## Chess Club Update - April 2016

## Chairman's Chatter

With the last matches in Team 550 competition having been completed, it is starting to feel like the end of the season and our thoughts are naturally turning to the summer. At the last club AGM, we discussed the Summer Sprint competition and how the format might be improved. If you have any ideas which would encourage your participation, please let me know.

Paul tanks

## Diary Dates

$13^{\text {th }}$ April Club Championship, Round 5 $5^{\text {th }}$ May CCCA Jamboree, Godmanchester
Please remember we still have to schedule the next round of the Fenland Plate when our opponent's become known. Also, a new club in Chatteris is looking for a friendly match after the league season.

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution (Locker 1970) Position : 8/8/7B3N3Q/8/8/3r2P1/4k1K1
1 Nf4 Rxg2+ 2 Nxg2\# [1 ... Re2/Rd any 2 Qxe2\#; 1 ... R other $2 \mathrm{Nd} 3 \#$ ]

## Website to Watch

The US Chess Championship takes place in St Louis from $14^{\text {th }}$ to $26^{\text {th }}$ April. It is an all-play-all event with 12 contestants (Nakamura, Caruana, So etc.) and has www.uschesschamps.com as its website. It is not clear whether it will carry live games.

Norway now hosts one of the strongest tournaments in the chess calendar but has withdrawn from the Grand Chess Tour. ANC (Altibox Norway Chess) will take place in Stavanger from 18th to $30^{\text {th }}$ April, has a top class field headed by Carlsen and Kramnik and can be followed at norwaychess.com.

## Window on the Web

This is part 2 of my review of http://www.chess.com . Over 50,000 tactical problems are on the site covering all the usual themes such as forks, skewers, pins, inbetween moves, overloading, double attack and many more. Your progress as you solve the puzzles against the clock is rated. Each puzzle is treated as your "opponent" so that if you solve it correctly you gain points but it loses points and vice-versa if you make a mistake. The ratings should be reasonably accurate when hundreds of thousands of members have attempted the puzzles. You can choose not to be rated and to tackle the problems by tactical theme or at random.
Lessons are presented in a "Chess Mentor" format. You are presented with critical positions and asked to find the best moves, again being rated on your performance. There are over 100 courses grouped under such subjects as openings, endgames, strategy and tactics. Each course has about 20 lessons exploring a different theme. For example, the 8 Strategy courses include weak colour complexes, the art of exchanging pieces, Silman's lessons in strategy and roots of positional understanding.
There are 6 courses on Attacks including lessons on checkmate patterns, the initiative, pawn storms and premature attacks on the king. Openings has 18 courses including 40 challenges in the King's Indian, 41 in the Sicilian and 3 about exploiting opening errors by your opponent. There are 13 Endgames courses covering, for example, knights, bishop $v$ knight, opposite-coloured bishops and pawn play. Games has 6 courses based on the games of such great players as Carlsen, Kasparov and Capablanca.
On the Home page, clicking on Share brings up several links such as News and Articles which includes tips on avoiding time trouble, why chess players blunder and finding your real weaknesses. Forums takes you to member's discussions of various aspects of the site and general chess matters. There are also links to a vision trainer and to chesstv which is an online TV channel specialising in chess. The new site interface seems to be error-free and the site is well worth a visit whether you want to learn something new or just review the basics.

## Result Round-up

Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| New England A | $\mathbf{4}$ | Peterborough B | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R Taylor | $1 / 2$ | M Connolly | $1 / 2$ |
| F Bowers | $1 / 2$ | D McLennon | $1 / 2$ |
| S Caraway | 1 | J Conlon | 0 |
| M Dunkley | 1 | P Silman | 0 |
| P Turp | 1 | A Krivins | 0 |
| New England B | $\mathbf{2}$ | Warboys C | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| R Jones | 0 | N Greenwood | 1 |
| S Wozniak | 0 | J Beck | 1 |
| D Lane | 1 | P Clough | 0 |
| S Walker | 1 | B Taylor | 0 |

Team 550 Competition

| NE Cavaliers | $31 / 2$ | Warboys | $1 / 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M Dunkley | 1 | R Mann | 0 |
| R Jones | 1 | C Watkins | 0 |
| D Lane | 1/2 | M Onyons | $1 / 2$ |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | P Wells | 0 |
| NE Patriots | 1112 | Godmanchester | 21⁄2 |
| S Caraway | 1 | J Wright | 0 |
| S Walker | 1/2 | M English | 1/2 |
| I Garratt | 0 | J Bygrave | 1 |
| N Foreman | 0 | D Green | 1 |
| Godmanchester | 1112 | NE Patriots | 21/2 |
| J Wright | 1 | C Russell | 0 |
| A Rankine | 1/2 | S Wozniak | 1/2 |
| J Bygrave | 0 | P Weinberger | 1 |
| M Lynn | 0 | I Garratt | 1 |

