

Chicago Industrial Chess League

Bulletin 8 Volume 32
May, 1989

AWARDS BANQUET

Here are the facts about this season's annual CICL awards banquet:

- WHERE:** Holiday Inn of Rolling Meadows
3405 Algonquin Road
Rolling Meadows, IL 60008
259-5000
(Just east of Illinois Highway 53 on
Algonquin Road, which is Illinois Route 62.)
- WHEN:** Friday, June 9, 1989
Cash bar w/hors d'voures at 5:00 p.m.
Buffet dinner at 7:30 p.m.
Awards presentation and speed chess tournament
follow the dinner.
- HOW MUCH:** \$14.00 per person for dinner
Entry fee for speed chess tourney is \$1.00

All money for banquet tickets and speed chess tournament entry fees will be collected on the evening of the banquet.

IMPORTANT:

The Holiday Inn requires a count for the buffet dinner by June 1. **ALL TEAM CAPTAINS** are asked to provide a count to their division chairman of how many people from their teams expect to attend. **ALL DIVISION CHAIRMEN** are asked to provide Bruce McNeil with a total count for their divisions.

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE:

1. The minutes from the April 12, 1989 business meeting.
2. Numerous games for CICL matches.
3. Announcement of the 50th U.S. Open from Chief Organizer Helen Warren.

Bulletin Editor: Marty Franek

-2-

1989 U.S. OPEN

August 5th — 13th 1989

HYATT REGENCY  O'HARE

AT O'HARE INT'L AIRPORT

PLAYING SITE: HALL E, Rosemont Expo Center
(adjatt to Hyatt)

PRIZE FUND...\$33,000!

\$5,000	+ Fidelity Cup - 1st	
3,000	- 2nd	
2,500	- 3rd	
2,000	- 4th	
1,500	- 5th	150 GRAND PRIX
1,400	- 6th	POINTS!
1,300	- 7th	
1,200	- 8th	
1,100	- 9th	

2399-2200: \$1,000-800-600-450-250-150
Experts: 900-700-500-350-150-100
Class A: 800-600-400-300-100
Class B: 700-500-400-200-100
Class C: 600-400-300-200-100
Class D: 500-300-200-100-100
Class E: 300-200-100-100
UNR. 200-100-100-50

PLANNED ACTIVITIES: shopping tour/Art Institute, Ballgame at Cubs Park, and Great America Amusement Park. Visit our fabulous museums, restaurants, and sport centers! It's all waiting for you!

9-round Swiss, time limit 50/150.
Entry: \$80 if postmarked 7/19; \$90 at site. Registration: Fri., Aug. 4: noon-8 PM; Sat., Aug. 5: 9 AM-4 PM. Rds. 7 PM daily, except for Aug. 13: 1 PM. FIDE RATED.

Hotel rates: \$65 single or double.

FREE UNLIMITED PARKING!! FIVE MINUTES FROM O'HARE AIRPORT!! FREE MINI-BUS FROM AIRPORT TO HOTEL!

Hotel Reservations: (312) 696-1234

DAYTIME CHESS EVENTS GALORE

U.S. Open Speed Championship, Action Chess events, workshops, grandmaster lectures and simuls, USCF's Annual Awards Banquet, Hall of Fame induct-ions, and 50th Anniversary Celebra-tion!

SEE CHICAGO! THE IDEAL PLACE FOR A VACATION WITH THE ENTIRE FAMILY! Reasonable car rental on site. Public transportation to Chicago Loop 1 block!

For more information, to reserve tickets to the Cubs game (Aug. 8), Great America, or shopping tour/Art Institute tour, write: Helen Warren, U.S. Open Chief Organizer, PO Box 305, Western Springs, IL 60558. Or give me a call! (312) 246-6665.

MAIL YOUR ENTRY TODAY TO: USCF, 186 Rt 9W, New Windsor, NY 12550

Enclosed is \$80. Enroll me in the U.S. Open. I will need a $\frac{1}{2}$ bye for rd.1 _____

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

USCF ID# _____ USCF Expiration Date _____

50th Golden Anniversary
U.S.C.F.

Chicago Industrial Chess League
Business Meeting of April 12, 1989
Motorola, Schaumburg

1. The meeting was called to order by CICL President Bruce McNeil at 7:37 PM.
2. Marty Franek read the secretarial minutes from the August 24, 1988 business meeting. Bruce McNeil moved to accept the minutes without amendment. Jim Brotsos seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.
3. The next item of discussion was the nomination of league officers for the 1989-1990 season.
 - A. Current East Division chairman Ross Siegel was nominated by Russ Rzeszutko for the office of CICL President. Charlie Ward seconded. There were no other nominations for the office of CICL President. (Bruce McNeil has earlier indicated that he would not be able to serve an additional term.)
 - B. Tim Kras was nominated by Ross Siegel for the office of CICL East Division chairman. Russ Rzeszutko seconded. There were no other nominations for CICL East Division chairman.
 - C. Irwin Gaines was nominated by Bruce McNeil to serve a second term as CICL Far West Division chairman. Russ Rzeszutko seconded. There were no other nominations for this office.
 - D. Wayne Brandt was nominated by Bruce McNeil for the office of CICL Near West Division chairman. Marty Franek seconded. There were no other nominations for this office.
 - E. Norm Hughes was nominated by Ross Siegel for another term as CICL North Division chairman. Jim Brotsos seconded. There were no other nominations for this office.
 - F. Jim Brotsos was nominated by Norm Hughes for another term as CICL Treasurer. Dan Kumro seconded. There were no other nominations for this office.
 - G. Fred Ciba was nominated by Ross Siegel for another term as CICL Secretary. Marty Franek seconded. There were no other nominations for this office.
4. Bruce McNeil moved to vote on and approve all nominees as a slate by acclamation. Marty Franek seconded this motion. The slate was unanimously approved.

5. Russ Rzeszutko volunteered to direct the CICL post-season championship playoffs again this year.

6. The CICL awards banquet, scheduled for Friday, June 9, 1989, was discussed. In the absence of a volunteer for banquet chairman, Bruce McNeil had investigated the possibility of having the banquet at the Holiday Inn in Rolling Meadows. Several members present indicated a desire to have the banquet at Harvey's Prime Rib restaurant in Westmont. Charlie Ward suggested that, if the league can still get the same banquet room that was obtained for last year's banquet, the banquet be held at Harvey's Prime Rib again. This possibility will be investigated by Bruce McNeil.

7. League Treasurer Jim Brotsos summarized the financial condition of the CICL. The current checking account balance is \$351.65, and the current savings account balance is \$2935.09. Jim added that these figures do not include any interest accrued since the last bank statement. Jim also stated that all teams in the CICL have paid their dues for the current season.

8. Trophy chairman Wes Underwood asked for verification that he has approximately \$900 to spend on trophies. It was agreed by all members present that this was the understanding when the 1988-89 budget was approved at the August 24 business meeting.

9. Wes Underwood's proposal, which had been discussed at the August 24, 1988 business meeting, pertaining to playoff forfeits, was discussed again. It was decided that the proposal be amended to specify that the eligibility that would be lost by a team with excessive forfeits in the playoffs is the eligibility to participate in the post-season playoffs for the following year. Also amended was the minimum of players required for each of the three rounds. This minimum number was reduced from five players to four. The proposal, as amended, now reads:

"A team that becomes eligible for the playoffs is required to declare, in advance of the playoff pairings, its intent to compete in all three rounds of the playoffs. Failure (for any reason) to field a minimum of four players for each of the three rounds will disqualify that team for eligibility for the playoffs for the following year."

The proposal, as amended, was approved unanimously.

10. Norm Hughes asked if forfeit victories by individual players are counted toward century club consideration. Charlie Ward advised that forfeit wins are not currently being counted in a player's total number of CICL games. Jim Brotsos stated that the intent of recognizing a century club is to encourage participation in CICL events, and that forfeits wins are looked upon as 'participation', as long as the recipient of a forfeit win actually shows up to play. Wes Underwood also brought up the fact that forfeit wins can be used in MVP consideration.

However, some practical problems exist in keeping an accurate count of games in which a player wins because his opponent does not show up. While it was generally agreed that often a player will show up for a match not knowing in advance that his would-be opponent will be absent, no motion was made to change the current procedure for determining century club eligibility.

11. Norm Hughes noted that two teams in the North division will have to be approved again by a vote of team captains before the next season because of excessive forfeits. These two teams are FEL-PRO and the EXEMPLARS (an alumni team). Norm suggested the possibility of having the EXEMPLARS merge with the other North division alumni team, the EXCALIBURS. He also suggested converting the North division into a four-board team format division. Discussion followed. Reverting to a dual-format system in the CICL was generally considered to be a last resort. Discussion on the four-man team suggestion is to continue at the summer business meeting after options and alternatives are reviewed by North division team captains.

12. Russ Rzeszutko brought up for discussion allegations by a certain league member that the publishing of previously published chess diagrams and puzzles in the CICL bulletin were a violation of copyright laws and could result in a lawsuit by the author or publisher against the CICL. Some members present expressed doubt that, even with the full acknowledgement of the author by the bulletin editor, this practice is entirely legal. However, none present felt that the allegations merited any action, resolution or further discussion.

13. Jim Brotsos proposed that the CICL give some sort of special consideration to triple centurions, such as possibly a free meal at the annual awards banquet or some other substantive reward. Discussion followed, but no action was taken on the proposal at this time.

14. It was decided, in view of the decline in membership on some alumni teams, that team captains be requested to be on the lookout for former teammates who may be willing and able to play on an alumni team.

15. Norm Hughes made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Bruce McNeil seconded. Bruce McNeil closed this year's spring business meeting at 8:24 PM.

Attendees of the CICL Spring Business Meeting, 1989

Bruce McNeil	Motorola
Ross Siegel	Continental Bank
Russ Rzeszutko	Alumni East
Marty Franek	Alumni East
Wayne Brandt	Bell Labs DRAGONS
Dan Kumro	AT&T CHARGERS
Norm Hughes	Kemper
Charles Ward	Bell Labs DRAGONS
Jim Brotsos	EXCALIBURS
Wes Underwood	Wheaton College

Exhibit I Annual Awards Banquet, June 17, 1988

Income

Meal payments at door		\$896.00
Speed Chess Entry Fees		<u>43.00</u>
Total Cash Received		\$939.00
Prepaid dinner guarantees, 26 teams @ \$17		<u>442.00</u>
Total Income		\$1381.00

Expenses

Harvey's Prime Rib, 58 meals @ \$14.116	\$818.74	
Bar Tender's Fee	<u>35.00</u>	
	\$853.74	
Rebates of Pre-payments	280.00	
Cash Prizes, Speed Chess	<u>86.00</u>	
Total Expenses		<u>1219.74</u>
Net Income		\$161.26

Exhibit II C.I.C.L. Bulletin

Income

Subscriptions:		
2 Companies with 2 teams each: Argonne & Bell Labs		
2 @ \$14		\$28.00
22 teams @ \$14 each		<u>308.00</u>
2 Individual subscriptions (L. Crewse, R. Graf) @ \$6		<u>12.00</u>
Total Income		\$348.00


Expenses

Editor- Wes Underwood's production & postage costs		<u>290.59</u>
Net Income		\$57.41

Jim Brotsos, Treasurer, Chicago Industrial Chess League

Aug. 21, 1988


The 2 Squares Column Marv Cox
 "If two squares (or a space and a line)
 are attacked more times than they are
 defended they may fall."



