Harvey Williamson and Mark Uniacke of HIARCS providing OnLine help and computer analysis for ChessBase's PlayChess website for the World Championship Knockout stages involving Kramnik, Kamsky, Topalov, Aronian, Gelfand, Grischuk etc.

- **SUBSCRIBE NOW** to get REGULAR COPIES of the LATEST ISSUE and RATING LISTS mailed to you as soon as they come out!
- £24 per YEAR for 6 ISSUES by mail in UK. EUROPE addresses £30, elsewhere £34. For FOREIGN PAYMENTS CHEQUES must be in POUNDS STERLING, or (best for you) use a CREDIT CARD.
- **ARTICLES, REVIEWS, or GAMES** sent in by Readers, Distributors, and Programmers etc. are always welcome.
Chess software from ChessBase is now even stronger and faster than before, whilst retaining the same cool features – plus many enhancements – that have made their software the most sought-after chess programs for players of all strengths and abilities.

Whether you are a beginner, club player or professional – these programs have everything you could want including: automatically adjusting playing strength, coaching functions, explanation of positions, extensive analysis features and a database of well over 1.5 million games.

The completely redesigned interface of the current generation of programs gives you instant access to all the most important functions. This means quicker and more intuitive navigation through the software’s features.

Those with high specification machines will be glad to see improved engine management. 64-bit UCI engines can also now use more than 4GB RAM.

Multi-processor versions of the software, those with the prefix "Deep", allow you to run the software on a PC with multiple processors/cores, harnessing your additional hardware to speed up its calculations. This is particularly useful when analysing large numbers of positions, researching new moves in an opening variation, or analysing a single position in detail with a number of candidate moves. "Deep" versions of ChessBase software are roughly 75-120 Elo points stronger than the regular versions running on the same hardware.

Junior 12
3007 Elo
Aggressive and dynamic style of play

HiARCS 13
3013 Elo
HIARCS is famous for its human-like playing style

Fritz 12
2988 Elo
Solid style with good positional understanding

Rybka 4
3116 Elo
Strongest commercial playing engine

Shredder 12
3007 Elo
Active style – much more positional than tactical

All chess programs (single-processor versions) on this page just £40 (RRP £44.95).

All "Deep" chess programs (for multi-core PCs) just £80 (RRP £89.95).

Postage to UK addresses £2.50 (overseas enquire).

Ratings source: CCRL based on: 40 moves in 40 minutes on Athlon 64 X2 4600+ (2.4 GHz).

To order call 01353 740 323 or order online - www.countrywidecomputers.com
Welcome to another new issue of *Selective Search*... no. 154. If your sub. is due for renewal, please subscribe again! There will be at least 6 more issues of the magazine!

The label on your envelope shows the number of the last issue you will receive of your current subscription, so it's easy to check that, as well as make sure it's been updated after you've made a renewal payment!

I **cannot** take credit card renewals at present. I will organise a PayPal account for myself (erichallsworth@gmail.com) as soon as possible - check my website in late June.

**Countrywide Computers**

**Countrywide** still exists of course - the advert opposite tells you that! - it's just that I'm not there, even though the 'phone number is the same. Keeping the same number has made it easy for regulars to remember, and using it will transfer you straight through to Countrywide's new offices in London where you'll be well looked after.

**Selective Search**

As I said at the end of my notes in the last issue about the future of the magazine, for the moment nothing changes, **keep subscribing!**

Indeed a sincere thanks to everyone who took up the idea to subscribe through to issue 160! I have promised to keep the magazine going until then and will make up my mind whether to go for longer once I see the impact on my preparation of the magazine and whether I lose too many subscribers through not having a credit card access.

**Paying your Subscription**

For the moment all subscriptions will have to be paid by cheque! Or you can send cash through the post but you must register it, or do whatever alternative your country requires for sending cash if you are not in the UK.

I know that cheques can be quite difficult for my readers abroad as you have to add an amount of around £10 to include the Bank charges in the UK which apply to foreign cheques even when made out in £ sterling!

I am going to organise a PayPal account as soon as possible. I think many Internet users already have PayPal accounts, and this will especially be of help for my readers abroad.

If your sub. is due now, and you want to use PayPal, please be patient for a couple of weeks and then visit my website. Once I've got it sorted I will post the details there, and then of course in the next issue of Selective Search.

---

**CHESS: RESULTS SECTION**

**TCEC - THORESEN CHESS ENGINE COMPETITIONS**

I've shown results at Martin Thoresen's site where he runs Matches and Tournaments at long time controls. 40 moves/100 mins, on a fast 6-core i7 computer. Ponder is Off so the engines use all 6 cores on their moves.

Here are his two latest events, the first from his 2nd. Division, and then Martin's very latest shows the scores after 7 rounds, but there's a long way to go here of course!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Sp</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Ze</th>
<th>Ju</th>
<th>Sp</th>
<th>Hi</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spark 1.0</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>==</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Naum 4.2</td>
<td>==</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>=1</td>
<td>0=</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zappa Mexico II</td>
<td>==</td>
<td>0x</td>
<td>=1</td>
<td>==</td>
<td>5=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Junior 12.0</td>
<td>0=</td>
<td>1=</td>
<td>0=</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spike 1.4</td>
<td>0=</td>
<td>0=</td>
<td>=0</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>3=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hiarcs 13.2</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0=</td>
<td>0=</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1= Rybka 4.1, Shredder 12 5.5
3= Houdini 1.5a, Stockfish 2.01, Junior 12.5 5.0
6= Spike 1.4, Zappa Mexico II 4.5
8= Naum 4.2, Spark 1.0, Ivanhoe B47cB
Hiarcs 13.2, Sjeng c't 2010, Critter 1.01
Hannibal 1.0a
15= Komodo 4165, Gull 1.2, Equinox 0.96y
Bugchess2 1.9, Protector 1.4
20= Greko 8.0, Cuckoo 1.1, Crafty 23.4
Gaviota 0.83
24= Scorpio 2.7, Boost 5.1, Redqueen 0.98
Deuterium 11.01, Dirty 240411, Philou 3.51
Rotor 0.6
30= Danasah 4.6
31= Francesca 0.18
1.0

Martin's interesting website, with games to
PETER BILSON
Pete's idea, which he enjoyed more than he had even hoped, was to play a 'Team Match' between Novag and Saitek! And the Novags just won by 49-47, so it was exciting to the very end for Pete.

He loves the dedicated computers and in his match report commented: "I do still believe that should either Novag or Saitek bring out a new machine, with a new program, it would sell like hot cakes!"

He's perhaps a little optimistic, but I have always believed - and said so to some business associates - that the dedicated computer manufacturers yielded the top end market much too quickly to the PCs and their software. But once you've lost your place in a market it needs something pretty startling to stage a fightback: the Elo gap between even a Tasc R30 and today's top software is immense, and the manufacturers have continually insisted that 2500 Elo machines would cost too much to make and therefore would not sell in sufficient numbers. We'll never know if they were right, but we do know that Ruud Martin made a go of it as a private concern with his Resurrection and Revelation boards housing various software engine programs running at 200, 400 and 500MHz. It seems a pity that a Saitek, Novag or Mephisto didn't give that a go as well.

Anyway, it's no good worrying about it now. In Pete's tournament he input the first 5 or 6 moves for each machine, using 12 different popular and classical lines, and then let the computers fight it out from there, and the Novags opened up an early lead of 27-21. With 2 rounds to go it was down to 41-39 for the Novags and Pete was hoping for a draw.

Of course for me the greater interest was in the individual match scores - some valuable material for the Rating List... quite rare nowadays.

Here are the scores, with the ratings as they were in SelS153, and some of Pete's thoughts about each match!

**Novag Diamond 2085 v Saitek Centurion 1922**
The rating gap here suggests a 17-7 win for the Diamond, but the score was **14-10**, so the Centurion did well.

**Pete:** Some good games between these and, although Diamond came out on top, he was given some headaches.

**Novag Diamond 2085 v Saitek Expert 2022**
We expected this to be closer, the Elo figures suggested 13½-10½ would be about right, but in fact it was **14-10** again.

**Pete:** Some good games here as well as the Expert took an early 3-1 lead. But once the Novag got in gear he took full advantage of some sloppy defending by Expert!

**Novag Obsidian 1963 v Saitek Centurion 1922**
The 40 Elo gap suggested this would be very close, maybe 13-11 to the Obsidian. However the Centurion won by **13-11** instead! The Centurion has scored quite a bit better than expected in both matches and its rating for SelS154 will certainly go up a little.

**Pete:** Certainly different styles of play here, "Obsy" plays a kind of slow but measured game, whereas Centurion is all biff, bang,
wallop!

**Novag Obsidian** 1963 v Saitek Expert 2022
Another 60 Elo gap so the figures suggested that 13½-10½ for the Expert would be about right, and in fact it won 14-10.

Pete: *I have to say that the score line does somewhat flatter Expert. Each of these games was very tight and two or three could easily have gone to "Obsy", it was closer than the score suggests!*

**ERIC HALLSWORTH**

I still do quite a lot of engine testing, but now that Rybka has pretty much been proven to be a clone I find that much of this has a slightly dubious feel to it.

The "programmers" of engines that were already believed to be clones (mostly of Rybkal) such as Houdini, Ivanhoe, Fire, Saros and some others, and were being excluded from rating lists for that reason, are now mocking the rating lists that continue to show Rybka versions on them - inconsistency is one word being used, more often the accusation is of sheer hypocrisy, especially as you had to buy Rybka while theirs are free!

Other UCI engines such as Stockfish and Critter are not known to be clones, but do show up as stronger than commercial engines, so a main reason to buy an engine now is for an Interface that will then enable users to run the free, and sometimes cloned, UCI engines!

Anyway, at the risk of having nasty things thrown at me, or sent through the post, here are some recent clone or free engine results!

- Stockfish1.9 v Houdini1.5 19½-40½
- Stockfish2.0 v Houdini1.5 25½-34½
- Stockfish2.1 v Houdini1.5 29-31
- Stockfish2.1 v Rybka4.1 29½-30½

At this point you might ask why I don't include a Fritz, Hiarcs or Shredder in these matches, but I wonder - would their programmers really thank me for showing a Houdini, Rybka or Stockfish possibly big win score against them? To tell the truth I just don't know what the best way forward is!

**FRANK HOLT**

Frank sent me the results from 2 Tournaments, played at G/25 on his Quad i7/2.66Ghz. The difference is that the first series was played with Ponder OFF, and the second with Ponder ON!

### Ponder OFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Houdini 1.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rybka 4</td>
<td>11½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Firebird 1.1</td>
<td>10½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ivanhoe 63Mod5a17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stockfish 1.9.1</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rybka 3</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ponder ON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rybka 4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rybka 3</td>
<td>11½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Firebird 1.1</td>
<td>10½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Houdini 1.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stockfish 1.91</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ivanhoe 63Mod5a17</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As readers can see the Rybka engines both improved a lot with the Ponder ON setting?!
The IPON rating list uses Ponder ON, so let's have a look at the TOP in their latest figures!

**IPON RATING LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Houdini 1.5A</td>
<td>3011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rybka 4</td>
<td>2955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stockfish 2.1</td>
<td>2928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Critter 1.01</td>
<td>2921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rybka 3</td>
<td>2902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Komodo 64</td>
<td>2832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Naum 4.2</td>
<td>2824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shredder 12</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gull 1.2</td>
<td>2795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fritz 12</td>
<td>2779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Spike 1.4</td>
<td>2779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hiarcs 13.2</td>
<td>2751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As I am sure you expected, there was quite a bit of interest in our Cloning article in the last issue. I thought I should print a small selection from the responses.

Hi Eric,

I have just been reading Selective Search 153 which dropped through my door a couple of days ago. As always it's a very good read, but I must first offer my sincere sympathies with the three major items you mention on page 3. My best wishes go to your wife and brother-in-law, and to you of course for the upcoming sad end to Countrywide computers. I doubt it will be as good merged into the London building.

The article I have been following with great interest is that of chess program cloning. I don't know how far back we would have to look to see when cloning started, if in fact we could detect it in every case. I suspect though, that cloning has been more active in recent times with the influx of new engines appearing on the scene, many of which are free and now playing as strong if not stronger than commercial ones.

This is not meaning to say that non-commercial programs cannot be as good as the commercial counterparts. Far from it, when considering Stockfish and the fact that the programmers have also released the program code so not afraid of people seeing how it was written.

As a side issue, it's very good for the consumer to get such software for free but this could have a very negative effect on some of the genuine commercial chess programs such as Shredder and HIARCS whose programmers make their living this way. At this point I, like many others, are not sure if Rybka, is a genuine product, but will hold back judgement until I hear more evidence. I think it's getting to the point of asking ourselves is it worth paying for a chess program with so many free versions available all playing at Super Grandmaster strength, or thereabouts.

In your article you ask the question should these clones be included in rating lists. I really don't think that the chess world should be deprived of seeing clones playing and rated, provided they are labelled as clones of program X. After all, if they end up in top positions, then it's a good version of a chess engine to have and means the original programmer did not find the best settings within the program code.

The real problem is for the ICGA who have to identify the clones being passed off as genuine. Certainly in these cases this should be considered as theft and a suitable fine imposed. It will be very interesting to hear the outcome of the Rybka versus Fruit trial!

I realise that much chess programming information is common knowledge, and also, if chess programmers are going to make their program code open source, then new programs are going to benefit from this information. It's a matter of how different is the program code to the original, or is it just a rephrased version, like someone making notes from a book.

All the best,

Ray Couzens.

