



The League Leader

The Official Newsletter of the Long Island Industrial Chess League

Volume XIX, Number 04

www.liicl.com

October 24, 2008

Anand Way Ahead

Team Results - Round 3

Oct. 17, 2008

EDO		AlumniD		EOTS		Clear-Cut
-----		-----		-----		-----
RomeroS	1.0 0.0	CaulfieldB		PappacenoM	0.0 1.0	LambT
SommeseA	1.0 0.0	DaciukJ		PanicoNIII	1.0 0.0	DorskyM
AlikakosG	0.0 1.0	MilerJ		ChipkinL	0.5 0.5	VialeR
SprecklesC	0.0 1.0	ParrishA		PattardT	1.0 0.0	ProffimanP
	2.0 2.0				2.5 1.5	
CSI		LSF		AlumniC		KSF
-----		-----		-----		-----
BergG	1.0 0.0	LeoneD		DickersonT	1.0 0.0	Forfeit
DwulitJ	0.5 0.5	BonfanteC		GoldmanM	0.5 0.5	SpinnatoC
HomD	0.5 0.5	KolczynskiJ		WatnickM	1.0 0.0	Forfeit
ManosR	0.0 1.0	CelauroS		LoshinA	0.0 1.0	MasonM
	2.0 2.0				2.5 1.5	

Leads Kramnik 5.5-1.5

In their 12 game semi-final World Chess Championship match, Viswanathan Anand leads Vladimir Kramnik by a huge 3 point margin. With only 5 games remaining, this seems to be an insurmountable lead. The event is being held in Bonn, Germany.

The winner of the match is slated to face the winner of a match between ex-FIDE champ Veselin Topalov of Bulgaria and Gata Kamsky of the USA. That on again, off again match is supposed to be held next month in Lvov, Ukraine but so far no agreement has been signed.

The games of the Anand-Kramnik match can be followed on the Internet live at ICC.com for Internet Chess Club members.

Team Results - Round 3

Oct. 17, 2008

White		Black
-----		-----
WatnickS	0.0 1.0	MastandreaR
LustigD	1.0 0.0	KingsleyR
MaiglowA	0.0 1.0	StandingR

LIICL Team Fee Due Nov. 14

The LIICL Executive Board voted to keep the dues at \$120. Invoices will be sent out soon by the LIICL Treasurer, Paul Montenero. All payments are due payable to the LIICL by the completion of round 5 play on November 14.

In This Issue

Team Results - Round 3	1
Individual Results - Round 3	1
Anand Leads Kramnik 5.5-1.5	1
LIICL Team Fee Due Nov. 14	1
2008-09 LIICL Pre-Season Standings . . .	1
2008-09 Individual Class Standings . . .	2
LIICL Directory	3
2008-09 LIICL Pre-Season Ratings . . .	3
The Price of Relaxing	4
2008-09 LIICL Schedule, Rev.A	6

2008-2009 LIICL Regular Season Team Standings

Team	Team Rating	LIICL Points	Games				Match				F
			W	L	D	Pts	W	L	D	Pts	
EOTS	2054	52.0	9	1	2	10.0	3	0	0	3.0	0
CSI	1925	44.0	7	3	2	8.0	2	0	1	2.5	0
LSF	1890	42.0	6	3	3	7.5	1	1	1	1.5	0
CCC	1410	36.0	5	5	2	6.0	1	2	0	1.0	0
AlumniD	1658	35.0	6	6	0	6.0	1	1	1	1.5	1
KSF	1846	27.0	3	6	3	4.5	1	2	0	1.0	3
AlumniC	1467	26.0	3	8	1	3.5	1	2	0	1.0	0
EDO	1794	21.0	2	9	1	2.5	0	2	1	0.5	1

