## NEW ENGLANDER

## Chess Club Update - April 2017

## Chairman's Chatter

I like new names. In this issue, with his victory in the Handicap Tournament, Mahmoud becomes the fifteenth name on the club Honours Board. Not a bad sharing of the spoils when we typically have a membership of 20 or less!
Also, we welcome a first contribution to the Match of the Month from Jason just as his grade noses into three digits. In a fascinating game, he shamelessly leaves his knight en prise for several moves to achieve what is probably the best result of his lifetime.

Paul tanks

## Diary Dates

| $9^{\text {th }}$ April | EACU Team Championship in Bury St <br> Edmunds. Please contact F Bowers if <br> you wish to play. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $19^{\text {th }}$ April | Club Championship Round 5 |

Puzzle Problem
White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution (Lester 1924)
Position: 8/8/6p1/6B1/8/8/2Qpk1K1/4b3
1 Qb1 d1Q/R 2 Qe4\# [1 ... d1N 2 Qb5\#; 1 ... d1B 2 Qe4/Qb5\#; 1 ... B any 2 Qf1\#]

## Website to Watch

This month, we have the Korchnoi Zurich Chess Challenge, Switzerland ( $12^{\text {th }}$ to $17^{\text {th }}$ at www.zurichcc.com) and the Grenke Chess Classic in Baden Baden, Germany (at www.grenkechessclassic.de from
$15^{\text {th }}$ to $22^{\text {nd }}$ ). Both events have at least 6 leading grandmasters with Carlsen featuring in the latter along with 3 other grandmasters from the top 10 in the current rankings.
There are also references to the Gashimov Memorial in Shamkir, Azerbaijan $\left(20^{\text {th }}\right.$ to $30^{\text {th }}$ at www.shamkirchess.az) on several listings of forthcoming tournaments but ominously, the home page contains only details for 2016 and a headline "This event has been deleted".

## Window on the Web

If you missed the live coverage of the 2016 World Championship, the full story of the cycle can be found at en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Chess_Championship_2016
Included are scores of the games in the extremely close Carlsen - Karjakin match which was won by Carlsen in the rapid play tie-breaker.
Some may remember that in 2002 Karjakin became the world's youngest ever grandmaster at the age of 12 years and 7 months, which suggested great thing were to come. Fast forward 15 years and he is now (March) ranked 8th in the world just behind Anand.
This link http://rbth.com/sport/2017/02/25/grandmaster-sergey-karjakin-chess-707068 will take you to an article about an interview with Karjakin. He talks about his early life in Ukraine before moving to Russia where the chess rewards were much greater than at home. He is described as having a poker face and being the opposite of the stereotypical chess player. The interview took place while he played Mortal Kombat (not chess) with the reporter.
Karjakin assesses Carlsen as having no weaknesses and assesses himself as versatile with few weaknesses. He intends to continue to play chess until he reaches the age of 50 or 60 when he might consider a change to politics or business. For now, many might think he will be world champion long before then.

Ron dones
Result Round-up
Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| Peterborough A | $\mathbf{2}$ | New England A | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| C Tandy | 0 | R llett | 1 |
| I Bin Suhayl | 1 | P Hanks | 0 |
| A Summers | 0 | P Walker | 1 |
| M Dunkley | $1 ⁄ 2$ | S Caraway | $1 / 2$ |
| M Connolly | $1 / 2$ | P Turp | $1 / 2$ |


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


| Warboys C | $\mathbf{2}$ | New England B | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| M Misson | 1 | P Walker | 0 |
| N Greenwood | 0 | P Turp | 1 |
| J Beck | 1 | R Jones | 0 |
| D Polehonski | 0 | M Tarabad | 1 |

