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SOLUTIONS (I hopel) to the PRIZE COMPETITION in NEWS SHEET 43B.

THREE were FASCINATING POSITIONS from GRAHAM WHITE on PAGE 2, the FOURTH an ENDGAME from COLUMN 2, PAGE 13 of that Issue.

Let's print all the positions again alongside our SOLUTIONS, for the benefit of new Readers (and those who lost their copy of 43B during the Christmas fun).

(1) Black to play.

This never occurred in actual play, but is some opening analysis by Jimmy Adams from a line in the Sicilian Sveshnikov (of course!). N5e2+ will draw at least, but how can Black win?

The SOLUTION is 1...Bf4! The move threatens 2...Qf1+, and 3...Ne2 mate.

There are two possible defences, [a] 2.Rh2 Ne2+ 3.Kh1 Qxg3!! (Nc1 also forces mate, but this IS MUCH more spectacular). 4.Qxe5+ dx e5 5.fxg3 N xg3 + 6.Kg1 Be3 mate, and [b] 2.Kh2 Ne2+ 3.g3 Bxg3+ 4.Kg2 Nf4 + 5.Kg1 Qf3 mating (6.Qxe5 dxe5 7.Rh2 Bxh2 8.Kxh2 Qg2 was sent by Clive Curtis).

(2) White to play.

This is a position which nearly occurred in Sakaev- Silva. Somehow Black has managed to Queen his Pawn in 13 moves!! But what good are 2 Queens when your King dies? There's a mate in 7 here for White!

It was probably too easy for Chess Computer owners: VANCOUVER 020 finds the mate in 7 in 30 secs; RISC 2500 in only 8 secs. It's 1.Qxh8 + Ke7 2.Nc5 + Kd6 (Ke6 3.Qe8 + Kd6 4.e5+ mates even quicker) 3.e5 + Kxe6 4.Qe8 + Kf5 5.Bh3 + Qxh3 6.Qf8 + (or 6.Qf7 Kxe5 7.Qf6 mate was sent by Clive Curtis) Kxe5 7.Qf6 mate.

Charlie Gold sent me streams of superb analysis looking at all defensive options in ALL the positions. He also found an ALTERNATIVE PUZZLE here! Take White's Pawn OFF h2, and put it ON h3, and you have a MATE IN 9 which is rather pretty: 1.Qxh8 + Ke7 2.Nd5 + Kd6 3.e5 + Kxe6 4.Qe8 + Kf5 5.Qf7 + (in the previous solution Bh3+ had been possible) Ke5 6.Bf4 + Kd4 7.Rd1 + Bd2 8.Rxd2 + Kxc4, and mate next.

(3) White to play.

This is quite a mind-boggling puzzle from Savchenko composed in 1970. It's White to mate in 8! This one will definitely keep you quiet for a while!

Only folk who were willing to leave their machines on overnight would get help for this one from their Computers. Even then it would not be long enough for some! The solution requires 1.0-0-0! axb + 2.Kc2! b1 = Q + 3.Kc3!! Qb2 +! 4.Kd3! Qe2 + 5.Ke2 f3 + 6.Ke1 Nd2 7.Nd7 + Ke4 8.Bc2 mate!!!

A remarkable solution. One might ask, "Why not just 1.Rd1", which looks to lead to virtually the same position by 6.Ke1. However 5.Ke2 has to be played at some stage in
order to FORCE f3+... as this takes away what would otherwise be a safe flight square for BLACK's King! Wow.

Clive Curtis provides a different mate in 8 solution! We start off the same, though I'll miss out all the oohs and aahs (i.e.!) this time: 1.0-0-0 axb+ 2.Kc2 b1 = Q + 3.Kc3 Qb4 + 4.Kd3, but now a variation from Black: Qxc4 + 5.Kx4 Nd2 + 6.Rxd2 Bf1 + 7.Kc3 gxh5 8.Bd4 mate!

Now we come to the hardest of all.

(4)

White to play.

SCHACH & SPIELE Magazine states that 1.Nf3 + (chosen by many Computers) only draws, and that 1.Nc2 is the sole winning move. Some programs do find this, but often without conviction that it is a win - i.e. their evaluations are only small plusses, and far from, say, +500 or so.


But REUBENFINE in BASIC CHESS ENDINGS, page 92, RETI-MANDLER, 1924, shows Nf3+ analysis which wins? The question is, was he right?

One or two folk weren't happy that I was suggesting a Computer might have put some of Fine's analysis into the bid! But I never said that, even though Computers occasionally DO re-write the books in certain areas. Actually it was Schach & Spiele who were putting a few of their own oohs and aahs (in the form of '??') against a Novag Computer which played 1.Nf3+. Their stated reason was that 'only 1.Nc2 wins'.

Realising that this was from an endgame analysed in some depth (?) by Reuben Fine, I looked up his work for myself, and found analysis there which shows that, whilst 1.Nc2 is the SIMPLEST way to win, 1.Nf3 also leads TO a win if followed through correctly.

The question - and it IS a VERY hard one - is, "Do we - or our Computers - agree?"

The two main contenders for the YEAR'S FREE NEWS SHEET SUBSCRIPTION both sent in their work on this, having already done mountains of work on the first three.

Clive Curtis sent: 1.Nf3+ Ke3 2.Kg2 Ke4 3.Ng5+ Ke3 4.Nf3, admitting that this was done on his RISC 2500 which still showed an equal evaluation when at the root position. He also writes that, given its own freedom of choice, the RISC 2500 showed 1.Nc2! Kd1 2Nb4 Kd2 3.Nd5 Kd3 4.Nxf4 Ke4 5.Ne2 Ke5 6.Nxg3 Kf4 with a +544 eval. Well done! His Mephisto ACADEMY also chose 1.Nc2! expecting Kd3?? 2.Ke1 and showing +310 after 1 hour.

Charlie Gold sent 2 pages on 1.Nc2 - let's accept that that DOES win - plus a page on 1.Nf3!


[b] 1.Nf3+ Ke5 (the move chosen by KRIS for Black after 1.Nf3 was 'forced' on him...) and Charlie argues it GETS the ½/2) 2.Ne5 Kd4 3.Nc4 Kd3 4.Nb6 Ke3 5.Nd5+ Ko4 6.Ng4 + Kd2 7.Ne5 Ke3 8.Nf3 Kd3 9.Ke1 Ke3 10.Ne5 Kd4 11.Nf7 Ke3 12.Ng5 etc. If the Knight is given up for the Pawn in this line, White doesn't get the opposition, and only draws. The PRIZE goes to CHARLIE GOLD for this super effort!

A NEWS SHEET READER
ENJOYING HIS CHRISTMAS!

I have just received a really nice letter from JEREMY DEANE, a long-standing friend and NS-reader, telling me of a joyful Christmas and New Year spent with the latest additions to his range of Chess Computers and Programs.

"I am well pleased with my additions", he says, which is always good news - AND the best way to have a real chance of getting your name in print! The three 'additions' are, in fact, the Kasparov RISC 2550, and FRITZ2 and CHESSGENIUS for his 386/40MHz PC.

Actually the first reason for including something from Jeremy's letter in NS is a fascinating game which he sent me, between the RISC 2550 and CHESS GENIUS, and that is given in full later, along with our joint analysis and observations. However Jeremy raises one or two other very interesting points which are worth referring to.

PLAYING STRENGTH

'As a general comment, I found there is very little between these programs over a number of games in terms of overall strength'.

The programs are the three mentioned above, though Jeremy included his Mephisto VANCOUVER 68020 in the matches and noted reluctantly that the CHESS GENIUS program, with running on a 386 at 40MHz is actually better than his VANCOUVER! That will be correct, though he has VANCOUVER set to Rooks 110% and Pawns to 110% which he believes makes 'a very noticeable difference'. If you refer to the CMHz calculations in Issue 42 of my Magazine, you will see that a 386/40 obtains around 30CMHz, whilst VANCOUVER 68020 is just under 12CMHz. Therefore it's about 2½ times as fast, at least in theory!

GRAHAM WHITE obviously reads each issue carefully! He spotted that calculations for my own 386/20 suggested I should be getting a 25% or 30% speed increase with the PC version of Richard Lang's program, whereas I referred to an effective figure of 12% in NS/43B. Well done, Graham! However CHESSGENIUS does not use either Expanded or Extended Memory at all, and therefore is able to grab only a max. of 320K for Hash Tables - and that providing you've set up your CONFIG.SYS and AUTOEXEC.BAT files to use other Memory minimally. The VANCOUVER 68020 uses 1 MB (1024K), so one can see there the value of the Hash Table size for giving something of a speed-boost.

MEMORY USAGE

On this very point, Jeremy comments, 'Can I recommend that, as the Hash Memory used by a program is becoming such a significant aspect of its performance, it may be right to include it in some way in your rating'. And I've had the same thought expressed to me even more positively by CHRIS WHITTINGTON (programmer of CHESS CHAMPION 2175), so I aim to start a discussion on this elsewhere in the Magazine, if space allows.

Some PC programs make a lot of use of Hash - Chris's 2175, for example, and also FRITZ2. Using the latter Jeremy managed to get 2048K (2MB) operating, and notes that this 'transforms endgames'. When I say that FRITZ2 of all programs needs this, I am not just thinking of the chess in the endgame, but exhibiting sheer puzzlement. Though I have 4MB of RAM installed and have followed the FRITZ2 Manual to the letter (I think), I've never been able to persuade 2MB to make itself available for my Hash work, as I have on M CHESS PRO (though the effect on that program is pretty small), and C-CHAMPION 2175 (where it gives it a 50%-60% speed up!).

Suffice to say here that Jeremy's results for FRITZ2 on his 386/40 with 2048K appearing for Hash are better than mine with a 386/20 but only 128K on duty, though a couple of comparison timings at this stage show only a 2½ 'FRITZ2-SPEED' ratio between us (exactly the 40MHz/20MHz).
THE GAME!

Well, it's time for the game, which I will let Jeremy introduce: "... given this similarity in overall strength, the differences are to do with style, of course, and I agree with your review that KRIS (K-asparov RISC) often plays in a 'human' way - i.e. following through attacks quickly, and pushing Pawns in an aggressive manner, sometimes on both flanks at once. I have found, even when set on 'Normal', that KRIS quite often seems to over-estimate positions compared with the CHESS GENIUS or FRITZ22 evaluations - sometimes he is right, and sometimes wrong... I am enclosing a game which struck me as very exciting and is an example of KRIS being absolutely right about his positive evaluation of the position, and playing ablazing attack across the board. But in after-game analysis, FRITZ22 also found a brilliant move of its own, leaving Knight, Bishop AND Queen en prise... a move which both KRIS and CHESS GENIUS took over 10 minutes to realise the consequences of'. This is referred to quite fully at move 18.

Kasp RISC 2500 (White) vs CHESS GENIUS 386/40 Jeremy Deane's. 60/60. Notes by Jeremy and Eric Hallsworth. Slav Defence

1. Nf3 d5
2. d4 Nf6
3. c4 c6
4. Nc3 dxc4
5. a4 Bf5
6. e3 e6
7. Bxc4 Bb4
8. O-O O-O
9. Nh4 Bg4
10. f3 Bh5
11. Qb3

KRIS goes out of Book, and puts the GENIUS out with it. BCO has 11.g4 Bg6 12.e4 [12.Nxg6 hxg6] Qe7 [Nbd7 13.Nxg6] i3.g5 Nfd7
11. Qe7
12. g4

The first of a series of moves deliberately initiating a Kingside attack, and leaving the White King apparently very exposed. However KRIS already shows +67 and, noting the BCO line given at move 11, it looks as if KRIS has found for itself a usefully aggressive continuation.

12. .. Bg6
13. Nxg6
CHESS GENIUS expected a more solid-looking central thrust by e4.

13. .. hXg6
14. g5
Again CG expected e4 or Rd1, and a central build-up. KRIS contemplated Bd2 for two minutes, before deciding on the more risky flank advance showing +59.

14. .. Nfd7
15. f4 Nb6
16. Be2 Bb3
17. Bd2

17. Qb4?

This is a mistake. First, a Queen exchange here will benefit White's more open position; KRIS would have played Rd6, FRITZ22 Nd7. Second, it actually allows a brilliancy. CG obviously missed it, and so does KRIS.

18. Qc2

We are not putting a '?' here, though perhaps we should? However it is a perfectly good move and fits in nicely with the KRIS position, as we shall see. But White did miss the chance of earning a few '!!!' as, on playing over the game later, FRITZ22 after just 2 minutes [Jeremy's 386/40... mine takes 3m 50] found the quite remarkable 18.Nd5!!

Let's have a lengthy note, analysing 18.Nd5:
If Black takes the Queen, it is mate in 4: 18...Qxb3 19.Ne7+ Kh7 20.Rf3 Qd1 + 21.Bxd1 Bxd2 22.Rh3 mate. If Black takes the Bishop, it is mate in 7: 18...Qxd2 19.Ne7+ Kh7 20.Rf3 Qxe2 21.Qd1 Ba1 22.Qxe2, with 23.Rh3+ etc. to follow.

And now some strange statistics. After 18...Qxd2 (which Mephisto RISC, KRIS and CG all play), Mephisto RISC now analyses White as still BEHIND and only moves to a mere +137
for Ne7+ at 20 mins! KRIS is much better, and announces the mate through Ne7+, but still only after 13 mins. CG is a touch better still, making the mate announcement at 11 mins. Meanwhile FRITZ2 on my 386i20 finds Ne7+ as mate in just 1 min 45!!

What is there about this position that causes the three top tactical chess programs to really hang up - the Mephisto RISC particularly - whilst FRITZ2 shows them a clean pair of heels? Bear in mind that this is just one position - generally the boot's on the other foot and it's FRITZ2 which lags in these situations.

As a final compliment to FRITZ2, the above analysis looks only at the replies Qxb3 (which no programs choose after a few seconds), and Qxd2 (which all but FRITZ2 choose given 10 mins, though KRIS and CG change a little while after: at 12 mins Mephisto RISC actually still shows Qxd2 as +124, yet it's -m77!). The move KRIS and CG change to in due course IS BETTER: 18...Qd6, which FRITZ2 gets in 2 mins, and shows Black at -141.

Ah, well - none of that over happened. So remember it was 18.Qc2...

28. ... Qd7
29. Kg3

The correct logical follow-up, and again chosen in just 5 secs. His next, h4, is an instantaneous response, demonstrating exactly the comments about KRIS following through on its chosen strategies.

30. h4 Rh5

This Rook now looks out of the game, though CG still evaluates himself at +30. White will soon return to his advance on the Q-side which will result in the release and activation of all his forces ready for... a central push!

31. Qd3 Qc7
32. b4! e5
33. b5! exf4+
34. exf4 Nb8
35. d5! Qd7
36. Rd4 cxb5?!

When I played over the game on various programs to assist in these notes, CG actually chose cxd5 here.

37. Ne5 Qc7
38. Rc3 b4
Black STILL thinks he's winning, but only just.

39. Rxb4 Qxa5
40. Rxb7 Rc8
41. Qd4!

The indisputable breakthrough, which KRIS scores at +84, threatening Ne6 and attacks on g7 and a7.

Remarkably Black still cannot exploit the apparently wide open White defences: e.g. here he must provide urgent protection for g7 (and the whole 7th. rank). If, instead, 41...Qa1?? 42.Qxg7+! Kxg7 43.Ne6+ m4. This remains a feature right to the end.

41. ... Rh7
42. Nd3  Rd8
43. Rcc7!
Brilliant. A concerted attack. CG now concedes a
score of -291 and KRIS shortly has +333.
43. ...  Rf8
44. d6
Ignoring the a7-Pawn, and going outright for the
victory. Black must cover d6.
44. ...  Rh8
45. d7  Nxd7
Best. If 45...Kh7?? 46.d8 = Q Rxd8 47.Rxh7 m/5. If
45...Rxd8 46.Rc8! Kh7 47.Rbxh8 wins very easily.
46. Rxd7  Qe2
Now that the d-Pawn has gone, there is a chance
that the attack might have run out of steam. For
any practical chance Black must now try to
exploit the open White King if he can.
47. Qc5+  Kh7
48. f3
Played almost immediately, and showing +484.
48. ...  Qa1
49. fxg6+
And CG resigned this one here. 49...Kg8 is -m/2.
49...Kxg6 50.Rd6 + Kh7 51.Rxf7 Qg1 + 52.Qxg1
Rxf7 53.g6+ is m/4.
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NEWS and RESULTS, Jan. 1993

In response to my request for readers to keep me informed of results, there have been a really good number coming in over the past few weeks.

My thanks to everyone helping in this way - apart from the pleasure of enjoying one or two of the games also sent in (and some got into the Magazine, of course), the value of even the smallest set of results to the RATING LIST is high. One person's 4 games with, say, Chess Genius on a 386, may seem unimportant to you... but when we add that result to 4 from someone else, and 6 from another reader, plus those coming in from the Chess Computer Magazines in Sweden, Austria, Germany, the USA etc. we are soon able to provide quite accurate Gradings for all the programs involved.

Many scores arriving this time do indeed involve the NEW PROGRAMS - I will printout the current TOTALS for some of the newer ones at the end of this Article. For now, here are a few of the most interesting individual updates:-

GRAHAM WHITE is playing a monster Match between the RISC 2500 and his VANCOUVER 68020. The games are at 40/1h, which Graham feels is better than 60/1h without taking that much longer.

RISC 2500-VANCOUVER 020, 33-21
Graham did quite a few reports for us in earlier Issues on both Match Scores and Tactical Tests, as he upgraded through various of Richard Lang's programs for Mephisto (PORTOROSE, LYON and VANCOUVER in particular). He now reports on a series of the same using the Kasparov RISC:

Of 47 positions tested, KRIS solved 46, VANCOUVER 45. Of the 45 which both solved, KRIS did 34 faster. Total solving times for these 45 were:- KRIS 31½ mins, VANCOUVER 104 mins. Graham has offered to keep a supply of these positions coming to me for the NEWS SHEET, so that others can test them out on such machines as Mephisto RISC and M CHESS PRO.

A couple of pieces of news from Ireland. First GERRY GRAHAM tells us that, during last year's IRISH CHAMPIONSHIPS, Philip Short (FIDE 2320, Irish Elo 2285) took on Gerry's Mephisto LYON 68020 in a 3 game Match at Blitz G/15. The result was a win each plus a 104 move marathon draw, for 1½-1½.

From Co. Down, TONY SHERLOCK tells me he and Desmond Taylor are now playing two Mephisto's against each other, as Des has now got a BERLIN to go with his Super Forte, to try and get some revenge! It's opponent is Tony's long-standing friend, the LYON 68020. They are also testing with LYON on different playing styles.

LYON 020-BERLIN
40/1 2-1 = 5 (Lyon active)
0-1 = 5 (Lyon solid)
G/60 0-2 = 2 (Lyon active)
G/30 8-6 = 8 (Lyon active)
11-0 = 13 (Lyon solid... a VERY strange one, in the light of the others)
4-8 = 6 (Lyon risky)
G/15 6-6 = 11 (Lyon active)
9-5 = 10 (Lyon solid... again out of step with other results, so it suggests Lyon is best on solid in faster games)
8-6 = 8 (Lyon risky)

CHARLIE GOLD sent a series of 60/5 games. The results are interesting, and surprising in one or two cases - but don't count for the Rating List at such fast speeds, of course.

Fid MACH 3-Fid TRAVELMASTER 16-4
Fid MACH 3-Kasp TRAVEL CHAMPION 9-11
Fid TRAVELMASTER-Kasp TRAVEL

CHAMPION 11-9
Kasp TRAVEL CHAMPION-Novag SUPER
VIP 18-2 (!)

JOHN LILL (Britain's top Concert Pianist) is a very keen Chess and Chess Computer man, and reports on two scores:
TRAVEL CHAMPION-SUPER VIP, 6-2 at 60/60m I believe.

John also has a RISC 2500, and that leads 9-1 in a Match against his MACH 3.

One or two folk have asked for more games from the Mephisto VANCOUVER 020 and RISC 1MB performances at the British Championships last August. Sorry about that, I should have printed another one or two, but available space keeps running out! One bit of disappointing news is that I now have the OFFICIAL BCF Tournament Grading Results in front of me. The RISC 1MB is shown at 193 BCF (= 2144 Eb, not 2196 as previously quoted), whilst VANCOUVER 020 is given 185 BCF (= 2080 Eb. I had shown 2081, so that was okay). The difference is caused as incorrect adjustments were made during the Championship where a couple of players had a BCF and not an Elo grading and, in one case, vice versa. I should have checked into more carefully, so my apologies. Our NEWS SHEET RATING LIST has been corrected.

In the last Issue I squeezed in a brief reference to a good M CHESS performance in Croatia which NS Reader DARKO GOLO sent me. Its efforts got it into a couple of Newspaper reports as they gave coverage to the FIRST Croatian Open Chess Championship held in Split. Darko's own PC is a 286/16, but M CHESS on this had beaten his Novag SUPER FORTE C by 21-9, so that had decided him to enter M CHESS rather than the dedicated program. However a local firm, COMWARE-SPLIT, then lent Darko a 386/33MHz PC free of charge, so even more opponents found themselves on the losing end, as was generously pointed out in the news coverage. For the record, M CHESS 386/33 scored 6-5 = 4 (8/15) against FIDE rated opposition (i.e over 2200, in fact average 2273) for 2283 Elo. In 32 other games, against opposition averaging 2111, it scored 23-5 = 4 (25/32) for 2310, and an overall Rating of 2304.

As this was all at G/30, they don't go into our actual Ratings List, of course, but it's an interesting large-sample result. I have been sent a 5¼" Disk with all the game files PKUNZIPPED! If anyone can convert these to a 3½" disk for me, I'll have a look at them and probably put a couple into NS/45.

Back to COMPUTER-COMPUTER results.

These are from Sweden, for the new SCHRODER 30MHz ChessMachine! "What" did you say?... It's the latest TASC production using Ed Schroder's newest version of his GIDEON, and put onto an ARM61 RISC processor which makes it almost twice the speed of the standard 15MHz RISC systems ChessMachine GIDEON/PC, and ChessMachine KING/PC. The price for the Program and RISC Card, for installing into your PC, is £999! I'm not quite sure what we call it yet: ChessMachine GIDEON/30?... ARM61 GIDEON3? (Gideon1 being the first ChessMachine, Gideon2 the Mephisto version). Something like that. If you've recovered from the price shock, here are its scores:

- v RISC 2500, 1½-2½
- v DIABLO, 14-3
- v MM5, 6½-½
- v LYON 68000, 15-5
- v VANCOUVER 68000, 6½-½
- v VANCOUVER 68020, 6-3

Still with the ARM61 ChessMachine, it recently graded at 2525 in the Oviedo Quickplay, scoring 7½/11. This is a high figure, but needs to be compared with other Quickplay results from Mephisto RISC and VANCOUVER, Kasparov RISC and M CHESS on a 486. The Computers have produced some G.M results at Quickplay in the past 12 months.

JEREMY DEANE has sent a series of results, all at 60/1hr.

RISC 2500-VANCOUVER 020, 7-7 (this one suggests that KRIS improves at the slower time controls... cp. Graham White's 33-21 score above).

RISC 2500-Chess GENIUS 386/40, 3-3 (my score here is 6-4, but my PC is a 386/20, so half Jeremy's speed).

RISC 2500-FRITZ2 386/40, 2-2 (here I have 7½-4½).

NORMAN O'CONNOR's results at 40/2 are:

RISC 2500-M CHESS PRO 386, 3-3 (here mine is 4-2).

RISC 2500-ChessMachine GIDEON, 2-2

Computer-Computer results for M CHESS PRO have been a bit slow coming in, but it was recently entered a Tournaments against PLAYERS. It CAME FIRST in its debut in the MILAN ACTIVE Chess National Tournament with 7½/8! It was running on an 80486/33MHz.
with 8MB RAM (which enabled SMB Hash) getting a Rating of over 2600. Another entrant was the ARM61 ChessMachine which scored 5½/8. The two met in Round 4...

M CHESS PRO 486 (White)-ARM61 GIDEON3

ChessMachine GIDEON3/15 was there too, and got 5½/8, also the Kasparov BRUTE FORCE which got 4½/8. At an expected £599 complete in the RENAISSANCE board, this promises to be a good value buy.

BRIAN MARTIN's score for a Chess GENIUS test was: Chess GENIUS 386/40-VANCOUVER 000, 8½-3½

JOHN WATKISS has a score for Chess GENIUS on a 386, this time against Mephisto RISc 1MB, and it's 3-3.

MIKE HURD ran RISC 2500-Novag FORTE A... not surprisingly it went 4-0 (he might have wanted his money back with anything less!). So MIKE decided to try KRIS on 10s per move, with the FORTE still on 40/2!

He reminds me that we did this a few years ago using Mephisto AMSTERDAM and SciSys EXPRESS. At that time, by having the EXPRESS running 18 times as fast (i.e 4 doublings, should = 320 £16) we were trying to roughly reverse the speed advantage, and see if there were sufficient differences in their respective chess knowledge alone, made possible by the greater RAM of AMSTERDAM, to keep the latter ahead. It was quite interesting, though the Mephisto did win in the end.

However I've always respected the Novag chess knowledge since the good old SUPER CONNY, certainly in the middle game area, so rather wondered if an 18x time gap would be too much for KRIS.

Novag FORTE A 40/2 (White)-Kasp RISC 2500 60/10

JOHN RANDALL sent me his RISC 2500-BERLIN score, played at various time settings (not mentioned). The result was 5-3 for KRIS, made up of 2-0 = 6! It's not often you get so many draws between Computers.

FRANK COLE gave four members of his CLUB TEAM a chance of some Training Games against his TRAVELMASTER. The time control was 30 in 1½, and 41/hr, as used in their Club Matches. The 179 BCF grade won 2-0 = 0 The 158 lost 0-3 = 1 The 150 lost 0-1 = 0 And the 99 lost 0-1 = 0

So TRAVELMASTER scored 5½/8 for a Rating of 174 BCF! Not bad! It converts to 1992 Elo, virtually the same as we have this Computer on the Rating List.

Whilst mentioning here an 'Elo' Rating, Readers probably know that Prof. Arpad E Elo died recently (5 Nov 1992) at his home in Milwaukee, aged 89. A physicist and astronomer, and a founder of the United States Chess Federation, Prof. Elo devised the renowned rating system which carries his name in 1950. It has now been accepted by most Chess Federations, including the World Chess Federation... and it is used in other sports! For example table-tennis players are ranked using the Elo system!

Originally born in Hungary, Prof. Elo became a strong over-the-board player in his eventual home country of the USA during the 1930's and 40's. He played Bobby Fisher once, in 1957. After he had seen his rating system accepted, and done some work to ensure its statistical accuracy and integrity, Prof. Elo spent most of his time involved in his academic career.

But he made some relevant comments about the purpose of his system, perhaps anticipating the day when players would be more concerned to protect their Elo gradings than play chess: 'It is a measuring tool, not a device of reward or punishment. It is a means to compare...
performances, assess relative strength, and not a carrot waved before a rabbit (a 'rabbit' - I like that... Eric), or a piece of candy given to a child for good behaviour'.

The NEWS SHEET waits with some interest to see how the Elo system will deal with Bobby Fischer's comeback! He had a rating of 2780 when he gave up chess; since then he has kept that rating, but been listed by the Federation as inactive. Will the WCF rate his recently completed match with Spassky and, if so, how?!

G. SEDMAN (you must let me know your Christian name - you sound like a stranger when I write your name this way, but I know you're a regular reader and results provider) - anyway, he has upgraded FRITZ1 to FRITZ2. The former, on his 386/16, scored 3½-6½ against the Novag SUPER FORTE C/6; the upgrade has won 5½-4½. Mr Sedman managed to get 1024KB Hash and obtained a 20 BCF improvement here.

I was just thinking this would be the first issue for about 2 years without a series of latest scores from FRANK HOLT, when they arrived in the post this morning!

BERLIN-Meph RISC (normal), 5-3
BERLIN-Meph RISC (agreed), 1½-6½
BERLIN-C-Machine KING1, 3½-4½
BERLIN-C-Machine GIDEON1, 3-5
Meph RISC-C-Machine KING1, 6½-1½ (!)
Meph RISC-C-Machine GIDEON1, 5½-2½

Frank has sent me more games, and they include one or two beauties, plus I still have one 'on hold' from his previous report, so I'll try to include these a.s.a.p.

Also in this morning's post, two more results with RISC 2500:
GARY MEEKUMS' leads 10-4 against ELITE v9 69030 (!)

From PAUL WALSH it wins a long 2m per move match over MACH 3 by 32½-7½. Paul sends a nice letter, saying "I couldn't believe that KRIS could do this to a program of the MACH 3's quality. But these are correct!' In terms of wins/losses it went 28-3=9. I note that Mephisto RISC's current total score against MACH 3 is 14½-3½, so we see just how things have changed over the last couple of years or so!

Finally, here is a listing of TOTAL current scores for some of the new products. Where it is a PC program, I have printed the scores as on a 386 as that is what I have, therefore having more results altogether on the 386's than on other processors. This also enables Readers to compare like-with-like.

Kasparov RISC 2500, 2333 Elo
vC-Mach GIDEON3 ARM91, 2½-1½. vMephi RISC 1MB, 22½-2½. vMephi VANCOUVER 030, 1½-2½. vCHESS PRO 486, 4-6. vChess GENIUS 386, 9-7. vC-Machine GIDEON1, 2-2. vC-Machine THE KING1, 5½-4½. vCHESS 486, 2-0. vMephi VANCOUVER 020, 53-34. vM CHESS PRO 386, 7-5. vMephi BERLIN, 9-5. vKasp BRUTE FORCE, 2-2. vFid ELITE 030 v9, 10-4. vM CHESS 386, 6-4. vHIARCS MASTER 386, 3½-1½. vFRITZ2 386, 9½-6½. vZARKOV 386, 7½-½. vNovag SCORPIO/DIABLO, 7-1. vHIARCS MASTER 286, 5½-1½. vFid MACH 3 2265, 60-12. vZARKOV 286, 4-0. vMephi MILANO, 1-1. vMephi ACADEMY, 12½-½. vCHESSMASTER 3000 386, 15-5. vKasp GK-2000, 20-0. vNovag FORTE A, 4-0.

Kasp BRUTE FORCE, 2233 Elo
vMephi RISC, 3½-4½. vKasp RISC 2500, 7-9. vMephi VANCOUVER 020, 5-5. vKasp BRUTE FORCE, 3-1. vMephi VANCOUVER 000, 8½-3½. vCHESS PRO 386, 2261 Elo
vMephi RISC, 1-1. vKasp RISC 2500, 5-7. vMephi VANCOUVER 020, 1½-2½. vKasp BRUTE FORCE, 3-2. vHIARCS MASTER 286, 2-0. vNov SUPER EXP C/6, 7-3. vZARKOV 286, 2-0. vHIARCS MASTER 386, 2164 Elo
vKasp RISC 2500, 1½-3½. vMephi VANCOUVER 020, 1½-1½. vMephi BERLIN, 2-2. vKasp BRUTE FORCE, 1½-2½. vCHESS 386, 12½-13½. vFRITZ2 386, 2162 Elo

This listing is dated 15 Jan 1993. The finished NS/44 List will be printed in 7-10 days, and will include all the most up-to-date figures.
GAMES from the MADRID CHAMPIONSHIP, 1992

For the Tournament CROSS-TABLE and details of the ENTRANTS, their Programme and the various Hardware in use, please see Issue 43B (still available for £3).

First, a strange finish in Round 1 by Chess Computing's endgame expert (?!).

**Chess GENIUS-NIMZO**

56.Qb4+? [56.Qxd7+ Kxd7 57.Kf3 wins easily, of course. The finished Chess GENIUS now plays Qxd7+] 56...Qd6 57.Qe4+?! [But the revised CG still plays this, instead of exchanging, so the problem has apparently been only partially solved] 57...Kd8 58.Qf6 Qc5 59.Qg5+ Qe7 60.f4? [Here the finished CG plays 60.Bf7, which is a bit better than f4 - it probably forces Black to exchange Queens! But why will White still not do the exchange itself?] 60...Kf7 61.Bf3? Ke8 62.Bc6+ Kf7 63.Bd5+ Ke8 64.Qf5+? Ke8 65.Qc8+ Qd8 66.Bf7+ Ke7 67.Qe6+ Kf8 68.f5? [A bad final error, as the game is almost certainly a draw by perpetual check now. Another couple of moves indicates how this happened, though the game continued to move 98 before Chess GENIUS gave it up] 68...Qd2+ 69.Kg3 Qd3+ 70.Kq4 Qd1+ 71.Kf4 [71.Kg5 Qd2+ 72.Kh5 Qd1+ 73.Kg6 Qg4+! 74.hxg4 =] Qc1+ [etc] ½-½

Next we have a very interesting tussle between two programs which are now continuing their competition commercially at very similar prices. By the end of the Tournament FRITZ2 had excelled itself with 5th. position. HIARCS

would have been higher than 11th, if programmer Mark Unlacke hadn't risked everything on going all-out for a win in Round 5, thus losing from a dead drawn position.

**FRITZ2-HIARCS Sun-Sparc**

mate! 43.Rf8+ looks very optimistic for White] 36...Nc3! 37.e6? [The e-Pawn needed to stay within the range of its protectors. 37.Rb2 (expected by HARIKES) looks better, to reactivate the Rook, maybe to c2; e.g. ...b6 38.f4 g5 39.Rc2] 37...Re4 38.Rb2 Re3 [Virtually equalising; a good recovery by HARIKES] 39.Rxe4 Nxe4 40.Ra2 Rxe6 41.Rxa4 Nxc3 42.Rxg3 Re1 + 43.Kf2 Rb1 44.Ra5 b6 45.Ra7 Rxb5 [And this rather interesting game was agreed drawn at move 60] ½-½

I wonder what the Manufacturer hoped would happen when they learned that their newly released Kasparov RISC 2500 was drawn to play against the still secret SPARKLEN program in Round 2. The latter was on much faster SPARC hardware at Madrid anyway, so it was not really an equal contest.

RISC 2500-Kasp SPARC/SPARKLEN

1.d4 Nf6 2.c4 e6 3.Nc3 Bb4 4.Qc2 c5 5.dxc5 Nc6 6.e3 Bxc3 + 7.bxc3 Nxc6 8.b4 Nce4 9.Qd4 d5 10.c5 b6 11.f3 Ng5 12.Bf4, Nh5 13.a3 Bf5 14.Bd3 Ne7 15.Be5 0-0 16.Rd1 =] 15...Nxf4 16.exf4 [16.Qxf4 0-0 17.0-0 c5 18.Qg3 gives Black a big looking centre] 16...0-0 17.0-0 Bd7 18.Re1 Rc8 19.Qe3 Re8 20.Nd4 Qf6 [Both programs have developed into aggressive postures!] 21.Bb5 a6 22.Nxa6 Qd8 23.Nc5 Nc6 [Wanting to exchange Knights] 24.Rad1 Rc6 25.Nxc6 [It is thought better to let Black make the exchange himself on d4, according to the Tournament bulletin: 25.Rh1 Nxd4 26.Rxd4; or 25.g4 Nxd4 26.Rxd4 Qg6 27.Nh3] 26...bxc6 28.Qd3 a5 27.axa5 Ra8 28.a6 Qc7 29.Rc1 Qa7 30.Qe3 Qxa6 31.Ra1 Qc4 [Black has achieved a nice inversion of White’s position] 32.Re1 Qa4 33.Rc1 Kh7 34.Rb7 Ra7 35.Rxa7 Qxa7 [White has temporarily driven back the enemy advance; but his a and c-Pawns remain too weak to have a long term or trouble future] 36.Rb1 P a8 37.Rb6 [37.Rb3 was the alternative, I think. It ...g6 38.g3 Kg7 39.Kf2, Black will need to be patient moving towards the win. Not 37.Ra1, which leaves Black with chances of competing attacks on the a and c-Pawns, whilst White can only protect one of them twice (if you see what I mean!)] 37...Qd7! [37...Qxa3?! 38.Qxa3 Rxa3 39.Rxc6 Ra5 40.g4 and maybe both sides have chances, though a draw is most likely] 38.Qb3 Ra7 [The Tournament bulletin approved of this 'simpler' way of winning. A more complicated try with knife-edge moments was: 38...d4!? 39.Qb7 Qd5 40.Qxd5 exd5 41.Rc7 Rxa3 42.Rxc6 Ra1 + 43.Kf2 Ra2 + 44.Kg1 (44.Kf1 d3!) Rxd2 45.Rd6 Rxd2 46.Rxd5 Rc2 47.Kd1 Rb3 48.Ke2 Kg6 49.Rd6 + Kf7 50.c6 h5 51.Rd7 + Kg6 52.c7 h4 53.Kf2 Rb2 + 54.Kg1 d3 55.Rxd3 Rxc7 which Black should win] 39.Qd3 Ra5 40.Qc3 Ra4 41.Qb2 [41.g3 Rc4!] 41...d4 42.Qb3 Ra5 43.Qb4 Ra7 44.Kf2 d3 45.Ke1 Qd5 46.Qc3 Qa2! 47.Qb2 [47.Qxd3 Rxa3! 48.Qd2 Qa1 + 49.Ke2 Ra2 winning the Queen and the game] 47...Qc4 48.Rxc6 d2 + 49.Qxd2 Rxa3 [Again we see the Queen will be lost to Ra1 + Kf2 Ra2 +, so White resigned] 0-1

Here’s a rather sudden tactical find which won RISC 2500 a point in Round 3.

MIRAGE-RISC 2500

58...Rxf2!! [58...Re2 looks like standard fare. Then 59.Re1! and now not 59...Rxf2?? 60.Re8 + Kf7 61.Rf8 + Kg6 62.Qd6 + when it’s about even. Note that White could not have taken the Queen: 62.Rxf5? Rxf2 + 63.Kh1 Rh2 + 64.Kg1 Rg2 + mate] 59.Kxf2 Re8 + 60.Kg1 Qe2! 61.Kh1 [Bui could have resigned] 61...Rxf2 62.Rd2 Rxd2 63.Re1 Rh2 + 64.Kg1 Qf2 + mate 0-1

Richard Lang told me on the phone, when we were discussing the fact that 5 Rounds is FAR too few on which to base a TITLE, that he had been winning against the SCHRODER program in their Round 4 meeting. How easily the tables might have been turned in such a short Event!

Chess GENIUS-ChessMachine SHRODER

1.d4 Nf6 2.g3 e6 3.c4 d5 4.Bg2 Be7 5.Nf3 0-0
6.0-0 dxe4 7.Qc2 a6 8.Qxc4 b5 9.Qc2 Bb7
22.Nbd2 g4 23.Nh4 f5 [Persistent advances by
ChessMachine, but they’re not always well
co-ordinated. The manoeuvres by both sides have
occasionally seemed quite strange] 24.a3 Kh8
25.Nf1 Ne7 [25...bxa3 seems better. 26.bxa3
Rb8 27.Bc3 is still looking good for White, however] 26.Bxb4 Bxb4 27.axb4 Nac6 28.Qc4
Qd7 29.b5 axb5 30.Qxb5 Rb8 31.Rxa8 Bxa8
32.Da4 Ne5 33.Qa7 Nc6 34.Qa3 Bb7 35.Rc1
Ra8 36.Qc5 Ra5 37.Qc4 Nd5 38.Nd2 Nc4
39.Nb3 Ba6 40.Nc5 Bxc4 41.Nxd7 Ba6 42.Bxd5
Nxd5 43.Nc5 Bc8 44.Nd3 Ba6 45.Nf4 Nxf4
46.gxf4 Bb7 47.f3 gx6 48.Rxc7 Bxc6 49.Rc8+
Kg7 50.Rb8 Ra1 + 51.Kf2 Rc1 52.Nxf3 Rc2 +
53.Kg3 Bd5 54.Rb6 h5 55.h4 Re2

[Diagram. which we print here as it is clear that
Chess GENIUS has done everything necessary to
probably win the game. However it's not an easy
position, and Cg now proceeds to snatch defeat
from the jaws of victory in the next 20 moves]
56.Ne5 [56.Ra6 Rxe3 57.Ra3 Re2 58.b4 was a
FRITZ2 idea that doesn’t seem to make much
difference after 58...Rb2] 58...h5 57.g4? fxe4
58.fxg4 Rxf6 59.Qg6 + Kh7 60.Qg5 Be6
61.Rxb5 + Kg7 62.Bg5 + Kf6 63.Bf4 [After slight
hesitations, Chess GENIUS again looks to be
winning here] 63...Re3 + 64.Kf4 Rf3 65.Rg6 +
Kf7 66.Rh6 e3! [Aah! The thorn in the flesh]
67.Ne6 + Kd7 68.Na5 + Ke7 69.Nc6 + Kd8
70.Rh6 + Kc7 71.Ra6 Kd7 72.Ra8 Bc4 73.Ne5
[73.Rd8 + Kc7 74.Re8 e2 is no more inviolat!] 
73...Bb5 74.Nf7 + Ke7 75.Nh6 Rfx6 + 76.Kg5
[What would you play here? Of course asking
the question alerts you to something a bit different,
so you’ll probably get it right!] 76...Rxh6! 77.Kxh6
g2 78.Ra5 [78.Ra1 f4!] 78...e1Q 79.Rxb5 [but
resigned] 0-1

We come to the final Round, and the two Leaders
are both on 3½/4. A showdown is inevitable.

Kasp SPARC-ChessMachine SHRODER

Bd6 6.0-0 0-0 7.c4 Bxe5 8.dxe5 Nc6 9.cxd5 Qxd5

[Diagram. We reached the endgame early on in
this one. Black clearly has an advantage - is it
even for the full point and the Title?] 21.Bg3
Rf7 22.Rf1 g6 23.Rxf7 Kxf7 24.Bh4 Rd7 25.Kf2
Bf5 26.Bxf5?! [The exchanges tend to make
Black’s Rook stronger] 26...gx6 27.Na4 b6
32.Nc4 Rd3 + 33.Kc2 Rd4 34.Kd3 b5 35Nb2 Kb5
36.Nd3 a5 37.Bg3 Re4 + 38.Kd2 Re8 39.Bc7 a4
40.Kc3 [40.bxa4 bxa4 isolates Black’s Pawns,
and the threatening march on the Q-side is halted
in this suggested line. Was it just more likely to
get the draw?] 40...b4 + 41.Kd2 axb3 42.axb3 c4!
43.Bxb4 + Kc5 44.Kc3 Re9 + 45.Kd2 Rf3 46.Nc2
cxb3 47.Na3 Kd5 48.Bb6 f4 49.Ba7 Ke4 50.Kc1
Rh3 51Nb1 Kd3 52.Kb2 [52.Bg1 at least LOOKS
better! Both have played the endgame well -
some parts are worth more study time, I think -
but White could have used his Bishop with a little
more effect. However, in fact, in here 52.Bg1, we
should place a '?' as .,f3! 53.Nd2 b2 +! and
White must resign] 52...Rxh2 + 53.Kxb3 f3
54.Na3 f2 55.Bxf2 Rxh2 0-1, and ED SCHRODER
wins the Title, with just a single ½ point dropped to the Kasparov RISC 2500 in Round 1 (you
can see this endgame in my Chess Computer
column in the January Issue of CHESS Monthly
Magazine). Oh, for, say, 9 Rounds NEXT TIME!
OPENING THEORY - The KING'S GAMBIT
By Graham White

The subject of this Article is a sharp line of the KIESERITSKY GAMBIT:

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.Nf3 g5 4.h4 g4

Now 6...d5 is, according to modern theory, Black's only acceptable reply. But I want to look at Philidor's suggestion:
6...Qe7
And I hope to show that he was right!

Firstly, what is supposed to be the refutation of Philidor's 6...Qe7?? Both Gallagher, 'WINNING WITH THE KING’S GAMBIT', and Korchmoy, 'KING'S GAMBIT', give:
10.dxe5 Bxd7 11.Bb3 Qb4 + 12.Nd2
Nxe4 13.c3 Nxc3 14.Bg5 + Be7
15.bxc3 Qxc3 16.Bxe7 + Kxe7 17.0-0
This is shown as good for White. Convinced? I certainly wasn't, and my suspicions were confirmed when Mephisto VANCOUVER 020 found an improvement, 11...Kc8, simply unpinning the Bishop.

[See DIAGRAM 2, after 11.Bb3]

11...Kc8!
White's position is immediately unenviable, as 12.exf6 losas simply to Qxe4+ 13.Qe2 Qxf4.
The best I could find for White is:
But after,
14...Bxb3 15.axb3

Both,
15...Qxe4 + and Nxf4 are good for Black.

Clearly White needs an earlier improvement - and I think he has one in 8.Nxf7

7...
d6 [3]

Now here Korchmoy considers Nxf7... and gives it a '?'... thus:
8.Nxf7?
Showing,
8...Qxe4 + 9.Kf2 d5
As very good for Black. It took me a while to agree with this, but he's right if you follow the continuation which he gives:
Qf5 13.Qe2 + Be7!
Better than 13...Be6? 14.d5!
14.Qxc4 f3 15.Qb5 + Nc6 16.Qxf5
Bxf5 17.Bf4 0-0 18.Nf7 Rxd4!
19.Bxg3 Rg4
And indeed, Black wins.
But then I thought, 'What about 10.Re1?' as an improvement in the line given by Korchnloy.

9...
d5
[4]

10.Re1
I tried this in a Blitz game, G. White (White) - VANCOUVER 020, and the result was a spectacular tussle:

10...
Kxf7 11.Rxe4 Nxe4 + 12.Kg1
dxc4 13.Bxf4
Black has an advantage in material, but I hoped to drum up a bit of play around his King. Little did I know!

13...Bd6 14.Qf1! Kg7 15.Bxd6 Nxd6
16.Qf4 Nc6 17.Qg5 +
Now he begins to feel the draught - the King hunt begins!

Kc8 23.Nd5 Ne8 24.Qg5 Bxc2
25.Qxg4 + Kd8 26.Qg5 + Kd7?!

Maybe VANCOUVER should settle for a draw with 26...Kc8.

27.Qg4 + Kd6
Again 27...Kd6 would draw.

28.Rxf8 Rxf8 29.Ne3 Bd3 30.d5 Nd8
31.Nxc4 + Bxc4 32.Qxc4
I've yet to see any theory on Queen vs Rook and Knight endgames, but I'm sure this one favours White!

32...Rg8 33.Qf4 + Kd7
If 33...Kxd5 34.Qd2+ wins.

34.Qf5 + Kd6 35.Qxh7
That's the one I wanted.

35...Nf6 36.Qh6 Ke5 37.d6 Nc6
38.Qd2 Nd5 39.5h5!
Stop that if you can!

39...Kxd6 40.h6 Rh8 41.Qg5 Nd8
42.Qg7 Re8 43.h7 Ne6 44.Qg8 Rxg8
45.hxg8Q
Touchdown! And 1-0.

Despite the result of this game, I don't think I fully believe in White's attack and, still looking for improvements. I was amazed when both VANCOUVER and Fidelity MACH 3 found what looks like an earlier improvement, at move 9, for White... Kf11!

8...
Qxe4+
[5]

[After 8...Qxe4+, still in 'Korchnloy's line]

9.Kf1!
The point is that, if 9...d5?? as previously, then 10.Bd3, and this time Black has no check from d4. So:

9... Rg8 10.Ng5
This is very unclear as White will still pick up the exchange for a Pawn, but his Knight will be more healthily placed on g5. Given a choice I'd probably just rather play Black here, due to White's badly placed King.

Here are two test games between VANCOUVER 020 and MACH 3. They are so complicated (especially the first, which is a wonderful game to play through!) that, in the interests of brevity (and my sanity!), there are no comments.

[A] After 10.Ng5. MACH 3 (White)

VANCOUVER 020 60/60:
10...Qf5 11.Qe2 + Be7 12.Bxg8 Nxg8
13.Kg1 h6 14.Ne4 f3 15.Qd3 fxg2
19.exd3 Nb4 20.Nab5 Kd7 21.a3
Nxd3 22.Nxd5 c6 23.Nxe7 Nxe7
27.b4 b6 28.h5 Bb7 29.Rf1 Kd7 +
30.Kg1 Bf3 31.Bxh6 Rh8 32.Rd1
Bxd1 33.Rxf5 Ke6 34.Bg7 Kxe5
35.Bxh8 Bf3 36.h6 Kg6 37.Bb5 c6
38.Nc7 g3 39.Bd4 Nf4 40.Bxb6 Nh3 +
41.Kf1 g2 + 42.Ke1 Bb7 43.b5 axb5
44.Nxb5 Kxh6 45.a4 Kg5 46.Be3 +
Kg4 47.Nd4 g1Q + 48.Bxg1 Nxg1
A draw

Again from 10.Ng5, this time **VANCOUVER 020** (White) - **MACH 3. 60/60**

10. Nf5

10...Qf5 11.Bf7 + Kd8 12.Bxg8 Nxb8
13.d5 h6 14.Ne6 + Bxe6 15.dxe6Bg7
16.Kf2 g3 + 17.Kf1 Qxe6 18.c3 Ne7
19.Qf3 Qc4 + 20.Qe2 Qxe2 +
Rg8 30.g3 Ne5 31.Nb5 Rg4 + 32.Kf5
c6 33.Nc7 d4 34.Nd5 + Kf7 35.Nf6
Rxd3 36.cxd4 Ng6 37.Nxh5 Nxh4 +
38.Kf4 Rg2 39.b3 Kg6 40.Ng3
And, eventually, another draw.

Whilst it is clear that Korchnoy’s response to 8.Nxf7 of Qxe4 + is in no way a bad move - and
leads to very sharp play - both Computers prefer 8...Rg8. This is (surprise, surprise!) also
complicated - as the following game shows:

8. Nxf7

[7]

This game is **VANCOUVER 020** (White) - **MACH 3. 60/60**.

8...Rg8! 9.e5! d5 10.Bb3 Kxf7?!
It would be safer to play 10...Qxh7, which is
also preferred by the VANCOUVER.

11.0-0
An excellent Gambit - White will get 2 Pawns
for the Knight, and a strong attack.
11...Nh5 12.Bxd5 + Kg7 13.Bxf4
Nxf1 14.Rxf1 Qxh4 15.Qf1! Qd8
16.Qc4! Kh8! 17.Bxg8 Bh6 18.Re4 Bc1
A strange-looking move, but if 18...Qxg8
19.Qxg8 + Kxg8 20.e6! is unpleasant for Black.

19.e6! Nc6?!
19...Qxg8 is unclear. E.g 20.Qc3 Na6 21.d5 +
Qg7 22.Re5, still with a strong bind.

Now it’s all over.

23...Qxg8 23.d5 + Qg7 24.Qxg7 +
Kxg7 25.dxc6
And White wins.

Finally let’s take a quick look at a manic idea
of mine. After 8.Nxf7 [see diagram 7], what
about...

8...d5!? Then, after...

9.Nxh8 dxc4
We come to DIAGRAM 8; and it’s difficult to
look at this position without laughing. But let’s
try.

9...
dxc4

[8]

10.Nc3 Nxe4?
A strange move, maybe suicidal even, which
does no justice at all to my 8...d5 idea.

It was from **VANCOUVER 020 - MACH 3.**
Played at 60/60, it’s a ‘test game’ which turned
out to be something of a miniature!

11.0-0 Nxc3 12.bxc3 Qg7 13.Bxf4
Qxh8 14.Qe2 + Be7 15.Rae1 Nc6
16.d5
And, as you’d expect, Black was not long for
this world.
Let's just go back to DIAGRAM 8, which we print again to save folk who want to study this interesting position from having to keep turning the page forwards and backwards.

9...
dxc4
[8]

This is the return game, MACH 3 (White) - VANCOUVER 020. MACH 3 also played 10.Nc3, and now VANCOUVER responded with Bg7 (much wiser), but the game was somehow drawn.

But, in my opinion, Black has another reply to 10.Nc3:

10...Nh5

This looks like a good move, defending the f-Pawn. But I haven't got so much of a clue what's going on! Perhaps...

11.0-0

This looks a good reply, against three likely tries by Black. If...


The last line still looks a little better for White, so I have still not decided what Black's best continuation is after 10.Nc3.

It's all so complicated I will set my new Kasparov RISC 2500 to grapple with the various positions, and let you have further conclusions after that. In the meantime perhaps some NS READERS (or their COMPUTERS) have some thoughts they would like to share.

For the present my view is that 8.Nxf7+ is better than 8.Bxf7; and then 8...Qe4+, Rg9, and d5 all leave the game in a position in which both sides have prospects to play for a win.

ADDENDUM!

The NEW YEAR has arrived and, with it, an ADDENDUM by Graham following the arrival of his KASPAROV RISC 2500 and some initial further testing. He goes back to DIAGRAM 1:

First play 6...Qe7 7.d4, to return to the initial moves of Philidor's suggestion. Here the move for Black of 7...d6 has been taken for granted. However both the VANCOUVER 68020 and RISC 2500 prefer...

7...Bb7? when playing on 'higher' levels.

Remember the original game-play testing was done at 60/60 in the main. Both are now on a typical Club Match timing of 36/1½ hrs, and the following suggests the Bg7 line is at least as good for Black.

The first game from this position is VANCOUVER 020 (White)-RISC 2500. It suggests that the Bg7 line is at least as good for Black as 7...d6.


But Black was unable to convert its Pawn advantage into victory, and it ended another ½-½.

However this was not a 'miss' by the RISC 2500. The second game, with RISC playing White, shows that there are still some pitfalls awaiting Black! So, RISC 2500 -VANCOUVER 020. After 7...Bb7?

TWO MONTHS WITH CHESSBASE. By Correspondence
Senior Master JON R. EDWARDS (New Jersey, USA).

[This article appeared in the APCT Journal
vol. XXX, June 1992, and is reproduced
with the kind permission of the author].

I'm sure that during the past years you've seen
ads for computerised chess aids, and like me
you've probably wondered just how useful these
products might be. Two months ago I bit the
bullet and purchased ChessBase, a chess
database that provides a range of neat features
for storing, sorting, searching, statistically
analysing, and gaining access to chess games.
I have to admit that I'm already hooked.

I'd like to tell you about a few things I've been
able to do with ChessBase. I'm going to focus
on real life examples from my games and
experiences. I know I haven't come close to
exhausting the possibilities, but I think you'll be
able to get an idea of how useful such tools can
be.

JUST ASK THE DATABASE

I purchased ChessBase with roughly 90,000
games, the majority from 1986 to the present.
That's a lot of games! It includes all of the
games in Informant 43-52, plus approximately
75,000 other contemporary games or variations.
It's rather like having all the Informants,
NEW IN CHESS, and TOURNAMENT CHESS
games at your immediate disposal, with the
ability to ask such questions as:

* Show me all grandmaster wins in under 25
  moves.
* Show me all the games in my favourite
  variation of the French.
* How has White been doing in this line over
  the past six years?
* Show me all R+5P v R+N+2P endgames.
* Show me all Queens sacs that led to wins
  within five moves.
* What are the most obvious holes in my
  opening preparation.

You'll have got the idea!

The first thing I did was to assemble what I now
call my BIGBASE, essentially a single database
containing 90,000 games. ChessBase makes
the process pretty easy. It's as simple as
identifying the next set of games to add to the
database - and then adding them. The whole
process took about two hours - a challenge at
first, then just a lot of repetition.

As a reward for all of this 'hard work' I
searched for the games of Kasparov - just his
wins in under 30 moves. I found about 25, a
nice evening's entertainment! Not only is it easy
to find games, but it's also very easy to play
through them. You can speed through the
moves, or go slowly, and ChessBase keeps
track of everything, so there's no risk if you
want to explore a line or subvariation. For
example, after you check out a variation you
can get right back to the main line at the touch
of a key. And once you finish going through one
game you can easily move to the next, all
without having to set up the board!

There's a special treat in store when you press
[N]. You suddenly see the 'notation', i.e. the
entire game score with all of the variations.
Click on any part of the notation (even in the
variation) and, lo and behold, up pops an
appropriate diagram!

You can search for players, tournaments,
games in specific openings, players above a
certain strength, and on and on. It's also
possible to search for certain types of Pawn
formations, manouvres (like Bg5-h4- g3, Nxg3
and hxg3), and various material configurations.
More on that later.

OPENINGS CLASSIFICATION

ChessBase comes with an openings
classification scheme that will make most
chessplayers feel at home. Select the Sicilian,
then the Najdorf variation, then 6.Bg5. Instantly,
there they are: hundreds of games all starting
a6 6.Bg5. Of course, those of us who live and
breathe chess have had to learn the rather cryptic Encyclopedia of Chess Openings (ECO) codes, like B33 for the Pelikan, or C18 for the Winawer. And so I decided to classify my BIGBASE according to the ECO codes. Obviously they're not for everyone, and ChessBase do charge a bit extra for the feature.

Finally I used FINALE, an additional program that classifies all of the games according to their endgames. Those of you who have the ENCYCLOPEDIA OF CHESS ENDINGS will be familiar with the 'codes'. It took FINALE quite a while to classify all 90,000 games, about two hours during the night while I slept, but when it finished I had instantaneous access to every one of those endgame codes in my BIGBASE. ChessBase also provide a utility called Alpha which sorts games according to player's name and tournament venue. This is a big time saver because individual searches in a very large database can take a few minutes.

Of course maintaining a 90,000 game database requires a bit of work! I eliminated short draws, one move wins (yes, there were quite a few!), and over the course of time I know I'll need to prune the duplicate games that appear to have crept into it - mostly it seems because the games from INFORMANT also exist from elsewhere in my BIGBASE.

**MY GAMES**

It's hard to resist entering one's own games into a chess database. So I did it. It took me about a day to 'mouse in' my 150 correspondence games (played since 1985). ChessBase made the process quite enjoyable. You need only use the mouse to click a piece, or the square to which the piece will move, and ChessBase usually can guess the rest. After a while I developed a feel for how to do it. I'm now confident enough to enter a complete game in just two or three minutes. It is also easy to add evaluations (!, ?, !? etc), textual annotations (including Informant symbols), variations (and variations within variations!), and so on.

Once I had entered all my games, I used another ChessBase tool, CBTREE, to examine all of my games statistically. CBTREE processes the games to create a breakdown on the results, comparing moves. I discovered that I appear to do equally well with White and Black, but far better in some openings than others. For example, CBTREE's statistics showed clearly that I've been having a little trouble as Black in one particular variation of the Taimanov Sicilian.

So naturally I used ChessBase to search for all the games in the Taimanov, and then created a separate database for that opening. It was a bit manic, perhaps, but I then spent some more time going through my sources and adding in other key games that didn't already exist in my database - including my own ideas. Finally, I used CBTREE to examine the opening. It was a bit of work to set up (obviously far less than doing it manually... would that even have been possible?), but the results were well worth it.

For example in the line 1.e4 c5 2.Nf3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.Nxd4 a6 5.Bd3 Nf6 6.0-0, I have played Qc7 ever since it first became popular in 1988-89. CBTREE shows quite clearly that 6...d6 has more recently emerged as the preferred choice: something I had begun to suspect given the tough encounters I was getting in the Qc7 line, including an excruciating game in the National Team Championship. There it was, in the database, the key game that had been giving me fits. I had found it in TOURNAMENT CHESS after a long manual search; in ChessBase I had it after a minute's effort. Perhaps that's what my opponents have been doing?!

One of the other neat things to try with your own games (or with a collection of someone else's) is to generate an overview of your (or their) favourite openings. ChessBase can do this automatically for you, displaying a personalised opening book. I've found it to be a very interesting way to review my own opening choices, and to keep track of neat transpositions, and I am quite sure it would be a very useful resource were I scheduled to play an opponent to whose games I had access.

**STUDYING OPENINGS**

Recently David Myers graciously forwarded to me a review copy of his phenomenal
compendium, THE COMPLETE WINAWER, a ChessBase openings database with more than 6,000 games in the Winawer variation of the French. In addition to complete tournament disks ChessBase also sells such opening 'books', effectively their compilation of databases on specific openings. There are dozens and the number seems to be growing steadily. So if you're an addict of a particular opening, those databases can provide a fabulous fix. And I can't think of a better way to learn an opening than by playing over many games (not just the opening variations), in order to get a better feeling for the themes and endgames that tend to result.

It seems clear to me that with access to David Myers' Winawer database I would easily have avoided many mistakes that have occured in the past. Against one opponent, for example, I tried 1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.Nc3 Bb4 4.e5 c5 5.Qg4!? when Nge7 6.Qg7 Rg8 7.Qh6 Qc7 8.a3 Bxc3! 9.bxc3 left me, as White, a tempo down on the main line. I looked this up in Myers' database and there it was, a clear warning. His database includes 16 games in the 5.Qg4 line, and Black scored 2½/3 with 8...Bxc3 (as above). Other eighth moves fared less well, but obviously Black only needs one good line if he knows about it. Two of the key games were obscure European correspondence games that I would never otherwise have found.

HEDGEHOG ANALYSIS

For my first big ChessBase project I created a separate database of all games that involve Hedgehog formations. Over the past three years I've been experimenting with positions in which Black places Pawns at a6, b6, d6, e6, and sometimes also g6 - defying White to find a way to break through. I've reached that formation from three different openings, the Queen's Indian, the Symmetrical English and the Taimanov Sicilian.

