

CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA

GOVERNORS' LETTER FOUR

2000-2001



Responses may be mailed, faxed or E-mailed to the Chess Federation of Canada, E-1 2212
Gladwin Crescent, Ottawa, ON, K1B 5N1, fax: 613-733-5209, E-Mail: info@chess.ca

ATTENTION ALL GOVERNORS: Anyone with an E-Mail address can have their Governors' Letter sent to them via E-Mail and save the CFC paper and postage costs. Please E-Mail info@chess.ca if interested.

Deadline for next Governors' Letter is March 15, 2001

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

There are three items I wish to comment on in this G.L. The first one is an Ontario problem, the second one is the survey, and the third one is a strategy plan.

Once again we have an Ontario situation where there are conflicting tournaments, this time involving the Ontario Open. This is another situation which I believe could have been avoided if diplomacy and understanding had been prevalent. You will find comments by Roger Lamgen, Ontario Chess Association President on this matter elsewhere in this G.L. Also there is a motion by Gebhardt/Cohen that is related to the issue. Briefly, my understanding of the matter is that it was the Eastern Ontario Chess Association's turn to hold the event. They declined and asked the Dutton Chess Club to run it instead. The D.C.C. accepted the offer. However, the constitution of the O.C.A. dictates that this tournament be rotated around the Leagues. Subsequently, the O.C.A. asked each League in turn and finally found that Kitchener in the Southwestern Ontario Chess League were willing to run the event. In my opinion, this was the time when a diplomatic compromise should have been reached, with the possibility of Toronto and Kitchener taking turns this year and next year, one way or another. Anyway, this did not happen, and now we have the Ontario Open in Kitchener, Dutton Chess Club running a tournament in Toronto at the same time on the long weekend in May, and none of the people involved seemingly very happy about any of it. Anyone outside of Ontario is likely to say that it is just their problem. However, it is possible that a similar scenario could happen elsewhere. For instance, supposing an organizer in Vancouver decided to run a conflicting tournament against the Paul Keres event, what would happen then? The O.C.A. asked the C.F.C. Executive to ban an ad from the Dutton Chess Club for the D.C.C. event. The ban was turned down by a vote of five to one because it was generally felt that a legitimate advertisement for a C.F.C. rated tournament that was within the standards of the magazine should not be banned. After all this, I felt that I should give my comments on the situation since the C.F.C. had to be involved, although I would have hoped the matter could have been settled amicably in Ontario.

At the time of this writing I have not yet received

the February En Passant, but I noticed the survey results on our web site. Most of the questions were designed to give us an idea of all the components that make up our readership. However, the one key element that started the idea of a survey in the first place was to see how the members felt about having the magazine on line instead of in print as it is now. The results of the survey were not only inconclusive, they were downright puzzling. First of all, only about 4% of the members participated, which in my view renders the results questionable. The puzzling aspect arises from the following two questions:

Would you like to see En Passant in an on line version.

YES 47 NO 26

Would you like to keep the print version of EP instead?

YES 38 NO 20

Should not the answers for the second question have been just about the opposite of the first question? Maybe the key words were "see" and "keep", although I thought the key word was "instead". Well, it looks like the bottom line is that out of approximately 2500 members, just 20 would like to do away with the print version of the magazine.

Now for what I believe is a very important initiative. I have developed the following STRATEGY PLAN for the C.F.C. This came about in several ways, I had some specific ideas of my own which always seemed to go on the back burner because of major issues that kept arising. However having a strategy plan is a major issue. Then at the end of last year, there were submissions by both Larry Bevand and Peter Stockhausen in chess talk about planning for the C.F.C. In my opinion, Mr. Bevand's plan would likely be more helpful to Chess N'Math than to the C.F.C. However, Mr. Stockhausen's plan contained some of my thoughts as well as others that I feel are necessary for the C.F.C. to move ahead. I could not include all of Mr. Stockhausen's suggestions because some of them need more staff to operate than we have now. Therefore the following are my ideas along with some of Mr. Stockhausen's {some of which I have changed slightly} Some of the can be implemented now. Others need a motion approved by the Governors. The rest can be agreed upon by the Executive in July at the Annual Meeting. I would not want to impose any

new duties on the staff as we go through the transition period of training a new employee.

STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE C.F.C.

- a} Dedicate 10 man hours a week to increase and maintain scholastic activity, sales and support program.
- b} Translate Training Manual into French.
- c} On an ongoing basis contact Past Members, T.D./Organizers, Clubs, with the goal to establish positive relationships and support.
- d} Increase product line and expand, emphasizing the French market.
- e} Develop a quarterly sales analysis.
- f} Add a historical section to the web site.
- g} Continue translation of website until complete.
- h} Create a Membership Committee to establish ways to increase membership.
- i} Institute a 2 year business/budget cycle with monthly reports.
- j} Have the G.L. on line only.
- k} Reduce Governors to one for every one hundred equivalent paid memberships.
- l} Review plan items on a quarterly basis.

That is it. Items a, b, c, d, e, g, i and l can be agreed upon by the Executive in July. g and h can be ongoing now. j and k, I will work on for motions to be approved by the Governors.

Finally, since membership is the most important item, I ask now for a three person volunteer committee to work together to establish ways to increase memberships. Comments are welcome.

Maurice Smith
President
Chess Federation Of Canada

KEEPING GOVERNORS INFORMED

The President regretfully announces the resignation of our Executive Director, David Miriguay, effective February 2nd. David leaves on excellent terms wishing to pursue a management career and will be working in Ottawa very close to our Office. David has graciously offered to assist in training a new employee. During the two and a half years that David was with us, relations between our Office and our members noticeably improved. David will be missed, and we wish him much success in the future. Meanwhile Chris Collins will be holding the fort on his own for a short time, so I ask everyone to show understanding and cooperation while we go through this transition period.

The Executive voted 5 to 1 in favour of allowing an ad by Dutton Chess Club to be published in En Passant. The ad was for a Victoria Day weekend tournament that will be held at the same time as the Ontario Open.

The ICC tournaments are posted on the CFC web page under tournaments. The first of the scheduled monthly tournaments is on Feb 18th.

Maurice Smith
President
Chess Federation Of Canada

BIDS FOR 2001 ZONAL

The CFC Executive would welcome bids for the next Canadian Closed and Zonal Tournament. This event must be held before next year's World Championship, therefore a prompt response from organizers is necessary to allow adequate time for all the necessary arrangements. Please send all bids to the CFC Business Office.

Maurice Smith
President
Chess Federation Of Canada

WOMEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP

CFC (info@chess.ca) is accepting bids for the 2001

Canadian Women's Championship, with a final deadline of March 1, 2001. The tournament must be held in time for the winner to attend the next FIDE Women's World Championship. Preferred dates are in the summer of 2001, during school vacation. For further information, refer to CFC Handbook Section 11 and contact CFC Women's Coordinator David Cohen (bw998@freenet.carleton.ca).

MOTIONS

Motion 01-1a: (Roger Langen-Robert Webb): Whereas titles assist chess players to advertise competence for chess teaching and otherwise to enjoy the recognition of their peers for an achieved level of play;

be it resolved that the CFC adopt a title system for players rated above 1999 such that:

- 1) A player who attains a rating of 2000 be awarded the title of Expert, provided that this rating level is maintained for 24 consecutive games, exclusive of privately arranged matches or private tournaments not previously approved by the CFC;
- 2) A player who attains the rating of 2200 be awarded the title of Candidate Master, provided that this level is maintained for 24 consecutive games, exclusive of privately arranged matches or private tournaments not previously approved by the CFC;
- 3) A player who attains a rating of 2300 be automatically awarded the title of National Master;
- 4) A player who attains the rating of 2400 be automatically awarded the title of Senior Master, with attendant rights and/or privileges for national or international play as may be decided by the CFC;

Motion 01-1b: (Roger Langen-Robert Webb): Whereas titles assist chess players to advertise competence for chess teaching and otherwise to enjoy the recognition of their peers for an achieved level of play;

be it resolved that the CFC adopt a certificate system for class players such that:

- 1) A player who attains a rating of 1900 be certified an A-class player;
- 2) A player who attains a rating of 1700 be certified a B-class player;
- 3) A player who attains a rating of 1500 be

certified a C-class player;
4) A player who attains a rating of 1200 be certified a D-class player.

Roger Langen & Robert Webb: Questions related to the execution of the Motion(s) if passed may be treated separately. Certificates, for example, may be signified by an annotation on the membership card with updates reflected on the electronic rating list; that is, they need not be designed as paper products for members (although it may be useful to reward Junior players with a certificate proper). Title designations may be annotated as follows: Candidate Master (cm), National Master (NM), Senior Master (SM). If three Master titles seems too many, then I suggest dropping the Senior Master title for the time being. The other two titles affect more players.

A mid-range rating is not suggested for the D-class certificate as that rating range is a novice attainment; as, furthermore, first entry into a Class category should be recognized at the point of contact (to encourage younger players and reward participation in CFC events); and as distinction for prize purposes is not usually made among players rated below 1400, so that a concern to establish a D-class standard is not pertinent.

A qualification period is not suggested for the titles of National Master or Senior Master, as the attainment of the ratings 2300 and 2400 under the current system is already a remarkable achievement.

Players active over the last three years (or more, as the CFC may determine) should receive titles or certificates immediately as per the criteria above. Exceptions might be made in some cases for the period prior to the rating change, e.g. ratings of 2300 attained by the 16+ formula but not maintained. For players not active in the last three years, a committee of the CFC may decide the manner of assigning titles and certificates.

The movers of these Motion, Governors Roger Langen and Robert Webb, recommend these Motion to our fellow Governors and to the CFC Executive. We believe it will encourage greater interest and participation in CFC events at all rating levels. We invite discussion.

Motion 01-2: (Martin Jaeger/ Wilf Ferner) That after the words "highest rated chosen" in 1203a) the words "from among participants in the most recent Closed and Zonal" be inserted.

Martin Jaeger: At the AGM, particularly as part of the masters' rep report, the question of strengthening participation in the Closed was addressed. The above motion would provide for an added incentive for increased participation by strong players.

This motion would make participation in the Closed a necessary condition for being chosen a selection rating list member of the team. Hence the strong players would have a stronger incentive to participate. Accordingly other registrants would have an enhanced opportunity to meet strong players over the board, and thereby earn selection rating list rating points. The event would be stronger and the Closed would serve partially as a qualifier event. The increase in the strength of the tournament would provide an increased incentive for organisers to step forward.

Motion 01-3: (Richard Bowes / Ken Craft) That in Motion 01-1a, the clause "exclusive of privately arranged matches or private tournaments not previously approved by the CFC" under articles 1 & 2 be eliminated.

Richard Bowes: This is impractical and implies an undefined criteria to apply to the 24 consecutive games in order that they qualify.

Motion 01-4: (Richard Bowes / Ken Craft) Whereas the rules for the selection of the Olympic Team were not followed when choosing replacements for the resignations of Yan Teplitsky and Ron Livshits from the Canadian Olympic Team; and Whereas the President of the CFC has a clear and direct responsibility to ensure that the rules are correctly applied for the selection of players. The New Brunswick Governors request the resignation of Maurice Smith as President of the Chess Federation of Canada.

