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An Introduction to Fish Men

BY WILLA J. TAYLOR

The Urban Dictionary defines hustling as anything you need to do to get paid.

I am a hustler. But my hustle isn’t just about money; it’s about getting what I want and knowing where I want to be in life. Chess is like that. A chess match is about having game in three stages. There is your opening – what pieces are you moving first to be in the strongest position. There is the middle game – trying to control the center of the board so your men/pieces can cover the most territory. And there’s the end game – checkmating my opponent and getting the win. How I learned to think about my hustle – my strategy for life – I learned from chess.

I am not a great player and when I first started playing I would often get mated in five moves. But I love the game because it teaches me to think in a way no school or classroom ever did.

So here are the five hustling lessons I learned from chess...

1. Ground yourself in the basics. Learn what you need to know to play the game you need to play. Before you ever start your opening game in chess, you first have to understand how the board is set up, what the pieces are and how they move, and the etiquette of play. Hustling to make bank takes a basic understanding of the board you are playing on and the stake all the players have in the game, whether it is school and teachers, home and parents, or on the streets in a hoodie.

2. Take control of the board so you have options. The middle game in chess is all about controlling the center of the board, getting your pieces in the position to maximize their movements. Chess, like hustling, takes not only a game plan going in (how you open, what you will counter with, etc.) but requires flexibility and enough knowledge and understanding of your options to be able to respond to your opponent. You cannot have a good hustle without both strategic (long-term) and tactical (short-term) thinking and planning.

3. Play someone better than you. I played a long time with the same folks I could beat because I like to win. But that never improved my game so I was losing when I played someone new. Hustling is like that too. The more times I work with, talk to, people who know more than I do or know about something out of my sphere, the better equipped I am to take advantage of opportunities.

4. Learn from others’ mistakes. My chess game started improving when I started studying games played by masters. There are videos, books, tutorials, social media play, and even daily games in the newspaper that allow me to study how players have managed to win – and lose games. I can adapt my hustle because I know what has worked – or not worked – in the past and can develop a new strategy to get what I need.

5. Always keep the end game in sight. The point of the game is to checkmate your opponent no matter how many pieces you have to sacrifice or how long the game takes. That’s my hustle as well. I determine what I want, figure out what I have to do to get it, stay flexible to meet any challenges. Then I go for it.

Nothing can stop you from being everything you can be if you have a good strategy.

You just gotta keep hustling.
An Introduction to Teatro Vista

BY ELIZABETH RICE

Celebrating its 22nd season, Teatro Vista—Theater with a View—is the largest equity Latino theater in Chicago. Founded in 1990, the theater produces Latino-oriented works in English. Teatro Vista not only works to bring the Latino voice to the theater-scape through new works and playwrights, it reworks classic plays to expand them to a multinational view.

In 1989, while acting in a production together, Goodman Theatre Resident Director Henry Godinez and current Teatro Vista Artistic Director Eddie Torres discussed the lack of acting opportunities in Chicago for Latino actors outside of the most stereotypical roles. Working in the Chicago theatre scene, they continually came across great new works by Latino playwrights and, thus, envisioned a company that would open roles to Latino actors and actresses as well as bring into the forefront writers and directors of Latino descent and issues within the Latino culture. However, Torres believes that the term “Latino” has a more multicultural definition than perceived. “What is Latino? All the big world cultures—indigenous, African, European and Asian—I look at Latinos as a mix of all of these.” His goal for Teatro Vista is to help bring to the stage works that “support and develop a Latino voice with a global perspective. Pieces that reflect the culture, but always in a universal way.”

*Fish Men* is the second play in Teatro Vista’s season from new resident playwright, Cándido Tirado. Goodman Theatre has previously partnered with Teatro Vista on José Rivera’s *Cloud Tectonics, El Nogolar*—Tanya Saracho’s adaptation of Chekov’s *The Cherry Orchard*—and the Latino Theater Festival.

[We wanted] to produce these great new Latino plays, creating opportunities for these Latino actors, directors, and designers to showcase their talents” ~ Henry Godinez, on the founding of Teatro Vista.
This spring marks the second production in the Goodman’s ongoing collaboration with Teatro Vista, Chicago’s largest Equity theater company dedicated to producing Latino-oriented works in English. Starting April 7, the world premiere of Cándido Tirado’s Fish Men will take to the Owen stage. Set in Manhattan’s Washington Square Park, Fish Men chronicles an afternoon with a group of chess hustlers as they attempt to lure unsuspecting “fish” into high-stakes games for cash. But the action—played out rapid-fire in real time—quickly leads to a series of devastating revelations.

Playwright Cándido Tirado is Teatro Vista’s writer-in-residence this season, and while Fish Men contains only one Latino character, director Edward Torres—also Teatro Vista’s artistic director—maintains that the play’s multiethnic focus is an essential element of its Latino identity. “The urban landscape has shifted dramatically, and I define ‘Latino’ now as being at the center of world cultures—African, indigenous European and Asian—because for me Latino culture is rooted in all these other cultures,” he says. With this shift in the cultural landscape in mind, Fish Men also represents a first step in a change of direction for Teatro Vista towards presenting more multicultural work. Says Torres, “We hope to present the work of fresh Latino writers from their unique perspective and the world they’re living in, which is often at the intersection of many different cultures.”

It is precisely at this intersection of cultures that the Fish Men playwright Tirado spent his formative years. A native-born Puerto Rican, he immigrated to the Bronx at age 11 and came of age in a densely populated neighborhood where people of myriad cultures converged. Just before rehearsals began, he talked to the Goodman’s Lesley Gibson about chess, Latino theater and how his experience as a live witness of the events of 9/11 informed this new play.

LESLEY GIBSON: What was your initial inspiration for Fish Men?

CÁNDIDO TIRADO: I’m a chess master myself, and it’s one of my greatest loves. I’d been trying to work on a play about chess and had a lot of false starts. Then...
one day I was out with a friend and we walked into Washington Square Park and the play came to me like a wave. My initial inspiration was to make the play about hustlers. But man’s inhumanity to man is a big theme in my life, and I’ve always wanted to write about it because that’s a great interest of mine—how we treat each other and how things like genocides happen; there were so many genocides in the twentieth century. So I decided to try to deal with that subject in the context of a chess hustle, where the hustler is trying to almost dehumanize his opponent, not just over the [chess] board but psychologically to make him feel worthless, to make him feel less-than, to break him down so he’ll be easier to beat. There’s a type of psychological war that happens. So instead of just being a play about playing chess, it becomes about life and death.

LG: Did you spend a lot of time in the park researching and playing chess?

C T: I always go to the park to play. I used to hang out to listen to people talk. Chess players are very funny, and a lot of them are a little bit more than acquaintances; we talk often. So that’s part of my world, whenever I walk in there everybody says, “Hey, Tirado!” And I love that, because it’s like Cheers, where everybody knows your name. They make you feel welcome for a little while, then they just want to play you and try to beat you. But for five minutes it’s good.

LG: Are any of these characters based on actual people you played with in the park?

C T: They’re basically composites of people. [Cash] is a composite of three different people; I knew a guy who was really brilliant but he dropped out of school and became a hustler. Nobody knew why he dropped out of school, but he was really intellectual, he had a fast mouth and he could beat you with his mouth he talked so much. He was a great trash-talker but he was also nerdy, so in order to create the character [Cash] I wanted to give him more street toughness. I know another hustler who was more “street” who could confront you—because when you’re hustling you got to get tough. Sometimes the people losing don’t like losing; not everyone wants to give you their money, and sometimes you have to make a stand or a threat. So I wanted to make this character live in both worlds; have a kind of a street toughness and an intellectual side. But some of the other characters are totally fictional or are based on situations I’ve seen that I’ve taken creative license with.

LG: The characters in this play come from all different backgrounds; only one of them is Latino. Do you think of this as a “Latino play”?

C T: I don’t; that’s my quick answer. For me, the central theme of Fish Men is whether human beings are going to continue on this planet. So the characters in the play come from different ethnicities—there’s only one Latino character—but he’s a major character because I wanted to talk about some part of a Latino/Indian genocide that happened. So I don’t consider the play a Latino play, but I’m Latino, and I wrote it so I guess it is. In this country everybody gets defined by their background. So I’m a Latino playwright in this country. But the plays I write—I like to do more symbolic characters, I like to do metaphorical characters. In Mamma’s Boyz, one of my plays that Teatro Vista just produced, there are three young drug dealers whose names are Mimic, Shine and Thug. Each name means something, but they don’t have to be Latino actors to play them. They could be Italian or Irish or African American; as long as their culture is that of the street, impoverished, where drugs or crime seem like a way out. I had a friend from Italy who saw the play said, “Wow, that seems like me and my two friends.”

LG: You mentioned in a previous interview that you were in lower Manhattan on September 11, 2001; did your experience that day affect your work on this play?

C T: It did, a lot. After the first plane hit I was still going to work—I worked across the street from the second tower that got hit. There was a policeman in the middle of the street—it had just happened—and he was blowing his whistle and telling people, “Don’t go that way,” but people weren’t listening. But he looked me in the eyes and told me not to go where I was going, so I walked away, and about two minutes later the second plane hit; I would have been underneath that building when the second plane hit. With all the glass and parts that were falling I probably would have been really hurt or killed. I ended up walking home across the Brooklyn Bridge, and there was a lot of fear and adrenalin, because at the time I thought, “If they hit the building they’re going to hit the bridge too,” which sounds dramatic now but it’s
what I was thinking.

