## NEW ENCLANDER

## Chess Club Update - November 2017

## Chairman's Chatter

Our record in the Fenland Trophy has been very poor of late but at last, we can celebrate a success. Congratulations to the Cavaliers squad in beating Royston but it does play havoc with my spreadsheets!

Paul tanks

## Diary Dates

18-19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ November Cambridgeshire Individual Championships at Peterborough Bridge Club, Lincoln Road with Open, U140 and Junior sections. Entry forms are available from $F$ Bowers.

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution
Position : 6Q1/8/8/8/4p1N1/1K3k2/4N3/7R
1 Qd5 Kxg4 2 Qh5\# [1 ... Kg2 2 Qxe4\#; 1 ... Kxe2 2 Qd1\#]

## Website to Watch

If you hurry, you can catch the closing rounds of the European Team Chess Championship taking place in Crete until November $7^{\text {th }}$. The offical website euroteams2017.com only seems to carry administrative details so you may need to use a general game viewer. The last in the FIDE Grand Prix series runs from $15^{\text {th }}$ to $26^{\text {th }}$ November and will determine who goes forward the candidate stage of the World Championship. Again, dedicated websites lack information so try www.chessbomb.com.

## Result Round-up

Club Championship

| Round 1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| P Spencer | P | P | P Weinberger |
| M Tarabad | 0 | 1 | P Hanks |
| Round 2 |  |  |  |
| M Ingram (0) | 0 | 1 | P Weinberger (P) |
| P O'Gorman (1) | 0 | 1 | D Lane (1) |
| S Walker (0) | 0 | 1 | R Jones (1) |
| E Serban (1) | P | P | M Tarabad (0) |
| P Hanks (1) | P | P | T Ingram (Rd 1) |
| T Ingram (P) | P | P | P Spencer |


| Round 3 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R llett (2) |  |  | E Serban (1+P) |
| R Jones (2) |  |  | P Walker (2) |
| D Lane (2) |  |  | P Hanks (1+P) |
| P Spencer (2P) |  |  | J Parker (1) |
| S Wozniak (1⁄2) |  |  | P O'Gorman (1) |
| P Weinberger (1+P) |  |  | F Bowers (1) |
| N Wedley (0) |  |  | C Russell (1⁄2) |
| M Tarabad (0+P) |  |  | M Ingram (0) |
| T Ingram (2P) |  | I Garratt (0) |  |
| M Tarabad (Rd 4) |  | S Walker (0) |  |
| Match night : 3rd January |  |  |  |
| Next draw : 4 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ January (14t if possible) |  |  |  |

Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| Cambridge | $\mathbf{2}$ | New England A | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| C Davison | $1 / 2$ | R llett | $1 / 2$ |
| N Hutchinson | $1 / 2$ | P Walker | $1 / 2$ |
| R McCorry | 0 | F Bowers | 1 |
| M Symanski | 0 | P Hanks | 1 |
| J Daugman | 1 | E Serban | 0 |


| New England B | $\mathbf{1}$ | Warboys B | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| F Bowers | 1 | M Misson | 0 |
| R Jones | 0 | N Greenwood | 1 |
| D Lane | 0 | P Baddeley | 1 |
| J Parker | 0 | P Wells | 1 |


| Peterborough | $\mathbf{2} ½$ | New England A | $\mathbf{2 ¹ ⁄ 2}^{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| I Bin Suhayl | 1 | R llett | 0 |
| C Tandy | 1 | P Walker | 0 |
| S Caraway | 0 | F Bowers | 1 |
| A Kaszuba | 0 | P Hanks | 1 |
| M Dunkley | $1 ⁄ 2$ | P Spencer | $1 / 2$ |

Fenland Plate

| St Neots | P | NE Patriots | P |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Re-arranged for $4^{\text {th }}$ December |  |  |  |


| NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{2}$ | Royston | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| P Walker | $1 / 2$ | K Clark | $1 / 2$ |
| F Bowers | 1 | K Woodhouse | 0 |
| P O'Gorman | $1 ⁄ 2$ | M Johnson | $1 / 2$ |
| M Tarabad | 0 | A Andrews | 1 |

