## New Englander

## Chess Club Update - July 2019

## Chairman's Chatter

It has seemed like a long season but it came to a close with the match on $12^{\text {th }}$ June. Thank you all for your contributions and help over the last 10 months.

Paul Hanks

## Diary Dates

$30^{\text {th }}$ June $\quad$ Final day for graded games in the 2018-19 season. Please submit any last minute results to Chris Russell.

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2. This is the first problem included in the ECF newsletter by the British Chess Problem Society (see www.theproblemist.org). It came with a hint that was of no help - particularly, as I thought it was mate in one! Now there is a good clue!


Last Month's solution (Gazimon 1969)
Position : 8/8/8/8/1R1P1R2/3k4/B7/3K4
1 Bd5 Ke3 2 Rf3\# [1 ... Kc3 2 Rb3\#]
Result Round-up
Team 550 Competition - Play-Off

| NE Cavaliers | $1 / 2$ | Cambridge | $\mathbf{3} 1 / 2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R Ilett | $1 / 2$ | M Symanski | $1 / 2$ |
| P Hanks | 0 | S Pride | 1 |
| E Knox | 0 | D Cattermole | 1 |
| M Tarabad | 0 | A Norman | 1 |

New England Grand Prix

| Player | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 읓 } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\beth}{\Xi} \\ & \text { ® } \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{2}{5}$ |  | ฐّ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R Ilett | $51 / 2$ | 3 | $21 / 2$ | $21 / 2$ | 5 | 181/2 | 164 |
| P Spencer | $51 / 2$ | 3 | 4 |  | $31 / 2$ | 16 | 140 |
| J Sadler | 51/2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 151/2 | 126 |
| M Tarabad | $31 / 2$ | 6 |  | 0 | $51 / 2$ | 15 | 108 |
| C Russell | $41 / 2$ |  | 6 | 1 | 2 | $131 / 2$ | 123 |
| P Hanks | $61 / 2$ | 0 | 2 | $31 / 2$ | 1 | 13 | 156 |
| P Turp | $51 / 2$ |  | 2 | 0 | 3 | 101/2 | 137 |
| P Walker | 4 | 5 | 1 |  |  | 10 | 169 |
| P Weinberger | 3 | 1 | 2 |  | 3 | 9 | 99 |
| E Knox | $41 / 2$ |  | 1 |  | 21/2 | 8 | 106 |
| S Walker | $31 / 2$ |  | 2 |  | 2 | $71 / 2$ | 94 |
| R Jones | 4 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 7 | 112 |
| S Wozniak | $41 / 2$ |  |  |  | 21/2 | 7 | 124 |
| J Dilley |  |  | 5 |  |  | 5 | 202 |
| N Wedley | 21/2 | 1 |  | 1/2 | 1 | 5 | 94 |
| D Lane | 1 | 11/2 | $1 / 2$ |  | 2 | 5 | 89 |
| J Parker | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 70 |
| J Sutherland | 21/2 |  |  |  | 1 | $31 / 2$ | 100 |
| T Ingram | 21/2 | 1 |  |  |  | $311 / 2$ | 93 |
| M Ingram | 1 |  |  | 1/2 | 11/2 | 3 | 94 |
| E Smith | 2 | 1/2 |  |  | 0 | 2112 | 60 |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 74 |
| N Foreman |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 80 |

## Website to Watch

It may be the closed season for us but the elite grandmasters are busy in July.
The Grand Chess Tour has an 11 round-robin tournament from $26^{\text {th }}$ June to $7^{\text {th }}$ July with Carlsen and Caruana heading an impressive field of 12 (see https://grandchesstour.org/2019-grand-chess-tour/2019-croatia-grand-chess-tour).

From $11^{\text {th }}$ to $25^{\text {th }}$ July, the second leg of the FIDE Grand Prix series takes place in Latvia. The website has yet to be announced.

The Dortmund Sparkassen Chess-Meeting is a small event with 6 competitors from $13^{\text {th }}$ to $21^{\text {st }}$ July (see https://www.sparkassen-chess-meeting.de/). Grand Prix win Nepomniachtchi is scheduled to play (and in the simultaneous event in Latvia!).
From $21^{\text {st }}$ to $30^{\text {th }}$ July, the Biel Chess Festival (see https://www.bielchessfestival.ch/Tournaments/Closed-Tournament/Grandmaster-Tournament.html) has a grandmaster tournament covering classical, rapid and blitz disciplines. Who will be left standing to play?

## Match of the Month

When is the "Silly Season"? If you believe online sources, the term dates from 1861 and refers to the part of the year when Parliament and the Law Courts are not sitting. Generally, the period over the summer months is typified by the emergence of frivolous news stories in the media and is known in many languages as cucumber time (https://en.wikipedia.org/).
From my point of view, it can also occur in February...

