



Challenged

As you probably know, we have the opportunity to change the Laws of Chess every four years. During the FIDE congress in Spain we again have this possibility. To be well prepared I would like to follow the same procedure as I did before. Anyone who has ideas for modification of the Laws of Chess is welcome to contribute.

COLUMNISTS

An Arbiter's Notebook

Geurt Gijssen

We certainly have to make a new article regarding clock settings. I think that the actual situation is that in the majority of important tournaments, digital clocks are used. Each type of digital clocks has its specific way to set the desired time limit. But I have been told often that many times the arbiters do not set the clocks correctly. It is my opinion that we need to make it very clear what should be done in these situations.

Furthermore there is a new time limit: 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 third session. The producers of the DGT clocks have released a new line of clocks with this time limit. There are two possibilities with this clock: with or without a move counter. The regular reader knows my opinion about the move counter. I do not like it, as it always causes problems at the end of the time control. The question is then, what should happen at the end of the second time control? Well, if White, let us say, at move 62 has used all his time, the clock should add 15 minutes 30 seconds on both sides. But, if Black has used all his time, the situation is different. Of course, Black should receive 15 minutes 30 seconds, but White should receive 15 minutes and twice 30 seconds, or 16 total minutes extra for the remaining moves. I spoke with several colleagues about it and all agreed. An important requirement is in this case, that the clock “knows” who is White and who is Black.

Some months ago I received a letter from South Africa, in which it was proposed to describe the various time limits.

Proposal My proposal, in short, is that we should simply describe the type of chess by the expected maximum duration of the game, e.g., 10-minute chess (what we usually call 5-minute chess); 7-hour chess (as in the Armenia Olympiad 1996) etc. If “add-on” times are used the Gijssen formula (see later)

should be used and the words “extra time per move, or etpm” included. What follows is essentially background etc to this idea.

At the Rules Commission meeting in Bled 2002 Stewart Reuben and Geurt Gijssen raised the ever more complex issue of naming and properly describing the various types of time-control in current use.

In the beginning, of course, there were no time limits. Games were played with adjournments and could, and sometimes did, go on for days. Then competitive chess began to be played with clocks, demanding that a certain number of move be made in a certain time. The standard international rate was 40 moves in 5 hours (150 minutes on each clock). “Lightning chess” was a fast form controlled by a buzzer at, say, 10-second intervals indicating the need for a move to be made. This was not entirely sensible since one could not “save” the time saved when only a second or so was required to make a particular move. Also, some players would tend to stretch their time a little and shorten their opponent’s time by moving “late”. The terms ‘Rapidplay’ (15 to 60 minutes) and ‘Blitz’ (less than 15 minutes) were eventually introduced, governed by appendices B and C to the Laws.

Stewart Reuben favours calling these faster forms ‘speed chess’ as opposed to ‘classical chess’. Originally, and sometimes still, speed chess had a ‘guillotine’ finish (also called ‘sudden-death’, and sometimes ‘allegro’). Guillotine finish was also employed in the final ‘Quickplay’ phase of serious games, e.g., the Olympiad in Armenia, 1996, where adjournments were deemed undesirable.

Digital programmable clocks permitted the easy implementation of automatic time-increments per half-move (‘add-on’ - Fisher or Bronstein Mode). Geurt Gijssen has proposed that the determination of whether a game is governed by Classical, Rapidplay, or Blitz Laws should be made on the basis of the primary time plus 60 times the increment. The point has been made, however, that increments alter the character of the game and therefore the rules could change. For example, with ‘large’ increments (30 seconds or more) the players should notate at all times.

The trouble with all of this is that Joe Chessplayer may not understand or care much about the fine details of the distinctions. Chess might be perceived as ridiculously complicated. We must simplify the plethora of what we have already [Classical with adjournments; Classical with Quickplay finish; Rapidplay; Blitz – the last two with or without increments (and of what size)?]

We have a similar situation in track events. It’s all about running but there are different distances involved. And, again, there is broad classification into ‘sprint’, ‘middle distance’, and ‘long distance’. There are slightly different rules [e.g., staggered starts and runners keeping to their lanes in the sprints].