White has an extra pawn but may have difficulty preventing black's perpetual checks. If white can trade off queen and bishop for queen and knight he could win a favorable pawn ending. But where can he get the extra tempo needed to force both trades? Let's go to the two-squares theory. White has an attack against d5. He also can put his bishop to either f7 to attack the line from a2 to g8 or to f3 to attack the line a8 to h1. d5 is on both these lines. If white moves the bishop first then black goes after the perpetual. However, if white moves the queen first and captures the knight on d5 he gains the needed tempo.

1. Q x n check q x Q
2. B - f3 k - d6
3. B x q k x B(d5)

and white has accomplished his objective of trading off all the pieces without loss of a tempo and so leave him with a won pawn ending. Do you know how to win this simple pawn ending? My uncle says "The win is obtained by putting the king in front of the pawn and always maintaining the opposition." A few weeks back I watched a solid, sound player allow a draw in a simple, won pawn ending. Learn your simple pawn endings. It can add a hundred points to your rating.



Evidently white can win the pawn on d4 without difficulty. Can he get more? Black's king and queen are on the same file and are under masked attack by the white rook and queen. Furthermore, black's queen is unguarded and the black king could be subject to a check from b6 if white's bishop could get to that square. A swish-en-zug (run and hit) could obtain the extra move needed to get the bishop there. Black's rook on h8 is under masked attacked by the same white bishop. So we are attacking four squares b6, d6, d8, and h8 if we can set up the proper swish-en-zug. Four attacks and only one guard. Surely we can get something up and it must involve a swish-en-zug bishop jumping off from d4. An immediate B x p(d4) is obviously bad because our key bishop would be traded off and we have no further attack. Also N x p(d4) doesn't accomplish anything because black's rook would vacate h8. What about the sac of R x p(d4). If the black queen scrams we win the knight and then the rook. So black captures our rook with his bishop and we recapture using our bishop. Ha! A second threatened swish-en-zug in the same combination. If black moves his rook we check at b6 with our swish-en-zug bishop and win his queen. My uncle tells me a swish-en-zug bishop can hit up to 31 squares, a swish-en-zug knight up to 34 squares, and swish-en-zug rook up to 63 squares. Compare that with the usual bishop that never attacks more than 13 squares, the usual knight never attacks more than 8 squares, and the usual rook never attacks more than 14 squares. The swish-en-zug can provide a piece with almost magical power.

EVENT: UOP Procon (Vis.) vs. EXCALIBURS (Home)

Date: March 16, 1989


White: Ed Buerger

Black: Frank Micklich

- 1. d4 Nf6
- 2. c4 g6
- 3. Nc3 Bg7
- 4. e4 0-0
- 5. f3 d6
- 6. Be3 Nc6
- 7. Qd2 e5
- 8. Ng-e2 Nh5?!
- 9. d5! Ne7
- 10. g4 Nf6
- 11. Ng3 a6?

It may already be too late, but Black, I think should try Ne8 so that f5 can be played while there's still time.

- 12. h4 h5
- 13. gh gh
- 14. Bh6 Ng6



- 15. Qg5! Kh7

I could not find a saving move for Black.

- 16. B:g7 K:g7
- 17. Nf5ch Kg8
- 18. Rg1 Ng4

18. ... Ne8 does not work either. 19. Qh6 Ne8 20. Q:h5 Ng7 21. Qg4! and h5, winning a piece, cannot be prevented. For example, 21. ... Qf6 22. h5 N:f5 23. e:f5 B:f5 24. Qg3 Kh7 25. h:g6ch and Black will get one pawn for the piece.

- 19. Q:d8 R:d8
- 20. f:g4 hg
- 21. R:g4 Kh7
- 22. h5 B:f5
- 23. e:f5 Nf4
- 24. Ne4 Rf8
- 25. Nf6ch Kh8
- 26. Be2 Ra-d8
- 27. Kd2 Ra8
- 28. Rag1 Ra-d8
- 29. Rg7 1:0

Nice game, Ed. And quite an argument for the Saemisch Attack against the King's Indian defence. M.F.

Event: EXCALIBURS (Vis.) vs. Motorola (Home)

Date: April 6, 1989

White: Chris Fridrich

Black: Jim Brotsos

- 1. e4 c5
- 2. Nf3 Nc6
- 3. Bb5 d6
- 4. B:c6 ch b:c6

Surrendering the two bishops so early in this opening is dubious.

- 5. c4 Nf6
- 6. d3 g6
- 7. Bd2 Bg7
- 8. Bc3 O-O

By taking two moves to oppose Black's dark-square bishop on the long diagonal, White has effectively given up the opening-move advantage and allowed Black easy equality.


- 9. h3 Rb8
- 10. Qd2 Bd7
- 11. e5 Ne8!
- 12. ed ed
- 13. B:g7 N:g7
- 14. O-O Qf6!
- 15. Qc3 Q:c3
- 16. b:c3 Rb2
- 17. Nbd2 Bf5
- 18. d4 cd
- 19. cd Ne6
- 20. Rfc1 ? Nf4
- 21. Kf1 ??

- 21. ... Bd3 ch
- 22. Ke1 Re8 ch !

More devastating than 22. N:g2 check!

- 23. Kd1 Be2 ch
- 24. Ke1 B:f3 dis ch
- 25. Kf1 Be2 ch
- 0:1

Next comes 26. ... R:d2 and the roof caves in.



EVENT: Motorola vs. Excaliburs
DATE: April 6, 1989
White: Jim Sullivan Black: Nik Goncharoff
Candidate for Best Upset Victory
(Annotated by Tim Kras)

- 1. d4 Nf6
- 2. c4 c5
- 3. d5 b5
- 4. Nc3?

- 14. 0-0 Nh5!
- 15. Nh2?

If White wants to avoid the mainline Benko gambit, then he ought to play the other Knight move 4. Nf3.

15. Ne1 had to be played here. Now Black obtains a significant material advantage.

- 4. ... b4
- 5. Nbl d6

- 15. ... Bd4ch
- 16. Rf2 B:f2ch
- 17. K:f2 N:f4
- 18. Bf1 e5
- 19. Ndf3 Qf6
- 20. g3 Nh5
- 21. Bg5 Qg7
- 22. Re1 f5
- 23. Bd3 f4
- 24. g4 Nf6
- 25. Kg2 Ne8
- 26. Bh4 h6
- 27. Qe2 g5
- 28. Bf2 Nf6?

Black has obtained an advantage in space on the Queenside and lead in development.

- 6. Qc2 g6
- 7. e4 Nbd7
- 8. h3 Bg7
- 9. f4

Giving White a further opportunity to sacrifice. Best seems to be 28. ... Bc8, followed by Nd7 and Nef6, eventually planning h5.

White insists on moving pawns while Black moves pieces.


- 9. ... Nb6
- 10. Bd3 0-0
- 11. Nf3 Bd7
- 12. Nbd2

- 29. N:e5! d:e5
- 30. B:c5 Rfb8
- 31. Bd6 Re8

Better seems to be 12. Be3 and 13. Nbd2, in order to guard the central dark squares.

- 12. ... a5
- 13. Rbl a4

- 32. B:b4 Nc8
- 33. c5 Ne7
- 34. c6



- 49. B:a4 Qe6
- 50. Qb5 Re7
- 51. Bb3 Qd7
- 52. Qc4 Qc7
- 53. Q:c7 R:c7
- 54. B:e5 Re7
- 55. B:f6ch K:f6
- 56. Bd5 Rc7
- 57. Ba8 Ke5
- 58. Kf3 Rc3ch
- 59. Kg2 Rg3ch
- 60. Kh2 Re3
- 61. Kg2 Kd4
- 62. Bb7 Kd3
- 63. Bc6 Ke2
- 64. h4 f3ch
- 65. Kh2 f2
- 66. hg hg
- 67. Bb5ch Kel
- 68. Kg2 R:e4
- 69. Kf3 Rf4ch
- 0:1

Worthy of consideration here is Bc4, threatening d6 dis ch, c6, and Bc3 (with the idea of b4). Now Black returns the material to arrive at a position which he can win.

- 34. ... N:c6
- 35. d:c6 B:c6
- 36. Qf3 Qf7
- 37. Bb1 Kg7
- 38. a3 Qb7
- 39. Qe2 Rbd8
- 40. Bc2 Bb5
- 41. Qf3 Bc6
- 42. Nf1 Rd7
- 43. Re2 Bb5
- 44. Rd2 B:flch
- 45. Q:f1 R:d2ch
- 46. B:d2 Q:b2
- 47. Qc4 Q:a3
- 48. Bc3 Qe7

EVENT: BTL DRAGONS at BTL ROYALS
Date: April 5, 1989


White: P. Mathur Black: C. Hicks
(Candidate for Best Salvage of Draw or Win)

- 1. d4 Nf6
- 2. e3 d6
- 3. Bd3 g6
- 4. f4 Bg4
- 5. Nf3 Qd7
- 6. O-O Bg7
- 7. Nb-d2 O-O
- 8. Qe1 Nc6
- 9. c4 Rf-e8
- 10. Qh4 Nh5
- 11. h3 B:f3
- 12. N:f3 Bf6
- 13. Ng5 Bg7
- 14. f5 Nf6
- 15. f:g6 h:g6
- 16. Bd2 Ne5
- 17. Be2 Nc6
- 18. Rf3 Nd8
- 19. Ra-f1 Ne6
- 20. Bd3 N:g5
- 21. Q:g5 Rf8
- 22. d5?! Nh7
- 23. Qg3 B:b2
- 24. B:g6? f:g6
- 25. Q:g6ch Kh8
- 26. Rf7 R:f7
- 27. R:f7

- 27. ... Nf8!

[Editor's note: I would guess that this is the move that White missed when deciding to sacrifice a piece. More preparation was needed for such a sac. The fact that White's other bishop is completely unable to participate in the attack has much to do with why the sacrifice fails. (Note that if his bishop could get to h6, White would, in effect, be up the exchange since Black's rook is temporarily unavailable for defense.) Nevertheless, White two connected outside passed pawns are dangerous, and Black must consolidate his overall material advantage expeditiously.]

- 28. Qh5ch? Kg8
- 29. e4 Qe8!



The game is effectively over when the Queens come off.

- 30. Rf5 Q:h5
- 31. R:h5 Bd4ch
- 32. Kf1 Nh7
- 33. Bh6 Nf6
- 34. Rh4 Kf7
- 35. g4 N:e4
- 36. g5 Ng3ch
- 37. Kg2 Be5
- 38. Rg4 Nf5
- 39. g6ch Kf6

- | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------|
| 40. | Bg5ch | K:g6 |
| 41. | B:e7disch | Kf7 |
| 42. | Bg5 | Rh8 |
| 43. | h4 | Rg8 |
| 44. | Kf3 | Nd4ch |
| 45. | Ke4 | Nc2 |
| 46. | Rg2 | Na3 |
| 47. | c5 | Nb5 |
| 48. | Rf2ch | Kg6 |
| 49. | Rf3 | Re8 |
| 50. | c6 | b6 |
| 51. | Kd3 | a5 |
| 52. | Kc4 | Nd4 |
| 53. | Rd3 | b5ch |
| 54. | Kc3 | N:c6disch |
| 55. | Kb3 | Nd4ch |
| 56. | Kc3 | Nf3disch |
| 57. | Kc2 | N:g5 |
| 58. | h:g5 | K:g5 |
| 59. | Kb3 | Rf8 |
| 60. | a4 | b:a4ch |
| 61. | K:a4 | Ra8 |
| 62. | Rf3 | Bf4 |
| 63. | Rc3 | Kf5 |
| 64. | Kb5 | a4 |
| 65. | Ra3 | Ke5 |
| 66. | Kc4 | Ra5 |
| 67. | Ra2 | a3! |
| 68. | Re2ch | Kf5 |
| 69. | Ra2 | Ke4 |
| 70. | Re2ch | Kf3 |
| 71. | Ra2 | Rc5ch |
| 72. | Kb4 | Bc1 |
| | 0:1 | |

EVENT: FERMILAB VS. BELL LABS INDIANS (round 9)

Date: March 23, 1989

White: Lawrence Chachere


Black: Mark Kozlovsky

Candidate for BEST UPSET Victory
(annotated by Tim Kras)

- 1. d4 e6
- 2. Nf3 c5
- 3. e3

If White wants more space,
he plays 3.e4 and trans-
poses into a Sicilian defense.

