


April - May 1996

Volume 39.7

The Chicago Chess Player

The Official Bulletin of the Chicago Industrial Chess League



"The Dragon" Artwork by Andrew Groeger.



"Founded 1957"

INSIDE

(3) News from Around the C.I.C.L.

(8) FIDE's New Bylaws

(12) The Finishing Touch - Review

(15) Selected C.I.C.L. Games

(20) Match Results & Ratings List

Bulletin Editor

Tim Williams (CASE)
 (708)887-3706 (Business)
 twilliams@casecorp.com (E-Mail)
 16W472 Honeysuckle Rose #114
 Hinsdale, IL 60521

The Officers for the CICL:**President**

Satish Kale (CASE)
 (708)887-2372 (Business)
 (708)325-KALE (Home)
 skale@casecorp.com (E-Mail)
 CASE Corp
 7 South 600 County Line Rd
 Burr Ridge, IL 60521

Secretary

Tony Jasaitis (CRT)
 (708)448-4967 (Home)
 tony@trdink.com (E-mail)
 P.O. Box 664
 Bedford Park, Illinois 60499-0644

Treasurer

Wes Underwood (Wheaton)
 (708)752-5127 (Business)
 (708)462-0393 (Home)
 wu@david.wheaton.edu (E-Mail)
 207 South Dorchester Avenue
 Wheaton, Illinois 60187

Publicity Director

Carl Reid (CASE)
 2289 Grand Drive
 Northbrook, Illinois 60062-6937

Trophy Chairman

Wayne Ellice (PAWNS)
 (312)838-3215 (Business)
 (312)838-3243 (Fax)
 wayne.ellice@crous.sprint.com (E-Mail)
 Crosfield Catalysts
 4099 West 71st Street
 Chicago, Illinois 60629

Banquet Chairman

Len Spiegel (Fermi)
 (708)840-2809 (Business)
 (708)377-2675 (Home)
 lenny@fnal.gov (E-Mail)
 Fermilab MS 219
 P.O. Box 500
 Batavia, Illinois 60510

Ratings Chairman

Charlie Ward (Lucent Tech Dragons)
 (708)979-4599 (Business)
 (708)979-6124 (Fax)
 (708)325-3885 (Home)
 c.e.w.ward@att.com (E-Mail)
 615 South Lincoln
 Hinsdale, Illinois 60521

Division Chairmen**Far West**

Irwin Gaines (Fermi)
 (708)840-4022 (Business)
 (708)420-1452 (Home)
 (708)840-2783 (Fax)
 gaines@fnalv.fnal.gov (E-Mail)
 Fermilab MS 127
 P.O. Box 500
 Batavia, Illinois 60510

East

Dan Fraats (Bank of America)
 (312)247-4343 (Business)
 (312)581-0923 (Home)
 5820 West 55 th Street
 Chicago, Illinois 60638

Near West

Howard Klinefelter (CASE)
 (708)961-0482 (Home)
 1125 Manchester Court
 Naperville, Illinois 60563-2110

North

Pat Sajbel (UOP)
 (847)391-2134 (Business)
 (847)506-9302 (Home)
 posajbel@uop.com (E-Mail)
 616 S. Edward
 Mt. Prospect, IL 60056

FINAL REGULAR SEASON STANDINGS*

(Teams in bold have qualified for the Championship Play-off's)

NEAR WEST DIVISION 04-20-1996

TEAM NAME	W L D	GAME POINTS	MATCH POINTS	PCT
CASE	8 1 1	43.0	8.5	0.850
ARGONNE KNIGHTS	7 3 0	38.5	7.0	0.700
LUCENT TECH. CHARGERS	5 4 1	27.0	5.5	0.550
MIDCON CORP	4 6 0	28.5	4.0	0.400
PAWNS	0 10 0	12.0	0.0	0.000

FAR WEST DIVISION 04-20-1996

TEAM NAME	W L D	GAME POINTS	MATCH POINTS	PCT
LUCENT TECH. ROYALS	7 0 3	36.0	8.5	0.850
ARGONNE ROOKS	7 2 1	38.0	7.5	0.750
FERMILAB	5 2 3	36.0	6.5	0.650
LUCENT TECH. DRAGONS	4 3 3	34.0	5.5	0.550
LUCENT TECH. TYROS	2 8 0	25.0	2.0	0.200
WHEATON COLLEGE	0 10 0	9.0	0.0	0.000

NORTH DIVISION 04-20-1996

TEAM NAME	W L D	GAME POINTS	MATCH POINTS	PCT
MOTOROLA	10 0 0	43.0	10.0	1.000
UOP PROCESS DIV.	6 4 0	30.5	6.0	0.600
EXEMPLARS	4 4 2	28.5	5.0	0.500
NORTHROP CORP.	3 4 3	26.5	4.5	0.450
SEARS	2 7 1	25.5	2.5	0.250
KEMPER INSURANCE	2 8 0	23.0	2.0	0.200

EAST DIVISION 04-20-1996

TEAM NAME	W L D	GAME POINTS	MATCH POINTS	PCT
ALUMNI CENTRAL	10 0 2	48.0	11.0	0.917
BANK AMERICA ILLINOIS	5 2 5	39.0	7.5	0.625
CHICAGO POST OFFICE	6 4 1	41.5	6.5	0.591
CHICAGO RES. & TRDG.	5 5 2	33.0	6.0	0.500
AMOCO CORP.	3 7 2	31.0	4.0	0.333
CTA	3 6 0	21.0	3.0	0.333
CHICAGO MERC. EXCH.	1 9 0	11.5	1.0	0.100

* The standings represent the final regular season standings for all divisions except the East Division, where three matches remain to be played :
 MERC at CTA - Round 2; Post Office at CTA - Round 11; CTA at MERC - Round 14.

CICL TOP TEN PLAYERS LISTS

As of 4-20-1996

NEAR WEST DIVISION TOP TEN

BENEDEK,R	KNIGHT	2160D
WILLIAMS,T	CASE	2086
WARREN,J	CHRGR	2086T
CONNOR,P	MDCON	2086
CONDRON,J	MDCON	2039
KEISLER,J	KNIGHT	2014
EGERTON,J	MDCON	1985
HILL,R	KNIGHT	1881
ELLICE,W	PAWNS	1878
KALE,S	CASE	1859

FAR WEST DIVISION TOP TEN

BEZZUBOV,V	FERMI	2338*
LEVINE,D	ROOKS	2331
TEGEL,F	DRGNS	2164T
BUCHNER,R	ROYLS	2149
BERRY,G	ROOKS	2134T
KOZLOVSKY,M	FERMI	2106
TAMEZ,I	TYROS	2099
LUDWIG,T	DRGNS	2098C
SPIEGEL,L	FERMI	2090C
SHEYNIN,S	ROOKS	2041

NORTH DIVISION TOP TEN

REYES,R	SEARS	2346D
STEVANOVIC,M	UOP	2271C
HASAN,Y	MTRLA	2245
WONG,P	EXMPL	2209C
JAKSTAS,K	NORTH	2175C
SIWEK,M	KEMPR	2157C
MELNIKOV,I	MTRLA	2139
BUERGER,E	UOP	2139D
GOLUMBOVSKI,P	NORTH	2099
BOLDINGH,E	UOP	2095

EAST DIVISION TOP TEN

INUMERABLE,F	PSTOF	2336
JASAITIS,A	CRT	2149C
HODINA,J	AMCRP	2132
FRIESEMA,W	CRT	2109
CZERNIECKI,A	ALUMN	2090C
COX,M	ALUMN	2028C
MAREMA,D	PSTOF	2006
SMILEY,R	AMCRP	2005
LEONG,D	ALUMN	2005
SANTIAGO,T	ALUMN	1961

MOST IMPROVED PLAYERS

ROSENBERG,B	MDCON	147
PAYTON,P	KEMPR	108
WILLIAMS,T	CASE	100
SPIEGEL,L	FERMI	91
OLSEN,A	KEMPR	90
JONES,M	CTA	84
MORRIS,R	MTRLA	70
BOLDINGH,E	UOP	67
SLAGLE,S	MERC	65
HICKS,C	DRGNS	64

The CICL Play-off's

1995-6 Season Playoffs - Round 1

S
e
e
d

#	Team	Final Match Record	Final Match Percentage
		W L D	Pct
1	Motorola	10 0 0	1.000
2	Alumni Central	10 0 2	0.917
3	Case	8 1 1	0.850
4	Lucent Royals	7 0 3	0.850
5	Argonne Rooks	7 2 1	0.750
6	Argonne Knights	7 3 0	0.700
7	Bank of America	5 2 5	0.625
8	UOP	6 4 0	0.600

The format for the play-off's will be a three round swiss. The pairings are the top half versus the bottom half (1 vs 5, etc). Top half teams are home.

The seedings above are based on Pct within first place, then Pct within second place (which in this case happens to be in the same order as absolute Pct). Game points were the seed tie-breaker (strictly speaking, it would be game point % if the teams involved had different schedule lengths).

Regular season time control rules apply to this first round. Please review the playoff section of our rules, especially regarding forfeits and player eligibility.

Please avoid scheduling for the week ending May 18, to allow the possibility of adjoumments (though I would discourage them), the resolution of disputes, and to give everyone a chance to prepare for the second round.

If your opponent must travel a much greater distance than normal, or to/from downtown, a later starting time or a more liberal grace period than customary may be appropriate.

I presume that your e-mail lists are sufficient information for contacts. If you need phone

numbers, your opponent's division chairman can assist you.

Rounds 2 and 3 will be on May 18 at Midcon. Time control will be 45/90, then Game/60. Starting time will be 9am. Full details will be distributed later. Individuals finishing exceptionally early may play in the Second Tier as individuals (time control assigned by TD). Details about the Second Tier will be issued separately.

Two-part scoresheets will be provided for the production of our playoff book. At this point, our President Satish Kale is planning to distribute 14 sheets to each home team for both teams to use. You may deliver copies and leftovers to the TD on May 18, as well as match result sheets.

Directions To MidCon Corp. From Various Locations

MidCon is located at: 701 E. 22nd St., Lombard, IL.

From O'Hare:

I-90 East to I-294 South. Take I-294 South 9 miles to I-88 West. I-88 West 4 miles to Highland Avenue. Go North on Highland Avenue to 22nd street (approximately 1 mile). Go East on 22nd Street

approximately 6/10 of a mile. Building is on the South side of the street.

From Chicago:

I-290 West approximately 20 miles to I-88 West. I-88 West 4 miles to Highland Avenue. Go North on Highland Avenue to 22nd street (approximately 1 mile). Go East on 22nd Street approximately 6/10 of a mile. Building is on the South side of the street.

From Oakbrook:

Butterfield Road West to Meyers Road. North on Meyers Road to first stoplight which is 22nd Street. Turn left at 22nd Street. Building is on the South side of the street approximately 2 blocks.

From I-355 South:

Exit at Butterfield Road and go East to Highland Avenue. Go North on Highland Avenue to 22nd

street (approximately 1 mile). Go East on 22nd Street approximately 6/10 of a mile. Building is on the South side of the street.

From I-355 North:

Exit at Roosevelt Road and go East to Highland Avenue. Go South on Highland Avenue to 22nd street Go East on 22nd Street approximately 6/10 of a mile. Building is on the South side of the street.

From Midway Airport:

Take 63rd Street west 1/2 mile to Central Avenue. Go North on Central Avenue 1 and 1/2 miles to I-55 South. Take I-55 South to I-355 North. Go North on I-355 to Butterfield Road. Exit at Butterfield Road and go East to Highland Avenue. Go North on Highland Avenue to 22nd Street (approximately 1 mile). Go East on 22nd Street approximately 6/10 of a mile. Building is on the South side of the street.

