

THE NORTH CAROLINA CHESS BULLETIN

Volume I, #6, November - December, 1951

Editor: Kit Crittenden, 1537 Caswell St., Raleigh, N.C.

North Carolina is no match for Sameul Reshevsky, International Grandmaster. This was conclusively proved in his two simultaneous exhibitions, one at Raleigh and the other at Charlotte, in which he faced a total of 53 players, including many of the strongest players in the state. Reshevsky won all of his games, 24 at Raleigh and 29 at Charlotte.

For the Raleigh exhibition, Reshevsky was dressed in a dark blue suit and a tie which we shall term colorful. He is very short but very lively. During the games, he was willing to exchange comments with anyone who would be so daring; and afterward, he was kind enough to answer a few questions put to him by your Editor.

Asked what he thought of Larry Evans, who won the U.S. Championship ahead of Reshevsky last year, he said, "Evans is a coming player." Reshevsky also answered a few questions about the recent tournament in Amsterdam.

After his victorious showing at the Charlotte exhibition, Grandmaster dined at the home of A. H. Gaede along with a few of the latter's friends. There they were interested to hear his impressions of Botvinnik and Alekhine.

The UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA CHESS CLUB was host to the chess team of Duke University on January 24th. A four man match was held between these two arch rivals, the result being a 2 - 2 tie. In a later match, held February 22nd at the Durham Chess Club, the Carolinians won by a score of 3 - 1. Here are the line-ups:

January 24th				February 22nd			
U.N.C. (2)		Duke (2)		U.N.C. (3)		Duke (1)	
1 Crittenden	1/2	Chapman	1/2	1 Crittenden	1	Chapman	0
2 Makens	0	Crowder	1	2 Makens	0	Holina-Y-Vedia	1
3 Kahn	1/2	Huntly	1/2	3 Evans	1	Crowder	0
4 Evans	1	Sarles	0	4 Kahn	1	Huntly	0

The U. of N.C. club has also held a tournament to determine team standings. The results were: 1, Crittenden, 5 - 0; 2-3, Makens and Evans, 3 - 2; 4-5, Kahn and Hubbard, 2 - 3; and 6, Teichman, 0 - 5.

At the same club, an all-campus tournament has progressed past the preliminaries. From ten entries, the five finalists are: Hubbard, Kahn, Bowers, Makens, and Evans. Kahn leads with 3 - 1, but the others have not completed their schedule.

At RALEIGH, Ephraim Solkoff is teaching a group of boys about chess. Most of his pupils are of early high-school or late grammar school age. They meet every Friday night at the home of one of the boys.

The Raleigh Championship seems to have been won by Kit Crittenden with a score of 7 - 1. However, the tournament has faded away and Crittenden, at last report, is the only one to have played so many games. His loss was to Solkoff.

In addition to Raleigh chess is Djuras Ivanovitch. A former President of the U.S. Chess Federation, Ivanovitch is doing work at State College for his government.

Here is the score of a game played in the first round of the United States Intercollegiate Championship, Philadelphia, 1951. This game received the brilliancy prize.

Kit Crittenden (U.N.C.) - Allen Kaufman (N.Y.U.), #19

1 P-Q4	P-K3	9 BxB	QxB	17 QR-B1	N-K3	25 RxB	RxB
2 P-QB4	P-Q4	10 NxN	PxN	18 Q-Q2	P-KN4	26 RxB	RxP
3 N-QB3	N-KB3	11 B-K2	P-QN3	19 P-KN3!	Q-B3	27 P-R4	R-Q1
B-N5	QN-Q2	12 O-O	B-N2	20 KR-Q1??	P-Q5!	28 P-B4	R-Q6
5 P-K3	N-K2	13 PxP	KR-B1?!	21 NxP	NxN	29 PxP	RxPch
6 N-B3	O-O	14 P-B6!	RxB	22 QxN	RxB!	30 K-N1	RxB
7 Q-B2	P-B4	15 Q-Q2	R-R3	23 P-K4	BxB!	31 R-K3ch	K-N2
8 BxP	NxP	16 Q-Q4!	N-B4	24 P-B3	QxQch	32 R-K7	R-QN6!

Resigns

Here is a game by the winner of the 1951 Southern Championship, held at Asheville. H. Seidleman - H. Stark, #20

1 P-K4 P-K3
2 P-Q4 P-Q4
3 N-QB3 N-KB3
4 P-K5 ...

This variation, of which White's next move is a necessary part, is little seen nowadays because of the method of counterplay adopted by Black in this game.

4 ... Kf1-Q2
5 Qf1-K2 P-QB4
6 P-QB3 Pxp

Formerly delayed, but now considered best immediately, because Black's Bishop can check after the pawn recapture.

7 Pxp P-B3
8 P-B4 ..

All a part of White's scheme.