## C J Russell v P Hanks

New England Club Championship Rd 7, 20.02.2019

$$
1 \quad e 4
$$

d6
Chris and I have played many times over the past four decades and know each other's opening repertoire. I decided to try something different to negate his preparation.

## 2 <br> f4

He knows what I play, I know that he knows and he knows that I know... Chris also avoids my preparation. First blood to me then since I had not done any!

| 2 | $\ldots$ | c5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | Nf3 | Nc6 |
| 4 | Nc3 | g6 |

Without an early d2-d4 to open lines for both sides, my Sicilian Defence is almost forced down the route of a kingside fianchetto (the Dragon Variation).

| 5 | d 4 | cxd 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | Nxd 4 |  |

In New in Chess magazine, Nigel Short annotated a game that reached this position and commented "A clever little move order against inveterate Najdorf devotees, tricking the opponent into the Dragon. The only problem, from White's perspective, is that he ends up playing the stupid Levenfish Variation." Is this a compliment and if so, for White or Black?
Had I known, I should have realised

- I had inadvertently avoided the more dangerous Yugoslav Attack (f2-f3 facilitating the later kingside assault g2-g4 etc.)
- I need not waste time with a7-a6.

| 6 | $\ldots$ | Bg 7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | Be 3 | $\mathrm{a6}$ |

On autopilot, I still played the Najdorf trademark. After the game, I was mollified by finding grandmasters had reached this position and continued $7 \ldots$ Nf6

- 8 Nb 3 0-0 (Fritz prefers grasping the opportunity with $8 \ldots \mathrm{Ng} 4$ ) 9 Be2 Be6 10 0-0 Anand (2670) v Gelfand (2665), Linares 1992 - an expert endorsement of our play so far, well maybe!
- Subsequently 8 Be2 Bd7 9 Nb3 Rc8 10 0-0 0-0 11 Qe1 (Short v Nepomniachtchi, Havana 2010) at which point Nigel comments "I am not quite sure why I did this, to be honest. Nepomniachtchi was apparently not the only one to be slightly confused."
8
Qd2
Nf6

By now, I had identified that the feature distinguishing the move order in our game was that White's pawn on e4 was lightly defended. It was a long shot but perhaps, Chris would share my lack of vigilance.


Here goes! Nimzovich did not approve grabbing a pawn in the opening unless it was in the centre, as here. Not only does the loss of this pawn free Black's pieces but it also devalues the tempi White has invested in maintaining the e4 and f 4 front.
The simple justification for my move is 11 Nxe4 Qxd2 12 Nxd2 Nxd4 but then White's bishop pair are embarrassed into dropping another pawn viz.

- 13 Bd1 Nf5 14 Bf2 Bxb2
- 13 Bxd4 Bxd4+ 14 Kh1 Bxb2
- though 13 Bd3 Bf5 14 Ne4 Rc8 15 c3 d5 16 Bxd4 Bxd4+ 17 cxd4 dxe4 18 Bb1 Rc4 would have been too deep for me.
In the interests of full disclosure, my muddled analysis did not even go as far as these variations until I was sitting waiting for Chris's reply. Only then did I realise he had a viable alternative.

A moment of frantic improvisation revealed :-

$$
11 \text {... Qxc3 }
$$

11 ... Bxc3 is almost an alternative but 12 Nxa 5 Bxd 2 13 Bxd2 Nxd2 14 Rfd1 Ne4 when White has a distinct development advantage for the pawn e.g. 15 Bf3 f5 16 Rd4 with counterplay.

## 12 bxc3

Black is getting away with an extra pawn but the variations all revolve around whether White has sufficient activity to compensate e.g. 12 Qxc3 Nxc3 13 Bf3 (not 13 bxc3 bxc6 though $13 \ldots$ Bxc3? 14 Bf3 Bxa1 15 Rxa1 when all Black's pieces are on their home squares) $13 \ldots \mathrm{Na} 4$.

| 12 | $\cdots$ | Nxd2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | Bxd2 | bxc6 |
| 14 | Bf3 | d5 |
| 15 | Rab1 | a5 |

$15 \ldots$ Bf5 was tempting (or tempting fate). Fritz is unimpressed by White's prospects on the seventh rank continuing 16 Rfc1 (16 Rb2 0-0) $16 \ldots 0-0-0$. This looks risky but Black has time to counter threats down the open b file with 17 Rb2 Kc7 18 Rcb1 Rb8

## 16 c4

Fritz recommends 16 Be 2 but such a retreat is hard psychologically.

| 16 | $\ldots$ | Ba6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | cxd5 |  |

Fritz still sees value in 17 Be 2 but deems it barely any different. Chris joins in the madness with a choice that is far more feisty and gives practical chances.

