

Adams,Mi **B12**
2706
 Summerscale,A **2428**
 97th ch-GBR Canterbury ENG (27).07.2010

1.e4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.e5 ♕f5 4.♗f3 e6
 5.♙e2 c5 6.♙e3 cxd4 7.♗xd4 ♗e7
 8.♗d2 ♗bc6 9.♗2f3 ♙e4 10.0-0 ♗g6
 11.♙b5 ♖d7? The queen is misplaced
 here for a few, obvious and less obvious,
 reasons.

[Lars Schandorff simply gives 11...♖c7
 . If we compare with the game, we can
 see that the d7-square is useful.

12.♗g5 ♗gxe5 13.f4 ♗d7!∞
 Δ14.♗xe4 dxe4 15.f5 e5 16.♗xc6
 bxc6 17.♙c4 ♗f6=]

12.♗g5! ♗gxe5 13.f4 ♗g6 14.♗xe4?!
 White is of course doing well in the game,
 but even stronger was:

[14.♖e2! ♙d6 15.♗xe4 dxe4 16.f5
 exf5 17.♙xc6 bxc6 18.♗xf5 ♙e5
 19.♖ad1 ♖c7 20.♙c5+-]

14...dxe4 15.f5 exf5 16.♙xc6 bxc6
 17.♗xf5± ♖xd1 18.♖axd1 ♗e5 19.♖f4
 f6 20.♖xe4 g6 21.♗d6+ ♙xd6
 22.♖xd6 0-0 23.♙h6 ♖f7 24.h3 ♖e8
 25.♖xc6 g5 26.b3 ♖fe7 27.♖xf6 ♗f7
 28.♖xe7 ♖xe7 29.♖c6
 1-0

Rudd,J **A56**
2236
 Greet,A **2451**
 97th ch-GBR Canterbury ENG (27).07.2010

1.d4 ♗f6 2.c4 c5 3.d5 e5 4.♗c3 d6
 5.e4 ♗bd7 6.g3 g6 7.♙g2 ♙g7 8.♗f3
 0-0 9.0-0 ♗e8 10.♖b1 f5?! 11.♗g5
 ♗c7 12.exf5 gxf5 13.f4 e4 14.g4
 ♗b6 15.gxf5 ♙xf5 16.♙xe4 ♙xc3?

[16...♖f6∞]

17.bxc3 ♖f6?

[17...♖d7±]

18.♖b2!± ♖ae8?

[18...♗h8 19.♖g2 ♖g8± was the last
 chance.]

19.♖g2 ♗h8 20.♗xh7!! ♙xh7

[20...♗xh7 21.♖h5+ ♖h6

22.♙xf5+-]

21.♙xh7 ♗xh7 22.♖d3+

[Another way to mate was 22.♖h5+!

♖h6 23.♖xh6+ ♗xh6 24.♖f3!]

22...♖f5 23.♖g3! ♖f6 24.f5 ♖e4

25.♙f4

1-0

Caro-Kann advance
 4.h4 h5 5.Bg5

1.e4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.e5 ♕f5 4.h4 h5
 5.♙g5 In GM7 we missed this idea. It is
 not especially dangerous, but this is not
 why it was left out :-). ♖b6 6.♙d3 ♙xd3
 This is the safest option, but it is not
 clear to me that it is too risky to take on
 d4. Here are some quick notes.

[6...♖xd4!? 7.♗f3 ♖xb2 8.♙xf5
 (8.♗bd2N ♗h6 9.♖b1 ♖xa2 10.♖a1
 ♖b2 11.♖b1 ♖a3 12.♖xb7 ♙xd3
 13.cxd3 ♗d7 14.0-0∞) 8...♖xa1 9.e6
 ♗h6 10.exf7+ ♗xf7 11.♙c8?
 (11.♙h3∞) 11...♗a6! 12.♙h3
 (12.♙xb7 ♖b8+-) 12...e5 13.0-0 ♙d6
 14.♗fd2 ♗g4 15.♙xg4 hxg4 16.♖xg4
 ♗c5 17.♗b3 ♖xa2 18.♖f5+ ♗g8
 19.♗c3 ♖a6 20.♗xc5 ♙xc5 21.♖e6+
 ♗h7 22.h5? (22.♖f5+=) 22...♖c4?
 (22...♖af8!+-) 23.h6? ♖hg8?
 (23...♖af8!+-) 24.♖f5+ ♗h8 25.♖h3
 g6?? (25...♖gf8=) 26.♙f6+ ♗h7
 27.♖d7+ 1-0 Kislinsky-Krutul, Warsaw

2006.]

7. ♖xd3 e6

[7... ♖xb2 8.e6! has a 4-0 score for White and seems risky. Still it can be analysed, of course.]

8. ♖d2 c5 9. ♖e2 ♖c6 10.0-0

[10.c3 ♖ge7 11.dxc5 (11.0-0N cxd4 12.cxd4 ♖f5=) 11... ♖xc5 (11... ♖xe5!?!N 12. ♖g3 ♖c7 13. ♖d4 ♖7g6∞) 12. ♖g3? ♖f5 13. ♖f4 ♖b6!± 14.0-0 ♖xe5 15. ♖d4 (15. ♖xe5 ♖d6 16. ♖c4 ♖xe5 17. ♖xb6 axb6±) 15... ♖g6-- 0-1 G. Smith-Roberson, Great Yarmouth 2007.]

10... cxd4!N

[10... ♖h6 11.c4 cxd4?! (11... ♖a6!N =) 12.cxd5 ♖b4 13. ♖b3 (13. ♖c4!N) 13... ♖xd5 14. ♖a4+ ♖c6 15. ♖xc6+ bxc6 16. ♖xd4± Dmitriev-Buchniecek, Mlada Boleslav 1993.]

11. ♖f3 ♖c5

[11... ♖h6 12. ♖exd4 ♖g4=]

12. a3 ♖c7!±

□ Greet,A

E62
2451

■ Ledger,D

2233

97th ch-GBR Canterbury ENG 26.07.2010

During the British Championship, Andrew Greet got the chance to try out one of the novelties from GM2 - 1.d4 volume two. 1.d4 ♖f6 2.c4 g6 3.g3 ♖g7 4. ♖g2 0-0 5. ♖c3 d6 6. ♖f3 c6 7.0-0 ♖a5 8.e4 ♖g4 9.h3 ♖xf3 10. ♖xf3 ♖bd7 11. ♖e2 ♖e8 12. ♖d1 c5 13.dxc5 ♖xc3 14.cxd6 ♖xd6 15. ♖d5!N Page 442.

[15.bxc3 ♖e5 16. ♖g2 ♖exc4 was probably ok for Black in Baburin-L. Kaufman, New York 1997.]

15... ♖a4

[15... ♖c5 16.bxc3 ♖xc3 17. ♖b1 ♖ac8 18. ♖h6 ♖fd8 (18... ♖fe8 19. ♖g4 ♖e6 20.e5 ♖xc4 21. ♖xb7 ♖b6 22. ♖xe6 fxe6 23. ♖d2± looks horrible for Black.) 19. ♖bd1 ♖e6 20. ♖g4± was Avrukh's main line.]