8 ... Pxp
9 BxpP Q-R5ch
10 N-N3 B-N5ch
11 K-B2 ...

Not B-Q2?, QxQP. This variation first saw light, as far as I know, in a game Alexander-Purdy, Gt. Britain - Australia radio match. There White played 11 K-K2, the game continuing 0-0; 12 N-B3, Q-N5; 13 B-K3, N-QB3; 14 K-B2, N-N3.

11 ... O-Och
12 N-B3 N-B3
13 B-K3 N-N3
14 R-B1 ...

Designed to prevent Black's Knight from occupying QB4. But if he is not to accept the pawn offer made two moves later, this move is valueless. 14 P-QN3 is also bad because of ...B-B6 and BxQP. Perhaps 14 P-QR3 followed by P-QN3 would have provided enough time to develop harmoniously. Then the King's Bishop could be kept on the board, since then there would be no need to exchange it for a Knight. In any case, Black's freedom of movement and development give him the better game. White's wedge pawns at K5 and Q4 do little to cramp the enemy pieces as the opposing Queen Bishop has at least two methods of getting into play.

14 ... B-Q2
15 B-K2 N-B5
16 BxN PxB
17 R-B1 ...

If now 17 Rxp, Black can play simply R-R4, threatening NxpP and N-K2, B-B3, N-Q4 or B4 at appropriate moments, with strong pressure. If the pawn is accepted,

Black is assured of a long initiative. But as played, White's defensive powers also undergo a severe test. The best policy would have been to take the pawn and hope.

17 ... Rxd1ch
18 KxR ...

If 18 QxR, R-B1. Or 18 PxR, QxRPch wins the Knight next move.

18 ... QxRP
19 R-R1 ...

The Queen is trapped!

19 R-B1ch
20 B-B4 ...

K-N4 is better, but White hopes to away with the Black Queen. Watch now.

20 ... NxpPch
21 QxN ...

Moving the King is also futile:

21 K-N4, P-R4ch; 22 Nxp, QxPch; 23 B-N3, (N-N3, B-B3; 24 R-B1, B-K5wins), B-B3 wins
21 ... B-B3ch
22 K-N4 P-R4ch
23 Nxp QxPch
24 B-N3 ...

Or 24 N-N3, Q-B6ch; followed by RxB and wins.

24 ... B-B6ch
25 K-R4 B-K2ch
26 N-B6ch RxdN
27 Pxr P-N4ch
28 Kxp QxBch
29 K-R6 B-B1, Mate.

Very enjoyable.

Many will remember the winner of this game from the N.C. Open in Charlotte. Karl Burger - Kit Crittenden, #21 Intercollegiate Tournament, 1951

1 P-QB4 P-K3
2 P-Q4 P-Q4
3 N-QB3 P-QB4

The Tarrasch defense. Black strives for immediate freedom at the cost of weakening his pawn structure.

4 BxpP KPxP
5 N-B3 N-QB3
6 P-KN3 P-B5

This move introduces a variation played by the Swedish team at Folkestone, 1933. The idea is to establish a pawn majority on the Queen side and allow White a more or less free hand in the center.

7 B-N2 B-QN5
8 B-Q2 ...

White wants to follow Najdorf-Stoltz, Bled 1950, in which this move was played

two turns later. Black follows Stoltz' recommendation, to prepare for an early P-QN4.

8 ... P-QR3
9 O-O KN-K2
10 P-QN3 ...

Najdorf played P-QR3 first, driving the Bishop to a square occupied by the Knight in this game. Black takes advantage of White's omission.

10 ... N-QR4!
11 P-K4! ...

An action in the center is almost always the correct reply to an early advance on the Queen-side.

11 ... PXP
12 NXP BXB
13 N/4xB PXP
14 PXP B-K3

Black plays this move at once in order to be able to reply ...B-Q4 to an eventual N-K5.

15 R-K1! ...

Very strong. The Rook "seizes the open file" while preventing 2 moves Black would like to make ...O-O and ...N/4-B3. Black cannot now play ...O-O because of 16 N-N5, B-Q4; 17 Rd1/7 winning two pieces for a Rook. 15...N/4-B3 is also bad because of 16 N-N5, B-Q4; 17 Q-R5, P-KR3 (to be able to Castle); 18 BXB, QxB; 19 N-K6!! and White has a winning position.

So Black must defend first.

15 ... P-R3!
16 N-K4! ...

Once again, best. The N pawn is en prise, but if 16 BXP; 17 Q-Q2, N-B3; 18 R-N1 and White infiltrates via the Knight file. 16...NxdP; 17 R-R3 was intended. Then 17 ...N-R4; 18 P-Q5, BXP; R-Q3 leads to tremendous complications. Burger commented "Take it if you dare. The complications are unfathomable." Practically, it is much better to leave the pawn alone and prevent White's threat, N-B5.