Club Championship

| Round 1.5 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| I Garratt (0) | 0 | 1 | P Hanks (0) |
| Round 2 |  |  |  |
| S Wozniak (1/2) | P | P | R Jones (1/2) |


| Round 3 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S Caraway (11⁄2) | P | P | R llett (2) |
| C Russell (11⁄2) | 1 | 0 | N Wedley (11⁄2) |
| P Turp (2) | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | F Bowers (11⁄2) |
| N Foreman (1) | 0 | 1 | P Hanks (11⁄2) |
| J Parker (1) | 0 | 1 | G Dharmasena (1) |
| P Walker (1) | 1/2 | 1/2 | R Jones (1/2+P) |
| P Weinberger (1) | 0 | 1 | S Wozniak (1⁄2+P) |
| S Walker (1/2) | 0 | 1 | D Lane (0) |
| P O'Gorman (0) | 0 | 1 | M Tarabad (0) |


| Round 3.5 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| M Ingram (1+P) | 1 | 0 | P O'Gorman (0+P) |
| R llett (2+P) | 1 | 0 | M Ingram (2) |


| Round 4 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S Wozniak (11⁄2+P) | 1/2 | 1/2 | P Turp ( 2112 ) |
| F Bowers (2) | 1 | 0 | C Russell ( $2^{1 ⁄ 2}$ ) |
| N Wedley (11⁄2) | 0 | 1 | S Caraway (11⁄2+P) |
| G Dharmasena (2) | 1 | 0 | P Hanks (2½) |
| M Ingram (2) | 0 | 1 | P Walker (11⁄2) |
| $R$ Jones (1+P) | 1 | 0 | N Foreman (1) |
| D Lane (1) | 0 | 1 | J Parker (1) |
| S Walker (1⁄2) | 0 | 1 | P Weinberger (1) |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| P Turp (3) | R llett (3+P) |
| S Caraway ( $2 ½+P$ ) | G Dharmasena (3) |
| P Hanks ( $21 / 2$ ) | F Bowers (3) |
| C Russell ( $21 / 2$ ) | P Walker ( $\mathbf{2}^{1 / 2}$ ) |
| P Weinberger (2) | N Wedley (11⁄2) |
| J Parker (2) | S Wozniak (2+P) |
| M Ingram (2) | R Jones (2+P) |
| P O'Gorman (0) | D Lane (1) |
| N Foreman (1) | M Tarabad (1) |
| I Garratt (0) | S Walker (1/2) |
| Match night : $19^{\text {th }}$ April Deadline : $30^{\text {th }}$ April Next draw : $1^{\text {st }}$ May |  |

New England Grand Prix

| Player | $\underset{\substack{\text { Q } \\ \underset{U}{U}}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { d } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{0} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbb{O} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{0}}{ }$ |  | 历 | 足 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P Walker | 21⁄2 | $11 / 2$ | 81/2 | 0 | $31 / 2$ | 16 | 166 |
| M Tarabad | 2 | $61 / 2$ | 3 | $1 / 2$ | 3 | 14 | 91 |
| S Caraway | 21/2 | $11 / 2$ | 7 | 1/2 | 2 | 131/2 | 152 |
| D Lane | 1 | 4 | $31 / 2$ | 0 | $41 / 2$ | 13 | 118 |
| R llett | 3 | $41 / 2$ | 5 | 1/2 |  | 13 | 172 |
| P Hanks | 21/2 | $31 / 2$ | $41 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 111/2 | 152 |
| F Bowers | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1/2 | 1 | 111/2 | 157 |
| P Weinberger | 2 | 6 |  |  | 21⁄2 | 101/2 | 101 |
| J Parker | 2 | 5 |  |  | 2 | 9 | 107 |
| N Wedley | $11 / 2$ | $51 / 2$ |  |  | 1 | 8 | 114 |
| P Turp | 3 |  | $31 / 2$ |  | 1 | $71 / 2$ | 136 |
| $R$ Jones | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 7 | 117 |
| C Russell | 2112 |  |  | 1 | 3 | $61 / 2$ | 130 |
| M Ingram | 2 | $11 / 2$ |  |  | 1 | $41 / 2$ | 101 |
| S Walker | $1 / 2$ | $31 / 2$ |  |  |  | 4 | 89 |
| P O'Gorman | 0 | 3 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 67 |
| G Dharmasena | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 126 |
| S Wozniak | 2 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 112 |
| I Garratt | 0 | 1 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | 49 |
| N Foreman | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 48 |