Richard Bowes: The New Brunswick Governors wish to express their great displeasure with the manner in which the CFC handled the selection of replacement members for the Olympic team. The CFC President acted without authority, in

contravention of the CFC Constitution, in personally appointing Jack Yoos & David Cummings to the Olympic team instead of following the procedures set out in the CFC By-Laws. If Yan Teplitsky's & Ron Livshits' quitting the team created an issue as described under Article 11 of By-Law 2 then, if there was no time for a Governor's vote, the President had a duty to refer to the Board for a decision as to how to proceed. If this situation cannot be characterized as an issue under Article 11 because the procedures are clear regarding selection, then the President had a duty to refer directly to the selection rating list and to contact eligible players in their order of listing. In the latter event we would note the following:

The CFC procedures for selecting the Olympic team ensure that an objective test will be applied in selecting players for the team. These procedures exist with the approval of the Assembly of Governors. The Governors are the representatives of the CFC members and work to ensure that the interests of the members are protected and respected by the governing body. In this instance the governing body (in the person of the President) has acted in such a manner as to ignore the proper procedures and to trample on the rights of certain members by not following the rules under the CFC Constitution.

It is noted that the President has asserted that he acted within his authority inasmuch as the situation was one of great urgency. Presumably he considers that this event constituted an "issue" under By-Law 2, Article 11. However, assuming this to be the case, this claim of urgency has not been substantiated by facts. It has been noted that the President had several days after receiving notice of Teplitsky's & Livshits' quitting in which to, at the very least, contact the Board and to have them decide the course of action as stipulated under By-Law 2, Article 11. The President first learned of the pullout on Friday, October 20th and failed to even try to contact the members of the Board for the next 2 days. In fact it was certain Board members who contacted him eventually and when they gave their decision as to how to proceed (via the selection list) the President ignored their decision. Furthermore, there has been no evidence presented to indicate that Jack Yoos and David Cummings were contacted by the President any earlier than the following Monday, illustrating that there was plenty of time

to telephone everyone on the selection list.

Note: Under the CFC rule titled " Conflict of Interest " the President must declare a conflict and abstain from involvement/voting/discussion in this proposal. Therefore we demand that the Vice President be the one to make the ruling on this submission with respect to it's inclusion in the GL.

Moved 01-6: (David Cohen/ David Gebhardt) 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.

David Cohen: We are a free enterprise society. Events which cannot survive on their own in a competitive environment should not be propped up by regulation.

It is the CFC's job to promote chess across Canada. Preventing an event from being rated by the CFC MIGHT be helping an event that cannot survive on its own. However, it would DEFINITELY be hurting the second event, which could be run successfully in another location.

In the best situation, we would have many tournaments across Canada every weekend. North Bay and Toronto could run events on the same weekend or one after the other. In a competitive environment, players will choose one or the other. In a cooperative environment, the organizers will arrange for players to play in both! There no need to prevent one event from coming into being.

Furthermore, there is no need to place an organizer in the position of being threatened with not having an event rated. This situation has occurred twice within the past year to the CFC's largest customer. I do not think that we should treat our best customer and our most prolific organizer in this fashion. This motion will ensure that no organizer will be placed in this position.

Straw Vote Topic SV-01-1: (Martin Jaeger)
"That the Canadian zonal be held biennially and if a second world championship be held between zonals, Canada's representative to the second world championship be the winner of a match held between the first and second place finishers at the most recent zonal."

Martin Jaeger: The world championship is now tending to be an annual event but holding a zonal every year is beyond the financial capabilities of Canadian players and organisations. Accordingly the above straw vote motion is presented.

While we (players and organization) cannot afford to hold a zonal every year, we should be able to finance a biennial Closed and a biennial match. In my view the match would be an interesting event for our membership.

MOTIONS UNDER DISCUSSION

Final Discussion of 01-1a & 01-1b

Refer to previous discussion by R. Langen, T.Ficzere, G.Taylor, D.Cohen, F.Cabanas, L.Craver, GL#3. Refer to previous discussion by A. Mendrinos, D. Gebhardt, D. Miriguay, A. Mayo, L.Craver, and J.Rutherford, GL#2.

Brett Campbell: I support it because I believe it might encourage more players to play and keep playing, although critics are right in suggesting it may not have that desired effect. The point is, why not try something, especially if its cost is trivial.

Peter Stockhausen: I do not support either motion and will vote no. Mr. Cabanas and Craver have expressed the points of views that I share and therefore no repeat of them is necessary.

Richard Bowes: Vote no. The CFC already has a suitable system of titles and class recognition. I don't see any advantage to the certificates, in particular, and I think before you down-grade a master to a candidate master the opinions of the members themselves should be canvassed.

Wilf Ferner I will be voting NO. I am not against some type of "Canadian Rating Achievement Awards" system including some titles. The top 5% of active players, juniors, and ordinary players should be surveyed as to the type of system they want, if any. I would like an opinion from our Rating Auditor and Fide Rep re a practical solution for Canadian titles. Any system should be fee based, like the TD Certification Programme of 25 years ago. CFC business office labour/costs should be kept at a

minimum; ie make full use of existing office systems/procedures. Chess organizers should be consulted re type of system and their role.

Denis Allan: 01-1a I support this motion, although I would prefer it without the suggestion that Senior Masters have some privilege. However that does no harm. It is a simple fact that inflation has rendered the title "Master" meaningless if achieved by a rating of 2200. At one time there were less than ten players over 2200 in Canada. Now there are seventy over 2300. I agree that there are regional problems. It is virtually impossible to maintain a high rating in Atlantic Canada, because there are so few players. Normally 2400 players feast on 2200s, 2200s' on 2000s, 2000s on 1800s, etc. But in Atlantic Canada that is not possible. Most games of strong players are against others rated much lower. But that should be addressed in another manner. I could write much more about the obvious inflation, but will not, because I know this motion will not succeed anyway. Indeed I was not even going to bother to comment on it, and thought it would be for vote this time, but noticed there is more discussion. I do feel strongly about one aspect. Much abuse has been heaped upon this motion and its movers in "Chesstalk" which is completely unwarranted. Mr. Langen is to be commended for a motion which appears to be against his personal interest. Other Governors who flirt with 2200 can be counted on to vote against it.

01-1b I will vote against this. I think it is too complicated and I think certificates are for kids.

Kevin Spraggett: "WE ARE WHAT WE REPEATEDLY DO. EXCELLENCE, THEN, IS NOT AN ACT, BUT A HABIT." Aristotle

I intend to show that the Langen/Webb motion is an exercise in vanity, self-absorption and futility.

If any of the Governors have found that it is rather difficult to fathom the overall objective and intent of the Langen/Webb motion, then not only do I express my solidarity with them, but I would go a little further and contend that if Mr. Langen is not being downright evasive about it, then he is most certainly being knowingly mischievous.

The Governors will no doubt agree with me that it is somewhat curious that on the one hand Mr. Langen's motion proposes detailed, sweeping, and far reaching changes to the CFC's ranking system, and then on the

other hand he seems to have 'forgotten' the need to explain to us why he would like to see those changes implemented (or why we should want to adopt them). No less puzzling is the astute observation that - for a motion that presumably focuses on a chessplayer's 'strength' (and how it is measured by the CFC, compared to other members, perceived, classified, defined, awarded, honored, saluted, pickled and prepared) - Mr. Langen has religiously refused to use the word 'strength' (even once) in either the wording of the motion, or in the discussion within the Governor's Letters (or even in his discussion of the topic on www.chestalk.com) ! He uses the words 'recognition', 'achievement', 'accomplishment', 'attainment' 'competence', 'playing level', 'worth' and 'rating range' BUT never the word that would come first to every chessplayer's mind: 'strength'. Why? Is Mr. Langen simply trying to help us expand our vocabulary?

Moreover, it is hard not to notice that in a certain part of the motion the wording is vague and unexpected: while a peculiar point is made 'en passant' about one of the titles having "attendant rights and/or privileges for national and international play as may be decided by the CFC", in the ensuing discussion presented by Mr. Langen there is not as much as a hint of this startling concept, what it means or refers to or even why it is included in the scheme being considered.

Furthermore, as if both the motion and the discussion do not already burden us with enough terms, new classifications, definitions and numbers, then what is Mr. Langen doing trying to knock us further off balance for by throwing in the onerous "The above motion may be treated as a single motion subject to various amendments or deletions; or reduced to two motions, on titles and certificates, respectively."

The impression is that instead of Mr. Langen presenting us with a clear-cut proposal, he has simply thrown at us a type of complex maze and is leaving it to us to figure out its ultimate design.

And this is not all: on the site www.chestalk.com Mr. Langen engaged in a discussion of certain aspects of the implementation of this motion that are barely hinted at in any of the material in the GLs. It was an educational experience for me to see this! For example, he argues that the new titles are for life, as are the certifications of the players lower than 2000 rating. And then he implies that once certified, these titles and certifications will define a new ranking system (where undoubtedly titles will decide qualification for important events and not rating). He even comes out and declares the present rating

based ranking system ‘masochistic’! Reviewing both Mr. Langen’s motion and discussion in GL 2 and 3, I can find no trace of such ideas. Such arguments should have been made clear in the Governor’s Letter. Omission or tactic?

It is important for us Governors to remain focused: this is Mr. Langen’s motion. He is bringing this to us to decide upon. Normal procedure is to introduce to us a concrete, clear, well defined and concise motion, and then to try to convince us of the merit(s) of the motion . None of this is happening here!

As it is, Mr. Langen has succeeded in getting people to turn their attention away from the big picture (and the consequences this motion will have on our ranking system) and instead get us to focus on the individual details of the motion (and their personal impact). The majority of the comments concerning this motion have revolved about details of the details , such as how much it would cost both the CFC and its members to implement, the 24 game minimum period, title definitions, peak rating or current rating, etc.

If Mr. Langen’s intention was to side-track us ,then he has certainly succeeded. As Governors, we have an obligation to consider not only WHY we should want this motion passed but WHERE this motion would take the CFC if passed. I believe I have figured out what the Langen/Webb motion is all about.

I ask you to bear with me.

THE ESSENTIAL POINTS OF OUR RANKING SYSTEM

- The CFC employs a rating system; a title system (FIDE) accompanies this
- Rating determines ranking; title is for show and is awarded by FIDE
- The highest rated player is also considered the best player and ranked no. 1
- The relative difference in strength between any two given players can be seen from the difference in their ratings
- The Rating System compares relative strength , and not absolute strength. Rating does not mean or intend to represent ones ‘understanding’ of the game.
- When players compete , rating points are exchanged and therefore normal fluctuations occur. Over time these fluctuations cancel each other out, or indicate change in playing strength (as when one is either very young or very old)

- Each player is wholly responsible, under this rating system, for his results, his rating fluctuations, as well as his current rating
- Almost without exception, all of our qualification criteria for national and international events (teams included) are rating based
- The CFC has an informal rating division nomenclature, A to D-classes, Expert and Master
- Under this system, when one asks “How good are you?” the normal reply is to give your current rating

HOW THE AMERICAN CONTRACT BRIDGE LEAGUE (ACBL) RANKS ITS MEMBERS

For those who would like more information on the ranking system used by the ACBL I suggest taking a trip to www.acbl.org/tournaments/WebMPs.html. It is only one page in length and is fast reading.