Team 550 Competition

| NE Patriots | $\mathbf{2}$ | Spalding | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R llett | $1 / 2$ | P Szutkowski | $1 / 2$ |
| C Russell | $1 / 2$ | J Smith | $1 / 2$ |
| S Wozniak | 0 | R Coats | 1 |
| S Walker | 1 | T Bennett | 0 |


| NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{2}$ | Godmanchester | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| D Lane | 0 | J Wright | 1 |
| M Ingram | 0 | M English | 1 |
| M Tarabad | 1 | A Ellul | 0 |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | B Smith | 0 |


| Godmanchester | $\mathbf{2} 1 / 2$ | NE Patriots | $\mathbf{1 1 / 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| J Wright | $1 / 2$ | P Hanks | $1 / 2$ |
| M English | 1 | C Russell | 0 |
| A Ellul | 0 | J Parker | 1 |
| B Smith | 1 | I Garratt | 0 |

New England Club Ladder

| White |  | Black |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| N Wedley | 0 | 1 | P Hanks |
| J Parker | 1 | 0 | S Walker |
| F Bowers | 1 | 0 | P Walker |
| P Spencer | 1 | 0 | J Parker |
| J Parker | 0 | 1 | N Wedley |


| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 0 . \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Change |  | Player | Record @ 25/10/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { d } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 1 | - | - | F Bowers | 1,1 |
| 2 | +2 | +2 | P Hanks | 1 |
| 3 | +4 | +4 | P Spencer | 1 |
| 4 | -2 | -1 | N Wedley | 1/2, 0,1 |
| 5 | -2 | -3 | J Parker | 0,1/2, 1, 0,0 |
| 6 | -1 | -1 | S Walker | 0 |
| 7 | -1 | -1 | P Walker | 0 |

New England Grand Prix

| Player | $\stackrel{\text { Q }}{\substack{\mathbb{I}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { む̀ } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 5 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{R}{3} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | - | 堇 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F Bowers | 1 | 2 | $31 / 2$ | 1 |  | 71/2 | 181 |
| P Hanks | 1 | 1 | $31 / 2$ | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 51/2 | 177 |
| R llett | 2 |  | 1 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 4 | 176 |
| J Parker | 1 | $11 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | $31 / 2$ | 97 |
| P Walker | 2 |  | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 3 | 153 |
| P O'Gorman | 1 |  |  | 1/2 | 1 | 21/2 | 95 |
| E Serban | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 163 |
| R Jones | 2 |  | 0 |  |  | 2 | 123 |
| D Lane | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 97 |
| N Wedley | 0 | $11 / 2$ |  |  |  | 11/2 | 108 |
| P Spencer |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 11/2 | 148 |
| M Tarabad |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 78 |
| S Walker | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 87 |
| C Russell | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 99 |
| P Weinberger | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 151 |
| S Wozniak | 1/2 |  |  |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 89 |
| M Ingram | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| I Garratt | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| P Turp |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | - |

## Match of the Month

The start of a new chess season always comes around too soon. Every year, I promise myself that I will get in a bit of study during the summer and invariably come to the board feeling rustier than ever. This year was no exception. So, here is my first game of the season, facing a stronger opponent and really wishing I had done some basic preparation!

## Ray Ilett v Chris Russell

Round 1 New England Club Championship, 06.09.17

| 1 | d4 | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | c4 | e6 |
| 3 | Nc3 | Bb4 |

The Nimzo-Indian Defence is a solid response to d4. White can force the exchange of the black bishop for knight in exchange for doubled pawns on the c file. The main argument centres on whether this is a good deal.

## $4 \quad$ Nf3!

Frustrating! Ray wants to steer the game into a Queen's Indian hybrid and suddenly my opening theory is on much stonier ground (sigh).

$$
4 \quad \ldots \quad \text { c5 }
$$

Hoping to get to something like 5 dxc5 Bxc5 6 a3 0-0 7 Bg5 Be7 8 Qd2 b6 9 e4 d6 after which Black has less space but counter-attacking opportunities. However, Ray again does not oblige, aiming for more of a classical Queen's Indian formation.
5
6 exd4
cxd4
b6?!