- 3. ... d5
- 4. c4 Nf6
- 5. Nc3 Nc6
- 6. a3 cd
- 7. ed Be7
- 8. Bg5 O-O
- 9. Bd3 cd
- 10. B:c4 h6
- 11. Be3



A fairly typical isolated
queen pawn game has arisen.
White often strives for an
advantage by playing d5 after
competing his development, or
if d5 is not feasible, plays
for an attack along the b1-h7
diagonal. In this game, White
obtains attacking chances by
opening the f file.

- 11. ... a6
- 12. O-O b5
- 13. Ba2 Bb7
- 14. h3

To be considered was 14. Qd3,
intending Rad1 and Bb1.

- 14. ... Rc8
- 15. Qd2 Nh7
- 16. Rad1 Ng5
- 17. N:g5 B:g5
- 18. f4 Bh4
- 19. f5 ef

20. d5?


Here is the turning point of the
game. 20. R:f5 (threatening
Rh5 and B:h6) seems better.
20. d5 obstructs the diagonal
of the White king bishop and
allows the Black knight access
to c4.

- 20. ... Ne5
- 21. R:f5 Nc4
- 22. B:c4 R:c4
- 23. B:h6 Bc8!
- 24. Rh5 Qb6ch
- 25. Kh1

If 25. Be3, then Qg6
26. Qe2 B:h3 with
advantage to Black.

- 25. ... Qg6
- 26. B:g7 Q:h5
- 27. B:f8 K:f8

28. d6 Bd7
29. Nd5



29. ... Bg5!

Black forces the exchange of major pieces to win.

30. Qd3 Q:dlch
31. Q:d1 Rcl
32. Q:c1 B:c1
33. Nf6 Be6
0:1

Credit Black for playing actively in defense, and using good technique against a strong opponent.

EVENT: KEMPPER VS. MOTOROLA

Date: December 1, 1988

White: Norm Hughes

Black: Nik Goncharoff


Candidate for BEST SALVAGE of DRAW or WIN

(annotated by Tim Kras)

- | | | |
|-----|-----|------|
| 1. | e4 | c5 |
| 2. | Nf3 | Nc6 |
| 3. | Bb5 | e6 |
| 4. | O-O | Nge7 |
| 5. | c3 | a6 |
| 6. | Ba4 | b5 |
| 7. | Bc2 | d6 |
| 8. | Qe2 | Ng6 |
| 9. | d4 | Be7 |
| 10. | Rd1 | Qc7 |

What started as a Sicilian defense has transposed into a position which much resembles a Ruy Lopez.

- | | | |
|-----|------|------|
| 11. | Be3 | c:d4 |
| 12. | N:d4 | N:d4 |
| 13. | c:d4 | O-O |
| 14. | Nc3 | Bb7 |
| 15. | Rac1 | Rac8 |



Black has completed his development without incurring any weaknesses. The position offers approximately equal chances for both sides.

- | | | |
|-----|--------|------|
| 16. | Bb3 | Qb8 |
| 17. | Qg4 | Ba8 |
| 18. | B:e6 | f:e6 |
| 19. | Q:e6ch | Kh8 |

With only two pawns for the Bishop and no real chances to continue the "attack", White now stands worse.

- | | | |
|-----|--------|------|
| 20. | Nd5 | B:d5 |
| 21. | Q:d5 | R:c1 |
| 22. | R:c1 | Rc8 |
| 23. | R:c8ch | Q:c8 |
| 24. | g3 | Qg8! |

Black wisely offers to simplify into an endgame he should win.

- | | | |
|-----|-----|------|
| 25. | Qb7 | Q:a2 |
| 26. | h4 | Bf8 |
| 27. | Kh2 | h6 |
| 28. | h5 | Ne7 |
| 29. | Qd7 | Ng8 |

Black adroitly counters his opponents threats, while maintaining his material advantage.

- | | | |
|-----|----|------|
| 30. | e5 | de |
| 31. | de | Q:b2 |
| 32. | e6 | Qf6 |

White's position is completely hopeless. That he succeeds in drawing is due to his perseverance and belief that "It's never over till it's over." Or, Black was feeling generous that day.

- | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|
| 33. | Bd4 | Qe7 |
|-----|-----|-----|

34. Qc6 b4

Certainly 34. ... Qd6
clinches the victory almost
immediately

35. Q:a6 Nf6

36. Qe2 Ne8

37. f4 Nf6

(editor's note: Is Black in
time trouble? Could that be
why he missed Tim's recom-
mended 34th move?)

38. Kg1 Qd8

39. Bb2 Be7

40. g4 Qb6ch

41. Kf1 Qc6

42. Ke1 Qe4

43. g5 h:g5

44. Q:e4 N:e4

45. f:g5 N:g5

46. h6 N:e6

47. hg ch N:g7

48. Kd2 Kg8

49. Bc3?? b:c3ch

50. K:c3 Kf7

½-½ (??)

Black does not care to
demonstrate the technique of
the classic B+N+K
versus K mate!

EVENT: AT&T CHARGERS at A & B RADIO

DATE: March 22, 1989

White: Dan Kumro (CHARGERS) Black: Joe Lasky (A & B Radio)
Candidate for BEST SALVAGE of WIN or DRAW
(Annotated by Dan Kumro and Marty Franek)

- 1. d4 d5
- 2. Nc3 a6

White's play has been correct and consistent, and has a well-earned victory well within his grasp. However, (M.F.)

(2. ... Nf6, transposing into the main line of Richter-Veresov attack, is more consistent with opening principles.- M.F.)

- 23. Rel? (D.K.) Qd2
- 24. Re2?? (D.K.) Q:d4
- 25. Bb3 Q:c5
- 26. Q:h5 Q:d6
- 27. Ra#1
e

- 3. e4 de
- 4. N:e4 Nf6
- 5. N:f6 e:f6
- 6. Nf3 Bd6
- 7. Bc4 b5
- 8. Qe2ch Be7
- 9. Bb3 O-0
- 10. O-0 Bb7
- 11. Be3 Bc6?! (M.F.)
- 12. Rfd1 b4

After 26 moves, White finds that he is 2 pawns down and a loss seems like a strong possibility. A loss for White would end the match in a 3-3 draw. A discouraging thought after being ahead a B for a P! (D.K.)

(Black's neglect of his development will surely come back to haunt him. - M.F.)

Actually, because of his huge lead in development, White has good chances to at least draw. (M.F.)


- 13. c3 Bb5
- 14. c4 Bc6
- 15. d5 Bd7
- 16. B#2! (M.F.) Bd6
- 17. Bd4 c6
- 18. c5 Bf4?? (D.K.)
- 19. Qe4 B:h2ch
- 20. N:h2 f5
- 21. Qf3 Qg5
- 22. d6 h5

- 27. ... Qh6
- 28. Qf3 a5? (D.K.)

Black's position is very difficult, but worth a try was Ra7, unpinning the c pawn so that c5, followed by Bc6 might be possible. - M.F.

- 29. Re7 Qf6
- 30. Qh5 Be6? (D.K.)

- 31. R/7:e6! (M.F.) f:e6
- 32. B:e6ch Rf7
- 33. B:f7ch Q:f7



- 34. Re8ch Qf8
- 35. R:f8ch K:f8ch
- 36. Q:f5ch Kg8
- 37. Qc8ch Kh7
- 38. Nf3

38. Qb7 wins the Black Knight right away. (D.K.)

- 38. ... c5
- 39. Ne5 c4
- 40. N:c4 1:0

Event: Argonne ROOKS at Fermilab
Date: November 8, 1988
White: H. Motta Black: S. Decman
Candidate for Best Upset Victory

(Annotated by Steve Decman)

- 1. e4 g6
- 2. Bc4 Bg7
- 3. c3 d6
- 4. Nf3 Nf6
- 5. d3 O-O
- 6. Bf4 d5 ?!
- 7. ed Nbd7

23. ... h5! is threatened. If
23. Qf3 Rd3! Black now enters
into an endgame with the
better pawn structure and
active rooks.

If 7. ... N:d5 then 8. B:d5
Q:d5 9. B:c7.

- 23. Nh3 h5
- 24. Qg5 N:h3 ch
- 25. g:h3 Q:g5
- 26. N:g5 Rd2
- 27. b3 Rfd8
- 28. Ne4


- 8. d4

Or, 8. Bb3! a5! 9. c4 b5!?
or Nh4!

(Both players are in time trouble.)

- 8. ... Nb6
- 9. Bd3 Nb:d5
- 10. Be5 Nh5
- 11. B:g7 N:g7
- 12. O-O Bf5
- 13. B:f5 N:f5
- 14. Ne5 c6
- 15. Nd2 Qc7
- 16. Ne4 f6
- 17. Nd3 e5
- 18. Ndc5 Ng7
- 19. de fe
- 20. Ng5 Qe7
- 21. Nce4 Rad8
- 22. Qg4 Nf4

- 28. ... R2d3
- 29. f3 Nf4
- 30. f4 Re3
- 31. Rae1 ef
- 32. R:e3 f:e3
- 33. Nf6 ch Kf7
- 34. N:h5 ? e2
- 35. Re1 Rd1
- 36. Kf2 R:e1
- 37. K:e1 g:h5
- 38. K:e2 Ke6
- 39. Kf3 Ke5
- 40. c4 a5
- 41. a3 Nd4 ch
- 42. Kg3 Kf5
- 43. b4 ab
- 44. ab Ne2 ch
- 45. Kh4 Kg6
- 46. b5 cb
- 47. cb Nd4
- 48. b6 Nf5 mate



Event: Wheaton College at Fermilab

Date: December 7, 1988

White: H. Motta Black: W. Underwood
Candidate for Best Overall Game

(Annotated by Tony Jasaitis)


- | | | |
|----|------|------|
| 1. | e4 | d6 |
| 2. | d4 | Nf6 |
| 3. | Nc3 | g6 |
| 4. | Bc4 | Bg7 |
| 5. | Nge2 | O-O |
| 6. | O-O | N:e4 |

Cute rather than good, expecting
7. N:e4 d5. But White does it
his way, with a better position.

- | | | |
|-----|---------|------|
| 7. | B:f7 ch | R:f7 |
| 8. | N:e4 | c6 |
| 9. | Ng5 | Rf8 |
| 10. | Nf4 | Qa5 |
| 11. | Nge6 | Rf6 |
| 12. | N:g7 | K:g7 |
| 13. | d5 | cd |
| 14. | N:d5 | Rf7 |
| 15. | Qd4 ch | e5 |
| 16. | Qh4! | |

White sets a clever and efficient trap,
making it look like he is losing a piece
being too hasty in his aggression.

