## New Englander

## Chess Club Update - October 2018

## Chairman's Chatter

It is always heartening to see the room filled with chess games on a club evening. So, round 1 of the club championship was an excellent start to the new season. Let's try to keep the momentum going, particularly with good communication among players and teams, throughout the coming months.

Paul Hanks

## Diary Dates

24-25th November The Cambridgeshire County Individual Championship is a Swiss tournament with Open, U140 and Junior sections and takes place at Peterborough Bridge Club, Lincoln Road.

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution (Marandyuk 1971)
Position : 8/8/1K6/1PPk4/5P2/8/2P1Q3/8
1 c6 Kd6 2 Qe5\# [1 ... Kd4 2 Qd3\#]

## Website to Watch

From $12^{\text {th }}$ to $18^{\text {th }}$ October, Chalkidiki in Greece is the setting for the 2018 European Chess Club Cup (see http://eurochess2018.com). Entries include our nearneighbours Grantham Sharks but other teams have average ratings ranging from 261 to a plucky Turkish team's 102. Do you fancy a New England team going next year?

## Result Round-up

Club Championship

| Round $\mathbf{1}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| S Walker | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | M Tarabad |
| R Jones | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | C Russell |
| S Wozniak | 1 | 0 | P O'Gorman |
| P Walker | 1 | 0 | D Lane |
| P Spencer | 1 | 0 | J Parker |
| R llett | 1 | 0 | E Knox |
| T Ingram | 1 | 0 | E Smith |
| J Sutherland | 1 | 0 | P Weinberger |
| P Hanks | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | P Turp |
|  |  |  |  |


| Round 2 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| J Sutherland (1) | 0 | 1 | P Walker (1) |
| S Wozniak (1) | P | P | R llett (1) |
| T Ingram (1) | 0 | 1 | P Spencer (1) |
| M Tarabad (1/2) | P | P | P Turp (1⁄2) |
| C Russell (1⁄2) | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | S Walker (1⁄2) |
| P Weinberger (0) | 1 | 0 | R Jones (1⁄2) |
| E Knox (0) | 0 | 1 | N Wedley (Rd 1) |
| D Lane (0) | 1 | 0 | J Parker (0) |
| P O'Gorman (0) | 1 | 0 | E Smith (0) |
| Match night : 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ September | Next draw : 13th September |  |  |
| N Wedley (P) | P | P | P Hanks (1⁄2) |


| Round 3 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P Walker (2) |  |  | S Wozniak (1+P) |
| P Spencer (2) |  |  | N Wedley (1+P) |
| P Turp (1⁄2+P) |  |  | R llett (1+P) |
| P Weinberger (1) |  |  | D Lane (1) |
| S Walker (1) |  |  | T Ingram (1) |
| C Russell (1) |  |  | J Sutherland (1) |
| R Jones (1⁄2) |  |  | P O'Gorman (1) |
| P Hanks (1⁄2+P) |  |  | M Tarabad (1⁄2+P) |
| J Parker (0) |  | E Smith (0) |  |
| Match night : 23 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ October |  | Next draw : see below |  |
| E Smith (0) |  | E Knox (0) |  |


| Round 4 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R llett (1+P) |  |  | P Spencer (2) |
| P Hanks (1⁄2+P) |  |  | P Walker (2) |
| P Turp (1⁄2+P) |  |  | C Russell (1) |
| S Walker (1) |  |  | P Weinberger (1) |
| N Wedley (1+P) |  |  | R Jones (1⁄2) |
| D Lane (1) |  | S Wozniak (1+P) |  |
| P O'Gorman (1) |  |  | J Sutherland (1) |
| M Tarabad (1/2+P) |  |  | T Ingram (1) |
| J Parker (0) |  | E Knox (0) |  |
| Match night : 31 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ October |  | Next draw : 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ November |  |

