# NEW ENCLANDER 

## Chess Club Update - July 2015

## Chairman's Chatter

The club has had a poor year over the board but every season, a few things give me special delight none more so than a new name on the club honours board. Congratulations to Jason for winning the Club Ladder competition.

## Paul tcanks

## Diary Dates

In accordance with the summer schedule outlined in the last newsletter, $8^{\text {th }}$ July has been set aside for the Summer Sprint competition. Sam Caraway will again give a Masterclass session on $15^{\text {th }}$ and on that night, members can decide whether to have competitive chess or tuition on the $22^{\text {nd }}$.

The Special General Meeting to determine the club's team entries to the County leagues next season will take place on $29^{\text {th }}$ July.
Here is some advance notice of forthcoming local tournaments.

- The next Cambridgeshire Rapidplay event is on $11^{\text {th }}$ October at its regular venue in Whittlesford Memorial Hall.
- The County Individual Championship will take place at Peterborough Bridge Club, Lincoln Road on $28^{\text {th }}$ and $29^{\text {th }}$ November.
Entry forms are available at www.cambschess.co.uk.


## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution (Marble/Bettmann 1933)
Position : 7Q/2p5/1P1N3R/3k4/8/2K5/8/8
1 Qe8 cxd6 2 Rh5\# [1 ... cxb6/Kc5 2 Qb5\#; 1 ... c6 2 Qh5\#; 1 ... c5 2 Qe4\#]

## Website to Watch

July is a quiet month for elite chess and even the strong Biel International Chess Festival from July $20^{\text {th }}$ to $30^{\text {th }}$ will be missing some names familiar as recent world championship contenders. Nevertheless, it still boasts Vachier-Lagrave, Adams and rising star Rapport in a field of six grandmasters. The website is www.bielchessfestival.ch/en/home/ but it is not yet clear whether it will carry live games.

## Window on the Web

The Chess Website describes itself as "your one stop shop for all things chess". It is financed by membership subscriptions which are $\$ 7$ per month or $\$ 50$ per year. If you don't fancy becoming a member, there is plenty of interesting and instructive free content on the site.
At http://www.thechesswebsite.com/, on the home page, you will see 12 chessboards which represent links to different areas of the site. Learn to Play covers the basics. Openings shows a brief description of each opening with a short explanatory video and some famous games to play through via links to chessgames.com. Access is free to the Albin, Benko, Benoni, Bird's, Budapest, Dutch, English, Reti, Scandinavian and many more.
Strategy and Tactics has notes and videos on such themes as open v closed positions, good v bad bishops, outposts, decoy, development, deflection, bishop sacrifice and the windmill.
There are 3 grades of Puzzles: easy, medium and hard. Practice leads to 20 free "find the best move" positions. End Game has 10 free basic short lessons on such themes as king \& pawn, knight v rook and triangulation. Famous Games includes games to play through by such luminaries as Fischer and Kasparov (v Deep Blue), plus some more recent (not very famous) games. Traps contains 16 free descriptions of various traps including the Fishing Pole and Queen Amidala traps - both new to me and well worth a look!

## Result Round-up

New England Club Ladder

| White |  | Black |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S Caraway | 1 | 0 | N Wedley |


| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\delta}{0} \\ & : y \\ & 0 . \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Change |  | Player | Record |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\Sigma}{\tilde{1}} \\ & \underset{\mathbf{D}}{ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 1 | +2 | +4 | J Parker | 0,1,1,1,1 |
| 2 | -1 | +7 | P Hanks | 1,1,1/2 |
| 3 | -1 | -1 | D Lane | 1,1,1 |
| 4 | +6 | +8 | S Caraway | $1 / 2,1$ |
| 5 | -1 | -4 | M Tarabad | 0,1,1,1,1 |
| 6 | -1 | +4 | S Wozniak | 1 |
| 7 | -1 | -1 | P O'Gorman | 1,1,1,0,1/2, 1 |
| 8 | - | -4 | I Garratt | 0,1,0,0,0,1,0,0,0,0,0 |
| 9 | -2 | -6 | N Wedley | 0,0,0,1,0,1,1,0 |
| 10 | +2 | -2 | P Stevens | 0,0,0,0 |
| 11 | -2 | -4 | N Foreman | 0,0,0 |
| 12 | -1 | -1 | S Walker | 1/2 |

