

PROFESSIONAL CHESS ASSOCIATION NEWSLETTER

Volume 1 Number 1, January 1978

THE FUTURE BELONGS TO THE CREATIVE MASTER AND TO AN ORGANIZATION WHICH WORKS IN UNISON WITH HIM—Emanuel Lasker.

Please send contributions or correspondence
PCA, BOX 1182, RENO, NEVADA 89504

This first newsletter is edited and compiled by Larry Evans.

PROPOSED PROFESSIONAL CHESS ASSOCIATION BYLAWS

Article I

Name and Principal Office

Section 1. Name. This organization shall be known as the Professional Chess Association (hereinafter referred to as the "PCA").
Section 2 Principal Office. The principal office of the PCA shall be located at such place as the officers of the PCA may from time to time designate.

Article II

Purposes and Objectives

Section 1. Purposes. The purposes of the PCA shall be:

- (a) To unite all chess professionals in a single association for the purpose of maintaining a representative and unified organization to consider, agree, and act upon all matters affecting the activities of its members.
- (b) To promote and protect the mutual interests of all chess pros.
- (c) To promulgate and enforce just and reasonable rules and regulations to govern the sport of chess in the USA.
- (d) To strive for the improvement of playing and working conditions generally, to regulate and correct abuses relative thereto.
- (e) To encourage the maintenance of minimum levels and continued growth of prize money, and to insure the just and equitable distribution thereof.
- (f) To raise and administer funds for the promotion of chess.
- (g) To act as collective bargaining agent for chess pros and chess journalists with the U.S. Chess Federation.
- (h) To furnish reliable information to its members with respect to matters of mutual concern.
- (i) To maintain and administer group insurance and pension plans.
- (j) To maintain jurisdiction over U.S. master chess events.
- (k) To select players and teams for international chess events.
- (l) To formulate and maintain ethical standards to govern the conduct of its members in their relations with each other and the public.
- (m) To develop programs through which the PCA and its members will derive further benefits and/or revenues.
- (n) To assist its members in securing employment.
- (o) To maintain training programs and workshops.
- (p) To develop chess talent and encourage excellence.
- (q) To publish and distribute bulletins of U.S. master events.

Article III

Membership

Section 1. Members. There shall be two classes of membership: voting and non-voting.

- (a) Any chessplayer is eligible for membership who has ever held a master rating (2200 or higher) on the Elo rating scale. This member is eligible to vote for officers upon payment of the annual dues.
- (b) Any chessplayer who derives a substantial portion of income from either teaching chess, organizing and directing events, or as a chess journalist. This member is not eligible to vote for officers but is entitled to all benefits of the PCA upon payment of the annual dues.

Article IV

Officers

Section 1. Election of officers and term. Five officers shall be elected for a term of two years until their successors are elected. These officers shall consist of a President, First Vice President, Second Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer.

Section 2. The property, affairs, activities and business of the PCA shall be managed and controlled by these five officers.

Article V

Meetings

Section 1. Annual meeting. The President shall call an Annual Meeting for the purpose of electing officers and transacting any other business that may arise.

Section 2. The quorum for the Annual Meeting shall consist of those members present in person.

Section 3. The rules contained in *Robert's Rules of Order* (revised) shall govern the PCA in all cases to which they are applicable.

Section 4 These bylaws may be amended at any Annual Meeting by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of those members present

The following statement was delivered by grandmasters Evans and Lombardy to the USCF Policy Board on November 20, 1977. It was an historic occasion: the first time that a delegation of masters met with the Policy Board. We expect these meetings to continue on a regular and permanent basis.

The Professional Chess Association and Promotion of Chess

A special drawing...for the cover of CL&R in July...depicts the theme of the USCF Membership Drive... 'be a USCF builder'— and shows eleven workers using bricks and mortar to build a giant USCF tower (Rook). The faces of the workers are caricatures of certain of our easily recognizable players, and we do not intend to exclude the most special group of all—the Grandmaster.. (Letter of Services Director Doris Thackrey to U.S. Grandmasters 5/18/77).

Many chess organizers seem to believe that masters have no right individually or collectively to participate in the USCF decision-making process, and that whatever masters receive is patronage or favor. They seem to forget that any real prosperity was due chiefly to the efforts of a chess professional: Bobby Fischer. This notion is not unique to the current CL&R editor but is expressed quite succinctly by him in his 10/10/77 Open Letter: "Fact: One might well ask what the master is doing for the USCF..." Presumably the obvious answer to this rhetorical question is "nothing" and that therefore any benefit filtering down from on high is pure privilege.

If such is the opinion of the membership in general, the Board of Delegates, the Policy Board, and the paid administration of the USCF, one might well ask precisely what the USCF has in mind when it uses, without consent, the images and names of U.S. grandmasters for the purpose of raising funds in a membership drive to benefit the USCF!

Since the editor seems unfamiliar with the services rendered to chess of our masters, let us simply list some of the deeds and accomplishments of the nine signers of our Open Letter of 9/20/77. We assume services rendered to chess are synonymous with advancing the cause of the USCF.

Larry Evans has been U.S. Champion 3 times, U.S. Open Champion 4 times, as well as a member of 9 Olympic teams including our World Champion squad at Haifa 1976. His books and columns are aimed at the general public and he has made countless mention of the USCF in his syndicated newspaper column. On 11/11/75 Executive Director Edmondson wrote: "Thank you for continually plugging USCF...Although we have not attempted to make an exact count, we feel that hundreds of our junior members came to us as a result of the exposure in your *Boys' Life* column."

Walter Browne is 3-time U.S. Champion whose tours promoted USCF and attracted valuable publicity such as a feature in *Sports Illustrated*. He has made the man-on-the-street aware of the existence of organized chess.

William Lombardy is a 3-time U.S. Open Champion, World Junior titleholder 1957, first board on our World Championship Student Team in 1960 and member of World Champion men's Olympic team in 1976. He was also instrumental in helping Fischer get the title by serving as his second in Iceland. Bill organized Catholic High School League in New York City, two NY City Junior Championships (the first) and served as our FIDE delegate at Dubrovnik 1958 where he obtained third qualifying space for U.S. in Interzonal — (subsequently lost).

