MARK UNIACKE came round to ERIC’s for a Christmas Lunch Celebration of the HIARCS victory in the 2011 World Computer Chess Software Championship... and brought the World Championship Trophy along with him!
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FRITZ 13 - DUE OUT 17/10/11

"Let's Check" is the revolutionary new feature of Fritz 13. With it Fritz 13 users can join a worldwide community that will put together a giant knowledge base for chess. Whenever you analyse a position to any meaningful depth with any engine Fritz 13 will, if you allow it, send the main line and evaluation to a central server, to be shared by all participating users. Soon you will be able to find deep analysis to almost every position you look at – instantly, pre-generated by the finest engines in the world, running on the most powerful machines available. Gone are the days where you would have to wait for your computer to reach substantial depth in order to make sure you are not falling into a trap. You will even be able to see the analysis of different chess engines and compare their results – all without a second of waiting time.

Discover a position! It does not matter whether you are a beginner, a club player or a Super-GM. If you use a powerful engine to analyse a previously unknown position with the Let's Check function switched on, you will be automatically registered as the "discoverer" of that position.

Conquer chess positions! Let's Check keeps updating the evaluations to any given position with newer, deeper analysis as this becomes available. Using powerful machines and the latest engines allows you to "conquer" positions, with your name attached to the newest, deepest analysis. You can also add comments to your analysis, which other users will see when they encounter the position.

Even if you are not an openings expert you can become one using Let's Check. The entire body of openings theory is built into the system, and Let's Check provides you instantly with the statistics of any position in the opening: how often did it occur, which moves were played, with what success. The openings book (LiveBook) is updated on a weekly basis and will show you which variations are currently topical and how good they are. It will also reveal which lines are being analysed and debated in the international community, and with what conclusions.

Other new features in Fritz 13:
- Enhanced database management
- Improved user interface in Windows
- New and more powerful Fritz 13 engine, especially tuned for deep analysis.
- Updated database and opening book.

ORDER NOW FOR JUST £40
(including free delivery to all UK customers) RRP £44.95

To order call 01353 740 323 or 020 7288 1305 or order online - www.chess.co.uk/shop
Welcome to another issue of Selective Search... no. 158. 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, and also you can make sure it’s been updated after you’ve made a renewal payment!

I cannot take credit card renewals now, but I have organised a PayPal account for myself (ericallsworth@gmail.com). You can access it at my website and renew your sub. quite easily.

A SINCERE THANKS to everyone who has taken the opportunity to re-subscribe using PayPal! I set this up because I don’t have access to a credit card facility since my retirement, but PayPal seems to work well, so thank you!

PAYING YOUR SUBSCRIPTION
For the moment all subscriptions can be paid in the following ways...

- 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!
- by PayPal. If you have a PayPal account you can use it to send your subscription to [ericallsworth@gmail.com] or, even easier, go to my website www.elchess.demon.co.uk and click on Pay Subscription by PayPal in a central box near the top, read the instructions there and then click on the ‘Donate’ button!

I USUALLY like to start with a general NEWS Section, but that would mean readers opening this issue of Selective Search to more depressing news on the Rybka ban front. That will follow, but instead we’ll get going with...

NEW CHESS SOFTWARE PRODUCTS!

THERE ARE some New Software engines out which will certainly be of interest to my readers, especially the free ones no doubt! Let’s start with the commercial ones...

Very soon, if not already when you get this through your letterbox, there will be new uci versions of Junior and Hiarc.s, and these will both be available from the Hiarc.s website...

- www.hiarc.s.com

Junior 13 was intended to be the release of the new World Champion engine, but it has been delayed waiting for the final Junior 13 opening book which, I am told, is significantly stronger than the Junior 12 book. The Deep Junior engine is also going through extensive testing to ensure that it offers the best possible strength against other engines although programmer Amir Ban is absolutely certain it is already between 30-40 Elo stronger than 12.5 - and it did win the World Championship after all!

Next we come to Hiarc.s WCSC Tilburg which is of course the new World Software Champion.

Of course my readers will know that programmer Mark Uniacke and I are good friends, so I am always likely to be a little biased! I admire Mark and his work greatly because he has stuck to his guns and stayed true to his beliefs about how a chess engine should be programmed and play. This has meant that while he has seen the minimum chess code fast searchers going past him in Computer v Computer Elo ratings, he has refused to be moved into doing a speed rewrite of Hiarc.s, which would mean removing much of its specialised chess knowledge, or even being tempted to start again working from one of the easily available speed engine codes and then seeking to add selected ‘Hiarc.s knowledge’ to that. Instead he has
continued to work hard testing the Hiarc's knowledge code and making improvements to it. Mark's priority is to make Hiarc play as strongly as possible but in an interesting and humanlike style. The fact that a limited knowledge speed merchant can beat Hiarc in computer vs computer must mean that some of the knowledge can be improved on, perhaps (quite probably) some knowledge overlaps, perhaps some is surplus. But at the end of the day, as far as Mark is concerned, Hiarc must retain its character and style, it must be useful for even the strongest players to be able to use it valuably for opening preparation, the creation of new, interesting over-the-board ideas, position and game analysis. And I am in full support of this outlook.

Okay, that's off my chest. The good news is that the WCSC version is a really good improvement not only in Elo terms but also retaining all the style and all that's good in the Hiarc engine! It's 'the same' Hiarc but at least 80 Elo stronger in computer vs computer games than Hiarc13/13.1/13.2 - in fact the team that tests Hiarc believe it's just over 100 Elo, but I don't want to be accused of exaggerating.

The Hiarc WCSC Tilburg version should be available from the Hiarc website by the time you are reading this.

Additionally there is the new Hiarc 13h Tournament Opening Book. This is considerably bigger than the previous 13g Book and includes all the work that Mark did preparing for the World Championship, adding top Grandmaster games, and some tweaks after the World Championship to make sure it retains all of its freshness and strength. Mark tells me that this book has comfortably defeated all other opening books that he has played it against, both commercial and private! I really do recommend this Book for anyone interested in Openings.

Finally Mark is working with another Computer Programmer on his own Hiarc GUI! Typically this also is aimed specifically at the chess player of whatever strength. Some of its new features to aid study, preparation, game comparison, IM/GM player opening preferences and style are quite brilliant as well as being unique and, because purchasers can also include access from within the engine, when it's actually on your PC screen and in use, to an OnLine continually being updated Hiarc Tournament Book, with all the game statistics behind it, I believe it will be the very best GUI there is for all chess players. Mark brought it round for me to 'have a play with' just before Christmas, and I had a wonderful time with it!

Still with the commercial engines there is an update for the Houdini 2 engine. You buy this from...

- www.cruxis.com/chess

which is programmer Robert Houdart's own website. Also there is a Convecta version on dvd which you can buy from Countrywide or Chess & Bridge. Both 2.0b and 2.0c versions came out at the end of 2011, so if you buy and download now it is 2.0c you'll get. If you purchased the original, Robert gives free updates via the Internet, so you should already have been told.

My results with 2.0b weren't as good as they had been with the original, but 2.0c has done well.

Okay, over to the freebies!

We got news of a new Critter 1.4 at the end of December. It's a uci engine of course and you can get this from the Critter website...

- www.vlasak.biz/critter

There was some trouble with this at first as it wasn't working properly under the ChessBase gui, but a corrected version came out soon after and was doing well, except that now it was losing some Blitz games on time. Finally that was corrected so you can download this one happily, and it seems to be about 25 Elo better than previous version 1.2, and only about 40 Elo behind Houdini. However it does seem to draw quite a lot of games, a characteristic of the defensive nature of the fast-deep search method which looks to avoid mistakes in preference to finding winning moves.
One extra possibility readers might like to try is that I saw some reports and results that indicated that Critter1.4 performs slightly better with Minimum Search Depth (msd) changed from the default 5 to 8, and I also got a small improvement with this on my 64-bit quad.

Shortly after this a new **Stockfish 2.2** was announced, but this was losing some Blitz games on time under the ChessBase gui. As I almost always test with a time addition per move - e.g. G/5+3 - I never saw this and thought it was a worthwhile upgrade, but the IPON list withdrew it as the impact of the G/5 type losses made it seem worse than 2.1!

(Strange that both Critter and Stockfish came out with time issues in new versions so close to each other - I leave you to work that one out!).

Anyway we then got a 2.2.1 version, but that went worse in my testing. Then a new 2.2.1 came out which was about 5% faster but no improvement. I should mention that the 'basic' versions for 32-bit and 64-bit older PCs didn't seem to be affected as much as the SSE42 compiles for newer i5 and i7 processors. Next came a 2.2.2, but that wasn't working properly in 64-bit mode, only running on 1 core/thread. At last a new Jim Ablett compile of 2.2.2 for SSE42 was produced, and that seems to be fine! It is approximately 15 Elo above the previous version Stockfish 2.1, and equal to Critter 1.2.

You can get Stockfish from...
- www.stockfish.com

I've played quite a few 60 game matches using my ELH openings testset, and here are the main results I had:

- Critter 1.4 v Critter 1.2 33½-26½
- Critter 1.4 v Houdini 2.0c 21½-38½
- Critter 1.4 v Rybka 4.1 33-27
- Critter 1.4 v Stockfish 2.1.1 33½-27½
- Critter 1.4 v Stockfish 2.2 29½-30½
- Stockfish 2.2 v Stockfish 2.1.1 32-28
- Stockfish 2.2 v Houdini 2.0c 23½-36½
- Stockfish 2.2 v Rybka 4.1 31½-28½

There are also new **Ivanhoe 999946** versions but these need you to download another completely new Tablebase set so I haven't bothered! And **Komodo 4** has come out, but still SP and now commercial, and I'm not interested in **paying** for an SP only engine, so I haven't seen it. Also I've seen a new **Robbylot 0.10** version. The last time this was being worked on (pre Firebird/Fire releases, which are no longer available), it was SP only, but the new version is MP. However first impressions are not so great...
- Robbolot 0.10 v Houdini 2.0c 22½-37½

**CHESS: NEWS SECTION**

Well, I've not not been looking forward to it, but it has to be done...

**THE RYBKA SCANDAL AND BAN CONTINUES TO RAISE HACKLES!**

WHEN ANYTHING NEW happens in the Computer Chess world, the thing I usually do is log on to one of the Chess websites or popular forums where you can be sure to get the latest information, and some opinion/s!

The forums I visit are Computer-Chess Wiki, Hiarc, OpenChess and TalkChess, or for new engine news Ridderkerk and Jim Ablett. General Chess and Computer Chess news can be found at ChessVibes, and there's TWIC and Chessbase for other chess news. These were all visited when cloning concerns re-appeared early in 2011, and Selective Search issues 152-157 have covered developments as fairly as I felt I could without becoming an opinionless robot.

Surprisingly I should have deleted one from the above list as the Chessbase website had consistently failed to mention anything about it at all during the accusations, the programmers' complaint to the ICCA, the David Levy and team investigation and subsequent report with their decision banning Rybka and stripping it and programmer Vasik Rajlich of all titles, a procedure which took over 6 months. Nor did they mention the ban, or make any effort to support Rajlich,
their top engine producer, while all of this was going on.

As David Levy commented: 'It was the biggest computer chess story of recent years, but the editorial team of Chessbase didn't cover it'.

Then, out of the blue and nearly 12 months after all this started, an article finally appeared on their website in January 2012, and in defence of Rybka and Railich. They were defending something they now said was "A Gross Miscarriage of Justice", which had been "widely reported in the global media", but which they themselves had never mentioned a word of!

The article was produced in 4 parts over 4 days, and the first part seemed to imply that it was some voluntary research done by a keen amateur, though with chess and computer credentials, and a doctorate and PhD in Maths from a prominent English University. So it was presented initially as if Dr. Soren Riis was curious about what had happened and had taken it upon himself to investigate the whole matter. And now, as a result of his efforts, he had concluded that Rybka and Railich might be innocent, and had made his work and findings available to Chessbase.

But it didn’t take long for the alert and knowledgeable Internet computer chess community to caution the innocent and gullible, letting them know that Riis is actually a Moderator on the Rybka forum no less, and has been a supporter for ages! There's nothing wrong with that, of course, I'm a Hiarcs fan - but so much for impartial reporting.

By part 3 of his report he was admitting his allegiance and Rybka involvement, and also that Vasik Railich had supplied information and helped him compile the defence.

To present both sides more fully here I should add that one of the original complainant programmers, Ed Schroder, and another programmer from some years ago, Chris Whittington of CS-Tal fame, have joined the Railich side, though some of their defence seemed to be more of a complaint against 'the rule' than any suggestion that Rybka was unique code from the very beginning. I think it is pretty well proven that Rybka was once built on Crafty, and in its new strong form of Rybka1.0, built on Fruit2.2.1. Certainly Bob Hvatt and Fabien Letouzey, the respective Crafty and Fruit programmers, are certain and have testified that this is the case, as have many other respected programmers.

'The rule' in question is: 'Each program must be the original work of the entering developers. Programming teams whose code is derived from or including game-playing code written by others must name all other authors, or the source of such code, in their submission details. Programs which are discovered to be close derivatives of others (e.g., by playing nearly all moves the same), may be declared invalid by the Tournament Director after seeking expert advice. For this purpose a listing of all game-related code running on the system must be available on demand to the Tournament Director.'

Some argue that the rule is out-of-date because it is virtually impossible to start from scratch without using some ideas already in use regarding the playing board, piece movement and the like. But of course what is at issue is whether the playing engine's method, ideas, algorithms and code is the programmers own, and not taken from another. The rule clearly give a fair and reasonable provision for naming others when an engine is entered in an ICCA/ICGA tournament where someone else's code has been used in it.

If I steal £1,000 from someone's wallet, and invest it (or put the money on a fast horse which wins) and end up with £5,000, how much of the £5,000 is now legitimately mine?! Does it make it now right that I stole the £1,000 because I improved on it? Have I become innocent thanks to my success with someone else's stolen money? The idea that, if a programmer steals code and manages to make a 200/400/600 Elo improvement on it, then he now hasn't stolen it because of his success and value to the computer chess fraternity, and should be declared innocent and given awards, doesn't make logical, legal or right sense to me.

David Levy uses another comparison: 'How would we view an Olympic athlete found guilty of taking performance enhancing drugs if he performed superbly, winning races by huge margins, breaking world records and taking gold medals? Would he be forgiven his drug taking just because his
performances were so outstanding?"

Dr Riis points out that RaiJlich admitted on his own website forum to 'going through the Fruit code forwards and backwards' and making use of it, but Vasik said that he didn't get much from it... 'my wild guess is that Rybka would be 20 rating points weaker had Fruit not appeared'. Who believes that?! And why did he declare and make it show on our PC displays a nodes per second count and search depth indicating that it was a (very) slow searcher and reached much lower depths than almost all competitors, when in fact it is a fast searcher and, at that time, reached greater depths than almost any other engine? I'd suggest to hide a guilty truth.

Anyway, David Levy on behalf of the ICGA as its President has now written a very fair, and gracious but fact-filled defence of the ICGA conclusions, decision and judgement.

