Trying to win the World Championship is a tense affair - and it shows, as Shay Bushinsky and Amir Ban watch their program JUNIOR in a play-off against Stefan Meyar-Kahlen's SHREDDER!

- **SUBSCRIBE NOW** to get a REGULAR COPY of the LATEST ISSUE and RATING LIST mailed to you as soon as it comes out!
- **£20** per YEAR for 6 ISSUES by mail. FOREIGN addresses: **£25**. For FOREIGN PAYMENTS please note that CHEQUES must be in POUNDS STERLING, or (best for you) use your CREDIT CARD.
- **PUBLICATION DATES** Early Feb, Apr, Jun, Aug, Oct, late Nov.
- **ARTICLES, REVIEWS, GAMES** sent in by Readers, Distributors, Programmers etc are more than welcome.

Visit the **SELECTIVE SEARCH & COUNTRYWIDE** web pages at: www.elhchess.demon.co.uk

- Reviews, Photos, best possible U.K. Prices
- for all computer chess products.
- Order Form, credit card facilities, etc.

**SELECTIVE SEARCH** is produced by **ERIC HALLSWORTH**.

CORRESPONDENCE and SUBSCRIPTIONS to Eric Hallsworth at The Red House, 46 High St., Wilburton, Cambs CB6 3RA. Or E-MAIL: eric@elhchess.demon.co.uk

- All COMPUTER CHESS PRODUCTS are available from COUNTRYWIDE COMPUTERS LTD, Victoria House, 1 High Street, Wilburton, Cambs CB6 3RB 01353 740323 for INFO or to ORDER.

- FREE CATALOGUE. Readers can ring **ERIC** at COUNTRYWIDE, Mon-Fri, 10.30am-5pm
RATINGS for all these computers and programs are on pages 31-32. This is not a complete product listing - they are what I consider to be current BEST BUYS bearing in mind price, playing strength, features + quality.

Further info/photos can be seen in Countrywide’s CATALOGUE - if you want one, ring or write to the address/phone no. on the front page.

Note the software prices! - some retailer prices seem cheaper, but there's a post & packing charge at the end... our insured delivery p&p is FREE to £5 folk. Adapters are £9 extra. Subscribers Offer: buy from Countrywide and deduct 5% off dedicated computer prices shown here... mention 'SS' when you order.

---

**PORTABLE COMPUTERS**

**Kasparov**

**BRAVO** - new £49. Barracuda program!

**COSMIC** - new £69. Hand-held Touch chess! Board displayed on screen, plus clocks, evaluations, hints etc.

**COSMOS £99** - great value, 4½"x4½" plug-in board, strong Morsch ‘2100’ program. Multiple levels + info display and coach system

**Excalibur**

**TOUCH CHESS £49** - play on screen using touch pen. Includes carry pouch.

---

**TABLE-TOP PRESS SENSORY**

**Kasparov**

**BARRACUDA £79** - The Morsch ‘2000’prog. Compact board, display etc. This is great value!

**CENTURION £79** - Baracuda 2000 program in slightly larger board, and value-for-money buy

**COUGAR £99** - the Cosmos ‘2100’ program + features in 16"x11" board, good info display.

Novag

**AGATE PLUS/QUARTZ £72** - Opal Plus program, good hobby computer + teaching

**Mephisto**

**MILANO PRO £249** - Morsch at RISC speed, big book, strong, good features and display

**ATLANTA £379** - the fast hash-table version of Milano Pro - even greater strength. 64 led board

---

**WOOD AUTO SENSORY**

Mephisto

**EXCLUSIVE** all wood board, felted pieces with MM6 - Morsch's 2100 program £449

with MAGELLAN - Atlantis program £749

---

**PC PROGRAMS from CHESSBASE on CD**

All Win & run INDEPENDENTLY + analyse within C87/8. Great graphics, big databases, opening books, printing, max features.

**FRITZ 7 £39.95** - by Franz Morsch. Extra chess knowledge for top strength - a beautiful program! Plus superb new Interface, terrific Graphics, excellent in both analysis and play, plus good hobby levels and teaching features.

**DEEP FRITZ 7 £75** - new '7' program! for single, dual & quad processors, giving GM strength on top Pentium and multi-processor machines


**TIGER14 £39** - by Christophe Theron. Features for play, analysis, printing etc. as Fritz6. Tiger14.0 is very strong & reliable in all aspects of the game, while Gambit 2.0 plays some amazing, attacking chess - possibly the new no.1! A great chess CD!

**SHREDDER 6 £39.95** - Stefan Meyer-Kahlen's program in both his own and latest ChessBase Interface. Feature-packed format - knowledge-based program playing stylish chess. Good for quality analysis. Pay £2 extra for the 6.02 Paderborn upgrade on disk.

**JUNIOR 7 £39.95** - top features, latest ChessBase Interface etc. Strong, good positional chess but aggressive with fast tactics!

**DEEP JUNIOR 7 £79** - the multi-processor World Champion version of Junior 7!

**POWERBOOKS 2002 £39** - turn your ChessBase playing engine into an openings expert! 7.6 million opening positions + 630,000 games!!

**ENDGAME TURBO CD's £39** - turn your ChessBase playing engine into an endgame expert with this 4CD Nalimov tablebase set!

---

**Other PC PROGRAMS on CD**

**REBEL CENTURY 4 with GANDALF 5 £46**. CD contains the new Century4.0 (DOS & Win) by Ed Schroder, as well as Suurbaile’s latest Gandalf Win version. Wonderful chess - Century4 is crammed with chess knowledge, about as human-like as you can get, new king safety awareness, and running faster than ever. The CD is packed with some unique analytical features, openings books, big games database etc.

**HIARCS7** - for PC and MAC! £49

---

**PC DATABASES on CD**

**CHESSBASE 8.0 for Windows £99!!**

The most popular and complete Games Database system, with the very best features. 1.6 million games, players encyclopedia, multimedia presentations, search trees, statistics, superb printing facilities and much more, incl. 3 recent ChessBase magazines on CD! The business!

**CHESSBASE 7.0 for Windows, now only £49**
NEWS & RESULTS - Keeping you right up-to-date in the COMPUTER CHESS world!

Frank HOLT

As I ran out of space without managing to squeeze Frank's latest results into our Aug/Sept Issue, it seems fair to start off with his latest news this time, to make sure it doesn't happen again!

We start off with a list of Frank's match results for Hiarc8 on his P/800 set-up, using various time controls from G/30–90 blitz and 40/30–1hr tourney, which is his usual range, providing an all-round test.

**Hiarc8 results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opponent</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc8</td>
<td>6½-5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz 7a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc8</td>
<td>5½-6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambit Tiger 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc8</td>
<td>7-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shredder 6.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc8</td>
<td>7-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously these are excellent results for Hiarc8, at the longer time controls, and easily a confirmation of its 2nd. place in the Ratings behind Fritz7.

In furtherAt Frank's Blitz tournament timings it was not so successful, though H8 did better than H7 as you'd expect.

**Table 1. All-Play-All x 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gambit Tiger 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fritz 7a</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Junior 7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shredder 6.02</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hiarc732</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nimzo732</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. All-Play-All x 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fritz 7a</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Junior 7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gambit Tiger 2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hiarc8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shredder 6.02</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Crafty 18.14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nimzo732</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these Frank concludes - "In my opinion Hiarc8 needs more time to work on the moves (as have previous Hiarc8 versions) and is better at longer time controls than Blitz.

Nevertheless it's 2nd. place at tournament time controls is a fine position, as Hiarc732 had dropped quite a few places in the rankings."

Gerhard Sonnabend continues to keep busy and his TOURNAMENT 6 is becoming a real blockbuster for comparing the performances of the latest and strongest programs!

**Gerhard Sonnabend: Tournament 6. Dual P3/800MHz. Time Control 40/40mins**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F7</th>
<th>H8</th>
<th>J7</th>
<th>CT14</th>
<th>GT2</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Sb</th>
<th>Gan5</th>
<th>N8</th>
<th>Grum</th>
<th>/180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fritz7</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>11½</td>
<td>13½</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12½</td>
<td>14½</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hiarc8</td>
<td>8½</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13½</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11½</td>
<td>11½</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Junior7</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>12½</td>
<td>10½</td>
<td>12½</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gambit Tiger 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>10½</td>
<td>10½</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The King3.12c GS*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10½</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12½</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shredder 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13½</td>
<td>10½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gandalf 5.1</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>8½</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8½</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nimzo8</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>8½</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10½</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gromit 5.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>11½</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>71½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GS* The settings for The King3.12c are a lengthy series of preferences developed by Gerhard - visitors to his website who can read a bit of German may be able to obtain them. As I understand it, The King3.12c is the latest version update number for ChessMaster 6000, though I can't be sure as I don't have it!
GM v Computer Matches!


The Kramnik - Deep Fritz match, due to take place 4-10 October 2002, was originally scheduled to take place exactly 1 year earlier.

This pair meet because Deep Fritz beat Deep Junior 14-12 in a play-off match, and Kramnik beat Kasparov to take the latter's version of the World Champion crown from him!

The 2 entry computer play-off match was (very) controversial at the time!

I had originally understood the idea was to have the Computer World Champion v the Human World Champion match, which at the planning stage sounded like Shredder v Kasparov!

When Shredder's programmer Stefan Meyer-Kahlen learned that there would be a further play-off to determine who played Kasparov, he refused on the grounds that he was already the undisputed World Computer Champion.

DF and DJ were the only other programs invited, thus the play-off qualifier was between just that pair in Irazoqui's home in Cadoques.

In the meantime Kramnik had (unexpectedly?) wrested the human crown from Kasparov, so overtures were made to make sure if he would agree to play a match against the Computer winner, and agree he did.

Readers may then remember that, in the computer play-off match, Deep Junior actually led by a straight 5-0 in the early part of the contest!

How Bahrain and its organisers in the Arab world viewed the prospect of the Israeli programmed Deep Junior qualifying we'll never know, as Fritz produced a remarkable fight-back, levelled at 12-12 and squeezed home by winning 2 extra play-off games.

So it became Kramnik v Deep Fritz, and the match was scheduled to take place in Bahrain, October 2001.

The initial 2 month delay was due to worldwide fears following the dreadful attack on New York and Washington last Sept. 11th.

But the rescheduling to December, and then other proposed dates, was not possible because of Kramnik's other commitments.

It is not too clear what those commitments were, as Kramnik seems to have been noticeable more by his absence than his chess appearances during the past 12 months!

But whatever, it's back on track, and the 6 games should be taking place starting October 4th.


Suddenly, a week or so ago, in early August, an announcement appeared on the Internet indicating that Kasparov had agreed to a public match with Deep Junior, which now is the Computer World Champion!

It's ironic that Junior has just beaten Shredder - and in a play-off! - for that title, so Stefan Meyer-Kahlen might well feel that life has not been too kind to him of late!

We all know that Kasparov would really like a re-match with Deep Blue following the embarrassment of his 3½-2½ defeat to the massive mainframe in 1997, but as it is now thought to be directing traffic in Pittsburgh, that's not going to happen!

On that result he comments: "The Deep Blue match is the one people remember. It was not just a personal defeat but a disaster for chess. We allowed a computer giant to steal the result and deceive the public."

I'm not sure what he means by 'we allowed', but one gets the point I'm sure!

Deep Junior is programmed by the Israeli pair Amir Ban and Shay Bushinsky. Ban being the creator and main programmer, though Bushinsky has perhaps become the better known because of his work with the Kasparov website, and being the program operator for the Gulko and Smirin matches.

This match will take place in the famous King David Hotel in Jerusalem (so Junior has home field advantage!) and the chosen dates are.... 1st to 13th October!

Now isn't that dandy?

FIDE president Kirsan Ilyumzhinov was involved in the press conference, as well as ICCA president David Levy. Apparently at last year's FIDE General Assembly in Greece it was agreed that they would move to standardise and organise man-machine events.

The 'co-incidental' clash of
dates, with the Kasparov match grabbing the headlines by starting 3 days earlier, was ignored in the press releases which majored on Kasparov's love for Israel (he was born Gary Winstock of course), and Israel's pride that Junior is 'their' world champion.

The time control will be 40/2, with Kasparov being paid $500,000 up front and 60% of a further $500,000 if he wins, or 40% if he loses.

Finally Kasparov says that he will not be getting a copy of the program in advance, though obviously he already has access to Junior 7.

But once the match starts no changes to the program or book will be allowed, and the software will have to comply fully with 'tournament standards', which must mean if it crashes (which would never happen with good old Windoze, of course) then it will be hard luck! For a million dollars I'd want that rule as well!

P.S.I!

A further revelation has appeared on the ChessBase web site, where it has directed us to an interview of Anatoli Jaworski. There it is intimated that 12 months ago Ruslan Ponominov - who is the FIDE World Champion! - was himself offered $30,000 to play Junior 7.

No, I didn't miss a zero out... Kasparov gets $500,000 at least a further $200,000 for losing, but Ponominov was only offered $30,000!

He says that he didn't think the offer was sufficient, and turned it down!

BILL REID's

Let's Finish with some Chess

Regular contributor Bill Reid prepares a special 'tricky for Computers' (and sometimes humans!) position for us each issue, and readers are invited to check it out themselves alongside their computers, and send in their findings!

As you know, Bill loves to catch the computers out, and has shown us various areas of weakness which the programmers no doubt have on their 'to do' lists!

Bill introduces the solution to number 101 from our last issue with the following remarks:

"After the simplicity of the issue 100 position, which was easy for the latest programs with their endgame tablebase crib lists in their back pockets, we turn to the complexities of the position for 101.

"How well did they do on that?!"