Cricket, to make the games more TV-marketable and spectator-practicable, introduced limited overs games requiring slight modifications to the rules

So if we just see to it that players are pre-informed of the time limits and the rules in operation are known to arbiters and competitive chess players, we can let the spectators get on with enjoying the spectacle. But there is one thing the spectators (and TV producers) really do need to know – how long (approximately) will a game take to complete? Here we might go with the suggestion of base time plus 60 increments (although base plus 100 increments would probably be more sensible and avoid lots of grey hair for spectators with later ‘commitments’ or TV producers with limited time for the segment!).

How about describing games by giving their expected duration? This will also indicate roughly the rate of moves. That is all spectators really need to know. We will have 10-minute chess [which is usually called 5- minute chess!!]; 1-hour chess (e.g., 30 minutes on each clock with guillotine finish); 2-hour chess; 7-hour chess; etc. The current Olympiad rate (base-time 90 minutes, increment 30 seconds) is then 4-hour chess. Some games will, of course, last somewhat longer but surely that is a small price to pay for the resulting simplification. The by now somewhat less common ‘Classical chess with adjournments’ can be described just as such if necessary and spectators know they will be getting the highest quality chess possible and the games might take a long time to complete. In any event it is invariably obvious from the schedule of play if this is the situation. We will surely adjust to the idea of having the 4-hour champion, the 10-minute champion, etc just as we have the 100 metres, 200 m, 10000 m champions. If we wanted to be more specific in the nomenclature we might describe games as 60 minutes or 60 minutes/etpm (short for extra time per move).

And, just as it does now, the Rules Commission will monitor the situation on an ongoing basis and determine, where necessary, modifications to the various sets of rules for the various time-limits. **Eddie Price, South Africa**

Comment First of all I would like to thank you for your very constructive proposal. It really has some merit and is very useful.

From a practical point of view I like many of your suggestions; for instance to call a game based on the total time needed for a game is a good idea, although it may cause some problems for the chess players. I am sure that a chessplayer, seeing an announcement for 10-minute games, shall think, that each player shall receive 10 minutes instead of 5 minutes each. But if we in the beginning explain what it means, I think that this is soon very clear.

Another comment is that we should not mention the possibility of adjourned games. Probably we should remove Appendix A: Adjourned Games. I cannot imagine that there is one organiser in the world who intends to organise a

tournament with adjourned games. The era of adjourned games is in my opinion definitively over. If I am wrong, please let me know.

Another remark I would like to make is that we should keep in mind what kind of rules we have to apply for each type of game. I discover more and more that chessplayers, even professional chessplayers, confuse the different types of rules.

For example, few months ago I received a letter from Grandmaster Tiviakov. He told me that in a "normal" game (sorry Mr. Price for calling a game normal) an incorrect time limit was installed in the clock. Some people were of the opinion that it was not possible to change the clock setting after three moves were played. But this rule applies only for rapid and blitz games and not for normal games. Another example: Leko had problems in Linares in his game with Kasparov, when he pointed out that he could claim a draw, because the same position had already appeared three times, even four times on the board. Leko was correct to a point. And he mentioned that in the Amber tournament the monitor shows repetition of position. But the Amber tournament is a private tournament, not FIDE rated and has its own rules, especially for the blindfold competition. We need these special rules, because there are no other blindfold competitions and therefore general rules for this type of competition do not exist.

Question Dear Mr. Gijssen, as you know, the proliferation of pocket sized chess computers escalates the probability of cheating at tournaments. Numerous ideas have been suggested to fix this problem but most strike me as unrealistic and intrusive. A friend suggested an idea to me that seems logical. The first part is that a person cannot leave his board during the game. The obvious flaw in this rule is that it does not make an allowance if the player has to go to the bathroom or has some other important task to perform. To fix this problem my friend suggested that the rule should be modified to read, "If a person leaves his board he must make his move and *leave his clock running.*" This will not only make it harder to cheat but will also make it more obvious if someone is cheating since not many chess players would leave their board with such a penalty. I'm wondering what you think of this idea and if you have any other possible solutions. Also, I think if a person is caught cheating he should be banned from chess play for 5 years. **Brian Karen (USA)**

Answer Let me start to tell you that I fully agree with you that there is a problem with these small computers. I think that this problem is much bigger than the so-called drug problem. In my opinion this is not a problem at all in our sport. It is a pity that large sums of money are spent to solve this non-existent problem. But we have to find a solution for the real problem of these small computers and other technology of transmitting computer moves to a chessplayer during the game in the playing hall.

