

nally in a language other than German. Given as the original source for the first is *Deutsche Zeitung in den Niederlanden* (German News in the Netherlands); for the second and third, *Pariser Zeitung* (Paris Journal). Strangely, a Paris date line heads the second and first articles; there is no date line for the third.

We are indebted to Mr. Arthur Rath, eminent linguist and member of the staff of the Queens (New York) Public Library, for the certified translation. Mr. Rath tells us, quite in confirmation of your authors' estimate on the basis of a comparatively limited acquaintanceship with German, that the articles are "vitriolic," "hysterically incoherent," and, generally, remindful of the solecisms and panicky screechings in A. Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Mr. Rath adds that it is almost impossible to catch the calumny and vindictiveness in translated form, incorporated as they are in a web of *nonsequiturs*. In short, whatever is found to be coherent in the translation tends to elevate the tone of the original. Rath has found no evidence pointing to the possibility that the articles were written by more than one person.

JEWISH AND ARYAN CHESS

A psychological study which—based on the experiences at the chess board—demonstrates the Jewish lack of courage and creative power.

By World Chess Champion Dr. Alekhine in *German News in the Netherlands*.

Paris, March 22, 1941

Can we hope that with Lasker's death, the death of the second and probably the last Jewish World Chess Champion—Aryan Chess, misguided so long by Jewish defensive thinking, will find its way to the top? It is incumbent upon me not to be too optimistic, for Lasker has created a school and has left disciples behind who can, conceivably, do much harm to chess.

Lasker's great offense as a leading Chess Master—I can't

speak about him as man and philosopher—was manifold. After Lasker, on the strength of his tactical skills, defeated Steinitz, 30 years Lasker's senior, he never contemplated to offer the chess world a creative thought of his own, but merely published a series of talks he had given in Liverpool entitled, "Common Sense in Chess." It was "edifying," by the way, to observe these two adept tacticians, Lasker and Steinitz, strain to tell the world that they were great strategists and innovators.

LASKER PLAGIARIZED THE GREAT MORPHY

In these talks, Lasker plagiarized the great Morphy appropriating the latter's ideas on the "struggle for the center" and on the "concept of attack." To Lasker the idea of attack as a gratifying experience was altogether foreign, and in this respect he was a natural successor to Steinitz, the most grotesque player in chess history.

What is actually Jewish Chess, the Jewish concept of chess? This question is not difficult to answer. 1. Material gain at all costs. 2. Opportunism in the extreme, which seeks to eliminate every shadow of possible danger and, as a result, gives rise to an idea (if one can call it an idea), "defense *per se*." In the last analysis, this "idea" of Jewish chess, amounting as it does to suicide in every form of struggle, has dug its own grave. For by mere defense one can occasionally (and not too often) avoid loss—but how does one win with it? One possible answer would be: through an error of the opponent. But what if this error does not materialize? Then the "defender *à tout prix*" has nothing left but tearful complaints about his opponent's stubborn refusal to blunder.

The question of how the concept of defense gained a following is not so easy to answer. Between the spirited La Bourdonnais—MacDonald matches and the appearance of Anderssen and Morphy, a period of stagnation, of which the high point was the Staunton—St. Amant match, settled on European chess. The latter event ended with Staunton's victory, assuring the Englishman a legitimate claim to a place of eminence in the chess history of the 19th century. While I am writing this, I have before my eyes a book by Staunton dealing with the first world tournament held in London in 1851 and won by the brilliant German Master Adolf Anderssen. This tournament which in fact marked a breakthrough for our * aggressive,

* I.e. Aryan; wherever *our* appears hereinafter in similar context it denotes "Aryan." [Translator's note.]

fighting chess against the English-Jewish concept (Anderssen annihilated the Polish Jew Kieseritzky * in the first round of the tournament) has been considered by the theoretician Staunton as a pure coincidence. Staunton claimed that he had not been feeling well, being overburdened with numerous chores in connection with the event, etc.; in essence, the familiar alibis. But Staunton's defeat by Anderssen was far more than a decision between two chess masters; it was actually the defeat of the Anglo-Jewish concept of defense and a triumph for the German-European idea of fighting chess.

