

TENNESSEE CHESS NEWS

TCA Dues \$1 a Year

JANUARY, 1964

Volume 6, No. 1

Published bi-monthly. Editor: Peter P. Lahde, 80 Lyle Lane, Nashville 11, Tenn.
 Games Editor: Robert R. Coveyou, 104 Stanton Lane, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
 Postal Editor: Brandt Kuperstock, 108 Wabash Lane, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
 Contributors: Bowen (Nashville), Burris (Knoxville), Finucane, Sr. (Kingsport),
 Hurt (Memphis), Mercer (Dayton), Murphy (Maryville), and Smithson (AEDG)

OPERATION MM

The slogan "Operation MM" was adopted by USCF several years ago, the double M standing for more members. More members is what we would like to get for TCA in 1964. This will not be difficult to do if each present member just get one new member to join up. This is what TCA President John Hurt would like to see. Particularly we would like the Officers of the Membership Committee to make a special effort to get new members.

The Nashville Chess Club is considering to sponsor an "International Tournament" on a local level as described by USCF President Major Edmundson in Chess Life. This would be an excellent way to get new members for TCA as well as USCF. Why not some of the other clubs try this also?

Several TCA members for 1963 have not yet signed up for 1964. Please do so at once so as not to miss an issue. This you can do by sending one dollar to: Peter P. Lahde, 80 Lyle Lane, Nashville, Tenn. 37211. Check can be made out to TCA.

MOMIC REPEATS TO RETAIN MID-SOUTH CROWN

Milam Momic of Leighton, Ala., for the second year in the row won the strong Mid-South Open in Memphis over the Thanksgiving weekend. He only gave up one draw to Eric Bone of Baytown, Texas, to score $5\frac{1}{2}$ points. Steve Luining of New Orleans was second with $4\frac{1}{2}$ points. Four players scored four points in this order: 3. Eric Bone, Baytown, Texas; 4. Richard Schultz, New Orleans; 5. Jude Acers, Baton Rouge; and 6. Frank Repass of New Orleans. Seventh and Eighth respectively were Hunter Weeks and John Hurt with $3\frac{1}{2}$, both of Memphis. Four more players had $3\frac{1}{2}$ including Mark Gilley of Memphis.

Despite being busy directing the Open and the E&C division, Frank Garner won the lower division with 5 points giving up only two draws.

Attendance by states was as follows: Tennessee 16, Louisiana 8, Alabama 7, Arkansas 4, Kentucky 2, Missouri 1, Mississippi 1, Texas 1, Okla. 1; 41 in all.

Open Division

Player	USCF	Score	Player	USCF	Score
1. Milam Momic (Ala.)	2242	$5\frac{1}{2}:\frac{1}{2}$	15. James Wright (Tenn.)	1941	3 :3
2. Luining, Steve (La.)	2075	$4\frac{1}{2}:\frac{1}{2}$	16. Peek, Billy (La.)	1892	3 :3
3. Bone, Eric (Texas)	2069	4 :2	17. Williamson, Ken (Ala.)	1999	3 :3
4. Schultz (La.)	2127	4 :2	18. Scrivener, R.S. (Miss.)	2200E	3 :3
5. Acers, Jude (La.)	2139	4 :2	19. Mitchell, Jms. (Tenn.)	1553	3 :3
6. Repass, Frank (La.)	1899	4 :2	20. Madden, Paul (Okla.)	UNR.	$2\frac{1}{2}:\frac{3}{2}$
7. Weeks, Hunter (Tenn.)	2016	$3\frac{1}{2}:\frac{1}{2}$	21. Kiefling, Larry (Ala.)	1768	$2\frac{1}{2}:\frac{3}{2}$
8. Hurt, John (Tenn.)	2017	$3\frac{1}{2}:\frac{1}{2}$	22. Jordan, Thomas (la.)	1624	2 :4
9. Banffy, Francis (Ga.)	2053	$3\frac{1}{2}:\frac{1}{2}$	23. Lahde, Peter (Tenn.)	1929	2 :4
10. LeCompte, G. (La.)	1984	$3\frac{1}{2}:\frac{1}{2}$	24. Savery, Charles (Calif.)	1870	2 :4
11. Gilley, Mark (Tenn.)	1808	$3\frac{1}{2}:\frac{1}{2}$	25. Balsai, Steve (Ark.)	1929	2 :4
12. Barnes, John (Mo.)	1971	$3\frac{1}{2}:\frac{1}{2}$	26. McDowell, Rich. (Tenn.)	1680	$1\frac{1}{2}:\frac{4}{2}$
13. Rosenblum, Rich. (La.)	1723	3 :3	27. Hargett, Paul (Ala.)	1810	1 :5
14. Truesdel, Dave (Macon, Ga)	2130	3:3	28. Haanan, James	UNR.	1 :5

