

Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov, Part 1: 1973-1985

Pages: 520

Publisher: Everyman Chess (November 22, 2011)

Format: pdf, epub

Language: English

[[DOWNLOAD FULL EBOOK PDF](#)]

First published in 2011 by Gloucester Publishers plc (formerly Everyman Publishers plc), Northburgh House, 10 Northburgh Street, London EC1V 0AT Copyright © 2011 Garry Kasparov English translation © 2011 Ken Neat First published 2011 by Gloucester Publishers plc The right of Garry Kasparov to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyrights, Designs and Patents Act 1988. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission of the publisher. British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library. ISBN: 978 185744 752 1 Distributed in North America by The Globe Pequot Press, P.O. Box 480, 246 Goose Lane, Guilford, CT 06437-0480. All other sales enquiries should be directed to Everyman Chess, Northburgh House, 10 Northburgh Street, London EC1V 0AT tel: 020 7253 7887 fax: 020 7490 3708 email: info@everymanchess.com website: www.everymanchess.com Everyman is the registered trade mark of Random House Inc. and is used in this work under license from Random House Inc. Everyman Chess Series Chief advisor: Byron Jacobs Commissioning editor: John Emms Assistant editor: Richard Palliser Translation by Ken Neat. Typesetting and editing by First Rank Publishing, Brighton. Cover design by Horatio Monteverde. Contents [Foreword](#) [1 Baku Universities Childhood Years First Steps Entry into the all-union Arena 'He attacks like Alekhine!' 'Who will be the Champion after Karpov?' Meetings with the Greats Young Champion Two-times Champion! Turning Point](#) [2 Adult Games Master Class Smile of Fortune High Society Debut 'This is the new Fischer!' First 'Bronze' European 'Gold' Grandmaster Chess Prince Olympiad Debut First Battle with the Champion Moscow 'Tournament of Stars' Audacious Challenge Confirmation of Class Tilburg Lessons USSR Champion Dress Rehearsal](#) [3 Challenger Decisive Finish First 'Oscar' Match with Beliavsky Riga Novelty Fairy-tale in Niksic Match with Korchnoi Match with Smyslov 'Return Match of the Century' First Match with Karpov: 1984/85](#) [Index of Games](#) **Foreword** The autobiographical three-volume *Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov* is a continuation of the series *My Great Predecessors* (Parts I-V) and *Modern Chess* (Parts 1-4). Initially I was intending simply to annotate about three hundred of my best games, dividing them into three volumes in accordance with the stages of my competitive career: the pre-champion period (1973-1985), the time when I was champion within the FIDE framework (1985-1993) and the years outside of FIDE (1993-2005). But then I realised that to complete the picture I needed to include not only the best, but also the most memorable games and endings, which became landmarks on my chess career (although some of them have already been annotated in previous books). Throughout my life it has been said that I won mainly thanks to deep and comprehensive opening preparation. Thereby – deliberately or otherwise – my ability to play creatively at the board itself was disparaged. 'I don't know another player who would prepare so thoroughly for a match or a tournament. In this respect he surpasses even the legendary Botvinnik', Anatoly Karpov once said about me. In fact, without the ability to play creatively at the board, nothing can be achieved, whereas the art of preparation has

been a distinguishing feature of many world champions and has always furthered the progress of chess thinking. In the 1920s Alekhine worked at chess more persistently than anyone before him in history, and as a result the entire culture of the 'amateur game' sharply improved. In the 1940s Botvinnik's methodical mind and scientific approach assisted the transformation of chess into a genuine profession. In the 1970s Fischer's fantastic enthusiasm for analytical work forced any player who did not want to 'miss the boat' to devote more time to theoretical preparation. In the 1980s, when I became the leader of the new opening revolution, the need for such preparation was already axiomatic. I grew up in an atmosphere of strict discipline, created by my mother. My chess outlook was formed at the school of Mikhail Botvinnik, and my opening repertoire developed under the influence of my trainers – the outstanding analysts Alexander Nikitin and Alexander Shakarov. Apart from an innate combinative gift, from childhood I possessed an unlimited appetite for analytical work. I studied all the latest games of the leading grandmasters, recorded novelties and analysed critical positions, trying to find improvements. The choice of a particular opening system was always the fruit of deep creative processing, and certainly not blind imitation. Later, in the period when I was fighting for the world crown, my circle of analytical helpers expanded, but as before I tirelessly generated my own ideas. And when personal computers appeared, I was the first player to include machine analysis in my system of preparation and to make systematic use of playing programs and databases. Soon I discovered how weak some of my earlier preparations had been. A useful, sobering discovery! Under the microscope of powerful computer programs it transpired that at times I had gone along to a game not with a some kind of Excalibur, but with a blunt pen-knife. Nevertheless, my intensive preparation was invariably rewarded with good results, even when by no means all the ideas were used. Between labour invested and success achieved there always exists if not a direct connection, then some almost mythical one. Probably also a psychological one: after all, every time when beginning a battle, I thought that I possessed some 'deadly weapon', and this gave me confidence, even if the weapon was unused or proved to be altogether ineffective. This volume contains one hundred newly annotated games and endings. It is partly based on my first book *The Test of Time* (1986). In the preface to it Botvinnik wrote: 'Kasparov is on the right path: analyses of games should be published by a player not only to afford pleasure to the readers, but also, by putting forward the results of his work to their strict judgement, to be able to use the readers' criticisms to check the objectivity of his searchings. This is an essential step for anyone who wishes to become a researcher in chess. In this way creative and competitive successes can be raised, and the very maximum possible "squeezed" out of his talent...' The large amount of annotation work done then was, of course, not free of analytical mistakes, and in addition the rapid progress of opening theory has changed the assessments of numerous variations. Therefore a number of annotations had to be significantly refined and amplified, and some shortened. As Botvinnik anticipated, 'not all the games have survived'. But on the whole my earlier conclusions have withstood the test of time. *I should like to express my gratitude to my former trainers Alexander Nikitin and Alexander Shakarov for their help in preparing the manuscript for publication.*

Chapter One Baku Universities Childhood Years It is the spring of 1963. In Moscow, in the Estrada Theatre, the Botvinnik-Petrosian match for the world championship is taking place, and in Baku Vladimir Makogonov, trainer in the chess section of the Regional Officer's Club, is carefully analysing each game with his pupils. Valery Asriyan: *'In early April, when the scores were level, I asked Makogonov who, in his opinion, would win the match. "Petrosian", he replied without thinking. "And who will be champion in 10 years time?" I ventured to ask. "Probably Fischer", said Makogonov after a slight pause. "And in 20 years time?", I jokingly enquired. Vladimir Andreevich smiled: "You are wanting to look too far ahead. It is possible that the player who will be world champion in 20 years time has not yet been born". Of course, it was hard to imagine that just a few days later, 13th April, would see the birth in Baku of a boy, whom his parents would name Garry and who within 22 years would become world champion!*'

Strictly speaking, I could have been born a day later, since I came into this world at a quarter to midnight. In a sense my mother would have preferred this to happen. But I was nevertheless born on the 13th day of the 4th month of the year 63 (again $4+6+3=13$) and, contrary to all superstitions, for me this has proved a lucky number. So much so, that I even became the 13th world champion,

and, moreover, after an unscheduled match for the title, which took place in the year of 85 ($8+5=13$). The origin of my name is curious. This was one of the strong-willed decisions of my father, which influenced my fate and my character. *'My name is Kim – short, and rather voiceless'*, said my father, *'whereas a boy's name should be resounding. Let it be pronounced firmly, let there be a letter 'r'. We will call our son Garry!'* Baku was the capital of Soviet Azerbaijan, a typical outpost of the imperial state. A kind of large 'Odessa on the Caspian' – a melting-pot of different nationalities, united by the common Russian language and the dominating Russian-Soviet culture. My own roots are no exception: my mother was Armenian, and my father Jewish. This is sometimes called an explosive mixture. At any event, I think that I inherited both the sensible pragmatism of my mother, and the capricious, creative nature of my father – and it was a combination of these traits that determined the atmosphere in our home. My father, Kim Moiseevich Weinstein, grew up in a family of musicians. He had an excellent ear and he studied the violin at music school, but then he entered the Azerbaijan Industrial Institute and became an electrical engineer, and later the author of scientific articles and an almost completed dissertation. Five years later my mother, Klara Shagenovna Kasparova, completed a course at the same Institute, but in a different faculty, and after obtaining her engineer's diploma on the speciality 'automatic equipment and remote control', in the autumn of 1959 she joined the laboratory where my father was then working. It was there that they met. My parents had a wide range of interests in common – books, music, theatre, cinema – and chess! Both my mother and my father had learned to play when they were young, and they loved solving the studies and problems published in the Baku *Vyshka* newspaper. In the early 1960s my father changed jobs and began working in a specialised construction bureau associated with the oil industry, where chess was also especially popular. It can be said that, from the first days of my life, chess fluids were floating around me. The biographies of famous chess players usually begin with some remarkable episode from their early childhood. Thus the young Capablanca and Reshevsky, without knowing the rules of chess and by simply watching the game being played in their family, suddenly began defeating their fathers. Karpov was introduced to chess in the same way, although his father was a much stricter examiner (this was, after all, the Soviet Chess School!). I will not break with tradition and I will also begin with my early childhood. My relatives recall that I began walking at 10 months – and I immediately became resolute and free. But even before that I displayed exceptional tenacity in achieving a goal. Once my grandmother sat me down with toys in my cot and went off to the kitchen to prepare dinner. But I got bored and, overcoming all the obstacles, I gradually crawled my way to the kitchen, where there was my favourite folding chair. My grandma was surprised and carried me back. Within ten minutes I crawled in again... My grandma wondered: 'How many times will he do this?' But in the end she lost count and merely repeated: 'There's character for you!' It is said that I was a very self-sufficient child: I could play for hours in a sand pit with a bucket and spade. And when I started talking, I loved a game called 'Why?' The idea of the game was to put an adult on the spot, by making them unable to find a reply to this eternal question. And often, cheerfully smiling, I would exasperate those around by endlessly asking 'Why?'. Very early I learned the importance of numbers and once I surprised my relatives by being able to distinguish on the street where the even and odd-numbered houses were. Like all the children, I went to the kindergarten, but I was very unwilling and I was often unwell – this was obviously a defensive reaction of the organism. But if I had to go there, I used to display a feeling of responsibility and innate punctuality. I was usually taken to the kindergarten by my grandma, and if she were to linger carelessly at home, when the hour hand on the wall clock inexorably began approaching the figure '8' I would become terribly nervous and begin crying: 'Grandma, I'm going to be late!' I began reading at the age of four, and I learned to put letters together to make syllables – from newspaper headlines. I knew that, before we went out for a walk, my father would look at the newspapers, and I would patiently wait for him to finish. When a newspaper was put to one side, I would promptly unfold it and with a most serious expression I would also unhurriedly 'look at it'. My desire to imitate everything my father did was a source of great amusement to my parents, and in this way I was introduced to 'reading' newspapers. And soon, during one of our walks, sitting on my father's shoulders, I saw on the roof of a building some large neon letters. I pointed with my index finger and slowly

pronounced the syllables: 'Dru-zhba' ('Friendship' – this was our local cinema). When I was unwell, I spent long days in bed, and reading completely replaced my toys. On one occasion, roughly a year later, I staggered a visiting friend of my mother, when she saw me reading a newspaper aloud: 'Po-lo-zhe-ni-e v Ka-i-re' ('Situation in Cairo'). And then the whole article to the end. When she asked if I remembered what I had read, I told her everything I knew from the newspapers about the situation in the Middle East. I had an exceptional memory. When I was not yet able to read, I would remember by heart all the stories that had been read aloud to me, and later I would enthusiastically retell them. And when I learned to read without hesitating, I would do this very quickly and grasp everything. A passion for books, like some kind of spiritual greed, has always possessed me. My innate chess gift revealed itself at the age of five, when my parents, sitting at the table, were racking their brains over the regular problem in the *Vyshka* newspaper. As usual, I was sitting beside them, attentively following the movements of the pieces. I didn't yet know how to play, but I knew the point of the Latin letters and numbers along the edge of the board. And at some point I suddenly suggested the solution of a difficult problem, which greatly amazed my parents. *'If you know how the game ends, we'll have to show you how it begins!'* my father exclaimed, and he began explaining the rules. Soon I was inseparable from chess, and a year later I was already beating my father. Had I not shown an ability for chess at that time, I might well have gone to music school. This is what my paternal grandmother Olga Yulevna, a music teacher, was very much hoping. Her husband and my grandfather, Moisey Rubinovich Weinstein, who died prematurely in the summer of 1963, was a composer, conductor and violinist, and worked as artistic director of the Baku Philharmonia. They thought that a musical education for a child was essential, even if he did not have perfect pitch. *'The main thing is a sense of rhythm'*, Olga Yulevna used to say. *'That's how it was with Lyona, whose musical talent only emerged when he was eleven.'* And how it emerged! In contrast to my father, his younger brother, my uncle Leonid Weinstein, did not give up music, but completed a course at the Conservatoire and became a well-known composer, an Honoured Artist in Azerbaijan. He composed several operas and symphonies, numerous chamber and vocal works, musical operettas, variety pieces, three dozen songs, and music for the theatre, cinema and television, and when he was a student he was a member of the legendary Baku group who in 1967-68 were the champions of a popular national TV competition. (Incidentally, his son Teimour, my younger cousin, although he studied medicine, was the artistic director of the 'Lads from Baku' group, who were famous in the 1990s. Nowadays he is a prominent Russian TV and film producer.) My father was categorically against me attending the music school. *'The boy has an excellent analytical brain'*, he said. *'He will study chess, not music!'* It was an unexpected decision: after all, my father had never been a serious chess player, whereas my mother had a definite talent for the game. At the age of six she used to beat boys older than herself, and she also competed successfully with adults. But she preferred more active games. When she was in the eighth class, a trainer visited her parents and tried to persuade them to allow their daughter to play for the republic basketball team. But my grandmother would not allow it: she did not like the idea of the inevitable travelling that it would entail. So my mother did not take up either chess, or basketball. But she firmly supported my father's decision to take me to the chess club. There is no doubt that, during the seven short years that fate granted us to live together, my father managed to exert an enormous influence on my entire future life. My mother recalls how I literally used to keep watch at the door, waiting for him to return from work, and with what joy I went for walks with him. It was during those hours that my father gradually instilled in me his own perception of life, and laid the foundations of my future outlook on things. Our relationship was always adult-like. My father loved geography and on my 6th birthday he gave me the best possible present. When I woke that morning I discovered by my bed an enormous globe. And I even rubbed my eyes, not believing that it was real. I was so happy! Already then I loved looking at maps, and above all hearing stories about the journeys of Marco Polo, Columbus and Magellan. It all began when my father read me *Conqueror of the Seas – the Story of Magellan* by Stefan Zweig. From then on our favourite game was to trace on my globe the routes followed by famous seafarers. Soon I knew the names of the capitals of most countries, their populations, land areas and masses of other interesting facts. On one occasion at Baku airport, waiting with my

parents to board a plane, I overheard one of the passengers incorrectly naming the capital of Uruguay – and I politely listed all, without exception, the Latin American countries and their capitals. It was only my mum and dad who were not surprised – they, like all our relations, were already accustomed to my daily questions such as: ‘Do you know what the population of Guatemala is?’ Real stories about pioneers entranced me more than any fairy-tales. Although my father did not draw attention to the terrible misfortunes and hardships associated in those times with seafaring, I realised that to accomplish such a journey, incredible courage was needed. These stories awakened the pioneering spirit in me. I have always wanted to lay new paths, even if, as in childhood, it only meant taking a new way home. Throughout my chess career I aimed for unexplored tests by challenging existing stereotypes. This is how important the timely present of a globe can be... (Later this globe became a relic and was displayed in the geography room of my former school.) Equally early – this time thanks to my mother – I developed an interest in history. Unable to do anything by halves, I immersed myself in the history of Ancient Rome, France, Spain and England. It was those countries that fired my imagination. At the age of eight I read a book about Napoleon by the Soviet historian Tarle, which made an enormous impression on me. I have always been attracted by the biographies of strong individuals who forged their own destinies. In the summer of 1970 my father fell seriously ill. He spent many months in Moscow, at the Oncology Centre in Kashirka, then he died of lymphatic sarcoma at the age of 39. The last time I saw him was on 1st January 1971. He gave me a present of a chess clock – I had just achieved third category rating. After that they would not let me see him. It was my father’s wish: he wanted me to remember him healthy and cheerful, as I had always known him. They also did not take me to the funeral, fearing that it might upset me too much. I remember saying to my mother: ‘Let’s pretend that dad has gone away on business.’ And at school for a long time I continued talking about him as though he was still alive... But years later there came a bitter realisation. When you’re five or six, you think that’s how it will always be: your dad, and your mum, and life the way it is. But then suddenly you wake up and you realise that your dad is no longer there. My father was a man of firm principles, uncompromising, and I am glad that I have inherited these traits. I always have with me a photograph of him. By the age of thirty I became outwardly very similar to him. My relatives think that, when speaking on the phone, I gesticulate exactly how my father used to; and like him I easily get worked up, but just as quickly I come back to normal. The two of us were left on our own, so my mother and I moved in with her parents in Armenikenda – an ancient district of Baku, where since time immemorial and until the tragedy of January 1990 there was a large Armenian community. Our address was Yerevan Prospect, block 3. My other grandmother, Susanna Bagdasarovna, completed a course at the Moscow Finance Institute, but she worked for only a short time in her speciality (for the State Bank in the 1930s), and she devoted the greater part of her life to bringing up her three daughters – Klara, Nelly and Zhanna, and then me. She taught me to be truthful, to trust people, and to appreciate any human creation. A strict woman of strong character and good sense, my grandmother enjoyed universal love and respect. Although she had lived through hard times, she never lost her natural optimism and kindness. When I remember today the words that she liked to repeat: *‘It’s wonderful that all my grandchildren are of different nationalities’*, I admire her wisdom. Among my cousins there are Armenians, Azeris and Jews. But my grandmother did not single any of us out, preserving the right of each of us to her warmth and love. My maternal grandfather, Shagen Mosesovich Kasparov, was an oil worker by profession. Back in 1949 on the Caspian Sea, 100 km from Baku, they began extracting oil from the sea bed, for the first time in the world erecting offshore derricks. And by the end of the 1950s directly on the water, on piles and stationary platforms, joined by gantries, the unique town of Neftyanie Kamni had developed. At the age of nine I gave a simul’ there against oil-workers, which gave Shagen Mosesovich particular pleasure: for a good twenty years he had worked as the chief engineer of a large offshore oil field. After my father died, my grandfather retired and he was with me throughout my school years. We became very close. He was an old communist, he revered Marx’s economic theory, and he believed that I would live in better times. Towards the end of the 1970s he spent hours talking to me about politics, and he introduced me to books on philosophy. We often argued about the various events occurring in the country and in the world, and it was not

