

8TH EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIP

DAILY BULLETIN

Wrocław, Tuesday 29 July

Bulletin nr 4

6 teams within 10 points



Europe scores

The overnight leaders from Belgium had a difficult day. First they lost the Derby (see inside) and were lucky not to be overtaken, then they had to face second place Poland. Despite winning that match, they were now overtaken, but the battle is very close at the top.

In the afternoon, the attention turned to the Football pitch, where four teams battled for a title. The motto of the day was European Union, as no less than 5 countries provided members to the winning team, aptly called "Europe".



Jakub dribbles

Results

Round 12

Wroclaw P	Italy	17- 13
Wroclaw U	Aalborg	16- 14
Warsaw 1	Prague K2	20- 10
Netherlands 1	Prague K1	14- 16
Lodz	Prague E	14- 16
Poland	Rome	25- 3
Netherlands 2	Warwick	13- 17
Warsaw 2	Belgium	16- 14
Gdansk	Leuven	25- 4
Wroclaw AZS	Antwerp	25- 4

Round 13

Aalborg	Wroclaw P	22- 8
Prague K2	Wroclaw U	16- 14
Prague K1	Warsaw 1	10- 20
Prague E	Netherlands 1	22- 8
Rome	Lodz	19- 11
Warwick	Poland	19- 11
Belgium	Netherlands 2	11- 19
Leuven	Warsaw 2	8- 22
Antwerp	Gdansk	6- 24
Italy	Wroclaw AZS	18- 12

Round 14

Wroclaw P	Prague K2	13- 17
Wroclaw U	Prague K1	9- 21
Warsaw 1	Prague E	25- 0
Netherlands 1	Rome	21- 9
Lodz	Warwick	6- 24
Poland	Belgium	14- 16
Netherlands 2	Leuven	16- 14
Warsaw 2	Antwerp	25- 3
Gdansk	Italy	7- 23
Wroclaw AZS	Aalborg	9- 21

Football

Semi-finals:		
Poland B	Europe	4- 6
Poland A	Czech Rep	9- 3
Consolation:		
Poland B	Czech Rep.	4- 9
Final:		
Poland A	Europe	1- 5

Ranking after round 14

1	Italy	266.0
2	Warwick	265.0
3	Belgium	265.0
4	Warsaw 1	261.0
5	Poland	260.0
6	Prague K1	256.0
7	Netherlands 2	242.0
8	Gdansk	234.0
9	Warsaw 2	232.0
10	Wroclaw P	207.0
11	Aalborg	205.0
12	Wroclaw U	200.0
13	Lodz	193.0
14	Prague K2	190.0
15	Netherlands 1	176.0
16	Rome	175.0
17	Prague E	172.0
18	Wroclaw AZS	163.0
19	Leuven	107.0
20	Antwerp	55.0

The Football tournament

Four teams participated, Poland A (Warsaw & Gdansk), Poland B(ubu) (Wroclaw, Lodz), the Czech Republic and the Rest of Europe, composed of Danes, Italians, a Dutchman and a Belgian.

Bubu played gallantly for a full three minutes, after which he had to be stretchered off.

After the semi-finals, the Italian members of the European team had to leave. That left the team rather short in numbers, so they asked three of the Poles to switch sides. One of them was Jakub Kotorowicz. A former team mate of his, in the stands, joked "just like in bridge, he's always playing for the opposition". He did so with great success, apparently.

Meet the English

Dave, Leigh, Sarah, Ben



Ever since the European University championships started, the British, later the English have sent to them the winning team of their national University Championships. This year the English Bridge Union has again sent the winning team, and we can only be sad that the other Universities did not take up the invitations to also send teams.

Whereas previously the English teams were either from Oxford or Cambridge, this year Warwick University near Birmingham ran away with the title, beating Durham university in the final. Let's meet them:

Leigh Chapman, Sarah Whitehead and Dave Cropper all study Maths, and **Ben Cowling** tries telling them Statistics is not just Maths.

Leigh and Dave can't get enough Bridge, it seems. When they return home they will be playing over 100 boards at the English trials starting this Friday. Then a few days later they will be playing 9 days in a row at the summer nationals.

Sarah and Ben seem to think that 5 days Bridge here is quite enough for them ... how strange!

Meet the Italians



Top 1-8, Bottom 9-13

There are two Italian teams here. One team is representing the **Campus Bio Medico di Roma**, but they actually study in different universities in the Eternal City. The Romans brought three young ladies: Francesca de Marchis (13), who studies Mathematics at Sapienza, Manuela Aprile (10), Engineering at Roma Tre and Giorgia Tani (11) Biomedical Engineering.

