## NEW ENGLANDER

## Chess Club Update - February 2017

## Chairman's Chatter

New members are always a cause for celebration. If you see an unfamilar face on club nights, it will be Mike Ingram who has returned after a break of several years. Welcome, Mike!


## Diary Dates

There are no internal club events during February due to the continuing high concentration of League fixtures. One of these is the match between our Cavalier and Patriot teams - our local rivalries will not go unsatisfied!

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution (Hanks 2016) Position: 5/K1k/6p1/5N1b/4N2b/6R1/8/8/8
1 Rg6 Bxg6 2 Nxg6\# [1 ... B other 2 Nf7\#; 1 ... gxf6+ 2 Rxh6\#]

## Website to Watch

The next cycle of Grand Prix tournaments to decide the candidates for the next world championship challenge kicks off in Sharjah, UAE. Further rounds will take place later in the year in Moscow, Geneva and Palma de Mallorca. With 18 top grandmasters in a 9 round Swiss congress, it should be a very competitive event. Websites for these FIDE competitions are rarely ready ahead of time but the viewer https://www.chessbomb.com/arena/ should allow you to follow it between $17^{\text {th }}$ and $28^{\text {th }}$ February.

## Window on the Web

Arguably, the most famous chess players in history are those who became world champion. There are, however, very strong players who never reached that pinnacle but achieved fame for their ideas and their contribution to chess theory through their games and books. Let's spare a thought for some of those who could have become world champion, but never did. Five such players are named on the website Uncrowned Kings http://www.uncrowned-kings.co.uk/. (Click on the Files link.)

- Akiba Rubinstein (1882-1961) won 5 consecutive major tournaments in 1912. At that time Lasker was world champion but Rubinstein, who was thought by some to be stronger than Lasker, never had the opportunity to challenge him for the title.
- Well known for his books on chess strategy, Aron Nimzowitsch (1886-1935) played his best chess in the 1920s, winning several elite tournaments. He beat Alekhine but was never able to win against Capablanca.
- Paul Keres (1916-1975) tied for first place with Alekhine at the 1936 Bad Nauheim tournament and the following year, finished ahead of Alekhine at Margate. He finished equal first in the Avro Tournament of 1938 but only equal third in the 1948 world championship tournament won by Botvinnik, followed by second or equal second place in the Candidates' tournaments of 1953, 1956, 1959 and 1962.
- Victor Korchnoi (1931-2016) was USSR champion four times and was a candidate for the world championship cycle ten times. He played matches for the title against Karpov in 1978 and 1981, losing them both.
- The strongest ever Danish player Bent Larsen (1935-2010), played in several Candidates' matches and was at his peak in the 1960s and 70 s. He gave his name to Larsen's Opening (1 b3) and was known for reinvigorating such out of favour openings as the Scandinavian Defence, the Bishop's Opening and Bird's Opening.
Databases containing almost 9,000 of these players' games can be downloaded in CBV format, (familiar to Chessbase users) and apart from the games of Larsen and Korchnoi, in PGN format as well. On the Home page there are links to downloads of more databases containing the games of other masters such as Reti, Staunton and Winter.


## Result Round-up

Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| New England A | $\mathbf{3}$ | St Neots A | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R llett | 1 | A Chapman | 0 |
| F Bowers | $1 / 2$ | P Brown | $1 / 2$ |
| P Hanks | 0 | R Gompelman | 1 |
| S Caraway | 1 | P Barkas | 0 |
| R Jones | $1 ⁄ 2$ | C Emery | $1 / 2$ |


| New England A | $\mathbf{3}$ | Royston | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R llett | 0 | K Clark | 1 |
| F Bowers | 0 | P Kemp | 1 |
| P Hanks | 1 | B Judkins | 0 |
| S Caraway | 1 | P Ribbands | 0 |
| P Walker | 1 | S Jackson | 0 |


| Cambridge | $\mathbf{3}$ | New England A | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| B Buisman | 1 | R llett | 0 |
| R McCorry | $1 / 2$ | F Bowers | $1 / 2$ |
| S Pride | $1 / 2$ | P Hanks | $1 / 2$ |
| C Roberts | 1 | S Caraway | 0 |
| C Geach | 0 | P Walker | 1 |


