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Chess notation symbols that represent frequent comments about a position allow readers of any language to understand analysis of a game produced in any other language. Here is a key to the symbols used in this text. Those I am unable to produce in my word processing software, I have embedded in the game below.

written after a move

! a good move
!! an excellent move
!? a move worth considering
? a mistake
?? a blunder
?! a dubious move
□ only move
+- white has a decisive advantage
± white has the upper hand
-+ black has a decisive advantage
= position is even
∞ unclear
↑ initiative
→ attack
+ check
# checkmate

written before a move

RR editorial comment
≤ worse is
= equivalent is
Δ with the idea
Δ! aimed against

Wild Bill – Sam Sluggard [B21]

[Wulebgr]

Introduction

This opening pamphlet showcases one game played by email in October-November 2002. This game was my second against The Prosecutor in which he employed a Leningrad Dutch Defense in response to my opening move 1. Nf3, although we have also played a Réti that shared some of the characteristics of the Leningrad. We played the first Leningrad Dutch over the board (OTB) six months prior to the showcase game. Both it and the Réti are among the games I have annotated for this pamphlet.

In my first game against the Leningrad Dutch, I built up a long-term initiative and seemed to have good winning chances, but settled for a draw. After the game the lawyer and I spent most of an hour going through variations with Curt, the strongest player in the City Chess Club. Curt seemed convinced that I should have won, and sought to show how certain lines might have scored the full point, though he was unable to convince the lawyer and me. I continued analyzing the game more at home, using the analysis engines Fritz 4.01, Chessmaster 7000, and Crafty 17.9 to augment my skills. It became evident that I misplayed my attack. Not only did I miss the most favorable lines, but I presented the lawyer with opportunities through which he might have gained the advantage. I became determined that should I play against the lawyer’s Leningrad again, I would deviate much earlier in the game.

I looked at a number of games from master play that used the Leningrad Dutch opening. Playing through a large number of these games clarified some of the strategic motifs in my OTB game with the lawyer. In addition, I found in these games an idea that might increase the opportunities for my opponent to err. I became intrigued about the possibilities for white after 7. d5! This pamphlet offers some of these instructive master games, several of my games, and some discussion of the merits of an early d5 against the Leningrad Dutch.
The Series

My series of email games with The Prosecutor began in 2000 when he wanted to practice some ideas in the Grand Prix attack against the Sicilian Defense, an opening that had not produced the success he might have expected against me in OTB play. He succeeded in winning the first email game with a novel (to me at least) move order. However, the draw in the second game seemed to indicate that I had found the antidote to his new plan. In the third game I had the white pieces, faced his beloved Pirc, and evened the score. Since then, however, I have had less success against the Pirc. In the last two Pirc games I have reached what I thought was the better position, but have come away with two draws. Since then I have been opening with the king’s knight when I have the white pieces against the lawyer.

This match has continued for a little more than two years, with long breaks in the summer, and stood at six points each when we began the feature game. The entire series has provided both enjoyment and instruction for the players involved. Several of the games may be of interest to students of the narrow range of openings we play, and because these games have had a number of sharp variations with the consequent lessons in tactics.

Our series has been characterized by opening innovations. Both players have employed move order novelties as an effort to throw the other off his game. Sometimes this strategy has worked; sometimes it has backfired spectacularly, as in game 6 where white’s (TP) premature 4. f5 presented black with excellent opportunities for attack.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>game</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>ECO</th>
<th>Prosecutor</th>
<th>Wulebgr</th>
<th>score P-W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.5-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>B07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>C00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>B07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>B07</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>4-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>B07</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>4.5-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>B07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.5-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>A04</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>6-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>B24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>A87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>A04</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bold numbers indicate the player with white

The Leningrad Dutch

The Leningrad variation of the Dutch Defense takes its name from its innovative development by several strong players in Leningrad during the mid-twentieth century, although it had been played as early as 1922. These players, among whom the strongest was Yevgeny Kuzminykh, imported strategic ideas from the King’s Indian Defense into
the Dutch with some success. Then Viktor Korchnoi adopted the system among his vast and diverse repertoire, helping popularize it. The main line Dutch Leningrad arrives after the moves 1. d4 f5 2. c4 Nf6 3. g3 g6 (diagram). But the opening frequently comes about though a variety of other move orders. For example, in a database of 7256 Dutch Defense games in which black plays Bg7, 1078 games began 1. Nf3 f5.

The Leningrad Dutch is classified as A86-A89 in the Encyclopedia of Chess Openings. But some games that are classified according to ECO as A80-A81 and A84-A85 merit consideration with this opening. I summarize the relevant portions of the ECO classification system with the common names of the primary variations in the appendix.

Presented below are three games that reflect some of the early history of the opening: (1) the earliest game from what became the main line of the Leningrad, Saemisch-Réti 1922; (2) the earliest win by black against the main line, Feigin-Apscheneek 1937; and (3) a model game that probably helped generate some interest in the system, Goldberg-Kuzminykh 1947. According to the records in my largest database of Leningrad and Leningrad-like games, there are 25 games over a forty year period preceding game 3. The next 25 of these games were played within the following five years, and at least 15 such games were played in the 35th Chess Olympiad in Bled, Slovenia up to press time for The Week in Chess, number 417 (4 November 2002). The chokehold black’s pawns gained over the white king in game 2 is the sort of situation that I hoped to prevent when I played 7. d5 in the showcase game (also see Crowl-Ozols in the supplemental games). Games 1 and 2 reach the same position after black’s move 8 (diagram).

