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## Foreword

In 1982，the late Ken Smith’s publishing house Chess Digest published the first edition of my small monograph Beating the Sicilian，The Chameleon Variation． It was well received and a second edition came out in 1990．It proposed a very flexible way for White to handle the Sicilian Defense using the move order 1．e4， 2．00c3 and 3．0ge2．It kept most of White＇s options open and allowed White the possibility of luring Black into unfamiliar territory．

I was certainly not the first person to play 3．0ge2 in the Sicilian，and I did not play it to create opening theory．I did it to avoid theory．I had found it increasingly difficult to keep up to date with the latest nuances and changes in the main Sicilian lines，such as the Najdorf，Taimanov，Kan and Dragon，or even the rarer lines like the Kalashnikov．When I first analyzed 3．$巳 \mathrm{ge}$ 2，I was concerned about Black＇s attempts at refutation，such as $2 \ldots \mathrm{f} 63 . \triangleq \mathrm{ge} 2$ 气f6 $4 . \mathrm{g} 3 \mathrm{~d} 55 . \mathrm{exd} 5$ 气d4．But，not to worry．

With a 3．0ge2 move order，I could get to a perfectly playable middlegame in which I could expect to know as much about it as my opponent．Of course，there were some Sicilian main lines that I was happy to visit．So，for example，after 1．e 4 c5 2． 0 c 3 （ 0 c 63.0 ge 2 ©f6，I would reply $4 . \mathrm{d} 4 \mathrm{cxd} 45.0 \times \mathrm{d} 4$ and get to play a Sozin（5．．．d6）．

When Bobby Fischer adopted the Chameleon，he took the same approach．On $3 . . . e 6$ ，he would transpose into a main line with 4．d4．Curiously，Bobby played 2． 0 c 3 e e6 3．$勹 \mathrm{Qge} 2 \mathrm{~d} 64 . \mathrm{h} 3$ in one of his last tournaments．Fischer also used the 2．©e2 ©ff 3．仓bc3 move order in his 1992 rematch with Boris Spassky－himself an occasional Chameolonist－to play an Open Sicilian．

So，I initially looked upon 3．0ge2 as a kind of ruse．But I also began to appreciate it as a trap．It got my opponents thinking at move three，no small trick in the over－analyzed，over－memorized Sicilian．After I had been playing it for a few years，I was surprised by how many players，even some masters，didn＇t understand White＇s third move．They saw 2．今c3 and thought＂Closed Sicilian．＂They mentally ruled out an Open Sicilian．So I won quick games that went 1．e4 c5 2． 0 c3 0 c6 3．0ge2 e6 4．g3 g6？5．d4！cxd4 6． $0 \times \mathrm{d} 4$ 县 g ？7． 7.0 db 5 ．

Back in the 1970s，we believed that $2 \ldots \mathrm{~d} 6$ and $3 \ldots e 5$（or 2．．．0c6 and 3．．．e5）had to favor White after 4．0d5 and 5．0ec3 and c4．After all，one central square was superior to the others and White owned it．But one square isn＇t all that important． Fischer used the Chameleon in his rematch with Spassky，but avoided ect in favor of g2－g3 and g 2 ．

Why the name? Chess Digest had issued my previous pamphlets with titles like 1.b4. He wanted something memorable. For subsequent pamphlets I suggested names like Nimzo-Larsen Attack (for 1.b3) and Baltic Defense (for 1.d4 d5 $2 . c 4$ \$55). How the name stuck and won acceptance - and how 2. $0 \mathrm{C} 3 / 3.0 \mathrm{Qe} 2$ grew into a worthwhile chapter of opening theory - continues to surprise me.

And now, the journey of the Chameleon continues in this thorough, comprehensive update by well-known author Carsten Hansen.

Andy Soltis
New York City
September 2017

## Chapter 9

## 1．e4 c5 2．亿c3 e6 3．©ge2 d5

## 1．e4 c5 2． 0 c 3 e6 3．ضge2 d5 $4 . \mathrm{e} \times \mathrm{d} 5 \mathrm{e} \times \mathrm{d} 55 . \mathrm{d4}$

We have already looked at other lines that involved Black playing ．．．e7－e6 followed by ．．．d7－d5．This chapter will cover the lines where Black doesn＇t play ．．．气c6 immediately．

The absence of the knight on c6 means that Black can develop other pieces first and only later decide whether the knight should be placed on c6．The downside for Black is that White has not yet commited to g2－g3 which，technically speaking，weakens the light squares on the kingside．White still has the option of going in that direction if he so chooses，but can also attempt to exploit Black＇s loose pawn center through pressure against the center and rapid piece development，exactly what Black attempts to do as well．