New England Grand Prix

| Player | $\stackrel{\text { Q }}{\substack{\mathbb{T}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { d} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 <br> 0 <br> $\boxed{0}$ <br>  | $\stackrel{0}{5}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { ※ } \\ & \text { た } \\ & \text { に } \end{aligned}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{*}{\text { ¢ }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P Walker | 2 | 3 |  |  |  | 5 | 173 |
| P Spencer | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 | 158 |
| R llett | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 179 |
| M Tarabad | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  |  |  | $11 / 2$ | 112 |
| N Wedley | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 130 |
| S Wozniak | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 120 |
| J Sutherland | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 115 |
| C Russell | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 114 |
| D Lane | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 107 |
| P Weinberger | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 102 |
| S Walker | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 102 |
| T Ingram | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 93 |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 80 |
| P Turp | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 162 |
| P Hanks | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 130 |
| R Jones | 1/2 |  |  |  |  | 1/2 | 89 |
| J Parker | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 74 |
| E Knox | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 64 |
| E Smith | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 22 |

## Match of the Month

I think my first local league game was back in 1982 for Perkins in the (now defunct) Hunts \& Peterborough Chess Association league. I cannot now remember who that was against but as I get older, it is a sad fact that more and more of the senior chess players that I knew then are dying off. Amongst others, last season saw the demise of David Carew, a long time veteran of Spalding Chess Club, against whom I recall playing many times. We had some terrific battles, but sadly I
find I no longer can find the earliest (and probably the sharpest) encounters - when David usually won. However, as a tribute to David I have dug out this game from the 'middle years', from the days when I was experimenting with obscure openings, in the hope of gaining some extra time on the clock..

## David Carew v Chris Russell

Spalding v Perkins, H\&PCA Div 2; 21.02.1995

| 1 | e 4 | e 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | d 4 | d 5 |
| 3 | Nc 3 | $\mathrm{Nf6}$ |

At this time, I felt the classical French Defence was a solid opening line and played it quite often. It is rarely seen today, because Black has better options, most notably 3 ... Bb4! (the Winawer variation), but this line requires careful preparation, so the text might be regarded as a safer option.

## $4 \quad$ Bg5

Expecting the usual $4 \ldots$ dxe4 5 Nxe4 (the Burn Variation) or the classical $4 \ldots$ Be7 5 e5 but I have found something different.

## 4

...

## Bb4!?

This is known as the McCutcheon Variation, after its inventor. I remember liking more obscure lines like this for their surprise value, which then would often lead to an advantage on the clock. Sure enough, David stopped to think here for a good 10 minutes and then came up with:

## 5 a3?!

A surprise. I am not sure whether David was trying to avoid prepared lines but this move cedes the initiative to Black.
The normal continuation is 5 e 5 h 6 . However, one of the points of this variation is that White struggles to make any headway with the direct approach. For example, if White exchanges off the bishop:

- 6 exf6 hxg5 7 fxg7 Rg8 with a level game because 8 h4 gxh4 9 Nf3 Rxg7 10 Rxh4 Rg8 is solid for Black.
It might be thought that retaining the bishop is better, since, in this variation of the French, White does not necessarily get saddled with doubled pawns, but the retreat involves a loss of tempo that Black can exploit to equalise:
- 6 Bd2 Bxc3 7 Bxc3 Ne4 and now
- 8 Bd2 c5! 9 Be3 Nc6 10 c3 Qb6 11 Rb1 cxd4 12 Bxd4 Nxd4 13 Qxd4 Nc5 14 Nf3 Bd 7 is safe.
- 8 Qg4 0-0 9 Bb4 c5 10 Bxc5 Nxc5 11 dxc5 b6! looks good for Black.
- 8 Bb4 Nc6 9 Ba3 Qh4 10 Nh3 (White could try 10 g 3 since $10 \ldots$ Nxg3 11 fxg3 Qe4+ 12 Qe2+ Qxh1 13 Nf3 when Black struggles to save his queen after $140-0-$ 0) 10 ... f6 11 exf6 Nxf6 with level chances.
- 6 Be3 Ne4 7 Nge2 c5 8 a3 cxd4 9 Bxd4 Nxc3 10 Nxc 3 Be 7 is also equal. More combative is 7 Qg4 g5 8 a3 Bxc3+ 9 bxc3 c5 10 Bd3 Nxc3 when both sides have chances.
My conclusion is that Black has nothing to fear in this line - although you cannot guarantee that White will play 4 Bg 5 as 4 e5 (the Steinitz Variation) is playable. However, back to the game...