Arthur Bisguier former U.S. Champion and U.S. Open Champion gave many exhibitions at schools on behalf of the USCF at bargain rates. He was also our FIDE delegate in Sweden 1955.

Ken Smith editor and publisher of *Chess Digest* promotes chess at a financial loss. He helped arrange San Antonio 1972.

Jack Collins is an author and teacher who is an inspiration to youngsters who flock to his door because he was Fischer's teacher. He brought three kiddie teams to the U.S. Team Championship.

Kim Commons has a brilliant future ahead and was a member of our 1976 World Champion Olympic team. He also captained the student team to Mexico City in 1977.

Richard Verber has tirelessly organized chess in the Chicago area, including a U.S. Open and a U.S. Closed Championship. He was Chairman of the Masters Affairs Committee and headed a CL&R Overview Committee at no pay.

Jude Acers is listed in the Guinness Book of World Records and has given countless free prison and hospital exhibitions. Single-handed he is doing more to promote chess in America than all the current USCF programs combined.

Why The Emergence of the PCA at this Moment in Chess History?

The Board of Delegates further determined that the first dollars of profit, if any, should go to restoring the recently suspended junior, college, and educational programs, rather than master chess. (Fred Townsend letter of 9/26/77 to the Board of Directors of the Northern California Chess Association)

This quote demonstrates concisely the current status of masters—pawns to be pushed about without any say. The master is the basic ingredient of all the programs mentioned; yet the programs were unilaterally established and then liquidated by non-masters who say the reestablishment of these programs will be given priority "rather than master chess"

At the annual membership meeting of the USCF at Lincoln, Nebraska in 1975 Col. Edmondson assured the membership that if the budget got tight master programs would be the first to be cut. The notion of masters-the-first-to-go is not new and recent USCF actions make it painfully obvious that masters are considered second-class citizens.

As if these quotes did not establish a case for the urgent need of unity among chess professionals, the past and present policies of the USCF loudly inform masters where their best interests lie: with an association whose avowed purpose is to promote chess with master interests as the major priority. All other groups have customarily placed the master last on the list.

Furthermore the PCA intends to exclude politics and maintain such objectivity as allows it to consider and accept new and worthwhile ideas from whatever source.

Whatever the good intentions of the USCF, the promotion of top level chess has been at best retarded. The USCF has never organized one great international tournament. Benefits received by masters must in the main be regarded as tokenism.

Chess rivalries have been exploited, creating jealousies which are intended to keep the masters disunited. (See Hochberg's "strange bedfellows" in reference to the 9 signers of our Open Letter.)

A system of favoritism impresses upon a master interested in writing for CL&R or in obtaining a title opportunity that he must quietly adopt USCF policy and attitudes—or else. That's called cooperation. If a master does not criticize or rock the boat he is coopted by being given a plum

At first grandmasters were specifically excluded from the Masters Affairs Committee by the Policy Board! Of course this committee has been a figurehead anyway. Then grandmasters whose "cooperation" was thought assured were invited to participate in their own affairs. Whatever the surface improvement over generally deplorable attitudes towards masters, the recommendations of this and other duly constituted committees continues to be ignored, shelved, or tabled for future discussion. A committee created and dissolved at will by the Policy Board clearly has no clout, can readily be ignored, and cannot do the work for which it was created. Puppet committees such as Masters Affairs ought to be dissolved.

Few masters thrive financially and those who do cannot attribute their "success" to USCF munificence or promotion. The recently retired Executive Director was heard frequently to lament that when he had help at the office he would be freed to do his real job—raising corporate funds. No one claims raising funds for chess is an easy task, but Col. Edmondson in possession of the required "help" for several years apparently failed to concentrate his efforts on corporate or any other kind of fund raising.

Instead he promoted division among masters by allowing himself to be quoted in *Sports Illustrated* to the effect that American grandmasters do not teach young stars (as in the case of Russia, according to Mr. Edmondson) because "Grandmasters are afraid the the young stars will take the bread out of their mouths." Even were his understanding of chess conditions in the USSR correct (which it is not) the remark must at best be construed as imprudent, coming from a USCF official charged with the task of unifying and promoting chess in America.

But this general USCF policy of dividing the masters neither began with Col. Edmondson, was peculiar to him alone, nor has it ceased with his retirement. Our editor now carries the banner. He questions our leadership because we dared to criticize him of all people. He tells us of Paul Keres' attempts to form an International Union Of Chessmasters. The bottom line is that although Keres did dream of such an idea there wasn't the slightest chance that his Federation would allow him to form such a group or even join it should it have become a reality. That is fact as any number of grandmasters more familiar with the situation and more personally acquainted with grandmaster Keres than Mr. Hochberg could attest. Paradoxically Mr. Hochberg who is "for" a PCA attempted to dissuade at least one master from joining the only group on record as specifically for the masters.

One member of the Policy Board boasts of how cheaply he has organized a couple of "international" events here at home. Since he is one of the few doing any work organizing toursneys, he may be the only light in the fog. Rather than boast, however, he ought to lament the "cheap" image chess receives from such "publicity" and the poor compensation masters receive for their input.

The U.S. Championship is either omitted or organized at the last possible minute with the natural result of little or no publicity. Even a USCF member could not have attended in 1977 because no notice ever appeared in CL&R.

American masters and grandmasters are given short notice in invitation to both home and foreign events—aside from the favoritism in the distribution of these invitations. To keep players on the hook as far as possible, invitations to events like the national championship and olympic teams are never firm until the very last moment. In some cases players needing practice are afraid to compete least their ratings drop and the invitations be withdrawn.

In the distribution of jobs of any nature, the USCF gives top priority to political considerations. For example, the newly created post of Services Director was unadvertised and a member of the Policy Board was bounced to the business office before anyone was aware of what had happened.

Chess needs the leadership of masters. Chess needs heroes whose status rests firmly on great chess feats, character and integrity. Such is the hero the chess world must use to attract people young and old to the game.

ATTEND THE ANNUAL PCA MEETING AT LONE PINE ON APRIL 8, 1978.

There is at present with the USCF not the least security for masters and no real voice in decisions concerning masters. Tokenism is the order of the day with regard to current administrative attitudes towards masters. The consistent hiring of foreign writers for CL&R when a U.S. master is available seems inconsistent in an organization laying claim to govern American chess and promote all levels, even if finances really do not permit the ideal promotion of top level chess.

