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## Editor's Notes:

It's been another wonderful season! l'd like to thank everyone who has helped out with the bulletin this past year, from submissions to photos to spreading the word about tournaments and what CICL players are up to. I'd especially like to thank Tom Friske, Marty Franek, Tony Jasaitis, and Len Weber for their guidance and advice while I learned the ropes!

Special thanks go out to roving reporter Tom Friske, Games Editor, who provides us with detailed analysis of the matches from Round one of the play-offs. He was literally on the scene- at all four matches! Keep an eye out for the second half of his report in the July bulletin!

That's right, I said the July bulletin! For procrastinators and those players looking for a little extra reading over their summer vacations, we'll release another bulletin next month. So you no longer have the excuse you don't have enough time to finish notating that game for submission!

I think all players and officers would like to again thank Tony Jasaitis for his hard work as CICL president for the past five years (and his continuing future support of the CICL!). Please find his own reflections on his experience on page 4.

Best of luck to Lucent Team players Gene McPhail and Chuck Dobrovolny who are playing in the Continental America Amateur Chess Championship this July $4^{\text {th }}$ weekend- we hope to hear about your fantastic results next month!

Best to all,
Patrice Connelly, Bulletin Editor

## Bulletin@ChicagoChessleague.org.

## Dear CICL,

Thanks for the honor, privilege, and trust in having me lead the league for the last five seasons.

The league has seen major changes during that time, especially the reorganization of non-company team types, resulting in Associate Teams and Club teams. A new ratings system has also been a major accomplishment. All of these took a significant effort to develop, and would not have been possible without major contributions of time, thought, effort, and support by many dedicated members. I could acknowledge names, but will not for fear of omitting someone, but most people know who you are.

This position of President would not have been bearable for five seasons without the commitment of such people, and of all the officers in the more routine yet critical tasks that make the season work for all of us, not to mention the officers' thoughtful input when decisions need to be made.

I would also like to compliment the outstanding sportsmanship of the league's members, and the management by the Division Chairmen. During these five years, there have been only a few disputes that reached my office to deal with. This also helps makes the President's life easier.

Irwin Gaines is now our new President; I know that the league will be in excellent hands with him at the helm. My sincere best wishes to him and the league.

Best regards,
Tony Jasaitis


# THE COMPLETE GAMES OF THE 2011 CICL PLAYOFFS 

## The Games Begin

What a let-down this year's Playoffs had to be! Would there be another blood-letting where every team suffered a loss ? Could there possibly be a more dramatic finish than last year's 5 -way tie that formed in the last game of the last match? And then there was that "zen" mood everyone seemed to be in (including the gang of players in the Individual event). Did playing in a Buddist temple really affect us that way? And it's the same teams every year, too... Right?

That is a very superficial assessment. A real comparison of this year's Playoff seeds with last shows that everyone can "wait until next year". Real changes were seen in that time span! Teams reformed, players were added and removed, new teams were invited, and this time we even have some analyzed games to fascinate us! No, this year had plenty of drama of its own !

The stage was set when the seeds were declared:

1. Downer's Grove CC
2. Motorola Knights
3. South Suburban CC Wombats
4. St Charles CC
5. Walgreen Forks
6. South Suburban CC Pawns
7. Tradelink Hedgehogs
8. AMA Rogue Squadron

## New old news and New new news

Same old teams, huh ? A quick comparison with last year's seeds says "No!"; clearly half of the teams were not part of the previous race (just happens to be the bottom half, however). What brought them to the finale?

Once again, of this year's "new" seeds, clearly only one was a true newbie-the Rogue Squadron. The difference for them appears to be the addition of first board Bill Brock, who is obviously under-rated as a mid-1900. At any rate, his presence also allowed the rest of the team to shift down a board and push them up to the East Division's second place.

Major overhauls of the three old "new" teams produced qualifying results. The fifth-seed Walgreen Forks were formed with the best players from last season's two teams; even here barely holding on with a wild-card placing.

Meanwhile, the Pawns similarly beefed-up with strong South Suburban Club players Tim Kras (2100+), Jim Caveney (2100+), and M.Korenman (1900+) adding some muscle to the not-so-lean veterans Ed Latimer (1900+) and Ray Fabijonas (1400+).

Finally, the formerly perennial Hedgehogs were back in full force with returning stars Dave Franklin (2200) and Michael Rauchman (2000+). Add Tony Jasaitis under-rated at 1900+ and the improved $66^{\text {th }}$ board player A.Chavez... well, this looked like a very serious contender (see the 2006 playoff report for proof).

## Top Seeds' shifty moves

But the old teams certainly weren't their old selves, quietly improving their chances with roster adjustments.

For the top seeded Downer's Grove Club, Greg
Bungo appeared and produced an undefeated
season (earning the West Division MVP). This
heavy burden on their imposed ratings-cap was balanced with the near-MIP performance by Caleb Romanowitz, an under-1400 player who gained 166 rating-points during the previous six months !

The Motorola Knights weren't sleeping and added long-time veteran Len Augsburger (1750+) to increase their hopes on the lower half. It would be seen whether being the only team without a ratings cap would be a major advantage. They were at least able to field their three top boards with ratings well over 2000!

Speaking of the ratings cap, the Wombats were plagued by it (see the Round One details, for one example), where rapid improvement of Patrice Connelly (1600+) and Wayne Ellice (1750+) paired with heavy-hitters Steve Tennant (2250+) and Todd Freitag (2000+) pushed Captain Len Weber (2050+) to the sidelines !

The last of this group, the St Charles Club, have such depth that missing Jim Marshall (2300+) for Jeff Wiewel (2100+) didn't appear to radically effect their threats.

## Isn't someone missing?

But what happened to last year's other teams? Clearly, the force just wasn't with them.

The usually-challenging UOP team had trouble getting together all season. Other responsibilities interfered. Even new players couldn't shore up the needs.

There's no apparent reason for the ALU Tyros' absence; an insider's report is required.

Similarly, DRW appears to possibly had some lowerboard stumbles. BCBS didn't come to the top, even with a stellar season from League Most-Improved Player Sonny Mata.

## Proof is in the Playing

This is what makes team chess so exciting ! A new player here, a veteran missing there is enough to affect the balance. Teams desiring a shot at the top only need a boost from one or two new players !

Even when the same-named teams compete, the match-ups tend to change. Who knows the result ?

The only way: Pull up to the table and see what happens!

## FIRST ROUND PAIRINGS

For the first round, the seeds were matched :
South Suburban Pawns play at Motorola Knights Walgreen Forks play at Downer's Grove CC South Suburban Wombats play at Hedgehogs St Charles CC play at AMA Rogue Squadron.

Your favorite roving reporter was back on the job, promising to detail every move! This year, available to attend all of these first-round matches (thanks, in part, to each being scheduled on a separate night!). Lo and behold!; he actually used his notes and wrote up the games ! Unfortunately, he forgot to take pictures at the first Pawns-Knight match, couldn't find his camera for the next, so ended up with only the last two photo-graphically covered.

Each match had a story of it's own. You'll find detailed descriptions of them in the following pages. After a couple paragraphs to set the scene, we list the order the boards finish, and then present each battle analyzed in order of their finish! With an additional running-tally of the match total, you should feel like you're watching live !

## MATCH 1 - Tuesday, May 3, 2011 <br> South Suburban CC Pawns at Motorola Knights

So another Playoff season is upon us; always a personal favorite time! We open this time in Schaumburg, home of the mighty North Division ("cheers") Champion Motorola Knights ("booes").

But seriously, my first attitude was to just go and cheer for my heroes, but, as I settled into the familiar surroundings, began to realize it was a great way to get in Playoff Mode (whatever that is). A bit selfish perhaps, I found myself discussing the next night's Forks match and was stunned with the news that my proposed line-up (one that included a 1900+ rated on board 5) was not going to fit the cap (l'd missed a rule, can you believe it ???).

I couldn't get that "Playoff Mode" thing out of my head... How do you "step up your game" in chess, as one always heard said in other sports ?? Can a chessplayer really suddenly produce a GM-level game, just by trying harder ? Is the key a little more preparation before the game? Or is it better concentration during the game ? I was on the look-out for answers.