EUROPE'S CHESS DRAMA

Anderssen's victory set the stage for Europe's chess drama: one genius was opposed by an even greater genius from New Orleans. This, however, would not have been such a calamity, because Morphy's game was chess in the truest sense of the word. It turned out to be a catastrophe, for Morphy lost his mind shortly after his defeat of Anderssen and thus was lost to chess; and because Anderssen never recovered from this defeat and, with no will to win, defaulted the title to the Jew Steinitz in 1866. In order to clarify the question who Steinitz really was and why he was successful in playing a prominent role in chess, one must first look into the status of professional chess. In any art (and chess, notwithstanding its competitive character, is a creative art), there exist two categories of professionals—those who devote themselves compulsively and exclusively to the one chosen field, and show no interest whatever in any other line of endeavor. These "victims of the art" can by no means be reproached for trying to earn their living only in their chosen profession, for they bring esthetic and spiritual pleasures to their fellow men. The same criteria can, however, not be applied to the second category, namely the "Eastern Jewish" type of professional chess player. Steinitz, a Jew born in Prague, was probably the first representative of this type, and he promptly set a pattern.

Do the Jews as a race show talent for chess? After 30 years' experience in chess I would like to suggest this answer: Yes, indeed. The Jews are extremely talented in the exploitation of chess for the gain it offers. But up to this day there has never

* Was Kieseritzky really a Jew? Schlechter, whom the world champion also considers to be Jewish, certainly was not. [*Deutsche Schachzeitung* Editor's note.]

been a real Jewish chess artist. By contrast, I would like to name the following representatives of creative Aryan chess, men of top calibre: Philidor, La Bourdonnais, Anderssen, Morphy, Tchigorin, Pillsbury, Marshall, Capablanca, Bogoljubow, Euwe, Eliskases, Keres. During the same period, on the other hand, the "Jewish crop" turned out to be rather mediocre. Besides those of Steinitz and Lasker, the "achievements" of the following group (in chronological order) warrant closer examination.

1. In the period of decadence marked by Lasker's predominance (1900-1921) two of his nearest Jewish rivals—Janowski and Rubinstein—do, in some respects, merit attention.

"BRILLIANT MATCHES" (*Glanzpartien*)

AGAINST WEAKER OPPONENTS

The Polish Jew Janowski, as a resident of Paris, was probably the most typical representative of this group. He succeeded in becoming the protégé of another Jew in the French capital, the Dutch "artist" Leo Nardus, on whom Janowski kept a firm grip for 25 years. Someone in America demonstrated before Nardus a number of Morphy games featured by sacrifices. Nardus was so carried away by Morphy's style that he demanded from his protégé Janowski nothing but so-called beautiful games. Janowski created "brilliant games," *volens*, but as it soon turned out, only against weaker opponents. When he played real masters, his style was as unimaginative, dry, and materialistic as the style of 99 out of 100 of his Jew brethren. Janowski never was a serious threat to Lasker, who easily beat him in their matches. In this connection, we would like to point out one of the typical attributes of Lasker's "talent," avoiding the most dangerous opponents while in their prime. He took them on only when they were handicapped by old age, illness, or lack of preparation. Numerous examples of this tactic can be cited; for example, his dodging matches against Pillsbury, Maroczy, and Tarrasch, while accepting Tarrasch's challenge (1908) when the latter was no longer a serious contender for the title; and finally the brief matches against Schlechter (Vienna, 1910), ending in a tie, which were set up as a decoy for the staging of an impressive and, needless to say, profitable championship tournament.

Reared in hate against the "Goyim" (Gentiles), the second of Lasker's Jewish rivals was the Master from Lodz, Akiba

Rubinstein. Strictly (Hebrew) orthodox, steeped in Talmudic hatred against the "Goyim," he saw himself, at the very beginning of his chess career, charged with fulfilling a sort of "mission." He therefore started, as a young man, to study the theory of chess with the same ardor with which he had, in his childhood, tried to absorb the Talmud. This happened in a period of decadence of chess when the so-called Viennese School reigned supreme on the world chess stage. Founded by the Jew Max Weiss, and fostered later on by the Jews Kaufmann and Fahndrich, this School saw the secret of success not in winning, but in not-losing.

