

FOUR NATIONS

CHESS LEAGUE

## Division 2 Round 3 report by Jack Rudd

## Pool A

## Brown Jack vs. Sambuca Sharks 1 (3.5-4.5)

Ben Purton writes: "Both Tom Rendle and I and by the looks on Mike Truran's face during the game, everyone, felt Tom was better, but afterwards, Tom's silicon best friend suggested otherwise. Sam Williams won his first game for us in years; the former Ampleforth U16 and British U18 champion can, I hope, show some of such promise. Roberson was solid against a player who played well at Hastings recently.
 Ben Edgell always draws, that's why he was there and board 1 of the 2nds on the Sunday. Liam "the anchor" Varnam is having a bad season and this game he threw away a nice position and just let his opponent have a clear edge in the ending. I forgot my theory, but I won with a cheapo. Chris Russell was the star of the weekend as Jane Richmond blundered in time trouble. Selina arrived around 70 minutes late and luckily her opponent let her play; I thought she had a draw in the ending but then she lost. This is probably the most critical ending we had, so worth looking at."

This narrow win for the Sharks put them further ahead in the promotion race; Brown Jack, meanwhile, stayed bottom without a point.

| RD 3 |  | BROWN JACK | 2136 | v | SAMBUCA SHARKS | 2158 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | w | Truran, Michael C | 2215 | 1/2-1/2 | Rendle, Thomas E | 2382 |
| 2 | b | Richmond, Peter A | 2247 | 0-1 | Williams, Samuel G | 2198 |
| 3 | w | Padilla Cabero, Pablo | 2169 | 1/2-1/2 | Roberson, Peter T | 2221 |
| 4 | b | Headlong, Timothy | 2188 | 1/2-1/2 | Edgell, Ben P | 2100 |
| 5 | w | Girdlestone, Paul C | 2135 | 1-0 | Varnam, Liam D | 2174 |
| 6 | b | Rabbitt, Michael | 2074 | 0-1 | Purton, Ben J | 2144 |
| 7 | w | Richmond, Jane (F) | 2118 | 0-1 | Russell, Christopher | 2065 |
| 8 | b | Hall, Joshua DW * | 1939 | 1-0 | Khoo, Selina (F) | 1981 |
|  |  |  |  | $31 / 2-41 / 2$ |  |  |

## Wessex 1 vs. White Rose 2 (2.0-6.0)

Perhaps stung by my suggestion on the English Chess Forum that they were in danger of relegation, White Rose 2 announced their intention to stay in the division in crushing style in this match. Their 6-2 victory included wins on the top four boards, as a typically ferocious attack from Martin Simons didn't quite come off:
1.e4 e6 2.d3 d5 3.Nd2 c5 4.Ngf3 Nc6 5.g3 Bd6 6.Bg2 Nge7 7.0-0 0-0 8.Re1 f6 9.c3 Rb8 [9...Bd7 10.a3 a5 11.d4 cxd4 12.exd5 exd5 13.Nxd4 Nxd4 14.cxd4 Qb6 15.Nb1 Rad8 16.Nc3 Kh8 17.Qd3 Rfe8 18.h3 Nf5 19.Rd1 Ne7 20.Be3 Qxb2 21.Rab1 Qxa3 22.Bc1 Bf5 23.Bxa3 Bxd3 24.Bxd6 Ljubojevic,L (2600)-De la Villa Garcia,J (2500)/Pamplona 1996/½-1/2 (60); 9...b5 10.Nf1 Rb8 11.d4 dxe4 12.Rxe4 cxd4 13.Nxd4 Bc5 14.Be3 Bxd4 15.Bxd4 Nxd4 16.Rxd4 Nd5 17.Bxd5 exd5 18.Rxd5 Qc7 19.Ne3 Be6 20.Rd4 Rbd8 21.Nc2 Rxd4 22.Nxd4 Rd8 23.Qh5 Bc4 24.Re1 Rogov,I (2006)-Alimov,A (2049)/Novokuznetsk 2008/1-0 (39)]
10.d4 cxd4!? An interesting decision, setting up an IQP position in which black's ...f6 prevents the usual Ne 5 move, but instead allows white play against the weak e6 pawn. [10...c4 11.Nf1 Bc7 12.h4 b5 13.h5 b4 14.Nh4 Ba5 15.Bd2 bxc3 16.Bxc3 dxe4 17.Bxe4 Nd5 18.Ne3 Bxc3 19.bxc3 Nxc3 20.Bxh7+ Kxh7 21.Qc2+ Kg8 22.Qxc3 Qxd4 23.Qxc4 Qxc4 24.Nxc4 Rd8 25.Rab1 Klein,J (2090)Meier,V (2290)/Pardubice 1996/0-1 (40)] 11.cxd4 dxe4 12.Nxe4 Bb4 13.Bd2 Bxd2 14.Qxd2 Nf5 15.Rad1 Qb6

