



COLUMNISTS

*An Arbiter's
Notebook*
Geurt Gijssen

From New York to Moscow

This is my 60th column. This means that the first *Arbiter's Notebook* started five years ago. I had my doubts then that there would be enough to write about! it was agreed that I should start with 9 columns and then we would evaluate how things were going. I am not sure that there was an evaluation, but I know for sure that there certainly was enough interest and material to write a monthly column. I would like to express my thanks to everyone for their contributions and I look forward to more of the same.

The life of a chessplayer can be very diverse. He plays a match, his next event can be a team event and then he has to travel to an open tournament. These were my thoughts when the 2003 Aeroflot Open Tournament finished. I had flown January 21st to New York for the Kasparov – Deep Junior match and then from New York directly to Moscow to be the chief arbiter in the Aeroflot Open; from an event with one player and a computer to an open tournament with three groups and a total of 476 players. It would be difficult to experience a bigger difference. In the match Kasparov – Deep Junior there were one or two rest days between each game, while in Moscow there were no rest days at all. (By the way, I do not like rest days, unless the city is interesting or I have the opportunity to meet some friends. This was indeed possible in New York.)

In New York the games started at 3.30 pm. In Moscow one group started at 9.30 am and two groups at 3.00 pm. In New York I had to take care that the computer was ready in the room next to the playing room; in Moscow I was asked to check that no player was using a pocket computer during the round. And there were more differences. New York and Moscow had only one thing in common: it was quite cold and it was snowing.

But let me tell you more about these two events. The match Kasparov – Deep Junior took place in a small room on the 12th floor of the New York Athletic Club located on Central Park South. Only a very few spectators had access to the playing area. In another room next to the playing hall is where Deep Junior was located. Again, few people had access to that room. Two members of the computer team followed the games on a monitor. On another monitor three others checked what was going on in the game: IM David Levy, IA Peter Wilson and Professor Jonathan Schaeffer. They are all computer

experts. The monitors showed the variations considered by the computer and the evaluation of these variations. In the playing hall a third computer monitor showed the same. The screen was visible to the operator and me, but of course not for Kasparov. There was a clear agreement with Kasparov about where he was permitted to walk and where not. Kasparov was the only one who never was allowed to leave the playing room during the game. The operator had permission to consult his teammates in the event Kasparov offered a draw or the operator himself wanted to do so. This never caused a problem, although it could have.

Let me explain. The operator was in fact only the person who could act on behalf of the computer: he wrote the moves, he made the computer moves on the board, he entered Kasparov's moves into the computer and pressed the clock. The operator did not have to think. He was simply the playing extension of the computer. But in case of a draw offer the situation was completely different. Then he had to decide what to do. In the regulations it was stated that in such cases he might consult his teammates: the other operator, the author of the Deep Junior program and grandmaster Boris Alterman. It was also in the match regulations that, in case the computer had made a move before the draw offer was accepted, the operator might offer a draw even after the next move was made by the computer.

In fact this is what happened in the last game. Kasparov offered a draw. Shay Bushinsky, who was the operator in this game, went to the computer room asking for advice. But, unfortunately, he could not find anyone. In the meantime Kasparov came up to me, stating, that, based on his knowledge of computers, the evaluation of Deep Junior should show that he, Kasparov, had the better position. I told him, that it was very difficult for me to react because I knew that the computer showed something different. And in the meantime the computer made a move. This meant that the draw offer was rejected. After a few moves the operator offered a draw and Kasparov accepted. I have described this part of the match quite extensively, because several spectators have asked me what we discussed.

There were some very strange aspects in this match, in fact in all matches between a human being and a computer. The computer is never disturbed by his opponent, the spectators or even the arbiter. It does not feeling any tension, is not nervous, is never tired and does not need any rest. It is in a very comfortable position: complete opening books are available for it; it has simply to browse in its database. The operator may consult his teammates at any moment he likes; he may walk in and out. The only restriction for the operator is that he has to be as quiet as possible and may not disturb the human player.

How different is the situation for the human player. First of all, he has to be very focused and in these situations every noise can be disturbing. I was, for instance, quite annoyed when the heating system made a lot of noise during

the game. But Kasparov never complained about it. And I was furious when a mobile of one of the photographers started to ring.

(By the way, I would like to praise the photographers and television crews for the way they did their job and their understanding when I gave them only a few minutes to make pictures. There were so many photographers that we were forced to split them in two or three groups and each group got only two or three minutes to do their job.)

Kasparov had a limited area in the playing room. In this area he walked and rested. He was absolutely forbidden to leave the playing room. He had no opening book available. Well, he did have one advantage. He could talk, he could make noise and he could make faces and so on, because this was not disturbing for his opponent. I do not say that he was always talking, making noise or making faces, but he had the possibility of doing so.