New England Club Ladder

| White |  | Black |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| N Wedley | 1 | 0 | M Tarabad |
| N Foreman | 0 | 1 | P Weinberger |
| J Parker | $1 ⁄ 2$ | $1 / 2$ | R llett |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 읓 } \\ & \text { B } \\ & 0 . \end{aligned}$ | Change |  | Player | Record @ 29/03/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | +1 | +11 | D Lane | 1,1,1/2, $1 / 2,1$ |
| 2 | -1 | - | R llett | 1/2, 1, $0,1,1 / 2,1,1 / 2$ |
| 3 | +1 | +2 | J Parker | 1,0,1/2, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1/2 |
| 4 | -1 | -3 | F Bowers | $1 / 2,1 / 2,1,1,0$ |
| 5 | +1 | +6 | P O'Gorman | 1/2, $0,1,0,0,1 / 2,0,0,1,0,0$ |
| 6 | -1 | +8 | S Walker | 0,1,1/2,1,0,1 |
| 7 | - | +8 | M Ingram | 0,1,1/2 |
| 8 | +2 | -1 | N Wedley | 1,0,1,1,1/2, 1/2, 1, 1/2, |
| 9 | -1 | -6 | P Hanks | 1,1,1/2,1 |
| 10 | -1 | -1 | M Tarabad | 1,1,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,0,1/2,0 |
| 11 | - | +5 | S Caraway | 1,1/2 |
| 12 | - | -4 | P Weinberger | 1,1,0,1,1,1,0,0,0,1 |
| 13 | - | - | P Walker | $1 / 2,1 / 2,1 / 2$ |
| 14 | - | -10 | I Garratt | 0,0,0,1,0,0,0,0,0 |
| 15 | +1 | -9 | N Foreman | 0,0,0,0,0,0,0 |
| 16 | -1 | -6 | R Jones | 1,0 |

Club Handicap: 15 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ March 2017

| Player |  | Round |  |  |  |  | 끈 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| 1 | M Tarabad | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 41/2 |
| 2 | J Parker | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | $31 / 2$ |
|  | S Caraway | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | $31 / 2$ |
| 4 | N Wedley | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 5 | D Lane | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
|  | P Turp | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 7 | P Hanks | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $11 / 2$ |
| 8 | P O'Gorman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Match of the Month

You may have heard - I did indeed draw with Ray llett - and I cannot quite believe it to be honest. I have gone through my game and written down not so much an analysis of the game, but more the thoughts I was thinking as I was playing the match. I have never done anything like this before so I have invited some added analysis from Paul and the computer software Fritz (in italics).

## J Parker v R Ilett

New England Club Ladder, 08.03.2017

$$
1 \text { e4 }
$$

d5
I didn't want to take this pawn and bring out a much stronger opponent's queen so early. I tend to struggle against aggressive opponents but all the options for
defending the pawn or pushing it on seemed poor so I took it.
Once known as the Centre Counter Game, the Scandanavian Defence has always been an aggressive way to meet 1 e4 and even top grandmasters use it as an occasional weapon when they wish to avoid mainstream theory. Short, Ivanchuk and Karpov have been converts. One of the most popular continuations at the moment is 2 exd 5 Qxd5 3 Nc3 Qd6.

2 exd5 Nf6
Defending the pawn with my knight is pointless as it is clearly outgunned. I know that defending a pawn in this position can be risky but I would like to hang on to my material advantage if possible as my opponent is so much stronger so....
3 c4
c6

I really need to develop a piece but if I leave him to take my pawn, I will lose my pawn advantage AND have a very weak queen's pawn. So I have to take, but after his reply, I'm now very under-developed.

4 dxc6
5 Nc3
I want to keep developing my pieces but I feel a pawn push is necessary to stop his centre pawn marching down.
6
d3
Bb4
7 Bd2
Bf5

He has two pieces hitting my queen's pawn and I only have the bishop defending it because my other bishop has blocked the defence by the queen. All the squares I can move the queen to which defend the pawn seem too risky (e.g. 8 Qf 3 Nd 4 ) and if he manages to push the king's pawn, there will be three attackers on my queen's pawn.

```
8 a3
a3
```


## Bxc3

If I threaten his bishop, hopefully he will take my knight and I will recapture with my bishop thus removing the blockage. Fortunately he obliged.

