# ALL EUROPEAN FINAL 



Only another million boards to go for the duplicating team

The last match of the 2nd European Mixed Teams Championship is a Scandinavian affair, with Norway's Erichsen and Sweden's Goldberg contesting today's Final. In the semifinals the Norwegians were too good for Brigada's Latvia/Russia combination, while the Swedes survived a tough match with Herbst's Israel/Netherlands alliance. Both losing semifinalists are assured of bronze medals, the first of the Championships.

You can follow all 48 boards of the final at www.bridgebase.com and www.swangames.com The Mixed Pairs Championship has reached the semifinal stage. The Dutch Internationals Wietske Van Zwol \& Huub Bertens headed the field closely followed by Sweden's Pia Andersson - Arne Larsson and Italy's Maria Pia Totaro - Carlo Totaro.


## THE ROUND OF 32

The round of 32 saw the opportunity for upset with 32-board matches giving everyone at least a nominal chance of overturning the form-book.
The first 16 deals gave little opportunity for the sparkling bid or play at the table that I was watching. However I thought the Glassons handled this deal well, buoyed by their partnership style of sound weak-two bids.

| Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ 65 |  |  |  |
| ¢KJ 10975 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 1085$ |  |  |  |
| \% A 8 |  |  |  |
| +92 | N |  | ¢ 18743 |
| $\bigcirc 864$ | W E |  |  |
| $\checkmark 63$ |  |  | J 74 |
| *QJ9632 | 2 S | *105 |  |
|  | $\triangle A K Q 10$ |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 2 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK 92 |  |  |
|  | ¢K 74 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 2NT(R) |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 4\% (R) |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 6NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

When Bob Glasson opened a weak two his partner asked, and discovered a club feature together with some extras, then asked for key-cards and found two of them. Since the partnership style would not be to open kingsixth, Joann Glasson opted for the safest slam - as you can see 6NT has 12 top tricks while 68 might be down on a ruff. That was worth II IMPs for the Glassons on their way to a comfortable win over Wolfarth.
The board with the most potential for swing was probably this one:
Paul and Linda Lewis (the Glassons' teammates) cashed out against 5\% declared by North after that player had shown both minors. Disa Eythorsdottir and Jeff Meckstroth had a much harder task.


Disa Eythorsdottir, USA

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul. - K

ค1064
$\diamond$ AKJ 96
\& AK 83
-107632
$\triangle$ A 83
$\diamond 107$
2642


QQJ 7
$\diamond$ Q 32
\& Q J 1097

| West <br> Jeff | North <br> Goldberg | East <br> Disa | South <br> Goldberg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 190 | 19 | 29 |
| 34 | 4\% | Pass | 5\% |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Disa led the spade ace and Jeff dropped the \& 10 - upside down count, playing normal suitpreference. East now has a problem; was the highest spade-spot suit preference - the only indication being that West might not have given the highest spade without tolerance for a heart shift? That was what Disa thought, so she played a heart to let the defence cash out.
Elsewhere, in the match between De Botton and Kowalski both North players demonstrated that - like beauty - a stop is in the eye of the beholder. If you represent that you have a stop, maybe you do! At both tables North opened l $\diamond$ and East overcalled lis, raised by South to $2 \diamond$, with West jumping to 34. Nick Sandqvist bid 3NT as North now without a care in the world. Everyone passed, and on a low spade lead declarer had +660 . In the other room Kowalski also bid 3NT, but Janet De Botton tried $4 \checkmark$ as East now knowing the QK was on her right and that partner was short in diamonds she could even see $4 \checkmark$ getting close to making (it is only one down after all). When her LHO tried 4NT everybody passed and Janet untrustingly led the sA; down four!

In the second half of the round of 32 there were a couple of deals that offered the opportunity for accurate play and defence - not always taken!

Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.


| West <br> Molson | North <br> Jansma | East <br> S-Molson | South <br> Arnolds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $1 \%$ <br> Dble <br> 49 |
| Pass | $3 \Omega$ | Pass |  |

In 4e Seamon-Molson won the club lead and cashed the top spades, to find the bad news, then ducked a heart, and essentially relied on finding hearts 3-3 with the diamond finesse right. No luck there; but consider the following approach. After cashing the top spades and ducking a heart to South you ruff


Bob Glasson, USA
the club return in hand and duck a spade to South. Might that player win the 9 and cash the $\Phi \mathrm{Q}$ to produce this ending?


No one has done anything wrong yet, but South has to be very careful now. If he thoughtlessly exits with a club, the eK wins in dummy, and what does North discard? If he pitches a diamond, declarer can establish the $\diamond 9$ for his tenth trick, if a heart, declarer sets up the 89 instead. The only defence in this ending is to play back a diamond, which disrupts the timing for the ruffing squeeze. (You will find a congruent ending in Jordi Sabate's article, in the Spanish section.)

Gunnar Hallberg played 3NT on this deal after South had opened a Polish club. (19 Dble - Pass - 2s - Pass - 3NT - All Pass). North trusted the opponents and led the Rusinow $\diamond I O$ to the $\diamond K$ and $\diamond A$. Gunnar cashed the top spades and on finding the bad split led a heart to the 810 and 8 K . Back came a diamond and Gunnar contributed the $\checkmark 6$ to persuade North to win and play a third diamond to dummy's $\diamond 9$. Since North appeared to have a I-4-4-4 shape declarer came
to hand with the K and led a heart from hand, trying to decide whether to finesse the $\bigcirc 8$ or to play South for having false-carded in hearts from the PKQ . When North followed low in unconcerned fashion Gunnar decided to play South for the bare 9 KQ and went up with the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ to drop the queen and bring home nine tricks: two spades, two hearts, three diamonds and two clubs.
The next deal presented an opportunity for virtually the whole field - but most of them neglected to take their chance. This was what happened at the table I was watching:

| Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q 16 |  |  |  |
| P- |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A Q 876542 |  |  |  |
| ¢1086 |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ Q 10 | N |  | ¢ 98542 |
| $\checkmark$ A 74 | W E |  | -K98652 |
| $\checkmark$ K 103 |  |  |  |
| ¢) 9532 | W |  |  |
|  | Q AK 73 |  |  |
|  | QQJ 103 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 9 |  |  |
|  | \&Q 74 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Molson | Jansma | S-Molson | Arnolds |
|  |  | 18 | 14 |
| 2 | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \bigcirc$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Arnolds led two top spades and shifted to the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$. Molson ruffed and led a heart to the $\checkmark 10$ and $\triangle A$; down one.
It may not be clear that declarer can do any better, but by contrast Marion Michielsen playing with llan Herbst also declared $4 \Downarrow \times$ on an equally informative auction: (I®-Pass INT - (3 ) - Pass - Pass - $3 \diamond$ - Pass - $4 \checkmark$ - Dble - All Pass). The defence led a top spade, North echoing, and shifted to the $\diamond$ J, covered and ruffed. Marion returned a heart to the $\vee 10$ and $\vee A$ and ruffed a diamond, then played a second spade to South. Back came a spade, and Michielsen won in hand and cashed the top clubs, ruffed her winning spade, then ruffed a club. In this ending:


Marion led a spade from hand, forcing South to ruff but lead from her trump tenace to concede the rest. Could the defence have done any better? Yes they could, though it may be hard to see. Declarer needs to ruff two diamonds and one club to shorten her trumps enough to create this ending. If South for instance simply leads three rounds of spades, (or cashes two spades and shifts to a club) the best declarer can do is discard from dummy and try the cross-ruff, but the timing is irremediably altered. Try it and see!