(1) Saemisch, F – Réti, R [A87]
Vienna, 1922

(2) Feigin, M – Apscheneek, F [A87]
Kemeri, 1937


(3) Goldberg, G. – Kuzminykh, E [A88]
Leningrad, 1947


Playing 7. d5!

Before saying much about my innovative move (stolen from others, of course), it is important to clear up possible confusion. The move 7. d5 has become a common book move in one of the lines in the Karlsbad variation of the Leningrad Dutch. That system is not my focus. The Karlsbad is noted by white’s move Nh3, while in the line in focus in
this pamphlet the white knight is played to f3. The Karlsbad derives its name from the 1923 tournament there (now called Karlovy Vary) where Nh3 was played in Alekhine-Tartakower, Bogoljubov-Tartakower, and Rubinstein-Bogoljubov. For the chess historian the beginnings of this move are worthy of examination, even though it takes us off our main path towards the showcase game. In game 4 Alekhine played Nh3 as preparation for an immediate kingside assault against the castled king, succeeding in driving Tartakower’s king over to the queenside before castling himself on move 22.

(4) Alekhine, A – Tartakower, S [A81]
Karlovy Vary, 1923


Bogoljubov-Tartakower is the model game that associates the Karlsbad name with a main line of the Leningrad Dutch (A86). It was a marathon game of maneuvers that began with little bloodshed—the first piece captured was white’s king knight after it moved h3–f2 on move 18. Along the way Bogoljubov won a pawn, and finally prevailed in a rook and pawn endgame. This game would not seem likely to encourage Nh3 for players looking for a quick knockout.

(5) Bogoljubov, E – Tartakower, S [A86]
Karlovy Vary, 1923

Pushing the d-pawn prior to black playing e5 may have been rare before 1950 when Zuikov tried it against Korchnoi. This game illustrates the coordination of the d5 push and the knight’s placement on h3; Nh3 is preliminary to Nf4 where it protects the pawn on e6 (after ... e5 dxe6 e.p.). The knight was easily driven off its post on f4 by 11... g5, but perhaps white wanted to provoke this advance. Many games along these lines have been wild tactical fights with a slight plus score for white, although Korchnoi won the opener.

(6) Zuikov – Korchnoi, V [A86]
Leningrad, 1950


Back on Course

Outside of the Karlsbad, white’s earliest important victory after 7. d5 against the Leningrad Dutch occurred in 1952. Or, so it would appear from the largest database that I employed for this study, although Samuel Reshevsky won after he played 3. d5 in 1937 in a game that developed along lines resembling the Leningrad (see Supplemental Games). Here is the 1952 game.

(7) Van Scheltinga, T – Kostic, B [A86]
Beverwijk, 1952


In a game three years later the exchanges that took place on e6, followed by white’s c-pawn advance, contributed to temporarily closing black’s light square bishop within its own pawn chain.

The earliest significant effort to employ 7. d5 from the position in which I played the move, and that I came across prior to the game was Petrosian – Knezevic 1979, although a little more research turned up Andersson – Tatai the previous year. With the aid of a much larger collection of Dutch Defense games, I have identified 268 games that reached the key position after 7. d5.

(9) Andersson, U (2545) – Tatai, S (2455) [A88]
Dortmund, 1978


(10) Petrosian, T – Knezevic, M [A88]
Banjaluka, 1979

White’s d-pawn advance follows the thematic Qe8 in the final game in this chapter.

(11) Kelecevic, N – Szabolcsi, J [A87]
Nuovo Budapest, 1992

Leningrad Dutch Initiation: Taxing Quads

I have faced the Dutch on only a few occasions, and have been fortunate to gain a plus score against it, even though my opponents have been higher rated. Both games against The Prosecutor have begun with 1. Nf3, an opening I have been using more often lately in important games. The Dutch can arise after 1. d4, 1. c4, and 1. Nf3—all moves I have sometimes adopted as my preferred opener with white. Against Dan at the July Open in River City in 1998, I played 1. c4 hoping for an English; Dan’s reply 1. … f5 was my first exposure to the Dutch Defense in tournament play. Scoring twice against Dan made me a little more comfortable when the lawyer trotted out 1. … f5 in the Taxing Quads in April 2002.

Detours around Leningrad

The Leningrad Dutch is not black’s only system against white d4, c4, and Nf3 that follows from the reply 1. … f5. Black can defer the characteristic Leningrad move (g6), or even avoid it altogether. One strategy that gets some play at the top levels, for example, resembles the Nimzo-Indian with black playing the dark squared bishop to b4, and usually exchanging it for white’s queen knight. This maneuver is characteristic of the Dutch Indian (also called the Bogo-Indian variation). In the classic Dutch, of course, black plays the king bishop to e7, which often precedes a Dutch Stonewall. Some of the possible variations that might have been reached through move order transpositions in either of the two principle Wulebgr-The Prosecutor games are worth considering before examining my initiation into the mysteries of the Dutch Leningrad by The Prosecutor.
The Prosecutor takes the Route to Leningrad

After the first two rounds in the Taxing Quads, so named because they are played every April, I had 1½ points and could assure myself of second place with a draw. I was pleased to be in such a position, as I was the only class C player against three class B players in my quad. My third game was against The Prosecutor. Every previous OTB game against the lawyer with standard time controls, I had black and faced his Grand Prix Attack against my Sicilian. Because these games had gone my way more often than not, I felt some pressure to keep the streak going; having the white pieces only increased this pressure. In theory, white has the advantage, but the history of our email games shows that the lawyer gets better results against me with the Pirc than when he has white (see Table 1). We had recently played a couple Pirc games, so I decided that steering into a different opening system would be in my best interest. Although I was uncertain how my opponent would reply to 1. Nf3, I had experienced some success employing the Réti—and other systems that begin with this knight move—against higher rated players in internet blitz, as well as a few OTB games. In a recent game, I had a good position against a strong expert, though I misplayed the attack and lost.

