FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1957

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 3.2 (1957)**

In a competition of FIDE or one under FIDE auspices, it is recommended that the pieces be of the Staunton pattern or a similar pattern in order that the participants may recognise the pieces without confusion.

If the pieces would be different from those prescribed in the preceding paragraph and if one of the players or the captain of a team demands demands that the prescribed pattern be used, the utilization of that pattern is obligatory.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 21: 1957**

Individual prizes in team tournaments**.**

When in a team chess competition, special prizes are instituted for the best percentage results arrived at by individual players, only the results of participants who have played a number of rounds at least two-thirds of the total number of rounds to be counted.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1958

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 9.4 (1958)**

Question: What is the procedure when it is established in the course of a game that the game began with colours reversed?

Answer: The Commission declares that this is a situation of the kind indicated in Article 9.4.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 11.1: 1958**

Question: Should the stipulation of Article 14.4 that “the last move is not considered as completed until after the player has stopped his clock” be applied also in the situation where the last move was a mating move executed on the board in accordance with Article 7.1 before the time limit had expired?

Answer: The Commission refers to Articles 7.1, 11.1 and 14.4. When considering this question, it ought to be remembered that the Laws of Chess are divided into General Laws (Articles 1 -12) and Supplementary Laws for Competitions (Articles 13 – 21). In the Supplementary Laws for Competitions are prescribed such amendments to the General Laws as have been found necessary to meet the special requirements of competitions. In the General Laws it is said that a move is completed “when the player’s hand has quitted the piece”, and this is a final definition as far as the game as such is concerned. This definition as such is not overruled by Article 14.4 where it is stated only that “the last move is not *considered as completed until* after the player has stopped his clock”.

Why in a special situation an already completed move should not be “considered” as completed until after an additional action has been taken is merely because in most cases an effective control cannot be at hand just at the moment when the player has completed his move on the board with his clock still in motion. In this particular case it should also be remembered that the “last move” was a mating move by which the game, according to Article 11.1, had been finished and “won for the opponent who has mated his opponent’s King”, so that, from a material point of view, it was of no importance for the opponent whether the one or the other clock was going after the end of the game.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 12.3a (1958)**

The Commission declares that when a player has claimed a draw because the same position has arisen three times and he has declared his intention of playing a move which in his opinion will bring about this third appearance, but the arbiter has established, after checking the claim, that the position has not occurred three times, then the player must play the move which he declared he intended to play.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 12.4 (1958A)**

Question: Can a player lose the game by exceeding the time-limit when the position is such that no mate is possible, whatever continuation the players may employ (this concerns Part II of the Laws)?

Answer: The Commission declares that the Laws must be interpreted in such a way that in this case, as in the case of perpetual check, a draw cannot be decreed against the will of one of the players before the situation foreseen in Article 12.4 is attained.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 12.4 (1958B) (Deleted Jan 1980)**

The Commission declares that this Article concerns only the possibility of indicating in the regulations for a certain tournament or match certain positions for which the number of fifty moves may be increased.

FIDE should not assume the responsibility for inserting into the Laws details which might be revealed as incorrect as a result of future investigations.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 13.2 (1958)**

Question: How should the words “extreme time-trouble” be interpreted?

Answer: The Commission, referring back to what has been stated in the General Observations FIDE Interpretations 1 (1959), is of the opinion that in each particular case the interpretation should devolve on the arbiter of the competition

**FIDE Interpretation 14.3 (1958)**

Question: How should this Article be interpreted in a case where the player with the black pieces is absent as well as his opponent?

Answer: The Commission considers that Article 14.3 should be applied in all its rigour.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 14.5: 1958.**

Having been asked for more exact definitions as to what constitutes evident defects of a clock, the Commission replies by referring back to the general principles clearly outlined in the General Observations (FIDE Interpretation 1: 1959)

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 16.1: 1958**

Although recognizing that the prescription – before the commencement of the last round of a competition, all unfinished games from preceding rounds should be finished – is of a certain utility for the organization of competitions in most cases, the Commission allows the organizers complete freedom to undertake, if necessary, other measures dictated by circumstances.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 16.4: 1958**

Question: What happens in the case when, in the situation described in Article 16.4, a player has sealed a move, the real significance of which it is impossible to establish.

Answer: The Commission declares that this case is covered governed by Article 17.3

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 17.2: 1958**

 In the case where a player or team of players arrives late for a competition, the Commission deems that it should stand by the general principles of the General Observations (FIDE Interpretation 1: 1959). If the delay is due to a cause for which the players are not responsible, then it must follow from the principle of chess fellowship, at least in international tournaments, that concessions should be granted as far as it is possible to do so without creating eventual difficulties to other players or to the organization itself.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 17.3: 1958**

Having been asked for a more precise formulation of Article 17.3, the Commission once again refers to the General Observations (FIDE Interpretation 1: 1959). It is the duty of the arbiter to make the necessary decision in accordance with the circumstances of each particular case.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 19.1c: 1958**

Article 19.1c should be applied in the case when a player who has proposed a draw reiterates his proposal without reasons that are clearly well-founded before the opponent has, in his turn, made use of his right to propose a draw.

Article 19.1c protects the players sufficiently, and the application of this Article can always be requested from the arbiter against a player who proposes a draw too frequently to his opponent.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 20.3: 1958**

The Commission considers that there is no need to include in the Laws of Chess prescriptions concerning the appeals against the decision of an arbiter. However, when it is a question of international tournaments, it is doubtless appropriate to have a committee at the place where the competition takes place entrusted with the task of solving disputes in the event of appeals against an arbiter’s decision.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1959

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 1 (1959)**

General Observations. The Laws of Chess cannot, and should not, regulate all possible situations that may arise during a game, nor can they regulate all questions of organization. In most cases not precisely regulated by an Article of the Laws, one should be able to reach a correct judgment by applying analogously stipulations for situations of a similar character. As to the arbiters' tasks, in most cases one must presuppose that arbiters have the competence, sound judgment, and absolute objectivity necessary. A rule too detailed would deprive the arbiter of his freedom of judgment and might prevent him from finding the solution dictated by fairness and compatible with the circumstances of a particular case, since one cannot foresee every possibility.

The decisions of the Commission [The FIDE Rules Commission, which proposes Interpretations of the Laws] are founded on the above general principles.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 13.2 (1959)**

Question: The words “extreme time-trouble” figuring in Article 13.2 cannot be precisely defined. It is the arbiter’s task to find out, considering time, the number of moves, and the character of the position at the moment, if these words apply to a player’s situation. In this case the arbiter’s opinion decides.