16.bxc3 ♖b6 17.c5 This exchange sacrifice is simply too tempting. ♖xd5 18.exd5 ♖f5 19.g4 ♖g7 20. ♖b1± ♖ac8 21. ♖e3 ♖c7 22. ♖d4 ♖d7 23. ♖b4 ♖a5 24. ♖b2 ♖c7 25.c4 ♖e8 26. ♖a3 ♖f4 27. ♖e3 ♖c7 28. ♖b5 a6 29. ♖b6 ♖g7 30. ♖e5 ♖c8 31. ♖a3 f6 32. ♖f4 ♖d8 33. ♖b4 ♖c8 34.c6 bxc6 35. ♖b8 1-0

B23

□ Jones,Gawain C

2554

■ Van Wely,Loek

2655

Staunton Memorial 7th (7) 14.08.2009

Relevant to Grandmaster Repertoire 6 - The Sicilian Defence, page 75. 1.e4 c5 2. ♖c3 d6 3.f4 g6 4. ♖f3 ♖g7 5. ♖b5+ ♖d7 6. ♖c4!± We were asked why this option was not covered in GM6 - The Sicilian Defence. The reason is simply - you cannot cover everything. Anyway, here is a few options for Black. ♖c6 7.0-0 e6

[7... ♖a5!?! 8. ♖e2 ♖f6 9.d4 (9. ♖e1 0-0 10.d3 ♖c6= Lyell-Papp, Budapest 2009.) 9... cxd4 10. ♖xd4 0-0 11. ♖h1 ♖c8 12. ♖f3 ♖c4 13.b3 ♖a5= Macieja-Gelfand, Bermuda 2005.]

8.d3 ♖ge7 9.f5?! This looks too ambitious.

[9. ♖e1 is more quite, but Black should do well if he manages to avoid giving White a target. I would suggest that

castling, although probably playable, would be too soon. ♖d4 (9...0-0?! 10.♖h4 ♖d4 11.f5!∞ Lyell-Szabo, Budapest 2009. ; 9...a6!? 10.f5?! gxf5 11.♖h4 b5 12.♙b3 ♖b6

Ramon Perez-Movsziszian, Balaguer 2006.) 10.♖xd4 cxd4 11.♖e2 d5!?N 12.♙b3 (12.exd5 exd5!) 12...dxe4 (12...a5 13.a4 0-0 14.f5 exf5 15.exd5∞) 13.dxe4 ♖b6! (13...♙c6 14.f5! gxf5 15.exf5 ♖xf5 16.♖xf5 exf5 17.♖g3+ ♖d7 18.♖f2) 14.♖f2 (14.♖h1 0-0 ♖d7 15.♖h4 ♖ae8) 14...♙b5!?= (14...♖d8=)]

9...exf5 10.♙f4 ♖e5 11.♙xe5

[11.exf5 ♖xf5 12.♖e1 0-0 13.♖xe5 dxe5 14.♙xe5 ♙xe5 15.♖xe5 ♖f6=]

11...dxe5 12.♖g5 0-0 13.exf5 ♖xf5

14.♖ce4 ♙e8! White's threats are not really happening. **15.♖g4 h5 16.♖h3 b5 17.♖xf5 bxc4 18.♖f3 cxd3**

19.cxd3 ♖b8

[19...f6!N 20.♖e6 (20.♖xf6+ ♙xf6 21.♖e6 ♖e7 22.♖xf8 gxf5 23.♖xa8 ♖xf8) 20...gxf5! 21.♖xd8 (21.♖g3 ♖c8 22.♖xg7 ♖xg7 23.♖xf5+ ♖h7-+) 21...fxe4 22.dxe4 ♖xd8]

20.♖f6+ ♙xf6 21.♖xf6 ♖b6 22.♖f1 ♖e7 23.♖f2 ♖g7 24.♖e4 ♙c6 25.♖d6 ♙xg2 26.♖xf7+ ♖xf7 27.♖xf7+ ♖xf7 28.♖xf7+ ♖h6 29.♖d7 ♙h3 30.♖f7+ ♖g7 31.♖xa7 ♖f6 32.b3 ♖b4 33.♖d6 ♖g4+ 34.♖f2 ♖g2+ 35.♖f3 g5 36.♖e4+ ♖g6 37.♖a6+ ♖g7 38.♖g3 h4 39.♖f5+ ♖f7 40.♖d6+ ♖e7 41.♖f5+ ♖f7 42.♖h6+ ♖f8 43.♖g6 ♖xh2 44.♖xg5 ♙d7 45.♖xe5 ♖xa2 46.♖f5 h3 47.♖xc5 h2 48.♖g3 ♖a1 49.♖g2 ♖a2+ 50.♖f3 ♖d2 51.♖h5 ♖xd3+ 52.♖f4 ♖d2 53.♖e3 ♖b2 54.♖f1 ♙h3 55.♖xh2 ♖xh2 56.♖f4 ♖f7 57.♖g3 ♖b2 58.♖xh3 ♖xb3+

59.♖g4 ♖xh3 60.♖xh3

1/2-1/2

B21

2.f4 I

Staunton Memorial 7th

11.08.2010

1.e4 c5 2.f4 d5! 3.♖c3 The so-called toilet variation, because the inventor made it up while sitting on the toilet, having played 2.f4, wondering what to do against this modern 2...d5 nonsense. **d4** [3...dxe4 is also ok, but White gets better play, it seems to me.]

4.♖ce2

[4.♖b1

A) 4...♖f6 5.♙b5+ ♙d7 6.♖e2 ♖c7!?N 7.♙xd7+ ♖bxd7 8.e5 ♖d5 9.d3 g5!? (9...e6=) 10.♖h3 gxf4 11.♖xf4 ♖xf4 12.♙xf4 ♙g7 13.0-0 ♙xe5 14.♙xe5 ♖xe5 15.♖f3 ♖f6 16.♖a3 (16.♖xb7 ♖b8) 16...♖d5 17.♖h3∞ ;

B) 4...♖c7!?N 5.♙b5+ ♖c6 6.♙xc6+ (6.♖f3 ♖xf4 7.d3 ♖c7) 6...♖xc6= 7.d3 f5!? 8.♖f3! fxe4 9.♖e5 ♖a6 10.dxe4 ♖f6 11.♖d3 (11.♖d2 g6) 11...♖xd3 12.cxd3 g6=]

[4.♙b5+ ♙d7 5.♙xd7+ ♖xd7 6.♖ce2 d3 7.cxd3 ♖xd3 8.♖c3 (8.b4 ♖xe4 9.♖f3 cxb4 10.a3 e6 ♖ Waddingham-Kuczynski, Oakham 1986.) 8...♖c6 9.♖ge2 Cubas-Matsuura, Brasilia 2002. e6N 10.0-0 0-0-0!]

Black is at least equal, I would think.

