## NEW ENCIANDER

## Chess Club Update - June 2017

## Chairman's Chatter

Congratulations to Ray llett who becomes this season's Club Champion at his first attempt. Another new name on the Honours Board!
Due to early publication, this newsletter does not contain the final tables. There is just time to squeeze in a telling last game in the Ladder and Grand Prix competitions before the season ends on $31^{\text {st }}$ May!
*aul tanks

## Diary Dates

| $7^{\text {th }}$ June | Club AGM at 7-30pm |
| :--- | :--- |
| $14^{\text {th }}$ June | Club Rapidplay |
| $21^{\text {st }}$ June | Masterclasses/Summer event starts |
| $28^{\text {th }}$ June | Cambridgeshire County Chess |
|  | Association AGM at Warboys |

Puzzle Problem
White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution
Position : 8/8/7p/5K1k/7b/6p1/6P1/7R
1 Rh2 gxh2 2 g4\#

## Website to Watch

June just spoils you for choice. The elite competition, Altibox Norway Chess 2017, is billed as the strongest tournament of the year and it is hard to disagree as all of the top 10 highest graded players will be participating. Visit Stavanger via norwaychess.no/en between $5^{\text {th }}$ and $17^{\text {th }}$ to see Carlsen, So, Caruana, Kramnik, Anand etc in action.

The stars will obviously be missing from two overlapping events. The European Individual Chess Championship is normally a fiercely competitive tournament and this year, it is hosted in Minsk, Belarus (see www.openchess.by) from $30^{\text {th }}$ May to $11^{\text {th }}$ June. Later in the month, the World Team Championship will be held in Siberia from $16^{\text {th }}$ to $26^{\text {th }}$ June (see chess.ugramegasport.ru).
Furthermore, major rapidplay and blitz events in the Grand Chess Tour circuit are to take place in Paris and Leuven over the period $19^{\text {th }}$ June to $2^{\text {nd }}$ July. For details, visit www.grandchesstour.com.

## Result Round-up

New England Club Ladder

|  | Change |  | Player | Record @ 10/05/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 들 |  |  |  |
| 1 | - | - | R Ilett | $1 / 2,1,0,1,1 / 2,1,1 / 2,1$ |
| 2 | - | - | D Lane | 1,1,1/2, $1 / 2,1$ |
| 3 | - | - | J Parker | 1,0,1/2, $0,1,1,1,1 / 2$ |
| 4 | - | - | F Bowers | 1/2, $1 / 2,1,1,0$ |
| 5 | - | - | S Walker | 0,1,1/2, 1, $0,1,1$ |
| 6 | - | - | P O'Gorman | 1/2, $0,1,0,0,1 / 2,0,0,1,0,0,0$ |
| 7 | - | - | M Ingram | 0,1,1/2 |
| 8 | - | - | N Wedley | 1,0,1,1,1/2,1/2, 1,1/2, 1, 1 |
| 9 | - | - | M Tarabad | 1,1,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,0,1/2,0 |
| 10 | - | - | P Hanks | 1,1,1/2,1 |
| 11 | - | - | S Caraway | 1,1/2 |
| 12 | - | - | P Weinberger | 1,1,0,1,1,1,0,0,0,1 |
| 13 | - | - | P Walker | $1 / 2,1 / 2,1 / 2,0$ |
| 14 | - | - | I Garratt | 0,0,0,1,0,0,0,0,0,0 |
| 15 | - | - | N Foreman | 0,0,0,0,0,0,0 |
| 16 | - | - | R Jones | 1,0 |

This table will be updated with the final results on/after $1^{\text {st }}$ June and published in the next
newsletter.
Club Championship

| Round 3 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S Caraway (11/2) | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  |
| Round 5 |  |  |  |
| R Ilett (2) |  |  |  |
| P O'Gorman (0) | P | P |  |


| Round 6 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F Bowers（4） | 0 | 1 | R Ilett（4½） |
| P Walker（3½） | 1／2 | 1／2 | S Caraway（4） |
| G Dharmasena（3） | P | P | P Weinberger（3） |
| R Jones（3） | 1／2 | 1／2 | P Turp（3） |
| P Hanks（ $21 / 2$ ） | 1 | 0 | J Parker（3） |
| S Walker（11⁄2） | 0 | 1 | C Russell（ $2^{112}$ ） |
| S Wozniak（ $211 / 2$ ） | 0 | 1 | M Ingram（ $\mathbf{2}^{1 / 2}$ ） |
| M Tarabad（1＋P） | 1d | 0d | N Foreman（1＋P） |
| N Wedley（11⁄2） | 0 | 1 | D Lane（1＋P） |
| P O＇Gorman（0＋P） | 1 | 0 | I Garratt（0） |