If the arbiter thinks the above words do not apply, but if the player refuses to record the game according to Article 13.1 then Article 17.4 should be applied.

If the player does not refuse to comply with the arbiter’s request, but declares he cannot complete his scoresheet without consulting his opponent’s, the request for this scoresheet must be made to the arbiter, who will determine whether the scoresheet can be completed before the time control without inconveniencing the other player. The latter cannot refuse his scoresheet for two reasons: the scoresheets belong to the organisers of the tournament and the reconstitution of the game will be made on the opponent’s time. In all other cases the scoresheets can be completed only after the time control. At this point two situations may prevail –

1. If one player alone has not completed his score sheet, he will do so on his own time;
2. If the two players have not completed their scoresheets, their clocks will be stopped until the two scoresheets are completed, if necessary with the help of a chessboard under the control of the arbiter, who will beforehand have noted the position.

If in case (a) the arbiter sees that the complete score sheet cannot help in reconstituting the game, he will act as in case (b).

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 18.1 (1959)**

From a sporting point of view, it is quite inappropriate that a game be finished before a real fight has commenced; competition ought to imply that every player should try to fight in order to win his game until the moment when the situation does not afford any further hope of victory.

Attention is drawn in particular to the fact that in this respect the International Grandmasters and the International Masters of FIDE ought to serve as examples to the other players. Players who repeatedly act without respecting their duty to the organizers and to the chess public may be subject to disciplinary measures taken by the arbiter.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1960

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 9.4 (1960)**

In a Swiss-System tournament, the arbiter made a mistake by giving to Player X the white pieces and to Player Y the black pieces instead of the opposite. After detecting the mistake some days later, Player Y claimed that the game should be annulled and a new game played in its stead, with Player Y having the white pieces.

The Commission declares that in accordance with the fundamental principles of Articles 9.4 and 9.5, the claim, since it was submitted after the end of the game, must be rejected.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 12.3 (1960)**

A game cannot be declared drawn on the basis of Article 12.3 unless the same player has the move after each one of the three appearances of the same position on the chessboard.

The right to claim a draw belongs exclusively to the player:

1. Who has the possibility of playing a move that will bring about a repetition of the position, on condition that he indicates the move and claims a draw before executing this move.
2. Who has to reply to a move by which the repeated position has been brought about, on condition that he claims a draw before executing his move.

If the claim turns out to be incorrect the game continues, the player who has indicated a move according to (a) is obliged to execute this move on the chessboard.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 12.3a (1960)**

If the claim turns out to be incorrect (Article 18.2) and the game continues, the player who has indicated a move according to (a) is obliged to execute this move on the chessboard.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 19.1a: 1960**

The Commission shares the opinion that the result of a game of chess ought to depend exclusively on the actual playing strength of each partner and that consequently the collaboration of other people ought to be allowed no more after an adjournment than in the course of the game on the chessboard. It must, however, be observed whereas in the locale of play perfect control can be upheld, this is not possible during the time the game is adjourned. It must therefore be held in mind that a general prohibition of the use of seconds would probably not be respected by all players and that in practice it might be disadvantageous for the players who would loyally respect the prohibition.

Thus the only effective and just means of eliminating, as far as possible, the use of seconds probably consists in a change of the system for the organisation of tournaments.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 18.1 (1960)**

It is hardly possible to establish prescriptions sufficiently detailed to be directly applicable to each particular case. On the basis of the general principle that the players may not ignore the necessity of an honest fight, the examination of each particular case ought, according to the opinion of the Commission, to devolve upon the person who is in charge of the tournament in which the game in question has been played. At this examination it must not be forgotten that a player may have quite legitimate reasons— his actual situation in the tournament table, his state of health, etc.—for desisting from whatever prospects he has in a given situation for continuing the game to a victory and that he may therefore be considered entitled to make or accept an offer of a draw.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1962

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 17.2: 1962**

The Commission declares that the stipulations of Article 17.2 and 17.4 of the Laws of Chess, stating that a game is lost for players arriving at the chessboard more than one hour late, are applicable as much at the commencement of a game as on resumption of play after an adjournment. In the opinion of the Commission, there cannot be any difficulty in applying this rule in the situation in which, on resumption of an adjourned game, the player who has sealed a move is absent while his opponent presents himself at the chessboard. If the former is still absent after the lapse of one hour, the game is lost for him unless it has been decided previously by one of three circumstances, viz-

1. The absent player has won the game by virtue of the fact that the sealed move is checkmate;
2. The absent player has produced a drawn game by virtue of the fact that the sealed move entails stalemate, or
3. The player present at the chessboard has lost the game according to Article 17.1 by exceeding his time-limit.

This declaration by the Commission implies basically a mere substantiation of the evident fact that what happens in consequence of an action or of an omission after the termination of a game is without importance.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1963

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 9.1 (1963).**

Question: How are the words "during a game" to be interpreted if a game has been submitted for adjudication? Specifically, is the game considered to be still in progress for the purposes of Article 9.1 if, before the arbiter has registered the result of the game after adjudication, it is established that an illegal move was made or that one or more pieces were accidentally displaced and incorrectly replaced?

Answer: The Commission declares that in such cases a game submitted for adjudication is considered to be still in progress for the purposes of Article 9.1.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 18.1 (1963)**

It seems necessary to stipulate clearly and in writing certain moral principles which should guide the game, but are not incorporated in the Laws, in order to enable the arbiter to secure as far as possible a fair, sportsmanlike contest.

The Commission emphasizes the following points.

(a) Every agreement to draw should, as a matter of principle, be based on a position on the chessboard which, in the opinion of each of the two players, offers no tangible possibility of pursuing the game to a victorious conclusion without running an obvious risk of defeat.

(b) Particular circumstances may exist, however, which would authorize a player to propose or accept a draw in cases differing from those mentioned in (a). It is not possible to define these particular circumstances in a complete manner, just if the official regulations the stipulations governing agreements to draw should, in the opinion of the Commission, be so conceived as to comprise only basic principles and goals, as competent arbiters must be presumed to know how to apply them to concrete cases in an equitable manner.

The principles so formulated relate to a basic principle, according to which each player should conduct his whole game gg a fight for the best possible result. Voluntary measures to evade the fight or to favour the opponent or a third player should 'be held contemptible for reasons of sport and be judged accordingly.