LIICL 2008-2009 Individual Class Standings After Round 3

Rating	Name	Team	PPR	G	W	L	D
Class A							
2120	Berg, George	CSI	5.00	3	3	0	0
2087	Panico, Nick III	EOTS	5.00	3	3	0	0
2012	Pattard, Tom	EOTS	5.00	3	3	0	0
2012	Leone, Dave	LSF	3.67	3	2	1	0
1956	Bonfante, Charles	LSF	3.67	3	1	0	2
2095	Pappaceno, Mike	EOTS	3.00	3	1	1	1
2062	Chipkin, Len	EOTS	3.00	2	1	0	1
1975	Romero, Steve	EDO	3.00	3	1	1	1
1943	Dwulit, Jim	CSI	3.00	2	1	0	1
2020	USCF Zilbermintz, Lev	EOTS	2.33	1	1	0	0
1952	Hodos, Julian	ALD	2.33	1	1	0	0
1919	Lamb, Terry	CCC	2.33	1	1	0	0
1932	Muttreja, Mahesh	KSF	1.00	1	0	1	0
1916	Wilkie, Clayton	CSI	1.00	2	0	2	0
Class B							
1844	Hom, Dennis	CSI	4.33	3	2	0	1
1739	Montenero, Paul	CCC	3.67	2	2	0	0
1860	Spinnato, Charles	KSF	3.00	3	0	0	3
1837	Kolczynski, Jim	LSF	3.00	3	1	1	1
1831	Viale, Rich	CCC	3.00	3	1	1	1
1821	Sommese, Anthon	EDO	2.33	2	1	1	0
1818	/4 Manos, Bob	CSI	2.33	2	1	1	0
1800	USCF Kubelle, Matt	KSF	2.33	2	1	1	0
1792	Muttreja, Suresh	KSF	2.33	2	1	1	0
1753	Celauro Sal	LSF	2.33	2	1	1	0
1729	Standing, Robert	LSF	2.33	1	1	0	0
1845	Dorsky, Mike	CCC	1.67	2	0	1	1
1882	Lustig, Darren	IND	1.00	0	0	0	0
1770	/10 Daciuk, John	ALD	1.00	1	0	1	0
1720	Frohreich, Frank	ALD	1.00	1	0	1	0
1713	Alikakos, George	EDO	1.00	3	0	3	0
Class C							
1600	Est Dickerson, Todd	ALC	3.67	3	2	1	0
1690	/5 Parrish, Alan	ALC	2.33	1	1	0	0
1612	Rusch, Ed	ALD	2.33	2	1	1	0
1504	Goldman, Mel	ALC	1.67	2	0	1	1
UNR	/3 McCormick, Paul	EDO	1.00	1	0	1	0
1695	Spreckles, Charle	EDO	1.00	2	0	2	0
1636	Kingsley, John	ALC	1.00	2	0	2	0
Class D							
UNR	/0 Cauffield, Brian	ALD	2.33	2	1	1	0
UNR	/0 Watnick, Steve	IND	2.33	2	1	1	0
UNR	/0 Miler, Joe	ALD	2.33	1	1	0	0
UNR	/0 Mason, Mike	KSF	2.33	1	1	0	0
1348	Hartten, Ed	ALD	2.33	2	1	1	0
1341	Watnick, Mel	ALC	2.33	2	1	1	0
1120	Cretaro, A	CCC	2.33	2	1	1	0
UNR	/0 Maiglow, Amy	IND	1.00	0	0	0	0
1474	Proffman, Paul	CCC	1.00	1	0	1	0
1398	Mastandrea, Bob	ALC	1.00	1	0	1	0
1289	Loshin, Al	ALC	1.00	2	0	2	0
949	Montenero, Zack	CCC	1.00	1	0	1	0

The League Leader

www.liicl.com

Editor-in-Chief
Robert Rizzo

Copy Editor
Clayton Wilkie

Photography
Kathy Dwulit
Tony Cretaro

Board of Directors

President
Steve Romero

Treasurer
Paul Montenero

Rules Director
Mike Pappaceno

Executive Board

KSF
Suresh Muttreja

EDO
George Alikakos

Alumni C
John Kinglsey

Clear-Cut Computing
Paul Montenero

Alumni D
Ed Rusch

Life Service Foundation
Robert Standing

CSI
Jim Dwulit

Eye of the Storm
Mike Pappaceno

The League Leader, © 2008, Long Island Industrial Chess League, is published approximately biweekly during the Long Island Industrial League season from October to May each year. The Long Island Industrial Chess League is a non-profit organization founded for the purpose of promoting goodwill and friendship through the game of chess and to conduct tournaments, matches and other forms of chess competition. Neither the LIICL nor its members assume any responsibility for the accuracy of the information contained herein. No reproduction in part nor in full may be made without the expressed written consent of the Board of Directors of the Long Island Industrial Chess League. Requests and inquiries may be made in writing to:

Board of Directors
LIICL
102 Rosebud Ave.
Merrick, NY 11566

LIICL Directory

September 18, 2008

<u>Name</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Telephone</u>	<u>E-mail</u>
Alikakos, George	EDO, Captain	718-836-1250 (H) 631-630-5343 (W)	george.alikakos@edocorp.com
Dwulit, Jim	Chess Space Invaders, Captain	631-467-7565 (H) 631-331-6482 (W)	dwulit@photon.com
Kingsley, John	Alumni C, Captain	631-591-2660 (H)	JKingsley@msn.com
Montenero, Paul	Clear-Cut Computing, Captain Treasurer, LIICL	516-845-4081 (W)	clearcut@mindspring.com
Muttreja, Suresh	King Solomon's Foods, Captain		
Pappaceno, Mike	Rules Director, LIICL Eye of the Storm, Captain	631-940-0886 (H) 631-682-2281 (C)	MPappaceno@aol.com
Rizzo, Robert	Editor, League Leader	516-575-2306 (W) 516-378-1342 (H) 516-984-7438 (C)	robert.rizzo@ngc.com rrizknight1@optonline.net
Romero, Steve	President, LIICL	(631) 421-1468 (H) (631) 897-4161 (C)	
Rusch, Ed	Alumni D, Captain	516-735-0417 (H)	
Standing, Robert	LSF, Captain	631-271-6120 (H) 631-697-9846 (C)	
Huntington Library	Playing Site	631-427-5165	
LIICL	Board of Directors		www.liicl.com

2008-2009 LIICL Pre-Season Ratings

Rating	Name	Rating	Name	Rating	Name
1713	Alikakos, George	1636	Kingsley, John	1474	Proffman, Paul
2120	Berg, George	1837	Kolczynski, Jim	2066 USCF	Rabin, Evan
1956	Bonfante, Charles	1919	Lamb, Terry	1925	Rizzo, Robert
1523	Celaru, Adrian	2012	Leone, Dave	1975	Romero, Steve
1753	Celauro, Sal	1289	Loshin, Al	1612	Rusch, Ed
1120	Cretaro, Anthony	1882	Lustig, Darren	1716	Schilling, Pete
1770/10	Daciuk, John	1398	Mastandrea, Robert	1559	Shattuck, John
UNR/1	Dickelson, Todd	1818/4	Manos, Bob	1836	Solomon, Steve
1845	Dorsky, Mike	1600 Est	McBride, William	1821	Sommese, Anthony
1943	Dwulit, James	1672	McCormick, Paul	1818	Soto, Jorge
UNR/2	Finnegan, Mike	1739	Montenero, Paul	1695	Spreckles, Charles
1720	Frohreich, Frank	949/11	Montenero, Zack	1729	Standing, Robert
1756/4	Goldgaber, Sergey	1932/4	Muttreja, Mahesh	1425	Thomas, Walter
1504	Goldman, Mel	1792	Muttreja, Suresh	1831	Viale, Rich
1408	Greenwald, Justin	1925	Panico, Danny	1440	Warnock, Andy
UNR/1	Grossman, Kurt	2087	Panico, Nick III	1341	Watnick, Mel
1348	Hartten, Ed	2095	Pappaceno, Mike	1916	Wilkie, Clayton
1952	Hodos, Julian	1690/5	Parrish, Allen	UNR/1	Wolfe, Tyler
1844	Hom, Dennis	2012/11	Pattard, Tom	1682	Wu, Danny
1656	Insogna, Matt	2138	Pour, Darius		

The The Price Of Relaxing

I've always felt one learns more from their defeats than from their wins and, therefore, I've decided to annotate my loss to Terry Lamb, CCC's top board, on October 17th. I learned a valuable, albeit painful, lesson in this game: When you have a strong and tenacious opponent (as Terry certainly is) on the ropes you MUST put them away. You can't relax for even a second. If you do, you pay the price, as I did here. This was only my 2nd loss with the London System. I had first taken up this system back in 2006 after seeing my LIICL teammate, Nick Panico, achieve good results with it against strong opposition. My only other loss with it was to IM Zlotnikov in the 2008 New Jersey Championship. In each of my 2 losses with this opening to date, the loss was due to a one move blunder in a winning position. In the other games in which I have employed this system to date, I have never been in serious danger of losing, winning approximately two-thirds of the games and drawing the rest. I have learned a lot about positional play from studying this opening and have even more incentive to do so after this disappointing loss. My philosophy is when you lose a game you have 2 options: Either stew about it or learn from it so as to improve. I choose the latter approach.

