New Englander

Chess Club Update – June 2019

Chairman's Chatter & AGM Summary

No change was the order of the day at the AGM :-

- Subscriptions stay at £28 p.a. (£23 for OAPs)
- The Committee was re-elected en bloc
- CCCA teams, the Club Championship and Ladder competition will run as last season
- Please contact Paul Spencer to join the internet correspondence team on chess.com
- Open evenings will be held including a Peterborough championship.

Paul Hanks

Diary Dates

5 th June	First Masterclass of the summer				
12 th June	Team 550 Play-off v Cambridge	at home Ca	avaliers		
12 th June	Cambridgeshire Association AGM a		Chess		

Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2



Last Month's solution (Meinartz 1933) Position : 8/8/8/3p4/RKpk4/8/4Q3/8 **1 Ra1 c3 2 Rd1#**

Website to Watch

For classical chess by the elite grandmasters, the Altibox tournament in Stavanger Norway from 4th to 14th June is hard to beat. It advertises 10 participants in the world's top 13 and the event can be followed at https://norwaychess.no/en.

Result Round-up

Fenland Plate - Final

St Neots	2 ½	NE Patriots	1½
P Brown	1	R llett	0
C Emery	1⁄2	P Hanks	1⁄2
P Barkas	0	C Russell	1
K Holditch	1	M Ingram	0

Rapidplay : 15th May 2019

"S	Player		Total			
So Player		1	2	3	4	70
1	E Knox	1	1⁄2	1	1	31⁄2
	C Russell	0	1	1⁄2	1	21⁄2
2=	M Tarabad	1	0	1⁄2	1	21⁄2
	J Sadler	1	1⁄2	1	0	21⁄2
5=	P Hanks	1	1	0	0	2
<u>э</u> –	D Lane	0	1	0	1	2
7	N Foreman	0	0	1	0	1
8	B Sadler	0	0	0	0	0

Club Championship

Postponements						
N Wedley (1)	Rd	4	R Jones (1½)			
P Spencer (3 ¹ / ₂)	0	1	P Turp (21⁄2)			
E Knox (3)	0	1	P Spencer (3 ¹ / ₂)			
P Weinberger (3)	Rd	7	T Ingram (1½)			

Redraw								
D Lane (Rd 4)			J Sutherland (Rd 6)					
Round 8								
J Sadler (5)	1/2	1/2	P Hanks (6)					
R Jones (4+P)	0	1	R llett (4½)					
E Knox (4)	1/2	1/2	J Sadler (Ladder)					
P Spencer (5 ¹ / ₂)	0	1	C Russell (3 ¹ / ₂)					
P Weinberg'r (3+P)	0	1	P Turp (4½)					
J Suth'land (1½+P)	1	0	E Smith (2)					
D Lane (1+P)	0	1	S Walker (21/2)					
J Parker (1)	0	1	T Ingram (1½+P)					

