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Back in 2002, as a young and ambitious international master, I got into a huge competitive crisis. For a period of about a year I was unable to break above the 2450 rating level and was generally dissatisfied with my chess. I felt that I needed some changes, especially in my opening repertoire. What bothered me the most was how to play against 1.d4. Back then I was playing the King's Indian and Slav Defences, but I was not completely satisfied with either of them. In the King's Indian, I felt 'suffocated' due to the lack of space, while in the Slav I was bothered by the prospect of the Exchange Variation against weaker opponents, and so I found it to be a slightly passive opening. During that time I was constantly thinking about which openings I should add to my repertoire as Black. I went to my good friend Jovan Todorovic, an international master and a renowned coach in Serbia, and asked him to help me escape from the rut I was in.

When Jovan recommended a switch to the Stonewall Dutch against 1.d4, it came as an unpleasant surprise! How could he seriously suggest that I make a gaping hole on the e5-square while blocking the c8-bishop with my own pawns? At first I rejected the proposal but, on Jovan’s insistence, I agreed to check a few ideas from strong players such as Predrag Nikolic, Artur Yusupov, Evgeny Gleizerov and Mikhail Ulybin. As I looked through their games, my opinion on the Stonewall began to change. In addition to seizing plenty of space at an early stage, the opening often leads to rich positions offering good chances to play for a win. Black has a variety of options in different areas of the board, and the game often becomes unbalanced. The “bad” light-squared bishop often finds its way into the game by means of ...\textit{d}d7-e8-h5, or ...\textit{b}6 followed by ...\textit{b}7 or ...\textit{a}6. Moreover, this bishop often plays a more active role in the game than its supposedly “good” counterpart, which sits on g2 and stares into a solid barrier of black pawns. The black king seldom comes under attack, as the Stonewall formation controls plenty of space and Black's pieces develop naturally to posts where they control plenty of important squares. Rather, it is Black who is more likely to develop attacking chances on the kingside, with ideas like ...\textit{g}5 and ...f4 in the air, as well as a possible rook lift with ...\textit{f}6-h6. It also came to my attention that White cannot force a quick perpetual check or easily simplify to a dead equal endgame, which I particularly liked.

Full of energy and enthusiasm, I started to prepare and work on my new weapon. At my next tournament, I already started to use my soon-to-be-favourite opening with great success. Over the next year I improved the quality of my play, and was rewarded with improved tournament results along with the Grandmaster title. Thus, I remain extremely grateful to my friend Jovan for his selfless help and support. To this day, the Stonewall remains one of my favourite and most trusted weapons.

Many chess legends and other strong grandmasters have contributed to the development of the Stonewall: among them, Mikhail Botvinnik, Evgeny Bareev, Nigel Short, Alexei Dreev, Artur Yusupov, Simen Agdestein (the former coach of Magnus Carlsen), Viktor Moskalenko,
Evgeny Gleizerov and Mikhail Ulybin all come to mind. Other noteworthy names include Teimour Radjabov, winner of last year’s World Cup in Khanty-Mansiysk, as well as World Champion Magnus Carlsen, who has used the Stonewall with great success against Anand and Caruana, among others.

A final important point concerns the influence of computers on opening preparation. The Stonewall offers a solid, stable pawn structure and usually results in a semi-blocked middlegame position, making it quite resistant to the kind of deeply forcing, concrete opening preparation which has become increasingly prevalent in the engine era. Of course there are certain variations where some specific knowledge is needed – but compared with many openings, succeeding with the Stonewall depends much more on positional understanding and knowledge of plans than on memorizing long variations. On a related note, it is rare that a single mistake from Black will have dire consequences. In light of all this, dear readers, I wholeheartedly recommend that you learn the Stonewall and start playing this opening without any fear!

The material in this book is presented using a combination of variation trees and complete games. The tree format provides valuable structure to each chapter, helping the reader (not to mention the author!) to keep track of the various lines. At the same time, complete games are helpful in showing thematic plans and ideas in the middlegame, and even the endgame in some cases. This is especially important for an opening such as the Stonewall, since the pawn structure tends to be relatively static for much of the game, so a good understanding of typical plans will go a long way. Naturally, the emphasis on complete games and middlegame plans has not come at the expense of theoretical rigour – I have presented many important novelties and move-order subtleties, many of which I was unaware of myself before working on this book.

