Two new dedicated chess computers! The STAR DIAMOND (left) from Novag, and (below) the auto-sensory GRANDMASTER from Excalibur.

Visit the SELECTIVE SEARCH & COUNTRYWIDE web pages at: www.elchess.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@elchess.demon.co.uk

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

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

Further info/photos can be seen in Countrywide's CATALOGUE, available free if you 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 SS folk.

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

**PORTABLE COMPUTERS [por]**

Kasparov

BRAVO - new £49. Barracuda program!

COSMIC - new £69. Hand-held Touch chess!

Board displayed on screen, moves made by stylus pen, plus clocks, evaluations, hints etc.

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

Excalibur

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

**TABLE-TOP PRESS SENSORY [ps]**

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 £72 - Opal Plus program, good hobby computer + teaching features

OBSIDIAN £129 - with carry case! Excellent

Mephisto

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

ATLANTA £349 - the fast hash-table version of Milano Pro-seven greater strength, 64 led board

**AUTO SENSORY [asl]**

Excalibur

GRANDMASTER £199! - big 2" squares, green & white vinyl auto-sensory surface. Looks great!

Mephisto

EXCLUSIVE all wood board, felted pieces with MM6 - Morsch's 21000 program £449

with SENATOR - Milano Pro program £679

FRITZ £39.95 - by Franz Morsch, Extra chess knowledge for real top strength - a beautiful 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 program for single, dual & quad processors, giving GM strength on multi-processor machines. The program which drew a-4 with Kramnik!

JUNIOR 8 £39.95 - 2 new versions - the engine which drew with Kasparov, and a newer 'stronger' version, more suited to computer u computer chess. Obviously potent, aggressive, and with all the latest ChessBase features!


JUNIOR 7 £25 - 2 left! - top Features in its ChessBase Interface etc. Strong; decent positional chess but aggressive with fast tactics!

DEEP JUNIOR 7 £45 - 2 left! - the multi-processor World Champion version of Junior 7!

TIGER15 £39.95 - by Christophe Theron. Features, interface, 'net connection etc, and gameplay, analysis, printing etc. all as Fritzb. Tiger15 is very strong and reliable in all aspects of the game. Alternative playing style options (aggressive, suicidal etc included)

POWERBOOKS 2003 £39 - turn your ChessBase playing engine into an openings expert! 7 6 million opening positions + 630,000 games!!

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

Other PC PROGRAMS on CD

CHESS TIGER 15 £46. The Lokasoft version of Christophe Theron's Tiger program. Includes new opening book by Noemans and Nalimov's 4 piece Tablebases also on CD.

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, incl. 3 recent ChessBase magazines on CD!!

CHESSBASE 7.0 for Windows, now only £49

see next column...
Welcome to yes another issue of Selective Search!

I can already see that I made a strategical error or perhaps more accurately, lost the exchange a few months ago in issue 102, when I discussed the difficulties and future of the magazine, and warned that it would close down if subscriber numbers dropped close to or below 200.

That remains the position, but I hope readers know me well enough to know that I wouldn't just stop the magazine on the spot at that <200 subs issue number and keep all of your outstanding money!

Some folk must have thought I might, and that they could be paying a sub for issues that would never happen, as the number of lost subscribers since 102 has been very disappointing, almost alarming.

What will happen is that, if the subscriber number drops below 200 then I will produce just 6 more issues thereafter. So folk offered renewal with 'the end is nigh' issue would pay the standard sub. and get the last 6 issues.

Renewals sent out with the next issue after that would offer the last 5 issues for approx. £17 UK/£20.50 elsewhere, and then the next issue's renewal offers would go out for the final 4 issues at approx. £13.50 UK/£16.50 elsewhere, etc. etc. So everyone will definitely get what they've paid me for!

As it stands at present there will certainly be at least 6 more issues.

Therefore, unless you've had enough of the Magazine, please always re-subscribe!

If you share your magazine with someone else, or know somebody who might be interested, can you perhaps persuade them to subscribe themselves for a year?

Subscription numbers stood healthily at 270 when issue 100 went out, so there were no alarms bells ringing at all. But by our last issue (105) they had dropped to just 221, most of the losses coming since I expressed my concern over the workload and viability.

Perhaps some folk faithfully stayed just to see me through my 100th. issue, and left after that. Certainly I am aware that the amount of information obtainable from the Internet is having a serious impact on my readers willingness to spend Selective Search subscription money, just as it is with other, much bigger and now struggling publications!

But as long as there's 200+ subscribers we'll keep it going. Once we're <200 there will be just 6 more issues. The only thing that might happen with the last 6 issues when announced is that I might not worry about sticking exactly to publication dates.

Enough! Even though we're heading into the summertime's quieter chess period, there's still plenty to catch up on. So we'd best get on with it!

**Sonabend UCI Tournys**

Since our last issue Gerhard has included another new program, Delphi 4, in his two major tournaments.

It didn't do particularly well, nor did it's results change the top placings as our clear leaders, Ruffian and List, both scored well against it in the Tournament 40/40 section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Prag</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ruffian 1.01</td>
<td>109½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>List 5.04</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aristarch 4.4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nimzo 8</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gronkh 3.11.5</td>
<td>89½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yase 0.99.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Delf 4.0</td>
<td>84½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pharoen 2.62</td>
<td>80½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Crafty 18.15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Top 5.4</td>
<td>73½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incidentally, in the last issue I apologised for not having managed to find a source for List5.04. Shows how easy it is to be a bit thick!

As Frank Holt pointed out to me, it's available on ChessBase's own site at the bottom of the list of downloadable engines! Installs as easy as pie.

When we add the latest results to the Blitz scores, List and Nimzo with 15-5 and 14-6 respectively outscored Ruffian's 13-7 against Delf, so the gap between the top two in the Blitz section has become very close!
**Sonnabend Blitz, G/10+2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>/180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ruffian 1.01</td>
<td>109½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nimzo 8</td>
<td>108½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>List 5.04</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Groń 3.11.5</td>
<td>94½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yace 0.99.56</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Crafty 18.15</td>
<td>88½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pharron 2.62</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aristarch 4.4</td>
<td>79½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Delf 4.0</td>
<td>77½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tao 5.4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frank HOLT's latest scores**

Having just mentioned him it's obviously the right time to bring you up-to-date with hard working Frank's latest scores!

You'll not be surprised that, having found List 5 in the most obvious of places (where I'd never thought to look!), Frank has started testing it against some of the top commercial programs.

As is the case with Ruffian, it is clear that List is another free program right up there with the best!

- List 5.04 - Fritz 7 2½–3½
- List 5.04 - Junior 7 3½–2½
- List 5.04 - Shredder 6 2½–3½
- List 5.04 - Gambit Tiger 2 3½–2½

As always the games were played on Athlon 1800 equipment at Frank's differing time controls: 2 games in each match at 40/1hr., 2 at 60/1hr., and 2 at 40/30mins.

Just before I got these scores I played List 5.04 against our latest Hiarcs version (8257). The score went heavily in Hiarcs' favour 13–3, but my games were played at a faster time control of G/10mins +5secs per move.

Frank feels that List needs longer time controls, and a comparison of the Sonnabend results seems to confirm this.

Frank also pointed out that List doesn't use endgame tablebases at all - very strange! - and would have scored 1 or maybe 2 extra half-points with them in his matches!

Even so it's 12–12 total result above against those particular 4 programs would put List 5.04 at 2639 Elo in the SelSearch Rating List.

This is a little higher than we have estimated for Ruffian, whereas most of the evidence points to Ruffian being stronger than List. In a few moments we will look at Ridderkerk's latest figures!

First here is the table from Frank's other recent tournament, this time an all-play-all at 40/2hrs:

**Frank Holt's ALL PLAY ALL 40/2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shredder 6</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tiger 14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gambit Tiger 2 agg</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hiarcs 8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fritz 7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Junior 7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pete Blandford update**

In our last issue Pete had a G/60 tourny with the leaders being:

1. Fritz 8 15½/24
2. Hiarcs 732 14½
3. Hiarcs 8 13

Since then he's added a couple of new entrants, so his latest, all-play-all 4 games table now looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>/32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hiarcs 732</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fritz 8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fritz 7</td>
<td>16½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hiarcs 8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fritz 7</td>
<td>14½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That's very nearly the first 'ordinary' result we've had for the new Shredder 7, which is (narrowly) ahead of Fritz 8 on both mine and the Swedish Ply lists at this moment in time.

Mark Uniacke will be delighted to see Hiarcs at the top... but very surprised to see it's version 7 there rather than version 8! Ah, well, these things happen sometimes!

**Ridderkerk's UCI Ratings**

Internet connected readers with a particular interest in the UCI program ratings - there are loads of them, with varying degrees of ability! - can do a lot worse than visit the
excellent Ridderkerk site.

There’s much more there than just ratings, as you’ll find plenty of information as well as engine download sections, background information and instructions.

- http://wbec-ridderkerk.nl/

The last time we looked at Ridderkerk’s ratings I took the decision to knock 60 Elo off his figures so that the results would, hopefully, equate as nearly as possible to those given for the commercial programs in Selective Search.

The thing with his figures then was that his Ruffian version was 0.76, and rated at 2646 - 60 = 2586 Elo. But last week I noted that he’d upgraded to the same version most of us are using, 1.01, with which he’d got 152 game results in.

So here’s the updated table, again with the 60 Elo deduction to enable readers to equate the UCI engine ratings with Selective Search figures.

### Ridderkerk’s UCI Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCI Rating</th>
<th>Figure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2625</td>
<td>Ruffian 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2526</td>
<td>Yace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2520</td>
<td>Gandalf 4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Crafty 19.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2490</td>
<td>Little Goliath 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2487</td>
<td>WARP 0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2474</td>
<td>Nimzo 2000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2451</td>
<td>Comet B54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2448</td>
<td>Pepto 1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2437</td>
<td>Pharaoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2436</td>
<td>Aristarch 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2431</td>
<td>Top 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2417</td>
<td>SmartThink 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2417</td>
<td>Zarkov 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403</td>
<td>Dragon 4.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403</td>
<td>Nejmet 3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2396</td>
<td>Comit 3.8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2392</td>
<td>Quark 1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2383</td>
<td>Thinker 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2375</td>
<td>Francesca MAD 0.0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2370</td>
<td>Patzer 3.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2370</td>
<td>AnMon 5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2360</td>
<td>Delft 3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The list goes on... and on... and on. Down to position 120 and then there’s a separate inactive engines listing.

