



# Chess Life



Vol. IV  
Number 14

Official Publication of The United States Chess Federation

Monday,  
March 20, 1950

## PLAN 1950 U. S. vs. CANADA

### CONTEST IS HOT IN MSCA ELECTION

The Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts State Chess Association developed into a very hot contest when one disgruntled candidate circulated prior to the meeting an open letter in which he charged the officers with various acts of misconduct. That the charges were not seriously considered by the bulk of the membership became apparent when the candidate failed of election at the meeting which showed confidence in its officers of the past year by electing a slate which supported the policies of the past administration.

Part of the new program of the MSCA includes a State Championship Tournament to be played over four week-ends and an increased emphasis upon the already developed program of chess for grade and high school ages. Interscholastic Director Robert W. Reddy was successful in obtaining the gift of a suitable trophy for the grade school championship from Dr. Godfrey Lowell Cabot and a similar trophy for the high school championship will be acquired.

Officers of the MSCA elected at the annual meeting were: Jeremy Coulter president; Sidney Woolbridge, Paul Worcester, John Egan and Roger Curtis vice-presidents; Charles Acorn treasurer; J. Leland Cawthorne secretary; Waldo L. Waters publicity and tournament director; and retiring president Robert W. Reddy interscholastic director.

### MORGAN WINS AT HUNTINGTON

Victory in the Huntington (W. V.) City Championship went to Charles Morgan with an 11-1 score. Morgan, state junior champion, lost his only game to veteran Murray Scott, and in a tournament marred by large number of forfeits benefited only from one (Dr. Werthammer) while besting Landis Marks, Tyson Cobb and other leading players.

Tyson Cobb placed second with 10½-1½, while Paul Dunn and H. Landis Marks tied for third with 9-3 each. Nineteen forfeits marred the event with Dr. Werthammer losing 7 games in that manner and Mark two. There were 13 entries in the event.

### NSW TEAM BESTS SO. AUSTRALIA

In a 10-board telegraph match, a team from New South Wales with Australian champion Purdy facing So. Australian champion Arlauskas on board one, defeated the South Australian group by a 7-3 score. Purdy and Arlauskas drew on board one, but Koshnitsky bested Endzelins on board two for NSW while teammate Pilker was defeating Bowman on board three. Arlauskas and Endzelins represent recent Lithuanian arrivals who have strengthened Australian chess immeasurably, while Koshnitsky has now become almost an old timer.

### RESHEVSKY HOLDS OLD TIME MAGIC

As reports on the simultaneous exhibition tour of Grandmaster Samuel Reshevsky pour in, it becomes evident that he has lost little of his old time magic touch. Victories scored against him have been few.

At the Edison Chess & Checker Club (Detroit) Reshevsky scored 37 wins and 3 draws in a 40-board simultaneous, and his only loss was his hat which Mr. A. R. Brauer of Midland had taken in mistake for his own. Despite this loss (of the hat) Reshevsky scored a 40-board victory at Bay City on the following night. In Detroit, the event was notable for the excellent press notices, including a feature story in the Detroit News on the loss of his hat and the whole of the Monday column "The Empire" by H. G. Salsinger, relating his chess career.

### STAGE SUPER-SIMUL AT MILWAUKEE

Samuel Reshevsky gave a super-simultaneous exhibition in Milwaukee in the gymnasium of Lapham Park against a galaxy of 86 local and state players in an exhibition sponsored by the Milwaukee Public Schools, and drew over 400 spectators.

Former Wisconsin state champion Arpad E. Elo was the only player to defeat the American Grandmaster, a feat which was accomplished in 20 odd moves. 18 other players succeeded in gaining draws. These were: Mark Surgies, Jerome Kraszewski, Dr. O. M. Wehrley, Ben Zukrow, David Arganian, Ralph Abrams, Heinz Loewy, Rev. Raymond de Dobay, Paul Diebold, William Oneby, Robert Schmidt, Paul Engberg, John Thompson, Carl Bauer, George Wamboldt, Maurice Kuchinsky, Sally Eisenberg and Marlene Kujoth.

