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I first played against Ilya in 1980, when we were both in our early twenties. He was already a strong player of course – as well as a big King's Indian fan. Since then, he has played this opening successfully against some of the best players in the world.

I believe there are two types of people who play the King's Indian. One type bases their play on knowledge and analysis; the other type plays according to feeling and understanding. Ilya Smirin undoubtedly belongs to the latter camp. I don't think he ever studied any deep theory! He has an excellent feeling for the middlegame, particularly for dynamic possibilities. When he gets a chance to attack the king, there are very few who can stop him.

Ilya may not know as much opening theory as some players, but he knows a lot about the history of the King's Indian. I know that Ilya has been greatly inspired by the games of Mikhail Tal, Robert Fischer and especially Leonid Stein, one of his favourite players. The way Ilya handles the King's Indian has been influenced by all of them. Stein in particular is one of Ilya's heroes; the Soviet GM would often aim for the most complicated position possible, in order to obtain attacking and other dynamic possibilities. Ilya possesses the same type of flair for such positions – and nowhere is his talent more obvious than in the King's Indian.

Ilya has played the King's Indian successfully against some of the very best players in the world. See, for instance, Chapter 2, which contains Ilya's games against Vladimir Kramnik, who is known as one of the strongest players on the White side of the KID. I find Ilya's success against Kramnik and other elite players extremely impressive, as each game is a huge challenge. When you play this opening you take a big risk from the very beginning. White gets space in the centre and a lot of freedom for his pieces, while as Black you must rely on your dynamic and tactical qualities.
Ilya is deeply confident in the potential of the black pieces in the King’s Indian. Chapter 8 contains the game Gelfand – Smirin from the 2005 European Club Cup in Saint Vincent, where Ilya played brilliantly and I was really lucky to save the game. Ilya’s resourcefulness and feeling for dynamics was really impressive in this game.

Everything in chess is a reflection of one’s personality. Ilya is a big fan of theatre, as well as action movies – and I think this is reflected in his handling of the King’s Indian, which always leads to a lot of drama and action on the board! I’m sure the readers will enjoy the many ferocious attacks and dramatic battles contained in this book. Hopefully it will inspire some readers to start playing the King’s Indian – or return to it, if they’ve not played it for a while.

Reading this book gives you a different type of insight into the King’s Indian. It’s not a theoretical book, where you get answers to your opening questions – and probably the King’s Indian is not meant to be played in such a clinical way. Ilya’s games have great instructive value, to be sure – but this is also a book for pleasure and for inspiration. For players who enjoy wild chess, who value imagination, creativity and epic fights on the board, this book will be a treat.

Boris Gelfand
2012 World Championship Finalist
In this book I would like to present my best King's Indian Defence games and in the process share with the reader my views on this complex and double-edged opening.

The King's Indian Defence is one of the most fascinating openings in chess. It involves everything I love about the game: risk-taking, attacking, exchanging weaknesses or material for dynamic chances, clever tactics, surprising turnarounds and a deep sense of possibility.

Many outstanding chess players played the King's Indian Defence throughout their whole careers. It is enough to mention just a few names (in chronological order): David Bronstein, Efim Geller, Mikhail Tal, Leonid Stein, Robert Fischer, Garry Kasparov. In modern days the King's Indian Defence is the main (and successful) opening in the games of Teimour Radjabov, and it is also played by Hikaru Nakamura, Alexander Grischuk and various other top players.

*Not a King's Indian, but at least a current photo...*
I have been a great lover of the King’s Indian Defence from the very beginning of my chess life – that’s over 30 years now. It is my favourite opening, so when I chatted to Jacob Aagaard after our game at the 2011 European Team Championship, and he asked if I had ever thought about writing a book, I felt attracted to share my love for and experience in handling this exciting opening.

