

TENNESSEE CHESS NEWS

TCA Dues \$1 a Year

JULY 1967

Volume 9, No. 4

Published bi-monthly. Editor: Peter F. Lahde, 80 Lyle Lane, Nashville, Tenn. 37211
Games Editor: Robert R. Coveyou, 104 Stanton Lane, Oak Ridge, Tenn. 37830
Postal Editor: David Burris, 6309 Stonecross Road, Knoxville, Tenn. 37920
President of TCA: Dr. Robert Keathley, 822 Kirkwood, Murfreesboro, Tenn. 37130
Contributors: Estes (Nashville), M. Coveyou (Oak Ridge), Hurt (Memphis), Murphy (Maryville), Clark (Murfreesboro), and Smithson (AEDC).

TENNESSEE OPEN 1967 TO BE BIGGER AND BETTER

Would you believe the Tennessee Open 1967 is going to be bigger and better than ever and less costly too. We are going to raise the cash prizes from \$230 to \$325, a very ambitious undertaking.

How can we do it? First of all we are counting on your support by making this the biggest turnout in Tennessee history. We are especially counting very heavily on the support of the local promoters to interest players in coming from their respective areas. We are also putting on the biggest advertising campaign and we are asking local merchants to co-sponsor the event by contributing trophies, etc.

How are expenses to be less? Well we are going to have the tournament held at a new site (very near the "Pick"). This is the Mercury Motel, Quality Court at 411 Murfreesboro Rd., Nashville, Tenn. 37210. Here the rates will be lower as follows: Single \$8.50, Double \$10.50 - 12.50, and Twin \$12.50 - \$14.50. You can make reservations directly from the Quality Court in your area at no charge. Please do so soon as rooms will be scarce on Saturday. In addition you have the choice of three economical but fine restaurants, a waffle shop for breakfast, and several small eating places. The playing area is more spacious and appears to be better lighted.

The prizes have been raised to make your coming more inviting. They are:

Open Division: 1st \$100	Amateur: 1st \$50
2nd \$75	2nd \$30
3rd \$50	3rd \$20

As far as trophies are concerned we have added a Class B trophy in the Open Divis., to give us now a total of ten trophies. The team plaque, won last year again by Memphis, will also be at stake.

While we are not increasing the entry fees in the real sense we are strongly suggesting that you send your entry fees in advance, or what we call pre-registration. This will give the organizers a good idea on how many to expect and then make plans accordingly. Pre-registration should be paid no later than August 19, 1967. Entry fees in the Open are still \$8 and \$5 in the Amateur. TCA dues are required and are now \$2, and if you owe USCF dues they are \$8, a 20% discount rate. For Juniors USCF dues are \$5 if under 21. Make all checks payable to Dr. Roy Clark. His address is: 1315 Lakeshore, Murfreesboro, Tenn. 37130. All entry fees paid after August 19 will be \$2 more, that is, \$10 in the Open and \$7 in the Amateur.

A time limit of 60 moves in 2½ hours has been established. This is halfway between the fastest and slowest permissible, or 2.5 minutes per move. After rounds 2, 4, and 6 an additional 12 moves in 30 minutes must be made before adjudications will take place. We hope that in this way we can reduce adjudications to a bare minimum.

See you all then Labor Day Weekend, September 2 - 4, 1967.

WHAT FAMOUS MASTERS HAVE SAID

The refutation of a sacrifice frequently consists in its acceptance.

W. Steinitz

A threat is more powerful than its execution.

S. Tarrasch

Help your pieces so that they can help you.

P. Morphy

The mistakes are all there, waiting to be made.

S. Tartakover

SOUTHERN WELL ATTENDED BY TENNESSEANS

Reported by Tony Estes

The Southern Chess Tournament took place over the July 4th holiday weekend in Birmingham, Ala. About sixty players mostly from the South played in three divisions: Open, Amateur, and Reserve. Some twelve players were from Tennessee, with all the three regions represented.

