and it offers scope for the creative mind. A purely practical advantage is that it makes booked up Dragon or Najdorf players think for themselves.

White usually seems to be able to get the better of it if Black adopts the time-honoured panacea of ‘simple development’. Black really has to know what he is doing, and even then it is not clear he can equalize. It is as much for Black as for White that this booklet is intended.

This survey includes 70 key games played with 2 f4 with several more incorporated in the notes. As far as possible I have tried to use recent material though with a few variations it has been necessary to go back a few years. The reader may find it useful to note games played with 2 f4 or 2 Qc3 and 3 f4 in forthcoming volumes of Informator or the Pergamon Tournament Chess series. This will enable him to keep up-to-date with new developments.

Nigel Davies
SECTION 2

2 f4 and 2 Qc3: is there a difference?

This book deals with the variations arising from 2 f4, but most of them can also be reached via 2 Qc3 and 3 f4. So what is the difference?

Amongst the advantages of 2 Qc3 are that it avoids both 2 ... d5 and 2 ... Qf6 (3 e5!). In addition it maintains the possibility of an Open Sicilian if White were to follow up with 3 Qge2 and 3 d4. Najdorf, Scheveningen and Paulsen addicts are likely to play 2 ... d6 or 2 ... e6 unless they are fairly sure White will not switch systems.

The disadvantage is that it rules out the lines where White delays Qc3 such as the ‘Big Clamp’. It also makes 2 ... Qc6 followed by 3 ... g6 a better plan for Black as I will explain.

After 2 f4 Qc6 3 Qf3 g6 4 Qb5 Qg7 White can play 5 Qxc6!. But after 2 Qc3 Qc6 3 f4 g6 4 Qf3 Qg7 5 Qb5 Black has 5 ... Qd4!

After 2 f4 Black usually tries to get into this 5 ... Qd4! line by playing 2 ... g6 3 Qf3 Qg7 4 Qc3 Qc6. But White has another dangerous possibility: 2 ... g6 3 d4!

Finally it should be noted that if White intends to adopt the aggressive lines based on Qc4 rather than the positional Qb5 or the ‘Big Clamp’ then 2 Qc3 loses these disadvantages. In that case it is likely that White will choose it as his second move.

SECTION 3

2 ... d5 3 ed Qxd5

2 ... d5 is a popular reaction to White’s system, posing an immediate challenge to the duo of pawns on e4 and f4. White’s obvious reply is 3 ed and after 3 ... Qxd5 to hit the Queen with 4 Qc3. White’s lead in development gives him the initiative.

The traditional retreat is 4 ... Qd8 (games 1-3). If Black then fianchettoes his king’s bishop he tends to get much the worst of it (games 1 and 2) but the plan used in game 3 seems quite respectable.

The US grandmaster Yasser Seirawan has suggested that the move 4 ... Qd6 (game 4) is a clear improvement and in fact gives Black the advantage. But the Queen finds herself exposed on that square and practice has favoured White.

Game 1

□ Hebden Kudrin ■

Hastings, 1983-84

1 e4 c5 2 f4 d5 3 ed Qxd5 4 Qc3 Qd8 5 Qf3 g6 6 Qe5 [6 d4!? Qg7 7 Qe3 cd 8 Qxd4 Qf6 9 Qxf6 Qxf6 10 Qxd8+ ± Westerinen-Plaskett, Brighton 1983]
Game 2

Amsterdam 1971

1 e4 c5 2 f4 d5 3 ed ½xd5 4 ½c3 ½d8 5 ½f3 ½f6 [5 ... ½e6?! 6 ½b5 ½d7 7 0-0 ½f6 8 ½e5 ½c8 9 ½e2 e6 10 ½xc6 ½xc6 11 f5 ± Westerinen-Tseshkovsky, Sochi 1981] 6 ½e5 [6 ½b5+ ½d7 7 ½e2 g6 8 ½c5 ½g7 9 ½c4 0-0! 10 ½xc5 ½f5! unclear Westerinen-Polugaevsky, Sochi 1981] e6 [6 ... ½bd7?? 7 ½c4 e6 8 ½e2 ½xe5? 9 fe ½d7 10 0-0 ½e7 11 d3 0-0-0 ½f3 ± Hebden-Kiss, Hungary 1981-82] 7 ½c3 [7 ½b5+ ½f7? unclear] ½e7 8 b3 ½bd7 [8 ... 0-0 0 ½b2 ½bd7?? 10 0-0-0 ½c7 11 ½e1 a6 12 g4 b5 13 ½g2 ½b6 14 g5 ± Hennings-Polugaevsky, Klokovskov 1972] 9 ½b5 0-0 10 ½xd7 ½xd7 11 ½b2 a6 12 ½d3 ½b8 13 ½b3 f5! 14 g4 ½h4+ 15 ½e2 b5! 16 gf ½c4! 17 ½e4 ½c5 18 ½ag1 ½f6 19 d4 cd+ 20 cd ef 21 ½d5+ ½e6 22 ½xe6+ ½xe6 23 ½f1 ½e8 24 d4 ½xd4+ 25 ½f2 b4 0:1

Game 4

□ Fredericks

New York 1961

1 e4 c5 2 f4 d5 3 ed ½xd5 4 ½c3 ½d6 5 ½f3 ½f6 6 ½c4 [In Hodgson-Horvath, England 1984 White opened the centre with 6 d4. But after 6 ... a6 7 ½e3 cd 8 ½xd4 ½xd4 9 ½xd4 ½c6 10 ½xf6 ef 11 0-0 0-0 ½e6 12 ½d3 0-0-0 he failed to achieve anything tangible] ½c6 7 0-0 ½g6 8 d3 ½a5 9 ½b5 ½b6 10 ½e1 ½xe4 11 dc ½e6 12 ½g5 ½d8 13 ½xe6! ½xd1 14 ½bc7+ ½d7 15 ½xd1+ ½c6 16 ½a8! ½a6 17 ½d8 mate 1:0
SECTION 4

2 ... d5 3 ed \( \text{\#f6} \)

The most exciting recent development for Black is the gambit initiated by 3 ... \( \text{\#f6} \). Introduced by Tal in game 5 it immediately made life difficult for White. And when 8 ... \( \text{\#xe6}! \) was discovered in game 6 and that 4 ... \( \text{\#bd7} \) was also interesting (game 8), addicts of 2 f4 suddenly started to worry.

In game 7 Hebden won with 7 f5 but this certainly wasn’t thanks to his opening. White was in desperate need of a new idea.

The first attempt to improve was with 4 c4 but game 9 showed that Black still had excellent compensation for his pawn. The second attempt was to opt out with 3 \( \text{\#c3}(1) \) which is looked at in the next section.
Game 7

□ Hebdon

Nottingham 1983
1 e4 c5 2 f4 d5 3 ed 6f6 4 b5+ d7 5 xe7+ xe7 6 c4 e6 7 w2 d6 8 f5!? 0-0 [8 ... a6!? 9 de fe 10 fe w7 11 a3 b4 12 a3 0-0 13 0-0 a3 with compensation for the material] 10 fe de 9 w8! [10 ... w7? 11 d3 d4 12 e7! ± 11 ... c6 12 c3 c4 13 xd4 cd 14 b5 g3+ 15 d4!] 11 a3 w5 12 c3 [12 0-0? xh2+!] c6 13 d3 eae8 14 d2 g3+ 15 d1 d6? [15 ... g4/4 16 e4 c7 with the idea of 17 ... xe6 is very strong] 16 e1 d8 17 g5 g4 18 e4 xh2 19 h1 xe6 20 xh2 xh2 21 xg4 xg1+ 22 e1 d4 23 d2 f1 24 c3 b5 25 cb c4? [25 ... xxb5 unclear] 26 de xe6ed6 28 xe6+ xh8 29 b3 fe8 30 cd6 ec8 31 ed5 ed8 32 d6 f8 33 c3 1:0

Game 8

□ W. Watson

London 1983
1 e4 c5 2 f4 d5 3 ed 6f6 4 b5+ d7 5 c4 a6 6 a4? [The superior 6 xxd7+ was played in Westerinen-Burger, Brighton 1983. But even then Black got an excellent position after 6 ... xxd7 7 d4 g4 8 c3 cd 9 0-0 e6 10 de xxe6 11 e1 c7 12 b3 0-0 13 h3 c5 14 b5 7 eb 6 [Also good is 7 ... xxd5] 8 ba+ xa4 9 xxa4+ d7 10 xxe6 11 c3 d6? [In his notes to the game Razuvaev gave 11 ... cd as being stronger. His analysis continued 12 xxd5 xxd5 13 xxd5 xxa6 14 c3 c6+ 15 e2 e2+! 16 xg1 (and not 16 g3 xg2+!) b5 17 xdx8+ cd8 18 d3 xxd3 19 e1 e1e4 with a clear advantage to Black] 12 de xexe6 13 lb5+

□ Hodgson

Oakham (England) 1984
1 e4 c5 2 f4 d5 3 ed 6f6 4 c4 e6 5 de xxe6 6 d3 c6 7 c3 [Naturally, White is not keen to repeat the 7 d4? of Hodgson-Salov, Leningrad 1983. That game continued 7 ... xxd4 8 xxd4 wxd4 9 wxd4 cd 10 c3 d7 11 f5 c5 12 fe xd3+ 13 b2 e5 14 e1 xf7 15 b3 c8 16 xae8+ when Black's powerful passed pawn gave him a clear advantage.] c7 8 d3 0-0 9 b2 w7 10 d5 11 g2 w7 12 xf6+ xf6 13 ed5 w6 14 0-0 b4 15 xb4 c6 16 a3 c5

17 ab w7 18 c3 xxd3 19 g3 xxe4 20 c2 xxf1 21 e1+ xf1 22 xg2 c8 23 a4 c2+ 24 xe2 xexe4+ 25 xh3 xf1+ 26 g4 h5 27 xf5 w6 mate 0:1
After 3 \( \text{\$c3} \) Black has four possibilities. He can transpose into game 15 with 3 ... \( \text{\$f6} \), he can transpose into games 23-30 with 3 ... \( e6 \), he can play 3 ... \( \text{de} \) or advance with 3 ... \( \text{d4} \). It is these last two moves which are examined in this section.

After 3 ... \( \text{de} \) 4 \( \text{\$xe4} \) Black usually meets the attack on \( \text{c5} \) with 4 ... \( \text{e6} \). White then seems to get the better of it whether he adopts Hebdon's exotic double-fianchetto treatment (game 10) or Plaskett's more direct approach (game 11).

Black's play (game 12) was a bit more like it. He chose 4 ... \( \text{\$c7} \) in preference to the passive 4 ... \( \text{e6} \).

3 ... \( \text{d4} \) will tend to favour White if he gets a King's Indian with colours reversed and his pawn already on \( \text{f4} \) (game 13). The most interesting question is whether Black can put a spanner in the works early on, for example with 4 ... \( \text{e5} \). Future encounters will doubtless provide the answer.

17 \( \text{\$f3} \) \( \text{\$xf3} \) 18 \( \text{\$xf3} \) \( \text{\$c6} \) 19 \( \text{\$e1} \) a5 20 a3 \( \text{\$fd8} \) 21 \( \text{\$f1} \) \( \text{\$ab8} \) 22 \( \text{\$eb1} \) \( \text{\$a8} \) 23 \( \text{\$f1} \) b6 24 \( \text{\$c2} \) e5 25 \( \text{\$fe} \) \( \text{\$fe} \) 26 \( \text{\$e1} \) \( \text{\$e8} \) 27 \( \text{\$g2} \) \( \text{\$e8} \) 28 \( \text{\$f2} \) \( \text{\$c7} \) 29 d3 b5 30 cb \( \text{\$e7} \) 31 \( \text{\$e4} \) \( \text{\$d5} \) 32 a4 \( \text{\$d8} \) 33 \( \text{\$d6} \) \( \text{\$e6} \) 34 \( \text{\$c4} \) \( \text{\$e8} \) 35 \( \text{\$f1} \) \( \text{\$f6} \) 36 \( \text{\$ae1} \) \( \text{\$c3} \) 37 \( \text{\$xa5} \) e4 38 \( \text{\$c4} \) ed 39 \( \text{\$xe6} \) \( \text{\$xe6} \) 40 \( \text{\$b4} \) \( \text{\$e2} \) 41 \( \text{\$f2} \) \( \text{\$e4} \) 42 \( \text{\$xe2} \) de 43 \( \text{\$d3} \) \( \text{\$c5} \) 44 \( \text{\$cb2} \) \( \text{\$xb3} \) 45 \( \text{\$f2} \) a5 46 \( \text{\$xe2} \) \( \text{\$f7} \) 47 \( \text{\$f4} \) \( \text{\$e7} \) 48 \( \text{\$d3} \) \( \text{\$d7} \) 49 \( \text{\$d5} \) 1:0

---

**Game 11**

\[ \text{\$} \]

Plaskett – Howells

Brighton (British Ch) 1984

1 e4 c5 2 f4 d5 3 \( \text{\$c3} \) dc 4 \( \text{\$xe4} \) e6 5 \( \text{\$f3} \) \( \text{\$e7} \) 6 \( \text{\$f6} \) 7 \( \text{\$e2} \) \( \text{\$c6} \) 8 \( \text{\$d6} \) \( \text{\$c3} \) 9 0-0 0-0 10 \( \text{\$d2} \) \( \text{\$c7} \) 11 \( \text{\$g3} \) \( \text{\$d6} \) 12 \( \text{\$d2} \) \( \text{\$e7} \) 13 \( \text{\$g5} \) \( \text{\$e7} \) 14 \( \text{\$e4} \) \( \text{\$xe4} \) 15 \( \text{\$d6} \) 16
Section 6

Counterattack with

... \( \square f6 \)

[diagram]

Game 13

Jugashvili  Tereshenko-Nutsu

Rumania 1982

1 e4 c5 2 f4 d5 3 \( \square c3 \) d4 4 \( \square c6 \) g6 [The immediate 4... e5 is an interesting idea which aims for control of e5. A sample variation is 5 \( \square c3 \) \( \square c6 \) 6 d3 ef 7 \( \square x f4 \) \( \square d6 \) 8 g3, with about even chances.] 5 d3 \( \square g7 \) 6 \( \square f3 \) \( \square e6 \) 7 g3 e5 8 \( \square g2 \) \( \square e7 \)

see following diagram
This section looks at the main variations 2 ... $\text{Qf}6$ and 2 ... $\text{Qc}6$ 3 $\text{Qf}3$ $\text{Qf}6$.