| New England A | $\mathbf{3}$ | Peterborough B | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R llett | 1 | G Tandy | 0 |
| F Bowers | $1 / 2$ | M Dunkley | $1 / 2$ |
| P Hanks | $1 / 2$ | M Connolly | $1 / 2$ |
| S Caraway | $1 / 2$ | A Kaszuba | $1 / 2$ |
| P Walker | $1 / 2$ | N Fisher | $1 / 2$ |


| St Neots B | $\mathbf{2} 1 / 2$ | New England B | $\mathbf{1 1 / 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R Palumbo | $1 / 2$ | S Caraway | $1 / 2$ |
| C Emery | 1 | D Lane | 0 |
| M Friday | 1 | P O'Gorman | 0 |
| F Rock | 0 | M Tarabad | 1 |

Team 550 Competition

| Spalding | $\mathbf{2} 1 / 2$ | NE Patriots | $\mathbf{1 1} 2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| P Cusick | $1 / 2$ | S Caraway | $1 / 2$ |
| T Nottingham | $1 / 2$ | P Hanks | $1 / 2$ |
| F Robinson | $1 / 2$ | C Russell | $1 / 2$ |
| R Coates | 1 | P Weinberger | 0 |

Club Championship

| Round 1.5 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I Garratt (0) | P | P | P Hanks (0) |

Round 2

| P Turp (1) | 1 | 0 | N Foreman (1) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| S Wozniak (1/2) | P | P | R Jones (1/2) |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| S Caraway (11⁄2) | R llett (2) |
| C Russell (11⁄2) | N Wedley (11⁄2) |
| P Turp (2) | F Bowers (11⁄2) |
| N Foreman (1) | P Hanks (1⁄2+P) |
| J Parker (1) | G Dharmasena (1) |
| P Walker (1) | R Jones (112+P) |
| P Weinberger (1) | S Wozniak (1⁄2+P) |
| S Walker (1/2) | D Lane (0) |
| P O'Gorman (0) | M Tarabad (0) |
|  |  |


| Round 3.5 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| M Tarabad (0) |  |  | I Garratt (0) |

New England Grand Prix

| Player | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { d } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \text { T} \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbb{O}$ $\mathbb{Z}$ $\mathbb{Z}$ | $\underset{\substack{0}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { ※ } \\ & \text { た } \\ & \text { గ్ల } \end{aligned}$ | ञ | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P Walker | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 169 |
| D Lane | 0 | 4 | 21⁄2 | 0 | 3 | 91⁄2 | 117 |
| M Tarabad | 0 | 6 | 2 | $1 / 2$ | 2 | 9112 | 88 |
| R llett | 2 | 3 | $31 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  | 9 | 171 |
| S Caraway | $11 / 2$ |  | 5 | $1 / 2$ | 2 | 9 | 151 |
| P Hanks | $1 / 2$ | $31 / 2$ | 4 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 9 | 156 |
| F Bowers | $11 / 2$ | $21 / 2$ | 3 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 81/2 | 163 |
| P Weinberger | 1 | 4 |  |  | 1 | 6 | 104 |
| N Wedley | $11 / 2$ | $31 / 2$ |  |  |  | 5 | 117 |
| C Russell | $11 / 2$ |  |  | 1 | 21/2 | 5 | 143 |
| J Parker | 1 | $21 / 2$ |  |  | 1 | $41 / 2$ | 96 |
| $R$ Jones | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $11 / 2$ |  | 1 | 4 | 108 |
| S Walker | $1 / 2$ | $21 / 2$ |  |  |  | 3 | 94 |
| P Turp | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 4 | 128 |
| P O'Gorman | 0 | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 76 |
| I Garratt | 0 | 1 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | 52 |
| G Dharmasena | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 72 |
| N Foreman | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 52 |
| M Ingram |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 87 |
| S Wozniak | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 89 |

