

TENNESSEE CHESS NEWS

TCA dues \$1 a year

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1962

Vol. 4. No.5

Published bi-monthly. Editor: Peter P. Lahde, 80 Lyle Lane, Nashville 11, Tenn.
Contributors: A. Bowen(Nashville), R. Coveyou(Oak Ridge), T. Finucane(Kingsport),
B. Griffith(AEDC), J. Murphy(Maryville), Weaks and Gilley(Memphis), and
Burris (Knoxville).

MEMPHIS WIN OVER NASHVILLE CLOSE WITH $6\frac{1}{2}:5\frac{1}{2}$

A double round match on six boards saw Memphis pull out a win with $6\frac{1}{2}:5\frac{1}{2}$ in an exciting encounter between the two clubs. The match took place on October 28 in Huntingdon, Tenn. Both teams were very nearly at top strength and it can therefore be considered as one of the best matches between the two clubs.

Nashville took the lead in the first round with $3\frac{1}{2}:2\frac{1}{2}$ though this did not become apparent until the match was over. Memphis won the second round with a 4:2 score. The game between Scott and Weaks lasted all during the match with Scott having a B-Pawn in a Queen's ending. It was felt that at the crucial point Scott had chances to win and thereby clinch a tie for the match, instead Weaks found a draw by perpetual check. A second game between Weaks and Scott was not played, but it was agreed to call it a draw.

The match was USCF rated. For comparison of their performances with their ratings, the latest USCF ratings are given in parenthesis. But the teams were paired more or less by club ratings as they are considered more representative.

Board	MEMPHIS		NASHVILLE	
1	Hurt (2015)	1 1	Long (2051)	0 0
2	Weaks (1992)	$\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	Scott (1871)	$\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$
3	Middleton (1978)	0 0	Lahde (1843)	1 1
4	Scrivener (1869)	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	Bowen (1841)	1 $\frac{1}{2}$
5	Wright (1980)	1 1	Sommer (1675)	0 0
6	O'Bannon (1767)	0 1	Vines (1835)	1 0
		$6\frac{1}{2}$		$5\frac{1}{2}$

MEMPHIS DEFEATS HUNTSVILLE 7:5

A team from Memphis defeated a Huntsville team by a score of 7:5 at Sheffield, Ala. There were to be six players from Huntsville and six from Birmingham to play twelve Memphis players. But unfortunately the Birmingham car broke down. So six Memphians played the six from Huntsville in a.m. and the remaining six from Memphis played the same six from Huntsville in p.m.

Too bad a match between Memphis against Birmingham and Huntsville did not materialize. (But Memphis would have won, I think, as Huntsville just beat Birmingham $8\frac{1}{2}:5\frac{1}{2}$, ed.). A match is planned for December between Huntsville and Nashville.

Here are the results: (The second player listed on the Memphis team played in the p.m. round.)

BOARD	MEMPHIS		HUNTSVILLE	
1	Weaks/Hurt	$\frac{1}{2}$ 1	Willinson	$\frac{1}{2}$ 0
2	Middleton/Gilley	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	T. Ousley	1 $\frac{1}{2}$
3	Scrivener/Wright	1 0	Roberts	0 1
4	Priddy/Byrom	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gerbers/Severn	0 $\frac{1}{2}$
5	O'Bannon/Lipman	$\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	Kiefling	$\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$
6	Garner/ Ritenour	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	K. Ousley	0 $\frac{1}{2}$
		7		5

NASHVILLE SCORES AT ROCKET CITY OPEN

Three Nashville players made the trip to Huntsville on Oct. 13 & 14 to play in the Rocket city Open. Richard Long, now a graduate student at Vanderbilt, took second place and divided \$20 (\$10 each) in prize money. He had the same score of 4:1 as last year when he won the event. But this time, Momic, new Alabama champ won with $4\frac{1}{2}$ points. Peter Lahde won the \$25 handicap prize with $3\frac{1}{2}$. Dr. Robert Sommer took the second handicap of \$10 with 3 points. John Hurt of Memphis also had a 3:2 score. Frank Garner, President of the Memphis Chess Club, took part in the Class B tournament.

