## NEW ENGLANDER

## Chess Club Update - April 2009

## Chairman's Chatter

In his famous book Chess for Tigers, Simon Webb addresses the problem of what to do when facing a much stronger player. His advice is simple complicate! If neither player understands what is going on, your chances approach $50 \%$. Steve Walker sent in this month's game in which he faces a grading deficit of 37 yet still managed a rousing finish.
*aul tanks

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2.


Last Month's solution
In Forsyth notation: 8/8/4Q3/K1k5/2N1b3/2n1P3/8/8
1 Ne5 Bd5 2 Qe7\#; 1 ... Bc6 2 Qxc6\# or 2 Nd3\#; 1 ... other 2 Nd7\#
Result Round-up

| Buckden A | $\mathbf{1}$ | New England A | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| M Thornton | 0 | C Ross | 1 |
| P Barkas | 0 | F Bowers | 1 |
| C Norton | 0 | P Turp | 1 |
| T Hazel | 0 | P Hanks | 1 |
| C Money | 1 | R Jones | 0 |
| New England A | $\mathbf{2}$ | Peterborough A | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| C Ross | 0 | A Timoshenko | 1 |
| F Bowers | 0 | P Walker | 1 |
| P Turp | 1 | R llett | 0 |
| P Hanks | $1 / 2$ | M Connolly | $1 / 2$ |
| R Jones | $1 / 2$ | G Ward | $1 / 2$ |


| Cambridge B | $\mathbf{2 1} 2$ | New England B | $\mathbf{1 1} / 2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| D Cattermole | $1 / 2$ | R Jones | $1 / 2$ |
| D Jackson | $1 / 2$ | A Brookbanks | $1 / 2$ |
| W Stimpson | 1 | M Tarabad | 0 |
| H Burgess | $11 / 2$ | H Currie | $1 / 2$ |

Club Handicap : 18th February 2009

| Player |  | Rd 1 |  | Rd 2 |  | Rd 3 |  | Rd 4 |  | Rd 5 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 历. } \\ \stackrel{1}{\circ} \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 응 | $\begin{array}{\|c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 응 | O | $\bar{\circ}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | O | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 0 |  |  |
| 1 | F Bowers | 6 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | C Ross | 3 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 3 | D Lane | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | A Brookbanks | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 5 | M Tarabad | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 6 | H Currie | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

Club Championship

| Division One | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathrm{S} \\ \mathrm{C} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{F} \\ & \mathrm{~B} \end{aligned}$ | C |  | $\begin{aligned} & R \\ & \mathrm{~J} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P} \\ & \mathrm{H} \end{aligned}$ |  | T | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K} \\ & \mathrm{~T} \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S Caraway | X | 1/2 | 0 |  | 1 | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $31 / 2 / 6$ |
| F Bowers | 1/2 | X | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $4 / 6$ |
| C Ross | 1 | 1 | X | X | P | 1/2 |  | 1 | 1 | $41 / 2 / 5$ |
| R Jones | 0 | 0 | P |  | X | P |  | P | P | $0 / 2$ |
| P Hanks | 1/2 | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  | P | X |  | 1 | 1 | $3 / 5$ |
| P Turp | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 |  | P | 0 |  | X | 1 | $2 / 5$ |
| K Talnikar | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | P | 0 |  | 0 | X | $0 / 5$ |
| Division Two | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathrm{H} \\ \mathrm{C} \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N} \\ \mathrm{~W} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{R} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~B} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{~L} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline s \\ \mathrm{w} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{~T} \end{array}$ | Total |
| H Currie | $\mathbf{X}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | $2 / 7$ |
| N Wedley | 0 | X | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | d | 0 | 1 | 1 | $31 / 2 / 7$ |
| C Collins | 1 | 1 | X | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | $5 / 7$ |
| C Russell | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | X | 1 |  | 0 | P | 0 | $31 / 2 / 6$ |
| A Brookbanks | 1 | Od | 0 | 0 | X | X | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | $31 / 2 / 7$ |
| D Lane | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | X | 0 | 1 | 51/2/7 |
| S Walker | 1 | 0 | 0 | P | 0 | 0 | 1 | X | 1 | $3 / 6$ |
| M Tarabad | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | $1 / 7$ |

## Diary Dates

The club championship should have been completed by now so I must encourage those with outstanding results to fit their games into the calendar as soon as possible.

## Website to Watch

The competitors for the world chess championship in 2010 continue their series of Grand Prix events from 14th to 30th April at Nalchik in the north Caucasus. Sadly, the format was changed in November and several participants withdrew in protest. The website is http://grandprix.fide.com but this still displays the original schedule. From past rounds of the competition, I am guessing that eventually there will be a link to the tournament on www.nalchik2009.com.

