oooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo

Eric Hallsworth
West Winds
ABERDOVEY
Gwynedd

March 1986

COMPUTER CHESS ******************** NEWS SHEET 6

oooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo

A CHANGE OF ADDRESS!

My wife and I start a new job in a couple of weeks'
time when we will be Managing the Rotary Club Guest
House "West Winds". It is used by Rotary Clubs in the
Midlands area to give elderly and needy folk a holiday
which they would not otherwise be able to manage. it
does mean I shall be pretty busy for the 6 months April
to October and I anticipate that NEWS SHEETS will
probably be approx. bi-monthly during the summer. In
the winter it will be back to the monthly system,
though readers I'm sure already realise that such aims
are always subject to having material worth printing.

We actually wont be moving for another 10 days yet,
so I am getting this NEWS SHEET out before we go as it
gives my many correspondents our new address at the
same time.

NEWS SHEET CIRCULATION!

This has risen rather dramatically during the past
few weeks, largely because of EUREKA's advert in the
Guardian Newspaper based on their issue of free copies
of an earlier News Sheet. I must apologise to the many
folk who wrote after that asking me direct to send 'all
earlier issues' and 'all new ones as they come out'. I'm
afraid I didn't know of the advert until the day before
(that's not a complaint, I was quite happy for it to be
used), but I was unprepared for the rush! I'm especially
sorry to the folk who sent me money or stamps towards the
costs. I sent out back-issues till they ran out, and
everyone should have received NS/5 for which I did a re-
duplication as it was the most recent issue to meet the
demand I'm afraid NS/4 was a photo-copies issue whilst
both my Duplicator and Typewriter were in for repair and
therefore a bit expensive to start getting an extra 30 or
so copies made up at nearly £1 a time, (I can get 'normal
issues out for about 40p each incl, postage). Anyway, I
do trust none of my new Readers are too disappointed as
its good to have you with us!

Can I remind all Readers that I'm always GLAD to hear
from you, especially when you send in INFORMATION (or
money!) as the value of these labours does depend to some
degree on the amount of consumer info. sent to me.

NEWS FROM THE MANUFACTURERS

FIDELITY. I am hearing rumours of a PAR EXCELLENCE
running at 5mhz. Fidelity has always had the excellent
(in my view) policy of bringing out their current top
ELITE version in a cheaper form - usually at a slightly
slower running speed and with a reduced Openings Book -
but encouraging a much wider range of purchasers. So
this may well be the AVANT GARDE programme (which is a
sort of ELITE D based very much on the ELITE C/ELEGANCE/
EXCELLENCE programme but with improvements) and, if so
and running at 5mhz for under £250 will be another good
seller. I also understand that the ELITE A, B and C
models, also the ELEGANCE can be up-dated to the AVANT
GARDE programme, but I have no price details etc. at
present. In reply to many enquiries, the EXCELLENCE
will NOT take an Openings Book Cartridge in its present
format.

NOVAG. The new 'EXPERT' in the SUPER CONSTELLATION
board for £250 should be out in May - I also hear it
will have a wooden playing surface!

SUPER ENTERPRISE. Both this and its stable-mate, the
ADVANCED STAR CHESS, also now have BCF endorsement and
recommendation. They certainly represent a significant
advance in the standard of lower price range Chess
Computers and are a match for the higher end of only
2-3 years ago.

CONCHESS. I have heard there is an 8mhz version just
becoming available. However I don't know if its the
PRINCESS or the PLYMATE programme that is running at
the increased speed so have not been able to include it
in my Rating List. Readers have sent me details from
the latest Rating List issued by the Conchess distrib-
utors, Contemporary Chess Computers. (They seem able to
get bundles of advertising literature out, though their
Magazine for which readers have paid £5 has been ('un-
avoidably delayed since last September). CCC didn't
send me a copy of their Rating guide either; I can't
think why unless it's got something to do with the fact
that they are showing their CONCHESS/6 in equal 1st.
place with the same rating as the MEPHISTO AMSTERDAM.
They must have remembered that I have a letter in my
possession from their Managing Director, Mr A.J.G.
Roland, and dated 6th Jan 1986, which reads as follows.
[I had written inviting them to send a contestant to
play against my MEPHISTO AMSTERDAM for the benefit of
many NS readers keen to see what the outcome would be].
They declined and said - "By the by I am not in doubt
that the Amsterdam running on the 68000 is the strongest
program on the market at present". I see that they also
put their CONCHESS/4 in overall 3rd. position which
really seems to me to be stretching things rather a lot.
If readers will just take a brief glance at the figures
from the Swedish University shown in NS/3 they will have
a fuller understanding of my surprise (and bear in mind
that there were no Mephisto MM2's, Novag Expert's,
SciSys Turbo Kasparov's, Fidelity Avant Garde's in that
set of results which stiil left Conchess/4 in 4th. place,
5th if you count the Fidelity Private Line which is a
European Elegance version at 4mhz.