## New England Grand Prix

| Player | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{N}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { す} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 <br> $\boxed{0}$ <br> $\boxed{y}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { R } \\ & \mathbf{U} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { ※犬 } \\ & \text { た } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ | 历 | $\stackrel{*}{\text { cor }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S Caraway | $41 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | 9 | 1／2 | 3 | 181／2 | 159 |
| R llett | $51 / 2$ | 51／2 | 6 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 181／2 | 180 |
| P Walker | 4 | 11／2 | 9 | 0 | $31 / 2$ | 18 | 163 |
| M Tarabad | 2 | 61／2 | 4 | 1／2 | 3 | 15 | 93 |
| D Lane | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | $41 / 2$ | 141／2 | 120 |
| F Bowers | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1／2 | 2 | $131 / 2$ | 158 |
| P Hanks | $31 / 2$ | 31／2 | $41 / 2$ | 1／2 | $1 / 2$ | $121 / 2$ | 150 |
| P Weinberger | 3 | 6 |  |  | 21／2 | 111／2 | 101 |
| J Parker | 3 | 5 | $1 / 2$ |  | 2 | 101／2 | 109 |
| R Jones | $31 / 2$ | 1 | 3 |  | 2 | 91122 | 120 |
| N Wedley | $11 / 2$ | 61／2 |  |  | 1 | 9 | 106 |
| P Turp | $31 / 2$ |  | $31 / 2$ |  | 1 | 8 | 132 |
| S Walker | $11 / 2$ | 41／2 | 1 |  | 1 | 8 | 101 |
| C Russell | $31 / 2$ |  |  | 1 | 3 | 71／2 | 129 |
| M Ingram | $31 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ |  |  | 2 | 7 | 112 |
| P O＇Gorman | 1 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 5 | 70 |
| G Dharmasena | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 117 |
| S Wozniak | $21 / 2$ |  |  | 0 | 0 | 21／2 | 98 |
| I Garratt | 0 | 1 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 11／2 | 47 |
| N Foreman | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 48 |

Problem Night ： $3^{\text {rd }}$ May 2017

| Team | Rd 1 | Rd 2 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P Weinberger \＆S Wozniak | 18 | 16 | 34 |
| F Bowers | 18 | 7 | 25 |
| I Garratt \＆C Russell | 16 | 8 | 24 |

## Match of the Month

P Hanks v R Mann<br>New England A v Warboys A，02．11．2016<br>1 d4<br>d5

Since 2007 under New England colours，I have met Richard Mann no less than 10 times．Normally，we contest a King＇s Indian but once，he surprised me with a Lasker＇s Defence in the Queen＇s Gambit．I quickly found myself in a terrible position and so，I decided to try something different for the current game．

| 2 | Nf3 | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | g3 | e6 |
| 4 | Bg2 | c5 |

Just prior to the game，I had been looking at So v Nakamura，St Louis 2016 which I was considering as a potential example of the Catalan for a summer Masterclass session．There，White played 2 c4（which I had avoided for the sake of variety as previously mentioned）but we would have transposed after the routine developing moves $4 \ldots$ Be7 50－0 0－0 6 c4．
Strategically，White is happy to surrender the pawn on c4 in exchange for pressure from the fianchetto along the h1－a8 diagonal，particularly against c6 and b7． With the active text move，Black foregoes the option of c7－c6 to solidify the defence．

## 5 c3

Again motivated by the desire for unfamiliar positions， this is probably not a good path to follow．In Fritz＇s opening book，the move receives a＂？＂and the statistics show that White only achieved one draw in three games in which the move was played．I hoped to force an early e2－e4 to open the long diagonal．

| 5 | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{Nc6}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | $0-0$ | Be |
| 7 | Re 1 | $0-0$ |
| 8 | Nbd 2 |  |

At least，I am being consistent！I was looking forward to 9 e4 freeing my game but my opponent correctly identifies that I have created a weakness on $\mathfrak{f 2}$ ．

$$
8 \text {... }
$$

Qb6
Fritz prefers the version of this with $8 \ldots$ cxd4 9 cxd4 Qb6．Presumably，the computer can see there is little threat in a battery with the black queen on b6 and bishop on c5 after White＇s d4xc5 and prefers to undermine the centre d4 pawn e．g． $10 \mathrm{Nb} 3 \mathrm{a5}$ ．I had a long think at this point and did not like my position．

## 9

## Nb3

By simple arithmetic，the d4 pawn is attacked more times than it is defended． 9 dxc5 Bxc5 10 Rf1 or 10 e3 puts me on the back foot and seems to defeat my intention of e2－e4．I did not delve too deeply into 9 e4 but I doubt if I should have seen the tactical way to hold d4 utilising the open e file－ 9 e4 cxd4 10 exd5 exd5（10 ．．．dxc3？ 11 Nc 4 ） 11 cxd4 because $11 \ldots$ Nxd4？ 12 Rxe7．This is a complex line which the computer initially resolves by 10 ．．．Nxd5 11 Nxd4 Nxd4 12 Bxd5 exd5 13 Rxe7 Ne6．Fritz thinks White has survived but having given up the light－squared
bishop and trapped an isolated rook, I am not convinced. After some reflection, Fritz agrees and switches to 12 Nc 4 with equality.