THE SPRING BUSINESS MEETING

Minutes by Tony Jasaitis, CICL Secretary

CHICAGO INDUSTRIAL CHESS LEAGUE Meeting of March 27, 1996 at Case Corporation

Attendees:

Jim Atkinson	Amoco
Joe Blazie	Lucent Tech. Tyros
Karel Dobr	Lucent Tech. Chargers
Charles Dobrovolny	Lucent Tech. Royals
Wayne Ellice	Pawns; Trophy Chairman
Marty Franek	Alumni Central
Brent Hansen	MidCon
Steve Jackson	Cook County Department of Corrections
Tony Jasaitis	Chicago Research & Trading; CICL Secretary
Satish Kale	Case Corporation; President
Howard Klinefelter	Case Corporation; Near West Division Chairman
Algis Litvinas	Alumni Central
Art Olsen	Kemper
Carl Reid	Case Corporation; Publicity Chairman
Lenny Spiegel	Fermi; Banquet Chairperson
Frank Suerth	Exemplars
Wes Underwood	Wheaton College; Treasurer
Tim Williams	Case Corporation; Bulletin Editor

1. President Satish Kale called the meeting to order at 7:15pm.

2. No changes were noted to the minutes of the Fall 1995 meeting.

3. Treasurer Wes Underwood presented a report of CICL finances, which will be published in the bulletin. He pointed out that the disbursements figures are not very meaningful, since most league expenses occur at the end of the season. He stressed

the continued uncertainty of counting on free copying costs for the bulletin. He called attention to the cash balance of \$1400, which has been used for years as a reserve for a new computer. He wondered if the reserve is necessary anymore, as computers have become so widespread.

The Mercantile Exchange team prepaid its dues for three seasons, when team dues were \$70. Wes has been unable to collect the additional \$10. The philosophy of whether teams that prepay should be entitled to frozen dues was debated, and whether prepayment is desirable. Wes recommends continuing to use a simple cash method of accounting and has been avoiding more complicated forms for the benefit of future Treasurers who might not be accountants.

4. Trophy Chairman Wayne Ellice reported that he has requested bids on our trophy order. So far two firms have responded. The greatest factor in the cost of a trophy is whether it has a plastic or metal king (queens or knights are also available, with knights the costliest). Al Litvinas indicated that his team desired cash instead of a trophy; this idea received no support; he was pointed in the direction of individual trophies or chess equipment. He also said that the crosses on kings break off.
5. Bulletin Editor Tim Williams reported disappointing submissions of games, not even having enough for awards. He proposed that the league supply teams with 2-part forms to ensure an adequate pool of games for publication, with an estimated cost of less than \$100 for a full season. He felt that the league has a lot of talent that should be showcased. He would like to put the bulletin on the Internet to increase CICL exposure, and having our own games in the magazine rather than others would be appropriate in such a case. He pointed out that the league is gradually shrinking, and that we should take steps now to counteract the trend.

The idea of 2-part scoresheets was well-received, with the following reservations: a) unequal opportunity for awards, as some people might not indicate such a request on their scoresheet, and the bulletin editor might not devote equal attention to all

games; b) some people record games in their own private binders; c) some new people might not know how to keep score; d) some score sheets may be illegible.

The proposal to use 2-part score sheets next season was adopted unanimously. Home team captains will be responsible for collecting the score sheet copies from both teams on a best efforts basis. Games of particular interest should be marked in some way. Tim will look into the feasibility of scoresheets customized for the league. Wes pointed out that game awards were created to encourage submissions, not to give out more awards. Now that we have another means of obtaining games for publication, he recommended that we eliminate the awards, redirecting the funds toward the cost of the scoresheets. Support for the idea was strong at first, then waned; it was tabled for consideration at the next meeting.

6. Banquet Chairman Len Spiegel distributed an announcement and registration form, which will appear in the bulletin. Team captains are asked to encourage attendance, since we had to guarantee a minimum of 80. Tony Jasaitis will repeat as TD for the sectioned speed tournament. [A craft project for the ladies is planned again. Interested parties should contact me. -TJ]
7. Publicity Chairman Carl Reid reported distributing league literature at USCF tournaments. He was unsuccessful at obtaining coverage from Channel 9 TV. The cost of advertising anywhere was prohibitive. He will look into the possibility of local coverage of the playoffs. Several members suggested sending letters and literature to large firms and colleges.
8. Midcon has volunteered its site for rounds 2 and 3 of the playoffs on May 18. The TD will determine an appropriate secondary time control, which will need to be sudden death. Tony Jasaitis volunteered to be the TD. The Second Tier will be open to all teams; those interested should contact him by April 16. Individuals who show up on May 18 will be paired with someone appropriate.
9. President Satish Kale and Treasurer Wes Underwood indicated a desire to continue

their posts were retained without a formal election. No nominations were made for Secretary. The position remains open for next season.

10. Satish asked for feedback on the new time control. The overall consensus was positive, with minor pockets of resistance.
11. Cook County Department of Corrections requested admission into the West Division, after playing an exhibition schedule this season. Captain Steve Jackson reported a growing roster of 12 players, with a playing site in the court house, and chess equipment. The team was admitted unanimously.
12. Satish initiated discussion of a proposal by Motorola to extend eligibility to relatives of team members. The idea received no visible support, with objections that included difficulty of verification. Chuck Dobrovolny suggested that the people wanting such a change make a published case for it in the bulletin; those opposed could do likewise.
13. Brent Hansen reported that his firm Midcon might not be able to participate next season after the impact of layoffs. He requested consideration of 4-man teams, since there are other struggling teams. Karel Dobr pointed out that the league at one time consisted of 2 divisions, with 8-man and 4-man teams, which eventually were combined into a compromise of 6 to yield one champion. No resolution of the question emerged.

14. At the request of Rating Chairman Charlie Ward, Satish initiated the discussion of the tie-break rule for final standings, which gives priority to head-to-head results. Tim Williams pointed out that the most common form of tie-break is game points, which are obvious and are listed in the standings. Karel Dobr pointed out that the present form encourages teams to play their "second string" more against weaker teams, instead of trying to stomp everyone to the max. The overall consensus was that the added complexity is not a problem for the teams that are involved in a tie-break situation.

15. Marty Franek distributed copies of last season's playoff book to those present; the remainder will be mailed along with the latest bulletin.
16. Howard Klinefelter suggested renaming the league, since the word "Industrial" is misleading, with connotations of heavy industry and blue-collar workers. The idea was well-received. Members should think of proposals for a new name next meeting.
17. The following members were approved for alumni status (former team is indicated):
 - Bill Hess (Fel-Pro)
 - Kelvin McAlister (Columbia)
 - Ron Weitz (Fel-Pro)
 - Bob Young (Hull Trading)
 - Eli Soriano (Franklin-Watts)
 - M. Praats (Columbia)
 - Ted Santiago (Columbia College)
 - Roman Golla (Sears)
18. President Satish Kale closed the meeting at approximately 9:40pm.

FIDE: The Big Mess

A report of the FIDE European Meeting in Utrecht, 27-28 April 1996 by Patrick Rasenberg (ROYAL DUTCH CHESS FEDERATION)

(I've chosen to run this re-print instead of writing my own article. The whole thing is getting way too ridiculous! -Ed.)

After the decision of the FIDE Leadership to grant the World Championship to Baghdad the Royal

Dutch Chess Federation convened, after consulting other chess federations, a meeting of the European chess federations. After the cancellation of the Baghdad match there was a general understanding that the meeting should go on. There were enough FIDE and European items to discuss. In total 25 federations were represented. Some federations were represented by proxy. At the request of the US Chess federation Roustam Kamsky was invited too. The meeting took place in the Dutch city of Utrecht, 27-28 April 1996 in the Hotel Holiday inn. The

meeting was presided by Herman Hamers (President of the Royal Dutch Chess Federation, chairman), Roman Toran (President of the Spanish Chess Federation), Einar Einarsson (FIDE Delegate for the Icelandic Chess Federation) and Marton Krajcovits (FIDE Delegate for the Hungarian Chess Federation). The meeting was opened by the Mayor of Utrecht.

Match for the world championship Karpov - Kamsky

The discussion started with the situation concerning the match for the World championship between Karpov and Kamsky. It was agreed that the World Championship match never should have been granted to Iraq. The members of the Presidential Board that in Utrecht declared that they were not consulted nor informed before the decision was made public. They also said that communication within the Presidential Board was very bad. After Baghdad was canceled, the World Championship match was granted to Elista. The Russian chess federation stated that, because Elista is part of Russia, it should have been consulted about this. The delegates agreed that FIDE should have consulted with the Russian federation. There were also serious doubts that the town of Elista is ready to host such an important FIDE-event. Kamsky declared that he had asked for more information from Mr. Ilyumzhinov about the conditions and safety regulations in his letter of 21 April but has not received an answer yet. Also, in contrary to what was stated by Mr. Ilyumzhinov, Kamsky already said to FIDE that he could not play in Baghdad before the March 6 Paris press conference. The next day a motion was accepted which stated that the World Championship match under no condition be held in Baghdad and that FIDE Regulations for the organization of the World Championship match be abided by. Kamsky and Karpov should be guaranteed playing under fair and equal chances and conditions. Nobody should be banned from FIDE-events for not playing the World Championship match.

World Championship cycle

The delegates were not in principle against the idea of a knock-out world championship tournament, but they agreed that it is doubtful that US\$5,000,000 can be found on a regular basis. GM Ian Rogers spoke as the former president of the Player's Council. He said that the Player's Council had not been consulted beforehand about the idea, although FIDE had stated that the Player's Council agreed with the new format. This was why Rogers had

resigned as chairman. GM Timman said that he himself was against the new World Championship tournament, but that he had talked to some players and he had found that their opinions were mixed.

However, all those present agreed that the cycle should not have been changed before it had concluded. The interruption of the cycle was rejected by the delegates. A motion which was accepted the next day stated also that the Interzonal Tournament, Candidates Tournament and World Championship match must be organized.

FIDE Matters

There was general dissatisfaction about the way FIDE operates. The lack of consultation, the inscrutability of the decision making, the lack of consistency in the policy of FIDE, the lack of cooperation and communication within the various sections branches of FIDE and the general financial situation of FIDE were all of great concern to the delegates. One of the goals of the present leadership was to reunite the chess world. However, a reunification match now looks further away than ever, in spite of the promises made at the Paris FIDE Congress.

Because of these concerns the delegates recommended that all federations that were not satisfied with the services of FIDE withhold their payments to FIDE with the exception of those services really received (e.g. for titles). This motion was accepted. The Treasurer of FIDE, Willy Icliki, stated that FIDE could only last 2 more months without bankdraught if no income was received and he was afraid that this could mean that the FIDE Office will have to be closed.

The meeting decided furthermore that a committee was formed which shall make a proposal for a alternative presidential ticket before 1 June 1996. The members of the committee will be E. Ditt, I. Gelfer and G. Loewenthal. Although the meeting expressed its wish that FIDE be preserved, a committee was appointed to evaluate alternatives to the present situation. This committee will evaluate 3 options: changing the FIDE Statutes, creating an organization within FIDE and creating a substitute organization for FIDE. Members of the committee are F. Adams, E. Ditt, E. Einarsson, G. Loewenthal, A. Makarov. The committee will present a report by 30 June 1996.

European Matters

- The German federation had proposed that in the future federations, instead of organizers, pay for their own travel and living expenses of the players at European Championships. Opinions differed on this. The proposal, in a more detailed form will be discussed during the European meeting at the Yerevan FIDE Congress.
- The meeting decided that the European team placed next to the three highest placed men's teams in the Chess Olympiad 1996 should qualify for the World Team Championship.
- The proposal about increasing the women's team for the European Team championship from 3 to 4 (+1 reserve) will be discussed in Yerevan.
- The German federation has an offer for chartering a plane to Yerevan. All federations who want to make use of this should contact the office of the German federation.
- The meeting expressed its wish to hold an annual meeting like this one in Utrecht.
- Prof. Jungwirth made some announcements concerning several European (youth) championships.

