

GOWISE PRINT

Quality lithographic and digital print



COLOUR PHOTOCOPYING
DIGITAL PRINTING
DOCUMENT SCANNING TO DISK/EMAIL
AND
HIGH QUALITY LITHO PRINTING

THE FIRST CHOICE FOR
ALL YOUR PRINTING NEEDS

Gowise is a family company, established at our premises in Belmore Road in 1983 supplying Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich and the UK with high quality printing for 25 years.

From a few sheets of A4 duplicating to 10,000 colour brochures - we are ready and willing to assist with all your printing & copying needs.

Artwork & design facilities. Top-of-the-range Xerox copying. Litho Printing and a range of finishing including booklet making & wirebinding.

4 BELMORE ROAD,
THORPE ST ANDREW
NORWICH NR7 0PT

Tel 01603 431304
Email print@gowise.co.uk
www.gowise.co.uk



En Passant

The magazine for Norfolk's chessplayers



Summer 2009
Volume 15 No 0

Free 12-page trial issue!!!

My friend Fritz

Analytical discoveries with the computer

Who's afraid of the black pieces?

The secret: use rarely played openings like the Latvian Gambit

You too can write a chess article!

Peter Clarke: the Modest Master

How to play lots of attractive short games





En Passant
Volume 15 No 0
Summer 2009
© NCCA 2009

Subscriptions to *En Passant* are available to any individual

Volume 15 (12 issues):
 £30 for printed version
 £5 for email version

Please send your articles, letters, games and subscriptions to:
 David LeMoir, Manor House Farm, Mill Road, Walpole St Peter,
 Norfolk PE14 7QW Telephone 01945 780251
 Email hutcheson.lemoir@virgin.net

Important websites:
 NCCA: <http://www.norfolkchess.org>
 EACU <http://www.eacu.org.uk>

In this issue...	
My friend Fritz	3
Who's afraid of the black pieces?	4
You too can write a chess article!	5
Peter Clarke: the modest master	7
How to play lots of attractive short games	9

© Copyright is retained by the author of an article where one is credited, otherwise by NCCA. Where material has been copied with permission from other sources, the copyright holder is acknowledged.

This magazine is not to be circulated except in its original printed form without the prior permission of NCCA.

This trial edition of *En Passant* is edited and printed by David LeMoir on behalf of **Norfolk County Chess Association**. Please note: the views expressed in this magazine are not necessarily those of NCCA or of the editor.

game more drawish. White doesn't want a draw, so he tries to resist simplifications.

12 Qe1

Here was another quandary for me. The natural approach now is 12...fxe5 13 Nxe5 Nd4, when I have the d4 square and a threat to fork queen and rook with 14...Nxc2. However, White can ignore the threat and approach the black king with 14 Bh5!, when 14...Nxc2 loses to 15 Qg3!:

- a) 15...Nxa2 allows 16 Nf7 Bd4 (or 16...g6 17 Nh6 mate) 17 Bxd4 Qxd4 18 Nh6+ Kh8 19 Rxf8 mate
- b) 15...Nd4 (15...Bd4 is similar) is met by 16 Rxf8+, when all recaptures fail. 16...Qxf8 allows 17 Bf7+ Kh8 18 Ng6+! hxg6 19 Qh4 mate, while 16...Bxf8 17 Bf7+ Kh8 18 Bc4! forces the queen to desert the protection of the knight on d4 in order to save her own life.

Instead, I decided to take a leaf out of White's book. I wound up the pressure.

12...Qd5 13 exf6

Now it is White who loses patience.

13...Bxf6 14 Bxf6 Rxf6 15 Qc3

15 c3 followed by 16 d4 looks better, but this is not bad.

15...Be6 16 a4

He wants to centralise his a1 rook without losing the a-pawn.



16...Raf8 (see diagram)

White stands OK if he can develop a reasonable plan. He could play 17 d4, or 17 Rb1 followed by 17 Rb5. White decides to hit the black queen with Bf3, grabbing the long light-squared diagonal, so he retreats his knight. The only problem is that Black is allowed a move in the mean time, and it happens to be a very strong one.