Small wonder that Rubinstein who had his openings consistently better prepared during this period than his opponents, scored impressive victories shortly after his first appearance in international tournaments. His most important success perhaps was a share in the first prize with Lasker in St. Petersburg (1909), a memorable tournament which I attended at the age of 16. After this climax, Rubinstein's star began to fade, first imperceptibly, then rapidly. No doubt he studied tirelessly, scoring occasional victories, yet one could feel that this effort was too much for a brain showing a talent for chess but otherwise altogether mediocre. When I returned to Berlin after 4 years in the Soviet Union, I found Rubinstein disintegrating both as a grandmaster and as a human being. His intellectual capacity was impaired; partly by megalomania, partly by a persecution complex. The following episode may serve as an illustration: At the end of the same year (1921), Bogoljubov arranged a small tournament in Triberg in which Rubinstein also took part. As usual, there were *post-mortem* analyses by the participants. On one such occasion I (the tournament director) asked Rubinstein: "Why did you make this opening move? This one is certainly not as strong as the move which enabled me to beat Bogoljubov a few months ago, and which we analyzed together as most effective."

HE WANTED TO ESCAPE THE OPPONENT'S
INFLUENCE

"True," answered Rubinstein, "still it is somebody else's move." In short, *his* chess and only *his* chess was meaningful to him during this period. In the last 10 years of his activity (1920-30), he undoubtedly played some good games, scored partial successes, but the symptoms of his persecution complex became more obvious. In the last 2 or 3 years of his public ap-

pearances, he used to run away from the chess board every time he had completed his move, sit in a corner of the tournament room, and return only after his opponent had countered his move. This he did "in order not to have to submit to the evil influence of the opponent's ego." Right now Rubinstein is somewhere in Belgium, forever eliminated from chess.

The Jew from Riga, Aaron Nimzowitsch, belongs to the Capablanca rather than the Lasker period. His instinctive, anti-Aryan chess concept was, in a strange way—subconsciously and in spite of himself—influenced by the Slavic-Russian concept of attack (Tchigorin!). I say "subconsciously," because he violently hated us Russians and Slavs. Never will I forget a brief conversation we had at the end of the New York tournament in 1927. Nimzowitsch had been overtaken by me in the standings and had been beaten in several single games by the Yugoslav Grandmaster, Prof. Vidmar. Incensed at his poor showing, he did not dare to assail us directly, but instead he turned the conversation to Soviet Russia. Turning toward me he remarked: "Who says Slav, says slave" to which I replied: "But who says Jew has surely nothing more to add."

In certain circles Nimzowitsch gained the reputation of a "deep thinker," mainly through the publication of two books entitled "My System" and "The Praxis of My System." Yet I am fully convinced that this whole "Nimzowitsch system" is based on wrong premises (apart from the fact that it lacks originality). For Nimzowitsch not only makes the mistake of attempting to proceed from an analytical beginning to a synthetical end, but he compounds his error by basing his analysis exclusively on his own practical experience, while offering the results of this analysis to the chess world as the supreme synthetical truth. Certainly there are bits of truth, traces of correct thinking in Nimzowitsch's teachings. These ideas, however, did not originate in his own brain, but were borrowed from both old and contemporary masters and were consciously or unconsciously plagiarized. His correct ideas: 1. The fight for the center, a Morphy concept illustrated both by the best achievements of Tchigorin and the Pillsbury-Charousek matches. 2. and 3. The obvious fact that it is advantageous to occupy the seventh rank; and finally, that it is more profitable to exploit two weaknesses of the opponent than just one. And with such petty tricks ("niaiseries") Nimzowitsch succeeded in building up his reputation as a chess authority in England and in New York (not America, because this city of Jewry is, thank heaven, not at all representative of America).

Alexander Alekhine

Those were the few elements of truth which Nimzowitsch expounded in his books, alongside much that was wrong, reflecting his basic attitude toward chess. His half-original ideas were contaminated; they were a negation of the creative spirit. For example: 1. His idea of "manoeuvring" is nothing but a variation of the old Steinitz-Lasker theme of waiting until the opponent makes a mistake. 2. The idea of overprotection (the premature defense of supposedly weak positions) again is a clearly Jewish idea contrary to the concept of fight. In other words: Fear of the fight, doubts about its spiritual qualities—a sad picture indeed of intellectual self-degradation! Leaving this pitiful chess legacy behind him, Nimzowitsch died lamented by few disciples and even fewer friends (except for some Jews).