Website : <u>www.newenglandchess.org.uk</u>

Hanl Sadle		1	2	3						Total
adle		41		3	4	5	6	7	8	
		1⁄2	1	1	1	1⁄2	1	1	1⁄2	61⁄2
Sper	er	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1⁄2	5½
	ncer	1	1	1	1⁄2	0	1	1	0	5½
Turp		1⁄2	1	1⁄2	1⁄2	1	1	0	1	5½
lett		1	1⁄2	1⁄2	1⁄2	0	1	1	1	5½
Ruse	sell	1⁄2	1⁄2	1	1⁄2	0	1	0	1	41⁄2
Noz	niak	1	1⁄2	0	1⁄2	1	0	1⁄2	1	41⁄2
۲no	(0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1⁄2	41⁄2
Jone	s	1⁄2	0	1	Ρ	1⁄2	1	1	0	4
Tara	lbad	1⁄2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	31⁄2
Valk	ker	1⁄2	1⁄2	1⁄2	0	0	1⁄2	1⁄2	1	31⁄2
Veir	nberger	0	1	1	1	0	0	Ρ	0	3
ngram		1	0	1⁄2	0	0	0	Ρ	1	21⁄2
l Wedley		1	0	0	Р	0	0	1⁄2	1	21⁄2
Suthe	utherland		0	0	1⁄2	0	Ρ	0	1	21⁄2
Smit	h 0		0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Parke	er 0		0	0	0	0	1⁄2	1⁄2	0	1
ane	9	0	1	0	Ρ	0	0	0	0	1
Valk	ker	1	1	1	0	1	-	-	-	4
)'Go	orman	0	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
ngla	nd Club Lac	dde	<u>r</u>							
aba	d	1/2	2	1⁄2	DI	Lan	e			
ema	n	1/2	2	1⁄2	E	Sm	ith			
ange										
Overall	Player	Record @ 29/05/19								
+2	P Walker		1/:	ź,1,	½,1	,0,	1,1			
+10	P Weinberg	erger		,1						
+10	J Sadler			,1,1	,1,1	1/2,1/	2			
-2	J Parker		0	,0,1	,1,0	0				
+1	M Tarabad		1	,0,1	,1, ⁻	1,1,	0,0	,½,	1⁄2	
+4	N Wedley		0	,1,0	0,0					
	Voz (no) Jone Tara Valk Veir ngra Ved Sutho Sutho Sutho Sanit Parko	Wozniak Knox Jones Tarabad Walker Weinberger ngram Wedley Sutherland Smith Parker Jores Walker O'Gorman ngland Club Lad abad eman Image Player +10 P Walker +10 J Sadler +10 J Parker +10 J Parker +11 M Tarabad	Wozniak 1 Knox 0 Jones 1/2 Tarabad 1/2 Walker 1/2 Weinberger 0 Ngram 1 Wedley 1 Sutherland 1 Sutherland 1 Sutherland 1 Sutherland 1 Orderane 0 Valker 1 O'Gorman 0 ngland Club Ladde 1/2 ange Player ange Player +2 P Walker +10 P Sadler +10 J Sadler -2 J Parker +1 M Tarabad	Nozniak 1 1/2 Knox 0 0 Jones 1/2 0 Jones 1/2 0 Valker 1/2 0 Walker 1/2 1 Neinberger 0 1 Ngram 1 0 Weinberger 0 1 Nedley 1 0 Sutherland 1 0 Sutherland 1 0 Parker 0 0 Parker 0 1 O'Gorman 0 1 Nalker 1/2 1 D'Gorman 0 1 ngland Club Ladder 1/2 aman 1/2 1 aman 1/2 1	Nozniak 1 ½ 0 Knox 0 0 1 Jones ½ 0 1 Jones ½ 0 1 Janes ½ 0 1 Janes ½ ½ ½ Valker ½ ½ ½ Weinberger 0 1 1 ngram 1 0 ½ Weinberger 0 1 1 Nedley 1 0 0 Sutherland 1 0 0 Smith 0 0 1 Parker 0 1 1 O'Gorman 0 1 1 O'Gorman 1½ ½ amar ½ ½<	Nozniak 1 $1/2$ 0 $1/2$ Knox 0 0 1 1 Jones $1/2$ 0 1 P Tarabad $1/2$ 0 0 1 P Walker $1/2$ $1/2$ $1/2$ $0/2$ $1/2$ Weinberger 0 1 1 1 1 ngram 1 0 $1/2$ $0/2$ $0/2$ Sutherland 1 0 $0/2$ $0/2$ $0/2$ Smith 0 0 1 $0/2$ $0/2$ $0/2$ Smith 0 1 1 $0/2$ $0/2$ $0/2$ Smith 0 1 $1/2$ $0/2$ $0/2$ $0/2$ D'Gorman $0/2$ $1/2$ $1/2$ $1/2$ $0/2$ <td>Nozniak 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ 1 Knox 0 0 1 1 1 1 Jones $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 1 P $\frac{1}{2}$ Tarabad $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 1 P $\frac{1}{2}$ Tarabad $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ Walker $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ Neinberger 0 1 1 1 $\frac{0}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ Weinberger 1 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ Sutherland 1 0 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ Smith 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 O'Gorman 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 D'Gorman $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ 1</td> <td>Nozniak 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ 1 0 Knox 0 0 1 1 1 0 Jones $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 1 P $\frac{1}{2}$ 1 Tarabad $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 0 1 P $\frac{1}{2}$ 1 Walker $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{$</td> <td>Nozniak 1 1/2 0 1/2 1 0 1/2 Knox 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 Jones 1/2 0 1 P 1/2 1 1 Tarabad 1/2 0 0 1 0 1 1 Walker 1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2 0 0 1/2 1/2 Weinberger 0 1 1 1 0 0 P 0 0 P Nedley 1 0 0 1/2 0 0 1/2 0 P Sutherland 1 0 0 1/2 0 P 0 0 Sutherland 1 0 0 1 0 1 0</td> <td>Nozniak 1 1/2 0 1/2 1 0 1/2 1 Knox 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 1/2 Jones 1/2 0 1 P 1/2 1 0 1 1 0 Tarabad 1/2 0 0 1 0 1 1 0 Nalker 1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2 0 0 1/2 1 1 0 Nalker 1/2 1/2 1/2 0 0 1/2 1 1 0 0 P 0 1 1 1 0 0 P 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0</td>	Nozniak 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ 1 Knox 0 0 1 1 1 1 Jones $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 1 P $\frac{1}{2}$ Tarabad $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 1 P $\frac{1}{2}$ Tarabad $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ Walker $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ Neinberger 0 1 1 1 $\frac{0}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ Weinberger 1 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ Sutherland 1 0 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ $\frac{0}{2}$ Smith 0 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 O'Gorman 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 D'Gorman $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ 1	Nozniak 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ 1 0 Knox 0 0 1 1 1 0 Jones $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 1 P $\frac{1}{2}$ 1 Tarabad $\frac{1}{2}$ 0 0 1 P $\frac{1}{2}$ 1 Walker $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{$	Nozniak 1 1/2 0 1/2 1 0 1/2 Knox 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 Jones 1/2 0 1 P 1/2 1 1 Tarabad 1/2 0 0 1 0 1 1 Walker 1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2 0 0 1/2 1/2 Weinberger 0 1 1 1 0 0 P 0 0 P Nedley 1 0 0 1/2 0 0 1/2 0 P Sutherland 1 0 0 1/2 0 P 0 0 Sutherland 1 0 0 1 0 1 0	Nozniak 1 1/2 0 1/2 1 0 1/2 1 Knox 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 1/2 Jones 1/2 0 1 P 1/2 1 0 1 1 0 Tarabad 1/2 0 0 1 0 1 1 0 Nalker 1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2 0 0 1/2 1 1 0 Nalker 1/2 1/2 1/2 0 0 1/2 1 1 0 0 P 0 1 1 1 0 0 P 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0