Any ranking scheme employed in bridge must necessarily be less accurate than what is used in chess because bridge is a game played in pairs. The final result is always a team effort, and, since it is rare that the members of a pair are equal in ability, breaking that team effort into mathematically precise components is practically impossible.

Therefore, the ACBL limits the expectations of its ranking scheme to merely indicate the “approximate overall ranking relative to that of every other member.” In chess one can confidently and accurately refer to a given player’s ‘strength’ or ability in terms of his rating (or his ranking). Or the difference in strength of two players as being the difference in their respective ratings. In bridge ‘strength’ is not as easy to accurately assert , and so what is preferred is to use the word ‘*accomplishment*’ or ‘*achievement*’ instead: for example, again quoting from the web site of the ACBL...

- “The masterpoint plan is the means by which ACBL ranks each member’s *accomplishments* in sanctioned bridge play.”
- “ACBL awards titles to members...(who) *achieve* predetermined levels of bridge *accomplishment*.”

(If this sounds a bit similar to some of the jargon used by Mr. Langen in his motion and its discussion, then it is not by coincidence.)

The ACBL uses a combination of point system and title system. To simplify a bit, the masterpoint system (as the point system is called) is cumulative and dependent not so much on your final tournament

result as on what place you end up in the final classification. (First place gets more masterpoints than second place, second place gets more masterpoints than third place, and so on down the final classification table.) There are also different colours of masterpoints, to reflect the level of competition (ie, club, local, regional or national) There is never any exchange of points between players, as is what happens in chess tournaments.

Since the points are cumulative and mostly indicate how long a player has been playing, their use for ranking purposes is very questionable. Therefore, the ACBL uses a title system which is dependent both on the number of masterpoints a player has and on their colours to help establish a more accurate ranking scheme. These titles (also called honor titles) are for life. Advancing to a higher title level is achieved by accumulating more masterpoints. "The ACBL awards honor titles to members as they amass a sufficient number of masterpoints to *achieve* predetermined levels of bridge *accomplishment.*"..."The honor titles that members earn...serve as close approximations of their overall standing." -from the web page given above.

Under the ACBL system (which is similar in principle to most other bridge ranking schemes used around the world), although Life Master is the highest title awarded (there are, however, several different levels within this rank), almost all other titles have the word 'Master' in them. This has an attractive ring to it and the members (especially the weak players) don't seem to mind. Masterpoint levels for these 'Master' designations vary from 5 (for Junior Master) to 300 (for Life Master). However, it is not uncommon for an experienced player to accumulate as many as 10,000 or more.

Under the ACBL system, if one asks "How accomplished are you?" the usual response is to give your honor title.

There has been lots of discussion in the bridge world about trying to find a more accurate ranking scheme, in particular a rating based scheme (as in chess), but the practical obstacles presented by the nature of bridge (a game played by pairs) have not allowed the mathematical models to have much success.

In summary, the basic differences between the ACBL ranking scheme and the CFC ranking (rating) scheme are:

- In chess, rating decides ranking. Titles are irrelevant to the ranking scheme

- In chess, relative 'strength' is synonymous with rating or ranking
- In bridge, ranking is done by titles; titles are awarded depending on the number and colour of masterpoints achieved
- In bridge, one prefers the use of 'accomplishment', 'achievement' (or something similar) as opposed to the use of 'strength' when referring to the ability of any particular player

WHAT MR. LANGEN REVEALED ON CHESSTALK

As Mr. Langen felt it was unnecessary to do us Governors the favour of promoting the merits of his motion in the GLs, I have taken the liberty of quoting from his comments that appeared on Chesstalk.

- 1) 12/28/2000
"The Langen/Webb motion is intended-quite simply-to recognize levels of attainment...it would do this by freeing recognition for achieved levels of play from the vagaries of ratings. In other words, it would separate recognition away from a strict adherence to one's current rating level, which is bound to fluctuate...(This motion) involves nothing more than saying, really, you've played this much and you've played this well, and we're ready to say so. On the ratings only model, it's a case, unfortunately, of 'Now you see him, now you don't'. In other words, you're only as good as your last game. That's hardly an inducement to keep on playing, unless you're masochistically inclined."
- 2) 12/29/2000
"What I am mainly interested in is the title and certificate system, one that would run parallel with the rating system, where ratings and titles supported each other. This is precisely how the international system works..."
- 3) 12/28/2000
"There is no "present system" for awarding titles; there is only...(the) 'mathematical robotics'."
- 4) 11/2001
"The motion is intended to enhance the current system, not replace it. The modification to our current practice is slight, not significant. Of course, a small change...can mean a lot to some people and help the sport. That is precisely the intention of this motion...I am more interested in the title concept per se, as an honorific, nothing more. I did suggest that the CFC might like to relate international support to 2400+ levels, but that is not part of the motion as such...For a player who has attained a rating of 1900

but has fallen back to 1700, it is possible...for him to say that he is an A player with a B rating...he is able to say (fairly) that he is an A player, meaning that...he can lay claim to an A level of understanding. After all, he's been there...I can see that the motion may fail. Fine, it's only a motion...certainly there's much more ailing our sport than the desire of a few enthusiasts to have stable recognition for their time and devotion in the game."

WHAT THE MOTION ACTUALLY PROPOSES

The motion sets up the basic structure of a completely independent title based ranking system. This is exactly as in the title based ranking system described above (ACBL). It defines 'titles' and 'certificates' by pre-established progressively increasing rating fields. Each title or certificate is awarded once an established rating is recorded. The title or certificate is 'for life', meaning that one can never lose that 'status' once achieved. A player can advance to the next level of title or certificate by increasing the number of rating points he has.

The motion then proposes to go further than this by creating a master title with "attendant rights and/or privileges for national or international play as may be decided by the CFC". The significance of this must not be missed: under current regulations, all qualification for national and international play (ie, our championships, our Olympic team) are based on our rating system. By setting up a mechanism that Mr. Langen argues is only 'parallel' to our rating system, he is in fact creating the means to fully displace the rating system as our qualification system.

(As a very strong supporter of our current Olympic Selection system, I of course am very concerned that on the one hand Mr. Jaeger is presenting a motion to eliminate the selection of our National Team by ratings and then on the other hand Mr. Langen is setting up a master title with 'rights' and 'privileges' that can quite naturally fill the National Team positions.)

MR. LANGEN'S MISCONCEPTIONS

It is necessary to point out some misconceptions in Mr. Langen's arguments on Chesstalk.

1) "This is precisely how the international system works..."-Langen

This is not true. In FIDE, the rating system and title system do not support one another, at least in the

sense that Mr. Langen is arguing. With the exception of the FM title, all titles are awarded based on a 'norm' criteria and this has nothing to do with rating. Norms require exceptional results to be achieved in tournament play. For the specific cases of the GM and IM titles, to CONFIRM these titles a minimum rating (2500 and 2400 respectively) has to be shown for one rating list. After that, the player's rating can drop but he would keep the title for life. And please note that the minimum rating requirement for confirmation purposes was introduced only recently, to keep in check the cheating that was noted by some federations who were trying to sell titles to players who could pay for them. The FM title is awarded to any player who achieves a 2300 rating, and is the only title awarded by FIDE that does not require norms. This is a relatively recent 'invention' and was meant to be a device to 'promote' chess in third world countries. The FM title has virtually no prestige connected with it.

The FIDE system is in fact almost the exact opposite of the system proposed by Mr. Langen. Under the proposed system, titles would be awarded for simply achieving established ratings and would have absolutely nothing to do with norms or exceptional tournament results.

2)"There is no present system for awarding titles..."-Langen

The CFC has an informal nomenclature for rating divisions. Canadian players strive for titles offered by FIDE. Canada has presently 3 living Grandmasters and more than a couple dozen IMs. And innumerable FMs. The title 'system' that we use is identical to that used in virtually every other country in the world.

3) "mathematical robotics", "vagaries of ratings" - Langen

Mr. Langen does not seem to realize that our Rating System is actually a RANKING system in itself. A player's rating is not an independent or random number awarded to a given player...but actually defines the player's RELATIVE strength (compared to every other member's) based on his results relative to everyone else's. Because points are exchanged between players whenever they play (dependent of the results) the rating continually fluctuates to reflect the change(s) in ranking. Mr. Langen talks of 'vagaries' and 'fluctuations' of our Rating System as though they are an unavoidable evil or flaw in the system, when in fact these changes are the very essence of the ranking system! That is why it is so

accurate. (I am not saying that the system is perfect.)

This is one of the key failings in Langen's argument: he wants to be able to say 'Here, let's go by this number (the rating) to define this new title based ranking system" when he is IN FACT using an already existent ranking system to define yet another ranking system, and this is not logically consistent.

In bridge there is no logical inconsistency because the Masterpoint system is not a ranking system by itself. Masterpoints can not be lost, can not be exchanged between players and are not dependent on 'results' per se. They do not reflect the player's ranking.

4. "achievement", "understanding"--Langen

Once a player achieves an established rating one can say ONLY one thing with certainty: the player's RELATIVE strength is indicated by his rating. One can not say that the player's rating is his 'understanding' level or his real 'skill' level. Ratings are by nature relative animals; they reflect practical results, nothing more.

On top of this, a player can become a master level player (2200) in a variety of ways, not all equal. One can become a master by playing only strong players all the time or by only playing weaker players all the time. The latter way takes the longer time to achieve, since one has to play in many tournaments , each time gaining a minimum number of points. So it is entirely possible for a player to achieve a master's rating without actually having the 'understanding' (as Mr. Langen puts it) of a master. Why is this possible? Again, it has to do with the relative nature of the Rating System. Points are exchanged in the group of players in which you are part of: if you are the strongest player in the group then it is very possible that the group simply supplies you with rating points.

So when Mr. Langen describes the title of the player (under his proposed system) as being the true measure of his 'understanding' or 'achievement', then he is simply fooling himself. There is no such thing as an "A player with a B rating", either in the current Rating System used by the CFC nor in his proposed title based ranking system. You can not logically argue on the one hand for a title based solely on rating and then on the other hand arbitrarily differentiate that title from the player's rating.

Certainly it is very rare , even in the best of circumstances, that a chessplayer can perform up to

his 'real' understanding of the game. Practical considerations , such as time controls, level of opposition, fatigue, etc prevent one from playing up to one's 'true' understanding. Strong correspondence players are an excellent example: when they have to play in normal clock tournaments they never even remotely approach their real 'understanding' level. Ranking systems are about competition, about results.

MR. LANGEN'S ASSUMPTIONS THAT HE WANTS US TO SHARE

Mr. Langen wants us to believe that his proposed ranking scheme will be able to differentiate a player's true 'understanding' and his 'achievement' from his 'practical' results and rating. Such a ranking scheme is impossible, in spite of his dedication and persistence in trying to convince us to the contrary. Let's consider the numerous assumptions and leaps of faith involved...