Message to alt the Monen players

Anna Maria Torlontano
Chairman of the EBLWomen's Committee

Dear Friends,
I have some very good news for you!

As you know the European Bridge League has its own web site at www.eurobridge.org. What you may not realise is that, within the site, we have built a special section about Women's Bridge.

There are various sections:


- Message from the EBL President, Gianarrigo Rona
-Composition of the EBL Women's Committee (clicking on each name will tell you more about each of them)
-Contact addresses
-Chairman's communications
-European Championships and Events, specifically for the Women Players.
-Calendar
-Women Administrators in Europe
-Women Directors in Europe, credited
 by EBL
-Women Teachers: in a short while the official register of the Teachers credited by EBL, will be published.
- EBL WOMEN STARS. This is a special area in which you can find biographies, information and pictures of distinguished Women Players, great personalities, both of today


Information is also provided on today's 10 Top Women Players, according to the EBL Master Points Scale; these are players who have achieved and continue to achieve im-

portant results in the Tournament World.

All the Sections will be continuously updated.

PLEASE VISIT OUR SITE: www.Eurobridge.org and in the section "Categories", please click on "WOMEN"

TAKE THIS DAILY BULLETIN HOME WITHYOU OR WRITE DOWNTHEADDRESS.
Their lives and positions in Bridge, their successes, their love and devotion to this marvellous sport, serve to show and teach us what it means to have been a GREAT CHAMPION in Bridge History.


The EBL Women Committee is working very hard to keep you informed about what happens in our "Women's Bridge World". (W)


## ROUND OF 32: BAREL vs GITELMAN

## by Jos Jacobs

With 16 matches to choose from, the decision on Monday morning of which match to follow was not easy. Of course, there was the possibility of watching another match in the second half of the round, but there were so many interesting matches around that changing tables would be a random decision too.
After some consideration I went to table 10, where the Barel v. Gitelman match was scheduled. An all-Israeli team against a North American team with a distinct French flavour, as Philippe Cronier and Catherine D'Ovidio were also members of the side.
For the first half, it would be Michael Barel and Migry Zur-Campanile against Gail Greenberg and Brad Moss, a rare mother and son mixed combination, in the Open Room, whereas Fred Gitelman and Sheri Winestock would be facing Doron Yadlin and Gila Emodi in the Closed Room.
The scoreboard really started moving at board 2:

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
© 182
QQ 109762
$\diamond 974$
$\% \mathrm{~A}$
. 10543

$\checkmark$ A Q 65

- Q 83

$\$ 6$
©K 84
$\checkmark$ KJ 1082
\&K 764

QJ 5
$\diamond 3$
\&) 10952
Open Room:

| West <br> Moss | North <br> Barel | East <br> Greenberg | South <br> Zur-Campanile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | $2 \&$ | Pass | Pass |
| 2NT | 38 | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |

When Migry Zur-Campanile wisely made


Brad Moss, USA
no further move over 24, Brad Moss balanced with 2 NT , stressing the minors in the process. Barel showed his hearts but Gail Moss was not to be deterred, so $4 \diamond$ became the final contract. Two black aces and a club ruff was all the defence could get, so EW scored +130 here.

\section*{Closed Room: <br> | West <br> Yadlin | North <br> Gitelman | East <br> Emodi | South <br> Winestock |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \$$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{Q}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | All Pass |  |}

If North had held four spades, rather unlikely on the basis of their agreements ( 24 basically shows 8 - 10 h.c.p. with 3 trumps) there would have been a play for game on this hand. When trumps proved to be 4-I declarer soon lost control and ended up down four, happily doubled by West at the table in the post-mortem, but not during the auction itself. So Barel got +400 here and registered their first substantial swing of 7 IMPs.
A few boards later, Gitelman became the victim of too much routine.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/WVul.

|  | QJ965 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PJ 62 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 964$ |  |
|  | \& A Q 9 |  |
| ¢ 742 | N | ¢ 103 |
| $\bigcirc$ AKQ 1075 | W E | $\bigcirc 93$ |
| $\checkmark 7$ |  | $\checkmark$ K 108532 |
| \$742 | S | \& 1053 |
|  | ¢ AKQ 8 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 84$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q J |  |
|  | \&KJ86 |  |

What's the problem, you would say? With 8 h.c.p. including two jacks, raising partner's 2NT straight to 3NT looks very much in order.
Not this time, however: Doron Yadlin quickly claimed down two when he saw dummy after leading his $\vee \mathrm{K}$.
Needless to say that at the other table a Stayman sequence was used after which NS ended up in the proper contract of 49, making II tricks and gaining a maybe surprise II IMPs in the process.
Two boards later, careful declarer play made a difference of two tricks:

| Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢KQJ 97 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 87$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J 10 |  |  |
| \& 1095 |  |  |
| ¢ 853 | N | ¢ A 62 |
| QJ 94 | w | PAK 1062 |
| $\checkmark$ K 87 | W | $\diamond 962$ |
| \& 463 | S | \& 74 |
| -104 |  |  |
| PQ 53 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A Q 543 |  |  |
| \% KJ 8 |  |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Moss | North <br> Barel | East <br> Greenberg | Sur-Campanile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 28 | 2 | All Pass |  |