1. d4 d5

While there is, of course, nothing wrong with this symmetrical response I, when called upon to face the London System with the black pieces, opt to not commit my d-pawn to d5 so early. I don't like ceding the e5 square since, quite often, this can lead to dangerous kingside attacking chances for white and persistent positional pressure which can be difficult to shake off.

2. Nf3

In his excellent and informative lecture at the 2008 LIICL Awards Ceremony my teammate, Nick Panico, who knows a lot more about this opening than I do, discussed one of his "London" wins in which he advocated the move order starting with 2.Bf4. There is a lot to be said for that approach, which I've used myself with good results. White reasons that it is more important to set up as quickly as possible the "ideal" formation with Bf4, e3 and c3, preferring to delay the development of the g1 knight until a more opportune moment. If white is intent on playing the London, this might be the most accurate move order. I'm still in the process of learning this system, so

I'm not sure.

Nf6 3. Bf4 Bf5

Terry opts for a symmetrical response. While there is, of course, nothing wrong with this, Black must play accurately in order to neutralize the pull white seems to get in this system. Positional play is the order of the day, and this was fine with me since I've played Terry before and am fully aware of how strong he is tactically and what he can do with the initiative.

4. e3 e6 5.Be2

This is an important moment. I knew 5.c4 was the critical move here to try to obtain an advantage from the opening, but was concerned whether I could remember all the analysis if black now takes the knight on b1. World Championship Semifinalist Gata Kamsky won a very fine positional game in 2007 at Foxwoods against GM Shulman in this line. The game went as follows: 5.c4 Bxb1 6.Rxb1 Bb4+ 7.Ke2 Bd6 8.g3 O-O9.Qb3 Nc6 10.cxd5 Nxd5 11.Bg2 Be7 12.h4 Na5 13.Qa4-c5 14.dxc5 Bxc5 15.Ne5 Bd6 and Kamsky squeezed black to death. While this is certainly impressive, I, unfortunately, being a mere mortal, have nowhere near GM Kamsky's technique and, besides, playing with the king in the center like this is not to everyone's taste. This merits further analysis. I was also concerned about the possibility, after 5.c4, of black's checking with the bishop on b4. I had this position arise in a game of mine earlier this year in a tournament at my club in Freeport and was unable to obtain any advantage from the opening and the game ended in a draw. I'll have to study that continuation further as well.

5...Nbd7

5...c5 will, of course, be answered by 6.c3.

6. O-O Be7 7. h3

This is a very important move in this system. Now that black has played his dark-squared bishop to e7 he is threatening ...Nh5 in order to snag the important f4 bishop, so white preserves it from exchange.

7...h6

Black follows suit, a solid approach.

8.Nbd2

I guess c4 is still possible. The knight is not as active on d2 as it would be on c3.

8...c6

Black opts for a Slav-type pawn structure, which is a very reasonable thing to do. Again, ...c5 would be answered by c3.

9. c4

I finally play this advance. Maybe I waited too long?

9...O-O 10. Qb3

A standard idea in this system and in analogous positions. White applies pressure to the pawn on b7.

10...Qb6

The usual and logical response. Placing the queen on c8 looks passive and can lead to problems on the c-file if white places a rook on c1.

11. c5

This is the start of white's plan to gain space on the queenside and squeeze black. GM Kovacevic has won some beautiful games with this strategy.

11...Qxb3

Forced.

12. axb3

While recapturing with the knight on b3 is also playable, this is superior. White not only opens up things for the a1 rook, but also prepares to advance with b4 and b5 to open up lines on the queenside and, maybe, saddle black with a weak pawn on c6.

12...Ne8

This doesn't look right. I thought, at first, that maybe Terry was contemplating ideas such as ...Bd8-c7 in order to try to exchange off my powerful f4 bishop. Instead, I would prefer either ...Ne4, seeking simplification, or ...Rfe8.