16. ... Q:d5 ??



Black does not expect anything fatal
to happen when White has only one piece
developed.

17. Bh6 ch 1:0

Event: Motorola vs. Kemper
Date: March 27, 1989
White: D. Cieslek Black: N. Hughes
Candidate for Best Upset Victory

(Annotated by Tim Kras)

- 1. d4 d5
- 2. Nf3 Nf6
- 3. e3

Here the only move is 13. ed.
Now Black forces the win of
decisive material.

Voluntarily locking in the
queen bishop. More natural and
better is 3. c4, attacking
Black's center, and preparing
4. Nc3.

- 13. ... e5 ! (--)
- 14. B:e5 N:e5
- 15. N:e5 B:d1
- 16. B:f7 ch Ke7
- 17. Rf:d1 Qc7
- 18. Ndc4 Rd8

- 3. ... Bf5

Black has the right idea in the
opening. Develop pieces and
fight for the center!


White's attack is insufficient
to compensate for his
disadvantage in material.
Black will win as soon as he
develops his King side pieces.

- 4. Nbd2 Nbd7
- 5. b3 c5
- 6. Bb2 Rc8
- 7. c4 d:c4

- 19. Rdc1 Nd7
- 20. f4 N:e5
- 21. N:e5 Qb6
- 22. Rc3 Kf6
- 23. Rac1 Bd6
- 24. Nc4 Qb4
- 25. Bh5 Rhf8
- 26. g3 Bb8
- 27. e4 g6
- 28. e5 ch Kg7
- 29. Bf3 Rc8
- 30. Rd3 Rfd8
- 31. R:d8 R:d8
- 32. Nd6 B:d6
- 33. e:d6 Q:d6
- 0:1

Perhaps Black did not like the
isolated queen pawn after
7. ... e6 8. c:d5 e:d5 (if
8. ... N:d5? 9. e4 +-), but
this appears to offer Black
great activity for his pieces.

- 8. B:c4 Bg6
- 9. O-O e6
- 10. Nh4? Bh5
- 11. Nhf3 a6
- 12. a4 c:d4
- 13. B:d4 ??



Event: Fermilab at Wheaton College
Date: April 26, 1989
White: W. Underwood Black: H. Motta
Candidate for Best Overall Game

(Annotated by Tony Jasaitis)

- 1. d4 d5
- 2. c4 dc
- 3. Nf3 e6
- 4. e4 b6
- 5. B:c4 Bb7
- 6. Nc3 h6
- 7. O-O Nd7
- 8. Qe2 Bb4
- 9. d5 ?

Looks strong, but is actually premature, allowing Black to close up the position. 9. Bf4 first would allow White to force open the position to easily exploit his big lead in development.

- 9. ... e5
- 10. Bb5 Bd6
- 11. a3 Ne7
- 12. B:d7 Q:d7

White continues to dissipate his advantage by trading his developed pieces for Black's cramped pieces.

- 13. Nb5 O-O
- 14. N:d6 c:d6
- 15. Bd2 ?


- 15. ... f5 !

Ugly as it may seem, White needed to move his knight to preserve his center pawn chain. Now Black has a winning initiative.

- 16. ef N:f5
- 17. Be3 B:d5
- 18. Rfd1 Qb7
- 19. Rac1 Rad8
- 20. Ne1 Rf6
- 21. Qb5 N:e3
- 22. f:e3 R8f8
- 23. Nf3 ?


23. h3 would hold out considerably longer.

- 23. ... B:f3
- 24. g:f3 Rg6 ch
- 0:1



Event: Argonne Rooks at Wheaton College
Date: October 5, 1988
White: Greg Berry Black: Pete Walhout
(Candidate game for Best Sacrifice)
(Annotated by Greg Berry)

- 1. e4 c5
- 2. Nf3 e6
- 3. Nc3 d6
- 4. d4 cd
- 5. Q:d4 Nc6
- 6. Bb5 Bd7
- 7. B:c6 B:c6
- 8. Bg5 Qc7
- 9. 0-0-0 a6
- 10. Rh-e1 b5
- 11. Nd5



The Knight is not being sacrificed just yet. 11 ... e:d5 12. ed dis ch and 13. d:c6

- 11. ... Qa7
- 12. Qc3 Rc8
- 13. Be3 Qb7
- 14. Qd4

Now the Knight is being sacrificed.

- 14. ... e:d5
- 15. ed Bd7
- 16. Bg5 dis ch Ne7
- 17. g4!

Taking away f5 from Black's Queen bishop, from which square it could harass White's Queen Bishop two square.

- 17. ... Rc4 (?)

- 18. R:e7ch

Upgrading the sacrifice from a Knight to a rook.

- 18. ... B:e7
- 19. Q:g7

An interesting position.

19. ... B:g5 is not playable because after 20. N:g5 Rf8 (to save the rook and guard f7), 21. Relch is a killer.

- 19. ... B:g4
- 20. Q:h8ch Kd7
- 21. B:e7 Rc8

Black's retreat is a sign of the futility of 17. ... Rc4

- 22. Qf6 B:f3

(editor's note: In case anyone is wondering if 22. ... Qc7, threatening mate and guarding the d pawn saves Black, consider simply 23. c3 b4 24. Rd3. If Black tries to recover the piece via 23. ... B:f3 24. Q:f3 K:e7 25. Relch Kf8 26. Qf6 with the irresistible threat of Qh8.)

23. Q:d6ch Ke8
24. Rg1

Threatens mate. Its all over but
the mopping up.

24. ... R:c2ch
25. K:c2 Be4ch
26. Kd2 l:0

EVENT: Alumni Central at Amoco
Date: November, 1988
White: C. Wentling Black: M. Cox
Candidate for Best Salvage of Draw or Win
(Annotated by Marvin Cox)

- 1. e4 d6
- 2. d4 Nd7
- 3. Nf3 e5

Philidor's Defense. A passive but tenable position. Usually White does not exchange ecenter pawns but tries to restrict Black to less and less pace.

- 4. de de
- 5. Be3 Ngf6
- 6. Nbd2 Bd6

Black had originally intended to develop his bishop at g7, but changed his mind.

- 7. Bd3 h6
- 8. c3 Qe7
- 9. Qb3 O-O
- 10. O-O-O a5

Castling to opposite corners with the center open generally leads to a wide game. "He who gets there fustest with the mostest ---!"

- 11. a4 Bc5

Black wants to attack the a pawn with his QN and QB, then use his b pawn as a pry bar to open a file against the White king.

- 12. B:c5 N:c5
- 13. Qc2 Bd7
- 14. b3 N:d3 ch
- 15. Q:d3 Rfd8
- 16. Qc2 b5
- 17. Qa2 Qc5

Forking two pawns.

- 18. Nbl ba
- 19. ba Bc6

Two pawns are now en prise. Also, the black rook is no longer tied to the queen file to protect the square d5.


- 20. R:d8 ch R:d8
- 21. Rd1 Rb8

Threatening B:e4 and R:bl

- 22. Rd2 N:e4

Help! The sky is falling!

- 23. Rc2



- 23. ... N:f2 ???

This was not a brilliancy. This was a boner. Black forgot the pawn was guarded twice. However, this stupidity may be the only move which could produce a win!!! What's your analysis?

- 24. R:f2 Be4

Despite the loss of the piece, Black still has a huge positional advantage.

25. Rb2 Qe3 ch
26. Nbd2 Q:c3 ch

Black has a bishop and three pawns against two knights, so materially it is even.

27. Rc2 B:c2

Material advantage Black.

28. Q:c2 Q:c2 ch

My uncle says when ahead in material, trade off the queens as soon as possible to prevent a possible counter attack.

29. K:c2

Black now has a rook and three pawns against two knights and so should win.

29. ... f6

It is axiomatic that knights are superb attackers and bad defenders. All black has to do is use his extra force to restrict the knights so they can't do any attacking.

30. Nb3 Rb4
31. N:a5 R:a4
32. Nb3 Ra2 ch
33. Kd3 R:g2

Shuffling another pawn and also tying up White's KN.

34. h4 Kf7
35. Nbd2 Ke7

Black worries that his rook may be immobilized and trapped.

36. Ke3 Ke6
37. Ne4 Rc7

The rook flees to a square that restricts one knight.

38. Kd3 Rc6

Still restricting the knight.

39. Ng3 f5

If White goes after the g pawn he'll be sorry.

40. Kd2 g6
41. Ne2 Rc4
42. Ke3 Rg4
43. Kf2 c5

To restrict the knight from the d4 square.

4. Ng3 e5
O:l

Even if White could trap the rook Black's five pawns would flatten the one remaining White knight.

EVENT: Bell Labs INDIANS vs. Argonne ROOKS

Date: April 13, 1989

White: Erick Blackmon

Black: Jay Shachter


Candidate for Best Salvage of Win or Draw

(Analysis by R. Rzeszutko and A. Jasaitis)

- 1. e4 e5
- 2. Nf3 Nc6
- 3. Bb5 a6
- 4. B:c6 d:c6
- 5. d4 Nf6
- 6. O-O N:e4
- 7. N:e5 Be7
- 8. Be3 O-O
- 9. Nd2 Ng5
- 10. Ndf3 Ne4
- 11. Qe2 Be6
- 12. b3 c5
- 13. c4 cd
- 14. B:d4 Nd6
- 15. Rad1 f6?
- 16. Ng6 h:g6
- 17. Q:e6 ch Kh8

I think the simplest way to force a winning advantage is: 18. Nh4! Kh7 (forced) 19. c5. Now, if 19. ... Nf5 20. N:f5 g:f5 21. Q:f5 ch Kh8 22. Qh5 ch Kg8 23. Rd3 and Black can't rearrange his King-side fast enough to avoid mate.

If 19. ... Nf7, then 20. B:f6 wins a Queen and pawn for a rook and a bishop. And, if 19. ... Ne8 20. N:g6 K:g6 21. Rd3 wins. (If 19. ... Nb5?! 20. N:g6 N:d4 21. Qe4 and White wins at least the exchange and a pawn.)



- 18. ... Nf7
- 19. Nh4 Kh7
- 20. Rf d1 Qd6!
- 21. Qe3

White's advantage has almost completely dissipated, but he could still harass the Black King with Qg4.

18. Rd3?!


- 21. ... Rfe8

18. Rfel looks good, but then 18. ... Qc8 19. Q:c8 (19. Q:e7? Re8!) N:c8 and, with the queens off the board, Black probably can hold a draw. White has outplayed Black through the first 17 moves of this game, but now he must play actively if his advantage is to be converted to a full point.

(Black's position is steadily improving. - M.F.)

- 22. Bc5?? Q:c5
- 23. Qg3 Ne5
- 24. Re3 Bd6
- 25. Rdel g5
- 26. Nf5 Kg6
- 27. Nh4ch Kf7

- 28. Nf5 N:c4
- 29. Qh3 N:e3
- 30. Qh5ch Kg8??



Allows perpetual check. But
 30. ... g6 31. Qh7ch Ke6!
 is better. Yes, White will
 win the rook back after 32.
 Ng7ch Kd5 33. N:e8 Kc6!
 (R:e8 34. Qf7 ch Re6 35.
 g3!) 34. N:d6 N:g2 Black
 should win the endgame.

