## New Englander

## Chess Club Update - June 2024

## Chairman's Chatter

The end of another playing season is here and we can look back with great satisfaction. The club retained the Cambridgeshire Division 1 title and decisively won the inaugural Team 4000 league. Congratulations to both the captains for an excellent job done and the squads on their success.
Just as important, however, is the level of participation and commitment shown in Division 2 and Team 7000 competitions. The respective captains have not found team selection as easy during the year but their efforts ensured we involved the full membership, completed our league obligations without defaults and performed competitively. My thanks to all.

In the internal events, it is most gratifying to see so many names in the winners' enclosure :-

| Event | Winner | Runner-up |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Club Champion | R llett | P Hanks |
| Club Challenger | A Neville |  <br> J Jennings |
| Ladder | P Walker | R llett |
| Grand Prix | P Walker | N Chedd |
| Rapidplay | P Walker | 3-way tie |
| Lightning | P Walker | P Spencer |
| Christmas Special | P Walker | 5-way tie |
| Handicap | I Goodwin |  <br> C Russell |

With a finishing burst, Ray took the Champion's section of the club championship and must be used to the plaudits. Not so for newcomer Andy who likewise saved his best until last in the Challenger's group final. Peter has been the most regular player and is worthily rewarded with most of the other titles. After a break, the Handicap competition returned with Isaac defying the ratings to come out on top. Congratulations!
Paul Hanks

## AGM Summary

Ten members attended the AGM on $15^{\text {th }}$ May 2024 with one joining online. The main points were :-

- The Yard of Ale is happy to welcome us again without increasing the price for room hire
- Five new clocks are being acquired under an ECF discount scheme
- The club made a small surplus and with a balance of around $£ 300$ in the bank account, is in a financially healthy state. As a result, there is no need to increase subscriptions
- Teams fared well in the Cambridgeshire league competitions. The A team retained the Division 1 title whilst the B team encouraged wide participation and still achieved a $50 \%$ record. In the Team 7000 event, the squad were competitive but lost out as innocent bystanders when winners St Ives had the benefit of a late match default. The club topped the inaugural Team 4000 league (North) and went to win the play-off 3-0 against St Ives
- All the usual internal events were completed as listed previously
- No changes for next season were made to the committee officers and captains, league entries or the programme of internal competitions. Jamie Sutherland volunteered to increase the club profile through media postings.


## Puzzle Problem

White to play and mate in 2.


Last Month's solution (Grin 1985)
Position: 6K1/8/8/5P2/8/1Q6/1P1N4/kb6
1 Qc3 Ba2+ 2 b3\# [1 ... other 2 Qa3\#]
Diary Dates

| $18^{\text {th }}$ June | AGM of the Cambridgeshire County <br> Chess Association at Ivy Leaf Club, St |
| :--- | :--- |
| $4^{\text {th }}$ September | Ives from 7-30pm |
| Start of next season (to be confirmed) |  |

## Website to Watch

The Grand Chess Tour continues with a classical tournament in Bucharest, Romania from $25^{\text {th }}$ June to $5^{\text {th }}$ July. The ten-player round-robin event features nine top grandmasters (Caruana, Nepomniachtchi, So, Gukesh et al.) and local hopeful Deac. Details can be found here. Action will be available via the St Louis Chess Club channels on Twitch and YouTube.

## Result Round-up

Team 4000 play-off final

| NE Cavaliers | $\mathbf{3}$ | St Ives | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| J Sutherland | 1 | J Canamares | 0 |
| J Jennings | 1 | K Walachnia | 0 |
| D Dhokia | 1 | M Tataran | 0 |