I sincerely hope that my knowledge and experience of the Stonewall, combined with the hard work that went into this project, will prove to be of genuine value in helping the readers to improve their understanding, technique and results in this opening.

Nikola Sedlak
Subotica, Serbia
May 2020
Chapter 5

7.b3

Variation Index

1.d4 e6 2.c4 f5 3.g3 g6 4.g2 d5 5.f3 c6 6.0–0 d6 7.b3 e7

A) 8.a4 Game 16

B) 8.b2 0–0
   B1) 9.c1 b5!
      B11) 10.a3
      B12) 10.bd2 Game 17
      B13) 10.a3? Game 18
   B2) 9.bd2 b6 10.e5 b7 11.c1 a5 12.e3 a6!
      B21) 13.e2
      B22) 13.b1! Game 19

C) 8.e5 0–0
   C1) 9.c2!
   C2) 9.d2 Game 20
   C3) 9.f4 Game 21
   C4) 9.b2 b6 10.cxd5
      C41) 10...exd5?
      C42) 10...cxd5 Game 22
1.d4 e6 2.c4 f5 3.g3 d6 4.g2 d5 5.f3 c6 6.0–0 e7 7.b3

This has been White’s most popular choice by a wide margin. Straight away White creates a positional threat of a3 to trade the dark-squared bishop, so Black’s next move is an automatic choice.

7...e7

Now we have a major branching point, with A) 8.a4, B) 8.b2 and C) 8.e5 all requiring attention.

A) 8.a4

GAME 16

Svetozar Gligoric – Vladimir Tukmakov
Palma de Mallorca 1989

1.d4 e6

The game actually started 1...f5 2.g3 d6 3.g2 e6 4.f3 d5 5.0–0 d6 6.c4 c6.

2.c4 f5 3.g3 d6 4.g2 d5 5.f3 c6 6.0–0 e7

Having played our standard sequence, we re-join the game.

7.b3 e7 8.a4

This radical way of insisting on a3 comes with an obvious drawback, namely the weakening of the b4-square. Practice has shown that the resulting positions are not dangerous for Black and nowadays it is rarely seen.

8...a5!

Obviously we should prevent any further expansion on the queenside while securing the b4-outpost for the knight.

9.a3xa3 10.xa3 0–0 11.c2

White’s idea is to manoeuvre his knight via e1 to d3, where it eyes the key e5-square.

11.c2 has also been tested at a high level, but after a few natural moves Black equalized without any trouble. 11...a6 12.e5 b4 13.b2 d7!= By trading off the active knight on e5, Black solved all his opening problems in Novikov – Dreev Manila (ol) 1992.

11...b6 12.c1 c7 13.d3 a6 14.e1!

14.e5 is a natural move but 14...c5 15.e3 b4= gives Black a comfortable game. There is
no reason to fear 16...\texttt{xb4} axb4 because Black has gained space on the queenside, as well as a potential outpost on c3 which his knight may use later.

14...cxd5 gives Black a typical choice between two equally valid recaptures. 14...exd5?!N is more to my taste. (14...cxd5 is perfectly reasonable, and 15...\texttt{d2} e4 16...\texttt{b2} b4 17...fe5 a6 was level in Ghaem Maghami – Reefat, Kelambakkam 2000) 15...fe5 c5 16.e3 b4= Here too the position is balanced, but the asymmetrical pawn structure should offer more chances to play for a win.

14...c1 has been White's most popular continuation, but after 14...c5 15...cxd5 exd5 there is no essential difference to the main game, because White should play:

15...\texttt{e4}  
This natural-looking move is not exactly a mistake, but it would not be my first choice. 15...\texttt{ac8}!N brings another piece into play, and after 16...\texttt{ac1} dxc4! 17.bxc4 \texttt{b4} Black obtains a lot of activity, with ...\texttt{fd8} coming next.

16...fe5 \texttt{fd8} 17.e3 \texttt{ac8} 18...\texttt{fd1} b4 19...\texttt{f4}  
19...\texttt{ac1} was played in a subsequent game, when 19...dxc4!? (rather than 19...cxd4? 20.exd4 \texttt{xd3} 21...\texttt{xd3} f6 22.f3 \texttt{g5} 23.e5= as seen in Rangel – Borensztajn, Rio de Janeiro 2014) 20.bxc4 \texttt{d6} 21...\texttt{f4} \texttt{cd8}= would have been fine for Black.