When Larsen first began experimenting with 2 $\text{f}4$ he faced 2 ... $\text{Qf}6$ on a couple of occasions. His reaction was the quiet 3 $\text{d}3$ (game 14) which leads to positions related to the Big Clamp.

The most natural reply is 3 $\text{Qc}3$ when Black usually plays 3 ... d5. An exotic alternative (3 ... g6) was played by Murei (game 16).

After 3 ... d5 4 e5 Black has a choice between 4 ... d4 (game 15), which gives him a difficult endgame, and a discreet retreat with 4 ... $\text{Qf}d7$. The retreat transposes into a French Defence after 5 $\text{Qf}3$ e6 6 d4 but White also has the option of 6 g3, transposing into game 23.

After 2 ... $\text{Qc}6$ 3 $\text{Qf}3$ $\text{Qf}6$ White again has the choice between 4 d3 and 4 $\text{Qc}3$. The endgame after 4 $\text{Qc}3$ d5 5 e5 d4 (game 17) again favours White but not so clearly as in game 15. After 5 ... $\text{Qd}7$ White again has a choice between a French (6 d4) and game 23 (6 g3). Black can also try an interesting Murei concoction with 5 ... $\text{Qe}4$ (game 18).

Finally it should be noted that 3 ... $\text{Qf}6$ 4 $\text{Qc}3$ e6 is game 35.

**Game 14**

\[ \text{Larsen} \quad \text{Bednarsky} \]

Palma de Mallorca 1967

1 $\text{c}4$ c5 2 $\text{f}4$ $\text{Qf}6$ 3 $\text{d}3$ $\text{Qc}6$ 4 $\text{Qf}3$ d5 5 e5 $\text{Qg}6$ 6 $\text{Qe}2$ $\text{Qg}4$ 7 0-0 e6 8 $\text{c}4$ $\text{Qe}7$ 9 $\text{Qc}3$ dc 10 dc $\text{Qf}5$ 11 h3! [A clear improvement on Larsen-Tal, Amsterdam 1964 which went 11 $\text{wa}4$ $\text{Qd}4$ 12 $\text{xd}4$ $\text{xd}4+13\text{f}2$ $\text{xe}2$ 14 $\text{xe}2$ $\text{d}3$ 15 f5 $\text{ae}7$ 16 $\text{f}4$ $\text{we}4$ with a good game for Black.] $\text{xf}3$ 12 $\text{xf}3$ $\text{xd}4+13\text{e}4$ $\text{e}7$ 15 $\text{c}5$ $\text{f}6$ 16 $\text{d}6+$ $\text{d}7$ 17 $\text{b}4$ fe 18 $\text{b}5$ $\text{xd}6$ 19 bc+ bc 20 cd $\text{xd}6$ 21 fe $\text{xe}5$ 22 $\text{g}4$ c5 23 $\text{f}7+\text{d}6$ 24 $\text{g}5$ $\text{ae}8$ 25 $\text{f}3$ $\text{ab}8$ 26 $\text{xa}7$ $\text{b}6$ 27 $\text{c}1$ $\text{f}6$ 28 $\text{d}2$ $\text{eb}8$ 29 $\text{e}4$ h6 30 $\text{a}5$ $\text{g}5$ 31 $\text{xb}6$ $\text{x}b6$ 32 $\text{b}1$ $\text{xb}1+$ 33 $\text{xb}1$ c4 34 $\text{f}1$ d3 35 $\text{xg}7$ e5 36 $\text{xg}5$ hg 37 $\text{f}2$ e4 38 $\text{e}3$ $\text{d}5$ 39 g3 $\text{e}5$ 40 a4 1:0

**Game 15**

\[ \text{Miles} \quad \text{Plachetka} \]

Dubna 1976

1 $\text{e}4$ c5 2 $\text{f}4$ $\text{Qf}6$ 3 $\text{Qc}3$ d5 4 e5 d4 5 $\text{ef} dc$ 6 $\text{fg}$ cd+ 7 $\text{wd}2$ $\text{xd}2+ 8\text{xd}2$ $\text{Qg}7$ 9 0-0 $\text{Qf}5$ [Black also found life difficult in the game Bisguier-Hartston, Hastings 1975-76 which continued 9 ... $\text{Qc}6$ 10 $\text{ab}5$ $\text{d}7$ 11 $\text{ae}3$ b6 12 $\text{Qf}3$ $\text{Qe}5$ 13 $\text{xd}7+\text{Qd}7$ 14 $\text{he}1$ h5 15 $\text{Qf}2$ $\text{h}6$ 16 $\text{g}3$ $\text{Qf}6$ 17 $\text{Qb}1$ $\text{Qg}4$ 18 $\text{Qg}1$] 10 $\text{Qe}2$ $\text{Qc}6$ 11 $\text{Qe}3$ $\text{xc}8$? 11 ... $\text{b}6$ 12 $\text{Qg}3$ $\text{Qg}4$

13 $\text{bd}5$$\text{d}4$ 14 $\text{xd}4$ cd 15 $\text{ab}5$ $\text{ad}7$ 16 $\text{Qe}4$ $\text{Eh}8$ 17 $\text{xc}6$ bc [17 ... $\text{xc}6$ 18 $\text{f}6+!]$

18 $\text{Exd}4$ $\text{Qf}5$ 19 $\text{xa}4$ $\text{Ed}7$ 20 $\text{Qg}3$ $\text{Qe}6$ 21 $\text{Ea}1$ $\text{Ec}7$ 22 $\text{f}5$ $\text{Qc}8$ 23 $\text{Ed}4$ e5 24 $\text{Qe}4$ $\text{e}7$ 25 f6+ $\text{Qd}6$ 26 h3 1:0

**Game 16**

\[ \text{Watson} \quad \text{Murei} \]

Brighton 1982

1 $\text{e}4$ c5 2 $\text{f}4$ $\text{Qf}6$ 3 $\text{Qc}3$ g6 4 $\text{e}5$ $\text{Qh}5$ 5 d3 d6 6 $\text{Qe}2$ de 7 $\text{xf}5$ gh 8 $\text{wx}5$ $\text{Eg}8$ 9 $\text{Qb}3$

$\text{Qg}4$ 10 $\text{wxh}7$ $\text{xg}7$ 11 $\text{wh}4$ $\text{xf}3$ 12 $\text{wx}f3$

$\text{Qc}6$ 13 fe $\text{wd}4$ 14 $\text{Qe}3$ $\text{xe}5$ 15 $\text{wh}3$ $\text{wb}4$
2 ... e6 and 3 ... d5
— but not main line

Preparing ... d5 with 2 ... e6 is one of the most natural and popular systems at Black's disposal. It could be argued that if White's best to 2 ... d5 is 3 \( \text{c3} \) then preparation isn't necessary! But in mitigation 2 ... e6 is often a handy move anyway and if White adopts the 2 \( \text{c3} \) move order then preparation certainly is useful.

Categorising the variations stemming from 2 ... e6 was no easy matter but four basic types can be identified. The main line is arrived at after 3 \( \text{c3} \) d5 4 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 5 \( \text{b5} \) and this is dealt with in section 8.

Section 9 is devoted to lines in which Black delays ... d5 for the time being. Section 10 deals with the various closed formations which can arise after 2 ... e6.

This section features lines in which 3 ... d5 is played but the main line is not
reached. Game 19 shows 4 exd5 in action which despite its ugly appearance contains a certain amount of venom.

The main alternative to 4 c3 is 4 b5+. A more usual reply than the experimental 4 ... d7 (game 20) is 4 d7. After 5 xd7+ the natural 5 ... wxd7 seems to lose a pawn for inadequate compensation (game 21). The prudent 5 ... cxd7 gives a position in which White will put his pawns on White squares and claim he has the better bishop. (game 22).

The vigilant reader may notice that game 23 is in fact an Alekhine's Defence. But quite a few Sicilian f4 lines can transpose into it so the darn thing had to go in somewhere.

It appears in this section by virtue of the possible continuation 3 f3 d5 4 c3 f6 5 e5 fxe7 6 g3 (6 d4 gives a French Defence). It could have appeared with equal justification in sections 3, 4, 7, 8 or 10.

Game 19

□ Sikora
□ Jansa

Fremstat (CSSR Ch) 1982
1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 c3 d5 4 ed [A fairly innocuous idea is the attempt to set up a 'Big Clamp' with 4 e5. Day-Clayton, World Open 1979 continued 4 ... c6 5 g3 c6 6 g2 d5 7 d3 h5 8 c3 e7 9 d3 d7 10 e2! with counterplay for Black.] ed 5 b5+ d7 6 e2+ [Much more dangerous than the 6 xd7+ of Kurajica-Pritchett, London 1976. Play continued 6 ... xd7 7 0-0 d6 8 d4 e7 9 e3 c4 10 c3 0-0 11 g4 d8 12 d2 b4 with an excellent game for Black] e7 7 0-0 bx5 wb5+ wd7 9 c3 c6 10 e5 xe5 11 fe d4 12 wb3 c6?! [12 ... 0-0-0 13 c4 f5! = Plachetka] 13 d5 0-0 14 d3 g4 15 f4

18 h3 gf 19 hg wb6 20 xf4 wb3 21 ab fe8 22 h2 e6 23 g3 de8 24 f5 a6 25 h1 a2 26 g5+ f8 27 xh7 xb2 28 gg7 xe5 29 xf7+ g8 30 fg7+ f8 31 xh7 e8 32 h8 mate 1:0

Game 20

□ Westerinen
□ Boussios

Thessalonika 1981
1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 c3 d5 4 b5+ c7 [4 ... c6 5 ed ed 6 c5 d7 7 c6 is somewhat better for White] 5 xd7+ xd7 6 d3 c6 7 e5 c5 8 e2 g6 9 c4 c8 10 c3 d4 11 d1 g7 12 0-0 0-0 c6 14 e5 f5 15 ef xh6 16 g4 e5 17 d2 ef 18 c4 xh6 19 xf4 e6 20 wg2 b6 21 wh3 c6 22 xg5 xf1+ 23 xf1 xh2 24 xh2 xh2 25 xh2 xh2 26 xh2 xh2 27 c8+ h6 28 g5+ 1:0

Game 21

□ Watson
□ Conquest

London 1982
1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 c3 d5 4 b5+ d7 5 xd7+ xd7 6 c5 e7 7 ed ed 8 f3 [8 e3 d6 9 f3 transposes after 9 ... wd6, but in the game Larsen—Brinck-Claussen, Danish Ch. 1964 Black chose the inferior 9 ... wd8. After 10 we2 xg4 11 xg4 xg4 12 xd6 xg2 13 xg2 xg2 he found himself with nothing for his 'sacrificed' pawns] wd6 9 c3 d6 10
Game 22

Hodgson Delaney
Groningen (European Junior Ch) 1981-82
1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 d4 cxd5 4 c5+ d7 5

14 dxc5 
15 dxe5 
16 f6 16 Wh5+ g6
17 Wh2 Wh7 18 d5! ed 19 Wh6! Whg4
20 Wh3 Whc7 21 Whxg7 Whxg7 22 Whc1 with

with a winning position for White.] 9 d3 f6

The famous game Nimzovich-Alekhine,

Semmering 1926 went 9 . . . b6 10 c2
d4 11 g4 f6 12 ef gf 13 Gg3 c5 d4 14 Wh2
d6 15 Wh4 Whce7. With 16 Wh5 White

could have developed a dangerous attack.] 10 ef Whf6 11 Wh2 Whg8

12 Whd2 Whd6 13 h3 Wh6 14 Whae1 c5 15 fe

Whxe5 16 Whxe5 Whxe5 17 Whd1 a6 18 Whf4

Whxe1 19 Whxe1 Whxf4 20 Whxf4 d4 21 Whd5

Whxd5 22 Whxd5+ Whh8 23 Whh4 Wh5 1:0

SECTION 8

2 ... e6: main line

Game 23

Halle 1976

1 e4 d5 2 c3 d5 3 e5 Whd7 4 f4 e6 5 Whf

Balashov Schmidt

In the game Balashov-Smit, USSR 1975, Black
delayed castling but got his king caught in the
centre. Play went: 8 ... a6 9 a4 Wha5

10 d3 b5 11 f5! b4 12 fe fe 13 Whc2 Whd5

11 Whc7 Whc7 35 Whxd4 Whg7 36 Whd5 Whc8 37

Wha1 1:0
The sequence 1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 g3 d5 4 g4 c3 5 dxc6 6 a5 represents the main line of 2... e6. Black can now choose between 5... d6f6 and 5... d6e7.

Some very strong grandmasters have shown a liking for 5... d6f6 which indicates that it should be treated with respect. White seems to keep an edge with the plan used in game 24.

After 5... d6e7 White normally plays 6 ed (game 25 featured the rare but reasonable 6 d6e2) and again Black has a choice.

6... d6xd5 is often applauded but White seems to get the better of it with 7 d6e5 (game 26) and can also offer an interesting gambit with 7 0-0 (game 27).

