Eric Hallsworth, The Red House, 46 High St. Wilburton, Cambs CB6 3RA

Computer Chess NEWS SHEET 23

June/July 1989

The purpose in publishing the "NEWS SHEET" is to provide a survey of the CHESS COMPUTER scene, with a special emphasis on realistic assessments of the PLAYING ABILITIES of the many Machines now available. My work at COUNTRYWIDE COMPUTERS is of special help in this as we handle there a very wide range of Computers and I enjoy a freedom to maintain personal opinions and preferences which I seek to share with Readers. Final Games and Articles selection for each Issue is done independently and solely by myself. The NEWS SHEET is also financed by myself and by NS Readers whose voluntary contributions are always welcome (please!); but folk who make little attempt to 'pay their way' will not remain on the Mailing List for ever. (Hint: £5 just covers my costs for 4 Issues; Foreign Readers £8). Articles or Games sent in by Readers or others involved in Chess Computing will always receive fair consideration for publication!

Welcome to another Issue of News Sheet - and out somewhat quicker than the last one! Well, we've settled into life at Wilburton a little now and I really did feel it was right to get things up-to-date with important Games that I know some Readers have been straining at the leash to see!

With this Issue you also get a copy of Ross Withey's "TEST YOUR COMPUTER'S CHESS". Although we have collaborated in the planning a little, Ross has done all the work on this whilst I have paid for the printing so as to include it with the News Sheet. I think Ross has done a good and potentially valuable job for us all here and I do urge Readers to put their own Computer/s to this TEST and let me have the Results... for better or worse! In NS24 we would like to print a Table of the Results and compare the Resulting "Order of Merit" with the actual Rating List. We expect most Machines to get 200+... will any get to 400? So far we have tested just 4 Computers and one has a good lead! To find out which one... or if something beats it with a 400+ score... make sure to get Issue 24. And do, please, send in your findings.

Within this 12-page Issue:-

* GAMES SELECTION Computer vs Computer and Computer vs Human (some surprises, some "crackers"!)
* NEWS and REPORTS some left over from NS23 and promised in same.
* Playing LEVELS in Computers.
* INTERVIEW with Sid Samole.
* RATING LISTS

"Thanks" for Writing

It has sometimes been frustrating to feel unsure of what NS Readers think about various comments I make - or what you may want to see in the NS. Once or twice Problems or Positions in the NS with requests for Timings for different Computers have met with such a nominal response (only 4 or 5 replies from nearly 300 Readers! Seems unbelieveable doesn't it... especially if you are one of the 4 or 5!). But the large number in agreement with my comments in NS22 concerning

Pergamon Chess' (or, rather, Kevin O'Connell's) abysmal "Computer Chess Survey" has restored my confidence that you really are 'out there' and that you care! I appreciated these and the many other letters of "good wishes" re my move and thank all of you who took time to write and give encouragement. As a matter of interest, as far as I know, all of the Computer Distributors in Britain also took objection to the O'Connell nonsense as well - and I reckon the Computer Industry spends at least £20,000 a year on advertising with *"Chess"!*

Playing Levels

One of the most frequent requests I get both 'at work' and via the News Sheet is to give advice on what Playing Strengths to expect from the different Levels available on Chess Computers. Some folk I speak to at work are still confused about what the Playing Levels do - I've recently been asked for a Machine that plays at its maximum strength provided its on its fastest level!

In fact changing a Level simply gives the Computer a different Time Control to play under... and the longer it is allowed to think the deeper its analysis and the better (hopefully) its play. Thus the quality of a Computer's play at 3 mins per move should be better than it is at 5 secs a move, or 5 min Blitz Chess! So - how strong <u>is</u> its play at the different Levels?

I fear I must give 2 answers to this! Firstly, if a Computer has a Grading of, let's say, 175 BCF at 3 mins per move, that means we would expect it to score a 5-5 draw in a 10 Game 3 mins per move Match with a Player graded at 175. If these 2 also played a Match at 15 secs per move or, maybe, 30 min Action Chess, I believe they would still score around 5-5. Maybe the Computer would just win as it is less prone to "silly" mistakes. In other words a 175 graded Computer is equal to a 175 graded human at ALL Time Controls providing both play under the same Time Control! At Blitz Chess, the Computer's <u>quality</u> of play is not as good... but neither is mine!

However, what folk usually mean when they ask me this question concerning the Computer's strength at different levels is "What is its quality of play at the faster levels comparing the moves it makes at fast speeds with those it makes at slow speeds and ignoring the time differences?" Or, put another way to try and make the thought clear, "If it played the moves it chose at 5 secs per move in a 3 min per move Tournament, what sort of Grading would it then get?" It's a useful question, especially if you are someone like me!

Here's why.

I grade the Mephisto Monte Carlo at around 175 BCF. It's a Computer I like to play on as it has a wooden Board and is auto sensory with full Display Features which I like to make use of during a game - not so much to get Hints (on what moves I should make!), as Evaluations (so that I can go back over a Game later having a good idea where the critical moments were). And it's a nice size for my coffee table!

It's also a bit too strong for me!

At least it is if we both play under the same Time Control! But if I set the Monte Carlo to around 10 or 15 secs per move whilst I take a "little" longer, it evens things up somewhat and makes our games much more interesting (to me!).