*Note to BCM and Chess - as you know you are welcome to
quote from my News Sheets whenever you wish. Can I ask,
please, that you don't use critical paragraphs such as
the above which are included really to keep consumers
informed and to protect folk from what I think are wild
claims. Thanks.

WHAT DO THE ELO RATINGS MEAN IN PRACTICE?

In the many letters from new readers which I have received over the past 4 weeks, one question has been asked more than any other. It goes like this: "I have an XYZ Machine at the moment which appears on your Rating Table at (say) 1750. I am thinking of buying a - Fidelity Excellence/Novag Expert/Scicys Turbo Kasparov/Mephisto MM2 - and wonder if you can tell me by how much it should be able to beat my present Computer?"

Although I have answered all such questions for each person individually, as well as many other questions concerning the relative qualities and abilities of various Machines in as fair a way as possible, I thought it would be a good idea to print a Table for a full range of ELO values. I must ask Readers to understand that the score shown WILL work out correctly as an average over many tests, but in any set of 16 games (the number used in my Table) a variation can of course occur. A further article in this NEWS SHEET discusses the range and extent of possible variations for Matches of 4, 8, 16 and more Games.

Rating (ELO) Gap	Likely Result over 16 Games
25	8½-7½
50	9 -7
75	9½-6½
100	10 -6
125	10½-5½
150	11 -5
175	11½-4½
200	12 -4
225	12½-3½
250	13 -3
275	13½-2½
300	14 -2
325	14½-1½
350	15 -1
375	15½- ½
400	16 -0

By comparing the figures in my Rating Table and finding the ELO Gap between your existing Machine and the proposed purchase, you can soon see what sort of Result you are likely to obtain.

THE EFFECT OF THE COMPUTER'S RUNNING SPEED

I hope my longer-standing readers will forgive me for re-printing part of an Article which appeared in NEWS SHEET 4. I thought that the Table showing the Rating effect of a Programme having its speed increased was quite useful as many of the Computer's are

now having this done. For example the FIDELITY EXCELLENCE (issued originally running at 3mhz) is now available at 4mhz and, in the States, at 5mhz. What difference can a Purchaser expect in the Performances of those running at the higher speeds?

INCREASED SPEED:-	2	3	3.6	4	5	6	8	10	12
2 mhz	-								
3 mhz	57	-							
3.6 mhz	82	25	-						
4 mhz	97	40	15	-					
5 mhz	128	71	46	32	-				
6 mhz	153	97	71	57	25	-			
8 mhz	193	137	113	97	66	40	-		
10 mhz	225	168	143	128	97	71	32	-	
12 mhz	250	193	168	153	122	97	57	25	-
	2	3	3.6	4	5	6	8	10	12

So that there is no confusion I must tell you that the actual ELO figures are from my own calculations and so the Table is my responsibility if there is anything wrong with it! However the calculations are based on information given by Ken Thomson (Belle's programmer) who considers - "6 x Speed = 250 Elo, and 1.8 x Speed = 75 Elo", and David Levy in 'The Computer Chess Handbook' that "2 x Speed = 100 Elo".

From the Table we can expect that a Fidelity Excellence/4 will be 40 Elo above the Excellence/3; a Conchess/6 should be 57 Elo above a Conchess/4; a Novag Constellation/3.6 82 Elo above the Const/2 etc.

HOW MANY RESULTS ARE NEEDED BEFORE WE CAN HAVE CONFIDENCE IN A RATING'S ACCURACY?