After 6... exd5 White plays 7 d6e2 and Black is at a crossroads yet again. 7... d6g4 (game 28) seems clearly in White's favour which leaves 7... d6d6.

Traditionally White has replied to this with 8 d6e5 (game 29) but this seems to waste time against accurate defence. Kosten's 8 d6xc6+ (game 30) looks like a dangerous improvement.

Game 24

Foguelman   Marcucci

Cuba 1981

1 e4 c5 2 d4 c3 d6 3 f4 e6 4 f3 d5 5 a5 d6f6 6 c5 [The best. Black developed excellent counterplay after both 6 d6e2 d6e7 7 0-0 0-0 8 d6xc6 bc 9 d3 c4 10 d4 d6xe4 11 d6xe4 de 12 d6xe4 d6d5 13 d6xc2 c5 (Bilic-Stein, Kecskemet 1968) and 6 d3 d6d7 7 e7 0-0 0-0 8 d6xc6 bc 9 d6d2?! (9 b3) d6a6 10 c5 d6d7 11 d6el d4! 12 d6e4 c4! (Hug-Gligoric, Skopje (ol) 1972)] d6d7 7 d6xc6 bc 8 d3 [Also possible is the immediate 8 0-0. Bangiev-Tukmakov, USSR 1979 continued 8... c4 9 b3 d6a6 10 bc d6xc4 11 d3 d6d6 12 d6e2 g6 13 d6c3 d6w5 14 h3 h5 15 d6h2 with slightly the better prospects for White] d6a6 9 0-0 d6e7 10 d6e1 c4 11 d6d4 c5 12 d6e3

Rb8 13 Rb1 0-0 14 Rg3 cd 15 d6d4 d6c5 16 ef 17 d6xf5 d6d6+ 18 d6e3 Rb6 19 d6exd5 Rb6 20 d6f4 d6g5 21 d6xg5 d6xg5 22 c6 fe 23 d6d7+ d6h8 24 d6xf8+ d6xf8 25 d6f1 d6g6 26 d6e4 Lg4 27 d6d6 h5 28 h3 d6d4 29 d6xg6+ d6h7 30 d6d8+ d6g8 31 d6e8 c3 32 bc Rb8 33 d6xe6 d6xe8 34 d6c7 d6xf1 35 d6xe8 d6c4 36 a3 d6b5 37 d6d6 d6a4 38 h4 d6xc2 39 d6f2 d6f8 40 d6e3 a6 41 d6d4 d6e7 42 d6e4 d6e6 43 g3 d6f5 44 d6f2 g6 45 c4 d6e6 46 d6d3 a5 47 d6e5 d6f5 48 c5 d6c2 49 d6e4 a4 50 c6 d6d1 51 d6c5 1:0

Game 25

Konarkowska-Sokolov   Aseneva

Subotica 1967

1 e4 c5 2 d4 c6 3 f4 e6 4 f3 d5 5 b5 d6e7 6 d6e2 [6 d6e5? has been shown to be dubious. Figler-Podgaets, USSR 1971 continued 6... d4! 7 d6xc6+ d6xc6 8 d6xc6 bc 9 d6b1 d3 10 c4 e5 with terrible problems for White.] d4 [6... de 7 d6xe4 a6 8 d6xc6+ d6xc6 9 bc 10 d6e7 10 d2 0-0 11 0-0 also slightly favours White (Rossolimo-Zuckerman, USA Ch 1966-67)] 7 d6d1 [Or alternatively 7 5... a6 8 d6xc6+ d6xc6 9 b3 d6e7 10 d3 (Bangiev-Novikov, USSR 1978)] a6 8 d6xc6+ d6xc6 9 d3 d6e7 10 0-0 h5 11 a4 d6b7 12 h3 d6c8 13 d6f2 0-0 14 d6d2 d6c7 15 d6g4 d6fd8 16
Game 26

□ Hebden

London 1982

1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 Qf3 Qc6 4 Qc3 d5 5 Qb5 Qe7 6 ed Qxd5 7 Qe5 Qd7 [7 ... Qxc3 was successfully tried in Watson-Mürei, Brighton 1983. But instead of Watson’s 8 dc Qxd1+ 9 Qxd1 Qd7 10 Qxc6 Qxc6 11 Qxc6 bc 12 Qc3 White should try 8 bc. In that case he has good chances.] 8 Qxc6 Qxc6 9 Qxc6 bc 10 0-0 Qe7 11 We2 0-0 12 Qe4 Qb6 13 Hb1 He8 14 Qb3 f5 15 Qg3 [15 Qf2 and Qd3 is interesting according to Hort] Qf6 16 Qa3 Qd6 17 Qh1 g6 18 Qf2 Qd7 19 Qe2? [White should play 19 Qbd1 with a slight edge] Qxd2 20 Qf3 Qxc2 21 Qxc6 Qxa2 22 Qxd7 Qxa3 23 Qg1 Qa6 24 Qd2 Qad8 25 Qc2 Qd5 26 Qf3 Qd6 27 Qc4 Qb8 28 Qa4 Qd7 29 Qa2 Qb4 30 g3 Hd3 0-1

Game 27

□ Korolov

Obutkhovsky

USSR 1973

1 e4 c5 2 Qc3 Qc6 3 Qf6 4 Qc6 5 Qg5 6 ed Qxd5 7 0-0 Qxf4 8 d3 Qg6 9 Qg5 f6 10 Qxc6+ bc 11 Qf3 Qe5 12 Qg3 Qd4+? [12 ... Qe7 unclear] 13 Qe3 Qg4 14 Qf2! fg 15 d4 ed 16 Qxd4 Qf3+? [16 ... Qf4] 17 Qxf3 Qxd4+ 18 Qh1

see following diagram

18 ... Qd7 19 Qad1 Qc7 20 Qe4 Qa6 21 Qh5+ g6 22 Qf6+ Qf7 23 Qd5+ Qg7 24 Qxc7 gh 25 Qd7+ Qg6 26 Qxa6 Qg7 27 Qd6 Qhe8 28 Qc7 Qad8 29 Qxe8 Qxe8 30 Qe1 Qf5 31 c3 c5 32 Qd7 Qf6 Qxa7 33 Qb8 34 Qf1+ Qg6 35 Qa6 Qf7 36 b3 h4 37 Qa7+ Qg6 38 Qa6 Qe8 39 Qc6 Qxc3 40 Qxc5 Qd4 41 Qc6 Qh5 42 h3 e5 43 Qff6 Qg4 44 Qf5 mate 1:0

Game 28

□ Zinn

Doda

Lugano 1968

1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 Qf3 Qc6 4 Qc3 d5 5 Qb5 Qe7 6 ed Qxd5 7 0-0 Qe2 Qg4 8 Qxc6+ bc 9 0-0 Qd6 10 Qd1 c4 [10 ... Qe6 11 Qf2 Qxf3 12 Qxf3 Qf5 13 Qa3 Qd4 14 Qd3 Qf5 15 Qae1+ Qd7 16 Qa6 led to disaster for Black in Rumens-Benjamin, Charlton 1976] 11 bc Qxh4 12 Qa4 Qe8 20 Qc5 Qd6 21 Qa3 Qxb7 22 Qxb7 Qd7 23 Qc5 Qc8 24 f5 Qg8 25 Qg3 Qh6 26 Qae6 Qxf5 27 Qxf5 g6 28 Qxf6+ 1:0

Game 29

□ Hebden

Kristensen

Silkeborg 1983

1 e4 c5 2 f4 Qc6 3 Qf3 e6 4 Qc3 d5 5 Qb5 Qe7 6 ed ed 7 Qe2 Qd6 8 Qe5 f6 [8 ... Qd7? 9 Qxc6 Qxc6 10 Qb5 Qd8 11 0-0 f6 12 Qxc6 bc 13 Qc3 Qf7 14 f5! put Black
in terrible trouble in the game Rogoff-
Tukmakov, Student Olympiad, Graz
1972] 9 a6+ bc 10 f3 g6?! [10 ...
ag4! looks natural and strong] 11 b3 f7
12 a3 xf4 13 a5 a5 14 xf8 a8 15 0-0
g8 16 eae1 d7 17 w2 h7 18
d4 d4 19 c5 w6 20 a4 w4 21 d4 dc
d5 30 d5 34 d6 w5 35
a4 a4 36 e5 g7 37 f1 d5 41
d5 42 xf6 43 xf6 44 xf3 e6 44
f3 10:

**SECTION 9**

2 ... e6: delayed ... d5

By delaying ... d5 Black hopes to avoid
the pressure to which he was subjected in
the main line. After 1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 d3
d6 4 g3 ge7 both 5 ... d4 and 5 ...
a6 make White's pieces look silly.

But the lack of immediate tension
allows White to change plan. After 3 a3
a6 a6 b4 b4 d4 4 c3 a3 5 d4 6 ... a6
followed by d3 and c3 (game 31)
and Westerinen's interesting
formula initiated by 6 a6 (game 32).

In addition White can play 3 d3 c3
c6 4 a3 c3 a3 5 d4, opting for a favourable
form of Open Sicilian, games 33 and 34
show Hebden's expertise with this plan.

In game 35 Black used a different
method of delaying ... d5 by playing his
knight to f6 rather than e7. Black often
gets blown away when he does this but
Nemet's formula against Hebden looks playable.

**Game 30**

Kosten

Rovid

Budapest 1984

1 e4 c5 2 d3 e6 3 f4 d6 4 d3 d5 5 b5
d7 6 ed ed 7 w2 w6 8 a6+ [Unusual but possibly the best. Another
interesting variation is 8 0-0 a4 9
a6+ x6 10 h3 x7 11 x7 g6 12
f5!) 13 d4! cd 14 a2 unclear which was
played in Davies-Suba, Cardiff 1984.]

x6 9 a5 w6 10 0-0 a6 11 d3 f6 12
x5+ g6

13 x6 14 f5 w5 15 d2 w4+
16 w2 w4 17 e1+ f7 18 f5+ hg 19
xd5+ g7 20 g3 w3 21 e4 h5 22
w8 1:0

**Game 31**

Miles

Reshevsky

Amsterdam 1977

1 e4 c5 2 f4 e3 3 d3 c6 4 b5 a3 5 a5 ...
0 a6 6 e2 g6 7 d3 g7 8 c3 0-0 9 c3 b6
[Larsen-Kavalek, Las Palmas 1974 varied with 9 ... d6 10 d4 cd 11 Qxd4 Qxd4 12 Qxd4 e5 13 fe when Black could have equalised completely with 13 ... Qc6! But White should go 12 cd with similar play to Miles-Reshevsky] 10 d4 fs
11 e5 Qd5 12 d2 cd 13 Qxd4 Qxd4 14 cd d6 15 Qc3 de 16 de Qb7 17 Qf3 Qf7 18 Qxd5 Qxd5 19 Qxd5 Qxd5 20 e3

20 ... W e4 21 Qxb6 g5 22 W d6 Qe8 23 a1 c4 24 W el W b7 25 W c6 Qb8 26 Qd4 Qd8 27 Wxb7 Qxb7 28 Qc4 W f7 29 Qc3 Qh6 30 Qc6 Qa7 31 W f2 Qd3 32 Qd6 Wad7 33 Qxa6 Qf8 34 Qa5 Qe7 35 Wf1 Qh4+ 36 Wg1 Qd1 37 Wg4 Wxf1+ 38 Wxf1 Qd1+ 39 Wxe2 Wgl 40 g3 Qg5 41 Qf2 Qh4 42 Qd3 Qh1 43 Qh4 44 Qa4 Qh1 45 a5 Qd1+ 46 Wc2 Qd7 47 a6 Wf2 48 Wb7 Qe8 49 b4 Qa7 50 Qxd7 Qxd7 51 Qd3 1:0

Game 33

□ Hebeden

Kuligowski

Lewisham 1981
1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 Qf3 Qc6 4 Qc3 Qg7 5 Qd4 5 g3 did not work out well in Ozsvath-Witkowski, Lublin 1969. Play continued 5 ... d5 6 Qg2 d4 7 Qe2 d3 8 cd Wxd3 9-0-0 Wxe4 when White didn’t have enough for his pawn] cd 6 Qxd4 Qxd4 7 Wxd4 Qc6 8 Wf2 d5 9 Qd3! [9 ed gives Black too much freedom. Hug-Smyslov, Petropolis 1973 continued 9 ... ed 10 Qd3 Qe7 11 Qd2 0-0 12 Qd4 0-0 Qd4 13 Qe4 Wd5 with a good game for Black] Qe7 10 0-0-0-0 11 Qd1 d4 12 Qe2 Qc5 13 a3 a5 14 Qhl f6 15 Qg1 Wb6 16 Qf3 Qd7 17 Wh4 Wad8 18 Qd2 Qa4 19 Wg1 Qe7 20 g4 Qh5 21 Qg6 22 Wg5 Q f5 23 Qg3 Qxd3 24 cd Wfe8 25 Qh3 Qf8 26 Qe5 g6 27 Wxg6 Wc7 28 Qxf8 Wxf8 29 g6 Qd7 30 Wg1 Wh8 31 Qg3 Qg7 32 Wh7 Qf7 33 Qf3 Qe8 34 Qxg7 Qxg7 35 Wh8+ 1:0

□ Westerinen

Burbach

West Germany 1981
1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 Qf3 Qc6 4 Qc3 Qg7 5 Qd4 [In Westerinen-King, Lewisham 1981 Black tried 7 ... b5. But after 8 c4 Qe7 9 Qc3 Wb6 10 Qe3 Qb7 11 Qb1 0-0 12 b4 Qd4 13 Qxd4 cd 14 c5 Qa7 15 Qe2 a5 16 a3 ab ab he soon discovered that his pawn on d4 was indefensible] 8 c4 Qe7 9 ed ed 10 Qc3 dc