- If the title achieved by a player (solely based on established rating) were not for life, but would DEPEND on the player's current rating, then I would find the motion much less objectionable. In that case the player's title could move up and down the title ladder. However, it is Mr. Langen who INSISTS on us using a 'for life' title. This is very arbitrary, and reflects his personal wish.
- Definitions such as 'achievement' and 'understanding' are never clear or unanimous. Again, Mr. Langen INSISTS on the 'title' and 'certificate' as DEFINING 'achievement' and 'understanding'. This is really pushing the envelope of credibility. As explained above, neither rating nor title could ever hope to define 'understanding'. And 'achievement' can not be treated like popcorn in a cinema...got on demand.
- Mr. Langen INSISTS that, by approving this motion, everyone RECOGNIZE and acknowledge these (arbitrary) definitions and qualifications as being the truth in our chess community. That there is such a thing as an "A player with a B rating".

Contrary to what Mr. Langen would have us believe, these assumptions have nothing to do with 'enhancing' our current system, nor are they 'small' modifications to the way we do things at present. Mr. Langen's vision of his motion as being an

alternative perspective on ranking is delusional. Any argument that runs something like "If we assume A, and then if we assume B, and if then we assume C , things quite naturally fall into place." is not proposing a workable, natural system!

Nor does this proposal have anything to do with being 'honorific', as Mr. Langen coins it. Perhaps making the title for life can be construed to being 'honorific', but to then proceed to make the other assumptions is to push things into the land of pure fantasy. Mr. Langen wants his cake and eat it too.

CLOSING COMMENTS

This motion is--to be completely frank-- based solely on one person's ego, his vanity and his absorption in his eroding 'status' in the chess community. En route to get what he wants--some sort of 'life title' status pleasantly detached in any way from his current rating--he also wants us to redefine what we believe to be 'achievement' and 'understanding', and to 'write it in marble' as a rule. He flippantly dismisses all those who support a highly respected and universally accepted rating based ranking system as being 'masochistically inclined'.

It is very hard to believe that he can on one hand sing the praises and merits of a title based solely on rating and then on the other hand try to then convince us that ratings are only for those who are 'masochistically inclined'!

If it was only for these reasons, I think that voting no to this motion is an excellent idea. However, as this motion also creates a ranking system that threatens to interfere with how Canada will select its National Championships and Olympic Teams, I believe that it is the Governors' duty to defeat this motion in no uncertain way.

Vote NO!

Final Discussion of 01-2

Refer to previous discussion by T.Ficzere, G.Taylor, M.Jaeger, D.Cohen, F.Cabanas, L.Craver, GL#3. Refer to previous discussion by K. Spraggett, GL#2.

Brett Campbell: I have read everyone's arguments, and would have to, with difficulty, vote no to the motion. Titled professional Grandmaster chess players who make a living at chess (Lesiege and Spraggett) certainly should

be on the team, and they have the highest Canadian ratings. Now, the other team positions should also be chosen by rating, and it is a good question whether Canadian or Fide ratings should be given priority.

Peter Stockhausen: I suggest rejection of this motion. We should, for once, stay with what is here and practice it for a few Olympiads.

Richard Bowes: I vote no. This motion seeks to force players to play in the Closed. I disagree with that idea. Players can't always attend the closed, for many different reasons. To limit the team to only closed participants could result in barring otherwise deserving players, thus adversely affecting the team's "strength".

Martin Jaeger: By now governors will have been able to determine that the standard operating procedure for choosing Canada's representatives to the world competition level is nationals trials. Clearly, as usual, there is opposition to change but the fact that a proposal involves doing things differently to how they have been done in the past is not in itself a valid reason for maintaining a current practice that is contrary to that used for good reason by other sporting federations.

Mr Taylor argues that we should be seeking to send the strongest team. What better way to determine the strongest team than in direct competition among candidates? Moreover "sending the strongest team" is but one of perhaps competing valid goals. Having fair competition for team spots is also a valid goal as is promoting the CFC institutions such as the national championship.

I recognize that effort and expense is involved in coming to a national trial. However the chance to travel to an exotic locale to compete with the best players in the world is I think a prospect that sufficiently compensates for the granting to others of the ability to directly compete for places on the team.

In Ontario, the OCA (on my initiative, as it turns out) has set aside \$1000 to help Ontarians compete in the national championship and I suggest that other provincial associations should support participation by their strong players.

I do not believe that it is appropriate for the CFC to structure its affairs so that cheapened titles

(and CFC life memberships incidentally) are awarded.

Kevin Spraggett: After circumspect consideration of GL3, I think that I have gained some insight into why many are disillusioned with the CFC decision making process. I believe that I now understand not only why many CFC members feel that their opinions are not particularly relevant to those inside the political process, but also why they find the whole process rather distasteful. It is no longer surprising to me why almost all of the CFC governorships are gained by 'acclamation' (as opposed to being 'elected', as in 'running against someone' for the role). I had always thought that it was the growing 'apathy' of the typical chessplayer that explained the widening distance between the actual decision making process and the general membership. But now I realize that this explanation is not only insufficient to explain much that has happened in recent years, but that it is also very inaccurate. The truth of the matter, as now I understand, is that it is really the Governors who are the ones who are distancing themselves from the CFC membership, and that the apathy that exists today among the general membership is but a natural response to the way the political process is functioning.

Let's take two concrete examples from GL3: the Langer/Webb motion(s) and the Jaeger/Ferner motion(s). Neither motion is the result of a preliminary membership inquiry or a proper study (or ANY study for that matter). The Langer motion wants to make sweeping and controversial changes to what has become an accepted (and respected) way to do things before the membership is even made aware of the existence of the proposal. The Jaeger motion wants to change the nature of both the Canadian National Chess Championship and the Canadian National Olympic Team regardless of what the top players think. (Jaeger is rated 1796!) Neither motion is a response to any particularly pressing political reality or necessity or demand for change that any segment of the membership has expressed. Both motions lack popular support.

Is this type of leadership from our Governors supposed to elicit respect from the general membership of the CFC? In effect, each proposal is a 'rabbit of an idea' pulled from a Governor's 'magic hat', presented to us (the rest of the Governors) in the form of a motion. We are expected to intelligently discuss them, and in the process mystically endow them with some sort of 'raison d'être' that they otherwise would not possess, pass them, and then (and only then) communicate to the general

membership that things are going to be a little different from now on BECAUSE WE SAY SO!

Instead of our decision making system starting from the basic concerns of the general membership and then working itself up to the Governors' attention (who then can respond to real problems), what we see is the REVERSE: the Governors impose THEIR own ideas downward on an increasingly passive membership—who quite naturally, after a while, try to separate themselves from the whole dubious process by showing disinterest, disdain and general apathy.

What has happened to us Governors? Shouldn't what the membership want be the Governors' primary concern? How much longer is the CFC supposed to go on with this charade whereby the governors try to RULE the membership?

Well, I hope we begin to change our ways of doing things TODAY starting with this GL. Let's start by getting rid of that 'magic hat' approach to inventing motions. Let's put an end to those times where obtaining consensual support from a handful of governors is more important than responding to the legitimate concerns of the membership. Let's stop doing things the easy way.

Martin Jaeger's motions concerning changes to both the National Championship or the National Olympic Team are 'magic hat' motions. As Masters' Representative for several years now, I find his ideas to be an affront to the integrity and dignity of every strong player in this country. His strong arm approach to doing things is distasteful and unacceptable. I strongly believe that his motions presented here, if passed, would gravely damage Canadian Chess.

I ask each Governor to re-read what I had written in GL2, and then to send a very clear signal to Martin Jaeger: VOTE NO!

Final Discussion of 01-3

Refer to previous discussion by R.Langen, D.Cohen, L.Craver, GL#3. Refer to previous discussion by R. Langen, GL#2.

David Cohen: I am in favour of the new motion 01-3. I was opposed only when the original 01-3 contained a reference to eliminating certificates for players below 2000.

Peter Stockhausen: See my comments to 01 - 1a and 01 - 1b.

Ari Mendrinos: I agree to this amendment.

First Discussion of motion 01-4

Refer to previous statements by M.Smith, R.Langen, GL#3.

Roger Langen: The Executive of the OCA wishes to advise the Governors that it objects strongly to the failure of the CFC to follow procedure in selecting the Olympic Team.

The resignation of Yan Teplitsky and Ron Livshits from the team should have resulted in telephoning players on the selection rating list in order of their appearance. In Ontario, two players who had expressed their willingness to play, IM's Bryon Nickoloff and Tom O'Donnell, were neither called nor invited.

Of course, it does not matter that the Canadian Olympic Team as it was composed has done well. That would only argue that there might be another method for making up the team. But such a change would have to be moved, discussed, and voted on first, not imposed at the pleasure of the President before time.

Roger Langen, President
Martin Jaeger, Vice-President
Shivaharan Thuraisarah, Treasurer
Bryan Lamb, Secretary
Ari Mendrinos, Junior Coordinator

Kevin Spraggett: (In response to the above OCA statement.)

I would like to make a number of pertinent observations concerning the OCA executive's news release, which was addressed to the governors of the CFC in GL3.

One, it should be emphasized—to keep things in perspective—that the undersigned (of the news release) do not in any way speak on behalf of Ontario chess players , nor do they speak in any way on behalf of the OCA as an organizational entity. They speak only on behalf of themselves as private citizens, obviously sharing the same personal opinion, but using the good office of the OCA executive as a mouthpiece in order to try to lend some weight to their views.

There is a good case that could be made that both Roger Langen and Martin Jaeger are being derelict of duty and responsibility (as officers of the OCA) presenting a news release which uses the good office of the OCA executive as a vehicle for their own personal opinions (already expressed elsewhere through other instruments) to further their own vendettas and political agenda against the current CFC executive, of which a number are themselves highly respected members of the OCA.

Two, to merely describe Yan Teplitsky and Ron Livshits as 'resigning' from the team is a gross misrepresentation of the situation and intentionally seeks to underscore the enormous pressure which the CFC was put under as a direct result of their action. We are really talking about exceptional circumstances .

Four (4 !) Ontario members (Yan and Ron included) of the Canadian delegation that was to be sent to Istanbul simultaneously withdrew less than one week before they were to have left Toronto's Pearson International Airport. Why did they do this? For fear for their lives, due to unsettling and potentially very explosive events developing in the middle east. (Whether their action is right or wrong is irrelevant: it was a very difficult decision for them to take and must be fully respected for obvious reasons.) This put in doubt the eventual participation of Canada in the Istanbul Chess Olympics: what if other members of the Canadian delegation were to follow suit? Very quick action was necessary to prevent this occurring.

Three, the news release tries to argue the thesis that Ontario chess players had somehow been deprived of something or were somehow wrongly treated by the subsequent manner in which the CFC President acted to prevent the disintegration of the Canadian National Olympic Team.

Nothing is further from the truth! While there exists some controversy and difference of opinion (within the CFC) about who had what authority to make the final decision (about who the replacements were to be) , Ontario chess players were not the least bit prejudiced. Quite the contrary! Deen Hergott, an Ontarian, was asked to participate on the team and he declined to do so. In the end another Ontarian, David Cummings, did accept to participate.