LIST OF COUNTRIES REPRESENTED - THE EUROPEAN MEETING / UTRECHT / THE NETHERLANDS

AUSTRIA	K. Jungwirth
BELARUS	proxy/Makarov
BELGIUM	D. de Ridder
CANADA	P. Haley
DENMARK	S.B. Hansen
ENGLAND	D. Jarrett/D. Sedgwick
ESTONIA	I. Nei
GERMANY	E. Ditt/H. Metzger
GEORGIA	proxy/Makarov
HUNGARY	Z. Ambrus/M. Krajevits
ICELAND	E. Einarsson
ISRAEL	A. Burstein/I. Gelfer
ITALY	L. Bombelli
LATVIA	proxy/Nei
LIECHTENSTEIN	proxy/Liniger
NETHERLANDS	G. Loewenthal
PORTUGAL	J. Durao
RUSSIA	A. Makarov
SCOTLAND	J. Glendinning
SPAIN	R. Toran
SWEDEN	proxy/Hansen
SWITZERLAND	R. Liniger
UKRAINE	proxy/Makarov
USA	F. Adams
WALES	proxy/Jarrett

Observers:

IGM Jan Timman
 IGM Ian Rogers (former chairman of Player's Council)
 Roustam Kamsky (father of Gata Kamsky)
 W. Iclicki (FIDE Treasurer)
 B. Kouatly (FIDE Deputy President)

PROPOSAL FOR CHANGING TEAM STRUCTURE

by Tony Jasaitis, CICL Secretary

After writing up the minutes from our spring meeting, I reflected upon what was said and the "prevailing winds" lately, and kind of put one and one together. There was our visionary Bulletin Editor Tim Williams slapping us in the face with the cold fact that we are withering away and that we should start acting now. Later Brent Hansen of Midcon, whose team has been providing us with a most valued resource (a playoff site), announced that due to layoffs his team would be too short-handed to play next year. There they were side by side, reality confirming theory. It got me thinking...

Layoffs... that's become a recurring theme killing off our teams. In my time, we've buried at least Waste Management, Fel-Pro, Rockwell, A&B Radio, Franklin-Watts, Hull Trading, Columbia College, Unilever, Alumni West, Walgreens, Amoco West, First National Bank, Excaliburs, Veteran's Administration, Marshall Field's, Wheaton College (off and on), Chicago Board Options Exchange, and probably now Midcon.

Publicity... that's been getting us a decent number of teams: Waste Management, Franklin-Watts, Hull Trading, Columbia College, Unilever, Midcon, Cook

County Department of Corrections. Not as many as we've lost, but I wouldn't expect to mine new teams all that quickly. Looks like the publicity is working. Looks like something else isn't. I'm calling for a fresh look at what isn't.

Brent asked us to consider 4-board teams, something the league got away from decades ago. With the prevailing trend toward corporate downsizing, layoffs, spin-offs, etc., maybe we can't afford to insist on 6-board teams anymore. Besides the mentioned "funerals", there have been "miscarriages" ... firms that have contacted us but were unable to field a team as large as we require.

So what do we do? The following attempts at solutions have crossed my mind:

- a) A separate section of 4-board teams, as before.
- b) Reducing team size to 4.
- c) Reducing team size to 5.
- d) Flexible team sizes.

Some thoughts on each alternative:

a) Ideally, a separate 4-board section could be a great idea, if we could launch one as large as our existing one, complete with geographical divisions. But if we only have a handful of such teams for starters, spread out all over, how viable would it be? Would the teams want to travel really far to play? If we contacted all the firms that have dropped out over the last 20 years, maybe we could pull it off. Unfortunately, I no longer have a record of most of the people who contacted me who were interested in submitting smaller new teams. If we publicized the change in the ICB, **MAYBE** we'd have a chance at pulling it off.

b) Reducing the team size to 4 "across the board" seems too drastic. We have lot of members who wouldn't be able to play regularly. Teams could be split, but they would need team captains, and we all know that the lack of a captain is the death of a team.

c) Teams of 5? With the "writing on the wall", that's not unreasonable, and not too drastic.

d) Flexible team sizes? Well, I haven't thought the concept through completely, but the more I think about it, the more everything falls into place. I want to toss it out for all you creative minds to build on. What if the minimum team size was 4, expandable to whatever works (even more than 6)? A team would declare its official team size at the beginning of the season, based on what the team captain felt would avoid forfeits for a full season, subject to league review. A turnout less than that would result in forfeits; a turnout larger than that would be as "extra boards".

When teams of different sizes would play, the match result would be based on the smaller team's official size. For the playoffs, 6 would still be the standard, and teams of smaller official sizes would be excluded, keeping strong small teams from taking it all, but giving them incentive for a divisional prize. In the event of a tie, the award would be given to the officially larger team. Heck, we're halfway there already, with the evolution of exhibition teams. Let's pull them in completely.

An advantage of this approach is that the league could grow toward a possible goal of 2 different sized sections, if that turns out to be even more desirable, without having to deal with the disadvantages of doing it immediately. Since smaller teams would not have full league status, they could pay slightly lesser dues while adding to our treasury, and quite possibly reduce our dues as well, and fill that ever-rising banquet minimum!

I suppose some petty teams might object to a "cripple" taking their trophy, but let's keep in mind that this is the "Chicago INDUSTRIAL Chess League", not the "Chicago SIX-MAN League". Let's expand our horizons for playing chess, and play some extra games with some new people.

Let's have feedback on this idea already. If this looks likely to pass at the next meeting, we can contact likely candidates over the summer, and start the next season with more new teams than we've lost in a decade!

The Finishing Touch


by Ruben Reyes

From the Playoff Book here're UPSETS GALORE.

First up is this fine win Jim Warren (2100) had against R. Benedek (2205). This match up between two of CIGL's top veterans (Warren's a triple centurion!!! Benedek's a double centurion!! That's over 500 games between the two) lives up to expectations: an interesting clash of wits.

Let's drop in after 21.Nxf4 f5

R. Benedek (Black)



J. Warren (White)


22.Rd1 fxe4

22...Bf6, to prevent White's next move, seems a nicer alternative.

23.Rd8+!

This check is deadly because it practically paralyzes Black's Rook and c-Bishop right where they stand.

23...Kf7 24. Nxe4 Ke7 25.Bb6 Bxb2



Though Black's a pawn up, he's got a serious problem with the development of his c-Bishop and Rook.

26.a4


White sees he can win Black's c-Bishop later on with Nd6 (that's because 26...Be5 fails against 27.Nd3) and so avoids giving Black even the slightest of compensation.

26...Ra6

Black's last move seems as good as any

attempt to loosen White's deadly grip as White threatened 27.Nd6.

27.Rxc8 Rxb6 28.Rc7+ Kf8



Black has finally activated his imprisoned Rook. But White doesn't give Black even one single moment to recover his breathe.

29.Ne6+

The start of a forceful mating attack.

29...Kg8


Else mate in one: 29...Ke8 30.Rc8++

30.N4g5

Mate in one is threatened: 31.Rc8++

30...Bd4+ 31. Kh1 1-0

Final Position



There's no defense to the threat of mate: with 32.Rc8++. If 31...Bf6 then 32.Rc8+ Bd8 (what else is there) 33. Rxd8++


A nice ending from Jim Warren, masterfully executed and with precision.

The full text of Warren-Benedek game is in Game #74 of the Playoff Book

R. Brady's (1282) upset win over A. Para (1571) comes from having excellent end-game technique and from making one fewer error.

Position after 12.Bh6

A. Para (Black)



R. Brady (White)

Black gets the advantage early via the following nice combo which wins a pawn:

12...Bxh6

Draws the Q away from the d-pawn

13.Qxh6 Bxf3

Takes care of the last defender to the d-pawn.

14. Nb5

White sees he loses the d-pawn after 14. Bxf3 and so tries to save it by defending the pawn with tempo via an attack on the Q.

14...Qb6


But Black won't be denied his d-pawn.

15.Bxf3 Nxd4

And Black's a pawn up.

But Black's advantage doesn't last long as both sides begin to make mistakes. Lets fast-forward to:

Position after 30.N(c3)a4




White's last move is a blunder as 30...Qxa4 wins the N.

30...Qa6?

Black also overlooks ...Qxa4.

31.Qxa6 Nxa6 32.Nb6 Kf8?



Another mistake. Black doesn't see Nd7+.

33.Ra2?

Both fail to see the N fork (Nd7+).

33...e6?

Black's still unaware of the N fork.

34.Nd7+


This time White doesn't miss a thing.

34...Ke7 35.Nxb8 Rxb8

Though the exchange down, Black puts up a stiff resistance. White returns the exchange to gain progress in advancing his a-pawn.

Let's fast-forward to:

Position after 47.g3



47...Kb6

Black probably could have improved his chances by driving White's K away first with 47...e4+.


48.f4

Well played as this enables White's K to penetrate and cause Black's d-pawn to lose its support and enable White to win Black's d-pawn.

48...e4+ 49.Kxd4 Ka7 50.g4

(See diagram top of next column)


Position after 50.g4



50...Rd8+


50...Re8 not only threatens 51...e3, 52...Re4+ and 53...Rxf4 but also fences off White's King away from Black's pawns. It also threatens ...Re6 and ...Rxa6.

51.Ke5 Re8+ 52.Kf6 e3 53.gxf5 gxf5 54.Kxf5 e2 55.Re1 Kxa6



White's endgame technique in having the K play an active role is well executed.

56.Kq4 Kb5 57.Kf3 Kc5 58.Rxe2 Rxe2



59.Kxe2

Winning now is a matter of endgame technique which Brady now performs nicely.


59...Kd5 60.Kf3 Ke6 61.Kg4 Kf6 62.h4 Kg6 63.h5+ Kf6 64.f5 h6 65.Kf4 Kf7 66.Ke5 Ke7 67.f6+ Kf7 68.Kf5 Kg8 69.Kg6 Kh8 70.Kxh6 Kg8 71.Kg6 Kh8 72.Kf7 Kh7 73.Ke8 1-0

(See Game #7 of Playoff Book for full text of Brady-Para)

The upset win C. Van Zile (1367) tallied against G. Thomas (1505) is a beauty.

Let's pick up the action after 8...0-0:


C. Van Zile (Black)



G. Thomas (White)

Black gives up his e-pawn and allows the doubling of his c-pawn for development.

9.Bxc6 bxc6 10.Nxe5 Qf6 11.d4 Bd6 12.f4




White's in good shape and should be fine once he catches up in development.

12...Qh4 13.c4

To be able to bring the N to c3 as well as to drive back Black's centralized N.

13...Nf6 14.c5 Bxe5



All White needs to do now is play 15.exd5 and he'd be just fine.


15.g3?

This not only loses a pawn but also weakens the light squares around White's K, a weakening which proves fatal.

15...Bxd4+ 16.Qxd4 Qh3 17.Nc3 Ng4

The start of a deliberate campaign against White's King.

18.Qd2 Bc4 19.Rd1 Rae8!



Black's last move is a beauty. The threat's 20...Re2!! winning as 21. Nxe2 results in mate in two (21...Qxh2+ and 22...Qf2++). And 21.Qxe2 because of 21...Bxe2 22. Nxe2 Qxh2+ and 23...Qf2++

20.Qg2


The only defense.

20...Qh5 21.Bd2

Finally, White gets to develop his B. But then it's all too late.

21.b4 seems to avoid the disaster into which White now falls.


21...Qxc5+ 22.Kh1 Nf2+



Black's last move finishes White off as 23.Kg1 Nxd1+ 24.Kh1 Nxc3 24.Bxc3 Bd4 followed by 25...BxQ wins.

23.Qxf2 Qxf2 24.Na4 Re2 0-1

Final Position




(For the full text of G.Thomas - C. Van Zile, see Game # 70 of the Playoff Book.)

This upset win E. Suarez (1602) of Argonne Knights pulls on A. Dzekhtser (1840) of Sears is awesome.


Position after 7.f4

A. Dzekhtser (Black)




E. Suarez (White)

7...f5 8.e5 b6 9.Bf3 Rb8



10.Qa4 dxe5 11.dxe5 Bb7 12.O-O-O!




White's foregoing of winning the Black a-pawn in favor of development and pressure on the pinned N at d7 is a master stroke.

12...Bxf3

This attempt to save the a-pawn allows White to increase his advantage in development.


13.Nxf3 Ra8 14.Ng5

See diagram top of next column



The N penetration tears Black's defense to shreds.

14...Bf8 15.Nxe6 Qc8 16.Nxf8 b5




Or 16...Rxf8 17.e6 and White's winning.


17.Nxb5

If 17.Qxb5 then 17...c6 enables Black to escape: 18.Qa4 Kxf8.

