## NEW ENGLANDER

## Chess Club Update - February 2016

## Chairman's Chatter

The ECF recently issued updated gradings which can be compared with the TPR estimates in the January Grand Prix table. The two new entrants were different but over $90 \%$ of the remainder who only play in club events were within 5 points and most were better than expected.

Paul tanks

## Diary Dates

After a hectic month in the leagues, we have a flood of internal events in February :-

$3^{\text {rd }}$ February Club Championship Round 3<br>$10^{\text {th }}$ February Handicap competition<br>$17^{\text {th }}$ February Club Rapidplay

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution (A Miyara)
Position : 8/5K2/8/4BBkn/3N4/8/8/7R
1 Rh4 Kh6 2 Bf4\# [1 ... Kxh4 2 Nf3; 1 ... N any 2 Bf6]

## Window on the Web

Those of you who have visited chesslecture.com might be aware that one of their lecturers until last year was the US National Master Dana Mackenzie. He left to pursue other interests. His chess blog at http://www.danamackenzie.com/blog/ is worth a visit.
There is much to explore here. The Home page contains the latest post. The Profile link takes you (as expected) to information about the author. There are
links to monthly older posts containing chess wisdom, games and positions. There are so many of these that quite a lot of spare time would be needed to read them all but, examples at random :-

- January 2016 contains analysis of a very complicated ending with rooks and pawns, where one or other side could promote a pawn to achieve a queen $v$ rook and pawns ending.
- November 2015 includes The Perils or Rewards of Doing Nothing which discusses whether to play it safe or take risks when playing a weaker opponent.
- September 2014 has part I of Six Games, Six Positions with analysis of critical points in the games.
- March 2014 has The Perils of Opening Preparation in two parts, dealing with the Caro-Kann in Part 1 and the King's Gambit in Part 2.
- September 2013 includes Prophylaxis and Flexibility with analysis of two positions showing it is better to play flexible moves that improve your position if you can, rather than impulsive committal moves that might end up ruining it.
- In October 2011, there is The Fourth Endgame of the Apocalypse, with instructive analysis of a difficult endgame.
There is also an index of categories of posts. Openings, for example, has many discussions of themes such as Why Does Anybody Play 1 e4? A good question, when you know the statistics...

Qoncones

## Website to Watch

February is a lean month for chess tournaments but six top grandmasters will compete in the Zurich Chess Challenge from $13^{\text {th }}$ to $15^{\text {th }}$. It combines rapid and blitz events and can be followed at www.zurich-cc.com.

## Result Round-up

Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| Peterborough A | $\mathbf{1} 1 / 2$ | New England A | $\mathbf{3} 1 / 2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| A Timosenko | $1 / 2$ | R Taylor | $1 / 2$ |
| C Tandy | 0 | F Bowers | 1 |
| S Herring | 0 | P Hanks | 1 |
| M Connolly | $1 / 2$ | S Caraway | $1 / 2$ |
| N Fisher | $1 / 2$ | M Dunkley | $1 / 2$ |


| New England A | $\mathbf{2}$ | Warboys A | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R Taylor | $1 / 2$ | D McFarlane | $1 / 2$ |
| F Bowers | 0 | C Watkins | 1 |
| P Hanks | 1 | M Misson | 0 |
| C Russell | 0 | B Duff | 1 |
| M Dunkley | $1 ⁄ 2$ | J Beck | $1 / 2$ |
| Buckden | $\mathbf{3}$ | New England B | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| A Chapman | $1 / 2$ | P Turp | $1 / 2$ |
| P Barkas | $1 / 2$ | R Jones | $1 / 2$ |
| S Buttercase | 1 | D Lane | 0 |
| C Norton | 1 | M Tarabad | 0 |