Why should aspiring young players sacrifice and work for mastership when there are no prospects at the end of the rainbow? It seems we might better train more people for the position of Executive Director or some other paid post.

Contributors to CL&R who have legitimate objections or who raise disturbing questions are fired by administrators who feel threatened by criticism and would rather not give these objections a fair and open hearing. Such contributors are replaced by compliant masters.

Masters are generally denied ownership (copyright) of their articles for CL&R. Lombardy did not choose to give up his job as a columnist (as editor Hochberg states). Lombardy was fired by Edmondson at the very same time as a personal copyright notice appeared under the editor's bylined article *Just For Fun*. All this while the Policy Board stood by silently.

Jack Collins' column was dropped without explanation. Mr. Edmondson answered no letter on the matter from either Lombardy or Collins, and editor Hochberg made no firm offer in writing to Mr. Collins. The editor made a vague gesture at restoring a column only after someone stood up at the 1974 USCF Membership Meeting and inquired as to the fate of the column. What Mr. Collins expected was not some vague offer but the restoration of the column yanked from under him.

The USCF discriminates against international masters and grandmasters who feel that they should be compensated for their time by appearance fees, as is quite customary for stars in all major sports. Appearance fees were discontinued in the 1977 U.S. Championship without regard to or consultation with the players who were most affected by this decision. As a result some grandmasters boycotted the event, thus weakening the overall quality.

Illegal and unjust pairings are allowed to stand in spite of legitimate protest. Martin Morrison, the chief director of the 1977 Paul Masson tourney disclaimed any responsibility for an illegal pairing dealt to Walter Browne in the last round of the 1977 event. Both assistant directors verified in writing that Browne protested to Morrison beforehand, yet Morrison let the bad pairing stand and passed the buck. He even denied that Browne protested beforehand.

There are rules for members, but the same rules take a different slant for administrators. The case of the "Experts Prize" at the 1977 U.S. Open is very much to the point. The winner of the Expert Prize tied with several others; the rule was that all prizes were to be pooled and divided equally. Mr. Morrison decided arbitrarily to give the Expert Prize only to the expert and divide the remaining funds to those who tied with him, thus resulting in less money for all the others. If Morrison believes the existing rule to be unfair which it may be, then he has an obligation to change the rule—not violate it.

Rules have never been properly enforced. In the Evans-Kashdan dispute over a last round airing at Lone Pine in 1975 the USCF Appeals Committee issued a 4-page ruling stating that they couldn't decide who was right!

Professional players are ignored as candidates for the title of International Arbiter or FIDE delegate. There is no understanding that these offices may lengthen the professional life of a master. A new avenue of income would be opened, allowing a master to utilize his vast experience and stay with chess. Political patronage seems to hold sway here as in other areas.

Because of past indifference great masters of legendary fame have lived under appalling conditions: Steinitz, Emanuel Lasker, Schlechter, Yates and Alekhine spring to mind. Must our American pros go the same route? Is one to be blackballed as a radical, as against the USCF when one struggles for reform and a change in conditions that have stifled the American chess pro in modern times? If criticism is to meet with reprisals, as the firing of Larry Evans so eloquently demonstrates, then the USCF is no better than the other Federations on which it has heaped the term "dictatorship" over these many years.

There appears to be a lack of administrative ability at the top resulting in a policy of guillotining rather than that of encouraging normal discussion, bargaining and compromise. Total and unquestioned control from the top seems to have been the basic objective. This is certainly not the criticism of one or two masters, but of a large number of chess notables. One would expect that this approach to USCF problems could not possibly continue, yet the shapers of USCF policy are full of surprises.

Clearly, in whatever areas masters may disagree with each other they must unite to promote chess. A union of chess professionals will do much to combat the iron grip of a bureaucracy which is interested chiefly in the perpetuation of its own power rather than the good of the game. The PCA joined with a strong USCF, each recognizing the other's goals, problems and ideals, can promote chess beyond limit.

EDITORIAL

Around 100 people have already indicated a willingness to join the PCA. We feel the organization should not be limited to masters, but that it should also be open to organizers and journalists who devote a good portion of their time to the game and derive an income from it.

Our meeting with the USCF Policy Board was productive in the sense that they recognized the need for a PCA and agreed to work closely in consultation with us. The points discussed on the agenda were as follows: #1. PCA Proposes that master events be placed under its jurisdiction and that 10% of the gross USCF income (in addition to other funds raised) be used to support these activities. (This item will probably meet with the most resistance and must be voted upon by the Delegates.) #2. Central booking bureau for lectures and exhibitions. (Agreed upon in principle, although the details must be worked out.) #3 Reform of weekend Swisses. (The Policy Board passed a resolution that certain events which meet PCA guidelines and offer free entry to masters will receive a favored status and have a special border in CL&R. The idea is to encourage organizers to hold quality events. We proposed that the USCF sweeten the kitty by adding \$1,000 to the top section. Hopefully a pro will be able to follow the surf and compete in 52 tournaments a year which offer decent prize money. Class prizes are entrenched, but the PCA can demand that a certain proportion of entry fees go directly to the top, and possibly even that no class prize should be greater than the last prize in the top section.) #4. In-house money policy: USCF job preference to masters if their qualifications match those of other applicants. (Agreed to in principle, though it remains to be seen how the USCF will implement this policy.) #5. A policy of using titled players as FIDE delegates who can serve double-duty by also competing while abroad. (This again met with no serious opposition, but we have to keep plugging away at it.) #6. A review of *Chess Life* editorial policy, budget, and its future as a house organ or recruitment tool. (No time to discuss this in depth. However the Policy Board agrees that American masters and writers should be used in preference to foreign contributors. The PCA also intends to act as a collective bargaining agent to negotiate minimum page rates. Furthermore no writer should suffer reprisals for dissent.)

