tal sample *par excellence*: Computer chess is the Drosophila of AI. [For those who have confined their genetics to the slow human gestation, let it be known that Drosophila, the fruit-fly, is the paradigm for genetics, breeding fast and furious: a generation is but a day.]

Sweeping along paradigmatically, Professor Michie takes our readers along a path leading from moderately successful chess programs to the unexplored realms of truly complex chess endgames, by way of meteorology towards animal genetics, the human genome being but a special case. In all areas, Professor Michie rests his case upon assumptions as yet to be proved, though likely in themselves, and sweepingly extrapolates towards an all-explanatory molecular science not unlike chess. As Editors, it would be foolish for us to give Michie less than his full due.

Likewise, we should be failing in our duty to give less than full honour to an article in this issue in which we - blushing is in order - adopt the grubbing approach. The theme is an exhaustively detailed and far from sweepingly broad analysis of White having two Knights and Black having precisely an h-Pawn. (Had Black had no Pawn, a draw would have been inevitable.) Grubbers all, we find that, working out the database bit by bit and piece by piece, there are still hopes for Black unless ...

It greatly redounds to Troitzky's credit, having published more than half a century ago, that he had worked out the precise conditions for White to win. Troitzky, of course unaided by any computer program, since those were not to be invented for two decades or more, exhibited a division of the chess board into safe and unsafe squares for the black King, grubbingly refined to the point where squares having less than a one percent probability of a loss were identified as potential losers.

It is not for your Editors to decide: we suspect the sweepers of unwarranted generalizations, we suspect the grubbers of plain programming errors. Still, we are a Journal of record, proud to publish any contributions to computer chess, not exploding but certainly expanding in this day and age.

Bob Herschberg
Jaap van den Herik

PLAYING FOR MATCHES?

Since the ICCA has reached the milestone of its 12th birthday human chess has been prodigiously matched by computer chess. Much of this development went on in the back-room departments, where boffins worked silently, if not secretively. Shortly, it will all come out into the open:

- The current human World Championship, Gary Kasparov, challenged but as yet invincible, has consented to play *Deep Thought*. It is to be a two-game match, an hour and a half to each side for each full game. The organizer is to be Shelby Lyman, the venue is New York NY, and the exciting date has been fixed for October 22.

- More intimately, your Association's President, David Levy, an International Master of no mean repute, has undertaken to play the very selfsame *Deep Thought* in London, UK. December 11 to 15, 1989, will see a four-game match under the rather more usual conditions of 40 moves within two hours. Needless to say, *Deep Thought* will not be present *in persona*, but it will be represented strongly enough to contest the US $5,000.-- *OMNI* prize for *Deep Thought* to win.

No bets are taken by this Journal on either outcome; both seem to be preordained. This will not diminish their interest, especially since our readers may be assured of having a blow-by-blow account of both matches, commented upon, we hope, by the more articulate player.

Bob Herschberg
Jaap van den Herik