As the night progressed, it became obvious there wasn't a better place to observe. The Knights and Pawns have long CICL histories that nearly stretch back to the League's start. Motorola has been around (if not these players) forever and the Pawns were sporting veterans. It was practically an all-star match !

Motorola got a fast start with two games (on boards 3 and 4) in their favor due to opening problems for their opponents. With an additional Pawn mistake on board 5, the win was sealed with a draw on board 6. Each team won one of the top boards, so their results cancelled.

BOARD FINISH ORDER: 6, 3, 4, 5, 1, 2

| BOARD 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Augsburger,Len (1782) - <br> Fabijonas,Ray (1448) | [C66] |

1.e4 e5 2.Nf3 Nc6 3.Bb5 Nf6 4.0-0 d6


## 5.d4

$5 . \mathrm{c3}$ allows a Pawn to recapture on d 4 .
5.Qe2 is most popular with the big boys.

There is also $\underline{5 . h 3}$
5...Bg4 Database says this is inferior (but only 8 high-level games from it).
[5...exd4;
5...Bd7]
6.dxe5 Bxf3 7.Qxf3 dxe5


## 8.Rd1

White might rather stay ahead in development. 8.Bg5 Be7 9.Rd1 (9.Nc3)
8...Bd6 9.c4 Qe7 10.a3 0-0

11.Bxc6 [11.Вe3 Bc5] 11...bxc6 12.b4 c5 13.b5 a6

14.Nc3 Qe6 hitting weak Pawn 15.Bg5

15...Nd7
15...Qxc4 16.Bxf6 gxf6 17.Nd5 Easily brews an attack
16.Nd5 f6 17.Bd2

17...f5 I really enjoyed Black finding a way to stir trouble!
18.Bc3 Nb6 19.Qe2 axb5 20.cxb5 fxe4 21.Qxe4


## 21...Ra4 22.Qc2 Nxd5 23.Rxd5

[23.Qxa4 Nxc3] 23...Raf4 . Black visibly relaxed here.
23...Rfa8 wins the a-Pawn, but allows White to trade an undeveloped Rook

## 24.Rd2 Qh6 25.Re2


25...e4? arrrg 26.Bd2 Qh5 27.Bxf4 Rxf4

28.93
28.Rxe4? Rxe4 29.Qxe4 Qxh2+ 30.Kf1 Qh1+ 31.Ke2 Qxa1
28...Rf3 [28...Rf8] 29.Qxe4 Rf8

30.a4 h6 31.Rae1 Qf7 32.Qe6


Black could resign here.
32...Ra8 33.Qxf7+ Kxf7 34.Ra2 Ra5

35.Kg2 Kf6 36.Kf3 Kf5 37.h3 g5 38.g4+ Kf6


## 39.Re4

39.Rb1 idea b6, should be fairly easy. White eventually follows with Rb5.
39...Bf4 40.Ke2 Be5 41.Kd3 Ke6


## 42.Rae2 1-0

Match tally:
Pawns 0 - Knights 1

| BOARD 3 |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Korenman,K (1989) - <br> Thomson,Jim (2005) | [B22] |

This game is a prime example of the need to be aware of tactics from the beginning of the game; yes, even in a known opening!
1.e4 c5 2.c3 Nf6 3.e5 Nd5 4.d4 cxd4 5.cxd4 d6 6.f4 Qa5+ 7.Qd2 Nc6 8.Nc3 Bf5

9.Bd3? allowing some real trouble because of a possible Knight fork on c2 (which is based on the overloaded Queen)

## 9...Bxd3 10.Qxd3 Ndb4



## 11.Qd1

## 11.Qe4?

A) d5 keeps the position intact


## 12.Qb1

(12. Qe2 Nxd4 gains c2 with tempo against the Queen) 12...Nxd4 and the a1-Rook is trapped
B) $11 \ldots$ Nxd4? sets up the game tactic, but... 12.Qxb7 at least forces Black to defend a bit $\underline{12 \ldots \text { Rd8 13.Kf1 }}$


The White Queen covers the light checking squares a6 and b5 (White also has Nge2 to block checks).

## 11...Nxd4 12.Kf2

A) 12.Qxd4?? Nc2+ wins Queen.
B) 12.Kf1 idea Nge2 may be safer
12...dxe5 13.Nf3


The battle is whether White can coordinate his pieces and get compensation before Black completes his development.

## 13...Rd8

I'd prefer mobilizing the forces with 13...e6 idea Bc5
14.a3 This does nothing to stop a discovery. Maybe he was depending on axb4 after Nxa1, but Black has a zwischenzig with the b-Knight.
14.Bd2 blocks the d-file and gives the Rook an escape at c1. 14...Nd3+15.Kg3 may generate some counterattack, but White's King is a bit exposed.

## 14...Ndc2 15.Qe2



## 15...Nd3+ 16.Kg3 Nxa1 17.fxe5

## 17.Rd1

A) $17 \ldots \mathrm{Nxc} 1$ transposes back to the game with 18.Rxc1 (18.Rxd8+? Qxd8 19. Qe1 Nab3)
B) $17 \ldots \mathrm{exf} 4+18 . \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Qf} 5+$

$19 . g 4 \mathrm{fxg} 3+20 . \mathrm{Kxg} 3 \mathrm{Qg} 6+21 . \mathrm{Kh} 3$ the King has few moves
17...Nxc1 18.Rxc1 Nb3 19.Re1 e6

"finally!" 20.Qc4 Nd2 21.Nxd2 Rxd2 22.Nb5 Rd7 23.b4 Qd8 24.Rc1


Nc7+ looks troublesome, but...
24...Qg5+ 25.Kf3 Qf5+ 26.Ke3

Nothing changes with $\underline{26 . K g 3 ~ Q x e 5+}$ 27.Kf3


## $\underline{27 \ldots \text {...Bd6 }}$

26...Qg5+ 27.Kf3 Qf5+ White must walk his King onto a square where Black can capture and check!
28.Ke3 Qxe5+ 29.Kf2 Bd6


Black will castle, so White has no hopes. 0-1

Match tally:
Pawns 0 - Knights 2

| BOARD 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Balicki,Jeff (1799) - <br> Latimer,Ed (1933) | [B06] |

This is my favorite game of the 1st
Round. Between an early transpostion and equally early sacrificial lines, there was plenty of fireworks (threatened and played!).
1.d4 c5 2.e4 d6 3.Nf3


So they've transposed a "1 d4" opening into a Sicilian Defense ("1 e4" opening).
3...g6 4.Bc4 Bg7 5.c3

5...Nd7 probably concerned with e4-e5 themes if he'd played Nf6 immediately (as in 5...Nf6 $6 . e 5$ dxe5 7.Nxe5)

## 6.Bg5

I spent a lot time (during the game) examining 6.Bxf7+Kxf7 7.Ng5+


## 7...Ke8 8.Ne6 Qa5 9.Nxg7+ Kf7


but, with the Knight trapped, couldn't see how White continues.
10.Nh5 gxh5 11.Qxh5+

nets a couple Pawns for the piece, but not too fond of this mess.
6...a6


Isn't time for such a slow move !
Maybe 6...Nb6.
But not 6...Ngf6


## 7.e5 dxe5 8.dxe5 Ng4 9.e6

## 7.Qb3 Ngf6

Maybe Black provides some space after 7...Nh6 8.Bxh6 Bxh6 9.Bxf7+

9...Kf8

## 8.Bxf7+

8.e5 first, before check, would keep the f6-Knight from e8

## 8...Kf8


9.e5 dxe5 10.dxe5 Ne8 11.0-0

11...b5

I actually had to turn on Rybka to check the following analysis! A single trade of minors looks to help Black survive.
11...Nxe5
A) 12.Re1? Nxf7 13.Bxe7+ Qxe7 14.Rxe7 Kxe7 White gives up too much winning the Queen.
B) $\underline{12 . B d 5}$

idea $\operatorname{Re} 1$ 12...Nxf3+
(Rybka prefers 12...Nf6 13.Nxe5 Nxd5)
13.Bxf3 Nf6