The Open Division attracted 27 players of which at least eight were from Tenn. Gonzalez, a master from Florida shared first with Schutt of Houston, Texas at 6-1. Ruffy, a Class A player from N.C. came in a surprising third with 5-2. The best score by a Tennessean was made by Dave Burris of Knoxville who scored $4\frac{1}{2}$, provided his last game was a draw with Jude Acers as it appeared to Tony. But the most surprising performance came from M.C. Wright of Nashville who scored $3\frac{1}{2}$ points. In round 1 he defeated Memphis expert John Hurt and in round three got a draw with tourney winner Gonzalez to have $2\frac{1}{2}$ points after 3 rounds. A phenomenal start, but then he slowed down to score only one out of four possible points. McNeely of Knoxville also scored $3\frac{1}{2}$ points as did Gilley of Memphis. John Hurt of Memphis had three while Tony Estes of Nashville had $2\frac{1}{2}$ points. Other performers were R.S. Scrivener of Memphis and Tsitseklis of Knoxville. Their scores we don't have.

The Amateur Division was won by Belke of Ark. Two players from Johnson City and Garner, son of Frank Garner of Memphis were participants from Tennessee. There were about twenty players in the Amateur and eleven in the Reserve Divisions.

As we receive more news, results, and games we will give you those.

NASHVILLE WINS MATCH WITH MURFREESBORO

Revening a loss from late last year, the match between Nashville and Murfreesboro ended in a decisive victory for the former by a 12-5 score. The match took place on May 21 at the home of Dr. Keathley in Murfreesboro. It was a double round affair on nine boards, with the exception of board one where only one game was played. Double victories for Nashville were scored by Estes, Bowen, Lynch, Matthews, and Leinard. M. C. Wright won his only game he played. The games between Lahde and Wagner were split. Double wins for Murfreesboro were scored by Frahl and Keathley. There were no draws. Selection of games may be found on page twenty-five.

The results follow:

Board	NASHVILLE		MURFREESBORO	
1	Wright	- 1	Mueller	- 0
2	Estes	1 1	Smiley	0 0
3	Bowen	1 1	Yokley	0 0
4	*Lahde	1 0	*Wagner	0 1
5	*Lynch	1 1	*Price	0 0
6	*Matthews	1 1	*Stein	0 0
7	*Leinard	1 1	*Clark	0 0
8	Hofstetter	0 0	Frahl	1 1
9	Dillon	0 0	Keathley	1 1

*USCF rated match

KANN THAT CARO

I feel I'd be happier man if I could play the Caro-Kann.

But as it seems to me when I play Pawn to Q3

White gets a Knight upon K5, and then, as sure as I'm alive

My Rook file's opened and my Queen exposed to dangers unforeseen

By Nimzovich and all that lot who think the Caro rather hot.

Then if I reach the middle game my play is lifeless, cold and tame.

White's game is logical and bright, while nothing I can do is right.

I grow so tired of "Check", "Check", "Check", that I become a nervous wreck
And get into a hopeless pin, allowing White an easy win.

Tell Nimzovich it's all a plant. The opening is really Caro-Kann!

Huxley St. John-Brooks

(Originally published in Chess (British Magazine) on October 7, 1964.)

OPENING STUDY No.2

By Robert Coveyou

Game: Peter Lahde - Grog Fulkerson, Vienna Game, Tennessee Open, 1966.

1. P-K4	P-K4	5. N-B3 (b)	P-Q3
2. N-QB3	N-KB3	6. P-KR3 (c)	O-O (d)
3. E-B4	E-B4	7. N-Q5 (c)	P-B3
4. P-Q3	P-KR3 (a)	8. N-Nch	QxN

