## New Englander

## Chess Club Update - December 2019

## Chairman's Chatter

There are plenty of subtle hints - background music at the supermarkets, TV advertisements, shortening hours of daylight... All this expense as a gentle reminder that the Club's Christmas Special is coming soon. I look forward to seeing you all then in a social context rather than over-the-board rivalry!

Paul Hanks

## Diary Dates

$11^{\text {th }}$ December Fenland Knock-out Trophy matches Cambridge v New England A and Cavaliers v Peterborough
$18^{\text {th }}$ December Club Christmas Special - fun chess with refreshments

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution (F Lazard 1926)
Position: 3K1k1q/3P3B/5NQ1/8/8/8/8/8
1 Nh5 Qg7 2 Qxg7\# [1 ... Qf6+ 2 Qxf6\#; 1 ... Qxh7 2 Qe8\#; 1 ... Q other 2 Qxg8\#]

## Website to Watch

December is the month for the London Chess Classic, part of which is the Grand Chess Tour Finals. The latter is billed as the "biggest-money showdown of 2019" but with 4 participants this year, it is a pale shadow of its early years. Full details can be found at https://www.londonchessclassic.com/ for the knockout matches between $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ December.

The last FIDE Grand Prix event is in Tel Aviv $10^{\text {th }}-24^{\text {th }}$ December. It is another knock-out competition but this time, starting from 16 grandmasters. Please see the official website www.worldchess.com.

## Result Round-up

Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| Royston | P | New England A | P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Provisional date : $13^{\text {th }}$ January 2020 |  |  |  |


| Warboys C | $\mathbf{2}$ | New England B | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| N Greenwood | 0 | R llett | 1 |
| M Shaw | 1 | E Knox | 0 |
| P Wellsl | $1 / 2$ | R Jones | $1 / 2$ |
| D Bently | $1 ⁄ 2$ | N Wedley | $1 / 2$ |


| Warboys B | P | New England B | P |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date to be arranged |  |  |  |

Team 550 Competition

| Spalding | P | NE Cavaliers | P |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Date to be arranged |  |  |  |


| NE Cavaliers | $P$ | Spalding | $P$ |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Provisional date $: 26^{\text {th }}$ February 2020 |  |  |  |

Fenland Trophy

| NE Patriots | $\mathbf{3} 1 / 2$ | St Neots | $\mathbf{1} / \mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| P Hanks | 1 | C Emery | 0 |
| P Spencer | $1 / 2$ | P Barkas | $1 / 2$ |
| C Russell | 1 | M Friday | 0 |
| M Ingram | 1 | F Rock | 0 |

Club Championship

| Round 3 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| E Smith (0) | 0 | 1 | D Lane (0+P) |
| P Hanks (1+P) | 1 | 0 | S Walker (1½) |
| E Knox (1+P) | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | R llett (2P) |


|  | Round $\mathbf{4}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| C Russell $(11 / 2+\mathrm{P})$ | 0 | 1 | R Ilett $(1 / 2+2 \mathrm{P})$ |
| S Walker $(11 / 2)$ | 1 | 0 | N Wedley $(11 / 2)$ |
| P Spencer $(1+\mathrm{P})$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | P Weinberger $(1 / 2)$ |
| P Hanks $(2+\mathrm{P})$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | S Wozniak $(2+\mathrm{P})$ |


| Postponements |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| E Knox | Rd | 1 | M Tarabad |
| J Sutherland | Rd | 1 | R llett |
| D Lane（0） | Rd | 2 | P Hanks（1） |
| R llett（P） | Rd | 2 | R Jones（1） |
| C Russell（1／2） | Rd | 2 | P Turp（1） |
| J Sutherland（1⁄2＋P） | Rd | 3 | M Tarabad（0＋P） |
| R Jones（1＋P） | Rd | 3 | P Spencer（1） |
| S Wozniak（2） | Rd | 3 | P Turp（1＋P） |
| P Turp（1＋2P） | Rd | 4 | E Knox（1½＋P） |
| D Lane（1＋P） | Rd | 4 | T Ingram（1／2） |
| J Sutherland（1⁄2＋2P） | Rd | 4 | R Jones（1＋2P） |
| M Tarabad（0＋2P） | Rd | 4 | E Smith（0） |