16.g4 [16.d5 is the thematic IQP advance, and looks quite promising for white here: 16...exd5 17.Qxd5+ Kh8 18.Qc5 with the more active pieces in the endgame.; 16.Qc3 , maintaining his central pawn and preparing Nc5, may be best.] 16...Nfxd4 17.Nxd4 Rd8 18.Nxf6+ gxf6 19.Qh6!? [19.Bxc6 bxc6 20.Qf4 is a good winning attempt, but it seems just to lead to a draw: 20...e5 21.Qxf6 Rxd4 22.Rxe5 a) 22.Qg5+ Kf7 23.Qh5+ Kf8 24.Qh6+ Kg8 25.Qg5+=; b) 22.Qxe5 Rxd1 (22...Rxg4+? 23.Kh1 Bf5 24.Qxf5 Rg7 25.Rg1+-) 23.Rxd1 Bxg4 24.Qg3 Kh8!=; 22...Rxd1+ 23.Kg2 Bf5! 24.Rxf5 Rd5 25.Qg5+ Kh8 26.Qf6+ Kg8=] 19...Rxd4 [19...Nxd4 20.Qxf6 Rd7 21.Re5 $\mathrm{Ne} 2+$ 22.Kf1 Rxd1+ 23.Kxe2 Qxb2+ 24.Kxd1 Qb1+ and perpetual will result.]

## 20.Be4 Rxe4 21.Rxe4 Qxb2


22.g5? Allowing the black queen to come back into the defence. [22.Re3! is the right follow-up to the previous play. 22...Qb4 23.Qxf6 Qe7 24.Qxe7 Nxe7 25.Rd8+ Kg7 26.Rf3 ties black up in knots in the ending; 26...Nc6 27.Rdf8 Ne5 28.R3f6 Bd7 is the only way to extricate his pieces, but 29.Rxb8 Kxf6 30.Rxb7 probably favours white, if anything.]
22...f5 23.Rxe6 [23.Rh4 Qg7 24.Qh5 Qg6 and the attack is over.] 23...Bxe6 24.Qxe6+ Kh8 25.Rd7 Qc1+ 0-1

| RD 3 |  | WESSEX 1 | 2131 | v | WHITE ROSE 2 | 2088 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | w | Lock, Gavin R | 2188 | 0-1 | Townsend, M Paul | 2186 |
| 2 | b | Kawuma, Steven Male | 2187 | 0-1 | Adams, David M | 2217 |
| 3 | w | Simons, Martin J | 2200 | 0-1 | Arnott, Jonathan W | 2154 |
| 4 | b | Rutter, Nick J | 2189 | 0-1 | Shaw, Peter | 2156 |
| 5 | w | Neil, David R | 2157 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ | O'Driscoll, Keiran | 2062 |


| 6 | b | Jenks, Bruce | 2127 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ | Archer, Richard | 2066 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | w | de Coverly, Roger D | 2101 | 0-1 | Webb, Matthew D | 1986 |
| 8 | b | Thilaganathan, Jessica (F) | 1900 | 1-0 | Hollingworth, Evie (F) | 1874 |
|  |  |  |  | 2-6 |  |  |

## Anglian Avengers vs. Barbican Youth (3.5-4.5)

Barbican Youth had cause to be grateful for the players their team is named after - wins from Franklin, Sen and Cumming against higher-rated opponents proved vital in this narrow victory. The board 8 game between Ynojosa and Wallis was notable for a strange feature: the white queen's rook recaptured a bishop on a2 early on, and never went back; this proved vital in allowing the black queen and rook to invade on the $8^{\text {th }}$ rank later to decisive effect.