It is easy to establish that it is difficult, in certain cases even impossible, to judge correctly the measures to be taken in situations varying in character, and the arbiter should impose penalties only in cases which clearly constitute contraventions of the moral principles involved.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1964

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 12.3 (1964)**

Concerning the repetition of a position on the chessboard, a position should not always be considered the same if pieces of the same kind and of the same colour occupy the same squares (static identity), but only on the additional condition that the possibilities for moving these pieces are also the same (that is to say, that there is also dynamic identity). If one adds this last stipulation, a player would thus no longer be entitled to demand a draw if, after the repetition of a position, the right to castle or to take a pawn "en passant" had been lost.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 18.1 (1964)**

An agreement to draw a game before the 30th move in many cases involves an act which rightly could be deemed contradictory to the stated principles on premature draws. Arbiters are requested to impose, in cases where clear contraventions of the moral principles of the game are demonstrated, penalties as severe as loss of the game.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1965

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 17.3: 1965**

According to the opinion of the Commission, it ought to be clearly established by the wording of this Article that not only when the notation is inexact but also when a clear notation indicates an irregular move, it is incumbent on the arbiter to judge whether there exists any reasonable doubt as to the move which the player has intended to indicate.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1966

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 15.1: 1966**

In adjourning a game, the player having the move made a note of the adjourning move, plaved the paper in an envelope, sealed it, and put it on the table; however, the clock was not stopped. When the arbiter took the envelope, the player asked him to return it, since he was still thinking over his move. The arbiter refused to do so, stating that in that phase of the game it was not possible to permit modification of an adjourning move.

The Commission declares that an adjourning move had not been definitely made and therefore the decision of the arbiter was not correct.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 17.2: 1966**

Question: If, in adjourning a game, a player has some remaining time in his favour (more than one hour), should his opponent, when the game is continued, wait an hour or wait until the full time which the player has in his favour has elapsed before claiming a win in case of the player’s nonappearance?

Answer: This case has already been solved by FIDE Interpretation 17.2: 1962.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1967

**FIDE Interpretation 13.2 (1967)**

During the course of a game, the two players, under extreme time pressure, did not write down their moves after move 30. After a series of moves they agreed that they had played at least 40 moves. Being unable to reconstruct the course of the game without the help of a chessboard, they asked permission of the arbiter to reconstruct the game. The arbiter gave permission, and the reconstruction started. The arbiter stopped the clocks, but during the course of the reconstruction the clock of the player with the black pieces was restarted by the player with the white pieces because the player with the black pieces had started to reflect on the game. At the beginning of the reconstruction the player with the black pieces disposed of one minute and a half for reflection. During the reconstruction this player exceeded the time-limit, and it was discovered that he had made only 39 moves.

The Commission’s opinion, as no other details are available, is that the player with the White pieces won the game. (See also FIDE Interpretation 13.2 (1974A)

**FIDE Interpretation 14.3 (1967)**

Question: Is an arbiter entitled to call a player’s attention to the player’s neglect to stop his clock and/or to the fact that the opponent has made a move and put the clock of the player in motion?

Answer: The opinion of the Commission is that the arbiter should refrain from any action of this kind.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 21: 1967**

Application of the Sonnenborn-Berger System in the case of a tie in a team tournament.

Question: How is the Sonnenborn-Berger (Tie-Breaking) System to an individual tournament, every player is assigned a number of points calculated by a special rule. Specifically, each player is given the total number of points scored by each opponent he defeated and half the total number of points scored by each opponent with whom he drew. Three alternatives, then, are possible: a win giving the total number of points scored in the tournament by the opponent, a draw giving half that number of points, and a loss giving no points.

In a team tournament, when game points are being use, the number of alternatives possible depends upon the number of players on each team. For example, in a tournament where the number of players in each team is four. There are nine possible alternatives: 4, 3½, 3, 2½, 2, 1½, 1, ½, 0. If, in a tournament of this kind, two participating teams, A and B, have the same number of game points, whereas a third team, C, has 16points, the Sonnenborn-Berger totals which Team A and Team B each obtain in their match with Team C is calculated as follows –

If the team scored 4 points (100%) its S-B total is 16.

 “ “ “ “ 3½ “ (87½%) “ “ “ “ 14

 “ “ “ “ 3 “ (75%) “ “ “ “ 12

 “ “ “ “ 2½ “ (62½%) “ “ “ “ 10

 “ “ “ “ 2 “ (50%) “ “ “ “ 8

 “ “ “ “ 1½ “ (37½%) “ “ “ “ 6

 “ “ “ “ 1 “ (25%) “ “ “ “ 4

 “ “ “ “ ½ “ (12½%) “ “ “ “ 2

 “ “ “ “ 0 “ (0%) “ “ “ “ 0

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1970

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 17.1 (1970)**

With reference to the General Observations (FIDE Interpretation Art. 1 [1959]), the Commission expresses the opinion that special regulations should be allowed insofar as they are required for conducting tournaments in which the number of players is large and the number of arbiters is rather small, so that the procedure to determine whether a player has lost a game under Article 17.1 cannot be observed.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 13.1: 1970**

Question: A player, referring to the Laws of Chess, asked his opponent to make his move first and only then to write it down on his scoresheet. It is thought not to be correct to write down the move first and only then to make it on the board. The arbiter of the tournament in question regarded it to be insignificant.

Answer: The Commission is of the opinion that every player who has the move has the choice.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 16.5: 1970**

Question: What measures should be taken when the conditions indicated in Article 16.5 are only partially fulfilled, in that the envelope containing the sealed move has disappeared, but it is still possible to establish by an agreement between the players the position at the adjournment and the times used until that moment?

Answer: The Commission decides that the game under such circumstances has to be continued.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 21: 1970**

Question: What are the consequences when a player or team withdraws or is expelled from a (round robin) tournament?

Answer : If a player has not completed at least 50% of his games when he leaves the tournament, his score remains in the tournament table (for rating and historical purposes), but the points scored by him or against him are not counted in the final standings. For the games not played or finished, the player, as well as his opponent, gets a /-/ in the tournament table.

If a player has completed at least 50% of his games when he leaves the tournament, his score remains in the tournament table and will be counted in the final standings. For the games not played the opponents will get /1/ and the player himself will get a /0/.

The same rules apply equally when a team is concerned instead of a player.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1971

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 6.1 (1971)**

If a player in castling starts by touching the rook, he should receive a warning from the arbiter, but the castling shall be considered valid.