## Bxf1

17 ... Bd4+ may not seem to change much but shifting the rook on b1 to f1 after 18 Kh1 Bxf1 19 Rxf1 takes the wind out of the sails of the queenside pawn advance. I had visualised White's sacrifice earlier and felt I could defend but it was not too late to bail out with $17 \ldots$ cxd5 because 18 Bxd5 runs into $18 \ldots 0-0-$ 019 c4 e6 winning a piece.

| 18 | dxc6 | Ba6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 19 | c7 | Rc8 |

Again, it should be enter the dragon with 19 ... Bd4+ 20 Kh1 Ra7

- 21 Bxa5 0-0
- 21 Bc6+ Kf8 22 Bxa5 (22 Bb7 Bxb7 23 Rxb7 Kg7) 22 ... Kg7
- 21 Rb8+ Kd7 22 Bxa5 Rc8.

| 20 | Bc6+ | Kf8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | Bxa5 |  |

I worried about 21 Bd7 Rxc7 22 Rb8+ Rc8 23 Bxc8 which looked deadly but the check saves everything 23 ... Bd4+ 24 Kh 1 Kg 7 . However, it should never get this critical because 21 ... Bd4+ 22 Kh1 Rxc7 23 $\mathrm{Rb} 8+\mathrm{Kg} 7$ is simply winning and $21 \mathrm{Rb} 8 \mathrm{Bd} 4+22 \mathrm{Kh} 1$ Kg7.

| 21 | $\ldots$ | Bd4+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | Kh1 | Kg7 |
| 23 | Rd1 | Bc5 |


| 24 | Rd8 | Bd6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | Bd7 |  |

A last gasp might be 25 Rd7 Bc4 26 Bb7 Rce8 27 Rd8 Bxc7 28 Rxe8 Bxa5.

| 25 | $\ldots$ | Rxc7 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | Bxc7 | Bxc7 |  |
| 27 | Rxh8 | Kxh8 | 0-1 |

The weakness of the isolated queenside pawns is soon fatal. 28 g3 Bb7+ 29 Kg 1 Bd 530 a3 Be4 31 c 3 (31 Ba4 Bd6) 31 ... Ba5 32 c4 Bb6+ 33 Kf1 Bd3+. All rise!

Paul Hanks

## Eye Opener

Finding an unexpected combination to win a central pawn can be very destructive. Here, White chose to resign rather than fight on


Apart from White's profligacy with a few tempi, it all looks fairly normal. If I were a bystander, I should pass on to the next game and miss...

```
11 ... Nxe4 0-1
```

Unfortunately, recapture falls into 12 Nxe4 Nc2\#. Trying to fiddle with 12 b4 also loses to $12 \ldots$ Nxd2 13 bxa5 Nf3+ (either!) with another smothered mate.

Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| A Team | Fenland | Cambridgeshire League |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 00000 |  | Grading |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 100 世LL $\forall$ олоqдəəəd |  | $\text { Warboys A } 21^{\text {st }} \text { Nov }$ |  |  |  |  | $\text { Warboys A } 13^{\text {th }} \text { Mar }$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jason Dilley |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 5 | 8 | 190 | 202 |
| Ray llett | 1/2 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 21/2 | 11 | 174 | 157 |
| Paul Hanks | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1/2 |  | 3 | 8 | 170 | 157 |
| Peter Walker |  | 1d |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0+1d | 2 | 164 | 114 |
| Phil Turp |  |  |  | 1/2 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1/2 | 4 | 160 | 120 |
| Paul Spencer |  | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ |  | 21/2 | 6 | 148 | 139 |
| Ed Knox |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 166 | 70 |
| Ron Jones |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 144 | 94 |
| Jonathan Sadler | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 3 | 141 | 107 |
| Peter Weinberger | Od |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 136 | 86 |
| Chris Russell |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1/2 |  |  | 1 |  | 3 | 6 | 133 | 130 |
| Total | 1112 | 11/2 | 2 | 21/2 | 1 | 1/2 | 2112 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11/2 | 17+1d |  | - | - |
| Sum of opponents' grades | 465 | 595 | 827 | 844 | 755 | 883 | 764 | 891 | 848 | 731 | 818 | based on grades at start of the season |  |  |  |
| Sum of New England grades | 451 | 547 | 773 | 792 | 720 | 746 | 809 | 741 | 774 | 773 | 669 |  |  |  |  |  |
| B Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 잉U |  | Grading |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peter Walker |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 155 | 205 |
| Ray lett |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1/2 | 1 | 137 | 137 |
| Phil Turp |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 11/2 | 3 | 131 | 131 |
| Paul Spencer |  |  |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |  |  | 11/2 | 5 | 132 | 112 |
| Ron Jones |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 21/2 | 5 | 114 | 114 |
| Chris Russell |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 3 | 5 | 103 | 113 |
| Des Lane |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1/2 | 1 | 117 | 117 |
| Steve Walker |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 55 | 113 |
| Peter Weinberger |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 74 | 126 |
| Jonathan Sadler |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 11122 | 4 | 125 | 113 |
| Ed Knox |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 86 | 136 |
| Mike Ingram |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 68 | 118 |
| Total |  |  |  | $31 / 2$ | 3 | 21/2 | 2 | 11/2 | 11/2 | 21/2 | 21/2 |  |  | - | - |
| Sum of opponents' grades |  |  |  | 472 | 499 | 337 | 446 | 484 | 487 | 407 | 416 | based on grades at start of the season |  |  |  |
| Sum of New England grades |  |  |  | 597 | 475 | 468 | 468 | 513 | 498 | 459 | 459 |  |  |  |  |  |

