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# SWEDEN STALK ITALY 



EBL President, Gianarrigo Rona and Polish Bridge Union President, Radoslaw Kielbasinski

## WARSAW 2006

## POLAND TO HOST THE 48th EUROPEAN BRIDGE TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIPS IN 2006

Here in Malmö the contract was signed between the European Bridge League and the Polish Bridge Union to hold the 48th edition of the European Teams Championships in Warsaw from 12th to 26th August 2006.
The event will take place in the prestigious Victoria-Sofitel Hotel in the centre of Warsaw, very close to the beautiful old town.

# Today's VuGraph Matches 

OPEN TEAMS - Round 17
Belgium v France
10.30

OPEN TEAMS - Round 18 Sweden v Italy
14.15

WOMEN'S TEAMS - Round 13
Sweden vFrance
17.40

## Victory Banquet

The Victory Banquet Desk will be located at the Hospitality Desk and will be open from 0930 to II 100 and from 1630 to 1730 on Monday 28th and Tuesday 29th.
Team captains are kindly requested to collect the invitations for the team.
Only captains, npcs, coaches and players are entitled to receive invitations. Wives, companions, etc, can participate; the cost of the ticket is 300 SK.
All department heads should collect invitations for their staff.
The Victory Banquet will be held at Malmö-Mässan at 2030 on Saturday July 3rd.
There will be a show during the banquet.
IMPORTANT: Invitations must be collected no later than 1000 on Wednesday 30th.


 Malmonted

GAIDGE

OPEN TEAMS RESULTS

| ROUND I5 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| I | RUSSIA | BELGIUM | $46-60$ | $12-18$ |
| 2 | BYE | NETHERLANDS |  | $0-18$ |
| 3 | ITALY | LITHUANIA | $117-13$ | $25-0$ |
| 4 | FAROE ISL. | FINLAND | $57-53$ | $16-14$ |
| 5 | CZECH REP. | CROATIA | $9-69$ | $3-25$ |
| 6 | SAN MARINO | SWEDEN | $25-86$ | $3-25$ |
| 7 | PORTUGAL | SWITZERLAND | $54-47$ | $16-14$ |
| 8 | IRELAND | SCOTLAND | $35-56$ | $11-19$ |
| 9 | ISRAEL | SPAIN | $79-43$ | $22-8$ |
| IO | NORWAY | TURKEY | $37-57$ | $11-19$ |
| II | WALES | DENMARK | $60-53$ | $16-14$ |
| I2 | ROMANIA | FRANCE | $27-60$ | $8-22$ |
| I3 | LATVIA | ICELAND | $23-59$ | $8-22$ |
| I4 | BULGARIA | ENGLAND | $21-43$ | $10-20$ |
| I5 | AUSTRIA | GERMANY | $17-78$ | $3-25$ |
| I6 | POLAND | HUNGARY | $21-80$ | $4-25$ |
| I7 | GREECE | SERBIA/MONT. | $45-45$ | $15-15$ |


| ROUND 16 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| I | NETHERLANDS | RUSSIA | 53-41 | 17-13 |
| 2 | LITHUANIA | BYE |  | 18-0 |
| 3 | FINLAND | ITALY | 19-40 | 10.5-18.5 |
| 4 | CROATIA | FAROE ISL. | 65-16 | 25-5 |
| 5 | SWEDEN | CZECH REP. | 33-21 | 17-12 |
| 6 | SWITZERLAND | SAN MARINO | 52-28 | 20-10 |
| 7 | SCOTLAND | PORTUGAL | 50-44 | 16-14 |
| 8 | SPAIN | IRELAND | 13-48 | 8-22 |
| 9 | TURKEY | ISRAEL | 35-46 | 13-17 |
| 10 | SERBIA/MONT. | NORWAY | 51-46 | 16-14 |
| 11 | DENMARK | BELGIUM | 15-47 | 8-22 |
| 12 | FRANCE | WALES | 65-25 | 23-7 |
| 13 | ICELAND | ROMANIA | 51-21 | 21-9 |
| 14 | ENGLAND | LATVIA | 54-20 | 22-8 |
| 15 | GERMANY | BULGARIA | 48-39 | 17-13 |
| 16 | HUNGARY | AUSTRIA | 28-83 | 4-25 |
| 17 | GREECE | POLAND | 41-20 | 19-11 |

It should be known by now that bringing mobile phones into the playing area is not allowed. We announced random checks but, for the moment, we try to do without these. But not only are mobile phones brought into the playing area, even sometimes the players forget to shut them down.

So far, players have collected 8 VPs in penalties and 400 Euros in fines. The fines are given to the Swedish

- Federation to support their youth.

So my request remains not to bring mobile phones into the playing area but, if you do, please, please, let them ring!

Ton Kooijman

## OPEN TEAMS PROGRAM

| ROUND 17 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |
| 1 | RUSSIA | LITHUANIA |  |
| 2 | BYE | FINLAND |  |
| 3 | ITALY | CROATIA |  |
| 4 | FAROE ISL. | SWEDEN |  |
| 5 | CZECH REP. | SWITZERLAND |  |
| 6 | SAN MARINO | SCOTLAND |  |
| 7 | PORTUGAL | SPAIN |  |
| 8 | IRELAND | TURKEY |  |
| 9 | ISRAEL | NORWAY |  |
| 10 | NETHERLANDS | DENMARK |  |
| 11 | BELGIUM | FRANCE |  |
| 12 | WALES | ICELAND |  |
| 13 | ROMANIA | ENGLAND |  |
| 14 | LATVIA | GERMANY |  |
| 15 | BULGARIA | HUNGARY |  |
| 16 | AUSTRIA | GREECE |  |
| 17 | POLAND | SERBIA/MONTENEGRO |  |


|  | ROUND 18 | $8 \quad 14.15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |
| I | FINLAND | RUSSIA |
| 2 | CROATIA | BYE |
| 3 | SWEDEN | ITALY |
| 4 | SWITZERLAND | FAROE ISL. |
| 5 | SCOTLAND | CZECH REP. |
| 6 | SPAIN | SAN MARINO |
| 7 | TURKEY | PORTUGAL |
| 8 | NORWAY | IRELAND |
| 9 | SERBIA/MONTENEGRO | ISRAEL |
| 10 | DENMARK | LITHUANIA |
| 11 | FRANCE | NETHERLANDS |
| 12 | ICELAND | BELGIUM |
| 13 | ENGLAND | WALES |
| 14 | GERMANY | ROMANIA |
| 15 | HUNGARY | LATVIA |
| 16 | GREECE | BULGARIA |
| 17 | POLAND | AUSTRIA |


|  | ROUND 19 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |
| 1 | RUSSIA | CROATIA |
| 2 | BYE | SWEDEN |
| 3 | ITALY | sWITZERLAND |
| 4 | FAROE ISL. | SCOTLAND |
| 5 | CZECH REP. | SPAIN |
| 6 | SAN MARINO | TURKEY |
| 7 | PORTUGAL | NORWAY |
| 8 | IRELAND | ISRAEL |
| 9 | FINLAND | DENMARK |
| 10 | LITHUANIA | FRANCE |
| 11 | NETHERLANDS | ICELAND |
| 12 | belgium | ENGLAND |
| 13 | WALES | GERMANY |
| 14 | ROMANIA | HUNGARY |
| 15 | LATVIA | GREECE |
| 16 | BULGARIA | POLAND |
| 17 | AUSTRIA | SERBIA/MONTENEGRO |

## WOMEN'S TEAMS RESULTS

|  |  | ROUND IO |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| 21 | HUNGARY | GERMANY | $35-61$ | $10-20$ |
| 22 | ICELAND | ENGLAND | $13-78$ | $3-25$ |
| 23 | NORWAY | DENMARK | $40-34$ | $16-14$ |
| 24 | SRAEL | TURKEY | $75-73$ | $15-15$ |
| 25 | IRELAND | SWEDEN | $23-37$ | $12-18$ |
| 26 | SCOTLAND | FRANCE | $58-61$ | $14-16$ |
| 27 | FAROE ISL. | LEBANON | $49-43$ | $16-14$ |
| 28 | NETHERLANDS | AUSTRIA | $40-30$ | $17-13$ |
| 29 | CZECH REP. | POLAND | $34-12$ | $20-10$ |
| 30 | ITALY | CROATIA | $59-41$ | $19-11$ |
| 31 | FINLAND | SPAIN | $25-23$ | $15-15$ |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | ROUND I I |  |  |  |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| 21 | GERMANY | ICELAND | $45-40$ | $16-14$ |
| 22 | ENGLAND | NORWAY | $38-34$ | $16-14$ |
| 23 | DENMARK | ISRAEL | $41-53$ | $13-17$ |
| 24 | TURKEY | IRELAND | $51-37$ | $18-12$ |
| 25 | SWEDEN | SCOTLAND | $49-30$ | $19-11$ |
| 26 | FRANCE | LEBANON | $45-20$ | $20-10$ |
| 27 | HUNGARY | NETHERLANDS | $32-63$ | $9-21$ |
| 28 | AUSTRIA | CZECH REP. | $42-23$ | $19-11$ |
| 29 | POLAND | ITALY | $38-31$ | $16-14$ |
| 30 | CROATIA | FINLAND | $44-53$ | $13-17$ |
| 31 | SPAIN | FAROE ISL. | $59-48$ | $17-13$ |

WOMEN'S TEAMS PROGRAM

| ROUND 12 |  |  |  | I4.15 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |  |
| 21 | NORWAY | GERMANY |  |  |
| 22 | ISRAEL | ENGLAND |  |  |
| 23 | IRELAND | DENMARK |  |  |
| 24 | SCOTLAND | TURKEY |  |  |
| 25 | LEBANON | SWEDEN |  |  |
| 26 | FAROE ISL. | FRANCE |  |  |
| 27 | NETHERLANDS | ICELAND |  |  |
| 28 | CZECH REP. | HUNGARY |  |  |
| 29 | ITALY | AUSTRIA |  |  |
| 30 | FINLAND | POLAND |  |  |
| 31 | SPAIN | CROATIA |  |  |


| ROUND |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |
| 21 | GERMANY | ISRAEL |
| 22 | ENGLAND | IRELAND |
| 23 | DENMARK | SCOTLAND |
| 24 | TURKEY | LEBANON |
| 25 | SWEDEN | FRANCE |
| 26 | NORWAY | NETHERLANDS |
| 27 | ICELAND | CZECH REP. |
| 28 | HUNGARY | ITALY |
| 29 | AUSTRIA | FINLAND |
| 30 | POLAND | SPAIN |
| 31 | CROATIA | FAROE ISL. |

SENIOR TEAMS RESULTS

| ROUND 5 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| 41 | NETHERLANDS | FRANCE | $8-22$ | $12-18$ |
| 42 | SWITZERLAND | GERMANY | $8-97$ | $0-25$ |
| 43 | SCOTLAND | CZECH REP. | $29-60$ | $8-22$ |
| 44 | ITALY | DENMARK | $23-17$ | $16-14$ |
| 45 | IRELAND | ISRAEL | $6-92$ | $0-25$ |
| 46 | ENGLAND | SWEDEN | $52-21$ | $22-8$ |
| 47 | NORWAY | WALES | $65-26$ | $24-6$ |
| 48 | POLAND | FINLAND | $54-16$ | $24-6$ |


|  | ROUND 6 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| 41 | GERMANY | NETHERLANDS | $22-19$ | $16-14$ |
| 42 | CZECH REP. | SWITZERLAND | $5-24$ | $11-19$ |
| 43 | DENMARK | SCOTLAND | $55-8$ | $25-4$ |
| 44 | ISRAEL | ITALY | $42-24$ | $19-11$ |
| 45 | SWEDEN | IRELAND | $71-13$ | $25-3$ |
| 46 | FINLAND | ENGLAND | $26-27$ | $15-15$ |
| 47 | WALES | FRANCE | $18-48$ | $8-22$ |
| 48 | POLAND | NORWAY | $37-25$ | $18-12$ |

