



SPRING 2010

VOLUME 53

NO. 2

Tenn. Individuals Final .....	5
Tenn. Regional Team Qualifying Tournaments .....	7
Tenn. State Team Finals .....	9
Tenn. Girls Championship .....	11
Cumberland County Spring Open .....	11
Team Finals Crosstables .....	14

---

---

May 14–16, 2010      **2010 Tennessee Senior Open**  
Fair Park Senior Center  
1433 Livingston Road  
Crossville, TN  
Hotel: Crossville Comfort Suites  
Harry Sabine    (931) 484-9593; [hdsabine@citlink.net](mailto:hdsabine@citlink.net)

May 29, 2010      **Rutherford Co. Open**  
Grace Lutheran Church, Murfreesboro, TN  
Rutherford Co. Chess Club: [rccc@rccc.us](mailto:rccc@rccc.us)

June 26, 2010      **John Hurt Memorial 7**  
Hampton Inn, Memphis, TN  
Entries: Memphis Chess Club

July 17, 2010      **Clinton Pearson, Jr. Memorial Summer**  
Cumberland Co. Community Complex, Crossville  
Harry Sabine    (931) 484-9593; [hdsabine@citlink.net](mailto:hdsabine@citlink.net)

This magazine is being provided to current Tennessee Chess Association members as one of their benefits for supporting chess activity in Tennessee. It is the official publication of the *Tennessee Chess Association* and its legal property. We are trusting you to not abuse the privilege of access to this information. Abuse would be considered copying over two pages for publication without crediting the source (Tennessee Chess News—TCN). However, you are permitted to download a copy of this publication to your personal computer. If you desire to use this content for other purposes than your own copy, contact the editor, Leonard Dickerson, for approval. Thank you for your support of chess in Tennessee and observation of these few requests!

## MEMBERSHIPS

TCA annual dues are \$10 for a *regular* membership or *student* membership. Additional members of a family may join for one dollar each, but only one copy of printed TCN's will be available per family. Both regular and patron memberships are for a 12-month period, starting in the month of purchase and expiring after a 12-month period.

**Tax deductible Patron Memberships** are available beginning at \$100 per year for those who wish to help support the TCA and the FFTC. These memberships expire one year from the date of payment. The Patron membership categories are:

**PATRON — \$100; PATRON KING — \$300; PATRON MASTER — \$500; PATRON GRANDMASTER — \$1000+**

The benefits that pertain to the different level of patronage are currently being refined and will be detailed on our website soon.

## TOURNAMENT ANNOUNCEMENTS

TCN prints listings of upcoming tournaments that require TCA membership in each issue for free. Submit complete TLA information to Larry Grohn, Tournament Coordinator: E-MAIL: [LarryGrohn@comcast.net](mailto:LarryGrohn@comcast.net)

## TCN CHESS NEWS STAFF

### Editor

Leonard Dickerson

### Contributors

Alvin Harris

Roy Manners

## TCN PUBLICATION SCHEDULE

**Spring 2010** — Scheduled for May 1st covering Feb, Mar, and Apr events

**Deadline for submission: Apr 18, 2010**

**Summer 2010** — Scheduled for Aug 1 covering May, Jun, and Jul events

**Deadline for submission: July 18, 2010**

**Fall 2010** — Scheduled for Nov 1 covering Aug, Sept, and Oct events

**Deadline for submission: Oct 18, 2010**

**Winter 2011** — Scheduled for Feb 1 covering Nov, Dec, and Jan events

**Deadline for submission: Jan 18, 2011**

Please submit material by e-mail to: [lsdick@tds.net](mailto:lsdick@tds.net)

# PATRON MEMBERS

**TENN. CHESS ASSOC. & FOUNDATION FOR TENN. CHESS**

 **Patron Grandmaster**   
**Dr. Martin Katahn**

 **Patron Member**   
**Malcolm Estrada**  
**Peter Lahde**  
**R. K. Shimabukuro**  
**Paul Semmes**  
**Brian Vogt**

# TN HALL OF FAME

The **Tennessee Chess Hall of Fame** was established to honor those members who have distinguished themselves through their outstanding achievements in chess, either in competition or in chess organization or promotion. Peter Lahde is chairman of the electing committee, and guidelines for nominations are posted onsite. Below is a listing of the current members and their year of induction.

Peter Lahde	1990	John Hurt	1992
Robert Coveyou	1990	James A. Sweets	1993
Jerry Sullivan	1990	Rea Hayes	1997
Martin Southern	1990	James A. Wright	1998
Tom Finucane	1990	Dr. Martin Katahn	2002
Robert Serivener	1990	David Burris	2003
L. Hunter Weaks	1990	Albert Hodges	2005

# FROM THE EDITOR

## Scholastic Winners and Scholarships

The Tennessee Individual Finals and both the Regional Team Qualifiers and Team Championship events are included in this issue. I didn't receive many games but all that were submitted and legible have been annotated and included.

Tenn. Technological University contributed \$130,000 in scholarship monies to the champions of our scholastic events. Undefeated Peter Suich received the \$4,000 per year Academic Service Scholarship from TTU. Second-place finisher (after tie breaks) George Woodbury received the second-place scholarship of \$2,500 per year. See more about the Individual Finals on page 5. White Station High School became the team champion and four members of its members received \$4,000 per year scholarships. Hume-Fogg fought through a 10-minute tie breaker to finish in second place monies, with four of its members receiving \$2,500 scholarships. Read more about the Team Finals on page 9 of this issue. Donations of over \$100,000 must be regarded as serious money. We should do all that we can as members to assure that TTU's generosity will continue in the future. Hence, you are encouraged to write the President or Dean of TTU to personally thank them for their support of Tennessee scholastic chess. Not only have we used their site free (the student center, which is now called the Roaden University Center) for over a decade, but they have long been generously donating the scholarship awards.

## TCA Operating Monies

At the last TCA Board meeting of March 13, our treasurer informed us that the TCA has \$52,083 total monies, including endowments and money market funds. Moreover, the TCA's main sources of income were from TCA-supported tournaments (49%) and the Regional Scholastic tournaments (33%). Membership dues accounted for only 14% of the TCA's income. The main expenditures were for TCA-supported tournaments (66%) and the Regional Scholastic tournaments (24%). Don't be fooled by the size of the amount, though. This really does not give our organization much flexibility and certainly does not give us enough to start spending! We are obligated to spend approximately \$6,000 on the Tenn. Open, \$5,000 on the Tenn. Winter Open, and over \$10,000 on our scholastic tournaments. So couple that with just regular operating expenses (liability insurance, etc.) and will quickly see that we aren't rolling in the money. In fact, we are sorely in need of additional funds so that we can seriously consider supporting chess education in schools and other goals. Thus we have a need for sponsorship and are in need of donations.

## TCA website

The revised TCA website (tnchess.org) is functioning well with updates being rapidly made. Many have commented with surprise on how speedily information on the scholastic tournament winners was available. Not only that, but photographs and short biographies of the winners of the scholastic events are highlighted on the website. Too, the tournament calendar is up and active. Several have already used our PayPal service to sign up for upcoming tournaments and pay TCA membership dues. So this service has been a big addition to our site and will see much more use in the future as the membership acquaints themselves with it. The site is still under development, and this is most evident when one tries to view games online. We are addressing this problem and our game viewer will be operational soon. If you find any other feature of our website that is not performing properly-or if you can think of a feature that we need to add-let an officer of the TCA know immediately.

Any of you guys over 50? Then immediately make plans to play in the Tennessee Senior Open Championship!

**Tennessee Senior Open Championship**      **May 14-16, 2010**  
*5 Round Swiss    Traditional Schedule (3 days)    Game/120    Class Prizes*  
*\$550 Guaranteed Prize Fund & Plaques/Awards*

## TN Individual Finals

On Feb. 27th, the Tenn. Individual Finals tournament was again hosted by Tennessee Technological University (TTU). **Peter Suich** emerged as undefeated champion in the **High School Championship** with a perfect score and pocketed the \$4,000 yearly-scholarship money. Three other players tied for 2nd-4th place. After the 10-minute tie-break games were held to determine who would receive the \$2,500 per year Service Scholarship, **George Woodbury** captured the second-place money over Chase Knowles and Graham Gibson.