Supposing we have 2 Computers which are exactly equal (for example, and to save argument, a Novag Super Constellation and a Novag Super Constellation!). If we play them against each other in a 4 game Match, what are the chances of getting a 2-2 result? - or a 3-1 result? etc. There must be a mathematical formula for such possibilities of course, but the creating of it proved beyond me when I started to consider the same question for Matches of 8, then 16 and even more Games. So I persuaded my Home Computer of the equalness of the 2 Machines and that, in any Game

there was a 25% chance of a draw, and persuaded it to run a series of 5,000 Matches of 4 Games on a random win/draw/loss basis to see what happened. Included in the Programme (the BASIC for it is included in this NS for Computer owners, though I used my Sharp Compiler to get it to run faster) was a request for information averaging out the results to see what the likely variation from the 2-2 normal score would be. At 4 games it was +/-0.68 which represents 2.68-1.32 or a 34% error. I also found there was a 41% chance of getting a 50%+ error (ie. a 3-1, 3½-½ score etc).

This is, of course, an unacceptably high figure and shows something of the serious danger if Ratings are to be produced from such a small number of games on their own.

The same Test was then done 2,500 times for Matches of 8 Games; then 1,250 times for Matches of 16 Games. The FULL Tables from these Tests are shown together with a Table showing 'CALCULATION CONCLUSIONS' from same PLUS further Tests for Matches of even more Games!

TABLE 1. 5,000 Tests over Groups of 4 Games.

Score	No of Results	%tage
0 -4	108	2%
½-3½	254	5%
1 -3	668	13%
1½-2½	875	17%
2 -2	1169	23%
2½-1½	909	18%
3 -1	654	13%
3½- ½	256	5%
4 -0	107	2%

TABLE 2. 2,500 Tests over Groups of 8 Games.

Score	No.	%	Score	No.	%
0 -8	4	-			
½-7½	5	-	4½-3½	355	14%
1 -7	21	1%	5 -3	298	12%
1½-6½	56	2%	5½-2½	185	7%
2 -6	127	5%	6 -2	134	5%
2½-5½	171	7%	6½-1½	40	2%
3 -5	295	12%	7 -1	22	1%
3½-4½	369	14%	7½- ½	7	-
4 -4	407	16%	8 -0	2	-

TABLE 3. 1,250 Tests of 16 Games.

Score	No.	%tage	Score	No.	%tage
0 -16					
½-15½			8½-7½	143	11%
1 -15			9 -7	111	9%
1½-14½			9½-6½	83	7%
2 -14			10 -6	66	5%
2½-13½			10½-5½	59	5%
3 -13			11 -5	44	4%
3½-12½	2	-	11½-4½	19	2%
4 -12	12	1%	12 -4	11	1%
4½-11½	26	2%	12½-3½	2	-
5 -11	37	3%	13 -3	2	-
5½-10½	62	5%	13½-2½	1	-
6 -10	76	6%	14 -2		
6½- 9½	103	8%	14½-1½		
7 - 9	108	9%	15 -1		
7½- 8½	161	13%	15½- ½		
8 - 8	122	10%	16 -0		

TABLE 4. FIGURES to indicate some CONCLUSIONS.

Group Size	Scores in Test			%tage Error	Error Range	Chance of 50% Error	ELO Reliabil
4	7545-	7537=	4918	34	+/-0.68	40.9%	136.4
8	7534-	7553=	4913	24	+/-0.98	16.7%	97.9
16	7488-	7599=	4913	17	+/-1.41	2.4%	70.5
32	9532-	9599=	6469	12	+/-2.01	0.1%	50.2
50	11403-	11250=	7347	10	+/-2.50	-	40.0
100	15025-	15022=	9953	7	+/-3.75	-	29.7
200	18671-	18822=	12507	4	+/-4.67	-	18.7
500	37580-	37479=	24941	2	+/-7.46	-	11.9

In other words, once we have a Machine's Rating based

on over 200 games, I would expect that Rating to be
accurate within 20 Elo points, which is pretty good.
When we have over 500 games for that Machine we should
be down to a +/-12 error likelihood which is excellent.
A Rating based on 50 games can only be considered
reliable in a +/-40 range, and anything less than 10
games isn't really reliable at all and such a Machine
could easily prove to be 100 higher or lower. Matches
of 10 games or less can, however, be valuable when used
in conjunction with and added to other results involving
the same Machine. (Thus the value of a 'central Results
system' such as ME!).