Club Championship

| Final Round 6 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| P Hanks (4½) | 1d | Od | J Sadler (3½) |
| S Caraway (4) | 1 | 0 | D Lane (3) |
| S Walker (3) | 1 | 0 | P Turp (3) |
| J Parker (2½) | 0 | 1 | M Dunkley (2+P) |
| P O'Gorman(1) | 0d | 0d | N Wedley (2½) |
| C Russell (2+P) | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | S Wozniak (2) |
| I Garratt (1) | 1d | 0d | B Sadler (1) |


| Player | Round |  |  |  |  |  | Pts | Grade |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | Opp | TPR |
| P Hanks | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 d | 51/2 | 117 | 172 |
| S Caraway | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 5 | 133 | 170 |
| M Dunkley | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 4 | 115 | 140 |
| S Walker | 0 | 1 | 1 d | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 108 | 118 |
| J Sadler | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 d | 0 | 1 | 0d | $31 / 2$ | 125 | 132 |
| P Turp | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 125 | 128 |
| D Lane | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 3 | 121 | 121 |
| M Tarabad | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 97 | 90 |
| N Wedley | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | Od | 21/2 | 121 | 117 |
| C Russell | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 21/2 | 125 | 114 |
| S Wozniak | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 21/2 | 112 | 102 |
| J Parker | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 21/2 | 113 | 94 |
| I Garratt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 d | 2 | 100 | 66 |
| P O'Gorman | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0d | 1 | 80 | 53 |
| B Sadler | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1d | 0 | 0d | 1 | 91 | 30 |

New England Grand Prix

| Player |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { む } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{0} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbb{O} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{Q}}{ }$ |  | ঙ্ড | $\stackrel{*}{\text { a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P Hanks | 41/2 | 21/2 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 162 |
| D Lane | 3 | 3 | $311 / 2$ | 0 | 3 | $121 / 2$ | 109 |
| M Dunkley | 4 |  | 4 | $1 / 2$ | 4 | 121/2 | 160 |
| M Tarabad | 3 | 4 | 2 |  | 3 | 12 | 100 |
| S Caraway | 5 | $11 / 2$ | 3 | 0 | 2 | 111/2 | 161 |
| J Parker | $21 / 2$ | 4 | 3 |  | $11 / 2$ | 11 | 95 |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | $41 / 2$ | 0 |  | $31 / 2$ | 9 | 83 |
| J Sadler | 21/2 |  | 2 |  | 3 | $71 / 2$ | 124 |
| P Turp | 3 |  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 144 |
| N Wedley | 2112 | 3 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 6 | 101 |
| S Walker | 3 | $1 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | 6 | 95 |
| S Wozniak | 2112 | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  | 2 | 6 | 114 |
| P Spencer | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 4 | 133 |
| R Jones | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | $11 / 2$ | $31 / 2$ | 126 |
| I Garratt | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 3 | 55 |
| C Russell | 2112 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 21/2 | 100 |
| N Foreman | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 46 |
| B Sadler | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 30 |
| P Stevens |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 29 |

## Match of the month

Some time ago, I complained that our league teams were having no luck. Here is a game after which I would decry my misfortune to anyone who would listen but in reality, I was plainly not equal to the challenges of the position.

## P Hanks v R McCorry

New England A v Cambridge, 25.03.2015

| 1 | d4 | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | c4 | e6 |
| 3 | Nc3 | Bb4 |
| 4 | a3 |  |

The Saemisch Variation of the Nimzo-Indian Defence has disappeared from the grandmaster game. White invites pawn structure damage in return for the bishop pair.

| 4 | $\ldots$ | Bxc3+ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | bxc3 | $0-0$ |
| 6 | Qc2 | d5 |

I was quite pleased to see this move. In this opening, White often struggles to defend the pawn on c4 which Black can attack with b7-b6, Bc8-a6 and Nb8-c6-a5. Now, I can rid myself of the weakness at any time.

A second plan for Black is to occupy e4 with a knight supported by the queenside fianchetto and eventually f7-f5. My play since move 6 has aimed to deter this manouevre, to prepare f2-f3 and claim the square for myself with e3-e4.

| 8 | $\ldots$ | dxc4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | Bxc4 | b6 |
| 10 | Ne2 | Bb7 |
| 11 | $0-0$ | Nbd7 |

