

# **“SCARBOROUGH COMMUNITY OF TORONTO CHESS TALK”**

Newsletter of / Le Journal de  
**Scarborough Chess Club**

e – mail : [scarboro@idirect.ca](mailto:scarboro@idirect.ca) Website : <http://webhome.idirect.com/~blamb/>  
Wexford Seniors’ Apartments (Comm. Ctre. ), 1860 Lawrence Ave E. ( just east of Pharmacy Ave. )  
( easy access – Victoria Park Stn./Pharmacy Bus; Lawrence E. Stn./Lawrence W. Bus )

“ **FRIENDLY** Chess Since 1960; Second **LARGEST** Can. C. C. ”

*ITEMS OF INTEREST TO BOTH MEMBERS & NON-MEMBERS*

**ISSUE # 12 – February 15, 2001**

**Special 5 - Page Edition**

## **DO YOU KNOW ? / SAVEZ-VOUS ?**

### **The Ontario Open '01 – The CFC / OCA Dispute**

This is a follow-up to the Ontario Open '01 article in our last Issue. The CFC felt that they should make a statement on the role of CFC, as presented in that article. We are therefore pleased to publish an “ official “ position statement from CFC (Maurice Smith, President ), as well as from OCA ( Roger Langen, President ). The overlap with last Issue’s article in the “ Facts Summary “ below, is necessary to provide the context for the CFC and OCA positions. We hope these “ official “ statements will help you as our readers, evaluate this complex and continuing situation.

### **Facts Summary**

The Southwestern Ontario Chess Association had the right to bid on the OCA’s Ontario Open '01, and got organizers in Kitchener-Waterloo to run it. It will be held the May Victoria Day long weekend. Dutton Chess decided to hold a tournament in Toronto on the very same weekend. On Jan. 8, D.C. asked CFC to advertise the Toronto tournament in En Passant and on the CFC website. On Jan. 12, the OCA wrote to CFC objecting to D.C. holding the Toronto tournament; it was long the practice in Ontario that the OCA didn’t allow another tournament on the same weekend as the Open, to try to protect its turnout; it considered the D.C. Toronto tournament a “ conflicting “ tournament. The OCA Constitution, Article 16 j) states : “ The OCA Executive to have the power to enact sanctions against conflicting tournaments by requesting the CFC not RATE said tournament, with due recognition of OCA Power-of-Discretion over these

tournaments, and the CFC not to ADVERTISE any such tournament." So, OCA requested that CFC not ADVERTISE this "conflicting tournament" in En Passant, and remove it from the website ( it had already been posted ).

The CFC Executive ( 5 : 1 ) decided to advertise the Toronto tournament.

SCTCT asked OCA if it was going to next ask CFC not to RATE the tournament. OCA said it wouldn't because it had already been made clear to it " that the CFC would refuse this request ". The OCA indicated that it would now raise the matter before the CFC Governors, in their letter, " as a policy problem in general ".

So the current situation is that we have 2 Ontario tournaments, one being the Ontario Open '01, on the very same May Victoria Day weekend, in cities 1 hour drive from each other.

### **CFC Position Statement**

( Maurice Smith, President, Chess Federation of Canada - Mon, 05 Feb 2001. )

This is in answer to your article in the last Scarborough Chess Talk that was headed "CFC Abandons Ontario Chess Association".

This is absolutely not true. The result of a recent CFC Executive decision to allow a Dutton Chess Club advertisement to be published in En Passant, should not be taken in any way as abandonment of the OCA.

To begin with, it was generally felt that it was inappropriate to intervene in a dispute that was not National, but rather was Provincial and local in nature. To ban any advertising for a CFC rated event that was within the standards of the magazine just because of a dispute between individuals and organizations would be illogical. The decision to allow the ad to run was not about taking sides, but was about allowing a legitimate ad for a CFC rated event to be published.

It appears that this dispute was the result of several mistakes. First of all the Eastern Ontario Chess Association upon turning down the offer to run the Ontario Open should not have invited Dutton Chess Club to run the event. If indeed that is what occurred. Only the OCA has the right to ask for bids for the Ontario Open. Then it seems that the DCC was opportunistic in deciding to take up the offer without checking with the OCA to see if this was the right procedure. However, it could be argued that if an experienced group such as the EOCA ask you to run an event, you might consider it the right thing to do. Subsequently, upon learning of the DCC's decision it would have been appropriate for the OCA to negotiate with DCC and arrive at a reasonable solution. While the Ontario Open is supposed to be rotated around the Province through the Leagues, it seems that the only League willing to run the event was the Kitchener area of the Southwestern Ontario Chess League. This was after all the other Leagues were asked. Surely then, a compromise could have been attained with Toronto and Kitchener flip flopping one way or another with the Ontario Open in one city this year and the other city

next year. Of course this would have taken diplomacy from the OCA representative, the DCC representative and the Kitchener representative. However, if no one wants to compromise, and just wants to pursue their own agenda, the result is a dispute and in this case a mess that does not help chess.