"B" & "C" Division

1. Garner, Frank	5:1	8. Carter, J. J.	$3\frac{1}{2}:\frac{2}{2}$
2. Haas, R. S.	$4\frac{1}{2}:\frac{1}{2}$	9. White, Allen	3 :3
3. O'Bannon, Robert	4 :2	10. Weis, L. T.	$2\frac{1}{2}:\frac{3}{2}$
4. Moore, J. D.	4 :2	11. Gifford, Mrs. C. W.	2 :4
5. Carter, C. H.	$3\frac{1}{2}:\frac{2}{2}$	12. Brewer, F. A.	2 :4
6. Waldrep, Carl	$3\frac{1}{2}:\frac{2}{2}$	13. Elias, Ronnie	2 :4
7. Topp, Ed.	$3\frac{1}{2}:\frac{2}{2}$		

ANNOUNCING SECOND GEORGIA OPEN
February 15 & 16

A five round Swiss, 50 moves in 2 hours, sponsored by the Georgia State Chess Association starts at 9 AM at Augusta Town House Motor Inn, 744 Broad Street, in Augusta, Ga. USCF rated. 80% of all open entry fees go into open prize fund with guaranteed minimums of first \$50, second \$25, third \$15, and fourth \$10. Remainder of open prize fund to be divided equally among top 20% (lowest whole numbers) of open finalists. If over 40 total entrants there will be an amateur division (under 18000 USCF rating) and 70% of all amateur entry fees go into a separate amateur prize fund with guaranteed minimum of \$20 for first. Remainder of amateur prize fund to be divided as in open. Separate directors and prize funds for open and amateur. Entry fee \$5 plus USCF membership (available for \$4 at site). Bring clocks and sets. Inquiries to Lee Hyder, 440 Crossways Place, Aiken, S.C.

The above announcement was given in cooperation with the Georgia State Chess Association. Last year three Tennessee players participated in this event, they were Emmy Tsitscklis (scoring $2\frac{1}{2}$ points) and Mike Coveyou (2) and John Hutton (2). Hope to see participation from Tennessee again this year. Also, a former Tennessee player, Lee Hyder, and a regular at the Tenn. Open will be directin the event.

TED MERCER WINS HANDICAP TOURNEY

Ted Mercer won an 8 round handicap tournament in Dayton, Tenn. with $7\frac{1}{2}:\frac{1}{2}$. He gave odds to all players from Queen and two moves to KBP and move. A surprise second place was the impressive score of 7:1 made by beginner Betty Powers.

Dayton is now playing three matches by mail against Oak Ridge, Knoxville, and Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

The boards against the Oak Ridge and Knoxville players are as follows:

	Oak Ridge	Dayton
Board 1	Robert Coveyou	Ted Mercer
Board 2	Brandt Kuperstock	J. D. Anderson
Board 3	Mike Coveyou	Pat Morgan
Board 4	Rusty Norton	Ellen Fahnsworth
	(Dayton is ahead 2:0, on the basis of 2 fourth board wins.)	
	Knoxville	Dayton
Board 1	David Burris	Ted Mercer
Board 2	Bill Porier	J. D. Anderson
Board 3	Brooks McNeely	Incy Hall
Board 4	Marshall Tipton	Ellen Farnsworth

BOB COVEYOU WINS KNOXVILLE OPEN

Bob Coveyou of Oak Ridge again won the Knoxville Open with the score of $4\frac{1}{2}:\frac{1}{2}$, drawing only with Ken Williamson. Three players scored $3\frac{1}{2}$ points, Mike Coveyou of Oak Ridge, Ken Williamson of Huntsville, Ala. and Ted Mercer of Dayton. We hope to get more complete results for next issue. The event took place just after Christmas in Knoxville.

We are indebted to Ted Mercer for both the Knoxville and the Dayton report.

THREE NEW CLUBS

Three new chess clubs have been organized recently in our state, two of which are in Middle Tennessee.

In Donelson, a suburb of Nashville, the Donelson Chess Club was formed. The meetings are held the second and fourth Tuesday each month. Meetings are held at the home of the Vice President Harold Elkins at 3100 Stafford Dr.