17 Nd2? Nd4!

Completely natural, but also completely decisive.

18 Bf3

The least challenging of all the available defences. However, after 18 Rae1 Qe5! hits e2 and threatens a check with the knight to win the queen. Then 19 Kh1 allows 19...Rxf1+ 20 Rxf1 (20 Nxf1 Qxe2! wins at once) 20...Qxe2 21 Rxf8+ Kxf8 22 Qxd4 Qe1+ 23 Qg1 Qxd2 with an extra piece. 18 Bd1 is only slightly different: 18...Qe5! 19 Qb4 Qe3+ 20 Kh1 Rxf1+ and mate next move.

The best defence is 18 Bh5!?, but 18...c5 cements the knight and leaves the bishop with nowhere to go. After 19 Rxf6 Rxf6, White's best is 20 Ne4 Qxh5 21 Nxf6+ gxf6, when Black has a material advantage and should win easily enough. 20 Bd1 is less good because 20...Qg5! threatens 21...Qe3+ mating, and 21 Nc4 loses brilliantly to 21...Qh4! 22 g3 Rf1+!! 23 Kxf1 Qf6+ (onto the same diagonal as the white queen) and all main replies lose the white queen to a knight check.

White goes ahead with his idea, hoping that the d4 knight will exchange itself, but it finds far more lucrative employment.

18...Rxf3! 0-1

White cannot recapture due to the knight fork on e2.

8 Apply sound general principles – which can work if your opponent doesn't
7 Adopt little-known and sharp pet openings – see my earlier article on the Latvian

6 Provoke an early crisis – although you could also lose quickly!

5 Be prepared to sacrifice for the initiative and the attack – who dares wins

4 Never under-estimate knights! – see the game below

3 Target the king early – queenside attacks rarely result in quick wins

2 Play against slightly weaker players – stronger players rarely lose quickly, but much weaker players rarely lose attractively!

1 Be tactically aware – to exploit early opportunities.

The game below is not one of the most spectacular that I have played, but it is one of many that feature sudden death by knights.

White: R.C.Smith

Black D.A.LeMoir

London League 1986

1 e4 e5 2 Nc3 Nf6 3 f4 d5 4 fxe5 Nxe4

I have reached this position, a standard in the Vienna Gambit, just twice in my life. Just a few years ago came the second occasion, against Swanson in the English Minor Counties Championship Final at Uppingham. He uncorked 5.Qf3, which I had always assumed was bad. The game went 5...Nc6 6.Bb5 Nxc3 7.dxc3!?, and now I looked at 7...Qh4+ 8.g3 Qe4+ 9.Qxe4 dxe4, but shied away from it. Swanson later told me that he has won a succession of games from that position, despite theory frowning upon it. After a very lengthy think I came up with the pawn sacrifice 7...Bd7!?, intending 8 Qxd5 Qh4+ 9 g3

Qe7 10 Nf3 0-0-0, when Black can hardly be prevented from regaining the pawn by ...Bg4. Swanson declined the pawn with 8.Bf4, when I could achieve easy equality with 8...Ne7!. Instead I played sharply with 8...Qe7 9.0-0-0 g5?! 10 e6! Bxe6 11 Be5 Bh6? (11...Rg8 is awkward, but safer) 12 Qg3 (12 Qh5! gives Black a big problem) 12...0-0-0? (12...0-0 and 12...Rg8 both looked very dangerous, but White only has a small advantage after 13 Bxc7) 13 Bxh8, and White won at a canter.

Smith plays one of the standard lines.

5 d3 Nxc3 6 bxc3 d4 7 Nf3 Nc6 8 Be2

I knew a little about this line because an old sparring partner of mine, Maurice Staples, used to play the Vienna in the 1970s. I anticipated 8 cxd4 Bb4+ 9 Bd2 Bxd2+ 10 Qxd2 Nxd4 11 c3 Nxf3+ 12 gxf3 f6, with a sharp position. The quiet text move sank me deep into thought, most of which was presumably around whether or not to play 8...Bc5. In order to avoid any snap attacks with knight or bishop jumping into g5, I went for the less ambitious bishop move.