5．．． 2 f 6
（a） $5 \ldots \mathrm{c} \times \mathrm{d} 4$ is not an outright mistake， but Black is risking becoming seriously behind in development：6． $0 \times \mathrm{d} 4$ 包 6
 9．Myd3 气c6 10．0－0－0 0－0 11．©f5 $0 \times f 5$


and Black resigned，1－0，Herman－Feher， Hungary 2000）7．．．d7 8．$\times \mathrm{C} 7+$ 畑 $\times \mathrm{d} 7$ 9．0－0 县 e ？！（ $9 \ldots$ ．．．）c6 is better，but White has an advantage anyway） 10 ．${ }^{\mu} \mathrm{d} 3$ 3 $0-0$ 11． Qf 5 b 4 ？12．h6！（now it goes downhill rather rapidly for Black）


包e5 21．0d4＋\％d6 22．M M $\times$ f6＋，and Black resigned，1－0，Skovgaard－ Avdeeva，Serpukhov 2004.
（b） $5 \ldots$ e6 6．g3（6．©f4 0 ff 7 7．D5＋ ©c6 8．0－0 a6 9．$\times \mathrm{C} 6+\mathrm{bac6}$ 10．Me2
 and it is pretty clear that Black＇s opening play has been a failure，Maki－ Keskinen，Jyvaskyla 1996）6．．． 0 c6 7． $\mathrm{g} 2 \mathrm{c} \times \mathrm{d} 4$ 8． $0 \times \mathrm{d} 4$ 且 b 4 9．0－0 $0 \times \mathrm{d} 4$

 when Black＇s messed－up pawn structure provides White a clear positional advantage，Sirias Martinez－ Theerapappisit，Mallorca 2004.
（c） $5 \ldots \mathrm{c} 4$ 6．g3 ${ }^{\text {b }} \mathrm{b} 4$（or $6 \ldots$ ．．． ff 7 ． g 2
 and White is already much better，Gu－ Zhang，Hefei 2010）7．g2 ©e7 （7．．．g 4 8．0－0 $\times \mathrm{C} 3$ 9．b×c3 会 e 7
 0－0－0 13．씁d2 h5 14．©ff4 and Black＇s position is a few small steps away from completely falling apart，Baumhus－ Denk，Vienna 1991）8．0－0 0－0 9．©ff4（or 9． g 5 会bc6 10． $0 \times \mathrm{d} 5$ 畑a5 $11.0 \times \mathrm{b} 4$留 $\times \mathrm{g} 512.0 \times \mathrm{C} 6$ 包 $\times \mathrm{c} 613 . \mathrm{c} 3$ when Black is clearly in trouble，Ertl－Camerini， ICCF email 2004，but 9．．．f6 improves for Black，although 10．e3 ©bc6 11． B e 1 g 4 12．M g d 2 is still somewhat better for White） $9 \ldots \times \mathrm{C} 310 . \mathrm{b} \times \mathrm{c} 3$ 畑 a 5 11．a4 ©bc6 12．a3 f5 13． m e1 g fe 8 $14 . \mathrm{e} \mathrm{e} 3$ with a large advantage for White，Al Qudaimi－Darini，Muscat 2015.
（d） $5 \ldots .0 \mathrm{C} 6$ transposes to chapter 13.

## $6 . g 3$

White has tried a few other ideas as well：
（a） $6 . \mathrm{g} 5$ ，and now：

（a1） $6 \ldots . .0 \mathrm{c} 67.6 \times f 6 \mathrm{~g} \times \mathrm{f} 68 . \mathrm{d} \times \mathrm{c} 5 \mathrm{~d} 4$ 9． $0 \mathrm{e} 4 \mathrm{f} 510.0 \mathrm{D} 6+\mathrm{Cd}$ 11．cxd6 M M $\times \mathrm{d} 6$

 with better chances for White， Pancevski－Dinev，Skopje 2007.
（a2） $6 \ldots$ ．．．e7 7．dxc5（or 7．$\times \mathrm{xf} 6 \mathrm{f} 6$