The time limit in this match was 40 moves in 2 hours, then 20 moves in 1 hour and finally 30 minutes for the remaining moves. I was very afraid that Article 10.2 would have to be applied. But I was happy that we never came to the third period.

During this match Levy, Wilson, Schaeffer, Yasser Seirawan and your columnist tried to establish rules for future matches between humans and computers. We suggested a time limit of 40 moves in 2 hours, then 20 moves in 1 hour and finally 15 minutes for the remaining moves with an increment of 30 seconds per move in the last period. We would like to present the draft of the regulations for matches between a humans and computers to the General Assembly of FIDE for approval.

The Aeroflot Open Tournament in Moscow was something else. There were 476 participants in three groups. The participants in group A needed a rating of at least 2401, the participants of group B needed a rating of at least 2150, but lower than 2451. The time limit in these two groups was 40 moves in 2 hours, then 20 moves in 1 hour and 30 minutes for the remaining moves. Article 10.2!!! Finally group C: the ratings in this group were under 2201. The time limit was 90 minutes for the whole game with an increment of 30 seconds from the first move.

As in the 2002 tournament, we played with Phileon clocks. We had no problems in group C, but in the groups A and B we had a lot of problems. The clock has a move counter. As a result one hour was added after white and black each had pressed the button 40 times. And occasionally the time was not added at the correct moment. Sometimes it occurred before move 40, sometimes at move 41 or 42. This caused a lot of confusion. This problem notwithstanding, it was very complicated to adjust the clocks if the flag dropped at the wrong moment. It is my opinion that 99% of the problems that we faced in this tournament were related to the move counter. I suggested to

the manufacturer of the clocks, who was present in Moscow, that the move counter should be eliminated.

I have already mentioned Article 10.2. I was very surprised that only few players claimed a draw based on this article. But I was even more surprised that they claimed it incorrectly. For example, claims were made when it was the opponent's move or without stopping the clocks. And I also witnessed some unfortunate situations. Some players became very upset when they saw how the remaining time was approaching 0:00 and they did not know what to play. I promised the players that I would suggest that the time limit in 2004 would be the same as in the draft of the regulations of the matches between humans and computers. But in that event some manufacturers will have to modify the clocks.

In my opinion the ideal digital clock has to fulfill the following requirements:

1. One option with three controls. For each it should be possible to set the time and an increment.
2. The clock has a memory of at least 50 hours
3. The players have the possibility to see from a reasonable distance which clock is running.
4. The display must be large (excellent in the Phileon clock)
5. The clock is easy to press without much noise.

There were other problems, especially at the start of the tournament. As I mentioned before for each group a player needed a certain rating: Group A: ≥ 2401 , Group B: ≥ 2151 , but ≤ 2450 and Group C: ≤ 2150 . As you can see some players had a choice to play in A or B and others in B or C. Only players with a rating of more than 2450 or lower than 2150 had no choice.

Not all chessplayers who had a choice, declared clearly in which group they would play. In these cases the organisers had to choose and unfortunately several times the wrong choice was made.

Another problem previously mentioned in previous columns was the spelling of names. Therefore it was impossible to find some players in the FIDE rating list. Furthermore I had the impression that some players had deliberately changed their names a little. In this way they could be considered as unrated players and could play in the C group. I am, of course, not sure about this, but I have my doubts.

Finally the prize awards created some problems. The prizes were awarded according to the Hort System, based on the average rating of opponents less the highest and the lowest rating. I had prepared the list and received from a programmer the average ratings. But unfortunately, he made a mistake and calculated the averages after 8 rounds instead of 9. In some cases the

difference was substantial. But fortunately the mistake was discovered before the prizes were awarded and could be corrected.

Reading about the Aeroflot Open, one might get the impression that there were only mistakes, failures and so on. But this is absolutely not so. It was a great tournament with 154 grandmasters and players from 46 countries. Having in mind that the youngest player was born in 1992 and the oldest in 1919, you may consider this tournament as a tournament of four generations. The playing hall was excellent and the hotel "Rossiya" is nicely located in the center of Moscow, very close to the Kremlin.

As far I could see the vast majority of the chessplayers was very happy and many of them told me that they would like to return next year. Finally, one very important item I would like to mention: the players are very sure that the announced prize fund is available and will be paid.

Some readers wrote me that they were very surprised about something in Hans Ree's column in which he wrote about the Corus tournament. The text in question:

In the sixth round Karpov and Radjabov had a long endgame that Radjabov, having Rook + Bishop versus Rook, tried to win. Of course this endgame is a theoretical draw, but the defense is difficult, even more so because after move 60 players get only half an hour for the rest of the game.