8...Be7 9 0-0 0-0 10 Bb2

White is trying hard to keep the knight out of d4, so he avoids the natural 10 cxd4 Nxd4 11 c3 Nxe2+ 12 Qxe2, when the knight has disappeared but Black has the two bishops. Now 10...Bc5, holding down the d4 square, probably attracted me, but I resisted the loss of tempo involved. The solution I hit upon should have satisfied White more than Black.

10...dxc3 11 Bxc3 f6

The idea is to exchange bishops, but after 12 exf6 Bxf6 13 Bxf6 Rxf6 14 d4, White has possession of the d4 square, and he no longer has a pawn at e5 getting in his way. Having said that, the liquidation makes the

My friend Fritz (or Rybka, or...) – Part 1

David LeMoir

There was a lot of fuss surrounding Garry Kasparov's use of computers in the analysis for his "On My Great Predecessors" series of books. (Incidentally, I can unreservedly recommend them for historical interest and wonderful content.)

Some people feel cheated if a writer uses electronic assistance in his analytical work. I will not attempt to answer for Kasparov - I will simply state that I could not do without it. I hope that my readers are entertained and instructed by my books, but I am happy knowing that no-one can easily pull apart the analysis contained in them.

In the preparation of my books, I have made several exciting discoveries that, if 'my' analysis is correct, should alter our perception of some well known games.

The first example is from Essential Chess Sacrifices, and is the famous Greek Gift game Colle-O'Hanlon, which featured in Vukovic's The Art of Attack. (I have an early English Descriptive Notation edition.) Vukovic claimed that O'Hanlon could have refuted the sacrifice, a claim that Baburin correctly disproved in Mega Database 2001. Baburin agreed with Vukovic's assessment that O'Hanlon could have forced a draw in another line,

but both missed a clear win for White.

Colle has just played a Greek Gift (Bxh7+) sacrifice and followed up with a knight check on g5. After the game continuation, **13...Kg6 14 h4!** (threatening 15 h5+ Kf6 16 Qf3+) O'Hanlon played **14...Rh8?** and lost quickly after **15 Rxe6+!** Vukovic claimed a win for Black by 14...f5 15 h5+ Kf6 16 Qxd4+ Be5 17 Rxe5 Nxe5 18 Nh7+ Kf7 19 Ng5+ Kg8 20 Qxe5 Qd1+, but Baburin pointed out 17 Qh4! (instead of 17 Rxe5) 17...g6 18 f4! and a bishop move loses the queen to 19 Nxe6+. Here 17...Qa5 protects the bishop and pulls the queen out of danger, but it loses to 18 b4! Qd5 19 Bb2!, when the threat of 20 c4 wins the bishop.

Instead of emerging via g6, the black king had the option of retreating to g8, and after 13...Kg8 14 Qh5 Ne5 15 Rxe5 Bxe5 16 Qxf7+ Kh8 17 Qh5+ Kg8 both commentators assumed that White has to settle for a perpetual check, missing the immediately decisive 18 b3!, which I found with the help of *Fritz*. White threatens 19 Qh7+ Kf8 20 Ba3+, and 18...Bd6 loses to 19 Qh7+ Kf8 20 Qh8+ Ke7 21 Qxg7mate.

Part of the excitement at finding such an improvement is that it fits the logic of the position. When the king is short of breathing space, it often requires just one more piece to join the attack to make the defence crack. White left his dark-squared bishop at home in order to play a very early Greek Gift sacrifice. That bishop delivers a coup-de-grace by joining the attack in a way which would have been impossible from any other square but c1.

Another exciting point is that Baburin's



annotations were very recent, so it is unlikely that anyone else had found, or at least widely published, my discovery.



Who's afraid of the black pieces? *Lemonade*

If I was to tell you that I have a defence for Black which has scored 69% for me in all games, I guess that you would ask:

What is it?

Across how many games has that 69% been scored?

What is the general strength of your opponents in those games?

Would you recommend it for me?

Let's take the questions one at a time.

The defence is the Latvian Gambit, **1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 f5**.

