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Gary Lane


Opening Lanes is based in large part on readers' questions. Do you have a question about a particular opening line? Baffled by a branch of the Benoni or Budapest? Submit your questions (with you full name and country of residence please) and perhaps Gary will reply in his next Chess Cafe column...

## Yes, I have a question for Gary!

## Sideways

What should one do when playing a mysterious woman and she plays a novelty on move two? Do not adjust your chess sets when you see what is to come, but look at it sideways and it might seem quite good. Actually, from a distance the following position might even be reasonable, especially if you stand about 200 metres from it.

I suspect that David Robert Lonsdale, is from the French Speaking part of Canada and this Sherlock Holmes analysis is because of his opening message: "Bonjour, Mr. Lane! I was starting an e-mail chess game with a new opponent and she surprised me with this second move in the CaroKann! It went like this: 1 e 4 c6 2 d 4 b 5 !? Is this new? It is not exactly the same as 1 e 4 a 62 d 4 b 5 , right? Any thoughts on this?"

I am sad to say that I have actually analysed this position at a Belgian chess club called Boistfort. Yes, my team-mates obviously had too much time on their hands and had noticed some games by expert blitz player Ricardo Gervasio who at one time always seemed to employ it. The thing I remember most was lots of chatter in French and then a question in English "Why 2...b5?" and after I shrugged my shoulders, sighed and ordered another coffee there was a lot less chatter in French. Actually, I managed to track down some serious games by Gervasio but longer time limits allow White to simply carry on developing with the advantage:

Janos Nagy-Tibor Fellegi Hungarian Team Championship 1994 1 e4 c6 2 d4 b5


I think anyone who plays this immediately tells the world he has a sense of humour! It has little to recommend in the positional sense compared to ...d7-d5 but has great surprise value. $\mathbf{3} \mathbf{B d} 3$ It is a sound policy to bring a piece into play. Other moves: a) 3 Nf3 a6 4 Bd3 d5 5 Nbd2 dxe4 6 Nxe4 Nd7 7 Qe2 e6 (7 Ngf6?? is rather amusing because of 8 Nd6 mate) 8 Neg5 Ngf6 9 Nxf7!
Kxf7 $10 \mathrm{Ng} 5+\mathrm{Ke} 8$ (10...Kg8 is even worse after 11 Qxe6 mate) 11 Nxe6 Qe7 12 Nc7+ Kd8 13 Ne6+ Ke8 14 Nc7+ Kf7 15 Nxa8 Qxe2+ 16 Kxe2 Bb7 17 Nc7 Bd6 18 Nxa6 Bxa6 19 a4 with the advantage, G. Neron de Surgy-R.Gervasio, Paris 1994. b) 3 g3 d5 4 exd5 (or 4 Bg2 dxe4 5 Bxe4 Nf6 6 Bg2 e5! 7 dxe5 Qxd1+ 8 Kxd1 Ng4 with equal chances) 4...Qxd5 5 Nf3 Bg4 6 Bg2 Nf6 7 Nc3 Qe6+ 8 Qe2 with a slight edge for White, H.Fattoumi-R.Gervasio, Paris 1994. c) 3 f 4 a 5 ?! (something tells me that Black is getting carried away in advancing the pawns on the queenside) 4 c 4 b 45 Nf 3 e 66 e 5 g 67 Bd 3 Bg 7 (Black is probably disappointed to move a piece) 8 Be 3 Ne 79 Nbd2 Bb7 10 Ne4 Nf5 11 Bf2 d5 (or $11 . . .0-0$ when 12 g4 Nh6 13 Bh4 is better for White) 12 Nc5 Ba6 13 Nxa6 Nxa6 14 c5 Nc7 15 a4 0-0 16 g4 led to an initiative in C.Dilek-C.Onez, Kusadasi 2004. 3...e6 Actually 3...a6 used to be a trademark move by Gervasio to facilitate ...d7-d5. For instance: 4 f4 d5 5 e5 Nh6 6 Nf3 Bf5 7 0-0 e6 8 a4 b4 (or $8 . . . B e 79$ axb5 cxb5? 10 Bxb5+ wins) 9 Be 3 Nd 710 Nbd 2 c5 11 Qe2 occurred in X.Mancini-R.Gervasio, Paris 1994, when Black could have emerged from the opening with an edge if 11...c4 had been tried. $4 \mathbf{N f 3} \mathbf{b 4}$ If I was going to play this line I would choose a weak opponent but Zigowski at San Pablo 1947 made the mistake of taking on legendary player Miguel Najdorf and was consequently walloped, even if it was a blindfold simultaneous display: 4...Nf6 $50-0$ Qc7 6 Nc3 h5? (surely Black has to develop some pieces instead of weakening his kingside) 7 e 5 Nd 58 Ne 4 the knight is well placed on e4 to take advantage of the weak dark squares $8 . . . \mathrm{d} 69$ exd6 Bxd6 10 b3 h4 11 c 4 bxc4 12 bxc4 Nf4 13 Bc2 Nd7 14 Re1 Nf6 15 Ne 5 (another good option is $15 \mathrm{Nxd6}+$ when $15 .$. Qxd6 16 Ne 5 is very good for White) $15 .$. Bxe5 16 dxe5 Nxe4 17 Bxf4 g5 18 Bxe4 gxf4 19 Qf3 Bb7 20 Rab1 (the big threat is 21 Rxb 7 Qxb7 22 Bxc6+) 20...Rc8 21 Re2 Ba6 22 Reb2 Bxc4 23 Rc1 Bb5? 24 Rbc2 a6 25 Bxc6+ Bxc6 26 Rxc6 1-0. 5 a3 bxa3 After 5...a5 White has a comfortable position upon 6 axb4 Bxb4+ $7 \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{Be} 780-0$ when Black needs to hurry up and get his pieces into play. 6 Nxa3 d5 7 0-0


