As well as wishing all my readers a Happy CHRISTMAS this year I can offer a strong recommendation for a really good Christmas present idea - the great FRITZ 8! Out early December @ £39.95.

■ 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.
CHESS COMPUTERS and PC PROGRAMS... the BEST BUYS!

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 UK folk.

Adaptors are £9 extra, Subscribers Offer - buy from Countrywide and deduct 5% off dedicated computer prices shown here.... mention 'SS' when you order.

■ PORTABLE COMPUTERS [port]
Kasparov

BRAVO - new £49, Barracuda program!

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

COSMOS £99 - great value, 4¼"x4¼" 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 touch.

■ TABLE-TOP PRESS SENSORY [as]
Kasparov

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

CENTURION £79 - Barracuda '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 procam, good hobby computer + teaching

Mephisto

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

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

■ WOOD AUTO SENSORY [as]
Mephisto

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

with MAGELLAN - Atlanta program £749

■ PC PROGRAMS from CHESSBASE on CD
All Win & run INDEPENDENTLY + analyse within CB7/8. Great graphics, big databases+opening books, printing, move features.

FRITZ 8 £39.95 - by Franz Morsch. Extra chess knowledge for real top strength - a magnificent program! Superb Interface, 'net connection, terrific Graphics. Excellent in both analysis and play, game/diagram printing. Good hobby levels, set your own Elo, many helpful features.

DEEP FRITZ 7 (81) £75 - new "7" program! for single, dual & quad processors, giving GM strength on multi-processor machines. The program which drew 4-4 with Kramnik!


TIGER 14 £39 - by Christophe Theron. Features for play analysis, printing etc. Timed play + book features

Tiger 14.0 is very strong and 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 2003 £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 Suurballe'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! £29

■ PC DATABASES on CD

CHESSBASE 8.0 for Windows £99!!
The most popular and complete Games Database system, with the very best features. 2.3 million games, players encyclopedia, multimedia presentations, search trees, statistics, superb printing facilities and much more, inc. 3 recent ChessBase magazines on CD! This is the business!

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

Firstly a quick “thank you” to the folk who replied with some good ideas and encouragement, following my comments in the last issue relating to the work pressure and problems associated with keeping Selective Search running.

I’ll be thinking through these in the New Year. I should say that, helpful though the responses really are - and I appreciated that nearly all indicated they’d be willing to pay more for the magazine - they represented only 10% of the readership!

What the other 90% would do if I stuck up the prices, it’s hard to know.

But there’s a lot to cover in this Issue, so we need to get started.

To everyone who reads this Issue:
I wish you a very happy CHRISTmas and a good NEW Year in 2003!

New TIGER 15!
As mentioned briefly in our last issue, Lokasoft have now added to their own Chess Partner range many of the products previously distributed by Ed Schroder.

As a result Christophe Theron’s new Tiger 15 has been produced by them, and is now available on CD for all Windows environments!

The previous versions Gambit Tiger 2 and Chess Tiger 14 have been continually placed in the top 3 or 4 places on our Rating List ever since their launch by ChessBase, so I expect this newest version to be well in the running for the top spot!

Lokasoft reckon the engine is about 50 Elo stronger than the previous version, and though this is likely to prove a bit optimistic, it is interesting to note that this CD has one engine rather than two! Theron’s aim has been to ‘combine the strong points of the previous Gambit and Chess Tiger versions’.

For those who like the Gambit style, there are 4 playing styles available within the engine options.

Other improvements:
- Improved search algorithm
- Improved evaluation function
- New enhanced opening book
- Supports tablebases, includes 3 + 4 and some 5, and will use Nalimov’s from ChessBase
- Support for Winboard and UCI engines

To save readers wondering, it is NOT ChessBase compatible, so only runs under its own steam, but it will import cbf (old ChessBase format), pgn and epd files.

The price incl p+p is £46.95, but if you already have Rebel11 or Gandalfr installed, we can send an upgrade CD for £36.95.

Lokasoft show some of their own test results:
Tiger 15 v Fritz7 10½-9½
Tiger 15 v Deep Fritz 7 5½-4½
Tiger 15 v Deep Fritz 6 6½-3½
Tiger 15 v Hiarc8 5½-4½
Tiger 15 v Junior7 7-3
Tiger 15 v Junior6 5-5
Tiger 15 v Shredder6 10½-9½
Tiger 15 v Tiger 14 6-4
Tiger 15 v Gambit Tiger2 7-3
Tiger 15 v Crafty 18.15 7½-2½

I’d guess that, if our readers, the SSDF and everyone else reproduced figures like that, Tiger 15 would go top... We shall have to wait and see!

Results from Frank HOLT
We saw some of Frank’s results in our last Issue, which enabled an interesting comparison between Hiarc 7 and 8.

His latest results are designed to do much the same, but comparing his P2/800 table results with those from the faster Athlon 1800 throws up another interesting variation!

P2/800. Game in 2 hours
Double Round All-Play-All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pos</th>
<th>prog</th>
<th>score/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fritz7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Junior7</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crafty 18.11</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gambit Tiger 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hiarc 732</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now compare this result!:

Athlon 1800. G/2hrs
Double Round All-Play-All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pos</th>
<th>prog</th>
<th>score/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gambit Tiger 2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hiarc8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fritz7</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nizmo 732</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Crafty 18.15</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So on the P2/800 Fritz7 wins easily, whilst Gambit Tiger gets a rare bad result, and the older Hiarc also struggles.
But on the Athlon/1800 Fritz7 drops, Gambit and Chess Tiger almost swap places, Hiarc8 does very well, and the upgraded Crafty 18.15 performs worse than its predecessor.

Of course small sample effects may be considered a possible culprit - though it’s an excuse which can be overused, especially when a result doesn’t suit the writer!

Frank also sent me his solution to Bill Reid’s position no.9 from issue 101. I am sorry, Frank, that I couldn’t include it during my desperate attempts to find a computer I could use that worked, when getting our last issue to the printing stage!

I only found time to read your solution properly after I’d taken everything to the printers, and lo and behold, yours was almost exactly the same as my proposed alternative to Bill’s own analysis!

But along with his solution Frank sent another very interesting position with a slightly similar theme.

The PC programs gobble this one up, but it’s still worth checking out. It’s from an ancient game, Sieglen-Gawehn, 1994, and it’s White to play:

1.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{x} f7}}}

which leaves him 2 pawns down, so... he resigned?

1-0

However after

1.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{x} f7}}}

... This is the move which should be marked ?? Black has:

1...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{b} b1+}}++ 2.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{g} g2 \textit{h} h1+}}}

3.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{x} h1}}}

Or 3.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{h} h3 \textit{f} f1+ 4.\textit{g} g4 \textit{g} g5+}}}

5.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{x} h5 \textit{h} h3#}}}

3...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{f} f3+ 4.\textit{g} g1 \textit{d} d1+ 5.\textit{e} e1}}}

\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{e} e1#}} 0-1}

So 1.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{x} f7?}} won, but it should have lost!

Finally:

1.\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{a} a8!}}}

should probably win in its own right, though it wouldn’t be all that easy:

1...\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{b} b6 2.\textit{e} e8+ 3.\textit{g} g6+}}}

\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{c} c6+}}}

\texttt{\textit{\textbf{\textit{d} d6 4.\textit{e} e6+ \textit{e} e2 5.\textit{g} g2 \textit{f} f5}}}

6.\texttt{\textit{e} e8}

And White has good chances

Carl Bicknell decides a lot has happened in 8 years!

Carl has sent me an interesting e-mail, following a 3 program all-play-all match he has completed using 2 PC’s: a Celeron/1000 and P3/933.

“They produce an almost identical node count,” says Carl. “The time control was G/30. It seems a pity that only G/60 or more counts for computer grading purposes, because modern PCs at G/30 search deeper than a 386/33 left on overnight!”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F7</th>
<th>H8</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fritz 7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hiarc8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Genius 3</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Car: “Hiarc8 looks like Nimzowitch and often strangled Genius with all sorts of subtle positional squeezes.

I’ll send you some games later. Just occasionally the subtle route petered out into nothing so Genius was able to grab a few draws and a win.

“However Genius just couldn’t cope with Fritz at all. Fritz7 seems incredibly good in sharp unbalanced positions where it plays very direct aggressive chess. Fritz strove for these positions and nearly every one of its wins was concluded by an attack against the Genius king!

“All programs were optimally set. Hiarc8 used your own downloaded book, whilst Fritz and Genius used their own books... and these were all reset before the matches to make sure they played as intended.

“I’m greatly surprised that Genius was despatched so easily - at one time people were saying that it might be hard to improve on the program, and others say that current improvement is only coming from hardware, but this match has opened my eyes as to how much has happened in the last few years!”

“I continued the Fritz7 - Hiarc8 match through to 20 games, and the final score was 11½-8½”. Regards, Carl

Paul Walsh: Hiarc8 v Fritz

As we’re on Hiarc8 v Fritz, it’s worth mentioning that Paul told me recently that he’s in the middle of a match between this pair, using at 40/90 time control. I admire that patience of folk who still stick to playing the longer games!

Anyway, for this match Paul has Hiarc8 on its Aggressive setting, and currently it leads by 5-2, though F7 had an advantage in game 8 that might peg the score back to 5-3.
Of course Mark Uniake and I do test our various settings quite carefully from time to time. But you can't run every 60 game test match with different versions and settings or you'd never get anything done.

The last time we tested the Solid and Aggressive variations in the run-up to the Hariacs8 release, we found that Solid was definitely down on the Normal style, but Aggressive was quite close.

However, going through the games it seemed that Hariacs was sometimes just a bit too sharp for its own good, so we stayed with Normal. I must admit that some other king safety changes were made by Mark after this, and before the release, so it is just possible that these alterations had a particularly good effect on the Aggressive setting, which we didn't test again.

Maybe other readers might care to see if it's possible we sent Hariacs8 out and missed the best default playing style!? We'll certainly make sure we check it ourselves carefully before the Bareev match (see news on this later) and an eventual Hariacs9?

Charles Palmer and DEEP Fritz7

Charles recently purchased the new Deep Fritz7 from me, and quickly sent in his first result.

Before I show it I note that the advertising blurb tells us that the new coding in DF7, in advancing the chess knowledge of the original single processor Fritz7, makes it stronger on all machines! Yes, that's right... on all machines. For the new Deep version will actually run fine on both single and multi (2, 4 or 8) processor PC's!

However, there have been some moans and groans on the Internet sites complaining that the version is not performing as well as Fritz7 did, when used on single processor machines.

Bearing in mind that Fritz7 costs £39.95, and Deep Fritz7 costs £74.95, this is a valid complaint if true! That said, Harald Faber's scores which follow shortly show it doing just fine!

Obviously if you've got a multi-processor, then DF7 is the program for you.

It will probably prove to be at least maybe 80 or even 100 Elo stronger than the previous Deep Fritz (6) version.

And, in producing a 1.8x speed-up on dual processor machines - on quad machines it's approx. 3x - it will clearly be much stronger than Fritz7 could be when running on any multi processor units.

But if you're a single processor owner, as are most of us, then you may want to exercise a little caution!

