## New Englander

## Chess Club Update - May 2019

## Chairman's Chatter

Oh, what a night! On $17^{\text {th }}$ April, the club hosted two matches and in both, a league title was on the line. In the Cambridgeshire division 2, a big win against St Neots B would put us out of reach of the pursuers but as it happened, the $2 \frac{1}{2}-1 \frac{1}{2}$ result was sufficient. Spalding were unable by $1 / 2$ point to achieve the required whitewash of Warboys B. Maybe it was only by the smallest of margins but the $B$ team are league champions!
On the other side of the room, Cavaliers were playing Warboys and the tension here was even greater. Both teams were in contention in the North Division of the 550 Competition with our opponents having a match in hand and with the event being decided on game points, every board counted. Again, we triumphed by $21 / 2-1 \frac{1}{2}$ and became uncatchable.

Congratulations to all who participated throughout the season. The clean sweep on the bottom boards in the crucial encounters was particularly impressive and it has made the year our most successful to date. Something to celebrate at the AGM!

Paul Hanks

## Diary Dates

| $8^{\text {th }}$ May | Problem night |
| :--- | :--- |
| $15^{\text {th }}$ May | Club Rapidplay |
| $29^{\text {th }}$ May | Club Annual General Meeting |

## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2


Last Month's solution (Abdurahmanovic)
Position : 5QKB/2P5/8/3k4/8/1R4N1/8/8
1 Ne4 Ke6 2 Qf7\# [1 ... Kc4 2 Qf7\#; 1 ... Kc6 2 Qd6\#; 1 ... Kxe4 2 Qf3\#]

## Website to Watch

From $17^{\text {th }}$ May, FIDE restarts its Grand Prix series of tournaments to determine candidates for a future World Championship challenge. The format has changed to four knock-out rounds each with two classical games on successive days followed by tiebreaks on the third. It is free to watch at www.worldchess.com.

Result Round-up
Cambridgeshire County Chess Leagues

| New England A | $\mathbf{1} 1 / 2$ | Cambridge | $\mathbf{3} 1 / 2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| J Dilley | $1 / 2$ | R McCorry | $1 / 2$ |
| R llett | $1 / 2$ | B Buisman | $1 / 2$ |
| E Knox | 0 | J Daugman | 1 |
| J Sadler | $1 ⁄ 2$ | M Fountain | $1 / 2$ |
| P Weinberger | 0 | S Pride | 1 |


| Warboys B | $\mathbf{1} 1 / 2$ | New England B | $\mathbf{2 1 ⁄ 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| N Greenwood | $1 / 2$ | P Turp | $1 / 2$ |
| D Polehonski | 1 | J Sadler | 0 |
| D Bently | 0 | R Jones | 1 |
| K Harbour | 0 | E Knox | 1 |


| New England B | $\mathbf{2} 1 / 2$ | St Neots B | $\mathbf{1 1 ⁄ 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| P Spencer | 0 | J Dunn | 1 |
| C Russell | $1 / 2$ | M Friday | $1 / 2$ |
| P Weinberger | 1 | F Rock | 0 |
| S Walker | 1 | S Westwood | 0 |


| Division 1 | $P$ | W | D | $L$ | ¢ | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peterborough A | 10 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 35 | 18 |
| Royston | 10 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 32 | 15 |
| Cambridge | 10 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 30 | 13 |
| St Neots A | 10 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 5 |
| Warboys A | 10 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 171/2 | 5 |
| New England A | 10 | 1 | 2 | 7 | $161 / 2$ | 4 |


| Division 2 | $P$ | W | D | L | \% | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New England B | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 11 |
| Spalding | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 181/2 | 11 |
| Peterborough B | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 171/2 | 10 |
| Warboys B | 8 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 141/2 | 7 |
| St Neots B | 8 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 101/2 | 1 |

Team 550 Competition

| NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{2} 1 / 2$ | Warboys | $\mathbf{1 1 ⁄ 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| P Hanks | 0 | B Duff | 1 |
| P Turp | $1 ⁄ 2$ | J Beck | $1 / 2$ |
| J Sadler | 1 | P Wells | 0 |
| D Lane | 1 | D Polehonski | 0 |
| Spalding | $1 ⁄ 2$ | NE Patriots | $\mathbf{3} 1 ⁄ 2$ |
| J van Gemeren | 0 | R llett | 1 |
| T Nottingham | $1 ⁄ 2$ | C Russell | $1 ⁄ 2$ |
| T Bennett | 0 | S Wozniak | 1 |
| F Robinson | 0 | M Ingram | 1 |


| North Division | $\boldsymbol{P}$ | $\boldsymbol{W}$ | $\boldsymbol{D}$ | $\boldsymbol{L}$ | Games |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NE Cavaliers | 8 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 22 |
| Warboys | 8 | 6 | 0 | 2 | $211 / 2$ |
| NE Patriots | 8 | 4 | 0 | 4 | $161 / 2$ |
| Spalding | 8 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 13 |
| Godmanchester | 8 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 |

