Mark Unicke ‘on top of the world’ on a mountain in New Zealand during a recent family holiday - his Hiarc 10 program still tops our Rating List as well!
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### PORTABLE COMPUTERS (port)

**Kasparov**

**ADVANCED TRAVEL** (was BRAVO) **£34.95** - plug-in set with Centurion program! 160 BCF. Scrolling info display. Amazing value!

**MAESTRO touch screen travel** **£49.95** - new version of the Cosmic/Touch Screen, great product, incl. Leatherette cover. Backlight switch on side for easy operation when needed. Decent chess, est'd 130 BCF

**EXPERT** **£99.95** - replaces COSMOS - great value! 4½"x4½" plug-in board, strong Morsch program. Multiple levels, sound in display & coach system.

**Novag**

**STAR RUBY** **£79.95** - 165 BCF program in touch screen style with stylus, and secure screen cover. Batteries only, excellent pocket portable

**STAR SAPPHIRE** **£179.95** - the long-awaited and very strong 200 BCF touch screen model. Fits just nicely in the pocket in its pouch carry case with pen. Only a few left and wont be replaced!

### TABLE-TOP PRESS SENSORY (tast)

**EXPLORER** **£49.95** - excellent value, neat design. Batteries only, with info display and 160 BCF program

**Mister - the price for these 3 incl. adapter**

**CHALLENGER** **£69.95** - Cougar '2100' program in newly designed board, a v.good value-for-money buy

**TALKING CHESS ACADEMY** **£99.95** - good 160 BCF program, and packed with features incl. display and voice option!

**MASTER** **£139.95** - the Milano Pro program + features, in attractive 13"x10" board. Strong, with info display. incl. plastic carry case.

**Novag**

**OBSIDIAN** **£125** - 167 BCF with nice carry case! Good board, wood pieces, excellent features/chess

**STAR DIAMOND** **£199.95** - brilliant, strong 9"x9" play area 200 BCF model. Hash-tables + big Opening Book + includes nice carry case

### AUTO SENSYORY (tas)

**Excilbur**

**GRANDMASTER** **£199.95** - big 2" squares, 4" king! With green/white vinyl board in USA tournament style. Full auto-sensory surface. Looks great! Plays to 150 BCF. Display at both ends of board

---

### EXCLUSIVE - All wood board 15"x15" and nicely carved wood, felted pieces. Superb to play on, display for user-selectable info
- With 190 BCF SENATOR (Master) program **£449**
- ONE only with 205 BCF MAGELLAN program **£699**

**PROGRAMS from CHESSBASE on CD**

All run INDEPENDENTLY + will also analyse within ChessBase8/9. Great graphics, big databases + opening books, analysis, printing, max features.

**BUY ANY 2 items from this ChessBase section, and deduct £5, buy ANY 3 and deduct £12.50!**

**FRITZ 9** **£39.95** - by Franz Morsch. Extra chess knowledge for real top strength - a beautiful program! Superb Interface, net connection, terrific Graphics. Excellent in both analysis and play, game/diagram printing. Good hobby levels, set your own Elo, many helpful features and includes 1 million Games database + three Chess Media video training excerpts, and Beginners Course!

**DEEP FRITZ 8** **£75** - probably the top program for single, dual & quad processors. Earlier engine drew 4-4 with Kramnik!

**JUNIOR 9** **£39.95** - an updated version of the engine which drew 3-3 with **Kasparov**. Is very potent and aggressive, also highly suited to computer v computer chess. The nearest you'll get to Tal on your computer!

**DEEP JUNIOR 9** **£75** for dual & single PCs!

**HIACS 10** **£39.95** - Mark Unlacke's latest version. Simply outstanding: knowledge packed yet searching deeper-stronger than ever! All the latest superb ChessBase features + Opening Book by Eric Hallsworth.

**SHREDDER 9** **£39.95** - Meyer-Kahlen's latest in its great ChessBase Interface. Feature-packed & knowledge-based playing stylish chess. Plus the usual big Opening Book and Games Database

**CHESS TIGER 15** **£39.95** - the ChessBase version gives compatibility with other ChessBase products, which the Lokasoft version doesn't. Same strong Tiger program, playing style settings include Gambit etc. Jeroen Noomans quality opening book, and CD also includes main 4 piece Tablebases

**POWERBOOKS DVD** **£39.95** - turn your ChessBase playing engine into an **openings expert!** 20 million opening positions + 1 million games!

**ENDGAME TURBO DVDS, set 2 or 3** **£39.95** - turn your ChessBase playing engine into an **endgame expert** with this 4/9 dvd Nalimov tablebase set!

---

**CHESSBASE 9.0 DVD for Windows** **£99.95**!

The most popular and best Games Database system, with the top features. 2.8 million games, players encyclopaedia, multimedia presentations, fast search trees, opening reports + statistics, embed notes, engine analysis, superb printing facilities and much more, incl. recent ChessBase CD magazines & a multimedia CDI
NEWS AND RESULTS - KEEPING YOU RIGHT UP-TO-DATE IN THE COMPUTER CHESS WORLD!

Welcome to another new issue of Selective Search... 123! If your sub. is due for renewal at this time, can I please encourage you to subscribe again! There will still be at least 6 more issues of the magazine, so your money won't be wasted!

Occasionally readers ask me to let them know when their sub. is due for renewal. In fact the label on your envelope always shows the number of the last issue that you will receive of your current subscription, so it's easy to keep a check on it and also make sure I've updated you correctly after a payment has been made.

NEWS

I am glad to say that some of the fuss about Rybka has finally died down. Perhaps folk like me who paid, and were promised a finished version in February, have got fed up of having to download interminable 'upgrades' only now to be told that the final 1.2 version won't be out until May! As I write (March 22nd) version 1.1 has just been released!

Also when Jeroen Noomens' Opening Book (in ChessBase only format?!) appeared for it, we were all then expected to download a 41MB file (!) and told there might be changes to that in due course, requiring further downloads. For those who see it through to the end I reckon it will be the most expensive piece of chess software ever!

If you've not got it already and still want to, then go to

- www.rybkachess.com

From there you can now download the original beta version for free, or pay and download the latest beta version and be given the option to download the 41MB Opening Book.

But do again please remember that, as it's a UCI engine, Rybka will NOT run unless you have a ChessBase program or Arena or Winboard or something to run it in!

RESULTS SECTION

More results have come in, showing how Rybka, our SelSearch 122 top-rater Hiarcs 10, and the new Fritz 9 and Fruit 2.21 are doing, and these follow. However there are so many other things going on - and some important chess games to cover - that I am trying to minimise the RESULTS section this time so as to get everything else in!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rybka 1.01-13b</td>
<td>2871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fruit 2.21</td>
<td>2785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fritz 9</td>
<td>2783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hiarcs 10 hmi=ON</td>
<td>2774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Toga II 1.1A</td>
<td>2772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shredder 9</td>
<td>2756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gambit Fruit 1.04bx</td>
<td>2755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Thinker 5.0B</td>
<td>2730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Spike 1.1</td>
<td>2721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fritz 8 Bilbao</td>
<td>2721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SmartThink 1.00</td>
<td>2709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ktulu 7.5</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ChessMaster 10000</td>
<td>2696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Junior 9</td>
<td>2693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hiarcs 8 Bareaev</td>
<td>2687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings in the CEGT table are about 25 Elo higher than Selective Search figures.

A 64-bit version of Rybka1-13d is also shown at an astonishing 2914 Elo. This is about 60 Elo higher Kasperov at his best, surely that's not right... in fact I think we will find the Rybka ratings are all too high, probably due to the limited 5 move Openings the programs have to play with ?!

Others of interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiarcs9</td>
<td>2680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChessTiger15</td>
<td>2672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandalf6</td>
<td>2666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffian1.05</td>
<td>2659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffian2</td>
<td>2654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProDeo1.1</td>
<td>2647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Sjeng</td>
<td>2609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zappa 1.1</td>
<td>2606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth comparing the above with another
new Rating List I have come across, as it also uses the same time control but a different set of Openings and, so far, not as many engines are involved:

**Computer Schach2 - BFF-Liste (40/40)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hiarc8 HM=ON</td>
<td>2770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fruit 2.21</td>
<td>2768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Toga 2.1.1A</td>
<td>2754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shredder 9</td>
<td>2728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fritz 9</td>
<td>2726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spike 1.1</td>
<td>2709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>etc....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incidentally hm=ON activates the Hypermodern setting in Hiarc8. This is what we used with Hiarc8 against Bareev, and there's quite a few folk believe it gives Hiarc a few extra Elo. Obviously we tested it thoroughly prior to release, and our results at a wide range of time controls indicated that the default setting was fractionally better. But the gap was so tiny maybe we were wrong!

**SSDF (Sweden) Ratings: 40/2 Time Control!**

The Ratings we showed from the popular and valuable SSDF Rating List in our last issue came out when Hiarc 10 had only just reached them.

However their latest list is an update with Mark Uniacke's new program now included, and it just failed to replace Fruit in top place! Also I note that Fritz and Shredder have dropped a few points from past time.

I may be wrong, but I don't think the SSDF is too impressed with the way Rybka is being promoted and sold.

I'm sure programmer Vasik Rajlich hoped that the Opening Book (by Jeroen Noomens, ex Rebel), which you can now download to go with it, would persuade them to start testing his latest beta version.

Whatever, the SSDF seem to have decided to wait until it's a finished release rather than test lots of beta versions. Even then it sounds as if they question whether it is right for an independ uci engine to have a 'ChessBase' format opening book when the sold product has nothing to do with ChessBase at all!

For PC programs the SSDF ratings are approximately 80 Elo higher than those in Selective Search, although both are based on the engines running on 1200MHz machines. I personally think it is hard to believe that Fruit - or for that matter Hiarc - on a P4/1200, is as strong as Kasparov was at the height of his powers, but maybe I'm wrong.

**SSDF Rating List 40/2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fruit 2.2.1</td>
<td>2853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hiarc8 HM=ON</td>
<td>2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shredder 9 uci</td>
<td>2815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fritz 9</td>
<td>2807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shredder 8</td>
<td>2806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shredder 7.04</td>
<td>2802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Junior 9</td>
<td>2786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Deep Fritz 8</td>
<td>2782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Junior 8</td>
<td>2767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Shredder 7</td>
<td>2767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Deep Fritz 7</td>
<td>2765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fritz 8</td>
<td>2752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Deep Junior 8</td>
<td>2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fritz 7</td>
<td>2739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gandalf 6</td>
<td>2738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hiarc8</td>
<td>2736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pro Deo 1.1</td>
<td>2727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 2004</td>
<td>2725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So the SSDF and CEGT 40/40 both have Fruit just ahead of Hiarc310, but the BFF Liste and SelSearch have it the other way round. Either way they both edge Fritz9, but there's never more than a few points in it.

Note that there are also indications in some of these lists that Fritz9 might not be as strong as first thought and could be dropping just below Shredder9! Even at the lower figures it is still some 50 Elo better than Fritz8!

**CSS Rating List**

The latest Computer Schach & Spiele Rating List is also of great interest. Whilst the SSDF
use a slower time control than anyone else (40/2), and CEGT use a sort of middle 40/40, the CSS testers use a fairly fast one, namely G/10mins+10secs.

It is useful to compare the differences and how they affect some programs!

"Hiarcs is back" was the header for the CSS Rating List posted on their website in early January. With a massive effort they had managed to play their 480 games and were the first to include Hiarcs10.

Since then they have also tested the Spike1.1 upgrade (Spikel1.0a Mainz was on 2704). Although the new version has jumped up in 5th. place, the top 4 placings are unchanged with Fruit holding on to top spot!

They have stated that they will test Rybka when version1.1 finally comes out, but there is no mention of Toga and I have no idea why they are not testing that at present.

---

CSS Rating List. G/10+10secs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRUIT 2.21</td>
<td>2810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HIARCS 10</td>
<td>2797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FRITZ 9</td>
<td>2792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SHREDDER 9 UCI</td>
<td>2772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SPIKE 1.1</td>
<td>2740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SMARTHINK 1.00</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CHESS TIGER 15</td>
<td>2697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>JUNIOR 9</td>
<td>2693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LOOP LIST 600</td>
<td>2689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KTULU 7.5</td>
<td>2686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PRO DEO 1.1</td>
<td>2667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gandalf 6.0</td>
<td>2662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CHESSMASTER 10000</td>
<td>2660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>GLAURUNG 1.0.1</td>
<td>2652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>RUFFIAN 2.1</td>
<td>2647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

OTHER RESULTS

RESULTS from Selective Search READERS

TONY SHERLOCK

When I made reference earlier to the fact that some of the lists were showing Fritz9 to have dropped a little from its earliest results, I had Tony particularly in mind! He rang me after he received the last magazine issue to tell me that he just could not believe that Fritz9 was better than Shredder9. To support that he gave me his engine-engine score, all games played at 40/2 - a monumental effort Tony!

- Fritz9 73½ - 86½ Shredder9

I remember that another reader, Paul Walsh, used to play all his matches at 30/1hr or 40/2hr, and he also insisted that the Shredder7-8-9 versions were even stronger than the ratings! But because they were always top until recently, I guess we didn't worry about a few Elo too much!

I do believe that, in a match situation, Shredder9 is very hard to beat. But I also think that, due its more cautious, defensive playing style, however skilful, it probably doesn't beat some of the lesser programs as heavily as does Fritz9, and some big wins by Fritz9 against lower ranked opponents help it recover to a higher rating.

FRANK HOLT

Frank continues to run a range of interesting tournaments and matches for us - usually a new one for each issue!

Always remember that in Frank's tests he uses two PCs. This makes his results more reliable than engine-engine testing, and they therefore get included in our Rating List.

For his last Tournament he had downloaded the latest free uci version Toga2.1.

I told Frank it was good, but he thought I meant 'good' as in 'decent, okay' rather than 'good' as in GOOD, and pitched it in with some older commercial versions and the final free version of Fruit, which was also 2.1.

"I felt perhaps being Amateur these programs would probably be about 2700, so I matched them for that. Just how wrong could I be, they walked over them!!"

"It's Toga and Fruit v the BIG BOYS next", says Frank! So here it is!
Frank Holt: G/1hr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Score/48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SHREDDER 9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TOGA 2.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FRUIT 2.1</td>
<td>23½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SHREDDER 8</td>
<td>21½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ZAPPA 1.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few weeks ago Frank purchased Hiarc10 and Fritz9 and is playing them in a new Tournament - alongside the original Rybka beta version. We'll look forward to that result for our next issue!

CARL BICKNELL

Carl's contributions have been missing for an issue or two, but he's just completed an Interview/Article with Mark Uniacke for SelSearch and has sent in two interesting Tournament Results for us:

Carl Bicknell. G/4+2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Score/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIARCS 10</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRUIT 2.21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JUNIOR 9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SHREDDER 9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FRITZ 9</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=</td>
<td>CRAFTY 19.19, FRITZ 5.32</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carl Bicknell: G/5mins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Score/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HIARCS 10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRITZ 9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SHREDDER 9</td>
<td>10½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RYBKA BETA 1.13</td>
<td>9½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=</td>
<td>CRAFTY 19.19, FRITZ 5.32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think it is an interesting and useful idea of Carl's to include one or two 'weaker' opponents, so one can see how well the 'top' programs do in getting good wins against weaker opposition. The low position of Rybka was a bit of a surprise, but this was the last beta version before endgame coding and tablebases.

FORTHCOMING EVENTS!

COMPUTER CHESS WORLD CHAMPS!
The first details for the next Computer Chess World Championships have just been announced.

They will be held in Torino, Italy in conjunction with the 11th. Computer Olympiad (all sorts of other well-known and weird and wonderful games!), and co-ordinates with the human FIDE Chess Olympics also held in Torino between May 25-June 4 2006!