Nice on the above to see my friend (and Selective Search regular) Tom King has got a placing with Francesca!

I guess List isn’t going to be included because it’s a direct though free ChessBase engine rather than true UCI/Winboard.

### Harald Faber

Harald has been busily testing Shredder7 recently and, as it topped our Selective Search Rating List last time round, his results are of interest:

- Shredder 7 - Tiger 15  9½-10½
- Shredder 7 - Hiarcs 8  15-5
- Shredder 7 - Junior 7  10½-9½
- Shredder 7 - Chessmaster 9000  13½-6½
- Shredder 7 - Fritz 8  10½-9½

From most results coming in, Tiger15 hasn’t been doing quite as well as might be expected. Yes, it’s scoring a little better than Tiger14, but the improvement doesn’t seem to be so much.

As can be seen, Shredder7’s total score above is 59½/100. The same matches played using Shredder7 set to Gambit style have resulted in a 51½/100 score, so it’s obvious which is the best setting! The biggest cause of the drop-off was a 10-10 result v Hiarcs8.

### Pocket PC and Palm

Readers often ask me for reviews and ratings for the various hand-held units with whatever programs are available for them.

The first reason there has been no review is that I don’t have either a Pocket PC or Palm unit myself. I’d certainly like one! Maybe if I get a nice bonus for Hiarcs9 topping the rating list I’ll treat myself!

The other reason there has been no review is that a couple of people who have sent me results and have been asked if they’d like to do a review for us have errrr... declined.
Even so, there is now some testing going on in Sweden by the SSDF, so combining scores from there with other information I have persuades me to risk the following guesstimates! as to where they'd be on my own Rating charts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Program (Shredder)</th>
<th>Elo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pocket PC</td>
<td>Compaq 206 MHz</td>
<td>Fritz (Shredder)</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket PC</td>
<td>Casio 150 MHz</td>
<td>Fritz (Shredder)</td>
<td>2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket PC</td>
<td>Compaq 206 MHz</td>
<td>Genius</td>
<td>2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm</td>
<td>42 MHz</td>
<td>Tiger 14</td>
<td>2175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm</td>
<td>42 MHz</td>
<td>Genius</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two things are fairly clear:
- The Pocket PC will produce 200+ Elo more than you'll get with a Palm (and cost you at least twice as much!)
- Pocket Fritz (which is actually the Shredder playing engine) is maybe 150 Elo stronger than Genius.

Therefore the best buys are Pocket PC with Fritz, or Palm with Tiger.

As I've said at least one hundred and one times, you need a PC in order to install your software to the PocketPC/Palm, and to get any updates which occasionally appear (free) on the Internet.

I'm looking through SelSearch 105 and can't see that I've announced that Tiger 15 is now out in the ChessBase version!

I think you probably get better battery life with a Palm than a PocketPC.
The Riverdale Elite Tourny

Issue 105 referred to someone new on the Internet, logging-on under the name 'Chaos' and signing himself as 'Dayffd'. He's completed a massive G/10 double-round Blitz tournament involving 22 'just below the top', or 2nd. division programs! The top 7 of the 22 placings were:

Riverdale G/10 Blitz Tourny

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>Score/42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ruffian 1.01</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hiarcs 6</td>
<td>30½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=</td>
<td>Fritz 532</td>
<td>29¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>List 5.04</td>
<td>27½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pharaoh 2.62</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fritz 516</td>
<td>25½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I've just had a follow-up e-mail from him sending the results of his Elite Tourny, played at G/15 and this time with the engines playing 4 games against each opponent! A truly massive effort!!

Riverdale G/15 Elite Tourny

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>Score/104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shredder7</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hiarcs 8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fritz 7</td>
<td>66½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fritz 8</td>
<td>65½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gambit Tiger 2</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fritz 6</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8=</td>
<td>List 5.04 : Shredder 532</td>
<td>58½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fritz 532</td>
<td>55½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Junior 7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12=</td>
<td>Ruffian 1.0.1 : Crafty 19.03</td>
<td>51½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Junior 5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15=</td>
<td>Hiarcs 732 : Shredder 6</td>
<td>49½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17=</td>
<td>Nimzo 732 : Little Goliath 3.9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Crafty 18.15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Crafty 17.06</td>
<td>45½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Junior 6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Anaconda 1.0</td>
<td>43½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nimzo 8 (1111.)</td>
<td>41½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Too 5,4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Anyan 1.57</td>
<td>40½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Little Goliath 2000</td>
<td>34½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nejmet 3.06</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chris has just sent me a very useful article on Winboard engines, which he volunteered to do for us recently.

I just can't squeeze it into this issue, but it will certainly be included next time!

He's also offered to do an article for folk who don't have one of the latest ChessBase programs... i.e. Fritz8, Shredder7, Tiger15, Junior8. Under ChessBase you're supposed to 'need' one of the latest versions to get the UCI engines to work. But Chris has found out how to get older versions such as Fritz6 & co. to work as well!

I think most SelSearch folk keep their versions pretty up-to-date, so I'm not sure if we'll need the second article or not. If there's a hue and cry from my readers for it, I'll ask him to get to work!

Chris also sent me the result of his ProAm Tourny, played at G/10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Pts/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ruffian 1.0.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Junior 6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yace Pederborn</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Little Goliath 3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pepito 1.55</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=</td>
<td>Lamb Chop 10.99 : Pharaoh 2.6.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A nice mixture of top programs from a couple of years ago and new amateur ones!

As can be seen the popular Ruffian made sure the older commercial entries didn't fill the top two places on their own.

Chris says that Yace in 4th. was a little unlucky. He also finds that Pepito isn't as good under Winboard as it is converted to a UCI engine file running within Fritz6. Even then he still finds its results a little erratic and not as strong as the Ridderkerk results in SelSearch 104. Surprisingly Pepito 1.58 has gone even higher in Ridderkerk's list this issue than 1.55 had done there!

Next Issue!

In addition to the Winboard article by Chris, mentioned above, our next issue should also include:

- The big 2003 CSVN Tournament. 9 rounds played, 15 participants. Result, photos and games selection.
Won by The King and Shredder, ahead of Deep Sjeng and Fritz.

- Rob van Son's report, games and photos from the 7th. Gebruikers. A unique event as only pre-1990 computers were allowed to enter! A chance for Mephisto Amsterdams, MM4s, Simultanos, the Super Enterprise... and Rob's own 25 year old Fidelity Chess Challenger 10 to re-live their glory days! Should be quite interesting doing the analysis for some of those!

Let's Finish with some Chess!

Regular contributor Bill Reid prepares a special position for each issue, designed to be tricky for computers, and sometimes humans! Readers are invited to analyse it alongside their computers, and send in their findings.

Bill Reid- 13. Black to play

Introduction: Black seems to have the worst of things because of White's kingside passed pawns.

But my programs think the draw can be held with 1...Na7.

But is there something even better? Given 10 minutes, what can humans and programs come up with?

Bill's Solution: In his comments on the Kramnik-Bareev position in SS105 Eric wisely remarks of Kramnik's 1.Bf6! that "These things are much harder to find in play that they are when you've been told that there's something special in the position".

I'm pretty sure I wouldn't have found that move if I hadn't been tipped off that a brilliancy was on the board somewhere.

All this is very relevant to our current position. I'm guessing that Black's winning move

1...Ba6!

is so implausible that humans might miss it even when they know that there's something on. Computer programs, on the other hand, ought to find it because it's pretty well all tactics (okay, we might argue that those doubled c-pawns with the king blocking them on c4 add up to a kind of quasi-static).

Once again an end file's rook pawn is an ace! White's reply is forced:

2.Bxa6

and now after:

2...a4 3.Kd5 Na5

White is lost.


[2] Slightly more promising is the attempt to throw the pawns forward with 4.f4 a3 5.e5 a2 6.dxe+ Kd8 7.Nf3 a1=Q 8.Ne5 Qxa2+, but White is still lost.

Bill Reid- 14

In this position Black has just played

1...B(h2)-f4.

Against a human opponent the choice would have been 1...Qxh5 when Black has an edge, but there are problems about the win. One such is that his bishop is on the wrong coloured square to control the queening square of the passed rook pawn.

However the player of the White pieces is not a human, but a computer program, and Black thinks that Bf4 offers a good chance of luring it into a fatal error. Was that a correct judgement? What move does your program play after a five minute think?

Please don't forget to send yours and your computer's view of the position to Eric.
The Paderborn Computer Chess Championship continues to be a major annual event, organised by Ulf Lorenz who is a researcher at Paderborn University where the event takes place.

The quality of the tournament can be seen from a list of recent winners:


So the joke was, "Who would finish 3rd. this year?"

For a while it seemed that the top 2 places were also going to be changed, as the leaders after 4 rounds were:

- 3½ Fritz
- 3
- 2½ Brutus, Shredder, Gandalf, Ikarus, Comet
- 2 Yace, SOS, Diep

Fritz was leaving them all behind, and it had already beaten Gandalf and Yace. Its round 5 game would be against Shredder, and it as well as all the other programs needed a Shredder win.

It's worth noting that both Shredder and Fritz were running on the fastest dual processor equipment currently available, as the Transect 2200 Xeon Chess Workstation contains 2 x Intel Xeon 2.8GHz processors!

You'll notice that Chilly Donninger's current project Brutus was also there, running on its special Field Programmable Gate Arrays hardware. All I can tell you is what the tournament notes say: 'This makes it much faster than programs running on a general purpose PC'. These were inevitably expected to be the 'big three'.