As for the two Ontario players referred to in the press release , Bryon Nickoloff and Tom O'Donnell, their situation is not as clear cut as the news release would have you think. One had already declared publicly

(there are witnesses) that he would not want to play if asked, and the other's health (advanced stage of terminal cancer) would probably not have stood up to the ordeal of traveling to Istanbul and participating in the Olympics.

Four, to tear away the last remaining leg of the news release's thesis that Ontario was somehow left out in the cold by the action of the CFC, the CFC President himself--- who personally made the final decision --- Maurice Smith , is actually an Ontario resident, OCA member in good standing, and a long time chess organizer in that province! How much more could the OCA have asked for?

What is the truth here about this news release? Do we need to ask Maurice Smith for how many years , before this latest incident, both Martin Jaeger and Roger Langen had been trying to undermine his good reputation? Internal Ontario chess politics is a mad house: and has been for a long time. The OCA at war with the Toronto, which is at war with the CFC, who is at war with the CMA... and every possible permutation on the theme.

I think the governors should realize that the news release sent by Martin Jaeger and Roger Langen is useful only for wrapping fish, and maybe not even for that.

David Cohen: Opposed. I am happy that the president acted, I am happy with the way in which he acted, and I am happy with the results of his actions.

Brett Campbell: I oppose the motion, and all that's really important is that I don't think a dedicated volunteer like Maurice should be asked to leave, even if the rules were not followed. Why? Because he was in "time trouble", and had to make a hasty decision to replace two players who at the last minute declined to go. If anyone disagrees with his decision, they should try to become President themselves at the next annual meeting. Really, as I indicated in my other letters, the first "controversy" was the unfortunate pairing of Livshits/Teplitsky as team members along with their employer Belzberg paying for the Canadian team to go. Obviously Livshits and Teplitsky are fine chess players, but an outsider could be forgiven for jumping to the conclusion the selection process may have been influence by monetary concerns (even if that is totally false). If Maurice made a mistake with the replacements (and this is debatable) then a simple apology would suffice, and we could

move on to the future.

One thing worth mentioning: a large number of players donated to the chess Olympic team funding, and I would hope their donations will be saved (if these donations were not needed at the last Olympics) to be used to send the team the next time around.

Peter Stockhausen: The appropriate section reads as follows: "If a player declines after selection, the replacement player shall be filled from the selection rating list."

There is no reference to "procedure" or "sequence" for the replacements. This was on purpose in order to give the decision maker maximum flexibility since such replacements are usually very last minute. The President acted within this framework.. Before the next Olympiad we may want to improve this one aspect of the Olympic Selection Rules. In any case I do not see any reason for the President to resign over his handling of this issue.

Phil Haley: I did not agree with the manner in which the two replacement players were appointed to the team.

The decision was made unilaterally by President Smith even though Messrs Palsson, Keshet and Haley (plus Denis Allan) had all advised that we should properly go down the selection rating list. The only other member of the executive, Fred McKim, was away at the time.

Prior to President Smith's statement on the CFC web page, I e-mailed him "I trust that your statement will make it clear that this decision was made by you alone, even though Messrs. Palsson, Keshet and Haley (plus Denis Allan) had all advised that we should properly go down the selection rating list." I also noted that as a member of the executive, I had a duty to be fair to all players who had a right to be asked to join the team. Mr. Smith did not include this information in his web page statement nor has he included it in his statement in the Governors' Letter. Accordingly, I was left with no alternative but to provide this information myself.

The president did not have authority based on Bylaw 2, Section 11, as in fact there had been time to consult with the executive as demonstrated by the fact that three of the four members of the executive had provided their input.

I had hoped that Mr.Belzberg would reconsider his decision to not allow Yan Teplitsky and Ron Livshits to go to Istanbul. The Belzberg group had advised Mr. Smith that the Israeli Olympic team would have thirty bodyguards in Istanbul. I immediately on Saturday e-mailed my FIDE friend Almog Burstein in Israel and he immediately replied that this was nonsense and that their team would have two bodyguards as they do for all olympiads. I accordingly had good reason to think that Mr. Belzberg would reconsider his decision not to allow Yan Teplitsky and Ron Livshits to go to Istanbul and I suggested to Mr. Smith that he should phone Mr.Belzberg on the weekend rather than wait until Monday.

Mr.Yoos had advised Mr. Smith that he would like to be included on the team. Mr. Yoos could have been thanked and advised that we would keep him in mind but that first we had to make an effort to proceed down the selection rating list contacting each of those above Mr. Yoos on the list. This could have been done on Saturday or Sunday. Instead, Mr. Smith said that he would "call him shortly and advise him to start packing.".This was Saturday morning. I e-mailed Mr.Smith and advised that skipping down to Jack Yoos would be bypassing not just one but a number of players on the selection rating list and that such an action cannot be defended. I asked Mr. Smith to "please do not make any commitment to Jack Yoos until the matter has been voted on by the executive." Instead, Mr. Smith acted unilaterally even though he knew that the executive had already expressed disagreement with his course of action.

Finally it should be noted that the Selection Committee of Brian Hartman and Alexandre Lesiege selected Igor Zugic and Pascal Charbonneau to be team members. The Selection Committee did an excellent job and both Igor and Pascal demonstrated that their selection was well justified. Similarly Jack Yoos and David Cummings were excellent team members...unfortunately, in their case, their inclusion on the team only came about by the unilateral action of the president and not by following the rules and going down the selection rating list in order.

Richard Bowes & Ken Craft: Comments on President Smith's statement:

The President's statement is more an admission of guilt than a defense. The President heard 3rd hand that certain qualified players wouldn't or couldn't go but he made no effort to contact them. He simply accepted rumour/gossip. He admits to having a full weekend to make the necessary few phone calls to confirm the availability of those on the list but chose to not do so. He convinced himself that calling the qualified players would be fruitless based on his experience with some closed tournaments?! Essentially, he didn't even try.

The relevance of the great result does elude me.

The precedence argument only illustrates that the President has a history of ignoring the rules and not respecting the member's rights. It does not constitute a good reason for continuing to do so.

The allusion to By- Law #3 is erroneous. Presumably the President refers to Article 4, quoted in part:
"The President shall have full power to take such action in the name of the Federation, as he may in his sole discretion decide." This allusion is not convincing when one considers the context of this Article. It grants the President a wide latitude in how he exercises his powers in matters of "constant active and general supervision". In other words, when exercising his general authority, as conferred on him by the Assembly/Board of Directors. A reading of the Constitution makes it clear that Olympic team selection does not fall under this heading.

The motion does not maintain there was anything personal in the selections.

Ari Mendrinos: I think that sometimes a President of an Institution, a firm, an establishment etc etc is entitled to make a Presidential decision that may come out from an emergency situation or no time permitted to act otherwise.

I know how everybody feels but I've got some experience when I was President of the GTCL(Greater Toronto Chess League). Sometimes I had to make a decision without calling an emergency meeting. Naturally that decision (wise one) created some kind of a stir up; but when I explained the situation life went back to

normal. We are Presidents but not Dictators when an immediate action required.

Gordon Taylor: I disagree with the President's decision, but I will keep my discussion brief and in point form:

- the President says he applied his discretionary power under Bylaw Number Three, part 4. I think it was an abuse of power.

- players withdrawing at the last minute is something we've seen before. It's a sad comment on our organization that contingency plans were not in place. A little advance planning would have avoided this mess. Is it so hard to send out a letter to those players who just missed being selected for the team and asking could they be available in the event a vacancy occurred?

- the President wasted three days hoping for a change of heart. Withdrawal is not a decision taken lightly, and I would not be inclined to let them back on the team, period.

- finding replacements should be a task for the Business Office, not the President. The President should have instructed the Business Office to contact the players in the order of the Olympic Selection List to see who was available. Some will say no, some you might not be able to contact, but they each deserve the courtesy of a call.

- the President makes no mention of his discussions with his Executive and that their majority opinion was to go down the list -- this fact was communicated to us by Phil Haley through a Chesstalk posting.

- participation on our Olympic team should not be the result of a fortuitous phone call by a player to the President. Serendipity ought not to replace due process!

- the President should provide us with more details as to which players were contacted, when and by whom. His comment that "I learned that the next three on the rating list did not appear to be available." is terribly vague.

Denis Allan: There was a motion a few years ago to provide a mechanism for impeaching the President. It failed, largely because most

governors thought that annual elections are quite sufficient. So I will oppose the motion, but appreciate the basis for it. In my view Mr. Smith has not provided a full explanation of what happened that weekend. I do know that the Saturday and Sunday which could have been used to contact players was used discussing a proposal to send a five man team consisting of Lesiege, Spraggett, Zugic, Charbonneau and Yoos and that at 8:30 a.m. Eastern time on the Monday, Mr. Smith sent an e-mail to various persons announcing his decision that those five would be the team. Cummings was added later in the day. I suspect that Mr. Smith acted under some duress - perhaps the direct or implied threat that one or both of our Grandmasters would withdraw if some other particular player or players played. I would support a motion that Mr. Smith make available all e-mails he sent or received dealing with the issue of replacing Teplytsky and Livshits. If I were allowed to select the replacements, my choices would have been Yoos and Cummings. But that is not what the rules required and there was time to comply with the rules.

Martin Jaeger: Most of us are familiar with the story of the convicted double parenticide who appeals for leniency on the basis he is an orphan. Similarly Mr Smith asks for tolerance on the basis that his delay in carrying out team rules led to an emergency which he cites as justification for his flaunting the rules. Both arguments are equally fatuous. Mr Smith did not follow the rules despite the fact that each member of the executive consulted recommended that the rules be followed. Mr Smith further supports his (in)action by arguing that he did not so act with the intention of including Yoos and Cummings. However what is under discussions is not the inclusions but rather exclusions. I marvel at Mr Smith's audacity in suggesting that Mr O'Donnell should have contacted the CFC rather than that the CFC should have contacted Mr O'Donnell.

Kevin Spraggett: There is a price to pay for allowing ourselves to yield to indifference and complacency: we become mediocre. That is what is happening to us Governors. We are beginning to find ourselves, as each year passes, grow increasingly accustomed to not having to focus on real problems, pressing matters or complex and demanding issues. This is amply illustrated by the ethereal substance of the motions in GL3. Having gradually come to limit our role to one of submissive 'meditation' of

superfluous motions concerning non-existent or intangible problems, should any of us really be so surprised , when we finally do encounter a real-life knotty situation, that some of those amongst us get a little excited and run about shouting “The sky is falling! The sky is falling!” ? In the case of the Bowes/Craft motion we even see two Governors go so far as to ‘request’ the President’s resignation because he created a CONTROVERSY for having had the courage to exercise his authority!

Governors’ Letter 3 says it all in black and white : mediocrity. There is no middle ground in those motions, or any attempt to do things by consensus: just extreme opinions; a call for radical change; of reckless experimentation to our important institutions such as our rating system, our olympic team and our national championship; of the unrestrained arrogance and vanity of several unimportant Governors from Ontario; absolutely nothing based on the membership’s will or for their benefit. Nothing constructive or positive for Canadian Chess.