Richard Reti of Pressburg has earned the "gratitude" of the chess world by carrying Nimzowitsch's overprotection theory *ad absurdum*. He applies the theory of guarding one's weak positions in the openings, regardless of how the opponent builds up *his* position. He thought he could attain his objective by the double flank of the bishops. This manoeuvre was called the "double-hole game" by the German Grandmaster Richard Teichmann, a man of unusually fine chess instinct.

A united front of purely destructive Jewish chess tacticians (Steinitz-Lasker-Rubinstein-Nimzowitsch-Reti) began to shape up, destined to hamper, for half a century, the logical evolution of our fighting chess.

(to be continued)

JEWISH AND ARYAN CHESS

By World Chess Champion Dr. Alekhine in the *Pariser Zeitung*.

Herewith the reprinting of the World Champion's comments is continued. These would have been more convincing several years ago. But at the outbreak of war in 1939, Dr. Alekhine joined forces with Tartakover (who is today a lieutenant in the army of a traitor, General De Gaulle), in the masters' tournament in Buenos Aires, and together they aided the Palestine team, all Jews, in an effort to demoralize the German team and to prevent its victory. Compare Becker's letter, *Deutsche Schachzeitung*, 1940, page 1.

By the way, as we already suspected, Kieseritzky was not a

Jewish and Aryan Chess

Jew. G. Jirikoff points out that Kieseritzky was born in Dorpat (Livonia, not Poland!) which was among the Russian cities in which no Jews were permitted to live. Besides, Kieseritzky is a highly regarded Baltic-German name and many of its bearers probably live in Greater Germany today. See also *Deutsches Wochensach* 1912, p. 353.

(Editor's Comment; M.B.)

THE AGGRESSIVE JEWISH PLAYER BOTVINNIK
AND CAPABLANCA, WHO STRONGLY BELIEVED
IN THE DEFENSE CONCEPT, WERE
EXCEPTIONS TO THE RULE.

PARIS, MARCH 28, 1941

Just as Nimzowitsch with his "System," so did Reti with his tract, "The New Ideas in Chess," earn the warm applause of the majority of the Anglo-Jewish pseudo-intellectuals. These people were particularly impressed by the absurd slogan which Reti invented: "We, the young players (he was already 34 at that time) are not interested in the rules, but in the exceptions." If this statement makes any sense at all, it is supposed to mean: "We (really I) know the rules which govern chess only too well; to explore them further shall from now on be the task of the general chess community. I, however, the great master, shall devote myself exclusively to the finer "filigree" work and demonstrate before a spellbound chess world brilliant exceptions accompanied by lucid explanations." This cheap bluff, this shameless self-advertisement was swallowed hook, line, and sinker by the chess world that had been poisoned by Jewish journalists. Jews and their friends triumphantly chanted: "Long live Reti, long live ultramodern, neo-romantic chess!"

THE "DOUBLE HOLE IDEA"
DIED BEFORE RETI

Reti died young, at the age of 40. But his "double hole idea" had already before him died a quiet, inglorious death. Today's representatives of Jewish chess theory do not follow him, but prefer to imitate older exponents (Steinitz and Rubinstein).

Alexander Alekhine

Thus, Solomon Flohr of Prague is a product partly of Steinitz's timorous concept of defense, partly of Rubinstein's "religious" faith in the intensive study of openings and endings. There is, however, one difference: Flohr, in contrast to Rubinstein, is sound of body and mind, and will therefore probably maintain his standing for some time to come.

Reuben Fine, a New Yorker of Eastern European Jewish descent, is undoubtedly more intelligent than Flohr. Educated in a Communist school maintained by a Jewish community, he is perhaps not under the influence of Russian chess, but certainly under the political influence of the ideas of today's Russia. For this reason, he is more aggressive than the other Jewish masters, in his personality as well as in his chess. His general chess attitude, however, is nevertheless purely traditional: Don't risk anything. He tries to accomplish this in a relatively novel manner: not by mere waiting tactics or pure defense, but through intensive study of modern opening variations, enabling him to improve his chances in the game. For example, he undertook to modernize the old English textbook by Griffith and White. In doing so, he had to study thousands of opening variations and because of his superior knowledge of modern theory, he shared top honors at the AVRO tournament of 1938, to everyone's surprise, a success unlikely to be duplicated.

