## NEW ENCLANDER

## Chess Club Update - May 2010

## Chairman's Chatter

Another season is practically over. There are a few straggling results to come through so please help to bring it to a tidy and satisfying conclusion.

Paul tanks

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2. I got this introductory problem to 2009 British Solving Championship wrong!


Last Month's solution
Position : 8/2pnB3/Pbk5/4R3/1PKn4/8/8/8

## 1 Re6+ Nxe6 2 b5\#

Result Round-up
Fenland Knock-Out

| New England A | $\mathbf{1} 1 / 2$ | Cambridge A | $\mathbf{4 1 / 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| C Ross | $1 / 2$ | O Winfridsson | $1 / 2$ |
| F Bowers | 0 | P Fallon | 1 |
| P Hanks | 1 | R McCorry | 0 |
| P Turp | 0 | A Stewart | 1 |
| R Jones | 0 | A Cooper | 1 |
| J Alster | 0 | T Bramley | 1 |

Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| New England A | $\mathbf{2 1 1 2}$ | Cambridge A | $\mathbf{2 1 1 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| C Ross | 1 | O Winfridsson | 0 |
| F Bowers | $1 / 2$ | A Stewart | $1 / 2$ |
| P Hanks | 0 | R McCorry | 1 |
| P Turp | 112 | M Liguori | $1 / 2$ |
| R Jones | $1 / 2$ | P Ribbands | $1 / 2$ |


| Royston | $\mathbf{3} 1 / 2$ | New England A | $\mathbf{1 1 / 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| N Hutchinson | 1 | C Ross | 0 |
| K Clark | 0 | F Bowers | 1 |
| P Kemp | $1 / 2$ | P Turp | $1 / 2$ |
| P Rice | 1 | R Jones | 0 |
| P McMahan | 1 | D Lane | 0 |


| New England B | $\mathbf{3} 1 / 2$ | Buckden B | $1 / 2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R Jones | $1 / 2$ | A Young | $1 / 2$ |
| D Lane | 1 | B Taylor | 0 |
| A Brookbanks | 1 | C Money | 0 |
| M Tarabad | 1 | A Ellul | 0 |


| New England B | $\mathbf{1}$ | Buckden A | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R Jones | $1 / 2$ | P Barkas | $1 / 2$ |
| D Lane | 0 | C Norton | 1 |
| A Brookbanks | $1 / 2$ | C Hamilton | $1 / 2$ |
| M Tarabad | 0 | S Buttercase | 1 |

Club Championship : at 28/04/10

| Division One | CR |  | FB |  | PT |  | RJ |  | PH |  | MD |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C Ross | X |  | 11 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | P | 8/9 |
| F Bowers | 0 |  | X | P |  | P | P | P |  | 1/2 | P |  | 1/4 |
| P Turp | 0 |  | P |  | X | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | P | P | $2 / 5$ |
| R Jones | 0 | P | P P |  | 0 |  | X |  | 0 |  | P | P | $0 / 5$ |
| P Hanks | 0 |  | $1 / 21 / 2$ | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  | X |  | P | P | $5 / 8$ |
| M Dunkley | P |  | P | P | P | P | P P | P | P | P | X | X | $0 / 1$ |


| Division Two | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathbf{D} \\ \mathbf{L} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{R} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{s} \\ \mathbf{w} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{B} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{N} \\ & \mathbf{W} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathbf{J} \\ \mathbf{A} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{H} \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{T} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{K} \\ & \mathbf{T} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathbf{S} \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D Lane | X | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | P | 1 | 1 | 0 | 51/2/8 |
| C Russell | 1 | X | 1 | P | $1 / 2$ | 0 * | 1 | 1 |  | P | 41/2/6 |
| S Walker | 0 | 0 | X | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 41/2/9 |
| A Brookbanks | 0 | P | 1/2 | X | 1 | P | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $5 / 7$ |
| N Wedley | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | X | 1 | P | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 4/8 |
| J Alster | 1/2 | 1* | 0 | P | 0 | X | 1 | 1 |  | P | 31/2/6 |
| H Currie | P | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | P | 0 | X | 0 | 0* |  | 1/2/6 |
| M Tarabad | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | X | 1 | 1 | 4/9 |
| K Talnikar | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |  | 1* | 0 | X | P | 11/2/6 |
| D Sivell | 1 | P | 1 | 0 | 0 | P |  | 0 | P | X | $2 / 5$ |

[^0]
## Quickplay Tournament 17.03.10

| Player |  | Rd 1 |  | Rd 2 |  | Rd 3 |  | Rd 4 |  | Rd 5 |  | 历్ర | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\frac{\circ}{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{0} \\ & \boldsymbol{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | 응 | $\begin{gathered} \boldsymbol{\sim} \\ \underset{\sim}{*} \end{gathered}$ | 응 | $\begin{gathered} \boldsymbol{\infty} \\ \text { む } \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \boldsymbol{\infty} \\ & \boldsymbol{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | O | $\begin{gathered} \boldsymbol{\theta} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 1 | C Ross | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | $1=$ |
| 2 | D Lane | 3 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | $1=$ |
| 3 | F Bowers | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 4 | $1=$ |
| 4 | P Spencer | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 4= |
| 5 | S Walker | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 4= |
| 6 | A Brookbanks | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4= |
| 7 | M Tarabad | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | $7=$ |
| 8 | H Currie | 4 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | $7=$ |

## Diary Dates

The league season finishes in May. The event will be marked by the Jamboree at Warboys on 5th which starts with the presentation of the trophies - sadly, none for New England!

