


The Chicago Chess Player
The Official Bulletin of the Chicago Industrial Chess League



Inside

- The finishing touch
 - Games
 - Tactics and Technique
 - Speed chess ratings - Tony Jasaitis
 - Top 25 speed chess ratings
 - Team standings by division
 - Match results
 - Top 10, CICL MVP lists
- Ratings list

CICL OFFICERS

President: Satish Kale (skale@casecorp.com (E-Mail))
CASE Corp
7 South 600 County Line Rd.
Burr Ridge, IL 60521
W:(630) 887-2372 H:(630) 325-KALE

Secretary Tony Jasaitis (CRT) (tony@trdlnk.com (E-mail))
P.O. Box 664
Bedford Park, IL 60499-0664
H:(708) 448-4967

Treasurer Wesley K. Underwood (Wheaton)
(wu@david.wheaton.edu (E-mail))
207 S. Dorchester Ave.
Wheaton, IL 60187
W:(708) 752-5127 H:(708) 462-0393

Ratings Chairman Charles Ward (Lucent Tech Dragons)
(c.e.w.ward@att.com (E-mail))
615 S. Lincoln
Hinsdale, IL 60521
W:(708) 979-4599 H:(708) 325-3885
Fax: (708) 979-6124

Publicity Director Carl Reid (CASE)
2289 Grand Drive
Northbrook, IL 60062-6937

Trophy Chairman Wayne Ellice (Pawns)
(wayne.ellice@crous.sprint.com (E-mail))
Crosfield Catalysts
4099 West 71st Street
Chicago, IL 60629
W:(312) 838-3215 Fax:(312) 838-3243

Banquet Chairman Len Spiegel (Fermi)
(lenny@fnal.gov (E-mail))
Fermilab MS 219
P.O.Box 500
Batavia, IL 60510
W:(708) 840-2809 H:(708) 377-2675

Bulletin Editor Ruben Reyes (Sears)
(RRgb@aol.com (E-mail))
2019 W. Leland Ave.
Chicago, IL 60625-1513
W:(847) 286-0758
H:(773) 334-0591
Fax:(773) 769-0311

Far West Division Chairman Irwin Gaines (Fermi)
(gaines@fnal.gov (E-Mail))
Fermilab MS 127
P.O.Box 500
Batavia, IL 60510
W:(708) 840-4022
H:(708) 420-1452
Fax:(708) 840-2783

North Division Chairman Pat Sajbel (UOP)
(Posajbel@uop.com (E-Mail))
616 S. Edward
Mt. Prospect, IL 60056
W:(847)391-2134
H:(847)506-9302

Near West Division Chairman Howard Klinefelter (Case)
(hklinefelter@casecorp.com)
1125 Manchester Court
Naperville, IL 60563-2110
H:(630) 961-0482

East Division Chairman Dan Fraats (Bank of America)
592- West 55th Street
Chicago, IL 60638
W:(312) 247-4343
H:(312) 581-0923

Reader's Forum


Ruben,

December 1996 CICL Bulletin (Chicago Chess Player) presents analysis of Blazie-Baurac game on page 11.


The analysis note after Black's 23 move (**diagram right**) reads: "**23....Qb2 24.Rh5 Bd4 25.Rd1 threatening 26.Nxd4.**"

This overlooks **25...Bxf2+** (diagram right) and mate next move.

Enjoy your presentation of interesting games and positions. Keep up the good work. — Steve Decman



Blazie-Baurac after 23.Rh4



Analysis - after 25...Bxf2+!

Editor:

The following situation occurred recently at a Far West division match:

- White makes his 45th move (45/90, remember).
- Black makes his 45th move, hits his clock thereby starting white's clock.
- White notes that black's flag is down and claims a win on time forfeiture.
- Black disputes the clai, the two team captains instruct them to continue the game concluding that, since the requisite number of moves had been played before white noted that black's flag had fallen, the first time control had been achieved by both players.

Question: Did black lose or did both players make the time control?

Section 9F of the 4th edition of USCF rules states:

"There should never be a dispute about whether the final move of a time control or a flag fall occurred first, because a player's task is to punch the clock in time to prevent the flag fall. If the flag is down, the player has not accomplished this task, and the director must rule that the move was not completed in time."

This situation provided a real-time reminder that time must still exist on a player's clock when he or she reaches a particular time control. Only then can one breathe that familiar sigh of relief!

Chuck Dobrovolny
Lucent Royals

(I received Steve Decman's E-mail and Chuck Dobrovolny's letter in December of 1996. By the time this issue's out in February 1997, I'd have been long gone to the 7,000 islands in the Pacific and won't be back till March, 1997.


I'll be able to read any mail sent to me about last week of March. Thanks for your support. - ed)

The finishing touch

by Ruben Reyes

The game **Greg Barnard (Unrated,) - Carl Sullivan (1425); CRT-Alumni match** has one flashy finish. One moment **Carl Sullivan** is down a Bishop and the next thing you know he's giving up Rook for Bishop and a few moves later, he's got Greg Barnard's King mated in the middle of the board!

Let's have a look see after: **23. bxa6 Nd3+ 24. Bxd3 cxd3 25. Qxd3.** (diagram below)



25...Bc4?

Black's not looking.


26. Qxc4 Qg6

Avoiding a Queen trade is Black's only chance to make a come back.

27. b4

The King's safety takes precedence over everything else because having two extra queens on the board (if White queens both a-pawn and b-pawn) would mean nothing if White's King gets mated. Correct here is 27.Kg1.

27....Rac8 28. Qf1 Rfe8! (diagram below)



Black's demonstrating superb technique in deploying all of his pieces before he undertakes an attack.


The Rook is a powerful piece second only to the Queen. It'd be sheer waste of firepower to let the Rook stand idle at the square f8 doing nothing.

Black has correctly calculated that pursuing White's K with only R and Q would lead to nowhere (28...Rc2+ etc). Notice now how Black has activated his other Rook to help in the attack.

29. b5

Again White ignores King safety. Correct here is 29.Bc5 or 29.Rf3 so as to be able to bring the King to safety to g1 without losing the B.

29....Rxe3! (diagram below)




A shocker.

30. Kxe3?


Correct is 30. Kg1. White's taking unnecessary risk with the King to gain more material.

30...Qb6+ (diagram below)



This may have been a move White overlooked. This particular check with the Q effectively keeps the White K in the middle of the board and prevents it from getting back to g1.

31. Kf3 Rc3+ 32. Kg4 Qg6 mate (diagram below)




Winning the game seven moves after losing a piece is a flashy finish or what.

A nice demo on how to conduct a King hunt from **Carl Sullivan**.


As in the previous game, fortunes are reversed when it comes to a mating attack.

Diagram below is an oldie from an East Division board 1 match after 22.Nb5 Bc4.




White sees a nice combo based on White's pin of whatever Black has at d6 with

23. Nxd6 Bxd6 24. e5 (diagram below)




24...Qg5 (diagram below)



25. exd6


After 25. f4 Qg4 White won't have time for 26.exd6. That's because he'd lose Q and R to stop a mate coming from 26.exd6 Qe7 27.Rd2 (else there's 27...Qxg2# or 27...Qxh2#) Rxd2 28.Qxd2 Qxd2.

25...Qe3+ 26. Kh1




26...Qe2

A flashier finish is 26...Qf2 27. Rg1 Bf1 (see diagram right). 28.Bxf1 leads to 28...Qxh2# and 29.Rxf1 to 28... Qxg2#. If 28.h4 then 28...Bxg2+ 29. Kh2 Bxf3+ and mate next move (30.Rg2 Qxg2# or 30.Kh1 or Kh3 30...Qh2#)



27. Rg1 Nd3 0-1




Black threatens 28...Nxb4 as well as 28... Nf7#

J. Krueger (1390) of the Lucent Dragons was producing one tactical surprise after another and seemed to have **E. Blackmon** (1790) of the Lucent Royals in big trouble. But the slippery **Blackmon** escapes via a mind-jarring Rook sacrifice.

Let's step in right before things begin to pop after: 12.


Nxe5 Nxe5



13. Bxh7+

Nice surprise.

13...Kxh7 14. Qh5+ Kg8 15. Qxe5 dxc3 16. bxc3 f6



17. d6

Interesting thought 17...fxe5, 18.dxe7


17...Qf7 18. Qg3 b6 19. Ne4 Bb7 20. Rfe1 Bd5 21. h4 Rac8 22. Rad1 e5

(See diagram top of next column)

23. Nxf6+!


Another of Krueger's tactical surprises. This one wins another pawn.

23...Qxf6 24. Rxd5 Rxc3!




Position after 22. Rad1 e5

Blackmon comes up with his own surprise.




25. Qxc3 Qxf2+ 26. Kh2 Qxh4+



27.Qh3 Qxe8 28.d7 goes for the whole bowl of wax.

27.Kg1 Qf2+ 28.Kh2+ Draw



Excellent display of tactical savvy by J. Krueger; nice save by E. Blackmon.


GAMES

This board 4 match between two Lucent teams featured double centurion **Charlie Ward** (1568) of the Dragons playing black against **C.R. Dobrovolny** (1854) of the Royals.