Edward Lasker who just turned 92 said that he gladly joins the PCA. We quoted him in our Open Letter of 9/20/77: "The USCF has an historic opportunity to resolve an age-old conflict between organizers and masters, so vividly sketched by Dr. Edward Lasker in *THE ADVENTURE OF CHESS*: Like its counterpart in too many other countries, the German Chess Federation was run by politicians who were mainly interested in their own glory... Since more votes come from mediocre players than from masters, these politicians would always cater to the little vanities of local chess talent rather than make an effort to advance the cause of master chess. When they derided Em. Lasker because he had stipulated a fee for playing in any tournament, he reminded them that Steinitz had died in poverty; and he added that he would do all in his power to raise the financial status of professional chessmasters throughout the world."

The USCF? All master programs were suspended for lack of funds, yet administrators got raises. USCF gross income was \$1,300,300 from which they succeeded in losing around \$40,000. Although they refuse to release the aggregate amount of raises given to office personnel, it seems to correspond closely to this \$40,000 loss for the year.

Already the attempt has been made to blame this loss on our masters.

WHAT OTHERS SAY: EDITORIALS AND LETTERS

Scott Chadwick, Madison, WI.

I think the pro tour idea is the key to the entire problem. I am not a master player but I am working on it. So what you are talking about is of interest to me. I've won enough plastic chess sets and \$30 first prizes to make me very concerned about the future. Everyone is out for themselves in this world, and if chess players don't stick up for what we have given our lives to, who will?

I'll give you all the support you allow me to. Please tell me what I can do.

(Ed note: This is the most common response. All that you can do right now is participate actively in the PCA, run for office, try to raise money from local corporations to sponsor chess events. Above all, contribute whatever you can to help support the cost of this newsletter and to get the PCA off the ground. If masters don't help themselves, nobody else will.)

Former U.S. Champion Arnold Denker, Fort Lauderdale, Fl.

Just got back from months in Spain and happy to see that you are finally doing something to get chess on a better footing here in the States. It is a pity you didn't join me when there was still some money left in the Treasury, but maybe it is not too late.

Ralph Berton, North Bergen, N.J.

The ratfight in the USCF is a mess. How hateful to decent people are all political scraps—and it always smells worse when the antagonism occurs within a milieu that should be "above" all such behavior: the arts, chess, etc.

Arpad Elo, Brookfield, WI:

I have followed your dispute with Hochberg & Co. and your complaints to USCF with a great deal of interest and with sympathy. Let me know what I can do to support the PCA. Do you have some membership fee?

There is a serious malaise within USCF, but it is one thing to point at the symptoms and another to point the causes and the cure. Perhaps the whole thing is a matter of leadership. We have had a leadership dedicated to self-aggrandization and which frittered away the greatest opportunity ever presented to any chess organization. Is it any wonder then that so many faithful workers for chess have been turned off?

Concerning CL&R: It tries to be everything to everyone and manages to become only a hodge-podge. I think USCF could afford to publish 2 journals, one analytical along the lines of *Chess Digest* for the serious player and one devoted to the educational, social and cultural aspects of chess—with an appeal to the tens of thousand cursorily interested in the game. A USCF member could be given a choice of either journal and both journals for an extra charge. Many professional societies have similar arrangements—and with smaller membership than USCF. Needless to say you would need very competent people in the editorial posts. (By the way, do you know of any high grade national chess journal whose editor is less than of master stature—and not a high level master at that? It is rather a joke to have a Class A player edit a national magazine.)

Concerning USCF representation in FIDE: FIDE delegates are fully aware of the problems in USCF and of the financial scandals, so the federation, or at least the "permanent" delegate is not held in high esteem. An the zonal president, a provincial organizer, is regarded as just another mouth for the delegate. We need in FIDE, as a representative, a respected senior master who will regain the respect of the other FIDE delegates for USCF and its policies, and not a conman type playing games.

I regret to write that you will not get very far with your grievances with the Policy Board. The controlling majority on the board are also provincials with a very narrow outlook and very fearful of making significant decisions. They may be dedicated people, but as far as I can see they are dedicated only to the preservation of their own political power. They are more an obstacle to any progress than innovators of fresh ideas.

Harry Radke, San Jose, Ca.

I agree totally with everything stated in your Open Letter and would definitely like to belong to the PCA. The existence of ripoff chess organizers is all too clear here in the Bay area. Although the San Jose/Santa Clara areas are blessed with true promoters like John Sumares and Francisco Sierra (who go out of their way to guarantee substantial prize funds for top masters, even taking on big losses), we are surrounded by half-assed organizers. These people, notably the organizers of the Central Calif. Chess Association, have completely alienated masters and amateurs alike—lining their pockets in the process. Speaking personally, these power-made patzers told me that I would not be allowed to play in Bay area tournaments unless I joined their organization, which does absolutely nothing except distribute a rag for F-players. They told me this with gleeful expressions on their faces, despite the fact that I offered to play in tournaments at the regular entry fees (I could not afford more, since I was working as a janitor at the time).

Baseball and Football are geared to the promotion and glorification of their best—so why shouldn't chess? The money is there, as you pointed out in your letter, even with the absurd promotional schemes and priorities established by the USCF. CL&R should be altered by 90%. Your association is long overdue.

Peter Cleghorn, Berkeley, Ca.

I think the tennis pro association might be contacted so that their boycott be studied to see if these tactics could be adapted to chess. Second, I believe broadening your base is essential. There are many lovers of chess who have been successful enough in business or other endeavors to be relatively envy free. Some way should be found to seek them out and involve them. Incidentally, it seems to me that the strongest force behind the notorious class prize was, and is, envy. This force is difficult to combat because few people are honest enough to admit it, even to themselves.

Robert Snyder, Garden Grove, Ca.

I earn 100% of my income from chess related activities. I teach 4 nights a week at local colleges, give lessons, write articles, hold simuls and lectures. I refuse to play in any more USCF tourneys because over the years I feel that I have been given the shaft. Over the last few years my rating has fluctuated between 2210 and the low 2300's. Because of high costs, hard work (both in playing and preparing) and few financial returns, I simply consider it un worthwhile to play in these events, or to even try and spend the time increasing my rating. With a 2255 rating I must seek other ways (which I actually enjoy) to earn a living and play chess. I have started International correspondence play against foreign masters. It gives me the competition and at a fraction of the cost. I'm not interested in an occasional tournament with good prizes, paid expenses, appearance fee. I want to see these offered on a regular enough basis to make a living from them. Until this I won't even consider a USCF event at all. I can tell you that it will take a tidal wave to change things very quickly.