"Indeed, how well did I do?"

"The position offers so many possibilities that I'm quite prepared for readers to point out holes in my analysis."

"The programs to which I have shown it start off in pessimistic mood.

"Black is losing, they say, so the best idea is just to struggle on with 1...Rg8 2.Qxg8 Qxg8 and do the best they can."

"But eventually they brighten up and see that Black can actually draw with 1...Nd4, or 1...Rh6."

"However I think that Black can do better!"

"The player with the Black pieces has sacrificed the QR with the intention of taking advantage of White's inferior development by aiming the pieces at the weakish castled position of the king.

"The problem is that non-forcing aggressive moves in that direction can be countered by the re-emergence of White's queen onto h8 or f8."

"So now is the time for a quiet move - 'reculer pour mieux sauter', as the French say!"

"In other words: 1...Bc8!"

"Now" says Bill, "will the latest generation of programs have got full marks by seeing all that?"

"Or will they, more likely, come back and say I've got my analysis wrong...?!

Bill Reid- 9. Black to play.

First let's check out some of Bill's initial analysis on the moves which only draw!

1...d4?!"

Bill indicates that this leads to a draw, but has not sent any further analysis.

Other ideas which don't work (i.e. lose or draw): 1...h6?! 2.f7h3 draw.

1...g8? 2.xg8 xg8 3.h3, and the advantage is White's.

1...h3?! 2.f8 f8 3.fxg3 h3+ 4.xg3 draw.

We shall come back to this line later.
Next let's take a look at Bill's winning line.

1...\textbf{c8}!

I should say here and now that, whilst most of the analysis is Bill's, I have added a few bits of my own to extend or adjust some lines to a more certain conclusion!

Readers should (and I'm sure Bill will also want to where he sees my work!) check out these variations for improvements or alternative conclusions.

**Try 1.**

2.\textit{De}4 \textit{f3}!? or ?! and mate is unavoidable says Bill. But is it? What does Black do after 3.\textit{h}1! \textit{xe}4 (not 3...\textit{h}3? 4.\textit{g}1! and it's 1-0) 4.\textit{e}3 and White seems okay. If so 2...\textit{f3} does not lead to mate.

However 2...\textit{d}4 I'll give a ! to! 3.\textit{f}3 \textit{xf}3 + 4.\textit{xf}3 \textit{xf}3 5.\textit{d}2 \textit{fxg}3 0-1

**Try 2.**

2.a4, to activate the QR is countered by \textit{d}4! 3.\textit{a}3 (3.\textit{e}1 also loses to 3...\textit{h}3) 3...\textit{h}3 (3...\textit{e}2+ 4.\textit{h}1 \textit{h}6 5.\textit{f}3 \textit{g}x\textit{g}3 6.\textit{g}x\textit{g}3 \textit{g}x\textit{g}3 + 7.\textit{g}1 \textit{xf}1+ 8.\textit{xf}1 \textit{f}6 and Black should win) 4.\textit{e}1 \textit{h}6 is definitely 0-1

**Try 3.**

2.\textit{e}1! ?\textit{h}3! As Bill says, there are various new possibilities now:

\textbf{B1)} 3.\textit{f}3 \textit{fxg}3 4.\textit{fxg}3 \textit{g}x\textit{g}3 + 5.\textit{hxg}3 \textit{g}x\textit{g}3 +

6.\textit{f}1 \textit{xf}3 + 7.\textit{g}1 \textit{g}3 + 8.\textit{h}1 (8.\textit{f}1 \textit{h}3 + leads to mate) 8...\textit{xe}1+ 0-1

\textbf{B2)} 3.\textit{e}2? \textit{d}4! wins instantly, with the dual threat of winning the rook with check and \textit{f}3:

\textbf{B3)} 3.\textit{h}1 \textit{h}6 0-1;

\textbf{B4)} 3.\textit{f}1 \textit{f}3 leads to mate.

\textbf{B5)} 3.\textit{e}4 \textit{d}6! (threatening \textit{xd}2 and then \textit{f}3 and \textit{g}2 mate) 4.\textit{f}3 \textit{xf}3 5.\textit{hxg}3 \textit{g}x\textit{g}3 + 6.\textit{f}1 \textit{d}4 0-1

**Try 4.**

2.c5 \textit{d}4 3.\textit{h}1 \textit{h}3 and Black wins 0-1

**Try 5.**

2.b4 \textit{h}6 followed by \textit{h}3 0-1

So we're going for 1...\textbf{c8}! winning, with the best continuation being 2...\textit{d}4 3.\textit{f}3 \textit{xf}3 + 4.\textit{xf}3 \textit{xf}3 5.\textit{d}2 \textit{fxg}3 0-1

Okay, I said we'd come back to 1...\textit{d}4, which we said only draws, but I now think that maybe it also wins!

So, hoping I'm right, we'll now show it with a !:

1...\textbf{d}4!

2.\textit{e}1

\begin{itemize}
  \item Other tries:
  \begin{itemize}
    \item 2.\textit{f}3 \textit{h}4 0-1
    \item 2.\textit{g}8 \textit{e}2+ 3.\textit{g}2 \textit{h}3 + 0-1
    \item 2.\textit{b}3 \textit{e}2+ 0-1
  \end{itemize}
  \item 2...\textit{h}3! \textit{c6}, or \textit{f}3 followed by \textit{g}2
  and mate
\end{itemize}

3.\textit{a}7

I loved 3.\textit{h}8! when I found it, it's a clever idea, as with subtlety, it stops both planned mates.

So if 3...\textit{c}6? 4.\textit{xe}5+

For a while I even thought White might win with this:

4...\textit{d}6! 5.\textit{f}3 \textit{fx}3 6.\textit{c}5+ \textit{d}7 7.\textit{xf}3 \textit{xf}3 + 8.\textit{f}2 and now 8...\textit{fxg}3 + gets Black the draw after all.

And if 3...\textit{f}3? 4.\textit{xe}5+ \textit{d}6 5.\textit{c}5+ \textit{c}6 6.\textit{e}7+ \textit{c}8 7.\textit{e}8+ \textit{c}7 8.\textit{e}7+ etc. for the draw

However Black has 3...\textit{g}8! 4.\textit{xe}8 \textit{f}5! and now White must sac his queen to delay mate. He can do this in various ways with 5.\textit{h}6, 5.\textit{e}4, or 5.\textit{xe}5, but of course all lose, 0-1.

If he tries to avoid losing his queen with 5.\textit{c}5+ \textit{c}6 6.\textit{e}7+ \textit{c}8 7.\textit{f}3, then \textit{fxg}3! and the mate threat on \textit{h}2 forces the shedding of nearly everything (and the queen) to delay mate for a few more moves only!

Another possible defence is certainly 3.\textit{h}8! Then it seems that one of the moves prepared (by 2...\textit{h}3!)

3...\textit{c}6! is best, and now 4.\textit{e}7+ \textit{b}6 5.\textit{b}4+ \textit{a}7 6.\textit{c}5+ \textit{b}6 7.\textit{e}7+ \textit{c}7 8.\textit{xb}7+ \textit{xb}7, and mate follows soon.

Back to our main defence to 2...\textit{h}3! with 3.\textit{a}7

3...\textit{f}3 4.\textit{xe}5+ \textit{c}6 5.\textit{e}7+ \textit{b}6 6.\textit{b}4+ \textit{a}7 7.\textit{c}5+ \textit{b}6 8.\textit{xb}6+ \textit{xb}6 9.\textit{c}5+ \textit{b}7 10.\textit{xf}3 \textit{xf}3 + and mate next 0-1

I do hope someone will check these sometimes quite complicated ideas, and let us know (!) if they find improvements or corrections to add to or change the conclusions we've reached.
Well, now to Bill's next little tester!

**Bill Reid- 10. White to play.**

![Chess board diagram]

Bill says: "This position looks fairly level, though it is unbalanced and both sides may have chances for the win.

"What should White play? Quite a bit to think about here, so humans will need a full 10 minutes. Those sophisticated computer programs may, of course, figure it out in a bit less....?"

Sad as well as enclosing his analysis for 101 and a new position in advance for 103 (and his subscription!), a little note also accompanied Bill's letter:

**Dear Eric**

...... I'll send you a further position for SS104 and then I'll take my retirement.

I'm getting old and these new programs are too good for me! But I note some new names appearing in your pages who, I am sure, could do a better job.

With best wishes... Bill

I have greatly appreciated Bill's support over the years and his faithful production of the 'Let's Finish with some Chess' articles.

These have not only been a bonus for the magazine, but have also provided personal enjoyment, as I like to find the solutions (if I can!) before Bill sends them to me.

So I have replied as follows:

**16 August 2002**

**Dear Bill**

Thanks, Bill, for your letter and subscription.

I was (very) sorry to learn that you'd decided to bring your column in Selective Search to an end - but I know the feelings!

I doubt if anyone will be able to exactly fill your shoes, as you have had a great knack for finding apparently simple positions which regularly foxed the computers! I guess as they get better new positions get harder to find, and we can't keep using the same ones over and over!

Maybe we could issue a small booklet of your positions from over the past couple of years or so - it would make a useful computer test booklet for the future, especially some of those wonderful static positions which the programs were so far from solving!

The front part could be the positions, and the second half the solutions! If you think that's an idea, I'd do the work... but maybe it would spur you on to see if you could just find another 1 or 2?!

Whatever.... many thanks for all your hard work and support with 'Let's Finish with some CHESS'!

Best wishes from **Eric**

I hope he'll change his mind and see if he can find a few more for us!

---

**BEAT YOUR COMPUTER**

**Using The 'Cooper Chess System'© by Stephen Cooper**

It is certainly unusual to have two new books coming out at almost the same time, both looking at the same issue - 'anti-computer' chess. Our brief review of Dr. Pecchi's heavyweight effort can be found on page 34.

Stephen Pecchi's effort is much less pretentious, 64 A4 pages, privately printed and ring bound, and is designed for beginners, novices and intermediate players.

After a brief description of the game of Chess and its general Rules, the Book splits conveniently into 4 parts:

- The Cooper OPENING STRATEGY, 6 pages
- MIDDLEGAME STRATEGY, 5 pages
- ENDGAME STRATEGY, 6 pages
- APPLYING THE STRATEGY and 5 part-Game EXAMPLES, with light comments 26 pages.

The book ends with a few more games without notes, against Corel Chess, Chessmaster, Harcs and Fritz. The time controls are not mentioned, but the computers only appear to have had 1 or 2 secs per move - e.g. Corel Chess seems to have played its 27 moves in only 9 seconds!

To give readers an idea of the basis for the system - and noting that the author recommends 'experience' and the use of 'the back feature' - the BASIC OPENING as White involves:

1.d4, 2.a4, 3.g3, 4.e5. Now, if 4...x a3, 5.bxa3, 6.h4.

By this time the out-of-book computer should have castled to 'safety' and left himself open to attack on the f, g and h-files, which the MIDDLE GAME section then demonstrates, starting with 7.h5.

To get a copy of the book, send £9 (cheque or P.O) to Stephen Cooper, 108 Queens Court, Ramsey, Isle of Man IM8 1LQ.
A 4 game MATCH between Junior 7 and G.M Mikhail Gurevich (2641 Elo) was organised in May, and took place in Greece.

The time control was G/1 hr. which we would probably consider just favours the PC program slightly, but it also gives the GM sufficient planning and tactical time as compared with the popular G/25 and G/30 time controls which do seriously favour the computer by as much as 80 Elo I believe.

Also it should be noted that the playing program was Junior7 in its non-Dual form, on a standard P/1000.

This would suggest that Junior7 would rate at 2631 + 50 = 2681 for the match, so have only a slight 40 Elo edge for the match. We therefore expected a very close result!

In game 1 Gurevich, playing White, turned the Opening into a Catalan, which is not a bad idea for playing a computer... they still struggle to understand some of the ideas behind fianchettoed bishops.

The Internet kibitzers remained optimistic up to around move 20, but then Junior started to gain space (a match theme) and despite a worse pawn structure also got an initiative.

A strange thing happened at move 62 where Gurevich claimed a 3-fold repetition. Indeed (shades of its game with Smirin!) Junior seemed to be struggling to find the win, but shortly after the arbiter had concluded there was no 3-fold, Junior found the right plan and went on to win!

If White is very slightly better (pawn structure, especially the weak Black c5 pawn), Junior should still hold easily enough

22...h4
22...de5 hxg2 23...c4 and the 24...hxg2 is also about equal

22...d5 23...xd5 hxd5

Definitely best. 23...exd5? 24...h3 &c6= and White can also now get his knight to f3 at some time

24...f1 g6

Junior was already showing itself 0.75 ahead here

25...f3 h6 26...e1 e7
27...c2 f5 28...e3

Black now has more space, a rook on the 7th. and his king is more centralised – enough compensation for the c3 pawn weakness. Junior also has 26 mins on the clock to Gurevich with 21...