Fenland Knock-Out

| St Neots | $\mathbf{2 1} / \mathbf{2}$ | New England | $\mathbf{1 1 / 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| P Brown | 0 | P Hanks | 1 |
| R Gompelman | $1 / 2$ | R llett | $1 / 2$ |
| C Emery | 1 | J Sadler | 0 |
| K Holditch | 1 | Default | 0 |

Club Championship

| Postponements |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| N Wedley (1) | Rd | 4 | R Jones (1½) |  |
| P Spencer (3½) | Rd | 5 | P Turp (2½) |  |
| E Knox (3) | Rd | 6 | P Spencer (3½+P) |  |
| P Weinberger (3) | Rd | 7 | T Ingram (1½) |  |
| Redraw |  |  |  |  |
| J Sadler (Rd 6) | 0 | 1 | P Spencer (Rd 7) |  |
| D Lane (Rd 4) |  |  | J Sutherland (Rd 6) |  |


| Round 8 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| J Sadler (5) |  |  | P Hanks (6) |
| R Jones (4+P) |  |  | R llett (4½) |
| E Knox (4+P) |  |  | P Walker (4+2P) |
| P Spencer (4½+2P) |  |  | C Russell (3½) |
| S Wozniak (3½) | 1 | 0 | M Tarabad (3½) |
| P Weinberg'r (3+P) |  |  | P Turp (3½+P) |
| J Suth'land (1½+P) |  |  | E Smith (2) |
| D Lane (1+P) |  |  | S Walker (2½) |
| J Parker (1) |  |  | T Ingram (1½+P) |
| Match night : 1t $^{\text {st }}$ May |  | Deadline : $28^{\text {h }}$ May |  |

New England Club Ladder

| White |  | Black |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| D Lane | 0 | 1 | J Parker |
| P Weinberger | 1 | 0 | J Parker |


|  | Change |  | Player | Record @ 24/04/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { 들 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { त్ } \\ & \text { Ò } \\ & \text { Ó } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 1 | - | +2 | P Walker | 1/2, 1, 1/2, 1, 0, 1, 1 |
| 2 | +9 | +10 | P Weinberger | 0,1 |
| 3 | - | +10 | J Sadler | 0,1,1,1,1/2 |
| 4 | -2 | -2 | J Parker | 0,0,1,1,0 |
| 5 | - | +1 | M Tarabad | 1,0,1,1,1,1,0,0,1/2 |
| 6 | -2 | +4 | N Wedley | 0,1,0,0 |
| 7 | +1 | +4 | E Smith | 0,0,0,0 |
| 8 | -2 | -7 | P Spencer | 1,1/2,1/2,1 |
| 9 | -2 | -1 | R llett | 1,1,1 |
| 10 | -1 | -6 | T Ingram | 0,1 |
| 11 | -1 | -2 | D Lane | 0,1,0,0,0 |
| 12 | - | -7 | P Hanks | 0 |
| 13 | - | -6 | P O'Gorman | 0 |

New England Grand Prix

| Player | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & \text { IT } \\ & \text { Ũ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { む } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \pi \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \mathbb{Z} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{Q}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { ※犬 } \\ & \text { た } \\ & \text { గ్ } \end{aligned}$ | 끈 | ＊ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R llett | $41 / 2$ | 3 | $21 / 2$ | $21 / 2$ | 5 | 171／2 | 166 |
| P Spencer | $41 / 2$ | 3 | 4 |  | 3112 | 15 | 144 |
| J Sadler | 5 | $31 / 2$ | 2 | 0 | 4 | 141／2 | 126 |
| M Tarabad | 3112 | $51 / 2$ |  | 0 | $51 / 2$ | 141／2 | 110 |
| P Hanks | 6 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 162 |
| C Russell | $31 / 2$ |  | 6 | 0 | 2 | 111／2 | 118 |
| P Walker | 4 | 5 | 1 |  |  | 10 | 169 |
| P Weinberger | 3 | 1 | 2 |  | 3 | 9 | 100 |
| P Turp | $31 / 2$ |  | 2 | 0 | 3 | 81／2 | 133 |
| E Knox | 4 |  | 1 |  | $21 / 2$ | 71／2 | 110 |
| S Wozniak | 41／2 |  |  |  | 21⁄2 | 7 | 124 |
| R Jones | 4 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 7 | 111 |
| S Walker | $21 / 2$ |  | 2 |  | 2 | 61／2 | 90 |
| J Dilley |  |  | 5 |  |  | 5 | 202 |
| N Wedley | 2112 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 5 | 94 |
| D Lane | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  | 2 | $41 / 2$ | 91 |
| J Parker | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 73 |
| M Ingram | 1 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 11122 | 3 | 96 |
| T Ingram | 11／2 | 1 |  |  |  | 21／2 | 86 |
| J Sutherland | 11／2 |  |  |  | 1 | 2112 | 96 |
| E Smith | 2 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 61 |
| P O＇Gorman | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 74 |