## SENIOR TEAMS PROGRAM

| ROUND 7 |  | 10.30 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |
| 41 | NETHERLANDS | CZECH REP. |
| 42 | SWITZERLAND | DENMARK |
| 43 | SCOTLAND | ISRAEL |
| 44 | ITALY | SWEDEN |
| 45 | IRELAND | ENGLAND |
| 46 | GERMANY | WALES |
| 47 | FRANCE | POLAND |
| 48 | NORWAY | FINLAND |


| ROUND 8 |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |
| 41 | DENMARK | NETHERLANDS |
| 42 | ISRAEL | SWITZERLAND |
| 43 | SWEDEN | SCOTLAND |
| 44 | ENGLAND | ITALY |
| 45 | FINLAND | IRELAND |
| 46 | WALES | CZECH REP. |
| 47 | POLAND | GERMANY |
| 48 | NORWAY | FRANCE |


| ROUND 9 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |
| 41 | NETHERLANDS | ISRAEL |
| 42 | SWITZERLAND | SWEDEN |
| 43 | SCOTLAND | ENGLAND |
| 44 | ITALY | IRELAND |
| 45 | DENMARK | WALES |
| 46 | CZECH REP. | POLAND |
| 47 | GERMANY | NORWAY |
| 48 | FRANCE | FINLAND |


| OPEN TEAMS RANKING |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| after 16 rounds |  |  |
| I | ITALY | 332.00 |
| 2 | SWEDEN | 327.50 |
| 3 | POLAND | 283.00 |
| 4 | RUSSIA | 279.50 |
| 5 | BELGIUM | 279.00 |
| 6 | NETHERLANDS | 278.00 |
| 7 | TURKEY | 272.50 |
| 8 | GERMANY | 267.00 |
| 9 | ISRAEL | 265.00 |
| 10 | FINLAND | 261.50 |
| II | GREECE | 261.50 |
| 12 | NORWAY | 253.00 |
| 13 | AUSTRIA | 252.00 |
| 14 | ENGLAND | 250.00 |
| 15 | ICELAND | 249.50 |
| 16 | FRANCE | 240.00 |
| 17 | WALES | 233.50 |
| 18 | CROATIA | 231.00 |
| 19 | SPAIN | 230.00 |
| 20 | HUNGARY | 229.00 |
| 21 | PORTUGAL | 224.00 |
| 22 | DENMARK | 221.00 |
| 23 | BULGARIA | 220.50 |
| 24 | SCOTLAND | 218.00 |
| 25 | SERBIA/MONTENEGRO | 211.00 |
| 26 | IRELAND | 209.50 |
| 27 | LATVIA | 209.00 |
| 28 | LITUANIA | 206.50 |
| 29 | SWITZERLAND | 194.50 |
| 30 | ROMANIA | 187.00 |
| 31 | FAROE ISLANDS | 180.00 |
| 32 | CZECH REP. | 164.00 |
| 33 | SAN MARINO | 140.50 |


| WOMEN'S TEAMS RANKING |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| after 11 rounds |  |  |
| I | FRANCE | 206.00 |
| 2 | SWEDEN | 202.00 |
| 3 | NETHERLANDS | 199.00 |
| 4 | ENGLAND | 194.00 |
| 5 | AUSTRIA | 193.00 |
| 6 | GERMANY | 189.00 |
| 7 | SPAIN | 186.00 |
| 8 | NORWAY | 178.00 |
| 9 | TURKEY | 178.00 |
| 10 | ISRAEL | 172.00 |
| I I | IRELAND | 169.00 |
| 12 | FINLAND | 168.00 |
| 13 | ITALY | 166.00 |
| 14 | POLAND | 157.00 |
| 15 | CZECH REP. | 151.50 |
| 16 | SCOTLAND | 148.00 |
| 17 | DENMARK | 142.00 |
| 18 | HUNGARY | 135.00 |
| 19 | CROATIA | 122.00 |
| 20 | ICELAND | 120.00 |
| 21 | LEBANON | II5.00 |
| 22 | FAROE ISLANDS | I I 2.00 |

## SENIOR TEAMS RANKING after 6 rounds

| I | GERMANY | $12 I .00$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | FRANCE | $I I 9.00$ |
| 3 | POLAND | $I I 7.60$ |
| 4 | DENMARK | $I I 4.00$ |
| 5 | ENGLAND | $I I 2.00$ |
| 6 | SWEDEN | 94.00 |
| 7 | NORWAY | 93.00 |
| 8 | NETHERLANDS | 89.00 |
| 9 | ISRAEL | 88.00 |
| I0 | ITALY | 82.00 |
| II | CZECH REP. | 76.00 |
| I2 | FINLAND | 70.00 |
| I3 | WALES | $6 I .00$ |
| I4 | SWITZERLAND | 45.40 |
| I5 | SCOTLAND | 5.00 |
| I6 | IRELAND |  |

## OPEN TEAMS

## Round 13

## Italy v Belgium

Going into this match, Italy were in the lead, having scored 144 out of 150 VPs in their previous six matches, including four 25 s . The experienced Belgian team had meanwhile moved quietly into fourth place. This would be a good test of the seriousness of the Belgian challenge.

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

|  | ¢ 982 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 87$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q 6 |  |  |
|  | 2 AJ 1075 |  |  |
| ¢ AK 73 | N |  | Q 4 |
| $\bigcirc 10632$ |  | E $\quad \bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ Q J 95 |
| $\checkmark$ J 74 |  | E $\diamond$ | $\diamond \mathrm{K} 10952$ |
| \& 84 | S |  | \& Q 92 |
|  | Q Q J 1065 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 4 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 83$ |  |  |
|  | \& K 63 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Versace | Kaplan | Lauria | Polet |
|  | 1\% | I $\diamond$ | 19 |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Rdbl | 24 | Pass | 49 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Neve | Bocchi | Coenraets | Duboin |
|  | INT | Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | 49 | All Pass |  |

System made a big difference to this first board. Bocchi had an easy time in 4s played from the North hand on a diamond lead to his queen. He played a spade to the ten, ducked, then a second spade to Olivier Neve's king. Neve's club switch speeded the play up considerably as it went to the jack, queen and king. Neve won the next spade and played a second club and Bocchi claimed eleven tricks for +450 .

At the other table Guy Polet was declarer as South and that was much more taxing after a diamond lead through the acequeen. He rose with the ace and played three rounds of hearts, ruffing, then a spade to the ten and ace. Back came the jack of diamonds for the queen and king and Lauria played back another diamond. Polet ruffed and played a spade to dummy's nine, ran the jack of clubs then played a club to the king followed by a trump. When Versace won that he had a heart left with which to force declarer so there was a trump for the defence; down one for -50 and II IMPs to Italy.

To succeed as the cards lay, declarer needed to be able to run the clubs so as to avoid the necessity of taking a heart ruff, thereby avoiding establishing West's fourth heart for the late force. That seems impossible after winning at trick one as the ace of diamonds is the only sure entry to dummy and without a firstround club finesse the suit cannot be run. If declarer takes the club finesse at trick two he rates to run into a club ruff. The best chance would seem to be to duck the opening lead as East wins
and cannot hurt declarer. Say he switches to a heart, declarer can now afford three rounds of a hearts, then a spade, ducked, and another spade. West wins and plays a diamond to the ace and now comes the club finesse, a club to the king and another spade. Now declarer is OK.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

- AK 4
-K 93
$\diamond$ J 32
\& 965
\& J 1075
$\vee J 6$
$\diamond K 986$
$\& Q 102$
$W^{N} \quad \mathrm{E}$
- 963

81052
$\diamond$ Q 1074

- Q 82
- A Q 874
$\diamond A 5$
© $\mathrm{A} K$
West
Versace
Pass
Pass
Pass
West
Neve

Pass
Pass

| East | South |
| :---: | :---: |
| Lauria | Polet |
|  | 18 |
| Pass | 30 |
| Pass | $5\rangle$ |

All Pass
East
Coenraets
Pass
All Pass

South
Duboin
18
2 NT

Six Hearts is a thoroughly bad contract, as it requires a third club winner even after avoiding a diamond lead and bringing in the trumps without loss. It has one merit, however, in that the cards lie such that the slam is cold on the spade lead that was found at both tables; +480 for Italy but +980 to Belgium and II IMPs. Clearly someone did too much in the Belgian auction, presumably North, but let us not quarrel with success.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- 54
- 107
$\diamond$ AKQ 1065
2 A 74
- 1082

J 82
$\diamond 74$

* K Q 862

- KJ 76

คAK96
$\diamond 8$

* J 1093
- AQ9 3

Q Q 543
$\diamond$ J932
\& 5

| West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Versace | Kaplan | Lauria | Polet |  |
|  |  | 1\% | Pass |  |
| INT | Pass | 2\% | Pass |  |
| 3\% | $3 \checkmark$ | 4\% | $4 \diamond$ |  |
| All Pass |  |  |  | $\pm 85$ |
| West | North | East | South | $\bigcirc$ Q 953 |
| Neve | Bocchi | Coenraets | Duboin | $\diamond$ K Q 82 |
|  |  | 18 | Pass | \% 1087 |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 | Pass |  |
| 2080 | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | 3\% |  |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.
© 12
$\checkmark$ AJ 7
$\diamond A J 1072$
\& A 109
\& Q 985
ค85432
43
\& 12


Both North/Souths bid it INT - 3NT and both Easts led a low spade. Declarer played low so West won the $\varphi \mathrm{Q}$ and returned the suit to the ace, then East played the $\$ 10$ to dummy's king. Both declarers now ran the queen of diamonds to the king. Coenraets defended in simple style, winning the $\diamond K$ and leading his last spade to Neve's eight. Neve switched to a heart and Bocchi rose with the ace and cashed the diamonds. That squeezed Coenraets between his club stopper and the $『 \mathrm{~K}$ and Bocchi had nine tricks for +600 .

Upon winning the king of diamonds, Lauria did not cash the defensive spade trick, instead returning a diamond. On the run of the diamonds he unconcernedly gave up the club guard and Alain Kaplan crossed to dummy in clubs to take the heart finesse. That was one down, of course, as Lauria now 'discovered a fourth spade; -100 and 12 IMPs to Italy. That was very nicely done by Lauria on defence and by Bocchi for reading the play and judging that West would probably not lead away from the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ when not being certain that declarer held the $\oslash \mathrm{J}$.
\& AK 9743
$\bigcirc 1086$
$\diamond 97$
$\%$ Q 4

West
Versace
Pass
Pass

All Pass
West
Neve
Pass
Pass

| North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kaplan | Lauria | Polet |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | Dble | $4 \Phi$ |

All Pass

North
Bocchi
East
Coenraets
Pass
Pass

South
Duboin
2NT
4

This one was decided by system. The natural weak two bid saw the spade game played by North and Coenraets made the normal lead of his singleton heart. Bocchi won the ace and cashed two top spades then passed the ten of hearts; ten tricks for +420 .

Kaplan's multi saw the same contract reached from the other side of the table. Even without the lead-directing double, West might well lead a diamond. With the double it was automatic and


Norberto Bocchi, Italy
$\diamond K$ followed by $\diamond Q$ and a club switch in response to partner's playing the two lowest diamonds established the fourth defensive winner for when the heart finesse lost; down one for -50 and 10 more IMPs to Italy.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.


Lauria made a negative double and that silenced Polet so that Kaplan had no reason to bid again over Versace's INT rebid. Kaplan led the queen of hearts andVersace won and played a club to the ace and a second club to the jack then rattled off the clubs. Then he played the 89 to Kaplan's king. Back came the jack of diamonds, run to the king, and now Versace had two hearts to cash as Kaplan had thrown too many of those away on the clubs; +150 .

