



Rapids in Moscow

In my previous column I promised to inform you about the number of participating countries in the 35th Olympiad in Bled. Well, as far as I can see it will be a record: 142 men's teams and 100 women's teams are at the moment registered, really unbelievable. If all these teams will really play, the Olympiad is already a success.

From September 8 – 11 there was a match Russia vs. The Rest of the World in the Kremlin in Moscow. Each team had ten players and two reserve players. The time limit was 25 minutes for the whole game with an increment of 10 seconds from move 1, a fairly familiar time limit. All Amber tournaments and the tiebreak games of the World Championships are played according this time limit. The rules were very simple: the normal rules were applied, with only one exception: instead of the players, the arbiters – a Russian arbiter for each game – took down the moves. As a result, the arbiters called illegal moves (there were none) and called flag falls (this happened several times). The system of play was the Scheveningen system: each player played all the players of the other team and, with ten players on each team, there were therefore ten rounds.

Before the match there was a lot of discussion about how to apply the Scheveningen system. I suggested a system that a team should have in each round the same color on all boards. The big advantage of this system is that all players alternate white and black. For the individual player this system is without any doubt the best, but in a team event it has probably a disadvantage. It was the opinion of some players that the team that was playing with the white pieces in the last round would have a big advantage. Then we tried to develop a system that in each round each team has 5 blacks and five whites. We were not able to create such a system and a system with 6 whites and 4 blacks was developed. Here is the table of this system:

1st Set	2nd Set	3rd Set	4th Set	5th Set	6th Set	7thSet	8th Set	9th Set	10thSet
A1-B1	B2-A1	A1-B9	B10-A1	A1-B7	B8-A1	A1-B5	B6-A1	A1-B3	B4-A1
A2-B2	B1-A2	A2-B10	B9-A2	A2-B8	B7-A2	A2-B6	B5-A2	A2-B4	B3-A2
B3-A3	A3-B4	B1-A3	A3-B2	B9-A3	A3-B10	B7-A3	A3-B8	B5-A3	A3-B6
B4-A4	A4-B3	B2-A4	A4-B1	B10-A4	A4-B9	B8-A4	A4-B7	B6-A4	A4-B5
A5-B5	B6-A5	A5-B3	B4-A5	A5-B1	B2-A5	A5-B9	B10-A5	A5-B7	B8-A5
A6-B6	B5-A6	A6-B4	B3-A6	A6-B2	B1-A6	A6-B10	B9-A6	A6-B8	B7-A6

COLUMNISTS

An Arbiter's Notebook Geurt Gijssen

B7-A7	A7-B8	B5-A7	A7-B6	B3-A7	A7-B4	B1-A7	A7-B2	B9-A7	A7-B10
B8-A8	A8-B7	B6-A8	A8-B5	B4-A8	A8-B3	B2-A8	A8-B1	B10-A8	A8-B9
A9-B9	B10-A9	A9-B7	B8-A9	A9-B5	B6-A9	A9-B3	B4-A9	A9-B1	B2-A9
A10-B10	B9-A10	A10-B8	B7-A10	A10-B6	B5-A10	A10-B4	B3-A10	A10-B2	B1-A10

It was agreed that in the players' meeting there should be a drawing of lots for which team should be A and which team should be B. Furthermore, there would be a drawing of lots about the order of sets. This order was the order of the rounds.

We made this drawing of lots and Kasparov realized almost immediately that some players would play three times in a row with the same color. Then it was decided that I should try to find a better solution. I developed the following guidelines:

1. The system must be fair for both teams. It was very easy to make a schedule that all players of one team played alternately white and black, but to arrange this for the other team was impossible. Therefore both teams might have to play the same twice in a row.
2. For the publicity of the tournament and also to create some drama, the top players should meet each other in the last rounds.
3. I did not want to change the pairings of the first day. The sets 4 and 3 (in this order) were fixed for the first day.