always the older person who won the argument. I was a very inquisitive youth; I read dozens of books, to say nothing of newspapers, I listened to the seditious recordings of songs by Vysotsky, Galich and Okudzhava, I asked a mass of questions and on much I had my own point of view. But my grandfather did not greatly approve of this spirit of defiance. Although we listened together on the radio to 'Freedom' and 'Voice of America', he found it hard to accept criticism of the state ideology. We had an especially heated debate at the end of 1979, after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. But even my 'sincerely believing' grandfather could no longer understand much of what the country's leaders were doing. The endless queues and empty shelves in the shops, resembling the post-war times, became a great disappointment to him... Nikitin: *'I often had occasion to visit the Kasparov home, where the ambience of Klara's parents reigned – Shagen Mosesovich and Susanna Bagdasarovna. The time spent with these calm and wise people is remembered now as a joyous dream. They instilled much good in the heart of their favourite grandson.'* Incidentally, my late paternal grandfather was also a convinced communist. It was no accident that he gave his first son the revolutionary name Kim – in honour of the Communist Youth International (Kommunisticheskiy Internatsional Molodyozhi). Despite the fact that in 1937 his older brother, the chief of medical staff in one of the Baku hospitals, was subjected to repression and my grandfather himself was a whisker away from being killed, he retained his ideological convictions and his devotion to the Communist Party. But after the exposures expressed at the 20th Communist Party Congress, he suffered a severe heart attack... In the family circle, however, Moisey Rubinovich was essentially alone. His sons Kim and Leonid (later he too had a great influence on me), his nephew Marat Altman (a prominent lawyer), and their friends were typical representatives of the intelligentsia: they always queried the official viewpoint and were very critical about Soviet propaganda. For them it was quite natural to have doubts about generally-accepted values. My mother's scepticism was more a consequence of her analytical mind, rather than mistrust of officialdom. Far more than ideology, she was concerned about purely practical problems. She did not teach me what I should think, but that I should have a critical attitude to everything that I read and heard. Her technical education and work in a scientific research institute instilled in her the habit of always relying only on concrete, trustworthy facts. After spending 22 long years advancing from junior technician to section manager and scientific secretary, in 1981 she left the scientific research institute in order to devote herself entirely to her son's career. 'My mother plays a big part in my life', I wrote in a school essay. 'She has taught me to think independently, and she has taught me to work and to analyse my own behaviour. She knows me better than anyone else, because I discuss all my problems with her – school, chess and literary problems. My mother has taught me to appreciate fine things, and to be principled, honest and frank.' It was probably my father's and uncle's love of freedom, my mother's sensible thinking and the many years of heated discussions with my grandfather that determined my interest and serious attitude to politics throughout the entire politically conscious part of my life. My family did not spoil me, and there was no hint of imitating childish speech. They cultivated conviction. At that time my mother was trying to restrain my obstinate striving for chess, and not to pander towards it. When the first successes came and they began praising me in the press, she gave me 'inoculations' against conceit, suggesting: *'Everyone has a talent for something, but that talent doesn't always reveal itself. You are lucky that your abilities have shown themselves so early. Simply lucky!'* And she would give me jobs around the house, like sending me to the shop for bread and milk, or leaving me to look after my younger cousins. My mother also remembers being summoned to the school and talking to the teacher of the first-year classes, who reproached me for my cheeky behaviour in a lesson. I had tried to correct her! And to the comment that I shouldn't behave like that, since the rest would think that I regarded myself as the cleverest, I retorted: 'But isn't that so?' Yes, my teachers had a hard time with me. Later, when chess became my profession, I had hardly any free time. But before this, after lessons I would run around the streets, and quarrel and fight, like all little boys. At school my closest friend was Vadim Minasian, with whom I remained friends for many years. The number of times we got into scrapes together! But our most desperate escapades involved fires. On one occasion we lit a bonfire in the school itself and began jumping through it, to impress the girls... True, until I was sixteen I did not pay any particular attention to girls, treating them

disdainfully (although I was also a little afraid of them). I once asked my mother: 'Why do girls spend so long preparing for lessons? Why are they so narrow-minded? I hate them!' Now, when she tells this story, she adds with a gale of laughter: '*Six months later he fell in love.*' I remember that in the third year at school a girl sent me a note: '*I love you. And I want you to marry me.*' I'm afraid that my reply was not terribly gallant. Fortunately (or otherwise), my message was intercepted by the teacher before it broke my admirer's heart. But when I finally fell in love, the whole situation was reversed. She was younger than me and was in a different class, so I somehow had to attract her attention. But how? I gathered my friends and we played out a little show. They met her on the street and pretended to pester her. It was a critical moment. And then I appeared – a knight in shining armour, courageous and strong. Later I arranged a firework display in her honour, with real rockets! My health, or more correctly my illnesses, caused my mother a great deal of concern. At the age of nine I had my appendix removed. The day after the operation my uncle arrived at the hospital and found my bed empty. He was alarmed, but the nurse calmed him down and took him to the staff room. Looking in, he saw me lying on a trolley, giving a blindfold simul' against the doctors. When I was ten the doctors became concerned about my heart, and diagnosed rheumatic carditis. They said that I should avoid catching colds, as this might strain my heart. After that my mother learned how to give injections, and wherever we travelled she carried a syringe with her, since up to the age of fifteen I had to take antibiotics. Later, thanks to my sports activities, I was able to lead a normal life. I swam, played football and badminton, and went cycle racing... I began travelling abroad to chess tournaments from the age of thirteen. Before every trip I would prepare myself thoroughly for the unfamiliar country, eagerly absorbing all the information I could find and discussing it with my school teachers. I would return so full of impressions, that at first I couldn't sleep. And only after I had released my emotions, and told my classmates about everything I had seen, did I calm down. I remember being hugely impressed by the fact that in Paris you could sit on the grass in the parks. With my childish curiosity and the same thoughtfulness that I applied to chess, I would compare what I had seen with our everyday life. Occasionally this got me into trouble. Some adults reprimanded me for criticising my own country. But already then I knew that you should not be afraid to say exactly what you think. At school I found mathematics, especially algebra, quite easy. I enjoyed solving difficult problems. The teacher even tried to insist that I should take extra lessons with the aim of developing my mathematical ability, but my mother was against this. She thought that the combination of mathematics and chess was unlikely to lead to me becoming a fully-rounded person, and she wanted me to study literature, and to read not only prose, but also poetry. Life has shown that she was right. Deep down I am a romantic, a person of feeling, or at least that is how I see myself. This may seem surprising, but only to those who think that chess is mainly a science and that it is played by impassive, computer-like people. I firmly believe that the game of chess is an art, because, among other qualities, a chess player must have a well-developed and rich imagination. In view of their abstract character, chess, music and mathematics do not require a knowledge of the world and a great experience of life. And so at the age of five Reshevsky used to give simul's against adults, at the age of four Mozart was making compositions, the 12-year-old Pascal was drawing proofs of complex geometry theorems on the walls of his home, and a boy called Kim Ung Yong from South Korea was solving integral equations. There is a well-known theory that chess, music and mathematical abilities are linked to a powerful but narrowly specialised zone of our brain, and that in some way this zone goes into action in early childhood and develops independently of the brain as a whole. Well, this is quite possible. At any event, this theory explains the emergence of child prodigies. But to emerge, even their extraordinary gifts need favourable conditions! If Mozart's father had been, for example, a painter, and not a music teacher, we might never have heard about the brilliant composer. **First Steps** When I arrived for my first day at school on 1st September 1970 I was already able to read and to write in block capitals. The lady teacher handed everyone a sheet of paper and invited us to write or draw anything we wanted. And the first words that I wrote at school were: 'Party, world, mama'. I still have this sheet at home. At that time I was intending to become a medical officer: an officer – in order to fight, and a doctor – in order to save the wounded. But soon, when I was accepted into the chess club, such thoughts

no longer entered my head. For two years I played chess at school at the slightest opportunity. And after I began beating my father, my constant trainer became uncle Kotik – Konstantin Grigorian, the husband of my mother's sister Nelly. Later I even gave him a book with the inscription: 'To my first trainer'. My uncle recalls: *'Initially I won more often, but when Garik began going to the club it became increasingly hard to beat him. He made amazingly rapid progress, and within two or three months I was no longer able to win a single game – against a seven-year-old boy! And that was it – we stopped playing. In the only game we played later, Garik gave me odds (I think it was a whole rook), and in the end he had just his queen left, while I had my queen, some piece and a couple of pawns. Here he loudly exclaimed "check!" and made an unexpected queen move. With the words "well, no one ever died from a check", I moved my king, but Garik instantly – bang! – took my queen with his and won the game. It turned out that, in giving check, he had deliberately placed his queen en prise in the desperate hope that I would not notice. He really hated losing!'* It was uncle Kotik who on 3rd September went with me on a reconnaissance to the Pioneers Palace – to find out how and what. And later uncle Lyonya took me down and enlisted me in the chess club. At that time I had already moved in with my mother's parents, since my mother had flown to Moscow, where my father was in hospital. My grandfather proudly informed her by telephone that *'the trainer discovered Garik has phenomenal capabilities'*, but my mother, naturally, was not in the mood for compliments. When I first saw the Baku Pioneers Palace named after Yuri Gagarin – a white, two-storey building overlooking the Caspian Sea – it looked to me like some kind of fairy-tale chess castle. I was taken to my first lesson by Rostislav Korsunsky – he was six years older than me and lived in the neighbourhood. When I was a child my favourite piece was the bishop, and once Rostik and I played a unique type of match: in the initial position, apart from the kings and pawns, the only pieces I had were two bishops, and he had only two knights! Already in 1975 Korsunsky became a master (alas, in the mid-1990s he passed away). Incidentally, it should be said that apart from him there was a whole group of gifted chess players in Baku: the future grandmaster Elmar Magerramov, future international masters Mikhail Shur, Alexander Avshalumov and Elena Glaz (and also Boris Sheynin – the future father of the prominent grandmaster Teimour Radjabov). And earlier the chess section of the Pioneers Palace had trained more than 300 first category players, 25 candidate masters, a good dozen masters, the first Baku grandmaster Vladimir Bagirov, and the challenger for the title of lady world champion Tatiana Zatulovskaya. My first real chess teacher was Oleg Isaakovich Privorotsky, a strong candidate master and later an honoured trainer of the Azerbaijan Republic. He immediately noticed my chess memory and my ability to shut myself off from the outside world during a game. And after the first few lessons he remarked in surprise: *'I don't know whether there have been similar beginners in other towns, but there has been no one like him in Baku!'* Indeed, I easily solved the exercises given to the older children, within three months I had achieved third category rating, at the age of eight – second category, and at the age of nine – first category. In addition, in the initial classes I also went swimming. But on one occasion in the pool the trainer reproached me for turning up for training only fifty per cent of the time, and he demanded: *'You have to choose – either chess, or swimming.'* On returning home I shouted from the threshold: 'Mama, I've been told to choose one of two. I'm choosing chess!' Years later Privorotsky recalled: *'Garik mastered all the rudiments of chess by himself, before he went to school; somehow imperceptibly he understood the point of the movements of the pieces and the pawns – in this way many great players are introduced to the ancient game. The boy was interested not so much in chess puzzles, as in the logic itself of the construction of combinations. Possibly this forced him to relate very seriously to chess... I saw a small, sociable boy, who had an exceptional knowledge of chess history. About the Capablanca-Alekhine match he knew everything. It seemed that he was simply fanatical about chess... Successes came quickly. He has an excellent memory. He achieved first category rating in the second year of studies. When the documents for awarding the title reached the city sports committee, they phoned me from there and asked: "Why this forgery? How can there be any talk about first category at his age?" Six months later they began talking about Garik's talent: everyone was staggered by his brilliant and confident play in blitz tournaments.'* I was awarded first category rating after I reached the final of the Baku adult blitz championship in June 1972 and my success was first mentioned in the press: *'Third year pupil Garik Weinstein, playing standing up (when sitting he can't reach all the pieces), achieved the overall best result in the first stage –*

9 points out of 9.' Or: 'Among the fourteen winners of the second stage were 13 candidate masters – and a second category player.' And the main West German newspaper *Neues Deutschland* unexpectedly published an article entitled 'Chess wunderkind from Baku'. That memorable blitz championship took place in the Republic Chess Club, where usually serious individual and team tournaments were held. After triumphantly concluding the quarter-final and semi-final, I 'lost my rhythm' in the final: nevertheless it was still hard for me to play without a break against strong adult opponents. Vitaly Melik-Karamov: 'Directly above the chess pieces a tuft of wiry black hair stuck out on his crown. Garik won, without even having the opportunity to look at the board from above. He looked at it from the side, the board was transformed into a battlefield, and the pieces into a live little army, going into battle with the enemy.' Valery Asriyan: 'A thin, lively, dark-eyed boy stands with his mother, awaiting the moment when the arbiters will invite the players to take their seats at the board. We – a group of candidate masters, playing for not the first time in such a tournament – looked with interest at this "child", who had already caused a stir by qualifying for the semi-final. We didn't know much about him: he was called Garik, surname Weinstein, and he was studying in the Pioneers Palace with the trainer Oleg Privorotsky. And from time to time the anxious thought occurred to each of us: "Suppose I lose to this boy? They will all laugh at me!" It went ok. The only one they laughed at (and, as it soon transpired, quite wrongly) was Slava Gadzhikasumov. Garik lost the remaining eight games in the first nine rounds, but then he burst into tears, and his mother took him away, not allowing him to finish the tournament. It was June 1972, and in distant Reykjavik a match was about to start, a match which would present the chess world with its 11th champion – Robert Fischer. And you would have had to possess an excessively rich imagination or a very rare gift of foresight, to guess both Fischer's departure, which shocked everyone, and the extraordinary fate of that nine-year-old boy, who on that hot summer day departed in tears from a modest club on the banks of the Caspian.' At precisely that time my mother was very concerned about the fact that at night I would recite in my sleep: 'King b2, king b2...' etc. She approached a paediatrician, who advised her to take the child to Kislovodsk. And in August, five of us – my mother and I, my aunt Nelly (a doctor by profession), uncle Kotik and their five-year-old son Zhenya – had a holiday there, renting rooms in private flats. In the grounds of the nearby sanatorium, where we usually went for walks, we immediately discovered a giant chess set – an invariable piece of equipment at health treatment establishments in Soviet times. Of course, I promptly went into battle – and easily defeated the adults, until I ran up against some candidate master. After losing the game, again I burst into tears... And so, in my third year at school I began playing in the city tournaments, and life immediately became divided into humdrum days and festive ones. The festive days were tournaments, while all the others were humdrum. But soon I also began enjoying daily chess lessons, and there were no longer any humdrum days! In January 1973 I reached a new level by achieving success in the Baku junior championship – a Swiss event with more than thirty players (in one of my notebooks the games from this tournament are preserved): 1–2. Korsunsky and Melkumov – 7½ out of 9; 3–4. Mamedov and **Weinstein** – 7. I began with four wins, including one over Korsunsky, but then suffered two defeats and could no longer catch the leaders, although I won my last three games. The chief arbiter of the tournament, which took place in the regional officers' club, was my future long-standing trainer Alexander Shakarov. As the senior trainer of the Azerbaijan junior team, he was looking for players for his team. And whereas my contact with him at the time was restricted to handing in scoresheets at the end of games, my mother came to the games and got to know Alexander Ivanovich. After finishing high up in the championship, I caught his eye and at the age of nine (!) I was included in the junior team of the republic. In March 1973, as preparation for the all-union junior games in the summer, the Azerbaijan team made a tour of Latvia and Estonia, where two matches were played against the teams of each of these republics. There I 'bagged' 4 out of 4, and the trainers were finally convinced that I should be included in the team. And in May, in the chess club attached to the 'Veten' (Motherland) cinema in Baku, we played another friendly match against our Caspian neighbours – the Turkmenistan junior team. There I played one of my first memorable games. **Game 1 G.Weinstein-S.Muratkuliev** Azerbaijan-Turkmenistan Match, Baku 1973 *Ruy Lopez C84* **1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 Bb5 a6 4 Ba4 Nf6 5 d4** At that time my opening repertoire was largely formed under the influence of Privorotsky, who avoided the main theoretical paths and showed his pupils

sidelines such as 5 d4 (instead of the usual 5 0-0 – *Game Nos. 14, 31*). **5 ... exd4 6 e5 Ne4 7 0-0 Be7 8 Re1** I also employed 8 Nxd4 Nxd4 9 Qxd4 Nc5 10 Bb3 (the usual move is 10 Nc3) 10 ... Nxb3 (10 ... 0-0 was considered more accurate, and if 11 Bf4 Ne6 with equality) 11 axb3 0-0 12 Bf4 Kh8?! (after 12 ... d6 13 exd6 Bxd6 14 Bxd6 Qxd6 15 Qxd6 cxd6 16 Nd2 White has only a minimal plus) 13 Nc3 b6 14 Rad1 Bc5 15 Qe4 Rb8 16 b4 Bb7 17 Qc4 Be7 18 Qd4 Bc6 19 Rd3 f6 20 Rh3 f5 21 Rd1 Bg5 22 Qe3 Bxf4 23 Qxf4 Qe7 24 Qd4 Rbe8 25 f4 Qe6 26 Nd5 Rc8 27 c4, and White won (Weinstein-Rudyka, Vilnius 1973). **8 ... Nc5 9 Bxc6 dxc6 10 Nxd4 0-0 11 Nc3 11 ... Ne6?!** This move surprised me: Black allows the active Nf5 (I always liked placing a knight on f5), then Qg4 etc. The position is roughly equal after the old continuation of Janowski and Keres – 11 ... Re8 12 Be3 Bf8 13 f4 f6, or the more energetic 11 ... f5! with the idea of 12 f4 Ne6 (Kostic-Trifunovic, Zagreb 1946). **12 Nf5 Bg5** The ancient 12 ... f6!? is slightly better, although here too after 13 Qg4 fxe5 14 Nxe7+ Qxe7 15 Rxe5 Qd6(f6) 16 Qg3 White retains some advantage. **13 Qg4 Nd4** This tactical trick somewhat confused me, and I stopped to think. Earlier and later Black invariably went into an inferior endgame by 13 ... Bxc1 14 Raxc1 Qg5 15 Qxg5 Nxc5 16 Ne7+ Kh8. But what now? **14 Bxg5 Bxf5 15 Qg3?!** An error. 15 Qh4! with the initiative was more accurate: 15 ... f6 16 exf6 gxf6 17 Bh6 Rf7 (Stohl) 18 Rad1 Rd7 19 Rd2!, or 15 ... Qd7 16 Rad1 c5 17 Be7 Bxc2 18 Bxf8! Bxd1 (after 18 ... Rxf8 19 Rc1 White has the exchange for a pawn) 19 Bxc5 (19 Bxg7 Qg4 20 Qxg4 Bxg4 21 Bf6 is also good – Stohl) 19 ... Ne2+ 20 Nxe2 Bxe2 21 Qe4 Qb5 22 Rxe2 Qxc5 23 e6 etc. 'However, the thinking of a child is unsophisticated and pure: Garik knew that the main thing in chess is to give mate to the king, and for the creation of mating threats the queen stands better on g3' (Nikitin). **15 ... Qc8?!** After 15 ... Qd7! 16 Rad1 c5 with such a fine knight on d4 Black would have had nothing to fear (17 b4 b6 – Stohl). **16 Rad1** (of course, I sacrificed the pawn) **16 ... Nxc2 17 Re2 Qe6?!** An oversight, allowing White to regain the material with an elegant combination and to obtain an obvious positional advantage. The prophylactic 17 ... Kh8 (17 ... Bg6? 18 Rdd2!) was sounder, although after 18 e6! fxe6 19 Rdd2 the knight on c2 would have given Black problems: 19 ... h6 20 Qh4 (20 Bh4!? – Stohl) 20 ... Qe8 21 Bxh6 gxh6 22 Qxh6+ Kg8 23 Ne4 Qg6 24 Qxg6+ Bxg6 25 Rxc2 with the better endgame. **18 Bf6! Bg6 19 Bxg7! Kxg7** 19 ... Rfd8 20 Bf6 Rxd1+ 21 Nxd1 Nd4 22 Rd2 Nf5 23 Qf4 is to White's advantage, when 23 ... Qxa2? is bad in view of 24 g4 Ng7 25 Bxg7 Kxg7 26 h4. The kingside pawn offensive is the recurrent theme of the entire game. **20 Rxc2 Rad8 21 Rcd2 Qe7** In the event of the more resilient 21 ... Rxd2 22 Rxd2 f6 (Stohl), 23 exf6+ Rxf6 24 f3 would have led to a favourable structure for White. I think that objectively White already has a technically won position, even against the opponent's best defence: he can quite quickly create a pair of connected passed pawns on the kingside, whereas it is far harder for Black to do the same on the queenside. **22 h4! Kh8** Muratkuliev's last two moves are frankly amateurish, dictated by the illusion of counterplay on the g-file. Again 22 ... Rxd2 23 Rxd2 Kh8 24 Qg5! f6 (Stohl) was more appropriate, but nevertheless the endgame after 25 exf6 Qxf6 26 Qxf6+ Rxf6 27 f3 is better for White, for example: 27 ... Rf7 28 Kf2 h5 29 Ne2 Kg7 30 g3 Re7 31 Nf4 Bf7 32 a3 b6 33 g4 with winning prospects. **23 Qg5!** I remember being terribly proud of this far from obvious move. 'It turns out that the h2-h4 advance also contained a positional threat. White unexpectedly seizes control of the d-file and takes play into a highly favourable ending. "So young – and so cunning!", you will say. "Fantastic!", I say as a trainer. For this one idea – combining the romanticism of attack with the prose of the endgame – one can immediately enlist a boy in the most prestigious chess school. The level of understanding of technical subtleties is a good indicator in assessing how promising a young player is.' (Nikitin) **23 ... Qxg5 24 hxg5 Rxd2** (things would not have been changed by 24 ... Rde8 25 f4 or 25 g4 – Stohl) **25 Rxd2 Bf5 26 f4** Now Black can no longer escape from the vice: he does not have ...f7-f6, White is threatening Kf2-f3, g2-g4, f4-f5 and so on, and therefore ...h7-h6(h5) has to be played, but then White simply captures on h6 and all the same he advances his pawns. **26 ... Kg7 27 Kf2 h5** (or 27 ... Rh8 28 Kf3 h5 29 gxh6+ Rxh6 30 Ne4) **28 gxh6+ Kxh6 29 Kf3 Rg8 30 Ne4 Bg4+ 31 Ke3 31 ... Kg6?** (a blunder; however, 31 ... Be6 32 Nf6 Rh8 33 b3 Kg6 34 g4 was also hopeless) **32 Nf6 1-0** After the rook moves there follows Nxc4. Not a complicated game, but an interesting one. Nikitin is still astonished by it: *'It is hard to believe that the white pieces were brought into battle by a ten-year-old commander. There is not a single futile, pointless move, and the harmony and logic in the actions of the white army are amazing. This little*