Coenraets did not find the negative double and Duboin responded with the South hand. Bocchi rebid his hearts and played there, losing two trumps, one diamond and two clubs for +1I0 and 6 IMPs to Italy.

## Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- 9653
© 642
$\diamond$ K 3
\& Q 953
- K 108
- KJ3

Q 96

- A864

Q Q 108
$\diamond 10542$

- J 2
- Q 7
©A975
$\diamond$ AJ 87
\& K 107



Guy Polet, Belgium


Italy had a natural auction to INT. With his two four-card suits bid by the opposition, Kaplan decided to try the effect of leading the ten of hearts. Polet put up the king and Versace ducked. He won the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ continuation with the ace and played the \&K from hand, collecting the jack from North. When Polet ducked, Versace switched his attention to hearts, Kaplan winning the queen and leading his remaining club to the ace. Polet switched to the now but on this lay-out there was no way to get more than three tricks in that suit and Versace claimed the rest for +90 .

Coenraets decided to try a little diversion and responded in his three-card heart suit, attracting a simple raise from Neve. Nobody had anything to add to that and Duboin led the $\diamond 6$ to the ten and king. It looks as though declarer does best to start on trumps now but in practice Coenraets led to the king of clubs then a second club to the jack, queen and ace. Bocchi was given a club ruff and he then switched to ace and another spade to the king. The fourth club allowed Bocchi to get a second ruff and there were still two trumps to lose; down two for -100 and 5 IMPs to Italy.

That was almost the end of the scoring. Italy ran out comfortable winners by 59-18 IMPs, 23-7 VPs, and moved still further clear at the top of the standings.

## OPEN TEAMS

## Round 13

## Greece v Germany by Jos Jakobs

Over the first four days of these Championships, Greece had been doing quite well and were in fourth position, top of the hunting squad though way behind the leaders, when the day started. Germany had begun the day in ninth, 16 VPs behind Greece. In their first match of the day, both teams had suffered a small defeat:, Germany 14 against Hungary and Greece 13 against England. So, to stay in the hunt, a good win for either team was essential. A well-fought match therefore could be expected, and so it turned out.

Before starting this report, I have to specifically introduce two of the Greek players to you: Theodoros Triantafyllopoulos and Yiankos Papakyriakopoulos. There is in fact no special reason for this separate introduction, except that their family names are far too long for the paper format and size we are using in these Bulletins. So we have to abbreviate their names for efficiency's sake. My apologies to their parents (etc.)

There also was another problem for this match, restricted mainly to the Open Room, as the communication between the players had its uncertainties due to a certain lack of fluency in English in both camps. Maybe, this is the reason why the bidding and play of the first board in the Open Room took a full 22 minutes. This, however, is including the time needed by West to pick up his cards after dropping all of them when his partner got doubled in INT...

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

$\bigcirc 87$
$\diamond$ A Q 6
\& AJ 1075


## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Filios | Reps | P'poulos | Ludewig |
|  | INT | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | $3 Q$ | Pass | 49 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

INT was 10-12 and $2 \bigcirc$ an invitational transfer, accepted gratefully. East led the 8 Q to dummy's ace and Reps led a low trump from the board, ducked by West. Declarer went on to cash the $\oslash K$ and ruff a heart before returning to trumps. West won and played a diamond to the queen and king, and East returned the $\diamond 10$ to Reps' ace. Reps now advanced the ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{J}$, which was quickly covered by East to solve declarer's problems; just made, Germany +420 .

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gotard | Kannavos | Piekarek | Triantafyllopoulos |
|  | 18 | INT | Dble |
| 29 | Dble | $2 \Omega$ | $2 \Phi$ |
| Pass | $3 \Phi$ | Pass | $4 \Phi$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Maybe, this hand looked a trifle straightforward, taking into account the proceedings in the Closed Room. This is probably true, but it also makes it even more unclear why playing such a hand should take 22 minutes. As it was, the bidding was much more lively, but also gave away much more information.

INT showed five diamonds and a major, 8 - 15 HCP and, after the double, West, once he had found back his cards, showed at least four hearts and three spades by bidding $2 \boldsymbol{2}$. He led a heart to declarer's ace and then came a low spade, dummy's nine winning (please note that South was the declarer here). Another trump went to the king and a diamond came back, finessed and won by East's king.

To make the hand, declarer has to guess the clubs. With West already having shown the AK this should not have been too difficult, so declarer called for the 10 from dummy in the fullness of time, running it to make his contract; no swing.

The first substantial swing of the match was due to overenthusiasm:

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- 54
- 107
$\diamond$ AKQ1065
- A74

- Q 543
$\diamond$ J 932
- 5

Closed Room
West
Filios
$1 \varnothing$
Pass

All Pass
A good and disciplined auction by the Germans saw them land nicely on their feet for a score of +400 . Please note the nice semi-psychic $I \boxtimes$ reply from Filios.

## Open Room

| West | North <br> Kannavos | East <br> Piekarek <br> Gotard | South <br> Triantafyllopoulos |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 e}$ | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | $6\rangle$ | All Pass |  |

The problem here apparently was, according to our sources, that Triantha made an enthusiastic double, green $v$ red, followed by an irresponsible cuebid. This may or may not be true, but what counted was the +50 to Germany, good for 10 IMPs to lead by 10-2 now, a lead they were never to lose.

The next board proved quite interesting.
Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- 12
$\checkmark$ AJ 7
$\diamond$ AJ 1072
- A 109

4Q985
ค85432
$\diamond 43$
\& 12


- A 1063
$\bigcirc$ K 10
$\diamond$ K 98
Q Q 654
- K 74
- Q 96
$\diamond$ Q 65
\& K 873
At both tables, North opened INT third in hand and South raised to three.

In the Closed Room, East led a club, giving declarer four tricks in the suit and an easy road to his contract; Germany $\mathbf{+ 6 0 0}$.


Theodoros Triantafyllopoulos, Greece

In the Open Room, Piekarek for Germany led a spade. Declarer won the third round of spades with the king and played the $\diamond$ Q which went to the king. Now East crossed to his partner with the last spade (having unblocked the 10 before) and Gotard went into a huddle. He emerged with a very good card, a completely neutral $\diamond 4$. Had he played a heart, declarer would no doubt have risen with the ace and cashed his winners, squeezing East between hearts and clubs in the process. Left to his own resources, declarer eventually decided to go for the heart finesse. He might have done otherwise had he believed in what he could see at the table. East had made heavy weather of his two discards, the 810 and the $\mathbf{~ 4}$. So there might have been a case for playing for the squeeze to work, but one never knows in this sort of situations; one down, another +100 to Germany and 12 IMPs.

On the next board, Greece recouped some points as the defence erred in the Open Room:

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.
-AK9743
ค 1086
$\diamond 97$

- Q 4

485
-Q953
$\diamond$ K Q 82

- 1087



## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Filios | Reps | P'poulos | Ludewig |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \$$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \$$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

$2 \triangleleft$ was multi and 3 showed an invitational hand. West led the $\diamond K$ on which East played the jack. Nevertheless, West switched to a club, which was as good as anything. The ace won the trick and declarer cashed the A , noting the fall of the ten. He then crossed to the $8 \mathbf{A}$ and finessed the spade queen. East, on lead to his surprise, cashed the $\dot{\mu}$ jand $\diamond A$ for down one; Greece +50 . That's what the scorecard said the last time I saw it. Suggestions will be accepted.

## Open Room

West
Gotard
Pass

North Kannavos 2.

East South
Piekarek Triantafyllopoulos Pass 4
All Pass
In the Open Room, the contract was played from the other side of the table, which made the successful defence very unlikely. East has to lead the $\diamond \mathbf{A}$ and continue the suit (or underlead the ace at trick one, for the purists) and West should play a club when on lead.

East led the $\vee 7$, however. Now declarer could win, draw trumps and concede a heart. All the defence got more were the two diamond tricks they were entitled to; Greece +420 and 10 IMPs back.

Two boards later, the German hopes of defeating the opponents in INT, vulnerable, prevailed over their assessment of their own chances to make a contract.


Here you see the point. Reps clearly was hoping for undertricks, rather than going for a contract for his side with so many losers. In the long run, he may well be right but, this time, holding a double stopper in the suit, declarer had no trouble to come to two overtricks with the clubs lying favourably for him too; Greece +150 .

Open Room

| West | North <br> Notard <br> Kannavos | East <br> Piekarek | South <br> Triantafyllopoulos |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | Pass |
| 19ass | 18 | All Pass |  |

In the Open Room, Kannavos made the risky $2 \triangleleft$ bid and found a quite suitable dummy, notably it included the priceless $\vee \mathrm{J}$. This card enabled him to make his contract easily for another +110 to Greece and 6 IMPs.

On the next board, we saw Klaus Reps ensure his contract in a very elegant way:

|  | Board II. Dealer S | None Vul. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - AKJ3 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 76$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ KJ8 3 |  |
|  | 2 K 108 |  |
| - Q 1094 | N | - 6 |
| $\bigcirc$ A 82 |  | ¢ K Q J 4 |
| $\diamond$ A 1095 | W E | $\diamond 7642$ |
| 2 J 4 | S | \& Q 762 |
|  | - 8752 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10953$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q |  |
|  | - 4953 |  |

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Filios | Reps | P'poulos | Ludewig |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| I $\downarrow$ | 14 | Dble | 34 |

## All Pass

Playing in a four-four fit after his unorthodox overcall, Reps had to play well to bring home the bacon. He indeed found a very neat way to ensure his nine tricks. Hearts were led and continued, Reps ruffing the third. Next came a diamond to the queen and ace, and West returned the 4 . Being down to $\$ A K J$ bare already, Reps reasoned that West was out of hearts and would probably have at least four diamonds, in accordance with his opening bid. So it would be $100 \%$ safe to win the A, cash the K K as well and play for the loss of one spade and one club trick. If spades happened to be 4-I, there would be no problem either. West would then hold 4-3-4-2 distribution, so declarer would be able to could cash the top clubs ending in his hand, then cash the two top diamonds and ruff the fourth round. Next, he would be able to play the 810 and score his $\$$ en passant.

Had West held five diamonds after all, he would have to hold a singleton club. In that event, playing a club from dummy towards the king would give West the losing options of ruffing fresh air or discarding his fifth diamond. Either way, the same coup en passant would develop.

Nicely played and a joy to watch; Germany +140 .

## Open Room

| West | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| Gotard | Kannavos |


| East | South |
| :---: | :---: |
| Piekarek | Triantafyllopoulos |
|  | Pass |
| All Pass |  |



Klaus Reps, Germany

No real problem here either; Greece +120 and a loss of I IMP to them.

The only other sizeable swing of the match came five boards later and went to Germany again:

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- K Q 832

ค843
$\diamond 94$

- QJ 7
- J 107

Q QJ 1052
$\diamond$ A 7

- 1043

$\stackrel{-}{A}$
$\bigcirc$ AK
$\diamond$ K QJ 106532
- 985
- A9654
$\bigcirc 976$
$\checkmark 8$
AK 62
Closed Room

| West <br> Filios | North <br> Reps | East <br> P'poulos | South <br> Ludewig <br> 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 2 | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Ludewig led the K on which Reps dropped the queen. What does this mean? North clearly holds the ${ }^{2}$, but what about his count?

If South returns the 2 (or the 6 if playing a different agreement) North may be able to work it out.
At the table, it certainly went wrong as South continued the \$K and then tried the $\Phi$ A first. Greece had scored +400 and were set for a nice swing, I thought.