**Jason Fu** won the **Jr. High Championship** by defeating higher-rated Nathan Vogt in the last round. Jason had a perfect score, while both Vogt and Neglia Salvatore tied for 2nd-3rd with 4.0 points.

In the **Elementary Section**, **Arum Jambulapati** captured clear first with 4.5 points, being trailed by three others who had 4.0 points: Alexander Qin, Max Friedman, and Kevin Hong.

**Shaun Burgess** (who was rated about two classes above his opposition) scored a perfect 5.0 to promote himself as champion of the **Primary Section**. Four others trailed him with 4.0 points (Weston Sharpe, Nina Bhat, Joshua Kouch, and Lucas Pao).

Crosstables of the tournament along with a nice bio of the players are available online as the Tenn. Chess Assoc. Website: [tnchess.org](http://tnchess.org). Photographs of the champion are also included there!

Below are three games from the Reg. 4 Ind. Qualifying tournaments. No games were submitted from the Finals.


### Reg. 4 Indiv. Qualifier

Feb. 13, 2010

Chase Knowles - 1787

Graham Horobetz - 2011

1. c4 d6 2. d4 Nf6 3. Nc3 g6 4. g3 Bg7 5. Bg2 O-O 6. Nf3 a6 7. O-O Nbd7 8. e4 e5 9. dxe5 dxe5 10. Bg5 c6 11. Qc2 (11. Qd6 Re8 12. Rad1 Qb6 13. Rd2 Bf8 14. Qd3 h6 +/-) 11... Qc7 12. Nd2 Fritz had White at a slight plus if he had followed up with the logical Rad1. Being unsure of the knight's destination, it now considers the game equal or favoring Black. a5 13. f4?! Now we know why the knight moved! But this radical move is unjustified, weakened both the king's position as well as the Black squares. Ng4 Stronger was h6, but this move still retains a nice edge, too. 14. Nd1 If f5, then Bf6 or h6. h6 This is slightly more forcing than the immediate exf4. 15. Bh4 exf4 16. gxf4 Nc5 Fritz11 gives Black a 0.68 edge. 17. h3 Nf6 Fritz recommends g5, but few would be in a hurry to play it. 18. e5?! Better was Nb3, challenging Black's strongly posted knight. Also okay is f5, which restricts Black's other bishop. Bf5 (18... Nh5!) 19. Qc3 Nh7?! Much better was Nh5. 20. Qe3 = b6 21. Ne4 Bxe4 22. Bxe4 Nxe4 23. Qxe4 Rae8 24. Qg2



g5 25. fxg5 (25. Bg3 Kh8 26. Nc3 gxf4 27. Bxf4 Bxe5 28. Bxe5+ Rxe5 -/+) 25... hxg5 26. Bxg5 Nxg5 27. Qxg5 Rxe5 28. Qf4 Qd7 29. h4 f5 30. Rf3? Necessary was Nc3 to defend e4 and bring the


other rook into the game. Re4 31. Qg5?? Rg4+ 32. Rg3 Rxc4 33. Rxc4 Qd4+ 34. Kf1 Qxc4+ 35. Kg2 Qxh4 36. Rg3 f4 37. Rh3 Qg4+ 38. Kh2 Qe2+ 39. Kh1 f3 40. Nf2 Qxf2 41. Rg1 Qxb2 More consistent would be Rf4, threatening Rh4. 42. Rhg3 f2 43. Rf1 Qxa2 44. Kg2 Qd5+ 45. Kh2 a4 46. Rh3 Be5+ 47. Rg3+ Bxg3+ 48. Kxg3 Qg5+ 49. Kh3 Rf4 50. Rxf2 Rh4# 0-1

### Reg. 4 Indiv. Qualifier


Graham Horobetz - 2011

Graham Gibson - 1651

1. e4 c5 2. Nc3 Nc6 3. f4 e6 4. Nf3 d5 5. d3 Be7 6. g3 Nf6 7. e5 Nd7 8. Bg2 a6 9. a4 Qc7 10. O-O O-O 11. h4 f6 12. Bh3 f5 13. Ng5 Nd8 14. Qh5 h6




15. Nxe6! Nxe6 16. Nxd5 Qd8 17. Bxf5 Nd4 (17... Nb6 18. Nxe7+ Qxe7 19. Be4 Nd4 +/- 20. a5 Bh3 21. axb6 Nxc2 22. Bd2 Nxa1 23. Rxa1 Fritz gives Black a 1.4 advantage.) 18. Be4 Nxc2



19. Qg6 Black's best is returning the piece with Nf6. Nxa1 20. e6 Rf5 21. Bxf5 Nf6 22. Qf7+ Kh8 23. Nxe7 Qe8 24. Ng6+ Kh7 25. Ne5+ Kh8 26. Bd2 Nb3 27. Bc3 b5 (27... Qxf7 28. Nxf7+ Kg8 29. Nd6 Nd4 30. Bxd4 cxd4 31. Rcl +-) 28. axb5 axb5 29. g4!? b4 30. Ng6+ Kh7 31. Bxf6 1-0


Reg. 4 Individ. Qualifier  
Shane Franklin - 1231  
Graham Horobetz - 2011

1. d4 Nf6 2. c4 e6 3. Nc3 Bb4 4. Qc2 O-O 5. Bg5 h6 6. Bh4 Nc6 7. Nf3 d6 8. e3 e5 9. d5 Nb8 10. a3 Bxc3+ 11. Qxc3 a5 12. Nd2 a4 13. Bd3 Nbd7 14. O-O Nc5 = 15. Bc2 Bg4 16. f3 Bh5 17. e4 (17. g4 Bg6 18. Bxg6 fxd6 would favor Black.) 17... g5 18. Bf2 Nfd7 19. Rfel Bg6 20. Nf1 b6 Better was the immediate f5. 21. Ng3 Qf6 22. Qb4 Rfe8 23. Be3 Kh7 24. Ne2 Kg7 Better was g4. Now Black wins the a-pawn with advantage. 25. Nc3 Rf8



26. Bxa4 Capturing with Nxa4 was better. Nxa4 (26... Nd3! 27. Qb5 Nxe1 28. Qxd7 Rfd8 29. Qxc7 Nxf3+ 30. gxf3 Rxa4 31. Nxa4? Qxf3 32. Bf2 Bxe4 33. Kf1) 27. Nxa4 Qe7 +/- 28. Nc3 f5 29. Rf1 Rf7 30. Rf2 Raf8 31. Raf1 Better was exf5 so that the bishop could be maintained on an effective diagonal. f4 32. Bd2 Nf6 Nc5 was better, threatening Nd3 and keeping the White queen out of the game. 33. Qb3 g4 34. Qc2 g3!? 35. Re2 gxh2+ 36. Kxh2 Nh5 37. Kg1? Bel would have

stopped the immediate invasion. (37. Bel Qg5 38. Rh1! Ng3 39. Bxg3 fxd6 40. Kg1 Bh5 41. Qd2) 37... Ng3 38. Kf2 (38. Rcl Qh4 +- 39. Re1 Kh8 40. Ne2 Qh1+ 41. Kf2 Nxe4+ 42. fxe4 Qh4+ 43. Kg1 f3)




38... Qh4 39. Ke1 (39. Qb3 Bh5 40. Ke1 Rg8 41. Ref2 Nxf1 42. Kxf1 Kh8 43. c5 {43. Nd1 Qh1+ 44. Ke2 Rxd2} 43... Rfg7) 39... Nxe4+ 40. Kd1 Nf2+ 41. Kc1 Bxc2 42. Kxc2 e4 43. Nxe4 Nxe4 44. Rxe4 Re7 45. Bc3+ Kh7 46. g3 Qh2+ 47. Kd3 Rxe4 48. Kxe4 Qe2+ 49. Kd4 Qe3# 0-1

An interesting game occurred between elementary players in the Team Finals. The players avoided the usual lines of the Petroff Defense with some spirited play.