The themes of most reader response was similar to Ray's, but one reader looked at it very differently and from the side of the consumer. Until very recently that was you, but now it's you and me!

Dear Eric,

With ref. S/S 153 P.16 'THE RATING LISTS'

Chess and Tennis has gone through the same phase, but with opposite effects. The board
of directors at Wimbledon got very concerned when the gates at Grand Tennis matches started to drop dramatically. So they then let the Professionals into the game. Before then it was only amateur players allowed to play. This decision changed the whole game of Tennis, and the gates went up to a new heights.

Whereas with Chess, which I have mentioned before the Professional Programmers, sat back on their laurels and improved their programs to about 30-40 Elo a year.

I said at the time we wanted some new innovation to come up with something different, so that Chess Programs started to climb back up to the top.

Then to cap it all they brought out two versions SP. £45 and DP. £85-90.

Now they are all moaning about Clones done by the amateurs, and how unfair they all are, these nasty amateurs.

No mention of us, the public buyers.

Now we find the innovation has come from an amateur "Fruit" with open source codes for all to see and digest. Also to Clone/Copy to further their Chess Programs.

Even the great Rybka 1.01 used this knowledge allegedly: but he came out with Free downloads SP/DP both in the same package. Now of course since going professional, he has gone the same way as the others SP £40 DP £85-90.

Now we come on to Houdini 1.5/ 1.5a I say, "Well done to Robert Houdart for bringing out a world leader, also the best Problem solver of the bunch." Importantly a Free Download program for all to use.

I wonder how many Professionals are looking closely at the inner workings of this program?

The ones bleating the most are Fritz and Hiarcs, who still only have 32-bit programs and not the standard 64-bit. How anyone can say these programs are wonderful is beyond my comprehension, The Rating List shows this, in the results.

Who is it that lives in a dream world, I ask the Chess fraternity?

I now come on to my final point. If IBM, had continued with their Court case regarding IBM Compatibles, the big boys would all still be on Main frame computers, and Lap-tops, and Desk-tops would still be in the things to come category.

Eric, 'Have I gone too far in my statement?' After May you will only wear one hat.

Kindest Regards,

Frank Holt.

I think this is where I am supposed to say something along the lines of, "Views expressed by others in this publication are not necessarily those of the Editor"!

I do indeed only wear one hat now, but I wouldn't want you to think I've been promoting opinions I don't really believe in for the past 26 years. I've always said what I believe - sometimes I've had my knuckles rapped for what I've said, and sometimes I've found out I was wrong and had to say 'sorry'. I also believe we're all entitled to our opinions.

I am sure there would have been some interesting comment from Peter Grayson, but unfortunately he's been in hospital following a heart attack, and is currently recovering from a quadruple bypass. I'm very pleased to say that he was able to ring a couple of weeks after the operation to say he's doing well. We send you our very best wishes Peter.

That brings me to the third e-mail/letter. I am not usually too keen on printing anonymous opinions, but one of my American readers sent a particularly insightful e-mail, though asking for his name not to be mentioned as he is in the computer - though not chess computer - business. I found his comments to be very interesting and informative, so have decided to print them.

Mr. Hallsworth:

First of all, I am even more satisfied with
Selective Search -- its quality and value both continue to improve from my perspective. Please carry on as long as you decide to.

Made it a priority to start reading the latest issue of your magazine this evening (#153). The clones issue is quite unfortunate and I take it very seriously because as you said - people's livelihoods were harmed if the allegations are true. I cannot pass judgement on it either yet and there may not ever be a totally definite conclusion to the matter.

My profession is IT professional - that is, specifically the writing, designing, maintaining, etc. of computer software - ironically enough. I'm quite accomplished and skilled in my field (I'm perhaps under-stating this since I'm told I tend to sell myself short).

I concur to the best of my knowledge with what you have said on the matter in your magazine. The source code might provide definitive proof of cloning since two programmers can come up with very different solutions to the same problem.

Unfortunately it is possible to reverse-engineer source code, "mine" it for ideas, and then re-code. If this is done in a sufficiently clever way a programmer could assert his program is different and the source code would be different. What Mr. David Levy has said about the evaluation function of Rybka I also agree is very concerning; that is, it is a legitimate question of Rybka's originality.

The evaluation function to a great extent really is the "keys to the kingdom" not only among computer programs but with human chess players. It has been said in a book (do not have the reference - read it and am recalling this from memory) that the big difference between an ordinary master and the "international" players (IM and higher) is their positional evaluation.

Be that as it may, as you also imply, there are two sides to every story; I would not wish a program and by implication its author and team - to definitively be considered clones without a fair hearing. In America, we call this issue by a much more harsh term: piracy.

The basic framework of the ICGA's tribunal which you describe on the surface seems fair - especially their plan to give the authors of the suspect programs a chance to defend themselves. I am not sure a proper defence can be given in certain situations without at least providing a copy of the source code for evaluation and comparison, plus depending upon the circumstances notes about why a certain function was coded in a certain way.

Source code is not always well-documented (I know that from experience having probably seen at least hundreds of thousands of lines myself) - the documentation and the development notes, if they exist, also can tell why a certain function was coded. If the evaluation function was alleged to be original - for example, providing notes about how it was designed can help the defence -- but so much time has gone by, there was of course time to produce those as well by the same process - "function mining."

Finally cutting to the chase (thank you for your patience in reading this far) - in your rating lists, I agree with the idea of removing programs which were ruled to be clones by the ICGA tribunal process. I will reinforce this by saying if the ICGA finds that Rybka and by implication its successors were determined to be clones - Rybka should be removed as well. Although I respect the contribution of Mr. Rajlich and his team to the advancement of computer chess - in my humble opinion it is inappropriate to give them credit in such a situation - especially given what Mr. Rajlich has said (next para).

However, this entire situation is becoming quite dicey. Indeed, on page 10 of Selective Search 153, Mr. Rajlich mentioned the possibility of "major action" if a later version of his Rybka is cloned; I cannot reasonably draw any other conclusion but to assume that this would involve solicitors. This could be very bad for the computer chess industry because it would not take too many of these "actions" to make an even larger mess of things. I would also be concerned about flagging a program in the ratings lists as being questioned as a clone for obvious legal reasons -- although our legal climate in
America is different. As it is I applaud your courage in publishing these allegations.

Was a bit unsure of how far to stick my neck out on this matter, but again, especially because this is a very serious matter please consider me at your service to this extent: please feel free to consult me on the computer science perspective of this issue for an opinion. My time is limited but if I can squeeze it in I will do so. At this point I wish to remain anonymous.

Best wishes to you and your family in the challenges ahead.

Name removed as requested....

That is pretty much where we are up to. The only major development/accusation to appear since SelSearch 153 came out is that it has emerged that the pre-Fruit versions of Rybka might have been Crafty clones! It seems there wasn't much original about Rybka, at least in those early days.

Readers may well wish to know how the ICGA tribunal is going. Well, progress is slow, and opinion is varied!

"There is one group of voices which posits that everything before approximately Rybka 2.3.2a lacks relevance because nothing prior won an ICGA event.

Others take the stand that Turin 2006 is the first version of interest to the ICGA (and that if guilt is found there, at the very least an apology/explanation is necessary for that version).

Then a third group expects the Panel [in this instance or separately] to address Rybka 1.0 Beta and (say) Paderborn 2005.

Persons from all three of these groups seem to exist both inside the Panel and in the Internet at large. There is nothing particular in the Statutes that either prohibits or mandates any of these investigations. It's not clear that the Panel should become a "clearinghouse" for cloning investigations beyond just ICGA events, but it seems more suited to undertake such work than other entities."

Here are two important sections relating to the purpose of the Panel and which are worth repeating:

[1a] Investigate and discuss allegations of cloning or creating a derivative of strategy games programs;

[3h][iii] Recommending to other computer event organizers the exclusion of persons who have been found guilty by the Panel.

The last point is an important point in my view: it's the person who will be excluded, and not the software. If so it's irrelevant if Rybka3/4/4.1 or any future versions are clean, since a decision that Rybka1.6 is a clone of Crafty, and/or the later Rybka1.0 is a clone of Fruit would be enough to exclude Vasik Rajlich as the main programmer.

Incidentally the ICGA have asked and invited Vasik Rajlich to respond to the allegations, but after all these weeks he has chosen to make no response.

Someone has managed to collect a lot of Rybka games from 2004 when it was called Rybka1.5 then Rybka1.6 and came near the bottom of any tournament it entered, however weak the opposition. A year later and a few months after the appearance of Fruit with its source code, Rybka1.0 had jumped to the top of the rating lists. But in 2004 it was losing regularly even to almost unknown opponents.

Here is a game against an early version of Jonny, a 'known' opponent. I have left evaluations in - they can be quite revealing - and added some light notes.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
1.e4 & c5 & 2.d\text{f}3 & e6 & 3.d4 & cxd4 & 4.\text{c}xd4 & \text{c}6 & 5.\text{c}c3 & \text{c}ce7 & 6.\text{c}e3 & a6 & 7.\text{d}d2 & \text{d}f6 & 8.0-0-0 & \text{b}b4 & 9.\text{f}3 & \text{a}a5 & 10.\text{c}b3 & d5 & 11.\text{h}b1 & \text{cxb}3 & (-0.93/12 & 46) & 12.\text{axb}3 & (\text{cxb}3) & 0.00/11) & 12...\text{cxc}3 & (-0.37/12) & 13.\text{bxc}3 & (0.26/12) & \text{dxe}4 & (-0.12/12) & 14.\text{d}d4 & (0.07/11)
\end{array}
\]
14...exf3?! (0-0, -0.06/12)

Jonny expected 14...0-0 15.ϕxf6 gxf6, and indeed that was better. After 16.fxe4, ϕg7 seems best to protect the ϕ/f6, but Black's position is nevertheless disjointed

15.ϕxf3 (0.73/11) ϕg8?!

Again not best, but the evaluation (-0.06) is worse than the move, it should show that Black is definitely struggling!

15...ϕd7 16.ϕg5 0-0-0 would have given Rybka a better chance

16.ϕg1! (1.03/11 28)

Threatening 17.ϕxf6

16...ϕh5?! (0.50/11 43)

The third inferior move on the run. 16...ϕd8 was correct, but Black's chances would still be fading after 17.ϕc4!

17.ϕe5! (1.26/10 56) ϕe7? (0.87/12 43)

Make that four wrong moves on the bounce!

Of course not 17...ϕxe5?? 18.ϕd8#

Instead 17...ϕd7 was the best try, though 18.ϕd3 f6 19.ϕh7 ϕxd2 20.ϕxd2 is good for White after 20...fxe5 (trying to save the rook with 20...ϕh8? doesn't work due to 21.ϕg6+ ϕe7 22.ϕd6+ ϕd8 23.c4! and Black cannot move anything while White will go ϕg1-g4-h4 winning) 21.ϕg8+–

18.ϕd6 (1.83/10) ϕd8 (0.93/12 43)

At last we get a correct move, but the evaluation at 0.93 is a long way from real. +5.00 would be more like it!

19.ϕh6 (2.93/11) 19...ϕa5

4.50/13. That's nearer the truth, Rybka has seen the light – or, rather, the gloom.

Of course not 19...gxh6?? 20.ϕxg8+ ϕd7 21.ϕe5+ ϕe7 22.ϕxd8 winning very easily

20.c4 (2.97/11 50)

Rybka expected 20.ϕxh7 which was better than the move chosen. Then 20...ϕf6 21.ϕxg7 ϕh7 22.ϕxg8+ ϕd7 23.ϕb4! winning queen for rook.

But both Rybka and the early version of Jonny have missed the immediate 20.ϕb4! ϕf5 21.ϕh3 winning easily

20...ϕf5 (2.18/12 39) 21.ϕd2 (3.26/10)

21...ϕf6 (2.12/12 44)

Or 21...ϕd7!! 22.ϕg5 ϕf6 23.ϕxh5 ϕc6

24.ϕg2 ϕd8 25.ϕxh7 ϕd7 which resists a little longer

22.ϕg5! (4.38/10) ϕxf3 (4.56/13) 23.ϕa3 (4.64/12 50) 23...ϕd7 (4.68/12 36)

24.ϕg2! (3.52/11 35) ϕxf6 (7.93/13 36)

25.ϕxb7 (6.94/11) ϕa7 (8.00/12 35)

25...ϕd8 was the best defence, but it hardly matters now

26.ϕxc8 (7.21/10) ϕd8?! (8.25/12 35)

26...ϕe7 would delay the mate: 27.ϕxe7 ϕxe7 28.ϕxd7 m/8

27.ϕd6 (11.19/11 16)

Actually it's m/5

27...ϕc7 (0.01/0 3)

This early Rybka had a unique way of showing mates... here and for the remaining moves it has 0.01??!

28.ϕe5 (9.4/12 12) ϕg5 (0.01/0 0)

29.ϕxc7 ϕc5 (0.01/0) 30.ϕxg5 ϕxb3 (0.01/0 0) 31.ϕd7# 1-0

Mmmmm. Spoke too soon once again!

I'd just finished and was trying to work out how to fill in the inch of space which was left over at the bottom of the page when I received copy of Anthony Cozzie's (Zappa) view of the Cloning situation.

It contains a lot of informative stuff, some even coming from chats he's had with Vasik, and I think is a convincing "must read". So his article will take up the next few pages.
The Rybka Cloning Issue

The Future of Computer Chess

Anthony Cozzie

I had originally intended to stay out of this mess, since I am after all retired, but after some discussions with Mark Uniacke and Zach Wegner I was persuaded put my name on the Rybka cloning letter.