The Bowes/Craft motion is little more than an over-reaction to mask our usual complacency. An exaggeration to try to deny our usual indifference. If all three motions presented in GL3 were to pass, who among us would dare to say that chess in Canada would be better off? We Governors have got to start to ‘get real’ and begin to do things in measured and responsible ways.

The Bowes/Craft motion has its origins in a misguided and politically charged motion Jaeger/Langen , which had previously been ruled out of order by the President. Mr. Bowes and Mr. Craft feel strongly that we should consider this motion anyway. We Governors are NOT being asked to judge the President for his actions, BUT instead to agree with an interpretation of two very inexperienced Governors...two Governors who have no national experience what so ever in the CFC, who have absolutely no idea of the real problems the CFC has had in fielding its National Team and how they have been dealt with in recent years. Probably both Mr. Bowes and Mr. Craft had only recently bothered to read the Bylaws, and in the process, came to the conclusion that they had discovered something which no one else had been able to see up to now: that things don’t always go as we had planned.

That the President of the CFC actually happened to find an effective and highly successful solution to a very tricky crisis-- that was thrust upon him --seems to have been deemed ‘beside the point’ by these gentlemen. These gentlemen do not seek better

solutions for the CFC’s problems, or improvements to our Bylaws, or even to find out exactly what happened this time around when with only 6 days left our National Team suffered what can best be described as a hemorrhage. These gentlemen want only one thing: blood.

Every country has stories of Olympic Team selection nightmares. One chessplayer in Australia was so convinced that he deserved to be on the Australian National Team that he spent \$30,000 in court fighting the chess federation. (He not only lost, but was lectured to by the judge for wasting everyone’s time!) Another federation saw its entire executive board resign in protest over the never ending squabbles amongst the potential team members. Ireland didn’t solve its problems before the team left home and so what happened is that several players refused to speak to each other for the duration of the Istanbul Olympics. In Portugal not only is there controversy in picking the team each time, but the federation obliges each player to sign a ‘good behaviour’ contract! (You don’t sign, you don’t go!)

Canada, fortunately, has a very good selection process. Controversial at times, yes, but so what! We seemed to be problem free this time, right up until the Middle East peace process collapsed like a deck of cards; with only six days (6!) to go before Canada was to have left for Istanbul, four (4 !) members of the Canadian Delegation withdrew as a direct result of that collapse.

SIX DAYS! A crisis situation was thrust upon us. We had to find two National Team replacements who could simply drop what ever they were doing and head over to Istanbul for three weeks, all at a moments notice. Threatening to make the situation even worse was the rumour that several other members of the National Team were also considering withdrawing. (This was infact more than a rumour, and had the two players actually made good their threat then the rest of the team –or what would have been left of it—would have simply disintegrated.) Add to this mess that the Executive was initially divided on how to proceed: one didn’t want a ‘hasty’ decision to be made; another had no opinion (or was difficult to contact); yet another wanted to immediately deal with the situation ‘by the rules’.

For those involved, or, perhaps more precisely, for those who actually felt that they had some responsibility in trying to find a way out of the crisis situation, there was no real consensus on how to proceed. Our Olympic Selection rules consider finding replacements under normal circumstances,

but how to proceed when we literally need last-minute replacements? (SIX DAYS!) Through the years, modifications to the Selection rules had taken place, but we had consistently underestimated the need to put into place a workable replacement system. (Does a practical one really exist? Are we not just kidding ourselves ?) Each time we had a crisis we kept thinking that “It can’t happen again!”, but somethings can’t be prevented...and it keeps getting worse! The entire Olympic Selection process is one of those ‘complex and demanding issues’ that the Governors have steadfastly refused to deal with properly. We have been using the band-aid approach: a slightly different rule each time.

With six days left there was no time to waste on complaining about having a problem with our rules...what was needed was leadership.

We all know what decision the President, Maurice Smith, took on the Monday in question. He assumed all authority in making the decision and ended the crisis his way. It was made clear from the very beginning that Bylaw 3 was the central pillar of his decision. There was also some precedent in the recent past to this decision...such as in '98 and '96. Both times a member of the team withdrew with several weeks to go before having to leave for the Olympiad...which is bad enough, but still not as acute as this time around (6 days!).

I am in full agreement with the President’s decision. And I support him here. He resolved the crisis situation in such a manner that the National Team was kept together, and at the same time the choice of last minute replacements did not seriously reduce the team’s prospects. And, inspite of our problems, for the first time in quite a while, Canada was able to send a complete six player National Team. And what a team it was!

For those spared the real-life agony of having to go through this tense crisis with crossed fingers—that is, for those far removed from both the centre of the storm and the decision making process, (Mr. Jaeger, Mr. Langen, Mr. Bowes, Mr. Craft)—it is confidently held that the ‘correct’ course of action should never have been in doubt at any moment. They also confidently argue that not only was the President’s decision incorrect but that the President actually ‘violated’ the ‘rules’ when he made his decision. That he “acted without authority, and in contravention of the CFC Constitution” and that he “acted in such a manner as to ignore the proper procedures and to trample on the rights of certain members by not following the rules”.

(It is a good thing for Maurice Smith that there was no earthquake in Istanbul, because these people most certainly would have blamed this on him too!)

Of all these charges, I believe two things. I believe that these people are very confident of themselves. And I believe that they are just plain wrong.

Let’s consider their arguments for a while...

For instance, what are the rules that they so confidently refer to ? Are they the rules that consider the notification of replacement players from a selection list by registered mail? That insist on a reply from players by registered mail? Are they the rules that refer to leisurely and comfortable 90 and 75 day time frames? Or of warnings to those players who withdraw less than 60 days (!) before the Olympiad is to begin that they might (maybe) have their wrist slapped ? (HOW NICE IT WOULD BE IF REALITY ACTUALLY FOLLOWED OUR RULES!) I would think that these are not the rules that anyone should want to refer to –let alone with confidence—under the given circumstances...if for no other reason than with only six days remaining until the Canadian Delegation was to leave for Istanbul – and assuming one could prevent the team from disintegrating before then—anyone advocating these rules would have only succeeded in aggravating the situation! Not because the rules are wrong, but because the given CIRCUMSTANCES WERE EXCEPTIONAL (and had not even been considered by the authors of the specific regulations when they were written.) These authors had considered finding replacements only under NORMAL circumstances (60 days !) , and not , literally, the last minute! Put most simply: the selection process (as in the handbook) broke down under the given circumstances. The President’s responsibility is to note this.

And what about the famous Bylaw 2 which Mr. Bowes so confidently mentions by name no less than four (4) times in his discussion of his motion? The one that clearly refers to one of the specific powers of the Board of Directors : ie, “The qualification, participation and selection of Canadian chess players to and in FIDE events.” Mr. Bowes strenuously argues that if the ‘normal’ procedures to pick the team are not to be followed then the CFC President has no choice but to defer to the Board of Directors’ right to decide. His ‘if not A then B’ thesis has a lot going for it... (?)

Yes, it does sound convincing to those who only read

Bylaw 2, but let me advise you: things are not quite as simple as Mr. Bowes would have you believe.

Being a lawyer by profession, Mr. Bowes has gotten into the habit of arguing for only one side and if you catch him , from time to time, 'overlooking' a small detail that might take away from his case then please don't assume that he is not aware of it. Or that it would make the slightest difference to him!

The Assembly of Governors , as when the CFC was incorporated in 1976, delegated powers to the Board of Directors and to the President as described in Bylaws 2 and 3. If you read these Bylaws carefully (and with strong coffee) then you will notice that the Board of Directors (the Executive) has only very SPECIFIC powers delegated to it. The President, however, has very BROAD powers. More specifically, for ANY situation that is not already CLEARLY defined by the rules: "The President shall have full power to take such action in the name of the Federation, as he may in his sole discretion decide." and "...the President shall confer with the other Officers of the Federation (i.e. the Executive—editor), but as a matter of general policy only, and not so as to limit in any way his authority."

This is very sweeping authority for any President! I remember in '87 that when I had a big crisis with the CFC and I had to consult with a very expensive Montreal lawyer, I gave him a copy of the Bylaws. After having studied them, his first remark to me was that who ever had written these regulations had deliberately given the President extraordinary powers such as what one wouldn't normally expect to find in organizations of this type.

Getting back to the specific powers delegated to the Executive, since the time of incorporation of the CFC in 1976 , the Governors have made some very specific rules and regulations that have , effectively and in no uncertain manner, restricted and/or reduced those delegated powers. (This is normal for any organization as it evolves.) The entire authority for the 'qualification, participation and selection' of the Olympic Teams has been taken away from the Executive , by the Governors, and has been replaced by a set of concrete but complex rules and regulations (please feel free to consult the cfc handbook). These rules and regulations have been modified, by the Governors (note: not the Executive), from time to time, but the nature of their authority remains unchanged. And more precisely, nowhere in those regulations concerning the 'qualification, participation and selection' of players is there so much as a single clause that refers to the Executive to decide in situations that are not covered within the

exact wording of the rules and regulations specified.

Other similar reductions and qualifications of the originally delegated powers to the Executive exist and can be found in the handbook. For example, in Section 22 of the handbook, article 2230, dealing with certain general selection circumstances for international FIDE events, it is specified that it is the President (note: not the Executive) who should get involved to resolve the selection.

Elsewhere in the handbook, in some other 'qualification, participation and selection'- type rules, the Governors have infact chosen to make specific exceptions that do allow the Executive to assume some degree of authority for situations not precisely covered by the said rules. For example, Section 8—Canadian Championships Rules —the Board of Directors has a direct say in many of the details of how things are run, of who plays, and what not. More specifically, article 814 spells this out:"Authority of the Board of Directors: The CFC Board of Directors shall rule on any situation not covered by these regulations and shall have the authority to rule on any matter where there is a dispute."

Furthermore, in Section 10, dealing with both the Canadian Youth Championship Tournaments and the Canadian Junior Tournament, you can find two articles, 1014 and 1063, each identical to the above article 814: "Authority of the Board of Directors: The CFC Board of Directors shall rule on any situation not covered by these regulations and shall have the authority to rule on any matter where there is a dispute."

BUT THERE IS NO SUCH ARTICLE WITH RESPECT TO THE OLYMPIC TEAM SELECTION RULES

This is not oversight. The Governors have made it such that the Board of Directors simply has no say in the matter! Period. (There can be no doubt on this point.)

So, let's get back to Maurice Smith : the President of the CFC, when the 4 members of the Canadian Delegation withdraw just 6 days before having to leave for Istanbul, finds himself in the following awkward situation:

- the 'normal' replacement procedures are inadequate;
- there are no other clear rules that describe concrete action in this particular and unique

circumstance.

What does he do?

The President is charged with exercising active and constant supervision of the conduct of the CFC's affairs. (Bylaw 3) With this in mind, and understanding that the CFC must urgently find two replacements, and keeping in perspective Bylaw 3's "The President shall have full power to take such action in the name of the Federation , as he may in his sole discussion decide.", the President assumed total authority on the matter.