The point is that Black has wasted plenty of time on pawn moves but White has more pieces developed. This means it is Nagy who will have more tactical opportunities in the opening. 7...Ba6 8 Bxa6 Nxa6 9 exd5 cxd5 Even at this early stage Black can go wrong with 9...exd5? because of $10 \mathrm{Qe} 2+$ when the knight on a6 will drop off the board. 10 Nb5 Qb6 10 ...Qc8 is met by 11 Rxa6 winning because of 11...Qxa6 $12 \mathrm{Nc} 7+\mathrm{Kd7}$ 13 Nxa6 and Black can fetch his coat. $11 \mathbf{c 4}$ White renews the threat of Rxa6. Or 11 Rxa6 allows 11...Qxb5 with roughly equal opportunities. 11...Nc7 12 Nxc7+ Qxc7 13 cxd5 exd5 14 Re1+ Kd8? In a difficult situation Black goes astray because the king is very vulnerable in the centre of the board. Instead $14 \ldots \mathrm{Be} 7$ is relatively better although 15 Ne 5 intending Qa4+ gives White the advantage. 15 Qa4 Nf6


16 Bd2! 1-0 It's a nice finish that White eventually develops his queen's bishop and Black instantly gives up.

Now your female opponent could be luring you into a false sense of security in the opening before she uses a computer to find a way to destroy you in the middlegame. If you want my honest opinion then I would say she is a beginner.

Now there are probably still a majority of you wondering why Mr. Lonsdale should think 1 e4 a6 2 d 4 b 5 is reasonable. Therefore, I need to go back in history to explain to a new generation. In 1980 the reigning world champion was paired against maverick Englishman Tony Miles in the first round of the European Team Championship. At the time Karpov was at the peak of his powers and a renowned expert on all the main lines. Therefore, after 1 e4 Black played 1...a6 and later Miles discovered that "Karpov felt insulted by my choice of opening." I have a feeling it was also something to do with the result. It reminds me of a question by Pat Sloan from the USA "Ideas behind Modern Chess Openings - Love the book! Especially pleasing are the colorful comments and insight on the 150 attack. Karpov-Miles, Skara 1980 was delightful, both in the description of the spectators' embarrassing laughter and the fact a world champion (and Russian) was toppled by The St. George. However, your analysis concludes 19 Bxh7+ ends with White down a piece following 25 ...Kh5. Question: How would Black counter 26 Nh7 (threatening 27 Qg5 mate, and taking the rook at f8 when black defends g5)? Thus, instead of white being down "a piece down," he has a rook and pawn for two minor pieces; of course, he must extricate the knight. Considering the black king is on h5, White seems to have chances."