THE COMPUTER PROGRAMME

I know from the letters sent to me that many of my
readers have their own Home Computers so I thought I'd
include for such the BASIC of the Programme I used to
produce the above. Maybe others would then like to
check it out, or run the Tests for a larger number of
games, or vary the draw possibility in line 80!?

```
10 PRINT"[C]RESULT PROBABILITY CALCULATOR
20 INPUT"HOW MANY GAMES IN EACH GROUP?";G
30 INPUT"HOW MANY TEST GROUPS DO YOU WANT?";TG:
   PRINT"[C]
40 G1=G*2:DIMI(G1):GH=G1*.749:GL=G1*.251
50 FORX=1TOTG
60 HX=0
70 FORY=1TOG
80 R=INT(RND(1)*8)*IFR>6THENHX=HX+1:DR=DR+1:GOTO90
   REM draw is at 25%  for draw at 20% make RND(1)
   *.75
85 IFR>3THENHX=HX+2:WI=WI+1:REM win
90 NEXTY
100 I(HX)=I(HX)+1:IF(HX>GH)+(HX<GL)THENE5=E5+1
110 ER=ABS(HX-G)/2:ET=ER+ET:AV=ET/X:EL=AV*800/G
120 PRINT"[H]GAMES";G;" TESTS";TG;" DONE";X
125 IFG>16GOTO180:REM my screen is 40x24 and wont fit
    more than 16 on  Alter yours if you can
130 PRINT" SCORE    NO      %          SCORE    NO      %
140 FORR=0TOG:IFR>GTHEN160:REM makes screenprint left
    and right
150 PRINTR/2;TAB(6);I(R);TAB(11);INT(I(R)*100/X+.5);"%
    ":GOTO170
160 CURSOR17,R+2-G:PRINTR/2;TAB(23);I(R);TAB(28);INT
    (I(R)*100/X+.5);"% "
170 NEXTR
180 PRINT:PRINT"WHITE";WI;" BLACK";G*X-WI-DR;" DRAWN";
    DR
190 PRINT"ERROR RANGE +/-";INT(100*AV+.5)/100;"  ",
200 PRINTTAB(24);"=";INT(200*AV/G);"% "
205 PRINT"CHANCE OF A 50% ERROR";INT(1000*E5/X+.5)/10;
    "%
210 PRINT"ELO RELIABILITY estimate";INT(10*EL+.5)/10;
    "
220 NEXTX
230 PRINT"PRESS ANY KEY FOR ANOTHER SET"
240 GETZ$:IFZ$=""THEN240
250 RUN
```

In view of my findings from this effort it is my
intention to show where each COMPUTER and its RATING
stands in approximate terms of Reliability in my
RATING LIST - maybe * after the Rating to indicate a
base of 50+ games, and ** to show a base of 200+ games.
But that will have to wait till the next Issue, I'm
afraid!

As most of my NS Readers will know, Richard Lang is the Programmer of the PSION QL and MEPHISTO AMSTERDAM computers; even more important (well, perhaps not MORE important!) he is a Reader of these NEWS SHEETS and another reader (Gerald Murphy) and I sent Richard some questions recently for an 'INTERVIEW BY POST'. Richard not only answered our questions but also kindly gave permission for a selection of same to appear in these columns. Because of space I haven't typed out the actual questions, but their type and content will be clear enough I think from the answers.

"I think that computers will one day be stronger than the top humans. The progress in the last few years has been very rapid, perhaps 400 Elo points in 5 years (only 580 to go!!). I expect both the hardware and software to carry on improving though at a slower and decreasing rate. As for a date when computers will reach 2780 Elo I would guess sometime in the first half of the next century with mainframe's a few years before micros.

"The Amsterdam programme was not based on the original Exclusive S. The chess playing part of the Amsterdam is a further development of the home computer programmes QL Chess and MACINTOSH Chess published by PSION Ltd. The input output code was written to emulate the original S.

---The next bit is me (Eric)---

Some readers may know that an Exclusive S from Mephisto appeared in the US Computer Champs last year at Mobile. It's result was not so good (2/6) though it was hampered by an independent operator who insisted on writing each move down before making the move and pressing the clock. This 10-15 secs. time loss each move, despite urgent please from Mephisto reps. present for the operator to alter his unique procedural method, eventually cost the Exclusive S a point in one round when, about to make its 40th. move and a full Hook up, its flag fell. That would have been 3/6, but still disappointing and gave little indication at that time of the amazing transformation that Richard would be able to make after his sight of these games. Maybe even the Mephisto management didn't know fully what to expect when the World Micro Champs of 1985 began.