If a player, intending to castle, touches king and rook at the same time and it then appears that castling is illegal, the player has to move his king. If the king has no legal move, the fault has no consequences.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 6.6c (1971A)**

In a game between Player A (White) and Player B (Black), B played on the 45th move . . . c1. However, he neglected to exchange the pawn immediately for a queen. On his scoresheet he had written 45 . . . c1Q and stopped his clock afterwards. Then he left the board. At the time, his opponent was not present. When A returned to the board, he protested because B had not immediately exchanged the pawn on cl, though B told him the piece on cl was a queen. The arbiter decided as follows: A's clock was restored to the position it had before the move . . . cl was made. B had to make his move 45 . . . c1Q again, as it was obvious that he intended to promote that pawn to a queen. Then the game was resumed in the normal way.

The Commission confirms the decision of the arbiter. FIDE Interpretation Art. 6.6c (1971B). In a competition, if a new piece is not immediately available, the player must ask for the assistance of the arbiter before making his move. If this request is made and there is any appreciable delay in obtaining the new piece, the arbiter must stop both clocks until the required piece is given to the player having the move. If no request is made and the player makes his move and stops his clock without exchanging the promoted pawn for a new piece, he is breaking the Laws and must be given a warning or a disciplinary penalty, such as the advancement of the time on his clock. In any case, the opponent's clock must be set back to the time it registered immediately before the player stopped his clock, the position on the chessboard must be re-established to what it was before the player moved his pawn, and the clock of the player having the move must be started. FIDE Section The player must then make his move correctly, in the manner specified in Article 6.6c.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 11.2 (1971)**

If a player shakes hands with his opponent, this is not to be considered as equal to resigning the game as meant in Article 11.2.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 14.5: 1971.**

With regard to article 14.5 and 14.6, the arbiter should endeavour to check all clocks periodically to make sure that they are operating properly.

A clock with an obvious defect should be replaced, and the time used by each player up to the moment whited on the new clock as accurately as possible.

If one unit of the defective clock has stopped, the corresponding unit of the new clock should be advanced so that the total time indicated by the two units is equal to the time of the session of the competition had been in progress.

If both units have stopped, the difference between the total of the times registered by the defective clock and the elapsed time of the session should be divided in half and each unit of the new clock advanced by this amount.

If any of the above clock adjustments would result in an indication that a player had exceeded the time limit or if the time used by each player cannot be accurately determined, the arbiter may set the hands of the new clock in accordance with his best judgement.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 21: 1971**

Awarding of prizes in case of withdrawal.

The question of whether or not a player who withdraws from a match is still entitled to receive the loser’s prize was not decided.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION OF SUPPLEMENT No 1: 1971**

The Commission recommends that all affiliated federations promote the use of the algebraic chess notation as much as possible. In particular, young chess players should be encouraged to use the algebraic notation.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1972

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 8.2 (1972)**

In a recent game the player with the white pieces claimed that his opponent violated Article 8.2 by touching a piece, then moving a different piece. Black denied the accusation, and an arbiter was called to the board. There was no independent witness of any kind to the alleged violation, so the arbiter rejected the claim for lack of evidence.

The Commission declares that the arbiter was correct. As in the case of all other Laws, unbiased evidence is required to support any claim by a player that his opponent violated a Law. If the accused player denies the allegation and it is impossible to prove otherwise by the testimony of an arbiter or other disinterested witness, it is just a question of one player's word against that of his opponent. An unsubstantiated claim would have to be rejected.

**FIDE Interpretation 13.2 (1972)**

Question : Concerning Article 13.2 of the Laws about keeping score, is a player in time-trouble obliged to stop his clock with the same hand with which he keeps score?

Answer: The Laws of Chess make no such requirement, whether or not the player is in time-trouble, nor is there any law that requires a player to stop his clock with the hand he uses to make moves on the board.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 14.6: 1972**

Question: With regard to Article 14.6 is the sudden illness of a player during the course of a game or the sudden decease of a close relative covered by this Article?

Answer: With regard to Article 14.6 if the sudden illness is in the course of a game is deemed to be of short duration, then the answer is yes, but if it is not regarded as likely to be brief, the answer is no. In this case and also in the case of the sudden decease of a close relative, the matter must be left to the discretion of the arbiter.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1973

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 6.6c (1973)**

The penalty referred to in FIDE Interpretation Art. 6.6c (1971B) is meant to be indefinite. The penalty should depend on the circumstances.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 9.4 (1973)**

The Commission states that in the case of FIDE Interpretation Art. 9.4 (1958) it does not matter who made the mistake (even if it was the arbiter as well as both players). The rules must be obeyed in any case.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 9.5 (1973)**

This Article applies only in the case where the initial position of the pieces on the chessboard accorded with that specified in Article 3.3 except that each of the squares on which the pieces rested was of the opposite colour. Otherwise, Article 9.4 applies.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 13.1 (1973)**

In a tournament game a player who was not short of time (his opponent was, though) recorded his moves two at a time (one move for White, one move for Black), as was his habit. Several players have the same habit. The arbiter told him that he should record his moves one after another. The player considered this to be an unnecessary disturbance and an indirect help for his opponent who was in time trouble.

The question is: is it a breach of Article 13.1 of the Laws of Chess if the moves are not recorded separately?

Answer: Technically speaking, this is indeed a breach of Article 13.1. However, the arbiter should intervene only when the arrears in scorekeeping are more than one move for White and one move for Black.

**FIDE Interpretation 13.2 (1973)**

The Commission points out that time-trouble is a relative matter, not at all the same for all chess players. What is time-trouble to one player might well mean “lots of time” to another player. This point must be left to the discretion of the arbiter.

**FIDE Interpretation 14.3 (1973)**

FIDE Interpretation 14.3 : 1967 is based on the conviction which the Commission maintains that the normal handling of the clock should be done solely by the players. If a player forgets to stop his clock when he has made a move, that is *his* responsibility. The arbiter’s function is not to correct the faults or omissions of the players in this respect. Furthermore, a correcting action of the arbiter should not depend on whether he notices these mistakes.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 14.5: 1973.**

The last paragraph of FIDE Interpretation 14.5:1971 clearly indicates that the correction of the hands of the clock(s) should not lead to disastrous results for one (or both) of the players. For that very reason, the last paragraph of the Interpretation gives the arbiter the option to use his own judgment.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 15.1: 1973 (Deleted Jan 1980)**

The Commission declares that it should be left to the discretion of the arbiter whether no game should be adjourned more than an hour before the end of the time fixed for adjourning.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 16.1: 1973A**

The Commission accepts the proposal that before the last round starts all adjourned games should be finished as a recommendation.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 16.1: 1973B**

The Commission declares that it should be left to the discretion of the arbiter whether, in order to finish the adjourned games as quickly as possible, the arbiter has the right, on the day reserved for adjourned games, to interrupt a game of presumed long duration in favour of one or more adjourned games which might be finished more quickly.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 16.1: 1973C**

The Commission declares that it should be left to the discretion of the arbiter – provided that in FIDE tournaments no player should be forced to play more than seven hours a day – whether the duration of the time fixed for the playing off of adjourned games may be prolonged, if necessary, but not by more than two hours, provided that the players concerned have been warned in advance.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 16.6: 1973**

The Commission points out that checking the times on the clocks before play is entirely the responsibility of the players. If they neglect to check the times indicated on the clocks, they must bear the consequences of their negligence.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 21: 1973**

Relating to a player’s retirement from a tournament, chroniclers of events are at liberty to indicate in the tournament table whether the defeats of such a player were “actual” or “declared” (defaulted).