I started playing it in 1988, and played it in odd games up to 1996, by which point I had played it eight times in league chess and once in a rapidplay tournament, and had scored five wins, two draws and one loss. Since 1999 I played it more regularly and my overall score was Played 35 Won 16 Drawn 16 Lost 3. Not bad, hey?

I played it against a cross-section of my opponents, but it is fair to say that many of them tended to be weaker than me. The Latvian helped me to achieve the healthy plus score that I needed to maintain my grade. Compare that with my average over the same period of 62% with Black and 65% with White.

Would I recommend it for others? Clearly, we should choose openings which suit our style, so I would not recommend it for everyone. On the other hand, we can all learn lessons from my success with it.

The Latvian has a reputation as being both

In the coming months, I shall reveal several more new discoveries that I have made, some of them in very famous games.

tactically and positionally suspect. That reputation is fairly well deserved, but only if White knows his stuff and plays accurately. When it is sprung on an unsuspecting opponent, its aggressiveness can occasion a surprisingly muted response. Weak players with little or no book knowledge are often reduced to 3 d3?, which simply hands the initiative to Black. Players who know little about the Latvian shy away from the most critical lines because they don't want to be the victim in a game like the one below.

White: Mark Hindle

Black: Dave LeMoir

Fakenham, 2001

1 e4 e5 2 Nf3 f5 3 Bc4 fxe4 4 Nxe5 d5

4...Qg5 leads to a win for White with best play, but can anyone reel it off without any preparation? I prefer the move played, although I'm pretty sure that Black should not gain enough compensation for the exchange and pawn sacrificed. Over the board, it's not so simple for White, and I have scored three wins and one draw in this line.

5 Qh5+ g6 6 Nxg6 hxg6 7 Qxh8 Kf7 8 Qd4 Be6 9 Bb3 Nc6 10 Qe3 Bh6 11 f4 Nge7 12 0-0 Nf5 13 Qe1!

Mark Hindle has been playing it all by ear for some time now. I was aware of 13 Qf2, when the queen can become vulnerable on the g1-a7 diagonal. Now I, too, was on my own. The reply 13...Qd6 is given by Kosten in *The Latvian Gambit Lives!*, but my move also has its points.

pawn majority. If 40...c6, White exchanges twice on c6, then plays e4 when he wins the king and pawn ending as Black's king must move over to the kingside and leave his queenside pawns to the white king.

41 Rg1 c6 42 g4! fxc4+

42...cxd5 43 gxf5 Re7 44 h6! gxh6 45 Rh1 and White is effectively a pawn ahead due to Black's doubled d-pawn.

43 Rxc4 Re7 44 dxc6+ Kxc6 45 e4 d5

Black is gradually over-stretching.

46 e5 b5 47 Rg2 Kc5 48 Ke3 Rf7 49 a3 b4 50 Rc2+ Kb6 51 axb4 axb4 52 Rc8

Neither of Black's pieces can play an effective part in the game. Now it only needs White's king to join in and the game is effectively over.

52...Rf5 53 Kd4! Rxh5 54 e6 1-0

Clarke was known as a quiet positional player, but a man of his class could produce a big attack when the opportunity arose, as our final game shows.

White: Peter Clarke

Black: George Wheeler

WECU Championship, Winchester,



How to win lots of attractive short games *Dave LM*

A few years ago, I discovered that I had played an unusually large number of attractive miniature chess games (usually defined as being of 25 moves or less) and decided that I would work out the common factors that may have led to their short length. In *CHESS* magazine I published a count-down of the top ten factors, in terms of those which appeared most in my list

1981

1 d4 f5 2 Nf3 Nf6 3 g3 e6 4 Bg2 Be7 5 0-0 0-0 6 b3 d6 7 c4 Qe8 8 Nc3 Nbd7 9 Bb2 c6 10 b4 d5 11 c5 Ne4 12 Ne5 Nxc3 13 Bxc3 Nxe5 14 dxe5 b6!? 15 cxb6 axb6 16 b5 cxb5 17 Bxd5

Exploiting the weakening of the long diagonal caused by Black's 14th move. But Wheeler could have ignored this and played 17...Ra3 18 Bb3 Bc5, with a slight edge as White's kingside is weakened. Wheeler decides to capture the bishop - a deliberate exchange sacrifice - knowing that he gets good chances against White's king with the disappearance of the light-squared bishop.