New England Club Ladder

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


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 䯧 } \\ & \vdots \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Chat } \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | hange | Player | Record @ 2501/177 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | - | - | F Bowers | 1/2, $1 / 2,1,1$ |
| 2 | +3 | + +10 | D Lane | 1,1,1/2,1/2,1 |
| 3 | - | -1 | R Ilett | 1/2, 1,0,1,1/2 |
| 4 | +9 | +7 | P O'Gorman | $1 / 2,0,1,0,0,1 / 2,0,0,1,0$ |
| 5 | +10 | +10 | M Ingram | 0,1 |
| 6 | -2 | +8 | S Walker | 0,1,1/2, 1,0 |
| 7 | -5 | +2 | M Tarabad | 1,1,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0 |
| 8 | -2 | - | P Weinberger | 1,1,0,1,1,1 |
| 9 | -2 | -6 | P Hanks | 1,1,1/2, 1 |
| 10 | -1 | -3 | N Wedley | 1,0,1,1,1/2 |
| 11 | -1 | -6 | J Parker | 1,0,1/2,0,1 |
| 12 | -4 | -2 | R Jones | 1,0 |
| 13 | -2 | - | P Walker | 1/2,1/2 |
| 14 | -2 | -10 | I Garratt | 0,0,0,1,0,0,0,0,0 |
| 15 | -1 | -9 | N Foreman | 0,0,0,0,0,0 |

## Match of the Month

The opening 1 d4 Nf6 2 Bg 5 is known as the Trompovsky Attack and I am aware that an in-depth study of all the myriad variations appeared in the August 2011 issue of the New Englander newsletter. It was very successfully popularised by Julian Hodgson in the 1990's but is only one line of an opening complex in which White immediately threatens Bg5xNf6 to wreck Black's pawn structure.
For instance, 1 d 4 d 5 Nc 3 Nf 63 Bg 5 is the Veresov System and 1 d4 Nf6 2 Nf3 e6 3 Bg5 is the classical approach to the Torre Attack. Although the latter is a close relation of the Trompowsky Attack, the Torre Attack was not actually considered in the newsletter article.
If you doubt the relevance of these openings in current grandmaster chess, you have to look no further than Carlsen v Karjakin, $1^{\text {st }}$ Match Game from the recent World Championship match!

## S Walker v M Tarabad

New England Club Ladder, 07.12.2016
OPENING : Torre Attack (Tartakower Variation)

| 1 | d 4 | d 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Nf 3 | $\mathrm{Nf6}$ |
| 3 | Bg 5 | $\mathrm{Nc6}$ |
| 4 | e 3 |  |



Both sides might seem slightly paranoid about the pin by the bishops (Bf1-b5, Bc8-g4) but not without reason. A perfectly acceptable continuation here for Black is $4 \ldots \mathrm{Ne} 4$. With moves that run parallel to the actual game, the position can rapidly become very sharp e.g. 5 Bf4 Bf5 6 c 4 when 6 ... e5 7 dxe5 Bb4+

- 8 Nc3 Nxc3 9 bxc3 Bxc3+ and 10 ... Bxa1
- 8 Nbd 2 g 59 Bg 3 h 510 h 3 d 411 a3 (11 exd4

Nxd4 when 12 Nxd4 Bxd2+) 11 ... Bxd2+ 12 Nxd2 Nxg3 13 fxg3 dxe3

- 8 Nfd2 g5 9 Bg3 h5 10 f3 Nxg3 11 hxg3 d4
- 12 exd4 Nxd4 13 Qa4+ c6
- $14 \mathrm{Kd} 1 \mathrm{Bc} 2+$
- 14 Qxb4 Nc2+
- $14 \mathrm{Na} 3 \mathrm{Nxf3+} 15 \mathrm{Kf} 2 \mathrm{Bc} 5+16 \mathrm{Kxf} 3$ (16 Ke2 Qxd2+ 17 Kxf3 g4\#) $16 \ldots$ Bg4+ 17 Ke4 Qd4\#)
- 12 e 4 with continuing complications.

