## New Englander

## Chess Club Update - March 2020

## Chairman's Chatter

Sadly, I need to remind everyone of "death by ringtone" which mandates loss of the game if your phone rings and is incorporated in Cambridgeshire's match conduct rules. As a recent victim, I can assure you it leads to a very fruitless evening...
On a happier note, the club entered a team in our venue's Quiz Night. Anyone interested in having fun on a Monday evening should contact Paul Spencer.

Paul Hanks

## Diary Dates

7-8 $8^{\text {th }}$ March Closed Championship Congress for the East Anglian Chess Union at Whittlesford. For an entry form, please see www.eacu.org.uk under the tab "Fixtures and Events"
$11^{\text {th }}$ March Chairman's Challenge Round 3
$18^{\text {th }}$ March NO CHESS CLUB MEETING due to Lancaster Club AGM.

21 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ May Cambridgeshire Chess Association Jamboree at Godmanchester

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution (M Vukcevic 1997)
Position : 5N2/2B4R/1pp5/3k3p/r5Rq/bP3P1N/2KP2B1/6Q1
1 Rb4 Rxb4 2 Rd7\# [1 ... Qxb4 2 Rxh5\#; 1 ... Qg3/ Qxh3/Qg5 2 Qd4\#; 1 ... Qf4 2 Nxf4\#; 1 ... Qe4+ 2 fxe4\#; 1 ... Qg4 2 fxg4\#; 1 ... other 2 f4\#]

## Website to Watch

Yekaterinburg, Russia is the venue for the FIDE Candidates Tournament from $17^{\text {th }}$ March to $4^{\text {th }}$ April. Eight top grandmasters meet in a knock-out series of mini-matches to decide a challenger for Magnus Carlsen's world title. Games will be available at https://www.chess.com/events/2020-candidates-chess-tournament among other websites.
Result Round-up
Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| New England A | $\mathbf{2}$ | Peterborough A | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| J Dilley | 1 | F Bowers | 0 |
| P Hanks | 0 | S Caraway | 1 |
| R llett | $1 / 2$ | A Richards | $1 / 2$ |
| P Turp | $1 / 2$ | M Connolly | $1 / 2$ |
| P Spencer | 0 | R McMorran | 1 |


| Spalding | $\mathbf{2}$ | New England B | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| P Cusick | 1 | P Hanks | 0 |
| P Szutkowski | $1 / 2$ | P Turp | $1 / 2$ |
| T Nottingham | 0 | E Knox | 1 |
| J Smith | $1 / 2$ | R Jones | $1 / 2$ |

Team 550 Competition

| NE Patriots | $\mathbf{2 1} / \mathbf{2}$ | Peterborough | $\mathbf{1 1} 2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| P Hanks | 1 | S Caraway | 0 |
| P Spencer | $1 ⁄ 2$ | M Connolly | $1 / 2$ |
| C Russell | 0 | L Howland | 1 |
| P Weinberger | 1 | J Conlon | 0 |
| Warboys | $\mathbf{2}$ | NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| C Watkins | $1 ⁄ 2$ | R llett | $1 / 2$ |
| B Duff | $1 / 2$ | E Knox | $1 / 2$ |
| D Polehonski | 1 | M Ingram | 0 |
| J Beck | 0 | J Sutherland | 1 |
| NE Patriots | $\mathbf{3} 1 ⁄ 2$ | Warboys | $1 / 2$ |
| P Hanks | $1 ⁄ 2$ | C Watkins | $1 / 2$ |
| P Spencer | 1 | B Duff | 0 |
| P Weinberger | 1 | D Polehonski | 0 |
| S Walker | 1 | J Beck | 0 |


| NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{1 1} / \mathbf{2}$ | Spalding | $\mathbf{2 ¹}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R llett | 1 | T Nottingham | 0 |
| E Knox | 0 | J Smith | 1 |
| R Jones | $1 ⁄ 2$ | R Coats | $1 / 2$ |
| D Lane | 0 | F Robinson | 1 |


| Peterborough | $\mathbf{1}$ | NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| F Bowers | $1 / 2$ | P Turp | $1 / 2$ |
| A Richards | $1 / 2$ | P Spencer | $1 / 2$ |
| L Howland | 0 | E Knox | 1 |
| C Bengston | 0 | R Jones | 1 |