When I say a "little" longer, I confess I often find at the end of a game that the Computer has used around 10 mins and I've used 30 to 40, so I don't know if the word "little" is all that accurate!? But our games and the results are more even! So, what is the Monte Carlo's strength at one-quarter of my Time usage.. obviously not 175 BCF... and from this, what is my own! I'm going to leave you to work that out for yourselves, but I'll give you a Table which will get you there and give you a useful guide to playing strength changes between the Levels.

Basically an extra Ply of Search = approx. 250 Elo (30 BCF). For most 6502 Processor Machines an extra Ply of Search takes around 5 times as long as previous work. E.g. the Computer has taken 1 min to complete 5 Ply; therefore it will take around 5 mins to complete the 6th Ply. Having said this, I'm afraid it's not quite the same with the Fidelity and Mephisto 68000's using Hash tables as they are able to get through the Plies faster because they store analysis as they go along and don't need to keep researching it. The Fidelity Mach 3 is close to 4* instead of 5*, and the Mephisto 32 bit is close to 3*!

For the moment we will stay with the 6502's. Using a Speed increase of 5 times for an extra Ply as equalling around 250 Elo means that a doubling in Speed gets around 100 Elo. There's a proper mathematical formula for this of course and our result of "doubling Speed = 100" enables us to draw up the following initial Table.

180 secs per move. Play Quality 2000 Elo, 175 BCF
90 secs per move. Play Quality 1900 Elo, 163 BCF
45 secs per move. Play Quality 1800 Elo, 150 BCF
22 secs per move. Play Quality 1700 Elo, 138 BCF.

I'm sure you get the idea. There is a bit more to it (there always is!). If the Computer is on 30 secs per move, but you take 1 min per move... AND the Computer has anticipated your move so spends 'your' minute preparing for your move - how much of the 100 Elo Gap through Time Difference does the Computer make up? On THAT move, all 100 (of course?!). Not quite... it would have had that same 1 minute of 'your' time if it had been set at 1 min per move itself, so its real gain is only ½ a minute, not a full one, and therefore maybe a 50 Elo improve for that move only. Perhaps not even that in practice as the real result is that it has 'saved' ½ a minute for use at a later stage in the game when, after accumulating a few such 'saved ½ mins' it will be able to afford time for a full extra ply on one specific move. This isn't going to happen that often and, in fact, for practical purposes, I think we are just about safe to leave the figures alone. Anyway 100 is a nice round figure (!) and easier to work with than, say 90.

The other thing which should be mentioned is that the improvement in a Computer's play between the levels is more marked through the lower levels than it is when it goes through the higher ones. This is simply because, changing from level 1 to level 2 may enable the Computer to move from a 2 ply search to a 3 ply search. 2 and 3 ply are pretty close to the "root" position and tactical discoveries here are likely to be more frequent and important (and generally also spotted by the Computer's illustrious opponent - perhaps even me!) than discoveries made after 2 or 3 mins. So the lower level changes will be worth MORE than 100 Elo whilst a change from, say, level 6 to 7 may well be worth LESS than the 100. At higher levels searching an extra ply may take a further 4 or 5 mins and therefore will only be possible every 3 or 4 moves at best. Also

because this search is further from the "root" position it is less likely to be of vital importance and move changes occur less often.

So my estimate of the finished Table would be:-

3 mins per move.	2000 Elo,	175 BCF
2 mins per move.	1950 Elo,	169 BCF
1 min per move.	1860 Elo,	158 BCF
30 secs per move.	1760 Elo,	145 BCF
15 secs per move.	1640 Elo,	130 BCF
10 secs per move.	1560 Elo,	120 BCF
5 secs per move.	1440 Elo,	105 BCF

From this Table, suppose your Computer grades at 165 BCF instead of 175? You can still use the above but simply deduct 10 BCF or 80 Elo at each time level. Conversely if your Machine is a 190 Grade, then add 15 BCF or 120 Elo at each time level.

Another comparison that could be made using the Table would be that a MONTE CARLO at 1 min per move (c.1860 Elo) is about equal to a NOVAG SUPER CONST, a FIDELITY EXCELLENCE or a MEPHISTO MM2 at 3 mins per move (c.1840-1875). And the MONTE CARLO at 30 secs per move (c.1760) should win a 10 game Match against the ADVANCED STAR CHESS on its top level (c.1680). Of course I ***don't*** want any scores from such Matches for the News Sheet - for the Rating List to become involved all games must have the Computers on EQUAL settings.

I have covered this too generally for it to be anything more than a guide, and it would be wrong to pretend otherwise. Even so I think you will find the Table holds good in a surprising number of tests and situations and I hope my effort helps give you an idea of "where your Computer is at" when it's on its own various levels/time controls. Maybe those who, with me, like to play at unequal time levels will also be able to gain some idea of their own grading from the results they obtain.

Advert

FOR SALE: **Mephisto 68000 Mondial Dallas XL.** Absolutely Brand New Condition. ***£245 or very near offer. ANTHONY BROWN, Flat 3, Richard Burton Court, 30 Palmerston Rd., Buckhurst Hill, Essex IG9 5LW.*** Tel. [0/Hill] 505-7379.

Interview — SID SAMOLE

[With thanks to Goran Grottling, Ply Magazine for sending this for our use].

Sid Samole, of course, has been the powerful manager of Fidelity for many years and is the man who first introduced the idea of Computers dedicated to Chess.

Please tell us how it all started! The Fidelity company started in 1959 in Chicago. In the beginning we imported hearing-aids from Austria. I began to work for the company in 1968 as a director. We also produced other types of medical equipment. In 1970 I bought the total stock of shares and, since then, I have owned the company myself.