0,0,0,0,1/2

1,1/2,1/2,1

1,1,1

1⁄2

0,1

0

0

0,1,0,0,0,1/2

7

8

9 -1

10 -1

11

12

13 -1

14 -1

-

+4 E Smith

-8 P Spencer

+3 +1 D Lane

-2 R llett

+3 +3 N Foreman

-8 P Hanks

-7 P O'Gorman

-2 -8 T Ingram

Problem Night : 8th May 2019

Team	Rd 1	Rd 2	Total
Chris & Ed	24	8	32
Paul S & Mahmoud	10	8	18

New England Grand Prix

Player	Champ	Ladder	League	Cup	550 Team	Total	TPR*
R llett	5½	3	21⁄2	21⁄2	5	18½	165
P Spencer	5½	3	4		31⁄2	16	140
J Sadler	5½	4	2	0	4	15½	126
M Tarabad	31⁄2	6		0	5½	15	109
C Russell	4½		6	1	2	13½	123
P Hanks	6½	0	2	31⁄2	1	13	159
P Turp	5½		2	0	3	10½	137
P Walker	4	5	1			10	169
P Weinberger	3	1	2		3	9	99
E Knox	4½		1		21⁄2	8	108
S Walker	31⁄2		2		2	7½	94
R Jones	4		2		1	7	112
S Wozniak	4½				21⁄2	7	124
J Dilley			5			5	202
N Wedley	21⁄2	1		1/2	1	5	94
D Lane	1	1½	1/2		2	5	89
J Parker	1	2			1	4	70
J Sutherland	21⁄2				1	31⁄2	100
T Ingram	21/2	1				31⁄2	93
M Ingram	1			1/2	1½	3	94
E Smith	2	1⁄2			0	21/2	60
P O'Gorman	1	0				1	74
N Foreman	Deting	1⁄2				1/2	80

* Tournament Performance Rating is approximate

Match of the Month

Picture this. With one round of matches to go, the standings at the head of the Cambridgeshire Division Two were :-

Division 2	Р	w	D	L	Games	Pts
Peterborough B	8	4	2	2	17½	10
New England B	7	4	1	2	16½	9
Spalding	7	4	1	2	15	9

and the final matches were against the lower teams. TV pundits would pontificate endlessly over the

possible scenarios but the situation was really quite simple. Against St Neots B, 2-2 or worse would allow Spalding to leapfrog to the top of the league. 3-1 or better and we should be champions but after $2\frac{1}{2}-1\frac{1}{2}$, keep your fingers crossed. So a good result was essential – no pressure then!