17...Kxf8 18.Nxa7 Nb6 19.Bxb6 cxb6 20.Nxc8 Rxa4 21.Rd8+Kg7 22.Rxh8 Kxh8 23.Nxe7 Rxa2 24.Kc2



Black played on but to no avail. 24...Kg7 25.Nd5 Kf7 26.Rd1 Ra4 27.Nxb6 Rb4 28.Rd6 h5 29.Kc3! 1-0 (See Game #68 of Playoff Book for full text of this game)




GAMES SECTION


C42/5

Underwood W - Buchner R
CICL Match Game, , 1996


1. e4 e5 2. ♖f3 ♗f6 3. ♜xe5 d6
4. ♗f3 ♜xe4 5. d4 d5 6. ♙d3
♜c6 7. 0-0 ♙g4 8. c3 [8. c4 ♗f6
9. cxd5 ♙xf3 10. ♖xf3 ♖xd5 11.
♖e2+ ♙e7 12. ♙b5 ♖d6 13.
♜c3 0-0 14. ♙xc6 bxc6 15. ♙e3
♜d5 16. ♞ac1 ♞f8 even and
nearly dead, Timman - Yusupov,
match 1986)] 8... ♙e7 9. ♜bd2
♜xd2 10. ♙xd2




10... ♖d7!? A speculative attempt
to complicate, Qd6 followed by
O-O is more normal. 11. ♙b5
♖f5 12. ♖a4 0-0 13. ♙e2 Also
possible is [13. ♙xc6 ♙xf3 (13 ...
♙xf3 14. ♙d7 ♖d3 15. ♙e3 ♙e4
16. ♞fd1 ♖c4 17. ♖xc4 dxc4 18.
♙b5 ♙d3 19. b3 a6 20. ♙xc4
♙xc4 21. bxc4) 14. ♙d7 ♖g6 15.
♙h3] 13... ♙d6 14. ♖d1 Also
possible is [14. ♜h4 ♖h5 (14 ...
♖h5 15. ♙xg4 ♖xh4 (15 ...
♖xg4 16. ♗f3 ♖h5 17. h3 g6)
16. ♙h3 g5) 15. ♙xg4] 14... ♖h5
15. h3



15... f5! A sacrifice to increase the
pressure, taking advantage of
white's overall lack of mobility and
uncoordinated pieces. 16. hxg4
fxg4 17. ♜e5 Forced. ♜xe5 18.
dxe5 ♙xe5 19. g3




19... ♞f3! With a permanent bind,
white can't capture the rook
without getting mated. 20. ♙f4
Hoping to hold the position with
exchanges. 20... ♙xf4 21. gxf4
♞f8 22. c4 Attempting to break
out white's queen. 22.c6 Premature
are both R8xf4 and Rh3.



23. cxd5 White fails to relieve the
pressure in time. 23... ♞h3 Under
some time pressure, black chose to
quickly simplify and consolidate
his advantage, R8xf4 threatening
g3 also looks very strong for black.
24. ♙xg4 If 24.Kg2 Rh2+! and if

24.f3 g3! 24... ♞h1+ 25. ♙g2
♖h2+ 26. ♙f3




26... ♖xf4+ 27. ♙e2 ♖xg4+ 28.
♙e3 ♞e8+ 29. ♙d2 White's king
has somehow managed to escape,
however white's position has little
hope. 29... ♖xd1+ 30. ♞axd1
♞xf1 31. ♞xf1 ♞d8 0:1

C41/10


Sollano - Olsen A
CICL Match Game, , 1996

1. e4 e5 2. ♗f3 d6 3. d4 exd4 4.
♜xd4 ♙e7 [4 ... g6 5. ♜c3 ♙g7
6. ♙e3 ♗f6 7. ♖d2 0-0 8. 0-0-0
♞e8 9. f3 a6 10. g4 b5 11. ♙g5 ±
Joksic - Lehmann, Plovdiv 1975
(MCO-13)] 5. ♙c4 ♗f6 6. ♜c3
c6 7. ♜de2 0-0 8. ♜g3 b5 9. ♙e2
b4 10. ♜a4 Black seems to be
getting an awful lot of space for
playing a Philidor's.




10... ♞e8 11. 0-0 ♙a6 [11 ...
♙e6!? ; 11 ... ♙b7 12. ♞el c5]
12. ♞el ♙b5 13. c4!? [13.
♙xb5?? cxb5] 13... ♙xa4 Maybe
Ba6 followed by c5(?). 14. ♖xa4

c5 15. ♖e3 ♘bd7 16. ♜ad1 ♚c7
 17. f4 ♖f8 18. ♖f3 ♜ad8 19.
 ♚c2 ♚c8 20. ♖c1 ♚c7 21. ♜e2
 ♖e7 22. ♘f5 ♖f8 23. g4 ♘b6 24.
 g5 ♘fd7 25. b3 ♘c8 26. h4
 ♘db6 27. h5 ♘e7 28. ♘h4 ♘c6
 29. ♖e3 ♘d7 30. ♜ed2 Black has
 chopped a lot of wood while
 watching white over-extend
 himself, but he has no weaknesses
 on the king-side and white is
 creating them for himself.




30... f6 31. ♘f5 ♖fg5 32. ♘xd6
 ♖xd6 33. ♜xd6 ♖xf4 34. ♖xf4
 ♜f8 35. ♜f6 ♘de5 36. ♜xf8+
 ♜xf8 37. ♖xe5 ♘xe5 38. ♖g2




38... ♘g4 White's king must be
 feeling somewhat exposed now.
 39. e5 ♚xe5 40. ♖d5+ ♚h8 41.
 ♖f7 ♚e3+ [41 ... ♜xf7?? 42.
 ♜d8+] 42. ♚g2 ♚e5 43. ♚h3
 ♘f6 44. ♚f2 ♚e7 45. ♖g6 ♖hg6
 46. ♖hg6 ♚e6+! White now gets
 mated or loses material. 47. ♚g2
 ♚g4+ 48. ♚g3 ♚xd1 0:1

D35/14
 Williams T - Hill R
 CICL CASE-Argonne, 1996

1. d4 d5 2. c4 e6 3. ♘c3 ♘f6 4.
 cxd5 exd5 5. ♖g5 ♖e7




6. e3 0-0 7. ♖d3 h6 8. ♖h4 c6 9.
 ♘f3 ♖e6!? Different but not
 necessarily bad. 10. ♚c2 ♘bd7
 11. h3 ♜c8 12. 0-0 a6 13. a3




13... ♜e8 14. b4 b5 White is
 moving much too slow with his
 minority attack. 15. ♜fb1? White
 is taking off in the wrong
 direction. This move is just plain
 bad. 15... a5 16. ♖g3 a4 17. ♜c1
 ♘b6 18. ♖e5!! Either that or a ??,
 hard to say. During the game I
 realized that something had really
 gone wrong and I tried to come up
 with something to stop what might
 turn into a slow death. White's
 idea is to use black's own
 expansion against him - trade both
 bishops for the black knights and
 then creep through the holes in the
 pawn structure. I went over this
 game with Al Chow and he was


stunned when I presented this
 idea. Good or bad, you tell me!



18... ♘c4 19. ♖xf6 Normally,
 white will play e4 and undermine
 the knight on c4, etc, but I'm
 taking my own path. 19... ♖xf6
 20. ♖xc4 dxc4 Is the bishop pair
 really better here?




21. ♘e4 ♖d5 22. ♘xf6+ ♚xf6
 23. ♚e2 Closed pawn structure,
 bad bishop. The white knight can't
 be too bad. 23... ♜e6? Black
 should chop off the knight without
 thinking. I gave the move a ? more
 because black declines the trade
 repeatedly during the game, as
 opposed to it being a full-fledged
 blunder now.




24. ♘e5 ♚h4 25. ♚g4 ♚xg4 26.
 ♖hg4 Taking with the knight is
 pretty ugly. 26... g5 27. ♜e1 ♜e7

28. ♖f3 ♗g7 29. ♜ac1 f6 30. ♖d2 That's it! I had to reposition my rooks but I'm not going to let the knight sit in front of the bishop any more. The knight is heading for c3 where it blockades the c4-pawn (Hail Nimzowitsch!) and supports the push e4. Black seems to overestimate his position now. 30... ♜ce8 31. ♜c3 ♗g6 32. f3 ♜h7 33. ♗f2 h5




34. g4 ♜xh5 35. ♖b1 f5 36. ♜cc1 ♜h8 Black controls the h-file! But so what? There's no entry point so the black rooks look impressive but are actually passive. Meanwhile, white is ready to continue plans for the e4 push.




37. ♖c3 37... ♗e6 38. ♜cd1! White is about ready for a central pawn push. Hmm... Nimzo would be proud of white in this position. A blockading knight, counter-thrust in the center in response to a premature flank action. Break out those copies of My System and Chess Praxis. 38... g4 39. fxg4 fxg4 40. e4 And now for those of you who get into computer analysis: [0.69 (10/27): 40. ♗g3 ♜d8 41. e4 ♗g5 42. ♜e3 ♗f7 43. ♖e2 ♜dh8 44. ♜e1 ♜h1


(00:06:26)] Analysis by Fritz 3. Does this make sense to anyone?? 40... g3+!? You wouldn't think black could play this, but yes, he can! [41. ♗xg3? ♜g5+ 42. ♗f2 ♜f8+ 43. ♗e3 ♜g3+ 44. ♗d2 ♜f2+]



41. ♗e3 ♗g4 42. ♖e2 White is on the edge of having his flag fall. The remaining moves to the time control were blitzed out. Play them real fast and it's just like being there! 42... ♜f8?? Black played faster than he needed to. I'm sure he thought the knight was pinned.




43. ♖f4+! ♗g5 44. ♖xh5 ♗xd1 45. ♖xg3! ♗g4 46. e5 ♗e6 47. ♖e4+ Heading back to the queenside.




47... ♗g4 48. ♖c3 ♗g3 49. ♜e2 ♜f1 50. d5! I really liked this


move. It seemed the best way to make progress.




50... cxd5 51. ♖xb5 ♜d1




52. ♜d2 Black was threatening mate! 52... ♜e1+ 53. ♗d4 ♜e4+ 54. ♗c5 ♜xe5 55. ♖c3




55... ♗f4 Black is tied up in knots. The rest is a matter of technique. 56. ♜d4+ ♗e3 57. b5 ♜g5 58. b6 ♜xg2 59. b7



59... ♖g8 [59 ... ♜b2?? 60. ♖d1+] 60. ♖d1+ ♕e2 61. ♖c6 c3 62. ♖xc3+ ♕e3 63. ♜xa4 d4 64. ♜a8 ♜b8 65. ♜xb8 dxc3 Black has one last swindle to be dealt with. Believe it or not, white is once again running out of time.



66. ♜h8 c2 67. ♜h1 ♖g4 68. ♜c1 That takes care of any drawing chances. The rest is to see whether or not white can make the time control at move 75. 68... ♖f3+ 69. ♖c7 ♖d2 70. ♜xc2+ ♖xc2 71. b8=♖ ♖c3 72. ♖d6 ♖c4 73. ♖b4+ ♖d3 74. ♖b3+ ♖d4




75. a4 White reaches the time control. 1:0

C05/12


Dobrovolny C - Morrison J
CICL - Royals v Rooks, 1996

(Notes by Dobrovolny)


1. e4 e6 2. d4 d5 3. ♖d2 ♖f6 4. e5 ♖fd7 5. ♖gf3 c5 6. c3 ♖c6 7. ♖d3 c4? (This push is only good when white has played a3 and left a hole at b3. Black has given up his tension in the center for nothing.) This and black's next two pawn moves are too time-consuming. And they deprive black of the possibilities offered by 7... ♖b6. In addition, relaxing the tension allows white to continue his development without a threat to his pawn chain.




8. ♖c2 b5 9. 0-0 b4 10. ♜e1 It's nice to get this move in before black has challenged white's e-pawn with ... f6. 10... ♖e7 11. ♖f1 ♖b6 Not bad if black has no intention of castling and instead using the king-side pawns as weapons. But it seemed as if black wanted to castle, but was perturbed by white's eleventh move. 12. ♖g3 g6? 12... h5 looks like it fends off white's knight while preparing h4-h5. The text just creates a hole and a great home for white's dark-squared bishop. (As a long-time French player I can tell you that when moves like this are played, black is in for some real trouble. - Ed.) 13. ♖h6 13... ♖f8 14. ♖d2



14... ♖e7? Giving me something to chase while leaving black's bishop in his own way. 15. ♖g5 ♖c7 16. ♖f6 ♖g8 17. ♖g5 ♖h6?