Charlie held ground for a while. But after Dobrovolny won a pawn, Dobrovolny's surgeon-like endgame precision was just too much for Charlie to overcome.


WHITE: C.R.Dobrovolny (1854)
BLACK: Charlie Ward (1568)

1. e4 e5 2. d4 d6 3. dxe5 dxe5 4. Qxd8+ Kxd8 5. Nf3 Bd6 6. Bc4 Ke7 7. Nc3




Black's OK so far.

7...h6 8. Be3 Nf6 9. 0-0-0 Re8



Black wants the K out of harm in the center.

10. h3 Kf8 11. g4 Be6 12. Bxe6 Rxe6



Position after 12...Rxe6


13. g5

The objective of this pawn move becomes clear a few moves later.

13...hxg5 14. Nxg5

Forces away the Rook which guards the B.


14...Re8 15. Nb5



The point of White's 13th move. White wins a pawn by force and there's nothing that Black (who's one tempo behind) can do to prevent it.

For example, if now 15... Rd8, then 16.Bc5 Ke7 17.Bxd6+ cxd6 18.Nc7 wins the exchange. Or 15...Rd8 16. Bc5 Ne8 17. Nxc7! wins (17...Nxc7 18.Bxd6+ Rxd6, else 19.Bxc7, 19.Rxd6 wins the exchange).


15...Nc6 16. Nxd6 cxd6 17. Rxd6 Rad8 18. Rhd1 a6 19. Bc5 Kg8



20. Rxd8


Only now that Black's K is farther away from the center does White conduct whole-scale exchanges of the Rooks.

20...Rxd8 21. Rxd8+ Nxd8 22. Be7



White's not only relentless but he also doesn't miss a thing.

22...Nc6 23. Bxf6 gxf6 24. Nf3 Kg7




With White having a passed pawn in the King's wing and a pawn majority on the other, Black doesn't stand a chance for a draw.

25. c3 Ne7 26. Nh4 Kh6 27. Nf5+!

With the N trade White has assured himself of a K and Pawn ending that's simpler to win because of his distant passed pawn and Queenside majority.


27... Nxg5 28. exf5 Kg5



29. c4 Kh4


Or before proceeding farther, 29....Kxf5 first.

30. Kd2 Kxh3 31. Ke3 Kg4 32. Ke4



Nice. Black's King is fenced out.

32...Kg5 33. b4 Kh6 34. a4 Kg7
35. Kd5 Kf8 36. Kd6 Ke8 37. Kc7
e4 38. Kxb7 Kd7 39. c5 1-0



Neat and efficient endgame surgery performed by C.R. Dobrovolny.

This one's an interesting draw on board 1 between **Tim Williams** of Case and **Jim Warren** of Lucent Technologies (Chargers).


Tim punctuates his play with an energetic N for P sac to create a central pawn roller.

Jim puts up a gallant defense, succeeds and comes up a pawn up.

WHITE: Tim Williams (2154)
BLACK: Jim Warren (2097T)

1. d4 Nf6 2. c4 e6 3. Nc3 Bb4 4.

e3 c5 5. Bd3 0-0 6. Nge2 d5




7. cxd5

Although the diagram above appears to be a combination Rubinstein and Mainline variation of the Nimzo, White's last move seems to indicate transposition to Botvinnik's line.

The purpose of the N at e2 is not to avoid doubled pawns (...Bxc3; Nxc3) but to support from it's ultimate destination at g3 the creation of a central pawn roller via the moves f3 and e4.


7...exd5 8. 0-0 b6 9. a3 Bxc3 10. bxc3 Ba6 11. Bxa6 Nxa6 12. Qd3



12...c4


Releases the tension on the center but fixes the White c-pawn to a color square same as White's B. Also, Black's c-pawn is now forever safe from capture by White's B.

13. Qc2 Re8 14. f3 Nc7 15. Ng3 h5



An ingenious way of discouraging the creation a central pawn roller as 16.e4 is met by 16...h4.

16. Qf2 Qd7 17. Bd2 Nb5 18. Rae1 Nd6 19. Ne2 g6 20. h3 Kg7 21. Nf4 Rh8




White has collected all of his forces on the King's wing and is faced by an opposing force that temporarily excludes the two Rooks (at a8 and h8)

22. Nxd5!?

Energetic play by Tim Williams.

The tactical ramification of this N sacrifice is difficult if not impossible to determine.


22...Nxd5 23. e4 Ne7 24. d5 f6



25. Qd4


Just a thought: 26.Bg5 Raf8 27.e5 fxg5 28.e6+ wins or 27...fxe5 28.Qxe5+

25...Nb5 26. Qxc4 Nxa3 27. Qb3 Nb5 28. c4 Nd6




White has vastly improved his position and now has excellent possibilities for the B.

29. f4 Rhf8 30. Bc3 Kh7 31. e5 fxe5 32. fxe5 Rxf1+ 33. Rxf1 Ndf5 34. g4 hxg4 35. hxg4 Ng7 36. e6 Qd6




37. Be1

The pressures of the clock may be an unseen hand playing in this game.




After 37. Bxg7 Kxg7 38. Rf7+ Kg8 39. Qh3 (diagram right), White has Qh7# coming.

37...Qe5 38. Qh3+ Kg8



39. Bg3

White wins after 39. Bc3 Qd6 (or Qg5) 40. Bxg7 Kxg7 (else 41. Qh8#) 41. Rf7+ Kg8 42. Qh7# (diagram right)




Again, time pressure may have had a hand in the conduct of this closing phase of the game.

At this point, White's got six more moves to make before he can reach the first time control. It's extremely dangerous to be looking for mate if the time left on the clock can be measured in number of "ticks" left.

39...Qe3+ 40. Kg2 Qe4+ 41. Kh2

Rc8 42. Rf7




42...Nxd5

Black gets mated in 2 after 42...Rxc4? 43. Rf8+ Kxf8 44. Qh8#. In 6 after 42...Qxc4? 43. Rxc7+ Kxc7 44. Be5+ Kf8 45. Qh8+ Ng8 46. Qg7+ Ke8 47. Qf7+ Kd8 48. Qd7#.

Now Black gets to hit back as soon as the c-file gets open for his R.


43. cxd5 Rc2+ 44. Rf2 Rxf2+ 45. Bxf2 Qxd5



The first time control has been reached.

Black has weathered the attack and is in the process of now eliminating the last of White's passed pawns.

46. Qa3 Qxe6 47. Qxa7 Qxg4 48. Qxb6 Nf5 49. Qb3+ Kg7 50. Qc3+ Draw




Quite an interesting contest between two Titans of the Far West Division.

E. Roytburg of Case and **J. Keisler** of Argonne (Rooks) engaged in a tactical battle of moves, counter moves. The one making the last mistake ended up losing the game.

WHITE: E. Roytburg (1982)
BLACK: J. Keisler (2019)

Modern Defense


1. e4 g6 2. d4 Bg7 3. Nf3 d6 4. Bc4 c6 5. Nc3 Nf6 6. Be3 b5 7. Bd3 b4 8. Ne2 a5 9. O-O Nbd7 10. c4 O-O 11. Qd2 Ng4 12. Bg5 f6



13. h3

Move (White's B is attacked), counter move (attack Black's N).

13...fxg5 14. hxg4 Nf6 15. Nxg5 e5 16. c5 Nxg4 17. f3



17...Bh6


Move, counter move: Black's N is threatened with capture, and likewise to White's N at g5.

18. fxg4 Rxf1+ 19. Rxf1 Bxg5 20. Bc4+

White sees that 20. Qe1 (to prevent 21...Qh4) Be3+ 21. Kh1 Bxd4 would lose a

pawn. The text move vacates the d3 square. White hopes to gain tempo via a check and then get the Q to go to d3 where it'd prevent 21...Be3+


21...d5 21. Qd3



21...exd4

Black foregoes winning the B (21...dxc4) and goes for either mate or the exchange.

22. exd5 Be3+ 23. Rf2 Qf6?



24. Ng3?

Both players fail to see that Black's Q hangs and the only thing that keeps Black's Q alive is Black's B at e3. So 24.Qxe3! wins the B: 24...dxe3 25.Rxf6.

24...Qxf2+ 25. Kh2 Bxg4 1-0

Tom Miller of Sears raked in 60 rating points last season. About 1/4th of these or 18 points came from this nice draw against **I. Melnikov** of Motorola.


Miller held on in the opening and middgame.

WHITE: T. Miller (1809)
BLACK: I. Melnikov (2157)

KING'S INDIAN

1. d4 Nf6 2. Nf3 g6 3. g3 Bg7 4.

Bg2 0-0



A fianchetto defense can be tricky.


5. Nc3

This takes Black out of familiar KID type situations, in other words out of book.

5...d5 6. Bg5 Nbd7 7. Qc1 c5

7...Re8 anticipates the threatened 8.Bh6 with 8...Bh8


8. Bh6 cxd4



9. Nxd4 e5

As Black's dark colored B will be off the board pretty soon, a pawn at e5 blocks the long diagonal a1-h8.

10. Nb3 Nb6 11. Bxg7 Kxg7 12. e4 d4



13. Ne2 Bg4 14. f3


Or 14.Qd2, with the possible continuation of 15. 0-0-0 and an attempt to attack the

base pawn supporting the Black pawn at d4.