## 14.Rd1 Qc7 15.Bf4!

C) 12. Nxe5 Bxe5 13. Re 1

13...Qc7 Black can hang in for a while
(13...Bf6? 14.Bxe8 forcing Queen or King onto a pin. White has Bxf6 next !)
12.Bd5 gaining a tempo thanks to Black's last 12...Ra7 13.Nbd2

The engines suggest opening another front with $13 . \mathrm{a4}$
13...Nb6 [13...Nxe5] 14.Be4

14...Nc7 15.Rad1 Qe8 16.Qc2 Ne6 17.Be3 Kf7


Part of my enjoyment of this game was the fact that both sides have spent time re-arranging their pieces, but White's superiority never changes. You don't always have to sacrifice to win.
18.Nh4 sac's appear at g6 18...Bb7 $19 . f 4$
A) We all thought Black had covered one threat with his last move: $19 . \mathrm{Nxg6}$ My initial comments only considered 19...Bxe4 and stopped, but 20.Nxh8+

is with check! 20...Qxh8 21.Qxe4 Bxe5 22.Qf5+ Bf6 23.Qh5+


The attack continues! 23.. Kg8
(23...Kg7?? 24.Bh6+ Kg8 25.Qe8+ Nf8 26.Qxf8\#;

## 23...Kf8 24.Bh6+)

B) But there was also the combination: 19.Bxg6+! The sacrifice must be accepted ! 19...hxg6 20.Qxg6+ Kf8 (also forced) 21.Qxe6

with two threats: Ng6+ (mate wins Queen) and Qxb6
21...Rxh4 (also forced) 22.Qxb6 Qb8 23.Nf3


White has Nxh4 or Rd8+ both winning major material! It was pure joy to see the pieces so active, they just played themselves !!
19...Qc8 Now Bxg6+ doesn't work

Not surprisingly, the defence is helped by removing a key attacker 19...Bxe4

But Rybka's favorite is dodging threats with the King-move 19...Kg8

But White had other threats, anyhow.... 20.f5 gxf5 21.Nxf5 Ke8


There has to be an immediate mate here with the Rooks hemming in the King, but no one found it.

## 22.Nxg7+

Rybka says the kill is through winning material instead of mate! 22.Nc4!!

A) ..Nd7 23.Ncd6+

winning Queen for 2 Knights
B) $22 \ldots$...Bxe4 to stop the mating combo, allows a killer fork! 23 .Nfd6+ when the Knight captures the Queen, it discovers check up the d-file... giving White a chance to bring his Queen to safety
C) The mating line is: $\underline{22 \ldots . . . N x c 4}$ 23. $\mathrm{Nxg} 7+\mathrm{Nxg} 7$


## 24.Bg6+hxg6 25.Qxg6\#

22...Nxg7 23.Nf3 White doesn't have to be in a hurry

Again, I was delving into throwing the pieces around (it's a nice luxury to stand around watching, not having to worry about if it works out)
23.Bg6+

23...Kd7
23...hxg6 24.Qxg6+ Kd7 25.Nc4+ Kc7

26.Qxb6+ Kb8 27.Bxc5
$\underline{24 . e 6+}$
24.Bf5+ e6 25.Nc4+ Kc7
24...Kc7 (24...Nxe6 25.Nc4+ Kc7) 25.Bf4+

25...Kc6 26.Be4+ Nd5 27.Bxd5+

27...Kb6
(27...Kxd5 28.Qe4\#)
28.Nc4+ bxc4
23...Nc4 24.Bc1


I loved White's retreats only improving the pieces!
24...Qg4 25.Bxh7 I see the hangman's noose. 25...e6 26.b3

No need to give Black any chances after 26.Ng5 Nxe5 27.Bg6+

27...Ke7
(27...Nxg6?? 28.Qxg6+ Ke7 29.Q77\#)
26...Nb6 27.Ng5 Bd5

28.Qg6+ White is aware that Black threatens Qxg2\#, so he can't get too crazy winning material
28...Kd7

29.Rxd5+! idea Rf7+-xha7 or a Q-check somewhere on the $6^{\text {th }}$
29.Qxg7+?? Kc6 The Queen is attacked and that Qxg2\# threat must be solved. 1-0

Match tally:
Pawns 0 - Knights 3

## BOARD 5

Holloway,Matt (1793) Cherkassky,Georgiy (1764) [D61]
1.d4 e6 2.c4 d5 3.Nc3 Nf6 4.Bg5 Be7 5.e3 0-0 6.Nf3 Nbd7 7.Qc2 b6


## 8.Bxf6 Nxf6 9.Ne5 Bb7 10.cxd5


10...exd5
10...Nxd5 11.Nxd5 Qxd5
11.Bd3 c5 12.g4 h6 13.h4


This is the way I like to go for it! But Ne 5 is vulnerable and White loses some of his attack potency. See comments in the Klug-Inumerable 1st round match between DGCC-Forks.
13...Nd7 14.Nxd7 Qxd7

15.Bf5 [15.g5 h5] 15...Qc6 16.g5 h5 17.Bh7+ Kh8

18.96 ick! Black doesn't have to capture, and the White Bishop is useless.
18...cxd4 19.exd4 Qe6+ 20.Qe2 Qxe2+ 21.Kxe2 f6


So White is an effective piece down. Black only needs to assure that he doesn't need his King (as in an endgame).
22.Kf3
22.Rh3


Maybe the immediate theme should be Rf3-f5-xh5, to clear the way for his hPawn to reach h6 and eventually free the Bishop.

## 22...Rad8

(22...Bc8 covers f5 with attack on Rook, but d5 and Be7 hang, so... 23.Re3)
23.Rf3 Bc8 24.Re3 Rfe8 25.Re1

would be a killer if his King wasn't in the way ! This analysis-block makes me think the King belongs on d2, holding c3, getting off the e-file $-22 . \mathrm{Kd} 2$ instead.
22...Bb4 23.Nb5 Rfc8 24.a3 Ba6


## 25.Nxa7 Rxa7 26.axb4 Rca8



Black can have backrank problems, he must be (was) careful !
27.Rhe1?! Fortunately for White, Black's cornered King compensates for the material loss.
27.Rae1 dodges the discovery

## 27...Be2+ 28.Rxe2 Rxa1



From a material view, Black is ahead. But a practical view quickly reveals that Black must keep a Rook ready to drop back to his backrank, so that piece has no long-term hopes. An interesting balance.

## 29.Re6 Rb1 30.Rxb6 Rxb2



As long as White avoids mate, he is at least equal.
31.b5 Rb4 32.Rb7 Rxd4 33.Rc7 Rb4


## 34.Rb7

34.Rc5
A) $34 \ldots \mathrm{n} 4$ 35.Rd5 (35.Rxh5? Rd8 One Rook pushes the Pawn down, the other keeps the opposing King from blocking it.)
B) $\underline{34 \ldots \text { Rd8 }}$ will require White's Rook to blockade

## 34...Rxh4

Again, Black has strong threats with 34...Rd8
35.b6
35.Rd7 d4 36.b6

36...d3! 37.b7 (37.Rxd3? Rh3+) 37...Rb8 38.Ke3 Rb4
35...Rb4 36.Rd7 Rxb6 37.Rxd5


The draw is now obvious.
37...Rb3+ 38.Kf4
38.Kg2 Keep King in front of passers !
38...h4 39.Kf5 Re8 40.Kg4 h3


## 41.f4

41.f3 blocks Rooks' connection with the passer 41...h2 42.Rh5 Rb2 43.Kg3
41...h2 The advance of this passer has changed the position's evaluation.
42.Rd1 Rbe3 43.Rh1 Re2 44.Kf3?

44...Rb2? Black misses mate !!
44...f5! idea R8e3\# 45.Kg3 R8e3+ 46.Kh4 Rg2

idea Rg4+,Rh3\#
47.Kh5 to avoid Rg4+ 47...Rh3\#
45.Kg3 Ree2 46.Rd1

46...Rb3+ 47.Kh4 Rb8 48.Kg3 Rbe8 49.Rb1

49...R8e3+ Black is apparently only aware of mating themes.
A) $49 . . . f 5$

isn't as strong with the White Rook active
A1) 5 0.Kh4?? idea Kg5 50...Rg2

51.Rh1 (51.Kh3 Rg1 and wins) 51...Re3 Back to that mate from move 44 !

