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World Championships!

Summer used to be the ‘quiet time’ for Chess... but no more it seems. The months of June and July saw the FIDE men’s and women’s World Championship and the World Computer Championships all taking place.

As far as the Women’s Event was concerned, the then current Champion Zhu Chen opted out due to her master’s degree studies in China... and her pregnancy! Instead she chose to play a short match against Fritz8 which was playing on a new AMD 64-bit 3400MHz super laptop. These games are covered elsewhere in this issue.

The Men’s Event was part of the hoped-for unification system, with the FIDE knockout aiming to find a new Champion to replace Ponomariov, who had refused to play Kasparov as part of the unification plans. The winner will have to defend his new title against Gazza later this year! In the meantime, Kramnik and Leko are also due to face each other later this year for their version of the World Championship. Kramnik is its current Champion having beaten Kasparov who instigated this version when he broke away from FIDE to play Nigel Short. The winner of the current FIDE Event was surprise finalist Rustam Kasimdzhanov from Uzbekistan who beat England’s much below par Mickey Adams. So, he plays Kasparov, and the winner will then play the winner of Kramnik v Leko to produce one undisputed World Champion.... at least that’s the theory!

And while all this was going on Shredder, Junior, Fritz, Deep Sjeng, Diep, Crafty & co were fighting for the 2004 World Computer Title, each hoping eventually to win a lucrative meeting with the holder of the Human Title! More news of this elsewhere.

**Frank HOLT tests Shredder8!**

As readers will have taken note of I’m sure, Shredder7 went clear at the top of our Rating List as soon as its upgrade version 7.04 was released, and more recently Shredder8 has even surpassed that.

As far as my memory goes, only Carl Bicknell’s scores and views on Shredder8 have been disappointing so far, but in this issue we will see one or two others raising questions about the latest offering, and Frank also questions whether it has actually passed 7.04. In his recent matches, it lost narrowly to 7.04, and also to Hiarcs9. However its other scores are very good - as usual!

Here is his full results list:

- Shredder8 - Shredder7.04 5 - 7
- Shredder8 - Hiarcs9 5½ - 6½
- Shredder8 - Fritz8 7½ - 4½
- Shredder8 - Junior8 7½ - 4½
- Shredder8 - Chess Tiger15 8 - 4

Frank sent me a couple of very interesting endgames, well worth looking at...

**Shredder 8 - Fritz 8**

After 50.\&h8 \&e6

51.\&c8 g5? A very surprising choice by Fritz. Surely the simple 51...\&d6 would keep Black
in the game, and White must decide if the
time is right to run with the a-pawn! 52.a5?! 
$\mathcal{A}a7$ 53.$\mathcal{B}b4$ cxb4+ 54.$\mathcal{A}xb4$ $\mathcal{B}b7+$ 55.$\mathcal{A}a4=$
52.$\mathcal{C}c6+$ $\mathcal{D}d7$ 53.$\mathcal{A}xc5$ $\mathcal{D}d6$ 54.$\mathcal{D}d4$ $g\times h4$
55.$\mathcal{A}xd5+$ $\mathcal{C}c6$ It's a tricky choice between
the move played - eyeing White's passed
pawns - or 55.$\mathcal{A}e6$, hoping to support his
own, slightly more advanced passer! So
56.$\mathcal{H}h5$! $\mathcal{G}g4+$ (forcing White to make a
similar decision) 57.$\mathcal{A}c5!$ $\mathcal{F}f6$ 58.$a5$ (the
chase is on) 58.$\mathcal{G}g5$. Now the $\mathcal{R}$ must make
a choice - $\mathcal{H}h8$ to slow the h-pawn's
progress, or $\mathcal{D}d5$ after which both pawns will
probably queen. Is this better or worse for
Black than the moved played? 56.$\mathcal{B}c5+$ $\mathcal{B}b6$
57.$\mathcal{H}h5$ $\mathcal{G}g3$ 58.$\mathcal{A}c4$ $\mathcal{G}g4+$ 59.$\mathcal{C}c3$ $\mathcal{G}g3+$
60.$\mathcal{B}b4$ $\mathcal{G}g4+$! The pawn shouldn't be
pushed yet. 60...$h3$? 61.$a5+$ $\mathcal{C}c6$ 62.$\mathcal{A}a4$.
Getting close to being able to play $b4$. Black
has one way to stop this... 62...$\mathcal{G}g1$ 63.$\mathcal{A}xh3$
(63.$b4?$ $\mathcal{A}a1+$ 64.$\mathcal{B}b3$ $\mathcal{B}b1+$ 65.$\mathcal{A}c3$ $h2$
66.$\mathcal{A}xh2$ $\mathcal{B}b5$ and White must still play with
care to win) 63...$\mathcal{A}a1+$ 64.$\mathcal{A}b4$ $\mathcal{G}g7$ 65.$\mathcal{H}h6+$ 1-0 64.$\mathcal{A}a3$
$\mathcal{A}d4$ 62.$\mathcal{H}h6+$ $\mathcal{C}c5$ 63.$b4+$ $\mathcal{C}c4$
64.$a5$

Shredder 8 - Shredder 7.04

After 101.$\mathcal{G}g7+$ $\mathcal{H}h6$

So, who is winning. Black with the extra
pawn, or White with its d-pawn seemingly
unstoppable? 102.$d6!$ $\mathcal{D}d4$! Everything else
loses, e.g. 102...c3 103.$\mathcal{G}g8$ threatens $Rh8$
mate 103...$\mathcal{H}h7$ 104.$d7$ $\mathcal{D}d4$ 105.$d8+$ $\mathcal{A}xd8$
106.$\mathcal{B}xd8$ $f3$ 107.$\mathcal{D}d3+$ 1-0 103.$\mathcal{G}g6+$ $\mathcal{H}h7$
Frank tells me that S704 showed itself
moving into the lead at this point, but Hiarcs
and Fritz (+238) both favour White. Interes-
ting! 104.$\mathcal{F}f6$ c3! 105.$h4$? or! 105.$g6$?!
would get perpetual check, but as $S8$, $F8$ and
$H9$ all think White is still ahead, they play $h4$
to win 105...$\mathcal{A}b4$ 106.$d7$ $\mathcal{D}d4$! Anything else
loses, e.g. 106...$\mathcal{A}b7$? 107.$\mathcal{D}d6$ c2 108.$\mathcal{H}xg5$
threatening $\mathcal{H}h6$ mate, and indeed it will
mate in a few moves after 108...$\mathcal{A}xd7+$
109.$\mathcal{A}xh7$ c1$\mathcal{W}$ 110.$\mathcal{A}f6+$ etc 107.$\mathcal{A}e7$ c2!
108.$\mathcal{C}c6$ $g\times h4$ 109.$\mathcal{A}xc2$ $f3$ Finally we are
about to find out why Fritz and Hiarcs have
been favouring White, though the fact (I
think!) is that a draw is still the best White can
hope for

64...$\mathcal{D}d1$? Allowing the pawn to be taken, but
really Black's only hope is to keep it on the
board just in case White makes any mistake.
So I think 64...$\mathcal{A}b5$?! is best, then White
should go 65.$\mathcal{B}b6+$ $\mathcal{C}c4$ 66.$\mathcal{A}a4$ $\mathcal{D}d1$
(66...$h3$? 67.$a6$ h2 68.$\mathcal{A}h6$ $\mathcal{D}d6$! 69.$\mathcal{H}h4+$ $\mathcal{D}d4$
70.$\mathcal{A}xh2$ 1-0) 67.$\mathcal{A}c6+$ $\mathcal{D}d5$ 68.$\mathcal{A}h6$ $h3$ 69.$a6$
when White should still win 65.$\mathcal{A}xh4+$ $\mathcal{B}b5$
66.$\mathcal{H}h5+$ $\mathcal{A}a6$ 67.$\mathcal{H}h6+$ $\mathcal{B}b5$ 68.$\mathcal{A}b6+$ $\mathcal{C}c4$
69.$a6$ $\mathcal{E}e1$ 69...$\mathcal{A}a1+$ can't save the game:
70.$\mathcal{B}b2$ $\mathcal{A}a4$ 71.$b5$ $\mathcal{A}a5$ 72.$\mathcal{B}b7+$! 70.$b5$ $\mathcal{F}f1$
71.$\mathcal{B}b7+$ $\mathcal{A}a1+$ 72.$\mathcal{B}b2$ $\mathcal{A}a5$ 73.$a7$ $\mathcal{C}c5$ 74.$b6$
1-0

Here is another very interesting and slightly
strange finish. Does Shredder7.04 outplay its
opponent or, this time, is it Shredder8 which
apparently errs unexpectedly?!

110.$\mathcal{C}c6$?? Shredder8 still has this top even
after 3 or 4 mins! But what is needed is
110.$\mathcal{C}c5!$ $\mathcal{G}g6$ (110...$h3$ wont work anymore
here as the rook safely goes to $h5$ with
check) 111.$\mathcal{B}h5+$ $\mathcal{G}g6$ 112.$\mathcal{A}xh3$! 111.$\mathcal{B}f5$,
and it's probably a draw after 111...$\mathcal{E}e4+$
112.$\mathcal{B}d6$ $\mathcal{D}d4+$ 113.$\mathcal{C}c7$ $\mathcal{C}c4+$ etc 110...$h3$!
Now of course White can't play the saving
line above, $\text{h}\text{h}6+$, as he just loses the rook! What a difference a file makes! 111.d8\text{??}
Even here 111.e\text{c}2! seems to draw, as does 111.d\text{d}6! e4+ 112.e\text{a}6 111..\text{x}d8 112.e\text{c}1
If 112.\text{x}d8 f2 113.e\text{c}1 \text{g}6, and Black's king arrives first to force one of the pawns home 112...\text{g}6 113.e\text{h}1 f2 and again Black's king will win the day 0-1

Paul WALSH tests Shredder8!

Before I give you his scores, it's worth taking note of Paul's comments on the Shredder programs!

"After reading Carl (Bicknell's) observations concerning Shredder7 I'm inclined to agree with him concerning quick time controls - there is a decline in Shredder8's play... but it goes into over-drive at the longer time controls!

This is why I am personally reluctant to play quick games computer-computer. Firstly such games can't be used for ratings in SelSearch and mainly I like to see my programs playing at their best.

For example I play most games at 40/2hr, then 30/1hr and a G/30 finish where needed. Here Shredder8 seems to be able to find good plans which other programs either miss or don't understand. This also applies in endgames, I recently watched it outmanouvre Gambit Tiger when both sides had K+5P in a totally equal position, but Shredder found a way to win which Tiger wasn't worried about until it was too late.

Please pass on my thanks to Frank Holt for that lovely Shredder7.04 game. I think even Tal would have liked to play 18...Nxb2, but I noticed that you said Shredder8 didn't play this move, and when I tested Shredder7 it changed to S8's 18...Nxe3 after 15 mins. I think both of them saw your suggested refutation of 19.Bb6! and if so, then Shredder8 found it more quickly. But the point is that even if it does only lead to a draw with best play, S7's amazing move put the onus on Fritz to find the draw, and it didn't!

One last thing on this game - by 15mins Shredder8 has changed from 18...Nxe3 to 18...Rc8! More work for your magazine's analysts to do!

As far as I am concerned at the moment the Shredder7 and 8 versions seem to be really out in front.

Paul's hardware is P4/3000 and his results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40/2 + 30/1 + G/30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Shredder7 22/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2= Hiarc8 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Fritz8 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Shredder8 - Junior8 9-1 !

The next tournament is still in progress with 8 rounds to go, but Shredder8 has made an excellent start

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Shredder8 10/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2= Hiarc8Bareev 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gambit Tiger2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hiarc8 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Game/90
- Shredder7 - Chess Tiger14 6-4
- Shredder8 - Chess Tiger14 7-3

The last set of games is of great interest I think!

Game/60
- Shredder8 (def) - Fritz7 13-7
- Shredder8 (act) - Fritz7 13-7
- Shredder8 (nor) - Fritz7 13-7
- Shredder8 (agg) - Fritz7 16-4 !
- Shredder8 (sol) - Fritz7 12-8

Joe SHARP and Shredder!

Joe is another whose interest was sparked by Carl's article. He also has sent me some revealing results to share with readers!

Joe's results are engine-engine Shredder8 v Deep Fritz7 on an Athlon 2700+ and, as he says, "the results on Blitz confirm Carl's (and now Paul's) conclusions, and are remarkable given that Shredder is the current world blitz champion".