**Shredder - Fritz**

Paderborn, round 5

1.e4 c5 2.e3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.exd4 Qf6 5.c3 a6 6.g5 e6 7.f4 e7 [Our Hiarcs book prefers 7...Nd5! 8.exd5 Qxb2
9.d3 a3 10.exf6 gx6 11.e2 Qc6 12.0-0 d7 8.Qf3 Qc7
9.0-0 Qbd7 10.Qd3 h6 [Here we prefer 10...b5 11.Qh1 Qb7
12.Qg3 b4 13.Qd5 exd5 14.e5 dx5 15.fx5 Qh5 and now either 16.e6 Qg3 or 16.Qh4]
11.Qh4 g5 12.e5 [This is marked '? in F8, but it seems it must be good!]
12.fxg5 is the Fritz-recommended move, then
12...d5 13.Qe2 Qxg4 14.Qf3]
12...Qxh4 13.exf6 Qxh4 14.Qxe1 Qd7 15.Qe3 0-0-0 [What about
15...Qb6? It seems to be a new idea, but might be an improve-
ment for Black in this line]
16.Qe4 bxc6 17.Qxa8+ Qb8
18.Qxa6+ Qb7 19.Qe5 Qg4
20.Qf3 Qxh2 21.Qh3

Fritz Paderborn - Brutus

Paderborn, round 6

1.e4 c5 2.e3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.exd4 Qf6 5.c3 a6 6.g5 e6 7.f3 b5 8.g4 Bxd7 9.Qd2 Qb6
10.0-0 Qbd7 11.Qf2 Qb7
12.Qd3 Qc8 13.Qe2

[The Shredder book ends with this it seems (don't know when Fritz's did!) and the game, sadly for Fritz, is essentially over]

21...d5 [I found I'd put 21...e5 in our Hiarcs book, but it's our last move. The idea when I added it must have been to threaten Qxh3 removing the deadly threat of said rook to c3+. But I reckon now that 22.Qd5 would still put White nicely on top]

22.Qa4!!

Qxe4 [There's nothing better that I can see]

23.Qe3+ Qb8
24.Qxh6+ Kh8 25.Qe6+ Qxh6
26.Qg6+ Kh7 27.Qd3 Qc5
28.Qb3 h3 29.Qxb6+ Qxb6
30.Qb5 Qa7 31.Qd7+ Qb8
32.Qc6+ Qa8 1-0

13...Qe7!? [Slightly surprising - this has an 8% winning record, whereas 13...Qc6 shows 80% and 13...Qc7 70%] 14.Qb1 0-0

15.h4 Qa4 16.g5 Qd5 [The end of my theory line] 17.Qg3 Qc7

[Maybe 17...d5!? is better]

18.Qc1 d5 19.e5 Qa5 20.h5!?
4¼ Fritz
3½ Shredder, Gandalf
3½ Yace, Brutus, SOS, Diep, Ikarus

The final round, and Fritz drew with Diep, so finished with 5, Brutus ended with 4½ by beating Gandalf.
So for our final game this issue we'll see how Shredder dealt with Yace.
A win would give Shredder 5½ and a share of the title.
We join it at move 83! It's been Shredder with N+5P v Yace B+5P since exchanges at move 40. It's had draw written all over it!

Shredder - Yace

83...f3? [83...d6 &d7 would have been a repetition draw – the obvious outcome as, with the on d6, 83...xc2? 84.xb5 is better for White: 84...g7 85.c7 e4 86.q a8 followed by b6 1-0. But instead of the safe 83...d6 Shredder (no doubt set to avoid a draw if possible) decides to shed the c2 pawn to try for a win and a share of the title] 83...xc2 84.xd6 b4! [Excellent and, I'm sure, quite unexpected] 85.cxb4 c3! 86.e3 g6 87.b5 c2

[We now have a very different picture from 4 moves ago]
88.d2 d4! 89.c3 g3 90.e2 g2 91.g1 [Some programs are still quite unworried, but few of us would fancy being on the White side of the board, 2 enemy pawns sat on our 2nd. rank, all pawns spread out and our knight v his bishop] 91...d3 92.h3 g7 93.b5! xb5 94.hxc2 [One problem solved] 94...e2 95.d2 g4 96.g1 g6! [Here comes trouble!] 97.d3 g5 98.e3 f5 99.f2 e4 100.xg2 [Second problem pawn gone] 100...xd4

[But a new problem looms!]
101.g3 d7 102.f2 \[If 102.f4 c3! 102...xe5 103.e2 d4 104.e1 b5 105.c1 c4 106.d1 f4 107.d2 e4 108.c2 e3 109.b1 d2 0-1

I like endgames! but that one cost Shredder its usual place at the top of the Paderborn table!
Congratulations obviously to Fritz, and also the amateur program Yace which shared 2nd. with the mighty Brutus and SOS.

Paderborn 2003
Final Placings, 7 rounds

- 5 Fritz
- 4½ Yace, Brutus, SOS
- 4 Shredder, Gandalf 6.0, Diep
- 3½ Ikarus, Anaconda, Comet
- 3
- 2½ Holmes, Quark
- 2 Patzer
- 1½
- 1 Matador
THE NEW NOVAG STAR DIAMOND ON TEST!

Oh, I like it! Very similar in appearance to the Diamond2, with a nice bigger-size 225mm square playing area, it looks classy, and also comes with a fitted fabric carry case.

But I know my readers! You want to know if it plays good chess!!

I wanted to know as well, because strong chess is what will really sell the Star Diamond and its sister machine the Star Sapphire!

I needed to decide what to play it against. At first I’d thought the Mephisto Atlanta, in view of the Diamond2’s placing in the SelSearch ratings:

2237 Elo Atlanta
2148 Elo Diamond2
2111 Elo Milano Pro

There’s an understandable and natural desire to see if the new and slightly faster version might have caught the Atlanta.

But when you add a price comparison to the list, that’s not exactly being fair!

2237 Elo Atlanta £349
2148 Elo Star Diamond £199
2111 Elo Milano Pro £249

So my decision was this: I would play it against Mephisto’s Milano Pro for the first match of 4 games, and the second match (if Star Diamond wins) will be against the Atlanta! If the first match is drawn or MPro wins, then I’ll take that match to 10 games!

Milano Pro - Star Diamond

Game 1. B52: Sicilian: Moscow Variation with 3...Bd7.

1.e4 c5 2.d4 d6 3...b5+
   d7 4...xd7+ xd7 5.0-0
   f6 6...e1 c6 7.c3 e6 8.d4
   cxd4 9.cxd4 d5 10.e5 e4
   11...bd2 xd2 12...xd2

   Both programs go out of book, but successfully find
   some known theory

   12...Ec8
   12...b4 13...xb4 xb4
   was drawn in Damljanovic-
   Cvitan, 1989.
   12...h6 13.a3 e7 was a
   win for Black in Bonham-
   Booth, 2002.
   12...e7 13...c1 0-0 is
   also playable

   13...c1 e7 14...g5
   The first totally new move.
   14...c3 0-0 15.a3 b5
   16.xd3 was a draw in Aung
   Thant Zin-Jiravorasuk, 2001

   14...0-0 15...xe7 xe7
   16...d2 b5 17.a3 xfd8
   18.b4 f5 19.xc8!
   A simplification that proba-
   bly suits Black more than
   White. I prefer 19...c5

   19...Ec8 20...c1 Ec4!

   Some initiative plus the
   c-pawn will need watching

   22.g4 e7
   I wrote on my game sheet
   here that it looks like a draw

   23...e3 h5?
   A bold attempt by StarD

   24.gxh5
   If 24.h3?! hxg4 25.hxg4
   c2+?

   24...f5! 25...g5!

   MPPro is quite pleased with
   the outcome of Novag’s bold
   play and shows itself +40

   25...h7
   Note that the temptation of
   25...xd4?? leads to instant
   death in 4 26.wd8+ h7
   27.h5+ h6 28.xf7+
   xh5 29.g5#

   26...d2?
   This yields to Black a big
initiative. 26.h6!? giving back the pawn, is an interesting idea: 26...\text{exh6} 27.\text{e7} \text{c1}+ 28.\text{g2}, but White hasn't gained anything as both players have infiltrated with their queens.

26.\text{g2}= was probably best.

MPro had 26.\text{d8} for a while, showing +100, then it dropped to equal. It could have dropped more than that in view of 26...\text{c1}+! 27.\text{g2} \text{f4} 28.\text{g5}+ \text{h6}+

26...\text{b3}!

StarD jumps to a small +42 evaluation

27.\text{g5}+ \text{g8} 28.\text{c1}

And now MPro shows -80 even though, for the moment, it is still a pawn ahead

28.\text{c4} 29.\text{xc4}

29.d2? is clearly worse after 29...\text{xd4} 30.\text{xd4} \text{cxd4}

29...\text{xc4}

We need a diagram for a rare and therefore interesting \text{N+P} ending

30.\text{e4}

In this position the programs' use of their kings will be essential. Probably some early centralisation even now with 30.\text{f1}! would be worth considering, particularly taking note of the Black pawn on c4

30...\text{xd4}

StarD actually has itself +192 here, which I think is a little high

31.\text{g2}?

31.\text{f1}! is the other way for the king, which I still prefer

31...\text{b5} 32.a4 c3! 33.\text{c5} c2 34.\text{b3} \text{d4}!

A surprise?! Of course it can't be taken

35.\text{c1}

35.\text{xd4}?? \text{c1}+ 0-1

35...\text{c6} 36.f4?!

Best has to be 36.b5. Of course it still loses a pawn, but a different one and, after 36...\text{xe5} 37.\text{f1} there may be slight drawing chances

36...\text{xb4}

Played showing +392?!

37.\text{f3}

I think it's fair to say that StarD now has a won game, but what begins to happen is that it makes a few second best moves -- none are in themselves bad, but it allows MPro to start creeping back towards a draw

37...\text{h8}?! 37...\text{h7} is surely better, then if 38.\text{g4} \text{h6}

38.\text{e3} \text{h7} 39.\text{d2} b6?!

39...\text{h6}!

40.\text{b3} \text{h6}

It's having fun by finding the right move, but on

alternate goes!

41.\text{d4} \text{exh5} 42.f5 exf5

43.\text{xf5} \text{g6}

43...\text{g5}!

44.\text{d4} \text{c1}+ 44...\text{g5}!

45.\text{xc1} \text{d3}+ 46.\text{c2} \text{xe5}

47.\text{b5} \text{c6} 48.\text{d6} f5!

49.\text{d2} f4 50.\text{d3} \text{e5}+?!

50...\text{h5}! 51.\text{e4} g5 looks very strong

51.\text{e2}?! Missing the best chance which was 51.\text{e4} f3 52.\text{f5}

51...\text{g5} 52.\text{c8}?

It's hard to assess this. Winning one or both of Black's queenside pawns obviously gives the MPro its own chances, but if the knight finds itself too far from the kingside action it will regret being here

52...\text{f5}?