28...d6 29...a1...b6
30...e1...xg2

Some preferred 30...c4 31...xc4...xc4, but I'm not convinced

31...xg2 g5 32...e3...e5
33...c1...d4 34...c2...d5
35...e3+...c6 36...f1 h5
37...g3...b4 38...xh2 f4?!
39...gxf4...xf4 40...g2...d5
41...e2 e5 42...c1...b2
43...h4...b4 44...b1...d6
45...g2...c6 46...f1...c2
47...c1...d5

Junior continues its patient build-up, showing +2.20, but now takes ages to find the winning method. Folk may prefer to read my note to the next diagram, and jump to the one after it!
48.\(\text{d4}\) \(\text{d4}\) 49.\(\text{e1}\) \(\text{e6}\)
50.\(\text{f2}\) \(\text{f6}\) 51.\(\text{f1}\) \(\text{e2}\)
52.\(\text{f2}\) \(\text{g5}\)

Gurevich is now down to 5
mins, Junior has 11
53.\(\text{f1}\) \(\text{c2}\) 54.\(\text{h3}\) \(\text{f6}\)
55.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{b2}\) 56.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{f5}\)
57.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{g5}\) 58.\(\text{g2}\)

68.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{g6}\)!! 69.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{h6}\) 70.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{c2}\) 71.\(\text{h4}\)
\(\text{e2}\) 72.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{e2}\) 73.\(\text{b4}\)
\(\text{b2}\) 74.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{g6}\) 75.\(\text{h4}\)
\(\text{f7}\) 76.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{b2}\) 77.\(\text{h4}\)
\(\text{f6}\) 78.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{g5}\)!

Hurray! Finally the king
hits g5 at a time when it
stops Nh4, and Gurevich is
in trouble!

58...\(\text{f6}\)!!

How to win from here? Move
the rook along the
2nd. rank, and leave the
king on g5 (to stop the
Nh4-g2-h4-g2 repeti-
tions!). White must then play
a weakening move.
59.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{a2}\) 60.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{f5}\)
61.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{g5}\) 62.\(\text{g2}\)

79.e3?!
79.\(\text{f2}\) was probably the
better chance
79...\(\text{fxe3}\) 80.\(\text{exe3}\) \(\text{f5}\)
81.\(\text{g1}\) \(\text{e2}\) 82.\(\text{f1}\) \(\text{e1}\)
83.\(\text{e1}\) \(\text{f4}\) 0-1

For game 2 Gurevich adopts
his favoured French Defence!

Junior 7 - Gurevich, M (2641)

CO1. Game 2

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.exd5?!
exd5 4.c4 \(\text{f6}\) 5.\(\text{c3}\) \(\text{b4}\)
6.\(\text{f3}\) 0-0 7.\(\text{e2}\) \(\text{dxc4}\)
8.\(\text{xc4}\) \(\text{g4}\) 9.0-0 \(\text{c6}\)
10.\(\text{e3}\) \(\text{d7}\)

This is where Gurevich
claimed a three-fold repe-
tition, rejected by the arbi-
ter: on one previous
occasion with the knight on
b2, Black's rook was on b2,
and on another his king was
on f6. But Junior hasn't yet
found the winning plan!
62...\(\text{f6}\)!! 63.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{c2}\)
64.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{f7}\) 65.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{d2}\)
66.\(\text{g2}\) \(\text{f6}\) 67.\(\text{h4}\) \(\text{g5}\)

in this variation.
E.g. after the supposed top
White move - 11.\(\text{e2}\) -
Black gets a high winning
percentage with \(\text{d4d8}\).
11.a3 \(\text{a5}\) is about even, so
Junior goes for the third
choice, which also works
out about equal according to
the database records!
11.h3 \(\text{h5}\) 12.a3 \(\text{a5}\) 13.\(\text{e1}\)
The move 11 preference
(\(\text{e2}\)) is also the recom-
manded theory move here
13...\(\text{d8}\) 14.\(\text{c1}\) \(\text{e8}\) 15.\(\text{b4}\)
\(\text{b6}\) 16.\(\text{b5}\) a6 17.\(\text{xc6}\)
\(\text{xc6}\) 18.g4?!

Indicating again Junior's
lust for space, but rather
risky. 18.d5 \(\text{d6}\) 19.\(\text{xb6}\)
\(\text{xb6}\) 20.\(\text{xg8}\) \(\text{xe8}\)
21.\(\text{d3}\) is about equal...
how will the isolated d-
pawn get on?!
18...\(\text{g6}\) 19.d5 \(\text{d6}\) 20.\(\text{xb6}\)
\(\text{xb6}\) 21.\(\text{e5}\) \(\text{d6}\) 22.\(\text{d4}\)
\(\text{d7}\)!

Yielding a small initiative
to the PC program. 22...\(\text{c6}\)
23.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{f8}\) maintained
some tension quite nicely
and the position may have
even still slightly favoured
Black
23.\(\text{c4}\) \(\text{f6}\)?

Black should avoid the
queen exchange with
23...\(\text{f8}\) 24.\(\text{xe8}\) \(\text{xe8}\), and
if Junior re-invites it with
25.\(\text{e3}\) then perhaps
25...\(\text{b5}\)!! when White may
only just be winning
24.\(\text{xf6}\) \(\text{xf6}\) 25.\(\text{a5}\) b6
26.\(\text{e6}\) \(\text{a8}\) 27.\(\text{f4}\)!
27...h6 28.Ee5 $d3 29.Ec1 $f8 30.Exe8+ $xe8!
Not 30...Exe8? because of 31.Ee5! $h7 32.g5
31.Ee7 $c4 32.$f2?!
32.g3?
32...f6 33.Exc7 Exd5
34.Ed5 Exd5 35.a4 $b3
36.a5 bxa5 37.bxa5 $a4
38.Exe5 $e8 39.Cc6

m/3) 32.Cxg5+ it’s 1-0

I shouldn’t think that anyone would have expected a 2-0 start for Junior!

In game 3 Gurevich uses some typical anti-computer strategies right from move 2, and soon builds up a winning advantage.

Even so, the computer manages to find a few tactical half-threats (a particular merit of Junior in my experience), and a new question then hovers over the game: ‘will the GM keep his nerve to complete the win?’

Gurevich, M (2641) - Junior 7
D03, Game 3

1.d4 $f6 2.c3!? e6 3.Ag5 d5
4.$d2 e5 5.e3 $e7 6.Ed3 Bbd7 7.$d3 b6 8.0-0 $b7
9.Ee2 0-0 10.Ed1 c4?!

39...f6?

Gurevich has just about kept himself in the game with a chance, and if he’d played 39...Exc6 40.Exc6 $a7 a draw must have still been possible

40.f5 $f7 41.Ab4! $e8
42.$d3 $g8 43.Ec5 $f7
44.Edg3 $e8 45.Exa6 $e3+
46.Cc2 $xh3 47.Ec5 h5
48.g5 fxg5?
48...d5 49.g6 $f8
50.Ee6+ $xe6 51.fxe6 $a3 was a better try, and Junior probably still has a bit to do before the full point is his!
49.Ec8+ $h7 50.$e4

After 50...$h2+ 51.$g3 $d5 (51...$h1? 52.Cxg5+

Well done by Junior, from a rather ropy position it tries to create real counter-threats!
22.f4 h4 23.f5 hxg3 24.$g4 $g8 25.Exg3
25.f6+?!
25...Exd8 26.Ef1 $a6 27.f6+
28.$f8 29.Ef6 29.$g4 $h6
30.$f2 $e8 31.$g5 $xg5
32.Ed5

So we have an excellent fight-back. Gurevich might be 2-0 down, but here he is a pawn up and has a good position to go with it!

32...$h5 33.$f3 $f8 34.$h1! $xh1

Forced, or Black loses material
35.$xh1 bxc3 36.bxc3 $b2!

Blocking the pawns and rather falling for the anti-computer tactics being employed in this game

11.$c2 h6 12.$h4 g5?
13.$g3 $h5 14.e4 b5 15.e5 a5 16.$f1 $e8 17.$e3 $b4
18.$g4 $xg3 19.hxg3 $g7
20.$d2 h5 21.$e3 $h8!

A rook on the 7th is always likely to cause a bit of panic!
37.$h8! $e6 38.$e1 $xa2
39.$g5 $e7

I don’t think there was any choice! The threat of $h7! combined with that fearfully restricting pawn standing on
f6, has put Black’s king in great jeopardy and the sacrifice is the only way out 40.fxe7 Qxe7 41.Qd2 a4!
White, with knight for pawn, is winning... but Junior keeps finding ways to make the heart of Gurevich beat faster and faster!
42.Nh1 a3 43.Kf1 Ke8
44.Nb1 f6 45.Nb7+ Kd7

46.Qf3?
The first sign of a major attack of nerves! Best was 46.exf6+ Qxf6 47.Qh7+ Ke7 48.Qa7! keeping a close eye on Black’s danger pawn! Then 48...Qd6 49.g4! and White should win
46...fxe5 47.Qxe5 Qd8
48.Qc6+ Qc8 49.Qa7?
Threatening Qa8+, but it’s easily dealt with. 49.Qb1! threatening Qb4 was much stronger!
49...Qf6 50.Qb4 Qe4+!
51.Qe1 Qa1+ 52.Qd1 Kh5
53.Qa4 Qb8 54.Qc6+ Qc8
55.Qb4 Qb8 56.Qc6+ Qc8
57.Qb4 and a draw agreed \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}

Even with the match over it is worth playing through the final game.

After Junior wrongly blocks the central pawns again (as we know, it’s good theory against humans often enough, but not usually recommended for computers... or perhaps the Junior programming team think otherwise, an interesting possibility?) it is allowed to easily unblock them at move 18. After this Gurevich is under pressure for a while, finding ways to protect his backward c-pawn.

In the end it looks like a certain draw, but the pawn structure is unbalanced with both sides having potential passed pawns on different parts of the board. At move 37 Gurevich decides to see if, with the support of his rook, he can press either his g or h-pawn home, but will it work?!

Junior 7 - Gurevich, M (2641)
CO1 Game 4

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.exd5 exd5
4.c4 Qf6 5.Qc3 Qe7
Gurevich played 5...Qb4 in game 2
6.d3 0-0 7.e2 Qc6 8.0-0 Qe6 9.c5?!
A new move? And to be honest not what you’d really want your computer to play, as it blocks the centre! Just what Gurevich wants? Perhaps this time, Mikhail?
9...Qc4 10.Qd3 Qf5
Fighting for the e4 square
11.Qe1 Qxc3 12.Qxc3 Qxd3
13.Qxd3 Qe8 14.Qb1! h6
The position is very even at this stage, but the last pair of moves has given Junior the chance to unblock the centre if he wants

15.h3
Junior appears to be sensitive about back rank risks!
15...Qd7 16.Qf4 Qf8 17.a4 Qab8?!
17...Qxe1+ 18.Qxe1 bxc5 looks quite good for Black — also safe, though he probably wants to at least try for a winning chance
18.cxb6
As expected Junior has easily managed to unblock the pawn centre
18...Qxb6 19.Qg5!
This looks strong, and White now has the beginnings of an attack!
19...Qg6 20.Qg3 Qxe1+
21.Qxe1 Qc8

Black has some heavy artillery back, all in defence of the backward c-pawn!

22.Qf3 Qg7 23.Qh4 f6
24.Qg4
This appears to offer Gurevich every chance of a draw, though the position only just favoured Junior anyway
24...\text{wxg4} 25.hxg4 g5
26.\text{g3} \text{f7} 27.\text{d2}

At this point Junior had 37 mins on his clock, Gurevich had 20
27...\text{f8} 28.\text{f1} \text{a3} 29.\text{e3} \text{e7} 30.\text{b1} \text{e6}
Or 30...h6 31.\text{c2} \text{d6}
32.\text{xd6} \text{cxd6} 33.\text{b3} with a small advantage to White
31.\text{h2} \text{d6} 32.\text{e1} \text{g3} 33.\text{g3} \text{f7} 34.\text{c4} \text{dxc4}
35.\text{e1}

The draw seems certain!
35...\text{e6} 36.\text{e4} \text{d7}
37.\text{f3} \text{h8}??!

But surely Gurevich is being a bit over-optimistic with this idea
38.\text{d5}!! \text{h5} 39.\text{gxh5} \text{gxh5}!!
39...\text{f5} might have been a better try, but after 40.\text{g4} \text{f4}
41.\text{c2} \text{xd5} 42.\text{e4}
White still has at least a useful edge
40.\text{g4}! \text{d8} 41.\text{xf6} \text{h8}
42.\text{e4} \text{h2} 43.\text{e1}

Black must lose the R for N exchange
44.\text{f3} \text{d6} 45.\text{g3} \text{h6}
Gurevich now had only 5 mins left on his clock, Junior had 17!
46.\text{g4} \text{h8} 47.\text{e5} \text{h8}+ 48.\text{g2} \text{f5} 49.\text{e1} \text{c8}
50.\text{f3} \text{b7} 51.\text{h3}!

Watch this fine king march from Junior!
51...\text{f8} 52.\text{g4} \text{a8}
53.\text{g5} \text{exa4} 54.\text{f6} \text{d4}
55.\text{e6} \text{d2} 56.\text{g4}!
Perfect timing now that the king is so well positioned!
56...\text{b5}

57.\text{d6}?!
Junior seems to have a propensity for 'going round the houses' sometimes!
Surely the immediate 57.g5 \text{d4}+ 58.\text{e7} would get the job done quicker!
57...\text{c3} 58.\text{b4} \text{d4} 59.\text{c3} \text{a4} 60.\text{c6} \text{c5}+ 61.\text{e5}
\text{d1} 62.\text{b4} \text{d7}+ 63.\text{c5} \text{c5} 64.\text{g5} \text{d4}?
64...\text{a6} 65.\text{d3} \text{h1} was the last, very feint, hope, but
66.g6 \text{h5}+ 67.\text{e6} \text{g5}
68.\text{f4} would surely settle it
65.g6! \text{xb4} 66.\text{g7} 1-0

What do we make of this?

Smirin's performance against the computers strongly suggests that the likes of Kramnik and Kasparov will be much too strong for the programs.

You should read his after-the-match remarks in our next article... he thinks he would do even better in a re-match, which means win easily!

Boris Gulko thought pretty much the same.

But the highly rated player and analyst Gurevich has gone down with a bit of a crash, by 3½-½... not even close!

