## 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

$5^{\text {th }}$ June
First Masterclass of the summer
$12^{\text {th }}$ June $\quad$ Team 550 Play-off at home Cavaliers v Cambridge
$12^{\text {th }}$ June Cambridgeshire County Chess Association AGM at Warboys
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 $4^{\text {th }}$ to $14^{\text {th }}$ 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.

| Postponements |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N Wedley (1) | Rd | 4 | R Jones (11/2) |
| P Spencer ( ${ }^{1} 1 / 2$ ) | 0 | 1 | P Turp ( $2^{1 ⁄ 2}$ ) |
| E Knox (3) | 0 | 1 | P Spencer ( $\mathbf{1}^{1} / 2$ ) |
| P Weinberger (3) | Rd | 7 | T Ingram (11⁄2) |
| 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 Ilett (41⁄2) |
| E Knox (4) | 1/2 | 1/2 | J Sadler (Ladder) |
| P Spencer ( $5^{1 / 2}$ ) | 0 | 1 | C Russell ( $311 / 2$ ) |
| P Weinberg'r ( $3+\mathrm{P}$ ) | 0 | 1 | P Turp (41⁄2) |
| $J$ Suth'land ( $11 / 2+\mathrm{P}$ ) | 1 | 0 | E Smith (2) |
| D Lane (1+P) | 0 | 1 | S Walker ( $2^{1 / 2}$ ) |
| J Parker (1) | 0 | 1 | T Ingram (11⁄2+P) |


| Postponements |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N Wedley (1) | Rd | 4 | R Jones (11/2) |
| P Spencer (31⁄2) | 0 | 1 | P Turp ( $\mathbf{2}^{1 / 2}$ ) |
| E Knox (3) | 0 | 1 | P Spencer ( $3^{112}$ ) |
| P Weinberger (3) | Rd | 7 | T Ingram (11⁄2) |
| 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 (41⁄2) |
| E Knox (4) | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | J Sadler (Ladder) |
| P Spencer ( $51 / 2$ ) | 0 | 1 | C Russell ( $\mathbf{3}^{1 / 2}$ ) |
| P Weinberg'r (3+P) | 0 | 1 | P Turp (41/2) |
| $J$ Suth'land ( $11 / 2+P$ ) | 1 | 0 | E Smith (2) |
| D Lane (1+P) | 0 | 1 | S Walker ( $2^{1 / 2}$ ) |
| J Parker (1) | 0 | 1 | T Ingram ( $11 / 2+\mathrm{P}$ ) |

Rapidplay : $15^{\text {th }}$ May 2019

| is | Player | Round |  |  |  | 历్ర |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| 1 | E Knox | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | $31 / 2$ |
| $2=$ | C Russell | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 21/2 |
|  | 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 |
|  | 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
Result Round-up
Fenland Plate - Final

| St Neots | $\mathbf{2 1} / 2$ | NE Patriots | $\mathbf{1 1} / \mathbf{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 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 |


| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline E_{i} \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Player | Round |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| 1 | P Hanks | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 61/2 |
| 2 | J Sadler | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 51/2 |
|  | P Spencer | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | $51 / 2$ |
|  | P Turp | 1/2 | 1 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $51 / 2$ |
|  | R llett | 1 | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 51⁄2 |
| 6 | C Russell | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 41122 |
|  | S Wozniak | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | $41 / 2$ |
|  | E Knox | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | $41 / 2$ |
| 9 | R Jones | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 | P | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| 10 | M Tarabad | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3112 |
| 11 | S Walker | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 3112 |
| 12 | P Weinberger | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | P | 0 | 3 |
| 13 | T Ingram | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | P | 1 | $21 / 2$ |
| 14 | N Wedley | 1 | 0 | 0 | P | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 2112 |
| 15 | J Sutherland | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 0 | P | 0 | 1 | 2112 |
| 16 | E Smith | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 17 | J Parker | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 0 | 1 |
| 18 | D Lane | 0 | 1 | 0 | P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 19 | P Walker | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | - | - | 4 |
| 20 | P O'Gorman | 0 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |

New England Club Ladder

| M Tarabad |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | D Lane |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N Foreman |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | E Smith |
|  | Change |  | Player |  | Record @ 29/05/19 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 들 } \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ | \} |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | - | +2 | P Walker |  | 1/2, 1, 1/2, 1, 0, 1, 1 |  |
| 2 | - | +10 | P Weinberger |  | 0,1 |  |
| 3 | - | +10 | J Sadler |  | 0,1,1,1,1/2,1/2 |  |
| 4 | - | -2 | J Parker |  | 0,0,1,1,0 |  |
| 5 | - | +1 | M Tarabad |  | 1,0,1,1,1,1,0,0,1/2,1/2 |  |
| 6 | - | +4 | N Wedley |  | 0,1,0,0 |  |
| 7 | - | +4 | E Smith |  | 0,0,0,0,1/2 |  |
| 8 | +3 | +1 | D Lane |  | 0,1,0,0,0,1/2 |  |
| 9 | -1 | -8 | P Spencer |  | 1,1/2, $1 / 2,1$ |  |
| 10 | -1 | -2 | R llett |  | 1,1,1 |  |
| 11 | +3 | +3 | N Foreman |  | 1/2 |  |
| 12 | -2 | -8 | T Ingram |  | 0,1 |  |
| 13 | -1 | -8 | P Hanks |  | 0 |  |
| 14 | -1 | -7 | P O'Gorman |  | 0 |  |