More news and details of entrants will follow next Issue or when available.

DEEP FRITZ v VLADIMIR KRAMNIK

The next $1million Man v Machine match is scheduled to take place between Nov 25 and Dec 5 later this year. It will be a 6 game match between Kramnik and Deep Fritz, and will be held in the 'very prestigious' Art & Exhibition Hall in Bonn, Germany.

The ChessBase web site announces Kramnik as the 'human World Champion', which I think Topalov would strongly dispute as he recently won the official FIDE World Title crown in an Event which Kramnik chose not to play in!

They also announce Deep Fritz as 'the world's strongest chess program' which a few other programs ahead of it, both in and not in the Rating Lists, would also no doubt dispute. Other than that everything's fine, and we look forward to the match!
Kramnik, as I expect most readers know, has been unwell for some months with a serious, but not life-threatening, rheumatic disease.

Nevertheless he is now rumoured to be playing a World Championship unification match with Topalov in September before going on to meet Deep Fritz. Some comeback if it all happens!

Concerning computers Kramnik had this to say, "For me playing the computer is a very serious challenge. I think that it is maybe one of the last opportunities for a human being to beat the machine. I consider the computer to be the favourite, and I mean in any match against any human being. They have really become incredibly strong. But we are still at a point in history where there is a chance".

**HYDRA v VESELIN TOPALOV**

There are also strong rumours that the PAL Group representing the Abu Dhabi based Hydra team have offered $1 million to the (real) current World Champion Topalov and challenged him to see if he can do anything better than Mickey Adams did! Readers will recall that match went ½-½.

That's all I know at present, but if Topalov has accepted, as I hear he has, then this also will be scheduled for the end of the year sometime. More a.s.a.p!

-------------------------------

But talking of Abu Dhabi another rumour reaching me is that this is where Rybka might be headed?!

If so the 'scheduled for May 2006' Rybka1.2 release might be the last one PC users get, and we'll see Hydra and Rybka compete head-to-head for the World's best but, for us, unavailable software+hardware combination.

I'll bet Chrilly Doninger's thrilled :-)

---

**VERY LATE NEWS FROM CEGT**

CEGT are running a major Knock-out Tournament at Blitz G/4.

They started with 8 Groups of 10 Engines (all to be on single processors, but some were included in their 64-bit versions - we never quite seem to get a level playing field!).

It's an all-play-all with White and Black, so 20 games were played by every engine in each Group, and the top 4 in each of those Groups progress into 2 new Divisions of 16 Engines each!

Those progressing from the 1st Group stages are:

- **Group A**: Rybka13/d64 17½, CM9000-Metallicus 13½, Pseudo0.7c 10½, Glaurung1.0.2 10
- **Group B**: Hiarcso10 15, GambitTiger2 14½, LoopList600 13, ProDeo1.1 13
- **Group C**: Fruit2.21 15, Pepito1.59 12, Aristarch4.51 11½, SlowChessBlitzWV2 11
- **Group D**: ChessTiger15 14½, Gandalf6.01 13½, Spike1.1 12½, CraftyCito1.4.3 64 12
- **Group E**: Toga1.1a/d64 14½, Moveio0.8.352 12½, Kulu7.5 11½, Thinker7.7a 11½
- **Group F**: Fritz9 14½, Naum1.91/d64 14, CM9000-Pestilence 11½, Nimzo8y14 11
- **Group G**: Ruffian2.1 10 13½, Junior9 13, SmarThink1.0/d64 11, Jonny2.89 10½
- **Group H**: Shredder9.1 16, Zappa1.1/d64 10½, DeepSjeng1.6 10½, Scorpio1.7 10

4 versions of ChessMaster 9000, each with different Preference settings, were allowed to enter after they had had their own knockout. Two got through the 1st Group stages and two didn't.

Others amongst those failing to qualify were: SOS5.1, TheBaron1.7, CometB69, TaO5.7, Yace0.99, Phalanx22, Zarkov4.86, DelfI4.6, Pharaon3.3, Ikarus0.18, Nimzo2000

---

**PLANNED FOR THE NEXT ISSUE!**

- Frank HOLT's very latest results arrived just after I'd finished the NEWS. Tournaments include Fritz9, Hiarcso10, Toga2, Shredder9 etc.
- More games Excalibur Grandmaster from Pete BILSON still planned
- Tony KOSTEN partnered Hiarcso10 in a recent Internet event - we're trying to persuade him to do a little report for us!
- Jim CROMPTON's match between Star Diamond v RISC 2500, a tough one.
- **Hydra v Nickel**. We looked at this in issue 122, page 33. A few more moves have been played so we'll catch up next time!
... and who knows what else? We never get it all in, but honestly we always do our best!
As with our main Gebruikers report elsewhere, the fact that Rob van Son was not present at the Winter event means that I am unable to provide the usual coverage. As however I already know, at the time of writing this intro, that SelS123 will be packed, maybe the fact that I don't have all of the games and photos is for the best. Whatever Rob, we do miss you - make sure you go next time!

Even more embarrassingly the only 3 games I've managed to retrieve from the Gebruikers website were wins by the computers. Anyway, here goes!

R Hylkema (1950) - Meph Montreux
D00: 1 d4 d5: Unusual lines

1.d4 d5 2.g5 f6 3.h4 c6 4.e3 e5
Michael Adams once played 4...h6 here, against van Wely in 1997
5.b5 exd4 6.exd4 d6 N
Here 6...a6 and 6...ge7 have been played
7.c3
I noticed 7.h5+!? which would mess up Black's king position somewhat
7...e7+ 8.e2 e4 9.g3 xg3 10.hxg3
xg2 11.xg1 h2 12.d2 ge7 13.f1
h6 14.e3 0-0 15.d3?!
15.f4 h8 16.f3 looks better
15...d8 16.c2 f5 17.0-0-0 h6 18.g4!
fxg4?!
18...f4 19.g5 d6 20.xh7+ f7 is better
and, after 21.f5 xf5 22.xf5 f3, the game is quite tense!
19.h7+ h8

20.h1!
20.xg4? is no good because of 20...xg4
21.xg4 h6+ 22.f4 (if 22.b1 the h7 is lost) 22...f8!
20...g6?
This really should have cost the Montreux the game! Only 20...d6 offered some hope to Black, though it is still difficult after 21.dg1!
21.xg6+ g8 22.h7+ f8 23.g3 e6
24.gf5 xf5
Rather peculiarly Rybka here thought this to be a quite serious blunder, and instead suggested 24...f7?! However now it recommended 25.b1? as best for White, whereas surely with 25.h5! xf5 26.xf5 White would be well in control
25.xf5
This is much better than 25.xf5?! c7
26.g3 when, with 26...f7 Black might have got back into the game
25...xf5 26.xf5 d7 27.h5 e8 28.dh1 e7

29.h8+
Here 29.h7! was even stronger: 29...g5+
30.b1. Now h6 is threatened so Black is almost forced to play 30.xf5 31.xf5+
xf5 when 32.xd7 followed by xd5 gives White a big advantage. Nevertheless he's still winning after the move played!

29...g8 30.d1?
This I don't understand. Perhaps he was getting nervous, or maybe trying to play a non-move while he worked out how to pursue the attack. Anyway 30.e3! g3 31.h6 had to be better
30...f7! 31.h5 a6
32.\textit{\textbf{Qe3}}??

Very unfortunate, and obviously missing Black's killer reply! Correct was 32.\textit{\textbf{Qg3}} and after 32...\textit{\textbf{Qf6}} a little reorganisation with 33.\textit{\textbf{Qd2}} \textit{\textbf{Qg6}} 34.\textit{\textbf{Qc1}} \textit{\textbf{Qe7}} 35.\textit{\textbf{Qf4}}+ \textit{\textbf{Qf7}} 36.\textit{\textbf{Qf5}} maintaining the pressure with a definite advantage

32...\textit{\textbf{Qxe3}}!!

No doubt a nasty shock for Hylkema – Black simply removes the errant defender

33.\textit{\textbf{c4}}

Absolutely not 33.\textit{\textbf{fxe3}}?? \textit{\textbf{Qf1}}+ 34.\textit{\textbf{Qd2}} \textit{\textbf{Qf2}}#

33...\textit{\textbf{Qxa2}} 34.\textit{\textbf{fxe3}}

Although in one sense it's game over, Black still has to be careful!

34...\textit{\textbf{Qa1+}}

Grabbing the pawn would be a deadly mistake: 34...\textit{\textbf{Qxc4}}?? 35.\textit{\textbf{Qxg8+}} \textit{\textbf{Qc7}} 36.\textit{\textbf{Qxc4}} dxc4 37.\textit{\textbf{Qc5+}} and now White has a rook for 2 pawns, which would soon become 1!

35.\textit{\textbf{Qd2}} \textit{\textbf{Qf2}}+ 36.\textit{\textbf{Qc3}} \textit{\textbf{Qe1}}+ 37.\textit{\textbf{Qb3}} \textit{\textbf{Qxc2}} 38.\textit{\textbf{Qxc2}}

Two major blunders, one from each side, but the second one was White's and it's all over as Black starts to polish a few pawns off

38...\textit{\textbf{Qe2}}+ 39.\textit{\textbf{Qb1}} \textit{\textbf{Qd3}}+ 40.\textit{\textbf{Qa1}} \textit{\textbf{Qf1}}+ 41.\textit{\textbf{Qa2}} \textit{\textbf{Qxc4}}+ 42.\textit{\textbf{Qb1}} \textit{\textbf{Qd3}}+ 43.\textit{\textbf{Qa2}} \textit{\textbf{Qxe3}}

44.\textit{\textbf{Qh1}} \textit{\textbf{Qxd4}} 45.\textit{\textbf{Qf1}}+ \textit{\textbf{Qg7}} 46.\textit{\textbf{Qh1}} \textit{\textbf{Qh6}} 47.\textit{\textbf{Qc1}} \textit{\textbf{c6}}

White saw that 48.\textit{\textbf{Qe1}} \textit{\textbf{Qf5}} is hopeless and resigned. 0-1

\begin{center}
\textbf{Leslie Tjo} (1826) - Mephisto Atlanta
\end{center}

C49: Four Knights: 4 \textit{\textbf{Bb5}} \textit{\textbf{Bb4}}

1.\textit{\textbf{Qc3}} \textit{\textbf{Qf6}} 2.\textit{\textbf{e4}} \textit{\textbf{e5}} 3.\textit{\textbf{Qf3}} \textit{\textbf{Qc6}} 4.\textit{\textbf{Qb5}} \textit{\textbf{Qb4}}

5.\textit{\textbf{Qxc6}} dxc6 6.\textit{\textbf{Qxe5}} \textit{\textbf{Qe7}} 7.\textit{\textbf{Qf4}} \textit{\textbf{Qxc3}} 8.\textit{\textbf{bxc3}} \textit{\textbf{Qxe4}} 9.\textit{\textbf{Qf3}} \textit{\textbf{Qf5}} 10.0-0 \textit{\textbf{Qc5+}}? N

10...\textit{\textbf{Qf6}} 11.\textit{\textbf{Qd3}} 0-0 is theory, but the Atlanta's TN seems fine to me

11.\textit{\textbf{Qh1}} 0-0 12.\textit{\textbf{a4}}?!

12.\textit{\textbf{d3}} here instead of the next move was better, then if 12...\textit{\textbf{Qxc3}} 13.\textit{\textbf{Qd4}}! \textit{\textbf{Qxd4}} 14.\textit{\textbf{Qb2}} \textit{\textbf{f6}} 15.\textit{\textbf{Qxc3}} \textit{\textbf{Qxc5}} 16.\textit{\textbf{Qfb1}} \textit{\textbf{fxe5}} 17.\textit{\textbf{Qb4}} \textit{\textbf{Qxc2}} 18.\textit{\textbf{Qxf8}} which might just favour White

12...\textit{\textbf{Qfe8}} 13.\textit{\textbf{d3}} \textit{\textbf{Qxc3}} 14.\textit{\textbf{Qe3}}?!

White's pawn sacrifice might have worked better if it had been followed by a line similar to that shown above: 14.\textit{\textbf{d4}}!? \textit{\textbf{Qxd4}} 15.\textit{\textbf{Qb2}}! \textit{\textbf{f6}} 16.\textit{\textbf{Qxc3}} \textit{\textbf{Qc5}}. But now if 17.\textit{\textbf{Qfb1}} fxe5 Black's rook is still on e8, so \textit{\textbf{Qb4}} wont work and 18.\textit{\textbf{Qxb7}} is the best he can try, but 18...\textit{\textbf{Qg4}}! 19.\textit{\textbf{Qxg4}} \textit{\textbf{Qxc3}} must be good for Black

14.\textit{\textbf{Qb4}} 15.\textit{\textbf{Qd2}} \textit{\textbf{Qd4}} 16.\textit{\textbf{Qa3}} \textit{\textbf{Qd5}} 17.\textit{\textbf{c3}} \textit{\textbf{Qc5}} 18.\textit{\textbf{Qb3}} \textit{\textbf{Qb6}}

White is in some trouble and it is not easy to find a good move here. I've looked at:

19.\textit{\textbf{Qh5}} \textit{\textbf{Qe6}} 20.\textit{\textbf{c4}} but 20...\textit{\textbf{Qf6}}

And 19.\textit{\textbf{c4}}?! \textit{\textbf{f6}} 20.\textit{\textbf{Qg4}} and now 20...\textit{\textbf{Qd6}}

19.\textit{\textbf{Qa1}}? 19...\textit{\textbf{Qf6}}! 20.\textit{\textbf{Qg4}} \textit{\textbf{Qd5}}

20...\textit{\textbf{Qxg4}}! was even better: 21.\textit{\textbf{Qxg4}} \textit{\textbf{Qf2}}!

21.\textit{\textbf{Qxd5+}} \textit{\textbf{cxd5}} 22.\textit{\textbf{Qe3}} \textit{\textbf{Qxd3}} 23.\textit{\textbf{a5}} \textit{\textbf{Qc4}}

24.\textit{\textbf{Qxc4}} dxc4 25.\textit{\textbf{Qxb7}} \textit{\textbf{Qe2}}
26.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}1}}?
26.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}b}2} was the only chance, then 26...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{a}e}8} 27.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g}1}} has a small chance of holding for a draw
26...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}e}4}! 27.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{x}c}7} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{x}g}2}!
Ow!
28.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{x}c}4} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f}3}}
29.h4 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}8}}! and White has had it 0-1

\textbf{Berlin Pro - Van der Wosten (1857)}
A30: Symm. English, Double Fianchetto/Hedgehog

1.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}4}} e5 2.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f}3}} b6 3.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}4}} exd4 4.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{x}d}4} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b}7}} 5.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}3}} e6 6.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}4}} d6?!

We are in rare territory. As far as I can see 6...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c}e}5} 7.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c}3}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c}6}} is all that has been played before
7.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c}3}} a6 8.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{d}3}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}7}} 9.0-0 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{d}d}7} 10.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}e}3} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g}6}} 11.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f}d}2} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c}7}} 12.b3 0-0 13.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}ad}1} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}ad}8} 14.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c}e}2} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{h}8}} 15.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{d}e}2} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g}8}} 16.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g}3}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c}e}5} 17.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f}4}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}8}} 18.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g}e}2} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{a}8}} 19.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f}e}1} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{h}4}} 20.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{g}3}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}7}} 21.a3 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{f}6}} 22.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b}4}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b}7}} 23.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b}3}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}8}} 24.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}3}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b}8}}

25.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}4}} b5 26.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{c}b}5} axb5 27.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}1}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{d}8}} 28.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}6}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}5}} 29.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}g}5} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{x}b}6}+ 30.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}3}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{a}6}} 31.a4!