14...Be6 15. Nc5 Bc4 16.b3

16.Qd2 keeps White's options open for castling.

16..... Bxe2




Black has obtained a good game. Now the c-file beckons for the Fooks to come in and pressure White's c-pawn.

17. Kxe2 Qe7 18. Nd3 Rac8

Black's swift to focus attention on the c-file.


19. Bh3 Rc3 20. a4 Nbd7 Draw



Final Position Melnikov-Miller

Chess for thought

In the diagram on the right, White wins the f-pawn with 1. Qxe7 Rxe7 2.Rxf7 Rxf7 3. Rxf7. But the pawn may not be enough for a win because of the opposite colored Bishops.



White to play and win

White wins with 1.Qxg7+!Kxg7 2.Rxf7+ Kg6 (2...Qxf7 3.Rxf7+ Kxf7 4.dxe6+ Kxe6 7.Bxa8) 3.dxe6 Qe8 4.Bxa8 Qxa9 5.e7 Qe8 6.R7f6+ K-any 7.Re6 and the e-pawn queens after 8.Rf8

Speed Chess Rating 1996 Banquet

Sorted by name

(* - Did not play in 1996; Old rating)

Name		New Rating	Change	Score	Name		New Rating	Change	Score
ABRAHAM	T	1460	0*	1.5	LITVINAS	A	1730	117	5.0
AUGSBURGER	L	1969	-14	4.0	LOMONT	K	1458	0*	1.0
BENESA	A	2176	0*	3.0	LOSOFF	A	1858	0*	3.0
BERRY	G	2085	0*	3.5	MACKIE	A	2129	202	6.0
BHOJWANI	R	1544	0*	1.0	MELNIKOV	I	2245	0*	5.5
BLACKMON	E	1849	-76	2.5	MELNIKOV	N	1490	0*	4.0
BLAZIE	J	1713	-100	2.5	MICKLICH	F	1421	0*	1.5
BLOEDOW	P	1701	0*	5.0	MILLER	T	1657	0*	6.0
BOLDINGH	E	1849	-104	2.5	MORRIS	R	2374	326	5.5
BUERGER	E	2009	17	4.5	MORTON	B	1337	0*	2.0
BUJALSKI	J	1316	0*	3.0	MOTYCKA	R	1294	126	4.0
BURIAN	D	1809	-64	2.0	McCARTNEY	M	1332	32	3.0
CARTER	O	1383	0*	6.0	NOWAK	W	1063	0*	2.0
CHEVERESAN	S	1344	0*	4.0	OGASAWARA	L	1938	0*	4.0
CIESLEK	D	1769	-116	1.5	OLSEN	A	1214	-46	3.0
CISKO	G	1415	0*	1.0	PADLO	R	1172	-228	1.0
COLE	P	1236	0*	2.0	PAWLUS	D	1066	0*	0.5
COOPER	W	1704	0*	3.0	RADAVICIUS	E	1660	0*	4.0
CREWSE	L	2334	-19	5.0	REICHERT	P	1458	0*	1.0
CUMMUTA	P	1212	-233	1.5	REID	C	1294	124	4.0
CZERNIECKI	A	1934	-242	0.0	REYES	R	2296	0*	4.5
DECMAN	S	1410	-262	1.0	ROJAS	R	1208	0*	2.5
DEZONNO	T	1391	0*	5.0	RZESZUTKO	R	2193	0*	7.0
DIAZ	P	2134	-231	2.5	SAJBEL	P	1913	140	5.0
DOBR	K	1753	0*	1.5	SAMELSON	C	1953	0*	4.0
DOBROVOLNY	C	1913	53	5.0	SAMOYLOV	A	1570	0*	5.0
DUMAR	R	1613	0*	2.0	SANCHEZ	R	1769	0*	5.0
DURKEE	D	1743	0*	1.5	SATTERLEE	D	1412	137	4.0
EGERTON	J	1993	0*	4.5	SATTERLEE	M	974	-226	0.0
ELLICE	W	1593	-120	1.0	SCHWARTZ	M	1270	0*	3.0
EUSTACE	D	1330	0*	2.0	SHEYNIN	S	2325	0*	6.5
FRANEK	M	2049	151	5.0	SIEGEL	R	1595	0*	6.0
FREEMAN	R	1500	0*	3.5	SIWEK	M	2134	9	2.5
GASTON	K	1076	0*	0.0	SMILEY	R	2096	0*	2.0
GAZMEN	B	2256	0*	4.0	SOLANO	E	2137	0*	4.0
GONCHAROFF	N	2073	260	7.0	SPIEGEL	L	1937	0*	2.0
GREEN	D	1873	63	4.5	STAMM	V	1650	37	4.0
GRYPARIS	J	1673	-20	2.0	STAPLES	M	1214	22	3.0
HAMMOND	M	1500	0*	7.0	STEVANOVIC	M	2214	89	3.5
HANSEN	B	1332	40	3.0	SUERTH	F	1650	110	4.0
HARD	R	1490	0*	4.0	SULLIVAN	J	1903	0*	3.5
HASAN	Y	2312	0*	5.5	SURTI	V	1195	0*	1.0
HESS	W	1330	-125	0.0	SZAUKELLIS	W	1264	0*	3.0
HILL	R	1864	0*	5.0	TSEITLIN	E	1780	0*	5.5
HODINA	J	2205	0*	5.0	UNDERWOOD	W	1933	0*	6.0
HUGHES	N	2023	0*	5.0	VALDEZ	C	1595	0*	6.0
INUMERABLE	F	2193	0*	4.0	VAN ZILE	C	1292	-60	2.5
JACKLIN	E	980	0*	0.5	WALLACH	C	2094	62	2.0
JARETT	T	1580	0*	3.0	WARREN	J	2072	0*	2.5
JASAITIS	A	2176	0*	3.0	WEST	R	1190	0*	2.0
JONES	M	1134	-116	2.0	WHITE	H	1650	121	4.0
KALE	S	1673	-200	2.0	WILLIAMS	T	1953	0*	4.0
KARPIERZ	J	1572	312	6.0	WILSON	A	1500	0*	2.0
KLINFELTER	H	1570	0	3.0	YOUNG	A	1992	0*	3.5
LESTER	M	1500	0*	2.0	ZOELLNER	J	1374	114	5.0
LEVINE	D	2365	0*	7.0					

Top 25 Speed Chess Ratings

NAME		NEW RATING	CHANGE	OLD SCORE
MORRIS	R	2374	326	5.5
LEVINE	D	2365	0*	7.0
CREWSE	L	2334	-19	5.0
SHEYNIN	S	2325	0*	6.5
HASAN	Y	2312	0*	5.5
REYES	R	2296	0*	4.5
GAZMEN	B	2256	0*	4.0
MELNIKOV	I	2245	0*	5.5
STEVANOVIC	M	2214	89	3.5
HODINA	J	2205	0*	5.0
INUMERABLE	F	2193	0*	4.0
RZESZUTKO	R	2193	0*	7.0
BENESA	A	2176	0*	3.0
JASAITIS	A	2176	0*	3.0
SOLANO	E	2137	0*	4.0
DIAZ	P	2134	-231	2.5
SIWEK	M	2134	9	2.5
MACKIE	A	2129	202	6.0
SMILEY	R	2096	0*	2.0
WALLACH	C	2094	62	2.0
BERRY	G	2085	0*	3.5
GONCHAROFF	N	2073	260	7.0
WARREN	J	2072	0*	2.5
FRANEK	M	2049	151	5.0


(* - DID NOT PLAY IN 1996; OLD RATING)

Tactics and Technique

Note: Examples shown in this column are taken from actual CIGL games. In most cases, names have been omitted to protect the identities of the players.


Power of the Pin -

This is **R.Brady** (1358) against an unrated after **10.h4** (diagram)




Black's N is pinned by the B at g5. Such a pin should not be tolerated and an attempt should be made immediately to break it such as with 10...h6.

10...e5? 11. Nd5



Black's N is attacked three times and is defended only twice and so must fall. The N is unable to escape because it's pinned against the Queen.

11...Nxd4 12. Bxf6 Qd7 13. h5?



White's Q is under attack.


13...c6?

Black also fails to notice that White's Q hangs.

14. Ne7+ Kh8


Correct is 14...Qxe7 15.Bxe7 Nxf3 16.gxf3.

15. hxg6 fxg6



Now the pin reaches maximum power.


16. Nxf6 mate (diagram below)



Black's mated all because his h-pawn is pinned.

Fork -


This is **J. Karpietz** (1238) vs. a 1419 after **11.Nd5.**



White threatens 12.Nxf6+ winning a pawn.


Now came:

11...Bg4? 12. Nxf6+




The N forks Black's K and B. The game continued:

12...Kh8 13. Nxf4 Rg8 14. Nh6 Rg6 15. Nxf7+ Kg7 16. a3 Rf8 17. N7g5 Nd4 18. Nxd4 Bxd4 19. Ne6+ (diagram)




The N forks Black's K and R.