Allowing my light-squared bishop activity to counter White's centre and keeping the option of retreating the dark-squared bishop, but I think I am beginning to get my systems mixed up. $6 \ldots$ d5! 7 a3 Bxc3+ 8 bxc3 0-0 9 Bf 4 b 6 is better and would be more consistent.

```
7 Bd3
Bb7
0-0
```

SInce the knight is no longer pinned, I need to decide what to do with the dark-squared bishop. Logically, having committed it, I should continue with $8 \ldots$ Bxc3 9 bxc3 d6 10 Qe2 0-0 11 Bf 4 Qc 7 . Fritz rates this as equal (if 12 a 4 Nbd 713 a 5 e 5 !), but to me, the white bishops are starting to look menacing. So I decided that I want to keep the bishop for defence. This is not a great idea...

## 8

...
Be7?!
This loses significant tempo and is premature anyway. Fritz recommends $8 \ldots 0-0$. Now I am really on the defensive.

$$
9 \quad \text { Qe2?! }
$$

Thankfully Ray helps me out here. This is too passive.

- 9 d5! exd5 10 cxd5 Nxd5 11 Nxd5 Bxd5 12 Re1 Nc6 13 Bf4 Bxf3 14 Qxf3 0-0 15 Be4 keeps the pressure on
- 9 Bf4 d5 10 cxd5 Nxd5 11 Nxd5 Bxd5 12 Ne5 0-0 13 Rc1 Nd7 14 Nc6 Bxc6 15 Rxc6 Nf6 16 Be5 Rc8 17 Rxc8 Qxc8 is still tough going.
9
$0-0$
10 Bf4

Fritz marginally prefers Bc1-g5 though both bishop moves look to be solid attacking moves.

```
1 0
d5
```

The problem with 9 Qe 2 is that it gives me the time to make this advance. Fritz also likes $10 \ldots$ Re8.

Ray spent a good 15 minutes thinking over his next move. After the game, he said that 12 Qe4 looked promising but after $12 \ldots \mathrm{~g} 6$ could not see a way to penetrate. Fritz suggests 13 Ne5 Bf6 14 Bc4 Bg7 15 Bxd5 Bxd5 16 Nxd5 Qxd5 17 Qxd5 exd5 18 Rac1 Re8 or $13 \ldots$ Nd7 14 Bh6 Nxe5 15 Bxf8 Nxc3 16 Qxe5 Bf6 17 Qg3 Na4. Both keep an advantage but there is no easy win. Eventually, Ray decides that discretion is the better part of valour and plays...

## 12 Bg3

After this move, the game is level and I have a healthy lead on the clock.

| 12 | $\ldots$ | Nd7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | Rac1 | Rc8 |

13 .. N7f6 $14 \mathrm{Ne5}$ a5 might have been a better try.

## 14 Nxd5

Bxd5
As a result of my $8 \ldots$ Be7, $14 \ldots$ exd5 is worse than bad. Not only does it saddle me with an isolated pawn but the bishop is hanging after 15 Rxc8 Bxc8 (not 15 ... Qxc8 16 Qxe7) 16 Rc1 with control of the open file and 17 Rc1-c7 to follow. Even so, the game starts to revolve around how White can exploit the c file.

## 15 Ba6

This looks strong. I was worried about 15 ... Rxc1 16 Rxc1 threatening Rc1-c8. Fritz points out that I get full value for the queen after 16 ... Bxa2! 17 Rc8 Qxc8 18 Bxc8 Rxc8 19 h3 Bc4 20 Qc2 a5. But I was not happy about giving up my queen when the board was relatively open for white's queen to manoeuvre! So I was looking for an alternative.

```
15
Rc6?!
```

Losing the opportunity to gobble the pawn on a2. I had intended to follow up with Nd7-b8 to dislodge the bishop on a6, as BxNb8 gives up the bishop pair. I should have stuck to this strategy!

| 16 | Rxc6 | Bxc6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | Rc1 |  |

Now 17 ... Nb8 18 Bd3 Bxf3 19 Qxf3 Qxd4 20 Rd1 Qa4 is perfectly sound, as is 17 ... Bxf3 but I think I have seen something better.

## 17

...
Qa8?!
As usual, I am wrong (sigh again). This does nothing to ease the bind I am in. 18 Ne 5 ! Nxe5 19 Bxe5 Re8 20 Qg4 Bf8 21 Rc3 Be4 21 Rc7 still leaves me with a difficult defence.

```
18 d5?!
```

An interesting gambit but, much to my relief, not really sound. It takes the pressure right off as the penetration of the rook onto c7 is not decisive (but only with best play!)