### BOSTON ADDS CHESS COLUMN

A new chess column has made its appearance in Boston in the newspaper Darbininkas, as a tribute to the number of Lithuanian chess players now in New England. Editor of this Lithuanian language chess column is Kazys Merkis who placed third in the recent Boston City Championship, won by his fellow-countryman, Povilas Tautvaisha.

### MYERS CAPTURES DECATUR TITLE

Victory in the annual Decatur (Ill.) City Championship went to Hugh Myers with a 14½-1½ score, nosing out defending champion Gerald Garver by one-half point. Third place went to Max Schlösser with an 11-5 score. 17 players were entered in the round-robin event.

Position No. 29  
E. Nash vs. S. Schwartz  
Washington, 1950



r1b1c2r, pp4pp, 3pt, 8, 2R1p2r1a, 5P2, PFP3QP, 5R1R1K1  
White to play and win

Position No. 30  
G. E. Hartleb vs. C. M. Burton  
Correspondence, 1949-50



r1b1r1k1, pp4ppp, 4c3, 2S6pp2, 2P5, R1P3P1, P1Q1PFP, 1R1R1K1

### Finish It The Clever Way!

Conducted by Edmund Nash

Send all contributions for this column to Edmund Nash, 1530 28th Place, S.E., Washington 20, D. C.

THE solutions to the two positions above do not call for immediate knockout blows. In Position No. 29, White with his first move paralyzes Black's rook (a problem-like position!). In the game, Black resigned after White's fifth move.

In Position No. 30, a quiet threatening first move by White leads to a position where White stands to win a pawn while at the same time undoubling and uniting his Q-side pawns. In the game, Black avoided this unpleasant possibility and met disaster, resigning after White's fourth move.

Please turn to page four for solutions.

### The Kibitzer Has His Day

From the Editor's Mail Bag

### The Truth Prevails? But Does It? Mr. Harvey Finds His Defenders

What the reader thinks is important, even when there may be doubts about the validity of his viewpoint—what he thinks is even more important when he may possibly be correct in his view. Therefore, we make no apology for intruding upon front page space with these various critical comments—The Editor.

Dear Mr. Major:  
I have in the past enjoyed and admired your Editorials, they have been sharp and refreshing but the one attacking my fellow Kibitzer, CCLAer Mr. Harvey Jr., is not worthy of your signature. I had to read it several times before I believed my eyes. I also read Mr. Harvey's letter to the above department, I read it very carefully but failed to find anything that should cause such an outburst of distemper. Every member present on our last meeting of the Attleboro Chess Club was asked to give his opinion about the letter and the verdict was unanimous, they found Mr. Harvey to be correct in all of his statements.

I am also a Kibitzer, so I will side in with Mr. Harvey. I know it is hard for a chess editor to stay clear of the "Cold War" 100 per cent, but to make an issue of it is a different story.

And furthermore, I question your source of information. Dr. Bogatyrczuk was on the staff of the Russian "Quisling" Vlasov at Kiev six years ago. Or in other words, he was a "Nazi" sympathizer at the time our country was at war with the Nazis.

For my money, Mr. Harvey's criticism is worth more to us than

half-truths supplied by Dr. Bogatyrczuk.

It will always be difference of opinion between nations, religions, politicians, people and kibitzers. It should be a sad world indeed if we all agreed on everything.

You have made "Chess Life" one of the most interesting magazines of our time, keep it that way. Let's not start any foolish arguments about things that have nothing to do with chess.

SVEN BRASK  
Attleboro, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Major:

For a long time now I have refrained from writing you a letter, believing that the very arguments I'd have to use in the letter would be arguments against my even writing you in the first place! But what little intellect I possess has finally been battered to death by my emotions—I must write in protest against your policy of vitriolic attack on anyone and everyone who happens to displease you.

Your treatment of Mr. Harvey in the February 20th issue of "Chess Life" was just about the most vicious piece of backstabbing I've ever run across. It was obvious that Mr. Harvey's reasoning was (Please turn to page 2, col. 2)

### CHOOSE CAPTAINS; SET MATCH DATE

As we go to press, formal acceptance of a coast-to-coast team match between the USA and Canada has been made by both the United States Chess Federation and the Chess Federation of Canada.

Plans for a bigger and better battle along the 3000 mile border are being laid in the hopes of surpassing last year's encounter which saw the victory go to the USA by a score of 116½ to 86½.