A nice way to maintain the initiative
31...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}6}} 32.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}5}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}8}} 33.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}4}}?!
33.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}c}7}! looked strong here, and if 33...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b}7}} 34.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}c}1}!
33...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}5}} 34.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}e}3} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}6}} 35.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}d}1} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b}d}8} 36.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b}6}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}d}7} 37.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{a}2}} \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}8}}?!

The best way to meet the attack was to allow the pawn to be taken with 37...\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{b}7}}! 38.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}e}6} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}e}6} 39.\texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{e}x}e6} and now 39...d5! However this doesn't really get Black back into the game as the Computer has 40.exd5 \texttt{\textcolor{blue}{\textbf{x}d}5} 41.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}1}} with a clear advantage in material and pressure
38.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}5}}! d5 39.exd5 \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}4}} 40.d6

40...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{b}7}}?
Black didn't need to prepare e4, he should have played it straight away: 40...e4 41.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}2}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{c}6}} but 42.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}e}4} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}e}4} 43.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}1}} is still winning for White. Now Black's position collapses as White plays the killer move
41.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}c}7}! \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}c}7} 42.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}c}7} e4 43.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{d}6}}

The best Black could try would be 43...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}f}3} 44.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}b}7} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{e}2}+} (44...\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}b}7}?! 45.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{a}6}l}) 45.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{f}2}} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{g}4}+} 46.\texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}f}3} \texttt{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{x}h}2+} but the knight checks can't last for ever! 1-0

\textbf{All the Results:}

- Ludden (2288) ½-½ Pocket Fritz2
- Blok (2018) ½-½ Pocket Chess Tiger
- Roering (2115) ½-½ Tasc R30
- Van Wijk (2087) 1-0 Berlin Pro 68020
- Hylkema (1950) 0-1 Mephisto Montreux
- Van der Leij (1918) 1-0 Novag Diamond
- Van Putten (1920) 0-1 Mephisto Megellan
- De Kleuwen (1834) 0-1 Saittek Risc 2500
- Tjo (1826) 0-1 Mephisto Atlanta
- Van der Wosten (1857) 0-1 Berlin Pro 68020

Black is trying to 'do nothing, but do it well' - a method which can work against Richard Lang's slightly passive programs – but der Wosten's position is so cramped it wouldn't be palatable for everyone.
MAN v MACHINE, Bilbao 2005: The FINAL GAMES!

Readers will recall that we left the Nov. 2005 Man v Machine with the Computers already guaranteed the win with a 6½-2½ lead and only 1 round to play.

Hydra and Deep Junior both had 2½/3 and the score for the GMs would have been worse if Ponomariov and Fritz hadn’t swapped blunders in round 2, with Fritz unexpectedly making the last and therefore losing one!

But the GMs were still playing for pride! In our first game I have to say that the PC operators let us down. The players reached a blocked position by move 8 and, in reality, a draw by move 18. Yet the operators made Ponomariov play on to move 153 before agreeing the draw, and our diagrams show the central pawns were in exactly the same positions at the end as they were at move 8!

Deep Junior - Ponomariov, Ruslan
Man vs Machine, round 4
1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.c3 b4 4.e5 c5 5.a3
xc3+ 6.bxc3 a5 7.d2 a4 8.b1 c4

Kasimdzhanov, Rustam - Hydra
1.f3 f6 2.c4 b6 3.g3 c5 4.g2 b7 5.0-0 e6 6.c3 e7 7.d4 cxd4 8.xd4 d6 9.d1 a6 10.b3 bd7 11.e4 c8 12.c3
Perfectly playable, though 12.b2 is better known
12...c7 13.b2 0-0 14.d4
Kasimdzhanov in play against Hydra on the final day

In these types of positions Black usually has a decent position if he can make the freeing break d5. So already that square is overprotected by both sides

14...\textit{Bac8N}

14...\textit{Bfe8} 15.\textit{Bac1 Bbd8} (15...\textit{Bac8} is in Fritz) 16.\textit{Bc2 Bb8} was Valdes–Granados, 2001, \frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}

15.h3 \textit{Bfe8} 16.\textit{Bc1 Bf8} 17.\textit{Bad1 Bb8} 18.\textit{Bc2 h6} 19.\textit{Bd2 Bc5}

So e4 has become a focus of attention as part of the fight for d5

20.\textit{Bde1 Bxa8} 21.\textit{Bh2 Bed8} 22.\textit{Be3 d5!}

The ! is because the break is achieved. However Kasimdzhanov will get some attacking prospects on the kingside, but he will decide it is too risky to make a telling advance

23.exd5 exd5 24.e5 \textit{Bfe4} 25.\textit{Bd1 b5} 26.\textit{Bc2 Bb8} 27.\textit{Bce2 Bxe8} 28.f3 \textit{Bf6} 29.\textit{Bf5 Bfd7} 30.f4 g6 31.\textit{Bh4 Bf6} 32.\textit{Bd4 Bfe4} 33.\textit{Bdc1 Ba7} 34.\textit{Bc2 Bb8}

35.\textit{Bd4}

The GM goes for a second repetition. The best attempt for the full point is probably 35...\textit{Bc6} 36.\textit{Bc2 Bb8} 37.\textit{Bf5}, but it already looks double-edged and the GM's now have a lot of respect for Hydra in such positions!

35...\textit{Bc7} 36.\textit{Bc2 Bb8} 1/2-1/2

\textbf{Khalifman, Alexander - Fritz}

Man vs Machine, round 4. E12: Queen's Indian: Unusual White 4th moves, 4 a3, and 4 Nc3 Bb7

1.d4 \textit{Bf6} 2.\textit{Bf3 e6} 3.c4 b6 4.\textit{Bc3 Bb7} 5.g5 h6 6.\textit{Bh4 Bfe7} 7.e3 \textit{Bc4} 8.\textit{Bxe4 Bxe4} 9.\textit{Bxe7 Bxe7} 10.\textit{Be2 0-0} 11.0-0 d6 12.\textit{Bd2 Bb7} 13.\textit{Bf3 c5} 14.\textit{Bxb7 Bxb7} 15.\textit{Bf3 Bd7} 16.\textit{Bxc5 Bxc5} 17.\textit{Bc2N}

17...\textit{Bd6} has been the theory move, then 17...\textit{Bad8} after which White plays either rook to d1 in a battle to control the d-file

17...\textit{Bad8} 18.\textit{Bd1 Bfe8} 19.\textit{h3 Bc7} 20.b3 \textit{Bf6} 21.\textit{Bac1 c5} 22.\textit{Bxd8 Bxd8} 23.\textit{e4 Bd6}
It seems Fritz has won the d-file!
24.\textit{e}e1 \textit{h}h7 25.\textit{h}h2 \textit{f}6 26.\textit{f}f1 \textit{d}d3
27.\textit{xd}d3 \textit{xd}d3 28.\textit{h}h4 \textit{f}f8 29.\textit{e}e2 \textit{e}e6
30.\textit{d}d2 \textit{d}d4 31.\textit{xd}d4!?
Closing in on tablebase territory. Probably
31.f3 was both better and wiser
31...\textit{cxd}4

32.\textit{d}d2 \textit{f}f7 33.g3 \textit{g}6 34.\textit{f}f1 \textit{f}5 35.\textit{e}e2
\textit{c}c5 36.\textit{f}f3 \textit{h}5 37.\textit{b}b4 \textit{e}e6 38.\textit{xf}f5 \textit{gx}f5
39.\textit{d}d3 \textit{e}e7 40.a3 \textit{a}6 41.\textit{b}b3 \textit{d}d6 42.\textit{d}d2
\textit{b}5 43.\textit{b}b3 \textit{f}4! 44.\textit{g}4

The game is becoming very tense for both
Khalifman and the Fritz operator and team!
44...\textit{xg}4 45.\textit{fxg}4 \textit{bxc}4+ 46.\textit{xc}4 \textit{e}4
47.\textit{xd}d4 \textit{f}3
Perhaps 47...\textit{e}e5!? 48.\textit{c}c6+ \textit{f}f6 49.\textit{d}d4 \textit{f}3
was nominally better due to the better

The three GMs: Khazimdzhanov, Khalifman and Ponomariov -
to be congratulated as this trio worked as a team and fought
to the end this year!

placing which results for Black's king. Now I
think it must be a draw
48.\textit{xf}3 \textit{xf}3 49.\textit{d}d3 \textit{e}e5 50.\textit{e}e3 \textit{d}d4
51.\textit{h}h5! \textit{e}e6?!
Was 51...\textit{g}f6! a better try. Perhaps, but if
Khalifman found 52.a4! (which I'm sure he
would) he'd still get the draw
52.\textit{h}6 \textit{f}f7 53.\textit{g}5 \textit{g}6 54.\textit{a}4 \textit{c}c2+ 55.\textit{xf}3
\textit{xb}4 56.\textit{e}e4 \textit{d}d6 57.\textit{d}d5 \textit{d}d8 58.\textit{c}c5
\textit{e}e6+ 59.\textit{h}b6 \textit{gx}g5 60.\textit{xa}6 \textit{h}h5-½

So an honourable draw on the last day, for a
final score of:

\textbf{GM's 4. Commuter 8}

The individual scores were:

\textbf{GM's (all ex World Champions!)}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1½/4 Ponomariov, Kasimdzhanov
  \item 1 Khalifman
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Computers}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 3/4 Hydra, Deep Junior
  \item 2 Fritz
\end{itemize}

It is little wonder that Kramnik now views the
Computers as favourites in "any" match
against "any" opposition! But hopefully that
won't put the organisers off maintaining this
Tournament for another year or three! The
attendances each day were good, the event
appeared to be enjoyed enthusiastically by
everyone concerned, and it provided us all
with some interesting chess!
The CHRIS GOULDEN Column:
UCI and Winboard Engines, Latest News and Tables

UCI ENGINES UPDATE BY CHRIS GOULDEN

For newcomers: CHRIS GOULDEN runs a relegation and promotion system, with new UCI engines starting in either his 3rd, or a 4th, division, and having to work their way up... if they’re good enough. His review each issue helps us greatly in keeping a check on up-and-coming newcomers from the amateur programmer ranks and, usually, they are freely available on the Internet.

21 March 2006
Hi Eric

Please find enclosed my latest spreadsheets and reports from the last run of divisions.

I took the decision to remove the engines that have now gone commercial since the last issue. This included Smarthink, List... and Pro Deo - although free this is based on the commercial Rebel 12 so may be a boring one for the readers.

Division 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TOGA II 1.1A UCI</td>
<td>13½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DELFI 4.6</td>
<td>10½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=</td>
<td>SLOWBLITZ WV2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHARON 3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SPIKE 1.1</td>
<td>9½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>THINKER 4.7A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ARISTARCH 4.5</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8=</td>
<td>SCORPIO 1.6X6</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAUM 1.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CRAFTY 20.1 BH32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First up, this was a good one for our editor as you had been talking about Toga for some time. Toga duly won the first division with the commercials missing, and got ahead of Delfi this time. Although Toga is based on Fruit the author still makes free versions available. I have left it in as a grade marker for the time being and there is also a newer version than the one that played here. Toga appears to be around 2700 Elo.

Delfi was second again and, because of the reshuffle, Crafty was promoted early but found it too heavy going and was relegated straight away, as is Naum having scored fewer wins than Scorpio.

In the Second division although Danchess won it, it will not be included next time as the Scorpio programme is by the same author and they are of similar strength at about 2605 Elo.

The upgraded Glaurung and Pseudo will be promoted as second and third place. There was also a very good showing from the new ET Chess who was nearly promoted at the first time of asking.

Division 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DANCHESS CCT7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GLAURUNG 1.0.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PSEUDO 0.7c</td>
<td>10½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=</td>
<td>ZAPPA 1.1 PO ET CHESS181005</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=</td>
<td>SOS 5 ARENA UCI WILDCAT 6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>GLC 3.01.2.2</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Johnny 2.83</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>THE BARON 1.7.0</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I will be relegating two engines here but promoting 3 from the qualifiers to make up for Danchess.

The amazing thing in the second division was Jonny 2.83 which has in effect dropped straight through two divisions, which gives you an idea of the second division strength now.

The three coming up from the Qualifiers will be Yace Paderborn, Little Goliath Evolution and King of Kings 2.56.

I had mentioned recently about Chepia and Chiron but they have gone private making them unavailable other than in much earlier versions which did not qualify.

Speak to you soon.

Chris

Again many thanks for all your work, Chris, and particularly the 'Review & Report comments' you always send me to highlight the main changes for everyone!
Carl Bicknell reviews the new HIARCS 10!

HIARCS 10 Review by Carl Bicknell

I have enjoyed testing chess programs for about 17 years now. It started at school when I was given my first chess computer – a Kasparov Conquistador, which played at about 120BCF. Then a few years later I got hold of a Vancouver 68000 (190BCF) and I was amazed at how strong it was. Suddenly I had a real tool to analyse my chess games with!

Soon however, everyone started switching to the PC. At one point in time I tested just about every dedicated chess computer and PC program. I got hold of HIARCS 3, 4, 5, 6, 8... and now finally version 10 is here.

HIARCS always had an attractive style of play, mainly because I felt it played positively like it was trying to win and it showed good awareness of kingside attacks without being unbalanced. I enjoyed other early chess programs too, like The King, MChess and Junior, but I felt their ability to kill the enemy king came at a high price... poor end-game play / bad closed positions.

I liked Genius a lot since it occasionally reminded me of my hero Capablanca but I tore my hair out at some of its passive moves that Capa would never make. HIARCS was clearly capable in all phases of the game and, if I'm blunt, I liked it because I felt that it, along with Fritz, had a playing style I could partially mimic, and my grading has slowly gone from about 130 to 180BCF as a result.

I work with computers, I specialise in building them and as such I get to play around with hardware most people don't have. The test system I'm using is an Athlon FX 60, a dual core 2.6Ghz machine with 2 GB RAM. I reckon it's equivalent to a Pentium 4 running at 4GHz for single threaded programs like HIARCS, and about 7.5 GHz for ones like Deep Shredder 9.

The first thing I noticed about all the latest programs is just how comprehensive a package one gets. A decent game database is provided, clear, sharp graphics with lots of simple tools to analyse are in abundance. Make no mistake this is a program that is designed to do work, it's not a "game" in the high street pac-man sense where you 'play' on it – this program wants to help you find answers to chess mysteries or else, if you challenge it to a game, it'll bite your head off.

With that in mind I wanted to see just how strong it was.

The difficulty in reviewing a chess program these days is that they are all very capable at all phases of the game. Consider for example the following position:

Black wins by 1...♕xh2!! 2.♕xh2 ♕xf3! 3.gxf ♭h5+ 4.♗g2 ♗g6+ and ♦e5

This used to be my benchmark position at University for deciding if a program was any good (I've got better at testing chess programs since then!). Some of the timings are comical:

Vancouver 68000: 31 hours 5 minutes!!
M Chess (12Mhz 286) not solved in 24 hours.

I was amazed when HIARCS 3 (Pentium 166Mhz) solved this in 40 seconds. That was 10 years ago.

Rebel 8 managed it in 6 minutes on the same hardware.

Just for fun I unleashed HIARCS 10 on this position and it solved it instantly. Not in 1 second, faster than that. Most modern programs do, which is why testing them has
become hard. I have a book of 450 hard tactical tests, most programs these days will solve 95% of them in under 5 seconds, that’s the tactical firepower you get when you buy one of these things.

So how does HIARCS 10 stick out from the crowd? Well I decided to ask its creator Mark Uniacke the same question and, along with some other questions and answers, this is what he said:

**Interview with Mark Uniacke.**

**Programmer of HIARCS.**

**Q1:** Mark tells us about yourself and family, what do you do on a day to day basis?

I am married to a New Zealander and we have two boys.

Apart from the usual commitments with a family, on a day to day basis I work on HIARCS including website development, customer support, testing, and sometimes design and development of HIARCS ;)

**Q2:** How did you get involved in chess programming and why the name HIARCS?

It’s a long story, I was a strong junior chess player and enjoyed computer studies at school. It was not long before I combined my two intellectual passions to produce a chess program.