Taxing Quads 2002: Wulebgr-The Prosecutor

The showdown during April turned out to be an exciting game in which I failed to convert an apparent advantage into a full point. Nevertheless, the draw gave me clear second, putting me in the money in a tough quad. After this draw, I had a week of hope for a minor miracle: the game between The Prosecutor and Phil had been postponed, and was to be played after all the other games concluded. Had The Prosecutor found his way to victory, he would have given me first in the quad. He failed, but he deserves respect for the lessons he gave me in our game.

(12) Wulebgr (1473) – The Prosecutor (1650) [A85]
Taxing Quads (3), 2002
annotated by Wulebgr

1. Nf3 f5
When something weird gets thrown my way, and the Dutch is still in my category of weird, I usually respond according to classic principles. Hence
2. d4 Nf6 3. c4 g6 4. Nc3
   [4. Bg5 Bg7 5. Nc3 0–0 6. e3 (6. Qd2 Kelecevic–Rajkovic, Jugoslavija 1973 16/86) 6. ... d6 7. Qb3 c6 8. d5? (8. Bd3) 8. ... Qc7 9. c5 (diagram) (9. Rd1 e6) 9. ... Bd7?? (9. ... Kh8; 9. ... Nxd5³) 10. dxc6++ 1–0 Wulebgr–Shirer, USCL, 2001]
   [RR 4. g3Bg7 5. b4!? Kramnik–Illiescas Cordoba, Dos Hermanas, 1999 75/69]
4. ... Bg7 5. Qc2
[5. e3 ECO A85 line 5 ... 0–0 6. Bd3 (6. b4 b6 7. Qb3 c5 8. a3 e6 9. Be2 Qe7 10. 0–0 d6 11. Bb2 Nbd7 12. Rad1 Ne8= Quinteros–Sax, Wijk aan Zee 1973) 6. ... d6 7. 0–0 Nc6 (7. ... Qe8 Dorfman) 8. d5
A) 8. ... Nb4 9. Be2 (9. Bb1!?± Dorfman gives this suggested move and evaluation in Informant 51, but Fritz finds the position even.)
A1) 9. ... c6 10. a3 Na6 11. Rb1 e5 12. dxc6 (12. dxe6 Bxe6 13. Ng5 Bc8 14. b4± Dorfman 14. ... Ne8=– Fritz 4.01. The enormous contrast here in evaluation highlights the need for scepticism regarding the claims of computers and grandmasters. Their analysis of a position does not always converge; where they diverge, there is a compelling need for concrete evaluation of moves more than mathematical scoring of a position.) 12. ... bxc6 13. b4 Kh8± Dorfman–Gurevich, France 1991 51/85.

B) 8. ... Ne5 9. Nxe5 dxe5 10. f3 e611. Qb3 Kh8 12.e4 exd5 13. cxd5 f4 Murrey–Zsu. Polgar, Royan 1988]
[5. Bg5 see Kelecevic–Rajkovic; 5. g3]
5. ... d6
6. g3 Nbd7 7. Bg2 e5 (diagram).
Contact is made at d4 and the two central squares on the e-file. White has a slightly better grip on the central light squares, while the central dark squares are evenly contested. Black's immediate threat of e5–e4, however, threatens to substantially alter the balance of power in the center. Although white could play d4–d5 and Nf3–g5–e6 to establish an outpost for the knight, white can easily neutralize this threat by exchanging his light squared bishop for the knight. In addition, the resulting black pawn chain h7–e4 both limits the mobility of white's light squared bishop, and improves the mobility of the black knights on the king side. Therefore, white must immediately exchange the central pawns that are in contact in order to have any prospects of retaining the initiative. It seems from the way this game developed subsequent to this exchange, and from several master level games, that white should prefer e6 to e5 as the square for exchanging his d–pawn for black's e–pawn. Having this point of contact deeper in black's territory presents white with a somewhat freer game than in this instance. Hence the move 7. d5 in my next game with The Prosecutor.
8. dxe5 Nxe5 9. b3 0–0 10. 0–0 Ng4 11. Bb2 Nxf3+ 12. Bxf3
12. ... f4 13. Rad1 Bf5
[13. ... Ne5 14. Bd5+
A) 14. ... Kh8 15. Bg2 f3 (15. ... fxg3 16. hxg3±) 16. exf3 Nxf3+ 17. Bxf3 Rxf3= B) 14. ...Nf7 15. gxf4 Qh4 16. Qe4 c6=]
[13. ... Qg5 14. Nb5 Qe7 15. c5 Bxb2 16. Qxb2±]

14. Qd2 fxg3 15. hxg3 Qe8?
[=15. ... Bc8 16. c5 Ne5 17. Bd5+ Kh8 18. f4±]

16. Nd5!?

16. ... Rf7 17. Bxg7 Rxg7

18. Qd4
[18. Qg5 with the same idea against f6, but more flexible. 18. ... Kh8! 19. e4=]
[18. c5!? dxc5 19. Qg5 Kh8 20. e4=]

18. ... Ne5 19. Qh4=

19. ... Nxf3+ 20. exf3 Qd8 21. Qd4

21. ... Qf8
[21. ... Rf7]

22. Rfe1
[22. g4]

22. ... Rf7 23. Re3
[23. g4 Bc8]

23. ... c6 24. Nf4?