Club Championship

| Round 3 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R Taylor (11⁄2) | 1 | 0 | D Lane (1) |
| Round 4 |  |  |  |
| P Walker (2) | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | R Taylor ( $2^{1 / 2}$ ) |
| S Caraway (2) | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | M Dunkley (3) |
| S Wozniak (11⁄2) | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | R Jones (2) |
| D Lane (1) | 1 | 0 | N Wedley (11/2) |
| P Turp (11⁄2) | 1 | 0 | C Russell (11⁄2) |
| P Weinberger (1) | 0 | 1 | J Parker (1) |
| S Walker (1) | 1 | 0 | N Foreman (1/2) |
| I Garratt (0) | 0 | 1 | P O'Gorman (1/2) |
| Round 4.5 |  |  |  |
| P Hanks (3) | 0 | 1 | P Walker ( $2^{1 / 2}$ ) |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| M Dunkley ( $3^{1 ⁄ 2}$ ) | P Walker (3½) |
| R Taylor (3) | P Hanks (3) |
| R Jones ( $2^{1 / 2}$ ) | F Bowers ( $2^{1 ⁄ 2}$ ) |
| S Caraway ( $2^{1 ⁄ 2}$ ) | P Turp ( $2^{1 / 2}$ ) |
| J Parker (2) | D Lane (2) |
| S Walker (2) | M Tarabad (2) |
| N Wedley (11/2) | S Wozniak (2) |
| P Weinberger (1) | C Russell ( $11 / 2$ ) |
| N Foreman (1/2) | 1 Garratt (0) |
| P O'Gorman (11/2) | Bye |
| $\begin{aligned} \text { Match night : } & 13^{\text {th }} \text { April. } \\ & \text { Deadline }: 30^{\text {th }} \text { April. } \\ & \text { Next draw }: 1^{\text {st }} \text { May } \end{aligned}$ |  |

New England Club Ladder

| White |  | Black |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| P Weinberger | 0 | 1 | F Bowers |
| N Foreman | 0 | 1 | J Parker |
| P Weinberger | 1 | 0 | I Garratt |
| I Garratt | 0 | 1 | F Bowers |
| P Weinberger | 0 | 1 | J Parker |
| M Tarabad | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | N Wedley |
| D Lane | 1 | 0 | I Garratt |
| N Foreman | 0 | 1 | M Tarabad |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | 0 | P Weinberger |
| F Bowers | 1 | 0 | P Walker |


|  | Change |  |  | Player | Record @ 2303/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 言 } \\ & \text { din } \end{aligned}$ | シั |  |  |  |
| 1 | - | +1 | 12 | S Caraway | 1,1,1 |
| 2 | - | +1 |  | F Bowers | 1,1,1,1,1/2, 1, 1, 1, |
| 3 | - | +6 |  | P O'Gorman | 1,0,0,0,0,1,1,1,1,1,0,1 |
| 4 | +1 | +8 |  | P Hanks | 1,1,1/2, 1, 1 |
| 5 | +1 | -4 |  | N Wedley | 1,1,1,1,1/2,0,1/2 |
| 6 | -2 | +5 |  | M Tarabad | 1,0,1,0,1/2,1 |
| 7 | - | +7 |  | R Jones | 1,1,1 |
| 8 | - | +2 |  | D Lane | 0,0,12, $0,1,1$ |
| 9 | +3 | -5 |  | J Parker | 0,0,0,1,1,0,0,1,1 |
| 10 | -1 | -8 |  | N Foreman | 0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0 |
| 11 | -1 | -4 |  | P Turp | 1 |
| 12 | +2 | -4 |  | P Weinberger | 0,0,0,1,0,1,0,0 |
| 13 | -2 | -8 |  | I Garratt | 1,0,0,0,0,0,0 |
| 14 | +1 | +1 |  | P Walker | 0 |
| 15 | -2 | -9 |  | P Cairns | 0,0 |