But how did you get the idea of making Chess Computers? Yes, that was funny!

We can thank Star Trek for that! In 1976 I was at home watching Star Trek and I saw Spock playing chess with a computer. I became fascinated and the thought was in my mind all night. In the morning I discussed it with my secretary, and she told me that her boyfriend was writing a chess programme in his spare time. Talk about coincidences. "I want to meet him at once", I said, and that was arranged. The man was Ron Nelson, who is now our hardware expert. I hired him and he was the one who wrote all the Fidelity chess programmes before the Spracklens came on the scene. We introduced our first Chess Computer, Chess Challenger 1, on a fair in January 1977 and the rest, as they say, is history!

Is it a good business? Yes, Fidelity is OK. My wife is pleased! 1977, our first year on the Chess Computer market doubled the turnover for Fidelity! In 1980 Fidelity sales amounted to $40 million! Because of business reasons I don't want to tell you our present turnover, but I don't think that the Chess Computer business will ever be as big as it was in the beginning. At present the Fidelity staff consists of 174 persons in Miami.

How many Computers have Fidelity sold? We have sold about 3m. computers. Our big sellers were the oldest ones; for example we sold 600,000 Chess Challenger 7 and 500,000 Sensory 8. The cheapest computers have the biggest part of the market. In our opinion we have most of the American market concerning both cheap and more expensive machines. But Saitek wouldn't agree, of course! The Mephisto share of the American market is almost zero. *[Ed. comment - the same as Fidelity's share of the German market].*

Can you tell us about Fidelity's plans for the near future? Directly after the World Championship in Spain we start production of the Mach III and Mach Iv. Mach III will be sold for around $500 and Mach IV for around $2,000 in USA. Mach IV is very expensive to produce with its 68020 and lots of RAM. But if prices for RAM-memory would go down, maybe Mach IV can be sold for $1,000 in the future. We plan to produce the Mach III in a wooden board also, the same as Avant Garde.

Any other news? I hope to be able to bring to fruition an old dream! I would like for all old owners of Prestige, Elite A/S and Avant Garde to be able to rebuild their computers to Mach IIIs. I feel a bit sorry for everyone who has spent a lot of money on a Chess Computer with now obsolete programmes. It must be technically possible, but the question is whether it is economically profitable! I hope so!

Wouldn't it be interesting to buy for example Chiptest and build it into a Fidelity board?! No, I don't think that sounds interesting. How many would buy it? The price would be maybe $5,000 or $10,000. We can't see any meaning in making a product that we would be able to sell only about 50 or 100 units of. In such a case it would be something our technicians would have to make manually. We must have a series of at least 10,000 units in order to make them in serial production.

How do you think the loss in the World Micro will influence your sales? Results in Almeria mean nothing for us in the USA. But for the European market I think it is important and maybe our reputation will be hurt there. But why should buyers in the US be interested in results from events like these with heavily tuned machines? The computers which we compete with here are of types that will not be sold to regular customers for many years! I also want to point out that these results are influenced by different manipulations of opening

books. Mephisto has not done anything that is not allowed, but we feel outbooked. They were better prepared than us and I can only congratulate them on the success. In the USA the CRA-tests are important for us. They are also much cheaper than World Micro events like this as the cost for a CRA-test is about $2,000.

Doesn't the glory of a World Micro victory mean anything for Fidelity? No, not for me personally. I'm a businessman and I'm only interested in the commercial field. But of course the honour would mean a lot for our programmers.

A few years ago you said that Fidelity should try to win the World Micro for all categories. Is that still valid? Yes, why not? We are not juniors anymore! When I stated that, I was very tired of all aggressions and trouble about the World Micro Championship. Then we felt we were maybe 200 rating points behind Cray Blitz, the champion in those days, and we thought that it was a realistic goal. Now we have reached championship level and probably we are equal with Cray Blitz. But now Deep Thought has turned up, and maybe we are 300 points behind! Really I wonder what the point is with all this development! The fact is that nowadays only a very few chess players are able to beat the best Chess Computers. Many people cannot even beat the oldest ones!

What is your own score against the best programmes of Fidelity? Oh goodness. I am without a chance! I cannot play chess. Maybe I am rated 1200.

Do you think that a chess programme will ever beat the world chess champion? I think this will happen, but it will be a terrible day! People may lose their interest for chess! Fidelity has sold an Othello programme that won over the world champion and after that it was almost impossible to sell the programme. No human being wants to be beaten all the time! I think Fidelity will have to close the day a chess programme becomes chess champion of the world.

Review of 1988-9 CCR

I promised this in my last Issue, but space necessitates brevity after all. Larry Kaufman has produced another very good Issue of his annual *"Chess Computer Reports"*, in which some of the main Articles are:-