| RD 3 |  | ANGLIAN AVENGERS | 2113 | v | BARBICAN 4NCL YOUTH | 2049 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | w | Munson, Shaun D | 2172 | 1-0 | Hodgson, John H | 2180 |
| 2 | b | Talsma, Paul A | 2252 | 0-1 | Franklin, Samuel GA | 2131 |
| 3 | w | Player, Edmund C | 2149 | 0-1 | Sen, Subin | 2098 |
| 4 | b | Fegan, Chris | 2078 | 0-1 | O'Toole, George E | 2146 |
| 5 | w | Cook, Michael P | 2073 | 1/2-1/2 | Farrand, Julian T | 2103 |
| 6 | b | Gregory, Stephen J | 2126 | 0-1 | Cumming, Rhys | 1969 |
| 7 | w | Merry, Alan B (J) | 2074 | 1-0 | Wells, Daniel J | 2014 |
| 8 | b | Wallis, Ian J | 1982 | 1-0 | Ynojosa, Angelica Maria (F) | 1753 |
|  |  |  |  | $31 / 2-41 / 2$ |  |  |

## Kings Head vs. AMCA Dragons (6.5-1.5)

4 wins out of 4 with the black pieces (well, really 3 out of 3 - one was by default) helped Kings Head to an emphatic victory, and kept them at the top of the Pool A table after three rounds. The games in this match were generally hard-fought but not spectacular; they were nearly all resolved in the endgame.

| RD 3 |  | KINGS HEAD | 2120 | $v$ | AMCA DRAGONS | 2149 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | w | McMichael, Richard J | 2286 | 1-0 | Webb, Richard M | 2260 |
| 2 | b | Wittmann, Jochen | 2266 | 1-0 | Frostick, Clive A | 2160 |
| 3 | w | Thomas, Rik H | 2220 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ | Norman, Kenneth I | 2182 |
| 4 | b | Ward, Julian T | 2132 | 1-0 | Richardson, Keith B | 2189 |
| 5 | w | Stevenson, James AB | 2089 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ | Coates, Kenneth G | 2220 |
| 6 | b | Mackenzie, Colin | 2120 | 1-0 | Turner, Caius AW (def) | 2122 |
| 7 | w | Davey, Mark | 2020 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ | Purdon, Colin | 2102 |
| 8 | b | Haria, Ravi (J) | 1828 | 1-0 | Zhu, Yao Yao (F) | 1954 |
|  |  |  |  | $61 / 2-11 / 2$ |  |  |

## Pool B

## Bristol 1 vs. Celtic Tigers 1

Our inability to find a female player or junior proved costly this weekend, although at least the snow rules meant that we weren't deducted the half-point that would have lost us this match instead of drawing it. The final $4-4$ scoreline included a win by our in-form captain, against a promising young Irish player:

6.Qa4+!? The most aggressive response to black's play: white wins a piece for two pawns, but said two pawns are far advanced and dangerous. 6...c6 7.b4 b5 [Attempting to save the piece with 7...cxb3 8.axb3 b6 goes horribly wrong: 9.b4 Nb7 10.Qxc6+ Qd7 11.Nb5 Kd8 12.Ne5+-] 8.Qxa5 Qxa5 9.bxa5 b4 10.Nd1 cxd5 11.g3 [11.Bf4 e6 12.g3 Bc5 13.Bg2 Bd7 14.0-0 Ke7 15.Rb1 Ne4 16.Ne5 g5 17.Be3 Bxe3 18.fxe3 Nd6 19.Rxb4 Rab8 20.Rxb8 Rxb8 21.Nc3 Rb2 22.Rc1 Nb5 23.Nxd7 Kxd7 24.e4 Nxc3 25.Rxc3 dxe4 Tania,S (2410)-Karlovich,A (2211)/San Sebastian 2009/1-0 (59)]
11...e6 12.Bg2 Be7 13.0-0 [13.Ne5 Ba6 14.Nc6 Rc8 15.Nxe7 Kxe7 16.Rb1 Rb8 17.Ne3 b3 18.axb3 cxb3 19.Ba3+ Kd7 20.Bb2 Rhc8 21.Kd2 Rb5 22.Be5 Ne8 23.Rhc1 Rxc1 24.Kxc1 f6 25.Bd4 Rb7 26.Kd2 Nc7 27.f4 Nb5 Granados Gomez,M (2295)-Garcia Cano,A (2315)/Sant Cebria 1998/1-0 (51)] 13...0-0 14.a3 b3 15.Bb2