During the world chess championships in Moscow the players were checked with a metal detector when they returned from the bathrooms. This is in my opinion only the first step. I am afraid that we have to check in the future all players before the start of each round with metal detectors. This is the only way to stop this problem. I do not see another solution.

I am not sure that your solution helps. First of all, there are many players who really have to go to the bathroom very often during the game. It has to do with their physical condition and why punish them and give the opponent a time advantage?

I fully agree with your last sentence: persons, who are caught cheating should be banned from the chess scene for a long period.

Question In your 60th ChessCafe column you mention "in Moscow I was asked to check that no player was using a pocket computer during the round". How did you do that? I have heard some concerns here also about the possible use of pocket computers. **Greg Wren (USA)**

Answer I discussed this point with the organisers, although I knew that it was impossible to check the players. Nevertheless, I shall keep asking for measures.

Question I was hoping you could answer a question for me. I was wondering what would happen if one player, being a few moves away from checkmating his opponent, runs out of time. The other player, knowing that he was outplayed, refuses to accept the win (instead he insists on his opponent getting the victory). Who wins? I asked a friend and he said that the second player would be bringing the game into disrepute, though I don't see how. Giving a victory to the better player seems to be more of a noble gesture than anything else. **Kelly Woodrow (South Africa)**

Answer Article 6.10 says very clearly that a player who does not complete the prescribed number of moves in the allotted time, loses the game, provided he has mating material. This is simply the rule and this rule can be interpreted only in one way. And in fact the flag fall finishes the game. If a player feels embarrassed to win in a lost position, he should resign before the opponent's flag falls. I do not think it is correct to refer to Article 12.1 of the Laws of Chess:

'The players shall take no action that will bring the game of chess into disrepute.'

Question Dear Mr. Gijssen, My name is Horacio Arévalo, my country is Uruguay. I am National Arbiter, and ex-president of Federation Uruguaya de Ajedrez. My question is: why, in a Swiss Tournament, nobody uses the Rating

Performance for tiebreaks. I understand that the Rating Performance is better than Buchholz because we know in a Swiss tournament the same number of points does not mean, same playing strength of adversaries. Let me know, if somebody have proposed this tiebreak system, and if not, why. **Eng. Horacio Arévalo (Uruguay)**

Answer In fact, there is at least one system in which even the pairings are based on the Rating Performance. It is the Dubov system. When you go to the FIDE website and then go to the FIDE handbook, you will see a description of the Dubov pairings system.

But there is more. Let me first of all explain a little bit about the Rating Performance, or as it is officially called, Tournament Performance Rating (TPR). TPR is the sum of two figures. The first figure is the average rating of the opponents, the second figure is a figure related to the percentage score.

There are tournaments in which the order in a score group is decided by the average rating of the opponents. For players in a score group (a score group is a group of players with the same score) the second figure is the same. This means that the order of average ratings is the same as the TPRs. In the recently played Aeroflot tournament the order in the A and B group were based on the average ratings of the opponents minus the highest and the lowest rating.

Question Dear Mr. Gijssen, I have a question for you regarding whether a tournament is valid for title purposes or not. We are going to organize an International Swiss tournament, and we'd like to use the FIDE time control: 90 minutes for the entire game and 30 seconds per move starting from move number 1, but we don't know whether it is valid for title purposes or not. Of course, the tournament will have 9 rounds. We know that Olympiad was played using this time control, but we don't know whether there was any title results and neither whether this result was because it was achieved at Olympiad or it was due to "normal" conditions. **Mikel Larreategi (Spain)**

Answer The answer is very simple: Yes, it is.

Question Dear Geurt Gijssen, White promoted a pawn to the eighth rank in a classical chess tournament, kept it there for a few seconds and was searching for a queen. In the meantime Black called the arbiter and told him that it was a 'dead' pawn since the pawn occupied the square on the eighth rank and was not promoted to a queen or any other piece. Black is of the opinion that the pawn should not be kept on the eighth rank square from the seventh rank but when the pawn is in flight from the seventh rank to eighth rank, only then the queen or any other piece should be put on the promotion square. White's clock was still running. Was Black's claim right? **S.K.Talwar (India)**

Answer The correct procedure is that the pawn should be played from the seventh to the eighth rank. After this the player has to take this pawn from the board and replace it with a Queen, Rook, Bishop or Knight of the same color. If the required piece is not available, the player may even stop both clocks and asking for the arbiter's assistance. The conclusion is clear: White acted correctly.