A2) 50.Ra1 Re1
(50...R8e3+51.Kh4 Black has no time for Rg 2 here)
B) 49 ... Re1! wins, key threat is simply queening 50.Rxe1 Rxe1 51.Kxh2

51...Rf1 52.Kg3 Not holding the Pawn will allow the same ending, but with the $f$ Pawn already won.
52...Rh1 53.Kg4

53...Rxh7 this is the key to the ending-Black goes up a Pawn with his in prime position to win any Pawn ending
(The rule is: passer not moved two squares cannot lose to King opposition).

## 54.gxh7 Kxh7


A) $55 . \mathrm{Kf5} \mathrm{Kh} 6$

A1) $56 . \mathrm{Ke} 6 ? ? \mathrm{~g} 5$ !

57.f5
(57.fxg5+ fxg5 58.Kf5 Kh5 59.Ke4 Kg4 $60 . \mathrm{Ke} 3 \mathrm{Kg} 3$ is obvious win)
57...g4 Black queens just in time !
(57... $\mathrm{Kg} 758 . \mathrm{Kd5} \mathrm{Kf7}$ is slower)

A2) $56 . \mathrm{Ke} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6$;
A3) $56 . \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6$
B) $55 . \mathrm{Kh} 5 \mathrm{~g} 6+$
C) $55 . \mathrm{f} 5 \mathrm{Kh} 6$


Black wins the f-Pawn 56.Kf4
(56. Kg3 Kg5;
same as mainline is $56 . \mathrm{Kf3} \mathrm{Kg} 5$ 57.Ke4 Kg4)
56...Kh5 57.Kf3 Kg5 58.Ke4 Kg4
50.Kh4 Rf3 This is the recorded move, but he absolutely did not allow the backrank mate.
50...Re8 Brings back the Re1 threat
51.Kg4 Rfe3 52.Kh4 and with a frustrated sigh, Black accepted the draw. $1 / 2-1 / 2$

## Match tally:

Pawns 0.5-Knights 3.5
BOARD 1
Kras,Tim (2143) -
Fridman,Yuri (2266)
[A16]
1.Nf3 Nf6 2.c4 g6 3.Nc3 d5 Black responds to the English Opening with Gruenfeld themes.
4.cxd5 Nxd5 5.Qb3


This move caused me to abandon the whole system (in my tournament days!). White hits d5 again and makes the Knight trade undesirable.

## 5...Nxc3

5...Nb6 6.d4 becomes similar to a Gruenfeld Russian position, that I didn't know "back in the day"-but had an adversion for placing a Knight at b6.

That variation runs $1 . \mathrm{d} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 62 . \mathrm{c} 4 \mathrm{~g} 6$ 3.Nc3 d5 4.Qb3


## 4...dxc4 5.Qxc4

In this position, Black builds around attacking Pd4 and hitting the Queen. 5...Bg7 6.Nf3 Nfd7 idea Nb6. The current game could follow similar themes.

## 6.Qxc3



The point to White's play- his Queen enters the long diagonal before Black gets his Bishop on it.

I never found an answer that was comfortable, but Yuri comes up with one on-the-fly!

## 6...f6 7.e3


7...Bh6 already targeting e3, but also g5 needs some help after White's Bf1-c5 (which threatens $\mathrm{Ng} 5-\mathrm{e} 6$ due to the pinned f-Pawn).

## 8.Bc4 e6



Can these Pawns really be defended? After the game, a teammate claimed Yuri in "computer mode", referring to his ability to find odd moves that seem to work.
9.b3 0-0 10.h4 Nc6 11.Bb2 Qe7

12.a3 Bd7 13.0-0-0 White obviously wants to start a Pawn storm, but it looks like Black's attack is faster.
13...a6 The coming b5 gains a tempo for the Pawn storm, chases Bishop off his
gaze at the King.

## 14.Qc2 Na5 15.Be2 c5 16.d3 b5



White has a "hedgehog" Pawn formation, but the King is never part of it as the strategy is to look for Pawn breaks at b4 or d4. Either of which would open lines to his King here.
17.Nd2 Rac8 18.Kb1 e5 19.Rc1 Be6


The progress Black has made in the last six moves is amazing. 20.h5
20.94 idea $\mathrm{g} 5, \mathrm{~h} 5$ might be more rewarding in forcing open some Kingside lines (even if at cost of a Pawn)
20...g5 21.Ka1 Rfd8 22.g3

22...Qf7 23.Bd1 c4


## 24.dxc4 bxc4 25.b4 Nb7

25...Nb3+?! just trades and frees some space for the opponent.

## 26.Bc3 Nd6 27.a4 Bg7 28.h6 Bh8


29.Bh5 Qe7 30.Bf3 f5

31.e4 Bf6 (idea g4,Bg5) 32.Rce1 g4 33.Bg2 Bg5

34.exf5

## 34.Bxe5

A) 34 ...Bf6 35.exf5 Bxf5

36.Qc3 (36.Bxf6 Qxf6+ 37.Qb2 c3)
36...Bxe5 37.Rxe5 Qd7
B) $34 \ldots \mathrm{Bxd} 2$ 35. Qxd 2 Nxe 4
34...Nxf5 35.Rxe5? Bxd2 36.Bxd2

36...Nd4 forking 37.Qc3 Nb3+ forking, White flagged 0-1

Match tally:
PAWNS 0.5 -- KNIGHTS 4.5

## BOARD 2

Morris,Robert (2206) Caveney,Jeff (2084)
[A55]
1.d4 Nf6 2.c4 c6 3.Nf3 d6 4.Nc3 Nbd7 5.e4 e5 6.Be2 Be7 7.0-0 0-0

8.h3 Why this now? Even if a waiting move, Black has many normal moves that keep a real plan from being shown (such as Re8,Nf8-g6,Bf8, etc)

White has plenty of useful moves like:
8.Re1 / 8.Rb1 to start Queenside play / 8.a3/8.d5 / 8.Qc2.

But $\underline{8 . B e 3}$ is most popular with the GMs
and if $\underline{8 . . . \mathrm{Ng} 4} 4$ 9.Bd2. The interested reader can lookup Friske-Caveney from playoff Round 3 (Forks at Pawns) for another handling (not necessarily a better one).
8...a6 9.Qc2 Re8 10.Rd1 [10.Be3]
10...Qc7 11.Be3 exd4 12.Nxd4 Ne5

13.Nf3 Rob didn't like this move, but had trouble finding anything else.
13...Nxf3+ 14.Bxf3 Be6 15.Ne2 Rad8


## 16.Nf4 Bc8

It's hard to analyze such positions. I prefer White due to his strong center, but it takes a lot to crack Black's defense.

## 17.Nd3 h6 18.Bd4 Qa5


19.e5 dxe5 20.Bc3 Qb6 21.Nxe5 Bc5
22.b4 Bf8 23.c5 Qc7 24.Nc4


In such positions, sometimes you just have to maximize your pieces' flexibility and look for a break. Here, White has made holes at b6 and d6. But, in figuring out this play, had landed in time pressure!
24...Nd5 25.Bxd5 cxd5 26.Ne3 Be6 27.Qb2

27...Qf4 28.Be5 Qg5


## 29.Bc7

29.f4 Qg3 idea Qxe3+ or Bxh3 30.Nf1 Qg6 31.Qc3
29...Rd7 30.Qe5 Qxe5 31.Bxe5 Both
sides rush to make the time control
31...Bxh3 32.Bd6?! Playing quickly
(Game Editor should've spent some analyzation time at this game turningpoint!)
32...Bxd6


## 33.cxd6

Most of White's remaining time was examining here... likely stuff as 33. Rxd5?
A) 33...Rxe3 $34 . f x e 3$ Bh2+ $35 . \mathrm{Kxh} 2$ Rxd5 36.Kxh3

B) Most convincing is 33 ...Be5! 34.Rxd7 (34.gxh3 Rxd5 35.Nxd5 Bxa1) $\underline{\text { 34...Bxd7 }}$

## 35.Rd1

C) $33 . . . \mathrm{Be} 634 . \mathrm{Rxd} 6 \mathrm{Rxd6} 35 . \mathrm{cxd6} \mathrm{Rd} 8$ 36.Rd1 Bxa2

33...Be6 34.Nxd5 Red8


## 35.Nc7

Probably the trades were chosen more for a forced way to make quick moves. White blitzes his way to move 45.

