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**PORTABLE COMPUTERS**

Kasperov

- BULLET - Talking coach - £49 - talks + travels!
- COSMOS - £99 - great value, 4½"x4½" plug-in board, strong program + info display
- Novag
  - AMBER £139 - excellent plug-in, strong Cosmos with great features and info display
  - SAPPHIRE £224 - v. strong calculator style, 32MHz H8. Incl. magnetic disc set - excellent
- **TABLE-TOP PRESS SENSORS**

Kasperov

- EXECUTIVE £99 - GK-2000 Morsch prog. Display etc., plus lid cover. This is good value!
- COUGAR - £129! - top quality Morsch program, good info display, recommended

Novag

- TURQUOISE £149 - the Amber/Emerald Classic Plus program in a modern style board
- EMERALD CLASSIC PLUS £179 - beautiful wood look board, wood pieces. Display etc.
- DIAMOND £279 - strong, very good features, big 120,000 opening book and A1 for value!

Mephisto

- MILANO PRO £249 - Morsch at RISC speed, strong, good features and info display
- ATLANTA £379 - the fast hash-table version of Milano Pro=even greater strength. 64 led board

**WOOD AUTO SENSORS**

Kasperov

- PRESIDENT £299 - top value wood board ever - good range of features, scrolling display

Mephisto

- EXCLUSIVE all wood board, felted pieces
  - with MM6 - President program £449
  - with SENATOR - Milano Pro program £649
  - with MAGELLAN - Atlanta program £749

Novag

- SAPPHIRE2 DE LUXE £449 includes Novag Sapphire2, lovely wood UNIVERSAL board, WCChess PC program, all connection cables and adaptor. Excellent value and quite brilliant!

**PC PROGRAMS from CHESSBASE**

All run INDEPENDENTLY, + analyse within CB7.0. Great graphics, databases, big opening books, max. features. Win95/98

- HIARCS 732 by Mark Unioniace: an outstanding program running faster+stronger than ever! £45
- FRITZ 532 (2 CD's) - £45 - by Franz Morsch;
  For FRITZ5: PowerBook set £45
- JUNIOR5 - £45 - another strong, faster searcher
- NIMZO 99 - £45 - as Junior 5, by Donninger

**Other PC PROGRAMS on CD**

- HIARCS7 - for PC and MAC! - most human-like playing style, very strong, great analysis features and player help. 488,000 Opening Book user adjustable/extendable. Full learning! £89
- ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF CHESS for Rebel 10, 1 million games database plus 50 million opening tree! Incredible for study and pleasure. £39

- GENIUS 6 £89. By Richard Lang.
  To run within GENIUS6: WCHESS 2000, NIMZO 2000 £45 each

- Also, SHREDDER3 £89, MChessPRO8 £69, CS_Tal2 Windows £45. Please allow 7 days for delivery on these.

- CLASSIC GAMES COLLECTION for PIC
- SAGE 4000 DRAUGHTS (a very strong program!), includes DRAUGHTS variations, 10x10
  - Flip It (OTHELLO) and other games! £39!

**PC DATABASES on CD**

CHESSBASE 7.0 for Windows £199!!
32-bit high speed, over 1 million games, position trees and stats. Crafty analysis chess eng

CHESSBASE 6.0 for Windows now £87.50.
"The" games and work DATABASE, Multi-media and with Player 'encyclopedia. 'BASIC' package 300,000 games. A bargain!
Analysis modules, to use within CBase6 (or Fritz5): HIARCS6 £45, or JUNIOR4.6 £45
With CHESSBASE 6.0 you can UPGRADE to CHESSBASE 7.0 for £87.50

**PC TUTORIALS**

Chess MENTOR - number '1' for chess training

- COMPREHENSIVE: novice/hobby £59.95
- ADVANCED: best for SS readers? Strategy and Technique for study and pleasure £59.95

FULL DE LUXE: The COMPREHENSIVE COURSE plus all 11/available modules £225

**SECOND-HAND & EX-DEMO**

all with 9 month guarantee and free adaptor

Kasparov TRAVEL CHAMP 2100 [pl] £65
Fidelity CLUB 68000 [pl] £69
Fidelity MACH2 (ps) £85
Mephisto ACADEMY (as new) [as] £295
Mephisto LONDON 68000 [ps] £345
Fidelity ELITE MACH4 2325 [as] £549
NEWS and RESULTS

I need to be concise with the NEWS for this packed issue, so have condensed some items here, and will expand on the most important ones in SS/83.

HIARCS 732!
A new 32-bit HIARCS engine is out in the Fritz/Junior/Nimzo style! HIARCS 7 for Windows! Superb graphics, database etc.
The FULL program runs entirely on its own, and there is an engine included which will also run under Fritz and work brilliantly for analysis within ChessBase 7!

HIARCS 732 for Win95/98... £44.95

FRITZ 632?!
There are frequent rumours about this, but ChessBase say that there will be no new version until Christmas at best, and maybe not until the year 2,000.

JUNIOR 5 beats GELFAND
Another major MAN v MACHINE contest took place in Tel-Aviv, Israel on May 10th.

Firstly JUNIOR 5 drew 2-2 with the Israeli Olympic Team. Time control was G/60 and the PC was a Pentium3/450MHz.
Then 'DEEP JUNIOR' beat super GM Boris Gelfand by 1½–½. Here the time control was G/30 + 20secs per move.
DEEP JUNIOR is a new parallel version of Junior, running on a multi-processor platform which I understand is a Compaq Proline 550 using 4 x 450MHz processors. Mark Uniecke reckons it's £40,000 worth!
I will have the games ready for SS/83.

Frank HOLT: Latest RESULTS
Frank's latest report is full of great enthusiasm for HIARCS 7.01: "I'm delighted with the new HIARCS 7! Of course I am!"

Long-awaited feature improvements for clicking on hint moves and book moves, and the showing of individual move times are very welcome."

"The playing strength has knocked my previous no.1, Nimzo 98, well and truly off its perch. I also tried it on some mate in 12’s/13’s and it found them all on its infinite level."
"The only only thing I am concerned about now is - Will it be too good? Will any of the others be able to beat it? It will be Genius 5’s turn next!"

Don't worry, Frank! There's some clever folk out there working on Fritz, Rebel, Nimzo, Junior etc. unwilling to take it lying down. Although programming progress has slowed down (inevitably) in the last couple of years, it's not ended... and the arrival of new programs such as Junior, Nimzo and (soon, perhaps) Chess Tiger leaves me optimistic - the battle at the top isn't over yet.

However the fact that Hiarc is a 'slow, knowledge-based' program indicates that it will possibly have more to gain from the continuous advances being made in computer hardware than the 'fast searchers'.

We will see. In the meantime, here are Frank's latest results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiarc 701</th>
<th>Nimzo 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiarc 701</th>
<th>Nimzo 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agg 8-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiarc 701</th>
<th>Nimzo 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sol 7½-4½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiarc 701</th>
<th>Fritz 532</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiarc 701</th>
<th>Fritz 532</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agg 3½-8½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiarc 701</th>
<th>Fritz 532</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sol 6½-5½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As always, only the results with Hiarc on its normal setting are used in the Rating List, so Nimzo gets away with its 2 worst scores! Frank has sent me the best games, here are two of them.

Fritz 532 – Hiarc 701
A28 English, 4 Knights. 40/1hr

| 1.c4 e5 2.d4 c6 3.dxc6 e5 4.e3 c5 5...c8 6.c4 Puts H7 out of book, but it proceeds to play rather well! 6...xc3 |
| 7...xc3 g8 8.d4 xf3 F5 now out of book, reading 0, but H7 has itself +87! This will represent its eval. of White's forthcoming doubled pawns on the f-file and... |
accompanying king safety weakness
9.gxf3 exd4 10.exd4 0-0

Note the other major unbalanced feature:
two Fritz 8s against two Hiarcs 8s! 11.d5
2e5 12.Qg2 Qd7 13.0-0 Wh5 14.Qb3 Qab8
15.Qf4 Qg6 16.Qe1 Qh4 17.Qh1 Qbe8
18.Qd2 Qh5 19.Qad1 Qxf4 20.Qxf4 Qxf4
21.h3 b6 22.Qc3 f6 23.Qe6 Qg6 24.Qd4
Wh6 25.Qde4 Qxe6 26.Qxe6 Qf4 27.Qe3
Wh4 28.Qf1 Wh5 29.Qd4 Qxh3 30.Qg2
Qg5 31.b4 a6 32.Qc3 Qd1+ 33.Qe1 Qg4
34.Qe7 Qc8 35.Qg1 Qf3 36.Qe3 h5 37.b5
a5 38.Qd3 h4 39.Qh2 Wh4+ 40.Qg1 Qe8
41.Qxe8+ Qxe8 42.a4 h3 43.Qe2+ Qf7
44.Qh1 h2+ 45.Qg2 Wh4 46.Qd3 Qe4
47.Qe3 Qc5 48.Qh3! 48.Qa3 Qxc4
49.Qxh2 Qxa4+; 48.Qc3 Qxa4+
50.Qf3 Qc5 H7 reads +1783, so we'll leave it there! 0-1

Hiarcs 701 – Nimzo 98
B35 Sicilian, Acc.Dragon. G/60

1.e4 c5 2.Qc3 d6 3.Qf3 g6 4.d4 Qxd4
5.Qxd4 Qg7 6.Qe3 Qf6 7.Qc4 0-0 8.Qb3
a5 9.f3 d5 10.Qxd5 Qxd5 11.exd5 Qb4
12.Qde2 Qf5 13.Qc1 b5 14.0-0 Qc8
15.Qd4 H7 goes out of book 15...Qxd4
16.Qxd4 Qxc2

17.Qxc2 Frank reports that he saw Hiarcs’ sac for Q or a more than once. This
time, however, it’s a necessity rather than a

sac. If 17.Qd2? Qxe3 18.Qxe3 b4! and
White is in trouble 17...e5 Nimzo played
this from book, so has been specially pre-
pared for this line. 17...Qc2 is what you’d
expect! 18.Qxe5 Qe8 19.Qd4 Qc4 20.Qd2
Qc2 21.b3 Nimzo expected Qxb5, so now
exits book, at last 21...Qc8 22.Qxb5 Qf5
23.Qc3 Qe7 24.Qd4 Qf6 25.Qe1 Nimzo’s
last pair of moves are?! and H7 recognises
this, showing itself +132 25...Qb4 26.Qg4
Qd7 27.Qe3 a4 28.Qe4! f5 29.Qf6+ Qxf6
There’s no choice but to return the ex-
change. If 29...Qf7?? 30.Qe5 threatening
Qxd7 and Qg7 mate is deadly 30.Qxf6 Qe8
31.Qe7 Qa5 32.Qxf5 Qxb3 33.axb3 Qxd5
34.Qf6 Qc6 35.Qh6 Qf7 36.Qe3 Qa6 37.Qf2
Qb5 38.Qc5 Qe8 39...Qxf6?? 39.Qe7?
39.Qe7 Qxe7 40.Qxe7 Qg7 41.Qf4 Qf7
42.Qe5 Qc6 43.f4 g5 44.f5! Qh5 45.Qe6+
Qf7 and Nimzo resigned in the face of
46.Qxc6 Qxf5+ 47.Qe3 and the Q escapes
via d6 1-0

I don't know why the majority of my readers (349 approx) didn't bother with the
How Good Is Your Chess article in SS/81, but only Frank sent in any results!

"What a surprise," he says, "Genius4 top
and Genius5 second. I was also rather
pleased with Doctor3.0 (good at analysis)
which was 7th of the 14 entered programs."

HOW GOOD IS YOUR CHESS? SS/81
PC: P2/200MHz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Score/60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Genius 4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Genius 5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fritz 4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hiarcs 7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rebel 10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rebel 9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rebel 8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fritz 532</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DOC 3.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hiarcs 6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nimzo 98</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MChess Pro 6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MChess Pro 7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Crafty 16.6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Novag UNIVERSAL BOARD

Work at Novag to extend the range of PC programs which will work with this wood, auto sensory board, has been going on for some months now.

I have the file for FRITZ 532 at home, and that is working with no problems that I have experienced. I believe Fritz 516 works as well. Also, if you run Junior 5, Nimzo 98 or Hiarc 732 within the Fritz 532 program, they also work!!

I can supply a disk with the FRITZ files on it, to folk buying the Novag Board (£279) from Countrywide.

Operations are now in progress to get Rebel 10 up-and-running as well (it nearly works, there's just one small glitch at present which they've not quite managed to overcome). I believe Genius 6 will be next in line!

DGT Boards

Whilst the prospects for the Novag board improve all the time, the DGT board remains almost unobtainable.

It is now supposed to be close to availability, but there is a rumour of a price increase to coincide with its arrival, since it is now being manufactured by a different company. I haven't got the new price details yet, sorry - but should know and could have some by the time SS readers get this Issue!

NEW SOFTWARE OUT

CS, TAL 2 for Windows by Oxford Softworks is now out. It is auto232 and Internet Chess Server compatible. Price £39.95.

DATES for your DIARY!

- On June 20, after the WCCC above, there will be a Man v Machine match between the FIRST 4 programs and GM's van Wely, Vaganian, Sokolov and Lutz. Time control will be 40/2 + 1 hour.
- Hiarc 7 v G.M Yermolinsky, June 1999 in the USA, 6 games @ tournament times... Hiarc again takes the 40/2 risk!
- The Frankfurt Masters, June 28 - July 2, includes Polgar, Adams, Morozevich, Topalow, Svidler and... Fritz!

