

TENNESSEE CHESS NEWS

TCA dues \$1 a year

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1961

No. 18

Published bi-monthly. Editor: Peter P. Lahde, 80 Lyle Lane, Nashville 11, Tenn.
 Postal Chess Editor: Robert R. Coveyou, 93 Outer Drive, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
 Contributors: A. Bowen(Nashville), R. Coveyou(Oak Ridge), T. Finucane(Kingsport),
 H. Hairfield(AEDC), J. Murphy(Maryville), C. Lipman(Memphis).

MID-SOUTH OPEN WON BY JOHN RAGAN.

John Ragan of East St.Louis, Ill. took with a clean sweep the strong Mid-South Open held over the Labor Day weekend at Memphis. The event attracted 27 players, including a master, two master emeritus, and two experts. In addition 9 players participated in the amateur division.

Behind John Ragan, tied for second and third with $4\frac{1}{2}$ out of 6 were Richard Long of Nashville and Ed Middleton of Memphis. This tie could not be broken by any of the three tie breaking systems applied. Fourth was Norman T. Whitaker of Washington, D.C. also with $4\frac{1}{2}$. Fifth through seventh places were taken by John Hurt of Memphis, James Wright of Millington, Tenn., and Louis Stephens of E.Alton, Ill. Hunter Weaks of Memphis, last year's winner, only scored $3\frac{1}{2}$ points for 9th place behind Morton Rappaport of Wynne, Ark. who also had $3\frac{1}{2}$. Also Uncle Bob Scrivener had the same score to take 10th place.

Bob O'Bannon of Memphis won the Amateur division with $5\frac{1}{2}$ points.

An indication of the strength of the Open event is given by the fact that Troy Miller of Natchez, Miss. could only win one game and had to settle for last place. Last year he tied for first with Weaks in this event and took second only after tie breaking. On the brighter side, Norman Whitaker was able to play in the tourney after being involved in a serious car accident, although he had to play from the Shrine Hospital in Memphis.

For the tourney record and one game from this event see next page.

KNOXVILLE WINS MATCH OVER MARYVILLE 6:2.

A match on four boards took place recently between Knoxville and Maryville, which ended in a victory for Knoxville. Admittedly Maryville did not have its top strength and is planning on a return match with a stronger team as well as matches with other cities. Knoxville claims that Martin Southern could have helped their cause.(But I wonder if he is still active in chess?-Ed.) Knoxville's team consisted of students from U.T. except for Burris who is a high school student. Perhaps a match between U.T. and Vanderbilt could materialize in the near future?

Here are the results:

Board	KNOXVILLE		MARYVILLE	
1	Emanuel Tsitseklis	1 1	Jack Murphy	0 0
2	David Burris	1 1	Larry York	0 0
3	Steve Tsitseklis	1 0	Jim Yoakum	0 1
4	Karl Elza	0 1	Tom Jobe	1 0
	TOTALS	<u>6</u>		<u>2</u>

NEWS IN BRIEF

A new chess club has been formed at Fort Campbell, Ky. Recently Dr. Jordan Trafimow, their top player, gave a simultaneous exhibition there winning ten out of eleven games. For one of the games which was taken from the Fort Campbell Courier see page 2. Five of the club members also belong to the Nashville CC.

Memphis put in a bid for the Southern this year which is held around the 4th of July. Let's wish them good luck in this endeavor.

The December issue of CHESS LIFE listed five players from Tennessee as experts. This is an increase of two. They are as follows: 1. Robert Coveyou(Oak Ridge) 2120, 2. Jerry Sullivan (Oak Ridge) 2109, 3. Richard Long (Nashville) 2090, 4. Hunter Weaks (Memphis) 2033 and 5. Wolf Wolfensberger (Greeneville) 2002. In all 60 players from Tennessee were rated.

Walter Edzard, a former city champion of Hamburg, Germany recently became a member of the Nashville Chess Club.

Bowen won the match over Lahde by a score of 6:4. That the match was hard fought is indicated by the fact that no game ended in a draw.

REMINDER. Please be reminded that the TCA dues (only \$1 a year) should be paid now for 1962. Unless you played in the Tenn. Open in '61 you probably still owe yours. Please send your checks or bills to the editor. Thank you!

