## 64th World Congress of Chess Composition 2022

## Award of Internet Composing Tourney (\#3 using Superguards fairy condition)

Superguards: A piece (including King) cannot be captured if it is guarded by a piece of its own colour.
I thank Marjan Kovacevic, Julia Vysotska and the organisers of the 64 th WCCC for inviting me to be the judge for the Internet composing tourney.

Superguards is a relatively new fairy condition that has not been fully explored, especially in the area of 3movers. This was one of the reasons for selecting it for this tourney!

After a slow start, 21 entries were received by the director, Thomas Brand. These were sent to me in anonymous form the very next day after the closing date. Thank you, Thomas!

The overall standard was quite high and I have selected 15 problems for the award. Due to the characteristics of the condition, waiting keys and plugging of black pieces were seen in many of the problems. However, some of the successful entries managed to achieve an open position and/or with a threat. An interesting fact was that almost all the entries had quiet W2 continuations! Many problems showed square blocking/unblocking as defence motives/weaknesses. Consequently, the Umnov theme and its anti-form defence on the threat square, also featured in these. Another Superguards specific effect used was the shutoff of a line piece guarding the BK. Other than these, themes and styles like Cycles, ODT correspondence and Logical plans were seen,

To conclude, I would say it was a successful tourney, which showed new possibilities in Superguards. I hope more composers will be inspired to try their own hand. My thanks to all the participants, congratulations to the winners and apologies to those whose entries didn't make it to the award.

Shankar Ram<br>Bangalore<br>11-Nov-2022

## List of participants

Attached by the director after the award was completed.
Balasubramanian, S. K. (IND) $\mathbf{8}^{*}$, 11;
Caillaud, Michel (FRA) 21;
Crisan, Vlaicu (ROU) 17*, 18*;
Daga, Anirudh (IND) 14;
Einat, Paz (ISL) 13, 19;
Gockel, Hubert (GER) 9*;
Gvozdják, Peter (SVK) 6, 7;
Huber, Eric (FRA/ROU) 17*, 18*;
Krätschmer, Ralf (GER) 9*, 10;
Lörinc, Juraj (SVK) 1, 3;
Ooms, Andy (BEL) 15;
Rittirsch, Manfred (GER) 20,
Seetharaman, Kalyan (IND) $\mathbf{8}^{*}, \mathbf{1 2}^{*}$;
Shapiro, Misha (ISL) 4, 5;
Syzonenko, Viktor (UKR) 16;
Uitenbroek, Hans (NDL) 2;
Velmurugan, Nalussamy (IND) 12*.

* indicate joint compositions.

1.Kc4! Zz
1...Qd6 2.d5 Qb8 3.d6 $\ddagger$ (2.Kd5? Qb8/c7! 3.R/Kd6+ Ke4/xd4!; 2.Rd5? Qc7! 3.Rd/Red6+ Qa5/Ke4!)
1...Qe4 2.Kd5 Qe1 3.Ke4 $\ddagger$ (2.Bd5? Qe~! 3.Be4+ Qxe4!)
1...Kd6 2.Be5 Kd7 3.R×d5 $\ddagger$ (2.Re5? Kd7 3.Rexd5 $\ddagger 2 \ldots$ Qe6!)
1...Ke4 2.Re5 Kf3 3.B×d5 $\ddagger$ (2.Be5? Ke3/f3!)

In four variations, the BK and BQ try to stay together, but are finally forced apart. The play includes BQ selfblocks on d6 and e4, 2 square vacations/occupations (Umnov) each on d 5 and e5, and a further one on d6 and e4. Also seen are two captures of the BQ on d5, making up a total of 4 moves to d 5 (a 5 th one appears after the 2 nd move try $1 \ldots \mathrm{Kd} 62 . \operatorname{Re} 5$ ? Kd7). In each variation, White has alternate moves to the thematic squares which however fail. The piece economy is excellent, with a BQ minimal setting and an open position. The harmonious play after the key with ODT resembles that seen in a HOTF $\mathrm{h} \# 2$ ! Similar play is also seen in No.21, but the position here is more light, elegant and dynamic.