## Website to Watch

With the World Championship clash between Anand and Topalov still taking place in Sofia, one of the qualifying routes to become the next challenger starts in Astrakhan on 9th May. This latest round of the FIDE Grand Prix series lasts until 25th May. It can be followed from links on http://grandprix.fide.com

## Match of the Month

Here's a game with a very interesting twist. I believe it was Capablanca who once said that one advantage in chess sometimes needs to be switched for another. I'm paraphrasing, of course, but essentially, the point is well made.
In this round 8 game from the 4 NCL , I adopted that very policy on move 7 in the most remarkable of ways. Who would have thought that 15 moves later, my opponent would resign, materially equal and no attack visible? Instead, a simple accumulation of positional gains from a switch of strategic objectives. A very unusual opening and a very interesting 7th move by Black, which will require some explanation. Enjoy!

> J Foster (2089) v C Ross (2205)

Sambuca Sharks v Braille Chess Association 4NCL Division 3, Daventry, 28.03.10

| 1 | c 4 | e 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Nc 3 | d 5 |
| 3 | e 4 |  |

I'm astounded to find this opening in the database but there it is, in all its glory. Needless to say Black scores very heavily with it! Black has several options here, pushing onto d4 being a perfectly acceptable choice. But why blockade and then have to waste yet another tempo by pushing e6-e5? No, take the game to White and ask him to justify his obscure opening.
3
...
dxe4
4
Nxe4
c5

Saddling White with a backward d pawn, the whole focus of my game hereafter. Black has equalised and maybe more due to White's backward central pawn.

## Nc6

White must not be allowed to play d4. If White gets this in, he could even claim the advantage! He would have a queenside majority and the black pawn on e6 lumbers Black with the problem of developing his queen's bishop.

## 6 d3

I started getting a sense of White playing a strange reversed Sicilian Nadjorf set-up. A bit creepy but I started thinking at this point about my strategy. I had played all of my moves automatically so far and after my next, it was time to dig in and ponder.

6

## Nf6

$7 \quad \mathrm{Be} 3$
OK, crunch time. Now I sat for over 20 minutes and thought deeply about Black's strategy. Naturally, tactics have to be considered as well, but the longterm game plan has to be established. So, have a good, long think. Take your time on this position and examine every element - it's important. Move first, explanation afterwards...


Let me quote myself from move 4: "Saddling White with a backward d pawn, the whole focus of my game now". What happened to that then?! This is where my little friend Capablanca was muttering away in my subconscious and my unease of studying the position on move 6 came back to tickle my fancy.
Was the backward pawn on d3 that important after all? Was it really on a weak square? The pawn had plenty of defenders and with the bishop sitting on e2, White could cling on and hope for the best. Let's contemplate the other positional factors. The knight on e4 stands on a very good square and if the white pawn on d3 were to occupy that square, is it any
stronger there than on d3? No, it's actually weaker as Black can attack it much more freely and White can't defend it any easier. Indeed, after the fianchetto of his queen's bishop, Black will hit the e4 square directly.
Now tactics. Black had to be wary of Nxc5. I dismissed the idea immediately as I was convinced that Qa5+ must give me something. However, White is threatening to play $\mathrm{d} 3-\mathrm{d} 4$ and release all the pressure. That can't be allowed. Snaffling the bishop with Ng 4 for Black is probably fine but White will be happy with the subsequent fxe3 supporting his centre after 8 d 4 . Back to positional considerations. Consider the central squares. Black has a clamp on d4 with his pawn on c5 and knight on c6. Yes, Nimzovich would roll about in his grave with delight at the nature of the blockading square in front of the backward d pawn. That's all fine, but what's the point in blockading the pawn if you want to attack it? And think about the pawns on c4 and e4. They have the Maroczy Bind, but with the black pawn being on e6, their effectiveness is limited. In many ways, I have a slightly better version of the Exchange variation of the King's Indian Defence, where the black c and e pawns have been interchanged. In that regard, the black bishops can be put on better diagonals and those two little pawns on c4 and e4 will become sad targets. The final move of the game is so, so, ever-so fitting to this remarkable switch in positional play!