- (a) Such a move, meant to be cautious, is, on the contrary, a reckless waste of time, serving no sufficient purpose, and weakening the King-side. Note, however, that this does not mean that P-KR3, for White or Black is always wrong. The critical point here is that White has not committed himself to any particular form of attack, and can still choose the most effective means of exploiting Black's mistake. For this purpose, the most vigorous and effective is 5. P-B4, transposing to the King's Gambit Declined, in which the extra tempo will prove a definite advantage. The game might then go 5. P-B4 P-Q3 6 N-B3 N-B3 7 N-KR4 B-N3 8 NxB R-PxN 9 O-O, with advantage to White.
- (b) Of course not bad, but making little or nothing of the extra tempo.
- (c) White returns the extra tempo. But this is on quite a different footing from Black's ...P-KR3. Since both have developed their King Knights and played P-Q3, an early opening of the center is not to be expected. Hence, although P-KR3 does not further White's game appreciably, it is not a serious error.
- (d) Early O-O, for Black or White, in the slow form of the Guico Piano, is suspect. Here, it is surely a serious, almost decisive, error. Now Black's ...P-KR3 represents a near-fatal weakness, while White's P-KR3 has been transmuted into a powerful attacking move. White should continue 7. P-KN4! N-R2 (necessary, an immediate P-N5 is intolerable; note that the Pawn even threatens to go to N6) 8. R-KN1!, and P-N5 cannot be prevented.
- (e) This, on the contrary, must be wrong, even if White is unwilling to commit himself to the attack given above. It leads to the exchange of three tempos (N-B3-Q5-xN) for two (N-KB3 and xN). Indeed after Black's 8...QxN, Black clearly has to move; he has played the (developing) ...E-B4, ...O-O, ...Q-B3, against White's (developing) E-B4 and N-B3. Since, further, each side has released his QB with P-Q3, Black has, momentarily, the initiative. However, it is true that Black's undeveloped piece (Q) is further out of play than White's (the Queen). Conclusion: even game.

ADJUDICATIONS

Following are Robert Coveyou's comments to the Middleton - Long Game.

(Editorial) This game is the best evidence I know that our adjudication practice need radical revision. The post-game analysis of this position was long and arduous; it extended the tournament by hours. Also it was the decisive game of the tournament, and it is quite unsatisfactory that the result of such an important game should be decided by debate among players other than those in the game. Even more serious, the adjudications of such a game, necessarily in the presence of players and spectators, and after the strain and fatigue of the tournament, is very likely to produce serious personal disagreements and hard feelings which the association cannot afford. This game just escaped being such a bone of contention, if indeed it did. Also, I have come to the conclusion that the task of adjudication is a very heavy burden upon the adjudicators, invariably participants and themselves contenders in the tournament. I, for one, am no longer willing to sacrifice my (slender chances) in the tournament by exhausting myself in adjudicating or waiting to see if adjudications will be necessary. It is my belief that this situation can be corrected only by abolishing adjudications completely, together with an appropriate revision of the time limit. I have written USCF, suggesting alternative time limit schemes, and asking for permission to use them on a trial basis. But I suggest it is time that we make players win their own games; if they can play well enough to produce those devilish positions, they should be competent to solve them.

THE DECISIVE GAME IN THE TENNESSEE OPEN

Annotated by Robert Coveyou

KING'S INDIAN REVERSED		White: Ed Middleton	Black: Richard Long
1. N-KB3	N-KB3	18. R-R	R-Q1
2. P-KN3	P-KN3	19. P-KR3	N-Q3
3. B-N2	B-N2	20. P-QR4	Q-Q2
4. O-O	O-O	21. K-R2	Q-B3
5. P-Q3	P-Q4	22. N-K1	N-B2
6. QN-Q2	QN-Q2(a)	23. N-Q3	Q-R3
7. P-K4	PxP	24. Q-K3	P-N3
8. PxP	P-K4	25. Q-Q2(e)	P-QB4
9. R-K1(b)	Q-K2	26. P-QB4	Q-B1
10. P-N3	R-Q1	27. P-B4(f)	Q-Q2
11. B-N2	N-K1	28. B-QB3	N-Q1
12. N-B4(c)	N-N3	29. PxP	PxP
13. Q-K2	NxN	30. N-K1	QxQ
14. QxN	B-K3	31. BxQ	N-B3
15. Q-K2	P-KB3(d)	32. N-B2(g)	K-B2
16. Q-R-Q1	RxR	33. K-N1	B-KB3
17. RxR	R-Q1	34. K-B2	N-Q5
		35. NxN	KTxN
		36. B-B4	B-Q1
		37. B-N8	P-QR3
		38. B-R7(h)	P-QR4(i)
		39. B-N8	K-K2
		40. B-K5	K-Q2(j)
		41. B-B1	B-B2
		42. BxB	KxB(k)
		43. K-N2	K-Q3
		44. P-KN4(1)	K-K4
		45. K-B3	P-R4
		46. B-Q3	B-B1
		47. B-B2	B-N2
		48. B-Q3	B-B3
		49. B-B2	B-K1
		50. B-Q3	B-B2(m)
		51. Adjudicated win for Black.	