Contrary to popular opinion, it is absolutely false that I pay people to mention my books. Perhaps the occasional drink and engraved watch, but nothing more. Anyway, it is a good excuse to see Karpov being humiliated:

Anatoly Karpov-Tony Miles Skara 1980
1 e4 a6 2 d4 b5


Miles's notes to the game are worth repeating: "by this time the spectators' laughing was becoming embarrassing." It does look ridiculous but it has some merit in that Black intends ... Bb 7 to undermine the white pawn centre. At the time of this game Michael Basman, who has a knack of playing amusing openings, was causing havoc in English weekend tournaments with this line. Of course, in those days the scoresheets were not put on the Internet immediately after the tournament but instead usually confined to the rubbish bin. 3 Nf3 Bb7 4 Bd3 Nf6 5 Qe2 e6 6 a4 White having protected his central pawn now attempts to refute the foolish opening. 6...c5 7 dxc5 Bxc5 8 Nbd2 b4 9 e5 Nd5 10 Ne4 Be7 11 0-0?! 11 Bg 5 is a possible improvement to try and weaken the dark squares but by this time Karpov must have been wondering why there was no respect anymore. 11...Nc6 12 Bd2 Qc7 13 c4 Karpov is renowned as a careful player but he has his moments of tactics. Here he is just trying to refute the opening but failing dismally. 13...bxc3 14 Nxc3 Nxc3 15 Bxc3 Nb4 16 Bxb4 Bxb4 17 Rac1 Qb6 18 Be4 0-0 19 Ng5 Karpov is already annoyed that someone has the nerve to play a silly opening so he would be in no mood to give up a piece unless he can see a crystal clear win which with 19 Bxh7+ is certainly not the case: $19 \ldots$ Kxh7 $20 \mathrm{Ng} 5+\mathrm{Kg} 6$ ! (20...Kh6 21 Rc4 intending Rh4 is very dangerous when 21...g6 is met by 22 Qg 4 ! winning) 21 Qg 4 f 522 Qg 3 Qd 4 (just for the record I have a feeling that $22 \ldots \mathrm{Rg} 8$ is the most precise move) 23 h 3 Kh 5 !


24 Nh 7 is certainly a move to contend with when 24...Be7 25 Nxf8 Bxf8 is certainly a good try by White and Mr. Sloan has a keen eye although I see no forced mate or way of accelerating the white attack. The problem is that if Black is allowed to consolidate then the pair of bishops will allow him to come out on top. For example: 26 Rc7 Be4 27 Kh1 intending f2-f4 to set up a mate threat 27 ...g5 28 f 4 Bh6 when Black is better because the white attack has evaporated. 19...h6 20 Bh7+!? Perhaps 20 Bxb7 Qxb7 21 Qe4 would be seen as an invitation to draw so Karpov avoids it because who wants to be known approximately 25 years later as the world champion who couldn't win against 1..a6? 20...Kh8 21 Bb1 Be7


The ending is forced upon White and Miles has superb technique so the extra pawn and powerful pair of bishops ensure victory at this high level. 28 Qxd5 Bxd5 29 Nc3 Rc8 30 Ne2 g5 31 h4 Kg7 32 hxg5 hxg5 33 Bd3 a5 34 Rg3 Kf6 35 Rg4 Bd6 36 Kf1 Be5 37 Ke1 Rh8 38 f4 gxf4 39 Nxf4 Bc6 40 Ne2 Rh1+ 41 Kd2 Rh2 42 g3 Bf3 43 Rg8 Rg2 44 Ke1 Bxe2 45 Bxe2 Rxg3 46 Ra8 Bc7 0-1

After this victory Michael Basman declared that the opening should be known as the St. George after the patron saint of England. If you want to get some idea of the hilarity that raced around the world at Karpov's demise then just imagine Kasparov facing 1 e4 c6 2 d4 b5 and still managing to lose! If anyone has played an upset game then please send them in and remember if you only won by a lucky trick then that is even better.