POOR AMERICAN CHESS

Two more of the present Jewish masters are to be mentioned; Reshevsky and Botvinnik. The East European Jewish *wunderkind* (there have been so many child prodigies of this race in all branches of the arts—why not one in chess?) Reshevsky was systematically exploited by his Jewish managers ever since he was 5 years old. Of course, in that period (1919–1922) there was enough money in circulation to satisfy all appetites in democratic countries intoxicated with war profits. No wonder that Reshevsky, now about 30 years of age, Americanized and holder of the U.S. Championship, is the possessor of a fortune, the interest of which permits him to play chess (to which he really owes everything) as a pure amateur.* To the surprise of all, however, when he returned to Europe as a grown man, he showed that he represented the worst type of

* Amateur, in the sense of economically secure; hence, not in need of financial return from Chess. [Translator's note.]

The Aryan Concept of Attack

chess professional, resorting to the shabbiest tricks. If Reshevsky, as it is claimed, really represents American Chess of today, one can only say "Poor American Chess."

The Soviet Champion Mikhail Botvinnik probably owes the development of his style, in even greater measure than the American Jew Reuben Fine, to the influence of the young Russian school. Instinctively leaning toward "safety first" chess, he slowly developed into a master who uses his offensive weapons to great advantage. But the way in which he reached this stage is strange and typical at the same time; not through the concept of attack, and, if necessary, of sacrifice, but—paradoxically as it may seem—through the idea of gaining additional security by attacking. Only through exact knowledge, and through extremely intense study of (1) new opening possibilities, and (2) the technique of attack and sacrifice as developed by the old masters, did Botvinnik perfect his original style and develop an ostensible versatility. That he is strong today, even very strong, is not to be doubted. How else could he have won the championship of Russia 5 or 6 times in succession, despite the high level of chess in that country? This obvious superiority can only be compared with the series of convincing victories gained by the German Master Eliskases, at home and abroad, during the last few years. Yet, most of Botvinnik's games leave a dry uninspired impression. This is not really so strange because in the realm of art a copy, no matter how perfect, can never generate the same feeling as the original, and Botvinnik's chess, as far as attack is concerned, is only a very fine copy of the old masters. All the same, Botvinnik can be called an exception to all others referred to.

(to be continued)

THE ARYAN CONCEPT OF ATTACK

By World Chess Champion Dr. Alekhine in *Pariser Zeitung*.

THE CHESS PHENOMENON CAPABLANCA

The case of Ex-World Champion Capablanca is highly informative. Idolized as a type of a wonder child in his native

Alexander Alekhine

Havana, where he won the Cuban Championship at the age of 12; admired at the beginning of his career as a fiery aggressor with Morphy-like ideas, Capablanca would have become not only the God of the Latin chess world—a role he actually held for a long time—but the idol of the whole chess world, had he not been sent to Columbia University, in New York, and in that Jewish capital had not acquired the professional methods of the chess-Yankees. Suppressing tremendous tactical gifts, Capablanca prevailed upon himself, at the early age of 18, to look upon chess not as an end in itself but as a means of making money; and to develop the Jewish "safety-first" principle to its extreme.

But his natural gift for chess was so great that for a certain time he was able to maintain a leading position even as a master in the art of defense; and he was clever enough to make half-hearted attempts to justify the negative principle of defensive chess in various articles, by means of pseudo-strategic concepts. At times, though, fiery flashes of genius occurred even during the period when Capablanca was World Champion, but essentially these were brilliant exceptions, probably subconscious reactions to his stifled chess temperament. Today, however, he produces such brilliancies less and less frequently.

