## NEW ENGLANDER

## Chess Club Update - December 2014

## Chairman's Chatter

As mince pies have been in the shops for several weeks, it must the season of good cheer. Enthusiasm and enjoyment are the hallmarks of our club but please continue to be considerate when serious games are still in progress. Many thanks.
*anl tanks

## Diary Dates

$17^{\text {th }}$ December? Where else but the chess club for our Christmas Special? This will be the final formal club session before the New Year and we shall let off steam with the usual format of light-hearted events.

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution (Goldschmidt 1927)
Position: 8/8/8/4K1N1/8/3pk3/4n3/3BQ3
1 Ne4 d2 2 Qxe2\# [1 ... Kf3 2 Qg3\#]

## Website to Watch

December is the month for the London Chess Classic. This sixth year of the event has yet again changed the format (see http://londonchessclasic.com/). On $6^{\text {th }}$ and $7^{\text {th }}$ December, there is the Super Rapidplay and $10^{\text {th }}$ to $14^{\text {th }}$ sees the Super Six classic tournament featuring Caruana, Anand, Giri, Nakamura, Kramnik and Adams. It is such a pity that the weekday playing sessions of $4-11 \mathrm{pm}$ so heavily favour fans living in London.

## Window on the Web

The ECF is changing the way grades are calculated, starting with the January 2015 list, to address two issues they have identified.
The first issue is the effect of incorrectly recorded dates. At present, a grade is calculated using a player's last 30 games, whether they were played in the last 6 months or in the last 3 years. A player's record will be inaccurate if the dates of games played at or around the 30 -game cut-off point are incorrect. The order of those games could make a difference of 3 points or more to a player's grade two years later.
The second issue is the need to indicate the strength of newly-graded players as soon as possible.
The changes being introduced are :-

1. Instead of averaging only 30 games, category A grades will be calculated using the average of all games played in the last two grading periods, so category X will no longer be needed.
2. For categories below $A$, the calculation will still, as now, involve 30 games, but instead of a cut-off point part way through a grading period, the system will take from each previous period as many games as necessary to total 30, but the grading points from those in the earliest period used will be taken to be the average per game for the whole of that period.
3. Grade category $F$ will be introduced, showing a grade based on only 5 games in the last 36 months, including at least 1 in the latest period. This is expected to increase the number of graded players from less than 12,000 to around 13,600 or more.
Full details of the changes can be found in the appendix to the ECF grading help pages here :-
http://www.ecfgrading.org.uk/new/menu.php
Ren dones
Result Round-up
Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| Warboys B | $\mathbf{2} 1 / 2$ | New England B | $\mathbf{1 1} 2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| B Duff | $1 / 2$ | R Jones | $1 / 2$ |
| M Davies | 1 | P Spencer | 0 |
| P Baddelev | 1 | D Lane | 0 |
| K Harbour | 0 | J Parker | 1 |

Fenland Trophy

| Peterborough | $\mathbf{3} 1 / 2$ | New England A | $1 / 2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| C Tandv | 1 | P Turp | 0 |
| F Bowers | $1 / 2$ | M Dunkley | $1 / 2$ |
| A Summers | 1 | R Jones | 0 |
| N Fisher | 1 | S Walker | 0 |

Team 550 Competition

| NE Patriots | $\mathbf{1 1} / \mathbf{2}$ | Spalding | $\mathbf{2 1 ⁄ 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| S Carawav | 0 | R Malczvk | 1 |
| S Wozniak | $1 / 2$ | J Smith | $1 / 2$ |
| J Parker | $1 / 2$ | P Szutkowski | $1 / 2$ |
| P O'Gorman | $1 / 2$ | R Coats | $1 / 2$ |
| NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{2}$ | Warboys | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| M Dunklev | 1 | R Mann | 0 |
| R Jones | 0 | B Duff | 1 |
| D Lane | 1 | M Onvons | 0 |
| M Tarabad | 0 | P Baddelev | 1 |