Team 550 Competition

| NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{3}$ | NE Patriots | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| M Dunkley | $1 / 2$ | S Caraway | $1 / 2$ |
| R Jones | $1 / 2$ | C Russell | $1 / 2$ |
| D Lane | 1 | S Walker | 0 |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | N Foreman | 0 |
| Warboys | $\mathbf{4}$ | NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| R Mann | 1 | F Bowers | 0 |
| C Watkins | 1 | R Jones | 0 |
| M Onyons | 1 | D Lane | 0 |
| P Wells | 1 | M Tarabad | 0 |


| Godmanchester | P | NE Patriots | P |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| NE Patriots | $\mathbf{1}$ | Warboys | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| S Caraway | $1 / 2$ | C Watkins | $1 / 2$ |
| S Walker | $1 / 2$ | B Duff | $1 / 2$ |
| P Weinberger | 0 | M Onyons | 1 |
| I Garratt | 0 | P Wells | 1 |


| NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{1} 1 / 2$ | Spalding | $\mathbf{2 1 ⁄ 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| P Turp | 1 | P Golimowski | 0 |
| R Jones | $1 / 2$ | T Nottingham | $1 / 2$ |
| D Lane | 0 | J Smith | 1 |
| M Tarabad | 0 | T Bennett | 1 |

Club Championship

| Round 2 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| D Lane (1) | P | P | M Dunkley (1) |
| P Weinberger (1) | P | P | R Taylor (1/2) |
| I Garratt (0) | P | P | P Cairns (0) |



New England Club Ladder

| White |  | Black |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| N Foreman | 0 | 1 | P O'Gorman |
| P Hanks | 1 | 0 | I Garratt |
| J Parker | 0 | 1 | F Bowers |
| I Garratt | 0 | 1 | P Hanks |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | 0 | N Foreman |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | 0 | M Tarabad |
| P Weinberger | 1 | 0 | D Lane |
| I Garratt | 0 | 1 | R Jones |


|  | Change |  | Player | Record @ 2701/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & \hline \text { 喜 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 1 | +6 | +8 | P O'Gorman | 1,0,0,0,0,1,1,1,1,1 |
| 2 | - | +1 | F Bowers | 1,1,1,1,1/2,1 |
| 3 | -2 | +8 | M Tarabad | 1,0,1,0 |
| 4 | -1 | +8 | P Hanks | 1,1,1/2,1,1 |
| 5 | -1 | -4 | N Wedley | 1,1,1,1,1/2,0 |
| 6 | -1 | +8 | R Jones | 1,1 |
| 7 | +1 | -5 | N Foreman | 0,0,0,0,0,0,1 |
| 8 | -2 | -1 | P Turp | 1 |
| 9 | - | -4 | I Garratt | 1,0,0,0 |
| 10 | - | -6 | J Parker | 0,0,0,1,1,0,0 |
| 11 | - | -5 | P Cairns | 0,0 |
| 12 | - | -4 | P Weinberger | 0,0,0,1 |
| 13 | - | -3 | D Lane | 0,0,1/2,0 |
| 14 | - | -1 | S Caraway | 1,1 |

New England Grand Prix

| Player |  | D <br> 0 <br> 0 | $\cong$ <br> 0 <br> $\Xi$ | $\underset{\substack{0}}{2}$ |  | 뀽 | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P Hanks | 2 | $41 / 2$ | 5 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 121/2 | 167 |
| F Bowers | 1 | 51/2 | 2 | $1 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | 101/2 | 167 |
| S Caraway | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 3 | 9 | 171 |
| P Turp | 1 | 1 | 5 |  | 2 | 9 | 153 |
| R Jones | 2 | 2 | 3 |  | 2 | 9 | 125 |
| P O'Gorman | 0 | 6 |  |  | 2 | 8 |  |
| D Lane | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $21 / 2$ |  | 3 | 7 | 102 |
| M Tarabad | 1 | 2 | $11 / 2$ |  | $11 / 2$ | 6 | 81 |
| N Wedley | $1 / 2$ | $41 / 2$ |  |  |  | 5 | 108 |
| J Parker | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 90 |
| M Dunkley | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 21/2 | 137 |
| C Russell | $1 / 2$ |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 2 | 112 |
| S Wozniak | $11 / 2$ |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 2 | 123 |
| R Taylor | $1 / 2$ |  | $11 / 2$ |  |  | 2 | 162 |
| P Weinberger | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 62 |
| S Walker | 1 |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | 100 |
| I Garratt | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 46 |
| N Foreman | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| P Cairns | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 16 |

## Match of the Month

This game was played in the first victory for the $A$ team in the past two seasons.