## New England Club Ladder

|  |  |  | Player | Record @ 26/02/20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 0 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ī } \\ & \text { Ò } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 1 | - | +3 | J Sadler | 1/2, 1 |
| 2 | - | +1 | P Spencer | 1 |
| 3 | - | -2 | P Weinberger | 0 |
| 4 | - | -2 | M Tarabad | 1/2,0 |

Chairman's Challenge

| Player | Es | SW | $\boldsymbol{M T}$ | $\boldsymbol{N W}$ | JP | JS | Tot |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E Smith | X | $11 / 3$ | $11 / 3$ | 0 | P | P | 0 |
| S Wozniak | $11 / 3$ | X | P | P | $11 / 3$ | P | 0 |
| M Tarabad | $11 / 3$ | P | X | P | $11 / 3$ | P |  |
| N Wedley | 1 | P | P | X | 0 | $11 / 3$ | 1 |
| J Parker | P | $11 / 3$ | $11 / 3$ | 1 | X | P | 1 |
| J Sutherland | P | P | P | $11 / 3$ | P | X |  |

Club Championship

| Round 1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E Knox | P | P | M Tarabad |


| Round 2 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| C Russell (1/2) | P | P | P Turp (1) |
| D Lane (0) | P | P | P Hanks (1) |


| Round 3 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| J Sutherland (1/2) | $P$ | $P$ | $M$ Tarabad (0+P) |
| R Jones (11/2) | $P$ | $P$ | $P$ Spencer (1) |
| S Wozniak (2) | $P$ | $P$ | $P$ Turp (1+P) |

## Round 4

| P Turp (1+2P) | $P$ | $P$ | E Knox $(11 / 2+P)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| D Lane (1+P) | $P$ | $P$ | T Ingram $(1 / 2)$ |
| J Sutherland $(1 / 2+P)$ | $P$ | $P$ | R Jones $(11 / 2+P)$ |
| M Tarabad $(0+2 P)$ | $P$ | $P$ | E Smith $(0)$ |

Round 5

| R llett (3) | 1 | 0 | S Wozniak ( $211 / 2+\mathrm{P}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R Jones (11⁄2+2P) | 1/2 | 1/2 | P Hanks ( $211 / 2+P$ ) |
| E Knox (11⁄2+2P) | 1 | 0 | S Walker ( $21 / 2$ ) |
| P Turp (1+3P) | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | P Spencer ( $11 / 2+\mathrm{P}$ ) |
| N Wedley (11⁄2) | 1/2 | 1/2 | C Russell ( $1112+P$ ) |
| D Lane (1+2P) | P | P | J Sutherland (1/2+2P) |
| T Ingram (1⁄2+P) | P | P | E Smith (0+P) |
| M Tarabad (0+3P) | P | P | P Weinberger (1) |
| Deadline : $31^{\text {st }}$ Marc |  |  | Next draw : $1^{\text {st }}$ April |

New England Grand Prix

| Player | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & \text { İ } \\ & \text { Ĩ } \end{aligned}$ | ¢ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{0} \\ & \mathscr{O} \\ & \mathscr{O} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{2}{5}$ | EI ¢ ¢ ¢0 | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R llett | 4 |  | 6 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 168 |
| R Jones | 2 |  | $31 / 2$ |  | $31 / 2$ | 9 | 143 |
| E Knox | 21/2 |  | $31 / 2$ | 1 | $11 / 2$ | 81/2 | 132 |
| P Spencer | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 3 | 71/2 | 124 |
| P Hanks | 3 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 2 | 61/2 | 152 |
| J Dilley |  |  | $41 / 2$ | 1 |  | 51⁄2 | 209 |
| C Russell | 2 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 105 |
| S Walker | 21/2 |  |  |  | 2112 | 5 | 116 |
| P Weinberger | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 4 | 107 |
| P Turp | $11 / 2$ |  | $11 / 2$ |  | 1/2 | $31 / 2$ | 144 |
| $J$ Sutherland | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 3 | $31 / 2$ | 91 |
| S Wozniak | 21/2 |  |  |  | 1 | $31 / 2$ | 132 |
| N Wedley | 2 |  | $1 / 2$ |  | $1 / 2$ | 3 | 97 |
| J Sadler |  | $11 / 2$ |  |  | 1 | 21/2 | 146 |
| M Ingram |  |  |  | 1 | 11/2 | 21/2 | 99 |
| M Tarabad | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  | 1 | 11/2 | 87 |
| D Lane | 1 |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 79 |
| T Ingram | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 70 |
| E Smith | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| J Parker |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 41 |