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1974

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 1 (1974)**

During recent years Commission has been more or less overwhelmed by a steadily growing number of proposals and questions. That, of itself, is a good thing.

However, there is a marked tendency in those many questions and proposals to bring more and more refinements and details into the Laws. Clearly the intention is to get more and more detailed instruction concerning "how to act in such and such a case." This may be profitable for a certain type of arbiter, but at the same time may be a severe handicap for another, generally the best, type of arbiter.

The Commission in its entirety takes the firm position that the Laws should be as short and as clear as possible. The Commission strongly believes that minor details should be left to the discretion of the arbiter. Each arbiter should have the opportunity, in case of a conflict, to take into account all the factors of the case and should not be bound by too detailed sub-rules which may not be applicable to the case in question. According to the Commission, the Laws of Chess must be short and clear and leave sufficient scope for the arbiter to deal with exceptional or unusual cases.

The Commission appeals to all chess federations to accept this view, which is in the interest of the hundreds of thousands of chess players, as well as of the arbiters, generally speaking. If any chess federation wants to introduce more detailed rules, it is perfectly free to do so, provided –

(a) they do not in any way conflict with the official FIDE Laws;

(b) they are limited to the territory of the federation in question; and

(c) they are not valid for any FIDE tournament played in the territory of the federation in question.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 6.1 (1974)**

The Commission regards the warning by the arbiter an adequate means of dealing with those who castle in the wrong manner.

The Commission disagrees with the principle that if the king has no legal move, then a move with the rook shall be made, which would apply if the move was initially one with the rook alone.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 8.1 (1974)**

A player who wishes to adjust one or more pieces when his opponent is absent may make the adjustment after warning the arbiter of his intention.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 8.2 (1974A)**

A player who touches more pieces than those indicated in this Article may be penalized at the discretion of the arbiter.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 8.2 (1974B)**

Question: If a player reaching for a piece to make a move (but not having touched it yet) touches another piece with his arm in passing, is this grounds for the opponent to claim that the player must move that piece?

Answer: A piece is considered to be touched under this Article only when a player touches it with the intention of making a move with it. Doubtful cases are left to the discretion of the arbiter.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 8.4 (1974)**

The enforcement of this Article by the arbiter does not require a claim to be made.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 11.1: (1974)**

The limitation of FIDE Interpretation 11.1: 1958 to the last move before the time control, differing from any other move which was a mating move, is correct, because only when the question of priority of checkmate above the question of whether or not the player has made the prescribed number of moves within the time-limit arises.

The Interpretation should apply not only to similar cases of checkmate but also to similar cases of stalemate.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 12.3a (1974)**

A requirement to the effect that a player should not only declare his intention of making a move leading to the repetition of the position but also execute the declared move on the board is not necessary. It is clear that the player who claims the draw has to make the intended move in any case, but the Commission is of the opinion that the declared move should not be immediately executed on the board.

**FIDE Interpretation 13.2 (1974A)**

If the arbiter stops the clocks for reasons mentioned in FIDE Interpretation 13.2 1959, then only the arbiter decides when the clocks should be put in motion again.

**FIDE Interpretation 13.2 (1974B)**

There being a certain ambiguity in the words “as soon as time-trouble is over”, the Commission agrees that when, by the arbiter’s count, the prescribed number of moves has been made by each player, the arbiter will require the players to update their scoresheets at that time, if necessary.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 14.5: 1974.**

The Commission is of the opinion that with regard to FIDE Interpretation 14.5: 1973, the players involved should never have the right to deal with the situation of a defective clock. This task belongs exclusively to the arbiter.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 15.1: 1974**

Question: Is the length of the playing session determined by the total time on the chess clocks or by astronomical time?

The following example illustrates the importance of this question. During the first session a player considered his sealed move for some time, so that the session took 5 hours and 45 minutes. The rate of play was 2½ hours for 40 moves and 16 moves for every further hour. According to the programme, play was to be resumed at 16.00 hours and to last until 22.00 hours. After 5 hours and 15 minutes of play in the resumption (second session) i.e., at 21.15 hours, one of the players wished to seal his move because the total of the times registered by the chess clocks, for the first and second sessions together, was 11 hours. Both players had passed the third time-control and had made 90 moves each. However, the other player demanded continuation of play until 22.00 hours, according to the astronomical clock, because in the second session play was to continue for 6 hours. The arbiter decided that what counts is the time registered by the chess clocks and, since the total time was 11 hours and the scheduled time-controls had been passed, granted the request for sealing the move.

Answer: Duration first session: 5 hours on the watch or wall clock.

Time taken to seal the move: (Say) 45 minutes.

Duration second session: 6 hours on the watch or wall clock for adjourned games.

Total duration of the two sessions: 11 hours and 45 minutes on the watch or wall clock.

As usual, the time taken after the end of the first session for sealing the move (say, 45 minutes) has not been mentioned in the programme.

Furthermore, the Commission points out that it has become common practice that a player has the right to seal his move when the prescribed number of moves has been made before the end of the session and he still has sufficient time left on his chess clock, unless for organisational reasons the arbiter deems otherwise.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 15.1: 1974**

Question: Is the length of the playing sessions determined by the total time on the chess clocks or by astronomical time

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 18.1 (1974A)**

A proposal to draw not made in accordance with Article 18.1 is treated as follows –

(a) if a player proposes a draw while his opponent's clock is running, the opponent may agree to the draw or reject the offer; or

(b) if a player proposes a draw while his own clock is running, the opponent may accept or reject the offer, or he may postpone his decision until after the player has completed a move.

In these situations the opponent may reject the proposal orally or by completing a move at his first opportunity. In the interval between the offer of a draw and the opponent's acceptance of it, the player who made the proposal cannot withdraw it.