Elementary Team Finals  
Board 3, Round 2  
Joshua Leow - 1044  
Elsa Wilson - 847

1. e4 e5 2. Nf3 Nf6 3. d4 d6!?



4. dxe5 More popular is 4. Nc3, offering Black a

transposition to the Philidor Defense. Nxe4 5. exd6 Now Qd5 followed by Bg5 gives more. cxd6? Certainly the simple Bxd6 is better. 6. Bf4 Nc6 7. Bc4 Bg4 Black could assume an initiative with Qf6, hitting the bishop and b2. 8. Qd5 Be6 9. Qxe4 Be7?? Playing d5 would have limited the loss to only a pawn. 10. Bxe6 Qa5+ 11. Nc3?! Defending with the obvious Bd2 would have won another piece. fxe6 12. Qxe6 Nb4 13. O-O Best was Bxd6, threatening mate on e7. Nxc2 14. Bxd6 Qd8 15. Rad1 Qd7 16. Qxd7+ Best is Qe4, hitting the knight and retaining all other threats. Kxd7 17. Bxe7+ Kxe7 18. Nd5+ Kf7 19. Rcl Rhd8 20. Rfd1?! Best was Nc7 followed by Rxc2. Rac8 21. Ne5+ Had White played the better



Ng5+, the king could not have approached without being exposed to a check on e7 which would have forked his rook. Ke6 22. Nc7+ Rxc7?! Best is Kxe5 when White must be careful that he does not expose his back rank: (22... Kxe5 23. Rxd8 Rxd8 24. f4+! {24. Rxc2 Rd1#} 24... Ke4 25. Rxc2 Rd1+ 26. Kf2 Kxf4) 23. Rxd8 Kxe5 24. Rd2 Nb4 25. Rxc7 Nxa2 26. Rxb7 a5 27. Rxd7 a4 28. Rxh7 Ke4 29. Rd8 Nb4 30. Re7+ Kf5 31. Rf8+ Kg6 32. Rf3 Nd5 33. Re8 Kg7 34. Re4 Nf6 35. Rxf6 Kxf6 Black plays on because it is a team game. 36. Kf1 Kf5 37. Re8 Kf6 38. Ke2 Kf7 39. Re3 Kf6 40. Kd3 Kf5 41. Kc4 Kf6 42. Kd4 Kg5 43. Ke5 and White gave mate on the 49th move. 1-0

## Tenn. Regional Team Qualifiers

On March 6, the Tenn. State Scholastic Team Chess Qualifying tournaments were held in the four regions of Tenn. to determine those who would become eligible to become the state team champions. The below teams and the next top-three finishers in the respective sections went on to represent their regions in the state finals.

### Championship Teams of Regional Qualifiers

#### Reg. 1 Championship Teams

HS: Webb HS  
JH: Farragut MS  
Elem: Sequoyah Elem.  
Prim: Woodland Elem.

#### Reg. 2 Championship Teams

HS: McCallie School  
JH: Crossville Home  
Elem: CSTHEA  
Prim: CSTHEA

#### Reg. 3 Championship Teams

HS: Hume-Fogg Magnet  
JH: Shanan Home School  
Elem: Meigs Magnet  
Prim: Univ. School of Nashville

#### Reg. 4 Championship Teams

HS: White Station  
JH: Memphis University  
Elem: Sycamore Elem.  
Prim: Grahamwood

In the Elementary Section of Region 1, Sequoyah and Woodland both finished with 3.0 points. But Sequoyah won the 10-min. tie-break games and emerged as over-all champion. Moreover, in Region 4 the Elementary Section was very competitive. Three teams finished with 3.0 points. Their tie-break finish was Sycamore Elem., Grahamwood, and White Station Middle School. (Trailing by only a half point was St. George.)

In Region 1, it is noteworthy that the powerful Webb Middle School already had 3.0 points in the third round. Why didn't they win? They made the mistake of substituting in an Alternate on Board 3 above a registered player on Board 4. They failed to properly substitute toward the top, and, consequently, had to forfeit their third-round win. Since they achieved only a draw in their last round, they ended up not even qualifying to represent the region. So be warned: substitute properly or risk forfeiture.

Heroics were also demonstrated in Region 1. In the Jr. High and High School Sections there were only three Middle School Teams and four High Schools. So that all teams would get four competitive games to prepare for the Finals, the teams were offered the opportunity to combine their sections. This of itself was no big deal. But this merger was a real threat to the high school teams because the middle schools averaged equal or higher ratings! Hence the high school teams were understandably hesitant to commit to this arrangement, especially if they had a goal of obtaining the first place honors. The three high school teams did courageously agree to combine with the Jr. High teams. And the final scores did reflect their "fears" as

the Farragut Middle won the section with 3.5 points, a full point above second-place finishers Webb and Oak Ridge High School. (Of course, the trophies and qualification were granted based on divisions.)

Home schools really showed their prevalence and strength in Region 2. The top three lower divisions were dominated by home schools. CSTHEA (Chattanooga Southeast Tennessee Home Education Assoc.) and Crossville Home School finished first and second, respectively, in both the Primary and Elementary Sections while switching places in the Jr. High division. It is very likely that these home schools will also be a factor next year.

For a break-down of the qualifiers by region and section, check out the results on the Tenn. Chess Assoc. website. Games from the tournament appear throughout this issue.


#### Team Finals Elem Rd 1/Bd 2 March 27, 2010

Carter, Mekhi - 670  
Friedman, Max -1549

1. e4 e5 2. Nf3 Nc6 3. Bc4 Bc5 4. O-O Nf6 5. d3 h6 6. c3 O-O 7. Nbd2 d6 8. Re1 Ng4 9. h3? Nxf2 10. Qe2 Nxd3+ 11. Kf1 Nxe1 12. Nxe1 Qf6+ 13. Nef3 Be6 14. Nb3 Bb6 15. Be3?? Overloading his own defending piece. Bxe3? Wrong capture. With 16. Bxe6 White could minimize the damage. 16. Qxe3?? Bxc4+ 17. Kf2 Qf4 18. Qxf4 If you are going to play on, keep some pieces to try for counterplay. Otherwise you just rush to a hopeless endgame. exf4 19. Rd1 Bxb3 20. axb3 Rfe8 21. e5? Nxe5 22. Nxe5?! dxex5 23. Rd7 Rac8 24. Kf3 f5 25. b4 g5 26. g4 e4+ 27. Kf2 e3+ 28. Ke2 f3+ 29. Ke1 Of course if Kxf3, then the e-pawn queens. e2 30. Kf2 e1=Q+ 31. Kxf3 Re3+ 32. Kg2 Rg3+ 33. Kh2 Qg1#

Reg. 1 Team Qualifier (4)  
 March 6, 2010  
 Corry Marsh  
 Charles Blue  
 Result ½ - ½


1. d4 d5 2. c4 c6 3. Nc3 Nf6  
 4. Nf3 Bf5?! This is premature. Qb3 can cause problems here, at the least crippling Black's queenside pawns: 5. Qb3 Qb6 6. Qxb6 axb6 7. cxd5 cxd5 8. e3 +/- 5. e3 Nbd7 6. Bd2?! Better was Bd3 or, first, cxd5. e6 7. cxd5 exd5 8. Be2 Bd6 9. O-O O-O 10. a3 c5?! Ne4 was better. This move weakens Black's position and gives White an easy target on d5. Now White can continue strongly with Nb5, dxc5, and either Rc1 or Nbd4. 11. dxc5 Bxc5 12. b4 Bd6 13. Nd4 Be6 14. Ncb5 Nb6 15. Nxd6 Qxd6 +/- 16. Nb5 Qd7 17. Bc3 Ne4 18. f3 Better was Qd4 because the text unnecessarily weakens White's pawn structure and takes a nice attack square from White's bishop. Nxc3 19. Nxc3 = Rac8 20. Rc1 Rfd8 21. Bb5 Qd6 22. Rf2 d4! (22... Nc4 23. Bxc4 dxc4 +/-) 23. Rd2



This natural move looks strong but actually just concedes a real advantage to Black. Qe5! +- 24. e4 (24. Rd3 a6 25. Ba4 Bf5 26. e4 Be6 27. Bc2 Bc4 28. Rd2 Qg5 -) 24... Bb3 25. Qxb3 dxc3 26. Rxd8+ Rxd8 27. Bc4 Qd4+ 28. Kf1 Qxc4+ 29. Qxc4 Nxc4 30. Rxc3 b5 31. a4 a6 32. Kf2 g6 33. axb5 axb5 Black increased his advantage from this position but failed to win because Marsh was able

to obtain what appeared to be a perpetual check. Though there was still a problematical win present, Black didn't look too deep into the position because all his team needed at that time was a half point to win the match. Below is the position from which the draw resulted:


ANALYSIS



Position could have resulted in a win.

