

Central California Chess League
by N. T. Austin

San Jose overwhelmed Sacramento in the final round and acquired the first leg on the new trophy.

Fresno and Pittsburg played to a 4-4 tie, and Fresno remained in 3rd place.

Modesto had the bye and finished in 5th, as Stockton defeated Oakdale to gain a tie for 6th.

Final Standings

	<u>Matches</u>	<u>Games</u>
1. San Jose	5½ - ½	34 - 14
2. Sacramento	5 - 1	30 - 18
3. Fresno	4 - 2	30½ - 17½
4. Pittsburg	3½ - 2½	26 - 22
5. Modesto	1 - 5	17½ - 30½
6. Oakdale	1 - 5	15 - 33
7. Stockton	1 - 5	15 - 33

What Happened to Sacramento?

After squeaking by Fresno with a score of 4½-3½ in the first round of the Central California Chess League team matches, we won our next four matches by comfortable though not decisive margins and entered the final round of the 1954-55 season with a match score of 5-0. In the meantime San Jose, the defending champions, had met a few obstacles in its patch and found itself with a match score of 4½-½ by reason of a drawn match with Fresno. Stockton had almost upset the champs, but the latter squeezed by with a 4½-3½ win to remain in the running. Thus we needed only 4 points in our final match to dethrone the always dangerous San Jose contingent and gain a leg on the new League Trophy.

When the smoke of battle cleared away the score favored our opponents by 6½-1½; they had retained the championship and we had taken a drubbing equalled only by what Fresno did to us during the 1950-51 season. One might advance numerous arguments to explain the collapse of our team, but we prefer to admit that the better team won and let it go at that. The result was not unexpected, but we will concede that we did not anticipate losing by a margin of 5 points.

During the past season, J. Celle, O. Celle, Scheuerman and the writer played in each of our matches, scoring 15 wins, 6 losses, and 3 draws. The Sacramento Captain stepped aside in the Oakdale match in order to permit another member to play; otherwise Austin (as usual) would be included among those who participated in all team matches.

Two of our top players, O. Celle and Janushkowsky, sustained their first losses in team matches during the season recently ended. One of the best ways to terminate an undefeated record is to move up to first or second board, and if it is of any consolation to our colleagues they are in good company. Mueller of San Jose had compiled a record of 11 consecutive wins when he played first board and suffered his initial defeat. Kalnins of San Jose had established a record of 13 consecutive games without a defeat until he moved to a high board. The "spoilers" were, respectively, Russell and Gee of Sacramento. O. Celle had recorded a string of 19 consecutive games without a loss until he met Leigh of Stockton at first board, and the string was broken. Janushkowsky had not tasted defeat until he collided P. D. Smith of Fresno, likewise at top board. Thus it goes.

The record of our players during the past season is shown elsewhere. It discloses plus scores at boards 2, 3, 4, and 7, even scores at boards 5 and 8, and deficits at boards 1 and 6. We were undefeated at third and fourth boards; the better record being made at the former where Scheuerman and Meyer combined their efforts to score 4 wins and 2 draws. Of those who played in at least half the

matches, the best averages were achieved by the former who scored 3 wins and one draw and the latter who had 4 wins and 2 draws. None of the other "regulars" escaped defeat. In addition to board 3, scores of 5-1 were made at boards 2 and 7 where our players had made a clean sweep until they encountered San Jose.

As for the answer to the question which heads this article, we suggest that what "happened" was simply our failure to score at least 4 points against San Jose. It may be, of course, that our opponents had something to do with such failure, and in the absence of conclusive evidence to the contrary, there are those who will insist that San Jose did not co-operate with us! Looking back at the match and shuddering slightly when the final score is recalled, such accusation appears plausible. But, then, what else can one expect from a team which insists upon winning the championship? Having started with a question it seems appropriate to end with one.

Results of COCL Matches

Round 3 - 12/5/54

Pittsburg		San Jose		
1 R Burger	1	W T Adams	0	
2 R Trenberth	0	E Mueller	1	
3 F Weinberg	0	D Haville	1	
4 R Guzman	0	J Kalnins	1	
5 G Garcia	0	Barber	1	
6 W Whisler	1	Gasse	0	
7 T Snavely	0	H O'Shaughnessy	1	
8 F Olvera	0	T Kimball	1	
	<u>2</u>		<u>6</u>	