Club Championship

| White | Postponed |  | Black |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| N Chedd | 1 | 0 | E Knox |
| P Spencer | 0 | 1 | P Hanks |
| P Hanks | 1 | 0 | N Chedd |
| E Knox | $1 / 2$ | $1 / 2$ | P Walker |
| J Jennings | $1 d$ | Od | I Goodwin |


| Champions League | $R$ | $\begin{aligned} & P \\ & \boldsymbol{H} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & C \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline P \\ & S \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline P \\ W \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline B \\ S \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline E \\ K \end{array}$ | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R llett | X | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1/2 | 5 |
| P Hanks | $1 / 2$ | X | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | $41 / 2$ |
| N Chedd | 0 | 0 | X | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| P Spencer | 0 | 0 | 0 | X | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | $21 / 2$ |
| P Walker | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | X | 0 | 1/2 | 2 |
| B Stephens | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | X | 1/2 | $11 / 2$ |
| E Knox | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1/2 | X | $11 / 2$ |


| Challengers | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline A \\ N \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline D \\ D \end{array}$ | J | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & W \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline S \\ R \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1 \\ & G \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline C \\ & R \end{aligned}$ | Pts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A Neville | X | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| D Dhokia | 0 | X | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $31 / 2$ |
| $J$ Jennings | 1 | 1 | X | 1/2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $31 / 2$ |
| N Wedley | 0 | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | X | 1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 3 |
| S Reid | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | X | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| I Goodwin | 0 | 0 | 0 d | 1/2 | 1 | X | 1/2 | 2 |
| C Russell | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | X | 2 |

Online Problem Night : $22^{\text {nd }}$ May 2024

| Team | Rd 1 | Rd 2 | Tot | Pts/person |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chris, Dak, Jim | 16 | 10 | 26 | 8.7 |
| John, Phil | 16 | 5 | 21 | 10.5 |
| Andy, Ed | 15 | 5 | 20 | 10 |

New England Club Ladder

| I2000 |  | nge | Player | Record @ End of season |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | +1 | - | P Walker | 1,1,1,1,1,0,1,1 |
| 2 | -1 | +6 | R llett | 0,1 |
| 3 | +6 | +9 | D Dhokia | 1,0,1 |
| 4 | +6 | +1 | J Jennings | 1,0,0 |
| 5 | -2 | +2 | C Russell | 1,1 |
| 6 | -2 | - | A Neville | 0,0,0,0 |
| 7 | -2 | -5 | P Hanks | 0 |
| 8 | -2 | -5 | P Spencer | 1 |
| 9 | -2 | - | E Knox | 1 |
| 10 | -2 | -6 | I Goodwin | 0,0,1 |
| 11 | +1 | - | N Wedley | 0,1 |
| 12 | +1 | +1 | B Stephens | 0,0 |
| 13 | -2 | -3 | N Chedd | 0 |
| 14 | - | - | J Peoples | 0 |

New England Grand Prix

| Player | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Q } \\ \text { I } \\ \text { UU } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \grave{ \pm} \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\underset{0}{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { O } \\ & 1 \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { ® } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P Walker | 6 | 7 | 4 | 11121 | $11 / 2$ | 2 |  | 22 | 1942 |
| N Chedd | 8 | 0 | $41 / 2$ | /2 6 | 0 | $11 / 2$ |  | 20 | 1851 |
| B Stephens | $41 / 2$ | 0 | $41 / 2$ | 2 5 | 1/2 | 2 |  | 161/2 | 1743 |
| P Spencer | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 |  | 21⁄2 |  | 141/2 | 1731 |
| R llett | 7 | 1 | $31 / 2$ | 11/2 | 1 |  |  | 121/2 | 1915 |
| C Russell | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | $1 / 2$ | 2 |  | 13 | 1488 |
| P Hanks | $71 / 2$ | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1/2 |  |  | 11 | 1925 |
| E Knox | $41 / 2$ | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 21⁄2 |  | 10 | 1770 |
| N Wedley | 4 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  | $11 / 2$ | 81/2 | 1562 |
| D Dhokia | 3112 | 1 |  | 0 |  |  | $31 / 2$ | 8 | 1348 |
| I Goodwin | 21⁄2 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 2 | 6 | 1392 |
| J Sutherland | - |  |  | 21122 | 0 | 1 | 2 | $51 / 2$ | 1628 |
| $J$ Jennings | 2112 | 1 |  | 0 |  |  | 2 | $51 / 2$ | 1326 |
| A Neville | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1488 |
| S Reid | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1307 |
| J Peoples | - | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1150 |