It seems to me that 19...\texttt{xb4}!N would have been a better bet for White. For instance: 19...\texttt{xb4} (19...\texttt{axb4}? is worse in view of 20...\texttt{xe4} fxe4 21.a5 bxa5 22...\texttt{xa5±} 20...\texttt{xe4}? fxe4 21...\texttt{ac1}
I regard the position as strategically risky for Black, even though engines evaluate it as equal. White has the simple plan of \( \texttt{c2} \) and \( \texttt{dc1} \) followed by exchanging all the rooks, after which the well-known cooperation between queen and knight may come into effect.

20...\texttt{dxc4}!

An excellent decision! With this changing of the structure, Black gets a clear plan of attacking along the d-file, as well as a clear diagonal for his bishop.

20.\texttt{bxc4} \texttt{d6} 21.\texttt{f3}?! 

White unnecessarily weakens his king.

21.\texttt{ac1} \texttt{cd8} 22.\texttt{a1=} would have kept the position balanced.

21...\texttt{df6} 22.\texttt{ed2} \texttt{ec8} 23.\texttt{ad1} \texttt{dd7}!

Black will have one less worry after eliminating White’s biggest asset, namely the knight on e5.

24.\texttt{h4}?

White should have preferred 24.\texttt{fd3} \texttt{xd3} 25.\texttt{xd3} \texttt{c6} 26.\texttt{a3=} when Black is certainly more comfortable, but White remains solid and is only marginally worse.

In general it’s a good idea for White to stabilize the knight on f4 and to gain space, but here there is a concrete threat which he presumably overlooked.

24...\texttt{exe5}! 25.\texttt{dxe5} \texttt{xd2} 26.\texttt{xd2} \texttt{xd2} 27.\texttt{xd2} \texttt{c6}–+

Simply winning the a4-pawn, which will leave Black with a mighty outside passed pawn.

28.\texttt{e4}

Defending the pawn with 28.\texttt{d1} is useless due to 28...\texttt{d7}, so White must aim for counterplay and hope for the best.

28...\texttt{xa4} 29.\texttt{exf5} \texttt{d7}!

Well calculated by Tukmakov. 29...\texttt{exf5} should also work, but the game continuation kills all White’s counterplay.
30.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}}e1

The point of Black's previous move is revealed after 30.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}}xd7 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xd7 31.fxe6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xe6! 32.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xe6 a4\textleft right when the a-pawn is unstoppable.

30...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}}d1! 31.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}}xd1 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xd1

The rest of the game was essentially just a delaying of White's resignation.

32.fxe6 a4 33.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}d5 a3 34.e7 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}f7 35.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}h3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xd5 36.cxd5 a2 37.d6 a1=\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}} 0–1

\textbf{\textcolor{red}{B)}} 8.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}b2

\begin{center}
\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chessboard}
\caption{Chessboard Diagram}
\end{figure}
\end{center}

Surprisingly, this natural move already opens up a debate about Black's best move order.

8...0–0

I tend to favour this natural move. Some strong players take a different view, based on the fact that the text move allows 9.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}e5. However, White could have brought about the same position by starting with 8.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}e5, and I don't consider the resulting position to be a problem anyway, so I see no special reason to avoid it here.

Many strong players have preferred:
8...b6?!

However, it seems to me that White gets a pleasant game with:

9.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}}c1!

9.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}d2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}b7 10.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}e5 0–0 11.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}c1 a5 transposes to variation B2 on page 134.

The main point of Black's move order is to meet 9.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}e5 with 9...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}b7, and if 10.cxd5 (10.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}d2 0–0 11.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}c1 a5 is another transposition to variation B2) 10...cxd5!= White does not have the \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}c4 trick that we will see in variation C42, because ...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}b7 has been played in time. A good example continued 11.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{W}}}c1 0–0 12.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}a3 13.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xd6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xd6 14.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}e1 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}c8 15.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}a3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xa3 16.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xa3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}c6 17.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xc6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xc6 18.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}ac1 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}ac8 19.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xc6 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xc6 20.e3 g5! when Black was dominating and White soon collapsed in Brkic – Kovacevic, Rijeka 2001.