Comment Dear Geurt, Regarding the question of Joshua Franz about the player with an apparent medical condition. I really think it is unfair, unsporting and unethical to disallow such a player from participating in a tournament. It is really not his fault. Yes, I agree with you that the player could (before the event) inform the Arbiter of his condition. But, sometimes a player may be shy about this. We have a well-known player with a medical condition (I don't know what it's called but he's in a wheelchair, and he has basically no control over his arms which make funny movements in the air). He can't pick up the pieces but will indicate to the opponent (by touching the piece) what piece to move and then indicate to what square. Sometimes, in the process, he will knock over quite a number of the pieces. Players accept this and will adjust the board and make his move. He presses his own clock though. Many times (when I was the arbiter and he was playing) his opponents would leave the board (after making a move). When I see this, I go over and sit in the opponent's seat. I will then help him to make his move. We always try to make him feel at home. When playing, we will seat him at the end of a row so that he is not "squeezed" between other players. If the space is too small, we will set up his table in the back of the hall, some distance away from the other players. He is quite an interesting chap. **Günther van den Bergh (South Africa)**

My Comment Thank you very much for your comment. Provided that the arbiter knows in advance about disabled persons, he is able to handle appropriately. And generally the opponent accepts some inconveniences, although there are some exceptions. See my comment to the next letter.

Comment Mr. Gijssen, I have, rather than a question, some comments on a question/answer from your February column. In it, you posted a letter from Joshua Franz (USA) who wrote about a player with Tourette's syndrome, a disability that can be exceedingly distracting. The question was, "do players have any recourse under the rules in this situation [being paired with or playing in the same tournament as the person with the disability] or must we simply accept these conditions. If I am someday paired with this opponent can I make any protest if I am distracted by his condition?" Your answer was that it was a difficult question, since the distraction is not intentional, and that the player with the disability should "speak with the arbiter before the start of the tournament and make arrangements in case something happens."

I am a certified special education teacher currently working as a disability

specialist at a small, liberal arts college. In my opinion, what was overlooked in the question, and perhaps to some degree in the answer, is the issue of what "reasonable accommodations" might actually be made. A fair gloss on making reasonable accommodations takes it to mean "making adjustments to the conditions under which a person with a disability participates in an activity (chess, in this case) without rendering the activity pointless (unfair, inconsequential, etc.)".

When considering what kind of reasonable adjustments might be made, the situation experienced by the late Tony Miles comes to mind. As I recall, during at least one tournament Mr. Miles experienced excruciating pain that was (only somewhat) abated by being prone. In that case, it was decided that Mr. Miles need only appear at the board to make his moves and that between moves he could, in the most comfortable position available to him, use a set and board to duplicate the position (without, of course, being allowed to touch the pieces). While discussing the issue of "reasonable accommodation" with a colleague, he related that he once played a high school tennis match against an opponent who had only one arm. The accommodation in this case allowed the player to bounce the ball off the court before serving it (rather than tossing it into the air and hitting it immediately). Bouncing the ball gave him time to prepare his racket, which he held under arm. The point of these examples is that the accommodations made allowed participation without spoiling the competitive nature of the activity.

In his letter, Mr. Franz noted that the player's disability displays itself, "most often when it is his opponent's turn to move." This being the case, allowing the player to spend his time in a quiet location, with a duplicate position set up for his consideration, suggests itself as a possible accommodation. Conversely, allowing the non-disabled player to set up a second board seems to also be reasonable, as it doesn't seem that it would afford any advantage (or disadvantage) to either player.

This situation is interesting (to me) in that the person with the disability does not appear to be asking for accommodations. With that in mind, setting up a second board should not be thought of as an accommodation made for the direct benefit of the player with the disability but as an accommodation made on behalf of the player in order that he be able to participate (without violating a fundamental rule of chess). Hopefully, this serves to at least partially answer Mr. Franz's question about what recourse a player has when playing an opponent with a "distracting" disability: The player can ask that, if his opponent has a disability that makes distracting behavior unavoidable, one of them be provided with a second board.

In implementing this accommodation, it is not unreasonable to ask the player to provide documentation of the disability in one of two situations: First, the player discloses that he has a disability.