For a while after I got really depressed—coming so close, being there, and then dealing with a lot of survivor’s guilt. It informed me about the play, and about the characters, and how big this thing is—man’s inhumanity to man. There are characters in the play who lost their family; I could never get close to that and I hope I never will, but I got a little taste—a very small taste—of that.

But then at the same time as I was coming out of my depression and my fear and all that stuff, there was kind of a spiritual thing going on in New York. You know, if the recovery workers needed socks, in an hour they had too many socks. If they said, “We need blood,” in an hour they had too much blood, and they kept making announcements, you know: “Stop giving blood, stop giving socks.” So there was this spiritual thing that brought everybody together, and that feeling was amazing. The fear was horrible, but this spiritual thing was amazing, and that informed in me in the play because I think that’s very special in humanity.

LG: Do you think your chess skills seep over into your process as a playwright?

C T: People tell me that the way I think is like a chess player. In chess there’s something called a “trio of analysis.” You analyze a few variations of a move, and each variation has all of these branches, so it could go on forever, but you usually pick the top three responses and analyze them to see which has the best payoff. And I look at writing like that—I analyze the possible ways of doing something, and sometimes I take the least likely way to get to that place. People tell me all the time, “The way you just made that point is like a chess player.” I really don’t get it because that’s how I think naturally. I’m a playwright; I think about structure and form and how you make a play, and I also know chess and the argument of chess. So maybe writing a play and playing chess are more similar than they appear.
What's in a word?

Raphael Lemkin sat at his desk at Duke University in 1944 and penned a book entitled *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation*. It examined this attack on people because of ethnicity, race or religion as an international crime—an elaboration on an address that he had made to the Fifth International Conference on the Unification of Penal Law. Lemkin’s 1933 address to the conference played an instrumental role in the prosecution of Nazi war criminals during the Nuremberg Trials of 1945. In his book’s discussion of the events that took place during the Holocaust, Lemkin coined a word that would be used to describe possibly the worst crime against humanity: genocide.

While today’s definition has somewhat changed, genocide has kept its ominous connotation. Lemkin defined it as “the destruction of a nation or of an ethnic group,” but he also noted that genocide has two phases: 1) the annihilation of the cultural pattern of the targeted group; and 2) the imposition of the oppressor’s own culture in its stead. Defining and naming the horror did nothing to punish those who were guilty, so Lemkin petitioned the United Nations asking its members to define genocide in legal terms and to create laws of prosecution surrounding it.

In 1947, the United Nations met for this purpose. On Dec. 9, 1948, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was signed and adopted.

Two important distinctions were made during the Genocide Convention, as it was called. The first was the classification of genocide as a crime against humanity, making it punishable by the United Nations Security Council. The second and perhaps most important distinction was the inclusion of both wartime and peacetime as times when genocide could occur. The Nuremberg Trials, which punished the Nazi Party leaders, had already ended the year before. So the UN Security Council did not evoke the convention until 1994 when hell broke loose in Rwanda.

Genocide: An Eight-Step Process

Gregory H. Stanton, founder and president of Genocide Watch, wrote a briefing paper to the U.S. State Department in 1996, offering a theory that genocide is an eight-step process, regardless of when and where it takes place. His theory quickly became widely accepted, although his proposed preventative measures were seen as too extreme and therefore rejected by many genocide scholars across the world.

Crimes against humanity often begin by breaking up large groups of people and putting them into smaller groups according to race, religion or ethnic background. This is known as classification, and it is part of our natural tendency as humans. Of course, normally we are not classifying in an attempt to isolate or, even worse, exterminate. Symbolization often goes hand in hand with classification; it is the use of physical or personal attributes to classify people into certain groups.

The next steps in the process of genocide have to do with isolation, which is important in any act of hatred or violence targeted at a specific group. Isolation has two tiers. First is dehumanization, which is giving non-human attributes to a targeted trap (Jews as rats, for example). This does two things: It paints a portrait of the oppressed people as less than human, thereby making it easier for those who are not targeted to join in or ignore the oppression. The second tier of the isolation is polarization, when the oppressors force any moderate thinkers to choose a side, a sort of “if you’re not with us, you’re against us” ultimatum. This usually ends with moderates siding with extremists, if only for fear of their own well-being.

The fifth and sixth steps of the genocide process have to do with the planning the crime itself. Organization is the gathering of a group of like-minded people who are willing to commit the atrocities involved in genocide, and preparation occurs when the organized plan is put into action. This is broken down into three smaller steps: identification, which includes making lists of future victims, marking houses or mandating identification branding for people who are part of an oppressed group; expropriation, which involves the acquisition of any home or property owned by members of the oppressed group; and concentration, which is the herding of victims to extermination or concentration camps.

Extermination is the seventh step of genocide. Stanton’s...
use of this word is interesting; it links back to another step in the crime of genocide, dehumanization. Humans are murdered. Vermin are exterminated.

The final step to genocide, according to Stanton, is denial. Historically, when a group or country has been accused of genocide, denial begins immediately. Mass graves are covered up, concentration camps are burned down and wartime casualty seems to become a common theme.

Let Bygones be Bygones?

Although genocide has only been a legal term for a few decades, the crime has existed for much longer. To that end, there has been debate concerning certain events in our own country’s past that may be considered genocide when looked at through Stanton’s lens.

Christopher Columbus returned to the New World in 1493 after his famous first expedition with a fleet of 17 ships. Over the course of seven years, he annihilated an estimated 8 million indigenous people of the Taíno tribes on the Caribbean islands through a systematic program of slavery and extermination with permission from the Spanish crown.

George Washington sent a letter to Major General John Sullivan in 1789 to “lay waste all the [Iroquois] settlements around...that the country may not be merely overrun, but destroyed.” A few months later, Sullivan gave the following response: “I will try to inoculate the [Indians] with some blankets that may fall into their hands, and take care not to get the disease myself...I wish we could make use of the Spanish method, to hunt them with English dogs, supported by rangers and some light horse, who would, I think, effectually extirpate or remove the vermin.”

President Andrew Jackson ordered the largest forced migration in American history when he signed the Indian Removal Act in 1830, displacing five Native American tribes from their homes. The Native Americans were taken by wagon over hundreds of miles and across the Mississippi so that their lands could be sold off. An estimated 46,000 Native American people were moved, and countless died of starvation and illness, including 4,000 of the 15,000 Cherokee who were relocated in the movement known as the Trail of Tears.

California Gov. Peter Burnett made the following statement in 1851: “…that a war of extermination will continue to be waged between the two races until the Indian race becomes extinct, must be expected.” Burnett made legal and encouraged the organization of private citizen-run militias to murder Native Americans within the state. Six massacres occurred from 1850-1854, decimating 90 percent of the Native American population in California. Several acts were passed in 1851 and 1852 authorizing a payment from the federal government for $1.1 million for “private military forays.”

Apologies have been made to the remaining descendants of nearly-lost peoples on behalf of governments that barely exist anymore, but will that ever be enough to remedy the complete exhaustion of entire cultures that may never achieve their original splendor?
From Egyptians fighting and capturing Nubians to slave traders ripping African men, women and children from their homes to be sent across the ocean to work on fields for white men, the history of civilization is riddled with the destruction and persecution of peoples all over the world. What many do not know is that the horrible atrocities experienced throughout history have occurred again, to catastrophic results.

As was the case with many instances of conquest and colonization, Spanish settlers in Guatemala and the rest of Central America was riddled with blood shed. The Maya had weaponry that could stand up to other indigenous civilizations that might have threatened them, but they were no match for the muskets of the strangers. What was left of the Great Mayan Civilization fell to the Spanish, who quickly replaced the socio-economic government the Maya had developed with a plantation economy based on harsh forced labor, which is how it would remain until Guatemala gained independence in 1821.

The liberation from Spain gave little solace to the Maya, who had been forced to work the fields of Guatemala for four hundred years prior, stayed where they were as one by one, military dictators took control of the land that was once ruled by their ancestors. In 1954, after a year-long flourish of elections, removal and a coup d'état orchestrated by the United States CIA, a right wing military dictator took the reins.

Throughout the next two decades, the military rulers of Guatemala continued to take out their political enemies, and in response to the military aggression, the Left formed their own militia and declared civil war against its government. Some of the oppressed indigenous Maya originally took the side of the guerrillas, as they saw the last home for their people’s economic and political remediation. What the Maya did not know, however, is that the government would see this grasp for hope and use it against them.

The Guatemalan government saw the alliance between a percentage of the indigenous Maya and the guerrilla army as an advantage for themselves. They developed a widespread idea that all Maya were natural allies of the revolt, and as it followed, were enemies of the state. The government used this idea to justify the destruction of the allies, thus removing the popular support from the guerrilla militia. This was just the first tactics of many that the Guatemalan government used against its own people, turning next to something much worse.

When the United States intervened in the Guatemala conflict, they also trained militia corps in counterinsurgency techniques, with a hope that they would only be used to reinforce the national intelligence as a whole. The plan backfired when a death squad trained by the US captured thirty leftist citizens in the dead of night, tortured and murdered them, and threw their bodies in the Pacific. This became known as a “forced disappearance,” and it was not by any means the last instance Guatemala would see.