9...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}b7 10.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}a3

I am not a big fan of this position. I would not go so far as to say that White is definitely better, but I don't see much potential to play for a win with Black. A good example involving two strong GMs continued:

10...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xa3

Perhaps Black should maintain the tension with 10...0–0 or 10...\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}bd7, as recommended by JBA. Still, after 11.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xd6 followed by 12.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}d1 White's position seems marginally more pleasant to me.

11.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xa3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}bd7 12.cxd5 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xa3 13.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}xa3 exd5 14.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}fc1 a5 15.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}c2 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}e4 16.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}ce1 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}e7 17.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}d3 \textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}hc8 18.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}c2 c5 19.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}ac1 a4 20.\textit{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{Q}}}h3 g6 21.g4
White went on to win a fine game in E. Hansen – Lenderman, Montevideo 2015. Overall I would say that 8...b6!? is certainly playable, but the plan of \( \text{w}c1 \) followed by \( \text{d}a3 \) leads to a fairly quiet position where Black has yet to equalize fully. By contrast, my recommended move enables Black to meet White’s plan in a more active manner.

In this section we will analyse B1) 9.\( \text{w}c1 \) and B2) 9.\( \text{d}bd2 \).

As mentioned earlier, 9.\( \text{d}e5 \) is an important option, and it will be covered under the 8.\( \text{d}e5 \) 0–0 9.\( \text{b}2 \) move order in variation C4 on page 152.

B1) 9.\( \text{w}c1 \)

I recommend meeting this thematic move with:

9...b5!?

This method of gaining space on the queenside leads to much more interesting positions compared with the 8...b6 9.\( \text{w}c1 \) line mentioned in the note above.

We will cover three options in detail. White may proceed with B11) 10.\( \text{d}a3 \) anyway, develop naturally with B12) 10.\( \text{d}bd2 \), or try the rare B13) 10.\( \text{d}a3!?, \) which also deserves attention.

White may also opt for a completely different type of position with 10.\( c5 \) \( \text{d}c7 \), when he closes the position in the hope of exploiting his space advantage. 11.\( b4 \) (11.\( \text{d}e5 \) enables Black to activate his light-squared bishop with 11...\( b4!? \) 12.\( a3 \) \( \text{bxa3} \) 13.\( \text{xa3} \) \( a5 \) 14.\( \text{c}2 \) \( \text{a}6 \) 15.\( \text{e}3 \) \( b5 \) with a good game, as occurred in Roeder – Moskalenko, Balassagyarmat 1990) 11...\( a5 \) 12.\( a3 \) \( \text{d}bd7 \)

13.\( \text{e}5 \) Otherwise Black plays ...\( e5 \). 13...\( \text{xe5} \) 14.\( \text{dxe5} \) \( \text{g}4 \) 15.\( f4 \) \( \text{d}7 \) 16.\( h3 \) \( \text{h}6 \) 17.\( \text{d}2 \) \( g5= \) Kanakaris – Goritsas, Katakolo 2009.

10.\( \text{d}e5 \)

This is a popular choice but it is likely to transpose to one of the lines analysed below. 10...\( \text{bxc4} \) 11.\( \text{bxc4} \) \( \text{a}6 \) 12.\( a3 \)

12.\( \text{d}2 \) leads straight to variation B12 below, while 12.\( \text{d}a3 \) transposes to variation B13.

12...\( \text{fd}7 \) 13.\( \text{xd}6 \) \( \text{xd}6 \) 14.\( \text{xd}7 \) \( \text{xd}7 \)
White has achieved her aim of trading dark-squared bishops but has spent a lot of time doing it, and Black’s remaining bishop has found a good home.

15.\xa3 \xa3 16.\xa3 \xb6 17.cxd5 cxd5 18.\xc1 \xc8 19.\xf1 \xf7 20.e3 \xf1 21.\xf1 \xe7=

The endgame was level in Galojan – Hoang Thanh Trang, Chakvi 2015.

**B11) 10.\xa3**

This has been played several times, with White aiming to provoke the ...\b4 advance.

**10...\bxc4!**

This is clearly the best reaction. It is more important to open the b-file and activate the light-squared bishop than to preserve the dark-squared bishop.

