

SACRAMENTO CHESS NEWS

Volume II Issue 8

5425 8th Ave., Sacramento 17

Aug. 22, 1951

Chess has been rather slow during the summer months, hence there is not too much news to keep the bulletin active. It has been over a month since our last issue; with fall coming on and chess activities on the increase, there will be issues oftener to keep up with the events. There is some interesting news in this copy, as you will find (we hope!)

Club finances as last reported were \$50.50. Money on hand for the News, \$1.66, has been combined with club money. Rent collection over \$1.45, plus one subscription \$1.00, less 7th Issue 4.00, Rent Log Cabin match 1.00, postage 60¢, and 100 3¢ stamps leaves \$45.91 on hand. The 60¢ postage was used today in mailing out notices of dues for the next year. If all dues are promptly paid, this will put the club in a good position - financially - to meet the expenses of tournaments and travel this fall and winter. As one person acts as Sec-Treas-Editor, your payment of dues just once for the whole year will help lighten the workload considerably. While on the subject of finances, it is also the practice now at the Club to put 25¢ into the kitty (formerly 10¢) to pay the rent, excess over rent goes into Treasury to help defray costs of this little paper.

The subject has come up of changing our customary meeting night of Wednesday to Fridays. This has been checked with the majority of members present each night, and it seems highly favorable. Most state workers would approve of the change, and it would suit our club President, George Flynn, as he would be able to attend meetings. Friday is his "night" off. Jack Hubert could also attend club. As most people do not work Saturdays nowadays, Friday night would be a natural. It could hardly cut our attendance any further, altho Stagg reports ten at last night's meeting. Ye Ed attended three straight meetings this summer, where only three others were present. It is a bit discouraging to do that. Also hard to pay rent!

The Annual Dinner is being discussed. It could come off shortly, places are available on very short notice. It should be held before the fall season starts, and that is only a few short weeks away. The question of a change in meeting place can then be discussed. We suggest Flynn & Russell could work out the details on the Annual Dinner. Let's have it soon. How about a rapid transit that night?

C. Capps of Oakland wound up the Northern Calif. Championship with 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ -1 $\frac{1}{2}$, for a cinch on first, with Bagby and Schmitt hard on his heels for a tie, and about that time the tournament fell apart, as far as Ye Ed is concerned. The Director took off for a month's vacation and really left things up in the air. When it finally developed that Gee could not arrange a game except on a weeknight, and that meant three games in one week, he just came home and stayed there. So our chess efforts henceforth will be directed elsewhere.

We are happy to report that Neil Austin is back in full health again, and was seen playing chess at the Club in a ferocious match with Ralph Stagg. Our Auburn friends, Champ Russell and side-kick Hardy continue to drive down to play chess. Johnson is on hand as usual. Chapman came out of retirement to play against Log Cabin and just plain chewed up his opponent. If we hadn't lost Ed Czapski we would be doing fine. What happened to the Meyer-Kozen match? And who is the undisputed Champion of the CCCL? Jackson or Strob? The Executive Committee of the CCCL will meet at Oakdale the 3rd Sunday in September.

Does anyone have any suggestions for a new inexpensive meeting place????

COMMENTS
by Flynn

Wow! The Forty-Niners sure took those travelling Log Cabineers--41-11. The amazing part was that we all figured to lose for certain. But the team we lined up for the match was one of the best ever to represent Sacramento.

The Log Cabin club is from West Orange, New Jersey, and is composed of a group of live-wire chess fanatics who think nothing of travelling 8,000 miles to play across the country and back. They even get down into Mexico and up into Canada.

And they seldom lose. In 18 matches played on their 1949 tour, for instance, Log Cabin lost only two--Toronto and Dallas. But the best feature of these Log Cabineers is that they love chess and are first-rate sportsmen. When they lose a game or a match, they take it right in stride. And you never hear a complaint out of them. Just name the conditions of the match, and they accept without question.