This is wrong! 52...\text{g4}! would have made life much easier for Black: 53.\text{d6} (or 53.\text{f1} \text{h3} 54.\text{g1} \text{g5}!) 53...\text{h3} 54.\text{e4} \text{cxh2} 55.\text{f2} \text{h3}+

53.\text{xa7} \text{e4}?! 53...\text{f3}+! 54.\text{e3} \text{g4} was stronger: 55.\text{f2} \text{f4} 56.\text{b5} \text{g4}++

54.\text{c8} \text{f3}+ 55.\text{e1} \text{c4}

56.\text{f2} \text{f4}

56...\text{g5}!
57...\textit{e4} 58.h5 \textit{f4}!
This is now the only move with winning chances!
58...\textit{e3}?! 59.\textit{xb6=}

59.\textit{e7}
The horse will need to be a Derby winner to get back in time!

59...\textit{e3}! 60.\textit{g6+ e4}
61.\textit{e7}?! Having got it back this far I'd have tried 61...\textit{h4}, but after 61...\textit{g4+!} 62.\textit{g3 e5}
63.\textit{f2 f4} 64.\textit{f1 g4}! it's over

61...\textit{g4+} 62.\textit{g3 f2!}
63.\textit{g2 d3} 64.\textit{f1}
Best

64...\textit{d2} 65.\textit{f5 e3+}
Again nothing else wins. That's what happens when you've made a couple of 'second best' moves, you suddenly have to find a few 'only' moves to keep the win. Fortunately for StarD it's doing just that

66.\textit{xe3}
The only way to prolong the game a little was with
66.\textit{xf2} when 66...\textit{xf5}
67.\textit{f3} \textit{e3} 68.\textit{f4} \textit{h6}
69.\textit{g5} \textit{g8} and now if
70.\textit{g6} \textit{f6} 71.\textit{g7} \textit{xh5+} 0-1

66...\textit{xe3}

Fritz tells me that this is mate in 12. But we obviously have to follow through a little longer with the dedicated machines just to make sure the StarD plays it out correctly

67.\textit{g2}
The only other thing to do in order to delay the pawn promotion is to sac the a and h pawns in turn, which is hopeless

67...\textit{e2}! 68.\textit{g3 f1=}
69.\textit{g4 e3}
Here is the conclusion to the mate sequence: 70.\textit{g5 f6+} 71.\textit{g4 f4+} 72.\textit{h3 f2} 73.\textit{h6 g3#} 0-1

Before the next game I'd like to share how much I enjoyed first playing and then going over the two games!

It seems quite a while since I've done much Dedicated v Dedicated computer game playing - something I once did perhaps 3 or 4 evenings a week! I found it quite refreshing to be doing it again.

Usually I am battling through strong Engine-Engine, or Engine-GM games.
These are fine, but I don't always know what's going on properly, even after sometimes relying quite heavily on the work of Fritz or Hiarcs to keep my head above water with the tactics, and working

out some of the 'what if they'd played ...?'

Whilst these StarD-MilPro games were playing, I contented myself with keeping the gamescore, and made a few personal notes against the moves from time to time.

It was a nice change to find that I mostly knew what was happening, and feel that I could contribute some ideas to the game with a reasonable (I hoped) level of expectancy that I might have come up with some worthwhile ideas and spotted some of the doubtful moves made!

So when I went over these games with Fritz and Hiarcs, it was partly to analyse the game, but also to examine the value of my own notes!
I must say I found this a very worthwhile exercise.

It is often said that the best way to improve is to seriously analyse your own games, and whilst I can't claim that this really comes exactly into that category, I did find it quite beneficial. Sometimes it was very encouraging, and at other times I found things I'd overlooked.

It also definitely added to the pleasure I got preparing the magazine article.

Piecing the analysis together for Selective Search was also something of a challenge!
Using 2600+ Elo software to analyse 2200 Elo computers obviously means that, if we nit-pick, we'll find a few mistakes here and there.

So the challenge was to present these 2 good games, and get over to my readers the fact that, not only did both computers play well - certainly up to expectation - but at the same time to point out the main errors as well as
the good moves that determined the outcome.

So to game 2....

**Star Diamond - Milano Pro**

Game 2. C42: Petroff Defence: 3 Nxe5 and unusual White 3rd moves

1.e4 e5 2.†f3 †f6 3.†xe5 d6
4.‡f3 †xe4 5.‡e2 ˆe7 6.d3
†f6 7.†g5 8.†d7 8.‡c3
†xe2+ 9.‡xe2 ˆe7

The Star Diamond now goes out of Book. Which side should it castle?

10.0-0-0

10.†d2 is also playable, as indeed is 0-0!

10...c6

The Milano Pro probably expected castling kingside as it also now goes out of Book. However both programs do find Book moves for a short while! 10...‡b6 11.‡e1 ˆe6
12.‡b1 ˆd7 has been seen at GM level, as has 10.0-0

11.‡e1 0-0 12.‡d4

We finally leave theory, but this move is fine. 12.d4 d5
13.‡f3 ˆe8 14.‡e2 ˆd6
15.‡e1 was 1-0 in Wiech-Kosiorek, 1998

12...d5 13.‡f5 ˆc5?! 14.d4!

StarD shows +50 playing this

14...§b4 15.§d3

15...g4?!

Too ambitious too soon against a strong opponent. Therefore better was 15...g6
16.a3 ˆa5 and if 17.§e7+ 8g7+

16.¢e7

Now the StarD has +126 and in a couple of moves MPro will agree

16...xc3?!

16...‡xe7 was correct, then 17.‡xe7+ 8h8 18.‡xc8 ˆxc8 19.¢e7 8g6, and things are not so bad after probably 20.‡f5 8cd8. Of course we’re guessing what the dedicated’s would play – it’s one thing to use Fritz or Hiarcs to analyse 2700 Elo games, but their best ideas are not necessarily so applicable here!

17.bxc3 8xf2!

Having got this far, this is the best move to play. The sequence of moves which follows has both computers playing consistent best moves

18.8xf8 †xf8 19.8d6 8f6
20.8d2 8xd3+ 21.cxd3 b6
22.8xc8 8xc8 23.8de2! a6
24.8d2 c5 25.dxc5 bxc5

26.8e7?!

26.8e5! c4 27.8b1 cxd3
28.8xd3 is the continuation recommended by Fritz8, with an evaluation of w119
26...8e4+!

MPro expected the move we recommend, and its eval, which has been showing itself -100 or more for sometime, now comes back to -60

27.dxe4 8xe7 28.exd5+ 8d6
29.c4

Okay, they’re playing optimally again now, but Black has obtained equality. In fact at this point it looks like a draw, but White’s passed pawn on d5 will always need to be watched

29...8b8 30.8c2

Why not the immediate 30.8c3! a5 31.8f1

30...8b4! 31.8c3 8a4 32.8e2 h6

33.8c2?!

Apparently trying for a win, believing it has a small advantage due to the passed pawn on d5. But instead this yields a small chance to the Milano Pro. Instead 33.8b3 8b4+ 34.8c3 8a4 draw

33...8a3+ 34.8d2 8e5
34...f5!

35.8b2 8a4

Again 35...f5 looks strong

36.8d3

We’re back in draw territory again
36...Ra3+ 37.\textit{\textbf{\textcircled{c}2}}
37.\textit{\textcircled{d}2=}

37...g5!?
Now the Milano Pro is showing a small plus and takes its turn to spurn the draw and play for something more. 37...\textit{\textcircled{a}4} would go for the draw

38.\textit{\textcircled{d}2} f5 39.\textit{\textcircled{c}}

40...f4 40.\textit{\textcircled{e}1} g4
Black, showing the position as =, has got his pawns marching menacingly, and prepares the advance f3. But this has made the StarD more hopeful again, and it shows itself +57

41.\textit{\textcircled{e}2+} \textit{\textcircled{f}5} 42.\textit{\textcircled{d}2} f3??
Fatal! Correct is 42...\textit{\textcircled{e}3+} which would keep Black in the game after 43.\textit{\textcircled{f}2} \textit{\textcircled{e}8}. I think this would probably be a draw

43.gxf3
43.\textit{\textcircled{f}2} is also very strong, after which 43...g3+ is the only saving chance, but 44.hxg3 fxg2 45.\textit{\textcircled{g}2=}

43...\textit{\textcircled{e}3+} 44.\textit{\textcircled{f}2}
Now StarD reads +223, though MPro remains less convinced

44.\textit{\textcircled{xf}3+} 45.\textit{\textcircled{g}2} \textit{\textcircled{e}4}
45...\textit{\textcircled{e}3!} was probably better, and after 46.d6! \textit{\textcircled{e}8} 47.d7 \textit{\textcircled{d}8} 48.\textit{\textcircled{g}3}. Here however Black needs to find some way of relieving his rook, so 48...\textit{\textcircled{e}6 seems

necessary. But the result of this is that the g-pawn goes with 49.\textit{\textcircled{x}g4}, so White still has a win!

46.d6 \textit{\textcircled{f}8} 47.\textit{\textcircled{d}5} \textit{\textcircled{d}8}
48.\textit{\textcircled{g}3}

48...h5 49.d7 \textit{\textcircled{e}3} 50.\textit{\textcircled{h}4}
51.\textit{\textcircled{x}h5} \textit{\textcircled{f}4} 52.\textit{\textcircled{g}6!}
At this point StarD is showing around +400 compared to the Milano Pro at around 200.

52...\textit{\textcircled{e}4}
52...\textit{\textcircled{f}3} offered the best resistance, but even with that 53.\textit{\textcircled{f}6} \textit{\textcircled{g}2} 54.\textit{\textcircled{e}7} \textit{\textcircled{g}8} 55.\textit{\textcircled{x}c5!} would be terminal

53.\textit{\textcircled{f}6} \textit{\textcircled{f}3} 54.\textit{\textcircled{e}7} \textit{\textcircled{g}8}
55.\textit{\textcircled{d}8=} \textit{\textcircled{d}8} 56.\textit{\textcircled{d}8} \textit{\textcircled{g}2}

Of course it's all over now, but we'll just play through a few final moves

57.\textit{\textcircled{d}2+} \textit{\textcircled{f}3} 58.\textit{\textcircled{d}7} \textit{\textcircled{e}3}
59.\textit{\textcircled{d}6} \textit{\textcircled{e}4} 60.\textit{\textcircled{c}6} \textit{\textcircled{f}3}
61.\textit{\textcircled{x}c5} \textit{\textcircled{g}2} 62.\textit{\textcircled{d}2+}
and I switched off! 1-0

So what do we conclude?

Obviously the fact that the Star Diamond has gone straight into a 2-0 lead is very encouraging for Novag.

I think we can also say that, with a good quality and slightly bigger board than average, and the inclusion of the fitted fabric carry case, the new machine represents excellent value for money at £199.