Closed Room:

| West <br> Yadlin | North <br> Gitelman | East <br> Emodi | South <br> Winestock |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 3 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In both rooms, East led a top heart and switched to the e 7 . Both declarers called for dummy's e K, hoping to induce West to win his ace immediately. Both Wests duly responded and both returned a club, declarers winning the return.
From here, the paths diverged. Barel in 24 attacked trumps immediately, but when East won her ace the second round she could return a diamond and thus obtained her club ruff after all to beat the contract by one trick. Gitelman +50.
Gitelman carefully won the club return in hand and next led his remaining heart. East had to win and could play a diamond now, but it was too late. Dummy's ace went up, the diamond loser disappeared on the $\triangleright Q$ and the only other trick he lost was the inevitable ace of trumps. Contract made for a useful 5 IMPs back to cut the deficit to a mere 4 at this stage.
Another useful partscore swing to Gitelman came along two boards later:

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

$$
\text { ص } 985
$$

$\bigcirc 10$
$\diamond A K$

* A Q 109742

| ¢103 | N | ¢AKJ 742 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢K Q 52 |  | PA643 |
| $\diamond$ J 10732 | W E | $\checkmark 5$ |
| \% ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | S | 26 |
|  | , Q 6 |  |
|  | ¢J987 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 9864 |  |
|  | ¢K 3 |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Moss | North <br> Barel | East <br> Greenberg | South <br> Zur-Campanile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 14 | Pass |
| INT | 20 | 24 | Pass |
| Pass | 30 | 3 | All Pass |

Nicely done by Gail Greenberg for nine tricks when the trumps broke 4-I. In fact, the Americans were lucky to miss game on this one...

Closed Room:

| West <br> Yadlin | North <br> Gitelman | East <br> Emodi | South <br> Winestock |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1 \mathbf{2 0}$ | Pass |
| INT | 20 | 20 | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \mathbf{e}$ | All Pass |  |

When Emodi did not compete any further,

The auction came to rest in $3 \%$. The play was easy enough: two top spades and another, dummy ruffing with the K . An immediate finesse of the then produced ten tricks for another +I30 and 7 IMPs to Gitelman who thus took over the lead.

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
,
Q1064
$\diamond$ AKJ 96
\& AK 83
↔ 107632
$\triangle$ A 83
$\diamond 107$
9642


$$
\text { A Q J } 94
$$

$\diamond$ K 952
$\diamond 854$

45
©Q J 7
$\diamond$ Q 32
\& Q J 1097
Open Room:


Gila Emodi, Israel
A normal enough auction to a sound enough contract that just had one little flaw: three top tricks were missing and they were duly cashed with South declarer.

## Closed Room:

| West <br> Yadlin | North <br> Gitelman | East <br> Emodi | South <br> Winestock |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \stackrel{4}{2}$ | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| $3 \Omega$ | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

When the Gitelman team discussed this hand after the first half, it became very clear that, with a twinkle to what I said about the auction at the other table, the 3NT bid can be best described as an action that is both statistically insane and statistically winning. The number of defenders who have forgotten to lead the $\mathbb{M}$ against such a gambling bid is already innumerable, and was augmented by one when East led a low club, obviously hoping to reach her partner somewhere. So +630 to add to the +100 and 12 IMPs more for Gitelman.
Barel recouped two small swings on the last two boards, so at halftime the score was 35 26 to Gitelman.
For the second half, the French would replace Gitelman-Winestock and also move
over to the Open Room, whereas mother and son Moss would move to the Closed Room.As it had been a pleasure to watch this tense match, I decided to stay and once again, I did not at all feel disappointed about the bridge I saw.
On the first two boards of the set, Barel cut down their deficit to just one IMP and then came:

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul. - 10952

8 Q
$\diamond$ KJ 652
\& 92

| ¢ A Q J 43 | N | ¢ K |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ A 965 |  | $\bigcirc 742$ |
| $\checkmark 83$ |  | $\diamond$ A 974 |
| 98 | S | ¢KJ543 |
|  | ¢ 876 |  |
|  | ¢KJIO 83 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 10 |  |
|  | \% 106 |  |

In the Open Room, the French EW reached a decent contract of 2NT and just made eight tricks. Gitelman + I20.
In the Closed Room, something happened:
Closed Room:

| West <br> Yadlin | North <br> Moss | East <br> Emodi | South <br> Greenberg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | $1 \mathbf{8}$ | 18 |
| Is | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Well judged by Gila Emodi to sit the double. She had an easy lead with the $\varphi \mathrm{K}$ and duly shifted to a low heart. Yadlin won the ace and cashed two more top spades on which East's remaining hearts went away. Next, he found the club switch, won by Brad Moss with his ace. Next, he played the $\$ 10$, ruffed by East with the $\diamond 4$ (why?) and overruffed in dummy. A top heart followed on which declarer shed a club. East ruffed this and cashed the ek followed by another club which was ruffed by West with the $\diamond 8$ and overruffed by declarer's $\diamond$ J. As East was down to $\diamond$ A9 now declarer only lost one more trick and escaped with down two for -300, a loss of 5 IMPs nevertheless.
A baby psyche by Brad Moss backfired when opponents were talked out of the game they might well not have made:

Board I9. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

|  | ¢ 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8J 742 |  |
|  | 勺J1087 |  |
|  | ¢9832 |  |
| - AK | N | ¢ 187542 |
| Q9653 |  | $\bigcirc$ A 108 |
| $\checkmark$ A Q 62 |  | $\checkmark 953$ |
| \&AK 6 | S | \& 5 |
|  | - Q 963 |  |
|  | ๑KQ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 4 |  |
|  | \& Q J 107 |  |

In the Open Room, the French had reached 44 which had gone down one, though Deep Finesse tells us, elsewhere in this issue, that it had considerable play.

In the Closed Room, there was more action from North and less action from East:

## Closed Room:

| West <br> Yadlin | North <br> Moss | East <br> Emodi | South <br> Moss |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 10 <br> Dble |
| IQ (?!) | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 4}$ |  |
| 2NT | All Pass |  |  |

This contract was easy enough and was even made with an overtrick when Brad Moss inserted his $\odot \mathrm{J}$ in the second round of the suit, trying to deny declarer an extra entry to dummy had the layout been different. As it was, declarer won the $\triangle A$ which brought down South's $\vee Q$ as well...
So the lead remained where it was, with the Barel team. On board 20 Moss was lucky to be able to make $3 \triangleleft$ by finessing both the 2 K and the 10 - he needed them to be successful for his contract. Then came:

Board 22. Dealer East. E/WVul. - 943
$\bigcirc$ Q
$\diamond A K$ Q 54
\&Q 975

| ¢ A 65 | N | Q 182 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ®K9865 |  | ¢J 2 |
| $\diamond 7$ | W E | $\checkmark 109862$ |
| AK 63 | S | ¢1084 |
|  | \& K Q 107 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 10743 |  |
|  | ১J 3 |  |
|  | \% 2 |  |