Blockading the pawns. I think I prefer white here; although the pawns look scary, it's actually hard for black to find places to put his pieces - and he always has to watch for tactics that will win his pawns.15...Bd8 16.Ne5 Ba6 17.Nc6 Bc7 18.Rc1
18...Bb5?! [18...Bb7 19.Ne5 $\div$ ] 19.Nd4 Bd7? [19...Ba4 avoids the immediate loss of material, although 20.Nc3 Bd7 21.e4 Bxa5 22.exd5 Bxc3 23.Rxc3 exd5 24.Re3 looks good for white - there's no real way for the black pawns to advance, whereas white can gradually work towards a minor-piece ending where his black-squared bishop will dominate.]

20.Nxb3 Rfb8 21.Nc5 Bc8 22.a6 Rb5 23.Na4 Bxa6? The c4 pawn is black's last real asset, and allowing this to go as well signals the end. [23...Rab8 was better, but 24.Bd4 Ra5 25.Ndc3 Rxa6 26.Rb1 is still going to be winning for white.] 24.Rxc4 Rc8 25.Rc2 e5 26.Bh3 1-0

| RD 3 |  | BRISTOL 1 | 2218 | $v$ | CELTIC TIGERS 1 | 2125 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | w | Rudd, Jack | 2296 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ | Hetey, Laszlo | 2347 |
| 2 | b | Beaumont, Chris R | 2306 | 1/2-1/2 | Maciol, Ryszard | 2245 |
| 3 | w | Buckley, David E | 2274 | 1-0 | Mueller, Jan | 2165 |
| 4 | b | Bicknell, Carl | 2194 | 0-1 | Kemp, Peter D | 2164 |
| 5 | w | Sherwin, James T | 2235 | 1/2-1/2 | Pedersen, Carsten | 2155 |
| 6 | b | Bennett, Dominic | 2098 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ | Josse, Mark | 2064 |
| 7 | w | Dilleigh, Stephen P | 2120 | 1-0 | French, Angus J | 2099 |
| 8 | b | default |  | 0-1 | Owens, Megan R (F) | 1764 |
|  |  |  |  | 4-4 |  |  |

## Poisoned Pawns 2 vs. Warwickshire Select (4.0-4.0)

This year's surprise package, Poisoned Pawns 2, kept up their good form in this match with a draw against a higher-rated Warwickshire Select team. It would be easy to tell from this match that the 4NCL does not have Sofia rules - five of the eight games were drawn in under 30 moves - but most of these draws were clearly not in the "non-game" category.

| RD 3 |  | POISONED PAWNS 2 | 2085 | $v$ | WARWICKSHIRE SELECT 1 | 2145 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | w | Byway, Paul V | 2158 | 1/2-1/2 | Pitcher, John | 2193 |
| 2 | b | Goodger, Martyn | 2147 | 0-1 | Mason, Donald J | 2255 |
| 3 | w | Winfridsson, Ola | 2133 | 1/2-1/2 | Hynes, AM (Tony) | 2223 |
| 4 | b | Rosen, Daniel B | 2137 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ | Shephard, Chris CW | 2206 |
| 5 | w | Kemp, Paul R | 2109 | 1/2-1/2 | Clarke, Brandon Gl | 2039 |
| 6 | b | Bailey, Kevin J | 2083 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ | Baruch, Andrew JD | 2089 |
| 7 | w | McMahon, Paul | 2043 | 1-0 | Fishburne, Stewart K | 2106 |
| 8 | b | Redman, David (J) * | 1866 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ | James, Ann-Marie (F) | 2050 |
|  |  |  |  | 4-4 |  |  |

## Cheddleton vs. FCA Solutions (7.5-0.5)

The division's sole trailers came up against a side with five titled players, and the resulting $71 / 2-1 / 2$ scoreline was hardly a surprise. Among Cheddleton's seven wins was Keith Arkell's, in which the former joint English champion makes defending against a minority attack look surprisingly easy:

Almond,Richard (2144) - Arkell,Keith C (2478) [A40]
1.d4 e6 2.c4 Bb4+ 3.Bd2 Bxd2+ 4.Qxd2 d5 [4...b6 5.Nc3 Bb7 6.Nf3 Nh6 7.d5 0-0 8.g3 Na6 9.Bg2 Nf5 10.0-0 Nd6 11.Qd4 Qf6 12.Qxf6 gxf6 13.Nd2 f5 14.Rac1 c6 15.dxc6 Bxc6 16.Rfd1 Rfd8 17.b3 Kf8 18.Nf3 Ke7 19.Nd4 Hansen,C (2635)-Miles,A (2595)/Biel 1992/1-0 (58); 4...Nh6 5.Nc3 0-0 6.Nf3 d6 7.e3 Nd7 8.Bd3 f5 9.0-0 b6 10.Ne1 Bb7 11.f3 a6 12.Nc2 Qg5 13.Qe2 c5 14.d5 exd5 15.Nxd5 Bxd5 16.cxd5 b5 17.b3 Nb6 18.e4 fxe4 19.fxe4 Davda,R (1839)-Arkell,K (2478)/Uxbridge 2009/0-1 (45)] 5.Nc3 Nf6 [5...Nc6 6.e3 Nge7 7.Nf3 0-0 8.Be2 b6 9.cxd5 Nxd5 10.0-0 Bb7 11.Rac1 1⁄2-1/2 Shishkin,V (2498)-Malaniuk,V (2523)/Lazy 2009] 6.e3 Nbd7 [6...0-0 7.cxd5 exd5 8.Bd3 Bg4 9.Nge2 Bxe2 10.Bxe2 Qe7 11.0-0 Nbd7 12.b4 a6 13.Rab1 c6 14.Bd3 Rfe8 15.Rfe1 Qd6 16.h3
 g6 17.a4 b5 18.a5 Re6 19.Rec1 Kg7 20.Rc2 Rae8 21.Na2 Flear,G (2519)-Turner,M (2487)/Southend 2000/1⁄2-1/2 (72)] 7.cxd5 exd5 8.Bd3 0-0 9.Nge2

9...b6! A move demonstrating some fine positional judgment on Arkell's part. He will, at some point, have to play ...c6 to defend the d5 pawn, and this move is aimed against the minority attack that white is likely to play in response.
10.b4 c6 11.0-0 Qe7 12.Rab1 a5 13.b5? Falling in with black's plans. [13.bxa5?! Rxa5, with a later ...b5 and ...Nb6-c4, also looks comfortable for black.; 13.a3 , maintaining the tension on the queenside, is probably best.]
13...c5 14.a4 Bb7 [14...c4? would give black a protected passed pawn, but would also release the
pressure on d 4 , making an e3-e4 advance more tempting later. It would also ease the decisionmaking pressure on white: with the pawn still on c5, he always has to consider dxc5.] 15.Ng3 g6 16.Be2 Rfd8 17.Bf3 Ne4 18.Qd3 [My trusty silicon monster recommends 18.Bxe4, which I think is advice I can safely ignore. With the white bishop gone, black's bishop would have a field day supporting an eventual kingside attack or pawn break in the centre.] 18...f5 19.Nge2 Rac8 20.Rfc1 Ndf6 21.g3

21...g5! With all his pieces on good squares and no favourable transformations of the position available to white, Arkell now starts on a kingside attack. The ...f4 advance hangs over white without his being able to do anything about it. 22.Bg2 Re8 23.Nd1 c4 Finally committing himself to this advance; the difference now is that attacks on the queenside pawns could potentially interfere with the kingside attack, and f3 and e4 for white is no longer a serious option.
24.Qc2 Rc7 25.Nec3?! [25.Ndc3 may be a tougher defence: 25 ...Nxf2 is hugely tempting, but it may not quite work immediately: ( $25 \ldots B c 8$, or something like it, would probably have been Arkell's choice, continuing to build until the moment is really ripe.) 26.Qxf5 (26.Kxf2!? Ng4+ 27.Kg1 Qxe3+ 28.Kh1 Nf2+ 29.Kg1 Nd3+ 30.Kh1 Nxcl 31.Rxcl Qd3 looks good for black, but again it's not $100 \%$ clear) 26...Nd3 27.Qxg5+ Qg7 28.Qxg7+ Kxg7 29.Rf1 Rxe3 30.Rf5 and white has chances because of the weak d5-pawn.] 25...f4 26.Qe2 Qd6 27.Rc2 Rce7 28.Nxe4 Nxe4 29.Nc3 Nf6 30.e4 [30.Nd1 would look absolutely horrible anyway; here it also gives black an ideal opportunity to reroute his bishop with gain of tempo. $30 \ldots \mathrm{Bc} 8$ and the bishop's coming in to g 4 or f5.] 30...dxe4 31.Qxc4+ Kh8