## Match of the Month

Being a newcomer to the club，I actually knew nothing about Phil＇s style and so did not really know what kind of game to expect．Having looked at a few past Match of the Month articles，it seemed Phil appeared to favour 1 Nf3 and d4，so a combative King＇s Indian Defence would be a possibility．
In the event，the game took a more positional turn． Fritz gives several equivalent continuations from almost every position－a sure sign that there are no tactical pitfalls－and the early part of the game needs little commentary．It is only towards the endgame that the gloves come off．

## P Turp v E Knox

New England Club Championship Rd 7；20．02．2019

| 1 | Nf 3 | $\mathrm{Nf6}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | g 3 | d 6 |
| 3 | d 4 | g 6 |
| 4 | Bg 2 | Bg 7 |
| 5 | $0-0$ | $0-0$ |
| 6 | c 4 | $\mathrm{Nbd7}$ |

7
Nc3
e5
We have reached the Fianchetto Variation of the King＇s Indian Defence．

| 8 | e4 | $\operatorname{Re8}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | d5 |  |

A large number of games on the Fritz database yield this position by various move orders but if you filter for only grandmaster clashes，there are far fewer．One such is Portisch v Kavalek，Tilburg 1979 which went 9 h3 c6 10 Be3 b6 11 Qc2 Ba6 12 b3 exd4 13 Nxd4 Rc8．White eventually won after 52 moves using his domination of the d5 square to prevent d6－d5 and piling pressure on the weak pawn on d6．
The text move 9 d 5 has far－reaching strategic consequences．Normally，the light－squared bishop of the kingside fianchetto aims at c6 and b7 but the central pawn advance blocks the long diagonal． Portisch met Kavalek again and did indeed play d4－d5 but in a position in which Black had played c7－c6 and Bc8－e6 when the thrust forced exchanges to open the position．It will be interesting to see how the game hinges around the restricted scope of the white bishop．

| 9 | $\ldots$ | Nc5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | Qc2 | a5 |
| 11 | Ne1 | c6 |
| 12 | Nd3 | Nxd3 |
| 13 | Qxd3 | Qc7 |
| 14 | Be3 | Ng4 |
| 15 | Rac1 | Nxe3 |
| 16 | Qxe3 |  |

I have＂gained＂the pair of bishops but Fritz gives me no advantage whatsoever．Its assessment is 0.0 ！

| 16 | $\ldots$ | Bf8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 17 | Rc2 | Bd7 |
| 18 | Kh1 | c5 |

In general terms，closing the position negates the long range of the bishop pair．Here，however，there are compensations．I played 18 ．．．c5 because with my queen on the c file and Phil maybe able to double rooks there，I wanted to keep it closed．Also，it helps to block out Phil＇s light squared bishop on the long diagonal．
19
f4
Bh6
20 Qf3
f5

20 ．．．exf4 would create some dangerous mobile pawns e．g． 21 gxf4 f5 22 e5 dxe5 23 d6 Qxd6 24 Rd1 Qc7 25 Qxb7 Qxb7 26 Bxb7 Rad8 27 Rcd2 with awkward threats．

## 21 Rcf2

White seems reluctant to initiate exchanges in the centre with 21 fxe5！？Rxe5 22 Bh3 Rf8 23 Qg2 fxe4 24 Rxf8＋Bxf8 25 Bxd7 Qxd7 26 Nxe4 with level chances．
$\qquad$ exf4
A thought similar to my move 18 occurred here．With Phil＇s queen and both rooks lined up on the f file，I wanted to try and block this．

## 22 <br> gxf4 $\quad \mathrm{Bg} 7$ <br> 23 exf5 <br> Bxf5

Fritz recommends 23 ... Bxc3 24 Qxc3 Bxf5 but it is hardly convincing.