Thus it happened that the Latin Capablanca and the Jew Botvinnik found each other on the same mental and spiritual path (*Wege*) or rather, bypath (*Abwege*). Their existence is no doubt useful for our art and for the fight against the concept of defense, because they are the exceptions confirming the rule. Exceptions? Yes, truly exceptions. Unfortunately there are also false exceptions in *our* chess, phony artists, who exploit the Aryan idea of attack to satisfy their professional lust for money. The most typical representatives of this tendency are probably the Viennese Jew Rudolph Spielmann, who at present lives in Stockholm, and the Leipzig Jew Jacques Mieses whose home is now London. Spielmann, who is unquestionably gifted for tactical chess, realized at an early stage of his career that he had the best chance to drain money from the large chess public if he succeeded in making a name for himself as a "brilliant sacrificial player." And just as Fine and Botvinnik, a quarter of a century later, studied the openings and the principles of attack, Spielmann concentrated on the much simpler problem of the technique of sacrifices. One must admit that after long years of practice he succeeded in gaining a number of suc-

The Aryan Concept of Attack

cesses in his chosen field. In 1935 he even published a little book with the attractive title, "How to Make Correct Sacrifices." In it he analyzed every possible type of sacrifice, except the one that characterizes the real artist—the intuitive sacrifice.

Just as remote from the true concept of sacrifice are the ideas of the chessmaster and journalist Mieses who years ago flooded the German Press with releases of his "brilliant achievements." Mieses furnished convincing proof of this in an article written for *Chess*, a journal edited by the Jew Baruch Wood in Birmingham, in which he published as the best game of his career the one against Von Bardeleben for which he had been awarded a prize (Barmen 1905).

Up to now I have said much about the Jewish concept of defense and little about the Aryan concept of attack. I would like to clarify this concept by giving a literary source which typifies the complex misconception regarding the game of chess. In the 30's and 40's of the past century, after the meteoric rise of Mahé De La Bourdonnais, the game of chess suffered a definite eclipse. At that time the Englishman Howard Staunton was—justifiably, perhaps—considered the most formidable chess player in the world. His game, which unfortunately had some influence on his contemporaries, was so monotonous and unimaginative that one need not be surprised at Edgar Poe's devastating critique of chess art in his *Murders in the Rue Morgue*. Right at the beginning of his mystery, Poe writes, actually without inner conviction: "Yet to calculate is not in itself to analyze. A chessplayer, for example, does the one without effort at the other. It follows that the game of chess, in its effects upon mental character, is greatly misunderstood. I am not now writing a treatise, but simply prefacing a somewhat peculiar narrative by observations very much at random: I will, therefore, take occasion to assert that the higher powers of the reflective intellect are more decidedly and more usefully tasked by the unostentatious game of draughts than by all the elaborate frivolity of chess. In this latter, where the pieces have different and bizarre motions, with various and variable values, what is only complex is mistaken (a not unusual error) for what is profound. The attention is here called powerfully into play. If it flag for an instant, an oversight is committed, resulting in injury or defeat. The possible moves being not only manifold, but involute, the chances of such oversights are multiplied; and in nine cases out of ten it is the more concentrative rather than the more acute player who conquers."

AND NOW THE POSITIVE SIDE

"In draughts, on the contrary, where the moves are unique and have but little variation, the probabilities of inadvertence are diminished." And later on Poe continues: "Whist has long been noted for its influence upon what is termed the calculating power; and men of the highest order of intellect have been known to take an apparently unaccountable delight in it, while eschewing chess as frivolous. Beyond doubt there is nothing of a similar nature so greatly tasking the faculty of analysis. The best chessplayer in Christendom may be little more than the best player of chess; but proficiency in whist implies capacity for success in all those more important undertakings where mind struggles with mind."

THE CONCEPT OF CHECKMATE IS
ALL-IMPORTANT

Enough of Poe! These quotations prove beyond doubt that the illustrious creator of "The Raven," the captivating author of "Eureka" and "Dialogue between Monos and Una," committed, in this particular instance, a monumental error of judgment or, for reasons unknown, he deliberately misled his readers. The game of chess cannot be compared with any other board game on account of one basic element which elevates chess to an art. The absence of this element which elevates chess to an art. The absence of this element which elevates chess to an art. The absence of this element which elevates chess to an art. While other games aim at conquest or "territorial gains," chess is distinguished by the unique concept of checkmate. It is true that the initial phases of a chess match are characterized by moves designed to gain "territorial and material" advantage. However, as soon as checkmate, that is, the idea of doing in the opponent's King, is envisioned, neither time, nor territory, nor material is spared in pursuit of this objective. What makes chess so constructive and appealing is the fact that it answers a human yearning—if often only present in the subconscious—for an ideal; a joyful self-sacrifice for a cause. And because the deeper spirit of chess generates in us the creative power of self-sacrifice, it gratifies, by the same token, our aesthetic needs.

