

SOUTH AFRICAN CHESS ARBITERS AND ORGANISERS ASSOCIATION



NEWSLETTER 2014-02

Editor : Colin Fibiger

JOIN THE ARBITER WEBSITE CHATROOM

For those of you who do not know yet, we have a chat room set up off the website where anyone interested in discussing arbiter matters can join and get involved.

This is an excellent place to ask your questions, get involved in discussions and air your views.

Why not join up today and help share knowledge amongst the arbiter and chess playing community!

NEW RULES ARE NOW APPLICABLE!

Hopefully everyone is aware that the new set of FIDE Rules is now applicable and should be applied at all tournaments from 1 July onwards.

If you do not have a copy please download a set from our website.

A Tricky Question Arises

Under the new rules relating to a 75 move draw, what if White played a checkmating move that happened to be the seventy-fifth move of a sequence without a pawn move or piece capture?

Under rule 9.6 b. the game would be drawn: "any consecutive series of 75 moves have been completed by each player without the movement of any pawn and without any capture" but under rule 1.2 and 5.1 the opponent whose king has been checkmated has lost the game.

Personally I think the game has been won by checkmate because purely because that is the point of the game. Despite the lack of clarity in the wording, (Surely FIDE can do better than this????)

There are however views that the game should probably be declared drawn, which may not be the result arbiters and players wish for.

The thinking is that the definition of checkmate requires consideration of what the opponent's next move would be if there was one, whereas the seventy-five-move rule does not.

Thus, verification of the draw occurs at an earlier stage in the game than the checkmate. Therefore the draw is to be awarded.

Any thoughts from other arbiters?

CHESSA EXECUTIVE CHAOS

Those of you who are active on Social Media are painfully aware of the drama, fighting and resignations at Chessa executive level.

Eddie Price, our Arbiters and Organisers Commission Chairman, raises in amongst this, the issue of our finances.



As you all probably know Chessa insisted on taking control of AOC finances from 2014 April 01 even though for a couple of years we had been running these through the old SACAA account without problems.

The AOC balance in this account was transferred to Chessa a few days later. All financial enquiries should now be addressed to Chessa. I hope it can provide us with up-to-date Income and Expenditure statements since April 1st in time for the next general meeting.

There might be complications if it is true that Hendrik and Caren have resigned from ManCo. Eddie can be contacted directly if you have any questions in this regard. eddie.price@hotmail.co.za (011)782-7544

In addition to the obvious financial concerns, there is also the real concern that no official communication has been made in this regard. Surely the chess community deserves some form of enlightenment other than having to piece the issue together on Facebook?

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL GAME

This story comes from way back from 1927 when chess players were real characters and revolves around a game between Lasker and Nimzowitsch.

Lasker had a fondness for smoking big black cigars and Nimzowitsch, typical of many theoreticians did not have the temperament for big tournaments. He accordingly asked L to refrain from smoking which was readily agreed.

After 15 or so moves, L took out a cigar and begin to toy with it. N made his move and L replied very quickly.

As N considered his next move, L put the cigar in his mouth, savouring the feel and taste of it. But true to his promise he did not light it.

N shifted uncomfortably in his chair. He tried to concentrate but it was impossible with that cigar dangling from L's mouth. Finally his patience could stand it no more. While still his move, N stormed up to the tournament director, "Lasker promised not to smoke! Look at him now. Do something!"

"But Lasker is not smoking," replied the director. "There is nothing I can do my dear Nimzowitsch."

"Yes! Yes!," sputtered the irate N. "It is true Lasker is not smoking. But you must do something all the same! You know as well as I do that Lasker considers the threat stronger than it's execution!"

PS : Lasker Won ☺

Other than the valuable chess lesson regarding threats – would we as arbiters consider L's behaviour as disturbing and give a warning? Thereby sanitising the game of chess to dullness, or would we say "Suck it up and Play on!"

Letters to Editor

Hi Colin. Congratulations on producing the first newsletter! It made delightful reading. The Bye story reminded me of something from our own history. Ann Bye (of Johannesburg) was one of our first computer-qualified arbiters and ran many large Opens. She had two boys (whose names and initials I don't remember. Once upon a time there was a pairing Bye-Bye. In many rounds players paired against a Bye did not sit at the table because they thought they had a bye. *Eddie Price*

ADVERTISE ON THE ARBITER WEBSITE

We have a few spots available to advertise on the Arbiters and Organisers website. This is not limited to chess products or services but any business you wish to market.

Cheap cheap rates just to boost our coffers a little and a great way to reach a broad audience. Contact Johan to make arrangements : j.veldsman@vodamail.co.za



A STANDARD TO BE SET?

Various rules state that certain items must be announced in advance e.g. **6.7a** *The rules of a competition shall specify in advance a default time.*

Exactly what is reasonable as far as "In Advance" goes? Many tournaments I have been at, these announcements are made about 30mins prior to start of play.

Is this acceptable or should organisers/arbiters be providing proper notice at least a week in advance?