With this control over the centre, I find it unbelievable that Black should get mated.]

4...♖c6 5.♖f3 g6!? I like this move, with the aggressive idea of attacking f4.

[Another interesting idea is: 5...♔g4
6.♘g3

**A) 6...e5 7.fxe5 ♘ge7!?N 8.♔c4
(8.♔b5 a6=) 8...♘g6=;**

**B) 6...♖c7!N 7.d3 (7.h3 ♖xf4
8.♘e2 ♔xf3; 7.e5 g5 8.fxg5 h6
9.♔b5 0-0-0↑) 7...e5 8.fxe5 h5↗]**

6.d3

[6.♘g3?! ♔h6 7.d3 ♘f6 8.h3 ♔e6
9.♔e2 ♖c7 10.e5 (10.♖d2↗)
10...♘d5↗ Tamashiro-Altea, e-mail
2000.]

6...♘f6 7.g3

[7.♘g3?! ♔h6! transposing to
Tamashiro-Altea.]

[7.h3 ♔g7 8.g4 Reefschlaeger-
Kovalev, Gausdal 1990. 0-0N 9.♔g2
b6 10.0-0 ♔b7∞]

7...♘g4 8.♔g2 ♔g7 9.0-0 ♖b6↗

B21

2.f4 II

Staunton Memorial 7th 11.08.2010

1.e4 c5 2.f4 d5! 3.exd5 ♘f6 4.♔b5+

♔d7 The main move, but not necessarily
the best. **5.♔xd7+ ♖xd7 6.c4 e6**

**7.♖e2 ♔d6 8.f5?! This like looks
suicidal. 0-0 9.fxe6 fxe6 10.dxe6 ♖c7**

11.♘f3

[11.♘c3 ♘c6!N (11...♔xh2 12.♘f3
♔g3+ 13.♔d1 ♘c6 14.d3 ♖ad8
15.♔g5 ♘b4 16.e7 ♖xd3+ 17.♘d2
♖e8 18.♖e6+ ♔h8 19.♔xf6 ♔f4
20.♘ce4 ♔xd2 21.♘xd2 gxf6
22.♖xf6+ ♔g8 23.♖e6+ ♔g7
24.♖h6+ ♔f7 25.♖xh7+ ♔e6
26.♖h6+ 1-0 Sulskis-Ringoir, Dresden
2007.) 12.♘b5 ♖e7 13.♘f3 a6
14.♘c3 (14.♘xd6 ♖xd6 15.0-0
♖ae8↑) 14...♘d4 15.♘xd4 cxd4

16.♘d1 ♘h5!! 17.♖xh5 ♖xe6+

18.♘e3 (18.♖e2 ♖g6-+) 18...dxe3

19.♖d5 exd2+ 20.♔xd2 ♖xd5+

21.cxd5 ♖f5↗]

11...♘c6 12.♘c3

[12.0-0 ♘d4→]

12...♖ae8 13.d3

[13.0-0 ♘d4 14.♘xd4 cxd4 15.♘b5

♔xh2+ 16.♔h1 Kahn-Horvath,
Budapest 2008. ♖g3!N 17.♘xd4

♘e4!! 18.♘f3 ♖g4 19.♔xh2 ♖xe6

20.d3 ♘g5-+]

13...♘d4 14.♘xd4 cxd4 15.♘b5 ♔b4+

16.♔d2 ♔xd2+ 17.♔xd2 ♖b6 18.♖e5

♖xe6 19.♖xd4?!

[19.♖c7 ♘d5 20.♖xb6 ♖f2+ 21.♔c1

♘xb6↗]

19...♘e4+! 20.♔c2

[20.♔c1 ♘f2↗ Chernov-Bouaziz,

Bucharest 1992.]

20...♖f2+ 21.♔c1 ♘c5 22.b4

[22.♔b1 ♘xd3 23.♖xd3 ♖ee2-+]

22...♘xd3+ 23.♖xd3 ♖ee2 24.♔d1

♖f6 25.♖d5+

[25.♖b1 ♖f1+ Suta-Schoen, Budapest
1994.]

[25.♖d4 ♖d2+ 26.♖xd2 ♖xa1+

27.♖c1 ♖xa2 28.♘c3 ♖b3+ 29.♔e1

♖c2 30.♖e3 ♖xc3+ 31.♖xc3 ♖xc3

32.♔f2 ♖xc4 33.b5 ♖b4 34.♖a1

♖xb5↗]

25...♔h8 26.♖c1 Wheeler-Emms, West

Bromwich 2005. ♖xa2N 27.♖e1 ♖f1!-+

B21

2.f4 III

Staunton Memorial 7th 11.08.2010

1.e4 c5 2.f4 d5! 3.exd5 ♘f6 4.♔b5+

♔d7 5.♔xd7+ ♖xd7 6.c4 e6 7.♖e2

♔d6 8.d3 0-0 9.dxe6 fxe6 10.♘f3

**♗c6 11.0-0 ♖ae8 12.♗c3 e5 13.f5
♗d4 14.♖d1 ♗xf5 15.♙g5 e4**

After having looked for a bit of time, I think this is the safest option.

[15...♗g4 16.♖d2 (16.♗d5 h6
17.♙d2 e4 18.dxe4 ♖xe4=

Zubov-Averjanov, Kharkov 2005.)

A) 16...e4!? 17.dxe4!N (17.♗xe4?!

♗d4→ as in a few games.) 17...♗d4

18.♕h1 is maybe compensation, but I find that the responsibility lies on Black's shoulders. ;

**B) 16...♗d4 17.♗e4 ♙e7 18.♙xe7
♖xe7 19.♖ae1 b6=** Janse-Tikkanen, Stockholm 2007.]

16.dxe4 ♗xe4 17.♗xe4 ♖xe4

18.♖d5+ ♖e6= 19.♖ad1?

[19.♖xb7 h6 20.♙d2 ♖xc4 21.♖ac1
♖e6=]

[19.♖xe6+ ♖xe6 20.♖ae1 ♖xe1
21.♖xe1 ♗d4 22.♗d2=]

19...♖xd5 20.♖xd5 h6 21.♗d2 ♖e2

22.♖xf5 ♖xf5 23.♖xf5 hxg5 24.♖f2

♙xh2+ 25.♕f1 ♖e6= 26.♖e2 ♖f6+

27.♕e1 ♖f5 28.♕d1 ♙d6 29.♗e4 ♙f8

30.♕c2 g4 31.♕d3 ♕f7 32.♗c3 ♙e7

33.b3 ♙f6 34.♗e4 ♙e7 35.♗c3 ♖f1

36.♗d5 ♙f6 37.♗e3 ♖f4 38.♗d5

♖d4+ 39.♕c2 ♙g5 40.♗c7 ♖d7

41.♗d5 ♕g6 42.♗c3 ♙f6 43.♗d5

♕g5 44.♖e4 ♙d4 45.♗e7 ♖d6 46.♗d5

♖d7 47.♗e7 ♖d8 48.♕d3 ♖f8 49.♖e2

♖f7 50.♗c8 b6 51.♗d6 ♖d7 52.♗e4+

♕f4 53.♕c2 ♙f6 54.♖e1 ♖d4 55.♗c3

♕g3 56.♖e2 ♕h2 57.♗d5 g3 58.♗e3

♖f4 59.♕d3 ♙d4 0-1 Shkuro-

Kryvoruchko, Alushta 2008.