White to move tried to engineer a perpetual check. Indeed, Black conceded that the game was drawn after a few tentative moves. But he could have pressed on and got the win: 1. Rh8+ Kg4 2. Rh4+ Kf3 3. Rf4+ Ke3 4. Re4+ Kd2 5. Rd4+ Ke1 6. Rd1+ Kf2 7. Rf1+ Kg3 8. Rf3+ Kh4

ANALYSIS




Winning position after 8... Kh4.

9. Rxh3+ (9. Rf4+ g4) 9... Kg4 10. Kxg2 Nf4+ but, as stated above, Blue did not persist but settled for the draw. 1/2-1/2

Team Finals - High School  
 Neel Martin - 1020  
 Rohith Parvathareddy - 1660

1. e4 c6 2. Nf3 d5 3. Nc3 dxe4 4. Nxe4 Nd7 5. d4 Worth a thought was 5. Qe2 when N(g)-f6 could reveal 6. Nd6++ Ngf6 6. Bd3 Nxe4 7. Bxe4 Nf6 8. Bd3 Bg4 9. O-O e6 Worth playing at the scholastic level is Bxf3 to snatch a pawn: 9... Bxf3 10. Qxf3 Qxd4 11. Be3 Qg4. Though Fritz assesses this as drawish because White's two bishops and development perhaps offset Black material, it is likely that Black will win when two equally matched scholastic players are playing. 10. Re1 Bd6 11. Bg5 O-O 12. c3 h6 13. Bh4 Be7 14. h3 Bxf3 15. Qxf3 Nd5 16. Bxe7 Qxe7 17. Re2 Qc7 18. g3 Rad8 19. a3 Rd7 20. c4? Exposing the d-pawn to a terminal attack. Nf6 21. Qe3 Rfd8 22. d5 b6 Black could have obtained a whole pawn by simply capturing but he gives White the chance to go astray and capture one of pawns. 23. Qe5 Qxe5 24. Rxe5 cxd5 25. cxd5 Rxd5 26. Rxd5 Rxd5 27. Rd1 Ne4 28. Bc2 Rxd1+ 29. Bxd1 Nd6 30. Be2 f6 31. f4 Kf7 32. Kf2 Ke7 33. Kf3 Definitely better is Bd3, trying to dominate the knight. Nf5 34. b4?? Necessary was Bc4. Now White loses a queen-side pawn and any hope of a draw. Nd4+ 35. Ke3



Nc2+ Instead of the simple capture of the bishop and an easy win, Black's pawn snatching later cost him the game. 1-0

## Tenn. Team Finals

The Tenn. State Scholastic Team Finals Chess tournament was held March 27 at the Roaden University Ctr. of Tenn. Technological Univ. The top 16 teams from each region competed in their respective divisions to determine not simply which team is the best but-in the particular case of the High School teams-who would secure their future with TTU's scholarship monies. TTU awards four-year University Service Scholarships to the first and second-place finishing teams of the High School Section, with \$4,000 per year being granted to each of the four members of the first place team and \$2,500 per year each to four members of the second place team.

In the **High School Section**, **White Station High** emerged undefeated, winning all their matches by 3 or more points. (The intimidating team was composed of Roh Parvathareddy, Chase Knowles, Jonathan Beatty, Nishit Reddy, Oscar Carrillo, and Jordan Berryhill.) There was a three-way tie between Hume-Fogg Magnet, Webb High School, and McCallie School for the \$2,500 second-place scholarship monies. Tiebreak games of 10-min were conducted to determine which of the three teams would take the money. In the first thrilling tie break session, McCallie held Webb to a draw. So another tie-breaking session was necessary-which also ended in a draw! Finally, Webb triumphed in a third tie-break session. However, they still needed to get through Hume-Fogg before they could claim the money. This was not to be. **Hume-Fogg** (composed of Vikas Kumar, Manu Nair, Max Breyer, Michael Schoenfield,

Jacob Schafer, and Andrew Yang) won the 10-min. tie breaker and collected the \$2,500 scholarships for their school.

In the **Junior High Section**, Memphis University School and **Farragut Middle School** both ended up with 3.5 points, a full point ahead of the field. After a tie-break session, **Farragut Middle** (Jason Fu, Charles Blue, Kevin Hong, and Kai Smith) took the title and notched their first victory as divisional team champions of Tennessee.

In the **Elementary Section**, favored Grahamwood Elementary suffered a forfeit-loss to St. George in the third round. This catapulted **St. George's Independent School** (Shaun Burgess, William Federman, Carter Burgess, Richard Kuehn, and John Mann) into the driver's seat and they drew their match with powerful White Station Middle School in the last round to earn the title of the Tennessee Elementary Team State Champions. (They

scored 3.5 team points in doing so-almost perfect!)

**Grahamwood** (Nina Bhat, Joshua Kouch, Kevin Cao, Michael Rotz, Allen Wu, and Justin Couch) displayed outright dominance in the **Primary Section**, winning every individual game that they played except one. They showed that their 200-rating point spread was meaningful as they out-paced second-place finishing University School of Nashville by a full point, earning themselves yet another Championship title.

Below is a photograph of the Junior High Championship team. Photographs of the all the championship teams are available online for viewing at the TCA website. Crosstables of the event are presented on pages 14-17. Several games from the event are annotated throughout this issue.


Photo submitted by Kathy Blue.



**2010 Jr. High Champions: Farragut Middle School**  
Charles Blue, Kevin Hong, Jason Fu, and Kai Smith


High School Team Finals  
 March 27, 2010  
 Wyatt Whicker - UNR  
 Matt Hassler - 898

1. e4 e5 2. Nf3 Nc6 3. Bc4 h6 4. Nc3 Bb4 5. Nd5 Nf6 6. Nxf6+ Qxf6 7. a3 Bd6?! This is a terrible spot for the bishop, killing its own action as well as clamping down on the white-squared bishop's hopes. 8. c3 Qg6 9. O-O Qxe4 10. d3 (10. d4 ! O-O 11. Re1 Qf5 12. dxe5 Nxe5 13. Nxe5 Bxe5 14. Bd3 Qf6 15. Bc2 threatening Qd3 b6 (15... g5 16. h4 =) 16. Bxh6 gxh6 17. Qg4+ Qg7 18. Qe4 =) 10... Qg4?!



11. h3 (11. Bxf7+ ! Kxf7 12. Ng5+ Qxg5 13. Bxg5 hxg5 =) 11... Qg6 12. Re1 O-O 13. Bd5 Qf6 14. Bxc6? This is a major blunder. Even though White was down a pawn, Black's wretched development assured White an equal game. Now White gives up an active piece and gives Black's other bishop freedom. So White's edge in development evaporates and Black's material plus becomes significant. dxc6 15. Qe2 Re8 Even Bd7 is possible, setting a trap: (15... Bd7 16. Nxe5 ? Bxe5 17. Qxe5 Rae8) 16. d4 e4 17. Ne5 Bxe5 18. Qxe4? Bf5? (18... Bh2+ ! 19. Kxh2 Rxe4) 19. dxe5 Bxe4 Better was Qg6, maintaining an advantage. 20. exf6 gxf6 Necessary was c5 to enable the pawn on c7 to advance if attacked. 21. Bxh6 Bc2 22. Bf4 Rxe1+ 23. Rxe1 Rc8 Better is Rd8, since the pawn can't really be defended. 24. Re7 b5 25.