The HIARCS name came about in a school physics classroom after seeing how bad all the early chess machines were. It stands for Higher Intelligence Auto Response Chess System. Full details of the origins of the name can be found on the HIARCS website [http://www.hiarcs.com/beginning.htm](http://www.hiarcs.com/beginning.htm)

**Q3:** I believe I’m right in saying that you, Eric and myself have something special in common besides being HIARCS fans! How and when did you become a Christian? What has it meant for you and does your awareness of Jesus as Lord affect the way you program HIARCS?

I went to a Church of England primary school and so I had a “connection” with God from those early days, but I only really became a Christian in early 1998 after a number of “co-incidents” led us to Jesus. A faith in Jesus of course has an impact on my life and how I lead it but I am not sure how it affects my programming of HIARCS.

**Q4:** For people who have never heard of HIARCS, how is it distinctive amongst the rest of the chess programs?

I think HIARCS is distinctive because it tries to take a different path by trying to put more emphasis on chess knowledge and use that to direct everything else, e.g. move selection, search and evaluation. It also seems to have grown its own style and “never say die attitude” which often leads to the unexpected which I like.

**Q5:** HIARCS is one of the most popular chess programs ever. We’ll see in a later article why it’s so strong, but apart from strength why do you think it has so many fans?

I think its style of play is distinctive and interesting and that appeals to chess players looking for something special - it is not just another bean counter like so many other chess programs.

**Q6:** Obviously you’ve done a lot of work between version 9 and the latest release, version 10. Can you tell us specifically what areas HIARCS has improved in?

It has improved in so many areas affecting all phases of the game and it has become even more aggressive. I include the release information about the new version below:

"HIARCS has long been renowned for its human-like playing style, now HIARCS 10 goes much further with improved chess knowledge, a more aggressive style and an ability to search very deeply for the truth of a position. New chess knowledge enables HIARCS 10 to identify deep attacking motifs long before they become apparent especially concerning king attacks and unbalanced positions and material. HIARCS 10 often prefers initiative and attacking
options over more materialistic concerns associated with traditional chess programs.

Matched to this new chess knowledge HIA RCS 10 searches much more deeply than its predecessor often enabling it to find new unexpected moves and ideas much faster.

New enhancements mean that while playing or analysing games, HIA RCS 10 is able to learn more about the positions and moves it sees to improve its chess strength in future games. This feature is essential for all chess players who analyse chess games, studies, positions and openings as it enables HIA RCS 10 to understand deep strategic or tactical ideas while analysing with you. With HIA RCS 10 you get an intelligent chess partner, which actually learns and improves with you!

The new HIA RCS 10 opening book is included which has been significantly enhanced with the latest GM theory and a wealth of novelties to provide a huge repertoire of finely tuned variations. This is the work of computer chess expert Eric Hallsworth and HIA RCS author Mark Uniacke who have combined to provide an exceptional new opening book.

These features all add up to make HIA RCS 10 an essential tool for chess players of all strengths making the chess games you play or analyse much more interesting, unpredictable and exciting than ever before!.

Q7. I started using HIA RCS at version 3 and I found it to be a very aggressive chess program for the time. Mark, this may be a little unfair but I felt versions 6, 7 and 8 were a touch stodgy by comparison. Then with version 9 HIA RCS seemed to be playing very sharply again. HIA RCS 10 is rumoured to be the most aggressive HIA RCS ever - can you tell us about this?

I too like the aggressive style of play particularly against the enemy king. So in HIA RCS 10 I worked hard to make it better understand attacking motifs against the king and allied this with an ability to search much more deeply in attacking lines so it could produce the long term attacking ideas we find so appealing to see in chess games.

HIA RCS 10 is much less materialistic than any other HIA RCS before and this coupled with its “love” of dynamic positions leads to some very interesting chess games.

Q8: If you had to pick one player from history that plays like HIA RCS - who would it be? Do you try to model HIA RCS on particular players or just “see what happens”?

I cannot really pick one player; it is very difficult because in some way it does them and HIA RCS a disservice. I try to make HIA RCS play in the style I would like to see chess played. It always falls short of my objective but each release gets closer to my hypothetical perfect chess player.

Q9: Naturally there are other very strong chess programs out there like Fritz, Shredder, Junior, The King, Toga II to say nothing of Rybka. In what areas do you think HIA RCS excels over its rivals? Be specific!

I think HIA RCS is normally better in king attacks than its rivals. Also surprisingly for a “slow searcher” it seems to grasp deep tactics very quickly. It’s a finder of strong and interesting moves. It does not use the ‘play it safe strategy’ like many other chess programs.

Q10: The program Rybka is causing a bit of a storm at the moment. The author claims he uses something called bit boards as his programming base. Is HIA RCS programmed this way? What are the alternatives and pros and cons of your way?

Bitboards are a very old concept used since 1970 when two different groups invented them. Bit boards are just a data structure for representing chess concepts like the position, they favour 64 bit processors but are cumbersome for smaller and older 16 bit and 32 bit devices, e.g. Palm devices. HIA RCS uses a different but nonetheless interesting hybrid approach.
11. What are your opinions of Hydra? Do you think it’s the strongest thing out there?

It has not played anywhere near enough games to know. Clearly it’s very strong, how strong I don’t know.

12. Can you give us a “dummies guide” at how HIARCS searches? Does this differ from other chess programs?

HIARCS tries to search good moves more deeply while avoiding wasting time on less important variations. There can be a huge difference in the depth of search of different variations; some are searched only a few moves while others variations can extend to 60 plies or more. The details of the search are different to other chess programs, but nearly all chess programs search in a similar way to some extent.

13. How have you succeeded in adding more chess knowledge and yet increased HIARCS’ tactical strength?

HIARCS is able to use its chess knowledge to help direct its search and evaluate tactics in positions. It is tactically stronger than before as a result.

14. Is the knowledge you’ve added mainly in the search or just general knowledge about chess positions?

Various elements of chess knowledge have been added or modified. Sometimes I even remove some “knowledge” which is not productive or is ineffective. It’s difficult to put ones finger on any one thing as many parts have been improved.

15. With HIARCS 8 we heard about the use of pruning to keep the search profile streamlined. Do you incorporate fail-low pruning and how has this developed with HIARCS 10?

In each HIARCS version I improve the search and this usually requires improved pruning of various types. I have continued to work on the profile of the search in HIARCS 10.

15. How do you think you’ve succeeded over the years to keep on increasing HIARCS strength when many other programmers like Richard Lang and Marty Hirsh - who were once your rivals - hit a plateau?

I have many ideas and keep trying to improve the program with them. I hope I am still able to continue to make progress. So far this has been the case and I have already made some progress towards HIARCS 11!

16. Dual Core processors are upon us. I heard the other day they’re even being installed into laptops now, which means multi processor machines are no longer the private domain of the Rich and Famous. For a long time HIARCS has been a single CPU program only. Do you have any plans to make it threaded?

Yes, 2006 will see a multithreaded HIARCS and perhaps some other surprises.

17. If you did would you compete in the World Championships? Why / Why not?

Maybe yes, if I thought the conditions were right. We shall see.

18. Are there certain programs or types of players that HIARCS has a bit of a sweet spot with and always takes to the cleaners? Are there any it finds unusually difficult? Why?

Inevitably there are opponents who fit into both categories, which is why it is important to play against many different opponents to get a true measure of chess playing strength.

19. Is it now a well deserved break? When will the work begin again? What plans do you have for HIARCS 11?

No real break, HIARCS 11 is already underway. My plans for HIARCS 11 are to make it much stronger than before! ;-)
Eric Gallula, a long time French subscriber to Selective Search, sent me 6 games between the new touch screen portable Novag Star Ruby, and the old 68000 processor table-to-Fidelity Mach3. The time control was G/15.

Of course the latter used to do battle with Richard Lang's early Mephisto Almeria and Lyon 68000 machines for top place in our Rating List. For the record the SelS 122 ratings for the pair were:

- Novag STAR RUBY...... 1954
- Fidelity Mach3............. 1985

... so the expectation was for a close match with maybe the Fidelity just edging it by ½ a point! And game 1, with the Star Ruby playing White, was indeed a draw. So here is game 2.

**Fidelity Mach3 - Novag Star Ruby**

D25: Queen's Gambit Accepted: 4 e3: sidelines and 4...Bg4

1.d4 d5 2.c4 dxc4 3.d3 f6 4.e3 g4
5.xc4 e6 6.h3 h5 7.c3 bd7 8.0-0 d6
9.e4 c5 10.dxe5 xe5 11.e2 0-0 12.d4 xe2 13.xe2 g6 14.d1 e8
14...c8 15.g5 &e5 is better known - e.g. Portisch–Miles, Tilburg 1978 1-0 - but it has a poor record

15.db5N

15.g5 or 15.gf5 are known but I don't think there's anything wrong with the Mach3 choice

15..e5 16.g5 b8 17.xf6 xf6 18.c4 e5

No less than five of White's next six moves are with a knight, and to little or no avail

19.d4 d8 20.f5 c6 21.ea1 f4
22.e7+ h8 23.f5 wc7 24.d4! ab8
24...e7! would have punished the Mach3 quite seriously after 25.e1 xg2! as if

26.xg2 xf4 would put Black material up 25.d2?

It was probably best to play something like

25..f1 to further cover e2

25...d6!? This is good, but again there was something better: 25..b5! and the queen is in BIG trouble. 26.xb5 (if 26..c5? xd4 27.xd4 c6! 0-1, or if 26..c6? xc6 27.xc6 xd2 28.xb8 xb8 0-1) 26..a5 27..c3 xd4 28.xd4 g5! threatening xg2 mate, 29.xd8+ xd8 30.g3 xh3+ 31.g2 xc1 0-1

26.f3?! Continuing a series of second best moves, and this one probably leaves the Star Ruby with too big an advantage for the Mach3 to come back!

26..cd1 was the best try, then 26..g6
27.g3 xh3+ 28.f1 and White is only a pawn down, though might have to face 28..e8 which certainly keeps an initiative with Black as well

26..g6 27.xd8+ xd8 28.g3 xh3+ 29.f1 f6

29.xg3! was even better: 30.d1 (30.fxg3?? xg3 31..e2 d3 0-1)
30..xd1+ 31.xd1 c7 and Black is 2 pawns to the good

30.d1 xd1+ 31.xd1 h6 32.d3 g5
33.xg5 xg5 34.g2 a5 35.d7 d8
36.\textit{\texttt{x}}d8+ \textit{\texttt{x}}d8

We'd better have a diagram for the endgame!

37.f4! \textit{\texttt{b}}6 38.\textit{\texttt{h}}3 \textit{\texttt{d}}4 39.\textit{\texttt{g}}4 g6 40.e5 \textit{\texttt{g}}7 41.\textit{\texttt{f}}3 h5 42.\textit{\texttt{e}}4 \textit{\texttt{c}}5 43.a3 b6 44.\textit{\texttt{f}}3 a5

So far it's been somewhat tentative, and the Star Ruby has made little progress to take advantage of the extra pawn. His bishop of course can cover both sides of the board quicker than White's knight, but the latter can work on and against both square colours

45.\textit{\texttt{g}}2?
The wrong way for the king to be going. 45.\textit{\texttt{c}}3 was best, then maybe 45...\textit{\texttt{d}}4 46.\textit{\texttt{d}}1. Now, would the Star Ruby find 46...c5! or make do with 46...f6. Either should be heading for a win, but c5 is harder to meet

45...\textit{\texttt{d}}4 46.\textit{\texttt{c}}3??
Suicidal, simply gifting Black a distant passed pawn when the time comes.

If 46.\textit{\texttt{f}}3, which was best, then 46...c5 47.a4! f6 48.exf6+ \textit{\texttt{x}}xf6 49.g4! Here Black wont want to exchange and may struggle to find the best move, so White could still have slight drawing chances

46...\textit{\texttt{x}}c3 47.bxc3 b5 48.\textit{\texttt{f}}3 f6! 49.\textit{\texttt{e}}4
If 49.e6?! then 49...\textit{\texttt{f}}8 50.f5 \textit{\texttt{x}}xf5 51.\textit{\texttt{f}}4

c5! 0-1

49...\textit{\texttt{f}}xe5 50.\textit{\texttt{e}}xe5 c5! 51.\textit{\texttt{d}}5 b4! 52.axb4 h4?
That's a bit strange as 52...cxb4! 53.cxb4 axb4 wins easily. Still Black's okay

53.gxh4 cxb4 54.cxb4 axb4 55.\textit{\texttt{c}}4
PC programs with tablebases are announcing mate here, but it's worth just watching what the dedicated machines do with their still fairly low \textit{\texttt{f}} evaluations, each trying to change the outcome

55...\textit{\texttt{f}}6!

56.\textit{\texttt{d}}4
56.\textit{\texttt{x}}b4 was best, but 56...\textit{\texttt{f}}5 57.\textit{\texttt{c}}3 \textit{\texttt{x}}f4 58.\textit{\texttt{d}}3 \textit{\texttt{g}}3 59.\textit{\texttt{e}}4 \textit{\texttt{x}}h4 60.\textit{\texttt{f}}3 g5 61.\textit{\texttt{g}}2 \textit{\texttt{g}}4 etc

56...\textit{\texttt{f}}5 57.\textit{\texttt{c}}4 \textit{\texttt{g}}4
57...\textit{\texttt{x}}f4!

58.\textit{\texttt{d}}4 \textit{\texttt{x}}b4 59.\textit{\texttt{c}}4 \textit{\texttt{g}}3 60.\textit{\texttt{b}}3?!
The Fidelity just wont take the pawn!

60...\textit{\texttt{f}}f4 61.\textit{\texttt{x}}b4
Hurray

61...g5 62.\textit{\texttt{c}}3 \textit{\texttt{e}}3
And we can leave it there as the win is secure 0-1

Game 3, again with Fidelity as White in the 'odd' games, was another draw. So the Star Ruby led 2-1 going into game 4. It's a repeat of the opening played in game 2!

