

“ SCARBOROUGH COMMUNITY OF TORONTO CHESS TALK ”

Newsletter of / Le Journal de

Scarborough Chess Club

e – mail : scarboro@idirect.ca

Website : <http://webhome.idirect.com/~blamb/>

Wexford Seniors' Apartments (Comm. Ctre.), 1860 Lawrence Ave E. (just east of Pharmacy Ave.)
(easy access – Victoria Park Stn./Pharmacy Bus; Lawrence E. Stn./Lawrence W. Bus)

“ FRIENDLY Chess Since 1960 ”

ITEMS OF INTEREST TO BOTH MEMBERS & NON-MEMBERS

ISSUE # 15 – April 1, 2001

DO YOU KNOW ? / SAVEZ-VOUS ?

To Rate Or Not To Rate – That is CFC's Question !

“ Conflicting “ Tournaments

The last SCTCT Issues have dealt with whether a chess body should have the power to designate a tournament “ conflicting “. This means that a tournament is directly in competition with a tournament being sanctioned and supported by that chess body.

OCA has in its Constitution that it has the power to take such a step. And it has taken it. It has designated the Toronto Victoria Day Open '01, organized by Dutton Chess, as “ conflicting “, since it is on the same May Victoria Day long weekend as the OCA-sanctioned Ontario Open '01, being held in Kitchener-Waterloo. Similarly, the Greater Toronto Chess League Constitution also sanctions 7 Open tournaments throughout the year, such as the Toronto Open. GTCL has always taken the position that it would declare any other tournament held the same weekend as a GTCL-sanctioned tournament, as a “ conflicting “ tournament. The GTA is in a unique position this year. Due to the actions of Dutton Chess in refusing any longer to organize for the GTCL, there are “ potential “ conflicting tournaments to all the GTCL-sanctioned ones. DC is running tournaments on the exact dates reserved by GTCL for its tournaments. GTCL currently has all its 2001 tournaments out for bidding, despite the advertised schedule of DC tournaments. Should it get an organizer to hold one of its tournaments, then it will be in a position to designate the DC Toronto tournament as “ conflicting “.

“ Enforcement “ Mechanisms

When a tournament is designated as “ conflicting “, then there are a number of things the chess body can do to enforce penalties on the organizer. Some are future

penalties : the organizer can be banned temporarily from any future participation in the chess organization; any bids put in on future tournaments sanctioned by the chess body can be ruled out of order, and ignored, thus preventing the organizer from holding other tournaments sanctioned by that body. One current penalty that OCA and GTCL always thought they had, was asking the CFC not to ADVERTISE, and not to RATE, any such “ conflicting tournament “. This would be a discouragement to players deciding to play in the “ conflicting “ tournament, though the organizer certainly would still have every right to go ahead and hold such non-CFC-rated tournament. But, though OCA and GTCL believed they would be supported by CFC in this way, neither had previously gone to the CFC to have them develop a policy to support them.

The Shocking Truth

When the OCA went to the CFC Executive Committee to request it not advertise the “ conflicting “ DC tournament, the request was denied. And when it inquired informally concerning a request by it that the “ conflicting “ tournament not be rated, OCA was again advised such request would also be refused by the Executive Committee. GTCL also went to the CFC Executive to see if CFC would help it in the case of a GTCL “ conflicting “ tournament. Bryan Lamb, GTCL Secretary, wrote to the CFC Executive Committee on Jan. 17, 2001 (though he advised he was only writing in his own personal capacity, despite using the title) : “ I would request that the CFC Executive come to an advance decision on whether the CFC is prepared to actively support sanctioning protection at the GTCL level should the need arise at some point in the future “. Well, the future is now here, and GTCL has never ever received a reply from the CFC Executive Committee. But now events have made any reply redundant.

The CFC Governors’ To Vote on a “ Conflicting Tournaments “ Policy

Dutton Chess, having now twice had its tournaments threatened with requests to CFC that it not advertise a DC tournament, because it was “ conflicting “, has made a pre-emptive strike. It approached 2 Governors and requested that they bring forward a policy once and for all that would clarify this whole business of “ conflicting “ tournaments. So David Cohen/David Gebhardt brought the following motion in the Feb. Governors’ Letter # 4 (it also contains short supporting statements, as well as the OCA formal statement effectively against the motion) :

“ That the CFC policy on rating events be that a tournament, which is otherwise qualified to be rated, cannot be prevented from being rated on the grounds that its dates conflict, whether directly or indirectly, with those of another event “.