L. Ogasawara (1836) reached the position on the right against a 1261 after **9. Be3 Qf6**




White achieved a pawn fork as follows:

10. f4 Nd7 11. e5




Note that 10.f4 attacking Black's N gave White a tempo for setting up the fork.

Position below was reached after 8. a3 Be6 in a game between a 1550 (White) and a 1965 (Black).




Black's B is attacking White's c-pawn. In reply, White defended with 9. Nd5 and missed out on a pawn fork using the tempo-gaining technique shown by Ogasawara on page 11 as follows:

9. d4!



White gains a tempo by an attack on the Black B at c5 and can proceed with the pawn fork d5.


9...exd4 10. exd4 Bb6 11. d5



White forks N and B.


The fork, power of the pin, and the technique of using gain of tempo to accelerate a tactical motif (this time a pin instead of a fork) can occur in quick succession such as

in this one between two 2300+ after 11. h3.



Black now finds a resourceful way to get White's f and h-pawn and Rook in exchange for B and N and an attack on White's King.


11...Nxf2! 12. Rxf2 Bxf2+ 13. Kxf2 h6



This is the tactical motif of **Removing the guard** (removing White's N which guards the pawn at h3).

White can't respond with 14. Nxe6 because White would lose his N at d5 with 14...fxe6 which checks White's K while at the same time attacking White's N at d5.


14. Nf3 Bxh3 15. Bxh6?



White's B can't be captured because after 15...gxh6 16. Nf6 White forks Black's K and Q.

Correct, however was 15. Be3. Black now gets a powerful pin with:

15...Bg4




16. Qh1

Without hesitation, White immediately moves the Q away from the pin while keeping an eye on the N at f3.

16...f5

White's in trouble now. Black's last move allows the capture of White's B at h6 because the fork Nf6 isn't possible anymore.


17. Be3 fxe4 18. dxe4



Black's powerful pin on White's N at f3 should now result in material gain. However Black continued with...

18...Nd4

Black wins material with 18...Rxf3+! 19. Bxf3 Rf8 (diagram)



So...never underestimate the power of a pin and a fork.

Proposal to change playoff tiebreaker

Compiled by Tony Jasaitis, CICL Secretary

At the start of last year's playoffs, Tim Williams and Case Corp. objected to the current "sums of the rounds" primary tiebreaker used in the playoffs for prize determination, and proposed that game points be used instead.

After a series of e-mail debates, the proposed tiebreaker was adopted with no objections from the teams involved.

Irwin Gaines has pointed out that this deviation from the rules has no permanent standing, as it was not adopted at a league meeting. As playoff director, I would have used the "sums of the rounds" as the next tie-breaker if it had been needed.

I was at the hub of the debate and have a record of the ideas exchanged at the time. I am publishing these thoughts to hopefully reduce the time necessary for debate of this topic at the next meeting.

As a refresher, the "sums of the rounds" tiebreaker sums the cumulative team score at the end of each round. For example, suppose two teams with 2.5 points each have the following cumulative points at the end of 3 rounds:

	Rd1	Rd2	Rd3	Tiebreaker
Team A	0.5	1.5	2.5	4.5
Team B	1	2	2.5	5.5

The reworded relevant section of our rules under this proposal would read:

E. TROPHIES

Trophies will be awarded to the top three teams of the playoff tournament. The tiebreak method will be game points scored during

the playoffs. Teams still tied will share equally in the honors and trophies, unless there are not enough trophies allotted (eg, if the tie extends beyond third place). Then the tie-break methods of Section II.I will be applied, replacing the words "regular season" with "playoffs".

If it passes, the membership might wish to consider a separate amendment to use "sums of the rounds" as a secondary tiebreaker.

The following are relevant e-mail exchanges from last year:

TIM WILLIAMS:

In regards to the 1st Tier - What is the tie-break system that will be used?

I understand that following match points, the first tie-break is accumulative match points. Is this right?

If so I would like to point out that USCF discourages such a tie-break for team tournaments. In our situation, such a tie-break is extremely unfair to the number three seed (just by coincidence that happens to be my team).

If the pairings "swiss-out" then number 1 and number 3 play in the second round and number 2 and number 4.

Given that the number one seed wins and there is a clear winner in the 2/4 match then first and second places are already out of reach for all teams but these two winners going into the last round!

Withinly three rounds to play this isn't good.

My point is that whoever is unlucky enough to run into Motorola in the second round (versus the third) is screwed.

Consider this - Given their strength, Motorola wins all three rounds. A logical round 2 and 3 for them would be CASE and then Alumni Central.

Just for argument assume that these two teams get their final match scores of 2-1 by the following game scores, respectively, (6-0, 2.5-3.5, 6-0) and (3.5-2.5, 3.5-2.5, 0-6).

This is exaggerated for argument's sake but is it fair to say a team with 7 game points should finish ahead of a team with 14.5 game points (match points equal and looking at their comparative result versus the first place team)?

Based on this, if a team wins the first two rounds they could forfeit the last round and still take home second place.

While I agree with the ideology of the regular season tie-breaks, I strongly think that for a short swiss tournament (team) that following match points, the next tiebreak almost has to be game points.

Maybe there is no history (CICL) to back up my point but a major injustice could be in the making if more thought is not given to the format of the play-offs.

I have a uneasy feeling about giving all the top seeds the same color in the first round (home play yes but alternating colors too) but it's too late to bring that up again.

Personally, I wouldn't mind changing the format of the play-offs to a three round robin of the division winners or some sort of knockout tourney where the top seeds are seeded into the second round. Or ???

IRWIN GAINES:

Here are my thoughts on playoff tiebreakers:

1) I agree that the accumulated match points is a bad tie-breaker, especially for 2nd and 3rd place, and we should have some serious discussion about what to replace it with (in its defense, I would point out that its primary motivation was to break a 1st place tie, and there it is somewhat better, the point being that the team with a higher early score (and hence a better cumulative match point score) faced stronger opposition with a Swiss pairing scheme than a team with a lower early score; ie a team with a match record of 1,1,1/2 really did a lot better than a team with a match record of 1/2,1,1 (this team faced much lesser opposition in last 2 rounds)

2) I feel VERY STRONGLY that no change should be made in the tiebreak rules for this years playoffs.

You should not change the rules in mid-stream (and even if the playoffs haven't started it is mid stream in the season, and everyone knows going in what the rules were), you don't discuss rules changes when most of the parties involved have clear vested interests (ie, everyone knows where they are seeded and who their 1st round opponent is), and there is not adequate time now to discuss these issues...they are non-trivial and need a face to face calm meeting to explore alternatives.

So despite my feeling that there are better systems than what we use now, it is not at all clear what the right system is, and I do not think any change should be made until next year...people should submit specific proposals for discussion at the fall business meeting.

TONY JASAITIS

Can anybody provide a reason why game points are NOT used as a tiebreaker?

As for the current method of "sums of the rounds", I vaguely recall Dan Kumro explaining that it rewards teams with "staying power" (my euphemism for whatever he actually said), on the assumption that they lasted the longest to play the strongest teams.

As Tim points out, in a tournament of just 3 rounds, this is as much a matter of pairing luck as much as anything else.

In addition to what Tim said, the current method is a sham from the viewpoint of the philosophy of the third-place trophy, which was added to encourage teams to keep playing after losing the first round.

A first-round loser (to say, Motorola) is at a tiebreak disadvantage to the second-round loser to Motorola, even though as the top seed of the 2nd half of the pairings, it may well be the stronger team.

[Although I no longer have a copy of the exact message, I later pointed out that the USCF rule book recommends game points over "sums of the rounds" as a tiebreaker for team tournaments.]


ART OLSEN

After giving the matter more thought, Kemper is in favor of tiebreaks for the

AMBUSH

WHITE: E. Sedlock (1791) IBT-A
BLACK: R. Reyes (2264) Sears
4-Man team, East Division
October 27, 1976


1. d4 Nf6 2. c4 c5 3. d5 b5 4. cxb5
a6 5. Nc3 axb5 6. e4



6...b4

Removes White's guard to the e-pawn. At the time this game was played, I had not yet received the new issue of Chess Life. Erv did. So I had no idea that he was lying in ambush with the Zaitsev which was discussed in the then new issue of the CL.

7. Nb5 Nxe4? 8. Qe2



The ambush is complete. Black has fallen into a trap with eyes wide open. If now 8...f5, then 9.f3 wins the N at e4 as the N just can't dare move: 9...Nf3 10.Nd6#.

8...Qb6 9. Qxe4 Ra5 10. Bf4
Rxb5 11. Bxb5 Qxb5

See diagram top of next column. Black has minimized the damage - R for N+P -

playoffs in this order.


1. Match Points
2. Game Points
3. Head to Head competition results

PAT SAJBEL

I agree that the "sum of rounds" tie-break system is unfair and that the CICL should discard it.

Game points seems the fairest way to go at this time.


instead of a whole N.



But White could not be denied his victory and won on move 27.

WHITE: P. Wong (2205) Exemplars
BLACK: R. Reyes (2343) Sears
North Division; March 14, 1995

1. d4 Nf6 2. c4 c5 3. d5 b5 4. cxb5
a6 5. e3 axb5 6. Bxb5 Bb7 7. Nc3
Qa5 8. Bd2 Qb6 9. Qb3 e6 10. e4
Nxe4! 11. Nxe4 Bxd5 12. Qd3
Qb7 13. f3 c4 14. Bxc4 Bxc4 15.
Qxc4 d5 16. Qc2 dxe4 17. fxe4
Nd7 18. Nf3 Bc5



Black has excellent compensation for the pawn.