Aaron Craig from the USA writes, "I am a 1400 player and I am not confident with black against inferior players if they play 1 e4. I usually reply with $1 \ldots$..c5 and $2 \ldots .$. Nc6. Lately I haven't had good positions because no one actually plays the book Sveshnikov line. Please give me advice for a sharp defense for Black."

It can certainly be frustrating to learn an opening and then find no one is willing to challenge you. However, as you make progress this opening knowledge will help you against stronger players so don't be too worried about the situation. Of course, a lot of people try to avoid the main lines with the anti-Sicilian such as the c3 Sicilian (2 c3), the Grand Prix Attack, ( 2 Nc 3 followed by 3 f 4 ) and the Closed Sicilian (2 Nc3 followed by 3 g 3 ). Then again, you might be suffering from the Rossolimo Attack 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5. The thing is I don't know because you didn't tell me! This is a typical error from people who are keen to e-mail their problems, but forgot I don't know the exact openings. Therefore, if you have any games available where things have gone wrong just send them on and I will be delighted to find a way to thwart such inconsiderate players who fail to learn 20 moves of the Sveshnikov.

Patrick Byrne lives in Bahrain and in his spare time tries to revive old lines of the Vienna. Well, that is just a guess considering the following message: "In the Vienna Game you commented the Oxford variation leads to a forced win for White after: 1 e4 e5 2 Nc3 Nf6 3 f4 d5 4 fxe5 Nxe4 5 d 3 Qh4+ 6 g 3 Nxg 37 Nf 3 etc. But why is Black so bad after 6...Nxc3. Instead 1 e4 e5 2 Nc3 Nf6 3 f4 d5 4 fxe5 Nxe4 5 d3 Qh4+ 6 g3 Nxc3 7 bxc3 Qd8 looks OK to me."

Patrick is spot on in his analysis so let us take a closer look:

6...Nxc3 I think this certainly avoids the tricky complications associated with taking the pawn on g3 with the knight. However, if Black intends this, why not just play 5 ...Nxc3 because after 6 bxc3 he has the move. If we follow Patrick's advice we have the merit of arguably weakening the white kingside with g2-g3 but by retreating the queen to d 8 then White is presented with an extra move. Perhaps the whole point is just to prove that after 6 g 3 Black need not give up instantly! The critical line is $6 \ldots \mathrm{Nxg} 3$ when it looks like that Black is on top but deep analysis has uncovered the news that White should win: 7 Nf3 Qh5 8 Nxd5 and now:
a) 8...Na6 9 Nf 4 Qh6 10 Ne 2 Qxc1 11 Rxc1 Nxh1 12 Bg 2 is easily winning, E.Beckmann-S.Victor, Willingen 2003. b) 8...Nxh1 9 Nxc7+ Kd8 10 Nxa8 Be7 11 Bg2 Bh4+ 12 Kf1 Nc6 (12...Bh3 13 Be3 Qg4 14 Nxh4 Qxh4 15 Qf3 Bxg2+16 Qxg2 Qb4 17 Bxa7 led to victory in J.Perez Gonzalez-F.De la Fuente Gonzalez, Madrid 2003) 13 Qd2 Nf2 14 Nxh4 Nh3 15 Bxc6 Qxh4 16 Qa5+ Ke7 17 Qc5+ with a winning advantage, R.Schuermans-M.Krukowski, Belgium Team Championship 2003. c) 8....Bg4 9 Bg2 Nxh1 10 Nxc7+ Kd8 11 Nxa8 Bxf3 12 Qxf3 Qxe5+ 13 Kf1 Bd6 14 Be3 Re8 15 Re1 Qxb2 16 Qxf7 Qf6+ 17 Qxf6+ gxf6 $18 \mathrm{Bxb} 7 \mathrm{Ng} 3+19 \mathrm{hxg} 3 \mathrm{Bxg} 320 \mathrm{Re} 2$ when the extra piece eased the path to victory, Y.Molchanov-Y.Nahutin, Kapuskasing 2004. 7 bxc3 A sensible reply because White will soon be able to strengthen the e5pawn with d2-d4. Instead O.Zakoucky-J.Kiss,Svetla nad Sazavou 1998, saw 7 gxh4 Nxd1 8 Kxd1 which means that White enters an ending where he has lost the right to castle and has an inferior pawn structure: 8...Nc6 9 Bf4 Bc5 10 c3 Bf5 11 Nf3 h6 12 d4 Be7 when Black has a slight edge. 7...Qa4 An interesting idea to keep an eye on the c2-pawn and allow the possibility of retreating the queen via the a4-e8 diagonal. Mr. Byrne's choice of 7...Qd8 has been tested: 8 d 4 Be 79 Bg 2 (well, White has been forced to play g 3 so he might as well use it fianchetto the king's bishop) 9...c6 10 Nh3 Na6 11 0-0 0-0 12 Qh5 with roughly equal chances, W.Prueske-B.Siem, Dortmund 1988. 8 Bg2 Be7 9 Nf3 Not 9 Bxd5?! because of $9 \ldots \mathrm{Aa} 5$ attacking the bishop and the e5-pawn. For instance: $10 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \mathrm{Qxc} 3+11 \mathrm{Bd} 2 \mathrm{Qxe} 5+$ with the advantage. 9...0-0 10 $\mathbf{0 - 0}$ Nd7 11 Qe2 Nb6 12 Kh1?! There is no need to hide the king in the corner so this is a waste of a move. 12...c5 13 Bf4 Bg4 Black pins the knight and further delays White's efforts to play d3-d4. 14 h3 Be6 15 Ng5 Bxg5 16 Bxg5 Qd7 17 Qh5 Turcan is trying to look adventurous by advancing his queen but the attack is rather lightweight. The typical tactic is to sacrifice with Bf6 at some point, but timing is everything. 17....Bf5 18 Kh2 Rac8 19 Qf3 Be6 20 Rf2 Kh8 21 Raf1 Qc7 22 Re1 White protects the e5-pawn which is an indication that after putting his major pieces on the f-file he realises there is no obvious breakthrough. 22...Nd7 23 Qh5 Rg8 24 Rf4 Nf8 The knight guards the h7-pawn to prevent any tricks. Then again 24...g6 allows White to leap for joy and then play like Paul Morphy with 25 Qxh7+!! Kxh7 26 Rh4+ Kg7 27


26 Rf1?! I like 26 c4! because of $26 .$. dxc4 27 Be 4 (which is the point of the combination to crank up the pressure on the h7-pawn) 27...Bf5 (or 27...h6 28 Bxh6 Nh7 29 Bg5 leads to mate) 28 Bxf5 Qxf5 29 Rf4 Qe6 30 Rf6! Qe8 31 Qxf7 when White is on top. 26...c4 Black acts promptly to curtail the possibility of c3-c4 and consequently lock out white's lightsquared bishop from the attack 27 dxc4 Rxc4 28 Rxc4 dxc4 29 Rd1 29
Be4 no longer has an impact now that the rook on h4 has been exchanged, which relieves the pressure on the h7-pawn. 29...Qc7 30 Qe2 Ng6 31 Re1 31 Rd6 should be considered to shield the e5-pawn. 31...b5 32 h 4 Nf 833 h 5 h 6 Black stops the advance of the white h-pawn. 34 Bf4 Qc8 35 Bf3 Nh7 36 Rf1 Perhaps 36 Rb1 is more useful to attack the bpawn when 36 ...a6 37 Rd 1 intending Rd6 to hit the a-pawn is reasonable. 36...Re8 $37 \mathrm{g4}$ ?! The problem of advancing the g-pawn is that it is now a liability. There is no prospect of safely playing $\mathrm{g} 4-\mathrm{g} 5$ so it is merely a target. 37...a6 38 Qg2 Qd8 39 Rd1 Qh4+ 40 Kg1 Ng5! The knight threatens ...Nh3+ or ...Nxf3+ to eliminate the defence of the g4-pawn. 41 Bxg5 Qxg5 42 Qe2