Arthur Dake, Portland, Or.

I know the story well. In the 30's I was a professional chess player for about 7 years. When Helen and I were married, little did I realize that money was just not there to support a family, especially when our daughter was born.

However I must say that through chess I had the opportunity to meet people who were wonderful to us. As you know, I taught chess in Milwaukee for one year at their public high schools and senior citizen centers in the evening. I did have to give this position up, because during the summer months we received no compensation when school was out.

So we went back home to Portland and worked for the Department of Motor Vehicles for 30 years. When we were married at the New York City Hall Al Horowitz and Carolyn Marshall "stood up for us." Frank Marshall at that time shook his head. At the time I did not realize why. But he realized that my chess career because of financial reasons (no money in chess to support a family) would end.

Frank Szarka, co-editor of Canadian Chess Chat.

The Canadian Chess Federation on a meeting where top level players' participation in chess affairs was recommended, voted that no pros can be elected for office! So, the same story: no support. The Canadian Chess Federation probably is a carbon copy of the USCF.

Michael Valvo, West Orange, NJ.

Count me in. I think we ought to get started immediately! We will need to be chartered nationally, etc. For this to work everyone will have to get involved. Organize in all sections of the country, but let's get something rolling now. We will need money. Should there be a fee to join? I think so. And not just \$20. More like \$50 at least. Establishing market areas and PR ought to be up front considerations.

(Not one of the chess patrons contacted even responded to our plea. Our first goal is to establish an annual Masters' Open where every participant receives an appearance fee. I don't think we should use our dues to promote tournaments, but we are investigating a group life insurance policy to cover accidental death as one of the immediate benefits as soon as the amount of dues is voted upon at our first meeting in Lone Pine on April 8, 1978.)

Lindsay Phillips, El Paso, Tx.

I am convinced that Professional chess and Amateur chess need to be distinctly separated. Pro chess needs to be organized along lines similar to the Pro Golf Association with a pro tour open to pros only. Open events can still be help, as they are now, where both pros and amateurs compete.

The pro game in order to appeal to mass spectators may have to undergo some radical changes. For example, (a) Short time controls. (b) No agreed draws! (c) No adjournments and no seconds. (d) A maximum wall clock time per game, after which it is declared a draw independent of material. (e) One hour blitz. If your flag falls before your game is complete, you lose.

I am firmly in favor of a PCA. Whether it should be a part of the USCF or independent is a question which needs long and careful thought. It will take long and careful consideration of these and many other factors to bring a PCA into being, but I believe the requirement is immediate and the effort worth the misery.

Rob Salgado, Burbank, Ca.

I am continually amazed by the number of people I meet who are familiar with chess on at least a casual basis. Probably the potential public interest is much greater than most of us suspect. I also remember *Chess Review* and what a fine publication it was. I agree something along those lines—a picture chess magazine—would attract many people.

Danny Kopec, Edinburgh University, Scotland

I agree with everything you stated in your Open Letter. But how can I be sure the same prejudices you state will not occur between one group of masters and another? How can I know that your goals, especially player selection to international events, will not keep endorsing the same people who signed the letter? Does dirty politics have to rule chess too?

(Ed. Note: All we can do is seek quality leadership and hope for the best. Players who want a crack at international titles should submit their names and, based on their qualifications, will be selected on a rotating basis. It is certainly not grandmasters who need international invitations—they already get all expenses paid and usually have to turn down invitations. Most organizers abroad will accept a high-rated untitled player provided that an American grandmaster accompanies him to the event. We have to work to organize more strong international tournaments at home.)

Ross Williams, syndicated chess columnist for the Copley chain

Although my playing may not be up to master level, my respect for chess is very high. I know of no sport that does more to develop fine qualities in youth than chess.

I'm not sure what USCF is doing about chess. They're funding some programs, I guess. I don't know what they are or how much money is allotted to each one. I wrote a letter to them once asking for some better accounting for how USCF spends our money, and perhaps we need a better control over who decides how much will be spent.

I recently received a letter from top players condemning USCF policies relating to masters, and I must agree. USCF must do more to support master programs. If we don't show the youngsters that being a master means something, what's to compel young players to strive to be a master?

I'd like to see USCF push to have chess recognized as a scholastic sport in the U.S. If chess were recognized nationally as a sport, there would be funds in modest amounts available at every school level to support chess activities. This might provide at least part time employment to many masters.

What couldn't the federation use \$150,000 to provide, say, 3000 per year to the top 50 eligible professional masters in the U.S? This would supplement their other income. With that added yearly support, many of those masters might be able to make a modest living playing chess. But more important, with the time they would spend to earn the money these masters could train promising young players, give exhibitions to promote chess, help with new school programs that would lead to regular employment later perhaps.

Would something like this help the masters? All it takes is a realignment of present USCF priorities.

Excerpt of a letter from Mike Thomas, a tournament director, which appeared in NORTHWEST CHESS, November 1977.

Our national chess federation, the USCF, as has been noted many times in the past, appears to be in considerable difficulties. These problems stem from a declining membership and, in my humble opinion, from a national publication that in a vain attempt to be everthing for everybody has degenerated into the worst English language chess magazine in the world. Especially disgusting are the repeated attempts to create a personality cult around the young juniors: i.e., Joel Benjamin and Michael Wilder

In a chess tournament in Olympia Viktors Pupols claimed a win on time and then guess what? The TD committed a number of errors, intervening illegally and making several blatantly illegal decisions. Uncle Vik, no novice in these matters, decides to appeal the decisions. I saw the reply from USCF which Uncle Vik received. Point by point the impropriety of the TD's decisions was made. Nothing the TD had done in this matter, according to the USCF, was legal. BUT... Uncle Viktors was several days past the deadline for his appeal, through no fault of his own. Tough luck—appeal overturned, TD upheld. Great! A triumph for justice and fairplay, folks.

You've been wondering what can be done to increase the membership in USCF Mr. Morrison? Let me give you my opinion. Just one person. An insignificant statistic from out west.