A game from the tournament for team standings at the University of North Carolina.
Kit Crittenden - T. E. McKens, #22

1 P-K4 P-K3 9 QNXP O-O
2 P-Q4 P-Q4 10 B-Q3 N-N
3 N-QB3 B-N5 11 N-N Q-N3
4 P-K5 P-QB4 12 P-QB3 N-B3
5 B-Q2 PXP 13 N-B3 P-B3
6 N-N5 BXBch 14 PXP RXP
7 QXB N-QB3 15 O-O P-K4
8 N-KB3 K1-K2 16 B-K2 P-Q5

White's quiet moves gently repulse Black's violence.

16 ... P-QN3!

17 P-QN4 N-B5

Not N/5-B3; 18 P-N5, N-N5; 19 PXP, NXP; 20 Q-R4ch and the King must move, for if Q-Q2 or B-Q2; 21 N-Q6ch.

18 N-K5 O-O

19 N-Q2!! ...

White plays the only correct move each time. This looks like a killer.

29 ... N-N/4!

and taking the exchange is risky for White. 20 BXR, N-Q6; 21 R-K3, QXP gives Black excellent counterplay.

20 PXP B-Q4

21 N-K4 QR-R2?

Better is B-N.

22 N-B6ch! PXP

23 PXP N-N3

24 QXB QXP

25 Q-B4! ...

White has a slight advantage.

Eventually he should be able to win both Queen side pawns for his one, but, as there would then be pawns on one side only, Black's drawing chances would be excellent. Unfortunately, time pressure affects the outcome, both players having less than ten minutes for twenty-five moves.

25 ... P-QR4

26 Q-N5 Q-Q1

27 KR-Q1 Q-B2

28 QR-B1 Q-K2

29 QdNP PXP

30 B-Q5 R-K1

and loses. K-N2 is correct, but Black has the worse of the game. It is a moot point whether it is a losing disadvantage or not.

I do not mind losing when my opponent plays well, as here, but to mar such a game as this with a hideous blunder made me feel sad as well as disgusted. 31 Qdch and White won.

17 PXP PXP 25 R-B1 QR-KB1
18 KR-K1 B-N5 26 RxB RKR
19 N-N5 BXB 27 P-KR3 N-K4
20 QxB P-Q6 28 Q-B7 R/1-B2
21 QXP QXPch 29 Q-N8ch R-B1
22 K-R1 Q-B5 30 QdNP N-Q6
23 Q-B4ch K-R1 31 QdRP NXP
24 N-B7ch RdN 32 Q-Q4 R-QN1
33 P-QR4 NXP
34 RdN and won

BREAKING THE TOURNAMENT TIE

by Ephraim Solkoff

Part One

It is the proposition of this article to find the most nearly correct system for breaking a tie which may occur in a tournament. The words "most nearly correct" are used because it will be shown later on that there cannot be a technically correct system.

Taking a page from our geometry lessons of high school days, the approach used will be development to a conclusion beginning with axioms and postulates, which we shall call rules. Once a rule is established and accepted by the reader of this article, other rules will be developed in a pyramid manner.

Assume any typical tie in a tournament such as follows:

PLAYER	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	FINAL SCORE
A	1	1	1		0	0	0		$\frac{1}{2}$		$\frac{1}{2}$				4 - 4
B		0		1	1			$\frac{1}{2}$		$\frac{1}{2}$		0	0	1	4 - 4

Such a result might occur in a Swiss type tournament, wherein two tying players will not have faced exactly the same opponents.

Rule One: No one game is more important than another and conversely no one game is less important than another.

This rule does not include tie evaluations which vary because a game is won from a stronger or weaker opponent. But it does refer to attempts to minimize a loss because the player might have had a "bad day." Just as much as a player is given credit for winning from a strong player, so should he be discredited for losing to a weak player. Also, it is immaterial whether or not A had played against B. If they had, their particular game is worth no more or less than any other game on their respective schedules. The fact that A might have lost to B is no reason to lend undue importance to the fact, for the simple reason that A has earned one more point than B against the remaining opposition, and the points cancel out in order to reach their final evaluation. Rule one is fundamental and must be accepted as an axiom.

Examining the typical tie, one finds that A and B had both played against D and G. Therein one cannot find grounds for a tie-breaking procedure because the results of the remaining games cannot be "thrown out of the window." For the reason, see rule one. Examination shows that the only grounds for the tie-breaking comes from the very fact that A and B had not faced the same opposition. For then we may grasp at the only yardstick available; namely A and B had earned their scores against varying quality in the opposition, according to its strength or weakness as shown from the final standings of the opposition. Thus, we are ready to adopt the first rule for actual tie-breaking purposes.