In Murfreesboro, at the Middle Tenn. State College a club was organized. Mr. Leon Stancliff of 926 Kirkwood St. in Murfreesboro is one of the sponsors. A meet between this club and the Donelson Club is planned.

At a Memphis suburb in Fraser another club was organized. John Hurt gave a simul there last year.

MANY THANKS

Your editor would like to take this opportunity to express his appreciation and thanks to the Tennessee Chess Association for the Plaque presented to him at the last Nashville Club meeting before Christmas. The inscription read as follows: "Tennessee Chess Association presents to Peter P. Lahde this token of thanks for a job well done in the promotion of organized chess in Tennessee." Mr. Albert Bowen, TCA Secretary and Treasurer made the presentation.

GAMES FROM THE STATE TEAM TOURNEY 1963

QUEEN'S PAWN OPENING		White: Jerry Sullivan (Oak Ridge)		Black: Long (Nashv)	
1. P-Q4	N-KB3	8. P-B4	Q-K1(f)	15. KR-Q1	B-B1(h)
2. N-KB3(a)	P-KN3	9. N-B3	P-K4	16. P-KN4!(i)	P-N3(j)
3. B-B4(b)	B-N2	10. PXP	PXP	17. P-N5	B-KN2
4. P-K3	O-O	11. B-R2	Q-K2(g)	18. PXP	BXP
5. B-K2	P-Q3(e)	22. Q-B2	R-Q1	19. N-K4	B-KN2
6. P-KR3	QN-Q2(d)	13. QR-Q1	N-K1	20. P-B5	B-N2
7. O-O	P-B3(e)	14. R-Q2	P-B3	21. B-B4ch	K-B1
The Annotation is by Robert Covyou.				22. N(3)-N5	Resigns(k)

- (a) Fischer says that this move is a mistake, since White will have no effective line against the King's Indian. If this comment is valid as between grandmasters, as it might well be, it doesn't apply here.
- (b) But I would say that this move can be good only against a player of less than master strength - hence it might just barely get by here. Black (and White) should now keep a sharp eye on possible White weaknesses on the long diagonal and the Queen-side.
- (c) With this move Black seems to be bent on playing ... P-K4, a very uncertain project. A reasonable project is ... P-B4, ... N-B3, ... Q-N3. Hence I feel 5... P-B4 is better, and in fact, satisfactory for Black.
- (d) 6... P-B4 is still O.K.; now Black is nearly committed to the ... P-K4.
- (e) Still 6... P-K4 would be tactically sound all along here if only the KN had an effective square to go after PXP. Hence 7... P-QN3 is possible: 8.P-B4, B-N2; 9.N-B3, N-K5 looks alright for Black. But White could try 8.QN-Q2, B-N2; 9.B-Q3. However, although ... N-K5 is prevented, now ... P-K4 is easy to attain, and White's pieces on the Q file make an exploitation of this file by White possible. Conclusion: 7... P-QN3 is as good as 7... P-B3, until someone proves otherwise.
- (f) 8... Q-B2 looks very dangerous, but nevertheless is probably better; the preparation of ... P-K4 this way (8... Q-K1) loses precious time.
- (g) Clearing the back row by ... P-KN3 and ... B-N2 is probably the most urgent task, which holds next move also.
- (h) Black's position is critical. Just possibly ... P-N3 and ... B-N2 will stave off the worst.
- (i) A very effective way of exploiting the fact that Black removed one of the essential guardians of his KP.
- (j) Now too late for certain. But even if 16... B-N2 again, Black has an impossibly difficult task.
- (k) White's last seven moves have been surprisingly powerful; return to the position after 15.KR-Q1 and see if it suggests any such drastic finish.

FRENCH DEFENCE		White: John Hutton (Oak Ridge)		Black: Peter Lahde (Nashville)	
1. P-K4	P-K3	10. N-B3	NxNch	19. B-R6	KR-B1
2. P-Q4	P-Q4	11. PxN	Q-R4	20. Q-Q2?(i)	B-N4!
3. B-Q3(a)	P-QB4(b)	12. N-K4!(c)	O-O	21. B-N5(j)	BxB!
4. PXP	QXP	13. N-N3(f)	BxPch!?(g)	22. Q-K3	R-B7ch
5. N-KB3	PXP	14. K-N2!	BxN	23. K-R3(k)	R-K7
6. O-O(c)	N-QB3	15. PxB	Q-Q4	24. Q-B1	QxBP
7. P-QB3	B-B4	16. Q-B2(h)	B-Q2	25. BxN	B-B4ch
8. R-K1	N-B3	17. R-R1	P-KN3	26. Resigns	
9. PXP	NxP!(d)	18. Q-B3(?)	P-K4		

