## New Englander

## Chess Club Update - March 2018

## Chairman's Chatter

It must be a record! This issue carries results or the draw for no less than 7 rounds of the Club Championship. This is, in part, due to the number of postponements and I hope the coming gap of over a month between rounds will enable us to bring the competition back on schedule.

Paul Hanks

## Diary Dates

$10-11^{\text {th }}$ March The EACU will be holding its new Individual Championship tournament at Whittlesford, Cambs with Open, U170 and U-130 categories. The entry form appears on the club website.
$21^{\text {st }}$ March Lancaster Club AGM. There will be no club meeting on this evening.

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution (Hanks 2018)
Position: 5K2/5p1k/4R1b1/6Pp/5N2/1B6/1B6/8
1 Rxg6 fxg6/f5 2 Bg8\# [1 ... h4/f6/f5 2 Rh6\#]

## Website to Watch

There should be a feast of chess during March. From $10^{\text {th }}$ to $28^{\text {th }}$, the FIDE Candidates Tournament is being held in Berlin. https://worldchess.com, the official website, seems to be directed solely at collecting subscriptions. The event will determine who will challenge Magnus Carlsen in a 12 game match
scheduled to take place in London from $9^{\text {th }}$ to 28 November. For updated details, perhaps you should bookmark https://Iondon2018.worldchess.com.
The European Individual Championship overlaps the above competition, taking place in Batumi Georgia from $17^{\text {th }}$ to $28^{\text {th }}$. The website is www.e2e4.ge.
For neither event is it clear whether the website will host live games and so, it may be wise to use a general viewer such as www.chessbomb.com.

## Result Round-up

Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| New England A | $1 / 2$ | Cambridge | $\mathbf{4 1 ⁄ 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| R llett | 0 | C Davison | 1 |
| P Walker | $1 ⁄ 2$ | N Hutchinson | $1 / 2$ |
| F Bowers | 0 | B Buisman | 1 |
| P Spencer | 0 | M Symanski | 1 |
| R Jones | 0 | J Daughman | 1 |
| Peterborough B | $\mathbf{2}$ | New England B | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| G Tandy | 1 | P Turp | 0 |
| M Connolly | $1 ⁄ 2$ | P Spencer | $1 / 2$ |
| M Dunkley | $1 ⁄ 2$ | R Jones | $1 / 2$ |
| D McLennon | 0 | D Lane | 1 |

EACU Team 500: 25 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ February 2018

| New England | $\mathbf{1}$ | Linton | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| F Bowers | 1 | S Weersing | 0 |
| M Ingram | 0 | A Weersing | 1 |
| M Tarabad | 0 | L Tun | 1 |
| T Ingram | 0 | N Weersing | 1 |


| Bury Dons | $\mathbf{3}$ | New England | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| R Martinez | 0 | F Bowers | 1 |
| J Pack | 1 | M Ingram | 0 |
| G Tebble | 1 | M Tarabad | 0 |
| R Scott | 1 | T Ingram | 0 |

## Team 550 Competition

| Warboys N | $\mathbf{3} 1 / 2$ | NE Patriots | $\mathbf{1} / \mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| C Watkins | 1 | R llett | 0 |
| B Duff | 1 | C Russell | 0 |
| P Baddeley | $1 ⁄ 2$ | P Weinberger | $1 / 2$ |
| M Onyons | 1 | P O'Gorman | 0 |


| NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{1} 1 / 2$ | Spalding | $\mathbf{2 1 ⁄ 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| P Walker | 1 | T Nottingham | 0 |
| R Jones | $1 ⁄ 2$ | P Szutkowski | $1 / 2$ |
| D Lane | 0 | R Coats | 1 |
| M Ingram | 0 | T Bennett | 1 |


| Spalding | $\mathbf{1}$ | NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| P Szutkowski | 0 | F Bowers | 1 |
| J Smith | 0 | P Turp | 1 |
| F Robinson | 0 | D Lane | 1 |
| T Bennett | 1 | M Tarabad | 0 |


| NE Cavaliers | P | NE Patriots | P |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Provisionally re-arranged on $28^{\text {th }}$ March 2018 |  |  |  |