B21

2.f4 IV

Staunton Memorial 7th

11.08.2010

**1.e4 c5 2.f4 d5! 3.exd5 ♗f6 4.♙b5+
♙d7 5.♙xd7+ ♖xd7 6.c4 e6 7.dxe6!**

This is by far the critical try. ♖xe6+

[7...fxe6 8.♗f3 ♗c6 9.♗e5!

might be good for White.]

8.♖e2 ♗c6

[8...♖xe2+ 9.♗xe2 ♗c6=]

9.♖xe6+ fxe6 10.♗a3 0-0-0!

The play in the following comes close to perfection.

[10...♗b4 11.♗h3 (11.♕e2 0-0-0

12.♗f3 ♗d3 13.g3 g6 14.♗c2 e5

15.fxe5 ♗g4) 11...♗d3+ 12.♕e2

0-0-0 13.♗c2 e5 14.fxe5 ♗xe5

15.b3 ♙d6 16.♙b2 ♖he8 17.♗e3

♗fg4 18.g3 (18.♖ad1 ♗c6=)

18...♗xe3 19.dxe3 ♗g4 20.♕f3

♗xe3 (20...h5 21.♖ae1 ♙e5 22.♙c1±

Kharlov-Senff, Amsterdam 2005.)

21.♖he1 ♗c2N (21...♗f5?! 22.♖xe8

♖xe8 23.♖d1± Kharlov-Tyomkin, Saint

Vincent 2005.) 22.♖xe8 ♖xe8 23.♖d1

♙e5!= Tyomkin. Black secures equality

with the d4-square.]

11.♗f3 ♙d6 12.d3

[12.g3 ♖he8 13.0-0 e5 14.fxe5 ♙xe5

15.♗c2 ♗g4 16.♖b1 ♙d4+ 17.♗cxd4

♗xd4 18.♗xd4 ♖xd4 19.b3 ♖d3

20.b4 ♗e5 21.bxc5 ♗f3+ 22.♕g2

♗xd2 23.♙xd2 ♖xd2+ 24.♕h3 h5

25.♖f7 g5 26.♖h7 ♖e5 27.♖h8+ ♕c7

28.♖h7+ ♕c6 29.♖h6+ ♕d7 30.♖h7+

♕e6 31.♖h6+ ♕f7 32.♖f1+ ♕g7

33.♖xh5 ♖xc5=]

12...e5 13.0-0 ♖he8 14.♗b5 ♙b8

[14...exf4N 15.♗xd6+ ♖xd6 16.♙xf4

♖xd3=]

15.fxe5 ♗xe5 16.♗xe5 ♖xe5 17.♙f4

♖e2 18.♗c3

[18.♙g5 ♖xd3 19.♗ae1 ♖xe1
20.♖xe1 a6 21.♗c3 ♙d6=]

18...♖xb2 19.♗a4 ♖e2 20.♙xb8 ♖xb8

21.♗xc5 ♖e5 22.♗e4 ♗xe4 23.dxe4

♖xe4 24.♖f7 ♖xc4 25.♖xg7 ♖c7

26.♖xc7 ♖xc7 27.♖c1+ ♖b6

½-½ Sulskis-Bucher, Geneve 1999.

B21**2.f4 V**

Staunton Memorial 7th 11.08.2010

1.e4 c5 2.f4 d5! 3.exd5 ♗f6 4.♙b5+

♗bd7! I actually personally prefer this move slightly. It leads to equality too, but the positions are more interesting. **5.c4**

[5.♗c3 a6 6.♙xd7+ ♖xd7 7.♗f3
♗xd5 8.♗e5 Pirisi-Fancsy, Hungary
2007. ♗xc3 9.bxc3 ♖c7 10.0-0 g6=]

5...a6 6.♙a4

[6.♙xd7+ ♙xd7 7.♗f3 e6 8.dxe6
♙xe6 9.d3 ♙e7 10.0-0 0-0 11.♗c3
♖e8= 12.♗e5 ♖d4+ 13.♖h1 ♖ad8=
14.♖f3? ♗d7! 15.♗xd7 ♙xd7=]
16.♙e3 ♖xd3 17.♖ad1 ♖xc4
18.♖xb7 ♙g4 19.♖de1 ♙h4 20.g3
♖xe3 21.gxh4 ♖xe1 22.♖xe1 ♖xf4
23.♖e7 ♙f3+ 24.♖g1 ♖g4+ 25.♖f2
♖d2+ 0-1 Janse-Wang Hao Taby
2007.]

6...b5 7.cxb5 ♗xd5 8.♗f3

Hodgson-Yrjola, Tallinn 1987. **c4!N**

9.♗c3

[9.0-0 axb5=]
[9.d3 axb5 10.dxc4 ♖xa4 11.♖xd5
♖xc4=]

9...♗xf4 10.0-0 ♗d3 11.bxa6

[11.♖h1 e6 12.♗e1 ♗xe1 13.♖xe1
♙d6=]

11...e6!

[11...♖xa6 12.♙b5 ♖b6+ 13.♖h1
♗f2+ 14.♖xf2 ♖xf2 15.♗e4 ♖b6
16.♙xc4 ♖a5=]

[11...♖b6+ 12.♖h1 ♗f2+? 13.♖xf2
♖xf2 14.d4 cxd3 15.♖xd3+-]

12.♖h1 ♙c5

[12...♙e7=]

13.♗e4

[13.♙c6 ♖a7!]

13...0-0**D78**

□ **Giri,A**

2672

■ **Nielsen,Peter Heine**

2700

4th NH Chess Tournament (5) 16.08.2010

During Politiken Cup, Peter Heine Nielsen told me that, of course the Avrukh books were great, but you cannot expect to find an advantage against the symmetrical Grunfeld, when no one has been able to do so for 30 years. I sort of agreed and agree with him, but think that other factors play in as well. Surely, it is uncomfortable to be Black in these positions; certainly Avrukh found a lot of interesting ideas, and Black has to improve on these lines. And finally, but most importantly, these positions do not suit a lot of players for Black, the objective near equality is hard to translate into a 50% score. And if you drop to 45%, you are scoring as poorly as in any other sound opening. For this reason I see the lines suggested as very practical - and as we shall see here, also very dangerous in practice. **1.d4 ♗f6 2.c4 g6 3.♗f3 ♙g7 4.g3 0-0 5.♙g2 c6 6.0-0 d5 7.b3 dxc4 8.bxc4 c5 9.♙b2 ♖b6 10.♖b3 ♗e4 11.e3 ♗c6 12.♗e5 ♗d6 13.♗d2**

[13.♖xc6 bxc6 14.dxc5 ♖xc5
15.♗xg7 ♔xg7 16.♗d2± was Avrukh's
recommendation. This is as of yet
untested.]