1.Sg6? [2.R $\times \mathrm{g} 2 \mathrm{~A}[3 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \ddagger]]$
$1 . . \mathrm{R} 7 \times \mathrm{g} 6 \times 2 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{~B}[3 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{b} 6 \ddagger]$ (2.Qxe5? R7g5/Rf6!)
1...Rf7 y $2 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{e} 5 \mathrm{C}[3 . \mathrm{d} 5 \ddagger](2 . \mathrm{Rxg} 2$ ? Rf2!)
$1 \ldots \mathrm{Rd} 2 / \mathrm{e} 2 / \mathrm{f} 22 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{d} 2 / \mathrm{e} 2 / \mathrm{f} 2[3 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \ddagger]$
1...e3!
1.Sf7! [2.R×a7 B [3.B $\times \mathrm{b} 6 \ddagger$ ] ]
$1 . . . R 7 \mathrm{~g} 6 \times 2 . \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{e} 5 \mathrm{C}[3 . \mathrm{d} 5 \ddagger]$ (2.Rxa7? Rxc6! 3.Bxb6??)
$1 \ldots \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{f} 7$ y $2 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{g} 2 \mathbf{A}[3 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \ddagger](2 . \mathrm{Qxe} 5$ ? Re7/f5!)
1...Rg82.Q×e5 [3.d5 $\ddagger$

| $1 . \mathrm{Sb} 7 ?[2 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{~B}[3 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{b} 6 \ddagger]]$ | $1 . \mathrm{c} 7 ?[2 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{~B}[3 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{b} 6 \ddagger]]$ | $1 . \mathrm{Qh} 5 ?[2 . \mathrm{Qe} 2[3 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \ddagger]]$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \ldots \mathrm{Rc} 72 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{g} 2 \mathrm{~A}[3 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \ddagger]$ | $1 \ldots \mathrm{Rd} 7 / \times \mathrm{c} 72 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{g} 2 \mathrm{~A}[3 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \ddagger]$ | $1 \ldots \mathrm{Rd} 22 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{d} 2[3 . \mathrm{Kb} 2 \ddagger]$ |
| $1 \ldots \mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{~g} 6!\mathrm{x}$ | $1 \ldots \mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{~g} 62 . \mathrm{Qe} 8[3 . \mathrm{Qa} 4 \ddagger] \mathrm{b} 53 . \mathrm{Bb} 6 \ddagger$ | $1 \ldots \mathrm{R} 7 \mathrm{~g} 42 . \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{a} 7 \mathrm{~B}[3 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{b} 6 \ddagger]$ |
|  | $1 . . \mathrm{Rg} 8!$ | $1 \ldots \mathrm{e} \times \mathrm{f} 4!$ |

The Shedey theme is featured here, with Superguards well used in the play of both White and Black. Other effects seen are line closings, line openings, unguards and batteries. Dual avoidance is also seen. Some additional byplay tries round off an excellent problem. The matrix is symmetrical, as often happens with Cyclone theme settings, but the play on the a-file and the 2 nd rank lessens this to some extent. The heavy plugging with both white and black pawns is needed to restrain the white pieces and seems unavoidable in this setting.

1.e4! Zz
1...Rd6 2.Qf5 A Rc6+ 3.d6\$ B (2.Rf5??)
1...Kf5 2.d6 B Ke6 3.Qf5 $\ddagger$ A (2.Qd6? Kxe4!)
1...Bf5 2.Qd6 C Bg4 3.Rf5 $\ddagger$ (2.d6? Kxf6!)
$1 . . . \mathrm{Kd6}+2 . \mathrm{Bf5}$ Ke6 3.Qd6 $\ddagger \mathrm{C}$ (2.Qf5??)
1.Rh7? Bf5! 1.Qd6? Kf5! 1.d6? Bf5!

In 4 variations, all the play happens uniformly on d 6 and f 5 : Mutual incarceration by $\mathrm{BK} / \mathrm{BR} / \mathrm{BB}$, followed by square blocks by White, switchbacks of the $\mathrm{BK} / \mathrm{BR} / \mathrm{BB}$ and culminating with Umnov style mates. One pair of variations show a sequence reversal of W2/W3, while the other pair avoids it ("anti-reversal"). All the White continuations also have dual avoidance of some sort. Like No.3, this problem also features HOTF style ODT correspondence, but the position here is less open and the Black pieces are more restricted by pawn plugs.