masterpiece shows with what an enormous chess talent Garik was endowed from birth. **Entry into the all-union Arena** My first baptism of fire outside of Baku came at the All-Union Youth Games (Vilnius, 14-24 July 1973). Teams of the fifteen union republics, plus Moscow and Leningrad, were divided into three semi-final tournaments (6+6+5), from the results of which the first, second and third final groups were determined (also 6+6+5). Each team consisted of eight players: four juniors not older than 18, two not older than 15 (I in fact played on board 5), and two girls. In these Games, as was usual in such events, many future grandmasters participated – Yusupov, Dolmatov, Alexander Ivanov (on board 2 he scored 8 out of 8!), Malaniuk, Kochiev, Yermolinsky, Kengis, Lputian, Machulsky, Kantsler and so on, to say nothing of a future world champion, the future lady world champion Maya Chiburdanidze, and a challenger to this title, Elena Akhmylovskaya. The top, final group produced the expected results: 1. Russia, 2. Moscow, 3. Leningrad, 4. Ukraine, 5. Belorussia, 6. Georgia. At that time the Azerbaijan team was a ‘solid second division team’ (this was considered great progress, but from 1974 we began regularly finishing in the top six), and in Vilnius it confirmed its reputation, finishing 3rd in the semi-final. In this stage I scored just 2 out of 5, losing in the first round to the formidable Kiev player Leonid Zaid (within six months he became USSR junior champion, and soon also a master). What told were the anxiety and inexperience of a novice: my opponents were four or five years older than me. But in the final stage I went through undefeated, making four fighting draws, and my team, finishing ahead of Uzbekistan, Armenia, Lithuania, Moldova and Latvia, won this tournament and finished in 7th place overall. The game that I remember best was the one with the Latvian candidate master Edvins Kengis, which was later published in Volume 16 of the Yugoslav *Informator* (this was our debut in the cult publication of the late 20th century). Nikitin: *‘That day I watched Garik’s game almost from the very start. My attention was immediately drawn to the board at which two contestants of quite different sizes were playing. A small, puny, dark-haired boy was looking seriously at the board and endlessly fidgeting on his chair. And sitting immobile opposite him was a tall, good-looking Latvian, who when thinking would literally tower over the battlefield. Compared with Garik, Kengis looked not only a giant, but also a highly-experienced fighter, but the events which occurred on the board forced the age difference to be forgotten.’* **Game 2 E.Kengis-G.Weinstein** All-Union Youth Games, Vilnius 20.07.1973 *Sicilian Defence B89* **1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 Nc6 6 Bc4 e6 7 Bb3 Be7 8 Be3 a6 9 Qe2** The Velimirovic Attack was fashionable at that time, and it had also been analysed by the Azerbaijan team. **9 ... Qc7 10 0-0-0 0-0 11 g4** This is what Fischer played against Larsen (Palma de Mallorca Interzonal 1970). Later 11 Rhg1 came to the fore, with the idea of 11 ... Nxd4?! 12 Bxd4!. For details, see *Revolution in the 70s* (pp.154-155). **11 ... Nd7** A new move, employed by Larsen, but before that recommended by Nikitin – my future trainer! But 11 ... Nxd4! 12 Rxd4 (12 Bxd4 involves a dubious pawn sacrifice) 12 ... b5 is objectively better. I followed this course in a game with Dvoyris (Vilnius 1975) and gained an advantage after 13 g5 Nd7 14 Qh5 Rd8 (14 ... g6!?) 15 Nd5? (15 Rg1 is correct) 15 ... exd5 16 Bxd5 Ne5!. **12 g5** Fischer responded badly – 12 h4?! Nc5 13 g5 b5 14 f3? (14 h5!), and after 14 ... Bd7! 15 Qg2 b4 16 Nce2 Nxb3+ 17 axb3 a5 Larsen repelled the premature attack and gained a memorable victory (Game No.42 in Volume IV of *My Great Predecessors*). This symbolic game influenced an entire chess generation. Only later did it transpire that here there is a very dangerous piece sacrifice – 12 Nf5!. **12 ... Nc5 13 Rhg1 Bd7 14 Rg3 Rfc8 15 Qh5** (this typical attacking plan looks menacing, but I was prepared for it) **15 ... g6 16 Qh6 Bf8 17 Qh4 Nxb3+ 18 axb3 Be7** With the idea of 19 Rh3 h5 – an important defensive device! Shakarov taught us that Black’s fortress was impregnable, and later this confidence came in useful to me in similar Scheveningen positions. Today it is apparent that 18 ... Nxd4!? 19 Bxd4 e5 20 Be3 b5 is also good (Valenti-Paoli, Reggio Emilia 1975/76). But I played ‘as I had been taught’. And whereas up till now we had made our moves quickly, here Kengis stopped to think. **19 f4** Avoiding the repetition of moves – 19 Qh6 Bf8. If 19 Nde2 either 19 ... h5 or 19 ... Nb4! is acceptable (but not 19 ... b5? 20 Nf4!). **19 ... b5 20 Qh6** Now White himself repeats moves – perhaps to gain time on the clock. Black would have been happy with 20 Rd2 h5 21 Nxc6 Qxc6 22 f5 b4 (22 ... a5!?) 23 fxc6 fxc6 24 Na4 Rf8 25 Nb6 Rf1+ 26 Rd1 Raf8. **20 ... Bf8 21 Qh4 b4!** Why play 21 ... Be7, if it is possible to launch a counterattack?! **22 Nxc6?** A serious mistake. We both overlooked the spectacular blow 22 Nf5!! – in the event of 22 ... bxc3 (22 ... gxf5? 23 Rh3 Bg7 24 exf5 and wins) 23 Rh3 h5 24 gxh6

White has the initiative, although after 22 ... Be8 23 Rh3 h5 24 gxh6 Qd8! the chances are roughly equal. **22 ... Bxc6** 22 ... bxc3! would have won immediately – because of the weakness of the c2-point White loses a piece: 23 Nd4 e5 or 23 Bd4 e5! 24 fxe5 dxe5 25 Bxe5 cxb2+ and ...Qxc6. **23 Rh3 h5! 24 gxh6 bxc3?** 24 ... Be7! would have won, for example: 25 Qg3 Kh7 or 25 h7+ Kh8 26 Qg3 (26 Qg4 Bf6) 26 ... Bxe4 27 Bd4+ f6 etc. Now, however, the situation becomes much sharper. **25 Qf6 Kh7 26 Bd4! cxb2+** (a small plus would still have been retained by 26 ... e5! 27 fxe5 Qe7) **27 Kxb2 e5 28 fxe5 Bxe4 29 e6?** Kengis overrates his chances: this seemingly spectacular blow meets with a refutation. The balance would have been most easily maintained by 29 Rf1! Qxc2+ 30 Ka1 Qd2! 31 Qxf7+ Kh8 32 Qf6+ with perpetual check (pointed out in 1996 by the 12-year-old Serb Milos Perunovic – at that time a pupil of Nikitin). **29 ... Qxc2+ 30 Ka3 d5+ 31 e7 Bxe7+ 32 Qxe7 Qc7!** This strong reply (incidentally, the only move!) was overlooked by White: it turns out that Black is also threatening mate – 34 Qf6? Qa5+ etc. White is forced to seek salvation in a difficult ending. **33 Qxc7 Rxc7 34 Rg3** (Kengis begins acting very enterprisingly, creating counterplay) **34 ... Rc2 35 Rf1 f5 36 h4 Kxh6?!** Having decided that Black was easily winning, I relaxed. 36 ... Re8(g8) was correct. **37 Be3+ Kh7 38 Rfg1?!** (the immediate 38 h5! was more accurate, with good drawing chances) **38 ... Rc3 39 h5** 39 Kb4 Rd3 40 h5 was probably more resilient, although in this case Black's moves would have been easier to find: 40 ... Rb8+ 41 Ka5 Rdx3 42 hxg6+ Kg8 43 Ba7 R8b5+ 44 Kxa6 f4 etc. **39 ... g5?** Alas, in time-trouble I became frightened by ghosts of some kind and I missed a win, which could have been achieved by 39 ... Rb8! 40 hxg6+ Kg8 41 Bf4 Rxb3+ 42 Ka2 Ra3+ 43 Kb2 Bd3! 44 Be5 Rcb3+ 45 Kc1 d4! (from afar it is not easy to find such a move) 46 Bxd4 Ra2!. **40 Bxg5 Rxg3 41 Rxg3 Rg8 42 Kb2 d4 43 Bf4** I had thought that this too was a winning endgame, but when Kengis offered the exchange of rooks, I belatedly realised that the position was a draw. **43 ... Rxg3 44 Bxg3 Kh6 45 Be5 d3 46 Kc3 Kxh5 47 Kd2 Kg4 48 Ke3 48â€¦! Kh3** Black can win the bishop – 48 ... f4+ 49 Bxf4 d2 50 Kxd2 Kxf4, but not the game: the queening square of the rook's pawn is of the wrong colour! It was hard to accept the inevitable... **49 Bd4 Kg2 50 Bc3 Kf1 51 Bd2 Kg2 52 Bc3 Kg3 53 Be5+ Kg4 54 Bd6 Kg5** $\hat{A}\frac{1}{2}$ - $\hat{A}\frac{1}{2}$ At the conclusion of the games I received my first ever prize – ‘for the youngest player in the tournament’. But the most important result of this trip was my meeting with Alexander Sergeevich Nikitin, state trainer of the USSR Sports Committee – my future friend, mentor and reliable support in the most difficult periods of my life. He became a master at a very early age and in his youth he played for the national student team, alongside Boris Spassky. But then, after qualifying as a radio engineer, he for a long time disappeared from the chess scene. And yet his love for the game outweighed other things: early in 1973 Nikitin decided to devote himself entirely to training work (and later he developed the system of opening preparation by which we studied). Nikitin: *‘Playing side by side in Vilnius were 18-year-old youths and boys who were barely visible above the chess board. That was how, through a gap in the row of heads, on the first day I “discovered” Garik. At the board he found it hard to maintain his composure – and he promptly lost it, no sooner had the game ended. The childish spontaneity of his ideas merely added charm to his array of obviously outstanding chess qualities. The ability of his pieces to occupy “correct” positions in the most natural and rapid way was amazing. Also amazing was his opening erudition and his memory – capacious and sticky, like blotting-paper. He did not find it at all hard to calculate variations many moves ahead – for him this was not difficult work, but an amusing game. Several times during the tournament I managed to talk to this amazing boy. It turned out that he loved reading and his range of interests was unusually wide. He had an excellent knowledge of geographical names, historical facts and dates. He read very rapidly, and his exceptional memory ensured that things were firmly retained. Attempts to test his erudition often put the questioners in an awkward position, because it would suddenly transpire that the boy knew more than the examiner. But most of all I was staggered by Garik’s eyes – intelligent, with a kind of amazing sparkle. At the time I decided purely intuitively that such eyes were a sign of great talent.’* It was Nikitin who in August 1973 arranged an invitation for me to Dubna, to the next session of Mikhail Botvinnik’s junior school. It had opened back in 1963, the year I was born, but at the time it did not function for long – just eighteen months. Among its first pupils were Karpov, Balashov, Razuvaev, Timoshchenko and Rashkovsky. The lessons were resumed in 1969, and from around the mid-1970s Botvinnik’s pupils began achieving notable successes. Two or three times a year, some fifteen boys and girls from various

towns assembled for 10-day sessions. They included Yusupov, Dolmatov, Psakhis, Akhmylovskaya, Akhsharumova, Kharitonov, Ehlvest, Andrey Sokolov, Rozentalis, Nenashev... The Kiev player Borya Taborov and I were summoned to an interview with Botvinnik and questioned by the famous champion for a couple of hours: we showed him our games and talked about ourselves. Mikhail Moiseevich asked his favourite questions, such as 'do you analyse your own games?', or 'do you play any sports?'. I remember how staggered I was when he suddenly stood up and supported himself on a chair with just his hands! This particular example showed what a person is capable of even at the age of 62 (however, he was still able to do this at the age of 77). For some reason only one of us was accepted into the school. I was a 10-year-old first category player, whereas Borya was a 12-year-old candidate master, who had just won the board six tournament at the youth games in Vilnius (7½ out of 9!). His games were, of course, more substantial than mine, but it was I who was accepted into the school. A symbolic event! Two years later Taborov became a master (the youngest in the country!), played for a few more years, but then gave up chess: his parents wanted him to go to a respectable institute, to study science... One has to give Botvinnik's intuition its due: he lived chess and he deeply understood and sensed all its nuances. Something about me caught his fancy – they say, 'liveliness of mind'. Nikitin: *'The great Maestro was delighted by the contact with Garik. He became visibly younger when chatting with the boy, who immediately became his favourite pupil. The teacher liked everything – the smartness of his replies combined with their accuracy, the speed with which he calculated variations, his staggering memory... Being enlisted as a pupil of the great Botvinnik stirred his young heart, and Garik became even more fascinated by the ancient game. As for me, after Vilnius I returned to my work in the chess section of the Sports Committee. But the link with Garik was not broken: bulky parcels with chess magazines and books were sent from Moscow to Baku, and it was a rare week when we did not have conversations by phone.'* To come under Botvinnik's wing was undoubtedly a stroke of good fortune. This fact was also remarked on by the republic newspaper *Sport*, which in the autumn of 1973 published an article by Valery Asriyan, 'Ex-world champion's ten-year-old pupil'. At that same time Botvinnik wrote a letter to the chairman of the Azerbaijan Sports Committee, where, in particular, he gave the following directive: *'I consider it advisable to arrange individual studies for Garry, and for him to play in tournaments with a stronger line-up. The number of tournament games per year in the period 1973-75 should not exceed 40...'* The letter had the desired effect. Privorotsky: *'For two years I gave individual lessons four hours a week in Garik's apartment. We selected positions, developed the technique of calculating variations, studied the endgame and the opening, and so on. During the lessons Garik always raised questions, and sometimes the answers were very difficult to find. In such cases I promised to reply at the next lesson, and I gave him a lot of homework which he always carried out...'* Lessons with Alexander Shkarov also continued – for the moment not individual, but group lessons, as part of the junior team. Thus at the age of ten and a half I had a full program of commitments, and soon I went to the Pioneers Palace only to play blitz with the older lads and with my first teacher, or to play training games. One of these games became, as Nikitin expressed it, *'another high-quality chess canvas, painted by a youthful hand'*. My opponent Elmar Magerramov was five years older than me, but this did not prevent us being friends. In the 1970s we played numerous training games, in which there was always a sharp, uncompromising fight. Gradually Elmar developed into a strong master, and then also a grandmaster – I should remind you that he shared 1st-2nd places in the last, 58th USSR Championship (1991). **Game 3 E. Magerramov-G. Weinstein Training Match, Baku 18.11.1973 Sicilian Defence B85 1 e4 c5 2 Nc3 e6 3 Nf3 Nc6 4 d4 cxd4 5 Nxd4 d6 6 Be3 Nf6 7 Be2 a6** My first experience of the classical Scheveningen, which Privorotsky taught me – it was his favourite defence, along with 2 ... Nc6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 d6 (*Game No.6*). My trainer quite reasonably assumed that two central pawns against one was a good basis for Black, promising him a favourable endgame. Nikitin was also a Scheveningen devotee, so that this set-up remained with me for ever. **8 f4 Be7 9 0-0 Bd7** A little trick, which I had learned at the lessons: Black immediately creates the threat of simplifying by ...Nxd4 and ...Bc6. After the usual 9 ... 0-0 10 a4 Bd7 11 Nb3 he does not have the reply ...b7-b5. **10 Nb3?! 10 a4** is nevertheless better, and if 10 ... Nxd4 11 Qxd4 Bc6, then 12 b4! (in the 1970s this was not considered) 12 ... 0-0 13 b5 Be8 14 e5 (an example: Grischuk-Rublevsky, 1st match game, Elista 2007). **10 ... b5** (now Black is completely alright) **11**