CRA Tests, a brief history; An argument for **Computer v Computer** testing being the most accurate; Coverage of **1988 World Micro** and **N.American** Championships, incl. Games; Discussion of the various **European Rating** efforts and a general article on **Rating commercial Computers** ; Some annotated games; **Rating Lists** and large **Reference Chart** giving Computer dimensions, features, opening book sizes, processor info. etc. A **Review of the Year** plus a review of all new **1988 Products** incl. **CXG** SPHINX, **FIDELITY** MACH 3 *"the strongest model on the market under $1,000 at 40/2, though Mondial 68000 XL has done better at 60/1"*, PHANTOM, **MEPHISTO** ALMERIA *"it excels at tactics, but does not seem to go out of its way to provoke them"*, ACADEMY, SUPER MONDIAL II/COLLEGE, **NOVAG** SUPERS *"moving towards more selective search, like Mephisto"*, SUPREMO and SUPER VIP *"strongest inexpensive hand-held model"*, **SAITEK/KASPAROV** SIMULTANO *"quite weak at action chess and blitz, but rather strong at the minute a move level"*, GALILEO and RENAISSANCE. To close some discussion on **PC Programmes** and Software as well as **"The Big Guns"**, i.e. HiTech, Chiptest & Co; A Discussion on **Ply Counting** and **Selective vs Full- Width Search** *"it certainly looks like well-done selective search is typically worth 100+ points over full-width"*

CALDERDALE, 1989

The Countrywide Team had a Display Stand as well as an Entrant in the prestigious Calderdale Open, probably the North of England's biggest Congress. The Open Event boasted Murray Chandler (the eventual winner), Keith Arkell, Peter Wells and other very strong players, so the MEPHISTO ALMERIA 32 bit had a tough task and didn't do badly at all to score 3½/6, thanks to winning its last two games on the Bank Holiday Monday. Unfortunately (from a Grading point of view) its scheduled opponent for the last round and graded 195 BCF refused to play against Almeria, so the Computer was given a 97 grade to play instead. An easy win in 30 moves resulted, but it didn't help in the working out of a proper Grading which will probably end up at a slightly disappointing 174 or 175 BCF (2000 Elo). It is included in the new Rating List at this figure.

On the Stand the Mephisto ACADEMY scored massively well at 5 and 10 min Chess; a Novag SUPER FORTE/6 and Mephisto's MEGA 4, MM4 and MONTE CARLO were not far behind. A Fidelity MACH 3 was on the Stand on the final day and also scored very well after losing a couple of games to a chap who came with a prepared Opening. The ALMERIA 32 went onto the Stand after its final round game and scored 6/6. Of course not all of the folk who play in these Congresses and visit the Displays are 170, 180 or 200+ Grades! Many are in the lower 100's so Computer "fans" would expect to see the Machines scoring around 80%. But the impact of these performances on many of the folk was obvious and it was a succesful trip for us. We also entered the MEGA 4 against Keith Arkell in the Simultaneous and that game follows (one of only 2 draws yielded by Keith):-

White **MEPHISTO MEGA 4**, Black **KEITH ARKELL**

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nc3 Bb4 4 Qc2 Nc6 5 e3 0-0 6 Nf3 -

This is the Mega 4's first move out of its Opening Book.

6 - d6 7 Bd2 e5 8 a3 Bxc3 9 Bxc3 Re8 10 d5 Ne7 11 Be2 a5 12 e4 Ng6 13 0-0 Nf4 14 Rae1 Bg4 15 Bd1 b6 16 Nd2 Bd7 17 Bf3 a4 18 Rd1 h5 19 Rfe1 g6 20 Bb4 Kg7 21 Rc1 Rh8 22 Red1 h4 23 Nf1 Ng4 24 h3! -

An exclamation mark simply because the operators from Countrywide Computers were very relieved to see the Mega 4 play this! We had hoped for it at move 23 and felt it was vital now.

24 - Nf6 25 Ne3 Qe7 26 Rd2 Bc8 27 Rcd1 Nd7 28 Qc1? -

Here we think that 28 Bg4 retains a (very) small advantage.

28 - Nc5 29 Bxc5 bxc5 30 Qc3 Bd7 31 Bg4 Rab8 32 Bxd7 Qxd7 33 Ng4 f6 34 f3 Rb3 35 Qc2 Rhb8 36 Qc1 R8b6 37 Re1 Qd8 38 Re3 Qb8

38 - f5 also looks strong.

39 Rxb3 Rxb3 40 Rc2 g5 41 Nf2 Qb6 42 Qa1? -

We had been very impressed with the way in which Keith had transferred, in such a blocked position, from a good-looking attack on the King-side up to move 24 over to one on the Queen's wing which we felt gave him some advantage. This disappointing move from Mega 4 rather negates the previous good, solid work which it had done and we would have preferred to see 42 Rd2 or Qd2.

42 - Re3 43 Rd2 Qb3 44 Qf1 Kg6?

Here 44 - Qa2 followed by Rxa3! looks best. However it works out well...

45 Ng4? Rd3!

For White 45 Kh2 would have been sounder. Now Rd3! hardly deserves an exclamation mark in that it is forced, but it does guarantee the win of a Pawn (the first to go off the Board!) and with added pressure.

46 Qf2 Rxd2 47 Qxd2 Qxc4 48 Kh2? -

48 Nf2 is preferred.

48 - Qd3! 49 Qe3 Qc2 50 Qf2 Qc1 51 Ne3 —

As a matter of interest the Mega 4 evaluated its position as -2.18 here.

51 - Nd3 52 Qe2 -

Both the Mega 4 and ourselves had expected Keith to play 52 - Nxb2 now but, after looking at the position for just a few seconds, he muttered just loudly enough for us to hear, "Hmm. I can't take the Pawn". We spoke to Susan Arkell after the game and she felt that making the capture would have given Mega 4 some counterplay with its Queen. Indeed our home analysis confirms that after 52 Nxb2 simply 53 Qb5! will gain a draw by perpetual check! The move we now consider might have been best for Black is 52 - c4 followed by 53 Nd1 Nf4! This wins the b-Pawn as White, in moving his (its !) Queen cannot protect both the b-Pawn and the Knight.