In Dedication

Mike CUMMINGS sent me the following game, played by a close friend of his a couple of months before he died, aged 53. Mike says of Pete Salter, "His grade was around 1700 I think. He was a regular club player and a really nice man - a good friend. I would be grateful if you could include this game in your next Issue, and dedicate it to his wife Pam, children Paul and Clair, and grandson Peter."

Mike had hoped that Pete would be analysing the game for SS, but it was not to be, so I (Eric) have added a few notes.

Pete Salter - GK 2100

Opening: C05. Time 60/60
1.e4 e6 2.d4 d5 3.c2 d6 4.e5 dxe5 5.dxe5 c5
6.c3 cxd4 7.cxd4 c6 8.d3 d6 9.0-0-0 d7
9...wb6 has played in tournaments, and 9...f6! might be possible 10.d3 c7 11.d4 d4
12.d1 f6 13.a3 fxe5 14.fxe5 c6 15.d3

Now there's a mate threat involving bxh7
15...g5?? 15...g6 was correct 16.g4 dxe5
17.dxe5 dxe5 18.dxe5
Good enough to finish a well-played game, though there's a brief lapse on the way there 18...c5 19.dxe7+ 20.f6 20.d4??
What a pity, just when victory was in sight. 20.f6 secures the win 20...f6 21.h4 f6 22.Bab1 Bxb2??
22...d7 23.g5 dxe5 might have nearly held equality 23.h5?!
Harc's found a line for White leading to mate! 23.g5! dxe5 24.Bxe1 Bxb3 25.Bxe5 g4 26.Bxf5+ Bxe7 27.Bxe7+ Bxe7 28.Bxe5+ Bc6
32.Bxd6 b5 33.Bxb5 a4 34.Bxe4+ Bb7 35.Bd4+ Bc6 36.Bd8 c8= 23...Ba?? A disaster - now it does all slip away! Either 23...Bxe7 or 23...Bxb1
24.Bxb1 dxe7 is much better, possibly close to equal after 25.h6 d7 24.Bh6 dxe5?? Black needed 24...d7, but it still loses: 25.Bc5! b6
25.Bh8+ d7 26.Bxd8 Bb7 27.Bh7! It's over 27...Bd7 28.h8= 1-0
Judit POLGAR v FRITZ532

An 8 GAME EXHIBITION MATCH between JUDIT POLGAR and FRITZ532 took place in Hungary between April 27–30th. Two games were played each day, at G/30 mins.

FRITZ532 was on a Pentium2/350MHz with 64MB hash tables running. Both players are renowned attackers so some serious battles were on the menu. Nor were we to be disappointed! Most of the games lived up to expectations, full of complications – human judgment versus calculating power. Here are all of the games with light notes.

Polgar, J (2677) – Fritz 5.32
Game 1. B47 Sicilian Def. Paulsen
1.e4 c5 2.e3 e6 3.d4 exd4 4.Qxd4 Qc6
5.Nc3 a6 6.e2 Qc7 7.0-0 Qf6 8.Qh4 Qb4
9.f3
9.Qd3 is more popular. If the f-pawn is moved, it is usually by 9.f4?! then 9...Qxc3
10.bxc3 Qxe4 but the advantage is with Black.
9...0-0 10.Qg5 Qe7 11.Qxc6 dxc6 12.f4
Qd8 13.Qe1 h6 14.Qh4 b6 15.e5 Qd5
16.Qxe7 Qxe7 17.Qe4 Qb7 18.Qd6 Qf5
19.Qxf5 exf5

Game 1 is already heading for a draw.
20.Qd3 Qc8 21.Qe3 c5 22.Qad1 c4 23.Qe2
Qe6 24.Qf3 Qxf3 25.Qxf3 Qe8 26.Qd5 Qa4
27.Qd1 Qxd5 28.Qxd5 Qf8 29.e6 Qxe6
30.Qxe6+ Qh7 31.b3 cxb3 32.axb3 Qxf4
33.Qxb6 Qc8 34.Qxa6 Qxc2 35.Qd3 Qe4
36.Qxe4 fxe4 37.Qe1 Qg6 38.g4 Qb2
39.Qxe4 Qxb3 40.Qe5 Qb2 41.h3 Qd2 ½-½

Fritz 5.32 – Polgar, J (2677)
Game 2. B40 Sicilian (Fritz calls it French?)
1.e4 c5 2.Qf3 e6 3.Qe2 Qc6 4.g3 d6
5.Qg2 g6 6.d3 Qg7 7.0-0 Qge7 8.c3 0-0
9.a3 a5?! 9...b6 10.Qbd2 h6 is a book line, though it doesn't come with high credentials!
10.Qe1 a4 11.Qg5 f6 12.Qc1 f5 13.exf5
gx5 14.c4 e5 15.Qc3 Qh8 16.Qg5

16...Qe8?! 16...h6 is preferred, putting the question to the annoying Q.
17.Qd1 f4!
This follow-up to Judit's debatable 16th can't be criticised – it's a nice little pawn sac' that gives her some fine attacking initiative, which is her usual style.
18.Qf4 Qg4 19.h3
19.Qxa4? is a second pawn grab that is not to be recommended: 19...Qd4!
19...Qh5 20.Qe4 Qf5 21.Qg3 h6? A second sac' 21...Qxf3 22.Qxf3 and then 22...h6 would be the computer's way.
22.Qxh5 Qxh5 23.Qxe5 Qxd1 24.Qg6+
Qh7 25.Qxf8+ Qxf8 26.Qxd1 hxg5
27.Qxg5

We need the diagram to see the outcome of the exchanges and do a material count. In fact it comes out favouring White, as do the computer evaluations with those 3 kingside passed pawns. However Judit's extra piece will counteract all of this, as extra pieces tend to very often! Perhaps
the materialist computer programs slightly over-value pawns, to try and make sure they don't lose them?!

27...\texttt{g6} 28.f4 \texttt{axb2} 29.b1 \texttt{d4}+ 30.h1
30.sh2 \texttt{e3} 31.xe3 (31.xxb7? \texttt{xf4}+ 32.g1 \texttt{e5}+ 31.xe3=
30.xe3 31.xb7 \texttt{cd4} 32.xe3 \texttt{xe3}
33.e4+ \texttt{ef5} 34.g2 \texttt{f7} 35.xf7 \texttt{xf7}
36.xf5 \texttt{xf5} 37.g2 \texttt{g6} 38.f3 \texttt{d4}+
39.g4
39.g4 Perhaps Judit was running short of time, and didn't fancy trying the tempting
39..\texttt{c2}. However 40.f5+ \texttt{g7} 41.xh5
\texttt{xa3} 42.g6+ \texttt{g8} 43.f6 \texttt{xc4} 44.dxc4 a3
45.h6 still appears to be a draw. \(1/2-1/2\)

Fritz 1 Polgar 1

Polgar, J (2677) – Fritz 5.32
Game 3. B42 Sicilian Def. Paulsen

1.e4 c5 2.d3 d6 3.d4 cxd4 4.xd4 d5
5.ad3 e5 6.0-0 a6 7.c4 \texttt{e7} 8.d3 0-0
9.d3 \texttt{bd7} 10.b3
Judit tries something a little quieter than the standard, and committal book move, 10.f4.

10..\texttt{wc7} 11.cc1 b6 12.b4 \texttt{e5} 13.ae2 \texttt{b7}
14.e2 \texttt{ac8} 15.f4 \texttt{.fd8} 16.f1 \texttt{fd7}
17.e2 \texttt{f6} 18.h3 \texttt{c5} 19.b4 \texttt{cd7} 20.f4
\texttt{g6} 21.f5 \texttt{g8} 22.g4 h6! 23.h4

A dramatic effort by Polgar to break the deadlock after 2 draws. But Fritz is handling the defence very well.

23..\texttt{e5} 24.g5 \texttt{hxg5} 25.hxg5 \texttt{e8}
26.g2?! 26.e2 gives the piece more scope to get involved in the attack.
26..\texttt{xd4} 27.xd4 \texttt{exf5} 28.exf5
28..\texttt{d5} looks interesting. If 28..\texttt{xd5} 29.exd5 \texttt{e5} 30.xf5 \texttt{xc4} then I'm not sure who's winning!

28..\texttt{g2} 29.xg2 \texttt{b7}+ 30.d5 \texttt{xc4}
31.f3 \texttt{c8} 32.f1 b5 33.xc4 bxc4
34.xf4 \texttt{c6} 35.f3 \texttt{a4} 36.h1 \texttt{c2}+

36..\texttt{xa2}+ Why not? 37.g3 \texttt{d2} looks alright to me.
37..\texttt{g3} \texttt{e5} 38.h5 \texttt{d3}+ 39.e3 \texttt{eg6}
40.fxg6

Again Judit opts for an unbalanced position, hoping that Fritz will not understand which are the key squares and pieces.

40..\texttt{xe3}+ 41.xe3 \texttt{xe3}+ 42.xf3 \texttt{xg5}+
43.xg4 \texttt{xf4}+ 44.xg4 \texttt{xe6} 45..\texttt{f1}!
Judit finds the pawn that matters!

45..\texttt{e5}+ 46.f4 \texttt{d3}+ 47.e3 \texttt{xh4}
48.xd6 \texttt{xg6} 49.xa6
The game is now a draw barring blunders.

49..\texttt{b4} 50.a4 \texttt{d5}+ 51.d4 \texttt{f4}
52.xc4 f6 53.xe4 \texttt{e6} 54.d6 \texttt{f7}
55.xb6 g5 56.f5 \texttt{g7} 57.xg4 \texttt{g6}
58.a6 \texttt{f5} 59..\texttt{b6} \texttt{e3}+ 60.f3 \texttt{c4}
61.xb4 \texttt{e5}+ 62.g4 \texttt{f7} 63..\texttt{b6} \texttt{h6}
64.a6 \texttt{f5} 65..\texttt{b6} \texttt{h4} \(1/2-1/2\)

Fritz 1½ Polgar 1½

Fritz 5.32 – Polgar, J (2677)
Game 4. B40 Sicilian Scheveningen

1.e4 c5 2.d3 e6 3.d4 cxd4 4.xd4 \texttt{b6}
5.\(\mathcal{b}3\) 6.\(\mathcal{c}6\) 6.\(\mathcal{e}e3\) \(\mathcal{w}c7\) 7.\(\mathcal{d}d3\) \(\mathcal{f}f6\) 8.\(\mathcal{c}3\) a6 9.\(\mathcal{f}4\) b5 10.\(\mathcal{w}f3\) \(\mathcal{b}b7\) 11.0-0 d6 12.\(\mathcal{e}ae1\) \(\mathcal{e}e7\) 13.a3

\(\mathcal{w}g3\) is theory in the Fritz book, but it was using Nimzo’s book for this match, a neat idea as Judit has almost certainly prepared using FRITZ with its own book or the PowerBooks!

13...\(\mathcal{b}4\)

Polgar’s push on the queenside is probably ill-advised. If you look at the diagram after move 22 and not White’s excellent 23.c4! it is clear who benefits from this.

14.\(\mathcal{a}a4\) 0-0 15.\(\mathcal{b}b6\) \(\mathcal{w}d7\) 16.\(\mathcal{f}f2\) \(\mathcal{e}ad8\)

17.\(\mathcal{w}e2\) bxa3 18.bxa3 \(\mathcal{d}d4\) 19.\(\mathcal{a}x\mathcal{d}4\) \(\mathcal{w}xa4\)

20.\(\mathcal{b}b1\) \(\mathcal{a}8\) 21.\(\mathcal{b}b6\) \(\mathcal{w}xa3\) 22.\(\mathcal{b}xa6\)

22...\(\mathcal{w}b4\)

22...\(\mathcal{w}b2\) was probably best, to discour-age White’s strong centre-controlling thrust with his/its next.

23.c4! \(\mathcal{w}b7\)!

23...\(\mathcal{w}b8\) seems to be the only way for Judit to stay in the game here. 24.\(\mathcal{f}f1\) \(\mathcal{a}b7\) 25.\(\mathcal{b}b6\) \(\mathcal{x}c6\) 26.\(\mathcal{x}c6\) \(\mathcal{e}e8\) 27.\(\mathcal{b}b8\) \(\mathcal{b}a7\) 27.\(\mathcal{c}c7\).

23...\(\mathcal{b}b8\) is best according to J5, but then H7 says 24.\(\mathcal{c}c2\) and J5 suddenly agrees, dropping to –250! Strange.

24.\(\mathcal{f}a1\)

The threat of 25.\(\mathcal{a}a7\) is serious because Black’s 7 bishop is unprotected.

24...\(\mathcal{d}d7\)

24...\(\mathcal{d}d7\) to block the threatened attack on the bishop by interposing a knight on a protected square doesn’t help: 25.\(\mathcal{a}a7\)!

