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WORLD MICRO COMPUTER CHAMPIONSHIP

This is the most important result in the current issue, and the final table with some early comments and a couple of games are included on pages 8-11. There will be more in issue 62 plus analysis, discussion and the main games.

NEW PROGRAMS!

1. GENIUS4 for Windows
   New features announced include: Windows only program, re-sizeable windows, on-line help, choice of piece sets, ChessBase, PGN and EPD compatible, user may add own game comments, printing of games, comments and diagrams, improved database searching, 200,000 position book, more aggressive playing style. £89.

2. M CHESS PRO5
   New features announced include: self-improving 400,000 position opening book, ability to learn from mistakes, EPD and PGN capability, analysis of multiple games, DOS, OS/2, Windows and Win95 compatible, openings classification and ECO codes, drop down menus, tracks users win/loss record. £89.

3. HIARCS4
   New features announced include: improved graphics, 10% speed-up, DOS based but PIF and icon provided for Windows users, EPD and PGN compatible, 100,000 position opening book, more middle game knowledge, improved endgames for K+R+Pawns and K+Pawns, monitor mode simultaneous analysis of 1, 2 or 3 top moves, add own notes and comments. £89.

4. CHESSMASTER 5000 for Windows
   The latest news is that this is on schedule for release in March 1996. I don’t know what’s gone wrong to cause such a staggering delay but it can hardly be good for business!

PLY MAGAZINE

The most recent issue contained an interesting comparison of MChess Pro4 results using Tournament and Standard book. It has always been strongly asserted by the MChess Pro folk that only the Tournament book should be used in competition, computer vs computer etc.

One or two folk have wondered if the narrowness of this book would, after being effective against other computers for the first few months of its life, then become of doubtful value as later releases of other programs found anti-MCP responses (which is not so hard to do given the limited variations in its Tournament book).

The PLY comparison suggests the strength gap is just 3 BCF/27 Elo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCP4</th>
<th>Tourn book</th>
<th>Stand book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vs Genius3</td>
<td>9½-12½</td>
<td>7-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs Genius2</td>
<td>10-10</td>
<td>7½-12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs Genius1</td>
<td>13-7</td>
<td>7½-12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs Rebel6</td>
<td>14½-13½</td>
<td>14½-13½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs Hiarcs3</td>
<td>11-9</td>
<td>9½-10½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs W Chess</td>
<td>11-9</td>
<td>13-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs MChess3.5</td>
<td>13-9</td>
<td>15-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs Fritz7</td>
<td>12-9</td>
<td>12-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs Kallisto</td>
<td>16½-3½</td>
<td>18-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110½-82½</td>
<td>104-89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see that the Tournament book is vital against Richard Lang programs (so
presumably it is against Genius that most booking-up has been done), whilst other results are more equal (indeed the wider Standard book actually does better against W Chess and Kallisto!).

**MAN vs MACHINE in New Zealand**

Bruce Barnard sent me this result recently, in which the Computers won 9½-6½, games being at Game in 30 as far as I know.

The individual scores were, with the players first to establish grading calcs:

- Robert Smith 2275 2/4
- Martin Dreyer 2320 1½
- Ewen Green 2290 1½
- Ortvin Sarapu (IM) 2300 1½

And now the computer programs

- Genius3 486 3½/4 2596
- MChess Pro 486 3½ 2596
- Rebel6.0 486 1½ 2196
- Hiarc3 486 1 2096

**NEW CHESS RULES!**

The World Chess Federation has just announced its intention to make some significant changes to the Rules of Chess.

It is believed that a major purpose behind these changes is to increase the complexity of programming in an attempt to arrest the constant advance of Chess Computers closing in on the top Grandmasters!

The proposed new rules are:-

1. There will be no more stalemate games. If the king can't move without getting into check then the game is lost.
2. En passant captures will no longer be allowed.

This is intended to help newcomers to the game as this is a rule which often causes great confusion. The number of queries we get from new computer owners who can't understand what the computer has just done after an en passant move is quite astonishing. Mind you we find some have got the king and queen on the wrong squares as well and think the computer is cheating when it plays a subsequent Kh5+!

3. Castling is to be allowed even if the squares which the king must pass over are attacked.

**Other changes considered but not likely to be included were:**

- The king can castle out of check.
- The queen, which can already move like a rook or bishop, to be allowed to incorporate the knight's move.
- A newly promoted queen cannot be captured on the next move. If someone's gone to all the effort of getting that poor little pawn all the way up there then they should get the benefit of keeping it for at least one turn!

I don't think the changes will create a major problem for the programmers, but unfortunately everyone wanting a computer which will play to all the forthcoming chess rules will have to buy a new one! Perhaps it's time to mention there's only 25 shopping days to Christmas!

*Of course, I'm only joking! :-) ...but I liked the idea so much I couldn't hang on till April 1st.*

**KASPAROV-ANAND... dull??**

Following on from the above the lengthy series of 'dreary' draws in the recent Kasparov vs Anand World Championship Match provoked considerable comment in the Chess Magazines and on the Internet. It was the refusal 'to even try', or 'to play out uncertain positions', and the very short draws at the end which caused most annoyance - especially for spectators, with their not-so-cheap tickets, arriving after 2 of the games had already been 'played'!
Once an early theory had been jettisoned (that Kasparov was secretly a werewolf and needed to get back to his hotel before dark!), various ideas to brighten up chess started to come in. After all, that's what GK has continually insisted his PCA was formed for.

Some felt that football's so-called solution of 3 points for a win and 1 for the draw - to 'end the dull draw' - was needed, overlooking the simple mathematical truth that this makes no difference whatsoever in a 2-player Match... and if you count the number of draws it hasn't made a difference in football anyway!

A TOURNAMENT!... with Computers?

Others felt that a Tournament was the better way to decide the Championship, assuming that the break-up of the Soviet Union now ensures there could be no repeats of the Fischer era and the repeated claims of 'cheating'.

A final, excellent suggestion (!?), motivated by the earnest desire to remove all possible human conspiracies, was that the qualifying human Finalists should each play a series of Matches against 4 selected top Computer programs, and the World Champion would be the one with most points against the programs.

To put icing on the cake they could also play a Match against each other at the same time, and that score would be included in the final result. The player doing worst against the Computers would have to go for wins in the human Match, which could liven things up. 2001 perhaps?!

"Chess is, above all, a fight"
- Emanuel LASKER

Open Dutch COMPUTER CHESS CHAMPIONSHIPS 1995

This Event was played over two week-ends - 11/12 and 18/19 November - and is of interest due to the participation of some top commercial programs alongside various amateur and weak amateur efforts. The time control was 60/1½hrs then 40/1hr.

The 6 rounds of the first week-end saw Kallisto jump into an early lead with 5/6 after wins over Bionic, Dapek, Zarkov, The King, and draws with Schaakmeester3 and Quest-Fritz.

The King and Arthur (by Walter Ravaneck) were on 4½, the latter having lost to The King, but beaten the well-known Schach3.0. Those on 4/6 were ZarkovX, Quest-Fritz, Schach3.0 and Goldbar.