Round 4 - Jan. 9, 1955

Fresno		San Jose		
1 M Hailpam	1	W T Adams	0	
2 T Fries	1	E Mueller	0	
3 O Maschke	0	D Haville	1	
4 E Achterberg	1	J Kalnins	0	
5 C Fotias	0	L Daugherty	1	
6 W Shirey	0	H O'Shaughnessy	1	
7 L Legler	0	T Kimball	1	
8 R Clark	1	P Foley	0	
	<u>4</u>		<u>4</u>	

Round 4 - Jan. 9, 1955

Modesto		Stockton		
1 L Davis	1	R Leigh	0	
2 E Jeffers	1	R Juhre	0	
3 H Paul	1	M Sanders	0	
4 L Krogness	1	W Jarvis	0	
5 Dr C J Cook	1	J Lindsteadt	0	
6 H Wente	0	A C Saxon	1	
7 E Hawksworth	$\frac{1}{2}$	J Condegre	$\frac{1}{2}$	
8 C M Hobbs	1	J Finucane	0	
	<u>6$\frac{1}{2}$</u>		<u>1$\frac{1}{2}$</u>	

Round 4 - Jan. 9, 1955

Pittsburg		Oakdale		
1 W Whisler	1	S Slosted	0	
2 F Weinberg	$\frac{1}{2}$	Ed Sai	$\frac{1}{2}$	
3 G Garcia	1	H Blickenstaff	0	
4 J Smith	1	H Mortensen	0	
5 R Turner	1	Corporan	0	
6 L Lensing	$\frac{1}{2}$	Mrs C J Smith	$\frac{1}{2}$	
7 F Olvera	0	C J Smith	1	
8 T Snavely	0	A Buerer	1	
	<u>5</u>		<u>3</u>	

Round 5, Jan. 30, 1955

Pittsburg		Sacramento		
1 R Burger	1	A Janushkowsky	0	
2 R Trenberth	0	O Celle	1	
3 R Guzman	$\frac{1}{2}$	J B Gee	$\frac{1}{2}$	
4 W Whisler	$\frac{1}{2}$	M O Meyer	$\frac{1}{2}$	
5 J Smith	0	N T Austin	0	
6 F Weinberg	0	J Celle	1	
7 F Olvera	0	J Scheuerman	1	
8 R Turner	0	A Bishop	1	
	<u>3</u>		<u>5</u>	

Round 5, Jan. 30, 1955

Fresno		Stockton		
1 M Hailpam	1	R Leigh	0	
2 P D Smith	1	Dr J M DavidMalig	0	
3 T Fries	$\frac{1}{2}$	R Juhre	$\frac{1}{2}$	
4 O Maschke	$\frac{1}{2}$	J Saxon	$\frac{1}{2}$	
5 Dr H Kallmann	0	H Minch, ca	1	
6 C Fotias	1	M Sanders	0	
7 R Baker	1	J Lindsteadt	0	
8 R Clark	1	W Jarvis	0	
	<u>6</u>		<u>2</u>	

Round 5, Jan. 30, 1955

Modesto		San Jose	
1 L E Davis	0	Bill Adams	1
2 E L Jeffers	1	Bert Mueller	0
3 Herb Paul	0	Dewey Haville	1
4 L Krogness	0	H O'Shaughnessy	1
5 Dr C J Cook	0	L H Daugherty	1
6 Herman Wente	0	Tom Kimball	1
7 Ed Hobbs	0	Al Lutz	1
8 Bill Kessler	0	Phil Foley	1
	<u>1</u>		<u>7</u>

Round 6, Feb. 20, 1955

Modesto		Fresno	
1 L E Davis	0	M Hailpam	1
2 E L Jeffers	0	P D Smith	1
3 L H Kerfoot	0	T Fries	1
4 H E Paul	1/2	C Fotias	1/2
5 L Krogness	0	O Maschke	1
6 C J Cook	1/2	W Shirey	1/2
7 R E Hawksworth	0	M Phetterplace	1
8 E Hobbs	1	R Clark	0
	<u>2</u>		<u>6</u>

Round 7, March 13, 1955

Sacramento		San Jose	
1 O A Celle	0	W T Adams	1
2 A Janushkowsky	0	Bert Mueller	1
3 M O Meyer	1	D Havill	0
4 M T Austin	1/2	J Kalnins	1/2
5 J C Scheuerman	0	G Barber	1
6 W Rogers	0	L H Daugherty	1
7 A W Bishop	0	J Kimball	1
8 J A Celle	0	P Foley	1
	<u>1 1/2</u>		<u>6 1/2</u>