## Match of the Month

When this game was played, our opponents Spalding were sitting at the top of the league but our B team captain, Ron Jones, had designs on causing an upset. All he needed was some poor innocent to act as a punchbag for their very strong top board in order to increase the chances of players lower down the order. I cannot recall him actually using the words "poisoned chalice" but when he telephoned to invite me, I could certainly smell a whiff of hemlock in the air.

## P Hanks v P Cusick

New England B v Spalding, 11.02.2020 1 d4 c5
Knowing my fate as a lamb to the slaughter, I had looked up our previous encounter with these colours and found he played the Nimzo-Indian Defence. Over the previous weekend, I leafed through a game of Vishy Anand's to try to survive past the opening. With this Classical Benoni, however, any preparation went out of the window.

| 2 | Nf3 | cxd4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | Nxd4 | Nc6 |
| 4 | e4 | Nf6 |
| 5 | Nc3 | d6 |
| 6 | Bc4 | e6 |

We have steered the game back to the Sozin Variation of the Sicilian Defence. It will not show but I have a book on this line (published 1974!) and over the period March-April 2013, I even published two Serious Study articles about it in the club newsletter. How quickly memory fades!

## 7 <br> f3

If you want to get away from accepted theory, this is the sort of rubbish you have to play. I have some experience with the opening but starting from the Najdorf move order i.e. 1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc 3 a 66 Bc 4 e . I was unsure what difference the slight change in position (knight on c6 instead of a pawn on a6) would make.
As my bishop is less likely to be chased by Black advancing his queenside pawns, I resisted Fischer's plan of 7 Bb 3 and $8 \mathrm{f4}$. I wanted a Velimirovic Attack ( $\mathrm{Be} 3, \mathrm{Qe} 2,0-0-0$ and g 4 etc) but felt exposed to Black's Qd8-b6 hitting both d4 and b2. My move is akin to the English Attack but f2-f3 is generally condemned in the chess literature and when played a few moves later, lead to a famous loss for Bobby Fischer against Larsen at the 1970 Interzonal.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
7 & \ldots & \text { Be7 } \\
8 & \text { Nxc6 } &
\end{array}
$$

Another move I hated to make. On my few outings on the Black side of a Sicilian, I am always glad to see this move because with a supporting pawn on c6, Black will have an easy game after d6-d5. In fact, there was no need to worry about 8 Be 3 Qb 6 because 9 Qd2 Qxb2 loses to 10 Rb1 Qa3 11 Ncb5 Qa5 12 Nxc6 Qxd2+ 13 Kxd2 bxc6 14 Nc7+.

| 8 | $\ldots$ | bxc6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | Be 3 | $0-0$ |
| 10 | $0-0$ | Qc7 |

Black could already gain dominance in the centre with 10 ... d5 but Fritz is equally happy to wait, as here, because the thrust is unstoppable.

| 11 | Qe2 | Rd8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | Rad1 | d5 |

I think White is in a far worse state than Fritz's assessment of lagging by a quarter of a pawn. I cannot retreat 13 Bd 3 due to $13 \ldots \mathrm{~d} 4$ and the alternative 13 Bb3 may trap the bishop whilst also
opening the $\mathrm{a} 6-\mathrm{f} 1$ diagonal to Black's light-squared bishop winning the exchange. Fortunately, I just about have enough force covering $d 5$ to prevent an immediate c6-c5.

| 13 | Bb3 | a5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Qf2 | Nd7 |

This surprised me. My $14^{\text {th }}$ move had bought a little breathing space but I expected Black to continue 14 ... Rb8 although that would remove any eventual possibility of a5-a4. The computer, of course, points out that there is an option of $14 \ldots$ Bd6 when 15 Bb6 is an illusion because $15 \ldots$... Bxh2+ 16 Kh1 Qf4 17 Bxd8 Qh6.
It seemed to me that Black has a strategically won position with the centre pawn majority and White must react quickly to avoid being pushed backwards. As it happens, Black's temporary deficit in development gave me an idea.


