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 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.**

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 Swiss tournaments, the Arbiter can allow the game to continue.

**FIDE INTERPRETATION 18.2: 1979**.

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.