# A GALAXY OF STARS 

With play in the Open，Women＇s and Senior teams starting in the evening and a deadline to meet you will have to wait until tomorrow before results and the best of the action ap－ pear in the Bulletin．Meanwhile you might like to consider if this is the greatest ever collec－ tion of World，European and National Cham－ pions to compete in the same tournament．

We are counting them and you might like to compare our figures with yours when we publish them tomorrow．
There were fears that a strike by Iberian airlines might cause major disruption to the Championships，but fortunately these proved to unfounded，although a few matches have been postponed．


What better way to relax than by the pool？
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## 


－Registration for late arrivals｜
－Open／Women／Seniors
Today from 9：00－10：00
Room Cibeles
■－$-\infty=-\infty=\square$


The local newspapers have been speculating about the possible participation of the sport＇s best－known celebrity．If you spot this man in Tenerife let us know at once．

## 

【 The senior teams continue their round robins in Royale with three matches today
I（ $10.30,14.00,17.00$ ）．
｜The women teams will start playing in Imperial also with three rounds（I0．30，14．00， 17．00）in their respective round robins．
The open teams finish the first stage with 5 matches of 10 boards．Thereafter we form
Ithe semi－final A with the top teams（half of the teams in each group），played in Los Espe－
I jos and the semi－final B played in Tenerife．Both events are played as a Swiss with 6 rounds I of 8 boards tomorrow．

There is a carry－over of $6,4,2$ and 0 vp＇s for the teams qualifying for the Swiss $A$ in a
group of 7,8 teams and a carry－over of 6,3 and 0 VP for the teams qualifying out of a
【 group with 5 or 6 teams．Going to the Swiss B there is a carry－over of 2 and IVP for the 【
｜teams ranked 5 and 6 out of a group with 7,8 teams and 2VP for the fourth ranked team out of a group with 5 or 6 teams．

ITon Kooijman

## THE MIXED TEAMS SEMIFINALS - GOLDBERG v. HERBST by Jos Jacobs

After the morning excitement of the quarterfinals the winning tams had to sit down again at 16.00 hrs . to contest the berths for the finals. It would be Brigada v. Erichsen and Goldberg v. Herbst. One might thus say that the last stages of these Championships are an all-European affair with a slight Israeli flavour as one or two players from the Herbst team are not Dutch
Below are a few swing boards from the Goldberg v. Herbst semifinal:
A more flexible approach by the Dutch South scored a sizeable swing for her side:

| Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ AK Q J 8 |  |  |
| ๑Q 953 |  |  |
| - 9 |  |  |
| 2982 |  |  |
| $\checkmark 109643$ | N | $\checkmark 7$ |
| 8J10 2 |  | 864 |
| - Q 54 |  | -KJ107632 |
| ¢ 6 | S | ¢ 105 |
| $\checkmark 52$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ AK 87 |  |  |
| - A 8 |  |  |
| 9AK Q 74 |  |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Herbst | North <br> Goldberg | East <br> Barr | South <br> Goldberg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4 *$ | $1 \%$ | 3 | $4 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $6 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $5 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The disadvantage of $4{ }^{\circ}$ was that North could not make any more constructive move on his own over the diamond raise. South did her best with 5NT, a general try for a possible grand, but North saw too many holes in his hand to accept. A good grand missed.

Closed Room:

| West <br> Efraimsson | North Cleeff | East <br> Svedlund | South <br> Van Ettinger |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \vee$ | $3 *$ | Dble |
| $4 *$ | $4 \vee$ | Pass | $4 N T$ |
| $5 *$ | Pass | Pass | $7 \vee$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

South's double over 3* gave North the chance to voluntarily introduce his heart support. That was all Van Ettinger needed more, so it took little time to reach the grand. Well bid and a fully deserved 13 IMPs.
A declarer misplay proved very expensive on board 6:


Helena Svedlund, Sweden


Open Room:

| West <br> Herbst | North <br> Goldberg | East <br> Barr | South <br> Goldberg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 12 | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \vee$ | $2 \dot{2}$ | $3 \%$ |
| Pass | 40 | All Pass |  |

Not very exciting, II tricks and 450 to Goldberg.

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 18 | Pas |
| 1 * | 19 | $3{ }^{2}$ | $3 \%$ |
| Pass | 4v | Pass | Pass |
| 5\% | Dble | All Pass |  |

The save was a little too expensive right from the beginning, but by ducking the first round of diamonds declarer would easily have stayed in control to collect nine tricks. When she first cashed the $\leqslant$ and then ducked a trick in the suit, she saw the third diamond ruffed away and later lost three more heart tricks as well for an unhappy 1100 and 12 IMPs gone instead of just 2.
Next, an interesting defensive problem came up.

| Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ AKQ 1097 |  |  |
| ®KJ 5 |  |  |
| - 7 |  |  |
| ¢ 42 |  |  |
| $\checkmark 842$ | N | $\checkmark 53$ |
| Q1042 |  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 8 |
| -AJIO 8642 | W E | - Q 3 |
| - | S | \&1076543 |
| vJ6 |  |  |
| 89763 |  |  |
| - K 95 |  |  |
| \&K Q J 8 |  |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Herbst | North <br> Goldberg | East <br> Barr | South <br> Goldberg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4 \diamond$ | $4 \vee$ | All Pass | Pass |

East led the $\bullet Q$ and partner contributed the two. In view of the fact that West should not hold less than a seven-card suit to open at the four-level, this $\downarrow 2$ should obviously be read as Lavinthal. In that case, you can return the 10 for partner to ruff and the contract will go down three as the $\vee A Q$ provide two entries.