- 31. Nh6ch! g:h6
- 32. Qg6ch ½-½

NORTH DIVISION 04/30/89 (FINAL)

TEAM NAME	W	L	D	GAME MATCH		PCT
				POINTS	POINTS	
MOTOROLA	7	1	2	39.5	8.0	0.800
EXCALIBURS	7	3	0	40.5	7.0	0.700
UOP PROCESS DIV.	6	3	1	36.5	6.5	0.650
KEMPER INSURANCE	4	6	0	24.0	4.0	0.400
EXEMPLARS	3	6	1	23.5	3.5	0.350
FEL-PRO	1	9	0	11.0	1.0	0.100

EAST DIVISION 04/30/89 (FINAL)

TEAM NAME	W	L	D	GAME MATCH		PCT
				POINTS	POINTS	
ALUMNI CENTRAL	9	1	0	48.5	9.0	0.900
SEARS	7	2	1	41.5	7.5	0.750
CHICAGO POST OFFICE	6	3	1	35.0	6.5	0.650
CONTINENTAL BANK	3	6	1	21.0	3.5	0.350
AMOCO CORP.	2	7	1	21.0	2.5	0.250
CHICAGO MERC.EXCH.	1	9	0	12.0	1.0	0.100

NEAR WEST DIVISION 04/30/89

TEAM NAME	W	L	D	GAME MATCH		PCT
				POINTS	POINTS	
ARGONNE KNIGHTS	10	0	0	46.5	10.0	1.000
AT&T CHARGERS	5	3	2	33.0	6.0	0.600
BELL LABS DRAGONS	5	3	2	32.5	6.0	0.600
BELL LABS ROYALS	4	5	0	27.0	4.0	0.444
J. I. CASE	3	5	0	19.5	3.0	0.375
ROCKWELL INT'L	1	5	3	21.0	2.5	0.278
A & B RADIO	0	7	1	12.5	0.5	0.063

FAR WEST DIVISION 04/30/89

TEAM NAME	W	L	D	GAME MATCH		PCT
				POINTS	POINTS	
FERMILAB	8	1	1	42.5	8.5	0.850
BELL LABS INDIANS	7	2	1	36.0	7.5	0.750
WHEATON COLLEGE	5	3	2	34.0	6.0	0.600
AMOCO RESEARCH LABS	2	5	2	24.5	3.0	0.333
ARGONNE ROOKS	1	7	2	19.0	2.0	0.200
TELLABS	2	7	0	18.0	2.0	0.222

NORTH DIVISION TOP TEN

STEVANOVIC, M	UOP	2121
WONG, F	EXMFL	2118C
MCNEIL, B	MTRLA	2062
EASTER, R	MTRLA	2002
LEONG, G	EXCAL	1968C
BLOOM, B	MTRLA	1948
CREWSE, L	EXMFL	1943
BUERGER, E	EXCAL	1931C
SIWEK, M	KEMFR	1920
ILANGA, R	FLPRO	1899*

EAST DIVISION TOP TEN

GILES, M	SEARS	2505
GELBART, S	ALUMN	2207
REYES, R	SEARS	2195C
CZERNIECKI, A	ALUMN	2189C
INUMERABLE, F	FSTOF	2160
KRAS, T	ALUMN	2152
GREGORY, J	FSTOF	2142
JAKSTAS, K	ALUMN	2033
HUTTAR, C	ALUMN	1946
WIRTSCHAFTER, D	ALUMN	1945

NEAR WEST DIVISION TOP TEN

LEVINE, D	KNIGHT	2272
TEGEL, F	DRGNS	2090D
BOLDEN, D	KNIGHT	2066
GUID, J	ROYLS	2056
BENEDEK, R	KNIGHT	2049C
WARREN, J	CHRGR	2032D
JONES, B	ROCKW	2027*
WHEATLEY, D	CHRGR	1949
MARCOWKA, R	CHRGR	1921C
CHRISTIAN, R	DRGNS	1890

FAR WEST DIVISION TOP TEN

CHACHERE, L	INDNS	2335
STEIN, F	TELAB	2076
STREETS, D	ROOKS	2027C
LUDWIG, T	INDNS	2007
MOTTA, H	FERMI	1999
WALHOUT, F	WHEAT	1956
SAGALOVSKY, L	FERMI	1949
BERRY, G	ROOKS	1939D
SPIEGEL, L	FERMI	1923
UNDERWOOD, W	WHEAT	1906C

MOST IMPROVED PLAYERS

HAHNE, D	ROYLS	146
SAJKOWSKI, D	AMOCO	119
SAJBEL, P	UOP	104
TOGAMI, P	JCASE	97
O'DELL, DW	RADIO	93
AUGSBURGER, L	WHEAT	91
GRYPARIS, J	MTRLA	88
HICKS, C	ROYLS	76
GAVIN, L	MERC	73
ERLENBORN, M	TELAB	64

17-JAN-89 SEARS

ROUND 6 BD

			3	AMOCO CORP.				3
	RATINGS	SCORE			RATINGS	SCORE		
1 GILES, M	2487	2	1	WEIHMILLER, W	1920	-2	0	
2 LATIMER, E	1914	10	1	SMILEY, R	1786	-15	0	
3 DENMARK, T	1628	-20	0	ATKINSON, J	1672	20	1	
4 CHERNOMORDIKOW	1608	-27	0	SOPRYCH, T	1539	27	1	
5 VAN METRE, R	0	0	1	WENTLING, C	1520	0	0	
6	0	0	OF	CAMPBELL, C	1166	0	1F	

20-JAN-89 ALUMNI CENTRAL

ROUND 7 BD

			2.5	SEARS				3.5
	RATINGS	SCORE			RATINGS	SCORE		
1 GELBART, S	2215	-8	0	GILES, M	2489	8	1	
2 KRAS, T	2176	2	.5	REYES, R	2196	-1	.5	
3 CZERNIECKI, A	2190	-25	0	LATIMER, E	1924	25	1	
4 WIRTSCHAFTER, D	2018	-33	0	GOLLA, R	1844	22	1	
5 JASAITIS, A	1908	7	1	DENMARK, T	1608	-7	0	
6 FRIESEMA, W	0	0	1	BROCKETT, M	1739	0	0	

06-FEB-89 CONTINENTAL BANK

ROUND 7 BD

			2.5	CHICAGO MERC. EXCH.				3.5
	RATINGS	SCORE			RATINGS	SCORE		
1 FRAATS, D	1739	-17	0	ZEIDEL, J	1832	17	1	
2 PARADAN, E	1686	19	1	DIXON, R	1627	-19	0	
3 AYALA, M	0	0	0	GAVIN, L	1239	0	1	
4 SIEGEL, R	1452	0	.5	RUDY, J	0	0	.5	
5 HAMMOND, M	1238	0	0	BROSKA, P	0	0	1	
6 ZOELLNER, J	1155	0	1	HILTON, J	0	0	0	

15-FEB-89 CHICAGO MERC. EXCH.

ROUND 8 BD

			0	CHICAGO POST OFFICE				6
	RATINGS	SCORE			RATINGS	SCORE		
1 DIXON, R	1608	-22	0	COOPER, W	1615	22	1	
2 GAVIN, L	1239	-8	0	CARTER, L	1496	8	1	
3 RUDY, J	1238	0	0	REED, L	0	0	1	
4 GLEICH, S	0	0	0	FELICIANO, H	0	0	1	
5 BROSKA, P	0	0	0	PETWAY, L	0	0	1	
6 HILTON, J	0	0	0	HOWARD, W	0	0	1	

21-FEB-89 ALUMNI CENTRAL

ROUND 8 BD

			5	AMOCO CORP.				1
	RATINGS	SCORE			RATINGS	SCORE		
1 CZERNIECKI, A	2165	6	1	WEIHMILLER, W	1918	-9	0	
2 COX, M	1867	16	1	SMILEY, R	1771	-16	0	
3 JASAITIS, A	1915	-13	.5	ATKINSON, J	1692	13	.5	
4 RZESZUTKO, R	1798	9	1	SOPRYCH, T	1566	-9	0	
5 LITVINAS, A	1684	-10	.5	WENTLING, C	1520	10	.5	
6 FRANEK, M	1725	2	1	CAMPBELL, C	1166	-2	0	

07-MAR-89 CHICAGO POST OFFICE

ROUND 7 BD

			4	AMOCO CORP.				2
	RATINGS	SCORE			RATINGS	SCORE		
1 INUMERABLE, F	2182	8	1	WEIHMILLER, W	1909	-8	0	
2 GREGORY, J	2111	5	1	SMILEY, R	1755	-5	0	
3 COOPER, W	1637	-28	0	SOPRYCH, T	1557	28	1	
4 CARTER, L	1504	-21	0	WENTLING, C	1530	21	1	
5 PETWAY, L	0	0	1	CAMPBELL, C	1164	0	0	
6 HOWARD, W	0	0	1	COOPER, J	0	0	0	

14-MAR-89 AMOCO CORP.

ROUND 9 BD

		1.5 CONTINENTAL BANK		4.5	
	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 WEIHMILLER, W	1901-33	0	FRAATS, D	1722 33	1
2 SMILEY, R	1750 -3	.5	PARADAN, E	1705 3	.5
3 ATKINSON, J	1705 9	1	SIEGEL, R	1452 -9	0
4 SOPRYCH, T	1585 0	0	PATEL, R	0 0	1
5 WENTLING, C	1551-39	0	HAMMOND, M	1238 39	1
6 CAMPBELL, C	1164 0	OF	ZOELLNER, J	1155 0	1F

14-MAR-89 ALUMNI CENTRAL

ROUND 9 BD

		4 CHICAGO POST OFFICE		2	
	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 CZERNIECKI, A	2171 16	1	INUMERABLE, F	2190-24	0
2 KRAS, T	2178-26	0	GREGORY, J	2116 26	1
3 WIRTSCHAFTER, D	1985-40	0	COOPER, W	1609 40	1
4 JAKSTAS, K	2031 2	1	CARTER, L	1483 -2	0
5 RZESZUTKO, R	1807 6	1	PETWAY, L	1497 -6	0
6 FRANEK, M	1727 0	1	HOWARD, W	0 0	0

21-MAR-89 CONTINENTAL BANK

ROUND 8 BD

		.5 SEARS		5.5	
	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 FRAATS, D	1755 -1	0	GILES, M	2497 1	1
2 PARADAN, E	1708 -9	0	LATIMER, E	1949 6	1
3 HAMMOND, M	1277 -1	0	GOLLA, R	1866 1	1
4 AYALA, M	0 0	0	CHERNOMORDIKOW	1581 0	1
5 PATEL, R	0 0	0	DENMARK, T	1601 0	1
6 ZOELLNER, J	1155 0	.5	VAN METRE, R	0 0	.5

28-MAR-89 SEARS

ROUND 10 BD

		2.5 CHICAGO POST OFFICE		3.5	
	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 GILES, M	2498 6	1	INUMERABLE, F	2166 -6	0
2 LATIMER, E	1955-26	0	COOPER, W	1649 38	1
3 GOLLA, R	1867 3	1	CARTER, L	1481 -4	0
4 SCHWARTZ, S	1634 0	.5	REED, L	0 0	.5
5 DENMARK, T	1601-29	0	PETWAY, L	1491 29	1
6 VAN METRE, R	0 0	0	HOWARD, W	0 0	1

28-MAR-89 ALUMNI CENTRAL

ROUND 10 BD

		6 CONTINENTAL BANK		0	
	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 CZERNIECKI, A	2187 2	1	FRAATS, D	1754 -3	0
2 JASAITIS, A	1902 11	1	PARADAN, E	1699-11	0
3 FRIESEMA, W	0 0	1	SIEGEL, R	1443 0	0
4 FRANEK, M	1727 3	1	HAMMOND, M	1276 -3	0
5 RZESZUTKO, R	1813 0	1	PATEL, R	0 0	0
6 LITVINAS, A	1674 2	1	ZOELLNER, J	1155 -2	0

28-MAR-89 AMOCO CORP.