Set Play:
$1 . . \mathrm{Sb} 3+\mathrm{x} 2 . \mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{b} 3 \mathrm{~A}[3 . \mathrm{Sd} 4 \ddagger]$ (2.Sc2? bxa5!)
$1 . . . \mathrm{Sc} 2+\mathrm{y} 2 . \mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{c} 2 \mathrm{~B}[3 . \mathrm{Sd} 4 \ddagger]$ (2.Sb3? fxe3!)
1.Sb3! [2.S $\times \mathrm{d} 4 \stackrel{+}{+}]$
$1 . . . \mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{b} 3+\mathrm{x} 2 . \mathrm{Sc} 2 \mathrm{~B} \mathrm{~S} \sim 3 . \mathrm{Sd} 4 \ddagger$
$1 . . \mathrm{Sc} 2 \mathrm{y} 2 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{C}$ [3.Sd4 $\ddagger$ ] (2.Sxc2? stalemate!)
1.Sc2! [2.S $\times$ d4\#]
$1 . . . \mathrm{Sb} 3 \times 2 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{c} 3 \mathrm{C}[3 . \mathrm{Sd} 4 \nleftarrow]$ (2.Sxb3? stalemate!)
$1 . . . S \times \mathrm{c} 2+\mathrm{y} 2 . \mathrm{Sb} 3 \mathrm{~A} \mathrm{~S} \sim 3 . \mathrm{Sd} 4 \ddagger$

In the set play, the B checks are met by straightforward captures, with immediate threat of mate on d 4 . Superguards being only used in the dual avoidance. In the two solutions, one of the BS moves is no longer a check and is met by the WB move to c3, while the other check is met by a non-capturing WS move to b3/c2. In both cases Black is in zugzwang after W2 and is forced to unguard d4. Duals are avoided by stalemate in the solutions and by the availability of BP captures in the set play. The final result is a Rice cycle, combined with a Kiss cycle. This combination has already been shown with 3 thematic Black defences (WinChloe\# $54040,82564,90543,150016,232317,666058)$. This problem might well be the first with 2 thematic Black defences. The heavy plugging is required to prevent the BS from making other moves, as well as to avoid other unsoundness issues. The reduced Superguards specificity in the set play and the short threats detract.
$1^{\text {st }}$ Honourable Mention - No. 2
Hans Uitenbroek

1.Kg4+? A Bd8! 2.Kg5+? Rf4! B
1.Kg5+? B Rf4! 2.Kg4+? Bd8! A
1.Rg5+? B $\times$ e1!, Kg 3 !
1.g7! $[2 . \mathrm{g} 8=\mathrm{Q}[3 . \mathrm{Qg} 5 \ddagger]]$
1...Bc3 2.Kg4+ A Bf6 3.Kg5 $\ddagger$ B
$1 \ldots \mathrm{Bd} 22 . \mathrm{Kg} 5+\mathrm{B} \mathrm{Rf} 43 . \mathrm{Kg} 4+\mathrm{A}$
1...Bd8 2.Rg5+Kg3 3.Rh×h5+

A lightly constructed problem in the logical style, also showing a sequence reversal of W2/W3. The two WK checks in either order are refuted by the BB and BR. The WR battery check is refuted by moves of both the BB and BK . After the key, the BB is decoyed to 3 different squares, where the tries now work. On c 3 , the Roman theme is seen, wherein a substitute defence by the BB to f 6 now interferes with the BR. The decoy to d 2 shows a pericitical maneuver, where the BR defence on f 4 now interferes with the BB. Finally, the decoy to d8 allows the WR battery to fire, closing the BB's line from d8, followed by a BK flight to a guarded square and the final mate by capture of the guarding BS on h 5 .

1.Qf3? [2.Qxh1[3.Qxd5†]] Rg1!
1.Qe1/e2? [2.f7[3.f8Q/R†]] Rg1! 2.f7 Rg8!
1.Ke1? [2.Qxh5/Qa4] Rfl! 2.Qxh5 Rxf6!
1.Ke2? [2.Qxh1/Qa4] Rf1! 2.Qa4 Rxf6! 3.Qd7/e8+ Rf8/d6!
1.Kg1! Zz
1...h4 2.Qg4 [3.Qg8 $\ddagger$ ]
$1 \ldots \mathrm{~d} \times \mathrm{c} 4$ 2.Qb1 [3.Qb6 $\ddagger$ ]
1...d4 2.Qa1 [3.Q×d4\#]

The tries by the WK/WQ fail to moves by the BR to fl and g 1 . After the paradoxical key, the unguards/line opening by the BP moves allow the WQ to maintain guard of the WK and also threaten mate - a kind of Pelle move effect. A very lightly constructed Meredith.

