


Mathematical Go

Chilling Gets the Last Point



Elwyn Berlekamp

David Wolfe

Mathematical Go



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Mathematical Go

Chilling Gets the Last Point

Elwyn Berlekamp
U C Berkeley
Berkeley, California

David Wolfe
U C Berkeley
Berkeley, California



CRC Press

Taylor & Francis Group

Boca Raton London New York

CRC Press is an imprint of the
Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Reprinted 2010 by CRC Press
CRC Press
6000 Broken Sound Parkway, NW
Suite 300, Boca Raton, FL 33487
270 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10016
2 Park Square, Milton Park
Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN, UK

Editorial, Sales, and Customer Service Office

A K Peters, Ltd.
888 Worcester St., Suite 230
Wellesley, MA 02482

Copyright © 1994 by A K Peters, Ltd.

All rights reserved. No part of the material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or utilized in any form, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the copyright owner.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Berlekamp, Elwyn R.

Mathematical go: chilling gets the last point / Elwyn Berlekamp,
David Wolfe.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-56881-032-6

1. Go (Game) 2. Go (Game) — Mathematical Models. I. Wolfe,
David. II. Title.

GV1459.55.B47 1994

794—dc20

93-40859

CIP

Contents

Foreword	ix
Preface	xi
List of Figures	xv
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Why study Go	2
1.2 Easy (?) endgame problem	3
1.3 Teaser	7
1.4 Useful programs	7
2 An Overview	9
2.1 Fractions	9
2.2 Chilling	13
2.3 The need for more than just numbers	14
2.4 Ups, downs and stars	16
2.5 Tinies and minies	22
2.6 Multiple invasions	26
3 Mathematics of Games	31
3.1 Common concerns	31
3.2 Sums of games	34
3.3 Difference games	38
3.4 Simplifying games	40
3.4.1 Deleting dominated options	40
3.4.2 Reversing reversible options	41
3.5 Combinatorial game theory	45
3.5.1 Definitions	45
3.5.2 Canonical forms	47
3.5.3 Examples of games	48
3.5.4 Cooling	50

3.5.5	Incentives	51
3.6	Warming	52
4	Go Positions	57
4.1	Conventions	57
4.2	A problem	58
4.3	Corridors	65
4.4	Sums of corridors	68
4.5	Rooms	70
4.6	Proofs	79
4.7	Group invading many corridors	80
4.8	Another problem	85
4.9	9-dan stumping problem	88
4.10	Multiple sockets	93
4.10.1	Consistency check	97
4.10.2	Another example	99
4.10.3	A “realistic” example	100
4.10.4	The economist’s view	100
4.11	Infinitesimals generalizing up-second	102
5	Further Research	105
5.1	Applying the theory earlier in the game	105
5.2	Approximate results	105
5.3	Kos	106
5.4	Life and death	107
5.5	The last play	108
5.6	Extensions of current results	108
5.7	Hardness results	109
A	Rules of Go — A Top-down Overview	113
A.1	Rulesets can (rarely) yield differing results	114
A.2	Who has used these different rulesets?	114
A.3	Top-down view of rule options	116
A.4	Interpretations of territories	121
A.5	Loopy play and hung outcomes	121
A.6	Protocol	122
A.7	References to official rules	124
A.8	Overview	124