New England Grand Prix

| Player |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { d } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \pi \end{aligned}$ | 0 <br> 0 <br> $\Xi$ | $\underset{\substack{0}}{ }$ |  | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F Bowers | 21/2 | 81/2 | $31 / 2$ | 1/2 | 11/2 | 161/2 | 169 |
| P Hanks | 3 | $41 / 2$ | 6 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 141/2 | 166 |
| S Caraway | 21/2 | 3 | 5 |  | 4 | 141/2 | 171 |
| R Jones | 21/2 | 3 | 5 |  | 3 | 13112 | 130 |
| D Lane | 2 | $21 / 2$ | 5 |  | 31/2 | 13 | 106 |
| P Turp | 21/2 | 1 | 7 |  | 2 | 121/2 | 154 |
| P O'Gorman | $11 / 2$ | 7 |  |  | 3 | 111/2 | 94 |
| M Tarabad | 2 | 3112 | 21/2 |  | $11 / 2$ | 91/2 | 87 |
| M Dunkley | $31 / 2$ |  | 3 | 0 | 11/2 | 8 | 154 |
| J Parker | 2 | 4 |  |  | 1 | 7 | 96 |
| N Wedley | $11 / 2$ | 5 |  |  |  | 61/2 | 106 |
| R Taylor | 3 |  | 2 |  |  | 5 | 161 |
| S Walker | 2 |  | $11 / 2$ |  | 1 | 41/2 | 96 |
| P Weinberger | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 79 |
| P Walker | $31 / 2$ | 0 | 1/2 |  |  | 4 | 173 |
| C Russell | $11 / 2$ |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 3 | 107 |
| S Wozniak | 2 |  | $1 / 2$ |  | 1/2 | 3 | 111 |
| I Garratt | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 50 |
| N Foreman | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1⁄2 | 45 |
| P Cairns | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 16 |

## Match of the Month

## P Golimowski v P Hanks

Spalding v New England B, 14.10.2015

| 1 | e4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | d4 | d5 |
| 3 | Nd 2 | $\mathrm{c5}$ |

A long time ago, I built up a very promising position in a high profile game against the Tarrasch Variation of the French Defence but failed miserably to make progress. Ever since, I have found it tricky to meet the opening and have vacillated between the text move and $3 \ldots$ Nf6. This is not a good approach because it means I have no detailed knowledge of either option!
Although it negates the difference between 3 Nd 2 and 3 Nc3, the Rubinstein Variation (3 ... dxe4 4 Nxe4) is something I have never considered. It appears unadventurous but subsequent to this game, I learned that White has a range of treacherous attacking plans to ensnare the unwary. Obviously not suitable for me!

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
4 & \text { exd5 } & \text { exd5 } \\
5 & \text { dxc5 } & \text { Bxc5 }
\end{array}
$$

I did not recognise this structure but reckoned Black had easy development in exchange for the weak pawn. Indeed, Psakhis backs my judgement saying,
"Anyone afraid of an IQP is not a French Defence player!" We are actually following the path given the code C08 by the Encyclopaedia of Chess Openings (ECO) and the standard strategy for White is to blockade the d 4 square to create a static target on d 5 .

| $\mathbf{6}$ | Ngf3 | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | Nb3 | Bb6 |

The closest grandmaster game I can find is Adams v Gurevich, Bundesliga 2001 which went 1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nd2 a6 4 Ngf3 c5 5 exd5 exd5 6 dxc5 Bxc5 7 Nb3 Bb6 where I am not convinced of any superiority in the waiting move a7-a6. White continued 8 Qe2+ which is supposed to be the only troublesome line for Black.

| 8 | Bg 5 | $0-0$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | Be 2 | Be 6 |

This was a significant psychological turning point. A move earlier, I had been pondering which of us would be accepting a poisoned pawn with 9 Bxf6 Qxf6 10 Qxd5 Qxb2 and played my move quickly to remove the possibility. My opponent quietly added ?! to his eighth move on his scoresheet. I realised I had missed 9 ... Bxf2+ $10 \mathrm{Kxf} 2 \mathrm{Ne} 4+11 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Nxg} 5$. This is a novel variation on a regular theme. Usually, the bishop on g5 is undefended and the discovered attack from the black queen by $10 \ldots \mathrm{Ng} 4+$ would suffice. Here, the combination works because there is no white knight on c3 and the fork 10 ... Ne4+ works despite the bishop's protection. More importantly, it showed my opponent could overlook simple tactics (as could I!)
Incidentally, you may have (should have!) spotted 8 ... Bxf2+ but White gains a little comfort from the uncastled black king following $9 \mathrm{Kxf} 2 \mathrm{Ne} 4+10 \mathrm{Kg} 1$ Nxg5 11 Nxg5 Qxg5 12 Qe1+ Be6 (12 ... Qe7 13 Qc3) 13 Nd 4 but this should be insufficient compensation.

| 10 | $0-0$ | Nbd7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | Qd2 | Rc8 |
| 12 | c3 | Ne 4 |

White is proceeding smoothly with his plan to hold d4 and attack d5. I felt the game needed a change of direction even if it ended in a slightly inferior endgame after 13 Bxd8 Nxd2 14 Bxb6 Nxf3+ (the knight cannot escape after $14 \ldots$ Nxf1 when White can chose between 15 Bd 4 Nxh 2 and 15 Bxa 7 b 616 Nbd 4 Rc 7 17 Nb5) 15 Bxf3 Nxb6.
I am still unsure if my decision is objectively incorrect. After 12 ... Ne4, Fritz favours White by 0.3 pawns due to the variations given above. The concept, however, must be justified because the computer gives two options that maintain equality for Black - 12 ... Qe8 (as a pre-cursor to Nf6-e4) and $12 \ldots$ h6 (as a precursor to Qd8-e8).