The chess playing quality seen so far also bodes well for the Star Sapphire at £179. This will come out at the end of June I'm told, and will have the exact same engine and processor!

My gut feeling - and it should be no more than that after only 2 games - is that the StarD may just fall short of the Atlanta.

But I've seen some reputations damaged by trying to reach conclusions based on only 1 or 2 games! We need more! I once saw a Fidelity Par Excellence go 4-1 up against a Mephisto Amsterdam, but the final score ended 40-10 the other way! In this match of course we may well see the StarD extend its lead!

So I shall play the 2 more games for SES 107 and then switch to the Atlanta.

Equally one of our readers has shown an interest in playing a 4 or 6 round G/60 tournament with the StarD, a Mephisto Berlin Pro, an Atlanta and a Fidelity Mach3!

So one way or another we should be able to establish a rating fairly soon.
Deep JUNIOR-KASPAROV: A second look at game 5

I said in our last issue that we should look again at game 5 where Kasparov was accused of 'ducking out' by spectators and others, but in which some GMs/S/IMs have insists he took the only safe option.

I wanted to play the latest Hiarc v Junior8 from both sides of the sac' position - DJ as Black apparently believed it had at least a draw, whereas many believe White would win. But my Junior8 hasn't arrived yet, so I've played Hiarc against the new Tiger15, Junior8 next time!

I've laid it out to help you follow the original game notes and the new game moves across the columns.

Kasparov - Deep Junior

Game 5. E48. Nimzo Indian

1.d4 Nf6 2.c4 e6 3.Nc3 Bb4 4.e3 0-0 5.Bd3 d5 6.cxd5 exd5 7.Nge2 Re8 8.0-0 Bd6 9.a3?! c6?! 10.Qc2 Bxh2+?! This MUST have surprised Kasparov. He raised his eyebrows but took the bishop without much thought. Is Junior's Bxh2 destined to find a place in MCO, BCO and the rest?! 10...b6 would be a 'standard' type move, or Nbd7 and heading for b6 11.Kxh2 Ng4+ 12.Kg3 Played somewhat derisively by Kasparov, looking around him, 'is this serious?'. Of course the pattern of the sacrifice is known, but with Black's pieces mostly undeveloped how can it succeed here? 12...Qg5 According to Amir Ban DJ showed 0.00 here and for the remainder of the game. Other programs show White ahead. For example the Hiarc8X I have has White +135. Indeed after only a few seconds it shows the same next few moves exactly as they were played, but varies at move 16 with 'an improvement' on what Kasparov played. If there was a chance for Kasparov to play for the win at move 16 (as most commentators also now believe!) then Junior's evaluation was wrong. We shall need to do some analysis when we get there! 13.f4 Kasparov isn't smirkings now - he spent more than an hour over this and his next 3 moves! 13...Qh5 14.Bd2 Qh2+ 15.Kf3 Qh4 16.Bxh7+? This can only draw, which probably all PC programs also show instantly. Maybe Kasparov was hoping for the error 16...Qxh7 when Black has an inferior endgame, but that was not really likely! The issue DJ's sac and evaluations surrounds the move 16...g3! which was Kasparov's chance for the win. Black has two chances for his continuation: [1] 16...Nh2+ is the move which I understand DJ would have played, then 17.Kf2 Ng4+ 18.Kxh1 Qh3. Here White has 3 choices 19.Nd1 Nh2 20.Bxh7+ Kh8 21.Rf2±. Or 19.Rg1 Ng4 20.e4. But not necessarily DJ's 19.f5?! when 19...Rxe3! 20.Nxd5! Re8! appears uncertain with equal chances, and [2] 16...Qh2 was the move which concerned G17.f5 17...h5 (DJ would play h5 rather than 17...Qh3) 18.e4 dxe4+ 19.Bxe4, and now DJ would play 19...c5 to which Ban adds a .... but ends his analysis. So what has Black got? I look at a few moves further with 20.dxc5 Nd7 21.Be3 Nde5+ 22.Kf4 Bxf5 23.Bxf5 g6+ 24.Kxg6 Nxe5 and it seems White's position is no longer so secure! Note, if 17.f5 indeed runs into problems, as my analysis suggests it could, then 17.Rae1 g6 18.e4 might be better, though I'm doing an Amir Ban and leaving it there! 16...Kh8 Not 16...Qxh7?? 17.Qxh7+ Kxh7 18.Rh1+ leaving White with better endgame prospects 17.Ng3 DJ is still the bishop down, so must now take the draw, which he can do easily 17...Nh2+ 18.Kf2 And Kasparov, trying to look cool, put on his watch, which means the game is over and the draw can be agreed. 18...Ng4+ 19.Kf3 Nh2+ ½-½

Our 2 games, played at G/30mins + 15secs per move, start from the same position after 10...Bxh2+.

Hiarc 8.295 - Tiger 15.0

P4/1800, Blitzz:30+15

W=12.3 ply; 188kN/s; 3,156 TBAz

1.d4 d6f 2.c4 e6 3.d3 d5 4.e3 0-0 5.d4 d5 6.exd5 exd5 7.Ree2 Bxe8 8.0-0 d6 9.a3 c6 10.c2 Bxh2+

11.Bxh2 0.47/12 3:23 Qg4+

1.24/14 43 12.Bg3 0.72/12 1.36

Here Tiger changes Black's line of attack from 12...Qg5 to...

12...d6+(Qg5) 1.36/14 1:27

13.f4 1.56/11 1:09 Nh6

1.06/14 33 14.d2 1.52/11 55 Nh2+ 1.20/14 46 15.Bf3

1.55/11 7 Bxh4 1.60/15 2:14

16.g3 1.55/11 32 Nh5 (Qh2) 1.52/15 30 17.Bxh1 1.80/12 47

18.ex3 1.60/16 46 18.Bxh5 1.80/13 47 Qg4+ 1.78/16 32

19.Bf2 1.66/13 11 xc2
The ChessBase game info:

GAME HEADING
- P4/1800=my laptop.
- Blitz:30+15 = time control.
- Ply=ave depth of search each program during game.
- kN=ave * 1,000 nodes per second searched during play.
- TBA=s-tablebase accesses.

IN GAME AFTER EACH MOVE
- If there's a move in brackets, it shows the (unplayed) expected move. Otherwise move played was the one expected.
- 1.18/16 = eval from White's side and depth of search.
- 45-45secs taken on move, 1.45 means 1min 45secs taken on move.

Now Hiarc changes the attack for Black. Instead of 14...Qh2+ it plays...

The experiment so far is a bit of a failure! Although White won both games, neither engine as Black pursued the attack in the same way that Junior did against Kasparov!

This also meant that neither game came to the position where Kasparov allegedly ducked out with 16.Bxh7?? instead of playing 16.g3?!
At the beginning of the year Rob and I swapped e-mails discussing his next potential article. I thought his idea was great - the subject of his article being the first creation and early work of a couple whose names were probably the best known in all of computer chess in those early, heady and exciting days - Dan and Kathe Spracklen!

April 2003

Hi Eric,

Now here it is, my new article for the June issue.

As already agreed, I wrote the story of the program Sargon of the famous couple Kathe and Dan Spracklen.

The main part of the article is about the first years of Sargon.

I read a lot of the history in different books, in particular the small book of the late chess reporter, Martin Gittel.

He died in December 1989, but in 1983 he had published (under his own control) a very interesting book: "Sargon: Portrait eines Schach-Programms." In English it means: "Sargon, portrait of a chess program."

I think, totally only 200 copies were published in 1983, but in 1999, his wife Marianne was so very kind to send me an original copy!

Martin hoped that this book would be a stimulus for people to write a chess program by themselves.

And then during last year and this, Dan Spracklen himself gave me some information and sent me a few photos by e-mail!

I hope you like it!

All the best, regards......
Rob

Sargon fought until the very end!

You may wonder what does this title have to do with chess?
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They soon started writing, first in a pseudo-code that was suitable for the machine language Assembler.

They did this because they did not know yet on which computer the program would be able to run and what instructions the processor belonging to it would ask for.

Home computers were not very well known in those days. There was the Apple II, but that did not run on Assembler.

**Developing a Strategy**

They chose to write their program according to the Shannon A and B-strategy.

First all possible moves are calculated in detail by the program with the brute-force method (A-strategy), but when the variants tree becomes too big and too deep, the B-strategy sees it that a selection is made of the best moves only, thus saving much time.

In an electronics store Kathe and Dan spotted a Wave Mate Jupiter III computer with a Z80 microprocessor running at 2 MHz (2MHz... how times have changed!).

An additional advantage of this computer was that it could be programmed with the Assembler programming-language. They bought it and because they did not yet have a computer table or suitable alternative, they had to put it on the kitchen table for the time being.

Dan needed to be away from home for a week for his work and in the meantime Kathe energetically started manufacturing the interface of their chess program.

She saw in it that the graphical material such as the chessboard and the chess pieces could be seen on the screen of the computer.

When Dan came home again, Kathe had largely finished the graphical part of the program.

In the first three weeks of January 1978 the Spracklens worked intensively on the program.

Dan busied himself with the chess part of the program (the engine) and Kathe took care of programming the graphics.

**First moves!**

Those weeks of hard work had not been for nothing.

The program now was able to play two plies from the opening. A ply is half a move so 1. e4 and the program could respond to this move with the ply 1...e5.

**Naming their Baby!**

They also thought about a suitable name for their new creation. First they meant to name the program Jupiter after the name of the computer the program was running on, but they did not like that so much after all.

The planet Saturn and a moon of this planet, Oberon, also did not suit them.

But the combination of these two names led to **Sargon**, which also happened to be the name of an Assyrian warrior from Mesopotamia who won many fights.

Sargon of Akkade lived around 2300 years before Christ. Kathe thought this name sounded powerful and so Sargon was born.

**Sargon’s first Tournament**

On 25 February 1978 the Spracklens received an invitation to participate the next month, from 3 through 5 March, in the first chess tournament for microcomputers in the Convention Centre in San Jose, situated in the famous Silicon Valley in California.

Among the eleven participants were three chess computers that were already commercially available: **Boris, Compu Chess** and **Chess Challenger 3**.

Also participating was a prototype, the **Commodore Chessmate**, the commercial version of which was to be launched at the end of 1978. The Metalbox was a computer from Steve Stuart and he had assembled the machine himself for only 85 dollar.

The other six programs ran on so-called hobby or home computers, predecessors of the present personal computer. Two of those, **Processor Technology** and **Compucolor**, were already being sold on cassettes. **Sargon, Mark Watson, SD-Chess and Tenberg Basic** were programs that were individually developed by amateurs.