Cambridgeshire Team 550 Competition

| NE Patriots | Plate |  |  | Team 550 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ou } \\ & \text { O } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | Grading |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\text { Cambridge } 27^{\text {th }} \mathrm{Feb}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \sum_{0}^{\infty} \\ & 0 \\ & N \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 150 ч०L 1, чэиешроэ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { U } \\ & \text { © } \\ & \underline{0} \\ & \text { O } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ray llett | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 153 | 187 |
| Paul Hanks | 1 | 1 | 1/2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21/2 | 3 | 139 | 172 |
| Paul Spencer |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  | $21 / 2$ | 4 | 137 | 150 |
| Chris Russell | 0 | 1/2 | 1 |  |  | 1/2 | 1/2 |  | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 3 | 8 | 133 | 120 |
| Steve Wozniak |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 21/2 | 3 | 108 | 141 |
| Peter Weinberger |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 21/2 | 6 | 106 | 97 |
| Steve Walker |  |  |  | 0 | 1/2 |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 2 | 4 | 93 | 93 |
| Jason Parker |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 0 |  | 1 | 2 | 69 | 52 |
| Ed Smith |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 94 | 44 |
| Mike Ingram | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 1 | 2 | 5 | 99 | 89 |
| Total | 2112 | 21/2 | 11/2 | 0 | 21/2 | 31/2 | 3 | 1 | 11/2 | 11/2 | 31/2 |  |  | - | - |
| Sum of opponents' grades | 422 | 529 | 544 | 405 | 361 | 418 | 473 | 396 | 538 | 512 | 473 | based on grades at start of the season without 100 as fixed minimum |  |  |  |
| Sum of Patriots grades | 548 | 548 | 548 | 432 | 450 | 428 | 468 | 395 | 534 | 486 | 489 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NE Cavaliers |  | Plate | Team 550 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Final | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 응 } \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ |  | Grading |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\text { ue؟ «0ع } 1, \text { чэиешроэ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0.2 \\ & \vdots 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ray llett |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1/2 | 21/2 | 3 | 160 | 185 |
| Paul Hanks |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 151 | 135 |
| Phil Turp |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1/2 |  | 1/2 |  | 3 | 5 | 138 | 148 |
| Paul Spencer |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 127 | 177 |
| Jonathan Sadler |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 4 | 5 | 118 | 148 |
| Ron Jones |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 3 | 118 | 84 |
| Ed Knox |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 |  |  |  | 0 | 11/2 | 5 | 105 | 84 |
| Des Lane |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 103 | 153 |
| Peter Weinberger |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1/2 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 100 | 100 |
| Mahmoud Tarabad |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 51/2 | 9 | 99 | 117 |
| Jamie Sutherland |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 80 | 130 |
| Norman Wedley |  | 1/2 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 11/2 | 2 | 74 | 99 |
| Total |  | $11 / 2$ | 4 | 4 | 21/2 | 11/2 | 3 | 2 | 2112 | 21/2 | 1/2 |  |  | - | - |
| Sum of opponents' grades |  | 448 | 432 | 361 | 538 | 506 | 395 | 487 | 384 | 546 | 529 | based on grades at start of the season without 100 as fixed minimu |  |  |  |
| Sum of Cavaliers grades |  | 500 | 398 | 426 | 499 | 427 | 396 | 467 | 443 | 513 | 499 |  |  |  |  |  |