New England Club Ladder

| White |  | Black |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| N Foreman | 0 | 1 | P Spencer |
| N Wedley | 1 | 0 | M Ingram |
| N Wedley | 0 | 1 | F Bowers |
| M Tarabad | 1 | 0 | T Ingram |


| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | Change |  | Player | Record @ 28/02/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 도 } \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ĩ } \\ & \text { Ĩ } \\ & \text { Ô } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 1 | +1 | +6 | P Spencer | 1,1 |
| 2 | -1 | 2 | P Hanks | 1,1 |
| 3 | - | +9 | M Tarabad | 0,1/2, 1, 1, 1 |
| 4 | - | -3 | F Bowers | 1,1,1/2,1/2,1/2,1,1 |
| 5 | - | +1 | P Walker | 0,1/2, 1, 1 |
| 6 | - | -3 | N Wedley | 1/2, $0,1,1,1,1 / 2,0,0,1,0$ |
| 7 | - | +1 | R llett | 1,1,1/2,0,1/2, 1 |
| 8 | +1 | -3 | S Walker | 0,1,0 |
| 9 | -1 | -7 | J Parker | 0,1/2, 1,0,0,1,1/2 |
| 10 | +1 | -1 | M Ingram | 0,1,1/2, 0, 0, 0, 0 , |
| 11 | -1 | -1 | P O'Gorman | 0,0,0,1 |
| 12 | - | +2 | T Ingram | 1,0,1,0,0 |
| 13 | +1 | -2 | P Weinberger | 0,1,0 |
| 14 | -1 | -1 | R Jones | 1 |
| 15 | +1 | +1 | I Garratt | 0,0 |
| 16 | -1 | -1 | D Lane | 0,0 |
| 17 | - | - | N Foreman | 0 |

Club Championship

| Round 1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P Spencer | P | P | P Weinberger |


| Round 2 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| N Foreman (Rd 1) | P | P | J utherland (0) |
| M Williams | 1 | 0 | N Foreman |


| Round 3 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R llett (2) | P | P | E Serban (2) |


| Round 4 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| J Parker (1) | 0 | 1 | P Weinberger (1+P) |
| M Williams (0+P) | P | P | M Tarabad (0) |


| Round $\mathbf{5}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| P Spencer (3+P) | P | P | E Serban (3+P) |
| R Ilett (3+P) | P | P | P O'Gorman (3) |
| S Walker (2) | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | C Russell (2) |
| M Ingram (1) | 1 | 0 | J Parker (1+P) |


| Round 6 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P Walker (4) | 1 | 0 | E Serban (3+2P) |
| R llett (3+2P) | P | P | P Spencer (3+2P) |
| P O'Gorman (3+P) | 0 | 1 | F Bowers (3) |
| S Wozniak ( $21 / 2$ ) | P | P | P Hanks (31⁄2) |
| C Russell ( $\mathbf{1}_{1 / 2}$ ) | 1/2 | 1/2 | R Jones ( $2^{1 ⁄ 2}$ ) |
| T Ingram (11⁄2) | 1 | 0 | D Lane (2) |
| M Williams (1+2P) | 0 | 1 | P Weinb'r $\left(2^{1 ⁄ 2}+\mathrm{P}\right)$ |
| N Wedley (11/2) | 1/2 | 1/2 | S Walker ( $2^{112}$ ) |
| $J$ Sutherland (0+P) | 1 | 0 | M Ingram (2) |
| M Tarabad (1+P) | 0 | 1 | $J$ Parker (1+P) |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| P Spencer (3+3P) | P Walker (5) |
| E Serban (3+2P) | F Bowers (3) |
| P Hanks ( $311 / 2+P$ ) | R Ilett (3+3P) |
| P Weinb'r ( $3112+\mathrm{P}$ ) | C Russell (3) |
| T Ingram ( $21 / 2$ ) | $R$ Jones (3) |
| S Wozniak ( $211 / 2+\mathrm{P}$ ) | S Walker (3) |
| D Lane (2) | M Williams (2+P) |
| M Ingram (2) | N Wedley (2) |
| J Parker (2) | $J$ Sutherland (1+P) |
| N Foreman (0+5P) | M Tarabad (1+P) |
| N Foreman (0+4P) | P O'Gorman (3+P) |
| Match night : $18^{\text {th }}$ April Deadline : $2^{\text {nd }}$ May Next draw : $3^{\text {rd }}$ May |  |

