

CORRESPONDENCE

APPLES TO PEARS ON KNOWLEDGE SYNTHESIS

Walter Korn

This is a general observation about comparing apples to pears when we look at the subjects Professors Michie and Bratko chose for testing the limits of human power in chess conceptualization and its limitations, as against the need to complement it with computer power.

They chose one such subject, and described AJR as "one of the world's leading scholars of the chess endgame", as the guinea pig for testing the optimum for a human performance. May I state in very simple terms - I am not a computer scientist - that I presume that in testing human efficiency as against needed machine support, you must use a proponent of presumably highest calibre available and applicable - and that must be a chess mind of Grand-Master calibre.

I realize that they chose someone "available" - AJR and not a GM - but let there be no doubt that regardless of the topic, "game" or "endgame", a GM capability of conceptualization, and also within a given time, is far superior to a class A's or expert's (AJR is no more than that) prodding mind; capable perhaps of arriving at just some, imagined, concepts, after so many months, as against the infinitely greater capacity of the Grand Master to recognize and collect a far greater sum of concepts within a shorter period.

In my time of collecting studies (I am the author of "American Chess Art", Pitman 1975, 300 pp. and I am also a FIDE judge of chess composition and author of prize-winning studies), I found a number of endings from GM games where on the spur of the moment the GM saw the winning line in some most complicated ending that looked like a draw to anyone - which would include any "scholar" expert of the endgame unless he simply has that GM intuition of visualizing the win.

From the point of overall insight, be it opening or middlegame or endgame, the creative theme and ability still has to be present and discernible. As far as I notice, AJR's "Endgame Study Compositions" may be analytical, often-constructed types of "themes" that have been carefully followed in their arithmetic progression, but they are neither "romantic", nor even truly natural studies, and when "thematic" they are not aesthetic.

The authors must enrol a Grand Master for fair comparison.

MASTER CHESS BY NOW, NO WORLD CHAMPION CHESS AT 2000

Stuart Cracraft

I am enclosing in this message two brief statements that may be of interest to the ICCA Journal readership. First, I would like to accept David Levy's challenge to ICCA readers wishing to make a wager regarding the future probable course of computer chess strength. I am prepared to wager US \$ 2000 that a machine will *not* defeat the World Champion in an extended match by the year 2000.

Second, the computer-chess community now has a new master in its midst. The program is called "Novag Turbo". This machine has entered in and played a total of 24 USCF-sanctioned games at both local and national tournaments. The game scores are:

Wins against: 2057, 1908, 2108, 2126, 1565, 2117,
 2235, 2034, 2016, 2007, 2239, 2144,
 2180, 1811, 1887

Draws against: 2080, 1831

Losses against: 2545, 2137, 2112, 2293, 2401, 2240,
 2217

I have asked both Ken Thompson and USCF Senior Master Larry Kaufman to estimate a rating based upon these results and their consensus was a performance rating of 2247 and an actual rating of 2228.