

## NEWS, INFORMATION, TOURNAMENTS AND REPORTS

### THE SECOND U.S. OPEN COMPUTER-CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP

*Mobile, Alabama, U.S.A*

*July 18-29, 1986*

As reported by the Editor

In Mobile, Alabama, the Second US Open Computer-Chess Championship was held on July 18-20, 1986. The list of participants contained 5 Fidelity computers, 5 Mephisto computers, 3 Novag computers, 3 Chess Master 2000 computers and 2 amateur programs. Fidelity repeated its victory in the 1985 tournament. Fidelity Challenger N was awarded three titles: U.S.A. Computer Champion, Super Computer Class Winner and Best New Program. Fidelity Private Line was dubbed Best Micro Computer. Only the fifth trophy, the Best PC Program, did not fall into the hands of Fidelity, but was won by Chess Master 2000 Apple.

The results are:

<i>Place</i>	<i>Machine</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Resistance</i>
1	Fidelity Challenger N	5	19
2	Fidelity Private Line	5	17
3	Mephisto Janus	4.5	14.5
4	Chess Master 2000 Apple	3.5	14.5
5	Fidelity PC	3.5	14.5
6	Novag Monster M	3.5	13.5
7	Mephisto Exclusive Rebel	3.5	11.5
8	Mephisto Mobile Rebel	3	11.5
9	Fidelity Elite	3	11
10	Fidelity Excellence	3	9.5
11	Novag Expert M	3	7.5
12	Mephisto Experimental	2.5	11
13	Novag Forte X	2.5	9
14	Chess Master 2000 IBM	2.5	5
15	Mephisto Rebel	2	8.5
16	Chess Master MS DOS	2	4.5
17	Zsu Zsa	1	4
18	Ega	1	3

The performance of the Fidelity machines may surprise those who know that, a year ago, Fidelity decided to withdraw temporarily from computer-chess tournaments. No Fidelity machines were entered in the 5th World Microcomputer-Chess Tournament in Amsterdam 1985, nor in the Fifth World Computer-Chess Championship in Cologne 1986. When analysing the final score, one encounters another unexpected result: what in Cologne seemed to be a new star in the sky of chess computers is in this tournament biting the dust, placed 7th, 8th and 15th. We refer to Ed Schröder's Rebel programs. Admittedly, the road to the top is long and winding, but we expect Rebel to find yet another short cut.

The Editor is happy to have gathered that such incidents as occurred last year (cf. Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 158-170) were not repeated this year. However, rumour has it that commercial interests are still sometimes more important than "sportsmachineship". We have been told that some machines did not play under the same conditions against stablemates as against other opponents. This preset behaviour implies that in certain companies the in-house winner was pre-ordained. In short, though there were no illegal matters, The Editorial Board (and many other computer-chess enthusiasts) would appreciate it if tricks like these were prevented in future. In possession of this rumour, the reader may well be tempted to re-interpret the results.

[The information above has reached the Editor from various sources.]



Photo by M.T. Fürstenberg

THE RACE IS NOT TO THE SWIFT...  
Tiny Rebel holding its own against Cray's  
number-crunching arrays (Cologne, 1986).