

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

Newsletter of / Le Journal de
Scarborough Chess Club

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

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

ITEMS OF INTEREST TO BOTH MEMBERS & NON-MEMBERS
ISSUE # 11 – February 1, 2001
Special 4-page Edition

DO YOU KNOW ? / SAVEZ-VOUS ?

Spotlight on the GTCL (Part II)

We had fully intended to continue our series on the GTCL Scholarship Policy issue which has recently caused upheaval in the organization. But we have deferred it to next Issue, due to recent issues wracking the Ontario Chess Association (see below).

CFC Abandons Ontario Chess Association !

The Ontario Open '01

The Eastern Ontario Chess Association had the right to hold this year's Open, and had Ottawa organizers in place. But they decided they could not do it. So the Open was returned to the OCA.

Dutton Chess, who was aware of this, as a white knight, and seeing a business opportunity to hold another major tournament, prepared a bid to hold it in Toronto on the Victoria Day weekend. It submitted it to the OCA, hoping to pick it up, though it knew , by the OCA Constitutional rotation system, that it was not yet GTCL's turn to bid. But Mark Dutton advised SCTCT that it had had some indication from one OCA executive that some package might be arranged by settlement of all the parties, whereby DC might get it. Apparently there was some disagreement within the OCA executive, as to whether they should follow the Constitution, or negotiate some type of all – player package that would allow them to accept the DC bid.

At the OCA Board meeting in Nov. 2000, it was confirmed that the Constitutional provincial regional rotation procedure had to be applied. The Southwestern Ontario Chess League, who had submitted a bid under the rotation system, since it was their turn

to bid, got the Open '01, with organizers in Kitchener-Waterloo to run it. It is now slated for the traditional Ontario Open May Victoria Day weekend.

Freemarket Competition

When it was decided that the Constitution had to be applied, and the tournament awarded to Kitchener-Waterloo, and that the DC bid was out of order, DC, which was attending the meeting, immediately withdrew from the meeting, and the meeting was then adjourned by those left. Immediately, DC formally notified OCA that it was “disaffiliating” itself from the OCA, the point being that it would no longer agree to honour the OCA Constitution, if it so decided. At the same time, it also decided to run a Toronto tournament in May, on the very Victoria Day weekend the Ontario Open '01 tournament was on in K-W.! So the scheduling of the “Toronto Victoria Day Open '01” was posted in Nov. on the DC website. DC was aware that the OCA Constitution, and historical practice, were against the holding of such a “conflicting” tournament, but DC had given notice it was no longer honouring the OCA Constitution!

Then nothing happened!! So, on Jan. 8, DC submitted its ad for the Toronto tournament to the CFC business office in the normal way, asking it be put on the website, and in the next *En Passant*. It noted the date, place, that it would be CFC-rated, etc. It was put on the CFC website. On Jan. 10, at the request of the CFC Exec. Cttee., the business office forwarded the DC e-mail to the OCA (Roger Langen, President). On Jan. 12, Roger sent a blistering letter to the CFC, objecting to DC holding the tournament – it had long been OCA practice that no other Ontario tournament could be held the same weekend as the Ontario Open; this was to protect the turnout at this premier Ontario tournament, which was traditionally held the Victoria Day weekend. On Jan. 15, DC issued a vocal complaint, in an open letter to CFC, OCA, GTCL, and GTA players, condemning the OCA position, and reaffirming its right to hold the tournament, as advertised.

Sanctions or No Sanctions ?

Roger's letter also requested that the CFC support the OCA in this dispute, by refusing to publish the ad in the next *En Passant*, the publishing deadline for which was imminent (and presumably to remove it from the website). It would appear arguable that DC by then had a “contract to advertise” with the CFC. So OCA was asking CFC to break its contract with DC. It put forward its position, as giving CFC the right legally to break the contract without consequences. The OCA executive also gave indications they relied on a section of the OCA Constitution in asking CFC not to ADVERTISE this “conflicting tournament”. Article 16 j) states :

“The OCA Executive to have the power to enact sanctions against conflicting tournaments by requesting the CFC not RATE said tournaments, with due recognition of OCA Power-of-Discretion over these tournaments, and the CFC not to ADVERTISE any such tournament.”

The letter made no formal request to the CFC that it not RATE the tournament.

The CFC Decision

The matter was handled by the CFC Exec. Cttee., since there was urgency; on Jan.16, DC was advised that the CFC Executive had decided (5:1) to publish the DC ad.

OCA felt abandoned! How else could they protect their tournament ? Could it be that the CFC might still be willing not to RATE the tournament, if asked (especially if this new request could go to all the Governors this time)? After all, the decision to advertise did not specifically include the express decision that CFC had also decided to RATE the tournament.