| 9 |  | Ne4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 ... cxd4 10 Nbxd4 Nxd4 11 cxd4 Ne4 black knight its fine outpost and prese pair. It would also resemble Lasker's De |  |  |
| 10 | dxc5 | Bxc5 |
| 11 | Nxc5 | Qxc5 |
| 12 | Be3 | Qe7 |
| 13 | Nd2 |  |

I was starting to feel better about my position. I had rebuffed the early activity and kept my pawn structure intact though I had quite some work to do before e2e4. Instead, I could have attacked Black's centre with 13 c4 Rd8 (13 ...dxc4 14 Qc2) 14 Qc2 when Black could end up with a vulnerable isolated pawn.

| 13 | $\ldots$ | Nxd2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Qxd2 | Bd7 |
| 15 | b4 |  |

I felt my development was superior and that this justified grabbing the initiative. I was gratified to see the computer thinks my move is best. Not only does it have the crude threat Be3-c5 skewering the black queen and rook, it has the prospect of unblocking the e pawn, displacing the knight on c6 or in the case of b7-b6, creating possibilities on the long diagonal. Perhaps, even more significant is the psychological effect. For the next few moves, Black feels under siege and retreats into his bunker.

| 15 | $\ldots$ | Rfe8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | Bc5 | Qd8 |
| 17 | e4 |  |

At last! The bishops are destructive on an open board. 17 dxe4
Black should try to drive off some of White's more active pieces with $17 \ldots$ b6.

18 Rad1


This is just about a dream position for White - the bishop pair, centralised rooks, an open file and not forgetting, Black's undefended kingside...

| 18 | $\ldots$ | Bc8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 19 | Qc2 | Qg5 |
| 20 | Bxe4 | f5 |

After $20 \ldots \mathrm{~g} 6$, I anticipated play revolving around the weakened dark squares near the black king e.g. 21 f4 Qf6 22 b5 Ne7 (22 ... Na5 23 Qa4) 23 Bd 4 and the position is a joy to behold. Thanks to a discovered attack on the rook on e8, Fritz notices there is also pressure on the other flank with 23 Qa4 Qxc3 (23 ... Rf8 24 Qb4 Re8 25 Rd8) 24 Rc1 Qf6 25 b6 Nc6 26 Bxc6 bxc6 27 Qxc6 Ba6 28 b7.
I expected 20 ... h6 when White can continue to inflict shell-shock by 21 Rd5 e5 ( 21 ... exd5 22 Bh7+ Kh8 23 Rxe8\#) 22 f4 Qh5 (22 ... Qf6 23 b5) when further constriction by 23 f 5 will trouble Black. A little care is needed because interpolating 21 f 4 Qh5 precludes 22 Rd5 when $22 \ldots f 5$ is viable with e8 defended.

## 21 Bxf5

White is now winning. 21 ... exf5 22 Rxe8+ Kf7 23 Qb3+ is murderous.
21
b6

21 ... g6 $22 \mathrm{Be} 4-22 \mathrm{Be} 3$ is not possible because of 22 ... Qxf5 - avoids the worst for Black but it leaves White with an extra pawn and with Black's queenside development crippled, control of almost the entire board. For instance, an attempt to gain relief by swapping pieces by 22 ... Rd8 runs into 23 Rxd8+ Qxd8 24 Bxg6 hxg6 25 Qxg6+ Kh8 26 Bf8 Qxf8 27 Re4 with a mating attack - computer analysis, of course, but actually a pattern I should recognise.

| 22 | Bxh7+ | Kh8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | Bg6 |  |

I have been presented with a choice of winning moves. 23 Be 3 is probably simplest and strongest 23 ... Qf6 24 Be4 Bb7 25 Rd7.
23
Ne 5

Sheer desperation. The game is over.

| 24 | Rxe5 | Qxe5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | Bd4 |  |

I had been thinking of trapping the black queen but it takes a computer to see $25 \mathrm{f4}$ Qf6 (25 ... Qc7 26 Qe2 allows checkmate by $26 \ldots$ bxc5 27 Qh5+ Kg8 28 Qh7+ Kf8 29 Qh8+ Ke7 30 Qxg7\#) 26 Be7 when 26 ... Rxe7 (26 ... Qxe7 27 Qe2 etc.) 27 Rd8+.

| 25 | $\ldots$ | Qg5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | Bxe8 | Bb7 |
| 27 | Qg6 | Qe7 |
| 28 | Qh5+ |  |

A mistake! 28 Bf 7 is quicker.

| 28 | $\ldots$ | Kg8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 29 | Bg6 | $1-0$ |

A fitting finale might have been 29 ... Qc7 30 Qh7+ Kf8 31 Bf6.