13...♗e6? A poor novelty. it was better to
play:

[13...cxd4 14.exd4 ♗e6 , as has been
tried a few times. Here White has to
look carefully to find anything.

A) 15.♖fe1!? ♗h6 16.d5 ♖xe5
17.♗xe5 ♗xd2 18.♖e2 ♖xb3
19.axb3 ♗xd5 20.♖xd2 (20.♗xd5
♗b4=) 20...♗xg2 21.♔xg2 ♖fd8
22.♖ad1 ♖ac8= ;

B) 15.♗xc6?! bxc6 16.♖xb6 axb6
17.♗xc6 ♖fe8± ;

C) 15.♖fc1 ♖fc8 16.♖xb6 (16.c5
♗xb3 17.cxb6 ♗a4 18.bxa7 ♖xa7=
Zhou Weiqi-Ding Liren, Danzhou
2010.) 16...axb6 17.f4 ♖xe5
½-½ Jakovenko-Svidler, Dagomys
2010.]

14.♗xc6! bxc6 15.dxc5 ♖xc5

[15...♖xb3 16.axb3 ♖b7 17.♖a2
♖fc8 18.♖fa1 (18.♗d3±) 18...♗xc5
19.♖xa7 ♖ab8 20.♖1a3 f6 21.♗ef3±
and Black has no obvious
compensation for the pawn.]

16.♗d4 ♖a5 17.♗xc6 ♖c7

[17...♖xd2 18.♖fd1 ♗xc4 19.♖xd2
♗xb3 20.♗xe7+ ♔h8 21.♗xg7+
♔xg7 22.axb3±]

**18.♗xg7 ♔xg7 19.♖c3+?! This keeps
the pawn, but**

[19.♗d4!N looks like a complete
refutation: ♗xc4 (19...♗h3 20.♖fc1±)
20.♖fc1 ♖fc8 (20...♗xb3 21.♖xc7
♗d5 22.♖xe7±) 21.♗xc4 ♖xc4
22.♖c3 ♖ab8 23.♖a4 ♖c5 24.♖ac1
♖b4 (24...♖b4 25.♖a6 e5
26.♗b3+-) 25.♖xb4 ♖xb4 26.♗b3
♖a4 27.♗d2 ♗xd2 28.♖xc8 ♖xa2

29.♔g2 ♗e4 30.♖1c2+-]

19...♗g8 20.♗a5 ♖ab8 21.♖fc1± ♖fc8
22.♖e5 ♗h3 23.♗ab3 ♖b4 24.c5 ♖b7
25.f3 ♖b5 26.♔f2 ♗e6 27.♖c2 ♗a3
28.♖c3 ♖b5 29.♖c2 ♗a3 30.♖c3 ♖b5
31.♖d3 ♖a6 32.♗e4 ♗d6 33.♗xd6
♖xd3 34.♗xc8 ♗xc8 35.♖e1 ♖c4
36.♗d4 ♗a6 37.♖xe7 ♖c1 38.♖d8+
♔g7 39.♗e6+
1-0

B94

□ Nakamura

2729

■ van Wely

2677

NH Chess Tournament (7.5)

2010

[Robot 3]

1.e4 c5 2.♗f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.♗xd4
♗f6 5.♗c3 a6 6.♗g5 ♖bd7 7.f4

♖b6!? This line is quite interesting. In
Experts vs. the Sicilian, we were not
believers, but as can be seen, there is a
case to answer. **8.♖d2 ♖xb2 9.♖b1**
♖a3 10.♗xf6 This is the principal move.
♗xf6 11.e5 dxe5 12.fxe5 ♗d7?

This appears to be the losing mistake.

[Correct was: 12...♗g4 13.♗d5 ♖c5
14.♗b3 ♖c6 15.♗a5 ♖d7!

(In Experts vs. the Sicilian we only
gave 15...♖c5 16.♗xb7+-) 16.♗c4
e6! 17.♗db6N (17.♗cb6? ♖c6
18.♗xa8 exd5 19.♗e2 b5±

B. Smith-Laznicka, USA 2010.)

17...♖xd2+ 18.♔xd2 ♖b8 19.♗e2
♗h6 (19...h5 20.♖hf1 ♗c5 21.h3
♗h6 22.♗xh5±) 20.♗xc8 ♖xc8

21.♖xb7 ♗c5 22.♗d3± The endgame
does look a bit more pleasant for White,
but it is nothing special.]

13.♗d5 ♖c5 14.♗b3 ♖c6 When the
computer does not think preventing

♘c7+ is the best option, something has gone wrong. **15.♘a5 ♖c5 16.♘xb7** And Black loses - Van Wely in New in Chess Magazine, not yet published at the time of the game - but certainly written. **♖c6 17.♖b6!** Black resigned. After **♘xb6 18.♘f6+** he is mated. **1-0**

		B94	
□	Giri	2672	
■	Gelfand	2739	
	NH Chess Tournament (7.3)	2010	
	[Robot 3]		

1.e4 c5 2.♘f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.♘xd4 ♘f6 5.♘c3 a6 6.♙g5 ♘bd7 7.♙c4 ♖b6 8.♙b3 e6 It has been mentioned on Chess Publishing that our coverage of this variation was a bit "thin". It is always a question on where you should expand your efforts in a book on 432 pages. Wherever you consider the lines to be unimportant is exactly where people are going to think you did not do enough :-). But ok, let us have a short review. **9.♙xf6!?** An interesting positional idea. White wants to play on the light squares. It is necessary to take on f6 before playing f4, so that Black cannot take back with the bishop. Other ideas are:

[9.f4 ♙e7 10.f5 ♘c5 has a good reputation for Black. White's most recent try has been: 11.♖f3 ♘xb3 12.♘xb3 ♖c7 13.fxe6 (13.♘d4 ♙d7 14.0-0-0 0-0 15.g4 b5♞ 16.♖hg1 b4 17.♘ce2 ♖ac8 18.♙b1? e5--+

Savchenko-A. Kovacevic, Budva 2009.) 13...fxe6 14.0-0 0-0 15.♖g3 b5 16.a3 ♙d7 17.♖ad1 ♘h5 18.♖h4

(18.♖e3 ½-½ Gashimov-Karjakin, Kallithea 2008.) 18...♖b6+ 19.♙h1 ♖xf1+ 20.♖xf1 ♘f6 21.e5 dxe5 22.♙xf6 ♙xf6 23.♖xf6 ♖d8! 24.♘e4 ♙c6 25.♖g4 ♙xe4 26.♖xe6+ ♙h8 27.♖f1 ♖g5♞ Kurnosov-Areshchenko, Budva 2009.]