 a better game for White，Antoniewski－ Torotto，Tatranske Zruby 2008）7．．．0－0


 completely in control，Rogovski－ Zhornik，Simferopol 2003.
 8．b5 a6 9．$\times \mathrm{c} 6+\mathrm{b} \times \mathrm{c} 610.0-0 \mathrm{~h} 6$
 when Black does not have sufficient compensation for the pawn，Isaev－ Polonsky，Moscow 2008）8．씁xd4 ©c6 9．$\times \mathrm{f} 6$（9．b5 e 10．$\times \mathrm{c} 6+\mathrm{bxc} 6$ 11．0－0－0 0－0 12． $0 \times e 6$ fxe6 13．${ }^{\text {g he1 }}$
 Eff6 was played in Gavrilov－Plich， Koszalin 1996，and now $17 .{ }^{\circ} \times \mathrm{d} 5$ ！ g g 6 18．Mé 4 would be clearly better for White） $9 \ldots$ ．．ㅆㅂ $\times f 6$ 10．씁 $\times f 6 \quad g \times f 6$ 11． $0 \mathrm{C} \times \mathrm{d} 5$ 是 $\times \mathrm{d} 512.0 \times \mathrm{d} 5 \quad 0-0-0 \quad 13.0-$ $0-0$ and Black has lost a pawn without adequate compensation，Kron－ Ginzburg，Itkutsk 2016.
（b）6．e3 cxd4 7．$\times \mathrm{d} 4$ e7 8．g3 0－0 9．g2 ©c6 10．0－0 g4 11．h3 © $\times \mathrm{d} 4$
 （or 14．c3 c5 15．씁d3 Meb6，Hou Yifan－ A．Muzychuk，Beijing 2014，and now 16．b4 d6 17．$\times \mathrm{d} 5 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{fd} 8$ 18． g 2
 21． $9 \times b 7$ is somewhat better for White）
 a fd8 18．${ }^{\text {and }} \mathrm{fd} 1$ with a small plus for White，Spassky－Borik，Germany 1982.

## 6．．． $\mathrm{g}^{4}$

 0－0 9．0－0 ©c6 10．2e3 ©g4 11． $2 \times \mathrm{d} 5$气xe3 12．fxe3 c5 13．c3 气e5 14．M M 5 with better chances for White，Comas Fabrego－Berkovich，La Massana 2012）

学fe8 14．h3 包c5 15．筸f1 when White has some initiative，Moskalenko－ Sveshnikov，Alushta 1994，now both $16 \ldots d 7$ and $16 \ldots$ e6 should be met with 17．c4！with a pleasant game for White．

## 7． g 2 气c6

A reasonable alternative for Black is 7．．．cxd4 8．씁xd4 气c6 9．算a4，and now：

（a） $9 \ldots \mathrm{c} 510.0 \times \mathrm{d} 5 \times \mathrm{e} 2(10 \ldots 0-0!$ ？$)$ 11． $0 \times \mathrm{ff} 6+$ 留xf6 and now instead of
是xe3 15．fxe3 气d 4 16．M M c 4 号 $\times \mathrm{e} 3+$ and White is completely busted， Tseshkovsky－Gorelov，Aktjubinsk 1985，White should have played
思he8 15 ． e 3 with a clear advantage．
 better although 11．0－0－0 is still problematic for Black）11．$\times \mathrm{x} 6 \times 2$


是 $\times \mathrm{c} 315 . \mathrm{b} \times \mathrm{c} 3$ 筸 f 516 ． B ab 1 and Black is，in fact，losing；the threat is c3－c4， Lobron－Hector，Reykjavik 1984.
（c）9．．． b 4 10．0－0 $0-0 \quad$（10．．． $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ma5 }\end{aligned}$


 \＄b6 20． B fe1 with a small plus for White，Novitzkij－Balashov，St． Petersburg 2000）11．g5（or 11． Df 4道 $\times 3$ 12．bec3 ©e5 13．f3 d7 14．M M 4
㽞a5 18．씁d2 0 c6 and Black clearly does not have any problems，Bryzgalin－ Lugovoi，Moscow 1998）11．．．d4 12．是xf6 씁xf6 13．0d5 씁d6 14．0 $\times \mathrm{d} 4$包 $\times \mathrm{d} 4$ 15．씁 $\times b 4$ 留 $\times b 4$ 16． $0 \times b 4$ a5
 in Novitzkij－Kupreichik，Minsk 2003， and now White＇s best continuation would have been 19． 0 e $7+$ et $\mathrm{b} 820 . \mathrm{a} 3$幺d3 21．骂c7 气xb2 22．㽞b1 气d3 23．$\times$ b7 ad8 24.0 c 6 with a small plus on account of his active and better－ placed pieces．

## 8．h3



8．Ne3 c4（8．．．cxd4 9．$\times \mathrm{d} 4$ 包 $\times \mathrm{d} 4$ ？！

 $15.0-0-0$ and White is completely winning，Iskov－Grooten，Amsterdam 1982，but Black can easily improve with

9．．．d6）9．h3 h5 10．0－0 0 b4 11．g5

 17． $0 \times \mathrm{g} 6 \mathrm{~h} \times \mathrm{g} 6$ 18． $0 \times \mathrm{b} 7$ 莒ab8 19． $\mathrm{O} \mathrm{c} 5+$ and White is clearly better，Savage－ Sprenkle，Chicago 1984.