To start the second week-end rounds 7 and 8 saw Kallisto beat both Goldbar and Quest-Fritz so, with 7/8 stood ½ ahead of The King (also with 2 wins) but well ahead of others due to Arthur, Quest-Fritz, Schach3.0 and Goldbar all losing at least one game.

Then, in round 9, Kallisto finally stuttered with a defeat by Schach3.0, The King and Quest-Fritz both won, so the stage was set for a good finale, with The King holding a tiny lead which it just kept to the end.

9/11 The King
8½ Kallisto
8 Quest-Fritz, Arthur
7½ Zarkov
7 Schach3.0... (20 participated)

FORTHCOMING EVENTS
27-28th December 1995
Harvard Cup, USA: Comps vs GM's.
10-17th February 1996
Garry Kasparov vs Deep Blue
6 games at 40/2; Philadelphia, USA
$500,000 prize fund.
For new readers: 'MEPH', under the watchful eye of Phil Gosling, continues its successful BCCS campaign. It is entered as a Computer, so all its opponents know exactly what they are playing!

BCCS 2494 (2490) – Vancouver 020 (2275) [B00] Corr. 20, 1994

22...£e8

[The #60 eval was +9 >h5, and we commented that Kasparov and Anand would have agreed the draw long ago if their first 8 games were anything to go by! With opposite coloured Bishops it would require something rather remarkable for it to be anything else]

55...g6 56.f2 £e6 57.Oc5
[Necessary as MEPH must stop the Black rook from reaching c1]

57...£e8 58.Oe1 £a8 59.Od2 h5 60.Oe3 £a6 61.f2 £a4 62.Ob4

[61 eval +18 >Ra6. Phil and MEPH have offered the ½ and await the next post to confirm it] =


62...£e8

[Vancouver 020 – BCCS 2466 (2275) [A00] Corr. 24, 1994

[This game has been played with MEPH using the Basmanic 'Global Opening' 1.h3 and 2.a3. Not Richard Lang's Book I hasten to add... it's a Phil Gosling special! MEPH did emerge with a passed pawn late in the middle game, but it has never looked enough to win]

55.Og2

[The computer hasn't shown a single]
plus evaluation throughout the whole game, and has mostly been hanging on grimly for a share of the points! #60 eval -63 >Rb8

63...h8

[Our illustrious opponent has reached the top of the BCCS list with a 2620 rating, but MEPH manages to keep cool]

63...e7 64.a8 Q 65.g4 Qf7+ 66.Qd6 Qc6+

[66...e1, trying to get behind the White pawns, would have been a mistake: 67.h3xa4 Rb1 68.ea3 c1 69.f3] 67.Qc5 Qe8 68.Qd3 Ke5+ 69.Qd5 Qxd5+ 70.Qxd5 Qf7+ 71.Qe5 Qb3

[#61 eval -78 >Ra6+. Phil and I believe that securing the bishop on b3 from where it protects both the a-pawn and the g8 square should get MEPH the draw. I suppose our opponent could try sacing his rook to dispose of a4 and Bb3 thus giving us the win, but it's hardly likely!] =

Vancouver 020–BCCS 2428 (2275)

[At move 34 in Issue 59 MEPH had an eval of just -21. 'And the rest!' we said, fearing that our strong opponent knew more about the endgame than us, and was heading exactly where he wanted to go]

43.h3

[43...dxe5. Our concern looks to have been spot on – MEPH dislikes the Black k-side pawn advance! The block-

[43...dxe5 44.Qg1 Qe5 45.Qc1 Qd4 46.Qd3] 46...Qe2 looks better to us, expecting 46...b5 47.b4 perhaps]

46...Qf5 47.Ke1

[Eval -84 >g4]

47...Qg4 48.Qxg4+ hxg4

['Does MEPH realise that he is losing yet?' enquired our opponent as he sent this move, 'or is he still blissfully ignorant of events beyond his horizon?' In fact our eval had dropped to -124 with move 48, so the light is definitely dawning!]

49.Qxg4+ Qxg4 50.a3 Qe4 51.d6

[51.b4 f3! 52.gxf3+ Qxf3 53.Qe2 Qd2+ wins]

51...Qb4

[Threatening Rh1 mate]

52.Qg1 Qh6 53.d7 Qd6 54.Qf1

[43...Kb4 threatens Rh1 mate] 54...Qf5

[#61 eval -306 >Rxd7. It seems that MEPH is no longer either blissful... or ignorant! A fine game by our opponent] +


[Roy has 'threatened' us that he is going to be busy doing nothing in this game after experiencing a reversal in an earlier meeting with MEPH]

17...dxe5
[MEPH reads +84 >Rb4 here]
21.\(\text{Qh4 \text{Qg4}?!}\)

[21...\(\text{Ec2}\) would have been more to our liking]

22.\(\text{Qc3! \text{Ba3} 23.\text{d2}}\)

[MEPH had expected 23.Rxb7 of course. This clever move took some sorting out!]

23...\(\text{Raa8}\)

[With an eval of just +12. Could the pawn have been saved? Both 23...\(\text{Rb8}\) 24.\(\text{Qxd5 \text{Qf8} 25.\text{Ec7}}\) and 23...\(\text{Qc8} 24.\text{Qd5 \text{Qf8} 25.\text{Ec7}}\) leave Black under pressure, so we think MEPH was right to let it go now]

24.\(\text{Rxb7 \text{Qg7} 25.\text{Rb4 \text{Qe6} 26.\text{Qd4 \text{Qf5}}}\)

[#61 eval +39 >Bf2 and intending then 27...\(\text{Bg7} 28.\text{Ng5 Bd7. It will be nice to see the horribly placed h8-bishop recovering some scope and the small + might then be earned!] \(\checkmark\)


15.\(\text{Qf1}\)

[#60 eval +15 >Nh5. These two games are getting interesting; Roy is highly rated and very computer chess aware!]

15...\(\text{Qh5} 16.\text{Qe5 f6 17.Qg3 \text{Qxg3} 18.hxg3 \text{Qb6} 19.\text{Qc2 \text{Qa6} 20.a3 \text{Qad8} 21.\text{Qb3 \text{Qf8}}\)

22.\(\text{Qc3 \text{Qd6} 23.\text{Qac1}}\)

[#61 eval +33 >Rd7. MEPH appears unconcerned about the doubled pawns on the g-file... 'or is the negative eval for this offset by a bonus for the doubled rooks?' Phil wonders! I think many programs would give the edge to Black?!

Finally we have two new games, with a different opening for MEPH as far as his Correspondence adventures go.