Round 7, March 13, 1955

Stockton		Oakdale	
1 R Leigh	1	E Said	0
2 David-Malig	0	C J Smith	1
3 R Juhre	1	H Blickenstaff	0
4 J Saxon	1	H Lortensen	0
5 M Sanders	1	Mrs. V Smith	0
6 A Saxon	0	D Thiel	1
7 J Lindstead	1/2	S Slosted	1/2
8 J Finucane	1	S Sampson	0
	<u>5 1/2</u>		<u>2 1/2</u>

Round 6, February 20, 1955

Sacramento		Oakdale	
1 O Celle	1	A Buerer	0
2 J B Gee	1	C J Smith	0
3 M O Meyer	1/2	H Blickenstaff	1/2
4 J Scheuerman	1	R Ewing	0
5 W R Rogers	1	S Slosted	0
6 J Celle	1/2	Mrs. V Smith	1/2
7 A Janushkowsky	1	R Corporan	0
8 W Hartley	0	S Sampson	1
	<u>6</u>		<u>2</u>

Round 6, Feb. 20, 1955

1 E Mueller	1	R Leigh	0
2 D Havill	0	David-Malig	1
3 H O'Shaughnessy	1/2	Scholtz	1/2
4 L Daugherty	1	R Juhre	0
5 J Kimball	1	J Saxon-Isaac	0
6 P Foley	1	M Sanders	0
7 Chapman	0	J A Saxon	1
8 G Van Hooser	0	Isaac-A. Saxon	1
	<u>4 1/2</u>	Stockton/	<u>3 1/2</u>

Round 7, March 13, 1955

Pittsburg		Fresno	
1 R Trenberth	0	M Hailpam	1
2 R C Guzman	1	T Fries	0
3 G Garcia	0	W Shirey	1
4 F Olvera	1/2	O Maschke	1/2
5 F Weinberg	1	R Barabedian	0
6 W Whisler	1	R Baker	0
7 J Smith	0	M Phetterplace	1
8 T Shively	1/2	R McCullough	1/2
	<u>4</u>		<u>4</u>

Attention Team Captains & Club Secretaries: Some of the names of your team members are not very clear. Also, we want first names or initials. If a name above is misspelled, or has no initial, please let us know. Our records need more than merely a last name. As the next issue is coming out soon, please send in corrections promptly.

CENTRAL CALIFORNIA CHESS LEAGUE
A Summary of the 1954-55 Season
and some reflections

M. O. MEYER

For the first season since 1948-49 each of the teams played the same number of games during the course of the League's team match play. Altho we may be somewhat prejudiced, having suggested for some years the adoption of a rule providing for teams of equal size, it seems to be the consensus that the plan used during the past season was successful. We are hopeful it will be continued.

The San Jose contingent was not troubled by the change, and emerged the winner by decisively defeating Sacramento in the final round. For the losers it was the worst beating handed them by the champions in their six meetings to date. There is no question but that San Jose deserved the victory, and to the team

which had to win, and did so in a very convincing manner, we offer our congratulations.

Final standings of the teams were as follows:

Place	Team	Match Score	Won	Lost	Drew	Game Score
1	San Jose	5½ - ½	32	12	4	34 - 14
2	Sacramento	5 - 1	27	15	6	30 - 18
3	Fresno	4 - 2	27	14	7	30½ - 17½
4	Pittsburg	3½ - 2½	22	18	8	26 - 22
5	Modesto	1 - 5	15	28	5	17½ - 30½
6	Oakdale	1 - 5	11	29	8	15 - 33
7	Stockton	1 - 5	12	30	6	15 - 33

Fresno, which compiled the second best game score, was the only team that did not lose to San Jose. A first round loss to Sacramento by the close margin of 3½-4½ and a drawn match with Pittsburg in the last round cost Fresno its chances for first place.

In our opinion a comparison of the scores compiled by the top four teams at the 8 boards played offers an interesting sidelight on the season's competition. We leave to the readers the task of analysing the results and deriving therefrom such conclusions as may be inherent in the figures displayed;

Board	San Jose			Sacramento			Fresno			Pittsburg			Total		
	W	L	D	W	L	D	W	L	D	W	L	D	W	L	D
1	4	2	-	2	4	-	6	-	-	4	2	-	16	8	-
2	3	3	-	5	1	-	4	2	-	3	2	1	15	8	1
3	4	1	1	4	-	2	3	2	1	2	3	1	13	6	5
4	3	2	1	3	-	3	2	-	4	2	2	2	10	4	10
5	6	-	-	3	3	-	3	3	-	5	1	-	17	7	-
6	5	1	-	2	3	1	3	2	1	4	1	1	14	7	3
7	4	1	1	5	1	-	3	3	-	1	4	1	13	9	2
8	3	2	1	3	3	-	3	2	1	1	3	2	10	10	4
Totals	32	12	4	27	15	6	27	14	7	22	18	8	108	59	25