Foundations of the Rules of Go	127
B.1 Abstract	127
B.2 Ancient Go	129
B.2.1 The capturing rule	130
B.2.2 Ancient rules	131
B.2.3 Historical note	132
B.2.4 Greedy ancient Go	132
B.2.5 Groups of stones and topological configurations	133
B.2.6 Decomposition of a TGAP into a sum of configurations	135
B.2.7 Proof of completeness of the list of configurations	136
B.2.8 Definitions of <i>seki</i> and <i>independent life</i>	137
B.3 Local versions of the ancient rules	137
B.3.1 Philosophical revision of the ancient rules	137
B.3.2 American score = Chinese score	138
B.3.3 Komi	139
B.3.4 Five variations on the ancient rules	139
B.3.5 Mathematized ancient rules	140
B.3.6 Parity	141
B.3.7 One-point adjustments among C , J , and MU	142
B.3.8 The mathematized half-integer komi	145
B.4 Modeling by mathematical rules	145
B.4.1 Foreseeing the terminal configurations	145
B.4.2 Dead stones in ancient territory	146
B.4.3 Modernized territory in living regions	149
B.4.4 Earned immortality	149
B.4.5 Ko-playing, a la Conway	149
B.4.6 Ko playing, a la Japanese <i>confirmation phase</i>	150
B.4.7 Chinese komi	151
B.4.8 Mathematical rules which approximate the Japanese ko-scoring rule	151
B.4.9 Encore formally defined	151
B.5 Traditional basic shapes	152
B.5.1 False eyes and sockets	152
B.5.2 Sequences of sockets	153
B.5.3 Defective shapes in TGAP-imposters	154
B.5.4 Semi-terminal ancient positions	157
B.5.5 Other terminal ancient positions	158
B.5.6 Bent 4 in a corner	158
B.5.7 Positions which stress the fine print of Japanese rules	163

C Problems	169
D Solutions to Problems	179
E Summary of Games	189
Examples of Go positions with simple values	189
Combinatorial game theory summary	193
Summary of incentives	194
Generalized corridor invasions	196
Summary of rooms	202
F Glossary	207
Bibliography	219
Index	223

Foreword

This is an extraordinary book. The senior author (Elwyn Berlekamp) plays Go at only the 10-kyu level, and his colleague David Wolfe is rated an amateur shodan, yet they have developed techniques to solve late-stage endgame problems that stump top-ranking professional players. The problems typically offer a bewildering choice of similar-looking moves, each worth only one or two points, but with subtle priority relationships that cannot be adequately described by sente and gote. The solutions come out of combinatorial game theory, a branch of mathematics that Berlekamp helped develop. A Go player who masters its techniques can extract a one-point win from positions where the uninitiated will almost invariably lose or draw.

The theory presented in this book assigns each active area on the board an abstract value, then shows how to compare these values to select the optimum move, or add them up to determine the optimum outcome. Some of the values are familiar numbers or fractions, but most are more bizarre objects (arrows, stars, trees) quite unlike anything in the existing Go literature. From these abstractions, the reader will learn that positions seeming to have the same numerical value can be crucially different, while positions that appear completely different can be mathematically identical.

It should be emphasized that this book will not help the reader improve his opening or midgame strategy. Nor does it reveal any tactical secrets; locally, the tactics are all of the simple kind that a beginner can read out easily. In terms of practical benefit on the board, the most the reader can hope for is to get stronger by one point. (Of course, a lot of games are decided by one point.)

A Go player with an interest in mathematics, however, or a mathematician interested in Go, will relish this book, because it describes substantial connections between the two subjects which have hitherto been largely unrecognized. The theory developed is precise, rigorous, intellectually appealing, and demonstrably successful. As a bonus, there is a novel discussion of the mathematical rules of Go.

September 1993

James Davies
Tokyo, Japan



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Preface

History of combinatorial game theory and its role in Go

As a typical game of Go approaches its conclusion, the active regions of play become independent of one another. Play in each region is not affected by play in the others; although one player may make several successive plays in the same region while his opponent chooses to play elsewhere. The overall board position therefore may be regarded as a *sum* of disjoint partial board positions.

Combinatorial game theory has long been concerned with such sums of games. The first nontrivial result was perhaps the solution of the game of Nim by Bouton at Harvard in 1901. In the 1930s, his work was extended to a broader class of games by Sprague and Grundy; later, Guy and Smith [GS56] [Guy89] masterfully exploited this theory to obtain complete, closed-form solutions to a wide variety of games. Most of their work dealt only with *impartial* games, in which all pieces on the board have the same color and can be moved by either player. These games have no scores; rather, the outcome depends only on who got the last move. Nonetheless, the impartial theory later played a major role in the analysis of Dots and Boxes [BCG82, pp. 507–550], even though it is a contest over scores.