Your Governors had to March 15 to submit their arguments on the motion for inclusion in the next Governors’ Letter # 5 (the “ discussion on the motion “ stage). Unfortunately, the GTCL did not see fit to have a Governor state its position on the motion. In fact, GTCL had not even debated the issue of GTCL conflicting tournaments and the CFC, either at the Executive Committee level, nor the Board level, by March 15 !

To date, it must be said that those wanting no regulation of “ conflicting “ tournaments have the upper hand (ChessTalk postings; write-ins to SCTCT; ChessTalk readers’ Poll). The majority view seems to favour letting tournament organizers do battle if they are so inclined, even if one of the tournaments is sanctioned by an official chess body, and let the players vote with their feet.

If this view maintains, then the CFC motion will pass handily. When GL # 5 comes out, we’ll know the pro and con arguments of the Governors from across Canada.

The Silence Is Deafening !

Your intrepid representatives at the GTCL got another opportunity (they blew the first one at the last Feb. 12 meeting – see the last SCTCT) to debate both the issue of the OCA “ conflicting “ tournament (being held in Toronto), and the CFC and “ potential “ GTCL conflicting tournaments, at their Board meeting on Friday, March 23.

As to the CFC motion, it was not even raised ! It was listed in the agenda under “ Ontario Open ’01 “, but no board member spoke to it. The meeting just went on to the next agenda item ! So GTCL will submit to the CFC GL # 6 (which will be the “ vote on the motion “ stage) NO statement against the motion !

With respect to the Ontario Open ’01/Toronto Victoria Day Open ’01 conflict, at its March 23 meeting, GTCL took the position it would take NO position! Ari started debate with what he fully intended to be a debate-stopping proposal, as Acting President. He stated that both tournaments are CFC-rated; thus individual players are left to decide. No board member even continued debate on this point! No one agreed nor disagreed. Thus GTCL decides it has NOTHING to say to its member chess bodies, or the GTA players. It refused to take any position re a role in promoting, as part of OCA, the Ontario Open ’01, over the DC Toronto tournament.

Ontario Open ’01 – Our Readers Do Know How to Write !

The past number of Issues have focussed on “ conflicting “ tournaments, and in particular, the one involving the Ontario Open ’01 in May in Kitchener-Waterloo. We have invited your comments, and this seems a good spot to share them with you :

1. " It (the Ontario Open) is usually one of my events I go to. I feel that the ONTARIO OPEN is the Victoria Day Tournament. Unlike the so called Toronto Elite, I have travelled to Refrew, Sarnia, Hamilton..... This tournament should be supported by as many chess players as possible....Someday Mark will retire from the chess scene then where will chess be. We have to allow smaller tournaments to continue or chess will die in Ontario.... I will be going to the Ontario Open ’01 in Kitchener-Waterloo." - John Brown, President, Peel Chess Club.

2. “ If the Ontario Open is to be a meaningful event, it should be the Premier event in May. That saidToronto is a large city with many chess players who would like to compete in a strong swiss tournament on the Victoria Day Weekend. Many of these players may not have the time or money to travel beyond the city for the weekend. For them it is good to have the Dutton tournament.

I don't know all the issues involved (being "new" to chess) but there are many ways to give status to a tournament. Money is only one of them. Having local clubs such as Scarborough give support/prominence is one. Giving exemptions to some other tournaments, or establishing pins/order of merit for consecutive years of participation (e.g., 5, 10 and 20), is another. Making sure there is the participation of a senior master (e.g., Lawrence Day) is another. Making it a festival (e.g., speed tournament, or special lecture by a noted Chess Player) is yet some another idea.

As far as I can see, The Dutton Chess Club will pursue its agenda (which it has a right to do) and the best approach is to find a way to build chess through cooperation. If there are 2 good events in Ontario Victoria Day Weekend, Chess in Ontario will be the better for it. It is in the end the Ontario Chess Association's (and member clubs) responsibility to use positive, rather than restrictive steps to make the Ontario Open the Premier event. “ - Brian Deslauriers, Dutton CC member, and previously member of Ottawa CC ‘s.

3. “ I am glad that this subject was put to the public's opinion so we can determine how we can play chess and control the Tournaments on one hand and without causing a stirup or controversy on the other. How many times have I said that we can run 52 Tournaments a Year but not 52 Tournaments in a week. It is too late to take action now but for the future Dutton Chess shouldn't have run this conflicting tournament. – Ari Mendrinis, Acting President of GTCL, and Scarborough and Dutton CC member.

4. “ I am very much a believer in free enterprise and therefore do not see any problem with anyone running whatever tournament they wish in whatever time slot they want. I do not believe in trying to legislate the success of tournaments in locations that otherwise would not attract significant attendance.