I no longer believe that anything can be done to prevent the present federation from dying. I think it is the victim of a debilitating disease, sometimes known as bureaucratic incompetence. The incredible rigidity with which it meets problems and challenges will ultimately alienate more and more members, finally ending in the formation of a new, more vital and responsive association. It is impossible upon reading *Chess* from England or the *British Chess Magazine* not to note how much more alive and interesting these publications are. Even with sea mail delaying these publications for a month or more, they remain more current than CL&R.

I can say one thing which is not mere opinion. I personally know of at least 25 USCF members who feel as I do—that it is time for a change.

James Schroeder, Cleveland, Ohio.

It is the duty of an Editor to protect the members from the officials. The editor of CL&R should encourage members to write letters opposing "official" positions on everything. Considering that Hochberg is a petty, ignorant, ~~_____~~ I don't see how CL&R will ever be a good magazine as long as he is editor. In fact, I have never seen a good magazine that was not edited by a master.

Alan Benson about the illegal pairing received by Walter Browne at the 1977 Paul Masson Tourney directed by USCF Executive Director Martin Morrison, author of THE OFFICIAL RULES OF CHESS.

I wish to state that I alone made the original mistake in the color allocation given to the pairing of the Grefe-Browne game in accordance with rule 21 and further substantiated by rule 10.

To complicate matters further, Mike Goodall checked my incorrect pairings and found them to be correct...As both Mike and I aspire to become National Tournament Directors this is a black mark against our records.

In your September 9 letter to us you state the following: "Although no appeal was lodged at the time by Browne so that the matter might have been adjusted, and therefore it is too late to do anything about the allocation, I thought that it would help for the future to review for you two, as assistant directors who did the pairings for the Master Section, what the mistake was." You go on to further state in your Sept. 20 letter to Mr. Acers: "I should point out that Browne did not protest the pairing before beginning play. If he had, it would have been quickly rectified. His appealing to me, as the chief director to overrule the decision of two of the assistant directors would have been a very simple matter and one which would have been fully in accord with the rules. Unfortunately, Browne did not even mention the matter to me until several weeks after the tournament (I suspect he did not even reach his conclusion until then)."

I am greatly upset and surprised over two things that you have done. First, your refusal to accept any responsibility as chief director and organizer for the mistakes made by Mike and myself. Would a General blame his soldiers for the loss of a battle? Second, your insistence that there was no protest lodged by Walter Browne before the beginning of the last round.

I honestly must speak against you in this matter and say for the record that Walter Browne did indeed protest to you as chief tournament director the correctness of his color allocation for the pairing against John Grefe in the last round of the Paul Masson Chess Tournament 1977. There is one thing above all that I have always greatly admired in Walter Browne's character and that is his devotion to the truth.

Will I be able to say the same about you? "In truth there are no deadlines."

(Ed note: Cover-up and buck passing—that's the kind of leadership the USCF provides. Martin Morrison, the supreme authority on chess rules Evans was forbidden to discuss rules in his column has never played a tournament chess game in his life. There is simply no proper enforcement of rules, and players currently have very little recourse against arbitrary acts of officials.)

Shelby Lyman in his syndicated chess column.

With rare exceptions, chess players, like most actors, artists and writers, are unable to make a living from their chosen field. Therefore it is not surprising that the recent actions by the deficit-ridden U.S. Chess Federation to curtail or eliminate writing and teaching fees paid to chessmasters has proven to be a proverbial last straw.

THE CHESS ARTS #53 September-October 1977.

The details of the Evans firing from *Chess Life & Review* will be detailed in the next issue. I recommend that you get to your typewriter and complain about this since it was the most popular item in CL&R. If you want to, you can recommend that Hochberg be fired instead. He's obviously very heavy handed in running a magazine that isn't even his!

CHESS VOICE Vol. 10 No. 5 October-November 1977.

Larry Evans starts union, gets fired from CL&R...In proposing his new masters' union, Evans also levied some sharp criticism at USCF policy decisions and at the editing of CL&R, describing the magazine as "a censored house organ catering chiefly to tournament players." He was particularly upset that while his own salary was being cut by 25% as an "economy measure" Hochberg was getting a 25% raise.

Hochberg replied, denying the accuracy of many of Evans' charges, and accusing him of masking his personal greed under a cloak of concern for "starving masters." Evans responded in kind. And then came Hochberg's letter dismissing Evans from the CL&R staff.

Evans' firing as a columnist may have come about for exactly the reasons given by Hochberg (failure to agree to the proposed terms by the specified deadline). But its timing is bound to raise the spectre of establishment retaliation.

Andrew Soltis in the New York Post 11/5/77.

The hottest controversy in American chess since Bob Fischer forfeited the world championship boiled over last week when grandmaster Larry Evans was fired as a columnist for *Chess Life & Review*. The dispute, fueled with charges of unionbusting, censorship and nepotism, has the nation's leading masters and organizers lining up on either side.

Since Evans began answering analytical questions from readers 11 years ago, his column has been rated the most popular item in CL&R, the only truly national magazine devoted to the game. But there has been bad blood between Evans and editor Burt Hochberg since the Fischer forfeiture in 1975. Hochberg ran several articles in the magazine supporting Fischer's proposed match conditions. Evans was the only CL&R writer to attack Fischer's proposals.

Evans told Hochberg he was "whitewashing" Fischer. Hochberg said Evans was antagonizing readers and that, as a house organ of the USCF, the magazine had a right to be biased in Fischer's favor.

Matters came to a head last week when Hochberg told Evans his column was being terminated this month because of his refusal to sign the contract Evans, however, said he as being fired in retaliation for his unionizing activity.

Meanwhile, Evans said he will sue the USCF for \$1 million and that he has favorable responses to his masters union from 60 top-rated players. Hochberg said he would give Evans' magazine space to other masters.

Editorial Excerpt from Illinois Chess Bulletin, December 1977

On The Importance of Being Hochberg

All is not well with CL&R. You may have noticed in your November issue that both columns by Larry Evans were missing. You see, Hochberg fired him. It did not come as a complete surprise; there has been cause for genuine grievances among many USCF masters in recent months, and much of the discontent is centered about CL&R's editor Burt Hochberg. Tension between Hochberg and Evans has been building since Evans' criticism of the Fischer match conditions and the bloated, logic-defying Kalme article defending Fischer, a piece of rubbish that would embarrass a Jesuit with its tortuous syllogisms. To many of us attending the CL&R workshop in Columbus last August, this meeting was not just a harbinger: it was a prophecy. The very mouthpiece who most criticized Evans there, Chairman of the puppet Masters Affairs Committee, will get a byline along with others of his ilk in a new feature called *Ask The Masters*.

