

over games you are going to learn something. And yet, even some of my own students, who get pretty high ratings, just don't enjoy going over GM games! This makes it hard for them to keep improving.

**MJ:** Is it true that tactics are 99% of chess?

**JP:** Yes. They're like the alphabet. There aren't that many different tactical ideas. But you combine them in different ways like you combine the letters of the alphabet to make a lot of words. Somebody who doesn't know all the letters of the alphabet is going to have a lot of trouble reading a complicated book.

**MJ:** What's Jack Peters' worst trait? What area do you want to work on improving in your life?

**JP:** I guess that I'm secretive. I'm not going to tell you any of my faults. If you don't know them, you're not going to learn them from me!

**MJ:** How do you want to be remembered?

**JP:** I'm not sure I really care. I'm sure I've offended people and irritated people and that I didn't do things the way I should have. And they can tell me during my life, but I don't care what they say about me afterwards.

**MJ:** Is there anything you'd like to add to the interview?

**JP:** You didn't ask me about computers.

**MJ:** Well, I know you and I have different views on them. That you were upset about computers taking over and I didn't have that same feeling.

**JP:** I've stated my case several times and I still feel that people don't understand what I was saying. I think that there are going to be profound negative effects on chess because of computers and they won't show up for years.

**MJ:** Well, what do you think about the latest news from IBM, that they are retiring Deep Blue. I guess that makes you happy?

**JP:** No. The only result that could make me happy was that if Deep Blue and all the other top computer programs played a series of matches against the best players and were thrashed over and over and over! So that the general public would feel that computers are not as good as the best human players. Now the general public thinks that computers are better than Kasparov because Deep Blue won this ridiculous match.

And a lot of chess players believe that it's inevitable, that even if Deep Blue did not win convincingly, that in a few more

years a faster computer will be even better. I don't believe either of those things!

I think that the perception that computers are better are going to affect teenagers. Some kids who would become real chess fanatics are going to go into some other field. So, we're not going to get the future Kasparovs. The ones with the real big egos, who have to be the very best. They're not going to want to be the very best if they think that there's a computer that's going to be much better than them, no matter how good they get.

**MJ:** Yes, but we still have world class track runners and yet we have cars that go 120 miles an hour.

**JP:** It's not the same thing. People are suppose to be unique because we are the only thinking creatures. And now there's a computer that comes along and produces better results.

**MJ:** Yes, but what about those people who say that it's really another feather in mankind's cap, since it's men's minds that created the computers.

**JP:** I've never heard anybody say that except computer programmers!

**MJ:** For example, IBM gets credit for creating Deep Blue, and IBM is made up of people.

**JP:** Well, my perception is a bit skewed because I care about chess a lot more than I care about IBM. And it might be a wonderful thing for IBM to have accomplished this feat, and they might think it's a great test for their machine. But I think, "What's it doing to the game of chess?" And, I don't like the answers I come up with.

**MJ:** Yes, but your answers seem based more on emotion than logic. Where's the proof that computers have hurt chess? I mean, if you can show me that there's been a decline in the USCF membership over the past six to eight months . . .

**JP:** All I can say is that if I'm correct, the future Garry Kasparovs will not develop. So, we won't know for sure for maybe 30 years.

**MJ:** But, how will we have any way to prove it?

**JP:** If there are no more Kasparovs, great players 30 years from now, we'd know it. If there are great players in the next couple of decades, then I was wrong. I hope I'm wrong.

**MJ:** But even if in the next 30 years there's no more Kasparovs, there's no way to prove that it was as a direct result of the computers.

**JP:** All right, that's true . . . but I will claim that I was correct!