\textbf{Fidelity Mach3 - Novag Star Ruby}
D25: Queen's Gambit Accepted

1.d4 d5 2.c4 dxc4 3.\textit{\texttt{f}}3 \textit{\texttt{f}}6 4.e3 \textit{\texttt{g}}4
5.\textit{\texttt{x}}c4 e6 6.h3 \textit{\texttt{h}}5 7.\textit{\texttt{d}}3 \textit{\texttt{d}}bd7 8.0-0 \textit{\texttt{d}}6
9.e4 e5 10.dxe5 \textit{\texttt{x}}xe5 11.\textit{\texttt{e}}2 0-0 12.\textit{\texttt{d}}4
\textit{\texttt{x}}e2 13.\textit{\texttt{xe}}2 \textit{\texttt{g}}6 14.\textit{\texttt{g}}5?!N
14.\textit{Fad1}, a theory move, was seen in game 2!
14...\textit{h6} 15.\textit{\texttt{c3\texttt{e3}}} 16.\textit{\texttt{d1\texttt{xc3?!}}}
16...\textit{\texttt{e8}}!
17.\textit{\texttt{e6}}! \textit{\texttt{e8}}
Black can hardly respond to the knight fork by grabbing it: 17...\textit{fxe6}? 18.\textit{\texttt{xd8}} \textit{\texttt{axd8}}
19.\textit{\texttt{bxc3}} and White almost has a materially won game already!
18.\textit{\texttt{xf8}} \textit{\texttt{xf8}} 19.\textit{\texttt{bxc3}} \textit{\texttt{exe4}} 20.\textit{\texttt{b2}} \textit{\texttt{c6}}

With the win of the exchange for a pawn the Fidelity is clearly on its way to securing its first win of the match and squaring it at 2–2
21.\textit{\texttt{d4}} \textit{\texttt{e4}} 22.\textit{\texttt{f3}} \textit{\texttt{d6}} 23.\textit{\texttt{fe1}} \textit{\texttt{e6}} 24.\textit{\texttt{f2}}
\textit{\texttt{b5}} 25.\textit{\texttt{e3}} \textit{\texttt{d6}} 26.\textit{\texttt{b3}} \textit{\texttt{e8}} 27.\textit{\texttt{de1}} \textit{\texttt{c4}}
28.\textit{\texttt{d3}} \textit{\texttt{b6}} 29.\textit{\texttt{a3}} a6 30.\textit{\texttt{a4}} \textit{\texttt{h7}} 31.\textit{\texttt{dd1}}
\textit{\texttt{h8}} 32.\textit{\texttt{e4}} \textit{\texttt{d6}} 33.\textit{\texttt{h4}}?
This is a mistake, but fortunately for White the Star Ruby misses an equalising reply!
33.\textit{\texttt{e2}} was correct
33...\textit{\texttt{d8}}?
33...\textit{g5}! is surprisingly the correct reply, despite first impressions from 34.\textit{\texttt{xe6+}}
\textit{\texttt{g7}}, as now White must play 35.\textit{\texttt{xe6}} and after 35...\textit{xe6} it's about equal!
34.\textit{\texttt{h5}} \textit{\texttt{c4}} 35.\textit{\texttt{xd8+}} \textit{\texttt{xd8}} 36.\textit{\texttt{h4}} \textit{\texttt{d6}}
37.\textit{\texttt{c2}} \textit{\texttt{e6}} 38.\textit{\texttt{d3}} \textit{\texttt{c5}} 39.\textit{\texttt{d4}} \textit{\texttt{f5}}
40.\textit{\texttt{d8+}} \textit{\texttt{h7}}

White still has the exchange for a pawn, but

On your left the famous Fidelity Mach3, here in the later Designer 2265 board which is what Eric Gallula used in this match, and on your right, the Novag Star Ruby,

is about to make a mistake
41.\textit{\texttt{c4}}?
41.\textit{\texttt{g4}} is the move, then 41...\textit{f6} 42.\textit{\texttt{d2}}! It's given up the attack, but reorganised, still material ahead
41...\textit{\texttt{d6}}! 42.\textit{\texttt{g4}} \textit{\texttt{e6}}! 43.\textit{\texttt{e7}} \textit{\texttt{xc3}}
The material is unbalanced, but approximately equal as, now, is the game
44.\textit{\texttt{g3}} \textit{\texttt{h5}}!
The Star Ruby is playing out of its skin
45.\textit{\texttt{h4}} \textit{\texttt{g6}}! 46.\textit{\texttt{xd6}} \textit{\texttt{xd6}} 47.\textit{\texttt{f2}} \textit{\texttt{c5+}}
48.\textit{\texttt{f1}} \textit{\texttt{d5}}!

49.\textit{\texttt{e8??}}
The exchange 49.\textit{\texttt{xc5!}} bxc5 was unpalatable, but after 50.g4 hgx4 51.fxg4 the rook has some chance of overcoming the knight and pair of passed central pawns
49...\textit{\texttt{f4}}?
The problem for game analysers is to present a game fairly, but in a good light as far as possible, so folk enjoy playing through it. Constant interruptions 'better was...' can be a bit boring for readers: 'did either of them play ANY good chess'!!
However I cannot ignore the fact that here 49...c1+! wins outright. If I ignore this
readers will either have inadequate game
coverage or, worse still, think I'm getting too
old! 50.\(f2\) c2+ 51.\(e1\) c5 52.\(d4\)
\(c3+\) 53.\(d2\) b3 54.\(c6c2\) b2+ 55.\(c6d2\)
\(c2d2\) 56.\(c6d2\) c5 and an easily won pawn
capital. No doubt beyond the dedicated
machine's horizon to get this far

50.g4?!
50.\(xf4\) was necessary, then best play would
have gone 50...c1+ 51.\(f2\) \(xf4\) 52.\(c6+f\)
53.\(x5\) h4+, and Black wins either \(a4\) or \(h3\) to remain 2 pawns ahead, but the
queens are still on the board

50...\(c4\) 51.\(f2\)

We need another diagram so readers can
assess whether the Fidelity misses something
in the draw by repetition phase. You see
Black needs to avoid repetitions, while White
goes for them! But sometimes in jumping
onto the 0.00 evaluation chance the program
can miss a second best move (say -1.00)
which keeps a draw just in sight. If the 0.00
evaluation is genuinely correct (i.e. the
opponent cannot bypass it) then you want to
play for it. But if the opponent can vary and
bypass the draw line, then it may be that
White's second best move would have been a
better practical chance! Hope you get the
idea! I've marked 2 or 3 of them but a reader
might perhaps find an opportunity I missed?!

51...\(c5+?\)
51...\(d3+\) was straightforward: 52.\(g1\)
\(c5+\) 53.\(h1\) c1+ 54.\(h2\) \(f4+\) 55.\(g2\)
\(d2+\) 56.\(h1\) \(f4!+\)

52.\(f1!\)
Here 52.\(g3??\) \(d3\) would be much worse
52...\(c4+??\) 53.\(f2!\)
53.\(g1?\) \(d4+\) 54.\(f1\) \(d1+\) 55.\(f2\) \(d3+\)
is no good
53...\(d3+\)!
Breaks out of the repetition sequence
54.\(g2\) a2+ 55.\(h1\) b1+ 56.\(g2\) c2+
57.\(h1\) f4 58.gxh5+ \(h7\) 59.\(xf4\) \(c1+\)
60.\(g2\) \(xf4\) 61.\(c6\) g5+ 62.\(h2\) \(f4+??!\)
Running back into repetition territory
63.\(g2!\)
63.\(g1??\) g3+ 64.\(f1\) \(xf3+\) is no good
63...\(g5+\) 64.\(h2!\) \(xh5\) 65.\(xb6\) \(xf3\)
66.\(d4\) \(e4\) 0-1

So the little Novag Star Ruby leads 3-1 and,
with the Mach3 again drawing as Black in
game 5, it needed to win as White in the last
round to gain some credibility!

Fidelity Mach3 - Novag Star Ruby
C81: Open Ruy Lopez: Keres Variation (9 Qe2)

1.e4 e5 2.\(f3\) \(c6\) 3.\(b5\) a6 4.\(a4\) \(f6\)
5.0-0 \(xe4\) 6.d4 b5 7.\(b3\) d5 8.\(xe5\) \(a6\)
9.\(xe2\) \(e7\) 10.\(d1\) 0-0 11.\(c4\) \(xc4\)
\(c5\) 13.\(e3\) \(xe3\) 14.\(xe3\) \(b8N\)

14...\(e7\) and \(b8\) have both been played. Of
course the Opening Books in the dedicated
computers cannot go as deeply as can
Hiercs10 and Fritz9 or the ChessBase data-
base, but they generally have done pretty
well in this match!

15.\(d3??!\)
There was no need to move the bishop, the
\(e5\) is pinned!

Definitely better was simple development
with 15.\(c3\) and, after the inevitable
15...\(xc3\), just 16.\(xc3\) The pawn is still
pinned and attacked twice, so the queen has
to stay on the d-file for its protection

15...\(e8\)
15...f5!?
16.\textit{\textsc{q}}xe4 dxe4 17.\textit{\textsc{b}}xe4 \textit{\textsc{b}}xb2 18.\textit{\textsc{c}}c3 \textit{\textsc{b}}b4
19.\textit{\textsc{e}}e3 \textit{\textsc{g}}g4 20.\textit{\textsc{d}}d5 \textit{\textsc{xf}}3 21.gxf3 \textit{\textsc{b}}b7
22.\textit{\textsc{ac}}1?!

Heading into an exchange that improves the Black piece placements. 22.f4 looks okay
22...\textit{\textsc{b}}xe5 23.\textit{\textsc{d}}xc7 \textit{\textsc{w}}e7 24.\textit{\textsc{xa}}6 \textit{\textsc{f}}6
25.\textit{\textsc{c}}c5

If White protects the f3 pawn with 25.\textit{\textsc{ac}}3?! then 25...\textit{\textsc{b}}b2! is good; If the Mach3 moves the pawn 25.f4 then perhaps 25...\textit{\textsc{g}}g6
26.\textit{\textsc{c}}c5 \textit{\textsc{e}}e7 and the pawn falls anyway
25...\textit{\textsc{b}}b2 26.\textit{\textsc{d}}xe4 \textit{\textsc{xf}}3+ 27.\textit{\textsc{h}}1
27.\textit{\textsc{g}}g2?! isn't really any better as 27...\textit{\textsc{h}}4 forces to h1 after all
27...\textit{\textsc{w}}f5 28.\textit{\textsc{g}}3 \textit{\textsc{g}}4

The only real plus White has is the a/pawn... it needs to start running a.s.a.p. But Black has its pieces around White's king!
29.\textit{\textsc{d}}d3 \textit{\textsc{h}}h4 30.a3 \textit{\textsc{w}}h3 31.\textit{\textsc{g}}g1 \textit{\textsc{g}}g6
32.\textit{\textsc{g}}g1 \textit{\textsc{h}}h4 33.\textit{\textsc{g}}g1 \textit{\textsc{b}}b1

The rook can't be taken because of \textit{\textsc{g}}g2 mate
34.\textit{\textsc{e}}e4 \textit{\textsc{fb}}8 35.\textit{\textsc{gd}}1?
35.\textit{\textsc{e}}e2?! was a better try, so as to kick the Black queen away from his king a little
35...\textit{\textsc{xd}}1+ 36.\textit{\textsc{xd}}1 \textit{\textsc{g}}g6

Please note the beginner's move 36...h6 to avoid the back rank mate possibilities. As it thus frees the \textit{\textsc{b}}b8 it is also the BEST move!
37.\textit{\textsc{f}}5 \textit{\textsc{h}}6 38.\textit{\textsc{g}}1 \textit{\textsc{e}}e8 39.a4!

Not forgotten!
39...\textit{\textsc{h}}h4 40.a5 \textit{\textsc{b}}b4?!
40...\textit{\textsc{a}}a4 just had to be better
41.a6! \textit{\textsc{a}}a4 42.\textit{\textsc{d}}d6 \textit{\textsc{e}}e1+ 43.\textit{\textsc{f}}f1 \textit{\textsc{f}}8
44.\textit{\textsc{d}}d3?!

White's only real problem is the knight pinned on f1. Therefore 44.\textit{\textsc{g}}g2! and the game is probably just about even

44...\textit{\textsc{g}}g4+! 45.\textit{\textsc{g}}g3 \textit{\textsc{e}}e2!++ 46.\textit{\textsc{h}}h3 \textit{\textsc{a}}a1

47.\textit{\textsc{f}}4?

Most other moves were better than this – it weakens itself as well as the king protection. 47.\textit{\textsc{g}}g2 was best
47...\textit{\textsc{c}}c4 48.\textit{\textsc{d}}d3 \textit{\textsc{xf}}4 49.\textit{\textsc{b}}b6 \textit{\textsc{g}}g5+ 50.\textit{\textsc{g}}g3
\textit{\textsc{c}}c5+ 51.\textit{\textsc{f}}f2 \textit{\textsc{c}}c4 52.\textit{\textsc{f}}f5 \textit{\textsc{xa}}6 53.\textit{\textsc{xa}}6
\textit{\textsc{xa}}6

Now 2 pawns ahead Black should be able to win. We'll play on for a little longer to see if the Mach3 can resist
54.\textit{\textsc{g}}g2?
54.\textit{\textsc{e}}e3!?
54...\textit{\textsc{g}}g6+! 55.\textit{\textsc{x}}g6 \textit{\textsc{g}}g6
2 extra pawns and now the queens gone – it must be enough
56.\textit{\textsc{g}}g3 \textit{\textsc{f}}6 57.\textit{\textsc{g}}g4 \textit{\textsc{e}}e5+ 58.\textit{\textsc{f}}f5 \textit{\textsc{f}}f7
59.\textit{\textsc{g}}g3 \textit{\textsc{g}}6+ 60.\textit{\textsc{e}}e4 \textit{\textsc{e}}e6 61.\textit{\textsc{e}}e2 \textit{\textsc{f}}5+
62.\textit{\textsc{f}}f4 \textit{\textsc{h}}6 63.\textit{\textsc{d}}d4+ \textit{\textsc{f}}f6 64.\textit{\textsc{g}}g3 \textit{\textsc{g}}5! 65.\textit{\textsc{f}}f2
\textit{\textsc{h}}5 66.\textit{\textsc{g}}g3 \textit{\textsc{f}}4+ 67.\textit{\textsc{f}}f2 \textit{\textsc{g}}4

Almost without doing anything the Star Ruby is overwhelming its opponent, and indeed won after not too many more moves 0-1

A great win by 4½-1½ for the Star Ruby!
The News section of last month's issue was nearly swamped with information about the new Rybka program. There is no question from the results shown that it has presented a major challenge to existing software, both commercial and amateur.

Indeed all of those results suggest that Rybka in its Beta/Preview stage then was around 30 or 40 Elo stronger than even the top 3 in Selective Search... Hiarcs10, Fruit2.21 and Fritz9. Some feel that the latest beta version (1-13d) is another 15-20 Elo stronger!

The claim was/is that this has all been done by knowledge. However most programmers and computer chess experts, who noted that the 2004/5 version of a weak Rybka was sheer search speed, have strongly suggested otherwise! And if anyone has the time to check Rybka's analysis at the game start position, and other early positions with just 2 or 3 moves played, will find it comes up with some pretty unusual ideas for how to develop!

In a strange way it has done us all a favour! Just when we thought that programming limits had been nearly exhausted, and that faster computers, 64-bit and multi-processors would be the key to all major future improvement, Rybka has shown us that 'the end is not so nigh' as we had thought.

Indeed, in fairness, the sudden arrival of Fruit and the big improvements in the upgrades Fritz8->9 and Hiarcs9->10 have shown that there is still life in computer chess programming. I am now expecting that the 'Rybka challenge' will see further Elo point gains later in 2006!

Okay, so Rybka is giving all but the top 3 or 4 PC programs a very hard time. But how does it do against strong humans?

Here are 3 games, the first 2 from a mini-match against GM Morovic (who also kindly put annotations with the 2 games, to which I've added just a few extra notes), and then a one-off game it played against an up-and-coming 17 year old IM, Bassem Amin Matta.

```
Rybka 1.01 Beta 32-bit - Morovic, Ivan
Opening B43. Game 1, Jan 2006

1.e4 c5 2.d4 f3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.exd4 a6
5.e3 c6 d6!? An interesting move that hasn't been played lately. Nevertheless it gives good chances for Black.
7.g4 e5
7...h5 8.g5 e7 9.g3 xg3 10.hxg3 d6 is theory, but seems to favour White after 11.g4
8.e3
An alternative was 8.de2!? f6 9.h4 d6 10.f4 xc3+ 11.xc3 bd7 with chances for both sides.
8...f6 9.h4 c6 10.f3 xc3+ 11.bxc3 h6!
The only move to avoid the annoying 12.Bg5, or even 12.Bh6!! After 11...h6 Black's chances are equal.
12.g3
Another possibility was 12.g5 h7 with equality.
12...xg3 13.hxg3
```

```
13...d5! 14.exd5
If 14.e5 d7 15.d4 0-0 the threat of 16.f6 would cause White some problems.
14...xd5 15.d2 e5! 16.0-0-0
If instead 16.0-0 de7 17.fef1 f6 Black would have an easy game
16...f6
```
If 16...\textit{\&}dce7?! 17.\textit{\&}de1! f6 18.\textit{\&}h4 White would have the initiative.