The U. S. Team Captain for the 1950 battle will be Phil J. Mary, 43 Gallatin Ave., Buffalo 7, N. Y. The date of Sunday, June 18th has been set for the encounter.

Both the USCF and the CFC have hopes that contacts can be made this year for more representative groups from those regions which supplied few or no players in the engagement of last year.

### DOMSKY TAKES RACINE TITLE

Art Domskey, 26 year old veteran became the Racine (Wis.) City Champion in a 7-round Swiss event, winning five and drawing two for a 6-1 score. Also undefeated was 18 year old David Arganian, the runnerup, who won four but permitted three draws for a 5½-1½ score. Defending champion Rudy Kunz suffered a 1st round upset defeat from Nielson and lost to Domskey in the 5th round, but was otherwise victorious for a 5-2 score and third place. Twenty-eight entered the Swiss event, and Domskey not only captured the title but became Racine's official entry in the Wisconsin State Championship in May.

### OMAHA ROUTED BY RESHEVSKY

In a brilliant performance at Omaha, Samuel Reshevsky stunned the local chess talent by winning 24, drawing 1 and losing none in his simultaneous exhibition at the site of the 1949 U. S. Open Championship. Howard Ohman salvaged the only draw, while such local stars as Lee Magee and Jack Spence went down to defeat. Before the exhibition Reshevsky lectured upon an ending he had played against Alatorsev in a Russian tournament some years before in which he achieved the almost legendary feat of drawing with two pawns minus in every variation.

### CLEVELAND ROUTS COLUMBUS TEAM

By a one-sided score of 22-7 a 21-man team from Cleveland routed the Columbus team in a recent inter-city match. State Champion Walter Mann went down before former Cleveland Champion John Hoy on board one while Larry Friedman was besting Jim Schroeder on board two.

### SAVE THESE DATES!

July 10 - July 22

FOR THE

51st Annual U. S. Open Tournament AT DETROIT, MICH.

# Chess Life

Published twice a month on the 5th and 20th by

## THE UNITED STATES CHESS FEDERATION

Entered as second class matter September 5, 1946, at the post office at Dubuque, Iowa, under the act of March 9, 1879.

Subscription—\$2.00 per year; Single copies 10c each  
Address all subscriptions to:— 845 Bluff Street OR 12869 Strathmoor Avenue  
Edward L. Treend, Secretary Dubuque, Iowa Detroit 27, Michigan  
Make all checks payable to: THE UNITED STATES CHESS FEDERATION

Address all communications Editorial 123 North Humphrey Avenue  
on editorial matters to:— Office: Oak Park, Illinois

Editor and Business Manager  
**MONTGOMERY MAJOR**  
Contributing Editors  
Dr. A. Buschke Gene Collett Vincent L. Eaton  
Gultherme Groessner Erich W. Marchand Edmund Nash  
Fred Reinfeld William Rojiam Dr. Kester Svendsen

Address all communications to the United States Chess Federation  
(except those regarding CHESS LIFE) to USCF Secretary Edward L. Treend, 12869 Strathmoor Avenue, Detroit 27, Michigan.

Vol. IV, Number 14 Monday, March 20, 1950

### THE REVERSE OF THE MEDALLION

IN THIS issue we publish in "The Kibitzer Has His Day" several letters from various readers who have leapt vigorously to the defense of Mr. Harvey and his presumed cause. We will not comment upon these epistles individually, for we believe that each one speaks for itself in revealing what emotions passed through the mind of its author and prompted him to write.

From the college undergraduate, who has not yet learned that logical thinking can be clothed in rhetoric without ceasing to be logical (we recommend a perusal of "In L. Catlinam" or "Pro A. Licinio Archla Peeta"), to our still highly esteemed colleague from New England—one strangely common factor is apparent in all these comments: One is not permitted to voice a criticism of any Soviet action without being denounced as contributing to the "Cold War."

To our mind it is both striking and slightly appalling that this admittedly too vehement editorial on Mr. Harvey (who did not merit the space and probably did not deserve the excessive declamation) has brought forth such a flood of denunciations when an equally (or even more) vigorous editorial about a certain American chess player of note, which was published some months ago, was permitted to pass without adverse comment from any reader. One can but assume, therefore, that Mr. Harvey gains his host of belligerent defenders merely because he speaks on behalf of the Soviet Union; and not because his communication was severely criticized in print. Else we would expect disapprobation for the two other occasions (yes, there were only two; although some readers have magnified the numbers), when we by name criticized the actions and words of other chess players.