17...exd5!? 18 Qxd5+ Qf7 19 Qxa8 Bc5 20 Rfd1!

Black was threatening 20...Bb7 21 Qa7 Ra8 winning the queen. This move is directed against that possibility. Now Black could play to exploit the weakness of the f2 square by ...f4!, which gives him good counterplay.

20...Bb7? 21 e6! Qe7 22 Qxb7! Qxb7 23 Rd7 Qxd7 24 exd7 g6?

Both 24...Rb8 and 24...Rd8 would lengthen resistance.

25 Bf6! 1-0

of attractive short games, each with an illustrative game of my own. That count-down went as follows:

10 Play on the opponent's greed - setting traps to exploit it

9 Remember the standard sacrifices - an advertisement for *Essential Chess Sacrifices!*

several annotated games. Here are some of them, with my notes.

First two typical Clarke endgames. It is hard to see where his opponents went wrong.

White: Trefor Thynne

Black: Peter Clarke

WECU Championship, Weymouth, 1970

1 d4 d5 2 c4 dxc4 3 Nf3 Nf6 4 e3 e6 5 Bxc4 c5 6 0-0 a6 7 dxc5 Bxc5 8 Qxd8+ Kxd8 9 a3 b5 10 Ba2 Bb7 11 b4 Bd6 12 Bb2 Ke7 13 Nbd2 Nbd7 14 Nb3 Rac8 15 Rac1 Bd5

To weaken the light squares.

16 Rxc8 Rxc8 17 Rc1 Rxc1+ 18 Nxc1 Bxa2 19 Nxa2 g6

To move the f6 knight without losing the g-pawn.

20 Bd4

Otherwise ...Nb6 eyeing c4.

20...Ne4 21 Kf1 f5 22 Nc1 g5! 23 Nd3 g4 24 Nfe5 Bxe5 25 Bxe5 Nd2+ 26 Ke2 Nc4 27 Bb2 e5

Threatening ...e4.

28 Bc1 e4!

Normally, giving away f4 and d4 would be dangerous, but here the knight cannot easily reach d4, and on f4 it can be challenged from g6. Most important is Black's light square grip which prevents any counterplay.

29 Nf4

29 Ne1 looks better, preserving his better minor piece.

29...Kd6 30 Kd1 Nde5 31 Ke2 Ng6! 32 Nh5 Ke5 33 Kd1 Nh4 34 Nf4 Kd6 35 Ke2 Ne5! 36 Bb2 Nd3! 37 Nxd3

exd3+ 38 Kxd3 Nxd3

Clarke has converted his advantage into a multitude of light-square paths into his opponents' position. In particular, the knight can win the h-pawn from f3.

39 Bd4 Ne1+ 40 Kc3 Kd5 41 Bb6 h5 42 Bc7 Ke4 43 Bd6 h4 44 Kd2 Nd3!

Changing tack. The a-pawn is the new target.

45 Ke2 h3 46 Bg3 Nb2 47 Bh4 Nc4 48 Bf6 Nxa3 49 Bb2 Nc2 50 Bc3 Nxe3! 0-1

51 fxe3 allows 51...g3 queening a pawn.

White: Peter Clarke

Black: George Wheeler

WECU Championship, Weymouth, 1975

1 c4 f5 2 Nc3 Nf6 3 g3 e5 4 Bg2 d6 5 d4 exd4 6 Qxd4 Nc6 7 Qd2 Be7 8 b3 0-0 9 Bb2 Rb8 10 Nh3 Ne5 11 Nf4 a6 12 Ncd5 Nxd5 13 Nxd5 Be6 14 Nxe7+ Qxe7 15 0-0 Qf7 16 e3 Qh5 17 Qd1 Qxd1 18 Rfxd1 Nd7 19 Rac1 a5 20 Bd4 b6 21 Bc6 Nc5 22 h4 Kf7 23 Kg2 Bd7 24 Bd5+ Be6 25 f3 Rfe8 26 Kf2 Re7 27 Rc3 Rbe8 28 Bc6 Bd7 29 Bxd7 Rxd7 30 Rc2 Rde7 31 Re2 Ne6 32 Ree1 Nd8 33 Bc3 Nc6 34 Rd5 Ne5 35 Bxe5 Rxe5

Now Clarke forces a weakness on the c-file.