13. b4

The queenside pawns start rolling.

13...g5

I agree with this reasonable attempt at counterplay. Black has to do something before he gets steamrolled on the queenside.

14. Bh2

This is probably best, simply retaining the strong bishop, but 14.Ne5 is interesting here. I did not consider this continuation during the game.

14...f6

Aiming for e6-e5 in order to shut the h2-b8 diagonal. The only other move I considered for black here was 14...a6. For example: 14...a6 15.g4 (15.b5 cxb5 16.Bxb5 Nef6 17.Be2 Rfc8 18.Rfc1 Ne4 should be playable for black) 15...Bh7 16.Nb3 and the knight eyes the a5 square, increasing the queenside pressure.

15. b5, e5

This seems pretty much forced so as to shut down the h2-b8 diagonal. If instead 15...cxb5 16.Bxb5 Nb8 (Here we see a drawback of 14...f6: black doesn't have use of the f6 square

for his knights; if instead 16...e5, 17.c6 simply appears to be too strong) 17. Bxb8 Rxb8 18. Rxa7 simply wins a pawn.

16. b4

I wanted to shore up the c5 pawn so as to threaten to take on e5 at an opportune moment, but I think white can do better here with either bxc6 or Nb3. For example: 16. bxc6 bxc6 17. b4 (I fail to see how black can avoid dropping material at this point. White has considerable pressure typical of this variation. If instead 16. Nb3 cxb5 17. Na5 ((even stronger than taking on b5 immediately)) appears very strong for white.)

16...Nc7

If black takes on b5 instead then 16...cxb5 17. Bxb5 Nc7 18. Ba4 clears the way for the b-pawn's advance at some point, gaining more queenside space.

17. bxc6 bxc6 18. dxe5

Simply winning a pawn.

18...Ne6

Probably the best try. If black takes on e5 instead then 18...Nxe5 19. Nxe5 fxe5 20. Bxe5 Bd8, while...18 fxe5; 19. Nxe5, Nxe5 (forced, as the c6 pawn is also being hit); 20. Bxe5 leads to the same thing.

19. Ba6

I wasn't happy with this move afterwards. While it's reasonable to want to threaten Ba6-b7, I should have seized the opportunity to put the boot in and play Ra6! instead. For example: 19. Ra6 !Nb8 (19...Rfc8 20. Rfa1) 20. Ra2 a6 (If instead 20...a5 then 21. Rfa1 Bd8 22. Nb3 hits the pawn on a5 too many times and it must fall.) 21. Nb3 looks very strong for white. There is pressure on the pawn on a6 and the b3 knight can hop into either d4 or a5 to increase the pressure on the c6 pawn.

19...Nd8

I felt 19...Rfb8 was a better try. For example: 19...Rfb8 20. Ra4 Bc2 21. Ra2 Bg6 although now 22. exf6 spears an exchange.

20. exf6

I didn't consider pushing the pawn to e6 here. This looks interesting. For example: 20. e6! Nxe6 (if instead 20... Bxe6 21. Nd4 Bf7 ((21... Kf7 22. Bc7 {The point of the pawn sac, to open up the h2-b8 diagonal. This looks good for white, who is simply threatening to take on d8 and then c6.} 22. Nf5) 21. Bb7.

20... Bxf6 21. Nd4 Bg6

If black takes the knight on d4 instead then: 21... Bxd4 22. exd4 Nb8 23. Be2 Ne6 24. Nf3 (24. Nb3!?) 24... g4 25. hxg4 Bxg4 26. Bd6 and the

bishop emerges from hiding to do some damage.

22. Bd6 ! Re8

If instead 22... Rf7 23. N2f3 Be4 24. Ra3 getting off the long diagonal.

23. b5

I now think this is premature, and makes the win harder. My original intention was 23. N2f3, trying to achieve better piece coordination.

23... Bxd4

23...Nb8 is the alternative: 23... Nb8 24. Bc8 (24. N2f3 Nxa6 25. Rxa6 cxb5 26. Be5 {!} Bxe5 27. Rxc6+ Kf7 ((27... Bg7 28. Nf5 Ne6 29. Nxb6+ Kh7 30. Rxe6 Rxe6 31. Nxc6+ Kxh6 32. Nxe6) 28. Nxe5+ Rxe5 29. Rxb6 b4 30. f4 Rxe3 31. fxc6+ and the black king gets hunted down. 24... Bxd4 25. exd4 cxb5 26. Nf3 a5 27. Ne5 Kg7 28. f4 prying open the f-file.