New England Grand Prix

| Player | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ®̃ } \\ & \text { §̃ } \\ & \text { ভ̃ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { o} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{0} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbb{O} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{Q}}{ }$ | $$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{*}{\text { a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F Bowers | 4 | $51 / 2$ | 41/2 | $11 / 2$ | 1 | 161/2 | 167 |
| P Hanks | $31 / 2$ | 2 | 7 | $11 / 2$ | 1/2 | 141/2 | 164 |
| R llett | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | $11 / 2$ | 121/2 | 171 |
| P Walker | 5 | $21 / 2$ | 3 | 1 | 1 | 121/2 | 171 |
| P Weinberger | $31 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 21/2 | 9 | 108 |
| P Spencer | 3 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 | 9 | 145 |
| M Tarabad | 1 | $31 / 2$ | 1 | 1/2 | 2 | 8 | 91 |
| N Wedley | 2 | 5 |  |  |  | 7 | 105 |
| R Jones | 3 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 7 | 126 |
| S Walker | 3 | 1 |  |  | 3 | 7 | 110 |
| J Parker | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 94 |
| D Lane | 2 | 0 | $31 / 2$ |  | $11 / 2$ | 7 | 99 |
| M Ingram | 2 | $11 / 2$ | 1 |  | 1 | 51/2 | 89 |
| P O'Gorman | 3 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 51/2 | 83 |
| C Russell | 3 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | 5 | 109 |
| T Ingram | 21/2 | 2 |  |  |  | $41 / 2$ | 87 |
| E Serban | 3 |  | 1 |  |  | 4 | 143 |
| S Wozniak | 21⁄2 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | $31 / 2$ | 102 |
| M Williams | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 71 |
| P Turp |  |  | 0 |  | $11 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | 141 |
| $J$ Sutherland | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 58 |
| N Foreman | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| I Garratt | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 27 |

## Match of the Month

Ray Ilett v Liam Varnam (201)
New England v Royston, CCCA Division 1, 11.01.18

| 1 | d4 | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | c4 | c5 |
| 3 | d5 | b5 |

The Benko Gambit is a popular choice of attackminded players with the black pieces.

## 4 cxb5

White can decline the gambit with 4 Nf 3 but capturing the pawn is considered strongest.

4
...
a6
With this move, Black offers to play a full pawn down but he has good compensation with play down the half open a and b files and pressure against White's centre.

| 5 | e3 | axb5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | Bxb5 | Qa5+ |
| 7 | Nc3 | Bb7 |

Black's best choice here with pressure along the long white diagonal although moves like $7 \ldots$ e6 and 7 ... Na 6 are also playable.

## 8 Bd2!

A fairly obvious move, but a good one - developing and protecting d4 with tactics. If now $8 \ldots$ Nxd5? (or Bxd5?) then 9 Nxd5 Qxb5 10 Nc7+ picks up Black's queen, a recurring theme in these positions.
8
....
Na6?!

Playable but missing a much stronger move 8 ... Qb6! (removing the queen from danger).
This move was played against me twice recently by the current Cambridgeshire county champion I Bin Suhal. In the first game, $8 \ldots$ Qb6! 9 Bc4 e6 10 e4 Nxe4! (another recurring tactical device, especially against me!) 11 Nf3 Nd6 12 Ne5 Nxc4? 13 Nxc4 Qa6 14 Qe2 Be7 15 Nb5! (1-0 in 20 moves, CCCA County Championship 2016).
Our most recent game went $8 \ldots$ Qb6! 9 Qb3 e6 10 e4? - a big blunder here - $10 \ldots$ Nxe4! and Black is clearly better (later 0-1, Peterborough v New England, CCCA league 2017).