Bf3 Qc7 12 a3 12 a4!? is perhaps safer, in order after 12 ... b4 to maintain the balance by 13 Ne2 e5 14 f5 Na5 15 Nxa5 Qxa5 16 c4 or 13 Nb1 0-0 14 Qd3 e5 15 f5 Rfc8 16 N1d2. **12 ... Rb8** The position after 12 ... 0-0! is the dream of any Sicilian player. But I decided to launch an immediate attack and I could have been made to pay for this. **13 Qe1 a5 14 Qg3 a4?!** (again 14 ... 0-0! was more sensible) **15 Nd4 Nxd4 16 Bxd4 b4?** And here 16...0-0 was simply essential, although after 17 e5 White has the initiative (and it was not for the sake of this that I embarked on the attack!). **17 axb4?** Elmar also missed the typical stroke 17 e5!, refuting Black's premature aggression. We both overlooked that after 17 ... bxc3? White has the decisive 18 Qxg7 with the pretty idea 18 ... Rg8 19 exf6!! Rxg7 20 fxg7. 17 ... dxe5 is also hopeless: 18 fxe5 Bc5 (18 ... bxc3 19 Qxg7) 19 Ne2 bxa3 20 bxa3 or 18 ... g6 19 exf6 Bd6 20 Qh4 bxc3 21 Bxc3. **17 ... Rxb4 18 Ne2?!** Again passive (it appears that Elmar was slightly afraid of me). The 18 e5! break would have still enabled White to fight for the initiative: 18 ... dxe5 19 fxe5 Rxd4 20 Qxg7 Rf8 21 exf6 Qe5 22 Ne4!? Rxe4 23 Bxe4 Bc5+ 24 Kh1 Qxe4 25 Qg3! etc. **18 ... 0-0** (at last!) **19 Bc3** (now there is no longer any point in 19 e5 dxe5 20 fxe5 Nd5) **19 ... Rc4 20 e5?!** At the most inappropriate moment! 20 Rfd1 g6 21 Rd4 was more solid, aiming to exchange the active black rook. **20 ... dxe5 21 fxe5?!** (the lesser evil was 21 Bxe5 Qb6+ 22 Kh1 Rxc2 23 Nc3 with some compensation for the pawn) **21 ... Nd5?!** 21 ... Ne4! 22 Bxe4 Rxe4 23 Nf4 Qc4! (and if 24 Nh5 Rg4) would have given me an obvious advantage. **22 Bxd5 Qc5+** (not wishing to spoil my pawn structure by 22 ... exd5!?) **23 Kh1 Qxd5 24 Nf4?!** This plays into Black's hands, although all the same his chances would have been better after 24 Rad1 Qb7 25 Nd4 Bb4 or 24 Rfd1 Qb7 25 Nf4 Kh8 26 Nh5 Rg8. **24 ... Qe4! 25 Rae1** (25 Qd3 Bb5!) **25 ... Qxc2 26 Rf2 Qf5?** Underestimating the opponent's threats. After 26 ... Qb3!? White would not have had sufficient compensation for the pawn: 27 Nh5 g6 28 Nf6+ Bxf6 29 exf6 h6!. **27 Ref1?** The losing move. 27 Nd5! would have equalised – after 27 ... Qg5(?) we both missed the strong reply 28 Bd2!, when after 28 ... Qh4 29 Nxe7+ Qxe7 30 Bh6 g6 (30 ... f6? 31 exf6 Rxf6 32 Bg5) 31 Bxf8 Qxf8 32 Qg5 Black is in difficulties. I don't know whether I would have found the saving queen sacrifice: 27 ... exd5! 28 e6! Rxc3! 29 bxc3 Qxe6 30 Rxe6 Bxe6 with a probable draw. **27 ... Bc5! 28 Rd2 Bc6** 28 ... Bb5 with the threat of ...Rxc3 was also good. The bishops have begun operating at full power, and Black has not only an extra pawn, but also a menacing attack. It was possibly under the influence of this game that Elmar, as far as I remember, never played 1 e4 again... **29 Rdd1** If 29 h4 the most unpleasant is 29 ... Re4!. **29 ... h5!?** (I could have won 'as I pleased', but I had my own plan, based on a deep calculation) **30 h3** If 30 Nd3, then 30 ... h4! 31 Rxf5 hxg3 32 Rg5 (32 Rff1? Rh4!) 32 ... Bf2! 33 hxg3 Be3! and ...a4-a3. **30 ... h4! 31 Qh2** Of course, not 31 Qxh4? g5!. 'Very few at such a young age could conceive the idea of such a pawn storm: ...h7-h5, and then also ...g7-g5' (Nikitin). **31 ... Qg5** (31 ... Qc2! was more forceful) **32 Nd3** (32 Bd2 Qf5) **32 ... Bd4** (32 ... Be3!?) **33 Rf4 Rd8 34 Rdf1** (34 Rg4 Qe3 35 Ne1 Rxc3 36 bxc3 Bb6 etc. was also hopeless) **34 ... Rd7** (34 ... a3!?) **35 Be1 Bxe5** Or 35 ... Rc2!?. But, as it was, White resigned (**0-1**). In December, just four months after the first session of the Botvinnik School, I achieved the candidate master norm, scoring 8 out of 14 in an interesting double-round tournament held on the Scheveningen system: seven candidate master trainers (including Shakarov) against the seven best junior first category players. We again played in the club attached to the Veten cinema – this was one of the training points of the special-purpose chess school, where lessons were held, as well as competitions with the participation of the republic junior teams. That was how 1973 concluded – a year which was undoubtedly a turning point in my chess career: first success in junior chess, a place in the Azerbaijan junior team, emergence into the all-union arena, and acquaintance with the Moscow trainer Alexander Nikitin and the great Botvinnik! **â€™He attacks like Alekhine!â€™™** The following year, 1974, began for me with a fresh victory. In January the team from the Baku Pioneers Palace won the qualifying stage in Kiev for the prize of the newspaper *Komsomolskaya pravda*, and on board 2 I scored 4½ out of 5. The home team from Kiev were considered the favourites, and they did indeed defeat all their rivals, including us – 4-3 (that day I made my only draw). But in the end, thanks to big wins in our remaining matches, we finished ahead of the Kiev team by 4 points! To many this seemed incredible luck: the strength of our 'magnificent seven' (which apart from me included Korsunsky, Magerramov, and Elena Glaz) was clearly underestimated. The final of the All-Union Tournament of Pioneers Palaces took place from 25-31

March in Moscow. Six teams contested an unusual competition: they did not play against one another, but in daily simultaneous displays with grandmasters – the captains of the rival teams. The points scored by the team and the captain were added together, which determined the result of each ‘match’. I remember that Privorotsky prepared us for this test and advised us to make a careful study of a small brochure published in Moscow, dedicated to the previous final (1972). There it was described how Zaid won against Petrosian, Dvoyris against Spassky, and so on. The trainer said that we had to try and understand how to play against grandmasters. Nikitin: *‘In these clock simul’s on seven boards (six boys and one girl) the grandmasters sometimes had a very hard time of it. Although they did not play one another and it was only the totals of their simul’ results that were compared, the habit of being first forced the grandmasters to fight just as in the most prestigious tournament. But for the youngsters playing in these simul’s it was not so much the result that was important, but rather the invaluable experience and the impression left by their formidable opponents.’* On the very first day I experienced a severe shock, on seeing in front of me a living legend – Mikhail Tal! I could even shake his hand! I had heard about his intimidating, hypnotic glare with which he would fix his opponents. True, to overcome me, Tal did not need this... Later, largely under the impression of these feelings, I considered it my direct duty to take part in these ‘tournaments of chess hopes’ (as the Pioneer Palace tournaments were rightly known), as captain of the Baku team, since I realised how important it was for young players to meet renowned grandmasters at the board. I also failed to cope with my excitement in the 2nd round, losing to Lev Polugayevsky (whereas Rostik Korsunsky, by contrast, won both games!). Then I adjourned my game with Yuri Averbakh in a not altogether clear queen ending with an extra pawn; at these tournaments adjourned games were not resumed, but were adjudicated by a grandmaster panel, and at the insistence of our captain Vladimir Bagirov I was awarded a win. In the 4th round came a draw with Gennady Kuzmin, after which my opponent declared to a reporter: *‘It never occurred to me that a 10-year-old boy could play the endgame so competently.’* Alas, at the finish I lost ‘stupidly’ to Mark Taimanov and finished up with 1½ out of 5. Nevertheless the prominent Moscow journalist Alexander Roshal drew attention to me: *‘It should be said that playing in the Baku team is one of our most interesting young players. Garry Weinstein is only 10 years old, but he (like his older colleague Korsunsky) has already achieved the candidate master norm. Botvinnik, in whose school the boy studies, speaks highly of his capabilities; national master Dvoretzky, the ex-world champion’s assistant, is also delighted by the youngster. We will not hurry to draw conclusions, which may harm the young player, but comment that whereas Tal and Polugayevsky managed to outwit the 10-year-old in complications, Averbakh lost to him! Curiously, when I asked him whether it was a good game that he had won against the grandmaster, Garik Weinstein replied: “No, no! Yuri Lvovich simply blundered a pawn in the opening...”* The tournament was confidently won by the Leningrad team, who together with Taimanov scored 42½ out of 70, ahead of Moscow with Averbakh and Chernovtsy with Kuzmin (both 34), Riga with Tal (33½), Baku with Bagirov and Chelyabinsk with Polugayevsky (both 33). These battles earned the Baku players respect. At the All-Union Schoolchildren’s Spartakiad (Alma-Ata, July 1974) the Azerbaijan team, for which I played on board 3, reached the main final for the first time and finished in an honourable 4th place! But we could even have won the bronze medals, had Korsunsky and I not both lost in the final match with Georgia... And in general I did not perform very successfully: I started with 3 out of 3, but then in my game with the Muscovite Baryshev, after obtaining a completely won endgame, I overlooked an elementary draw – and either through vexation or fatigue my play sharply declined at the finish (which, however, was excusable for the youngest player in the tournament). During the previous months I had also attended two sessions of the Botvinnik school. Nikitin: *‘Lessons at the school run by Botvinnik, who at that time was helped by the splendid instructor Mark Dvoretzky, brought much benefit, since the boy had sufficient time for the homework he was set. I also continued setting him questions, and Garik not only succeeded in solving all the problems, but even asked for more. His mother wrote to me, saying that sometimes she had to forcibly tear her son away from chess. I was afraid of putting too much early psychological pressure on Garik, and the exercises sent by me were never obligatory.’* From the autumn of 1974 I began playing in Baku team tournaments, as chess life in the city was bubbling over. And I sensed that adults were already a little afraid of me. Appearing on board 2 for the Pioneers

Palace team in the City Spartakiad, I scored 5 out of 7, and, moreover, I missed a win in a very interesting endgame with Velibekov of the Burevestnik team (in adjournment analysis Bagirov found a miraculous saving line for my opponent). Also memorable for me was the game with Rafael Grigorievich Sarkisov, the Spartak junior trainer (incidentally, this team was headed by Shakarov, who battled on the neighbouring board with Korsunsky). It displayed my natural inclination for Benko-King's Indian positions. *Game 4 R.Sarkisov-G.Weinstein* City Spartakiad, 3rd round, Baku 17.09.1974 *King's Indian Defence E90* **1 d4 Nf6 2 Nf3 g6 3 c4 Bg7 4 Nc3 0-0 5 e4 d6 6 Bg5** (a way of getting away from theory) **6 ... c5 6 ... h6** is also good, but I was seized with the idea of undermining the queenside, even at the cost of a pawn. **7 d5 a6 8 Bd3 b5 9 cxb5 axb5 10 Nxb5** 10 Bxb5? is weak in view of 10 ... Nxe4!. **10 ... c4!** I was also to make successful use of this idea in a game against Hernandez (Banja Luka 1979). **11 Bc2** (11 Bxc4?! Nxe4!) **11 ... Qa5+ 12 Nc3 Bg4!** (in order to exchange this inactive bishop for the knight on f3 and create pressure on the b-file) **13 0-0 Nbd7 14 h3 Bxf3 15 Qxf3 Rfb8 16 Rab1** For the moment White has a sound position, but also Black's chances are no worse than in the Benko Gambit. **16 ... Ra7 17 Qe2** (or 17 a4 Nc5 18 Qe2 Rab7) **17 ... Rab7 18 Qxc4** (18 Na4!?) **18 ... Rb4! 19 Qd3 Nc5 20 Qe3 Rxb2 21 Rxb2?** A mistake. Approximate equality would have been maintained by 21 Bb3 or 21 e5. **21 ... Rxb2 22 Bb1?!** (this aggravates White's difficulties; 22 e5 or 22 Bd1 was more resilient) **22 ... h6** The alternative 22 ... Ne8!? 23 e5 Bxe5 24 Ne4 Nc7 would also have given a big advantage. **23 Qc1?** (resistance would have been prolonged by 23 e5 hxg5 24 exf6 Bxf6 25 Ne4 Nxe4 26 Qxe4 Qc5) **23 ... Rxb1 24 Qxb1 hxg5!** More vigorous than 24 ... Qxc3. **25 Rc1 g4** (25 ... Nfd7 was also good) **26 Qb5** (26 e5 Nfd7 and wins) **26 ... Qa3 27 Rc2 gxh3 28 gxh3?! Nfd7! 29 Qc4 Ne5** (29 ... Nb6!) **30 Qe2 Ned3 31 Nd1 Nf4 32 Qe3 Qa4 33 Rd2 Be5 34 Nc3 Bxc3! 35 Qxc3 Qxe4 0-1** Times: 1.20-0.50. Then I played for my own, 151st school in the Baku Schools Team Championship. On this occasion in this normally weak event there were also candidate masters competing. My opponent in the next game, Viktor Gazarian, playing for the 42nd school, was a pupil of Shakarov (who worked there as a trainer and teacher), and later was to become a member of the national Azerbaijan junior team. *Game 5 V.Gazarian-G.Weinstein* Baku 25.11.1974 *Grünfeld Defence D86* **1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 g6 3 Nc3 d5** My sole junior experience of employing the Grünfeld. **4 cxd5 Nxd5 5 e4 Nxc3 6 bxc3 Bg7 7 Bc4** (7 Nf3 – *Game Nos.38, 48*) **7 ... 0-0 8 Ne2** (8 Be3 – *Game No.72*) **8 ... b6** I was always attracted by fianchettoed bishops, and this set-up (instead of the usual 8...c5) was one that I copied from either Smyslov or Simagin. But in general at that time I had only vague notions about the Grünfeld Defence, and I handled it rather uncertainly. **9 0-0 Bb7 10 f3 Nc6** (Smyslov nevertheless played 10 ... c5) **11 Be3 e6** (and Simagin 11 ... Na5) **12 Qd2 Re8** (with the 'uncompromising' idea 13 Bh6 Bh8) **13 Rfd1 Qd6 14 Rac1 Rad8 15 Bf4 Qe7 16 Bg5 f6 17 Be3 Na5 18 Bb5 c6 19 Bd3 c5 20 Bb5 Rf8 21 Qb2 f5!** Thanks to his opponent's rather slow play, Black has achieved a good game. **22 e5 c4?!** (22 ... a6! 23 Bd3 b5 was correct, with equality) **23 Qb4! Qc7?!** Not wanting to go into a depressing endgame (23 ... Qxb4 24 cxb4), or to give up a pawn (23 ... Qf7 24 Bxc4). **24 Bg5 a6** A Petrosian-style positional exchange sacrifice! **25 Bxd8?** The culmination of the battle. We both overlooked the strong reply 25 Nf4!, when both 25 ... axb5 26 Nxe6 Qc8 27 Nxd8 Rxd8 28 Bxd8 Qxd8 29 Qxb5 and 25 ... Kf7 26 d5! are dismal for Black. **25 ... Rxd8 26 Ba4** Here 26 Nf4 Kf7 27 d5 no longer gave anything in view of 27 ... exd5 28 e6+ Kf6!. Or 27 Ba4 b5 28 Bc2 Bh6 etc. **26 ... b5 27 Bc2 27 ... Bh6!** Now my idea completely justifies itself: Black is able to exploit the power of his bishops and his knight on the d5 blockading square. **28 Rb1 Nc6 29 Qb2 Ne7 30 a4 Bc6 31 axb5 axb5 32 Ra1 Qb7 33 Kf2?** 33 Rf1 Nd5 34 Ra5 was correct, still hoping to maintain the balance. **33 ... Nd5 34 Ra2?** (a blunder in a difficult position) **34 ... Qe7?** 34 ... Be3+! 35 Kf1 Qe7 36 g3 Qg5 and ... Qh5 would have been quickly decisive. **35 g3?** The king should have been urgently brought back 'to base' – 35 Kg1, although after 35 ... Qh4 36 Rf1 Ne3 the initiative would have remained with Black. **35 ... Qg5 36 f4 Qh5 37 h4 37 Rg2 Qxh2+ 38 Rg2 Qh5** was also hopeless. **37 ... Bxf4! 38 Nxf4 Nxf4 39 gxf4 Qxh4+** (the attack on the light squares is irresistible) **40 Kf1 Qh1+ 41 Kf2 Qg2+ 42 Ke3 Qg3+ 43 Kd2 Qxf4+ 44 Ke1 Qe3+ 45 Kf1 Qh3+ 46 Ke1 Qh4+ 47 Kd2 Qf4+ 48 Ke1 Bf3! 49 Ba4 bxa4 50 Rd2 Qh4+ 51 Rf2 Qe4+ 52 Kf1 Qd3+ 53 Kg1 Be4 54 Qd2 Qg3+ 55 Kf1 Bd3+ 56 Re2 Rb8 0-1** The year concluded with the Azerbaijan Spartakiad, which differed little from the City Spartakiad: the teams consisted largely of