He discusses 'How the Scandal Started' and states that he believes that the bare facts of the case, as presented by the ICGA, are beyond dispute. He goes on to comment on and correct many of the Riis comments, quoting statements actually made by RaiJlich in the past as well as the views of other programmers, with details of comparisons of the Fruit and Rybka code.

In a paragraph headed 'Biased Reporting' he answers the unfounded Riis criticism that the investigating panel was determined to destroy RaiJlich, and decided who was and was not allowed to participate. He reveals that RaiJlich refused 'multiple requests' to join the investigating panel, and that Rybka's newest supporters Ed Schroder and Chris Whittington were initially included on the panel but removed themselves for no stated reasons. This is a lengthy paragraph dealing with and finding fault with many other issues before moving on to a 'Summary' in which Levy promises a robust technical rebuttal to the Riis article in due course.

Considering the aggressive and dubious nature of the Riis report, the Levy reply is a welcome, factual, carefully thought out and fairly worded and presented response.

I found complete pdf files of the Riis article, also one by Ed Schroder, the Levy response, and a separate technical response by Mark Watkins (not the forthcoming ICGA one, but a knowledgeable one discussing code similarities), and a brief comment by Vasik RaiJlich, all on the ChessVibes website...

- www.chessvibes.com

By all means visit it if you want to go through the whole thing for yourselves.

I doubt if we'll have heard the last of it!

---

**FRANK HOLT - A FASCINATING ENGAME!**

Our good friend Frank Holt has been having considerable computer troubles recently, as we've reported. His main PC has been locking up mid-game. This was initially diagnosed as a dust problem - a 'look after your PC' article appeared on the Chessbase website recently but, as Peter Grayson said... "Selective Search got there first!" But cleaning the PC only proved to be a temporary solution and Frank's PC has been back and forth to the suppliers and the manufacturers a few times in the last couple of months.

However he's been playing games on his i7/266GHz and sent me a very interesting endgame from a G/15 match. It's especially interesting because Stockfish (which doesn't use tablebases) outplayed Critter (which does!). This was even more interesting to me as Peter Grayson and I have been looking at one or two endgames with quality play by Stockfish. If you try Stockfish on the Eigenmann Endgame Test it doesn't do quite as well as 3 or 4 top engines with tablebases, but it still scores highly, as we showed in the last issue:

- 87 Houdini2 Pro
- 85 Rybka 4.1 SSE42
- 79 Naum 4.2
- 78 Stockfish 2.1.1 (no tablebases!)
- 78 Critter 1.2
- 78 Zappa Mexico 2
- 73 Shredder 12
- 69 Hiarcs 13 32-bit
- 65 Junior 12.5
- 55 Fritz 12 32-bit

But in games its endgame play can seem more dynamic and aware of possibilities. Here's the game that Frank sent me!
Stockfish 1.7.1 - Critter 1.2

1.c4 c5 2.d3 c6 3.g3 e6 4.e3 c6 5.e4 d5 6.exd5 cxd5 7.0-0 e7 8.d4 0-0 9.e4
b6 10.d5 exd5 11.exd5 b4 12.e1 c4
13.a3 a6 14.a4 c5 15.a5 b3 16.axa2
xc1 17.xc1 dx7 18.xf4 xc5 19.xf3
6d6 20.xxc6 xxc5 21.xd4 xxd7 22.b4 c6
23.xd4 xb4 24.xf4 xxxf4 25.xe4 xg6
26.d6 xfd8 27.xb2 xdx6 28.xdx6 xdx6
29.xc3 h6 30.xb7 xxf5 31.xc1 g6 32.xf1
xe6 33.xd7 h5 34.xc4 xc5 35.xe6 xc6
36.xed1 h4 37.xc6 xh8 38.xd5 xf6
39.xa7 xeb2 40.xf1 xd4 41.xg2 h3+
42.xh3 xf2 43.xxf2 xf2 44.xxf2 xf2
45.xd4

62...xe1+ or xd3 were much better, we see why with the next Stockfish move 63.xg3!
Enabling the h-pawn to advance 63...e1+
44.xf3

64...e6 A new series of checks with 64...h1+ leads to 65.xf4 xh2+ 66.xe4
xxh3, but now 67.xe5! xf5+ 68.xd6
xf8+ 69.xc6 xc8+ 70.xb6 xh8+ 71.xa6 and the checks have ended so
71...g8 72.xf5+ xh7 73.xg6! wins as
Black cannot protect the g6-pawn with xg7 because of 74.xb7+! h5! is now a
potential threat in many situations 65.xg8
65.xh3 doesn't get anywhere because
after 66.xe2 xh8? cannot be played
because all the initiative passes to White
with 67.xe7+! 66.xf4 The Stockfish
evaluation now stands at +4.52 66...d7? A
fatal mistake, allowing the a-pawn to
progress. 66...h7 was better though
67.xe7+ xg8 68.xb6! will still win.
67.a6! Stockfish jumps to +6.42, Critter
with its tablebases only has +2.84, but the
game is lost! 67.xd2+ 68.xe4 xh2+
69.xd4 xg2+ 70.xc4 xe2+ 71.xb4 xh2+
72.xa5 xa2+ 73.xb6 xe6+ 74.xc7

Stockfish has found a safer place for its king
where it will be much more difficult to get
him in check 58...g8 59.h3 xe2 60.xb8+!
Stockfish gets its queen closer to its poten-
tially dangerous a-pawn promoter!
60...f7 61.xe7+ xg8 62.xc5 xh7?

74...xa6 The position is hopeless, Black
only had one available check anyway (with-
out losing its queen): 74...xg7+ 75.xd8
xa2 76.a7 xd2+ 77.xc8 xg2 78.xc4+
m/18 75.xd5+ m/22 75...xh8 76.xd8+
xg7 77.xd7+ xg8 78.xc8+ 1-0
Hi Eric,

I mentioned in my assessment of Critter 1.4's initial batch of games that it seemed to be a bit of a draw merchant and as a consequence it was likely to drop points to lower rated engines. To confirm this I ran Critter 1.4 against HIARCS 13.2 to compare outcome against projected Elo expectancy. As suspected HIARCS came out of this better than the Elo tables would suggest. There were also some games with low move totals and positive results and, as so often happens, the fastest win was by HIARCS with Black in a beautifully played Nimzo-Indian. I concluded some time ago that engines seem to struggle with the ideas for Black in this opening but in this case it seemed well suited for HIARCS style, exposing what seems to be a space knowledge problem for Critter.

So often I have criticised HIARCS (and I think you have too) for getting into a cramped position but the attached game No.47 shows Critter has that same problem with its pieces being caught on the wrong side of the board, allowing HIARCS to do what it does best and develop an overwhelming King attack. The two games in the attached file are both game 47, first from HIARCS' evaluation perspective and then Critter's. I've added some comments to the first game.

Interestingly, Black's line appears in the HIARCS 13h book with 9...a6!? and just one game for 10.Qe7! After which I certainly do not see White's position as cramped and each side has an opening legacy of one undeveloped bishop. A good line choice by Noomen because 10...Qe7 is the last HIARCS book move although 11.Na2 is in the Fritz books. Whites 12.Ba2 looks wrong allowing 12...e4 that seems to lock down White's position. I think 12.dxe or maybe 12.d5 was the move for White. Only concern from HIARCS' perspective was the -#185 evaluation at move 41...Qxg4. It shows same deep mate when running in the Arena 3 gui too, so this is engine not GUI interpretation issue.

When I see HIARCS play like this I think maybe it would not take too much to bring it back into contention with the top engines so perhaps there is still hope yet!?

Best regards,
Peter

Critter 1.4 x64 +GaviotaTB -
HIARCS 13.2 MP
5/40+5/40+5/40 Newport, South Wales

1.d4 ²f6 2.c4 e6 3.²c3 ²b4 4.e3 0-0 5.²d3
d5 6.²f3 c5 7.0-0 dxe4 8.²xc4 ²bd7 9.²e2
a6 10.a4 ²e7

Last book move – and I do not see any particular spatial problem for White here with balanced development for both sides, each having an undeveloped queenside bishop. 11.²d1 c5 0.38/15 10 12.²a2
dxe5) This seems to be the cause of White's problem inviting Black's reply that gave it a significant spatial advantage. 12.dxe5 seems to keep the position sufficiently open for White. 12.d5!? may be giving Black something to think about with the well trodden idea of a passed central pawn. 12...e4!

−0.14/17 11 13.²d2 ²e8 −0.10/17 0
14.²b1 (Nc4) perhaps this is why Critter allowed the Black pawn to e4. Maybe the bishop to knight weighting is too high and it
did not anticipate Black exchanging or that it was beneficial for White if Black did so? 14...\textbf{xc3} Usually expected at some point in the Nimzo-Indian! 0.00/17 11 \textbf{bxc3} \textbf{b6} 0.10/16 13 \textbf{h3} (Re1) addressing the threat of ...\textbf{g4} but perhaps the suggested Re1 was better. 16...\textbf{d7}

Completing HIARCS development and leaving White with a cramped position with so many pieces on the queenside back rank -0.03/16 11 \textbf{a5} Perhaps an attempt to put pressure on c5 with the idea of Ba3 and Qc4. 17...\textbf{bd5} 0.00/18 9 \textbf{c4} \textbf{b5} 0.00/17 11 \textbf{b3} From a human perspective, all of White’s pieces have moved to the queenside leaving little for the defence the King. Personally I prefer a more prophylactic approach. 19...\textbf{c4} 0.01/18 11 \textbf{c2} (Qa3) 20...\textbf{xc4} keeping the focus where White’s pieces are and drawing attention from the King. 20...\textbf{xc4} 21...\textbf{xc4} \textbf{ac8} 22...\textbf{f1} \textbf{xc3} 23...\textbf{d2} restores some defence for White. It’s interestingly balanced with White’s passed d pawn and Black’s queenside pawn majority and the b7 pawn could be a weakness for Black. At least there are opportunities for White to expand out.

20...\textbf{c7} Simple but nice. Putting pressure on a5, supporting c4 and control of B8 to H2 diagonal. 0.06/17 7 21...\textbf{b2} Highlighting White’s spatial problem. The bishop would like to be on a3 but Black just takes the a5 pawn. 21...\textbf{e6} 0.05/18 4 22...\textbf{e1} \textbf{e7} The knight manoeuvres begin. With White effectively chocking, Black can use its spatial advantage to mount a king attack. 0.03/19 0 22...\textbf{a8} 23...\textbf{a2} \textbf{e7} transposes to the game moves. 23...\textbf{a2} \textbf{e8} 0.06/18 0 24...\textbf{a3} \textbf{f5} -0.28/19 0. Not 24...\textbf{xa5}? 25...\textbf{xe7} \textbf{xe7} 26...\textbf{xc4} \textbf{b6} 27...\textbf{xb5}

(27...\textbf{eb1} \textbf{c8} 28...\textbf{xb5} axb5 29...\textbf{b3}±) 27...\textbf{xb5} 28...\textbf{eb1} ± (28...\textbf{c4} \textbf{c6} 29...\textbf{eb1}) 28...\textbf{c6} 29...\textbf{c4} 25...\textbf{d1} \textbf{h4} -0.39/18 0 26...\textbf{b2} (Kh1) Critter’s evaluation started to go negative here too.

26...\textbf{d7} -0.41/18 19. 26...\textbf{d5!} 27...\textbf{h5} \textbf{xg2}!! 28...\textbf{xg2} \textbf{g6}+ 29...\textbf{h1} \textbf{h6} 30...\textbf{g5} \textbf{c8}+ 27...\textbf{h1} \textbf{g6} -0.60/18 4 28...\textbf{g1} \textbf{f6} -0.82/17 8 29...\textbf{f1} \textbf{d8} -1.23/17 0 30...\textbf{h2} \textbf{d5} -1.49/17 0 31...\textbf{f1} (Ba3) 31...\textbf{h6} -2.41/17 21 32...\textbf{e2} (g4) 32...\textbf{d5} -5.49/19 13

33...\textbf{f1} \textbf{f3} -5.53/19 0 34...\textbf{gf3} \textbf{xf3} -5.69/19 0 35...\textbf{xf3} \textbf{xf3} -6.24/19 0 36...\textbf{f4} \textbf{xa5} -6.49/19 14 37...\textbf{g5} (Bb3)

37...\textbf{c4} -8.71/20 20 38...\textbf{e2} (Kg2) 38...\textbf{c2} -12.50/21 35 39...\textbf{b1} (Ba3)

39...\textbf{e2} -14.84/21 33 40...\textbf{g3} (j5) 40...\textbf{g4} -19.40/18 22 41...\textbf{g4} \textbf{xf4} -#185/16 8 42...\textbf{g1} \textbf{e2} -#14/17 6 43...\textbf{f5} (Rg2) 43...\textbf{xf2} -#11/18 7 44...\textbf{g2} \textbf{e1}+ -#10/20 0 45...\textbf{g1} \textbf{h4} -#9/22 0 46...\textbf{g2} \textbf{xe3} -#8/24 0 47...\textbf{g1} (a5) 47...\textbf{e1}+ -#7/25 9 48...\textbf{f1} \textbf{f3} -#6/30 5 49...\textbf{h2} \textbf{xf1} -#5/47 2 50...\textbf{gx7}+ \textbf{g7} -#4/62 0 51...\textbf{f6}+ \textbf{xf6} -#3/62 0 52...\textbf{c1} \textbf{f2}+ -#2/62 0 53...\textbf{h3} \textbf{d7} # 0-1
A beautiful game by HIARCS, and when I see it play like this I think that maybe it would not take too much to bring it right back into contention with the top engines.

Peter was also testing the newest Stockfish version (2.2.1) as well as the latest Critter (1.4), and a week or so later he sent me all his final scores.

Completed outstanding matches with results as follows...

Critter 1.4 won its match against Stockfish 2.2.1. Critter had a purple patch of 6 consecutive wins games 9 to 16 and Stockfish never recovered from that. Perhaps another run may give closer outcome. However the completed table shows there is not much to choose between Critter, Stockfish and Deep Rybka with about a 20 Elo range from this set of results. Deep Rybka continued to frustrate with its inability to follow through its mate announcements and that is one of several improvements needed to polish up the engine in my view.

In summary:

**Houdini 2.0c x64 GTB**
- Very efficient, adventurous engine with about the right balance of prophylactics. Scope for some endgame improvement but as it stands, the leader by some margin.

**Critter 1.4**
- Gives a tough game but direction seems to be less adventurous resulting in tendency to draw. May cost it points against weaker engines.

**Stockfish 2.2.1**
- No EGTB capability undoubtedly cost it points so scope for major improvement there. Evaluation unstable giving some very odd eval scores during some positions in a game. Main issue is where it shows a 0 eval several times during a sequence of large positive or adverse scores and then reverts back to the previous score.

**Deep Rybka 4.1 x64 LP**
- Now others have caught it and overtaken it, the holes were showing in some of its analysis and move choices plus the inability to complete the projected mating sequence is particularly frustrating. Creaking at the joints!

**HIARCS 13.2 MP**
- Chosen as the weaker element over Zappa Mexico II because it is still current and under development. Perhaps a little unfair because its stated aim is to play human-like chess. Showed it is still capable of causing an upset in individual games but its endgame needs some work!