In the early 1970s, Conway discovered and axiomatized the theory of combinatorial games, including *partisan* games, which generalized impartial games so that players might control pieces or stones of opposite colors. Conway also discovered several theorems about the special role of games called *numbers*, including the *mean value theorem*, which provided a new formulation of earlier work by Hanner [Han59] and Milnor [Mil53] on sums of games with scores. Many results were published in *On Numbers and Games* [Con76]; more results plus numerous examples appeared in *Winning Ways* [BCG82], a two-volume treatise on which Berlekamp, Conway, and Guy had collaborated since the late 1960s.

These results made it possible to analyze games in which score determined the winner, and so it was tempting to apply the theory to Go. Initial attempts to apply combinatorial game theory to Go endgames in the 1970s

failed, partly because certain crucial notions (particularly, *chilling* and *warming* operators) were not yet sufficiently well understood.

By the early 1980s, combinatorial game theory had developed powerful techniques for handling many other games in which board positions tend to break up into disjoint active regions. These included Hackenbush, Toads and Frogs, and Domineering. Here, the theory assigns an abstract *value* to each active region. In a simple inactive region, this value coincides with a numerical count of the score. In an active region, this value embodies the traditional Go player's notion of the *count*, as well as a considerable amount of additional information about the local situation. Each value depends only on a local analysis of the relevant partial board position. The value does *not* depend on who moves next; it takes all competent sequences of local play into account. And fortunately, the values of most simple positions all belong to a relatively small set of common simple values. Each value can occur in many different positions. So, to analyze the entire board position, one can compute the mathematical *sum* of all of the mathematical values representing the various regions of the board.

However, the practical utility of such a theory depends very much on the properties of the values which occur. If the local positions are sufficiently complicated that their values are intractable, then the sum can be very hard to analyze. Until the late 1980s, it had appeared as though the values which occur in even simple Go positions were so strange and intractable as to limit the theory's usefulness.

In 1984, Robin Pemantle [Pem84] calculated values for many $2 \times n$ and $3 \times n$ Domineering positions. Efforts to understand the properties of these values led to refined *warming* and *overheating* operators, and to a new game called Blockbusting, which can be viewed as a simplified variation of $2 \times n$ and $3 \times n$ Domineering. Chilled Blockbusting values are well-understood numbers, and, in Blockbusting, an appropriate warming operator inverts chilling.

This book

In 1989, it became clear that *chilling* reduces many common Go positions to familiar values, such as numbers, infinitesimals, and switches, and that chilling can be inverted by an appropriate warming operator. The authors of this book met and our collaboration began. Much of this book is based on Wolfe's dissertation [Wol91].

After chilling, many values which are common in late-stage Go endgames

turn out to be very tractable, even though these values and their mathematical properties are not yet well known outside a small community of specialists. The values which appear are universal; they apply directly to Winning Ways games and to the ancient Hawaiian game of Konane. They facilitate a complete, precise, and thoroughly rigorous analysis of sums of Go endgames.

Acknowledgements

Since 1990, significant contributions to Mathematical Go have been made by a number of students from four incarnations of Berlekamp's combinatorial game theory courses, including Raymond Chen, David Moews, David Moulton, and Yonghoan Kim.

Our work on this book has also benefitted from the advice, criticism, and novel ideas of many others. We received support from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, from the Center for Pure and Applied Mathematics of the University of California at Berkeley, and from Mitsubishi Electric Research Laboratory, where Berlekamp was a Visiting Fellow in the spring of 1992. During the past 3 years, both of us have given a number of formal and informal seminars and lectures on this subject. We have received some very constructive ideas and comments from many persons, including Eric Baum, David Kent, Kiga Yasuo, Martin Mueller, Jurg Nievergelt, Nick Patterson, Lisa Stewart, Herb Taylor, and Takizawa Takenobu. Stephen Parrott, James Davies, and Richard Bozulich reviewed early versions of this book and suggested so many major improvements that it was substantially rewritten. Richard Bozulich has also served as the facilitator, coordinator, and translator for our visits to Japan, and Fujisawa Kazunari has coordinated our interactions with the professional Go community at the Nihon Ki'in.