OPEN DIVISION

MID-SOUTH OPEN, Memphis, 1961.		Rd1	Rd2	Rd3	Rd4	Rd5	Rd6	Score	S.M.
1. Ragan, John	E. St. Louis, Ill.	W3	W16	W12	W5	W2	W6	6 -0	23
2-3. Long, Rich.	Nashville, Tenn.	W13	W27	W8	W17	L1	D3	4 1-1 1/2	21
2-3. Middleton, Ed	Memphis, Tenn.	L1	W22	W21	W11	W5	D2	4 1-1 1/2	21
4. Whitaker, N.T.	Washington, D.C.	L11	W20	D19	W21	W12	W9	4 1-1 1/2	15 1/2
5. Hurt, John	Memphis, Tenn.	W25	W7	W11	L1	L3	W14	4 -2	22
6. Wright, J.A.	Millington, Tenn.	W23	L11	W15	W8	W7	L1	4 -2	21 1/2
7. Stephens, Louis	E. Alton, Ill.	W18	L5	W14	W24	L6	W17	4 -2	17 1/2
8. Rappaport, M.	Wynne, Ark.	W14	W9	L2	L6	W24	D10	3 1/2 -2 1/2	20
9. Weeks, Hunter	Memphis, Tenn.	W26	L8	W23	D12	W13	L4	3 1/2 -2 1/2	17
10. Scrivener, R.S.	Nesbit, Miss.	L15	D21	D18	W22	W11	D8	3 1/2 -2 1/2	15 1/2
11. Williamson, Ken	Huntsville, Ala.	W4	W6	L5	L3	L10	W24	3 -3	22
12. Balsai, Steve	Hot Springs, Ark.	W22	W15	L1	D9	L4	D13	3 -3	22
13. Cleveland, Ch.	Birmingham, Ala.	L2	D18	W26	W19	L9	D12	3 -3	17 1/2
14. Lipman, Clift.	Memphis, Tenn.	L8	W26	L7	W23	W16	L5	3 -3	17 1/2
15. Joe Spiegel	Memphis, Tenn.	W10	L12	L6	L25	W19	W22	3 -3	16 1/2
16. Bowen, Albert	Nashville, Tenn.	W20	L1	L24	W27	L14	W18	3 -3	16 1/2
17. Gilley, Mark	Memphis, Tenn.	Bye	D19	W27	L2	D18	L7	3 -3	15
18. Savery, Charles	Memphis, Tenn.	L7	D13	D10	W20	D17	L16	2 1/2 -3 1/2	18
19. Dovons, Mich.	Topeka, Kansas	D21	D17	D4	L13	L15	W26	2 1/2 -3 1/2	15 1/2
20. Mitchell, James	Memphis, Tenn.	L16	L4	Bye	L18	D26	W23	2 1/2 -3 1/2	13
21. Spies, Carl	St. Louis, Mo.	D19	D10	L3	L4	L23	A27	2 -4	18 1/2
22. Roberts, Larney	Huntsville, Ala.	L12	L3	W26	L10	W27	L15	2 -4	16 1/2
23. Taylor, John	Birmingham, Ala.	L6	W25	L9	L14	W21	L20	2 -4	15 1/2
24. Williams, Ed.	Memphis, Tenn.	L27	Bye	W16	L7	L8	L11	2 -4	15
25. Sims, Dennis	Fayetteville, Ark.	L5	L23	L13	W15	Bye	F	2 -4	12
26. Hardin, Drexel	Memphis, Tenn.	L9	L14	L22	Bye	D20	L19	1 1/2 -4 1/2	13
27. Miller, Troy	Natchez, Miss.	W24	L2	L17	L16	L22	F21	1 -5	15

Tournament Director: Clifton M. Lipman

AMATEUR DIVISION

Name	City & State	Rd1	Rd2	Rd3	Rd4	Rd5	Rd6	Score	S.M.
1. O'Bannon, Bob	Memphis, Tenn.	W5	W2	W6	D3	W8	W4	5 1/2 -1 1/2	
2. Kiefling, Larry	Huntsville, Ala.	W4	L1	W3	W6	W7	W8	5 -1	
3. Ritenour, Doug	Memphis, Tenn.	W9	W5	L2	D1	L4	Bye	3 1/2 -2 1/2	16 1/2
4. King, Ralph	Memphis, Tenn.	L2	Bye	D8	W9	W3	L1	3 1/2 -2 1/2	16 1/2
5. Cpt. McCune	Columbus, Miss	L1	L3	W7	L8	Bye	W6	3 -3	16
6. Pipkin, C.M.	Memphis, Tenn.	Bye	W7	L1	L2	W9	L5	3 -3	16
7. Patterson, John	?	W8	L6	L5	Bye	L2	W9	3 -3	13
8. Garner, Frank	Memphis, Tenn.	L7	W9	D4	W5	L1	L2	2 1/2 -3 1/2	
9. Green, Alcee	Memphis, Tenn.	L3	L8	Bye	L4	L6	L7	1 -5	

Tournament Director: Bob O'Bannon

Note: All ties were broken by 1. Solkoff, 2. Sonnenborn-Berger, and 3. Median System. But 2nd and 3rd place could not be broken by any in the Open Division.