The notes are by Peter Lahde

- (a) This move is seldom met. It therefore has a certain surprise value.
- (b) The only line given in FCO is: 3... PXP 4.BxP N-KB3 5.B-Q3 P-B4 6.PXP BXP 7.N-KB3 N-B3 8.O-O Q-B2 with equality. The text appears at least as good.
- (c) Probably best. If 6.NxP QxNP (But not QxN?, and 7.B-N5ch wins Q) 7.Q-B3 QxQ; 8. NxQ N-KB3 and Black is a Pawn up.
- (d) Giving White a doubled Pawn.
- (e) This is White's best counterstroke.
- (f) White had two more promising alternatives: 12.NxNch and 12.NxB.
- (g) This combination wins a Pawn. But the resulting open R-file may be good for W.
- (h) This is too slow. He should play P-QN3 and B-N2, which may be hard to meet for Black. He has this chance til the 19th move.
- (i) The decisive error. 20. Q-N3 seems best.
- (j) If 21.BxB, QxQch! 22.BxQ R-B7 23.QR-Q1 R-Q1 regaining the piece with advantage. John saw this line and pointed it out after the game. I only saw 21... QxB etc.
- (k) If 23. K-N1, R-K7; 24. Q-B1, QxBP is decisive.

GAMES FROM THE STATE TEAM TOURNEY 1963 (cont.)

FRENCH DEFENCE		White: John Hurt (Memphis)	Black: Jerry Sullivan (Oak Ridge)
1. P-K4	P-K3	17. N-R5!(i)	Q-B4(j)
2. P-Q4	P-Q4	18. QxQ	PxQ
3. N-QB3	N-KB3	19. R-KN3	P-B5
4. P-K5(a)	KN-Q2	20. RxFch	K-R1
5. N-B3(b)	P-QB4	21. F-QB3(k)	P-KR3(1)
6. FxF(c)	BxF	22. P-KN4	R-B3(m)
7. B-Q3	N-QB3	23. R-K1	R-KN3
8. O-O(d)	N/3xF(e)	24. RxR	FxR
9. NxN	NxN	25. R-K7	BxF
10. R-K1	NxB	26. N-N7(n)	K-N1
11. QxN	O-O	27. N-K6	R-B3
12. B-B4(f)	B-Q3(g)	28. N-Q8(o)	P-Q5
13. BxB	QxB	29. FxF	R-Q3
14. N-K4	Q-B5(h)	30. R-K8ch	K-N2
15. N-N3	B-Q2	31. K-N2	B-Q2(p)
16. R-K3	QR-B1	32. R-K7ch	K-B1
		33. R-R7	RxF
		34. NxP(q)	B-B3ch
		35. K-R3!	R-Q2
		36. RxR	BxR
		37. K-R4(r)	K-K2
		38. N-B5	B-B4
		39. F-N4	K-Q3
		40. N-N7ch	K-B2
		41. N-R5	B-K3
		42. N-N3(s)	BxN
		43. FxB	K-N3
		44. K-N4	K-N4
		45. KxF	KxF
		46. F-R4	KxF
		47. F-R5	F-N4ch
		48. K-B5	F-R4 and Black wins