We have grown increasingly appreciative of the very different perspectives from which games are viewed by Go players, mathematicians, and computer scientists. People who routinely visualize the subject from more than one angle are rare, but they do exist. One such person was Bob High, who was President of the American Go Association at the time of his untimely death in a white water rafting accident on January 8, 1993. He was a strong amateur Go player who also had a keen interest in mathematics. He attended several of our seminars and learned a great deal about this subject by studying the papers and notes that we sent him. He then wrote two papers, [Hig91] and [Boz92, pp. 218–224], [Boz92, pp. 218–224], aimed at making some version of this material accessible to the Go player who had no

training in advanced mathematics. These manuscripts played a pivotal role in persuading us of the feasibility of this book.

We believe the study of mathematical Go is still in its infancy. Generalizations of the notions of *temperature* and *mean values* to include many types of Kos are already known. Progress is continuing rapidly, and we are hopeful that others will refine and extend the results presented in this book.

List of Figures

1.1	<i>Which move is better for Black?</i>	3
1.2	<i>Reducing the number of stones on the left makes a the better move</i>	4
1.3	<i>A position where b is better</i>	4
1.4	<i>Two possible lines of play</i>	5
1.5	<i>What if White plays the other way?</i>	6
1.6	<i>White to move and win</i>	8
2.1	<i>White to move and win — How much is each move worth?</i> .	10
2.2	<i>Each corridor with its value for Black, and the value of a move (Partially shown stones are safe.)</i>	11
2.3	<i>The number of points each region is worth</i>	11
2.4	<i>Values of corridor areas, unchilled temperatures and chilled incentives</i>	13
2.5	<i>White to move and win. (Both positions are identical except for the region around c.</i>	14
2.6	<i>Solutions to problems posed in Figure 2.5</i>	15
2.7	<i>White to move and win — How much is each move worth?</i> .	16
2.8	<i>Each corridor with its value for Black, and the value of a Black move and of a White move when playing the chilled game</i> . .	20
2.9	<i>The value of each region. Black and White have the same number of markings</i>	21
2.10	<i>Mathematical solution to Figure 2.5</i>	21
2.11	<i>The possible move sequences from $\{\dashrightarrow \mid 0 \parallel 0 \parallel \parallel 0\}$</i>	23
2.12	<i>(Text on page 26) Which corridors Black should attack first. Here, x and y are numbers with $y > x > 0$. In the examples, $x = 2$ and $y = 4$. Remember to ignore any pair of chilled games summing to zero. Positions higher in the table are more urgent for Black.</i>	24
2.13	<i>Unconnected group invading many corridors</i>	27
2.14	<i>The same group connected at \triangle</i>	27

3.1	<i>Four small endgame problems</i>	35
3.2	<i>A bigger problem which actually consists of the 4 smaller problems pasted together</i>	36
3.3	<i>Each position is evaluated separately</i>	37
3.4	<i>Endgame question</i>	38
3.5	<i>Differencing</i>	39
3.6	<i>Black wins moving first (left), but White only ties (right)</i> . .	39
3.7	<i>Game tree for example position. In the lower left, the same tree is repeated, and in the lower right the game is shown unchilled</i>	44
3.8	<i>Definitions of common infinitesimals</i>	50
4.1	<i>Two related endgame problems</i>	59
4.2	<i>Two related endgame problems</i>	59
4.3	<i>Two related endgame problems</i>	62
4.4	<i>The independence of the two regions needs justification</i> . . .	62
4.5	<i>Partial order of Left's Incentives. x and y are numbers, with $y > x > 0$.</i>	69
4.6	<i>3, 4 and 5 node rooms</i>	71
4.7	<i>6 node rooms</i>	72
4.8	<i>7-node rooms</i>	73
4.8	<i>(continued from prior page)</i>	74
4.8	<i>(continued from prior page)</i>	75
4.8	<i>(continued from prior page)</i>	76
4.9	<i>Rogue 7-node room — the chilled game graph is shown here</i> .	77
4.10	<i>Rogue 7-node room — the warmed game graph is shown here</i>	78
4.11	<i>Game g — Unconnected group invading many corridors</i> . . .	80
4.12	<i>Game g' — The same group connected at Δ</i>	80
4.13	<i>Examples of socket environments. The shaded thick line on each diagram indicates a group of stones of any size which must eventually connect at the socket to survive.</i>	82
4.14	<i>A problem requiring Theorem 8</i>	85
4.15	<i>The same problem; there are 12 black markings and 12 white</i>	86
4.16	<i>Solution to problem</i>	87
4.17	<i>White to move and win. There are 45 markings of each color.</i>	89
4.18	<i>Calculations done to solve problem</i>	90
4.18	<i>(continued from prior page)</i>	91
4.19	<i>Solution to problem</i>	92
4.20	<i>Multiple sockets invasion</i>	93