Best regards................. Peter

Thanks Peter for another outstanding contribution! Cheers - Eric
The WORLD COMPUTER CHESS CHAMPIONSHIPS, Tilburg 2011

I managed to squeeze in only the results of the annual World Computer Chess Championships, for 2011 held in Tilburg, at the end of our last issue. So in this and our next issue I will be looking at the Event in more detail.

There are two main Tournaments, the World Computer Chess Championship [WCCC] where the engines play on their own hardware which can be at a remote site which they access from Tilburg via the Internet, and the World Chess Software Championship [WCSC] where the engines play on exactly equal hardware as provided by the Tournament event holders, the ICCA.

In both Tournaments the stars were Junior and Hiarc's, and readers, knowing of my involvement with Hiarc's over many years, will understand that I would have loved to cover the WCSC in this issue, with Hiarc's winning. However at the World Championships they ran the WCCC first, so I am resisting temptation and covering the Event in chronological order!

One of my readers, John Hamlen, UK programmer of Woodpusher, kindly sent me details of the engines and hardware. I think that John just likes to enter the Championship every 10 years or so and, for 2011, he entered with his 1997 version running on a 1 Core (SP) PC!

The pre-tournament consensus of opinion was that the Title would be fought out between three main engines - Hiarc's, Junior and Shredder. Junior was just about on the fastest hardware of the three and Amir Ban believes he has improved on Junior12.5 by around 30-40 Elo. I don't think Stefan has done a lot of work on the Shredder engine as he's been working on where there's a bit of money, the mobile versions. I know that Hiarc's has been improved quite a bit since 13.2 (actually 13.1 was a touch stronger in my view) and, though Mark continues to work on its skills rather than its speed - for play against and use by humans - this has resulted in at least an 80 Elo improvement against computers. So I rather fancied Hiarc's might win. Then there were believed to be three good 'outsiders', each able to score a ½ or even a 1 against the top engines 'on their day' but probably not good enough to do so consistently. These were Jonny, Pandix and The Baron. Jonny because of its massive hardware advantage, though I'm sure everyone knows by now that whatever less than optimum chess knowledge an engine has is not helped by speeding it up unless the fast hardware manages to get it deep enough to see the error of its ways! But 800 cores is a bit awesome! Pandix has had some good tournament results recently and can't be far behind our proposed top 3 but is on slower hardware. The Baron has always hovered a little way below the top but has shown it can be a spoiler from time to time. Probably the other 3 will only take points off each other, or maybe the odd draw against one of the 'middle 3'.

A final note of some amusement, I thought. With Rybka banned, its operator Hans van der Zijden offered his services to the Hiarc team, which Mark Uniacke very gladly accepted! Harvey Williamson normally operates for Hiarc at the big events, but works for Radio 4 which has necessitated a move to Manchester (lucky fellow!) and knew he would be unable to be there for the full tournament.

Good - on with the chess!

Junior - Woodpusher

Round 1. ECO B33. Sicilian, Pelikan & Sveshnikov variations

1.e4 c5 2.Qf3 Qc6 3.d4 cxd4 4.Qxd4 e5

Going into these particular Sicilian variations is taking a big risk against Junior, unless you're very sure of what you are doing

5.Qb5 d6 6.Qc3 Qf6 7.Qg5 a6 8.Qa3 Qe6 9.Qc4 Qc8
10.Qxf6 gxf6 11.Qe3 Qh6
Here my opening theory says that 14...h5! is almost universally agreed to be Black's best reply. Instead...

14...0-0? 15.0-0  \text{g7}
16.\text{e1!}

With this White already threatens to aggressively penetrate against Black's rather vulnerable king

16...\text{e7}  17.\text{f2}  \text{g8}
18.\text{e2}  \text{xb2}?!  

I can't quite class this as suicidal, but I'm sure that 18...\text{h8} would have been safer as, even after the likely 19.\text{g3}, Black perhaps surprisingly has 19...f5 and after 20.exf5 \text{c4}, though now maybe 21.f6?!±

19.\text{ab1}  \text{a3}  20.\text{g3}

20...\text{h6}?

This looks wrong - and it is! Better by far was 20...\text{fd8} and after 21.\text{h5+ f8} 22.\text{xb7 b8}. Certainly Junior would be winning here, but after 23.\text{xb8 bx8} 24.\text{xf6 xf6} 25.\text{xf6} Woodpusher

11.f4?!

11.\text{g2} was probably better, certainly less committal

11...\text{d4}  12.\text{xd4}  \text{e5}
13.\text{fxe5}  \text{dxe5}  14.\text{xd4 dx e5}
15.\text{xc4}  \text{a5}  16.\text{xe3}  \text{e6}
17.\text{c5}  \text{xc5}  18.\text{xc5}  \text{d7}
19.\text{c7}  \text{b8}  20.\text{d5}  \text{f8}
21.\text{g2}  \text{d8}  22.\text{c3}  \text{xd5}
23.exd5 f5!

We've seen the typically stubborn play we are used to from Shredder, but this thrust suggests that it might finally have obtained a slight advantage

24.d6  \text{g6}  25.\text{ed1}  \text{e4}  26.\text{g4}
27.\text{xc8+ xc8}  28.\text{gf5}
29.\text{d5}  \text{d8}  30.\text{c4}  \text{db6}
31.\text{d4}  \text{e8}  32.\text{d2}  \text{h6}
33.\text{b4}  \text{g8}  34.\text{h3}  \text{g5}  35.\text{c5}
\text{d7}  36.\text{d5}  \text{f4!}  37.\text{xf5}  \text{xf5}
38.\text{xf5}

My analysis engine is already showing 0.00, and that's how it ends

38...\text{e3+}  39.\text{e2}  \text{e5}  40.a3
41.\text{h5}  \text{h4}  42.\text{f1}  \text{e5}
43.\text{h4}  \text{c8}  44.\text{a4}  \text{c6}  45.b5
axb5 46.axb5 \text{d4+}  47.\text{d3}
\text{xb5}  48.\text{e2}  \text{d7}  49.\text{axh5}
\text{xd6}  50.\text{cx d6}  \text{xd6}  51.\text{e4}
f3  52.\text{xe3}  f2  53.\text{xf2}  \text{d5}
\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}

Other main round 1 results:-

- Jonny - Hiarcs draw
- The Baron - Boost draw
Woodpusher - Jonny
Round 2. A04. A sort of King's Indian Attack

1.\f3 g5?
What is this?! It seems the Jonny programmer Johannes Zwanzer (an IM) has a low opinion of his opponent and just wants to get it straight out of book and wait for mistakes?! So I guess you can call the move a sort of contempt factor!

2.\xdxg5 e5 3.\xd4 \xe7
Not surprisingly White is out of Book and now starts to develop some of its pieces on strange squares!

4.\xe3?! \exd4 5.\wxd4 \xf6
6.\xc3 \xc6 7.\xa4 d5 8.\xe3?
With 8.\xg5 I think White would have retained an advantage - after all it is a pawn up thanks to Black's totally unexpected 1st move. I'd guess Jonny would have replied with 8...\xg8 or \xd7, but would still be some way off equalising

8...\xd7 9.a3 d4 10.\xd3d4 b5!
11.\xf6!

Even after 11.\xb5 \xd4
12.\xd4 \xb5 13.e3 \xf1
14.\xexf1 \xd4 15.exd4 0-0-0 we'd have still seen Black holding an advantage

11...\bxa4 12.\dxh8 f6!

A rather strange position has arisen after only 12 moves!

13.\g7 \db8 14.0-0-0 \wc8

15.e3?
Perhaps 15.\xd5 was best, and after 15...\xe5 16.e4 \xc6
17.\xexf5 \xe5 18.\xe5, but Black is still winning

15...\xb7! 16.\xa4 \e5!
Threatening \xa4 so forcing...

17.\xd7 \xd7 18.f3 \c5
19.\xc5 \xb2+ 20.\dd2
\xc5 21.\d3 \d8 22.\h6
\xa3 23.\e2 \b4 24.g4
\xd3 25.\xd3

25...f5
25...a5! would probably have resulted in an immediate resignation

26.gxf5 \c3+ 27.\b2 \c4+ 28.\f2 \h4+ 29.\g2 \hxh6 is an easy win 0-1

Hiarcs - Rookie
Round 2. C90. Closed Ruy Lopez

1.e4 e5 2.\f3 \c6 3.\b5 \a6
4.\a4 \f6 5.0-0 \e7 6.\e1
b5 7.\b3 d6 8.\c3 \a5?!

I think 8...0-0 is generally considered better, then White should reply with 9.h3 or 9.d4
9.\c2 c5 10.d4 \c7
11.\bd2 \cxd4 12.\cxd4 0-0
13.b3 \c6 14.\b2

Now I'd have expected 14...\g4 but instead....

14...\b4?!

Disrupting White's piece development, but leaving the e5/pawn less well protected

15.\b1 \c6 16.a4 \d7
17.\c2 \b6 18.axb5 axb5
19.\xa8 \xa8 20.\xe5 \b4
21.\d1 \xe5 22.\xe5
So White has gone a pawn up but Rookie has good piece mobility

22...\c5 23.\e2 \h5 24.h3
g6 25.g4 f6 26.\h2 \g7
27.\g3 \e8 28.\c1 \c8
29.\f1 \e6 30.\e3

Hiarcs has defended itself comfortably against Rookie's tactical threats and has now also negotiated its knights to excellent positions to enable a kingside attack

30.\c6 31.\g5! \xf5
If 31...\xg5 then 32.\xg5 \f5 33.\g4 and now Black must play 33...\e8, but after 34.\xg5 \xe3 35.\xe3 \d7
36.\c7?! its defences would be stretched

32.\g4 \f8?!
32...h5 was probably Black's best try, then we'd have 33...f6+ g7, but White is still ahead after 34...e5!
33...e5! h6 34...a1!

It is worth a diagram to see the unusual but very strong positions of the Hiarcs bishops
34...h5 35...f6+ xf6
Best. If 35...xf7?! 36...e5+ g7 37...xc6! and there is no adequate way to meet the threat of the bishops raking across the board and d7
36...xf6 c7 37...xc5 xc5
38...c3 g4
Or 38...ba6 39.b4! xe4
40...xe4 xe4 41...xe4 xc3
42...xg6+ f8 43...xg5, and Hiarcs would win the e6/knight and the game after a short series of checks
39...e3 ba6
If 39...gxf3 40...xc5 wins
40...b4 gx3 41.bxc5 f8
42...g5 e8 43...xg6+ d8
44...g8+ e8 45...f6+ d7
46...d5+

46...c8 47...e6+ b7
48...xe8 xc5 49...e7+
xe7 50...xe7 c6
and Black, a piece down, resigned now 1-0

Shredder - The Baron
Round 2. D35. QGD, Exchange variation
1.d4 f6 2.c4 e6 3...c3 d5
4...xd5 exd5 5...g5 c6 6.e3
d6 7.f3 0-0 8...d3 h6
9...h4 e6 10...b3 b5 11.0-0
bd7 12...c2 xc8 13...ac1
13.e4 is theory here, then games usually go 13...dxe4
14...xe4 e7 and now White can play 15.e4 or 15...xf6+
13...e8 14.a3 a6 15.e4 f4
16...e1 g5 17...g3 h5
18.b4 b6 19.e5 c4
20...a1 a5

After placing knights on the queenside a surprising move back to kingside operations by Shredder
31...b6
31...g4 was the alternative response, but then Shredder would be likely to play 32...e2 with f5! to follow
32...f2 gx3 33.gxf3 b7
34...f3!

Rookie's operator could have resigned here
A strong and typical move that many engines don't find
34...\texttt{g2} 35.\texttt{f2} \texttt{b2}
A defensive reaction such as
35...\texttt{d6}?! would run straight into
36.\texttt{h1}!+-
36.\texttt{e2} \texttt{xd4} 37.\texttt{e3} \texttt{d3}+
38.\texttt{f1} \texttt{xb4} 39.\texttt{xd4} \texttt{xd4}
40.\texttt{xd4} c5 41.\texttt{xb5} c4

Shredder is \texttt{A} for pawn\texttt{A} up, but will need to keep an eye
on the connected passed c+d
pawns!
42.\texttt{g3}+ \texttt{h7} 43.\texttt{xg8} \texttt{e8}
44.\texttt{f2} \texttt{b8} 45.\texttt{d4} \texttt{a8}
46.\texttt{e3} h5 47.g3 \texttt{e8} 48.\texttt{f3}
\texttt{f8} 49.\texttt{e4}!
After some meandering
Shredder finds the way to
win!
49...\texttt{b8}
If 49...\texttt{d3} 50.\texttt{e3} c3
then
50...\texttt{b6} releases the pinned
knight enabling 51.\texttt{ac6}
51.\texttt{xc3} (51.\texttt{d4} seems to
take a risk with Black's
c-pawn, but after 51...\texttt{e8}
52.\texttt{d6} \texttt{e1}+ 53.\texttt{f2} c2
simply 54.\texttt{xc2} \texttt{xc2} 55.\texttt{b7}
and Black's isolated pawns
are very weak and would
soon fall) 51...\texttt{xe5}+ 52.\texttt{xe5}
\texttt{e5} 53.\texttt{c7} winning
50.\texttt{e3} \texttt{b6} 51.\texttt{f5}!
Nicely timed
51...\texttt{g7} 52.\texttt{d2} \texttt{d3}
53.\texttt{ac6} \texttt{c5} 54.\texttt{e8} \texttt{h7}
55.\texttt{e7}
After
55...\texttt{e4}+ 56.\texttt{e3}
\texttt{g3} 57.\texttt{f4}! c3 58.\texttt{xd5}
\texttt{xc6} 59.\texttt{xc6} c2 60.\texttt{a1} 1-0

Other main round 2 results:-
- Hiarcs - Rookie 1-0
- Pandix - Junior draw

Jonny - Pandix
Round 3. D58. QGD,
Tartakower Defence
1.d4 \texttt{f6} 2.c4 e6 3.\texttt{f3} d5
4.\texttt{c3} \texttt{e7} 5.\texttt{g5} 0-0 6.e3
h6 7.\texttt{h4} b6 8.\texttt{c2} \texttt{b7}
9.\texttt{xf6} \texttt{xf6} 10.\texttt{cxd5} exd5
11.\texttt{e2} c6

A decisive moment as Jonny
chooses to castle on what
most would consider to be
the wrong side!
12.0-0-0?!
12.0-0 is theory, then
12...\texttt{e8} 13.\texttt{f1} \texttt{d7}
14.\texttt{ad1} and an approxi-
mately equal game
12...\texttt{c8} 13.\texttt{d3} a5!
I don't know if Hungarian
programmer Gyula Horvath's
rediscovered interest in
computer chess is because
he has joined the ranks of
speed and depth, but this
move suggests there is still
some decent chess knowl-
dge in Pandix as it is the
perfect strategical reaction
to Jonny's castling queenside.
Well done! A lot of the speed
merchants play \texttt{a6}, actually
blocking in the a-pawn
14.\texttt{b1} \texttt{a6}! 15.a3 \texttt{b8}
16.\texttt{e2} c5 17.\texttt{e5} \texttt{d6}
18.\texttt{xa6}?
A strange choice, leaving