## 9 Bxc3 0-0

He is castled already, I have to develop my pieces and get my king safe asap. One option would be 10 Qd2 aiming for 11 0-0-0 but after my earlier pawn advances, that flank looks too exposed.

10 Nf3
Re8
I want to develop my bishop but if he pushes his king's pawn, I'm in trouble. In fact, despite White retaining the gambit pawn, Fritz assesses Black as having the equivalent of almost a pawn advantage after 11 Be2 e4 12 dxe4 Nxe4 13 0-0 (if 13 Qxd8 Raxd8 and Black threatens $14 \ldots$ Nxc3 15 bxc3 Bd3) $13 \ldots$ Nxc3 shattering the queenside pawns. However if I move my knight and he pushes his king's pawn later, I can just play d3-d4.

| 11 | Nh 4 | Bd 7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | Be 2 | e 4 |

The option to push the queen's pawn is still there but I want to get castled and bring my knight back from the edge of the board at the earliest opportunity.

## 13 0-0 g5

Too late! My knight is trapped, but fortunately I have found a move that would win a knight back and even threaten checkmate.


Now 14 ... gxh4 fails to 15 Qg5+ when Black would have to give up his queen after 15 ... Kf8/h8 16 Bxf6.

$$
14 \text {... } \operatorname{Ng} 4
$$

By moving his knight he has fully defended against my idea and my knight is still trapped, all I can do is threaten his knight back.
The computer prefers 14 ... h6 but I can calmly continue 15 Rad1 because 15 ... gxh4 still allows 16 Qxh6 Re6 17 dxe4 when White has many threats (e.g. $18 \mathrm{Bg} 4, R x d 7$ etc.)

## 15 h3

This is the computer's second favourite and still yields a healthy game for White but 15 dxe 4 would have been more demanding when 15 ... gxh4 16 Bxg4 Bxg4 (16 ... Re7 17 Qg5+ mates) 17 Qf4 Qd7 (17 ... Bh4 18 Bf6) 18 Qg5+ Kf8 19 Bg7+. These variations highlight the weakness of Black's dark squares following his $8^{\text {th }}$ and $13^{\text {th }}$ moves. Black would be safest to return the piece with 16 ... Re6 17 Qxg4 Rg6 with an initiative to compensate for the lost pawns.

## 15

## Nxf2

Oh, I did not expect that! I can just take with my rook, can't I? No, hang on. If I do that he forks my queen and rook with his pawn. Oh no there goes my pawn advantage and my knight looks doomed too. It's not looking good.

16 Qe3

This looks a brave move by White but 16 ... exd3 17 Qxf2 Rxe2 overlooks 18 Qxf7\#!
16
17

## Bxd3

Nxd3

White could usefully interpose 17 Nf5 threatening 18 Nh6+ Kf8 19 Rxf7\#. Instead, after 17 ... Bxf5 18 Rxf5, Black's position looks difficult with Rxg5+ and Bf6 in the offing.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
17 & \ldots & \text { exd3 } \\
18 & \text { Qg3 } &
\end{array}
$$

I wanted to take the pawn back 18 Qxd3 but if I move here, he cannot take my knight, for now at least. Actually, the knight remains taboo and White could consider 18 Qxd3 provided of course you can see the rather tricky variation 18 ... gxh4 19 Rxf7 Kxf7 20 Qxh7+ Kf6 (20 ... Kf8 21 Qg7\#) 21 Qg6+ Ke7 22 Qf6\#.
18
19
Rad1
h6
Qb6+

Deciding where to move the king was tricky but I went with h1 because if I moved to h2, at some point in the future, he could have forced a queen exchange on the h2-b8 diagonal but I'm not sure which square is better.

Re3
I had to make a bold choice here, possibly leaving my knight to its fate, but as I will be attacking his bishop and two pawns, one of which could result in mating chances, I went for it.

## 21 Qd6

There was another choice 21 Qf2. Black has to defend $f 7$ with

- 21 .. Re7 22 Qf6 Ne5 23 Qxe7 Re8 24 Qf6 (Phew!)
- 21 ... Nd8 and then, 22 c5 Qe6 (22 ... Qxc5 23 Qf6) 23 Nf5 (finally after 9 moves en prise!) Re4 24 Ng 7 and Black is squirming e.g. 24 ... Qg6 25 Nh5 Re7 26 Qd4.