The bylaw gives the President a blank check in any situation that is by nature similar to what occurred. (Let's be blunt about it!) He can do many things: he can let the Board of Directors share in the responsibility; he can nominate who ever he pleases; he can use the selection rating list or not; he can decide to only send 4 players; he can ask me or you for advice. Etc. No restrictions are placed on him.

We know what Maurice Smith did. HE ACTED RESPONSIBLY. And decisively. He picked, in my opinion, the right players under those difficult circumstances. Both players had been hoping for such an opportunity, had notified those concerned long in advance, were prepared to accept at a moments notice, and presented no conditions on their acceptance. Both players were in excellent health and would fit in beautifully in the team.

Maurice Smith could have contacted other players who were on the selection rating list...if he wanted to. There was clearly no obligation for him to do so. Contrary to what Mr. Bowes argues, and wants us to agree with him, Maurice Smith did NOT trample on any players' rights. (Can he please tell me what these rights are that he is referring to and where in the Constitution these rights are awarded ?) Nor did the President "act without authority, or in contravention of the CFC Constitution".

People are free to argue that it was simpler to have just phoned those on the selection rating list, one after the other, until finding two substitutes, rather than assuming full authority of the whole process. But this is just an opinion. Apart from conveniently sidestepping the question of why the authors of the 'normal' Olympic Team selection rules hadn't done a better job in the first place (and actually taken into account exceptional circumstances), those people ignore two fundamental points:

- the President has a RESPONSIBILITY to take

action (Bylaw 3) as the 'normal' rules were inadequate given the extraordinary circumstances;

- the President could have gone by the selection rating list, but CHOSE not to.

MAURICE SMITH –AS PRESIDENT OF THE CFC–ACTED WITHIN HIS AUTHORITY AND ACCORDING TO THE CFC CONSTITUTION.

Maurice Smith made the best of a bad situation. He deserves our thanks, not this motion. He did not create the crisis, nor did he write the bylaws. And he certainly didn't author the 'normal' rules. Many may disagree with his decision, and use fine words and loud means to express that disagreement, but make no mistake here: only the President had the RIGHT to make that decision. He exercised that right. And I am glad he did! And so should Mr. Bowes and Mr. Craft...

THE SKY IS NOT FALLING.

I call upon the Governors to defeat this motion in no uncertain fashion!

Preliminary Discussion of New Motion 01-6

David Gebhardt: There is no doubt that in the long term competition will be to the benefit of chess. However, we are faced with a situation in Toronto where it is a distinct possibility that there may be competing tournaments on the same weekend much of the time. In the long term, only one side will probably end up running tournaments, but in the short term this will seemingly only lead to two tournaments with reduced numbers. I cannot see how this in any way benefits chess in the short term, and I would prefer to see the current problems in Toronto worked out through another solution. However, this seems unlikely to happen in the current climate.

Having said this, I support this motion since it deals with the right of an organiser to run tournaments on his own terms to promote chess. It is up to the governors to decide whether this motion should be passed or whether there should be some control over the running of tournaments simultaneously.

I would, however, ask that the parties involved in the dispute leading to this motion at least attempt to work out a resolution that will benefit all chess players now.

The following submission by Roger Langen was written independently of 01-6, and is not directly

addressing it, but this would seem like the best location for its inclusion in the GL.

Roger Langen: Just prior to the deadline for this newsletter, the CFC informed the OCA that Dutton & Associates would be running a Victoria Day Open in Toronto. The event would be in direct conflict with the Ontario Open, scheduled for Kitchener. As such, it would contravene OCA rules for the holding of this event.

The Ontario Open is the only important event in Ontario which rotates throughout the regions. The OCA protects its regions by preventing a major tournament being organized on the same weekend, primarily in Toronto. That protection takes the form, usually, of information to organizers, specifically in the Greater Toronto Chess League (GTCL) area. The standard enforcement device, understood but rarely stated (since no organizer has thought to challenge this reasonable practice), was the likely disbarment of the organizer from holding further sanctioned tournaments, usually under the GTCL umbrella.

The Ontario Open last year was awarded to Dutton & Associates and held in Toronto. This year, the Eastern Ontario Chess League declined to run the event. The OCA constitution dictates procedure in such a case; the next region in line is asked if it wishes to run the event. In this case, it was the South Western Ontario Chess League (SWOCL) and they chose to exercise their option.

So the question is: What does the OCA do to protect the Kitchener organizers, who have done much already and have, as I understand, the enthusiastic support of the city?

Dutton & Associates indicated, when the tournament was awarded to Kitchener, that they could not afford to give any more credence to either the OCA or GTCL tournament bidding process. They were already certain, as I understand, that the CFC would advertise and rate their events regardless of OCA or GTCL procedures. Dutton & Associates would no longer have to bid for GTCL or OCA calendar events; they would simply run them. As Mark assured me, both the GTCL and the OCA were "irrelevant".

The president of the GTCL apparently agrees, as he promptly resigned when this affair blew up in his face.

Of course, the OCA did not have time to meet formally around this issue. As president, I wrote the CFC and asked that the advertisement of the Dutton tournament be deferred until we had time to sort out a correct response.

(Remember that the CFC carried an ad for the Toronto Summer International before later trying to cancel the event.) The CFC Executive voted 5-1 to carry the Dutton ad. It was further suggested to me that the matter was not really a CFC concern. In other words, the implied sanction that a tournament organizer's event might not be rated if it flouted official process (designed, for example, to protect a major event) would not be applied.

Would another sport organization - say, tennis - support such a challenge to a provincial affiliate's marquee tournament?

It should be said in favor of Dutton & Associates that they have been organizing excellent tournaments in Toronto for a few years now. They run a strong club on Bayview Avenue. They have the support of many Toronto players. Mark Dutton can't be blamed for striking out on his own if the CFC indeed is prepared to support him.

Mark has been open and clear as well about his long term intentions: to run successful private events which might have, but should not require, an amateur organization's approval. Fair enough. But that is why his vilification of the OCA Vice-President, Martin Jaeger, for engineering the SWOCL award, should not be taken at face value. Mark is simply ready to make his move. (And would it be so bad to have successful private organization of chess in Canada, some might ask?)

But what happens if the CFC itself becomes "irrelevant"? The Dutton Chess Club meets on the Toronto premises of Chess & Math. It is not inconceivable that a strong enough, Toronto-based chess organization could disregard not only a paltry affiliate's process, but that of the CFC. Would the CFC then expect FIDE, for example, to decline to rate a competitor organization's events? Would the current OCA Directorship have much reason to support the CFC in this scenario? On what example?

Given recent similar events in the Philippines, and FIDE's response, the CFC should probably give this some thought.

Roger Langen

President, OCA

STRAW VOTE

DISCUSSION

Final Discussion of SV-01-1

Refer to previous discussion by A.Merindos, D.Cohen, L.Craver

Peter Stockhausen: We may want to wait for a while on this, pending FIDE decisions. Once Mr. Haley can tell us how the cycles will work, we can adopt our time frames.

Martin Jaeger: How predictable it is that whenever a suggestion is made that would conserve resources someone suggests that someone else be found to give the federation money. Opposition to staging the championship every second year exists despite the fact that the federation is currently having difficulty in staging the tournament every second year and that for the last 6 months each GL has brought a plaintive plea for an organizer to step forward.

REPORT ON THE FIDE CONGRESS IN ISTANBUL, TURKEY, NOVEMBER 3-13, 2000

**by P. G. Haley, FIDE
representative and Zonal
President**

I attended the recent meetings of the Executive Board and the General Assembly in Istanbul, Turkey. The various committee meetings were held in the Istanbul Hilton hotel but the meetings of the Executive Board and the General Assembly were held in Olympic House which was a $\frac{3}{4}$ hour bus ride each way from the hotel. In fact, on one occasion, the drive took 1½ hours. The traffic in Istanbul is the worst I have seen anywhere in the world. Istanbul is one of the bidders for the 2008 Olympic games and Olympic House was built in preparation for this event and the organizers wanted to show this site off to the participants in the FIDE Congress.

President Ilyumzhinov was not present for meetings of the Executive Committee and was absent as well from a good part of the General Assembly meetings. The meetings were chaired by Deputy President

Georgios Makropoulos assisted by Executive Director Emmanuel Omuku.

A disproportionate amount of time was spent on discussing which of two Philippine chess federations should be accepted as the official one. There was very heated discussion that was not handled too well and at one point both Steven Doyle of the United States and Morten Sand of Norway threatened to leave the meeting and go home. The discussion mostly centered not on which Philippine federation should be accepted but rather on the fact that the Presidential Board had not followed the FIDE statutes and had accepted the new Philippine organization the National Chess Federation of the Philippines under the leadership of GM Eugenio Torre as opposed to the former long time Philippine Chess Federation whereas the statutes require that any such decision be made only by the General Assembly. Mr. Morten Sand of Norway and Bill Kelleher of the United States worked with representatives of both Philippine organizations in an effort to secure cooperation but their efforts failed. After long and heated discussion, the General Assembly accepted the decision of the Presidential Board although a significant number of countries including Canada and the United States voted against the manner in which the Presidential Board had acted.

The most important part of the Congress both at the Executive Board and the General Assembly was the question of the proposed agreement with FIDE Commerce PLC. The General Assembly approved concluding an agreement with FIDE Commerce International re the commercialization of FIDE. FIDE Commerce International will be owned 70% by President Ilyumzhinov and 30% by Artiom Tarasov. I had serious concerns about the first two drafts of this agreement and in a series of letters to FIDE, I detailed these concerns. Prior to the meeting my intention had been to vote against this proposal...however, major improvements were made and I believe the final agreement is a good one. Those of us who had concerns about the earlier proposals were well represented on the committee studying this question by Morten Sand of Norway, Bill Kelleher of the US, Egon Ditt of Germany and in particular by David Anderton of England who led the discussion on this subject at the meeting of the General Assembly. FIDE Commerce International will provide the prize fund for the World Championship. In exchange for

commercial rights, 10% of the net profit of the company shall be paid to FIDE with a minimum guarantee of US \$1 million for each of the first three years and US \$500,000. per year thereafter. If either party is in breach of the agreement, the other party can serve notice. This agreement is essentially being exchanged for the present agreement with Kirsan Ilyumzhinov's World Chess Foundation.

The law suits of Anatoly Karpov and Zsuzs Polgar have still not been resolved. Both Mr.Karpov and Ms. Polgar approached FIDE with offers to settle but their demands were deemed to be too much and no settlement was reached so the law suits proceed. The hearing on the Karpov case is now scheduled for January 9, 2001.*

New proposals have been made for the World Championship Cycle. It was pointed out that three principles would be involved first that the format be commercially marketable, second that it be supported by the leading players and third that the system be respected as producing a worthy World Champion and a balancing exercise of these three principles is required.

GM Alexei Shirov proposed changing the time control to 40 minutes per player per game plus 30 seconds for each per move. Input was sought from the players in the World Championship in New Delhi and subsequently the Presidential Board announced that in all FIDE events the time control will be 75 minutes for 40 moves and 15 minutes for the rest of the game plus an incremental time of 30 seconds per move for each move of the game. This is substantially slower than Shirov's proposal but substantially faster than the present time controls. The Presidential Board " realizes that there are many federations and chess organizers who may not have the resources to apply the cumulative time control of an additional thirty seconds from move one. Therefore, there is no compulsion involved here for organizers to use this mode in the transitional period so long as there is substantial compliance within the limits set out by the Board."