We have been accused of anti-Russian propaganda, merely because we reprinted portions of Dr. Bohatirchuk's letter regarding chess conditions in the Soviet Union with a few restrained comments of our own. (The British magazine "Chess" received several caustic letters for publishing the letter originally, although the editor made no comments.) But none of our accusers deems it to be propaganda when chess conditions in the Soviet Union are lauded as ideal and held up as an example of a perfection that we in our lands must strive to attain. Since when has the reverse side of the medallion been so much less important than the face?

We have no objection to what has been written voluminously about the fine features of chess promotion in the Soviet Union, for this promotion has many very striking characteristics which we can well study to advantage and endeavor to adapt for use in our own country. On the other hand, there is no need (and certainly little intelligence) for us to become disciple of the literary ostrich and hide our heads in the sand at the slightest suggestion that there may be some disadvantages also in the Soviet chess regime. Only a very bigoted person (and apparently, we have a number of these among our readers) can object to a simple statement of a certain number of disadvantages which have developed during the course of Soviet chess promotion. We cannot have a clear picture of the situation unless we see both sides of the medallion; and we cannot judge without knowing both disadvantages and advantages. That the Soviet sympathizers cannot bear the revelation of the reverse of the medallion is in itself a stronger criticism of the Soviet chess situation than any that could be written.

But, of course, the Soviet enthusiast, like every righteous zealot, cannot bear even the hint of criticism, however honestly offered and however restrained in tone. To him the Soviet Union can do no wrong, and the slightest suggestion that Communism in common with every other man-created ideal must have a few practical defects in its organism is a mortal heresy that he cannot bear.

Most interesting of all is the united reaction that our criticism of certain FIDE resolutions becomes a move in the "Cold War"—a thought so preposterous that we did not even foresee the possibility of this accusation until our zealous readers enlightened us.

Certainly, we do not intend to let a group of delegates at the FIDE assemblies ride roughshod over the rights of other nations, merely to avoid a ridiculous charge of participating in the "Cold War." Our criticism of the FIDE decisions would have been made equally vigorously, if the recipients of the favors had been England, France or Norway—or even the United States. The criticism of what happened at the FIDE Assembly last summer bore then and bears now no relation to the political situation abroad. Only those extremely devoted partisans of the Soviet cause, to whom all criticism becomes an "act of war," however kindly intended, could so interpret an objection to certain decisions which placed the interests of one group ahead of the interests of all other groups within the FIDE organization.

We confess we have found the letters of "complaint" and "accusation" most interesting and enlightening. To quote another correspondent, whose letter we do not publish because it is among those which

endorse our policy; "It is an ever amazing thing to me to observe who hollers when the Soviet is punched."

In closing, we must accord the scoring of a point to Mr. Lester, who is quite correct in commenting that "rising luminary" hardly is an adequate description for the veteran Levenfish. Frankly, the editor did not recognize the noted Lowenfish in Levenfish until too late. But in conceding this point, we must still maintain that while we would accept the nomination of Levenfish as grandmaster upon the basis of past achievements, we still object vehemently to the form in which he and Ragozin were accorded the title of grandmaster—not on past performance, but separately as "Russian grandmasters"—in a category by themselves. (To forestall comment from those who have read the resume of the FIDE meeting in an English reprint from "Tidskrift for Schack," the article is very misleading on this point, indicating that Ragozin and Levenfish were included in the group of Duras, Rubinstein, etc.; whereas the official draft of the minutes of the FIDE meeting definitely indicates that the nomination of Ragozin and Levenfish was a separate act.)

It is reported that Reshevsky is having difficulty in obtaining a visa for Hungary, as the State Department seems to eye with disfavor the entry of U. S. nationals since the Vogler affair. The British editor B. H. Wood failed to attend a FIDE committee meeting in Europe recently because he could not obtain a visa from the British Foreign Office. We report these incidents as news, and we trust that we are not held personally responsible for them, as we seem to be held responsible for all other acts displeasing to the Soviet Union.