1.Rb3+? Ra7!
1.Rb7+? Bd1!
1.S $\times \mathrm{f} 7$ ? Be 2 !
1.Kxg4? Rf4+!
1.Bd5! [2.Bb3+ Ra7 3.Ba5 $\ddagger$
2...Rf4 3.c4\#]
1...Ra7 2.Ra5+ Bd7 3.Sb5 $\ddagger$
2...Bd1 3.Bb3 $\ddagger$
1...Rf4 2.Rb4+ Bd7 3.Sb5 $\ddagger$
2...Bd1 3.Bb3 $\ddagger$
$1 . . . \mathrm{Rc} 72 . \mathrm{B} \times \mathrm{c} 7$ [3.Bb3 $\ddagger$ ]
The two checking tries from the WR/WB battery c6-a4 with shutoffs of the BR/BB fail as the piece not shutoff guards the BK. The key abandons the battery and sets up a threat with shutoff mates on a5 and c 4 for the 2 nd move BR defences on a 7 and f 4 . The very same moves by the BR now occur as defences on the 1 st move and are met by a different set of shutoffs on a5 and b4, followed by shutoff mates on b 3 and b 5 for the 3rd move defences by the BB on d 1 and d 7 . A 3rd byplay variation rounds off the content. An intensive treatment of the Superguards specific shutoff motif in an elegant Meredith position.


## 1.Qh4!

1...K×e8 2.Rcd7 [3.Qh5†] (2.Rdd7? Kf7! 3.Qh5+ Ke6/f6!)
$1 \ldots \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{c} 72 . \mathrm{Rd} 7+\mathrm{Kc} 8$ 3.Sb6 $\ddagger$ (2.Bd7? Stalemate!)
$1 . . . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{d} 62 . \mathrm{Bd} 7 \mathrm{~K} \times \mathrm{c} 73 . \mathrm{e} 8=\mathrm{S} \ddagger(2 . \mathrm{Rd} 7+? \mathrm{Ke} 5 / \mathrm{e} 6!)$
2...Ke5 3.Sc4 4
1.Qb1/h1? K×d6!
1.Qd1/d2? $\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{e} 8$ !

Y-flights of the BK , which also captures one of the 3 white pieces, followed by one of the remaining 2 pieces moving to d 7 (Umnov). There is a cycle of the captured/moving pieces. Also seen is dual avoidance on W2. A pretty task rounded off with two thematic tries and an open position.


```
1.Sg5! [2.Se6 [3.Kd8\ddagger]]
1...Rc~ 2.Sc4 [3.Sd6 #]
1...Re~ 2.Se4 [3.Sd6%]
1...f4 2.Sf5 [3.Sd6\ddagger]
1...f6 2.Sf7 [3.Sd6/Kd8\ddagger]
```

4 Superguards specific square vacations on $\mathrm{c} 4 / \mathrm{e} 4 / \mathrm{f} 5 / \mathrm{f} 7$ for the BSs to prevent the threat, which also act as square vacations for the WSs. The BSs on g3 and h8 look like they could be replaced with a single BS on h6, but then the check on g8 looks difficult to stop. After 1...f6 2.Sf7, there is an unseparated dual threat 3.Sd6/Kd8.

1.Rb8? [2.Kg8\#] 0-0!
1.Kg8? [2.Rb8 $\ddagger$ ]
1...Rh7 2.K×h7 [3.Rb8\$]
1...Rh6!
1.Se7? [2.Sg8+Kd8 3.Ke7†]
1...Rf8 2.Rd7 Rh8 3.Sg8 $\ddagger$
$2 \ldots \operatorname{Rg} 83 . S \times \mathrm{g} 8 \ddagger$
$2 . . \mathrm{Kd8} 3 . \mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{f} 8 \ddagger$
$1 . .0-0$ !
1.Sf6! [2.Sg8+Kd8 3.Ke7母]
$1 . . .0-02 . \operatorname{Re} 7 \mathrm{R} \sim 3 . \mathrm{R}(\mathrm{x}) \mathrm{e} 8 \ddagger$ 2...Kh8 3.Kg8
1...Rf8 2.Rb8 R~3.S(x)g8 $\ddagger$
$2 .$. Kd8 3.Se8 $\ddagger$
With just 8 pieces, this problem elegantly features castling and a changed reply to $1 \ldots$ Rf8. The final mates are also of interest with the guarding line between the BR and BK being interfered with twice each on e8 (WS/WR) and g8 (WS/WK).