24. ... Rd8 25. Qc3

25. ... Re7
[25. ... g5 26. Nd3 Re7 27. Qd4 d5=]

26. Kg2
[26. Rxe7]

26. ... Rxe3
[26. ... b6]

27. fxe3 Qe7 28. g4 Bc8 29. Rh1 Qe5 30. Qe1
[30. Ne2]

30. ... Re8 31. Qh4?
[31. Qd2]

31. ... Qg7
[31. ... Re7=]

32. Qf2 Qc3 ½–½
Playing by the Numbers

I determined through looking through several games from master play, as well as my experiences in the Taxing Quad game, that white more often gained an advantage when he or she plays d4-d5 before white advances the e-pawn. Below I present several of the games I had gone over in the process of coming to this conclusion. In addition to examining other games, I performed statistical analysis of white’s relative success after each of the candidate moves on move 7. I present this analysis in the notes to the feature game in this chapter (below). This analysis, however, was focused on the predicted position that occurred after black’s move 6 (diagram). This analysis does not quite answer the more basic, and probably more instructive question of how white’s performance improves when the d-pawn advance precedes black’s advance of the e-pawn. Closely related is the question of how advancing the d-pawn compares to capturing the e-pawn on e5 (dxe5 rather than dxe6 e.p., or no exchange of white d-pawn for black e-pawn).

Chess Base offers remarkable capabilities for performing such statistical analysis. In a matter of a few seconds, the program can find all games in a selected database in which a particular maneuver occurs. In the core database for this research—over 3300 games classified A86-A891—white’s scoring percentage is 56%.

---

1 The core database was downloaded from the PGN archive at the University of Pittsburgh “Pitt Chess Archives” <http://www.pitt.edu/~schach/Archives/index2.html>. Some duplicate and misclassified games
that is 38% wins + ½ of 35% draws. Comparing this baseline to games where white
captures the e-pawn on e5 (dxe5) during the first 25 moves suggests this maneuver may
not be in white’s favor. White scores under 52% (51.55) in such games. Pushing the d-
pawn, whether before or after white advances the e-pawn, improves white’s score. White
wins a higher percentage of games pushing the pawn after black’s e-pawn advance
(42.42) than before black’s advance (41.07), but relative to losses does better playing d5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>games</th>
<th>white wins</th>
<th>draw</th>
<th>black wins</th>
<th>white score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entire database</td>
<td>3386</td>
<td>1297 .38</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>910 .27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white d-pawn captures</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>175 .33</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>159 .30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the e-pawn on e5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white advances the</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>56 .42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>36 .27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-pawn after black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has advanced the e-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white advances the</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>343 .41</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>188 .23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-pawn prior to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black advancing the e-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

before black pushes the pawn (1.82:1) than after (1.55:1). Capturing the pawn on e5 does
less well (1.10:1) than in the database as a whole (1.43:1), and substantially less well than
pushing the pawn. Of course, such statistical analysis does not substitute for concrete
analysis of specific positions. But this data does reinforce my impression from a limited
number of sample games that advancing the d-pawn before white plays e7-e5 is worth
considering.

were removed from this database, and several hundred games from the past few years were added. In
addition to 3344 games classified as A86-A89, I have included 2 games with an ECO classification of A80,
7 A81, 6 A84, and 27 A85. Black plays g6 in all of these additional games, followed by Bg7 in all but one.
For an example of an A84 game that should not be excluded from surveys on the Leningrad Dutch, see
Kramnik - Illescas Cordoba in the Supplemental Games below.
Lessons from the Masters

(13) Braun, P. – Galdunts, S. [A87]
Schwabisch Gmund (Germany), 1996
annotated by Wulebgr

1. d4 f5 2. g3 Nf6 3. Bg2 g6 4. c4 Bg7 5. Nf3 0–0 6. Nc3 d6 7. d5 Na6 (diagram)
12 games 42%–41–17 (W–D–L for white)

8. Nd4

[8. 0–0
A) 8. ... Qe8
A1) 9. Rb1 Bd7 10. b4 c6 11. Qb3
Kh8 12. Ba3 Ne7 13. b5 c5 14. Rbd1
h6 15. Bb2 g5 16.e4 ½–½ Gavrikov–Kindermann,1995
A1a) 16. ... Ng4 17. exf5 Bxf5 18.
Rfe1 Qd7 19. h4 gxh4 20. Nxe4 Bd4
21. Re2=
A1b) 16. ... fx e4 17. Nd2 (17. Ne1 Bf5
18. Nc2e6 19. dxe6 Qxe6 20. Ne3 B g6
21. f3=) 17. ...Bg4 18. Rfe1 e5 19.
dxe6= Nxe6= Fritz
A1c) 16. ... Nxe4 17. Nxe4 (17. Nd2
Nxd2 18. Rxd2 f4 19. b6 Na6 20. gxf4
Rx e6 21. bxa7 Rxa7=) 17. ...fxe4 18.
Nd2 Bg4 19. Bxg7+ Kxg7 20. Rde1
e5 21. dxe6=
A2) 9. Be3 9. ... c5 10. Qc2 h6 11. Rad1 g5 12. Bc1 Qh5 13. e3 Rf7 14. a3 Bd7
B) 8. ... Nc5
Nd4 Nc3=±
B3) 9. Nd4 9. ... a5 10. b3 Bd7 11.
Bb2 Qc8= 1–0 Bartels–Becx, 1987]