25.\(\mathcal{w}b8\) 26.\(\mathcal{w}a8\) \(\mathcal{w}xa8\) 27.\(\mathcal{w}xa8\) \(\mathcal{w}xa8\)

28.\(\mathcal{d}d1\)

25.\(\mathcal{a}e7\) \(\mathcal{w}e8\) 26.\(\mathcal{b}b5\) \(\mathcal{c}c6\) 27.\(\mathcal{c}c7\) \(\mathcal{w}d7\)

28.\(\mathcal{d}d5\) \(\mathcal{b}b7\)

28...\(\mathcal{e}xd5\) delays the end slightly: 29.\(\mathcal{e}xd7\) \(\mathcal{e}xd7\) 30.\(\mathcal{c}xd5\) \(\mathcal{e}a8\) 31.\(\mathcal{e}xa8\) \(\mathcal{w}xa8\) 32.\(\mathcal{d}d4\)

\(\mathcal{a}a4\) 33.\(\mathcal{w}b2\) \(\mathcal{h}h5\)

29.\(\mathcal{b}b1\) \(\mathcal{e}xd5\) 30.\(\mathcal{b}xb7\) \(\mathcal{d}xc4\) 31.\(\mathcal{x}c4\) 1-0

Polgar 1½ Fritz 2½

**Polgar (2677) – Fritz 5.32**

*Game 5. B48 Sicilian Def. Paulsen*

1.e4 c5 2.\(\mathcal{f}f3\) e6 3.d4 \(\mathcal{c}xd4\) 4.\(\mathcal{b}b5\) \(\mathcal{c}c6\)

5.\(\mathcal{c}c3\) a6 6.\(\mathcal{b}b3\) \(\mathcal{w}c7\) 7.\(\mathcal{w}d2\) \(\mathcal{f}f6\) 8.\(\mathcal{f}3\) \(\mathcal{e}5\)

9.0-0-0 \(\mathcal{b}b4\) 10.\(\mathcal{b}b3\) b5 11.\(\mathcal{d}d4\) h6 12.\(\mathcal{e}e1\)

12.a3 and 12.\(\mathcal{b}b1\) are in the Fritz book, though neither have the greatest of reputations!

12...\(\mathcal{c}c6\) 13.\(\mathcal{e}e3\) 0-0 14.\(\mathcal{g}g4\) \(\mathcal{e}e5\)

15.\(\mathcal{w}g3\)?

*Why not 15.\(\mathcal{b}b5\) axb5 16.\(\mathcal{w}xb4\) \(\mathcal{c}c3\) (or 16...\(\mathcal{b}b7\) 17.\(\mathcal{w}c5\) 17.\(\mathcal{g}g2\) \(\mathcal{h}xh2\) 18.\(\mathcal{e}e5\)

19.\(\mathcal{c}c3\) \(\mathcal{w}e5\) 19.\(\mathcal{w}xa8\) \(\mathcal{w}e3+\) 20.\(\mathcal{b}b1\) \(\mathcal{c}c4\) 21.\(\mathcal{w}xb5\)

15...\(\mathcal{c}c3\) 16.\(\mathcal{b}b3\) \(\mathcal{d}d5\) 17.\(\mathcal{g}g5\) \(\mathcal{h}xg5\)

18.\(\mathcal{g}g5\) \(\mathcal{c}c5\) 19.\(\mathcal{c}c3\) \(\mathcal{b}b7\)

20.\(\mathcal{w}h5??\)

*Oops. Black has a devastating reply for this, which decides the game immediately! Necessary was the clever 20.\(\mathcal{f}f4\) \(\mathcal{w}h3\) (20...\(\mathcal{w}f3\) also looks possible) 21.\(\mathcal{e}e3\)

\(\mathcal{g}g6\) 22.\(\mathcal{c}c4\) \(\mathcal{w}xf4\) 23.\(\mathcal{w}h1\) \(\mathcal{e}e5\) 24.\(\mathcal{c}c5\)

with fighting chances.*

20...\(\mathcal{w}xg8\) 21.\(\mathcal{c}c4\) \(\mathcal{w}xe3\) 22.\(\mathcal{c}c4\) \(\mathcal{w}xe4\)

23.\(\mathcal{w}g4\) f5 24.\(\mathcal{c}c4\) \(\mathcal{w}xg5\) 25.\(\mathcal{h}h1\) \(\mathcal{e}e2\)

26.\(\mathcal{b}b2\) \(\mathcal{f}f3\) 0-1

Polgar 1½ Fritz 3½

Two behind, with 3 to play, Judit now has major problems. She decides to jettison her
beloved Sicilian Defence and tries a Caro-Kann.

Fritz 5.32 – Polgar, J (2677)

1.e4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.\(\text{c}3\) dxe4 4.\(\text{dxe}4\) \(\text{\text{c}}\)6
5.\(\text{\text{f}}x\)6+ \(\text{gx}f6\) 6.\(\text{\text{f}}3\) \(\text{\text{f}}5\) 7.\(\text{\text{e}}2\) \(\text{\text{d}}7\) 8.c3
Another neat Nimzo book choice. 8.0-0 \(\text{e}6\) 9.c4 is the Fritz book line.
8...\(\text{\text{c}}7\) 9.\(\text{\text{e}}3\) \(\text{e}6\) 10.\(\text{\text{d}}2\) \(\text{\text{b}}6\) 11.\(\text{\text{g}}4\) \(\text{\text{g}}6\)
12.\(\text{h}4\) \(\text{h}6\) 13.\(\text{\text{b}}3\) \(\text{\text{d}}5\) 14.0-0-0 \(\text{a}5\) 15.\(\text{a}4\)
\(\text{\text{d}}6\) 16.\(\text{h}5\) \(\text{h}7\) 17.\(\text{\text{x}}h6\) \(\text{b}5\)

Thematic, with the makings of a useful pawn storm attack.
18.\(\text{\text{e}}6\) \(\text{\text{b}}8\) 19.\(\text{\text{a}}x\)b5 \(\text{a}4\) 20.\(\text{b}6\)
20...\(\text{\text{e}}x\)a4? would be a bad mistake here and later: 20...\(\text{\text{b}}6\) 21.\(\text{\text{d}}1\) \(\text{\text{a}}7\)!
20...\(\text{\text{b}}6\) 21.\(\text{\text{a}}2\) \(\text{\text{d}}5\) 22.\(\text{\text{h}}3\) \(\text{\text{d}}7\)!
23.\(\text{\text{c}}4\) \(\text{\text{f}}4\)+ 24.\(\text{\text{x}}f4\) \(\text{\text{xf}}4\)+ 25.\(\text{\text{d}}1\) \(\text{\text{e}}4\)
26.\(\text{\text{\text{d}}3}\) \(\text{\text{f}}4\)?
 Completely missing the Fritz reply! With 26...\(\text{\text{f}}4\) revealing the attack from h7 on \(\text{\text{d}}3\), Judit could have retained chances
27.\(\text{\text{\text{x}}a}4\)

The threat of a check on a7 is lethal.
27...\(\text{\text{b}}7\) 28.f3 \(\text{\text{d}}5\) 29.\(\text{\text{d}}2\) \(\text{\text{h}}8\) 30.\(\text{\text{a}}6\)
\(\text{\text{g}}2\) 31.\(\text{\text{g}}1\) \(\text{\text{f}}4\) 32.\(\text{\text{b}}4\) \(\text{\text{b}}5\) 33.\(\text{\text{a}}2\)

An excellent defensive sequence by Fritz, waiting for its own attacking chances.
33...\(\text{\text{g}}5\) 34.\(\text{\text{h}}1\) \(\text{\text{d}}5\) 35.\(\text{\text{a}}1\) \(\text{\text{\text{x}}b}4\)
36.\(\text{\text{e}}5\)+

36.\(\text{\text{x}}b4\) \(\text{\text{b}}4\) 37.\(\text{\text{b}}2\) is also ++ for White.
36...\(\text{\text{f}}x\)e5 37.\(\text{\text{a}}x\)b5 e4?
37...\(\text{\text{a}}x\)b5 38.\(\text{\text{x}}b4\) \(\text{\text{e}}3\) puts up a better fight.
38.\(\text{\text{e}}7\)+ \(\text{\text{c}}8\) 39.\(\text{\text{c}}x\)b4 \(\text{\text{b}}5\) 40.\(\text{\text{f}}x\)7
\(\text{\text{b}}4\) 41.\(\text{\text{a}}x\)e6+ \(\text{\text{c}}7\) 42.\(\text{\text{h}}3\) \(\text{e}3\) 43.\(\text{\text{x}}e\)3
\(\text{\text{d}}7\) 44.\(\text{d}5\) \(\text{c}5\) 45.\(\text{e}6\)+ \(\text{\text{d}}8\) 46.\(\text{f}6\)+ \(\text{d}7\)
47.\(\text{g}7\)+ \(\text{\text{d}}6\) 48.\(\text{h}6\)+ \(\text{\text{e}5}\) 49.\(\text{f}4\)+
announcing mate. 1-0

Judit takes charge again – you’ve got to admire her courage! This time the Fritz queen’s move against Polgar’s king proves indifferent as it finds itself on the wrong side of the board for the next action.
14...\(\text{\text{a}}4\)?? 15.\(\text{\text{b}}1\) \(\text{\text{d}}7\) 16.\(\text{\text{f}}3\) \(\text{\text{a}}\)6
17.\(\text{\text{f}}5\) \(\text{\text{c}}8\) 18.\(\text{\text{h}}4\) \(\text{\text{e}}8\) 19.\(\text{\text{h}}5\) \(\text{\text{d}}6\) 20.\(\text{\text{h}}6\) \(\text{g}6\)
21.\(\text{\text{e}}5\) \(\text{\text{g}}5\) 22.\(\text{\text{h}}2\) \(\text{\text{b}}6\) 23.\(\text{\text{d}}x\)d5 \(\text{\text{e}}x\)g4
The Fritz team resigned, expecting something nasty like 24...h6f1! 1-0

Polgar 2½ Fritz 4½

Fritz 5.32 - Polgar, J (2677)
Game 8. E97 Kings Indian Def. Classical

1.d4 ♖f6 2.c4 g6 3.♘c3 ♘g7 4.e4 d6
5.♗f3 0-0 6.♖e2 e5 7.0-0 ♘c6 8.d5 ♘e7
9.♗b5 ♘h5 10...♘eg8 is usual.
11.cxd6 cxd6 12.♕g5 ♘f4 13.♗xf4 exf4
14.♖c1 h6 15.♕f3 g5 16.♗b5 ♘g6 17.a4
g4 18.♕e1

As ♘g3 would have been White's best answer if 26...♘h4 had been played, the move is nothing like as dangerous now. 28.♗d4! ♘ag8 29.♕f5

29...♖g5 30.♖c7 ♘h5 31.♖xb7 ♘g4
32.♖xa7
Fritz is now 3 pawns ahead, so Judit HAS to find a way of breaking through with her attack if she is to avoid another defeat.
32...♗f6+ 33.♕g2
Saves the day!
33...♖h5 34.♖xg5 ♘xg5 35.♕g3 h5
36.♖xf7
The 4th pawn.
36...♖h4 37.♖xf5 ♘g6 38.♖f3 hxg3 39.♖xg3
♗g7 40.♖c2 ♘g8 41.♖c1
Now that both g1 and g2 are protected, the knight is genuinely under threat.
41...♖d3 42.♖e3 ♘c6 43.♖xd3
Fritz is now 5 pawns ahead!
43...♖c1+ 44.♖d1 ♘g4 45.♖f8+ ♘g7 46.♗f1
♘h3 47.♖f3 The material deficit is too much, so 1-0

Judit has yet another pawn storm attack on the Fritz king. How to proceed now?
18...f3?!
Sac' a pawn...the standard solution in this match. The first of a series of pawns Fritz is happy to accept!
19...♗xf3 gxh3 20.♖e1 ♘f4
22.♖h1!
Showing excellent awareness of the tactical possibilities and how they must be dealt with. A serious mistake here would be 22.♗d2?? thinking about driving the annoying knight away. Judit would defend with 22...♗h1 threatening ♕g6+ and adding more pressure than Fritz would ever be able to survive.
22...♕g4?!
Best was 22...♖xd7 23.♖h1 almost the only move. Now 23...♖g4 would leave Judit with good compensating chances for her pawn.
34.♖d2 ♘e5 24.♖e3 ♘g8 25.♖h1 ♘xf3+ 26.♖xf3 ♘g4?
It’s a little surprising that Judit didn’t try the dangerous-looking 26...♖h4 here, which would certainly (says he, wishing he could play chess half as well as Judit Polgar!) enable us to call the position ‘uncertain’. I’d expect 27.♖g3 ♘g5 28.♖xg5 ♘xg5
27.♘g3 ♘h4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fritz532</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>½ ½ ¼ ½ 1 1 0 1 ½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Judit Polgar | ½ ½ ½ 0 0 0 1 0 ½ |

It’s a very lop-sided final score in favour of FRITZ 532, and a result which implies a 2825 Elo rating for the PC program when playing at G/30. With REBEL 10’s win over Anand last year as further evidence, I believe that at BLITZ and ACTIVE time controls (i.e. from G/5 to G/30 inclusive) the top PC PROGRAMS are almost too strong for even the best HUMANS nowadays.

And, considering that FRITZ is a ‘fast program’ supposedly designed for play against computers, I think this excellent result opposes the view held by those who believe that strong v computers doesn’t mean strong v humans! Strong is strong!
CHESS in 2010
Excerpts from the REBEL HOMEPAGES

Introduction
This is a short recollection of a big (and quite technical) discussion that recently took place in a public chess forum on Internet which was started by REBEL's programmer Ed Schr-der.

Schr-der pointed out that making a chess program to perform better in the computer-computer area doesn't necessarily mean that the program automatically will play better against humans too.

As a matter of fact Schr-der believes there is even a great risk that the opposite might come true and that chess programs only become better in the computer-computer area but will lower in strength against humans.