10...\b4 has been a more common choice but 11.\b2 gives White chances for an edge, for instance: 11...a5 12.a3 \a6 13.\e5 \b7 14.axb4 axb4 (14...\xb4 15.\c3 \xc8 16.\a4 was pleasant for White in Van Wely – Moskalenko, Metz 1990)

15.\d3 c5 This was Garcia Paolicchi – Rivas Pastor, Thessaloniki (ol) 1988, and now 16.e3!N \f would have left Black with a nagging disadvantage due to the weird placement of the knight on \a6. In similar positions Black usually has a pawn on \b6, which would be more desirable, as Black would then be able to meet dxc5 with ...\bxc5 and also use the b4-square for his knight. It is worth adding that exchanging central pawns is of no help to Black; for example, 16...\xd4 17.exd4 dxc4 18.\xb7 \xb7 19.bxc4\pm and White’s centre remains strong while the passed b-pawn is not dangerous.

**11.\bxc4 \a6 12.\xd6**

12.\e5 transposes to the 10.\e5 line in the notes above.

**12...\xd6**
White’s queen on c1 was more passive than its counterpart on d6, so exchanging them makes sense.

A similar position occurred after 13.c5 \textit{c}7 14.a1 \textit{c}d7 15.a3 \textit{b}5 16.a3 a5 17.a3 \textit{a}6= in Barus – Gleizerov, Biel 2011.

Here I found a useful novelty:

It is important to create counterplay on the open b-file.

The passive 15...\textit{e}c8?! 16.e2 \textit{f}8 17.e3 \textit{e}7 was played in Muse – Ulybin, Berlin 1995, when White could have caused problems with 18.\textit{f}1!N, targeting the undefended bishop on a6. 18...c5 (18...\textit{b}7?! is well met by 19.a1 \textit{a}8 20.cxd5± when Black must accept a bad pawn structure, because 20...\textit{a}6?? loses outright to 21.\textit{xb}7!+) 19.cxd5 \textit{xf}1 20.dxe6 \textit{d}3 21.exd7 \textit{xd}7 22.\textit{cc}1± Black has some compensation for the pawn, but not enough to claim full equality.

Black can afford to weaken his pawn structure temporarily, as he will soon liquidate the isolated c-pawn.

With a drawish endgame.
B12) 10..bd2

GAME 17

Arkadi Vul – Evgeny Gleizerov

New Delhi 2009

1.d4 e6 2.d5 f5 3.g3 4.g2 d5 5.0–0
d6 6.c4 c6 7.b3 c7 8.b2 0–0 9.bd2

Black has tried a few different moves here
but I like the direct approach seen in the game.

10...bxc4!

Black is not forced to make this exchange,
but why wait to activate the light-squared
bishop?

11.bxc4 a6

A while ago I decided to try 11...a5!? before
putting the bishop on a6, which also makes
some sense. The game continued: 12.a4 a6
13.a3 b7 14.xd6 xxd6

12.e5 c8 13.b3?

Presumably White wanted to transfer the
knight to a5 or c5, but a more important factor
is that the c4-pawn is left with insufficient
protection.

13.d3 is a reasonable move which has been
played a few times. After 13...b7 14.c5 c7
15.f3 Black keeps a good position with:

15...e4N (rather than the weird 15...g4?! as played in Hamitevic – Vlashki, Albena 2012) 16.c2 ab8 17.ab1 g5=

13.c2 is quite logical, when it is important
for Black to respond with: 13.e4!
(13...bd7?! 14.a4 b7 occurred in Sarosi
– Gleizerov, Budapest 1990, when 15.fc1!N±
would have been good for White) 14.df3
(14.\textit{d}xe4 fxe4 15.\textit{f}xc1 \textit{d}xe5 16.dxe5 \textit{d}d7 17.cxd5 cxd5 18.\textit{d}d1 \textit{e}c4 19.\textit{d}d4 \textit{f}ac8=) Now we can improve on Black’s play from Jozefek – Sosovicka, Lubovnianske Kupele 2012, by means of:

14...\textit{d}d7!N 15.\textit{d}xd7 \textit{d}xd7 16.c5 \textit{c}c7 17.\textit{d}c1= White intends \textit{d}d3 and f2-f3 with an interesting battle ahead. However, Black has a sound position and has activated his light-squared bishop, so he is not worse at all.
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13...\textit{d}bd7 14.\textit{d}xd7 \textit{d}xd7?! Evidently Black wanted to cover the c5-square but it was not necessary.

14...\textit{f}xd7!N would have kept the knight more active on f6, with excellent prospects for Black. For instance:

15...\textit{d}c7 16.\textit{f}c2 \textit{f}ab8!? Gleizerov, a leading Stonewall expert, aims to develop pressure on the queenside.