RECENT INTERESTING MINIATURE GAMES

MID-SOUTH OPEN, Memphis, 1961.

Catalan System		White: Richard Long		Black: Mark Gilley	
1. N-KB3	P-Q4	6. N-B3	P-B3	11. R-CB1	R-CB1?
2. P-KN3	N-KB3	7. P-Q4	B-C3	12. PXP!	BPXP?
3. B-N2	B-B4	8. N-KR4	B-N3	13. N-N5	Q-N1
4. P-B4	P-K3	9. B-N5	QN-Q2	14. RxRch!	Resigns
5. Q-N3	P-QN3	10. O-O	Q-B2		

ROCKET CITY OPEN, Huntsville, Ala., 1961.

French Defence		White: Larry Kiefling		Black: Peter Lahde	
1. P-K4	P-K3	6. N-B3?	NxKP!	11. N-R3	Q-R4!
2. P-Q4	P-Q4	7. NxN	BxB	12. B-C2	N-K5
3. P-K5	P-QB4	8. B-B4	N-B3	13. N-N5?	NxB
4. P-QB3	N-QB3	9. P-QN3	QR-B1	14. KxN	PxP
5. B-QN5	B-C2	10. P-QR4	B-R3	15. NxQP?	QxPmate

SIMULTANEOUS GAME, Ft. Campbell, Ky., 1961.

Pirc Defence		White: Jordan Trafimow		Black: David Rogers	
1. P-K4	P-C3	6. B-B4	P-N3	11. P-B5	R-CB1
2. P-Q4	N-KB3	7. O-O	B-N2	12. B-Q3!	NxP?
3. N-QB3	P-KN3	8. P-Q5	P-B3	13. PXP	N-B3
4. P-B4	B-N2	9. N-KN5	PxP	14. RxN!	BxR
5. N-B3	O-O	10. PXP	N-R3	15. Q-R5	Resigns

TWO MORE GAMES FROM TENN. OPEN, 1961.

Annotation by State Champ R. Coveyou.

French Defence		White: Jerry Sullivan		Black: Bob Scrivener	
1. P-K4	P-K3	21. K-B1	Q-N4(m)	41. PxP	K-K4
2. P-Q4	P-QN3(a)	22. K-K2	R-KN1(n)	42. R-R5	RxP
3. P-QB4(b)	B-N5ch	23. R-KN1	P-R5	43. PxP	PxP
4. B-Q2(c)	BxBeh	24. K-Q2	R-N3	44. K-B1	P-B6
5. QxB	N-K2	25. K-B3	R-QN1(o)	45. R-R8	R-N2
6. B-Q3(d)	B-N2	26. P-R3	P-KB4(p)	46. R-R8	KxP
7. N-KB3	P-Q3	27. B-B2	R-B3	47. RxP	K-Q5
8. N-B3	N-Q2(e)	28. P-QN4(q)	R-CR1!	48. R-R8	P-Q4
9. O-O	N-N3	29. PxBP	BxP	49. P-R4	R-N7
10. N-K1	P-K4(f)	30. B-K4	BxB	50. P-R5	K-Q6
11. P-Q5(g)	N-B4	31. QxB	Q-B4	51. R-Q8	P-Q5
12. B-B2(h)	P-QR4	32. QxQ	RxQ	52. R-Q5	R-R7
13. N-Q3(i)	NxN	33. K-Q3	K-K2	53. K-N1	R-R5
14. B-R4ch	K-B1(j)	34. K-K4	R-N4(r)	54. R-R5	K-B5
15. QxN	N-B5	35. K-B3	K-B3	55. R-K5	P-Q6
16. Q-B3	P-R4(k)	36. P-B5	K-B4	56. R-K8	P-Q7
17. N-K2	P-KN4	37. KR-K1(s)	RPxP	57. R-Q8	K-B6
18. NxN	NPxN	38. RPxP	RxR	58. P-R6	K-B7
19. P-KR3(e)	B-B1	39. RxR	P-K5ch	59. R-QB8ch	K-Q6
20. KR-B1	Q-R5	40. K-K2	NPxP	60. R-Q8ch	K-K7

