

December 23, 1954

Mr. Guthrie McClain
244 Kearny Street
San Francisco 8, Calif.

My dear Mr. McClain:

Since your letter of December 21st to Mr. Jones refers to CHESS LIFE specifically and complains regarding contents of this publication still remain my business, I will make a few comments regarding your remarks.

Item No. 2 is not my business, but that of the Ways and Means Committee; but I cannot refrain from remarking that since you yourself did not hesitate to circulate an open letter of attack upon the Federation without either consulting any Federation officials or making any intelligent endeavor to check the validity of your charges in advance, I can see no reason why you should even expect the courtesy of a preview of the committee's report or proposed ballot. Such courtesies are reciprocal in nature; and you have certainly done nothing to merit courtesy. However, the Ways and Means Committee will answer you upon this point, and they may see fit to extend the undeserved favor you request.

Your suggestion, however, that the report be free from prejudice is definitely a bit of brazen impertinence from a man who has circulated as one-sided a statement of rumors, hearsay, slander, and deliberate misrepresentation as you did prior to the New Orleans meeting. No doubt you judge the Ways and Means Committee by yourself and your typical actions. But I can assure you that they are indeed men of probity and honor who would not stoop to the chicanery and deceit practiced and embodied in your own slanderous charges of last summer.

Now, regarding item no. 3. This is indeed an amusing protest, in view of the fact that your Southern California buffoon has just recently circulated a mimeographed pamphlet of carefully selected letters, chosen with greatest care to represent a one-sided picture of the controversy. I presume this circulation of this deliberately falsified presentation was a noble effort at creating harmony? And I presume his less widely circulated collection of excerpts from letters in which paragraphs have been taken from context so that they seem to say the opposite from what was actually stated in the full letter is also a straight-forward, impartial effort at the creation of harmony and good will?

Really, while your West Coast group indulges in such clownish effort it is both deceitful and impertinent for you to mention harmony. You have mouthed a number of phrases about the need for harmony in chess but your actions while making these pious declarations have not been designed to create harmony and make your declarations seem just about as sincere as the Soviet clamor for peace while waging undeclared war.

December 28, 1954

Precisely what connection there is between the fact that Mr. Hipponax is described as "not a chess player" and the "dictates of the New Orleans meeting" is something beyond my comprehension. I have carefully reread the minutes of said meeting and still do not know what you are talking about. In addition, I doubt very much if you know yourself.

If you had read the news item on Mr. Hipponax carefully and intelligently you would have found him described as "although sometimes he plays chess, he is not a chess player". There are, on conservative estimate, several million similar such players in the USA, and the Federation hopes in time to reach a number of them, hence the welcome to Mr. Hipponax as a writer. Mr. Hipponax himself ~~xxxx~~ has stated that the principal reason why he does not belong to organized chess is the fact that there are too many characters in organized chess like Alexander, McClain, Whittaker, and Lasker. That may be the explanation for the failure of many other such players to join organized groups -- I would not know, validity

As to the "Alexander-Popoff" remark in the tail-end of Mr. Hipponax' scachic dialogue -- the only possible objection that could be made to it would be that there was danger of too many chess players considering it to be an apt characterization of Mr. Alexander. It would seem to me that you are crying that the glove fits too snugly. But I am a little surprised that you make this admission.

Your suggestion, however, that the report be free from prejudice is definitely a bit of brazen impertinence. **sincerely yours,** has circulated as one-sided a statement of rumors, hearsay, slander, and deliberate misrepresentation as you did prior to the New Orleans meeting. No doubt you judge the **Montgomery Major** committee

Copies: Irving Rivise
Neil T. Austin
Francis Crofut
Henry Gross

Frank R. Gaves
A. Wyatt Jones
W.M. Byland
Dr. N.M. Hornstein

Now, ~~xxxx~~ 3. This is indeed an amusing protest, in view of the fact that your Southern California buffoon has just recently ~~xxxx~~ a mimeographed pamphlet of carefully selected letters, chosen with greatest care to represent a one-sided picture of the controversy. I presume this circulation of this deliberately falsified presentation was a noble effort at creating harmony? And I presume his less widely circulated collection of excerpts from letters in which paragraphs have been taken from context so that they seem to say the opposite from what was actually stated in the full letter is also a straight-forward, impartial effort at the creation of harmony and good will?

Really, while your West Coast group indulges in such clownish efforts it is both deceitful and impertinent for you to mention harmony. You have mouthed a number of phrases about the need for harmony in chess but your actions while making these pious declarations have not been designed to create harmony and make your declarations seem just about as sincere as the Soviet clamor for peace while waging undeclared war.