As a comparison with the foregoing results for the 1954-55 season, the following shows the leading scores compiled at each of the 8 top boards for the period from 11/14/48 to 3,13/55:

Board	Team	No. of Games	Won	Lost	Drew	Average
1	Fresno	39	23	9	7	.679
2	San Jose	36	27	5	4	.806
3	Sacramento	39	24	5	10	.744
4	Sacramento	39	27	5	7	.782
5	San Jose	36	26	6	4	.778
6	San Jose	36	29	4	3	.847
7	San Jose	35	22	6	7	.729
8	San Jose	33	22	8	3	.712

It is not surprising to find that San Jose dominates the above listing because in its six seasons of play it has won the championship four times and was second on the other two occasions. Insofar as averages, in terms of games won and lost are concerned, San Jose has led the League each year.

We believe some recognition should be given the individual players who have participated in at least 20 team matches and have in so doing compiled an average of more than .500. There are 19 players in this category, and altho the list necessarily excludes many who have made fine records for their teams in a lesser number of matches, the inclusion of all would result in a tabulation of considerable length. Please remember that the writer has compiled these data voluntarily, and altho he has attempted to avoid errors by the customary procedures adopted in tabulation, a few may have slipped in inadvertently. Thus,

if a player finds an error, or what he believes to be an error, let him be somewhat charitable in his comments. Finally, let it be understood that this is not an attempt to rate the players; anyone with a fairly good knowledge of statistics and mathematics realizes that there may be other ways in which to waste an equal amount of time but few which result in as much adverse criticism. Besides it is our opinion that ratings in chess, no matter how ingenious the system employed to compute them, are relatively meaningless. We have noted with a certain amount of amusement the claims on the part of an individual we will not name to convince the chess players of this country that he has devised a system which will serve to rate all players. The latest claim we have noted is that under the most recent advanced scheme more tournaments will be rated than if all tournaments were rated, or at least this seems to be the general idea.

At any rate, the following shows the games won, lost, and drawn, and the averages achieved; it is not intended to portray anything more!

<u>Name</u>	<u>Club</u>	<u>Games</u>	<u>Won</u>	<u>Lost</u>	<u>Drawn</u>	<u>Average</u>
O Celle	Sacto	23	18	2	3	.848
Kalnins	SJ	23	16	3	4	.783
Gee	Sacto	34	22	4	8	.765
Mueller	SJ	36	27	8	1	.764
Adams	SJ	33	23	6	4	.758
Daugherty	SJ	33	22	5	6	.758
Hailparn	Fresno	26	18	5	3	.750
Crofut	SJ	29	18	5	6	.724
Austin	Sacto	37	22	8	7	.689
Fries	Fresno	27	15	7	5	.648
Meyer	Sacto	38	19	8	11	.645
Russell	Sacto	25	14	7	4	.640
Malig	SJ:Stkn	26	15	8	3	.635
Cook	Fresno	26	15	9	2	.615
Jackson	Modesto	25	14	9	2	.600
Davis	Modesto	35	19	13	3c	.586
Leigh	Stockton	20	11	8	1	.575
J Saxon	Stockton	20	10	7	3	.675 .675
Krogness	Modesto	30	15	13	2	.533

As for any profound conclusions which may be drawn from the foregoing, my suggestion is to avoid them. Those who do not dislike me can say "Hilt isn't so bad after all - he has lost only 8 out of 38 games". Those who do may comment "He isn't so good - he's won only 19 out of 38". Both will be correct. Suppose for a moment that a player has played and drawn 38 games. His friends may claim "That fellow is good - 38 games and not a single loss" while his enemies may claim with equal accuracy "The guy's a bum - 38 games and not a single win". Has either side proved anything? I have attempted to prove nothing and have accomplished exactly that.

- - - - -
F L A S H F L A S H F L A S H - - - - -

The Central Calif. Chess League "Open" will be held April 30 & May 1st at Modesto. Entries are to be sent to CCOL President Mike Hailparn, 727 Ferger, Fresno 4, Calif. Or if you're real late, contact Lee Kerfoot, 607-16th St., Modesto. Mike has suggested if more than 16 enter, have 5 rounds and the first two rounds at 25 moves per hour. Considering everything, we believe four rounds would be better in any case. But there is not much chance of more than 16 entering.

- - - - -
N E X T issue coming out shortly. Send in news pronto if you want it printed.
 (have almost a full issue on hand now)