At the table, East continued diamonds so the contract was made in comfort.

Closed Room:

| West <br> Efraimsson | North <br> Van Cleeff | East <br> Svedlund | South <br> Van Ettinger |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | $4 \vee$ | Pass | Pass |
| 3 | All Pass |  |  |

At this table too, East led the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, partner contributing the 8 this time. Though this does not look like a suggestion to play a club, the switch duly came; it was a priori a $50 \%$ chance anyway. As East led the 24 partner safely returned a trump after ruffing, so the contract went exactly one down.
A remarkable way to do it, but Goldberg had scored 12 IMPs on the board.
The halftime score was 46-37 to Goldberg.
The second half was a peaceful affair until board 19 arrived:

Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.


Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Van Cleeff | Goldberg | Van Ettinger | Goldberg |


|  |  |  | Pass |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | Dble | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5 | $5 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

On the actual layout slam can be made by EW, but as this is odds-against they did well by doubling their opponents in $5 \checkmark$ and defeating it by three tricks. The lead was the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, partner playing the 10 , followed by the $\bullet A$ and a club! This way the defence collected three hearts, a diamond and a club trick for down three, 500 to Herbst.

| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Efraimsson | Herbst | Svedlund | Michielsen |
|  |  |  | Pass |

Pass $4 v \quad$ All Pass
At the other table, East did not think her cards were worth a double, so there it rested. When the club switch was not found in time, the club loser disappeared on the last heart, as West could not ruff this at any stage. So only 50 to Goldberg and IO IMPs back to Herbst to trail by only 5 now.
Two boards later, an unlucky lead caused a blockage in the club suit, the only way to let through 3NT, which meant 10 IMPs back to Goldberg. The end then came with a score of $62-5 \mathrm{I}$ to Goldberg. It would be Sweden v. Norway in the final.

## THE MIXED TEAMS QUARTERFINAL

The match between Erichsen and Gitelman was decided by three consecutive deals in the second half that each provided a double figure swing for the Norwegian-British team (don't forget Espen Erichsen is now a British resident and married to British-born Helen, his bridge partner here).
Board 17 provided the opportunity for Defence of the Year so Barry Rigal has reserved the deal for reporting elsewhere. Here are the two less beautiful swings:


There was nothing to the play once Boye Brogeland unkindly led the ace of clubs, so the debate centred on the bidding. Both agreed that 6 was West's only grand slam try ( $6 \%$ would ask for the queen of trumps). East's argument was that had she held a club void her bid over $2 \%$ would be $4 \%$, therefore her partner should know the void was in diamonds, and 6 must imply all key cards present, so her solid hearts and excellent


Catherine d'Ovidio, France
trumps made the grand a near-certainty. West clearly was not sure which void his partner held and thought over 6* East would not progress to a grand unless the void was in clubs. At the other table Mr \& Mrs Helness had stopped in $6 v$ so the swing was 17 IMPs to Erichsen.
And here was the last of the trio:

| Board 19. Dealer South. E/WVul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - K 85 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ - |  |  |  |
| -K Q 109862 |  |  |  |
| ¢654 |  |  |  |
| - Q 62 | N | $\checkmark 74$ |  |
| QAJ 109532 | 532 N | ¢K 84 |  |
| - - | W | - J 743 |  |
| \% 108 | S | ej 932 |  |
| v J 1093 |  |  |  |
| QQ 76 |  |  |  |
| - A 5 |  |  |  |
| \%KQ 7 |  |  |  |
| West N | North | East | South |
| Cronier Brog | Brogeland B. | D'Ovidio | Brogeland $T$. |
|  |  |  | INT |
| 38 | 5 | Pass | Pass |
| Dble All | All Pass |  |  |

East gave due consideration to pulling the double to 5 『, but this contract was doomed to go at least one off and may be more, and she decided to take her chances in defence.
The lead of the king of hearts was ruffed, and Boye Brogeland looked a happy man until a trump to the ace revealed he had a trump loser.

Brogeland now went into one of those lengthy pauses that makes one wonder whether he is analysing in great depth or merely summoning up the courage to do what his instinct tells him is right. Anyway dummy eventually produced some body language that indicated the decision could not be put off until the morrow and Boye duly ran the jack of spades, to feelings of relief when it held. There was a further delay while Boye worked out that he could not afford a second finesse for if the suit was 4-I East would ruff, put West in with a club and obtain a second ruff. Having checked that he drew trumps and played the king of spades, and claimed. As the contract at the other table was 6 doubled down two the swing was 13 IMPs to Erichsen. Erichsen had won 764I with the whole margin arising on those three deals.