This was completely wrong. Mistakes can always be improved on. The Open Room was the scene of a horror show, even more so if you once again take into account the huddles that were part of it:

## Open Room

| West <br> Gotard | North <br> Kannavos | East <br> Piekarek | South <br> Triantafyllopoulos |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | $5 \diamond$ | 54 |
| Pass | Pass | $6 \diamond$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Five Spades would already have been a little expensive, but it helped to push the Germans overboard. Defeating the slam was not so easy, however, but it might have been not so difficult using the advantage of playing five-card majors (contrary to what North/South were playing in the Closed Room).

You lead the A and see partner follow suit with the queen. Knowing that partner holds at least four spades for his 2NT bid, why not continue a low club and let partner work it out? Holding five spades himself, he would have continued clubs for sure... Would not partner have shown count, holding five clubs, rather than follow suit with the queen?

At the table, South played the A to trick two, thus conceding the contract; Germany +1090 and 12 IMPs to them instead of a loss of 12 IMPs.

The 24 IMPs turnover on this board was almost exactly the final IMP difference between the teams. At the end, nothing very much more happening on the final boards, the score stood at $45-22$ to Germany, a win by $20-10$ VPs.

## Herman's Women's Team Ratings

For a few years already, Herman De Wael of Belgium has been calculating bridge team ratings. Do contact Herman by e-mail (hermandw@hdw.be) or visit his website (www.hdw.be) for further information.

Just prior to the Europeans, the Women's ratings are like this:
(The first number is the rating (in VP); the second is the number of (16-board) matches that are taken into account for the rating.)

| I | France | 20,88 | 68 | 38 | India | 12,65 | 61 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | United States | 20,47 | 113 | 39 | Wales | 12,55 | 50 |
| 3 | China | 20,33 | 89 | 40 | Venezuela | 12,51 | 43 |
| 4 | Germany | 20,27 | 89 | 41 | Colombia | 12,46 | 30 |
| 5 | Netherlands | 19,94 | 90 | 42 | Zimbabwe | 12,41 | 6 |
| 6 | Austria | 18,68 | 63 | 43 | Morocco | 12,31 | 7 |
| 7 | England | 18,25 | 93 | 44 | Argentina | 12,29 | 31 |
| 8 | Canada | 18,00 | 59 | 45 | China HongKong 11,86 | 25 |  |
| 9 | Italy | 17,67 | 62 | 46 | Iceland | 11,79 | 43 |
| 10 | Poland | 17,50 | 39 | 47 | Singapore | 11,76 | 24 |
| 11 | Denmark | 17,23 | 66 | 48 | Pakistan | 10,62 | 46 |
| 12 | Israel | 17,18 | 47 | 49 | Trinidad\&Tobago 10,45 | 9 |  |
| 13 | Sweden | 17,12 | 79 | 50 | N. Ireland | 10,28 | 30 |
| 14 | Czech Republic | 17,08 | 37 | 51 | Bermuda | 10,02 | 4 |
| 15 | Norway | 16,71 | 60 | 52 | San Marino | 9,94 | 24 |
| 16 | Chinese Taipei | 16,56 | 66 | 53 | Uruguay | 9,69 | 15 |
| 17 | Spain | 16,44 | 38 | 54 | Tunisia | 9,33 | 7 |
| 18 | Finland | 16,07 | 58 | 55 | Malaysia | 9,20 | 1 |
| 19 | Mexico | 15,77 | 16 | 56 | Reunion | 9,02 | 14 |
| 20 | Belgium | 15,71 | 11 | 57 | Jordan | 9,00 | 20 |
| 21 | Russia | 15,68 | 38 | 58 | Thailand | 8,92 | 26 |
| 22 | Switzerland | 15,39 | 2 | 59 | Barbados | 8,56 | 10 |
| 23 | Australia | 15,27 | 76 | 60 | Faroe Islands | 8,51 | 32 |
| 24 | Indonesia | 15,27 | 58 | 61 | Bahrain | 8,37 | 6 |
| 25 | Croatia | 15,20 | 38 | 62 | Sri Lanka | 7,75 | 22 |
| 26 | South Africa | 15,01 | 55 | 63 | Jamaica | 7,13 | 13 |
| 27 | Scotland | 14,72 | 64 | 64 | Bolivia | 7,07 | 14 |
| 28 | New Zealand | 14,06 | 54 | 65 | Guadeloupe | 6,55 | 11 |
| 29 | Hungary | 13,81 | 33 | 66 | Chile | 6,14 | 14 |
| 30 | Brazil | 13,77 | 58 | 67 | South Korea | 6,04 | 25 |
| 31 | Japan | 13,75 | 54 | 68 | Philippines | 4,95 | 22 |
| 32 | Greece | 13,59 | 25 | 69 | Peru | 4,79 | 13 |
| 33 | Turkey | 13,22 | 30 | 70 | Paraguay | 3,68 | 4 |
| 34 | Egypt | 13,14 | 42 | 71 | Mauritius | 3,51 | 1 |
| 35 | Ireland | 12,93 | 57 | 72 | Martinique | 3,18 | 9 |
| 36 | Monaco | 12,76 | 4 | 73 | French Polynesia | 2,83 | 11 |
| 37 | Portugal | 12,73 | 2 | 74 | Palestine | $-3,19$ | 8 |

We are saddened by the news that Jean-Christophe Quantin has had to return to France following the death of his father.

## OPEN TEAMS

## Round 14

On Thursday evening, the vugraph match was to be Netherlands v Italy. This happened to be an excellent choice, as the Netherlands for sure were very much in a winning mood, having earlier in the day added two successive blitzes to their tally. Of course, playing the Czechs or the Faroe Islands might be slightly easier than having to face those who have been reigning champions for the last decade or so, but it can only be a moral advantage to enter into such a match with 50 VPs behind your name for the day so far.

For Italy, on the other hand, it was going to be business as usual. So far, they have shown the form everybody expects from them and thus it's no surprise to see them in the lead again for the last three days.

The match started very quietly, the Netherlands taking a lead on extra over- and undertricks of 5-0 over the first five boards. From Board 6 onwards, things started to happen in quick succession.

## Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- J 62

คA75
$\diamond 82$

- A 10432


Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Wijs | Fantoni | Muller | Nunes |
|  |  | 14 | Pass |
| $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 31 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

A perfectly normal contract and a perfectly normal club lead by North. South won the king and returned the suit, North ducking his ace when declarer played the queen. De Wijs then went on to unblock his $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ and play a low heart to the king. Fantoni elected to rise with his ace, apparently thinking his clubs would be all good but, when he next cashed the \& to find out that this was not the case, the contract could no longer be beaten. In fact, when North next exited with a heart, declarer could even afford the luxury of a diamond finesse and thus ended up with an overtrick for a score of +630 to the Netherlands and good prospects of a favourable game swing.
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Duboin | Verhees | Bocchi | Jansma |
|  |  | 14 | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ (i) | Pass | 2 NT | Pass |
| 30 | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
| Transfer to hearts |  |  |  |

And so it turned out when the Dutch defenders made no mistake. South led a diamond, won by dummy's jack, the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ was unblocked and a heart was led. This time, North ducked, so the king won and declarer continued with two rounds of spades, establishing the suit. South, on lead with the $\leq \mathrm{Q}$, first played the $\vee \mathrm{J}$, which held the trick, before switching to the ek and another. With the $\vee A$ still to lose, declarer was down one and the Netherlands had got their first major swing of 12 IMPs in the match to lead by 17-0.

It should be noted that playing a heart to the king at trick three cannot be the winning play, as in many situations it will set up five tricks for the defence before declarer has time to enjoy the spades. So it should be correct to play a diamond to the ace first, hoping for the spades to break and for the $8 \mathbf{A}$ (as well as, possibly, the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ ) to be right.

There was more to come:
Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.


Fulvio Fantoni, Italy

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Wijs | Fantoni | Muller | Nunes |
| Pass | INT | $2 \bigcirc$ | 3s |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5\% |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 54 |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

In the Closed Room, North/South had a bidding mix-up. 34 by Nunes showed spades, as he himself explained, but it was (correctly) explained as minors at the other side of the screen. At the table East/West thus were no longer in a position to judge clearly what was going on. So they did not double the final contract at first attempt. When play was over, it came to light that two different explanations of 3 had been given at either side of the screen, so the TD ruled that a double should be added to the final contract after all.Thus, the Netherlands scored +300 instead of +100 .

Not that it mattered too much:

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Duboin | Verhees | Bocchi | Jansma |
| Pass | 18 | 18 | Dble |
| $4 \varangle$ | Pass | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| Pass | Pass | $5 \oslash$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

Well, 4s would probably have gone down as well, but how could Bocchi know when Duboin could not double this? South led the $\Phi K$, ruffed by declarer who went on by leading two high trumps, both ducked. Sort of locked in his hand now, Bocchi next led the which ran to North's queen. Verhees now cashed the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and played another spade, ruffed by declarer with his last trump. Bocchi then ruffed a club and played a diamond to the jack which held. When the king dropped under the $\diamond$ A there were no diamond losers, but there also was no way to dispose of the last two clubs. Down two for (another) +300 to the Netherlands or 12 IMPs again. It stood at 29-0 now and a sensation was in the air.

On Board IO, Italy opened their account with an overtrick to trail by 29-I, but then came:

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

- 103
-KJ954
-KJ72
\& 82
- 84
-A 32
$\diamond$ A 10943
\& 1094

- Q 765
-Q 108
$\diamond$ Q 865
$\because 63$
- AKJ9 2

ค 76
$\checkmark-$
AKQJ75

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Wijs | Fantoni | Muller | Nunes 190 |
| $1 \diamond$ | 18 | 3 | $3{ }^{4}$ |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | 4. | Pass | 59 |

When West led the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ the play was quickly over, the Q becoming the defence's only other trick; Italy +400 .

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Duboin | Verhees | Bocchi | Jansma |
|  |  |  | 1\% |
| $1 \diamond$ | Dble | 3 - | 4* |
| Pass | $4{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 520 | Pass | 68 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Double dummy, 6\% can be made by guessing the hearts and finessing the $\triangle Q$ but, after the pleasant lead of the $\vee A$, declarer adopted another line - he cashed the top spades and tried to ruff the third round. When West could ruff in front of dummy he was down two for +100 again to Italy and their first substantial swing; II IMPs.

Then:
Board I 2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

```
4 Q 3 2
QQJIO932
\diamond }
&96
```

| - J 107 | N | 4 AK9865 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 86 |  | $\bigcirc 7$ |
| $\diamond$ QJ 107 | W E | $\diamond$ A 5 |
| 2 A Q 2 | S | 2 K J 43 |
|  | ¢ 4 |  |
|  | ๑K 54 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 9842 |  |
|  | \& 10875 |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Wijs | Fantoni | Muller | Nunes |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 12 | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | $3 \%$ | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 54 | Pass | 64 | All Pass |

Another perfectly normal contract. You need either the $\Delta K$ onside or a good guess/favourable split in trumps. Muller won the lead of a low heart with dummy's ace, cashed two top trumps, crossed in clubs and took the diamond finesse. Alas, that was one down for Italy +50 .

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Duboin | Verhees | Bocchi | Jansma |
| INT | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 2. | Pass | 320 | Pass |
| $3{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| 48 | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 64 | All Pass |

Here too, South led a heart to dummy's ace, but declarer took a different line, maybe playing for a swing or just following his nose. He cashed one top trump, crossed in clubs and ran the $\$ 10$. He lost a diamond later on but had gained a huge swing for his team of 14 IMPs. Well played!

The complexion of the game had changed dramatically as the scores now were almost level again. Would the Netherlands be the umpteenth team to lose an early advantage when playing Italy?

Not really, as these were the two boards to follow.
Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \& J 109 \\ & \diamond \text { AJ } 876 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 87$ |  |
|  | 2943 |  |
| - K 732 | N | - 54 |
| $\bigcirc 4$ |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 952$ |
| $\checkmark$ KJ 10632 |  | $\checkmark$ A 54 |
| \& K 7 | S | - AJ 102 |
|  | - A Q 86 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 103 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 9 |  |
|  | 2 Q 865 |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Wijs | Fantoni | Muller | Nunes |
|  | Pass | $1 母$ | Pass |
| I $\diamond$ | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| I | Pass | INT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Hoping for a balanced hand with his partner, De Wiis made an aggressive shot at game, assuming that his long diamonds would come in. Right he was. South led a club into the tenace, so the Netherlands chalked up an easy +630 when the $\diamond Q$ popped up in front of the $\forall K J$.

## Open Room

| West | North <br> Verhees | East <br> Bocchi | South <br> Jansma <br> Duboin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| I 8 | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

I $\triangleleft$ showed spades and $3 \triangleleft$ was a non-forcing canapé. Not knowing about the extra length, Bocchi could not find any reason to go on, so there it rested. With both major-suit aces wellplaced, eleven tricks were there for the taking, but the Netherlands had struck back immediately, winning 10 IMPs on the deal. On the next board, for once we saw Bocchi/Duboin overboard:

Board I4. Dealer East. None Vul.

- K J

Q QJ 53
$\diamond$ Q 532
\& Q 85

| , - | N | - A 8742 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 109642$ |  | $\bigcirc$ A 8 |
| $\diamond$ A 10 | W E | $\diamond$ J 9874 |
| - AK 1043 | S | -9 |
|  | - Q 109653 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 7$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 6 |  |
|  | \% 1762 |  |

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Wijs | Fantoni | Muller | Nunes |
|  |  | $2 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $3 \vee$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ | All Pass |

24 showed spades and a minor and $3 \bigcirc$ was forcing. Muller had a natural raise and even the bad trump break did not trouble the declarer; Netherlands +420 .

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Duboin | Verhees | Bocchi | Jansma |
|  |  | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 28 | Pass | 2. |
| 34 | Dble | 4 | Pass |
| $4{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 5* | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 68 | All Pass |

When East had no gadget available to open the battle, Jansma introduced a well-timed very weak multi. Thus, Duboin had to


Jan Jansma, Netherlands
wait one round before he could start bidding his suits, and the bidding got out of control once he went on over partner's $4 \nabla$. The affair ended with down two; Netherlands + 100 and another II IMPs to go firmly into the lead again, 50-26.

One push and one Italian overbid to a game with no legitimate play had brought the score forward to 56-26 when Board 17 arrived:

## Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.

- Q 1094

ค 765
$\diamond$ KJ 76
\& A

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| De Wijs | Fantoni | Muller | Nunes |
|  | INT | Dble | 2 |
| Dble | 2 | 34 | Pass |
| $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | $5 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 5NT | Pass | 68 | All Pass |

INT was 10-I2 and the double was for penalties. When De Wijs could double the $2 \triangleleft$ transfer Muller had no trouble in evaluating his hand to perfection and bid 34. When De Wijs made one more positive action, trump quality was the only thing that mattered. Well bid for an easy enough +980 to the Netherlands when the trumps and the clubs behaved.

## Open Room

West
Duboin

Pass

North
Verhees 18
East
Bocchi
Pass
Dble

## South <br> Jansma $1 \diamond$ <br> 14

3NT
All Pass
I\& could be anything, $I \diamond$ could be anything as well and the same applied to $I \triangleleft$, believe it or not. This is called Orange Club, a national football(?) variation of the Polish Club. East's double showed an unspecified strong hand. When Jansma introduced his suit, Duboin made the practical bid of 3NT, only to find out that he had missed a slam in three possible denominations; Italy +490 but another swing to the Netherlands of 10 IMPs. The score was 66-26 now.

When the last board arrived, the Dutch lead had gone up to 68-26, which was actually converting to a sensational 24-6, but Italy recouped 12 IMPs when they made a game that went down at the other table. Still, the outcome was a fairly convincing 68-38 win, 21-9 VPs to the Netherlands, or the biggest defeat suffered by Italy in these Championships so far.

The Netherlands found themselves back in a morale-boosting fifth place after a national record-breaking score of 71 VPs on a day that included a match against Italy but, for their great opponents, it would be little more than one of those things that can happen from time to time. No doubt they will continue pretty much undisturbed and qualify for Estoril with matches to go.

## Analysis by Anders

by Anders Wirgren
The match between Denmark \& Germany contained a deal which might have led to a cute ending:

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

- 6

Q Q 83
$\diamond$ K 97

* AKJ854
© J 109754
AJ 63
- 62

- AQJ8754
PAK62
$\diamond 5$
- 7
West
28
Pass

| North East |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 30 | Pass |

South 3.

All Pass
4NT was presumably intended as keycard but North did not want to go any higher. On the two of diamonds lead (Journalist), West took the ace and returned the jack. (Why the jack? Editor) If declarer takes the king, East must be careful to retain the four of diamonds!

If he does not, declarer can cash three hearts, finesse in spades, cross to the ace of clubs and exit with a diamond. East will have been squeezed down to $\uparrow K 9 \diamond$ - $\diamond$ QIO 2 Q 10 and, after cashing two diamonds, will have to surrender the rest to either dummy or declarer.

If East still has the four of diamonds it will be possible to get across to West and the winning hearts.

At the table declarer ducked the jack of diamonds and had no chance.

## Championship Diary

Reading Friday's Bulletin results a patriotic member of the Welsh Open team tells me: 'We are still well-placed in fifteenth spot whereas England is way down the field in sixteenth.'

At least one team has a captain who has put a severe restriction on his players' intake of wine, restricting them to two glasses a day. There is a rumour that on Friday evening some of them used up their entire allowance for this Championship....and the next!

The absence of shuttle buses on Friday meant the Editor decided to walk back to the Ibis. It took 38 minutes (beating the previous record of 43 minutes set by Brian Senior), thanks to the discovery of a short cut. Given the editor's nickname is 'Ratty', it was a remarkable coincidence that the name of the road he used was Rättsväg (Ratsway).

We have received a number of enquiries requesting an explanation of the meaning of the word 'interfrastically'. It is a 'Chameleon' word - it means whatever you want it to. So, if I say I will do it interfrastically, it might mean now, later, today, tomorrow, quickly, slowly or whatever.

When you go to the site for the Bridge Festival in Vienna, www.bridgefestival.at Mozart is playing. On hearing this Brian Senior enquired, 'what's he playing, 3NT?'

# Appeal No. 2 <br> England $v$ Finland 

## Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Jean-Claude Beineix (France), Maria Erhart (Austria), Tommy Gullberg (Sweden), Anton Maas (the Netherlands)
Herman De Wael acted as Scribe

## Women's Teams Round 4

Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.


## Comments:

Weak No Trump

## Contract:

No trump Doubled, played by South
Result: Three tricks, NS -IIOO

## The Facts:

After the board, South asked North why she had passed. North said she thought the double had not been for penalties. The Di rector was called. The Double was strong (against weak no trump) but the Convention Card has the following mentions: Under "vs NT" it says "X=5c.m+4c.M", and
under "Notes that don't fit in elsewhere" it says "Vs. weak NT: X=strong", without cross-reference.
North showed the Director the resumé sheet of their opponent's system, which showed their Captain had been misled by the Convention Card as well. North/South had decided not to run so often if the Double was not for penalties.

## The Director:

Decided that the Convention Card had been badly filled in and that this was the main cause for the events at the table.

## Ruling:

Score adjusted to 3NT+I by East/West (NS -630)

East/West receive an Official warning to clarify their Convention Card

Relevant Laws: Law 75A, 40C, I2C2

## East/West appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains

## The Players:

East/West, through their Captain, stated that North ought to have known that the Double had been for penalties, because East had not alerted it. West had not alerted it either, and South had correctly interpreted this.
East stated she had asked if INT was weak, and when that was confirmed, she had not alerted the Double.
The Captain of North/South admitted that the alternate meaning of this Double was indeed on the Convention Card, and that he had missed it when studying the system, because it was not in the correct place.
North stated she had been convinced the Double showed some $5-4$, and would not be passed out. She had been delighted about this. She knew the meaning because of the East/West Convention Card and of her Captain's notes and had followed them. She would never not have run if it was sure the Double was strong. She explained the escape sequence: she would have bid $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ and, if that was doubled, she would redouble to start bidding fourcard suits up the line.
When asked if it had occurred to her that even a conventional Double might be passed out, she replied that she had been convinced it was Take-Out. The Captain added that it was not very likely that a conventional bid would be passed out by East, because East was a passed hand.

## The Committee:

Started by confirming that the Convention Card was wrongly filled in. Some members thought that North had not done enough to protect herself, she could and maybe should have asked when the Double was not alerted. It was, however, the opinion of the Committee that a player can trust a clear information on the Convention Card.
The Committee found that North had been misinformed, and decided that North had been damaged through this misinformation, and that the score should be adjusted.
As to the score adjustment, the Committee saw no reason to change the Director's adjustment, noticing that none of the parties had challenged it.

## The Committee's decision:

Director's ruling upheld.

## Deposit: Returned

In a separate decision, the Systems Committee, following its normal procedure, decided to suspend East/West for one match, during which they should complete their Convention Card. Furthermore, they should make absolutely certain that they inform their future opponents of the original misplaced mention of this particular sequence.

## Appeal No. 3 <br> France v Poland

Appeals Committee: Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Herman DeWael (Scribe, Belgium),Tommy Gullberg (Sweden),Anton Maas (the Netherlands), Steen Møller (Denmark)

Open Teams Round II
Board 5. Dealer North. North/South Vul.


Contract: Five Clubs, played by East

## Lead: 23

Play: to Queen and Ace, es to the King, $\vee \mathbf{2}-\odot \mathbf{3}-\odot \mathrm{K}-\odot \mathrm{A}$
South now returned the $\oslash J$ and the contract was made
Result: II tricks, N/S -400
The Facts: South called the Director after the board, claiming that his return of the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ had been influenced by a wrong explanation of East's shape. East had explained his bid of 2 as showing either $15+$, 49-5\% OR 18+, 49-4\%. West had explained it as only the first possibility. South had correctly interpreted his partner's 83 as showing an odd number, so East's shape had to be 4-I-3-5. In that case, the return of the $\oslash \mathrm{J}$ had been perfectly normal.
The Director: Consulted with his colleagues and with 5-6 good players, none of whom would have returned the 8 J . The Director concluded that South was not damaged through any possible misinformation, but through his own actions.

## Ruling: Result Stands

Relevant Laws: Law 75A, 40C

## North/South appealed.

Present: All players and both Captains
The Players: West told the Committee that South had asked him about the bidding, and that according to his understanding, 2e showed five clubs.
East explained that this was true, but that there were hands, of 18 points and more, where the systemic bid of 3NT was not advisable. That is why he had chosen to bid 2e and why he had explained it in the way he did. East/West could provide no written evidence for either explanation.
South explained how he had arrived at the conclusion that East's shape was 4-I-3-5. The $4-5$ were as he was told, and his partner's distribution signal showed that East was $3-I$ in the reds. The $3 \triangleleft$ bid had not been alerted, so it could not have been on a singleton. That left just the 4-I-3-5 shape. Given that conclusion, only a heart return could not cost, and South could simply wait for his diamond tricks, and for any spade trick his partner might make. North must have a spade honour, because if declarer has sKQxx, he can throw the diamond losers away.
East pointed out that in any case $3 \checkmark$ was natural, and South's assumption that East held the bare $\vee \mathrm{K}$ was a mistake.