In 1978, General Fernando Romeo Lucas Garcia was elected as the president of Guatemala, and the escalation of violence was astounding. One-hundred murders ordered by the Guatemalan government were carried out in the year 1978, but by 1981 ten-thousand men, women and children had been killed in the night and in plain light of day, their bodies either left in the street, burned, or thrown into the ocean. Many were terrified, but there were few who tried to speak out. In 1891, a group of Mayan leaders sat in at the Spanish Embassy in Guatemala city, and despite the ambassador’s please for non-violence, Guatemalan forces stormed the embassy and in the seceding chaos, a fire broke out that killed thirty-six people, many of whom were Spanish.

The sheer terror of seeing entire villages destroyed forced citizens all over the country to flee from their homes, the Maya in particular. The estimate of the number of fled and otherwise displaced people from 1981 to 1983 ranges from 500,000 to 1.5 million. Those who fled left just in time to miss the bloodiest period in Guatemala’s history, a time that is referred to as the “silent holocaust.”

In 1892, General Efrain Rios Montt was elected to replace Lucas Garcia as head of state. The first thing he did when stepping in to office was to lead a campaign to wipe out enormous portions of the country’s indigenous populations. In the time from March 1982 to August 1983, 70,000 people fell victim to murder or forced disappearance. In April of 1982, Rios Montt launched...
a new attack on the Maya: something he called the Scorched Earth Operation. The government led militia, as well as several civilian patrols who were forced to join, systematically attacked 626 villages. People were tortured and murdered, crops were burned, drinking water was fouled. Their reasoning laid in the idea that those non-combatant civilians who lived in the villages still held sympathy for the combatants, so all were seen as targets.

After this bloody seventeen-month period, General Rios Montt was finally forced out of office in a coup in 1983. Three years later, the civilian government had taken shape. The new government passed a new constitution and slowly but surely started to bring peace and peace of mind to the citizens of Guatemala.

For almost a decade after the conflict was ended, two truth commissions closely examined the horrific events that took place in Guatemala during the 1980’s, and found undeniable evidence that the Guatemalan government had committed the crime of genocide against the Mayan people. The Historical Clarification Commission, mandated by the UN, found that 93% of the atrocities committed could be attributed to government forces, and of the 200,000 documented victims, 83% were indigenous. But those who wanted their crimes hidden still had the power to do so; all those who have attempted to expose the perpetrators of the crime have been silenced, one way or another, so the abusers of the human rights of the Maya were not brought to justice for a long time, despite two attempts to do so in Guatemalan and Spanish courts.

This year, a Guatemalan court charged General Efrain Rios Montt, now eighty-five, with genocide and crimes against humanity. He was only indicted on January 26, and his trial will not start for months, but there have already been problems with the system. On February 21, the judge who was supposed to be presiding over the case against Rios Montt stepped down after the defense questioned her ability to be unbiased. No one knows what the first hearing—scheduled in March—will bring, but the families of 200,000 Guatemalans are holding their breath until they find out.
The Trail of Tears
BY VINCENT PAGAN

"Murder is murder, and somebody must answer. Somebody must explain the streams of blood that flowed in the Indian country in the summer of 1838. Somebody must explain the 4,000 silent graves that mark the trail of the Cherokees to their exile. I wish I could forget it all, but the picture of 645 wagons lumbering over the frozen ground with their cargo of suffering humanity still lingers in my memory."

The Cherokee, a Native American tribe located in what is now Southeastern Tennessee, were a patriarchal community, holding brave warriors, medicine men and priests in high respect. They thought of war as a form of pollution among humanity and purified their warriors before assimilating back them into the community, but their first interaction with English settlers in 1654 would change their fate forever.

From 1654 until the end of the 17th century, the European settlers thought it in their best interests to form alliances with the natives they found in the New World. Trading flourished between the two groups of people, but in 1754 war broke out and the nature of these alliances drastically changed.

For the first four years of the French and Indian War, the Cherokee fought amicably at the side of the English settlers, but suspicions of betrayal drove a wedge between the two groups. The Anglo-Cherokee War was then fought, ending in 1761 with a peace treaty between the Cherokee nation and Virginia, and for a half-century, the Cherokee Nation remained docile.

In 1812, leaders of the newly founded U.S. called upon alliances with the Native Americans when they waged war against Britain to ensure their independence. The war went on from 1812-1815, claiming as many as 15,000 lives, many of them Cherokee. After the war ended, the Cherokee returned to their homes and looked forward to a peaceful coexistence with their American neighbors, never suspecting what was to befall them in only a few short years.

In 1828, Andrew Jackson was elected U.S. president. In his inaugural address, he made mention of the Native American tribes who fought by his side during the War of 1812:

It will be my sincere and constant desire to observe toward the Indian tribes within our limits a just and liberal policy, and to give that humane and considerate attention to their rights and their wants which is consistent with the habits of our Government and the feelings of our people.

President Jackson’s actions in the years following his election were far from “considerate.” He favored removal of the Native Americans from their home territories, although his predecessor, John Adams, did not. In 1825, Georgia threatened to nullify the laws protecting the rights of the Cherokee Nation residing in the state if Adams did not forcibly remove them from the land. Adams refused. When Jackson was elected in 1828, Georgia followed through with its threat and stripped the Cherokee of their protective rights, extending Georgia state law over their entire territory and making it illegal for Cherokee men to meet for legislative purposes.

At the federal level, Jackson began talks with the Senate and the newly founded Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to draft and sign the Indian Removal Act. The act was supposed to start voluntary migration from the native home of the “Five Civilized Tribes”—the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek and Seminole—to the territory west of the Mississippi. However, government pressure suggested that the migration was something more than “mandatory.” Jackson tried to use the Indian Removal Act as a tool to ratify the conflict in Georgia, but few Cherokee chose to leave their homelands, leading the president to take further action.

The Cherokee National Council (the head of Cherokee government) took the state of Georgia to federal court, and even though the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Native Americans, Georgia continued to enforce its laws. In 1835, the Treaty of New Echota was negotiated, allotting a small amount of land and state citizenship to those Cherokee who chose to stay in their homeland and abide by state laws. The Council pleaded with the Senate not to pass the law, but in May 1836, it passed by a single vote. A year later, Jackson’s presidential term was over, and Martin Van Buren, Jackson’s former vice president, took over and continued his predecessor’s work.

In 1838, John Ross (principal chief of the Cherokee
Nation) hand-delivered a petition signed by 15,665 people to the U.S. Senate asking the officials to overturn the treaty, but two months later, Congress tabled it and it was never considered again.

On May 10, 1838, Major General Winfield Scott gathered the Cherokee who remained in Georgia and warned them:

Cherokees! The President of the United States has sent me with a powerful army, to cause you, in obedience to the treaty of 1835 [the Treaty of New Echota], to join that part of your people who have already established in prosperity on the other side of the Mississippi...Think of this, my Cherokee brethren! I am an old warrior, and have been present at many a scene of slaughter, but spare me, I beseech you, the horror of witnessing the destruction of the Cherokees.

The Cherokee did not resist. On May 23, 1838, the first wave of Cherokee was rounded up and moved westward.

A major draught hanging over the southeast region of the country postponed further movement until September when mass numbers of Cherokee were forced from their homes to the other side of the Great River to fend for themselves.

The journey to the Western Territory was not an easy one. John Burnett, a soldier appointed to accompany the walk, gave one of the few first-hand accounts of the conditions in which the Cherokee lived:

I saw the helpless Cherokees arrested and dragged from their homes, and driven at the bayonet point into the stockades. And in the chill of a drizzling rain on an October morning I saw them loaded like cattle or sheep into 645 wagons and started toward the west.

One can never forget the sadness and solemnity of that morning. Chief John Ross led in prayer and when the bugle sounded and the wagons started rolling many of the children rose to their feet and waved their little hands good-by to their mountain homes, knowing they were leaving them forever. Many of these helpless people did not have blankets and many of them had been driven from home barefooted.

On the morning of November the 17th we encountered a terrific sleet and snow storm with freezing temperatures and from that day until we reached the end of the fateful journey on March the 26th, 1839, the sufferings of the Cherokees were awful. The trail of the exiles was a trail of death. They had to sleep in the wagons and on the ground without fire. And I have known as many as 22 of them to die in one night of pneumonia due to ill treatment, cold and exposure. Among this number was [a] noble-hearted woman [who] died a martyr to childhood, giving her only blanket for the protection of a sick child. She rode thinly clad through a blinding sleet and snow storm, developed pneumonia and died in the still hours of a bleak winter night, with her head resting on a saddle blanket...Her unconfined body was buried in a shallow grave by the roadside far from her native home, and the sorrowing Cavalcade moved on.

The only trouble that I had with anybody on the entire journey to the west was a brutal teamster...who was using his whip on an old feeble Cherokee to hasten him into the wagon. The sight of that old and nearly blind creature quivering under the lashes of a bull whip was
too much for me. I attempted to stop [the teamster] and it ended in a personal encounter. He lashed me across the face, the wire tip on his whip cutting a bad gash in my cheek. The little hatchet that I had carried in my hunting days was in my belt and [he] was carried unconscious from the scene...

The long painful journey to the west ended March 26th, 1839, with 4,000 silent graves reaching from the foothills of the Smoky Mountains to what is known as Indian territory in the West. And covetousness on the part of the white race was the cause of all that the Cherokees had to suffer.