## 8 <br> dxe4 <br> Qxd1+

Of course I want the queens off. The rook has no effective squares down the $d$ file and anyway, I'm going to exchange it. Meanwhile, White has to contend with Nb4/Nxa2/Nc2+/Nxe3 concepts.

| 9 | Rxd1 | b6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | Be2 | Bb7 |
| 11 | a3 |  |

This P-R3 move (in descriptive notation) gives him yet more weaknesses in his pawn chain. It is logical as I was willing to play Nb4 to force such a breech in the pawn barrier even if this meant a loss of tempo by retreating immediately to c6.

| 11 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Be7}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | $0-0$ | $\mathrm{Bf6}$ |

Demonstrating that tempi in the position are irrelevant and that strategic gains are the meal of the day. White doesn't want to push e4-e5, as this would weaken the e pawn and ensure that the knight on f3 can't move easily, as it would be bound to defend the e5 pawn. However, my control of that all-important d4 outpost has yet another piece on it. So, White may well do best to push the bishop away. I did even think about Bd8/Bc7 ideas to hit the pawn on e5, which looked very tasty indeed.

| 13 | Rd2 | Rd8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Rfd1 |  |

Taking on d8 doesn't solve his problems. I would recapture with the king, shuffle it to c8 and then continue with the plan.

Quietly going about my job, rushing isn't necessary here. The rooks have to come off at some point.

## 15 Bf4

White gets a glimmer of hope but it's soon snuffed out. White's desperately hoping for e4-e5 tactics, which would win the blocked up bishop on f6. No counterplay though, no counterplay, remember that... 15 Bd3 Rd7 16 Bf4 e5 would put up more resistance.

15
Bd4
And onto that outpost I now land. 15 ... Nd4 16 Nxd 4 Bxd4 17 Bc7 looked awkward, as White would then have Be5 tactics. I didn't want any of that rubbish, and avoided it like the plague.

## 16 Nxd4

White had to be bold and play for tactics - going for broke, as it were. 16 e5 would give him Bg5+ threats, to which Black would respond with h6 or f6. Either way, the question would remain as to whether Rd7, Rhd8 and Bxf2 or Bxb2 were on the cards. The knight on f 3 would not be able to support e5 and the rook on d2 and would eventually become overloaded.

## 16

$$
\ldots
$$

## Nxd4

Look at that knight outpost! White thought he was ridding himself of it, but I soon disillusioned him.

And everything is now perfectly set. I can play e6-e5 at any time, rendering that bishop on f 3 an utterly useless piece of wood. The white pawns are far too weak and the white position is hopeless. No wonder he resigned a few moves later.

18
Be3
18 b4 Ba6 doesn't help his cause...
18 ... Nb3
The final insult. The b3 square is White's final undoing. How these P-R3 moves come back to haunt folk..

19 Rd3 Na5
Demonstrating with minor piece mobility that White's pawns are simply too weak and his back rank is vulnerable. Not everything can be defended successfully.

| 20 | Rxd8 | Rxd8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | Rc1 | Nb3 |

Back we go to deliver the coup de grace. Poor old White...

## $22 \operatorname{Re} 1$ <br> Nd2 0-1

Illustrating the defencelessness of the white pawns. Both c4 and e4 are hit and can't be defended. If White were to capture the knight on d2, the black rook reaches the 7th rank and mops up the queenside pawns. The bishop on f3 is useless and the white back rank vulnerable to flash checkmates. White had had enough and threw in the towel. A beautifully fitting end to attack the two pawns that I deliberately strategically placed on move 7 !

## Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| A Team |  |  |  | $\text { PO isLZ } \forall \text { sКоqueM }$ | Peterborough $4^{\text {th }}$ Nov |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & 5 \\ & \boxed{\circ} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\text { Warboys } \mathbf{A} 10^{\mathrm{th}} \mathrm{Feb}$ | Peterborough $25^{\text {th }}$ Feb |  |  | 0 0 0 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chris Ross | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1d | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1d | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 12 |
| Francis Bowers | 1 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 61/2 | 11 |
| Ron Jones | 1/2 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| Mike Dunkley |  |  | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 |
| Phil Turp | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $31 / 2$ | 8 |
| Jack Alster | 1/2 | 0 |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 | 5 |
| Chris Russell |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| Paul Hanks | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | $41 / 2$ | 9 |
| Des Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  | $1 / 2$ |  | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Total | 4 | $11 / 2$ | 4 | 2 | $11 / 2$ | 2 | 2 | $31 / 2$ | 2112 | 21/2 | 2112 | 1112 | 24 |  |
| B Team |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { o } \\ & \text { i } \\ & \text { e } \\ & \text { e } \\ & \text { o } \\ & \text { م } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { Un } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { Warboys B } 17^{\text {th }} \text { Feb }$ |  |  |  | $\text { ıd } \forall \text { «৪Z \& squeə }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Ron Jones |  |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1d | 0 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & \text { d } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { 픈 } \end{aligned}$ | 4112 | 9 |
| Harry Currie |  |  |  |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1d |  |  |  |  |  | $11 / 2$ | 3 |
| Mahmoud Tarabad |  |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 4 | 7 |
| Alan Brookbanks |  |  | 0 |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1d | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  | 5 | 8 |
| Jack Alster |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1/2 | 1 |
| Des Lane |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1d | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 3 | 6 |
| Kaewallya Talnikar |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |
| Total |  |  | 0 | 3 | 21⁄2 | 21⁄2 | 4d | 1 | 2 | 3112 | 1 | - | 191/2 |  |


[^0]:    * $=$ game played in league match to count in both competitions

