

## MIND OVER MIPS

*Reinhold Gellner and Gaby von Rekowski*

Bohnenkampstrasse 12  
4500 Osnabrück  
Germany

As a sequel to Don Beal's article *Rules, Titles, and just what is a PC anyway?* (*ICCA Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 94-96) we would like to have a discussion on program versus machine.

In London 1990, one of us (Reinhold) stated: "Mind over MIPS!" But this is probably too weak. He should have said: "Mind over Money!" which presumably has a stronger psychological effect. Obviously, it is not necessary explicitly to conclude that the faster the machine, the better it performs. Nevertheless, we must admit that losing with a slow machine makes you feel bad. You are inclined to believe that the quality of the program is second class.

Therefore, we advocate for the establishment of an *Intelligence Group*, playing with programs supported by the same hardware. We see the following advantages:

- Any sponsor of machines always support a World Champion.
- The best *program* will win.
- The tournament results are fully comparable.
- The programmers need no longer look for expensive machines (they can concentrate on artificial-intelligence research).

Of course, several additional questions have to be answered. We mention:

- What type of hardware should be used?
- What type of compiler should be used?
- etc.

However, the two questions above already have a different nature. The hardware development is much faster than the software development. Nobody can buy a new machine every year, but a compiler is much cheaper. We would like to advocate for IBM PCs (or at least IBM compatibles) as a platform for World Championship programs.

We believe that there is some support to this (old) idea, e.g., by Don Beal, Martin Hirsch and some others.

Currently we are facing World Championship titles for the Manufacturers group (with emphasis on hardware), for the Software group, for the best Amateur, for the best PC program, etc.

We suggest the following dichotomies: (1) for the participants we distinguish between professionals and amateurs and (2) we distinguish between an open and an intelligence group.

Although not given here, it should be possible to find a suitable definition of a professional. Perhaps the definition should include persons who are supported by industrial companies or university funds. But we can leave this point to a further discussion.

This simple classification will avoid future disputes on the program-versus-machine issue and will help to support the development of stronger programs.

For us it does not seem to be "intelligent" to have two world championships next year. But even for a Micro-computer Championship, the classification above could be applied.