4.21	<i>A tree representation, with root at top and leaves at bottom</i>	93
4.22	<i>Solution to example</i>	95
4.23	<i>Complicated example</i>	98
4.24	<i>Position with interesting infinitesimals. Shown on the right is an example where $b_0 = 1/4$, $b_1 = 1/4$ and $b_2 = 1/8$.</i>	103
4.25	<i>A surprisingly complicated position</i>	104
A.1	<i>A position where all territorial scoring rules agree</i>	113
A.2	<i>What is the score? White has just played at Δ, capturing a single black stone in ko. Each side has 1 captive, and 52 stones on the board, none of which are dead.</i>	114
A.3	<i>Score of Figure A.2 under different rules. A \checkmark indicates that mathematical rules can be designed to match any of the scoring methods.</i>	115
A.4	<i>A suicidal Taiwanese kothreat, before and after the move</i>	119
A.5	<i>"Eternal life" — A Japanese loop of length 4. Best play is Black at a, White at b, Black at ①, White at ②, returning to the same position.</i>	120
A.6	<i>A triple ko (in seki) — Black to move. After the sequence shown on the right, each move capturing a single stone, the position is repeated.</i>	120
B.1	<i>The first few moves</i>	130
B.2	<i>Examples of capture rule</i>	131
B.3	<i>As many as four strings can share life in a TGAP</i>	134
B.4	<i>Bichromatic linear seki with 9 groups and 11 strings</i>	135
B.5	<i>Summary of one-point adjustments to Mathematized endings</i>	143
B.6	<i>The 6 point Chinese komi</i>	151
B.7	<i>A $2n \times 5$ board providing $2n$ dame</i>	152
B.8	<i>Some basic eye (and false eye) shapes</i>	153
B.9	<i>Four sockets (or false eyes) along the top</i>	153
B.10	<i>Single eye shapes. If a single black string captures either of the above shapes, Black immediately has 1 eye.</i>	155
B.11	<i>Big eye shapes. If a single black string captures any of these shapes, Black can be assured of only one eye.</i>	156
B.12	<i>Four in a line is a living eye space</i>	156
B.13	<i>A 2-group seki with adjacent empty nodes</i>	157
B.14	<i>A semi-terminal seki position</i>	158