What I want to achieve with this book is to give the reader a course in playing the King’s Indian, which in turn will also be a course in playing dynamic chess. Every chapter will be structured in the following way:

- A few positions from the games in the chapter for the reader to solve
- General introduction to the topic; for example, tactics typical of the King’s Indian
- Some of my own games that are relevant to the topic

The basic idea is to explain the topic in a simple (yet hopefully not simplistic) way and then show how the concepts showed up in my games, which were played at a high grandmaster level. I would implore the reader to be realistic when trying to solve the positions from the games. My intention is to help you broaden your mind and improve your imagination.

I decided quite deliberately to have 49 main games in this book. I could easily have made it 50, of course, but I like the number 49 for several reasons. 7x7 is one of them, but there is also the feeling of incompleteness. Or in other words: I am leaving room for more. And it is certainly my goal to add to this collection of memorable King’s Indian games in the years to come.

I hope this book will help the reader to play better chess, and inspire more players to take up this fascinating opening.

Ilya Smirin,
Kfar Sava, August 2016
In the King’s Indian it is important to look beyond apparent obstacles to success...
1. \( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 2. \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{g6} \) 3. \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{g7} \) 4. \( \text{e4} \) \( \text{d6} \) 5. \( \text{d4} \) 0–0 6. \( \text{e2} \) e5 7.0–0 \( \text{c6} \)

The most popular continuation among such moves as 7...\( \text{a6} \), 7...\( \text{bd7} \), 7...\( \text{exd4} \), 7...\( \text{e8} \) and 7...\( \text{e8} \) and 7...\( \text{e6} \).

8. \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{e7} \) 9. \( \text{e1} \) \( \text{c6} \) 10. \( \text{e3} \)

One of the most aggressive setups for White against the KID, and a pet variation of Viktor Korchnoi. 10...\( \text{f5} \) 11.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{f4} \) 12. \( \text{f2} \) g5

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

An interesting story is connected with this move. It was first played by Korchnoi against Hulak just two days before my game with Huzman. There were neither databases nor internet in those ancient days, so information usually reached players much more slowly than nowadays. However, the Korchnoi – Hulak game was an exception – it was published the next day in the Russian language newspaper “Soviet Sport”. I was lucky, as during the lunch break, only a few hours before the game, Boris Gelfand enlightened me about the brilliant idea played by Korchnoi.

13. \( \text{d3} \) \( \text{f6} \) 14. \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{g6} \) 15. \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{f7} \) was played in Taimanov – Najdorf, Zurich 1953, as mentioned in the introduction.

13...\( \text{b6} \)!

Forewarned is forearmed, even though I did not expect that my future Israeli teammate Alexander Huzman would follow Korchnoi’s footsteps. Here is his game:

13...\( \text{a6} \) 14. \( \text{a7} \)!!

A really beautiful move!

14...\( \text{xa7} \) 15. \( \text{xa7} \) \( \text{b6} \) 16. \( \text{b4} \) \( \text{b7} \) 17. \( \text{c5} \) \( \text{dxc5} \) 18. \( \text{c1} \) \( \text{c8} \) 19. \( \text{xc5} \) \( \text{a8} \) 20. \( \text{c6} \) \( \text{f6} \) 21. \( \text{xb6} \)

The bishop falls in the end, but the price is very high.

21...\( \text{xb6} \) 22. \( \text{xa6} \) g4 23. \( \text{d3} \) g3 24. \( \text{h3} \) \( \text{e8} \) 25. \( \text{c5} \)


I did not want to repeat Hulak’s fate, and found the best move 13...\( \text{b6} \) over the board.