## New England Grand Prix

| Player | 通 | － | O | $\stackrel{0}{3}$ | E | 犬 | 员 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R llett | $11 / 2$ |  | 3 |  | 1／2 | 5 | 169 |
| P Hanks | 21／2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1／2 | $41 / 2$ | 162 |
| P Spencer | $11 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $41 / 2$ | 131 |
| R Jones | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 4 | 136 |
| S Wozniak | 21／2 |  |  |  | 1 | $31 / 2$ | 141 |
| C Russell | 11／2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 0 | 3 | 109 |
| J Sadler |  | 11／2 |  |  | 1 | 21／2 | 146 |
| S Walker | 21⁄2 |  |  |  |  | 21／2 | 119 |
| P Weinberger | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 2 | 93 |
| N Wedley | $11 / 2$ |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 2 | 91 |
| J Sutherland | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 1 | $11 / 2$ | 105 |
| P Turp | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 11／2 | 136 |
| M Tarabad | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 1 | $11 / 2$ | 103 |
| E Knox | $11 / 2$ |  | 0 |  | 0 | $11 / 2$ | 113 |
| T Ingram | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 70 |
| D Lane | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 93 |
| M Ingram |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 89 |
| J Dilley |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 177 |
| A Bhattacharyya | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 30 |
| E Smith | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 44 |

Chairman＇s Challenge

| Player | AB | ES | SW | $\boldsymbol{M T}$ | $\boldsymbol{N W}$ | JP | JS | Tot |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A Bhattacharyya | X | $\underline{4 / 3}$ | 0 | $\underline{22 / 1}$ | $25 / 3$ | $29 / 1$ | $1 / 4$ | 0 |
| E Smith | $4 / 3$ | X | $\underline{11 / 3}$ | $11 / 3$ | $\underline{8 / 1}$ | $\underline{19 / 2}$ | $8 / 1$ |  |
| S Wozniak | 1 | $11 / 3$ | X | $8 / 1$ | $19 / 2$ | $11 / 3$ | $19 / 2$ | 1 |
| M Tarabad | $22 / 1$ | $11 / 3$ | $\underline{8 / 1}$ | X | $19 / 2$ | $11 / 3$ | $19 / 2$ |  |
| N Wedley | $\underline{25 / 3}$ | $8 / 1$ | $19 / 2$ | $19 / 2$ | X | $8 / 1$ | $11 / 3$ |  |
| J Parker | $\underline{29 / 1}$ | $19 / 2$ | $11 / 3$ | $11 / 3$ | $8 / 1$ | X | $\underline{8 / 1}$ |  |
| J Sutherland | $1 / 4$ | $\underline{8 / 1}$ | $19 / 2$ | $\underline{19 / 2}$ | $\underline{11 / 3}$ | $8 / 1$ | X |  |

New England Club Ladder

|  | Change |  | Player | Record＠20／11／19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \text { It } \\ & \text { d } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { त̄ } \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 1 | － | ＋3 | J Sadler | 1／2，1 |
| 2 | ＋2 | ＋1 | M Tarabad | 1／2，0 |
| 3 | －1 | －1 | P Spencer | 1 |
| 4 | －1 | －1 | P Weinberger | 0 |

## Match of the Month

Many of us must rush home after a game and feed the moves into our chosen software for an authoritative assessment of the sequence of positions that arose． For the following game，I have included in brackets the evaluation by Deep Fritz 13 in multiples of a pawn． However，finding the reasons behind the number is where the process becomes instructive．

## P Spencer v P Turp

Club Championship Rd 7；15．05．2019
This game could well be described as an example of how difficult it can be to win a won game．You may say＂it＇s not over until．．．．＂．I had played Paul earlier in the season and won but not before I had won an exchange then blundered a piece back！This time，I obviously decided I should just blunder the piece first！

| 1 | d4 | d5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | c4 | c6 |
| 3 | Nc3 | Nf6 |
| 4 | Nf3 | Bf5 |