Maybe White can defend better with another piece on board. 35.Ne3 Rxd6 36.Rxd6 Rxd6


## $37 . a 3$

35...Rxd6 36.Rxd6 Rxd6 37.Nxe6 Rxe6


## 38.Kf1 f6 39.Rd1 Re7


40.Rd8+

I originally mis-entered the move as 40 Rd4, but following the game play leads to some interesting observations.
40.Rd4 Kf7 41.f3 Ke6 42.a4 The rule is to not advance Pawns until the base can be defended. Here, White has established the 4th rank, but Black goes after its defender. Of course, both sides are heavily relying on intuition (in the time pressure). 42...f5 43.Kf2 Ke5 44.Ke3 (44.Rc4 Kd5 chases the Rook off the 4th) 44...f4+
A) 45.Rxf4 actually is OK! The Black King can't discover check while attacking the Rook 45...Rc7 idea Rc3+ 46.Re4+ Kd5 47.Rd4+repeats position or forces the King to retreat(47.g4 Rc4 captures the Queenside in the Pawn ending)
B) $45 . \mathrm{Kd} 3$ The King has walked away from its fight to hold the 2-3 Pawn imbalance 45...Rc7
40...Kf7 41.f3 Ke6 42.a4 f5 43.Kf2 Ke5 44.Ke3

44...f4+ 45.Kd3 Rc7 46.Re8+ Kf5


## $47 . a 5$

47.Re4! allows the King to return to the Kingside, even if trapped against 1st rank. But then the White Rook could attack on the 7th.
47...Rd7+ 48.Kc3 cutting his King off from the 3-2 majority

Not very hopeful for White is $48 . \mathrm{Ke} 2 \mathrm{Rd} 4$ 49.Re7 Rxb4 50.Rxg7

50...Ra4 (50...Rb5 just delays White's Rxb7) 51.Rxb7 Rxa5
48...Kg5 49.b5 axb5 50.Re5+ Kh4 51.Rxb5 Kg3 52.Rb2

52...h5

Sending the Pawn to undermine the opponent's formation: 53.Kc4 h4 54.Kc5 h3 55.gxh3 Kxf3 56.Kb6 Kg3 0-1

## MATCH FINAL TALLY: Pawns 1.5 - Knights 4.5

## MATCH 2 - Wednesday, May 4, 2011 <br> Walgreen Forks at Downers' Grove Chess Club

How do you kill a dragon ?? As Forks Captain it was my duty to lead the charge. I came up with three requirements: 1) spear it to death, 2) avoid its fire, and 3) out-maneuver it.

If that wasn't a big enough task, I had to wonder if my key guys were going to show and, also, thanks to the previous night's chat with Jim Thomson, a last-minute re-arrangement was required to pass the ratings-cap rule. I had simply averaged out the six boards, and made a killer roster that was under 1900-only to find out that board 5 has a floor of 1600 which screwed-up my average. One of our top two boards had to sit out! Do I want the over-match on board 1 or board 6 ?

It became a question of match-ups. Downers Grove was in position to field their top half with players rated over 2000; ending up with a line-up that featured an 1800 player on board five. What Fork player would match up best on top ? I decided to put our best against their best, let Teddy attempt to confuse their unbeaten second board and see what wins the other guys would produce. In explaining it to the team, I could see their agreement. The look in Teddy's eye assured me he was going to do his best.

If it was just one board breathing fire, we probably could dodge it and survive. But this dragon is a two-headed beast ! The Forks had one head, but unfortunately, his flame had lately been that of a match! The best we could hope for would be to keep the dragon occupied so the other boards' Liliputians could stab and slash the beast to death.

The Forks did make a fight of it, but blundered pieces on three different boards. The DGCC win then was not long in coming! When all was done, it was that most-worried second game that produced the Forks' only win. Just proves that there comes a time to stop analyzing, pull up to the table, and go at it "mano-to-mano" (or, in this case, "mano-to-Bungo").

BOARD FINISH ORDER: 6,1,5,3,4,2

| BOARD 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Nick, Xan (1222) - <br> Romanowitz,Caleb (1447) | [B47] |


6.Bd3? argggg, not a good way to start a game
6...Nxd4 7.0-0 Nf6 8.Be3 Nc6 9.a3 a6 10.a4 Bb4 11.Ne2 d5 12.c3 Bd6

13.f4 dxe4 14.Bc2 0-0 15.Ng3

15...Nd5

Black has the more pressing threats
16.Qd2 f5 17.b4

17...Ncxb4! a nice find 18.cxb4 White's Queen is overloaded 18...Nxe3 19.Qxe3 Qxc2

20.Qd4 At least White is trying to attack before Black gets his Queenside unwound. Yet, Black controls the key areas.
20...Qd3 21.Qb2 Qe3+ 22.Kh1 Bxf4


## 23.Ra3

23.Nh5 forking g7 and $\mathrm{f} 4 \underline{23 \ldots \text { Bh6 }}$
24.Ra3 Qg5 25.Nf4 Qf6
23...Qd2 24.Qa1 Bxg3 25.Rxg3

25...Qh6 26.Rd1 Qf6 27.Qc1 e5 28.Qc7 g6 29.Rd6 Rf7

30.Rd8+ Kg7 0-1

Match tally:
Forks 0 - DGCC 1

## BOARD 1

Klug,Steffan (2151) Inumerable,Florin (2162)
[D55]
1.d4 Nf6 2.c4 e6 3.Nc3 d5 4.Nf3 Be7 5.Bg5 0-0 6.e3 b6

7.cxd5

I like to wait on this until Black has committed his Bishop on the diagonal. It works out to have less scope that way. But my DB says this is the current popular line with the big boys !

## 7.Qc2 Bb7 8.Bxf6 Bxf6 9.cxd5



Black will block the long diagonal with 9...exd5 10.Bd3. White has the makings of an attack, especially including h4 and g4.

Interested readers can write the Games Editor who is currently too lazy to look up the Bulletin issue (10 years ago ?!) where I got deep into it...But also see Holloway-Cherkassky, from the Round 1 Pawns-Knights match.

Other tries are 7.Rc1 and
7.Qb3 which is my DB's top-scoring move ( $71 \%$ ), but based off only 37 games.

## 7...Nxd5

7...exd5 highlights the down-side of White's early trade- the Bishop can post to several good squares.
8.Bxe7 Nxe7 9.Bd3 Bb7 10.0-0

10...Ng6 11.Be2 c6
11...Nd7 allows the classic $12 . \mathrm{d} 5$
12.Qa4 Qd6 13.Rfd1 Nd7 14.b4

14...Nf6 15.Bd3 Qe7 16.a3 c5 17.dxc5 bxc5

18.b5 Interesting, cutting down the Bishop activity with hopes of making a passer - versus - allowing Black an immediate center passer (even if isolated).
18...Rfd8 19.Ne4


## 19...Rxd3 20.Rxd3

20.Nxf6+ doesn't work 20...Qxf6 and the d-Rook is tied to a-Rook defense !

## 20...Bxe4 21.Rd2



## 21...Bxf3

21...Qb7 seems stronger- win a Pawn at f3 or g2! 22.Ne1 Don't like White's setup, but not seeing how Black gets his extra pieces barking. CB-engine
suggests $\underline{22 . . . a 6}$ (22...Nh4 23.f3)
22.gxf3 Qb7 23.Kg2 Nd5 [23...Ne5 24.Qf4] 24.Rad1 h6

25.Qc4 Qe7 26.Qg4 Kh7 It's instructive how Black is satisfied to take a "time out" and tidy-up the castle. 27.Kf1


Contrarily, White allows the famous "Frisky Knights". 27...Nc3 forking, of course 28.Rd7 now another fork at e5 28...Qf6 29.Rc1 Ne5


## 30.Rxf7 Nxf7 31.Rxc3 Qxc3


32.Qe4+ forking, of course... But Black is still up a piece from all the stuff.