Schr-der noticed that adding more tactical power to his chess program REBEL, this in return for taking out existing chess knowledge, made REBEL a stronger computer-computer player but also that REBEL's positional understanding lowered because of the lack of the chess knowledge that was removed.

This phenomenon is not new. Hans Berliner programmer of the famous HITECH program already pointed this out some 15 years ago. He more or less proved that chess knowledge (in computer-computer play) is only worth just one extra ply.

The BERLINER experiment
Berliner took the Hitech program, removed important chess knowledge but left the very basic chess knowledge and called this version Hi-tech_Low (HL) and his original version Hi-tech_High (HH).

Then computer-computer matches were played with HL and HH at several ply-depths.

It showed up that HL (8-ply) lost from HH (8-ply) because HH was a much more intelligent program than HL, but that HL (9-ply) vs HH (8-ply) was already about equal and that HH (8-ply) was crushed when it played HL (10-ply)!

The conclusion more or less was: (extra) chess knowledge is just worth one ply in the computer-computer area. The advantage of HH having much more chess knowledge than HL wasn't enough to survive against a program with only the very basic chess knowledge searching 1-1½ ply deeper.

Recent Computer Chess developments
Especially the last years ideas based on the BERLINER experiment have been practiced in chess programs with extremely good results in the computer-computer area. Chess programmers discovered that by a new approach that looks illogical at first sight their programs became a lot stronger in the computer-computer area.

Computer chess development of the last years:
- Make the program as fast as possible.
- Even remove existing chess knowledge to ensure a fast chess program.
- Add lots of tactics to out-search the opponent.
- Add only the very basic chess knowledge (Berliner concept)
- Make the program aggressive to ensure tactics in games.

Schr-der about this new trend
It's my opinion it all seems to work in the comp-comp area.

Now for comp-comp lovers this is great news but what about the people who use a chess program for analysis, study and playing games?

Recently I released REBEL 10C as an engine update for Rebel 10.

In 10c I removed some chess knowledge - this Rebel 30% faster.

Next this 30% speed gain was used to add new tactics. As a result 10c is now a better comp-comp player but a lower positional player than the original Rebel10. [Note by Eric: the 'UPGRADE' style is an OPTION, you can still play/analyse etc. with the 'proper' REBEL10 version if you wish!].

This is actually what is happening the last years and I want to report it in all its details in the hope it will be understood.

There are advantages and disadvantages. The advantages are for the comp-comp lovers. The disadvantages are for people who use a chess
program for analysis, study and playing games as the positional understanding of chess programs will drop and no progress is made.

My personal opinion is that the disadvantages are bigger than the advantages because the vast majority of people that use a chess program use it for playing games, analysis and study.

It's my hope the computer chess press will pick up the subject, explain and judge.

Other expert opinions

Several other colleagues of Schr+der joined the discussion and gave their opinion.

ROBERT HYATT, programmer of Cray Blitz and Crafty: There is an alternative. Do as I try to do... ignore computer vs computer games unless you see something you are consistently doing wrong in those games.

I'm not hung up on trying to beat every program by being as fast as possible. I have gotten slower the past 3 years, not faster, and I think that direction is perfectly ok. I've said before that far too much attention and emphasis has been placed on SSDF results, which has led to today's situation.

I think it much more interesting to continue what I've been doing for along time: trying to find ways to make these 'anti-computer' strategies backfire. Because once you learn how to break anti-computer you also learn how to play it. And there would be nothing to prevent you from using that against other computers, of course. :)

BRUCE MORELAND, programmer of Ferret: Responding to Ed's original post I have considered these issues carefully. My own goal is to create something that is interesting and strong, and I'm not going to gut my program's style just to get an extra quarter ply to use against computers.

I think that in the long term a good eval function is necessary to avoid catastrophic mis-evaluation of crucial features, against both humans and computers.

I avoid things like the Swedish list, in part because they've never invited me to send a version, and in part because I don't want to get sucked into that whole core-wars deal. I would much rather be ranked on the FIDE list, which is where every player really belongs.

In Paderborn, assuming I am selected to go, I will be competing with something that will also play, with no modifications, against the humans on ICC, which is how I've always done it.

CHRIS WHITTINGTON, programmer of Chess System Tal: If you're a slow (knowledge) program, you can beat a fast one by having essential chess knowledge. You maybe find some theme or weakness or king attack or whatever, go for it, sit on it, exploit it and maybe get a win from it.

Also, you can find this stuff, but not be able to convert it! If you're a slow program, and you get into a game where these exploitation possibilities don't exist for some reason, then, effectively, the game turns into slow bean-counter against fast bean-counter, with the inevitable conclusion.

We all see these games, in fact you don't need my program to show them, because they happen all the time in comp-comp. These game types are the norm for bean vs bean.

Take a scenario. Your program now, Ferret, against your program 4 years ago. Or even your program now against your own program on slow hardware.

Result inevitable? Probably. Game style and type? Probably predictable like so:

- Ferret(fast) will have 1,2,3,4 nominal plies on Ferret(slow). Game style and type will be strongly dependant on the nominal ply gap.
  a) High gap. Ferret(slow) will likely go down into rapid material collapse. Ferret(fast) may even have some flashy pyrotechnics to demonstrate it. A naive reviewer could call Ferret(fast) a spectacular attacking program. He could call Ferret(slow) a stupid bean-counter, typical computer.
  b) Medium gap. Ferret(fast) will slowly grind Ferret(slow) down. Ferret(slow) will keep finding at its higher iterations, possible loss of material. It will go to panic time, find a way to avoid material loss by giving double pawns instead, or whatever. A naive reviewer will call Ferret(fast) a great positional player. He'll call Ferret(slow) dumb, accuse it of not having simple knowledge like double pawns, or whatever.
  c) Small gap. Probably you'll get reasonable games. The reviewer can't tell much, so he'll likely start making things up. "Human style", or "plays more interesting", or some other nonsense that says nothing.

What I'm trying to say to you, is that Ferret is none of these things. It has none of these 'naive reviewer properties'. The properties are all emergent from the search gap, and therefore depend on the opponent. It knows everything and nothing, all at the same time. Which is why Genius was thought to be the greatest thing, and now
you all think it is boring. It isn't either, or its both. Schrodinger's cat.

Which is why programs seem to keep making progress on the SSDF list. And why reviewers, either dumb, or with axes to grind, wax lyrical about the latest programs.

It's the search gap. Gettit? Out of this search gap comes all the naive speculation and nonsense that gets written. The program has every style and no style, it has no consistency to play against, only materialism, you can't learn from it, tomorrow it will be different - found another mine in the search gap - only the difference is just a rejection of whoops, trod on another mine. What can you do with such a program? Use the take-back key and try again? - and imagine
this helps you improve or learn?

Now, I claim this search gap has no meaning or understanding possibilities for a human. That a human can't relate his heuristics to it. That you can't extract the knowledge out of it and represent it to a human. That you can't even extract the knowledge out of it and represent it to yourself. You can't get heuristics from it. So I call it counting beans - useless for us humans.

Now, take a knowledge program, you can play it and see the play style. You can try and work out what it does and why. There'll be a reason, based on human chess heuristics. The game has plan, and flow, and doesn't consist of hidden minefields. It won't grind you down by search, it will try speculative ideas which it might, or might not, be able to get to work. You can see the speculative ideas, and try them yourself.

I think you can, as a human, relate to this type of program. If you know the programmer, maybe you can see patterns into the program that come from him, and so on. I think these types of programs are infused with some force, in so far as any chunk of silicon can be.

I hate materialists.

In response BRUCE MORELAND wrote again: This is an extremely substantial post. I think this accurately describes what happens when you have a hardware advantage against someone else. Dubious positional choices will be backed up by tactics, and you'll have a better chance than usual of forcing real positional advantages and cashing them in. The opponent looks correspondingly bad, but there will be little that they can do about it.

I think that most of this post has to do with the goals programmers choose for themselves, how they measure progress toward these goals, and how other people measure progress toward goals that they set for the programmers.

I have my own opinions about these issues and obviously you do too.

ED SCHREDEr, in response to the Chris Whittington posting: Right, Chris' posting should be framed in gold and re-read again by everybody who is interested in the topic and did not get the point immediately.

REBEL policy

As a result of the above Rebel company feels that something needs to be done for the future to ensure progress in both areas (Man vs Machine and Computer vs Computer).

To reach that goal CHESS TIGER programmer Christophe ThUron from now on will only focus on computer-computer programming and make his program (if possible) the best computer fighter around.

Although in a minority, many people are in love with computer vs computer play, and we want to keep serving them.

REBEL programmer Ed Schr-der will concentrate to make his chess program an even better positional and human-like chess player and make REBEL an even more attractive and configurable chess engine.

Doing so we believe we can serve the chess community best as progress is guaranteed in both areas.

Opinion poll

In the poll now on REBEL's HomePages, a large 75% majority declared a greater interest in performance against humans than computers.

Also a big majority of 67% believe that a Computer's FIDE rating would be likely to be more than 50 Elo different to its Selective Search or SSDF rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Votes for Top Program:</th>
<th>v HUMAN</th>
<th>v COMPUTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebel 10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiarcis 7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz 532</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChessMaster 6000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Chess Pro 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafty 16.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genius 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chess Tiger</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McLANE's 'TOP 16' CHRISTMAS TOURNY
Round 14 Update - LATEST SCORES & GAMES

This was the situation, as reported in Selective Search 81, up to and including round 11:

McLANE's CHRISTMAS TOURNY
40/2. PC's: 2 x AMD K6/200MHz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Rnd.7</th>
<th>Rnd.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hiarc 7</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rebel 10b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chess Tiger 11.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shredder 3</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CS_Tal Win95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fritz 532</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nimzo 98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Genius 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Junior 5</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Zarkov 5</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gandalf 3</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M Chess Pro 8</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The King 2.55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Crafty 16.3</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>W Chess 2000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Diep 1.6</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McLANE (Thorsten Czub) reports all of his results on the Internet, in rgece.
He makes some interesting remarks about his Tournament, which is an All-PLAY-ALL; therefore 15 rounds and nearly over!

- Why am I doing this Tournament?
  Because it is fun. I like to test all new programs and know what they do. Also see how they compete against each other, because I learn about the programs while watching their games live.
- Why do I allow the programs to be updated? Because I am not interested in testing and learning about old versions, I want to know about the new ones.
- Why tournament time control 40/2hrs? Because I want to enjoy the games, and when I watch them playing at 60/60 or even faster, the time for analysing their main lines and intentions is not enjoyable enough. Blitz games are even less enjoyable.

So, since the report in SS81, Hiarc 7 has been upgraded to 7.1, Rebel 10b has been upgraded to 10c (Tiger mode), Chess Tiger 11.7 is now 11.8, and The King 2.55 has been changed for de Koning's latest in its ChessMaster 6000 form.

Hiarc 7.1 has continued its winning ways unabated, opening the gap to such a degree that it now cannot be beaten.
Rebel 10c has run into a drawing sequence since the Tiger mode was adopted. The 63 move½ against Crafty must have been a particular annoyance.
Rebel's draws have enabled Chess Tiger 11.8 to catch it in second place, this despite a defeat against ChessMaster 6000 whose 2/3 since our last report has moved it up the Table slightly.
Shredder 3 has had a less happy time with 1/3, including a draw v Gandalf.
Fritz532 has improved its position with 2 draws and a good win over Junior 5, but M Chess Pro 8's unhappy time continues. After coming 2= with Junior5, behind Hiarc 7.1 in the Iraozqui Tournament (see SS81, page 3), it's results in Sweden especially have caused it to tumble down both the SSDF and SS ratings. It's 48 move loss to Zarkov 5 is shown below.

Let's have a small GAMES SELECTION, before the updated TABLE.