52 - Nf4?! 53 Qf2 c4 54 Qg1 Qd2?!

After correctly avoiding the Pawn capture once, we do believe it would have been perfectly safe here. Again the Mega 4 expected it and its forward analysis went 54 - Qxb2 55 Nxc4 Qc3 56 Ne3 Qxa3 winning comfortably. If White had tried protecting the Knight with 56 Qf1? then Nh5! leaves White in Zugzwang.

55 Nxc4 Qc2 56 Qf1 Ne2 57 Ne3 Qxb2 58 Qf2 Qa2 59 Nf5 Nc3?

59 - Qc2 was needed to protect a4 and c7. If White now tries 60 Qa7 as in the game itself, then Qc5!

60 Qa7! -

The Countrywide staff was all smiles after this! The Mega 4 showed 0.00 as its evaluation confirming it had found a drawing method and Susan was ribbing Keith about possibilities of the Computer mating him with the inevitable resultant appearance of the game in a multitude of various magazines!

60 - Nxd5!

The 'only' move!? We think so. For example the previously winning 60 - Qc4 allows 61 Qb8 and it is White who now has the won game as Black would have to sacrifice to avoid mate.

61 Qxa4 Nf4 62 Qe8+ Qf7 63 Ne7+ Kg7 64 Nf5+ and we shook hands on the draw as Mega 4 had clearly found perpetual check.

Match : COMPUTERS v DUTCH CHAMPS Select

Played on April 9 and recorded by the AVRO Broadcasting corporation for transmission on Dutch TV the following evening, this Match was in no way organised to 'show off' Computer prowess... if anything, quite the reverse. The Team selected from entrants in the Dutch Championship was extremely strong and even Jaap van den Herik (a leading figure in the ICCA) was forecasting a possible 11-1 defeat when he had seen the strength of the opposition. The line-up and individual games results were as follows:-

CHIPTEST	vs John van der Wiel (2560, GM)	0-1
HI-TECH	vs Jeroen Piket (2500, GM)	½-½
CRAY BLITZ	vs Paul van der Sterren (2500, IM)	1-0
FIDELITY MACH 4+	vs Rini Kuyf (2485, IM)	0-1
MEPHISTO ALMERIA 32	vs Rudy Douven (2445, IM)	0-1
BEBE	vs Friso Nijboer (2445, IM)	0-1
LACHEX	vs Joris Brenninkmeijer (2415, FM)	0-1
PHOENIX	vs Jeroen Vanheste (2410, FM)	0-1
BELLE	vs Frans Cuypers (2405, IM)	0-1
QUEST	vs Peter Gelpke (2395, FM)	1-0
MEPHISTO HILVERSUM	vs Kick Langeweg (2365, IM)	0-1
FIDELITY MACH 4	vs Albert Blees (2345, IM)	1-0

Obviously quite a few of the Computer participants were Main-Frame machines, so not commercially available, but it is good to see that Fidelity and Mephisto have commercially available programmes considered good enough to warrant inclusion. Indeed the Fidelity scored one of the wins recorded for the Computers which eventually went down by 8^{1}_{2}-3^{1}_{2}. Games were played at 60 moves in an hour with GM Jan Timman adjudicating after that.

Here is the FIDELITY MACH 4 win, **Albert BLEES** White, **Fidelity MACH 4** Black.

1 d4 Nf6 2 c4 e6 3 Nf3 b6 4 a3 d5 5 cxd5 exd5 6 Nc3 Bd6 7 Bg5 c6 8 e3 0-0 9 Bd3 Re8 10 Qc2 h6 11 Bh4 Bg4 12 h3 Bd7 13 Ne2?! c5 14 g4?! *(0-0, or 0-0-0!? looks to keep White just ahead)* **- c4 15 Bf5 b5 16 g5 Qa5+ 17 Kf1 hxg5 18 Nxg5 Bxf5 19 Qxf5 Nbd7 20 Rg1 Qd2? 21 Nf3! Qd3 22 Qxd3 cxd3 23 Nc1 d2 24 Nxd2 Rac8 25 Ke2 Rc2 26 Nd3??** *(White was probably just winning in this complicated position... until this move. 26 Bxf6 Nxf6 27 Kd1 Rec8 28 Nd3 Ne4 29 Nxe4 dxe4 looks okay for White. Or 26 Kd1 Rec8 27 Bxf6 which transposes to the above)* **- Ne4! 27 Rad1 Nb6 28 f3?** *(Blees has not seen the fine, forthcoming Fidelity combination. Here 28 Ke1 Nc4 29 Nf3 Nxb2 30 Nxb2 Rxb2 31 Ra1 f6 certainly would still favour Black, but nothing like as much as the following!)* **- Nxd2 29 Rxd2 Rxe3+!! 30 Kd1 Rxd2+ 31 Kxd2 Nc4+ 32 Kc2 Rxf3 33 Bf2 Nxb2 34 Nxb2** *(If 34 Kxb2 Rxd3 and a3 will follow)* **- Rxf2+ 35 Kc3 Rf3 36 Nd3 Bxa3 37 Kd2 f6 38 h4 Rh3 39 Rg4 Rh2+ 40 Kc3 Bd6 41 Rg1 a5 42 Ra1 Bc7 43 Rc1 Rxh4 44 Kd2 Bd6 45 Rc8+ Kf7 46 Rc6 Be7 47 Ke3 Re4+** *and White gave up the unequal task.* **0-1.**

PORZ, Jan 1989, and the MACH 3

We stay with Fidelity for the next game and its quickest win from Porz (reported in NS22) where it scored a fine 2151 Grading in a Tournament notorious for poor Computer results as a rule. Played in Round 2:-

White **Fidelity MACH 3**, Black **Dr Muller-Using** (1944 Elo)

1 e4 d5 *(An Opening in current "vogue" as mentioned in a recent Pergamon Chess)* **2 exd5 Nf6 3 d4 Nxd5 4 c4 Nb6 5 Nf3 g6 6 Nc3 Bg7 7 Be2 0-0 8 0-0 Nc6 9 Be3 e5 10 d5 Ne7 11 Qb3 Nf5 12 c5 Nxe3 13 fxe3 Nd7 14 Qa3 Bh6 15 Ne4 f5 16 Ned2 Nf6 17 d6 Ng4 18 Nc4 e4 19 Nfd2 f4 20 Nxe4 Qh4 21 h3 Bf5 22 Bxg4 Bxe4 23 dxc7 f3 24 Nd6 Qg3 25 Rf2 fxg2 26 Qb3+ Kh8 27 Nf7+ Rxf7 28 Qxf7 Bxe3 29 Qf6+..** 1-0.

JON SPEELMAN Simul v NOVAG

In February Jon Speelman gave his talents in a Simultaneous Display over 32 Boards to raise funds for the "Fight for Sight" Charity. Ray Keene reported in *"The Times"* of his intriguing game against the Novag Super Expert which was of some value for chess openings theory.

White **Jon SPEELMAN**, Black **Novag SUPER EXPERT**

1 c4 e5 2 Nc3 Nc6 3 Nf3 Nf6 4 g3 Bb4 5 Bg2 0-0 6 0-0 e4 7 Ng5 Bxc3 8 bxc3 Re8 9 f3 exf3 10 Nxf3 d5 11 d4 *(So far a repeat of Kasparov-Ivanchuk, 1988 Soviet Champs. where Black now played 11 - Ne4 and White got a fierce attack via 12 Qc2 dxc4 13 Rb1 f5 14 g4. The Novag Computer varies..)* **- dxc4 12 Rb1?!** *(The "obvious" attacking move is 12 Bg5 to capture on f6 and play Ne5)* **- Qe7 13 Bf4 Nd5** *(Ray Keene recommended the immediate 13 - Qxe2 here)* **14 Qc2 Nxf4 15 gxf4**

Qe3+ *(Not 15 - Qxe2?? 16 Rbe1 Qxc2 17 RxeS++)* 16 Rf2 Ne7 17 Ne5 Bf5 18 Qc1 Qxc1+ 19 Rxc1 f6 20 Nxc4 Be6 21 Na5 Bxa2 22 Bxb7 Rab8 *(White's possible central Pawn advance vs Black's split Q-side Pawns means that Speelman now holds a good positional advantage)* 23 e4 Bc4 24 Ra1 Kf7 25 f5 Bd3 26 Rd2 Bb5 27 Kf2 Kf8 28 Kf3 Kf7 29 h4 Nc8 30 c4 Bd7 31 Bd5+ Ke7 32 c5 Rd8 33 Raa2 Be8 34 Rab2 Rb5 35 Rxb5.. *Whatever Time Limits were in force came into action here and the game fell into adjudication and a win for White. Fair enough as the Super Expert itself on "auto play" awarded the game that way analysing 35 - Bxb5 36 Bc6 Bf1 37 Ke3 g6 38 Rb2 gxf5 39 Rb7 Kf8 40 Rxc7 Ne7 41 d5 Nxc6 42 Nxc6 followed by d6 and those central Pawns do indeed get the win.*

JUDIT POLGAR Simul vs MEPHISTO

The Polgar sisters are getting rather good at Simultaneous Displays in addition to their remarkable Tournament achievements. For example, after Zsofia's amazing win above many GMs with 8½/9 at the February Rome Open, Judit's Simul. score was a tremendous +19 =4 -2 while older sister Zsusza went through undefeated +22 =3 -0. But they don't win all of them!!

White Judit POLGAR, Black Mephisto ALMERIA 32, Nurnberg.

1 e4 c6 2 d4 d5 3 exd5 cxd5 4 c4 Nf6 5 Nc3 e6 6 Nf3 Bb4 7 cxd5 Nxd5 8 Bd2 Nc6 9 Bd3 0-0 10 0-0 Nf6 11 Bg5 h6 12 Bh4 g5 13 Bg3 a6 14 a3 Be7 15 Qd2 b5 16 h4 Nh5 17 Bh2 Bb7 18 hxg5 hxg5 19 Be4 Na5 20 Bxb7 Nxb7 21 Rae1 Ng7 22 Ne4 f6 23 b4 Qd5 24 Nc3 Qb3 25 Re3 Nf5 26 Rd3 g4 27 Ne1 Rac8 28 Nxb5 Qc4 29 Nc3 Kf7 30 d5 e5 31 d6 Nbxd6 32 Nd5 Qc1 33 Qe2 Rc4 34 Nxe7 Kxe7 35 Bxe5?! fxe5 36 Qxe5+ Kd7 37 b5 Rc5 38 Rxd6+ Nxd6 39 Qg7+ Rf7 40 Qxg4+ Kc7 41 Nd3 Qg5 42 Qd4 Rd5 43 Qa7+ Kd8 44 Qb8+ Kd7 45 bxa6 Qxg2+ *and White resigned.* 0-1.