Here goes! I had an alternative in 16 Nb5 Qc6 which may lead to a draw by repetition by 17 Nd 4 Qc 718 Nb 5 etc. I expected $16 \ldots \mathrm{Qb} 7$ when 17 a 4 is unclear and I should have opted for the more combative 17 c 4 since 17 ... a4 18 Bc 2 dxc 4 fails to 19 Be 4 .
I played the sacrifice intuitively - justified by the need to strike at this point. Would it also have worked against 15 ... exd5? Acceptance would transpose, declining might net me a pawn and at worst, would shatter his centre. The only real difference comes if Black takes the opportunity to interpose 16 ... Ba6 before accepting but that is clearly bad after 17 Rfe 1 cxd5 18 Nxd5 Qe5 19 Bb 6 or $18 \ldots$ Qd6 19 Bf 4. Nevertheless, 17 ... Bd6 (which I had not seen) would dull the threats on the e file and leave White with a problem. I should have needed to find and analyse 18 Bg5

- $18 \ldots$ cxd5 19 Nxd5 is supposedly level but there are so many variations, this has to be a computer evaluation
- 18 ... Bc5 19 Bxf7+ Kxf7 (19 ... Kf8 20 Be3) 20 Rxd7+ Qxd7 21 Qxc5
- 18 ... Bxh2+ 19 Kh1 Nf6 (19 ... cxd5 20 Nxd5 again with many threats) 20 Bxc6 Bg3 21 Qc5 Bxe1 22 Bxa8.
An interesting sideline. Time trouble, anyone?

| 16 | $\ldots$ | exd5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | Nxd5 | Qe5 |

I expected the dangerous $17 \ldots$ Qd6 when I could play 18 Nb 6 if I could find nothing better. Many variations are similar those in the game such as 18 Bf4 Qc5 19 Nxe7+ Qxe7 20 Bc7 Rf8 (20 ... Re8 21 Rde1 Qf8 22 Bd6 Qxd6 23 Rxe8+ Nf8) 21 Bd6.

## 18 <br> f4?

Wrong! This move eliminates the opportunity for a discovered attack by Be3-f4. Instead with 18 Rfe1, we have a case of a threat being stronger than its execution. What does Black do?

- 18 ... Qd6 19 Bf4, no thanks
- 18 ... Re8 19 Bb6 Qd6 19 Nxe7+ wins the black queen
- 18 ... Bd6 19 Bf4 Bc5 20 Bxe5 Bxf2+ 21 Kxf2 Nxe5 22 Ne7+
- 18 ... Bf6 19 Bb6 Qg5 20 Bxd8 Bxd8 21 Re8+ Nf8 22 Qc5 - awful!

$$
18 \text {... Qe6 }
$$

19 Rfe1
A move too late. I did not appreciate the subtle differences from the previous comment and thought I had the same level of threat.
We have seen the consequences of 19 f5 before i.e. 19 ... Qd6 20 Bf4 Qc5 21 Nxe7+ Qxe7 22 Bc7 etc.

$$
19
$$

... Nf8
My opponent took 22 minutes over this move and it was time well spent. This move (which I confess I did not foresee) and $19 \ldots \mathrm{Bb} 7$ are jointly rated as the best defence. I hoped for 19 ... Nf6 but that is easily dealt with by 20 Nxe7+ Qxe7 21 Bc5 Qc7 22 Bb6. Now, in this line, Black can play 21 ... Qf6.

## 20 <br> Bb6

With Black's queen, rook and bishop en prise, I thought this was winning but I had not properly counted how much Black can obtain for his queen. However, other options lead to a similar odd material balance:-

- 20 f5 Qxd5
- 20 Nc7 Rxd1 21 Nxe6 (21 Rxd1 Qg4) 21 ... Rxe1+ 22 Qxe1 Bxe6
- 20 Nxe7+ Qxe7 21 Bc5 Qf6 22 Be7 Qxe7 23 Rxe7 Rxd1+ 24 Re1 Rxd1 25 Qxe1.