TOURNAMENT CALENDAR

Nov. 23-24-25

3rd ANNUAL MID-SOUTH OPEN

Sponsored by the Memphis Chess Club, a six round Swiss with 40 moves in 2 hrs. will be played at the Hotel Claridge, 109 North Main Street, Memphis, Tenn. First prize \$75.00, 2nd prize \$40.00, 3rd prize \$20.00 plus Handicap prizes in the Championship Division. Three Trophies in Reserve Division. Prize for biggest upset in either division. Reduced hotel room rates and free parking for players and their families registered at the hotel..... Starting time 1:00 p.m. Nov. 23rd. Entry fee \$8.00 in the Champion Division and \$6.00 in the Reserve Division, plus USCF membership. Address entries and inquiries to Douglas Ritenour, 884 Wrenwood, Memphis, Tenn.... Players are requested to bring sets, boards, and clocks.

Handicap prizes will probably be three trophies and the upset prize will be a chess clock. The tournament is budgeted on the expectation of 40 players, 20 in each division. Any excess money will be used to give free TCM memberships, first to nonmembers, then to extend current membership, and finally any other.

All Tennessee players are hereby invited to help Memphis have a successful tournament.

Jan. 5-6

ONE YEAR COMMEMORATION

The Knoxville Chess Club is sponsoring a tournament to commemorate its one year existence. The tourney will be held at the Knoxville YMCA on Jan. 5-6, 63. It will be a four round Swiss with 2 games to be played each day. Morning rounds will start 10 a.m. Knoxville time. Entry fee will be \$3 and USCF membership will be required. The winner will receive one third of the entry fees, one quarter to runnerup. One fifth to third, one seventh to the fourth and the remaining to fifth place winner. Class B and C winners will receive chess book prizes. The following time controls will be observed: 25 moves in one hour and 15 moves in each half-hour thereafter. For further information write: Emmanuel Tsitsekis, 1303 Forest Ave., Knoxville, Tenn.

This is the first time that two tournaments are announced in TCM at the same time. A good sign that chess is on the increase in Tennessee. In order for these events to be successful let us give our support by at least attending one of the two tournaments.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
1962

INCOME		EXPENSES	
On hand*	\$ 36.00*	Trophies	\$17.45
Entrance Fees	145.00	Books	8.55
USCF Dues	38.00	Cash Prizes	147.50
Nashville Donations	50.00	Rating Fees	9.00
TOTAL	\$269.00	USCF Dues	38.00
		Postage, materials..	4.50
BALANCE	\$44.00	TOTAL	\$225.00

TENNESSEE CHAMPIONS

For the first time a list of the past Tennessee Champions and other interesting facts has been compiled. It certainly shows some interesting facts. Unfortunately the earlier tourneys (1947 was the first) were not available to this writer. Anyone who can supply the information please write to the editor. Any volunteers?

No.	YEAR	PLACE	OPEN CHAMPION	STATE CHAMPION	PLAYERS	TENN. PLAY.
8	1954/5	Bristol	Norman T. Whitaker	Robert Coveyou	24	11
9	1955	Knoxville	Robert Coveyou	Robert Coveyou	10	6
10	1956	Kingsport	Jerry Sullivan	Jerry Sullivan	14	12
11	1957	Memphis	Jerry Sullivan	Jerry Sullivan	16	9
12	1958	Nashville	Robert Coveyou	Robert Coveyou	29	13
13	1959	Nashville	Robert Coveyou	Robert Coveyou	21	17
14	1960	Nashville	Robert Jacobs	Jerry Sullivan	31	28
15	1961	Nashville	Robert Coveyou	Robert Coveyou	31	26
16	1962	Nashville	Em. Tsitsekis	Em. Tsitsekis	30	27

GAMES FROM THE NASHVILLE-MEMPHIS MATCH

SICILIAN DEFENCE		White: Middleton		Black: Lahde	
1. P-K4	P-C4	15. P-KN4	N-B3	29. 1xP	QxRP
2. N-KB3	P-C3	16. NxN	BxN(d)	30. R-C3	B-N4
3. P-C4	PxP	17. P-N5	BxN	31. C-N5!	C-R8ch(m)
4. NxP	N-KB3	18. CxB	C-R-B1?(o)	32. K-C2	C-N7ch
5. N-CB3	P-CR3	19. 1xP!	P-K4!(oo)	33. K-K3	R-KN1
6. B-KN5	P-K3	20. C-C2(f)	P-N3	34. B-R5!	B-K1!(n)
7. P-B4	P-R3	21. P-B5	K-R2	35. C-K7ch	KxP
8. B-R4	B-K2(a)	22. PxFch	PxP	36. CxCP?(o)	CxRP!
9. BxN(b)	BxB	23. KR-N1	B-K1(?) (g)	37. R-N4(p)	CxB
10. C-C2	P-CN4	24. C-N5	C-B2	38. C-K6	B-N4
11. P-CR3	C-N3	25. R-C2	C-B2	39. R-C5	C-R6ch!(q)
12. O-O-O	O-O	26. C-K3?(h)	C-R7!(i)	40. K-B2(r)	R/N-B1ch
13. B-K2	B-N2(c)	27. P-B3(j)	P-N5!(k)	41. K-K1(s)	R-B8ch
14. B-B3	R-Q1	28. K-Q1(1)	PxBP	42. K-C2	Qximate

Annotation is by the winner.