## 8．．．e6

Black has tried several other things at this juncture：
（a） $8 \ldots \times \mathrm{e}$ 9． $\mathrm{O} \times \mathrm{e} 2$（9．．． m b6 $10.0-0 \mathrm{cxd} 411 . \mathrm{c} 3$ 昷 $512 . \mathrm{cxd} 4 \times \mathrm{d} 4$
 with a clear advantage for White， Misailovic－Kontic，Cetinje 1993）10．0－ 0 0－0 11．We3 c4 12．c3 h6 13．M．M 2 b5 14．b3 営c8 15．b×c4 b×c4 was played in Reinderman－Yermolinsky，Wijk aan Zee 1999，and now 16．©ff4 would have left White with the better game．
（b） $8 \ldots \mathrm{cxd} 49 . \mathrm{h} \times \mathrm{g} 4$（or $9.0 \times \mathrm{d} 50 \times \mathrm{d} 5$

是xf4 16．0d5 with clearly better chances for White，Teichmann－ Spielmann，Berlin 1914）9．．． $\mathrm{d} \times \mathrm{c} 3$ $10.5 \times \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{~d} 4$（also $10 \ldots \mathrm{~b} 4$ favors White： $11.0-0 \quad \times c 312 . b \times c 3 \quad 0-0$
営ad8 16． g 5 씁a5 17 ．$\times \mathrm{l} \times \mathrm{f} 6 \mathrm{~g} \times \mathrm{f} 6$ ， Lepelletier－Marciano，Toulouse 1995， and now 18．g5 f5 19．留d3 f4 20．g×f4 would have left White with a large advantage）11．щe e2＋（11．．． H e7 12． 0 d 5 © Od 5 13． Od 5 M $\mathrm{m} \times \mathrm{e} 2+$

 winning for White，Sale－Hulak，Pula 1999） $12 . \mathrm{g} 5$ 气d7 13． 0 d 5 筸f8 $14.0 \times \mathrm{e} 7$
 clear advantage for White，Novitzkij－ Litvinov，Minsk 2002.
（c） $8 \ldots$ h5，and here：

（c1）9． $\mathrm{g}_{5} \mathrm{c} \times \mathrm{d} 4$ 10．0 $\times \mathrm{d} 5$ 留a5＋ 11．H2 M M8 12． 0 df 4 县g6 $13.0 \times \mathrm{g} 6$ $\mathrm{h} \times \mathrm{g} 6$ 14．0－0 M g d7 15 ．县f 4 with a lead in development and a superior pawn structure for White，Shirazi－Sprenkle， Pasadena 1983.
（c2） $9 . g 4$ 具g6 10． C 3 （White can improve with 10．0－0 $\mathrm{c} \times \mathrm{d} 411.0 \times \mathrm{d} 4$且e7 12．© 0 0－0 13． 0 de 2 when he has positional advantage） $10 \ldots . \mathrm{c} \times \mathrm{d} 4$
 14．$\searrow \mathrm{y} 4$（d6 $15.0 \times \mathrm{g} 6 \mathrm{~h} \times \mathrm{g} 6$ 16． B e 1具e5 17．c3 $\times \mathrm{d} 418 . \mathrm{cxd} 4$ 留b6 with equal chances，Smederevac－ Velimirovic，Osijek 1978.
（c3）9． $\mathrm{e} 3 \mathrm{c} \times \mathrm{d} 410$ ．$\times \mathrm{d} 4$ 县 $\mathrm{b} 411.0-0$

 17． $0 \times b 4$ 包 $\times \mathrm{b} 4$ 18．${ }^{\mu} \mathrm{d} 2$ with better chances for White．Botterill－Adorjan， Canterbury 1973.

## 9． 1 e3

White can also play 9．g5，e．g．，9．．．h6 10．$\times \mathrm{Cf} 6$ 㽞 $\times \mathrm{f} 611.0 \times \mathrm{d} 5 \times \mathrm{C} 512$ ．$\times \mathrm{d} 5$ 0－0－0 13．$\times$ ． 6 筸 $\times$ c6 14．0－0 and White is somewhat better，Troianescu－ Kortschnoj，Bucharest 1954.

## $9 . . \mathrm{c} \times \mathrm{d} 410.2 \times \mathrm{d} 4 \mathrm{~S} 4$ 11．0－0 0－0 12． 0 ce 2 具 7