Obviously, weakening the e1-a5 diagonal with 6 c 4 is dangerous with the black knight on its fine outpost and I should instead have continued 6 Bb5. A natural move such as $6 \ldots$ e6 would fail to 7 Ne 5 strongly favouring White. Black would have to find 6 ... f6 to try to stay on level terms and even then, he is falling behind in development.
$5 \quad \mathrm{~h} 3$
Bf5
Nb4?

This move proves to be too risky so early on in the game and sets White up for queenside attack.

| 7 | Qa4+ | Nc6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | Ne5 |  |

A natural move to control the centre.
8
...
Bd7

To cover c6, Black has to retreat the bishop.
9 Qd1 b5
Having forced a retreat, Mahmoud again weakens c6 and I could have exploited this with 10 Nxd7 Qxd7 11 cxb5 axb5 12 Bxb5 when Black struggles to defend 12 ... Rb8 13 Qa4 Rb6 14 Na 3 and 15 Rc1. Fritz rates 10 $\ldots \mathrm{Nxd7}$ as a slightly worse continuation because after 11 cxb5 axb5, instead of 12 Bxb5, White plays 12 Nc3. It is then hard to defend the pawn on d5 without again falling into the crippling pin on c6 e.g. $12 \ldots$ Nb6/Nf6 13 Bxb5.

## $10 \quad$ cxb5

## Nxe5

10 ... axb5 would transpose into the previous variation after $11 \mathrm{Nxd7}$.

| 11 | dxe5 | Ne4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | Bh4 | Bxb5 |
| 13 | Bxb5+ | axb5 |
| 14 | f3 |  |

Instead, the immediate 14 Qc2 sets different but not insoluble problems. It would threaten 15 Qc6+ and cut off the retreat squares for the black knight in the event of 15 f 3 . Black can meet the move in a variety of ways e.g. 14 ... Qd7 15 f 3 g 5 or even $14 \ldots$ Ra4 15 f 3 Rc4.

## 14

$$
\ldots
$$

Nc5
At first glance, this seems to be the only move but an alternative might be $14 \ldots \mathrm{~g} 5$ but is there enough compensation for the pawn after 15 fxe4 gxh4 16 exd5? Possibly because $16 \ldots \mathrm{Bg} 7$ either regains the material or stirs up complications and you have to see far enough ahead to assess 17 Nc 3 b 418 Qg 4 or 17 Qd4 Ra4 18 b4 c5 etc.


Most obvious for Black was 15 ... Nd7 when he does not lose his queen's rook but even better, Black could try $15 \ldots$ Ra4!! Such a move is far-sighted and very difficult to see over the board. It seems to salvage a draw from a lost position because the computer recommends White to accept the perpetual check after

- 16 Qxc5 Rc4 17 Qxb5+ c6 18 Qb7 Rc1+ 19 Kf2 Rxh1 20 Qxc6+
- 16 b3 Nxb3 17 Qxb3 Rxh4 18 Qxb5+ Qd7.

| 16 | Qc6+ | Qd7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | Qxa8 | Nd8 |

The contest is over and Black could have resigned even at this point. The remainder of the game is given with brief annotation because I found the conclusion rather amusing.

18 0-0
After the initial attack, all White has to do is develop his pieces.

| 18 | $\ldots$ | c6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 19 | Nd2 | g6 |
| 20 | Rac1 | Bg7 |
| 21 | f4 | $0-0$ |
| 22 | Nb3 | Ne6 |
| 23 | Qxc6 | Qa7 |
| 24 | Rc3 |  |

24 Bf2 was also good to protect e3 and 24 Nc 5 would initiate exchanges getting me nearer to a winning endgame.

| 24 | $\ldots$ | g5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | Bxg5 | Nxg5 |
| 26 | fxg5 | Bxe5 |
| 27 | Rd3 | Bxb2 |
| 28 | Qxd5 | Qb8 |
| 29 | Nd4 |  |

Blocking out the bishop

| 29 | $\ldots$ | Bxd4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 30 | Rxd4 | e6 |
| 31 | Qd7 | Qe5 |
| 32 | Rf3 |  |

Of course, if $32 \ldots$ Qxg5, 33 Rg 4 wins the queen but Black has very few good squares for his queen.

| 32 | Rf6! |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | Qg7? |

This move has a paralysing effect on the black queen by keeping it totally out of the game and entombed in the corner.
33
34 h4
Kh8

To support the g pawn.
34

$$
\ldots
$$

h5
In desperation but Black may be having final thoughts of stalemate by making his pawns immoveable.