BCCS 2352 (2350) – Vancouver 020 (2275) [A44]Corr 31, 1995

1.d4 c5 2.d5

[Our opponent wrote with this move that he would have also liked to have played 2.e4 against the Computer. 'Anything to oblige' was the tireless offer from MEPH, so the 'other' game follows]

2...c6 3.e4 d6 4.Qc3 a6 5.Qf3 b5

[#61: the book ends here] =

BCCS 2352 (2350) – Vancouver 020 (2275) [B21]Corr 32, 1995

1.d4 c5 2.e4 cxd4 3.c3 dxc3 4.Qxc3 Qc6 5.Qf3 e6 6.Qc4 Qf6

[#61 eval +51 >c5. This was MEPH's first out of book. It will be more than a little useful to see how our Computer copes with this pair of fairly rare Old Benoni's. ChessBase classifies this as B21 from 1.e4 c5 2.[d4. Hmmm?] \(\checkmark\)

MEPH drops out of the 'Top Ten'!

Here is the latest info. of the leaders on the BCCS Rating List, showing that MEPH is out of the top ten for the first time.

BCCS LEADERS

2620 Current games 24, 25
2605 A.N.Other
2561 Finished game 26
2561 A.N.Other
2502 Current game 20
2475 A.N.Other
2471 A.N.Other
2469 A.N.Other
2458 A.N.Other
2451 A.N.Other
2446 MEPH
2404 Roy Thomas games 29, 30
**World Micro-Computer Championships 1995**

The 1995 World Micro-Computer Championship, held in Paderborn, Germany, was amongst the best of these Events in recent years. This was partly due to playing the games at a slightly faster time control (effectively 2mins per move) to allow 2 games to be played by each machine on most days. This enabled an 11 round Event which gave everyone a feeling that the result would be much more relevant than the shorter Tournaments usually held.

**AN EXCITING TOU RN Y!**

Another reason was the poorish start of some of the favourites, while one or two Amateur programs are showing marked progress - especially in the openings where it became clear that much time had been spent searching through the 'commercial' books for possible weaknesses.

The understandable customer requirement - to see all of his purchased program's book to help his own preparation might get extra sales but it also helps other programmers (including the non-commercial ones) to prepare lines against them. Ed Schroeder explained that a main reason for REBEL 7's non-participation was the fact that he didn't want to go in with his commercial book and that his opening programmer, Jeroen Noomen, had not been available to do a tournament version!?

The consequence of all of this was that the pre-Tournament favourites had to stage a major comeback over the last few rounds, thus setting up a very exciting finale!

**CONTROVERS Y!**

In the middle of all this there was controversy over the 'efforts' of one or two of the 'hired' operators, with some accusation and heated discussion after the Event. This largely concerned the possibly unlucky Hiarcs which lost a 'won' game on time (with one move to make) and was subsequently set by its operator to play at 30/50 whilst retaining the 10 secs per move operator allowance already input for it by programmer Mark Uniacke... who might have to decide to attend himself (or send me?) in future! More on this next time, but for now a brief look at the major round-by-round happenings!

**Round 1.** There were few surprises as all the 'favourites' won with the exception of The King ½-½ Dragon, and Schach3 ½-½ Shredder. Some of these strange names will re-occur as we proceed! Two top contenders met, and Quest (Fritz) beat Nimzo3 in a handy 39 moves.

**Round 2** was a stunner! MChessPro 5 beat Mephisto (don't know which program!) in a clever game. Quest beat Kallisto, The King beat Virtual, but Chess Genius lost to Ferret in a 71 move tussle and, in the biggest shock of all, Hiarcs lost to Gandalf in just 18 moves!

**HiarcsX (2500)** - **Gandalf (2450)**

1.e4 c5 2.d4 c6 3.e5 d6 4.0-0 c5 5.dxe5 dxe4?? 6.e4 xxe4!!

[A move unknown to BCO, MCO or even the ECO volumes. Yet it's probably a forced win if White makes the obvious capture (and all programs seem to, with a very large + evaluation!)]

7...xh4!! 8.xh8 d5! 9.g3
Round 3. MChessPro5 beat the above-mentioned Gandalf in 41; The King lost to the dangerous Schach3. It was here that Hiarc5 lost on time at move 70 to Chess System-Tal. CST had gained a hard-won advantage in the middle game, but Hiarc5 had turned it into a won endgame when the flag fell leaving it on a dismal 1/3.

Round 4. CS-Tal did it again, this time getting a fully deserved win over Genius with a marvellous sac at move 29. A 'must' game for Issue 62! Quest made it 4 in a row to lead over MChessPro5 and Schach3 both on 3½. On 3 were Cheiron, CS-Tal, Ferret, Kallisto and Shredder.

Round 5. Quest and Schach3 went ½-½ in 34 moves. CS-Tal lost to Shredder while Virtual was coming back into things with a 1-0 over Mephisto. Genius beat the highly rated Israeli program Junior which was having a hard time on 2/5. So was Hiarc5, on the same score after 2 difficult draws. Also in this round MChessPro5 went ½-½ with Cheiron, Itchess (3½/5) beat The King and Ferret beat Kallisto.

Round 6 went better for the commercial progs with Genius, The King and Hiarc5 returning to winning ways. Nimzo3 beat Mephisto, but the threat from the 'unknown' programs was still clear as we had Shredder ½-½ Quest, and Zeus ½-½ CS-Tal. Kallisto-Virtual was also ½-½.

Round 7. MChessPro5 beat Quest in a speedy 28 moves to go clear. Genius beat Zeus, Hiarc5 won again, Nimzo beat CSTal which was losing touch, but Dark Thought and Ferret won over Schach3 and Shredder respectively. Another key result was Gandalf ½-½ The King.

Further proof of the rise of the amateur programs came in Round 8 with the win of Ferret over MChessPro5 in a 63 move tussle. There were other key clashes: The King 1-0 Kallisto, Nimzo3 1-0 Schach3, Quest 1-0 Dark Thought, Shredder 0-1 Genius, and Virtual ½-½ Hiarc5.

Round 9. Dark Thought 1-0 The King, Schach3 0-1 Virtual, and a big one... Genius ½-½ MChessPro5! A very big one was Quest 1-0 over Ferret giving the commercial programs renewed hope with 2 rounds to go.

Could Quest (Fritz) do the WCC and WMCC double? That became less likely in Round 10 as Genius beat it in 46 moves. Also vital were MChessPro5 1-0 Dark Thought, Kallisto 0-1 Hiarc5, Nimzo3 ½-½ Ferret, and Shredder ½-½ Virtual.


Genius and MCP had already met, so the draw was Nimzo3 vs MChessPro5 and Dark Thought vs Genius... and both were draws putting the 2 leaders on 8/11. That left Ferret and Quest with a final chance if either could win, but Ferret was playing Hiarc5 and that also went ½-½ whilst Quest's late disappointment was worsened as it lost to Virtual, leaving Genius and MChessPro5 as joint winners.

Games + notes/comments etc next time!
### 13th World Micro-Computer Championship

**ROUND-by-ROUND RESULTS and FINAL STANDINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>R5</th>
<th>R6</th>
<th>R7</th>
<th>R8</th>
<th>R9</th>
<th>R10</th>
<th>R11</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alpha-I</td>
<td>b10-</td>
<td>w5+</td>
<td>b11=</td>
<td>w4-</td>
<td>b26-</td>
<td>b27+</td>
<td>w18+</td>
<td>w20-</td>
<td>b2+</td>
<td>b36-</td>
<td>w13=</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>b24-</td>
<td>w18+</td>
<td>w33=</td>
<td>b23-</td>
<td>w19=</td>
<td>w26+</td>
<td>b14-</td>
<td>b32=</td>
<td>w1-</td>
<td>w27+</td>
<td>b5+</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ananse</td>
<td>w7-</td>
<td>b32-</td>
<td>w18-</td>
<td>b5-</td>
<td>w27-</td>
<td>w16-</td>
<td>b6-</td>
<td>w13-</td>
<td>b4-</td>
<td>b26-</td>
<td>w11-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bobby II</td>
<td>w9-</td>
<td>b16+</td>
<td>w28=</td>
<td>b1+</td>
<td>w12-</td>
<td>b23-</td>
<td>w21=</td>
<td>b6-</td>
<td>w3+</td>
<td>w35+</td>
<td>b26+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Breakthrough</td>
<td>w22-</td>
<td>b1-</td>
<td>w26-</td>
<td>b3-</td>
<td>b32-</td>
<td>b18-</td>
<td>w27+</td>
<td>w16+</td>
<td>b13=</td>
<td>b11=</td>
<td>w2-</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Centaur</td>
<td>b20=</td>
<td>w11-</td>
<td>b14=</td>
<td>b19=</td>
<td>w34=</td>
<td>b21-</td>
<td>w3+</td>
<td>w4+</td>
<td>b35+</td>
<td>b23-</td>
<td>w22-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cheiron</td>
<td>b3+</td>
<td>w10+</td>
<td>b15=</td>
<td>w29-</td>
<td>b24=</td>
<td>b12-</td>
<td>w22-</td>
<td>w14=</td>
<td>b19-</td>
<td>b34=</td>
<td>w21-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chessbrain</td>
<td>WITHDRAWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chess Genius 3.0</td>
<td>b4+</td>
<td>w15-</td>
<td>b13+</td>
<td>w10-</td>
<td>b21+</td>
<td>b17+</td>
<td>w35+</td>
<td>b31+</td>
<td>w24=</td>
<td>w29+</td>
<td>b12=</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chess System Tal</td>
<td>w1+</td>
<td>b7-</td>
<td>w19+</td>
<td>b9+</td>
<td>w31-</td>
<td>b35=</td>
<td>b28-</td>
<td>w21+</td>
<td>b22-</td>
<td>w17-</td>
<td>w34-</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Comet</td>
<td>w33=</td>
<td>b6+</td>
<td>w1=</td>
<td>b22-</td>
<td>w28-</td>
<td>b32-</td>
<td>b16=</td>
<td>w36=</td>
<td>b21-</td>
<td>w5+</td>
<td>b3+</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dark Thought</td>
<td>w34=</td>
<td>b14+</td>
<td>w31-</td>
<td>b28+</td>
<td>b4+</td>
<td>w7+</td>
<td>b30+</td>
<td>b29-</td>
<td>w23+</td>
<td>b24-</td>
<td>w9=</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td>b21-</td>
<td>w27+</td>
<td>w9=</td>
<td>b16+</td>
<td>w17-</td>
<td>b19-</td>
<td>w36-</td>
<td>b3+</td>
<td>w5=</td>
<td>b18-</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dragon</td>
<td>b23=</td>
<td>w12-</td>
<td>w6=</td>
<td>w32+</td>
<td>w35-</td>
<td>b34+</td>
<td>w2+</td>
<td>b7-</td>
<td>b36-</td>
<td>w30-</td>
<td>b18=</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ferret</td>
<td>w16+</td>
<td>b9+</td>
<td>w7-</td>
<td>b35+</td>
<td>w22+</td>
<td>w30=</td>
<td>b31+</td>
<td>w24+</td>
<td>b29-</td>
<td>b28-</td>
<td>w19=</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Francesca</td>
<td>b15-</td>
<td>w4-</td>
<td>b27=</td>
<td>w13-</td>
<td>w18=</td>
<td>b3+</td>
<td>w11=</td>
<td>b5-</td>
<td>w26-</td>
<td>w32=</td>
<td>b35-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gandalf</td>
<td>w32+</td>
<td>b19+</td>
<td>b24-</td>
<td>w20-</td>
<td>b13+</td>
<td>w9-</td>
<td>w23=</td>
<td>b35+</td>
<td>w31-</td>
<td>b10+</td>
<td>w30+</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gromit</td>
<td>w35-</td>
<td>b2-</td>
<td>b3+</td>
<td>w33=</td>
<td>b16=</td>
<td>w5+</td>
<td>b1=</td>
<td>w34-</td>
<td>b27-</td>
<td>w13+</td>
<td>w14=</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>HiarcS X</td>
<td>b27+</td>
<td>w17-</td>
<td>b10-</td>
<td>w6=</td>
<td>b2=</td>
<td>w13+</td>
<td>w32+</td>
<td>b33=</td>
<td>w7+</td>
<td>b22+</td>
<td>b15=</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Isichess</td>
<td>w6=</td>
<td>b31-</td>
<td>w34+</td>
<td>b17+</td>
<td>w23+</td>
<td>w24-</td>
<td>b33-</td>
<td>b1+</td>
<td>w28-</td>
<td>b21-</td>
<td>w36+</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>w13+</td>
<td>b35-</td>
<td>w22-</td>
<td>b26+</td>
<td>w9-</td>
<td>w6+</td>
<td>b4=</td>
<td>b10-</td>
<td>w11+</td>
<td>w20+</td>
<td>b7+</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kallisto</td>
<td>b5+</td>
<td>w29-</td>
<td>b21-</td>
<td>w15-</td>
<td>w53=</td>
<td>b7+</td>
<td>b23-</td>
<td>w10+</td>
<td>w19-</td>
<td>b6+</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The King</td>
<td>w14=</td>
<td>b33+</td>
<td>b30-</td>
<td>w24+</td>
<td>b20-</td>
<td>w4=</td>
<td>b17=</td>
<td>w22+</td>
<td>b12-</td>
<td>w6=</td>
<td>w31+</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mirage</td>
<td>w36-</td>
<td>b28-</td>
<td>b5+</td>
<td>w21-</td>
<td>w1+</td>
<td>b2-</td>
<td>w34=</td>
<td>b27-</td>
<td>b16+</td>
<td>w3+</td>
<td>w4-</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nightmare</td>
<td>w19-</td>
<td>b13-</td>
<td>w16=</td>
<td>b34-</td>
<td>b3+</td>
<td>w1-</td>
<td>b5-</td>
<td>w26+</td>
<td>w18+</td>
<td>b2-</td>
<td>b32-</td>
<td>3½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Nimzo 3</td>
<td>b29-</td>
<td>w26+</td>
<td>b4=</td>
<td>w12-</td>
<td>b11+</td>
<td>b36+</td>
<td>w10+</td>
<td>w30+</td>
<td>b20+</td>
<td>w15=</td>
<td>w24=</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Quest-Fritz</td>
<td>w28+</td>
<td>b22+</td>
<td>w35+</td>
<td>b7+</td>
<td>b30=</td>
<td>w31=</td>
<td>b24-</td>
<td>w12+</td>
<td>w15+</td>
<td>b9-</td>
<td>b33=</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Schach 3</td>
<td>w31=</td>
<td>b34+</td>
<td>w23+</td>
<td>b36+</td>
<td>w29=</td>
<td>b15=</td>
<td>w12-</td>
<td>b28-</td>
<td>w33-</td>
<td>b14+</td>
<td>b17-</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Shredder</td>
<td>b30=</td>
<td>w20+</td>
<td>b12+</td>
<td>w24=</td>
<td>b10+</td>
<td>b29=</td>
<td>w15-</td>
<td>w9-</td>
<td>b17+</td>
<td>w33=</td>
<td>b23-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Stobor</td>
<td>b17-</td>
<td>w3+</td>
<td>w36-</td>
<td>b14-</td>
<td>w5+</td>
<td>w11+</td>
<td>b19-</td>
<td>w2=</td>
<td>b34-</td>
<td>b16=</td>
<td>w27+</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Virtual Chess</td>
<td>b11=</td>
<td>w23-</td>
<td>b2=</td>
<td>b18+</td>
<td>w36+</td>
<td>b22=</td>
<td>w20+</td>
<td>w19=</td>
<td>b30+</td>
<td>b31=</td>
<td>w29+</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>b12=</td>
<td>w30-</td>
<td>b20-</td>
<td>w27+</td>
<td>b6=</td>
<td>w14-</td>
<td>b26=</td>
<td>b18+</td>
<td>w32+</td>
<td>w7=</td>
<td>b10+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Zeus</td>
<td>b18+</td>
<td>w21+</td>
<td>b29-</td>
<td>w15-</td>
<td>b14+</td>
<td>w10=</td>
<td>b9-</td>
<td>w17-</td>
<td>w6-</td>
<td>b4-</td>
<td>w16+</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mephisto</td>
<td>b26+</td>
<td>w24-</td>
<td>b32+</td>
<td>w30-</td>
<td>b33-</td>
<td>w28-</td>
<td>b13+</td>
<td>b11=</td>
<td>w14=</td>
<td>w1+</td>
<td>b20-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL STANDINGS:**