With these guidelines in mind I tried to make a schedule. It is probably possible to improve the schedule that was implement; here it is:

Rd 1	Rd 2	Rd 3	Rd 4	Rd 5	Rd 6	Rd 7	Rd 8	Rd 9	Rd 10
B10-A1	A1-B9	A1-B7	B8-A1	B6-A1	A1-B5	B4-A1	A1-B3	B2-A1	A1-B1
B9-A2	A2-B10	A2-B8	B7-A2	B5-A2	A2-B6	B3-A2	A2-B4	B1-A2	A2-B2
A3-B2	B1-A3	B9-A3	A3-B10	A3-B8	B7-A3	A3-B6	B5-A3	A3-B4	B3-A3
A4-B1	B2-A4	B10-A4	A4-B9	A4-B7	B8-A4	A4-B5	B6-A4	A4-B3	B4-A4
B4-A5	A5-B3	A5-B1	B2-A5	B10-A5	A5-B9	B8-A5	A5-B7	B6-A5	A5-B5
B3-A6	A6-B4	A6-B2	B1-A6	B9-A6	A6-B10	B7-A6	A6-B8	B5-A6	A6-B6
A7-B6	B5-A7	B3-A7	A7-B4	A7-B2	B1-A7	A7-B10	B9-A7	A7-B8	B7-A7
A8-B5	B6-A8	B4-A8	A8-B3	A8-B1	B2-A8	A8-B9	B10-A8	A8-B7	B8-A8
B8-A9	A9-B7	A9-B5	B6-A9	B4-A9	A9-B3	B2-A9	A9-B1	B10-A9	A9-B9

B7-A10	A10-B8	A10-B6	B5-A10	B3-A10	A10-B4	B1-A10	A10-B2	B9-A10	A10-B10
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	---------

From the arbitration point of view there were more interesting things. 10 rounds were played in 4 days. On day 1 two rounds were played, on day 2 and 3 the number of rounds was 3 and on the last day again 2 rounds. On day 1, rounds started at 16.00 and 18.00., on day 2 and 3 at 16.00, 18.00 and 20.00 and on day 4 at 14.00 and 16.00. The captains (coaches) agreed that they should deliver the team line-up on days 1, 2 and 3 before noon and on day 4 before 10.30. It was my opinion that submitting the line-ups on days 2 and 3 (the days with 3 rounds) at noon was not a good idea. Suppose a player lost both games or the same player played two long endings, then it would be impossible to replace such a player. Therefore I suggested that on day 2 and 3 only the team line-ups for the first two rounds of that day should be submitted and the team line-ups for the third round within 10 minutes after the finish of the second one. The captains agreed and the players were quite happy with this change.

Except for one game, the arbiters were able to record the moves. In that game, the two players played 17 moves in 1 minute. But the computer print-out was complete and with it we were able to obtain the moves of this game.

Question Hi, following up on Michael Soong's question I make the following comments and ask your thoughts.

1. Games have two sides, therefore if copyright exists then it is to both black *and* white. How can one player copyright a game? I think he must do it jointly with his opponent. If allowed to control copyright, then Russian Grandmaster Evgeny Svesnikov must have permission from his opponent.

2. Individual moves are generic; anyone can make them. A comparison may be seen in software copyright:

In Tom Kerrigan's Simple Chess Program (TSCP) line 128 of module Eval.c is:

```
For (i = 0; i < 64; ++i) [A loop control, incrementing integer t i from 0 through 63]
When does generic software components become a copyrightable piece of IP
(Intellectual Property)? When they are built into a complete and unique program. The
whole program is copyrighted by Tom but this line of code also exists in many C/C++
programs. It in itself is generic and not copyrightable. In fact the particular line of code
exists in many programs, especially chess programs.
```

If a complete game were able to be copyrighted would that then mean the second and subsequent players to follow the same line would need to pay royalties to the originators??