A difference in style on this board led to two completely different final contracts. In the Open Room, South opened $I \triangleleft$ and quickly found herself in 3NT, which looks quite OK in spite of the lack in high-card points. The defence was up to the occasion, however. West led a low club to the 7,8 and jack. The $\varphi \mathrm{K}$ won the next trick and declarer continued by running four diamond tricks. A spade to the ten was won by West who cleverly returned another low club for the nine and East's ten! The $\diamond 10$ and the sAK meant an unexpected one down. This defence was found at other tables by for example Gunnar Hallberg and Jack Migel
In the Closed Room, South passed so it was West who opened $1 \bigcirc$. He was left to play there and quietly went one down for another +100 to Gitelman. This little swing brought


Michael Barel, Israel
the lead back to Gitelman, but only just: by 3 IMPs.
The last three boards of the set were full of drama. The score stood at +6 for Gitelman when board 26 hit the table:

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.

|  | ¢ 16 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ - |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q 876542 |  |
|  | \&1086 |  |
| Q Q 10 | N | ¢98542 |
| $\bigcirc$ A 74 |  | -K98652 |
| $\checkmark$ K 103 | W E | $\diamond$ - |
| 2) 9532 | S | \& K |
|  | ¢ AK 73 |  |
|  | QQJ 103 |  |
|  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ } 9$ |  |
|  | \& Q 74 |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Cronier | North <br> Barel | East <br> D'Ovidio | South <br> Zur-Campanile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \mathbf{1 2}$ |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \vee$ | Dble |
| 2 | $5 \diamond$ | 5 | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

This looked like absolute par, with $5 \diamond$ an easy make if you start trumps by leading dummy's jack, the standard play of course (except for those who want to drop singleton kings offside). Due to the bad trump break D'Ovidio went two off, 500 for Barel. It looked like another small gain for the French, but...

## Closed Room:

| West <br> Yadlin | North <br> Moss | East <br> Emodi | South <br> Greenberg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 |  | 18 | Pass |
| 2 | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

This time, the light opening worked very well for the Israelis, as Brad Moss had absolutely no idea what to bid after $2 \vee$. Even 3NT would have worked, but when he was left to play $4 \diamond$ he just played safe for 10 tricks, thus making it a loss of 9 IMPs for his team.
With two boards to go, the lead had changed hands again: Barel were up by five now.


Migry Zur-Campanile, Israel

Cronier, left in happily by D'Ovidio, caused another little swing on the penultimate board:

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

| Q Q 1075 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ¢A 10543 |  |
| $\checkmark$ - |  |
| 2) 1052 |  |
| N | A 63 |
| W E | QQ1962 |
| W E | $\checkmark 985$ |
| S | 943 |
| ¢) 94 |  |
| ¢K 8 |  |
| $\checkmark$ AK 102 |  |
| 2K 987 |  |

At both tables, it went, with EW passing: $\mid \diamond-I \triangleleft-I N T-2 \triangleleft$. When this came round to West, Yadlin passed but Cronier doubled. The result was the same at both tables: down two.
The swing of 5 IMPs meant that the scores were level now. The last board would be decisive, and it proved to be a clear-cut case too:

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

|  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {2 } 2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ®K 10952 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 6$ |  |
|  | 2K 10742 |  |
| QK 10 | N | ¢ 1986543 |
| QJ |  | $\bigcirc 86$ |
| $\checkmark$ K Q J 1083 | W E | $\checkmark 942$ |
| \& A Q 96 | S | \% 3 |
|  | , Q 7 |  |
|  | QAQ 743 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 75 |  |
|  | e) 85 |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Cronier | North <br> Barel | East <br> D'Ovidio | South <br> Zur-Campanile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \diamond$ | 18 | 24. | 3 - |
| Pass | 4\% | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| 49 | Dble | All Pass |  |

Two diamond ruffs, one of them with the AA made it down two when a heart continuation forced dummy to ruff with the $\$ 10$, thus establishing a trick for South's Q . Would this be a good compensation for the vulnerable $5 \triangleleft$ lost?

## Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South <br> Godlin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Moss | Emodi | Greenberg |  |
| I | 2 NT* $^{*}$ | $3 \Omega$ | $4 \checkmark$ |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | 5 |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

No way. Look at the difference in approach again: Moss showed his two-suiter immediately over $\mathrm{I} \diamond$, thus bringing his partner in a much better position to judge, whereas Barel's approach made it more difficult for his partner to go to $5 \checkmark$ over the double of 44 .

Played from the South side of the table, $5 \checkmark$ cannot be defeated: even A and a club ruff, followed by a spade switch will not be enough, provided declarer has not played the eK at trick two.

So this swing of II IMPs all of a sudden broke the tie in favour of the transatlantics. It had been a good match with a sensational finish.

## Some Number of Spades

Now the we are well into the first week it is business as usual with stories coming in to the office from all the usual suspects. You might enjoy this one from the Mixed Teams Consolation.

## Dealer North, East/West Vul <br> 4AQ976543 <br> 8 KQ 852 <br> $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}$

After North opens le your partner passes and South responds $I \nabla$.
My informant, the genial Sascha Wernle politely enquired what I would do with this hand. 'Some number of spades' was the obvious start and as Tacchi fancied 49 I could hardly bid less. 'Okay, you go for at least 800.'
This was what happened at the table:


As Edgar Kaplan might have remarked 4s is the right bid - but not on this deal. It cost 1100.When Tacchi was given the auction and asked what he would do over the double of 5\% he said he would draw his Smith \& Wesson and shoot partner, echoing his father's words, 'A Smith \& Wesson beats Four Aces.'
Still, West doubtless consoled himself with the thought that his opposite number might well get into trouble at the other table. Let's take a look:

| West <br> Birman | North | East <br> Birman | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 10 | Pass | INT |
| 2 | All Pass |  |  |

David Birman's - wait - and see approach paid a big dividend. Reckoning North/South could make INT (indeed, as nine tricks are possible) he contended himself with 24 and although that failed by one trick, his thoughtful approach had contributed significantly to a massive gain for his team.