(a) An alternative is 8... C-N3 here.

(b) Up to this point a standard line of the Najdorf Variation of the Sicilian Def. But here White can play 9. C-B3. This also defends against the threat of 9... NxP!; 10. BxB, NxN; 11. BxC, NxQ winning a Pawn.

(c) I considered here 13... P-K4; 14. N-B3 (But not 14. PxP??, 15. B-N4 loses the Queen) but if now 14... 1xP; 15. N-C5! is very strong.

(d) 16... CxN may be a bit better.

(e) Overlooking White's reply. I had also considered 18... P-KR4; for if then 19. BxP?, BxP wins for Black. But White may be able to play the move later even sacrificing the Bishop. Black is safer with simply 18... 1xP.

(oo) The move 19... 1xP appears to dangerous. White could continue with 20. KR-N1ch, K-B1; 21. C-N7ch, K-K2; 22. B-R5 with a promising attack.

(f) Black was threatening 20... BxP!

(g) KR-N1 was much better here.

(h) Much stronger is here 26. B-N4. The text allows a counter attack.

(i) This possibility White had overlooked. The immediate threat is mate.

(j) Probably best, though R/2-N2 and K-Q1 also came under consideration.

(k) The only way to continue the attack.

(l) If 28. RfxP these are some possibilities, C-R8ch; 29. K-B2, B-R5ch, 30. P-N3, C-R7ch; 31. K-Q1 (Not 31. K-C3?, B-N4ch; 32. P-B4, Bxich! and mates) ... BxPch and Black has counterplay. Or if 30. K-C3, B-N4ch, 31. P-B4 (K-B2 is as before) BxPch, 32. K-B3, B-K7ch at least draws. Another possibility for White is 28. C-R7ch R-C2; 29. CxN! but even here Black is not without resources.

(m) Not 31... BxR??; 32. CxPch, K-R1; 33. C-N7 mate

(n) If 34... 1xB? White wins 35. C-K7ch, K-R1; 36. C-B6ch, K-R2; 37. R-N7ch mates.

(o) Loses quickly. But there probably was no saving move.

(p) If 37. R-N5 then C-B5ch wins Rook.

(q) This mates in four. (r) Or 40. K-C2 CxPch 41. K-Q1, C-B7ch; 42. K-K1 C-K7mate

(s) Or 41. K-N1, R-B8 mate.

KING'S INDIAN DEFENCE		White: O'Bannon		Black: Dr. Vines	
1. P-C4	N-KB3	12. N-C3	N-C2	23. R-B2	P-N4
2. P-C4	P-KN3	13. P-B4	PxP	24. N-K2	B-C2
3. N-CB3	B-N2	14. NxP	N-K4	25. N/2-C4	P-CB3
4. P-K4	P-C3	15. C-N3	P-KR4	26. PxF	PxP
5. N-B3	O-O	16. CR-C1	N-N5	27. NxP	BxN(C5)
6. B-K2	CN-C2	17. R-C3	B-K4	28. RxB	P-B3
7. O-O	P-K4	18. BxN	PxD	29. N-B7!	KxN
8. P-C5	N-B4	19. C-Q1	C-N4	30. RxBeh	K-N3?
9. B-N5	P-KR3	20. Q-C2	C-R3	31. RxPch!!	KxR
10. BxN	CxB	21. P-KN3	K-N2	32. C-B2ch(?)	K-K4
11. N-K1	C-Q1	22. N-N5	R-R1	33. C-B5mate	

* NOTE: Correction to Financial Report on previous page - Last year a balance of \$51 was reported. But in the meantime \$15 were returned to Mr. Whitaker who had registered in advance three players to last year's Open but they could not attend due to a car accident.