Federico Assenzo (12) studies the same, Antonio Rosati (1) does "Biomolecular Organic Chemistry" at Sapienza and Marco Romei (2) does Management Engineering at Tor Vergata.

The Roman captain is Enrico Guerra (4).

The **Federazione Italiana Gioco Bridge** have also sent a combined team, with players from six different universities, all over Italy. Two players study in Milano: Francesco Ferrari (5) does Economics and Commerce at the Cattolica, Alberto Sangiorgio (11) Engineering at the Politecnico. Two players study in Napoli: Stefano Uccello (6), Engineering at Federico II, and Simone Pisano (7) Medicine at SUN. Andrea Boldrini (9) studies Law at Lumsa in Palermo. Matteo Sbarigia (8) joins Manuela in the Engineering at la Terza di Roma.

Their captain is Gianpaolo Rinaldi (3).

Missing Photos

Hans Broeksteeg was mentioned in two articles yesterday, but we had no room for the picture:



Marcin Elmer of Wroclaw P tried sneaking into several photos yesterday (including the team photo of the Czechs), but he finally made it when he proudly announced he had just won 89 IMPs. He was so truly saddened to have to admit to me that it was against Antwerp that I could not resist and publish his picture:



Several people have wondered what the first flag is in the building. It is the new (not yet official even) flag of **Serbia and Montenegro**.



red, blue and white



And finally, here is the missing captain of Prague K2, **Zdenek Pirek**

Inspired by the Wind

By Richard Ritmeijer

While Sunday was hot and demanding, a fresh wind offered new opportunities on Monday. Hard work and perspiration made room for inspiring moments. Erwin Barendregt (Neth 2) had one of these moments in round 11 against Rome.

Board 6. Dealer East.

E/W Vulnerable.

♠ 9 6 4	♠ 10 8 7 5
♥ A Q J 4 2	♥ K 7 5
♦ 10 9 7	♦ A Q 5
♣ 10 6	♣ K J 7
♠ Q J 2	♠ A K 3
♥ 10 9 8 3	♥ 6
♦ J 8 3	♦ K 6 4 2
♣ 8 5 4	♣ A Q 9 3 2

After a 1♣ opening in East, Erwin had no better alternative than to bid 1NT in South. Obviously his partner showed little respect for his inspired action and transferred to 2♥ which became the final contract. The spade lead was for the ace and a heart to the queen was ducked by East. This gave declarer the chance to take the finesse in clubs and ruff a third round of clubs, followed by ♥A and a heart to East's king. East returned a spade taken by South who played the ♣3 which won the trick. Another trump trick and ♦K ensured 10 tricks in the 5-1 heart fit. Unfortunately this cost us 6 IMPs because the other table managed to make 3NT

Although inspiration is sometimes lacking in the last round the boards are nonetheless no less spectacular. Both the

Netherlands and Warwick reached 6NT by East:

Board 12. Dealer West.

N/S Vulnerable.

♠ Q J 10 8 4	♠ K 6 5 3
♥ J 2	♥ K 8 3
♦ 9 8 6 2	♦ A K Q 7
♣ 10 5	♣ Q 9
♠ 9	♠ A 7 2
♥ A Q 10 7	♥ 9 6 5 4
♦ J 5 3	♦ 10 4
♣ A J 8 6 3	♣ K 7 4 2

Martin Bootsma had to play the contract after a 2♠ overcall in North and a 3♠ raise in South. Despite their (OVER)active involvement during the auction, South led ♣7. The only reason for South not to lead a spade is that he has the ace. Therefore Martin could have reasoned that the only winning play is to take the ♣Q and play 4 hearts and 4 diamonds, leaving South with his bare ♠A and ♣K42. Then he can play club to the jack followed by a spade, endplaying South. At the other table North/South did not intervene. Again ♣7 was led to 10 and queen. Ben Cowling immediately played club to the jack and ace. North signalled for spades on his first discard, so Ben tried a spade to the king, leaving him with 9 tricks. Martin actually followed the same reasoning but also had to find out that it is difficult to remain inspired in the last round.

Appeal 1 – Gdansk v Wroclaw P

Appeals Committee:

Geert Magerman (Chairman, Belgium),
Herman De Wael (Scribe, Belgium),
Christer Andersson (Sweden), Stanislaw
Golebiowski (Poland)

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vulnerable.