As always the programmers have to try and balance the relationship between speed and knowledge, so maybe the extra knowledge in the new Deep Fritz7 suits the multi-processors with their extra speed, but not necessarily the single variety.

Charles Palmer, G/5+4 Dual P3/1200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DJ</th>
<th>HB</th>
<th>/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep Fritz7</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>11½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Junior 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hariacs8</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5¼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is an obviously excellent result for the new Deep Fritz7 program.

Roy Quinn

Roy was amongst the many who kindly wrote encouraging me to keep SelSearch going 'in some shape or form... the Internet has a lot to answer for!' :-)

He also sent me some results from his own games against various PC programs.

I'm not going to print all the scores - Roy has had a hard time scoring points, from 51 games only 7 draws so far... well you will buy yourself an AthlonXP/1800 Roy!

But one result and his comments were of particular interest:

Quinn v Hariacs8 2-15

"The first 10 game match finished 2-8, with 2 of the draws in only 14 and 16 moves respectively. This match was played without Eric's book and the short draws were at Hariacs' own instigation due to the eccentric ChessBase book.

"I proved this when I downloaded your book, Eric, and the lines could not be played. As you can calculate for yourself, the next 7 games with your book have all been losses, in fact crushing defeats!

"For the first time in my computer-playing career, a draw now seems like a good result!"

Harald FABER

Deep Fritz7 is also included in some of Harald's latest test, as is the recently released Chessmaster 9000.

So here are his results involving these 2 programs, all matches played on 2 almost identical 1500-1600 MHz PC's.

Deep Fritz7-Cmaster 9000 13½-6½
• Deep Fritz7 - GamTiger2 25-15
• Cmaster 9000-Shredder6 7½-12½
• Cmaster 8000-Hariacs8 7½-12½
Gerhard Sonnabend

Always hard at work, the latest result table from Gerhard is a new 40/2 Turny which is very similar to the tournament previously shown in SelSearch involving even more programs.

But the re-run used the Fritz7 upgrade version P7.007 downloaded from the ChessBase web site, and was run on his P4/1600 PC instead of the dual P3/800.

Fritz7.002 (111/180) won the previous event, with Hiarcs8 (101) 2nd. & Junior7 (96½) 3rd. Fritz wins again, but this time Hiarcs does less well, and just look at Junior!

Sonnabend
40/2 on P4/1600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pos</th>
<th>prog</th>
<th>score/60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fritz 7.007</td>
<td>35½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The King 3.12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hiarcs 8</td>
<td>28½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gandalf 5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shredder 6 Paderborn</td>
<td>26½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Junior 7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be clearly seen, Tiger got very close to Fritz this time, mainly because it won their individual match by 6½-3½.

The Junior7 result (the latest version is the new World Champion!) was a shock: it went down 2½-7½ to The King, and 3½-6½ to Fritz!

New... Genius 7 from Richard Lang!

It was a really nice surprise to read on the Internet a few weeks ago that Richard has a new Genius 7 version.

He tells me it is much the same as Genius5/6 but with some improvements, so I am sure Genius fans of old will be keen to have a copy.

Of course Chess Genius will always hold its own place in history due to its Speed Match victory by 1½-½ over Gary Kasparov, when the latter was at the height of his powers!

To get it you will first need to download the ChessGenius Classic file from Richard’s site.

It will work on Win98, NT, ME, 2000 or XP.

The initial version you get will have some time and function limitations, but will come with appropriate registration information. Once you e-mail Richard with your name and payment details, or send him a cheque (only £15.50), then he will let you have a registration code to unlock the whole program.

- For web download: http://www.chessgenius.com
- Snail mail: Richard Lang, Lang Software Ltd 31 Clifton Rd, Poole BH14 9PW

Ruffian & Genius!

Before leaving the subject of Chess Genius it is appropriate to mention a new UCI-Winboard engine!

I had an article on these last month, with regard to how they can be obtained and installed for use with Fritz7, Hiarcs8 & Shredder6.

Since that article a new program called Ruffian has come to my attention!

This downloads as a zip file and can be used as a UCI engine within the above ChessBase programs, in the same way as the LambChop and Monarch zip engines.

But Adrian Millet’s web site for his Sage draughts and Richard’s Genius also explains how the Ruffian engine can be used within Genius in Winboard format!

I can’t believe Ruffian will stay free for long! It is strong!

In fact in my tests - admittedly a small sample of 10 games and at a fast G/6mins +4secs per move - Ruffian actually beat Genius with a bit to spare! It beat Pharaoh with great ease (see next result for the relevance of that) and only Fritz7 (7-3) and Hiarcs8 (6-4) put it slightly in its place!

The French Championships

This 12 program all-play-all event, played at the unusual G/20mins +5secs per move so it could be completed within 2 full days, caused something of a surprise.

Glance down at the final table, and you’ll see some quite well known names.

2002 French Comp Champs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>Proc</th>
<th>/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chess Wizard</td>
<td>Athlon 1750</td>
<td>9½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pharaoh 2.6</td>
<td>Athlon 1666</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chinito</td>
<td>Athlon 1550</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 15</td>
<td>P3/1000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Capture</td>
<td>Athlon 1200</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dester 2</td>
<td>P3/750</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BB Chess</td>
<td>Athlon 1800</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Small C</td>
<td>Athlon 2100</td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chess Christy</td>
<td>P3/533</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certainly Chess Wizard by Louquet has been seen near the top in various tournaments before - a surprise that it has never become commercially available. You may remember the programmer as he produced the famous Louquet Test a few years ago.

Chinito, Dragon, and The Crazy Bishop are also well known... ooh! And did you see that in passing - Chess Tiger 15. It’s a pity Chess Tiger wasn’t on the same hardware as the top 4 - it would have been interesting to see if that would have
saved it from its 2 defeats, against Chinito and Pharaon.
Pharaon2.62 by Frank Zibi is the same UCI engine mentioned in SelSearch102.

It would seem that Pharaon, Crafty and now Ruffian are the 3 challengers for the title of top free software. But in my tests Ruffian beat Pharaon easily (5-1), and I heard from someone else that it had comfortably beaten Crafty as well. A little 3-way Tournament needs to be played before the next issue of the magazine, I think!

Hiarc8* to play Bareev!
The * by Hiarc8* is to let you know that we have permission to play our latest and best when we meet the highly rated Evgeny Bareev at the end of January. The current version no. is 8.091!

This is the annual 4 game 40/2 match at Maastricht. In previous years Ed Schroder's Rebel has represented the computer chess world, but this time Hiarc steps into the limelight against Bareev who, at 2726, is rated 7th in the World on the latest FIDE list!

Mark Unicke and I (mainly Mark!) are still at work on Hiarc8 and are already nicely on the way towards a Hiarc9.

We have some more interesting ideas we want to try out, and then a technique Mark has found which will give the program a nice little speed-up - this to be applied when everything else is in place!

Hopefully it can come out as a Hiarc9 to co-incide with or be just after the match!

Gerhard Sonnabend
A Ruffian Update
I might have known that Gerhard would be quick off the mark when news of Ruffian started spreading.

I paid a quick visit to his web pages 'just in case' and there indeed was his latest Shareware Program tourny, with Ruffian already playing!

The time control is 40/40 + G/30 finish, 20 games each match. The tournament is particularly useful as Gerhard has included the commercial Nimzo8 to provide us with a useful benchmark! Also Goliath3 will be added to the tournament in due course.

After 6 rounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ruffian 1.0.1</td>
<td>21½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nimzo 8</td>
<td>64½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Artstoch 4.4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pharaon 2.62</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tog-5.4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Crafty 18.15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, Ruffian is right where I’d thought it might be and, from these figures, would probably be somewhere close to 2600 Elo on our Rating List.

Nimzo in 2nd. is just above some other promising amateur programs, including Pharaon which is nicely placed having played both Nimzo and Ruffian. But what’s happened to Crafty?

Gerhard has also completed a Blitz G/10min + 2sec tourney. The winner was again Ruffian, just 3½ points ahead of Nimzo this time, with List 3rd. and Gromit 4th.

Fritz8!
I can tell already, that this will cause some confusion! Nevertheless, a new Fritz8 will be out in early December, just in time for your Christmas stocking!

In the distance the recent purchasers of DeepFritz7 are screaming! But it's okay!

I think ChessBase would have been wiser to call the new DeepFritz7, which came out to co-incide with the Kramnik match, DeepFritz8. Because basically that’s what it certainly is.

Here is the recent Fritz series:

- 11/1999 Fritz6
- 11/2000 Deep Fritz (which contained the Fritz6 program, but for running on multi-processors only)
- 11/2001 Fritz7
- 09/2002 Deep Fritz7 which contained the new, and therefore Fritz8 program, for the Kramnik match. This release runs on both single and multi-processors
- 11/2002 Fritz8 which is clearly advertised as containing the program which drew with Kramnik!

It is fairly obvious from following the dates, and the information on which engines were in use, that DF7 should indeed have been called Deep Fritz8. It contains the new '8' program released to Kramnik in late August to enable him to prepare for his match, and to the public in Sept. 2002.

In other words, if you purchased DeepFritz7, don’t be aggrieved that a newer version has come out so soon. It hasn’t, it is the ‘8’ engine!

So, for multi-processor PC owners, Deep Fritz7/8 at £74.95 will give you the program with extra speed (approx. 1.75x faster on a dual, and 3x faster on a quad), whilst Fritz8 at £39.95 gives you the same engine for single processor machines!

Kasparov - Deep Junior
Just as I’m completing the last section of our News columns (after which it’s off to the printers), I hear that the GK-DJ match has been put
Black pawns streaming down the board, a draw is the inevitable outcome!
[f] the delay first:
2...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{a}}d4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}x5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}}7
And there is no win in sight.
[ff] now the immediate sac:
2...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}x6 3...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}x6 d4 4...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}f5 d3
5...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}e4 a5 6...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}d2
6...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}j4 a4 7...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}e3 a3 8...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}d2=
6...a4 7...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}e4 a3 8...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{x}}xd3 a2
9...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}b3 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}}g7=

If the White king comes back to defend the h-pawn, we have effectively K+h-pawn v K, because the knight must cover the Black a-pawn. If he relieves the knight by picking up the a+ b pawns, then White's h-pawn fails to the Black king.

White's problem after 1.Kf6 is that the knight has too much work to do! Perhaps this is a position where humans can do better than the programs because they can, as Rowson suggests in his book 'The Seven Deadly Sins of Chess' 'talk with their pieces' (p40).

The key piece is the knight, so we should ask him: 'How would you feel if I went 1.Kf6?'

No doubt the reply would be 'Well I'm not too keen on that, After the bits come off on e6 I'll be left to chase up all those passed pawns and look after the h-pawn'.

But you've got the king to help you!

'Yes, but he's even less good at chasing pawns than I am! Why not play 1.f6! fixing the position - then I can stay on this nice square where I am safe, and can threaten all sorts of things against the Black king?! And we'll keep all the pawns on and not be left with just a miserable h-pawn'.

But then there's nothing to stop the passed pawns!' Never mind them, they won't be going anywhere! Do you want to win or not?'

Well, okay, if you think you can handle it!