The OCA Decision

SCTCT asked OCA if they intended to make such a 2nd request to CFC. Roger Langen, OCA President replied : No – “ it has already been made clear to me that the CFC would refuse this request. ” OCA was abandoned on the “ not rating “ issue as well! But what the OCA will do to pursue this, is “ raise the issue in CFC Governors’ Letter # 4 as a policy problem in general ”. Do the other provinces agree with the CFC Exec. ? Do you ?

The Greater Toronto Chess League Connection

The GTCL has studiously stood aside in this dispute. But the “ conflicting ” tournament, the “ Toronto Victoria Day Open ‘01 “, is set to be held in its territory, the GTA. And the GTCL Constitution itself may be relevant. Article II 3. d) states :

“ The aims of the GTCL shall be : To be the sanctioning and administrative body for the annual organization of :Toronto Victoria Day Open/ Ontario Open in applicable years (May)”

SCTCT approached Bryan Lamb, Secty of the GTCL, as to why GTCL was not involved, given the GTCL Constitution. He said the GTCL must honour the OCA rule that there be no “ conflicting “ tournament re the Ontario Open. Since the Open is being held, at the moment, in Kitchener-Waterloo, then the GTCL could not claim jurisdiction over any tournament that weekend without falling afoul of the rule. This even goes so far as being unable to issue a cease and desist request to DC to stop using the name “ Toronto Victoria Day Open “, even though it is the name of the tournament used in its own Constitutional list of sanctionable tournaments. But when asked if the GTCL will take steps to support the OCA, and to discourage GTA player registration in the proposed “ conflicting “ tournament, Bryan said only : “ it should be a reasonable thing for the GTCL to support the OCA ”. When asked what else the OCA might do, Roger replied : “ not much ”. So what does all this mean with respect to the “ independent “ DC tournament to be run in Toronto this Victoria Day weekend ?

Future Predictions

Roger, though he mused about resigning, will remain as OCA President, and take the fight to the CFC Governors. K-W, though they mused about folding, will duke it out with the Toronto tournament. OCA/GTCL will try to discourage the Toronto tournament registration, by running a high visibility promotion of the Open. And we will see this year, or in future, major tournaments in major cities across Canada, on the same weekend as the Canadian Open (CFC's " survival of the fittest " rule). Your thoughts/predictions?

63rd Corus Tournament (Category 19 – 2709 Av. Rtg.), Wijk aan Zee, Netherlands

This 14 player round-robin event began Jan. 13 and ended Jan. 28. All of the top 9 FIDE-rated grandmasters played (G. Kasparov –1-Russia-2844; V. Anand –2-India-2790; V. Kramnik –3-Russia-2772; M. Adams –4-England-2746; A. Morozevich-5/6-Russia-2745; P. Leko –5/6-Hungary-2745; A. Shirov –7/8-Spain-2718; V. Topalov –7/8-Bulgaria-2718; V. Ivanchuk –9-Ukraine-2717;). It was won by Kasparov, the defending champion, undefeated, 1/2 pt. ahead of Anand, Fide W.C. 2000 (also undefeated), and 1 pt. ahead of Kramnik and Ivanchuk. Is Kasparov " unofficial " World Champion 2001 ??

Strong Turnout for SCC First Thurs. Multi-week Tournament of New Millennium

On Jan. 18, 31 players showed up ready to rumble in the " Real New Millennium " Swiss '01 (the average turnout for Thurs. swisses for years; but it is particularly significant now because total club membership has dropped significantly from 2 yrs. ago– the active players are continuing to enjoy SCC 's friendly OTB format !). The class totals are : Master/Expert – 5 (1 Master); A – 6; B – 11; C – 5; D & Unr. – 4. The tournament average rating is a high 1743 ! And, as it is a one-section swiss, moderate strength players may meet a Master or Expert !

SCC Has Winners

The Winter (Sun.) Round-Robin '00/01 consisted of four groups of 5 players of approximately similar rating range. The winners : Grp.#1 – Bryan LAMB (3.5/4); Grp.#2 – Frank J. TEBBS Jr. (3/4); Grp.#3 – Gaja SRINIVASAN/Murt RAMZI (3/4); Grp. #4 – Steven TONG (4/4).

GTCL Club Team League Update

On Jan. 23, SCC A won their match with DCC A (2.5 : 1.5 – LAMB[W], CAI[D], PICANA[D], IBRAHIM[D])!! This leaves them in clear 2nd with 8 pts. Polonia A leads with 10 pts.

SCC B lost to Brampton on Jan 16 (3.5 : .5 – ROLAVS[L], IBRAHIM[L], SRINIVASAN[D], HENRY[L]). SCC B plays DCC A on Feb. 13.

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.