♠ A J 8 7 6 3	
♥ K 4 2	
♦ K 9 8 3	
♣ -	
♠ 10 4 2	♠ K Q 9 5
♥ Q 6 5 3	♥ J 10 8 7
♦ 10 7 5	♦ -
♣ K 10 4	♣ Q J 6 5 2
♠ -	
♥ A 9	
♦ A Q J 6 4 2	
♣ A 9 8 7 3	

West	North	East	South
<i>Robak</i>	<i>Kasprzak</i>	<i>Wolanski</i>	<i>Nowosadzki</i>
Pass	1♠	1NT	Dble
Pass	Pass	2♣	Dble
Pass	2♠	Pass	3NT
All Pass			

Result: 10 tricks, NS +630

The Facts: 1NT was meant as 8-15, 4 hearts and 5+ of a minor, and East explained it like that to North.. West explained it to South as natural, 15-17.

The Director: Could not find anything on the Convention Card of East/West to suggest that West's explanation was correct, so he ruled that South had been misinformed. The Director believed that East/West should not keep their good score, but that on the other hand North/South had contributed considerably to their own bad score.

Ruling:

North/South receive: NS +630
East/West receive: 6♦+1: NS +1390

Relevant Laws: Law 75A, 40C, 12C2

North/South appealed

The Players: South explained that he had realized after 2♣ that there might be something wrong. He had asked again, and West had told him again that it was 15-17, although he could not be certain. South told the Committee that there were two options: either West's explanation was wrong, or East did have a normal NT with long clubs. His partner could have as few as 10 HCP. He had decided that he would not show opponents anything they might use in defence and just bid 3NT.

East/West had nothing to say. They agreed with the facts and accepted the ruling.

South further added that they might well bid the grand slam.

The Committee: Saw no reason to question the part of the ruling concerning East/West. If they had given correct information, North/South could easily find the slam.

The Committee then concentrated on North/South and the Director's decision to split the score. The Code of Practice states that this can only be done if the actions of the non-offending side can be described as "Wild, Gambling or Irrational". South's decision was indeed bad, but was it very bad?

The Committee observed that South's reasoning was flawed. North passed on 1NTX so he cannot be very weak, and

then he ran from 2♣X, so he must be unbalanced. Playing weak twos means that one-level openings with unbalanced hands must be stronger. North's spades can't be all that good, if East has a natural 1NT, so again there are more points in the red suits. South really should have bid 3♦. Even North could have bid 2♦ in the previous round.

All in all, it was felt that North/South had contributed greatly to their own bad score. 3NT was a gambling action by a player who might have known something was amiss.

The Committee's decision:
Director's ruling upheld.

Deposit: Returned

News from Antwerp

The players from Antwerp wish to express their gratitude to all their opponents who haven't ceased to help them learn to play bridge. They want to have it known that they have all (bar one) had their first bridge course last September. They also want to thank their sponsors (too many to name) who have made it possible for them to come here.

They wish to invite you to the next edition of the annual tournament their club (DUA, whose slogan is "Sex, Bridge and Rock & Roll") organizes on 14 March 2004.

More news at www.dua.be.

Iron defence

By Alon Amsel

Apparently Herman wants me in every bulletin and before he digs up another one of my mistakes, I'll write this little article. I was East:

Board 11. Dealer South.
None Vulnerable.

♠ K Q 6 5	
♥ K Q 9 4	
♦ 9 6 5	
♣ 10 7	
♠ 10 8 4 3	♠ A 9 7 2
♥ 6	♥ A J 5 3
♦ Q J 7 4	♦ 10 8 2
♣ A Q 9 8	♣ 3 2
	♠ J
	♥ 10 8 7 2
	♦ A K 3
	♣ K J 6 5 4

South opened 2♣, clubs and a major. After North had established that his partner had hearts he optimistically jumped to 4♥.

Steven led the ♦Q. Declarer took with the ace and led his spade, which was easy to read as a singleton, since he must have the ♦K and with 2 spades and 2 diamonds he would try trumps first. So I took my ♠A and played another diamond. Hearts to the king and ace. Steven now let me keep the ♦10 after which I switched to clubs. Steven cashed a second club and played a third, which was correctly ruffed with the 9, but when I did not overruff, declarer trumped a low spade to try the heart finesse. He was so astonished when Steven discarded that he actually forgot to take the queen. Trumps back and I made another trick with the last trump. Down 4, but that was just 3 IMPs.

By Paul Magerman and Christer Andersson

Match of the Day - Netherlands 2 - Belgium

The Derby of the Low Countries has a tradition in University Championships. In the past, the match has even been specially arranged to coincide with the Pairs tournament just to attract visitors from both countries.

It has happened before that one of the teams was leading the event, but this was the first time the old rivals met with the Belgians as favourites.

