

Dear Mrs H.Otten and F.Teer,

After I left the post of the CPI-President in 2005, I was not involved in the CPI activity. I did concentrate myself for my new book “History of draughts problematic”, successfully finished this summer. Too, since August 2008 I am the member of the “De Problemist”-magazine redaction-team, what also took my attention. So, I watch the CPI events from a distance, not being involved in, and not being entered me into either critic or comment for the CPI activity.

However, in the end of 2012 I did receive from the CPI the proposition (made by the former CPI Secretary, Mr A.Kaciuska) to take the post of the CPI President. I answered: I have to study the situation.

After I did study the situation, I did refuse that the CPI proposition, because I do not agree the CPI would lead also 64-problemism, as it is now, since 2010. The CPI/SPI was not formed for 64-problemism in Russian version of draughts’-game, which is popular for problemists from the former USSR-countries only. My position for that subject now is the same like 12 years ago, when I was the CPI President, namely: in the FMJD the special section for 64-game does exist, so, let that section does lead everything concerned with 64-game, including 64-problemism.

But that studying of the nowadays situation did open my eyes to some things. And, so far in the CPI documents (world championships regulations) it’s written “...FMJD which is fully responsible for tournament organization”, that’s why I do address to you as the FMJD/CD leaders. This letter does not bring me a pleasure, but a reserve of my patience is overfull.

I would like to attract your attention to facts, which, as I suppose, did not reach the CD attention, not being mentioned in the CPI report to the GA from 22.07.2013, placed at the FMJD website (http://fmjd.org/GA/2013/downloads/EN_GA_2013_REPORT_OF_THE_CPI_FMJD.pdf).

First of all it’s concerned with the first World Championship for 64-problemism (I do not touch protests, which were there a lot, much more than in contests of 100-problemism).

In Table below, in left column – the regulations of the contest with my comments, in right column – my comments and quoting of the CPI documents: the CPI Statutes (revised edition, based on the CPI Statutes confirmed by General Assembly on 24 August, 2003) and Rules International (RI) established in the CPI.

The 64-worldchampiunship (PWCP-I) regulations	The CPI STATUTES and Rules International (RI), part 2.
1. First World Championship in Droughts-64 Problem Solving (64-PWCP-I) is an official World Championship approved by FMJD which is fully responsible for tournament organization.	It is correct only partially. The 64-PWCP-I was approved being present in Calendar of concourses, among other contests. The 64-PWCP-I regulations themselves were never present to the CD (SY).
	The CPI STATUTES The main tasks of the CPI are: - Organizing World Championships - Formulation, publishing and maintaining rules and regulations for international draughts composition

<p>Regulations of the 64-worldchampionship (PWCP-I) were not both checked and approved by the CD, in spite of the CPI Statutes does require such procedure.</p>	<p>contests (RI /RIE). - Recognizing international contests on behalf of the FMJD and checking the application of the rules and regulations.</p> <p>In Russian text of the FMJD Statutes there is also a phrase, which is absent in English text of Statutes (on yellow phone): “Регламенты этих чемпионатов должны быть одобрены Советом директоров FMJD”. What means (in S.Y. translation): “Regulations of these championships (World Championships – S.Y.) should be approved by the CD FMJD”</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">THE CPI STATUTES</p> <p>1.1. b): “Every competition can have its own regulations besides the general regulations for competitions (RI, part 2), as long as they are in accordance” (marked by me, SY).</p> <p>This requirement of the Statutes is broken, so, regulations of the 64-PWCP-I do contradict both the CPI Statutes and RI. See next line (SY).</p>
<p>5.2. Co-authorship of composition is allowed, however the evaluation of credit will be scored to one author who sent the composition to the competition, but not more than 2 problems from the author on the whole Championship.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">RI</p> <p>2.1. “... Problems with joint authorship will not be accepted, except in team competitions” (in S.Y. translation from Russian text of the RI in version of 2010 year).</p>

The 64-PWCP-I regulations themselves was composed by the person, who did take part in the 64-PWCP-I, it was the winner, Mr P.Shkludov. Those regulations themselves were composed in such way, which took off some problems, composed in 1990s, of one of the main favorite for the 64-PWCP-I, the former USSR champion, Mr A.Fomin (Russia). Those regulations were not discussed proper, and that did lead to great scandal in the 64-championship.