Annotation is by Robert Coveyou

- (a) Theory and experience both testify to the lack of force of 4.f-K5. The basic difference between this and 4.B-KN5, B-K2; 5.f-K5 is that then White's worst and Black's best Bishop both disappear - and this accounts for both the dubious value of the text and the dubious nature of the Classical Defence for Black.
- (b) After 4. B-KN5, B-K2; 5.f-K5; KN-Q2; 6. BxB, QxB White's development is easy and unhindered. Here, White's commitment to defend his center hampers his development. The usual moves for White instead of the text are:
- (A) 5. QN-K2 (preparing to support the center with i-B3)
- (B) 5. Q-N4 (a pseudo-attack on the King-side, and)
- (C) 5. i-KD4 (attending immediately to the defence of the center.)
- (c) Correct strategy; the Queen Pawn cannot be held in place.
- (d) 8. B-KB4 is met by 8...Q-N3. But 8. Q-K2 looks reasonable: 8. Q-K2, Q-B2; 9. B-KB4.... This pawn sacrifice looks weak.
- (e) Lasker's rule: when offered a center pawn, grab! The point is that such a pawn can frequently be paid for by the return of a loss valuable one.
- (f) It is manifest that White has considerable compensation in development for the pawn - but absolutely none in position: Black has no weaknesses.
- (g) As play later goes, this move does not work out very safely. Black is in too much hurry to exchange. 12... Q-N3 looks like it might steal the initiative from White.
- (h) After this White's works up an annoying attack. Best seems 14... Q-R3; 15. QxQ, FxQ 16. N-B5, R-N1 17. i-N3, R-N3 18. QR-B1, R-B3 19. N-R4, i-QR4, and Black should probably win.
- (i) Black's situation is highly dangerous:
- (A) 17... Q-B4; 18. QxQ, i xQ; 19. R-KN3, winning the KN1.
- (B) 17... Q-N5?? 18. N-B6ch
- (C) 17... Q-N4; 18. NxN1, K-R1 19. R-N3, Q-R3 20. Q-Q4, i-B3 21. R-K1, RxR; 22. i-KR3
- (D) 17... Q-R3; 18. R-R3, Q-N3; 19. N-B6ch
- (E) 17... Q-Q3; 18. Q-Q4, i-B3; 19. R-N3, R-B2 20. NxRch, K-R1; 21. N-N4, RxB1; 22. N-R6, R-B2; 23. Q-B6!!
- Not all these variations are forced, but it is clear that Black has no easy task.
- (j) Ed. Lasker quotes Em. Lasker as advising him always, when such a choice exists, always play the move that contains "a drop of poison". This is it.
- (k) The Rook can escape by 21. R-N5. But then 21... i-B6 complicates the game for both players.
- (l) The trap closes; 22... B-B4 is the threat.
- (m) If White is allowed time, he can free himself by a King-side pawn advance.
- (n) The rescue is completed, but it has cost a pawn.
- (o) White probably did not like 28. N-Q4, R-B2. But this ending would have been difficult for Black to win. So is the one that occurs.
- (p) Neatly forcing an exchange of Rooks.
- (q) Not 34. RxR1, K-N2; 35. R-R4, B-B1.
- (r) White's pieces keep getting trapped! Now the King has no move.
- (s) The pawn ending is hopeless. Best seems 42. i-QR3, K-N3; 43. i-R4, i-R3; 44. i-R3 (44. i-B3?, i-N4ch; 45. K-R5, i-N5). Long analysis of this position has left me no wiser than before, but I incline to the view that it can be drawn by White.

GAMES FROM THE TENNESSEE OPEN 1963

PIRC DEFENCE White: Ted Mercer (Dayton) Black: Dave Burris (Knoxville)
 Bob Coveyou, our Games Editor, and Ted Mercer, the loser of this game, both have annotated this game. After Bob's comment his name is given in parenthesis, and the same after Ted's comment. It is interesting to note their different evaluation of certain positions. Question and exclamation marks are by Ted Mercer.

1. P-K4	P-Q3	10. KN-K2	P-QN4	19. P-N5	N-K1
2. P-Q4	N-KB3	11. N-N3	P-N5	20. BxB	RxB
3. N-QB3	P-KN3	12. QN-K2?(e)	P-QR4	21. P-KB4(j)	P-N6
4. P-B3(a)	E-N2	13. P-KR4	B-Q2	22. BPxP(k)	P-R6!!
5. B-K3	O-O	14. P-R5	Q-N1!(f)	23. K-B2(m)	PxP
6. Q-Q2	P-K4(b)	15. PxB(g)	BPxP	24. KxP(n)	RxP!(o)
7. P-Q5(c)	QN-Q2	16. B-R6(h)	BxB	25. KxR	QxPch
8. P-KN4	N-B4	17. QxB	R-B2	26. K-R1	P-B3!
9. O-O-O(d)	P-QR3	18. B-R3(i)	P-R5		Black wins