B.15	<i>Terminal ancient positions which are not termed terminal greedy ancient positions</i>	158
B.16	<i>Above left (in the top left corner of a Go board) is a bent 4 in a corner shape. Above right might lead to bent 4.</i>	159
B.17	<i>Bent 4 in the corner. After 3 plays it's a kofight, and Black must make the first kothreat.</i>	159
B.18	<i>White wins by 1 (easily counted by Chinese scoring along the main diagonal)</i>	160
B.19	<i>In (a), White appears 3 points ahead (because of bent 4 in the corner), but he loses the encore by 7. Diagrams (b-c) show how when Black has an irremovable kothreat, the bent 4 in the corner may not be dead.</i>	161
B.20	<i>A more complex variant of bent 4 in the corner</i>	162
B.21	<i>The approach ko</i>	164
B.22	<i>An anti-seki with score 0. Under 1989 official Japanese rules, seven black stones and one white stone are officially dead, but cannot be removed.</i>	165
B.23	<i>Seven dead black stones can be removed, in any ruleset</i>	165
B.24	<i>An unusual situation. In the first line of play, Black moves first. In the second, White moves first. Captives are shown below the boards.</i>	167
C.1	<i>Numbers warmup</i>	170
C.2	<i>Ups and stars warmup</i>	170
C.3	<i>Combination of $0^n x$ warmup</i>	170
C.4	<i>#'s, ↑'s and *'s</i>	171
C.5	<i>#'s, ↑'s and *'s</i>	171
C.6	<i>#'s, ↑'s and *'s</i>	171
C.7	<i>#'s, ↑'s and *'s</i>	171
C.8	<i>#'s, ↑'s and *'s</i>	172
C.9	<i>#'s, ↑'s and *'s</i>	172
C.10	<i>#'s, ↑'s and *'s</i>	172
C.11	<i>#'s, ↑'s and *'s</i>	173
C.12	<i>$0^n x$'s</i>	174
C.13	<i>$0^n x$'s</i>	174
C.14	<i>$0^n x$'s</i>	174
C.15	<i>More ↑'s and *'s</i>	175
C.16	<i>More ↑'s and *'s</i>	175
C.17	<i>Multiple corridors</i>	175

C.18	<i>Multiple corridors</i>	176
C.19	<i>Lots of $0^n x$'s</i>	177
C.20	<i>Capturing race? Five white captives are off the board.</i>	178
C.21	<i>Hot miai</i>	178
C.22	<i>Two switches</i>	178
D.1	<i>Total $-\frac{1}{8}$</i>	180
D.2	<i>Total \uparrow^*</i>	180
D.3	<i>Atomic weight 1</i>	180
D.4	<i>Total \downarrow</i>	181
D.5	<i>Total \downarrow^*</i>	181
D.6	<i>Total $*$</i>	181
D.7	<i>Total \uparrow^*</i>	181
D.8	<i>Total \uparrow^*</i>	182
D.9	<i>Total $*$</i>	182
D.10	<i>Total \uparrow^*</i>	182
D.11	<i>Total \uparrow^*</i>	183
D.12	<i>Atomic weight 0</i>	184
D.13	<i>Total $\frac{1}{2} 0$</i>	184
D.14	<i>Atomic weight 1</i>	184
D.15	<i>Total \downarrow</i>	185
D.16	<i>Total $*$</i>	185
D.17	<i>Total $-\frac{1}{32}$</i>	185
D.18	<i>Atomic weight 0</i>	186
D.19	<i>Atomic weight 1</i>	187
D.20	<i>Total $-\frac{1}{2}$</i>	188
D.21	<i>Atomic weight 1</i>	188
D.22	<i>Only one switch works</i>	188
E.1	<i>Some examples of positions worth $\frac{1}{2}$</i>	189
E.2	<i>Some examples of positions worth $\frac{1}{4}$</i>	190
E.3	<i>Some examples of positions worth $*$</i>	191
E.4	<i>Some examples of positions worth \uparrow</i>	191
E.5	<i>Some examples of positions worth \uparrow^*</i>	192
E.6	<i>Some examples of positions worth \uparrow_1</i>	192
E.7	<i>Some examples of positions worth $0 \uparrow_2$</i>	192
E.8	<i>Summary of definitions of games</i>	193

E.9	<i>Which corridors Black should attack first. Here, x and y are numbers with $y > x > 0$. In the examples, $x = 2$ and $y = 4$. Remember to ignore any pair of chilled games summing to zero. Positions higher in the table are more urgent for Black.</i>	194
E.10	<i>Summary of blocked corridor invasions by connected or unconnected invading groups</i>	197
E.11	<i>Rooms which chill to numbers. All ≤ 7 node rooms are sorted by shape in Section 4.5</i>	202
E.12	<i>Rooms which chill to values infinitesimally close to numbers .</i>	203
E.13	<i>Hot rooms</i>	204
E.13	<i>(continued from prior page)</i>	205
E.13	<i>(continued from prior page)</i>	206

Chapter 1

Introduction

Since you are reading this book, you are likely to fall into one of three categories:

- A mathematician interested in the applications of mathematics to games and Go.¹
- A Go player interested in how mathematics might improve your game.
- A computer scientist interested in how to design or improve Go playing programs.