At move 113 Karpov, with about ten seconds left on the clock, claimed a draw because of the 50-move rule. Days later he was still indignant because Radjabov had tried to make him overstep.

"But imagine this," said Bottema. "What if Radjabov had put his bishop *en prise* and Karpov would have taken it? Then a new 50-move stretch would start and Karpov would really overstep."

Would he? Karpov can be very quick with brain and hands. This hinged on a subtle point. Karpov was White, so the clock would be on his left hand. No, in that case he would have no chance to make it.

But can't you claim a draw with Rook versus Rook? Our distinguished columnist Geurt Gijssen gave a clear answer: only in rapid and blitz games, not in classical chess.

But Karpov wouldn't have to take the bishop, he could just

ignore it, we tried to argue. But to this also Bottema had a considered answer: “This would be so if Radjabov would put his bishop *en prise* near the end of his 50-move winning try. Then Karpov could safely ignore it. But if Radjabov would do it say ten or fifteen moves earlier, Karpov wouldn't be able to ignore this, for he would be mated. Rook + Bishop v Rook may be a draw, but Rook + Invulnerable Bishop v Rook must be a win.

The following is a draw according to Article 10.2 in classical chess (if there is no increment) and in Rapid chess, but not in Blitz chess. And in classical chess it is only possible in the period in which all moves must be completed in a limited time.

But the case is very interesting. Therefore I would like to add something. Ton Bottema asked: “What to do if Radjabov had put his bishop *en prise* and Karpov would have taken it? Then a. new 50 move-stretch would start and Karpov would really overstep.”

I am not so sure that Karpov or any other player would overstep the time control. Unless there is an immediate forced win, at the moment the endgame Rook vs. Rook appears on the board, a player has the possibility of claiming a draw pursuant to Article 10.2. There is no arbiter who would reject the claim. To declare a draw or to postpone a decision is, in my opinion, the only options. If the arbiter postponed a decision, the game would normally be declared a draw after a flag fall. It is even my opinion that the moment the player put his bishop *en prise* and the opponent took it, the arbiter could declare the draw if the opponent so claimed. It would be very evident that the player did so with the intention to win on time and not to win by normal means. And these are exactly the conditions under which a draw should be claimed.

In the annual, Amber tournament, normally played in Monaco, but this year in France, there was in the first round a very interesting Rapid game. It was the game Shirov – Topalov.

1. e4 c6 2. d4 d5 3. Nc3 dxe4 4. Nxe4 Nd7 5. Ng5 Ngf6 6. Bd3 e6 7. N1f3 Bd6 8. Qe2 h6 9. Ne4 Nxe4 10. Qxe4 Qc7 11. Qg4 Kf8 12. O-O c5 13. b3 e5 14. c3 b6 15. Re1 Bb7 16. Qh3 Rd8 17. Bb2 g6 18. dxe5 Nxe5 19. c4 Bxf3 20. gxf3 Rh7 21. Be4 f5 22. Bd5 Nd3 23. Qh4 g5 24. Qh3 Bxh2+ 25. Qxh2 Qxh2+ 26. Kxh2 Nxb2 27. Re5 Nd3 28. Rxf5+ Ke7 29. Kg3 Nf4 30. Kg4 Rd7 31. Re1+ Kd8 32. Rf8+ Kc7 33. Be4 h5+ 34. Kf5 Rhg7 35. Rf6 Ng2 36. Rc6+ Kd8 37. Rh1

h4 38. Rh6 Nf4 39. Re1 Rdf7+ 40. Kg4 Kc7 41. Bf5 Rf8 42.
Re5 Rd8 43. Be4 Rd1 44. Re8 Rd8 45. Re5 Rd6 46. Rh8
Rd8 47. Rh6 Rd6

A question for readers: If black had claimed a draw after 47 Rh8, because in his opinion the same position would have then appeared three times on the board and you had been the arbiter, would you allow this claim or not?

A reader (Mr. Howard S. Sample) noted that I gave the wrong move in the game Karpov – Leko. And I have to admit, that he was completely right. Instead of 1. e4, Karpov played 1. d4 and offered a draw, which was accepted by Leko. The “game” was played in Groningen 1995. Karpov won the tournament with 7½ out of 11 and finished the tournament a half-point ahead of the second place finisher. When I went to my database to check, I realised that Karpov and Kamsky during this tournament were negotiating the terms of their upcoming match for the world championship, which was subsequently played in Elista, June 1996. I know that the negotiations were very tough. This explains why Karpov would have been happy to have a quick last round game.

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 2003 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.