- (a) This is certainly safer and probably better than 6...l-B4, resulting in a King's Indian Reversed in which White's extra tempo can be important. Another thought is 6...N-B3, leading to a kind of Robatsch Reversed and, specifically, placing the knight more effectively in case of 7. P-K4 PxP 8 PxP P-K4 as in the game. In this case, Black's command of d4 could be a distinct asset. Black would, before playing 6...N-B3, have to consider whether White has a more effective continuation based upon the faint weakening of the long diagonal (h1-a8) implied by 6...N-B3; what would he do after 7. l-B4, say?
- (b) The game starts over from here; neither the risks nor the prospects for either player are as great as they were at the start of the game. The open Q-file and the rather unaggressive, though sound, position of the pieces, makes any attempt by White to get real pressure unlikely. However, placing a Rook on a closed file, as here, looks less natural than getting the Queen off an open file, as Black does.
- (c) White's idea of applying pressure to the King Pawn seems to have had the minor success of slowing down and distorting Black's development. But this move, and its obvious sequel, allows Black to complete his development favorably with gain of time, cannot be right (unless Black has, indeed, already achieved equality). L2. Q-K2 looks most natural (and suggests that 9 Q-K2 would indeed have been better than 9 R-K1). If then Black plays 12...N-N3 (against N-B4), White can start to give him problems with 13. P-QR4, annoying the Knight, but also (B-R3), embarrassing the Queen.
- (d) If anyone stands better, it is Black. King side action is out of the question for either player, and the QB stands better for play in the center and on the Q-side. The following exchange of all the Rooks increases White's safety, but decreases his legitimate winning prospects to zero.
- (e) It seems that 25 N-N4 Q-N2 26 N-Q5 P-B3 27 N-B3 would make it very difficult for Black to get his Knight to d4 without allowing the White knight the square at d5.
- (f) If the Knight starts immediately, it can reach Q5: 27. N-K1 N-Q1 28 N-B2 N-B3 29 N-K3 N-Q5 30 Q-Q1 or Q-Q3. Whether then Black could still get a telling advantage is questionable. After the text move, which increases White's responsibilities when he already has enough, Black quickly gets a real advantage.
- (g) The Knight is too important to use for defence unless absolutely necessary. White should try 32. B-KB3 N-Q5 33 B-Q1, and then attempt (again!) to get his knight to d5 via N2 and K3. This is difficult, because of ...B-KR3 at the right moment. Hence White also must get his QB off the present diagonal, and prepare to support the Knight on K3 with the King. This, in turn, exposes the KR1, and that also must be provided for. It may be that the problems are not solvable.
- (h) Threatening P-R5
- (i) Threatening B-B2
- (j) Threatening B-B2, forcing the exchange of White's "good" for Black's "bad" Bishop. White should not allow this.
- (k) It is now very likely that Black should win.
- (l) Another pawn on White squares; bad unless forced.
- (m) The last few moves of this game are obviously stalling in anticipation of the 50-move adjudication. I have not tried to reconstruct the adjudication! (For Bob Coveyou's comments on adjudicating this game and in general are found in this issue on page 22.)

MATCH GAME BETWEEN TWO NASHVILLE YOUTHS

Annotated by Gary Matthews

The Nimzovich Attack against the French Defence (1 P-K4 P-K3 2 P-Q4 P-Q4 3 P-K5) is well known but not too good. However, the Nimzovich Attack against the Sicilian Defence is fairly good but not too well known. As with most of Nimzovich's variations, it unleashes a torrent of wierd and beautiful complications.

SICILIAN DEFENCE

White: Gary Matthews

Black: Jerry Meyer

1. P-K4	P-QB4	11. P-KR3	B-Q2?(f)	21. R-N8ch	K-Q2
2. N-KB3	P-Q3	12. N-B4	Q-B2	22. R-Q1ch	B-Q5!(k)
3. B-N5ch(a)	N-B3(b)	13. P-QR4!(g)	B-QB3	23. P-QB3	K-B3
4. O-O	P-QR3	14. B-B4	N-B3(h)	24. PxB	PxF
5. BxNch	PxB	15. P-K5!	N-Q4	25. RxF	B-Q4
6. P-Q4	PxF	16. B-N3!(i)	N-N5	26. P-N4	P-B3!(l)
7. QxF!(c)	P-QB4?(d)	17. PxF	NxQ	27. P-N5ch	K-B4
8. Q-Q3	P-KN3	18. PxQ	BxN	28. RxBeh!	KxR
9. R-Q1	B-N5(e)	19. RxN	B-K7	29. P-N6	P-K4
10. QN-Q2	B-N2	20. R-N3?!(j)	BxN	30. RxQR	RxR
				31. P-N7	Resigns(m)

