



C O L U M N I S T S

*From the
Archives*

Hosted by
Mark Donlan



From the Archives...

Since it came online many years ago, ChessCafe.com has presented literally thousands of articles, reviews, columns and the like for the enjoyment of its worldwide readership. The good news is that almost all of this high quality material remains available in the [Archives](#). The bad news is that this great collection of chess literature is now so large and extensive – and growing each week – that it is becoming increasingly difficult to navigate it effectively. We decided that the occasional selection from the archives posted publicly online might be a welcomed addition to the regular fare.

Watch for an item to be posted online periodically throughout each month. We will update the [ChessCafe](http://ChessCafe.com) home page whenever there has been a “new” item posted here. We hope you enjoy *From the Archives*...

An Arbiter's Notebook by Geurt Gijssen

The Time Limits They Are a-Changin'...

During the 1983 European Team Championship in Plovdiv, Bulgaria, I was the captain of the Dutch team. I remember very well one of the team meetings several weeks before the event. One of the items on the agenda was who should take which chess book with him. Clear agreements were made who should take care for the latest issues of *Chess Informant*, who was responsible for the *Encyclopedia of Openings*, who should bring the endgame books of Chéron and so on. Now each top player has his own laptop and arrangements similar to those of 1983 are completely unnecessary.

But even more things have changed in the chess world. In 1987, I was the Chief Arbiter of the Kasparov-Karpov world championship match in Seville. The time limit in this match was forty moves in two and one-half hours and then one hour for every additional sixteen moves. After five hours the games were to be adjourned. The same time limit was applied in the next match in 1990 between Kasparov and Karpov in New York/Lyon. But there was something new. Both players used computers to analyse the games after they had been played and for adjourned games. And from time to time the computer showed some improvements to the moves played in the games, even in the opening. Tom Fuerstenberg has written several interesting articles concerning the help of the computer.

To diminish the influence of the computer, the match Karpov-Timman (Zwolle, Arnhem, Amsterdam, Djakarta 1993) was played according to the same time limit (forty moves in two and one-half hours and then one hour for every additional sixteen moves), but this time the games were not to be adjourned until there had been seven hours of play. It is clear that this time limit reduced the number of adjourned games and therefore the influence of computers.

Immediately after the opening ceremony of the Karpov-Kamsky match (Elista 1996), there was an unexpected incident. Rustam Kamsky, the father of Gata Kamsky and chief of his delegation, got into a furious dispute with Anatoly Karpov. According to Rustam Kamsky, in a press conference about four weeks before the start of the match, it had been announced that the time limit would be forty in two, then twenty in one, and finally thirty minutes for each player for the remaining moves.

However, Karpov said that there was a letter signed by both Gata Kamsky and himself, which had been sent from Groningen during the Koop Tjuchem tournament in December 1995. In this letter both players suggested that the time limit should be forty moves in two hours, then one hour for every additional sixteen moves, with adjournments after six hours of play. After prolonged negotiations in Elista, it was finally decided that they would play with this time limit. Since the first forty moves would be played more quickly than in the match Karpov-Timman, the probability for adjourned games was less.

In the last world championship tournament, i.e. the knock-out tournament in Groningen 1997 and Lausanne 1998, there were no adjourned games. The time limit was totally different: 100 minutes for forty moves, then 50 minutes for twenty moves and finally 10 minutes for each player for the remaining moves. After each move, thirty seconds were added. For the first time control this effectively meant forty moves in two hours and for the second time control twenty moves in one hour.

Before the start of the tournament many people were afraid of incidents and of possibly very long games. During the entire tournament there were no incidents and the games were generally shorter than before. I think that it had to do with the time limit. When a player had a lost position he resigned. With the “old” time limit, players who found themselves in a lost position sometimes tried to take advantage of the opponent’s “Zeitnot.” With this new time limit, it is almost impossible to do so.

In this regard, I would like to mention another development. In the 1991 Candidates Matches at Brussels it was decided that, in the event a match finished 4-4, the match would be continued with rapid games (60 minutes for forty-five moves and then 15 fifteen minutes for each series of twenty moves). The Yusupov-Ivanchuk match required the rapid games to break the ties. The first game of this mini-match is probably one of the most fascinating games of the last decade. This game was chosen as the best game in *Chess Informant No. 52*. In 1996 the Informant published a book entitled *640 Best Games - 64*

Golden Games. The best games of the period 1966-1996 were published in this book. A jury of grandmasters and readers voted again for the best game. The result was that the game Ivanchuk - Yusupov finished second. Here are the moves of this remarkable game:

Ivanchuk - Yusupov

1991 Candidates Match

**1 c4 e5 2 g3 d6 3 Bg2 g6 4 d4 Nd7 5 Nc3 Bg7 6 Nf3 Ngf6 7 O-O O-O
8 Qc2 Re8 9 Rd1 c6 10 b3 Qe7 11 Ba3 e4 12 Ng5 e3 13 f4 Nf8 14 b4
Bf5 15 Qb3 h6 16 Nf3 Ng4 17 b5 g5 18 bxc6 bxc6 19 Ne5 gxf4 20
Nxc6 Qg5 21 Bxd6 Ng6 22 Nd5 Qh5 23 h4 Nxh4 24 gxh4 Qxh4 25
Nde7+ Kh8 26 Nxf5 Qh2+ 27 Kf1 Re6 28 Qb7 Rg6 29 Qxa8+ Kh7 30
Qg8+ Kxg8 31 Nce7+ Kh7 32 Nxg6 fxe6 33 Nxg7 Nf2 34 Bxf4 Qxf4
35 Ne6 Qh2 36 Rdb1 Nh3 37 Rb7+ Kg8 38 Rb8+ Qxb8 39 Bxh3 Qg3
0-1.**

It was decided that in the match Karpov - Kamsky, in case of a tie, tie-break games should also be played.