And that against Junior on the sort of standard hardware quite a few of us have at home.

Is Junior particularly suited for play against humans?

At this point readers should have a look through the interview comments made by Amir Ban.
These will be squeezed into the magazine somewhere I hope, having been made after Junior's victory in the World Computer Championship.

On the Rating Lists we have got used to seeing Fritz7 at the top

..... but in the Computer Championships Junior and Shredder seem to share most of the titles, and against humans Junior along with Tiger, Fritz and Hiarcs are the group which often achieve the best performances!
SMIRIN v THE PC PROGRAMS
AFTER-MATCH COMMENTS by SMIRIN

I'm sure everyone will have relished playing through the games from the Smirin - PC Programs match.

With a bit of luck you even enjoyed the analysis and comments for each game (which took hours of work I can tell you).

Many readers will have been particularly pleased to see Smirin get revenge for the human race, after the Computers' 5-3 victory over Gulko.

It is also interesting to see what GM Ilya Smirin said about the result and programs in an INTERVIEW a few days after the match!

**Interviewer**
Firstly, congratulations on winning the contest!

It's been almost a week since the end of your match against the best chess engines and I want to ask are you satisfied with the final result?

**Smirin**
I think the outcome of the match reflected more or less accurately its character.

I mean I won two games, one of which (second encounter with Tiger) I had a quite dubious position at some stage and then managed to outplay the program in tactical complications.

I saved one objectively lost position versus Hiarcs, and was saved in one lost position versus Junior.

But I spoiled at least two winning positions myself, so I feel in this sense we are even!

So if you ask me whether I am satisfied with my result in general, the answer would be "yes, I am!"

Before the match I was expecting the worst and suspected that what happened to Gulko might happen to me as well, mainly due to very little experience I have accumulated in computer chess in the past. The last time I played computers was back in 1995-1996.

But I grew confident as the contest was in progress, and frankly speaking, I think the outcome could have been even more convincing when I look at it now!

Somehow it seemed to me that the computers were stronger when I was analyzing Gulko's games!

**Interviewer**
The final score was GM Smirin 5, Computers 3. Were you surprised by the level of your computer opponents?

**Smirin**
As a matter of fact I was! This match has revealed (or emphasized??) that chess programs have both extremely strong and extremely weak sides. I was expecting more "stable" performances, if I may describe it that way.

Some aspects of the chess programs' play are still calling for serious improvement - such as their incapability to carry out a long-term plan, even if this plan is simple enough.

I also see room for improvement in the computer's way of thinking in closed position, which is quite primitive and naive, while their level of play in open positions is simply outstanding!

**Interviewer**
Did you manage to impose on the computers the character of play you intended to in your pre-match preparation?

How do you explain the fact that with White, you were dominating over the computers scoring two wins and spoiling another winning position, while with Black you seemed to have certain problems? Is the color of the pieces that significant versus computers?

**Smirin**
I will start to answer this series of questions from the last one!

Yes, it makes a huge difference whether you play with the computer as Black or White!

With White it is much easier to drag it into kind of positions you want to without taking too many risks, while with Black you have to go intentionally for objectively much worse positions, but which you assume is suitable to play against a computer,
and try to outplay the program in it.

I don't like this strategy and didn't use it in my match sticking to my original opening schemes such as King's Indian Defense versus d4 and going for 1...e5 versus 1.e4, which I had prepared.

For some reason, in none of the games the programs opted for the main lines, so I didn't face too many problems in the opening!

### Interviewer
Did you feel an additional psychological tension during the contest? Do you feel exhausted after the match?

### Smirin
Well, even though we played only four games per week, which helped me to pull myself together between the games, it wasn't so easy psychologically.

As a result, I lost concentration a few times during the match and it cost me at least ½ a point - and it could have been even more if the computer was more accurate!

It's just not so simple to play chess when you know that you have to avoid certain kind of positions, even if your intuition is telling you it's objectively correct to go for them!

However, I think I managed to withstand the pressure, and at the moment I'm full of energy and not tired at all!

### Interviewer
Do you feel you played a different type of chess?

### Smirin
In one sense, yes, I played a different kind of chess. I've got to admit that on one hand it was an extremely interesting experience for me and I kind of enjoyed it. But on the other hand there were a lot of elements inherent to "human" chess I missed in this contest.

As I previously mentioned I had to limit myself to certain way of thinking in order to avoid complications and a sharp tactical struggle - even if you are sure it clearly favors you! This probably made the games less attractive to the audience.

The thing I missed the most in this contest was the clash of two intellects, two personalities, two energies which can be found only in "human" chess!

### Interviewer
What moment of the match do you remember the most?

### Smirin
My White game versus Tiger, it's no doubt about that one!

It's always nice to beat your opponent "on his territory".

I managed to find a very nice combination, when in one of it's main variations, Black is left with a rook and two bishops versus a lonely knight of White, but he is helpless to stop the passed pawn!

### Interviewer
I guess it's just about a time for you to get back to regular chess! Would you please tell us what are your plans for the immediate future?

### Smirin
I'm going to participate in very strong round-robin tournament in Sarajevo between May 16 to May 25 and afterwards to take part in FIDE Grand Prix in Moscow starting on June 2. I guess that's about it at the moment.

### Interviewer
Thanks a lot for this interview and good luck in Sarajevo!

At Sarajevo in a Category 16 tournament (average rating 2628), Ilya Smirin came 3= with 5/9, level with Shirov, Dreev and Radjabov, but behind winner Movsesian and 2nd. Sokolov.

The FIDE Grand Prix is a series of knock-out tournaments. In the June event in Moscow, Smirin managed to reach the quarter-finals before losing to Belyavsky.

The Moscow meeting was won by Kasparov, but interestingly it is led overall by Peter Leko at present, ahead of 2nd. Grischuk and 3rd. Kasparov.

'Interesting' because Leko has recently qualified to meet Vladimir Kramnik for his version of the World Title as part of the World Champion re-unification process!

### Man v Machine
It was shortly after working on the above article I heard about the dual forthcoming matches between both Kramnik and Deep Fritz, and Kasparov and Deep Junior.

A frequent discussion on the 'net (which is best avoided, it often descends into a mud-slinging row) is: 'How do the current software programs compare with Deep Blue?'. The Smirin result suggests they are not as good, but we'll know more soon!
Late NEWS, REVELATIONS and, yes, some SHOCKS!

First I must apologise that this issue of Selective Search is so 'higgledy-piggledy' - disorganised is an approximately equivalent expression for my foreign readers!

It really has been a most difficult 2 months in the Hallsworth household, mostly due to computer crashes - there are times when I have to say that I think computers have ruined our lives!

Considering they are supposed to make life easier they have an alarming habit of being so terribly time consuming that they often actually make it harder - in my view!

The well-known phrase or saying goes: "They're fine while they're working!", but I'm not even sure if that's true anymore.

Constant little niggles (also called crashes); software that works with Win95, or Win98, or WinME, but not WinXP... and of course vice-versa; articles which print out fine with one printer but need re-aligning to work with another; all the reference books and accumulating paper piled up around the house or office .... aaagh. If you've got a PC, you probably know exactly what I mean.

But these are the things we cope with! When the PC really goes down, that's when what they call "the fun" starts.

My main laptop, a P/700, did just this on me 18 months ago. It had already been repaired under guarantee once (the processor was overheating and the whole thing locked up every 5 minutes or so unless you left it off for an hour to cool down!).

Sadly a few months later (and now out of guarantee) it started happening again.

So I got myself a new P/1000. It had just run out of guarantee when it started with a very similar problem early in August.

The problem with the P/1000 is a bit worse as, when it locks up the hard drive light comes and stays on and the whole thing has to be reset.

PC owners will know what this means - your 'work in progress' will revert to the last time you pressed the 'Save' button! In addition the hard drive clearly doesn't like being switched off when its light is on, so likes to lose or corrupt files! Charming.

I suppose I was fortunate that I'd just got SelSearch 101 out to readers when it first started to happen, but trying to work on this issue has been a nightmare, as text files, chess game files, analysis and various other things, as well as work supposedly DONE, has just got lost.

Obviously I need ANOTHER new laptop - I'd buy a desktop but they're so hard to carry between home and office every day! Anyway, having had to replace not only the P/700 18 months ago and my two printers in the last 12 months, it's just not that easy!

At the moment I'm copying the files I've salvaged off the P/1000 onto floppies, and transferring them to the old P/700 which seems willing to work at the moment as long as I don't push the processor too hard - e.g. by using Fritz, Hiarcs, Junior & co. to either do analysis or play chess!

As I write in mid-September, how or when SS/102 comes out I've no idea!

The whole costs of my computing over the last 18 months really bring into question the future of Selective Search.

It doesn't make all that much of a net profit anyway, considering the hours I spend working on it. Once I add in equipment costs, it probably makes nothing at all, though of course one of the printers and the laptop are used for other work as well.

I'm not the only magazine with a problem!

I've just received a letter from PC MAGAZINE, to which I subscribe to try and keep up-to-date with all the constant changes and flow of new ideas and product in the world of the PC.

Their circulation has always been just slightly larger than mine :-)

But they have now had to decide to stop publishing the magazine in printed format.

I quote: "The recession in the technology market has had a dramatic effect on all our magazines.... with more readers using the Internet for IT information than ever before, the print versions of this magazine has struggled..."

The circulation of Selective Search has also dropped significantly over the past 4 or 5 years.

At one time I had 380 subscribers, but the current number is barely hanging on at
around 250. There are 2 main reasons for this:

- **Selective Search** was formed in the day of the dedicated chess computer, when a PC filled a side of a room and the Internet was still futuristic. The printed page ruled... so did the dedicated chess computer! Many of those early readers have dropped off because of the dearth of product and news related to dedicated computers. Even major efforts with the help of folk like Rob van Son, to maintain some coverage has not been enough to keep everyone interested.

- Now, of course, the PC rules, and not only for chess! My readers can get so much info. if they are willing to hunt the 'net for themselves, that it's very difficult to find 'news' that no-one's seen, and hard work plus longer hours trying to produce unique articles. I quite understand that some folk don't feel 'the need' for the printed magazine anymore.

To try and slow down the loss of subscriptions and income I have bought new equipment, so I can produce higher quality and include some photos. I've left the **price unchanged for over 4 years**. I've made offers of free (Rebel Decade) or very cheap (Hiarcs 6 and 7) software - thanks largely to help from Ed Schroder and Mark Uniacke. And I generally produce a 36 page issue instead of the old 28 or 32 page variety.

And it still hasn't stopped the fall in numbers, whilst publication costs and postage have all continued to climb steadily.

**So WHAT NOW?**

You might not believe it, but I'm not daft!

I don't really want to bring the magazine to its end, but if it can't pay its way, then I will reclaim a few hours of freedom each week!

**The ALTERNATIVES?**

- I could reduce the number of pages back to 32. That would save some work and reduce printing costs a little, but will the number of subscribers just drop further?

- I could increase the price! I can imagine that, say, 150 of you would say 'yes, do that, we'll gladly (!?) pay'. The problem of course is the 50 or more who decide not to pay, so in the end it may not change anything.

- I could reduce it to quarterly issues of 40 pages, but for the same subscription. That would mean a little less work. The postage would go to the next weight bracket but would only post out 4 times a year, so I think it might just be a bit better for me. But again, if I continue to lose subscribers, it might still only delay 'the inevitable' for a while longer?

- If it has to close down, I would announce a future issue number, say 112. Once subs. were due that would obtain less than 6 issues, I'd work a pro rata figure out when sending reminders. **So no-one will miss out by re-subscribing now!**

So, what to do? The bottom line is that, **if the circulation drops below 200 it would suggest that there is no longer a need for it, and it would hardly seem to make sense spending 60-80 hours on each issue in such circumstances.**

Encouragement, ideas and/or suggestions will be warmly received!

**Other INTERESTING items!**

**DRUG TESTING**

FIDE have been insisting on drugs testing at recent chess events!

Why? Because they have been hoping that the IOC (International Olympic Committee) would accept chess (and bridge) into the Olympic Games.

Unfortunately the IOC have ruled that the cannot be accepted into the Olympics because they entail no physical exertion - they've obviously not seen some players I know banging their queens down on the board to emphasise the threatening nature of their attack - or me when I've got my Tasc R30 on the run (rarely).

Nevertheless FIDE intends to proceed with drug testing at the forthcoming Olympiad in Slovenia, though some players and Federations have declared they will refuse them!

The drugs tested for (and 100 substances are involved) are supposed to enhance physical performance - but the IOC say there is no physical exertion involved! Mmm!

**ED SCHRODER & REBEL**

Ed made it known recently that he has transferred most of his business to Lokasoft.

Ed and Lex Loe have been in cooperation for some time - e.g. the Rebel Tiger 12 version which appeared on a recent Rebel Century CD, using the Lokasoft Windows interface - and a new release, namely Chess Tiger 15 should emerge sometime in September!

Because of new involvements it sounds as if Ed is not going to be so actively involved in computer chess in the future, but he has promised that he will continue to work on his Rebel XP Windows version, though it is not certain yet when that will be released.
Readers should note that this is one of the Articles affected by my computer crashes, as discussed on pages 15-16.

I would hope to cover more games in the next issue, especially I would like to look at some of the games of BRUTUS, QUEST and DIEP, all of which played the eventual 1st. And 2nd., JUNIOR and SHREDDER.

Most of the programs were on very fast hardware - as you'd expect!

I regret that I have never managed to find the full details. This is a great pity when the programs run on vastly differing hardware, from single processor units, through dual/quad machines, finally to Brutus (see our last issue) and Diep (on a 1024 CPU TERAS system capable of 10^12 operations per second)!