- (a) The "Nimzovich-Rossolimo" Attack.
 (b) A centralized Queen is quite strong if it is safe from attack.
 (c) This is probably sharpest. Also good are 3...B-Q2 and 3...N-Q2, 4 P-Q4 PxF 5. QxF!
 (d) Better is 7...P-K4, to prevent a future P-K5. Now Black cannot play P-K4 as he would have a backward Queen Pawn.
 (e) If 9...B-KN2? 10 P-K5! B-N5 11 PxF PxF 12 N-B3 with strong pressure on Black's backward Queen Pawn.
 (f) Losing time to keep the two Bishops. BxN was best, though White should still have the advantage.
 (g) 13. P-K5 is also good, but I wanted to keep Black wondering where to put his Knight. The text prevents ...B-N4 and still threatens ...P-K5 by White.
 (h) To play this seems bad, but not to play it would be even worse. If 14...N-B3, 15. Q-K3! followed by 16 P-K5.
 (i) 16. B-R2 might have allowed a back-rank mate in the end-game. However, if Black had played 15...N-R4, then 16 B-R2 (threatening 17 P-KN4) would have been alright.
 (j) 20 N-N6! which I overlooked, wins faster, but the text is prettier.
 (k) Black cannot allow the other Rook to penetrate.
 (l) Threatens 27...P-K4, but, as usual, one tiny tempo decides the fate of the game.
 (m) Note that if White had played 16. B-R2? (instead of 16 B-N3!), Black could have played 27...PxF and could now play ...R-R8 mate instead of resigning!

NASHVILLE INTERSCHOLASTIC INDIVIDUAL CHAMP.

May 13, 1967

FOUR KNIGHT'S GAME

White: Carl Geier

Black: Vernon Vix

1 P-K4	P-K4	8. N-B4	B-K3	15. PxB	Q-R8ch
2. N-KB3	N-KB3	9. N-K3	Q-K2	16. N-N1	B-R7
3. N-B3	N-B3	10. B-Q2	QR-Q1	17. B-B3!	NxF?!
4. B-N5	B-N5	11. P-B3	B-B1	18. BfxN	RxF?!
5. BxN	QxB	12. Q-K2	Q-K4	19. P-QN3!a	QxNch
6. P-Q3	O-O	13. O-O-O	B-K3	20. K-Q2	BxF
7. NxF	R-K1	14. P-QR3	Q-Q4?!	21. RxQ	Resigns

- (a) But not 19 PxB QxN mate.

Judging from both of these games one can see the improvements that have been made in the quality of their play among Nashville's young people. The first game is an example of a decisive attack, the second of a cool defence in the face of a premature attack.