In Reno, they had only six players and Reno had twenty. What did Log Cabin do? They said, OK, we'll play all twenty. And they did. Julius Partos played against 5 or 6 of Reno's best in a simultaneous and yielded only one draw. Julius, by the way, is something of a genius in several fields, and especially chess. He drew with J. B. Gee here, and the next night with Pafnutieff in San Francisco.

Howard Rideout, from Toronto, played second board and ran into a blitz by R. E. Russell. Russ has been resting up from chess, and apparently the vacation did him good. Rideout scored 7 out of 12 points in the U. S. Open at Fort Worth, and took 5th place in U. S. Open Speed Championship. Quite a scalp for Russell to add to his collection.

On Board 3, Log Cabin had George Partos, the second of the chess-playing brothers. His opponent was a gentleman, and lost to the visitors. Of course, he was outplayed in the ending which helped him be courteous. Who was this gentleman of our gang? None other than Messer George W. E. Pluribus Unum Flynn. Just by the by, if Editor Gee runs my game, what about 35...R-B1 (a tricky move) or 37...B-B5 (an obvious move, which draws, I think). You see, if we lose the game, we can always out-analyze them afterwards.

Board 4 had Milt Meyer playing E. Forry Laucks (who seems to be the spark-plug of the Log Cabin team). Milt was at his trickiest and developed an overwhelming attack. Although some present claimed Laucks could have drawn by perpetual check, I think Milt would have figured something out.

Board 5 was handled very ably by Bob Burger, who won in what I believe was his first clock game. Bob is a terrific player and my only hope is that he gets a chance to prove it one of these days in tournament play. He is going back to school near Chicago this fall, and maybe he can get some team play there.

Dick Chapman pulled some neat shenanigans in winning a piece from Ted Miller on Board 6. Ted, who is quite a guy, promptly sacrificed a second piece, hoping Chapman would blunder. But Dick is a little too steady for that.

Well, sir, all in all--it was a fine match and we do hope that Log Cabin comes back next summer, and probably they will. Maybe next time they'll bring along some extra-heavy guns, like Weaver Adams, for instance. Yes, Adams has played on their team.

And probably they'll give us a good trouncing. But we won't mind. Win, lose, or draw--they're a great gang to play chess with.

Oh yess, and one thing we particularly appreciated in the Log Cabin match. They handled the business end of it perfectly. They wrote J. B. Gee three weeks ahead of time, then wired him from Reno the day before, then called him on the telephone the minute they reached Sacramento. So there was no chance of a mix-up on the time and date of play. Details like that are what make the Log Cabin team so popular wherever they go.

WHO WAS THE GREATEST OF THEM ALL?

Neil Austin

As the modern era of boxing may be said to have begun with James J. Corbett, so may the modern era of Chess be said to have begun with Wilhelm Steinitz. Tournament and Match play as we now know them, together with the Time Limit, were developed during his reign as World Champion. With the exceptions of Morphy and Anderssen, there is no satisfactory yardstick to measure the great players of the pre-Steinitz period.

It would be easier to select the greatest player of Modern Chess, if it was only necessary to consider the five World Champions from Steinitz. But, due to the fact that Chess has not had much organization until recently, there were many great players who did not have an opportunity to play for the title. Also, even into Lasker's reign, there were players such as Zukertort and Tarrasch who were claimants of the Championship because of their tournament records. Therefore it is necessary to consider not only Steinitz, Lasker, Capablanca, Alekhine, Euwe, and Botvinnik, but also several of their contemporaries.

The first player to be considered would be, of course, the great Paul Morphy. As Knoch later said of Rubenstein, for a brief period he bestrode the chess world like a Colossus. Probably no other player ranked so far above his contemporaries as did Morphy. What other master could play five of his rivals in a simultaneous exhibition and get a plus score? Morphy instinctively understood the theory of the center, and therein lies his great contribution to Chess. In spite of his short career, and the general weakness of his opposition, he must be listed among the greatest. Perhaps the most convincing proof of this is to cite his superiority over H. E. Bird, who was still able to defeat Steinitz at Hastings thirty-five years later.

Adolf Anderssen, probably the greatest combinational player of all time, suffers by comparison with Morphy and Steinitz. However, he must be included in any list of great players.