Game 32
Game 34

□ Hebben
Razuvaev ■
Manchester 1983
1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 □f3 □c6 4 □c3 □ge7 5 d4 □xd4 6 □xd4 cd 7 □xd4 □c6 8 □f2 b6 [A similar plan was seen in Sigurjonnsson-Cioicultea, Caracas 1970 which continued 8 ... □b4 9 □d3 0-0 10-0 0-0 d6 11 □e3 b6 12 □xd1 □xe3 13 be □c7 14 □g3 f5 15 □f1 e6 ef ef 17 □b5 ±. Clearly 10 ... d6 doesn’t fit in too well. The solid 8 ... □e7 9 □d3 0-0 10-0 0-0 □b4 11 □e3 □xd3 12 cd b6 13 f5 gave White a nice position in Lazarevic-LEVITAN, Yugoslavia 1983. Finally the experimental 8 ... □a5 9 □d3 □c5 10 □e3 □a3 proved unsuccessful in the game Hodgson-Favatov, Leningrad 1983. After 11 □d2 □xb2 12 □xb5 □a4 13 □b1 □d4 14 □xd4 □xd4 15 □xd4 □xd4 16 □c3 □bc6 17 □xg7 □g8 18 □f6 □xg2 19 ef □d4 20 □f1 □g4 21 □f2 □f5 22 □hg1 □xf4+ 23 □e2 □e7 24 □g7 d6 25 □xh7 White had a dangerous passed pawn] 9 □e3 □b4 10 □d3 0-0 11 0-0 □xc3 12 bc □b7 13 □ad1 f6 14 □ed2 □we7 15 □fd1 □ad8 16 □we2 d6 17 □f2 □a5 18 □b5 □a6 19 e5 ef 20 fe □g5 21 □xg3 d5 22 □h4 □e8 23 □b4 □h6 24 □e7 □f5 25 □b4 □g6 26 □d3 □xc3 27 □xf5 ef 28 □b4 □c8 29 □xa5 ba 30 e6 □c8 31 □e1 □f6 32 □xh7 □d4+ 33 □h1 □g4 34 □xg4 fg 35 □h4 □b7 36 □xg4 □e8 37 □a4 □xc6 38 □g1 □f7 39 □xa5 □e7 40 □a6 1:0

Game 35

□ Hodgson
van Baarle ■
London 1978
1 e4 c5 2 f4 cd 3 □c3 □d5 4 □c4 e6 5 □b5 [The immediate 5 e5 is also interesting. A game Hodgson-Weidemann played in 1982 continued 5 ... □g8 (5 ... □d5 6 □xd5 ed 7 d4) 6 f5??

□d4 7 fe de 8 □e4 □d5 9 d3 □xf3 10 □xf3 □xf3 11 □e2 □c7 12 □f4 □xb2 13 0-0 with a dangerous attack.] □d4 6 e5 □xb5 7 □xb5 □d5 8 e4! [8 0-0 a6! is good for Black] □xf4 [A better try is 8 ... □b4 as in Hebben-Nemeth, Biel 1983. Play continued 9 d4 a6 10 □d6+ □xd6 11 cd 12 a3 □c6 13 0-0 b5 14 c5 □b7 15 □d3 □f6 with quite a reasonable position for Black.] 9 d4 □g6 10 0-0 cd 11 □g5 f6 12 ef 13 □e4 □e7

14 □bd6+ □xd6 15 □xd6+ □c7 16 □xd4 □a5 17 e5 18 □d5 □a4 19 □f7+ □d8 20 □xh6+ □c7 21 □e8+ □e8 22 □d6+ □d8 23 □g5+ □c7 24 □xe7+ □xc7 25 □xh8+ □c8 26 □xe8+ □xc8 27 □xc5+ □d8 28 □f6+ □c7 29 □d6+ 1:0

SECTION 10

2 ... e6: closed lines
If Black plays 2 ... e6 3 \( \text{\texttt{d}f3} \) a6 he can prevent \( \text{\texttt{b}5} \) once and for all. On the other hand the time lost with ... a6 makes it more attractive for White to switch to a closed formation. This is what happened in game 36.

White often adopts a closed set-up without any encouragement from Black. Games 37 and 38 see an early \( \text{\texttt{w}e2} \) played by the Canadian master Lawrence Day. This method of development is reminiscent of Tschigorin's 2 \( \text{\texttt{w}e2} \) against the French and many positions can arise from either opening.

The idea behind these so-called 'Big Clamp' formations is that White's line of pawns will absorb any attempt by Black to open lines on the queenside while White calmly increases his space advantage on the other side. But White must be careful when adopting such a strategy as over-extravagant play can have him fall behind in development, fail to keep the lines closed and get pole-axed (game 39).

Finally in this section there is an example of 1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 e5!? (game 40) which transposes into Steinitz's old treatment of the French Defence. I doubt if it will really catch on but the idea is worth noting.

Game 36

\[ \begin{array}{c}
1 \text{e}4 \text{c}5 2 \text{f}4 \text{e}6 3 \text{\texttt{d}f3} \text{a}6 4 \text{\texttt{d}c3} \text{[If White wants to adopt a formation with \texttt{w}e2 then he should omit \texttt{d}c3. I recommend 4 \texttt{w}e2 \text{\texttt{a}7} 5 \text{g}3 \text{d}5 and now 6 \text{d}3 rather than the dangerous 6 e5 \text{\texttt{d}c6} 7 \text{\texttt{g}2} \text{h}5 8 \text{d}3 \text{h}4! 9 \text{g}4 \text{h}3! of Westerinen-Conquest, Lewisham 1981]} \text{\texttt{d}e6} 5 \text{g}3 \text{[Alternatively White can play 5 d3 and 6 \text{\texttt{e}2}] d5 6 \text{d}3 \text{\texttt{d}f6} 7 \text{\texttt{w}e2}! [Better is 7 \text{\texttt{d}d2} \text{\texttt{e}7} 8 \text{\texttt{g}2}
\end{array} \]


12 \( \text{\texttt{g}2} \) \( \text{\texttt{b}4}+1 \)
13 \( \text{\texttt{d}2} \)
14 \( \text{\texttt{w}d2} \)
16 \( \text{\texttt{w}e2} \)
17 \( \text{\texttt{w}xg2} \)
19 \( \text{\texttt{w}d1} \)
20 \( \text{\texttt{h}1} \)
21 \( \text{\texttt{g}4} \)
22 \( \text{\texttt{f}b8} \)
23 \( \text{\texttt{w}d} \)
27 \( \text{\texttt{c}1} \)
28 \( \text{\texttt{b}6} \)
29 \( \text{\texttt{e}4} \)
30 \( \text{\texttt{w}c6} \)
31 \( \text{\texttt{w}c1} \)
32 \( \text{\texttt{w}d} \)
33 \( \text{\texttt{w}f1} \)
35 \( \text{\texttt{w}a1} \)
36 \( \text{\texttt{w}d4} \)
37 \( \text{\texttt{w}h5} \)

Game 37

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\square \text{\texttt{d}y}1
\end{array} \]

Brighton 1980

1 \text{e}4 \text{c}5 2 \text{f}4 \text{e}6 3 \text{\texttt{w}e2} \text{\texttt{d}c6} 4 \text{\texttt{d}f3} \text{\texttt{d}f6} 5 \text{c}3
6 \text{g}3 \text{\texttt{e}7} 7 \text{\texttt{d}a3} \text{\texttt{b}7} 8 \text{d}3 \text{a}6 9 \text{\texttt{d}c2} \text{b}5
10 \text{\texttt{g}2} \text{\texttt{c}7} 11 0-0 0-0 12 \text{\texttt{h}1} \text{\texttt{a}5} 13
\text{\texttt{g}5} \text{b}4 14 \text{c}4 \text{h}3 15 \text{\texttt{d}e3} \text{ba} 16 \text{\texttt{w}a2} \text{\texttt{b}3}
17 \text{\texttt{h}3} \text{d}4 18 \text{\texttt{w}d} \text{d}6 19 \text{\texttt{a}d2} \text{a}5 20 \text{\texttt{c}3}
\text{\texttt{d}7} 21 \text{\texttt{g}4} \text{\texttt{c}6} 22 \text{\texttt{g}5} \text{\texttt{h}b8} 23 \text{\texttt{w}h5} 24 \text{\texttt{w}d} 25 \text{\texttt{w}b3}
26 \text{\texttt{a}3} 26 \text{ba} \text{\texttt{b}8} 27
\text{\texttt{d}g} 28 \text{\texttt{w}d} \text{d}8 29 \text{\texttt{w}d} \text{c}4 \text{cd} 29 \text{\texttt{d}c2} \text{\texttt{d}c5} 30
\text{\texttt{d}x} \text{\texttt{d}4} \text{\texttt{e}8} 31 \text{\texttt{f}5} \text{\texttt{w}xg5} 32 \text{\texttt{f}6} \text{\texttt{w}xf6} 33
\text{\texttt{w}xf6} + \text{gf} 34 \text{\texttt{h}3} \text{\texttt{w}f8} 35 \text{\texttt{w}g7} \text{\texttt{w}a5} 36
\text{\texttt{x}e} \text{\texttt{x}e} \text{\texttt{w}x} 37 \text{\texttt{w}e} 38 \text{\texttt{w}e} 39 \text{\texttt{w}a} 40 \text{\texttt{w}x} +
\text{\texttt{w}h} 42 \text{\texttt{w}f} 1:0
Game 38

Dr. Day

Marshall Invitational 1980

1 e4 c5 2 f4 d6 3 d3 e6 4 d4 e2 d6 5 c3
6 a3 a6 7 d2 e7 8 d3 0-0 9 g3
b6 10 h3 b7 11 0-0 exd8 12 g4 c4 13 d4
a5 14 d2 f8 15 g5 d7 16 f2 e7
17 d3 g6 18 g4 g7 19 h4 f8 20
g2 c6 21 f6 22 f3 e5 23 h3
h5 24 gh 1:0

Game 39

Dr. Bohm

Le Havre 1977

1 e4 c5 2 f4 e6 3 d3 d5 4 d2 c6 5 g3
f6 6 d3 d3 7 g3 b6 8 e5 g4 9 h2 h5
10 g2 b7 11 a3 e7 12 0-0 d4 13 e4
dc 14 bc 0-0-0 15 d1 a6 16 c6 f6 17 ef
gf 18 a4 f5 19 f2 f6 20 b2 b7 21
d3 h4 22 d4 xh2

23 dc f7 24 d4 xd4 25 cd xg2 26
xg2 bg 27 h3 g4 28 ac1 xh3 29
ch+ bh 30 ba+ xa7 31 xh3 h8+ 32
xg3 h3+ 0:1

Game 40

Dr. Steinitz

Schwarz

Vienna 1882

1 e4 c5 2 c3 d5 3 d3 e5 4 d4 d6 [Another example is Steinitz-Wiess, Vienna 1882 which continued 3 ... d5 4 ed xd6 5 g3 d7 6
f3 c6 7 g2 f6 0-0 0 0 bd7 9 d3 0-0
10 bd2 b6 11 we2 wc7 12 b3 e7 13
a2 a5 14 a4 df5 15 df4 db4 16 ac1
d5 17 fe5 dc6 18 a7 e8 19 g4
d8 20 g5 e7 21 dg4 dc6 22 wh4 dh4
d4 23 e4 with a winning attack]
4 d3 h6 5 g3 e7 6 g2 0-0 7 d3 f6 8 ef xf6 9 0-0
d7 10 c3 bh8 11 d6 12 dc2 b7 13
d3 d5 14 g4 e5 15 xf6+ gf 16 dh4
e7 17 fe ce 18 wg4+ fh8 19 wh5 he8
20 d4 a6 21 xe1 cd 22 cd e4 23 x4 dc8
44 ac1 gh8 25 cc7 ch8 26 wg5+
dxg6 27 xa7 ad3 28 cc1 dc6 29 xh7
xf4 30 xh6 x6 31 gxg6 1:0

SECTION 11

2 ... g6:

Independent lines

In the variation 2 f4 dc 3 d3 g6 4
b5 g7 5 xc6, doubled pawns are
inflicted which limit Black’s possibilities
for counterplay (see section 16). The idea
behind 2 ... g6 is that after 3 df3 g7 the
move 4 b5 is clearly pointless. White
could of course play 4 dc3 dc6 and now
5 b5, but then 5 ... d4 isn’t bad (see
section 17).

But after 2 ... g6 White can play 3 d4
when there are transpositional
possibilities into the Pirc (3 ... g7 4 d5
d6 5 df3 df6 6 dc3), Modern (game 41)
or even King’s Indian (3 ... c4 4 d5 d6 e4) Defences. Game 42 shows the independent possibility of 3 ... cd.

By playing 3 Qf3 g7 and now either 4 d3 or 4 c3 White can adopt the closed formations considered in the next section. 4 g3 is also possible but Black then has 4 ... d5 (Game 43). Black’s loss was due to an excess of ambition rather than his opening.