This infringement of the RI – to allow co-author’s problems (while 64-PWCP-I was personal contest) – did influence to final result (more details for this article of the RI see in PS). Without of co-author’s problem, without of the help of the other problemist, the winner, Mr P.Shkludov (Belarus), would not became the winner.

Next – one more fact, which has no precedent, I think, in all the FMJD history of tournament’s organization.

The 64-championship was run under special rules, accepted by the CPI: “The CPI Rules for Russian draughts”, written by Mr P.Shkludov.

As it was written in the official CPI bulletin “CPI-info”, # 11, December 2011: “8.4.13. ...These rules are written in Russian and they are written by their author in English” [“8.4.13. ...Данные правила написаны на русском языке и переведены их автором на английский.”].

But:

That is the **lie**. Those 64-rules were never translated in English.

Of course, 64-problemism is popular only in countries of former USSR, but such reality must not take off a possibility for a man from another country, who does not speak Russian, to take part in a World Championship, organized within of the FMJD.

Thus, the presence only Russian text of the rules for 64-problemism is itself discrimination according to language, in spite of the fact such kind of discrimination is not foreseen by the FMJD Statutes (and it's understood why: because people who wrote the FMJD Statutes could not imagine that Statutes will serve for the interests of only Russian-language people).

Accordingly, for winner of such tournament it would be correct to award the title "World Champion among Russian-language people", but, as far as it's known, the FMJD does not award such title, is not it?

The former FMJD President, Mr P.Hildering, wrote at the site SHASHKI V ROSSII 16.07.2006 in his letter to the CPI (in Mr A.Kandaurov' translation): "...titles, recognized by the FMJD, should be justice for all types of draughts, united in the FMJD", placed at <http://shashki.com/PNphpBB2-viewtopic-t-666.html> (in the end of that pages there are also links to English texts).

In my opinion, that statement of Mr P.Hildering is justice statement, in accordance with which it would be injustice to award "World champion" title to Mr P.Shkludov, as it's announced in the report of Mr F.Teer about handling the FMJD diplomas at the FMJD site, here: http://fmjd.org/downloads/cpi/INFO_CPI_01-07-2013.pdf

Because in Personal Championship that title has to be won by somebody personal, and not like Mr P.Shkludov won "64-championship" with help of the other problemist: Mr R.Shayakhmetov, Russia, who recently has got the diploma of International Master. Two men for one side – it's already a team (like, i.e., in some other kinds of sport – in the rowing, in the beach-volleyball etc.), it is not more a personal competition.

From the CD side there was no proper control for the CPI activity in recent years, beginning since 2010, as it's seen from the CD Minutes published at the FMJD site. Now it would be difficult to deny that the infringement of the CPI rules did lead to injustice result in "64-championship". Or, in other words, the CD is partially guilty in that what happened. I understand, that now it's too late to re-consider final results, but to award "word champion" title to the person, who used the other problemist' help/contribution – it would contradict to that "fair play" principle, which is mentioned in the FMJD Statutes, I quote the article 1.10.1: "*The game and concept of draughts is based on the assumption that everyone involved / concerned observes existing rules and regulations and attaches the greatest importance to fair play and good sportsmanship.*"

That what happened in "64-championship" – that is not "fair play". That is a shame.

But the 64-PWCP-I is not, unfortunately, a single example of the policy of the present CPI team, which, in absence of a West-Europe representative since 2010, becomes "a former USSR committee". Accordingly, with the former USSR norm: "it's more titles – it's better". I.e., in 2002-2009 the CPI organized two world championships in the problems-genre, while in 2010-2012 there was organized three world championships (and 64-championship else!), also several contests (mainly in Belarus), accepted by the CPI, organized by former USSR problemists. The level of the quality of problems is, sometimes, ridiculous, but this fact is not in the field of the CPI attention, like also the infringement of the CPI rules.