For more than a century, the Native American tribes who were relocated during the Trail of Tears received no remuneration for what had happened to them, but on Sept. 8, 2000, the Bureau of Indian Affairs concluded a formal apology to the Native American peoples with the following statement:

We cannot yet ask your forgiveness, not while the burdens of this agency's history weigh so heavily on tribal communities. What we do ask is that, together, we allow the healing to begin: As you return to your homes, and as you talk with your people, please tell them that time of dying is at its end. Tell your children that the time of shame and fear is over. Tell your young men and women to replace their anger with hope and love for their people. Together, we must wipe the tears of seven generations. Together, we must allow our broken hearts to mend. Together, we will face a challenging world with confidence and trust. Together, let us resolve that when our future leaders gather to discuss the history of this institution, it will be time to celebrate the rebirth of joy, freedom and progress for the Indian Nations. The Bureau of Indian Affairs was born in 1824 in a time of war on Indian people. May it live in the year 2000 and beyond as an instrument of their prosperity.

Over the course of the past century, scholars and historians have reexamined the history of the U.S., calling into question the decisions and actions of our country’s past leaders. The task of proving a president’s error is not an easy one, but in December 2003, Alfred A. Cave, a professor of history at the University of Toledo, wrote a 23-page article for the scholarly journal The Historian entitled, “Abuse of Power: Andrew Jackson and the Indian Removal Act of 1830.” In his article, Cave became the first person in academia to properly label what occurred in 1838: genocide.

In 2009, President Barack Obama signed into law the Native American Apology Resolution, which apologized for the past actions by the U.S. against Native American people. The law also included a disclaimer that said the bill neither authorizes nor supports any legal claims against the U.S.

The Cherokee call the forced migration of their ancestors Nunna-da-ul-tsun-yi: The Place Where They Cried.
Kristallnacht came…and everything changed.” — Stadt Krefeld

On Nov. 9, 1938, at a dinner memorializing a new beer hall, news reached Adolf Hitler about the death of his comrade, Ernst von Rath. The Nazi official had been shot by the son of a Polish Jewish family who had been expelled from their home. After speaking with Hitler, a Nazi official said: “The Führer has decided that… demonstrations should not be prepared or organized by the Party, but insofar as they erupt spontaneously, they are not to be hampered.”

Late into that night, Nazi troops dressed in civilian clothes and armed with axes and sledgehammers entered Jewish neighborhoods all over Germany; citizens awoke the next morning and found the shattered glass of holy buildings and Jewish businesses covering the streets. 267 synagogues were destroyed across Germany; more than 15,000 businesses were vandalized; and perhaps most abhorrently, 30,000 men were arrested and sent to concentration camps on the basis of their ethnicities and religions alone.

The night of Nov. 9, 1938, became known as Kristallnacht, or the Night of Broken Glass. It was one of the major events that sparked the series of atrocities known across the world as the Holocaust.

“Then they came for me, and there was no one left to speak for me.” — Martin Niemöller

Throughout the 1930s, Jews in Nazi-occupied Germany slowly started losing their rights as citizens. April 1, 1933, saw a boycott of Jewish businesses, July of that year saw the sterilization of more than 400,000 people against their will, and 1936 saw the Nuremburg Laws go into effect, which effectively stripped German Jews of any rights that they had left and forbade interreligious marriages or even sexual relations. When introducing the laws, Hitler said: “Should this attempt fail, [the Jewish people] must then be handed over by law to the National-Socialist Party for a final solution.”

After the vandalism of Kristallnacht in 1938, the persecution of Jews began to go even further toward the inevitable. Families were forced from their homes, sometimes in the dead of night, and taken to live in small, gated, overcrowded areas called ghettos, which were hardly fit for safe or healthy living. The worst and most crowded was the Warsaw ghetto, which contained 400,000 people and, only covering 1.3% of the city’s total area, averaged about seven people per room.

Men, women and children died every day in the ghettos from starvation or illness, or from being murdered in plain sight by Nazi soldiers who were in charge of patrolling the ghettos. The families in the ghettos lived with caution every day, so that they would not become one of the people who disappeared from one day to the next. But that caution escalated to fear on July 22, 1942, when the first group of 300,000 Jews was deported from the ghettos to the Treblinka II extermination camp.

From the start of the persecution of Jews and the birth of Hitler’s army in the early 1930s, concentration camps were built all over Europe. The camps were not built for extermination, but rather for the housing of incarcerated Jews. Prisoners were brought into the camps and tattooed with identification numbers, after which they would stand at roll call, sometimes for hours, and be taken to be put to work. The camps were a systematic way of mass murder; men and women were worked to exhaustion or death, and many of those who survived the slave labor, particularly in the late ‘30s, were sent to extermination camps to be killed.

By 1942, countless numbers of lives had already been lost to the Holocaust, but that year, the Nazi Party would propose a solution that would cost millions more.

“It is my melancholy duty to inform you officially that, in persistence by Germany in her invasion of Poland, Great Britain is at war, and that, as a result, Australia is also at war...” — Robert Menzies, Prime Minister to Australia

In the meeting that was held on the night following Kristallnacht, Hermann Göring said: “The Jewish problem will reach its solution if, in any time soon, we will be drawn into war beyond our border—then it is obvious that we will have to manage a final account with the Jews.” It would be four years before the Nazi Party came to their “solution,” and before they could, other steps needed to be taken to ensure their success.

On Sept. 1, 1939, Germany invaded Poland from the
north, west and south, and was joined by the Soviet Union on Sept. 17 from the east. Polish forces, with limited aid from the British and French (the “Allies”), were defeated Oct. 6, and Germany took complete control of Poland on Oct. 8.

Nazi forces continued moving westward, annexing countries such as Sweden and Denmark, which had been previously uninvolved in the war. On May 10, 1940, less than a year after the invasion of Poland, Germany invaded Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and France. The following month, France was invaded by Italy, which was, in effect, declaring war on France and Great Britain. Expansion continued over the following two years, and by 1941, German forces had seized control over most of Europe and parts of Northern Africa. Göbel said the following during a speech on Dec. 14, 1941:

We should have sympathy rather with our own German people. If the German people have to sacrifice 160,000 victims in yet another campaign in the east, then those responsible for this bloody conflict will have to pay for it with their lives.

The war had gone past German borders, and in 1942, the Final Solution went into effect.

“I have received a letter written on the Fuehrer’s orders requesting that the Jewish question be now, once and for all, coordinated and solved one way or another.” — Hermann Goering

On Jan. 20, 1942, a conference led by Reinhard Heydrich was held in the Berlin suburb of Wannsee to discuss a solution to the Jewish “problem” in Axis-controlled Europe. At the meeting, Heydrich made the following statement, which was difficult to misunderstand:

Regarding the Jewish Question, the Führer is determined to clear the table. He warned the Jews that if they were to cause another world war, it would lead to their own destruction. Those were not empty words. Now the world war has come. The destruction of the Jews must be its necessary consequence. We cannot be sentimental about it. It is not for us to feel sympathy for the Jews.

Under proper guidance, in the course of the Final Solution the Jews are to be allocated for appropriate labor in the East. Able-bodied Jews, separated according to sex, will be taken in large work columns to these
areas for work on roads, in the course of which action doubtless a large portion will be eliminated by natural causes. The possible final remnant will, since it will undoubtedly consist of the most resistant portion, have to be treated accordingly, because it is the product of natural selection and would, if released, act as the seed of a new Jewish revival.

This “Final Solution” was approved by those in attendance at the conference and was put into effect on March 6, 1942.

“When I came to power, I did not want the concentration camps to become old age pensioners’ homes, but instruments of terror.” — Adolf Hitler, Leader of the Third Reich

After the Final Solution began in 1942, Jews were deported from ghettos all across Europe and were taken in cattle trains to extermination camps. Upon arrival, people were branded and sent one of two ways: to go to the right meant they’d be going to slave labor, and to go to the left meant they’d be going to the gas chamber. By the time the second or third group arrived at the camp, the victims crammed into the cattle cars knew that 90 percent of the people who surrounded them would lose their lives in the coming hours.

From 1942 to 1945, millions of people were killed in extermination camps—not only Jews but people from many different ethnic backgrounds, homosexuals and the disabled—using horrific methods, including gas chambers and mass shootings. People all around Europe were being taken from their homes in the night and sometimes killed in front of their entire families or in the street. Resistance groups in France and Denmark did what they could to help escaped refugees flee to Switzerland and Britain, but they could only do so much.

By May 1944, Nazi leader Heinrich Himmler proclaimed that “the Jewish question in Germany and the occupied countries [had] been solved.” Millions of people had lost their lives to the concentration and extermination camps, but the Nazi party felt that there was still more to be done, and their tasks at hand were becoming more difficult. Soviet forces were defeating Nazi armies, and the Germans had been evicted from Italy. Former allies to the Germans were joining forces with the Allies of the west, and the U.S. had joined the war.

“There our troops found sights, sounds and stenches horrible beyond belief, cruelties so enormous as to be incomprehensible to the normal mind.”

As Soviets grew closer, concentration camps started to close and death marches of hundreds of thousands of prisoners across tens of miles commenced, claiming 250,000 more lives. Upon learning about the Soviet advance to the east, Nazi leaders started to close down and destroy any evidence of the existence of the camps. Corpses were cremated, crematoriums destroyed and crops were grown over the remains of the buildings.