## C Tandy $\vee$ F Bowers

Peterborough A v New England A, 14.01.2016

| 1 | $e 4$ | $e 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $f 4$ |  |

The King's Gambit has become a cinderella opening in grandmaster events at the highest level. Spassky used it roguishly to defeat Fischer in their first meeting (Mar del Plata, 1960) and it still appears spasmodically even with some big names as White (Nakamura, Ivanchuk, Short). Its charm from the romantic era has been replaced by its role as a surprise weapon to avoid your opponent's preparation.

$$
2 \text {... exf4 }
$$

If you want to reciprocate and take White into unfamiliar territory, you might like to consider the Keene Variation 2 ... Qh4+ 3 g3 Qe7 4 fxe5 d6.

## $3 \quad$ Nf3 <br> d6

Fischer played $3 \ldots$ g5 but was not happy with his play. His search for an improvement alighted on the text move which he claimed as a "refutation".

| 5 | h 4 | g 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Ng 1 | $\mathrm{Nf6}$ |
| 7 | Nc 3 | Nh 5 |

Avid readers of NEW ENCLANDER will remember the December 2015 issue which featured an Eye Opener article in which Grischuk faced the gambit with $3 \ldots$ g5. By advancing the kingside pawns and defending them with Nf6-h5, he cramped White's development. This game shows the same trait but here White's king's knight has not even reached an outpost on e5 thanks to the alternative at move 3.

## 8

Nge2
f3
8 ... Be7 comes into consideration when White might miss 9 Nxf4 Bxh4+ 10 Ke2 Ng6+. Already, the normal initiative after a gambit has passed to Black.

| $\mathbf{9}$ | gxf3 | gxf3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | Nf4 |  |

Although it looks wrong, 10 Ng 1 might be playable because Black seems unable to profit from 10 ... Bg4 11 Nxf3.

| 10 | $\ldots$ | Bg4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | Qd3 | Ng3 |
| 12 | Rh2 | Be7 |
| 13 | Nfd5 |  |

Perhaps White should damp down the flames on the kingside with 13 Bh3 Bxh3 (13 ... h5 14 Be 3 and 15 0-0-0) 14 Rxh3 Bxh4 15 Qxf3 Nf5+ 16 Kd1 Nxd4.
13
...
Bxh4

The computer prefers $13 \ldots$ Nxf1 14 Kxf1 c6 but it is hardly in the spirit of the position. Instead, I am sacrificing a rook. It makes my philosophy simple - go for the jugular!

| 14 | Nxc7+ | Kd7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | Nxa8 | Nxe4+ |
| 16 | Kd1 | Nxc3+ |
| 17 | Kd2 |  |

The series of forced moves comes to an end. 17 bxc 3 is not viable because $17 \ldots \mathrm{f} 2+18 \mathrm{Be} 2$ (18 Bd2 Bg5+) $\mathrm{f} 1=\mathrm{Q}$ and the new queen cannot be captured due to the pin. White had to assess 17 Qxc3 f2+ 18 Kd2 Nc6 ( $18 \ldots$ Qg5+ 19 Qe3) when there is a sudden calm in the storm. There are numerous tries from this position but at worst, I can take the knight in the corner to regain material equality while retaining very dangerous threats down the open e file. White is fairly helpless e.g. 19 Kd 3 Re 820 Bd 2 (otherwise 20 ... Re1) b5 or 19 Qc4 Qe7 20 Kc3 Bf6.

## 17

...
Nc6
The strongest move is supposed to be $17 \ldots \mathrm{Ne} 2$ but I think you need the long-range vision of a computer to justify this.

## 18

## Qxc3

Black has to re-capture or be at a serious disadvantage. Unfortunately, 18 Kxc 3 only leads to 18 ... Qa5+ $19 \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{~d} 5+20 \mathrm{~Kb} 3$ Qb4\# but this can be avoided by the zwischenzug $18 \mathrm{Nb} 6+$ axb6 (18 ... Qxb6 19 Rxh4) 19 Kxc3 Qf6 20 Be3 Rc8 when Black is on top but not landing a knock-out blow.