14. \( \text{b4} \) a6
15.\textit{\textipa{Da}3} \\
In my opinion, retreating this knight to c3 is more logical, even though Black is usually doing OK after that. Below is another of Korchnoi’s games – this time he was on the receiving end of Black’s attack:
\begin{align*}
15.\textit{\textipa{Da}3} & \text{ h5 16.\textit{\textipa{Dh}1} \textit{\textipa{Df}6} 17.\textit{\textipa{Cc}5} \textit{gf} 18.\textit{\textipa{Cxb}6} \textit{\textipa{Cc}6} 19.\textit{\textipa{Cc}1} \textit{g3} 20.\textit{\textipa{Dg}1} \textit{gxf2} 21.\textit{\textipa{Df}2} \textit{h4} 22.\textit{\textipa{Da}4} \textit{\textipa{Db}8} 23.\textit{\textipa{Cc}5} \textit{\textipa{Ax}b}5 24.\textit{\textipa{Cxb}5} \textit{\textipa{Dh}5} 25.\textit{\textipa{Dh}2} \textit{\textipa{Dg}3} 26.\textit{\textipa{Dg}1} \textit{\textipa{Dg}6} 27.\textit{\textipa{Cc}1} \textit{\textipa{Df}6} 28.\textit{\textipa{Db}4} \textit{\textipa{Dh}3} \\
29.\textit{\textipa{Dxc}8}!! & \\
29.\textit{\textipa{Dxh}3} \textit{\textipa{Dxh}3}! 30.\textit{\textipa{Dc}5} \textit{\textipa{Dg}5}!! gives Black a winning attack. \\
29...\textit{\textipa{Dxc}8} & 30.\textit{\textipa{Dxh}3} \textit{\textipa{Dh}8} 31.\textit{\textipa{Cc}6} \textit{\textipa{Wc}7} 32.\textit{\textipa{Cc}3}? \textit{\textipa{Dxb}8}! \\
Black has a big attack and won in Korchnoi – Ye Jiangchuan, Novi Sad 1990.
\end{align*}

15...\textit{gf}?! \\
Black starts his usual routine in this variation – activity (attack) against the opponent’s king. However, in this case I would prefer 15...\textit{\textipa{Df}6}, with the further transfer of this rook to g6 or h6, or 15...\textit{\textipa{Cc}5} 16.\textit{\textipa{Cc}5} \textit{\textipa{Dg}6} 16.\textit{\textipa{Cc}5} b5, which I like most. In contrast, after 15...a5?! (activity on the wrong flank) 16.\textit{\textipa{Cc}5}! \textit{\textipa{Ax}b}4 17.\textit{\textipa{Cc}d}6 \textit{\textipa{Cc}d}6 18.\textit{\textipa{Cc}c}4 \textit{\textipa{Cc}c}5 19.\textit{\textipa{Cc}d}3 White’s chances should definitely be preferred – he is far ahead in developing an initiative.

16.\textit{\textipa{Cc}5} \textit{b5} \\
Now it’s evident that the knight on a3 is preventing White from playing a2-a4, so he must move it first – and time is very valuable in such positions.

17.\textit{\textipa{Cc}e}2 \textit{\textipa{Df}6} 18.\textit{\textipa{Cc}a}4 \textit{\textipa{Ax}a}4 19.\textit{\textipa{Cc}a}4 \textit{\textipa{Dg}6} 20.\textit{\textipa{Cc}b}5 \textit{\textipa{Cc}5} 21.\textit{\textipa{Cc}b}4

21...\textit{\textipa{Dg}3}!! \\
After the famous game Taimanov – Najdorf (see above) this pawn sacrifice became typical in such positions.

22.\textit{\textipa{Dxh}3} \textit{\textipa{Dxh}3} 23.\textit{\textipa{Dg}3} h4 \\
Black’s activity is based mainly on the weak dark squares around the white monarch. Black’s knights strive to reach f4 and g3; the bishop will support them from h6 and the g-file is free for Black’s heavy artillery. The question is: will
Black have enough time to do all these things, or will the opponent smash Black's queenside and/or centre first?

24.\(\text{c6}\) \(\text{d7}\) 25.\(\text{h2}\) \(\text{h6}\)

Now 26...\(\text{e3}\)\(+\) 27.\(\text{h1}\) \(\text{h5}\) is threatened.

26.f4?! 

