game could take, all the possible paths, if drawn on a piece of paper, would resemble an upside down tree with its branches (the possible paths) sticking out of the bottom, its trunk a single line reaching up to the sky.

The trunk of the tree begins at a single point representing one of all the possible moves the computer will consider to figure the best (hopefully) move of all those possible. At each "node" in the tree, those dastardly crooks where one path is broken into two possible directions, the computer must decide which path is the most likely one to eventually be followed when the game in progress gets there. If the computer guesses correctly, and this can be a big if, it will play the game of an expert competitor. But if it guesses wrong, it may be beaten by the simplest of strategies.

I do not mean to degrade the value of a look-ahead. But I do want to impress upon you that just because a game uses a deep look-ahead to calculate its move does not mean that it will play a good game. Unless the computer looks in the right direction, its search, no matter how deep, could prove to be useless. Even defeating.

The means of reaching a look-ahead depth, then, are potentially more important to the success of the process