## Match of the Month

## Why can't I play like Carlsen?

For those that are unaware, Paul runs an excellent series of club Zoom meetings throughout our chess year. We mostly spend an hour in the evening analysing a Grandmaster game, attempting to predict the correct method to successfully execute a flamboyant attack on one of the lesser lights of the game while they try to use their ingenuity to wriggle out of their difficulties, often leading to an exciting king hunt. What I have learned from these games is that it requires considerable chess vision (generally considerably more than I have!) to find the way past potential pitfalls thrown up by a skilful opponent and subsequently win the game. Also, that you need a lot of nerve to launch a sacrificial attack when the resulting win is a lot further on than would normally be expected to be seen over the board. Sadly, it is all too easy to play it safe, for fear of throwing away a winnable game.
However, swashbuckling attacking chess was what first got me excited about the game so, when the opportunity presents itself, I do try to play in a slightly more adventurous style. Often, I end up with egg on my face. Here is a recent example when I managed to look good instead...

## Chris Russell v Mike Hellewell

New England B v St Neots B Bd 4; 20.3.2024

| 1 | e4 | e5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Nf 3 | $\mathrm{Nc6}$ |
| 3 | d 4 | exd4 |
| 4 | $\mathrm{Nxd4}$ | $\mathrm{Nxd4}$ |

I have found this exchange surprisingly popular in the Scotch Game, despite the fact that it gives a strong position for the white queen. After the game, Mike told me that he felt that he had to swap off knights as I can otherwise double his pawns and if he puts a knight on f6, I could attack it with e4-e5. However, if 4 ... Nf6 5 Nxc6 bxc6 6 e5 (the Mieses Variation) 6 ... Qe7 7 Qe2 Nd5 8 c4 Ba6 9 b3 leads only to a minimal advantage for White, if any. Had the game gone this way, I should have been playing like Carlsen (see Carlsen v Sulskis, Khanty-Mansiysk Olympiad 2012)! A more typical line would be 4 ... Bc5 5 Be3 Qf6 6 c3 with equality.

| 5 | Qxd4 | d6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | Nc 3 | a6 |
| 7 | Be 3 | Be 6 |
| 8 | Be 2 | Nf6 |
| 9 | f 3 | $\mathrm{~h} 6 ?$ |

Up to this point, Mike has been playing solid chess, but this is much too passive. I had expected something like $9 \ldots$ c5! 10 Qd 2 b 5 ! when Black is starting to put up a fight.

$$
10 \quad 0-0-0!\quad \text { Be7 }
$$

Logical but Fritz still prefers $10 \ldots$ c5.

## 11 g 4 !

I have completed my development and am ready to launch a kingside assault. Had I been Black, I would
have now played $11 \ldots$ Qd7 intending to castle on the queenside. Fritz still prefers $11 \ldots$ c5 or $11 \ldots$ b5, though castling to kingside is no longer on its radar.

## 11

g5??
Oh dear! This concedes the h file to maintain material equality and the isolated $g$ pawn will be horribly weak.

## 12 h4

With the knight on f 6 pinned, 13 h 4 xg 5 is a horrible threat and $12 \ldots$ gxh4 13 Rxh4 h5 14 g 5 c 515 Qd3 Nd 716 f 4 gives me the attack I was dreaming of.

| 12 | $\ldots$ | Rg8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | hxg5 | hxg5 |
| 14 | Qd2 |  |

Fritz prefers 14 Bc4 c5 15 Qd3 Qd7 16 Bxe6 fxe6 17 Qd2 when Black can castle but the g pawn is lost.

| 14 | $\ldots$ | Nd 7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | Nd5 | f6?? |

Attempting to save the $g$ pawn but another mistake. Even at my skill level, this one should be decisive. I had been expecting $15 \ldots$ Ne5 16 Nxe7 Qxe7 17 Bxg5 f6 (17 ... Rxg5? 18 Rh8+) 18 Bh4 0-0-0 19 b3 when I have won a pawn but Black has managed to complete his development and the game is not over. Alternatively, $15 \ldots$ Bxd5 16 Qxd5 c6 17 Qf5 when I have a dangerous attack. Fritz recommends $17 \ldots$ Qc8! 18 Rh6 Nf8! and Black fights on.