Actually, however, I came across this line in a game (F. Inumerable-A.Chow) published in the Illinois Chess Association bulletin a few days back and planned to ambush Phil Wong with Albert C. Chow's concoction.

19. Bc3 0-0

Only now am I playing on my own.

20. a3 Rfc8 21. Rf1 Bb4 22. Ng5
h6?

22....Ne5.

23. Nxf7 Nf6?

This second blunder ruins Black's game completely.

But White, however has consumed a lot of time in the opening and is now running short.

24. Nxf6+ gxh6 25. Rxf6 Qg7 26.
e5 Kh8 27. Rd1 Bf8 28. Qd2 Ra4
29. Qf2 Rg4 30. Kf1 Kg8 31. Rd3
Be7 32. Rf4 Rxf4 0-1 (White lost
on time)

**IMPORTANT INFORMATION
PLEASE NOTE**

February 1, 1997

Gentlemen,

Some Area codes and E-Mail addresses have changed. This information has arrived too late for the February / March issue (Ruben completed them both prior to his departure for his overseas trip). Till the situation is corrected in the April bulletin, please make a note of this.

Thank you for your patience.

Satish Kale

PS If your area code / E - Mail address has changed recently and has not been reflected in the bulletin, please contact Charlie Ward immediately.

Thank you.

Changed Area Codes and E-Mail Addresses.

The following people have incorrect area codes given for their phone numbers:

Name -----	Correction -----
Wes Underwood	708 should be 630
Charlie Ward	708 should be 630
Wayne Ellice	312 should be 773
Len Spiegel	708 should be 630
Irwin Gaines	708 should be 630
Dan Fraats	312 should be 773

Also, the following people have incorrect e-mail addresses:

Name -----	Correct e-mail -----
Wes Underwood	wesley.k.underwood@wheaton.edu
Charlie Ward	ceward@lucent.com
Irwin Gaines	gaines@fnal.gov

NEAR WEST DIVISION 01-30-1997

TEAM NAME	W	L	D	GAME MATCH		PCT
				POINTS	POINTS	
CASE	4	1	0	21.5	4.0	0.800
ARGONNE KNIGHTS	4	1	0	19.0	4.0	0.800
LUCENT TECH. CHARGERS	2	3	0	15.5	2.0	0.400
COOK CO. DEPT. OF CORR.	2	3	0	11.5	2.0	0.400
PAWNS	0	5	0	7.0	0.0	0.000

FAR WEST DIVISION 01-30-1997

TEAM NAME	W	L	D	GAME MATCH		PCT
				POINTS	POINTS	
ARGONNE ROOKS	5	1	1	25.5	5.5	0.786
LUCENT TECH. TYROS	4	2	0	22.5	4.0	0.667
LUCENT TECH. ROYALS	4	2	0	21.5	4.0	0.667
FERMILAB	3	3	1	23.5	3.5	0.500
LUCENT TECH. DRAGONS	2	4	0	14.5	2.0	0.333
WHEATON COLLEGE	0	5	0	4.0	0.0	0.000

NORTH DIVISION 01-30-1997

TEAM NAME	W	L	D	GAME MATCH		PCT
				POINTS	POINTS	
MOTOROLA	5	0	0	22.0	5.0	1.000
EXEMPLARS	3	1	1	20.5	3.5	0.700
UOP PROCESS DIV.	3	1	1	19.5	3.5	0.700
SEARS	2	3	0	11.5	2.0	0.400
NORTHROP-GRUMMAN	1	4	0	13.5	1.0	0.200
KEMPER INSURANCE	0	5	0	3.0	0.0	0.000

EAST DIVISION 01-30-1997

TEAM NAME	W	L	D	GAME MATCH		PCT
				POINTS	POINTS	
ALUMNI ACES	7	0	0	31.5	7.0	1.000
NATIONSBANK-CRT	4	2	0	23.0	4.0	0.667
COLUMBIA COLLEGE	3	3	0	16.5	3.0	0.500
AMOCO CORP.	2	1	0	9.0	2.0	0.667
POSTAL SERVICE	1	4	0	9.0	1.0	0.200
BANK AMERICA ILLINOIS	0	4	0	8.0	0.0	0.000
CTA	0	3	0	4.0	0.0	0.000

The following motion has been proposed by Wayne Ellice, The Team Captain of PAWNS and our Trophy Chairman, to be voted on in the Spring Business meeting. Please review it and be prepared to voice your opinion.

Thank you.

Motion to change the CICL Constitution for Merged Teams as follows:

I. B. 5. MERGED TEAMS

Motion A:

A MERGED team will be one comprised of 2 or more separate companies that once had a CICL team but individually can no longer support a team. MERGED teams should inform the CICL prior to the start of each season and state the name of their team, the names of the merged companies, the name of the team captain and alternate, and the location(s) where home matches will be played.

Motion B:

A MERGED team could be comprised of 2 or more separate companies as above but has one or more companies that never had a CICL team. Non CICL companies must first demonstrate that they were unsuccessful in forming their own team. Such merged teams need approval at a regularly scheduled business meeting and meet the other requirements of a merged team.

Motion by Wayne Ellice (PAWNS) intended for discussion at the Spring Business Meeting

07-JAN-97 UOP PROCESS DIV. 3.5 NORTHROP-GRUMMAN 2.5
 ROUND 5

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 STEVANOVIC, M	2321-27	0	CURTIS, M	1962 40 1
2 BUERGER, E	2095 3	1	CAIRONE, B	1719 -5 0
3 BOLDINGH, E	2040-43	0	VIGANTS, A	1545 43 1
4 PLETT, M	1829 0	.5	WALKER, A	0 0 .5
5 MICKLICH, F	1617 7	1	BABINEC, J	1406-10 0
6 VAN ZILE, C	1347 8	1	ELEK, G	1088 -8 0

09-JAN-97 BANK AMERICA ILLINOIS 2 POSTAL SERVICE 4
 ROUND 5

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 KOGAN, G	1886 -4	0	INUMERABLE, F	2293 4 1
2 FRAATS, D	1869 0	1F	MARCOWKA, R	1934 0 0F
3 PARAOAN, E	1805-11	0	ALLEN, H	1911 16 1
4 SOMBONG, M	1643 0	1F	COOPER, W	1637 0 0F
5 ZOELLNER, J	1381-16	0	CARTER, L	1486 16 1
6 WHITE, T	1332-14	0	TURNER, K	1464 14 1

13-JAN-97 ARGONNE KNIGHTS 4 ARGONNE ROOKS 2
 ROUND 6

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 BENEDEK, R	2105 16	1	BERRY, G	2128-16 0
2 KEISLER, J	2039 0	1	ANSELL, S	0 0 0
3 MAKAI, M	0 0	0	GREEN, D	1872 0 1
4 HILL, R	1872 26	1	KABELAC, J	1919-26 0
5 GOLCHERT, B	1854-35	0	DECMAN, S	1645 23 1
6 SUAREZ, E	1665 21	1	BAURAC, D	1642-14 0
7 YACOUT, A	0 0	1F	WALSH, W	1500 0 0F
8 ELLIOTT, M	1318 0	0	GARCIA, J	0 0 1

14-JAN-97 SEARS .5 EXEMPLARS 5.5
 ROUND 5

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 LATIMER, E	2026 -9	0	GAZMEN, E	2171 14 1
2 DORFF, M	1623 -5	0	FRISKE, T	2002 5 1
3 HALL, L	0 0	0	SOLLANO, E	1956 0 1
4 CUMBERLAND, N	0 0	.5	WEITZ, R	1699 0 .5
5 KIUSALS, D	1078 -1	0	BURIAN, D	1671 1 1
6 POLONCSIK, D	0 0	0	SUERTH, F	1623 0 1

16-JAN-97 PAWNS 2.5 LUCENT TECH. TYROS 3.5
 ROUND 6

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 ELLICE, W	1920 31	1	DIAZ, P	2065-31 0
2 HANSEN, B	1353 -2	0	STOLTZ, B	1934 2 1
3 MIKULECKY, B	1372 20	.5	BLAZIE, J	1861-13 .5
4 HARD, R	1200 -7	0	SMITH, BR	1509 7 1
5 FERGUSON, K	0 0	0	KARPIERZ, J	1238 0 1
6 SKRZYPCZAK, T	0 0	1	SCHWARTZ, M	1073 0 0
7 KREMER, T	0 0	1	LOGAN, H	1269 0 0 (PAWNS)
8 LOGAN, H	1269 0	1	UHLEMAN, T	0 0 0 (PAWNS)

16-JAN-97 WHEATON COLLEGE 1 LUCENT TECH. DRAGONS 5
ROUND 5

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 BOSTICK, T	1476 -1	0	TEGEL, F	2163 1 1
2 BROLLIER, B	1258 0	0	CHIRCHIKOV, S	0 0 1
3 TAN, M	1196 -5	0	WARD, C	1559 3 1
4 LAKE, T	0 0	0	HICKS, C	1539 0 1
5 HELLER, T	0 0	1	KELLY, S	1258 0 0
6 NEWCOMER, K	0 0	0	LICARI, T	0 0 1