Since my position is not precisely identical with that letter (I'm sure none of the other authors' are either) I thought I'd do it right and write down my exact thoughts here. It seems computer chess has found yet another way to waste my time.

Clone Evidence

I have always been slightly suspicious of Rybka. Strong new programs are usually either clones or the second attempt of a previous author. It just takes time to experiment and tweak things until you get something that works.

Most people forget this, but Vasik's first attempt at an engine finished 53rd out of 54 engines in CCT6. His second attempt was about 1000 elo higher; so clearly something changed in the interim. It's easy to compare this with Zappa's 17th, 3rd, and 1st place finishes as I gradually improved it over two years.

In addition Rybka was and continues to be the only program that obfuscates its output of nodes per second and depth. This is usually only done by clones who have something to hide, since users don't really care about nodes per second or reported depth except owners of big hardware who like to brag about it (you can find a hilarious thread of me trolling George Worthington in the CCC archives).

Finally I became convinced of the dubious nature of Rybka with the release of Strelka (which is so obviously similar to Fruit that it is amazing Vasik was able to dodge those accusations) and with the clear evidence from Dr. Watkins and Zach that one piece of user interface code was copied verbatim from Fruit.

Most people do not understand just how large the exponential space of programs is - it is totally impossible for two people to write even a small piece of code in an exactly identical way. It is now becoming clear that 90% of Rybka 1.0's evaluation is a direct translation of Fruit, and that even Vasik's original engine was a direct copy of Crafty (how he managed to make it 500 Elo weaker, we may never know). I suspect the evidence will only increase from here on out.

The (Accidental?) Genius of Vasik Rajlich

Most people don't understand how, if Vasik Rajlich is an evil cloner stealing the work of others, how he could dominate the computer chess world so thoroughly for so long.

In fact, I remember having dinner in Toronto with Stefan, Amir, Shay, and a few other guys and we were all stumped as to why Rybka was so effective. We all thought he must have invented some new super technique, the equivalent of null move or history pruning.

This puzzle was resolved with the release of the Strelka code. I was very curious to read it, of course, but it rapidly became apparent that there were no special techniques in it at all. It was simply a highly optimized and well-tuned program. After thinking about this for a few weeks I realized the secret sauce: hyper-bullet testing.

If you want to see how an engine performs, you have it play games against other engines. In 2005 while I was working on what would become Zappa Reykjavik, my methodology was to play standard time control games, look at games where Zappa lost, analyze, and make changes until it would play better moves in the critical positions. This is a very reasonable way of doing things, but it isn't very scientific. It's easy to fix one position while breaking 10 others.

This all changed in 2005 when Fabien Letouzey appeared with Fruit. He used blitz testing: make changes, play a few thousand
games, and compute the error bars for your change.

This is nicely analytical but requires a huge number of games; even after several thousand games played there is an 95% error bar of +/- 20 Elo, and many changes have a much smaller effect.

Nonetheless, blitz testing was effective enough for Fruit to become a top engine in only a year or two (it's also worth noting that unlike Rybka, its easy to see a solid progression in the strength of the Fruit versions).

The surprise for a lot of us was how accurately strength at slow time controls matches strength at long time controls, which I thought at the time was more dominated by evaluation and less by search.

I had a discussion with Vasik in Mexico about his tuning. His procedure was to play games at 3-4 ply which would finish in 10 seconds or so. At that speed the context switching and parsing of UCI would be much to slow, so he had written a special tester to link two versions of Rybka.

To accurately measure 2-3 elo changes requires about 100,000 games; at 10 seconds per game that equates to about 10 days of computer time. With a few quad core machines this is eminently practical and the logical extension of Fabien's approach.

I think he and Fabien can be compared to Kepler and Copernicus: Fabien broke the ground, and Vasik perfected it. The massive improvement in engine strength from 2005 (when GMs could still play computers and not embarrass themselves too badly) to 2010 is mostly due to them.

So I think Vasik Rajlich is simply a good programmer with the chess knowledge of an International Master and no moral issues with plagiarizing the work of others, and who was using a better tuning method than the rest of us. I'm guessing here, but I don't think he really understood that and instead considered other engine authors incompetent morons (understandable when you go from zero to domination in 6 months, even when you are starting with something decent), which also explains why he was willing to tell me his procedure in Mexico.

Of course the other possibility is that Vasik is a genius and the rest of us really are incompetent morons, but I think the simpler explanation is a lot more likely.

**Sour Grapes**

One of the things that I found very surprising about the whole Strelka controversy was how people were willing to give Vasik every benefit of the doubt, and claim that all these cloning accusations were just attempts to win by legal means what we could not do at the chessboard.

To me it was quite obvious at that point that Rybka was at least very shady if not a full-blown clone at its inception, tainting any further success, and it was amazing to see people making every possible excuse for him. Some of this is celebrity bias, like how pro athletes can get away with rape and murder (chess engine authors can only get away with minor crimes), but a lot of it is that for some reason people tried to associate themselves with Rybka to gain status and are now having to backpedal.

Many people have pointed out that the source code from Fruit and Crafty is available and everyone reads it. This is certainly true; I have read both and taken some ideas. For example, Zappa's SEE routine is quite similar to Crafty's (but better, because it uses CMOV).
Interestingly Vasik also figured out this optimization since it shows up in Strelka.

But what most of these people do not understand is that its very difficult to take one piece of a chess engine and add it to another, because all the pieces depend on each other. An evaluation pattern that fixes a gaping hole in one program may be partially covered by three other patterns in another, resulting in no gain, and the same is true for search terms.

To give a personal example: after the release of Strelka, I decided to give futility pruning a shot. The biggest difference between Zappa Mexico and Zappa Mexico II is that futility pruning is on by default. The new version crushed the old one in self play, but against other engines it was a miniscule improvement. According to CCRL there is only an 80% chance that it's an improvement at all, and there were a few bug fixes in there as well.

So copying a full engine and modifying it is a completely different thing from looking at the source code and taking a few pieces.

As a final note, I really got almost nothing from Fruit. In fact I was always kind of irritated because I would figure things out which would then later appear in Fruit for all the world to see. The free version of Zappa is within 80 elo of Fruit 2.1 on CCRL and was released 6 months earlier.

There is no doubt in my mind that we would never have seen a strong Rybka in 2005, and probably not in 2006 either (and remember, without sales he gets to do what the rest of us did, and that is work in the evenings for two years) if Vasik had tried to develop an engine from scratch on his own, so he obviously obtained a huge advantage from his intellectual theft.

For comparison, it took me two years of steady work (2003-2005), and I had access to the Crafty source code, I just didn't copy it wholesale. Again, it's not impossible that Vasik is 10 times smarter than I am, but I doubt it.

I consider stealing code immoral, but there is one big point where I diverge from the open letter. In my opinion, his advantage was not insurmountable to the rest of us. To make a sports analogy, Vasik was not using steroids, making him much stronger and faster than any normal athlete at the cost of testicle size and roid rage, but rather having his rich parents buy him training sessions with excellent coaches. Or it's like playing against a basketball team that gets a few bad calls in their favor: if your team is good, you should win anyway.

So I feel that even though he clearly had an unfair advantage, and without his intellectual theft it's quite possible no one in computer chess would have ever heard the name of Rajlich, it is not one that we as commercial engine authors could not have overcome.

**Conclusion**

At this point I am out of computer chess with no intention of returning. I think as a field it is almost solved at this point, and my collaboration with Zach on Rondo was about 10% me and 90% him (you guys may not believe this, but in 2005 after winning the title in Reykjavik I considering forming a similar partnership with an aspiring author since I needed to devote a lot of time to graduate school. The first candidate I had in mind: Vasik Rajlich, mainly because he seemed reasonably smart from my conversations with him during the CCTs. As it happened, he found another, cheaper, code-base to use).

So I while I would like the truth to come out, I don't really have a dog in this fight. Technically Zappa would pick up a title in 2007 if Rybka is forfeited, but under the circumstances I couldn't really be proud of that.

Finally, I find it incredibly amusing and hypocritical that the Rybka team is constantly attacking the various engines based on disassembling Rybka 1.1 (Strelka) and Rybka 3 (Ippolit).

I can't really condone it, but AFAIK disassembly is legal, while direct code theft is not.

*Anthony Cozzie*
CSVN/LEIDEN TOURNY, Nov. 2010... AT LAST!

I've been promising and trying to get to the Leiden Tournament for the last couple of issues, and this time I've made it!

Should I start with the Chess, or the Trouble?!

Well, the entry list was encouraging, Rybka was there, and connected to Lukas Cimioti’s home where the latest Cluster set-up of 260 Intel Nehalem cores, each 2.93GHz and up, were in waiting. Sjeng was also on a powerful Cluster, but Jonny outdid them all with a 500 core Cluster!

The rest, mostly on standard 4-8-16 core PC’s, included many well-known and strong engines such as Hiarc, Shredder, Spark, Spike, The Baron, The King and Kallisto. Most engines were of course the very latest versions, but not Kallisto which used its 1997 Aegon version!

There were some known weaker ones, there as ever for the fun, plus some new ones. Engines that appear from nowhere and suddenly do well in either the Internet rating lists or a big tournament are immediately suspect - no-one can write a brand new program from scratch in a short time and have it playing at 2800+ as soon as it appears. Scaramanga was a new entrant and performed "out of its skin" but was announced to be an exact copy/clone just after the end of the event. It’s record was allowed to stand so as not to mess up the results and in the final Tournament table it was called by its correct name, Now, as if that made everything all right!

An interesting precedent by tournament director Cock de Gorter, known cheaters and clones have always been kicked out in the past.

Round 1
Rybka, Sjeng, Hiarc, Jonny, Spike, The Baron, Spark and The King all won. Scaramanga drew a very long game against Shredder.

Round 2
The start was delayed due to Internet connection problems before Rybka beat Spike, Sjeng beat Spark, Hiarc beat The Baron - the latter was a pawn up 'but thoroughly lost' after just 23 moves, Shredder beat The King. Scaramanga also won.

Hiarc - The Baron

Probably both engines were out of book here
10.Ag5 Ab8 11.Ab1 Ae5 12.Ag3? A bold choice from Hiarc’s! 12...Aa5?
I’ve queried this, mostly because White’s reply proves to be so strong, but what was better? If 12...h6 13.f4! looks good 13.Aa3! Axc3 14.bxc3 Aa8 15.f4 h6 16.Ab4 Ae7 17.Bbe1 Ae6 18.e5! dxe5 19.fxe5 Ab5 20.Bf3 g6 21.Bf4
For a moment The Baron thought this allowed it back in the game, but after...
21...\textit{\v{a}}a6 22.c4!
...it changed it's mind! 22...\textit{\v{a}}xa3 23.\textit{\v{w}}e3
\textit{\v{a}}xc4 If 23...\textit{\v{d}}h7 24.g4! \textit{\v{g}}g7 25.\textit{\v{f}}f6 and
wins 24.\textit{\v{w}}xh6 \textit{\v{a}}xd3 25.cxd3 g5 26.\textit{\v{w}}xh5 A
very powerful win from Hiarcs 1-0

Round 3.
Rybka beat Hiarcs, Spike beat Scaramanga
when the latter collapsed from a good-
looking position, Spark also won, while
Sjeng-Jonny, The Baron-Shredder were
draws, and The King also drew.

\textbf{Scaramanga - Spike}
1.d4 \textit{\v{c}}f6 2.c4 e6 3.\textit{\v{c}}c3 d5 4.cxd5 exd5
5.\textit{\v{g}}g5 \textit{\v{e}}7 6.e3 c6 7.\textit{\v{w}}c2 0-0 8.\textit{\v{d}}d3 \textit{\v{b}}d7
9.\textit{\v{g}}ge2 \textit{\v{e}}e8 10.\textit{\v{h}}3 \textit{\v{f}}8 11.0-0-0 a5 12.g4 b5
13.\textit{\v{g}}g3 h6
I was still in theory until this, and I think
maybe it's as good as the 13...a4 I have
14.\textit{\v{f}}f4 \textit{\v{e}}e6! 15.\textit{\v{b}}b1?!
I prefer 15.\textit{\v{c}}ce2 \textit{\v{d}}xf4 16.\textit{\v{d}}xf4 and both
sides have chances
15...\textit{\v{d}}xf4 16.\textit{\v{e}}xf4 \textit{\v{d}}d7 17.\textit{\v{h}}4 \textit{\v{b}}b6 18.g5
\textit{\v{d}}d6?!

\textbf{The LEIDEN Cups}

A little premature, and White finds the
best defence!

19.\textit{\v{d}}d1! \textit{\v{f}}8
If here 19...\textit{\v{d}}xf4?! 20.\textit{\v{c}}e2! (better than
\textit{\v{d}}h5, though that too is strong) 20...\textit{\v{f}}3
21.\textit{\v{w}}xh6 \textit{\v{f}}6 22.\textit{\v{h}}xg7 \textit{\v{g}}xg7 23.\textit{\v{h}}5!+-
20.\textit{\v{f}}5
White's attack looks strong...
20...b4 21.\textit{\v{d}}d1 a4

...so does Black's, which one wins?!

22.\textit{\v{d}}e3?
22.\textit{\v{c}}c1 looks best. Then if 22...\textit{\v{d}}h8 (if
22...b3? there is no immediate threat so
White can play 23.\textit{\v{w}}xh6 \textit{\v{h}}8 24.\textit{\v{d}}h5
winning) 23.\textit{\v{h}}5 and White still has a defi-
nite advantage here. The game was won and
lost on White's 23rd move!