*Montgomery Major*

### The Kibitzer Has His Day

(Continued from page 1)

not altogether sound, but the un-soundness could have been pointed out without tearing Mr. Harvey to bits in your editorial. Besides, his main point was a good one; your attempts to make "Chess Life" a medium for anti-Russian propaganda are positively disgusting. How about cancelling our subscription to Montgomery Major and renewing our subscription to "Chess Life?"

A college freshman, with one course in psychology, is acquainted with the fact that calling one's opponents names doesn't immediately effect their reform. Rather, it is apt to anger them. Keep them from seeing any logic you may have used along with your name-calling. So if you are so intent upon proving that all who oppose you are indispitably wrong, tame down your Winston Churchillesque rhetoric and try a little common courtesy. You remind me of some teachers who take advantage of their position to heap sarcasm and abuse upon the pupil who dares to disagree with them. Harvey gets a half-column and you take more than two columns to answer him, and then you have the colossal nerve to say, "we have accorded to Mr. Harvey's comments space and notice beyond their importance." Talk about idiotic denunciations and intolerance—Harvey couldn't begin to compete with you! The famous Major logic operating again!

And talking about logic, you could stand a little grooming yourself! Remember your attempt to belittle Ragozin and Levenfish because of their failure in one particular tournament? Levenfish is over 60 years old, was accorded the grandmastership because of past performances, not because anyone thinks he is currently in the running for the world's championship. Why not quibble about Vidmar and Mieses if you're going to find fault with the selection of the Russian grandmaster? But then, anyone who would designate Levenfish "a rising luminary" (Chess Life editorial, Jan. 5th) is not very likely to be conversant with the facts in the case. Ragozin is admittedly erratic, but his second to Botvinnik in the Tchigorin Memorial Tourney (only 1/2 point behind the winner and ahead of Smyslov, Boleslavsky, Keres, Kotov, etc.), his overwhelming defeat of Bondarevsky in a match, his 4 points out of a possible 4 in the U.S.A.—U.S.S.R. matches, and his fine showing against the grandmasters in the Moscow 1935 Tournament ought to be convincing proof of his talent. I have great respect for Kashdan's ability, but where

do you think he'd have finished in the Tchigorin Memorial?

Isn't it bad enough that most of our newspapers, magazines, and radio programs are stuffed full of flag-waving and truth distortion without lousing up our chess journals with the same sort of junk? And even if you honestly believe that everything you say is true, does it need to be couched in terms that inspire hate and distrust? Wouldn't an attitude that tries to see both sides lead to more understanding in the long run? Or are you one of those guys who gibbly dismiss this possibility by saying, "Oh, you can't reason with those Russians!", meaning, of course, that they aren't going to try to!

I realize that in this letter I have stooped to the same name-calling I accused you of, but, as I stated in the first paragraph, my emotions have finally overcome my reason. Reason tells me that this letter will do nothing to change you, will instead serve as a springboard from which you will leap to new name-calls, but my emotions demand that something be said about your mud-slinging tactics.

ORLANDO A. LESTER, JR.  
Portsmouth, New Hampshire

Dear Sir:  
I am convinced that J. W. Harvey is fundamentally wrong and you are fundamentally right in the recent argument (I don't suppose you'll print this letter, but if you do for heaven's name don't leave out that first phrase). However, before you condemn Harvey too severely for his emotional and illogical letter, I would advise you to reread your own article.

Such statements as "intolerance as the idiotic denunciation," "thoughtless correspondent," "folly of his remarks," "fantastic arguments," "religious zeal," "impene-trable immunity to both logic and common sense," "devoted zealot," "the chimaeras that exist in the stygian darkness of ignorance and prejudice," "(not) the remotest semblance of intelligence," "false and priding accusations," etc., etc., etc., throughout the next twelve paragraphs or so may or not be true. But they are certainly not logical, restrained, or unprejudiced. Their use of simple name-calling, exaggeration, and metaphor (I beg you to reconsider that "stygian darkness" phrase) is certainly contrary to all logical principles of which I know.