The favourites at the start were SHREDDER, Junior and QUEST which, between them have won most of the recent major tournaments.

QUEST is the name Franz Morsch gives to his experimental version of Fritz!

One would have to add BRUTUS and probably DIEP to this list, because of their ultra fast hardware!

Of my ideas above of the 5 favourites, all won their first round games, except junior which drew with Black against Ikarus.

It was almost the same in round 2 but this time it was Diep which got the draw, with Black against Warp, and the others won. So already SHREDDER, QUEST and Brutus were 1= on their own with 2/2, with Diep, Junior and Warp on 1½/2 placed 4=, and a large group another ½ pt. Behind.

The pairings for round 3 promised some sort of resolution of this, with Shredder v Brutus, Quest v Warp, and Diep v Junior.

As it happened the first 2 games were both drawn, enabling Junior to catch up when he beat Diep!

Round 4 saw two REALLY BIG games! Junior v Shredder, and Brutus v Quest. All four went into these games with 2½/3.

Junior - Shredder

ECO: E20. Round 1

1.d4 Qf6 2.c4 e6 3.Qc3 b4 4.f3 d5 a3 Qe7 6.e4 dxe4 7.fxe4 e5 8.d5 0-0 9.g4 Qe4 10.f3 Qc5 11.Qe2 Qf2 + 12.Qd2!!

New. 12.Qd1 Qd4 13.Qc2 has been played by the GM's!

12...Qc5 13.h3 Qf2 14.Qf1 Qxd3

15.Qxd3?

Over-adventurous, it seems to me. 15.Qd3 Qd7 16.g2 and the king is more secure

15...Qc6

Inviting the pawn grab! 15...Qc6 is okay, the d5-pawn is pinned. But the

real threat then is Qd4, so

16.Qd1! f5!? 17.Qc2 Qd4 forcing 18.Qb1 and now

18...fxe4 19.Qxe4 Qf5, when White has to get himself untangled quickly

16.Qxe5 Qd6 17.Qg4?!

17.Qf3 =

17...Qxd5 18.exd5 f5 19.Qf2

White is still his pawn up, but needs to find refuge somewhere for his dangerously open king. Can Shredder find an attack before White sorts himself out?!

19.Qd7 20.Qe3?!

Again moving the king to a safer haven seems wisest with 20.Qc2

20...Qe8! 21.Qf3 Qa6 22.Qf4 gxf4 23.Qxf4 Qb5 24.Qc2 Qc8!

Black's piece activity and potential would now delight any attacking player

25.Qd3 Qxc4 26.Qe5

The counter-attack. It's
hard to be sure who’s winning, the evaluations are close to equal
26...\textit{c}e5 27...\textit{d}xd7?! It’s tempting to ‘win’ bishop for knight in this open position, but it increases the danger on the \textit{c}–\textit{d}–\textit{e} files from the rooks and queen.
27...\textit{d}ae1 looks best. Now Black has two choices:
27...\textit{xe}5 (27...\textit{d}d3
28...\textit{xd}3 \textit{cxd}3+ 29...\textit{xd}3
and White has probably equalised) 28...\textit{xe}5 \textit{h}b6
29...\textit{e}3 \textit{b}b8 and Black still has some pressure but the result is uncertain!
27...\textit{xd}7 28...\textit{ad}1
Probably best
28...\textit{b}b8 29...\textit{b}1
29...\textit{xc}4 \textit{e}c8!
29...a5!

\begin{center}
\textbf{Diagram 102}
\end{center}

This is more dangerous than it looks, as it hurts White’s threatened, backward \textit{b}–\textit{pawn
30...\textit{xf}5??!
If 30...\textit{g}4 then 30...\textit{fxg}4
31...\textit{hxg}4 \textit{bc}8 seems best but may not be decisive
30...\textit{b}7! 31...\textit{d}6 \textit{b}b3+
32...\textit{c}1 \textit{b}6! 33...\textit{b}d4 \textit{cxb}3
34...\textit{d}5+ \textit{e}6 35...\textit{d}1 \textit{b}2+
36...\textit{c}2 \textit{h}8! 37...\textit{e}4

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
pos & prog & score/4 \\
\hline
1 & Shredder & 3½ \\
2 & Brutus, Quest, Warp & 3 \\
5 & Junior, Ikarus, ParSOS, Sjeng (a Winboard prog!) & 2½ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The main game for round 5 was Shredder v Quest, and this was drawn, which allowed Brutus in beating Warp, and Junior likewise over ParSOS, to recover ground. Indeed Shredder and Brutus were now 1= with 4/5.

Thus the top 3 games for round 6 were again all vital: Brutus had White against Junior! The next were Sjeng v Shredder, and Quest v Diep.

That Shredder beat Sjeng was not a surprise, but Junior’s win over Brutus is one for our next Issue! Quest v Diep was a surprise draw, and Warp lost to IciChess in this round

After 6 rounds then, we had this:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
pos & prog & score/6 \\
\hline
1 & Shredder & 5 \\
2 & Junior & 4½ \\
3 & Brutus, Quest, IciChess & 4 \\
6 & Ikarus, ParSOS, Diep & 3½ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
We halt coverage of the main Tournament briefly here, as the World Speed Championship was played on the next day.

This was once the domain of Ferret (whatever happened to Bruce Moreland's ever-so-promising program?) And Fritz.

But not in 2002!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pos</th>
<th>Blitz Championship</th>
<th>score/9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goliath</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ParSOS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quest, Brutus, Ikarus, Junior</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>XiniX</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Diep</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sjeng, Insomniac</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NoctianChess</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gap between the top 2 and the rest is considerable!

So well done Shredder and Goliath!

An earlier Goliath could be found on the ChessBase "Young Talents" CD, whilst Diep was not performing anything like as fast as expected, at either fast or slow chess! Programmer Vincent Diepepeeven was already aware that his later plan to run on the fastest possible hardware configuration was backfiring on him!

Back to the main Championship and round 7. By this time most of the main contenders had played each other, so it was a question of whether a mid-table program might sneak a ½-pi off one of the leader/s to let another program in!

Shredder still had Goliath and Diep to play, but met Ikarus in this round and duly won.

Junior and Quest still needed to meet and duly did here and now, with Junior getting its second big scalp in succession - Brutus in 5 and now Quest.

Brutus still had Goliath and Diep to play, but was drawn against Isic chess in this round, and won.

After this round Quest was probably out of the title chase with 4/7, but only had Diep and Isic chess still to be faced.

Round 8 was the penultimate round, and Shredder was drawn to play Black against Diep, and a draw was the result.

This let Junior and Brutus back in with a chance, and both dutifully won against Warp and XiniX respectively.

Quest also beat Isic chess, so the leaders going into the final round were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pos</th>
<th>prog</th>
<th>score 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shredder, Junior</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brutus</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quest, Diep</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ParSOS, Chinito</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Warp, Isic, Sjeng, Goliath, XiniX</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I know, it would be dramatic if I could tell you there were some major shocks in the final round... But it was not to be!

Shredder beat Chinito, Junior beat Sjeng, Brutus beat Diep, and Quest beat ParSOS.

But we weren't finished!

On the next day a 2 game decider between Shredder and Junior was arranged!

The Junior team, perhaps uniquely, have a GM - Boris Alterman - advising them on various aspects of Junior's play. Not surprisingly Shay Bushinsky and Alterman (left) were soon hard at work planning Junior's opening!

Shredder - Junior
ECO code: D46. Playoff 1
1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.Øc3 Øf6 4.e3 e5 5.Øf3 Øbd7 6.Øc2 Ød6 7.Øe2 0-0 8.0-0 dxc4 9.Øxc4 a6

10.e4?!
Did they put Shredder out of book!? 10.Ød1 h5 (or 10...Øe7??) 11.Øe2 is usual!
10...e5 11.Ød1 Øe7 12.d5?!
Shredder is out of book now. 12.h3 exd4 13.Øxd4 Øe5 is all I have, and seems to lead to an equal game
12...Øb6 13.Ød3 cxd5
14.exd5 Øg4!
The pin is quite a nuisance
15.Øg5 h6 16.Øxf6 Øxf6
17.\textit{\textbf{h}7+}
I'd have preferred to see 17.\textit{\textbf{e}2} to break the pin
17...\textit{\textbf{h}8} 18.\textit{\textbf{e}4} \textit{\textbf{d}8} 19.\textit{\textbf{h}3}
\textit{\textbf{x}f3} 20.\textit{\textbf{x}f3} f5!

Just how threatening is this? We shall see, but the game looks level to me. One question mark is over White's (passed) d-pawn... is it strong, or weak?!
21.\textit{\textbf{e}2} \textit{\textbf{h}4} 22.\textit{\textbf{a}4} e4 23.\textit{\textbf{a}5}
\textit{\textbf{d}7} 24.\textit{\textbf{a}4}
24.\textit{\textbf{a}c1}?! Is more active
24...\textit{\textbf{b}d8} 25.\textit{\textbf{c}e2} \textit{\textbf{c}8}
26.\textit{\textbf{e}1} \textit{\textbf{e}7} 27.\textit{\textbf{d}2} \textit{\textbf{e}8}
28.\textit{\textbf{c}e2}
28.\textit{\textbf{a}d1}?!?
28...\textit{\textbf{f}6}

Although Black has White under quite a bit of pressure, you'd still not expect we're only a few moves away from the World Championship being decided. Has Shredder's renown for defensive awareness and counter-attacking (we can't ignore the Gulko and Smirin games when we say this) been diminished in the work aiming to make Shredder more active in its style?
29.\textit{\textbf{f}1}?!?
The first time I played through the game, I marked this move as no. 1 culprit. But now I find it quite hard to find anything all that much better – Shredder's passive play earlier is the main cause!
Stefan was already looking very depressed by his program's over-defensive approach, and he was facing his first game defeat in a major computer event for many a year!
Maybe 29.\textit{\textbf{a}d1}?! Was better, but 29...\textit{\textbf{f}4} 30.\textit{\textbf{f}1} \textit{\textbf{e}3}
31.\textit{\textbf{g}3} \textit{\textbf{g}5} has White in trouble
29...\textit{\textbf{e}3} 30.\textit{\textbf{g}3}
30.\textit{\textbf{a}xe3} looks to be the best try: 30...\textit{\textbf{e}xe3} 31.\textit{\textbf{f}xe3} and now 31...\textit{\textbf{g}3}. Mmmm! That looks strong, and so it should still go 0-1
30...\textit{\textbf{g}5} 31.\textit{\textbf{h}2}?!?
31.\textit{\textbf{a}g2} was best, then 31...\textit{\textbf{f}4} 32.\textit{\textbf{d}1} \textit{\textbf{e}c7} and 33.\textit{\textbf{f}3} seems to offer a fighting chance, until
33...\textit{\textbf{xf}2}! 34.\textit{\textbf{e}xe7} \textit{\textbf{a}xe7}
35.\textit{\textbf{a}xf2} \textit{\textbf{fxg}3}! and 0-1 looms again
31...\textit{\textbf{f}4}! 32.\textit{\textbf{h}1} \textit{\textbf{f}3} 33.\textit{\textbf{h}4}!
\textit{\textbf{h}5} 34.\textit{\textbf{a}xe3}

If 34.\textit{\textbf{d}3} \textit{\textbf{e}2}!
34...\textit{\textbf{e}xe3} 35.\textit{\textbf{g}1} \textit{\textbf{g}4} 0-1

In the second play-off game, which Shredder had to win with Black of course, Stefan's program got a good position from the opening.

At move 45 Vincent Diepseeven (the strongest player amongst the programmers there) believed he had found a forced win for Shredder, involving the exchange of queens. Shredder played a move which seemed plausible enough to everyone else, avoiding this exchange, and the game petered out into a draw, leaving Junior as the new \textbf{World Champion}.

We shall have to leave this interesting moment and our coverage of other games, including some exciting stuff from Brutus, until next time.

To close, here are the results of the \textbf{Simultaneous} given by GM Boris Alterman:

\begin{itemize}
  \item He beat Insomniac.
  \item And drew with Brutus, Goliath, NoonianChess and Shredder.
  \item And lost to Diep, Ikarus, IsiChess, ParSOS, Sjeng and XiniX.
\end{itemize}

As he helps with the programming of Junior, it was perhaps a bit much to expect Amir and Shay to let him have a go at that, under the watchful eyes of so many spectators!
HIARCS8 in ARGENTINA

The brave organisers of the Republica Argentina Chess Masters 2002 tournament in Buenos Aires were to be commended for deciding to ‘risk’ inviting another PC computer opponent. Last year’s famous victory by Chess Tiger, which won outright with a score of 9½/11 for a 2759 rating, would have put many off, I’m sure.

Nevertheless the massive extra publicity generated in terms of newspaper coverage and spectator interest makes it definitely worthwhile commercially, whilst the players made it known that they had fully prepared themselves to exact revenge this year!

The average rating for the tournament was 2427, with a GM norm requiring a score of 7½/10. Tournament 40/2 time controls were used, and well-known GM Oscar Panno was playing again, though he was 4th. Favourite behind HIARCS8 (on a P/1000 and rated as 2600), and GM’s Hugo Spangenberg and Sergio Slipak.

HIARCS started off slowly, with 1 win and 2 draws for a 2/3 start. In the next round things got worse, as Bernardo Roselli (2426) played some neat ‘anti-computer’ chess to beat ‘us’ in 57 moves.

This was followed by a draw against Panno, so at the half-way stage we were on a disappointing 50% with 2½/5.

At this point Mark Uniacke and I didn’t even know the tournament had started!