## Sandbin for Sandqvist

## by Ace Ventura

This nicely played hand comes from the second session of the Mixed-Pairs SemifinalA.
North opens IV and South shows support in spades later in the auction.
How many tricks as East would you make in $4 \checkmark$ when South leads the ace of spades then switches to the nine of diamonds?
$\checkmark 3$
-K 87
© AKJ 7 QQ 1054

- 532
- A Q 10
\& A 10986
2542

Well, one can hope the diamond honours will be well-placed in North's hand. In that case a second finesse in diamonds provides the tenth trick. Shall we agree on ten tricks?
Nicklas Sandqvist, the Swede who, for a quite number of years now, flew from all the Swedish good-looking girls to a better weather climate (?) in England, was the only one in the field to make eleven tricks. This was the full layout:

Board I3, Dealer North, All vul

- QJ 10654
$\checkmark 2$
-KJ86
+K Q

| $\checkmark 3$ | N | $\checkmark$ K 87 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QAKJ 7 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 1054 |
| - 532 | W E | - A Q 10 |
| \& 10986 | S | ¢ 542 |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 92 |  |
|  | ¢9863 |  |
|  | -974 |  |
|  | \&) 7 |  |


| West <br> Dhondy | North | East <br> Sandqvist | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Iq | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $2 \mathbf{Q}^{*}$ | Dble |
| $3 \mathbf{3 0}$ | Pass | $3 \vee$ | Pass |
| $4 \varnothing$ | All Pass |  |  |

At some tables North/South judged correctly and took a sacrifice in $4 \vee$, for a maximum of -500. However, back to Nicklas. When South switched to the nine of diamond at trick two, North played the jack and Nicklas won the queen. Next came a club to the ace and a successful diamond-finesse. Ace and king of trumps exposed the bad trumpbreak. Nicklas changed tactics and continued with a diamond to the ace then the king of spades and a spade ruff. This was the ending: $\vee$ QJIO


A club followed - and North was thrown in. He had only spades left to play for a ruff and a discard. This brilliant performance contributed to a sixth place for Dhondy/Sandqvist at the end of the Semi-Finals.

# THE MIXED TEAMS FINAL - ERICHSEN V. GOLDBERG <br> <br> by Jos Jacobs 

 <br> <br> by Jos Jacobs}

On Wednesday, the Mixed Teams Finals was played between Erichsen, a Norwegian team of three couples: Erichsen, Helness and Brogeland, against the Goldberg team from Sweden, consisting of Lars and Ulla Goldberg couple and Efraimsson with Svedlund.
The Norwegians took a big early lead which at a certain point amounted to 39-6, mainly due to this board:

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
$\checkmark$ A 102
-K 1084
-A 72
\&8 32

| v K Q 754 | N | v1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ 7 |  | $\bigcirc$ - |
| -985 | W E | - Q 43 |
| \& Q 7 | S | 2) 109654 |
|  | $\checkmark 3$ |  |
|  | ¢Q96532 |  |
|  | -KJIO6 |  |
|  | * A K |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Goldberg | North <br> Brogeland | East <br> Goldberg | South <br> Brogeland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IV | Pass | $3 \%$ | 3 |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \vee$ | Pass |
| Pass | $4 \vee$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Shrewd tactics by Boye Brogeland paid rich dividends. He passed $3 \bigcirc$ as he was pretty sure his screen mate would compete with $3 \vee$. Of course he knew that had been a Bergen raise. When the auction went as he had been hoping for, he bid his intended $4>$ and even enjoyed the pleasure of this contract being doubled. If you guess well in both red suits you might even make six, but one overtrick only was still worth a fine +990 .

## Closed Room:

| West <br> Erichsen | North <br> Efraimsson | East <br> Erichsen | South <br> Svedlund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iv | Pass | 20 | All Pass |

When Svedlund did not consider her hand worth an overcall, the bidding ended rather prematurely. When the defence failed to cash their diamond tricks, Erichsen even made his contract for another +1I0 and 15 IMPs to the Norwegians.
When the last board of the first segment arrived, the Swedes had just started a rally. They very much continued their good work at their last attempt of the session:

Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- Q 108763
$\bigcirc 86$
- 1052
$\%$ Q

| $\checkmark 42$ | N | $\checkmark 5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QJ 105 | $W^{N}$ | \& AK 9742 |
| -A8643 |  | -KJ 7 |
| 932 | S | -1076 |
|  | $\checkmark$ AKJ 9 |  |
|  | ¢Q 3 |  |
|  | - Q 9 |  |
|  | \& AJ 854 |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Goldberg | North <br> Brogeland | East <br> Goldberg | South <br> Brogeland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 2 , | 28 | Dble |
| Pass | 20 | $3 \bigcirc$ | $3 \vee$ |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | 4v | All Pass |  |

East led his top hearts, partner contributing the jack and the ten. After this suit preference, East duly found the diamond switch to put the contract one down. No doubt her task had been made easier by West's $4 \checkmark$ bid: he was sure to hold at least some useful values somewhere.

## Closed Room:

| West <br> Erichsen | North <br> Efraimsson | East <br> Erichsen | South <br> Svedlund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $2 \vee$ | Pass | $4 \vee$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

At this table, East had no clue whatsoever. On the top heart led, West contributed the five and East promptly switched to a club. One overtrick and at least one happy Swede. At the end of the segment, the score stood at 39-29 to the Norwegians.

The second segment was very, very quiet. At the end of it, the score was 63-53 to the Swedes, who thus continued the good work they had started on the closing boards of the first session.
The final session suddenly livened up when board 9 appeared:

Board 9. Dealer North. E/WVul.

| $\checkmark$ A Q 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 76$ |  |
| - Q 96 |  |
| \& AK 943 |  |
| N | $\checkmark 97652$ |
| W E | $\bigcirc$ AKQ 92 |
| W E | -7 |
| S | \& Q 5 |
| $\checkmark 4$ |  |

QJ 8543
-AJ 108
\& 108
In the Closed Room, Boye Brogeland got excited when his partner showed majors after North's INT opening bid:

## Closed Room:

| West <br> Brogeland | North <br> Goldberg | East <br> Brogeland | South <br> Goldberg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INT | $2 \boldsymbol{q}$ | $2 \downarrow$ |
| $2 \downarrow$ | Pass | $3 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| $4 v$ | Dble | All Pass |  |

When East made a further move over his voluntarily bid $2 \vee$, he was all too eager to accept. Understandable, but very expensive as it was North who spoke the final verdict.
Goldberg +800. At the time they were playing this hand in the Closed Room, it looked as if the Swedes had sealed their victory with a likely big swing here.
In English cricket, there is an old saying: "No score is either good or bad until you have seen what the other side has made." This say-
ing apparently also applies to bridge, as was shown once the replay of the board got underway.

## Open Room:

| West <br> Efraimsson | North <br> Helness | East <br> Svedlund | South Helness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INT | 200 | Dble |
| $2 \vee$ | 3\% | 4V | 5\% |
| 5 | Dble | All Pass |  |

Svedlund too showed majors with $2 \%$, but not having been warned about the hearts she went all the way to $4 \vee$ when partner showed signs of a genuine spade fit. This was asking too much of her partner, however, when he had to review the auction after South's 5\%.
Helness thus had an even easier double than Goldberg to pick up a fully unexpected IIOO. The 7 -IMP swing meant that Erichsen were now only 2 IMPs behind Goldberg and not 20.

We will skip board II, the 6NT at both tables, as it is published elsewhere in the Bulletin as an appeal case.
However, the next board after this common disaster was the first board of what really was a comedy of errors till the end of the match. The only exception was board 15, on which both NS pairs bid the grand slam with complete confidence.

| Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ AK 106 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 82 |  |  |
| - 2 |  |  |
| 2107632 |  |  |
| $\checkmark 32$ | N | vJ 85 |
| 863 | W E | ¢KJIO 754 |
| - A 107653 |  | - K Q 9 |
| \&Q 95 | S | \% |
| $\checkmark$ Q 974 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A 9 |  |  |
| - 184 |  |  |
|  | \& A K 84 |  |

Open Room:


Helen Erichsen, England

When Efraimsson did not find his hand worth a diamond preempt (and why should one disagree with that view?) the bidding was quickly over. Helness had little trouble in producing II tricks. Erichsen +650 .

## Closed Room:

| West <br> Brogeland | North <br> Goldberg | East <br> Brogeland | South <br> Goldberg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

Boye Brogeland did open the West hand, and when East made a raise NS really had a problem. When Ulla-Britt Goldberg elected to sit the double, their spade game was lost and they had to be content with +100 . Erichsen thus got II more IMPs to lead by 9, all of a sudden.
The next board saw a game off four top losers being made at both tables. Then, both West overcalled wildly on a red twosuiter, one of them being caught but the other escaping with a plus score when his opponents drove to slam where making game was already quite difficult.
After the grand slam, Goldberg kept their opponents out of a cold vulnerable game at one table to recoup II IMPs but it was too late. The difference was 9 IMPs to Erichsen's favour at that stage, and the Appeals Committee had to decide what would happen next.
As we all know now, the 5,5 IMP decision made it a victory by $3,5 \mathrm{IMPs}, 99-95,5$ to Erichsen. Congratulations to the winners of the gold, and to the silver medallists as well.

## Championship Diary

Sabine Auken dropped by for a coffee and we commiserated with her over her team's exit from the Mixed Teams where her side lost by just I IMP. 'How's tricks?' we enquired.
'Didn't take enough.' She replied.
John Kranyak came by to report a fine defence by his partner - watch out for it in the Bulletin - and trying to recall the deal said it came late in the session, probably around Board 27. You guessed it; there were only 26 Boards in play.
Thomas Schønfeldt was another visitor, looking for the EBL Treasurer's office. Tacchi asked if he had tried the office with the sign EBL Treasurer. On hearing that Thomas hadn't been able to find it Tacchi enquired 'Are you a bridge player? And I use the word in its loosest possible sense.'
In the interests of getting as much bridge as possible into the space available we are considering various possibilities. One suggestion is to leave out the diagrams and asking you to refer to the hands records!