the same Baku players (it was simply that these competitions were staged by different sports committees – city and republic). I again played on board 2 for the Pioneers Palace and started with 4½ out of 5, beginning with an amusing game which abounded in mutual tactical strokes and mistakes. **Game 6 R.Sarkisov-G.Weinstein** Azerbaijan Spartakiad, 1st round, Baku 4.12.1974 *Sicilian Defence B56* **1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 d6 6 f4** After 6 Bg5 Privorotsky showed us the variation 6 ... e6 7 Qd2 a6 8 0-0-0 Bd7 9 f4 h6 10 Bh4 Nxe4, which I employed against Polonsky (Kiev 1974). **6 ... Bd7 7 Nb3?!** (Sarkisov was not strong on theory and he again played the opening unpretentiously) **7 ... g6** At that time I fianchettoed my bishop at the slightest opportunity. **8 Bd3** (8 Be2 Bg7 9 Be3 and 0-0 was more purposeful) **8 ... Bg7 9 0-0 0-0 10 Kh1 a6 11 a4 Na5!** Enterprising play: I already had a good knowledge of Black's various 'Sicilian manoeuvres'. **12 Nxa5 Qxa5 13 Qe1** (13 Bd2 Qc5) **13 ... b5!** This sharp attack confused my opponent, and he thought that I had overlooked a typical combination. **14 Nd5 Qxe1 15 Nxe7+? Rfe8?** An error in reply: after 16 ... Rae8! 17 axb5 axb5 18 Nxc6+ fxc6 19 Ra6 Re6 White would not have had sufficient compensation for the piece. **17 axb5 Rxe7 18 Rxa6** (and this is already a double-edged position) **18 ... Rxa6?** 18 ... Rae8(b8) was correct, with favourable prospects. **19 bxa6 Bc6 20 e5 Nd5 21 Bd2 dxe5 22 c4?** And now White loses his advantage, which he would have retained after 22 fxe5 (after all, he has three connected passed pawns!), and he again finds himself on the verge of defeat. **22 ... Nc7** (the a6-pawn is under attack, and also the bishops on the d-file are hanging) **23 b4?** (23 Bf1 was more resilient) **23 ... Nxa6?** 23 ... Rd7! would have won, but I saw a combinative blow that was possible in three moves time and I could not refrain from capturing the a6-pawn. I quickly calculated a variation – and promptly rattled it off! **24 b5 Nc5?!** (here too 24 ... Rd7! was better) **25 Bb4?** Overlooking the excellent latent resource 25 bxc6! Nxd3 26 Rb1! with equality. **25 ... Nxd3 26 Bxe7 26 ... Bxc2+! 27 Kxc2 Nxe1+ 28 Kf1?!** (28 Kg3! is not so clear) **28 ... Nf3 29 b6 Nd4 30 f5?** The immediate 30 b7 Nc6 31 Bd6 is stronger, but after 31 ... e4! 32 b8Q+ Nxb8 33 Bxb8 Kg8 34 c5 Kf8 Black has a won endgame: his king succeeds in stopping the passed c-pawn. **30 ... gxf5 31 b7 Nc6 32 Bd6 e4 33 b8Q+ Nxb8 34 Bxb8 Bd4 35 Bd6 Kg7 36 c5 Kf6 37 c6 Ke6 38 Bf4 f6 39 Bb8 Be5 0-1** But in the 6th round I lost to the strong candidate master Karo Askarian, and he overtook me by half a point. Now, in order to fight for the best result on my board, I had to win 'to order' in the 7th, last round. And here our match opponents. the Burevestnik team, made a substitution, and put out against me their reserve player – Oleg Privorotsky! I don't know, perhaps my first trainer had decided to relive the good old days and give me a 'farewell' lesson? At any event, initially he did indeed outplay me. But he faltered as soon as I was able to complicate the play. **Game 7 G.Weinstein-O.Privorotsky** Azerbaijan Spartakiad, 7th round, Baku 11.12.1974 *Sicilian Defence B40* **1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 b3** (avoiding my opponent's favourite weapon – the Scheveningen) **3 ... Nc6** If 3 ... Nf6 I would have replied 4 e5, following the familiar game Westerinen-Tal (Tallinn 1973). **4 Bb2 d6** (I was already confused by this move) **5 g3?!** 5 d4! is more energetic, as occurred in the ancient game Kieseritzky-Anderssen (London 1851). But – I liked fianchettoing my bishops! **5 ... Nf6 6 Qe2** A loss of time. The immediate 6 d3 was better, in the spirit of the King's Indian Attack (although the moves b2-b3 and Bb2 do not fit in well with it). **6 ... Be7 7 Bg2 0-0 8 0-0 Bd7** (the immediate 8 ... e5!? was more accurate) **9 d3 e5! 10 c4?!** 10 c3 was preferable, trying for d3-d4 (at least this would somehow justify 6 Qe2). Now Black has slightly the better game. **10 ... Bg4 11 h3 Bxf3** (hardly any stronger was 11 ... Nd4 12 Bxd4 Bxf3 13 Bxf3 cxd4 14 Nd2 or 14 a4) **12 Bxf3 a6 13 Bg2 Nd7 14 Nd2 b5** (the correct plan) **15 f4** It was quite possible to manage without this thrust: 15 h4 Nd4 16 Qd1, intending the manoeuvre of the knight to e3 and d5. But I was dreaming of an attack! **15 ... Bf6 16 Nf3 b4** Not the best move: it was more advantageous for Black to retain the pawn tension, threatening a possible ...b5xc4. **17 f5 a5 18 a4!** (suppressing the threat of ...a5-a4) **18 ... bxa3** With the queenside blocked White has nothing to fear, for example: 18 ... Nd4 19 Bxd4 cxd4 20 h4! (depriving the black bishop of the g5-square) 20 ... Nc5 21 Nd2. **19 Rxa3 Nd4 20 Bxd4** (20 Qd2! Qb6 21 Bc3 was sounder, with equality) **20 ... cxd4 21 h4?!** The immediate 21 Rfa1 was more accurate, with the idea of b3-b4 and the inevitable exchange of the a- and b-pawns. Here White

would probably have maintained the balance. **21 ... Nc5 22 Rfa1?! With a delay, alas.** It would appear that already I needed to go in for extreme measures: 22 Nxd4!? exd4 23 e5 Bxe5 24 Bxa8 Qxa8 25 b4! with sharp play. **22 ... Qb6** Now White has a difficult position: he does not manage either to capture on a5, or to create an attack on the kingside. **23 g4?! (a desperate pawn sacrifice with the aim of complicating the play) 23 ... Rfb8?! Stronger was 23 ... Nxb3 24 Qb2 (24 Rb1 a4) 24 ... Rfb8 or 23 ... Be7 24 g5 (24 Rb1 Qb4!) 24 ... Nxb3 with an obvious advantage. 24 g5 Bd8** An interesting psychological moment: Privorotsky removes all his pieces to the queenside, demonstrating his faith in his own attack and his lack of faith in White's counterattack. **25 Rf1?! Objectively 25 Nd2 Qb4(c6) 26 Bf1** was far more resilient, but that was not in my style! 'White's timidity in the first half of the game can be explained by the natural restraint of a boy, playing against an adult, indeed against his teacher. One should not forget about the colossal psychological pressure on the boy. Garik cast off the shackles only at the instant when the threat of defeat was finally hanging over him.' (Nikitin) **25 ... Qb4 26 Ra2 Qxb3 27 Rd2** White would not have been saved by 27 Nxd4 exd4 28 e5 Nxd3 29 Bxa8 Nf4! etc. Here Privorotsky stopped to think: how best to neutralise the threat of g5-g6 and convert his material advantage? **27 ... f6** The most vigorous was 27 ... a4! and only after 28 g6 – 28 ... f6 29 gxh7+ Kh8! with the ideas of ...a4-a3 and ...Ba5. The move in the game gives White a ghost of a chance. **28 Nh2!** My steadily growing King's Indian experience came into action: I immediately saw the attacking scheme – Nh2, Qh5, Ng4, Bf3 and Rg2. Of course, nothing should have come of this, but – it did! **28 ... a4 29 Qh5** And at this moment, on seeing that the situation was beginning to become sharper, my teacher unexpectedly panicked... **29 ... Be7?** By instinctively wanting somehow to reinforce the defence, Black throws away the win. After the fearless 29 ... Ba5! 30 Rdd1 Nxd3 31 gxf6 Rb7! White's attack would have petered out. **30 Ng4** (with the threat of 31 g6!) **30 ... Nd7?** A catastrophic mistake: the knight and bishop have blocked the 7th rank and the black rooks are unable to come to the aid of their king. Indeed, they were called on to defend the 7th rank (Capablanca's principle!), while on c5 the knight was carrying out an important function – it was attacking the d3-pawn. 30 ... Ra7! was essential. Now the hasty 31 g6? h6 32 Nxh6+ gxh6 33 g7 is bad because of 33 ... Bf8! 34 gxf8Q+ Rxf8. However, after 31 Bf3! the attack is good enough for at least a draw: a) 31 ... Nxd3 (if 31 ... Rf8?, then 32 g6 h6 33 Kh2! is very unpleasant) 32 g6 h6 33 Nxh6+ gxh6 34 g7! Nc5 (34 ... Bf8 with a draw) 35 Re1 or 35 Re2, and the threat of Qxh6 forces 35 ... Bf8 with a draw; b) 31 ... Bf8 32 gxf6! Kh8 33 fxd7+ Rxd7 34 f6 Rg8 35 f7 Rg6 36 Rg2 Qxd3 37 Nf6! Qe3+ 38 Kh1 Qh6 39 Rfg1! Kg7! 40 Ne8+! Kxf7 41 Nxd6+ Bxd6 42 Rxd6 Qxh5 43 Rg7+ Kf6 44 Bxh5 Rb7 45 Rg8 with a draw. **31 Bf3!** (now both g5-g6 and Rg2 are threatened) **31 ... Qc3** Black would no longer have been saved by either 31 ... Kh8 32 g6! Nf8 33 Nh6!+, or 31 ... a3 32 g6! Nf8 33 Nh6+! gxh6 34 Rg2! hxg6 35 Rxd6+ Nxd6 36 Qxd6+ Kh8 37 Qxh6+ Kg8 38 Qg6+ Kh8 39 Kh1 Qb1 40 Bd1 with unavoidable mate, or even the most resilient 31 ... Bf8! 32 Rg2! Kh8 33 gxf6 a3! 34 Qf7 Rb7 35 Bd1! Qb6! 36 Nh6! Nxf6 37 Qxf6!! d5! 38 Nf7+ Kg8 39 Qe6! Qxe6 40 fxe6 dxc4 41 Ba4! Rc7 42 dxc4, and White should convert his extra piece without particular problems (if 42 ... Bc5 or 42 ... d3, then 43 Bb3!). **32 g6!** (Privorotsky underestimated this thrust: he was hoping to repel the assault after 32 Rg2? Rb2!) **32 ... Nf8** 32 ... hxg6 33 Nh6+! would have led to mate. And after 32 ... h6 33 Nxh6+! gxh6 34 Qxh6 Nf8 White wins by 35 g7 Nh7 36 Bh5, although the immediate 35 Bh5 or 35 Rfd1! is simpler. **33 Nh6+!** (or first 33 Rg2! Is also good) **33 ... Kh8** In the event of 33 ... gxh6 34 Rg2! hxg6 (34 ... Rb2 35 gxh7+) 35 Rxd6+! Nxd6 36 Qxd6+ White would have given mate: 36 ... Kf8 37 Bh5! (the decisive blow is struck by this 'blunt' bishop, which has been inactive for the entire game), or 36 ... Kh8 37 Qxh6+ Kg8 38 Qg6+ Kh8 39 Kh1! Qd2 40 Rg1. **34 Nf7+ Kg8 35 gxh7+ Nxh7 36 Rg2!** The finishing touch. 'Nevertheless David outwitted Goliath' (Nikitin). **36 ... Qxd3** (or 36 ... Rb2 37 Rxd7+! Kxd7 38 Qg6+ Kf8 39 Nh6) **37 Nh6+! Kh8 38 Rxd7!** Black lost on time (1-0). After 38 ... Rg8 39 Nxd8 Kxd7 40 Nxe7 White's threats are irresistible. 'A splendid finish, disclosing the strong features of the future world champion' (Nikitin). Times: 1.45–2.00. The final attack made a big impression on those present, and I was terribly proud of this win. But when I showed the entire game at the Botvinnik School, I was rightly criticised by both Botvinnik and Dvoretsky for my 'disgraceful play' in the opening and early middlegame. A year later in a match with Burevestnik I had one more duel with Privorotsky (I was now playing on board 1, and on this occasion Bagirov avoided

meeting me). This was a crucial battle: my first trainer was eager for revenge, especially as he had the white pieces. But I again won, and at that our 'confrontation' came to an end. From the memoirs of an eye-witness – Valery Asriyan: *'Garik's mastery developed amazingly quickly. One was struck by his astounding combinative talent. Already then he attacked with enormous power, and he calculated variations uncommonly quickly and very deeply, astonishing all the Baku players, including his trainer. In the mid-1970s Garik twice defeated Privorotsky in team competitions, with both games following one and the same course. In a positional struggle the trainer outplayed the pupil and began active measures on the queenside, but Garik succeeded in developing a strong attack against the opponent's king, which Oleg was unable to parry: Kasparov was already too strong in such assaults. After the games Privorotsky could only spread his hands: "What can I do, if he attacks like Alekhine!".'* **â€™Who will be the Champion after Karpov?â€™**™ In January 1975 Magerramov and I were dispatched to Vilnius to the USSR Junior (under-18) Championship – our first individual competition of this standard. Among the thirty-six participants in this Swiss event were at least a dozen future grandmasters, and the tournament was won 'with obvious superiority' by the almost 18-year-old Alma-Ata master Evgeny Vladimirov (later one of my seconds). I made a stunning start – 3 out of 3! Moreover, in the 2nd round I beat the Kiev player V.Sokolov, who in the end shared 2nd-3rd places. But in the 4th round I suddenly lost without a fight to Yurtaev (cf. *Game No.13*, note to Black's 18th move). In the 5th round I made a confident draw with Black against Vladimirov, and in the 6th, after passing through a lost position, I overcame Gorelov. In the 7th round I had a peaceful encounter with Kengis (after 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 I played 3 Bb5+), and in the penultimate, 8th round, by contrast, a sharp, gripping duel with Dvoyris – but again a draw. Soon afterwards Nikitin wrote in the magazine *Shakhmaty v SSSR*: *'I would like to talk about 11-year-old Garik Weinstein. Mature beyond his years, a confirmed bibliophile, he at the same time has retained the spontaneity of his age. Garik is passing through that golden period, when for him there are not yet any problems, but there is already a mass of problems for the people taking care of him. Garik's chess development is being carefully followed by ex-world champion Botvinnik, who is already deciding his ration of chess studies and playing commitments. I will not praise the boy – for the moment he is simply playing chess, I repeat – playing.'* Thus I was on 5½ out of 8, and in the event of a win in the concluding round I could have shared 2nd-4th places and on the tie-break won the silver medal. I was paired with White against the Leningrad player Alexey Yermolinsky, who was half a point behind. He was five years older than me and proved to be a difficult opponent (this was also confirmed two years later in Leningrad – cf. p.84). Nikitin: *'That day I did not urge Garik to win, seeing his anxiety and fatigue, but simply asked him to play a "good" game...'* **Game 8 G.Weinstein-A.Yermolinsky** USSR Junior Championship, 9th round, Vilnius 15.01.1975 *Alekhine Defence B05* **1 e4 Nf6 2 e5 Nd5 3 d4 d6** The expected opening – Yermolinsky's favourite defence. **4 Nf3 Bg4** (4...g6 – *Game No.27*) **5 Be2 e6 6 0-0 Be7 7 h3 Bh5 8 c4 Nb6 9 exd6** It is evidently better to play 9 Nc3 0-0 10 Be3 d5, and now not 11 c5 Bxf3 12 Bxf3 Nc4 or 12 gxf3 Nc8 (the earlier main line, which was upheld for Black by Albur and Bagirov), but the new set-up with 11 cxd5!? Nxd5 12 Qb3, as I played against Gitsyn (Riga 1977), or 11 ... exd5 12 g4 Bg6 13 h4 (I enthusiastically analysed these variations with Korsunsky). But Nikitin and I had prepared something different. **9 ... cxd6 10 Nbd2 0-0 11 b3** 'Garry chose a piece set-up which he had spotted a week before the tournament, studying *Informator* Volume 17 sent by me to Baku.' (Nikitin) **11 ... Nc6 12 Bb2 Bf6** At that time they usually played 12 ... d5 13 c5 Nd7 14 a3, but later Albur's plan with 12 ... Bg6 13 a3 a5 and ...Bf6 was deemed more flexible. **13 a3 d5** (here too 13 ... Bg6 is acceptable, not hurrying to increase White's spatial advantage) **14 c5 Nc8?!** A new move, not as good as 14 ... Nd7, which would have led to a position from the *Informator* game Torre-Schmid (Nice Olympiad 1974), where after 15 b4 a6 16 Rc1! b6?! 17 cxb6 Qxb6 18 Qa4 Rfc8 19 Rc3! White seized the initiative. **15 b4 a6 16 Rc1** The cunning 'Torre manoeuvre'. If 16 Nb3 there is the good reply 16 ... Bxf3 17 Bxf3 N8e7, but now in the event of 16 ... Bxf3 White retains a plus by 17 Nxf3!. **16 ... N8e7??** An unexpected blunder of a piece. Hardly had he made the move when Yermolinsky saw the winning 17 g4! Bg6 18 g5 and his face promptly changed. But I did not notice anything, since I replied without thinking. **17 Nb3??** 'After this for almost the whole of 1975 I called Garik not by his name, but only "g4"! Even a mistake can become a part of useful experience, if you remember about it.' (Nikitin) **17 ... Bxf3 18 Bxf3 Nf5 A**