Black with 2 bishops against
Jonny's 2 knights. 18.\texttt{c3}
was surely better, minimising
Black's advantage as much
as possible
18...\texttt{xa6} 19.\texttt{g4} \texttt{d8}
20.\texttt{he1} c4 21.\texttt{f5}

Jonny is attempting to start a
kingside counterattack, but
even with an 800-core Clus-
ter this is going to be hard to
pull off!
21...\texttt{c7} 22.\texttt{e5} \texttt{c8} 23.\texttt{f3}
\texttt{h7} 24.\texttt{g3} f6 25.\texttt{g4} b5!
26.e4 \texttt{b4}

27.\texttt{f5}!?
27.a4 looks to be the best
defence, seeking to limit the
impact and advance of
Black's dangerous pawns.
Then play might continue
27...\texttt{c6} 28.\texttt{hxh6}! c3!
29.\texttt{c1} \texttt{hxh6} 30.\texttt{exd5}. Black
still has a good advantage
with 30...\texttt{d7} but Jonny can
try 31.\texttt{e6} and might still
scrape a draw
27...\texttt{d7} 28.\texttt{gxh6} \texttt{gxh6}
29.\texttt{e3} \texttt{g8} 30.\texttt{h6} \texttt{h7}!
Forcing the exchange
of queens enables Pandix to
make the most of its pair of bishops
31.\(\text{exh7+} + \text{exh7} 32.\text{axb4 dx4} 33.\text{exh7 f5 34.d5!}
This looks promising for White, but Black ignores it!
34...\text{axb4!} 35.\text{c6} \text{e8} 36.d6 \text{e8f1!} 37.\text{exb4 edx6 38.exd6} \text{exd6} 39.\text{c5} \text{b3} 40.\text{d1} \text{c6} 41.\text{d1} \text{g6}
The closing moves might have been 43.g3 \text{d7} 44.e2 \text{a4!} 45.e3 \text{d3} 46.c2 \text{g7}, and White is helpless. 0-1

Other main round 3 results:
- The Baron - Hiarcs draw
- Boot - Shredder 0-1

It is time to start showing my readers the Tournament Table as it progresses. Please remember that with there being 9 Engines playing, one Engine gets a bye in each round, so they haven't all played the same number of games. So for example in our first look at the Table you can note that Junior and Pandix have each played one game less than the engines above them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarcs</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonny</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandix</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rookie</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Baron</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodpusher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harics - Boot
Round 4. D17. Slav Defence
1.d4 d5 2.c4 c6 3.\text{d3 f3} \text{d6} 4.\text{c3 dxc4} 5.a4 \text{e5} 5.\text{d5 e5} \text{d4} 7.\text{exd4} \text{e6} 8.\text{e5 e6} 9.f3 \text{dxd7 10.a5 \text{dxe5}}
This is a popular line for Black in which it sacrifices a pawn for good piece mobility. The alternative and lesser known line, but which I prefer is 10...\text{d5} 11.e4 \text{dxe5} 12.dxe5 \text{dxc3} 13.\text{fxd8+} \text{bxd8} 14.bxc3 \text{g6}
11.axb6 \text{d7} 12.e4 \text{g6} 13.exa7 \text{bxb6} 14.\text{xb7 e7}
The only line I could find in my database was 14...\text{e8} 15.\text{e6} \text{d6} (I slightly prefer 15...\text{e7}) 16.0-0 which has been played a couple of times and is thought to favour White slightly
15.\text{e2} \text{b8} 16.\text{AXB8} \text{AXB8} 17.0-0 0-0 18.\text{B3 h6} 19.\text{e3} \text{d7}

It is hard to believe that Black has enough compensation for the pawn as things stand here.
20.\text{c4} \text{h7} 21.\text{AXB8 AXB8} 22.\text{a4} \text{e5} 23.\text{d1 exd4} 24.\text{d4 f6} 25.\text{e3} \text{e8} 26.\text{d6} \text{f8} 27.\text{f5} \text{g6} 28.\text{h3} \text{b5} 29.\text{d2} \text{a5} 30.\text{b6} \text{g7} 31.\text{c8} \text{c5} 32.\text{e2} \text{xe3} 33.\text{xe3} \text{f5} 34.\text{fxe5} \text{gx5} 35.\text{b4} \text{a3} 36.\text{xf4} \text{e4} 37.\text{fxe5} \text{AXB4} 38.\text{e3} \text{b3} 39.\text{f2} \text{g6}
40.\text{e7 c5}

Boott seems to be pinning all is hopes on this passed pawn
41.\text{d6 h7?}
This allows Hiarcs the chance to push the Black king further away from the main action, an opportunity which Hiarcs grabs of course
After 41...\text{f7} 42.\text{e4} \text{e6} 43.\text{f5} Black must choose between 43...\text{f5} or \text{f6}. It's prospects are not good but maybe better than after the game move
42.\text{xh7} \text{h7} 43.\text{f5} \text{h5} 43...\text{g6} is no better:
44.\text{a7+} \text{h8} 45.\text{d6+-}
44.\text{e6+} \text{g8} 45.\text{AXBh5 e6}
46.\text{h4} \text{b2} 47.\text{g3} \text{f7}
48.\text{e4}

48...\text{g5}
This doesn't seem to be the best defence. Preferable was
48...\text{f6} 49.\text{e3} \text{d4} 50.\text{f4} and then 50...\text{xb7} to place the rook for defence or even to get behind it's own c-pawn. However I'd expect Hiarcs to still win from here
49.\text{d6}! \text{f6} 50.\text{c4} \text{e6}
51.\(\text{Q}e4+\) \(\text{Q}e5\) 52.\(\text{Q}xc5\) \(\text{Q}d5\) 53.\(\text{Q}a4\) \(\text{B}xg2\+)
After 54.\(\text{B}xg2\) \(\text{B}xc4\) 55.\(\text{Q}g3\)
It is the clearest way to finish it, though 55.\(h4\) would also do the job quite quickly 1-0

Other main round 4 results:
- Pandix - Rookie 1-0
- Junior - Jonny draw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIARCS</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonny</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Baron</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rookie</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>2(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td>2(\frac{1}{2})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodpusher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I apologize to my friend John Hamlen for including another Woodpusher loss - sometimes we can actually learn more from games between unequal opponents. John and Mark are also old friends and were pleased to meet up again in Tilburg after many years! John told me 'Mark hasn’t changed'... I wish they could say that about me!

HIARCS - Woodpusher
Round 5. A05. Transposes to a Reti Opening
1.\(\text{B}3!\) \(\text{Q}f6\) 2.\(\text{B}b2\) g6 3.\(\text{g}3\) d5
4.\(\text{f}3\) \(\text{Q}c6\) 5.\(\text{g}2\) \(\text{g}7\) 6.0-0
0-0 7.d4 \(\text{B}f5\) 8.\(\text{B}d2\) \(\text{B}e8\)N
8...b5, \(\text{Q}e4\) or \(e6\) are all known
9.\(\text{c}4\) e6 10.h3 dxc4 11.\(\text{b}xc4\)
\(\text{B}b8\) 12.e3 \(\text{Q}d3\) 13.\(\text{R}e1\) b5
14.\(\text{Q}c1\) \(\text{bxc4}\) 15.a3 \(\text{Q}b4\)
16.\(\text{B}xb4\) \(\text{B}xb4\) 17.\(\text{Q}e5\)

Woodpusher is a pawn up but has committed 2 pieces to hang on to it on c4. Here it needs to respond to White’s last move, threatening \(\text{Q}c6\) forking \(\text{Q}\) and \(\text{P}\) of course, so 17...\(\text{B}c8\) must be best
17...\(\text{Q}d5\)? 18.\(\text{Q}c6\) \(\text{B}d6\)
19.\(\text{B}xb4\) \(\text{B}xb4\) 20.a3 \(\text{B}b5\)
21.\(\text{Q}f1\) \(\text{xf1}\) 22.\(\text{xf1}\) \(\text{B}b6\)?!
Probably 22...c3 was the best, maybe only chance here, and after 23.\(\text{Q}e4\) there’s 23...\(\text{B}c4\), but 24.\(\text{B}c2\)
\(e5\) 25.\(\text{Q}xc3\) \(\text{exd}4\) 26.\(\text{exd}4\)
\(\text{Q}xd4\) and \(\text{White can force exchanges with 27.\(\text{Q}a4\) \(\text{B}b5\)
28.\(\text{Q}c4\) \(\text{Q}xc4\) 29.\(\text{Q}xc4\) \(\text{Q}e5\)
30.\(\text{Q}f1\) ...
23.a4 \(\text{B}b4\) 24.a5 \(\text{B}xa5\)
25.\(\text{Q}xc4\) \(\text{d}5\) 26.\(\text{B}xb6\) \(\text{B}xb6\)
27.\(\text{B}a4\) \(\text{e}7\) 28.\(\text{B}c8\)+ \(\text{Q}f8\)
29.\(\text{B}f6\) 30.\(\text{B}c7\)

Despite the slightly unusual start to the game we are still in theory. Here 12.\(\text{B}b5\) is popular and has a better record than Boot’s choice
12.\(\text{Q}d2\)?! \(\text{B}b8\) 13.\(\text{B}b5\)
start to see that White has problems! So what should it do? 32...\textbf{f}3!? \textbf{w}xh4 33.\textbf{g}3 has a stubborn look to it, maybe 33...\textbf{w}g5 keeps Black on top, but after something like 34.\textbf{w}b2 progress for Junior might not be easy 32...\textbf{w}f6 33.\textbf{h}5 \textbf{h}7!

\textbf{34.\textit{xa}8??}

Yielding the a-file is a big mistake. Instead 34.\textit{hxg6+} and White appears to have much better chances of holding after 34...\textbf{g}7 35.\textbf{f}4 \textbf{xa}2+ 36.\textbf{xa}2 \textbf{xf}4 37.\textbf{wa}7 \textbf{d}5 38.\textbf{xc}5\textbf{f}

34...\textbf{xa}8 35.\textbf{xg}6

35.\textbf{g}3? also fails: 35...\textbf{xa}3
36.\textit{hxg6+} \textbf{g}7 37.\textbf{b}2 (if 37.\textbf{gx}3? \textbf{a}1 threatening \textbf{ff}1 mate and winning) 37...\textbf{h}4 38.\textbf{d}2, and now 38...\textbf{f}8 settles it
35...\textbf{f}7
36...\textbf{g}3
The only hope as after 36.\textbf{b}2? (which stops \textbf{a}1), but instead 36...\textbf{f}8! 37.\textbf{g}1 \textbf{ff}1+ 38.\textbf{h}1 \textbf{f}2 wins

36...\textbf{xg}3
White resigned anyway! Black only needs to be careful to avoid a tactical mistake after 37.\textbf{xc}2, so 37...\textbf{f}8!
38.\textbf{e}2 (38.\textbf{xg}3? \textbf{f}4+ 39.\textbf{g}2 \textbf{ff}1+ 40.\textbf{h}2 \textbf{ff}2+ wins White's queen) 38...\textbf{e}5
39.\textbf{g}4 \textbf{f}6 40.\textbf{h}6 \textbf{f}7 41.b6 \textbf{wh}6 42.\textbf{e}1 \textbf{g}7 wins 0-1

Other main round 5 results:-
- Shredder - Pandix draw
- The Baron - Jonny draw

Round 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiarcs</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandix</td>
<td>0 ½</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>0 ½</td>
<td>0 ½</td>
<td>0 ½</td>
<td>0 ½</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonny</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>1 ½</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Baron</td>
<td>0 ½</td>
<td>0 ½</td>
<td>0 ½</td>
<td>0 ½</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rookie</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodpusher</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just at the moment then it looks as if Hiarcs is running away with the Championship. But it has played an extra game to the 3 engines behind it, so we will get a better idea of where we are at after round 6 in which Hiarcs has its bye!

\textbf{Junior - The Baron}

Round 6. B08. Pirc Defence, Classical system
1.e4 d6 2.d4 \textbf{f}6 3.c3 g6
4.\textbf{d}3 \textbf{g}7 5.\textbf{c}2 0-0 6.0-0
7.a4 \textbf{a}5 8.h3 \textbf{a}6 9.\textbf{f}4
10.\textbf{b}4 10.\textbf{d}2 \textbf{b}6 11.\textbf{h}6

All theory so far and now White usually goes with 12.\textbf{e}3. But Junior prefers to leave the threat of an exchange on g7 which would
39...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}c6} bxc6 40.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}7}+, though the full point isn't quite secure yet \\
33.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}h}5+ \textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}8} 34.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}6}+

40...\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{f}8}

34...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}7} looks at first to be the best try, but 35.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{e}e}3 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{c}7} \\
36.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}3} \textcolor{red}{\textsf{c}e}6 37.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}f}6 is 1-0

35.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}f}6+ \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{g}8} 36.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{b}xc}4 \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{a}c}5 37.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{h}4} \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{a}a}4?! \\
The Baron decides to grab a few pawns when 37...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{c}7} \\
would surely have put up a better struggle. But 38.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}6}+ \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{f}8} and then the by now 

familiar 39.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{e}e}3 will win

38.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{h}5} \textcolor{red}{\textsf{xc}4} 39.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{h}6} \textcolor{red}{\textsf{xc}3} \\
40.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{e}e}3! \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{c}4} 41.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{f}3}

After 41...\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{d}d}1+ (if 41...\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{f}4} \\
42.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}3} \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{e}e}4 43.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{x}e}5 is 1-0) 42.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{h}2} \textcolor{red}{\textsf{d}7} 43.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{e}3} \\
\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{xe}4} 44.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{f}7}+ \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{d}6}, and now 

either 45.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{h}7} or \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{x}d}1 finishes it 1-0

Other main round 6 results:

- Woodpusher - Shredder 0-1
- Pandix - Boost draw
- Jonny - Rookie 1-0

Rookie - Junior

Round 7, B83. Sicilian
Scheveningen

1.e4 c5 2.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{d}f}3 e6 3.d4 \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{cxd}4} \\
4.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{x}d}4 \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{f}6} 5.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{c}c}3 \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{c}c}6 \\
6.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{e}e}2 \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{d}6} 7.0-0 \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{e}e}7 8.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{x}c}6 \\
bxc6 9.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{x}d}3 0-0 10.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{d}d}1

Now 10...\textcolor{red}{\textsf{c}7} is the most 

popular for Black, and I also 

have some liking for \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{b}8}. But 

Junior goes with something 

new (at least to me)!

10...\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{d}5} 11.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}3} \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{d}7} 12.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{b}1} \\
a5 13.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{h}3} f5?!

You've got to love the Junior style - let's play chess!

14.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}f}5 \textcolor{red}{\textsf{x}f}5 15.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{h}6}?