$$
5 \text {... }
$$

## Bxc3+

5 ... h6? 6 axb4 hxg5 7 e5 Nfd7 8 b5 would be wrong as White is better.
6 bxc3
dxe4

This appears playable, though Fritz rates 7 Ne 2 heading for g2-g3 as better. But after 7 ... h6 8 Bxf6 gxf6, White is still in difficulties.

$$
7 \text {... Qd5 }
$$

Forcing off White's best piece. Though 7 ... h6 would probably have the same effect and would have been safer as it does not allow White to double my pawns.

```
8 Bxf6
gxf6
9 fxe4
```

David spent another 10 minutes over this move (result!) Fritz lists his response as best, but the queen on e2 hampers his kingside development, which was no doubt bothering him.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
9 & \ldots & \text { Qxe4+ } \\
10 & \text { Qe2 } & \text { Qc6?! }
\end{array}
$$

Rather better would have been 10 ... f5! 11 Qxe4 fxe4, which activates Black's central pawn steamroller and gains a valuable central passed pawn. (If 11 Nh 3 Rg8 12 Qxe4 fxe4 13 Nf4 Nd7 14 Kd2 b6!) I am a pawn up and 20 minutes ahead on the clock, so I really should have taken more care over this move (sigh).

## 11 c4

David is looking to counter in the centre but 11 Qe3 giving him squares to develop the bishop was a safer option.

$$
11 \text {... b6! }
$$

Best. 11 ... Qb6 was playable, but I need to develop the queenside to prevent the black king getting trapped in the centre. Putting the bishop on b7 both gives it a powerful diagonal and potentially frees d7 for my knight.

| 12 | Nf3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 | d5?! |

This looks strong but unfortunately is not strategically sound. In my opinion, White should have tried to develop with $\mathrm{Qd} 2, \mathrm{Be} 2$ and $0-0$ but it is probably now too late for this in view of Rg8. Fritz recommends 13 c3 Rg8 14 Qf2 Qe4+ 15 Be2 Qc2 16 0-0 Qxc3 17 Rfc1 when the more secure king gives some compensation for the pawn deficit but White is still in severe difficulty.

Fritz likes 13 ... Qc5 better and if then 14 Rd1 Qxa3 15 Nd4 Na6 16 dxe6 0-0-0 17 exf7 Nc5 when White has levelled the material deficit, but is in a horrible position.

14 Nd4 Qe5
Playable, but Na 6 heading for c 5 was better.

## 15 Rd1

David has aggressively pushed in the centre to counter my material advantage and is threatening to prevent my king from castling. But how should I continue?


Oh dear! This gives away all of Black's advantage. For some reason, I must have thought that exchanging queens would help get my king to safety but in that case, why not either $15 \ldots \mathrm{Nd} 7$ (or perhaps Na 6 ) first? 15 ... Rg8 looks to be a potentially strong move too.
If $15 \ldots \mathrm{Nd} 7$, then a long analysis of (best computer) play by Fritz gives 16 Qxe5 Nxe5 17 dxe6 Rd8 18 e7 Rd7 (18 ... Kxe7 19 Nf5+ Ke8 20 Ng7+ with a perpetual check) 19 c5 Be4 20 c6 Rd6 21 Nb5 Rxd1+ 22 Kxd1 Kxe7 23 Nxa7 Ra8 24 Nb5 Bxc6 as a possible outcome, when Black retains a winning advantage into endgame. But there was a lot of play in the position and we have both been moving far too slowly. Now the game peters out into a messy draw, with both players short of time...