## 16 Rh7! <br> Bf8

The black king is trapped in the centre and now I just need to create some open lines to get at it. What is the best way to proceed?


I was quite pleased with myself when I found this move, because it attacks c7 and f6 simultaneously plus I have the threat of an exchange sacrifice that cuts through Black's defences e.g. 17 ... Rc8 18 Rxd7 Kxd7 19 Nxf6+ and 20 Nxg8. But sadly, with hindsight it not good enough here - so much for trying to play adventurously and messing it up (sigh). What should I
have played here to open up the position, and what resource for Black did I miss?
I really should have seen 17 Bc4! Black cannot play 17 ... Bxd5?? 18 Qxd5! winning quickly. But more difficult to see is that after 17 ... c6?? 18 Nb6! Bxc4 19 Nxc4 Ne5 20 Qh2! Rg7 21 Rxg7 Bxg7 22 Nxd6+! Best for Black is 17 ... Rg7! 18 Rxg7 Bxg7 19 Nxc7+ Qxc7 20 Bxe6 Ne5 21 f4 gxf4 22 Bxf4 Ke7 23 Bf5 Rh8 24 g 5 when White still has a large advantage.
According to Fritz, even better is 17 f 4 !! Rg 7 (if $17 \ldots$ gxf4 18 Nxf4 Bxa2 19 Qa5 Bf7 20 Bc4 or 20 Rxf7) 18 Rxg7 Bxg7 19 fxg5 Bxd5 20 Qxd5 Qe7 21 Qxb7 Rb8 22 Qc6 fxg5 23 c3 Be5 24 Bxa6 Qe6 25 Bb5 but only a GM or a chess computer finds lines like this!

$$
17
$$

...
c6??
The losing move. Mike misses his chance to stay in the game and I get to look good after all! Much better was 17 ... Bxd5!! (the resource I overlooked) 18 exd5 Rg 719 Bd 3 Qe 720 Rxg 7 Bxg 721 Bf 5 when there is still plenty in the game.

## 18 Rxd7!

I had seen this when playing 17 Qc3 and it does win now but there is a better move on the board - what?
$18 \mathrm{Bb} 6!$ ! is absolutely crushing. Black must exchange his queen for two minor pieces.

- 18 ... Qc8? 19 Nc7+ forces $19 \ldots$ Qxc7 as 19 ... Kd8 allows checkmate after 20 Qxf6+ Nxf6 21 Nd5+ Qc7 (21 ... Ke8 22 Nxf6\#) 22 Bxc7+ Ke8 23 Nxf6\# or 22 ... Kc8 23 Nb6\#
- 18 ... cxd5 19 Bxd8 Kxd8 (19 ... Rxd8 20 Nc7\#) 20 Qa5+ etc. winning.


## 18

...

## Bxd7

If $18 \ldots$ Qxd7?? Nxf6+ wins. Fritz prefers $18 \ldots$ Kxd7 but after 19 Bb6 Qc8 20 Nxf6+ Ke7 when White is still winning with 21 e5 d5 22 Qe3 continuing the attack or the similar but simpler $21 \mathrm{Nxg8+}$ Bxg8 22 e5 d5 23 Qe3 Bh6 24 Rh1 (24 ... Qf8 25 Bc5+).

| 19 | Nxf6+ | Kf7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | Nxg8 |  |

Fritz likes 20 Bc4+ d5 21 Nxd7 Qxd7 22 exd5 Ke8 23 dxc6 Qxc6 24 Qe5+ Be7 25 Bxg8.

| 20 | $\ldots$ | Kxg8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | Bc4+ | Kh7 |
| 22 | e5?! |  |

Fourth best, but I have several mates here. I rejected the much better 22 Rh1+ because of 22 ... Bh6 but should have seen that simply 23 Qd 2 ! wins.
22 ( 23 d5
keeping my bishop in the game but missing 23 Qd3+ Kg 724 Rh 1 with 25 Qh 7 to follow.