With the possible exception of Alekhine, no master has contributed to the game as did Steinitz. Furthermore, he put his title on the line against every one of his chief rivals, which was in contrast to his successors. His superiority in match play was clear, but he was not the equal of Zukertort in tournament play and hardly superior to Tchigorin and Blackburne in this respect. Lasker concedes that his three great contemporaries were superior to Steinitz as players, but that Steinitz was able to win because of his greater knowledge of theory, in which he was the pioneer.

Zukertort, was one of the all-time greats, but suffers in comparison with Steinitz in that he was not able to defeat him in two matches. Tchigorin's greatness may be attested to by the fact that in sixty games against Steinitz, Steinitz had only a plus of three games. Blackburne had a great match and tournament record, but could never come close to Steinitz in their individual matches.

The early years of Lasker's reign are known as the Golden Age of Chess. Steinitz and Tchigorin were still active, Tarrasch and Pillsbury were in their prime, while Schlechter, Maroczy, Janowski, Teichmann, Charousek, and Marshall were becoming factors to be reckoned with. Of all these, probably only Tarrasch and Pillsbury deserve consideration among the greatest. Tarrasch might have been Champion had he felt able to travel to Cuba to meet Steinitz. Certainly, he was among the best of his time. He has probably done more for the average player than anyone else. He was the Great Chess Teacher. Unfortunately for him, he could not overcome Lasker.

(continued next page)

Like Morphy before him, Harry Nelson Pillsbury had a brief but brilliant career. For about seven years, he was among the world's best, then illness detracted from his play and he died at the age of 34. It was unfortunate that a match with Lasker could not have been arranged about 1900.

Emmanuel Lasker presents one of the great paradoxes of Chess. Despite his long and successful career, he left very few great games, no contributions to theory. Despite this, he ranks with the very greatest. Judging by results he was in a class by himself. He was 66 years old, in 1936, before he finished worse than third in a tournament. The only black mark against him was his loss of the title to Capablanca in 1921, after having held it for 26 years. Even then, he was able to come back at New York in 1924 and win against one of the strongest fields in history. It is interesting to note that of the ten tournaments listed by Reuben Fine as the most important of all time, Lasker won three of them, finished 3rd in one, and failed to win a prize in only one, Nottingham 1936. His great points were a tremendous fighting spirit, and his ability to steer through middle game complications.

About halfway through Lasker's supremacy, a new crop of greats appeared. Rubenstein, Vidmar, Tartakower, Bernstein, and Nimzowich were to vie with Capablanca and Alekhine in the future. Of these, Rubinstein and Nimzowich are the most deserving of consideration. Neither had an opportunity to meet the champion in a match. Rubinstein was nearly in a class by himself as a tournament player for a few years. He produced as many great games as any other player. However, his play was not consistent after about 1914, and his mind gradually failed.

Aron Nimzowich is mainly noted for his contributions to theory. He was also a great player, but could not quite equal Capa and Alekhine in results.

J. R. Capablanca, who succeeded Lasker, was probably the greatest natural player who ever lived. Until his declining years, when some of the younger players defeated him, no one had an equal score against him. He dominated every event he entered, and it was even thought that the rules should be changed because he had accomplished the ultimate in chess knowledge. His one drawback was mental laziness, and after winning the New York 1927 Tournament, he suddenly succumbed to Alekhine in a match.

Alexander Alekhine was probably possessed of a greater technique than any other player. His great love for the game caused him to develop mastery of every phase. He made more contributions to opening theory than anyone else. His middle game was superb, while his endgame play was surpassed by perhaps only Capablanca and Rubenstein, if at all. He was the greatest attacking player of all time, being rivaled only by Tchigorin in this respect. The weak spots in his armor were a love for the "cup that cheers", and an overwhelming vanity. These weaknesses caused his occasional downfalls, as his loss to Euwe in the 1935 match.

Other players such as Reti, Flohr, and Bogoljubow are worthy of mention, but never reached the heights attained by Alekhine and Capablanca.