16 Bxe2 e5?!
This is another lemon, dissipating the tension in the centre. $16 \ldots$ Nd7 or $16 \ldots$ Na6 both allow 17 dxe6 fxe6 18 Nxe6 when White has some tactical prospects.

| 17 | $\mathrm{Nf5}$ | $\mathrm{Nd7}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | Bf 3 |  |

Both 18 Rf1 and $180-0$ were better, but the text does help consolidate White's position.
$190-0$ ?
Both settling for a draw!
19 ... h5
To prevent 20 Nh6.

## 20 d6??

Trying to develop another outpost for the knight but David is moving quickly to avoid running out of time. He could have considered 20 Ne7+ Kb8 21 Nc6+ Bxc6 22 dxc6 Nc5 23 Rxd8 Rxd8 24 Bxh5 with a difficult assessment of which side has the weaker pawns or the faster passed pawn.

| 21 | $\ldots$ | Bxf3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | Rxf3 | c5?? |

Horrible! $21 \ldots$ Nc5! keeps an advantage, but by now I have no more time than David. (We are not going to make the time control - the remainder of the game is just skittles.)

| 22 | Ne7+ | Kb7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 23 | Nd5 | Kc6 |
| 24 | Nxf6 | Rh6? |

24 ... Nxf6 25 Rxf6 Rd7 also draws.

$$
25 \quad \text { Ne4 } \quad \text { Rf8 } \quad 1 / 2-1 / 2
$$

Either 26 Rdf1 or 26 Rf5 levels the game.
In hindsight, we both spent far too much time looking for the 'killer' blow. But sometimes it just does not exist and the best thing to do is make a developing move and keep your opponent's clock ticking down. At the time, David was quite a few grade points higher than me so I suspect that I was happy to escape with a draw in the end. I remember this game as an object lesson in not wasting your clock time. Looking back, I spent more than 15 minutes on move 16 alone - I suspect mainly kicking myself on how I had just blown the win - and even then I could not come up with anything good (sigh). Golf, anyone?

Chris Russell

## Eye Opener

Turov v Glek
Corinth 2000

| 1 | e4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | d 4 | d5 |
| 3 | Nc 3 | $\mathrm{Nf6}$ |
| 4 | Bg 5 | $\mathrm{Bb4}$ |
| 5 | exd5 |  |

"Perhaps the most popular alternative to 5 e5" Psakhis

$$
5 \quad \text {... }
$$

## Qxd5

Black wants to take the opportunity to activate the queen since she cannot be easily dislodged from her centralised position. Instead, $5 \ldots$ exd5 is quite promising for White but hardly terrifying after 6 Qf3 c6.

## 6 Bxf6

If 6 Nf 3 Ne 47 Bd 2 when Black will achieve equality by doubling White's c pawns.

This is not essential and I think most of us would preserve the bishop pair, at least for the moment.

gxf6

The attacking option.

## 8

...
Nd7?!
Black protects the pawn on f 6 against the threat of Qg4-g7 but there is little to fear from $8 \ldots$... Bd7 9 Qg7 Rf8 10 Qxf6 Ba4 11 Qf4 Qa5 (defending c7) 12 Qd2 Nc6 13 Bd3 0-0-0 14 Nf3 e5 with counterattacking chances.

$$
9 \quad B d 3
$$

Kf8
This is not a move I would consider. There are good alternatives e.g. $9 \ldots$ Qg5 but that would go against Black's opening philosophy.
10
Qf4
h5

If 10 ... Qxg2, 11 Be4 Qg5 12 Qxc7 when Black has much to ponder (Qd8+, Bxb7, Nf3 etc).


13 ... Qf3 is Fritz's best try but 14 Qd8+ Kg7 $15 \mathrm{Rg} 1+$ Qg4 16 Qc7 and $13 \ldots$ Qg2 $14 \mathrm{Rg} 1 \mathrm{Qxg} 1+$ is no better. Black obtains two rooks for the queen but Fritz prefers White's chances in both cases probably due to Black's unsafe king and lack of development and coordination.

14 Qd8+ 1-0
It is checkmate by $14 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 715 \mathrm{Rg} 1+\mathrm{Kh} 616$ Qxh8\#
Paul Hanks