1.f6!

How many programs choose this, given 10mins each!
1...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}}b5 2...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}}4 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}e2 3...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}}5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}8

4...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{b}}b7
Now I am enjoying myself!
This is much better than chasing after passed pawns!
4...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{e}}e8 5...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}}g6 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}f8 6...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}d8 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{d}}d3+
7...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{g}}g5 \textcolor{red}{\texttt{f}}f5 8...\textcolor{red}{\texttt{h}}h6 1-0

You may feel Black has other possibilities, but they all lose!
A couple of issues ago Eric found some programs with a sense of humour. Now let's see how many turned up that can chat to their pieces before making major decisions!

My thanks to all who responded, especially Frank Holt who sent in a goodly list of results for different PC programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success f6</th>
<th>Failure Kf6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fritz7</td>
<td>Junior 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz6</td>
<td>Gambit Tiger2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shredder 0.2</td>
<td>Tiger 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior 7</td>
<td>Hlarc 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlarc 8.091</td>
<td>Nlame 732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goliath Light</td>
<td>Crafty 18.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well, it's time for the Christmas Issue puzzle - a bit unique, I'd say!

Bill Reid 10 - either side to move

In SelSearch 101 we ran into a problem about whether it was White or Black to play (my fault - Eric). So here is a position that makes life easy for editors!

It's either Black or White to play (two for the price of one, one might say). And in either case: what is the best move, and what should be the result?!

Five minutes all round!
The greatly anticipated million dollar ‘Brains in Bahrain’ match between 2807 rated Vladimir Kramnik and an 8 processor (Xeon 933 Mhz’s each I believe) Deep Fritz7 finally took place in October.

Who did we want to win?!
I’m not really sure whose side I was on!!

On the one hand I tend to side with the computer playing programs - after all, that’s the business I’m in. And, with Hiarc5, I’m a part of one of the programming teams trying to get our engines to a place where they really are a match for the top players.

On the other hand I was also on Kramnik’s side. Partly I’ve always hoped it might by Hiarc5 itself that won the first proper match victory of a commercial program over one of the World Champions! Also I saw the damage Karpov’s blunder did to chess in general against Deep Blue - and once a commercial program is provably better than the top human, I guess the programmers’ incentives and the buying public’s desire for something stronger will both wane somewhat!

Actually I think I am one of many people who are a little bit unfair to Kasparov.

We should remember that whilst the Deep Blue team had plenty of time to prepare for Kasparov specifically, and were allowed to make major program changes if they wished to between games, Kasparov really had no idea what to expect other than a

half-way stage, and that he would then play cautiously and content himself with quiet draws unless DF presented him with a clear opportunity to extend his lead.

So I expected it might be something like 5-3 for Kramnik, or possibly 5½-2½. Under the match conditions I did not believe that Deep Fritz (nor any other commercial program for that matter) had much of a chance.

What went ‘wrong’?
For the first 4 games you’d think I had written the script, and had insider knowledge.

What happened after that... well, I’m not sure!?!?

Was the match fixed, to set us up for a big pay-off rematch? Quite a few people seemed to think so but, apart from the amount of money at stake, I reckon that Kramnik would value his credibility far too much to risk throwing any games, never mind a match victory.

Perhaps the critical and deciding factor was that the GM was able to get the queens off early in the first 4 games, but the hard-working Fritz team found openings which kept them on the board for the second half. There is probably some truth in this, but I wouldn’t really have thought that someone like Kramnik would be likely to crack just because queens were still on the board after 20 moves. Gracious me, he’s 2807 Elo!

Perhaps, when he got in front he decided that, instead of playing cautiously, he would ‘mix it’ and ‘show
everyone (including Fritz) what he could really do! Mankind is still the master of strategy and tactics!

And perhaps, despite the very fair playing conditions - the same as for a ‘normal’ World Championship match (if there is such a thing anymore!), he found himself firing quite seriously as the match with its pressures and tensions went on. Exactly as had Kasparov v Deep Blue, though in his case under more difficult conditions still.

A bit of each of the last 3, but definitely not number 1. That’s my view, anyway. So let’s have a look at the games!

Deep Fritz - Kramnik, V

Game 1

C67: Ruy Lopez: Berlin Defence: 4 0-0 Nxe4

1.e4 e5 2.ởf3 cação 3.खb5 croft 4.0-0 <decimal>xe4 5.d4 6.d6

6.<decimal>xe6 7.dxe5 8.<decimal>xf5

8.<decimal>xd8+ <decimal>xd8 9.<decimal>c3 h6

10.b3 <decimal>e8 11.<decimal>b2

This was Fritz’s last book move as Kramnik’s reply caught it out. He was prepared, and would certainly know what the DF reply would be.

And I must say, however deep (!) or wide they thought their book was, I’m amazed they allowed a Berlin Defence against Kramnik. If

Kasparov couldn’t break it down they should have known they couldn’t. A gamble I guess – I mean, if DF had won ....!!

Also better known is 11.h3 a5 (or 11...<decimal>e6 12.<decimal>b2) then 12.<decimal>h2

11...<decimal>e7!!

11...<decimal>e6 is the main move, but Kramnik has tested out the DF book in practice at home, so will know how the next few moves are likely to go as Fritz starts to think on its own

12.<decimal>d1 a5 13.a4 h5 14.<decimal>e2

<decimal>e6 15.c4 <decimal>d8 16.h3 b6

17.<decimal>fd4 <decimal>x4 18.<decimal>x4

Inferior is 18.<decimal>x4? <decimal>f5

19.<decimal>d2 c5

20.<decimal>c5 19.<decimal>xe6 fx6

20.<decimal>x8+ <decimal>x8 21.<decimal>c1 <decimal>e8

22.<decimal>d1 <decimal>d8

Inviting the exchange. One must imagine that Kramnik has had similar positions on the board in preparing the Berlin Defence in the past, and felt that he could play accurately enough to draw from here

23.<decimal>x8+ <decimal>x8 24.g4 g6

25.h4?!

Probably missing its last chance of really testing the GM. 25.f4! was proposed as better, aiming to get the king to e4 and play an eventual f5

25...<decimal>e8 26.<decimal>f2 <decimal>f7

27.<decimal>e3 <decimal>f8 28.<decimal>e4. That’s as far as I’m going! I can’t decide if Black should exchange with hgx4, or just put the bishop back on e7. Either way White will be poised to play f5, but how strong a chance that would be against Kramnik you need to ask a better player than I am! My guess still a draw

25...hxg4

25...<decimal>xh4? would be great except for 26.g5+

26.<decimal>g5 <decimal>xg5 27.hxg5 <decimal>e8

28.<decimal>g2

The Fritz operator, Matthias Feist illegally offered the draw here – the particular rules for this match only allow Kramnik to offer a draw. But White has the advantage yet can’t win, so it was a good idea to settle it here ½-½.

Kramnik, V - Deep Fritz

Game 2

D27. Q Gambit Accepted

1.d4 d5 2.c4 dx54?! For me, a slightly disappointing, as whilst it opens lines quickly, it can also lead to early simplifications and even a queen
exchange. The Fritz 7 book normally chooses e6 or c6
3...f3 f6 4.e3 e6 5...xc4 e5
6.0-0 a6 7.dxc5
This is perfect for what Anand wants, he probably never even gave a thought to
the more critical a4 or b3
7...xd1 bxc1xc5
9. xf1!?.
Would neatly put most PC
programs out of book.
9.db2 db7 10.e2 b6
was Kramnik—Kasparov in
their 4th. game in London,
2000. Of course Fritz would
have been ready for that!
9...b5 10.e2 b7 11.db2
b7 12.b3 f8?
An embarrassing choice
for the programmers!
12...b6 or c7 were clearly
better. But WHY f8? at
all? It appears that DF
expected White to return the
knight to d2, so he could play
b3 and b2. However DF
concluded this would give it
an early draw by repetition
with f2 back to c5. Not a
chance! Obviously there's
something not quite right in
the balance between the
evaluation function and the
cost factor here!
13.a4

Kramnik is now well
ahead in development
13...b4 14.f2 d5 15.f3
d6 g3 e5!
Nicely limiting the scope of
the knight on b3. 16...c5
certainly doesn't work out
any better: 17...xc5...xc5
18.e4...c6 19.b3 e7

20.a5
17.e4...e6 18...c4...c7
The poor bishop has been
chased around mercilessly,
and now tries its chances on
c7?
19...e2 a5 20...c5...c5
21...xc5...d7
This seems to be the only
move. 21...d8?! 22...d6+
xd6 23...xd6...d7 24...b5!
is a winning attack for White
22...d6+

22...f8!

Best, but I wonder what
the Fritz evaluation was
here! The rook is only briefly
locked in, so it may still
have thought it was
reasonably okay.
Note that 22...d8? might
seem kinder to the rook, but
23...a1 (not 23...xf7+ just
yet, because of 23...xf7
24...b5...e6 25...xd7...xd7
26...d1...a8 27...xd7 g6 and
when Black finally gets his
rooks working he will be in
the game with some chances)
23...xc5 24...xf7+...e7
25...xc5...b6 26...c6 would
leave DF in big trouble
23...f2
Nigel Short was with
Malcolm Pein in Bahrain,
and here Nigel was
convinced that 23...b5+
xc5 24...xc7 was winning.
Next comes 24...c8 25...a1
which looks 'crushing', but
when they got the ChessBase
team to check the idea with
DF, it came up with
25...h3+! 26...e1...c7!
27...d8+...e7 28...h8
...c3+ and survives!
23...xd6 24...d6...e7
25...d1...c8 26...b5...c5!
27...c6...c4+!
A second excellent find on
the run! Apparently Kramnik
expected 27...xc6 28...xc6
...xa4 and now 29...d2
would leave him on top!
Kramnik confessed after the
game that DF's resourcefulness
in difficulty had
surprised and worried him!
28...e1?
Fritz quite likely expected
28...g2
28...d3+ 29...e1...d3...d3
30...c5
30...d3??...xc6 0-1
30...a3 31...d4+!
Forcing the game into a
R+P ending, which Kramnik
sees he has a big advantage
in because he controls the
central file affecting king
mobilisation
31...f6 32...xc4...c6
33...e7+...xe7 34...xc6
We need to see where the exchanges have left us, as a new game phase begins!

34...\( \text{\#d7} \) 35.\( \text{\#c5} \)

Kramnik's rook will make it difficult for Black's king to get into the game effectively, whereas his own king should not have any such problem

35...\( \text{\#f6} \)
35...\( \text{\#d6} \) 36.\( \text{\#d5+} \) 37.\( \text{\#e6} \)
36.\( \text{\#d2} \) 37.\( \text{\#d5+} \) 38.\( \text{\#d3} \) 39.\( \text{\#c4} \) 40.\( \text{\#h3} \)
41.\( \text{\#h4} \) 42.\( \text{\#xh4} \) 43.\( \text{\#a7} \) 43.\( \text{\#h5} \)

The aim is zugzwang

43...\( \text{\#a8} \) 44.\( \text{\#c5+} \) 45.\( \text{\#b5} + \)
46.\( \text{\#c6} \) 46.\( \text{\#d5} \)

ChessBase supreme Frederic Friedel analysing the game, using Fritz no doubt?