---Back to Richard---

"The Exclusive S machines in the Mobile Alabama Tournament were early 'bugged' versions of the programme which became the Amsterdam. The tournament took place a few days after I had got the first early version of the programme running in the Exclusive S hardware. In fact I had been working night and day to get it ready in time. Unfortunately I had introduced a few mistakes into the programme which were only found afterwards. Also I worked exclusively on improving the programme between the Mobile and Amsterdam tournaments.

"We intend to enter an Amsterdam in the 5th World Computer Chess Championship (Cologne 11-15th June 1986)

so perhaps that will provide the answer to how a Match
between the Amsterdam and, say, Cray Blitz might go.

---We asked how Richard felt about other Chess
   programmers:-
"The rivalry between chess programme authors is much
friendlier than the rivalry between manufacturers of
chess computers. I admire and respect all the authors
I've met, perhaps the Spracklens in particular as
they've been writing top programmes for many years.
[They write for Fidelity - Eric].

"I do not think anyone was aware of Mephisto's strength
before the Amsterdam tournament. Fidelity had already
achieved a good result in Mobile and therefore had a
lot to lose by being beaten (by anyone) in Amsterdam.

RESULTS SECTION

   The content of each NEWS SHEET is largely decided
before typing etc. begins. Mostly it's simply a
question of how much I can squeeze in. No ICCA Journal
having arrived with European results I decided I must
go ahead without and, OF COURSE, half-way through the
Journals start to pop through British letter-boxes.
Mine's not made it yet, but I have some of the Results
which contain surprises! These are printed here
WITHOUT Elo Rating figures - in the next Issue I will
show the Results with Performance Ratings in full.
Before I re-type the actual Rating List I will run
the Results I have through my Home Computer so that
the RATING LIST will be as up-to-date as possible for
all Readers.

   Firstly some up-to-date Results with Ratings:-
MEPHISTO AMSTERDAM ' F.ELITE C 9-1 (2338-1892)
Scores went ½ ½ 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

MEPHISTO AMSTERDAM ' F.EXCELLENCE/3 9-4 (was 5-1)
   (2086-2060)
MEPH AMSTERDAM ' N.CONST EXPERT 2½-1½ (2140-2112)

An Australian source:-
N.CONST EXPERT ' S.TURBO KASPAROV 6-0 (well outside
   error limit likelihood, but I have no reason to doubt
   its validity and game-scores were offered)
N.CONST EXPERT ' MEPH AMSTERDAM 2-2 (2211-2045)

My Games:-
```
                   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
MEPH AMSTERDAM    1 ½ ½ 1 0 1 1 1½1 1 1 1 1 ½ 1 0
F.ELEGANCE+CB16 w0 ½ ½ 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 ½ 0 1
```
Score 12½-3½ (2250-1984)
```
                   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
MEPH AMSTERDAM    1 1 ½ 1 1 1 1 1 ½ 0 0 1 1 1 1 0
S.TURBO KASPARV w0 0 ½ 0 0 0 0 0 ½ 1 1 0 0 0 0 1
```
Score 12-4 (2211-2012)
```
                   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6
F.ELEGANCE+CB16 w0 ½ 0 1 0 0 1 1 ½ 0 1 1 1 1 1
S.TURBO KASPAROV 1 ½ 1 0 1 1 0 0 ½ 1 0 0 0 0 0 0
```
Score 10-6 (2111-1925)

Table from a SPEED Tournament (30 min. Time Limit per
Game) amongst the above 3.

	MA	TK	FE	
MEPH AMSTERDAM	x	7½	7½	= 15
S.TURBO KASPAROV	2½	x	6½	= 9
F ELEGANCE+CB16	2½	3½	x	= 6

SOME of the latest Swedish University scores:-

F.EXCELLENCE/3 ' S.TURBOSTAR 432 10½-7½
F.EXCELLENCE/3 ' MEPHISTO MM2 7½-5½
S.TURBOSTAR 432 ' N.SUPER CONST 37-32 (was 29-24)
S.TURBOSTAR 432 ' MEPHISTO MM2 10-6
S.TURBOSTAR 432 ' MEPHISTO BLITZ 11-5
N.SUPER CONST ' MEPHISTO BLITZ 23½-20½

Game 9 from MA v N.Super Const. VIENNA Opening
Wh. MEPHISTO AMSTERDAM (4½)
Bl. NOVAG SUPER CONST (3½)

1 e4 e5 2 Nc3 Nf6 3 a3 d5*

   3 - d5* = SC 'out of Book' !

