

recently was in the backwoods of theory. It was employed by the Swedish grandmaster Jonny Hector; other players regarded it with scepticism.

And it was only when the outstanding (and highly authoritative) Armenian grandmaster Rafael Vaganian began playing it, that the variation went sharply up in the world. Now it can be confidently called one of the most popular in the Veresov Opening.

The advantage of 4. ₩d3 over 4. Wd2 is that when White advances e2-e4, at no point can Black threaten tempo-gaining the ②f6xe4.

4.

h7-h6

In the theoretical section the position after **4...e6** 5.e4 de 6. 公xe4 يe7 7. 🖗 xf6 + 🖗 xf6 8. 🖗 f3 0-0 9.0-0-0 b6 is analysed. It is very similar to a corresponding variation of the French Defence: 1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.6)c3 de 4.6)xe4 6)d7 5.6)f3②gf6 6. ③xf6+ ④xf6 7. 違g5 違e7 8. 单d3 0-0 9. We2. However, the

placing of the queen on e2 and the bishop on d3 looks more natural than what we have now, in the Veresov Opening: queen on d3, and bishop on f1. Incidentally, in the 'French' Black cannot play 9...b6? in view of 10. \$xf6 \$xf6 11. We4. but in the Veresov Opening this is perfectly possible.

Nevertheless, if the move 4. Wd3 interested Vaganian, it means that all is not so simple... As. incidentally, is indicated by the variation 4....c5 5.0-0-0 cd 6. Wxd4, in which White now stands very well:



6...e5 7.₩a4 d4 8.∅d5 \$e7 9. ∮) xe7 ₩xe7 10.f4!? 0-0 11.fe ⑤xe5 12.⑤f3 ⑤c6 13.⑥xd4 ⑤xd4 14. [™]xd4, remaining a pawn up (Vaganian Adamski. Copenhagen 2006);

6...e6 7.e4 de?! (7...≜c5!?) 8. ∅xe4 ₩a5? (the lesser evil was 8... ≜e7 9. Ød6+ ≜xd6 10. ₩xd6 營b6) 9. ≜xf6 gf 10. 公xf6+ 公xf6 11. wxf6 国g8 12. 逸b5+!, and Black resigned a move before mate (Hector – Kirkegaard, Copenhagen 2006).

5. **£g5-h4** e7-e6

The theory of the branch 5....c6 6.0-0-0 營a5 7.登b1 b5!? 8.e4 b4 is developing rapidly. For the moment, alas, not in White's favour:

9.e5 bc 10.ef ②xf6 11.違xf6 ef 12.②e2 cb 13.豐e3+ 查d8 14.②f4 違d6 (Velicka – Dydyshko, Czech Republic 2004) or

9.ed bc 10.dc 心b6 11. 象xf6 gf 12. ④e2 cb 13. 豐c3 豐d5 14. ④f4 豐d6 15.g3 e5 16. 象g2 ef 17.c7 ④d5 18. 單he1+ 象e7 (Vaganian – Ruck, Mainz 2006). In neither case did White gain sufficient compensation for the sacrificed material.

6. e2-e4	d5xe4
7. 🖄 c3xe4	≗f8-e7

8. ⊲)e4xf6+ ... This exchange is

This exchange is obviously necessary. In the event of the immediate 8.0-0-0 White has to reckon with 8... \textcircled xe4 9. \textcircled xe7 \textcircled xf2 (Lalev – Espig, Varna 1983).

8. ...

≗e7xf6

8...公xf6 is more natural, and then 9.公f3 0-0 (9...營d5!?) 10.0-0-0 b6. This position differs from the *tabiya* (cf. the note to Black's 4th move) only in the inclusion of the moves h7-h6 and 盒g5-h4. New possibilities, new temptations... (Diagram.)

The chief of which, of course, is the g2-g4-g5!? breakthrough. But



it cannot be crudely carried out: **11**. \exists **g1** &b7 12.g4? \blacksquare d5 with a double attack on f3 and a2.