S Walker v S Westwood

New England B v St Neots B, Bd 4; 17.04.2019

1 d4

2 Bf4

...

The London System has various move orders and transposition back to a classical Queen's Gambit is still a possibility. It is a favourite of Gata Kamsky who used it to win the World Open with 1 d4 Nf6 2 Nf3 e6 3 Bf4 b6 4 e3 Bb7 5 h3 c5 6 c3 (Kamsky v Adams, Philadelphia 2011).

2

Nc6

d5

This is an aggressive response which does not seem strategically justified. Black often has to find a counter in the centre and c7-c5 is the natural attempt. Having blocked this option, however, the knight move would instead support e7-e5 which is both riskier and exactly what my second move aims to prevent.

Seeing what I considered to be a substandard move appear so early put me in a confident – even ambitious – frame of mind for the rest of the game.

One high-level encounter continued symmetrically with 2 ... Bf5 3 e3 e6 (Carlsen v Giri, Bilbao 2016) but Magnus only needed a draw to win the tournament (though he won from a roughly level position). A point to note here is that after 4 c4, Black can try 4 ... Bxb1 5 Rxb1 Bb4+ 6 Ke2.

3	e3	Nf6
4	Nc3	e6
5	g4!	

Grabbing space on the flanks is a modern trend in the opening and with the position in the centre being fairly stable, White cannot be easily punished for neglecting his development temporarily. Besides, if Black does not react correctly, I will get a kingside attack. This is just the sort of move required in such an uncompromising situation.

I also considered exploiting the weakness of c7 and doubling his pawns with 5 Nb5 Bd6 (forced) 6 Nxd6 cxd6 with the bishop pair. I rejected it as it opens the c file and facilitates the desired pawn advance to e5.

5		Bb4
6	Bd3	a6

With g4-g5 imminent, Black could move his knight from danger with 6 ... Ne4 7 Nge2 (7 *Bxe4 Bxc3*+ 8 *bxc3 dxe4*) 7 ... e5 8 dxe5 Bxg4 9 Bxe4 dxe4 10 Rg1.

7 a3 Ba5

Surprisingly, Fritz prefers 7 \dots Bxc3+ for Black but after 8 bxc3 0–0 9 g5 Ne4 10 Qh5, with the bishop pair, White's position is much easier to play.

8	b4	Bb6
9	Nf3	

I could remove some complications with 9 g5 Nd7.

9 h6	h6
------	----

Can Black now nab the pawn with 9 ... Nxg4? The most forceful rebuff is 10 Rg1 f5 11 h3 Nf6. The obvious 12 Rxg7 is what I intended but it leads to some very strange variations after 12 ... Nh5. If I want to preserve my dark-squared bishop by 13 Bg5 Qd6, who in their right mind would even contemplate Fritz's wild suggestion of 14 Rf7?

- 14 ... h6 15 Bf6 Kxf7 (15 ... Nxf6 16 Rxf6) 16 Bxh8 Ng7
- 14 ... Kxf7 15 Ne5+ Kf8 16 Qxh5 Nxe5 17 dxe5 Qxe5 18 Bh6+ Ke7 19 Bg5+
 - 19 ... Kd6?? 20 Bf4
 - 19 ... Kd7 20 Qf7+ Kc6 (20 ... Kd6 21 Qe7+ Kc6 22 b5+ axb5 23 Bxb5#) 21 b5+ axb5 22 Bxb5+ Kc5 23 Be7+ Qd6 24 Qf6
 - 19 ... Kf8 with a draw by perpetual check. Not what the match required!

As a result, Fritz prefers 12 Na4 when it assesses the position as level.

 10
 Ne5
 Nxe5

 11
 Bxe5
 0-0

Now I have a target whereas	11	Bd7	would	have
kept me guessing a little longer	r.			



12 h4!

Here Fritz and I disagree over punctuation. The software may give this move as !? (i.e. worthy of attention) because it approves of the soundness of my move but marginally recommends 12 g5 as an alternative due to :-

- 12 ... Nd7 when I have an attack and extra material 13 gxh6 Nxe5 (13 ... gxh6 14 Rg1+) 14 dxe5 Qh4 (14 ... gxh6 15 Rg1+ Kh8 16 Qh5) 15 hxg7 Rd8 (15. .. Kxg7 16 Rg1+ Kh8 17 Qf3)
- 12 ... hxg5 13 h4 g4 (13 ... gxh4 14 Rxh4 Re8 15 Qf3; 13 ... Ne4 14 Bxe4 dxe4 15 Qh5

g4 16 Nxe4) 14 h5. I have invested a pawn but Black cannot maintain the knight at f6 with h5-h6 in the offing so Qd1xg4 will recover the material with an ongoing initiative.