## The Committee:

Arrived at three separate conclusions:

- To start with, the Committee concluded that there had been misinformation. East's explanation about not wanting to jump to 3NT seems logical, and any benefit of the doubt about what is the agreement between East and West should go with North/South. South had been misinformed.
- The second conclusion was less easy. Was South damaged through the misinformation, or not? South's explanation seems equally logical, and South should not be blamed for not analysing the distribution more fully, which under these circumstances was difficult. The Committee found that it was not clear that the return of the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ was Wild, Gambling or Irrational. Therefore, South was entitled to redress.
- This left the problem of what score to redress to. South had three possible returns, and two of those (the return of a spade or a diamond) are equal, leading to one down. That left only the heart return to be considered. It was suggested that the heart return was impossible, with a correct information, but the Committee found that that was not true, since the correct explanation still contained the high probability of a 4-5 in the black suits. Rather than discussing if the heart return would be found more or less than one third of the time, the Committee decided on that particular proportion.


## The Committee's decision:

Score adjusted to
Both sides receive:
66.7\% of 5 e-I by East (NS +50)
plus $33.3 \%$ of $5 \%=$ by East (NS -400)

## Deposit: Returned

Note: the result at the other table was 3NT-2 by East (NS+100) so the final result on the board was:

## 66.7\% of -2

plus $33.3 \%$ of -11
or -5 IMPs to the team of North/South.

## Swedish Open Pairs Final

by Sven-Olov Flodquist

Swedish Open Pairs tends to be a lively and interesting event. This year's final begins today with 170 pairs playing a 66 -board qualification from which the 52 best placed will make it into the A-final. The nicest play from last year's final was this hand from the qualification:

Dealer South. E/W Vul.

- QJ 3
- 7654
$\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ } 3$
- AK 72


| West | North <br> Mån Berg | East | South <br> Mikael Lindblom |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $2 \checkmark *$ | Pass | $2 \wedge$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | All pass |

West opened a Multi $2 \diamond$ and $2 \Delta$ showed some interest in a high heart contract. Why East doubled $4 \diamond$ is unclear. It might be that he felt that his side could do better than +50 or +100 in a spade partscore.

Anyway, West led the ace of spades and East played the ten West switched to the two of hearts, third or fifth, and South followed to two rounds of hearts, playing the ten on the second. What next?


South was much too strong for a $3 \diamond$ first in hand pre-empt and he didn't like the alternative of opening $\ \diamond$, hence the initial pass. East continued by leading the nine of spades and declarer ruffed. After drawing trumps in two rounds, declarer could have claimed the contract. West's original distribution was obviously 6-3-2-2 and East must thereby have been born with four hearts and four clubs.

Four more rounds of diamonds, pitching black losers from dummy, gives this end position:


East will still have to play a card. If he throws a heart, declarer can establish dummy's heart with a ruff. In practice East pitched another club, but Micke now won the sAK and his hand was good.

East should have played a third heart to kill the menace for the ruffing squeeze, after which South would have been doomed to go one down.

At another table the first round of the bidding was the same, but then South tried $3 \diamond$, and after 3 , by East she persisted with $4\rangle$. East passed and misdefended but, sadly enough, South failed to see how to make her contract. Nobody knows how overheated a bridge player's brain may become.

Dealer West. None Vul.

- A 109
- Q 4
$\diamond$ KJ 7
- 107653


West led the king of spades and East showed his length by playing the seven and played the two on the jack of spades to indicate some interest in clubs. If West has the jack of clubs it might be essential to shift to clubs and avoid establishing declarer his ninth trick with a heart switch. But since West had no help in clubs he played a heart to the ten and king. South crossed to the king of diamonds, cashed the ace of spades and took the heart finesse through East, who after all had opened the bidding.

West ruminated for quite some time on whether to play a heart or a club before deciding to return a club, only to learn that a heart would have been more successful.
"Could I know that I should have played a heart instead of a club?" asked West. "Well, you might have cashed your two high spades, to see my discards." answered East. Things went very well for Frederic Wrang on this board against Altmae/Hjelm.

|  | Dealer East. None Vul. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -109 |  |
|  | - J 986 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 7 |  |
|  | \% K Q 754 |  |
| ¢ Q 2 | N | ¢ K 543 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 10543 |  | $\bigcirc 7$ |
| $\diamond$ K 84 |  | $\checkmark$ QJIO 53 |
| \& 863 | S | * AJ 10 |
|  | ¢ A J 876 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK 2 |  |
|  | $\diamond 962$ |  |
|  | ¢92 |  |

East openedl $\diamond$ and Freddan bid 14 .

| West | North | East <br> $1 \diamond$ | South <br> $1 \Delta$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Dble | $3 \diamond$ |  |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | $3 \oslash$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

The eight of diamonds was led to the ten and another diamond to dummy's ace. The ten of spades was run to the queen and West played a club to the king and ace, after which West continued a third round of diamonds, ruffed in dummy.

South played a spade to the jack and continued with the ace, ruffed and over-ruffed. Queen of clubs and a club ruff and a spade towards dummy meant that all West could make, despite his stack of trumps, was the queen for -140 .

The wildest board of the first day was this one,
Dealer East. All Vul.

which was not entirely obvious from my position in South-East.

| West <br> Jan-Erik | North <br> Peter | East <br> Håkan | South <br> Fredrik |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thomasson | Bertheau | Strääf | Nyström |
|  |  | Pass | 19 |
| 2\% | $2 \diamond *$ | Pass | Pass |
| 3\% | 3 | All Pass |  |

I don't know who was most amazed, Håkan to see the auction end, or Fredrik to see his partner make eleven tricks. Anyway, Fredrik's opening bid becalmed both West and East.

At one table West, rather unwisely, decide to open Is and then bid his clubs vigorously. When East later on - very ambitiously - bid 5 s over $5 \diamond$, West was not too happy with that decision, but had he opened instead he would not have ended up paying an IIOO penalty in 5s doubled. E/W can be held to nine tricks in clubs if the defenders cash the red kings and ruff a spade, before exiting in a red suit.

Nevertheless, one E/W pair got +750 , maybe after two rounds of diamonds and an innocent looking spade towards dummy. Maybe South had bid spades, so that North did not want to ruff his partner's trick? A club finesse after the jack of spades is followed by another round of trumps and the fifth spade can be ruffed in dummy.

South might, however, make twelve tricks in hearts. After a heart lead, ruffed in dummy, declarer must play the jack of hearts to the king, dropping the queen, and draw trumps with the ten and finesse East's nine.


Swedish top players are renowned to employ a large number of conventional opening bids and do often claim to have well-prepared countermeasures to most destructive nonsense bids. It was therefore very disappointing to see Nyström/Bertheau fail completely after a multi $2 \diamond$ from their San Marino opponents. This convention was very popular in the eighties but has since, owing to its inefficiency, become nearly extinct among Swedish top players. Exactly what went wrong is not known, but presumably Bertheau intended $3 \triangleleft$ as forcing. The bidding began similarly at the other table.

| West | North <br> Magnus Lindqvist | East | South <br> Peter Fredin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $2 \diamond *$ | Dble | $2 \diamond^{*}$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \triangleleft$ | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | $5 \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| $6 \curvearrowright$ | Dble | Rdbl | Pass |
| Pass | Pass |  |  |

The 3400 penalty just about covered the cock-up at the other table, 6\% bid and made would have earned Sweden another IMP. Some of you might remember that Peter Fredin, in the European Championships in Montecatini, first bid spades and then doubled the opponents in 44, only for the enemy to run to $7 \boldsymbol{m}$ making. Magnus Lindqvist, an excellent bidding theoretician, will no doubt carefully explain the difference between a double in direct position and in a reopening position to his more pragmatic partner.

This deal was of course the talk of the day among the Swedish players. Björn Gustafsson, secretary of the Swedish Bridge Federation, remarked that he always has a good result at his table when his team-mates have collected a 3400 penalty.

## Talking about cards

by Martin Nygren

"What happened against Finland?" has been the question that everyone has asked the Norwegian press representatives here at the championship. The answer is that Jon-Egil "Turbo" Furunes executed an endplay in a spade partscore to gain I IMP and make the final score 1-84 in favour of the Finns.

Midsummer night's standard procedure is to jump around a maypole and get drunk enough to not be embarrassed about it. When I was invited to spend the day playing board games and eating good food I thought that was a very much better idea. Trivial Pursuit was on the menu and strangely enough everyone wanted to be on my team and no one on Daniel Auby's. It is well known that Daniel's knowledge about uninteresting trivia and useless facts is vastly superior to mine but with the aid of four team-mates I fancied that I might have a chance. Well, had I only known that a tomato plant is a kind of a potato I might have been fine, but as it was Daniel did win. He took particular pride in having defeated a PhD in theoretical physics, but had there been plenty of questions about quantum mechanics and statistical physics Daniel would certainly not have come out victorious.

Richard Bowdery, England, and Elke Weber, Germany, entered silver barometer nine believing that they were playing in a matchpoint event. After a few rounds, one of their opponents explained to them that the scoring was IMPs across the field. The gentleman in question spoke with a deep Scandinavian accent and there is no such thing as an Englishman that is overseas and trusts any information received from a native. Richard picked up a scoreboard and checked it, match-point scoring. Then the director came with another scoreboard, IMPs. Not entirely sure how to adapt her tactics to the scoring method, ElkeWeber picked up Q 7 Q K J $32 \triangleleft$ K J 84 AK 10 and opened a strong no trump vulnerable against not and the bidding went Pass, Pass and Double by her right-hand opponent. Her left-hand opponent bid 2 and after two more passes it was her turn in the reopening position. Double is for takeout but should you double at teams, or pairs or both? Elke doubled and collected a healthy number of IMPs for +300 .


Gudrun Strandberg, Sweden

Now fully convinced that the scoring was IMPs, Richard Bowdery adapted his tactics to the Acolistic team's slogan "You cannot afford to miss a thin game by failing to bid a thin suit". Vulnerable against not he picked up $8 \vee 5432 \diamond$ J 7 AJ 10432 and heard the auction begin one funny club to his left, double from partner and one diamond to his right. Some people pass, some people introduce their club suit and some cannot refrain from bidding a four-card major. Richard Bowdery belongs to the last category and pulled out the $I \oslash$ card. Four to the five is definitely a tad thin, but a four-card major is a four-card major. Next thing to happen was the lead of the two of diamonds against four hearts.

> Dealer East. N/S Vul.
> \& 8
> \& 5432
> $\diamond$ J 7
> $\&$ AJ 10432

| - K 432 | N |  | - AJ 76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 9$ |  |  | ¢KJ86 |
| $\checkmark 109653$ | W E |  | $\checkmark$ Q 82 |
| * Q 85 | S |  | \& 96 |
|  | - Q 1095 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 107 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK 4 |  |  |
|  | - K 7 |  |  |
| West | North | East | t South |
|  |  | 18 | Dble |
| $1 \diamond$ | 18 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |

## All Pass

He won the lead in the dummy and played the queen of spades, won by the king and West returned the ten of diamonds to the jack, queen and ace. Now came a spade ruff and a heart to the ten, the nine of hearts warned declarer that trumps might not break. Another spade ruff, club to the king, diamond ruff and club ruff in dummy left West with three trumps and dummy with the ten of spades and ace-queen of hearts. West was forced to ruff the spade and play hearts into the tenace.

At another table, Ylva Strandberg was in the North seat and bid a heart after a funny diamond, Double from her sister Gudrun and Pass from West. When the auction had finished, East was declaring 49 doubled. Gudrun, the sisters playing reverse attitude, led the ace of diamonds but could not read the seven of diamonds correctly. To clarify the situation Gudrun cashed the ace of hearts and could not believe that the five of hearts was intended to discourage hearts. The heart continuation was just enough to make the sacrifice profitable. Some of us say that one should bid six to the ace, jack, ten before four to the five and others that South should have cashed the king of diamonds as North must bid a four-card major if it is four to the five. Is it not a lovely thing with bridge, that you can always blame your partner.

As the bridge festival is still regaining its momentum after the Midsummer festivities, there is not much to report from it, but Tommy will do his best. My plan was to watch Sweden's afternoon game and perhaps write a match report. Having learned that their opponents are San Marino, I do hope that there will be no reason at all to write a match report from that game. For some reason, the organizers suspect that the attendance of tonight's (read yesterday's) silver barometer might be low.