There it is! Kramnik visibly controls the board, but Fritz surely didn't need to yield ground quite so quickly as it does with its next?! 46...\( \text{\#c7}?! \)

46...\( \text{\#a7} \) would seem to be better, so we should check it out: 47.\( \text{\#d8} \) 46...\( \text{\#c7} \) (47...\( \text{\#f7} \)
48.\( \text{\#c8+} \) 49.\( \text{\#b6} \) 50.\( \text{\#d7+} \) 51.\( \text{\#xf6} \) 52.\( \text{\#xe5} \) followed by 53.\( \text{\#f4} \)
49.\( \text{\#a8} \) 50.\( \text{\#c2} \) 51.\( \text{\#xa5} \) 52.\( \text{\#xb4} \) 53.\( \text{\#b6} \!)

And White still wins

47.\( \text{\#b5} \) 48.\( \text{\#d3} \) 49.\( \text{\#b3} \)
50.\( \text{\#c4} \) 51.\( \text{\#c6} \) 52.\( \text{\#d5} \) 53.\( \text{\#e5+} \)

Having jettisoned one pawn, DF decides to offer the a-pawn as well. It is trying to obtain some counterplay against the White kingside pawns, or even produce a perpetual check

55.\( \text{\#c4} \) 56.\( \text{\#c3} \)

operator felt it was time to call it a day: 57...\( \text{\#xh5} \)
58.\( \text{\#d5} \) 59.\( \text{\#d4+} \) 60.\( \text{\#xb4} \) 61.\( \text{\#b5} \!)

After this game Nigel Short commented in the weekend Telegraph: “Deep Fritz is struggling valiantly, but probably in vain, against Vladimir Kramnik... (in comparing this with the Kaparov-DB match) the pendulum has perhaps swung too far in the opposite direction... Not only was Kramnik given Fritz’s program in advance of the match, but he has the anachronistic privilege of adjourning the game after 56 moves - whereupon he can rest and use his opponent to analyse the game for him. This enables Kramnik, with diligent preparation, to plot to a high degree of accuracy, the computer's errors”.

Nigel is NOT a great fan of computers, so when he takes their side, we can draw our own conclusions!

He continued: “I love a fair fight, which is perhaps why my joy at Kramnik’s success has been somewhat muted. I hope those responsible for re-writing the rules will take note, and strike a better balance next time”.

Deep Fritz - Kramnik, V
Game 3
Scotch Game. C45

1.e4 e5 2.\( \text{\#f3} \) 3.d4!? 4.\( \text{\#xd4} \) 5.\( \text{\#x5} \) 6.\( \text{\#d2} \) 7.\( \text{\#c3} \) 8.\( \text{\#e7} \)
the computer's monstrous calculating power, to use Kramnik's own description.
8...\texttt{e}f4

The best known plan to avoid the queen exchange is 8...\texttt{a}a4, but it has a doubtful reputation after 8...\texttt{d}d6 9.f4 0-0
8...\texttt{e}6! 9.\texttt{x}xf6 gxf6 10.\texttt{a}4
\texttt{b}4+ 11.c3 \texttt{d}d6 12.\texttt{e}e3 b6
13.f4

Fritz would be happy here, as its opponent has two pairs of doubled pawns. However, as can be seen, neither pair can be attacked by rooks so the immediate targets will be control of the open d- and half-open g-file.

It is interesting that Fritz's liking of doubled enemy pawns is proving very successful against other computer programs, which try to protect such pawns at all costs and let Fritz run the game with piece mobility. But Kramnik is not a PC program!

13.0-0-0

I would guess this put DF out of book. 13.\texttt{d}d7 and c5 are in my F7 book
14.\texttt{f}2 c5

Prophylaxis, stopping White's \texttt{d}d4
15.c4 \texttt{c}6 16.\texttt{c}3 f5

Kramnik's had a month's practice with DF, so will know it wont want to exchange here, as it values Kramnik's doubled pawn 'problem' quite heavily in its favour!

17.e5

17.\texttt{x}xf5 \texttt{xf}5 18.\texttt{d}d1 \texttt{e}7
17...\texttt{a}f8

I wonder if Kramnik smiled playing this? – it's the bishop placement for which Fritz was roundly condemned in the previous game. Here, of course, it's a different matter altogether

18.b3

18...\texttt{b}4!

Kramnik spent over 30 mins deciding on this, including a brief time away from the board for a quick cigarette! The lengthy deliberations proved worthwhile, as the simplifications which DF now allows leave it with a worryingly passive position, which suits Kramnik perfectly

19.a3?!

I'm not keen on this idea. In fact I wrote this comment going over the game on the day, and found next morning that Kramnik had highlighted the move for criticism!

19.\texttt{c}c1 \texttt{g}7 and then 20.a3 forcing 20...\texttt{c}6 and now 21.\texttt{d}5 looks more active and keeps his bishop pair!

19.\texttt{c}2 20.\texttt{c}c1 \texttt{x}e3

21.\texttt{x}e3 \texttt{g}7 22.\texttt{d}5! c6!

Not 22...\texttt{x}d5? 23.\texttt{c}xd5 \texttt{x}d5 as, with the simple 24.\texttt{d}3! White now has the more active pieces along with the better pawn structure

23.\texttt{f}f6 \texttt{x}xf6 24.\texttt{x}e6 \texttt{f}8

Kramnik visibly now has the better position
25.\texttt{f}f3 \texttt{d}d2 26.\texttt{h}f3 \texttt{d}f7 27.\texttt{g}3 \texttt{f}6

Kramnik's doubled pawns still stand, but one of DF's is going!

28.\texttt{f}b1 \texttt{e}f6 29.\texttt{e}e2 \texttt{e}6
30.\texttt{h}e1 \texttt{c}7 31.\texttt{f}1 b5
32.\texttt{b}c1

32.\texttt{c}xb5? is bad: 32...\texttt{c}xb5 33.\texttt{x}e6 \texttt{f}xe6 and if 34.\texttt{c}c1 \texttt{c}6+ 35.\texttt{f}e3 \texttt{a}2 36.\texttt{c}c5 \texttt{x}a3 37.\texttt{c}c3 b4 and 0-1. White could improve on a couple of my moves (e.g. 37. \texttt{b}3 isn't too clever, \texttt{g}2 is better), but Black is winning after 32.\texttt{c}xb5 whatever

32...\texttt{b}6 33.\texttt{b}4 \texttt{c}xb4
34.\texttt{a}xb4

The king-supported queenside pawn majority indicates that all the chances are now with Kramnik, and he takes full advantage with a masterly display of brilliant technique

34...\texttt{e}4 35.\texttt{d}d1 \texttt{e}d1
36.\texttt{e}d1 \texttt{e}6 37.\texttt{d}d3 \texttt{d}d4
38.\texttt{e}2?!

I wonder if 38.\texttt{c}3 might
have worked out better?!
38...\text{exd}1 39.e5+ \text{c}b7
40.\text{c}xd1 a5! 41.bxa5 \text{c}a6
42.\text{c}e3 \text{c}xa5 43.\text{c}d4
43.\text{f}3 wouldn't work,
Black just carries on with
43...b4 anyway!
43...b4 44.g4 fxg4 45.hxg4
b3 46.\text{c}c3 \text{a}4 47.\text{c}b2 f6
48.\text{f}3
48.f5 \text{f}7 49.\text{e}2 \text{b}4
50.\text{d}1 \text{xc}5 51.\text{b}x\text{b}3 \text{xb}3
52.\text{xb}3 \text{d}5 and it's all
over
48...\text{b}5 49.g5 f5 50.\text{c}3
\text{xc}5

Connected passed pawns...
Goodnight!
51.\text{e}2 0-1
Fritz played this, but the
team resigned without
waiting for Kramnik's
response. This time we don't
need any analysis to convince
readers of the win.

Was the match turning into
a rout? Would Kramnik try
for a major crush of DF (say
6-2) to put sponsors off
paying Kasparov $1,000,000
to show he could do the same
to Deep Junior? To try and
maintain some tension
Kramnik's manager assured
everyone that the GM had
needed to win as many as he
could now, in order to allow
for the inevitable dropping
off of his energy levels as the
match progresses!

Kramnik, V - Deep Fritz
Game 4
Tarrasch Defence. D34

1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6
As I'm sure I've said or say
elsewhere, although neither
the program nor the moves
in the opening book can be
changed or added to, the
preferences can! Under the
watchful eye of Enrique
Irazoqui 2...dxc4 was
demoted overnight, in view of
the game 2 result, and now
2...e6 is given its chance
3.\text{d}f3 \text{c}5
Well, this could be interest-
ing – the Tarrasch, in
which Black can blast open
the position to give himself
active pieces, but will suffer
an isolated pawn to do so.

Unfortunately Kramnik
doesn't take too long to work
out how to get queens off in
this line either!
4.exd5 exd5 5.g3?!
5.\text{c}c3 is seen more often,
but g3 and \text{g}2 puts the
bishop where it can be very
effective – and dare I say
that fianchettoes are not
always properly understood
by computers either!
5...\text{c}c6 6.\text{g}2 \text{d}6 7.0-0 \text{e}7
8.\text{c}c3 0-0 9.\text{g}5 \text{cx}d4
10.\text{cx}d4 \text{h}6 11.\text{f}4 \text{g}4
12.\text{h}3 \text{f}6 13.\text{c}c1 \text{c}8
14.\text{c}xe6 \text{fxe}6 15.e4!

We're still in theory (will
be right up to move 20!) and
it is clear that Kramnik is
again threatening to bring off
the queens
15.d4 16.e5 dxc3 17.exf6
\text{xf}6 18.bxc3 \text{xd}1
19.\text{xd}1
There they go!
19...\text{ad}8 20.\text{e}3 \text{xd}1+
21.\text{xd}1 \text{xc}3 22.\text{fd}7
There was a feeling up to
this point that Kramnik had a
position on the board that
he'd seen before, maybe in
preparation
22...\text{b}8 23.\text{xc}6 \text{bxc}6
24.\text{xa}7 \text{b}2!

As will be seen in a few
moves after more exchanges,
the presence of the rook, in
pinning White's king to the
1st. rank, will make it almost
impossible for Kramnik to
make progress
25.\text{a}6!
Ray Keene was watching
and thought this was very
strong, whilst Malcolm Pein
thought 25.a4!? \text{a}2 26.\text{a}6
was a better try. As my
Hiarcs also prefers 23.a4 I'm
agreeing with Malcolm... but
it would almost certainly still be headed for a draw.

25...d2! 26...xc6?!

This seemed a slightly disappointing choice, simplifying into a certain draw, especially as it enabled DF to access its tablebases. There were more positive continuations, but perhaps Kramnik fancied a quiet, easier finish to this one, and a 3-1 lead.

Widely expected was 26...xd4 when Fritz would continue with either 26...b4 or e2. Another possibility might be 26...xd2 exd2 27...xc6 dxe2 28...xe6

26...xe3 27.fxe3 xf7 28.a4

Another possibility is to play 26...xe3 27.fxe3 xf7 28.a4

Alas, 29...f4 xf6 30...f1 g5!