A computer, however, cannot know in the background the importance of the match. Fritz (and other software based on similar technology) favour small but certain advantages rather than an overwhelming position against all but extremely precise play by my opponent. I am sure my move would be played by AlphaZero with its positive, attacking "artificial intelligence".

12...Bd712...Nd7 might disrupt the attacking forces beforethey do too much damage 13 g5 Nxe5 14 dxe5 d4.

13 g5 Ne4

After 13 ... hxg5 14 hxg5, the computer is already flashing up checkmate signs in its forward analysis.

14	Nxe4	dxe4
15	Bxe4	f6

15 ... Bc6 16 Bxc6 bxc6 17 Qh5 is no better for Black.

16	gxf6	gxf6
17	Qq4+	-

It is all over either way e.g. 17 Rg1+ Kh8 (17 ... Kf7 18 Qh5+ Ke7 19 Rg7+) 18 Qh5 etc.

17 ... Kf7

Or 17 ... Kh8 18 Qg6 Qe7 19 Qxh6+ Kg8 20 Rg1+ Qg7 (20 ... Kf7 21 Qg6#) 21 Rxg7#.

18	Qg6+	Ke7
19	Qg7+	Rf7
20	Bxf6+	1–0

Black honourably avoids his fate 20 ... Ke8 (20 ... Kd6 21 Qg3+ e5 22 Qxe5#) 21 Qg8+ Rf8 22 Bg6#.

The match did indeed finish $2\frac{1}{2}-1\frac{1}{2}$ but Spalding were unable to score the whitewash needed to tie. We are champions!

Steve Walker

Eye Opener

Everything is relative, so they say. At grandmaster level, the advantage that would be expected from your opponent falling for a trap is far less than in club play.

G Kamsky (2709) v S Shankland (2611			
Sturbridge 2014			
1	d4	Nf6	
2	Bf4	d5	
3	e3	e6	
4	Nd2	c5	
5	c3	Nc6	
6	Ngf3	Bd6	
7	Bg3	0—0	
8	Bd3		

Part of the rationale behind the London System is that White's light-squared bishop can nestle comfortably on d3 with threats on the b1-h7 diagonal. If Black counters defensively with a kingside fianchetto, the dark-squared bishop on g7 runs into the solid pawn phalanx on d4, c3 and e3.

8		Qe7
9	Ne5	Nd7
10	Nxd7	



So here it is. Writing in *Informator*, Indian grandmaster Harikrishna numbers this position among his "tricks and traps" because 10 ... Qxd7 is the correct move for reasons that are not obvious even in a few moves.

10		Bxd7
11	Bxd6	Qxd6
12	dxc5	Qxc5
13	Bxh7+	Kxh7

Black cannot decline. 13 ... Kh8 14 Qh5 Rfd8 15 Ne4

- 15 ... dxe4 16 Qxc5 Kxh7
- 15 ... Qb6 16 Nf6 gxf6 (16 ... g6 17 Qh6 & 18 Bxg6#) 17 Bg6+ Kg8 18 Qh7+ Kf8 19 Qxf7#
- 15 ... Qe7 16 Bg6+ Kg8 17 Qh7+ Kf8 18 Qh8#

14	Qh5+	Kg8
15	Ne4	Qc4

The unguarded bishop on d7 prevents 15 ... g6 16 Nxc5 gxh5 17 Nxd7 Rfd8 18 Nf6+ Kg7 19 Nxh5+. The point!

16	Ng5	Rfd8
17	Qxf7+	Kh8
18	Qh5+	Kg8
19	Rd1	e5

A grandmaster assessment would show Black's powerlessness is not worth the material advantage e.g. 19 ... Be8 20 Qh7+ Kf8 21 Qh8+ Ke7 22 Qxg7+ Kd6 23 b3 Qh4 24 g3 Qg4 25 f3 Qf5 26 Ne4+. One idea is simply f2-f4 and Rh1-f1-f3-h3 etc.

20	Qf7+	Kh8
21	e4	

Black can still defend after 21 Rxd5? Qh4.

21		Ne7
22	Qxe7	

and White went on to win on move 31.