32.Re1 Dropping a pawn, but it may well already be too far gone even without this move: [32.Rd1 f3 33.Bh3 (33.Bf1 e3 34.fxe3 Ng4 and the exchange goes.) 33...Rc7 34.Qa2 e3 35.fxe3 Rxe3 36.Nb1 Rxc2 37.Qxc2 Qd5! and something nasty will soon happen with ...f2 or ...Re2.] 32...Rc8 33.Qb3 Qxd4 34.Rd1 Qe5 35.Na2 Rce8 36.Re1 e3 37.fxe3 fxg3 38.hxg3 [38.Bxb7 gxh2+ 39.Kh1 Rxb7 40.Rxh2 Ng4 is no better.] 38...Qxg3 39.Qc3 Re5

40.Ree2? [40.e4 at least keeps some fight in it, but the inevitable two extra pawns will be enough for victory.] 40...Ng4 41.e4 Qh2+ 42.Kf1 Rf8+ 43.Rf2 [43.Ke1 Qg1+ 44.Kd2 Rd8+] 43...Nxf2 44.Rxf2 Rxf2+ 0-1

| RD 3 |  | CHEDDLETON | 2297 | $v$ | FCA SOLUTIONS 1 | 2044 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | w | Gormally, Daniel W | 2479 | 1-0 | Tippleston, Charles E | 2137 |
| 2 | b | Arkell, Keith C | 2478 | 1-0 | Almond, Richard J | 2144 |
| 3 | w | Eggleston, David J | 2368 | 1-0 | Smith, Graham M | 2106 |
| 4 | b | Bellin, Robert | 2388 | 1-0 | Brown, Alan M | 2109 |
| 5 | w | Hawkins, Jonathan | 2383 | 1-0 | Borrowdale, Graham E | 2074 |
| 6 | b | Wallace, Paul A | 2238 | $1 / 2-1 / 2$ | Habershon, Paul F | 2089 |
| 7 | w | Bennett, Patrick J | 2087 | 1-0 | Kendall, Paul SN | 2069 |
| 8 | b | Whitfield, Craig M (J) | 1952 | 1-0 | Evans, Helen I (F) | 1626 |
|  |  |  |  | $7112-1 / 2$ |  |  |

## e2e4.org.uk vs. Guildford 3

The loss of sponsorship money has really hit Guildford hard, and their third team were the weakest team in the pool this round, being outgraded by an average of 158 points per board. Even so, the resulting $61 / 2-11 / 2$ scoreline was a good result for e2e4.

Talbot,Andrew R (2161) - Bryant,Richard BE (1945) [D31]
1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.Nc3 c6 4.Nf3 dxc4 5.a4 Bb4 6.e3

6...b5!? The Noteboom variation is one of the most interesting and controversial lines in the Semi-Slav. Black gives white the two bishops and a central pawn mass; in return, he gets two advanced queenside passed pawns.
7.Bd2 a5 8.axb5 Bxc3 9.Bxc3 cxb5 10.b3 Bb7 11.bxc4 b4 12.Bb2 Nf6 13.Bd3 Nbd7 14.0-0 0-0 15.Nd2 Bc6 [15...e5 16.Bc2 Qc7 17.Ba4 Rfd8 18.d5 Nb6 19.Rc1 Nxa4 20.Qxa4 Nd7 21.f4 Qb6 22.Rce1 Nc5 23.Qd1 Nd3 24.Bxe5 Nxe1 25.Bd4 Qa6 26.Qxe1 a4 27.Ne4 f5 28.Qxb4 Bxd5 29.cxd5 fxe4 30.f5 Sakaev,K (2656)-Timofeev,A (2578)/Moscow 2004/1⁄2-1/2 (35); 15...Qe7 16.f4 Rfd8 17.Qe2 a4 18.Rab1 g6 19.e4 a3 20.Ba1 Nb6 21.c5 Na4 22.Rxb4 Nxc5 23.dxc5 Qxc5+ 24.Rd4 Rxd4 25.Nb3 Qb6 26.Bxd4 Qxb3 27.Bxf6 a2 28.Ba1 Rd8 29.Bc4 Qb6+ 30.Kh1 Shishkin,V (2498)-Stepinski,S (1992)/Lubawka 2009/1-0 (34)]