## 32...g6 33.Qxa8 Qxa3



## 34.Kg2

34.b6? here allows Black to bail out with 34...Qa6+
34...Kg7?? missing the threat
34...Qa5 35.Qf8 forking

35...Qc7
35.b6

suddenly White wins 35 ...c4 36.b7 c3 37.b8Q h5 38.Qaxa7

38...Qc1 39.Qe5+ Kg8 40.Qxe6


As Steffan instructed his teammates:
"The lesson here is to never give up and always look for possibilities!"

This was the beginning of the Forks' demise; they really needed to win this game to balance the already-recorded loss on board 6.
1-0
Match tally:
Forks 0 - DGCC 2

## BOARD 5

Potts,Kevin (1846) Bian,Mike (1486)
[A00]

## 1.b4

Really felt bad that I hadn't prepared my lower-board teammate for this opening. So wrapped up in whether to play or sit out, never occurred that I know what Kevin plays !!
1...e5 2.a3 d5 3.Bb2 Bd6 4.e3

4...Nf6
4...Ne7 opens possibility of f 6 , to help e5 defence.
$5 . c 4 \mathrm{dxc} 4$
5...c6 maintains the center duo
6.Bxc4 0-0 7.Nf3 Bg4 8.Qb3 Nbd7 9.Nc3

9...Nb6 10.Nb5 Nxc4 11.Qxc4 Re8

12.Ng5 Be6 [12...Qe7] 13.Qh4 h6
14.Ne4 Nxe4 15.Qxe4 hitting e5 and b7

15...Bc8
A) 15...f5 16.Qxb7 Rb8 17.Qc6 (17.Qa6) 17...Bd7 18.Qc4+
B) $15 \ldots . . .6$ !? 16.Nxd6 Qxd6 17.Bxe5

opening lines against his Queen 17...Qd7 (17...Bd5) 18.0-0 Bd5

Black may have play for the Pawn, attacking e5 and g2.

## 16.d4 f5

16...exd4 17.Qxd4 threat Qxg7\#
A) 17...Bf8 18.Qxd8 Rxd8 19.Nxc7
B) 17...Be5? 18.Qxd8 Rxd8 19.Bxe5

## 17.Qc2

White can open the position through trades. 17.Qd5+ Kh8


## 18.dxe5!

Nothing results from 18.Nxd6 Qxd6 19. Qxd6 cxd6 20.dxe5 dxe5
18...Be7
(18...Bxe5? 19. Qxd8 Rxd8 20.Bxe5; 18...Bf8? 19. Qxd8 Rxd8 20.Nxc7)
19. Qxd8 Bxd8

20.Rc1 c6 21.Nd6
17...Qe7

18.Nxd6 cxd6 19.0-0 Bd7 20.Rac1 Rac8

21.Qb3+ Be6 22.Qa4 Bc4 23.Rfd1 b5 24.Qc2 e4


A two-sided move; it looks good now, but d4-d5 can open some lines
25.d5 Bxd5? apparently missing the facts the his Bishop hangs and there's a backrank check...
26.Qxc8 Rxc8 27.Rxc8+ Kf7 28.Rxd5 Qb7 forking Rooks, but they can get linked up

29.Rxf5+ Ke6 30.Rcf8 Qc6 31.h3 Qc2

32.Bxg7 Qc1+ 33.Kh2 Qxa3 34.Rxb5

34...a6 35.Rf6+ Kd7 36.Rb6

36...Qd3 [36...a5] 37.Rbxd6+ Qxd6+
38.Rxd6+ Kxd6 39.Bxh6 Kd5 40.Bf8


1-0
Match tally:
Forks 0 -- DGCC 3

| BOARD 3 |
| :--- |
| Egerton,Jim (2028) - <br> Levenson,Steve (1961) |

1.d4 Nf6 2.Bf4 g6 3.e3 Bg7 4.Nf3 0-0 [4...Nh5] 5.Be2 d6 6.0-0 Nbd7 7.h3 c5 $8 . c 3$


## 8...b6 9.Nbd2 Bb7

My database has more than a dozen plans for White here, speaking to its flexibility.
10.Re1
[10.a4;
10.Bh2]
10...Rc8
[10...Ne4]

## 11.Bf1 Re8


12.e4 Nh5 13.Bh2 e5?!


The center break actually needs a little more preparation as d6 hangs here.
14.Nc4 Qe7
14...Qc7 feels risky having Queen on diagonal with the h2-Bishop.
14...Ndf6 allows $15 . \mathrm{dxe5} \mathrm{dxe5}$ 16.Qxd8 Rcxd8 17.Ncxe5


At the post-mortem, don't remember a discussion of $\underline{17 \ldots . . . N x e 4}$
15.dxe5 Nxe5 16.Nfxe5 dxe5 17.Qc2

17...Red8 Black intends to double, but the constant need to defend e5 ties down his Queen (a problem he had not yet realized). [17...Rcd8 is more natural.
18.Rad1 Rc7? drops Pe5 19.Rxd8+ Qxd8 20.Nxe5

20...Re7 21.Nc4 Rd7 22.Be2 b5


Black is desperately trying to make trouble.
23.Bxh5 [23.Ne5] 23...bxc4 24.Bf3 Rd2 25.Qa4

25...Rxb2 26.Rd1 Rd2 27.Rb1 Qa8


I enjoyed how Black solved his scattered Pawns by making counter-threats 28.Bf4

Didn't see the downside to 28.Qxc4 Rc2 29. Qxc5 Rxc3

but now see 30.Qb4 idea is backrank check and Bd6 when Bg7-f8 blocks it

## 28...Rd3 29.Qxc4 Rxc3



Both sides began watching the clock.
30.Qe2 [30.Qb5] 30...Bd4 31.Qd2 f6
32.a4 Ra3 33.Qc2 Kg7 34.Bc1 Rc3 35.Qe2 Bc6 36.a5 Qe8


The rest of the game was played under horrific time trouble.
37.Bb2? Rb3 38.Qc2 Qb8 39.e5

39...Rxb2? in blitz mode, Black miscalc'd something thinking he was coming out a piece up.
39...Bxf3 is curtains
40.exf6+ Kxf6 41.Rxb2 Qxb2 42.Qxb2 Bxb2 43.Bxc6


Neither side recorded moves--- Of course, this is a dead draw (Black needs to make a passer on both wings, which is near impossible). But the Forks had lost three boards so the remaining games all had to be wins. The Forks Captain would not allow any draws!! So the finish was something like:
43...c4 44.Kf1 c3 45.Ba4 Ba3 46.Ke2 Ke5 47.Kd3 Bb4 48.a6 Kd5 49.Kc2


Jim jumps up loudly proclaiming "I'm never gonna move my King, so deal with that!!". Steve jumps up from his board, pleading.... and I just had to shrug and say "Yea, of course it's a dead draw". And the Forks hopes were vanquished....
***DRAW AGREED***
49...Ba5 idea Kc4,Bb5,etc
49...Kc4 idea Bc5-d4 and walk King to g3 50.Bb3+.
***AGAIN, I doubt this is the exact position..... I see, at analysis, 49...Bc5 $50 . f 3$ and the Black King can march to g3, where even Bf1 can be chased away from the base-Pawn at g2. So White would have a problem to solve.
(50.Kxc3 Bxf2 is no-where, Mr Anal-yzer)
49...Kd4 Blocks the Bishop's reach to f2. $1 / 2-1 / 2$

Match tally:
Forks 0.5 -- DGCC 3.5

| BOARD 4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Granata,Mike (1920) - <br> Tan,Gaddiel (1806) |

## 1.Nf3 Nf6 2.b4

One detail the Forks Captain forgot is that the DGCC teammates have surely dealt with this since Kevin Potts plays such stuff from both sides of the board.
2...d5 3.c4 e6 4.c5 g6 5.Bb2 Bg7 6.e3 0-0 7.Be2