Resigns

- (a) Some people just like to annoy annotators! This move may have been played many times, but I can find just one prior example: Mattison - Tartakower, Carlsbad, 1929. Mattison (White) won. Tartakower annotated the game in the tournament book.
- (b) Mattison played 3. N-KB3 and Tartakower says that the extension of the Pawn-center by 3. P-QB4 or 3. P-KB4 would be "too committing."
- (c) This move impresses me as if White were now trying to avoid the responsibilities he assumed with 3. P-QB4. If 4. N-B3 is not good, I would feel that 3. P-QB4 was not good either.
- (d) The proper deployment of this Bishop is White's major concern. On Q3 it will be hampered by two White pawns so long as the center Pawns are not advanced or exchanged. Better, I think, is 6. N-QB3, in order to await Black's action before deciding on the destination of the King Bishop. I am inclined to believe that it would be best placed at KN2.
- (e) Note the care with which Black avoids possible advances or exchanges of Pawns.
- (f) This advance is correctly aimed because White was obviously contemplating P-KB4 and correctly chose to fix White's center Pawns on White squares.
- (g) White has no reasonable alternative. Now Black may well work up a King-side attack. White's counter chances are on the Queen side, with the break through P-QB5. A point in favor of White is that, in this Pawn formation, ... P-QN3 and ... B-QN2 are lost moves.
- (h) In view of the relative inoffensiveness of White's Bishop, 12. P-QN4 suggests itself here. After 12... NxN; 13. NxN White seems to be a tempo or two ahead of the actual game in the development of his Queen-side attack.
- (i) 13. P-KN3, to play P-KB4, may be better here.
- (j) Loss of Castling in this position is at most a minor inconvenience. Indeed, as the game goes, it seems ever less significant.
- (k) Beginning a promising action against White's King side.
- (l) Perhaps 19. B-B6, to swap, would be better.
- (m) The first crisis. 21... B-N5 seems to give Black a very powerful attack. For instance: 21... P-N5; 22. PxB, PxP; 23. Q-Q3, Q-R8ch; 24. K-K2, QxP; 25. R-KB1 (See note below) R-R6; 26. Q-B2, R-K6ch; 27. K-Q2, K-N2 (27... RxKP probably suffices, but Black might as well take advantage of White's near-Zugzwang to mobilize his Queen Rook. Conclusion: Black must almost certainly win. On other Queen moves, at White's 23rd, the result differs only in detail. Note: Just to illustrate the difficulties of annotation, it seems that 25. R-KN1 and if 25... P-B6ch, 26. K-K3! gives a sufficient defence - Jerry pointed out this line in further analysis after the above note was written. Does 23. P-KN3 save White? Let us see: 23. P-KN3, Q-R6ch; 24. Q-N2, QxQch; 25. KxQ, P-B6ch 26. K-N1, K-N2; 27. B-B1, R-R6; 28. R-B3, R(1)-R1 and Black wins. The text move (21... Q-N4) seems to be based upon a decision to substitute quiet positional pressure for more vigorous but possibly risky attacks.
- (n) 22... B-N5 still looks quite strong.
- (o) The purpose of this move is obscure.
- (p) Black begins a (successful) effort to mobilize his center Pawns.
- (q) Those who like weird complications can analyze 28. P-KN4??!. White's actual move adds to his responsibilities in a position where he already has enough to keep him busy.

- (r) The position has clarified much to Black's advantage. The plausible attempt to block the position fails: 35. P-N5, R(1)-N1; 36. K-B3, K-B3; 37. R-K1, K-B4 38. R-K2, P-K5ch; 39. RxP, R-N6ch; 40. PxR, RxPch; 41. K-B2, KxR, 42. R-K1ch, R-K6. Black can always win a Pawn with ... PxP, ... RxR, and ... RxP. But he must delay this until he has sufficient resources against the counter attack R-QR7.
- (s) White must give way. The rest of the game is technique and Black never lets go. (Quite an accomplishment for Uncle Bob; this gives him now a plus score over Jerry. Their previous 3 or 4 games had ended in draws.-Ed)