From July 23, 1944, when the Soviet armies liberated the Majdnek concentration camp to May 1945, when an evacuated Treblinka was destroyed, 11 camps were discovered, liberated and destroyed by the Allied forces. When the war ended on Sept. 2, 1945, the British War Cabinet, led by Prime Minister Winston Churchill, began a search for those who would be held responsible for the death of an estimated 17 million lives.

“For the dead and the living, we must bear witness.” — Elie Weisel

Several trials were held to prosecute the leaders of the Nazi party for the acts of genocide during World War II, the most notable being the Nuremberg Tribunal in 1945. Twenty-four major war criminals were put on trial and indicted for four different crimes: (1) participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of a crime against peace; (2) planning, initiating and waging wars of aggression and other crimes against peace; (3) war crimes; and (4) crimes against humanity. Of the 24 indicted, five were acquitted, eight served prison sentences from 10 years to life and 11 were sentenced to death.

While the leading war criminals of the Holocaust were tried and punished for their crimes against humanity, the communities of those affected have still not recovered. Memorials and monuments all over the world have been erected in remembrance of the millions of lives lost to hatred and bigotry, many bearing the phrase “nie vergessen,” which means never forget.
On April 6, 1994, Rwandan Hutu President Juvenal Habyarimana was assassinated. This sparked the climax of a long-standing ethnic competition between two groups of people in Rwanda: the Tutsi, who were the minority, and the Hutu, who had controlled a majority of the power in the country up to that point. The assassination caused the Hutu to lash out, beginning with an uprising and the killing of Tutsis in large numbers. It ended with a post-civil war peace agreement between the two groups that has been in effect since the late 1980s. As many as 1 million Tutsis were massacred, totaling to about 20 percent of the country’s population before the conflict began. The following timeline depicts the centuries-old conflict between the Hutu and the Tutsis that led up to the genocide, as well as its aftermath.

1100s—Hutu people settle in a region formerly inhabited by hunter-gatherer Twa Pygmies and become peasant farmers.

1500s—Tutsis begin migrating to the area that is now Rwanda. Majority Hutu community come under the dominance of cattle-owning Tutsi peoples, immigrants from the east who become a semi-aristocracy and establish control through land and cattle contracts.

1600s—Tutsi King Ruganzu Ndori subdues central Rwanda and outlying Hutu area; Ruganzu Rwimba, a Tutsi leader, founds kingdom near Kigali.

1800s—Tutsi King Kigeri Rwabugiri establishes a unified state with a centralized military structure.

1905—British explorer Hannig Speke is the first European to visit the area. Rwanda becomes part of German East Africa.

1916—Belgian forces occupy Rwanda, renaming it and its neighboring kingdom of Burundi Ruanda-Urundi.

1923—Belgium grants the League of Nations (later the United Nations) the mandate to govern Ruanda-Urundi, which is ruled indirectly through Tutsi kings.

1946—Ruanda-Urundi becomes a UN trust territory governed by Belgium.

1957—Hutus issue a manifesto calling for change in Rwanda’s power structure to give them a voice that measures up with their numbers; Hutu political parties are formed.

1959—Tutsi King Kigeri V, together with tens of thousands of Tutsis, are forced into exile in Uganda following inter-ethnic violence. The Union National Rwandanise (UNAR) party is formed. Politician Dominique Mbonyumutwa (Hutu) is beaten by a UNAR member, leading to a violent backlash that kills thousands of Tutsis.

1960—An election is held. Rwandans vote to abolish the Tutsi monarchy. Dominique Mbonyumutwa (Hutu) becomes provisional President of Rwanda.

1962—Belgium grants Rwanda independence. Ruanda-Urundi becomes the two free states of Rwanda and Burundi.

1963—Gregoire Kayibanda (Hutu) becomes provisional President of Rwanda.

1973—Gregoire Kayibanda (Hutu) becomes the first elected President of Rwanda.

1990—The Tutsi Rwandan Patriotic Front makes an attack from Uganda, starting the Rwandan Civil War.

August 1993—The Arusha Peace Agreement is signed, ending the civil war.

September 1993—UN Security General recommends that the UN Security Council send a peacekeeping force to Rwanda as a matter of urgency.

October 1993—UN peacekeeping force (UNAMIR), led by General Romeö Dallaire, is established and 2,500 soldiers from 23 countries are deployed.

December 1993—General Dallaire receives an anonymous letter from within the Rwandan Army warning about a plan to murder Tutsis to prevent the Arusha Accords from being implemented.

January 1994—Human Rights Watch publishes a report on the continued arming of militias in Rwanda. The
United Nations refuses General Dallaire’s request for permission to seize arms.

March 1994—The Arusha Peace Agreement still has not been implemented. The Secretary General of the UN Security Council to extend the UNAMIR mandate by six months.

April 5, 1994—The UN Security Council renews the UNAMIR mandate with the proviso that they will pull out within six weeks should the Arusha Peace Agreement not be implemented in that time.

April 6, 1994—The airplane carrying President Habyarimana of Rwanda and President Ntarymira of Burundi is shot down. Both are killed. Almost immediately, Tutsis are blamed and roadblocks are placed around Kigali. Ten Belgian soldiers are shot and killed. The genocide begins.

November, 1994—The United Nations establishes the International Criminal Tribunal to prosecute the people responsible for events in Rwanda during that year. So far, the tribunal has convicted 29 out of 50 accused, 11 trials are in progress and 14 people await trial in prison.

2003—Kofi Annan, who was the head of the UN Peacekeeping forces in 1994 when the genocide exploded, is accused by General Dallaire of withholding UN troops and not taking the threats and warnings of genocide seriously.

2004—Kofi Annan, also Security-General of the United Nations, stands before the Commission of Human Rights and speaks on the prevention of genocide. He says, “But let us not wait until the worst has happened, or is already happening. Let us not wait until the only alternatives to military action are futile handwringing or callous indifference. Only so can we honor the victims whom we remember today. Only so we can save those who might be victims tomorrow.”
This History of Chess
BY ELIZABETH RICE

The game that we understand as chess today was only beginning to solidify in the late 15th century. However, its predecessor, the Indian game of chaturanga, predated that by at least 1,000 years. Sources say that around 500 AD an Indian philosopher invented a game that pitted two opponents against each other with pieces that represented the four arms of the Indian army: foot soldiers, cavalry, armed chariots and elephants. Chaturanga, in fact, means “four-armed.” In addition, there were two additional pieces representing the army commanders: the king and his vizier. As cultures came in contact with India, chaturanga and its variations spread to Greece, China, Japan, Korea and the Muslim world, and through them into Europe.

During the medieval period, chess was known by both the elite and the peasant classes. At this time, the game was still undergoing transformation. Aspects of the game that are considered normal today, like castling, en passant, or the strong powers of the queen and bishop pieces, were slowly being integrated into basic play. This was generally to help speed up the game’s tempo. More often than not, the visibility of chess in Europe at this time was through literature rather than participation—as allegories or metaphors in courtly tales or Arthurian romances. Even the Catholic Church, which was originally suspicious of the game, used it as symbolism for moral lessons. In 1275, a Dominican friar, Jacobus de Cessolis, writes De Ludo Scaccorum (On the Game of Chess), a book more on morality rather than actual game play.

With the dawn of the Renaissance, the Western World acquainted itself with chess as professional, entertainment and intellectual pastime. Professional chess players were essentially nomadic chess hustlers. Many were able to make decent money from their work and some even entered under royal patronage. Giaochino Greco spent some time in Madrid as chess player in the court of King Philip IV. At this time, the first chess instruction manuals also were beginning to be published. In 1575, what some considered to be the first international chess match took place. A group of Italians traveled to Madrid, Spain, to challenge Ruy Lopez to a rematch. In 1560, Lopez, a Spanish priest, had traveled to Rome on ecclesiastical business and in the meantime had beaten some of the best Italian chess players in matches. Unfortunately, the 1575 match was poorly documented; thus, the result of the match was inconclusive.

The 18th and early 19th centuries saw an amplification of chess as an intellectual pursuit. While earlier books and works on the topic of chess deal more with play instruction, more players began to indulge in the analysis of chess theory and strategy. In 1749, A.D. Philidor, a prominent musician, released the first publication of his book, Analyse de Jeu Des Echecs. The book increased the popularity of chess during its time period and is still considered to be the most popular chess book of all time. One of Philidor’s biggest fans was Benjamin Franklin. In 1796 Columbian Magazine published Franklin’s article, “The Morals of Chess.” This period of time also caused chess enthusiasts to rethink chess as an entertainment. Philidor brought playing chess “blindfolded,” in not looking at the board, back into vogue. In 1769, a Hungarian engineer created the first automaton chess machine, “The Turk.” It looked like a chess-playing robot at a table, but underneath it held a man who made all the robot’s moves using strong magnets. This type of novelty existed well into the 20th century.

In the second half of the 19th century, with the Industrial Revolution well under way, international game play became more prominent. The strongest players consistently held tournaments and matches against each other all over in Europe. In 1851, Howard Staunton organized the first official international chess tournament. Coinciding with the Great London Exhibition showcasing Queen Victoria’s vast domains, Staunton succeeded in luring the best chess players in Europe to come to play. A few years later, New York held the First American Chess Congress, which was won by Paul Morphy. Considered the first child chess prodigy, Morphy had already beat all the best players in his hometown of New Orleans and visiting chess great, Johann Lowenthal, by age 13. In 1858, he traveled to Europe to take on the best players the continent had to offer, beating most of them in multiple matches. Morphy may have been a prominent American in the world of chess at this time, but the U.S. also had become an important chess destination. In 1886, our country became the host of the first World Chess Championship, which was won by naturalized American citizen, Wilhelm Steinitz.