Although the draw is 'guaranteed' it is important for Black that it doesn't just passively wait for it, but threatens counterplay options on the kingside. In a less even position this approach could be vital.

31.h4 h5 32.hxg5+ xg5

At this point the computer actually failed (tell me something new!). A commotion ensued as operator Matthias Feist couldn't get it to reset correctly, and then only got 1 of the 8 processors running. Fortunately the position is simple enough with tablebases and it didn't matter.

33...e5

No doubt Fritz was showing exactly 0.00 by now.

34...f5 35...h4 g6 36...e4

37...h4 g5 38...g1

g6 39.g4 hxg4 40.xg4+

f5 41...e4 ½-½

A good game, and certainly Fritz's best effort so far.

The game we are about to see will be remembered forever because of a major, and quite astonishing blunder.

In my view this is slightly unfair - okay, the blunder decided it, but up to then Fritz had shown its best chess of the match so far, and definitely had Kramnik in some trouble!

Deep Fritz - Kramnik, V

Game 5

Queens Gambit, Lasker. D57

1.d4 f6 2.c4 e6 3.d5 d5

4...c3 e7 5.g5 b6 6.h4

0-0 7.e3 d6 8.xe7 xxe7

9...xd5

I think 9...c1 and c2 have the best reputations in this position, but the line chosen usually sees the queens staying on to the end of book! So some good preparation!

9...xc3 10.bxc3 exd5

11.b3 d8 12.c4 dxc4

13.bxc4 d6 14.e2 b6

15.0-0 b7 16...c1 eac8

This probably puts DF out of book, as my F7 only has 16...d5 17.b2 and then

17.a4 a5

A natural and oft-played move in this opening, but as played here the knight struggles to re-emerge back into active play.

18.e3 c5 19.a1 cxd4

20.bxd4 bxc3 21.bxc3 ac8

In the midst of the exchanges, an interruption by Kramnik with 21...e4 would have been more active. Then perhaps 22...f1 and now 22...c6 to enable dxc6 and get the knight into the

The position has draw written all over it, but while Kramnik has the distant passed pawn, he still has the badly placed knight! And with the queens still on, we can yet hope to see some tactical and initiative seeking play from the computer!

23.h3 g6 24...f1

DF is determined not to let the knight out onto c6!

24...d7 25.c2 c5

Would you like to exchange queens?

26...e4

No, thanks!

26...e1+ 27.h2 c7+

28.g3 c4

At last the knight gets into the game, but just as it does it is White's bishop that suddenly finds a real lease of life!

29.e2! e5

Not 29...b5? because of 30.a4! Now if 30...d6

(30...d6 31.c8+ c8

32.xc8+ xc8 33.axb5

axb5 34.dxb5 also puts White a pawn up) 31.a8+
32...axb5 wins a pawn
30...b5!

Also good! Black would like to get the knight to e6, to protect the weak a7-pawn, but Fritz is definitely making Kramnik's life difficult in this one
30...AXB5
30...a5 to ease the pawn weakness was probably better, then if 31.a4 (better than 31.f4?! when 31...AXB5 32.BXB5 D7 threatening D2+ and perpetual check gets the draw) 31...C5
32.g4 BXB5 33.BXB5 D7 and White doesn't have much
31.BXB5 C5 32.BxA7
DF isn't really winning a pawn, as Kramnik has different ways of winning it back
32...A5

Instead of regaining the pawn, Black could go with
32...C3 33.A8+ G7
34.D5 G8 and it's hard to see how White can progress
33.g2 Wxa2 34.c8

There's no doubt that Fritz has an advantage here, and for Kramnik it will be a long and probably unpleasant endgame. There will be many ways of making a mistake, especially if and when tablebases begin to make their presence felt. Instead of going this longterm difficult route, he looks for a complication, sees a problem with it, rechecks other analysis... then comes back to the tricky move but forgets the

would probably come into the brilliant category, and a 'Brilliancy' it certainly would be to win - but against a computer is it a move of genius, or an enormous gamble?!
We shall see.....

Kramnik, V - Deep Fritz
Game 6
Queens Indian, E15

1.d4 Cf6 2.c4 e6 3.Bf3 Bb6
4.g3

The Rubinstein is a solid setup against the QID - it looks as if Kramnik is reverting to safety first!
4...A6 5.b3 Bb4+ 6.Bd2
7.A7 7.g2 e6 8.C3 D5
9.C5 D7 10.Dxd7 Dxd7
11.Bd2 0-0 12.0-0 Bc8 13.a4
13.e4 b5 14.Bel is more usual. 13.a4 is considered doubtful by Fritz... so one imagines that Kramnik disagrees and has something prepared?!
13...A6 14.e4 c5!
I know this is in the Book, but it's still worth a ! for its active nature in a match like this!
15.exd5 cxd4 16...Bb4

Someone suggested simplification by exchange here, with 16.dxe6, though I must admit I don't know if it's a Book move in anyone's library
16...Be8
A new move, probably in the new DF book?!
17. \( \text{dxe7} \) \( \text{xe7} \) 18. \( \text{dxe6} \) (18. \( \text{xe1} \)!!?) 18...\( \text{fxe6} \) is old F7 book!

17. \( \text{dxe4} \)

With \( \text{dxe6} \) Kramnik can now win the exchange, but Black will have good compensation in central connected passed pawns. Still, it looks like advantage Kramnik!

17...\( \text{exd5} \) 18. \( \text{d6} \) \( \text{dxc4} \)

Arbiter Irazoqui watches closely as Fritz's Alexander Kure adjusts the opening preferences before game 6... Must somehow keep the queens ON!

Well, the cat is amongst the pigeons now...

19. \( \text{xf7} \)

The knight has to be taken of course and this, as well as most of Black's next few moves, are pretty well forced if Fritz is to survive

20. \( \text{d5+} \) \( \text{g6} \) 21. \( \text{g4+} \) \( \text{g5} \)

Here Kramnik must make a major decision on how to pursue the attack — if it fails he will be losing the game!

One of his aims will be to push either the \( f \)-pawn, or even better if he can get a rook to \( h1 \), the \( h \)-pawn. But he will have to do this whilst surrounding the Fritz king escape squares with his pieces, so Fritz gets no time in which to get his king into safety.

Note that 21...\( \text{h6} \)? would have run into trouble:
22. \( \text{d2}+ \) \( \text{g5} \) 23. \( \text{f4!} \) with a definite advantage to White.

22. \( \text{d4+} \)

I trust you are all in the right mood to check out some tricky ideas!

First 22.\( \text{f4!} \)? Looks dangerous, but it seems that 22...\( \text{h5} \)? is a satisfactory response: 23. \( \text{f7}+ \) (Tiger14 suggests 23. \( \text{xg5}+ \) \( \text{xg5} \) 24. \( \text{xf5} \) but it seems 24...\( \text{c3} \) leaves Black just ahead) 23...\( \text{xf7} \) 24. \( \text{xf5+} \) \( \text{h8} \) 25. \( \text{xh3} \) \( \text{g5} \) 26. \( \text{g6} \) \( \text{xg6} \) 27. \( \text{xg6} \) \( \text{d7} \) and Black has a decent but perhaps not yet winning advantage.

Secondly there is 22.\( \text{h4?!} \)

22...\( \text{c5} \) seems to hold the advantage.

Not (i) 22...\( \text{h5} \)? just yet as, after 23. \( \text{e4+} \) \( \text{xh4} \) 24. \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{h6} \) 25. \( \text{h5}+ \) \( \text{xg5} \) 26. \( \text{f1} \) and, if anything, Kramnik might have the advantage.

Nor (ii) 22...\( \text{xb3} \) which initially looks more promising but, after 23. \( \text{e4+} \) \( \text{xe4} \) 24. \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{h6} \) 25. \( \text{h5}+ \) \( \text{xg5} \) 26. \( \text{g2} \) and now the White rook's can gain access to the \( h \)-file, and White will win!

Back to 22...\( \text{c5} \) and now
23. \( \text{bxc4} \) \( \text{h5} \)! Is good for Fritz!

22...\( \text{xe4} \)

Only move!

We would expect DF to find such tactical necessities with comparative ease.

Although other moves do lose, a human would usually spend time having to check them all out, and we might expect them to struggle working through every variation correctly. In other words Kramnik's sac might have had good chances against a human!

E.g. 22...\( \text{xf7} \) 23. \( \text{h5} \) and White is winning; or
22...\( \text{h6??} \) 23. \( \text{h3}+ \) wins outright 23...\( \text{h4} \) 24. \( \text{d2}+ \) 23. \( \text{xe4}+ \) \( \text{h6} \) 24.\( \text{h4} \)!
One has to admire Kramnik’s relentless attack. Even though Fritz still shows >100 you really do wonder if this can work after all!

24...g6 25.d2+ g5
26.hxg5+ hxg5 27.h4+

Fritz expected 27...e6+, which is what Kramnik had planned, and after 27...f6 28.f4 (28.h3+!? would have been better, still looking for a chance to play f4 or get a rook to the h-file), he thought he was winning.

But at the last moment he saw that Fritz had 28...h4! Anything else would lose instantly, but this indeed wins, as White’s attack is now beginning to dry up!
Best is 29.h3 (not 29...gxh4
29...g8+ 30...xg8 31.h2 g4+ 32.h3 c3 is an easy 0-1) and now 29...c3
30...xh4+ h5 31.h2 cxd2 looks a definite 0-1.

So a disappointed Kramnik opted for 27...g6 instead, aware that his brilliance was not to be!

27...g6

Notes: Hopes for a mate now seem to have gone completely, so Kramnik is looking for the draw.

28...g7 29...xg5 hxg5
30.f6+

If 30...xd4+ then f6 is fine for Black

30...xb3 31.xd4+ f6
32.a5 d5
32...c5 is less forcing as White can avoid the queen exchange with 33.b2. But 33...d5! even now surely wins anyway

33...xd5 cxd5 34.axb6

Kramnik, now short of time, resigned in view of the apparently easy win

34...xb6 35.axb6 h2!

However Kasparov took it a little further:
36.a7+ g6 37.e7 b1 38.d6+ g6
39.dd1 b1 40.xc1 and Kasparov reckoned it would be quite difficult for Fritz to win from here.

Malcolm Pein explained why in the Daily Telegraph:

there are two possible endgames that have to be understood. An endgame with queen and h-pawn against rook, f and g-pawns is a draw; if the White rook reaches the f4 or h4 squares and can prevent the Black king from advancing. The second endgame arises if the Black king reaches the queenside and supports the advance of the b-pawn.

Under those circumstances White must give up his 2 rooks for queen and b-pawn, and reach a position with king f and g-pawns against king, knight and h-pawn. In the Encyclopaedia of Endgames there is reference to such an ending between Horvath and Sapis in 1986, showing that such endgames are drawn.

On reading Malcolm’s explanation I realise that I am out of my depth here!

Fritz would indeed probably continue with 40...e6 reading a plus of just over 300?!