22...b3! 23.\textit{\v{x}}xb3?
White might still have had some chances
with 23.\textit{\v{c}}c1! After 23...\textit{\v{x}}xa2+ 24.\textit{\v{x}}xa2
neither 24...a3 nor 24.\textit{\v{g}}a6 seem totally
convincing if falling engine evaluations are
anything to go by. I'm unsure who's winning!
23...\textit{\v{x}}xb3 24.\textit{\v{x}}xb3 \textit{\v{a}}a4! 25.\textit{\v{c}}c2 \textit{\v{d}}d7 26.\textit{\v{f}}6
g6 27.\textit{\v{d}}d1 \textit{\v{e}}e8!

Of course this wins outright
28.\textit{\v{w}}xa4 \textit{\v{x}}xa4 29.\textit{\v{x}}xa4 \textit{\v{b}}b4 30.\textit{\v{c}}c2 \textit{\v{g}}4
0-1
Round 4.
Everybody arrived on time and the Internet was ready and waiting - a first for this year! There was no stopping Rybka, this time it beat Jonny to go to 4/4. The Baron also won but most of the 'big' games were draws: Hiarcs-Sjeng, Shredder-Spike, Spark-The King.

Jonny - Rybka

1.d4 f5!?
The '!?' is not because it's a good move, but the surprise of seeing the Dutch in such an important tournament and between the 2 big cluster engines! This was the Rybka team's favourite game from the tournament 2.g3 Qf6 3.Qg2 g6 4.Qf3 Qg7 5.c4 0-0 6.0-0 d6 7.Qc3 e6

That's rare as well, in fact it has a very bad reputation after a Petrosian-Botvinnik game and 7...Qe8 is almost considered obligatory. But book programmer Jiri Dufek found that 7...e6 had been heavily analysed in a recent book and made good use of his findings!
8.Qc2 Qc6 9.Qd1 Qe7 10.a3 a5 11.Qc3?!N
The first non-theory move and not a particularly good one, nor says Jiri were Jonny's 12th and 13th
Qd8 12.Qa2?! b6 13.Qg5 Qb7 14.Qxb7 Qxb7 15.h3 a4!

A typical Rybka queenside pawn push, so often effective. This was programmer Vasik Rajlich's choice of tournament move from Rybka, and it gives White a tough choice. If he doesn't capture it then Black will defend it and permanently freeze White's queenside and probably play the annoying Na5. And if White captures? Well, that's what he did...

16.Qxa4
16.Qxa1 taking back the slightly strange 12th move was the alternative, then 16...Qh5 17.Qc1 Qa5 18.Qf3 and the reorganisation has left White behind
16...Qh5! 17.Qh2?!
There was no need for this, it is very slow, and with Black's reply the Qg7 leaps into action. 17.Qc3 was the best try
17...e5! 18.dxe5 Qxe5 19.Qf4 f4 20.gxf4
Qxf4+ 21.Qxf4 Qxf4 22.Qc3

22...Qe6!
22...Qxe2? is not as effective after
23.Qxe2 Qxe2 24.Qxe2 Qxf3 25.Qg2
23.Qg1 Qa5! 24.Qe4 Qe5 25.Qxb7 Qh5
26.Qe4 Qh3+ 27.Qh3 Qh3+ 28.Qg1
White is a rook up, but completely lost
28...Qf5! 29.Qd5 Qxd5 30.Qe8+ Qg7
31.Qd7+ Qh6 32.Qf5 Qxf5 33.cxd5 Qg5+
34.Qh2 Qd2 0-1

4 Rybka
3 Sjeng
2½ Hiarcs, Spike, Jonny, Spark, Shredder, The Baron, Rookie
Round 5.
Rookie had met some easy opponents, but now lost to Shredder. Rybka beat Sjeng, Spark beat The Baron. The King also won while Spike-Hiarcs and Scaramanga-Jonny were draws. The report says Jonny had Q v B+P but it was a draw - must check that out!

**Scaramanga - Jonny**

Here the engines see Jonny as winning

55.f6?
55...d4 d5 56..c4 was better, but
56...f4 57...xh7+ xh7-

55...d7 56...c3 d6 57..c4 f8?
57...e5 appears to be correct, then
58..b4 xc3+ 59..xc3 e5 60.g7 g4
61..b4 xf6 62.h6 h7 63..xa4 xh6
64..xb3 xg7 and Black wins

58..d5 a3 59..d6 a2 60..e7 fxg6

Some engines start to show 0.00 at this point

61.f7+ h7 62.xf8 a1
So Black queens, but has no to stop White doing the same, so can only draw

63.h6 a8+ 64..e7 b7+ 65..e6 a6+

etc.... ½-½

Round 6.
Finally Rybka drops a point... well a ½ point in fact as it draws with Spark! Sjeng beat The King, Rookie beat the lowly RedQueen but was heading for a surprisingly good score, Scaramanga also won again, while the games Shredder-Nightmare, Jonny-Hiarcs and Spike-The Baron were all draws.

- 5½ Rybka
- 4 Sjeng, Spark, Shredder
- 3½ Spike, Jonny, Hiarcs, Scaramanga, Rookie, Nightmare
- 3 The Baron, Hermann, The King

Round 7.
A defective cable and a misconnection delayed the start yet again, but Rybka is back to usual form and beat Shredder, also Spike beat Rookie and The Baron and The King both had wins. Hiarcs-Spark was a draw, as was Scaramanga-Sjeng where both thought they were losing so happily took a threefold repetition! Nightmare-Jonny was also a draw.

Interlude:

Somewhere round about here, Harvey Williamson took tournament director Cock de Gorter and his wife out for a meal - it's something he does. Only this time he had something else on his mind as well!

As most readers will know very well, Harvey is a main member of the Hiarcs team, working on the Hiarcs forum, opening book, and chief operator when Hiarcs goes on the road! And on the Hiarcs website you will find not only UCI, Palm, MAC, Mobile Phone and all sorts of other versions, but also the UCI versions of Junior, which Mark Uniacke distributes for Amir Ban and Shay Bushinsky.

It had come to Harvey's notice that de Gorter was using a cracked (i.e. stolen) version of Junior which a
friend in Brazil had provided for him. De Gorter being a fairly big noise in the Computer Chess World he usually gets given free copies of new engines - he writes "it is my principle never to write about anything I have to pay for", but he wasn't sure if he'd get one, and couldn't bear to wait, so he was using one which some computer whiz kid had broken the security code on and was distributing to friends in whatever way he wanted. And Cock was happily using it in a tournament on the Internet.

[What did you make of that "it is my principle never to write about anything I have to pay for" - if I'd followed that practice Selective Search would have been full of empty pages for some issues!]

Unsurprisingly Harvey wasn't best pleased about this, it affects the Hiarc's team income and the Junior team income, and renders all the hard work that goes into creating and maintaining these engines over many years something of a waste of effort. Surely someone in de Gorter's position would respect something like that?

De Gorter however was upset that he should be questioned about using an illegal copy, especially in front of his wife, and immediately went about persuading the CSVN board members to ban Harvey from all future tournaments. And a few hours after getting home that is what Harvey found when he opened his e-mails - "the CSVN board has no other option than to ask you not to attend CSVN-events in the future". What on earth had de Gorter told them? Did he explain it had all come about because he was using illegal Junior software? Also Amir Ban and Shay Bushinsky (and therefore Junior) were to be banned. All sorts of efforts have been made to get this sorted out, with copious e-mails from Harvey, Mark Uniakee, Amir Ban and including interventions by David Levy and Jeroen Noomen, who "tried to make them see sense", but to no avail.

None of these have received invites for the June 2011 Event in Leiden. I am not sure who the biggest loser is. It certainly doesn't come at a good time for computer chess, but as Harvey says "I don't know what else you can do when someone steals a product you are involved in selling".

Round 8.
The first game to finish was very quick, Hiarc's was still in book when Nightmare resigned - some engines were showing the final position as m/13 in the post mortem. You can bet that line's been added to everyone else's book now! Rybka beat The King, Jonny beat The Baron, while Shredder and Rookie also won. Sjeng-Spike and Spark-Scaramanga are both draws.

Here is the Hiarc's opening book win - if you were hoping I'd show you what steps Black should take to avoid this, or at least an improvement or two along the way, I'm sorry to disappoint! You'll have to buy the Hiarc's Professional Book, or do some very hard work of your own!

**Hiarc - Nightmare**

1.e4 c5 2.d3 f3 d6 3.d4 exd4 4.cxd4 g6 5.g3 a6 6.g5 e6 7.f4 b6 8.d2 b2 9.b1 a3 10.e5 dxe5 11.fxe5 d7 12.e4 h6 13.h4 h8 14.ed1 d5 15.e3 xe5 16.e2 c5 17.g3 xd4 18.xd4 a5+ 19.d2 0-0 20.d6 e8 21.0-0 f5 22.g3 xe4 23.g6 e8 24.f7

The only try seems to be 24...c3 (24...a1+ first doesn't help at all: 25.d1 c3 26.d1 1-0) but 25.h4 a1+ 26.d1 e5 27.d6 c3 28.d1 soon wins. 1-0
With 1 round to go:

- 7 ½  Rybka
- 5  Spike, Spark, Sjeng, Jonny, Shredder, Hiarcs
- 4 ½  Scaramanga, Rookie
- 4  The Baron, The King, Nightmare, Hermann

I'm sure some of you are wondering how the 1997 version of Kallisto is doing! Well it's on 2 ½/8 and meets Joker (3/8) in its final game!

**Round 9.**
Rybka v the rascal Scaramanga... no shocks, just 1-0! Spike beat Jonny, Sjeng beat Rookie, and Hiarcs beat Herman, so the 6-way tie for 2nd. became a 3-way tie. The King and The Baron both won, Kallisto also won, and Spark-Shredder was a draw

**Rybka - Scaramanga**

1.e4 e5 2.d4 d6 3.b5 a6 4.c4 b6 5.c3 d5 6.d4 g6 7.0-0 g7 8.e1 h5 9.h3 g6 10.h5 0-0 This is a rare Steinitz-type line of the Ruy Lopez. 10...h6 is usual 11.h3 h6 The computers are out of their books now, but the strange looking retreat by Rybka with its next move has been played before! 12.d1 c8 13.d2 a5 14.c2 c7 15.b4 b7 16.a4 h5 17.b3 d4 18.b1

31.xc4 g4 The alternative 31...xc4 32.xf7 xf7+ xf7 34.xd5+ leaves White well on top 32.xg4 fxg4 33.d5! f7 34.e6 gxf3 35.xf3 a3 36.xf4 xe7 37.a6! cxb6 38.b5 b2 39.g6xe5 40.xe5 d8 40...d8 41.d1 xf7 xf7 42.xf7 xf7 43.xc7 xc7 44.xc7 and White is showing m/10. Fine chess. 1-0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Rybka</strong></td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=</td>
<td>Spike, Sjeng, Hiarcs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spark, Shredder</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jonny, The Baron, The King</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Scaramanga/Now, Nightmare, Rookie, RedQueen</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Hermann, GoldBar</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kallisto</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Joker</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hansdampf</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fridolin</td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dolphin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many thanks to Eric for finding more pictures of those wonderful Isle of Lewis chessmen. What a different game it was when characters like that roamed the board! In SelS 152 we discovered that modern computer programs are not as good at talking with their pieces as the old Isle of Lewis players were and then, in SelS 153 it turned out that most of them are also very poor at spotting statics. Here is that position they were looking at:

White to move

The human eye has little trouble seeing that this has to be a draw. White can mop up all Black’s queenside pawns, but then will not be able to Queen a White pawn without capturing Black’s bishop, and that will result in stalemate.

With the exception of Stockfish and APILchess (who is he??), the computer programs failed to work out that it is a drawn position. So, given that any human with a decent grading can see this, how is it possible for programs like Stockfish and Rybka, with almost identical high level Elo ratings, to reach such totally different conclusions?

As far as explanations for why some engines can and others can’t do various things, I do know that Chess programmers have many tricky decisions to make!

In the first place the very way that they work to achieve what they do can be vastly different from each other - knowledge vs fast search is just one such issue! Some issues can be solved in a couple of lines of programming in a knowledge program, but trying the same thing in a fast searcher can slow everything down or even disrupt the way the engine does other things. The fast searcher tries to keep it simple! But equally it is notoriously difficult to add fast search routines to a knowledge program. No programmer will want to use line after line of programming just to solve something that only occurs in a chess game once every blue moon.

And then there’s the horizon effect which has been with us since the Fidelity Sensory days! Of course the engines are much better at this now than they ever were then, but it’s still there. If you put an engine on full width (no pruning or selective searching allowed at all), then when it gets to 100 ply it will know a position is drawn on the 50 move rule. But how often do you see a depth of search figure 100/100 on your screen? Never! Nor does any engine use full width searching throughout the search, it takes much too long and seriously weakens the engine. So selectivity, pruning and other tricks tell the engine to concentrate only on the potentially best moves, and 98% of the time this works fine and adds 500+ Elo to the engine rating. To do this, however, some/more moves have to be excluded from the search, and occasionally that means the engine will never get the correct solution... especially if it’s a position Bill Reid has sent us involving statics!!

Occasionally, as in this case with Stockfish and APIL, we find that an engine can get a result on a static or horizon issue... but
when it later fails on another fairly similar position, we might conclude it was as much by good luck as programmer genius!

Back to Bill! Well, did that other position where the old time players had no problem agreeing on a draw also produce widely different judgements from the programs?

Black to move

![Chess Diagram]

This one is a bit simpler than the last one, though poor old Fritz8 still doesn't get it.