Game in 4mins+2
- D Fritz7 - Shredder8 34-18 (!)
Shredder occasionally got itself into time trouble in that match. I increased the time control to...

\[
\text{G/15mins} \\
\text{DFritz7 - Shredder8} \quad 36:14 (!!)
\]

Only over 50 games at G/25 did the tide start to turn...

\[
\text{G/25mins} \\
\text{DFritz7 - Shredder8} \quad 24\frac{1}{4}-25\frac{1}{4}
\]

"It seems that Shredder needs more time for its better (?) pruning and deeper ply search to take effect", says Joe. "I am currently engaged on a marathon test at 40/2hrs + 20/1hr +G/30 finish, and so far Fritz now seems to be outclassed, with Shredder at times looking 5-7 ply deeper! Perhaps someone better qualified than I can explain what's going on here. I would have thought Shredder's pruning method would sometimes cause it to miss vital moves, and that does seem to happen but only at faster time controls".

At first it seemed Ruffian1 might be in for a right shock as SOS beat it in round 1, and Ktulu beat it in round 2. With Green Light beating Ktulu in round 1, the early table looked quite strange:

- 2/2
- 1\frac{1}{2} Green Light Chess, SOS
- 1 Ktulu
- 1/2
- 0 Ruffian !!

However Ruffian beat in turn each of its opponents in the next 3 rounds, to reassert itself, and at the halfway stage the scores were:

- 3\frac{1}{2}/6 SOS, Ruffian
- 3
- 2\frac{1}{4} Ktulu, Green Light Chess

Once Ruffian had beaten SOS in round 7 I guess the excitement was largely over, and the final scores were....

### RK2004 Tournament
by Utzinger & Buhler

Massive 8 engine, 140 rounds, 560 games, G/90 + 30secs on Athlon 1300 computers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Score/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ruffian 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOS 3 Arena</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=</td>
<td>Ktulu 4.2</td>
<td>4\frac{1}{2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Light Chess</td>
<td>4\frac{1}{2}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chris kindly always sends me a good games selection, and it is constantly my intention to print one or two in SelSearch. Somehow there always seems to be so much else demanding attention and inclusion - I'm especially aware I've got the 12th. WCCC being played right now, and Gebruikers and 4th CSVN left over from the last issue.

But one of these days I'll definitely set Hiarc or Fritz and myself to work and analyse some of the games, and we'll see what we can make of them.

In the meantime Chris has phoned to tell me how well the latest version of Aristarch (4.50) has played in his most recent mini-tournament. So he's planning to do another 4-player event with, this time, Aristarch, Ruffian, The King3.23 (which is Winboard compatible) and Ktulu, and see how that works out. He's forecasting that Aristarch will now run The King and Ruffian very close!
You could have forecast that Shredder would win the 4th. International CSVN Tournament, as reported in our last issue, as it had progressed from 3rd. in 2002 to 2nd. in 2003, so 2004 promised to be its year.

The strong entry list at Leiden included the mighty Hydra (representing the United Arab Emirates!), strong Dutch programs Chess Tiger, The King, Diep, Tao and others, plus Sweden's Ruffian, Belgium's Deep Sjeng, and Germany's Shredder, Nexus and IsiChess.

Following its first big success at Paderborn the 16-card Hydra was a hot favourite to win but, although only Diep was on dual hardware and all the others on fast single processor units, it was not to be!

Hydra made a good start despite being held to a draw by IsiChess in round 1, by winning its next two, including a good but not dramatic win over Ruffian.

Shredder's programmer Stefan Meyer-Kahlen must have had a bit of a shock as, after beating Ant and Nexus in rounds 1 and 2, it lost to Diep in round 3. In fact Diep won each of its first 3 games! After 3 rounds the leaders were:

- 3 Diep!
- 2½ Hydra, Chess Tiger
- 2 Ruffian, Shredder, The King, Nexus
- 1½ IsiChess, Deep Sjeng

But Diep then drew with Tiger and lost to Hydra, so, with Hydra also beating Nexus in round 4, Ruffian beating The King and IsiChess, and Shredder beating Tiger and Deep Sjeng, the leaders after 5 rounds were:

- 4½ Hydra
- 4 Shredder, Ruffian
- 3½ Diep
- 3 Chess Tiger, The King

In round 6 Shredder beat Hydra (aided by the latter's poor book line), then Ruffian in round 7, and The King in round 8. It is truly an amazing program at times! Hydra seemed to sulk after its defeat and could only draw its next 2 games. Ruffian beat Diep in round 6 but compounded its defeat to Shredder with another against Nexus so, with still 1 round to play Shredder was already 1½ pts clear!
33...Ec7?! I prefer 33...g4 34.f3! Stopping Black from playing my previous note suggestion 34...g5 35.EXb4 g4 36.fxg4?! Its opponent's e-pawn becomes a dangerous passer. 36.f4 was best 36...EXg4 37.Ee1 Exf6 38.Ee2 Exe5 39.Ee3 Ee6+ 40.Eb3 h5 41.Ed3 Ed5 42.Ec3 h4! 43.EXh4 f4 44.a4 Eg6 45.Eb4? The wrong way. 45.Ec2 Eh5 46.Ed2 f3 47.c6 Exc6 48.EXc6 Exc6 49.Ed7 Exh4 50.Ee3 was more likely to hold the draw 45...f3! 46.Exc4 Eb7+ 47.Ed5

47...Exc4+! Other programs head for a draw with 47...Ec6+. The very deep searching Hydra sees that a win is still possible and goes for it 48.Exc4 Ee7! 49.Ec1 e5! 50.c6! e4! 51.c7 Hiarcs' apparently ingenious 51.h5+! doesn't quite work: 51...Exh5 52.c7 Exc7 53.Exc7 e3! and even though the rook can get to both the e and f files, thanks to the 51.h5+ idea, one of the pawns must queen after a long series of checks 51...Exc7 52.Exc7 e3 53.Ee7 e2 54.Ee5 Eh6 55.h5 f2

56.Exe2 f1=Q 57.Ee6+ Exh5 58.Exa6 and now tablebases enabled 58...Qg1 to be played with mate announcement. A very impressive finish by Hydra! 0-1

Round 5... Chess Tiger - Shredder


Black threatens Qa1 an unpleasant pin, and even worse Qc5+ forcing the exchange of queens which is game over due to his 2 extra pawns 36.Edc1 if 36.Ed3 to stop Qc5+ 36.Qd1 37.Qd4 B3 0-1; if 36.Ed2 probably the most obstinate 36...Ed1+ 37.Ed3 Qb6 38.Edc2 Ed2+ 39.Edh3 Ed3 40.Qe3 Qxe3 41.Ed1 and Tiger can stretch the game out
for just a little longer yet 36...\text{\texttt{c5+}} 37.\text{\texttt{e3}} \text{\texttt{xc1+}} 38.\text{\texttt{xc1 \texttt{d4}}} 39.\text{\texttt{c2 \texttt{c5}}} and the queenside pawns will be running soon \text{\texttt{0-1}}

Also from round 5 came the following, Hydra's best effort in a tournament in which it showed few of the expected sparks.

**Round 5... Hydra - Diep**

1.\text{\texttt{d4 \texttt{f6}}} 2.\text{\texttt{c3 \texttt{d5}}} 3.\text{\texttt{f3?!}} Unusual! 3...\text{\texttt{e6}} 4.\text{\texttt{e4 \texttt{b4}}} 5.\text{\texttt{a3?!}} More unusual still! \text{\texttt{g5}} or \text{\texttt{e5}} are known to theory, but not this I think 5...\text{\texttt{e7}} 6.\text{\texttt{e5 \texttt{fd7}}} 7.\text{\texttt{f4 \texttt{c6}}} 8.\text{\texttt{e3 \texttt{b6}}} 9.\text{\texttt{h5 \texttt{g6?!}}} An unnecessary weakening of the king's position 9...\text{\texttt{0-0}} was better 10.\text{\texttt{h6 \texttt{f8}}} 11.\text{\texttt{h3 \texttt{a6}}} 12.\text{\texttt{f3 \texttt{xf1}}} 13.\text{\texttt{xf1 \texttt{h5}}} 14.\text{\texttt{g5 \texttt{e7}}} 15.\text{\texttt{g4! \texttt{c5}}}

16.\text{\texttt{xf7?! \texttt{xf7}}} 17.\text{\texttt{f5!}} Hydra has a fierce attack, but will it succeed? 17...\text{\texttt{cxd4}}

18.\text{\texttt{fxg6+?!}} I think most programs would play 18.\text{\texttt{xe6+}} and, after 18...\text{\texttt{g7}}, 19.\text{\texttt{xd4}} to regain some material. Of course most programs wouldn't have played 16.\text{\texttt{xf7!}}

18...\text{\texttt{g7}} 19.\text{\texttt{gxh5 \texttt{h4+}}} 20.\text{\texttt{e2 \texttt{xe5}}} The best defence, but it won't hold. 20...\text{\texttt{e8?}} runs into 21.\text{\texttt{xf7+ \texttt{g8}}} 22.\text{\texttt{h6!!}} 1-0 21.\text{\texttt{xd4 \texttt{xf6?}}} 21...\text{\texttt{bc6}} may have been more resilient, then 22.\text{\texttt{xf7+ \texttt{h6}}} 23.\text{\texttt{xe3+ \texttt{g5}}} 24.\text{\texttt{g7 \texttt{xf7}}} 25.\text{\texttt{gxh8\texttt{+ \texttt{g8}}} 26.\text{\texttt{xe6}}} 27.\text{\texttt{g6+ \texttt{f8}}} 28.\text{\texttt{xf1}} winning 22.\text{\texttt{xe5 \texttt{d7}}} 23.\text{\texttt{xf6!}} 24.\text{\texttt{xe5 \texttt{xe5}}} 25.\text{\texttt{xf7+ \texttt{xf7}}} 26.\text{\texttt{xf7+ \texttt{g8}}} 27.\text{\texttt{h6!}} 1-0

**Round 6... Shredder - Hydra**

1.\text{\texttt{e4 \texttt{c5}}} 2.\text{\texttt{f3 \texttt{c6}}} 3.\text{\texttt{d4 \texttt{xd4}}} 4.\text{\texttt{xd4 \texttt{g6}}} 5.\text{\texttt{c3 \texttt{g7}}} 6.\text{\texttt{e3 \texttt{d6}}} 7.\text{\texttt{f3 \texttt{f6}}} 8.\text{\texttt{h2 \texttt{0-0}}} 9.\text{\texttt{0-0 \texttt{xd4}}} 10.\text{\texttt{xd4 \texttt{e6}}} 11.\text{\texttt{b1 \texttt{d5}}} 12.\text{\texttt{h4 \texttt{f6}}} 13.\text{\texttt{h5 \texttt{g5}}} 14.\text{\texttt{h6 \texttt{g8}}} 15.\text{\texttt{a3 \texttt{e7}}} 16.\text{\texttt{f4 \texttt{xd4}}} 17.\text{\texttt{xd4 \texttt{f6}}} 18.\text{\texttt{f5 \texttt{gx5}}} 19.\text{\texttt{d5 \texttt{xd5}}} 20.\text{\texttt{exd5 \texttt{c5}}} 21.\text{\texttt{d3}}

27...\text{\texttt{d8?!}} The last chance to save it might have been 27...\text{\texttt{xd4}} 28.\text{\texttt{xd4 \texttt{xd4}}} 29.\text{\texttt{xd4 \texttt{xd4}}} 30.\text{\texttt{g5 \texttt{g8}}} 31.\text{\texttt{xe7}} A pretty devastating win from Shredder 1-0
Review of **CLASSIC Shredder**!

Because so many people buy their PC programs in ChessBase format - got used to the interface - engine v engine testing - comparative analysis - import/export of cbh files - the tendency is to review all new programs in their ChessBase guise.

However Shredder's programmer Stefan Meyer-Kahlen has always maintained his own interface, which is how all the early versions of Shredder appeared. Of course because of its many great successes ChessBase persuaded Stefan to release the program in their format, but recent releases - until Shredder8! - have also included the Shredder Classic version on their CD. I actually know quite a few folk who prefer the Classic version, and the only real drawback I know of is the fact that gamefile import is restricted' to cbf, pgn and epd, and doesn't include the latest ChessBase file system of cbh. However it's easy enough to convert pgn/cbf to cbh, and vice-versa, from within any ChessBase program so, apart from a few moments of 'wasted' time, there's not much lost.

Here is a brief listing of the main Shredder Classic features:
- User interface that is easy to handle and can be set up individually
- Four different sets of pieces and chessboards both in 2D and 3D
- Chess engine with extremely powerful play, that can be individually adjusted and configured
- Built-in Chess coach, which alerts of mistakes and suggests better moves
- Own games can be automatically examined for mistakes
- Moves can easily be entered by mouse or keyboard
- Extensive on screen documentation, which can be printed
- Games can be provided with alternative lines and comments
- Many features for training and analysis
- Manifold possibilities to systematically search and examine the endgame databases
- Free, open protocol between user interface and chess engine (UCI protocol) which means many other engines can be used from within Shredder Classic, and full advantage taken of its Triple Brain feature
- Possibility to simultaneously load up to ten chess engines, most of which differ in their playing style
- Many possibilities for automatic tests and comparisons of different chess engines

Okay, let's have a look at a couple of screenshots.