What other game even remotely embodies such virtues? No, not even the genius Edgar Poe could detect, let alone prove, these superb qualities in other games. Poe's comparison with whist is even less tenable because this card game stimulates a

mental process entirely different from that involved in playing chess. Chess is a war game of the moment and of the future; a move once completed no longer requires the player's attention. In bridge, by contrast (to name only the most modern card game), a good player is expected not only to recall each trick played but also each card in it. And as to the alleged "analysis," it is hard to see how it can be practically applied, since too many imponderables are here involved. Consequently, the attack on chess launched by the American poet fizzles out. Still as a typical voice of the past, he deserves a hearing.

Following is Alekhine's disclaimer preceded by a piece entitled "Alekhine's Defence!" Both appeared in *Chess World* [Australia], on March 1, 1946. The prefatory remarks are by Chessmaster C. J. S. Purdy, editor of *Chess World*.

ALEKHINE'S DEFENCE!

Dr. Alekhine, chess champion of the world, sent an open letter to Mr. Hatton-Ward, organiser of the masters' tourney held in London in January. It was in reply to a letter in which Mr. Hatton-Ward had evidently spoken of the United States Chess Federation as having sent him an "ultimatum." Apparently the U.S.C.F. had stated that the U.S.A. would not be represented if Alekhine played; the U.S.C.F. now denies that it sent an "ultimatum"—meaning of course, that it does not want it called that.

We publish Alekhine's letter in full. We also quote a sentence in a letter from a correspondent to *Chess*.

"If Alekhine had committed any offence it would have been dealt with by the War Crimes Commission—it is their job to dispense justice."

Very true—and let us give no more weight to hearsay accusations than a court of justice gives, i.e. nil. For instance, Dr. Bernstein, writing in *Chess*, accused Alekhine of failing to intervene to save the life of the Jewish master Przepiorka, who died in a concentration camp in Poland. Alekhine's answer to that was given in a short letter to *Chess*. He wrote:—

"As for Dr. Bernstein's information. I can only state that my friend D. Przepiorka was murdered before the end of 1939 (I heard the narrative of this from an eye-witness) and it is known that I played in Germany and Poland only from the end of

1941. What connection could I have with this tragical event?"

The Dutch player, Dr. Oskam, in the November *Chess* descends to vulgar abuse. He calls Alekhine "this small-minded drunkard." This harks back to a rumor (afterwards proven false) spread by Dutch newspapermen whom Alekhine had annoyed during his 1935 match with Euwe; it was part of a general campaign of vilification against him by the Dutch press at that time. See our books, *How Euwe Won*, page 7, and *The Return of Alekhine*, page 31. Oskam's letter in *Chess* is merely impassioned (not to say scurrilous) rhetoric, and contains not a word of direct evidence.

As a victim of Nazi brutality, Dr. Oskam commands all our sympathy, but we must not be swayed by purely emotional verbiage. His whole letter is based on acceptance of Alekhine's complete authorship of the notorious anti-Jewish articles, which Alekhine denies.

Chess World, March 1, 1946

ALEKHINE'S OPEN LETTER

Dear Mr. Hatton-Ward,

I received your letter on my return from the Canaries on November 28th. Before I knew what you now tell me, it was evidently impossible for me to undertake anything for I had no idea of the exact motives which had induced you to cancel your invitation. Now I can and must speak not because you are organising a tournament, whatever purely chess interest it might have for me—but above all because of the motives you give.

Firstly, you tell me that in certain circles people have lodged objections based on my alleged sympathies during the war. But any disinterested person must realise what must have been my real feelings towards the people who robbed me of everything which gives life meaning; the people who destroyed my home, robbed my wife's chateau (and eventually everything I possess) and finally stole my very name!