| 23 | $\ldots$ | Kg 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 24 | Rh 1 | Be 6 |

halting the pawn advance but $24 \ldots \mathrm{Bg} 7$ was better.

| 25 | Qd2 | Be7? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | Qh2 | Kf8 |
| 27 | Qh6+ | $1-0$ |

The bishop is lost and I also have mate in four - $27 \ldots$ Ke8 28 Qxe6 Kf8 29 Rh8+ Kg7 30 Rh7+ Kf8 31 Qf7\#.
So now you know. I cannot play like Carlsen because I miss too much. But this was a fun game and I do not get to play a king hunt very often. Plus, my opponent did let me look good, so thanks, Mike!

Chris Russell

## Eye Opener

## Magnus Carlsen (2214) v Adnan Orujov European U12 Championship, Peniscola Spain; 2002 <br> 1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 Nc6 3 d4 exd4 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nxc6 bxc6 6 e5 Qe7 7 Qe2 Nd5 8 c4 Ba6 9 b3

So far, this is recommended in the main game. Even the under-12s know their openings these days!
9 ... 0-0-0 10 g3 Re8 11 Bb2 f6 12 Bg2 fxe5 13 0-0 g6 14 Qd2 Nb6 15 Qa5
The computer evaluation hovers around equality for these logical developing moves. Magnus chooses a more aggressive option rather than 15 Re 1 .

## 15 ... Kb7 16 Ba3 Qf6



It is hard to see that this square is inferior to $16 \ldots$ Qf7 but White will deploy his knight aiming for c5 and the route via c3 and e4 would now gain a tempo.

## 17 Bxf8 Rhxf8 18 Nc3 Qe7

Black could try to hold back the tide tactically with 18 ... Qf5 19 Na 4 e4 $20 \mathrm{Nc} 5+\mathrm{Ka} 821$ Qb4 Bb7 22 Bxe4. It returns the pawn but so does the continuation...
19 Na4 d6 20 Bxc6+ Kxc6 21 Qxa6 e4
Black should seek shelter for his king by 21 ... Kd7.
22 c5 dxc5 23 Nxc5 Kxc5
Not 23 ... Qxc5?? 24 Rac1 but 23 ... Rf5 is a stronger defence. Magnus finishes the king hunt efficiently.

[^0]
## Cambridgeshire County Chess Association

Division 1

| A Team | Fenland | Cambridgeshire League - Division 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { O } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | Grading |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peter Walker | 0 | 1 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1/2 | 1d | 1 | 4+d | 10 | 1932 | 1890 |
| Ray llett | 1 | 0 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 1/2 | 1d | 1/2 | 41/2+d | 10 | 1894 | 1894 |
| Paul Hanks | 1/2 |  | 1/2 |  |  | 0 |  | 1 | 1d | 1/2 | 21/2+d | 6 | 1894 | 1894 |
| Ed Knox |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1855 | 2230 |
| Ben Stephens | 0 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 0 |  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | $41 / 2$ | 9 | 1799 | 1799 |
| Paul Spencer |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 3 | 6 | 1703 | 1703 |
| Neil Chedd |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1/2 |  |  | $41 / 2$ | 5 | 1675 | 1978 |
| Chris Russell |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1634 | 1259 |
| Total | 11/2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 21/2 | 2 | 11122 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Sum of opponents' grades | 8193 | 8190 | 9172 | 9039 | 8975 | 9172 | 8699 | 9232 | 3667 | 9138 | based on September grades excludes defaulted games * includes estimate |  |  |  |
| Sum of New England grades | 7581 | 9186 | 9366 | 9186 | 9186 | 9138 | 9109 | 9256 | 3622 | 9179 |  |  |  |  |  |