No-one had told us what the arrangements were, nor had ‘our’ operator Roberto Alvarez made any contact to discuss settings and preferences! By good luck I was paying my weekly visit to the ChessBase site, and this 2½/5 score was waiting there to greet me!

Although we were still unable to have any input into HIARCS’ involvement, it must have been aware that Mark and I were now logging-on to watch every day, as its results at last started to improve!

In its 6th game the unbeaten IM Pelikan was despatched in 33 moves, and then IM Scarella was undone even more quickly in 27.

The newspapers were back in business - they had front-paged the defeat to Roselli, but now wondered if, a point behind Panno, the PC program might still have an outside chance?!

At this point, the best day, (but computers don’t care!), HIARCS played an entertaining Blitz Simultaneous.

The time controls were a little hard on HIARCS: it played G/1 minute (!!!) whilst the humans had G/6 minutes + 3 secs per move!

So many people turned up to play that a second PC (a mere P/450) had to help out towards the end, to make sure no-one was disappointed!

HIARCS played all its games as White on the P/450, and went 13–0! On the P/1000 it was Black throughout, but went 57–0!!

Although the ‘all-comers’ naturally included some hobby players who came especially to ‘try their luck’, many of the opponents were from the Masters and other top events at the Congress. So if you consider the time control, this was some result!

Returning to the main event HIARCS beat Rodriguez with Black, and in 38 moves, in round 8, but a draw in round 9 against the tournament’s top-rated human, Spangenberg, meant it needed to win its last game... and both Roselli and Panno had to lose theirs for it to come top.

HIARCS did its bit, beating Granara in a superbly played endgame, but it was not enough!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pos</th>
<th>Final Table</th>
<th>Score/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roselli</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIARCS8, Panno</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rodriguez, Vatoaga</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Slipak</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spangenberg</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pelikan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Scarella</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Granara</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pagliala</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result earned HIARCS8 a 2578 Elo performance rating, but despite also achieving a GM norm, Mark and I were a little disappointed.

Disappointment turned to minor annoyance when we read the operator’s comments after the event: “One of the comments made by the participants was the poor opening selection made by HIARCS. When you use the optimal setting of the opening book the program always plays 1.d4 and gets closed positions, which are not the best ones for computers. Indeed the program is strong, but for playing humans its opening repertoire needs certainly to be revised”.

He apparently not only used the ‘fun book’ instead of our tournament book, but ‘learning’ which it had ‘gained’ from other games was overriding the correct preferences!

Presumably he forgot (or didn’t know how) to reset it and make it play properly from our chosen repertoire. Anyone with HIARCS8 and either the ChessBase ‘fun’ book or our own recommended one, will know well that the default is set to play 1.e4 and 1.d4 each 1/3rd. of the time, and 1.c4 and 1.Nf6 equally the other 1/3rd.
Reader's Letter!
ROY NEIL writes on HASH TABLES!!

Reader's Letter: HASH TABLES!

August 2002

Dear Eric,

Many thanks for issue 101, I've been a subscriber for many years and the magazine gets better all the time.

I always find the technical items of interest possibly as in an "earlier life" I was an assembler programmer on IBM mainframes.

These behemoths had nothing like the power of todays PCs, or the memory - the base model when I started had just 2 MB - but the operating systems supported multiple users and were basic and simple, and rewarded efficient coding.

For modern PCs and Unix systems hardware upgrades are cheap, and the emphasis is no longer for efficiency in commercial software, but for chess programmers this is still key.

So I noted your article on optimising hash tables (pages 18-19). You rightly state that too high a figure can cause swapping and this will create a swapping bottleneck.

However the inefficiency can start before this occurs - processing power is used scanning the tables, and the larger the dedicated table area the longer it takes!

I've proved this on a retired database server I have which has dual processors and 1 gigabyte of RAM. It's only an advantage to use vast amounts of this memory for very very long thinks, more time than I have got to spare.

A check with the Chessbase "Process Test Sets" using different hash table sizes will verify this.

However it won't indicate the optimum size! (.... please read that again! - Eric).

The tests sets proceed until the solution is found, and that won't necessarily correspond with your favoured time limit. Steven Lopez has written an interesting article on the Chessbase website and produced the following formula:

- "Hash size (MB) = [twice the processor speed (2 x MHz) multiplied by average think time (seconds)], divided by 1000".

However even this isn't the last word as the table size should surely depend on the nature of the engine used, for instance a fast searcher such as Fritz 5 will produce many more positions for hashing than a knowledge based program such as Hiarc3.

So the only constant about optimum hash table size is that it varies all the time, it depends on what program you have, what processor speed, how much RAM is available, and how long the program is going to think (including your time if permanent brain is on).

A further observation on my dual processor machine - though I don't possess Deep Anything, but Crafty can be used on one or more processors.

On the test sets I've found, it is generally faster with two processors than with one by anything from 10% up to 80%, but on some positions it was actually slower!

Now that is confusing!

Kind regards,

Roy Neil
ADVANCED CHESS

Advanced Chess is a relatively new form of chess in which a human and a computer join forces and play as a team against another human-computer pair.

It represents a high-tech approach to the game and some expect it will increase the level of play to heights never before seen in chess.

When available, after-game analysis by the competing players also gives the viewing public a unique insight into the thought processes of chess playing humans and computers.

Advanced Chess was conceived and introduced into the international tournament circuit by Garry Kasparov, who played the first public match against Veselin Topalov in June 1998.

The match was organised by Marcelino Sion in the city of Lyon, Spain. Since then Lyon has hosted three more Advanced Chess events, all of which were won by Vishy Anand.

ANAND - Advanced Chess CHAMPION!

Of course Anand’s successes came partly because he is an incredibly strong ‘super GM’ player.

But anyone who watched him during these matches will have also seen how very comfortable and fast he is using a PC, whether searching databases for games, results and new or popular lines, or checking out ideas with Fritz and Hiarcs, which he has previously declared to be his favourite programs. Indeed Anand makes little secret of the fact that he uses these ChessBase engines for preparation and practice.

If anyone is going to beat him, they will need to be similarly adept!

Background

For the first few hundred years since the invention of chess there were no machines capable of playing it. Even when there were, they were initially completely out-classed by all serious players and therefore obviously all IM’s and GM’s... but in very recent years the programs have made dramatic progress in playing strength.

One could well argue that this is mainly due to incredible improvements in sheer processing power - today’s Pentium 3 1000MHz PC machine is obviously massively more powerful that the old dedicated of the 1980’s and their 6502 processors running at 5MHz!

But there’s more to it than that! The programmers, once limited to 16K or 32K memory chips and having to restrict the programmed chess knowledge to fairly simple basics purely to fit it onto the chip, can now include as much knowledge as they want.

Of course they must carefully balance the subsequent loss of speed which adding knowledge always entails, but at 1000MHz that’s a pleasurable problem compared with the old days!

In addition enormous opening books are now built into the programs, PC RAM means that massive hash tables can be used during the game to store analysis to greatly speed up the search, and last but not least endgame tablebases help the programs to play far better endgames than they ever used to be able.

All this is on the proviso that the programmer has been able to re-write his program to incorporate all of the new possibilities... otherwise 'all you would have would be the old Fidelity, Mephisto, Novag and Saitek machines running 200 times faster!

Although a CD-based chess program on a decent PC is now able to beat the vast majority of human chessplayers nearly all of the time, it is worth noting that some players have responded by developing ‘anti-computer chess’ which is the human taking advantage of his awareness of aspects of the game (e.g. long term plans, statics, the slow build-up of a king attack, blocked pawn structure, excessive materialism) which the programs are still unable to understand or evaluate correctly.

And even more encouraging (so far!) is the fact that there is still an elite group of human players at the very top capable of beating the computer whilst still playing...
'normal' chess!

In fact at present these appear to still represent an almost insurmountable obstacle to what some had believed would, by now, have been the total dominance of computers at chess!

**Summary: Comparative Strengths**

Computers calculate at prodigious speeds. On a fast PC the strongest chess programs will generate and evaluate about 1,000,000 or more positions per seconds. With certain exceptions, in tactically complex positions they are superior to any human player. In the opening they can access unlimited knowledge from disk - tens of millions of tried and tested moves. In the endgame they use hash tables to search very deeply, and in certain restricted endings (with just five pieces on the board) they in fact possess total information and play absolutely perfect chess.

**Human strength**

Human masters look at only a very limited number of positions, compared to a computer.

But they are able to sort out the relevant from the irrelevant, recognise patterns which enable them to 'know' the right moves almost without analysing anything, look at meaningful moves instead of every nonsensical variation. Humans are able to judge the quality of a move in very long-term categories, formulate plans that go a long way beyond the horizons of even the fastest computers.

If a human chessmaster can survive the tactical onslaught of the machine, his strategical superiority will triumph, and sometimes it is even possible to prepare a tactical assault in a way in which the computer program is unable to recognise the dangers until it is too late.

Regular readers of **Selective Search** will have seen plenty of examples of these motifs, even recently, for example Tiger-Smirin in our last issue!

**Man AND Machine**

Because of their playing strength and general availability computers have begun to have a real influence on chess players of all categories.

Computers are being used to practise and train, to develop new opening plans, analyse complex positions, solve difficult endings. Owning a PC today is like having a GM at your personal and permanent disposal.

I don't know if all my readers have realised it, as I know (and am glad!) that many of you are keen hobby players rather than serious club or tournament attenders, but Computers have forced a change in the way serious chess tournaments are now conducted.

The old tradition of interrupting long games with an adjournment and completing them the next day, has had to be abandoned, as it has become possible to almost exhaustively analyse the position with the help of a computer, especially as adjournments often occurred as the endgame approached.

**How Advanced Chess should WORK!**

The game of Advanced Chess actually makes a virtue out of the reality of chess playing computers.

Both human players are equipped with a PC, which they can consult at will during the game. The rate of play in this annual event so far has been one hour for all the moves, so that the player must be careful to allocate his time well.

He can certainly flick through a database and check the win/draw/loss status of potential opening lines and variations, and enter ideas or possible variations for the
computer to analyse.

For example a player will execute a sequence of moves he would like to play on the
PC and then make the pro-
gram do a search to see
whether there are any (tacti-
cal) 'holes' in the plan.

The important aim of the
player is that the human-
computer partnership should
make him stronger than either
of their individual compo-
nents.

If I was playing, I would
need to recognise that Fritz,
Hiarcs, Junior or whichever is
stronger than I am, but I
should still be able to identify
a few occasions when I know
something they don't, and if I
can get that right, even I can
improve a little on their play!

With a very strong human
player, the reverse becomes
ture. He will be using the
computer's move selection
less frequently, being only
rarely swayed to the com-
puter's choice. It might hap-
pen occasionally, but mostly
he is using the machine to
check his ideas and plans
(maybe some 'wild' ones!)
rather than to choose moves,
and in this way the program
will help him improve his
play, though not by as much
as it would improve mine!

But when your name is Kas-
parov, Anand or Kramnik
you will want to spend time
pondering the position him-
self, while the computer is
checking the crucial vari-
ations, because you will al-
most certainly believe that
you know better! The human
is always in charge and
makes the final decision on
which move is made.

The importance of getting all
this right was probably seen
most clearly in the Anand-
Karpov Advanced Chess
Match.

Karpov was slow and un-
certain in his use of the com-
puter, often ran short of time,
and was soon behind in the
match.

As a result, at times, he
hardly used the computer at
all... but that didn't help either
because Anand certainly used
his and so had a clear advan-
tage throughout the match.

Displaying the thinking
process

A very attractive feature of
Advanced Chess on this oc-
casion was that, for the first
time, the public was able to
directly observe how top
Grandmasters use the PC's to
help them choose their
moves.

The monitor displays of
both players were projected
onto large overhead screens,
so that the audience could
follow every action of the
player.

As the match between Anand
and Kramnik started, my im-
mediate thought was that it
would perhaps indicate to
what degree Kramnik was
practised in his use of the PC!

With his important forth-
coming match against Deep
Fritz due to start in October,
one imagines he will have
been pretty busy using his lat-
est version of the program in
serious preparation for that.

The first 2 games were
drawn, so we will start with
game 3.