Dr. Euwe surprised the world by his defeat of Alekhine in 1935. A great player, he was subject to blunders, and has seemingly lost much of his skill in recent years.

(continued next page)

Of the current crop of masters, it is too early to judge their ability. Fine and Reshevsky showed great promise, but the necessity of earning a living has proven a great handicap. Paul Keres flashed brilliantly for a few years, but, like Rubenstein, has not lived up to his early form. Botvinnik shows signs of being among the very great, but it is still early to judge.

To get back to the original question, it seems that the answer lies between Lasker, Capablanca, and Alekhine. Their match and tournament records over long periods are unsurpassed. Closer examination of the records of these three giants leads one to the conclusion that year in and year out, if tournaments or matches were to be won, not by producing the most masterpieces, but by winning the most games, the winner would be Lasker.

Below are in my opinion the first ten of all time.

1. Lasker
2. Alekhine
3. Capablanca
4. Steinitz
5. Tarrasch
6. Rubinstein
7. Morphy
8. Tchigorin
9. Pillsbury
10. Zukertort

Log Cabin C. C. vs Sacramento
August 10

<u>Log Cabin</u>		<u>Sacramento</u>	
1. Partos, J.	1/2	Gee, J. B.	1/2
2. Ridout, H.	0	Russell, R. E.	1
3. Partos, G.	1	Flynn, G. W.	0
4. Laucks, E. F.	0	Meyer, M. O.	1
5. Blankarn, H.	0	Burger, Bob	1
6. Miller, Ted	0	Chapman, A. R.	1
	1 1/2		4 1/2

Log Cabin had White on odd numbered boards.

Partos vs Gee.

1 P Q4	P Q4
2 P QB4	P K3
3 N QB3	N KB3
4 B N5	QN Q2
5 P K3	B K2
6 B Q3	0-0
7 PXP	NXP
8 BxB	QxB
9 1NxN	PxN
10 Q B2	N B3
11 N K2	P B3
12 0-0	B Q2
13 N N3	P KN3
14 QR K	N N5
15 P K4	Q R5
16 P KR3	N R3
17 R K3	QR K
18 KR K	P KB4
19 PxBP	RxR
20 RxR	NXP

21 BxN	BxB
22 Q B5	B K5
23 QxRP	Q B5
24 N R	Q N4
25 N N3	Q B5
26 N R	Q N4
27 N N3	Draw
	:30 :45

11 B N2	NXP
12 NxN	QxN
13 N B5!	R K
14 R K	K B?
15 BxPch	K N
16 Q N4	N K4??
17 N R6 mate	
	:24 :56

11 PxN	0 0
12 N K5	B Q4
13 B Q3	N B3
14 P KB4	NxN
15 BPxN	P QB4
16 B K2	Q R4
17 P B4	B QB3
18 P Q5	PxP
19 PXP	B Q2
20 Q N3	P QN4
21 P QR4	PxP
22 Q N7	Q Q
23 KR Q	B KN4
24 R R3	Q B
25 Q N2	R N
26 Q B2	R B6
27 RxR	PxR
28 QxNP	P QR4
29 R QB	P R5
30 Q R3	Q N2

Russell Vs Ridout.

1 P K4	P Q3
2 P Q4	N KB3
3 N QB3	QN Q2
4 N B3	P K4
5 P QR4	B K2
6 B Q3	P QB3
7 0-0	0-0
8 P QN3	PXP
9 NxP	P Q4
10 PXP	Q R4

Partos-Flynn.