The first thing I noticed when I started testing was that the program seemed to be very slightly different than the ChessBase Shredder8 I'd been using. In fact Stefan tells me the Classic engine has the same knowledge as the ChessBase one, but the search is not quite so efficient. So when Stefan enters a tournament he uses the ChessBase Shredder8 engine. But if you have CBase Shredder8 you can easily install that engine into the Classic interface, and it runs fractionally faster there as well, so you can have the best of both worlds!

Stefan's interface is excellent, very reliable, and brilliant when resizing the board or any other window. The 2D pieces are easiest to view in my opinion, but the 3D pieces operate faster as, though they look good and are easy to see, are not photo realistic. When you buy Shredder Classic from Stefan's website (address shown below) you can also get a big bonus opening book by Sandro Necchi. This is worth having as the opening style options and variation weightings are easily adjusted. The engine piece values, positional consideration weightings, hash tables etc. can also be easily adjusted! and it can be given an Elo setting which a few quick games suggests it simulates quite well - hopefully I am right in thinking it plays a little above its settings in the 1800-2200 range, either that or my chess is deteriorating! Last of all it works with the DGT board... and the Tasc Smartboard for those of you out there with one gathering dust!  

**Website:** www.shredderchess.com
Many thanks are due as always to our regular contributor Rob van Son who sent me the entrants list, games and photos of this excellent bi-annual event.

We are very fortunate in my view to have such a dedicated group of owners playing these dedicated computers against each other so regularly.

The first thing to note for 9th. Gebruikers is that only computers manufactured before 1994, i.e. over 10 years old, were allowed to enter. This meant that the Mephisto RISC1 was the top-rated entrant, followed by Kasparov RISC 2500, Mephisto London 68020, earlier brother Portorose 68020, then a beautiful Fidelity Prestige board with the Mach3 program and extra RAM, next a Polgar, Super Expert C, Milano, MM4 and 3 others.

9th Gebruikers was won by the 2nd. rated entrant: Johan de Koning's program in the RISC 2500, with a 6-0-1 record and no less than 1½ pts ahead of the Mephisto RISC1 by Ed Schröder. The Novag Super Expert did better than expected and came 3=, whilst the Polgar was a disappointment coming next to last.

I had wondered whether to offer prizes for readers who could guess how many the old Chess Challenger7 got, but decided you'd probably all get it right!

Here a small games and photo selection to enjoy... I'm starting off with the best effort by Rob's beautiful Prestige Mach3, though I note that it was the only one to also get a draw off the RISC 2500 winner!

Mephisto MM IV - Fid Prestige Mach3

Round 2. Opening D13: Slav Defence: Exchange variation without ...Bf5

1.d4 d5 2.c4 c6 3.cxd5 cxd5 4.e3 f6 5.e3 c5 6.c4 fxe4 7.e3 exd4 8.e2 0-0 9.0-0 Bf5 10.exf5 11.Bxc6 Bg6 12.dxc6

New. Bf4 (probably just best) and Bd7 have been played here. 13.Bxe2 Probably better was 13.Bf4 Bxf4 14.exf4 followed by Bxf1 13...Bxg3 14.hxg3 Bd7 15.Bfd1 Be8

16.a3! To stop Bb4 16...h6 17.e1 f6! Can the Fidelity machine really be up to what it seems like!? 18.Bf5 h5 19.c3 Bf8

Yes, it is! 20.b4?! 20...e5! stops the queen from moving, and even after 20...fxe5 21.dxe5 his own queen covers h5 and there's not much in it 20...Bh5! 21.Bf1! 21...h4! was a bit better, then Black must reorganise as 21...Bxh4 22.Bxh5 Bxh5 23.gxh4 Bxh4 24.Bb5 probably favours White 21...Bh1+ 22.Bg1 Bh2 23.Bf1?? If the game can be saved it would need 23.f4 g5 24.Bf2 and now Black can try either gxh4 or Bg8, either of which keep him on top with an attack 23...Bd7? Black is lucky as this does nothing. He could have pressed home the attack with 23...Be2! threatening Bh5, and White is in big trouble after 24.gxf5 exf5 25.g4 fxg4 26.Bxd4 Bd4 27.exd4+ 24...Be2! 24...Be2! would really keep White alive as, if now 24...e8 25.Bf4 might hold the defence 24...e8
25.\*d3?? That does it, one mistake too many! 25.\*e2! \*xg2 26.\*d2 \*h2 27.\*h3! might just work as, if the obvious 27...\*xh3 28.\*h1! 25...\*e8 26.g4 f4 26...fxg4 was even better! 27.exf4 \*xd4 28.\*g3 \*h4! 29.\*xh2 \*xh2 30.f5 \*d7 31.\*ed1 exf5 32.gxf5 \*xf5 33.\*xf5 \*xf5 34.\*f3 \*g3+! 35.fgx3 \*xg3 36.\*d3 \*h1+ 37.\*e2 \*e8+ 38.\*e3 \*xe3+ 39.\*d2 \*h6 40.\*h1 \*xh1 41.\*xe3 \*c1+ 0-1

The **RISC 2500** beat the RISC 1MB in 52 moves in this round (2) and was never caught after that. But here's how the RISC 1MB dealt with the MM4!

**Meph MM IV - Meph Risc 1MB**

Round 5. D14: Slav Defence: Exchange variation with ...Bf5

1.c4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.cxd5 cxd5 4.\*f3 \*f6 5.\*c3 \*c6 6.\*f4 \*f5 7.e3 e6 Almost the same opening as our first game, but there we had Be7, here Bf5 8.\*b5 \*d7 9.\*e4 \*e8 10.0-0 a6 11.\*xc6 \*xc6 12.\*fc1 \*e7 13.\*e2 \*b6 14.\*xc6 \*xc6 15.\*e1 \*xb2 16.\*xa6 0-0 17.\*xc6 g5 18.\*g3 g4 19.\*e1 \*d2

20.\*c1 The first move new to theory. It doesn't look that bad, but watch what happens! Georgiev got a draw in 1986 against Khalifman with 20.\*f1 20.\*b8 21.\*xb8 \*xb8 22.\*f1 Seems sensible as it protects the knight 22...\*b2! 23.a4!? \*b4!

24.\*c8+?? Going for glory, but the only hope was to try and exchange off some aggressors. E.g 24.h3 gxh3 25.\*xh3 \*xh3+ 26.\*g2+ 24...\*g7 25.\*c1 \*d1! 26.\*xb1 \*xb1 27.\*c3 27.g3? allows mate after 27...\*xe1+ 27...\*a2 28.\*f3 \*c1+ 29.\*e1 \*c4+! And White must lose his queen to delay the mate 30.\*xc4 dxc4 A dynamic effort, explaining the Meph RISC’s top rating in this tourney 0-1

The RISC 2500 had an outstanding tournament, and despatched even its nearest-rated rivals with ease at times.

**Kasp Risc 2500 - Meph London 68020**

Round 5. Opening D18: Slav 5 a4 Bf5 6 e3

1.\*f3 d5 2.d4 c6 3.c4 \*f6 4.\*c3 dxc4 5.a4 \*f5 6.e3 e6 7.\*xc4 \*b4 8.0-0 \*bd7 9.h3 h6 10.\*e2 \*h7 11.e4 \*xc3 12.\*xc3 \*xe4 13.\*a3 \*b6 14.\*fc1 \*xc4 The end of the opening line 15.\*xc4 \*f6 16.a5 \*f4 17.a6 \*c7 18.\*e5

18...\*d2? The game would be nicely balanced after 18...\*b5 19.\*b4 0-0-0 as Black still has a pawn advantage, but the Risc has the attack 19.\*a2! \*e4 20.f3! Vancouver has an important choice, to defend with \*f6 or... 20...\*g3? Attack?! 21.axb7 \*xb7
22.\text{c5} h5?! An irrelevant move, sometimes a complaint against the Lang programs when they were under pressure. 22...\text{g7} was the best chance 23.\text{c4} \text{d8} 24.\text{wxa5+} \text{d7} 25.\text{e1} f6? 26.\text{xa7} \text{af8}

This attack just cannot work and White can now win a rook 27.\text{e5} \text{fg8} 28.\text{d6}! \text{a8} 29.\text{xb7} \text{xa5} 30.\text{xa5} \text{e8} 31.\text{e7} \text{g8}?? Missing that White now mates. 31...\text{f5} would prolong the agony 32.\text{d6+} m/6 32...\text{e7} 33.\text{xc7+} \text{xc7} 34.\text{b1} 34...\text{e2+} 35.\text{f2} \text{d8} 36.\text{b7} \text{d4} 37.\text{b6#} 1-0

The Novag machine played above itself - here's a good example against the higher-rated Portorose.

\textbf{Super Expert C - Portorose 68020}

Round 7. Opening C93: Closed Ruy Lopez: Smyslov Variation

1.e4 e5 2.\text{f3} \text{c6} 3.\text{b5} a6 4.\text{a4} \text{d6} 5.0-0 \text{e7} 6.\text{e1} b5 7.\text{b3} 0-0 8.c3 d6 9.h3 \text{h6} 10.d4 \text{e8} 11.\text{bd2} \text{f8} 12.\text{f1} \text{b7} 13.\text{g3} \text{a5} 14.\text{d2} \text{c4} 15.\text{d3} \text{d6} 16.\text{d2} c5 17.\text{e2} 17.d5 is the only theory move 17...\text{wd7} 18.\text{ad1} \text{a4} 19.\text{dxex5} \text{dxex5} 20.\text{xc1} \text{xe6} 21.\text{c4} \text{ec8} 22.\text{c2} \text{b6} 23.\text{cxb5}

And now the Portorose is tempted 23...\text{xa2?!} 24.\text{xe5} \text{e8} 25.f4! \text{ed8} 26.\text{f5} \text{g6} 27.\text{g3} \text{g7} 28.\text{f5}! \text{g5} Obviously Black has problems. 28...\text{e8} was probably the best try, then after 29.\text{g4} \text{hxg4} 30.\text{hxg4}

\textbf{Final Table - Gebruikers 2004}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Holland</th>
<th>SelS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto RISC 1MB</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>2239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov RISC 2500</td>
<td>2191</td>
<td>2205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto London 68020</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>2202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Portorose 68020</td>
<td>2127</td>
<td>2149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Polgar 5MHz</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Prestige Mach3</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Milano</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Super Expert C</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM4</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saitek Turbo Advanced Trainer</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGD Dominator</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Chess Challenger 7</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I've shown the comparative Dutch and British ratings for each computer in the final result Table, though their rating for the London 68020 was in fact the figure for the Vancouver, which I have 30 Elo lower. Most of our ratings are very similar!

\text{Rob with the Prestige}
Women's World Champ, ZU CHEN, plays FRITZ8 on the new 'Star of Unisplendour' laptop

Zu Chen, the Women's World Chess Champion until a few weeks ago chose, instead of defending her title, to play 2 games against Fritz8. A strange decision perhaps until one realises that [a] she is pregnant at this time, and [b] in the middle of studying for her master's degree at the prestigious Chinese Tsinghua University.

Rated at 2497 Elo the delightful 28 year old Zu would know she had her work cut out, as a local Beijing company was using the opportunity to demonstrate their new 'Star of Unisplendour' Tsinghua laptop with its advanced AMD 64-bit 3400+ CPU!

"I use a computer a lot to store information in my training, but have no practical match-play experience with it. I am clear it will let no mistake slip away, but it's not as creative as human beings, so I don't know who is better positioned".

In game 1 she was!!!