The Slav Defence to the Queen＇s Gambit differs from the Semi－Slav version（featured in September 2019） by withholding an early e7－e6 so that I can develop my bishop outside the pawn chain．A major alternative is $4 \ldots$ dxc4 which seems to be the grandmaster＇s choice because it eliminates any surprises based on White＇s Qd1－b3 hitting both b7 and the pawn on d5．

5
6
By permitting Bf8－b4，White is inviting pressure on c3． It is not serious e．g． 6 Be 2 Bb 47 Qb 3 when
－after $7 \ldots$ Bxc3 8 bxc3，the pawns are not going to be doubled for long and the open $b$ file is more useful

- 7 ... Qa4 $80-0$ removes the pin because without the black queen at home, 8 ... Bxc3 is answered by 9 Qxb7.
6 Nh4 violates the principle of not moving a piece twice in the opening but here, it is rewarded with the bishop pair and doubled pawns.

| $\mathbf{6}$ | $\ldots$ | Nbd7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The position is now equal. |  |  |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathrm{Be} \mathbf{2}$ | Ne4 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{0 - 0}$ | Ndf6 |

At this stage, there is very little difference between the range of options but a game S Mamedyarov (2753) v N Nguyen (2625), Khanty-Mansiysk 2013 continued 8 ... Bd6 9 Bd3 Bg6 10 Qc2 Nxc3 11 Qxc3 0-0 12 Re1 Bxd3 13 Qxd3 dxc4 14 Qxc4 c5. White won after 50 moves but the final evaluation of ( 0.22 ) suggests the opening was not to blame and Black can improve with 13 ... Nf6 with freer development in a solid position ($0.22)$.

## $9 \quad$ Bd3

By conceding a tempo, White acknowledges Black's control of the centre ( -0.42 ) whereas 9 cxd5 exd5 (not 9 ... cxd5? 10 Nxe4 Nxe4 11 Qa4+ forces an embarrassing $11 \ldots$ Ke7 though $10 \mathrm{Bb} 5+$ might tempt 10 ... Nd7 which is even worse after $11 \mathrm{Ne} 5 \mathrm{Nef6} 12$ e4 dxe4 13 Bg 5 ) 10 Nxe4 Nxe4 $11 \mathrm{Ne5}$ is a level, almost symmetrical contest (0.17).

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
9 & \ldots & \text { Bd6 } \\
10 & \text { h3 } & \text { h6 }
\end{array}
$$

Played to keep a slight squeeze on White. A predecessor game sought to capitalise on Black's slight lead in development with $10 \ldots 0-011$ Qc2 h6 12 Nd2 Nxc3 13 bxc3 Bxd3 14 Qxd3 Rc8 (M Saad Bouzid v M Cherrad, Algeria 2001) and Black went on to win in 67 moves.

| 11 | cxd5 | exd5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | Ne 2 | Qc8 |

Totally the wrong idea (0.09). 12 ... Qc7! would have covered the e5 square ( -0.58 ).

## 13 Ne 5 <br> Qc7?

One move too late and completely missing the obvious reply (1.60)! The aggressive intent behind my twelfth move is shown by the sample line $13 \ldots$ Bxh3 14 gxh 3 Qxh3 15 f 3 Ng 316 Re 1 Qh1+ 17 Kf 2 Qh2\# and either $16 \mathrm{Nxg} 3 \mathrm{Qxg} 3+$ or $15 \ldots$... Bxe5 16 dxe 5 Ng 4 lead to a perpetual check. White has some tricky choices which even the computer takes time to resolve but sadly, he can defend easily with 15 Nf4 Qh4 16 Ng 2 Qh3 17 Qf3 or not so obviously, 14 f 3 Bxe5 15 dxe5 Nh5 16 fxe4 Bxg2 17 Rf2 ( 17 Kxg2 Qg4+ is another draw).
One simple try would instead be Ne4-g5 either immediately ( 0.03 ) or after $13 \ldots 0-014 \mathrm{f3}$. There is even 13 ... Nc5 as a creative solution.