Rule Two: In a tournament tie, that player is ranked higher who has earned his score against the stronger opposition.

The definition of "score" and "opposition" is postponed momentarily only to establish the essence of rule two. Examination of the typical tie shows no other possibility and thus rule two must be adopted as fundamental. A breakdown of values will follow.

The next question at hand is the bone of contention between known tie-breaking systems. Looking at the score of player A, did he earn his plus score of four points against opponents C, D, E, K and M only or did he earn the score against all eight opponents?

Let us examine the results of the tournament at the end of three rounds. A had scored three plus points, and thus has a perfect score "to date." Proceeding to the end of six rounds, and examination at that point, we find that A has lost three games without adding to his plus total. A's record at this point is obviously not

as good as it was at the end of three rounds. After the sixth round, A has had the opportunity to earn six points, but was able to earn only three. He has earned only three points against six opponents, not just three. The first three opponents were inefficient against A and he benefitted thereby, so should A be penalized because the second three were more efficient than he. All six are members of his opposition because each had the power to give or take points from A's score.

We may show this is another, and novel, approach. A had drawn with K and each earned one-half point. The draw indicates that neither had been able to earn from the other. That is, A and K had struggled through a contest without effecting a change. It follows that A and K had started their game as a draw. This is simple, all games start as draws. Here is the novel idea. The tournament gives one-half point to each contestant at the beginning of each game. The players then struggle to win the half-point of their opponents. Since A and K played to a draw, they retain the half-point given them. Consider A versus C. Therein, A won from C. As a result, A won C's half-point which plus his own one-half point gives him one full point for the game. C, on the other hand, began with a half-point but lost it. Thus he wound up with zero for the game. Re-writing A's score according to this procedure, we have

	C	D	E	G	H	I	K	M	Total
A	$+\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	4 plus points

According to this analysis, A had won, lost or held on to one-half point for each round, and his final plus score is an accumulation from all eight opponents, not just five.

Reasoning another way, players Y and Z tie in the same tournament at 0-8. Both players have lost all eight games. Any system for the tie-breaking which evaluates plus points only from those opponents from whom points were gained is left without means of breaking this tie. Also, if players V and W tied in the same tournament at 1 - 7, such a system would attempt to break such a tie on the basis of only one of eight games played. Is not such a system preposterous?

Omitting games lost from consideration is a revolt from the very nature of chess. Chess players should readily admit that more games are lost than won. That is, few results are the culmination of brilliant play on the part of the winner while the majority of games are lost because of errors committed by the losing players. It seems therefore, that players should be weighed comparatively from examination of their lost games more readily than their won games. Unfortunately, time does not permit in any tournament, to rate the caliber of play by a contestant for all of his games and rating him finally on the caliber of total play.

Rule Three: A player makes his score against all opponents faced, and each and every opponent faced is a part and parcel of the player's opposition.

Rule Four: The strength of a player's opposition is the sum of the strengths of each and every opponent played.

The next part of this article will proceed from this point.

Tournament Notices

The annual NORTH CAROLINA CLOSED TOURNAMENT is scheduled for Durham, April 4th, 5th, and 6th. As now planned, it is to be a six round Swiss system event, with a round on Friday at 8 p.m, three rounds the next day, and two Sunday. However, if fewer than thirty-three players enter, the Saturday afternoon round will probably be canceled. There are to be prizes and trophies, and the tournament will be rated by the United States Chess Federation. The Lions Club Hut, on Guess Rd., is to be the scene of the tournament. For further details, write S. A. Agnello, 917 Burch Avenue, Durham, N.C.

The next month, the weekend of June 13, 14, and 15, the NORTH CAROLINA OPEN TOURNAMENT is to be held in Wilmington. This is also to be a six round Swiss system, a rated tournament, with trophies and prizes. Registration will be at 7 p.m. Friday the 13th, which will be a lucky day for someone, whether he may think so or not. Once again, if there are less than thirty three entrants, the Saturday afternoon round will be cancelled. Out of state players are most welcome. For further information, Mr. R. C. Harris, Community Center, Wilmington, N.C., is the man to write.

***** On Subscriptions

For some time, there has been a question of whether the dues you pay to the North Carolina Chess Association entitles you to membership for the year in which payment is made, or for a year from the date when dues are paid. That question is now settled. Most of the members of the Association have received through the mail a letter from Lawrence Wallace, our Secretary, containing a membership card and a request for one dollar, in payment for 1952 membership. Those of you who have not sent your dues in, please do so, for then there will be none of the confusion that always goes with a last minute payment, or paying them with a tournament entry fee. For your Editor, in particular, it is important that dues be paid early in the year, as only members of the N.C. Chess Association are supposed to receive the North Carolina Chess Bulletin; and he must have some list of people to whom to send it.

Thank you. See you at Durham!