UniStar Fritz8 - Zhu Chen (2497)
Game 1, Beijing 40/2. Opening B91

1.e4 c5 Sicilians are a brave choice for a first big game against the computer! 2.d4 cxd4 3.d4 cxd4 4.exd4 Qf6 5.Nc3 a6 6.g3?! e5 7.dxe5 Qxe5 8.b4 b5 9.Qg2 Qb7 10.h3 Qc5!? 10...Qe7! is the usual move here, and appears to score around 50%. White replies with 11.g4 and then 11...Qc5 is played, followed by 12.Qg3 0-0= 11.Qg5 Black's changed move order effectively stopped 11.g4 because of 11...Qxe4! winning a pawn 11...Qe7 12.Qxf6 Qxf6 13.Qd5 Qg5 14.h4!? Qh6 15.g4 g6

16.a5?! I recall Deep Blue2 seemed to have been programmed to push the rook pawns, though it was against the king as a rule, or to discourage castling on a particular side, as with White's 14, 15 and 18 16...Qxa5 17.Qec3 O-O 18.h5 Qg5 19.Qf3 Qc6 20.Qf1?! Does this look like Fritz to anyone?! 20.Qh3 seemed more likely. Nevertheless I found that F8 on my little laptop wanted to play the chosen move! 20...Qa7 21.Qc4 Qg7 21...Qb7 seemed more obvious, threatening to double up on the b-file 22.Qh3 h6 23.b3 Qb7 The dangerous (for whom?) 23...f5?! needs some working out! 24.hxg6 (24.exf5 gxf5 25.gxf5 Qa7! 26.Qe3! Qxe3 27.Qxe3 Qxf5!) 24...Qxe4 25.Qe3 Qf3. This is interesting! Hiarcs thinks this favours Black quite nicely, but after 26.Qf5+ Fritz has it equal!?! In either line Black is still a pawn up, but F8 clearly likes White's kingside compensations more than other programs! The real alternative to the move played was 23...a4!? 24.Qg2 Qb5 25.Qe2 Qe6 26.Qxb5 axb5 27.Qa2 Programs which want White to castle during this phase of the game just leave
themselves a pawn down. The threat up the g/h files must be maintained to have any chances 27...\texttt{Qf4?!}. Black probably still has a small advantage after this, but 27...\texttt{Qc8} 28.\texttt{Qe2} a4 looks stronger 28.\texttt{Qf3} \texttt{Qxd5} 29.\texttt{Qxd5} \texttt{a4}?! I know I've mentioned this move a couple of times, but sometimes timing is everything and here, it would have been better to prepare a4 with 29...\texttt{Qc8} first. If 30.\texttt{Qxa5} \texttt{Qxc2} 31.\texttt{Qf1} because of \texttt{Qc1}+ 31...\texttt{fx5} 32.\texttt{exf5} \texttt{Qd2}± 30.\texttt{Qe2}. Still 30.0-0? is wrong as after 30...\texttt{Qd7} and Black's plus pawn remains and with few problems 30...\texttt{a5}+ 31.\texttt{b4}?! 31.\texttt{c3}?! 31...\texttt{a7} 32.\texttt{c3} \texttt{Qc8} 33.\texttt{Qa3} \texttt{Qbb8} 34.\texttt{Qd3} \texttt{Qd7}!

The queen gets back to the good square recommended, and now Black has a decent advantage in the view of both Hiarcs and Fritz! White's only compensation remains the potential along the g/h files 35.\texttt{Qe2} \texttt{Qc6} 36.f3 \texttt{Qc4} 37.\texttt{Qxc4}. It doesn't seem to be in Fritz's interest to exchange queens – one normally tries to keep major pieces on when a pawn or more down, and White would need his queen if an attack on the kingside was to be effective. But what alternative good moves are there? 37...\texttt{Qxc4} 38.\texttt{Qe2} \texttt{Qf8}. Now that the danger on the kingside has lessened it seems it might have been worth Zhu Chen playing 38...\texttt{f5}?! when 39.gxf5 \texttt{Qxf5} 40.\texttt{Qd3} \texttt{fxe4}+ (actually 40...\texttt{Qc6}?! 41.\texttt{Qa1} \texttt{Qf8} might be better still!) 41.\texttt{fxe4} \texttt{Qc8}, but with 42.\texttt{Qf1} Fritz is threatening to grab a draw 39.\texttt{Qd3} \texttt{Qc6} 40.\texttt{Qh2} \texttt{Qe8} 41.\texttt{Qh1} \texttt{Qd7} 42.\texttt{Qh2}

Chen can do 42...\texttt{Qg8}?! It seems that the natural follow-up to her last 2 moves would be 42...\texttt{Qe6}, though now 43.\texttt{Qh1} \texttt{Qbc8} 44.\texttt{Qh2} and it is still difficult to see how she can break through for the win. Even so, it's better than maybe losing! 43.\texttt{Qc4}! With this one move the advantage swings to Fritz, though the win isn't certain by any means with best play from Black 43...\texttt{Qb8}? The win is gone, and Black needs to think defensively. Therefore 43...\texttt{Qxc4}+ I was wiser, and then 44.\texttt{Qc3} \texttt{gxf5} 45.\texttt{Qxf5} \texttt{Qb8} 46.\texttt{Qxa4} \texttt{Qb7} might still hold the draw 44.\texttt{Qxb5} \texttt{Qxb5} 45.\texttt{Qxa4} \texttt{Qc1}?! One admires her boldness, but she's still going for too much. Best was 45...\texttt{Qb7} 46.\texttt{Qha2} \texttt{gxf5}, and Black can maybe still hold, though I think 47.\texttt{a7}! gives White very good chances once the b-pawn starts to run, e.g. 47...\texttt{Qc8} 48.\texttt{Qa8}+ \texttt{Qb8} (or 48...\texttt{Qd7} 49.\texttt{Qa7} \texttt{Qxa7} 50.\texttt{Qxa7}+ \texttt{Qe8} 51.\texttt{b5})! 49.\texttt{b5}. Even now 49...\texttt{Qc1} would still seem to give Black drawing chances. I note that Fritz thought 45...\texttt{Qb6} 46.\texttt{Qa5} \texttt{Qb7} was Black's best chance 46.\texttt{Qa7}+!

46...\texttt{Qe6} 46...\texttt{Qc8} 47.\texttt{Qxf7} \texttt{Qxh5} 48.\texttt{Qa2} \texttt{Qb8} 49.gxh5 is also winning for Fritz 47.\texttt{Qxg6} \texttt{fxg6} 48.\texttt{Qxh6}! \texttt{Qxh5}+! Not 48...\texttt{Qxh6}?? 49.\texttt{Qg7} 49.\texttt{Qxd5}+ \texttt{Qxd5} 50.\texttt{Qa5}+ \texttt{Qc6} 51.\texttt{Qxd5} \texttt{Qf4} 52.\texttt{Qxg5}! White now has a second pawn running up the board! 52...\texttt{Qd1}+ 53.\texttt{Qe4} \texttt{Qb6} 54.\texttt{Qd5} 54...\texttt{Qe1}+ 55.\texttt{Qf5} \texttt{Qe3} 56.\texttt{Qxd6}+ \texttt{Qc7} 57.\texttt{Qd3} and either the b or g pawn will soon be in sprint mode! 1-0

A shame for Zu Chen, at one time she was slightly ahead and, even at move 42 a pawn ahead, she could have gone for the draw. "I chose to attack, and then made a mistake". The chief coach of the Chinese National team suggested, "If she was experienced with the machine she would not have broken. But her thirst for a victory made her commit a fatal error. I also compliment the computer - the combination of computer technology and chess programming has greatly promoted the spread of chess in the world".
Zhu Chen (2497) - UniStar Fritz8
Game 2, Beijing 40/2. Opening A15

1.c4 Qf6 2.d3?! e5 3.Qf3 Qc6 4.e3?! Chen is probably trying to get Fritz out of its book, but this move is pretty negative and has a poor 25% record. It would be better to proceed more normally with 4.Qc3 d5 5.cxd5 Qxd5 and then 6.e3 with an equal game 4...d5 5.cxd5 Qxd5 6.a3?! Readers might expect Fritz to be out of book after this, but not so, even though 6.Qc3 is usually played! 6...Qg4 7.b4! A good follow-up and finally F6 does go out of Book, but with 3 pieces developed to Chen's 1 - and her bishops won't be so easy to activate - Fritz is already on top 7...a6 8.Qe2 Qd6 9.Qb2! 0-0 10.Qbd2 Qe8 11.Qc1 Qf6 12.0-0 Qbd8 13.Qe1

Chen has come out of the early 'out of Book' manoeuvres quite well in fact, but Fritz feels ready to start an attack 13...Qh6 14.Qe4 Qf6 15.Qxd6 Qxd6 16.Qb3 Qg6 17.Qh1?! White could have pressed a little on the queenside here with 17.b5 axb5 18.xb5 and if 18.Qd7 19.Qb3 b6 20.Qh4 (20.Qf1?) 20...Qg5 21.Qf3 threatens to draw by repetition. 17.Qed1 Qh3 18.Qe1 was another possibility 17...e4! 18.dxe4 Qxe4

We soon see that the king should have stayed on g1 as Black threatens Qxf2+ 19.Qg1 Qh5 20.Qed1! Probably the best defence! 20...Qg6! 21.Qf1 Understandably trying to get her king out of the line of fire. But was 21.Qc6?! worth a try! How should Black

29.Qxc7? Chen could have hung on for longer with 29.h4! Qf6 30.Qxf6 gxf6 31.Qc5! Qe5 32.Qxe5 fxe5 33.Qc7, and now she is 'only' down rook for bishop. But having to constantly find critical defensive moves under pressure is very tiring, and I guess she just ran out of energy 29...Qd8! 30.Qd4 Qe5! 31.Qxe5 Qxf1+ 32.Qxf1 Qd1+ 33.Qxd1? 33.Qe2 Qxf7+ 34.Qf3 Qh3+ was headed for mate anyway 33...Qxf1# After getting into trouble, at around move 17, Zu Chen defended extremely well until the last few moves. 0-1
Mark Uniacke's Palm HIARCS!

Readers will recall that I didn't manage to get a full quota of information into our last issue about the new Palm HIARCS, but I did manage to report that the 'ARM conversion' work had been done successfully. This means that the release version actually now runs 20x faster on my Palm Zire21 126MHz (a £75 unit), and about 80x faster on Mark's posh Tungsten T3 400MHz (£289).

I also gave a few fairly staggering results which indicated that the program is at least 2400 Elo on my Zire21, and more like 2500 on the T3.

In fact results from the released 9.41 version being sent in by customers mean that it is necessary to increase those estimates by at least 25 Elo!

Both the Palm Genius website
- http://www.chessgenius.com
and the Palm Tiger site
- http://www.rebel.nl/chesstiger

give their gradings for their own products - in fact Palm Genius 2447, and Palm Tiger 2293. So when you see the following scores you will wonder why I haven't got Palm HIARCS at over 2600!

- Palm HIARCS v Palm Genius 37½-14½ (3 different contributors: 16-6, 7-3, 14½-5½)
- Palm HIARCS v Palm Tiger 31-3 (!) (2 different contributors: 22-0, 9-3)

To complete the picture here is a reminder of the Palm HIARCS website
- http://www.hiarcs.com

I think the Genius and Tiger sites are a bit over-optimistic, so I've produced a Table which might clarify where I think they stand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>If Genius &amp; Tiger are right</th>
<th>If Selective Search is right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palm TIGER 400MHz</td>
<td>2293</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm GENIUS 400MHz</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>2375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm HIARCS 400MHz</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>2525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whichever column you use, the Elo gaps between the programs comes out very similar.

As a final 'proof' that Palm HIARCS is strong, we now have scores coming in from users with it playing against Pocket Fritz2, where both programs were on their fastest 400MHz products!

- Palm HIARCS v Pocket PC Fritz2 19-11 (various users: 5½-4½, 2-2, 2½-1½, 5½-2½, 3½-½ at 40/2)

Let's have a look at a couple of positions!

White to play. The winning move isn't so easy to find quickly as White's rook is en pris.

1.exf6! xf6  If Black tries 1...xa3! 2.xh7+ is m/6 2.wh5 1-0.

The Fidelity Mach3 takes 30 mins, a Novag Scorpio 25mins, Chess Tiger/400 uses much
less with 3min23, the Saitek RISC 2500 does well at 1min28, Palm Genius/400 is better still at 1min14, but Palm HiarcS on my 126MHz Zire21 needs just 6secs!!

Here’s another. You’ve seen this one before as it was the 4th. position in Alvaro Benloch’s Star Diamond review in SelSearch 111.

White to play

1...\text{Exd}4! \text{exd}4 2.e5 1-0

Here a Mephisto MM5 needs 56mins, a Mach3 23mins, Palm Genius on my 126MHz takes 12mins56, another Richard Lang program, the Vancouver 68020 was good at 5mins25, the Star Diamond excellent at 1min18, and Palm HiarcS again on my 126MHz was 51secs. Not quite as dramatic a difference as the first one, but pretty impressive all the same! On Mark’s T3/400 it’s just 13secs!!

I’ve decided to show a couple of games from a Blitz match, with Palm HiarcS playing the Mephisto RISC! This was a very well-known dedicated computer in its day, and has a strongly established 2239 Elo rating, including 95 tournament games against humans in which it rated 2232 Elo!

However Palm HiarcS on a T3/400 made mincemeat (like 10-0!) out of it. Here’s two examples.

**Meph Risc 1Mb - Palm HiarcS 9.1/400**

1.c4 \$f6 2.\$c3 e6 3.e4 c5 4.e5 \$g8 5.\$f3 \$c6 6.d4 \text{cx}d4 7.\text{Ex}d4 \text{Ex}e5 8.\text{f}4 d6 9.h4? Discouraging Black from castling. However, we’re actually still in theory and 9.\text{d}2 is usually played, though 9.c5 is also possible 9...\text{d}7 10.b4?!

This rather weakens his c-pawn, a fact which HiarcS quickly fastens on to 10...\$c8! 11.c5 \$g6 12.\$g5 \text{f}6 13.h5 \$e5 14.c6 \$c6 15.\text{Ex}c6 \text{Ex}c6 16.\$e3 a6 17.a4 d5? 18.h6?! A disappointing push by the RISC. I’d guess at the fast blitz time control it mustn’t have seen that the pawn is attacked, not twice, but 3 times because the f8/bishop is also lined-up on it from behind the g7/pawn.