However I'm sure that more modern programs will quickly come up with a correct evaluation.

Eric: But Bill had written those words without knowing how the engines were faring at the end of the analysis line in the position we started with. If he'd seen that most of their evaluations were still awry 11 moves into the position he might not have been so generous in his expectations!

Of course the engines know that in the current position f8=Q is mate, therefore they mustn't allow White any breathing space to play that!

And with Tablebases or good searching they also know that 1...Qxg6 2.f8=Q draws. So if White is to win he must make checks or protect f8 with every move!

You and I can see that this will go on for ever, the only way Black could win would be for Black to blunder horribly with 1...Qf6+ 2.Kg1?? Qg6+ 3.K moves Qxf7 wins. But of course White would never allow that to happen, whether its player is a computer or a human, so the game must be a draw.

Simple! No, I'm afraid not!! The computer evaluations indicate a conviction that if they keep checking White for long enough, the queen will win the game for them eventually. And that's not just Bill's Fritz8!

- Deep Rybka 4: 1...b4 2.Ke2 b5+ -7.42/42
- Stockfish 2.0.1 JA: 1...f6+ 2.Ke2 f4 -8.96/36
- Zappa Mexico II: 1...f6+ 2.Ke2 f4 -5.22/22
- Hiarcs 13.2 MP: 1...b4 2.Ke2 b4+ -3.82/39
- Deep Shredder 12 UCI: 1...f6+ 2.Ke2 f5 -6.02/14
- Deep Junior 12 (Win32) UCI: 1...b4 2.Ke2 d6 -3.56/17
- Deep Fritz 12: 1...b4 2.Ke2 b4+ -10.12/20
- Naum 4.2 mp2: 1...f6+ 2.Ke1 f5 -7.63/41
- Houdini 1.5a w32: 1...c5 2.Ke2 d6 -7.07/48

Bill: Now here is another of those "Time for Adjudication" positions which the team did not have to send to the local chess master, along with his fee of five shillings!

White to move

![Chess Diagram]

The player of the White pieces was sure he had a win, but his opponent was unwilling to resign. So this time the decision lay with the team captains and they took no time at all to agree it was indeed a win for White.

What was the winning move they had in mind, and can Rybka find it? Or if not, perhaps Stockfish or one of the others will?

Eric: I've tested Critter, Fritz, Hiarcs, Houdini, Naum, Rybka, Shredder, Stockfish and Zappa on this, 4 minutes each on my dual2core. Two from this group get it but the others don't. So whatever engines readers have— and Glaurung, Sieng, Komodo, Spike and Spark should all be worth including if you have one of them— readers have a chance of seeing how this one's done!
I am still quickly attracted to any evidence pointing to someone going a bit over the top with regard to their Elo ratings! Selective Search (then the News Sheet) pretty much started out on that soapbox in 1985 when a pair of Fidelity and Novag chess computers (showing 1779 Elo and 2018 Elo respectively as I recall) fell below the expectations of my own chess playing level. Yet the figures shown on the boxes were "official". So I wondered where they came from, found out, and wrote a couple of articles for Mike Basman’s brilliant Popular Chess magazine sometime in 1984/5. From the letters I received in response to those articles was born the first few issues of the News Sheet.

For the last 2 or 3 years a certain Sanny has been causing some amusement - others would reclassify that as annoyance - on the Internet’s [rgcc] pages. Originally claiming his GetClub engine to be around 2000 Elo (a wild doubling at least of its true playing strength), he has more recently upped his estimate to 2400 Elo. This same GetClub, yes, on a PC, keeps losing Internet games to the moderate Excalibur Ivan computer on its desperately slow H8 10MHz processor. But still Sanny proclaims GetClub’s greatness, though some have started calling it GitClub?!?

I was recently playing through the extremely interesting Topalov-Kamsky game from the current World Championship cycle, doing a bit of opening book work for Hiarcs! Granted even the first 3 or 4 moves of the opening aren’t seen very often at the GM level, and Topalov’s 5.Qc2 is an early escape from theory. Quite a few commented on this and some blunders by both players later in the game, but that didn’t alter the fact that the opening is of real interest and, I would say, likely to have been computer generated for one or both players.

Now when I say computer generated I certainly wouldn’t include GetClub as a likely source of inspiration for Topalov, Kamsky, or if it comes down to it, even me!

Nevertheless Sanny obviously noted the various questions being asked about the line, and the criticisms of later moves, and decided to set GetClub to the task of commenting on the moves. From Black’s 1...Nf6 it fairly rubbished the game, criticising every 2nd or 3rd move. In total it claimed Topalov played 14 seriously bad moves, and Kamsky played 16. Sanny unwisely proclaimed that this proved that his GetClub engine was obviously now better than the world’s top GMs as it had found so many blunders in their play!

Here is the fascinating game in question, with a diagram to help you through the critical middle game moments,

**Topalov, Veselin (2775) - Kamsky, Gata (2732)**

1.\(\text{\&f3} \text{\&f6} 2.\text{c4} \text{g6} 3.\text{\&c3} \text{d5} 4.\text{\&xd5} \text{\&xd5}

Already GetClub has disagreed with 5 of the 8 moves, even 'strongly' criticising 2 of them. But I must interrupt myself for a moment as, in Sanny’s move list, he now has 5.Qb3 Nb6 6.d4 here... in other words he wanders off into an altogether different game to the one we were all talking about!

5.\text{\&e2} \text{\&g7} 6.\text{e4} \text{\&b6} 7.\text{d4} 0-0 8.\text{\&e3} \text{\&g4} 9.\text{\&e5} \text{\&xe5} 10.\text{dxe5} \text{\&c6} 11.\text{h3} \text{\&e6} 12.\text{\&d1} \text{\&c8} 13.\text{f4} \text{\&d8} 14.\text{b3} \text{\&b4} 15.\text{\&xd8+} \text{\&xd8} 16.\text{\&b1} \text{\&f5} 17.\text{exf6} \text{exf6} 18.\text{\&e2} \text{\&e7} 19.0-0 \text{\&f7} 20.\text{\&f2} \text{\&d8} 21.\text{\&d1} \text{\&xd1+} 22.\text{\&xd1} \text{c5} 23.\text{\&f1} \text{\&c6} 24.\text{g3} \text{\&g7} 25.\text{\&g2} \text{h5} 26.\text{\&b5} \text{\&c8} 27.\text{\&d2} \text{c4} 28.\text{bxc4} \text{\&xc4} 29.\text{\&d4} \text{\&b4} 30.\text{\&c1} \text{\&e7} 31.\text{a3} \text{\&a4} 32.\text{\&b2} \text{b6} 33.\text{\&h2} \text{\&f7} 34.\text{\&e3} \text{\&a2} 35.\text{f5} \text{\&c4} 36.\text{\&b2} \text{\&e5} 37.\text{\&d2} \text{g5}
38. $\text{De6}$? [38. $\text{Dg1}$ keeps an advantage]
38... $\text{Dc7}$?? [38... $\text{Dh3}$ probably draws here] 39. $\text{Dd6}$ [winning] 39... $\text{Dc8}$
40. $\text{Dc7}$?! [Here 40. $\text{Dd4}$ wins!] 40... $\text{Df7}$
[White still winning but not quite so clear]
41. $\text{Dd5}$ best 41... $\text{Dc2}$ 42. $\text{Dxf6}$+ $\text{Dxh8}$
43. $\text{Dxe6}$+ $\text{Df8}$ 44. $\text{Dg1}$? [The winning line is:
44. $\text{Dh6}$+ $\text{Dc8}$ 45. $\text{Dg5}$+ $\text{Dd7}$ 46. $\text{Df4}$+ $\text{De8}$ 47. $\text{Dg5}$+ $\text{Dd7}$ 48. $\text{Dc5}$+ $\text{Dd8}$
49. $\text{De6}$+ $\text{Df6}$+ $\text{Df7}$ 51. $\text{Dd7}$ $\text{Dxd7}$ 52. $\text{Dxd7}$+ $\text{Df7}$ 53. $\text{Dd4}$ $\text{Dd3}$ 54. $\text{f6}$]
44... $\text{Dd1}$+ [Kamsky is back in for a draw]
45. $\text{Df1}$ $\text{Dxd5}$ 46. $\text{Dxd5}$ $\text{Dd4}$ 47. $\text{Df6}$+ $\text{Dg8}$
48. $\text{Dxg5}$+ [48. $\text{Dg5}$+ $\text{Df7}$ 49. $\text{Da8}$ kept a slight plus, but probably draws] 48... $\text{Df7}$
49. $\text{Dh6}$ $\text{Dc8}$ 50. $\text{Dg5}$ $\text{Dc2}$ 51. $\text{Dh2}$ $\text{Dc2}$
52. $\text{Dg1}$ $\text{Df3}$+ 53. $\text{Df1}$ $\text{Df1}$ 54. $\text{Df2}$ $\text{Dxf2}$
55. $\text{Dc7}$+ $\text{Df6}$ 56. $\text{Dxf6}$+ $\text{Df7}$ 57. $\text{Dc7}$+ $\text{Df6}$
58. $\text{Dd6}$+ $\text{Df7}$ ½-½

For comparison here are a couple of GetClub's Internet games against Excalibur's Ivan. For the first games I asked Hiarc13 to do a Blunder Check, looking only for moves worse than a loss of 1.00 evaluation points. So a series of 2 or 3 'not best' moves is ignored, only blunders are covered. The first evaluation after a blunder is the eval resulting from that move. Then a better line is shown with its evaluation.

**GetClub - Ivan**
B12: Caro Kann: Advance Variation
1.e4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.e5 $\text{Df5}$ 4.$\text{Dc3}$ e6 5.g4 $\text{Dg6}$ [last book move] 6.$\text{Dd3}$ $\text{Dc7}$ 7.$\text{Df3}$ f5 8.$\text{exf6}$

8... $\text{Dxf6}+$ [Ivan makes the first mistake. 2.34. HIARC13 13.2 MP: 8... $\text{Dxf6}$ 9.$\text{hxg6}$+ $\text{hxg6} \pm 1.00/15] 9.0-0+ [But GetClub misses its chance. 1.10 HIARC13 13.2 MP:

19. $\text{Dd4}$??+ [−4.80 HIARC13 13.2 MP: 19. $\text{Df1}$−− −2.57/17] 19... $\text{Dxg6}$
20. $\text{Dxg6}$??+ [−8.21 HIARC13 13.2 MP: 20. $\text{Dc2}$ c5 21. $\text{Da4}$ $\text{f7}$−− −4.79/16]
20... $\text{Df3}$+ 21. $\text{Dh1}$ $\text{Dxd4}$ 22. $\text{Dxd4}$ $\text{Dh8}$
23. $\text{Df3}$ $\text{h8}$ 24. $\text{Dg2}$ $\text{Dde8}$ 25.f4??+ [−9.78 HIARC13 13.2 MP: 25. $\text{Dd3}$ $\text{Df7}$ 26. $\text{Df5}$
$\text{exf5}$ 27. $\text{Dxh5}$ $\text{Dxh5}$ 28. $\text{Dd3}$ $\text{Dg8}$ 29. $\text{Dxe8}$+ $\text{Dxe8}$−− −7.33/18] 25... $\text{g5}$ 26. $\text{Dh2}$?++
[−13.82 HIARC13 13.2 MP: 26. $\text{Dg4}$ $\text{Dxe1}$+ −9.74/17] 26... $\text{gxh4}$ 27. $\text{Df3}$ 0-1

**GetClub - Ivan**
C28
1.e4 e5 2.$\text{Dc3}$ $\text{Df6}$ 3.$\text{Dc4}$ $\text{Dc6}$ 4.d3 $\text{Dc4}$ 5.$\text{Dc5}$ $\text{Dxc4}$ 6.$\text{Dxc4}$ [last book move]
6... $\text{Dd4}$ 7.$\text{Df3}$ d6 8.0-0 $\text{Dd6}$? [Again it is Ivan that makes the first mistake. 0.49. HIARC13 13.2 MP: 8... $\text{Dxc3}$ 9.$\text{bxc3}$ h6
12. \textit{[Ivan was nicely ahead until this!]} \textit{-0.78 HIARCS 13.2 MP: 12. \texttt{xf6} \texttt{xf6}}

\textit{13. \texttt{xe4} \texttt{c5} 14. \texttt{ab1} \pm 0.93/16} \textit{12...exf3}

\textit{13. \texttt{xb4} fxg2 14. \texttt{h1} \texttt{g2} \texttt{xd5} 15. \texttt{d2} \texttt{e7}}

\textit{16. \texttt{ae1} \texttt{e8} 17. \texttt{w4} \texttt{d7} 18. \texttt{e4}+ ([-3.03 HIARCS 13.2 MP: 18. \texttt{xe7} \texttt{xe7} 19. \texttt{f3} a6}}

\textit{20. \texttt{g4} \texttt{exg4}+ 21. \texttt{fxg4} \texttt{eae8}+ \pm 1.62/15]}

\textit{18... \texttt{c6}+ [Ivan misses the best reply. -1.59 HIARCS 13.2 MP: 18... \texttt{c6} 19. \texttt{exe8}+ \texttt{exe8}}}

\textit{20. \texttt{d1} \texttt{f5} 21. \texttt{c1} \texttt{g6}+ 22. \texttt{h3} \texttt{e4}+ \pm \texttt{e4}+} \textit{-3.03/16] 19. \texttt{f3} \texttt{i5} 20. \texttt{exe8}+ \texttt{exe8} 21. \texttt{d3} \texttt{c5} 22. \texttt{g1} \texttt{e3}+ 23. \texttt{exe3} \texttt{exe3}}