## CLASIFICATORIO PAREJAS MIXTAS

Después de la eliminación del equipo Passarinho de los octavos de final del torneo mixto, la atención de los aficionados españoles pasa al torneo de parejas mixtas, compuesto de un total de 211 , que ha empezado su fase clasificatoria para decidir las que pasarán a las semifinales (aproximadamente un tercio de ellas). Sólo hay 8 parejas españolas participando en esta fase, ya que Panadero-Passarinho están clasificados por su buena actuación en el torneo de equipos.
Antes de estudiar un poco el torneo de parejas, sin embargo, sólo destacar que la derrota de Passarinho en equipos fue por tan sólo 8 IMPS, aunque la siguiente mano aportó mucho a su favor.
Dador Oeste. Este-Oeste vulnerables.

| Passarinho | Sur | Panadero | Norte |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paso | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Paso | $3 \checkmark$ |
| Paso | $4 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Paso | 4 |
| Paso | $5 \$$ | Paso | $5 \$$ |
| Paso | $6\rangle$ | Paso | $6\rangle$ |

La subasta merece una explicación: 2 es precisión (II-I5H, con palo a trébol al menos $5^{\circ}$ ), 3 es intento de slam a ese palo, $4 \%$ es natural $y$ $4 \diamond / 5 \% / 5$ son controles. El resto es confuso, incluso para los propios suecos, acabando en un slam a corazón al cual tiene que salir en Oeste con las siguientes cartas:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Q } 942 \\
& \vee 1084 \\
& \diamond J 1072 \\
& \& K 6
\end{aligned}
$$

Joao escogió una de las 2 cartas que multan el contrato, ... jel 6 ! Fijese el efecto demoledor de esta salida, ya que la mano completa era:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { \& } 107 \\
& - \\
& \Delta 986 \\
& \text { AQ } 98743
\end{aligned}
$$

| -9842 | N | Q Q 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 81084 |  | QQ 752 |
| $\diamond$ J 1072 | W E | $\diamond$ Q 543 |
| - K 6 | S | -105 |
|  | A ${ }^{\text {K }} 65$ |  |
|  | PAKJ963 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A |  |
|  | ¢ ${ }^{2}$ |  |

El contrato es ridículo, pero sin la salida a trébol podía cumplirse: sólo hace falta que el declarante acierte el corazón (jugando $\vee$ AK y después el $\vee$ J para capturar el 10 tercero de Oeste) y haga el impasse a trébol. Sin embargo, con la salida de trébol (el \&K también vale), aunque el declarante bajee hasta su ${ }^{2}$ y acierte el corazón, Este puede volver a trébol después de ganar la $\vee \mathbf{Q}$ y romper las comunicaciones mientras conserva aún un triunfo pequeño.
Pero concentrémonos ya en la competición de parejas mixtas, donde al término de la segunda (de un total de 3) sesión clasificatoria sólo 2 parejas españolas están en puestos para acceder a la semifinal: Gaviard - Ventín (55.2\% de media) y León - Wasik (54.7\%). Mientras se escribe esta crónica están luchando en la tercera y definitiva sesión.
Polémica resultó la siguiente mano en muchas mesas. ¿Es usted partidario de reabrir la siguiente mano por doblo después de abrir en primera posición de l\$ y que el adversario a su izquierda intervenga a $2 \diamond$, nadie vulnerable?

## -A 9843

○95
$\diamond$ K
\& K Q 543

Hay parejas que tienen establecido que hay que reabrir siempre que se tenga corta en el palo de intervención, para que el compañero siempre pueda castigar las intervenciones contrarias, sin límite de fuerza. Para ellas, sólo si tiene algo así
 pasar, ya que ahora no es posible que el compañero haya pasado para jugar el contrato de $2 \diamond$ doblados.
Sin embargo, esta mano es realmente peligrosa. Si reabrimos y el compañero había pasado por no tener juego, seguramente dirá $2 \boxtimes$ y la cosa se puede poner muy fea.
No sé cual es su estilo, pero en este caso lo bueno era doblar, ya que la mano completa era la siguiente:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { © K } 10 \\
& \text { ©A7 } \\
& \diamond \text { Q } 107652 \\
& \text { \& } 762
\end{aligned}
$$

Una demostración más que competir a nivel de 2 merece una mejor mano que la de Norte (y más con igualdad de vulnerabilidad). Con salida del 8 K , el declarante no tiene subida a la mesa ni tan siquiera para jugar hacia el Rey. Con una buena defensa se puede lograr hasta 1100 , aunque con 500 ya se conseguían 176 puntos sobre un top de 208. Dejar jugar $2 \diamond$ sin doblar valía entre 30 y 40 puntos, dependiendo del número de multas conseguidas.
Para los amantes de los contratos de alto nivel, un 6ST que requiere un poco de técnica. ¿Cómo cartean dicho contrato, después de la salida del $\diamond 2 y \sin$ intervención contraria?

| - K 1074 |
| :---: |
| PAK 643 |
| $\checkmark$ Q 93 |
| \& 3 |
| N |
| W E |
| S |
| , A Q 6 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q |
| $\checkmark$ K 765 |
| \& AKQ 87 |

Poner el $\forall 9$ de la mesa sólo es correcto si Oeste ha salido bajo $\diamond$ JIO (improbable en este tipo de contratos) así que pasamos pequeña confiando en que algo bueno ocurra en el palo. Este intercala el $\diamond 10$ y ganamos con el Rey. Como sólo tenemos II bazas aunque cobremos 4 bazas en pic, debemos jugar $\diamond$ al 9 del muerto, confiando en que Oeste saliera bajo el $\diamond$ J. Este gana nuestro $\diamond 9$ con el $\diamond$ A (primer paso completado) y vuelve de trébol.
Si el pic no se comporta (y el diamante no está $3-3$ ), la única opción que tenemos es que funcione algún squeeze o que podamos contar la mano. Adelantamos \&AKQ (descartando corazones) y Oeste no sirve en el tercero.Aunque no lo parezca, ya puede usted reclamar sus bazas, para no perder tiempo.
Después de adelantar la $\vee \mathbf{Q}$, la $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ (Este no sirve, pero no nos importa) y el 8 A, llegamos a un final de 5 cartas en el que debemos ganarlas todas:


Adelantamos el 8 K y si Este no descarta su trébol firme descartamos nosotros el nuestro. Oeste debe retener su $\diamond$ J, así que ninguno puede llegar al final con 4 cartas en pic. Tiramos de cabeza y conseguimos 12 bazas, para conseguir un total de 192 puntos sobre top de 208. La mano completa:

|  | ¢ K 1074 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PAK 643 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 93 |  |
|  | \& 3 |  |
| -1983 | N | ¢ 52 |
| ¢J 97 |  | P10852 |
| $\diamond 1842$ |  | $\checkmark$ A 10 |
| \& 6 | S | \& 109542 |
|  | - A Q 6 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 765 |  |
|  | ¢ AK Q |  |