GAMES FROM THE TENNESSEE OPEN, 1962
Annotated by R. Coveyou

Before this game, Whitaker was leading with $4\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$, while Jerry Sullivan and Emmy Tsitsekliis were tied with 4 - 1. As it turned out, this game decided the tournament by itself, since the tie-breaking situation was such that, given this game, Tsitsekliis could not be outscored.

KINGS INDIAN DEFENCE		White: Tsitsekliis		Black: N. T. Whitaker	
1. P-QB4	N-KB3	11. N-Q2	P-QR4(d)	21. R/R1-QB1	Q-Q1
2. N-QB3	P-KN3	12. N/2-K4	NxN(e)	22. B-B6	R-N1
3. P-KN3	B-N2	13. NxN	P-KB4(f)	23. BxR	QxB
4. B-N2	O-O	14. PxF!(g)	PxN	24. R-B7	R-N4
5. P-Q4	P-Q3	15. FxN	BxF	25. R/R1-QB1	Q-R1(j)
6. N-B3	R-K1(a)	16. BxF	BxF	26. F-B3(k)	F-R5
7. O-O	F-B3	17. F-QN3(h)	QR-N1	27. F-K4!	FxF
8. F-KR3	Q-B2	18. B-QR3	B-KB1	28. Q-R2!	QxB
9. R-K1(b)	F-K4	19. Q-Q2	F-QN4(i)	29. QxB(1)	Resigns
10. F-Q5	QN-Q2(c)	20. FxI	RxI		

- (a) This cannot be good; it does not facilitate the intended ...F-K4 and, in most variations, the Rook is better placed at KB1. The alternations are 6...N-B3; 6...QN-Q2, 6...F-QB4, the choice being a matter of taste.
- (b) White's last two moves, though perhaps not really bad, seem to contribute little to White's development or position. I think F-K4 should have been played in preference to either.
- (c) Here, after 10... P-QB4, it is difficult to see anything seriously wrong with Black's position.
- (d) Again, 11... F-QB4 may be alright, and 11... 1xI is also probably better than the text.
- (e) Black's difficulties start; 12... F-QB4 no longer works, of course (13.N-N5).
- (f) This is the last chance for ... F-QB4; though it is somewhat less attractive now because of the weakness on QN5; the White Knight may be able to get there with advantage. Likewise, it is too late for FxI. 13...N-KB3 is very likely best.
- (g) The point, leading to great superiority in position.
- (h) White has a strategically won game. The weakness in the Queen file must be fatal to Black.
- (i) In a bad position, Black slips.
- (j) This desperate attempt gives White his clue to end the game neatly. But Black was lost anyhow.
- (k) Preventing mate and ...
- (1) Preparing a mating attack, concluded successfully.

KING'S INDIAN DEFENCE		White: Sullivan		Black: Tsitsekliis	
1. F-K4	F-Q3	10. R-QB1(d)	R-N1(e)	19. Q-K1(h)	N-Q7(i)
2. F-Q4	N-Kb3	11. F-B4(f)	F-K4	20. R-B2	N-N5(j)
3. N-QB3	F-KN3	12. QixI	FxI	21. RxN	R-K1
4. F-KN3	B-N2	13. Bxi	R-R1	22. R-K2	Q-K4
5. B-N2	O-O	14. B-K3	ixI	23. N-Q3	QxN
6. KN-K2	QN-Q2	15. NxP(g)	F-QN4	24. QxQ	BxQ
7. O-O	F-B3(a)	16. F-R3	N-N3	25. FxN	
8. F-KR3(b)	Q-B2	17. B-B5	N-B5		and White won
9. B-K3	R-K1(c)	18. F-N3	R-Q1		

- (a) By transposition, the game is identical with Denko-Tal, Curacao, 1962, rd.3. Denko won.
- (b) Here Denko developed his Queen side effectively with 8. F-QR4, F-QR4; 9.F-N3, R-K1; 10. B-QR3, Q-B2; 11. Q-B2, F-K4; 12. QR-Q1. The line Jerry selects is more conventional, but not necessarily more or less effective.
- (c) It is not clear why this Rook is better placed here than where it was. I see two possible reasons for the move; to meet a later B-R6 with ...B-R1, ot to exert pressure on the White KP after ...F-K4 and ...KxFxQ.
- (c) Losing a Pawn practically by force! But Black is able to work up such efficient compensation for the Pawn that it might almost be regarded as a deep and even possibly sound sacrifice.