Rxc7 Rxc7 26. Bxc7 a6 There is no need to push this pawn now. Kg7 is best. 27. f4 f5 28. Kf2 Kg7 29. Kf3 Be4+ 30. Kf2 Kg6 31. g4 fxg4 32. hxg4 f5 33. gxf5+ Even stronger is g5 because it advances the pawn while allowing Black's own f-pawn to restrict his bishop from the b1-h7 diagonal. Kxf5 This should be a dead draw--unless White can, perhaps, get to the pawn on a6. 34. Ke3 Bd5 35. Kd4 Ke6 36. Kc5 Kd7 37. Bb8



Kc8 Better was a5, hoping to get in a4 while leaving the king position to keep White from switching his attack back to the kingside. (37... a5 38. f5 {38. a4!? Trying to imbalance the position as much as possible. bxa4 39. f5 Be4 40. f6 Bb1 41. f7 Ke7 42. Kxc6 Bd3 43. Kb6 Kxf7 44. Kxa5 Bc2 45. c4 Ke6 46. c5 Kd5 47. Kb6 Bf5 =) 38... Be4 39. f6 Bd5 40. Bd6 a4 =) 38. Be5 Kb7? Now a5 is imperative. 39. f5 Ka7? Wrong direction. Kc8 allows Black to stumble back to the kingside but jettisons the a-pawn. 40. f6 Kb7 41. Kd6 +- a5 42. Ke7 c5 43. f7 Bxf7 44. Kxf7 b4 45. axb4 cxb4 46. cxb4 axb4 47. Ke6 Kc6 48. Bg7 Kc5 49. Ke5 Kc4 50. Kd6 b3 51. Kc6 Kd3 52. Kc5 Kd2 53. Kb4 Kc2 54. Bf6 Kd3 55. Kxb3 Ke4 56. Kc4 Kf5 57. Bc3 Ke6 58. b4 Kd7 59. b5 Kc7 60. Kc5 Kb7 61. Be5 Ka7 62. b6+ Kb7 63. Bf4 Ka8 64. Kb5 Kb7 65. Be3 Kb8 66. Ka6 Kc8 67. b7+ Resigns 1-0

Elem Team Finals Board 2  
 March 27, 2010  
 Max Friedman - 1549  
 Nathan Baulch - 918

1. e4 c5 2. Nf3 d6 3. d4 cxd4 4. Nxd4 Nf6 5. Nc3 e6 6. Be3 Be7 7. f3 a6 8. Bd3 O-O 9. Qd2 b5 10. g4 h6 11. h4 h5 Properly trying to keep the kingside closed. 12. g5?! And this move falls in with Black's hope! Castling queenside and following up with placing the queen or rook on the g-file was proper. Don't shut down your own attack. Nfd7 13. f4 Bb7 14. Rg1 Cautiously moving the rook off the diagonal, though castling was still best. e5? Black self-destructs, demolishing his own position when either Nc6 or b4 would have given him some chances to fight back. 15. Nf5 +- exf4 16. Bxf4 g6



17. Nxd6 Black's position is damaged beyond repair. Hence, White does best to castle: (17. O-O-O! gxf5?! {17... Ne5 18. Nxe7+ Qxe7 19. Be2} 18. exf5 Ne5 19. f6 Nf3?! 20. Qe2) 17... Qb6 (17... Bxd6 18. Bxd6 Qb6 19. Bh2 Nc5 +/-) 18. Qh2 Nc6 19. Nxb7 Even stronger was Nd5. Qxb7 20. O-O-O Nd4 21. Rgf1 Rac8 22. Be3 Qb6?? 23. Nd5 Qe6 24. Nxe7+ Qxe7 25. Bxd4 Qe6 26. b3 Better was Kb1, keeping the position intact. Qe7 27. Bb2 Nc5 28. Rfe1 Rfd8 29. Kb1 Rd7 30. Qe2 Rcd8?? 31. Bf6 Qxe4 32. Bxe4 Nxe4 33. Rxd7 Nc3+ 34. Bxc3 Rxd7 35. Qe8+ Resigns 1-0

## Tennessee Girls Chess Championship Graham Gibson wins

Contributed by Alvin Harris

Nineteen of Tennessee's best girl chess players competed in this year's Tennessee Girls Chess Championship at the Nashville Chess Center on April 24. The tournament was open to any girl in grades K - 12 who is a Tennessee resident. When the dust cleared, **Graham Gibson** was awarded the title of 2010 Tennessee Girls Champion, receiving an engraved glass trophy.

Gibson lived up to her top rating and defeated all of her opponents to finish with a perfect 4.0 score. Gibson is an 11<sup>th</sup> grade home-school student from Cordova, Tennessee.

Joann Welch finished second with 3.5 points, giving up a draw to last year's champion Autumn Douthitt in the 3<sup>rd</sup> round. Douthitt finished in sixth place with 2.5 points after losing to champion Graham Gibson in the final round.

This year's tournament coincided with Nashville's Country Music Marathon and Half-Marathon which ran right by the Chess Center on Belmont Blvd. "Fortunately, the girls who played today were not distracted by the runners, the band playing right next door or the stormy weather," said Chief TD Alvin Harris. "Even with everything going on outside, the girls all did a great job of focusing on their games and playing excellent chess."

The top ten finishers received trophies. All other players took home a chess book or a set of tournament pieces and a vinyl carrying bag.

## Cumberland Co. Spring

The Cumberland Co. Spring Open was held in Crossville, TN on April 17. Twenty-seven of the 57 participating players played in the **Open Section**. **Andrew Crigger (1808)** and **Kevin Hong (1328)** tied with 3.5 points to win the section. Kevin gained over 140 points in addition to share 1<sup>st</sup>-place honors.


There was also a tie for first place in the **Amateur Section**. **Rachel Weishaar (905)** and **Quinton Bruyn (797)** both went undefeated to share the championship title and money. Too, Quinton added about 200 more points to his rating.

Several of the intense battles from this Game/60 event follow.

**CC Spring Open - 4**  
**John Plenis - 1241**  
**Earl Hutchison - 1108**

1. f4 Nf6 2. Nf3 g6 3. c3 Ordinarily, White controls the black squares with his pieces rather than occupying them, i.e., Bb2 and e3. d6 4. d3 Bg7 5. e4 O-O =/+ 6. Be3 Ng4 7. Bd4?! Much better was Bg1. e5 8. fxe5 dxe5 9. Bc5 Re8 10. Nbd2 Better was h3 to chase the knight from his commanding post. b6 11. Ba3? Ne3 12. Qb3 Nxf1 This is certainly okay, but harassing the queen by a5 was even stronger. 13. Rxf1 Qxd3 14. Ng5? Be6? Always look for checks and undefended pieces. White misses his winning checking-fork. 15. Nxe6 Rxe6 16. Qd5 Qe3+ Excellent. Not settling for a simple endgame but keeping White in the center and going for much more. 17. Kd1 Nc6 18. Qd7 Bf6 19. Re1 Qg5 20. Re2 Rd8 21. Qxc7 According to Fritz, Black has almost a 5-point advantage, if he continues with Qg4 followed by

bringing his bishop into the attack.