The end of the 19th century also saw changes in
technical game play. As a result of the abuse of unlimited time to ponder moves, time controls were instigated. Hourglasses were originally used, but in 1883, pendulum game clocks were introduced. This was further improved upon between 1895 and 1900, when push button game clocks were adapted for chess use. Over the years, variations of the push button clock have been introduced to chess play, including the Fischer clock, invented by Bobby Fischer, which can help players gain extra time.

International chess play becomes standardized in the 20th century and a professional vocabulary developed. After a tournament in St. Petersburg in 1895–1896, people began using the term “grandmaster” to refer to only the strongest players in the chess world. The Fédération Internationale des Échecs (FIDE), established in 1924, helped regulate international chess play and the bestowing of professional titles. In 1950, regulations were instigated for the title of “grandmaster.” These regulations would change in 1953, 1957, 1965 and 1970.

The second half of the 20th century forced chess into the media spotlight. The 1972 World Chess Championships was one of the most publicized games in the history of chess. While the game had no direct political implication, American Bobby Fischer playing against Soviet Boris Spassky seemed a real life metaphor for the Cold War. Fischer would win spectacularly, but renounce the title of World Chess Champion by default to challenger Anatoly Karpov three years later. In 1978, Nona Gaprindashvili became the first female to achieve the International Grandmaster title. With the advent of computers and the Internet, playing chess online becomes a phenomenon. In 1996, World Chess Champion and International Grandmaster Garry Kasparov was beaten by computer Deep Blue in the first game of their chess match. Kasparov would go on to win the match, however. Three years later, he would pit himself against the entire world, via the Internet. Moves were based on the plurality of vote and Kasparov ultimately won.

Throughout the history of chess, the center of the chess world has moved all over Europe, from Italy to France, Great Britain, Russia and even America for a time. However, male dominance has remained constant in the history of this sport. While ancient Greek, Byzantine and medieval images show women playing chess, men have dominated the competitive arena. It was only within the last half-century that women have gained the highest title of International Grandmaster in chess. In addition, since the Renaissance, chess has been largely a European pastime. The precursors of chess were originally developed in India, but that country did not attain its first Grandmaster until 1987. In our multicultural and advancing world, how do medieval prejudices still exist on a literally intellectual battlefield?
One of the most identifiable words associated with chess is the degree of Grandmaster. The title of Grandmaster, or International Grandmaster, is the highest awarded by FIDE, Fédération Internationale des Échecs or World Chess Federation. While this term has been used since 1896, it wasn’t until 1950 that FIDE awarded the first official titles to 27 players. FIDE does not award the title posthumously; thus, there are countless players who were deserving of the title but never received it. In 1953, the regulations to become a Grandmaster were changed because of previous political biases allowed by the rules. The regulations were changed again in 1957, 1965 and 1970. Today, regulations dictate that players need to have an Elo rating of at least 2500, in addition to at least two favorable outcomes out of 27 in tournaments with other Grandmasters. The Elo rating system was developed by Arpad Elo, a physics professor and chess enthusiast. It calculates a player’s relative skill level in two-player-based games. Since 1950, this title has been bestowed on many players. However, here we will highlight names mentioned in Fish Men along with other important chess players who may or may not have the “official” title of Grandmaster.

Ruy Lopez: (b. c. 1530 – d. c. 1580) In 1560, Ruy Lopez, a Spanish priest, traveled to Rome on ecclesiastical affairs related to the recent election of Pope Pius IV. While there, he engaged with many professional chess players including Giovanni Leonardo and Paolo Boi. Upon returning to Spain in 1561, Ruy wrote his own chess manual, Libro de la Invencion liberal y arte del juego de Axedrez, because he found the existing popular manual by Portuguese chess player Pedro Damiano insufficient.

Giovanni Leonardo: (b. 1542 – d. 1587) Giovanni Leonardo was considered one of the strongest players of his time. As a professional chess player, he was ostensibly a nomadic chess hustler. Chess hustling is not a new phenomenon and was popular during the 16th and 17th centuries. Leonardo, along with fellow player Paolo Boi, traveled to Madrid, Spain, in 1575 for a rematch against Ruy Lopez, who had played them while in Rome. Some consider this to be the first international chess match.

Gioachino Greco: (b. c. 1600 – d. c. 1637) Gioachino Greco was a professional chess player and considered one of the best of his time. In 1621, Greco left Italy to go to Paris. There, he won about 5,000 crowns, a currency of the period, and decided to travel to England in 1622. On his way to London, he was robbed of all his winnings. While in London, he beat the best of the English players and then returned to Paris where he recouped his lost winnings. He then moved to Madrid, where he defeated opponents at the court of King Philip IV of Spain. After such accomplishments, he decided to move to the West Indies with a nobleman. He died there in 1637, leaving all his money to the Jesuit order.

A.D. Philidor: (b. 9/7/1726 – d. 8/31/1795) Francois Andre Danican Philidor was born into a well-known musical family. Throughout his life, he maintained a career as both a musician/composer and a professional chess player. He was known for playing chess “blindfolded,” meaning he did not look at a board. While this feat was not particularly new in the world of chess, such a stunt had not been exhibited in 500 years. In 1749, he published Analyse du jeu des Échecs, a well-known chess manual. It is the most popular chess manual of all time.

Pierre Charles Fourne de Saint – Amant: (b. 9/12/1800 – d. 10/29/1872) After the death of La Bourdonnais, another prominent French chess player, in 1840 Saint-Amant was considered the strongest player in the world. Taking up La Bourdonnais’s mantle, he revived the chess magazine, La Palamède, in 1841 and edited it until 1847. La Palamède had originally been created by La Bourdonnais in 1836, but deteroriated in 1839 because of his waning health and a shrinking wallet. Saint-Amant would play Howard Staunton in 1843 and lose spectacularly to him at a rematch a few months later.

Howard Staunton: (b. 1810 – d. 6/22/1874) While perhaps not as strong of player as he thought he was, Howard Staunton was the first person to commercialize chess through product endorsement. He lent his name to Nathaniel Cooke, a prominent craftsman, who designed a set of chess pieces. The Staunton pattern chess set is the most popular design used today. Howard Staunton also organized the first official international chess tournament in 1851. He was able to get the leading chess greats of the time to come to London to compete for the title of World Chess Champion and a £500 prize.
He recorded the tournament in his 1852 book, The Chess Tournament.

Wilhelm Steinitz: (b. 5/17/1836 – d. 8/12/1900) Wilhelm Steinitz was considered one of the greatest chess theorists as well one of the strongest players of his time. He wrote multiple works on the “logical philosophy of chess.” In 1886, he inaugurated the World Chess Championship with a series of matches against Johann Zukertort across the U.S. He won and the competition has been played ever since. In 1895, he was one of the five strongest players to participate in the first Grandmaster tournament in St. Petersburg.

Paul Morphy: (b. 6/22/1837 – d. 7/10/1884) Paul Morphy is considered to be the first child chess prodigy. He picked up chess after watching his father play. At age 12, he had already beaten all the great chess masters of New Orleans. A year later, he was chosen to play against master Johann Lowenthal, who during a tour of the U.S. asked to play against New Orleans’ strongest champion. Thinking that Morphy was a joke, he was surprised that he lost to such a young boy. Passing his bar exam in 1857, Morphy was not allowed to practice law until he turned 21, so he decided to play chess in the meantime. He traveled to New York to play in the First American Chess Congress, which he won. In 1858, he traveled to Europe to play against Howard Staunton, who refused an initial invitation to the U.S. for a match. While Staunton continued to avoid the young prodigy, Morphy played the rest of the chess greats in Europe at the time. He abruptly left the chess world in 1860 at age 23.

Siegbert Tarrasch: (b. 3/5/1862 in Breslau, Prussia - d. 2/17/1934) Tarrasch was a German chess master and physician who was noted for his books on chess theories. He played in the Grandmaster tournament in 1895 in St. Petersburg. While Steinitz won the title of World Champion in the 1886 tournament, many considered Tarrasch’s skills to be on par in the following years. Between 1888-1894, he took five consecutive first prizes. Tarrasch’s skill would begin to wane as his theories on chess became more dogmatic and unwilling to change. However, he was considered to be a good teacher.

Emmanuel Lasker: (b. 12/24/1868 – d. 1/11/1941) Emmanuel Lasker was a German philosopher and mathematician who held the title of the World Chess Champion for 27 years through the late 19th and early 20th century. Along with Wilhelm Steinitz, Harry Nelson Pillsbury, Siegbert Tarrasch and Mikhail Tchigorin, Lasker played in the first Grandmaster tournament in 1895. His work included chess publications, a drama and developments in commutative algebra, bridge and game theory. He died in New York in 1941 at age 72.

José Raúl Capablanca: (b. 11/19/1888 – d. 3/8/1942) José Raúl Capablanca, a.k.a the Human Chess Machine, was a Cuban chess player who held the World Chess Championship title for six years from 1921–1926. He dominated with his high speed and skillful end games. He is remembered as one of the greatest players in history and revered among the Grandmasters. In 1918, Capablanca emerged as the strongest competitor against Emmanuel Lasker for the World Champion title. Lasker was hesitant to accept the challenge and in 1920 he resigned the championship to Capablanca by default. Not wishing to become the champion in this fashion, Capablanca’s backers were able to raise the prize purse to $20,000 if Lasker would come to play him in Havana. Thus in 1921, Capablanca beat Lasker fairly four games to none with 10 draws, winning the title of World Champion.