Obviously, 11 ... Ne4 12 f3 would have fallen in with my plan. I was feeling that the game was proceeding smoothly in the intended direction when I realised there is another way for Black to be awkward.
After the pawn exchange $8 \ldots$ dxc4, White is never going to play d 4 xc 5 which merely leaves the queenside pawns as targets. By being able to dictate when $c 5 x d 4$ is played, Black has the strategic initiative in the centre and $12 \ldots$ Ra8-c8 will create nasty threats. Left uncontested, the opening of the c file leads to disaster e.g. 12 f 3 Rc8 13 e4 cxd4 14 cxd4 Ba6. Initially, I thought 12 Ba 2 would suffice with a later option to play Ba2-b1 but 12 ... Rc8 13 Bb2 (say) cxd4 14 exd4 leads to the notorious hanging pawn formation (see the August 2014 issue of NEW ENCLANDER).

| 12 | Qa2 | Rc8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | Bb2 | Ne4 |

My strategy is in tatters. I avoided 13 Bd2 otherwise Black's last move would have negated the cherished bishop pair. Instead, my pieces are spectators on the queenside, Black has indeed occupied e4 and 14 f3 Ne 2 fails to repel the invader.

## 14 Bd3 <br> Qg5

By a combination of ideas (white knight on e2, attack on g2, lack of protection for e3 after f2-f3), Black has this tasty move. I had taken it into account in my previous calculation but had spent a lot of time worrying about an alternative $14 \ldots \mathrm{Ne} 215$ Rfd1 Nf3+. It looks very dangerous for White but I felt there should be a defence particularly after seeing 16 gxf3 Qg5+ 17 Ng 3 h 518 f 4 Qg 419 Be 2 Qh3 20 Bf1 with a draw by repetition at worst and $17 \ldots$ Bxf3 18 Rd2 Qh4 (18 ... h5!?) 19 Bf1 Nf6 20 Bg2 Ng4 21 h3. The computer finds stronger defences (naturally!) but generally confirms that Black cannot break through.

| 15 | Bxe4 | Bxe4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | Ng3 | Bb7 |
| 17 | f4 | Qg4 |
| 18 | f5 |  |

Fritz recommends bringing the offside pieces back into play by 18 Qb 1 or Qb3. I remembered a chapter from the book Counterattack! by Zenon Franco in which he gives examples of a rebuffed early assault being followed by a counterstroke. White's position does have the desired latent energy and the practical chances of the text move in my mind outweigh the objective solidity of the prosaic options.

Black plays along with only the computer's fourth alternative. Top of the list is $18 \ldots$ cxd5 19 exd5 h5. Maybe, Black's attack still had some life in it.

## 19 Rf4

And I reciprocate! I temporarily forgot that 19 ... Qg5 20 Nxf5 is not possible. This mental blunder suggested I needed to defend g2 and led me to visualise the continuation that actually occurred.


Accepting the offer by $22 \ldots$ gxf5 is best but cheerless after 23 Rxf5 Qxg2+ 24 Qxg2+ Bxg2 25 Kxg2 Ne4 26 d5 Nd6 when White's chances are preferable because 26 ... Nxc3 was impossible due to 27 Rg5+ Kh8 28 Bb2.
$22 \ldots$ Nh5 runs into problems that are typical of later variations. I am ashamed to admit that I did not consider it but sensed there were many attacking options such as 23 Rg4 Qd8 (23 ... Qxg4 24 Nh6+) 24 Nh6+ Kh8 25 Nxf7+. The more resilient $24 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 7$ allows you to practice finding checkmates 25 Rxf7+ Rxf7 26 Qxf7+ Kxh6 (26 ... Kh8 27 Qxb7) 27 e4+ Nf4 (27 ... g5 28 Rh4) 28 Bxf4+ Kh5 and either

- 29 Qxh7+ Kxg4 30 Qxg6+ Kxf4 31 Qg3+ Kxe4 32 Qf3\# or
- 29 Rg5+ Qxg5 (29 ... Kh6 30 Rxg6+ Kh5 31 Qxh7\#; 29 ... Kh4 30 Qxh7\#) 30 Qxh7+ Kg4 31 Qh3+ Kxf4 32 Qf3\#.
23
h4
Qxf4

The point is that the queen is lost after $23 \ldots$ Qh5 24 g4 and 23 ... Qf6 24 Nh6+.
The only realistic retreat is $23 \ldots$ Qd8 but White can continue vigorously and I saw 24 Nh6+ Kh8 25 Nxf7+ Rxf7 26 Rxf7 Ba6 (26 ... Kg8 27 Rxb7) 27 Rf8+ Qxf8 28 Rxf8+ Rxf8 29 Qxd5. I could fathom a few of the
more complex lines but for many, I had to trust my instincts after 24 Nh6+ Kg7 25 Rxf7+