16...f4?! would be more to my taste, looking for chances on the kingside! Both ideas are valid and the choice is a matter of taste.

17.\textit{f}c3 \textit{f}b7 18.\textit{f}b1 \textit{f}cb8

19.e3?! This move is not only unnecessary, but it also weakens White’s light squares, as will be felt later in the game.
It would have been better to improve the knight with 19.\(\textit{\underline{\text{c1}}}!\) \(\textit{\underline{\text{f6}}}\) 20.\(\textit{\underline{\text{d3}}}\) when White is still solid.

19.\(\textit{\underline{\text{f6}}}\) 20.\(\textit{\underline{\text{a5}}}\)?

This was a more serious positional mistake, allowing the knight to be traded for the dark-squared bishop, which is not such a good piece.

20.\(\textit{\underline{\text{d2}}}\) was a better idea, covering the c4-square, and after 20...g5 21.\(\textit{\underline{\text{b3}}}\) g4 22.\(\textit{\underline{\text{ab1}}}\) White’s disadvantage should be manageable.

20...\(\textit{\underline{\text{xa5}}}\) 21.\(\textit{\underline{\text{xa5}}}\) g5!

I often like this move in the Stonewall! Black’s king is safe and the gaining of space on the kingside can prove useful for attacking purposes, as well as in future endgames. In the short term, the main idea is to play ...g4 in order to secure an outpost for the knight on e4. This plan works especially well when White has compromised his pawn structure with e2-e3, because the f3-square also becomes weak.

22.\(\textit{\underline{\text{c3}}}\) g4 23.\(\textit{\underline{\text{b3}}}\)?!

White appears to have completely lost the thread of the position.

23.h4! would have been a good prophylactic move to prevent a future ...h5-h4.

23...\(\textit{\underline{\text{c4}}}\) 24.\(\textit{\underline{\text{bb1}}}\) h5 25.a3

Now it was too late for 25.h4 gxh3 26.\(\textit{\underline{\text{xh3}}}\) h4\# when White’s king is in big danger.

25...h4?

Black carries out the correct plan but with the wrong move order.

It was correct to play 25...\(\textit{\underline{\text{e4}}}\) first, followed by ...h4.

26.\(\textit{\underline{\text{b4}}}\)?

White misses his chance to obtain good counterplay.

26.gxh4! was necessary: 26...\(\textit{\underline{\text{e4}}}\) (26...\(\textit{\underline{\text{h7}}}\) 27.\(\textit{\underline{\text{a5}}}\) \(\textit{\underline{\text{h4}}}\) 28.\(\textit{\underline{\text{c7}}}\)\#) 27.\(\textit{\underline{\text{a5}}}\) \(\textit{\underline{\text{h4}}}\) 28.\(\textit{\underline{\text{xe4}}}\) fxe4

29.\(\textit{\underline{\text{c7}}}\)! This is a crucial defensive move! Surprisingly, the forgotten bishop makes
a dramatic return to the action. 29...d3 30.xb8! xb1† 31.xb1 xb1 32.xb1= Black is unable to realize his material advantage.

26...h3!–+ 27.xc4!?
A good try, but it does not work.

27.xf1 xf1 28.xf1 e4–+ is horrible for White.

27.h1 is no better in view of 27...xb4 28.xb4 b5–+ followed by ...a5 and ...h7.

27...hxg2!
Black is not interested in taking the exchange, and instead plays for a mating attack.

28.b4 xb4 29.axb4 e4 30.xg2

30...h7! 31.f4
The active 31.a4!? also cannot save the game after 31...h3† 32.h1 e8! 33.xc6 f7 34.xa7 f6–+ when the mating threats decide.

31...gxh3† 32.xf3 f4!
The tactics work perfectly for Black, thanks to the unfortunately placed queen on c2.

32...f2† 33.g1 f8 35.e1
35.f1 f2† 36.g2 f5–+ is deadly, so White desperately tries giving up his queen, but there is no fortress in sight.

35...f2† 36.xf2 xf2 37.xf2 xf2 38.xf2 xh2† 39.f3 h5† 40.f2 f7† 41.e2 b7 42.f3 g7 43.e2 g6 0–1
The Variation Index in the book is 5 pages long. Below is an abridged version giving just the main variations, not the sub-variations.
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