However 41.e6! goes into a demonstration of Malcolm’s discussion, and according to Mig Green’s comprehensive analysis on the 'net, is a saving move! (The more obvious 41.b1?! b5 42.b4 g4 43...f4 d7 appears to leave Black with a winning position). 41...b5 would probably follow 42.ee6 b4
43.\text{b6}! \text{\textbf{f7}} I noted that my Hari\text{c8} eval dropped from +250 to +150 when agreeing with this as Black's best move here. 44.\text{fxf6}! Of course the PC programs give this a ? rather than a! (44.\text{\textbf{ec6}} would be a computer choice, and showing Black only +136 now) 44...\text{\textbf{xf6}} 45.\text{\textbf{xb4}}! (45.\text{xf6}+?? \text{\textbf{xf6}} and the \text{b}-- pawn promotes) 45...\text{\textbf{d6}} 46.\text{\textbf{f4}}+

Press conference strain is showing as Kramnik explains how things aren't going as well as expected!

After the game I suggested to Malcolm Pein that Kramnik had actually won all 4 games - in 2 he beat Fritz and in 2 he beat himself.

16...\text{cxd4}

Better than 16...\text{exd4}

17.\text{\textbf{d3}} (or 17.\text{\textbf{bab1}) I can understand why Franz Morsch was looking worried here! The position is firmly closed and it was the turn of the GM team to look rather smug, expecting Kramnik to now reproduce his games 1-4 form. He should be able to take advantage especially of the \text{d4}-- pawn which, though not strong as a passed pawn, is a real thorn in the heart of White's position, and

The rook has reached \text{f4} and it is a theoretical draw. But, with great respect, could Kramnik have found all this over the board? I'd suggest his resignation after move 34 indicates that he was not aware of some of the unique resources in the position. 0--1

18...a5!

New, and an improvement on Polugaevsky--Gulko, 1976, when Gulko played 18...\text{\textbf{g7}}?? allowing 19.a5! \text{\text{\textbf{bx}}a5} 20.\text{\textbf{\text{\textbf{x}}a5}} f5 21.\text{\textbf{\text{\textbf{d2}} which is all F7 book. After 21...\text{\textbf{c8}} Black's queenside is dissolving: 22.c5 \text{\textbf{x}}xe4 23.\text{\textbf{\text{\textbf{x}}c8}} \text{\textbf{\text{\textbf{x}}c8}} 24.\text{\textbf{\text{\textbf{x}}e4}}\text{\textbf{dxc5}} 25.d6 and White won 19.\text{\textbf{\text{\textbf{a6!}}}}

Good. DF is now out of book, but a plan of \text{b3}--\text{b4} is correct, and impressive that Fritz should see the idea, even though Kramnik stopped it from being played!

20.h8

Kramnik is probably looking for a chance to break with \text{\textbf{f5}}.

21.\text{\textbf{g2}} \text{\textbf{g7}}! 22.\text{\textbf{d3}} \text{\textbf{eae8}}

23.\text{\textbf{d2!}} \text{\textbf{\text{\textbf{h6}}} 24.\text{\textbf{f4}}!
Fritz beats Kramnik to the break and, if anything, now has its opponent on the defensive, though only for a few moves:

24...c7 25.f1 g8
26.b1 d8
26...e1? 27.gxf4 might encourage Fritz to play on.
27.g1 b7 28.e2 a6

And the draw was agreed. Both sides seemed happy. The Fritz team were delighted to have ended up equal from a position that should have suited Kramnik, whilst his team, having been anticipating a winning opportunity, could see that it had been snuffed out with some ease. Indeed Fritz could easily have had its own chances if Kramnik had now erred due to tiredness. ½-½

3½-3½! Everyone wanted to get excited about the final, decisive game. Perfectly understandable, with most people also wanting Kramnik to come out on top.

But in Bahrain there was a feeling that the weary GM might well content himself with a draw unless the opening yielded clear possibilities.

Kramnik, V - Deep Fritz
Game 8
Queens Gambit Declined
D68

1.d4 f6 2.c4 e6 3.f3 d5

4.e3 c6 5.g5!?
5.e3 is the more usual line 5.e7

Kramnik is something of an expert in the following, more usual, lines: 5...h6; 5...xc4; 5...bd7.

Having indicated it might play a sharp line of the Slav with 4.c6, and getting Kramnik's interest in this idea with his bishop move response, Fritz has now transposed to a quieter, safer variation of the Queens Gambit. "If you can't catch the computer in the opening", said Kramnik later, "you don't stand much of a chance of winning". This solid response and sudden switch tricked Kramnik somewhat, he admitted afterwards, taking him out of his main preparation. He felt he would now need to take excessive risks if he was to play seriously for a win. 6.e3 0-0 7.d3 bd7 8.0-0 dx4

It's as long ago as Capablanca that this and the following moves were found, and which basically ease Black's cramped position and equalise the game

9.xc4 d5 10.xe7 xe7 11.xc1 xc3 12.xc3 e5
13.b3 edx4 14.exd4 f6
15.e1 w6 16.h3 f5

The Fritz book ended with this move. White's rooks are active, but opinions vary as to the strength or (eventual) weakness of his isolated d-pawn! Meanwhile DF's position is unexciting, but safe and sound, and Kramnik is behind on the clock
17.e3 a8! 18.e5 g6
19.a3?!

Probably trying to lure DF into some sort of excess, but it isn't interested
19...d8 20.e8 xe8 dxe8
21.d2

And here Kramnik offered a draw of both game ½-½ and match, in what will probably go down as a disappointing and anti-climatic end to a match which had promised so much: for the human race (and Kramnik with $1 million looming!) at 3-1, and then a potentially very exciting finish when it was 3-3.

But Malcolm Pein told me that Kramnik was visibly tiring towards the end, and seemed aware that he was no longer playing to his very best. In fact the last person to get away with such a quick draw as Black against Kramnik was Kasparov!

Honours even then, and the prize money shared at $500,000 each, with all DF's 'winnings' going to a European trust fund to promote chess for children. So I guess you could well say that, in the end, chess did win!
Jan Louwman - The father of computer chess tells his story!

It is spring 1978. Jan Louwman and his wife Coby are staying in the Dutch province Limburg where Jan settles down for a while to recover from a gall-bladder operation.

They decide to make a trip to Düsseldorf (Germany) to do some shopping and to look around a bit.

Before leaving the city again they take a look inside the Horten department store.

Jan, who has been an ardent chess player since the World Cup match Aljechin-Euwe in 1935, sees a small machine that immediately draws his attention.

The box flaunts the name ‘Chess Champion Mark 1’ and the machine literally and figuratively challenges him to play against it.

You guessed - it’s a tiny chess computer!

Jan had once, in 1959, seen an IBM 360 computer, which took up an area of 100 square meters (!), carry out a simple mate in two with much difficulty. Even though it now was twenty years later, he couldn’t believe what he saw.

Without a moment of hesitation Jan bought the small machine for only 289 Marks, not yet realizing then that in doing so, he was laying the groundwork for a whole new turn in his life.

This purchase would turn out to be the start of his development from an enthusiastic chess hobbyist into a worldwide known chess computer expert.

Often to the exasperation of Coby, Jan used to play chess against his new computer till far into the night.

But that was not all!

Next, he started collecting all models that came out at the end of the seventies and made all these chess computers play against each other at different chess tournaments.

Jan gained so much knowledge of the different chess computers, that he gave lectures and even demonstrated chess computers for department stores like Vroom & Dreesmann and the Bijenkorf.

On 18th October 1980, the Dutch Computer Chess Association Netherlands (CSVN) was founded, with Jan as a member of the board.

By organising the first Dutch Computer Chess Championships, Jan came into contact with talented chess programmers whom he would supervise in the eighties and nineties.

It was not long before, with
his many contributions to the CSVN publication Computerschaa, as well as in several other magazines, that the producers of chess computers discovered him.

Jan visited several factories all over the world to test their new chess computers, but also to mediate when a producer was looking for new programmers.

In the nineties he published the magazine MegaByte. The periodical existed for five years, during which sixteen issues came out.

Even now in 2002, at the age of 78, Jan is still very active with his big hobby, or should I say his life fulfilment? In his house, in a specially fitted up test-room, you will find eleven desktop computers and seven notebooks running constantly.

Almost everyone who wants to know something about a chess computer or chess program is familiar with the telephone consulting hours of Jan Louwman. You just can't ignore him, so it's time for a retrospective view of almost 25 years of computer chess.

**Rob:** Jan, at the end of the eighties you were demonstrating chess computers in the big department stores. Can you tell me how that was done?

**Jan:** I had been playing chess for many years and through this I had made the necessary contacts in the chess world.

The management of the department stores Vroom & Dreesmann (V&D) and the Bijenkorf had asked me in the spring of 1979 if I would organise a chess computer demonstration.

At the time I worked at the environment department 'Rijnmond' (a government authority) in Schiedam and demonstrating my chess computers at night in the company restaurant was no problem.

Also, I borrowed certain new models from the Horten department store in Düsseldorf, where I had good contact with the manager, Mr. Alfeld, who knew much more about chess computers than I did.

But only two years later the roles were reversed!

The management of V&D and the Bijenkorf were burning with enthusiasm after they had watched my demonstrations.

V&D agreed to let me give demonstrations for the public in different branches in a special stand during the Christmas holiday season.

I was demonstrating at least ten or fifteen chess computers and behind me they were being sold in large quantities. I most often worked in their Amstelveen branch because the management there was very interested in chess computers.

In addition, I once a year gave training to the V&D staff, demonstrating and explaining the features of the then very latest models.

Electronics Netherlands, a subdivision of the Vendex concern, imported chess computers, so it was important that the training was continued each year.

Since the eighties Mr. Kalkoene, at the time general manager of Electronics, intensified the contacts for the training between V&D and myself. This was partly influenced by IM Hans Böhm, who for a short while worked with them as an adviser.

**Rob:** You have discovered and coached many programmers and you brought them into contact with chess computer producers. Who were they and how did you do this?

**Jan:** Shortly after the CSVN was founded, I undertook the technical preparations and supervision of the first Dutch Championship Computer Chess (NK), held in September 1981 in Utrecht. I tested all chess programs before they were admitted.

One of the pioneers of computer chess, Jaap van den Herik, is still grateful to me because I did admit his Pion program to the tournament, in spite of its rather poor performance.

Ed Schröder's first program was written in Basic and I did
not admit it to the tournament.

He is still mad about this!

During the second NK, held in September 1982, I was able to admit him because by then he had written his program Rebel in Assembler.

After I had been declared unfit for my job at the environment department 'Rijnmond' in 1981, the phone often rang several times a day.

Different chess computer producers called me and said: "You in the Netherlands are the only people who do have a real Computer Chess Championship."

In America, they did have something a bit like it, but that involved people from the university and the manufacturers found the Dutch programmers more suited to write programs for their chess computers.

I said: "Wait a minute. I need at least two years to coach programmers and I need a lot of test material (computers). Also, I want to get more insight into EPROM (Erasable Programmable Read Only Memory or re-programmable memory)."

The programmers they had set their eyes on were Frans Morsch, Ed Schröder and Richard Lang. I didn't think they were professional enough by far, that's why I needed at least those two years.

I started with Frans Morsch, who then had a small build-it-yourself computer. He was not allowed to participate in the first two NK's because at that time you had to play three matches simultaneously using three computers, but I knew he was talented.