1.Sg7?
1...Bh5 2.Sg4 Ke5 3.R×g5 $\ddagger$
1...Ke6+2.S55+Kd5 3.Kd6 $\ddagger$
1...Rh5!
1.K~?
1...Bh5 2.Sg4 Ke5 3.R×g5 $\ddagger$
1...Rh5!
1.Kd6!
1...Bh5 2.Sg4 A Ke5+ $3 . \mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{g} 5 \div \mathbf{B}$
1...Rh5 2.Sg5 B Ke6+ $3 . \mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{g} 4 \ddagger \mathrm{~A}$

The solution features 2 variations with consecutive Umnov (also follow-my-leader) moves on W2/B2, and with a sequence reversal of W2/W3. After the $\mathrm{BR} / \mathrm{BB}$ incarcerate each other on h5, the WSs immobilize the remaining piece, forcing the BK to occupy the vacated square, while retaining its protection. The other WS then delivers the final mate by capturing the piece remaining on the g-file. The play is similar to No. 21. Here, a try by a WS adds an additional variation with a BK walk.

1.Bd6? [2.Ke7\# A] B $\times \mathrm{g} 4$ !
1.Sd6? [2.Ke8 $\ddagger$ B] a3!
1.Rf3/g3/h4? [2.Bd6 [3.Ke7市] Bb3!
1.Re3! [2.R×e4 [3.Ke7 A/Ke8\$B]
$1 . . . \mathrm{Bc} 22 . \mathrm{Bd} 6[3 . \mathrm{Ke} 7 \ddagger \mathrm{~A}]$
1 ...Bf3/×g4 2.Sd6 [3.Ke $8 \ddagger$ B]
The tries threaten single mates by the WK on e7 and e8 and are refuted by the BB moves gaining access to f5 and a4. After the key, White threatens both mates together. After Black loses control of one of the set play refutations, the tries now work. An interesting problem featuring logical, focal and pattern play.

1.Bg8++? R $\times \mathrm{g} 8$ !
1.Q×f6? [2.Sf8/Qf8 $\ddagger] 0-0$ !
1.Qg2! [2.Qg8+Ke7 3.Bf7\#]
$1 . . .0-02$.Sf7 R~3.Sf8 $\ddagger$
2...Kh7/h8 3.S×f8\$
1...Rf8 2.Bf7 R~3.Q(x)g8 $\ddagger$
2...Kd8 3.Re8 $\ddagger$

Castling, followed by shutoffs of the protecting BR. Similar to No.17, but with less economy and content.

1.S $\times \mathrm{c} 5+$ ? Ka5!
1.Bb7+? K×b7!
1.Kc3! [2.S $\times$ c5+ Ka5 3.b4 $\ddagger$ ]
1...Bd2/e3 2.Rh7 [3.Ra7/Bb7\#] e5! 3.Bb7 $\ddagger$
1...e5 2.Q×d5 [3.Qb7/Qc6/Bb7\$] Bxc8/Bd7 3.Qb7/Qc6 $\ddagger$
1...d4 2.R×c5 [3.Ra5/Rc6 $\ddagger$ ] e5/Bf3 3.Rc6 $\ddagger$

The 3 Black defences feature 2 line openings and an unguard, which allow White to play moves threatening 2 or more mates. These are then partially separated by further Black moves. Superguards, here, is only used in the key and as a defence motif to prevent the threat(W2) and partially separate the threats(W3).


1. $\mathrm{g} 7 / \mathrm{K} \sim / \mathrm{S} 3 \sim ? \mathrm{~g} \times \mathrm{f} 4$ !
1.S $\times \mathrm{g} 5$ ? Stalemate!
1.S4~? S~!
1.R~? Kd7!
1.Rc7! blocus
$1 . . . \mathrm{g} \times \mathrm{f} 42 . \mathrm{Kd} 7 \mathrm{Kd} 53 . \mathrm{Be} 6+$
1...Kd7 2.Se6 Ke8 3.Kd7 $\ddagger$

After some random tries fail, White makes a flight giving key, unblocking d7 for the BK. The ensuing 2 variations show a reciprocal occupation of d7 and e6 on W2/W3 with Superguards specific strategy. The BK is forced to move away and gets mated on d5 and e8.