The playing speed was fifty moves in two hours.
This immediately resulted in huge problems. The programs written in the programming language Basic sometimes needed nine hours to completely finish a game.

There was no way the intended playing time of two games a day could be realised.

So some games were broken off halfway and then arbitrated by the tournament leader.

In the end, however, there was no disputing the winner! Sargon won the tournament with a score of 5 points out of five games, ahead of programs like Boris and Chess Challenger 3, which only scored three points.

**Building and Sharing Knowledge**

After this big success the Spracklens steadily continued improving Sargon. They also wanted to propagate their knowledge to anyone who was familiar with programming in Assembler.

They for instance wrote a small brochure named: 'A Computer Chess Program in Z-80 Assembly Language', that sold for 15 dollars.

In addition they also wrote two large articles in the American trade journal BYTE, and they wrote a book for the Hayden Book Company in New Jersey with the title: 'Sargon A Computer Chess Program'.

Kathe and Dan felt it important that no one who wanted to write a chess program would need to re-invent the wheel all over again, but instead could obtain the basic instructions from their publications.

In the meantime they knew Sargon itself still needed a great deal of improving.

It is true that the program had won the first microcomputer tournament but it was by far not strong enough to participate in the ninth North-American computer chess champion-tournament that was to be played from 3 through 5 December 1978 in the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington D.C.

Fortunately Kathe and Dan were able to do quite a bit of tinkering on their Sargon in the next few months.

They improved the opening repertoire, refined the positional analysis of the program, and they developed a beginning of an endplay methodology.

**The North American Champion Tournament**

The result did not fail to come and in test games the new Sargon, renamed Sargon II, already proved to be playing much stronger than microcomputers like Boris of Applied Concepts or The Chess Challenger 10 of Fidelity Electronics.

In December 1978 the time had finally arrived.

Kathe and Dan travelled in their car - a Toyota with licence-plate SARGON 2 - to Washington D.C.

Chessmaster David Levy was the tournament organiser of the ninth North-American computer chess champion-tournament.

Guests of honour were the grand masters Robert Byrne and Edward Lasker. Indeed the latter celebrated his 93rd birthday during this tournament!

The big giants of computers were participating in this event.

Of the twelve participants only two were microcomputers: the programs Sargon II of Kathe and Dan Spracklen and the program MIKE from England.

Nevertheless Sargon II was able to obtain joint 3rd-5th place with 2½ points from its 4 games.

The program of Kathe and Dan, running on the Wave Mate Jupiter computer that cost five thousand dollar, managed to beat the program AWIT, running on a big Amdahl 470/V6 computer that cost five million dollars, in 66 moves.

The winner, with 4 points out of four games, was the program Belle by Ken Thompson. The mainframe computer Belle would become famous from its many early battles against the mighty Cray Blitz, and its programmer Thompson would become famous for his major contribution to the work on endgame tablebases.

Sargon II's effort in this tournament made it clear that it is really possible to play chess with much cheaper microcomputers, and after this tournament chess programmers henceforth felt able to enter each following tournament with their microcomputers.

**Sargon II hits the stores!**

Following the big success of Sargon II the program was by mid-1979 available in the stores on cassette for the TRS 80 (level 2) and the Apple II computer for the price of 30 dollar.
The trading-firm Chafiz from Rockville (a town near Washington D.C.) had been supplying electronic games for many years. Among other things they were responsible for the marketing and sales of the chess computers Boris, Boris Master and Boris Diplomat manufactured by Applied Concepts from Texas (USA).

Now Chafiz offered the new stars of computer chess, Kathe and Dan, a contract to start working with them and to further develop Sargon II.

In co-operation with Applied Concepts a new commercial version of Sargon was to be launched.

In the beginning of 1979 Kathe and Dan Spracklen accepted the contract and started to work with the programmers David Slate and Larry Atkin, who already had been working with Chafiz for some time and were the spiritual fathers of the famous chess program from the seventies: “CHESS.”

Pleasingly they did not need to travel to Rockville, but were able to continue working in their place of residence in San Diego.

_A table-top SARGON!

In December 1979 this led to a new 'store available' standalone chess computer: The Chafiz Sargon 2.5 Modular Game System (MGS).

John Aker, at the time hardware and software adviser with Chafiz, worked for a week in the cellar of his house in Kansas City together with Dan Spracklen to make the Sargon 2.5 program work well with the Modular Game System.

The chess computer was equipped with a small pushbutton-control panel and the chess program-module, running on a 6502/2 Mhz microprocessor.

The advantage of this system was that you could replace the program at a later stage by a more powerful module without having to buy a whole new computer.

Moreover this computer was suitable for other game-modules like checkers or blackjack.

The control panel contained a chessboard and the chess-pieces could be pushed underneath the chessboard in a drawer in a space next to the control panel.

The most unique difference of the program Sargon 2.5 as compared with its predecessor Sargon 2.0, as well as with the other then available commercial microcomputers, was that the Sargon 2.5 version could think in the time of its opponent, the so-called permanent brain.

The funny texts during the game such as: "Are there ladies present?" or "May I cheat?" or "Should we switch sides?" were taken over from the first Boris computer, but in the Sargon 2.5 MGS these texts would be more focussed on the board position.

_SARGON is top-rated!

The American trading-firm Palmer, McBride & Kincaid Associates tested the various 'store available' chess computers in detail, and in their conclusion the Sargon 2.5 MGS ended in first place.

At that time it's rating was estimated at approx. 1641 Elo-points.

Right up until 1981 the Sargon 2.5 continued to determine the image and standard for the public as the strongest playing chess computer.

However, there was a price attached to it.

At the Purveyor of toys to the Queen, Merkelbach (at the time situated at Kalverstraat 30 in Amsterdam), it cost 1500 guilders (€ 681!).

There was also a high luxury version available, the Sargon 2.5 ARB. This computer cost 3500 guilders (€ 1588!) and was fitted with a large and luxurious board of precious wood.

Its reed-contacts saw to it that the chess-piece only needed to be moved and that the computer registered the move immediately.

The answer of the computer was shown by means of 64 little LED-lamps, situated one at the corner of each square.

ARB stands for Auto Response Board. The firm of William F. Drueke & Sons, Inc. from Chicago (USA) made the wood cabinet of the
Finally a very exclusive chess-robot with the Sargon 2.5 program would come out on the market, the Boris HANDroid.

With a special arm, controlled by three servomotors, this robot was able to move the chess-pieces entirely by itself!

On 16 September 1980 the Boris HANDroid was presented to the public by the German importer of Applied Concepts, Sandy Electronic in Munich.

During and after the presentation the robot could already be ordered, and the computer was planned to be delivered before Christmas of 1980 for about 3000 Mark (€1534). Unfortunately the machine never reached actual production, and nowadays only a few prototypes remain.

**Legal battles force CHANGE!**

In May 1980 Applied Concepts announced that they would no longer contract out the marketing and sales of their products, including the Modular Game System (MGS), to the firm of Chafitz, but bring it under their own control.

Chafitz reacted vehemently and this incident led to a legal battle over the rights of the Modular Game System.

The contract of Kathe and Dan Spracklen was in jeopardy. Applied Concepts refused to pay the agreed two-dollar per computer sold.

In the end Kathe and Dan agreed to a compromise of fifty cent per piece sold. The computer was renamed Boris 2.5 again by Applied Concepts, while the actual program in it remained the same Sargon 2.5.

Because of the legal squabbling Kathe and Dan looked for a better employer.

They officially entered employment with Fidelity Electronics from Miami, USA, in June 1980.

Fidelity boss Sid Samole mentioned this in an interview during the first North-American computer chess champion-tournament in September 1980 in San Jose in California.

The winner of this tournament was their Champion Sensory Challenger X (X stands for experimental) with a score of 4 points out of four games.

Was it possible that Kathe and Dan had already been working on the development of this machine for Fidelity?

Ultimately Chafitz were forced to give back the marketing and sales of the Modular Game System to Applied Concepts, and Chafitz reached an agreement with Fidelity Electronics with respect to the taking over of Kathe and Dan Spracklen’s contracts.

After this the Spracklens were able to peacefully continue working on the development of Sargon with Fidelity Electronics.

They did not need to move to Miami for this employer either, and could keep on working in their place of residence in San Diego.

Kathe was also becoming an expert in making ever-larger opening libraries for their programs.

**An enforced change of NAME**

The name Sargon could not be used with their new employer, but it’s spiritual parents made Sargon live on in eventually highly modified form in various later Fidelity chess computers such as the Elite, the Sensory 9, the super-luxury Prestige, the Avant Garde, the Excel 68000 Club, and the Mach III.

These Fidelity chess computers were available in very luxury designs with a chessboard of high quality wood, but for the smaller
purse much cheaper models were also made out of synthetic materials.

Opinions about the appearance of these plastic machines differed quite a bit. Some people called the models "bathtubs", but no-one minded the low prices!

Four World Titles! a proud record


This resulted in the further production of many strong playing and well sold Fidelity chess computers.

Unfortunately their success came to an end at the end of the eighties, partly because of big competition from Hegener and Glaser (Mephisto) in Munich, Germany, and also by the high exchange rate of the dollar.

Indeed in 1989 Fidelity was taken over by Hegener and Glaser, and the Spracklens moved to work for Saitek from Hong Kong, which themselves took over Mephisto in 1994. Of course Richard Lang and Ed Schroder were also working for Saitek/Mephisto, as was Franz Morsch. Tough competition!

Kathe and Dan's last program, the Sparcmodule for the Renaissance board, was written for Saitek, and from 1993 everywhere for sale.

In spite of being the strongest program ever produced by the Spracklens (Elo ± 2200), this Sparc could hardly meet the emerging challenge of the cheaper and ever stronger playing chess-software for the Personal Computer.

In October 1993, during the 12th World Microcomputer Chess Championship in Munich (Germany), their Kasparov Sparc ended in 15th place only and that was enough reason for Saitek not to renew their contracts.

The End of an important Era

Kathe and Dan now washed their hands of computer chess and disappeared noiselessly from the chess-stage.

With this the computer chess world lost a famous couple that, with their programs, made so much of an impression on the numerous lovers of our royal game. Sargon was indeed an Assyrian warrior who often, but not always, won...!

Dan and Kathe are now enjoying life in Oregon, a state just above California where they moved 10 years ago to.