7...Re8 8.0-0 Nbd7 9.d4 c6 10.a4 Ne4 11.Nbd2 f5


So we get some kind of Dutch, where White is way ahead opening the weak Queenside (one of the downsides to Black's opening system). See Forks at UOP, Round 10, for another example.
12.Ne1 Qe7 13.Nd3 e5 (is the equalizing blow in Dutch positions) 14.Re1 Nxd2 15.Qxd2 e4

16.Nc1 Nf8 17.b5 Bd7 18.Nb3 Ne6

19.Na5 Rab8 20.b6 a6 21.Nxb7


White wants Bxa6 and two deep passers for the minor. 21...Ra8 An interesting choice which threw White in the soup..
22.Bc3 Rf8

23.f4 seems wrong positionally to create weaknesses on the e-file and open an area for Black to counter.
A) My immediate idea is 23 .Reb1 to continue Qe1-f1, but Black has 23...Bc8 24.Na5 Bb7 as in the game.
B) So maybe White starts with $\underline{23 . N a 5}$ tying the Bishop to c6

B1) Black doesn't benefit from play on the other wing 23...g5 24.b7 Ra7 25.Rab1 Rb8

26.Rb6

B2) $23 \ldots \mathrm{Nd} 8$ ?
B21) 24 b7 Rb8 25.Bxa6
B22) 24.Reb1 Bc8


Black still defends. $25 . \mathrm{b7}$ trying to post the Queen at b6, where it attacks a6 and c6

## 25...Bxb7 26.Nxb7 Nxb7 27.Qb2 Rfb8 28.Qb6


28...Nd8 29.Qa5 Nb7 and, again, White
hasn't broken through.
23...exf3 24.Bxf3 Ng5


## 25.Nd6 Bc8 26.Rab1 Bb7



Even so, I thought White was playing a piece up. But where does he have play?
27.Rec1 Very odd, let's see what the reason was for abandoning the backward Pawn on an open file.

Maybe 27.Rf1 with eventually g4, I don't know, though. At least Black's Queen is tied to b7 defense.
27...Nf7 28.Nxf7 Rxf7 29.Qd3 Re8 30.Bd2 Bh6 31.Rb3

31...Rg7 32.g3 Rf8 33.Bxd5+


OK, so maybe that's why Rec1 at \#27
33...Kh8 34.Bc4 g5 35.Bc3 g4


Blow-for-blow combat
36.Bb2 Re8 37.Re1 f4

38.d5?
$38 . e 4$ looks promising- the passer is blocked long enough to counter in the center.
38...Qxc5

Despite myself, had to admire Black's play
39.Bd4 Qa5 40.Re2 cxd5

41.Bxg7+ Bxg7 42.exf4 opens the diagonal to the King
42. Qf5!

pinning d5-Pawn and threatening Qf7 42...Qc5 43.Qf7
A) $43 . . . \mathrm{Rf} 844 . \mathrm{Qxb} 7 \mathrm{Qxc} 4$
B) 43...Rxe3? 44.Rbxe3 fxe3 45.Qxb7

45...Qxc4 46.Qa8+ +
42...Rf8 43.Rb1 Qc5+ 44.Kf1 dxc4


The Bishop pair is in full swing.
45.Qd7 Bc6 46.Qe7 Qd5 threat Qh1+xb1 47.Qe3 idea Qg1 47...Bd4 48.Qe4 0-1

Match tally:
Forks 0.5 -- DGCC 4.5

| BOARD 2 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Santiago,Teddy (1982) - <br> Bungo,Greg (2119) |  |

1.f4 g6 2.e4 Bg7 3.c3 d5 4.e5 c5 5.d4 cxd4 6.cxd4


During the game, I thought White already had a promising position. But Black has the possibilities of a French Advance by attacking the dark center squares, and eventually f 7 -f6.
6...Nc6 7.Nf3 h5 He is making a home for a Knight at $f 5$, but the natural Pawn move to fight the center wedge (f6-f7) will now weaken g6.
8.Bb5 Nh6 9.0-0 0-0 10.Nc3


## 10...Bg4

To continue that French counterattack, Black wants Qb6 and Nf5 played. But here, he needs to first over-protect d5. So maybe 10...Be6 would work.;
10...f6 weakens the diagonal to the King, even if stopping Nf3-g5.
10...e6 with idea Qb6,f6,Nf5
11.Bxc6 bxc6 12.h3 Bc8


Black has wasted time with this Bishop. Had he got f 7 -f6 in, counter-attacking themes would develop.
13.Be3 Nf5 14.Bf2 If Black could play Ng 4 (if he hadn't provoked h2-h3) a defender of d 4 and c 5 could be removed.
14...a5 15.b3 e6 16.g3 Ba6 17.Re1 Bh6

threat is $\mathrm{h} 5-\mathrm{h} 4$ to weaken f 4 .
18.Qd2 Qb6 19.Na4 Qb4 20.Qxb4 axb4 21.Nc5 Bb5

22.g4 hxg4 23.hxg4 Ne7 24.g5 Bg7 25.Nh4


I had to smile while watching this game develop. A closed center, play on a wing (here, on both!!), and Knights vs Bishops are all the positional factors Teddy loves and excels !

## 25...Ra7 26.Rec1 Rfa8 27.Rc2 Nf5

 28.Nxf5 gxf5

The b4-Pawn is doomed, with no compensation.
29.Be1 Bf8 30.Bxb4 Kg7 31.a4


No threat while the a1-Rook hangs.

## 31...Bxc5 32.Bxc5 Rb7 33.Rc3 Be2 34.Kg2 Rh8



## 35.b4

I wanted $35 . \mathrm{a5}$ to tie down a Rook or Bishop 35...Rh4? 36.a6 Rb8 37.a7 Ra8


In all the coming lines (including the game itself), it was wonderful how White has his opponent's King in a box!
38. Kf2 followed by Ke 3 with a walk to b7 via b6. 38...Bb5 Black must stop Ra6, which threatens Rxc6 or Rb6-b8. 39.Ke3 Rh3+ 40.Kd2 Rh2+
(40...Rxc3 41.Kxc3 and eventually Kb7)
41.Kc1 Rf2

42.Rh3 Rxf4 43.Kb2 Rg4 44.Rah1


White has mate or trading away the blockading Rook.
A) Losing quickly is $44 . . . \mathrm{Rxg} 5$ ? $45 . \mathrm{Rh7}+$ Kg8 (45...Kg6?? 46.R1h6\#) 46.Rh8+
B) $44 \ldots \mathrm{Ba} 645 . \mathrm{Rh} 7+\mathrm{Kg} 646 . \mathrm{Rh} 8 \mathrm{Bb} 7$

47.Rxa8 Bxa8 48.Rh8 Bb7 49.Rb8
35...Rh4 36.Rh1 Rxf4 37.Rch3 Kg6

38.Rg3
38.Rh8? threatens Rg8 mate but then I noticed 38...Bf3+

## 38...Rg4 39.Rh8 Kxg5 40.Rxg4+ Kxg4 41.Rc8


41...Kf4 42.Kf2 Bc4 43.Rxc6 Ke4


## 44.b5

44.a5 Makes a quicker win. 44...Bb5 45.Rd6 and a6-7, etc
(45.Rb6? An opposite-Bishop ending is one thing to avoid ! 45...Rxb6 46.Bxb6)
44...f4 45.Rc8 Somewhere around here, DGCC had won the match (or boards 1 \& 3 result was obvious).. which might explain why things now get a bit goofy.
45...Bxb5 46.axb5 Rxb5 47.Ra8 Rb2+ 48.Kf1 f3

49.Ra1

I wanted 49.Rf8?? but 49...Ke3 idea Rb1\# 50.Kg1

50...Rb1+
(I'd only examined 50...f2+51.Kg2 Rb1
52.Rxf7)
51.Kh2 f2 and queens $\underline{52 . R x f 7}$
49...Kf4
A) 49...f2? idea Rd2-xd4 would drop both f-Pawns 50.Ra7 Ke3 51.Rxf7 White is a tempo up on the same theme from move 49. $\underline{51 \ldots \mathrm{Rb} 1+52 . \mathrm{Kg} 2 \mathrm{Rb} 2}$

53.Rf3+ winning the f-Pawn.
B) $49 \ldots \mathrm{Rd} 2$ with idea Rxd 4 looked promising, but Re1+ messes that up
50.Ba3 Rh2 51.Bc1+

51...Kg3
51...Ke4 wins the d-Pawn because of the backrank problem
52.Be3 Rg2 53.Ra8 Re2

54.Rg8+ Kh3 55.Bf2 Re4 56.Rg3+ Kh4 57.Rxf3+ 1-0

FINAL MATCH TALLY:
FORKS 1.5 - DGCC 4.5

Next month, we continue with the final two matches of Round One.