Finally, the OCA is authorized by the CFC to be its representative in the Province of Ontario and the Greater Toronto Chess League is a division of the OCA. Therefore the CFC will always support its affiliates wherever possible and urges all chess clubs and organizations to work within the framework of the recognized chess authorities and resolve to settle all disputes in a diplomatic manner.

### **OCA Position Statement**

( Roger Langen, President, Ontario Chess Association - The OCA submitted its comments in the recently published CFC 's February Governors' Letter # 4 )

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.

### **Readers Survey**

**STATEMENT :** " The CFC should NOT RATE a tournament when a Provincial Affiliate ( like the OCA ) designates such a tournament as " conflicting " with one of its own sanctioned tournaments. Such decision not to rate will be taken well before the scheduled tournament, the organizer will be advised to cease advertising it as " CFC-rated ", and the decision will be widely publicized so all players know in advance. "

**AGREE ?? DISAGREE ??**

Send us your e-mail vote !! And if you'd like, tell us ( briefly ) why you agree or disagree ( we'll try to publish some of each ).

### **SCC "Y2K+1" ( Sun. ) Swiss '01 Multi-week Tournament**

This first Sunday tournament of the "real" New Millennium drew a solid turnout, though, as usual, slightly smaller than the Thurs. night tournament. 19 players ( happily including SCC Secty., Wilf FERNER, who hadn't played in a multi-week tournament in a while ) showed up. And a few of the upstart weaker lower half of the draw ( TURSMAN, SRINIVASAN, HARRIGAN ) gave some of the stronger top-half of the swiss draw, a hard time in round 1 [ we saw that on Thurs. night as well in the first 2 rounds ( ARMSTRONG, ROLAVS, M. SMITH, TURSMAN ) ]. The class breakdowns are : Master/Expert – 2; A – 5; B – 5; C – 3; D&U/Unr. – 4. The tournament average rating is a good 1711.

### **GTCL Club Team League Update**

SCC A is alone in 2<sup>nd</sup> with 8 pts. Polonia A leads with 12 pts. SCC A plays Polonia B on Wed., Feb. 21.

On Tues., Feb. 13, SCC B drew with DCC A in a hard-fought match ( CAI [ W ]; PICANA [ W ]; IBRAHIM [ L ]; TRIEFELDT [ L ] ). SCC B is now in second last place with 5 pts.

### **"Impressive Games" Section of the SCC Bulletin Board**

This year to date, we have been examining games using the Queen sacrifice tactic. Games where it worked were examined in Issues # 1 & 3. Now here is a local Toronto game played on January 10, 2001, by two junior experts, during Round 1 of the Toronto Closed '01–Championship Section. Bojana MITROVIC, as white, offers one Q-sac, which is rejected, and so does it a second time ! Evgeni MILLER played black.

1. Nf3 d5 2. g3 Nf6 3. Bg2 c6 4. 0-0 Bf5 5. b3 e6 6. c4 Nbd7 7. d3 Be7 8. Bb2 0-0  
9. Nbd2 a5 10. a3 Rb8 11. Rc1 b5 12. Nd4 Qb6 13. cxd5 cxd5 14. Rc6 Qb7 15. Nxf5 exf5 16. Qc2 Bd8 17. Nf3 Re8 18. Rc1 Bb6 19. Bd4 Rbd8 20. Bxb6 Nxb6 21. Nd4 f4 22. Nxb5 fxg3 23. hxg3 Nc8 24. Nd4 Qe7 25. Nf5 Qd7 26. Bh3 Qb7 27. Rxc8 Rxc8 28. Qxc8 ( the 1<sup>st</sup> offered Q-sac ) Qxb3 29. Qc3 Qb6 30. Qc7 Qb2 31. Nd6 Rf8 32. Qxf7+ ( the 2<sup>nd</sup> offered Q-sac ) Rxf7 33. Rc8+ Rf8 34. Be6+ Resigns 1-0

If you have any great Grandmaster games you enjoy that involve a Queen sacrifice, or even if you have one of your own that involves one, forward it to us and we'll try to include it in our series – great games are to be shared and enjoyed !

#### **NOTE :**

A – Members/ non-members may contact Bob Armstrong, ed., directly, or through SCC e-mail, to :  
1.be added to the e-mail list; 2. submit content ( fact, opinion, criticism - recommendations help!).  
B – An item in any language may be submitted for publication, if accompanied by an English translation.  
C – The opinions expressed here are those of the editor, and not necessarily those of the Scarborough CC.