A very interesting course was taken by Hall – Jones (Gothenburg 2005), in which White first played 11. De5 and only in reply to 13.c4 凹a5 14.a3 (14.含b1? 息e4) Black did not put up a tough resistance: 15...c5 16.d5! ed 17.\"h3 (the immediate 17.g5!? is also interesting, hoping for a queen sacrifice -17... dc 18.gf!, with mate all variations: 18... 罩xd3 in 19. Ixg7+ 查f8 20. Ixf7+ 查g8 22.邕g1+ 21. & xd3 cd ∲h8 23.②g6+ 會g8 24.邕g7#, or 21. 邕xe7+ ∲d8 cd 23.②f7+ 22.邕xd3+ $\oint c 8$ 24. \$h3+ \$b8 25. \$g3#) 17...d4 (it appears that 17...g5!? 18. \$g3 \$f8 would have rescued Black, but such moves are easier to recommend than to make yourself) 18.g5 hg 19. 旦xg5 国 d6 20. 单d3 单f8 21. 国 dg1. As soon as the queen joins the rooks on the

g-file, the attack will become irresistible.

Manea — Grunberg (Baile Tusnad 2005) also deserves to be mentioned. White did not tempt fate in an attack, but took play into an endgame: **11. 急xf6 急**xf6 12. 豐e4 豐d5 13. **急**d3 豐xe4 14. **急**xe4 單b8 15. ④e5 c5 16.f4 cd 17. 罩xd4, where he was also successful.

9. **≜h4xf6** ₩d8xf6

The alternative is 9...心xf6. In Ansell — Whiteley (Newcastle 1995) White responded with the quiet 10.②f3 0-0 11.g3 b6 12.奠g2 逸b7 13.0-0 etc. Knowing the enterprising playing style of grandmaster Stuart Conquest, one can be in no doubt that he would have chosen 11.0-0-0!?

10. 🖄 g1-f3 ...

This position was reached by transposition in Miles — Gheorghiu (Surakarta 1982). Black forced exchanges: 10...c5 11.0-0-0 cd 12.豐xd4 豐xd4 13.②xd4 ②c5 14. 盒b5+ 會e7 15. 罩he1 and was able to hold the draw.

10.... 0-0

With this move Andrey Sokolov shows that he is aiming for more complicated play.

11. ₩d3-e3 ...

Well-known prophylaxis. After 11.0-0-0 White would have had to reckon not so much with 11...c5, as with 11...e5!?. (Diagram.)

The game began in the Veresov



Opening, but it continued – again in the French Defence. This position is known in theory. Only, in the French version the queen goes to e3 not from d3, but from d2.

But it is something else that is more important: how to assess the position? If Black can complete his development normally (b7-b6, &c8-b7) and advance c7-c5, he will have no visible difficulties. The only question is with which move order to carry out this plan.

For White it is fundamentally important to try and forestall this plan. For the moment his own play with g2-g4-g5 is kept in reserve; what is important is to hinder Black's development. But it is one thing to want to, and another to be able.

One thing is clear: a crisis will arrive in the next 4-5 moves. Either Black will freely develop his pieces, when it will be equality, and perhaps an immediate draw. Or White will succeed in imposing his will, and directly on emerging from the opening he will gain a marked advantage.

11. ... c7-c5This is possibly an inaccuracy. Black played more convincingly in Felgaer – Bruzon (Buenos Aires 2005): 11...b6 12. 2b5!? (White tries to prevent Black's development; 12.0-0-0 £b7 etc. is harmless) 12... 邕d8 13. 逸c6 邕b8 14.0-0-0 \$b7 15.9 e5 \$)xe5 16.de ₩e717. \Zxd8+ \Wxd818. \Zd1 \Wc8 19. We4 \$\overline{20.} Wxc6 Wa6! 21. Wxc7 国f8. Draw agreed, since if 22.a3 Black has 22... We2, when he restores material equality.

11... 三d8 is less concrete: 12.0-0-0 (12. @d3 c5 13.dc @xb214.0-0 @b4 15. 三fd1 三f8 — 15... @xc5 16. @h7+! — 16.c6 bc, and Black is at least equal, Hector — Gausel, Oxford 1998) 12...b6, but there too White has not yet managed to achieve anything real:

13.豐e4 單b8 14.逸b5 逸b7 15.愈c6 愈xc6 16.豐xc6 豐f4+ 17.會b1 營d6. Draw. (van der Wiel – Nunn, Lugano 1987);

13. 逸d3 逸b7 14. 逸e4 逸xe4 15. 豐xe4 c5 16. d5 ed 17. 罩xd5 罩e8 18. 豐d3 ②e5 19. ③xe5 罩xe5 20. 罩xe5 豐xe5. The position is completely equal (Hector – Speelman, Roskilde 1998).