## 24 Qg3

24 Bh3 must definitely be considered. Black's bishops have reached good squares and I control the open file. White should be looking to reduce my forces before a rook can penetrate his position.

## 24

## Bd4

Around this point, Fritz starts to give me an edge equivalent to having won a pawn but it is hard to see how. It must be because White's assault on the kingside has come to a halt whereas I have prospects on the other flank with 25 Rf3 Bxc3 26 Rxc3 Qd7 27 Qf2 b5.

25 Nb5


25

## Bxf2

25 ... Qb6 26 Nxd4 (26 Rd2 Re3 27 Bf3 Rae8) 26 ... cxd4 when Fritz likes my passed pawn and supporting activity.

## 26 Nxc7 <br> Bxg3

After this, I was expecting 27 Nxa8. Taking on e8 felt worse but I agree in hindsight that just taking back on g3 is even better.

## 27 Nxe8?

Natural but 27 hxg3 Rac8 28 Nxe8 Rxe8 29 Rf2 leaves me with only a small initiative.

| 27 | $\ldots$ | Rxe8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | hxg3 | Re2 |

Now I am winning a queenside pawn and have great chances. Not only will I have extra material and an aggressive rook but my bishop will threaten White's queenside pawns.

| 29 | Bf 3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 | Re 1 |

Salvation for White must come from direct action since 30 a3 Rb3 mops up further pawns.

$$
30 \quad \text {... Kf7 }
$$

I could exploit the pawns more forcefully with 30 ... Rb1 31 Rd1 Bc2 32 Rxb1 Bxb1 33 a3 (33 a4 Bc2) 33 ... Bd3.

| 31 | Re 2 | $\mathrm{Rb} 1+$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 32 | Kg 2 | Rc 1 |

32 ... Bd3 would again hit the weakness on c4 and White would have fewer counterchances though 33 Re6 Rb6 34 g4 Bxc4 35 g5 Bxa2 36 f5 would make me work for the point under time pressure.

| $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{R b} 2$ | $\mathbf{R b} 1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{3 4}$ | $\mathbf{R d} 2$ |  |

Strangely, Fritz indicates $34 \operatorname{Re} 2$ as heading for a draw by repetition but 34 ... Bd3 merely transposes into the previous note.

## 34 <br> ... <br> b5

With $34 \ldots$ h5, Black can tie up White by removing any possibilities of g3-g4 but I wasn't really thinking about defence at that point. I was short on time quite early in the endgame, so wasn't able to calculate as much as I would have liked and was playing more on instinct.
35
36
g 4
cxb5
Bd7

There is no alternative because c4 is still indefensible - 36 Be2 bxc4 37 Bxc4 Bxg4 or 36 Rc2 bxc4 37 Rxc4 Rb2+.

| 36 | $\ldots$ | Rxb5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 37 | Kg3 | Rb1 |
| 38 | Kf2 |  |

White might have thoughts of a draw by repetition with 38 Rh2 Kg8 39 Re2 but with 39 ... Rg1+, I force White to block the manoeuvre $40 \mathrm{Kf} 2 / \mathrm{h} 2 / \mathrm{h} 4$ or 40 Bg 2 .

| 38 | $\ldots$ | a4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 39 | Ke3 | Bb5 |
| 40 | Rh2 | Kg7 |
| 41 | f5 | g5 |

White is persistent with his distraction efforts. Perhaps, I should have posed some problems of my own with $41 \ldots$ a3 threatening $42 \ldots$ Rb2.

## 42 f6+

If 42 Rh5, 42 ... Be8 would trap the rook after 43 Rxg5+ Kf8 44 f6 (otherwise 44 ... h6) 44 ... Bg6 45 Be2 (45 Be4 Re1+) 45 ... Kf7 46 Bd3 Rb2 with 47 ... Kxf6 to follow. White would have to concede the tempo with 43 Rh 2 .

| 42 | $\ldots$ | Kxf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 43 | Rh6+ | Kg7 |
| 44 | Rxd6 | Rb2 |
| 45 | Rb6 | c4?? |

"Black is ruining his position" (Fritz). It is galling to be chastised by a computer but White has generated some pressure. I have to cope with $46 \mathrm{Rb} 7+$ and 46 d6 etc and only $45 \ldots$ a3 maintains my advantage.