A) 10. ... e5!? (diagram) 11. dxe6 (11.
0–0 Re8 15.Rad1=) 11. ... Bh6 12. e3
Bxe6 13. h3= Nf6=;
B) 10. ... Nf6 11. Rd1 c5 12. dxc6
bxc6=
(14) Bany, J – Pytel, K [A87]
Jadwisin, 1985
annotated by Wulebgr

1. Nf3 f5 2. d4 Nf6 3. g3 g6 4. Bg2 Bg7 5. c4 0–0 6. Nc3 d6 7. d5 c6 8. Nd4 (diagram) [8. 0–0 363 games 38%–42%–20 see main line 7. 0–0]

8. ... cxd5


Qd2 Nxd5 22. Qxg5 Bf6 23. Qe3 Qxa2 24. h4 Qa4 25. h5 Qd4 26. Qe6+ Kg7 27. e4 fxe4 28. Bxe4 Qe5 29. hxg6 hxg6 30. Qg4 Qh5 31. Qd7 Rc4 32. Rfe1 Rb4 33. Kg2 Rh8 34. Rh1 Qe5 35. Bf3 Qf5 36. Qxf5 gxf5 37. Rhe1 Rxb2 38. Rxb2 Bxb2 39. Rb1 Bd4 40. Rb7 Kf6 41. Rh4 Ke5 42. Rh7 Kf6 43. Rb4 Bc5 44. Ra4 Rh8 45. Ra2 Rh1 46. Re2 a5 47. Bh5 a4 48. Re6+Kg7 49. Rxe7+ Kh6 50. Be2 a3 51. Be4 Rc1 0–1

(15) Ooi, C. – Vescovi, [A86]
Szeged (Hungary), 1994

Wulebgr takes the Lead!

Perhaps the lawyer misplayed this game, as he suggested near the end. But I think it is one of my better games. His most obvious mistakes, it seems to me, occurred after the game was already lost.

(16) Wulebgr (1526) – The Prosecutor (1627) [A87]
email match, 2002
annotated by Wulebgr

1. Nf3 f5 2. d4 Nf6 3. c4 d6 4. Nc3 g6 5. g3 Bg7 6.Bg2 0–0 7. d5 (diagram)
The novelty for me that resulted from my opening study. This move occurs in 56 games in one database with the results: 43%–34–23. Move percentages (score for white W–D–L) are derived from the games in a Leningrad Dutch database (3226 games): dutlenpg.zip at <http://www.pitt.edu/~schach/Archives/index2.html>. From a set of larger databases, I have identified 268 games that reached the diagram position with the slightly more modest results for white of 40%–30–30.
7. 0–0 2089 games 37%–34–29
7. Bg5 68 games 43%–31–26
7. Bf4 3 games 0%–33–67
7. b3 Nc6 (7. ... c6 8. Bb2 Na6 2 games 50%–0–50) 8. 0–0 44 games 36%–37–27
7. b4 0 games
7. Qb3 0 games
7. Qc2 1 game 0%–0–100
7. ... Nbd7 8. b3 e5 9. dxe5 Nxe5 10. 0–0 transposes into Stripes–Korsmo, Taxing Quads 2002.

7. ... e5
[7. ... Na6 12 games 42%–41–17 see Braun–Galdunts 1996; 7. ... c5 17 games 47%–24–29. Other moves in this database include 7...Qe8 (3 games), 7...Nbd7 (4 games), and 7...a5 (3 games). The total equals more than the 56 games mentioned above because of move order transpositions. The text move is absent from the original Leningrad Dutch database, although it was played in three other games found in the CM7000 database (500,000 games). I include these three games in footnotes below. In the larger group of 268 games, from the diagram position black played 7. ... e5 eight times.]

8. dxe6 Bxe6
[8. ... Nc6³]
[8. ... c6³]
9. Qb3!
[9. Ng5⁴]
9. ... Nbd7 10. Be3
10. ... Nb6
[Fritz prefers 10. ... Ng4 11. Bd4 Bxd4 and here I would have played 12. Nxd4,

2 Remlinger-Shabalov, 1993 continued:
3 Meduna-Torounova, 1996 continued:
4 Meduna-Lechtynsky, 1993 continued:
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expecting 12. ... Nc5 13. Nxe6 Nxb3 14. Nxd8÷

11. Bxb6
   [11. Nd2 c6 12. 0–0=]
11. ... axb6 12. Ng5 Bf7
   [12. ... Bc8? 13. c5+ d5 14. Bxd5+ Nxd5 15. Nxd5–]
13. Bxb7 Ra5?!
I gave this move! prior to working out some of the lines that follow my move 15. The lawyer's move seems to mobilize his rook and create some counterplay, but I was able to trap the piece and neutralize black's threats.
   [Fritz prefers 13. ... Ra7]
14. Nxf7
   [14. 0–0 Re5 15. Nxf7 Rxf7 16. Bd5 Nxd5 17. Nxd5 Qg5± (17. ... c6 18. Ne3 Qg5 19. Qxb6±) ]
14. ... Rxf7 15. Nb5!
A surprise! The Prosecutor, "Note for the record that I did not say it was a good move, only an unexpected one!" So, let us be clear for the record here: it is a good move.
   [15. Rd1 Qe8 16. 0–0±]

