

From: "Fried. L. Schunk" <Holzschu@t-online.de>  
To: "Anthony Treacher" <anthony@treacher.se>  
References: <003401c7081a\$34185410\$b532b652@oem2q4ncyhpsy>  
Subject: Re: Maurice Dougan and Linz  
Date: Wed, 15 Nov 2006 20:02:12 +0100

Dear Mr. Treacher,

Thank you for your call last night. At the moment, let me please simply confirm that I received your information.

The incident you have brought to my attention does seem to involve some issues relating to rules, but what appears to remain prominent at this point in time are the causalnexus aspects that clearly relate to personal conduct. At this point I do not wish to pass judgement. Permit me, please, to do a little research, also from a timing point of view of your inquiry. I will get back to you as quickly as I can.

Today, I would just like to comment that as an organisation, WMA always tries to do its best, to avoid situations that could lead to accusations of rules' violations. Ref's on location are mostly provided by the LOC, and while we have ultimate responsibility for their quality, we are far from being able to check out each one of them. Resource limitations contribute also to this lack of guarantee ahead of the start of the competition, to our own fullest satisfaction. So, in this area, we have to try to be fast on our feet, but we don't win every scrimmage. At Linz, some of the world-wide most respected rules experts available to masters were assembled. Still, not all went right, and the call for judgemental decisions - or its perception - will occasionally produce an unsatisfactory result.

And looking at your notes what comes to mind is an aspect that is not quantified by you - the time change. Those, of course, by themselves can be issues, but how much of a role did it play re this incident. Was the accommodation to permit a substitute, directly related to that fact, or did the other teams consent to your change, that under normal rules' interpretation should not have been permissible (other than for medical reasons). - What I really try to get across is that in the reality of running a championship there are situations where the rules may be stretched a little bit by intent, if it does not put anybody at an apparent disadvantage, or perhaps even by ignorance. Needless to say it is better not to have to rely on those measures in fairness to all participants, but, as they say, it is part of the game. And what role did the team manager play in getting the substitute accepted; was he present in the Call Room? For my own benefit of rounding up the picture, if you don't mind, perhaps you could elaborate on those issues.

As an aside, and having no bearing on anything (maybe), other than satisfying my present personal curiosity, how much better would you estimate the team would have placed with the originally nominated members. You may deduce from my way of thinking, that there could have very well been a protest had you ended up in the medal ranks depending on how the original substitution approval came about. (The other teams could have held this prospect in their back-pocket.)

It is certainly gratifying to know that not each and every competition requires that much attention. There wouldn't be enough volunteers around to get any event off the ground.

Again, thank you for bringing the matter to my personal attention. And as mentioned, I will attempt to provide an answer that will hopefully put your mind at ease. Ultimately, I of course hope that the thread of your expulsion from further team nominations will not prevail and more so, that your interest in participating in future championships will not diminish.

Good night,  
Friedel Schunk