**Game 41**

□ Hodgson  
Watson

**Brighton 1983**

1 e4 c5 2 f4 g6 3 d4 Ag7 4 d5 d6 [4 ... a6? was played in Westerinen-Jacobsen, Esbjerg 1983. Play continued 5 d6!? (5 c4 b5!) cd 6 Wxd6 Ae7 7 Axe7+ Axe7 8 c3 d6 9 Axe3 Ab6c 10 0-0-0 0-0-0 with quite reasonable chances for Black] 5 Axe3 [The immediate 5 b5+ is not so dangerous as Black can reply 5 ... Ac7. Westerinen-Forintos, Esbjerg 1983 continued 6 a4 a6 7 Ac4 Ac6 8 c3 0-0 9 Ac3 Ab6 10 Axe2 Ag4 11 0-0 Ac8 with a sound position for Black] 6 f6 6 Axe5+ Ae7 7 a4 0-0 8 Ae3 9 0-0 e6? 10 dc Axe6 11 f5 g5 12 fxe5 13 Ab4 Ac4 14 Axe2 Axe2 15 Axe2 Ac6 16 Ae5 Wd7 17 Ae3

**Game 42**

□ Westerinen  
Kristensen

Esbjerg 1982

1 e4 c5 2 f4 g6 3 d4 Ac6 4 Wxd4 Acf6 5 e5 Ac8 6 Wd3 Acg4 7 h3 Ac6 8 g4 Ac7 9 Ac3 0-0 10 Ac2 Wb6 11 Ac3 d6 12 Ac5 Ac5 13 Ad8 14 c4 Ac8 15 Axe3 de 16 fe 17 ef 18 Ac4 Ac7 19 Acx6 Ac6 20 Ac7 Ac7 21 Ac4 Ac5 22 Ac5 23 AcXb8 Ag8 24 Acf1 Ac5+ 25 Ac1 Ac1 Ac1 26 b3 Ac5 27 Ac5 Ac5 28 Acf6 Agx2 29 AcAg Ac2 30 Ac7 Ac7 31 Ac7 Ac7 32 Acf1 + 33 Acf1 Acf1  34 Acf1 Acf1  35 Acf1 Acf1  36 Acf1 Acf1  37 Acf1 Acf1  38 Acf1 Acf1  39 Acf1 Acf1  40 Acf1 Acf1  41 Acf1 Acf1  42 Acf1 Acf1  43 Acf1 Acf1  44 Acf1 Acf1  45 Acf1 Acf1  46 Acf1 Acf1  47 Acf1 Acf1  48 Acf1 Acf1  49 Acf1 Acf1  50 Acf1 Acf1  51 Acf1 Acf1  52 Acf1 Acf1

**Game 43**

□ Heiden  
Mestel

Hastings 1983-84

1 e4 c5 2 f4 g6 3 Acf3 Acg7 4 Acf3 Acf3 5 d5 ed [5 e5 is premature. Day-Angantysson. World Open 1979 continued 5 ... f6! 6 ef cf 7 Ac2 Ac7 8 Ac7 Ac8 9 0-0 Ac6 0-0 and now Black should play 9 ... d4 with a good game]

17 Ac8 18 Ac6 19 Acf3 Acf3 20 Ac6 21 Acf6 22 Ac8 23 Ac6 24 Acf5 Acf5 25 Acx Ac5 26
SECTION 12
Closed lines ("Big Clamp" and "Antoshin")

The so-called "Big Clamp" is a method of play closely related to the Closed Sicilian. The difference is that White's queen's knight does not go to c3.

Games 37, 38 and 39 were examples of the 'Big Clamp' not being met by a Black king-side fianchetto. The present section is devoted to games in which he does fianchetto.

The line of pawns White sets up acts as a kind of shock-absorber. Black finds it difficult to open lines in the centre or on the queenside. White will gradually increase his space advantage, normally on the kingside, and eventually prepare a breakthrough. Games 44-46 show the 'Big Clamp' in action.

Another close strategic relative is a kind of reversed Antoshin variation of the Dutch Defence. It can be distinguished from a Big Clamp by the positioning of the king's bishop on e2 rather than g2.

Game 47 shows the similarities to the 'Classical Big Clamp'. Game 48 shows a difference - White does not have e4 so well defended which gives Black the possibility of an early c5-c4. All the same White seems to maintain a nagging space edge.

**Game 44**

□ Day  MacLeod

Toronto 1978

1 e4 c5 2 d3 ☐c6 3 g3 g6 4 ☐g2 ☐g7 5 f4 e6 [5 ... d6 transposes into Korchnoi-

Karpov, Baguio (m) 1978. The game continued 6 ☐f3 ☐f6 7 0-0 0-0 8 c3 ☐b8 9

 ☐e2 ☐e8 10 ☐c3 ☐c7 11 d4 cd 12 cd ☐g4

13 ☐d1 d5 14 e5 ☐d7 15 ☐c3 ☐fc8 16

 ☐f1 b5 17 h3 ☐xh3 18 ☐xf3 b4 19 ☐g4 e6

20 ☐a4 ☐a5 21 ☐e2 ☐b7 23

☐xb7 ☐xb7 24 ☐dc1 ☐d7 25 ☐c2 b3 26

ab ☐xb3 27 ☐c1 ☐b7 28 ☐a6 and White won the exchange and later on the game.]

![Chessboard diagram](image)

6 ☐f3 ☐ge7 7 c3 d5 8 ☐e2 b6 9 ☐a3 ☐a6

10 e5 ☐f5 11 ☐e3 h5 12 ☐f2 ☐d7 13 ☐c1

☐f8 14 ☐c2 ☐e7 15 h3 ☐c8 16 ☐d2 ☐f8

17 ☐e2 b5 18 g4 ☐g7 19 b4 d4 20 cd cb 21

☐a1 ☐b7 22 ☐b3 ☐d8 23 ☐e3 a5 24

☐hg1 ☐b8 25 ☐xc8 ☐xc8 26 ☐fd2 ☐a6

27 ☐e1 a4 28 ☐a5 ☐d7 29 ☐b7 ☐b6 30

☐c5 ☐c6 31 ☐xe6+ ☐e 32 ☐xc6 ☐a7 33

☐c8+ ☐e8 34 ☐e4 ☐d7 35 ☐e6 ☐xc6 36

☐xc6 ☐ac7 37 f5 gf 38 gf ef 39 d5 ☐f7 40

d6 ☐xd6 41 ☐xh8 b3 42 ab a3 43 ed a2 44

☐d4 ☐f6 45 dc ☐xd4 46 ☐a8 1:0

**Game 45**

□ Nickoloff  Braga ■

Student Olympiad, Mexico City 1978

1 e4 c5 2 d3 ☐c6 3 g3 g6 4 ☐g2 ☐g7 5 f4 e6

6 c3 ☐ge7 7 ☐f3 0-0 8 ☐a3 ☐b8 9 0-0 b5

10 ☐c2 b4 11 d4 cd 12 cd d5 13 e5 b3 14 ab

☐xb3 15 ☐e3 ☐wb6

[see following diagram]
Game 47

Toronto 1979

1 e4 c5 2 f4 g6 3 d3 g7 4 c3 g6 5 e3 d6 6 e2 b8 7 a4 a6 8 f3 f6 9 bd2 0-0 10 h3 b5 11 ab ab 12 d4 cd 13 cd d5 14 e5 e8 15 g4 c7 16 b3 f6 17 ec1 h6 18 0-0 f5 19 e1 e6 20 f2 f7 21 d3 f8 22 f1 a6 23 fe2 a7 24 d2 b4 25 e1 h8 26 g3 g7 27 e1 h6 28 d3 b7 29 a1 e7 30 a3 31 axb5 32 f3 a5 33 f4 ec7 34 h2 ecx2 35 axc2 axc3 36 ah4 ec8 37 gf ef 38 bc ecx3 39 ecx3 40 ecx3 41 f7 cxh7 42 fxe7 b3 43 c5 wc6 44 wc6 45 wc6 46 wc6 47 wc6 48 wc6 49 wc6 50 f6+ h8 51 d2 wc4 52 a8 xf6 53 ef e8 54 wc4 55 wc6 56 wc8+ h7 57 wc8+ 58 wc8+ 59 ec7+ 1:0

Game 48

Moscow Ch 1984

1 e4 c5 2 f4 g6 [Antoshin-Georgadze, Nikolaev 1983 went 2 ... d6 3 g3 g6 4 d3 g7 5 c3 f6 6 e5 cd 7 0-0 8 e2 0-0 9 c4 8 e5 cd 9 axd3 e8 10 wc2 d6 11 h3 ec7 12 ed1 ed7 13 a3 with White having a slight space advantage.] 3 d3 d6 4 c3 d5 5 d3 d6 6 wc2 0-0 7 ec2 b6 8 b7 9 d3 c4

Game 46

Makarichev

USSR Ch 1979

1 e4 c5 2 g3 d6 3 g2 g6 4 d3 g7 5 f4 d6 6 f3 e6 7 0-0 a6 8 c3 0-0 9 e3 b6 10 ed f6 7 0-0 a6 8 c3 0-0 9 e3 b6 10 ed f6

Dolmatov

11 e1 h6 12 d4 cd 13 cd e7 14 c3 h7 15 h4 ae8 16 h3 f5 17 h5 gh 18 d5 ed 19 ef xf5 20 xe8 wc8 21 xc5 xc5 22 wc2 xc8 23 wc1 wd7 24 h4 wc8 25 wc5 wc5 26 wc5 wc5 27 wc5 wc5 28 xc1 xd7 29 h3 e2 30 63 31 b4 32 b5 a5 33 a3 34 ec3 db7 35 bh4 ec5 36 bc6 ef6 37 dd4 dx a4 38 xa3 39 xf6 edf6 40 db4 dd1 41 dd5+ 1:0

10 fg hg 11 g5 cd 12 xd3 bd7 13 wc2 wc8 14 wc4 15 ec7 16 ae3 wc4 17 wc2 wc4 18 ec7 19 wc8 19 wc4 20 db5 cg8 21 a4 wc8 22 wc4
The system based on 5 \( \texttt{c}4 \) is one of direct aggression. White will play f5, even at the cost of a pawn, and play for mate.

The positions that arise are often hair-raising to say the least. Both Black and White need a light breakfast and nerves of steel.

Black’s methods of defence can be divided into three categories. This section will deal with 5 ... e6 f5 \( \texttt{g}7 \), Section 14 will deal with 5 ... d6 6 0-0 \( \texttt{f}6 \) and section 15 with 5 ... d6 6 0-0 e6.

After 5 ... e6 f5 \( \texttt{g}7 \) White plays 7 fe. Game 49 shows the solid 7 ... de in action although White seems to have some pressure.

The alternative 7 ... fe leads to wild complications. White can choose between 8 d3 and 8 0-0. The former allows 8 ... d5 9 \( \texttt{b}3 \) b5?! (game 50) but keeps the possibility of 8 d3 0-0 9 \( \texttt{g}5 \) (game 51). This is not the case with 8 0-0 (game 52).

Black won all four games with 7 ... fe but that does not necessarily indicate what is happening. White had clear improvements in all of them.

---

**Game 49**

\( \texttt{Ciocalteu} \)  |  \( \texttt{Liebert} \)
---|---
1 e4 c5 2 \( \texttt{c}3 \) \( \texttt{c}6 \) 3 f4 \( \texttt{g}6 \) 4 \( \texttt{f}3 \) \( \texttt{g}7 \) 5
\( \texttt{c}4 \) e6 6 f5 [6 e5 is interesting when Ammann-Nikolaiczuk, Biel 1976 continued 6 ... d6 7 \( \texttt{e}4 \) \( \texttt{e}7 \) 8 \( \texttt{d}6 \) \( \texttt{h}8 \) 9 \( \texttt{a}e5 \) \( \texttt{x}e5 \) 11 e4 \( \texttt{xe}5 \) 12 d4!! with a dangerous initiative for White. But Black can do better with 7 ... \( \texttt{d}6 \) as in Barle-Ribli, Bled/Portoroz 1979. Play continued 8 d4 cd 9 \( \texttt{xd}4 \) 0-0 10 \( \texttt{xe}c6 \) bc 11 0-0 \( \texttt{d}5 \) 12 \( \texttt{e}4 \) [5 13 \( \texttt{g}5 \) \( \texttt{xd}6 \) with an interesting struggle in prospect] \( \texttt{g}7 \) [6 ... gf is very risky. Gik-Kimelfeld, USSR 1968 continued 7 d3 \( \texttt{g}7 \) 8 0-0 d5

**SECTION 13**

The aggressive 5 \( \texttt{c}4 \):

Black defends with 5 ... e6 6 f5 \( \texttt{g}7 \)

---

Surprisingly, the game which did most to popularise this plan was not a Sicilian Defence but an English Opening. The game in question is Saidy-Fischer, New York 1969 which went: 1 c4 e5 2 \( \texttt{c}3 \) \( \texttt{c}6 \) 3 g3 f5 4 \( \texttt{g}2 \) \( \texttt{f}6 \) 5 d3 \( \texttt{c}5 \) 6 e3 f4 7 ef 0-0 8 \( \texttt{g}2 \) \( \texttt{e}8 \) 9 0-0 d6 10 \( \texttt{a}4 \) \( \texttt{a}4 \) 11
\( \texttt{xd}4 \) ed 12 h3 h5! 13 a3 \( \texttt{a}5 \) 14 b3 \( \texttt{g}6 \) 15
\( \texttt{b}2 \) \( \texttt{f}5 \) 16 \( \texttt{e}2 \) \( \texttt{d}7 \) 17 \( \texttt{e}1 \) \( \texttt{c}5 \) 18
\( \texttt{f}1 \) \( \texttt{a}6 \) 19 \( \texttt{d}2 \) \( \texttt{h}6 \) 20 \( \texttt{xa}5 \) \( \texttt{x}b3 \) 21
\( \texttt{d}2 \) \( \texttt{a}8 \) 22 a4 \( \texttt{a}6 \) 23 a5 \( \texttt{h}7 \) 24 \( \texttt{e}d1 \)
\( \texttt{b}6 \) 25 \( \texttt{e}1 \) ba 26 \( \texttt{a}4 \) \( \texttt{x}d3 \) 27 \( \texttt{x}d3 \)
\( \texttt{xd}3 \) 28 \( \texttt{a}2 \) \( \texttt{b}4 \) 29 \( \texttt{a}3 \) \( \texttt{c}2 \) 30 \( \texttt{h}2 \)
\( \texttt{x}a1 \) 31 \( \texttt{x}a1 \) \( \texttt{xa}4 \) 32 \( \texttt{xa}4 \) \( \texttt{e}4 \) 33
\( \texttt{xa}5 \) \( \texttt{xa}5 \) 34 \( \texttt{e}1 \) 35 \( \texttt{h}2 \)
\( \texttt{xa}5 \) 0:1