Un amigo mío, que nunca salía bajo J, seguramente se hubiera negado a salir con la mano de Oeste. El resto tal vez hubieran escogido el $\oslash \mathrm{J}$ ya que era el palo natural que había subastado el muerto. Con esta salida el contrato no puede ganarse.Por último, una subasta curiosa de Gaviard - Ventín, en la que el palo de triunfo se subastó por primera vez a nivel de slam:
Dador Norte. Norte-Sur vulnerables.

| Ventín | Norte | Gaviard | Sur |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Paso | 12 | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Doblo | Paso | $4 \diamond$ | Paso |
| $5 \diamond$ | Doblo | Paso | Paso |
| $6 \diamond$ (!!) | Paso | $6 \diamond$ | Todos pasan |

Tras la intervención de 2 débil a $\diamond$ por Sur y el doblo negativo de Ventín, Gaviard mostró el potencial de su mano y ambos mayores con la voz de $4 \diamond$. Suficiente para que Ventín pidiera control a diamante para jugar slam a un palo mayor. Al no ser una pareja frecuente (es el primer torneo que juegan juntos), no quedó claro el significado del paso tras el doblo de Norte, pero Ventín pidió de nuevo palo a la altura de 6 .
La mano completa:
. 8765
Q186
$\triangleleft$ K 54

- 832


El contrato de 6s es mejor, ya que $6 \checkmark$ está en peligro si la defensa empieza con 2 vueltas a diamante y Norte tiene 4 triunfos de J. En ese caso habría que impasar en el segundo triunfo, pero eso es jugar a cartas vistas. Sin embargo, con la mano actual no hubo problemas para ganar el contrato. +980 para un total de 180 puntos sobre 208.

## MIXED TEAMS

QUARTER-FINALS

| Teams |  | $(I-I 4)$ | $(I 5-28)$ | Total | Teams |  | $(I-14)$ | $(15-28)$ | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Herbst | Armstrong | $23-24$ | $36-26$ | $\mathbf{5 9 - 5 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Goldberg SWE | De Botton | $19-34$ | $38-22$ | $\mathbf{5 7 - 5 6}$ | Goldberg SWE | Herbst | $50-37$ | $16-14$ | $\mathbf{6 6 - 5 I}$ |
| Levy | Brigada | $9-12$ | $26-37$ | $35-49$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Erichsen | Gitelman | $21-14$ | $55-27$ | $\mathbf{7 6 - 4 1}$ | Brigada | Erichsen | $22-39$ | $26-39$ | $48-\mathbf{7 8}$ |

## MIXED PAIRS QUALIFYING ROUND FINAL RESULTS

|  |  | 59.69 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Arne LARSSON - Pia ANDERSSON |  |
| 3 | Carlo TOTARO - Maria Pia TOTARO | 59.32 |
| 4 | Anni KOVACHEVA - Georgi SHOKOV | 58.61 |
| 5 | Kauko KOISTINEN - Sue BACKSTROM | 58.29 |
| 6 | Daniela Von ARNIM - Pablo LAMBARDI |  |
| 7 | Lou Ann O'ROURKE - Peter FREDIN |  |
| 8 | Enrico BENASSI - Chia MARTELLIN | 57.62 |
| 9 | George JACOBS - Sabine AUKEN |  |
| 0 | G.JANKUNAITE - Gedrius SARKANAS |  |
|  | Ewa HARASIMOWICZ - M. LESNIEWSKI |  |
|  | Agnieszka KUCHARSKA - P. KUCHARSKI |  |
|  | Piotr JUREK - Ewa KATER |  |
|  | Arturo WASIK - Pilar LEON | 56.52 |
|  | Verino CALDARELLI - R. COS |  |
|  | Juan Carlos VENTIN - Daniele GAVIARD |  |
|  | Francesco NATALE - Barbara CESARI | 56.39 |
|  | Andrea PAVIN - Rober BENEDETTI |  |
|  | Franco CEDOLIN - Marinella CANESI |  |
|  | Jovanka SMEDEREVAC - Sascha WERNLE |  |
|  | Jean-Michel VOLDOIRE - Nadine PEYROT |  |
|  | Dominique BEAUMIER - Anne BEAUMIER |  |
|  | Michael BAREL - Migry ZUR-CAMPANILE |  |
|  | Katalin MEZEI - Laszlo HONTI |  |
|  | Ellen VIGMOSTAD - Harald NOR |  |
|  | Giorgio DUBOIN - Maria Teresa LAVAZZA |  |
|  | Isabelle MAGIS - Dominique PILON |  |
|  | Mario D' AVOSSA - Daniela ROMANI |  |
|  | Apolinary KOWALSKI - Ewa MISZEWSKA |  |
|  | Erick MAUBERQUEZ - Vanessa REESS |  |
|  | Silvia CSIPKA - Peter MAGYAR |  |
|  | Marjo CHORUS - Carel BERENDREGT |  |
|  | Hartmut KONDOCH - Karin CAESAR |  |
|  | U. SCHRECKENBERGER-M. GROMOEL |  |
|  | Merih TOKCAN - Naci DEMIRBAS |  |
|  | Siv THORESEN - Jan Petter SVENDSEN |  |
|  | Danielle AVON - Lewis KAPLAN | 53.92 |
|  | uth LEVIT-PORAT - Natan HETZ |  |
|  | Francesco SCRIATTOLI - D. SALVE |  |
|  | Claudio NUNES - Stacy JACOBS |  |
|  | Pierre ZIMMERMANN - Renata SA | 53.33 |
|  | Antonio CUCCORESE - Angela De BIASIO |  |
|  | A. K. FUGLESTAD - Erik SAELENSMINDE |  |
|  | Egil HOMME - Marianne HOMME | 53.20 |
|  | Nevena SENIOR - Geoffrey WOLF |  |
|  | Alan NELSON - Kath NELSON |  |
|  | Marianne SERF - Jean- Claude FOUASSIER |  |
|  | Stanislaw GOLEBIOWSKI - J. ZALEWSKA |  |
|  | Sylvie LESUR - Herve CASSAR |  |
|  | Tormod ROREN - Aase LANGELAND | 52.92 |
|  | John HOLLAND - Michelle BRUNNER | 52.83 |
|  | Audhild VISTNES - Fred Arne MOEN | 52.79 |
|  | Jet PASMAN - Christoffer NIEMEIJER | 52.76 |
|  | Rafal JAGNIEWSKI - Grazyna BREWIAK |  |
|  | Fulvio FANTONI - Paola SCALAMOGNA |  |
|  | Lorenzo STOPPINI - Maria STOPPIN | 52.5 |
|  | Marta JANECZEK - Tomasz PILCH |  |
|  | Lilo POPLILOV - Matilda POPLILOV |  |
|  | Hanna KOWALSKA - Andrzej MAJCHER |  |
|  | Nedju BUCHLEV - Petra Von MALCHUS | 52. |
|  | Ewa BANASZKIEWICZ - P. LUTOSTANS |  |
|  | Jose DAMIANI - Colette LISE | 52.30 |
|  | Norbert SCHILHART - Angela GRAMBERG |  |
|  | Alessandro CROCI - Lorenza CROCI | 52.29 |
|  | M. De VINCENZO - F. COLAMARTINO | 52.26 |
|  | Rhona GOLDENFIELD - B. GOLDENFIELD | 52.2 |
|  | M. Dam MORTENSEN - Lone MORTENSEN |  |
|  | Tjali TUWANAKOTTA - B.Van Den BOOM | 2.05 |
|  | K. SKOV - Margaret JAMES - COURTNEY | 52.0 |
|  | Ronald VERDONK - Annet VAN LEIJEN | 52. |
|  | Massimo LANZAROTTI - Cristina GOLIN |  |
|  | Terry WALSH - Brid KEMPLE |  |