K6/200 40/120
Round 14

White DIEP winboard

Black Hiarc 7.01
Black ChessTal II


White ChessMaster6000

1.e4 e5 2.d3 d5 3.exd5 cxd5 4.Qf4 Qf5 5.Qg3 Qg6 6.Qf3 Qd7 7.Qd3 cxd3 8.Qxd3 e6 9.Qf4 c5+ 10.Qc3 Qf7 11.Qe3 Qe7 12.Qe2 Qd8 13.O-O Qg6 14.Qc3 Qe7 15.Qd4 Qf6 16.Qe5 Qxe5 17.Qxe5 Qf7 18.Qh5 Qh5 19.Qh5 Qh5 20.O-O Qf4 21.Qe4 Qd5 22.Qf1 Qf8 23.Qc3 Qc8 24.a4 Qf5 25.Qc2 Qed8 26.Qa2 Qd4 27.Qc4 a5 28.b5 Qd5 29.Qe1 Qb6 30.Qg3 Qf4 31.Qc2 Qf6 32.Qc6 Qg4 33.Qd2 Qg5 34.Qxf4 Qxf4 35.Qg3 Qd5 36.Qf4 Qh5 37.Qc6 Qe8 38.Qf2 Qg4 39.Qe5 f6 40.Qe1 h5 41.Qc1 h4 42.Qe2 Qxe2 43.Qxe2 Qf7 44.Qg2 Qg8 45.Qf3 hgx3 46.Qxg3 Qg5 47.Qce1 Qg1 48.Qg4 Qxe8 49.Qe2 Qh8 50.Qg1 Qd2+ 51.Qg3 Qe8 52.Qd8+ Qf7 53.Qc6+ Qd6 54.Qf2 Qh4 55.Qg2 Qe3+ 56.Qf3 Qf5 57.Qxh3 Qxh3+ 58.Qxe2 Qc3 59.Qd2 Qa3 60.Qc1 c3 61.Qe2 Qxa4 62.Qe2 Qa2+ 63.Qd3 Qxe2 64.Qxe2 Qd5 65.Qd3 0-1
White Zarkov 5.01

Black Mchess Pro8

1.e4 c5 2.d3f3 e6 3.b3 d5f6 4.e5 d5 5.d3 c4 e7 6.O-O 0-0 7.d2 b6
8.d3 c3 c3 x c3 9.d5 x c3 10.e2 d7 11.d3 f5 12.a6 a6 x a6
13.dxa6 d4 14.dxb4 cxb4 15.ac1 c8 16.d8 x a7 a8 17.d7 b7 b3 x a2 18.c3 d3 19.c x b4 b x b4 20.d4 d x b4
21.dfd1 d e8 22.c7 d a3 23.x d7 d x b7 24.d x b7 d e8 25.d x a1 d b2
26.d5 d b5 27.d c2 d b1+ 28.e2 b5 29.e6 x d6 d x f8 32.d d x d 33.d b x d 34.a d7 g5 35.x x d3 x f2 36.x d4 x e7
37.x x g8 38.x x e7 x e7 39.x x e7 x x g 40.x x g7+ h x h8 41.x x g5 x x g5
42.d x g5 x g7 43.d x e6+ x f7 44.x d4 x g6 45.x c4 f4 46.d x b4 x f7 47.x c5
f3 48.x f3 1-0

McLANE's CHRISTMAS TOURNY
40/2.PC's: 2 x AMD K6/200MHz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Rnd.7</th>
<th>Rnd.11</th>
<th>Rnd.14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hiarcs 7</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>8½</td>
<td>11½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rebel 10c</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chess Tiger 11.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>9½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fritz 532</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shredder 3</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS_Tal Win95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior 5</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nimzo 98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genius 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zarkov 5</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ChessMister 6000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gandalf 3</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W Chess 2000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M Chess Pro 8</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Crafty 16.3</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Diep 1.6</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the final round Nimzo 98 Paderborn
has been updated into Nimzo 2000,
the new engine of Chrilly Donninger.

Thorsten says: 'After reading an article of
Marcus Kaestner in Europa-Rochade, THE
German (computer)-chess-magazine
I have come to the conclusion that

a) I was right not to use
Nimzo99-engines (because Markus also
has the opinion that versions since
Nimzo98 paderborn were not as strong.

b) now to use Nimzo 2000, because it
seems drastically stronger - as Markus
reports about.'

And here are the pairings for round 15:

- HIARC5.1 v WCHESS 2000
- REBEL 10C v DIEP WB-PADERBORN
- GANDALF3 v CHESS TIGER 11.8
- FRITZ 5.32 v ZARKOV5.01
- JUNIORS JUN.CTG v NIMZO 2000
- CHESSMASTER 6000 v CSTAL WIN95
- GENIUS6 v SHREDDER3
- MCHESS PRO8 v CRAFTY 16.3

Final result and report in SS83.
The HUMAN side of FRITZ?!

**well, allegedly!**

If it's true - and the likelihood seems quite strong to me - then events at the BOBLINGER OPEN are just about the most remarkable ever presented in nearly 15 years of Selective Search.

At the centre of the astonishing accusations made by various national newspapers in Germany, and recently examined by Frederic Friedel in ChessBase Magazine 68, is one Clemens Allwermann.

**An AMAZING TOURNAMENT SUCCESS**

Allwermann is a 55 year old German, who has had a stable rating of around 1900 for the past 20 years. He is ranked number 10,000 or so in Germany - incidentally that figure '10,000' reminds us of the enormous success and popularity of chess in the nation - and Allwermann was seeded at 144 when he boldly entered the Boblinger alongside a small group of GMs and a bigger one of IMs.

In such an Event you'd have to class him as 'an unknown'. Not any more!

Allwermann's amazing achievement at Boblinger was to score 7½/9 (6 wins, 3 draws and no losses) thus winning outright with a performance rating of 2630. This would immediately elevate him to be Germany's no.2, behind Arthur Yusupov!

**HEADLINES in GERMANY**

The initial reward was front page news about chess in the German dailies, with the German equivalents of words like 'sensational' and 'astounding' everywhere.

But not for long - the accusations soon followed close behind as rumours grew that Allwermann had used some sort of outside help!

The fact that the incident is being reported here in Selective Search will no doubt alert my readers immediately to the type of 'help' being talked about!

'Was a pocket Deep Blue used for brain-doping?' asked one paper, whilst other remarks were more sarcastic and cutting. No one would believe that this 55 year old amateur could have done it all on his own.

Indeed the Tournament director Lorenz Skribanek was confronted by other sceptical players as the event had drawn to a close, but Allwermann had explained that some special opening preparation and a run of luck in some games had enabled him to play the Tournament of a lifetime. "It is because of my careful preparation, especially in the Sveshnikov - I now have a good knowledge of this variation, which I was able to use to defeat GM Kalinitschev in the last round."

In fact it was the end of this very game, in the final round, which actually convinced almost everyone that Allwermann's success was indeed due to outside help.

Here it is - see what you think!

White: Allwermann, C (1900)
Black: Kalinitschev, S (IM) (2505)
Boblinger Open (round 9), 1999

1.e4 c5 2.d3 c6 3.d4 cxd4 4.cxd4 e5
5.c5 b6 6.d4 f6 7.e2 a6 8.d5 c3 e6
9.0-0 d5 10.e3 0-0 11.a3 e7 12.b3 d7 13.d2
14.c4 15.d5 16.exd5 exd5 17.xf3 xf3 18.xf3 19.xf3
27.xf3

A position in which tactical possibilities visibly abound. Note especially that White is threatening to...
take deadly control of the \( f \)-file.

27...\( \text{Qg5?} \)

27...\( \text{Baf8} \) was fine. On my machine \( F5 \) would show a mere +22 for White if this had been played.

28.\( \text{Qxg5} \)

And now \( F5 \) has +300!

28...\( \text{Qxg5} \) 29.\( \text{Wf2!} \)

This move could not be played while the Black \( Q \) was on h4 of course.

29.\( \text{Bxc2} \) 30.\( \text{Bxf7} \) 31.\( \text{f6} \)

We move over to Wijk aan Zee where the big Hoogovens Tournament was taking place a week later. There ChessBase's Frederic Friedel was showing these games to some of the top GM's, to see what they made of them. Various simple ways for White to win from this position were proposed:

31.\( \text{Bxb7} \), or 31.\( \text{Bd7} \), or even 31.\( \text{Bxf6} \).

31.\( \text{Ba7} \)

"Fritzy" squealed Anand as he went into uncontrollable fits of laughter on seeing this.

If you check Fritz5 on multiple variation mode, you will find that \( \text{Bd7} \) is second, evaluated a mere tenth of a pawn behind. But \( \text{Bd7} \) and the other GM recommendations give White sure and steady winning routes which can hardly fail. The Fritz choice walks a tightrope. Few, if any, humans would be likely to go in for such risks and complications, in the last round, with the Tournament title at stake, and an easy win there for the taking.

31...\( \text{Bc6} \) 32.\( \text{Bxb7} \) \( \text{Se4} \)

Threatening mate on g2. White only has one move...

33.\( \text{Bf4} \) 34.\( \text{Bd7}! \) 35.\( \text{Bxe5} \) 35.\( \text{Bh1} \) g5

36.\( \text{Bh3} \)

On my machine \( F5 \) takes 3m13 to find this, running under ChessBase. Earlier it had \( \text{Bh5} \) (the move most humans would

play – safe square and attacks a piece), as well as \( \text{Bd5} \) for a while.

36...g4 37.\( \text{Bf2} \) \( \text{Bf5} \)

Look at this and consider what you would play!

You'd move your queen out of the way, right? Certainly. Well... unless your name is Allwermann, or a computer named Fritz perhaps. They'd play...

38.\( \text{Bxg4} \)

With the time control 2 moves away our 1900 Elo hero escalates again the growing tension against his IM opponent. "Nerves of steel – or silicon?" was Friedel's remark against this move.

38...\( \text{Bxe4?} \)

38...\( \text{Bxd7} \) 39.\( \text{Bxe5} \) \( \text{Bxe5} \) 40.\( \text{Bxd7} \)

would also win for White, though less quickly if the IM wanted to test his, errr, 'amateur' opponent's endgame skills!

39.\( \text{Bxf6} \) \( \text{Bxg2+} \) 40.\( \text{Bxe2} \) \( \text{Be4}+ \) 41.\( \text{Bh3} \)

Here Kalinitschev resigned. While they were shaking hands Allwermann couldn't resist mentioning that it was mate in 8!

It was one step too far!

"I don't think so," said the IM.

"Check it out, you'll find I'm right," replied Allwermann with a smile.

Nobody else could see it!

So the experienced Bundesliga player Hajo Vatter booted up Fritz5 on his PC, no doubt half-hoping to wipe the smirk off Allwermann's face.

Unfortunately Fritz agreed with him - from cold on a P2/400 it shows White has mate in 8 at move 42 after 74 secs and searching 33,117,000 moves. With hash tables running leading up to the move, the time could be less.
The finish according to Fritz5: 41...\texttt{We}8 42.\texttt{Wg}7 \texttt{Wc}4 43.\texttt{Wh}8 \texttt{Wd}3+ 44.\texttt{Wg}4 \texttt{Wg}6 45.\texttt{Wxg}6+ \texttt{Wxg}6 46.\texttt{Wxd}6 \texttt{Wxg}4+ 47.\texttt{Wxg}4 \texttt{Wh}5+ 48.\texttt{Wh}4 \texttt{Wg}7 49.\texttt{We}7+ \texttt{Wg}6 50.\texttt{Wf}6#.

It didn't take long for other players to set to work and discover that, at tournament time controls, Fritz played the vast majority of all Allwermann's moves in both this and his other games.

Hartmut Metz in particular revealed all of this in Schachmagazin 64 in which he revealed many examples which were then also published in the newspapers. His examples showed how the 1900 Elo Allwermann's often brilliant tactical shots, with which he had stumped many opponents round after round, were all the choice of Fritz5 as well... as were Allwermann's occasional lapses into strange and anti-positional moves!

A WORD from the ACCUSED!

Of course Allwermann has sought to defend himself with more explanations than 'the Sveshnikov Opening' and 'a bit of luck'.

Before we look at another game - and the particular position which Allwermann uses to protest his innocence - I must make it clear that, at this stage, no-one has proved that Allwermann did use a link to Fritz5, nor (if he did) can it be shown exactly how he did it.

But there are some suggestions as to how it might be possible, and we will look at these briefly after this game.

Allwermann says of it: 'The second game I played should be of interest to an objective reader. Anyone can see that a computer program would have easily won this game.'

That might be so, but I think there is another explanation for what happened at move 34, one which actually serves to almost prove his guilt.

Again, see what you think!

White: Giacopelli, V (2145)
Black: Allwermann, C (1900)
[A46]
Boblinger Open (round 2), 1999
1.d4 \texttt{Qf}6 2.\texttt{Qf}3 e6 3.\texttt{Qg}5 c5 4.e3 \texttt{h}6

5.\texttt{x}f6 \texttt{x}f6 6.\texttt{Qd}2 \texttt{ex}d4 7.\texttt{ex}d4 \texttt{Qc}6
8.c3 d5 9.\texttt{Qd}3 \texttt{Qd}6 10.0-0 0-0 11.\texttt{Be}1 \texttt{Qd}7
12.\texttt{Qf}1 \texttt{Qc}8 13.\texttt{Qe}3 a6 14.\texttt{Qg}4 \texttt{Qf}4 15.\texttt{Qh}3
\texttt{Qc}7 16.g3 \texttt{Qd}6 17.\texttt{Qd}2 \texttt{Qe}7 18.\texttt{Qh}4 \texttt{Qh}5
19.\texttt{Qc}2 \texttt{Qg}5 20.\texttt{Qe}5 \texttt{Qe}8 21.\texttt{Qd}3 g6 22.g4?
\texttt{f}6! 23.\texttt{Qe}3 \texttt{hx}g4 24.\texttt{hx}g4 \texttt{Qf}7?! 25.\texttt{Qe}3
\texttt{Qg}5 26.\texttt{Qg}2?

26.\texttt{Qd}3 threatening mate on \texttt{h}7 would certainly have given White equal chances after 26...\texttt{f}5 (26...\texttt{Qd}8?? 27.\texttt{Qh}6+ \texttt{Qf}8
28.\texttt{Qh}6+ \texttt{Qe}8 29.\texttt{Qx}f6++) 27.\texttt{Qg}2
26...\texttt{Qg}7 27.\texttt{Qf}1 \texttt{Qh}8! 28.\texttt{Qe}2 \texttt{Qh}6
29.\texttt{Qd}2 \texttt{Qg}6 30.\texttt{Qx}g6? \texttt{Qx}g6 31.\texttt{Qb}3 \texttt{Qh}3
32.\texttt{Qe}2??

32.\texttt{Qh}1 was needed.

32...\texttt{Qc}8

According to Hiarcs732...\texttt{Qe}4 is even more deadly! So I checked this on my Fritz532 and found it would have played \texttt{Qe}4 as well?!

33.\texttt{Qg}1 \texttt{Qe}4 34.\texttt{Qf}1

34...\texttt{Qx}g2??

What's this – he's moved a bishop allright, but the wrong one!

Of course with 34...\texttt{Qh}2 Black is winning easily: +406 according to Fritz with the fairly obvious continuation 35.f3
(or 35.\texttt{Qf}1 \texttt{Qx}c3 36.\texttt{Qxc}3 \texttt{Qc}8+ 37.\texttt{Qd}2
\texttt{Qx}d4+ Black +622) 35...\texttt{Qx}g1 36.\texttt{fx}e4
\texttt{Qx}c3 37.\texttt{Qe}2 \texttt{Qxd}4.

35.\texttt{Qx}g2 \texttt{Qh}2

The Fritz evaluation shows Black still at +80, but Allwermann agreed the draw here. ¥½

Two conflicting pieces of evidence emerge from this game: one says Allwermann's play was genuine, the other says it wasn't! 1. My Fritz5 doesn't want to play Black's 32nd.

2. Allwermann resigned early! Why? It could be that he had suddenly realised that his board position after 34...\texttt{Bx}g2 was not the same as that showing on
Fritz 5's board, after its intended 34...Bh2! Leaving Allwermann to finish the game on his own!

How could Allwermann make such a mistake with the bishop move?

Here is a possible explanation:

**HOW are MOVES TRANSMITTED?**

Is computer assistance for players in tournaments and matches really a present possibility and danger? Consider the following:

- Modern 'spy shops' today have electronic devices that are so small that even a body search can hardly reveal them.
- An acoustic receiver does not need to be worn in the ear - moves do not need to be announced 'in English' to be understood, but can be transmitted by pulses.
- A tiny receiver which emits pulses could be worn inside a shoe, under an armpit, or in other places.
- Moves can be transmitted as a sort of morse code, just following algebraic notation. a is dit, b is dit dit, c is dit dit dit, etc. Again 1 is dit, 2 is dit dit, etc. You could easily use the same for pieces: king is dit, queen dit dit, rook dit dit dit, bishop dit dit dit dit, etc. So Bh2 at move 34 in the game we've just seen is: dit dit dit dit - dit dit dit dit dit dit - dit dit. It would not be hard to imagine Allwermann, still getting used to the system in round 2 and with one bishop able to go g2 and the other to h2, either miscounting the 8 dits as 7 dits, or simply just 'assuming' Bxg2 himself.
- Oh, yes - Allwermann used to run a store selling electronic equipment!

Despite the above thoughts showing how information could easily have been transmitted by a pulse device, my guess is that it was, if it's all true, a verbal/visual transmission. Although the pulse method would certainly explain the mistake in game 2, it isn't so easy to work out how Allwermann knew about the mate in 8 in game 9!

The Tournament director remembers that the bespectacled and long-haired Allwermann, in a playing hall with a constant temperature of 32° centigrade, always appeared in a dark blazer and tie. Places to hide receivers, microphones and even a miniature camera abounded.

On the other hand, of course, if it was done verbally/visually, it is not so easy to explain the 'Bxg2/Bh2' mistake in game 2!

Because of these slight inconsistencies, just a little doubt remains in my mind.

Nevertheless the most positive evidence is the almost constantly repeated 'same move frequency' which is seen when comparing Allwermann's moves alongside Fritz 5's analysis. This remains the single biggest indication that it is all true!

**A RATING for FRITZ?!**

In conclusion, and strangely perhaps, we may have at last obtained a genuine Tournament Grading for Fritz 5! At a time when FIDE and almost all Tournament organisations have virtually closed the door to any form of computer participation - which is making it really hard to establish legitimate computer gradings anymore - maybe we have a genuine 2630 figure for Fritz 5?!

What a shame that Allwermann couldn't just admit that he had outside assistance at Boblingen - if indeed this was the case. He could have owned up that he had really just set out to demonstrate clearly this important development in chess today, that the best computer programs on fast PCs really can now achieve, at the very least, a comfortable IM stature.

Also, if indeed the 2630 grading belongs genuinely to Fritz, then it suggests my view - that computer-computer and computer-human gradings are not all that far removed from each other - might be correct!

Perhaps we'll know more next time Allwermann plays in a Tournament - will the Sveshnikov and the luck still be with him?!

Fuller details of the 'Allwermann-Fritz hoax' come with ChessBase Magazine 68 and the accompanying CD, which also contains all the games. Excellent value at £21.95, the CD is packed with Games, Reports and up-to-date News etc. It includes a 'Reader' so that no other software is required to run it!
Avoiding TACTICS v Computers

When Eric published my last piece, in issue 79, he quoted my offhand remark that 'top GMs are going astray against computer programs because they assume too readily that they cannot take them on tactically.'

I thought I had better try to write something to justify that, so here it is! I hope that it has something worthwhile to say............................................ Bill Reid

Anand v. Rebel

Was he right to avoid tactics?

REBEL 10's defeat of Anand (reported in Selective Search 78) was quite an upset. Anand's grade at the time was 2795 - much higher than ever been claimed for a computer program - and most of the experts were looking for an Anand win, probably by about 5-3. So what went wrong?

Clearly, when Anand was confronted by the program he modified his style of play. Whereas against a human opponent he would probably of gone for positions where tactical possibilities were likely to open up, confident that he could handle them to his advantage, when faced with an 'all-seeing' tactical machine he tended to 'play safe'.

In game 2 for example, after 1.d4 d5 2.c4 f6 3.g3 g6 4.h3 g4 5.g2 g7 6.0-0 0-0 - already a quiet opening - Anand chose the cautious 6.b3 and after 6...e5 followed up with the ultra cautious 7...b2. He maintained apparent equality for a while but, when things began to happen around move 25, it was his game that collapsed in a matter of 4 moves. So was his approach justified?

My contention is that it was not. I have argued elsewhere (SS 79, Dec. 1998) that computer programs generally treat any position with which they are confronted as presenting purely a tactical problem. Consequently there was no way that we can steer them away from tactics and into some other kind of game. The way to score points is not to run away from tactics, but to confront them! This sounds like a recipe for suicide. Surely the human brain can never match the computational power of a computer program, and isn't tactics all about computation? Well, actually, no!

Consider these 15 minute games.

Game 1

Rebel8 – NN (grade about BCF 150)
[E97] G/15

1.d4 f6 2.c4 g6 3...c3 g7 4.e4 d6
5...f3 0-0 6.e2 e5 7.0-0 e6 8.d5 e7
9.b4 d8

This puts Rebel8 out of book.

10...g5

10...d2 or 10.c5 is usual

10...h6 11...e3 f5 12...b1 f4

Black is looking for tactical opportunities, but the computational phase is well into the future. The idea is to concede a big queen's side advantage, while preparing an assault on the king's side. The tactical consideration is that, when the showdown comes, Black will be facing threats to pawns and pieces, but it will be White's king that is in the firing line!

13...d2 g5 14...c5 a6

The queen's side does need a little attention. The early arrival of a piece on b5 could mess things up

15...e1 d6 16.h5 f7 17.d3 d6
18...e1 d7 19.h3 e8 20...e1 xh5
21.xh5 e8

I think many human players might be getting a bit cautious around here. But Rebel's algorithms show no warning lights – danger is over the computational
horizon – and queen's side operations may continue!

22. cxd6 cxd6 23. c2 e8 24. e1 h4
25. d1 h5 26. b2?

Probably 26. e1 was a little better. So far Black has been building a pawn screen and manoeuvring pieces into position behind it. Now some tactical calculation is required. 26...g4 offers to sacrifice a pawn. If the pawn exchanges are made, the h-file will be opened for the Black rook. Then 28. xg4 29. d7.
Where will the White queen go? Must be e2 or d1 and the attack should swing in, fully compensating for the pawn.

26...g4 27. xg4 hgx4 28. xg4 d7
29. e2

We've reached the position as indicated by the last note. Now what?!

29...f3!

This is good, it traps the White king. Only a little calculation will show that 30. gxf3? f6 would leave White's king fatally exposed (621 says Fritz5 at 30 secs).

Even so, Black probably had an even better move in 29...xg2! but it needs more calculation

30. e3

Best, as per the note re gxf3 above. However Rebel thinks the position is level - and even given the chance of a long 'think' it reckons to be only 0.38 behind. To the human eye, however, I'm sure White's position looks distinctly shaky!

30...e8 31. g4

To stop h5. With more thinking time it would prefer 31. c4 but this is not much better after 31...h6 32. d3 (or 32. h6? xd2 33. xd2 h5 mate in 6)
32...xd2 33. xd2 h5 34. xf3

31...h6 32. b6 g6

Only in replying to this does Rebel start to show a big minus (1.77, thought not big enough!) and awake to the fact that it is lost by tactics

33. f1 xd2 34. xd2 f5 0-1

Mate in unavoidable. This is an example of a 'veiled attack'. Black sets his sights on the White king's position, but does his manoeuvring quietly so that, by the time Rebel's algorithm signals danger, the tactical battle is already lost! With all its pieces away on the other (wrong) side of the board, its superior computational abilities are of no avail.

Here is a variation on the same kind of theme. This time the idea that forms is to set the stage for tactics by giving up material for a lead in development, superior scope and the confinement of Rebel's king to the middle of the board.

Game 2

Rebel8 – NN (BCF 150)

[E85] G/15

1. d4 f6 2. c4 g6 3. c3 g7 4. e4 d6 5. f3

After this move, it's White who threatens to get a King's side attack, so other plans are required for the moment

5...0-0 6. e3 e5 7. g2 e6 8. d5 b4

a5 is the q-side attack method, e7 the defensive one... usually. NN's idea is to see if he can loosen White's Queen's side pawns with a move that is found to put Rebel out of book

9. a3 a6 10. b5

Threatening the a-pawn – but Black is happy to give it up!

10...h5 11. x7 d7

Necessary! The bishop will be needed when tactics break out!

12. b4 f5 13. c3 f6
14. e5?
This allows Black to obtain 2 or 3 advantages at once: the e-file is opened and White hasn't castled, the c8-h3 diagonal is opened and, with Black's next, so is the h8-a1 diagonal. However, even after a long think, the algorithm says this is the right choice (+0.84)

14...e4! 15. fxg6 exf3 16. w d3 g4
17. gxh7+ h8 18. w d4
At this point Rebel had to recognize that Black has good value for his pawns, and estimates the position as being level. But the White king is out in the open, while the Black king is safely tucked away behind the h7 pawn.
If White had tried to find some king safety with 18.0-0-0?! it's not hard to see that after 18... dxe3 19. wxe3 fxg2
20. wxg2 xf6 the White queen is overloaded.
18...w h4+ 19. g3
19. d d1 f f2+
19...ae8+ 20. d d1 h h6

21. b b5
Whatever White tries, 21...dxe3 will be a winner. With the king wide open and no rooks in play, neither Rebel's nor anyone else's computational powers will be able to save the day. For Black, on the other hand, good moves are easy to find
21... d e3+ 22. x e3 x e3 23. a a2 x d3+
24. x d3 w e3 25. c c2 f f2 0-1

So, what lessons should we be drawing?

Statics
In Selective Search 79 I suggested that the tactical abilities of computer programs can be limited by what I term as 'statics' — that is, features of a position which cannot be changed.

In one of my illustrative examples the program had played a move which resulted in its rook becoming trapped for ever on h8. The computer did not register that it could never be counted as a realisable asset, thereby completely mis-evaluating its prospects.

Semi-Statics!
Here, however, we are concerned with what I would call 'semi-statics' — situations where assets are, in the long run, realisable... but only when it's too late. In the short term they cannot influence the outcome of the contest.
In the first game, the White king's position could be unravelled, but it took so long that computations based on that assumption turned out to be misleading.
In the second game, the rooks could be mobilised, but the process was so time consuming that evaluations treating them as current assets proved worthless.

In situations like these, the highly efficient computing powers of programs compare poorly with the more instinctive computational methods of human players.
Anand, I am sure, would never have allowed Black a free hand to build up the kingside attack in game 1; nor, in game 2, would he have gone on collecting pawns at the expense of developing pieces and getting his king into safety.

That a mark of a top player is precisely an ability to exploit tactics in ways not involving precise computation is not a new discovery. In 1965 de Groot showed through research that, although chess masters tend to engage in deeper analysis than grandmasters, they were less good at finding the best move in a given situation.

The superiority of the grandmaster lay in seeing features of positions which could influence the outcome of tactics, but which lay beyond the limits of precise calculation (De Groot, A.D., Thought and Choice in Chess, The Hague, Mouton).

The 'all-seeing' program, on the other hand, can see nothing that is over its horizon.
Something for Anand to think about before he next tackles a non-human opponent?
The WORLD COMPUTER CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP: no. 1

1st World Computer Chess Championship, 1974
Stockholm

As promised in Selective Search 81 we are starting a series of Articles to look at some of the World Championship Tournaments which have taken place down the years. These will include both the micro and 'full' Championships, which meant mainframe machines at first, then included dedicated computers, and in the most recent years has extended to PC programs.

STATE of the ART

This first tournament took place altogether before my interest in Computer Chess started so, although I have all of the games, and know that Kaissa was from the then USSR, programmed by someone called Donskoy, and the general favourite Chess4.0 was programmed by Slate and Atkins in the USA, I cannot throw any light on the others.

Chess4.0 was the famous main-frame which, over a series of matches, took up British 1.M David Levy's bold $10,000 challenge that he could beat any computer. Indeed while Chess4.0 and its immediate successors were the best the computer world could produce, he did!

I don't know what speeds/nodes per second they were doing in 1974, or what search depth they were reaching (they were generally a fairly simple brute force), but to put it into some sort of context, 12 years later in the 1985 Championship, Hittech was quoted to be doing 175kN per sec., Cray Blitz 100kN, Mephisto Amsterdam 2kN and Mephisto Rebel ½kN!

Today, on a K6/300, Fritz5 and Junior5 will be doing >200kN, Rebel-10 about 100kN, and the knowledge-packed program Hiarcs7 around 25kN. All of these will be using selective search systems with specialised extension, null-move, hash table and other superior techniques.

The CHAMPIONSHIP

One of my thoughts for the History of the World Championships series was to see how the current crop of top PC programs would get on analysing the old games!

For this first article, I have used Hiarc7, Junior5 and Fritz532. Each was left to annotate a game at just 60secs per move, and I have included the main analysis of each, adding just a few comments of my own to make it as readable and interesting as I can.

I hope you enjoy this, and that it whets appetites for the better years still to come. It will be intriguing to see if we can judge when the PC programs efforts become inadequate in the analysis at 60secs and need 3mins or more to work things out properly!

The favourites, CHESS4.0 and KAISSA, both won their first round games. In round 2 CHESS4.0 met another quite well-fancied program called CHAOS!

Chaos – Chess4.0

[D29] 1st WCCC 1974, Round 2

[Notes and variations based on analysis by Hiarc7]

1.d4 d5 2.c4 dxc4 3.d3 f3 d6 4.e3 e6
5.exd4 c5 6.e2 a6 7.0-0 b5 8.b3 b7
9.d1 bd7 10.c3 d6 11.e4 cxd4
12.xd4 wb8 13.g3

I am not sure where the Chess4.0 and Chaos books ended back in 1974, but it's known theory to here, anyway!

13...b4 14.a4 xe4 15.f3

![Chess Diagram]
15...\( \text{g6} \)
In view of what follows 15...e5 was better: 16.fxe4 exd4 17.exd4 0-0 and = according to Hiarc7.

16...\( \text{xe6}!! \)
Sacrifice! The move of the Championship, an absolute sensation in 1974!
In analysis mode Hiarc7 approved of this, though it takes 7m46 to actually choose it on my PC. However Fritz5 preferred 16...\( \text{xe6} \) and evaluated \( \text{xe6} \) with a minus evaluation even after the next 2 moves were played.
It makes an interesting test position, and I would keen to know which other programs find 16...\( \text{xe6} \) and how soon... allow, say, 10mins.

16...\( \text{xe6} \) 17.\( \text{xe6} + \text{c7} \) 18.\( \text{e1} \) \( \text{d8}?! \)
18...\( \text{g8} \) was perhaps better, but 19...\( \text{g5} \) \( \text{a7} + \) 20.\( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c7} \) 21.\( \text{eac1} \) should also favour White.

19...\( \text{f4}! \)
"Finishes the game!"... says Hiarc7.

19...\( \text{ff8} \) 20.\( \text{ad1} \)

It's worth this extra diagram to see the mess Black has got itself into so quickly, all due to the remarkable sacrifice at move 16.

20...\( \text{a7} \) 21.\( \text{c1} \)
21...\( \text{d6} \) might have been even stronger, the variety of pins are killing!

21...\( \text{g8} \) 22.\( \text{cd1} \)
Again 22...\( \text{d6} \) was stronger.

22...\( \text{a5}? \)
White's failure to play \( \text{d6} \) actually gave Black the chance of 22...\( \text{e8} \) here. Then 23.\( \text{e3} \) \( \text{b7} \) 24.\( \text{d5} \) and whilst White is certainly winning, Black has chances to make him fight for it.

23...\( \text{d6} \)
At last, and it's pretty deadly!

23...\( \text{xd6}?? \)

However it didn't need to be this deadly! 23...\( \text{e8} \) was vital.

24.\( \text{xd6+} \) \( \text{e7} \) 25.\( \text{c5} \) \( \text{f5} \) 26.\( \text{g4} \) \( \text{e8} \)
The bishop has nowhere to run.

27.\( \text{a4}! \)

Beautiful

27...\( \text{b3} \) 28.\( \text{gxf5} \) \( \text{bxa2} \) 29.\( \text{xd7} \)
Of course it's all over now - programs like Hiarc7 and Fritz read +1500. But the rules were to play to a finish and, amazingly it's another 50 moves and countless missed mate opportunities before the game is over.

29...\( \text{a1} \) 30.\( \text{xa1} \) \( \text{a6} \) 31.\( \text{xa6} \) \( \text{d8} \)

32.\( \text{f2} \)
The first mate opportunity missed: Hiarc7 reports 32.\( \text{f6} \) is m7.

32...\( \text{f7} \) 33.\( \text{e6}+ \)
Here's another: 33.\( \text{c6+} \) \( \text{e8} \)
34.\( \text{c7+} \) \( \text{xc7} \) 35.\( \text{xc7} \) \( \text{g6} \) 36.\( \text{xa5} \) \( \text{f8} \)
37.\( \text{f6} \) \( \text{g8} \) 38.\( \text{a8} \)
33...\( \text{f8} \) 34.\( \text{xe7}+ \)
And another: 34.\( \text{f6} \) \( \text{f5} \) 35.\( \text{ec1} \) \( \text{gx6} \)
36.\( \text{e8} \) \( \text{g7} \) 37.\( \text{xd8} \) \( \text{g3} \) 38.\( \text{g4+} \) \( \text{h6} \)
39.\( \text{hxg3} \) \( \text{f5} \) 40.\( \text{h1} \). The last one for a
while!
34...Өxe7 35.Өxe7 Өxe7 36.Өc5
36.Өc6 might be the shorter path
36...Өd8 37.Өc3 Өd6+-
36...Өb8 37.өxa5 өxb2+ 38.өg3 өg6
39.fxг6 ҳxg6 40.өa6 өc2 41.өg6+ өf8
42.өe5 өc1 43.өg5 өf7 44.өe6+ өf6
45.h4 ҳxе5 46.ҳxе5 ҳxе6 47.ҳg5! ҳf6
48.өg4 өf7 49.өc5 өе6 50.өg5 өd6
51.өа5 өc6 52.f4 өb6 53.өа1 өc5
54.өd1 өb4 55.өxg6 өc3 56.өd8 өb4
57.өc8 өb5 58.h5
Threatening h6 and mate to follow.
58...өb6

I thought it worth having a diagram again: firstly because mate opportunities are about to go begging again, and secondly because it was a shock to me to realise the operators were having to play for hours with positions like this, because the computers could not be relied on to finish them off!

59.өc1
So here we are again! 59.h6! is m/7, and when it has been played in a moment, there'll be a bagful of missed h7 and mate opportunities!
59...өb5 60.h6 өa4 61.өb1+-
61.h7! is m/5 61...өb4 62.өh8 өаb3
63.өb8+ өa2 64.f5 өa3 65.өа1#
61...өа3 62.f5
62.h7! is m/4 62...өa2 63.өb7 өa1
64.өh8 өаb7 65.өа8#
62...өа2 63.өb8 өа3 64.f6
64.h7! өa4 65.өh8 өа5 66.өа1#
64...өа4 65.өb7
65.f7! өa3 66.ф8 өа2 67.h7 өа1
68.өа3#
65...өа5 66.өb8
66.f7! өa6 67.өb4 өа5 68.ф8 өа6
69.өа8#
66...өa4 67.өb1

67.f7! өa3 68.h7 өa4 69.ф8 өа5
70.өа3#
67...өa3 68.өb7 өа4 69.өb8
69.f7! өa3 70.ф8 өа4 71.өа8#
69...өа5 70.өg7
70.f7! өa6 71.ф8 өа7 72.h7 өа6
73.өа3#
70...өа4 71.өb7
71.f7! өa3 72.ф8 өа2 73.h7 өа1
74.өа3#
71...өа5 72.өb2
72.h7! өa6 73.өb2 өа7 74.өh8 өа6
75.өа8#
72...өа4 73.өb8
73.h7! өa3 74.өb7 өа2 75.х8 өа3
76.өа8#
73...өа5 74.өg8
74.h7! өа4 75.х8 өа3 76.өg8 өа4
77.өа2#
74...өа4 75.h7!
Hurray!
75...өа5 76.хh8 өа4 77.хh4+ өа5
78.өb4+ өа6 79.өа4# 1-0 Phew!

Already we see that the modern PC program set to analyse at just 60 secs per move can find many improvements for both winner and loser, especially relating to tactical issues!

This will be emphasised again in the next game, from round 3. At this point KAISSA, CHAOS, and a program called OSTRICH, had each won their first 2 games. Whilst CHESS4.0 was despatching OSTRICH, the other 2 leaders met.

Kaissa – Chaos

Notes and variations based on analysis by Junior5

1.e4 c5 2.өf3 өc6 3.е3 d5 4.exd5 ҳxd5
5.d4 ҳg4 6.ҳxe2 ҳe6 7.0-0 ҳf6 8.ҳc3 ҳxd4
9.ҳxd4 e5 10.ҳ3?!
10.ҳxе5 ҳxе5 11.ҳxe5 ҳxe5 12.ҳxg4
seems better
10...ҳxd4 11.hxg4 ҳd6?!
It was correct to complete the series of exchanges with 11...ҳxc3 12.ҳxc3 ҳxd1
13.ҳxd1 ҳxg4
12.ҳxd4 ҳxg4 13.ҳc3 ҳh5 14.g3 ҳd7?!
Chaosis appears to have had a thing for developing its king in this fashion!
15.ҳh4 f5 16.d5
16.ҳb3! ҳh8 17.ҳb5 would have given White a big advantage even at this early stage of the game
16...\textit{Qce5} 17.\textit{Wc2} \textit{Wf8}

18.\textit{d3}?

18.\textit{b5!} keeps White ahead here:

18...\textit{g5} 19.\textit{Qxd6} \textit{Wxd6} 20.\textit{Ac1}

18...\textit{Qxd3} 19.\textit{Wxd3} \textit{Qae8} 20.\textit{Qb5} \textit{f4}?

The idea looks okay in principle, but unfortunately it allows White to win a pawn all too easily.

So 20...\textit{Qe5} 21.\textit{Qb3} \textit{g5} is better, and Black's attack looks quite threatening. Even so 22.\textit{Qd4!} looks good for White, though I haven't tested it out further

21.\textit{Qxd6} \textit{Qxd6} 22.\textit{Qa3+} \textit{Qc7}?

This allows White a simple check whilst gaining valuable development at move 24. The game is all but over even now as White is potentially close to mating its opponent!

22...\textit{Qd7} was much better

23.\textit{Wxa7}

23...\textit{Wf7}

I thought I'd leave the following amazing Junior5 analysis in — is it suggesting there is a forced mate in 22 here, or did it just fancy playing a game against itself based on an alternative, inferior move Black could have played? I'll leave readers to judge for themselves.

If 23...\textit{g5}? 24.\textit{Qac1+}! \textit{Qd6} 25.\textit{Wxb7} \textit{Qf7} 26.\textit{Wc6+} \textit{Qc7} 27.\textit{Qe1+} \textit{Qe3} 28.\textit{fxe3} \textit{f3} 29.\textit{Qc5+} \textit{Qf6} 30.\textit{Qd4+} \textit{Qd7} 31.\textit{Qxf3} \textit{Qa8} 32.\textit{Qd6+} \textit{Qf8} 33.\textit{Wb6+} \textit{Qe8} 34.\textit{Wc6+} \textit{Qd7} 35.\textit{Qxa8+} \textit{Qf7} 36.\textit{Qe5+} \textit{Qg7} 37.\textit{Wxf8+} \textit{Qxf8} 38.\textit{Qxd7+} \textit{Qg7} 39.\textit{Qc5} \textit{Qf6} 40.\textit{Qd7} \textit{Qxc5} 41.\textit{d8W} \textit{h6} 42.\textit{Qc5+} \textit{Qe6} 43.\textit{Qb6+} \textit{Qd7} 44.\textit{Qc7+} \textit{Qc8} 45.\textit{Qb8#}

24.\textit{Qfc1+}

Well, I think the forced mate produced by Junior5 here is correct, so maybe the previous one was as well! 24.\textit{Qac1+}!

\textit{Wd7} 25.\textit{Wxb7+} \textit{Qd6} 26.\textit{Qc6+} \textit{Qc5} 27.\textit{Qc3+} \textit{Qd6} 28.\textit{Qf5+} \textit{Qxf5} 29.\textit{Qc7+} \textit{Qxd5} 30.\textit{Qc6+} \textit{Qd4} 31.\textit{Wd6+} \textit{Qc4} 32.\textit{f3+} \textit{Qe3} 33.\textit{Qec1#}

24...\textit{Qd6} 25.\textit{Qc5+} \textit{Qe5} 26.\textit{Wd6+}?

And another: 26.\textit{Qc4!} \textit{Qd6} 27.\textit{Qb4+} \textit{Qd7} 28.\textit{Wxb7+} \textit{Qd6} 29.\textit{Qc6+} \textit{Qe5} 30.\textit{Qb4} \textit{Qxd5} 31.\textit{Qe1+} \textit{Qe3} 32.\textit{Qxe3} \textit{fxe3} 33.\textit{f4+} \textit{Qxf4} 34.\textit{gx4#}

26...\textit{Qe6} 27.\textit{Qe1+} \textit{Qe3} 28.\textit{gx4} \textit{Qd7} 29.\textit{f5+} 29.\textit{Qxc3+} \textit{Qf6}

29...\textit{Qf6} 30.\textit{Qxe3} \textit{Qd8}?