Club Championship

| Round 2 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| D Lane (1) | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | J Sadler (1) |
| R Jones (1) | 0 | 1 | P Spencer (1) |
| P Hanks (1) | 1 | 0 | M Tarabad (0) |
| I Garratt (0) | 0 | 1 | S Walker (0) |
| M Dunkley (0) | 1 | 0 | N Wedley (0) |
| P Turp (1) | P | P | S Wozniak (0) |
| S Caraway (1) | P | P | C Russell (0) |
| B Sadler (0) | 0 | 1 | P O'Gorman |
|  | Round 3 |  |  |
| J Parker (2) | 0 | 1 | P Hanks (2) |
| J Sadler (1½) | P | P | P Spencer (2) |
| M Dunkley (1) | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | D Lane (1½) |
| S Caraway (1+P) | 1 | 0 | P Turp (1+P) |
| S Walker (1) | P | P | R Jones (1) |
| C Russell (0+P) | 1 | 0 | P O'Gorman(1) |
| S Wozniak (0+P) | 1 | 0 | B Sadler (0) |
| N Wedley (0) | 1 | 0 | I Garratt (0) |
| M Tarabad (0) | P | P | N Foreman |
| Deadline : 31st January |  |  | Next draw : 1st February |

New England Club Ladder

| White |  | Black |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I Garratt | 1 | 0 | P Stevens |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | 0 | I Garratt |
| N Foreman | 0 | 1 | P O'Gorman |
| I Garratt | 0 | 1 | P Hanks |


|  | Change |  | Player | Record 26/11/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I <br> I <br>  |  |  |  |
| 1 | - | +1 | D Lane | 1 |
| 2 | - | -1 | M Tarabad | 0,1,1,1 |
| 3 | - | - | N Wedley | 0 |
| 4 | +2 | +2 | P O'Gorman | 1,1,1 |
| 5 | - | - | J Parker | 0 |
| 6 | +3 | +3 | P Hanks | 1 |
| 7 | - | - | N Foreman | 0,0 |
| 8 | -4 | -4 | I Garratt | 0,1,0,0 |
| 9 | -1 | -1 | P Stevens | 0 |

New England Grand Prix

| Player | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{Q}{\mathbb{N}} \\ \underset{\sim}{U} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { む } \\ & \text { D } \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \text { O} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{0}}{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oi } \\ & \text { R } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \mathbb{O} \end{aligned}$ | - ָّ | $\stackrel{*}{\text { cr }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | 3 |  |  | $11 / 2$ | 51/2 | 97 |
| M Dunkley | $11 / 2$ |  | $11 / 2$ | 1/2 | $11 / 2$ | 5 | 165 |
| P Hanks | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 5 | 162 |
| D Lane | 2 | 1 | 0 |  | 2 | 5 | 114 |
| M Tarabad | 0 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 105 |
| J Sadler | $11 / 2$ |  | 1 |  | 1 | $31 / 2$ | 138 |
| R Jones | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | $11 / 2$ | $31 / 2$ | 126 |
| J Parker | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | $31 / 2$ | 90 |
| S Caraway | 2 |  | 1/2 |  | 1/2 | 3 | 162 |
| P Spencer | 2 |  | 0 |  | $1 / 2$ | 21/2 | 130 |
| P Turp | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | $11 / 2$ | 146 |
| S Wozniak | 1 |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 11/2 | 104 |
| C Russell | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 112 |
| N Wedley | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 95 |
| S Walker | 1 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 68 |
| I Garratt | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 54 |
| B Sadler | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 27 |
| N Foreman |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 20 |

## Match of the Month

Many players in the club are happy to participate in our internal events and support our team entries in various competitions. But have you thought about playing for the County? There are typically four matches per season played at Turner Hall, Newmarket over 16 boards.
Here is one of my efforts from a season in which Cambridgeshire topped the East Anglian first division.

|  | S Moore v M Dunkley <br>  <br>  <br> Norfolk v Cambridgeshire, 2013 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | e4 | e6 |
| 2 | d4 | d5 |
| 3 | e5 |  |

The Advance Variation is a popular alternative to the main lines with Nc3. It is a favourite of Grischuk but you will find Timman, Shirov and even Carlsen have given it a try.

| 3 | $\ldots$ | c5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | c3 | Nc6 |
| 5 | Nf3 | Bd7 |

5 ... Qb6 is commonly played but it has been criticised as "tennis" due to the successive attack and defence of d 4 resembling a baseline rally. The move played is now almost twice as popular at grandmaster level.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
6 & \text { a3 } \\
7 & \text { b4 }
\end{array}
$$

f6

7 Bd 3 is the choice of the professionals e.g Van Wely v Topalov, Dortmund 2005 but from the results, Black also more than holds his own.