14 f3
Oh dear, what to do now? The bishop on $f 5$ is hanging if I move the knight. I thought long and hard (I should have done that sooner!) and decided the only hope I
had was to try and convince White I was attacking. Just maybe I could do something.

```
14 ...
Bxh3
```

With correct play, White has a large material advantage (2.94). Objectively, 14 ... Bxe5 (1.57) might work better when 15 dxe5 Qxe5 16 fxe4 Bxe4 17 Bxe4 Nxe4 18 Nc3 Nc5 gives me two pawns for the piece and an isolated pawn target.

| 15 | gxh 3 | Ng 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | h 4 | $\mathrm{Ne6}$ |
| 17 | f 4 | $0-0-0$ |
| 18 | Ng 3 | g 6 |

Too quiet (2.38). Opening attacking lines with $18 \ldots$ g5 was called for (1.97) though after 19 Nf5 gxf4 20 exf4, it is hard to see how my forces penetrate e.g. 20 ... Ng7 21 Nxd6+ Rxd6 or 20 ... Rhg8+ 21 Kh1 Ne4 22 Qe1 f6.

| 19 | Bd2 | Rdg8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | Bc3 | Ne8 |
| 21 | Kf2 | Qe7 |
| 22 | Rh1 | g5 |
| 23 | hxg5 | hxg5 |
| 24 | Nf5 | Qf6 |
| 25 | Nxd6+ | Nxd6 |

The White position may look a little loose but he is OK, just better to the tune of three pawns. However with time ticking, White goes wrong.

## $26 \quad$ Qg4??

The pendulum swings and instead of 26 Ng 4 Qe7 27 f5 with a winning advantage (2.72), the assessment plummets to ( 0.18 ). Rather than reinforcement, the queen is a target. I am back in the game!

| 26 | $\ldots$ | gxf4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 27 | Rxh8 | Qxh8 |

Fritz prefers 27 ... fxe3+ 28 Kxe3 Qxh8 29 Nxf7 Rxg4 (29 ... Nxf7 30 Qxe6+) 30 Nxh8 Rg3+ 31 Kd2 (31 Ke2 Nf4+) $31 \ldots$ Rg2+ $32 \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 3+$ with yet another perpetual check.


This looks good but is a mistake (-2.68). I saw 28 Rh1 would end any hopes I had but luckily Paul goes wrong again. White is OK (0.30) after 28 Rh1! fxe3+ 29 Ke2 Qxh1 30 Qxg8+ Kc7 31 Qg3.
28
Qh2+
29 Kf3?

The computer favours Black after 29 Kf1 Rxg6 30 Bxg6 (-2.65) but the material balance ( $\mathrm{R}+2 \mathrm{~B} v 2 \mathrm{~N}+2 \mathrm{P}$ ) is just crazy! You would need to probe much deeper than $30 \ldots$ Nc4 to know whether White's exposed king or Black's material deficit is the bigger liability.
After the text move, I should win at a canter (-10.73). Don't panic!

$$
29 \quad \text {... Kc7? }
$$

And now Black starts to go wrong. The clock was ticking down and I knew there was a way to proceed but just did not see 29 ... Ne4! (-1.91). Not only does this threaten $30 \ldots$ Qf2\# but $30 \ldots \mathrm{Ng} 5+$ (either knight) will force White to give up his queen.
Most attempts at defence following $29 \ldots \mathrm{Ne} 4$ are for connoisseurs of king hunts :-