NASHVILLE-MURFREESBORO MATCH, 1967

Board 2 CARO KANN DEFENCE				White: Tony Estes	Black: Horace Smiley
1. P-K4	P-QB3	13. BxN	QxBch	25. RxR	R-QB1
2. P-Q4	P-Q4	14. Q-K2	QxQ	26. RxR	BxR
3. P-KB3	P-K3	15. BxQ	P-QN3	27. PxP	BxP
4. N-Q2	B-K2	16. K-B2	B-N2	28. B-B5	BxB
5. P-K5	Q-N3	17. N-Q4	NxN	29. PxB	K-Q2
6. N-N3	P-QB4	18. PxN	O-O	30. K-K3	P-QN4
7. PxP	BxP	19. KR-QB1	QR-B1	31. P-N4	K-K2
8. NxR	QxN	20. K-K3	KR-Q1	32. K-B4	K-Q2
9. P-KB4	N-K2	21. K-Q2	K-B1	33. K-N4	K-K2
10. N-B3	QN-B3	22. B-Q3	P-KR3	34. K-R5	P-R3
11. P-B3	N-B4	23. P-KN4	K-K2	35. P-KR3	Forfeits on time
12. P-KN3	N-K6	24. P-B5	RxR		
Board 3 VIENNA GAME				White: Albert Bowen	Black: Yokley
1. P-K4	P-K4	8. O-O	N-QR4	15. P-KR3	N-B3
2. N-QB3	N-KB3	9. P-N3	P-B3	16. P-B3	P-B4
3. B-B4	N-B4	10. P-Q4	P-QN4	17. Q-N3	N-R4
4. P-Q3	B-B4	11. B-Q3	P-N5	18. Q-R2	KPxP
5. N-B3	P-KR3	12. QN-R4	N-N5	19. KPxP	NPxP
6. B-K3	BxB	13. Q-K1	R-QN1	20. QPxP	PxP?
7. PxR	P-Q3	14. R-Q1	Q-K2	21. QxR	Resigns
Board 4 SICILIAN DEFENCE				White: Charles Wagner	Black: Peter Lahde
1. P-K4	P-QB4	17. P-R3	BxN	33. P-KR4	N-R2
2. N-KB3	P-QR3	18. QxB	B-Q1	34. B-N3!	R-B3?
3. P-Q4	PxP	19. P-B3	N-Q2	35. K-N1	P-N3
4. NxP	N-KB3	20. N-K3	N-K2	36. P-N4!	PxBP
5. N-Q2	P-Q3	21. N-N4	P-KR4	37. NPxBP?	R-R3?
6. P-KB4	P-K4	22. N-K3	N-K2	38. BxP	N-B3
7. N/4-B3	N-B3	23. B-B2	Q-B3	39. B-K6ch	K-N1
8. B-B4	N-R4	24. R-R2	B-N3	40. B-B1	R-R2
9. Q-K2	Q-B2	25. R-Q2	O-O-O	41. N-B2	Q-B3
10. B-Q3	P-QN4	26. R/1-Q1	R-R3	42. R-Q3	NxKP
11. P-QN4	N-B3	27. N-N2	B-R2	43. K-N2!	N-B3
12. P-QR3	B-N5	28. R-K2	Q-N3	44. B-N5!	N-N1?
13. B-N2!	N-KR4	29. K-Q2	N-B3	45. RxKP!	B-N3
14. P-B5!	Q-N3?	30. K-B1	N-R2	46. R-K1	R-KB2?
15. P-N3!	B-K2	31. N-K3	N-N4	47. BxN(N1)	N-K5
16. N-B1!	N-B3	32. Q-B1	N-K2	48. BxR	R-B1
				49. B-Q5	Resigns
Board 7 ALEKHINE'S DEFENCE				White: Mike Leinard	Black: Roy Clark
1. P-K4	N-KB3	7. QN-Q2	P-KN4	13. B-N5	B-K5
2. P-K5	N-Q4	8. N-B4	P-N4	14. Q-R4!	Q-Q2
3. P-Q4	P-Q3	9. BxNP	B-K2	15. R-KB1	O-O
4. N-KB3	B-B4	10. BxB	QxB	16. N-Q2	P-QR3
5. P-KN3	N-B3	11. N-K3	NxN	17. NxR	PxB
6. P-B3	P-K3	12. PxN	P-N5	18. QxR!	Resigns
Board 8 QUEEN'S GAMBIT ACCEPTED				White: Hofstetter	Black: Prael
1. P-Q4	N-KB3	12. P-K4	P-K4	23. QxQ	BxQ
2. P-QB4	P-Q4	13. PxP	NxP	24. KR-K1	O-O-O
3. N-QB3	PxP	14. NxN	QxN	25. QR-Q1	RxR
4. P-K3	P-K3	15. B-N2	Q-KN4	26. RxR	P-N3
5. BxP	N-QB3	16. P-QB4	R-KN1	27. P-B5	P-N4
6. N-B3	B-N5	17. B-B1	Q-B3	28. P-N3	K-N2
7. P-QR3	BxNch	18. B-N2	Q-N4	29. K-N2	P-KR4
8. PxB	N-K5	19. B-B1	Q-B3	30. P-KB4	K-B3
9. Q-B2	N-Q3	20. B-N2	Q-N3	31. K-B3?	B-N5ch!
10. B-Q3	P-KN3	21. P-K5	N-KB4	32. Resigns	
11. O-O	Q-B3	22. BxN	QxB		