Queen's Gambit Declined			White: Bob Coveyou	Black: Lee Hyder	
1. P-Q4	N-KB3	14. Q-N1	P-K5	27. R-N4(m)	B-Q4
2. P-QB4	P-K3	15. N-Q2	N-B3	28. NxNP	P-B4
3. N-KB3	P-Q4	16. B-N3	B-B4	29. R-Q1	P-B5
4. N-B3	B-K2(a)	17. B-B2(g)	B-N3	30. PxP	RxP
5. B-N5	O-O	18. N-B4(h)	N-Q4(i)	31. P-B3	P-QR4(n)
6. P-K3	P-KR3(b)	19. R-N3	N-N5	32. NxP	RxR
7. B-R4	N-K5(c)	20. N-K5	B-R2	33. PxR	PxP
8. ExB	QxB	21. P-QR3(j)	NxB	34. P-N5(o)	B-B5
9. R-B1	NxN(d)	22. QxN	P-B3(k)	35. NxR	RxN
10. RxN	P-B3	23. N-B4	K-R1	36. P-N6	R-N5
11. B-Q3	N-Q2	24. N-R5	QR-N1	37. PxP	RxP(7)
12. O-O	PxP	25. Q-B5(1)	QxQ	38. R-Q6	Resigns
13. BxP(e)	P-K4	26. PxQ	B-N1		

- (a) By his avoidance of ... QN-Q2 Black signifies his intention of playing Lasker's very sound defence.
- (b) With the addition of this modern wrinkle,
- (c) he does play Lasker's Defence.
- (d) The main variation (MOO,9, p. 189, col. 45) 9... N-KB3; has this interesting note (note p) "Further proof of the soundness of Lasker's defence is the additional line 9... P-QB3; 10. B-Q3, NxN; 11. RxN, PxP; 12. BxP, N-Q2 with an Orthodox Defence which is very comfortable for Black." Compare the game after Black's 12th move. Alekhine once said that in the Orthodox Defence, variations in which but one minor piece is exchanged tends to favor White, but with two pieces exchanged it would be even.
- (e) The position is now exactly that of a variation of the Orthodox Defence, (MOO,9, p. 181, cols. 1-6) except that Black has gained the tempo ... P-KR3. This raises two interesting questions:
- (1) Is the extra tempo good (escape square for the King) or bad (weakness on the King side)?
 - (2) What should White's procedure be in order to take proper account of this (very slight) difference from the usual line?
- Neither question got a real answer in this game.
- (f) MOO 9, p. 181-2, col. 5-6 prefers 13... PxP in the position without ... P-KR3. Col. 6 gives 13... P-K5; 14. N-Q2, N-B3; 15. B-N3, followed by R-B5-K5 with a slight edge.
- (g) I did not consider 17. R-B5, but it seems to me now that 17. R-B5, Q-Q2; 18. R-K5, QR-K1 gives White very little.
- (h) One possible objective of White's play thus far is the advance of the KB Pawn. But it seems to me not to lead to much in this position: 18. P-B3, PxP; 19. BxB, PxP; (not 19... PxP; 20. RxN!) 20. RxP, N-Q4. So I played to occupy K5 with my Knight, intending to survey the situation when I get there.
- (i) The removal of protection of the KP might have led to difficulties. An old rule- when you move a piece look at the effect of its absence from its old square as well as that of its presence on the new one.
- (j) Lee relies on the potential pin to protect the KP - and I believed him. But the matter is not that simple. 21. BxP, BxB; 22. QxB, P-KB3 (pin); 23. Q-R4 (counter pin), and the position is quite complex. White seems to come out on top. But Black can play 22... NxRP. The text move is based upon the belief that either an exchange of my B for his Kt or my Kt for his B would tend to leave me with an edge. Also 21. P-QR3 is intended to pressure Black's Q side.
- (k) Seemingly chasing me to where I want to be, but this move is also 'pawns. part of an awkward but necessary plan to get his Bishop back in the game.
- (l) Realizing that the Q-side cannot be defended after the exchange of Queens.
- (m) Simpler if not better than 27. RxP, RxR; 28. NxR, R-N1; 29. N-R5, RxP; 30. NxP, R-R7; 31. NxP, RxRP; 32. N-N5, R-R5; 33. R-N1, B-B5. This line is not compelling nor the final result convincing. I looked only as far as 28... R-N1.
- (n) The last effort.
- (o) 34. RxB also seems to win.