17.\textit{\&}xe5 \textit{\&}xe5 18.\textit{\&}de1 \textit{\&}fg4 19.f4 \textit{\&}e6 20.fxe5

After this forced combination, Black seemed to have no problems, nevertheless the next manoeuvre by Rybka in the purest Karpov style causes some problems.

20...\textit{\&}c8 21.\textit{\&}h4! \textit{\&}c5 22.\textit{\&}e2 \textit{\&}xe5

23.\textit{\&}b4

Here is the point. White maintains its material advantage, and Black must play with precision to secure the draw.

23...0-0

23...\textit{\&}xa2?! 24.\textit{\&}e3 \textit{\&}c7 25.\textit{\&}b6 \textit{\&}e7 26.\textit{\&}c5 \textit{\&}e6 27.\textit{\&}xb7 \textit{\&}d7 28.\textit{\&}b4 \textit{\&}d5 29.\textit{\&}c7 \textit{\&}b6 30.c4 \textit{\&}xg2 31.\textit{\&}c5!±

24.\textit{\&}xb7 \textit{\&}a5 25.\textit{\&}f1?!

After this move, it is Rybka that must play for the draw.

Another possibility was 25.\textit{\&}b6 \textit{\&}xa2 26.\textit{\&}xa6 \textit{\&}xa6 27.\textit{\&}xa6 \textit{\&}a8 and it is equal.

There was also 25.\textit{\&}f4 \textit{\&}e8 26.\textit{\&}xa6 \textit{\&}xa6 27.\textit{\&}xe5 \textit{\&}c8 with mutual chances.

25...f6 26.\textit{\&}b6 \textit{\&}xa2 27.\textit{\&}xa6 \textit{\&}xa6 28.\textit{\&}xa6 \textit{\&}d5 29.\textit{\&}f4 \textit{\&}e8 30.\textit{\&}f1 \textit{\&}c4 31.\textit{\&}b1 \textit{\&}a3+ 32.\textit{\&}h2 \textit{\&}c4+ 33.\textit{\&}xc4 \textit{\&}xc4

Draw. An interesting game for the theory of 6...Bd6? After passing this test against Rybka I became very confident about facing it with White in the second game! \(1/2-1/2\)

\textbf{Morovic, Ivan - Rybka 1.01 Beta 32-bit}

Opening E71. Game 2, Jan 2006

1.d4 \textit{\&}f6 2.c4 g6 3.\textit{\&}c3 \textit{\&}g7 4.e4 d6 5.h3 0-0 6.\textit{\&}e3!?

An interesting move idealized by David Bronstein in 1953, and played recently in the active chess match Karpov–Morovic, October 2005.

6...c5 7.dxc5 \textit{\&}a5

This is Black's best reply.

8.\textit{\&}d3 dxc5 9.e5 \textit{\&}fd7 10.f4

Here we see White's idea in this opening: get a spatial advantage in the centre, and paralyse the line of action of the bishop on g7.

10...\textit{\&}d8 11.\textit{\&}f3!

Another possibility was 11.\textit{\&}e2 \textit{\&}c6 12.\textit{\&}f3 \textit{\&}d4! 13.\textit{\&}xd4 \textit{\&}xe5! 14.fxe5 cxd4 15.\textit{\&}d2 dxc3 16.\textit{\&}xc3 \textit{\&}b6 and Black has no problems.

11...\textit{\&}xe5 12.\textit{\&}xe5 \textit{\&}xe5 13.fxe5 \textit{\&}f5

14.e6N

This move was found at home after long hours of analysis and causes serious problems even for my opponent Rybka.

In the game Romero Holmes – Juseinov, White played the looser 14.0-0? and after 14...\textit{\&}xd3 (or 14...\textit{\&}xd3 15.e6 f3) 15.\textit{\&}e2 \textit{\&}xc3 16.bxc3 \textit{\&}e6! Black started to gain the initiative.

14...\textit{\&}xe6

Another move for the studious is 14...f6

15.0-0 \textit{\&}xd3 16.\textit{\&}f3! \textit{\&}e6

If 16...\textit{\&}xf1?? 17.\textit{\&}xf1 \textit{\&}h8 (17... \textit{\&}c6? 18.\textit{\&}f7+ \textit{\&}h8 19.\textit{\&}h6 \textit{\&}g8 20.\textit{\&}e4 followed by mate in a few moves) 18.\textit{\&}h6 (threatening 19.\textit{\&}f8+ \textit{\&}xf8 20.\textit{\&}xf8 mate) 18...\textit{\&}d7 19.\textit{\&}f7 \textit{\&}g8 20.\textit{\&}e4!±

17.\textit{\&}h6!

During the game, I wasn't sure whether to continue the attack with 17.\textit{\&}f7+ \textit{\&}h8 18.\textit{\&}h6 \textit{\&}g8 19.\textit{\&}ad1! \textit{\&}f5! (19...\textit{\&}xf1 fails once more to 20.\textit{\&}e4 followed by an inevitable mate) and now the spectacular 20.\textit{\&}h5! g5!! The only move (the natural 20...\textit{\&}ad8
fails to 21.\(\text{Qxa7!!} \text{Qxd1} 22.\text{Bxd1 Qxa7} 23.\text{Bd8 Qxd8} 24.\text{Qxe7 followed by mate) 21.} \text{Qd6 (threatening 22.Qf6!! exf6 23.Nf7#)} 21...\text{Qc7!!} 22.\text{Qx5 exf5} 23.\text{Qxf5 Qd4!} 24.\text{Bxg5 Bxg5} 25.\text{Qxe2+ 26.} \text{Qh1 Qg3+ with a perpetual check. Nevertheless I played more ambitiously! 17...Qf5! A tough psychological blow since I had only expected 17...Qh8 after which 18.Qa1! [Eric: Here Morovic suggested that 18...Qc2? was the only move, and adds that after 19.Qc7 Qg8 the demolishing shot 20.Bd6!! wins in all variations, with which I agree. Better would be 18...Qf5 and now White needs 19.g4 Bxd1 20.Bxd1, and after 20...Qg8! 21.Qf1 to stay ahead]}

18.g4! All other moves leave Black with a small advantage 18...Qd3! 19.Qg2 Qc7

20.Qf4! The "!!" is Morovic's as he says: 'I spent nearly all my time on this move since the alternatives [a] 20.Qh1 Qg3! 21.Bxg3 Bxg3 22.Qh2 Bxc3 23.bxc3 Qd3+, as well as [b] 20.Qc2 Qd7?! (20...Qd4!? =) 21.gxf5 (21.Qae1?!) 21...exf5 don't seem very convincing for White, especially playing a fast time control against the computer. [Eric: Hiaires suggests 20.Qf4!? Qd4 21.Qxf1=] Though I played 20.Qf4 instinctively, it turned out to be best, Morovic concludes. 20...e5! 21.Qd5 Qd6 22.Qh6 Qd4 If 22...Qe6?! 23.Bf2! Qxd5 24.Qaf1 Black would be struggling for the draw due to the threats on the 7th and 8th ranks 23.Qae1!

Better than 23.gxf5 Qg3 24.Qxg3 Qe2+ with an unclear position that possibly just favours Black after 25.Qf2 Qxg3 26.Qxg3 Qxf5 23...Qe6 24.Qf6+! Unfortunately, I only found this vital tactical manoeuvre as I was about to lose on time. The original idea I had of 24.Qe3?! seems to lose to 24...Qd2! 24...Qh8 Bad would be 24...exf6 25.Qxb7 with a winning double attack 25.Qe4 Qc6

26.Qh2!? [Eric: Though very short of time it seems Morovic is still playing for a win through the complications. The peaceful 26.b3 would be more likely to conclude the game in a draw] 26...Qc7 27.Qg5!! Qg8! [Eric: 27...Qxc4 would lose due to 28.Qf2 Qb8 29.Qh4 Qg8 30.Qxe5 with a decisive attack for White]

28.b3! 28.Qxe5+ would also give an advantage 28...Qxe5 29.Qxe5 Qc6 only move 30.Qxe5 however my 30 seconds on the clock didn't let me think 28...b6 29.Qxe5? This mistake due to time trouble throws away the game. Instead after 29.Qf2! Black, only with difficulty, could have managed to draw according to Rybka with 29...e4! only move 30.Qxe4 Qe8 31.Qf7+ (31.Qf7?? Qd6 32.Qf4=) 31...Qxf7 32.Qg7+ Qxg7 33.Qxf7+ Qh6 34.Qg5+ Qxg5 35.Qg4+ Qh6 36.Qh4+ Qg5 and draw Also worth considering was 29.Qxe5+ Qxe5 30.Qxe5 with a certain White advantage. This was what I wanted to play with seconds on the clock yet my hand went for the rook!...
29...\textcolor{red}{\textit{Eg3+}}
A decisive intermediary move (zwischenzug)
30.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ke2}$}
30.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Fxg3?}$ $\text{Ee2+}$
30...\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ee3!}$} 31.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Kf1}$} $\text{Exe2}$ 32.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Kh1}$} $\text{Ed8}$
Not 32...\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ee5??}$} 33.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Kf7+}$} $\text{Exf7}$ 34.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ea8+}$} $\text{Eg8}$ 35.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Exg8+}$} $\text{Eg8}$ 36.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ef8#}$}

33.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ee1?}$}
[Eric: 33.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ee4}$} was the best try, then Rybka would play 33...\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ee2}$} and Morovic would have to make do with 34.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Exe2}$} $\text{Exe2}$ 35.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Exe2}$} $\text{Eg3+}$ 36.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Kh1}$} and now Rybka's 36...\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ed4}$} will force a winning material advantage ]
33...\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ee2+}$}
[Eric: The rest is easy... 34.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Exe2}$} $\text{Exe2}$ 35.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Kf1}$} (35.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Exe2??}$} $\text{Eg3+}$ 36.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ed1+}$} and mate next) 35...\textcolor{red}{$\text{Exe1}$} 36.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Exe1}$} $\text{Ee5+}$ 37.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ee4}$} $\text{Ea1+}$ 38.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ee2}$} $\text{Exa2+}$ etc] 0-1

Of course wins on time count, so Rybka gets the match by $1\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}$.

But you can't help feeling that Morovic would have at least drawn game 2 — and just maybe won it — if he'd been able to keep even another minute or two on his clock for the final stages. The 2551 Elo GM's notes also suggest that he was not as fazed (or pressured) by Rybka as super-GMs Kramnik, Anand and Bareev were by Fritz, Junior and Hiarcs some 2–3 years ago!

I wonder?!

**Bassem Amin Matta** is a 17 year old IM from Egypt, and is the current Arab Champion.

In fact he got his 1st. GM norm winning the Arab Men's 2005 title in September, and his 2nd. GM norm winning the Arab Mens Under 20 title two months later. He had previously won the African Under 20 title, and is now rated at 2452 Elo.

The **Rybka** version in play was 1-13b which is still pretty much the strongest version out.

---

**Bassem Amin Matta – Rybka 1-13b**
Opening A05. Single challenge game

1.e4 c5 2.\textcolor{red}{$\text{d3}$} d6 3.d3 g6 4.g3 $\text{Eg7}$ 5.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Eg2}$} $\text{Ee6}$ 6.0-0 $\text{Ef6}$ 7.c3 0-0 8.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ee1}$} $\text{Eg4}$ 9.h3 $\text{Ed7?!}$

I am not sure which borrowed Opening Book Rybka was using, but must guess that it was already playing on its own at this point. Why? Well, theory is 9...\textcolor{red}{$\text{Exf3}$} but Rybka's strong emphasis on mobility means it dislikes exchanging a bishop which has more immediate squares to go to than its opponents, especially as the exchange would release more squares to the enemy piece!

10.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ef4}$} $\text{Ec8}$ 11.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Eh2}$} $\text{Eh5}$ 12.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ee3}$} b5 13.a3 a5 14.d4 $\text{Ed8}$

15.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ebd2}$}
15.dxc5 would win a pawn, but White would be subjected to a $\text{Ee4->Ed}$ pin on the d-file
15...\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ec7}$} 16.dxc5 $\text{Ec5}$ 17.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Exe5}$} $\text{Ee6}$
I prefer 17...\textcolor{red}{$\text{Eab8}$} with threats to push the b-pawn
18.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ee2}$} $\text{Ee5}$ 19.\textcolor{red}{$\text{Ead4}$} b4?
I have to admit I am confused by this! Was this Rybka? Yes it was! It is clear (to me, anyway) that $\text{Eab8}$ still needed to be played to prepare b4. Now Rybka must loses material
20.axb4 axb4 21.Ea8 $\text{Ea8}$ 22.cxb4
White has a big advantage, we could almost say winning already. However, although my 1-13d version of Rybka only flirts with 19...b4?! briefly at the beginning of the search, it's eval even now is still only -100, so both it and version 1-13b clearly feel there is more compensation for the 2 pawns than I do!


Exchanging queens would end any hopes Black might still have

38.Ec3 Ea6

The evaluation function will make Rybka play this in the hope of a repetition of moves

39.h4 Ef1 40.Ed2 Eb5 41.Ed3 Ed3 42.eg1 Ef7 43.Ed2

43...f5?! I'm not sure about this. 43...Ec5 seems better to me. It's a shame because Rybka has done well to stay in the game, and even improved its chances of drawing during the last 10 moves or so

44.Ec5

44.exf5 gxf5 45.Ed4 also looks promising

44...Ec4 45.Ec3 Ed5 46.Ee2 Eb7 47.b5! Ef8?! Apparently preferring to be a blockader on e6 to keeping a check on White's advancing b-pawn

48.b6 Eb6 49.Ed3 h5 50.Eb5 Ea8 51.Ea6 Ed6 52.b7?! I didn't expect Bassem to give the valuable b-pawn up. Is the subsequent pin on the d1/e6 worth so much? Perhaps this and the queens coming off makes it right!

I prefer 52.Ea3 and if 52...Ec2 53.Ed3 Ec6 54.Ec3 Eb7 55.b4

52...Exb7 53.Exb7 Exb7 54.Ed4 Ec8 55.Ed2 Ed8 56.Ed3 Ed8 57.b4!

Well, here comes the other pawn, and supported by the two bishops plus an improved king position now that queens are off the board

57...Ec6 58.Ed5+ Ed7 59.Ed6 Ec6 60.b5 Ed7?

A mistake. 60...Ed5 was right so that Black controls the b7 square


Bassem misses the very deadly 68.Ed6! after which 68...Exe6 69.Ed8! and that's that. But the miss won't affect the game result


75.Ed4! was best, threatening Ed5+

75...Ec8
76.\( \text{d}5 \)?
This also is a small mistake which White will have a chance to correct. 76.\( \text{d}4 \) was correct
76...\( \text{f}3 \)+ 77.\( \text{c}5 \) \( \text{d}1 \)
Playing for the repetition draw again, and giving Bassem the chance to correct his mistake!
78.\( \text{d}4! \) \( \text{e}2 \) 79.\( \text{e}5 \) \( \text{g}4 \) 80.\( \text{e}8 \) \( \text{b}7 \)
81.\( \text{g}6 \)
81.\( \text{x}h5 \) would also win, as after 81...\( \text{x}h5 \)
82.\( \text{x}f5 \) and the \( \text{g} \) cannot stop the pawns rolling up the board
81...\( \text{x}b6 \) 82.\( \text{x}f5 \) \( \text{e}2 \) 83.\( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 84.\( \text{f}5 \)
\( \text{d}3 \) 85.\( \text{x}h5 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 86.\( \text{f}7 \) \( \text{b}4 \) 87.\( \text{h}5 \)

and it beats me why someone didn't pull the plug on Rybka here, but they played on for another 27 moves!
87.\( \text{a}2 \) 88.\( \text{h}6 \) \( \text{c}5 \) 89.\( \text{h}7 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 90.\( \text{h}8 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
91.\( \text{d}8 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 92.\( \text{xe}7 \) \( \text{c}4 \) 93.\( \text{f}6 \) \( \text{a}4 \) 94.\( \text{g}4 \)
\( \text{c}6 \) 95.\( \text{g}5 \) \( \text{b}3 \) 96.\( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{b}5 \) 97.\( \text{g}7 \) \( \text{c}6 \)
98.\( \text{g}8 \) \( \text{f}3 \) 99.\( \text{d}6 \) \( \text{e}4 \) 100.\( \text{x}e4 \) \( \text{c}3 \)
101.\( \text{e}7 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 102.\( \text{e}8 \) \( \text{c}1 \) 103.\( \text{e}6 \) \( \text{c}2 \)
104.\( \text{f}7 \) \( \text{c}1 \) 105.\( \text{f}8 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 106.\( \text{ee}8 \) \( \text{c}1 \)
107.\( \text{fd}8 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 108.\( \text{f}7 \) \( \text{c}1 \) 109.\( \text{fb}7 \) \( \text{c}2 \)
110.\( \text{f}4 \) \( \text{c}1 \) 111.\( \text{g}4 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 112.\( \text{g}6 \) \( \text{c}1 \)
113.\( \text{ee}8 \) \( \text{c}2 \) 114.\( \text{fe}8 \) 1-0

**TIME FOR ADJUDICATION - BY BILL REID**

It's early April, 1956. With Bulganin and Khruschev firmly in command in Moscow, things are a bit quieter at GCHQ and, for her part, HMS Romola is relaxing with HMS Plover on some minesweeping practice off the Scilly Isles.