I used MOTIV, the ChessBase tool that permits you to search for specific Pawn formations, positional elements, manouevres, and material configurations, and told it to search for all games in which White has Pawns on c4 and e4, but no Pawn on the d-file, and in which Black has Pawns at a6, b6, d6, e6 and f7, but none on the c-file! From my BIGBASE it found more than 200 games meeting the criteria. WOW. Naturally, since I had added my own games to BIGBASE, it also found the five games in which I had played the Hedgehog.

I now moved all of these games into a separate database, 'HEDGEHOG', and added many of the older games from my notebooks. Then I began to work with the new database. First, I wondered what was the distribution of the openings from which these positions came. To be sure, most were from the Taimanov Sicilian, the Queen's Indian and the Symmetrical English. But a few also arose from other openings, including one from the French Defence! A tribute to the versatility and popularity of the opening, and a tribute to ChessBase since how else would it be possible to collate the similar Pawn formations from so many different opening systems?

Next, I wanted to search through all of the Hedgehog games in which Black tried the strategic b5...d5 break. I found more than 40 examples, including my favourite, the Korchnoi-Adorjan game which Adorjan analysed in his wonderful book, 'BLACK IS OK!'. Using MOTIV I was also able to sort the games by White's Kingside and Queenside Pawn configurations, by Black's placement of the Pawns, and I searched for games using certain Black manouevres: e.g. Be7-f8-g7, Rc6/Qd7/Qb8/Qa8, Nc6-e5-d7, and Nd7-c5 (inviting b4?!). Also White attacking themes like Nxe6?!, e4-e5, f4-f5, and a4-a5. I also looked at games in which White succeeds in exchanging off the dark squared Bishops, something I instinctively have tried to avoid. Sure enough, White does tend to do very well there.

In one of my recent games as Black I chanced upon the idea of pushing the g-Pawn out of a Hedgehog formation. And here for my enjoyment were more than 20 other examples of Black attacking with g6-g5-g4! One player even initiated the idea with an early Rg8! I'm not quite that adventurous, but I certainly do appreciate the idea of being able to check such new ideas against grandmaster practice. After all isn't that what the GMs themselves do?

THE ENDGAME

For me one of the most difficult aspects of chess is the transition to the endgame. In almost every game we have to decide at what point to exchange off the pieces and towards what type of endgame to head. I often make these decisions
on a strategic basis - control over strong and weak squares, the number of Pawn islands, the strengths and weaknesses of the remaining pieces etc. When possible, and especially in critically difficult positions, I also use my library to hunt for specific endgame positions that are similar to the one towards which I appear to be headed. It can be a very tedious, labour-intensive process. ChessBase gives me fast access to a substantially larger storehouse of endgame positions.

In one of my postal games I have had to assess the viability of Queen + four Pawns against Queen + Bishop. Using ChessBase I easily retrieved 45 such examples and found, as you might expect, that the Pawns have good winning chances when they are all connected. In another game I reached an endgame in which each side had two Rooks and three Pawns. I had a rather clear positional superiority consisting of the more active Rooks, but the 145 examples in BIGBASE demonstrated that the positional superiority I enjoyed was insufficient for the win. Sure enough, my opponent showed that by sacrificing a Pawn he could activate his Rooks enough to guarantee a draw.

I don't regard the use of FINALE as a substitute for the old-fashioned hard work, or even for Fine's BASIC CHESS FINDINGS, but it sure has become an indispensable part of my endgame methodology. I should add that while the standard endgame classification is useful, and a great timesaver, there are still moments when you will want to use MOTIV to search for something a bit out of the ordinary.

**WISH LIST**

I must seem a bit ungrateful to ask for more, especially since as a comparatively new user I haven't yet discovered everything that ChessBase has to offer. But if and when they do come out with a new version, I hope they address some if not all of the following.

First, the product is quite expensive. Mind you, it's really worth what they charge, but from my conversations with others it obviously costs more than the chess-playing masses would want to spend on it. You can easily spend £500 or more on the program, utilities and sufficient data. Of course you don't need to buy all of the games that I did. A reasonable alternative would be to buy a few of the electronic 'books' that cover your favourite openings. CBTREE is probably the most important of the ChessBase utilities and would work well with the opening books. I think that FINALE (for endgames) becomes essential only when you acquire every large database. MOTIV is lots of fun, but it's not for the faint of heart. I recommend you buy it only if you have a little programming experience.

Second, ChessBase really ought to do more to integrate the various utilities into the main program itself. You have to leave the program to run many of the utilities, such as MOTIV.

Finally, I would hope for an even better opening classification scheme. David Myers is working on what he calls the Universal Key, a more comprehensive attempt that will integrate the ECO codes with more standard references (Poisoned Pawn, King's Gambit, etc.) For the moment I'd be content enough if the official subdivisions inherent in the ECOs (e.g. B42/5) were included. I also hope the folks who produce the ENCYCLOPEDIA OF CHESS OPENINGS soon produce an electronic (and up-to-date) version. Now that would really be something.

**AM I BECOMING A STRONGER PLAYER?**

Perhaps the single most important aspect of these chess databases is that I am now able to play through so many more games than ever before. In our local club I often tell players that the best way to improve is to play over grandmaster games, but I'm well aware that it can be relatively hard to do so. You have to set up a board, move the pieces around and, if you're courageous enough to try and follow someone else's analysis, more often than not you wind up losing track of the main line.

I can honestly say that in two months with ChessBase, I've reviewed more games and more analysis than in a whole year before that. Does this mean I'll become a stronger player? I suppose only time can tell that, but I do know that I'm now 'training' more correctly, and that I'm having a ton of fun in the process.

*Jon R. Edwards*
A LETTER from CHRIS WHITTINGTON

'Mothinks there is a problem with the Rating List for PC programs on 386 or 486 machines with extended memory and hash tables.

'There are four ways that programs use hash tables:

1. Small programs can use normal program memory (i.e. the bottom 640K that most PC's have). I know that some programs only use 16K or 32K of the PC data segment. They get a very small hash table - but it works.

2. EMS memory.

3. XMS memory.

For both [2] and [3] some programs require the user to set this up to get at the extended or expanded RAM, and thus have some hash. This is for more recent programs which have been written with 386/486 and extra RAM in mind.

4. It has been reported that there is a new way to get at the extra RAM, by-passing XMS/EMS. I'm not sure if anyone has done this yet.

If users and, especially, testers don't understand how to set up their memory management in their CONFIG.SYS file, they won't get EMS or XMS memory paged in. On Chess CHAMPION 2175 hash makes a fantastic difference! [Chris].

Others which can make use of hash are FRITZ2 and M CHESS PRO. I have 4MB RAM on my 386/20. Setting up correctly gives these and CC2175 a 2MB hash system. This makes a 50-60% speed difference to CC2175, 20-25% to FRITZ2, and around 10% to M CHESS PRO.

Chess GENIUS makes use of up to 320K hash from the first 640K. HIARCS and ZARKOV 2.6 can get 16K from the same area, all gaining between 10 and 20% speed-up from this.

What DIFFERENCE does it make?

On 286 machines, the Ratings are nothing to worry about. The figures on our List represent a 286 at around 16MHz. Users with 12MHz will only lose perhaps 3 or 4 BCF at most; those with 20MHz may gain 2 BCF. So the variation is small.

But when we come to 386/486, the potential variation can be massive. Our List represents 386 machines at 25-33MHz, with 4MB RAM. But a 16MHz with 1MB would lose half its speed running FRITZ2 and M CHESS PRO, and even more with CC2175 (thus over 10 BCF!). Equally someone with 40MHz and 8MB RAM could get double the speed and +8 or 10 BCF... a swing of 20 BCF between the two extremes. The RATING LIST, as it stands, does not distinguish between the types of 386. Thus 'too many' results with a particularly slow (or fast) PC can exert a wrong weighting on the gradings, especially for some Programs.

The same comments exactly apply to 486 machines, which are represented in the area of 33-40MHz and 4MB RAM. If someone has a 66MHz with 8MB RAM, they could create a serious 'over-rating' for some of the PC programs. NOT an over-rating as far as THEY are concerned, but another person buying that program for his 25MHz 2MB RAM 486 could get a big disappointment!!

Chris Whittington has seen his CC2175 486/PC rating drop from a 2218 figure based solely on 55 game scores from Thorsten Czub, to 2097 in NS/438 from a total of 105 games, which includes results from Austria and Germany (where CSS Mag. headed their Article on CC2175, 'Hopp oder Top, Champ oder Flop?'). Chris concludes that these results were either on slower 486 machines, or they had less RAM, or (most likely) the RAM was set-up incorrectly!

His suggestion is that we print FOUR TEST POSITIONS, and all readers sending in results for any 386/486 PC PROGRAM also send in the timings which that program achieves for these positions on their machine, plus details of that machine's hardware. In this way we can work out what real difference the various set-ups make... and (if time allows!) perhaps advise users how to get better results from their PC!

I had hoped to include the positions in this
issue, with 'optimum' timings, but all available space has gone. Perhaps it is best that readers, especially those affected, have the chance first to make their own comments. Please write.

SETTING UP YOUR PC.

I have cheated! I bought Quarterdeck's excellent product QEMM (£56.40 complete from Watford Electronics, 0582 487777). Installing this Memory Manager resulted in my 4MB RAM producing 16K for HIARCS and ZARKOV 2.6, and 320K for Chess GENIUS immediately (each being their max. possible).

M CHESS PRO and Chess CHAMPION 2175 also went straight to 2MB hash.

However a WARNING is needed on M CHESS PRO - you are NOT supposed to install it with QEMM, SMARTDRIVE, WINDOWS (!) or any other DOS-SHELL or disk-caching program running! Therefore make yourself a SYSTEM Disk (FORMAT /S), and add the following:

AUTOEXEC.BAT
@ECHO OFF
PATH C:\A\DOS;
LD MOUSE
KEYB UK.,C:\DOS\KEYBOARD.SYS
PROMPT $P$G

CONFIG.SYS
DEVICE = C:\DOS\HIMEM.SYS
COUNTRY = 044.\C:\DOS\COUNTRY.SYS
DOS = HIGH
BUFFERS = 40

If you install and Run M CHESS PRO from this Boot Disk, you should get the maximum your PC system enables it to (as with QEMM).