FIDE Interpretation Art. 18.1 (1974B). A player proposed a draw and made his move on the board before his opponent had replied to the offer. The opponent, after some minutes' consideration, accepted the offer. The arbiter rendered the player's proposal valid and thus proclaimed the game drawn. One of the arguments for this decision was that the proposal maintained its validity since the proposal itself is more important than the form.

The Commission disagrees with the last-mentioned argument, since here the way the draw is offered is the thing that matters. In spite of the reasoning offered, the Commission approves the actual decision taken in this particular case.

The Commission thinks that this matter has adequately been covered by FIDE Interpretation Art. 18.1 (1974A).

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 16.5: 1974**

Question: What happens –

1. If two players agree on a draw and announce their decision to the arbiter and then find, when the envelope is opened, that an illegal move has been recorded or
2. When one of the players in adjourned game notifies the arbiter in writing that he resigns and then finds, when the envelope is opened, that his opponent has recorded an illegal move?

Answer: In case (a) the draw is still valid. In case (b) the resignation is still valid.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 18.2 (1974)**

Question: What happens when an arbiter –

(a) accepts a claim of a draw, but then is proved to have made a mistake; or

(b) turns down a claim of a draw which afterwards proves to have been correct?

Answer: If a claim of a draw has been mistakenly accepted by the arbiter and a higher authority subsequently rejects the claim, then the player who has not claimed the draw is entitled to resume the game.

If a claim of a draw has been refused by the arbiter, then the player who has made the claim is entitled to stop playing and appeal to a higher authority. If then the player's claim is proved to be incorrect, the game shall be declared lost for that player.

FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1975

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 6.1:1975.**

Question: If a player moves his king two places, intending to castle with the king’s rook, and it then appears that castling is illegal, can the player castle on the other side (provided of course that castling on that side is legal)?

Answer: The answer is yes. The player has to make any legal move he chooses with his king, from its original square. There is no reason why that legal move should not be castling on the queen's side.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 8.2b: 1975**

Question: White has a pawn on c5 and a queen on c4, and black has a rook on d6 White intends to play cxd6. Many players are used to touching first the piece to be captured and, with the same hand, at (nearly) the same time, the capturing piece. In this example White touches the black rook, and in the following fraction of a second, he reconsiders his intended move and touches the white queen. According to article 8.2b he can play any move he likes with the queen, and the fact that he touched the black rook does not count any more. The Article gives priority to a move with the
player's own piece over the capture of an opponent’s piece. In most cases, would it not better correspond to the original intention of the player to give priority to the capture?

Answer: The Commission declines to give an Interpretation on the basis of hypothetical cases alone. It should be remarked, however, that the seemingly 'obvious' solution (changing the order of possibilities in Article 8.2b) is no good, because in that case another hypothetical case could be constructed, in which the reverse could happen.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 14.7: 1975.**

Question: In a game as part of a team match, both players were short of time as the time control approached. Both made their moves in time, and the game was then adjourned to allow both clubs to decide what claim to submit to the adjudicator; the rules of the competition stipulated that after the first full session of play, the game-should be sent for adjudication rather than continued.

 Before either team had submitted an adjudication claim; but 2 or 3 days after the match, one player discovered that his opponent had made an illegal 33rd move, the game having been adjourned at the 40th move. Examination of both players score sheets confirmed that the move had been illegal.

The arbiter of the competition ruled that since neither club had submitted a claim to the adjudicator at the stage when the illegality had been discovered the game could not be regarded as completed. He decided, however, that since
the game could not be continued without a major distortion of the time situation the player who had made the illegal move should lose the game. The club concerned appealed against this decision. The appeals committee overruled the
earlier decision and ordered the game continued from the stage where the illegality occurred. They further ruled (a) that the player who had made the illegal move should move the piece which he had touched to make the illegal move and (b) that to offset the distraction produced by the resumption of the game, the player who had made the illegal move should be allocated only 5 minutes on his clock, while his opponent should be allocated 24 mins, in accordance with Article 14.7. Would the commission care to comment on the issue raised by this case?

Answer: The decision of the arbiter (loss of game) was wrong. The decision of the appeals committee (to give the right potion of time to the player who did not make the illegal move and give considerably less time to the other) was wrong. The formula of Article 14.7 should have been applied to both players, not to just one of them. There is no indication whatsoever that the formula of 14.7 may be ignored; neither is there any indication in the Laws themselves or any Interpretation to this effect in existence. Leaving alone the reasons of the appeals committee for its decision, it should be remarked that the faulty decision made might easily be seen and felt as a kind of punishment, which should be avoided at all cost.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 17.3: 1975**

Question: In a recent tournament Player A was asked to seal a move of adjournment. Player A subsequently handed his sealed-move envelope to the arbiter, who kept it in his custody. When the adjourned game was resumed, the envelope was opened, but only the scoresheet of Player B was found in the envelope. The arbiter ruled that player A’s failure to seal his move automatically entailed the loss of the game under Article 17.3

Was the arbiter's ruling correct?

Answer: Yes. It should be remarked, however, that the arbiter (or one of his assistants) should be blamed, as he did not make sure that the scoresheet of Player A was in the envelope, even though it was his duty to do so.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 19.1a.: 1975.**

Question: In a time trouble game the captain of one side informed (without being asked to do so) the player of his side (White) that his opponent had just completed the last move of the prescribed series of moves. As a consequence of
this, White had now enough time to think his position over. He found the
winning continuation in the rather complicated position. Black felt that his chances had been damaged by the action of the captain of the opposite side particularly as in the time trouble phase of the game the chances for a win changed continuously. In this phase of the game both players did not write down their moves and did not even mark the number of moves they played. the appeals committee: did not accept the protest of Black and gave the motives for its decision by referring to many international tournaments where the players, the arbiter, and other persons present in the tournament hall can see continuously the position and the number of moves made on the big wall boards. The committee said that everyone had the right to inform the players at any time about the number of moves
completed, as long as there is no infringement of Article 19.1a. Here follow 3 specific questions:

(a) When may a player be informed about the number of moves he has played (before or after the time control)?

(b) Who has the right (or is obliged) to give that information (the arbiter, the team captain, other persons)?

(c) What kind of penalty should be given in connection with the above mentioned parties for incorrect behaviour?