36 f4! Rxd5

Retreat loses the f-pawn.

37 cxd5 Rc8 38 Rc1 Ke7 39 h5!

With later possibilities of h6, and making ...g6, as defence of the f-pawn, difficult.

39...Kd7 40 Kf3! Re8

White threatened e4, creating a kingside

13...Bf8!? 14 Nc3 Bc5+ 15 Kh1 Qh8 16 g4



If the knight retreats, then the white f-pawn will advance to open up the black king. Black must let the knight go, and he needs to act quickly to gain some compensation for the rook minus.

16...Qh3! 17 gxf5

Surprisingly, analysis later showed that White is in trouble here, and that the only way to save the game is 17 Nxe4! dxe4 18

Bxe6+ Kxe6 19 gxf5+ gxf5 20 c3! Bg1! 21 Qe2 Bxh2 22 Qg2 (so far, my analysis after the game; it seems that Black is lost but...) 22...Qd3! (Burgess) 23 Kxh2 Kf7! 24 Qh3 Qe2+ 25 Kg1 Rg8+ 26 Kh1 Rh8! 27 Qxh8 Qxf1+ with a draw by perpetual check.

17...gxf5 18 Bxd5

Now 18 Nxe4 loses to 18...fxe4! 19 f5 Rg8!! 20 fxe6+ Ke8! 21 Qe2 Nd4 22 Qf2 Nf5!, while 18 Qe2 Rg8! also leads to a win for Black.

18...Bxd5 19 Nxd5 Rg8 20 Qe2?

Now the roof falls in, but the better 20.Rf2 loses to 20...Bxf2 21 Qxf2 Nd4 22 Ne3 Nf3 23 Nf1 Qh4!! 24 Qe3 Qe1!.

20...Nd4 21 Qf2 Nf3 22 Qe2 Nxe2!

It's a shame that I didn't spot the lovely 22...Qg3!! 23 hxg3 Rh8+ 24 Kg2 Rh2 mate, but this also forces a quick mate.

23 Rf2 Nf1+ 24 Rh2 Rg1 mate 0-1



You too can write a chess article!

Your new editor

Articles are the lifeblood of *En Passant*, and more of us should be writing them. So why did JayCee have to send out repeated requests for new articles? There are probably three problems.

First, some of us may believe we are incapable of writing a worthwhile article.

Second, we may feel that our stronger brethren will pour scorn on our chess analysis.

Third, we can't think of a topic to write about.

I will address all three problems, and then hopefully I will be buried under a deluge of articles. In recent years there have been

two main writers, Mike Read and myself. My articles can go on a bit, and as editor I will have less time to write them. If you want more variety in your *En Passant*, indeed if you want the magazine to survive, the answer lies in the hands of readers like you.

I cannot write a worthwhile article

If you can write at all, then you can write about chess. As we shall see, there is a myriad of topics that you can write about, even if you do not want to annotate a game. If you do send in an annotated game and you are the lowest graded player in Norfolk, then you can be pretty sure that

all of your readers will understand what you are trying to say. If you are the highest graded player, it is far more difficult to ensure that everyone is comfortable with your analysis and comments.

I hear, first-hand or via JayCee, readers complaining that occasionally Mike Read's or my annotations go over their heads. The tone is set by the writers, not the readers, so if those readers start to send in articles of the type that they would like to read, then other writers will follow suit and *En Passant* will have even more popular appeal.

People will laugh at my attempts at analysis

When I first started writing chess articles, I felt the same way. I was plunging into a big pool where masters and grandmasters were writing (*British Chess Magazine* and *CHESS*). Surely, I would be unfavourably compared to them? My highest qualification in English Language was Grade 5 at O level, and my chess grade was way below master level. Right now, I look at those articles again and I can see glaring analytical errors. What negative reaction do you think I got at the time?