Kramnik - Anand

1...f3 d5 2.d4 e6 3.c4 dxc4
4.e3 c5 5...xe4 6.0-0 a6
7...b3 The idea of this
apparently unnecessary move
to that, if White played 7...c3
b5 pretty well forces 8...b3
7...cxd4 Okay, we might say,
so the bishop is on b3 either
way... but having put it here
voluntarily on move 7, if
Black had still played
7...b5?! then White now has
8.a4! and Black's pawns,
trying to thrust forward on
the queenside, will be
somewhat scattered
8.exd4

Is the isolated pawn strong or
weak – a question still
undecided and regularly
tested at GM level. I have 86
games on my database with
this position, including
Kramnik v Anand at last
year's Dortmund SuperGM
which this game follows until
move 13! White will usually
aim at creating a good
situation for pushing d4–d5,
and the more active his
pieces are when/if that
happens, the better his
chances should be
9...c3
10...g5 0-0 11...d2
12...c2 b5 13...d1?! A new
idea, bringing an end to both
Anand's preparation and the
information available on his
database. In their game last
year, Kramnik played 13...f4
here, and won in 39 moves. The next few moves in that game are of interest:
13...\text{a}7 now 14.\text{e}ad1 \text{\text{h}7}
15.\text{d}5! \text{\text{xd}5} 16.\text{\text{xd}5 exd}5
17.\text{\text{h}4\text{\text{z}}} An idea I would like to see tested is 13.\text{\text{d}3}\text{!}
In fact I think I might add it to the Hiarcs repertoire and see if we can try it out
against Fritz or Junior!
13...\text{\text{c}4} 13...\text{\text{h}7}\text{??} I was
tried by Hort last year against Epishin, but after 14.\text{\text{f}4 b}4 15.\text{\text{h}4}\text{!} \text{ missed}
by Epishin who played the weaker 15.\text{d}5?! \text{ infant}
analysed by others since!
15...\text{h}6 16.\text{\text{hx}6 gxh}6
17.\text{\text{x}h}6 \text{bxc}3 18.\text{\text{f}el Black}
has problems. If Eric
Hallsworth can find this on
his database in a few
moments, we can be sure that
Kramnik and Anand can with
their P4/2000 machines at
their side stuffed to the gills
with ChessBase software –
Kramnik thus playing
13.\text{\text{e}ad1} to set 'the trap', and
Anand to choose an
alternative line! 14.\text{\text{f}4 a}7
14...\text{\text{xb}2}\text{??} would have
been suicide: 15.\text{\text{xf}6 xf}6
16.\text{\text{e}4 with mate threat}
\text{\text{hx}7, so 16...g}6 and now
17.\text{\text{xa}8 xa}8 18.\text{\text{xd}1 leaves White with too much
material!} 15.\text{\text{e}5

15...\text{\text{c}7} Best I reckon. In the
Daily Telegraph, Malcolm
Pein wondered why Anand
hadn't tried 15...\text{\text{xb}2}\text{??}
Interestingly this was the first
choice of my latest Hiarcs
version, replaced only a
minute later by Anand's
actual move. Let's see what
would happen after the
capture on b2! 16.\text{\text{c}6}
\text{\text{xd}1. Here my favourite PC
program and Malcolm go
separate ways! Hiarcs, after
90secs, goes with 17.\text{\text{xd}1}
expecting 17...\text{\text{c}7 (if
17...\text{\text{c}7 18.\text{\text{xe}7+ xe}7
19.\text{\text{h}4 looks very ominous
for Black!} 18.\text{\text{xd}8 xc}3
19.\text{\text{h}7+ xc}7 20.\text{\text{c}6 with a good-looking
advantage and \text{\text{xe}7 for \text{\text{xc}3. Malcolm** – an IM
and friend, so I must be cautious!}
– goes with the immediate
queen capture 17.\text{\text{xd}8?}
\text{\text{xc}3} 18.\text{\text{f}3 xd}8 19.\text{\text{xc}3
\text{\text{d}5 and adds that this looks
fine for Black, with which
one must agree. Meanwhile Fritz
and Kavalek choose 17.\text{\text{h}4!}
h6 18.\text{e}4 xe4 19.\text{xe}7
and again White seems to
have a win from here.
Therefore I think that the
critical test of 15...\text{\text{xb}2 lies
in the Hiarcs idea of 17.\text{\text{xd}1
and/or Fritz's immediate

17.\text{\text{h}4, both of which look
good for White 16.\text{\text{xc}4
\text{\text{xc}4?! 16...\text{\text{xc}4 appears to
be better, so what put Anand
off? It's hard to know when
the players are accessing
Fritz, Junior, Hiarcs etc... i.e
was it something a program
found, or Anand's concern
over, say, 17.\text{\text{h}4 which
topped up dangerously in a
couple of the variations in my
previous note 17.\text{\text{f}6 \text{\text{f}6
18.\text{d}5! Marginalising
Black's c4 pawn which now
looks seriously weak 18...e5
Obviously giving Kramnik
the passed d-pawn is not a
pleasant choice to make, but
18...exd5?! 19.\text{\text{xd}5 \text{\text{b}7
20.\text{f}6+ \text{xf}6 21.\text{xf}6
gx6 22.\text{d}2 and White has
good chances because of the
damage to Black's pawn
structure 19.\text{\text{f}3 \text{\text{b}7
Looking for counterplay
down the b-file 20.\text{\text{e}4 \text{g}6
21.\text{\text{xc}4 \text{\text{xb}2

**I must tell you that I quite often
contact Malcolm Pein with com-
ments on his analysis in the Daily
Telegraph. His quick ability to rec-
nose and discuss my ideas, and
then explain his regularly correct
views never ceases to amaze me!
22.\text{h}b! Trapping the rook
22...\text{g}5 23.d6! As anticipated, the d-pawn is becoming a monster!
23...\text{e}6 24.\text{a}4 \text{xb}3
25.axb3 \text{b}6 26.\text{g}4

29...\text{xb}3 I'm sure Anand would have liked to relieve his queen of blocking duties, but 29...\text{c}7 30.\text{f}e1 \text{d}8 putting the rook in her place finds itself on the receiving end of 31.\text{e}8+!
\text{g}7 32.\text{x}d8 \text{x}d8 and the queen is back there after all
30.\text{x}f4 \text{h}8 31.\text{f}e1 \text{b}6
32.h4 \text{h}5 32...\text{bd}8 was the only alternative, but 33.\text{h}5! and White is making direct threats against the king!
33.\text{d}6 \text{c}5 34.\text{f}6 \text{f}5

26...\text{f}4?! Sets a little trap. I looked at rescuing the rook with 26...\text{xb}3?! but realised
27.\text{x}g5 \text{x}c3 28.d7! gets me one of my favourite comments... ooops! 27.\text{d}5
The trap?! 27.g3? appears to win the \text{f}, but 27...\text{e}3! and if 28.fxe3 \text{x}e3+ 29.\text{h}1
\text{x}c3 White is the one in trouble 27...\text{d}8 28.\text{xf}4
\text{xf}4 29.d7!

26...\text{f}4?! Sets a little trap. I looked at rescuing the rook with 26...\text{xb}3?! but realised
27.\text{x}g5 \text{x}c3 28.d7! gets me one of my favourite comments... ooops! 27.\text{d}5
The trap?! 27.g3? appears to win the \text{f}, but 27...\text{e}3! and if 28.fxe3 \text{x}e3+ 29.\text{h}1
\text{x}c3 White is the one in trouble 27...\text{d}8 28.\text{xf}4
\text{xf}4 29.d7!

Game 4 was drawn - here is game 5 with a few light notes.

\textbf{Kramnik - Anand}

1.d4 d5 2.c4 dxc4 3.\text{f}3 c6
4.e3 \text{f}6 5.\text{xc}4 c5 6.0-0 a6
7.dxc5 7.\text{b}3 was played in game 3 above 7...\text{xd}1
8.\text{xd}1 \text{xc}5 9.\text{bd}2 0-0
9...\text{bd}7 10.\text{e}2 \text{b}6 seems to get the better nod of approval nowadays
10.\text{e}2 \text{d}8 11.\text{b}3
b6 12.\text{b}2 \text{b}7 13.\text{ae}1? It's perhaps surprising that Kramnik didn't play 13.\text{e}5
\text{bd}7 14.\text{f}3 which is usual, and the resulting exchange of bishops on \text{f}3 makes it quite drawish, which would have suit him with being ahead in the match by 1 13...\text{bd}7
various threats, the main one being $\text{Bc7}$ and the knight at present has nowhere to run! So, in retrospect, Anand's move seems best even though it allows Kramnik to wreck his pawn structure. $25.\text{Bxf6}$
$\text{gxf6}$ $26.\text{Bxc5}$ $\text{bxc5}$

27.a4 $\text{Bb2}$ 28.$\text{Bxc5}$ $\text{Bxb3}$
29.$\text{Bc6}?!$ I think 29.$\text{Be2}$ is better, as here the bishop would afford White's king some protection from checks as it starts its advance. Incidentally, notice from our remark at move 22 that Black's bishop is still static on g6! 29...$\text{f5}!$ Finally extricating the aforesaid bishop. 30.$\text{Bxa5}?!$

With 30.$\text{exf5}$ $\text{Bxf5}$ 31.$\text{Bxa5}$ Kramnik would avoid the weak e-pawn he gets in the game, so his a-pawn might have had that bit better a chance to win the game.

30...$\text{fxe4}$ 31.$\text{fxe4}$ 31.$\text{Bxe4}$

$\text{Bxe4}$ 32.$\text{fxe4}$ $\text{Bb4}$ is pretty much the same, the bishops have just come off sooner 31...$\text{Bb4}$! Forcing an advance and weakening of the e-pawn as it goes beyond its king's reach. 32.$\text{e5}$ $\text{Bb4}$
33.$\text{Bxe4}$ $\text{Bxe4}$ 34.$\text{f2}$ $\text{Bg7}$
35.$\text{f3}$ $\text{Bb4}$

The draw is as good as achieved – White's king should not be able to advance as it will leave the g+h pawns vulnerable. 36.$\text{Ba7}$ $\text{Bb3}$+ 37.$\text{Bf4}$ $\text{Bb2}$! 38.$\text{Bf3}$ 38.$\text{g3}$ removes any chance of White's king finding a hiding place from perpetual check.

$38...\text{Bb4}+ 39.\text{Bf3}$ $\text{Bb3}+$ etc. $= 38...\text{Bb3}+ 39.\text{Bg4}$ $\text{Bb2}$
40.$\text{g3}$ $\text{Bb4}$ 1/2-1/2

With the final game also drawn Kramnik was left the winner by 3½-2½.

His whole demeanor during the contest made it very clear that he is totally at home with a PC and the various ChessBase products!!

Watch out Deep Fritz!

No doubt to promote interest, sponsorship and press coverage, and so that no-one belittles his task (Kasparov has stated that Kramnik 'should win easily', because he has had so much time with versions of Fritz in which to prepare), Kramnik insists that he really fears his forthcoming (October) match v DF!

Here are some of his comments during an interview with ChessBase supremo Frederic Friedel after the Advanced Chess match:

- "This form of chess is easier to play, because you have to just find
the right direction and the computer does the entire tactical work for you.

- It's a different kind of chess, and you spend less energy than in a regular game.

- How did you adapt for the match?
- I have worked with computer programs for many years already, so I know when to listen to it and when not. The main problem is that you have a limited amount of time. When you work and prepare you have as much time as you want. If a position is interesting you can spend half an hour on it. In these games you have to stop where you need to stop and continue where you need to continue. For instance in the second game in a very critical position where I could get an advantage with a precise move I played too quickly.

- Which was your best game?
- Games three and game five were my best games. In game five I played quite well and he made a couple of inaccurate moves. Then he got into serious trouble but he started to defend very well, which is what he usually does, even without a computer.

- How come there were five draws in this match?
- Well, I'm surprised that it was not six draws. It is very difficult to win a game in Advanced Chess, and I don't understand why there were so many decisive games in previous years. Even without a computer, as you know it is quite difficult to win a game against a player like me or Anand. Remember Mainz 2001, with eight draws out of ten. With a computer, which checks for blunders it is even more difficult. Against a player like Vishy to win one game is an achievement. I was close to winning two games, that that would have been a great success. Also with faster time controls there could be more decisive games, but of course that also means the standard of play is going down.

- What is your opinion of the level of play with a computer?
- Of course it is much higher than myself without the computer.

- How would you fare with the computer against a player like Leko, Topalov or Anand if they were not using a computer?
- I would win, of course, and the other way around also. I cannot give you an exact performance rating, but it makes a huge difference. In classical chess it would probably be less profitable, but even there it makes a serious difference. In one hour or 30 minute games it is absolutely decisive.

- Kasparov said (after the first Advanced Chess match) that Topalov with a computer would crush him without a computer.
- "Yes, I agree. I never tried it, and I wouldn't like to do so. Maybe somebody else can go for this experiment. I don't know about "crush". It depends on style. I think that my style is so solid that even if someone is playing with a computer I can fight. But only fight and lose with a respectable score.

- How about computers vs humans with computers? Do you think you could easily beat Fritz if you were allowed to use Fritz yourself?
- "Well, no question about that.

- How is your opinion of the level of play with a computer?
- Of course it is much higher than myself without the computer.

- How are your feelings about playing Fritz in Bahrain?
- I don't know really. I will start my preparations maybe in August. The experiment is quite difficult, psychologically. I still need to see the development of this program, what is going on there.

- You are watching the development, since you are getting new versions all the time. Do you see improvements?
- "I am sure there will be big improvements, because I can see that every new version is getting better and better, and I'm sure the Bahrain version will be better than the last commercial one. But that is not even the point. I know that it is going to be better, but I need to find out in what sense, in what kind of positions it is going to be better. That is very important to understand.

- What is the main weakness of Fritz?
- "Well, maybe after the match I will tell you (laughs).

- You don't want to help us now?
- "No, no. I think that Fritz is strong enough as it is (sniffs)."
NEW (soon) REBEL for Windows!
- Test Positions indicate IMPROVEMENT again!

As mentioned briefly in our last issue, Ed Schroder is now hard at work on a Rebel windows version!

Although the range of features in the DOS versions of Rebel is in many ways unparalleled, I am quite certain that people who never knew what the wonderful days of DOS were like (!), will find life with Rebel much easier when they can work in the true windows environment to which they are accustomed with 99% of their other applications. The higher screen quality and availability of proper printing options will be a bonus for everyone.

As I read the info. on the Rebel web site, all the DOS features (e.g. fast multi-position game analysis, the comprehensive internal thinking process visuals, and many other clever ideas) are retained, with various new ones added to provide even more available analytical information than ever!

Playing Strength

In addition to the new Windows environment, the program is also be stronger.

Ed’s current estimate is that this will be 33 Elo points.

This is gained partly from speed increases, but also (and more importantly for true chess strength) through improved understanding of king attacks.

Also further chess knowledge has been added, especially for strong square concepts and better passed pawn handling.

The new program - but in DOS version - is available for download for current Rebel Century owners on Rebel’s web site, so folk can test out the playing improvements for themselves. Pricing for RebelXP Windows will be announced as soon as possible.