Na5?! 22. b3 Nc6 23. Kc2 Qh6 = 24. Nf3 Bg5 25. Rf1 Targeting f7, hence Black should protect with Bf6. b5?? 26. Nxf5 Qh5 27. Qxf7+ Kh8 28. Nf3 More tactical would be Nxe6, threatening mate on g7. Qg4 29. Bf8! Nd4+ 30. Kb2 and White won, having multiple threats. 1-0

**Elementary Team Finals**  
**Board 2; Rd 1**  
**March 27, 2010**  
**Carter, Mekhi - 670**  
**Friedman, Max -1549**

1. e4 e5 2. Nf3 Nc6 3. Bc4 Bc5 4. O-O Nf6 5. d3 h6 6. c3 O-O 7. Nbd2 d6 8. Re1 Ng4 9. h3? Nxf2 10. Qe2 Nxd3+ 11. Kf1 Nxe1 12. Nxe1 Qf6+ 13. Nef3 Be6 14. Nb3 Bb6 15. Be3?? Overloading his own defending piece. Bxe3? Wrong capture. With 16. Bxe6 White could minimize the damage. 16. Qxe3?? Bxc4+ 17. Kf2 Qf4 18. Qxf4 If you are going to play on, keep some pieces to try for counterplay. Otherwise you just hurry to a hopeless endgame. exf4 19. Rd1 Bxb3 20. axb3 Rfe8 21. e5? Nxe5 22. Nxe5?! dxe5 23. Rd7 Rac8 24. Kf3 f5 25. b4 g5 26. g4 e4+ 27. Kf2 e3+ 28. Ke2 f3+ 29. Ke1 Of course if Kxf3, then e3-e2 queens the pawn. e2 30. Kf2 e1=Q+ 31. Kxf3 Re3+ 32. Kg2 Rg3+ 33. Kh2 Qg1 checkmate.



## Scholastic Corner


### Snatching Pawns While Uncastled

It is generally unwise to grab pawns with pieces while your king remains in the center. This especially applies to center pawns because you open lines upon which your opponent can post heavy pieces and target your homeless king. Just a consideration of the many opening systems and traps that willingly give up pawns for development (and time) should discourage you from snatching pawns.

Let's review the factors that determine your plans or attack notions. These imbalances are: the initiative, material balance, pawn structure, open lines and squares, quality of minor pieces, development, and space. In the May 2008 *Chess Life*, Mackenzie suggests that the mnemonic IMPLoDeS be used to remember these factors, where she has substituted "Officers" to signify the pieces (hence producing an "O").

When you snatch pawns, you usually are trading time for material. This is okay as long as your king's safety is assured. But you must be especially careful that you aren't also giving up the initiative.

Consider the seventh game of the current World Championship match being played between Anand and Topalov. Topalov gave up a whole piece for a single pawn but yet was able to maintain the draw because for his **material** outlay he obtained the **initiative and development**, later transforming these into a queening threat that maintained equality even though he remained a piece down. See the adjacent diagram.




This position resulted after Black's 20<sup>th</sup> move. (Note that Black also has king safety as a plus.) While lesser players such as us can't hope to have such a grasp of the elements to weigh their quality as Topalov can, we can make sure that our greed does not lead us astray before we even get out of the opening.

To illustrate this point, I am going to use a Round 1 game from the Cumberland Co. Spring Open between two Class E players. The game is further proof that it is difficult to win a center pawn without also possessing piece activity. Mainly, though, it illustrates the interplay of the application of the imbalances of chess and the rewards of following a clear plan (pressuring the center).

**Cumberland Co. Spring Open  
April 17, 2010  
Cole Evered  
Lukas Gonzales**

1. e4 e5 2. Nf3 Nc6 3. Bb5  
The Ruy Lopez is played to gain a long-term positional advantage, not to win the e-pawn. Nf6 4. Nc3 Bc5 Now that White has protected his e-pawn, he still can't win Black's pawn: 5. Bxc6 dxc6 6. Nxe5 Bxf2+ regains the pawn with a small advantage. 5. O-O O-O This is actually better than directly protecting the pawn with d6: 5... d6 6. d4 exd4 7. Nxd4 Bd7 +/- 6. Bxc6 dxc6 7. Nxe5



Qe7?! Better is the simple Bd4 or Re8, but the game continuation still guarantees return of the pawn. (7... Bd4 8. Nf3 Bxc3 9. dxc3 Nxe4) 8. d4 This move would not have been practical if Black had previously played Re8 instead of Qe7. Bd6 9. Bf4?! (9. f4 +/- c5 10. d5 Bxe5 11. fxe5 Qxe5 12. Bf4 +/-) 9... c5 10. Re1 Re8 (10... cxd4! 11. Nd5 (11. Qxd4?? c5 12. Qc4 Bxe5) 11... Nxd5 12. exd5 Bb4 13. Re2 Re8 14. a3 Bd6 15. Re1 Bf5 16. Qxd4 Bxc2 and Black's consistent pressures regains the pawn) 11. Nd5 +/- Better was Nd3, clinging to the pawn while defending the bishop and threatening e5: 11. Nd3 Bxf4 12. Nxf4 cxd4 13. Qxd4. 11... Qe6 12. Nxf6?! = Nd3 was still best. Qxf6 13. Qd2 cxd4 14. g3?? Black's continued pressure finally collapses White's position. Bxe5 15. Bxe5 Qxe5 16. f3 d3?! Better is the simple Be6. Until Black activates all his pieces, he can't boast about being a piece up. 17. Qxd3? Qxb2 18. a4 Qb6+ 19. Re3 There is no need to pin the rook. The simple Kg2 was best. c6 20. Rd1 Bh3 21. Kh1?? Rad8 22. c4 Rxd3 23. Rdx3 Qb1+ 24. Re1 Qxe1# 1-0

In summation, if White can get in this sort of trouble even after he has castled, then it certainly behooves you not to be snatching center pawns before you castle!

## 2010 TENNESSEE STATE TEAM FINALS — HIGH SCHOOL Wall Chart

School Name	Region	Rate	Rnd 1	Rnd 2	Rnd 3	Rnd 4
1. White Station High School	R4	1734	W4,4.0 1.0	B8,3.0 2.0	W2,3.0 3.0	B3,3.5 4.0
3. Hume-Fogg Magnet	R3	1678	B10,4.0 1.0	W7,4.0 2.0	B1,1.0 2.0	W8,4.0 3.0
2. Webb High School	R1	1193	B11,3.0 1.0	W13,4.0 2.0	B6,3.0 3.0	W1,0.5 3.0
4. McCallie School	R2	1041	B1,0.0 0.0	W5,4.0 1.0	B13,4.0 2.0	W7,2.5 3.0
5. Memphis University School	R4	1306	W6,2.0 0.5	B4,0.0 0.5	W11,3.0 1.5	B12,3.0 2.5
6. Cumberland County High School	R2	769	B5,2.0 0.5	W11,3.0 1.5	W3,1.0 1.5	B10,3.0 2.5
7. Cookeville High School	R2	1109	W9,3.0 1.0	B2,0.0 1.0	W12,3.5 2.0	B4,1.5 2.0
8. Stone Memorial High School	R2	1054	B12,3.0 1.0	W1,1.0 1.0	B10,4.0 2.0	B2,0.0 2.0
9. Ravenwood High School	R3	591	B7,1.0 0.0	W10,1.5 0.0	BYE 1.0	B13,4.0 2.0
10. Grahamwood Elementary	R4	832	W2,0.0 0.0	B9,2.5 1.0	W8,0.0 1.0	W6,1.0 1.0
11. Montgomery Central High School	R3	676	W3,1.0 0.0	B6,1.0 0.0	B5,1.0 0.0	BYE 1.0
12. Sycamore High School	R3	493	W8,1.0 0.0	BYE 1.0	B7,0.5 1.0	W5,1.0 1.0
13. Happy Valley High School	R1	394	BYE 1.0	B3,0.0 1.0	W4,0.0 1.0	W9,0.0 1.0
14. Oak Ridge High School	R1	1423	--- 0.0	--- 0.0	--- 0.0	--- 0.0
15. Blount Education Assoc.	R1	628	--- 0.0	--- 0.0	--- 0.0	--- 0.0