Ruy Lopez (or his estate) would be very rich! Clearly this is absurd, yet we do copyright software IP. I would suggest that the idea of copyrighting games would very seriously damage the game and that this should never be allowed. **Kym Farnik (Australia)**

Answer You are right that in each game two players are involved and that either's opinion should be respected. There is no doubt about it. Although I do not understand everything you mentioned (I am but a simple arbiter), there is one thing I would like to emphasize: a whole game is more than the sum of its moves played. Therefore I

understand that players have some rights. There are many games that are copied, especially short draws and it needs no explanation that the second pair of players is not always aware that they have copied a game.

I more or less agree with your conclusion that the copyrighting of games should not be allowed. Copyrights of analyses and reports are different however. I see very often that analyses are simply copied and I am always surprised that nothing is done against this kind of copying. I even know of examples where an "author" simply photocopied whole chapters of a book. And as far I know nothing was done. This is very hard for me to understand.

Question We had an interesting situation in the 22nd edition of our New York Masters event that seems to not be included in the rules, and it seems so bizarre, I don't know what to do except for ask the most senior people I know! The position is the following:



This is in a very extreme sudden death situation (time control: all moves in 30 minutes). Both players have maybe 15-30 seconds on their clock, but since it was an analog clock, we don't know for sure. (I personally thought the players were down to maybe 5-6 seconds at this time. It turned out that White had much more time than I thought.)

It's white's move. White attempts to play Qh8-h4+ (seeing that after the forced Kxf5 he will have Qh5+ winning the loose rook on d1.) Accidentally the queen slips towards the player and falls onto the

floor. Now one of two things happened:

The piece fell off the floor and bounced far away under the table; or somehow it was accidentally kicked by the mass of spectators standing around watching the game, by accident.

What to do, if: The player stops the clocks; The player doesn't stop the clocks and is frantically looking under the table trying to find the queen or reach it?

As an aside, what actually happened, I believe, is as follows. The piece hit the floor and landed next to the player. I stepped back (I was right next to him, right by where the queen fell). Somehow in the commotion that ensued, the queen was now about a meter under the table and to the side where the player couldn't reach it. I believed at the time that another player who bent down to grab the queen somehow knocked it farther back, or it was kicked, since it basically landed in the middle of a rugby scrum of players. The player was frantically trying to grab it, but couldn't reach it. I decided at this point that was fair to find a proper piece and hand it to him. (This was clearly quite a few seconds off his clock, maybe even close to 10 at this point.)

The opposing player of course went completely nuts, repeatedly screaming at me as he was methodically checkmated. In the end, he agreed that if a spectator had been involved in kicking the piece, that what I did was correct. But what if he didn't? What if somehow, by sheer speed of hands, the piece was sent flying many meters away? Even worse, what if it's on a stage, and the piece falls off the stage?

A player stopping a clock could end up causing a bizarre situation, where a player throws a piece as far as possible in order to be able to stop the clocks and gain some thinking time. While this would have to of course be carefully masked, it should be considered. Also, I feel that a player losing on time due to this is horribly unfair. A player should not lose by a complete accident. **John Fernandez (USA)**

Answer It is clear that something irregular happened. In cases such as this I look first of all to Article 7 of the Laws of Chess, titled Irregularities. In Article 7.3 it is written:

If a player displaces one or more pieces, he shall re-establish the correct position on his own time. If necessary, the player or his opponent shall stop the clocks and ask for the arbiter's assistance. The arbiter may penalise the player who displaced the pieces."

I have to say that in your letter there are many assumptions, but one thing is clear; the player's piece fell from the table and the player whose move it was unable to grab this piece immediately. For this he needed some assistance and the most likely person who might and could assist him was the arbiter. And as you can read in Article 7.4 of the Laws of Chess either player may stop the clocks in such a situation.

The last sentence of this Article is also very important:

The arbiter may penalise the player who displaced the pieces.

This means that it is up to the arbiter to decide whether or not he should penalise the player who displaced the piece(s). And if a penalty must be given in a situation as you described, the most appropriate one is adding time for the player who did not displace the pieces.