I am amazed and extremely displeased that you should have con-tention of Kashdan's ability, but where

### Alekhine's Early Chess Career

Additional Data  
By A. Buschke

THE FIVE games of this 10 game match, which were not published in either Alekhine's "Best Games 1908-1923" or Reinfeld's "Unknown Alekhine," follow here, with Alekhine's own notes.

We are certain that Alekhine would have found many of his own notes loquacious and open to revisions in later years, but we believe that by publishing just these early commentaries in complete translation and with as little absolutely necessary changes as possible for a conscientious translator, we are throwing more light on the character of the young Alekhine than by substituting "modern" notes for those of a young and not quite mature genius of the first order.

We shall later publish also the original Alekhine notes, as given in Novoe Vremia and Shakmatnyi Vestnik, to those three games which are now easily available in Alekhine's "Best Games 1908-1923" with his own later notes (i.e., in addition to the "doctored" game No. 8 published in an earlier article, the second match game) or in Reinfeld's "Unknown Alekhine" (i. e., in addition to the first game shortened by Reinfeld, and published by us in complete form in an earlier article, the third and fifth games).

At least for the third, fourth and fifth games, Alekhine's notes in the two early publications of the match games are not identical; for the fourth game our readers will find both versions of Alekhine's notes below; and by comparing them with each other one can gain a rarely encountered insight into the working methods of the mind of a genius. We believe that it is quite significant that the 3 games doubly annotated by Alekhine fall into that period of the match which must be considered the weakest for Alekhine: in the third game, he made what he calls himself a "gross blunder" in the 33rd move and is saved only by his opponent's weak 37th move; the fourth and fifth games went to his opponent in a row—there certainly was reason for young Alekhine to take stock at this particular juncture and to find out what was wrong with him at this moment.

#### VIENNA GAME

Fourth Match Game, St. Petersburg, February 19 (March 4), 1913.

Notes by A. A. Alekhine in Novoe Vremia (marked "N.V.") of March 5 (18), 1913 and in Shakmatnyi Vestnik (marked "Sh.V.") No. 5 of March 1 (14), 1913.

White: A. A. ALEKHINE. Black: S. M. LEVITSKY. 1. P-K4 P-K4 4. P-Q3 P-KB3 2. K1-QB3 K1-KB3 5. K1-R4 B-K3 3. B-B4 B-B4 (N.V.) If Black answers this way, White's preceding move becomes justified and White gets the somewhat better game. It was obviously better to permit the exchange on B4; Black then gets a slight pressure on the queen's file and a free game in general. 6. KxB PPK1 7. BxKt QxB 8. K-K2 P-K3 10. O-O P-KK1 9. K-K5 P-K3 11. K5-B3 (N.V.) White succeeded in leading the game into a variation, which in its type is similar to one which develops after 4... B-K5; 3... B-B4, P-K4, P-K4, 2. K1-QB3, K1-R4; 3... B-B4, K1-B5, 4. P-Q3, B-K5, 5. B-KK5, P-KB3; 6. BxKt, Bxkt ch!; 7. PxB, QxK; 8. O-O, P-KK4, but which is even more favorable for him, thanks to the absence of doubled pawns on the B-file, which always presents the well-known weaknesses and which in the given position prevents, at that, the important transfer of the White knight over B3 to Q3 or K3, and thus (2) to the fighter position of Black's queen's side pawns (a consequence of the doubling), which strongly hampers Black's defense. 11... P-K4 (N.V.) The King's position in the center is definitely not without danger; the minor of several evils would have been, after all, 12... P-K4 or 13... P-K3, then 12... Kt-Q1 and afterwards, at the first opportunity, castling. (Sh.V.) A risky move which for a long time lay in the shadow of White; in any case, 12... QR-Q1 was leading. 13... P-QB3 B-B 17. K4-R3 O-K13 14. PxB Kt-O1 18. R-K1 P-KB4 15. P-QB4 Kt-K3 19. P-R5! 16. P-QK4 K-K2 (N.V.) A good move which finally clarifies White's advantage; if Black took this pawn, the consequence would be 20. P-B5, PxB or 21. PxP, 22. P-K4, Kt-Q1, 23. Kt-B4, etc.; 21. Q-Q5 with complete destruction of Black's position. After the continuation of Black's position. After the continuation of Black's position. (Please turn to page 4, col. 5)