This should have been black's last mistake, but my desire to launch a king-side attack blinded me to the simple 18.Nxe6. [18. ♖xe6! fxe6 (18 ... ♖xd2 19. ♖xc7+ ♖d7 20. ♖xa8 ♖xe1 21. ♖xb6+ axb6 22. ♜xe1) 19. ♖xh6] 18. ♖f4? ♖d7? 19. ♖h4? ♖xg5 20. ♖xg5 Establishing the first pin. 20... ♖xf6



21. exf6! Establishing the second pin. At this point, my Elite 2100 standalone feels that I've whittled a 0.8 pawn lead down to a 0.5 pawn lead. But it doesn't appreciate the power of the two pins. White can develop his knight

to f5 unmolested, or play 22.Qxd5. [21 ... ♖a5 22. ♟f5 bxc3 23. bxc3 ♜xc3 24. ♙a4 ♙d7 25. ♟d6+] 21... ♜d6 22. ♟f5 ♜d8 23. ♙a4 The decisive third pin. Black must now lose the exchange. 23... ♟d7



24. ♙xc6+ I felt by capturing this way, I could tempt black to try to protect the hanging b-pawn and lure him further into the open. 24... ♟xc6 25. ♟e7+ ♟b5 26. ♟xg8 ♜xg8 27. ♟xb4 ♟xb4 28. ♜d2+ ♟b5 And black resigned a few moves later having used all but two minutes of the first time control. (29. b3 ♜d8 30. bxc4+ ♟c6 31. cxd5+ ♟d7 32. dxe6+ fxe6) 1:0

D10/4

Stamm V - O'Dell D
CICL Match Game, , 1996

1. d4 d5 2. c4 c6 3. ♟c3 h6 4. e4 dxe4 5. ♟xe4 ♙f5 6. ♟g3 ♙g6 7. ♟f3 ♟f6 8. ♙d3 ♙xd3 9. ♜xd3 e6 10. 0-0 ♙d6 11. ♟e4 ♜e7 12. ♟xd6+ ♜xd6 13. c5 ♜d5 14. ♙e1 ♟bd7 15. ♜e2 b6 16. b4 a5 17. bxa5 ♙xa5 18. ♟xb6 ♟xb6 19. ♙f4 ♟bd7 20. ♙eb1 0-0 21. a3 ♟e4 22. ♜c2 c5 23. ♙d2 ♟xd2 24. ♜xd2 cxd4 25. ♜xd4 ♙fa8 26. ♜xd5 ♙xd5 27. ♟f1 ♟c5 28. ♟e1 ♙d4 29. ♟c2 ♙c4 30. ♟e3 ♙c3 31. ♙c1 ♙xc1+ 32. ♙xc1 ♟b3 33. ♙c3 ♙xa3 34. ♟e1 ♙a1+ 35. ♟d1 ♟d4 36. ♙c8+ ♟h7 37. ♙d8 ♟f5 38. g4

♟h4 39. ♟e2 ♙a3 40. ♙d3 ♙a5 41. ♟e3 ♟g6 42. f4 f5 43. h3 ♙a4 44. ♟f2 ♙xf4+ 45. ♟g3 ♟g5 46. ♙d7 g6 47. gxf5 ♙f3+ 48. ♟h2 ♙xc3 49. fxe6 ♙xe6 50. ♙d5+ ♟f4 51. ♙d4+ ♟g5 52. ♙d5+ ♟f5 53. ♟g2 ♟h4 54. ♙b5 ♙e3 55. ♙b4+ ♟h5 0:1

B09/10

Stoltz R - Tegel F
CICL Match Game, 1996


1. e4 d6 2. d4 ♟f6 3. ♟c3 g6 4. f4 ♙g7 5. ♟f3 0-0 6. ♙c4 c6 7. a3 d5 8. exd5 cxd5 9. ♙d3 ♙g4 10. h3 ♙xf3 11. ♜xf3 ♟c6 12. ♟e2 a6 13. c3 b5 14. 0-0 ♜b6 15. ♙e3 ♟a5 16. ♙ae1 ♟c4 17. ♙c1 e6 18. ♟h1 ♙fc8 19. ♟g3 a5 20. f5 exf5 21. ♟xf5 gxf5 22. ♜xf5 ♟d6 23. ♜f3 ♟de4 24. g4 h6 25. ♙g1 ♙e8 26. ♙ef1 ♟g5 27. ♜g2 ♟fe4 28. ♙f5 ♜b7 29. ♙g1 f6 30. h4 ♟h7 31. ♜f3 ♙e7 32. ♟g2 ♙ae8 33. ♙h5 ♙f8 34. ♜f5 ♜d7 35. ♜g6 ♟h8 36. ♙ff5 ♙g8 37. ♙xd5 ♙e6 38. ♜f5 ♙f8 39. ♜xe6 ♙xe6 40. ♟f3 ♟d6 41. ♙xb5 ♙e1 42. ♙d2 ♙g1 43. ♙d7 ♙b1 44. ♙e6 ♙g6 45. ♙xa5 ♙xb2 46. ♙f4 ♙c2 47. ♙ac5 f5 48. ♙e5+ ♙g7 49. ♙xd6 fxe4+ 50. ♙g4 ♙xd6 51. ♙c8+ ♙f8 52. a4 ♟g7 53. ♙c7+ ♟g6 54. ♙e5 ♙f6+ 55. ♟e3 ♙d6 56. h5# 1:0

A04


Marcowka B - Jasaitis A
CICL Match Game, 1996

(Notes by Jasaitis)


1. ♟f3 Not a perfect game, but an instructive struggle as the balance tips several times. 1... f5 2. b3 Unusual at this move, but with this opening, most roads lead to... Holland? If one plays common sense moves, one eventually winds up transposing to the mainlines most of the time. The QB fianchetto is not unusual later in the opening in the standard lines. 2... ♟f6 3. ♙b2 g6




4. c4 [4. ♙:f6 would lead to a sterile game where white would not have any chances of exploiting] 4... ♙g7 5. ♟c3 d6 6. d4 0-0 7. e3 We are almost normal Dutchmen after all, as predicted, except that white opts against the usual fianchetto of the KB. White's choice is more passive than the pressure a bishop on the long diagonal would yield.




7... c6 8. ♙e2 ♜c7 9. ♙c1 e5




10. d:e5! The open file and dark square superiority helps white counteract black's K-side pressure. Otherwise, black would play e4 next and have an excellent form of a King's Indian Attack, as in McAlister - Jasaitis, circa 1992. 10... d:e5 11. 0-0 ♖e7 I didn't want to play the natural Rd8 until I could connect my rooks for a battle for control of the d-file. I did want to keep my opponent from controlling the Q-side with Ba3 and/or c5. Besides, after 11... Be6, 12.Nd5 is inconvenient.




12. ♖c2! With the triple purpose of fighting for the d-file, and by allowing Qc1, fighting for the Q-side dark squares and ultimately the c-file, as we shall see. 12... ♖a6 13. ♗c1 e4 14. ♕a3 ♘b4 15. ♘d2? This unnatural move surprised me. It turns out well, with the eye toward an eventual c5 and Nc4, but runs the risk of getting white badly bottled up. 15... ♕e6 The right idea was a5 followed by c5 when appropriate, so that white's c-pawn becomes immobilized, and with it most of white's army. Black had a second chance next move. 16. ♜d1



16... ♜fd8 17. ♘a4 c5? Black could still have avoided the worst with b6, since 18.c5? drops the rook. Now, white's pieces become roaring beasts instead of hibernators. 18. ♕:b4 c:b4 19. c5 ♜ac8 20. ♘c4




20... ♘e8 Hated to do it, but in a storm, one must get the umbrella out. 21. ♜cd2 ♕f6




22. ♘a5? White needed to trade a pair of rooks first, to get black's off the c-file. Now black should have played 22... ♜:d2 23. ♗:d2 (23. ♜:d2 b6) 23... ♕c3! If then 24. ♘:c3 b:c3 25. ♗:c3 b6 ♞. At this point black had about 15 minutes to get to move 45. 22... ♗e7? 23. ♕c4! ♕f7! Black plans the trades so as to keep white from winning


the weak b-pawn. 24. ♕:f7+ ♗:f7 25. ♗c4 ♜:d2



26. ♗:f7+?? What a relief as white forgets about his back rank! 26... ♗:f7 27. ♜:d2 b6 I leapt at the chance to make this obvious move with 5 minutes remaining, but b5! was even stronger.




28. ♘b7 ♜c7 29. c6 ♜:c6 30. ♗f1 ♕e7 31. ♗e2 b5 32. ♘b2




32... ♜c7 33. ♘d8+ ♕:d8? Missed a chance to win material with Kf6 by Nd6 and Rc8. Thanks, new time control (but I'd still rather leave downtown by 9pm)! With the following moves, I knew I was risking only drawing, as the black king has no obvious way into the position, but I needed a position that was easy to play and virtually impossible to blow (at

least that's MY priority when I'm in time trouble, since I'm not a blitz whiz). 34. ♖:d8 ♜c2+ 35. ♜d2 ♜:d2+ 36. ♔:d2




36... ♔e6 37. f4 ♞f6 38. ♞d1 ♞d5




39. ♞f2?? Afterward, White said he had intentions of K-side

counterplay at the time. Now it's an easy win. Black might still have a won position, however, by getting his king to c5, and saccing back the extra pawn with Nc3! after optimal placement of his pawns, taking advantage of standard K & P endgame tools such as better king position, opposition, zugzwang, etc. 39... ♞c3 40. ♞d1 ♞:a2 41. ♔c2 ♔d5 42. ♔b2 ♞c3 43. ♞:c3+ ♔:c3+ 44. ♔:c3 a5




45. h3 h6 [45 ... ♔c5] 46. h4 ♔c5 47. b4+ a:b4+ 48. ♔b3 ♔c6 49. ♔:b4 ♔b6 At this point I wasn't even cognizant that under the right circumstances white can try the cheap shot g4 followed by

h5, which wouldn't win even if white got to queen his f-pawn, but would drag the game out quite a bit. White resigns when that last hope gets snuffed out. 50. ♔b3 ♔c5 51. ♔c3 b4+ 52. ♔b3



52... h5 0:1



Submit those games and articles!
Your contributions are the heart of this bulletin.

THE FINAL WORD

Holy cow! Where did all the time go? This month *really* ran late and I could have used another week or two as it was. The international scene is total chaos but it appears (latest word) that Kamsky will be ready to play on June 5th against Karpov. And I've been trying to get my first issue of the Illinois Chess Bulletin ready to go.

AND, our own CIGL Championship has already started and I'm glad to say that CASE has beaten Bank of America 5-1 in the first match to be played. Also, Motorcia over the Argonne Rooks 4-2 and UOP beat the Royals by a score of 3.5-2.5 in two of the other four opening round matches in the First Tier. No news yet from the other first round pairing. Official results from the entire play-off's will appear in the next bulletin.

A million thanks go out to those of you who have submitted games. If your game did not make this issue, take heart! It will be in the next one. The next issue should be the first one dedicated first and foremost to league action and have the games to back up such a claim. Next season's game-copy submission rule should really put us into high gear! Keep those submissions coming and I'll do my best to keep pace. The very best submissions will move on to state-wide publication.

One more quick thing. I got an e-mail from Wayne Ellice wanting to know the next deadline, and well he won't make it for this announcement so I'll say it for him. If your team is fortunate enough to be raking in trophies at this year's banquet, please get in touch with Wayne and let him know your team's preferences. Check the front of the bulletin for contacting him (Trophy Chairman).

The next bulletin will be released at the CIGL Banquet. As such, there will be a deadline on June 1st for any submissions. Just a reminder, annotations are not required with game submissions. Just make sure the score is legible enough that I can read it and I'll take it from there. Because I intend to announce and showcase the best games of the season in the bulletin, copies will probably be distributed after the awards presentations - Just to keep it exciting!

See you at the play-off's and again at the banquet.