ROUND 10 BD

		3.5 CHICAGO MERC. EXCH.		2.5	
	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 WEIHMILLER, W	1868-24	0	ZEIDEL, J	1849 24	1
2 ATKINSON, J	1714 15	1	DIXON, R	1586-15	0
3 SOPRYCH, T	1585 5	1	GAVIN, L	1231 -5	0
4 COOPER, J	0 0	1	BROSKA, P	0 0	0
5 WINBORN, G	0 0	0	HILTON, J	0 0	1
6 CLEMONS, V	0 0	.5	FRANTZIS, G	0 0	.5

04-APR-89 SEARS
ROUND 9 BD

- 1 GILES, M
- 2 REYES, R
- 3 LATIMER, E
- 4 GOLLA, R
- 5
- 6 VAN METRE, R

RATINGS		SCORE	
2504	1	1	
2195	0	1F	
1929	1	1	
1870	0	1	
0	0	OF	
0	0	1	

CHICAGO MERC. EXCH.

- ZEIDEL, J
- GAVIN, L
- BROSKA, F
- HILTON, J

RATINGS		SCORE	
1873	-1	0	
0	0	OF	
1226	-1	0	
0	0	0	
0	0	OF	
0	0	0	

27-FEB-89 AT&T CHARGERS
ROUND 8 BD

- 1 WARREN, J
- 2 KUMRO, D
- 3 RADAVICIUS, E
- 4 DOBR, K
- 5 THOMAS, J
- 6 SHAFF, R

RATINGS		SCORE	
2033	2	1	
1679	12	1	
1601-23		0	
1511	6	1	
1535	7	1	
1495-40		0	

J. I. CASE

- WHITE, H
- SATTERLEE, D
- KLINEFELTER, H
- KANAS, W
- REID, C
- TOGAMI, P

RATINGS		SCORE	
1601	-3	0	
1600	-17	0	
1395	34	1	
1262	-9	0	
1251	-7	0	
1121	40	1	

08-MAR-89 BELL LABS ROYALS
ROUND 9 BD

- 1 GUIDO, J
- 2 CHEN, M
- 3 ROSLEY, D
- 4 HAHNE, D
- 5 HICKS, C
- 6 REVULURI, K

RATINGS		SCORE	
2025	3	1	
1877	8	1	
1700	8	1	
1524	16	1	
1442	7	1	
0	0	0	

J. I. CASE

- SATTERLEE, D
- WHITE, H
- SAWDO, E
- KLINEFELTER, H
- TOGAMI, P
- CARTER, D

RATINGS		SCORE	
1583	-3	0	
1598	-8	0	
1438	-8	0	
1429	-16	0	
1161	-7	0	
1102	0	1	

22-MAR-89 A & B RADIO
ROUND 9 BD

- 1 LASKY, JIM
- 2 MCGRUFF, M
- 3 LASKY, J
- 4 O'DELL, DW
- 5 MIKULECKY, B
- 6 WEISNER, T

RATINGS		SCORE	
0	0	0	
1470	-3	0	
1396	-7	0	
1406	33	1	
1368	32	1	
1139	-6	0	

AT&T CHARGERS

- WARREN, J
- MARCOVKA, R
- KUMRO, D
- RADAVICIUS, E
- DOBR, K
- SHAFF, R

RATINGS		SCORE	
2035	0	1	
1931	2	1	
1691	5	1	
1578	-22	0	
1517	-21	0	
1455	6	1	

05-APR-89 BELL LABS ROYALS
ROUND 10 BD

- 1 GUIDO, J
- 2 CHEN, M
- 3 ROSLEY, D
- 4 HAHNE, D
- 5 HICKS, C
- 6 ANDERSON, CJ

RATINGS		SCORE	
2028	28	1	
1885-26		0	
1708-16		0	
1540	5	.5	
1449	14	1	
0	0	0	

BELL LABS DRAGONS

- TEGEL, F
- CHRISTIAN, R
- JACOBS, N
- WARD, C
- MATHUR, P
- WHITSITT, S

RATINGS		SCORE	
2112	-19	0	
1837	26	1	
1819	10	1	
1606	-3	.5	
1309	-14	0	
0	0	1	

05-APR-89 ROCKWELL INT'L
ROUND 10 BD

- 1 JONES, B
- 2 SAMELSON, C
- 3 RAFACZ, T
- 4 EFRON, D
- 5 RAFACZ, W
- 6 DEWITT, G

RATINGS		SCORE	
2049-22		.5	
1822	4	1	
1432-22		0	
1401	22	1	
1469	16	1	
1319	11	1	

A & B RADIO

- LASKY, N
- MIKULECKY, B
- O'DELL, DW
- LASKY, J
- HUMPF, R
- WEISNER, T

RATINGS		SCORE	
1422	22	.5	
1400	-4	0	
1439	22	1	
1389	-22	0	
1364	-16	0	
1133	-11	0	

11-APR-89 ARGONNE KNIGHTS			5	AT&T CHARGERS	1	
ROUND 10 BD			RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1	LEVINE, D	2262 10	1	WARREN, J	2035 -6	0
2	BOLDEN, D	2075 -9	.5	MARCOWKA, R	1933 6	.5
3	BENEDEK, R	2038 4	1	KUMRO, D	1696 -4	0
4	YOUNG, C	1827 10	1	BROZOVICH, J	1694-10	0
5	BAURAC, D	1658 -4	.5	RADAVICIUS, E	1556 4	.5
6	HILL, R	1321 33	1	DOBR, K	1496-22	0

20-APR-89 BELL LABS DRAGONS			3	AT&T CHARGERS	3	
ROUND 11 BD			RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1	TEGEL, F	2093 -3	.5	WARREN, J	2029 3	.5
2	CHRISTIAN, R	1863 27	1	MARCOWKA, R	1939-18	0
3	JACOBS, N	1829-16	0	STOLTZ, B	1808 24	1
4	WARD, C	1603 19	1	KUMRO, D	1692-19	0
5	BRANDT, W	1348 13	.5	RADAVICIUS, E	1560 -8	.5
6	MATHUR, F	1295-12	0	DOBR, K	1474 8	1
7	SHEU, G	1310 -9	0	THOMAS, J	1542 9	1

26-APR-89 ROCKWELL INT'L			1	ARGONNE KNIGHTS	5	
ROUND 11 BD			RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1	JONES, B	2027 0	OF	BOLDEN, D	2066 0	1F
2	SAMELSON, C	1826-10	0	BENEDEK, R	2042 7	1
3	RAFACZ, W	1485 -5	0	YOUNG, C	1837 3	1
4	EFRON, D	1423 -9	0	BAURAC, D	1654 6	1
5	RAFACZ, T	1410 34	1	KELLOGG, K	1602-23	0
6	DEWITT, G	1330-21	0	HILL, R	1354 21	1

09-MAR-89 ARGONNE ROOKS			3	FERMILAB	3	
ROUND 8 BD			RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1	BERRY, G	1912 19	1	MOTTA, H	2009-29	0
2	DECMAN, S	1737 -9	0	SPIEGEL, L	1882 14	1
3	GREEN, D	1659 20	1	KALIHHER, C	1768-29	0
4	ZAROMB, S	1467-12	0	GAINES, I	1637 8	1
5	TASKER, I	1434 0	0	DORRIES, T	0 0	1
6	WALSH, W	1454 13	1	SUMMERS, D	1408-20	0

20-MAR-89 ARGONNE ROOKS			3.5	AMOCO RESEARCH LABS	2.5	
ROUND 9 BD			RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1	BERRY, G	1931 11	1	SAJKOWSKI, D	1844-17	0
2	DECMAN, S	1728-10	0	NAGLE, M	1841 15	1
3	GREEN, D	1679 3	.5	ROSE, K	1739 -4	.5
4	ZAROMB, S	1455 18	1	THOMPSON, M	1389-18	0
5	WIENCEK, T	1252 0	0	FULTS, J	0 0	1
6	REDEY, E	1037 0	1	ZHANG, L	0 0	0

23-MAR-89 FERMILAB			5	BELL LABS INDIANS	1	
ROUND 9 BD			RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1	KOZLOVSKY, M	0 0	1	CHACHERE, L	2331 0	0
2	SAGALOVSKY, L	1965-22	0	LUDWIG, T	1972 22	1
3	SPIEGEL, L	1896 19	1	STINSON, M	1836-19	0
4	KALIHHER, C	1739 23	1	OGASAWARA, L	1751-23	0
5	GAINES, I	1645 13	1	BLACKMON, E	1589-19	0
6	DORRIES, T	0 0	1	EUSTACE, D	1327 0	0
7	WALKER, R	1369 0	1	HAI, N	0 0	0

29-MAR-89 BELL LABS INDIANS

ROUND 8 BD

1 LUDWIG, T
 2 STINSON, M
 3 BLACKMON, E
 4 SHACHTER, J
 5 TURPIN, S
 6 ROBERTS, R

RATINGS SCORE
 1994 6 .5
 1817 17 1
 1570 12 1
 1508 15 1
 0 0 0
 0 0 1F

4.5 TELLABS

STEIN, F
 GRAFT, D
 MCKEE, M
 STELTON, N
 ERLNBORN, M
 TENNIE, E

1.5
 RATINGS SCORE
 2082 -6 .5
 1725-17 0
 1401-12 0
 1387-15 0
 1427 0 1
 1456 0 0F

12-APR-89 WHEATON COLLEGE

ROUND 9 BD

1 WALHOUT, F
 2 WALKER, F
 3 AUGSBURGER, L
 4 WIENS, F
 5 TAYLOR, F
 6 SATCHELL, E

RATINGS SCORE
 1956 0 1F
 1606 0 1F
 1639 0 1F
 1376 0 1F
 0 0 1F
 0 0 1F

6 TELLABS

0
 RATINGS SCORE
 0 0 0F
 0 0 0F
 0 0 0F
 0 0 0F
 0 0 0F
 0 0 0F

13-APR-89 BELL LABS INDIANS

ROUND 10 BD

1 CHACHERÉ, L
 2 LUDWIG, T
 3 STINSON, M
 4 BLACKMON, E
 5 SHACHTER, J
 6 HAI, N
 7 SHACHTER, J

RATINGS SCORE
 2331 4 1
 2000 7 1
 1834-10 .5
 1582 0 1F
 1523 0 1F
 0 0 1F
 1523 4 .5

5.5 ARGONNE ROOKS

BERRY, G
 DECMAN, S
 GREEN, D
 TASKER, I
 BLACKMON, E

.5
 RATINGS SCORE
 1942 -3 0
 1718 -5 0
 1682 6 .5
 1434 0 0F
 0 0 0F
 0 0 0F
 1582 -4 .5 (INDNS)