21-JAN-97 CASE 4.5 LUCENT TECH. ROYALS 1.5
ROUND 6

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 WILLIAMS, T	2150 11	1	GUIO, J	1956-11 0
2 KALE, S	1881 8	.5	PEHAS, A	1999 -8 .5
3 ROYTBURG, E	1962 17	1	DOBROVOLNY, C	1871-17 0
4 WHITE, H	1649 11	.5	OGASAWARA, L	1828 -7 .5
5 SATTERLEE, D	1631 5	.5	BLACKMON, E	1748 -8 .5
6 KLINEFELTER, H	1536 17	1	HAHNE, D	1590-26 0
7 GERONA, R	1503-27	0	REID, C	1429 27 1 (CASE)
8 KANAS, W	1333 -7	.5	MOTYCKA, R	1165 11 .5 (CASE)

22-JAN-97 COOK CO. DEPT. OF CORR. 2 LUCENT TECH. DRAGONS 4
ROUND 6

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 HALL, A	1467 -1	0	TEGEL, F	2164 1 1
2 JACKSON, S	1258 0	0	CHIRCHIKOV, S	0 0 1
3 ROJO, V	1359 38	1	EUSTACE, D	1658-38 0
4 GATSON, T	0 0	0	WARD, C	1562 0 1
5 SANDEFUR, B	0 0	0	KELLY, S	1258 0 1
6 APPLEBERRY, T	1264 0	1	LICARI, T	0 0 0
7 HAZELWOOD, R	0 0	0	MYART, V	0 0 1 (CCDOC)

22-JAN-97 LUCENT TECH. CHARGERS 1.5 FERMILAB 4.5
ROUND 6

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 WARREN, J	2094 0	.5	SPIEGEL, L	2087 0 .5
2 ROSLEY, D	1728-13	0	MOTTA, H	1884 13 1
3 STAMM, V	1647 -2	0	DORIGO, T	2080 3 1
4 RADAVICIUS, E	1610 16	1	HARRIS, R	1635-24 0
5 DOBR, K	1488 -6	0	KELLOGG, K	1644 9 1
6 THOMAS, J	1505-16	0	PARA, A	1487 24 1

23-JAN-97 KEMPER INSURANCE 0 MOTOROLA 6
ROUND 5

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 SIWEK, M	2127-17	0	WALLACH, C	2078 26 1
2 LEONG, G	2007-12	0	MORRIS, R	2074 18 1
3 OLSEN, A	1533 -3	0	SAMELSON, C	2002 2 1
4 MCKINNEY, T	1282 -1	0	CIESLEK, D	1897 1 1
5 PAYTON, P	1235 -1	0	HORTON, D	1831 1 1
6 AMUNDSEN, C	0 0	0	AUGSBURGER, L	1796 0 1
7	0 0	0F	FULLMER, G	0 0 1F
(MTRLA) 8 GRYPARIS, J	1458 -8	0	GONCHAROFF, N	1733 3 1

29-JAN-97 ALUMNI ACES
ROUND 9

3.5 POSTAL SERVICE

2.5

BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 CZERNIECKI, A	2046 24	1	INUMERABLE, F	2297-36	0
2 GOLLA, R	1949-16	0	MARCOWKA, R	1934 16	1
3 FRANEK, M	1804-10	0	ALLEN, H	1927 15	1
4 FRANK, M	1748-14	.5	CARTER, L	1502 14	.5
5 FABIJONAS, R	1741 0	1F	TURNER, K	1478 0	0F
6 LITVINAS, A	1740 0	1F	DAVIS, R	0 0	0F

29-JAN-96 ARGONNE ROOKS
ROUND 7

3 FERMILAB

3

BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 BERRY, G	2112-16	0	SPIEGEL, L	2087 16	1
2 ANSELL, S	0 0	0	MOTTA, H	1897 0	1
3 GREEN, D	1872 -7	0	DORIGO, T	2083 10	1
4 KABELAC, J	1893 16	1	GAINES, I	1785-10	0
5 BAURAC, D	1628 16	1	KELLOGG, K	1653-16	0
6 GARCIA, J	0 0	1F		0 0	0F
7 GARCIA, J	0 0	0	WALSH, W	1500 0	1 (ROOKS)

NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING	NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING
ABRAHAM, T	CTA	0	0	0	1590	CHRISTIAN, R	DRGNS	0	0	0	1811C
ALFONSO, E	NORTH	0	0	0	1583#	CICUCCI, S	KEMPR	0	0	0	0000?
ALLEN, H	PSTOF	3	0	0	1942	CIESLEK, D	MTRLA	3	0	1	1898
AMUNDSEN, C	KEMPR	0	3	0	0000?	CISKO, G	FERMI	0	0	0	1608
ANDERSON, CJ	ROYLS	1	0	0	1490	COLBERT, W	PAWNS	0	0	0	0000?
ANDRYSIAK, B	KEMPR	0	0	0	0000?	CONDON, J	MDCON	0	0	0	2039
ANSELL, S	ROOKS	3	3	0	1819#	CONNOR, P	MDCON	0	0	0	2086
APPLEBERRY, T	CCDOC	2	2	0	1264#	COOPER, W	PSTOF	0	0	0	1637C
ASSADIAN, K	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?	CORBIN, Z	AMCRP	1	1	0	1286*
ATKINSON, J	AMCRP	2	0	1	1835C	COSTELLO, W	NORTH	0	0	0	0000?
AUGSBURGER, L	MTRLA	4	0	0	1796	COTE, J	MERC	0	0	0	1323
AVERY, G	CCDOC	0	0	0	0000?	CUMBERLAND, N	SEARS	0	1	1	0000?
AZCUNA, L	WHEAT	0	1	0	1233	CUMMUTA, P	KEMPR	1	1	0	1449C
BABINEC, J	NORTH	1	3	0	1396*	CURRAN, T	CASE	0	0	0	1698
BALASE, E	SEARS	1	2	0	1360*	CURTIS, M	NORTH	4	1	0	2002
BALICKI, J	MTRLA	2	1	0	0000?	CZERNIECKI, A	ALUMN	2	3	0	2070D
BARGERSTOCK, D	CRT	1	1	1	1736	CZOSKE, M	ROYLS	0	0	0	0000?
BARNARD, G	CRT	1	2	0	0000?	DALTON, M	CTA	0	0	0	0000?
BARNES, D	CTA	0	0	0	0000?	DAVIDSON, M	ALUMN	2	0	0	1612
BAURAC, D	ROOKS	4	1	1	1644C	DAVIS, R	PSTOF	0	0	0	0000?
BENEDEK, R	KNGHT	2	3	0	2121D	DECMAN, S	ROOKS	1	2	1	1668D
BERRY, G	ROOKS	2	3	1	2096T	DELEON, J	CRT	3	1	2	1622*
BEZZUBOV, V	FERMI	1	0	0	2350*	DENISENKO, K	SEARS	0	0	0	0000?
BLACKMON, E	ROYLS	2	1	2	1740C	DIAZ, L	CASE	0	0	0	0000?
BLAZIE, J	TYROS	1	1	2	1848C	DIAZ, P	TYROS	2	2	2	2034
BLUE, J	CCDOC	0	0	0	0000?	DOBR, K	CHRGR	3	2	0	1482T
BOLDINGH, E	UOP	2	3	0	1997	DOBROVOLNY, C	ROYLS	3	1	2	1854
BOSTICK, T	WHEAT	1	3	0	1475*	DORFF, M	SEARS	3	2	0	1618
BOSWELL, H	CCDOC	1	1	0	0000?	DORIGO, T	FERMI	2	0	0	2093
BRADY, R	CHRGR	3	0	0	1399	DUCKSWORTH, R	PAWNS	0	0	0	0000?
BRANCH, Y	COLUM	0	2	0	1276*	DURKEE, D	DRGNS	0	0	0	1767C
BRIONES, M	UOP	0	0	0	1624C	DZURICKO, G	PAWNS	0	0	0	1114*
BROLLIER, B	WHEAT	1	3	0	1258#	EDWARDS, S	EXMPL	2	0	0	1296
BRONFELD, A	EXMPL	0	0	0	1827	EGERTON, J	MDCON	0	0	0	1995
BROTSOS, J	EXMPL	1	0	0	1563D	ELEK, G	NORTH	1	2	0	1080
BROZOVICH, J	TYROS	3	1	1	1716D	ELLICE, W	PAWNS	3	1	1	1951
BUCHNER, R	ROYLS	0	2	2	2089	ELLIOTT, M	KNGHT	0	3	0	1318?
BUERGER, E	UOP	2	2	0	2098D	ENKE, E	WHEAT	0	4	0	1385*
BURBA, K	KNGHT	0	0	0	1402C	EUSTACE, D	DRGNS	1	2	0	1620
BURIAN, D	EXMPL	2	1	0	1672C	FABIJONAS, R	ALUMN	2	1	0	1741D
BYRNES, R	CTA	2	0	1	2217*	FERGUSON, K	PAWNS	0	3	0	0000?
CAIRONE, B	NORTH	1	2	1	1714	FLEET, R	MDCON	0	0	0	1140#
CARNAL, D	CRT	0	0	0	1207#	FLOREY, J	SEARS	0	1	0	1432#
CARTER, D	CASE	0	1	0	1042	FRAATS, D	BKAMI	0	1	1	1869
CARTER, L	PSTOF	1	2	1	1516	FRANEK, M	ALUMN	4	1	1	1794C
CARTER, O	CTA	0	0	0	0000?	FRANK, M	ALUMN	2	0	1	1734
CARVALHO, W	FERMI	0	0	0	1895	FRIESEMA, W	CRT	0	0	0	2109
CHAMORRO, A	CCDOC	0	0	0	0000?	FRISKE, T	EXMPL	5	0	0	2007
CHIRCHIKOV, S	DRGNS	2	3	1	1740#	FROMM, J	FERMI	0	1	0	1540
CHOUDRY, A	KEMPR	0	1	0	1309#	FULLMER, G	MTRLA	1	0	0	0000?