## 9 a4?!

A well motivated move. The idea is to consolidate an outpost on b5 and ease the pressure down the a and b files. However, it is not necessary right now and weakens the b4 square allowing a possible knight outpost. I should simply develop with Nf3 and a big advantage.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
9 & \ldots & \text { Nb4 } \\
10 & \text { e4?! } &
\end{array}
$$

Nervously played! Surely it's correct here ... isn't it? Er ... not really though? It still suffers from a tactical drawback. Once again, simply 10 Nf 3 is correct.
10
...
e6

OK but it misses the elegant tactical reply $10 \ldots$ Nxe4! 11 Nxe4 Qxb5! 12 axb5 Rxa1 13 Qxa1 Nc2+ regaining the queen with equality.

11 Nf3
At last!
11 ... Be7
Of course not $11 \ldots$ Bd6? 12 e5 etc.
12 0-0
Simple and good. White's powerful centre is strongly protected and Black has nothing for his pawn minus.
13
...
14 Bc4

Qc7

I did consider the tactical 14 d6!? Bxd6 15 e5 but Black has15 ... Bxf3!? and I felt no need to complicate matters. The text is solid and good; it also reduces Black's chances of counterplay, an important consideration when playing against such strong players.

| 14 | $\ldots$ | exd5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | exd5 | d6 |
| 16 | $B f 4!?$ |  |

exd5
d6

Bf4!?

Not technically the best move (which is $16 \mathrm{Nb5}$ !) but it does set a trap and my opponent was by now getting short of time.


Regaining the exchange with a clearly winning advantage.

| 19 | $\ldots$ | Qe4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | Bxf8 | Qxc4 |
| 21 | Ne5 |  |

21 Nd 6 ! is stronger. The text does offer a pawn back, but after the exchange of queens, the position is simplified to White's advantage.

| 21 | $\ldots$ | Qd5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22 | Qxd5 | Bxd5 |
| 23 | Bxc5 | Na6 |
| 24 | b4 | Nxc5 |
| 25 | bxc5 | f6 |
| 26 | Nc7 | Rd8 |
| 27 | Nxd5 | Rxd5 |
| 28 | Nf3 | Rxc5 |

Black regains more material, but will soon have to give up his knight for the a pawn.

| 29 | a5 | Nf4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 30 | a6 | Nd5 |
| 31 | a7 | Nb6 |
| 32 | a8=Q+ | Nxa8 |
| 33 | Rxa8+ | Kf7 |
| 34 | g3 |  |

Avoiding the back row mate threat. The remaining game score was lost in the time scramble. With the extra piece, I later went on to win.

## Eye Opener

In the Match of the Month, Ray demonstrated his knowledge of the opening and the confidence it gave him against a very strong opponent. Sometimes, it is worth noting tactical variations that might let you escape with a creditable draw in such circumstances.

## Hultin v Fromm <br> Vaxjo 1992

| 1 | d4 | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | c4 | c5 |
| 3 | d5 | b5 |
| 4 | cxb5 | a6 |

So far, as in the featured llett v Varnam game.

| 5 | Nc3 | axb5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | e4 |  |

Here, both sides need to know what happens if


- $8 \ldots$ Nf6 $9 \mathrm{Nd} 6 \#$ is the direct justification
- 8 ... f5 leads to a long and convoluted variation with 9 f3 Ra4 10 Kd 1 Ba 611 fxe4 Ra5 12 Qe1 Bxb5 13 Bd2 Ba4+ 14 Ke2 Ra8 15 Bc3 Rg8 16 Kf2. The computer favour's White's final position but it is hard to disagree with the space advantage, better coordination and threats like Bf1-c4.
- 8 ... Qa5+ 9 Bd2 Nxd2 10 Nd6+ Kd8 11 Nxf7+ Ke8 [11 ... Kc7 12 Qxd2 with an extra pawn for White ] 12 Nd6+ with an honourable perpetual check.
The actual game finished

| 6 | $\ldots$ | b4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | Nb5 | Nxe4 |
| 8 | Qe2 |  |

and now, Black has none of the previous resources.