Tim Williams, Editor

RESULTS FROM AROUND THE CICL

26-FEB-96 AMOCO CORP.		4.5	CTA	1.5	
ROUND 12					
BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 ATKINSON,J	1779 -8	.5	WILSON,A	1576 12	.5
2 WENTLING,C	1582 16	1	JONES,M	1487-16	0
3 WOOD,L	1463 25	1	WILLIAMS,A	1499-25	0
4 NOTTOLI,R	0 0	1	STAPLES,M	1192 0	0
5 PORTER,D	0 0	0	MCCARTNEY	0 0	1
6 CORBIN,Z	1311 0	1F		0 0	0F

27-FEB-96 UOP PROCESS DIV.		4	KEMPER INSURANCE	2	
ROUND 8					
BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 STEVANOVIC	2242 12	1	SIWEK,M	2169-12	0
2 BUERGER,E	2125 -5	.5	LEONG,G	2002 5	.5
3 BOLDINGH,E	2063 10	1	HUGHES,N	1844 -7	0
4 SAJBEL,P	1792-16	.5	OLSEN,A	1508 16	.5
5 LIKHTEREV,M	1475-28	0	CUMMUTA,P	1386 28	1
6 VAN ZILE,C	1348 14	1	PAYTON,P	1215-14	0

13-MAR-96 LUC TECH CHARGERS		3.5	PAWNS	2.5	
ROUND 12					
BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 WARREN,J	2100-16	0	ELLICE,W	1854 36	1
2 STAMM,V	1690-20	0	O'DELL,DW	1560 20	1
3 RADAVICIUS,E	1663-13	.5	HARD,R	1193 20	.5
4 DOBR,K	1488 2	1	DZURICKO,G	1119 -5	0
5 THOMAS,J	1517 0	1F		0 0	0F
6 BRADY,R	1368 0	1F		0 0	0F

18-MAR-96 CCDOC		2.5	CASE	3.5	
ROUND 11					
BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 HALL,A	0 0	.5	WHITE,H	1604 0	.5
2 ROJO,V	1370-12	0	KLINEFELTER	1537 12	1
3 WALDEN,W	0 0	0	SAWDO,E	1412 0	1
4 JOHNSON,W	1207-11	0	REID,C	1394 11	1
5 APPLEBERRY	0 0	1	KANAS,W	1321 0	0
6 JACKSON,S	1140 0	1F	HALLMAN,W	1219 0	0F

19-MAR-95 CHICAGO POST OFFICE		5	AMOCO CORP.	1	
ROUND 13					
BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 MARCOWKA,R	1965 -8	0	HODINA,J	2144 12	1
2 ALLEN,H	1887 7	1	WENTLING,C	1598 -7	0
3 COOPER,W	1657 0	1	NOTTOLI,R	0 0	0
4 CARTER,L	1474 13	1	CORBIN,Z	1311-13	0
5 HOWARD,W	1559 0	1F		0 0	0F
6 DAVIS,R	0 0	1F		0 0	0F

19-MAR-96 KEMPER INSURANCE		2.5	EXEMPLARS		3.5
ROUND 9					
BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 CLSEN,A	1524 42	1	SOLLANO,E	1976-42	0
2 LAMBIRIS,J	1451 19	.5	BRONFELD,A	1846-19	.5
3 CUMMUTA,P	1414 -8	0	WEITZ,R	1690 5	1
4 PAYTON,P	1201 -3	0	BURIAN,D	1662 2	1
5 MCKINNEY,T	0 0	0	SUERTH,F	1635 0	1
6 CHOUDRY,A	0 0	1F	EDWARDS,S	1275 0	0F

20-MAR-96 CHICAGO MERC. EXCH.		1	ALUMNI CENTRAL		5
ROUND 12					
BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 FRANK,M	1733 -5	0	CZERNIECKI	2087 3	1
2 SLAGLE,S	1622 40	1	GOLLA,R	1982-27	0
3 SULLIVAN,C	1455 -6	0	FRANEK,M	1785 4	1
4 COTE,J	1326 -3	0	FABIJONAS,R	1779 2	1
5 GROTRANS,G	1258 0	0F	RZESZUTKO,R	1848 0	1F
6 HILTON,J	1119 -7	0	YOUNG,R	1406 7	1

20-MAR-96 LUCENT TECH. TYROS		4	WHEATON COLLEGE		2
ROUND 8					
BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 STOLTZ,B	1928-21	0	UNDERWOOD	1958 14	1
2 BLAZIE,J	1869 18	1	JOSEPHSON	1792-18	0
3 BROZOVICH,J	1720 4	1	ENKE,E	1412 -7	0
4 SMITH,BR	1540-31	0	BOSTICK,T	1409 31	1
5 SHAFF,R	1525 0	1	HELLER,T	0 0	0
6 KARPIERZ,J	1211 0	1	KERCSMAR,J	0 0	0

21-MAR-96 SEARS		2.5	UOP PROCESS DIV.		3.5
ROUND 9					
BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 REYES,R	2366-20	0	STEVANOVIC	2254 20	1
2 LATIMER,E	2051-12	0	BUERGER,E	2120 12	1
3 MILLER,TT	1817 -8	0	BOLDINGH,E	2073 8	1
4 DORFF,M	1531 32	1	MICKLICH,F	1687-21	0
5 VITAVER,L	0 0	1	BRIONES,M	1624 0	0
6 FLOREY,J	1392 -2	.5	VAN ZILE,C	1362 2	.5

21-MAR-96 ARGONNE KNIGHTS		5	LUCENT TECH. CHARGERS		1
ROUND 13					
BD	RATINGS	SCORE		RATINGS	SCORE
1 BENEDEK,R	2163 -3	.5	WARREN,J	2084 2	.5
2 KEISLER,J	2009 5	1	RADAVICIUS	1650 -3	0
3 HILL,R	1900-19	.5	THOMAS,J	1517 12	.5
4 SUAREZ,E	1651 13	1	DOBR,K	1490 -6	0
5 RONIN,D	1592 10	1	BRADY,R	1368-10	0
6 BAURAC,D	1590 0	1F		0 0	0F

02-APR-96 CHICAGO RES. & TRDG. 3.5 CHICAGO POST OFFICE 1.5

ROUND 14

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 JASAITIS,A	2122 8	1	MARCOWKA,R 1957 -8	0
2 BARGERSTOCK	1749-14	0	ALLEN,H 1894 14	1
3 SHATSKY,V	0 0	.5	COOPER,W 1657 0	.5
4 SITAR,K	0 0	1	HOWARD,W 1559 0	0
5 BARNARD,G	0 0	1	DAVIS,R 0 0	0
6	0 0	0F	0 0	0F

02-APR-96 CASE 6 MIDCON CORP 0

ROUND 14

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 WILLIAMS,T	2073 1	1	LORENZ,B 1480 -1	0
2 KALE,S	1849 2	1	HANSEN,B 1294 -2	0
3 ROYTBURG,E	0 0	1	LOGAN,H 1256 0	0
4 WHITE,H	1604 0	1	SAUNDERS,N 0 0	0
5 SATTERLEE,D	1617 0	1F	0 0	0F
6 DERRICK,C	0 0	1F	0 0	0F
7 DERRICK,C	0 0	0	REID,C 1405 0	1 (CASE)

04-APR-96 LUCENT TECH. DRAGONS 4 LUCENT TECH. TYROS 2

ROUND 9

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 TEGEL,F	2182-25	0	STOLTZ,B 1907 37	1
2 LUDWIG,T	2095 3	1	BROZOVICH,J 1724 -3	0
3 DURKEE,D	1792-25	0	SHAFF,R 1525 25	1
4 HICKS,C	1555 19	1	THOMAS,G 1493-19	0
5 EUSTACE,D	1629 4	1	KARPIERZ,J 1211 -4	0
6 WARD,C	1536 2	1	SCHWARTZ,M 1078 -3	0

04-APR-96 EXEMPLARS 3.5 UOP PRCESS DIV. 2.5

ROUND 10

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 WONG,P	2206 3	.5	STEVANOVIC 2274 -3	.5
2 FRISKE,T	1935-11	0	BUERGER,E 2132 7	1
3 SOLLANO,E	1934-14	0	BOLDINGH,E 2081 14	1
4 SUERTH,F	1635 16	1	MICKLICH,F 1666-16	0
5 BROTSOS,J	1532 8	1	VAN ZILE,C 1364-12	0
6 HESS,B	1455 0	1	VANDECOTTE 0 0	0

04-APR-96 MOTOROLA 4.5 SEARS 1.5

ROUND 10

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 HASAN,Y	2234 11	1	LATIMER,E 2039 -7	0
2 MELNIKOV,I	2157-18	.5	MILLER,TT 1809 18	.5
3 MORRIS,R	2048 0	1F	DORFF,M 1563 0	0F
4 MACKIE,A	1926 1	1	WILSON,M 1267 -1	0
5 CIESLEK,D	1938-43	0	FLOREY,J 1390 43	1
6 GONCHAROFF	1788 0	1F	0 0	0F
7 PADLO,R	0 0	1	LAWRENCE,P 0 0	0 (MTRLA)
8 GRYPARIS,J	1465 39	1	GONCHAROFF 1788-17	0 (MTRLA)
9 NIXON,L	0 0	0	GRYPARIS,J 1504 0	1 (MTRLA)

04-APR-96 CTA
ROUND 13

4 CHICAGO RES. & TRDG. 1

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 BYRNES,R	2197 -5	.5	JASAITIS,A 2130 3	.5
2 MATTHEWS,J	1777 9	1	DELEON,J 1530 -9	0
3 ABRAHAM,T	1590 0	.5	SHATSKY,V 0 0	.5
4 JONES,M	1471 0	1	SITAR,K 0 0	0
5 WILLIAMS,A	1474 0	1	BARNARD,G 0 0	0
6	0 0 OF		0 0	0F

09-APR-96 KEMPER INSURANCE
ROUND 10

2 NORTHROP CORP. 4

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 OLSEN,A	1566 -2	0	GOLUMBOVSKI 2097 2	1
2 LAMBIRIS,J	1470 -2	0	DIAZ,P 2043 2	1
3 CUMMUTA,P	1406 39	1	CAIRONE,3 1737-39	0
4 PAYTON,P	1198 41	1	ALFONSO,E 1624-41	0
5 MCKINNEY,T	0 0	0	VIGANTS,A 1558 0	1
6 HARDIN,L	0 0	0	BABINEC,J 1390 0	1

09-APR-96 AMOCO CORP.
ROUND 8

2.5 CHICAGO RES. & TRDG. 3.5

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 HODINA,J	2156-24	0	JASAITIS,A 2133 16	1
2 ATKINSON,J	1771 21	1	LOSOFF,A 1925-32	0
3 WENTLING,C	1591 31	1	BARGERSTOCK 1735-31	0
4 NOTTOLI,R	0 0	.5	DELEON,J 1521 0	.5
5 PORTER,D	0 0	0	SHATSKY,V 1538 0	1
6 CORBIN,Z	1298 0	0	SITAR,K 0 0	1
7 HOLMES,M	0 0	0	BARNARD,G 0 0	1

10-APR-96 LUCENT TECH. ROYALS
ROUND 10

5 WHEATON COLLEGE 1

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 BUCHNER,R	2136 13	1	UNDERWOOD 1972 -8	0
2 PEHAS,A	1975 0	1	LAKE,T 0 0	0
3 DOBROVOLNY	1855 3	1	ENKE,E 1405 -3	0
4 BLACKMON,E	1798 5	1	BOSTICK,T 1440 -5	0
5 ROSLEY,D	1758-42	0	MAYNARD,J 1310 42	1
6 HAHNE,D	1578 0	1	HELLER,T 0 0	0

10-APR-96 PAWNS
ROUND 13

1 CASE 5

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 ELLICE,W	1890-12	0	WILLIAMS,T 2074 12	1
2 O'DELL,DW	1580 -5	0	KALE,S 1851 8	1
3 DUCKSWORTH	0 0	0	REID,C 1405 0	1
4 STEVENSON,R	1363 -3	.5	KANAS,W 1321 2	.5
5 DZURICKO,G	1114 0	.5	VAYSBERG,D 0 0	.5
6	0 0	0F	MOTYCKA,R 1156 0	1F

15-APR-96 CASE 5 COOK CO. DEPT. OF CORR. 0
 ROUND 12

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 SATTERLEE,D	1617 8	1	HALL,A	1448-12 0
2 KLINEFELTER	1549 11	1	ROJO,V	1358-11 0
3 REID,C	1405 8	1	JACKSON,S	1140 -8 0
4 KANAS,W	1323 0	1	STEELE,B	0 0 0
5 KALE,S	1859 0	1	APPLEBERRY	0 0 0
6 WHITE,H	1604 0	0F	MATTAR,I	0 0 0F