Second, the player's disability displays itself and, when asked to refrain from making outbursts and/or distracting noises, the player discloses that he has a

disability.

So far as I know, it is not necessary to obtain documentation before making an accommodation (I don't believe that Mr. Miles had to submit a doctor's note before being given his accommodation). It is, however, permissible. As far as ADA goes in colleges and universities, students with disabilities must request accommodations for each semester-but they need only submit documentation (typically not more than three years old) once. Presumably that would hold for local chess tournaments as well; once a TD has seen the documentation, there shouldn't be a reason to ask to see it again. Since the player with the disability can be expected to produce documentation, he should bring it with him to tournaments. There will be issues with confidentiality, and what counts as documentation of a disability. Tournament Directors who find themselves needing to accommodate players with disabilities-where they also feel the need to request documentation-should contact someone well versed in the ramifications of ADA for advice and/or direction.

I am confident that there are numerous chess players who are more knowledgeable in the area of ADA accommodation than I am. I hope that (should you post this letter) they will correct any errors I make here. **Jason Lippert (USA)**

My Comment I was quite surprised when you referred to the disability of the late GM Tony Miles in the Interpolis Tournament 1985. I was one of the arbiters at this tournament and I can assure you that we had to make a lot of effort to keep Miles in the tournament. I remember very well the meeting with all players to solve the problem. And when you read it, you shall understand that the whole business is not so easy. Here is the story...

It was a double-round tournament with 8 players, therefore 14 rounds. During rounds 1-6, Miles had a lot of pain, but was able to play in a normal way, sitting on a chair. But from round 7 it was impossible in his opinion, which was confirmed by a doctor, to continue playing in a sitting position. The tournament committee and the arbiters agreed that he might play the next rounds lying on a massage table. In round 7 he played Ljubojevic, who apparently accepted the situation. The next game was versus Polugaevsky. It was played without problems. The same happened in the following rounds when he played Korchnoi and Timman, although Korchnoi told Miles after the game that he had the feeling that he was playing a handicapped player. But after round 9, the situation changed. The tournament committee and arbiters received a letter signed by four players, that the view of the tournament hall was totally changed with Miles playing his games lying on a massage table and the opponent and also the other players experienced a rather unpleasant feeling. In the opinion of the writers of the letter all players should play under the equal conditions.

The organisers decided that the following game Romanishin – Miles should

be played in a separate room. But Romanishin disagreed and the game was played in the playing hall. Then it was decided that a meeting should be called with players, organisers and arbiters. This was a very interesting meeting. One remark made by Korchnoi I remember very well. Korchnoi noted that all kinds of tournaments exist: women tournaments, tournaments for the blind, tournaments for the disabled etc., but this was a tournament of healthy players. Timman disagreed with him and said that also in “normal” tournaments blind players, disabled players and women were able to play.

The final result of this meeting was that the players scheduled to meet Miles in the last four round, agreed to play under conditions to be discussed with Miles.

As a result...:

Dzindzichashvili played his game standing in front of Miles. It looked like a simultaneous display. Drawn after 45 moves. The game Miles – Huebner was an agreed draw. Only the result was agreed, not the moves: 1 d4 e5 2. dxe5 Qh4 3. Nf3 Qa4 4. Nc3 Qa5 5 e4 Draw. Believe me, these were really the moves actually played. In round 13 Polugaevsky was Miles’ opponent. He played “normally” sitting in front of Miles. Polu won. In the last round Miles played Ljubojevic. Ljubo played from a separate table. Miles won. At the end of the tournament Korchnoi, Huebner and Miles shared first place.

If you would like to read the whole story, please read Miles’ report in *New In Chess* 1985/11. By the way, in the last Olympiad in Bled 2002, blind and disabled teams participated! Times are changing.

In last month's column I published the Rapid game *Shirov – Topalov* from the Amber tournament in Roquebrune:

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 (I) Rd1 44. Re8 Rd8 45. Re5 (II) Rd6 46. Rh8 Rd8 47. Rh6 (III) Rd6

The question was: If black had claimed a draw after 47 Rh6, because in his opinion the same position had then appeared three times on the board and you had been the arbiter, would you allow this claim or not?

The answer was: yes. The same position appeared on the board after 43 Be4,

45 Re5 and 47 Rh6.

This is a nice example of repetition of position without repetition of moves.

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.