Problem Night : $8^{\text {th }}$ May 2019

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

New England Grand Prix

| Player | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{Q}{E} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{J}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { o } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbb{O}$ <br> $\mathscr{Z}$ <br> $\pm$ | $\underset{\substack{0}}{2}$ |  | 뀬 | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R llett | 51⁄2 | 3 | $21 / 2$ | $21 / 2$ | 5 | 181/2 | 165 |
| P Spencer | $51 / 2$ | 3 | 4 |  | $31 / 2$ | 16 | 140 |
| J Sadler | 51/2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 151/2 | 126 |
| M Tarabad | $31 / 2$ | 6 |  | 0 | $51 / 2$ | 15 | 109 |
| C Russell | $41 / 2$ |  | 6 | 1 | 2 | 131/2 | 123 |
| P Hanks | $61 / 2$ | 0 | 2 | $31 / 2$ | 1 | 13 | 159 |
| P Turp | 51/2 |  | 2 | 0 | 3 | 101/2 | 137 |
| P Walker | 4 | 5 | 1 |  |  | 10 | 169 |
| P Weinberger | 3 | 1 | 2 |  | 3 | 9 | 99 |
| E Knox | $41 / 2$ |  | 1 |  | 21/2 | 8 | 108 |
| S Walker | $31 / 2$ |  | 2 |  | 2 | 71/2 | 94 |
| R Jones | 4 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 7 | 112 |
| S Wozniak | 4112 |  |  |  | 21/2 | 7 | 124 |
| J Dilley |  |  | 5 |  |  | 5 | 202 |
| N Wedley | 21⁄2 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 5 | 94 |
| D Lane | 1 | $11 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ |  | 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 |  |  | $1 / 2$ | $11 / 2$ | 3 | 94 |
| E Smith | 2 | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 0 | 21/2 | 60 |
| P O'Gorman | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 74 |
| N Foreman |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ | 80 |

## 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 | $P$ | W | D | $L$ | ¢ | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peterborough B | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 171/2 | 10 |
| New England B | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 161/2 | 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 $21 / 2-1 \frac{1}{2}$, 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

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
1 & d 4 \\
2 & B f 4
\end{array}
$$

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

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 c 4 , Black can try $4 \ldots$ Bxb1 5 Rxb1 Bb4+ 6 Ke 2.

| 3 | e3 | Nf6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 | Nc 3 | e6 |
| 5 | $\mathrm{~g} 4!$ |  |

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.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
5 & \ldots & \text { Bb4 } \\
6 & B d 3 & \text { a6 }
\end{array}
$$

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

## Ba5

Surprisingly, Fritz prefers 7 ... 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 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 9 | Nf3 |

I could remove some complications with 9 g 5 Nd 7 .
h6
Can Black now nab the pawn with $9 \ldots$ Nxg4? The most forceful rebuff is 10 Rg 1 f 511 h 3 Nf 6 . The obvious 12 Rxg7 is what I intended but it leads to some very strange variations after $12 \ldots$ Nh5. If I want to preserve my dark-squared bishop by 13 Bg 5 Qd 6 , who in their right mind would even contemplate Fritz's wild suggestion of 14 Rf7?

- $14 \ldots$ 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+
- $19 \ldots \mathrm{Kd} 6 ? ? 20 \mathrm{Bf} 4$
- 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 Na 4 when it assesses the position as level.

| 10 | Ne5 | Nxe5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | Bxe5 | $0-0$ |

Now I have a target whereas $11 \ldots$ Bd7 would have kept me guessing a little longer.


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 g 5 as an alternative due to :-

- $12 \ldots \mathrm{Nd} 7$ when I have an attack and extra material 13 gxh6 Nxe5 (13 ... gxh6 $14 \mathrm{Rg} 1+$ ) 14 dxe5 Qh4 (14 ... gxh6 $15 \mathrm{Rg} 1+\mathrm{Kh} 816$ Qh5) 15 hxg7 Rd8 (15. .. Kxg7 16 Rg1+ Kh8 17 Qf3)
- $12 \ldots$ 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 f 6 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

...

## Bd7

$12 \ldots \mathrm{Nd} 7$ might disrupt the attacking forces before they do too much damage 13 g 5 Nxe5 $14 \mathrm{dxe5} \mathrm{~d} 4$.

## 13 <br> g5 <br> Ne4

After $13 \ldots$ hxg5 14 hxg 5 , 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 | Qg4+ |  |

It is all over either way e.g. $17 \mathrm{Rg} 1+\mathrm{Kh} 8$ (17 ... Kf7 18 Qh5+ Ke7 19 Rg7+) 18 Qh5 etc.

$$
17 \text {... Kf7 }
$$

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 $20 \ldots$ Ke8 (20 ... Kd6 21 Qg3+ e5 22 Qxe5\#) 21 Qg8+ Rf8 22 Bg6\#.
The match did indeed finish $21 / 2-11 / 2$ but Spalding were unable to score the whitewash needed to tie. We are champions!

Stere 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 | d 4 | $\mathrm{Nf6}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Bf 4 | d 5 |
| 3 | e 3 | e 6 |
| 4 | Nd 2 | $\mathrm{c5}$ |
| 5 | c 3 | $\mathrm{Nc6}$ |
| 6 | $\mathrm{Ngf3}$ | $\mathrm{Bd6}$ |
| 7 | Bg 3 | $\mathrm{O-0}$ |
| 8 | Bd 3 |  |

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.


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

| 10 | $\ldots$ | 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 $15 \ldots$ 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
Qxe
Ne7
22 Qxe7
and White went on to win on move 31.