Rb6+
Ke7
Best play is to allow the perpetual check 47 ... Kf7 48 Rb7+ Kf6 49 Rb6+ Kg7 50 Rb7+ Kf6 but if I can blunder, so can Phil!

```
48 Rb7+??
```

48 d6+ would make the time scramble very interesting viz. 48 ... Kd7 49 Bc6+ Kxd6 50 Rxb5 (50 Bxb5 Kc5) 50 ... Rxa2 51 Be 4 when the game should be drawn.
48
Rh7
Kd6
49 Rxh7?

On either of the next two moves, White needs to activate his bishop with 49 Be 4 .

| 49 | $\ldots$ | Rxa2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 50 | Rh6+ | Kd7 |

50 ... Kc5 would make my queenside pawns virtually unstoppable.

| 51 | Kd4 | a3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 52 | Kc5? |  |

52 Rh7+ Kd8 53 Ra7 makes it hard for me to make progress. A sample try might be 53 ... Rd2+ 54 Kc 5 a 2 55 d6 c3 56 Be4 and I had to be careful to avoid 56 ... Be2 57 Ra8+ Kd7 58 Bf5\#.

```
52
53
    Kxb5??
```

53 Be4 Rb2 54 d6 looks ominous and would give practical chances when we were both down to our last minutes.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
53 & \ldots & \text { c2 } \\
54 & \text { Rc6 } &
\end{array}
$$

I am queening a pawn even after 54 Rh1 Rb2+ 55 Kc4 Rb1.
54
..
Rb2+

## 55 <br> Kc5

The computer can see the checkmates from this point e.g. $55 \mathrm{Ka} 5 \mathrm{a} 256 \mathrm{Rc} 7+$ and $55 \mathrm{Kc} 4 \mathrm{c} 1 \mathrm{Q}+56 \mathrm{Kd} 3$ Rb3+ $57 \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Qe} 3+58 \mathrm{Kf1}$ Qxf3+ $59 \mathrm{Kg} 1 \mathrm{Rb} 1+60$ Kh2 Rh1\#.

$$
55 \quad \text {... } \quad c 1 Q+\quad 0-1
$$

56 Kd4 Qd2+ 57 Ke4 (57 Ke5 Qf4\#; 57 Kc5 Qc3\#; 57 Kc4 Rb4+ 58 Kc5 Qd4\#) 57 ... Qf4+ 58 Kd3 Rd2+ 59 Kc3 Qd4+ 60 Kb3 Rb2+ 61 Kxa3 Qb4\# Ed Knox

## Eye Opener

In 1973, I had high hopes for my schoolmate Tony Miles in the World Junior Championship held in Teeside but despite defeating the Soviet representative Alexander Beliavsky, he had to settle for the silver medal. This was the first time I had heard of the Ukrainian but he went on to have a lengthy career culminating in a quarter-final match against Gary Kasparov in the World Championship. His claims to fame also included being for many years the oldest player in the world's top 100 and as joint holder of the record for defeating undisputed World Champions (nine). Here, he plays an up-and-coming talent who showed great potential...

M Carlsen (2625) v A Beliavsky (2626)
Corus-B, Wijk aan Zee Rd 5; 19.01.2006

| 1 | e4 | e5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Nf3 | Nc6 |
| 3 | Bb5 |  |

The Ruy Lopez is backed by such a fearsome body of theory that I cannot comment on the accuracy of the opening moves! Nevertheless, it still allows space for some creative thought.

| 3 | $\ldots$ | a6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | Ba4 | Nf6 |
| 5 | $0-0$ | b5 |
| 6 | Bb3 | Bb7 |
| 7 | d3 | Bc5 |
| 8 | Nc3 | d6 |
| 9 | a4 | $\mathrm{Na5}$ |

Fritz recommends this continuation slightly above $9 \ldots$ b5. Its opening book has 3 games with the text move scoring 0\% for Black whereas the record for the alternative is $45.5 \%$.

| 10 | $\mathrm{Ba2}$ | $\mathrm{b4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | $\mathrm{Ne2}$ | Bc 8 |
| 12 | c 3 | bxc 3 |
| 13 | bxc 3 | $\mathrm{Bb6}$ |
| 14 | Ng 3 | Be 6 |
| 15 | d 4 | $\mathrm{Bxa2}$ |
| 16 | $\mathrm{Rxa2}$ | $\mathrm{O-0}$ |
| 17 | Bg 5 |  |

So far, it looks fairly harmless except that Black is fairly uncoordinated. If you do not spot White's intention, it is easy to go wrong.


Suddenly, the pressure on $f 6$ is crushing and Magnus accurately adds to it by removing Black's g pawn.

| 18 | $\ldots$ | dxc3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 19 | Nh4 | Kh8 |
| 20 | Nf5 | $1-0$ |