Division 2

| B Team | Cambridgeshire League - Division 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Do } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | Grading |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peter Walker |  |  |  | 1⁄2 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 11/2 | 3 | 2092 | 2217 |
| Ray Ilett |  |  |  |  |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11/2 | 1 | 1843 | 1843 |
| Ben Stephens |  |  | 1 | 1/2 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 1822 | 1864 |
| Paul Spencer | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 | 1/2 |  | 2 | 7 | 1688 | 1527 |
| Neil Chedd | $1 / 2$ | 1 | 1 |  | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 6 | 8 | 1660 | 1848 |
| Norman Wedley |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1567 | 1942 |
| Paul Hanks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1447 | 1930 |
| Jamie Sutherland |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  |  |  |  | 21/2 | 3 | 1411 | 1661 |
| Jim Jennings |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1387 | 1012 |
| Chris Russell | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1/2 |  | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 1349 | 1519 |
| Isaac Goodwin* | $1 / 2$ |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1/2 | 2 | 1348 | 973 |
| Dak Dhokia* |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 1302 | 927 |
| Total | 2112 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 11/2 | 2 | 21/2 | 4 | 11/2 | 1112 | 3112 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Sum of opponents' grades | 6375 | 6452 | 6439 | 6926 | 6618 | 6020 | 6076 | 6221 | 6994 | 7308 | 6524 | 6020 | based on September grades excludes defaulted games * includes estimate |  |  |  |
| Sum of New England grades | 6618 | 6447 | 6857 | 7180 | 6499 | 6242 | 6665 | 6251 | 7070 | 7257 | 6895 | 6679 |  |  |  |  |  |

Team 7000

| Team 7000 | Fenland |  | Team 7000 |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { む̀ } \\ & \text { 心 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Grading |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peter Walker | $1 / 2$ | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | $31 / 2$ | 5 | 1986 | 2136 |
| Ben Stephens |  | 1/2 | $1 / 2$ | 1/2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | $21 / 2$ | 6 | 1775 | 1712 |
| Dak Dhokia |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1348 | 973 |
| Paul Spencer |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1/2 | 21/2 | 3 | 1765 | 2015 |
| Chris Russell | $1 / 2$ |  | 1 | 1/2 |  | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 21/2 | 4 | 1380 | 1508 |
| Jamie Sutherland |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1295 | 1319 |
| Ed Knox | 1 |  | 0 | 1/2 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | $31 / 2$ | 6 | 1689 | 1751 |
| Neil Chedd | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1/2 |  | 11122 | 4 | 1675 | 1582 |
| Total | 2 | 11/2 | 2112 | 21/2 | 4 | 1112 | 11/2 | 11/2 |  |  |  |  |
| Sum of opponents' grades | 6557 | 6961 | 6554 | 6713 | 6504 | 6809 | 6370 | 7043 | based on September grades excludes defaulted games * includes estimate |  |  |  |
| Sum of New England grades | 6952 | 6840 | 6829 | 6939 | 6884 | 6939 | 6819 | 6811 |  |  |  |  |  |

Team 4000

| Team 4000 | Team 4000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grading |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jamie Sutherland |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1513 | 1888 |
| Norman Wedley | 1/2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 11/2 | 2 | 1447 | 1635 |
| Jim Jennings |  |  | 1 | 1d | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2+d | 5 | 1441 | 1441 |
| Isaac Goodwin | 0 | 1 |  | 1d | 0 | 1 |  | 2+d | 5 | 1204 | 1264 |
| Dak Dhokia | 1d | 1 | $1 / 2$ |  |  | 1 | 1 | $31 / 2+d$ | 5 | 1167 | 1451 |
| John Peoples |  |  |  | 1d | 1 |  |  | 1+d | 2 | 1000 | 1375 |
| Total | 11/2 | 3 | 21/2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Sum of opponents' grades | 2749 | 3593 | 4177 | n/a | 3771 | 3898 | 3981 | based on September grades excludes defaulted games *includes estimate |  |  |  |
| Sum of New England grades | 3008 | 4275 | 4184 | 3949 | 3949 | 4296 | 4104 |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    24 Rfd1 Qe5 25 b4+ Kxb4 26 Rab1+ Kc3 27 Rb3+ Kc2 28 Qe2\#
    That's how it should be done, Chris!