Dan works as a 3D programmer for a game development studio. Kathe is doing the computer programming for a local company that wholesales craft supplies.

They no longer spend any time on chess, but they do think back fondly to their time with computer chess.

Their oldest daughter gave them four grandsons, which keeps Kathe and Dan pretty busy buying presents for!

References:
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Dan Spracklen, USA

Our author,
Rob van Son.
Many thanks Rob!
How did SHREDDER get 'shredded'?
Asks BILL REID

Dear Eric

Sorry to interrupt your holiday, but I couldn't resist a response to the piece you ran on Wiekrykas v Shredder

Best wishes.... Bill

How Did Shredder Get Shredded?

In his report on Dave Wiekrykas' win over Shredder7 in SelSearch 105, Eric said "I want to know 'how does he do it?'!"

I assume he was just trying to be provocative! Wasn't it Eric himself who coined the expression 'veiled attack' to describe what's going on here?!

If humans are to beat programs they have to find some strategy for seeing what is over their tactical horizons.

One way is to set up an attack (preferably against the opponent's king) which develops slowly and in such a way that when, finally, danger is imminent, the program's pieces are unable to regroup to fend it off.

Achieving this involves some or all of the following elements:

1. Blocking the centre. The point of this is to divide the board into two halves.
2. Inducing the program to castle into the part of the board where the attack will be launched.
3. Luring the program's pieces into the other part of the board, possibly by sacrificing a pawn or two.
4. Opening up lines for pieces against the program's castled position.

With these thoughts in mind I settled down to see if I could make it happen against Rebel 8.

Now Eric will say, "Why wasn't he playing Fritz 8? I know he's got it".

Well it's because my old computer won't run Fritz and I would have to get it set up on someone else's. That's my excuse!

I awarded myself the White pieces, set up 'Game in 15 minutes' and found myself playing against a Sicilian. A chance to follow the Wiekrykas tactics! Unfortunately it all went wrong and I lost.

Next it was a Lopez (I've won a few of those), but again my tactics let me down and it was 2-0 to Rebel. I wonder how many Dave loses before he hits the jackpot!? But third time was lucky. Rebel chose the French and I've a good sense of how it handles that.

Bill Reid - Rebel 8

1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.c3 c6 4.g5 e7 Now the block on the centre follows quite naturally

5.e5 dxe5 6.xe7 xe7 And here comes the tactic for getting the Black king castled with a queen hovering around it

7.b5 d8 8.g4! Instead 8.c3 0-0 9.f4 would probably keep some programs in their more comfortable theory

8...0-0 9.f3 a6 10.c3 Now it's quite natural for Black to want to expand on the queen's side

10...c5 11.d3 f5 Played in view of the possibility of 12.xh7+

12.g3 b6 13.0-0
13...cxd4

I believe that White is better in all lines after an immediate 13...\texttt{\textasciitilde}xb2, the best follow up being 14.\texttt{\textasciitilde}e2! c4 15.\texttt{\textasciitilde}f4 cxd3 (if 15...e8 16.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xf5! exf5 17.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xd5±) 16.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xe6 \texttt{\textasciitilde}f7 (16...\texttt{\textasciitilde}g6!? 17.\texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 \texttt{\textasciitilde}b6 18.\texttt{\textasciitilde}ab1) 17.\texttt{\textasciitilde}ab1 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xa2 18.\texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 \texttt{\textasciitilde}xe5 19.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xe5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c6 20.\texttt{\textasciitilde}d6

However it's all pretty tactical and I think this would have therefore been a better choice for a program

14.\texttt{\textasciitilde}e2

With the centre nicely blocked up the knight now heads for the kingside

14...\texttt{\textasciitilde}c6 15.\texttt{\textasciitilde}ae1!

The rook is needed to reinforce e5, and the sacrifice of the b-pawn of course gets the Black queen well offside!

15...\texttt{\textasciitilde}xb2 16.\texttt{\textasciitilde}f4 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e8 17.\texttt{\textasciitilde}h5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}e7 18.\texttt{\textasciitilde}g5 \texttt{\textasciitilde}f8 19.f4

More reinforcement for e5, plus there's now a way for a rook to get into the attack

19...\texttt{\textasciitilde}xa2?

Very risky, I guess Fritz would be more alert to the danger here?

Eric: Interestingly Fritz8 has this showing black +166, and that after 1min on a P1800?! Hiarcs9 leaves \texttt{\textasciitilde}xa2 after 3secs for \texttt{\textasciitilde}g6. It keeps this for a short while before settling on \texttt{\textasciitilde}h8

20.\texttt{\textasciitilde}f6+! \texttt{\textasciitilde}h8 21.\texttt{\textasciitilde}h4

21...\texttt{\textasciitilde}xf6

Eric: Hiarcs goes with Rebel's move, but Fritz strongly favoured 21...\texttt{\textasciitilde}h6! Is this better?

Both programs eventually agreed on the continuation 22.\texttt{\textasciitilde}f3! \texttt{\textasciitilde}d7 23.\texttt{\textasciitilde}g3! which is probably winning... well Hiarcs9 thought so along with myself. But Fritz8 seemed to think that Black was still okay with 23...\texttt{\textasciitilde}e8. Then Hiarcs would play 24.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xe6 and is fairly sure White is winning showing +122 (and rising) in less than a minute

22.exf6 \texttt{\textasciitilde}c7 23.\texttt{\textasciitilde}h6 \texttt{\textasciitilde}g8 24.\texttt{\textasciitilde}f3 \texttt{\textasciitilde}a5

25.\texttt{\textasciitilde}ef1

According to Fritz 25.\texttt{\textasciitilde}d1! wins on the spot, as it stops Black playing \texttt{\textasciitilde}d2. Then I guess 25...\texttt{\textasciitilde}g6 is best, but 26.\texttt{\textasciitilde}xh7 is just deadly
25...a2?
Rebel really has lost the plot. But it looks like there was no good move.

Eric: In the game Rebel has missed the best queen move, so Bill's choice also wins as quickly as the continuation from Fritz's excellent 25...d4!

But if Rebel had played 25...d2 26...g3 e3+ 27...xe3 dxe3, I reckon Bill would have been forced maintain concentration for a little longer. E.g. 28...f3! e2! and some care still needed though of course he's going to win.

26...g3!!
Mate in 6

26...e5 27...xh7+ f6 28...f8+ xh7
29...h3+ h4 30...xh4+ g6 31...h6# 1-0

**Bill's CONCLUSION**

Okay, I'm sure I wouldn't have pulled it off against Fritz, but Rebel is after all rated around 2500, and I would have no chance of beating a human player with that kind of Elo.

More importantly, this game does I think again illustrate the principles of Eric's 'veiled attack'!

So, should the GM's be paying attention?
I'm sure they should! In spite of the fact that programs get awarded grades as if they are actually humans, they are very different in how they approach the game!

On the other hand, if I had played this game as a GM in a match against a program, some interfering human would immediately be tweaking the opening book to make sure I couldn't do it again. It's not a fair contest!

**Bill has been contributing excellent articles and his often brilliant feature 'Let's Finish with some Chess' for some time. As readers know, that comes to an end very soon as he takes a well deserved rest.**

But fans of his work will be pleased to know that we are publishing a booklet based on many of his articles, discussions of computer weaknesses, statics etc. Some of the positions in the booklet will be those we've used in Selective Search and there will be some new ones of course.

The commentary will delve deeply into where computer programs have managed to progress, and what we can learn from them!

My aim is to include the BOOKLET 'Thought Processes in Chess' by Bill Reid FREE to subscribers with the next issue of Selective Search!

**New: Novag MODELS and the Excalibur GRANDMASTER!**

In our last issue I was glad to be able to announce forthcoming Novag models.

The **Obsidian £129.95** (pictured below) has already arrived - and with a rather nice black fitted fabric carry case for the computer, pieces and manual! It is based on the Emerald Classic program, but has 2 x 16MHz H8 processors = 32MHz, so is a little bit faster than its predecessor.

The **Star Diamond £199.95** will be here by around 10/June (I have a test model which is the subject of an article elsewhere), and the **Star Sapphire £179.95** should arrive probably 2-3 weeks later.

Another new machine in is the Grandmaster £199.95 from Excalibur Electronics in the USA. They are the same folk who make the popular little Touch Chess!

I believe this program is also based on the Emerald Classic, but the board is a really excellent solid vinyl auto-sensory. The 2" green and white squares mean it is genuine tournament size. The pieces are felted and lightly weighted - the king is 3¾"! Set up on the table it looks great!

A unique feature is that there's a display at both ends of the board to show clocks for when 2 are people playing - one player can even be computer assisted! The displays also show the usual analysis and evaluation info! It runs on mains or batteries.
I wonder how many of my readers remember our articles in issues 83-84 regarding a Deep Blue junior version which was being exhibited at various events?

At the time - remember it was 1999 - we were very excited, and I wrote:

"There have been occasional (unconfirmed) rumours that a simplified DEEP BLUE program could possibly emerge in a commercial PC format!

"A multi-processor junior version has been exhibited at one or two major events in the USA and, towards the end of the 1999 World Computer Chess Championships, was available via an Internet connection from Paderborn.

Although one assumes that a PC version still couldn't be as strong as this multi-processor version, it was hoped that these appearances gave some substance to the rumours, and that they would help demonstrate just how strong the Deep Blue project is.

Ed Schroeder's team quickly hooked up Rebel 10.5 for a 3 game match challenge, risking this latest version on a Pentium 233 (I) at G/10 with DBj on G/5."

We were all pretty optimistic that a form of Deep Blue junior - victorious in full format over Kasparov - was soon going to be available, either as a software item or, more likely, as a plug-in piece of hardware/software for desktop PCs! Wow!!

Our excitement was two-fold - not only to have what we thought would be the strongest program anywhere, but because we would finally get the chance to test IBM's constant (and often disputed) claims that Deep Blue's superiority was not only hardware based, but was also down to many special and sophisticated chess playing algorithms!

The price wouldn't matter! and I was already counting my sales commission!

But then we got the first game from a very chirpy Ed Schroder, which we covered in issue 83 (1-0 to Rebel!), and then two more came in time for our issue 84, and we all put our credit cards back in our wallets!

Here is one of those games, the third, with Rebel already 2-0 up.

Watch out for the strange opening (3...e6), some funny queen moves (6...Qd6 and 8...Qc6), and a reluctance or refusal to castle!