16-APR-96 CHICAGO MERC. EXCH. 3.5 AMOCO CORP. .5
 ROUND 9

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 FRANK,M	1728 5	.5	ATKINSON,J	1792 -3 .5
2 SLAGLE,S	1662 20	1	WENTLING,C	1622-20 0
3 SULLIVAN,C	1449 0	1	PORTER,D	0 0 0
4 HILTON,J	1112 34	1	CORBIN,Z	1298-34 0
5	0 0	0F		0 0 0F
6	0 0	0F		0 0 0F

17-APR-96 LUCENT TECH. DRAGONS 2 ARGONNE ROOKS 4
 ROUND 10

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 TEGEL,F	2157 7	.5	LEVINE,D	2343-12 .5
2 EUSTACE,D	1633 -2	0	BERRY,G	2132 2 1
3 PIAO,T	1711 -6	0	SHEYNNIN,S	2035 6 1
4 HICKS,C	1574 -9	0	GREEN,D	1804 6 1
5 WARD,C	1538 0	1F	MORRISON,J	1769 0 0F
6 KRUEGER,J	1353 17	.5	DECMAN,S	1683-11 .5

17-APR-96 LUCENT TECH. TYROS .5 FERMILAB 5.5
 ROUND 10

BD	RATINGS	SCORE	RATINGS	SCORE
1 BROZOVICH,J	1721 -3	0	SPIEGEL,L	2087 3 1
2 SHAFF,R	1550 -3	0	MOTTA,H	1948 4 1
3 THOMAS,G	1474 17	.5	GAINES,I	1804-11 .5
4 KARPIERZ,J	1207 -5	0	HARRIS,R	1571 5 1
5	0 0	0F	KELLOGG,K	1672 0 1F
6	0 0	0F	STAPLES,C	1199 0 1F

CHICAGO INDUSTRIAL CHESS LEAGUE RATINGS LIST**RATING CODES:**

? - UNRATED

- 5 TO 9 RATED GAMES

* - 10 TO 24 RATED GAMES

C - CENTURY CLUB MEMBER

D - DOUBLE CENTURION

T - TRIPLE CENTURION

Q - QUAD CENTURION

OFFICIAL RATINGS AS OF 4-20-1996

ABRAHAM,T	CTA	1	3	1	1590	CAIRONE,B	NORTH	2	6	2	1698
ALFONSO,E	NORTH	3	3	2	1583#	CARDI,P	HULL	0	0	0	1240#
ALLEN,H	PSTOF	9	1	1	1908	CARNAL,D	CRT	0	1	0	1207#
ANDERSON,CJ	ROYLS	1	2	2	1443	CARTER,L	PSTOF	3	4	1	1487
ANDRYSIAK,B	KEMPR	0	2	0	0000?	CARTER,O	CTA	0	1	0	0000?
ANGELOS,S	COLUM	0	0	0	0000?	CARVALHO,W	FERMI	2	2	3	1895
APPLEBERRY,T	CCDOC	2	4	0	1252#	CATENA,J	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?
AQUENDE,A	KEMPR	0	0	0	0000?	CHAMORRO,A	CCDOC	1	0	0	0000?
ASSADIAN,K	MTRLA	0	1	1	0000?	CHAN,H	SEARS	0	0	0	1574
ATKINSON,J	AMCRP	4	3	2	1789C	CHOUdry,A	KEMPR	0	1	0	0000?
AUGSBURGER,L	MTRLA	4	1	3	1739	CHRISTIAN,R	DRGNS	1	0	0	1811C
AVERY,G	CCDOC	0	3	0	0000?	CICUCCI,S	KEMPR	0	1	0	0000?
AZCUNA,L	WHEAT	0	1	1	1234	CIESLEK,D	MTRLA	1	2	0	1895
BABINEC,J	NORTH	3	3	0	1390#	CISKO,G	FERMI	0	1	0	1608
BAKER,B	FLPRO	0	0	0	1042	COLBERT,W	PAWNS	0	1	0	0000?
BAKER,LR	MERC	0	0	0	1093*	COLEMAN,O	CTA	0	0	0	0000?
BALASE,E	SEARS	0	1	0	1364*	CONDON,J	MDCON	1	0	0	2039
BARGERSTOCK,D	CRT	4	6	1	1704	CONNOR,P	MDCON	3	2	3	2086
BARNARD,G	CRT	2	6	0	0000?	COOPER,W	PSTOF	6	2	1	1657
BARNES,D	CTA	0	1	0	0000?	COPELAND,P	WHEAT	0	0	0	1229?
BARTUSIAK,P	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?	CORBIN,Z	AMCRP	2	6	0	1264*
BAURAC,D	KNGHT	4	2	4	1590C	COSTELLO,W	NORTH	0	1	0	0000?
BECK,P	MERC	0	0	0	0000?	COTE,J	MERC	0	1	2	1323
BENEDEK,R	KNGHT	5	1	4	2160D	COX,M	ALUMN	0	0	0	2028C
BERMAN,R	KEMPR	0	0	0	0000?	CREWSE,L	EXMPL	0	0	0	2058
BERNARD,D	CRT	0	0	0	1296	CROWE,R	ROYLS	0	0	0	1405*
BERRY,G	ROOKS	6	0	1	2134T	CUMMUTA,P	KEMPR	3	4	0	1445
BEZZUBOV,V	FERMI	0	0	0	2338*	CURRAN,T	JCASE	2	2	0	1698
BHOJWANI,C	TYROS	0	0	0	1933C	CZERNIECKI,A	ALUMN	4	3	5	2090C
BLACKMON,E	ROYLS	5	0	1	1803C	CZOSKE,M	ROYLS	0	1	0	0000?
BLAZIE,J	TYROS	3	0	0	1887C	DALTON,M	CTA	0	1	0	0000?
BLOOM,B	EXMPL	0	0	0	2034	DAVIDSON,M	ALUMN	3	1	1	1589
BLUE,J	CCDOC	1	0	0	0000?	DAVIS,R	PSTOF	0	2	0	0000?
BOLDINGH,E	UOP	7	2	0	2095	DECMAN,S	ROOKS	3	0	2	1672D
BOSTICK,T	WHEAT	1	9	0	1435*	DELEON,J	CRT	4	3	2	1521*
BRADY,R	CHRGR	7	3	0	1358	DENG,J	CRT	0	0	0	1549
BRIONES,M	UOP	0	3	0	1624C	DENISENKO,K	SEARS	1	0	0	0000?

BRITT-WEBB,E	AMCRP	0	0	0	1265#	DERRICK,C	JCASE	0	1	0	0000?
BROCKETT,M	SEARS	0	0	0	1801	DIAZ,L	JCASE	0	1	0	0000?
BROLLIER,B	WHEAT	1	5	1	1263#	DIAZ,P	NORTH	5	4	1	2045
BRONFELD,A	EXMPL	2	1	1	1827	DOBR,K	CHRGR	4	6	2	1484T
BROTSOS,J	EXMPL	3	1	2	1540D	DOBROVOLNY,C	ROYLS	5	3	2	1858
BROZOVICH,J	TYROS	3	6	1	1718C	DORFF,M	SEARS	2	4	1	1563
BUCHNER,R	ROYLS	3	1	3	2149	DOTY,B	HULL	0	0	0	0000?
BUERGER,E	UOP	4	0	6	2139D	DUCKSWORTH,R	PAWNS	0	1	0	0000?
BURBA,K	KNGHT	3	0	0	1402C	DUFRESNE,T	JCASE	0	0	0	997*
BURDICK,S	COLUM	0	0	0	1569	DURKEE,D	DRGNS	2	4	2	1767C
BURIAN,D	EXMPL	6	3	0	1664C	DYCJKOWSKI,R	CONBK	0	0	0	1565
BYRNES,R	CTA	1	0	3	2192#	DZEKHTSER,A	SEARS	0	0	0	1761*
CADE,M	UNILV	0	0	0	0000?	DZURICKO,G	PAWNS	0	8	1	1114*
EDWARDS,S	EXMPL	1	1	0	1275	HILL,R	KNGHT	4	2	1	1881
EGERTON,B	MDCON	0	0	0	0000?	HILLIARD,J	BKAMI	0	0	0	0000?
EGERTON,J	MDCON	3	1	2	1985	HILTON,J	MERC	4	4	0	1146
ELEK,G	NORTH	2	3	0	1052	HODINA,J	AMCRP	4	2	2	2132
ELLICE,W	PAWNS	3	7	2	1878	HOLMES,M	AMCRP	0	3	0	0000?
ENKE,E	WHEAT	2	6	0	1402#	HOWARD,W	PSTOF	1	2	2	1559
EUSTACE,D	DRGNS	5	3	1	1631	HUEBNER,R	ROOKS	0	1	0	0000?
FABIJONAS,R	ALUMN	5	4	0	1781D	HUGHES,N	KEMPR	1	3	0	1837C
FAHRENHOLTZ,S	MTRLA	0	0	0	1785*	INUMERABLE,F	PSTOF	7	0	1	2336
FELDMAN,A	FLPRO	0	0	0	1420C	ITZENHEUSER,W	JCASE	0	0	0	0000?
FERGUSON,K	MDCON	0	2	0	0000?	JACKLIN,E	JCASE	1	3	1	1261
FLEET,R	MDCON	1	1	0	1140#	JACKSON,S	CCDOC	2	8	0	1132#
FLOREY,J	SEARS	3	3	3	1433#	JAKSTAS,K	NORTH	2	4	1	2175C
FRAATS,D	BKAMI	2	4	1	1878	JARRETT,T	CTA	0	2	0	1639*
FRANEK,M	ALUMN	7	0	1	1789C	JASAITIS,A	CRT	4	2	4	2149C
FRANK,M	MERC	0	4	2	1703	JASUNAS,J	ROOKS	0	2	0	1422
FRIESEMA,W	CRT	1	0	0	2109	JOHNSON,D	CTA	1	0	0	0000?
FRISKE,T	EXMPL	2	4	2	1924	JOHNSON,W	CCDOC	2	6	0	1196#
FULLMER,G	MTRLA	0	3	1	0000?	JONES,M	CTA	5	2	0	1471*
GAINES,I	FERMI	6	1	2	1793C	JONES,MIGUEL	CCDOC	0	1	0	0000?
GALKO,D	KEMPR	1	0	0	0000?	JOSEPHSON,D	WHEAT	1	5	0	1774*
GALLAGHER,H	KNGHT	3	0	0	1317	JOSHI,A	UNILV	0	0	0	0000?
GANSER,A	BKAMI	1	2	0	1245*	KALE,S	JCASE	7	3	1	1859
GEBELE,R	UOP	0	0	0	0000?	KANAS,W	JCASE	6	3	2	1323C
GIMPLE,R	WHEAT	0	0	0	0000?	KARPIERZ,J	TYROS	3	3	2	1202*
GOLLA,R	ALUMN	0	1	0	1955D	KATAOKA,N	UOP	0	0	0	0000?
GOLUMBOVSKI,P	NORTH	1	2	5	2099	KATZ,J	JCASE	0	0	0	0000?
GONCHAROFF,N	MTRLA	5	2	1	1771Q	KAUFMAN,M	KEMPR	0	0	0	0000?
GORZ,E	RADIO	0	0	0	1289*	KEEFE,E	FLPRO	0	0	0	1181#
GREEN,D	ROOKS	6	1	3	1810C	KEISLER,J	KNGHT	3	0	0	2014
GRIESMEYER,W	PSTOF	0	0	0	1317	KELLOGG,K	FERMI	3	1	1	1672C
GRYPARIS,J	MTRLA	2	4	0	1504	KERCSMAR,J	WHEAT	0	1	0	0000?
GUIO,J	ROYLS	4	0	2	2025	KINSELLA,G	KNGHT	0	0	0	1481C