secondary drawback to 17 Nb3 is that the move Rc1 has been depreciated; with the rook on a1 it would have been possible to play Bc3, a3-a4 and Qd3, preparing b4-b5, but now White is forced to change plan. **19 Bg4! g6 20 Qd3 Bg7 21 Bc3 Qf6** (by intensifying the pressure on the d4-pawn, Black provokes the exchange of the enemy bishop for the knight on f5) **22 Bxf5** 22 Rfd1!? with the idea of 22 ... Nh6 23 Be2 was more forceful, but I wanted to deny the opponent any counterplay. **22 ... Qxf5 23 Qxf5 exf5** (23 ... gxf5 was no better) **24 a4** A standard flank offensive, which, however, does not promise any great benefits. **24 ... Nd8** (directing the knight in good time to e6) **25 b5 Ne6 26 Ra1** The rook has to be returned to the 'correct place'. **26 ... Rfc8 27 Rfd1** 27 Rfc1!? was more interesting, intending the c5-c6 breakthrough (and if ...b7xc6, then b5-b6). **27 ... b6?** A serious mistake, which could have led to defeat. The simplest was 27 ... Nc7, forcing 28 b6 Ne6 with equality (29 Na5?! is weak in view of 29 ... Nxc5!). However, the unexpected undermining move unsettled me: is it really possible to play this?! 'The quiet course of the game has suddenly changed abruptly, and the situation has become sharp and uncertain.' For a player who has just been rejoicing in his position, such a change is especially unpleasant.' (Nikitin) **28 Rdc1?** Again an error in reply! I saw immediately that after 28 c6? axb5 29 axb5 Nc7 the b5-pawn would be lost. But I completely overlooked 28 cxb6! Rxc3 29 Rac1! (not 29 b7?! Rb8 30 bxa6 Rxb3), when things are bad for Black: 29 ... Rxc1 30 Rxc1 Nd8 31 Re1! axb5 (31 ... Nb7 32 Re7) 32 Re8+ Bf8 33 a5, or 29 ... Rc4 30 b7 Rb8 31 bxa6 Nc7 32 Na5 Nxa6 33 Nxc4 dxc4 34 Rxc4 Rxb7 35 Rc8+ Bf8 36 d5 etc. **28 ... bxc5 29 b6 cxd4** 29 ... c4!? was also good: 30 b7 cxb3 31 Bb2 Rcb8 32 bxa8Q Rxa8 with full compensation for the exchange. **30 Bb2** (30 Bd2!? was more accurate, with equality) **30 ... Rab8** More complicated play would have resulted from 30 ... Re8!? 31 Rab1 or the clever 30 ... Rc3!? 31 Na5 Rb8 32 Bxc3 dxc3 33 Rab1. **31 a5?!** After 31 Rxc8+ Rxc8 32 Rc1 Rxc1+ 33 Bxc1 Be5 34 b7 with such a strong passed pawn White is not in danger of losing, despite his material deficit. **31 ... Rc4! 32 Nd2 Rxc1+?!** (I would have been set far more problems by the flamboyant 32 ... Rc3!) **33 Rxc1 Kf8 34 Nb3 Be5** 34 ... Ke7 was a little better, although here too the position is one of dynamic balance. **35 Ba3+ Ke8?** A typical time-trouble 'lapse'. 35 ... Kg7 36 Kf1 with equality was correct, whereas now Black is again on the verge of defeat! **36 Re1! f6 37 f4!** (a spectacular blow!) **37 ... Nxf4 38 Bd6! Rd8 39 Bc7!** Nikitin: 'The tactical resources in the position stirred the boy's thinking, and he made several strong moves in succession. In terrible time-trouble and in a difficult position Black decides on a trick.' **39 ... d3?** Strangely enough, this losing move – wins! 'Normal' continuations were insufficient: 39 ... Ne6 40 Bxd8 Kxd8 41 Rc1 Nf4 42 Rc5, or 39 ... Nd3 40 Re2 Kd7 (40 ... Nb4 41 b7!) 41 Bxd8 Kxd8 42 Rd2 Nb4 43 Nxd4. **40 Kf2??** Suicidal! As, however, was the naïve 40 b7?? Ne2+ 41 Kf1 Bxc7. I again cracked under the psychological pressure... 40 Rxe5+! fxe5 41 b7! would have been immediately decisive. But the most annoying thing was that 40 Kf1 would also have retained real winning chances – 40 ... Ne2 41 Bxd8 Kxd8 42 Rd1 Ng3+ 43 Kf2 Ne4+ 44 Kf3 and Rxd3. **40 ... d2! 41 Rxe5+** (alas, 41 Nxd2 was bad because of 41 ... Nd3+ and ...Nxe1) **41 ... fxe5 42 Nxd2 Nd3+** (42 ... Ne6!?) **43 Ke3 Nc5! 44 Bxe5 Kd7 45 Nf3 Re8 46 Kd4 Nb3+ 47 Kxd5 Nxa5 48 Bf4 Kc8 0-1** Nikitin: *'Garik manfully endured the blow of fate and, after signing the scoresheet, walked away in silence from the board. But his composure did not last long – only as far as the exit from the tournament hall. Here he went up to his mother, nestled up to her and quietly sobbed... After becoming a grandmaster, Garry was to gain fame as the best finisher – a player capable of winning any decisive game. But the first attempt proved a failure.'* Results of the 1975 USSR Junior Championship: 1. Vladimirov – 7½ out of 9; 2. Kengis and 3. V.Sokolov – 6½; 4–6. Yurtaev, Yermolinsky and Gabdrakhmanov – 6; 7–11. **Weinstein**, Dvoyris, Pekker, Magerramov and Dolmatov – 5½ etc. Taking into account my age, and the fact that I finished 7th on the tie-break, this was not a bad result for a debutant. On 24th February Leonard Barden, chess columnist for the *Guardian* newspaper, made the following forecast: *'Whatever happens to the world title in 1975, most experts predict that Karpov will be Fischer's successor – this year, in 1978, or in 1981. But who will be world champion after Karpov? In my opinion there is a very clear favourite for world champion in 1990. He is 11-year-old Garry Weinstein from Baku, youngest player in the USSR junior championship and youngest candidate master since Karpov.'* Barden was wrong by five years, but the very fact that he made such a forecast is worthy of note... After the battles in Vilnius I returned to my school studies, where I was at the end of my 5th year, and to regular chess lessons. Twice, in February and May, I went to

Dubna for sessions of the Botvinnik School. Nikitin: *'One spring day in 1975 into the Kasparovs' flat walked Vladimir Andreevich Makogonov – one of the strongest Soviet masters of the pre-war period, a player with a subtle, "Rubinstein" style and a grandmaster understanding of the game. He was already turned 70, and his meetings with Garik were infrequent, but they continued for more than two years, to the end of 1977. They took the form of conversations, and I asked the boy to follow carefully the logic of the Master's thinking and his approach to the evaluation of individual moves and positions. These conversations were of invaluable benefit to Garik, they helped him to systemise his positional knowledge, and in time the Tartakower-Makogonov-Bondarev-sky Variation in the Queen's Gambit and the solid set-up with 4...Bf5 in the Caro-Kann became reliable weapons for him.'* In Baku everyone learned the Caro-Kann from Makogonov's games! He was indeed a great master, and I am grateful to fate that I was fortunate enough to have contact with him. Early in July 1975 in Tbilisi the Baku Pioneers Palace team easily won the qualifying event for the final of the next 'tournament of young hopes', and on top board I scored 3½ out of 4. And in the second half of July I made my debut in the junior championship of the all-union Spartak sports society. This was an important moment: while retaining the right to play for the Pioneers Palace, I finally became a Spartak member, like my trainer in the republic's junior team, Alexander Shakarov (true, our individual lessons began only a year later). My mother and I lived quite modestly, and it proved most opportune when Botvinnik and his friend, the prominent chess official Yakov Rokhlin, were able to 'procure' Spartak food coupons for me, as well as a monthly stipend of 120 roubles. Nikitin: *'Such support by the Teacher became increasingly necessary with each new chess success by Garry, and each time it was timely and effective.'* That junior tournament took place in Peterhof, the famous suburb of Leningrad. The fourteen contestants were divided into two all-play-all semi-finals, and the four winners of each went through into the final. Here the results of the semi-final games between them were carried forward, and after the four final rounds the overall scores were determined. Nikitin, who regarded this event as a preparation stage for future serious tournaments, asked me to try and avoid any set-backs and to finish in the first six. Endeavouring to fulfil my trainer's objective, I became over-anxious and began with a loss, but I was able to take myself in hand and score three successive wins. But in the 5th round I lost with White to the 16-year-old Kharkov player Mikhail Gurevich, in the future a grandmaster and one of my seconds. And although I then defeated his contemporary, Leonid Yudasin from Leningrad – also a future grandmaster, my starting position in the final eight was very modest – only 1 out of 3. Now everything would be decided by the games with the four players from the other semi-final. My first opponent in the final, Boris Kantsler from Kirgizia, was just a year older than me and was reputed to be a promising young player. A few years later he was the winner (1979) and a prize-winner (1980) in the USSR Junior Championship, but later his chess development slowed sharply, his family emigrated to Israel – and at the very end of the century Boris nevertheless became a grandmaster!

Game 9 G.Weinstein-B.Kantsler
Spartak Junior Championship, 7th round, Peterhof 27.07.1975 **King's Indian Attack A08 1 e4 e6 2 d3**
After looking at Fischer's victorious games, for this tournament I prepared the King's Indian Attack and I successfully employed it in the 3rd round, but in the 5th Mikhail Gurevich obtained a comfortable game after 1 Nf3 d5 2 g3 c5 3 Bg2 e6 4 0-0 Bd6 5 d3 Ne7 6 e4 Nc6 7 Re1 Qc7?! (7 ... 0-0) 8 Nbd2?! (8 exd5!) 8 ... 0-0 9 b3 f6 10 Bb2 d4 11 a4 e5. I also did not achieve anything in a simultaneous game with Polugayevsky: 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d3 d5 4 Nbd2 Nc6 5 g3 Bd6 6 Bg2 Nge7 7 0-0 0-0 8 Re1 Bc7 9 Qe2 b6, etc. 'I called this way of playing the opening with White "a set-up for a lazy-bones". Soon it found its way on to the list I compiled of set-ups which were temporarily forbidden, and against the French Garik had to switch to the more active 2 d4.' (Nikitin) **2 ... d5 3 Nd2 c5 4 g3 Nc6 5 Bg2 5 ... g6** With this set-up Kantsler surprised me – I did not know its subtleties and was expecting only the popular 5 ... Nf6 6 Ngf3 Be7 (an example: Fischer-Miagmarsuren, Sousse Interzonal 1967). **6 Ngf3 Bg7 7 0-0 Nge7 8 Re1 0-0 9 Qe2?!** The immediate 9 e5 is more popular, and only if 9 ... Qc7 – 10 Qe2 with double-edged play after 10 ... b5(b6), 10 ... a5 or 10 ... g5!?. **9 ... b5 10 e5 a5** (as a result, Black has gained a tempo for his thematic offensive on the queenside) **11 Nf1 Ba6 12 h4 b4 13 N1h2** (2) **13 ... h6!** The key idea of the defence – otherwise Bg5 and Ng4. Here I felt rather dismayed, since I did not see how to breach the opponent's fortress. **14 Bf4 Kh7 15 Bh3?!** (3) A dubious undertaking: control over the

f5-square is of no use. 15 Ng4 Nf5 16 Qd2 with the idea of h4-h5 was correct, in order after ...g6-g5 (although in fact this is not obligatory) to sacrifice the knight on g5. **15 ... c4 16 Kg2 (3) 16 ... Nf5 17 Bxf5?!** (2) Risky, but at the least consistent – everywhere Black has a comfortable game. **17 ... gxf5** (17exf5!?) **18 g4!** White has to continue in the same vein. ‘Garik remembered his game with Yermolinsky and the jocular nickname “g4”. But the deliberate making of such moves is an indicator of the boy’s precociously mature thinking.’ (Nikitin) **18 ... fxg4?** Releasing the ‘animal’ from the cage – strangely enough, this is already the decisive mistake. Black had several good replies, in particular 18 ... cxd3 19 cxd3 d4 or first 18 ... Ne7 with the intention of ...cxd3, ...d5-d4 and play on the long light-square diagonal. **19 Nxc4** (building up the pressure) **19 ... Ne7** 19 ... cxd3! was far more resilient: 20 cxd3 (20 Qd2?! h5!) 20 ... Ne7, and in the event of 21 Bg5!! hxg5 22 hxg5 – not 22 ... Rh8 23 Nf6+! (as in the game), but 22 ... Ng6! with the pretty idea 23 Nf6+ Bxf6 24 Rh1+ Kg8 25 gxf6 Nf4+ 26 Kf1 Bxd3!, forcing 27 Rg1+ with perpetual check. But here too after the computer variation 23 Qd2! Bh8! 24 Rh1+! (if 24 Nf6+ Kg7, then ...Rg8 and ...Kf8) 24 ... Kg7 25 Rh6! Bxd3! 26 Rh1 Rg8 27 Nh4! Rc8 28 Nxc6 Be4+! 29 f3 Bxc6 30 Qf4 Bf5 31 Ne3 Bg6 32 b3! or 30 ... Rc4 31 Qf6+ Qxf6 32 exf6+ Kf8 33 Rxh8 Black’s problems are too great. It only remained to play 20 ... Nf5, and White’s attack would die out after hardly managing to begin... **20 Bg5!!** (18) A sudden, purely intuitive bishop sacrifice. Of course, I did not see all its consequences, but I sensed that White should be alright: his pieces are so well placed! At that time I did not yet realise that most of my opponents had a different attitude to material. And Kantsler probably believed that with his extra piece Black would somehow be able to defend himself. **20 ... hxg5** A difficult choice. White also has a terribly strong attack after 20 ... Rg8 21 Kh3! followed by Bf6 and Rg1, or 20 ... cxd3 (alas, too late) 21 Qd2! hxg5 (21 ... Rh8 22 Bf6! or 21 ... dxc2 22 Qxc2+ Kg8 23 Bf6! is also insufficient) 22 hxg5 Rh8 (22 ... Nf5 23 cxd3) 23 Nf6+! Kg6 24 Rh1, and Black has no defence. **21 hxg5 Rh8** This loses by force, as does 21 ... Ng6 22 Nf6+! Bxf6 23 Rh1+! Kg8 24 gxf6 Nf4+ 25 Kf1 Nxe2 26 Kxe2 or 25 ... cxd3 26 Qd2(e3) with unavoidable mate. However, it would also not have helped to play 21 ... cxd3 22 Qd2! (cf. the previous note), or 21 ... Bh8 22 Rh1+ Kg7 23 Nd4 Ng6 (23 ... Rg8 24 Qf3) 24 Qe3! or 22 Qf1!? Nf5 23 Qh1+ Kg6 24 Qh3 Rg8 (24 ... Bg7 25 Nf6) 25 Rh1 Kg7 26 Nf6 and wins. **22 Nf6+! Kg6** It turns out that 22 ... Bxf6 is not possible because of 23 Rh1+! Kg8 24 gxf6 Ng6 25 Rxh8+ Kxh8 26 Rh1+ Kg8 27 Qe3 Qf8 28 Ng5 or 27 ... Kf8 28 Nh4! with crushing threats. **23 Rh1! Nf5** (nothing would have been changed by 23 ... cxd3 24 cxd3 Nf5 25 Rxh8 B(Q)xh8 26 Rh1) **24 Rxh8 Bxh8 25 Nd4!?** 25 Rh1! was simpler. However, I picked up the knight on f3, in order to play 25 Nh4+(?), but at the last moment I saw that Black would capture the knight with check! I was forced to sacrifice it on d4... **25 ... Nxd4** (if 25 ... Bxf6 26 gxf6 Nh6 White decides matters with 27 Rg1 or 27 Rh1 Qg8 28 Rg1) **26 Qh5+ Kf5** The black king goes for its last walk. **27 g6+** (2) This is not only the shortest, but also the most spectacular way to the goal. **27 ... Kf4 28 Re1! Bxf6 29 f3!** Threatening Qg4 mate. A pretty combination with the sacrifice of three pieces and lethal quiet moves! This conducting of the enemy king into my own camp was undoubtedly a prototype for my game with Topalov (Wijk aan Zee 1999). **29 ... Nxf3 30 Qxf3+** (4) **30 ... Kg5 31 Qg3+** (alas, I did not see the mating 31 Rh1!) **31 ... Kh5?** Nevertheless blundering into a mate. However, 31 ... Kh6 32 exf6 Qxf6 33 Rh1+ Kg7 34 Rh7+ Kg8 35 Rxf7 Qxf7 36 gxf7+ Kxf7 37 Qc7+ Kf6 38 Qc6! Ra7 39 Qb6 Ra8 40 Kf2 cxd3 41 cxd3 etc. would also have been hopeless. **32 exf6** And in view of 32 ... Qxf6 33 Rh1+ Black resigned (**1-0**). Times: 0.50-0.42. After this I scored a further 2 out of 3, beating the Leningrad player Yuneev and at the finish drawing with Black against the leader – Desyatkov from Kurgan, a strong candidate master, who, however, did not break through to the USSR Junior Championships (in Russia the qualifying tournaments were incredibly tough). The results of the Spartak championship: 1. Desyatkov – 5½ out of 7; 2–4. **Weinstein**, Yuneev and M.Gurevich – 4 etc. On the tie-break I was placed second, and everyone considered this a great success. This tournament was the last in which I played under the surname Weinstein. In August 1975, at a family council of the Weinstains and Kasparovs, it was decided that I should take the surname of my mother, which she had not changed when she married. It seemed natural to become a Kasparov: for nearly five years I had been brought up in my mother’s family, and had grown up under the care of my grandfather Shagen, who had no sons. But the real implication of what happened was revealed to me much later. Nikitin: *‘Changing surname is a delicate process.*

While normal with women, it very rarely occurs with men and only, as a rule, when it is obligatory. The main burden in the fight to carry out the juridical formalities and, more important, to convince all the relatives and friends of the correctness of the decision, fell on Garik's mother. How many unpleasant hours Klara had to endure, how many tears were shed... A year before that, with Botvinnik's agreement, I began insistently trying to convince her of the need to change her son's surname. I had no doubts about the boy's brilliant chess future. From my work in the USSR Sports Committee I knew what inexplicable problems, not at all to do with chess, could suddenly be encountered by a youth with an "incorrect" surname, and how his sports career could be imperceptibly hindered or even altogether ruined. My fears were justified: much has now been written about the latent anti-Semitism, especially in the upper echelons of Soviet power. (I should remind you: in those times diplomatic relations with Israel were broken off and there was a mass emigration of Jews from the USSR – G.K.) I am convinced that Garry Weinstein would not have got through to a world championship match with Anatoly Karpov either in 1984, or in 1987. They would not have allowed it. He would have been eliminated at the distant approaches. At that time the system worked meticulously.' When in 1989, as three-times world champion and winner of the World Cup, I overtook Fischer's old rating record and reached the 2800 mark for the first time in history, Tal made one of his unforgettable jokes: 'Garry is playing so well, that now he can calmly perform under his previous surname!' I carefully carried the memory of my father through all the turbulent years, and I am absolutely sure that the Garry Kasparov, who became leader of the chess world, professed the same values as Garik Weinstein, who once, following the example of his father, became fascinated by chess... In October 1975, appearing for the first time under the surname Kasparov, I also achieved my first success among adults: in Baku I won the 'City Cup', a knock-out tournament with a shortened time control – an hour each for the entire game. At that time, on the initiative of David Bronstein, rapid chess had become fashionable (but it soon died away; its time had not yet come). There were 128 contestants: the strongest first category players, candidate masters, and one master – the highly-experienced Oleg Pavlenko, the No.2 in the republic team. His entry for the tournament was a surprise, and many thought the question of 1st place was already decided. The players met in mini-matches of two games: in the event of 1-1, two additional five-minute games were played. But I did not need these: all my matches, and there were seven (the tournament lasted exactly a week), I won by 1½-½ or 2-0. The culmination of the race was the final match with Pavlenko. My 33-year-old opponent was a heavily-built man, and compared with me he was a genuinely 'big chess player' (only Bagirov was taller than him). In addition, during the game he smoked incessantly – one cigarette after another. And in the 1st game I had to employ a 'prepared variation': as soon as my opponent sat down at the board and, after making a couple of moves, lit up, I immediately took from my pocket some chewing-gum, removed its wrapper, shoved it in my mouth and began vigorously chewing! I think that this made an impression on the master: he had not expected such impudence from a youngster. At any event, this entire game, which proved to be decisive, Pavlenko conducted at blitz speed. *Game 10*