Rebel 10.5 - Deep Blue junior
D06. QGambit (Unusual). Game 3, 1999 match

1.d4 Qf6 2.c4 d5 3.cxd5 e6?! 4.dxe6 Qxe6
5.Qc3 Qb4 6.Qf3 Qd6?! 7.a3 Qxc3+ 8.bxc3
Qc6?! 9.Qb2 Qb5 10.Qb1 Qc6 11.e4!

White almost has a won game already
11...Qb6 12.Qd3 Qa5 13.0-0 Qc4 14.Qc1
Qa5 15.d5 Qd7 16.Qe3 Qxb1 17.Qxb1 b6
18.Qf4 c6 19.Qe5 cxd5 20.exd5

20...Qc8

Even here castling would have been better: 20...0-0 21.Qxf6 gxf6. Now White takes full advantage of Black's inadequately projected king

21.Qg5! Qxd5 22.Qxg7 Kg8 23.Kf1+ Ke6
24.Qh6 Qe7 25.Qf5 Ke6 26.Kxh7 Qg8
27.Qe4 Qxc3 28.Qxc6 Kxb1 29.Kd5 Kh8
30.Qxf7 1-0

Pretty depressing for DBj.

Obviously Ed Schroder now had some wonderful advertising potential for his Rebel program, but IBM insisted that this particular Internet version was not the real Deep Blue junior at all, but a further cut-down version - just to give mere mortals a bit of fun.

In one sense this hardly seemed likely - after all it would be a crazy way to try and
advertise the program - but at the same time its 'quality' of play was so poor, the relationship between Deep Blue and this seemed to stretch belief just a bit too far!

After many discussions with IBM Ed Schroeder, in typical gentlemanly fashion, withdrew his claim that his Rebel had beaten Deep Blue junior (though in truth I believe he could say it had!), and it became accepted that this version really was 'just for fun'.

Now, 3½ years later, I have managed to get hold of 6 games played by (I think!!!) the real Deep Blue junior, between 1998-9. This DBj was on a multi-processor of some sort, though there are no known details.

Here are 3 of those games:

**Eva Moser (2159) - Deep Blue junior**
Guiocio Piano - Two Knights opening

1.e4 e5 2.d3 d4 3.c4 d6 4.d4 exd4 5.0-0 dxe4 6.e1 d5 7.exd5 edx5 8.a3 d6 9.dxe4 e6 10.g5 0-0-0 11.dxe6 fxe6 12.e6 d6 13.g5 ed8 14.e2 h6

All known theory to here, and we've reached a pretty equal but interesting position

15.h4 g5 16.b3 c3 17.hxg3 h5!
18.e4 b4 19.b3 g4 20.h4 d8 21.e7 c6

...22.g7?
As it turns out it would have been much better to repeat moves with e6 and hope for a draw

22.c3 c3 f1?
It's the oft-seen human 'two bad moves on the run' syndrome! Much better was 23.e1 giving DBj the choice of d8 or xe1+ after which Black's advantage is kept to a minimum. But not 23...xc2? 24.bc1±

23.d3! 24.f5 b8 25.f4 d4 26.d7?
Even White's best chance with 26.cxd3 f5 27.xc7 f4 28.xc3 a2 would have left DBj with too much material advantage

26...xc2 27.ad4?
Two mistakes on the run again!

27...ad3!
and queening the pawn wins more material 0-1

Well, that was better wasn't it! But many programs in 1998 were beating 2159 rated players. So let's check out DBj against someone a bit stronger:

**DBj - Nikolaus Stanec (2463)**
C67 Ruy Lopez, Berlin Defence

1.e4 e5 2.d3 c6 3.b5 d6 4.0-0 xe4 5.e1 d6 6.xe5 e7 7.f1 xe5 8.xe5 0-0 9.d4 f6 10.e1 f5 11.c3 d5 12.f4 c6 13.ad3 ad8?
Black varies from what I consider the best theory line of 13...h4 14.ad3 f5
14.xe8+ xxe8 15.ad3 g6?! 16.f3 f7

What do readers think? It looks as if Stanec has secured his king and obtained a solid position, and is now waiting for DBj to risk over-playing his small initiative?

17.d2 f5 18.xf5 xf5 19.e1 d7
20.e5 xe5 21.dxe5 e8 22.g5 f7
23.f4? xf5 24.xd1 e6 25.xf1 f5 26.b3 d7 27.f6 h5 28.e4 g7
With Black playing a series of innocuous and repeat moves it begins to seem as if DBj has nothing. But then a quiet computer move obtains an unexpected reaction
29.h3 c5?!

Hoping, somewhat out of character from his earlier play, to burst through with a passed d-pawn it seems
30.g4 d4 31.g6 f8 32.d3 e8 33.a5 c7?!

Why not his usual 33...g7 putting the onus back on DBj to avoid a draw
34.f5 g5 35.cxd4 cxd4

36.e6!
The winning move, because it causes Black to go wrong very, though it was pretty strong even against best play!
36...e6??

After 36...fxe6 37.h6 exf5 38.gxf5 White would have a useful but not yet winning attack
37.f6 a8?

If Black was to survive he needed 37...f6 38.exf7+ xf7 39.xd4 b6, though of course DBj is still looking good
38.exf7+ xf7 39.fxg6 hxg6?

He had to play 39...xg6, though I'm sure DBj would have still won easily with 40.cf4+ ef7 41.xf7+ xf7 42. e5+ e6 43.xc7 40.xd4 c6 41.f6! 1-0

We'll look at just one more, also against a highly rated opponent.

Ilia Balinov (2450) - Deep Blue junior
C45, Scotch Game

1.e4 e5 2.cf3 cf6 3.d4 exd4 4.cf4 c5
5.xc6 g6 6.wd2 dxc6 7.a3 e7?!

I found this interesting as I discovered that, whilst it is classified as doubtful in our Hiarcs book, it is strongly preferred by Shredder
7...e6 is our main move amongst many decent choices, but (surprise!) Shredder gives our move a '?'! I'll have to check this out with Mark!
8.a4

Here I prefer 8.f4! which is in fact the main reason why we are not so keen on 7.a7
8.d6 9.f4 0-0 10.wf2 g6 11.e5?!

An obvious looking choice, though 11.g3 is actually the theory line
11...xe5 12.fxe5 xe5+ 13.a3

White has finally come out of the opening with an okay position, though he still has to decide what to do with his king
13...g4 14.a3 f5?!

Wow, very enterprising! Can DBj really play this?!
15.g3?

Completely missing Black's follow-up it seems.

With 15.d2 he would have been fine: 15.b5 (15.a5+ doesn't work now as, when White plays 16.c3 the knight is already protected by the king on its new square) 16.c5 17.g5, and White is at least equal
15.a5+ 16.c3 a3!

The point which Balinov probably overlooked is that if 17.bxa3?? both the Nc3 and Ra1 are lost. Now he must rescue what he can from the position, which he proceeds to do with some expertise.
17.0-0 xb2 18.a2 xa1 19.xa1 h5
20.a4
Although DBj has a material advantage White's cause is not hopeless by any means, especially with the potential of the 2 bishops 20...\texttt{Eae8} 21.\texttt{Exf5 g4} 22.\texttt{c5?}

That's torn it! White needed to maintain the material status - already against him. With 22.\texttt{d2} he would do this and still have some positional compensation. Now the material imbalance will become too much 22...\texttt{Ef6!}

Not missing a trick
23.\texttt{d4 Exf5} 24.\texttt{xf5} 25.\texttt{c3} 26.\texttt{Ee4} 27.\texttt{a3 b6} 28.\texttt{Ee4} 29.\texttt{f2} 30.\texttt{g4} 31.\texttt{g3 b5!} 32.\texttt{h4} 33.\texttt{cxh4} 34.\texttt{axh4}

So Black's extra pawns are now connected and passed. He must win 35.\texttt{h5} 36.\texttt{c1} 37.\texttt{h2} 38.\texttt{h6}

Note, not 38.\texttt{xc5?} b2!

38...\texttt{e6}

39.g5?
39.\texttt{f4} 40.\texttt{d2} b2 41.\texttt{g5++} prolongs the game
39...\texttt{f3}

The mate threat now wins outright
40.\texttt{Exe4}

40.\texttt{d2?} doesn't work now. White needed his pawn on g4 to stop Black's queen reaching h5 which it can now do. Indeed 40...\texttt{h5+} is m/5!

40...\texttt{Exe4} 41.\texttt{xc5} \texttt{e2+}

announcing m/7 though Balinov played on another move or so! 0-1

Well, I believe these 3 games make it very clear that the DBj in the Rebel match really wasn't either the same hardware or engine which had been playing with very good results on the Internet.

It actually went 1½-½ in the other 2 games I've got but have not shown here: one a long draw against a 2396 Elo, and the other a very quick win against a 1895.

Of course this does not prove at all that a commercial DBj would be as strong as - or stronger than - our current top ChessBase programs.

Even if sold with its own multi-processor hardware (cp. the Brutus project, SelSearch 101, which is aiming to do this very thing), we now have various Deep versions available for 2x, 4x and 8x processor desktops.

Nor does DBj's success on the Internet mean too much - the ratings some of the programs have been able to obtain playing there are quite extraordinary, occasionally tipping just over 3000 Elo! So DBj's 2670 from the 5 games I have, even allowing for an adjustment because it was 1998-9, doesn't by any means prove it would beat today's Fritz, Shredder, Tiger, Junior or Hiarcs on whatever hardware!

I suppose it doesn't really matter... it's not coming out anyway!
### 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) / 8, or from USCF figures by (USCF - 720) / 8.

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

**+-**. The maximum likely future rating movement, up or down, or 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>366 &amp; 466 based PC's</th>
<th>566 &amp; 666 based PC's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>566 &amp; 666 based PC's</td>
<td>566 &amp; 666 based PC's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pent-PC** represents a program on a Pent/Pent2/MMX/K6 at approx. 150MHz, with 16-32MB RAM.

**P3-PC** represents a program on a Pentium3/K7 at approx. 500MHz, with 128MB 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.

### Selective Search

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any way without the express written permission of Eric Hallsworth, The Red House, 46 High Street, Wilburton, Cambs CB6 3RA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(e-mail)</th>
<th><a href="mailto:eric@ehchess.demon.co.uk">eric@ehchess.demon.co.uk</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(web pages)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.elchess.demon.co.uk">www.elchess.demon.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please send ARTICLES, RESULTS, GAMES and SUBSCRIPTIONS direct to Eric... thanks!