- 25 ... Kh8 26 Rxf8+
- Black cannot escape with 25 ... Kxh6 26 e4+ g5 (26 ... Kh5 27 Qe2+ Kxh4 28 Rxh7+ Kg3 29 Rh3\#) 27 Bxg5+ does not need deeper analysis but the computer can finish the job with 27 ... Kg6 28 h5+ Kxg5 29 R1f5+
- 29 ... Kh6 30 Qd2+
- 29 ... Kg4 30 Qe2+ (or $30 \mathrm{Rg} 7+\mathrm{Kh} 431$ Qf2\#) Kg3 31 Qf3+ Kh4 32 Qh3\#
- 29 ... Kh4 30 Qf2+ Kg4 transposes.
- 25 ... Rxf7 26 Rxf7+
- 26 ... Kxh6 27 e4+ g5 (27 ... Kh5 28 Rxh7+ Kg4 29 Qe2+ Kg3 30 Qf3\#) 28 Bxg5+ etc.
- 26 ... Kh8 27 Qf2 White has an extra pawn and a winning attack e.g. 27 ... Bc6 28 e4 Nxc3 29 Bg5 or 27 ... Nxc3 28 d5 Bxd5 29 Bb2 Bxf7 30 Bxc3+ Qd4 31 Qf6+ Qxf6 32 Bxf6\#. Very pretty!
After the superior 23 ... Nxc3, my intention was 24 Qc2 when Black cannot hold his threatened pieces but might simplify the position with $24 \ldots$ Qxg2+ 25 Qxg2 Bxg2 $26 \mathrm{Ne} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 727 \mathrm{Kxg} 2$. Would I have found the preferable $24 \mathrm{hxg} 5 \mathrm{Nxa} 225 \mathrm{Ne} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 726$ Bb2 Rc7 27 d5+ with a passed pawn and a trapped black knight?

$$
24 \text { exf4 }
$$

I dismissed 24 Rxf4 quickly as it is not obviously better but 24 ... Nxf4 $25 \mathrm{Ne} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 726$ Nxc8 Rxc8 (26 ... Nd3 27 Nd6 Nxc1 28 Qc2 Bc6 29 e4) 27 exf4 cxd4 28 c4 will leave Black with less compensation for the queen.


Here is the "man or mouse" test. White has an obvious draw by perpetual check. Do you take it or play on and hope for more?
There are several factors to consider to put yourself in my position :-
1 You have nine moves to make in as many minutes.
2 In your last game against Peterborough, you emerged with an advantage but lost as fatigue set in. Tonight, you have also driven all the way to Cambridge.
3 Your opponent's grade exceeds your own by about 20 points.

4 It is a match situation and your team has the stronger player on most of the other boards.
5 Material is approximately level but you hold the initiative through having a rampaging queen. It is difficult, however, to bring up support because the route for the bishop to h6 or rook to g3 are not available and you might lose the bishop to Nc3-e2+.
6 The opportunity may not present itself again. You might hope for 28 h5 Ne2+ 29 Kh2 Rxc1 30 Qg5+ Kh8 31 h6 Rg8 32 Qf6+ but Black defends instead with $28 \ldots$ Rc5 or $28 \ldots$ h6.
Man or mouse?...
28 Qg5+ $1 / 2-1 / 2$

Squeak, squeak, squeak... OK, I failed!
I simply did not see the possibilities after 28 ... Kh8 29 Qe7 when

- 29 ... Ne2+ 30 Qxe2
- 29 ... Rfc8 30 Qxb7 Ne2+ 31 Kh2

31 ... R8c7 32 Qb8+ Kg7 (32 ... Rc8 33 Qe5+ and Qxe2) 33 Bb2 or even 33 f5 Nxc1 34 f6+ Kh6 36 Qg8

- 31 ... Rxc1 32 Rxc1 Rxc1 33 Qxf7
- 31 ... Nxc1 32 Qxf7 R4c7 33 Qf6+ Kg8 34 Rf3 winning e.g. $34 \ldots$ Rc3 ( $34 \ldots$ Rg7 35 Qe6+; 34 ... Ne2 35 Qe6+) 35 Rxc3 Rxc3 36 Qd8+ Kf7 37 Qd7+ Kg6 (37 ... Kf6 38 Qxd4+) 38 f5+ Kh5 39 Qg7 Kxh4 40 g3+ Kh5 41 Kh3 Rxa3 42 Qxh7+ Kg5 43 Qg6\#.
There are many alternatives to these thematic continuations but even the lines given above are too long for exhaustive analysis. Positions are reached in which the action is unfinished at move 33 and require confident assessment - many are clearly advantageous only with the benefit of hindsight.
Was I really such a mouse?

Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| A Team | Fenland Cup |  | Cambridgeshire League |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & 00 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | Grading |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 . \\ & 0 . \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { Id } \forall \text { ч } 8 \text { əбр!ıqueכ }$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \bar{\omega} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\text { Warboys A } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { Dec }$ |  | $\text { Cambridge } 7^{\text {h }} \text { Jan }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mike Dunkley | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  | $1 / 2$ |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 41/2 | 10 | 173 | 168 |
| Phil Turp | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 173 | 142 |
| Sam Caraway |  | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 8 | 174 | 161 |
| Paul Hanks |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 4 | 11 | 172 | 158 |
| Ron Jones | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 159 | 107 |
| Des Lane |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 133 | 112 |
| Paul Spencer |  |  |  |  | 1/2 | 1/2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 156 | 156 |
| Steve Walker | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1/2 |  | 1/2 | 2 | 101 | 76 |
| Chris Russell |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 192 | 102 |
| Jason Parker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 186 | 72 |
| Jonathan Sadler |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 2 | 160 | 90 |
| Norman Wedley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1d |  |  | 1d | 1 | - | - |
| Total | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 21/2 | 2 | 21/2 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 21/2 | 21/2 | $11 / 2$ | 2 | 17 + 1d |  |  |  |
| B Team | ছO |  |  | Ю૦ чбZ 6u!pןeds |  |  |  |  |  | $\text { dd } \forall_{\text {ist }} \text { g sКоqueM }$ | Buckden A $13^{\text {th }}$ Apr |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Ron Jones |  |  | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 154 | 154 |
| Paul Hanks |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 197 | 146 |
| Des Lane |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1/2 |  | 1112 | 7 | 140 | 109 |
| Paul Spencer |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 149 | 99 |
| Steve Wozniak |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 1/2 | 2 | 143 | 109 |
| Steve Walker |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |  | 1 | 3 | 117 | 100 |
| Jason Parker |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 5 | 85 | 95 |
| Peter O'Gorman |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 2 | 111 | 61 |
| Jonathan Sadler |  |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 1d |  | $2+1 d$ | 6 | 119 | 109 |
| Mahmoud Tarabad |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 4 | 99 | 99 |
| Ivan Garratt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 74 | 24 |
| Total | 4d | 0d | 1/2 | 1 | $11 / 2$ | 0 | 21/2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 21⁄2 | 0d | 11 + 1d |  |  |  |

## Cambridgeshire Team 550 Competition

| NE Patriots |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | Grading |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paul Hanks |  |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 | 3 | 4 | 137 | 164 |
| Paul Spencer |  | 1/2 |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 124 | 124 |
| Chris Russell |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 119 | 69 |
| Sam Caraway |  | 1/2 | 0 |  | 1/2 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 5 | 161 | 154 |
| Steve Wozniak |  |  | 1/2 | 1 |  |  |  | 1/2 |  | 2 | 3 | 105 | 121 |
| Jason Parker |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 11/2 | 4 | 99 | 86 |
| Jonathan Sadler |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 3 | 4 | 111 | 136 |
| Peter O'Gorman |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 3112 | 6 | 88 | 97 |
|  | Total | 3 | 11/2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 11/2 | 11/2 | 21/2 | 16 |  |  |  |
| NE Cavaliers |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\mathrm{O}}{\mathrm{O}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\mathrm{V}}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{3} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 厄 } \\ \stackrel{5}{5} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\text { ᄃ }}{5} \\ & \text { En } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\sum_{\equiv}^{2}$ | $\sum_{\substack{\infty \\ \hline i n}}^{\text {no }}$ |  |  | Grading |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 을 } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  | 2 $n$ 0 0 0.0 $\frac{0}{2}$ 3 3 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 을 } \\ & \text { 흧 } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Phil Turp |  | 1/2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 2 | 3 | 155 | 174 |
| Mike Dunkley |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 4 | 6 | 150 | 167 |
| Ron Jones |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 11/2 | 3 | 134 | 134 |
| Ivan Garratt |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 79 | 29 |
| Des Lane |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 101 | 88 |
| Mahmoud Tarabad |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 91 | 91 |
| Steve Walker |  |  | 0 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 97 | 72 |
| Norman Wedley |  |  |  |  | 1/2 |  |  |  |  | 1/2 | 1 | 133 | 133 |
|  | Total | $31 / 2$ | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |

