

#9 (lec 8 I was out of town)

Next week: Tu class replaced by IS colloq on Wed., 4:30, 301 College Ave. Cristian DNM.

Th: guest lecture by CDNM ~~(I'll be @ bot)~~ ^{first} author of amazing set of papers on ~~topic~~ of class topic and former copilot of this very course.

Today: discussion of annotation exercise; ~~and influence~~

< horseshoe @ the board. Display Kasparov dialog, version "just-the-lines.pdf" to save space, on whiteboard for markup. > < Bring lots of whiteboard markers >

< Set screensaver display timeout to 0 >

~~discussion of discourse~~

- have one student ~~present~~ start annotating, people jump in w/ their analysis.

- discussion of (in response to having seen CMS response)

- o some students didn't have embedded DS's?
- o discourse segment purpose ≠ topic? Or = topic? (↔)
- o is the discourse coherent @ line 30?
- o interesting cues?

* how do you argue about existence of boundary or not? Intuition structure.

meta-
One reason I have always liked using this as a discourse to annotate

Background 2: this match from 1996: represents a big moment in the history of AI.

~~this was when I was in grad school:~~

You all will be astounded to hear this, but @ the time many people, inc me; my fellow grad students, thought there was no way that the [IBM chess computer] Deep Blue could possibly beat the human world champion, Garry Kasparov.

But DB was the first game; everybody I knew was stunned by this ~~DB~~ world would later go on to win the match, but everyone was very tense and excited @ this particular point, the start of game 2.

Many diff segs, including crossing brackets.
Conclusion that intention-based reasoning seems to work best for large segments.

Lillian

PSO (all)
talk about
the game.

DSP:
talk
about
pressure

1 MR. ASHLEY: Welcome to the ACM chess challenge. I'm Maurice Ashley. My
2 partner is Yasser Seirwan. Garry Kasparov is playing against IBM's
3 Deep Blue, and as most everybody here knows, he is down 1 nothing
4 already. So Kasparov needing to play well in order to come back. A big
5 question for him is whether or not he can handle the psychological
6 pressure of being down against the computer that, first of all,
7 everybody thought he was going to beat, including himself and, second
8 of all, he simply has no idea how strong it is because this version
9 that they're using has never been tested and is clearly playing some
10 excellent chess.

Intro of salient discourse
entities

embedded or not?
How do we determine?
(by ~~text~~ inferred
intention structure, of
course).

~~It's apparent~~
(Focus-stack arg would
say embedded)

11 Yasser, yesterday's game was a model of computer cold-bloodedness.

change in tense, attention - signal a pop?

12 MR. SEIRAWAN: Precision.

what is this for? A grounding ack? A correction?

13 MR. ASHLEY: It just did not care about Kasparov's attack and just
14 ripped him off the board. It was unbelievable.

15 MR. SEIRAWAN: It's terrible. I'm still recovering.

DSP: A joke? An ack?

11-23: embedded action
is each other.

16 (Laughter.)

DSP: explain the surprisingness. we phrase

17 MR. SEIRAWAN: Actually, prior to the match I had said, okay, it's
18 great. This is wonderful. There's a lot of hype, the best computer
19 the world versus the best human player in the world. Well, it's no
20 contest. Garry is going to just win. And I would be shocked, shocked
21 if the computer won any game. So naturally

interruption to show: I recognize the DSP.

22 MR. ASHLEY: So you're in shock. (jokes ack?)

repetition = pop

23 MR. SEIRAWAN: I'm in shock.

24 So naturally Deep Blue won the first, and just as you were saying,
25 Maurice, I can't fault any single move that the computer made.

26 We had dinner last night together with a group of ourselves, and we
27 just kept going through the game at various stages, and we said, this
28 is a very, very serious opponent for Garry. This is a very legitimate
29 match, and of course now that Garry is down a point, he's got to prove
30 himself. Yesterday I had spoken about the fact that in tennis -- and
31 again I'm probably misattributing the quote. It was of Rod Laver, when
32 he was going to sum up his opposition, he said, I only need to see 3
33 shots. I need to see the forehand, backhand and the serve, and then I
34 will tell you how long or how many sets the match is going to last
35 before I win.

Max support for premise: how long is in trouble, what Garry's expectations
are, he
has inputted the first
match & me.

apparent incoherence!

36 And Garry said the same thing on Friday at the press conference. He
37 said basically I need to see the computer on offense, on defense, and
38 then the match is going to be mine. So he basically saw the first 2
39 games as just being his ability to sum up his opponent and then
40 vanquish him in the latter half of the match.

= tennis game

41 Well, that may still work, but he's got his work cut out for him. He's
42 made it more difficult for himself.

43 MR. ASHLEY: What about the psychological pressure on him? From what
44 I've seen, I've seen Kasparov down in matches before. He was down
45 against Anand in game 9. He was down against Kramnik in the Paris leg
46 of the Gran Prix tournament and came back and won. In each case
47 Kasparov seems to bounce back from matches. He is not just the kind of
48 guy who goes down in chess games and falls apart.

seems to be
saying that
the pressure is
not a problem:
so why the
first time?

who?
could Ashley
have been there?

? or just close?

incoherence resolved. give bkgd.

tennis