Answers: (a) Never (b) Nobody (c) Left to arbiter's discretion (But see FIDE INTERP. 13.2 :1976 for the procedure at the time control)

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 21: 1975.**

See Interpretation 3.2: 1957.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 21: 1975**

These regulations define the general standards for chess equipment to be used in FIDE competitions and apply only to the equipment used in FIDE competitions. Manufacture of equipment and organisers are free to make and use equipment for all other competitions. Manufacturing is encouraged of all sets of artistic value, regardless of the practical possibilities of their use.

(a) Used in matches of 2 players shall be the chess pieces agreed upon by both. Their agreement shall also be observed concerning other equipment, -chess table, board and clock. In case the players disagree, the equipment to be used shall be decided by the chief arbiter of the match who shall bear in mind the following standards for size and form.

(b) Used in the tournaments, Olympiads, and other competitions within the FIDE system shall be the chess equipment offered by the organisers (hosts) of a particular competition, provided that it conform to the following standards and has been approved by the chief arbiter.

Chess Pieces.

Material. Chess pieces should be made of wood, plastic or an imitation of these materials.

Height, Weight, Proportions. The king's height should be 8.5 to 10.5 cm. 'I'he diameter of the king's base should measure 40-50% of the height. The size of the other pieces should be proportionate to their size and form. Other elements, such as stability, aesthetic considerations, etc., may also be taken into account. The weight of the pieces should be suitable for comfortable moving and stability.

Form, Style and Make. Recommended for use in FIDE competitions are those types of chess sets and equipment, which have already been used in Men's Olympiads, Interzonal Tournaments, Candidates matches and Tourney, and World Champ. Matches. The pieces should be shaped so as to be clearly distinguishable from one another. In particular the top of the king should differ distinctly from that of the queen. The top of the bishop may bear a notch or be of a special colour clearly distinguishing it from a pawn.

Colour of Chess Pieces. The dark pieces should he brown or black in colour or dark shades of these colours. The light pieces may be white or cream or other light colours. The natural colour of wood (walnut, maple, etc.) may also be used for this purpose. The pieces should not be shiny and should be pleasing to the eye.

Chess boards.

Material. Wood plastic, cardboard or cloth are recommended as materials for boards. The board may also be of stone (marble) with appropriate light and dark colours, provided that the chief arbiter has found it acceptable.

Natural wood with sufficient contrast such as birch, maple, or European ash against waInut, teak, beach, etc., may also beused for boards, which must have a dull or neutral finish, never shiny.

Colour of Chessboards. Combinations of colours, such as brown, green or very light tan and white, cream, off-white, ivory, buff etc., may be used for the squares in addition to neutral colours

Proportions. The board she should be such that the pieces appear neither too crowded nor too lonely on the squares. It is recommended that the side of a square measure 5-6.5 cm

Tables. A table, comfortable and of suitable height, may be fitted with a chessboard. If the table and board are separated from one another, the latter must be fastened and thus prevented from moving during play.

Chess Clocks.

Chess clocks should have a device signalling precisely when the hour hand indicates full hours. They should have the flag fixed at the figure 12 or at some other figure, but always so that its fall can be seen clearly, helping the Arbiter and players to check the time. The clock should have no shine making the flag poorly visible. It should work as silently as possible, in order not to disturb the players during play.

**FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1976**

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 11.1: 1976**

Question: (1) Player A makes a move that gives stalemate. This move is so menacing (e.g. a threatened mate in one) that his opponent, Player B resigns. It is subsequently noticed, either by the player or by a spectator or the arbiter, that the last move was a stalemating move. What is the result?

(2) Is the situation affected in any way by the nature of the person who points out the stalemate? For example, if it is the spectator who points it out, is the result of the game any different?

(3) If Player A gives checkmate without realising it and then player A resigns, possibly after one move or more has been made, and afterwards it is pointed out or noticed by Player A that mate was given, what is the result of the game?

(4) Is this situation affected by who points out the mate?

Answer: The Commission reiterates the principle that what happens in consequence of' an action or of an omission after the termination of a game is without importance. A checkmating or stalemating move ends the game regardless of subsequent actions or omissions.

Spectators are not to speak or otherwise to interfere in the games. However, if a spectator points out an irregularity, the arbiter may initiate action on his own, but should severely warn the spectator against future interference or even expel him from the tournament room.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 14.4: 1976**

In formal competitions, Article 14.4 provides that a move is not considered as completed until after the player has stopped his clock, in accordance with Article 7 (this general principle whether there is at the board a witness to these actions or not). In other words, the player's flag must remain unfallen after the opponent's clock has been restarted. (Exception: Rarely a player's own flag will fall while his opponent's clock is running. This circumstance, if it can be clearly proven, implies an evident defect of the flag.) Only if it can be clearly proven that a checkmate or a stalemate had been completed on the board or that a claim of a draw by repetition had been made under Article 12.3, is it of no importance whether or not the player was able to stop his clock before his flag had fallen.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 16.6: 1976**

The Commission points out that checking the times on the clocks before play is entirely the responsibility of the players. If they neglect to check the times indicated on the clocks, they must bear the consequences of their negligence unless the arbiter feels that, in a particular case, these consequences would be too severe.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 17.3: 1976.**

Question: According to Interpretation 1958 the arbiter has the duty of deciding the real significance of a sealed move. This is undesirable, as the arbiter should interfere as little as possible in the game and should serve only to see that neither player gains an unfair advantage of his mistakes. What is the opinion of the Commission?

Answer: The player sealing a move should be aware of the responsibility for sealing a correct move is entirely his and that if he seals an illegal move or ambiguous move he may lose the game.

**FIDE Interpretation Art. 18.2 (1976)**

Question: A player who claims a draw by repetition under Article 12.3 and asks the arbiter to verify the legitimacy of the claim while the clock continues to run in accordance with Article 18.2 is dependent upon the chess-playing ability of the arbiter as to the time taken for the verification. The outcome of the game may thus be determined by the arbiter's ability, yet no arbiter is required to have such ability. What is the opinion of the Commission?

Answer: The Commission agrees that in order to make consistent for all players the time taken to verify the legitimacy of the claim of a draw by repetition of position under Article 12.3, put at the same time to discourage frivolous claims of such a type the clamant is charged exactly five minutes on his clock for the verification. If the claim is found to be incorrect, the Divisions of Article 18.2 for this case apply after the five minutes have been charged.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 19.1a: 1976A**

The prohibition against handwritten or printed notes applies not only to notes brought in from the outside but also to notes made during play which could in any way serve as an aid to memory. Aside from the actual recording of the moves, only the addition of an objective fact such as the time on the clocks is permitted.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 19.1a: 1976B**.

Question: How is 19.1a to be applied in the case of a team competition and more specifically, what actions are permissible for a team captain while play is in progress?