## 13 Qf4

f6
White's mistake devalues the ensuing contest since Black should have a winning material advantage from this early stage. Nevertheless, my opponent reacts coolly and gets some compensation in the form of my damaged pawn formation.

## $14 \quad$ Bh4

An alternative way to give up the piece was 14 Bh6 gxh6 15 Qxh6 but I did not see any direct attacking threats after $15 \ldots$ Qe7. Perhaps White should have tried this with 15 Nfd 4 .

| 14 | $\ldots$ | g5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | Qc1 | gxh4 |
| 16 | Nbd4 | Bg4 |

$16 \ldots$ Bf7 relinquished the f5 square which could become a dangerous knight outpost.. 16 ... Qe7 may have been stronger but I thought vaguely the text move might enable me to remove the guard (Bxf3) and exploit the pin on the c file by Bxd4.

| 17 | Qh6 | Bxd4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | Nxd4 | Bxe2 |
| 19 | Nxe2 |  |

I was very happy with this simplification especially as | had to analyse 19 Ne6 Qe7 20 Nxf8 Qxf8 and 19 Nf5 Rf7 20 Rfe1 Bg4 when neither 21 f 3 nor 21 Nd 6 are viable. Perhaps, that is why I relaxed and started to worry more about repairing my time deficit.

## 19

 ...
## f5

19 ... Ne5 20 Qxh4 would give up the pawn without a fight but leave Black with great activity.

## 20 <br> Qe6+ <br> Kh8

I should have looked deeper at 20 ... Rf7 when 21 Qxd5 Qg5 starts the process of funnelling all Black's pieces towards the kingside.

| 21 | Qxd5 | Ndc5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | Qe5+ | Qf6 |
| 23 | Qf4 | Ne6 |

23 ... Nd3 was very tempting but I could not see far enough to notice the fork on d2 following 24 Qe3 Nxb2 25 Rab1 Nc4.

| 24 | Qe3 | b6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | f3 | N4g5 |
| 26 | Qf2 | h3 |
| 27 | g3 | h5 |

I wanted to play f5-f4 - it is Fritz's second favourite but did not want the response g3-g4 blocking the kingside. 27 ... Rcd8 is best. Either 28 Rad1 or 28 Ne2-d4 would eventually weaken White's defence of f 3 or f 4 respectively but I did not see this idea until the next move.

| 28 | Kh 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 29 | a 4 |

Opposing rooks with 29 Rad1 was the best defence but White does not want to head towards an endgame.

| 29 | $\ldots$ | Rd2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 30 | Qe3 | Rfd8 |

Black has a material advantage and an overwhelming position. I could have won pawns but Kasparov always warned against being bought off by such trinkets. It just remains to reach the time control.

Tick, tick, tick... Take on f3 with the knight or the rook? Tick, tick...

$$
32 \text {... Rxf3 }
$$

I saw a forcing continuation but it was very risky. Tick, tick... Were my nerves strong enough for creative chess under pressure?


Tick, tick... Would he take the bait? Had I missed a defensive resource? Tick, tick...
$35 \quad$ Nf4
Nf3

The trap bangs shut with possibly my prettiest move ever. There is no defence.

- 36 Rxe5 Rxh2\#
- 36 Qxf3 Qxe1+
- 36 Ng6+ Kg7 37 Nxe5 Rxh2\#
- 36 Ne 2 Nxe 1 when the white army is being devastated and its commander is hopelessly exposed. 37 Qxh3 (37 Nf4 Qe4+ 38 Kg1 Nf3+ 39 Kh1 Rxh2\#) 37 ... Qe4+ 38 Kg1 Nf3+ 39 Kg2 (39 Kf2 Qxe2\#) 39 ... Qxe2+ 40 Kh1 Qxh2+ etc.
- even the counter-sacrifices 36 Qg1 Qxe1 or $36 \mathrm{Ng} 6+\mathrm{Kg} 737$ Qe2 Rxe2 are to no avail.

```
36 Re2
Qe4
```

36 ... Nxf4 is slightly quicker.
37 Qxh3
Rd1+
$37 \ldots$ Qb1+ is more forcing and aesthetic. 38 Kg 2 Qg1+ 39 Kxf3 Ng5\#

| 38 | Kg2 | Nh4+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 39 | Kf2 | Qf3\# |