This is a "book" move but would come as a shock to anyone who hadn't seen it before. White should accept the sacrifice i.e. 9 cxd4 exd4 when Black gets three pawns for the piece and a dominating position.

## $9 \quad$ Nxe5

Instead, White plays for a kingside attack but does not have the development to back it up.

$$
9
$$

9 ... Nxb5 10 Qh5+ g6 11 Nxg6 is similar to the game but if Black gets too greedy with 10 ... Ke7, the attack gains the desired momentum with 11 Qf7+ Kd6 12 Nxd7 (12 Bf4 is also good) $12 \ldots$... Qxd7 $13 \mathrm{Bf} 4+$ e5 14 Bxe5+ Kc6 15 Bxb5+.

| 10 | Qh5+ | g6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | Nxg6 | Nf6 |
| 12 | Qh3 | Rg8 |
| 13 | Nxf8 | Rxf8 |

In fact, the past sequence is more or less forced. Material remains level but look at the difference in the activity of each side's pieces.

## 14 g4

With inferior development, the perennial problem is either the king's safety or defending weaknesses especially scattered pawns. An outright assault on White is unlikely here but this move only adds to the latter woes.
14 Bd3 could be played because the natural response $14 \ldots$ e5 is not yet possible due to $15 \mathrm{Bxf5}$.

| 14 | $\ldots$ | Nd6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | Bd3 | Bxb5 |

This move is satisfactory but after the game, I discovered Fritz suggests a significant improvement. Having displaced the knight on f5, White has invalidated the continuation in the previous comment and now, 15 ... e5 would mobilise Black's pawns and threaten 16 ... Bxg4 e.g. 16 Be 2 h 5 etc.

| 16 | Bxb5+ | Nxb5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | g5 |  |

White teeters on the edge of losing vital pawns but maintaining the balance comes at the cost of simplification. A deficit is however only being delayed and even Fritz cannot save the situation.

| 17 | $\ldots$ | Ne4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | Qxe6+ | Qe7 |
| 19 | Qxe7+ | Kxe7 |
| 20 | $0-0$ | Nbxc3 |
| 21 | Re1 |  |

With 21 Nxc3 Nxc3 22 f4 or 22 Bb2, White can try for counterplay but Black still holds a winning advantage.

| 21 | $\ldots$ | Kd7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | Re3 | d4 |
| 23 | Nxc3 | Nxc3 |
| 24 | Rh3 | Rf7 |
| 25 | Bd2 | Ne4 |
| 26 | Be1 | Nxg5 |

White's position is totally passive and soon, he will be facing advancing black pawns. Black might have emphasised his superior coordination with 26 ... Rg8.

| 27 | Rg3 | Nf3+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | Kg2 | Nxe1+ |
| 29 | Rxe1 |  |

After a complicated middlegame (where both sides missed better alternatives), Black has emerged with a won endgame.

## 29 ... Re8 30 Rb1 b6 31 Rb2 Kc6 32 a4 Rd7 33 Rh3

 d3 34 Rd2 c4 35 Rh4 Kc5 36 Rh5+ Kb4 0-1The win is easy from here :- $37 \mathrm{Rb} 5+\mathrm{Kc} 338 \mathrm{Rd} 1 \mathrm{~d} 2$ 39 Kf1 Kc2 40 Rbb1 Rde7 41 f4 Re1+ 42 Rxe1 dxe1Q+43 Rxe1 Rxe1+ 44 Kxe1 c3 45 f5 Kb2.

Mike Dunkley

