

8/29/77

Martin Morrison, Executive Director, USCF
186 Rt. 9W
New Windsor, NY 12550

Dear Mr. Morrison:

I would like to protest in the strongest possible way the behavior and actions of Jerry Rogers, Local Tournament Director, who directed the Hayward Chess Festival August 28 & 29, 1977 in San Lorenzo, CA. In my opinion Mr. Rogers grossly violated the contract he established by his listing in Tournament Life (Chess Life & Review, 8/77, p. 462) and the slightly different advertising flyer (enclosed) in regard to:

- a.) structure of the tournament
- b.) distribution of prizes.

In addition he committed several organizational lapses and acted in a manner by which he has become famous in Bay Area chess circles. In my opinion he is:

- a.) arbitrary, capricious, illogical, and unpredictable in his decisions and rulings
- b.) ignorant of and unconcerned with the laws of chess
- c.) irrational, stubborn, and unreasonable.

Mr. Rogers based his calculations on 100 entrants. Based on the wall chart there were 68 entrants:

- a.) Open & A: 14
 - b.) B : 8
 - c.) C : 16
 - d.) D : 10
 - e.) E : 4
 - f.) UNR, NEW: 16
- 68.

Before the first round started Mr. Rogers announced that, due to the small number of entrants, the tournament would be changed to a one-section open. After numerous protests he changed his mind and paired entrants into 3 sections:

- a.) Open, A
- b.) B, C
- c.) D, E, UNR, NEW.

I understand he told one person at this point (who wanted a refund if separate class prizes were not retained) that the class prizes would remain.

After the first round Rogers posted the prize distribution. It read:

- a.) Open & A: 1) \$100, 2) \$60, 3) \$40, 4) \$20
- b.) B & C: same
- c.) D, E, etc.: same

Total prize fund: \$660.

After many complaints, Rogers said he would think about it and would "probably" award class prizes of some sort. After the third round it was reported to me that someone had approached Rogers with Official Rules of Chess (it has been rumored that Rogers does not own a copy) and showed him Rule 5 under "Prizes" (p. 100). This is apparently what convinced Rogers to offer class prizes.

At this time I sat down and attempted to work out a simple, logical, and equitable system for prize distribution (I have completed an undergraduate minor in mathematics). I reasoned that, since Rogers had posted a prize fund of \$660, as opposed to \$850 as advertised in the flyer, the original structure could be used, with each prize to be 660/850, or about 77%, of the original. Thus:

- a.) the \$80 prize would be reduced to \$61.60
- b.) the \$60 prizes would be reduced to \$46.20
- c.) the \$40 prizes would be reduced to \$30.80
- d.) the \$30 prize would be reduced to \$23.10
- e.) the \$20 prizes would be reduced to \$15.40 .

If Rogers wished to change the prize fund, a similar proportional system could be used. I presented this to Rogers, who thanked me and said he would consider it. He then turned to a spectator and told him, in effect, that my proposal was absurd.

Rogers did not post the final prize distribution, but I gathered as much information as I could for my section (B & C) as an example. The highest finishers were as follows:

4 points:	Berrocoso	(C)
3-1/2 points:	Pastusak	(B)
3 points:	Buljan	(B)
	Fong	(B)
	Munson	(C)
2-1/2 points:	Berkey	(C)
	Glasscoe	(C)
	Gardner	(C)
	Shores	(C).

As far as I can determine, Rogers awarded prizes as follows:

- a.) First B/C: \$80 (Berrocoso)
- b.) Second B/C: \$60 (Pastusak)
- c.) Third B/C: \$12 each (Buljan, Fong, Munson).

There was at one time during the fourth round rumored to be a \$40 prize, but was not paid as Pastusak was eligible for and paid a higher prize.

Specifically, it is my contention here that 3 prizes were advertised for both Class B and Class C, and therefore Berkey, Glasscoe (myself), Gardner, and Shores, as equal third in Class C, each deserved a modest prize (about \$4 each). This is not intended to be a claim for unpaid prize money, but an illustration of the confusion and arbitrariness of Rogers' decisions.

In addition, typifying Rogers' lack of organization, Greg Shores was not paired in the first round because his card was misplaced, and Mike Divine was paired in the fourth round with someone who had officially withdrawn from the tournament. In the last Rogers' tournament I entered, I was paired in the third round with an entrant who had been officially excused for that round.

I contend that Jerry Rogers is completely incompetent as a tournament director and should be severely reprimanded or preferably have his certification revoked. I feel also that he is a detriment to the organization and promotion of chess, and exposure to him as a tournament director discourages interest in tournament chess and reflects adversely on the USCF.

It is not possible for me to adequately convey here the frustration and anger I felt and still feel, or that which was expressed to me in support of my writing this letter. Two local tournament directors present, Scott Laird of San Anselmo (who played) and Mike Padovani of San Leandro (who did not play) expressed their outrage to me, as did a number of players, including Mike Divine, Kris Lawson, Greg Shores, and Daniel Solovay of Berkeley. Robert Berkey of East Palo Alto, and Norman Symonds of Arcadia. At least five people told me they would never play in another Rogers' tournament, and at least three told me they would write additional letters of complaint.

I would appreciate a reasonable consideration of these charges and a prompt reply.

Sincerely,

Alan Scott Glasscoe
4149 Howe St.
Oakland, CA 94611
415-654-8108
USCF #10483018