A BLAST FROM THE PAST?!

After such a series of games demonstrating the progress currently being achieved by the leading Chess Computers, I thought it would encourage Readers to have an old game (c.1980) to play through! It is both interesting and amusing to reach the final position with WHITE having his 2 Knights on e8 and d8 to complete the win! Thanks to NS Reader Bernard Hill for sending me this one.

White Bernard HILL Black Fidelity VOICE CHESS CHALLENGER

1 e4 c5 2 Nf3 d6 3 d4 cxd 4 Nxd4 Nf6 5 Nc3 g6 *(VCC goes out of Book)* 6 Bg5 Nfd7? 7 Bc4 f6? 8 Ne6 Qb6 9 Nb5 Qa5+ 10 Bd2 Qa4 11 Nxc7+ Kf7 *(Forced)* 12 Nd8+ Ng7 *(Also forced)* 13 Ne8++. *How times have changed!*

I am sure that other NS Readers **must** have some games like this in their personal archives?... and that there's some amusing stuff out there which could be shared in the News Sheet! Some of those hilarious old blunders from the days when our Chess Computers *were* just a bit of fun - except when they went wrong or wouldn't let you take en passant - how we wished they could make them a bit stronger! Perhaps we could put a brevity in each Issue; sometimes I think we can take our Chess *too* seriously - of course it's easier to say that at my level of play! - a few light-hearted lines like Bernard's game above wont do us any harm.

Well the idea now was to have 2 or 3 pages of NEWS and Computer vs Computer GAMES... but already we reach the last page (apart from the RATING LIST in its usual "back-page" place). So a few Results will have to suffice. But first:-

---

Another ADVERT!

Mephisto DALLAS 16 bit in MODULAR Board - £350-
Enquirers contact *Andy S La Lond, 3 Cypress Drive, Puriton, Bridgewater TA7 8AQ. Telephone Puriton 683884.*

Late News!

Three **Mephisto** Computers are entered in the British Major at Plymouth.

Tom Furstenberg, Belgium, sent me results from Aegon 1989, an Event involving 16 Computers and 16 Humans. A **Fidelity** Multi-Processor scored $3\frac{1}{2}/5$ and graded 2409. **Chiptest** was 2nd. best Computer with 3 and a 2350 grade. Then **Fidelity MACH 4** and **Mephisto ALMERIA 32** with $2\frac{1}{2}$, grades 2208 and 2103 respectively. **Fidelity MACH 3** scored 2 and graded 2086. **Novag** had 2 "hi-speed" programmes entered and got $1\frac{1}{2}$ for 1939 and 1 for 1901 each. **Mephisto ALMERIA 16** graded 1909, **CXG SPHINX 1723 and Fidelity PHANTOM** 1637. Other Computer entries were experimental or unknown to British users and only scored "moderately" anyway!

Another **Fidelity** success is reported in *"MODUL"* an Austrian magazine. This was a Computer v Computer Tournament with 32 machines (!) and won by **MACH 4** with $6\frac{1}{2}/8$. **MACH 3** managed 2nd with 6, then came three **Mephistos, ROMA 32** 6, **ALMERIA 32** $5\frac{1}{2}$ and **MM4/8** with 5. Also with 5 but behind MM4/8 on tie-break were **Fidelity PAR E/12, Mephisto MEGA 4, Mephisto MM4, Novag SUPER EXPERT/6 normal.** Other placings which are of interest:- **Novag SUPER CONSTELLATION** came in the next group ahead of **Novag's Forte B, Super Forte/6 selective** and **Forte A.** A **CXG SPHINX DOMINATOR** (the same programme as GALAXY and COMMANDER, different boards) at 4MHz scored $4\frac{1}{2}$ but a 12MHz unit scored 0! One assumes there was something wrong with the latter! **Fidelity PHANTOM** and **Fidelity CLUB B** both came near the bottom, behind the **EXCEL DISPLAY** which scored 3. Two **SIMULTANOs** were entered and scored 4 and 3 respectively. 18 Computers scored 4, $4\frac{1}{2}$ or 5 so the middle of the Table was tightly packed!

A Blitz Event with 10 Computers run at the same time saw **Mephisto** gain revenge taking the top 4 places: **ALMERIA 32 scored 8/9 for 1st and the ROMA 32** and **MM4/8** got $6\frac{1}{2}$ to share 2nd ahead of **MEGA 4 . Fidelity PAR E/12** scored $4\frac{1}{2}$, then **MACH 4** with 4 ahead of **SIMULTANO** on $3\frac{1}{2}$, Nov **SUPER EXP/6** $2\frac{1}{2}$. 2 others.

The same Mag *(MODUL)* reports some good Computer vs Computer results for **Mephisto ACADEMY** but there is some mention of "selective 3" and "selective 5". I can't read the language so don't know what they are saying (I've written asking for a translation!). Readers will have seen comments in NS22 on the difficulties of knowing, [1] which is the **best** search system to use where there is a choice and, [2] how to rate the computers when results on various methods are used. I hear the **Novag SUPERS 'B'** version will have a wider choice of user-selection as well! Goran Grottling in *PLY* also refers to the same problem, then reports on a poor **Novag SUPER CONSTELLATION** grade of 1555/9 in a recent Tourny. *"Disappointing,"* says Goran. *"It makes me wonder if people nowadays are more used to playing against computers than before - so the old truths have become lies?!"* I think I've been saying something like that for a while now!