4 exd Nxd5 5 Qh5 Nc6 6 Bb5 Qd6 7 Nf3 Nx c3 8 Bxc6
bxc6 9 dxc3 e4 10 Ng5 Qe7 11 Qe2*

   MA is now out of its Book and assesses its position
   as a slight plus. Slowly he builds up a very strong
   looking attack which for some time he will rate as
   a +2.00 position. Yet the SC quietly hold the
   possibility of a King-side counter attack through
   the onslaught if he just gets a moment's breathing
   space

11 - f5 12 0-0 g6 13 Be3 Bg7 14 Rfd1 h6 15 Nh3
Qf7 16 Qd2 Bd7 17 Bd4 Rb8 18 b3 a5 19 Rb1 · '· '·

   MA's assessment jumped to +1.04 after 18 - a5 which
   he considered weakening to the Q-side

19 - Rd8 20 Bxg7 Qxg7 21 c4 0-0 22 Qxa5 Bc8
23 Nf4 Re8

   The possibilities for a Black attack are becoming
   clear, but he will have other problems to deal with
   yet

24 Qc5 Qf6 25 Qa7 (+2.00!?) Qg7 26 Rd4 Kh7 27 Rbd1
Qe5 28 Ne2 (still +2.00) f4 29 h3

   MA shows the first sign of concern as his rating of
   the position drops to +1.08. At this moment he
expects the SC to play 29 - e3
29 - f3!

30 Ng3 e3 31 Re4?

   MA assessess this fine-looking move at +1.55 which
   is an error as Black's unexpected reply will totally
   undermine the Rook's sole protection. R4d3 best.
31 - e2!

   I would love to know what the SC forward analysis was
   at this point - how much had he seen? MA's immediate
   reaction is to play Re1, but then he sees 32 - Qc3!
   so quickly changes his mind to Rc1 assessing it at
   0.20 and not seeing the Novag's devastating reply.
32 Rc1 Qg5!! 33 Qxc7+ Kh8 34 Rc1 Rxe4 and wins easily

****

Game 15 from FE v TK Match. CARO KANN
Wh. Fid.ELEGANCE+CB16 (8)
Bl. Sci.TURBO KASPAROV (6)

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 Nc3 dxe 4 Nxe4 Bf5 5 Ng3 Bg6 6 h4 h6
7 Nf3 Nd7 8 h5 Bh7 9 Bd3 Bxd3 10 Qxd3 e6 11 0-0* Bd6*
12 Nd2 Nf6 13 N2e4 Bxg3

   Perhaps 13 - Nxe4 14 Nxe4 would have been better ·

14 Nxg3. O-O 15 Bf4 Qb6 16 Bd6 Rfc8 17 b4 Re8 18 c3 e5
19 Rae1 exd 20 cxd Nd5 21 a3 a5 ..

```
| r - - - r - k - |
| - p - n - p p - |
| - q p B - - - p |
| p - - n - - - p |
| - P - P - - - - |
| P - - Q - - N - |
| - - - - - P P - |
| - - - - R R K - |
```

At this point the position
looks fairly even; the .
problem is finding White's
best way to proceed. None
of bxa, Ra1 or Rxe8 seem to
get FE anywhere.

22 Nf5!
An excellent find. Now 22 - Kh8 seems needed when
23 Rxe8 Rxe8 24 bxa Qxa5 25 Qg3 is still pretty even.
Perhaps 25 Qb3 gives White a slight edge?
22 - Rxe1?
 Black should NOT make the exchange himself leaving
 FE with the e-file
23 Rxe1 Kh8 24 Qg3 g6 25 hxg6 axb4
 If 25 - f6 26 Qh2 Kg8 27 Qxh6 axb4 28 Qg7 mate
26 gxf (announcing Mate in 5) Qxd4 27 Re8+ Rxe8
28 fxe8=Q+ Nf8 29 Qxf8+ Kh7 30 Qxh6 mate

****

Game 13 from MA v SciSys TK. FRENCH Defence
Wh. MEPH AMSTERDAM (8)
Bl. SCI TURBO KASPAROV (3)

1 e4 e6 2 d4 d5 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 exd Bxc3+* 5 bxc3* exd
6 Nf3 Ne7 7 Bd3 O-O 8 O-O Re8 9 Re1 Nc6 10 Bf4 f6
11 Rb1 b6 12 Nd2 h6
 MA assesses the position at +1.08. Times MA 0:26,
 TK 0:19