Alexander Alekhine: (b. 10/31/1892 – d. 3/24/1946) Alexander Alekhine’s defeat of Capablanca for the World Championship in 1927 resulted in the longest chess championship match at that time. However, negotiations for a rematch with Capablanca soured their relationship to the point where they would not play each other in tournaments because they both refused to meet the other. Alekhine enjoyed great success throughout his career and was a prominent chess writer and theorist. He died in a hotel room in Portugal in 1946 apparently of a heart attack, although some believe he was murdered for his anti-Soviet politics.

Ruben Fine: (b. 10/11/1914 – d. 3/26/1993) Ruben Fine was an American chess master, psychologist and author of many books about chess and psychology. Like Bobby Fischer a few decades later, Fine gave up chess at the height of his powers, retiring in 1938 after a tremendous victory at the AVRO tournament in the Netherlands. He was considered one of the finest speed players in the U.S. and also a skillful blindfold player,
meaning someone who plays without seeing a board. In those days, speed chess—often called “rapid transit,” or “rapids”—was played at 10 seconds a move. Fine won almost every rapid tournament he entered. He once took on four strong players simultaneously in a rapid blindfold exhibition. With his back to the boards and the moves relayed to him, he won all four games.

Eduard Gufeld: (b. 3/19/1936 - d. 9/23/2002) Gufeld was a Soviet International Grandmaster of chess and a chess author. He started the FIDE Committee on Chess Art and Exhibition.

Boris Spassky: (b. 1/30/1937) Boris Spassky was born in the Soviet Union in 1937 and broke many records with his early successes as a young prodigy. Interestingly, he was often at heads with the American prodigy, Bobby Fischer, two opposite sides of the Cold War played on the chessboard. In 1972, Fischer played Spassky for the World Championship. With preference toward Spassky to defend his title, he ultimately lost to the temperamental American. The oldest living former World Champion, he
has been a consistent and formidable presence in the international chess scene for more than 60 years.

Nona Gaprindashvili: (b. 5/3/1941) Nona Gaprindashvili is a Georgian chess player. She was the first woman to achieve Grandmaster title after winning the Women’s World Championship in 1978.

Bobby Fischer: (b. 3/9/1943 – d. 1/17/2008) Bobby Fischer was born in Chicago in 1943 to Regina Wender Fischer, a single mother and political activist who had recently returned to the U.S. from studying medicine in Moscow. Fischer was brought up in Brooklyn and went on to be one of the world’s greatest and most famous chess players, known not only for his proficiency at chess but also for his eccentric behavior and his conflicts with the U.S. government. Fischer had a meteoric rise through the world of chess becoming a Grandmaster at 15 and from age of 23 until his death, he won every match and tournament completed. He played Boris Spassky in 1972 for the World Chess Championship, which received unprecedented international attention. The Cold War context made it one of the most anticipated chess matches in history and Fischer’s victory was seen as as significant triumph for America in this Soviet-dominated sport. Bobby Fischer Day was held in New York to celebrate his win. Fischer was a controversial figure in modern chess, expressing anti-Semitic and anti-American views, and often making accusation of corruption and collusion within the chess community. He also contributed a great deal to the sport including new strategies, several books and a new type of chess clock.

Anatoly Karpov: (b. 5/23/1951) Karpov is a Russian chess Grandmaster and former World Champion. He was the official World Champion from 1975-1985 until he was defeated by Garry Kasparov. He played three matches against Kasparov for the title from 1986-1990, before becoming FIDE World Champion once again after Kasparov broke away from FIDE in 1993. He held the title until 1993, when he resigned his title in protest against FIDE’s new World Championship rules. For his decades-long standing among the world’s elite, Karpov is considered one of the greatest players of all time.

Garry Kasparov: (b. 4/13/1963) Garry Kasparov is now retired. He is one of the greatest chess players in history. He had the longest run as the No. 1 rated player in the world from 1986 until his retirement in 2005. Kasparov is also a political activist and vocal opponent to Vladimir Putin—he had intended to run for president in 2008, but was forced to withdraw when he couldn’t meet certain legal requirements, allegedly because of Putin’s interference.

Susan Polgár: (b. 4/19/1969) Susan Polgár, born Polgár Zsuzsanna and often known as Zsuzsa Polgár, is from Hungary. She is the first woman to attain an International Grandmaster status by achieving three GM norms and a rating over 2500 in January 1991.

Viswanathan Anand: (b. 12/11/1969) Anand is an Indian chess Grandmaster, the current World Chess Champion and currently fourth highest rated player in the world. Anand’s chess career began at a young age; he became India’s first Grandmaster in 1987 at age 18.

Judit Polgár: (b. 7/29/1976) Judit Polgár is a Hungarian chess Grandmaster and sister to Susan Polgár. In 1991, Polgár achieved the title of Grandmaster at age 15 years and 4 months, the youngest person ever to do so at that time.

Humpy Koneru: (b. 3/31/1987) Humpy Koneru of India took the title of not only an International Grandmaster, but the youngest Grandmaster in history (stealing this age record from Judit Polgár by three months) in 2001.

Magnus Carlsen: (b. 11/30/1990) Magnus Carlsen is from Tonsberg, Norway. He is currently the highest ranked Grandmaster in the world according to FIDE. At age 13, he became one of the youngest Grandmasters in the world.

Hou Yifan (b. 2/27/1994) Hou Yifan is a Chinese chess prodigy. She is the reigning Women’s World Chess Champion, the youngest ever to win the title, as well as the youngest female player ever to qualify for the title of International Grandmaster at age 14.
Breaking into the Boys Club

BY TERESA RNDE

In *Fish Men* we are acquainted with a cast of characters: Rey, 92, Cash, Jerome, PeeWee and John. While hustling for chess, they discuss the histories of such chess greats as artist Marcel Duchamp, grandmaster Bobby Fischer and champions Emmanuel Lasker and Anatoly Karpov. Absent from both the play and the players’ discussions, though, are women. Mothers, wives and girlfriends are referenced, but no female characters are present in *Fish Men*, nor in the stories of chess greats the characters tell. In the real world, though, there are female chess greats. They are not as numerous as are men in chess, and players and scholars alike have asked: “Why are there so few women in chess?” But like any opinion-based question, there is no single answer. We do know, however, about the lives of some very important women in chess, as well as the women who have earned the title of either Woman Grandmaster or International Grandmaster. Their stories are as interesting and varied as those of men in chess, even if they are not as prolific.

You might be asking: What is the difference between a Woman Grandmaster and an International Grandmaster? Like many sports, chess often is divided on gender lines, and as such, tournaments exist to award female chess champions in their own arena. The Grandmaster title is afforded to any human with an Elo rating of at least 2500, in addition to at least two favorable outcomes out of 27 in tournaments with other grandmasters. The Elo rating system calculates a player’s relative skill level in two-player-based games. Any woman or man classified as an “International Grandmaster” then must achieve an Elo of 2500 or more in conjunction with the appropriate tournament wins.

Woman Grandmasters, by comparison, need to have only an Elo of 2300 in conjunction with two or more norms in events covering at least 27 games. In any other sport, this would be akin to a handicap, and as such, some have argued the title of Woman Grandmaster is patronizing. Others, still, recognize it as an accomplishment in its own right, regardless of its lower standards. Women also can earn this Grandmaster title by winning a Women’s World Championship. Nona Gaprindashvili was the first woman to accomplish the Woman Grandmaster title after winning the Women’s World Championship in 1978, followed by Maia Chiburdanidze, who also won the Women’s World Championship.

A number of other women, however, have opted to win the International Grandmaster title in the traditional manner—the same manner by which a man might earn this title. The first woman to accomplish this feat was Susan Polgár in January 1991 by achieving three GM norms and rating over 2500. In December 1991, Susan’s sister, Judit Polgár, went on to be the second woman to earn the ranking of International Grandmaster by traditional means. She also broke a Bobby Fischer record by becoming the youngest International Grandmaster ever. Sisters Susan, Judit and Sofia Polgár, all trained in chess from a young age by their father, hold chess records and impressive titles for both male and female. The wins of women in the early ’90s set the stage for a quick increase in female Grandmasters.

Following the Polgár sisters’ International Grandmaster accolades in 1991, Pia Cramling of Sweden went on to become a Grandmaster in 1992. Xie Jun of China became the second Chinese Grandmaster ever and the first female Chinese International Grandmaster in the mid-’90s, followed in 2001 by another Chinese female International Grandmaster, Zhu Chen. By 2002 Humpy Koneru of India took the title of not only International Grandmaster, but the youngest Grandmaster in history (stealing this age record from Judit Polgár by three months). Bulgarian International Grandmaster Antoaneta Stefanova earned her Grandmaster status in 2003. Alexandra Kosteniuk of Russia and Zhaoqin Peng of Holland received their Grandmaster statuses for winning European World Championships, although now International Grandmaster status is no longer afforded for winning the EWC.