O.Pavlenko-G.Weinstein 'City Cup' Final, Baku, 1st game, October 1975 *King's Indian Defence E71*
1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 g6 3 Nc3 Bg7 4 e4 d6 This was the first year of my employing the King's Indian (beginning with *Game No.4*). **5 h3** A rare variation, but a popular one in Baku: this is what Makogonov himself played! Before this at a session of the Botvinnik School (Dubna 1975) Yusupov chose against me 5 Nf3 0-0 6 Be2 e5 7 d5 and after 7 ... Nbd7 8 0-0 Nc5 9 Qc2 a5 10 Bg5 h6 11 Be3 Nh5 12 g3 Bh3 13 Rfe1 Nd7?! 14 Nd2 f5? 15 exf5 Bxf5 16 Nde4? (16 Qd1!) 16 ... Ndf6 17 f3 Qd7 18 c5 g5? (18 ... Nxe4 19 Nxe4 Nf6 is equal) 19 Bd3 (19 Qb3!) 19 ... Nxe4 20 Nxe4 g4?! (20 ... Nf6!) 21 fxc4 Bxc4 22 Rac1 he gained an obvious advantage. But here I recklessly sacrificed my knight – 22 ... Nf4? 23 gxf4 exf4 24 c6! bxc6 25 dxc6 Qc8, and my opponent faltered: 26 Nxd6? (26 Bd2! Bf3 27 Bc4+! Kh8 28 Nf2 was correct, when White wins) 26 ... cxd6 27 Qc4+ (27 Bb6!? Bf3!) 27 ... Be6 28 Qe4 Bf5 (28 ... Rf7! with equality) 29 Qd5+ (29 Bc4+!? Kh8 30 Qxf4 was slightly better) 29 ... Be6 30 Qe4 – draw! Botvinnik was unhappy with my play: it reminded him of his ill-starred game with Tal (6th match game, Moscow 1960), where out of nothing with ...Nh5-f4 Black also placed his knight *en prise* to the g3-pawn (Game No.128 in Volume II of *My Great Predecessors*). My teacher strictly told me that I needed to study the heritage of the 'King's Indian classics' – Boleslavsky, Bronstein, Geller, Gligoric, Petrosian, Fischer, Stein... And when I arrived home, from all possible sources I

began copying model games into a special notebook, and later I looked at them. I also kept up with official theory. I tested variations in practice, and I gradually accumulated King's Indian experience. **5 ... 0-0 6 Be3 e5 7 d5 Nh5?!** I did not yet know the finer points of this variation; I simply wanted to avoid the typical bind with g2-g4 and to carry out ...f7-f5 at any price. **8 Be2** (after 8 g3 Gerusel-Bukic, West Germany v. Yugoslavia 1973, went 8 ... a5 9 Be2 Na6!? 10 Bxh5 gxh5 11 Qxh5 f5 with compensation for the pawn) **8 ... f5?!** Now this sacrifice is incorrect. After 8 ... Nf4 9 Bf3 f5 10 g3 fxe4 11 Nxe4 White has only a minimal advantage. **9 Bxh5?!** (Pavlenko played this without thinking, although more was promised by 9 exf5! Nf4 10 Bxf4 exf4 11 fxc6, then Nf3 and 0-0) **9 ... gxh5 10 Qxh5 f4** (10 ... Na6 11 Bg5) **11 Bd2 Nd7 12 0-0-0 Nf6** (12 ... a6! and ...b7-b5) **13 Qe2 Qe8** Again a non-essential move; 13 ... c6!? or 13 ... a6!? was more interesting. **14 Nf3 c5?!** (reducing the opportunities for counterplay; the immediate 14 ... a6 was better) **15 Kb1?!** Typical rapid chess: this merely deprives the knight of the b1-square and presents Black with an important tempo. 15 Rhg1 a6 16 g3! would have given an appreciable advantage. **15 ... a6!** (at last!) **16 g4?!** **Bd7?!** (an exchange of mistakes: 16 ... fxc3! and ...b7-b5 was correct, when Black succeeds in creating counter-chances) **17 Nh4 b5 18 Nf5?** An unexpected blunder of a piece – instead of the promising 18 Rdg1! and Nf5. **18 ... b4** (at the sight of this move Pavlenko flinched) **19 Nxd6 Qe7 20 Nf5 Bxf5 21 exf5?!** (White is rattled; 21 gxf5! bxc3 22 Bxc3 was stronger) **21 ... bxc3 22 Bxc3 Nd7?!** 22 ... Ne8! was more accurate. Now White has good compensation for the piece. **23 d6** (White could have managed without this move) **23 ... Qf7 24 f3** (24 Rhe1!?) **24 ... Rab8 25 Rd5?** Another slip – and this time the decisive mistake. 25 b3 would have maintained the balance. **25 ... Nb6 26 Rhd1** (desperation: 26 Rd3 Nxc4 or 26 Rdd1 Na4!) **26 ... Nxd5** The immediate 26 ... e4!? would also have won: 27 Bxg7 Qxg7 28 f6 Rxf6! 29 Qxe4 Nxd5 30 Qxd5+ Kh8. **27 Rxd5 27â€¦e4! 28 f6** (or 28 Bxg7 exf3 29 Qxf3 Qxg7 30 b3 Rbe8) **28 ... Bxf6 29 Rf5 Bxc3 30 Rxf7 Rxb2+ 31 Qxb2 Bxb2 32 Re7** (after 32 Rxf8+ Kxf8 33 Kxb2 exf3 the black pawn queens) **32 ... exf3 33 Re1 f2 34 Rf1 Bd4 0-1** In the 2nd game there was quite a lively battle; I tried to play as solidly as possible, but in a completely drawn endgame I suddenly blundered a piece! However, in his haste Pavlenko missed a win – it was obviously not his day. I remember not only my opponent's grief, but also the reaction of the crowd of fans: they were as though benumbed – no one could believe in the sensational defeat of the local maestro. A few days later the Moscow weekly *64* published an article about the Baku Cup by the well-known chess arbiter Vladimir Dvorkovich: *'...The tournament created great interest among Baku chess fans. Seven candidate masters and the master Oleg Pavlenko reached the quarter-finals, and in the final the higher-titled player met 12-year-old Garry Kasparov (earlier we knew him as Weinstein, but he now uses his mother's surname). A sharp battle ended in victory for the 6th class pupil by 1½-½. Within two weeks the young holder of the Baku Cup will be leading the Pioneers Palace team of the Azerbaijan capital in the all-union tournament for the prize of the Komsomolskaya pravda newspaper.'* **Meetings with the Greats** My first chess idol was Boris Spassky. It was in 1969, when I was beginning to play chess, that he became world champion, and my dad was one of his fans. The match collection *Petrosian-Spassky 1969* with excellent commentaries by the players' seconds, Boleslavsky and Bondarevsky, was my first chess book. Apparently, this was a sign of fate: its special editor was – Alexander Nikitin! But when in 1972 Spassky lost the match in Reykjavik, my interest in him cooled – and I developed a childish admiration for Bobby Fischer (however, at that time who didn't admire him!). And when I began studying chess seriously, my idols became Alekhine and Tal, whose play excited the imagination. My favourite chess reading was a book about Tal and Petrosian by Viktor Vasiliev, and a simultaneous game with Tal in the spring of 1974 was one of the most memorable events of my childhood. I keenly followed the sharp rivalry of the young Karpov with the 'old hand' Korchnoi – first in the Interzonal Tournament (1973), and then in the final Candidates match (1974). And the 21st game of this match was one that I even saw live: I was passing through Moscow, returning home from a session of the Botvinnik School, and Nikitin took me with him to the game. For the first time in my life I became absorbed in the amazing match atmosphere – that reverential quiet in the hall, occasionally broken first by murmurs of delight, and then of disappointment; to the seething of the press centre, where my trainer took me to 'look at the thinking giants'. Then he took me back to the hall and left me there. Staring at the enormous demonstration board, I was

stupefied: Korchnoi had a winning sacrifice! While the grandmaster was considering his 13th move, Nikitin returned. I whispered to him: 'Knight h7!' And he replied only 'Y-yes...'. Obviously others had also noticed this: the spectators became animated. Korchnoi played this – and won quickly. This first, brief encounter with top-level chess left an indelible impression on me. Of course, I did not yet imagine that within a year I would be meeting both stars at the board... This happened in November 1975 in Leningrad, at the final tournament of the Pioneers Palaces. The line-up of the Baku team had changed significantly: Korsunsky and Magerramov were now too old, and of the 'old-timers' in the seven, only myself and Elena Glaz remained. The line-up of the captains giving the simul's was also half renewed: among them now were Smyslov, Karpov and Korchnoi! Although I was already playing much more strongly than in the previous such tournament, I again began with a loss to an ex-world champion – the imperturbable Vasily Smyslov. And I was terribly upset, since first I squandered an advantage, and then in one move (26 Nd4? instead of 26 Ng3!) I lost an equal position. The next day I gained an enormous advantage with Black against the Alma-Ata master Boris Katalymov, but I 'did everything' to avoid winning. By the time that the game was adjourned my opponent appeared to have some saving chances, but I was nevertheless awarded a win on adjudication. In the 3rd-round match against the Kuybyshev team I had an interesting game with Lev Polugayevsky. From the opening I did not achieve anything (cf. *Game No.9*, note to White's 2nd move), but I was able to initiate tactical complications. Thinking over his 14th move, the grandmaster sat down at my board – and 'went to sleep' for 40 minutes! As a result – a rare occurrence in a simul' – his clock was going on all seven boards! Usually the simultaneous player does not allow this, but Polugayevsky was trying to solve a difficult problem: it turned out that the reply he had been intending would have lost a piece. In the end he found the only way of maintaining the balance and on the 26th move he offered a draw. I agreed, not seeing any real chances of success in a slightly better endgame. Polugayevsky breathed a sigh of relief – and won all the remaining games! In the 4th round I finally made the acquaintance of Anatoly Karpov, who was performing the role of captain of the Chelyabinsk team. He was 24 years old, and not long before he had inherited from Fischer the title of world champion. Even so, the first meeting with Karpov did not provoke in me the same trepidation, as in the previous year's game with Tal. But the other lads in the team were nervous and they went along to the game as though they were already lost. In the foyer of the hotel, where the tournament was being held, I said: 'What are you afraid of? Karpov is the world champion, but even he can make a mistake.' Apparently these words were overheard, and the following day one of Karpov's backers, the secretary of the local regional party committee, Tupikin, said to my mother: *'Bear it in mind: Karpov is unforgiving.'* In its report on this round *Soviet Sport* wrote: *'During Anatoly Karpov's simul' with the juniors from Baku there came a moment when the world champion was left with only one opponent – 12-year-old candidate master Garik Kasparov. Karpov sat down opposite the young player and, naturally, the photographers did not miss this moment. The point is that Garik is one of our most talented young players, and who knows, perhaps sometime in the future there will be another Karpov-Kasparov encounter...'* Who could then have imagined that years later, over a period of six years, we would have to play some hundred and fifty games against each other and spend more than 600 hours at the board?! **Game 11 A.Karpov-G.Kasparov** Tournament of Pioneers Palaces, 4th round, Leningrad 8.11.1975 *Sicilian Defence B92* **1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 a6** I think this was the first time I played the Najdorf Variation. Before the game Nikitin showed me the latest subtleties of the Polugayevsky Variation: after 6 Bg5 e6 7 f4 b5!? 8 e5 dxe5 9 fxe5 Qc7 10 Qe2 Nfd7 11 0-0-0 Bb7 12 Qg4 one should play not 12 ... Qxe5, but 12 ... Qb6. I remember that I tried to find out from my trainer: 'But what about this, and what about that?' And he said to me: 'Work it out at the board!' However, Karpov chose his favourite 6th move... **6 Be2 e5 7 Nb3 Be7 8 Bg5** Although this move was occasionally employed by Fischer and Tal, it offers fewer chances than the usual 8 0-0. But here 8...Be6 9 f4 would have led to a well-known position from the recent Karpov-Polugayevsky Candidates match (1974). And the champion did that which simultaneous players always do: he tried to deviate and take me away from my home preparation. **8 ... Be6** (4) Earlier 8 ... Nbd7 9 a4! was in fashion (Fischer-Olafsson, Reykjavik 1960; Karpov-Balashov, 38th USSR Championship, Riga 1970). **9 f4** In the aforementioned match Karpov played this with his

bishop on c1, and in the event of 9...exf4 he would have gained an important tempo for development. And after 9 ... Qc7 he used the tempo saved to squeeze Black on the queenside – 10 a4 (Game Nos.54, 56, 57 in Volume V of *My Great Predecessors*). Now, however, Black is forced to capture on f4, and Karpov could have hoped that I would complicate matters unnecessarily, when he would be able to outplay me, even a tempo down. Firm control over the d5-point – 9 0-0 0-0 10 Bxf6 Bxf6 11 Qd3 (after 11 Nd5 Petrosian and Fischer replied 11...Nd7!?) 11...Nc6 12 Nd5 – leads to a roughly equal position in the spirit of the Chelyabinsk Variation: 12...Bg5 and ...Ne7 (a manoeuvre, known from the game Taimanov-Boleslavsky, 17th USSR Championship, Moscow 1949), or first 12...Rc8 – as Tal played against K.Grigorian (39th USSR Championship, Leningrad 1971) and Hübner (Tilburg 1980). 9 Bxf6 is of more current interest: 9...Bxf6 10 Qd3 Nc6 (10...Be7 11 0-0-0 Nd7 is also played) 11 0-0-0! (but not 11 Nd5 Bg5 12 0-0?! Ne7! Arnason-Kasparov, Dortmund 1980) 11...Nd4 12 Nxd4 exd4 13 Nd5 Bxd5 14 exd5 0-0, or 11...Be7!? 12 Kb1 0-0 13 Nd5 Bg5 14 h4!? Bxh4 15 g3 Bf6 with sharp play (Kramnik-Anand, Wijk aan Zee 2004). This line has now acquired a large amount of practice. **9 ... exf4 10 Bxf4** (thus, Karpov has carried out the first part of his plan) **10â€¦!Nc6 11 0-0 0-0 12 Kh1** In the variation with 8 0-0 this move would already have been made, and White would retain chances of seizing the initiative by 12 Qe1. Ironically, a position has been reached from the very line of the Neo-Scheveningen – 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 e6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nc6 5 Nc3 d6 6 Be2 Nf6 7 0-0 Be7 8 Be3 0-0 9 f4 e5!? 10 Nb3 exf4 11 Bxf4 Be6 12 Kh1 – which later I was intending to play against Karpov in our first two matches (1984/85 and 1985), only here Black has played the additional move ...a7-a6, giving him an interesting possibility apart from 12...d5. **12â€¦!b5!?** (2) An active ‘Sicilian’ thrust (incidentally, it did not occur any more in practice), although perhaps it would, nevertheless, have been better to maintain the balance with the typical 12 ... d5 13 e5 Ne4 14 Bd3 f5 or 13...Nd7 14 Nxd5 Ndx5. In the Neo-Scheveningen, with the pawn on a7, these positions are problematic even today (cf. *Revolution in the 70s* p.151). **13 Bf3?!** After conceiving the rook manoeuvre via f2-d2, Karpov clears the necessary space for it. However, for the moment there is nothing for the bishop to do on f3, and the inactive knight should have been immediately brought into play – 13 Nd4!. The exchange 13 ... Nxd4 14 Qxd4 gives White some advantage in the centre, while after 13 ... Ne5 both 14 a4 b4 15 Nd5 Bxd5 16 exd5 Qd7 17 Bf3 and 14 Nf5 are possible. **13 ... Ne5** (now there is a much more point to this move) **14 Nd4 Bc4** (9) **15 Rf2?!** The start of a standard manoeuvre, but in the given instance it proves unsuccessful: the rook will not find any work on d2, and the coordination of the rooks is disrupted. 15 Re1 would have retained equal chances – it looks more passive, but in variations similar to those in the game the rook is obviously better placed. Thus, it was not I who complicated matters unnecessarily, but Karpov... **15 ... b4!** (10) **16 Nd5 Nxd5 17 exd5 Bf6 18 Rd2** Despite the weakness of the c6-square, Black feels very comfortable, and White already has to think about how to equalise. 18 Nc6!? came into consideration, and if 18...Qb6 the sharp exchange sacrifice 19 Bxe5 Qxf2 20 Bxd6 Rfe8 21 Bg3 Qc5 22 d6 Bb5 23 Qd5. It is safer to play 19...Bxe5 20 Nxe5 dxe5 21 Rd2 (21 Qe1 f5) 21 ... Qd6, blocking the passed d-pawn and planning ...f7-f5, ... e5-e4 and so on. Objectively here too Black’s chances are better. **18â€¦!Qb6** (I did not even consider 18...Nxf3: it is too early to exchange such a strong knight!) **19 Be3 19â€¦!Qc7!** (2) ‘The position is a tense one, and at any moment a combinative explosion may occur. Great complications would have resulted from 19 ... Qb7 20 Nf5 Nxf3 21 Qxf3 Bxb2 22 Rb1 Bc3 23 Bd4 Bxd2 24 Bxg7 f6 25 Qg4 Bg5’, wrote Viktor Khenkin. It is easy to see that after 26 Bxf8! Rxf8 (26 ... Bxa2 27 Rxb4; 26 ... Bxd5 27 Bxd6) 27 Qxc4 White has an overwhelming advantage: 27...Qd7 28 Qg4 Kh8 29 Rxb4 etc. Therefore 25 ... Rf7! is correct, not fearing the discovered check. And if 25 Qg3 both 25 ... Rf7 and 25...Qd7 are possible – everywhere White has no more than a draw. But why provoke the dangerous knight leap to f5? With the queen on c7 it clearly does not work (the d6-pawn is defended) and Black continues to build up his initiative. **20 Be4** White’s problems would not have been solved by 20 b3 Bb5 21 Be2 (after 21 Nxb5 axb5 Black also has pressure on the a-file) 21...Bd7 22 a3 Qc3 23 Qg1 bxa3 (23...a5!?) 24 Rxa3 Rfe8 – the powerful knight on e5 and the weaknesses in the enemy position give Black the advantage (although it is unclear how great it is). **20 ... Rfe8** (it becomes uncomfortable for the white bishops on the e-file) **21 Bg1** If 21 b3?!, then 21...Bb5 is again good, but it is also possible to play 21...Ng6 22 Bxg6 (22 Qf3 Nh4) 22...hxg6 23 Qf3, when Black has a