13 Qf3 Qd7 14 Bxh6!
 The MA forward analysis here is 14 - gxh 15 Qxf6 Rd6
 16 Bh7+ Kxh7 17 Qf7+ Kh8 18 Qxe8. Pretty impressive:
14 - gxh 15 Qxf6
 Now, will TK play Qd6 to save the h-pawn. He considers
 Qd8, then -
15 - h5? 16 Qg5+ (assessed at +2.68) Kf8 17 Re3!
 This strongly increases the power of the attack.
 MA now expects Nd8 and intends 18 Qh6+; however the
 move played next effectively ends the game.
17 - Qd6? 18 Rf3+
 This is assessed at +7.50, the point being that f5
 is under-protected after Black's 17th.
18 - Nf5 19 Bxf5 (9.95 resign recommend!) Nxd4 20 cxd4
Re3 21 fxe3 Ke8 22 Qg6+ Qf8 23 Bg6+ (announcing Mate in
6) Kd7 24 Qxd5+ Qd6 25 Rf7+ Kd8 26 Rf8+ Kd7 27 Bf5+ Ke7
28 Qf7 mate.
 Times at the end were 0:58 for both Computers. Seeing
 play like the above one wonders if the Amsterdam is
 ever likely to lose - the next game shows that he can!

****

Game 16 the MA v TK Match. SICILIAN Defence.
Wh. MEPH AMSTERDAM (12)
Bl. SCI TURBO KASPAROV (3)

1 e4 c5 2 c3
 BCO tells me this is the Alapin/Sveshnikov line! - see
 note at move 12.
2 - Nf6 3 e5 Nd5 4 d4 cxd 5 cxd d6 6 Nf3 Nc6 7 Bc4 Nb6
8 Bb5 dxe 9 Nxe5 Bd7 10 Nc3 Nxe5 11 dxe5* Bxb5 12 Qxd8+
 The above-mentioned Sveshnikov played 12 Nxb5 against
 Kasparov in 1979 when Black played Qxd1+ 13 Kxd1 and
 then 14 Re1 defends White's e5 pawn.

12 - Rxd8* 13 Nxb5 a6!

'Ruining' a balanced-looking position by winning a
pawn!

14 Nc3 Nc4 15 e6 fxe 16 b3 Ne5 17 Be3 Nd3+ 18 Ke2 e5

19 Rhd1?!

Is this best? 19 g3 would deny a useful retreat
square to the Knight, but allows Black time to play
e6

19 - Nf4+ 20 Kf3

TK had not expected this. Now, you may (I hope) say,
'How did he know that when the TK has no hint or
forward analysis functions?' The answer is that, if
the TK is expecting the move played, its Display
Move will immediately be flashing its expected
response. If the move is unexpected it is 3-4 secs
before any answer is displayed. So I gather that
here the TK had expected the King to retreat rather
than the bold advance.

20 - Rxd1

Perhaps both here and the next move e6 is best

21 Rxd1 Ng6 22 Bb6 (assessment +0.50) Nh4+ 23 Kg3
Nf5+ 24 Kh3 g6!

24 - Nd6 stops the check but is not as good

25 Rd8+ Kf7 26 Rd7 Nd6 27 f3?!

This seems to lose the slight edge, though I am
not sure what is better. Perhaps 27 Na4 Bh6 28 Nc5
Rc8 29 b4 and a very small plus?

27 - Ke6!

Times are MA 1:08, TK 0:34)

28 Rc7 (-0.20) Bh6 29 Bc5 Rb8 30 Ne4 Nc8 31 Kg4 b5!

32 Ba3 Bf4 33 g3 Be3 34 Kh4

In this interesting struggle the MA has anticipated

few of the TK moves and starts to make his moves
rather quickly, though he actually ends up with good
spare time.

34 - h6 35 Rc6+ Kf7 36 h3 a5 37 Rc3 Bd4 38 Rc7 b5!

The MA had forward planned and anticipated this move
from playing 36 h3. Now he realises that the intended
39 Nd6 wont do as Nxd6 40 Bxd6 Ke6 gives TK a clear
advantage.

39 Bc1 Bb6 40 Rd7 (-0.20) Ke6

Times are MA 1:46; TK 1:33

41 Rd3 Nd6!

A fine move obtaining Rook and Knight freedom,
undoubling his pawns and leaving MA to wonder if the
chance to recover his pawn is worth the cost!