Sitting down a bit tired Tuesday morning, the Bulletin staff was directly alerted by a speculative intervention by South in the closed room:

Board 1. Dealer North.
None Vulnerable.

♠ 7	
♥ 10 7 5 3 2	
♦ K J 6	
♣ J 4 3 2	
♠ 10 5	♠ A K J 4 3
♥ J 9	♥ A K Q
♦ Q 8 7	♦ 10 2
♣ K Q 10 9 7 5	♣ A 8 6
♠ Q 9 8 6 2	
♥ 8 6 4	
♦ A 9 5 4 3	
♣ -	

Open Room

West	North	East	South
Jannes	Alon	Martin	Steven
	Pass	2NT	Pass
3♣	Pass	3♠	Pass
3NT	All Pass		

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
Tine	Richard	Johan	Erwin
	Pass	2♣	2♠
Pass	Pass	Dble	All Pass

Had West led the ♠10 declarer could have escaped for three down by winning the queen and then a bit dangerously directly finesse in diamonds to get the extra entry to the table to ruff clubs.

Most likely declarer would have played diamonds from the top and gone four down. West, however, lead ♣Q for Erwin Barendregt to ruff. A diamond to the king, another club ruff, and the ♦A followed. There was another trump trick to come for -3. 500 to Belgium.

In the open room Steven De Donder intelligently kept quiet and the Dutch reached 3 NT with East as declarer. As spades had been bid by East, Steven had no trouble to find the diamond lead and beat the contract one trick. Belgium lead by 11 IMPs.

The Netherlands recovered directly on the second board to take over the lead. Both teams optimistically bid the North-South cards to 4♥:

Board 2. Dealer East.
N/S Vulnerable.

♠ Q 10	
♥ 9 6 2	
♦ J 4	
♣ K 10 9 7 4 3	
♠ 9 8 5 3 2	♠ J 6
♥ A 7	♥ J 5 4
♦ Q 9 7 2	♦ K 8 6 5
♣ A 2	♣ Q 8 6 5
♠ A K 7 4	
♥ K Q 10 8 3	
♦ A 10 3	
♣ J	

The $\diamond 7$ was lead to the king and ace at both tables and both declarers tried the $\clubsuit J$. In the closed room Tine Dobbels won the ace and made the slight error of continuing with ace and a small trump. South could draw the last trump, establish a diamond and enter the table to discard a losing spade on the king of clubs.

In the open room West ducked the $\clubsuit J$ and Jannes Van't Oever accurately won the king. Instead of finessing the trump ten, declarer now continued with three high spades to discard the valuable diamond from the table. East could ruff this trick, play a trump to partner's ace and get a second spade ruff. The $\diamond Q$ was now the setting trick, and Netherlands got 12 IMPs back.



Jannes: too difficult play

Board 3 saw both teams scoring game. Belgium was in the much better contract (5 \clubsuit) but lost 2 IMP as Netherlands played 4 \heartsuit at the other table. With the $\diamond A$ well placed there were no problems in the play.

Both teams reached 4 \heartsuit on board 4, but at one table a few overtricks increased the Dutch lead to 16-11.

Board 5 could have been more costly than the 2 IMPs Belgium paid out:

Board 5. Dealer North.
N/S Vulnerable.

	\spadesuit K J 7 4 3	
	\heartsuit K	
	\diamond 8 7 6	
	\clubsuit 10 8 7 3	
\spadesuit 10 6		\spadesuit A 2
\heartsuit A 9 7 6		\heartsuit 10 8 5 4
\diamond Q 9 5 3		\diamond A K J 10 2
\clubsuit A K 6		\clubsuit J 9
	\spadesuit Q 9 8 5	
	\heartsuit Q J 3 2	
	\diamond 4	
	\clubsuit Q 5 4 2	

Open Room

West	North	East	South
Jannes	Alon	Martin	Steven
	Pass	1 \diamond	Pass
1 \heartsuit	Pass	2 \heartsuit	Pass
4 \heartsuit	All Pass		

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
Tine	Richard	Johan	Erwin
	Pass	1 \diamond	Pass
1 \heartsuit	Pass	3 \heartsuit	Pass
4 \clubsuit	Pass	4 \diamond	Pass
4 \heartsuit	Pass	4 \spadesuit	Pass
4NT	Pass	5 \heartsuit	All Pass

In the closed room East bid optimistically, inducing West to initiate a slam try. The pair stopped a level too high and could not recover from the poor trump break. The contract was two down.