Having devoted my life to chess, I have never been concerned in anything not concerned with my profession. But unfortunately for me, throughout my life—and especially since I gained the world title—people have sought to present me in an absolutely fantastic political light. For more than twenty years I was labeled a "White Russian." This was particularly damaging as it made impossible contact with my native country, which I have never ceased to love and admire. In 1938–39 I

had hoped as a result of negotiations and correspondence with the champion of U.S.S.R., Botvinnik, to have put an end to this absurd legend, for a match between us and the U.S.S.R. had practically been fixed. [The "us" must mean France.—Ed.]. But . . . the war came—and after its termination here I am a "pro-Nazi," accused of collaboration, etc., etc. Far from thinking ill of you, I am grateful to you for having brought this accusation to a head—the uncertain situation in which I have lived for the last two years has been morally intolerable.

That Dr. Euwe protested does not surprise me—it would have been far more surprising if he had not. Among the heap of monstrosities published by the *Pariser Zeitung* appeared insults against the members of the Committee which organised the 1937 match; and the Dutch Chess Federation even lodged a protest on this matter with *Post*. At that time I was powerless to do the one thing which would have clarified the situation, to declare that the articles had not been written by me. Dr. Euwe was so convinced of my influence with the Nazis that he wrote me two letters asking me to take steps to alleviate the lot of poor Landau and my friend Dr. Oskam . . . but in Germany and the occupied countries we were under constant surveillance and threat of the concentration camp from the Gestapo. Therefore Dr. Euwe's reaction to my invitation is very natural; but like so many others, he is badly mistaken.

Your principal reason for withdrawing your invitation is the "ultimatum" (as you call it) of the U.S. Chess Federation. This is very serious, for these men have evidently taken this decision and given reasons which in their opinion justify it. I cannot know these at the moment but it seems reasonable to suppose that it is a question of collaboration with the Nazis. The charge "collaboration" is generally directed against those who fell in with the Vichy Government. But I never had anything to do with either that government or its officials. I played in Germany and the occupied countries because that was not only our means of subsistence but also the price of my wife's liberty, and going back in memory to the situation in which I found myself four years ago, I maintain that today I should act in exactly the same way. My wife would in normal circumstances have the ability and means to look after herself. But not in wartime, and in the hands of the Nazis. I repeat, if the charge of "collaboration" is based on my forced sojourn in Germany, I have nothing to add—my conscience is clear.

It is another thing entirely if I am accused of fabrications and in particular the articles which appeared in the *Pariser Zeitung*.

Alexander Alekhine

Against this I must formally protest. For three years, until Paris was liberated, I had to keep silent. But from the first opportunity I tried in interviews to show up the facts in their true light. Of the articles which appeared in 1941 during my stay in Portugal and which I learned about in Germany through their being reproduced in the *Deutsche Schachzeitung*, *nothing was actually written by me*. I had submitted material dealing with the necessary reconstruction of the F.I.D.E. (the International Chess Federation) and a critique, written well before 1938, of the theories of Steinitz and Lasker. I was surprised when I received letters from Messrs. Helms and Sturgis at the reaction which these articles—purely technical—had provoked in America, and I replied to Mr. Helms accordingly. Only when I knew what incomparably stupid lucubrations had been created in a spirit imbued with Nazi ideas did I realise what it was all about. But I was then a prisoner of the Nazis and our only hope of preservation was to keep silent. Those years ruined my health and my nerves and I am even surprised that I can still play chess.

My devotion to my art, the esteem that I have always shown for the skill of my colleagues, and the whole of my pre-war professional life should have made people realise that the articles were spurious. And I am particularly sorry not to be able to come to London and speak for myself.

Let's get to the point. *Was* Dr. Alekhine the author of the fantastic balderdash? He issued a disclaimer, some ten months after the Nazis were defeated. This denial came from a man who, under the most favorable conditions, had failed to endear himself to the world of Chess.

Respectable evidence in support of Dr. Alekhine's denial would offer all his Chess admirers much joy. In the meantime, we ask:

1. Since Dr. Alekhine lived in Nazi-occupied Europe throughout the war, and since a burning interest in Chess was always an integral part of him, is it not logical to assume that the publication of the articles had come to his attention long before he issued the disclaimer?

2. Why did not Alekhine, an excellent logician and a holder of a degree in jurisprudence, write an immediate denial? In