It's easy to understand the motivations behind this drastic decision: the black knight is deprived of the h5-square and White's pieces on the kingside have more space. On the other hand, White has returned the sacrificed pawn (though he will immediately take the pawn on a6), one black knight is already en route to the excellent outpost at f4, and the e4-pawn and g4-square have become much weaker. I think the more principled (and stronger) continuation was:

26.\(\text{b3}\) \(\text{f4}\) 27.\(\text{c4}\)

31.\(\text{b2}\) (the following exciting variations show the strength and danger of Black's direct assault against the white king: 31.\(\text{a5}\) \(\text{h3}\)\(+\) 32.\(\text{h1}\) \(\text{g3}\)\(+\) 33.\(\text{g3}\) hgx3 34.b7 \(\text{e3}\) And now 35.bxa8\(=\) \(\text{h7}\)\(+\) or 35.bxc8\(=\) \(\text{h7}\) 36.\(\text{b7}\) \(\text{c7}\) 37.\(\text{xc7}\) \(\text{f2}\)\(+\) 38.\(\text{xf2}\) gxf2 39.\(\text{xf2}\) \(\text{xc7}\).) 31...\(\text{h3}\)\(+\) 32.\(\text{h1}\) \(\text{g3}\)\(+\) 33.\(\text{g3}\) hgx3 hxg3 34.b7 (34.gxh3 \(\text{h7}\)\(+\) 35.\(\text{g1}\) \(\text{f4}\) 36.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{g7}\)\(+\))

28.\(\text{bxc7}\) seems to be losing after 29...\(\text{xb7}\)

After which the following complications are possible:

27.\(\text{h8}\) 28.b6

28.\(\text{a2}\) \(\text{g8}\) 29.\(\text{cxd6}\) cxd6 30.b6 \(\text{h5}\)

34...\(\text{e3}\)\!! 35.bxc8\(=\) \(\text{a5}\) 36.\(\text{xe3}\) \(\text{f4}\) 37.\(\text{a7}\) \(\text{e8}\) and despite two extra pieces White is helpless to prevent mate after...\(\text{h5}\).

28.\(\text{g8}\) 29.bxc7

29.b7 seems to be losing after 29...\(\text{xb7}\)

30.\(\text{xb7}\)
34...g5

The only move in this wild and picturesque position. If 34.\(\text{c3}\) d7 35.d7 xd7 36.xa6 d2! White gets mated in 6 according to the silicon brains.

34...e3 35.f7\(\text{g7}\)

And after the forced:

36.g5! xg5 37.hb2\(\text{f6}\) 38.e5 wh3\(\text{xh3}\) 39.g1 wh2\(\text{h2}\) 40.xh2 gh2\(\text{xh2}\) xe5\(\text{xe5}\) 42.f4 wh8\(\text{h8}\) 43.g3 xd6

There arises a complex endgame, the most probable result of which is a draw, despite White's extra pawn (the pawn on c7 will fall). I apologize for showing such long and possibly not error-free variations. Usually I try to avoid that, but on this occasion these variations are very important for understanding the whole picture. Also I hope you will find them interesting and even paradoxical.

26...xf4
27.\textit{bxa6?}

In such a sharp and unbalanced position this natural move, which would probably be made by the vast majority of players, proves to be a mistake.

Correct was 27.\textit{\texttt{d}d3!}, with an unclear battle.

27...\textit{\texttt{g}g7} 28.\textit{\texttt{xf}4}

The knight on f4 is very annoying, so Huzman decided to exchange it. But now the bishop, which replaces the knight, becomes really menacing. It’s hard to suggest something better, for instance:

28.\textit{\texttt{h}h1} \textit{\texttt{g}g4} 29.\textit{\texttt{a}g1} (29.\textit{\texttt{a}a3} \textit{\texttt{h}h3}!–+) 29...h3, and from h1 the king stares in fear at his numerous enemies.

28...\textit{\texttt{xf}4}

After the immediate 29...\textit{\texttt{d}d7!} (my opponent saw this move during the game) 30.cxd6 \textit{\texttt{c}c5!} 31.\textit{\texttt{e}e7} \textit{\texttt{h}h7} 32.\textit{\texttt{a}a3} \textit{\texttt{xa}4} Black would have a decisive advantage.