Huub BERTENS - Wietske Van ZWOL Arne LARSSON - Pia ANDERSSON Anni KOVACHEVA Georgi SHOKOV Kauko KOISTINEN - Sue BACKSTROM Daniela Von ARNIM - Pablo LAMBARDI Lou Ann OROURKE - Peter FREDIN BENASSI - Chia MA George JACOBS - Sabine AUKEN Ewa HARASIMOWICZ - M IESNIEWSKI Agnieszka KUCHARSKA - P. KUCHARSKI Piotr JUREK - Ewa KATER

Verino CALDARELLI - R. COSTANTINI Juan Carlos VENTIN - Daniele GAVIARD Francesco NATALE - Barbara CESARI Andrea PAVIN - Rober BENEDETTI Franco CEDOLIN - Marinella CANESI Jovanka SMEDEREVAC - Sascha WERNLE ean-MicheIVOLDOIRE - Nadine PEYROT Dominique BEAUMER - Anne BEAUMER Kal M 55.17 Giorgio DUBON - Maria Nerera LavazZa 55.01 Isabelle MAGIS - Dominique PILON 54.99 Mario D' AVOSSA - Daniela ROMANI Apolinary KOWALSKI - Ewa MISZEWSKA Erick MAUBERQUEZ - Vanessa REESS Silvia CSIPKA - Peter MAGYAR
Marjo CHORUS - Carel BERENDREG Hartmut KONDOCH - Karin CAESAR Merih TOKCAN - Naci DEMIRBAS Siv THORESEN - Jan Petter SVENDSEN Danielle AVON - Lewis KAPLAN Ruth LEVIT-PORAT - Natan HETZ Francesco SCRIATTOLI - D. SALVEMINI Claudio NUNES - Stacy JACOBS 69 59.42 59.32 58.61 58.29 57.9457.91 57.62 57.41 56.99 56.94 56.86 56.57Egil HOMME - Marianne HOMME53.20Alan NELSON - Kath NELSON53.05
Marianne SER - Jean- Claude ZOUASSIER ..... 53.02
Syid53.0052.9252.83

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $74$ | David JENSEN - Catherine JAG |  |
|  | Jean-yves DANIC - A.M. COLOM |  |
| 76 | Philippe MARILL - Fabienne PIGEAU |  |
| 77 | Krzystof BURAS - Anna GRUNT |  |
|  | John CARrUTHERS - Katie |  |
| 79 | Eric RODWELL - Helen COULTER |  |
| 80 | Elizabeth (liz) McGOWAN - Ken BA |  |
|  | David BIRMAN - Daniela BIRMAN |  |
| 82 | Veronique BESSIS - Olivier BESS |  |
| 83 | Tomas FORT - Eva DITETOVA |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Beverly PERRY - John KRANY |  |
| 86 | Patrick JOST - Nicole JOST |  |
|  | Erdal Olkay ERCAN - Lori |  |
| 88 | Christian MARI - Marie-France RENOUX |  |
| $89$ | Michail ROSENBLUM - Larissa |  |
|  | Giorgio ODELLO - Shalh MOFAHKAMI |  |
| 91 | Francesca De LUCCHI - Giancarlo MAR |  |
|  | Norberto BOCCHI - Emanuela CAL |  |
|  | Brian SENIOR - Sandra PENFOLD |  |
| 94 | Erik RYNNING -Vigdis THOREN |  |
|  | Stein Atle JUVIK - Ann-mari MIRKOV |  |
|  | Antonio VIVALDI - Enza ROSSANO |  |
| 97 | Rune HAUGE - Mariann |  |
|  | Louk |  |
|  | Jeff MILLERSHIP - Sandie MILLERSHIP |  |
|  | Ritva NIEMISTO - Pekka NIEMISTO |  |
|  | I Gilles SIMON - Charlotte ROT |  |
|  | Luca BELLUSSI - Fioren |  |
|  | Paula SPIL - Flip BOER |  |
|  | 4 Fried WEBER - Elke WEB |  |
|  | Tom GISBORNE - Sandy DAVIES |  |
|  | 6 Flora ZARKESCH - Robert BOED |  |
|  | Carlo ROMANI - Anna BRUCCULERI |  |
|  | 8 George COLTER - Donna RODWELL |  |
|  | Rino TRAPANI - Michaela POPA |  |
|  | TOFFIER - N Van PO |  |
|  | I G.VAN MIDDELEM - C.V.DEN BOSSCH |  |
|  | SSARD - Georges ROMANOW |  |
|  | Francois ALLIX - Nathalie FREY |  |
|  | 4 Massimo MUROLO - Anna ROMAN |  |
|  | 5 Philip DUFTON - Shirlie BROWN |  |
|  | Jan FUCIK - Chantal HAMMERLI |  |
|  | 7 Tomasz GOTARD - Barbara GOTARD |  |
|  | co FONTI - Vera Caldarelli |  |
|  | hir UZUMCU - Umran SEMERCI |  |
|  | 0 Pierre D' OVIDIO - Marie Louize DAS |  |
|  | TUSZYNSKI - Anna SARNIAK |  |
|  | 2 Shimshon HORVITZ - Nurit GRA |  |
|  | 3 Jari BACKSTROM - Eija MULTIMAKI |  |
|  | Sam DINKIN - Lynn BAKER |  |
|  | Marita MAI - Enrico LONGINO |  |
|  | Savid BURN - Rosie WHITE |  |
|  | B. CALLAGHAN - C. DUCKWORTH |  |
|  | Galieo VIOLIN - Elvira D'ANDREA |  |
|  | Konrad ARASZKIEWICZ - M. PASTERN |  |
|  | Tony PRIDAY - Vivian PRIDAY |  |
|  | T. COOREMAN -V. CARCASSONN |  |
|  | 2 Christine LUSTIN - Ross HARPER |  |
|  | Sean O'LUBAIGH - Mary FINN |  |
|  | 4 Doron YADLIN - Gila EMODI |  |
|  | Karl De RAEYMAEKER - Anna ONIS |  |
|  | S Guido RESTA - Gianna ARRIGON |  |
|  | Leonardo CIMA - Marc TEMPESTIN |  |
|  | 3 Maria PEL - Peter IJSSELMUIDEN |  |
|  | Leszek SZTYRAK - Marta MACHALINSKA |  |
|  | Matteo MONTANARI - Francesca CARA |  |
|  | I Benedicte CRONIER - Moza PANAHPOUR |  |
|  | MENICHETTI - Giuseppe ROCCHI | 48.53 |
|  | Paul CHEMLA - Muriel CLEMENT |  |
|  |  |  |