## Match of the Month

This game was played in the last round of the club championship. Des was unbeaten and had notched up an impressive sequence of straight victories.

## S Walker v D Lane

New England Club Championship, 2009

## 1 d4 Nf6 2 Bg5

The Trompovsky Attack was more fashionable a few years ago and Anand even used it to defeat Karpov in 1998. One strand of its strategy is to threaten an immediate Bxf6 and try to exploit Black's resulting doubled pawns. [There are many tactical tricks which may feature in a future "Eye Opener" feature.]
2 ... Ne4 3 Bf4 g5
On his second move, Des plays the main reply (2 ... e6 is also popular) avoiding damage to his pawn structure but this third move takes the game into uncharted territory. $3 \ldots$ c5 is the most successful of the orthodox continuations.

## 4 Be3 e6 5 f3 Nd6 6 Qd3 Nc6 7 Nh3 Be7

Both players seem happy to do without developing their light-squared bishops!

## 8 g4 Nb4 9 Qc3 Nb5 10 Qd2 h6

Superficially, the knight activity on the queenside looks promising but the pieces need to be careful. A knight on the fourth rank in front of its own pawns has few retreat squares. Now, Black defends his g pawn which is under threefold attack. Sadly, this is not necessary as 10 ... Nc6 11 Nxg5 Nbxd4. Instead he falls for something much worse.

## 11 c4 Nxd4

There is little alternative - 11 ... Nd6 12 Qxb4. Having trapped the knight with my eleventh move, I was now confident of winning the game but I had never managed this before in a serious game against Des. I had to guess that he would disdain castling on the queenside and his stranded king may give me chances if I could break through in the centre.

## 12 Bxd4 Rg8 13 Bc3 Nc6 14 e3 f6 15 Qd3 Rg7 16 Nd2 b6 17 Bg2 Bb7 18 0-0-0 a5 19 a3 Ra7 20 Qe2 Ba6

Black has been trying to open lines of the queenside and he could try a temporary sacrifice 20 ... Bb4 21 axb4 axb4 22 Bd4 e5 with Qa8 to follow.

## 21 f4 Nb8 22 fxg5

The computer is adamant that 22 f 5 is better here. I can see that 22 ... exf5 23 gxf5 opens the h5-e8
diagonal but 22 ... e5 seems to lead to further positional manoeuvring.
22 ... hxg5 23 Ne4 d6 24 Rhf1 Nd7


25 Rf2
White misses an opportunity. He could catch the king in the centre with a nasty attack 25 Nhxg5 Rxg5 (25 ... fxg5 26 Bxg7) 26 Nxg5 fxg5 27 Bc6 Bb7 28 Qc2.

## 25 ... d5 26 Nd2

There are still chances to cause mayhem but now the stakes are much higher. Fritz recommends putting your trust in the minor pieces with 26 Nhxg5 Bxc4 27 Qxc4 dxc4 28 Nxe6 Qc8 29 Nxg7+ Kf8 (29 ... Kf7 30 Rxd7 Qxd7 31 Nxf6 Bxf6 32 Rxf6+ Ke7 33 Nf5+ Kd8) 30 Rxd7 Qxd7 31 Nxf6 Bxf6 (31 ... Qd3 32 Nd5+ Kg8 33 Nxe7+ Kh7 34 Rf7). The variations do not look sufficiently decisive to justify the risk.

## 26 ... c6 27 Rdf1

The position deteriorates over the next few moves. 27 e4 would maintain the initiative.

## 27 ... e5 28 Rf5 Rc7

Black should still be trying to create counterthreats on the queenside and opening lines with $28 \ldots$ b5.

## 29 Qf2 Nc5 30 Qg3 dxc4

Both players were getting down to their last minutes (I had about 25 minutes but Des had around 4!) and there are still pitfalls to avoid. Here, Black had been planning $30 \ldots \mathrm{~d} 431$ exd4 exd4 but it fails to 32 Bxd4 Qxd4 33 Qxc7. By playing slightly faster than necessary, I did not give my opponent the chance to think in my time!
There is a maxim that you should always try to improve the position of your worst piece. Obviously, the knight on h3 is not pulling its weight. 31 Nf 2 would bring it closer to the centre but there, it would be interfering with the cooperation of the rooks so...
31 Nxg5 Rxg5 32 Rxg5 fxg5 33 Be4 Nb3+