Gives White yet another mating chance, which is again missed; but it hardly matters as a further opportunity soon comes its way.

Best was 30...\textit{Qxe3} 31.\textit{Qxc3} \textit{Qd8} 32.\textit{Wh4+} \textit{Qf7} 33.\textit{Qc4+} \textit{Qf6}

31.\textit{Qe7}

31.\textit{Qf4+} \textit{Qf7} 32.\textit{Wd5+} \textit{Qf6} 33.\textit{Qe6+} \textit{Qxe6} 34.\textit{Qxe6+} \textit{Qg5} 35.\textit{Qf3+} \textit{Qf4} 36.\textit{Qe3+} \textit{Qx5} 37.\textit{Qe1} \textit{Qg6} 38.\textit{Qg5+} \textit{Qf7} 39.\textit{Qd7+} \textit{Qg8} 40.\textit{Qxg7#}

31...\textit{Wh4}?

31...\textit{Qxd6} 32.\textit{Qxe6+} \textit{Qxe6} 33.\textit{fxe6} \textit{Qfe8} sidesteps the mate, but offers Black absolutely no chance of saving the game, of course

32.\textit{Wg5+} \textit{Qf5} 33.\textit{Qf3+} \textit{Qg4} 34.\textit{Qxg7+} \textit{Qh5} 35.\textit{Wh2+} \textit{Qh4} 36.\textit{Wxh4#} 1-0

So, after 3 rounds, KAISSA was out on its own with 3/3.

No programs had 2½, but there was a large group all with 2/3: CHESS4.0, CHAOS, RIBBIT, TECH2, OSTRICH, and MASTER.

The game everybody wanted was KAISSA v CHESS4.0, but the draw produced KAISSA v OSTRICH (which KAISSA won), and CHESS4.0 v TECH2 (which CHESS4.0 won).
CHAOS and RIBBIT also won their last games, so there was something of a bunch in 2nd place.

**WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP 1974**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>r1</th>
<th>r2</th>
<th>r3</th>
<th>r4</th>
<th>Tot</th>
<th>T/b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kaisa</td>
<td>+08</td>
<td>+05</td>
<td>+03</td>
<td>+06</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chess4.0</td>
<td>+04</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>+06</td>
<td>+05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chaos</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>+02</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>+09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ribbit</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>+07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tech2</td>
<td>+07</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>+08</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ostrich</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+09</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Frantz</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>+05</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Beal</td>
<td>bye</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tell</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>bye</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>=11</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>bye</td>
<td>=10</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A16chs</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Papa</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>bye</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the tournament KAISSA and CHESS 4.0 played an exhibition game 'to determine which program was stronger'?!

Well, that's what it says in the Tournament notes!

Granted it was the game everyone had wanted to see in round 4. Though the USSR's KAISSA had won the actual Championship, CHESS4.0 would be declared 'the Champion' if it won this 'exhibition' play-off game!

You can see where some of our modern human World Champions get their ideas from!

I can think of one now, who won his Title by default, without playing a game, and has lost matches for the Title since, yet still manages to retain the name 'World Champion', even to this very day!

Well, back to 1974's WCCC. Remember that these are probably the two best programs playing!

It's an up-and-down game, in which both sides have their chances for glory!

---

**Chess4.0 – Kaissa**


Notes and variations based on analysis by Fritz532

1. e4 d5 2.exd5 ∆f6 3.d4 ∆xd5 4.∆f3 g6 5.∆e2 ∆g7 6.0-0 0-0 7.∆e1 ∆f5 8.∆h4

8.c3 ∆c6 9.∆a3 is usual. However the presence of a diagram so soon is a clear sign that something's about to happen!

8...e5?

Much too wild. I wonder how deep it was searching, as this is a suicidal pawn loss. 8...∆e6 is the F532 choice and, though it blocks his e-pawn, if Kaissa is willing to cast it overboard so easily, perhaps it's not such a bad idea!

9.∆xf5 gxf5 10.dxe5 ∆b4 11.∆xd8?!

No doubt the program has a rule for exchanging as many pieces as possible once it's won a pawn, but the bull-in-a-china shop method is not called for here. Best was 11.a3

11...∆xd8

Well, White has a simple advantage that should be enough to win and, for a while, all goes according to expectations.

12.∆g5 ∆d7 13.∆a3 ∆xe5

Apparentely recovering the pawn, but not for long.

14.c3 ∆c6 15.∆c4 a5 16.∆f3

Weaker is 16.∆xe5?! ∆xe5 17.∆ad1 ∆g7++; But 16.∆f1 was good

16...f6 17.∆h6 a4 18.∆ad1 ∆xd1 19.∆xd1 ∆h8?

Clearly 19...∆f7 was better.

20.∆xe6

This is stronger than 20.∆xe5 fxe5 21.∆d5 ∆a6++; 20...∆c6 21.f4! b5 22.fxe5

22.∆xe5?! is not as good: 22...fxe5
23.\textit{\textbf{\text{\text{f}}}}\text{d}7 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}}\text{c}8
22...\text{\textbf{\text{x}}}\text{c}4 23.\text{\textbf{\text{e}}}\text{xf}6 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{d}8 24.\text{\textbf{\text{f}}}\text{f}1 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{g}}}}\text{g}8 25.\text{\textbf{\text{e}}}\text{xf}5

Probably close to the height of White's advantage, which is now enormous: there's a material plus, a passed pawn and mate threats... it should be an easy win!

25...\text{\textbf{\text{e}}}\text{d}1+ 26.\text{\textbf{\text{f}}}\text{f}2 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}}\text{d}8 27.\text{\textbf{\text{f}}}\text{f}4

It was time for both programs to start bringing their kings into action. Thus
27.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}\text{e}3} \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f7} 28.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{g}}}g}4

27...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}c}6

Again 27...\text{\textbf{\text{f}}}f7 28.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{g}}}g}3 says Fritz.

28.\text{\textbf{\text{f}}}\text{f}3! \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f}1+ 29.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}4 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{a}}}a}1

He could have played another check and then pushed his king one square inwards with 29...\text{\textbf{\text{e}}}e1+ 30.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}3 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f7}

30.\text{\textbf{\text{a}}}a3??

This is just a horrible move in its own right, by virtue of giving himself an awful backward b-pawn... especially as the game is within White's grasp — it just needed 30.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{h}}}h}5! \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}6 31.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{g}}}g}3 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f1} 32.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}5 and it's as good as over

30...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}1+ 31.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}3 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}2?

31...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f7} is again clearly needed, he must blockade the pawn apart from the fact that the king's duty is now to get into the action

32.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f2}?

What a pair they are. Okay so all these mistakes are evening themselves out, and leaving White with still a reasonable advantage. But here 32.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}5 would have been quite deadly: 32...\text{\textbf{\text{e}}}xg2 (32...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f7}
33.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f5} 33.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}8+ \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f7} 34.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}xd}8 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}xf6}
35.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}d}6+ \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}7 36.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}xc}6 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{h}}}xh}2 37.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}xc}4 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{h}}}h}5
38.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{c}}}c}4 and it should be goodnight

32...\text{\textbf{\text{e}}}e1!

Well done — avoiding the exchange is obviously correct

33.\text{\textbf{\text{d}}}d2
33.\textit{\textbf{\text{g}}}g4 \text{\textbf{\text{e}}}e6+-

33...\text{\textbf{\text{e}}}e6 34.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}d}6 \text{\textbf{\text{c}}}c5+ 35.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f3} \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}d}3
36.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}d}4
36...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{g}}}g}5 \text{\textbf{\text{e}}}e5+ 37.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f4} \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{h}}}h}6–
36...\text{\textbf{\text{c}}}c5! 37.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}3 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f7}!

Hurray! Now White needs to be careful, he is in serious danger of blowing his winning chances

38.\text{\textbf{\text{d}}}d7+??!
38.\textit{\textbf{\text{g}}}g5 \text{\textbf{\text{g}}}g6 39.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{h}}}h}4 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}8 40.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{a}}}a}6 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{a}}}xb}2
41.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{a}}}a}7! was better
38...\text{\textbf{\text{g}}}g6
Or 38...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}xf6} 39.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{h}}}xh}7 \text{\textbf{\text{c}}}c5+ 40.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f4}
\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}d}3+ 41.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}4 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{a}}}xb}2 42.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f3+
39.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{g}}}g}7+??!
39.\textit{\textbf{\text{a}}}a7 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}xf6} 40.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{a}}}xa}4 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}6–
39...\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}xf6} 40.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{h}}}xh}7 \text{\textbf{\text{e}}}e5+ 41.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f4} \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{d}}}d}3+
42.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}e}4 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{a}}}xb}2

43.g4??

I don't know what this is... presumably underestimating the pin on \textit{\textbf{\text{e}}}3. So White loses his winning chances and more... in fact Black will soon be seen to be on top!

Simply 43.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{f}}}f}3 \text{\textit{\textbf{\text{a}}}a}1 44.\text{\textit{\textbf{\text{a}}}xa}5 keeps White ahead, though we'd be headed for quite exciting times as Black can win a
pawn and threaten queening chances of his own after 44...$d3 45.$f8 $c1
43...$d1 44.$g5+ $g6 45.$h6+ $g7
46.$d5 $e3
Not 46...$x e3+? which fails to win the c-pawn after 47.$c5
47.$c4
47.$h4 $e3 48.$h5 $e3+ 49.$c4
47...$e3+ 48.$b5 $a3 49.$h4 $h3
49...$b2 50.$c5 $c3+ 51.$d5 $g3
was best
50.$x e5 $b2 51.$h5

51...a3?!
Well they certainly made it more exciting with their little inaccuracies!
Here 51...$g3! is again best. White would play 52.$b4! $b3+ (52...$x g5? 53.$g6+ $x g6 54.$h6=) 53.$c3+ 54.$d5 (striving to avoid a draw by repetition) 54...$d3+ 55.$e4 $d7 (trying to get behind his pawn, so...) 56.$a6 and I think it should be a draw but, from the way they've played so far, Black could still win!

52.$g6+! $f7 53.$f6+
For the next few moves, White has the chance of 53.$a6 which should be enough to draw
53...$g8 54.$g6+ $f7
54...$f8? should be investigated more closely, says Fritz: 55.$a6 $x h5+
55.$f6+ $e7 56.$h6
56...$a6?? $d3+ 57.$c4+
56...$a4+?!
Missing the clever 56...$h4! threatening $a4! forces 57.$f1 a2 58.$b5
(58.$a1 might be better) 58...$a4 59.$g6 $c3+ and I err. think Black wins?!
57.$b4! $a2!
Threatening a long-winded mate by $h4!

58.$f1!
Managing to avoid 58.$a6?? $h4+
59.$b3 (59.$h5 a1 would be in 7)
59...$a1 would be in 8
58...$c3 59.$b3
and the game heads for a draw after all the excitement
59...$a1 60.$xa1 $e4+ 61.$c4 $x g5
62.$a6 $f7 63.$a7+ $e6 64.$a6+ $f5
65.$d4 $x h6 ½-½

So with this draw, KAISWA was confirmed as the first World Computer Champion.

The FOLLOWING YEARS
It's interesting to see what happened to some of the others in later years. KAISSA, CHESS (4.6 and 4.9), CHAOS, OSTRICH and MASTER would all appear again in 1977 and 1980.
Indeed CHESS4.6 would win the 1977 event, which would mark the first appearance of BELLE, which would win in 1980.

Another interesting name appeared in 1980 - CHALLENGER! A Fidelity... the first entry by the commercial and dedicated brigade. It actually came last out of 18, but in the same year went on to win the World MICRO-Computer Championship! There was a great gulf between them in those days!

By 1983, when a whole group of dedicated representatives appeared, including Mephisto, Fidelity, Novag and Conchess, Bob Hyatt's CRAY BLITZ was also making its first appearance (and won!), and some of the 1974 main-frame and main-stay entries had sadly disappeared. More next issue!
RATING LISTS and NOTES

A brief guide to the purpose of each of the HEADINGS should prove helpful for everybody.

BCF. These are British Chess Federation ratings. They can be calculated from Elo figures by (Elo - 600)/8, or from USCF figures by (USCF - 720)/8. Elo. This is the Rating figure which is in popular use WorldWide. The BCF and Elo figures shown in SELECTIVE SEARCH are calculated by combining each Computer’s results with its results v humans. I believe this makes the SS Rating List the most accurate available for Computers and Programs anywhere in the world.

Games. The total number of Games on which the computer’s or program’s rating is based.

Human/Games. The Rating obtained and total no. of Games in Tournament play v rated humans.

A guide to PC Gradings:

386-PC represents a program running on an 80386 at approx. 33MHz with 4MB RAM.

486-PC represents a program running on an 80486 at between 50-66MHz with 4-8MB RAM.

Pent-PC represents a program on a Pentium at approx. 100-133MHz, with 8-16MB RAM.

PPRO-PC represents a program on a Pentium Pro/200-233, or a Pentium MMX/200-233.

Users will get slightly more (or less!) if the speed of their PC is significantly different. A doubling or halving in MHz speed = approx. 50 Elo; a doubling or halving in MB RAM = approx. 5 Elo.

Approx. guide if Pentium/133 = 0

Pentium Pro/2450 +100 Pent K6/Pro2/300 +80
Pent Pro2/MMX/233 +60 Pentium/166 +20
Pentium/133 0 Pentium/100 -20
486DX/4/100 -80 486DX2/66 -100
486DX-SX/33 -160 386DX/33 -220
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