42 Nxd6 h5+! 43 Kh5 exd6 44 Bd2

Assessed at -0.50, but considering 44 Kxh6 Rh8+ as
even worse!

44 - Rh8 45 h4 Bd8! 46 a4 b4 47 hxg hxg+ 48 Kg4 Rg8

49 Re3 Be7 50 Rel Rh8

Watch MA fight his way back really nicely now - until
move 62 of which more later!

51 Be3

51 Rc1 wont work - Rh2! 52 Bxg5 Bxg5 53 Kxg5 Rb2!

51 - Rc8 52 Bb6 Ra8 53 Rh1! d5 54 Rh6+ Bf6 55 Rg6 d4

56 Rh6 d3 57 Be3 Rg8 58 Bc1 Ke7 59 Kf5 Rf8 60 Rg6 g4

MA is back in the game now - I put 'well done' on my
score pad, not knowing what was coming. Times; MA
2:47, TK 2:19

61 Rxg4 (+0.60) Rc8 62 Rc4???

A real blunder; in all honesty the first I have seen
from the Amsterdam. It seems sure TK will reply with

Kf8 or Kh8 and actually takes 12 mins when checked
later to see the effects of TK's actual reply.
Funnily (?) enough, when presented with the position
from TK's side, it found TK's move immediately!
62 - Rxc4!

Excellent; the b abd d pawn pincer must win
63 bxc4 (-5.40!) b3 64 Ba3+ Ke8 65 Kxf6 d2 66 Kxe5
d1=Q 67 Kf4 Qa1 68 Bc5 (-9.99 resigns) b2 69 Bd4 Qc1+!
and wins easily.

With the AMSTERDAM winning games in my Tests in a
Ratio of 3:1 I feel I have been somewhat unfair having
now run out of space in the %tage of wins/losses from
its games which I have printed. Sorry! The balance will
be re-dressed next time, I have plenty of fine wins
and positions from its play from various Matches.

****

SUGGESTED RATING TABLE, March 1986

HiTech	2350	13 F.PRIVATE LINE	1995	29=AVE SARGON 4	1875
1 MEPHISTO AMSTERDAM	2203	14 CONCHESS/4	1994	29=COLOSSUS 4	1875
Cray Blitz	2172	15=N.SUPER CONST	1992	31 SARGON 3	1860
Belle	2155	15=F.EXCELLENCE/4	1992	32 COLOSSUS 2	1852
BeBe	2144	17 S.TURBOSTAR 432	1991	33 S.TURBO 16k/12	1850
2 F.AVANT GARDE/8	2132	Psion/8	1986	34 WHITE KNIGHT 12	1848
Int Chess Sft 2	2125	18 F.ELEGANCE/3.6	1985	35 SUPER ENTERPRISE	1832
3 CONCHESS PLYMATE/6	2063	Awit	1974	36 F.ELITE OLD	1830
Nuchess	2062	Phoenix	1970	37 N.CONST/2	1820
4 F.AVANT GARDE/5	2052	Advance 2.4	1952	38 MYCHESS 2	1812
Chaos	2052	19=F.EXCELLENCE/3	1948	39=PHILIDOR I.S.2	1805
5 N.CONST EXPERT	2047	19=F.SENSORY 12/5	1948	39=LA REGENCE/L'EMPEREUR	1805
6 CONCHESS/6	2030	21 F.PRESTIGE	1924	41 S.EXPRESS 16k/8	1800
7 F.EXCELLENCE/5	2022	22=F.ELITE A	1918	42 F.SENSORY 9/2	1790
Advance 3	2016	22=CONCHESS/2	1918	43 MEPHISTO 2A	1750
8=MEPHISTO MM2	2015	Ostrich	1910	44 CONCHESS A0	1748
8=CONCHESS PLYMATE/4	2015	24 MEPHISTO EXCL/12	1904	45=MEPHISTO 3A	1740
10 F.ELITE C	2013	25 PSION QL	1902	45=CHESS 2001	1740
11 S.TURBO KASPAROV	2.05	26 F.ELITE B	1893	47 WHITE KNIGHT 11	1730
Orwell 85	2000	27 N.CONST/3.6	1888	48 S.SUPERSTAR	1725
12 MEPHISTO BLITZ	1998	28 F.SENSORY 12/3	1878	49 CYRUS 2.5	1724

That's it folks! Best wishes to all till next time. *Eric*