12. 0-0-0 b7-b6

Possibly it was time to exchange -12...cd 13. $\exists xd4 - and$ switch to the idea of e6-e5:

13....a6 14. @e2 響e7 15. Ξ hd1 b5 16.g4 e5 17. Ξ d6 Ξ e8 18.h3 @f8 19. @b1. There is no impression that Black has equalised. Nevertheless the players agreed a draw (Wolff – Lputian, Tilburg 1992);

13...e5!? (a radical measure, and perhaps the most correct) 14. 旦e4 旦d8 15. 逸c4 ②b6 16. ②xe5 ③xc4 17. 旦xc4 逸e6 18. 旦f4 彎g5 19.g4 旦e8 20.h4 彎e7 21. ③f3 彎c7. Black is a pawn down, but he is full of optimism (Hector – Korchnoi, Hamburg 1995).

The move order chosen by Sokolov (first c7-c5, and only then b7-b6) allows Conquest to delay the development of the c8-bishop. For just 'five minutes', but this five minutes is sufficient to advance his pawn to g5.

13. ≜f1-b5 c5xd4 14. ⊒d1xd4 ⊮f6-e7

Here it is – an important tempo, which Black will be so lacking!

The last theoretical branch is the game Hector – C. Hanley (Jersey 2003): 14...0c5 15.0e5 a5?! (a strange move: it is though Black was planning 15...a6 and, misjudging the movement of his hand, advanced the pawn one square further than he should have done) 16. \blacksquare d6 0b7 17. \blacksquare xb6 etc.



15. g2-g4!? 🖄d7-f6

The computer disapproves of this move, suggesting that the knight should be played to c5. The point is not to block the queen's access to the g5-point.

響xh6 21.萬g3! 急h5 22.萬h4!
響xe3+ 23.fe. Even after agreeing to the exchange of queens, with his rooks alone White announces a linear mate.

16. g4-g5 h6xg5 17. ₩e3xg5 ...

Had the bishop been on b7, White would not have had this move.

The game is decided. Already here Conquest could have won the queen: $18. \Xi d7$, but he sensibly judged that the attack was more important.

18..... g7-g6 19. 兰d4-d7

But here White can be reproached for lack of restraint. The queen is good, but mate is better! Mate could have been achieved in a simple and pretty way: 19.②e5 豐c5 (19...罩ad8 20.罩h4) 20.彙d3! 豐xd4 21.②xg6!

19.	•••	₩e7xd7
20.	≗b5xd7	④f6xd7

For an instant it might seem that White has made it much harder to win. There is no mate, and for the queen Black has rook, bishop and some hopes of setting up a fortress.

But these reasonings are a mirage. And it disappears after one precise move.

21.②f3-h4! .

(Diagram.)

Threatening to capture on g6. To



save his king, Black is forced to part with his bishop. And without it there can be no question of a fortress.

21	<u></u>
22. ∐g1-g4	≗e4-f5
22@c5 23.f3	3 is also hopeless.
In general everytl	hing is hopeless.
23. ②h4xf5	e6xf5

24. ₩g5xf5 ...

Black resigned on the 35th move.

INDEX OF ILLUSTRATIVE GAMES

№ 1. A. Korotylev – S. Smagin	. 309
№ 2. Hoang Thanh Trang – K. Lahno	. 313
№ 3. V. Georgiev – A. Beliavsky	. 315
№ 4. A. Stefanova – M. Chiburdanidze	. 318
№ 5. Cao Sang – S. Karjakin	. 321
№ 6. M. Hebden – D. Gormally	. 325
№ 7. M. Hebden – O. Gladyszev	. 329
№ 8. Pendergast – Semko	. 333
№ 9. S. Marder – A. Larsen	. 334
№ 10. B. Czap – S. Kaplan	. 338
№ 11. N. Dobrev – D. Howell	. 341
№ 12. S. Conquest – A. Sokolov	. 343