15. ... Qe8
   [15. ... Ne4 16. Bd5 Nc5 17. Qe2; after the anticipated 15. ... Kh8!? (diagram) I planned to play 16. c5 bxc5 (16. ... Qe8 17. cxd6±; 16. ... Re7 17. cxb6 cxb6±) 17. Nxd6 cxd6 18. Qxf7]
16. Qc2
   [16. Nxc7? Rxc7 17. c5+ Kh8–+]
16. ... Re7
   [16. ... Ng4 17. Bd5±; 16. ... Ne4 17. Bd5± (17. 0–0 c6±) ; 16. ... c6 17. Nxd6 (17. b4 Rxb5 18. cxb5 Rxb7 19. Qxc6=) 17. ... Qd7 18. Nxf7 Kxf7 19. Bxc6 Qxc6 20. 0–0±]
17. b4! (diagram)
   [17. 0–0 Rxe2=; 17. e3 c6 18. Nxd6 Qb8 19. b4 Ra7 20. 0–0 Raxb7 21. Nxb7 Rxh7±]
17. ... Ra4
   [△17. ... Rxb5 18. cxb5 Qxb5 19. a3]
18. a3 ±
   This quiet move seemed to be the key to maintaining the material advantage gained through the maneuvers that succeeded in trapping the black rook on the a-file. The alternative of grabbing the rook immediately allows black a potentially game winning counterattack. I also believed at the time I played it, based on the analysis below, that it was the only move. After the game I learned that Fritz likes Rb1.
   [18. Qxa4 Rx2+]
   A) 19. Kf1 Ng4
       A2) 20. Bd5+ 20. ... Kh8±;
           23. Kb1 Qd3+ 24. Kc1 Qd2+ 25. Kb1 Qb2#) 21. ... Nxf2+ 22. Kc1 Nd3±]
18. ... d5 19. 0–0
   A) 20. ... Ng4 21. Bxd5+ Kf8 (21. ... Kh8 22. Nc3 Qxa4 23. Nxa4 Bxa1 24. h3
           Qa8 Rxf2+ 23. Kg1 Qxa8 24. Bxa8 Bxa1 25. Nxc7 Ke7 26. Nd5+ Kd6±) 22. ...
           Bxc3 23. Qxe8+ Rxe8 24. Rc1±;
   B) 20. ... c6
       B1) 21. Nc3 Re6
           B1a) 22. cxd5 Nxd5 23. Nxd5 Bxa1 24. Bxc6 Re1+ (24. ... Rxc6? 25. Qxc6 Qxc6
                26. Ne7+)+) 25. Kg2 Qe4+ 26. Kh3 Qg4+ 27. Kg2 Qe4= black can draw by
                repetition;
                27. Qa8+ Ne8=;
       B2) 21. Nc7 21. ... Qe4 22. Qa8+ Kg7 23. Kg1 Re1+ (23. ... Ng4?!→ 24. Bc6 Qc2
                30. Qe7+ Kh5 31. Qh4#) 24. Rx1 Qxe1+ 25. Kg2 Qe4+−]
19. ... Ng4
     20. ... Qxb7 21. cxd5 Nxd5 22. Rad1 c6 23. Nd6 Qb8 24. Qxc6−]
   [19. ... Ne4 20. Bxd5+]
20. Bxd5+ Kh8
     Bxa1 24. Rx1 Re7 25. Qa8 Qxa8 26. Bxa8−]
21. Qxa4 Bxa1
   [21. ... Rxe2 22. Nc3 Bxc3 23. Qxe8+ Rxe8 24. Ra2−]
22. Rxa1 c6
   [22. ... Rxe2 23. Qa8 Qxa8 24. Bxa8−]
23. Nd6−
     Qd4+ Kg8 28. Nf6++−;]
B) 23. ... Rxe2 24. Bxc6 Re1+ 25. Kg2
d；
C) 23. ... cxd5 24. Qxe8+ Rxe8 25. cxd5±
23. ... Qf8 24. Qxc6+ 25. Qa8+ Kg7 26. Qg8+ Kf6 27. Qh8+ Rg7 28. Ne8+ 1–0
Supplemental Games

Most of the games in this chapter are referred to in notes to some of the preceding games, but a couple have been added simply because I find them interesting. They are presented in order of ECO code.

(17) Wulebgr (1526) – The Prosecutor (1620) [A04]
email match (11) 2002
[Wulebgr]

1. Nf3 d6 2. c4 e5 3. d3
3. ... f5 4. g3 Nf6 5. Bg2 g6
   [5. ... Be7 6. b4?! 0–0 7. Bb2 a5 (7. ... e4) 8. Nbd2? (8. b5) 8. ... axb4 Wulebgr–MrSquid (BCL, 2002)]
6. b4
   [6. Nc3]
6. ... Bg7 7. Bb2 0–0 8. 0–0 c6
9. Qh3 Kh8 10. Nbd2
   [10. a4]
10. ... Na6 11. Rfd1
   [11. e4!? f4]
   [11. b5 Nc5 12. Qc2; 11. a3]
11. ... e4
   [\(\square\)11. ... f4]
12. dxe4 Nxe4
   [12. ... fx e4]
13. Bxg7+
   [\(\leq\)16. Nf1]
16. ... Bxe4 17. Qb2+
17. ... Kg8
18. Bxe4 Qb6 19. Rxd6?!
   [19. Bf3]
19. ... Qxf2+
   [19. ... Nxb4 20. Bf3]
20. Kh1 Rae8 21. Rd7
   [21. Bxg6 hxg6?? 22. Rg6+ Kh7  
    23. Qg7#]  
   [21. Bg2 Rxe2—+]  
21. ... Rf7 22. Rxf7 Kxf7
23. Bf3
23. ... Re3=?? 24. Qh8
24. ... Nxb4?! (The Prosecutor's evaluation)  
25. Qxh7+
25. ... Kf6 26. Qh4+
   [26. Qg8 Rxf3 27. Qf8+ Ke5 28. exf3 Kd4 29. Rc1 Qe3 30. Rb1 a5 31. c5]  
26. ... Kf7 27. Rd1 Nd3 28. Qh3
   [28. Qh7+ Kf6 29. Qh8+ Kf7; 28. Bg2]  
28. ... Rxf3 29. exd3\(\square\) Qe2 30. Rb1 b6 31. Qd7+
   [31. Qh7+ Kf6 32. Qh8+]  
31. ... Kg8 32. Rg1 Rf2 33. Qc8+ \(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\)
(18) Reshevsky, S – Hasenfuss, W [A80]
Kemeri, 1937