$42 \operatorname{Re} 1$ is met by $42 \ldots$....Rd8 heading for the second rank when play might continue: $43 \mathrm{Re} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 1+44 \mathrm{Kh} 2 \mathrm{Ra} 1$ winning. 42...Bxg4! The final breakthrough crushes White by stripping away the defensive pawn barrier. 43 Bxg4 f5 Now Black wins his piece back and White has a hopeless task. 44 e6 fxg4 45 Rd6 0-1

While we are discussing this opening I can add an e-mail by Tony from England who has been closely reading last month's column. "Hi Gary, Looking at your line in the Vienna 1 e4 e5 2Nc3 Nf6 3 Bc4 Bc5 4 d3 d6 5 f4 Ng4 6 f5! Nf2 7 Qh5 g6 - I hope you get a bit of time to have a quick glance mainly because I think you may be wrong about Blacks chances. I am waiting to be shot down in flames."

The position under debate is as follows: 1 e4 e5 2 Bc4 Nf6 3 Nc3 Bc5 4 d3 d6 5 f4 Ng4 6 f5 Nf2 7 Qh5 g6

and now I suggested $\mathbf{8}$ Qh6 with advantage to White.

I would like to examine Tony's analysis but the hyperlink he sent was one of the longest web addresses I have ever seen and it unfortunately led nowhere. Indeed, it seemed like a riddle wrapped in an enigma. Perhaps Tony could send some analysis in an e-mail so we can see what is going on. I will report back next month.

Now I think there are not enough players who wish to show off their best, amusing games but Åge Trulssen from Norway has rightly sent in a fine miniature. He wrote, "I don't have a question I only want to show you a fine win I had playing online, when my opponent made a mistake in the opening. It is a very short game so perhaps someone else has played similarly? If not, it only shows how many different ways a game can be played, even under 10 moves!"

I have taken the liberty of adding a few notes:
Lewinski-Åge Trulssen Internet Blitz 2004
1 Nc3 Nf6 2 e4 e5 3 f4 The game has now transposed to the Vienna Game. 3...d5 4 fxe5 Nxe4 5 Nf3 Bc5 6 Nxe4? 6 d4 is the main line. For instance: 6 ...Bb4 7 Bd2 c5 8 Bd3 Nxd2 9 Qxd2 Nc6 led to equal chances in O.Vea-D.Howell, Catalan Bay 2004. 6...dxe4 7 d4? This is another mistake but an understandable reaction in an Internet game. Of course, to be fair to White, he might have popped out to the kitchen to open a packet of biscuits the move before. Well, it might have happened! 7 Ng 1 also allows Black to threaten mate in one with 7...Qd4 when 8 Qe2 Bg4 9 Qe3 Qxe5 leaves White struggling. 7...exf3 8 dxc5

8....f2+ 0-1 White resigned in view of 9 Kxf 2 ( 9 Ke 2 is hit by $9 \ldots \mathrm{Bg} 4+$ ) 9...Qxd1 10 Bb5+ Qd7 11 Bxd7+ Nxd7 winning easily.

I am happy to enhance chess opening knowledge with such games - so keep submitting short, spectacular victories.

Copyright 2005 Gary Lane. All Rights Reserved.
Gary wants your questions on openings!! Send it along and perhaps it will be answered in an upcoming

# column. Please include your name and country of residence. Yes, I have a question for Gary! 
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