25-APR-89 WHEATON COLLEGE

ROUND 10 BD

1 WALHOUT, F
 2 UNDERWOOD, W
 3 WALKER, F
 4 AUGSBURGER, L
 5 TAYLOR, F
 6 SATCHELL, E

RATINGS SCORE
 1956 0 .5
 1925-19 0
 1606 -6 0
 1639 -8 0
 0 0 0
 0 0 0

.5 FERMILAB

KOZLOVSKY, M
 MOTTA, H
 SAGALOVSKY, L
 SPIEGEL, L
 KALIHHER, C
 GAINES, I

5.5
 RATINGS SCORE
 0 0 .5
 1980 19 1
 1943 6 1
 1915 8 1
 1762 0 1
 1658 0 1

28-MAR-89 FEL-PRO

ROUND 9 BD

1 WEITZ, R
 2 FELDMAN, A
 3 THOMPSON, R
 4 BAKER, B
 5 PETERS, P
 6 PETERS, B
 7 THOMPSON, R
 8 THOMPSON, R

RATINGS SCORE
 1760 -5 0
 1423-19 0
 1053 0 1F
 1039 0 1F
 1202 0 1F
 0 0 1F
 1053 32 1
 1085-25 0

4 EXEMPLARS

WONG, P
 BURIAN, D
 PETERS, P
 BAKER, B

2
 RATINGS SCORE
 2115 3 1
 1472 19 1
 0 0 0F
 0 0 0F
 0 0 0F
 0 0 0F
 1202-32 0 (FLPRO)
 1039 25 1 (FLPRO)

06-APR-89 MOTOROLA

ROUND 10 BD

		4 EXCALIBURS		2	
	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1	BLOOM, B	1921 27	1	LEONG, G	1995-27 0
2	EASTER, R	1982 20	1	BUERGER, E	1944-13 0
3	GONCHAROFF, N	1678 15	1	SULLIVAN, J	1868-22 0
4	OGASAWARA, R	1542 -7	0	KARLOVICS, S	1745 7 1
5	GRYFARIS, J	1397 35	1	CHAN, H	1615-35 0
6	FRIDRICH, C	1424-15	0	BROTSOS, J	1544 10 1

12-APR-89 UOP PROCESS DIV.

ROUND 10 BD

		6 FEL-PRO		0	
	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1	STEVANOVIC, M	2116 5	1	WEITZ, R	1755 -5 0
2	MICKLICH, F	1647 13	1	HESS, B	1498-13 0
3	BRIONES, M	1570 12	1	FELDMAN, A	1404-12 0
4	SAJBEL, P	1565 2	1	THOMPSON, R	1060 -2 0
5	STUHLBARG, D	1405 9	1	PETERS, P	1170 -9 0
6	CHEVERESAN, S	1365 7	1	BAKER, B	1064 -7 0

18-APR-89 EXEMPLARS

ROUND 10 BD

		.5 KEMPER INSURANCE		5.5	
	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1	SKULSKI, I	1690 14	.5	SIWEK, M	1934-14 .5
2	SUERTH, F	1603-21	0	GARLAND, G	1622 21 1
3	BURIAN, D	1491-11	0	HUGHES, N	1692 11 1
4		0 0	OF	BLOEDOW, P	1377 0 1F
5		0 0	OF	CUMMUTA, P	1267 0 1F
6		0 0	OF	VAN HOORN, G	0 0 1F

NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING	NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING
ABSIL, K	UOP	0	0	0	1270#	CHOU, S	WHEAT	0	0	0	0000?
AGGEN, R	CONBK	0	0	0	0000?	CHRISTIAN, R	DRGNS	5	2	3	1890
ANDERSON, CJ	ROYLS	1	5	0	0000?	CHURCHILL, W	INDNS	1	4	1	1664
ANDERSON, MARK	ATTSK	0	0	0	1301*	CIBA, F	SEARS	1	0	0	1401
ANDERSON, N	EXCAL	4	1	3	1697C	CIESLEK, D	MTRLA	1	2	1	1827*
ANGLIN, B	SEARS	0	0	0	1592*	CIPOLLA, J	MTRLA	0	0	0	1614*
ATKINSON, J	AMCRP	4	2	2	1729	CLAY, M	FLPRO	0	0	0	0000?
AUGSBURGER, L	WHEAT	6	1	1	1631*	CLEMONS, V	AMCRP	1	0	1	0000?
AYALA, M	CONBK	2	4	0	0000?	COKER, D	CONBK	0	0	0	0000?
BAKER, B	FLPRO	1	8	1	1057	COLTER, D	JCASE	0	0	0	0000?
BARTALONE, F	FLPRO	0	0	0	0000?	COOPER, J	AMCRP	1	5	0	0000?
BAURAC, D	KNGHT	6	1	3	1660C	COOPER, K	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?
BECKLEY, S	INDNS	0	0	0	1268#	COOPER, W	PSTOF	4	4	2	1687*
BENEDEK, R	KNGHT	7	0	2	2049C	CORBIN, Z	AMCRP	0	0	0	1321#
BERRY, G	ROOKS	4	5	1	1939D	COUGHLIN, B	WHEAT	0	1	0	0000?
BERTOLUCCI, S	FERMI	1	0	0	0000?	COX, M	ALUMN	2	1	0	1883
BEUNING, B	INDNS	0	0	0	1329*	CREWSE, L	EXMPL	1	3	0	1943
BHOJWANI, C	DRGNS	4	3	1	1767	CRUZ, R	FLPRO	0	1	0	1402*
BINGLE, J	ROOKS	0	2	0	1465C	CUMMUTA, P	KEMPR	0	3	1	1267
BLACKMON, E	INDNS	4	3	3	1578	CZERNIECKI, A	ALUMN	7	1	1	2189C
BLAZIE, J	TYROS	0	0	0	1587	DASBACH, D	RADIO	0	1	0	0000?
BLOCKER, C	CBOPE	0	0	0	2555	DAVIS, J	FLPRO	0	0	0	0000?
BLOEDOW, F	KEMPR	2	4	2	1377	DECMAN, S	ROOKS	2	6	2	1713C
BLOOM, B	MTRLA	3	4	1	1948	DENMARK, T	SEARS	4	3	0	1572#
BOLDEN, D	KNGHT	6	1	2	2066	DEWITT, G	ROCKW	3	5	1	1309
BOOTH, D	AMOCO	0	3	1	1406	DEZONNO, T	ROCKW	0	2	0	0000?
BORUM, J	DRGNS	0	1	0	0000?	DIXON, R	MERC	1	4	0	1571
BRADY, R	CHRGR	0	0	0	0000?	DOBR, K	CHRGR	4	5	1	1482D
BRANDT, W	DRGNS	2	2	1	1361*	DORRIES, T	FERMI	5	1	0	0000?
BRERETON, K	DRGNS	0	0	0	0000?	DOWNEY, J	CBOPE	0	0	0	0000?
BRIONES, M	UOP	4	5	0	1582	DUNWOODY, D	ROOKS	0	0	0	1549
BROCKETT, M	SEARS	3	1	0	1739	DURKEE, D	DRGNS	1	1	0	1736
BRONFELD, A	ALUMN	1	0	0	1732	EASLEY, K	INDNS	0	0	0	1688*
BROSKA, P	MERC	2	7	0	0000?	EASTER, R	MTRLA	6	1	1	2002
BROTSOS, J	EXCAL	6	1	0	1554C	EDWARDS, S	EXMPL	0	2	1	1259
BROWN, J	TYROS	0	0	0	0000?	EFRON, D	ROCKW	2	5	0	1414*
BROZOVICH, J	CHRGR	0	1	0	1684C	ERICKSON, R	PSTOF	0	0	0	1807
BUERGER, E	EXCAL	5	3	1	1931C	ERLENBORN, M	TELAB	3	0	1	1427*
BURBA, K	KNGHT	1	1	1	1417C	EUSTACE, D	INDNS	4	1	1	1327*
BURIAN, D	EXMPL	4	5	0	1480	FABIJONAS, R	ALUMN	1	0	0	1693D
CAGNEY, D	KEMPR	0	3	0	0000?	FAHRENHOLTZ, S	MTRLA	1	0	0	1616#
CAMPBELL, C	AMCRP	3	4	0	1164	FAJKUS, J	CHRGR	1	0	0	1582C
CARPENTER, F	ATTSK	0	0	0	1390	FELDMAN, A	FLPRO	1	8	1	1392
CARTER, D	JCASE	1	1	0	1102*	FELICIANO, H	PSTOF	1	0	0	0000?
CARTER, L	PSTOF	4	5	0	1477*	FINLAY, J	AMOCO	0	0	0	0000?
CHACHERE, L	INDNS	3	2	0	2335	FISCHLER, M	FERMI	0	0	0	1352
CHAN, H	EXCAL	3	3	0	1580	FOGERTY, A	CBOPE	0	0	0	1793#
CHEN, M	ROYLS	5	4	0	1859#	FONNEMAN, J	AMOCO	0	0	0	0000?
CHERNOMORDIKOW	SEARS	2	1	1	1581*	FRAATS, D	CONBK	2	7	0	1751
CHEVERESAN, S	UOP	3	5	1	1372	FRANEK, M	ALUMN	8	0	0	1730