\textit{24. \texttt{f1}+ ([-3.76 HIARCS 13.2 MP: 24. \texttt{d2} \texttt{e6} 25. \texttt{e1} \texttt{xc4} 26. \texttt{b3} \texttt{c5} 27. \texttt{c4} a5}}

\textit{28. \texttt{exe6} \texttt{fxe6} 29. \texttt{f4} \texttt{f5}+ \pm 2.67/18]}

\textit{24... \texttt{e5} 25. \texttt{f2} \texttt{d4} 26. \texttt{g2} \texttt{xb2} 27. \texttt{f2} \texttt{e5} 28. \texttt{h1} \texttt{g6} 29. \texttt{gg4}+- ([-12.50 HIARCS 13.2 MP: 29. \texttt{b1}+- 5.83/18] 29... \texttt{e2}}

\textit{30. \texttt{h4} \texttt{exe2}+- ([-6.67 HIARCS 13.2 MP: 30... \texttt{e3} 31. \texttt{g3} \texttt{e1} 32. \texttt{exe1} \texttt{exe1}+}}

\textit{33. \texttt{g1} \texttt{e2}+- 12.50/18] 31. \texttt{d8}+- ([-12.25 HIARCS 13.2 MP: 31. \texttt{g2} \texttt{a1}+ 32. \texttt{g1} \texttt{xa2} 33. \texttt{e1} \texttt{xc4} 34. \texttt{h6} \texttt{e2}}

\textit{35. \texttt{xe2} \texttt{exe2}+- 6.67/19] 31... \texttt{g7}}

\textit{32. \texttt{f4}? ([-2 HIARCS 13.2 MP: 32. \texttt{e3} \texttt{g3} f5 34. \texttt{g5} \texttt{e1}++- 20.01/20]}

\textit{32... \texttt{e4}+ 0-1}
As I mentioned Ivan - Ivan the Terrible to give it its full name - is, or rather was now that the USA company has disappeared, an Excalibur product. Its almost 100% score against GetClub over many Internet games - I've only ever seen 1 draw - might give the impression that it's close to GM strength.

However the Grandmaster was the strongest computer Excalibur produced, using Ron Nelson programs, and I have its rating at 1814 based on just over 100 games. I have never used or played Ivan, but from what USA contacts tell me it is a similar program size but runs a bit slower and is perhaps 100 Elo behind the Grandmaster. Let's call it a 1720 rating, I can't believe it's any more than that.

The operator for this Ivan computer, having had such success against the 'mighty' GetClub, sent out a challenge to the real PC engines, his intention being to now have Ivan at 30 mins per move and the chosen PC engine at 5 secs per move, trying to make an allowance for processing power and see if he could beat these. After much effort the [rgcc] users finally persuaded Ivan's man that he wouldn't have a chance unless the game was played at odds, and eventually it was decided knight odds plus the time control difference might make it interesting.

Stockfish2.1 did the Blunder Check for a 0.50 gap for these, I wanted to pick up some lesser mistakes with it being knight odds.

**Rybka ex Nb1 - Ivan**

\[
1. e4 d5 2. e5 d4 3. c4 \text{c6} 4. \text{d3} f6 5.0-0 fxe5 6. \text{c5} h6 7. \text{f3} \text{g4} 8. \text{b3}
\]
8...\(\text{b8}\)† [-0.76. That's nearly wiped the knight odds out with one move! Stockfish 2.1.1 JA: 8...\(\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d6}}\)} 9.\(\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f7}}+}\) \(\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d7}}} 10.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f3}}} 11.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d3}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d8}}} 12.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b6}}} 13.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e1}}} + -3.15/19 / 9.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f7}}} + \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xf7}}} 10.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xf7}}} + \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d8}}} 11.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d7}}} 12.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d5}}} + \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c8}}} 13.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{fxe5}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d7}}} + - [1.97. Goodness, Rybka is winning already. Stockfish 2.1.1 JA: 13...\(\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e6}}} 14.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h5}}} 15.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xe6}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g6}}} 16.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d5}}} = 0.00/21 / 14.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f7}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e6}}} 15.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xh8}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{exd5}}} 16.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xf8}}} + \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c8}}} 17.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xe8}}} + \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d7}}} 18.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xb8}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xb8}}} 19.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f7}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h6}}} 20.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d3}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f8}}} 21.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xh6}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xe5}}} 22.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h3}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{gxh6}}} 23.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xh6}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f7}}} 24.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f1}}} 24...\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e6}}} + [3.79 Stockfish 2.1.1 JA: 24...\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h7}} 25.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g5}}} a6 26.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xf4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xe6}}} 27.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f6}}} + \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d7}}} 28.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g2}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f7}}} 29.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xf4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d8}}} + 2.14/21] 25.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xf7}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xf7}}} 26.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xf4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e5}}?} + [4.84 Stockfish 2.1.1 JA: 26...\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c5}}} 27.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d8}}} 28.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c6}}} 29.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{h5}}} c4 30.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a3}}} b5 31.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f2}}} b4 32.axb4 \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xb4}}} 33.dxc4 dxc4 34.g5 + - 3.27/22] 27.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xe5}}} 1-0

Here's a second game, this time against a Stockfish engine from about a year ago.

Don't forget to take White's Nb1 off again before you start!

16...\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f5}}} + [-1.97. Ivan has stayed ahead longer in this one. Stockfish 2.1.1 JA: 16...\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d7}}} 17.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xd7}}} + \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xd7}}} 18.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a1}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c6}}} 19.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d3}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e7}}} 20.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xe7}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xe7}}} 21.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b1}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b8}} + -2.62/20] 17.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a3}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c2}}} [-0.59 Stockfish 2.1.1 JA: 17...\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c6}}} 18.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xc6}}} bxc6 19.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d2}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b7}}} 20.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b4}}} + \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a8}}} 21.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xd6}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{cx6}}} + -1.85/19] 18.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e2}}} + [-1.73. Hal! Interesting. Stockfish2.1 thinks its earlier version missed something here! Stockfish 2.1.1 JA: 18.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b1}}} a6 19.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xa3}}} 20.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xa3}}} + -0.59/22] 18...\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xb6}}} 19.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c5}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d6}}} 20.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a2}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xc5}}?} + [0.56. Finally Stockfish does have a small advantage. Stockfish 2.1.1 JA: 20...\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xa3}}} 21.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xa3}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a5}}} + 22.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a6}}} 23.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e7}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d7}}} 24.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xd7}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xd7}}} 25.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e1}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a8}}} 26.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a2}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e2}}} + 27.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{c2}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b6}}} + 28.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xb6}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e6}}} + -1.61/20] 21.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{dxc5}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xe6}}} 22.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xe6}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xe6}}} 23.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d3}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{xa3}}} 24.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{a3}}}

24...\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b6}}} + [2.42 Stockfish 2.1.1 JA: 24...\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d7}}} 25.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d4}}} g6 26.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{b4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{e8}}} + 1.05/20 / 25.\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{d4}}} \text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{g4}}?} + [2.78 Stockfish 2.1.1 JA: 25...\text{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{f7}}]
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26. \textit{f5 + \textit{b8}} 27. \textit{c1} \textit{h5} 28. \textit{d7 + --}
2.1.1 JA: 26...\textit{d7} 27.\textit{c6 \textit{g4}} 28.\textit{f3 \textit{h5}}
29.\textit{e1 \textit{e8} 30.\textit{xe8} + \textit{xe8} 31.\textit{xe7} + --
2.58/18] 27. \textit{b5 \textit{b7 + + -- [4.44 Stockfish}
2.1.1 JA: 27...\textit{d7 + + -- [4.44 Stockfish}
2.1.1 JA: 27...\textit{d7} 28.\textit{c6 \textit{g4}} 29.\textit{f3 \textit{h5}}
30.\textit{e1 \textit{e8} 31.\textit{xe8} + \textit{xe8} 32.\textit{xe7} + --
2.90/22] 28. \textit{e1 g6 + + -- [5.37 Stockfish 2.1.1}
JA: 28...\textit{d8} 29.\textit{e7 g5} 30.\textit{cxh6 \textit{d7}} 31.\textit{e3}
32.\textit{xc7 bxc5} 30.\textit{xe5 a4} 31.\textit{b5 \textit{b8}}
32.\textit{xc7 a3? [Allows #12. Stockfish 2.1.1}
JA: 32...\textit{c8} 33.\textit{b4 \textit{b7} 34.\textit{xa4} d4 + --
5.21/19, lasted longer, but White is going to
win of course] 33.\textit{a6 + 1-0}

The Excalibur portables are claimed to be of
similar strength to their table-top equivalents,
but I haven't found that to be so.

The \textit{Talking Touch Chess} is one of the port-
able Excalibur products, and it is basically an
earlier model than their popular \textit{New York}
touch chess computer. I have the latter, which
Countrywide have sold very successfully
over the last couple of years, and it's rated at
1530 Elo from games played by myself and
some \textit{SelSearch} readers.

However I did find the \textit{Talking Touch Chess} on Wiki at 1600 Elo, so they think the
series of programs is a bit higher than we have it.
Probably the actual playing engine has stayed the same over the 3 or 4 year
period and the pair are perhaps around 1560
Elo?!

See what you think from the following game,
against Novag's \textit{Star Ruby}, an established
1950 machine. I returned to Hiarcs13.2 for
the Blunder checking on this one, and have
added a couple of brief comments myself.

\textbf{\textit{Talking Touch Chess - Novag Star Ruby}}
\textbf{Opening D30. G/30}

1.\textit{d4 d5 2.\textit{c4 dxc4 3.e3 e5 4.\textit{xe4 e4}} 4.\textit{exe4}}

5.\textit{exe4 f6 6.\textit{f3 g7 [The TTC goes out of
book after this] 7.0-0 0-0 8.\textit{f4} [8.\textit{c3} (or
8.h3) 8...\textit{c6} 9.h3 \textit{a5} 10.\textit{d3} is usual.
The Star Ruby is now out of book] 8...\textit{g4}}
9.\textit{c3 \textit{xf3}}

10.\textit{gxf3? [Opening the g-file gives Black a
long-term weakness to aim its pieces at!}
10.\textit{xf3} has to be better, there's no need to
fear 10...\textit{xd4} because of 11.b3 \textit{b6} and
now 12.\textit{ad1} gives White a + = advantage]
10...\textit{bd7} 11.\textit{b5 c6} 12.\textit{c3 \textit{b6} 13.\textit{d3}
\textit{bd5} 14.\textit{g3 \textit{e8} 15.\textit{xd5} [15.\textit{e1}?]}
15...\textit{xd5}

[White's pawn structure and poor king
protection give Black the better chances
here. But the game is by no means lost with,
say, 16.\textit{e1 \textit{d8} 17.\textit{e5}] 16.\textit{f4}?! [This is
very loose. -1.67 Hiarcs 13.2 MP: 16.\textit{e1}]}
11...\texttt{c5} [2.50. The diagram would tell most folk that Black's opening play hasn't been particularly good. Even with Stockfish 2.1.1 JA's: 11...h5 12.\texttt{e2} \texttt{g4} 13.f3 e5 14.h3 \texttt{f8} 15.\texttt{b1} \texttt{d6} 16.\texttt{g5} \texttt{d8} 17.g3 h4 18.\texttt{xh4} \texttt{h6} 19.\texttt{g2} \texttt{h8} 20.\texttt{c4} 1.13/17 shows it would be struggling] 12.\texttt{d3} [0.96.
But Jester misses the best chance. Stockfish 2.1.1 JA shows: 12.e5 \texttt{d5} 13.\texttt{c4} \texttt{f4} 14.\texttt{g5} \texttt{c7} 15.f5 exf5 16.\texttt{xh5} 2.50/18] 12...\texttt{g6}? [2.50. It doesn't matter, GetClub has gone wrong again. Stockfish 2.1.1 JA: 12...\texttt{g4} 13.\texttt{h2} h5 14.h3 g6 15.\texttt{h1} \texttt{b8} 16.\texttt{xg6} \texttt{f2}+ 17.\texttt{h2} \texttt{g7} 0.96/18] 13.\texttt{e3} \texttt{h5} 14.\texttt{c4} \texttt{g4} 15.\texttt{g1} \texttt{g7} 16.\texttt{xf6}+ \texttt{h7} 17.e5

The Star Ruby won the match 9–1!

Back to GetClub which has since been 'improved two times'! Sanny says this means it is twice as good, not just two improvements. Let's see how it got on against the weak (<2000 Elo) Jester 3 weeks ago.

**Jester - GetClub Improved again**

1.e4 c5 2.\texttt{f3} d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.\texttt{x4} \texttt{f6} 5.\texttt{c3} a6 6.f4 \texttt{c7} 7.\texttt{xe6} bxc6 [Last book move All theory to here] 8.\texttt{c4} \texttt{c6} 9.\texttt{xe6} fxe6 10.0-0 \texttt{b6} 11.\texttt{h1}

You can rate these various dedicated computer ups or down maybe 50 Elo from my suggested figures if you wish, but one thing's clear - they all beat Sanny's '2400' GetClub! One thing's for sure, GetClub isn't a clone, it's all his own work - maybe we can give him some credit for that!

And I hope you've enjoyed playing chess at a lower level for a change, you know sometimes I get fed up of only looking at games I don't understand properly!
I promised in our last issue that I’d show you a game sent to me by reader John Sexton, so here it is. As you will see it contains a major shock ending!