But chess is still on the agenda, and our code breaker in Cheltenham is studying this position:

![Chess Diagram]

White to Play

It seems to be a dead draw. At first sight you might think White has an advantage - that rook looks a lot better than the poor old Black bishop stuck on a7. But where is it all going?

1. \( \text{b}5 \) \( \text{b}6 \) 2. \( \text{a}6 \) \( \text{d}5 \) 3. \( \text{f}3 \) \( \text{f}5 \)

And then what? There's just no way White can cash in on that passed a-pawn. So, it's very tempting to write down "Draw" and nip off to the cinema. "The Lady Killers" is showing at the Daffodil tonight - mustn't miss that!

But, somehow there's a lingering doubt. And it is quite an important decision. This game will decide which team gets promoted to the top division of the North Gloucestershire League. So, maybe better to put it on one side and have another look tomorrow.

Was that the right idea? Or should he just have written down "Draw" and posted the form off? What does your computer program think?
HIARCS AT LARGE!
WE LOOK AT SOME OF THE LATEST HIARCS 10 AND PALM HIARCS GAMES

First we have a couple of HiarcS 10 PC game played on the Internet, where many Tournaments and Invitation Cups are being run nowadays.

As you'd expect from our SelSearch 122 top-rated program, HiarcS10 has been doing very well. In one recent Tournament which was run on a League basis and then became a knockout Cup, HiarcS qualified for the Cup section quite nicely in 2nd. place behind a 64-bit Rybka... and then got drawn against Rybka in the semi-final! Ouch.

Also games played by the SSDF are now becoming available. Here's a stunner from the HiarcS 25½-14½ win over Shredder9.

**HiarcS 10 - Shredder 9 UCI**

B84: Sicilian Scheveningen: 6 Be2 a6, lines without early Be3

1.e4 c5 2.d3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.exd4 f6
5.e3 a6 6.e3 e6 7.e2 e7 8.f4 0-0 9.0-0
10.g4

10...e8?!  
10...d5 is the top move here. Both the move played and c6 are considered doubtful

11.g5! d7 12.d3!  
Best. 12.f5 is also shown as a possibility, but it is largely untried. I think 12...e5 13.f6 e8 14.e1 certainly looks fine for White

12...c6  
Maybe 12...c5 is worth looking at?! Or perhaps we should just say the 10...e8?! line is best avoided altogether!?

13...h5  
13...b6?  
The only move here is considered to be 13...g6, but even then, after 14.h4 f8 (or maybe 14.h5 to stop the immediate threats — but few would want to play with Black’s kingside pawn formation from here!) 15.a3 g7 16.d2 and already White has a very strong attack

In fact 13...g6 has been tried a few times, but with little success. However it isn’t the fault of g6, it’s the earlier moves we’ve queried that should be blamed.

In tournament practice, after 13...g6, there has followed 14.hh4 f8 15.f5 de5 16...e1 b5 17.c6 c6 18...d4 b4
19...e2 exf5 20...f4 ...b7 21...e3 fxe4
22...h3 h6 23...xh6 exd3 24.h7+ h8
25...f6+ g7 26.hxh7 h1+ 27.h2 g2+ 28.hxg2 Rafiei—Kotanijian/Iran 2005, 0-1, but Black outrated his opponent by nearly 300 Elo points

It is partly more interesting because Shredder has the better 13...g6 in its book, but with a question mark! So ‘over-the-board’ it had to find something else, but really nothing else is playable!

14.f5 xb2?!  
I suppose objectively 14...e7 is better for possible defensive resources than grabbing the b2 pawn. But it would make no difference to White’s immediate reply... 15.xg7 xg7 16.h6+ h8 17.e5 threatening mate on h7 and forcing 17...f5 18.exf6 xf6
19.exf6 winning easily

15.xg7 xg7
15...\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textbf{\upshape{\textblacksquare}}}}xc3} is no better, nothing can save the game now: 16.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}x}e8 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}d4 17.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}ad1 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}f8
18.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}c7 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}xc7 19.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}xh7 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}c8 20.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}xd4
16.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}h6+ \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}h8 17.e5

If Shredder hadn't resigned it would probably have gone 17...\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}f8 (only move) 18.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}e4 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}g6
19.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}f6! \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}xf6 (only move) 20.gxf6 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}g8
21.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}f3 and m/9 1-0

Hiarc's is now playing in the World Open League where the following excellent game caught my eye! It's partly memorable for some great chess played by Hiarc's, but perhaps even more so because, if you note the game heading, it's an early try at a \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}new development Hiarc's uci version,\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}} hot from Mark Uinciage's latest programming conversion work. It seems pretty good!

\begin{tikzpicture}[remember picture, overlay]
\node[anchor=north east] at (current page.north east) {
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
};
\end{tikzpicture}

23.d5 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}d7 24.e5 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}f5?!
Black's bishops are getting in a mess. Probably better was 24...\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}c7! so that, if 25.e6 there is an escape square with 25...\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}e8. Even so 26.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}d4! followed by either \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}f1 or \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}e4 is beginning to look ominous
25.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}f1 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}f4 26.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}c6!\n
26...\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}d7?!
Probably the game was already lost, but this settles it. The best try was 26...a5 and after, no doubt, 27.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}d4! \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}h6 But at this time control Hiarc's would now have come up with the very strong looking 28.g4! and one of the bishops seems certain to fall and probably for only one pawn
27.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}d4! \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}h6
Now Hiarc's finds a real humdinger!
28.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}xh6!\nWith a Hiarc eval. of +391
28...gxh6 29.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}e3! c5 30.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}f4 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}g6 31.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}g4! Relentless
31...\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}d8 32.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}xh6\n32.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}f6+ was good, but the move played (eval. +558) was even better
32...\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}h8 33.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}g5 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}g8

34.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}xh7!\nSome programs only see 34.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}c2 here

22...\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}g3
Or 22...c6 23.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}xe6 fxe6 24.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}xh4 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}xh4 which perhaps turns out a little better for Black. White would probably play 25.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}f3 and after 25...\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}g3 26.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}e1 \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}d6 27.\textit{\underline{\textbf{\textblacksquare}}}c3 and White has some advantage due to the strong central pawns
(Gandalf was one and, surprisingly, Rybka is another). But the move played, with an eval. of +1056, is absolutely conclusive 34.\textsuperscript{c}xh7 \textsuperscript{g}xh7 and now the other knight jumps in to threaten \textsuperscript{w}xh7 mate: 35.\textsuperscript{e}f6 \textsuperscript{g}g7 36.\textsuperscript{d}c2! 1-0

In \textit{SelSearch 117} we saw Palm Hiarc\textsc{s}9.1 beat the 2616 rated GM Jan Gustaffson by 3-1, and then in issues \textit{119-120} we had a look at the games in which is beat the 2682 rated GM Sergey Volkov by exactly the same score!

So the claim that Hiarc\textsc{s} on a 400MHz Palm unit is a GM is not an idle one. Recently the 9.6 version challenged 2660 rated GM Piotr Bobras at G/15m+5secs. Could it do it again?!

**Piotr Bobras - Palm Hiarc\textsc{s} 400MHz**

Game 1. B46: Sicilian: Taimanov: 5 Nc3 a6

1.e4 c5 2.\textsuperscript{d}f3 \textsuperscript{c}c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.\textsuperscript{d}xd4 e6 5.\textsuperscript{c}c3 a6 6.\textsuperscript{b}xc6 bxc6 7.\textsuperscript{d}d3 d5 8.0-0 \textsuperscript{f}f6 9.\textsuperscript{g}e1

This puts Palm Hiarc\textsc{s} out of its Book

9...d4

Generally 9...\textsuperscript{b}b7 or \textsuperscript{e}e7 are considered better, but we are still in theory with the move chosen by PH.

In fact I note that 9...\textsuperscript{e}e7?! runs into 10.e5! \textsuperscript{g}g4, so I guess just 9...\textsuperscript{b}b7 is best

10.\textsuperscript{d}b1 e5 11.\textsuperscript{d}d2 \textsuperscript{e}6N

We finally leave theory here, where 11...\textsuperscript{b}b4 and 11...\textsuperscript{e}e7 have both been played, with mixed results!

12.\textsuperscript{c}c4 \textsuperscript{b}b4 13.\textsuperscript{d}d2 \textsuperscript{x}xd2 14.\textsuperscript{x}xd2 \textsuperscript{x}c4 15.\textsuperscript{x}c4 0-0 16.c3 c5 17.cxd4

17...cxd4

Inferior is 17...exd4? 18.\textsuperscript{f}ae1! \textsuperscript{e}e8 19.e5 \textsuperscript{d}d7 20.\textsuperscript{f}f4, pretty much forcing 20...\textsuperscript{e}e7 and now with 21.c6 fxe6 22.\textsuperscript{x}xe6 White would be well on top

18.b4

Starting to exercise the potential distant passed pawn, a nightmare for computers of the past. At the British Championships in Plymouth (quite some years ago) I once watched Paul Lamford do this sort of thing in game after game against the 'great' Mephisto Lyon 68020

18...\textsuperscript{d}d6 19.a4 \textsuperscript{f}fb8! 20.b5?

In truth Black's previous move was to stop just this, and it shouldn't have been played. 20.\textsuperscript{a}ab1 was best

20...\textsuperscript{a}xb5 21.\textsuperscript{x}xb5?

The distant passed pawn remains more distant this way, but it's a mistake. With 21.axb5 \textsuperscript{c}xe4 22.\textsuperscript{f}d3 White would still have had some drawing chances after 22.\textsuperscript{x}xa1 23.\textsuperscript{x}xa1 \textsuperscript{c}c5 24.\textsuperscript{f}f3 \textsuperscript{f}f8 25.\textsuperscript{e}e8

21...\textsuperscript{x}xe4! 22.\textsuperscript{f}xe4

Note that now 22.\textsuperscript{f}d3? fails due to 22...\textsuperscript{c}c3! threatening e4 to which there is no good response

22...\textsuperscript{f}xb5! 23.\textsuperscript{c}ae1 \textsuperscript{e}xa4 24.f4 f6 25.\textsuperscript{c}xe5?

25.\textsuperscript{c}c2 was the last hope, though 25...\textsuperscript{e}a8 26.\textsuperscript{f}c4+ \textsuperscript{f}d5. Here White has little choice but to exchange queens even though, being material, down he doesn't want to. So 27.\textsuperscript{x}xd5+ \textsuperscript{x}xd5 28.\textsuperscript{f}xe5 f5 29.\textsuperscript{f}f4 g6, and I don't think White should draw this, but as Palm\textsc{f} has no hashtables, well he might have had some chance

25...\textsuperscript{f}xe5!

The move played is clearly better than 25...\textsuperscript{f}xe5? 26.c2 \textsuperscript{e}a8 27.\textsuperscript{c}c4+ \textsuperscript{d}d5
28. \( \text{Bxd5} \) + \( \text{Bxd5} \) 29. \( \text{Bxe5} \) and a position very similar to our last note

26. \( \text{Bc2} \) \( \text{Bxa8} \)

26...\( \text{Bxa8} \) 27. \( \text{Bc4}+ \) \( \text{Bd5} \) and now after

28. \( \text{Bxd5} \) + \( \text{Bxd5} \) there is no capture for White on e5 and Black would win easily. 0-1

---

**Palm Hiarcs 400MHz - Piotr Bobras**

Game 2. B33: Sicilian: Pelikan and Sveshnikov Variations

1.e4 c5 2.\( \text{f3} \) \( \text{d6} \) 3.\( \text{d4} \) \( \text{exd4} \) 4.\( \text{Bxd4} \) \( \text{Af6} \)

5.\( \text{Bc3} \) e5 6.\( \text{Bd5} \) d6 7.\( \text{Bg5} \) a6 8.\( \text{Bf3} \) b5

9.\( \text{Bd5} \) \( \text{e7} \) 10.\( \text{Bxf6} \) \( \text{Bxf6} \) 11.c3 \( \text{c6} \) 12.\( \text{Bc2} \)

\( \text{Bg5} \) 13.a4 \( \text{Bxa4} \) 14.\( \text{Bxa4} \) a5 15.\( \text{Bc4} \) \( \text{Bb8} \)

16.b3 \( \text{Bh8} \)

PalmH goes out of its book around here but continues to find the top theory moves, and his opponent leaves theory first at move 23!

17.\( \text{Bc3} \) g6 18.0-0 \( \text{f5} \) 19.\( \text{Bxf5} \) \( \text{Bxf5} \) 20.f4

\( \text{exf4} \) 21.\( \text{Bc2} \) \( \text{e5} \) 22.\( \text{Bd4} \) \( \text{d7} \) 23.\( \text{Bxa2} \)

\( \text{Bxc4N} \)

23...\( \text{Bxg8} \) has been played, but probably \( \text{Bxc4} \) is just as good. Fruit suggests that 23...a4?! might give Black a small edge after 24.\( \text{Bxf4} \)

24.\( \text{Bc8} \)

24...a4 25.\( \text{Bb5}! \)

With the bishop's protection of the a4/pawn now blocked Black doesn't have much choice but to exchange

25.\( \text{Bxb5} \) 26.\( \text{Bb5} \) \( \text{Bxb5} \) 27.\( \text{Bd4}+! \)

The more obvious \( \text{Bxa4} \) was okay as well, but this is very energetic

27...\( \text{Bf6} \) 28.\( \text{Bxf6} \) \( \text{Bxf6} \) 29.\( \text{Bxa4} \) \( \text{Bc5} \) 30.\( \text{Bc3} \)

\( \text{Bxe5} \)

Keeping the game alive rather than exchanging queens and almost certainly heading for a draw

31.\( \text{Bxa6}! \) \( \text{Be6}?! \)

31...\( \text{Bc6} \) was better, and if 32.\( \text{Bxf4} \) \( \text{Bxe3} \)

33.\( \text{Bxd6} \) then 33...\( \text{Bc5}+ \) 34.\( \text{Bd4+} \) \( \text{Bxd4}+ \)

35.\( \text{Bxd4} \) \( \text{Bg8} \) should be a draw

32.\( \text{Bxf4} \) \( \text{Bxd4} \) 33.\( \text{Bxd4} \) \( \text{Bc8} \) 34.\( \text{Bd3} \)

34...\( \text{Bg7} \)

Probably \( \text{Bc7} \) should have been played first, to stop the check on the 7th rank and the subsequent attack against h7

35.\( \text{Bxa7+} \) ! \( \text{Bg6} \) 36.\( \text{Bc3+} \) \( \text{Bf6} \)

36...\( \text{Bh6} \) wouldn't save the pawn: 37.\( \text{Bh3+} \)

38.\( \text{Bxh7} \)

37.\( \text{Bxh7} \) \( \text{Be2} \) 38.\( \text{Bd3} \) \( \text{Bc6} \) 39.\( \text{Bh6+} \) \( \text{Be5} \)

40.\( \text{Bh8} \)

The threat seems obvious, but Bobras must have missed it or he'd have played \( \text{Bc2} \) or \( \text{Be1+} \) \( \text{Bf2} \) \( \text{Bxh7} \) for example, or even \( \text{Bc4} \) so the king would protect the rook

40...\( \text{d5?} \) 41.\( \text{Bf8}+ \) \( \text{Bxe6} \) 42.\( \text{Bd8+} \) \( \text{Bf4}! \)

A superb trap, but PalmHiarcs doesn't fall for it!