I also believe that two tournaments on the same dates will result in a larger overall turnout for that weekend. There will be some people in the GTA and east who would not consider going to Kitchener-Waterloo for the Ontario Open - if for no other reason than the hotel costs or travel impositions. Likewise, there will be people in Windsor, London, Kitchener/Waterloo, Guelph, etc. who will play in Kitchener/Waterloo but would not consider coming all the way to Toronto for a tournament.

If Mark can run a successful tourney on those dates more power to him. Mark has done a superb job organizing chess activity in this province and deserves to be supported.” – Joachim Hentschel, Scarborough CC member.

5. “ As Toronto is a major centre, I believe that the city should be exempt from OCA's exclusive "right" to run a tournament on the Victoria Day weekend. There are too many people in the Toronto area who are not able or willing to travel outside the city for the Ontario Open. - Larry Luiting, President, Oshawa-Durham CC.

6. “ Dutton Chess is a business; if it sees opportunity (demand) it will try and fill it. This capitalistic view of chess is beneficial to chess players as it increases choice and forces organizers to provide a quality product(venue) or be forced out of the market. An increase in quality chess tournaments increases the draw to the public at large as well.

Monopolistic practices (ie. restricting a particular group from free enterprise) will always result in less selection, higher cost and poorer service. Any group worried about losing market share of players should spend more time focussing on the 99% of the population of Canada that has never seen a chess tournament. I would vote that Dutton Chess should go ahead as long they are following the guidelines of open competition and fair business practices. - Patrick Doucette, Scarborough CC member.

SCC “ Real New Millennium “ (Thurs.) Swiss ’01 Winners

This 31-player, one-section swiss concluded on Feb. 22. The winner was Bryan LAMB, club president. The class winners were : A – Guido BORTOLOTTI; B – Gaja SRINIVASAN; C – Ari MENDRINOS / Liam HENRY; D&U/Unr – Elias RIZK.

“ Impressive Games “ Section of the SCC Bulletin Board

This year we’ve looked at the Queen sacrifice tactic – some worked (Issues # 1, # 3, & # 12); some didn’t (Issue # 5); some involved a Queen counter-sacrifice (Issue # 8). But what is really disheartening is to have the Q-sac ---- and miss it ! I am the victim of such a situation, and will reluctantly share the circumstances of the oversight. The game was played August 16, 2000 in the Toronto Summer International ’00 - Under 2000 Section. I, Bob ARMSTRONG (then 1814), played black against Slava SVIRIDOVITCH (then 1927), as white. Watch and be amazed :

1.Nf3 g6 2. g3 Bg7 3. Bg2 d6 4. 0-0 Nf6 5. d3 0-0 6. c4 Nc6 7. Nc3 e5 8. Rb1 Nd7
9. Ne1 f5 10. f4 Nf6 11. e3 Ne7 12. Bd2 c6 13. b4 Be6 14. Qe2 Qd7 15. Nf3 e4 16. Ng5
d5 17. dxe4 fxe4 18. Nxe6 Qxe6 19. cxd5 cxd5 20. Qd1 Rac8 21. Ne2 b5 22. Bc3 Rc4
23. Bd4 a6 24. Bc5 Rd8 25. Nd4 Qd7 26. Re1 Nc6 27. Qd2 a5 28. a3 axb4 29. axb4 Ra8
30. Bf1 Nxd4 31. exd4 Ra3 32. Bxc4 dxc4 33. Re3 Rd3 34. Rxd3 cxd3 35. Ra1 h6
36. Ra8+ Kh7 37. Ra7 Qd5 38. g4 Nd7 39. Qf2 Qc4 40. Rxd7 Qc1+ 41. Kg2 d2 42. f5
Resigns .

By now a number of players were watching the game. They incredulously asked if I had truly resigned; I confidently replied “ Of course “. Then Sam HAZIPRODRUMU said I still had a recourse ! : 42. Qh1+ ! (the Q-sac) 43. Kxh1 d1=Q+ 44. Kg2 Qxg4+ 45. Qg3 Qe2+ 46. Kg1 Qd1+ 47. Kf2 Qd2+ Kf1 Qd1+ and perpetual ! That’s chess !!

NOTE :

A – Members/ non-members may contact Bob Armstrong, ed. , directly, or through SCC e-mail, to :

1.be added to the e-mail list; 2. submit content (fact, opinion, criticism - recommendations help!).

B – An item in any language may be submitted for publication, if accompanied by an English translation.

C – The opinions expressed here are those of the editor, and not necessarily those of the Scarborough CC.