In the open room the Dutch reached the proper contract. North led the $\clubsuit 7$ and the jack was covered by queen and ace. The trick with the hand is not to lose three trump tricks if the suit splits 4-1. If this is the case it is 3:2 for the singleton

being a high card. Thus, it looks correct to start with ace and another trump. However, declarer tried a small trump to North's singleton king. The ♣10 return went to the king and a club was ruffed. Now declarer has to play South for both remaining heart honours to succeed. When he chose to play the hearts from the top the contract went one off.

Board 6 was an uninteresting 3 NT, as long as North became declarer to protect his ♠K3 stopper. Both teams solved this problem. Board 7 was a simple 4♥ making an overtrick. The Netherlands lead was 18-11 with three boards to go. Board 8 could have become more costly than it actually did:

Board 8. Dealer West.
None Vulnerable.

♠ 9 4	♠ A Q 8 5
♥ J 10 7 6 2	♥ Q 8
♦ 9	♦ K Q 10 8 6 2
♣ Q J 10 6 5	♣ 3
♠ K 10 3	
♥ A K 9 5	
♦ J 3	
♣ A 9 8 4	

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Jannes</i>	<i>Alon</i>	<i>Martin</i>	<i>Steven</i>
3♣	Pass	Pass	3NT
All Pass			

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Tine</i>	<i>Richard</i>	<i>Johan</i>	<i>Erwin</i>
Pass	Pass	1♦	Dble
Pass	1♠	2♦	Pass
Pass	2♠	All Pass	



Martin Bootsma

Martin's outrageous pre-empt in the open room showed a two-suiter including clubs. Why South chose to bid 3NT instead of defend is unknown to us. West led ♥2 to queen and ace. Declarer had not much to choose between and continued with the ♣A and a club to the ten and king. A spade followed to the ten but from here declarer could do nothing better than cash his six tricks and throw East in to get a spade at the end. Two down gave the Dutch 100.

The bidding was more normal in the closed room but North-South reached a shaky 2♠ contract. East lead of the ♦Q was won by declarers ace. A heart followed to the ace, a club to the king and a spade to the ...king (!?). Declarer cashed the ♥K and ruffed a heart. But East overruffed with the trump eight, drew the trumps, put down the ♦K and asked for the remaining four diamond tricks. Three down and 2 IMPs to Belgium



Johan
takes all the tricks

On board 9 the Dutch bid and made 4♥ in the closed room, whereas their teammates tried 4♠ at the other table. They were doubled but the contract could only be defeated one trick. 6 more IMPs to the Netherlands.

The last board of the match was no advertisement for any of the teams:

Board 10. Dealer East.
All Vulnerable.

♠ 8 2	♠ J 7
♥ A K 10 5 3	♥ Q 9 7 6
♦ 2	♦ K Q 8 3
♣ A K 8 7 3	♣ Q J 2
	♠ K 10 9 6 5 4
	♥ 4 2
	♦ A 6
	♣ 10 9 6

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Jannes</i>	<i>Alon</i>	<i>Martin</i>	<i>Steven</i>
		Pass	2♦
4♣	Pass	4♦	Pass
4♥	4♠	4NT	Pass
5♦	Pass	5♥	Pass
6♥	All Pass		

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Tine</i>	<i>Richard</i>	<i>Johan</i>	<i>Erwin</i>
		Pass	2♦
2♥	3♥	3NT	All Pass

The Multi-2♦ bid by South created problems at both tables. In the open room Jannes chose to show a heart-club 2-suiter with his 4♣ bid. When Martin gave a positive response, the Dutch could not stop below 6♥. The contract was quickly two down.

In the closed room, a bidding misunderstanding (West meant the 2♥ bid as a take-out with hearts when it was a take-out with short hearts) led to the horrible contract of 3NT. The defence made no mistake and cashed their seven tricks. Three down and another 3 IMPs to the Netherlands.



Seven tricks to the defence ...

The match ended with the favourites Belgium losing 19-11 (27-13) to their dear enemies.

Meet the Officers



above: **Stanisław Bubu Gołębiowski** - Appeal Committee member,
Zdzisław Krzemiński - Duplicating, **Paul Magermann** - EBL EC member,
Sławek Latała - Chief Tournament Director, **Zdzisław Wójcik** - Tournament Director,
Geert Magermann - Chief Appeal Committee, **Czesław Tomaszewski** - Tournament
Director, **Jan Romański** - Tournament Director,

below: **Christer Andersson** - Daily Bulletin, **Dariusz Kaźmierski** - Duplicating,
Olgierd Bielewicz-Rodziewicz - Daily Bulletin, **Herman De Wael** - Daily Bulletin
Editor, Appeal Committee Scribe