

INTRODUCTION to the Article on Adjourning

Botvinnik's time control: Tried, Tested And Found Perfect

Give & Take: More time to consider moves = higher quality chess; it also means more time needed to complete games and tournaments. After many trials and deliberations, an ideal time control was established and unanimously approved, and remained, unchallenged, the norm for all chess events for full 70 years, 1925-1994, the truly Golden Era of our game.

In our opinion, this control can be equally well applied nowadays, if approved: say, by members of a local chess club, or by sponsors (and participants) of the super-tournament. And sponsors will appear, as for most of us chess is above all associated with deep, strategic thinking. Yes, many spectators like to watch fast-moving hands, falling pieces, quickly reached results—but even more of us were happy, for a full hour or even longer, to deliberate with Kasparov his next move.

We gave up the classic time control, as well as classic world-championship format—Botvinnik's Chess—not because of emerging chess computers, still quite weak by 1995. No, the real culprit was The Great Schism of the chess world. The image of chess was severely damaged; the prices and honorariums almost halved. Naturally, Grandmasters reacted, opting for shorter games and events, and, of course, no adjourning games with their tiresome nightly analyses. In a few years computers indeed achieved super-GM level, so it became natural to connect these two occurrences. By this mishap totally innocent comp became in minds of many the killer of adjourned games.

Please read pages 5-6 and 11-14 of our article. There we analyze, assisted—Of Course—by the strongest most recent machines—the adjourned position in Seville, game 24. Please, don't grandly dismiss us and our arguments. Better turn on your comp and tell us what we have missed. A forced win for Kasparov? A forced draw for Karpov?

Here is the position from Carlsen-Karjakin, game 3, as if adjourned after Black's 41st move, plus the very real proverbial computer print-out. Contrary to misleading expectations, the print-out doesn't show any definitive, neither forced win nor forced draw. The game doesn't end if adjourned! Well, if you have better hardware and software, you know better how to use them—Please, Show Us!

But even if one day Super-Supercomputer would calculate toward the end these positions, even the starting position (like it was done in checkers) — So What? Will someone remember all essential lines and start win one game after another? Ask Ivanchuk: Checkers, long ago fully calculated through, remain quite challenging, and quite popular.

Waiting for your refutations (if we're lucky, also for advice):

Lev Alburt, Jon Crumiller