## 2010 TENNESSEE STATE TEAM FINALS — JR HIGH SCHOOL Wall Chart

School Name	Region	Rate	Rnd 1	Rnd 2	Rnd 3	Rnd 4
1. Memphis University School	R4	1433	W6,2.5 1.0	B8,4.0 2.0	W4,2.5 3.0	B2,2.0 3.5
2. Farragut Middle School	R1	1337	W12,4.0 1.0	B10,3.0 2.0	W3,2.5 3.0	W1,2.0 3.5
3. White Station High School	R4	1346	B11,2.0 0.5	W15,3.5 1.5	B2,1.5 1.5	B8,3.5 2.5
4. Shanan Home School Group	R3	1265	B9,3.0 1.0	W7,3.0 2.0	B1,1.5 2.0	W5,2.0 2.5
5. Webb Middle School	R1	1220	W10,1.5 0.0	W11,4.0 1.0	B14,4.0 2.0	B4,2.0 2.5
6. Crossville Home School	R2	1145	B1,1.5 0.0	W9,2.0 0.5	B12,4.0 1.5	W13,3.5 2.5
7. White Station Middle School	R4	1185	W14,4.0 1.0	B4,1.0 1.0	W10,2.0 1.5	B9,2.0 2.0
8. Meigs Magnet School	R3	1185	B13,3.0 1.0	W1,0.0 1.0	B15,4.0 2.0	W3,0.5 2.0
9. Independence High School	R3	995	W4,1.0 0.0	B6,2.0 0.5	B11,3.0 1.5	W7,2.0 2.0
10. CSTHEA	R2	856	B5,2.5 1.0	W2,1.0 1.0	B7,2.0 1.5	W14,2.0 2.0
11. Cordova Middle School	R4	1136	W3,2.0 0.5	B5,0.0 0.5	W9,1.0 0.5	B15,2.5 1.5
12. University School of Nashville	R3	1002	B2,0.0 0.0	W13,2.0 0.5	W6,0.0 0.5	BYE 1.5
13. Jefferson Middle School	R1	790	W8,1.0 0.0	B12,2.0 0.5	BYE 1.5	B6,0.5 1.5
14. Cleveland Middle School	R2	445	B7,0.0 0.0	BYE 1.0	W5,0.0 1.0	B10,2.0 1.5
15. Cumberland County High School	R2	368	BYE 1.0	B3,0.5 1.0	W8,0.0 1.0	W11,1.5 1.0

## 2010 TENNESSEE STATE TEAM FINALS — ELEMENTARY Wall Chart

School Name	Region	Rate	Rnd 1	Rnd 2	Rnd 3	Rnd 4
1. St. George's Independent School	R4	1073	W10,3.0 1.0	B8,2.5 2.0	-5,4.0 X3.0	W2,2.0 3.5
2. White Station Middle School	R4	1187	W13,3.0 1.0	B7,3.0 2.0	W3,2.0 2.5	B1,2.0 3.0
3. Sycamore Elementary	R4	930	B11,4.0 1.0	W6,3.0 2.0	B2,2.0 2.5	W5,2.0 3.0
4. University School of Nashville	R3	903	W14,4.0 1.0	B5,1.0 1.0	W8,3.0 2.0	B7,3.5 3.0
5. Grahamwood Elementary	R4	1145	B9,4.0 1.0	W4,3.0 2.0	-1,0.0 F2.0	B3,2.0 2.5
6. Meigs Magnet School	R3	713	W16,3.0 1.0	B3,1.0 1.0	W15,4.0 2.0	B9,2.0 2.5
7. Harding Academy	R3	840	B15,4.0 1.0	W2,1.0 1.0	B12,4.0 2.0	W4,0.5 2.0
8. Ensworth School	R3	691	B12,4.0 1.0	W1,1.5 1.0	B4,1.0 1.0	W14,4.0 2.0
9. CSTHEA	R2	558	W5,0.0 0.0	B14,2.0 0.5	W16,3.0 1.5	W6,2.0 2.0
10. Woodland Elementary School	R1	524	B1,1.0 0.0	W12,0.5 0.0	W13,3.0 1.0	B15,3.0 2.0
11. Sequoyah Elementary School	R1	519	W3,0.0 0.0	B16,2.0 0.5	W14,2.0 1.0	B12,2.0 1.5
12. Cleveland Middle School	R2	397	W8,0.0 0.0	B10,3.5 1.0	W7,0.0 1.0	W11,2.0 1.5
13. Alcoa Elementary School	R1	597	B2,1.0 0.0	W15,1.5 0.0	B10,1.0 0.0	B16,4.0 1.0
14. Crossville Home School	R2	376	B4,0.0 0.0	W9,2.0 0.5	B11,2.0 1.0	B8,0.0 1.0
15. Snow Hill Elementary	R2	344	W7,0.0 0.0	B13,2.5 1.0	B6,0.0 1.0	W10,1.0 1.0
16. West Valley Middle School	R1	300	B6,1.0 0.0	W11,2.0 0.5	B9,1.0 0.5	W13,0.0 0.5

## 2010 TENNESSEE STATE TEAM FINALS — PRIMARY Wall Chart

School Name	Region	Rate	Rnd 1	Rnd 2	Rnd 3	Rnd 4
1. Grahamwood	R4	997	B9,4.0 1.0	W6,4.0 2.0	B3,4.0 3.0	W7,3.0 4.0
2. University School of Nashville	R3	697	B7,2.0 0.5	W13,4.0 1.5	B5,2.0 2.0	W8,4.0 3.0
3. St George's Independent School	R4	784	W12,3.0 1.0	B8,2.5 2.0	W1,0.0 2.0	W5,2.0 2.5
4. Sequoyah Elementary School	R1	585	W10,3.0 1.0	B5,2.0 1.5	W7,1.5 1.5	B12,3.0 2.5
5. OLPH	R4	447	B14,3.0 1.0	W4,2.0 1.5	W2,2.0 2.0	B3,2.0 2.5
6. CSTHEA	R2	435	W15,3.0 1.0	B1,0.0 1.0	W12,2.0 1.5	B10,3.0 2.5
7. Woodland Elementary School	R1	401	W2,2.0 0.5	W11,3.0 1.5	B4,2.5 2.5	B1,1.0 2.5
8. Ensworth	R3	525	B16,3.5 1.0	W3,1.5 1.0	B9,3.0 2.0	B2,0.0 2.0
9. Presbyterian Day School	R4	417	W1,0.0 0.0	B15,3.0 1.0	W8,1.0 1.0	B13,4.0 2.0
10. Harding Academy	R3	384	B4,1.0 0.0	W14,3.5 1.0	B11,3.0 2.0	W6,1.0 2.0
11. Webb Lower School	R1	466	W13,2.0 0.5	B7,1.0 0.5	W10,1.0 0.5	B15,3.0 1.5
12. Crossville Home School	R2	412	B3,1.0 0.0	W16,3.0 1.0	B6,2.0 1.5	W4,1.0 1.5
13. Thrasher Elementary	R2	300	B11,2.0 0.5	B2,0.0 0.5	W16,3.0 1.5	W9,0.0 1.5
14. Christian Academy of Knoxville	R1	300	W5,1.0 0.0	B10,0.5 0.0	W15,2.0 0.5	B16,2.0 1.0
15. Providence Christian Academy	R3	300	B6,1.0 0.0	W9,1.0 0.0	B14,2.0 0.5	W11,1.0 0.5
16. Big Ridge Elementary	R2	300	W8,0.5 0.0	B12,1.0 0.0	B13,1.0 0.0	W14,2.0 0.5

## Henry Robinson: giving back to the community

Roy Manners mentioned an interesting program being conducted at the Clarksville Chess Club that deserves both publication and emulation. At the club, NM Henry Robinson has been commissioned to provide chess lessons in four-week cycles. Interested members pay him a \$5.00 fee to participate in the 4-week cycle's developments. The fee covers the cost of CDs and printed materials that Henry prepares and provides to them. Material on the CDs include chess software, databases, and PowerPoint presentations of the lessons. Robinson has taught endgames, middlegame pawn structures, and is presently presenting his module on the pawn pair resulting from Isolated Queen Pawn games.