RATING LIST June/July News Sheet

BCF	Computer	Elo	+/-	Games	Pos	Human	Games
207	MEPH ALMERIA 32	2254	21	494	1	2187	87
203	FID 68020 MACH 4	2225	27	288	2	2209	77
197	MEPH ALMERIA 16	2178	23	412	3	1989	5
196	MEPH ROMA 32	2169	16	824	4	2041	57
193	FID 68000 MACH 3	2145	12	1490	5	2119	184
193	MEPH DALLAS 32	2141	15	987	6	2090	197
188	MEPH DALLAS 16	2105	13	1362	7	2010	50
188	MEPH ACADEMY	2102	25	353	8	2052	21
187	MEPH ROMA 16	2092	12	1397	9	1985	51
186	MEPH MOND/DALLAS XL	2091	23	420	10	2058	68
183	FID 68000 MACH 2C	2067	11	1768	11	2073	127
183	MEPHISTO COLLEGE	2063	50	85	12	2084	8
183	MEPH MEGA 4	2060	13	1343	13	2060	157
182	MEPH AMSTERDAM	2058	10	2226	14	2077	182
180	FID 68000 MACH 2B	2037	27	301	15	1978	25
179	NOV SUPER EXP-FORTE/6	2030	16	836	16	2072	127
179	MEPH MM4/5	2028	11	1813	17	2035	79
176	PSION ATARI/IBM	2004	14	1161	18	2043	25
175	CONCH PLY-VICTORIA	1999	69	46	19	1858	8
175	MEPH MONTE CARLO	1999	36	171	20		
174	KASP GAL ANALYST/8	1994	28	272	21	2026	98
173	FID 68000 MACH 2A	1981	26	330	22	1928	35
172	NOV SUPER EXP-FORTE/5	1973	13	1194	23	1846	29
171	CXG SPHINX	1969	18	657	24	1931	118
170	NOV EXPERT/6	1962	31	222	25	2046	22
170	FID 68000 CLUB B	1960	13	1296	26	1880	7
170	NOV EXPERT/5	1956	30	247	27	2062	62
168	FID AVANT GARDE/5	1944	12	1555	28	1875	77
168	KASP STRATOS/CORONA	1942	14	1133	29		
168	NOV FORTE B	1942	11	1798	30	1983	208
168	FID PAR E/ELITE 2100	1940	10	2160	31	1938	210
167	MEPH REBELL	1938	12	1503	32	1957	47
166	NOV FORTE A	1929	10	2036	33	1945	124
165	CONCH PLYMATE/5.5	1918	12	1474	34	1949	55
165	KASP GAL MAESTRO/6	1918	15	934	35	1883	123
164	MEPH SUPER MONDIAL	1914	15	941	36	2000	6
164	KASP GAL MAESTRO/4	1910	84	31	37	1992	6
163	NOV EXPERT/4	1901	16	873	38	1985	43
163	KASP TURBO KING	1900	40	132	39	1920	61
162	FID EXCELLENCE/4	1895	13	1311	40		

Top COMPUTER RATINGS vs HUMANS, June/July News Sheet

BCF	Computer	Elo	Games	Pos
201	FID 68020 MACH 4	2209	77	1
198	MEPH ALMERIA 32	2187	87	2
193	MEPH MEGA 4+TURBO*	2141	102	3
190	MEPH MM4+TURBO*	2123	36	4
190	FID 68000 MACH 3	2119	184	5
190	NOVAG SUPERS+TURBO*	2116	33	6
188	MEPH ACADEMY+TURBO*	2102	59	7
186	MEPH DALLAS 32	2090	197	8
186	MEPHISTO COLLEGE	2084	8	9
185	MEPH AMSTERDAM	2077	182	10
184	FID 68000 MACH 2C	2073	127	11
184	NOV SUPER EXP-FORTE/6	2072	127	12
184	NOV EXPERT+TURBO*	2072	78	13
183	NOV EXPERT/5	2062	62	14
182	MEPH MEGA 4	2060	157	15
182	MEPH MOND/DALLAS XL	2058	68	16
182	MEPH ACADEMY	2052	21	17
181	NOV EXPERT/6	2046	22	18
180	PSION ATARI/IBM	2043	25	19
180	MEPH ROMA 32	2041	57	20
180	MEPH MM4/8*	2038	8	21
180	CONCHESS PLYMATE/4	2037	6	22
179	NOV SUPER EXP-FORTE/8*	2035	24	23
179	MEPH MM4/5	2035	79	24
178	KASP GAL ANALYST/8	2026	98	25
178	KASP GALILEO+TURBO*	2022	49	26
176	MEPH DALLAS 16	2010	50	27
175	MEPH SUPER MONDIAL	2000	6	28
174	KASP GAL MAESTRO/4	1992	6	29
174	MEPH ALMERIA 16	1989	5	30
173	MEPH ROMA 16	1985	51	31
173	NOV EXPERT/4	1985	43	32
173	NOV FORTE B	1983	208	33
172	FID 68000 MACH 2B	1978	25	34
172	NOV SUPER EXPERT ORIG*	1973	22	35
172	MEPH BLITZ	1972	6	36
171	SCI TURBO KASP/4	1969	52	37
170	MEPH REBELL	1957	47	38
169	MEPH EXCL S/12	1951	27	39
169	FID PAR E/8*	1950	56	40