[9.♙e3 was apparently suggested by Shirov in a video annotation to his game with Dominguez. It is impossible for us to watch every DVD coming out these days, and we must admit that we missed it. However, the idea itself does not look too dangerous: ♖c7!?N I prefer this move order. (9...♘c5 10.♖f3!?) 10.g4 h6 11.f3 b5 12.♖d2 ♘c5 By transposition we have ended in existing games. 13.0-0-0 (13.♖g1 ♙b7 14.h4 ♘fd7 15.0-0-0 b4 16.♘ce2 ♖b8♞ Fierz-Herb, Switzerland 1999.)

A) 13...♙d7!? 14.h4!N (14.a3 a5!♞ ; 14.♙b1 b4 15.♘ce2 a5♞ Kraus-Jedlicka, Hradec Kralove 2010.) 14...b4 15.♘ce2 a5 16.g5 ♘h5! I generally don't like the knight in such a spot - but here it is weighed up by the troubles of the bishop on b3. (16...a4 17.♙xe6! fxe6 18.gxf6 b3 19.♙b1 gxf6 20.♘f4± ; 16...♘fxe4? 17.fxe4 ♘xe4 18.♘xe6! fxe6 19.♖d3 d5 20.♘f4±) 17.gxh6 gxh6 18.♙b1 ♖b8♞ ;

B) 13...b4 14.♘a4 ♙d7 15.♖xb4 Kerstens-Vink, Leiden 1998. ♖c8!N This leads to very forced play. Maybe this is the main line: 16.♘e2 ♘xb3+ 17.♖xb3 ♖b8

B1) 18.♙b6 ♖c6 19.♘ec3 (19.♖d4 ♙e7 20.♖b4 0-0 21.♘d4 ♖a8♞) 19...♙e7♞ ;

B2) 18.♖c3 ♖d8 19.♖a3 ♖a5

20.♖ec3 d5 21.♙c5 dxe4 22.fxe4
 ♙xa4 23.♙xf8 ♖xf8 24.e5 ♘xg4
 25.♖d4 f5 26.exf6 ♖g5+ 27.♖d2
 ♘xf6 28.♖xa4+ ♔f7=]

9...♗xf6 10.f4 e5!

[10...♙e7 11.f5! would give a lot of
 problems with the d5-square.]

11.♙a4+ ♔e7!N Technically this is a
 novelty, although we get back to a
 known position by transposition.

[White might be a bit better after
 11...♙d7 12.♙xd7+ ♘xd7 13.♗de2
 ♖c8 (13...exf4 14.♗d5 ♖d8

15.♖d4→ was dangerous for Black in
 Timman-Klein, Dieren 2009. Probably
 it was from this game Giri got the
 idea.) 14.♗d5 (14.♖d2N ♗f6

15.0-0-0 ♙e7 16.f5 0-0 does not work
 out well for White. He theoretically
 controls d5, but he cannot occupy it,
 while Black can get powerful play down
 the c-file.) 14...♖xb2 15.0-0 ♖a3
 16.♔h1 ♙e7 (16...b5N 17.♗g3=)
 17.♖b1 b5 18.♖b3 ♖a5 Here I think
 19.a4!N looks good for White. (19.♖g3
 g6 20.f5 ♙d8∞ Tukhaev-Borovikov,
 Kavala 2010.) 19...♙d8 20.axb5 0-0±]

12.♗de2 exf4 13.♙b3

[13.♗xf4 ♖e3+ 14.♗fe2 ♙e6=]

13...♙e6 14.♗d4

[14.♗xf4 ♖e3+ 15.♗fe2 g6 16.♖f1
 ♙g7=]

14...g6 15.♖d2 ♙h6N

[I actually prefer 15...h5 16.0-0-0
 ♙xb3 17.axb3 ♙h6 18.♔b1 ♔f8
 19.♖hf1 , as played in Naiditsch-
 Sjugirov, Moscow 2009. Black was fine
 in the game too, I think, but here the
 easiest equalizer was: ♖e8!N 20.♗de2
 (20.♖d3 ♖c5 21.♗de2 ♖e5=)
 20...♗xe4 21.♗xe4 ♖xe4 22.♗xf4
 ♔g8! (22...♔g7? 23.♖c3+-) 23.g3

♖c6 24.♖g2 ♔g7 25.♖xd6 ♖xd6
 26.♖xe4 ♙xf4= and it is only White
 that needs to be careful in this
 ending.]

16.0-0-0 ♙xb3 17.axb3 ♖hc8?!

[I think Black could have done better
 with the immediate 17...♔f8!N 18.h4
 (18.g3 ♖e8 19.♖he1 ♔g7 20.gxf4
 ♖c5⇒ looks ok to me.) 18...♔g7]

18.h4!! A great move by Giri, putting
 Gelfand under serious pressure. With
 good defence Black manages to draw
 the game. ♖xc3!

[18...♔f8? 19.h5! is horrible for Black,
 based on ♗xh5 20.g4 , winning a
 piece.]

19.♖xc3 f3+ 20.♔b1 fxc2 21.♖he1±
 ♙f4 22.♖h3 ♙e5 23.♗f3 ♖f2 24.♖g1
 ♖g3 25.♖xg3 ♙xg3 26.♖xg2 ♙f4
 27.♖e1 ♗d7 28.c3 h5 29.♔c2 ♗e5
 30.♗d4 ♗g4 31.♔d3 ♖e8 32.b4 ♙e5
 33.♖h1 ♙f6 34.♗e2 d5 35.exd5 ♔d6
 36.♖f1 ♙xh4 37.♖xg4 hxg4 38.♖xf7
 b5 39.♖f4 g5 40.♖xg4 ♔xd5 41.♖d4+
 ♔c6

5.f3 l

1.e4 c5 2.♗f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.♗xd4
 ♗f6 5.f3 e5 6.♗b5 a6 7.♗5c3 ♙e6
8.♗d5 Without this move, White's play
 makes no sense to me. I expect White
 players wants to follow up with c2-c4
 here.

[8.♗d2 b5 9.♗b3 ♗bd7 10.a4 b4
 11.♗d5 ♙xd5 12.exd5 ♙e7=
 looked like a normal Najdorf before
 strange things started happening.
 13.a5 ♖c7 14.♙e3 (14.♖a4 ♗c5!=)
 14...0-0 15.♖d2 ♖fc8 16.0-0-0?
 ♗xd5!-+ Feller-Edouard, Lyon 2008.]

8...♗xd5 9.exd5 ♕f5 10.♕d3 ♕g6!?

[10...♕xd3 11.♖xd3 ♕e7=
looks simple.]

11.0-0 ♕e7 12.c4 ♗d7 13.♗c3 0-0
14.♕e3 ♕g5 15.♕xg5 ♖xg5 16.♕xg6
♖xg6 17.♖d2 ♖ac8 18.b3 f5 19.f4 e4
20.♗e2 ♗c5 21.♖ac1 ♖fe8 22.♖c3
♖f6 23.♖d4 ½-½ Fine-Eliskases,
Semmering 1937.