The dismissal of Evans was shabby; salary negotiations were still in progress. On Nov. 20 Larry Evans together with GM Wm. Lombardy addressed the USCF Policy Board about the formation of a Professional Chessplayers Association. The PB expressed their hope that Hochberg and Evans might reach agreement and USCF Treasurer Peacor was appointed arbiter with a year's end deadline. Evans will return to CL&R in March with a fresh column of considerable length whose scope will not be restricted to analytical questions and with the freedom to speak out on chess subjects without the reprisal of editorial finger shaking.

It is not Evans alone, but a considerable number of masters who feel they have been cut off from the USCF decision-making process. Not so ironically, it is not the masters alone who share this view. Decision making in the USCF, an organization which characterizes itself as democratic, has long been monopolized, not by its delegates nor even its Policy Board, but by individuals like Ed Edmondson, and more recently by Burt Hochberg who carries the Edmondson banner.

Many of the issues involve the CL&R editor directly; others are the responsibility of the Policy Board which lately has demonstrated a unique penchant for silence and non-action on almost every issue... The actions of Hochberg do little to restore confidence in an organization badly in need of a new direction.

ATTEND THE ANNUAL PCA MEETING AT LONE PINE ON APRIL 8, 1978.

Letter of December 15, 1977 from Larry Evans to USCF Treasurer Norman Peacor

The editor has not contacted me once since the meeting in New Windsor last November 20. He has broken his word about every item we discussed. He has not submitted the proposed wording for the January issue announcing that my columns will be returned in March, as the Policy Board instructed him to do. Moreover, my unopened mail has not been forwarded to me from the Business Office as Martin Morrison promised; nor has the Editor forwarded my opened mail in his possession, as he said he would. Their actions in this matter are clearly unlawful.

In the December 1977 issue of *Chess Life & Review* there is a bylined article by a weak chessmaster, Larry D. Evans, which is clearly an attempt to give readers the impression that I am still writing for the magazine. Evans is to have a continuing series, which is okay with me provided he uses his middle initial as his first name and omits "Larry". The actors guild forbids members from using names of stars.

The editor's malice has even extended to Classifieds on page 664. My workshop notice was to run for 3 consecutive issues (November, December, January) along with free ads for all grandmasters as USCF policy. After appearing in November my notice was suddenly cancelled, although the other free ads for grandmasters are still there!

Is the Policy Board aware of the editor's outside sources of income derived from his use as editor of *Chess Life*? Not only is he in competition with various masters for magazine and publishing posts, but he is using our chess magazine as a power base now that he has control of the budget for the first time in 11 years.

The editor is involved in massive conflicts of interest. His personal animosity for me is based on the fact that I stand in his way and occupy pages in the magazine that he wants to give to clique of second-rate New York masters whom he probably intends to represent in book contracts. He is building up their names via the magazine.

The editor has already acted as agent for Kaplan and Shamkovich for books they are doing at David McKay. And he has business dealings with David Levy whom he has recently signed to do a column "Letter from Europe" when this money should be going to an American master instead.

There is no way that the editor can exploit me or make a profit as my agent. Significantly, he has hidden the fact that I was fired from the readers. His sneaky use of a column by Larry D. Evans in December is designed to forestall criticism so that he can say: "Look, we removed Larry Evans' columns from the magazine and very few readers complained."

When he announced on page 631 that Robertson Sillars was discontinuing his column, why didn't he take the opportunity to inform the readers that I was terminated? In 1972 why didn't he publish all the games of the U.S. Championship in the magazine, which is customary? Because he published a book *Title Chess* with his cohort Jeffrey Kastner: if readers could get the games free it would have hurt sales of his book which was about the 1972 U.S. Championship. Quite a coincidence.

Anyone who opposes him like Lombardy or Collins or myself suddenly becomes an un-person. They are destroyed by everlasting silence. Now he is dragging his feet on my contract, hoping that time will work in his favor. He has even defied the express wishes of the Policy Board, and pretended to be confused as to exactly what your role is. All his palaver about "normal editorial control" is a smokescreen. He has been harassing me in an attempt to make me quit. When that tactic failed, he fired me on a flimsy pretext that fools nobody.

You have all the facts in your possession and are the official mediator appointed by the Policy Board. The editor has disobeyed specific instructions put to him by the Policy Board; time is getting short for me to submit my columns for March. Can we reach an agreement or not?

I was fired for political reasons pure and simple. If the Policy Board allows Martin and Burt to provoke a legal confrontation, then I have no alternative except to turn the entire matter over to my lawyer.

The following petition was signed by hundreds of USCF members in California and submitted to the Policy Board:

We are disappointed to learn that Larry Evans has been terminated by the editor of CL&R because Evans refused to knuckle under to the massive censorship imposed on his column. He is also being punished for attempting to reform the USCF and organize a PCA. We believe that Larry Evans should be free to answer any question he chooses and that CL&R should be a democratic, uncensored magazine reflecting all points of view. We want EVANS ON CHESS not bureaucrats on chess. We demand that Evans be reinstated and that a new editor be installed for the magazine. We don't want chess politics to determine what is published.

Walter Browne, Berkeley, Ca.

I would like first of all to clear up any misconceptions you may have due to Burt Hochberg's thoughtless reply to Evans' letter about the Masters' association. He states "Walter Browne, whose face appeared on CL&R covers more times than Farrah's on the *Enquirer* and who was the beneficiary of free full page advertising for his tour, was never refused when he offered articles."

Whenever I got my picture on CL&R it was for winning a strong tourney and I won many tourneys that were barely mentioned. In November 1962 Reshevsky got his picture on the cover when they learned he was participating in the U.S. Championship! Fischer got his picture on many times when he hadn't won a strong tourney. The simple fact is that in the last 6 years I've won more tourneys than anyone in this country. Burt Hochberg did not accept one of my articles on one occasion and many times completely changed the meaning of some things I wrote.