18.\$b1 \$d6 19.b5 would at least have had the merit of being consistent with earlier moves 18...\$xh6 19.b5

19...\$b4! 20.bxc6 \$xc3+ 21.\$d2 \$xd2+ 21...\$xa1?! is not as good: 22.\text{cxb7}! \$c6 23.\$xh4! 22.\$xc2 \$d6 23.\$d1 \$xc6 24.f3 0-0 25.\$e1 \$d6 26.\$f2 \$f5 27.g4

27...\$c2! A great find by PH 28.\$xc2 \$g3+ 29.\$e2 \$d4+ 30.\$d3 \$xc2 31.\$xc2 \$c8+ After 32.\$d1 \$xf3+ 33.\$e2 \$c3 it’s mate quite soon 0-1
Palm Hiarcs 9.1/400 - Mephisto 1Mb

1.d4 ½f6 2.½f3 d5 3.e3 e6 4.½d3 c5 5.c3 c4?! MR goes out of Book and this move, though tempting, is not as good as theory suggestions such as ½e7, ½c6 or ½bd7 6.½c2 b5 7.½bd2 a5 8.0-0 b4

This looks quite threatening, but Hiarcs immediately counterattacks classically in the centre 9.e4! b3 10.½xb3 ½xb3 11.½xb3 dxe4 12.½g5 h6?! 13.½xe4 ½xe4 14.½xe4 f5?
15.½h5+! Very quickly found by PH 15...½d7 16.½g5

16...g6 17.½f3 hgx5 18.½xa8 ½b6 19.½c4 a4?! 19...½d6 was probably the only defence, though 20.½e1 ½xh2+ 21.½f1 ½b7 22.½xa5 would prevail 20.½xa4+ ½e7 21.½xg5+ ½f7 22.½a7+ After the forced 22...½xa7 23.½xa7+ ½g8 24.½f4 ½c6 25.½c7 Black's position is hopeless 1-0

Most of the games were much the same with Palm Hiarcs, even on its lowest-sized opening book, getting decent positions - the RISC making mistakes as soon as Hiarcs created any initiative - PH jumping on mistakes almost unerringly - getting the upperhand in the middlegame. It's a long time since I used a Mephisto RISC (Schroder/Rebel program), and I seem to recall we didn't think it was always at its best at Blitz. But even so 10-0 is rather impressive! Let's squeeze in one more!

Hiarcs 9.41 - Pocket Fritz 2.0 [D58]

G/80. Opening D58: QGD, Tartakower Defence

1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.½c3 ½f6 4.½g5 ½e7 5.e3 0-0 6.½f3 h6 7.½h4 b6 8.½d3 ½b7 9.½xd5 exd5 10.0-0 ½bd7 11.½c1 ½e4 12.½xe7 ½xe7 13.a3 c5 14.½c2? White has tried various ideas here: ½a4, ½b1, dxc5 and ½e1, but all have fared poorly. PH's first move out of book is therefore a useful novelty! ½ac8 15.½xc5 ½xc5 16.½e2 a5 17.½fd4 ½fd8 18.½b5 ½e6 19.½d3 ½f6 20.½xc8 ½xc8 21.b4 ½xd4 22.½xd4! Not 22.½xd4?! ½c3! 22...½xd4 23.½xd4 This is much better than 23.½xd4? ¼xb4 24.axb4 ½c2! When White could lose the b/pawn. The ½ will now also become a valuable piece! 23...½c3 24.½a1 ½f8 25.bxa5 bxa5 26.½a4 ½e7 27.½h4 ½f6 28.½b1 ½a3 29.½d7 ½c5 30.½h3

30...½e7! Not 30...½xa4? as 31.½b6+! ½e7 32.½b3! ½xb3 33.½xb7+ ½d6 34.½xb3 leaves White with ½ for ½! 31.½f5+ ½d7! 31...½f8 saves the g/pawn but runs into 32.½b5! 32.½xg7+ ½c6 33.½f5 ½xa4 34.g4! f6 35.½xh6 ½c8 36.½b8

PalmH shows it knows more about the endgame than PocketFritz in the next few moves 36...½c7? 36...½e6 had to be played 37.½xc8+! Wow! 37...½xc8 38.½g5+ ½c7 39.½g6! ½xh4 The only way the ½ could stop the pawn was 39...½xb4! 40.½g7! ½b8 but of course 41.½g6! ½xg6+ 42.½xg6 and Hiarcs is a full ½ up! 40.½g7 ½xh6 41.½b8! ½xh3 42.½g2! Wherever the ½ runs up the h-file, White plays a ½ check and wins! If ½h4 then ½g3+, if ½h5 ½f7+, if ½h6 ½g7+. Great Hiarcs play! 1-0
**Carl Bicknell interviews Chrilly Donninger**

**Subject: Brutus -> HYDRA**

I have told readers before how the very mention, even in hushed tones, of the words 'Brutus' or 'Hydra' get Carl Bicknell's ears a-wagging! We've also become aware of the fact that Carl has been persuading Hydra's main Internet operator to reveal a few bits of information to him, such as the number of FPGA cards and speed in nodes per second being achieved by Hydra at this time.

Just after our last issue had gone to the printers I got a very excited e-mail from Carl, who has for (many) months been trying to make contact with Chrilly Donninger himself.

The main reason this is rather difficult to do is that the e-mail address given for Chrilly on his website is fake?!! But by pestering one of the online operators Carl had finally been given the real one! And after a couple of introductory e-mail exchanges Chrilly had agreed to do an interview for Selective Search!

"In a day or two I'll e-mail my question list, how about you add to it and then I'll send it back to Chrilly for answers? How many questions do you think there is space for... Carl".

In fact Carl's list of questions arrived at my in-tray at the very same time as the introductory e-mail, as they were waiting for me on my return from holiday. I was somewhat over-run as there were over 600 other e-mails waiting for me - the worst part of holidays has always been coming home! - and it took me a couple of days to make time to respond with some additional questions of my own.

It was already too late, as Chrilly's busy-ness had decided Carl to send his own list as it was.

**Questions for Chrilly!**

**Q1:** Many people see Hydra as "the next Deep Blue", are you trying to accomplish the same thing as the IBM team (a Goliath chess computer), what are the differences?

**Chrilly:** It started as a commercial project for a single-card. But it is now on the way to a Goliath chess computer.

Differences on technical level is FPGA instead of ASIC (normal hardware). Organisatorial level. It is much cheaper, much less effort than DB. And on the symbolic level. It is the Arabic answer (Although the development team is Austrian/German).

**Q2:** Can you briefly and simply describe how Hydra works? We've heard lots of weird and wonderful things about FPGA cards - what are the benefits? How powerful are they?

**Chrilly:** The benefits: FPGAs are reprogrammable. It takes 2-3 hours till a new version is made (of course it takes sometimes weeks till a new version is programmed). This is important, because computer-chess is basically trial and error. The disadvantage is, that FPGAs are slower and per piece more expensive than ASICs.

**Q3:** How did you come up with the idea and opportunity to make this?

**Chrilly:** Ken Thompson (UNIX-inventor) asked his friend Frederic Friedel of Chessbase if he does not know a good programmer how can make such a chess-machine. First I did not want to do it, because I had no experience at all in Hardware design. But Ken promised me to teach it. I could not resist this invitation. It is like Tiger Woods promises you to teach you golf.

**Q4:** What is your goal with Hydra?

**Chrilly:** To do some interesting work which is also reasonable paid. I have no higher goals.
I do just my best, because I like to do that. But it has no higher meaning. The philosopher Wittgenstein said in his tractatus-logicus. When we have solved all scientific problems, we will realize, that nothing essential has been solved.

Q5: How many FPGA cards are you hoping to use in the end?

Chrilly: We are using currently 16 cards. For me the ideal number is 32. Currently we use somewhat outdated FPGAs (Virtex-I). I hope that the 32-cards are the latest Virtex-II. Other people in the team dream of 256. But it is in chess very difficult to use this number efficiently and it is only a lot of trouble to get 256 running at all.

Q6: How many nodes/sec does Hydra search? Does it double as you double the cards?

Chrilly: Each card searches appr. 3MegaNodes/sec. But the search on the card is somewhat simpler than in software. So it is a little bit comparing apples and oranges. The search is like in Deep-Blue mixed. The last part is done in Hardware/FPGA, the first part in software.

Basically 16 cards are searching 16x the number of nodes. But in a parallel system sometimes a processor has no reasonable work to do and just waits. Considering this waiting time, 16 processors search about 14x the nodes. Additionally there is some search overhead. A parallel program searches nodes, which need not be searched by a single processor version. The effective speedup is therefore about 12.

Q7: You clearly believe Hydra to be the best – in what way do you think it is superior to the P.C programs?

Chrilly: In Hardware one can do a more sophisticated evaluation. Hydra is especially good in king-attacks and general aggressive play. It is yet not so fine tuned than e.g. Fritz or Shredder.

Q8: Why have you used FPGA cards and not built a chess processor as IBM did, what are advantages/disadvantages of both?

Chrilly: Besides the points mentioned already in Q2, the so called Norecurring Engineering Costs (making a first mask) are in ASIC some 100K US$. Especially CB had not the money to finance this.

Q9: How do you think the P.C programs of today compare with Deep Blue, how do you think Hydra does?

Chrilly: I think the “big four”, Fritz, Hydra, Junior and Shredder are nowadays better than Deep Blue. There has been an unbelievable increase in playing strength in the last years.

Q10: Of the P.C programs which one do you think is the best and why? Is there one which gives Hydra a lot of trouble?

Chrilly: I think Fritz, Junior, Shredder are of comparable strength. Probably Shredder-8 was a step ahead of this crowd. But I think the others will catch up.

In the last tournaments the most “nasty” opponent was Junior. But in the long run it is Shredder. I think Stefan Meyer-Kahlen (Shredder-programmer) is the most creative of the 3 programm authors.

Q11: If Shredder etc was built on FPGA how
**Chrilly**: My goal of Hydra was/is: As much knowledge as Hiarcs and as fast as Fritz. (Actually it is somewhat faster).

Q16: Can you tell us anything about the search method in Hydra? Anything special?

**Chrilly**: The search is split up in a software and a hardware part. When searching to depth 18, 15 plies are done in software, 3 plies in Hardware. The Hardware search is relative simple (but more sophisticated than in Deep Blue), the software part uses many selective tricks and extensions.

Q17: I don’t mean to be rude but one of your online operators claimed that Hydra (with 16 FGPA cards) was 160 elo stronger than Shredder 8 running on an 8 x 2.6Ghz P.C....now I happen to notice that Hydra tends to be rated about 2750 (roughly 10th on the list) at chessbase, and none of the P.C progs have more than a dual processor machine – is everything on track??

**Chrilly**: The ChessBase Server is an own game for itself. For me the results on the server are not relevant. Sometimes a program changes more than 100 Elo a day up and down. This should not happen under “normal” conditions.

According our internal test-suite we are currently 120 Elo stronger than Shredder 8. But one can also question our method. Basically I do not care about this figures. For me it is only important, if a new version is better than the previous one. If the next version is 130 Elo better it is fine. It would not make any difference if it is in “reality” 50 instead of 120, and 60 instead of 50. The important message is: We have made 10 Elo progress.

By the way: I am not very happy that Erdos is so much on the server and especially that he talks many things when the day is long. I would call this “pub-talk”. What the people talk after drinking some beer. The only difference is, that on the server they need no beer.
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Chess ACADEMY - Chess CHALLENGER
Augusto Perez plays the 2 SAITEK MACHINES HEAD-To-HEAD

It is always pleasing to have new contributors to Selective Search, and Augusto Perez first started sending me games played by his new Novag Star Diamond then, more recently, games from matches involving Saitex’s Chess Challenger (the Cougar, Cosmos, Expert program), and (Talking) Chess Academy, and another Novag, the Obsidian.

I mentioned in our last issue that Augusto likes me to try and forecast the results in advance (1) and I was lucky last time getting the 6½-3½ right between the winner, the Star Diamond, against the Challenger.

For our next match, Chess Challenger (1999 Elo) v Talking Chess Academy, I forecast 6-4 for the Challenger. I should mention that the matches are played at the Game in 60mins time control. Let’s jump straight in and see how it goes!

Game 1 was a weird little draw in only 15 moves as the programs chose to repeat moves, so the first decisive game was the 2nd.