Brilliant! And imagine what White can do with his extra tempo!
9 ed ed 10 ab b c6 11 g5 d7 12 e2 h6 and now 13 h3 looks even more dangerous than Gik’s choice of 13 f3.] 7 fe de 8 0-0 0-0 9 d3 d7 [9 ... a5 10 b3 xxb3 11 ab c6 is Hodgson-Silva, London 1978. 12 e3 looks slightly better for White. Other possibilities are 9 ... 6 10 a4 d4 11 xcd4 cd 12 e2 c6 13 e1 a5 14 a2 d7 15 d2 c6 16 f4 (Geljžinės-Elijanov, USSR 1981) and 9 ... d4 10 xcd4, both of which are slightly in White’s favour] 10 e1 d4 11 xcd4 cd 12 e2 c6 13 d2 h8 14 f4 e5 15 e2 e7 16 b4 d8 17 b5 e6 18 b4 c5 19 c3 xac8 20 cd ed 21 f4 b6 22 a4 xed6 23 xed6 fe 24 xg3 e5 25 xg4 h6 26 g3 e3+ 27 g2 xxf1 28 xxf1 h8 29 xce5 xce5 30 xed6 g7 31 f7+ xf7 32 xf7+ h6 33 h4 xe8 34 e6 wc2+ 35 h3 xfl 1/2.
White was clearly better.] 11 \(\text{a}4\) b5 12 \\
\(\text{d}xe5\) \(\text{w}d6\) 13 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{w}xc5\) 14 \(\text{xf}8+\) \(\text{x}f8\) \\
15 \(\text{w}f1\) \(\text{e}5\) 16 \(\text{x}h7\) \(\text{c}7\)c6 17 \(\text{f}6+\) \\
\(\text{g}7\) 18 \(\text{e}8+\) \(\text{h}7\) 19 \(\text{f}6+\) \(\text{g}7\) 20 \\
\(\text{e}8+\) \(\text{h}7\)

21 \(\text{w}f2\) \(\text{e}7\) 22 \(\text{w}f4\) g5 23 \(\text{w}g3\) \(\text{d}8\) 24 \\
\(\text{d}d2\) \(\text{d}7\) 25 \(\text{f}4\) \(\text{d}f7\) 26 \(\text{xe}5\) \(\text{xe}5\) 27 \\
\(\text{c}7\) \(\text{w}xg3\) 28 \(\text{h}g\) \(\text{c}8\) 29 \(\text{h}e6\) \(\text{e}5\) 30 \\
\(\text{f}1\) \(\text{xe}6\) 31 \(\text{xe}6\) \(\text{xc}2\) 32 \(\text{f}5\) \(\text{c}1\) 33 \\
\(\text{e}2\) \(\text{xd}3\) + 34 \(\text{e}2\) \(\text{c}5\) 35 \(\text{d}5\) \(\text{d}3\) 36 \\
\(\text{d}2\) \(\text{c}2\) + 37 \(\text{d}1\) \(\text{a}4\) 0:1

### SECTION 14

**The aggressive 5 \(\text{c}4\):**

Black defends with 5 ... d6

6 0-0 \(\text{f}6\)

Against this method of defence White will again adopt the plan of d3, \(\text{w}e1\), \(\text{w}h4\) and f5. But what is crucial is the order in

which these moves are played.

In game 53 White adopts the conservative method of playing 7 d3, 8 \(\text{w}e1\) and only later f5. This is solid enough but Black can take the steam out of the attack with a timely ... e6.

The critical line is the immediate 7 f5 which led to a powerful attack in game 54. Black can also try 7 ... e6 transposing into game 55 (next section).

---

**Game 53**

\(\square\) Vorotnikov  

\(\text{USSR} 1972\)  

\(1\ e4\ c5\) 2 \(\text{d}c3\) d6 3 \(f4\) g6 4 \(\text{f}3\) \(\text{g}7\) 5 \(\text{g}4\) \\
\(\text{d}c6\) 6 0-0 \(\text{d}f6\) 7 d3 [The immediate 7 \(\text{w}e1\) was tried in Dorfman-Polugaevsky, \\
\(\text{USSR} \text{Ch} 1976\).]

Game continued 7 ... 0-0 8 f5 e6! 9 fe fe 10 e5! de 11 d3 \(\text{d}d4\) 12 \(\text{b}3\) \\
\(\text{d}5\) 13 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{gf}1+\) 14 \(\text{w}f1\) ed 15 \(\text{f}4\) \\
b6 16 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{w}d7\) 17 \(\text{h}h6\) \(\text{w}e7\) 18 \(\text{g}5\) \(\text{w}d7\) \\
\(1/2:\)1/2] 0-0 [7 ... a6 8 \(\text{w}e1\) transposes into \\
Rumens-Ginsberg, London 1981. White \\
won quickly after 8 ... \(\text{d}d4\) 9 \(\text{b}3\) e6 10 f5 \\
\(\text{w}e7\) 11 fe \(\text{d}x6\) 12 \(\text{e}d4\) cd 13 \(\text{d}e2\) \(\text{d}d7\) \\
14 \(\text{w}d2\) \(\text{d}e5\) 15 \(\text{xd}4\) \(\text{d}g4\) 16 \(\text{e}e6\) \(\text{fx}e2\) 17 \\
\(\text{d}g7+\) \(\text{h}d7\) 18 \(\text{xf}2\) \(\text{af}8\) 19 \(\text{d}d2\) \\
\(\text{c}8\) 20 \(\text{a}f1\) 1:0] 8 \(\text{w}e1\) \(\text{d}d4\) [Rumens- \\
Roberts, London 1977 went 8 ... a6 9 \(\text{h}4\) \\
\(\text{d}d4\) 10 f5 \(\text{xf}3\) + 11 \(\text{xf}3\) b5 12 \(\text{b}3\) gf \\
13 \(\text{g}5\) fe 14 \(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{xe}4\) 15 \(\text{x}e7\) \(\text{d}4+\) \\
16 \(\text{h}1\) \(\text{f}6\) 17 \(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{w}x7\) 18 \(\text{g}6+\) and \\
White won. The best defence is 8 ... e6! 9 \\
\(\text{h}4\) d5! 9 \(\text{b}3\) \(\text{xb}3\) 10 ab \(\text{d}7\) 11 f5 gf \\
12 \(\text{h}4\) fe 13 \(\text{g}5\) h6 14 \(\text{x}e4\) \(\text{xe}4\) 15 \\
\(\text{xe}4\) \(\text{h}7\) 16 \(\text{xf}3\) f6 17 \(\text{g}3\) f5 18 \(\text{g}5\) \\
\(\text{xf}6\) 19 \(\text{xf}6\) \(\text{xf}6\) 20 \(\text{h}5\) e6 21 \(\text{f}7+\) \\
\(\text{h}8\) 22 \(\text{e}1\) \(\text{d}4+\) 23 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{e}5\) 24 \(\text{xe}5\) \\
de 25 \(\text{h}5\) \(\text{g}5\) 26 \(\text{f}6\) \(\text{c}1+\) 27 \(\text{f}2\) \\
\(\text{d}2+\) 28 \(\text{g}1\) \(\text{c}1+\) 29 \(\text{f}1\) \(\text{e}3+\) 30 \\
\(\text{h}1\) 1:0
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Game 54

London 1978

1 e4 c5 2 f4 d6 3 g3 d5 4 c3 c6 5 g7 5 c4 d6 6 0-0 d5 7 f5 0-0 8 d3 g9 f6 e1 fe [After 9 ... d5 White can choose between 10 h4 xac4 11 dc fe 12 xg5 and 10 d5 fe (10 ... e6? 11 d5!) 11 d5 e6 12 xfx6 wxf6 13 xxe4 (Bellon-Merino, Orense 1974) with a powerful attack in either case. 9 ... c4 10 b3 xbd7 11 h4 xbx3 12 ab c8 e8 13 d5 is Balashov-Tsetlin, USSR 1969] 10 de xg4 11 h4 xfx3 12 xfx3 c3 13 h3 g6 [13 ... xxc4? 14 d5!] 14 wg3 wd7 15 d5 cxd5 16 xdx5 e6 17 b3 d5 18 c4 19 a4!

After 5 ... d6 6 0-0 e6 White usually sacrifices a pawn with 7 f5. But he can wait a while with 7 wxe1 and Black can decline with 7 ... a6 or 7 ... dxf6 (game 55).

Black usually accepts the pawn with 7 ... ef 8 d3 cge7 when White plays the thematic 9 wxe1. The reply 9 ... a6 was tried in game 56 and 9 ... dxe5 and the suicidal 9 ... 0-0 are incorporated in the notes.

The main line is 9 ... h6 (game 57) when White does best to play quietly with 10 wxe1, 10 hh1 or 10 cxd2 rather than jump straight in with 10 ef.

Game 55

Berlin 1971

1 e4 d6 2 f4 c5 3 g3 c6 4 c3 g6 5 c4 g7 6 0-0 e6 7 f5 [Rumens has shown a preference for 7 wxe1 cge7 8 wh4. Rumens-Rooney, Thanet 1978 went 8 ... c4 9 xfe4 cd 10 c2 d5 11 f5! ef 12 d5 c6 13 c5 wxc7 14 d4 c3 15 d5 woa5 16 b4 woa3 17 c6 c6 e6 18 woe6 1:0. Rumens-Whiteley, Nottingham 1978 went 8 ... a6 9 d3 b5 10 c3 waa5 11 f5 gf 12 xg5 woe7 13 ha1 xxb3 14 ab b4 15 d5 xdx5 16 cd e5 17 c6 wae8 18 wxg7+ wxg7 19 wg5+ c8 20 wh6+ c7 and now 21 wg7 wxd8 22 c5 e5 dc 23 cxe5+ would have won] c6 [Another solid move is 7 ... a6. Bisguier-Bellon,
Palma de Mallorca 1971 continued 8 fe fe 9 d3 b5 (9 ... Qd4?! 10 g5! as in Pribyl-Sursock, Vrnjacka Banja 1972, is dangerous) 10 b3 Qf6 11 a4 b4 12 Qe2 0-0 8 d3 0-0 9 fg fg 10 Wel Qd4 11 Qxd4 cd 12 Qe2 d5 13 ed ed 14 Qb3 Qb6 15 g5 Qe6 16 Qf4 Qf7

17 Qxf6 Qxf6 18 Qxd5 Qd6 19 Qxf7+ Hxf7 20 We4 Qg5 21 Qd5 Qd7 22 c4 dc 23 Qxc3 Qd4+ 24 Qxd4 ½:½

**Game 56**

**Hodgson**  
**Shamkovich**

**Brighton 1982**

1 e4 c5 2 Qc3 Qc6 3 Qf3 d6 4 Qc3 g6 5 Qc4 Qg7 6 0-0 e6 7 f5 ef [7 ... gf 8 d3 Qge7 is too risky. Bohosjan-L. Popov, Bulgaria 1971 went 9 Qg5! h6 10 Qxf7 Qxf7 11 ef with a strong attack] 8 d3 Qge7 [8 ... Qd6 was played in Timman-Baljan, Dutch Ch 1978. After 9 We1 0-0 10 Wh4 Qd4 11 g5 Qe6 12 Qxd4 cd 13 ef! dc 14 fe d5? 15 e7! Qxe7 16 Qb3 cb 17 Qae1 White was winning] 9 We1 a6 [Another possibility is 9 ... Qe5 which White should meet with either 10 Qxe5 de 11 g5 (Ghidzavu) or 10 g5 h6 11 Qxe5 Qxe5 12 b5+ unclear (Ammann-Barcza, Basel 1971)]. 9 ... 0-0 on the other hand proved disastrous in Tarjan-Rattinger, Mayaguez 1971 which went 10 Wh4 Qd7 11 h6 fe 12 g5 Wg4 13 Qxf7Wh4 14 Qg7+ Qh8 15 Qxh7 mate 1:0

10 Wg3 [The strongest possibility is 10 ef Qxf5 11 g4 but this was supposedly refuted by 11 ... Qc8! 12 g5? hg 13 Qxf7+ Qd7 14 Qxg5 Qd4+! 15 Qg2 Qe5 16 h3 (or 16 h4 Wh6 17 b3 Wh4! 18 Qd1 Qh7 —+ as in Ammann-Tatai, Basel 1971) Wh6 17 b3 Qh7 when White doesn't have enough for his sacrificed piece (Ammann-Hartoeh, Basel 1971). Strangely enough a game

**Game 57**

**Hodgson**  
**Malinausas**

**Leningrad 1983**

1 e4 c5 2 Qc3 Qc6 3 f4 g6 4 Qf3 Qg7 5 Qc4 d6 6 d3 e6 7 f5 ef 8 0-0 Qe7 9 We1 [9 a3 h6 10 We1 (Chiburdanidze-Alexandria, Women's World Ch, Borgoni 1981) looks too slow. 10 ... Qd5 looks like a good move when ideas based on Qg5 (after 9 We1 Qc5 10 Qg5 might be the best) are no longer possible] h6
After either 2 f4 Qc6 3 Qf3 g6 or 2 f4 g6 3 Qf3 Qg7 4 Qc3 Qc6 White can play the positionally motivated Qb5. White intends to exchange his bishop on c6 and then put his pawns on the White squares d3 and e4, a strategy reminiscent of the Nimzo-Indian Defence. Later on White may start a typical 2 f4 Sicilian Attack with Qe1, Wh4, f5, Qh6 and Qg5 etc.