**Novag Sapphire II - Mephisto Atlanta**

Time Control: 40/2 from John Sexton, 2006  
ECO Opening D67, Queen's Gambit Declined, Classical Main Line

1.d4 d5 2.c4 e6 3.\(\text{xc}3 \text{c6} 4.\text{g5} \text{e7} 5.\text{e3}\)  
0-0 6.\(\text{xf3} \text{bd}7 7.\text{xe1} \text{c6} 8.\text{d3} \text{dxc4}\)  
9.\(\text{xc4} \text{d5} 10.\text{xe7} \text{wxc7} 11.\text{e4}\)  
11.0-0 \(\text{xc3} 12.\text{xc3} \text{e5}\) is seen a little more often, but we (and our 2 dedicated computers) are still in their books as this is pretty much main line theory as the second most popular line

11...\(\text{e5}\)  
This is certainly known and, if you check your PC engines you’ll find some of them prefer this.

But mostly the GMs play 11...\(\text{xf6}\)  
12.\(\text{g3} \text{wxe4}+ 13.\text{wxd2} \text{wxd2}+ 14.\text{d2} \text{wxe2}\), though after 14...\(\text{d8}\) the game seems about equal

12.dxe5 \(\text{exe5} 13.\text{exe5}\)

This was the Sapphire's last book move, but the Atlanta stays in Book

13...\(\text{wxe5} 14.\text{xe5}\)?!  
Probably not best, preferable is 14.\(\text{xd5} \text{cxd5}\) and now 15.\(\text{xc3}\)

14...\(\text{d6} 15.\text{d3}\)?

This is also a mistake, and somewhat more serious. Correct was 15.\(\text{d5} \text{d5}\)  
16.\(\text{fxd5} \text{dxd5} 17.\text{c5} \text{dxc5} 18.\text{xd5} \text{cxd5=}\)  
So the Sapphire has played two consecutive non theory moves, the second especially being a mistake. Yet much to our surprise we find that the Atlanta is still in its book?! The opening book programmer seems to have prepared the line specifically against the Novag computer, but unfortu-

nately that someone must now have typed the wrong move for it!!

15...\(\text{wxe4}\)??

Of course the type—in should have sent the knight, not the queen, to f4!

If 15...\(\text{d7}\) leaving the e—pawne pinned, and best for White is 16.0-0 \(\text{d3} 17.\text{xc6} \text{xc6} 18.\text{xf7}+ \text{xf7} 19.\text{xc1}\). Here Black, with rook for knight+pawn, has an advantage, not overwhelming but probably sufficient to win eventually.

John tells me that, if you switch its book OFF, the Atlanta will play 15...\(\text{d7}\) every time!

16.\(\text{xf4}\)

...of course, and John switched the Atlanta off. I wonder if this opening book blunder bug appears in any other Mephisto machines?! Possibly not as the Atlanta had a bigger book than most others of its time, but someone with another Atlanta or a Milano Pro might feel it's worth checking out! 1-0

At about the same time Harvey Williamson sent me a game he'd been analysing from the Aeroflot Open in February of this year.

As most readers probably already know, Harvey is one of the Hiarcs engine team and also a titled Correspondence Chess player in his own right. So he's always on the lookout for new opening ideas and his contributions are welcome in Selective Search even if Cock de Gorter has, quite astonishingly, banned him from Leiden for complaining to Cock after he found he was using stolen software normally purchased from the Hiarcs website!

Harvey sent this game to me as it is not only interesting but there are some important moves in the attack which computers don’t manage to find! I have italicised Harvey's very helpful notes, and left my own (mostly about opening variations, in normal type.
this sacrifice. That White gets some compensation is clear: but whether or not it is enough... is up to the analysts. No doubt one could easily spend a few fun hours investigating it. Which I did!

Perhaps 18...xf3= was a safer alternative
18...gxh5 19...f5 e6

This is the second major crossroads.

Computer engines also suggest 19...f8 as an alternative for Black

20...xd6

My personal preference upon looking at the position for a bit, was 20...e2 with the idea of 20...f8 21.f3 followed by f4.

After a great deal of personal investigation, it seems as if this move is in fact the most promising. The reason for my preference for Ne2 is that I don't think White needs to try to cash in as quickly as possible. I think White can play for the slow-rolling attack, using his extra kingside pawns, and ALL his pieces, against the enemy king, while Black has yet to figure a way to bring in his queenside pieces into play, much less defend his precariously exposed king.

What now? 21...f6 is Houdini's choice after 15 mins of analysis. (21...c7 comes from DeepRybka4, then 22...f4 e5 23...xe6 fxe6 24...d4, the computer showing=)

22...f4 e6 23...xh5 g6 24...h1 w a5

Many engines actually now suggest 25.g4, but this is less promising than f4.

25.f4 ec5 26...d4. Even though this move is completely logical, some of the engines take a really long time finding it.

26...b5 27...h4 e6 28...e5!! Very curiously, the engines take an insanely long time finding this move. They suggest Be3 and then about equal. Some suggest Be3 which is
good, but the fact is that 28.Re3 is just winning.

On my laptop only Deep Fritz12 excelled, finding 28.Re3 in around 10 secs!

28...bxc4 (28...exd4 29.exd4 c5
30.\textit{xf}d1 exf6 31.f5 exd4 32.fxg6) 29.exg6
\textit{xf}h5 30.e8 \textit{xf}8 31.c3! \textit{h}6 32.g3!

Some are quicker than others but all the engines will climb to >1.00 for White here, and will keep on rising as they see the implications.

We now go back to the previous diagram, the one immediately before 20.\textit{xd}x6 which was the game move, and 20.\textit{e}2 which was Harvey's choice and which he's just analysed for us.

The engines actually all suggest 20.\textit{g}xg7 or \textit{e}2, two different moves entirely to those considered.

One person ran Stockfish on 8 cores for five hours and it said 20.\textit{e}2 was best and led to a repetition. 20.\textit{e}2 \textit{f}8=

Another put Houdini for TEN hours, and it suggested \textit{N}xg7 as leading to a draw by repetition. 20.\textit{g}xg7 \textit{g}xg7 21.\textit{e}2=

Needless to say I completely disagree with these moves out of principle.

Right, from the game move 20.\textit{xd}x6:

20...\textit{f}8 21.\textit{f}5 b6 22.\textit{e}2

22...\textit{g}e4?!

Presumably this was the point of b6 since otherwise White would be able to play Rx\textit{d}7 \textit{B}xd7 Bxc5 and the rook would be hanging. But Black should really have been trying to focus on bringing his pieces into play \textit{ASAP} instead of finding clever ways to win a pawn since he is in imminent danger of being run over.

More than one computer engine analysed the following improvement: 22.\textit{r}e8 23.\textit{d}f4
\textit{g}e5 24.\textit{h}xh5 \textit{xf}5 25.\textit{e}xf5 \textit{ad}8 and showed it as =. Would readers (or Harvey!) agree with that?

23.\textit{d}eg3

The engines now have White winning +

23...\textit{e}6 24.\textit{h}xh5 \textit{h}8 25.\textit{h}6?

Perhaps 25.\textit{f}4! is even better

25...\textit{g}h6?

Better seems 25...\textit{e}8! to give Black some sort of a fighting chance, but 26.\textit{e}3!
\textit{xe}3 27.\textit{xe}3 \textit{e}4 (27...\textit{e}4? 28.\textit{h}6+)
28.\textit{xe}4 \textit{xe}4 and here 29.\textit{g}7+ is surely winning though the engines disagree as to what saving chances Black might have. I think it's almost 1-0

26.\textit{g}7+ \textit{xe}7 27.\textit{xe}7 \textit{h}xh5 28.\textit{e}8+
\textit{g}7?

Maybe 28...\textit{f}8 was better, then 29.\textit{dd}8
\textit{g}7 30.\textit{xc}8 \textit{xc}8 31.\textit{xe}8 \textit{h}6. But White still has a winning position

29.\textit{c}3+ \textit{f}6 30.\textit{g}3+ \textit{g}5 31.\textit{e}7 \textit{e}5

32.\textit{x}c8 \textit{xc}8 33.\textit{d}x\textit{d}+ 1-0

I found this position in the always enjoyable CHESS magazine recently. It was part of an article written by GM Jim Plaskett in which he looked at a few positions he'd had, or nearly had, on the board.
This one was from an actual game:

FERNANDEZ GARCIA - JAMES PLASKETT

Plaskett admits that play had been far from perfect when the following position was reached after White's 25th. move.

25...d4!?
It is Plaskett who gives this the !?
The alternative would be 25...Ne4
29.Qe3 Qd5 with a small advantage for Black
26.Q5xd4?!
This time the ?! is mine. I nearly showed it as ? White had a better move available:
26.Ead1. Then 26...cd3 27.Exd3 c6
28.d6 Exd3 29.Wxd3 dxc3 30.exe8 which leaves Black with only a nominal advantage
26...cd3! 27.Exd1 Exd4 28.Exd3

The A on d4 is now attacked by 3 different pieces.
Black's next move is the real reason for including this game snippet.
STOP NOW and see if you can find it!
As a one-off move it gave me more pleasure than any single move has for quite some time. I thought it was delightful, and the more I considered White's options the bigger the smile it brought to my face
28...c6!
Yes, one of the nicest moves I've seen in ages. Of course the computer engines do find this, to save you checking!
The A on d4 is left en prise and can be taken by 3 different pieces, but for different reasons all of them lose! Check them out. All other defences also leave Black with an inning advantage.

One more, from the same article!

JIM PLASKETT - CLEMENT
Beniel Rapidplay. Sicilian Opening
1.e4 c5 2.df3 Ac6 3.d4 exd4 4.Axd4 Ac6
5.Ac3 Ac6 6.Bg5 e6 7.Ed2 da6 8.0-0 Ad7
9.f4 h6 10.Bh4 We7 11.Bf3 Ac7 12.e5 dx5
13.fx5 Ag8?!
Usual is 13...d5 14.Exd5 exd5 15.Axe7
Axc7=
14.Ae4 Bh4 15.Axh4 Aexe5?!
15...Axe7 is better, but 16.Af3+ 16.Ad6+
Af8 17.Af4!

Black doesn't have a good move now, but he does have a bad one!
17.f6?
No doubt thinking that the hole created on g6 doesn't matter, it's protected. But how many times do you see a move like White's next?!
STOP AGAIN NOW and turn your engines off... they get it of course, but can YOU..................

18.Axe5!! 1-0
I thought it might be interesting, once a year, to do a '10 Years Ago', article, and at a later date each year a '20 Years Ago' article. I am constantly amazed that Selective Search has been running long enough to do such a thing!

Selective Search in 2001!

- Selective Search cost £20 a year UK, and was always 32 pages. It was photocopied before printing, so the quality - especially photographs - were not up to today's standards!
- Deep versions of FRITZ and JUNIOR were appearing on very expensive new hardware in major tournaments, and SHREDDER soon followed. But commercial versions and Rating Lists were still SP. For most of us even a Penti-um4 was a rare sight!
- Ed Schroeder's REBEL Century3.0 P3/800 beat GM John van der WIEL (2640) by 3½-2½ at 40/2. Yes, a top GM beaten 10 years ago!
- JUNIOR6 won at Welser, SHREDDER5 won Paderborn, FRITZ6 won at Cadoques, FRITZ and Christophe Theron's Gambit TIGER shared 1 at Leiden.
- We analysed one of The Most Amazing Moves of All Time: Shirov's 1...Bh3!! in his 1998 game against Topalov at Linares. In those days the engines had to be shown 2.gxh3 Kf5 before some of them got the idea! It not only looks amazing, but after-the-game analysis showed it is the only move that guarantees the win.

- There was major controversy surrounding a match challenge by the computer World Champion, SHREDDER, to the human World Champion, KASPAROV. Would Kasparov accept? But others with financial and media clout thought it would be better if FRITZ or JUNIOR played, so they stepped in and invited Shredder's programmer, Stefan Meyer-Kahlen, to a qualifying tournament for these 3 engines. They gave Stefan 2 weeks to respond and collect up with a $5,000 entry fee! He refused. Despite a total outcry against this injustice from the rest of the computer chess world, Enrique Irazoqui was appointed to run a FRITZ v JUNIOR 24 game match (at his home!), on 2 'almost equal' PCs! Junior immediately went into a fantastic 5-0 lead, so Irazoqui changed the PCs round. He reckoned there was only 0.2% between their speeds, but Fritz soon started to pull back on the other PC and finally drew 12-12 before winning the 2 play-off games. Fritz had used the 'slightly faster' PC for 21 of the 26 games! But by now KRAMNIK had beaten Kasparov in their match, and FRITZ v KRAMNIK wouldn't take place until 2002 after all!
- Carl BICKNELL persuaded the UK's 2290 rated Chris BEAUMONT to play FRITZ6 on his P/933. The computer won 9-1 playing at 40/2.
- Early PALM handheld units were becoming available, but with Richard Lang's GENIUS program it was losing heavily to things like the RISC 2500 and SAPPHIRE2. Things would soon change with faster Palms, Pocket PCs... and Hiarc.
- Deep JUNIOR7 edged Greek GM Hristos BANIAKAS (2535) by 2½-1½ at a Blitz time control... not too convincing, and then Deep FRITZ in a sort of warm-up for Kramnik only drew 3-3 against GM Robert HUEBNER (2612).
- 2000's World Champion SHREDDER came 2nd. with 6/9 in the 2001 World Event. Deep JUNIOR won by 2 clear points in scoring a brilliant 8/9! But this was the start of World Championship controversy - it was all pretty friendly before the PC engines arrived! It was intended to be the usual 'Micro' event for single processors, so the engines would be on similar hardware. But folk with money and multi-engines persuaded the organiser David Levy to change the rules at the last minute and some engines turned up using multi-processors - e.g. Junior, Quest (Fritz), Ferret, Diep and Crafty, while others like Shredder, Tiger and Rebel played on singles. I'd say that, since 2001, hardware has determined the
The KRAMNIK CHALLENGE - DEEP FRITZ 'QUALITIES' AMIDST CONTROVERSY!