I introduced him to SciSys (Scientific Systems, later Saitex) in Hong Kong, but they did not want him. They didn't think he was good enough... something they much regretted later on, and put right!

Manfred Hegener of Mephisto (Hegener and Glaser) from Munich had been asking me since January 1981 for a programmer, but I advised him to first hire a good expert.

He took on Ossi Weiner who was a strong chess player with a rating of ± 2200 ELO and had great commercial insight.

The coaching of Frans Morsch did not last that long because he is somebody who can work much better by himself.

At some point in 1981 Ed Schröder called me that he wanted to write a chess program. He borrowed a couple of chess computers from me and promised he would give me all the games.

That had been going on for about two months, and then I got to see a jewel of a game! I coached Ed Schröder till the beginning of the nineties.

Every year Philips put up a "young discoverers" prize and I was told that in 1982 a talented mathematics student was going to win the prize in Brussels for his chess program.

I immediately went over there to meet this student, Kaare Danielsen from Copenhagen. By now I had brought the chess computer Sargon and used the opportunity to test this computer against his program.

I was fairly impressed by the results and Kaare asked me if I knew of any commercial opportunities for him.

But next, Kaare went to SciSys in Hong Kong, without my knowledge.

After SciSys had committed a breach of contract, he again came back to me.

However I knew Ken Cohen of Newcrest Technologies (Hong Kong) from the Nuremberg fair in Germany, and I immediately suggested that he should employ Kaare Danielsen.

So this is what happened and Kaare did his programming from his small student room in Copenhagen, while I was testing his programs in the factory in Hong Kong.

The co-operation was very successful and one of his chess computers is probably still well remembered: the Super Enterprise.

In 1983, during the world championship for microcomputers in Budapest, the
English programmer Richard Lang approached me. He said he no longer felt like working for Intelligent Software (of David Levy in London) and preferred a job with better conditions with another producer.

I phoned Newcrest and told them I had a top-programmer for them. Since Richard Lang did not have much self-confidence, I went with him to Hong Kong.

The meeting between Richard Lang and the management of Newcrest (Eric White and Ken Cohen) was a disaster, not in the least because of the unsympathetic way they made their conditions.

After this discouragement, Richard collapsed completely which was a good reason for me to make a lot of fuss about this the following day. The result was that I did not even get my return journey cost reimbursed!

In February 1984, at the trade fair in Nuremberg, I met Manfred Hegener (of Mephisto) who asked me how Richard Lang had fared.

I told him about the failure in Hong Kong and Manfred immediately said enthusiastically: "Call him up, I want him!"

Frans Morsch and Ed Schröder already worked for him and so it happened that on the 1st and 2nd of March 1985 the complete Mephisto staff and the three programmers Frans Morsch, Ed Schröder, and also Richard Lang, came to my house to deliberate how they should work together from then on.

Eventually we agreed that Richard Lang would program the expensive computers with Motorola processors from the 68000 and 68020 series.

Ed Schröder took on the middle range with the 6502 processor, and Frans Morsch would write programs for the cheaper range.

Richard Lang wasn’t satisfied with the royalties Mephisto offered.

I said to him: "I am organising the World Championship Computer Chess this year (1985) in Amsterdam. If you become world champion - and I don’t doubt that for a second - we will state strict terms to Mephisto, and otherwise we will go to the competitor."

Richard did become champion! I coached him for a year and after that the then advisor of Manfred Hegener (Mephisto), Ossi Weiner, took over the supervision. I had my hands full with the further coaching of Ed Schröder anyway.

One day at the beginning of the nineties I found Wil Sparreboom of the Rotterdam firm Tasc stood on my doorstep.

He was urgently in need of a programmer. At this time I had become acquainted with Bart Weststrate, who was working on a promising chess program and I immediately introduced him to Wil.

After the contract was signed Bart did not show up at his new employers... "because he no longer felt like it." Even so, Bart achieved success with his powerful chess program Kallisto.

After this disappointment, Wil Sparreboom asked me to quickly find another programmer.

Luckily I was coaching the very talented Johan de Koning whom I had met earlier at the Dutch Computer Chess Championships. At that time he was still participating as an operator only!

Johan worked, at first, on his chess program using an Atari computer. When I offered him to start working at Tasc, he said: "No, I don’t want that, I am not capable to do that."

Eventually I managed to talk him over and he did start working with Tasc after all. I coached him for a while longer, but the Dutch IM Cor van Wijgerden later took it over from me. His program The King was a big success and the commercial version, Chessmaster (which has become a series), was released in America.

Halfway through the nineties Erik van Riet Paap, a draughts computer programmer, also started to develop chess programs.

In 1994 Mephisto was taken over by Šaitek from
Hong Kong, and the manager, still Eric Winkler, was looking for a programmer for his cheaper chess computers. Frans Morsch was now doing the top-programs for the Saiitek chess computers in the more expensive range.

I thought that Erik's chess programs were perfectly suited for the Saiitek chess computers, but at the end of the nineties Erik had to quit programming there, because sales were falling considerably.

At a NK in the nineties I also met Dr. Christian (Chirilly) Donninger from Vienna because he had to be in the Netherlands for his (scientific) work.

He also wanted to write a chess program and eventually even quit his job to dedicate himself totally to his program.

I sort of coached him from a distance for a while, but when my co-operation with the other programmers gradually dropped off, I started to intensively test his program Nimzo.

Nowadays Chirilly no longer concerns himself with Nimzo, but is working on his new program Brutus, that runs on specially developed hardware.

Right now I am still doing some test work for the Dutch programmer Vincent Diepeveen with his program Diep and for the American programmer James Robertson with his program Insomniac.

I have been working with Vincent for five years now. He has a lot of knowledge of hardware and software and always claims that his program is the best.

I used to say to him: "Of all bad programs yours is certainly the best!"

This is no longer true of course, for Diep has recently started to make a pretty good breakthrough and has performed well in recent tournaments.

Rob: In the past two decades you set up computer teams that lined up against strong players of different chess clubs. How did you organise all this?

Jan: During my telephone consulting-hour several people had called to ask me if I would play a match with a number of chess computers against members of their club.

At the beginning of the eighties the chess computer was just starting to make its big advance and many chess clubs saw it as a good promotion if a computer team crossed swords with strong club players.

In those days many people were interested in chess computers and therefore such an event could also generate new members.

Of course I already had many contacts in the chess world and moreover I had a large collection of chess computers at home. So setting-up a chess computer team was no problem, no more than finding enough operators to work the machines.

In 1984 I set up my computer team ROM'84 and we played 4 to 5 matches a year against different chess clubs. In principle we received no pay, but if the club could afford it, the operators were compensated for their travelling expenses. Usually a well-to-do club member would be willing to pay these expenses.

I continued playing against chess clubs with my computer team until about 1994.

In the eighties we used dedicated chess computers and from the early nineties, when the sale of chess computers showed a strong decline, primarily notebooks with chess programs.

In 1994 I set up a new computer team, which I named after my computer chess magazine 'Megabyte', which I had started the year before.

With the Megabyte team we also played against different clubs and even now we each year play one match against the oldest chess club of the Netherlands, Messemaker 1847.

Rob: Can you tell me a little more about the computer magazine Megabyte that you founded?

Jan: Beside my telephone consulting hour, I gave advice on chess computers in the KNSB (Royal Dutch Chess Association) magazine Schade Nederland (now Schaak Magazine) for 10 years.

At the time members of the association could buy there several kinds of chess computers for a reduced price. When the KNSB stopped selling chess computers in 1993 I therefore no longer could give advice in their magazine, which I thought was a bad thing, both for the consumers and the
manufacturers. Besides, I did not have such a good understanding with the then editor of the CSVN magazine Computerschaak for which I had been writing since the foundation.

The big boss of Saitek, Eric Winkler, phoned me to ask if I would like to start a new computer chess magazine, with him taking care of the financing.

He also wanted to know if I would be willing to start selling his computers as well and continue my telephone-consulting hour.

At first I did not feel like selling his chess computers, but because of the bad situation that had developed, I agreed to his proposal.

The number of subscribers grew fast because I gave away a free one-year subscription to anyone who bought a computer from me, but I also handed out the magazine during the many Megabyte computer team matches.

At the same time the importer of Saitek, Electronics in Amsterdam, promoted my magazine when people bought a chess computer there.

In all Megabyte had about 500 subscribers, but that included a great number of free subscriptions that were only partly continued when the time came for them to be paid subscriptions!

After a few years the sale of chess computers fell off more and more and Electronics decided to stop importing them. Saitek would no longer subsidise my magazine and that I was also forced to stop.

Rob: Jan, it has been 25 years since the appearance of the first commercially available chess computers. Do you think that all the work you did in the past years for the computer chess world has borne fruit?

Jan: During his many meetings with me Eric Winkler of Saitek often remarked: "If it had not been for Jan, there would not be half as many chess computers in this world."

I am convinced that without me some of the top programmers would also not have reached their current high level.

The way it was for the dedicated chess computers in the beginning of the eighties up to the beginning of the nineties has never been equalled, not by far, by the PC chess programs.

As far as playing power is concerned yes, but definitely not with respect to sales.

Don't forget that back then fifty thousand chess computers were sold per year against only four or five thousand now, including chess programs.

And the sale of chess programs is still falling.

Rob: These days you still carry out a lot of test-work with different top chess programs. Can you tell me how this works?
Jan: I observe for instance how a new version of a chess program plays against older versions or against other top-programs.

I test this by playing several tournaments with different clock times. I let all the programs play automatically against each other.

The engines of the ChessBase programs can already play against each other, through the build-in auto player of the chess program, and I can test the other non-ChessBase programs by connecting two PCs with a so-called zero-modem cable.

With the help of special drivers in the chess program and the Windows operating system several matches can then be played automatically.

I also use different versions of Windows because a given program may show faults under Windows XP, but run perfectly well under Windows 98.

Following a tournament I look at the matches played. I don't replay them all, but I especially observe which of the games ended quickly.

This way I can see whether there are certain bugs in the program and what a particular program is specifically good or bad at.

The evaluation function may show a strong change with certain positions.

I select these games and study them more closely. If my technical knowledge of chess fails me when trying to find out why the evaluation changed this much, I can ask advice from a number of top-chess players.

Such a top-chess player may for instance say that a particular move is no good, and my experience will then tell me that perhaps the mobility of a chess-piece needs to be raised or lowered by the programmer.

Next, I pass on these matches with my comment to the programmer and he effectuates the changes in the program.

Suppose the mobility of the knights needs to be raised somewhat, then it is important that the programmer changes this very accurately, because otherwise the bishops may become too passive for instance! If this is not done very precisely, the 'improvement' usually will make other things worse at the same time.

Because of my many years of test experience I don't often have to call in the help of the top players.

There are actually two goals you have for your testing: "Tracking down bugs in the chess programs, and the final results the programs achieve at the end of the test tournaments played." Generally speaking you might say that most programs are not very particular when it comes to the king's safety.

Rob: If you could look into the future, how do you think the computer chess world will look in the year 2010?