In the Fifth Personal World Championship for problems (PWCP-5) four judges (from five) did not judge in accordance with the RI, and did score problems, which were not corresponding to the RI. The fifth judge firstly did score those problems correctly, with 0 points, but afterward change his score to 0,1 point, according to the request of the CPI. That request was ground so: "a compromise because not to complicate finishing stage of PWCP-5: to advert the

preliminary result” (such thesis is placed at the FMJD site in Russian language here: <http://fmjd.org/downloads/cpi/PWCP-V-Remarks-2.pdf>).

Well, “a judge mistake”, unfortunately, may happen in any kind of sport. But, as a rule, those mistakes are fixed and indicated. We did not see, i.e., that FIFA would say: “to recognize as correctly if to play football with hands”.

The other reaction I see in the CPI (for that moment only two persons – Mrs V.Shulga and A.Kaciuska – were in the CPI-team, what, by the way, itself is the infringement of the article 1.3. of the CPI Statutes, which foreseen three the CPI-members as minimum; so, from this point of view, such situation is the base to recognize the CPI-activity with two members only as illegal).

The CPI not only did not remove judges, who did judge out of rules problems A29, C08, D07 in the Fifth Personal World Championship (problems with such kind of endgame-positions are forbidden by the article 1.8.1. of the RI; they are forbidden in all rules existing), but, moreover, the CPI President, Mr V.Shulga together with the CPI member, Mr A.Kaciuska, took the decision: “To recognize problems A29, C08 and D07 as correct problems” (fortunately, that decision did not influence to final result as to winners).

So, because those problems – A29, C08 and D07 – are incorrect problems, according to the RI, that the CPI decision has to be read: “To recognize incorrect problems as correct problems”, having grounded such decision as “a compromise...” etc (see above).

Unbelievable. There is no precedent in the CPI history.

The similar situation happened in the contest “Belarus-2012” towards the problem C25. There was not correct judgment according to the RI (fortunately, it also did not influence to final result), but the CPI also does recognize that incorrect judgment. If you have a doubt towards information, which I do present, – then, please, to form an independent committee to investigate facts, which I do present in this letter.

In its documents the CPI indicates: “...FMJD which is fully responsible for tournament organization”. That is comfort position: the CPI does violate its rules, but “FMJD is fully responsible”.

But, if so, if “...FMJD ...is fully responsible”, then the FMJD must do something.

In the middle of 1980s Mr R.Fourgous (1920-1993) and me were the most “locomotives” to form the CPI, being sure it will lead to really international co-operation between West and East problemists. For the present time I am the single who is still alive from the first the CPI-team. Therefore, I think, I have right to say: in the present team of the CPI I see no hope to re-anime the CPI as really international team, for which the law – the CPI Statutes and the RI – would be first of all. The present CPI-team could easy keep its rules in both 64-PWCP-I and PWCP-5, but the present CPI-team did prefer to violate its rules. There is nothing to say more, and there is nothing to wait.

Since 2010 there is no representative either France or the Netherlands in the CPI. De facto, since 2010 the CPI FMJD is converted in “the former CPI USSR”, but the CPI was formed in 1987-1988 not for to serve the former USSR problemists ambitions (moreover in 64-problemism), or, even rather ambitions of Belarus problemists, looking to the CPI calendar for recent past years and for 2013-2014. It could be acceptable if the CPI in its activity would strictly keep International rules established by really International committee included Mr S.de Bruijn (1932-2004), Mr A.Tavernier and me, because, for the time being, the RI is the single thing in the present CPI, which remind about really International co-operation in the problemism field.

Unfortunately, examples indicated above lead to regrettable conclusion: the CPI FMJD policy in recent years was not correct, and the CPI activity was not controlled by the CD in proper way (or, rather, even in no way). The CPI did infringe its Statutes and International Rules, both documents, which the CPI itself did establish earlier. It leads to the conclusion: the judgment without respect of the RI becomes as a norm under the CPI umbrella. The number of contests is increased, while the quality of both organization and judgment is devaluated.

Such the CPI is not needed any longer.