The timing of Qb5 is vital. After 2 f4 Qc6 3 Qf3 g6 4 Qc3 Qg7 5 Qb5 Black can play 5 ... Qd4! which is examined in the next section.

On the other hand 4 Qb5! excludes this possibility and 4 ... Qg7 can be met by 5 Qxc6! When Black’s pawns are doubled he finds it difficult to generate counterplay.

For this reason Black prefers White to play Qc3 before he plays Qb5 which, as the reader may recall, is the idea behind 2 ... g6.

This section deals with the doubled pawns which can take two forms, depending on whether Black recaptures on c6 with his b or d pawn. Games 58-60 feature ... bc and games 61 and 62 feature ... dc.

Black’s problems stem from the lack of flexibility in his pawn structure. If for example after ... bc he plays ... d5 then his doubled pawns can become a weakness in their own right. Games 58 and 59 illustrate this condition.

Black’s best hope for counterplay after either ... bc or ... dc is to play ... c4. Black realised this advance in games 60, 61 and 62 but it didn’t really help him in any of them.

Game 58

0-0 0-0

Lewisham 1981

1 e4 c5 2 f4 Qc6 3 Qf3 g6 4 Qb5 Qg7 5
Game 59

Bisguier

Netanya 1971

1 e4 c5 2 f4 ∇c6 3 ∇f3 g6 4 ∇b5 ∇g7 5 0-0 ∇f6 6 ∇c3 0-0 7 ∇xc6 bxc6 8 d3 ∇b8 9 ∇e1 d6 10 b3 ∇a6 11 ∇d2 e6 12 ∇d1 ∇e8 13 e5 d5 14 ∇a4 ∇e7 15 c4 ∇c7 16 ∇e3 d4 17 ∇c1 ∇b7 18 ∇a3 ∇a6

Game 60

Watson

Shamkovich

Brighton 1982

1 e4 c5 2 f4 ∇c6 3 ∇f3 g6 4 ∇b5 ∇g7 5 0-0 [5 ∇xe6!] ∇f6 [5 ... ∇b6!? 6 c4 ∇d4 7 ∇xd4 ∇xd4+ 8 ∇h1 f5!? 9 e5?! (9 d3 unclear) ∇f7! (with the idea of 10 ... d6) 10 ∇e2 ∇a5 11 ∇f3 a6 12 ∇a3 ∇c7 13 ∇c3 d6 14 ∇d5 ∇d8 15 ∇a4 e6 16 ∇e3 de 17 de ∇c7 won for Black in Bisguier-Tatai, Palma de Mallorca 1971.] 6 d3 0-0 7 ∇xc6 bxc6 8 ∇c3 d6 9 ∇d2 c4 10 d4 ∇b6 11 ∇b1 e5 12 fe de 13 ∇a4 ∇c7 14 ∇xe5 ∇xe4 15 ∇f4 ∇d6 16 ∇c3 ∇f5 17 g4 ∇xc3 18 bc ∇e4 19 ∇xh7 ∇d5 20 ∇h6+ ∇h8 21 ∇e5 ∇f3 22 ∇xf3 ∇xf3 23 ∇e1 c5 24 g5 ∇e8 25 ∇b8 1:0

Game 61

Hebden

Large

British Ch, Torquay 1982

1 e4 c5 2 f4 ∇c6 3 ∇f3 g6 4 ∇b5 ∇g7 5 ∇xc6 dc 6 d3 ∇f6 7 ∇c3 0-0 8 0-0 b6 9 ∇e1 ∇e8 10 ∇h4 ∇d6 11 f5 gf 12 e5 ∇e8 13 ∇h6 f6 14 ∇h1 ∇xh6 15 ∇xh6 ∇g7 16 ∇ae1 ∇e6 17 ∇e2 c4 18 ∇f4 cd 19 cd ∇xa2.

20 e6 ∇c8 21 ∇e3 ∇xe6 22 ∇xe6 ∇xe6 23 ∇xe6 ∇f7 24 ∇fe1 ∇wd7 25 ∇h4 ∇e8 26 ∇xf5 ∇xd3 27 ∇d6 1:0

28
White's only try for the advantage is 6 0-0. Black can then choose between 6 ... \(\text{Qxb5 (game 65)}\) and 6 ... a6 (game 66) both of which offer reasonable prospects.

**Game 63**

Dzindzihashvili Tal

Gori 1968

1 e4 c5 2 \(\text{d}c3 \text{d}e6 3 \text{f}4 \text{g}6 \text{f}4 \text{f}3 \text{g}7 \text{d}5 \text{b}5 \text{d}e4 \text{c}6 \text{f}6 \text{h}3 2 \text{f}e1 \text{b}6 \text{a}6 11 \text{Wh}4 \text{[11 b3!]} \text{Wd7} \text{c}3 \text{e}4 \text{d}3 \text{c}5 \text{e}5 \text{b}7 15 \text{f}3 \text{f}6 \text{h}3 16 \text{f}e [16 ... \text{h}6! \text{unclear} 17 \text{Wh}7+ \text{f}7 18 \text{f}5 \text{ef} 19 \text{g}6 \text{g}8 20 \text{ef} \text{xf}5 21 \text{f}1 \text{xc}4 22 \text{g}3 \text{xf}1 23 \text{W}xg6+ \text{h}7 24 \text{g}5+ \text{g}8 25 \text{Wh}5+ \text{f}7 26 \text{we}4 \text{c}8 27 \text{f}3 \text{c}4 28 \text{Wxc}4 \text{Wxf}3 29 \text{gf} 1:0

**SECTION 17**

5 \(\text{Qb}5 \text{Qd}4: \) the main line

The position obtained after the moves 1 e4 c5 2 f4 \(\text{d}c6 3 \text{f}3 \text{g}64 \text{d}c3 \text{g}75 \text{b}5 \text{d}d4 is one of the most important lines of the f4 Sicilian. But because of the superior 4 \(\text{Qb}5! \text{g}75 \text{xc}6 it is usually arrived at via 2 \text{d}c3 \text{d}c6 3 \text{f}4 \text{g}64 \text{d}f3 \text{g}75 \text{b}5 \text{d}d4 or 2 ... \text{g}63 \text{f}3 \text{g}74 \text{d}c3 \text{d}c6 5 \text{b}5 \text{d}d4.

After the obvious 6 \(\text{Qxd}4 \) (game 64) White has to play accurately even to maintain equality. 6 a4 is rather better but still nothing special if Black defends as accurately as he did in game 65.

\[14 \text{f}4 \text{dc} 15 \text{d}c \text{c}5+ 16 \text{h}1 \text{f}2+ 17 \text{xf}2 \text{xf}2 18 \text{f}4 \text{d}6 19 \text{c}d6 \text{d}8 20 \text{c}7 \text{g}4 21 \text{c}d8 \text{c}d8 22 \text{c}2 \text{c}e5 23 \text{g}3 \text{c}3 24 \text{c}4 \text{c}xg3 25 \text{hg} \text{d}2 26 \text{a}4 \text{d}7 27 \text{xf}7+ 0:1\]

**Game 64**

Hebden W. Watson

London 1982

1 e4 c5 2 f4 g6 3 \(\text{d}f3 \text{g}7 4 \text{d}c3 \text{d}c6 5 \text{b}5 \text{d}d4 6 \text{a}4 \) [The retrograde 6 \(\text{Qd}3 \) gives a tempo down version of 6 0-0 a6 7 \(\text{Qd}3, \) also pretty poor for White.

Basman-Adorjan. London 1975 went 6 ... d6 7 \(\text{Qxd}4 \text{cd} 8 \text{Qc}e2 \text{f}6 9 0-0 0-0 10 \text{c}3 \text{e}5 11 \text{cd} \text{cd} 12 \text{b}3 \text{e}8 13 \text{Qg}3 \text{h}5! with a
dangerous initiative for Black] e6 7 e5 a6
8 Qc4 d5 9 ed Qxd6 10 d3 Qe7 11 Qe4
Qc7 12 c3 Qxf3 + 13 Qxf3 0-0 14 Qf2 b6
15 0-0 Qb7 16 Qh4 Qf5 17 Qf6 + Qxf6 18
Qxf6 Qc6 19 Qf2 Qad8 20 Qd2 b5 21 ab
ab 22 Qb3 c4 23 Qc2 cd 24 Qb3 Qd6 25
Ke1 Qc4 26 Qxe4 bc 27 Ke5 Qa8 28 Ke1
Qa5 29 Qe3 Qf5 30 Qh4 f6 31 Qa1 e5 32
fe 33 Qd2 Qd5 34 h3 Qf7 35 Qf2 Qa8
36 Qxa8 + Qxa8 37 Qh6 Qh8 38 Qd8 +
Qg8 39 Qe7 Qf7 40 Qd8 + Qg8 41 Qc7
Qf7 42 Qd6 Qe8 43 Qc7 Qf7 44 Qb8 +
Qg8 45 Qb6 Qd5 46 Qf2 Qxf2 47 Qxf2
Qd8 48 Qa7 Qf6 49 Qb8 + Qg8 50 Qe3
Qg7 51 Qg1 h6 52 Qc7 + Qf7 53 h4 Qf5
54 Qd8 Qg8 55 Qe7 + Qf7 56 Qd8 Qg8
57 Qe7 + 2:2/2

Game 65

[Image 0x0 to 377x568]

□ Plaskett

Trnava 1984
1 e4 c5 2 f4 g6 3 Qf3 Qg7 4 Qc3 Qc6 5
Qb5 Qd4 6 0-0 Qxb5 7 Qxb5 d6 8 d3
[Direct but not necessarily best. 8 a4 a6 9
Qc3 Qf6 10 Qe1 0-0 is Hebben-Ftačnik,
Hastings 1983-84 when 11 a5! would have
given White a slight edge according to
Ftačnik] Qf6 [Lein-Shamkovich. New
York 1983 showed that 8 ... Qh6 is a good
alternative plan. Play continued with
9 Qb1 a6 10 Qc3 f5 11 Qe2 0-0 12
Qd2 Qd7 13 e5 dxe5 Qxe5 with at
least equality for Black. 8 ... a6 9 Qc3
b5 transposes into Bisguier-Feuerstein,
USA Ch 1972 in which White maintained
a slight advantage after 10 Qe1 Qb7 11
Qd2 b4 12 Qd1 a5 13 Qb1 8 ... a6 9 Qc3
Qf6 brought a quick win for White in
Crawley-Large. London 1984 after 10
Qe1 0-0 11 f5 g6 12 Qh4 b5 13 Qh6
Qxh6 14 Qxh6 b4 15 Qg5 bc 16 Qf3 cb 17
Qb1 Qh8 18 Qg3 Qd7 19 Qxh7 Qxh7 20
Qg7 mate 1-0] 9 e5!? de 10 fe Qd5 11 Qe1
0-0 12 Qh4 Qd7 13 Qc3 Qb4 14 Qc4

Qxe2 15 Qh6 f6 16 Qae1 Qd4 17 Qxg7
Qxg7 18 Qxc5 Qe6 19 Qc4 b6 20 ef + ef
21 Qd4 Qxd4 22 Qxf6 Qe2 + 23 Qh1 h6
24 Qe4 Qb7 25 Qxe2 Qd6 26 Qef2 Qxd3
27 Qh5 + Qg8 28 Qf6 + Qg7 29 Qh5 +
Qg8 30 Qf4 We4 31 Qxh6 Qad8 32 Qg1
If6 33 Qh5 Qf7 34 Qg3 Qc6 1-0 (time)

Game 66

□ Hebben

Spraggett

New York 1983
1 e4 c5 2 f4 g6 3 Qf3 Qg7 4 Qc3 Qc6 5
Qb5 Qd4 6 0-0 a6 [6 ... e6 7 Qxd4 cd 8
Qe2 Qe7 9 d3 0-0 10 Qa4 Qd6 11 Qh1 a6
12 Qd2 b5 13 Qb3 Qb7 14 a4 gave White
a slight edge in Short-Georgadze, Lvov
1984] 7 Qe2 (!) [7 Qd3 d6 8 Qxd4 cd 9
Qe2 Qf6 10 Qe1?! (10 c3) 0-0 11 Qf2 e5!
12 c3 d5! 13 cd ec was tremendous for
Black in Sulman-Gheorghiu, Atlanta
White varied with 8 b3 Qg4 9 Qe2. But
Ftačnik claims an edge for Black with 9
... Qxf3 10 Qxf3 e6 and Qc7] d6 8 a4 e6 9
d3 Qe7 10 Qd2 0-0 11 Qh1 h6 12 Qaxd4 cd
13 Qa2 Qc6 14 Qb4 Qb7 15 Qxc6 Qxc6
16 a5 h5

[Image 0x0 to 377x568]

17 Qf3 Qc8 18 Qe2 Qd7 19 Qb4 Qf8 20
Qae1 f5 21 Qf2 fe 22 de Qb7 23 b3 Qh8 24
Qg4 Qf8 25 Qd2 Qf7 26 Qa3 Qc8 27
Qg1 g5 28 Qf 29 ef 29 ef Qc5 30 Qb2 h5 31
Qxh5 Qxf5 32 Qxf5 Qxf5 33 Qxd4 Qh7
34 Qxc5 de 35 b3 e4 36 Qd4 Qf6 37 Qxf6
SECTION 18

Miscellaneous Variations

This final section deals with an assortment of lines which were difficult to put in anywhere else.

In game 67 Black meets the b5 plan with ... d6 and ... d7. White missed a chance to inflict doubled pawns on move 6 but Black could have got to the same position with something like 1 e4 c5 2 f4 d6 3 d4 d5 4 c4 dxc4 5 e5 0-0 d7 and avoided this possibility.