Qxb5
Ignoring the en passant move but Fritz gives the quickest finish as 35 Rdf4 when among several similar
continuations, 35 ... e5 36 Rxf7 Rxf7 37 Rxf7 Qg8 38 g6 Qxg6 39 Qd8+ Qg8 40 Qf6+ etc.

$$
35 \quad \ldots \quad \text { Kg8 }
$$

I played 35 Qxb5 to free the d 7 square for my rook on d4 as all Black can do now is wait by shuffling his king and queen about in the corner.

| 36 | Rd7 | Qh8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 37 | Qb7 | Qg7 |
| 38 | Rc7 |  |

To link up with my the queen for when I need to play the rook to c8 later on in the game.

| 38 | $\ldots$ | e5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 39 | e4 |  |

Further cutting off the queen on the b1-h7 diagonal. White still has to be slightly careful to avoid any stalemate swindle.

| 39 | $\ldots$ | Qh7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 40 | g6! |  |

The natural move and the attack virtually plays itself. Black is helpless.

| 40 | $\ldots$ | Qg7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 41 | Rfxf7 | Qh6 |
| 42 | Rxf8+ | Qxf8 |
| 43 | Rc8 | $1-0$ |

Not stalemate but zugzwang! Any move by Black (43 ... Kh8, 43 ... Qxc8 etc) allows a simple checkmate.
In strategic terms, it is rarely wise to indulge in premature attacks (here $6 \ldots$ Nb4). They are too lightweight and once beaten off, they often leave a deficit in development and the possibility of a deadly counterattack. This was an excellent attacking game played by White which was instigated as early as 7 Qa4+ that forced the black knight to retreat and then gave White a foothold in the centre with 8 Ne 5 .

## Eye Opener

The game in the main feature refers to Trompowskystyle openings and gives a flavour of the tactics that can be expected if you venue into that territory. Rather than learning from your own mistakes, there is another way - to study errors made by others - and being lazy souls, we probably want our lessons in concentrated form.
In this first game, Black tries to profit from the absence of the white bishop from c1 by attacking the now unguarded pawn on b2.

## J Timman v H Bouwmeester <br> Training game, Vleuten 1967

| 1 | d4 | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Nf3 | d5 |
| 3 | Bg5 | Nbd7 |
| 4 | e3 |  |

Only one move is different from the Match of the Month but it gives Black extra options to contest the centre.

| 4 | $\ldots$ | $c 5$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | c4 | cxd4 |
| 6 | exd4 | Qb6 |

7 cxd5
Qxb2
Accepting the poisoned pawn is playable provided you know how to avoid the traps...

| 8 | Nbd2 | g6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | Nc4 | 1-0 |

The black queen is lost after $9 \ldots$ Qb4+ 10 Bd 2 Qb 5 10 Nd6+.

This second example highlights the danger to White already mentioned arising from a black knight leaping to e4 with tempo. In this case, Qd8-b6 has the secondary purpose of forcing a weakness on the e1a5 diagonal

## H O Lahlum v David <br> Gausdal Open, 1990

| 1 | Nf 3 | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | d 4 | d 5 |
| 3 | Bg 5 | c 6 |
| 4 | e 3 | Qb6 |

Apparently, the same motif as previously i.e. attacking b2.

| 5 | b3 | Ne4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | Bf4 | Qa5+ |
| 7 | Nbd2 |  |

7 c3 was better because the pawn cannot be captured with 7 ... Nxc3 due to 8 Qd2.


White could avoid the worst with 9 b4 but it is still highly unpleasant after 9 ... Bxb4 10 Qc1 Ba3 11 Nb3 Bxc1 12 Nxa4 Bb2.

| 9 | ... | Ba3 | 0-1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