? - UNRATED

- 5 TO 9 RATED GAMES

* - 10 TO 24 RATED GAMES

C - CENTURY CLUB MEMBER

D - DOUBLE CENTURION

T - TRIPLE CENTURION

Q - QUAD CENTURION

NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING	NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING
GAINES, I	FERMI	1	3	1	1775C	JOHNSON, D	CTA	0	2	0	0000?
GALKO, D	KEMPR	0	0	0	0000?	JOHNSON, W	CCDOC	1	1	0	1181#
GALLAGHER, H	KNGHT	0	0	0	1317	JONES, M	CTA	0	1	1	1473*
GANSER, A	BKAMI	0	1	0	1219*	JONES, MIGUEL	CCDOC	0	0	0	0000?
GARCIA, J	ROOKS	1	1	1	0000?	JOSEPHSON, D	WHEAT	3	1	0	1767*
GARWOOD, B	COLUM	0	1	0	1956	KABELAC, J	ROOKS	4	1	0	1909
GATSON, T	CCDOC	0	1	1	0000?	KALE, S	CASE	3	1	1	1889
GAZMEN, E	EXMPL	2	2	0	2185	KANAS, W	CASE	1	1	1	1326C
GERONA, R	CASE	1	2	1	1476	KARPIERZ, J	TYROS	3	1	0	1238*
GOLCHERT, B	KNGHT	1	1	1	1819	KEISLER, J	KNGHT	2	0	0	2039
GOLLA, R	ALUMN	2	2	2	1933D	KELLOGG, K	FERMI	1	2	1	1637C
GOLUMBOVSKI, P	NORTH	1	0	0	2129	KELLY, S	DRGNS	1	1	0	1258
GOMEZ, G	FERMI	2	1	0	1542	KERCSMAR, J	WHEAT	0	3	0	0000?
GONCHAROFF, N	MTRLA	2	1	2	1736Q	KINSELLA, G	KNGHT	0	1	0	1466C
GREEN, D	ROOKS	5	1	1	1865C	KIUSALS, D	SEARS	0	3	0	1077
GRYPARIS, J	MTRLA	0	2	2	1450	KLAUDER, C	WHEAT	0	0	0	0000?
GUIO, J	ROYLS	1	3	1	1945	KLINEFELTER, H	CASE	1	1	1	1553C
HAHNE, D	ROYLS	3	2	0	1564	KOGAN, G	BKAMI	0	3	0	1882
HALL, A	CCDOC	1	4	0	1466*	KOSTECKA, K	COLUM	1	2	2	1550
HALL, D	MDCON	0	0	0	0000?	KOZLOVSKY, M	FERMI	0	0	0	2106
HALL, L	SEARS	2	2	0	0000?	KREMER, T	PAWNS	1	0	0	0000?
HALLMAN, W	CASE	0	0	0	1219*	KRUEGER, J	DRGNS	0	1	1	1384*
HAMMOND, M	BKAMI	1	2	0	1431	KRULL, E	AMCRP	0	0	0	1510
HANSEN, B	PAWNS	1	2	0	1351*	LAKE, T	WHEAT	0	3	0	0000?
HARD, R	PAWNS	0	4	0	1193*	LAMBIRIS, J	KEMPR	1	1	0	1452
HARDIN, L	KEMPR	0	0	0	0000?	LANG, P	KEMPR	0	2	0	0000?
HARRIS, R	FERMI	3	2	1	1611	LARSON, T	CCDOC	0	0	0	0000?
HARRUFF, E	WHEAT	0	0	0	0000?	LASKY, N	PAWNS	0	0	0	1352C
HASAN, Y	MTRLA	2	2	0	2197	LATIMER, E	SEARS	1	3	1	2017D
HAZELWOOD, R	CCDOC	0	1	0	0000?	LAWRENCE, P	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?
HELLER, T	WHEAT	1	3	0	1163*	LEONG, D	ALUMN	0	0	0	1997
HESS, B	EXMPL	0	0	0	1451	LEONG, G	KEMPR	0	1	0	1995C
HICKS, C	DRGNS	1	4	0	1539	LESTER, M	MTRLA	0	0	0	1569
HILL, C	FERMI	0	0	0	1643	LEVINE, D	ROOKS	0	0	0	2357
HILL, R	KNGHT	3	1	0	1898	LEWIS, N	WHEAT	1	0	0	0000?
HILTON, J	MERC	0	0	0	1146	LICARI, T	DRGNS	1	3	0	0000?
HODINA, J	AMCRP	1	0	1	2149	LIKHTEREV, M	UOP	0	0	0	1447*
HOLMES, M	AMCRP	1	2	0	0000?	LITVINAS, A	ALUMN	4	0	1	1740C
HORTON, D	MTRLA	1	1	0	1832	LODEWYCK, D	MERC	0	0	0	1414
HOWARD, W	PSTOF	0	0	0	1566	LOGAN, H	PAWNS	2	2	0	1269*
HUEBNER, R	ROOKS	0	0	0	0000?	LORENZ, B	PAWNS	0	1	0	1479*
HUGHES, N	KEMPR	0	0	0	1837C	LOSOFF, A	CRT	3	1	1	1904
INUMERABLE, F	PSTOF	2	1	0	2261	LUDWIG, T	DRGNS	0	0	0	2098C
JACKLIN, E	CASE	0	0	0	1241	LUEDERS, J	CRT	0	0	0	0000?
JACKSON, S	CCDOC	3	2	0	1258*	MACBEAN, J	PAWNS	0	0	0	0000?
JAGGARD, A	WHEAT	1	1	0	0000?	MACKIE, A	MTRLA	2	0	0	1968
JAKSTAS, K	NORTH	0	0	0	2175C	MAKAI, M	KNGHT	3	1	1	1737#
JARRETT, T	CTA	0	1	0	1633*	MALEN, M	AMCRP	0	1	0	0000?
JASAITIS, A	CRT	3	1	1	2170C	MARCOWKA, R	PSTOF	1	2	0	1950C
JASUNAS, J	ROOKS	0	0	0	1420	MATTAR, I	CCDOC	0	0	0	0000?