I could have avoided lines in which Black returns some material by Rxh4 with 18 ... Bg3 19 Rh1 Qg5+ 20 Kd3 Qf5+ 21 Kc (21 Ke3 Qe4; 21 Kd 2 Qf4+ 22 Kd3 Ne5+ 23 dxe5 Bf5\#) 21 ... b5+ 22 Kb3 Qd5+ 23 Ka3 b4+.

## 19 Rxh4

White has to prevent $20 \ldots$ Be1+. After $19 \mathrm{Kd} 3,19 \ldots$ Re1 stops any co-ordinated defence :-

- 20 Bh3 Bxh3 21 Rxh3 f2
- 20 Bg5 Bf5+ 21 Kc 4 (21 Kd2 Qxg5+) 21 ... b5+ 22 Kb3 (22 Kd5 Be6\#) 22 ... Be6+ 23 Ka3 Qxg5

| 19 | $\ldots$ | Qxh4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | Kd3 | Bf5+ |
| 21 | Kc4 |  |

Not 21 Kd2 Qe1\#.

## 21 ... <br> Nxd4 0-1

Faced with a discovered check (22 ... Ne2+) and a skewer (22 ... Rc8+), Black resigned. There is no escape e.g. 22 Kd5 Be6\#; 22 Qxd4 Rc8+ 23 Kd5 Be6\#; 22 Kb4 Nxc2+ etc.

## Eye Opener

As shown above, the King's Gambit makes for great entertainment.

## Podgorny v Stulik

Czechoslovakia, 1956

| 1 | e4 | e5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | f4 | exf4 |
| 3 | Nf3 | Be7 |
| 4 | Bc4 | Nf6 |
| 5 | Nc3 | Nxe4 |
| 6 | Ne5 | Nd6 |

The antidote is supposed to be $6 \ldots \mathrm{Ng} 5$.

| $\mathbf{7}$ | Bb3 | Bh4+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | g3 | fxg3 |


| 9 | $0-0$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10 | $K h 1$ |

gxh2+
At this point, White has sacrificed no less than four(!) pawns in the first ten moves. The heartless computer evaluates the position as being in Black's favour to the tune of 1.8 pawns. White's attacking chances in this Cunningham Defence are therefore worth 2.2 pawns.

| 10 | $\ldots$ | Bf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | d4 | b6 |
| 12 | Qh5 | Bb7+ |
| 13 | Kxh2 | g6 |
| 14 | Qh6 | Bg7 |



Black fights back with the tactic 15 Qxg7 Qh4+.

## 15 Nxf7

White could have played 15 Qh3 0-0 16 Bh6 and with Ng 4 to follow, he has a continuing initiative. Instead, he has a surprising combination.

| 15 | Nxd6+ | Bxh6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | cxd6 |  |

Black is cruelly exposed on the centre files 16 ... Ke7 17 Bxh6 cxd6 18 Rae1+ and if he flees with 17 ... Kxd6 18 Bf4+ Kc6 19 Bd5\#

```
17 Bf7+ Ke7
```

17 ... Kf8 gives a choice of mates i.e. 18 Bxh6+ Ke7 19 Rae1+ Be4 20 Rxe4\# or 20 Nd5\#

## 18 Bxh6

Black has a choice of defences but none is adequate.
A) 18 ... Qc7 19 Bg5+ Kf8 20 Bd5+ Kg7 21 Rf7+ Kg8 22 Bh6 when Rf8\# cannot be avoided
B) 18 ... Qc8 $19 \mathrm{Nd} 5+\mathrm{Bxd} 5$ (19 ... Kd8 $20 \mathrm{Bg} 5 \#$ ) 20 Bg5+ Kf8 21 Bxd5+ Kg7 (21 ... Ke8 22 Rae1\#) 22 Rf7+ Kg8 23 Bh6 Qxc2+ 24 Rf2\#
C) 18 ... d5 19 Rae1+ Kd6 20 Bf4+ Kc6 21 Bxd5\#
D) 18 ... Qg8 19 Bxg8 when Black cannot recapture due to 19 ... Rxg8 20 Bg5+ Ke6 21 Rae1+ so 19 ... Kd8 20 Rf8+ Kc7 21 Nb5+ Kc6 22 c4 costs a ruinous amount of material.