New TEST SUITE

To demonstrate the types of position where the new tactical knowledge is having a big impact, the following positions were recently placed on the Rebel web site!

Clearly speed-ups alone cannot account for the huge timing improvements in many of these, and the new knowledge must be enabling Rebel to see these tactics at least 1 ply of search earlier!

In the timings given, RebXP is the new Rebel, and RC4 the current Rebel Century 4 version. I expect readers will want to see how other programs compare with these results - for comparison I’d guess they will have been running on something like a P1400-1800!

(1) Alekhine - Bxg6!

1.\xg6

An easy one to start with, though some programs may choose \xg2.
RebXP (0:01); RC4 (Bg2 after 10:00)
1...fxg6
2.hxg6 2...xd7; 1...xg6
2.xd7
3.e4 3...xf7 3...xc8 3...xc8
4.xf8 4...f8 5...e8 5...f5
6.xf8 6...xf8 7...c7 1-0

(2) Botvinnik - Ba3!

1...xa3 2...xa3
Now that the queen has been deflected from the defense we see White's aim!
RebXP (1:24) RC4 (3:32)
2...h5! gxh5 3...g5+ 3...f8
4.xf6+ 4...g8 5...f7+ 5...h8
6.g3 6...c1+ 7...e2 7...b2+
8...h3 8...h6 9...e7 1-0

(3) BS2830 - 0-0!

1...0-0!
1...e7 2...xd5 2...f8 3...f1
is not as convincing, though
Black should still win
RebXP (0:22) RC4 (2:36)
2...d8 2...f2+ 2...h3 d6+!
4.e6! 4...f4+! 5...g4 5...xe6
and it's all over!

(4) CCC - Rxb3!

1...xh3
Your program may choose
1...fxe4 2...f2 2...h6, as does
Hiares, and it's also good but
not as quickly decisive as
RebXP (0:22) RC4 (1:45)
2...xb3 fxe4!
Not 2...f4? which looks
very attractive but wins nothing after 3.gxf4 as far as I can see
3...f2 3...e5 b5 0-1!

(5) Combination - Nb4!

1...Nb4
Hiares doesn't get this in
any sort of reasonable time,
but Fritz7 does okay
RebXP (0:19) RC4 (2:13)
2.exb4 axb4 3.a3 3...f6 0-1

(6) Combination - Bf8!

1...f8!
RebXP (0:32) RC4 (2:36)
This is a great move, the
star in this series of positions
as far as I am concerned.
Hiares, for example, chooses
1...g5, but I haven't had
chance to see if any other
programs find Rebel's choice
this quickly! After 1...g5
1...g7 2...xf6 exf6 3...xd6
4...xd6 4...xd6 will also win
for White, but definitely take
much longer and require
some hard work!
1...xf6 2...xh8+ 2...xh8
3...h6+ 3...g8 4...h1!
That settles it!
4...h5 5.gxh5 1-0
1...\text{\texttt{Exa3!}}
This is deadly. \textit{RXP} (0:19) \textit{RC4} (5:37)
Alternatives are tempting.
Hiarcs chooses 1...\texttt{Exh5} and it seems almost the same;
2.\texttt{Exh5} \texttt{Exa3} 3.\texttt{bxa3} \texttt{Exa5}
4.\texttt{Ed3} \texttt{Exa3}+ but note that now the king can escape
the other way with 5.\texttt{Ed4} \texttt{a1}+ 6.\texttt{Ec2} which is very different to
having to interpose the bishop and Black still has work to do to obtain
the win 2.\texttt{bxa3} \texttt{Exa5} 3.\texttt{Ed3}
\[\text{if} 3.\texttt{Exf7+ H8054} 3...\texttt{d8}
4.\texttt{Eh2} \texttt{xb2} 5.\texttt{xb2} \texttt{Ee4} \text{is 0-1}
3...\texttt{Exa3}+ 4.\texttt{Ed1}
4.\texttt{Ed1} \texttt{a1}+ 5.\texttt{Ec1} \texttt{b2}!
wins]
4...\texttt{Ed4}
or 4...\texttt{Exf5}, both are 0-1

(8) ECM testsuite - \text{Rxe5!}

1...\texttt{Exe5!}
\textit{RebXP} (0:05) \textit{RC4} (0:39)
2.\texttt{dx e5}

(9) Judith Polgar - \text{Nd5!}

1.\texttt{Ed5}
\textit{RebXP} (2:26) \textit{RC4} (6:31)
Hiarcs (on my P1000)
needed 7mins to find this,
having started with 1.\texttt{gxh7+}.
In truth after 1...\texttt{Exh7} 2.\texttt{g6}
\texttt{Exh4} 3.\texttt{Ed3} Black also wins I believe
1...\texttt{dx e5} 2.\texttt{Exd5}+ \texttt{Ed8}
3.\texttt{gxh7} \texttt{Ed7} 4.\texttt{Ed4} 1-0

(10) Kasparov-Deep Blue - \text{Bxh7+!}

1.\texttt{Exh7+!}
\textit{RebXP} (1:46) \textit{RC4} (9:56)
Kasparov couldn't bring himself to risk this in his
match against Deep Blue, and you can understand why!!
Instead he played 1.a3 and won anyway
1...\texttt{Exh7} 2.\texttt{Ed5}+ \texttt{Ed8} 3.\texttt{Ed5}+
and Black has won 0-1

(11) Smyslov - \text{dxc4!}
(gxh5? To be avoided)

1...\texttt{dxc4!}
\textit{RebXP} (0:37) \textit{RC4} (gxh5?
after 10:00)
Hiarcs also finds this in
around 45secs on my P1000.
The interesting thing is
that it and other programs
only show 1...\texttt{gxh5} as a
draw, but as I understand it,
that is supposed to lead to a
win for White.
Presumably 2.\texttt{Exh5} \texttt{Ee8}
follows, but I have to admit I
couldn't find the win from
here! 3.a4 is one idea,
threatening to put the bishop
on a3 but Hiarcs viewed \texttt{Ed6}
as an adequate response for
the draw.
Fritz preferred 3.\texttt{Ed6}, but
also anticipates a draw. I
guess I need to get the new
Rebel to sort the win out!
Of course even if 1...\texttt{gxh5}
does draw and not lose,
1...\texttt{cx e4} is still better as it
wins!
2.\texttt{Exh6} \texttt{Exb3} 3.\texttt{Eh3} \texttt{Ed5}+!
and Black has won 0-1
Having FUN with UCI Engines!

I've been intending for ages to do a short article on either Winboard or UCI engines. In fact a couple of readers volunteered about a year ago to do something on the Winboard front for me, but nothing has been forthcoming (shame on you!).

However UCI-Protocol is really easy to use, so I can do that myself!


The intention is that both it and Winboard provide a standard interface for chess programmers to use, so that they can concentrate their work on the engine and its playing strength, and leave the graphics and features to the provided interface.

Indeed the UCI-Protocol for engines has been available within the last couple of Shredder versions using Stefan's own interface, but there has been a real shortage of engines to make use of it!

Generously however, the UCI-Protocol can be used by anyone without any license fees, both privately and commercially, and as soon as ChessBase took it up, the engines started to arrive!

This is a boost for programmers as well as end-users like us, as they now have an environment in which they can play engine-engine matches between their programs, which obviously helps them to evaluate attempted improvements (real or imagined!).

What Do You Need?!

Fritz7 with the 21/1.2002 update pack or Hiarc8. If you have Fritz7 you can always get the upgrade pack from the ChessBase web site, or just download UCI.zip which contains the vital latest version of the UCI.dll file. Please note that even with the new UCI.dll, this will still only work in Fritz7, Shredder6, or Hiarc8.

What Must You Do?

Anyone with a smattering of Windows knowledge - that's me! - and an Internet connection can soon get the job done. I'll tell you where to get some engines and what is available already in a moment.

First you need to do a bit of preparation:
- Create a folder on your hard drive in the ProgramFiles\ChessBase directory. Call this folder Engines.UCI
- The engines you download from the ChessBase site will execute automatically, so once you have done the above, you just download your engine/s files, drop them straight into c:\Program Files\ChessBase\Engines.UCI and then double-click on the .exe file there, and it will install itself! Just like that! If you go into your Fritz7 update or Hiarc8, and click on Engines, you'll find the engine/s you've just installed already there and ready to play chess!
- For other engines you will need to have an Unzip program such as WinZip. Two engines I have found are LambChop and SelSearch

reader Steve Maughan's Monarch. There's a bit more work to do for these, but it is still very easy!
- The downloads are zip files, which I put in a separate directory called Unzipped - it's a home for all my zip files, so I know where to find them. Double click on, say, Monarch.zip and by following the WinZip instructions you'll have a nice Monarch sub-directory with all the unzipped files placed in it. Simply move the complete directory, in this case Monarch with any sub-directories, straight into c:\Program Files\ChessBase\Engines.UCI
- Now go back into Fritz/Hiarc, click on Engines on the MenuBar across the top, and there click on Create UCI Engine. Use Browse get yourself to c:\Program Files\ChessBase\Engines.UCI\Monarch\ etc.
narch until you see the Monarch.exe file and click on that. You will know ChessBase has understood this, as in grey print in 2 boxes below the one showing Monarch.exe, you’ll see the full program name Monarch 2002-04c and then the programmer’s name, in this case Steve Maughan.

- Click OK, and you’re done. If you hit F3 to go to your list of engines, you’ll see Monarch already nicely in place.

If you’ve also got Crafty and Comet as suggested in the last issue of SelfSearch, you’ll now have quite a range of programs, with varying playing strengths and styles, to play against or use in addition to your purchased F7/H8/S6 versions.

Where To Get The Programs

- The ChessBase site is www.chessbase.com
- Once there click on Downloads which you’ll find towards the right on the bar running across the top of your screen.
- Once you’re in Downloads, click Engines to get Crafty and Comet (48 is there now, and better than 41 or 46!)
- UCI-Engines to get Pharaoh, Sjeng and Tao - and maybe others by the time you read this.
- You can also get UCI.zip from this page if you need it.
- For LambChop your best way is to get it from within the ChessBase site! Along the top where you found Downloads, you should see Support. Click on that, and the next page you find will have a list down the left-hand side which will include T-Notes 2002.
- Click on that, and then scroll down the next page you’re given to find Electronic T-Notes for 2002
- INSTALLING UCI ENGINES. Click on that and you’ll get Steve Lopez’s comprehensive version of an article similar to this, which is mainly why I’ve sent you by this route, as it is well worth reading and/or printing out for yourself for reference. In paragraph 4 there’s a link marked Peter’s homepage. This will take you to Peter McKenzie’s web site... he is the author of LambChop and this is where you can get the LambChop.zip file!
- For Steve Maughan’s Monarch, go to www.stevemaughan.com and you’ll see the link to Monarch Chess on the left-hand side. Steve also has a mean Othello program you can download free from his site!

You’re Not On The Web, Or It Sounds Like Too Much Hard Work!

Honestly it’s easy! But if you’d like all the files without the Internet hassle, so you just have to follow the installing and unzipping procedures, then send me £10 (cheques or cash only), and I’ll copy the latest versions of everything you need onto a couple of floppies, and post them off to you first class.

Currently these files are:

Disk 1
- UCL.dll to copy into Fritz7 if you don’t have the update or H8 52KB
- Setup pharaon.exe 357KB
- Setup sjeng.exe 213KB
- Setup taal.exe 619KB
- Monarch.zip 637KB

No picking & choosing, please - it’s all or nothing!
### RATING LISTS and NOTES

A brief guide to the purpose of each of the HEADINGS should be helpful for everybody.

**BCF.** These are British Chess Federation ratings. They can be calculated from Elo figures by (Elo - 600) / 8, or from USCF figures by (USCF - 720) / 8.

**Elo.** This is the Rating figure which is in popular use Worldwide. The BCF and Elo figures shown in SELECTIVE SEARCH are calculated by combining each Computer's results v computers with its results v humans. I believe this makes our SeiSearch Rating List the most accurate available for Computer Chess anywhere in the world.

**+-**. The maximum likely future rating movement, up or down, for that particular machine. The figure is determined by the number of games played and calculated on standard deviation principles.

**Games.** The total number of Games on which the computer's or program's rating is based.

**Human/Games.** The Rating obtained and total no. of Games in Tournament play v rated humans.

---

**A guide to PC Grading:**

- **386-PC** represents a program running on an 80386 at approx. 33MHz with 4MB RAM.
- **486-PC** represents a program running on an 80486 at between 50-66MHz with 8MB RAM.
- **Pent-PC** represents a program on a Pent1/Pent2/MMX/K6 at approx. 150MHz, with 16-32MB RAM.
- **P3-PC** represents a program on a Pentium3/K7 at approx. 450MHz, with 64MB RAM.

**Users** will get slightly more (or less!) if their PC speed is significantly different. A doubling in MHz speed = approx. 40 Elo; a doubling in MB RAM = approx. 3-4 Elo.

### Comp-v-Comp GUIDE, if Pentium3/450 = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quod Pent3/500</th>
<th>Dual Pent3/500</th>
<th>Pent Pro2K6-Celra/300</th>
<th>Pent/150</th>
<th>48DX4/100</th>
<th>48DX5/X/33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80 Pentium3-K7/1000</td>
<td>40 Pentium3-K7/450</td>
<td>40 Pent Pro2/MMX/K6/733</td>
<td>100 Pent/100</td>
<td>180 PentDX2/66</td>
<td>260 386DX/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>-300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Krasnoy - Deep Fritz match has been put back to December as planned.

A GLAMOUR-QRI LAST PLAIN COMMON SENSE??
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