43.\( \text{g3} \)

43.\( \text{Bxh5??} \) (and \( \text{Bxh5} \)) fall to mate in 2

43...\( \text{Bc1}+ \) 44.\( \text{Bf2} \) \( \text{Bxh2#} \)

43...\( \text{Bxh3} \) 44.\( \text{Bg8}+ \) \( \text{Bh5} \) 45.\( \text{g4+} \) \( \text{Bf6} \)

Best was 45...\( \text{Bh4}, \) but after 46.\( \text{Bxf5} \) \( \text{Be5} \)

47.\( \text{Bf3} \) \( \text{Be1}+ \) 48.\( \text{Bxg2} \) \( \text{Bxe3}+ \) 49.\( \text{Bf2} \) \( \text{Bxf2}+ \)
50.\text{\textit{hxf2 \textit{xe5 51.f6 \textit{f5+ 52.\textit{xe3 \textit{xf6 53.\textit{d4 White should win}}}}}}
46.\text{\textit{exe3+ exe3 47.gxf5 exe5 48.g3+ h4 49.f3!}}
49...g5 50.f6 etc 1-0, making it 2-0 for Palm Hiarc.

**Palm Hiarc 400MHz - Piotr Bobras**

Game 3. B33: Sicilian: Pelikan and Sveshnikov Variations

1.e4 c5 2.d3 c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.\textit{xxd4 d6} 5.e5 d6 6.d5 6.db5 d6 7.g5 a6 8.a3 b5 9.d5 e7 10.xf6 xf6 11.c3 0-0 12.c2
\text{\textit{g5 13.a4 bxa4 14.xa4 a5 15.c4 bb8 16.b3}}
17.\textit{a3g6}

PalmH is now out of book, but once more finds top theory moves on its own for a while

18.0-0 f5 19.exf5 gxf5 20.f4 exf4 21.\textit{c2 e5 22.xf4}}

26...\textit{e8??}

Sad, but how can the game be saved?

26...\textit{b3??} is no good because of 27.\textit{e6 and there is no longer a threat against g2 along the 2nd rank}

26...\textit{xd5 was the only hope, but 27.\textit{xb2 c6 28.a2 is clearly better for White}}

27.\textit{xf6+--}

27.\textit{xb2?! is the more visibly obvious but less attractive alternative after 27...\textit{xd5 28.xa5 xc4}}.

But on seeing 27.\textit{xf6} Bobras resigned as

27...\textit{xg2+ 28.xg2 ff6 29.a2+-- 1-0}

Game 4 was a short 21 move draw, but Palm Hiarc won again in game 5 - the complicated finish is worth checking out! Hiarc is White:

We're still in theory here, but now Bobras varies, though with a perfectly acceptable move.

Previously 22...\textit{b7 and 22.\textit{b6+ have been tried, but White won on both occasions though there is nothing obviously wrong with Black's position after either the latter or the \textit{xc4} played here}}

22...\textit{xc4N 23.bxc4 b2 24.e3 b7}

This is okay, but 24.\textit{b6! looked especially good for Black here}}

25.\textit{ed5 f6??}

25...\textit{e8? was strong, and maybe Black (with the 2 bishops) is even ahead after}}

26.b1 \textit{ed2 27.a2 xa2 28.xa2 \textit{b8 26.c1!}}

Computers don't miss chances like this!

26.\textit{e6 will work yet because of 26...\textit{g8!}}

34.\textit{d6 b1 35.bxc6 bxc6 36.xc6 dxe4 37.a6 exf3}}

38.\textit{xe6 xxe6 39.e7+ Note that 39.\textit{xd6?? would lose the game to}}

39...\textit{b1+ (not 39...\textit{xd6? 40.xd6 bb1+ 41.g2 which gets Black nowhere) 40.xf1}}

31.xf1 + 41.xf1 xg2+ 42.xg2 \textit{xd6+ 39...\textit{f7 40.xe6 1-0}}

They drew again in game 6, so it ended...

**PalmHiarc9.6 5-1 GM Piotr Bobras**
PC Programs - RATING LIST and Notes

The HEADINGS:

BCF. These are British Chess Federation ratings. They are calculated from Elo figures by (Elo - 600)/8. Elo. This is the main Rating system 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 the Se/Search Rating List the most accurate available anywhere for Computer Chess.

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

Games. The total number of Computer v Computer games played.

Human/Games. The Rating obtained and no. of Games played in Tournaments v rated humans.

A GUIDE to PC Gradiings:
The RATINGS shown represent the programs on a Pentium4/AMD at approx. 1200MHz, or Centrino 1000MHz, with 256MB RAM.

USERS will get slightly more (or less) if their PC speed differs significantly: A doubling/halving of 1200 MHz speed = approx. +/-30 Elo.

A doubling in MB RAM = 3-4 Elo.

The GUIDE below will help readers calculate approximately what rating their program should play at when used on such alternative hardware.

Comp-v-Comp PC GUIDE, if Pentium4/1200 = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCF</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Elo</th>
<th>+/-</th>
<th>Games</th>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>vHumans/Games</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Hiarcs 10</td>
<td>2780</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Fruit 2.21</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Fritz 9</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2670/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Shredder 9</td>
<td>2792</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2640/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Shredder 8</td>
<td>2721</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2619/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Shredder 7.04</td>
<td>2701</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2703/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Junior 9</td>
<td>2680</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Junior 8</td>
<td>2678</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2401/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Fritz 8</td>
<td>2677</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2660</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2769/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Fritz 7</td>
<td>2674</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Hiarcs 9</td>
<td>2664</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 15</td>
<td>2646</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Gambit Tiger 2</td>
<td>2646</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2542/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 14</td>
<td>2643</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2705/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Shredder 6</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2478/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Fritz 6</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2616/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Hiarcs 8</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2651/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Gambit 6</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Junior 7</td>
<td>2617</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2701/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Gambit Tiger 1</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Rebel Tiger 12</td>
<td>2610</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Junior 6</td>
<td>2606</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2621/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Rebel Century 4</td>
<td>2602</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2674/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Hiarcs 7-DOS</td>
<td>2596</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Hiarcs 732</td>
<td>2593</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2347</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2467/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Shredder 5</td>
<td>2576</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2624/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Shredder 4</td>
<td>2575</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2600/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Fritz 516</td>
<td>2576</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2513/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Fritz 532</td>
<td>2575</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Chessmaster 6000/7000</td>
<td>2574</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2594/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Nimzo 7</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Nimzo 8</td>
<td>2568</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Rebel Century 3</td>
<td>2567</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2655/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Nimzo 98</td>
<td>2566</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2473/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Junior 6</td>
<td>2568</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Gambit 5</td>
<td>2565</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Hiarcs 6</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2592/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Gambit 4</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Nimzo 99</td>
<td>2539</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Rebel 10</td>
<td>2539</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2598/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Rebel Century 1.2</td>
<td>2538</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2592/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Rebel 9</td>
<td>2537</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2677/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>SOS 4</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Rebel 8</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Goliath Light</td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>M Chess Pro 6</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2504/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>M Chess Pro 7</td>
<td>2525</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2600/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Chess Genius 5</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2459/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Shredder 3</td>
<td>2517</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2711/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Shredder 2</td>
<td>2514</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2218/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Tasc R30-1995 | 2351 | Novag Emerald Classic+Amber | 1954 | Novag Jade1+Zircon1 | 1760 |
| Mephisto London 68030 | 2314 | Novag Jade2+Zircon2 | 1954 | SciSys Turbostar 432 | 1760 |
| Tasc R30-1993 | 2310 | Mephisto Montreal+Roma68000 | 1953 | Mephisto MM2 | 1759 |
| Mephisto Genius2 68030 | 2304 | Mephisto Amsterdam | 1946 | Fidelity Excellence/3+Des2000 | 1755 |
| Mephisto London Pro 68020 | 2275 | Mephisto Academy5 | 1940 | Kasparov A4 module | 1740 |
| Mephisto Lyon 68030 | 2270 | Fidelity 68000 Mach2B | 1931 | Conchess4 | 1735 |
| Mephisto Portorose 68030 | 2269 | Novag Super Forte+Expert B/6 | 1928 | Kasparov Renaissance basic | 1730 |
| Mephisto RISC2 | 2260 | Mephisto Mega4/5 | 1924 | Kasparov Prisma+Blitz | 1730 |
| Mephisto Vancouver 68030 | 2253 | Kasparov Maestro D/10 module | 1921 | Novag Super Constellation | 1730 |
| Meph Lyon + Vanc 68020/20 | 2249 | Fidelity 68000 Mach2C | 1917 | Novag Super Nova | 1723 |
| Mephisto Berlin Pro 68020 | 2245 | Kasparov Explorer | 1908 | Mephisto Blitz module | 1717 |
| Kasparov RISC 2500-512 | 2243 | Kasparov Barracuda+Centurion | 1908 | Fidelity Prestige+Elite A | 1688 |
| Mep RISC1 | 2231 | Kasparov GK2000+Executive | 1908 | Novag Supreme+SuperVIP | 1688 |
| Mephisto Atlanta+Magellan | 2220 | Kasparov AdvTravel+Bravo | 1908 | Fidelity Sensory 12 | 1682 |
| Kasparov SPARC/20 | 2217 | Kasparov Talk Chess Academy | 1903 | SciSys Superstar 36K | 1668 |
| Mephisto Montreuex | 2197 | Mephisto Modena | 1902 | Mephisto Exclusive S/12 | 1666 |
| Kasparov RISC 2500-128 | 2193 | Kasparov Maestro C/8 module | 1900 | Meph Chess School+Europa | 1664 |
| Mephisto London 68020/12 | 2184 | Novag Ruby+Emerald | 1894 | Conchess2 | 1660 |
| Novag Star Diamond/Sapphire | 2181 | Novag Super Forte+Expert A/6 | 1890 | Novag Quattro | 1652 |
| Fidelity Elite 68040v10 | 2165 | Fidelity Travelmaster+Tiger | 1888 | Novag Constellation/3.6 | 1650 |
| Mephisto Vancouver 68020/12 | 2160 | Fidelity 68000 Mach2A | 1885 | Novag Primo+VIP | 1638 |
| Mephisto Lyon 68020/12 | 2143 | Meph Supermondial2+College | 1883 | Fidelity Elite E | 1638 |
| Mephisto Portorose 68020 | 2130 | Mephisto Monte Carlo4 | 1882 | Mephisto Mondial2 | 1611 |
| Mephisto London 68000 | 2125 | Mephisto Monte Carlo | 1882 | Fidelity Elite original | 1609 |
| Novag Sapphire2+Diamond2 | 2119 | Conchess Pymate Victoria/5.5 | 1872 | Mephisto Mondial1 | 1598 |
| Mephisto Berlin 68000 | 2117 | CXG Sphinx Galaxy | 1872 | Novag Constellation/2 | 1594 |
| Fidelity Elite 68030v9 | 2115 | Kasparov TurboKing2 | 1869 | CXG Advanced Star Chess | 1589 |
| Mephisto Vancouver 68000 | 2114 | Novag Expert/6 | 1859 | Novag AgatePlus+OpalPlus | 1580 |
| Mephisto Lyon 68000 | 2099 | Kasparov AdvTrainer+Capella | 1858 | Kasparov Maestro touch screen | 1560 |
| Mephisto Almena 68020 | 2099 | Conchess Pymate Roma/6 | 1850 | Kasparov Touch+Cosmic | 1540 |
| Mephisto Master+Senator | 2089 | Fidelity Par Excellence/8 | 1847 | Fidelity Sensory9 | 1527 |
| Mephisto Milano Pro | 2089 | Fidelity 68000 Club B | 1845 | Kasparov Astral+Conquistador | 1526 |
| Novag Sapphire1+Diamond1 | 2086 | Novag Expert/5 | 1845 | Kasparov Cavalier | 1526 |
| Mephisto MM4/Turbo18 | 2075 | Novag Super Forte+Expert A/5 | 1835 | Chess 2001 | 1500 |
| Mephisto Portorose 68000 | 2056 | Fidelity Par Excellence | 1833 | Novag Mentor16+Amigo | 1497 |
| Fid Mach4+Des2325+68020v7 | 2050 | Fidelity Elite+Designer 2100 | 1833 | GGM+Steinitz module | 1496 |
| Fidelity Elite 2x68000v5 | 2044 | Fidelity Chesser | 1833 | Excalibur Touch Screen | 1480 |
| Mephisto Mega4/Turbo18 | 2043 | Novag Forte B | 1833 | Mephisto 3 | 1479 |
| Mephisto Polgar/10 | 2040 | Fidelity Avant Garde | 1831 | Kasparov Turbo 24K | 1476 |
| Mephisto Dallas 68020 | 2026 | Mephisto Rebell | 1827 | SciSys Superstar original | 1475 |
| Mephisto Roma 68020 | 2022 | Novag Forte A | 1824 | GGM+Morphy module | 1472 |
| Kasparov Brute Force | 2010 | Fidelity 68000 Club A | 1820 | Kasparov Turbo 16K+Express | 1472 |
| Mephisto Almeria 68000 | 1992 | Kasparov Stratos+Corona | 1817 | Mephisto 2 | 1470 |
| Mephisto MM6 | 1992 | Kasparov TurboKing1 | 1810 | Conchess A0 | 1426 |
| Kasparov Challenger+Cougar | 1984 | Conchess/6 | 1806 | SciSys C/C mark5 | 1419 |
| Kasparov Cosmos+Expert | 1986 | Mephisto Supermondial1 | 1805 | CKing Philidor+Counter Gambit | 1380 |
| Kasp President+GK+TC2100 | 1985 | Conchess Pymate/5.5 | 1802 | Morphy Encore+Prodigy | 1358 |
| Mephisto Nigel Short | 1984 | SciSys Turbo Kasparov4/4 | 1798 | Sargon Auto Response Board | 1320 |
| Mephisto MM4/10 | 1981 | Novag Expert/4 | 1793 | Novag Solo | 1280 |
| Fid Mach3+Des2265+68000v2 | 1969 | Kasparov Simultano | 1792 | CXG Enterprise+Star Chess | 1260 |
| Meph Dallas 68000 | 1968 | Excalibur Grandmaster | 1792 | Fidelity Sensory Voice | 1250 |
| Mephisto MM5 | 1966 | Fidelity Excellence/4 | 1785 | ChessKing Master | 1200 |
| Mephisto Polgar/5 | 1965 | Conchess Pymate/4 | 1784 | Boris Diplomat | 1150 |
| Novag Obsidian+StarRuby | 1965 | Fidelity Elite C | 1779 | Fidelity Chess Champion 10 Champion | 1140 |
| Mephisto Mondial 68000 XL | 1956 | Fidelity Elegance | 1778 | Novag Savant | 1100 |
| Nov Super Forte+Expert C/6 |  |  | 1764 | Boris2.5 | 1060 |