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First a piece of disappointing news: the closure of *PC SCHACH* (previously MODUL) - the excellent Austrian Magazine edited by good friend Thomas Mally.

The reason given by Thomas was "private and professional pressures, which have escalated to a point where continuing with *PC SCHACH* on a regular basis seems quite impossible".

This is a great shame - although written in German which I cannot read very well, both MODUL and PC SCHACH have been a constant source of valuable information, results, games and tests over the years, especially as Thomas always followed-up the arrival of each issue with a 2 page letter in good old English indexing and explaining the main contents for me.

We’ll miss you Thomas - maybe the bug will bite again when you’ve had a well-deserved rest and you’ll be back!? Hope so sometime.

---

Holger Ulbricht in a recent Issue of Germany’s Schach & Spiele Magazine reported a destructive win by the new Tasc R30 over Novag’s DIAMOND. Played at G/90 the score was:

**Tasc R30 9-1 Novag DIAMOND.**

It was 8-0 for the R30, with 2 draws.

Another one-sided result comes from Andreas Braun in the same issue. He played 10 games at G/30 between his Genius3 on a 486/40 against the Kasparov RISC 2500-128.

**Genius3 486/40 8½-1½ RISC 2500**

This from a 7-0=3 split. It will be interesting to see how the newest version of dc Koning's program at 14MHz. in the Mephisto MONTREUX on an Arm-6 processor compares when it meets the Genius3 program.

**Rudiger Hartmann** ran a small Tournament using his Pentium/60 and Pentium/90! Games were played at G/30, and the program with White always had the 'disadvantage' of his Pentium/60.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>R6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3¼</td>
<td>2¼ = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CMMaster 4000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=</td>
<td>MChessPro3.5</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=</td>
<td>Rebel6.0</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Schach & Spiele review of W CHESS gives the following 486 scores at 40/2:

W Chess 2½-3½ Genius3
W Chess 1½-4½ MCPro4
W Chess 2-4 Rebel6
W Chess 2-4 Hiarc2
W Chess 3½-2½ Fritz3

Once again these are not terribly inspiring and the euphoria generated some months ago by the W Chess performance in the Harvard Cup has long since died away.

While I am on the subject of W Chess, the confusing ratings in our Issue 59 can be explained a little now. Our List showed W Chess on a 486 1 Elo higher than W Chess on a Pentium! However the 486/66 results all used W Chess version 1.03, whilst the Pentium/90 results were obtained with a later version 1.06. One hopes we are not set for a repeat of the M Chess farce a few years ago, with new versions coming out almost every week. The 1.03 version is claimed to be "nearly the same" (!) as the Harvard Cup version. Perhaps the peculiarity in the ratings is caused by our old friend 'small sample' but we had results from over 200 games in, so the more likely
reason seems to be that 1.06 is not as good! Mmm! The scores given above were obtained by version 1.03.

Still with Schach & Spiele I spotted Jurgen Faas' results from his review of MChess PRO4. Rather belated I'm afraid, but it's always helpful to see specific scores and relate them to the actual Rating List. All games were played on a 486/50 at the 40/2 time control:

MCPRO4 2-4 Genius3
MCPRO4 3-3 Hiarc3
MCPRO4 3-3 Fritz3
MCPRO4 2½-3½ Rebel6

Here was one of the games which I found particularly interesting!

MChessPRO4 (2430) – HIARCS3 (2420)

1.e4 c5 2...f3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4...xd4 ...f6
5...c3 a6 6...g5 e6 7.f4 ...b6 8...d2 ...xb2
9...b1 ...a3 10...xf6 ...xf6 11.e2 ...e6
12...x6 c6 13.0-0 ...a5 14...h1 ...e7
15.f5 h5 16...f3 ...f8!? 17...xe6 ...xe6!?

One would have expected 17...fxe6 and perhaps 18.e5 dxe5 19...x6+!

18...b7! ...e8 19...f1 ...c5 20.a4 h4 21...d1 h3 22.g3 f5 23...f2

23...g5!

23...fxe4 was the move expected by MCP, when 24...xe4 leaves him only marginally behind

24...e2?!

24...xg5 ...xf2 25...f4 fxe4 26...xe4 ...xf4 27.gxf4 d5+

24...c4 25...d3

I prefer 25...e1 d5 26...xd3

25...d4 26...h8?!

An awful move to have to make, but what else?

26...g7 27...xe8 ...xe8 28...e1 fxe4 29...f2 e3! 30...e2 ...d5 31...xd5 ...xd5+ 32...g1 ...e4 33...a1 ...a5 34...d1 ...xa4 35...f1 ...d2
36...f3 f5 37...d1
37...xc6? ...e4! taking the Queen out of it altogether

37...xc2 38...e1 ...c5 39...h1 ...b5 40...e2 e2 41...g1 ...c5

If 42...e1 (42...a1? ...xg1+ 43...xg1 ...xa1+ 44...f2 e1# mate) 42...e3 wins 0–1

The following Article appears in the latest edition of the USA’s COMPUTER CHESS REPORTS and refers to FRITZ3's shock win in the World Championship, reported on at length in our Issue 59.

Does FRITZ deserve to be World Champion?

by Larry Kaufman

What is the meaning of FRITZ3 becoming the World Computer Champion, ahead of several Supercomputers and machines like HiTech and IBM's Deep Blue Prototype built solely for chess, as well as ahead of higher-rated PC programs?

It is my understanding that the version of FRITZ that played in Hong Kong was the same or essentially the same as the
commercial FRITZ3, except for the opening book which was modified for use in this Event with lines prepared for individual opponents. This is more or less necessary in such an Event since otherwise your opponents may prepare lines against your own book! FRITZ managed to beat DEEP BLUE because the book produced a position in which the tactics were too deep even for the supercomputer, and it made a fatal error on its very first move out of book.

The book lines are one of the reasons for FRITZ's success, but another factor is simply the huge chance element in a tournament of five rounds (or six counting the play-off game). FRITZ3 is a strong program, especially tactically (it is considered the deepest searching, though at the expense of chess knowledge), but after 673 games on fast 486 computers the latest Swedish 'PLY' rating list had it from 45 to 104 points behind W Chess, Hiarc3, Rebel6, MChess Pro4 and Genius3 on the same hardware. 'PLY' will not even publish a rating for a program until it has played 100 games as it considers smaller samples to be too inaccurate. In a tournament of 5 or 6 rounds, any strong program may emerge the winner due to chance factors, which is why I always pay more attention to long events such as the Uniform Platform tournament of some 30 rounds.

It is also my opinion that testing with fixed opening lines, each side playing one white and one black, is more valid than free-style games, because of the possibilities of opening preparation. FRITZ3 is to be congratulated for winning the event, but anyone who gives more weight to a five round result than to the 673 games played by FRITZ3 for 'PLY' magazine is fooling himself.

[Eric's view: "I agree entirely with Larry's views here. In our own Rating List FRITZ3 on a 486 had no less than 876 games as the basis for its rating and was behind the W Chess->Genius3 group by from 28-93 Elo. However the gap was less on the Pentium ratings, a max. of 69 Elo in fact, though these are based on 'only' around 200 games for each program as yet.

There was considerable discussion on the Internet rec.games.chess.computer pages re the merit of FRITZ's performance. In the light of its wins against both DEEP BLUE and STAR SOCRATES it was generally agreed that FRITZ had performed above itself on the occasion and in that sense deserved the title. But it was equally felt that a doubling of the number of games played or a 20 game match against either of these opponents, or probably GENIUS3 or REBEL6, would see FRITZ beaten nine times out of ten].

Still with the INTERNET, a name you will see plenty of as you browse through the rec.games.chess.* pages is Robert HYATT. Bob has been involved in computer chess for about 25 years and is the principal author of the well-known CRAY BLITZ. The 'junior' of this program which he runs on his own PC is CRAFTY and there is often reference by Robert to how these respond to various positions etc.


Robert is often fairly bold/outspoken in his comments, and occasionally comes under tremendous verbal attack from other Internet users who dislike his authoritative approach. However he is the ONLY major chess computer programmer who contributes with any regularity. Much of what he says is of both interest and value, and I view the chess.computer section in particular as being all the better for his involvement.
POLGAR plays Zie JUN for the Ladies World Championship quite soon. How did she fare against MCHESS PRO4?!

E VOORTMEYER (1800) – JUNIOR
Pent (2300) [A18] Aegon, 1995

1.e4 c5 2.\(\heartsuit\)f3 \(\heartsuit\)c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.\(\heartsuit\)xd4 \(\heartsuit\)g6
5.\(\heartsuit\)e3 \(\heartsuit\)g7 6.\(\heartsuit\)e2 \(\heartsuit\)f6 7.\(\heartsuit\)c4 0–0 8.\(\heartsuit\)b3 \(\heartsuit\)a5
9.f3 d5 10.\(\heartsuit\)d5

[10.exd5 \(\heartsuit\)b4 is more usual I think]

10...\(\heartsuit\)xd5 11.\(\heartsuit\)xd5 f5 12.\(\heartsuit\)c6 bxc6
13.\(\heartsuit\)b6 \(\heartsuit\)b8 14.\(\heartsuit\)xd8 \(\heartsuit\)xd8 15.\(\heartsuit\)d1 \(\heartsuit\)xd1+
16.\(\heartsuit\)xd1 fxe4 17.\(\heartsuit\)xe8 \(\heartsuit\)xe8 18.\(\heartsuit\)b3 exf3
19.gxf3 a4 20.\(\heartsuit\)c1 \(\heartsuit\)a8 21.\(\heartsuit\)e2 \(\heartsuit\)f7 22.\(\heartsuit\)c5
e6 23.\(\heartsuit\)d2 \(\heartsuit\)e8 24.\(\heartsuit\)e2 \(\heartsuit\)e5 25.\(\heartsuit\)c3 g5
26.\(\heartsuit\)e4 \(\heartsuit\)f4 27.\(\heartsuit\)g2 \(\heartsuit\)f7 28.\(\heartsuit\)h4 \(\heartsuit\)h6 29.\(\heartsuit\)b4
\(\heartsuit\)b8 30.\(\heartsuit\)c3 \(\heartsuit\)a8 31.\(\heartsuit\)d4 \(\heartsuit\)a5 32.\(\heartsuit\)h5

32...\(\heartsuit\)g5 was better]

33.\(\heartsuit\)c3 \(\heartsuit\)a8 34.\(\heartsuit\)e5! axb3 35.exb3 \(\heartsuit\)xe5
36.\(\heartsuit\)xe5 \(\heartsuit\)e7 37.a4 \(\heartsuit\)b8 38.\(\heartsuit\)g5 \(\heartsuit\)xb3
39.\(\heartsuit\)g7+

39...\(\heartsuit\)d8?!

[39...\(\heartsuit\)f8 forcing the Rook to move, probably to c7, is much better: 40.\(\heartsuit\)c7
\(\heartsuit\)xf3 41.\(\heartsuit\)xe6 (41.\(\heartsuit\)xc6 \(\heartsuit\)e7 est. White +78) 41...\(\heartsuit\)a3 est. White +63]

40.f4!

[40.\(\heartsuit\)xe6 \(\heartsuit\)xf3 41.a5 \(\heartsuit\)a3 does not look as good]

40...\(\heartsuit\)b4 41.a5 \(\heartsuit\)a4 42.\(\heartsuit\)xe6 \(\heartsuit\)e4+??

I still have some AEGON games desperately determined to get themselves into print! Here are another couple well worth looking at.

JUNIOR is the leading Israeli chess playing PC program by Amir Ban and Shay Bushinsky. Originally developed solely as a hobby it made a giant breakthrough in 1984 coming 4= in a Major Open Tournament in Israel, beating G.M Leonid Gopolstein en route. Readers of Issue 59 will have seen that it came 3= with DEEP BLUE and FRENCH Chess in the recent World Championships. Its AEGON performance of 4/6 for a 2179 rating was less impressive, but here is the shortest game from that event showing what can happen to a sleepy 1803 grade!

EVOORTMEYER (1800) – JUNIOR
Pent (2300) [A18] Aegon, 1995

1.c4 \(\heartsuit\)f6 2.\(\heartsuit\)c3 e6 3.e4 d5 4.e5 \(\heartsuit\)e4 5.\(\heartsuit\)xe4 dx4 6.\(\heartsuit\)e2?

[6.\(\heartsuit\)g4 is the usual move in the MIKenas Variation of the English. Play might continue 6...\(\heartsuit\)d7 (6...\(\heartsuit\)e6?! 7.\(\heartsuit\)xe4 \(\heartsuit\)d4
8.\(\heartsuit\)xd4 \(\heartsuit\)xd4 9.\(\heartsuit\)d3±) 7.\(\heartsuit\)xe4 \(\heartsuit\)c6]

6...\(\heartsuit\)c6 7.\(\heartsuit\)c3 \(\heartsuit\)xe5 8.\(\heartsuit\)xe4 f5 9.\(\heartsuit\)c3 \(\heartsuit\)c5
10.h3 0–0

11.f4?? \(\heartsuit\)h4+ and mate in 3! 0–1

Susan (or is she still Zsuzsa officially?)
[42...\text{exa5} must have retained better drawing chances for Susan, though 43.f5 \text{e}a3 44.f6 \text{e}c3+ 45.\text{g}f7!++]

43.\text{d}d6 \text{ed}4+ 44.\text{d}xc6 \text{xf}4 45.a6 \text{e}c4+
[45...\text{e}f6+ 46.\text{g}b7!]

46.\text{b}b5 \text{e}c7
[A worthwhile last-gasp trap, but..]

47.\text{g}8+! \text{d}7 48.a7! 1–0

Dietmar Christoph in Dortmund has played a valuable series of games on his PC Autoplayer - 5 programs playing 10 games against each opponent at 60/60. The PC used was a 486/66.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H3</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>F3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4½ = 22½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genius2</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>6½ = 21½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRO4</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>6 = 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WChess</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5½ = 17½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regular contributor Frank HOLT has sent me latest scores from his marathon series with the Tasc R30-1993 against a range of PC programs on his 486/66. The latest test was vs MChess PRO4 and, as usual, Frank tested it at various time controls from G/30-G/120 and 60/60-40/20, with the R30 on its full range of styles.

The breakdown of these scores is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MChess PRO4</th>
<th>R30 normal</th>
<th>R30 active</th>
<th>R30 solid</th>
<th>R30 defensive</th>
<th>R30 offensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>on normal</td>
<td>6½-5½</td>
<td>5½-6½</td>
<td>8-4</td>
<td>6½-5½</td>
<td>10½-1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on aggress</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>7½-4½</td>
<td>7½-4½</td>
<td>5½-6½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is seen 90% of the time, the Tasc R30 again gets its best result total on the normal setting, with active not far behind. The difference in the scores with the R30 on offensive are rather interesting!

The RANKING for all opposition against Frank's R30, and taking all games into account is now as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>40/60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genius2 active</td>
<td>40/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRO4 normal</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc3 normal</td>
<td>36½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc3 solid</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genius3 active</td>
<td>34½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc3 aggressive</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genius1 active</td>
<td>33½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRO4 aggressive</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph Berlin Pro</td>
<td>32½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz3</td>
<td>30¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz2</td>
<td>29½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPRO4.1</td>
<td>27½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do NOT try to calculate any Tasc R30 ratings from this set of scores! Remember these results include often quite 'ordinary' scores on defensive and aggressive settings (viz. the offensive 1½-10½ vs MCPRO4 normal opposite).

I am just starting a G/60 match between the R30-1995 version against MCPRO4 on my 486, so am hoping some comparisons and conclusions between the 1993 and 1995 programs may prove possible. The first 2 games have gone to the R30-1995, and the extra chess knowledge of the new version (at the expense of a small loss in tactical speed) has appeared to me to be of benefit in both.

We shall see, but I also have a Tasc R30-1995 result vs. Meph Berlin PRO from Catherine Martin, time control 40/1hr, and that has gone to the R30 by a large 9½-2½! This Match is the subject of a separate Article elsewhere in this Issue.
An **Official CRA Test** run during the recent U.S. Open gave the **Kasparov PRESIDENT** (and thereby the **GK2100** and **Travel Champ 2100**, which carry the same program) a substantial boost!

Kasparov's **President**, excellent value wood auto-sensory!

I don't have details yet, but the PRESIDENT's US Active chess grade achieved from the 40 games was no less than **2320 USCF**! I'm sure readers are aware that we deduct 120 from USA figures to obtain our British Elo equivalents. Equally to adjust the grade to our Magazine Rating List (set for 60/60-40/2 time controls), there should be a further deduction of some 60 Elo. The net result is **2140**, suggesting that the PRESIDENT group of programs is stronger than the 2041 in our Issue 59 list.

Novag's JADE2/ZIRCON2 was also entered for a CRA Test recently, again at Active chess. This did less well than the PRESIDENT but, in getting a **2232 USCF** grade and after 'our maths' of -120 and -60, it still came out at **2052**, compared with the 2066 on our list. Almost dead on! The theory propagated in some quarters that Dave Kittinger programs do better against humans is not damaged by this.

result, but perhaps the same is now true of Franz Morsch? A strength comparison between the two portables (JADE2 vs TRAV CHAMPION 2100) and the table-top press-sensory (ZIRCON2 vs GK2100) comes out strongly favouring Franz Morsch's Kasparov programs based on the CRA Test performances.

For reference the Novag RUBY got **2181 USCF**, the Novag SAPPHIRE/DIAMOND **2285 USCF**.

The **AUSTRALIAN Human vs Computer** challenge last month resulted in a whopping win for the Computers. All programs were on Pentium/75’s and the time control of G/30 also favoured the silicon team which won **19½-5½**.

Genius3 got 5/5, Fritz3 and MCPro4 both got 4/5. Hiarcs (presumably 3, but could have been 2.1) got 3½, and Desperado (an Australian program in development) scored 3. The gradings of the opposition are not known, so the real value of the performances are not known. The following against a player who scored 0/5 hardly encourages us to believe they were **2000+**.

**N Steffenson vs Fritz3 Pentium. G/30**

1.d4 e6 2.Nf3 d5 3.c4 c6 4.cxd5?

[Mixing up his openings after arriving at a Semi-Slav?]

4...exd5 5.Nc3 Bd6 6.Qc2 Na6 7.Ne5 Nb4 8.Qb1 Ne7 9.a3 Bxe5

[9...f6 also looks good!]

10.dxe5 Na6 11.e4 Nc5 12.Bd3?

[12.Qc2 was needed here]

12...Nb3 13.Ra2 d4 14.Ne2 Qa5+ 15.Kf1 Be6 0-1. If 16.Bf4 Ng6! with material gains, a big attack and an easy win!
Hsu (The DB main-frame programmer) shares his WCC 'Deep' Disappointment

Internet Report from Feng-Hsiung Hsu

A major announcement was made at the closing ceremony of the 8th WCCC: IBM has accepted an invitation by ACM to play a 6-game match at regular time control with Gary Kasparov. The match will be played in Philadelphia as part of ACM's 50th Anniversary celebration. I don't have the press release with me, but if my memory is right, the match is to take place from Feb 10 to 17, 1996. (Correct, Eric)

WCC preparation, then it's Gary!

During the past 6 months, DT-2 was powered down most of the time, so that the new chip could be simulated on the only machine we have that has enough memory. The new chip was searching about one node per second (roughly the same speed as Gary Kasparov... joke), when running in simulation. When we play him it should be running at 3-5 million nodes/sec per chip. The plan is to use an SP2 as the host and somewhere between 128-512 chess chips as the slave processors!

The WCC result

With that out of the way, I will say something about the 8th WCCC:- first, I would like to congratulate the FRITZ team on their winning the WCC. The only annoying thing is that Frederic (Friedel) will be intolerable when I talk to him next time. I first met members of the Fritz team back in '93. Very nice chaps. Never did meet the new guy who prepared Fritz's opening book for this event! From what happened in the last two games, and from talking with GM Robert Byrne, I would have to say "a job well done".

Fritz played a tricky transposition in the game against Deep Blue Prototype (DT-2). The normal book line is to play Bg7 before f4. Our game database did contain the transposition, and gave the verdict that 0-0 0-0-0 is no good in the position, and g3 or c3 is called for. The automatically generated book unfortunately cut off right after the early f4, and our luck ran out. Normal book line is Bg7, 0-0, f4 and then g3, by the way. This loss is probably good for us in the long run. Book preparation will be taken far more seriously from now on. One additional side note. Instead of c4? allowing Qh5, the immediate g3 appears to hold - might still be lost against the likes of Kasparov, but I doubt Fritz can push it through. The machine did play g3, but the phone was disconnected at the worst possible time, and when it was re-started, it did not have enough time to re-discover the move.

I have not really seen the Star Socrates-Fritz game, but Grandmaster Robert Byrne has done some analysis in the past on the ancient line that Fritz played and is quite familiar with the line. His opinion is that unless white is prepared for the line, they are likely to get into deep trouble - as Star Socrates did. Yes, book preparation will be taken VERY seriously from now on.

The Tournament arrangements

Next, I would like to make some random comments about the competition itself. There were a surprising number of draws in this event. Before the last round, there was an ICCA/players' meeting. Players, or rather programmers, were not happy with the chancy nature of the format, and were asking that future events use a 7-round swiss format instead of the 5-round swiss format that has been used in the past few years. I would much prefer a double round-robin format myself, but it is probably logistically impossible.
The tournament location, Hong Kong, was fairly interesting. I was born in Taiwan, about 2-hour flight from Hong Kong, but this was my first trip to Hong Kong. Even though it was only May, the weather was quite hot and humid. The temperature was not really too bad. High was around 32 C, or 89 F, but the relative humidity was hovering around 90%. Food is excellent, but somewhat oilier than I would like.

One pleasant surprise is that smoking is not as popular as most places outside of North America. Signs are in both English and Chinese. The Chinese written language is roughly the same as in Taiwan.

The spoken dialect, Cantonese, however, is mostly incomprehensible to me. Once in a while, I did hear Mandarin being spoken.

There is fast growing trade with Mainland China, and Hong Kong will be reverting to Chinese rule in 1997.

We managed to do some sightseeing, but not enough to do the place justice. The playing site, the Chinese University of Hong Kong, is on a train route that connects directly into China. Some of the players took a train into China the day after the closing ceremony. We had a plane to catch and had to pass. The University is on a hill, and the playing hall has a spectacular view looking out from the window. The Guest House, where the closing ceremony was held, had an even better view. Almost like looking at a Chinese Painting.

The Internet connection

There were some mishaps with the internet connection from the University. The three main universities in Hong Kong use a common carrier for internet connection. Before the event, the remote teams tried out the connections remotely and the connections appeared ok. As it turned out, the connections into the Hong Kong universities appear fine, but getting out of the universities is almost impossible, at least during the tournament. IBM Hong Kong, as chance would have it, announced internet service for Hong Kong area the day before the tournament. The remote teams got to learn how to install OS2/Warp on PCs as a result.

How 'Disappointed'!?

Finally, some comments on the "Deep Disappointment". Yes, we are disappointed, but not too deeply. Given the format of the tournament, our chance to win it was around 50%, while any other team's chance was at around 4%, with the possible exception of Star Socrates. Going into the last round, our winning chance was up to around 90% (we pretty much clobber Fritz in test games). As Murphy's law would have it, Fritz grabbed the 10% chance. In hindsight, there were a bunch of things that we could have done to avoid the disaster, but hindsight is always 20-20.

The tournament also highlighted some of the deficiencies of the current hardware. The current hardware does not detect repetition, and effectively we are losing 4 plies as far as repetition is concerned. Repetition detection is not only important to hold draws, but also serves as an early warning system. In the game against WChess, the move Ra8? by DT-2 forcing rook trade was positionally incorrect, and it was also tactically bad as it allowed at least a repetition draw. The 0-0? move in the game against Fritz also allowed at least a repetition draw and would have been avoided if the hardware was capable of detecting repetition. In the past, we had not been burned by this deficiency, and it is a testimony to how far the other programs have advanced that we did get burned by it.

We will see how far we have or will have advanced, especially with regard to Kasparov... next February!
The Saittek Challenge (Human vs Computer Match on Sunday 28 May 1995)

As reported in Issue 59 the Human vs Computers match was won by the computers 4½-1½ (the computers had 3 wins and 3 draws) - another fine result for Computer Chess as the opposition was the official Hong Kong Olympiad team, though the programs were all on fast Pentiums!

Interestingly Fritz was held to a ½-½ by International Master Dr M.K.Wong, but he didn't know he was playing the future World Computer Champion at the time!

The Hong Kong National Champion, X. Yang (rated 2425) was managed to get a draw against Chess Genius. But the current Hong Kong Open Champion, H. Tsang (noticeably rated much lower on 2200) was defeated by the Mephisto Advantage, a commercial version of a previous world champion, Rebel 6.0, designed for use on a PC for connection to the new Mephisto AutoBoard.

Here, as promised, are all of the games:

Wong Meng Kong (IM, 2430) - Fritz (Pentium 90MHz)


Yang, Xian (FM, 2425) - Chess Genius (Pentium 120MHz)


WChess - John Ady (FM, 2325)

Dave Carless (FM, 2240) - Schach 3.0


Virtuca Chess - Kaarlo Schepel (2240)


Tsang, Hon (2200) - Mephisto Advantage (Rebel 6.0)


For those who think perhaps that chess players have little humour, here is a short sample list of the TEAM NAMES entered in the recent U.S AMATEUR TEAM CHAMPIONSHIPS:

- Dr. Quark and the Passed Pions
- If Rooks could Kill
- Two IMs and Two l Aints
- Castle Long Hoppity
- You Rook Mahvelous
- Baked Elasker
- Michael Rohde the Boat Ashore
- Tals from the Crypt
- Scotch on the Rooks
- Rook Shields
- The Master Maters
- Don't Throw in the Tal
- 1...KxQ+N: The Simpson Defence
- Chess Nuts Roasting on an Open File

And here are one or two rather nice DEFINITIONS seen on the Internet.

- ADJOURNMENT: an interruption in play to enable both players to obtain analytical help from their strongest chessmaster friends, their endgame libraries or their computer endgame ROMS.
- ADJUDICATION: a binding decision about the outcome of an unfinished game, made by someone who is rated 200 Elo points below you and who renders his decision after spending a total time equal to only 5% of the time you devoted over the board to the game!
- BRILLIANCY: a combinative sequence which is understandable to anyone once the solution has been revealed.
- CHESS CLOCK: a mechanical device used to time tournament games which no one ever pays attention to until a little red marker is about to fall!
- THE HYPERMODERN CENTRE: the squares a1, a8, h1 and h8.
It is generally agreed that future COMPUTER rating increases will come from:

1. Improved programming/chess.
2. Increased computing power/speed.

In discussing SPEED increases the view is that there is and always will be a relationship between search depth and strength.

But it leaves a major point open to question. Yes, "deeper search yields better play", but do we expect that the relationship charting the progress in play strength and using the same program where only speed increases are made, will be roughly linear (a straight line) or exponential (in this case a decreasing curve)??

If it continues to be linear, then the computers will eventually have a rating that is significantly higher than Kasparov's. But here's the point: this can only happen if we are also able to maintain linear increases of the search depth as we have been in the past - that is the problem (and a big, possibly insurmountable one at that).

In fact we can't continue increasing the search depth as we have been because it already depends on exponential speed increases! If a computer was able to search, say, 40 plies deep, I'm sure it would beat Kasparov every time (and everyone around him), in which case it's rating would be significantly higher than his. But, can a program ever search accurately 40 plies deep?? Many don't think that's ever going to be possible.

Some mathematics

Let's see: if 14 ply was $268 \times 10^6$ positions, then 40 ply would be $1.2 \times 10^{24}$ positions - that is $4.4 \times 10^{15}$ times faster! Do you believe this is possible?? Indeed each advance of 1 ply requires an exponential increase in speed.

So we can't continue increasing the search depth as we have in the past, because it depends on exponential speed increases, and that will inevitably (?) eventually slow it all up, even if it doesn't seem to be doing so just yet! If we can maintain linear increase in speed it will not equate to linear increase in strength because linear increases in speed do not give us linear increases in search depth. An exponential increase in speed is needed to obtain a linear increase in search depth, which is not going to keep happening. Therefore the progress from computing speed alone will fall off. Note: I am not saying that I expect us to reach a standstill in the progress of computing power (not in my lifetime anyway), but I don't believe it can be maintained exponentially.

A second point, often made in this Magazine, is the fact that each extra ply takes us further away from the root position on the board, and is therefore successively
less likely to have an impact on that position. We will return to this point. First...

Robert HYATT commented on the Internet: "I am not assuming either a linear increase in playing strength, or a linear movement up the playing scale. I suspect that to get past the last few humans, even though they are 'only' 200 points or so above the group just below them, is going to be a difficult task. I.e, the rating scale might just be logarithmic without our yet knowing it. It might, just might, take a significant increase in speed to close this last gap. As a result, don't plot the playing strength progress achieved over the past few years on normal graph paper and try to predict when the point on the program's performance curve/line will exceed the best human. It isn't that easy.

Things might have been true near the bottom of the line or curve, but as we have gotten better and better, it has become clear that the curve begins to flatten out at the top".

Not everyone agrees! Another Internet user aired his view in replying to the comment that 'exponential computing speed increases were not happening': "For the last two or three decades, this is precisely what has been happening: the state of the art computers have increased their speed exponentially over this time. And for the same period people have been saying that this trend 'has to stop sometime'! However it is still not stopping, and may not level off for the next decade in my view. This means that every 3 years or so, you will add another ply to the search, without changing the software very much".

Back now to a brief discussion on the strength value of each extra ply gained. The effect of this extra ply does diminish. In its simplest form we can certainly say that there is a large difference between playing at 1 ply, 2 ply or 3 ply. But changing between 13, 14 or 15 ply obviously gives a lesser improvement.

- If 1 ply wasn't enough in a given position, what are the mathematical possibilities that 2 or 3 ply will be...? Good!
- If 13 ply wasn't enough in a given position, what are the chances that 14 or 15 ply will be...? I don't know the answer in either case, but in the first case the % must be pretty high, and in the second pretty low I would think.

If a strong G.M tells us that a particular move, chosen at 7 ply by a program such as Genius or Hiarcs, was "not good enough", how often will that move be corrected if the search can go to, say, 8 or 9 ply... or 14 ply! What about the miriads of 20+ply positional plans in chess?

Jonathan Schaeffer's experiments with Chinook, the World Champion (of humans and computers!) Checkers program shows a definite leveling off with increasing depth. Chinook can search 21 ply in tournament time constraints, and is on a par or marginally ahead of the world's best humans, but barely advancing now.

Now we're not talking about 6 or 7 ply, nor even 14 or 15, but 21! Will an accurate 21 ply search give us Kasparov's crown? How long to 21 ply? Before answering we must consider that Chess is somewhat different to Checkers and that searching is much simpler... note that (a) the size of the checkers board is 1/2 the size of the chess board (players have 12 pieces each placed on the black squares only), and (b) the number of legal moves is always substantially lower than in chess because there are only 2 types of piece including crowns, and their movement is comparatively restricted compared with those in chess.

Lots of questions, a few answers. Enough to tell me that my lovely graph doesn't work after all!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPUTER/PROGRAM</th>
<th>10m</th>
<th>3m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genius 3 PC-P/90MHz--32MB/ht</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASC R30-1993(normal)/30MHz</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc 3.0 PC-P/90MHz--48MB/ht</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Chess 4.0 PC-P/90MHz--10MB/ht</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The King 2.2 PC-RISC/32MHz</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The King 2.0(aggr) PC-RISC/32MHz</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MChess Pro 3.50 PC-486DX2/76MHz--16MB</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph. Genius 2.0 PC-486DX2/80MHz--36MB</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc 3.0 PC-486DX2/66MHz--8MB/ht</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genius 3 PC-P/90MHz--7MB/ht</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genius 3 PC-486DX2/66MHz--15MB/ht</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Chess Pro 4.0 PC-486DX2/76MHz--10MB/ht</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chessmaster 4000 PC-486DX/50MHz--8MB</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MChess Pro 3.11 PC-486DX/50MHz--8MB</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Lyon 68030</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc 3.0 PC-486/33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Berlin Pro 68020</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Vancouver 68030/36MHz</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chess Genius 1 PC-486DX/50MHz--8MB</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MChess Pro 3.10 PC-386DX/40MHz--8MB</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel 6.0 PC-486DX2/76MHz--20MB</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc 3.0 PC-386/25MHz--224K</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc 2.0 PC-486DX2/76MHz--6MB</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Lyon 68020</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph. Portorose 68030/36MHz</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The King PC-RISC/30MHz</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Chess PC-486DX2/66MHz--8MB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimzo Guernica PC-P/60MHz--8MB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Gideon 1 PC-486DX2/80MHz--16MB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph. Vancouver 68020</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Lyon 68000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph. Portorose 68020</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov RISC 2500-128K</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Diamond/Sapphire</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Elite V.9 68030/32MHz</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Almeria 68020</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rexcchess V.2.30 PC-386/16MHz</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Roma 68000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saitek Leonardo_Aналyst Modul/8MHz</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Super Expert B/6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saitek Turbo King+E-ROM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TurboStar 432+ KSO/6MHz</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TurboStar 432</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Amsterdam</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Supermondial</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Milano</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Academy+TurboKit20/18MHz</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargon IV PC-386SX/25MHz</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Final Chesscard PC-Comm64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Simultano</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ColossusX Chess PC-Amiga 500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo-Galileo Analys C-Modul</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psion Chess PC-Atari 1040ST</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Supermondial2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Polgar/10MHz</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM IV/5MHz</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM V/5MHz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chessmaster 3000 PC-386/16MHz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchess/8MHz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchess/4MHz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saitek Turbo King</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Super Expert A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov GK-2000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM V/10MHz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXG Sphinx 2.03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM IV+Turbo Kit20/18MHz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto MM II</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph. Polgar(sel.5)/4.9MHz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Mega IV/4.9MHz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Travel Champion 2100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov Blitz</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto B+P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Rebell</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Processor</td>
<td>Clock Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroder 3.1 PC-RISC/32MHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socrates 3.0 PC-486DX2/66MHz--16MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz3 PC-486DX2/66MHz--16MB/ht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Vancouver 68000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Portorose 68000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Almeria 68000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallisto(sel.2) V.1.82 PC-486DX2/66MHz--16MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meph. Risc 1MB V1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Mach IV 68020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarkov 3.0 PC-486DX2/76MHz--16MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarkov 2.6 PC-486/50MHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz 2 PC-486DX2/80MHz--32MB/ht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Diablo-Scorpio 68000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MChess 1.57 PC-386/16MHz--2MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimzo V.7/93 PC-486DX/50MHz--8MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtua Chess PC-486/25/2MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz 2 PC-486DX/50MHz--4MB/ht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz 2 PC-486DX2/80MHz--8MB/ht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz 3(sel.5) PC-386DX/40MHz--3MB/ht</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MChess 1.04 PC-386/25MHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Mach III 68000/16MHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Mach IIIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Mach IIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz 2 PC-386DX/40MHz--8MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroder 2.0 PC-RISC/16MHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo Maestro B+E-6/ROM/6MHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Super Forte C(sel.7)/6MHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Super Expert C(sel.5)/6MHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novag Diablo(sel.4) 68000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz 2 PC-386/16MHz--2MB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Elite V.5 (2x68000/16MHz)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo Maestro/6MHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarkov V.2.50 PC-386/16MHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Roma 68020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Dallas 68020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mephisto Dallas 68000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Excel Club 68000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**READERS** wanting a copy of the **ENDGAME TEST**, send £1 (in stamps if you wish) to Eric Hallsworth, The Red House, 46 High St. Wilburton, Cambs CB6 3RA.
The Tasc R30–1995 upgrade has been the subject of one or two previous discussions due to the fact that its very earliest results were slightly confusing.

The main cause of confusion was a discrepancy between 2 results at G/60: Simon Knight reported an 8½–1½ win for the R30, whilst Keith Kitson had reached 18½–16½... for the BERLIN PRO! Other results, including good ones from Peter Marriott and my own tests, have suggested the new R30 is a definite improvement.

Even so it is always good to have as much confirmation as possible, so we were very pleased when R30–1995 purchaser Catherine Martin offered to play a Match with it against her own BERLIN PRO. The proposal was for a 12 game Match, and the slightly slower time control suggestion of 40 moves per hour was particularly welcome. After an early draw the match quickly swung in favour of the R30 with a string of wins including this one in game 5.

Catherine herself comments that she 'particularly liked game 5 as I love the "romantic" openings – in fact I was amazed that the Tasc played this'.

R30–1995 (2420) – BPRO (2340) [C34]
C Martin. G5 40/1, 1995/ELH

1.e4 c5 2.f4

[I always delight to see an Opening Book exhibiting a programmer's courage for the King's Gambit!]

2...exf4 3.d3 f6 4.d4 g5 5.h4 g4 6.g1 Qh6 7.Qc3 c6 8.Qe2 Qf6 9.g3 f3 10.Qf4 Qe7 11.Qd3 f5 12.Qf2

[12.0–0 is also playable. Either way all Computers evaluate Black's position as 'virtually won' as they end their Books around here!]

12...Qg7 13.Qe3 fxe4 14.Qxe4 d5 15.Qg5 Qf6 16.Qe1 0–0 17.Qc1 Qd6 18.Qf6 Qxe6 19.Qf4!

[19.Qxe6?! looks tempting, but what next? If 19...Qd8 20.Qe3 Qe8 must be better for Black]

19...Qb4

[The popular move for most computers, but strategically her majesty might have been better placed elsewhere in the long term. e.g. 19...Qd7 20.Qxe6 Qf7]

20.Qxe6 Qf7 21.Qb1 Qa4

[21...Qbd7 is preferred, 22.c3 Qa5]

22.c3!

[My first thought was that this was wrong – a pawn behind and exchanging off Black's misplaced queen. But it proves correct so is my note at 19 suspect?!]

22...Qxd1 23.Qxd1 Qbd7 24.Qg5 Qff8

25.Qf5 Qe4+

[25...Qh5!?!]

26.Qxe4

[26.Qxe4 Qxe4 27.Qxe4 looks an even better move order!?!]

26...Qxf5 27.Qd6 Qff8 28.Qe7 Qf6 29.Qde1 Qh5 30.Qe5 Qf6 31.Qc7 a5 32.Qf5!

32...Qg5

[32...Qxe5? 33.Qh6+! Qh8 34.dxc5±]

33.Qg7! Qd8 34.Qxb7 Qf4?!?

[Full marks for creating a complication, which could work against some opposition. However 34...Qf6 35.Qf5 h5 was probably wiser]

35.Qxf4

[35.gxf4? loses most of the newly gained advantage to 35...Qxh4+ 36.Qf1 Qxe1 37.Qxe1 Qf7 38.Qx7 Qx7]
35...εxf4 36.gxf4 Ʌxh4+ 37.Ʌf1 Ʌxe1
38.Ʌxe1 Ʌf8 39.Ʌh5 Ʌf5
[39...Ʌh8 40.Ʌc7 is no better]
40.Ʌg7+ Ʌf8
[40...Ʌh8 is better, 41.Ʌg5 Ʌxg5! (41...Ʌg8 42.Ʌxg4) 42.fxg5 g3! 43.Ʌxg3 Ʌg7 44.b4! though White still wins]
41.Ʌxh7 Ʌf7 42.Ʌh8+ Ʌe7 43.Ʌf2 Ʌe6
44.Ʌh6+ Ʌe7 45.Ʌxc6 a4 46.Ʌc7+ Ʌe6
47.f5+ Ʌxf5 48.Ʌg7+ Ʌd6 49.Ʌxf5+ Ʌxc7
50.Ʌe3 Ʌd6 51.Ʌxg4 1–0

Game 6 is selected as my favourite: it is quite brilliant in places, and the play around moves 15–18 reminds me of that in the recent World Championship game, DEEP BLUE vs FRITZ 3 (see #59).

BPRO (2340) – R30–1995 (2420) [B83]
C Martin. G6 40/1, 1995/ELH]

1.e4 c5 2.Ʌf3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.Ʌxd4 Ʌf6
5.Ʌc3 d6 6.Ʌe2 Ʌc6 7.0–0 Ʌc7 8.Ʌe3 Ʌd7
9.Ʌd5 Ʌh8 10.Ʌf4 Ʌe5 11.Ʌg5 a6
12.Ʌxf6 gxf6 13.Ʌd4 b5
[Scheveningen's frequently result in sharp struggles when the computers come out of Book before 'too much' theory has killed the game, as can sometimes happen. 13...Qa7 was the expected 'Book' move and now both programs are on their own]
14.Ʌd2 Ʌb7 15.a3 f5?! 16.exf5
[16.f4?! Ʌc6! 17.Ʌxc6 (17.exf5?! Ʌb6±) 17...Ʌxc6=]
16...Ʌg8

[This and the following moves evoke memories of the World Championship game between Deep Blue and Fritz!]
17.g3 exf5 18.Ʌh6 Ʌg6 19.Ʌxh7 Ʌf6
20.Ʌh5 Ʌg7 21.Ʌh6
[The BP eval. reaches +300 here; the R30 shows –339 with its next!]
21...Ʌe7!
[21...Ʌg4?! 22.Ʌf6+ Ʌd8 23.Ʌg4 Ʌxd4 24.Ʌxf5 Ʌc7 25.Ʌe7!+-]
22.Ʌad1 Ʌg5 23.f4 Ʌh8 24.fxg5 Ʌxh6
25.gxh6 Ʌf8 26.Ʌxf5 Ʌa7+

[How do readers evaluate this? How strong/weak is White's h6 pawn? Is Black's queen a match for the rooks? Our computers have White around +250, but events soon show that this is not the case]
27.Ʌd4
[27.Ʌg2 Ʌb7+ 28.Ʌh3 Ʌc4 29.g4?!]
27...Ʌg5 28.Ʌd5
[28.h7 Ʌg7!]
28...Ʌxh6 29.Ʌf2 Ʌc5 30.Ʌb3?!
[30.Ʌf6 Ʌc8 31.Ʌe4 Ʌb6± or =]
30...Ʌa7 31.Ʌe2 Ʌc4 32.Ʌf4?!
[32.Ʌxc4 seems better though 32...bxc4 33.Ʌa5 leaves this knight badly placed, 33...Ʌg4 34.Ʌe1 Ʌc5]
32...Ʌg7! 33.c3 Ʌxb2 34.Ʌxd6 Ʌxc3
35.Ʌg2 Ʌc4 36.Ʌxc4
[Making the previously mentioned exchange in the end, but with an evaluation now close to =].
36...bxc4 37.Ʌe5?
[Played expecting the coming exchanges, but strangely showing itself at +87 which is no longer correct! Better was 37.Ʌd2 when I would expect 37...Ʌd4]
38...\(\text{Ec2} \text{Wb7+??}\]
37...\(\text{Wxc5} \text{38.Wxd7} \text{Wc6+} \text{39.Wd5} \text{Qe5}
[Of course the R30 is winning now!]
40...\(\text{Qg6+} \text{Qe8} \text{41.Wxe5} \text{Wxd5+} \text{42.Qf3} \text{Wd3}
43.Qd2?!  
[43.h4 creates a counter-threat which might give better practical chances. 43...c3 (43...\(\text{Qxa3}1? 44.h5) 44.Qe1]
43...\(\text{Qxa3} \text{44.Qf2} \text{a5!} 45.Qe2+ \text{Qf8} 46.Qd2
a4 47.Qd4?!  
[White is not going to be able to stop both pawns, but throwing away a tempo wont help. The better try was 47.Qe2 Qe7+ 48.Qd1 Qe4! 49.Qe1 though 49...Qb1+ 50.Qe2 a3 seems terminal for BP]
47...Qg7 48.Ed2 c3 49.Qc2 Qc5+ 50.Qe2
[50.Qg2 avoids a check, though to no avail: 50...a3 51.g4 a2 52.Qxa2 c2 53.Qa1 c1Q 54.Qxc1 Qxc1—]
50...a3 51.Qd3 a2 52.Qxa2 Qd5+ 53.Qxc3
Qxa2 54.Qd3 Qf2 55.Qe4 Qe2+ 56.Qf4 f5
57.Qg5 Qg4+
...winning the knight and this very interesting game 0–1

The coverage thus far seems unfair to the Berlin PRO and I must re-inforce the fact that it IS a very strong, excellent and popular machine. Packed full of features, incl. the 50 game save/retention much loved by Correspondence players, BP is not only excellent value for money but well worth its 2340 Elo grade on our Lists. The perfect introduction to game 7, in which the Lang program asserts itself!

R30–1995 (2420) – BPRO (2340) [D15]
C Martin. G7 40/1, 1995/ELH

1.d4 d5 2.c4 c6 3.Qc3 Qf6 4.Qf3 dxc4 5.e4
[A typically bold R30 choice compared with the more conservative 5.e3]
5...b5 6.e5 Qd5 7.a4 e6 8.axb5 Qxc3
9.bxc3 exb5 10.Qg5 Qb7 11.Qh5 g6
12.Qg4 Qe7 13.Qe2 Qd5 14.Qf3 h5 15.Qg3
b4 16.Qe4 Qc6
[Both computer books end here, having shown good depth. The position again is very double-edged, the programs at present just favour Black]
17.0–0 bxc3 18.Qe3 c2 19.Qe3 h4 20.Qg4
h3
20...Qxf3 21.Qxf3 Qb4 is also strong]
21.Qxd5 exd5 22.g3 Qb4 23.Qd2 Qd3
24.Qa5 Qe8 25.Qxc8+ Qxc8 26.Qxd5 Qb4
27.Qxb4 Qxb4 28.Qb7?!
[This allows the rook to improve its position marginally. White should have played Be4 straightforwardly]
28...Qe7 29.Qe4 Qd3 30.d5 c1Q 31.Qxc1
Qxc1 32.Qxc1 c3 33.f4
[White's pawn phalanx looks threatening and deserves a diagram!]

33...Qe4 34.Qc2 a5! 35.Qb3 Qc5 36.d6 0–0
37.e6
[Just overdoing it this time? Probably wiser was 37.Qf2 Qb8 38.Qa4!? (38.e6?!) fx e6 39.Qxe6+ Qf8 40.d7 Qe7) 38..Qb2+]
37...fxe6 38.Qxe6+ Qg7 39.d7 a4! 40.Qf2
[40.Qxh3? a3 41.Qe6 Qf6 42.Qb3]
Choosing which games to include is often a particularly hard task. There were many very close struggles, with first one side and then the other gaining small plusses before one of them managed to gain a decisive advantage. No less than 7 games went beyond 60 moves and the draws were all closely fought. Space forces us to make decisions, and the choice is: print all the games without notes, or use your editor's favourites! Inevitably there is a tendency for these to be the shorter ones, perhaps with specific 'mistakes' which I am capable of spotting and pointing out! So here is my final choice.

**R30–1995 (2420) – BPRO (2340) [E79]**

C Martin. G9 40/1, 1995/ELH]

1.d4 d5 2.c4 c6 3.e3 g6 3.d3 g7 4.e4 d6 5.f4 0-0 6.e2 c5 7.f3 exd4 8.exd4 c6 9.e3

[The programs come out of their Books a little earlier this time, in a position both consider to be level. However the R30 expertly forces BP into a very passive set-up in the next few moves]

9...d7 10.0-0 c4 11.exg4 xg4 12.xd2 d8 13.xd5 d7 14.xd1 e6 15.e3 a6 16.a4 d8 17.a6 d8 18.a3 f6 19.b4 h5 20.a3 e7 21.b2 f8 22.b5

[The R30 has quietly but firmly taken control of the game and is nearly ready to reap material rewards for cramping Black's game to a great degree]

22...d8

[22...axb5 23.cxb5 a7 might have been better, though 24.a4 would leave Black more cramped than ever]

23.e5

[23.e5 also looks interesting, 23...d5 (23...dxe5! might be better 24.xd7 xxd7 25.xd7 e8 26.bxa6! 24.ex5+–]

23...dxe5 24.fxe5 g4?

[A critical mistake I think, though Black's position is difficult. Two alternatives: 24.e8, but 25.e2 threatens Bg5 which is very strong; and 24.f5, though allowing 25.xd7, has to be best. However 25.xd7 26.exd7 27.xxa6 xxa3! (27...xg5 28.xg5 29.xh6 29.xa6 30.xf4 –) 28.xh8 29.xa6 29.xa6 would look much like a win for White]

25.e4! Wh5 26.e7 Wh7 27.xa6 axb5 28.xe7 bxc4 29.xc7 b5

[I prefer 29...x6 4 trying to make the c6/rook's life miserable!]

30.xe4 f6

[30...xh4?! 31.xh8 c3 32.xe5 looks like big trouble! If 32...e8 33.xb5!]

31.xf4 xh4 32.xb5 x7
...and the R30 upgrade completes an impressive game in powerful style 1–0

Which generously leaves us with just enough room to include one of the early games from my G/60 Match between the Tasc R30–1995 upgrade and MChess PRO on my 486/33.


1.e4 d5?! [More programs than ever seem willing to play the Centre Counter] 2.exd5

[33...c5]

33.a4 c5 34.h4 c5 35.c5 c7 36.d8+ d7 37.c5 c8 38.d8+ c7 39.c5 c8 40.g5+ c8 41.c5 c7 42.d8+ a7 43.d8+ f7 44.a5

[During the exchanges MCP briefly went +300 (?!), but as they are completed it shows +166, perhaps still slightly optimistic but not by too much. This good + eval stays for a further 10 moves] 27...b7

28.e3 [Ignoring the theory of exchanging pieces when you're ahead. 28.a8 a8 29.b4 would emphasise the advantage White has] 28.f4! [Which in turn draws attention to Black's main counter-threat!] 29.f3 f4 30.h7?! [Although it would leave either the a or d-pawn isolated, I believe White should give attention to energising his badly placed knight with, say, 30.e3 c3 31.c2 bxc3 32.exc3] 30...f3

31.c4 [31...c3? f2! 32.c5 e6 33.a7 c7 34.c4 b1 35.c2 d1 f6] 36.f1 [Exf1 would have made for an interesting finish] 31...c8 32.g7? [32.c5 is best – White must get the knight free soon to compete on equal or better terms] 32...c8 33.c2 28.d4 35.b1 c8 36.c5?! [Suddenly not the best, in spite of my remonstrations. I think 36.c5! cxd5 37.cxd5 c7 38.c5! looks quite unpleasant!] 36.xc5 37.dxc5 e8 38.g4 e8 39.4h4?! 39.xb4!? c2–+; but 39.h7f7 40.xg8+ c8 41.c4=– 39...e2 40.b3 d8 41.a3 e3 42.h1 43.g7 44.bxa4 e2 45.d6 e8 46.c6 c2 47.h4!! 47.h7 is best, 47.xd2 48.e7 c7 49.4c7 49..f2! [Black is winning now] 48.dxf2 h1+ 49.d2 49.f1? c1+ 49..e1 50.b8+ b7 51.dxe1 [Necessary to prevent 51...Rb1 mate] 51.dxe1 52.c7 c3+ 53.b1 c8 54.a5 e1+ 55.b2 c5 56.c5 c5+ 57.b1 h5 58.h4 f8 59.h4 c1+ 60.b2 c3+ 61.b1 f7 62.c5 f3 63.f8 d1+ 64.b2 d4+ 65.b1 c5... a remarkable turnaround achievement by the Tasc R30, 0–1.

LATE NEWS: MONTREUX (R30 prog. on Arm6 14MHz) just got 2495 USCF in an official CRA Test!
Subjects covered:
- Win95 (... incl. boot.up)
- ChessBase for Windows
- ChessMaster 5000
- Chessica 1.01
- Virtua Chess
- Rebel 7.0

The launch of Win95, intended to replace Windows3.1, is causing quite a storm, at least among chess computer folk.

Requiring 8MB RAM for a start ensures that many folk will need to upgrade their PC's just to run it ("perhaps it is designed to?" he said naively). In addition Win95 will take up a minimum of 60MB of your hard disk... 85MB is recommended for the whole thing and no doubt more when all the obligatory extra utilities that "you can't manage without" become available.

I wonder how much money is spent each year by we computer seekers buffs, constantly purchasing new hardware and equipment to keep up with the constant flow of 'state of the art' operating systems. And for what in the way of objective results?! The Daily Telegraph and PC Magazine have produced figures showing that "Windows 95 is slower than its predecessor, Windows 3.11, when run on six popular personal computers". The bold print is mine, but the 'slower' is by between 11% and 18% and the machines tested running 13 popular software applications ALL had 16MB RAM!

The primary (only?) beneficiaries are the hardware and software vendors! I think we are being hypnotised by technology and have forgotten that the purpose of a computer is to get things done. And to think I used to worry about whether we were giving value for money if a chess program upgrade only achieved 40 or 50 Elo! Regardless of whether there are 'bugs' or not in Win95... some say there are plenty, some say it's o.k - and probably the 'bugs' are nothing more than folk needing to get used to what is, by all accounts, almost a completely new operating system... the main question readers will need to check on is the compatibility between Win95 and whatever their current chess and other programs is. It seems that booting with Win95 overwrites some areas currently used by dear old MS-DOS, meaning that a few (or is it many?) programs may not work from it, and all should be checked.

Users would be wise initially to keep their MS-DOS and Windows3.1 files on their hard disk and create either a multi.boot config for switch-on, or have floppy boot.up disks for occasions when they want to bypass Win95 at switch on. This is done by installing Win95 in a new directory (e.g. WIN95) and then boot.up to a START menu by pressing [F8] after switch-on. From here DOS or Win3.0/1 can be selected.

Richard LANG was very quick to let me know how Win95 users could run GENIUS3 (and with full hash tables!).

1. 'UPGRADING' to Win95 with GENIUS already installed. There is NO need to de-install Genius.

2. Win95 users STARTING your PC. Here is the key to running probably all of your PC chess programs which can set-up their own hash tables.

► Switch on PC.
► As soon as you see 'Starting Windows 95' press the [F8] key.
► From the resulting Menu press the [6] key for the 'safe mode' command prompt. You will now see the good old MS-DOS prompt!
► Load your MOUSE driver. E.g. if your
path is c:\mouse type: c:\mouse\mouse
and press the [ENT] key. Substitute the
correct path if yours is different.
> Change to the Genius directory:
cd\genius3 and start GENIUS by typing
cg3 /x in the usual way.

Okay, so this isn’t running GENIUS or any
of the other programs yet from within
Win95, but at least we know we can get it
to run, and properly, in this way.

Thanks, Richard, for this speedy bit of
guidance! I won’t be able to upgrade my
486 4MB PC for at least some while, and
certainly not just to get Win95, so I’d be
pleased to hear from others who do get it,
and will pass on to readers what will and
what won’t work with it, and any tips such
as the above if there are ways round the
problems! However this coverage will be
minimal - the purpose of our magazine is
to cover chess computers and programs,
and some readers already feel there is too
much PC content, even where it directly
concerns chess.

> Here is an immediate little warning:-

..... Win95 will definitely NOT work with
ChessBase for Windows1.0.

This is due to the copy protection scheme
used by CBWin1.0, which allows you 3 in-
stalls. However by keeping the disk handy
you can actually do temporary installs, say
at your Chess Club or at a Congress, to
check something out, say on someone else’s machine! This possibility is in addi-
tion to your chosen permanent installs.

However as this copy protection method
will not work under Win95, an upgrade
to CBWin1.1 has already been released!
With this you will get a somewhat old-
fashioned form of copy protection called a
'dongle' which will need to be plugged into
your parallel port when you want to use
CBWin1.1! (I’ll bet the G.M’s with their
laptops just love that as they travel around
- can you imagine Mrs. Kasparov shouting
down the road as Gary trundles off to his
match with Anand, "Have you got your
dongle, dear?").

Early reports are that some other programs
don’t run correctly when the CBWin
dongle is attached, so users may need to
remember to unplug it after use etc, and
some are even experiencing printing diffi-
culties within CBWin itself if reports on
the Internet are correct. Almost certainly
the culprit is Win95 as I have no reported
difficulties from Win3.0/1 users! Internet
users also report that another 'Windows
specific' program, ChessMaster 4000,
causes a General Protection Fault under
their new Windows operating system.

There is a good plus in the new
CBWin1.1 which will now read the popular
PGN files.

> And now we move on to ChessMas-
ter 5000.

On 16 August 1995 Eric Schiller an-
ounced officially that "ChessMaster 5000
for Windows95 will be released on Octo-
ber 15".

That information, not surprisingly, landed
a steady flow of correspondence on certain
desks at ChessWorks! What about
Windows3.0/1, which ChessMaster 4000
runs under? (and which itself caused some
annoyance due to the fact that no MS-DOS
version was made available).

"There are NO plans to support either of
those platforms. Certainly no DOS ver-
sion. The decision to go Win95 only was
taken last week. There is no way that
Win3.1 could perform all the functions of
the Win95 version".

The ChessWorks company had earlier re-
quested, via the Internet, the help of all
subscribers there in making known what
features and quality etc. would be welcomed by prospective purchasers, but no one mentioned this restriction! Naturally there was a storm of protest in true Internet style!... :-( ...after all NOT everyone wants to buy new 8MB RAM PC's with 520MB hard drives... and Win95.

Then on 25 August 1995 came a further official announcement from Eric Schiller at ChessWorks. "ChessMaster 5000 is being delayed, significantly. No new date has been announced. I'll post information as I receive it, but don't look for it in 1995". Bold print mine!

**Tasc** has announced that a new version of **CHESSICA, v1.01**, is now available, and that it is 'the exact chess engine' that was used in the World Championships as FRITZ. Presumably the speed slow-down of 30%-70% compared with FRITZ3 under MS-DOS as reported in #59 still applies.

**VIRTUA Chess** has been almost 'ignored' here so far... for the very simple reason that it is only available on CD-ROM, and I don't have the appropriate drive.

All I have been able to report is comments by a couple of users who have been experiencing quite a few 'niggles' getting some things to run properly, including time control faults. The French distributors are aiming to transfer the program to a disc for me so that I can do a Review! I've warned them that their generosity could rebound on them!... but they seem fairly certain that I'll like it, so we'll see.

In the meantime I have initial results, though no games yet, of VIRTUA Chess' result in the **Grand Prix de Megeve** (France). Time control G/25 with a fair smattering of G.M's, I.M's and F.M's.

1= A Vaisser (GM, 2555) 8½/11
S Conquest (GM, 2520) 8½
3= E Bacrot (FM, 2395) 8

G Flear (GM, 2480) 8
E Relange (IM, 2455) 8
VIRTUA Chess P/120 8

VIRTUA, on a Pentium 120, lost to Vaisser, but beat Conquest.

**Finally we come to REBEL7.0** which will be out 'any day', in fact probably before this issue reaches readers! I am looking forward to this eagerly, having noted REBEL6.0's charge up the Rating List, especially on the Pentium PC.

**Ed Schroder** anticipates an increase of 50 Elo (would make it no.1!) for REBEL7.0's chess program, which also runs up to 25% faster on 486 and Pentium machines. An even greater attraction still will be the list of advanced features which includes:

- No copy protections restrictions!
- VESA support graphics
- Full Internet PGN support
- 5 playing styles
- ChessBase support
- AutoBoards and Auto232 support
- 500,000 Main O/Book
- Programmable Openings
- Can convert and USE Genius, MChessPro and Fritz opening books!!
- Extra multi-million size specialist books by Jeroen Noomen available
- ECO support
- Database can include comments, annotations and analysis
- Runs under Win95 (!).

A mouth-watering list! Computer chess aficionados will find a **Warroom** enabling a deeper look into the programs 'brain' - real ply depths incl. extensions; the search selectivity in %; hash table %; time usage. I will, of course, report on these features in the Magazine, probably next issue. At the time of writing the disc is on its way to me according to an e-mail from Ed just received, so maybe there will even be something in this time... if there's room!
For new readers: 'MEPH', under the watchful eye of Phil GOSLING, continues its successful BCCS campaign. Please note that MEPH is entered as a computer, so all of its opponents know exactly what they are playing!

The latest figures showing the BCCS 'Top Ten' players are on page 26.

BCCS 2494 (2490) – Vancouver 020
[B00]Corr.20, 1994

20.h3 \(\&c7\)

[#59 eval +6 >Rg6]
50...\(\&g6+\) 51.\(\&f2\) \(\&e6\) 52.g3 \(\&d5\) 53.\(\&b2\) \(\&d3\) 54.\(\&f8\) \(\&a6\) 55.\(\&g2\)

[#60 eval +9 >h5. Kasparov and Anand would have agreed the draw long ago if their first 5 games are anything to go by! With opposite coloured Bishops it would require something rather remarkable for it to be anything else it seems. It would be a good draw for MEPH and Phil may offer it before #61] =

BCCS 2466 (2606) – Vancouver 020

57.\(\&e3\) \(\&e4+\)

[#59 eval –72 >Kd5. 57...\(\&d6+\) would have allowed 58.\(\&c5\) though 58...\(\&e6+\) 59.\(\&d5\) \(\&f5\) may not be much different in evaluation to the game]
58.\(\&d5\) \(\&c7\) 59.\(\&f2+\) \(\&g7\) 60.h3 a5 61.\(\&a3\)

Vancouver 020–BCCS 2466 (but 2606 latest list!) [A00]Corr.24, 1994

50.\(\&g3\)
a4 62.b2 Qe8

[#60 eval -63>Rb8. Despite a minus eval. from the moment MEPH left its Book (a long time ago!) it seems more and more likely that we'll scramble the draw and score 1-1 against our illustrious opponent!] ±

For a short time MEPH actually reached TOP (!) place on the BCSCS charts during 1994. The opposition quite naturally got tougher and tougher and MEPH has slipped down slightly to 4th. Here is our game against the current no.1!


46...Qg8

...[#59 eval -378 >a4. Phil reckons MEPH’s best chance will be to show off a little by announcing a mate against itself before our opponent spots it! I think my intro should have said "Here was our game against the no.1 BCSCS player!"]

47.Bxe1 Qf8 48.Bc1 Qe8 49.Bc6 a5 50.Ba6 Qf6 51.Bxa5

[White suggested we finish the game here. MEPH read -593 with its last move, so Phil readily agreed. A well-deserved victory and a fine game by our opponent who has had us on the hop ever since his apparently innocuous (eval -18 at the time) but excellent 15.Ne4!] 1-0

Our opponent in the next game told us quite early on that he was looking to create quiet and subtle positions which the computer cannot necessarily 'understand' (i.e evaluate correctly!). True enough we found ourselves out of Book after 1.e4 g6 2.d4 Bg7 3.Nf3 d6. A couple of moves later MEPH came back into Book, but not for long after the second bishop was fianchettoed. Neat exchanges resulted in an unbalanced pawn structure and MEPH’s early +30 to +50 optimism evaporated.


34.Bxe3

...[#59 eval -21 (and the rest! Eric) >fxe3+]

34...fxe3+ 35.Qxe1 Qf6

[Black wants to block our d-pawn with his king, leaving the rook and knight free for more active duty]

36.Qc1 Qe5 37.Qc3 Qd6 38.Qe2 Qh4 39.Qf1

[39.Qg3 f5 (39...Qxg2+?! 40.Qxf1 Qh4 (stopping the winning fork Nf5) 41.Qe4+ Qxe5 42.Bxe5+) 40.Qxf1 f4 much as in the game]

39...f5 40.Ba3

[M Eph has -9 here, >f4]

40...f4 41.Bd3 h5 42.b3

[42.Qc3? Qxg2 43.Qxg2 e2 44.Qxe2 Bxe2+]

42...Qf5 43.h3

[#60 eval -45 >a6. Our concern expressed in #59 seems to have been spot on,
as MEPH dislikes the implications of Black's pawn advance! The blockading knight at e2 looks distinctly uncomfortable, but can hardly move whilst Black has Ng3 or Nd4 available. However we might still hold the draw I think?!) 

We don't usually name our opponents (to protect the innocent), but we make an exception with Roy Thomas who is a long-standing reader of our magazine. Roy is after a spot of revenge after losing Corr 15 to MEPH in a Blackmar Diemer Gambit.


The early moves were given in #59 and are repeated here instead of a diagram.

1.e4 d6 2.d4 2.f6 3.2.c3 g6 4.f4 2.g7 5.2.f3 c5 6.2.xc5 2.a5 7.2.d3 2.xc5

[With #59 we were still in Book]
8.2.xc3 2.a5 9.2.b5+ 2.xb5 10.2.xb5 2.a6
11.2.d3 0–0 12.2.xa7 2.h5

[MEPH remained in its Book to here. Roy has 'threatened/warned' us that he is going to "be busy doing nothing, and let the computer come at him" in these 2 games.]

In Corr 15 with Roy as White (at his own request) in the BDG, he had necessarily been forced into constantly applying pressure, but never won his pawn back against MEPH's fine defence]

13.2.c3 2.xb2 14.2.b1 2.h8?!

[14...2.g7 looks 'normal'!]
15.0–0 2.c5 16.e5?!

[MEPH expected this. But I would have thought 16.2.c7 2.xa2 17.2.d5 e6 18.2.e7+ 2.g7 19.2.d4+ 2.h6 20.2.e3 would have been simpler... or just 16.a3]

16...2.xd3 17.2.xd3 2.xe5

[#60 eval +63 >fxe5. Of course Nxe5 is also possible, so let's see what Roy has in mind to take advantage of our h8–bishop's poor scope. MEPH should be a plus pawn whatever the e5 exchanges, because of Rxa2] 

Vancouver 020 – Roy THOMAS,
BCCS 2448 [D03]Corr 30, 1995

1.d4 2.f6 2.f3 d5 3.2.g5 2.e4 4.2.f4 2.f5
5.2.bd2 e6

[Roy shows his computer awareness early – MEPH goes out of Book!]
6.2.c3

[#59 eval +3 >Bd6]
6...2.d7 7.2.xe4 2.xe4 8.2.d2 2.f5 9.2.c4 6
10.2.e2 2.b4 11.0–0 0–0 12.2.f3 2.e7
13.2.d3

[Do readers feel MEPH is right to exchange off this pair of bishops?]
13...2.xd3 14.2.xd3 2.f6 15.2.fc1

[#60 eval +15 >Nh5. At this early stage MEPH appears to be up in one game and even in the other. But as we've said, Roy's out for revenge, and I think both of these games could be very interesting knowing that our opponent is both highly rated and very computer chess aware!]

FORTHCOMING EVENTS:
The Challenge Match
6 Games at 40/2
Garry Kasparov vs Deep Blue
10–17 Feb 1996 in Philadelphia,
USA. $500,000 prize, split 80–20 to
the winner.

World Commercial Computer
Chess Championship.
8–15 Oct 1995 in Germany
A brief guide to the purpose of each of the HEADINGS should prove helpful for everybody.

**BCF:** British Chess Federation Ratings. These can also be calculated from Elo figures by (Elo-600)/8, or from USCF figures by (USCF-720)/8.

**£ 200:** Cost in Britain. [1] = £100, [10] = £1,000.

*+* after the price shows it can cost more! E.g. [10+] is for Mephisto RISC1 in an Exclusive hard drive. It is dearer in the Munich.

*+* after the price usually shows that it is an out-of-date model or version. The price is its original cost - you may be able to buy it second-hand and cheaper now, depending on availability. + [+] is shown relating to an Upgradeable program (e.g. Mephisto Portorose or Lyon) owners should be able to buy an upgrade.

**Elo:** The Rating figure which is popularly in use Worldwide. The BCF and Elo figures shown in the NEWS SHEET Rating List determine the ranking order, and combine each computer's results v. Computers with its results v. Humans.

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

**Games:** Total No. of games on which the computer's Rating is based.

**Human/Games:** Total games played in official Tournaments v Humans, and the Rating in same.

**A guide to PC Grading:**

- **286-PC** represents the program running on an 80286 at approx. 16MHz.
- **386-PC** represents the program running on an 80386 at approx. 33MHz, with 4MB RAM.
- **486-PC** represents the program running on an 80486 at approx. 50-66MHz, with 4MB RAM.

**Pent-PC** will represent the programs on a Pentium (586) 90MHz with 8MB RAM.

**Users** will get slightly more (or less!) in each case, if the speed of their PC is significantly different. A doubling in **MHz Speed** equals approx. 60 Elo. A doubling in **MB RAM** equals approx. 10 Elo.

---
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**The PENTIUM P/90 GAP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>486/66 P/90</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genius3</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel6.0</td>
<td>2406</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarcs3</td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MChro4</td>
<td>2417</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz3</td>
<td>2370</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WChess</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE**

**ELO 79**