## 18

Bxd5
Forced.
19 Rc7
This looks strong but I may the potential to develop some back row mate threats in compensation. The question is - should I play Qd8 or Rd8 - or something else?

## 11 <br> cxd5

Nxd5


19
Rd8??

Like I said at the start of this piece, I am very rusty. White has direct one-move threats ( 20 Rxd7 or if 19 ... Nc5 20 Rxe7), so it should not be too hard to see that this is a bad mistake. Due to the double attack on the pinned knight, simply 20 Bb 5 ! wins.

- 20 ... Nc5 no longer attacks the bishop. Had it still been on a6, I could respond to 21 Rxe7 with 21 ... Nxa6 when the white queen would have been unable to recapture 22 Qxa6 because of $22 \ldots$ Bxf3 23 gxf3 Qxf3 with the threat of $24 \ldots$ Rd1+.
- Also 20 ... Rc8 21 Rxd7 Rc1+ 22 Ne1 Bb4 23 f 3 does nothing - White is a piece up.
However, if 19 ... Qd8! 20 Rxa7 Bc5 gives Black a solid enough position. Another option is 19 ... Bxf3 and then if 20 Qxf3 Nc5 21 Be 2 Bf 622 Qxa8 Rxa8 is fine for Black, though Fritz found 20 gxf3! Qd5 (20 ... Rd8 21 Bb7 Qb8 22 Rxd7; 20 ... Qd8 21 Rc8 again!) 21 Bc4 Qd4 22 Bxe6! fxe6 23 Qxe6+ Rf7 24 Rxd7 Qf6 25 Qd5 Qg5 which should win for White - though this is hard to spot when you are running out of time.


## 20 Qb5??

Right idea, wrong piece! It is Ray's first game of the season too and he misses the opportunity. More rust, probably? To be fair, he is running short of time. (I have no such excuse!) After the knight moves, I still have the back row mate threats to save my bishop.

## Nc5

This is the move I was trying to get in when I played Rd8. Annoyingly Fritz points out that 20 ... Nf8 is better because if 21 Rxe7 Bxf3! 22 gxf3 Qxf3, and the exchange of the white queen for a rook is forced (23 Qb3 Rd1+ 24 Bf1 Qe2 25 Qxd1). If 21 Qe2 Bf6, White is simply the gambit pawn down.

## 21 Rxe7

Leaving me with another tricky position.


How do I recapture?
Nxa6??
All I can say is that this looked good at the time, but it is another blunder. White can simply recapture with 22 Qxa6! and then, in response to my intended $22 \ldots$ Bc4, 23 Qa4 prevents $23 \ldots$ Rd1\# and wins.
The best move is $21 \ldots$ Bb7! when White needs to relieve the mate threat with 22 h3 and 22 ... Bxa6 leaves me in a strong position. 21 ... Bc6 is also playable but after 22 Qe2 if I play 22 ... Nxa6? White gets an immediate attack with 23 Ng 5 Be 824 Rxe8+ Rxe8 25 Qh5 which should win for White (e.g. 25 ... Rd8 26 Qxf7+ Kh8 27 Qh5 h6 [27 ... Kg8 28 Qxh7 mates in 3 moves] 28 Be5 etc). Instead $22 \ldots$ Kf8! 23 Bh4 and the game is still in the balance.

## 22 Bd6??

At two blunders each, perhaps we should have agreed a draw! But Ray was really short of time.

## 22

Nc5?!
And this is not much better. Obviously not 22 ... Rxd6 when it is White who delivers the back rank mate but 22 ... Qc6! 23 Qxa6 Qxd6 24 Rxa7 h6 looks good for Black.

$$
23 \quad \text { Bxc5 } \quad \text { Bc6 }
$$

Fritz prefers 23 ... Bc4 24 Qa4 Qc6 25 Qc2 Qxc5 26 Rxa7 Bxa2 with a healthy advantage.