73 Chris JAGGER - Jane JENSEN
1.90
51.89
51.76
51.75
51.72 1.63
51.54
51.48
5.44
5.34
1.29
51.28
51.27
1.09
1.08
51.00

91 Francesca De LUCCHI - Giancarlo MARINI 50.99 92 Norberto BOCCHI - Emanuela CALANDRA50.97

Erik RYNNING - Vigdis THOREN

97 Rune HAUGE - Marianne HARDING
98 Louk VERHEES JR - Anneke SIMONS 99 Jeff MILLERSHIP - Sandie MILLERSHIP 01 Gilles SIMON - Charlotte ROTKOF 102 Luca BELLUSSI - Fiorenza BELLUSS 103 Paula SPIL - Flip BOER

04 Fried WEBER - Elke WEBER 106 Flora ZARKESCH - Robert BOEDDEKER 107 Carlo ROMANI - Anna BRUCCULERI George COLTER - Donna RODVELL IIO Philippe TOFFIER - N Van POPERINGHE III G.VAN MIDDELEM - C.V.DEN BOSSCHE 11 M. ROSSARD - Georges ROMANOWSKI II4 Massmo MUROLO - Anna ROMANO

145 Victor SILVERSTONE - Caroline GREGSON 48.43 146 Arthur MALINOWSKI - Marilyn NATHAN 48.43 47 Marit LANGSTON - Peter LANGSTON 48.40 148 Michael SCHNEIDER - Gisela SMYKALLA 48.23 149 Zahary ZAHARIEV - Netsy SAYER 150 Sabina GRZEJDZIAK - Igor GRZEJDZIAK 47.98 15I Pedro ROCA - Rosa MUNOZ CAMPOS 47.94 I52 Anna MATWIJOW - Bernard JADCZAK 47.74 I53 John PHELAN - Lucy PHELAN 47.72 154 Morten Lund MADSEN - C. MORTENSEN 47.60 155 Cl . CORSICO PICCOLINO - M. CORTESI 47.56 I56 Gadi LEIBOVITZ - Thalia KOREN 47.54
157 Maureen HIRON - Irving GORDON 47.5I
I58 Bjorn FALLENIUS - Biancastella RUSSO 47.43 I59 Greer McKENZIE - Moyna MACKENZIE 47.23 160 Thierry BINEAU - Nathalie MARX 47.18
161 Andrea BURATTI - Simonetta PAOLUZI 47.15 162 Marc VERDURMEN - Irmeli SALONEN 47.14 63 Lukas PAVLIK - Pavla SVOBODOVA 164 Donatella BERSANI - Elvio BASTARDINI 165 Guido MICHELI - Maria Brun MORELLI 166 Janet CAHM - Maurice CAHM 167 Dominique PORTAL - Denis FROUEIN 47.13 47.07 47.00 46.85 46.82 46.82
46.77

168 Ufuk UGUR - Aliye UGUR 69 Ran SCHNEIDER - Klara HETZ 170 Maria Dam MORTENSEN - Roman BUDZIK 46.58 71 Natalia CECI - Leonardo CAPORILLI 46.58 I72 Francesco RANDAZZO - D. BUZZATTI 46.45 173 Ivan STOIMIROV - Nevena STOIMIROV 46.31 174 Santino CASADIO - Patrizia JEREB 175 Krzysztof MARTENS - Iman CHAMAA 176 Ferruc RAINIERI - Giovanna CASSAI 177 Sofia SUAREZ - F.o JIMENEZ GARRIDO 78 Andreas BABSCH - Ilse B ARTMER 180 Drew CASEN - Teri CASEN 8। Nina ANIDJAR - Diego BRENNER 182 Giovanni MACI - M.cristina MOTTA 183 James BUGDEN - Sally BUGDEN 84 Filippo PALMA - Ana PRADOS 185 Klaas BRINK - Veri BRINK-BAKENS 186 Filippo RAFFA - Gabriella CAPRIOGLIO 187 Aydin UYSAL - Mine BABAC 188 Nurit NAVEH - Gabi MERMELSTEIN 89 Quentin ROBERT - Lucie CRISTOFARI 190 Flavio PASSI -Valeria BELLINI 191 John HARRISON - Nawal FENWICK
50.73
50.65
50.36 0.35
0.33
0.32
50.28
50.26
0.24
50.22
50.09
50.00
0.00
9.95
49.88
49.82
49.80
49.58
9.37

93 Eugene TORRE - Michelle TORRE 94 Paul HAMMOND - Sue LANE 195 Jimmy LEDGER - Maureen HANNAH 196 Gaetano LEONETTI - Silvana MORELLI 97 Rocco PAGANO - Stefania MASSARA 198 Elsa BISCOTTI - Giovanni LEPRE 199 Andrew MCINTOSH - Lila PANAHPOUR 200 Margaret PARNIS-ENGLAND - Mario DIX 41.93 201 Aureliano YANES - Isabel ROCA AROZENA 4I. 58 202 Consuelo DIAZ - Jose ARANAZ 41.44 203 Pietro MESSINA - Maria SFAMENI 41.42 204 Alain BENOIT - Barbara LAMOUR 205 V. Dgiassim AL-SHATI - Roz WOLFARTH 40.98 206 Antoinette MCGEE - Tos McGEE 40.88 207 Vittorio CATANZARO - A.M. BENEDUCE 39.58 208 Heidy HUPE - Alan MADDOCK 38.96 209 Barbara TYSDAHL - Dennis RYAN 38.71 210 Jacques GONFREVILLE - N. SCHULMANN 37.79 2II Osvaldo TORRES - Iolanda RIOLO