(19) Boidman, Y – Drill, F (2140) [A80]
Berlin, 1995


(20) Kramnik, V (2751) – Illescas Cordoba, M (2585) [A84]
Dos Hermanas, 1999

(21) Vincero (1562) – Wulebgr (1448) [A84]
Internet Chess Club, 2002
[Wulebgr]

1. d4 f5 2. c4 d6 3. Nc3 Nf6 4. g3 g6 5. Bg2 Bg7 6. Bg5
This sharp move does not win the percentage of games that might be expected.
[6. d5!?]
6. ... 0–0 7. e3 Qe8 8. Nge2 e5 9. 0–0
Compare position to Wulebgr–The Prosecutor, Taxing Quads, 2002. The pawn structure is identical but the queens are placed differently, as is one minor piece for each player.
32. ... Qf7 33. Rfx3 Qxf4
Black is now desperately fighting on in a hopeless position. But, as long as he can keep his pieces active, he might as well try. After all, this is a blitz game.
34. Qc3 Qg4+ 35. Rg3 Qd7 36. Qd4 Qe7 37. Qb4 Ra8 38. a4 Rf8 39. Qd4 Qf7 Hoping for Qf1#.
40. Qd3 Qf2+ 41. Kh1 Qe1+ 42. Rg1 Qf2 43. Qe2 Qf4 44. Kg2 Qe5 45. Nb5 Rf4 46. Rf1 Rh4 47. Qf3 [47. Kh1]
47. ... Qxh2# 0–1

(22) Khalifman, A (2615) – Salov, V (2655) [A86]
Reggio Emilia, 1991

(23) Crowl, F – Ozols, K [A86]
Australia ch–03, 1950


(24) Mednis, E – Santo–Roman, M [A86]
Cannes, 1995


(25) Karolyi, T (2432) – Lutz, C (2610) [A86]
Tel Aviv, 1999


(26) Kan, I – Kuzminykh [A87]
Leningrad, 1950

Qe6 Qc2+ 43. Kg1 Qc7 44. Kh2 d4 45. f6 Qc2+ 46. Ng2 Qxg6 47. Qd6+ Kf7 48. Qd5+ 1–0

(27) Oll, L (2595) – Topalov, V (2670) [A87]
Groningen, 1993


(28) Koehler, R (2245) – Bareev, E (2679) [A87]
Frankfurt, 1999


(29) Stoltz, G – Kostic, B [A88]
Bled (Slovenia), 1950

(31) Keres, P – Korchnoi, V [A89]
Moscow, 1952

1. c4 f5 2. Nf3 Nf6 3. g3 g6 4. Bg2 Bg7 5. Nc3 d6 6. d4 0–0 7. 0–0 Nc6 8. d5 Na5 9. Qa4
c5 10. dxe6 Nxe6 11. Rd1 Na5 12. c5 Bd7 13. Qa3 Ne8 14. Bg5 Be6 15. exd6 Nxd6 16.
Nd4 1–0

(32) Sceobo, A (2131) – De la Riva Aguado, O (2486) [A89]
Saint Vincent, 1999

Nxe5 dxe5 10. e4 fxe4 11. gxf4 exf4 12. e5 Ng4 13. e6 Ne5 14. Bg5 f3 15. Bxh6 g5 16. Re1
23. gxf6 Rg8 24. b3 h5 25. g5 hxg5 26. Rg1 Qxg5 27. Kf2 f3 28. gxf3 Kg7 29.
Qh5 Re8 30. Qg4 Qxe5 31. Qxe6 Rg8 32. Qe7 Rg8 33. Qf7 Rg8 34. Qg7 Rg8 35. Qh7 Rg8
36. Qg7 Rg8 37. Qh7 Rg8 38. Qg7 Rg8 39. Qh7 Rg8 40. Qg7 Rg8 41. Qh7 Rg8
42. Qg7 Rg8 43. Qh7 Rg8 44. Qg7 Rg8 45. Qh7 Rg8 46. Qg7 Rg8 47. Qh7 Rg8
48. Qg7 Rg8 49. Qh7 Rg8 50. Qg7 Rg8 51. Qh7 Rg8 52. Qg7 Rg8 53. Qh7 Rg8
54. Qg7 Rg8 55. Qh7 Rg8 56. Qg7 Rg8 57. Qh7 Rg8 58. Qg7 Rg8
59. Qh7 Rg8 60. Qg7 Rg8 61. Qh7 Rg8 62. Qg7 Rg8 63. Qh7 Rg8 64. Qg7 Rg8
65. Qh7 Rg8 66. Qg7 Rg8 67. Qh7 Rg8 68. Qg7 Rg8

And I end with a game that ends with an instructive technique.