Answer: The role of the team captain is basically an administrative one. According to the regulations of the competition the captain may be required to do such things as deliver to a tournament official a written list giving the players of his team who will participate in each round, see that those of his players who are not taking part in the current match or those who have finished their games are not present in the space reserved for the players, report the results of a match to the tournament official at the end of play, etc. In principle, the captain must abstain from any intervention during play. He should not, by virtue of his playing strength, give information to a player concerning the position on the board of that or any other player, since the captain would then be giving info to a member of his team on the play of the game which the team members own abilities might not have allowed him to discover for himself. The captain is, by the weight of practice, entitled to advise the players of his team to make or accept an offer of a draw or to resign a game, on condition that he does not make any comments concerning the actual position on the board. He must confine himself to giving only brief info which can in no way be interpreted by the player as an opinion on the game, but might instead be interpreted as based on any number of circumstances pertaining to the match.

In addition to the captain's being prohibited from expressing an opinion on the state of the game to any other person, he is also prohibited from consulting any other person as to the state of the game, just as players are subject to the same prohibitions.

The captain may say to a player 'offer a draw' ,'Accept the draw', or 'Resign the game’, but this brief information should be given in a general way and not; in any way that may be interpreted as an opinion on the state of the game
E.g., if asked by a player whether he should accept the offer of a draw, the captain should not begin to analyse for himself any board in such a way that his reply could be interpreted as an opinion on the position.

Even though in a team competition there is a certain team loyalty which goes beyond a player's individual game, a game of chess is, at base, a competition between two players. Therefore the player must, have the final say over the play of his own same. Although the advice of the captain should weigh heavily with the player, the player is not absolutely compelled to abide by that advice. Likewise, the captain cannot act on behalf of a player and his game without the knowledge and consent of the player.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 21: 1976.**

Upon an inquiry by the Hungarian Chess Federation, the Commission recommends that tie breaking be avoided if possible. For the purposes of published crosstables, tied players should be indicated as such and arranged in a suitable way, e.g. alphabetically. In those cases when tie-breaking must be used, such as to qualify players to a subsequent competition, or to award a single trophy, the organisers should announce in advance which methods will be used for breaking the ties, and these methods should be included in the regulations for the tournament.

**FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1978**

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 12.4: 1978**

1. In endings king and two knights against king and pawn, the 50 move rule will be extended to 100-moves if the following conditions are met:

a) the pawn is safely blocked by a knight

b) the pawn is not further advanced than for Black: a4, b6, c5, d4, e4, f5, g6, or h4: for White; a5, b3 ,c4, d5, e5 ,f4, g3 or h5.

2. Other endings will be considered by the Rules Commission if researched in detail and submitted to the Rules Commission with supporting evidence.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 15.1: 1978**

Question: Article 15.1 of the rules tells that a player who has the move must put his next move under envelop if the required number of moves is played on both sides and if the time prescribed for play is over. The following example which happened in an Open could perhaps need a new interpretation.

The speed of play was 50 moves in 2½ h with end of play after 5h; the next control was at move 70 with the rate of play of 20 moves per hour. At the end of the 1st playing session the situations were as follows:

Player A, having the move: 63 moves played in 3h 28 min; Player B: 63 moves played in 1h 32min. If arbiter had applied FIDE rules A had had to put his move in the envelope with practically 99% chances to lose on time since he had still 7 moves to play in 2 min to reach the second time control. So, arbiter has asked this player to play and ordered his opponent to put the move in the envelope. What is opinion of the Rules Commission on this matter?

Answer: The Rules Commission decided that ‘A’ 'had to seal the move. As he was extremely short of time he could use his right to make his move on the board and let the move stand as the sealed move. The envelope would then be prepared and sealed.

**FIDE INTERPRETATIONS 1979**

**INTERPRETATION 9.4: 1979**.

Question: The board was placed with a black square to the right. The queens and kings were facing each other, with white queen on a white square. The game was played until one player had checkmate. The arbiter rules that the checkmate stands, since any question of illegal position had to be claimed during the game.

Answer: The decision of the arbiter was correct.

**INTERPRETATION 11.2: 1979**

Question: In a Swiss System tournament the result of a game was reported as a win for white. The pairing for the next round was made on that basis. Later it was discovered that black won. The players agreed that black actually won. Should the result on the score-board remain for the later rounds or be corrected?

Answer: The result should be corrected. Pairings for any rounds already played should remain, but pairings for all later rounds should be based on the results.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 14.4: 1979.**

Question: A player resigned. Later he noticed that his opponent’s flag had already fallen. The arbiter decided that the player had actually won by forfeit. The commission is asked to determine whether over-stepping the time limit is equal to checkmate in ending the game.

Answer: The commission ruled that resignation or agreement to draw remains valid even when it is found later that the flag had fallen.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 14.4: 1979.**

Question: After sealing his move and stopping his clock, a player noticed that his opponent's flag had fallen. The Arbiter ruled that the claim was too late, and the game should be continued.

Answer: Arbiter’s decision correct.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 15: 1979**

Question: What should be the duration of an adjourned game session?

Answer: The adjournment game session shall be controlled by the wall clock with the time to start and finish announced in advance. The chess clock can be used for control in exceptional cases when clearly stated by the regulations of a competition.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 17,1: 1979A.**

Question: Player A had almost no time for several moves. He moved and inadvertently knocked over several pieces. He pressed his clock. Player. B immediately pressed his clock, stating that A had made an illegal move. A's clock fell.
Was A correct in pressing the clock before correcting the position?

Answer: A was wrong, and properly lost on time. B acted correctly.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 17.1: 1979B. (Amended Jan 1980\*)**

Question: Both players were in a time scramble. Player A's flag fell. They could not agree on how many moves were played, or on how to reconstruct the game. A offered a set of moves ending in 40, but B had another set that meant A would lose on time. The Arbiter ruled, since there was no clear reconstruction that the game should be continued.

Was he correct?

Answer: The Arbiter must make every effort to determine all the facts, including questioning of witnesses. If he is then not certain whether the time control had been passed, then, as an exception and only in tournaments played according to the Swiss System\*, the Arbiter can allow the game to continue.

* \*and only in tournaments played according to the Swiss System – deleted from answer.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 18.2: 1979**. (Amended Jan 1980\*)

Question: A player claims a draw under the provisions of 12.3. Can he withdraw his claim before it is verified?

Answer: \*After the Arbiter has stopped the clock to prepare to verify the claim, the player cannot withdraw the claim.

* \*Answer amended to “No.”