Qf6 23.c5 a3 24.Qxf6 gxf6 25.cxb6 axb2 26.Rxa8 Rxa8 27.Bd3 Rb8 28.Rb1 Rxb6 29.Rxb2 Kf7 30.Bc4 Ke7 31.f4 Kd6 Nogues,A (2221)-Giaccio,A (2470)/Buenos Aires 2006/0-1 (40)) 17...Nbd5 18.Ba4 Ne7 19.Nc4 Bxg2 20.Kxg2 Qd5+ 21.Qf3 Qxc4 22.e4 Qa6 23.h4 h6 24.Kh1 Kh8 25.Rg1 Rg8 26.h5 Raf8 27.Bc2 Nh7 28.d5 Ng5 29.Rxg5 hxg5 30.h6 f6 31.Qh5 Borowicz,M (1917)-Gora,J (1678)/Warsaw 2008/0-1 (72)] 17.Re1 Rfb8

18.c5 [18.e4? e5 19.d5 Bb7 would be a good example of how not to play this line for white: the protected passed pawn in the centre is easily blockaded, and c5 is a wonderful square for the black knight to support a pawn advance from.; 18.f4!? , preparing e4, is unclear.] 18...b3?! I am possibly being wise after the event here, but this looks like the wrong pawn to advance: the pawns are stuck and easily blockaded when both are on white squares, so trying to advance the a-pawn to a3 looks like the better plan. [18...Ra7 $\div$ ] 19.Bd3 Nd5 20.Nc4 a4 21.Nd6 With ideas of Bxh7+ in the air. Not that it's difficult to prevent, but it must be watched for. 21...Nf8 [21...f5! is an odd-looking move, but it may be best for black here: the important thing is to prevent a central steamroller, and this move does the job.]

## 22.e4 Nb4 23.Bb1 Bd7 24.Nc4 Bb5 25.Nb6 Ra6 26.Qd2 Nc6


27.d5! White's thematic advance. And suddenly black is in a world of trouble. 27...Ne5 [27...Na7 at least avoids immediate material loss, although 28.Qc3 f6 29.d6 Qf7 30.e5 f5 31.Bd3 is no fun for black at all.] 28.Qb4 Raxb6 [28...Be8 29.d6 wins the knight on e5.] 29.cxb6 Rxb6 30.d6 Qc4 31.Rxa4 Further increasing his material advantage. The rest is easy. 31...Qc6 32.Ra3 Bc4 [32...Nc4 33.Rc1 Qxd6 34.Rxb3] 33.Qc3 f6 34.Rd1 Qb5 35.Ra5 Qb4 36.Qxb4 Rxb4 37.Bxe5 fxe5 38.d7 1-0

| RD 3 |  | E2E4.ORG.UK 1 | 2088 | $v$ | GUILDFORD-A\&DC 3 | 1988 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | w | Sugden, John N | 2235 | 1/2-1/2 | Shepley, Julien M | 2022 |
| 2 | b | Hulmes, David I | 2227 | 1-0 | Eckloff, Colin | 2100 |
| 3 | w | Byron, Alan M | 2192 | 1/2-1/2 | Roset, Christophe | 2056 |
| 4 | b | Mansson, James C | 2142 | 1/2-1/2 | Higgs, Anthony RJ | 1967 |
| 5 | w | Talbot, Andrew R | 2161 | 1-0 | Bryant, Richard BE | 1945 |
| 6 | b | Kennedy, Craig | 2036 | 1-0 | Shaw, Matthew H | 1956 |
| 7 | w | Norinkeviciute, Rasa (F) | 2027 | 1-0 | Gibbs, Daniel C | 1869 |
| 8 | b | Foster, Chantelle L (F) | 1682 | 1-0 | default |  |
|  |  |  |  | 61/2-11/2 |  |  |

You can find all of the games from this round here:
PGN http://www.4ncl.co.uk/0910 div2-03.pgn
Game viewer http://www.4ncl.co.uk/0910 div2-03viewer.htm
And view results and information about the 4 ncl here: http://www.4ncl.co.uk/