24. exd4 Nb8

This is the best try, and is a tougher nut to crack than I expected. At this point I was up 30 minutes on the clock and now gave 25 of those minutes back seeking the best solution. My reply, sacking the exchange, is reasonable but Bc8, which I also considered, is better and avoids the technical difficulties which now ensue.

25. bxc6

If instead white plays the superior 25. Bc8 (Notice the b8 knight has no moves) cxb5 (regaining the pawn and obtaining a square at c6 for the knights) 26. Nf3 a5 (if instead 26... b4 27. Ne5 Bc2 28. Bg4 ((extricating the bishop)) Ndc6 29. Bxb8 Nxb8 30. Bf3 Be4 31. Bxe4 dxe4 32. Ra5 a6 33. Rb1 winning) 27. Bxb8 (27. Ne5!) Kg7 28. f4 when white's pieces dominate. 27... Rxb8 28. Bd7 Re7 29. Ne5 and the passed c-pawn is dangerous.

25... Nxa6

25...Nbxc6 is weaker: 26. Bb5 Re6 27. Nf3 Be4 28. Rfd1 Bxf3 29. gxf3 a5

26. Rxa6 Bd3 27. Rfa1 Bxa6 28. Rxa6

White has 2 pawns for the exchange but, perhaps, I shouldn't have gone in for this. The win is definitely harder now and both players were slipping into time pressure. At any rate, I felt I shouldn't lose.

28...Ne6

The best try. If instead 28... Rc8 then 29. c7 Ne6 30. Nf3 {I wouldn't want to give up the d4 pawn since then black's d-pawn becomes passed.} Nxc7 31. Bxc7 (31. Rxa7 is weaker due to Nb5) 31... Rxc7 32. Rxb6

29. Nf3

I wasn't sure whether to bring the knight to f3

or b3. Still not sure which is better. If 29. Nb3 instead then maybe Rec8 30. f3 is a reasonable continuation

29... h5

Black now threatens ...g5-g4 winning the d4 pawn, so white's reply appears to be forced.

30. g4 hxg4 31. hxg4 Kf7 32. Ra4

If instead 32. c7 Rec8 33. Be5 Rf8 34. Bg3 clearing the e5 square for the knight.

32... a5

If instead 32... Rec8 then 33. c7 Nxc7 34. Nxc6+ Kf6 (34... Ke8 35. f4) 35. f4. If instead of 32... Rec8 black tries 32... Kf6 then 33. Be5+ Ke7 34. Ra6.

33. Ne5+ Kg7 34. Nd7 Nf4

As Terry admitted after the game, this was sheer desperation and a last attempt at a cheapo. White proceeds to fall for it. 34... Ra7 was objectively best in order to try to prevent the c-pawn from advancing but then the bishop will come in to b8 and the knight to b6. For example: 35. Bb8 Ra6 36. Be5+ Kh6 37. Nb6 Ra7 38. Nxd5 Nxc5 39. Ra3 Ne6 40. Rc3 and the c-pawn is crashing through.

35. Nb6 ???

A terrible blunder due to moving too fast. At this point I had about 10 or 11 minutes left and, I think, Terry had about 7 or 8, so I cannot blame time pressure for this howler. If I had spent a minute or two on this move I would have realized I MUST take the knight on f4 immediately. A sample line runs as follows: 35. Bxf4 gxf4 36. Nb6 (only now) Ra7 (forced due to the threat of c6-c7; if instead black tries 36... Re1+ then 37. Kg2 Ra7 38. Nxd5 wins easily) 37. Nxd5 when the f-pawn will also fall and white will have 4 pawns for the exchange.

35... Re1+

I saw this...

36. Kh2 Rh8+

...But it was this check which I missed. Now, rather than get mated after 37. Kg3, Rh3 I resigned. A shame, as it could have been one of my better games. I have tried to make the most of this unpleasant experience and channel my energies into studying this system even more so as to deepen my understanding of its positional nuances. Congrats to Terry for escaping from a difficult position.

0-1