24 Qe2
bxc5?!
Missing 24 ... Bb5! 25 Qc2 bxc5 26 Rc7 Qd5.
25 Ne5?!
Time trouble. Fritz found 25 Ng5! Rd5 26 Nxf7 Kf8 27 Rc7 Ba4 28 b3 Qb8 29 Ng5 and White is better.

## 25

Bxg2!
The best move for once!
26 Nxf7

Looks to be best. Fritz says that 26 h 4 giving the king an escape square is better but I think that 26 ... Bh3 27 Qf3 Qxf3 28 Nxf3 f6 is winning for Black.

## 26

 ...Bf3???
One blunder too many. When I played 25 ... Bxb2, I had intended to follow it with Bh3 but had a sudden rush of blood to the head and thought that Bf3 was better. Why? I don't know - it isn't. From won position to lost game in one dumb move. After 26 ... Bh3 27 f3 Rd5 28 Qb5 a6 29 Qb3 Rd2 Black should win.

## 28 Nxd8

Seeing 28 ... Bxe2 29 Re8\#, Ray chops off the rook in a hurry and the game is over! In shell shock, I play :

## 28 <br> 29

## ...

Qxd6+
Qxd8
1-0
Just so. At which point I am going to blame the rust. It is as good an excuse as any. The fact is that if you get a double edged position you should get more opportunity to win, especially if your opponent is in time trouble. But such situations give you just as many chances to mess it up!
Chris Qussell

## Eye Opener

The Caro Kann Defence (1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5) has a reputation for being a drawish opening. In fact, I have considered making it the subject of a Masterclass during the summer with the objective of livening it up! Objectively, according to my database, the percentage of draws in grandmaster games in this opening is around $50 \%$ whereas the Najdorf Sicilian is 40\%.
There are three main variations - the Advance (3 e5), the Panov-Botvinnik Attack (3 exd5 cxd5 4 c 4 ) and the Classical ( 3 Nc 3 dxe4 4 Nxe4). The first named is the most decisive with only $42 \%$ of points shared and was the weapon of choice in a clash between the two leading exponents of the defence, Anand v Karpov, Wijk aan Zee 2003.

Herzog v Jacques
Correspondence, Switzerland, 1962

| 1 | e4 | c6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | d4 | d5 |
| 3 | Nc3 | dxe4 |
| 4 | Nxe4 | Nf6 |

We are already in a sideline. $4 \ldots$ Bf5 is the favoured choice and if you want an example of $4 \ldots \mathrm{Nd} 7$, look at the famous game Deep Blue v Kasparov, New York 1997.

## 5 Qd3

This is unusual. White invariably plays 5 Nxf6 nowadays.

| 5 | $\ldots$ | e6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | Nf 3 | $\mathrm{Be7}$ |
| 7 | $\mathrm{Ne5}$ | $\mathrm{Nbd7}$ |

White has an imposing position but Black has the typically compact defence but can it be exploited?


Black has two other options :-

- 9 ... Kf8 10 Nxe6+ can be discarded immediately
- 9 ... Ke8 10 Nxe6
- 10 ... Qa5+ 11 Bd2 Bb4 12 c3 Bd6 13 Nxg7+ with sufficient compensation
- 10 ... Bb4+ 11 c3 Qe7 12 Qe2 Bd6 13 $\mathrm{Nxg7+}$ and the position is unbalanced but Black has now developed
- 10 ... Ne5 11 dxe5 Qa5+ (11 ... Bxe6 12 exf6) 12 Qc3 (12 Kd1 Ng4 $13 \mathrm{Nxg} 7+\mathrm{Kf} 8$ and White has too much en prise; 12 c3/Bd2 Qxe5+) 12 ... Bb4 13 Bd2 Bxc3 14 Bxc3 Qa4 15 Nxg7+ Kf7 16 exf6 and this is unlikely to be drawn! For instance 16 ... Qe2 17 Be 2 Qxc2 18 Bh5+ Kf8 19 0-0.


## 10 Nxe6

Qe8
11 Nc7
In many similar positions, a check on the a2-g8 diagonal is embarrassing but there is no such problem here because Black can interpose e.g. 11 Qb3 Nd5. Why not simply regain the material?

## 11 <br> Bb4+ 0-1

A classical pattern $12 \mathrm{Kd1}$ Qe1\# which often occurs with a rook delivering checkmate after queenside castling.