B55

5.f3 II

1.e4 c5 2.♗f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.♗xd4
♗f6 5.f3 e5 6.♕b5+ ♗bd7 7.♗f5 d5
8.exd5 a6 9.♕xd7+

[9.♕a4 b5 10.♕b3 I prefer the flexible
approach here: a5! This has only been
played in 3 out of more than a hundred
games, but it looks like the best move
to me. (10...♗b6 11.♗e3 ♕c5
12.♗c3 0-0 13.0-0 ♕f5 14.♖h1 ♕g6=)
is known to score greatly for Black and
can also be recommended.) 11.c3
(11.a4 ♗c5 12.♗e3 ♗xb3 13.cxb3
b4+ ; 11.d6 a4 12.♕d5 ♖a6=)
11...♗b6

A) 12.♖d3 is probably best. a4
13.♕c2 ♗bxd5!? (13...♖xd5=)
14.♖xb5+ ♕d7 15.♖e2 ♖c7 16.0-0
♕c5+ 17.♖h1 0-0= ;

B) 12.♗e3 a4 13.♕c2 ♕c5 14.♖e2
0-0+ 15.♗d2 ♗bxd5 16.♗xd5
♗xd5 17.♗e4 ♕b6 18.♗f2 ♕a6
19.0-0 a3 20.♕d3 axb2 21.♖xb2
♗xc3 22.♖xc3 ♕d4 23.♖b3 ♕xa1
24.♕a3 ♕d4 25.♕xf8 ♖xf8 26.♖h1
♕c8 27.♕xb5 ♖a3 28.♖d5 ♕e6
29.♖b7 ♖xa2 30.♗e4 h6 31.♕d7
♖a7 0-1 Stoppel-Huebner, Athens
1969.]

9...♖xd7 10.♗e3 b5= 11.♗c3

[11.a4 ♕b7 12.axb5 axb5 13.♖xa8+
♕xa8 14.♖e2 (14.0-0 ♕c5 15.♖h1
Ginsburg-Kuczynski, Germany 1995.
♗xd5N 16.♗xd5 ♕xd5=) 14...♕e7
(14...♗xd5= seems most natural.)
15.0-0 0-0 16.♖d1 ♕c5 17.♗c3 b4
18.♗e4 ♕xe3+ 19.♕xe3 ♗xd5 20.c4
bxc3 21.♗xc3 ♗xc3 22.bxc3 ♖e6
23.c4 e4 ½-½ Bodnar-Andreev,
Alushta 2005.]

[11.0-0 ♕c5 (11...♕b7 12.♗c3 b4=
looks ok as well, the same can be said
for 12...♖d8 here. But Black plays
solidly for development.) 12.♗c3 0-0
13.♖h1 ♕xe3 14.♕xe3 b4 15.♗e4
♗xd5= Ioseliani-Womacka, Germany
2000.]

[11.♖e2 ♕c5 12.c4 0-0 13.♗c3
bxc4+ looks very uncomfortable for
White: 14.♕d2 ♕d4! 15.0-0-0? ♖b8
16.♕e1 ♖b7 17.♗xc4 ♗xd5 18.♗xd5
♖xd5 19.♕c3 ♕e6 20.b3 ♖fc8
21.♕xd4 exd4 22.♖d2 ♖d6
0-1 De Graaf-Cipolli, e-mail 2002.]

11...♕b7 12.0-0

[12.♖d3 b4 13.♗e4 ♗xd5=
Papageorgopoulos-Atalik, Aegina
1996.]

[On 12.a3 then 0-0-0 seems koo-koo.
12...♖d8 surely is safer. 13.♖d3
(13.♖e2!) 13...♗xd5 14.♗exd5
½-½ Ghaem Maghami-Moradiabadi,
Dresden 2005.]

12...b4 13.♗e4 ♗xd5 14.♗xd5

[14.c4 bxc3 15.♗xd5 ♕xd5 16.♗xc3
♕c5+ 17.♖h1 ♕c4+ Reichstein-
Wojtkiewicz, Fredericksburg 1999.]

[14.♗c4 ♖c7 15.♖e2 Gamsa-Soffer,
Tel Aviv 1990. ♕e7N is at least
equal.]

14...♕xd5

[14...♖xd5 15.♙e3 ½-½ Khachiyan-Wojtkiewicz, Los Angeles 2005.]

15.♗f2

[15.♙e3 ♘e7 16.♖f2 (16.♙c5 ♙xe4 17.♖xd7+ ♔xd7 18.♙xe7 ♔xe7 19.fxe4 ♖hc8) 16...♖c6 17.c4! ♙xe4!? (17...♙e6=) 18.fxe4 ♖c8! and it is not so easy to solve the problems. 19.♖d5 ♖xd5 20.cxd5 ♖c4]

15...♙c5 16.♖e2 0-0 17.♙e3 ♙e7
18.♗d3 f6 19.♙c5 ♙xc5+ 20.♗xc5
♖a7 21.♖f2 ♖ac8 22.♗d3 ♖b7 23.a3
bxa3 24.♖xa3 ♖fd8 25.b3 e4 26.fxe4
♙xe4 27.♗e1 f5 28.♖a4 ♖d6 29.♖d4
♖dc6 30.♖d2 a5 31.♖d4 h6 32.♖ff2
♖c5 33.♖d6 ♔h7 34.h3 ♖8c6 35.♖f8
♖c8 36.♖d6 ♖5c6 37.♖d4 ♖b8
38.♖a1 ♖a7 39.♖d4 ♖c7 40.♖a1 ♖c3
41.♖d1 ♖c5 42.♖d7 ♖e3 43.♖a1 ♖c3
44.♖d1 ♖c7 45.♖d8 ♖e3 46.♖dd2 ♖e7
47.♔h2 ♖e5+ 48.♔g1 ♖c5 49.♔h2
♖c7+ 50.♔g1 ♖g3 51.♖f1 f4 52.♖df2
♖xe1 53.♖xe1 ♙xg2 54.♖xg2 ♖xe1
55.♖xe1 ♖xe1+ 56.♔f2 ♖h1 57.♔f3
g5 58.♖d2 ♖xh3+ 59.♔g4 ♖c3
60.♖d7+ ♔g6 61.♖d6+ ♔g7 62.b4
axb4 63.♖g6+ 0-1 Manolov-Sakaev,
Elenite 1994.

5.f3 III

1.e4 c5 2.♗f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.♗xd4
♗f6 5.f3 e5 6.♗b3 This is the
fashionable move. ♙e7

[6...d5 7.♙g5 ♙e6 8.♙xf6 gxf6
9.exd5 ♖xd5 10.♖xd5 ♙xd5 11.♗c3
♙e6 12.0-0-0 ♗d7 13.♗b5 ♔e7
14.♗c7 ♖c8 15.♗d5+ ♙xd5 16.♖xd5
as in for example Varga-Antal,

Nagykanizsa 2003, looks ok for Black,
but he is only playing for two results
and the endgame could be long and
uncomfortable.]

7.c4

[7.♗c3 0-0 8.♙e3 ♙e6 9.♖d2 a5!?
compared to the Najdorf, Black has not
spent any time on ...a6.]