- 30 Qg1 N6g5+ 31 Kg 4 Qh3+ $32 \mathrm{Kxf4}$ Qf3+ 33 Ke5 f6\#
- 30 Qg2 N6g5+
- $31 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{f} 3+$
- 31 Kg 4 Qxg2+ $32 \mathrm{Kf5}$ (32 Kxf4 Qg3+ 33 Kf5 fxg6\#) 32 ... Qh3+ 33 Ke5 f6+ 34 Kxf4 Ne6\#
- 31 Qxg5 Qf2+ $32 \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Qg} 3+33 \mathrm{Kf5}$ Qxg5\#
What were the chances of me finding these intricate checkmates when I was unable to see the first move of the combination?
The only credible continuation is 30 Bxe4 dxe4+ 31 Kxe4 Rxg6 when I have regained my piece and the enduring attack will soon force resignation e.g.
- 32 Qf5 Rg5 33 Qxf7 Qc2+ 34 Kf3 Rg3\#
- 32 Qf3 Qc2+ 33 Ke5 Rg5+ 34 Kd6 Qg6 and either $35 \ldots \mathrm{Nd} 4+$ winning the queen or $35 \ldots$ Nc7+ 36 Ke7 Qe6+ 37 Kf8 Qe8\#
- 32 Qd1 Qh7
- 33 Kf3 Qh3+ 34 Ke4 Qxe3+ 35 Kf5 Ng7\#
- 33 exf4 Rg3+ $34 \mathrm{Ke} 5 \mathrm{Re} 3+35 \mathrm{Kf6}$ Qg6+ 36 Ke7 Ng5+ 37 Kf8 Nh7\#
- 33 Ke5 Rh6 34 exf4 f6+ 35 Kxe6 Qd7\#

Don't computers make it look easy!
$30 \quad$ Qh4 Qxh4?
Oh dear! Here we go again. The wrong time to simplify ( -0.07 ) and again, I missed the best move. Black should play 30 ... Ng5+! (-1.93)

- after $31 \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Qg} 2+32 \mathrm{Kxf4}$ (32 Kh5 fxg6+ 33 Kh6 Ndf7\#) Ne6+ 33 Ke5 Rxg6, there are several lengthy paths to checkmate e.g. 34 Qe7+ Kc8 35 Qxd6 Qh2+ 36 Kf5 Qh5\#
- 31 Qxg5 Qh3+ 32 Kxf4 (32 Ke2 Qxe3+ 33 Kd1 Qxd3+ 34 Kc1 Rxg6 etc.) fxg6 $33 \mathrm{Ba} 5+$
(33 Qe7+? Kc8 34 Rg1 Re8 winning) 33 ... Kb 8 . Black is much better but there must be plenty of mistakes left for both sides.

| 31 | Nxh4 | Rg3+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | Kf2 |  |

Fritz considers this position equal!!
32 ... Bc2

I still have a slight edge ( -0.68 ) due to the activity of my rook but 33 Rd1! ( -0.02 ) would equalise.

```
33
Rh3
```

Again, I help out (0.00) when $33 \ldots \mathrm{Ng} 5(-0.68) 34 \mathrm{Nf5}$ Nge4+ 35 Bxe4 Nxe4+ 36 Kg 1 Rh 3 would let my pieces invade and support the passed pawn.

| 34 | Nf3 | Ne4+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 35 | Ke 2 | Rg 3 |

$36 \ldots \mathrm{Rg} 2+$ is the strong threat.
36 Be 1
One last little mistake from White (-1.34) in place of 36 Rf1 (0.00) bringing the last piece into play.

36
...
Rg2+!
Black has strong compensation.
37 Kd3
The white king walks towards a mating net (-2.43) when 37 Kd 1 is the only move ( -1.24 ).
37
$\ldots$
c5
38 Rc1??

38 dxc5 (-2.33) N6xc5+ 39 Kd4 Rxc2 40 Kxd5 returns the piece leaving me with winning pawns. 38 Bb 3 might have been more testing as 38 ... c4+ 39 Bxc4 dxc4 40 Kxe4 is another pitfall. Instead, $38 \ldots$ cxd4 39 Bxd5 N4c5+ $40 \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{Rc} 2+41 \mathrm{~Kb} 4 \mathrm{Rxb} 2+42 \mathrm{Kc} 4$ (42 Ka5 b6\#) 42 ... b5\# would have been a suitably silly climax.
Black has managed to swindle his way out! Paul completely missed the next move and with the first move of the rook, .....

Phil Turp