? - UNRATED
 # - 5 TO 9 RATED GAMES
 * - 10 TO 24 RATED GAMES

C - CENTURY CLUB MEMBER
 D - DOUBLE CENTURION

NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING	NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING
FRANTZIS, G	MERC	0	1	1	0000?	KALIHHER, C	FERMI	7	2	0	1762
FREDERICK, M	CBOPE	0	0	0	0000?	KANAS, W	JCASE	1	5	0	1253
FRIDRICH, C	MTRLA	2	2	0	1409#	KARGE, W	KEMPR	0	0	0	1284
FRIEDMAN, S	FLPRO	0	0	0	0000?	KARLOVICS, S	EXCAL	4	0	2	1752C
FRIESEMA, W	ALUMN	5	0	0	1838#	KELLOGG, K	KNIGHT	4	1	0	1579C
GAINES, I	FERMI	4	2	1	1658C	KELLY, S	ROYLS	0	0	0	1333*
GARLAND, G	KEMPR	2	7	0	1643	KHOKHA, D	MTRLA	0	1	0	0000?
GAVIN, L	MERC	3	6	0	1225*	KLINEFELTER, H	JCASE	3	5	0	1413
GELBART, S	ALUMN	0	2	0	2207	KNOX, M	MTRLA	2	1	0	1630
GERNES, L	ATTSK	0	0	0	1494	KOZLOVSKY, M	FERMI	1	0	1	0000?
GILES, M	SEARS	9	0	0	2505	KRAKAU, H	EXMPL	1	1	0	1857
GLEICH, S	MERC	0	7	0	0000?	KRAS, T	ALUMN	3	1	2	2152
GOLLA, R	SEARS	7	0	0	1870C	KRULL, E	AMCRP	0	0	0	1301#
GONCHAROFF, N	MTRLA	3	2	2	1693D	KUKES, S	AMOCO	0	0	0	0000?
GORDON, D	PSTOF	0	0	0	0000?	KUMRO, D	CHRGR	4	5	0	1673D
GRAF, R	UOP	2	0	0	1416*	LANDRY, H	CBOPE	0	0	0	1178#
GRAFT, D	TELAB	2	4	2	1708	LANNOYE, D	CBOPE	0	0	0	1508*
GREEN, D	ROOKS	4	3	3	1688C	LASKY, J	RADIO	2	4	1	1367
GREENSPAN, F	MTRLA	1	0	0	1573C	LASKY, JIM	RADIO	0	2	0	0000?
GREGORY, J	PSTOF	4	1	0	2142	LASKY, N	RADIO	0	5	1	1444
GRIVETTI, M	AMOCO	0	0	0	0000?	LATIMER, E	SEARS	6	3	1	1930C
GRUCHACZ, R	CBOPE	0	0	0	2491	LAY, K	TELAB	0	1	0	0000?
GRYPARIS, J	MTRLA	6	2	2	1432	LEONG, G	EXCAL	3	3	2	1968C
GUID, J	ROYLS	4	2	1	2056	LESTER, M	PSTOF	0	0	0	1560
HAHNE, D	ROYLS	6	2	1	1545	LEVINE, D	KNIGHT	3	1	1	2272
HAI, N	INDNS	1	1	0	0000?	LITVINAS, A	ALUMN	5	0	1	1676C
HALLMAN, W	JCASE	0	0	0	1188*	LONOFF, M	CBOPE	0	0	0	2337
HAMMOND, M	CONBK	1	4	0	1273*	LUDWIG, T	INDNS	5	2	1	2007
HARRINGER, R	TYROS	0	0	0	1567C	MANASTER, R	ATTSK	0	0	0	1810
HATCHER, W	PSTOF	0	1	0	1025#	MANE, S	FERMI	1	0	2	0000?
HESS, B	FLPRO	0	2	0	1485	MANZKE, R	ATTSK	0	0	0	1129*
HICKS, C	ROYLS	4	3	1	1463*	MARCOWKA, R	CHRGR	4	2	2	1921C
HILL, R	KNIGHT	5	3	1	1375*	MARTIN, W	CONBK	0	0	0	0000?
HILTON, J	MERC	1	5	0	0000?	MARTINSONS, B	MTRLA	0	0	0	1839
HOLM, B	AMOCO	3	1	2	1680	MATHUR, P	DRGNS	2	4	1	1283#
HOPSON, A	CONBK	0	1	0	0000?	MCCALLON, J	WHEAT	0	0	0	1135#
HOWARD, W	PSTOF	6	2	0	0000?	MCGRIFF, M	RADIO	0	6	0	1467*
HUGHES, N	KEMPR	6	2	2	1703	MCKEE, M	TELAB	0	5	2	1389*
HUMPF, R	RADIO	0	6	0	1348*	MCLAURIN, J	MERC	0	3	0	0000?
HUTTAR, C	ALUMN	0	0	1	1946	MCNEIL, B	MTRLA	0	1	0	2062
ILANGA, R	FLPRO	0	0	0	1899*	MCQUINN, J	ROCKW	1	1	0	1477
INUMERABLE, F	PSTOF	6	3	0	2160	MICKLICH, F	UOP	4	5	1	1660
JACKLIN, E	JCASE	1	0	0	1288	MIHAILOVICH, S	ROOKS	0	0	0	1764D
JACKSON, T	CBOPE	0	0	0	0000?	MIKULECKY, B	RADIO	4	4	0	1396
JACOBS, N	DRGNS	2	3	2	1813C	MILLER, PAUL	ATTSK	0	0	0	0000?
JAKSTAS, K	ALUMN	1	0	0	2033	MORGAN, B	FLPRO	0	0	0	0000?
JANNEY, C	SEARS	0	0	0	0000?	MOTTA, H	FERMI	3	3	0	1999
JASAITIS, A	ALUMN	5	1	1	1913	MUIR, L	AMOCO	0	0	0	1521C
JOHNSON, R	TELAB	0	1	0	0000?	MUNOZ, A	INDNS	0	0	0	1247
JONES, B	ROCKW	3	1	2	2027*	MUSGRAVE, C	EXECU	0	0	0	1878

? - UNRATED

- 5 TO 9 RATED GAMES

* - 10 TO 24 RATED GAMES

C - CENTURY CLUB MEMBER

D - DOUBLE CENTURION

NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING	NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING
MYERS, W	CONBK	0	2	0	1522*	SAWDO, E	JCASE	0	3	0	1430
NAGLE, M	AMOCO	2	5	1	1856	SCHOONVELD, S	WHEAT	0	0	0	1271#
NELSON, B	PSTOF	0	2	0	0000?	SCHULMAN, R	EXMPL	2	0	2	1851C
NEUMANN, J	TELAB	0	0	0	1718#	SCHWARTZ, S	SEARS	0	1	2	1634C
NWABUDE, O	DRGNS	0	2	0	0000?	SHACHTER, J	INDNS	3	1	3	1527
O'BRIEN, D	UOP	0	0	0	1409*	SHAFF, R	CHRGR	4	1	1	1461C
O'DELL, DW	RADIO	4	2	1	1461	SHELBY, J	PSTOF	0	0	0	0000?
O'DONOHUE, D	TELAB	0	1	0	0000?	SHEU, G	DRGNS	2	5	0	1301*
OGASAWARA, L	INDNS	2	1	1	1728	SHOREY, S	UOP	0	0	0	1139#
OGASAWARA, R	MTRLA	2	1	2	1535D	SIEGEL, R	CONBK	3	4	2	1443
OSTERLUND, R	EXCAL	0	0	0	1857	SIWEK, M	KEMPR	2	3	3	1920
PAAUWE, N	AMOCO	0	0	0	1386	SKOWRONSKI, M	TELAB	0	0	0	1557*
FACE, M	FERMI	0	0	1	1754	SKULSKI, I	EXMPL	2	1	3	1704
PARADAN, E	CONBK	3	3	3	1688	SMILEY, R	AMCRP	0	6	3	1747
PARIKH, F	DRGNS	0	0	0	0000?	SMITH, BR	TYROS	0	0	0	1509
PARKER, L	TYROS	0	0	0	1740	SOLNER, J	ROYLS	0	0	0	1674*
PATEL, R	CONBK	1	3	0	0000?	SOMBONG, M	CONBK	0	0	1	1722
PEPPERS, G	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?	SOPRYCH, T	AMCRP	3	4	2	1590
PEREZ, M	PSTOF	0	0	0	0000?	SPANGLER, M	AMOCO	0	0	0	1354
PETERS, B	FLPRO	0	0	0	0000?	SPIEGEL, L	FERMI	7	1	1	1923
PETERS, P	FLPRO	0	6	1	1161#	STAMM, V	CHRGR	0	0	0	1586C
PETERS, S.	CONBK	0	0	0	0000?	STEIN, P	TELAB	4	3	1	2076
PETWAY, L	PSTOF	6	2	1	1520#	STELTON, N	TELAB	0	4	0	1372
PULTS, J	AMOCO	2	0	1	0000?	STEVANOVIC, M	UOP	8	1	1	2121
RADAVICIUS, E	CHRGR	5	3	2	1552C	STINSON, M	INDNS	4	1	4	1824
RAFACZ, T	ROCKW	2	6	1	1444	STOLTZ, B	CHRGR	1	0	0	1832
RAFACZ, W	ROCKW	3	5	1	1480#	STREETS, D	ROOKS	0	0	0	2027C
RAVANAM, S	JCASE	0	0	1	1227*	STUHLBARG, D	UOP	4	2	1	1414C
REDEY, E	ROOKS	2	2	0	1037*	SUERTH, F	EXMPL	1	3	1	1582
REED, L	PSTOF	2	0	1	1671#	SULLIVAN, J	EXCAL	7	2	1	1846C
REID, C	JCASE	1	3	1	1244*	SUMMERS, D	FERMI	3	2	0	1388*
REVULURI, K	ROYLS	2	3	0	0000?	TAGHAP, W	WHEAT	0	0	0	0000?
REYES, R	SEARS	1	0	2	2195C	TASKER, I	ROOKS	0	2	0	1434*
RINGENBERG, T	AMOCO	0	2	0	1324*	TAYLOR, F	WHEAT	1	4	0	0000?
RIZZITANO, J	CBOFE	0	0	0	2577	TEGEL, F	DRGNS	6	2	2	2090D
ROBERTS, R	INDNS	0	0	0	0000?	TENNIE, E	TELAB	1	3	0	1456#
ROMAN, J	ROCKW	0	0	0	0000?	THOMAS, J	CHRGR	5	1	1	1551C
ROSE, K	AMOCO	2	4	2	1735	THOMPSON, M	AMOCO	2	4	2	1371*
ROISING, G	CBOFE	0	0	0	1411*	THOMPSON, R	FLPRO	1	3	0	1058
ROSLEY, D	ROYLS	2	2	1	1692	TOGAMI, P	JCASE	3	2	0	1154*
ROTH, K	WHEAT	1	0	0	0000?	TURPIN, S	INDNS	0	1	0	0000?
RUDY, J	MERC	1	6	1	1238#	UNDERWOOD, W	WHEAT	3	2	4	1906C
RZESZUTKO, R	ALUMN	5	0	1	1813	VAN HOORN, G	KEMPR	2	2	0	0000?
SAGALOVSKY, L	FERMI	4	4	0	1949	VAN MEER, J	KEMPR	0	0	0	1808
SAJBEL, P	UOP	6	2	1	1567*	VAN METRE, R	SEARS	3	3	1	0000?
SAJKOWSKI, D	AMOCO	6	2	1	1827	VAN ZILE, C	UOP	0	2	0	0000?
SALGANIK, E	CONBK	0	1	0	0000?	VERIVE, J	TELAB	1	0	2	1543#
SAMELSON, C	ROCKW	3	3	3	1816	VICK, H	MTRLA	0	0	0	1477
SATCHELL, E	WHEAT	0	4	0	0000?	WALHOUT, F	WHEAT	3	3	3	1956
SATTERLEE, D	JCASE	2	5	1	1580	WALKER, P	WHEAT	2	5	1	1600

? - UNRATED
- 5 TO 9 RATED GAMES
* - 10 TO 24 RATED GAMES

C - CENTURY CLUB MEMBER
D - DOUBLE CENTURION

NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING	NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING
WALKER, R	FERMI	1	0	0	1369C	WIENS, F	WHEAT	3	3	1	1376
WALLIN, R	WHEAT	2	3	2	1664*	WILLIAMSON, E	CONBK	0	1	0	0000?
WALSH, W	ROOKS	2	1	0	1467C	WILLS, B	WHEAT	0	0	0	0000?
WARD, C	DRGNS	4	2	3	1622C	WINBORN, G	AMCRP	0	2	0	0000?
WARREN, J	CHRGR	2	2	1	2032D	WIRTSCHAFTER, D	ALUMN	1	2	0	1945
WEIHMILLER, W	AMCRP	0	7	1	1844	WONG, F	EXMPL	6	1	0	2118C
WEISNER, T	RADIO	1	4	0	1122	YOUNG, C	KNIGHT	7	1	2	1840C
WEITZ, R	FLPRO	2	6	1	1750	YOUNG, D	ROOKS	0	0	0	0000?
WENTLING, C	AMCRP	3	4	1	1512	ZAROMB, S	ROOKS	2	3	0	1473*
WHEATLEY, D	CHRGR	2	3	0	1949	ZEIDEL, J	MERC	2	5	2	1872
WHITE, H	JCASE	3	3	1	1590	ZHANG, L	AMOCO	1	3	0	0000?
WHITSITT, S	DRGNS	5	2	0	0000?	ZDELLNER, J	CONBK	2	4	2	1153
WIENCEK, T	ROOKS	0	2	0	1252*						

? - UNRATED
 # - 5 TO 9 RATED GAMES
 * - 10 TO 24 RATED GAMES

C - CENTURY CLUB MEMBER
 D - DOUBLE CENTURION