8th WORLD BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS


CHAMPIONSHIP PROGRAMME JUNE 2006

World Titles will be awarded for each Championship, including the IMP Pair

| Friday | 9 Par Contest - Opening Ceremony |
| :---: | :---: |
| Saturday | 10) Mixed Pairs-qualifying $1<2$ |
| Sunday | 11 Mixed Pairs - qualifying 3 \& 1 session final |
| Manday | 12 Mixed Pairs $-2 \& 83$ - w-ainn final Mixed Pairs Plate |
| Tuesday | 13 Rosemblum/McConnell |
| Weatnsitive | 14 Rosemblum/McCormell |
| Thursday | 15 Resemblum/MrConmell |
| Firiday | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16. Rosemblum (6i) /McConnell (32) } \\ & \text { Swiss Plate } \\ & \text { Scuior Ieams } \end{aligned}$ |
| Soturday | 17 Rosemblum (32) /McConnell (16) <br> Pairs Qualifying <br> Senior Teams |
| Sundiy | 18 Rosemblum (16) /McCormell (8) <br> Pairs Qualifying <br> Senior Tivams |
| Monday | 19 Rosemblum (8) /McConnell (4) Pairs Qualifying/Semi final Senior Teams |
| Tuesday | 20 Nosemblum (4)/McConnell (2) Parr.Scmi final /IMP Parss Senior Pairs |
| Wednesday | 21 Rosemblum Final <br> Pairs Semi final / IMP Pairs Senior Pairs |
| Thurscay | 22 Pairs Final /IMIP Pairs Senior Pairs |
| Friday | 23 Pairs Final/1MP Pairs |
| Saturday | 24 Pairs Final / IMP Pairs Closing Ceremony |

For the first time in JUNE and TRANSNATIONAI

## For Information and Registration

 World Bridge Federation José Damiani - President 40 Rue Francois 1er - 75008 Paris, France Tel. 0033.1.53230315-Fax 0033.1.40701451 E-mail: cfrancinecomm-unity.fr
## Playing Area

The championship will take place inside the 'Europa' Conference Centre, an area of 10,000 square meters situated in the modern complex 'Veronafiere', only 3 km away from the city centre. (www.veronafiere.it/) is well known all over the world for its magnificent Arena and, of course, for the everlasting love story of Romeo and Juliet. This delightfut dity offers many other attractions, and is visited by tourists from all over the world. Visiting Verona and, indeed, its province and the entire negion, means entering an arsa of beautiful landscapes with an unsurpassed artistic heritage while at the same time discovering vivid cultural and gastronomic traditions in a region known also for its excellent wines. This location is able to suit the needs of the most disceming travelles.


Verona is situated in a strategic position, from where other important Italian artistic towns are easy to reach:

Padova: Km. 84
Milan: Km .16
Bologna: Km. 142
Florence:Km. 320


How to reach Verona
By car AA motorway (Milan-Venice) exit 'Verona Sud' or A22 motorway (llempero-Modena) exat 'Verona Nond'

By train: The main railway station is 'Verona Porta Nuova', where the
 or Intercity (faster) trains from all main northem Italy stations almost
every hour (Far further infornation: Td +39892021 - wwwutnouthliait).
By air The airport 'Valerio Catultio' of Verona villafranca is situated 10 Imn from the city centre. There is a slutule-turs service from and to the
airport every 20 minn (for further informatiom: Jel +39.0458057911 .


AMT (the local public transportation company) and 'Verona Trade Fair' will provide shuttle-bus connections between Verona downtown, the hotels and the playing area.

## Hotel

1850 rooms in 52 different hotels are already available for all the participants of the World Bridge Championship in June 2006 . The offer is extremely flexible both in terms of hotel category and fare.

Everyone hosted in HPT associated hotels will movive a discount on the bridge entry fore

| ALL FARES ARE PER NIGHT PER ROOM, BREAKFAST AND TAXES INCLUDED |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | Junior Suite | Double | Double (Single use) | Single |
| Weltix |  | HSOE | अ60 ${ }^{\text {E }}$ |  |
| 5 Stars | $560 €$ | $300 €$ |  | $230 €$ |
| 4 Stars Sup. |  | 176E | 153 E | 140 E |
| 4 Stars |  | 160 ¢ | $145 €$ | $130 €$ |
| 3stars Sup |  | 150e | $170 ¢$ | T20e |
| 3 Stars |  | 140 € | $130 €$ | $110 €$ |
| 2 Stam |  | 93.6 | 85 E | 758 |

For further information and reservations: High Performance Travel HI'T (Felice Marabini) Tel: +390459693322 - Faxc +390459693321

## The Mixed Pairs Final, Session 2

by Jos Jacobs

Halfway through the Mixed Pairs Final, the Helness couple from Norway were leading the field by a small margin over Sylvie Willard and Hervé Mouïel from France and a relatively big margin over the rest of the field. So an eventual win by one of these two pairs was in the air and therefore the Bulletin team split up to watch at both their tables. The French did not have a particularly good start, but the Norwegians, after their first 10 boards, looked almost sure of achieving a remarkable double after their win in the Mixed teams the day before.
A fair share of luck and good play is all you need to win a pairs event. Below, I will present some of the boards played by the winners in the order they had to play them. This not only seems logical, but as we shall see there is also a very special reason for it.
Board 19, the third board played at the Helness table, was typical for their combination of luck and good bridge.

Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

|  | $\checkmark 73$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 842 |  |  |
|  | -K 104 |  |  |
|  | \% 1054 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ K 1052 | N |  | v J 6 |
| $\bigcirc 1097$ | W E |  | 8K63 |
| - J 532 |  |  | Q 876 |
| -1 2 | $S$ 2 |  | \&K 73 |
|  | $\vee \mathrm{A} Q 984$ |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AJ 5 |  |  |
|  | -9 |  |  |
|  | 4Q9 86 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jansma | Helness | Arnolds | Helness |
|  |  |  | IV |
| Pass | INT | 2 * | Pass |
| 3 . | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |



Carla Arnolds, The Netherlands

Their luck of course was that Jansma made a rather adventurous raise, and the good bridge was that Gunn Helness reopened with a double happily converted by Tor.
On a club lead to the ace and a heart return, down two was nearly inevitable when Arnolds put up the king to lose three quick heart tricks. Probably she had to, as the difference between -200 and -500 would have been marginal anyway. Needless to say, 500 was worth all the matchpoints.
In the next round, they inflicted another penalty upon their vulnerable opponents:

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
v 8762
$\vee$ K Q 87

- 1987
$\%$ A


Once again, Tor did not bother about a possible game or even slam (yes, it makes!) but went for the sure plus against his vulnerable opponents. He led the A and immediately shifted to a trump to ensure three undertricks and +800 for 47 m.p.
On the following board, we saw a remarkable effect of opening four-card majors:

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.
vJ42
8 Q 64

- 196
+9843

| $\checkmark 10985$ | N | $\checkmark$ K 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢K 75 |  | Q1098 |
| - A Q 103 | W E | -K754 |
| \& 76 | S | \& A K J 10 |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q 73 |  |
|  | QAJ3 2 |  |
|  | - 82 |  |
|  | 2Q 52 |  |


| West <br> Fantoni | North <br> Helness | East <br> Scalamogna | South <br> Helness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | 20 | $1 / 8$ |
|  |  |  |  |

It's as easy as this: if South opens le, as would happen at many tables, EW can never end in 2s. It may be true that East has a difficult decision about how to reopen, but South's systemic I $\vee$ made it almost impossible for her to find a double or a INT balancing bid though some desperados would find an INT call

This way, the Helness couple scored another 40 m.p.

Over now to a zero for the Helness couple, as plain a zero as I have ever seen and a fully unjustified one too:

| Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 875$ |  |
|  | QJ8643 |  |
|  | -K10 |  |
|  | \& Q 108 |  |
| $\checkmark$ AK 4 | N | $\checkmark 103$ |
| $\bigcirc$ AK 9 | W E | $\bigcirc 102$ |
| - Q 9643 |  | - A J 87 |
| - 5 | S | 2AK973 |
|  | - Q J 962 |  |
|  | QQ 75 |  |
|  | - 52 |  |
|  | 9642 |  |

This board was the 13th board played by the Helness couple in the afternoon session and look at what happened:

| West <br> Wladow | North <br> Helness | East <br> Nehmert | South <br> Helness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 1e | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | $4 \vee$ | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 6NT | Pass |
| 7NT | All Pass |  |  |

Though this bidding does not seem to make any sense at all when you see the cards, this is by no means true. Pony Nehmert was kind enough to explain to me what really had gone wrong. She and Dr.Wladow are playing Precision, so until 3 everything was according to system. The problem arose from the 4 bid: this was RKC for one of the bid suits, but Pony was unsure if it was the first or the second agreed suit. Her $4 \checkmark$ then showed 3 keycards for one of the minors as trumps. To end the auction she next decided to go all out to 6NT over the further inquiry (4NT), but Wladow was not content with that and raised to the grand.
Tor Helness led the $\vee 3$ and then the director was called. He removed the board from the table and summoned the players to play the next board first.

After the completion of board 4 the TD came back and next ordered the dummy, Nehmert, to come over and play the hand! What had happened? Wladow thought he would be dummy and had exchanged hands with Gunn Helness, his screenmate.
So it was now up to Nehmert to show her ability in finessing. She won the heart lead, played a diamond to the ten and jack, followed by the A felling the king. After the run of the diamonds and the $\vee A$ her next move was to run the When this held, an unlikely grand slam had come home for all the matchpoints (no doubt about that!).
It also turned the tide for the Helness couple. From that moment on, their luck seemed to have left them almost completely until near the end.
At their penultimate table, this was the second board:

Board 14．Dealer East．None Vul．

$$
\vee 9862
$$

$$
\text { 〇K } 7
$$

$$
\text { Q J } 108
$$

$$
\text { \& } 52
$$



| West <br> Golebiowski | North <br> Helness | East <br> Zalewska | South <br> Helness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | I |
| 18 | $1 \vee$ | $2 \downarrow$ | Dble |
| 38 | All Pass |  |  |

Finally，their luck had come back when their opponents voluntarily missed a game．The real reason to include this board in this re－ port，however，has to be found at another table：

| West <br> Versace | North <br> Berendregt | East <br> Cuzzi | South Chorus |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | 1 ＊ |
| 18 | 2 | $4 \bigcirc$ | 4『（？！） |

All Pass
As South told me：＂I went down five smiling all the way，and it was contagious too，as AI－ fredo eventually joined in the laughter．＂Any－ way， 38 m．p．for NS on the board，the last of the tournament at this table．
The Helness couple needed a reasonable final table，as it transpired，to win the event． They had a chance to do very well on the first board of the two：

Board I5．Dealer South．N／S Vul．

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \vee 1053 \\
& \vee K 10 \\
& * A Q J \\
& \& Q J 1092
\end{aligned}
$$

| $\checkmark$ AK 4 | N | －Q J 97 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ A 75 |  | ¢Q94 |
| －K62 | W E | －984 |
| ¢865 | S | \＆ A 74 |
|  | $\checkmark 862$ |  |
|  | 818632 |  |
|  | －10753 |  |
|  | \＆K |  |


| West <br> Svendsen | North <br> Helness | East <br> Thoresen | South <br> Helness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | Pass | IV | Pass <br> INT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

North leads the 2 Q and your 2 K wins． What next？Taking the bidding into account a diamond shift is far from obvious，but does a heart shift make sense？
If you play a diamond you get 37 m．p．for defeating INT．Returning a heart only scores 20 m．p．as it allows the contract to be made． At our table South played a heart and thus missed the chance to settle the issue with one board to play．However，he last board was no disaster for them either，so they had man－ aged to perform a very fine double indeed！ Congratulations again to them！

## 6 Redoubled Just Made By Two Pairs！ <br> by Ace Ventura

Perhaps the last board in the first session of the Mixed－Pairs Semifinal had the most excit－ ing distribution in the set of 26 boards．Hav－ ing the following interesting hand，what is your ideas when partner opens $I \vee$ ？

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \vee A K J 653 \\
& \text { QJ } 6542 \\
& 5 \\
& 10
\end{aligned}
$$

The scoreboard produced quite a lot of dif－ ferent scores．Let＇s see what happened at one table．

| Board 26．Dealer East．All Vul． |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ Q 97 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A |  |  |  |
| －AK 97 |  |  |  |
| \＆K 8642 |  |  |  |
| －AKJ653 | N |  | $v$－ |
| QJ6542 | W E |  | $\bigcirc$ K Q IO 987 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & \div 10 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | S |  | \＆AJ 973 |
|  | $\checkmark 10842$ |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 3$ |  |  |  |
| －Q J 10863 |  |  |  |
| Q 5 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| De Falco | Lambardi | Olivieri | von Arnim |
|  |  | 18 | Pass |
| 2NT | Dble | 3\％ | 4v |
| Pass | Pass | 5\％ | Pass |
| 58 | Dble | All Pass |  |

Italy＇s Dano de Falco started with 2NT game－forcing and Gabriella Olivieri＇s 3e showed a minimum hand with any shortness． De Falco looked a bit surprised when the tray came with Daniela von Arnim＇s bid： $4 \vee$ ．If West draw trumps against $4 v$ it＇s likely to see the contract go down six！
An old－fashioned penalty double by de Falco would probably have done the job since it＇s unlikely that South moves to $5 \diamond$ ．In this modern world of crazy conventions de Falco had to pass，since a double would strongly have suggested a continuation of the auction． Pass was the best bid de Falco could produce but Olivieri did not－this time－have the hand to double and bid 5\％．De Falco shook his head and corrected to $5 \vee$ ．Lambardi thought East／West were on thin ice and doubled．
Von Arnim led a spade and now the ace of trumps was the only trick that was left for the defence． $5 \checkmark$ doubled with one overtrick was worth $77 \%$ for East／West．North／South must have felt quite satisfied to receive $23 \%$ ．
At another table West had higher views：

| West | North | East <br> 18 | South <br> Pass |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2NT | pass | 30 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| Pass（！） | Dble | All Pass |  |

Well，some sunny day East might have the necessary cards，but this was not the day． West asked for aces but then was in deep trouble when two aces were missing．He took a chance to find a spade－fit and passed $5 \vee$ ．When North doubled West could recon－ sider．He knew that only a poor defence

would save him in $6 『$ so he instead hoped that North／South had misjudged the situa－ tion．They had not．When the smoke had cleared declarer was down for；North／South + IIO0．Do I need to tell the score was I00\％ （by a wide margin）．．．
The Dutch pair Jet Pasman／Christoffer Niemeijer and the British pair Nevena Se－ nior／Geoffrey Wolfarth both made $6 \checkmark$ redou－ bled on spade leads．What a disappointment， to make a redoubled contract and not be the only one．