## To lead or not lead

by Tommy Gullberg
Two interesting lead problems from the Sunday morning pairs event, Silver barometer I2:

On the first Henrik Noberius was on lead with:
\& A Q $108 \vee 1097643 \diamond$ A $4 \Leftrightarrow Q$

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M Swanström | H Johansson | K Swanström | Noberius |
| $3 \diamond$ |  | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $2 \Omega$ |
| 3 | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

The opening was Precision style.
Henrik Noberius decided to attack the spade suit. He did, however, not like us normal mortals play a small spade, but led the queen. The whole hand:


Declarer, Kjell Swanström, won the king of spades and played the ten of clubs to the queen and did eventually go two off for 13 out of II2 MPs.

Johan Upmark had the next lead problem:

- $10974 \vee A 92 \diamond 9652$ \& 54

Sitting West he listened to the following auction:

## Menu 27 June 2004

Lunch, served between II. 30 and $\mathbf{I} 5.00$ Ham steak with pineapple sauce $\quad 70 \mathrm{Skr}$ Vegetarian: Beetroot beef with "potato au gratin" 70 Skr

Dinner, served between 16.30 and 20.00 Midsummer buffet including desserts 175 Skr Pearl fish with shell fish filling in white wine sauce and potato wedges 125 Skr Minute steak with feta cheese
stuffing, olive sauce and potato wedges
125 Skr

## Pasta Frutti de Mare

 85 SkrSwedish meatballs with creame sauce 80 Skr
Cold dishes 60 Skr

| West | North | East | South <br> Upmark |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S Ryman | A Larsson | Hallberg |  |

$2 \triangleleft$ was weak and Svante Ryman passed with a, by Svante's standards, very clear break of tempo. He spent almost twenty seconds on his decision. Johan Upmark led the five of clubs. The complete deal was:

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- A Q J 8
$\vee 1073$
$\diamond K 84$
\& A 72
- 10974

ค 92
ง 952
54

© K 62
$\bigcirc 86$
$\diamond$ A Q 1073
K J 3

- 53
$\bigcirc$ KQJ54
$\diamond J$
\& Q 10986
Arne Larsson won the lead with the king and returned the jack to the queen. Next came a trump to the ten and a second round of trumps to the king and ace. Upmark switched to a diamond and declarer, Gunnar Hallberg, played dummy's king to tempt the defenders to continue diamonds. Arne Larsson, another of the fastest players in the tournament, paused to consider the position. Twelve seconds later he had decided to return a club that was ruffed by his partner. The king of spades scored the setting trick for the defenders and one off was worth 72 MPs.



## Butler Ranking after I 4 Rounds Open Teams

| I | Fantoni F | Nunes C | ITA | 1.22 | 180 | 54 | Eidur Magnu |  | Torvaldsson | ICE | -0.06 | 180 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Bocchi N | - Duboin G | ITA | 1.04 | 200 | 55 | Carcassonne |  | Labaere A | BEL | -0.08 | 160 |
| 3 | Bertheau P | - Nystrom F | SWE | 1.01 | 160 | 56 | Vainikonis |  | Olanski W | LIT | -0.09 | 220 |
| 4 | Chmurski B | - Puczynski M | POL | 0.84 | 160 |  | Salisbury J |  | Tedd M | WAL | -0.09 | 180 |
| 5 | Fredin P | - Lindkvist M | SWE | 0.79 | 260 | 58 | Piper D |  | Murdoch J | SCO | -0.10 | 200 |
| 6 | Sylvan J | - Sundelin PO | SWE | 0.70 | 140 | 59 | Matheson J |  | Patrick J | SCO | -0.11 | 180 |
| 7 | Balicki C | - Zmudzinski | POL | 0.69 | 200 | 60 | Diklic D |  | Miladin I | CRO | -0.12 | 200 |
| 8 | Gromov A | - Petrunin A | RUS | 0.66 | 179 | 61 | Madeira P |  | Sarmento P | POR | -0.13 | 200 |
| 9 | Ludewig B | - Reps K | GER | 0.62 | 160 |  | Terraneo C |  | Simon J | AUT | -0.13 | 200 |
| 10 | Atabey Y | - Kolata S | TUR | 0.61 | 200 | 63 | Sebane L |  | Thuillez L | FRA | -0.14 | 160 |
| 11 | Zipovski D | - Vlajniae B | S\&M | 0.58 | 200 | 64 | Wasik A |  |  | SPA | -0.15 | 280 |
| 12 | Kiema O | - Juuri-Oja J | FIN | 0.57 | 180 |  | Hackett Ja |  | Hackett Ju | ENG | -0.15 | 220 |
| 13 | Lauria L | - Versace A | ITA | 0.55 | 180 | 66 | Macaonghusa |  |  | IRE | -0.17 | 140 |
|  | Bakkeren T | - Bertens H | NET | 0.55 | 200 | 67 | Eliasson PG |  | Matisons M | LAT | -0.18 | 180 |
| 15 | Khven M | - Dubinin A | RUS | 0.53 | 200 |  | Kemeny G |  | Trenka P | HUN | -0.18 | 180 |
| 16 | Schifko M | Wernle S | AUT | 0.52 | 160 | 69 | Honti L |  | Harangozo L | HUN | -0.21 | 180 |
| 17 | Ginossar E | Pachtmann R | ISR | 0.51 | 200 | 70 | Bentzen B |  | Charlsen T | NOR | -0.22 | 180 |
| 18 | Kaplan A | Polet G | BEL | 0.48 | 180 | 71 | Zack Y |  | Lengy A | ISR | -0.24 | 180 |
| 19 | Partearroyo | Sabate J | SPA | 0.46 | 280 | 72 | Birbalas L |  | Poska G | LIT | -0.25 | 180 |
| 20 | Jansma J | Verhees L | NET | 0.45 | 180 | 73 | Maloviae M |  | Radojeviae | S\&M | -0.29 | 180 |
| 21 | Austberg PE | - Furunes JE | NOR | 0.39 | 180 | 74 | Tesorieri U |  |  | RSM | -0.31 | 200 |
|  | Kannavos P | - Triantafyllop | GRE | 0.39 | 160 |  | Lund Madsen |  | Lund Madsen | DEN | -0.31 | 180 |
| 23 | Nyberg C | Koistinen K | FIN | 0.38 | 200 | 76 | Romanovska |  | Rubins K | LAT | -0.36 | 160 |
| 24 | Baldursson | - Jonsson P | ICE | 0.37 | 180 | 77 | Gotard T |  | Piekarek J | GER | -0.37 | 180 |
| 25 | Kholomeev V | Zlotov D | RUS | 0.36 | 180 | 78 | Mouritsen J |  | Mouritsen H | FAR | -0.39 | 200 |
| 26 | Zorlu N | Assael S | TUR | 0.34 | 220 |  | Treossi $P$ | - |  | RSM | -0.39 | 260 |
|  | Kowalski A | - Tuszynski P | POL | 0.34 | 160 |  | Tyla A |  | Babickas R | LIT | -0.39 | 160 |
| 28 | Brogeland B | Salensminde | NOR | 0.27 | 200 | 81 | Mc Gowan E |  | Baxter K | SCO | -0.41 | 180 |
|  | Coenraets P | Neve O | BEL | 0.27 | 180 | 82 | Vincent H |  |  | SPA | -0.43 | 240 |
| 30 | Briciu M | - Ghigheci O | ROM | 0.26 | 180 |  | Abouchanab |  |  | SWI | -0.43 | 180 |
| 31 | Fischer D | - Saurer B | AUT | 0.21 | 160 |  | Nikolenkov |  | Piedra F | SWI | -0.43 | 200 |
| 32 | Wladow E | Elinescu M | GER | 0.20 | 179 |  | Sasselli M |  |  | SWI | -0.43 | 180 |
| 33 | Uzum D | - Pehlivan O | TUR | 0.19 | 140 | 86 | Volhejn V |  | Fort T | CZE | -0.45 | 180 |
| 34 | Castanheira | Dias J | POR | 0.18 | 180 |  | Timlin R |  |  | IRE | -0.45 | 220 |
|  | Price D | - Simpson C | ENG | 0.18 | 160 |  | Schaltz D |  | Schaltz P | DEN | -0.45 | 160 |
| 36 | Karakolev G | - Vikor | BUL | 0.16 | 180 | 89 | Borevkovic |  | Zoric V | CRO | -0.47 | 180 |
|  | Gal P | Vikor D | HUN | 0.16 | 160 | 90 | Kallsberg P |  | Mohr Danjal | FAR | -0.49 | 180 |
|  | Bilde M | - Hansen J | DEN | 0.16 | 180 |  | Folque L |  | Henriques J | POR | -0.49 | 180 |
| 39 | Muller B | - De Wijs S | NET | 0.14 | 180 | 92 | Keaveney G |  |  | IRE | -0.51 | 240 |
| 40 | Levinger A | Liran I | ISR | 0.13 | 180 | 93 | Batov V |  | Dyakov V | BUL | -0.52 | 180 |
|  | Zotos L | Lambrinos A | GRE | 0.13 | 180 |  | Einarsson B |  | Ingimarsson | ICE | -0.52 | 160 |
| 42 | Thomas A | Denning P | WAL | 0.11 | 180 | 95 | Dung Duong |  | Yalcin $T$ | SWI | -0.53 | 180 |
| 43 | Multon F | Quantin JC | FRA | 0.09 | 200 | 96 | Palau JJ |  | Rombaut J | FRA | -0.57 | 160 |
| 44 | Backstrom S | Salomaa M | FIN | 0.08 | 180 | 97 | Mlraz T | - | Svoboda O | CZE | -0.58 | 200 |
|  | Stefanov J | - | BUL | 0.08 | 180 | 98 | Voinescu D |  | Rotaru I | ROM | -0.65 | 180 |
| 46 | Zahariev Z | - | BUL | 0.06 | 160 | 99 | O'Brian P |  | Pigot PJ | IRE | -0.69 | 200 |
|  | Papakyriakop | Filios A | GRE | 0.06 | 180 | 100 | Vesturklett |  | Mouritsen G | FAR | -0.77 | 180 |
| 48 | Jourdain P | Ratcliff T | WAL | 0.04 | 160 | 101 | Vozabal D | - | Zadrazil M | CZE | -0.86 | 180 |
|  | Jansons U | Rubenis I | LAT | 0.04 | 180 | 102 | Savin D |  | Matei C | ROM | -1.04 | 160 |
| 50 | Gold D | Townsend T | ENG | 0.02 | 140 | 103 | Cantucci C |  |  | RSM | -1.05 | 220 |
| 51 | Coyne C | - | IRE | 0.00 | 120 | 104 | Fazzardi GF |  |  | RSM | -1.14 | 220 |
| 52 | Aronov V | - | BUL | -0.03 | 160 | 105 | Zucchini PG |  |  | RSM | -1.20 | 220 |
| 53 | Tesla M | - Tomic T | CRO | -0.04 | 180 | 106 | Kikiae S | - | Sabljiae S | S\&M | -1.26 | 180 |