Since 2004, the number of women with the International Grandmasters has doubled! Three women achieved the status in 2007 (two by traditional norms and one by winning the Women’s World Championship), five more women became International Grandmasters in 2008 by traditional norms and two more were added by traditional norms in 2009 and 2010, followed by another traditional norms female International Grandmaster in 2010! One of the 2008 International Grandmasters, Hou Yifan, also took the title of youngest female International Grandmaster at age 14.
Although chess is still a male-dominated sport, there is no longer a question as to whether or not women are capable of achieving what men do in chess. While this article focuses on only a handful of women who have won the title of International Grandmaster, there are almost 200 women with the Woman Grandmaster title, nearly 100 women with the International Master title and hundreds of women who compete in state, national, country and regional championships annually! When you imagine the odds of the few women who play at this level versus the thousands of men and recognize their success, it becomes clear that men and women can be capable of success in chess given the proper training, dedication and, of course, passion for the sport.

To learn about more female chess greats, visit: http://education.goodmantheatre.org
For Love or Money: The World of Chess Hustling
FROM GOODMAN THEATRE’S ON STAGE, BY STEVE SCOTT

They can be found in any of New York’s public parks or gathered in chess shops throughout the city. Their names evoke the legendary status that some of them achieve: Broadway Bobby, Russian Paul, Sweet Pea, Poe. Their ranks have included future Hollywood greats, day laborers, students, international champions and homeless knockabouts. Although the trade that they ply is technically illegal, they are largely ignored by legal authorities—and their unique brand of fame has been chronicled by newspapers, blog sites and at least one feature film.

Welcome to the world of chess hustlers, players who compete at the board game for money, a fixture of New York street life that has been referred to as the “largest growth industry” in the city. Chess hustlers have plied their trade in Manhattan’s parks for decades; according to local lore, actor Humphrey Bogart made his living as a master of speed chess during the Depression, as did future Unites States chess champion Arnold Denker. Film director Stanley Kubrick (whose passion for the game made its way into such movies as 2001: A Space Odyssey) was a frequent—and victorious—habitué of Washington Square Park’s chess boards in the early 1960s. But the popularity of street chess is generally acknowledged to have started with a former convict named Bobby Hayward, who in the late 1960s or early 1970s set up shop on a garbage can on Eighth Avenue, between 42nd and 43rd Streets. Word soon spread, and Hayward’s enterprise was immortalized by photographs in The New York Times. Such mainstream attention brought visibility (and perhaps legitimacy) to Hayward and his fellow hustlers, and soon street chess was a sought-after activity for both chess wizards and New York tourists.

The form of the game preferred by most hustlers is known variously as speed chess, blitz chess, or lightning, in which each side has five minutes (or three, in a variation known as bullet chess) to complete all their moves. There are two ways to play speed chess: touchmove (meaning that if a player touches a piece, he has to move it) or the more common clock-move (meaning that a move is not complete until a player punches the clock). Veteran speed chess players can keep several games going at once, keeping track of the tally as they go. This can be an effective method of bilking more money out of the neophyte player by causing him to lose track of the number of games that have actually been won, or to lose track of the amount of the wager made on each game. There are other tricks that the hustler can use to fix the outcome of a game: rigging the clock so that the opponent’s time runs out faster than the hustler’s or, when a hustler’s luck runs out, fleeing the game via an unannounced break. In his 2000 book The Virtue of Prosperity, author Dinesh D’Souza describes one such game in which his opponent, a storied street chess champion, was unexpectedly down after fifteen minutes. “I’ll be right back,” the opponent said, heading for the men’s room in a hotel across from the park. A few minutes later, an observer pointed out the obvious to D’Souza: the hustler wasn’t coming back, and D’Souza wasn’t getting his five-buck winnings.

Although such shenanigans are eschewed by many bona fide chess hustlers, the competition among hustlers is fierce, and the stakes may be higher than the monetary bet at hand. As the character [Cash] in Cándido Tirado’s Fish Men says, “We’re not happy with just winning. We want to obliterate the opposition.”
Theatre Etiquette with Robert Falls

What should I wear?

Definitely dress nicely but comfortably; try business casual. No tank tops, ripped jeans, etc. Baseball caps or hats must be moved once you enter the theatre. The Goodman is air-conditioned so be sure to bring an extra sweater or dress warmly.

What should I bring?

Only what you really need. Electronic devices such as PSP, Nintendo DS, smart phones, and laser pointers are not permitted during the show. If it makes noise or is distracting, please refrain from having it out in the theatre. A purse, bag, or backpack is fine. School supplies are not necessary. Remember that you are here to sit back, watch and enjoy, so don’t bring anything you don’t need.

(Please remember):

No smoking, and no eating or drinking while inside the theatre.

What if I need to leave the theatre during the show?

Only if it is an emergency. Otherwise, it’s very disrespectful. Make sure to use restrooms before the show, or wait until intermission.

Have respect for other audience members. This means no talking during the performance, no feet on seats, and no kicking. (For your safety and others’!)
How should I respond to what’s going on on the stage?

Honestly but appropriately. If you find something funny, then laugh—but don’t laugh for five minutes straight or laugh so hard that you need to leave the theatre. Theatre is very different from watching a movie at home. Always remember that you are in a room full of people who are there to watch the performance. They can hear your responses just as well as you can hear theirs. Most important, the actors can hear and see you. They will appreciate any appropriate feed back but might be extremely offended if it is inappropriate. Whether you enjoy the play or not, you owe respect to the actors for having given it a try.

What to do before the show:

When your class arrives, your teacher will let the Education staff know how many people are in your group. It is a good idea to arrive at least 15-20 minutes before the performance.

If you are late, often you will not be allowed to enter the show until after intermission. Once your group is called, an usher will lead you to your seats and hand you a program.

Please promptly sit where you have been assigned. Remember that the show needs to begin on time and everyone needs to be seated.

What to do during Intermission:

Most plays have a 15 minute intermission. This gives you time to stretch your legs, walk, use the restroom, get water and discuss the play with your friends.

We do ask that if you are sitting on the main floor that you remain downstairs and if you are sitting in the mezzanine that you remain upstairs. There are restrooms on both floors. When intermission is over, the lights in the lobby will flash several times; that is your cue to get back to your seat because the performance is about to begin!

What to do after the show:

There will be a post-show discussion immediately following the performance. Members of the cast will come out on stage and answer your questions. Feel free to ask anything that’s on your mind about the show, but please remember to be respectful.

And remember the Golden Rule of Theatre-going:

Theatre artists are paid professionals.
When you enter a theatre, you are entering their work space. Respect their work as you would have them respect yours.

Enjoy the Show!
Reading Your Ticket

As a patron of the theatre, it is important to know how to read your ticket and find your seat. Generally, seats for all performances in the Goodman’s Albert Theatre are assigned seating, so be sure to know how to be able to find your seat. When you come with your school, you will be ushered to a section where you and your fellow students can sit and enjoy the play together.

Below is a seating chart—a map of all the seats in the Albert Theater—and an explanation of how to read your ticket. If you have any problems, ask an usher for help. They’re here for you!

This will guide you to the lobby door closest to your seat—aisle numbers are on plaques that hang above the doors to the theater.

The section of the theatre you will be sitting in: Main Floor or Mezzanine.

This is your seat number, located on the edge of the bottom seat cushion.

The row where your seat is located, noted in a letter on the side of the end seat of each row.

Day and date of performance.

Curtain time.

Play you are seeing and its author.

Goodman’s Albert Theatre

Albert Ivar Goodman Theatre—Main Floor

Albert Ivar Goodman Theatre—Mezzanine

Stage

Stage
Dear Cast and Crew,

I would have to say that every single one of you have done a superb job in this play. All the effort you have put forth into this play has resulted in a memorable experience for all of us. I thought it was clever that the actors, actresses and the orchestra interacted with the audience. From viewing the original film of Animal Crackers, I think the cast played in the play and the original cast of Animal Crackers very similar! This play might have been the first encounter of the Marx brothers for many teenagers and children and I believe that the crew and cast of Animal Crackers proved that early comedy can also be entertaining and memorable!

The director’s vision of the play was a rather conscious one. Exposing the Marx brothers to the vast majority of people who never knew about them and bringing back nostalgic memories to the older audience was a great idea. This play was actually my first play and a first trip to Goodman Theatre. I myself, as a young adult, finally realized that plays are enjoyable and gratifying. The play had all the elements of emotion and slapstick comedy which made it a great one. The technical aspects as well as the props were amazingly set to follow each scene. My favorite scene had to be the scene where Harpo and Rivelli tried to clear up the misunderstanding of “The Flash.” I though the script was very flowing and comfortable. Was there any improv involved? I did not find any negative aspects of this play. I have found the play and the ambiance of Goodman Theatre very positive. I give Animal Crackers two thumbs up.

Sincerely,

A CPS student

Send your letters to:
Education and Community Engagement
Goodman Theatre
170 North Dearborn Street
Chicago, IL 60601
Or email us at:
education@goodmantheatre.org

Goodman Theatre’s Education & Community Engagement is also online! Check us out on Facebook:
http://www.facebook.com/goodmaned
Or Twitter:
http://twitter.com/GoodmanEd
Or on our blog at:
http://education.goodmantheatre.org/blog/

We love hearing your thoughts, so don’t be afraid to drop us a line, comment, tag us in a note, @reply, or retweet us. Also check out our online educational resources for more information regarding the play you’ve seen, or anything else you’d like to know about how our programs (and theatre) work!

Keep checking in for updates online!