Robinson provides lessons during the 4-week period and then takes two or three weeks off while he prepares another teaching module. Then a new cycle of lessons begin in which the interested members pay the small fee for materials to participate in the new cycle.

Based on the value received and the effort that Robinson expends to prepare and present the lessons, Manners feels that they are getting more than a bargain. He states that "this wonderful program of lessons is donated by the goodness of Henry's heart to help us all become better at the game we love. Wonderful things happen when you take the profit mongering out of the picture!"

I concur that Henry Robinson deserves recognition for his work and dedication to helping others gain a better understanding and appreciation of the game. If you know of someone who is similarly giving unselfishly for the advancement of chess, let a **TCN** representative know about it so that we can give them the recognition that they have earned!

Photo: Henry presenting a lesson to the members of the Clarksville Chess Club.



Photograph courtesy of Roy Manners

## review of Lahde's new book

In the Winter **TCN**, we mentioned that Peter Lahde had just published the comprehensive historical tome: **Isaac Kashdan, American Chess Grandmaster: A Career Summary With 757 Games**. If you need a little more information to convince you that it is a worthy buy, then consider GM John Donaldson's opinion:

"... Kashdan planned to write a book about his best games called **CHES** **HOLIDAYS** but it never came to pass. Thankfully the well-known chess historian and writer Peter Lahde has filled a huge gap in American chess literature with the publication of **Isaac Kashdan ...**, a project more than twenty years in the making.

What really makes this book something special are the dozens of games that Kashdan annotated for *Chess Review* in the 1930s. Played against some of the worlds best — Alekhine, Nimzovitch, Flohr, Fine, Reshevsky and Marshall to mention but a few — the games feature first-rate notes. **ISAAC KASHDAN AMERICAN CHESS GRANDMASTER** also benefits enormously from the goldmine of previously unpublished Kashdan scoresheets made available to Lahde by Richard Kashdan, the son of Isaac, and his cousin Teddy Seidenfeld. Chess has been made much richer by their generosity. It seems like over half the books written on the endgame feature Stoltz-Kashdan, Hague Olympiad 1928, as one of the classic model examples of the superiority of Bishop over Knight. They all start with the position after Whites 28th move because the first part of the game was lost. Now with Kashdan's scoresheet the missing first half has been made available.

*Author Lahde has done a first rate research job. Kashdan's career, first in New York, then Europe and finally Los Angeles, is thoroughly covered. Besides the games, which make up the bulk of the book, there are 70 pages of biographical material and 30 pages devoted to his overall record with pages and pages of crosstables. McFarland has done its usual high quality job with excellent paper, library binding and a clear layout.*


**ISAAC KASHDAN, AMERICAN CHESS GRANDMASTER** is a fitting tribute to not only one of the kings of American chess but also one of its greatest gentlemen."

*Highly Recommended*

**Regional Jr.High Team - 4**  
**Matthew Klawonn**  
**Sanchit Wadhawan**


1. c4 c5 2. Nf3 Nc6 3. g3 g6 4. Bg2 Bg7 5. Nc3 e5 6. d3 d6 7. O-O Nge7 8. Bg5

It is premature to put the bishop here since Black can gain a desirable tempo with h6. **f5** This seems premature. Black should play f6 followed by f5 later. Now Nd5 can reduce any coming attack. Fritz even claims a definite edge for White. **9. Nd2 O-O 10. Nb3?! This is a terrible move which kills off White's usual queenside counterplay. Again, Nd5 was good and even Bd5+ was better. h6 11. Bd2 (11. Bxe7 Qxe7 12. Nd5 Qf7 13. e3 =) 11... f4 12. Qc1 g5 13. Nd5 Nd4 Better is Bg4 or Ng6. Nd4 is awful because it rescues White's abandoned knight on b3. 14. Nxd4 cxd4 (See Diagram) 15. b4 (15. Ba5! {Fritz11} Qd7 16. c5 Nc6 17. Bc7 +/-) 15... Be6 16. Nxe7+ Qxe7 17. a4 Qd7 18. b5 Rac8 = 19. Qa3 d5 20. c5 Bf5 Interesting, revealing**




After 14 ... cxd4

ambitions of taking the center. Rf6 is more reliable, planning to double along the file. **21. Bb4 Rf7 22. Rac1 e4 23. Rfe1 =/+ g4** Be5 was much better, while g4 looks desperate and optimistic. Note that it also limits the white-squared bishop's possibilities.



**24. Bd2?** The simple gxf4 was required. **f3 25. exf3 gxf3 -/+ 26. Bf1**



**Bh3!** (26... e3 27. fxe3?! Bh3) **27. c6** Kh1 was necessary, followed later, perhaps, by Rg1. **bx c6 28. Rxc6 Bxf1 29. Rxc8+ Qxc8 30. Rc1 Qh3 0-1**

# BOARD OF DIRECTORS

## **PRESIDENT:**

Malcolm Estrada  
123 Annview LN  
Harrison, TN 37341  
H: (423) - 326-1446  
e-mail: straightleg111@aol.com

## **VICE-PRESIDENT:**

Paul Semmes  
1010 N. Maple Ave.  
Cookeville, TN 38501  
H: (931) 863- 4082  
e-mail: PaulSemmes@charter.net

## **SECRETARY:**

Chris Prosser  
733 Long Hunter Court  
Nashville, TN 37217  
H: (615) 399 - 8432  
e-mail: regioniii@aol.com

## **TREASURER:**

Angela McElrath-Prosser  
733 Long Hunter Court  
Nashville, TN 37217  
H: (615) 399 - 8432  
e-mail: tcanews@aol.com

## **INTERNET CHESS COORDINATOR:**

Alan Kantor  
577 Livingston Road, Apt. 23  
Crossville, TN 38555  
H: (931) 200-9038  
W: (931) 787-1234 ext. 128  
e-mail: kantor@charter.net

## **SCHOLASTIC COORDINATOR:**

Harry D. Sabine  
P. O. Box 381  
Crossville, TN 38557  
H: (931) 484-4878  
W: (931) 484-9593  
e-mail: hdsabine@citlink.net

## **TOURNAMENT COORDINATOR:**

Larry Grohn  
7032 Igoo Gap Road  
Chattanooga, TN 37421  
H: (423)-243-8235  
e-mail: LarryGrohn@comcast.net

## **TN CHESS NEWS EDITOR:**

Leonard Dickerson  
420 Oran Road  
Knoxville, TN 37932  
H: (865) 966-1095  
e-mail: lsdick@tds.net

## **EAST TENNESSEE DIRECTOR:**

Victor Suich  
707 Pritchard  
Morristown, TN 37813  
(423) 586-4351  
e-mail: vesuich@bellsouth.net

## **MIDDLE TENNESSEE DIRECTOR:**

Roy Manners  
1215 Cumberland Heights Road  
Clarksville, TN 37040  
H:(931) 552-1839  
e-mail: clarkvillechessclub@charter.net

## **WEST TENNESSEE DIRECTOR:**

Marla Stafford  
P. O. Box 770474  
Memphis, TN 38117  
e-mail: Westregion4@aol.com

## **Regional Scholastic Coordinators**

### **Region 1:**

David Marsh  
4411 Stillwood Road  
Louisville, TN 37777  
H: (865) 982-7216; NESGIV4DAVE@aol.com

### **Region 2:**

Michael Ake  
16 Pinecrest Dr.  
Wildwood, GA 30757  
Cell phone: (423) 505-8214  
O: (423) 493-5406; revmake@bellsouth.net

### **Region 3:**

Chris Prosser  
733 Long Hunter Court  
Nashville, TN 37217  
H: (615) 399-8432; e-mail: regioniii@aol.com

### **Region 4:**

Brian Vogt  
2669 Sweet Maple Cove  
Germantown, TN 38139  
H: (901) 624-0020; b-vogt@comcast.net