30.\textit{\texttt{xa}6} \textit{\texttt{xa}6} 31.\textit{\texttt{xa}6} \textit{\texttt{g}g3}

32.\textit{\texttt{d}d3?}

A serious mistake. After 32.\textit{\texttt{e}e3} \textit{\texttt{e}e3} (32...h3? 33.\textit{\texttt{e}e7} \textit{\texttt{h}h7} 34.\textit{\texttt{f}f5} \textit{\texttt{h}h2} 35.\textit{\texttt{f}f2} \textit{\texttt{e}e8} 36.\textit{\texttt{c}c4}–; 32...\textit{\texttt{x}xe}4 33.\textit{\texttt{xe}4} \textit{\texttt{h}h2} 34.\textit{\texttt{f}f2} \textit{\texttt{g}g3} 35.\textit{\texttt{g}g1}–) 33.\textit{\texttt{h}h1} h3

After 29.cxd6 \textit{\texttt{g}g3!?} 30.\textit{\texttt{xf}4} \textit{\texttt{xf}4} White is in trouble.

29...\textit{\texttt{x}xa}6?!

A tempting but, alas, wrong sacrifice.

34.\textit{\texttt{e}e2}! (the queen is back in time) 34...\textit{\texttt{f}f4} 35.\textit{\texttt{x}xh}3 \textit{\texttt{x}xh}3 36.\textit{\texttt{g}g1} \textit{\texttt{g}g4} (36...\textit{\texttt{h}h7} 37.\textit{\texttt{f}f2}) 37.\textit{\texttt{c}c2} \textit{\texttt{h}h2} 38.\textit{\texttt{h}h1} the game would have ended in a draw.

32.\textit{\texttt{e}e3} 33.\textit{\texttt{h}h1} h3! 34.\textit{\texttt{g}g1}?

The last error in time trouble.
34.\texttt{b3} \texttt{bxe1\texttt{f}} 35.\texttt{xf1} still would have allowed White to hold on, even though Black is much better.

This game, as was my encounter with Huzman, was played in a competition that was very memorable for me. The first league of the USSR Championship in Sverdlovsk (now Ekaterinburg) was my first really big success. Despite being a newcomer to tournaments of this calibre, I took clear first place ahead of such players as Tseshkovsky, Khalifman, Gelfand, Tukmakov and Malaniuk. Before the tournament I had not touched chess or even thought about it for around two months. The reason – I was in military service from 1986-88. By winning this first league I qualified for the 1988 USSR Championship. It was a super-tournament with the participation of Kasparov, Karpov, Yusupov, Salov, Ivanchuk, Beliavsky, Vaganian and others, but that’s already a different story.

1.d4 \texttt{f6} 2.c4 \texttt{c5} 3.d5 \texttt{g6} 4.\texttt{c3} \texttt{g7} 5.e4 \texttt{d6} 6.f4

The aggressive Four Pawns Attack (with a slightly different move order) – a sign that White is going for the maximum in the opening. He would love to smash his opponent with his powerful centre.
6...0–0 7.©f3 e6
As a teenager, a couple of times I played a pawn sacrifice in the spirit of the Benko Gambit – 7...b5 8.cxb5 a6 9.a4 ©a5 – but without much success.

8.dxe6
More common is:
8.©e2 exd5 9.cxd5
9...£e8 10.e5 leads to very deeply analysed complications. To play such lines requires one to have a lot of theoretical knowledge and a good memory.
10.0–0
The following is an inspiring (for Black) game by the great Mikhail Tal:
10...©xf3
Modern theory recommends 10...©bd7.
11.©xf3 ©bd7 12.©h1 a6 13.©e3 ©e8 14.g4 h6 15.g5 hxg5 16.e5
16...gxf4! 17.exf6 ©xe3 18.fxg7 ©e5 19.©g2 ©g5 20.©e4 ©h4 21.©d2 ©xg7 22.©f2 ©xf2 23.©xf2 £f3 24.©xd6 ©d8 25.©xb7 fxg2† 26.©xg2 ©xd6 27.b3 ©d3 28.©c2 ©e1 0–1 Doroshkievich – Tal, Yerevan 1975.