? - UNRATED

- 5 TO 9 RATED GAMES

* - 10 TO 24 RATED GAMES

C - CENTURY CLUB MEMBER

D - DOUBLE CENTURION

T - TRIPLE CENTURION

Q - QUAD CENTURION

NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING	NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING
MATTHEWS, J	CTA	0	0	0	1786	ROSENBERG, B	MDCON	0	0	0	1456*
MAYNARD, J	WHEAT	0	0	1	1369	ROSLEY, D	CHRGR	1	1	0	1715
MCALISTER, K	COLUM	3	1	2	1951	ROYTBURG, E	CASE	3	1	0	1979*
MCCARTNEY, M	CTA	0	1	0	0000?	RUBIN, A	CRT	0	0	0	0000?
MCKAY, P	PAWNS	0	0	0	1393#	RZESZUTKO, R	ALUMN	0	0	0	1848C
MCKEEL, B	CTA	1	2	0	0000?	SAHLI, E	UOP	0	0	1	1708
MCKINNEY, T	KEMPR	0	3	0	1281*	SAJBEL, P	UOP	2	0	1	1788
MELNIKOV, I	MTRLA	1	2	0	2081	SAMELSON, C	MTRLA	3	0	0	2004C
MICKLICH, F	UOP	3	2	0	1624C	SANDEFUR, B	CCDOC	2	3	0	1320#
MIKULECKY, B	PAWNS	0	1	2	1392C	SANTIAGO, T	COLUM	1	3	1	2008
MILLER, TT	SEARS	0	1	0	1823	SATTERLEE, D	CASE	2	0	2	1636C
MORRIS, R	MTRLA	4	0	1	2092	SAUNDERS, N	MDCON	0	0	0	0000?
MORRISON, J	KNGHT	1	1	0	1737	SAWDO, E	CASE	0	0	0	1412
MOTTA, H	FERMI	3	3	1	1897	SCHWAB, W	ROOKS	0	1	0	1419
MOTYCKA, R	CASE	1	1	1	1176C	SCHWARTZ, M	TYROS	0	2	0	1073
MYART, V	CCDOC	1	1	0	0000?	SEMONES, E	KNGHT	1	2	0	1136#
NEWCOMER, K	WHEAT	0	3	1	0000?	SHAFF, R	TYROS	0	1	0	1531C
NIXON, L	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?	SHATSKY, V	CRT	3	2	1	1499*
NOBLE, S	JCASE	0	0	0	1286#	SHENOUDA, R	TYROS	0	0	1	0000?
NOTERMANN, T	PAWNS	0	0	0	1178	SHEYNIN, S	ROOKS	0	0	0	2051
NOTTOLI, R	AMCRP	0	0	2	1320#	SHOUSE, B	MTRLA	0	1	0	0000?
O'DELL, DW	PAWNS	0	4	0	1531C	SIEGEL, R	BKAMI	1	0	0	1469C
OGASAWARA, L	ROYLS	1	0	2	1821C	SIMS, B	CRT	1	0	0	1519#
OLSEN, A	KEMPR	0	5	0	1530	SIPP, R	CCDOC	0	0	0	0000?
OLSON, C	CASE	0	0	0	0000?	SITAR, K	CRT	3	1	0	1573#
PADLO, R	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?	SIWEK, M	KEMPR	0	3	0	2110C
PARA, A	FERMI	2	0	0	1511	SKRZYPCZAK, T	PAWNS	1	3	0	1116#
PARAOAN, E	BKAMI	1	3	0	1794C	SLAGLE, S	MERC	0	0	0	1682
PATTON, D	CHRGR	0	0	0	0000?	SMITH, BR	TYROS	2	0	0	1516
PAYTON, P	KEMPR	1	3	0	1234*	SOLLANO, E	EXMPL	4	0	0	1956
PEHAS, A	ROYLS	4	0	2	1991	SOMBONG, M	BKAMI	1	0	1	1643
PHELPS, C	DRGNS	0	0	0	1248*	SPIEGEL, L	FERMI	3	1	3	2103C
PIAO, T	DRGNS	0	0	0	1705	STAMM, V	CHRGR	0	3	1	1645D
PLETT, M	UOP	1	1	1	1829	STAPLES, C	FERMI	1	1	0	1192#
POLONCSIK, D	SEARS	0	1	0	0000?	STAPLES, M	CTA	0	3	0	1170*
PORTER, D	AMCRP	0	1	0	0000?	STEELE, B	CCDOC	0	2	0	0000?
POZNIAK, J	KEMPR	0	3	0	1455*	STEVANOVIC, M	UOP	4	1	0	2294C
PRATTS, M	COLUM	1	0	1	1781	STEVENS, G	CTA	0	0	0	0000?
RADAVICIUS, E	CHRGR	2	3	0	1626D	STEVENS, J	COLUM	4	1	1	1407
REARDON, J	WHEAT	0	1	0	0000?	STEVENSON, R	PAWNS	0	0	0	1360
REDDY, S	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?	STINSON, M	ROYLS	0	0	0	1937C
REID, C	CASE	2	2	0	1456	STOLTZ, B	TYROS	3	1	0	1936
REYES, E	COLUM	0	1	0	0000?	SUAREZ, E	KNGHT	4	0	0	1686
REYES, R	SEARS	2	0	0	2362D	SUERTH, F	EXMPL	2	1	0	1623C
RINGER, D	SEARS	0	1	0	0000?	SULLIVAN, C	ALUMN	1	1	0	1425
ROBERTS, J	WHEAT	0	0	0	1328#	SULLIVAN, J	EXMPL	1	1	0	1977D
ROJAS, R	CTA	0	0	0	0000?	SZONTAGH, T	CRT	0	0	0	1184#
ROJO, V	CCDOC	1	1	1	1397*	TAMEZ, I	TYROS	4	1	0	2138
ROMENESKO, G	PAWNS	0	0	0	0000?	TAN, M	WHEAT	0	1	0	1191
RONIN, D	KNGHT	0	0	0	1537*	TAYLOR, M	CTA	0	0	0	0000?

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

C - CENTURY CLUB MEMBER
 D - DOUBLE CENTURION
 T - TRIPLE CENTURION
 Q - QUAD CENTURION

NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING	NAME	TEAM	W	L	D	RATING
TEGEL, F	DRGNS	3	1	2	2165T	WALSH, W	ROOKS	2	1	0	1500C
THOMAS, G	TYROS	2	0	0	1518	WARD, C	DRGNS	3	2	1	1562D
THOMAS, J	CHRGR	2	2	1	1489C	WARD, J	CTA	0	0	0	0000?
TOELLNER, T	ROOKS	1	1	0	0000?	WARREN, J	CHRGR	1	0	3	2094T
TRUDY, E	CCDOC	0	0	0	0000?	WEITZ, R	EXMPL	1	1	1	1699C
TURNER, K	PSTOF	1	1	1	1478	WENTLING, C	AMCRP	1	0	2	1620C
UHLEMAN, T	PAWNS	1	1	0	0000?	WHARTON, P	WHEAT	0	1	1	0000?
UNDERWOOD, W	WHEAT	0	2	0	1945C	WHITE, H	CASE	2	0	1	1660
VACCARO, M	COLUM	2	2	0	0000?	WHITE, T	BKAMI	0	2	0	1318#
VALDEZ, C	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?	WILLIAMS, A	CTA	0	2	0	1468#
VAN MEER, J	KEMPR	0	0	0	1958	WILLIAMS, T	CASE	4	0	1	2161
VAN METRE, R	SEARS	0	0	0	1483#	WILSON, A	CTA	0	1	0	1578
VAN ZILE, C	UOP	1	1	0	1355	WILSON, M	SEARS	0	2	1	1248*
VANDECOTTE, M	UOP	0	0	0	0000?	WOLF, D	MTRLA	0	1	0	2302
VAYSBERG, O	CASE	2	0	0	0000?	WONG, P	EXMPL	0	0	0	2210C
VEREZHENSKY, E	AMCRP	0	0	0	0000?	WOOD, L	AMCRP	0	0	0	1488#
VIGANTS, A	NORTH	1	2	1	1588	WRIGHT, E	CCDOC	0	1	0	0000?
VITAVER, L	SEARS	0	0	0	1546#	YACOUT, A	KNGHT	3	1	0	0000?
WALDEN, W	CCDOC	0	0	0	0000?	YOUNG, R	ALUMN	0	0	0	1413
WALKER, A	NORTH	0	2	1	0000?	ZOELLNER, J	BKAMI	0	4	0	1365C
WALLACH, C	MTRLA	3	0	0	2104						

? - UNRATED

- 5 TO 9 RATED GAMES

* - 10 TO 24 RATED GAMES

C - CENTURY CLUB MEMBER

D - DOUBLE CENTURION

T - TRIPLE CENTURION

Q - QUAD CENTURION

01-30-1997

NEAR WEST DIVISION TOP TEN

WILLIAMS, T	CASE	2161
BENEDEK, R	KNGHT	2121D
WARREN, J	CHRGR	2094T
KEISLER, J	KNGHT	2039
ROYTBURG, E	CASE	1979*
ELLICE, W	PAWNS	1951
HILL, R	KNGHT	1898
KALE, S	CASE	1889
GOLCHERT, B	KNGHT	1819
MORRISON, J	KNGHT	1737

FAR WEST DIVISION TOP TEN

LEVINE, D	ROOKS	2357
BEZZUBOV, V	FERMI	2350*
TEGEL, F	DRGNS	2165T
TAMEZ, I	TYROS	2138
KOZLOVSKY, M	FERMI	2106
SPIEGEL, L	FERMI	2103C
LUDWIG, T	DRGNS	2098C
BERRY, G	ROOKS	2096T
DORIGO, T	FERMI	2093
BUCHNER, R	ROYLS	2089

NORTH DIVISION TOP TEN

REYES, R	SEARS	2362D
WOLF, D	MTRLA	2302
STEVANOVIC, M	UOP	2294C
WONG, P	EXMPL	2210C
HASAN, Y	MTRLA	2197
GAZMEN, E	EXMPL	2185
JAKSTAS, K	NORTH	2175C
GOLUMBOVSKI, P	NORTH	2129
SIWEK, M	KEMPR	2110C
WALLACH, C	MTRLA	2104

EAST DIVISION TOP TEN

INUMERABLE, F	PSTOF	2261
BYRNES, R	CTA	2217*
JASAITIS, A	CRT	2170C
HODINA, J	AMCRP	2149
FRIESEMA, W	CRT	2109
CZERNIECKI, A	ALUMN	2070D
SANTIAGO, T	COLUM	2008
LEONG, D	ALUMN	1997
GARWOOD, B	COLUM	1956
MCALISTER, K	COLUM	1951

MOST IMPROVED PLAYERS

JACKSON, S	CCDOC	126
CURTIS, M	NORTH	118
FRISKE, T	EXMPL	73
ELLICE, W	PAWNS	73
STEVENS, J	COLUM	67
ALLEN, H	PSTOF	60
DORFF, M	SEARS	55
ROJO, V	CCDOC	50
BAURAC, D	ROOKS	50
ATKINSON, J	AMCRP	46