

6928 Clinton St.

Los Angeles, Ca. 90036

May 10, 1979

Gentlemen,

Thanks to all of you who responded to my earlier appeal for ideas on the U.S. Match Championship. I'm enclosing a copy of my letter to Arnold Denker. He will tell the fund-raiser to start his search for a sponsor. In the meantime, let's settle the remaining problems with the format of the tournament.

I see few problems with the organization of the finals. As many of you suggested, we will have 16 players. We've set the length of the matches at six games, and have come up with a reasonable distribution of prizes. Other details for the finals, such as the time limit, can be decided after consultation with the sponsor. Perhaps the sponsor would prefer very quick games so there can be television coverage, or slow games for better chess. If the matches are all held at one site, at one game per day, the tournament would last about 45 days, counting rest days and playoff days. Another possible plan would be to hold each round of the finals separately, with a month or more between rounds. This would give the sponsor a chance for publicity over a longer period of time, and might even heighten suspense. But, unless you can think of a more serious problem, these decisions can be postponed until we have found a sponsor.

Planning the preliminaries is more difficult. The procedure for choosing 16 players must be fairly simple because, when we find a sponsor, he might want to hold

the finals in a hurry, and we must be able to select the players fairly in a short time. On the other hand, we want to encourage many players to participate in the preliminaries. I agree with Larry Evans that a stiff entry fee (he suggests \$100) plus compulsory PCA membership would reduce entries to a manageable number, while still making the preliminaries open to all. Perhaps a \$50 entry fee would be sufficient, though, because a player who is eliminated in the first round of the finals would receive only \$500. What do you think about this? How many players should we hope to attract in each region in the preliminaries?

How should we get 16 players from 12 USCF regions? George Cunningham suggests that we dispense with qualification by USCF region, and, instead, sell "franchises" (the right to hold a qualifying tournament) to organizers in big cities. Each franchise would send one player to the finals. If we do use the USCF regions, it makes sense to give an extra spot to the regions containing New York and California, but we still need a fair way to choose two more players. Should we seed the U.S. champion, U.S. Open champion, or U.S. Junior champion? Harry Lyman suggests a formula that would give the regions with the most high-rated PCA members extra representation. It's also possible to award a second qualifying spot to the four regions that have the most advance entries; that plan's drawback is that nobody would know which regions will have two representatives until the close of advance entries.

Several of you have cautioned against the exclusive use of matches in the preliminaries. But choosing a rep-

representative to a match-tournament by a weekend Swiss seems inconsistent. I'm interested in proposals that would select the best match players. Could a Swiss (or several) be used to narrow the field to 8 or 16 in a region? Then matches could determine the qualifier.

Once again, I'm asking for your recommendations. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Jack Peters

Jack Peters

PCA President

copies to: Bisguier, Evans, Lombardy, Tarjan, Hanken, Sperling, Koltanowski, Cunningham, Lieberman, Dann, Corwin, Frymer, Gerzadowicz, Mirijanian, Townsend, Bolton, Martz, Goichberg, Commons, Fauber, Kashdan, Snead, H. Lyman, L. Kaufman, Schneider, Mednis
Benson