However, the move made by Yuri Dokhoian (a former long-time second of Garry Kasparov, and captain of both the men’s and women’s Russian national team) has its venom.

8...fxe6
Now Black's pawn formation in the centre becomes stronger.
I like the other possible capture 8...©xe6 less, but perhaps it's just a matter of taste.

9.©d3

9...e5!?
Over-the-board improvisation.

The main continuation here is:
9...©c6 10.0–0 ©d4
I’d like to mention a game by another World Champion:
11.©g5
More promising looks 11.©xd4 cxd4 12.©b5 and Black has to solve certain problems.
11...e5 12.f5 h6 13.©h3 gxf5 14.exf5
14...b5! 15.\textit{c}e3 \textit{bxc}4 16.\textit{xc}c4\textit{=} \textit{h}8 17.\textit{xd}4 \textit{cxd}4 18.\textit{d}5 \textit{a}6! 19.\textit{xf}6 \textit{xc}4 20.\textit{h}5 \textit{xf}1 21.\textit{g}4 \textit{d}7 22.\textit{xf}1 \textit{d}3 23.\textit{f}3 \textit{d}2 24.\textit{g}4 \textit{ac}8 25.\textit{d}3 \textit{a}4 26.\textit{f}2 \textit{d}4

Black won in Christiansen – Kasparov, Moscow 1982.

10.\textit{fxe}5

Interesting complications could have resulted after 10.f5!? \textit{gxf}5 11.\textit{exf}5 \textit{d}5!? 12.\textit{cxd}5 (12.\textit{xd}5 is possible as well) 12...\textit{e}4. I will leave it to the reader to bring in a verdict.

10...\textit{dxe}5 11.0–0

On the greedy: 11.\textit{xe}5

Black can (and should) continue 11...\textit{g}4! 12.\textit{f}3 \textit{xf}3! 13.\textit{gxf}3 (13.\textit{xf}3? \textit{e}5) 13...\textit{h}4\textit{=} 14.\textit{d}2 \textit{f}2 15.\textit{e}1 \textit{c}6\textit{=} (the point), with a devastating attack.

11...\textit{c}6

So the position is almost symmetrical, the only difference being that the bishop on \textit{g}7 is potentially slightly more active than its counterpart on \textit{d}3. Since it is White’s turn to move, chances should be roughly equal.

12.\textit{g}5 \textit{h}6 13.\textit{h}4 \textit{d}6 14.\textit{d}5?! 

In my opinion 14.\textit{c}2 \textit{d}4 15.\textit{xd}4 \textit{cxd}4 16.\textit{d}5 \textit{xd}5 17.\textit{cxd}5\textit{=} , with a dull position, was more to the point. But in that case I doubt this game would have been in this book.

14...\textit{g}5\textit{=}!

Fighting for the initiative.

15.\textit{e}1

After 15.\textit{g}3 \textit{h}5\textit{=} Black’s activity is annoying, and it is not easy to find a plan for White.

15...\textit{g}4 16.\textit{c}3 \textit{d}4 17.\textit{xd}4

This bishop has made a long trip just to be exchanged for the knight on \textit{d}4 – a definite achievement for Black.

17...\textit{xd}5\textit{=} 18.\textit{exd}5

18.\textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 19.\textit{exd}5 \textit{h}2\textit{=} understandably did not appeal to my opponent.
18...exd4 19.e4
It seems that White has a solid and perfectly safe position.

19.h3, to check the intentions of the bishop on g4, was the better move. Now if 19...hxh3 (19...hxh5 20.c2 f4 21.d3 c3† 22.xc3 dxe3 23.g4 f7 24.ae1 a8 25.e2 and White is not worse in this ending; 19...d7?) 20.gxh3 g3† 21.h1 xh3† 22.h2 c5 23.c2 f5 24.f5 f5 25.xf5 xf5 26.xf5 f4 Black would remain slightly better, with two pawns for the exchange, but after, let's say, 27.e1 a draw is the most probable outcome.

20.d3?
This natural move is a mistake, but it was not easy to foresee Black's reaction.