## The CICL Banquet: A Review in Pictures

## By Patrice Connelly; photos courtesy Fred Furtner and Len Weber

The CICL banquet was held this year at Alpine Banquets on Friday, June $17^{\text {th }}$. The strong turnout was rivaled only in the number of awards and honors awaiting the players!


CICL President Tony Jasaitis discusses last minute details with Banquet Chair Katherine Zack.
CICL officers finishing their first year in their respective positions, and those retiring, were honored with plaques.


Left, 14 years of service as rating statistician, Art Olsen shows off his award to a fan, who wasn't even born when he first started as Ratings Chair. (It's his daughter.) Right, First year bulletin editor Patrice Connelly poses for a picture (in order to include it in the bulletin!) with her plaque presented by President Tony Jasaitis.

Newly appointed president Irwin Gaines was also "passed the gavel" from current president Tony Jasaitis!


Left, leaving President Tony Jasaitis presents the gavel; Right, newly appointed CICL President Irwin Gaines explains how many times he has been "booted" out of the position of West Division Chair and kicked upstairs to league President!

This year's banquet included some particularly special honors. Nikolai Goncharoff was honored for reaching a six time Centurion- that's over 600 league games played! Nik played his first CICL game in 1961, and has been playing strong since! This year, the Centurion award was named after Nik, and he received the former CICL traveling trophy, now retired.


Nik Goncharoff delivers a motivational speech to other CICL players about achieving their own Centurion goals- even the catering staff is impressed!

Nik in turn helped present some of the other prominent Centurion awards this year, including a triple Centurion (over 300 games played!) to Marty Franek.


A triple replay of triple Centurion Marty Franek receiving his award from six-time Centurion Nik Goncharoff. Marty says it took him thirty years to reach his $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ games; give him thirty more and he'll catch up to Nik!

The Ron Dargis Award for lifetime-distinguished service to the CICL was presented this year to Jim Thomson. Beyond his current accomplishments of rewriting the much-improved ratings program and associated ratings proposal, chairing the North Division, and holding down the captain position for the Motorola Knights, Jim has a sustained distinguished history in the league as a past president, champion of significant league changes such as the associate teams and use of performance ratings for team standings and tie breaks, and a primary contributor to the latest CICL constitution. Jim received the Garde Digital Tournament Clock, used by FIDE.


Ron Dargis Award recipient Jim Thomson receives his "fancy and classy" (as described by leaving president Tony Jasaitis) new Garde Digital Tournament Clock in honor of his lifetime-distinguished service to the CICL.

After the delicious dinner, the annual speed chess tournament, organized by Art Olsen, was enjoyed by many players divided into five rating groups. Congratulations to Fred Scott Allsbrook, Todd Freitag, Charles Dobrovolny, C Guiu, and Sonny Mata for winning their respective divisions!


Former CICL President Marty Franek faces off against Former and Future CICL President Irwin Gaines in the speed tournament.

All agreed it had been another fantastic season, and a wonderful banquet!


CICL webmaster and Games Editor Tom Friske applauds the many honorees, and a great banquet!

No. Name

1. Allsbrook, Fred Scott
2. Fridman, Yuri
3. Thomson,James
4. Weber,Len.
5. Morris,Robert.
6. Friske,Tom. $\qquad$

St

| Rate 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $2165 ~ x$ | W | W | W | W |
| W |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2266 | L | X | W | W | W |
| W |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | L | L | X | D | W |
| W |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2079 | L | L | L | X | D |
| W | W |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | L | L | L | L | L |
| X |  |  |  |  |  |

CICL Blitz Championship -- Section 2
No. Name

1. Freitag,Todd
2. Boldingh,Ed
3. Cygan,J
4. Edeus,Dan
5. Eamon,Rob
6. Balicky,Jeff

St



St

| Rate 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1537 | x | W | W | W | W | W |
| 1609 | L | X | W | W | W | W |
| 1540 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1517 | L | L | L | W | W | W |
| 1512 | L | L | L | L | X | W |
| 1405 L | L | L | W | L | x | 1.0 |

## CICL Blitz Championship -- Section 5

No. Name

1. Mata,Sonny
2. Spitzig,Mark
3. Kratka,Tomas
4. Kratka,Martin
5. Sarna,Jaclyn
6. Olsen,Amanda
$\qquad$


## July 23, 2011 Downers Grove Swiss \#8

4-SS G/60 plus 5 sec delay. Fairview Village, 200 Village Drive, Downers Grove, IL
IM Angelo Young 7 time IL State Champion and Chicago Blaze player is playing in this event. NM Trevor Magness is playing in this event. More masters are expected to play, check DGCC's website for a current list of pre-registered players.

Early Entry fee is $\mathbf{\$ 2 0}$, if you preregister and payment is received by July $\mathbf{1 8 t h}$. After that EF is $\mathbf{\$ 2 5}$.
This is a CICL-friendly event. For current Chicago Industrial Chess League members (those who played in the 2010-2011 season), the EF is $\mathbf{\$ 2 0}$ (including at the door), and you are eligible for the best CICL-player non-cash prize.

Prizes: Based on 40 entries: 1st $\$ 325$, 2 nd $\$ 150$, 3rd $\$ 75$. (At least $70 \%$ of EFs will be returned as cash prizes.) Book prizes, DVDs, or McDonald's gift certificates for best u2000, u1800, u1600, CICLplayer, and upset. Unrated players can only win cash prizes.

Pre-registration: maximum number of players is 52, advanced registration is advised.
Send mail with your name, phone number, USCF id number and a check payable to "Brian Smith" to:
Brian Smith
483 Nantucket Road
Naperville, IL 60565
Onsite registration: 8:45 to 9:15 a.m. If paying at the door, pay cash only (no checks).
Rounds: rd1 9:30am, rd2 12:30pm, rd3 2:45pm, rd4 5pm
Clocks and sets provided. Daniel Parmet is the TD.
Email questions to brs483@att.net More info at
http://sites.google.com/site/downersgrovechess
USCF rated, USCF membership required. Players may take a half point bye in any round except the last round. A half point bye must be requested before the round starts. Zero point bye only in final round. Free parking, but park only in a space marked for visitors. " 200 Village Drive" is the "Village Apartments" building. Enter its main entrance, and tell receptionist you are there for the chess tournament. Multiple sections possible. Junior players (under sixteen years) rated 900+ are welcome, and must be accompanied by a parent throughout the day. Sorry, but we do not accept junior players rated under 900.

# Chicago Blaze Fundraiser <br> 4-hour training session with <br> GM Dmitry Gurevich \& GM Mesgen Amanov Saturday July 9th 11:30am-3:30pm Hosted at the North Shore Chess Center $100 \%$ of proceeds to benefit the Chicago Blaze! 

Must be rated above 1600 to participate as we will break up into groups of 10-12 during the training session

Only $\$ 75$ advance entry or $\$ 100$ at the door

## Spend 4 hours with two Chicago Blaze team members, as they review all aspects of the game from

 openings, to middle game planning, to end game technique.Lunch is included with this training session along with a simul with another local area master at 4 pm .

Entry Fee: $\$ 75$ received by $7 / 89 p m$ online; $\$ 100$ onsite (onsite entries are not guaranteed and based on available space)

Register online: http://www.nachess.org/training
Questions: sevan@nachess.org or call 847.423.8626
The Chicago Blaze is the representative for Illinois in the US Chess League.
The Chicago Blaze is entering its 4th season of competition.
Last season we made it to the playoffs for the first time. With your support we can build a team that will aim for the championship this season!

The North Shore Chess Center is located at 5500 W Touhy Ave Suite A Skokie, IL 60077