(33) Illescas Cordoba, M (2555) – Bareev, E (2635) [A93]
Linares, 1992

1. d4 e6 2. Nf3 f5 3. g3 Nf6 4. Bg2 Be7 5. 0–0 0–0 6. c4 d5 7. b3 Ne6 8. Ba3 Bd7 9. Bxe7
29. e3 Nc5 30. Qc5 Qxc5 31. dxc5 Ne3 32. Rd2 a5 33. Bf5 Ne4 34. Rf2 Kg7 35. Kg2 g6
36. Bg4 Ke7 37. Be2 Kd8 38. f3 Nf6 39. Kh1 Kg7 40. Bc7 41. Bg4 Re8 42. Bf5 Ng5
43. Gxh5 g4 44. Rd2 a4 45. b4 Nxd3+ 46. Rxd3 Kb5 47. Rd4 a3 48. Kf3 h5 49. gxh5
gxh5 50. f5 Kg6 51. Kf4 h4 52. Kg5 h3 53. f6 Kg4 54. Kg5 Rh8 55. Rd1 h2 56. Rh1 Rh3
57. f7 Rf3+ 58. Kg6 Rg3+ 59. Kh6 Rf3 60. Kg7 Rg3+ 61. Kh7 Rf3 62. Kg8 Rg3+ 63.
Kg8 Kf6 64. Kg7 Kg3+ 65. Kh7 Rf3 66. Kg8 Rf3+ 67. Kg7 Rg3 (diagram) 68. e4 dxe4 69.
Ke8 Rh8+ 70. Rf8 Rxf8+ 71. Kxf8 Kxb4 72. Ke7 Kg5 73. Rxe2 e3 74. Kd7 Kd5 75. Rh5+
Kd4 76. Kxc6 Kc3 77. Kb5 1–0
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### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 0</td>
<td>- without 1. c4, 1. d4, 1. e4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 04</td>
<td>1. Nf3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- without 1... Nf6, 1... d5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Nf3 f5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Réti: Dutch Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 8</td>
<td>1. d4 f5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- without 2. c4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2. c4 without 2... Nf6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2... Nf6 without 3. g3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 3. g3 without 3... e6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>1. d4 f5 2. c4 Nf6 3. g3 e6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutch Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 80</td>
<td>1. d4 f5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- without 2. g3, 2. e4, 2. c4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 81</td>
<td>1. d4 f5 2. g3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutch: Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 84</td>
<td>1. d4 f5 2. c4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- without 2... Nf6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2... Nf6 without 3. Nc3, 3. g3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 85</td>
<td>1. d4 f5 2. c4 Nf6 3. Nc3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutch: Queen’s Knight, aka Rubenstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 86</td>
<td>1. d4 f5 2. c4 Nf6 3. g3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- without 3... g6, 3... e6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 3... g6 without 4. Bg2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 4... Bg7 without 4... Bg7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 4... Bg7 without 5. Nf3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. d4 f5 2. c4 Nf6 3. g3 g6 4. Bg2 Bg7 5. Nh3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutch: Leningrad (Karlsbad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 87</td>
<td>1. d4 f5 2. c4 Nf6 3. g3 g6 4. Bg2 Bg7 5. Nf3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- without 5... 0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 5... 0-0 without 6. 0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 6. 0-0 without 6... d6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 6... d6 without 7. Nc3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 7. Nc3 without 7... c6, 7... Nc6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. d4 f5 2. c4 Nf6 3. g3 g6 4. Bg2 Bg7 5. Nf3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutch: Leningrad (Warsaw)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 88</td>
<td>1. d4 f5 2. c4 Nf6 3. g3 g6 4. Bg2 Bg7 5. Nf3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutch: Leningrad (Matulovic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a name recognized only in this pamphlet
7. d5 Index of Variations

1. d4 f5 2. g3 Nf6 3. Bg2 g6 4. c4 Bg7 5. Nf3 0–0 6. Nc3 d6 7. d5 c6
[7. ... Na6

A) 8. 0–0
   A2) 8. ... Nc5 9. Nd4 (9. Be3 1–0 Gheorghiu–Kaenel) 9. ... a5 10. b3 Bd7
   12. ... g5 1–0 Rogozenko–Bogdan 1993.


C) 8. Nd4 Bd7 (8. ... Nc5 0–1 Ooi–Vescovi 1994) 9. 0–0 Qe8

[7. ... Na6 8. Nd4 (8. 0–0 ½–½ Rajkovic–Kontic 1994) 8. ... Nb6 (8. ... Ne5 0–1 Dolezal–Praszak 1990) 9. b3 1–0 Hausner–Mossong 1989).]
[7. ... Qe8 8. 0–0 e5 (8. ... a5 1–0 Meduna–Potapov 1993) 9. dxe6 1–0 Saidi–Wailand 1990.]
C) 9. Re1 Nc7 (9. ... e5 ½–½ Obradovic–Keserovic 1994; 9. ... Rb8 0–1 Nocke–Moor 1995) 10. e4 0–1 Tayvanbaatar–Munhbayar 1994.

[7. ... a5 ½–½ Mednis–Santo–Roman 1995]
[7. ... e5 1–0 Wulebgr–The Proscutor 2002]

8. 0–0

[8. Nd4

A) 8. ... Qb6 9. 0–0 1–0 Naumkin–Berkovich 1986.


D) 8. ... cxd5 0–1 Bany–Pytel 1985

8. ... e5

[8. ... Qa5 ½–½ Gheorghiu–Lombardy 1979.]
[8. ... cxd5 ½–½ Thorhallsson–Kontic 1988.]
[8. ... Qb6 1–0 Ginsburg–Neihoff 1988.]

9. dx6 Bxe6 10. Qd3


10. ... Na6


11. Ng5


11. ... Bc8

[11. ... Nb4 1–0 Knoetsch–Jovanovic 1994]
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