As you probably know, in Groningen and Lausanne, rapid mini-matches of two (Rounds 1-6), four (Round 7) or six games (the final) were played. If after two, four or six games the standings were still level additional games would be played. The time limit was as follows: 25 minutes per player for the whole game with the addition of ten seconds per move; if after two games there was no decision, two more games were played; the time limit in these two games was 15 minutes per player for the whole game with the addition of ten seconds per move. If these games did not produce a match winner, sudden death games would be played. White received four minutes for the whole game and black five minutes. Once again ten seconds per move were added. The first decisive game would end the match. I was very surprised that even in these sudden-death games there were no incidents.

Personally, I was very happy that the last World Championship was not played using the time limits currently being used in many tournaments. By this I am referring to a final time control in which all remaining moves must be completed, e.g. 30 minutes. The problem I have often encountered is related to Article 10.2:

If the player has less than two minutes left on his clock, he may claim a draw before his flag falls. He shall stop the clocks and summon the arbiter.

(a) If the arbiter is satisfied the opponent is making no effort to win the game by normal means, or that it is not possible to win by normal means, then he shall declare the game drawn. Otherwise he shall postpone his decision.

(b) If the arbiter postpones his decision, the opponent may be awarded two extra minutes thinking time and the game shall continue in the

presence of the arbiter.

(c) Having postponed his decision, the arbiter may subsequently declare the game drawn, even after a flag has fallen.

All incidents during the Olympiads in Moscow and Yerevan had to do with Article 10.2 of the FIDE Laws of Chess.

In my next column at the **ChessCafe**, I will show just how dangerous the provisions of this article can be.

Now for **Readers' Questions**...

Robert Spieler (USA) asked whether it is considered unsportsmanlike or illegal, to use two hands when time is almost spent? In other words, is there a rule mandating that the same hand that moves a piece must also hit the clock?

Answer Until 1 July 1997, the rule that you may not use two hands for moving a piece and hitting the clock was applicable only to one hour, rapid and blitz games.

When the Rules Committee met in Paris in 1995 to consider some rule revisions, it had as a central theme to have, if at all possible, the same rules applying to all forms of the game: 'normal' chess, quick-play finish, rapid and blitz chess. With this in mind, you may not be surprised that we have now the following rule:

Article 6.7(b):

A player must stop his clock with the same hand as that with which he made his move. It is forbidden to keep the finger on the button or to 'hover' over it.

Alvaro Faria Paz Pereira (Portugal) sent the following inquiry:

Mr. Gijssen:

I found your [The King en Prise](#) article in the **ChessCafe** very interesting. It reminded me of something that happened in a blitz (five- minute) tournament, here in Portugal, a couple of years ago:

1. Two players were in time trouble. Player A had a winning advantage in the endgame. Player B tried a little trick: he slid his king next to his opponent's king. Player A, not noticing that, just pushed a pawn on its way to queen. Player B played KxK (or may be he just claimed a win by irregular move, I don't remember exactly; anyway, this is not relevant, because, in that tournament it was allowed to take a king "en prise," as a traditional way of claiming a win by illegal move). The arbiter was called and neither player disputed the underlying facts. The arbiter, supported by the tournament director, decided to award player B the win. She considered that, after player A's last move, an illegal

position had appeared on the board, so player B could claim a win. Arbiters who present agreed, but others have disagreed, citing two reasons:

In fact, it had been player B who had made the irregular move; and, prior to his claim of a win, player B had also engaged in what could be called “bad conduct” (the trick itself).

How would you decide if you were the arbiter?

2. A related question (again in a blitz game): Player A makes an illegal move, but player B only has his king. It’s a win for player B or a draw?

Answer Your questions may be answered with the help of the new Laws of Chess.

1. Player B made an illegal move and player A did not notice this and played a move. This move was also illegal and now player B can claim the win.

2. A player having only a king cannot win. Article C4 says:

In order to win, a player must have ‘mating potential’. This is defined as adequate forces eventually to produce a position legally, possibly by ‘helpmate’, where an opponent having the move cannot avoid being checkmated in one move. Thus two knights and a king against a lone king is insufficient, but a rook and king against a knight and king is sufficient.

Finally, as an update to last month’s column, I would like to announce that the Rules Committee, in the meeting during the Olympiad in Elista, will decide what the penalty will be when a player captures the opponent’s king.



[\[ChessCafe Home Page\]](#) [\[Book Review\]](#) [\[Columnists\]](#)
[\[Endgame Study\]](#) [\[Skittles Room\]](#) [\[Archives\]](#)
[\[Links\]](#) [\[Online Bookstore\]](#) [\[About ChessCafe\]](#) [\[Contact Us\]](#)

Copyright 2006 CyberCafes, LLC. All Rights Reserved.

"The Chess Cafe®" is a registered trademark of Russell Enterprises, Inc.