Details relative to qualification for the next world championship and in particular the status of zonal tournaments and continental championships are not clear but it has been announced that 128 players will qualify for the World Championship with all players starting play in round one. A committee chaired by Deputy President Georgios Makropoulos will meet in Lausanne in January, 2001 to clarify all technical issues related to the questions of the zones and

continental competitions as well as other issues of interest to players and National Federations.

It had earlier been suggested that drug testing on an experimental basis would be initiated for the Istanbul Olympiad. However, this did not happen in part because no funds had been provided to cover the cost thereof. Costs are expected to be as much as US \$300. per test. Starting in 2001 procedures for bids for FIDE competitions will have to be revised to include a requirement for drug testing. It has not been finalized as to what drugs will be tested for but we were advised that the FIDE Medical Commission had decided not to test for alcohol and marijuana.

Three GM norms were achieved at the Jack Collins tournament in New York by Igor Zugic and two others. These norms were not deemed to be acceptable by the Qualifications Commission on the basis that the format of the event was such that equal conditions did not apply to all players. Bill Kelleher, the USCF delegate, and I both made strenuous efforts at the General Assembly to have these norms accepted on the basis that it was not fair to penalize the players who had taken part in the event in good faith. We were not successful. Mr. Zugic's IM title has however been confirmed.

The World Youth U-10, U-12, U-14, U-16 and U-18 will be held in Spain from October 20 to November 3, 2001.

The Icelandic Chess Federation expressed interest in holding in organizing the World Juniors and Girls Championships for 2001 in Reykjavik.

Tunisia withdrew their proposal to hold the 72nd FIDE Congress in Hammamet, Tunisia. Three countries, namely China, Greece and Georgia expressed interest in organizing this Congress.

The Slovenian Chess Federation will host the Chess Olympiad 2002 and the 73rd FIDE Congress in Bled....it is very difficult to condense everything to a reasonable length...we had over 70 annexes to the agenda and the annex re the FIDE Commerce deal was over 40 pages and not handed out in advance.

PGH...January 5,2001

*Since this was written, an agreement has been reached highlighted by a payment of \$50,000. US to Karpov and acceptance by Karpov that Khalifman and Anand are the world champions for 1999 and 2000....

LETTERS TO THE CFC

I am pleased to report that the CFC has received an official report from our representative to the 1st FIDE Women's World Knockout Championship 2000, Johanne Charest; and from each of our representatives to the 19th Women's Olympiad 2000: Johanne Charest, Daniela Belc, Marina Bryskine and Stefanie Chu.

Their reports are appended.

David Cohen
CFC Women's Coordinator

Johanne Charest: [Dear Mr Miriguay:] The 19th Women's Chess Olympiad Istanbul, Turkey was my second international chess tournament, with a result of 3 wins, 2 draws and 5 losses, even though I wish I could have done better. From a personal point of view, I am satisfied with the result of finishing in the 71st position out of 85 because there were only 2 games where I believe I misplayed. The high quality of the players I had the chance to play with has given me the opportunity of going through a fantastic experience that I will remember for a long time. You are in the position to notice the evolution of our team. I have got to tell that the motivation of our team was just amazing. We all have been really pleased about Mr. David Chu's excellent work.

With regards to the World Chess Championship it was the first time I was playing this type of competition. It is not easy to talk about a tournament where I played only one round but I still believe that being ranked 56th out of 61 with a rating of 2136 compared to Marta Zielinska who was ranked 27th with a 2376 rating, was a wonderful challenge. During the first game I played, while I was really concentrating on my next move, we experienced power failures which were really distracting. With regards to the second game, I couldn't allow myself a draw since my position was too open.

I am taking this opportunity to thank you and your team for the support I received with the preparation for those two tournaments and wishing you Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

Best regards,
Johanne Charest

Daniela Belc: We were very fortunate to participate at the 19th Women's Chess Olympiad and I would like to thank all those who were involved, especially CFC for making this possible. I also want to express my most sincere thanks to our captain, David Chu for managing the team during the tournament and to the national team for helping us with the preparation. Despite the fact that Canada Women's team finished with 20 points and in 56 to 61 place (1 point less than in 1996), I cannot help but feel that this was not a bad result and at least we are going in the right direction. After all, we had three first time players including myself, and a bit of bad luck with the pairing. Croatia and Ecuador was certainly a tough pairing to get for the last two rounds. As a conclusion I think we did OK and Stefanie and myself both scored over 50% and gained FIDE ratings points. I look forward to qualifying for the next Chess Olympiad and I believe that the future of our results as an Olympic team is very positive.

Congratulations to Kevin Spraggett for winning the silver medal for board 2!

Below is my best game and the time I really felt I showed my best qualities as a player:

19th Women's Chess Olympiad, 2000.11.10,
Round 13,
Board 1
White Belc, Daniela, 2073, Canada
Black Macek, Vlasta, 2277, Croatia

1. d4 d5 2. c4 c6 3. Nf3 Nf6 4. Nc3 a6 5. c5 g6
6. Bf4 Bg7 7. h3 O-O 8. e3 Nbd7 9. Bd3 Ne8
10. b4 e5 11. dxe5 Qe7 12. O-O Nxe5 13. Nxe5
Bxe5 14. Bxe5 Qxe5 15. Qc2 f5 16. Rae1 Nf6
17. Ne2 Bd7 18. Nd4 Rae8 19. a4 Kg7 20. b5
axb5 21. axb5 cxb5 22. Bxb5 Bxb5 23. Nxb5
Rc8 24. Na7 Rc7 25. Nb5 Rc6 26. Nd4 Rcc8 27.
Rb1 Rf7 28. Rb6 Kg8 29. Rfb1 Nd7 30. Rxb7
Rxc5 31. Qa4 Qd6 32. Qa8+ Kg7 33. Qa1 Kg8
34. Ra7 Rc7 35. Ra8+ Rf8 36. Ra6 Qe7 37.
Ne6 Nc5 38. Nxc7 Nxa6 39. Nxa6 Ra8 40. Rb8+
Rxb8 41. Nxb8 1-0

Thank you,
Daniela Belc

Marina Bryskine: I would like to thank the

Chess Federation of Canada for giving me an opportunity to represent Canada as a member of the Women Chess Olympic team. It was a great experience playing in the same tournament with some of the world's leading players. Obviously, an event like this is not only important for the members of the team, but it is also significant for the whole country. I believe the Chess Federation of Canada has to continue its attempts to develop and popularize the game of chess in Canada in general, and support the Women Chess Olympic Team in particular.

I would also like to express my gratitude to all of the members of our team and special thanks to our captain who made our living in Istanbul much easier as well as comfortable.

I suppose all of us will remember these Games, and I hope the experience we obtained from the participation in them will not go in vain and will help us, or future team members, to achieve victories.

For me it was my first experience playing in the Chess Olympic Games. I was certainly nervous since I wasn't playing an individual tournament, I was a member of the team representing Canadian women chess. The environment in our team was very friendly and warm, which added to the support one received from other team members. I believe we tried to do our best, although sometimes it wasn't easy to compete on such a high level. Istanbul turned out to be a great city and the organization of the Chess Olympic games was very good too.

Marina Bryskine

Stephanie Chu: Impressions of the Olympiad.....The 2000 Istanbul Olympiad was a highly enriching experience for me. Although I already had some experience 4 years ago at the 1996 Olympiad in Armenia, this time around was extremely different, as I was less in awe of the whole grand event, and felt more able to concentrate on chess matters at hand! Aside from a few minor technical glitches in the early rounds, the event was well-organized and smoothly handled. Personally, I was amazed at their level of technology, having the ambitious goal of carrying all the games lives using electronic boards. I enjoyed the friendly relationship which all of my team mates shared, and it was a true pleasure and honour to be representing Canada with them.

I was lucky to overcome my first round 'jitters' by having an easy game against a much weaker opponent to open the tournament. However, in my second game, I played well but was disappointed that I wasn't able to find the relatively simple way to win, and instead drew. It's never a very nice feeling to let those ones slip away! The 3 rounds that followed were quite complicated and interesting, but I chose the wrong decisions at the crucial stages of the game in each case, and those misjudgements cost me the games. Fortunately, I managed to pick up the pace a little bit, and contribute to the team with some wins especially in the second half of the tournament. I feel that the team's final result is something that we can be satisfied with, given the fact that we were just one point away from achieving a 50% result, where one more point in the last round would have reached this - something which certainly was not impossible!

The national team was very helpful in helping the women prepare for their round, giving us their assistance whenever necessary, and I would like to thank them for their much-appreciated help. Also, a big thank-you to my father who acted as team captain, and worked hard to keep the team informed of any changes or obstacles which arose.

I was quite satisfied with my play at the Olympiad, and I feel that it has provided me with a very valuable experience which will continue to help me further in my chess studies. I want to thank the CFC for providing us with their support, and for making this opportunity possible.

Stefanie Chu

GENERAL REMARKS on CFC BUSINESS

a) FIDE Dues

Martin Jaeger: Mr Haley has brought back the information that inactive players with FIDE rating do not occasion the CFC paying dues to FIDE. In his note the term "inactive" was not defined. As it turns out Canada has 146 FIDE rated players of whom only 126 are members of the CFC. That is about one half of the fees currently paid to FIDE by virtue of FIDE rating of players

are occasioned by players who are not members of the CFC. Given that the FIDE fees involved have been recently cut to a low level, it is reasonable not to pursue the matter at the present time. However, the matter should be monitored and of course, to this end, I would like to know how FIDE defines "inactive players".

01-3 Bowes/Craft. Amendment to 01-1a (removal of 24 game provision in clauses 1 & 2)

YES _____ NO _____ ABSTAIN _____

If 01-3 is passed then the votes for 01-5 [01-1a amended by 01-3] will be tallied, however should 01-3 not pass, then the votes for 01-1a will be tallied. You should vote for both 01-1a and 01-5.

01-1a Langen/Webb. Proposal for National Title Program (those 2000 and above)

YES _____ NO _____ ABSTAIN _____

01-5 Langen/Webb (01-1a) as amended by Bowes/Craft (01-3)

YES _____ NO _____ ABSTAIN _____

01-1b Langen/Webb. Proposal for National Certificate Program (those under 2000)

YES _____ NO _____ ABSTAIN _____

01-2 Jaeger/Ferner. Modification to Qualification to National Olympic Team

YES _____ NO _____ ABSTAIN _____

Straw Vote Topic to be Voted on

SV-01-1 Jaeger. Holding the Canadian Zonal every other year.

YES _____ NO _____ ABSTAIN _____

Only votes received by March 15, 2001 will be counted.

Motion for Second Discussion (will be called for vote in the next GL)

01-4 Bowes/Craft. President asked to resign over selection of Olympic replacement players.

Motion for First Discussion

01-6 Cohen/Gebhardt. CFC Rating policy for conflicting events.

Deadline for next Governor's letter is Mar 15, 2001

Chess Federation of Canada - Governor's Letter #4 - 2000/01