MOST of the following are EXTRACTS from MASSIVE correspondence relating to the KRAMNIK challenge. The editing has been done by myself (RJH), and this is necessary only because otherwise the subject would take up the whole of this issue of Selective Search. Most of the following are also extracted from an e-mail from the Millennium company.

1. SHREDDER challenges Gary Kasparov!

October 2000, we received this e-mail from an official of the Millennium company:

MILLENNIUM 2000, a Munich-based company, is representing Shredder, the reigning Computer Chess World Champion for all types of computers (including minicomputers and parallel processor machines). This title was first gained at the official World Championship 1989 in Paderborn (Germany), organised by the Information Computer Chess Association (ICCA). The program, by the young German programmer Stefan Meyer-Kahlen, also won the title of Microcomputer World Chess Championship in 1995, and restricted it for use in Germany during August 2000.

Computer Chess World Championship of the last 5 years:

1996 Amsterdam
Shredder defeated 3 litres
1997 Paris
1st pot 2 litres 3rd Shredder
1998 New York
1st pot 2 litres 2nd Shredder 3rd Fritz
2000 London
Shredder 2 litres 3rd ReichCentury & ChessBase

As can be seen, SHREDDER is the most successful chess program of the past few years in World Chess Association tournaments, and for that reason SHREDDER is challenging the world's strongest chess player of recent years.

On 20 April 2000, after receiving Gary Kasparov's choice, the number of games that had been played on the World Chess Association's official website had hit 60,000, so we are now forwarding this e-mail.

The chess will start challenging Garry Kasparov

2. 'The challenge'

April 20

First mail from the Millennium company:

The Millennium company is confident and successful in their challenge to Mr. Kasparov, who is the world's top chess player. They will announce the start date for the match, the number of games, and the conditions of play. The challenger will be playing for a prize of $20,000.

The Millennium company is confident and successful in their challenge to Mr. Kasparov, who is the world's top chess player. They will announce the start date for the match, the number of games, and the conditions of play. The challenger will be playing for a prize of $20,000.

The Millennium company is confident and successful in their challenge to Mr. Kasparov, who is the world's top chess player. They will announce the start date for the match, the number of games, and the conditions of play. The challenger will be playing for a prize of $20,000.

The Millennium company is confident and successful in their challenge to Mr. Kasparov, who is the world's top chess player. They will announce the start date for the match, the number of games, and the conditions of play. The challenger will be playing for a prize of $20,000.

Some of the pages from 2001! Note that there was World Championship controversy even then - PC engines had arrived!
### The CCRL and CEGT Rating Lists!

The very interesting CCRL & CEGT Website Groups have COMPLETE RATING LISTS for a wide range of PC hardware, and include old, new, interim and free versions, though they don't always both test exactly the SAME engines! I extract from the lists their ratings for engines when they're running on a Single Processors.

#### CEGT 40/20 32/64-bit 1 cpu Rating List

- [http://www.husvankempen.de/nunn](http://www.husvankempen.de/nunn)

Helps compare SOME engines at both 32 & 64-bit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HOUDINI 1.5A x64</td>
<td>3211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RYBKA 4.1 x64</td>
<td>3152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RYBKA 4 x64</td>
<td>3130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>STOCKFISH 2.1.1 x64</td>
<td>3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>STOCKFISH 2.01 x64</td>
<td>3120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RYBKA 3 x64</td>
<td>3099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>STOCKFISH 1.9.1 x64</td>
<td>3098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RYBKA 4 x32</td>
<td>3096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CRITTER 1.0 x64</td>
<td>3085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CRITTER 0.90 x64</td>
<td>3077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>RYBKA 3 x32</td>
<td>3050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NAUM 4.2 x64</td>
<td>3029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>KOMODO 1.3 x64</td>
<td>3021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>NAUM 4.2 x32</td>
<td>3006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CRITTER 0.80 x64</td>
<td>3006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>KOMODO 1.2 x64</td>
<td>3001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RYBKA 2.3.2a x64</td>
<td>2995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SHREDER 12 x64</td>
<td>2982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NAUM 4/4.1 x32</td>
<td>2976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>GULL 1.1 x64</td>
<td>2976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SJENG CT 2010 x64</td>
<td>2975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SPIKE 1.4 x32</td>
<td>2974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>HIARCS 13.2 x32</td>
<td>2964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>RYBKA 2.3.2a x32</td>
<td>2960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>DEEP FRIT 12 x32</td>
<td>2960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>PROTECTOR 1.4.0 x64</td>
<td>2958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SPARK 1.0 x64</td>
<td>2954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>RYBKA 1.2F x64</td>
<td>2949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>KOMODO 1.2 x32</td>
<td>2944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>JUNIOR 12.5 x64</td>
<td>2943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SPARK 0.5 x64</td>
<td>2940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>DOCH 1.3.4 x64</td>
<td>2932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>DEEP FRIT 11 x32</td>
<td>2930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>RYBKA 1.2F x32</td>
<td>2927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>FRITZ 12 x32</td>
<td>2924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>HIARCS 13/13.1 x32</td>
<td>2922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>FRITZ 11 x32</td>
<td>2913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>THINKER 5.40 INERT x64</td>
<td>2910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>SPARK 0.4 x64</td>
<td>2905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ZAPPA MEXICO II x64</td>
<td>2904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>SHREDER WM (BONN) EDITION x32</td>
<td>2901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>NAUM 3.1 x64</td>
<td>2894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>BOOGT 5.1.0 x64</td>
<td>2877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CCRL 40/40 32-bit 1 cpu Rating List

- [http://www.computerchess.org.uk/ccrl](http://www.computerchess.org.uk/ccrl)

An EQUAL, all 32-bit, comparison of the engines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RYBKA 4.1</td>
<td>3138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CRITTER 1.01</td>
<td>3120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STOCKFISH 2.01</td>
<td>3116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RYBKA 4</td>
<td>3115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>STOCKFISH 1.9.1</td>
<td>3101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RYBKA 3</td>
<td>3096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CRITTER 0.90</td>
<td>3089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>STOCKFISH 1.8</td>
<td>3085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NAUM 4.2</td>
<td>3056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NAUM 4/4.1</td>
<td>3047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SJENG 2010 CT</td>
<td>3036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SHREDER 12 OA=OFF</td>
<td>3032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CRITTER 0.80</td>
<td>3026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SPIKE 1.4 LEIDEN</td>
<td>3020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>RYBKA 2.3.2A</td>
<td>3016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>KOMODO 1.3</td>
<td>3016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>HIARCS 13.2</td>
<td>3013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>JUNIOR 12.5</td>
<td>3007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>KOMODO 1.2</td>
<td>2999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>GULL 1.0A</td>
<td>2998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>FRITZ 12</td>
<td>2988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>PROTECTOR 1.4.0</td>
<td>2981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>HIARCS 13/13.1</td>
<td>2980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>RYBKA 1.2F</td>
<td>2977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SPARK 1.0</td>
<td>2969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>KOMODO 1.0</td>
<td>2964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>NAUM 3/3.1</td>
<td>2963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>JUNIOR 12</td>
<td>2959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>FRITZ 11</td>
<td>2959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>THINKER 5.40 INERT</td>
<td>2958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>BOOGT 5.1.0</td>
<td>2951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>DOCH 1.3.4</td>
<td>2948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SHREDER 11</td>
<td>2935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>JUNIOR 11.1A</td>
<td>2933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>CYCLONE xTREME</td>
<td>2931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>TOGA II 1.4.1 SE</td>
<td>2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>GRAPEFRUIT 1.0</td>
<td>2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>SJENG 4.4.1</td>
<td>2927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>SPARK 0.4</td>
<td>2923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>HIARCS 12/12.1</td>
<td>2920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>SJENG 3.0</td>
<td>2917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>ZAPPA MEXICO 2</td>
<td>2913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>TOGA II 1.4 BETA5c</td>
<td>2908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEDICATED CHESS COMPUTER RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasc R30-1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto London 68030</td>
<td>2331</td>
<td>Novag EmlidClassic+Zircon2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasc R30-1993</td>
<td>2301</td>
<td>Mephisto Montreal+Roma68000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Genius2 68030</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>Mephisto Milano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto London Pro 68020</td>
<td>2292</td>
<td>Mephisto Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Lyon 68030</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>Mephisto Academy/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Portorose 68030</td>
<td>2265</td>
<td>Mephisto Mega/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto RISC2</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>Fidelity 6800 Mach2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Vancouver 68030</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>Kasparov Barracuda+Centurion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph Lyon+Vanc 68020/20</td>
<td>2245</td>
<td>Novag SuperForte+Expert B/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Berlin Pro 68020</td>
<td>2237</td>
<td>Kasparov Maestro D/10 module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov RISC 2500-512</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>Fidelity 6800 Mach2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph RISC1</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>Kasparov GK2000+Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Montreux</td>
<td>2209</td>
<td>Kasparov Explorer+TAdvTrainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov SPARC/20</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Kasparov AdvTravel+Bravo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Atlanta+Magellan</td>
<td>2191</td>
<td>Kasparov Talk Chess Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov RISC 2500-128</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>Mephisto Modena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto London 68020/12</td>
<td>2175</td>
<td>Mephisto Maestro C/8 module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Star Diamond/Sapphire</td>
<td>2164</td>
<td>Mephisto Supermondial2+College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Elite 68040v10</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>Mephisto Monte Carlo 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Vancouver 68020/12</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>Novag Super Forte+Expert A/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Lyon 68020/12</td>
<td>2136</td>
<td>Fidelity TravelMaster+Tiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Portorose 68020</td>
<td>2136</td>
<td>Fidelity 6800 Mach2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto London 68000</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>Novag Ruby+Emerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Sapphire+Diamond2</td>
<td>2120</td>
<td>Kasparov Travel Champion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Elite 68030v9</td>
<td>2113</td>
<td>CXG Sphinx Galaxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Vancouver 68000</td>
<td>2108</td>
<td>Conchess Pymate Victoria/5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Lyon 68000</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>Mephisto Monte Carlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Berlin 68000</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>Kasparov TurboKing2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph Master+Senator+MilPro</td>
<td>2104</td>
<td>Novag Expert/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Almeria 68020</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>Kasparov AdvTrainer+Capella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Sapphire+Diamond1</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>Conchess Pymate Roma/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM4/Turbo18</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>Fidelity Par Excellence/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Portorose 68000</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>Novag Club B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fid Mach4+Des2325+68020v7</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>Novag Expert/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Elite 2x68000v5</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>Novag Super Forte+Expert A/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Mega4/Turbo18</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>Fidelity Par Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Polgar/10</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>Fidelity Elite+Designer 2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Dallas 68020</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>Fidelity Chester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Roma 68020</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Kasparov TurboB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM6+ExploerPro</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>Fidelity Avant Garde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Brute Force</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Mephisto Rebell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov GK2100+Cougar</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Kasp Stratos+Corona+B/6mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Cosmos+Expert</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Novag Forte A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Almeria 68000</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Fidelity 6800 Club A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Citrine</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Excalibur Grandmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Scorpio+Diablo</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Kasparov Maestro A/6 module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasp Challenger+President</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Kasparov TurboKing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fid Mach3+Des2265+68000v2</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Conchess/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM4/10</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Mephisto Supermondial1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph Dallas 68000</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Conchess Pymate/5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Nigel Short</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>SciSys Turbo Kasparov/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM5</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Novag Expert/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Polgar/5</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Kasparov Simultano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Mondial 68000XL</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Fidelity Excellence/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Obsidian</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Fidelity Pymate/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov SuperForte+Expert C/6</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Fidelity Elite C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Star Ruby+Amber+Jade21952</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Fidelity Elegance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciSys Turbotar 432</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM2</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Excellence/3+Des2000</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Jade1+Zircon1</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov A/4 module</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchess/4</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Renaissance basic</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Prisma+Blitz</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Super Constellation</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Blitz module</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Super Nova</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Prestige+Elite A</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Supremo+SuperVIP</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Sensory 12</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciSys Superstar 36K</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Exclusive S/12</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph Chess School+Europa</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchess/2</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Quattro</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Constellation/3.6</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Elite B</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Primus+VIP</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Mondial2</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Elite original</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Mondial1</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Constellation/2</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXG Super Enterprise</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXG Advanced Star Chess</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag AgatePlus+OpalPlus</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Maestro+Cosmic</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excalibur New York touch</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Sensory 9</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Astral+Conquistador</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Cavalier</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chess 2001</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Mentor18+Amigo</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGM+Steinitz module</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excalibur Touch Screen</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto 3</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Turbo 24K</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciSys Superstar original</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGM+Morphy module</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Turbo 16K+Express</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto 2</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciSys C/C Mark6</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchess A0</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciSys C/C Mark5</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKing Philidor+Counter Gambit</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphy Encore+Prodigy</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargon Auto Response Board</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Solo</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXG Enterprise+Star Chess</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Chess Challenger Voice</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChessKing Master</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Chess Challenger 10</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boris Diplomat</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Savant</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boris 2.5</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>