I have had a similar case. In a Blitz game between Karpov and Adams (Amber Tournament 1992) Karpov's Rook fell to the floor when he moved this piece. I stood next to the table and grabbed the Rook from the floor and placed it next to the board. In my opinion I did nothing wrong by helping a player. But after the game I was blamed by several players who explained me that it was not my duty to act like I did. Well, I am sure, if this were to happen again, I would do the same thing.

Question During the Dutch youth Blitz Championships in Bunschoten I was a witness to the following incident:

Black had only the King. White had King, Rook, Knight and a pawn. Both players were short of time. The only question was: Is White able to mate his opponent's King before his flag would fall? White's plan was to promote his pawn to a Queen and then to mate his opponent's King. But what happened? After the white pawn reached the last rank, the White player replaced the white pawn by a black queen. The black player claimed a win, saying that white player made an illegal move: a white pawn cannot promote to a black queen. White claimed a draw pointing out that a bare King can never win. He added that the black queen appeared irregularly on the chessboard and therefore the black king must be considered as bare. I am curious what decision you would take in this situation. **Theo Heukels (The Netherlands)**

Answer I was informed that the arbiter declared the game won for Black. It means that he agreed with the Black player that this irregularity has to be considered as an illegal

move. First of all we have to investigate if an irregular action has to be considered in the same way as an illegal move. Article 7 describes "Irregularities". And we find in the sub-articles of Article 7 two types of irregularities: displaced pieces and illegal moves. Article 3.7(e) states clearly that in case of promotion the pawn must be exchanged as part of the same move for a piece of the same color.

White's action is therefore in conflict with this Article and because an illegal move is generally a move not pursuant to one of the sub-articles of Article 3 (The moves of the pieces), it is reasonable to consider this incorrect promotion as an illegal move.

But this is not the end of the story. Let us go to Article C3 of the Blitz rules:

An illegal move is completed once the opponent's clock has been started. However, the opponent is entitled to claim a win before making his own move. If the opponent cannot checkmate the player's king by any series of legal moves with the most unskilled counterplay, then the player is entitled to claim a draw before making his own move. Once the opponent has made his own move, an illegal move cannot be corrected.

I do not know at which moment the opponent, the black player, started to protest. If he did so before the white player had stopped his own clock and started the opponent's clock, then white would have had the possibility to correct his mistake. See the first sentence of Article C3. If this happened after the clock of the black player was started, the illegal move could not be corrected. Let us assume that this was the case. Then it is for me very clear that the arbiter's decision was completely wrong and I agree with the white player that the game should be declared a draw.

Question Dear Mr. Gijssen, I understand that FIDE will lower or has lowered the rating limit for appearing on the FIDE rating list from 2000 to 1801. I have visited the FIDE site at www.FIDE.com but could not find any news concerning this change. Do you know if an official announcement concerning this change is available on the Internet and if so, where? When is this change scheduled to take effect? Do you know if FIDE's tournament software will properly submit results for new players at the new limit?
Ernest W. Schlich (USA)

Answer Yes, you are right that FIDE intends to lower the rating limit from 2000 to 1801. And it may even be lowered to 1000. You are also right that you could not find any thing about this on the FIDE website. I know, because I received some drafts indicating that FIDE will discuss these matters during the Congress in Bled in November 2002. Let's see what happens at the congress.

Have a question for Geurt Gijssen? Perhaps he will respond to it in a future column. Send it to geurtgijssen@chesscafe.com. Please include your name and country of residence.

Copyright 2002 Geurt Gijssen. All Rights Reserved.



[\[The Chess Cafe Home Page\]](#) [\[Book Reviews\]](#) [\[Bulletin Board\]](#) [\[Columnists\]](#)
[\[Endgame Studies\]](#) [\[The Skittles Room\]](#) [\[Archives\]](#)
[\[Links\]](#) [\[Online Bookstore\]](#) [\[About The Chess Cafe\]](#) [\[Contact Us\]](#)

Copyright 2002 CyberCafes, LLC. All Rights Reserved.
"The Chess Cafe®" is a registered trademark of Russell Enterprises, Inc.