Butler Ranking after 9 Rounds - Women's Teams

| 1 | D'Ovidio C | Gaviard D | FRA | 1.03 | 120 | 35 | Lancova M |  | Medlinova | CZE | -0.05 | 120 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Pasman J | Simons A | NET | 0.83 | 120 | 36 | Erdeova J | - | Hnatova D | CZE | -0.06 | 120 |
| 3 | Grumm I | - Weigkrich | AUT | 0.80 | 180 | 37 | Birman D |  | Levit Por | ISR | -0.07 | 120 |
| 4 | Santos C | Matut M | SPA | 0.78 | 120 | 38 | Toth J |  | Kovacs J | HUN | -0.08 | 120 |
| 5 | Von Armin D | Auken S | GER | 0.66 | 160 | 39 | Paoluzi S |  | Saccavini | ITA | -0.13 | 120 |
| 6 | Hoogweg F | - Van Zwol | NET | 0.65 | 120 | 40 | Kertesz Z |  | Ormay E | HUN | -0.15 | 120 |
| 7 | Forsberg C | Gronkvist | SWE | 0.61 | 100 |  | Pokorna J |  | Svobodova | CZE | -0.15 | 120 |
| 8 | Cronier B | Willard S | FRA | 0.59 | 120 | 42 | Siguryonsdott | - |  | ICE | -0.16 | 159 |
| 9 | Bertheau K | - Midskog C | SWE | 0.54 | 100 | 43 | Piscitelli F |  | Torielli | ITA | -0.18 | 120 |
| 10 | Zur Campanile | - Popilov M | ISR | 0.53 | 140 | 44 | Guy V |  | Peploe C | SCO | -0.20 | 100 |
| 11 | Greenwood D | - Burns C | IRE | 0.52 | 120 | 45 | Pattinson M |  | Kirby B | IRE | -0.22 | 120 |
| 12 | Banaszkiewicz | - | POL | 0.49 | 140 | 46 | Nurmi $P$ |  | Suppula T | FIN | -0.24 | 119 |
| 13 | Brock S | Teltscher | ENG | 0.47 | 100 | 47 | Bo Krefeld C |  | Kirstan M | DEN | -0.26 | 180 |
| 14 | Kandolu O | Yavas D | TUR | 0.46 | 160 | 48 | Barlund B | - | Savolaine | FIN | -0.30 | 120 |
| 15 | Fuglestad AK | - Harding M | NOR | 0.43 | 120 | 49 | Mezei K |  | Csipka S | HUN | -0.31 | 120 |
| 16 | Dhondy H | - Smith N | ENG | 0.40 | 180 | 50 | Brunner M | - | Goldenfie | ENG | -0.35 | 80 |
|  | Cleary E | Finn M | IRE | 0.40 | 120 | 51 | Langeland A |  | Torkelsen | NOR | -0.39 | 120 |
| 18 | Mantyla M | Kulmala S | FIN | 0.31 | 120 |  | Matijevic I |  | Ruso S | CRO | -0.39 | 120 |
| 19 | Alexander M | - Benson J | SCO | 0.29 | 120 | 53 | Rahelt M | - | Farholt S | DEN | -0.45 | 179 |
| 20 | Breivik K | Remen S | NOR | 0.27 | 120 | 54 | Restorff M | - | Mikkelsen | FAR | -0.50 | 120 |
| 21 | Andersson P | - Langstrom | SWE | 0.23 | 160 | 55 | Chamaa I |  |  | LEB | -0.54 | 100 |
| 22 | Smederevac J | Kriftner | AUT | 0.22 | 180 | 56 | Sigurbjornsdo | - |  | ICE | -0.56 | 80 |
|  | Nolanska A | - Krind | POL | 0.22 | 60 | 57 | El Khazen M | - | Kreidieh | LEB | -0.57 | 140 |
| 24 | Nehmert B | Reim A | GER | 0.17 | 160 | 58 | Brkljacic $T$ |  | Pilipovic | CRO | -0.61 | 120 |
| 25 | Adiguzel C | Merze S | TUR | 0.10 | 100 | 59 | Abousleiman L | - |  | LEB | -0.63 | 60 |
| 26 | Nielsen R | - | ICE | 0.09 | 139 | 60 | Arthur Ji |  | Mac Donal | SCO | -0.64 | 140 |
| 27 | Zaim M | - Baytok C | TUR | 0.06 | 100 | 61 | Ivarsdottir A |  | Oskarsdot | ICE | -0.71 | 120 |
| 28 | Krogulska | - | POL | 0.05 | 120 | 62 | Graizer N |  | Faur S | ISR | -0.82 | 60 |
|  | Viola C | - Viola M | SPA | 0.05 | 140 |  | Gudnadottir A | - |  | ICE | -0.82 | 100 |
| 30 | Bessis V | - Lustin C | FRA | 0.03 | 120 | 64 | Svenstrup H |  | Grunnveit | FAR | -0.86 | 139 |
| 31 | Mestres M | - Panadero | SPA | 0.01 | 100 | 65 | Petrovic R | - | Zagajsek | CRO | -0.87 | 120 |
|  | Buratti M | - Forti D | ITA | 0.01 | 120 | 66 | Ragi D | - |  | LEB | -0.89 | 120 |
|  | Arnolds C | - Vriend B | NET | 0.01 | 120 | 67 | Kekhia G | - |  | LEB | -1.14 | 80 |
| 34 | Brewiak G | - Sarniak A | POL | -0.04 | 180 | 68 | Christiansen | - | Danielsen | FAR | -1.22 | 100 |

Butler Ranking after 4 Rounds - Senior Teams

| 1 | Stoppa JM | - | Stretz F | FRA | 2.69 | 32 | 25 | Mosca C |  | Sbarigia S | ITA | 0.06 | 48 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Korpetta J | - | Radecki J | POL | 1.56 | 32 | 26 | Cagne' P |  | Harris D | WAL | -0.02 | 48 |
| 3 | Marsal R | - | Schroeder D | GER | 1.44 | 48 | 27 | Zdzienicki A |  | Aleksandrza | POL | -0.06 | 48 |
| 4 | Bull SE | - | Trollvik J | NOR | 1.41 | 32 | 28 | Auken J |  |  | DEN | -0.17 | 48 |
| 5 | Rue D | - | Stanley K | ENG | 1.31 | 48 | 29 | Nordby H |  | Koppang K | NOR | -0.33 | 48 |
|  | Kratz U | - | Strater B | GER | 1.31 | 32 | 30 | Romik P |  | Levit Y | ISR | -0.42 | 64 |
| 7 | Waterlow T | - | Hackett P | ENG | 1.27 | 48 | 31 | Marshall F |  | Innes W | SCO | -0.44 | 48 |
| 8 | Ekberg S | - | Jansson BA | SWE | 1.19 | 48 |  | Filip A |  |  | CZE | -0.44 | 48 |
| 9 | Forch GJ | - | Verhoef R | NET | 1.13 | 48 | 33 | Hebak P |  | Nosek J | CZE | -0.48 | 48 |
| 10 | Doremans N | - | Trouwborst | NET | 1.04 | 48 | 34 | Rae K | - | Gerrard D | SCO | -0.50 | 48 |
|  | Humburg H | - | Mattsson G | GER | 1.04 | 48 | 35 | Bomhof JW |  | Ramer R | NET | -0.63 | 32 |
| 12 | De Falco D | - | Romanin G | ITA | 0.88 | 32 |  | Nftali G | - |  | ISR | -0.63 | 32 |
|  | Lund P | - |  | DEN | 0.88 | 64 | 37 | Cedolin G | - | Tramonto D | ITA | -0.65 | 48 |
| 14 | Omernik K | - | Sikorski K | POL | 0.83 | 48 | 38 | Koivula K |  | Tolvanen J | FIN | -0.66 | 32 |
| 15 | Boesiger H | - | Spengler W | SWI | 0.73 | 64 | 39 | Rimon R |  | Honkavuori | FIN | -0.69 | 48 |
| 16 | Dahl F | - | Norris G | DEN | 0.72 | 64 | 40 | Sheridan L |  | Patrick J | WAL | -0.79 | 48 |
| 17 | Damiani J | - | Faigenbaum | FRA | 0.63 | 48 | 41 | Schwartz A |  |  | ISR | -0.88 | 64 |
| 18 | Alfredsson L | - | Hallen HO | SWE | 0.50 | 32 |  | Maesel H |  | Jensen O | NOR | -0.88 | 48 |
| 19 | Textor M | - |  | CZE | 0.44 | 32 | 43 | Collings J |  | Jones D | ENG | -0.97 | 32 |
| 20 | Favager E | - | Favager A | WAL | 0.41 | 32 | 44 | Zeligman S | - |  | ISR | -1.13 | 32 |
| 21 | Juuri Oja P | - | Juuri Oja E | FIN | 0.31 | 48 | 45 | Frei J |  | Imhof H | SWI | -2.03 | 64 |
| 22 | Dieden J | - | Hyden LI | SWE | 0.29 | 48 | 46 | Higgins C |  | Daly F | IRE | -2.09 | 64 |
|  | Chemla P | - | Mari C | FRA | 0.29 | 48 | 47 | Frew D | - | Liggat D | SCO | -2.72 | 32 |
| 24 | Jansa Z | - |  | CZE | 0.17 | 64 | 48 | Meehan P | - | O'Farrell R | IRE | -3.19 | 64 |

# (4) THEWORLD BRIDGE OLYMPIAD 

Istanbul, Turkey, 23 October - 6 November 2004



Istanbul - a fabulous city where East meets West, the bridge between Europe and Asia, a thriving metropolis of 12 million people - exotic yet distinctly western - a meeting place for peoples of many religions and cultures who came together and learned to live in peace and harmony.
Ultra-modern amenities, the splendours of the Ottoman past and the honoured traditions of Turkish hospitality combine to make Istanbul a fascinating city, one that will impress all visitors with treasured and lasting memories. Istanbul will reward you with the comfort of home while offering sights, sounds and smells that carry you swiftly to another culture, another time. This vibrant, exciting city is really accessible from all parts of the world, served by more than 50 airlines. Every major European Airport is 2-3 hours away. There are frequent non-stop or direct flights to Istanbul from most European cities, and all the important cities in the world.
Istanbul is a treasure trove of sight-seeing possibilities, and has many wonderful places that should not be missed for example, Tokapi Palace: the residence of the Sultan for four centuries, a city within the city; the Blue Mosque; St Sophia; the Basilica Cistern; the spice market; Rumeli Castle and many other historic monuments -followed, of course, by a shopping expedition to the Grand Bazaar.
The World Bridge Olympiad will be held in the heart of Istanbul at the Grand Cevahir Hotel and Convention Centre which is a truly luxurious deluxe hotel. It combines a state of the art convention centre with an extremely comfortable hotel, ideal for such a prestigious Championship. Accommodation will also be available in hotels nearby which will include 2 and 3 star hotels as well as the more expensive 4 and 5 star hotels, so that as wide a range of rates as possible can be offered to players coming to the Championships.
Five major Championships will be staged during the course of the two weeks, with the most important being the 12th World Open and Women's World Team Olympiad. The 2nd Senior International Cup will be held during the first week, the 2nd World University Teams Bridge Cup will be held during the second week, and the 3rd World Transnational Mixed Teams Championship will also be held during the second week, enabling players eliminated from the Olympiad to participate in this enjoyable and challenging event.

## 3rd WORLD TRANSNATIONAL MIXED TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIP

This event has been a successful and exciting Championship since its inception in Rhodes when 86 teams competed. We feel sure that many players would enjoy participating in this challenging event, which gives them the opportunity of pitting their bridge skills against some of the greatest players in the world, as well has having the chance to watch the exciting final stages of the World Team Olympiad on the expert vugraph presentation.

Entry fees: free for the eliminated players US \$ 800 for a new team

If a team is composed of players eliminated from the Olympiad together with players who have not competed in the Olympiad, the players who have not competed will be charged US $\$ 150$ per head if it is a team of six, or $\$ 200$ per head if it is a team of four. Teams must consist of at least two women and two men from any country, playing in Mixed partnerships.
The Transnational Mixed Teams will be played during the second week of the Championships, starting on Tuesday 2 November, with I5 rounds of 10 boards being played for the qualification to the semi-finals and final.
Teams wishing to enter this event should contact their NBO as soon as possible to request nomination. In any event, entries should be made before I5th August 2004, although late entries may be accepted provided there is sufficient space at the venue.