The flourish on move 31 is actually suspect in hindsight but is a good practical choice when only seconds remain. This is the point where Black can improve. Fritz oscillates between variations - a sure sign it does not really know what is going on. Which do you prefer - 33 ... Rc8 34 Bg6+ Kd7 35 Bf5+ Kc7 ( 35 ... Ke8 36 Qh3) 36 Qxe5+ or 33 ... Nxe4 34 Nxe4 Qd5 or Qd3 35 Qf3?
The move played is a tempting alternative but it allows a sharp coup de grace.
34 Nxb3 cxb3 35 Bg6+ Kd7 36 Rd1+ Bd6 37 Rxd6+ Kxd6 38 Qxe5+ Kd7 39 Bf5\#

Steve Nalker

## Eye Opener

In a previous Eye Opener, we considered an offshoot of the Budapest Gambit. Here, we shall look at the main line 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e5 3 dxe5 Ng4. Compared with $3 \ldots \mathrm{Ne} 4$, the onslaught is less direct because the black knight is further from the centre so the b4-e1 diagonal can be blocked naturally by Nb1-c3. Nevertheless, there are pitfalls.
1 White should aim for minor piece development rather than premature queen forays

## S Takacs v J Krejcik <br> Wenen 1920

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e5 3 dxe5 Ng4 4 Qd4 d6 5 exd6 Bxd6 6 Qxg7 Be5 0-1
In 2001, the same moves were played but Black had to be shown 7 Qg5 Qxg5 8 Bxg5 Bxb2.
2 The tactics can sometimes be so simple.

## Langner v Zander <br> Berlin 1926

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e5 3 dxe5 Ng4 4 e4 d6 5 exd6 Bxd6 6 Nf3 Bb4+ 7 Bd2 Bc5 winning material because 8 Be3 Qxd1+ 9 Kxd1 Bxe3 10 fxe3 Nf2+ 0-1
3 Remember the sacrifices on f2! The advance $\mathrm{h} 2-\mathrm{h} 3$ is a contributory weakening.

## Fomin v Fedossov

Iwantejewka 1988

| 1 | d4 | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | c4 | e5 |
| 3 | dxe5 | Ng4 |
| 4 | Nc3 | d6 |
| 5 | exd6 | Bxd6 |
| 6 | h3 | Nxf2 |
| 7 | Kxf2 | Qh4+ |
| 8 | Kf3 |  |

The alternative is not much better. 8 Ke 3 Bf 59 g 4 (9 Qd4 Qg5+ 10 Kf2 Qg3\# or 9 Qa4+ Nc6 10 g4 0-0-0 with an overwhelming attack e.g. $11 \mathrm{gxf} 5 \mathrm{Bf} 4+12 \mathrm{Kf} 3$ Qg3+ 13 Ke4 Rhe8\#) 9 ... Qg3+ 10 Nf3 Bf4+ 11 Kd4 Qf2+ 12 e3 Bxe3+ 13 Bxe3 Nc6+ 14 Kc5 Qxe3+
a) $15 \mathrm{Kd} 50-0-0 \#$
b) $15 \mathrm{Nd} 4 \mathrm{Qe} 7+16 \mathrm{~Kb} 5 \mathrm{Qb} 4 \#$ or $16 \mathrm{Kd} 5 \mathrm{Rd} 8 \#$
c) $15 \mathrm{~Kb} 5 \mathrm{Qb} 6+16 \mathrm{Ka} 4 \mathrm{Qb} 4 \#$


In passing, it is worth noting that another early continuation for White can lead to the same debacle if the unnecessary h2-h3 is played.

## 1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e5 3 d5 Bc5 4 h3

I have seen a game from 1936 which went 4 a3 Bxf2+ 5 Kxf2 Ne4+ 6 Ke3 f5 7 Nf3 d6 8 Nc3 f4+ 9 Kxe4 Bf5+ 10 Kxf5 Qf6+ 11 Ke 4 [11 Kg4 h5+ 12 Kh 3 Qf5+ etc] 11 ... Qg6\# but in this case, Fritz considers the sacrifice unsound with 6 Ke1 giving White the advantage.

## 4 ... Bxf2+ 5 Kxf2 Ne4+ 6 Kf3

6 Ke3 Qh4 7 g4 (7 Nf3 Qf4+ 8 Kd3 Nf2+) 7 ... Nf2 8 Qe1 Qg3+ 9 Nf3 Nxh1

## 6 ... Qh4 7 Nc3

7 g4 f5 8 gxf5 (8 Kg2 Qf2\#) 8 ... d6 9 Nc3 (9 Be3 Qg3+ 10 Kxe4 Bxf5+ 11 Kxf5 Qg6\#) 9 ... Qf2+ 10 Kxe4 Bxf5\#

7 ... Qg3+ 8 Kxe4 f5+ 9 Kxf5 d6+ 10 Ke4 Bf5+ 11 Kxf5 Qg6\#
Next time : White fights back!