Chess Academy - Chess Challenger
Game 2. Opening D34: Tarrasch Defence: 6 g3 Nf6 7 Bg2 Be7

1.©f3 d5 2.d4 c5 3.c4 e6 4.cxd5 exd5
5.©c3 ©c6 6.g3 ©f6 7.©g2 ©e7 8.0-0 0-0
9.©xc5 ©xc5 10.©g5 ©e6 11.©c1 ©e7
12.©e1 There’s actually a host of book moves here – 12.©a4; 12.©c2; 12.©d4;
12.©a4 – but the Academy choice isn’t so bad! 12...©c8 13.©h4? 13.e3!? 13...h6
14.©xf6 ©xf6 15.©d2 ©e8 16.©b3

White is trying to build pressure on the isolated d-pawn, but is fortunate that Black misses a strong response! 16...©c7?? What about 16...©a5! threatening the very unpleasant d4! Therefore 17.©a3 ©xa3
18.bxa3 but now 18...©e7 seems to force 19.©b5 after which 19...©b2! 20.©b1 ©c2
17.©a4 17...©xd5? doesn’t win a pawn with 17...©xd5 18.©xd5 as 18...©d4! driving the
queen from the defence of the d5-bishop and therefore forcing 19.©xf7+ ©xf7+ 17...©e7
19.©b3 was vital and, okay, White is still under pressure but after 19...d4 20.©e4 not
without counterplay 19...©xc3! Now the d5-bishop is unprotected 20.©xc6 ©xd2
21.©xe8 ©xc1 22.©xc1

White is a pawn up, and his bishop can’t yet be taken, but he is as good as lost! 22...a6
23.©d1 ©c7?? Black will be very lucky to get away with this move – the queen should have
gone here leaving the rook still threatening the bishop. So 23...©c7 24.a3 ©c8 and the
bishop falls and it should be 0-1 24.©xf7+?? There was just no need for this. With 24.©f4
©c2 25.©d7 both sides have threats and I’m not sure who is winning, but I reckon White is
definitely okay at present! 24...©xf7 25.e4?
Obviously (to me anyway) 25.©d2 was better
25...©e6? This is really strange – both sides are suddenly playing quite poorly for good
quality dedicated computers. Maybe I’m getting too used to using 2600 Elo PC
programs, and need to use our 2000 Elo brethren a bit more often to remind myself
what they’re like! I certainly shouldn’t turn my
nose up at them, my own grading never got
higher than 155 BCF (1840 Elo). Anyway,
here 25...©xb2 makes life much easier for
Black, and after the almost forced 26.a3, then
\[ \text{26.e4 d4 exd4 27.cxd4 \text{exf4} 28.b4} \]
\[ \text{Qf7 29.f4 Qe6 30.Qd8 Qd7 31.f5+ Qe7} \]
\[ \text{32.Qxd7+ Qxd7 33.e5 Qc6 34.h3 Qb5} \]
\[ \text{35.Qf2 b6 36.f6 gxf6 37.exf6} \]

Of course

Black doesn't have to worry about this pawn

with his bishop strategically placed on a2 to

stop any runaway!

\[ \text{37...Qxb4 38.g4 Qf7} \]

39.h4

Readers, just look at this and watch what

happens as we get two incredible blunders,

one after the other 39...a5?? A truly awful

mistake which should have cost the

Challenger the win! All that was needed was

39...h5 and the White pawns can do no harm:

40.Qe3 Qc4+. But now of course they can!!

40.Qe2?? Yet they don't, as White strolls

merrily down the path to defeat (I sound more

like Fritz every day!) 40.h5! putting his pawn

where Black's should have gone, unexpectedly

saves the day! Watch: 40...a4 41.g5

hxg5 42.h6! now either the f or h pawn must

queen... 42...a3 43.h7 a2 44.h8Q a1Q

45.Qf8+ Qb5 46.Qxf7 and it should be a
draw 40...a4 Black has got away with it and

there were no more shocks as the Challenger

finished the game with ease! 0-1

So the Chess Challenger takes an early lead

and, as it happened, game 3 also produced a

decisive result, so...

**Chess Challenger - Chess Academy**

Game 3. Opening C22: Centre Game

1.e4 e5 2.d4 exd4 3.Qxd4 Qc6 4.Qa4 b5+ 5.c3 6.d2 Qe7 6.Qc3 Qf6 7.0-0-0 is the

main line, but the move played isn't so bad!

5...Qc5 6.d5 6.Qf3 has been seen a few

times, but now both programs are out of book

6...Qh4! 7.g3 Qe7 8.Qf4 Qf6 9.Qd2

9...Qd5?! Looks clever, but probably 9...Qg4

was better 10.Qe2! Qxf4 11.Qxf4 Qf6 12.f3

Qe7 13.Qc4 Qd6?!

The Black position is getting somewhat cramped 14.Qd4 Qxf4

15.gxf4 Qh4+ 15...Qxd4 16.cxd4 just gives

White the centre and better development;

15...Qxf4 might be best, then 16.Qg1 Qg6

17.Qxg7 Qe3+ 18.Qf1 Qxd2 19.Qxg6 hxg6

20.Qxh8+ Qe7 is probably equal 16.Qd1 c6

17.Qc4! A small mistake which White gets

away with! 17.Qd3! was best 17...Qg8

17...Qd5! was the best option for Black as the

attack on the bishop gains him a development

tempo 18.Qd6! Qh5 19.f5 b5 20.Qe2

f6 21.Qb3 Qh8? Don't ask me, I don't know

why! 21...g6 22.Qe1 Qf7 offered much better

chances 22.Qc5 Qf8?!

Makes the previous move appear even more mysterious 23.a4

bxa4 24.Qxa4 Qf7

25.Qd4! Very strong! 25...a5 If 25...Qf8

26.Qg1+-- 26.Qxd7 Qxf5 27.Qc6 Qxd4

28.Qxf6+! Not 28.Qxa8? which loses

everything that's been gained after 28...Qxd7

29.cxd4 ( or 29.Qxc8+? Qh8#) 29...Qc5 and

a draw is most likely 28...Qe7 White has so

many captures available, which to choose?!

29.Qd5?! 29.Qxa8? would still win, less

convincingly: 29...Qxf6 30.cxd4 Qd7

31.Qg8++. 29.cxd4?! also just wins after

29...Qxf6 30.Qxa8 Qd7 31.Qg8++. There's

even a way to lose with 29.Qxh5?? and now

it's not even a draw after 29...Qc6 30.Qf1
h3\text{#} + 29...\text{d}8 30...\text{x}a8! Now the quickest way to finish the game 30...\text{b}3? A wild flying! However aiming to improve the defence with 30...\text{e}6 would still lose to 31...\text{x}a5+ \text{c}7 32...\text{c}2 consolidating his 3 pawn advantage 31...\text{c}2 \text{d}7 32...\text{a}6! \text{c}5 33...\text{x}b7 \text{xb}7 34...\text{b}8 \text{f}7 35...\text{d}1!

35...\text{e}6 36...\text{c}7+ \text{d}6 37...\text{b}5 \text{d}7 38...\text{x}d7+ \text{xd}7 39...\text{c}7+ \text{e}8 40...\text{x}c8+ 1-0

With the \textbf{Challenger} now 2 up, the \textbf{Academy} needed to at least consolidate and preferably get a win of its own pretty quickly!

I should perhaps say something more about the \textbf{(Talking) Chess Academy} as it has never had a proper 'Review' as such in \textit{Selective Search}'.

In fact it has an interesting, more selective type of program than many dedicated computers and, unusually for a Saitek-Kasparov model, isn't by Franz Morsch but is a program that has been developed and improved in collaboration from the days of the Simultano/Stratos.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chess_diagram.png}
\caption{Chess diagram for the game 1.d4 d5 2.c4 c6 3...cxd5 cxd5 4.d3 3f6 5...c3 \text{c}6 6...f4 \text{f}5 7.e3 \text{e}6 8...c1 \text{d}4 9...xe4?! 9...b3 \text{b}4 10.a3 \text{xc}3+ 11...xc3 \text{d}6 is known to theory and White must decide if he wants to exchange queens or not 9...\text{xe}4 10...\text{d}2 \text{a}5? The queen is misplaced here. Better is 10...\text{b}4 11.a3 \text{xd}2+ 12...xd2 \text{c}8 and, apart from having the 2 bishops, White has little 11.a3 \text{e}8 12...c3 \text{g}6 13...b3 13.b4 \text{xb}4 14.axb4 \text{xb}4 15...c1 was also quite strong 13...\text{d}7 14...b5 \text{d}6 15...\text{xc}6 \text{bxc}6 16...\text{xd}6 \text{xd}6 17...\text{b}8+ \text{d}8 18...\text{b}7 0-0 19.b4 \text{b}5 20...\text{xc}6
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chess_diagram_2.png}
\caption{Chess diagram for the game 20...\text{xc}6? That spoils it! With 20...\text{b}8 there are still good drawing chances, even after 21...\text{c}7 \text{a}8 22...f4, because of 22...\text{xc}8! 21...\text{xc}6 Okay, White is a (potential distant passed) pawn up and, with queens off the board, should have good winning chances now 21...\text{c}8 22...c5! Normally you'd expect the side with the extra pawn to want to exchange a pair of rooks, but the Academy is right to avoid this as 22...\text{xc}8?}
\end{figure}
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\( \text{Rx}c8 \) gives Black the open file and the threat of \( \text{Rx}c1+ \), so 23.0-0 \( \text{Rx}c3! \) and the gained initiative is close to equalising 22...e5 23.\( \text{Q}b3 \) \( \text{Q}c2 \) 24.\( \text{Q}a5 \) \( \text{Rx}c5 \) 24...\( \text{Q}a4 \) 25.\( \text{Q}d2 \) exd4 26.exd4 \( \text{R}c8 \) would avoid the rook exchange, but now 27.b5! puts him in big trouble 25.bxc5 \( \text{B}b8 \) 26.0-0

26...exd4? Again, being a pawn down, it would seem right to exchange pawns, but White has a big reply! Therefore 26...\( \text{Q}a4 \)! was best, then 27.c6! \( \text{B}f6 \) and, after 28.e4, not dxe4 29.d5! but 28...\( \text{Q}e7 \) 29.exd5 \( \text{Q}d6 \). Of course it still doesn't look good after 30.dxe5+ \( \text{Q}x\text{e}5 \) (30...\( \text{Q}x\text{d}5 \)? 31.\( \text{Q}f4 \)!) 31.\( \text{Q}c1 \) but it looks much better than the game! 27.\( \text{Q}c6 \) \( \text{B}b3 \)? Goodness, much too optimistic. The defensive 27...\( \text{Q}a8 \) was needed

28.\( \text{Q}x\text{d}4 \) \( \text{B}b2 \) In view of the previous move why not 28...\( \text{Q}x\text{a}3 \)!? 29.\( \text{Q}x\text{c}2 \) \( \text{Q}c3 \) for consistency in defeat! 29.\( \text{Q}c6 \) \( \text{Q}d3 \) 30.c7 \( \text{Q}a6 \) Challenger plays the only move that stays in the game 31.\( \text{Q}c1 \) \( \text{Q}f8 \) 32.\( \text{Q}c6 \)?! The promotion could have been played here:

32.c8\( \text{Q}+ \) \( \text{Q}x\text{c}8 \) 33.\( \text{Q}x\text{c}8 \) \( \text{Q}b3 \) 33.\( \text{Q}a7 \) \( \text{Q}a3 \) 34.\( \text{Q}c8 \)\( \text{Q}+ \) \( \text{Q}x\text{c}8 \) 35.\( \text{Q}x\text{c}8 \)

The Academy has an easy win now, though it faffed around for another 45 moves without getting far before it finally broke through at move 82...

Diagram is after...81...\( \text{Q}h7 \)

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Chess Challenger & \( \frac{1}{2} \) & 1 & 1 & 0 & \( \frac{1}{2} \) & 3 \\
Talking Chess Academy & \( \frac{1}{2} \) & 0 & 1 & \( \frac{1}{2} \) & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Well, the Chess Academy made heavy weather of getting the game finished, but it deserved its win and closed the scoreboard.

With game 5 being a 77 move draw, the scoretable looks like this...