Mathematicians will find theorems about Go both subtle and surprising. Combinatorial game theory provides general methods for analyzing games, particularly games in which typical positions have separate pieces with limited interaction. This decomposition into pieces gives *group* structure, and this structure can be exploited to precisely analyze Go endgame positions that don't yield to the methods of the strongest Go players.

Go players can find quicker ways to improve their game than to read this book. Many of the positions analyzed do not tend to come up in contexts which take full advantage of the subtleties of the results. However, there are some wonderful lessons for the Go player. *Sente* (the worth of keeping the initiative), and *gote* (giving up initiative) are issues which are only vaguely understood by all but the finest Go players. This is in part because the

¹A top-down overview of the rules to Go appears in Appendix A. In this book, Japanese or American style scoring rules are assumed (i.e., scoring territory minus prisoners). Extensions of the results to rules which score territory plus stones on the board are discussed in Appendices A and B. Also, a glossary of terms appears in Appendix F.

concepts are subtle, but also because the meaning of initiative is, by nature, vague and amorphous. The game theory does away with these concepts by providing clearer and more concrete methods, and these in turn will give the Go player a better understanding of *sente* and *gote*. Lastly, the technique of “playing the difference game” is basic to combinatorial game theory, and does not seem to exist in traditional Go theory; the Go player is encouraged to concentrate much of his/her attention on this technique given in Section 3.3.

For the computer scientist, the mathematical theory provides general and precise methods for simplifying local game trees in the endgame. These methods take into account the possibility that a player may move several times in a row in a local position when the opponent chooses to move elsewhere. Unfortunately, a virtually complete description of local game trees is required; the methods are therefore most applicable at a point when the typical game can be analyzed by brute force. Nonetheless, these methods are a start in a promising new direction. A good program will require a strong understanding of how to integrate what is known about nearly separated positions.

1.1 Why study Go

People want to understand the things that people like to do, and people like to play games. Perhaps that’s all the justification needed to study games. But games also provide a concrete, self-contained framework in which to study mathematical and programming methods. In a game not only are the rules (and therefore the model) clear, but one measure of success is clear: How does a human or computer play relative to an experienced player with established records or ratings?

Go is particularly attractive to study because:

- Go’s three or four thousand year old history and popularity throughout the world (particularly in Asia) means there are many experts on whom theories can be tested and from whom insights can be gained.
- Simple rules shorten the process of designing models, and make the game susceptible to mathematical analysis.
- Go poses new and more formidable challenges for the sorts of programming methods which have had great success in chess. Go is therefore an excellent testing ground for new artificial intelligence techniques.




Figure 1.2: *Reducing the number of stones on the left makes a the better move*

b is, indeed, better. Consider the position on the left in Figure 1.3 where White has just moved at ①. Assume that the obscured middle of the board has been completely resolved to a tie in score. So whoever does better in the last four endgame regions will win the game.




Figure 1.3: *A position where b is better*

If Belle Black responds at *b*, surely she can get a tie. The bottom of the board mirrors the top, and no matter what Wright White does from then on, Ms. Black simply maintains symmetry. Suppose, on the other hand, Black responds at *a*. Then, as we'll see in the diagrams that follow, Mr. White can proceed to win by one point, and *b* is indeed the better move!

One possible line of play is shown in Figure 1.4(a). Black simply blocks White's incursions, and then White blocks Black's. In this line, White gets the last move and consequently wins by one point. In fact, **getting the last move is the key** — when Black played the symmetric play at *b* in Figure 1.3, she could get a tie by maintaining symmetry throughout the game to guarantee the last play. It seems that Black's plays at ② and ④




Figure 1.4: Two possible lines of play