20.cxb5 c4† was barely playable, but after the modest 20.b3 bxc4 21.xc4 a8 Black would have only a little pressure.

20...bxc4 21.xc4

19...b5!
With the clear goal of opening up the position; my bishop pair would appreciate that very much!

21.c8!
A very strong and unexpected manoeuvre, with the idea ...a6. Also ...g5-g4 may be an important threat in some lines.

22.fc1
Slightly preferable was 22.e2 a6 23.e1, but with energetic play – 23...c4 24.h7† h8 25.e6 c5! 26.d3 (26.a6 d3† 27.f2 xf2† 28.xf2 xh7)

22...d3!
Black obtains a nearly-decisive advantage in the endgame.
I am sorry for using so many diagrams, but this four-move span (starting from my 19th move) is one of my favourites in my whole career. It’s hard to believe, but this powerful push basically decides the game in Black’s favour. The dynamics of Black’s position are so strong that the opponent is helpless.

23. \( \texttt{xd3} \)

What else? 23. \( \texttt{xc5} \) \( \texttt{xc5}^+ \) 24. \( \texttt{xc5} \) g4 25. \( \texttt{d2} \) \( \texttt{d4}^+ \) and 23. \( \texttt{ab1} \) \( \texttt{a6} \) 24. \( \texttt{xc5} \) \( \texttt{xc5}^+ \) 25. \( \texttt{xc5} \) \( \texttt{xf3} \) 26. \( \texttt{xf3} \) \( \texttt{d4}^+ \) and Black wins in both cases.

23... \( \texttt{xb2} \)

And a simple fork is the result. A decisive loss of the exchange is unavoidable.

24. \( \texttt{ab1} \) \( \texttt{xc1} \) 25. \( \texttt{xc1} \) \( \texttt{f5} \rightarrow 26. \texttt{d2} \) \( \texttt{g7}?! \)

26... \( \texttt{xd3} \) 27. \( \texttt{xd3} \) \( \texttt{ae8} \) would win faster.

27. \( \texttt{e4}?! \)

More stubborn was 27. \( \texttt{c3}^+ \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 28. \( \texttt{xf6}^+ \) \( \texttt{xf6} \) 29. \( \texttt{b5} \), but after 29... \( \texttt{xb8} \) 30. \( \texttt{xc5} \) a6 31. \( \texttt{c7}^+ \) \( \texttt{f8} \) 32. \( \texttt{f1} \) \( \texttt{b2} \) Black is winning anyway.

27... \( \texttt{e5} \) 28. \( \texttt{h4} \) \( \texttt{e4} \) 29. \( \texttt{xe4} \) \( \texttt{xe4} \) 30. \( \texttt{xe4} \) \( \texttt{f4} \)

The rest is simple and does not require further comment.

31. \( \texttt{d3} \) \( \texttt{d4} \) 32. \( \texttt{b5} \) \( \texttt{c8} \) 33. \( \texttt{c6} \) c4 34. \( \texttt{hxg5} \) hgx5 35. \( \texttt{f2} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 36. \( \texttt{e1} \) \( \texttt{e4} \) 37. \( \texttt{g3} \) \( \texttt{c3} \) 38. \( \texttt{e6}^+ \) \( \texttt{f7} \) 39. \( \texttt{e2} \) \( \texttt{c4} \) 40. \( \texttt{e2} \) \( \texttt{b8} \) 41. \( \texttt{d7} \) \( \texttt{b2} \) 42. \( \texttt{f1} \) c2 43. \( \texttt{f5} \) \( \texttt{f6} \) 44. \( \texttt{f7} \) \( \texttt{xa2} \) 45. \( \texttt{d6} \) \( \texttt{b2} \) 46. \( \texttt{f1}^+ \) \( \texttt{g7} \) 47. \( \texttt{d7} \) \( \texttt{d4} \) 48. \( \texttt{f5} \) \( \texttt{b1} \)

What I like most about this game is the speed with which White’s seemingly solid position fell apart after a few forceful strokes. 0–1