\textbf{Chess Academy - Chess Challenger}

Game 6. OpeningB18: Classical Caro-Kann:

4...\( \text{B}f5 \) sidelines

1.d4 c6 2.e4 d5 3.\( \text{Q}c3 \) dxe4 4.\( \text{Q}xe4 \) \( \text{Q}f5 \) 5.\( \text{Q}g3 \) \( \text{Q}g6 \) 6.\( \text{Q}f3 \) \( \text{Q}d7 \) 7.\( \text{Q}d3 \) \( \text{Qxd3} \) 8.\( \text{Qxd3} \) e6 9.0-0 \( \text{Q}c7 \) 10.\( \text{Q}c4 \) 0-0-0? 10...\( \text{Q}f6 \) 11.\( \text{Q}e1 \) \( \text{Q}b4 \) 12.\( \text{Q}d2 \) is known to theory, but Black's novelty must be nearly as good 11.\( \text{Q}e4 \) \( \text{Q}g6 \) 12.\( \text{Q}e5 \) \( \text{Q}g4 \)?! Attacking before we're ready. Better is 12.\( \text{Q}b8 \)

13.\( \text{Q}e2 \) 13.\( \text{Q}x\text{f7} \) \( \text{Q}c5 \) and now 14.\( \text{Q}e2 \) \( \text{Q}f7 \) 15.dxc5 would have put White on top even sooner 13...\( \text{Q}b6 \) 13...\( \text{Q}d6 \) 14.\( \text{Q}h3 \) \( \text{Q}h6 \) was worth looking at 14.\( \text{Q}h3 \) \( \text{Q}h6 \)
15...\texttt{d}d1! This is an okay move, and White definitely has the advantage after it. However, though probably a bit sophisticated for the Academy, the best idea was to start the queenside attack here and now with 15.a4! \texttt{d}d7 16.a5! \texttt{b}b8 17...\texttt{d}d2 15...\texttt{f}f5 16.g4! Advancing on the other wing and easily driving the knight back 16...\texttt{h}h6 17.e4 Again it's an okay move that retains an advantage, but once more there was probably something even better with 17.e5!! \texttt{d}d6 the best defence 18.f4 \texttt{d}d7 and now 19.e4 would put Black under enormous pressure 17...\texttt{e}e7 18.e5!

18...\texttt{h}h8?? The position is very sharp, and this allows White to pile on the pressure. 18...f5! had to be played, and seems to almost hold the position though I'm not sure why! 19.g5 \texttt{x}xg5 20.xg5 \texttt{e}e8 21.f4! g5 22.xg5 \texttt{f}f7, though returning the bishop to f4 with 23.f4! is still promising for White 19...f4! It looks as if the Academy is going to equalise at 3–3! 19...\texttt{g}g8 20.xh6?? What! 20.g6!! and the game is almost over! Black can try \texttt{d}d7 or \texttt{d}d6, but best is possibly 20.e5 21.xxe5 \texttt{f}f8 22.g6 \texttt{d}d7 23.xf8 \texttt{xf}8. White is only a pawn up, but still has terrible threats. Here is one winning line: 24.d5! \texttt{e}e8 25.\texttt{f}f3 \texttt{x}xe4 ( 25...\texttt{x}xc4? 26...\texttt{c}c5 1-0 ) 26.xe4 g5 27.h2 f5 28.e5 f4 29.dxc6 \texttt{xc}6 30.e6 1-0 20...gxh6 21.xf7 \texttt{d}d8 22.g3 \texttt{b}b8 23.e5

From having a 'certain' win White almost has to start rebuilding again. Okay, so first get the knight on a decent outpost 23...c5 24.b4 \texttt{c}xd4 25...\texttt{d}d4! 25.c5 was best, but yields no great advantage anymore, and White is in danger of losing this once won game now if any more mistakes are made 25...\texttt{xb}4 26.e4 \texttt{d}d8?! This gives the opponent some counterplay again. It is really quite interesting to see how, in such complicated tactical positions, the computers often miss the very best moves. Of course it's easier for us to spot nowadays with our Fritz–Shredder–Hiarcs on P4 machines showing two lines of analysis, but even so I've been a bit surprised by one or two things in this game. 26...a4! (with the threat \texttt{c}c3) would have given Black a reasonable advantage: 27.d3 \texttt{c}c3 28.e3 \texttt{x}xe4 29.xe4 \texttt{e}e7! 27.d3 It's level again and all to play for 27...\texttt{d}d6 28.c5 \texttt{x}xc5 29.xc5 \texttt{xc}5 30.e1 \texttt{d}d5 31.\texttt{d}d2 31...\texttt{c}c4! might have produced a small advantage 31...\texttt{g}g8! 32.e4 \texttt{e}e6 33.ee4 \texttt{b}b1+ 34.\texttt{f}f1

34...\texttt{f}f6?! Shredder reckoned there was an 'easy' win here with 34...\texttt{b}6! (the ! is Shredder's, not mine) expecting 35.\texttt{ax}h6 \texttt{f}f6 36.\texttt{w}h5 \texttt{d}d8 but, apart from the fact it misses 35...g3! for White (possibly drawing), the position even here is certainly not yet cut and dried. Nevertheless \texttt{b}6 was a better move than that played by the Challenger, and the Academy really should now seize on another chance to get the full point! 35.ee3? Aaagh?! 35.b4! \texttt{xf}2 36.eb1 \texttt{xd}2 37.xd2 \texttt{c}c3 38.f1 \texttt{x}xe4 39.xe4 and, though Black has 2 pawns for the knight, the weakness of the doubled h–pawns means White ought to be able to win 35...\texttt{h}5 36.\texttt{b}3 \texttt{g}6 37.ee3 \texttt{x}h4 38.\texttt{xe}4 \texttt{ff}7 39.\texttt{d}c4 \texttt{ff}8! 40.d6 White has to try and disrupt the attack down the h–file somehow, but...

40...\texttt{xf}2! 41.\texttt{w}h6?? I guess White was
getting short of time. If it had been a human I would blame the collapse on time—or demoralisation after missing clear winning chances! – 41.\textit{xd}4 was the move, to get extra protection for f2, and then 41...\textit{xf}1+ 42.\textit{g}2 \textit{xf}2+ 43.\textit{x}f2 \textit{xf}2+ 44.\textit{g}3, and although Black is 2 pawns ahead the presence of both pairs of rooks gives White some drawing hopes. Surely it is over now, and in favour of Black, but who can know! 41...\textit{xf}1+! 42.\textit{h}2 \textit{xf}2+ 43.\textit{g}2 \textit{e}1 44.\textit{x}b7+ \textit{a}8 And now White must sacrifice material to delay the end—I nearly said the inevitable, but after a game like this nothing seems that certain! 45.\textit{x}a7+ \textit{xa}7 46.\textit{g}7+ \textit{b}6 47.\textit{g}1 \textit{x}g1 48.\textit{g}xg1+ \textit{f}2+ 49.\textit{h}1 \textit{e}2 50.\textit{c}4+ \textit{c}5 51.\textit{d}2 \textit{xd}2 52.\textit{a}4 \textit{c}3 And now even sacrificing the queen won't delay mate for long! 53.\textit{xf}2+ \textit{xf}2 54.\textit{a}5 \textit{e}4 55.\textit{h}4 \textit{g}3# 0-1

Not content with winning the 6th game the Challenger went on to win a long 63 move game 7 as well, so the table looks like this...

| Chess Challenger | \(\frac{1}{2} \) | 1 | 1 | 0 | \(\frac{1}{2} \) | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Talking Chess Academy | \(\frac{1}{2} \) | 0 | 0 | 1 | \(\frac{1}{2} \) | 0 | 0 | 2 |

As I've given a brief description and photo of the Chess Academy, currently badly behind, I'd better do the same for the Chess Challenger!

In fact the Challenger (and the portable Expert) contain the same program on the same processor as the Cougar and Cosmos did. There have been very small changes, mostly 'bug' fixes to the code or incorrect opening moves, but nothing that amounts to much. The Challenger board however is more in the style of the (in my view) neater Centurion than the Cougar, though the playing area is still 200x200mm.

Well, game 8 went to the Academy in 84 moves, but Chess Challenger recovered its 3 point lead with a win in game 9. At 6-3 the odds are now against my 6-4 forecast being right, but these games have been so up-and-down you never know!

\textbf{Chess Academy - Chess Challenger}

Game 10. Opening D26: Queen's Gambit
Accepted: 4 e3 e5 5 Bxc5 c5 sidelines

1.\textit{f}3 \textit{f}6 2.d4 d5 3.c4 dxc4 4.e3 e6 5.\textit{xc}4 \textit{bd}7 6.0-0 \textit{d}6 7.\textit{e}2?! 7.\textit{c}5 0-0 8.e4 is the only GM-played line here 7...0-0 8.\textit{c}3 \textit{b}6 9.\textit{b}3 \textit{e}8 10.e4 e5 11.dxe5 \textit{xe}5 12.\textit{xe}5 \textit{xe}5 13.\textit{f}4 \textit{e}8 14.\textit{ad}1 \textit{d}7 15.a4 a5 16.\textit{f}3 \textit{c}8 17.h3 \textit{c}6 18.\textit{fe}1 \textit{b}8 19.\textit{g}3

The Academy has an advantage because it controls the d-file with its rook, and the Challenger still needs to find a way to develop the a8/rook and really also its queen on b8 19...\textit{a}6?!
This looks weird, I know, but at least it's trying to deal with the problem. Perhaps I'd try 19...\textit{e}7 to make room for the queen to get to e8 or f8 and release the a8/rook. Is this any better?... it would take ages to accomplish 20.\textit{f}4 \textit{e}7! 21.\textit{h}4 \textit{bd}7 22.\textit{c}4 \textit{b}6 23.\textit{g}3 \textit{h}5 24.\textit{e}3 \textit{e}8 25.\textit{d}5 \textit{xd}5! Challenger pleasingly avoids the temptation of 25...\textit{x}b2? when 26.\textit{xc}3 \textit{b}4 27.\textit{e}7+ \textit{xe}7 (27...\textit{h}8? 28.\textit{xc}6 \textit{xc}6 29.\textit{xd}7! 1-0) 28.\textit{xe}7 \textit{xe}4 29.\textit{b}3+- leaves White well on top. It's quite fascinating how sometimes the programs miss apparently fairly obvious tactics and then, just when you'd be sure they'd 'fall' for something, they sort it out. I think my conclusion is that sometimes they play 200 BCF chess, and sometimes 150 BCF, and the average comes out at 175! But at any given moment you often can't tell which you'll get next! 26.\textit{xd}5 \textit{hf}6 27.\textit{wc}3 \textit{ed}6?! 27...\textit{c}6 28.\textit{xf}6 \textit{xf}6
29.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}c4} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}e5} was best. After this we can again say that White 'should' win! 28.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xa5}?!
Another small inaccuracy as here 28.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}g3}! would give White a greater chance after 28...\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xd5} 29.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}exd5} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}xe1+} 30.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xe1}++. The Challenger finds the best reply, and is on the point of equalising in a couple more moves 28...\textit{\textit{\textbullet}c6} 29.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}c4} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}b6} 30.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}b4} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}xd1}? Perhaps 30...\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xe4!} 31.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xd6} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}xe1+} 32.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xe1} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}xd6} would nearly equalise!? 31.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xd1} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}xe4}

32.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xd7}! Well found by the Academy. Now, which is Black's best recapture?! 32...\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xc4}?!
The other one, I think! If 32...\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xd7}? then, okay, 33.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xf7}+\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xf7} 34.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xe4}, but this brings us to \textit{\textit{\textbullet}Q}+\textit{\textit{\textbullet}B}+5P \textit{\textit{\textbullet}v} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}Q}+\textit{\textit{\textbullet}N}+4P... not so easy to win in my view 33.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xc4} 34.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xd7} 34.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xc6} I know what you're going to say, it's exactly the same material as in our note above! But here Black's king is still on \textit{\textit{\textbullet}g8} instead of \textit{\textit{\textbullet}f7}, and in fact \textit{\textit{\textbullet}f7} is also still occupied so Black is at least one tempo worse off! 34...\textit{\textit{\textbullet}e5} 35.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}b5}! \textit{\textit{\textbullet}g6} 36.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}g5!} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}e5} Of course Black doesn't really want to exchange queens as White has the distant pawn majority. But as it stood his king can't easily get past the e8/\textit{\textbullet}e7 squares due to the clever placing of White's \textit{\textit{\textbullet}W}+\textit{\textit{\textbullet}a}, so this has become the only option 37.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}e3} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}xb5} 38.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}axb5}

38...\textit{\textit{\textbullet}f5}?! Endgames are so tricky for lower knowledge, non-hashable programs. Probably best was 38...\textit{\textit{\textbullet}f8!} and after 39.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xb6} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}e7! heading to stop the b-pawns. It may not save the day, but it has to be the best try 39.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xb6} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}f7} 40.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}a7} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}e7}! It is now clear that the king can no longer get to the b-file in time 41.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}b6!} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}c6} 42.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}b7} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}g5} Not much he can do - if he takes the bishop the pawn queens 43.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}b4!} \textit{\textit{\textbullet}xa7} If the knight's going to be dislodged, might as well then 44.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}b5?!}
Unexpected (why didn't the computer just queen?!) but it's okay 44...\textit{\textit{\textbullet}xb5} 45.\textit{\textit{\textbullet}b8} 1-0

So here is how it ended...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chess Challenger</th>
<th>½</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>½</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking Chess Academy</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis that the Chess Challenger is around 2000 Elo - a rating established from hundreds of Cougar/Cosmos results - then the rating for the Chess Academy based on this match is 1920 Elo. I've just looked in the Countrywide 2004 Catalogue - exactly what I claimed there, so it's a satisfying scoreline for that reason and because it's what I forecast!