- (a) Strategically dubious; if White was willing to protect his KP in this fashion he should have played this instead of 3. N-QB3, in order to keep the option of P-QB4. Then the game would in all likelihood become a true Kings Indian (Bob). This, along with 4. P-B4 is an aggressive way to meet this hypermodern debut-Ted.
- (b) If 6...QN-Q2; 7. P-KR4, P-K4; 8. P-R5! and White will have a strong attack for the Pawn. Or 7...P-KR4; 8. P-KN4! with a powerful attack (Ted).
- (c) I think this move is a decisive strategic error. Closing the center in this way cannot be good without some chance of initiative by White. In the Samish Variation of the King's Indian, this is furnished by the possibility of P-QB5, which is absent here. Most reasonable under the circumstances is probably 7. B-QB4. White's King-side can now not be developed reasonably (Bob).
- (d) Now Black's attack will develop more rapidly and effectively than White's (Bob).
- (e) Correct is 10. N-N1. The text move blocks an eventual B-QB4, QR-KN1, Q-R2 etc. The N remains an obstruction throughout the game. After 10. N-N1 a plausible continuation might be: 10...P-QR4; 11. P-KR4, B-Q2; 12. P-R5, Q-N1; 13. B-QB4, P-R5; 14. QR-KN1, B-N4; 15. BxB, QxB; 16. N-B5! (Ted).
- (f) But this move is too risky; White does have some attack. Safer is 14... Q-K2. Black's attack will still be very strong with the R on QN1 instead of the Queen (Bob). (Note that Ted gave this move an exclamation mark.)
- (g) This is a technical error, allowing the defence of the second rank by the KR, and ending White's attack. A much better chance gave 15. B-R6. Probably Black survives with best play, but this is not completely clear. After the text move, Black has everything his own way (Bob).
- (h) With 16. K-N1 and 17. N-B1 White still had chances of consolidating his position. But White continues to play for "attack" and gets smashed (Ted).
- (i) With 18. K-N1 and 19. N-B1 White has better than in the game, but still Black has the better chances (Ted).
- (j) Now if PxB? 22. NxB P-N6 23. NxB! and White wins. But Black strikes first (Ted).
- (k) If 22. P-QR3 PxB 23. KxB Q-N6ch 24. K-B1 N-Q6ch wins (Ted).
- (l) The decisive move, opening the QR and QN files (Ted).
- (m) If 23. PxB RxP 24. R-Q2 NxBch 25. PxB QxB and the RP marches on. Or 24. N-B3 NxBch 25. PxB QxB 26. R-Q2 PxBch (Ted).
- (n) 24. N-B3! RxP 25. NxB QxBch 26. K-N1 QxN/3 gives Black winning chances (Ted).
- (o) A pretty and effective finish. One could look for improvements on either side during the last few moves and probably find them. But it is difficult to imagine any other result after the position reached by Black's 15th move (Bob).

NIMZO-INDIAN DEFENCE White: Lee Hyder (Aiken S.C.) Black: Bill Wright (Nashv.)

1. P-Q4	P-Q4	10. KxN	O-O	19. P-KR4	N-Q4
2. P-QB4	P-K3	11. PxB	QxB	20. P-R5	P-B3
3. N-QB3	B-N5	12. P-QR3	BxNch	21. Q-R6	Q-B1
4. N-B3	N-KB3	13. PxB	KR-Q1	22. PxB	QxQ
5. Q-R4ch	N-B3	14. Q-N5	Q-Q3	23. RxQ	PxB
6. N-K5	B-Q2	15. B-Q3	QR-N1	24. QR-R1	K-B2
7. NxB(a)	QxN	16. P-B4	P-QR3	25. R-R7ch	K-K1
8. P-K3	N-K5	17. Q-KR5	P-KN3	26. BxPch	Resigns
9. B-Q2	NxB	18. Q-KN5	N-K2		

- (a) Note that 7. NxB does not win a piece by 7... BxN?; 8. QxB(4) as Black simply plays 7... BxNch.

GAMES FROM THE TENNESSEE OPEN 1963 (cont.)

KING'S INDIAN DEFENCE			White: Burnette (Knoxville)	Black: E. Coveyou (O.R.)	
1. P-QB4(a)	N-KB3	11. P-K4	R-N1	21. BxN	N-K4
2. N-QB3	P-KN3(b)	12. P-QR4	P-QN4(h)	22. B-K2	BxB
3. P-KN3	B-N2	13. RPxP	PxP	23. QxB	Q-N6
4. B-N2	O-O	14. PxB	Q-N3	24. R-Q1	Q-B5
5. P-Q4	P-Q3	15. R-K1(i)	N-N5(j)	25. QxQ	NxQ
6. N-B3	N-B3	16. N-B3	N-N6	26. B-N5	P-B3
7. O-O(c)	B-Q2(d)	17. R-N1(k)	BxP	27. B-B1	P-B4
8. P-Q5(e)	N-QR4	18. Q-B2(1)	N-Q5	28. B-N5	NxP
9. Q-Q3(f)	P-B4	19. Q-Q2	B-QR3	29. BxP	NxR
10. N-Q2(g)	P-QR3	20. P-KR3	NxNch	30. BxR	RxR
				31. Resigns	