15.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}4}, which gets played in 
a moment, would probably 
have been better played here 

instead of \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{h}6}. Now if 

15...\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{h}4} 16.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{d}6} \textcolor{blue}{\textsf{x}f}2+ \\
17.\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{x}h}1 and, assuming 

17...\textcolor{blue}{\textsf{f}6} to protect the e6 
pawn, 18.\textcolor{red}{\textsf{g}5} and a very 

interesting position has been reached with close to equal
chances I'd say
15...\(#f8! 16.\#g4 \#d6 17.f4
Best. Nothing else works. If
17.\#h4? gxh6 18.\#xf5 \#xf5
leaves Black with 2 bishops
for a rook, and 19.\#xh6
grabbing a pawn is met by
19...\#a6 when Black has a
range of threats: \#f8, or \#f6
\#f7 \#g8
17...\#f6 18.\#g5 \#g6 19.h4?! this is somewhat kind to
its own \# on g5, and also
weakens White's king safety!
Better would have been
19.e1 and after 19...\#f6
20.e2. Now the hoped-for
rescue with 20...h6! can be
met by 21.\#d3!\#f
19...e5! 20.f5

20...\#f6?! another surprise from Junior,
and the first of no less than 3
sacrifices of the exchange in
this game!
21.\#xf6 \#xf6 22.h3 \#e7
23.\#e1 e4
23...\#a6! would have been
very strong as well.
24.e2 \#a6 25.\#d4 e3
26.\#e6 e2

A particularly unusual posi-
tion. White is \# for \# ahead
but most of the computer
engines say Black is winning.
A typical Junior game and,
when it works, it sets this
engine apart
27.\#d4
Only move but...
27...\#e5! 28.\#f2
28.\#h1 \#xd4 29.\#xd4, thus
returning the exchange a little
sooner, might have been
better, but Black now has the
dangerous 29...\#e3!+-
28...\#e4! 29.\#xe4 dxe4
30.e1 \#b4 31.\#xe2
This had to be tried, the third
exchange 'sac'. If 31.c3?! \#xb2 32.f6 gxh6 33.\#f5 \#a7
34.e5 \#xe2 35.e5 \#h6 leaves
Black 2 pawns ahead.
White's attempted attack is
over and after a series of
pretty much forced
exchanges with 35.\#g4+
\#h8 36.\#xe4 \#xc3 37.\#xe2
\#xe2 38.\#xe2 \#b7, Black
wins easily
31...\#xe2 32.\#xe2 \#xb2
33.\#xe4 \#g3! 34.\#f1 \#b5+
35.c4
The only try
35.\#b2 36.\#d4 \#b8 37.h5
if 37.e5 \#xb2 38.e5 \#h8 39.e1 \#xg2+ 40.\#d1 \#a2
0-1
37...a4 38.\#xb2 \#xb2
The end: 39.a3 \#f2+ 40.\#e1
\#xg2+ 41.\#d1 \#a2 0-1.

Junior is on the charge! Pandix
also has been playing
very well, but suddenly
something goes seriously wrong!

The Baron - Pandix
Round 7. C54. Guioco Piano
1.e4 e5 2.\#f3 \#c6 3.\#c4
\#c5 4.c3 \#f6 5.d4 exd4
6.cxd4 \#b4+ 7.\#bd2 \#xd2+
Harvey Williamson did get to
Tilburg for part of the Champi-
0nships, and can always be relied
on to enjoy himself!

8.\#xd2 d5?!N
This is usually only played
after 8...\#xe4 9.0-0 d5
9.exd5 \#xd5 10.\#b3

10...\#a5??
Wow, a total blind spot.
10...\#c7 was best. Pandix
seemed to think that 11.\#xd5
can't be played because of
\#xc3. But of course...
11.\#xa5
There was no point in playing
on. If 11...\#e6 (11...\#f6??
12.\#xf7+ \#f8 13.\#d4+ \#e7+
14.\#xe7+) 12.\#xb7 1-0

Other main round 7 results:-
- Shredder - Hiarcs draw
This was an interesting game
deserving careful analysis
which I will try to find space
for next time!
For our next game a tablebase mystery!

**Rookie - The Baron**

Round 8. C91. Closed Ruy Lopez

1.e4 e5 2.\d3 c6 3.\b5 a6
4.\a4 \f6 5.0-0 \e7 6.\e1
b5 7.\b3 0-0 8.d4 d6 9.c3
\g4 10.h3 \xf3 11.\xf3
\xd4 12.\d1 dxc3 13.\xc3
\a5 14.\c2 \e8 15.\f4 \g6
16.b3 \h5 17.\d2 \g5
18.\d5 \xd2 19.\d2 c6
20.\c3 \b7 21.\d1 \a5
22.\b1 b4 23.\a4 \d8
24.\bc1 \g7 25.\b2 \e6
26.\d3 c5 27.\d1 \g7
28.\g4 \d4 29.\c4 h5
30.\xh5 \xh5 31.\g5+ \f8
32.\xf5 \e6 33.\f4 \e8
34.e5 \d8 35.\xe6+ \e6
36.\e3 d5 37.\h8+ \e7
38.\h4+ \e8 39.\xd4 cxd4
40.\xd4 \a5 41.\d3 \xax2
42.\xd5 \c2 43.\h2 \c6
44.\d4 \g6 45.g4 a5 46.h4
47.\g5 \c5 48.\g3 \c6
49.\f4 \e6 50.\f6 \f8
51.\f4 \e3 52.\e4 \e3
53.\xg3 \a4 54.\h5 \xb3
55.\xb4 \c2+ 56.\h3 \d7
57.g6 \xg6 58.\gx6 \f5+ 59.\g2 \e6 60.\h2 \e5
61.g7 \g4+ 62.\g1 \f6
63.\f8+ \d7 64.\xf6 \xf6

Of course the engines show that Black is winning here, and tablebases are running to support this evaluation. But as soon as White plays...

65.\g8

... they jump to show 65...\d4+ mate in 30! This happened in the game itself as well and The Baron had mate in 32 on display I believe.

65...\d4+ 66.\g2 b2
67.\g6

Now, very strangely, the mate claim has disappeared! If you take this move back my engine with tablebases shows 67.\f7+ with m/28 which is confirmed when the move is played; also 67.\h7+ m/28 and confirmed when played, as well as 67.\g6 m/28. But, when this is played the mate announcement disappears, which again is exactly what happened in the game! The Baron's operator had been asking if he could claim the win but now the tournament director insisted that they continue the game.

67...\d2+

Here it gets even more weird! When it's White's move there's a tablebase mate announcement, when it's Black's move an evaluation appears, around 200/-500 (big difference!) depending on the engine you use!

68.\h3 \c7 69.\e4 \d6
70.\f5 \h6+ 71.\g2 \c1
72.\f6+ \c5

Finally a mate shows on Black's move as well, m/42. But the operators agreed to play the game out to see what happened and in the end Black duly won

73.\e7+ \b5 74.\b7+ \a4
75.\a6+ \b3 76.\b7+ \a2
77.\d5+ \a1 78.\a8+ \b1
79.\d5 \c2+ 80.\h3 \e2
81.\f7 \c1 82.\f4+ \d1
83.\f5 \e1 84.\h4 \e3
85.\h5 \b3 86.\e4+ \f2
87.\d4+ \g2 88.\d2+ \h3
89.\d7+ \e3 90.g4+ \f2
91.\h4+ \g2 92.g4+ \g3
93.\e2+ \e2 94.g4+ \g2
95.\e4 \c5+ 96.h4 \c3
97.\f4+ \g2 98.\g4+ \f2
99.\f5+ \f3 100.\c2+ \e2
101.\f5+ \g2 102.g6+ \f1 103.\h3 \e3+ 104.\h2
\e2 105.\h5+ \e1
106.\g6 \d2 107.\d6+ \d3
108.\b4+ \c1
109.\e1+ \d1 110.\c3+ \c2+ 0-1

Mark Unicake was determined to go all out for a win against Pandix, so set a strong Contempt factor so that it would avoid anything leading to 0.00. As we will see this gets it into trouble! I think Mark will have to look at the way Hiarcs works when the Contempt factor is in place, today's engines on fast hardware are too strong to be allowed into lines showing -0.15 or worse, just to avoid a draw. Against a weak opponent or a human this method might indeed encourage it into complications where it/he might go wrong, but against the strongest engines
you're just giving away an initiative that can prove dangerous in the end! We'll see this happen again in round 9! Many engines nowadays use Contempt to make an adjustment to some or all of the piece values, making their own piece values a little higher than their opponents. This means the on-screen evaluations are less trustworthy for us, but instead of going into slightly worse positions it means the engine will avoid major piece exchanges throughout the game until the evaluation drop is too big, and this is often a better way to retain complications rather than just doing something when 0.00 makes an appearance.

**Pandix - Hiarcs**

Round 8. C95. Closed Ruy Lopez

1.e4 e5 2.d3 c6 3.b5 a6
4.a4 d6 5.0-0 b5 6.b3
7.e1 0-0 8.c3 d6 9.h3
10.d4 c5 11.d2 b7 12.c2 c5 13.f1 exd4
14.cxd4 cxd4 15.g3 e8
16.axd4 g6 17.a4 f6
18.e3 c5 19.e3 c7
20.axb5 axb5 21.e2 b4
22.b4 a4 23.e5 b5 24.e4 dxe4 25.g5 dxe5
26.xf7 df7 27.xc5 dx5
28.xc4+ d5 29.xc5

g5?!

I think this is a mistake. 54.xc2 was the best try, and if 55.b6 a6 56.c3 d8, though this would still clearly favour Pandix after 57.c5 c7 58.b3!

55.c5

Watching on the Internet I was now getting very nervous. I e-mailed Mark - so was he!

55...f7 56.g4 f6 57.f4!

Exe4 58.xg7 xg7 59.xg7
d5 60.xe2

The main Hiarcs threat for the past 15 moves has gone, instead it is Pandix that has the dangerous pawns!

60.a5 61.b2 b4

It is clear that Pandix, a pawn up, now has a small advantage. The clock means nothing, Hiarcs has a struggle on its hands!

47...e2?!

The alternative was 47...d3 48.c3 d4 49.b3 e2 50.c3 d3, which probably holds the draw more clearly, but Hiarcs, with its contenter factor in operation, is still trying to get a win

48.xc5 b2 49.b5 g8

50.h5 f7 51.h6 e8 52.xf2
c2 53.a4 a2 54.b4

Not 66.b7? as 66...h5=

66.b5 67.b7 d5+

68.e4+ g6 69.d2 xxe4+

70.xf4

Not 70.xe4? xg7 71.b7+ f6 72.xf4 b4+ and Black should get the draw
You are welcome from here to jump to the next diagram as the manoeuvres over the next 20 moves change nothing while Pandix searches for a way to win

73.\text{d}5 \text{g}5 74.\text{c}c5 \text{c}1+ 75.\text{b}5 \text{b}1+ 76.\text{a}5 \text{a}1+ 77.\text{b}4 \text{b}1+ 78.\text{c}4 \text{f}6 79.\text{h}7 \text{g}5 80.\text{c}7 \text{f}6 81.\text{d}5 \text{g}5 82.\text{d}7 \text{d}1+ 83.\text{c}4 \text{c}1+ 84.\text{d}4 \text{b}1 85.\text{g}7+ \text{f}6 86.\text{h}7 \text{g}5 87.\text{d}7 \text{d}1+ 88.\text{c}3 \text{b}1 89.\text{c}7 \text{g}6 90.\text{d}4 \text{c}3 \text{b}1 91.\text{d}3 \text{b}4 92.\text{c}3 \text{b}1 93.\text{g}7+ \text{f}6 94.\text{h}7 \text{g}6

By here the eval has dropped below -1.00 and we knew we’d survived a big scare!

113.\text{d}7 \text{g}5 114.\text{c}6 \text{xg}4 115.\text{c}5 \text{g}3 116.\text{d}4 \text{h}5 117.\text{c}3 \text{h}4 118.\text{d}3+ \text{g}2 119.\text{d}2+ \text{h}1 120.\text{c}2 \text{b}2 1/2-1/2

Other main round 8 results:
- Rookie - The Baron 0-1
- Junior - Shredder draw

Another interesting game, especially during the endgame, which I will try to analyse and find space for next time!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 8</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonny</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Baron</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandix</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boost</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rookie</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodpusher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see that Pandix is unable to make progress as long as Hiarc finds best moves. Now White could continue in the manner of the last few moves with 95.\text{e}7 but 95...\text{f}6 96.\text{c}7 \text{e}6 97.\text{d}4 \text{f}6 98.\text{c}5 \text{g}5 99.\text{g}7+ \text{f}6 and still there is no progress. So something different was required! 95.\text{c}2 \text{b}4 96.\text{c}7 \text{b}6

As we come to the final round, Shredder needs to beat Jonny and hope that Hiarc can at least draw with Junior. The Baron has played all its games, but we can also see that should Jonny beat Shredder and Junior beat Hiarc, then Mark’s engine would drop to 4th.

**Shredder - Jonny**

**Round 9. D30. QGD Declined**

1.d4 e6 2.c4 d5 3.\text{f}3 c6 4.\text{c}c2 \text{f}6 5.e3 \text{b}d7 6.\text{b}d2 \text{d}6 7.\text{d}3 0-0 8.0-0 e5 9.\text{d}xe5 \text{xe}5 10.\text{b}x e5 \text{xe}5 11.\text{h}3 \text{xe}7 12.\text{d}1 \text{d}8 13.\text{f}3 \text{d}6 14.\text{c}xd5 \text{cxd}5 15.\text{d}2 \text{d}7 16.\text{b}3 \text{e}4 17.\text{a}c1 \text{c}5 18.\text{c}3 \text{e}ac8 19.\text{b}1 \text{e}4 20.\text{wa}5 \text{c}6 21.\text{e}1 \text{b}6 22.\text{wa}6 \text{b}5 23.\text{a}3 \text{e}4 24.\text{d}3 \text{g}6 25.\text{e}2 \text{f}6 26.\text{a}3 \text{c}7 27.\text{d}4 \text{a}4 28.\text{b}3 \text{xc}1 29.\text{xc}1 \text{xa}3

The win of the pawn is only temporary and, despite the apparent complications, both engines constantly evaluated the game, almost throughout, as virtually equal

30.\text{c}7 \text{d}6 31.\text{xa}7 \text{d}7 32.\text{b}4 \text{b}8 33.\text{b}7 \text{a}5 34.\text{d}1 \text{d}6 35.\text{f}3 \text{c}3 36.\text{c}2 \text{xb}1 37.\text{xe}5 \text{xe}5 38.\text{xb}1 \text{f}5 39.\text{wd}1 \text{a}8 40.\text{wd}2 \text{ec}8 41.\text{f}3 \text{xc}2 42.\text{wd}4 \text{xd}4 43.\text{exd}4 \text{ec}1 44.\text{f}2 \text{ec}2+ 45.\text{g}3 \text{d}3 46.\text{xb}6 \text{f}1 47.\text{f}2 \text{h}5 48.\text{h}4 \text{g}5 49.\text{hxg}5 \text{h}4+ 50.\text{h}2 \text{xf}2 51.\text{g}1 \text{yg}2+ 52.\text{xf}1 \text{d}2 53.\text{d}6 \text{xd}4 54.\text{b}5 \text{d}2 55.\text{h}6 \text{b}2 56.\text{hxh}4 \text{xb}5 57.\text{e}2 ½-½
Hiarc's must beat Junior to be WCCC Champion! But using a highish Contempt again risks a defeat as well!