None at all. Many readers told me personally how interesting the articles were, even players who were stronger than me, but no-one said "I counted five analytical errors" or similar. Everyone appreciates any attempt to entertain or inform them. They are not searching frantically for faults to pick.

If you really are concerned that your analysis will be faulty, then don't include much analysis.

I can't think of anything to write about

You might be astonished at how many different possible topics for a chess article there can be. The latest *CHESS* magazine

gives some idea. It contains:

- two tournament reports, with annotated games and episodes
- a review of some of the more important tournaments around the world, with some annotated games and episodes
- "My Favourite Game" (by a leading grandmaster)
- an article on the role of chess in the lives of several British monarchs and their consorts, from King Arthur to Princess Diana
- an article about some old chess books
- what happened in the chess world this month 75 years ago
- a cartoon strip
- a regular humorous column about a fictional chess-playing character
- a set of "Find The Winning Moves" puzzles, with solutions later in the magazine
- "How Good Is Your Chess" - a deeply annotated game in which you guess all the moves of one side (after the opening phase) and receive points for your answers
- a chess studies column
- a chess problem column
- information about new chess books and software
- a list of forthcoming chess events.

Many of these articles and columns appear every month, but many are ad hoc. Do they give you any ideas?

I could add:

- personal reminiscences about chess (remember *Lords Of The Boards* by Alec Toll?)
- famous (and not-so-famous) players we have met (or admired), including past Norfolk players; A few years ago I wrote a series of articles about Owen Hindle, my material coming from *CHESS* magazine and *British Chess Magazine*. Someone could do the same for John Emms, Robert Bellin or Clive Cubitt for instance.

- your experiences in a pet opening (or one which has become a pet hate!)
- chess curiosities. A few years ago I wrote a series of articles in *CHESS* magazine entitled *What Has Chess Ever Done For Us*. Included were several curiosities such as the top women chess players who have married several chess players (not all at once of course) and the game with five exchange sacrifices (Orton-Hindle, rapidplay).

If you set your mind to it, I'm sure that you can think of more topics for chess articles.

Choosing games

We can find lots of excuses for publishing games, other people's or our own. *En Passant* has seen series on bullet and blitz games played on the internet, and famous 'micro-games' (very short) from the past. The only problem with such ideas (for me, at least) is that they are not relevant to us as Norfolk chessplayers. On the other hand, one player wrote a fascinating series containing several of his own annotated games whose outcome (and/or quality) was affected by time trouble. Most of his opponents were among the readership of *En Passant*.

Some people think that publishing and annotating their own wins is big-headed or a put-down to the losers. I can

understand and appreciate such modesty and considerateness, but it isn't really necessary. After all, if a game is worth publishing, then the opponent has done something worthwhile and is a full partner in the creation of a little bit of art. We publish games of which we are proud, or which have some merit to them. That tends automatically to exclude games in which several pieces were blundered away.

You may be concerned that you have played no games of sufficient quality to merit publication, but if you are graded 60 and beat someone graded above you then you are likely to have played well enough for anyone graded under 100 to appreciate greatly, and for the rest of us to at least give a nod to. Most importantly, all of *En Passant's* readers will understand what's going on, which is something that cannot be said of all of the games that see the light of day there!

If you have a game which was good in parts but spoiled by a blunder, then use the 'Episode' method - simply start from a diagram, missing out early embarrassments and/or state that "White (or Black) went on to win" to eliminate later embarrassments! Even a brief article with one short episode is worthwhile, and you can flesh out a brief episode with annotations, or use several episodes, to make a full-length article.



Peter Clarke – the Modest Master Norfolk Open Champion

Peter Clarke was a gentle, quiet man, and one of England's top players in the 1960s. He was several times West of England Champion, and beat me in the championship twice, with four draws (so I came out ahead on my reckoning: four draws to me, two wins to him!).

A gentleman named James Pratt decided

to write a booklet about him and asked me whether I could dig up any of Peter's games. As it happened, I had a collection of reports from the West of England Championship Congress (a copy of which went to every competitor in the congress) and for several years I actually wrote the report myself. I was therefore able to provide James with