- Annotation is by Robert Coveyou
- (a) This first-move finesse was popularized by Botvinnik. White is willing to play a true English Opening, but the main point is to avoid the Nimzo-Indian setup and encourage Black to play the King's Indian.
- (b) It is my usual practice to play any variation which I consider sound and for which my opponent seems to have a predilection - and I see no reason to avoid the King's Indian. Good is 2...P-K4, the Reversed Sicilian, which is not as good for White as one might expect. The reason seems to be that White seems to run into situations where decisions must be made before he is really ready for them, the relevant Black commitments not yet having been made. This is probably mainly psychological rather than an objective disadvantage, due to White trying to model his play after Black's strategy in the true Sicilian.
- (c) I had intended to answer 7. P-Q5 with 7...N-QR4!?, a move that could have sent cold shivers down the spine even of the hyper-modern masters (of the 30' & 40's) but which is quite often played in similar situations nowadays. This would have been MCO 9, page 321, col. 72. After 7.O-O I had to look for other possibilities.
- (d) MCO 9 (page 321, col. 71) gives 7...E-N5; 7...R-N1; 7...P-QR3 and 7...E-B4, but not the text. This was an impromptu move, which I decided upon as furthering my Queen-side possibilities without seriously interfering with my development. I was shown no reason in this game to doubt its validity, but I would not be surprised if it turned out to be disadvantageous if correctly and vigorously countered.
- (e) After my seventh move, I wondered how 8. P-K4 would work for White. I am still wondering. I have a feeling that 8. P-Q5 is appreciably weaker than it would have been earlier. For Black is now better prepared for vigorous Q-side counter play, while White's 7. O-O, though of course justified otherwise, has little local influence on the Queen-side.
- (f) 9. N-Q2 looks more natural. The textmove seems to facilitate Black's counter-play. But this may not be a correct judgment.
- (g) This certainly looks wrong. 10. P-K4 gives Black much harder problems.
- (h) Now or never -
- (i) Giving me the welcome opportunity of complicating the game on the King-side also, with very little risk.
- (j) Threatening ... NxP.
- (k) If 17. R-R6, BxP!, White is forced into extensive simplification: 18.NxB, QxN; 19. QxQ, RxQ.
- (1) I think it likely that White is lost, and that no continuation will recapture the initiative or relieve the Queen-side pressure. White struggles on manfully, but his task is too difficult.

ENGLISH OPENING			White: Sommer (Chigogo, Ill.)	Black: Hurt (Memphis)	
1. P-QB4	P-K3	12. O-O	O-O	23. KPxN	P-KN4
2. P-Q4	P-Q4	13. R-K1	QR-Q1	24. PxB	PxP
3. N-QB3	N-KB3	14. R-N1	KR-K1	25. P-N4	Q-R5
4. P-QR3	B-K2	15. Q-N3	P-KR3	26. Q-Q1	B-N2
5. N-B3	P-B3	16. P-K3	B-B1	27. RxRch	RxR
6. P-B5	QN-Q2	17. P-QR4	Q-K4	28. N-B5	Q-R2
7. P-QN4	Q-B2	18. N/3-K2	Q-R4	29. NxB	R-K7ch
8. P-N3	P-K4	19. P-B3	B-R6	30. QxR	QxR
9. PxB	NxKP	20. B-N2	BxB	31. N-B5	N-B1
10. N-Q4	N-N3	21. KxB	N-Q2	32. Q-K5	Resigns
11. KB-N2	B-Q2	22. N-B4	NxN		

GAMES FROM THE MID-SOUTH 1963

NIMZO*INDIAN DEFENCE		White: Weaks (Memphis)		Black: Schultz (New Orleans)	
1. P-Q4	N-KB3	14. P-B4	PxP	27. P-R5	RxR
2. P-QB4	P-K3	15. BxP	N-K4	28. RxR	N-Q4
3. N-QB3	B-N5	16. B-N2	KR-K1	29. R-Q4	R-B4
4. P-K3	O-O	17. BxN	RxB	30. B-B4	N-B3
5. B-Q3	P-B4	18. R-Q4	BxN	31. R-Q8ch	K-R2
6. N-B3	P-Q4	19. QxB	RxBP	32. BxBP	RxP
7. O-O	P-QR3	20. B-B1	R-K1	33. R-QN8	P-QN4
8. P-QR3	B-R4	21. R/1-Q1	R-B6	34. B-K6	K-N3
9. Q-K2	N-B3	22. P-QR4	P-R3	35. R-N6	R-R8ch
10. R-Q1	Q-B2	23. P-N3	Q-B3	36. K-N2	R-R4
11. BxP	KPxP	24. QxQ	RxQ	37. B-B8	R-R7
12. PxP	BxN	25. R-N1	R-B2	38. BxP	P-N5
13. PxB	B-N5	26. R/4-QN4	R-K5	39. B-Q3ch	K-N4

Black forfeits on time

The above game was contributed by Hunter Weaks for which we are thankful.
The two games below are from the tournament bulletin.