**Hiarc - Junior**


1.d4 ₪f6 2.c4 g6 3.dıc3 d5 4.dıf3 ₪g7 5.cxd5 ₪xd5 6.e4 ₪xc3 7.bxc3 c5 8.dıb1 0-0 9.dıe2 ₪c6 10.d5 ₪e5 11.dıxe5 ₪xe5 12.dıd2 e6 13.f4 ₪c7 14.0-0 exd5 15.exd5 ₪a5 16.d6 ₪b8 17.dıa3 ₪f5 18.dıbd1 ₪c8 19.g4 ₪d7 20.f5 ₪h4 21.dıf3

A long opening line ends. White's well supported d6 pawn is a small advantage.

21...b6 22.dıb2 ₪ce8 23.dıh1 ₪e5 24.fxe6 hxg6 25.dıf4 ₪xf4 26.dıe3 ₪xf3

Junior, typically, decides to sac the exchange for a pawn, so as to get itself good dynamic compensation.

27.dıxf3 ₪xg4 28.dıxg4 ₪xg4 29.dıd5 c4 30.dıh4 ₪e8 31.dıd4 ₪d7 32.dıxc4 b5 33.dıcf4 f5

I think it tells us a lot about computer engine progress that many of them evaluate this as an equal position! They consider Black's 2 bishops to be a match for White's rook + bishop.

34.c4 ₪c6+ 35.dıg1 ₪d2 36.cxb5 ₪xb5 37.dıf2 ₪e3 38.dıe1 ₪e4 39.dıxe3

Hiarc decides to return the exchange in the hope of making its d6 pawn finally count. It has to try for the win to take the Title of course, so Mark Uniacke has given it an increased contempt factor to try and avoid the draw even at some risk.

39...₫xe3 40.dıd2 ₪d7 41.dıg2 ₪f7 42.h5

The final desperate effort, but Junior comes up with an answer for everything.

42...gxh5 43.dıg7+ ₪e8 44.dıd4?!

Almost a risk too many, now Junior has some chances! A safe draw would have come from 44.dıg8+ ₪f7 45.dıg7+ etc. but that would mean 2nd place for Hiarc so, for the second game running it risks a negative evaluation in the hope that it's opponent might go wrong.

44...茹3! 45.dıe7+ ₪d8 46.dìf6 ₪e6 47.dıe5+ ₪c8 48.dìc5+ ₪c6 49.dìxc6+ ₪xc6

Internet finally begin to relax thanks to the opposite coloured bishops. For a while the engine's determination to seek a win had seemed, for the second time, that it might bring us a loss!

50.dìd4 a6 51.dìe5 ₪d7 52.dìf2 ₪e6 53.dìf4 ₪d5 54.dìe2 ₪e8 55.dìg3 ₪d7 56.dìf4 ₪xd6 57.dìg5+ ₪c5 ½-½

Other main round 9 results:-

- Boot - Rookie 1-0
- Woodpusher - Pandix 0-1

And so the **FINAL TABLE**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 9</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1½-½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandix</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonny</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Baron</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rookie</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodpusher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the presentation Amir Ban received the trophy for the WCCC Junior win, and Hans van der Zijden the trophy for the WSCC Hiarc win. **Selective Search** congratulates them both!
On 29 December 2011, Ray Couzens wrote:

Hi Eric,

Firstly, I hope you had a good Christmas, I certainly have and, as usual, far too much to eat and drink - oh well it’s only once a year! I am writing to say again just how much I enjoy the Selective Search Magazine and the wonderful positions that Bill Reid sends you. It is indeed unfortunate for us that he is retiring.

On the subject of these positions that challenge our chess engines if not ourselves, I read with interest the results of various engines running on various hardware, and in particular the times to solve or at least come up with the correct moves, if indeed the engines can solve the positions! Sometimes an engine will find the answer within say 5 minutes whereas another engine given the same position will not, or will solve it in say 3 minutes and another will solve it in just a few seconds. Is the engine that solves the position in a few seconds better than the slower ones? Often we see that given another position the roles are reversed thus making any conclusions about the best solver using this criteria unreliable. We therefore have to count the number of times the correct move is found for different positions within a reasonable time to measure the performance. Hence the WM-Test.

What I initially found strange was that a particular engine running on one PC does not find the solution within a certain time but on another PC it does. Now we might say that on a multi-core system with a faster CPU and more memory it should find the answer, at least quicker than when running on a slower PC. However, I have wondered if processing power is the complete answer to this. All current PC’s are pretty fast, and yes some more so than others, but is raw power the only reason for a quick solution? I know up until now, when I see one of these “Time for Adjudication” positions, I quickly put it into HIARCS or Rybka or now Houdini 2, to see if and how long it takes to solve and either being disappointed or pleased with the result.

What I had not been doing was re-trying the position several times with the same engine and settings! My first thought would be that the time to solve would be roughly the same on each run, but on testing this I have discovered some interesting results. I don’t know if it is standard practise to conduct several attempts at a puzzle and note the best times, or if people like myself just accept the first attempt?

For the test I used my home built PC with an I7 950 processor which is over-clocked to 3.7Ghz, and it has 6GB memory, so it’s a reasonably fast machine. I then found a mate in 12 puzzle on YouTube:

[FEN"2K1k1br/3p1n1r/P1p2pN1/3p1N2/2P4P/8/P2P1p2/8 w k - 0 1"]

web site: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lvMfSBtBg9Y

and used this in the Aquarium interface. I first tried Houdini 2.0c Standard (no point having the Pro version as you need multiple processors as opposed to a single multi-core processor to take advantage of the NUMA configuration). I decided to run two tests, 20 attempts with 4 CPU cores and 20 with 6 CPU cores. The reason being is that my processor has Hyperthreading which are virtual cores or threads running within a real core. According to Robert Houdart, the author of Houdini, it is better to limit Chess engines to the real cores for better overall parallel processing performance. I left the hash setting at 2048MB for all tests which may not have been optimum but kept things constant for the test. All other settings were left at defaults. After each run I closed the engine down and let Aquarium re-start it, this way
any hash results would be lost between tests.

The results below show that Houdini 2.0C Standard would always solve the position and find the mate in 12 moves but sometimes with quite varying times. I first thought that this could be Windows doing it’s housekeeping or other things like the virus checker slowing things down, but then I noticed that for each run both the times and the depth of search would differ. This told me that Houdini was not always finding the optimum path irrespective of the time. There was as much as 95 seconds difference between one solution and another. Sometimes Houdini would solve the mate in just a few seconds looking 17 moves ahead, and another time it would take well over a minute looking 22 moves ahead. I wondered if this was some peculiarity with Houdini so tried out Stockfish 2.1.1 with the same settings.

The results were not good for Stockfish as it only managed to find a mate in 17, and another attempt showed a mate in 20. Obviously it was cutting off the best moves in its search. Rybka 4.1 was none too hot either, but better than Stockfish. It managed to find a mate in 15 after 4 minutes at a depth of 19, and on another run found a mate in 20 after 4 minutes and 45 seconds. Finally it found the mate in 12 on the third run in 5 minutes 36 seconds at a depth of 19.

I tried Hiarcs 13.2 MP but after 15 minutes it had not found the mate so aborted this test. However, I think all these results show that I need to re-run the test positions 10 or more times and perhaps note the shortest and longest times. Just because one engine comes up with the move on one run does not guarantee it will on another, or if it does, that it will do it in the same time or in the same way. On consideration of this I suspect that when analysing positions it’s quite possible that two or more moves within the search tree could have the same evaluation, so how does the program pick one of these, probably/possibly at random? This random feature could explain the different solving times and depths of search I discovered in my tests.

What if the position does not lead to mate within a reasonable limit and the engines just have to find the best move? We often witness that the position evaluation for one of these test positions only indicates a slight advantage when the correct move is chosen. This means the engines really don’t fully understand the position.

What if the engines fail to get the correct move, perhaps re-running the test again they might happen to wonder down the correct path and then “see” the correct move? The random effect just happens to nudge them in the correct direction, at a particular depth. If this is correct it would explain why a chess match between two engines really does need to be over 100’s of games to be able to determine a probability that one could be better than another.

Here are the results of Houdini 2.0C running on 4 cores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test No</th>
<th>Time to correct move</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 min 16 sec</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38 sec</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 min 2 sec</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>39 sec</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>43 sec</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 min 20 sec</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 min 3 sec</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 min 28 sec</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18 sec</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>55 sec</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15 sec</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14 sec</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8 sec</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 min 40 sec</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 sec</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 min 21 sec</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 min 7sec</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13 sec</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 min 27 sec</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28 sec</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The best result here is just 5 seconds! This is
very impressive, and comparing to the chap on the You Tube web link given above - with his over-clocked PC running Houdini 2.0C Pro with 12 cores - he is boasting 14 seconds which immediately shows an anomaly. This of course is an excellent result, but highlights that despite apparently faster hardware, this has not made the difference. I think the random element is having more of a say here. Perhaps somebody can try this out with other engines and a different interface to see if they experience the same behaviour?

The 6 core results are very similar giving a quickest time of 8 seconds and longest time of 1 min 17 seconds. Probably not enough of a difference to determine if 4 real cores are better than 4 Cores plus 2 hyper-threads. I suspect a much larger test run would be required.

I hope I’ve not bored you to death with all that!

Best regards and Happy New Year!
Ray Couzens.

So it was no great surprise to me when I got Robert Houdart's reply....

Hello Eric,

Houdini 2.0c produces exactly the same analysis as Houdini 2.0b (you can easily verify this when you run with 1 thread), so I really don’t expect any difference in playing strength. My best guess is that you’re just seeing random variations.

Best regards,
Robert Houdart, Houdini Chess Engine

Even so, it is quite frustrating, as you’ve found out.

I may well publish your e-mail if that’s okay, maybe other programmers or PC experts will respond and throw some light on this and perhaps suggest a way to get MP to work more consistently

Glad you still enjoy the magazine!

Cheers... and Happy New Year to you also - Eric

Here is my take on the situation!

When PC’s were single processor only (e.g. our old Pentium friends), tests under such as the ChessBase gui generally produced consistent results. There’s always a bit of ‘noise’ from the gui, but you could replay a match (using the same openings database of course) and get very similar results. So you could test new versions of your engine whilst in course of preparation, or test new engines when they came out, and establish levels of improvement (or otherwise) quite easily and reliably.

But when dual, and then quad, and now 8/12/16 core PCs came onto the market, consistency became quite an issue. Not only did the engine have some noise from the gui to contend with, but also the way Windows divided the work between the processors could also vary, even while an engine is searching from move to move! [Now I’m blaming Windows here, I don’t believe the programmers
have much choice, and they can't really tell Windows how to apportion the work). So you can run a Testsuite (e.g. the popular WM-Test), or an engine-engine Match using MP engines, and get quite varying results from match to match! This makes testing for programmers (and their helpers!) very frustrating, so most programmers have written their own Test Programs, running in a simplified mode to reduce gui noise and other issues as much as possible. Of course this is boring if you want to watch a game in progress, because you can't, but it means that the PC churns out regular and reliable results, and you know if your latest tweak is good, bad or indifferent, and how much better a new (UCI) engine that's just come out really is!

You can test this yourself if you have a dual/quad/octal/or more PC! Firstly you need an openings database - you usually get a Noomens test database when you buy a ChessBase engine, I can e-mail one of my own if anyone hasn't got one from somewhere already. Secondly it is best to use 2 engines of fairly similar strength and, of course, they must be MP/Deep. So for example a recent Critter (1.2 or 1.4) and a recent Stockfish (2.1 or 2.2). Or if you have some ChessBase engines then Deep Hiarc13, Deep Junior12.5 and Deep Shredder12 are all close enough.

**Test 1:** Choose your engines - let's assume you're using ChessBase which at present is still the most popular - and put both engines into SP mode, i.e. tell them through Parameters to only use 1 core/thread. Incidentally you could switch Permanent Brain 'on' for this particular test. Make sure they aren't accessing their own opening books, but instead point them to your chosen Test Database (Noomens, ELH or whatever). Also make sure Learning is switched off. I'll leave you to decide on a Time Control, but I'd suggest something like G/2+2 which will give each engine a little time to 'think' and make sure that no games are won or lost on time, but also makes sure your match doesn't take too long. Then run the match! When you have the result you can re-run the match, using exactly the same parameters, and you will get a second result which will certainly be very close to your first one!

**Test 2:** Because you have learned from this Article that you get variations in MP mode, you might wonder if MP mode is worth having! And of course if we have an MP PC then we all definitely want to run our engines, for analysis or matches, in MP mode! So the next test is so you can confirm for yourself that MP mode does work, even if results from it will vary a bit. So go into your gui again. Keep the same pair of engines but pick one of them and change it to 2-cores/threads, or 4 or more if you've got a quad or better. Remember to use your same Opening Test Database again, make sure Learning is still off for both engines, but switch Permanent Brain off now so that your MP engine can use all its cores. Run this match. You will find for certain that the engine you've turned to MP mode will improve its score. But if you re-run this test, although your MP engine will always do better than before, you might well find that there's quite a bit of variation in the result... because the core sharing will vary for the engine running in MP mode.

**Test 3:** Go back into your gui and now make sure both engines are turned to MP mode - i.e. 2/4/8 cores/threads depending on your system. Make sure you're still using the same original Openings Test Database, Permanent Brain is still off, also that Learning is off, and run the Match. Probably the result will be fairly similar to the result you had in SP v SP mode, but if you run this MP v MP match again, even using all the same set-up criteria, you will almost certainly get more variety in the results.

I must admit that, so far, I have always used a ChessBase gui for my MP v MP tests, but one of these days I will run a series of tests using either the Aquarium, or Shredder or Arena gui. I'd like to know if there's as much variation using them as there is with ChessBase. Maybe other readers (or a programmer!) has already done this - as Ray has with Aquarium, with the same problem - and can tell us if their experience has been any better. Maybe there's a programmer out there who would tell us more about how decisions concerning the dividing of work between the cores/threads is done and whether it's all down to Windows or if there's anything the programmers themselves can do to improve what's happening!!
Long time subscriber Augusto Perez (see right) was very pleased recently to pick up a Mephisto Milano on eBay for a reasonable price - it's an excellent computer of course, with a good 2-line graphic display and a nice Ed Schorger program which used an early form of selective searching and plays quite positionally and cleverly at times. Augusto tells me that it's in fine condition!

So he decided to play a 10 game G/60 match with it against his Saitek Advanced Travel, which is a more tactical program and should provide an interesting style contrast. He has started to send me the moves so that we can cover it in Selective Search.

Before we begin let me mention the SelSearch 157 ratings for these two:
- Advanced Travel 1912 Elo
- Milano 1950 Elo

So there's not a great deal between them, it should be close with maybe the Milano edging it 5½-4½. Let's get started and find out with games 1 and 2!