I did feel, going through the games, that the Challenger's chess in its losing match (3½-6½) to the Star Diamond was actually a little more convincing at times than it was in its win here. Both the Challenger and the Academy occasionally made a mess of good positions in this match, so maybe their strengths lie more in their defensive capabilities than in their ability to win 'nearly won' positions. Equally I've become spoilt on playing with the latest top software running on 2000MHz hardware, and seeing incredible and sound tactical ideas produced confidently in just seconds. So I can produce fairly 'expert' analysis by checking initial outline notes for a game with a program, easily demonstrating corrections and improvements here and there for both moves played in the game - and ideas I've suggested in my notes!

Perhaps the real issue is what happens when we play the Challenger and Academy computers ourselves, and find out whether our 'unforced error' ratio is higher or lower than theirs!

In conclusion, despite the errors pointed out in the notes, I still enjoyed playing through these games - and it gave me some encouragement at times as well!
Well, I’ve done it again and run out of space with one major article still to do! What can I tell you in one page that will give everyone the basic vital details (=keep readers satisfied), yet leave you looking forward to the next issue, wanting to know more?! Tricky.

I know - first off I’ll scrap my inside front cover advert, then you’ll get 2 WCCC pages, that will help a little.

Here is the list of entrants in seeding order:

- **Shredder** by Stefan Meyer-Kahlen, Germany. The current World Champion from 2003 and running on 4xOpteron AMD/2000
- **Fritz** by Frans Morsch, Germany, on 4x Opteron AMD/2000
- **Junior** by Amir Bon & Shay Bushinsky, Israel, on 4xHP/2200
- **Diep** by Vincent Diepeveen, Holland on 4xOpteron/2000
- **IsiChess** by Gerd Isenberg, Germany on AMD 64-bit/3400+
- **ParSOS** by Rudolf Huber, Germany on AMD 64-bit/3200+
- **Falcon** by O D Tabbi, Israel on AMD 64-bit/3200+
- **Crafty** by Bob Hyatt, USA on 4xOpteron AMD/2000
- **Deep Sjeng** by G G Paschotte, Belgium on AMD 64-bit/3400+
- **Jonny** by Johannes Zwanzger, Germany on AMD 64-bit/3200+
- **The Crazy Bishop** by Rami Coulom, France on P4/2800
- **Movei** by Uri Blass, Israel on P4/2800
- **FIB Chess** by G B García, Spain on P4/2800

**Notes:**

- You will observe that, amongst the important programs missing (yet again in some cases, e.g. Hiarcs, Tiger, Rebel) there was also no sign of Hydra! That would probably be because the 2004 WCCC was held in the Bar-Ilan University in Israel, and Hydra now plays under the United Arab Emirates flag!
- Jonny was the program which, in reality ‘drew’ with Shredder last year, when Shredder allowed an unnecessary draw by repetition in a won position. But, you may recall, Zwanzger refused to take the draw and let Shredder play on to find the win. Thus Shredder made a play-off v Junior and went on to finally win the World Championship. Would they meet again?
- It is reported that FIB Chess was playing without an opening book!
- My ‘old’ friend John Hämlet’s name appeared late on the entry list with his Woodpusher 1997. John has got really interested in Japanese culture, and from this ‘discovered’ the game of Go. Also he hadn’t been to Israel before and wanted to, so decided to enter a rush version of his first attempt at a Go program - aptly called DumbGo - in the Go Olympiad being held at the same time as the WCCC. When they saw his name the organisers asked him to enter his old Woodpusher chess program - the same code as in 1997! - and he said ‘yes’, quite keen to see how it would run on today’s much faster hardware. He’ll write a report for us for the next issue, and hopefully compare Go programming with that for Chess!

The first 4 rounds saw some surprises, a few small, and a few big!. The main results were:-

- *(1)* Crafty drew with Shredder, DeepSjeng drew with Fritz, Jonny drew with Junior, Woodpusher drew with IsiChess
- *(2)* IsiChess drew with Fritz, DeepSjeng drew with Crafty, Jonny beat the Crazy Bishop
- *(3)* Jonny drew with Shredder (justice?!), Falcon beat Fritz (!), ParSOS drew with DeepSjeng
- *(4)* Junior beat Crafty, Shredder beat Diep, Falcon beat Jonny, Woodpusher beat the bookless FIBChess

So the scores **after 4 rounds** were:

- 3½ Junior
- 3 Shredder, Falcon
- 2½ DeepSjeng
- 2 Fritz, Diep, ParSOS, Crafty, Jonny, Woodpusher
- 1½ IsiChess, Movei

The **World Speed Chess Championships** were held on the Tuesday and Wednesday evenings, after rounds 3 and 4. Despite some misgivings amongst SelSearch readers concerning Shredder at
Blitz play - and note also that not all the main WCCC programs took part - the result was:

**WCCC - Speed Championship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Crafty</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Junior, Falcon</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ParSOS</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jonny</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Diep, The Crazy Bishop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here's what happened in the next few rounds of the main Championship:

*(5)* Junior drew with Shredder, but Falcon lost to DeepSjeng so that Junior stayed clear 1st. Fritz beat Crafty. Diep drew with Jonny, ParSOS beat Woodpusher.

*(6)* Junior beat DeepSjeng to stay clear 1st. Fritz drew with Shredder (Shredder's 4th. draw already), Falcon drew with ParSOS, Diep beat Movei, Jonny beat IsiChess. At this point the bookless FIBChess has 0/6.

*(7)* IsiChess drew with Junior... maybe there's still a chance for the others?! Shredder beat Movei, ParSOS beat Jonny, Crafty beat Diep, DeepSjeng beat Woodpusher, Falcon beat Crazy Bishop, Fritz beat the hapless FIBChess.

So, after 7 rounds we had...
- 5½ Junior
- 5 Shredder
- 4½ Fritz, Falcon, ParSOS, DeepSjeng
- 4 Crafty
- 3½ Diep, Jonny
- 3 IsiChess
- 2½ Movei, Woodpusher

By now most of the top programs had already met each other, so you'd imagine it would be pretty difficult for the programs on 5 and 4½ pts to catch Junior.

However, if the draw obliged, Junior still had Falcon and Fritz to play, Shredder still had to play DeepSjeng and Falcon, Fritz had Junior (as mentioned) and Diep to come, and Falcon had Crafty. DeepSjeng seemed to have an easier run-in as it had met most of the big names except for Shredder. ParSOS still hadn't played Junior, Fritz and Crafty!

* *(6)* Some of the big ones still outstanding took place straight away: Junior beat Falcon, Shredder beat DeepSjeng, and Fritz beat ParSOS. That just about settled the occupants of the top 3 places in one order or another! Crafty beat Movei, and Diep beat Woodpusher, while Jonny beat poor FIBChess.

* *(9)* The big one! and Junior and Fritz drew. Shredder beat Woodpusher, so it's 1= with 7/9 Junior and Shredder, threatening a repeat of 2003! Crafty beat Falcon, and Diep beat IsiChess, so in 3= but a full point behind we had Fritz and Crafty on 6/9! DeepSjeng and Diep are on 5½, but there's only 2 rounds left!

* *(10)* The leaders both win... Junior over CrazyBishop, Shredder over FIBChess. So they're both on 8/10. Fritz lost to Diep (!) so is out of it, and Crafty lost to ParSOS so its chance has gone as well! In another slight surprise Jonny beat DeepSjeng.

* *(11)* Junior beat ParSOS quite early, so now Shredder had to play Falcon to tie... but could only draw. Junior is the World Champion for 2004. In other games Woodpusher did nicely to draw with Jonny, whilst IsiChess beat DeepSjeng which had disappointed again. Diep beat FIBChess and consigned it to 0/11.

More details, analysed games and photos next time, with a report from John Hamlen 'who was there' as they say!
RATING LISTS AND NOTES

A brief guide to the meaning 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 v computers with its results v humans. I believe this makes our Se/Search 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 no. of Games played in Tournaments v rated humans.

A guide to PC Gradings:

386 & 486 based PCs have now disappeared from our top 50 listing. The GUIDE below will help readers calculate approximately what rating their program should play at when used on alternative hardware.

Pent-PC represents a program on a Pent/Pent2/MMX/K6 at approx. 200MHz, with 16-32MB RAM.

P4-PC represents a program on a Pentium4/K7 at approx. 1000MHz, with 256MB 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-Comp GUIDE, if Pentium4/1000 = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deep prog on 8xP4/1000</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>Deep prog on 4xP4/1000</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P4-Athlon/2000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Deep prog on 2xP4/1000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4/1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P3-K7/500</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPro2-K6/300</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>PPro2-K6/233</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent/200</td>
<td>-120</td>
<td>486DX4/100</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486/66</td>
<td>-240</td>
<td>386/33</td>
<td>-320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATING LIST (c) Eric Hallsworth. PC PROGS Se/Search 113 Aug 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCF Computer</th>
<th>268 SHREDDER B4-PC</th>
<th>2746 19 565 1</th>
<th>2619 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>266 SHREDDER 0.4-PC</td>
<td>2726 12 1481 6</td>
<td>2703 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263 JUNIOR8 B4-PC</td>
<td>2709 13 1211 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262 FRITZ B4-PC</td>
<td>2698 11 1616 4</td>
<td>2733 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261 HARISS B4-PC</td>
<td>2696 15 939 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258 CHESS TIGER 1B4-PC</td>
<td>2674 11 1712 8</td>
<td>2542 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257 CHESS TIGER 1B4-PC</td>
<td>2652 12 1305 9</td>
<td>2701 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 SHREDDER B4-PC</td>
<td>2651 12 1316 10</td>
<td>2478 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 HARISS B4-PC</td>
<td>2648 11 1602 11</td>
<td>2651 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254 FRITZ B4-PC</td>
<td>2640 10 2081 12</td>
<td>2616 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253 JUNIOR7 B4-PC</td>
<td>2640 12 1372 13</td>
<td>2701 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 REBEL TIGER 1B4-PC</td>
<td>2628 22 430 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 JUNIOR6 B4-PC</td>
<td>2620 15 873 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 REBEL TIGER 1B4-PC</td>
<td>2617 10 1891 16</td>
<td>2621 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 JUNIOR5 B4-PC</td>
<td>2617 21 480 17</td>
<td>2674 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 HARISS7 B4-PC</td>
<td>2603 9 2347 19</td>
<td>2467 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 HARISS7 B4-PC</td>
<td>2603 12 1357 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 SHREDDER B4-PC</td>
<td>2592 14 1018 20</td>
<td>2642 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 SHREDDER B4-PC</td>
<td>2585 16 760 21</td>
<td>2600 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247 FRITZ B4-PC</td>
<td>2583 12 1380 22</td>
<td>2513 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247 FRITZ B4-PC</td>
<td>2583 12 1402 23</td>
<td>2516 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247 CHESSMASTER B4-PC</td>
<td>2580 24 533 24</td>
<td>2594 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247 NIKZOB B4-PC</td>
<td>2580 12 1326 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247 NIKZOB B4-PC</td>
<td>2578 13 1208 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247 REBEL TIGER 1B4-PC</td>
<td>2576 25 340 27</td>
<td>2655 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247 NIKZOB B4-PC</td>
<td>2573 12 1308 28</td>
<td>2475 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 SHREDDER B4-PC</td>
<td>2567 20 503 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 NIKZOB B4-PC</td>
<td>2563 11 1357 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 TAL B4-PC</td>
<td>2562 13 1116 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 HARISS B4-PC</td>
<td>2556 13 1207 32</td>
<td>2592 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 NIKZOB B4-PC</td>
<td>2547 14 1051 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 TAL B4-PC</td>
<td>2546 14 974 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 REBEL TIGER 1B4-PC</td>
<td>2545 21 460 35</td>
<td>2592 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 REBEL B4-PC</td>
<td>2545 25 333 36</td>
<td>2598 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 TAL B4-PC</td>
<td>2544 14 1063 37</td>
<td>2677 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 REBEL B4-PC</td>
<td>2543 15 846 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 REBEL B4-PC</td>
<td>2543 19 549 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 CHESS PROB B4-PC</td>
<td>2538 17 712 40</td>
<td>2504 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 CHESS PROB B4-PC</td>
<td>2531 14 1068 41</td>
<td>2600 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 CHESS GENIUS B4-PC</td>
<td>2530 13 1207 42</td>
<td>2459 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244 SHREDDER B4-PC</td>
<td>2524 20 393 43</td>
<td>2711 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244 CHESS PROB B4-PC</td>
<td>2520 14 1031 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239 SHREDDER B4-PC</td>
<td>2519 15 878 45</td>
<td>2218 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 TAL B4-PC</td>
<td>2517 19 755 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 TAL B4-PC</td>
<td>2513 19 755 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 TAL B4-PC</td>
<td>2506 14 1031 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 TAL B4-PC</td>
<td>2496 27 282 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234 TAL B4-PC</td>
<td>2473 41 115 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 TAL B4-PC</td>
<td>2470 22 413 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 TAL B4-PC</td>
<td>2456 25 332 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 TAL B4-PC</td>
<td>2447 21 569 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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