21
...
Be6
22 Nf5
Having hung the knight out to dry for so long, maybe another move wouldn't hurt. 22 c5 Qb3 23 Nf5 Rd8 (23 ... Bxf5 24 Qxh6) 24 Nxe3 Rxd6 25 cxd6 would have been very tasty in a time scramble.

## 22

Oh dear ... I've just realised my queen is almost totally trapped, not quite though. I could take the pawn with my knight and check his king which has to move towards the knight. I could follow up with rook takes pawn check but the rook would fall and possibly the knight. It's too messy.
Thankfully, the post-mortem vindicated my judgement. The computer cannot find a fancy finish arising from 23 Nxh6+ Kh7 24 Rxf7+ Bxf7 (24 ... Kxh6 25 Rdf1 though does win for me 25 ... Rxd6 26 R1f6+ Kh4 27 Rh7\#) 25 Qf6 when 25 ... Ne5 gives Black a successful defence.

It's a good job I chose 20 Kh1!
23
... Bxf5
d2

At first glance, I thought I could take this pawn but my king on the back rank is very vulnerable (25 Bxd2 Rxd2 26 Rxd2 Re1+ etc.) so...

| 25 | Rff1 | Re2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | Qg3 | Rde8 |
| 27 | Qd6 |  |

This was my boldest choice of all because I needed my queen for defence but I decided to attack because I think (though I'm not sure) if we had both attacked, I would have got checkmate first (via Qd6-f6).

| 27 | $\ldots$ | R8e6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | Qd7 | $\operatorname{Re7}$ |
| 29 | Qd6 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ |

I did want to go for the win but I only had 10 mins left on the clock. Although Ray only had 3-4 mins left, I'm only too well aware how quick strong players can be when they have to and will actually gain time under the new time control. So I offered a draw and it was accepted.
Cason Darker

## Eye Opener

Chess is all about making decisions. Ideally, the move played should be the legal option that minimises your opponent's chances whatever the subsequent move sequence. Here is a chance to pit your wits.

Fernando Peralta (2546) v Robert Zysk (2474) Acropolis Open, Athens 2006
1 d4 f5 2 c4 d6 3 Nf3 Nf6 4 g3 g6 5 b4 Bg7
This move order in the Leningrad Variation of the Dutch Defence was common around the time this game was played but Black seems to have scored quite heavily.
6 Bb2 e5 7 dxe5 Nfd7 8 Bg2 Nc6 9 0-0 Ndxe5 10 Nxe5


Would you choose
a) $10 \ldots$ Bxe5
b) $10 \ldots$ Nxe5
c) $10 \ldots \mathrm{dxe} 5$
or d) leave the piece to be recaptured later?
Full marks for a) or c) which limit White to a slight advantage. If you contemplated d), you were unable to address the threat of 11 Nxc6. Black, however, opted for

10
but found that after

| 11 | $f 4$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 12 | exf3 |

he could resign due to $12 \ldots$ Bxb2 13 Qe2+ and 14 Qxb2.
A similar crisis point recently affected me.
I Bin Suhayl v P Hanks
Peterborough A v New England A, 23.03.2017

| 1 | d4 | Nf6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | c4 | e6 |
| 3 | Nc3 | Bb4 |
| 4 | e3 | c5 |
| 5 | Bd3 | b6 |
| 6 | Nge2 | Nc6 |
| 7 | 0-0 | Bxc3 |
| 8 | Nxc3 | d5 |
| 9 | cxd5 | exd5 |
| 10 | b3 | 0-0 |
| 11 | Ba3 | Nb4 |
| 12 | dxc5 | bxc5 |
| 13 | Na4 | Qa5 |
| 14 | Rc1 | Nxd3 |
| 15 | Qxd3 | Ba6 |
| 16 | Rxc5 |  |



Would you continue a) $16 \ldots$ Bxd3 b) $16 \ldots$ Qxc5 or c) some other move?