8/11 Chess Genius3, M Chess Pro5.0
7 ½ Ferret, Nimzo3, Virtual Chess
7  Dark Thought, Hiarc5X, The King, Quest-Fritz
6 ½ Gandalf, Junior, Kallisto
6   BobbyII, Shredder, XXXX
5  Æ Amy, Isichess, Schach3
5  Alpha-1, Centaur, Cheiron, Comet, Dragon, Stobor, Mephisto
4 ½ Chess System Tal, Mirage, Zeus
4   Diogenes, Gromit
3 ½ Breakthrough, Nightmare
3   Francesca
2 ½ 2 1½ 1½ ½...
0   Ananse

Declared JOINT WORLD Micro-Computer CHAMPIONS
1st M Chess Pro5.0
and Chess Genius3

Play-off game won by M Chess Pro5.0

World Micro-Computer BLITZ Champion
1st The King
Runner-up Nimzo3

World Micro-Computer AMATEUR Champion
1st Ferret
There has been a veritable spate of these in the past few months, and let us say immediately 'how welcome'!

Whilst the fact that it is an American initiative means that the Ratings achieved require an awareness of the grading differences between USCF/Elo/BCF — and the Tests are undertaken at Game in 30 mins, requiring a second adjustment — we can nevertheless very closely assess the relationship they bear to our RATING LIST as well as compare the various Computer's results with each other.

**The USCF->BCF adjustment**

We believe (USCF-120) is a correct conversion to the equivalent Elo standard in Britain which relates to the formulae:

\[
(BCF \times 8) + 600 = \text{Elo}
\]

or

\[
(\text{Elo} / 8) - 600 = \text{BCF}
\]

**The Game in 30 adjustment**

It is accepted by pretty well everyone that Computers get better results at Blitz (Game in 5 or 10) than they do at Action Chess (Game in 30), and at Action Chess than at Tournament Chess (40/2). We believe that, if x is taken as the 40/2 rating, the improvement expectancy is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40/2</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G/30</td>
<td>x + 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blitz</td>
<td>x + 160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore the full deduction from RATINGS obtained in CRA Tests should be -120 (for USCF->Britain) and -80 (for 40/2->G/30) = -200 total.

Finally it can be noted that the PRESIDENT program is also the GK-2100 and Travel CHAMPION 2100 program; the ZIRCON2 is also the JADE2 program; and the SAPPHIRE is also the DIAMOND program.

Having considered these factors in order to make the actual achievements meaningful to us, we can now view the Ratings obtained by the various programs in 1995's Official CRA Tests.

### Recent CRA Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Official USCF</th>
<th>Official British Rating List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZIRCON1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERALD</td>
<td>2181</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIRCON2</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JADE2</td>
<td>2230</td>
<td>2130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT</td>
<td>2383</td>
<td>2183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GK+TC-2100</td>
<td>2383</td>
<td>2183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPPHIRE</td>
<td>2495</td>
<td>2295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAMOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTREUX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The norm is for each Computer to play a total of 48 games, so it is a pretty thorough examination. Here are some of the best COMPUTER games, taking each program in turn.

### Kasparov PRESIDENT

**PRESIDENT (2050) — S SLOAN (2300)
[800] CRA Test G/30, 1995**

1.e4 g5 2.d4 h6 3.Qc4 c6 4.Qf3 d5 5.exd5 exd5 6.Qc2 Qe6 7.0–0 Qd7 8.Qe1 c6 9.Qc2 d6 10.h3 Qc7 11.Qc5 Qe7 12.b4 Qf6 13.Qb2 Qc7 14.a4 Qf5 15.Qd3 0–0–0 16.Qc2 Qg4? 17.Qxf5 gxf3 18.g3 Qxe8
19.\text{\texttt{\texttt{x}}e6} fxe6 20.\texttt{\texttt{d}}2 h5 21.\texttt{\texttt{x}}f3 h4 22.b5 hxg3 23.hxg3 \texttt{\texttt{h}}5 24.\texttt{\texttt{a}}ab1

[Sloan says he thought he had the advantage up to here, and blames his next move for his defeat. We agree there were better moves, but don't see that he was 'winning' previously! We think the President has looked after itself very nicely against this (to a computer) peculiar opening – Sloan's speciality – and was already ahead]

24.\texttt{\texttt{f}}5??

[24...\texttt{\texttt{h}}h8? 25.\texttt{\texttt{x}}e6 \texttt{\texttt{h}}1 + 26.\texttt{\texttt{g}}2+- gets Black nowhere; 24...\texttt{\texttt{h}}h8 25.\texttt{\texttt{c}}c3 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c7 26.bxc6 \texttt{\texttt{x}}xc6 27.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f1\texttt{\texttt{f}}1.; 24...\texttt{\texttt{c}}c7 25.bxc6 \texttt{\texttt{x}}xc6 26.\texttt{\texttt{g}}2 \texttt{\texttt{g}}7+ is best, though I think this still favours the President]

25.\texttt{\texttt{x}}e6 \texttt{\texttt{x}}xe6 26.\texttt{\texttt{x}}xf5 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c2 27.\texttt{\texttt{g}}6 \texttt{\texttt{a}}5 28.\texttt{\texttt{d}}d3 \texttt{\texttt{e}}8 29.bxc6 bxc6 30.\texttt{\texttt{c}}c3 \texttt{\texttt{x}}xa4 31.\texttt{\texttt{a}}a1 \texttt{\texttt{e}}4?!

[31...\texttt{\texttt{b}}5 offers the President the queen exchange in a way which it wont want to accept as 32.\texttt{\texttt{x}}xb5 \texttt{\texttt{c}}xb5 33.\texttt{\texttt{x}}xa7 \texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5 34.dxc5 \texttt{\texttt{x}}xc3 results in a position with 5 passed pawns! From here either player might win, even if the computer does still have 3 vs 2! Therefore after: 31...\texttt{\texttt{b}}5 best is 32.\texttt{\texttt{g}}6! \texttt{\texttt{f}}f8 33.\texttt{\texttt{x}}xa7+-]

32.\texttt{\texttt{x}}e4 \texttt{\texttt{x}}e4 33.\texttt{\texttt{x}}xa7 \texttt{\texttt{e}}2?!

[33...\texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5?! 34.\texttt{\texttt{x}}d2 \texttt{\texttt{e}}1 + 35.\texttt{\texttt{g}}2 \texttt{\texttt{e}}4 (anything else loses the c-pawn) 36.\texttt{\texttt{x}}xe4 \texttt{\texttt{xe}}4 37.\texttt{\texttt{a}}a4+-]

34.\texttt{\texttt{a}}a5 \texttt{\texttt{c}}3 35.\texttt{\texttt{x}}xc3 \texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5 36.dxc5 \texttt{\texttt{x}}xc3 37.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f1 \texttt{\texttt{f}}f2 38.\texttt{\texttt{g}}5 \texttt{\texttt{d}}4 39.\texttt{\texttt{e}}4 \texttt{\texttt{d}}8

[39...\texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5 40.\texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5 \texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5 41.g4 \texttt{\texttt{g}}5 42.f3 c5 would have also been a nice test of the President's endgame]

40.\texttt{\texttt{f}}4! \texttt{\texttt{e}}8?!

[40...\texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5 straight away was better, probably leading to 41.\texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5 \texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5 42.\texttt{\texttt{e}}2 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c2 + 43.\texttt{\texttt{g}}3 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c3 + 44.\texttt{\texttt{g}}4+-]

41.\texttt{\texttt{g}}4! \texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5 42.\texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5 \texttt{\texttt{x}}xc5 43.\texttt{\texttt{e}}2 \texttt{\texttt{c}}c3 44.\texttt{\texttt{g}}5 \texttt{\texttt{d}}8?

[44...\texttt{\texttt{x}}g3 was Sloan's last chance. Now 45.\texttt{\texttt{g}}7? would be the President's choice and then 45...\texttt{\texttt{d}}8 46.\texttt{\texttt{f}}5 c5 47.\texttt{\texttt{f}}5 \texttt{\texttt{e}}8 48.\texttt{g}6 \texttt{\texttt{f}}f8 49.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f2 \texttt{\texttt{g}}5 50.\texttt{\texttt{g}}3 c4 51.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f4 \texttt{\texttt{g}}2 52.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f5 and a few difficulties to be overcome avoiding all of the checks before the win is secured; 44...\texttt{\texttt{x}}g3 45.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f2! \texttt{\texttt{x}}g4 46.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f3 \texttt{\texttt{f}}f1 47.\texttt{\texttt{e}}4 might have been a clearer way to win]

45.\texttt{\texttt{g}}6! \texttt{\texttt{e}}8

[45...\texttt{\texttt{x}}g3 is too late now! 46.\texttt{\texttt{g}}7? c5 47.\texttt{\texttt{f}}5 c4 48.\texttt{\texttt{f}}6 wins easily]

46.\texttt{g}7 \texttt{\texttt{x}}g3 47.\texttt{\texttt{f}}5 \texttt{\texttt{g}}5 48.\texttt{\texttt{f}}6

[Announcing mate in 6 which goes 48.\texttt{\texttt{d}}8 49.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f1 \texttt{\texttt{e}}5+ 50.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f3 \texttt{\texttt{f}}f5 + 51.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f4 \texttt{\texttt{f}}f4+ 52.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f4 c5 53.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f1#. However Black played...]

48...\texttt{\texttt{c}}5??

...which allows mate in 2.

49.\texttt{\texttt{f}}7+ \texttt{\texttt{d}}8 50.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f8\# 1-0

B CALTON (2215) – PRESIDENT (2050) [C24]CRA Test G/30, 1995

1.e4 e5 2.\texttt{\texttt{c}}c4 \texttt{\texttt{f}}f6 3.d3 \texttt{\texttt{b}}b4+ 4.\texttt{c}c3 \texttt{\texttt{a}}a5 5.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f4 exf4 6.e5 \texttt{\texttt{e}}7 7.\texttt{\texttt{e}}e2 \texttt{\texttt{g}}g8 8.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f4 \texttt{\texttt{h}}h4+ 9.\texttt{\texttt{g}}3 \texttt{\texttt{h}}h6 10.\texttt{\texttt{f}}f3?!

[Apparently a fairly typical G/30 error which Computers react to without hesitation. Something like 10.\texttt{\texttt{d}}d2 would keep White slightly ahead – after all Black has to start developing both pawns and pieces yet! However the next few moves suggest that this 'mistake' is part of Carlton's plan! ?]

10...\texttt{\texttt{c}}1 + 11.\texttt{\texttt{d}}d1 \texttt{\texttt{b}}xb2 12.0-0?!

[The immediate reaction is that this is a compounding of the earlier 'error' which, as we have said so often, is a regular feature in Computer vs Human games. More likely White (a 2217 player after all) is actually taking advantage of Black's lack]
of development by also trapping his queen and going for an immediate all-out attack?! A more moderate idea was 12.\texttt{b2 dxc3 13.c1+}]
12...\texttt{xal 13.b3 e7}

14.e7f7+?!

[Because Black is so far behind in development it is well worth looking for possibilities in White's position. In fact 14.e1! could be played immediately. Then it should go 14...b6+ 15.h1 b6c6 16.e2! a5 and now 17.xf7+ d8 18.a3 c5 19.xc5 b2 20.h4++-

14...d8 15.e1 b6+ 16.e2??

[Spoiling it just as the play converges on the line noted above. If 16.h1 c6 17.e2 a5 brings us exactly to the 18th move in that earlier annotation, showing that White's sacrifices had some merit]
16...xf2+ 17.xf2

[17.xf2 a6 18.d4=]
17...a6 18.a3??

[In one way a great shame after Carlsen's fine sacrificial exploitation of the position. For the Presidential operators... a sigh of relief as the game was still unclear if 18.d4! b4! (18...f8? 19.e2=) 19.xb4 c6∞]
18...xb1 0–1

\textbf{PRESIDENT (2050) \textendash J HANKEN (2225) [A43]CRA Test G/30, 1995}

1.d4 e5 2.dxe5 e6 3.c3 dxc5 4.d4 d5 5.xc5 a5+ 6.e3 axc5 7.e4 f6 8.e5 d7 9.e3 c7 10.f4 g5?!

...and Black gave in to the inevitable 1–0

The \textsc{PRESIDENT} did lose to G.M. Arthur BISGUENTER, but the game record sent to me proved to be missing critical middle-game moves, giving us no choice but to be totally biased and end this section on another winning note!

\textbf{PRESIDENT (2050) \textendash E LEVIN (2200) [C42]CRA Test G/30, 1995}

1.e4 e5 2.d3 f6 3.xe5 d6 4.f3 xe4
5.d4 d5 6.c3 e6 7.0-0  e6?!
[7...f5 8.e1 and now unpinning the Knight with 8...e7 seems better, though 9.e3±]
8.e1 d7 9.exd4 dxe4 10.exf6 0-0 0 11.c3 d5 12.e1 f6 13.b2 g5
14.f4 h6 15.e2 g4 16.h4 f7 17.f5
g6
[17...f2!?!]
18.g3 b8 19.f4 h5 20.c4

20...e4?
[20...e7 had to be played – on this occasion discretion is the better part of valour! Then the PRESIDENT would go 21.d5 Now I think 21...e5 would be best again as (21...h4? 22.fxe6 htxg3
23.exg3 h6 24.e4 must be+-) 22.e5]
21.xe5 bxe5??
[This appears to be a fine move, putting both White's knights on pins. No doubt the PRESIDENT's reply came as a most unpleasant shock. In retrospect therefore Black's best was 21...hxg3
22.xg3 and maybe 22..h5 though 23.dxc6 bxc6 24.bxc6 bxc6 25.exb7 a5 26.eac1 should be more than enough for White to win]
22.e6!! xex6
[Hoping to save the queen with 22...f5 is an illusion due to 23.e5!]
23.xg6 xxf4 24.xf6 1-0

American I.M and Computer Chess expert Larry KAUFMAN had been in charge of
the Kasparov PRESIDENT's showing, and must have been well satisfied with its finished grading of 2330.

Novag ZIRCON2

The only ZIRCON2 games I have from its CRA test were part of Novag programmer David KITTINGER's report in Computer Chess Reports and, as they appeared in Britain's Chess Monthly, some readers may have seen them already, for which I apologise. However I have put some notes with them which I hope adds to their interest value.

In his report David draws attention to a couple of issues concerning the test procedure:

1. The Computers play 2 games against each of 24 opponents; 1 with White and 1 with Black.
2. The Players get incentive money! $25 for each draw and $50 for each win.
3. David sets the Computer to play all its moves in just 26 minutes, allowing himself only 4 minutes operator time.

After losing 6 of its first 8 games ZIRCON2 eventually rallied with 2 wins and then came the following game against well known Chess author and I.M Larry EVANS.

ZIRCON2 (2050) – L EVANS (2350)
[B96] CRA Test G/30, 1995
1.e4 c5 2.b3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.axd4 b6
5.f3 a6 6.g5 c6 7.f4 h6 8.h4 e6 9.f3 b7 10.f2 e7 11.e2 b8
12.0-0 b5 13.e3 g5??
[13...0-0 is more obvious and simpler. However Larry's mind is on getting the king 'out of the way' onto the 7th. rank and putting queen and rooks on the h-file for the 'known' type of anti-computer attack!]
14.fxg5 hxg5 15.ad1 h4 16.axb4 b4
17.b3 \(\&e5\) 18.\(\&g3\) g4 19.\(\&c3\) \(\&b8\)
[Back to the original plan]
20.\(\&a1\) \(\&b6\) 21.\(\&d2\)!
[Now there isn't a 'good' choice for Black. If 21...\(\&b7\)? 22.\(\&xe6\); if 21...d5?! 22.exd5 cxd5 23.\(\&a5\)±; 21...g3 22.\(\&xg3\) (22.hxg3? \(\&xg4-\)) 22...\(\&b7\) would be okay
(though still ± for White)... but it doesn't fit in with Black's plan so was probably not even considered]

21...\(\&b4\)!
[Lacking a 'good' move Evans sticks with his long-term plan - an eventual attack down the h-file!]
22.\(\&xa6\) \(\&xa6\) 23.\(\&xa6\) \(\&c8\) 24.\(\&d8\)
[The ZIRCON continues to make it difficult for Evans to progress with his ideas!]
24...\(\&xe4\) 25.\(\&xe4\) \(\&xc4\) 26.\(\&xd6+\) \(\&xd6\)
27.\(\&xd6\)!
[27.\(\&xd6??\) \(\&f4!\) 28.\(\&h4\) \(\&e3+\)±]
27...\(\&e7\)
[Black connects his rooks at last and is ready for the assault. Will it work?]
28.e4 \(\&xh2?!\) 29.\(\&xh2\) \(\&h8+\) 30.\(\&g1\) \(\&h7\)
31.\(\&e5!!\)
[At this point Larry informed us what he considers the real trouble with computers to be: "You sac a rook, and they don't get nervous!"
31.\(\&h2+\) 32.\(\&f2\) \(\&h5!\) 33.\(\&a6+\) \(\&f6\)
34.\(\&f4\) \(\&f5+\) 35.\(\&e1\) \(\&e3+\) 36.\(\&f2!!\)
[The defence just holds. Black, materially down, cannot afford exchanges now and can only shift his king a square and hope for a late computer blunder]

36...\(\&g6\) 37.\(\&xe5\) \(\&xe5+\) 38.\(\&d1\)
[And Evans resigned here as 38...\(\&xb3\) 39.\(\&c2+\) forces the very exchanges he has to avoid. ZIRCON2, with Black, drew their 2nd. game so this was its most satisfactory meeting in the test] 1–0

The second Novag game is a miniature!

ZIRCON2 (2050) – A YNIGO (2115)
[B98] CRA Test 6/30, 1995[ELH]
1.e4 c5 2.\(\&f3\) d6 3.d4 \(\&xd4\) 4.\(\&f6\) \(\&c3\) a6 5.\(\&d5\) e6 6.\(\&g5\) e5 7.f4 \(\&e7\)
[Black's game had followed the play in ZIRCON2–EVANS up to here, where Evans had played the less usual 7...h6]
8.\(\&f3\) \(\&c7\) 9.0–0–0 0–0 10.\(\&d3\) b5??
[In some games one just gets lucky! Now the computer will do the damage on the h-file that Evans had wanted to in the game above! The normal 10...\(\&c6\) would have stopped any ideas White might have of trying the attack which follows in the game. E.g. 11.e5 \(\&xe5\) 12.\(\&xf6\) \(\&xf6\)
13.\(\&h3\) g6]
11.e5! \(\&b7??\)
[The game was all downhill now anyway, but 11...dxe5 12.fxe5 \(\&xd5\) 13.\(\&xe7\) \(\&xc7\) 14.\(\&xe6\) \(\&xe6\) 15.\(\&xd5\) \(\&g5+\) would leave outside possibilities for escaping with a draw]
12.\(\&h3!\)
[After 12.\(\&h3\) dxc5 (12...\(\&h5\) 13.\(\&xe7\) \(\&xe7\) 14.\(\&f6\) h5++; 12...h6 13.\(\&xf6\) \(\&xf6\)
14.\(\&f6\) \(\&xf6\) 15.\(\&xf6\)++) 13.\(\&xf6\) g6
14.\(\&xg6!\) fxg6 15.\(\&xe6!\) \(\&e8\) 16.\(\&xe7\). You can take your choice, they are all +–!]
1–0

The ZIRCON2/JADE2's final score was 25%–22% against opposition graded 2216, for a 2235 USCF Action grade.

**Mephisto MONTREUX**

The 'SCARLET PIMPERNEL' – they seek it here, they seek it there, they seek the
Montreux everywhere (well, we did in Britain for rather a long while!).

Max HARRELL was Saitek's man-in-charge for the 96(1) MONTREUX games, in which it obtained the highest rating ever for a USCF test.

Our first game is against Eric SCHILLER of ChessWorks, the folk responsible for ChessMaster4-5000. As both the MONTREUX and ChessMaster use Johan de KONING 'King' programs, Schiller would know what he was about.

**MONTREUX (2295) – E SCHILLER (2275) [C29] CRA Test G/30, 1995**

1.e4 e5 2.c3 c6 3.f4 d5 4.exd5?!  
[In this sharp line of the Vienna, 4.fxe5 gets more theory. In fact Graham White's genius book gives exd4 a +-]

4...e4 5.c4 c5 6.d4 exd3 7.cx3d3 0-0  
8.d2d2 a6 9.0-0 b5 10.h3 c6!!  
[10...b7 looks better]

11.d4d4 g6 12.a3 f5 13.b2 e8 14.dxe6 cxe6  
15.xe5 xxe3+ 16.dxe3 g4

17.g3  
[17.xd5?! xxe6 18.xxc6 xxe3 19.xe7+ should also work out well for White]  
17...exe5?!  
[It looks as if Schiller had been watching too much of Kasparov–Anand or had his mind on his on/off/on/off ChessMaster 5000 release! Actually the move does have its good points, but probably better was 17...dxe5 18.xxe5 g7  
(18...exe5? 19.xf5! xxd6 20.xh6!) 19.xd5 xxe6 though 20.e6! xxe6 (20...fxe6  
21.dxe7!) 21.xh1! is still winning for the MONTREUX]

18.fxe5 xxe5 19.d5 b4 20.e6 xg3  
21.xf7+ g7 22.xh3 xhx3 23.xxc6  
24.b2+ 24.d1 xh8 25.d5 xh8  
25...xd7 26.xd7 e5 27.e5 xh8  
28.xh8 xh8 29.xh8

[With his h protecting the b2/pawn, and his g blocking at f8, Schiller decided here that the game was over with the free MONTREUX able to mop up at leisure] 1-0

**D STRAUSS (2520) – MONTREUX (2295) [D02] CRA Test G/30, 1995**

1.d4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.g3 f5 4.xg2 xh6 5.0-0 e6 6.c4 dxc4 7.d4 a4 d7 8.xc4 0-0 0-0 9.xf4 exd5! 10.xc3?  
[At first sight 10.e3 would seem to be correct, but the point of White's move soon becomes clear]

10.xxf4 11.gxf4 xxd4 12.c5!

12.b5  
[If the queen goes to e7 or e8, one of White's rooks goes to d1. Eg 12..xh8 and now:–]

A) 13.c3 looks good. 13...f6 (13..d2 14.xad1+!) 14.xd4 fxe5 15.xxe5=;  
B) 13.xad1 is probably best... 13..xb4  
14.xb4 dxb4 15.c3±]
move known to the MONTREUX, so the game proper is about to start]

11...\texttt{Bxd8??} 12.e\texttt{xd5 \texttt{Bxd5}} 13.e\texttt{xd5 \texttt{Bxd5}}
14.d\texttt{d3 g6 15.0-0 \texttt{Bd7}} 16.\texttt{Bb3}

![Chess Diagram]

16...e5?

[This would have been good on the previous move, but not with White's queen now on b3. Presumably Gliksman overlooked that it leaves his d5\texttt{B} under-protected. 16...b6 is close to equal. If White did then try the same 'sac offer of 17.xg6? hxg6 leaves him with nothing at all – except a lost game!]

17.xg6! \texttt{xe6}

[Best. If 17...fxg6 18.e4 (18.e\texttt{xd5 \texttt{xe6}}! However... 19.e\texttt{e4 \texttt{xd5}} 20.e\texttt{xd5 is still +--}]
18.xd5 19.e\texttt{xd5+ \texttt{xd5}} 20.e\texttt{xd5+; 17...hxg6 18.xd5 \texttt{Xd5}} 19.e\texttt{e4 \texttt{xe6!}}
20.e\texttt{xe5 \texttt{xe5}} 21.xe5+--]
18.xb7 \texttt{Bb8} 19.xe6 \texttt{xd2} 20.xc5 \texttt{xc8}
21.xb7 \texttt{xd5}?

[Now was the time to take the \texttt{Q}, before it does more damage. So 21...hxg6 22.xd2 \texttt{xe5} 23.xe7 \texttt{xb2} would have given Gliksman a better chance to save the game, though it's still +--]

22.xf7+!

[Again! Not often we see the same Bishop – and a computer's at that! – taking two pawns out of the enemy king's defence, each time leaving itself en pris. This time it gets taken, but the win is assured]

22...\texttt{xf7} 23.xg5+ \texttt{g6} 24.xe6 1-0

The MONTREUX graded 2495 USCF!
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.

£'00: Cost in Britain. [ 1 ] = £100, [10 ] = £1,000.

a '+' after the price shows it can cost more!

E.g. [10+] is for Mephisto RISC 1 in an Exclusive board; it is dearer in the Munchen.

a '-' 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. If '+' 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.

F: The maximum likely future rating MOVEMENT, up or down, for that particular machine. This 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) 60MHz 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.

**The COMPUTER CHESS NEWS SHEET**

(c) Eric Hallsworth

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any way without the express written permission of Eric Hallsworth, The Red House, 46 High Street, Wilburton, Cambs CB6 3RA.

e-mail: eric@elchess.demon.co.uk

**ARTICLES, RESULTS, GAMES etc should always be sent direct to Eric please.**

---

**The PENTIUM P/90 GAP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PC</th>
<th>486/66 P/90</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genius3</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>2543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel6</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>2519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarc3s</td>
<td>2411</td>
<td>2517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel7</td>
<td>2455</td>
<td>2508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MChPro4</td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>2469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz3</td>
<td>2369</td>
<td>2463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WChess</td>
<td>2381</td>
<td>2402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ELO 77</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>