I aware, Russian federation of International draughts did address to you Mr E.Zubov as the possible future President of the CPI. I think that proposition from Russian federation should be seriously considered, if the CD, towards the CPI, does not prefer to take the position, usually called as “I wash my hands”. As far as I could see, Mr E.Zubov did keep criterions what is good and what is bad, on the contrary of Mrs V.Shulga and A.Kaciuska, who did demonstrate they cannot lead the CPI in that way as it should (facts see above). Maybe, Mr E.Zubov will be successful to return the CPI as really international and honest organization. Otherwise the CD will stand “tête-à- tête” with the arbitrariness, which Mrs V.Shulga and A.Kaciuska did demonstrate recently so convinced, and which they did hide in the CPI report to the GA.

With best regards,
Your sincerely

S.Yushkevitch (Ukraine),
International Grand Master,
International Grand Master Honoris Causa,
International Arbiter,
The CPI FMJD President in 2001-2005,
The member of the redaction of the “De Problemist” magazine.
08.09.2013

PS

The requirement to forbid problems with join authorships was entered in the RI in 2002, during the work for the RI made by Mr S.de Bruijn, Mr A.Tavernier and me. We entered that article unanimously.

The problemism history knows examples of co-author’s production. The most known are Mrs Jan and Steven Klomps (they even won the KVD-championship in 1982 – but “co-author’s participation” was not forbidden there), Mr Jan Scheijen and Mr Leen de Rooij etc. I myself have nothing against this kind of composition, in my archive there are over 20 problems composed together with 19 problemists.

The reason – why “co-author’s participation” was forbidden in the RI is because in such kind of composition it’s impossible to understand a contribution of every co-author. It may happen, that both author did contribute 50%-50%, but also it’s possible the other balance, i.e., one author did contribute 30%, or even 10%. It does not correspond with the awarding of master points for master-titles (such reason did not exist in the KVD, because there are no titles within of the KVD).

However, such investigation is not necessary for co-author’s problems, because two men worked as a team. Therefore, “co-author’s problems” are allowed in the RI but only for team-competitions, and forbidden in personal competitions.

Too, it should say, that the “64-championship” regulations, worked out by one of participants, the future winner Mr P.Shkludov, allow for a participant to participate with “co-author’s problems” (limited by two problems from each participant) in strange form. Not like in

the KVD championship, when two authors participate with one and the same problem. In “64-championship” a problem with joint authorship was allowed the only one of co-authors!

See below all cases of “co-author’s problems” in “64-championship” and places taken by those problems in categories. In all of them the name of the author of the “64-championship” regulations, Mr P.Shkludov, is present!

A16 P.Shkludov (co-author N.Vergeichik) – 8 place
B51 N.Grushevskij (co-author P.Shkludov) - 14 place
B52 N.Grushevskij (co-author P.Shkludov) - 5 place
B62 A.Savchenko (co-author P.Shkludov) - 6 place
D58 A.Savchenko (co-author P.Shkludov) - 4 place
E12 P.Shkludov (co-author R.Shayahmetov) - 1 place

I remind: co-author’s, indicated in brackets, did not present those problem to “64-championship”. Apart from B51, all “co-author’s problems” took high places. And especially the last one problem – E12 – did influence to final result.

That co-author’ problems was published in December 2007, what after E12 was scored in Belarus’-competition with high score, what after one of it’s author, Mr P.Shkludov, writes regulation for 64-championship. So, it makes impression that regulation for the “64-championship” was special written taking in mind E12!

By the way, it is not the first time, when the author of that regulation, Mr P.Shkludov, did not care the CPI rules. In 2005-2006 years, being as the jury-member of the first world championship for 100-endgames, Mr P.Shkludov did not judge in accordance with the CPI rules and, therefore, he was removed out of the jury by the CPI President for that moment, Mr J.Bus. That fact itself was serious reason for the CPI would not co-operate with Mr P.Shkludov anymore, but the CPI did address to Mr P.Shkludov again, having trusted him the CPI rules for both 64-problemism and the “64-world championship”. And we see the result: Mr P.Shkludov did not care the CPI rules again (maybe, he hates the CPI rules?). What after the FMJD is going to award him “world champion” title. But such the FMJD intention does not correspond to everything happened, what about I wrote above.