Jan: I am quite pessimistic about that. Computer chess will still be there, but commercially it will be a problem.

Nowadays an incredible amount of software is copied illegally and in the long run this will be at the expense of the programmers.

One day, they will no longer be available. Also, I don't like the development where six top-programmers are working with one firm (ChessBase).

And at this time the sale of dedicated chess computers is already a sinking business.

Rob: What are your plans for the next few years?

Jan: After I was declared unfit for my job in 1981, I totally dedicated myself to computer chess.

This kept me going and even now I will keep on devoting myself to computer chess, as long as my health permits.

The many telephone calls I daily receive from the public demonstrate that there is still a great need for good advice. With my test-work, I anyhow hope to be able to contribute to the improvement of the top chess programs for now and in the future!

Rob van Son, 29 September 2002 for Selective Search.
Shredder6 plays the Swiss International Team!

How do we fit 4 games onto the page? Can't be done!
All we can do is reduce the print size and go for 2!

The match was played in Biel over 4 evenings in July/August. The time control was G/60, and Shredder was, I believe, on a P/1000.

The 2 games NOT shown were both drawn. Here are the 2 decisive ones!

Pelletier - Deep Shredder
A17: English Opening: 1...Nf6 with

1.c4 e5 2.d3 c6 6.e6 Avoiding the
2...e5?! it has errred with (against
humans) in some games 3...f3

b4 4.g3 c5 5.g2 0-0 6.0-0 c6
7.d3 d6 8.e4 Apparently a new
idea, still hoping to block the
centre. 8...b1, 8...d2 and 8...e4
are the popular theory moves
8...d7 9.h4 e7 10.f4

20.f6? Impetuously opening up
the position, which allows Shredder
to decide the game tactically.
Better was 20.e3 f8 and then
21.f6 could be tried less danger-
osly. 20...fxe6 21.ºh5 e7
22.xf7+ h8 23.h5?!

Presumably missing Black's
strong reply, easily done now that
tactics rule! 23.g6 and if
23...e3 24.e6 was better
23...g5 24.h4 g4 25.f5??
Ooops! this allows a quick end.
25.g5 was better, but unlikely to
change the outcome after
25...e8! 25...e3! winning the
knight on e2 for starters, and
therefore the game 0-1

Deep Shredder - Jenni, F
C56: Two Knights: 4.d4 exd4 5.0-0
1.e4 e5 2.d4 f6 3.d4 exd4
4.h3 f6 5.0-0 xe4 6.e7 d5
7.xd5 wxd5 8.c3 wa5 9.xe4

ºe6 10.e5 g5 0-0 11.xe6
fxe6 12.xe6 d6 13.g5 xe8
14.xe2 e7 15.e8 xh8
16.h3 e6 17.e2 w5
18...h7? It's all been theory to
here. I traced 2 games played in
the 1990's, one went 18.c3, and
the other 18..d1, both ended as
draw. 18...e7 19.e1

19...xa2? Commentators didn't
like this... more like a computer's
move! The queen goes out of play
for a pawn. 19...xe1+ 20.xe1
e5 would be just about equal
20.b3 g5 21.f5+! If 21.hxh6?!
g4 22.xe7+ xe7 23.e1 White
has nothing 21...d8 22.g6
h7 23.d1?! Slightly strange!
23...b2 24.h6

24...xc2? Not just greedy, but
overlooking the computer's
immediate and winning response.
With 24.g4 Black would still be
in the game after 25.e1 d3!=
25.h3+! d8 26.xg5 A
decisive pin 26...d3 27.e1
xe3 28.d3 a5 29.xf5 d8
30.xe7 xxe7 31.e1 c3
32.e3 a1+ 33.e1 a4?? A
rather sad ending, risking desper-
ate measures to try and save the
game. It only allows a deadly
check and results in a speedy
 demise. But if 33...d8 34.b5
b6 35.xf1 xc1 36.e3 and White
will win soon 34.e8+! e7
35.xf3+ 35...g7 36.e6 and
Black must shed lots of material
to delay mate 1-0
Playing Strength Isn't Everything. Features Rule!

Says Steve Harding

Steve Harding was one of just over 20 readers who responded with encouragement and ideas, following my little 'tale of woe' in SelsSearch102.

Amongst many useful ideas was his suggestion of a 'Reader Questionnaire' - though it occurred to me that if only 20-25 folk respond to a 1/2-threat of magazine closure, how many would bother to fill in a Questionnaire?!

Other good ideas were for an article on 'Strength isn't Everything'; another Interview with Mark Unracke; development potential of Learning in the programs; and an Interview with Richard Lang on his current work and the potential in Palm & Pocket PC products.

He even offered to do the 'Strength isn't Everything' article - and I said 'yes' before he had time to change his mind.

So here it is!

Strength isn't Everything!

Sssh! Don't tell the programmers, but times are a-changing.

Yes, there was a time when program playing strength was the key factor in our purchasing decisions.

And yes, it probably still is for some of us.

But, for how much longer?

Ok. This is going to hurt, but my secret has to come out sometime - so here goes.

Despite my best efforts, the only way I can beat Fritz 7, Hiarcs 8 or Tiger 15 in a proper game nowadays is when I resort to using the handicap levels. Alright, I admit it. It has been this way for a few years now.

To put it another way, when I go out to buy the latest version of a chess program, pure playing strength is no longer the deciding factor - it hasn't been for some time.

Am I alone or does anyone else think this way?

If so, then it is surely a massive compliment and 'thank you' to the programmers responsible for the phenomenal progress made over the last 10-20 years and long may it continue. But it is also a warning.....

A Changing Market

'Take heed, the 'market' has now matured, and it moves on apace. Us most ardent of fans are now also entitled to be the most demanding of users.'

When even Kramnik can only draw 4-4 with this year's latest super strength PC program, Deep Fritz, it leaves me for one wondering what will make me go and buy next year's version if all that has changed is playing strength - 'routinely' up again by another 30 ELO points.

A little cynical? Maybe. A challenge to the programmers, certainly.

Yes, we all want the extra 30 ELO points - more please if possible - but to be frank, many of us will demand a whole lot more than that if we are to part with our hard earned cash again next year and the year after.

Got the message? It's time for you, the programmers, designers and suppliers to get innovative again. It's time for you to consider new ways of adding value to your products. Come on, surprise us. Reinvigorate your product - we'll even help.

One thing is for sure. By the end of 2004, if your programs are to sell in any significant numbers, they are surely going to need to thoroughly distinguish themselves from the current offerings.

More features, more entertainment, more value and yes more strength. That's what we want.

A Wake Up Call

Anyone else feel this way?

In case you hadn't noticed by now, this is a wake up call to our favourite industry. In short, the product we have now is great, super strong with useful features - thank you.

But deep, nagging questions have also recently appeared.

Where on earth do 'we' all go from here? Is the future bright or bleak?

Well. Good news.

The answer to both questions is the same - and resoundingly simple.

It's up to us!.... 'us' being those of us with an interest as either customers programmers or suppliers.
The idea is that if we, as customers, can collectively tell the programmers and suppliers what we want to see in the next couple of versions, such that we would be sure to buy from them if they can deliver, then the future will be bright. Otherwise....

We as SS folk and customers can certainly do our part. Let's get together and make ourselves an SS shopping list of what we would like to see in future versions of our favourite chess playing programs - both PC based and dedicated.

It goes like this. Sit down and carefully consider what you would like to see added, enhanced, changed or even removed from next year's version. Have you got any other ideas or suggestions that would, if implemented, increase your chances of making a purchase next year?

Then write down YOUR personal shopping list. Send it to myself:
- steveharding@hotmail.com, or to
- Eric, 46 High St. etc., or his e-mail address, and he'll pass them on.

I will collate them, rank each request or idea in order of its popularity and return our overall SS readers shopping list back to Eric for publication in the next issue of SS for us all to see.

Once published, I will then distribute our SS list to all of the main programmers for their consideration and seek their comments for inclusion - again in a future issue of SS.

To get your ideas and creative juices flowing, I have included parts of my own shopping list below.

Provocative? See what you think.

---

**Chess Program 2004 - Shopping List**

1. Steve Harding, would like:
   **In a dedicated chess computer.**
   1. A wood, auto sensory dedicated chess computer that plays at the same strength as the top PC based programs and costs no more than £400. It would be upgradeable and able to communicate with and play against my PC based programs.
   2. A table top, press sensory version of the above with all the same features and strength (up to £200). A portable version (up to £100).

2. In my PC based programs
   3. Many more chess engines included as standard. Also a Linux version on the same CD.
   4. Engine - engine games where more than one engine plays on each side. Eg. Hiarcs 8 and Tiger 15 versus Fritz 7 and Junior 7.
   5. A proper 'print preview' facility - like the one provided in many word processing packages.
   6. Much more flexibility in the feature that allows me to set the rating level at which the computer will play. If I want to set the ELO level at say 1000 or 2600, then let me - using ELO, BCF, USCF, etc. Then have the program accurately playing to the level I have set.
   7. The ability to set an option which guarantees the same game is never played twice.
   8. The ability to gather full analysis from the program as the game progresses, rather than have to replay the game in 'analysis mode' to get it.
   9. The ability of a program, given a certain number of games played, to give a full text-based assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of my play.
   - then to provide a custom written set of chess lessons and tutorials designed to improve my play to a new rating level I have specified. Finally to guide me through these tutorials providing a continual assessment of the progress I am making. Wow!

10. Usage statistics. How much have I used the program. How many games have I played and for how long.

11. Much closer links from the program to the suppliers web site, including:
   - the ability to download bug fixes, improvements, new opening books, new engines, new personalities, new features, articles about the program, information about the programmers, future plans etc from a much more active and regularly updated web site.
   - an ability to easily have the program report a mistake or bad move or bug 'back to base'. To have the program generate all the necessary info in an automated way, requiring no real effort on my part.

12. A Chess Program Construction Kit. The ability to custom build my own custom written chess program using a comprehensive set of provided 'wizards' and menus. I could name 'my' program, play against it myself and play it against other custom programs I have created by using the kit.

Now it's over to you. What do you think? What's on your list? This is our make a difference! With the SS publication dates in mind, please try to get your own lists to myself or Eric by the 28th Feb 2003. Our cumulative list might just make it in the next issue of SS. Let's do it!

**Steve Harding**
(fan, enthusiast, once peaked at 150 BCF, programmer, no commercial interest at all.)

- steveharding@hotmail.com
- 8, Lincoln Close, Keynsham, Bristol BS31 2LJ.
### RATING LISTS and NOTES

A brief guide to the purpose of the HEADINGS may help everybody.

**BCF** These are British Chess Federation ratings. They can be calculated from Elo figures by (Elo - 600)/90, or from USCF figures by (USCF - 720)/28.

**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 with computers and its results with humans. I believe this makes our SelfSearch 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 on an 80386 at approx. 33MHz with 4MB RAM. 486-PC represents a program on an 80486 at 66MHz with 8MB RAM. Pent-PC represents a program on a Pent/Penti/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>Deep prog on 8xP4/1000</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep prog on 2xP4/1000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3-K7/1000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPro2/K6/300</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penti/150</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486/66</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>-200</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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