7...a5!? Quite an aggressive positional
idea. Black wants to play ...a4, ...♖a5
and ...♙d8-b6. 8.♙e3

[8.a4 weakens the dark squares too
much for most players liking. ♗c6
9.♙e3 0-0 10.♗c3 ♗d7 11.♗d5 b6
(11...♙g5N 12.♙f2 b6=) 12.♙e2
♗c5= Nyzhnyk-Hamitevici, Chotowa
2010.]

8...a4

[Another idea is: 8...0-0 9.♙e2 a4
10.♗3d2 ♗h5!?N (10...♖a5 11.0-0
♙d8 is another way to equalise. Black
is hoping to exchange bishops and
weaken the dark squares in the white
position. 12.c5 d5 13.exd5 ♗xd5=
Szczepkowska Horowska-Wojtaszek,
Wroclaw 2010.) 11.♗c3 ♙g5 12.♙xg5
(12.♙f2 ♗f4 13.0-0 ♗c6)
12...♖xg5 13.g3 ♗c6]

9.♗3d2 ♖a5 The bishop goes to d8 and
b6, where White will have to exchange it.

10.♖c2

[10.♙e2 ♗c6 11.0-0 0-0 12.♗c3
(12.♗a3 ♙e6 13.♗b5 ♙d8 14.♔h1
♙b6= Rublevsky-Gelfand, Moscow
(blitz) 2007.) 12...♗d4! (12...a3?!
13.♗b3 ♖b4 14.♖b1! axb2 15.♖d2
looks a bit risky. The black queen is
not well placed. ; 12...♙d8?! 13.♔h1
♙b6 14.♙xb6 ♖xb6 15.♗xa4 ♖b4
16.b3) 13.♙d3 ♖b4 14.♖b1 ♙d7
15.♔h1 ♙d8= 16.f4 a3 17.fxe5?!
dxe5 18.♖c1 Varga-Berkes,

B55

Kazincbarcika 2005. ♖g4!N 19.bxa3
 (19.♙g1? ♙a5!-+) 19...♗xa3]
10...♗c6 11.♗c3 ♙d8 12.♙e2 0-0
13.♙f2 ♗d4 14.♗c1 ♗a7 Black is in
 no way worse. **15.♗a3 ♙b6 16.♗b5**
♗xb5 17.cxb5 d5 18.♙xb6 ♗xb6+
19.♗c5 ♗a5
 [19...♗d8!=]
20.b4 ♗d8 21.♗c7 dxe4 22.♗xd8
e3+ 23.♙xe3 ♗xd8 24.a3 ♙e6 25.♗c4
♗d5+ 26.♙f2 ♗f4 27.♙f1 f6 28.♗b6
♗d2+ 29.♙g1 ♗ad8 30.♗xa4 ♙f5
31.♗c5 b6 32.♗e4 ♙xe4 33.fxe4
♗e2+ 34.♙xe2 ♗xe2 35.♗d1 ♗xd1+
36.♗xd1 ♗a2 37.♗d8+ ♙f7 38.♗a8
♙g6 39.♗a7 h5 40.h4 f5 41.exf5+
♙xf5 42.♗xg7 ♗xa3 43.♗g5+ ♙f4
44.♗xh5 e4 45.♗h8 ♗a1+ 46.♙h2 e3
47.♗e8 ♗b1 This position is drawish, but
 White blunders as much as you can...
48.♙h3?? ♗h1# Ivanchuk-Gelfand,
 Moscow (blitz) 2007.

B25

Closed Sicilian - 6.♗h3

1.e4 c5 2.♗c3 ♗c6 3.g3 g6 4.♙g2
♙g7 5.d3 d6 6.♗h3 This peculiar move
 is apparently not in GM6 either. It does
 not intimidate... Here is a suggested
 treatment. **e6 7.0-0 ♗ge7 8.♙e3 0-0**
9.♗d2 ♗d4 10.♙h6
 [10.♙h1 ♗b8 11.♙h6 b5 12.♙xg7
 ♙xg7 13.f4 b4 14.♗d1 d5 15.e5
 ♙b7] Tkachiev-Gelfand, Groningen
 1997.]

10...♙xh6 11.♗xh6 f6 12.♗d2 e5
 The structure should be absolutely fine
 for Black. The knight on h3 is not in the
 way, but is also out of play. **13.f4 ♗b6**
14.♗ab1 c4 15.♙h1 cxd3 16.cxd3

The question here is if White is even
 equal. The engines do not think so, but
 on the other hand, White has decent
 practical results from here. **♙d7**
 [16...♙e6 17.♗f2 ♙g7 18.♗bf1 ♗ac8
 19.♗g1 ♗c5 (19...exf4 20.♗xf4
 ♗ec6) 20.♗f3 ♗xf3 21.♗xf3 b5=
 Balashov-Timman, Rio de Janeiro (itz)
 1979.]
17.♗f2 ♙g7 18.♗bf1 ♗ac8 19.♗g1
♙e6 20.♗f3 ♗xf3 Around here Black
 loses his way.
 [20...♗a5!]
21.♗xf3 ♗c6 22.f5 ♙g8 23.h4 ♗d4
24.♗3f2 gxf5 25.exf5 ♗b5 26.g4
♗xc3 27.bxc3 h6 28.g5± ♙f7 29.g6
♙e8 30.♗b2? ♗xb2= 31.♗xb2 b6
32.c4 ♗c5 33.♙e4 ♙d7 34.♙g2 ♗fc8
35.♙f3 h5 36.♙e3 ♗a5 37.♗ff2 ♙a4
38.♙d5 ♙d7 39.♙d2 ♗a3 40.♙e3 ♙a4
41.♙e4 ♗c7 42.♗f1 ♗c3 43.♙e3 ♙c2
44.♙e4 ♙a4 45.♙d2 ♗a3 46.♗c1 ♙d7
47.♗cc2 ♗c5 48.♙e3 ♙a4 49.♗c1
♙d7 50.♗f1?? ♗xc4 51.♗b3 ♗xb3
52.axb3 ♗c7 53.b4 a5 54.bxa5 bxa5
55.d4 ♗c3+ 56.♙d2 ♗c4 57.♙e3
♗xd4 58.♗c1 d5 59.♙d3 ♗xd3+
60.♙xd3 ♙xf5+ 61.♙d2 ♙xg6 62.♗c5
d4 63.♗xa5 ♙g4 64.♗a1 ♙f5 65.♗f1+
♙e6 66.♙d3 ♙f5+ 67.♙c4 ♙e4
68.♗a1 ♙f3 69.♙d3 ♙f5 70.♗a6 ♙g2
71.♗d6 ♙f1+ 72.♙d2 ♙c4 73.♗c6 ♙f1
74.♗d6 ♙g6 75.♙e1 ♙c4 76.♙d2 ♙f7
77.♗c6 ♙d5 78.♗a6 ♙e7 79.♙d3 ♙g2
80.♗b6 ♙f3 81.♗b5 ♙c6
 0-1 Shchekachev-Goldin, Berlin 1993.