Hochberg also says that the USCF arranged tours for U.S. masters taking up a lot of executive time and talent, not to mention huge phone bills. On my last nationwide tour I arranged everything including a \$400 phone bill. I even sent in the ad which was used. The USCF did send me a small list from a prior tour of mine which never got off the ground which I do appreciate. The tour lasted two months after shaking thousands of hands and answering countless questions and going through Montana which was out of the way just to promote chess even though I almost fell off a cliff the next day rushing to my next exhibition. My poor results in the Interzonal were connected with this inhuman effort.

In my most recent article in September '77 he put my name in lower letters and put International Grandmaster next to my name as if nobody knew who I was. He also cut out a part of my article for reasons he didn't care to explain. I've only written once in the last two years and don't intend to write anymore due to the biased attitude of Burt Hochberg.

The Soviet, Yugoslav and Hungarian Championship have 20 to 22 players regularly so that the best player will emerge to represent them in a zonal year. I know this is not possible within the budget, but a ten player double round robin is. Since there would be only 10 players you would save approximately \$1200 on airfare, \$1,000 on food, and be able to up the prizes. It would also save on hotel expenses. I think that the fee of \$500 for defending champ should be reinstated and fees for all GMs if possible. Remember how popular the last Piatigorsky was? With increased first prize the media may take more of an interest.

I support the idea of a Masters' association for several reasons, especially because they will tackle the idea of soliciting corporate funds very energetically. I think a fixed amount of USCF funds should go to the Masters' association where they can deal with Master problems. I also agree that someone should check ratings thoroughly as I've found many mistakes in the computation of my rating.

Ed note: Experts tell us that the USCF paid through the nose for an inferior computer setup. We should press for an independent audit of the rating system at least once a year.

Helen Warren, editor of APCT, Western Springs, Il.

What was interesting—and important—I thought was the meeting of the CL&R workshop preceding the delegates meetings. In my judgment Hochberg had the place stacked. Mr. Kastner, chairman of the Masters Affairs Committee, began a heated attack on Larry Evans, calling his column carelessly prepared, amateurish, and unworthy. Mr. Hochberg listened in careful attention and many of us were astonished. I believe the meeting was choreographed by Mr. Hochberg.

Three of us, Bob Dudley, Paul Shannon and I, spoke up in your defense while Hochberg talked about "personality conflicts." Hochberg wants a Madison Avenue survey to the run of \$4,000 which will poll the readership to determine what they want in CL&R.

He also spoke of the likelihood of hiring Robert Byrne to do a column. When it was asked of him, "How does this square with belt-tightening? You get two extra pages by condensing Tournament Life, you have cut other writers, and instead of restoring features with your extra pages, you talk about hiring another columnist." This met with no satisfactory answer. Hochberg several times invited the audience to "write to Larry Evans if you find something amiss in his column." I found Kastner's remarks gross and offensive, and frankly I think if I were of the male persuasion I would have punched him in the mouth. Most regrettable throughout was the silence of Edmondson. Bush league, baby.

I think you might find the Thackrey report on CL&R a basis for discussion: Hochberg endorsed it 100%. It summarizes the philosophy of elitism that has become CL&R's hallmark. The FACT is that the great majority of editors, columnists, chess writers in general on the state and local levels disagree with this approach and endorse your position. MOST of them are wary of voicing their opinions in their own pages for fear of alienating New Windsor.

Frankly, I am pessimistic about CL&R as a recruitment tool for USCF. And there is no reason to think Hochberg will have a change of direction. All the sound recruitment techniques of Lynne Babcock will go down the drain unless USCF can offer a magazine of broader appeal, more human and humane emphasis, and some decent promotional and public relations programs.

Steven Buntin, Chapel Hill, NC.

The firing of Larry Evans from CL&R is undoubtedly a bad thing for American Chess. The foreign press will have a field day with this. I have used my most recent newspaper column to "get the point across" to the brass at USCF.

B.H. Wood, editor of CHESS

We plan to print your handout. We feel that many recent actions by some American chess organizations have merged on a scandal which should be publicized in the general interests of the community. These matters are extremely delicate. We should gratefully welcome any further details or developments.

Larry Paxton, Dayton, Ohio

It is my understanding that Grandmaster Larry Evans has been dismissed as a columnist for CL&R by editor Burt Hochberg, as a result of the September 20 letter and personal differences over the accuracy of charges made there. The essence of the feeling of many master players pours through the funnel of the very first sentence of that letter: "We feel the USCF is squandering a vital treasure in its neglect of grandmasters and top players." This feeling of neglect is one that I am certain would surprise Larry if he really realized it is shared by every level of player and organizer in this country. He admits there is a pinch.

If Grandmaster Evans believes our masters are "neglected" and "disillusioned" editor Hochberg can only feel frustrated and angered that he might be held personally responsible for all the master woes! But does the USCF really want to take the risk associated with this decision? Larry Evans' column is *read* and it is *liked* by all levels of players in the U.S. Its elimination for political purposes will not only tax all the resources and wisdom of our organization for the present, but it will do so for many months (and perhaps years) to come. This action will not blow over!

If Larry Evans has the energy to try to tackle some of the issues he raises through a new organization, why don't we try to tap this energy within the USCF. Or if Larry Evans feels that he can no longer work for the masters' cause within the Federation that is his problem and he must deal with it. But if the Federation tells him that he is no longer welcome for his view, that he is dismissed, that is quite another matter. I hope the editor will reconsider.

Jude Acers, San Francisco, Ca.

I am fearful that your right to speak freely will be destroyed by unfair people who state that theirs is the only game in town and just try to do something about it. The Hochberg admission that CL&R is censored ("So what, that's an editor's prerogative") is so crushing that an exception in your case would not long allow freedom. He would simply not renew your contract or sporadically censor your prose to demonstrate who is boss.

Freedom is very precious and I no longer have suggestions. I am depressed in general as the handwriting is on the wall: USCF cannot help chess in the U.S. for some time to come.

(Ed note: How many letters like these will ever appear in Chess Review? The editor has not even reported as a news item the formation of the PCA.)

"The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be." (Ecclesiastes 1:9)