**Milano - Advanced Travel**

Game 1. D23: Queen's Gambit Accepted: 3 Nf3 Nf6 sidelines

1.d4 d5 2. c3 f3 d6 3.c4 dxc4 4.a4+ c6
5.exc4 f5 6.c3 e6 7.g5 e7 8.xf6
8.e3 has a better record

8...xf6 9.b4N

An interesting alternative to the Book move as, with this, White traps the enemy king in the centre. 9.e4 is the usual choice and although Black can reply &g6 he usually plays 9...g4 10.0-0-0 d7 11.e2 a5= 9...d7?!

9...c7 would have been better, for reasons which become clear over the next few moves

10.e4 &g4

The bishop would have been safer with

10...g6 as now 11.e5 can be met with

11...c7

11.e5! xe5 12.dxe5

12...b6

12...e7!? would get the queen off the d-file and ask White what it wants to do with its own queen

13.f3 h5 14.d1!

If only the queen had gone to c7! Black's next move will virtually decide the game!!

14...b7?

14...e7 was correct. Now White would presumably play 15.d6, though c4 is also good, and now 15...xd6 16.exd6, but if Black managed to find 16...f6 White would have only a small advantage in an interesting position

15.d6

15...b5! would have been even better, pretty much forcing 15...e7 16.d6+ f8 17.c3

h6 18.h4! c5 19.g4 &g6 20.h5 &h7 21.b4!

and Black clearly has major problems!

15...d7 16.c4
16...\textcolor{red}{\textit{wc8??}}
16...\textcolor{red}{\textit{wxd6}}, taking the chance to exchange queens, was the only real chance, then
17.\textcolor{red}{\textit{exd6 \textit{c7}}} which catches up on development a little and also stops \textit{xc6} because of the fork \textit{xe5}.
The only other possibility was perhaps
16...\textcolor{red}{\textit{g6}} though 17.\textcolor{red}{\textit{f2}}, bringing its other rook into the game with so many of Black's pieces undeveloped, would have given White a big advantage.
17.\textcolor{red}{\textit{b5!}}
Threatening both mate and the win of the Black queen if the Advanced Travel isn't careful.
17...\textcolor{red}{\textit{d7}}
Alternatives are no better: 17...\textcolor{red}{\textit{cxb5}}
18.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xb5+}} is mate in 9, so that's worse:
18...\textcolor{red}{\textit{d7}} 19.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xd7+ \textit{xd7}}} 20.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xd7+}} etc.
17...\textcolor{red}{\textit{d7}} 18.\textcolor{red}{\textit{a3!}} and where can the Black queen go? if 18...\textcolor{red}{\textit{e7}} 19.\textcolor{red}{\textit{d6+ \textit{f8}}} 20.\textcolor{red}{\textit{f5}} threatening \textit{d8} mate and winning
18.\textcolor{red}{\textit{c7+ \textit{d8}}} 19.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xa8 b5}} 20.\textcolor{red}{\textit{b3 c5}} 21.\textcolor{red}{\textit{a4!}}

\textbf{Deadly.} Black is mated if its queen leaves the protection of \textit{d7}, so the king must move to break the pin which grips the knight
26...\textcolor{red}{\textit{e8}} 27.\textcolor{red}{\textit{c7+ f8}} 28.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xa4 \textit{xf3}}}
29.\textcolor{red}{\textit{gxf3 a6 30.f4}}
My PC says that 30.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xa6}} was m/11!
30...\textcolor{red}{\textit{g5}}
Creating an escape square for the king thanks to White missing the mate chance. However my PC says its still mate if the Milano can find the winning move this time.
31.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xa6!}}
Well done!
31...\textcolor{red}{\textit{b6}} 32.\textcolor{red}{\textit{a7 d7}} 33.\textcolor{red}{\textit{fxg5}}
33.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xe6+}} is m/8 and wins one move quicker
33...\textcolor{red}{\textit{d8}} 34.\textcolor{red}{\textit{a8 xxa8}} 35.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xa8 h5}} 36.\textcolor{red}{\textit{b7}}
37.\textcolor{red}{\textit{g7}} 38.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xe7}}
37...\textcolor{red}{\textit{h4}} 38.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xd7 g6}} 39.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xf7+ \textit{g5}}}
40.\textcolor{red}{\textit{f6+ \textit{g4}} 41.\textcolor{red}{\textit{g7+ \textit{h5}} 42.\textcolor{red}{\textit{g5#}}} 1-0

That was a tough start for the Saitek portable, all down to a poor queen placement in the opening. It also gets into trouble in game 2, but this time things are not quite so straightforward!

\textbf{Advanced Travel - Milano}

Game 2. B18: Classical Caro-Kann: 4...Bf5 sidelines
1.e4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.\textcolor{red}{\textit{c3 dxe4}} 4.\textcolor{red}{\textit{xe4 f5}}
5.\textcolor{red}{\textit{g3 g6}} 6.\textcolor{red}{\textit{c4 e6}} 7.\textcolor{red}{\textit{e2 f6}} 8.\textcolor{red}{\textit{f4 d6}}
9.\textcolor{red}{\textit{g6}}
This isn't played as often as either 9.c3 or 9.\textcolor{red}{\textit{b3}}, but actually has a better record and scores 66.7% on my database!
9...\textcolor{red}{\textit{hxg6}} 10.\textcolor{red}{\textit{c3}}
10.\textcolor{red}{\textit{g5}} is better and the most popular reply, rather than 10...\textcolor{red}{\textit{xc7}} or \textcolor{red}{\textit{bd7}}, is 10...\textcolor{red}{\textit{a5+}}
11.\textcolor{red}{\textit{d2 \textit{c7}}} 12.\textcolor{red}{\textit{f3}} when 12...\textcolor{red}{\textit{bd7}} results
in an even game
10...\$d5N
10...\$c7 11.\$f3 \$bd7 was theory here, much as in the line shown at move 10. Alternatively 10...\$bd7 could be tried, whereas the move actually played, by vacating the f-file, isn't as sound]
11.\$f3! \$d7 12.0-0 b5 13.\$b3 a5!

I like this, a very competitive response to White's kingside threats
14.\$e1 \$7b6 15.\$d2?!
I think the AdvTravel would have been better doing something about Black's advancing pawns with 15.a4 bxa4 16.\$c2
15...a4!
Probably equalising
16.\$c2 \$h4
This looks threatening but is easily met, and has slightly separated Black's forces.
16...\$c4! was the best way to make the most of its previous moves, and after 17.\$c1 \$f6 the Milano would have had a slight initiative
17.h3 \$c4! 18.\$e4! \$e7 19.\$c1 e5

20.b3
20.\$d2 would have given White a slight edge with the Black queen somewhat misplaced. Then 20...\$xd2 21.\$xd2 exd4 22.cxd4 is certainly okay
20...\$xb3 21.\$xb3
Obviously better than 21.axb3? \$xa1
22.bxc4 bxc4 23.dxe5 0-0 when having \$x for \$ will leave Black on top after some needed piece reorganisation!
21...f5 22.\$xc4 bxc4
When you're using a Chessbase engine to analyse you get a note here: 'White has a new passed pawn: a2'. Okay, let's keep an eye on it and see what our dedicated friends think of it!
23.\$g3
23...exd4
23...e4 also looks interesting and after
24...e2 a4+ perhaps
24...cxd4?!
This is wrong, though Black doesn't take full
advantage. There was an interesting alternative
in 24...e6 though perhaps it's a bit hard
for the AdvTravel to find. Black's only move
to stay equal then would be 24...f4 after
which 25...e2 h5 26...e4 seems best
24...exd4?!
With 24...0-0! the earlier attack on the king-
side would get some rewards. White protects
the d-pawn with 25...d1 and Black plays
25...d4 and if 26.a3 efe8
25...g5 a7??
Black gets lucky here because this also is
wrong! 25...0-0! just manages to keep the
Milano at least equal after 26...e7 e7
27...e2 d6. Here Black is a pawn ahead
but its pawns are looking so scruffy that the
real advantage is minimal
26.a4??
What a missed opportunity! There was a
pawn to be won with 26...xf5 gxf5 27...f5 and
it is hard to know how the Franz Morsch
tactical program which Saitek have put in the
AdvTravel could miss this
26...d3 27...e7
When I put the extra diagram in at move 23 it
was so that readers could follow the game for
a few moves here, and then a bit more,
even if they don't play through all of it.
At this point 27...e3 was best and after
27...d7 (not 27...xe3?!) 28...xc6+ f8
29...x e3 d6 30...xc4x 28...ed1 things
would have remained fairly even. Now Black
will maintain an advantage for something like
the next 20 moves

27...e7 28...xe7+ e7
28...xe7?! looks even better as it releases
the king's rook for action at last
29...e2 e2 30...xe2 d7 31...a5
The passed pawn is on the move!
31...a8 32...a6 c7 33...a4 b6 34...xc4
xa6
Now White doesn't have a passed pawn, but
Black does!
35...d4 a1+ 36...h2 e1 37...g3 e5
38...f3 d5

39...h4?!
Vacating the c4 square gives Black a chance
which unfortunately it doesn't take. 39...f4
was better
39...d8?!
If 39...c5! the rook must return 40...c4 and,
as White has lost a tempo, 40...c6 41...b5
would definitely improve the Milano's
chances
40...h7 g8 41...h4?!
I'd have put the rook back with 41...h4, ready
after 41...c5 to play 42...c4 After the new
commitment on the h-file (which also stops
the rook from coming back) you can see that
there must be good chances for Black to
make the queenside pressure really count
41...c5! 42...e5 b5!
There is now no doubt, the Milano is defi-
nitely winning this
43...g5
Consistent but dodgy!
43...c4 44...f3 c3 45...e1
White's knight is just about saving the day, at least for now

45...@c4?!

But Black's knight could have gone a long way towards winning the game here with 45...d5! which is a marvellous move because it makes the White king's journey back into the game a very long one as it can't travel via f4! So if 46.c2 then c4 47.g4 d3 is almost certainly 0–1 already, so best would be 46.xg6. Even so 46.e8 47.c2 c4 48.xf5 d3 49.xg7 xc2 50.d7 f8+ 51.g5 b4. Now that Black's king can hide on the b-file to release the c-pawn it will surely end 0–1

46.h4+
The rook is back

46.b3 47.d4 h8?

Pointless. 47...e8 was okay but best of all was 47...c2! 48.xc2 xc2 which would still leave Black in charge despite the big miss of the win with 45...d5!

48.d7!
The rook got back in the game at move 46 and suddenly is close to equalising

48...h5+ 49.f4 h4+ 50.g4

50.fxg4

Perhaps 50...c6 was better, and if the likely

51.xg7 d4+$

51.hxg4

The dedicated machines, with their lower depth of search, are often tempted to grab the best material available. So the AdvTravel does well to avoid 51.xe7?? because 51...gxh3 + 52.g3 h2 53.xh4 h1 #+ would give Black the win all over again

51...f5

The game is now equal, hard to believe from the big advantage which the Milano had only a few moves ago. What next?!

52.b7+ a2 53.f3 c2 54.c7 b2

55.xh4 xh4

White has won the exchange but the game should still be drawn because of Black's big compensation, the pawn on c2!

56.g3 g5 57.b7+ c1 58.f4 d1 59.d7+ e2 60.c7

And now comes the mistake to end all mistakes – at least in this game anyway!

60...gxf4??

Just keeping alongside the c2–pawn is all that's needed to draw. So simply 60...d2 would save the game 61.fg5 g6 62.d7+ e3 63.c7 d2 and the ½ could be agreed

61.xh4

Well of course, what on earth was Black thinking about?

61...d2 62.g5

PC engines with tablebases are showing long mates for Black now

62.c1

62.f3 makes no difference: 63.g3! and White still has m/22]

63.xc1 xc1 64.g4 d2 65.xf4

Beginners are shown how to win these, and Tablebases assure me that it is m/17 with best play. 1–0, and the match is level at 1–1!
THE EIGNEMANN ENDGAME TEST SUITE

I introduced the first group of these in our last Issue, and now it is time to give you the solutions. Many thanks to all who sent in results, especially Peter Grayson and Frank Holt who each tested a very wide range of engines. I have shown the engines which succeeded on each of the positions in each case.

Eigenmann 13
Salvo 1998. White to play + win

Houdini 1.5a, Houdini 2.0, Critter 1.2, HIARCS 13.2, Stockfish 2.1.1, IvanHoe 9.47b, Firebird 1.1

1. $\text{a1}+ / 1. gxf5 \text{xf7}$ 2. $\text{a1}+ \text{g7} / 1. \text{g6}+?$ 3. $\text{g7} 2. \text{g3} \text{b8}+ 3. \text{g2}$
4. $\text{a8}+ / 1. \text{g7} 2. \text{g6}$ $\text{a3}+ 3. \text{h4} \text{f8} 4. \text{g5}$ $\text{hxg4} 5. \text{h4}$ [5. $\text{hxg4}??$
$\text{b4+ is a draw!] 5. $\text{g3}$ [$5. \text{xf7} 6. \text{xf7} \text{h5} 7. \text{d5}$
$\text{h7} 8. \text{g5} \text{g3} 9. \text{a8}+?]
6. $\text{h3} \text{c8}+ 7. \text{xg3}+$

Eigenmann 15
Kasparian 1997. White to play + win

Houdini 1.5a, Houdini 2.0, Rybka 4.1, Critter 1.2, HIARCS 13.2, Zappa Mexico II, Stockfish 2.1.1, Fire 2.2 xTreme, IvanHoe 9.47b, Shredder 10.1, Firebird 1.1, Komodo 3

1. $\text{d1} e3 [1... $\text{xd1} 2. \text{xh5}$
$\text{e3} 3. \text{g4} e2 4. \text{h4} \text{e1} \text{g5} 3.-]
2. $\text{hxh5} e2 3. \text{xe2} c3$
[3... $\text{xe2} 4. \text{h5} \text{f2} (4...c3$
$5. \text{g4} c2 6. \text{h4} \text{c1} \text{g7} 7. \text{g3} =)$
$5. \text{g4} \text{xe2} 6. \text{h4} =] 4. \text{h5} \text{c2}$
5. $\text{g4} \text{c1} \text{g5}$

Eigenmann 26
Quekenstadt 1920. White to play + win

Houdini 1.5a, Houdini 2.0, Critter 1.2, HIARCS 13.2, Fire 2.2 xTreme, IvanHoe 9.47b, Firebird 1.1

1. $\text{g4} [1. \text{e2}? \text{e4} 2. \text{dx}e4 (2.d4$
$\text{c6}=) 2... \text{c6} =; 1.d4?$
$\text{c6} =] 1. \text{xe6} [1... \text{a4}+$
$2. \text{d2} \text{c6} 3. \text{g2} \text{b5}$
$(3... \text{xg}2 4. \text{e}4+?) 4. \text{a7} \text{a6}$
$5. \text{a6} \text{a7} 6. \text{f7} \text{f5}$
$7. \text{g5}+; 1... \text{e5} 2. \text{g2} \text{e4}$
$3. \text{dx}e4 \text{c6} 4. \text{exf5} \text{gxf5}$
$5. \text{fxe6}+ / 2. \text{g2}! \text{xg2}$
$[2... \text{a5} 3. \text{a7}+] 3. \text{e4} \text{f5}$
$[3. \text{c4} 4. \text{a7} \text{cxd3}+$
$5. \text{dx}d3+ -] 4. \text{gx}f5 \text{exf5}$
$[4. \text{e4} 5. \text{f6} \text{cxd3}+$
$6. \text{d2}+ -] 5. \text{a7} \text{f}4 6. \text{d4} \text{e3}$
[6...exd4 7.a5 8.d3+] 7...dxe5+

**Eigenmann 33**
Kubbel 1925. White to play + win

Houdini 1.5a, Houdini 2.0, Critter 1.2, Shredder 10.1, Komodo 3

1...b3 [1...d5=] 1...xd1 2.e2 g1 2...d5
3.xd1 e5 4.e8 f4
5.e2 g4 6.f2+ 7.f2
d1 4.e2 d5 5.e4 d7
6.dxd5 wins

**Eigenmann 43**
Zappa-Jonny, CompGame 2006.
White to play + draw


1.d7 [1...c3? c5=]
1...c5+ [This seems to spoil the win, but...]
2.e2 xd7 [2...b7 3.d6++]
3.e6
c6 [3...h3 4.f1--]
4.e7
h3 5.h1 h5 [5...h2]
6.g2+ 7.g1+

I hope you enjoyed these, and also seeing the solutions. More in future!