HAHNE,D	ROYLS	1	0	1	1578	KLAUDER,C	WHEAT	0	0	1	0000?
HALLA	CCDOC	0	7	1	1436#	KLINFELTER,H	JCASE	7	1	1	1560C
HALL,D	MDCON	0	1	0	0000?	KOGAN,G	BKAMI	5	3	1	1918
HALLMAN,W	JCASE	1	0	0	1219*	KOSTECKA,K	COLUM	0	0	0	1596
HAMMOND,M	BKAMI	2	5	0	1396	KOZLOVSKY,M	FERMI	0	3	0	2106
HANSEN,B	MDCON	2	5	1	1292*	KRUEGER,J	DRGNS	0	0	1	1370*
HARD,R	PAWNS	2	5	1	1213#	KRULL,E	AMCRP	1	0	0	1510
HARDIN,L	KEMPR	0	2	0	0000?	LAKE,T	WHEAT	0	4	0	0000?
HARRIS,FF	CTA	0	0	0	1401#	LAMBIRIS,J	KEMPR	1	2	1	1468
HARRIS,R	FERMI	4	4	0	1576	LARSON,T	CCDOC	1	0	0	0000?
HARRUFF,E	WHEAT	0	1	0	0000?	LASKY,JIM	RADIO	0	0	0	1693#
HASAN,Y	MTRLA	3	0	4	2245	LASKY,N	PAWNS	1	0	0	1352C
HELLER,T	WHEAT	0	8	0	0000?	LATIMER,E	SEARS	1	4	4	2032D
HERNANDEZ,DD	COLUM	0	0	0	1497	LAWRENCE,P	MTRLA	0	1	0	0000?
HESS,B	EXMPL	2	2	0	1455	LEONG,D	ALUMN	1	0	0	2005
HICKS,C	DRGNS	7	2	0	1565	LEONG,G	KEMPR	1	1	4	2007C
HILL,C	FERMI	0	0	1	1643	LERNER,R	SEARS	0	0	0	0000?
LESTER,M	MTRLA	3	1	0	1569	OSTERLUND,R	EXMPL	0	0	0	1943
LEVINE,D	ROOKS	5	1	3	2331	PADLO,R	MTRLA	1	0	0	0000?
LIKHTEREV,M	UOP	1	4	0	1447*	PARA,A	FERMI	0	0	0	1487
LITVINAS,A	ALUMN	8	0	0	1726C	PARAOAN,E	BKAMI	7	2	2	1776C
LODEWYCK,D	MERC	1	1	0	1414	PATTON,D	CHRGR	1	0	0	0000?
LOGAN,H	MDCON	1	6	1	1256*	PAWLUS,D	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?
LORENZ,B	MDCON	4	5	1	1479*	PAYTON,P	KEMPR	4	4	1	1239*
LOSOFF,A	CRT	4	3	0	1893	PEHAS,A	ROYLS	2	0	3	1975
LUDWIG,T	DRGNS	3	1	1	2098C	PENNINGTON,J	WHEAT	0	0	0	0000?
LUEDERS,J	CRT	0	2	0	0000?	PERAREN,E	PSTOF	0	0	0	1733
LULKIN,V	UNILV	0	0	0	1826#	PHELPS,C	DRGNS	1	3	0	1248*
LUSTRO,G	ROYLS	0	0	0	0000?	PIAO,T	DRGNS	1	1	0	1705
MACBEAN,J	PAWNS	0	1	0	0000?	PILLAI,J	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?
MACKIE,A	MTRLA	6	1	2	1927	POMA,D	AMCRP	0	0	0	1257
MARCOWKA,R	PSTOF	5	5	1	1949C	PORTER,D	AMCRP	0	6	0	0000?
MAREMA,D	PSTOF	0	0	0	2006	POZNIAK,J	KEMPR	0	1	0	1465*
MARTIN,K	COLUM	0	0	0	1493	PRATT,C	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?
MATTAR,I	CCDOC	0	0	0	0000?	PRATTS,M	ALUMN	1	1	0	1771
MATTHEWS,J	CTA	1	1	0	1786	QUARTETTI,C	NORTH	0	0	0	0000?
MAYNARD,J	WHEAT	2	4	0	1352	QUERUBIN,R	FLPRO	0	0	0	2067#
MCALISTER,K	ALUMN	0	1	0	1955	RADAVICIUS,E	CHRGR	2	3	3	1647D
MCCARTNEY,M	CTA	2	3	0	0000?	REDDY,S	MTRLA	1	0	0	0000?
MCFARLIN,B	KEMPR	0	0	0	1209#	REID,C	JCASE	6	3	0	1413
MCKAY,P	PAWNS	0	1	0	1393#	REYES,R	SEARS	4	1	1	2346D
MCKINNEY,T	KEMPR	1	4	0	1322#	RINGER,D	SEARS	0	2	0	0000?
MELNIKOVI,I	MTRLA	2	0	4	2139	RIPPE,D	TYROS	0	0	0	0000?
MICKLICH,F	UOP	3	4	2	1650C	ROBERTS,J	WHEAT	0	1	0	1328#
MIKULECKY,B	PAWNS	2	0	3	1382C	ROJAS,R	CTA	0	1	0	0000?
MILLER,J	NORTH	0	0	0	0000?	ROJO,V	CCDOC	1	9	1	1347*

MILLER,TT	SEARS	3	4	2	1827	ROMENESKO,G	PAWNS	0	1	0	0000?
MORRIS,R	MTRLA	7	0	0	2048	RONIN,D	KNIGHT	4	2	2	1602#
MORRISON,J	ROOKS	2	1	0	1769	ROSENBERG,B	MDCON	7	1	1	1438*
MORTADA,C	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?	ROSLEY,D	ROYLS	2	2	2	1716
MOTTA,H	FERMI	3	6	1	1952	ROYTBURG,E	JCASE	4	0	0	0000?
MOTYCKA,R	JCASE	3	3	0	1156	RUBIN,A	CRT	0	1	0	0000?
MUDAN,M	HULL	0	0	0	1123*	RUDDY,J	MERC	0	0	0	1234
NARSOLIS,F	UOP	0	0	0	0000?	RYU,R	UOP	0	0	0	1451
NAUGHTON,T	HULL	0	0	0	1308*	RZESZUTKO,R	ALUMN	4	1	0	1848
NELL,D	UNILV	0	0	0	1073#	SAHLI,E	UOP	1	1	0	1728
NISHIMURA,K	FLPRO	0	0	0	1329*	SAJBEL,P	UOP	2	1	1	1776
NIXON,L	MTRLA	0	1	0	0000?	SALAMANCA,R	ROYLS	0	0	0	1610
NOBLE,S	JCASE	2	5	0	1286#	SAMELSON,C	MTRLA	6	0	1	1995C
NOTERMANN,T	PAWNS	0	4	1	1178	SAMOYLOV,A	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?
NOTTOLI,R	AMCRP	2	3	1	1289#	SANTIAGO,T	ALUMN	3	2	1	1961
NOWAK,W	CTA	0	0	0	1365#	SATTERLEE,D	JCASE	5	2	2	1625C
O'BRIEN,D	UOP	0	0	0	1377*	SAUNDERS,N	MDCON	0	2	0	0000?
O'DELL,DW	PAWNS	3	4	1	1575C	SAWDO,E	JCASE	2	1	0	1412
OGASAWARA,L	ROYLS	2	1	2	1833C	SCHWAB,W	ROOKS	1	0	0	1481
OLSEN,A	KEMPR	3	5	2	1564	SCHWARTZ,M	TYROS	1	3	0	1075
OLSON,C	JCASE	2	6	0	0000?	SEMONES,E	ROOKS	2	3	0	1108#
SHAFF,R	TYROS	2	3	0	1547C	UNDERWOOD,W	WHEAT	1	4	1	1964C
SHATSKY,V	CRT	2	1	3	1538#	VAJSBERG,O	JCASE	1	0	0	0000?
SHEU,G	CHRGR	0	0	0	1333*	VALDEZ,C	MTRLA	1	0	0	0000?
SHEYNIN,S	ROOKS	5	2	3	2041	VAN MEER,J	KEMPR	0	2	0	1958
SIEGEL,R	BKAMI	2	2	2	1459C	VAN METRE,R	SEARS	0	1	1	1483#
SIPP,R	CCDOC	0	0	0	0000?	VAN OTRIVE,R	CTA	0	0	0	1092#
SITAR,K	CRT	2	1	0	0000?	VAN ZILE,C	UOP	3	5	1	1352
SIWEK,M	KEMPR	4	3	1	2157C	VANDECOTTE,M	UOP	0	2	0	0000?
SKRZYPCZAK,T	MDCON	0	0	0	0000?	VAYSBERG,D	JCASE	0	0	1	0000?
SLAGLE,S	MERC	3	5	1	1682	VENEGAS,B	HULL	0	0	0	0000?
SMILEY,R	AMCRP	0	0	0	2005	VEREZHENSKY,E	AMCRP	0	1	0	0000?
SMITH,BR	TYROS	2	3	1	1509	VIGANTS,A	NORTH	5	4	0	1558
SOLLANO,E	EXMPL	1	5	2	1920	VITAVER,L	SEARS	1	3	1	1546#
SOMBONG,M	BKAMI	1	1	0	1625	WACHTEL,H	COLUM	0	0	0	2230
SPIEGEL,L	FERMI	8	0	2	2090C	WALDEN,W	CCDOC	0	1	0	0000?
STAMM,V	CHRGR	1	6	0	1670D	WALLACH,C	MTRLA	4	2	2	2063
STAPLES,C	FERMI	1	1	0	1199#	WALLIN,R	WHEAT	0	0	0	1746
STAPLES,M	CTA	1	3	0	1192#	WALSH,W	ROOKS	1	2	0	1484C
STEELE,B	CCDOC	0	3	0	0000?	WARD,C	DRGNS	4	4	1	1538D
STEVANOVIC,M	UOP	4	3	2	2271C	WARD,J	CTA	0	0	1	0000?
STEVENS,G	CTA	0	1	0	0000?	WARE,K	MERC	0	0	0	0000?
STEVENS,J	COLUM	0	0	0	1340	WARREN,J	CHRGR	5	4	3	2086T
STEVENS,N	MDCON	0	0	0	0000?	WEBER,J	WHEAT	0	0	0	0000?
STEVENSON,R	PAWNS	0	0	1	1360	WEISS,G	HULL	0	0	0	0000?
STINSON,M	ROYLS	3	2	2	1998	WEISSKOPF,J	HULL	0	0	0	1381*

STOLTZ,B	TYROS	1	5	2	1944	WEITZ,R	EXMPL	3	3	0	1695C
SUAREZ,E	KNGHT	7	2	0	1664	WELTER,P	SEARS	0	0	0	1642#
SUERTH,F	EXMPL	8	1	1	1651C	WENTLING,C	AMCRP	2	8	0	1602C
SULLIVAN,C	MERC	1	5	2	1449	WHITE,H	JCASE	8	2	1	1604
SULLIVAN,J	EXMPL	0	2	0	1980D	WHITE,T	BKAMI	3	0	0	1355#
SZONTAGH,T	CRT	1	3	0	1184#	WHITED,W	MDCON	0	0	0	1829
TAMEZ,I	TYROS	3	1	0	2099	WILLIAMS,A	CTA	2	2	0	1474#
TAN,M	WHEAT	0	2	0	1196	WILLIAMS,T	JCASE	9	1	3	2086
TAYLOR,M	CTA	3	1	0	0000?	WILSON,A	CTA	2	4	1	1588
TEGEL,F	DRGNS	4	2	4	2164T	WILSON,M	SEARS	1	4	0	1266#
TERPSTRA,D	WHEAT	0	0	0	0000?	WOLF,D	MTRLA	1	0	1	0000?
THOMAS,G	TYROS	2	2	2	1491	WONG,KK	NORTH	0	0	0	0000?
THOMAS,J	CHRGR	8	2	2	1529C	WONG,P	EXMPL	1	0	3	2209C
THOMPSON,R	FLPRO	0	0	0	1061	WOOD,L	AMCRP	4	3	1	1488#
TRUDY,E	CCDOC	1	0	0	0000?	WRIGHT,E	CCDOC	0	1	0	0000?
TSEITLIN,E	MTRLA	0	0	0	0000?	YOUNG,R	ALUMN	1	0	0	1413
TURNER,K	PSTOF	0	2	0	1490	ZOELLNER,J	BKAMI	4	5	2	1423C
TYREE,D	RADIO	0	0	0	1475*						

RATING CODES:

? - UNRATED

- 5 TO 9 RATED GAMES


* - 10 TO 24 RATED GAMES

C - CENTURY CLUB MEMBER

D - DOUBLE CENTURION

T - TRIPLE CENTURION

Q - QUAD CENTURION



Submit those games and articles!
Your contributions are the heart of this bulletin.