pleasant choice between 23...Bb5 24 Bf2 Bd7 25 Rad1 Rac8, 23...Bxd5 24 Qxd5 Qc3 and 23...Bxb3 24 cxb3 Qc3, in every case with the better chances. Now he is again at a cross-roads. **21 ... g6** (4) A logical move, killing White's counterplay on the kingside. Black prepares ...Bg7 and ...f7-f5, and at the same time 22...Bg5 23 Rf2 Be3 is threatened. It also looks quite good to play 21 ... a5 22 a3 (Khenkin's recommendation 22 Rf2 is worse in view of 22...Ng6!) 22...Ba6 23 Rf2 Nd7, or immediately 21 ... Nd7 with the intention of ...Nb6, attacking the d5-pawn. In either case Black continues to exert appreciable pressure on the opponent's centre and queenside. **22 a3?! White** needs to do something, and Karpov sacrifices the exchange. 22 b3 Bb5 is more solid. Now in the event of the gambit move 23 a3?! Bg5 24 Rf2 (24 axb4 Qc3!) 24...Be3 25 axb4 (25 Rf6 Nd7!) 25 ... Bxf2 26 Bxf2 Qc3! 27 Qe1 (27 g3 Ng4) 27...Qc8 the compensation for the exchange is insufficient and Black has every chance of winning: 28 Nxb5 (28 c4 Nd3!) 28...axb5 29 Rxa8 Qxa8, or 28 Qd2 Ng4 29 Bf3 Nxf2+ 30 Qxf2 Qc3 etc. There only remains 23 a4 Bd7 or 23 Nxb5 axb5 24 Bd4 Nd7 (24 ... Bg7!?), when White's position is inferior with the material equal. **22 ... a5?! (6)** When you are playing the world champion for the first time it is no great sin to fear the complications after the strongest continuation 22 ... Bg5! 23 Rf2 Be3! (but not 23...bxa3 24 b3 Bb5 25 c4!), which enables the exchange to be won without any particular compensation for White: 24 axb4 (24 Rf6 Qe7!) 24...Bxf2 25 Bxf2 f5 26 Bf3 Nxf3 27 Qxf3 Qb7 28 Nc6 Re4 or 24 b3 Bxf2 25 Bxf2 Bb5 26 axb4 Qc3! (cf. the variation from the previous note). Now, however, Black's advantage is greatly reduced, although the initiative is still on his side. **23 axb4 axb4 24 Rxa8 Rxa8 25 b3 Ba6 26 Nc6 Nxc6?! (18)** I was carried away by the idea of invading with my rook on the e-file, but this exchange is fundamentally incorrect, since it activates the enemy rook on d2, which hitherto has been trying in vain to find work for itself. 26 ... Bb5! would have retained the better chances for Black, for example: 27 Bd4 Bg5 28 Rf2 Nxc6 29 dxc6 Bxc6 30 Qf3 Re8! 31 Bxc6 Re1+ 32 Rf1 Rxf1+ 33 Qxf1 Qxc6 with an extra pawn, or 27 Nd4 Bd7 28 Nc6 Bg7 (28...Ng4!?). **27 dxc6** (attacking the d6-pawn) **27 a6! Re8?** 'And this is already a mistake – Black tries for too much. The rook on the a-file was coordinating excellently with the bishop on f6, and all he needed was to give it scope by 27 ... Bb5, after which it would not have been easy for White to guard the 1st rank and simultaneously maintain his c6-pawn. Even so, after 28 Bd4 (28 Qf3 Bc3) he would have gained a draw: 28 ... Bxd4 29 Rxd4 Bxc6 30 Rxb4 (30 Rc4? d5! 31 Bxd5 Qe5) 30...Bxe4 31 Rxe4 Qc3 32 Re1 Ra2 33 h3.' (Khenkin) However, here Black has the thematic stroke 31...Qxc2!. Therefore instead of 30 Rxb4? White must play 30 Bxc6 Qxc6 31 Rxb4, avoiding major problems and with accurate play attaining the haven of a draw: 31 ... Qc3 (now 31...Qxc2? is refuted by the spectacular 32 Rb8+! Kg7 33 Qd4+) 32 Ra4 Re8 33 Ra1 and h2-h3. **28 Bd5?** A blunder in reply, typical of a simultaneous player: the fruit of not very deep penetration into the position when playing against several opponents. White was suddenly granted an opportunity to win a pawn and gain an overwhelming advantage – 28 Rxd6, but he did not do this, apparently because of 28 ... Bc3 29 Rd7 Qf4, overlooking an elegant refutation: 30 Re7!. Now the situation is again entirely favourable for Black. **28 ... Bc3 29 Rf2 Re1?! But** this is a mistake typical of a young player: also the fruit of a shallow penetration into the position. Through inexperience I did not realise that it was not yet time for such a stroke! First the threats on the f-file should have been neutralised: 29 ... Re7 30 Qf3 Kg7 31 g4 f6 32 g5 f5 33 Qh3 Kf8 etc. The position had become extremely sharp, and it was not surprising that Karpov was spending the lion's share of his time on my board. Alas, my team colleagues were unable to support me: the score was 5-0 in favour of the simultaneous player plus a strategically hopeless position for Lyosha Eppelbaum. Soon Lyosha also resigned, and Karpov and I were left face to face... **30 Qf3** My 'subtle' calculation – 30 Rxf7? Rxd1 31 Rxc7+ Kh8 32 Bf3 Rc1 with the irresistible threat of ...Bd4 said something about my inventiveness, of course, but it proved to be a simple little problem for the world champion. To the logical question 'why has Black's vitally important f7-pawn been left undefended?' the answer was found immediately. **30 ... Bd4?** A further error, which this time does not go unpunished. When I showed this game to Taimanov (after the tournament my mother and I, together with Nikitin, visited him at his home) he said: 'Of course, 30...Re7! should have been played. Here Black has nothing to fear – all his pieces are in play.' And although after 31 Qf4 Bb5 32 Qh4 Be1 he would have lost a pawn – 33 Rxf7 Rxf7 34 Qxe1 Bxc6 35 Bxf7+ Qxf7 36 Qxb4, he would have been in no danger of losing: 36 ... Qd5 37 Qg4 Qe4 or 36 ... Qf1

37 Qb8+ Qf8 38 Qb6 (38 Qxf8+ Kxf8 with a draw) 38 ... Qf3! with the unavoidable exchange of queens and a drawn ending with opposite-colour bishops. **31 Bxf7+ Kg7 (4) 32 Bc4!** Here is the punishment. In my preliminary calculations I missed this decisive retreat: mate at f8 is threatened, and the bishop at a6 is attacked. **32 ... Rxc1+ (9)** 'Black is rattled. The exchanging operation should have been carried out in a different order – 32 ... Bxf2 33 Qxf2 Rxc1+ 34 Kxc1 Qxc6, although here too after 35 Qd4+ Kh6 36 Bxa6 Qxa6 37 Qxb4 Qe2 38 Qc3 White would remain a pawn up.' (Khenkin). This is too modest a summary! 35 Qa7+! Bb7 36 Qd4+ is far stronger and prettier. Now 36 ... Kh6 37 Qe3+ Kg7 38 Qe7+ Kh6 39 Qf8+ Kg5 40 h4+ leads to mate, and 36...Kf8 to the loss of two pawns: 37 Qh8+ Ke7 38 Qxh7+ Kd8 39 Qxg6. 33...Bxc4 34 Qxe1 Bd5 was more tenacious, trying to draw with the queens and opposite-colour bishops. This is more like a middlegame, where White is the first to begin a victorious attack on the king: 35 Qh4! Qxc6 (35 ... Bxc6 36 Bd4+ and Qf6) 36 Qe7+ Kg8 37 Bd4 Bf7 38 h3! etc. **33 Kxc1 Bxf2+ 34 Kxf2 Bxc4 35 bxc4** The queen endgame with the white pawn on c6 is completely hopeless. **35 ... Qa7+ (2) 36 Ke2 Qd4 (3) 37 Qd5 Qf6 38 Qe4 b3 (3) 39 cxb3 Qb2+ 40 Kf1** Now the assistance of the king is not needed, and Karpov wins by hiding it in the corner. **40 ... Qc1+ 41 Qe1 Qf4+ 42 Kg1 Qd4+ 43 Kh1 Qb6 44 Qe7+ Kh6 45 Qf8+ 1-0** A fighting game! A comment in the press: *'Garik Kasparov was very upset at losing to the world champion. "I had such a good position!" he lamented. The young Baku player was right. He held the initiative throughout almost the entire game, but he used it uncertainly, and in the end he made a fatal mistake.'* I had the following dialogue with a journalist from the Baku sports newspaper: *'How do you explain your defeat at the hands of the world champion?'* 'Perhaps by the fact that I remained one to one with him. Just imagine, sitting opposite you is the best player on the planet. And so I overlooked his combination.' *'And what lesson did you learn from this meeting?'* 'You have to fight to the last, even if you are in a winning position.' In the next round I played a draw with Gennady Kuzmin. And at the finish we met the home team, from Leningrad, who were in keen competition with Moscow for 1st place. In addition, their captain Viktor Korchnoi was fighting for the best result by the captains. From the very start of the simul' he was obviously very keyed up, nervously smoking one cigarette after another. I was angered when on the 2nd and 4th boards after 1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 our lads played 3 exd5!? against him. But I, as usual, chose the King's Indian. **Game 12 V.Korchnoi-G.Kasparov** Tournament of Pioneers Palaces, 7th round, Leningrad 12.11.1975 *King's Indian Defence E80 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 g6 3 Nc3 Bg7 4 e4 d6 5 f3 Nc6 5 ... 0-0 (Game Nos.51, 81)* is more natural, but at that time against the Sämisch I liked to save a tempo by delaying castling. **6 Be3 a6 7 Nge2 (7 Qd2 – Game No.15) 7 ... Rb8 8 Nc1 (8 Qd2 – Game No.87) 8 ... e5 9 d5 Nd4** On seeing this move, Korchnoi looked at me and made a puzzled expression. **10 Bxd4!** Accepting the gambit at the cost of the exchange of this important bishop. I very much liked the idea of 10 N1e2 c5 11 dxc6 bxc6?! (11 ... Nxc6 is more tedious) 12 Nxd4 exd4 13 Bxd4?! Rxb2 14 Nb5? Nxe4! (Platonov-Shamkovich, 39th USSR Championship, Leningrad 1971). In the semi-final of the Baku Cup (1975) Gazarian played 14 Rb1 against me, but after 14 ... Rxb1 and ...0-0 all the same he had an inferior position. 13 Qxd4! is correct, with the idea of 13 ... Rxb2 14 0-0-0! Nh5 15 e5!, when Black is in trouble. But it is even better to play 10 Nb3! (killing Black's desire for 10 ... c5 11 dxc6 Nxc6) 10 ... Nxb3 11 Qxb3 or 11 axb3 c5 12 b4 with the initiative. But Korchnoi always used to capture pawns, if he did not see a direct refutation (thus, in the event of 7 ... 0-0 instead of 7 ... Rb8, if 10 Bxd4? exd4 11 Qxd4 there would have followed 11 ... Nxe4! and wins). Nevertheless, the grandmaster's choice surprised me: I was sure that the power of the activated bishop on g7 would more than compensate Black for his small material deficit. **10 ... exd4 11 Qxd4 0-0** (now threatening ...Nxe4!) **12 Qd2** (after 12 Be2 there would have followed 12 ... Nh5, and if 13 Qf2, then 13 ... c5! and ...b7-b5) **12 ... c5** Depriving the white knight of the d4-square and intending ...b7-b5 or ...Nh5 and ...f7-f5. I was very happy with my position: such activity, and for just a pawn! **13 a4** (an attempt to set up a bind – after 13 Bd3 Nd7 14 0-0 b5! 15 cxb5 axb5 16 Nxb5 c4 or 13 Nb3 Bd7 14 Be2 b5 15 0-0 bxc4 16 Bxc4 Rb4 Black has no reason for complaint) **13 ... Nh5 (3) 13 ... Nd7!?** was more circumspect. **14 g4!** (a bold, typically Korchnoi move, without prejudices!) **14 ... Qh4+ (4)** I did not want to retreat my knight immediately... **15 Kd1!?** But this 'playing for a win' is dubious. 15 Qf2 was more solid, although after 15 ... Qxf2+ 16 Kxf2 Bd4+ 17 Ke1 Nf6(f4) Black has good compensation for the pawn. **15 ... Nf6 (8) 15 ... Qf6! 16 Be2 Nf4 and ...Bd7, keeping the**

queens on the board, would have been far more unpleasant for White. **16 Qe1 Qxe1+** (now nothing would have been given by 16 ... Qg5, for example: 17 h4 Qf4 18 Be2 Nd7 19 Nd3 Qe3 20 Qg1, nevertheless exchanging the queens) **17 Kxe1 Nd7 18 Be2 Ne5** (10) **19 Rg1 f5** (3) A crucial choice: after 19...g5 Black would have had equal chances thanks to his powerful knight on e5 and the dark-square blockade, but I preferred more complicated and dynamic play. **20 exf5** (or 20 gxf5 gxf5 and ...Kh8) **20 ... gxf5 21 g5** (continuing to believe in the worth of the extra pawn) **21 ... Bd7** (7) A natural developing move, but 21 ... Re8!? (not allowing f3-f4) 22 Kd1(d2) Ng6 and only then ...Bd7 was more subtle – this would have maintained the favourable tension. **22 Kd2?!** (it was sounder to play the alternative 22 f4! Ng4 23 Bxg4 – 23 h3? Bd4 – 23 ... fxc4 24 N1e2 or 22 ... Ng6 23 Rf1 Rfe8 24 Kd2 with approximate equality) **22 ... b5!** (12) A completely unexpected thrust: after all, White is attacking b5 with many pieces! From this point Korchnoi switched almost entirely to the game with me, and the two other draws which he made in the simul' were to some extent a result of the chronic problems he faced here. **23 axb5** In the event of 23 cxb5 axb5 24 a5 (24 f4 bxa4!?) 24 ... c4 Black has an unpleasant initiative: 25 Kc2 b4 26 Na4 b3+! or 25 a6 Rb6!? and ...Ra8. Therefore White reconciles himself to simplification, hoping to defend in an inferior endgame. **23 ... axb5 24 cxb5 Bxb5!** (this was deeply calculated) **25 Nxb5 Rxb5 26 Bxb5 Nxf3+ 27 Kc2 Nxc1 28 Nd3** The attempt to imprison the knight on g1 by 28 Ra3 would not have succeeded after 28 ... Rb8 29 Rb3 f4. **28 ... Nf3 29 Bd7 29â€¦Nd4+** (6) Nowadays, without thinking, I would have played 29 ... Nxc1, obtaining a sound extra pawn: 30 Rf1 c4! 31 Nc1 f4 or 30 Ra4 Nf3 etc. **30 Kd1 f4 31 Be6+** (seeking practical chances – 31 Ra6 f3 32 Ke1 Nc2+ 33 Kd2 f2 34 Be6+ Kh8 35 Bh3 Nd4 was clearly advantageous to Black) **31 ... Nxe6** (7) The correct reply. Nikitin's recommendation 31 ... Kh8 would have left White with more hopes of saving the game. **32 dxe6 f3 33 Ra7 Re8** (11) Safely avoiding a pitfall: 33 ... f2 34 Nxf2 Rxf2 35 e7 Kf7 36 e8Q+! Kxe8 37 Rxc7 Rxc2 38 b3 with real prospects of a draw. But 33 ... c4!? 34 e7 Re8 35 Nf4 Bxb2 36 Nd5 Kf7 would have retained a serious advantage. **34 Rf7 c4** (2) **35 Nf4?!** (35 Nf2 Rxe6 36 Rxf3 Bxb2 37 Ng4 was more resilient) **35 ... Bxb2?!** (4) The sudden exchange of rooks would have been decisive – 35 ... Rf8!. **36 Nd5 Rxe6 37 Rxf3 Kg7?!** (4) This move suggests itself, but 37 ... Re4! was more energetic. In such situations all the participants in the simul's – and I was no exception – dreamt, without spoiling anything, of reaching the time control at move 45, adjourning the game and having it adjudicated. And there a win would be found by the grandmasters... But to make a dozen normal moves in a position with dynamic factors was not at all easy! **38 Ne3 38 ... c3?** (8) Alas, this cuts off the bishop on b2 and throws away the winning chances which would still have remained after 38 ... Re4!. **39 h4 Re5** (39 ... Kg6 40 Nd5 with a draw) **40 Nf5+ Kg6** (2) **41 Ng3!** (a very strong manoeuvre, creating adequate counterplay) **41 ... Re6** (4) **42 Rd3 h6** (3) ½-½ Draw agreed on Black's proposal. Of course, I was terribly annoyed: to be one step away from victory over none other than Korchnoi – and I stumbled... My opponent was also upset: this game proved very difficult for him, and three draws against the Baku team deprived him of 1st place among the simul' givers. Their 'tournament' ended as follows: Smyslov – 38 out of 42; Korchnoi – 37½; Karpov and Polugayevsky – 37 (I should mention that it was rather easier for the first two, since the remaining captains had to play both of the strongest teams – Moscow and Leningrad). The overall tournament was also won by the Muscovites, who together with Smyslov scored 54 out of 84 and finished ahead of Leningrad with Korchnoi (49½), Kuybyshev with Polugayevsky and Chelyabinsk with Karpov (both 42), Baku with Bagirov (39), Voroshilovgrad with Kuzmin (37½) and Alma-Ata with Katalymov (30). My performance, 2½ out of 6, was deemed comparatively satisfactory. Despite the fact that in the games with Polugayevsky, Karpov and Korchnoi I scored only one point, the character of the play showed that any result could have been possible!

Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov, part 1 is the first book in a major new three-volume series. This series will be unique by the fact that it will record the greatest chess battles played by the greatest chessplayer of all-time. The series in

itself is a continuation of Kasparov's mammoth history of chess, comprising My Great Predecessors and Modern Chess.

Kasparov's historical volumes have received great critical and public acclaim for their rigorous analysis and comprehensive detail regarding the developments in chess that occurred both on and off the board.. This new volume and series continues in this vein with Kasparov scrutinising his most fascinating encounters from the period 1973-1985 whilst also charting his development away from the board.

This period opens with the emergence of a major new chess star from Baku and ends with Kasparov's first clash with reigning world champion Anatoly Karpov - a mammoth encounter that stretched out over six months. It had been known in Russia for some time that Kasparov had an extraordinary talent but the first time that this talent was unleashed on the western world was in 1979. The Russian Chess Federation had received an invitation for a player to participate in a tournament at Banja Luka and, under the impression that this was a junior event, sent along the fifteen year old Kasparov (as yet without even an international rating!). Far from being a junior tournament, Banja Luka was actually a major international event featuring numerous world class grandmasters. Undeterred Kasparov stormed to first place, scoring 11½/15 and finishing two points clear of the field. Over the next decade this 'broad daylight' between Kasparov and the rest of the field was to become a familiar sight in the world's leading tournaments.

Garry Kasparov On Garry Kasparov Part I 1973-1985 - PDF - Garry Kasparov on My Great Predecessors, Part 5 - Garry Kasparov. \$43.95\$35.16 · Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov Part 1: 1973-1985. \$43.95\$35.16 Garry Kasparov On Garry Kasparov Part Iii 1993 2005 - Garry Kasparov on My Great Predecessors, Part 1 - This book, the fifth in Garry Kasparov's magnificent history of the World Chess Championship, catalogues the November 18 1985 calendar - My Great Predecessors is a series of chess books written by former World Champion Garry Kasparov et. Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov, Part 1: 1973-1985. Everyman Chess. p. 520. ISBN 978-1-85744-672-2 . Kasparov, Garry (2013). Garry Kasparov On Garry Kasparov, Part 1: 1973-1985 By - Garry Kasparov Part 1 1973. 1985 Everyman. 10 tips to start learn all japanese particles in 1 hour learn all japanese. Gill Book Mediafile Free File Sharing . Best Winter Is Coming Kasparov of 2019 - Top Rated - Garry Kasparov On Garry Kasparov Part I 1973-1985. 522 Pages · 2011 · 11.3 MB Zamans±z Hamleler Garry Kasparov'un Seşilmi Partileri I. 3 Pages·2009·66 E-Books Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov (eBook) - La Prueba Del Tiempo, Garry Kasparov, Jaque Xxi 1993 Ajedrez. \$ 859. Book : Garry Kasparov On Garry Kasparov, Part 1 1973-1985 -. \$ 4.550. Envío gratis Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov : 1973 - Books Kinokuniya - Garry Kasparov on My Great Predecessors, Part 5 - Garry Kasparov. \$43.95\$35.16 · Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov Part 1: 1973-1985. \$43.95\$35.16 E-BOOK Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov -

PART 1 - Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov, part 1 is the first book in a major new three-volume series. This series will be unique by the fact that it will record the greatest Garry Kasparov - Hardcover Teen & Young Adult - Amazon.ae - interactive Chess Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov, Part 1: 1973-1985 - Livros - Surname. Name. 1 Aagaard. Jacob. Attacking Chess (volumes 1 and 2) Garry. Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov: Part 1 1973-1985. Everyman Chess. 2011. Proposed Books for Trainees - Garry Kasparov on Garry Kasparov, Part 1 is the first book in a major new three-volume series. This series will be unique by the fact that it will

Relevant Books

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Ebook The Other World: Glimpses of the Supernatural - Volume I epub online

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Tied to the Bed pdf online

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Book The Book of The Animals - Episode 2 (Bilingual English-French) (The Book of The Animals (Bilingual)) online

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Download book Donau-Walzer Op. 314 pdf

[[DOWNLOAD](#)] - Pdf, Epub Introduction to Biomaterials: Basic Theory with Engineering Applications (Cambridge Texts in Biomedical Engineering) online