Game 68 shows a delayed ... c6 by Black before which White played b5+ and exchanged on d6. As with game 67 Black seems to be able to maintain reasonable prospects with accurate play.

In game 69 Black prevents b5 altogether with 3 ... a6. But White then reverted to a Closed Sicilian where ... a6 is not the best idea for Black.

Finally game 70 shows an unusual possibility favoured by Romanishin. Black managed to draw the ending but only by the skin of his teeth.

Game 67

□ Miles

Surakarta 1982

1 e4 g6 2 f4 g7 3 d3 c5 4 b5 5 c6 6 d6 0-0 [6 dxe6!+] d7 7 d3 a6
[Ideas based on ... d4 seem playable. Plaskett-Stohl, Trnava 1984 went 7 ... d6 8 e1 c6 9 dxe6 10 c4 e6 11 f5 w6 11 fe fe 12 c5 was about equal in Smyslov-Polugaevsky, USSR Ch 1972)] d4 9 e5?! dxe5 10 ef d6 11 d5 e6 12 f5 g5 13 c4 d4 14 xd4 xd4 15 x3 e5 16 xc5 0-0 with a mess which resolved itself in Black's favour. Hort-de Firmian, Oslo 1984 went 7 ... d4 8 x7+ w7 9 e3 d6 10 h1 f5 11 w7 12 xd3 13 xd3 0-0 with a sound position for Black.] 8 x6 c6 x6c6 9 w1 c6 10 a4 b6 11 w4 h6 [Very risky is 11 ... 0-0 which transposes into Hebden-Britton, Ramsage 1982. Play continued 12 f5 b5 13 h6 b5 14 xg7 xg7 15 ab ab 16 x8 a8 x8a8 17 x5 b6 18 xex7 wxb5 19 c5 w8 20 d6+ d8 21 dxf8 wxf8 22 dxf8 dxf8 23 g4 d7 24 a1 0-0. There again not castling can also have its drawbacks...]. 12 d2 e6 13 a1 b5 14 ab ab 15 e5 b4 16 d1 d7 17 w8d8+ w8d8 18 d6 25 xh5 19 xh5 20 b5 21 c3 b3 22 c4 d4+ 22 e3 e5 23 f5 w8 24 w1 g1 25 xh5 x6 26 b6 27 c6 27 c1 d8 28 c3 d6 29 c5 d7 30 x6d4 ed 31 c7+ c6 32 c8 33 34 c1 35 c2 36 g6 37 c8 38 d6 39 d7 40 e5 b1 41 c4 d6 42 c6+ c6 43 x6 xxb2+ 44 c1 c2+ 45 c1 1:0

Game 68

□ Padevsky

Browne

Amsterdam 1972

1 e4 c5 2 b5 3 d4 g6 4 d6 5 b5+ d7 6 d7+ w7d7 7 0-0 c6 8 d3 d6 8 [8 ... e6 was played in Luing-Gutman, USSR 1974. White got an edge with 9 x3 f6 10 h3 0-0 11 d4 cd 12 x4 d4 13 cxd4 w6 14 xd3 w7 15 d1 d5 16 e5 17 e3 b5 18 d2 d8 19 f4 9 h3 0-0 10 d5 b5 11 w2 b2 12 c2 xab8 13 f5 c4 14 h6 b3 15 f5 hg 16 xg7 xg7 17 dc bc 18 wxc2 w7 19 b3 c4 20 d c3 wxe4 21 d4 w3 22 w1 b7 23 d1 w4 24 w2 d2 w3 25 w1 w7 26 g5 e6 27 w4 h8 28 g3 w7 29 g5 e5 30 f5+ w8 31 w4 h4 w7 32 x6 xxf6 33 c1 w7 34
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textcopyright Hodgson} \\
\text{Gurevich} \\
\text{Brighton 1982}
\end{array} \]

1 e4 c5 2 f4 d6 3 \( \text{\textcopyright f3} \) a6 4 g3 \( \text{\textcopyright f6} \) 5 d3 g6 6 \( \text{\textcopyright g2} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g7} \) 7 0-0 0-0 [7 ... e5?! 8 \( \text{\textcopyright c3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright ge7} \) 9 \( \text{\textcopyright f5} \) gf 10 \( \text{\textcopyright g5} \) h6 11 \( \text{\textcopyright xf7} \) \( \text{\textcopyright xf7} \) 12 \( \text{\textcopyright h5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g8} \) 13 ef gave White a strong attack in Ruxton-Bagnall, corr. 1979.]

8 \( \text{\textcopyright c3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright c6} \) h3 \( \text{\textcopyright d4} \) 10 \( \text{\textcopyright e3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright d7} \) 11 g4 h5 12 \( \text{\textcopyright d2} \) \( \text{\textcopyright xf3} \) 13 \( \text{\textcopyright xf3} \) b4 14 \( \text{\textcopyright d1} \) \( \text{\textcopyright b7} \) 15 g5 f5 16 gf ef 17 f5 \( \text{\textcopyright e5} \) 18 \( \text{\textcopyright g2} \) \( \text{\textcopyright e8} \) 19 e4 \( \text{\textcopyright c7} \) 20 \( \text{\textcopyright h1} \) gf 21 \( \text{\textcopyright xf5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright c8} \) 22 \( \text{\textcopyright f1} \) f5 23 \( \text{\textcopyright g5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright e8} \) 24 \( \text{\textcopyright d3} \) h6 25 \( \text{\textcopyright f4} \) fe 26 de \( \text{\textcopyright c7} \) 27 \( \text{\textcopyright f3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright e4} \) 28 \( \text{\textcopyright c1} \) \( \text{\textcopyright x5} \) 29 ef \( \text{\textcopyright e5} \) 30 \( \text{\textcopyright d5} \) \text{\textcopyright h7} 31 \( \text{\textcopyright x5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright c6} \)+ 32 \( \text{\textcopyright h2} \) \( \text{\textcopyright x7} \) 33 \( \text{\textcopyright f6} \) \( \text{\textcopyright f3} \)+ 34 \( \text{\textcopyright g3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright x6} \) 35 \( \text{\textcopyright x3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright h4} \)+ 36 \( \text{\textcopyright g4} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g7} \)+ 37 \( \text{\textcopyright x4} \) \( \text{\textcopyright x3} \) 38 \( \text{\textcopyright e3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright a8} \) 39 \( \text{\textcopyright d3} \)+ \( \text{\textcopyright h8} \) 40 \( \text{\textcopyright xd6} \) \( \text{\textcopyright e4} \) 41 \( \text{\textcopyright d1} \) 1:0

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textcopyright Romanishin} \\
\text{Portisch} \\
\text{Tilburg 1979}
\end{array} \]

1 e4 c5 2 \( \text{\textcopyright c3} \) d6 3 f4 g6 [3 ... \( \text{\textcopyright c6} \) 4 \( \text{\textcopyright f3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g4} \)+ 5 \( \text{\textcopyright b5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright d7} \) 6 h3 \( \text{\textcopyright x3} \)+ 7 \( \text{\textcopyright x3} \) a6 8 \( \text{\textcopyright xc6} \) \( \text{\textcopyright xc6} \) 9 0-0 \( \text{\textcopyright f6} \) 10 d3 e6 11 a4 \( \text{\textcopyright e7} \) 12 a5 0-0-0 was about even in Timosev-Dvoiris, RSFSR 1983] 4 d4 cd 5 \( \text{\textcopyright xd4} \) \( \text{\textcopyright f6} \) 6 e5 \( \text{\textcopyright c6} \) 7 \( \text{\textcopyright b5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright h5} \) [7 ... de 8 \( \text{\textcopyright xd8} \)+ \( \text{\textcopyright xd8} \) 9 fe \( \text{\textcopyright e8} \) 10 \( \text{\textcopyright e3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright c7} \) 110-0+ was very good for White in Romanishin-Rashkovski, USSR Ch 1976] 8 \( \text{\textcopyright e3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g7} \) 9 \( \text{\textcopyright d1} \) de 10 \( \text{\textcopyright xd8} \)+ \( \text{\textcopyright xd8} \) 11 0-0-0+ \( \text{\textcopyright d7} \) 12 fe \( \text{\textcopyright x5} \) 13 \( \text{\textcopyright d5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright g7} \) 14 \( \text{\textcopyright f3} \) \( \text{\textcopyright d6} \) 15 \( \text{\textcopyright h1} \) \( \text{\textcopyright e6} \) 16 \( \text{\textcopyright g5} \) \( \text{\textcopyright e5} \) 17 \( \text{\textcopyright c3} \) f6 18 \( \text{\textcopyright x4} \) \( \text{\textcopyright b4} \)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>page no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 e4 c5 2 f4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ... d5 3 ed (\text{\textit{exd5}}) 4 (\text{\textit{\text{c3}}}) (\text{\textit{d8}}) +=</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ... (\text{\textit{\text{d6}}}) +=</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ... (\text{\textit{Qf6}}) 4 (\text{\textit{\text{b5}}}) (\text{\textit{Qd7}}) oo/ +=</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ... (\text{\textit{Qb7}}) oo/ +=</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 c4 oo/ +=</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (\text{\textit{Qc3}}) (\text{\textit{dxe4}}) +=</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ... d4 oo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ... (\text{\textit{Qf6}}) 3 d3 +=</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (\text{\textit{Qc3}}) d5 4 e5 d4 (\pm)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ... (\text{\textit{Qfd7}}) += (transposition)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ... g6 oo</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ... (\text{\textit{Qc6}}) 3 (\text{\textit{Qf3}}) (\text{\textit{Qf6}}) 4 d3 += (transposition)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (\text{\textit{Qc3}}) d5 5 e5 d4 +=</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ... (\text{\textit{Qfd7}}) += (transposition)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ... (\text{\textit{Qe4}}) oo</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ... e6 3 (\text{\textit{Qf3}}) d5 4 (\text{\textit{ed}}) =</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (\text{\textit{\text{b5}}}) (\text{\textit{Qd7}}) +=</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ... (\text{\textit{\text{d7}}) +=</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (\text{\textit{Qc3}}) (\text{\textit{Qf6}}) 5 e5 (\text{\textit{Qfd7}})</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ... e6 3 (\text{\textit{Qf3}}) d5 4 (\text{\textit{Qc3}}) (\text{\textit{Qc6}}) 5 (\text{\textit{\text{b5}}}) (\text{\textit{Qf6}}) +=</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ... (\text{\textit{Qe7}}) 6 (\text{\textit{Qe2}}) +=</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 exd5 (\text{\textit{Qxd5}}) +=</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ... exd5 +=</td>
<td>13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ... e6 3 (\text{\textit{Qf3}}) (\text{\textit{Qc6}}) 4 (\text{\textit{\text{b5}}}) (\text{\textit{Qge7}}) 5 0-0 a6 +=</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (\text{\textit{Qc3}}) (\text{\textit{Qge7}}) 5 d4 +=</td>
<td>15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ... (\text{\textit{Qf6}}) +=</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ... e6 3 (\text{\textit{Qf3}}) a6 oo/ +=</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (\text{\textit{Qe2}}) oo</td>
<td>17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 d3 oo</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 e5 oo</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 11</td>
<td>2 ... g6 3 d4 ( \mathcal{g}7 +\Rightarrow/\infty )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ... cd +\Rightarrow/\infty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ( \mathcal{f}3 \ \mathcal{g}7 4 \mathcal{g}3 \mathcal{d}5 = )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 12</td>
<td>2 ... g6 3 ( \mathcal{f}3 \ \mathcal{g}7 4 \mathcal{d}3 ) and ( g3 +\Rightarrow/\infty \text{ (transposition)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ( \mathcal{d}3 ) and ( \mathcal{e}2 ) (transposition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 13</td>
<td>2 ... g6 3 ( \mathcal{f}3 \ \mathcal{g}7 4 \mathcal{c}3 \mathcal{c}6 5 \mathcal{c}4 \mathcal{e}6 6 e5 = )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 f5 ( \mathcal{g}7 ) fe de +\Rightarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 ... fe oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 14</td>
<td>2 ... g6 3 ( \mathcal{f}3 \ \mathcal{g}7 4 \mathcal{c}3 \mathcal{c}6 5 \mathcal{c}4 \mathcal{d}6 6 0-0 \mathcal{f}6 7 \mathcal{w}e1 oo )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 f5 oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 15</td>
<td>2 ... g6 3 ( \mathcal{f}3 \ \mathcal{g}7 4 \mathcal{c}3 \mathcal{c}6 5 \mathcal{c}4 \mathcal{d}6 6 0-0 \mathcal{e}6 7 \mathcal{w}e1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 f5 gf +\Rightarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 ... ef oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 16</td>
<td>2 ... ( \mathcal{c}6 3 \ \mathcal{f}3 \mathcal{g}6 4 \mathcal{b}5 \mathcal{g}7 5 \mathcal{x}c6 \pm \text{ (transposition)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 17</td>
<td>2 ... g6 3 ( \mathcal{f}3 \ \mathcal{g}7 4 \mathcal{c}3 \mathcal{c}6 5 \mathcal{b}5 \mathcal{d}4 6 \mathcal{w}xd4 =+ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ( \mathcal{d}3 \pm )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 a4 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0-0 ( \mathcal{w}xb5 = )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ... ( \mathcal{e}6 += )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 ... ( \mathcal{a}6 = )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 18</td>
<td>2 ... g6 3 ( \mathcal{f}3 \ \mathcal{g}7 4 \mathcal{c}3 \mathcal{c}6 5 \mathcal{b}5 \mathcal{d}6 += )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 ... ( \mathcal{d}6 5 \mathcal{b}5+ += )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 ... d6 3 ( \mathcal{f}3 \mathcal{a}6 += )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ... ( \mathcal{c}6 4 \mathcal{f}3 \mathcal{g}4 += )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ... g6 4 ( \mathcal{d}4 \mathcal{c}d 5 \mathcal{w}xd4 += )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>