- (d) White answers Black's semi-mysterious Rook move with one that is completely mysterious, except for the fact that the Rook is no longer on the long diagonal.
- (f) Because of the threat of P-K5, Black's next move is practically forced.
- (g) Black's chances are based on the following:
- (1) the open QR file
 - (2) The long Black diagonal
 - (3) The squares K4 and Q5 for his Knights
 - (4) The isolated KP
- (h) Black has played skillfully to exploit his advantages, and has added the C-file to his assets. White's last four moves have been all but forced.
- (i) The position is indeed difficult. 19...N-RP is probably insufficient: 20. P-K5, R-K1?; 21. P-N, R-C; 22. K-R, B-B1 (B-P?) 23. R-K3, B-N2; 24. R/1-K1. This variation is not offered as a serious proof that White must win, but that, after dissipation of Black's positional pressure, White's better development can be very dangerous. Another try! 19...N-Q2. I think it likely that this is best, but if I tried to analyze it, we'd never get out of here.
- (j) This move definitely loses a piece and the game. It is likely that 20...N-Q2; 21. B-N4 does likewise, as 21...P-QB4 loses to 22. Q-N-Q5. Best is probably 20...N-Q4!? which produces still more complications which I leave for the reader to disentangle.

RUY LOPEZ		White: Shor		Black: Burris	
1. P-K4	P-K4	13. CxB	O-O(e)	25. RxB	1xP!
2. N-KB3	N-QB3	14. P-B4(f)	P-QB3	26. RxPch	K-N1
3. B-N5	P-QR3	15. N-B3	NxN	27. RxDP	R-R8ch
4. B-R4	N-B3	16. CxN	C-N3(g)	28. K-B2	RxPch
5. O-O	NxP	17. P-B5(h)	C-B2	29. K-K2	R-K5ch(1)
6. P-C4	P-CN4	18. N-C4!	P-KR3(i)	30. K-B2	R-B5ch
7. B-N3	P-C4	19. R-C3	P-QR4	31. K-K2	R-K5ch
8. PxF	B-K3	20. R-N3	K-R1(j)	32. K-B2	C-B5ch
9. C-K2(a)	N-R4(b)	21. P-B4	B-B1	33. R-B3	C-B5ch
10. R-Q1(e)	NxB(d)	22. R-K1	P-R5	34. R-N3	C-B5ch
11. R-PN	B-B4	23. P-K6(k)	PxKP	35. R-B3	C-B5ch
12. B-K3	BxB	24. NxP	BxN	36. R-N3	Draw(m)

- (a) This move, called in this country Howell's Attack, and known as the Adam Variation in Europe, almost ruined the Open Defence about the time of the 1948 World Championship Tourney. But it is now considered good only for equality.
- (b) MGO says that any of 9...B-K2, 9...N-B4, or 9...B-QB4 is better than the text.
- (c) MGO gives 10. N-C4, P-QB4; 11. NxB, P-N; 12. P-QB3, NxB; 13. P-N, P-B5 (Black's Knight is in trouble) 14. P-CN4, to White's advantage.
- (d) MGO gives 10...B-QB4; 11. B-K3, BxB; 12. CxB, P-QB4; 13. P-B3, R-R2, as good for Black.
- (e) It is likely that 13...P-QB4 is well met by 14. P-QB4, and that the text move is safer.
- (f) White is able to carry out the leading idea of the variation under favorable circumstances.
- (g) Losing a tempo and almost forcing White to do what he wants to do anyway - establish his Knight firmly on C4. 16... P-QR4 may be better.
- (h) White does not miss the opportunity.
- (i) Both a loss of time and a weakening of the King's side. Again 18...P-QR4 might be preferable. 18... CxP; 19. NxP, CxQ; 20. 1xC looks good for White.
- (j) Again, this move looks suspiciously like lost time. Now 20...CxP, 21. NxP, CxQ; 22. PxC has the advantage over the last note that Black's QRP is already on R4, and can advance further. The outcome of this possibility looks uncertain without extensive analysis.
- (k) Inexperience tells. The choice between this move and 23. P-B5 would be very difficult. But it is not difficult to see that both could and should have waited while Black's threat to open the QR file was attended to. Correct P-CN4.
- (l) 29... C-K2ch; 30. R-K3, R-K5! 31. RxR, CxRch; 32. K-B2, C-B7ch! seems to win for Black. Although similar opportunities present themselves to Black, he passes them up for a draw by perpetual check.
- (m) Black in this game was played by David Burris, 18 year old Knoxville champion (ahead of Tsitsekliis!) and 8-year old Andrew Shor of Oak Ridge, without previous serious tournament experience.