FRENCH DEFENCE		White: Hurt (Memphis)		Black: Repass (New Orleans)	
1. P-K4	P-K3	14. NxN	PxN	27. Q-R6	KR-K1
2. P-Q4	P-Q4	15. PxP	BxP	28. RxRch	RxR
3. N-QB3	N-KB3	16. N-N5	O-O	29. R-B3	R-K8ch
4. B-N5	B-K2	17. NxKP	B-B4	30. K-R2	N-K4
5. P-K5	KN-Q2	18. N-N3	QxKP	31. R-R3	P-L4
6. BxB	QxB	19. NxB	QxN	32. Q-Q2	NxB
7. P-B4	P-QR3	20. O-O-O	N-B3	33. RxN	Q-B5ch
8. N-B3	P-QB4	21. B-Q3	Q-K3	34. P-N3	Q-K5
9. B-K2	N-QB3	22. K-N1	QR-Q1	35. R-Q8ch	K-N2
10. PxP	NxDP	23. KR-K1	Q-B3	36. R-Q7ch	K-B3
11. Q-Q2	B-Q2	24. R-KB1	Q-K2	37. RxRP	Q-K1
12. P-QR3	N-R2	25. QR-K1	Q-B3	38. RxP	R-K7
13. P-B5	N-K5	26. Q-K3	P-KN3	39. Q-Q4ch	Resigns

SICILIAN DEFENCE		White: Bone (Daytown, Texas)		Black: Bonffy (Atlanta, Ga.)	
1. P-K4	P-QB4	7. B-K3	PxP	13. N-Q4	N-K2
2. P-QB3	P-Q4	8. PxP	P-K3	14. KR-Q1	O-O
3. PxP	QxP	9. B-N5ch	N-B3	15. BxN	PxB
4. P-Q4	B-B4	10. O-O	B-Q3	16. N-B2	Q-QN4
5. N-B3	BxN	11. P-Q5!	QxP	17. QxQ	RPxQ
6. RxB	Q-K5ch	12. Q-R4	P-QR3?	18. RxB	RxP
				19. N-N4	Resigns

GRUENFELD DEFENCE		White: Scrivener (Nesbit, Miss.)		Black: Lahde (Nashville)	
1. P-Q4	N-KB3	10. P-KN4	N-B3	19. B-Q3	Q-B2
2. P-QB4	P-KN3	11. P-KR4	Q-B2	20. RxRP!	QxN
3. N-QB3	P-Q4	12. KN-K2	Q-R4	21. RxBch	NxR
4. B-B4	B-N2	13. N-B4	P-K3	22. PxQ	RxBP
5. R-B1	P-B3	14. P-N5	N-K1	23. BxNP	P-N3
6. P-B3	N-R4?	15. P-R5	Q-Q1	24. Q-Q2	RxBP
7. BxN	RxB	16. PxNP	BPxP	25. Q-N5	B-R3
8. PxP	PxP	17. R-B2	QxNP	26. B-R7ch!	Resigns
9. P-K3	O-O	18. R-N2	Q-B4		

MEMPHIS CLUB GAME 1963

FRENCH DEFENCE		White: James Wright		Black: John Hurt	
1. P-K4	P-K3	9. QxP	N-K2	17. P-B5	RPxP
2. P-Q4	P-Q4	10. P-KB4	B-Q2	18. P-B6ch	PxP
3. N-QB3	B-N5	11. N-B3	N-B3	19. PxPch	K-Q1
4. P-K5	P-QB4	12. Q-Q2	R-QB1	20. N-N5	N-K4
5. B-Q2	N-QB3	13. B-Q3	Q-N3	21. B-K2	P-N6!
6. N-N5	BxBch	14. P-B3	K-K2	22. B-B3	RxP
7. QxB	NxP/5	15. R-Q1	R-B2	23. RxR	Q-N8ch
8. NxN	PxN	16. P-KN4	P-KR4!	24. Resigns	

The above game allowed Mr. Hurt regain the lead from Wright in the club ladder.