Today: discussion of annotation exercise: All Men and Influence

- horsehoe on the board: Display Kasparov vs. Deep Blue version "just the lines.pdf" to save space, on whiteboard for markup

- set screen your display time out to 00

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

- discussion q's (in response to having seen CMS response)
  - some students didn't have embedded DS's?
  - discourse segment purpose ≠ topic? or = topic?
  - is the discourse coherent @ line 30?
  - interesting cues?

× how do you argue about existence of bind or hot? Intuition structure.

Background: this match from 1996: represents a big moment in the history of AI.
You all will be astounded to hear this, but at the time many people, incl. me and 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 I was stunned by this. A week later go on to win the match, but everyone was very tense and excited @ this particular point, the start of game 2.
MR. ASHLEY: Welcome to the ACM chess challenge. I'm Maurice Ashley. My partner is Yasser Seirawan. Garry Kasparov is playing against IBM's Deep Blue, and as most everybody here knows, he is down 1 nothing already. So Kasparov needing to play well in order to come back. A big question for him is whether or not he can handle the psychological pressure of being down against the computer that, first of all, everybody thought he was going to beat, including himself and, second of all, he simply has no idea how strong it is because this version that they're using has never been tested and is clearly playing some excellent chess.

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

MR. SEIRAWAN: Precision.

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

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

(Laughter.)

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

MR. ASHLEY: So you're in shock.

MR. SEIRAWAN: I'm in shock.

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

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

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

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

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