20
21
22
...
Rxe6
Rxd5

Rxd5
Bxe6
Bxd5

With $Q+2 P \vee R+N+B$, Fritz says the position is equal but I feel the force of multiple minor pieces should be able to gobble my pawns. My only hope is to use queen actively to harass the black units before they can co-ordinate.

| 23 | Qd4 | Be6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | Qe4 | Rb8 |
| 25 | Bd4 | Rb5 |
| 26 | c4 | Rh5 |

$26 \ldots$ f5 would prevent my attempt to win the bishop on e7 (finally!) with 27 f5.

| 27 | g4 | f5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | Qb7 | Rh4 |
| 29 | Qxe7 | Rxg4+ |

My some miracle I have worked up an advantage equivalent to 3 pawns according to Fritz but the position is very tricky, particularly when combined with time pressure. White has three legal moves. One should win, one draws and the other loses. Which do you prefer? And will you have time to hit back with Bd4-c5?


Second prize for 30 Kf1 Rxf4+ 31 Bf2 Bxc4+ when White should accept the perpetual check $32 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Bd} 5+$ 33 Kf 1 . It is too risky to try to escape.

- $32 \mathrm{Ke} 1 \mathrm{Re} 4+$ winning the white queen
- $32 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Rg} 4+33 \mathrm{Bg} 3$ ( $33 \mathrm{Kh} 1 \mathrm{Bd} 5+$ ) 33 ... f4
- $32 \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Bd} 5+$
- $33 \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 4+34 \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Bg} 2 \#$
- 33 Kh3 Rxf2
- $33 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Rg} 4+34 \mathrm{Kf1} 1 \mathrm{Bc} 4+35 \mathrm{Ke} 1 \mathrm{Re} 4+$.

30 Kf2??
Surprisingly, 30 Kh1 is correct even though 30 .. Bxc4 threatens checkmate on the long diagonal. I considered

- 31 h 3 when $31 \ldots$ Bd5+ creates a devastating discovered check after 32 Kh2 Rg2+
- 31 Qe5 when 31 ... Bd3 looked deadly but there was tactical salvation with 32 Qd5+ Kh8 33 Bxg7+ and 34 Qxd3.
The trick I missed was 31 h4 when the pawn is defended by the queen and Black has to defend against 32 Bc5 with 31 ... h6.
My choice is by far the worst...

| 30 | $\ldots$ | Rxf4+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 31 | Ke3 | Re4+ |
| 32 | Kd3 | Bxc4+ |

0-1
"Oh death, where is thy sting?"
Paul Hanks

## Eye Opener

On some online chess databases, when looking for short games, I often find an example that comes come to an abrupt halt and cannot see any reason for resignation. Recently, I read that occasionally an electronic board can miss a move that is played too quickly and the game score can no longer be transmitted over the Internet when an eventual illegal position arises. There is also the possibility of the dreaded death by ringtone.
This game, however, was played way before these electronic "advances" - and by correspondence.

## T Demetriesu v Nagy <br> Correspondence 1936

| 1 | c 4 | e6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | d 4 | d 5 |
| 3 | Nc 3 |  |

The Queen's Gambit Declined is one of the most popular openings. I am intending to review it in the Masterclass sessions this summer.

```
3
...
c5
4 cxd5 exd5
```

Black has chosen the Tarrasch Defence and opted for the standard continuation rather than $4 \ldots$... cxd4 initiating the tricky Hennig-Schara Gambit. To highlight Black's chances, Jakab v Cernousek, Budapest 2003 continued 5 Qa4+ Bd7 6 Qxd4 exd5 7 Qxd5 Nc6 8 Bg5 Nf6 9 Qd2 h6 10 Bh4 g5 11 Bg3 Qa5 12 e3 0-0-0 13 Bc4 Bh3 14 Qxd8+ Nxd8 15 gxh3 Ba3 $0-1$. White's play leaves something to be desired but this gambit is a line you should be prepared for.

| 5 | Nf3 | Nc6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | g3 | Nf6 |

In the Tarrasch, Black is willing to risk an isolated queen's pawn in return for easy piece development and attacking chances. Here, $6 \ldots$ c4 is the Swedish Variation which avoids the isolated pawn. In that case, White's fianchetto will put pressure on the d5 pawn but if White tries e2-e4 at some stage, he will end up with the isolated queen's pawn!

| 7 | Bg2 | Be7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | $0-0$ | $0-0$ |
| 9 | dxc5 |  |

9 Bg 5 would also inconvenience Black. The threats of 10 Bxf6 and 10 dxc5 make the black bishop on e7