FRITZ2 is different. Firstly install it using the INSTALL command with FRITZ2 in Drive A.
Let's assume you install it to its own FRITZ2 Directory. If now you Run it from QEMM, or any other set-up, the most hash you will get is 128K. To get THE maximum, you need to prepare a separate floppy (again FORMAT /S), and now add the following:

AUTOEXEC.BAT
@ECHO OFF
PATH C:\A\DOS;
LD MOUSE
KEYB UK.,C:\DOS\KEYBOARD.SYS
C:

CD\FRITZ2
FRITZ2 \X

CONFIG.SYS
COUNTRY = 044.\C:\DOS\COUNTRY.SYS
FILES = 10
BUFFERS = 5

Put this Boot Disk into Drive A, and then switch on. FRITZ2 will load itself, and work out the maximum hash ready to go! [NOTE] All the programs have a feature enabling you to check what hash you've obtained, so you can always find out if everything has worked correctly.

THE NEW PROGRAMS

I've let you down! I had promised a REVIEW and COMPARISON of M CHESS PRO, Chess GENIUS, FRITZ2 and HIARCS... and all space has gone. I've also spent too much time getting QEMM and the various SET-UPS organised for myself and this Article, so leaving less time to run full feature comparisons etc. Here is a brief Chart to cover some of the MAJOR factors - more NEXT TIME, promise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCP</th>
<th>CG</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>£99</td>
<td>£89</td>
<td>£79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286 Machines</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2042e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386 Machines</td>
<td>2266</td>
<td>2329</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486 Machines</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>2409e</td>
<td>2242e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hash (up to)</td>
<td>16MB</td>
<td>320K</td>
<td>32MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installs allowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Infinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display quality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis shown</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations shown</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search info shown</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info avail in 2 play</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Styles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Best move</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clocks on view</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Levels</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diag. print</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game print</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Notes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas analyse</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save/Load games</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Database</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/Book size</td>
<td>200K</td>
<td>80Ke</td>
<td>25Ke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openings named</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add own Openings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

» means est'd. Scores 0-5 are my opinion!
Regular readers know that PHILIP GOSLING has entered his Mephisto VANCouver into one of the Tournaments run by the British Correspondence Chess Society (BCCS). Opponents also are fully aware that they are playing a Computer - in fact it's even been given a nickname... MEPH.

[The BCCA also runs a Computer Friendly Section, run on Correspondence lines. Interested readers should write to TERRY ARTHURS, 39 Orchard Avenue, Carston, Watford, Herts WD2 7JG].

Back to MEPH's games. The score at the end of issue 43 was 6-0 - 2 (i.e. MEPH has 7/8!) and a current BCCS Grading of 2420, for 4th position on their Grading List! There are just 2 games of the current Tournament to finish - both quite tough.

**Vancouver 020 (2275) - BCCS 2237. Game 5. 1992.**

The Computer has just played **30.Nb5** [NS43. Eval. +0.6]. I am not as optimistic as Phil and MEPH about this one, and anticipated that Black would NOT go for the Bishop/Knight exchange (30...Qe7 31.Nxd6 Qxd6 32.Rxf7 Rf8), but was more likely to play 30...Bb8 31.Qe3 Rb3.

![Chess Diagram]

Black continues to have difficulties in defending the Pawns and developing his pieces, and is faced with some finely balanced decisions. So MEPH and Phil are still happy with this one!

**BCCS 2445 - Vancouver 020 [2275]. Game 6. 1992.**

Our opponent is an Iranian in this one - a "very pleasant fellow" says Phil, and also Iran's No.1 player!

At first moves arrived at the rate of 1 a month ("the handicap of a medieval postal service", says Phil), but our opponent stirred himself for NS43 by getting a whole 4 moves ahead! It was in anticipation of a slowing down due to his wedding in January - and for the reason of likely pre-occupation with other things, Phil encouraged us not to worry about MEPH's evaluation at that time.

MEPH had played **10...Ne7** [NS43. Eval. -0.6].

![Chess Diagram]

**11.Nxf5 Nxf5 12.g4 Nh4** [NS44. Eval. +0.4 -> Qb4]

Phil adds a couple of notes. [1] Relates to the chess, commenting that MEPH seems very partial to the Queen's Knight Defence, 1.d4 NC6, and is playing this line in several other games. There isn't so much in the Books on this, so players are often fishing out their own moves very early on. [2] BCCS 2445 is not only Iran's top player, but he also won the 1992 Continuous Tournament "PLAYER OF THE
YEAR’ Award. [3] is a personal note, which Phil says helps to “put flesh on the games” for him. Now the underlining is, in truth, mine; but you will see what’s on his mind when I tell you that he next remarks that his opponents new bride has “the very attractive name of MAHBOOBEH”. Here the CAPS are Phil’s! Knowing that his wife has already shown some concern over Phil’s Correspondence exploits, I wonder how life in the Gosling household is going to be affected by this new exposure?


The moves for this game, in which MEPH represents the BCCS on Board 7, have come racing in. In fact SURREY offered MEPH a draw at 28...Qf7, but MEPH has turned it down and replied with 29.Rd6 [NS43. Eval. +060 -> Rb8].

MEPH’s good eval. is probably based on his piece centralisation; but I wondered last time what NS/Readers thought of that unpleasant Pawn on h3?!

29...e5 30.Qxf7 +

Does this exchange swing the balance toward the draw? MEPH shows +078 in making it, but has dropped to +027 at move 31.

30...Rxh7 31.Re6 Rd7 32.Rxe5 Rd1 + 33.Kh2 Rd2 34.Rxh5?! Our opponent wrote generously of MEPH’s play after the game, but thought this might have been a mistake as the draw is now guaranteed. MEPH reads only +006.

34...Rxh2 + 35.Kg1 Kg2 + 36.Kf1 Rxg3 37.Kf2 Kg2 + 38.Kxh3 Rd2 39.Kf4

And draw agreed, this time MEPH’s offer. ½-½.

SURREY wrote “I was surprised by the subtlety of the Computer’s play”. Phil bought MEPH a special Cup to commemorate his performance of a draw on County Board 1! Things like that are nice - I still have a Shield at home from when the Fiddely Mach2C beat Jim Piaskett and drew with Raymond Keene at the re-launch of CHESS in 1988.

Vancouver 020 [2275]-A MRUGALA [2415]. Friendly. 1992

This position comes from a French Steinitz (BCO2 page 245), chosen especially by our opponent. We have guessed from his choice of moves that he is either a specialist with the two Bishops, or rather good at endgames! He’s also rated 2415 of course! MEPH has just played 16.Be2 [NS43. Eval. +054 -> Bc6].


What an absorbing, fearsome endgame this has become. Our Polish friend’s colours are being revealed, and MEPH has a difficult game after 19...Rd2, despite his hopeful +042.

The Pawn on h7 is “polluted”, so definitely not 21.Bxh7 Rh8! 22.Be4 Bxh2 + 23.Kh1 Bc7 + 24.Kg1 Bh2 + 25.Kh1 is perpetual. Even worse might be 23...f5! But MEPH would never do something like that, would it?!

Whatever, his extra Pawn seems to be worth less and less, and a draw now looks most likely. That would be a good result against such a highly graded opponent who was allowed to choose the opening moves 1-5, and, after seeing MEPH’s 6th, moves 6-11.

The emphasis on Rook and Pawn play prompted Phil to investigate the Rooks 110% idea, which MEPH now uses.
NOTES re the RATING LIST, and other SYMBOLS used in the NEWS SHEET.

[1] The RATING LIST

/5 after a machine indicates its PROCESSOR SPEED. This is used where a program or computer is available at different running speeds. Showing /5, /6, /10 etc. enables Readers to distinguish which speed applies to a Rating.

Processors. 68000 (16 bit), 68020 and 68030 (32 bit) and RISC (32 bit) processors are indicated. Where the processor is not referred to, it is normally a 6301 or 6502 unit.

+/- This shows the maximum future RATING MOVEMENT, up or down, which is likely for the particular Computer. It is based on Standard Deviation principles, which means that the more games a Computer has had entered into the Rating List, the more reliable is its Rating, and the lower the +/- figure becomes. It is 95% certain mathematically that a machine's rating will stay within the +/- figure shown.

Human Games. This column shows the total results each Computer has obtained in Countries from which information has been made available relating to Tournament play against humans. The figures from abroad are also carefully adjusted to British BCF levels.

Whenever a figure is added to a particular Computer, it affects two things:-


[2] The OVERALL LEVEL of the finished list. The TOTALS of the Computer Ratings are compared with the TOTALS obtained against humans, and the whole List is adjusted up or down in accordance with the difference. The program, which I have developed specifically for Computer rating, also checks each Machine on an individual basis in this work, so the result is very exact. In addition it 'weights' the more recent results, so that they have a greater effect.

Thus, if any Computer gets, say, a BAD result v Humans, firstly this will affect its OWN Rating quite considerably. But it will also reduce the Level of the WHOLE List to some degree. Of course, a GOOD result has the opposite effect.

Some people feel that the Results v Humans are more important than those v Computers. I would not disagree with this, but such 'proper' Tournament results often involve only a small number of games. Some machines have NEVER played in a 'real' Tournament! Using these results only would leave us with a very unreliable, and sometimes quite misleading, finished List.

I have found that Computer v Computer results, played at a time control of at least 1 min per move, produce figures which relate VERY closely to the comparative results those machines also produce against humans. I therefore believe that the COMBINING of both makes the NEWS SHEET Rating List the most accurate available anywhere, including as it does a massive number of results from private owners all over the World AND incorporating all available and verifiable Tournament performances.

PC Ratings

PC programs are all printed in a separate list - I think this leaves the individual Ratings for both DEDICATED and PC computer programs easier to find and follow.

/PC is a basic PC (or the occasional Amiga/Atari program) at around 8MHz.

/286/PC is for the program running on a 16 bit 80286 processor at an average speed of around 16MHz. If you have a 286 running faster than 16MHz, you might get a slightly better result.

/386/PC is for the program running on a 32 bit 80386 processor, at an average speed of around 33MHz, with 2MB of RAM.

/486/PC is for the program running on the 32 bit 80486 processor at an average speed of around 40MHz, with 4MB of RAM.

For 386 and 486 machines, if you have a faster processor speed, or more RAM (valuable for some programs if used properly), you should get a slightly better result. A doubling of MHz speed = up to 8 BCF; a doubling of RAM may give 1 or 2BCF (and may mean nothing!).

[2] Other SYMBOLS often seen in the NEWS SHEET

Time Controls.

G/30 means Game in 30 mins.

G/60 means Game in 60 mins.

40/2 means 40 moves in 2 hours.

60/60 and 60/1 both mean 60 moves in 1 hour.

60/10 means 60 moves in 10 mins.

I try to include these details before printing each game wherever possible.