1 P Q4	P Q4
2 P QB4	N KB3
3 N QB3	P K3
4 B N5	B K2
5 P K3	P KR3
6 B B4	B Q2
7 N B3	PXP
8 BXP	B B3
9 0 0	N Q4
10 B KN3	NxN

31 RXP Q N6 26 KR Q P KN3
 32 QxQ PxQ 27 K B2 R B2
 33 R B3 P N7 28 RXP BXPch
 34 R N3 BXPch 29 KxB Resigns
 35 B B2 B B8
 36 B Q4 R K Northern Calif. Ch.
 37 B Q3 P KN3 Capos vs Gee
 38 K B2 B B4 1 P K4 P K4
 39 BxB PxP 2 N KB3 N QB3
 40 P Q6 R Q 3 B N5 P QR3
 41 BXP BxB 4 B R4 N B3
 42 RxB P B3 5 N B3 P QN4
 43 P K6 RXP 6 B N3 B B4
 44 R N8ch K N2 7 O O P Q3
 45 P K7 Resigns 8 N Q5 B KN5

Blankarn-Burger
 1 P QB4 N KB3 11 QxB N N4
 2 N QB3 P Q4 12 N B6ch PxN
 3 P K3 P K4 13 QxNch K K2
 4 P Q4 PxQP 14 P Q4 B N3
 5 QXP N QB3 15 BxN PxP
 6 Q KB4 B K3 16 PxP Q Q2
 7 N N5 R QB 17 PxPch QXP
 8 P QN3 B N5ch 18 QR Kch K B3
 9 K K2 N KR4 19 Q B3ch Q B5
 10 Q KB3 Q Q2 20 Q R5 QR KB???
 11 P KR3 PxP 21 Q R6ch Resigns
 12 P QR3? Q-Q6mate :36 1:05

Chapman-Miller

1 P K4 P K4
 2 N KB3 N QB3
 3 P QB3 P Q3
 4 P Q4 B N5
 5 P Q5 N N
 6 B K2 BxN
 7 BxB N QR3
 8 P QN4 N KB3
 9 B N5 B K2
 10 N Q2 P KR3
 11 B K3 Q Q2
 12 B K2 P KR4
 13 P QR4 N N5
 14 B QN5 P QB3
 15 PxP PxP
 16 BxN NxB
 17 PxN Q N5
 18 QxQ PxQ
 19 O-O B N4
 20 N B4 K K2
 21 B N7 QR KB
 22 BXP QR QB
 23 P N5 P KB3
 24 QR Q KR Q
 25 R Q3 B R3

Hear Ye, Hear Ye, Hear Ye
 O Fearless Chessplayers!
 Robin Hood Chess Club of Worktop
 Nottinghamshire, England (near
 famous Sherwood Forest) challeng
 es the Sacramento Forty-Niners
 to a correspondence match. Any-
 one welcome to play a board. All
 moves can be handled in one air-
 mail letter or individually, as
 you wish. Call George Flynn at
 G1 3-4788 or G1 3-5284 if you'd
 like to tangle with a pen-pal
 from Merrie Old England!

Our local speed champ, Ralph
 Stagg, reports there are 169,
 518,829,100,544,000,000,000
 000 possible ways to play your
 first 10 moves in a game of chess.
 (Guess he's something of a math-
 ematician too) Also says he has
 tried all of 'em, no good!

Some of our better players still
 fail to turn in game scores.
 Are they bashful? Or just lazy?

How about some more special eve-
 nts at the Club some night?

Ye Ed would suggest a tournament of 5 minutes per
 game for each player, played by clocks of course.
 Let's have a "5 minute champion" of the club.

Does anyone else have any suggestions? I have the
 rest of this page to fill. Hate to waste paper!
 Guess I'll dig in the scrapbox and see what I find.

THE PRINCIPLE OF PROPORTION

(from B. F. Winkelman's MODERN CHESS)

Certainly no mistake is made in reading in the
 game those strategic principles which underlie
 every vocation and every aspect of life. Such is
 the principle of proportion beautifully expressed
 by Lasker.

Briefly, it means that the immediate objective
 should be proportioned to one's position, equality
 justifying an effort to turn the position slightly
 to our advantage, a slight advantage justifying
 an effort to obtain a larger advantage, and only
 decisive superiority permitting the bold bid for a
 win that generally culminates the game. Viewed
 rightly this principle reveals some of the mental
 processes underlying master chess in contrast to
 the game of the amateur.

One principle is clear--Dr. Tarrasch expressed
 it aptly many years ago. To play to win when the position does
 not contain winning elements is a sure road to defeat.

That's all for now