**TIME for ADJUDICATION**

Now to Bill Reid's last position in SelS 157.

It is White to play and draw,
and we noted last time that, long ago in 2007 and SelSearch issue 128, all but one of the engines played 1.Qxh8..., which loses to 1...c5! 2.Kf2 Nd1+! This move has to be found to win, it allows the knight to move around the board as we shall see. In 2007 few engines found even this, which is why they chose the losing Qxh8? in the first place of course.

7.Ka4 Nf6 8.Kb5 Ne8
9.Qh7+Bg7 10.Kc6 Ne6 0-1.

Anyway in issue 129 in 2007 Bill concurred that 1.c5, the move excellently suggested by Fritz9 - though Fritz 10 and its versions since chose the losing 1.Qxh8? like the other 2007 engines - would certainly draw though probably not win, and that 1.Qxe3 would draw. But in our last issue 157 he wondered if the engines had improved?!

Over to Peter Grayson:

Hi Eric,

Bill Reid's position in SS157 was interesting in that, although a similar theme to the previous position, there was a subtle change from just trapping the queen to being able to win it. The key move after 1.Qxh8 c5 2.Kf2 was 2...Nd1+ allowing the knight to manoeuvre around the board to capture White's queen. So the engines needed to find and report this move.

I intended to test more engines but ran out of time.

Anyway HIARCS 13.2,

Houdini 2.0c Pro and Deep Rybka 4.1 all eventually declined Qxh8.

Deep Rybka reminded me here why I stopped using it as an analysis tool because its usefulness can be nonexistent sometimes! As in this position, it changes move but gives no reason! That's no good to me. It's analysis has shown 1.Qxh8 c5 2.Kd2 Nxc4 for quite some time, and we assume that it changes to 1.c5 because it has found something wrong with its previous line, but it doesn't update the faulty line before the change, so we don't ever find out about the vital 2...Nd1+ from Rybka's shown analysis, and are left none the wiser. HIARCS 13.2 and others show precisely what they found before they change to the improvement.

To conclude this position here is some analysis on the 2 drawing lines:

1.c5 Bg7 2.Qxe3 Rd8 3.cxd6 Rxd6 4.Qa7+ Kg8 5.Qb8+ Bf8 6.Kg2, and although White has a slightly better position, it is hard to see how progress can be made and the game should be a draw.

The same applies to the other line suggested in our original article and by many 2012 engines:

1.Qxe3 Be7 2.Qb6 c5 3.Kg2 Ra8! 4.Qb2 Rg8 and there is nothing White can do.

Peter continued in his e-mail:

Following the Bill Reid position in SS156 and my comment published in SS157, the attached game between Rybka 2.3.2a and Zappa Mexico II occurred when I recently ran them through the Noomens 2012 test opening lines.

**Rybka 2.3.2 - Zappa Mexico 2**

38...h2 4.24/23 8

Despite being two pawns ahead, where under normal situations exchanging Queens may benefit the side with the pawn(s) advantage, the interesting aspect was the overestimation of White's position by Rybka 2.3.2a. That is not uncommon but also, do any of the more recent engines have added knowledge to play this any better? Two moves, one in succession of the other tells an interesting story.

Black, Zappa, played the clever 38...Qg6, offering the queen exchange. Rybka 2.3.2a obliges and the game
runs through to move 171 before a draw is achieved, but with over evaluations, significant by Rybka and to a lesser degree by Zappa. I suspect most would see that after the Queen exchange, barring mistakes, Black seems able to hold the draw.

38...\texttt{\textit{g6}} 39.\texttt{\textit{xg6}+? Other engines chose:}\n39.Qxg6+: HIARCS 13.2 +3.46
39.Qf8:
Houdini 2.0c Pro x64 +4.62
Stockfish 2.1.1 JA x64 +6.02
Deep Rybka 4.1 x64 +3.43
Critter 1.2 x64 GTB +3.09
39...\texttt{\textit{xg6}} 40.a8
Houdini has dropped its eval. to +2.00 already! Others are much as they were
40...d5 41.a5 d2 42.d2 42...g2
\texttt{\textit{d3}} 43.a6 \texttt{\textit{a3}}

To most human eyes some basic rules for Black are already obvious. The rook must stay on the "a" file and the King must not move away from the pawn protection of the seventh rank that would allow White to check with the rook allowing a8=Q in the process. White's King cannot get into a position to support the a7 pawn because Black keeps checking with the rook until White's King is sufficiently distant from the a7 pawn. Having established\n
that, barring mistakes, a draw seems the only outcome.

44.a7 \texttt{\textit{h7}} 45.f4 g6 46.d2 \texttt{\textit{a2}+} 47.e3 \texttt{\textit{a1}} 48.d3 \texttt{\textit{a3}+} 49.d4 \texttt{\textit{a4}+} 50.e5 \texttt{\textit{a2}} 51.b6 4.80/26 \texttt{\textit{b2}+} 52.a6 \texttt{\textit{a2}+} 53.b7 \texttt{\textit{b2}+} 54.c6 \texttt{\textit{c2}+} 55.b5 \texttt{\textit{b2}+} 56.a4 \texttt{\textit{a2}+} 57.b3 \texttt{\textit{a1}}

58.a2 59.a4 \texttt{\textit{b1}+} 60.c5 4.80/13 \texttt{\textit{c1}+}

and finally, as I didn't want to try my readers patience for another 112 moves, I'm jumping to the position when it was agreed ½-½ after move 172!

So, Peter asks some pertinent questions...

1. Are current engines better able to improve on the understanding of the exchange? Given the relatively fast time control, I gave engines up to the first update of analysis that occurred after 2 minutes, and of those tested all except HIARCS 13.2 avoided the exchange and seemed to find something better. The Stockfish's evaluation may have been a little over optimistic at this point.

2. After the queens are exchanged at move 39, do current engines still see a major advantage for White at move 40? Here Houdini was best, returning what seemed to be a pure material advantage of 2 pawns. Stockfish was the most optimistic again but none of the evaluations showed much improvement on Rybka's over optimistic value.

Sometimes the evaluations may not tell the whole story and the fact that most shied away from the queen exchange by playing a different queen move at 39. may be sufficient for us to say, yes, they have improved.

Best regards and wishes for Christmas and the New Year.

God be with you............ Peter
# 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 Processor.

## 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>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Houdini 2.0 x64</td>
<td>3189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Komodo 4.0 x64</td>
<td>3165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Critter 1.4 x64</td>
<td>3164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stockfish 2.2.2</td>
<td>3162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Critter 1.2 x64</td>
<td>3159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Houdini 1.5A x32</td>
<td>3158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Critter 1.4 x32</td>
<td>3148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rybka 4.1 x64</td>
<td>3147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Komodo 3 x64</td>
<td>3140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rybka 4 x64</td>
<td>3128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stockfish 2.1.1 x64</td>
<td>3119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Stockfish 2.01 x64</td>
<td>3116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Komodo 2.03 x64</td>
<td>3112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Stockfish 1.9.1 x64</td>
<td>3095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rybka 3 x64</td>
<td>3095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rybka 4 x32</td>
<td>3091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Naum 4.2 x64</td>
<td>3023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Chiron 1.1 x64</td>
<td>3009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Naum 4.2 x32</td>
<td>3002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Rybka 2.3.2a x64</td>
<td>2994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fritz 13 x32</td>
<td>2986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Shredder 12 x64</td>
<td>2981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Naum 4/4.1 x32</td>
<td>2979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sjeng CT 2010 x64</td>
<td>2974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Gull 1.2 x64</td>
<td>2970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Spike 1.4 x32</td>
<td>2968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Harcs13.2 x32</td>
<td>2963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Deep Fritz 12 x32</td>
<td>2955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rybka 1.2F x64</td>
<td>2950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Protector 1.4.0 x64</td>
<td>2950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Spark 1.0 x64</td>
<td>2949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Junior 12.5 x64</td>
<td>2944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Spark 0.5 x64</td>
<td>2939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Doch 1.3.4 x64</td>
<td>2930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Deep Fritz 11 x32</td>
<td>2928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Hannibal 1.1 x64</td>
<td>2924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Harcs 13/13.1 x32</td>
<td>2921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Junior 12.5 x64</td>
<td>2919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fritz 12 x32</td>
<td>2919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Fritz 11 x32</td>
<td>2914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Thinker 5.4D x64</td>
<td>2906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Zappa Mexico 2 x64</td>
<td>2903</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>Houdini 2.0c</td>
<td>3214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Houdini 1.5A</td>
<td>3203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Critter 1.2</td>
<td>3182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rybka 4.1</td>
<td>3139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stockfish 2.1.1</td>
<td>3134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Critter 1.01</td>
<td>3126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Komodo 3</td>
<td>3123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stockfish 2.01</td>
<td>3118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rybka 4</td>
<td>3117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Komodo 2.0.3</td>
<td>3109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stockfish 1.9.1</td>
<td>3102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rybka 3</td>
<td>3095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Critter 0.90</td>
<td>3090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Naum 4.2</td>
<td>3061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sjeng 2010 ct</td>
<td>3048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Naum 4/4.1</td>
<td>3047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fritz 13</td>
<td>3023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Shredder 12 OA=OFF</td>
<td>3032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Spike 1.4 LEIDEN</td>
<td>3023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Komodo 1.3</td>
<td>3021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chiron 1.1A</td>
<td>3032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Rybka 2.3.2a</td>
<td>3014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Harcs 13.2</td>
<td>3011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Junior 12.5</td>
<td>3012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Komodo 1.2</td>
<td>2999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fritz 12</td>
<td>2989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Harcs 13/13.1</td>
<td>2980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Protector 1.4.0</td>
<td>2977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rybka 1.2</td>
<td>2975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hannibal 1.1</td>
<td>2980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Spark 1.0</td>
<td>2971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Gull 1.2</td>
<td>2969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Naum 3/3.1</td>
<td>2961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Junior 12</td>
<td>2960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Thinker 5.4D INERT</td>
<td>2960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fritz 11</td>
<td>2957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Doch 1.3.4</td>
<td>2948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Boost 5.1.0</td>
<td>2947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Shredder 11</td>
<td>2934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Junior 11.1A</td>
<td>2934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>ToGa II 1.4.1 SE</td>
<td>2928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cyclone Extreme</td>
<td>2928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Komodo 4</td>
<td>3128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chess Computer</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>SciSys Turbostar 432 1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM2</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Mephisto MM2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasc R30-995</td>
<td>2331</td>
<td>Mephisto Milano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto London 68030</td>
<td>2301</td>
<td>Novag Star Ruby+Amber+Jade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasc R30-993</td>
<td>2288</td>
<td>Mephisto Montreal+Roma6800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Genius2 68030</td>
<td>2292</td>
<td>Mephisto Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto London Pro 68020</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>Mephisto Academy/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Lyon 68030</td>
<td>2265</td>
<td>Mephisto Mega4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Portorose 68030</td>
<td>2258</td>
<td>Fidelity 68000 Mach2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto RISC2</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>Kasparov Barracuda+Centurion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Vancouver 68030</td>
<td>2245</td>
<td>Novag SuperForte+Expert B/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph Lyon+Vanc 68020/20</td>
<td>2237</td>
<td>Kasparov Maestro D/10 module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Berlin Pro 68020</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>Fidelity 68000 Mach2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov RISC 2500-512</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>Kasparov GK2000+Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mep RISC1</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>Kasparov Explorer+TAdvTrainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Montreux</td>
<td>2210</td>
<td>Kasparov AdvTravel+Bravo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov SPARC/20</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>Kasparov Talk Chess Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov RISC 2500-128</td>
<td>2208</td>
<td>Kasparov MM4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto London 68020/12</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>Kasparov Maestro C/8 module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Star Diamond/Sapphire</td>
<td>2175</td>
<td>Mep Supermondial2+College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Elite 68040v10</td>
<td>2164</td>
<td>Mephisto Monte Carlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Vancouver 68020/12</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>Novag Super Forte+Expert A/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Lyon 68020/12</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>Fidelity Travelmaster+Tiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Portorose 68020</td>
<td>2136</td>
<td>Fidelity 68000 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 Lyon 68000</td>
<td>2108</td>
<td>Conchess Pymate Victoria5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Berlin 68000</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>Mephisto Monte Carlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mep Master+Senator+MillPro</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>Kasparov TurboKing2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Almeria 68020</td>
<td>2103</td>
<td>Novag Expert/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Sapphire+Diamond1</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>Kasparov AdvTrainer+Capella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM4/Turbo18</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>Conchess Pymate Roma/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Portorose 68000</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>Fidelity Par Excellence/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fid Mach4+Des2325+68020v7</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>Fidelity 68000 Club B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Elite 2x68000v5</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>Novag Expert/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Mega4/Turbo18</td>
<td>2052</td>
<td>Novag Super Forte+Expert A/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Polgar/10</td>
<td>2042</td>
<td>Fidelity Par Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Dallas 68020</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>Fidelity Elite+Designer 2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Roma 68020</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Fidelity Chester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM6+ExplorerPro</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Novag Forte B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov G2K100+Cougar</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Fidelity Avant Garde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Cosmos+Expert</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Mephisto Rebell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Brute Force</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Kasp Stratos+Corona+B/6mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Almeria 68000</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Novag Forte A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Citrine</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Fidelity 68000 Club A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Scorpio+Diablo</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Excalibur Grandmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasp Challenger+President</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Kasparov Maestro A/6 module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fid Mach3+Des2265+68000v2</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Kasparov TurboKing1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM4/10</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Conchess/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph Dallas 68000</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Mep Supermondial1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Nigel Short</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Conchess Pymate/5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM5</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>SciSys Turbo Kasparov/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Polgar/5</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Novag Expert/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Obsidian</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Kasparov Simultano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Mondial 68000XL</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Fidelity Excellence/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov SuperForte+Expert C/6</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Conchess Pymate/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag EmidClassic+Zircon2</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Fidelity Elite C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>SciSys Turbostar 432 1762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>