## University Cup Rotterdam 2005

From 24th till 29th of August 2005， the University Cup in Rotterdam，Eu－ ropean Capital of Sports．The universi－ ty cup is a competition between Euro－ pean universities：any country may enter a illimited number of university teams．
Countries can register directly to Harry van de Peppel．There is no need to register via the National University Sport Federation．

We have so far several official entries and about 20 teams are yet an－ nounced．But several countries are still missing，and it is still possible to enter！！！
The winners of this Champiomships will be able to play a tournament with Zia Mahmood and the first lady with Sabine Auken．So there is no reason anymore not to be in Rotterdam！
All latest information about this event is available at www．unibridge．org！

See you in Rotterdam！

## MIXED PAIRS FINAL PART II <br> David Stern (australia)

Out of adversity often come opportunities. So it was with Menton, where my well-publicised objections to the poor conditions brought me into contact with Gianarrigo Rona - someone who I now appreciate is a hard working bridge administrator very much dedicated to the advancement of the game.
Following my articles in which I heavily criticised the organisers regarding Menton, Gianarrigo invited me to attend Tenerife to experience what he assured me would be an exciting tournament which would correct all of the shortcomings of Menton and deliver a world class event.
Most importantly he assured me that the venue would be air-conditioned!!
Well Tenerife has indeed delivered - it is one of the most alluring resorts I have been to and the hotel and playing rooms are befitting of a European Championship. My congratulations to the EBL for performing a radical turnaround.
And so to the bridge. When I learnt bridge ahem years ago it was drummed into us not to pre-empt with a side four card major. Modern bidding however dictates that anything goes. Board 25 from the final:


This must have felt like a possible loss to N/S but...


Bengt Erik Efraimsson, Sweden

| West <br> Helness | North <br> Efraimsson | East <br> Helness | South <br> Svedlund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| Pass |  |  |  |
| + 4 IMPS Ok back to modern bidding for me. |  |  |  |
| Board 30. Dealer East. None Vul. |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 952$ |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ 5 |  |  |  |
| -AJ 765 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A Q J 10 | N |  | 864 |
| ¢Q 873 |  |  | 64 |
|  | W E |  | Q 1094 |
| AK IO 5 | 2 S |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 73$ |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 102$ |  |  |
|  | -832 |  |  |
|  | \& Q 9876 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Goldberg | E Erichsen | Goldberg | H Erichsen |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 1\% | Pass | $1 \vee$ | Pass |
| 4* | Pass | 4v | All Pass |

South lead a club, which proved to be fatal. Perhaps with the knowledge that West was short in diamonds and therefore by inference long in the black suits South should have considered a trump lead which would prove fatal for declarer given the lack of high card tricks. At the other table:

| West <br> Helness | North <br> Efraimsson | East <br> Helness | South <br> Svedlund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| I2 | I | Pass | Pass |
| Double | All Pass |  |  |

I don't think anyone would crime a 1 overcall in the modern game but there is a theory that a $I$ overcall should be strongly lead suggesting - is A-J-7-6-5 really a suit in which one should suggest a lead? I leave it to you to decide. It proved very successful here with the contract going one down for - 100 and 8 IMPS to the Swedes.
I spoke to the organisers about the level of entries, which are a little less than anticipated and they felt that the non-mainland location may have had an impact. All I can say is that those who did not make the extra effort to come to Tenerife have missed a great tournament at a great location.
Tonye Brogeland found an excellent bid on the following hand:

| Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - A 8752 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 1085$ |  |  |
| - 4 |  |  |
| * A 52 |  |  |
| $\checkmark 106$ | N | -KJ4 |
| $\bigcirc 73$ | W E | $\checkmark$ AKQ 642 |
| -109532 |  | - AK |
| 2K Q 108 | S | 973 |
| $\checkmark$ Q 93 |  |  |
| QJ 9 |  |  |
| - Q J 876 |  |  |
| 2964 |  |  |


| West <br> B Brogeland | North | Eastdberg | T Brogeland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | South |
| :---: |
| Goldberg |

Knowing that the minors were probably well stopped and even with the lead coming through the high spades Tonye assessed NT as being a better contract that hearts and was rewarded when Boye made 10 tricks.

| West <br> Efraimsson | North <br> THelness | East <br> Svedlund | South <br> G Helness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | IV | Double | $2 \downarrow$ |
| 30 | Pass | $3 \vee$ | All Pass |

East presumably showed a strong single suited hand by doubling then bidding her suit. However West had no way of realising how strong and decided to pass allowing Erichsen to pick up 10 IMPS.
The hand that saw Erichsen win the event came with three boards to go:

Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Efraimsson | THelness | Svedlund | G Helness |
| $4 *$ | Double | Pass | All Pass |

Result -500

## Closed Room

| West <br> B Brogeland | North | East <br> Goldberg | South <br> Brogeland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Poldberg | $1 母$ |
| 4 | Double | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | $6 \vee$ | All Pass |  |

## Result - 100

Clearly defending 4* is a winning action yielding 500 , which is adequate compensation for any game that may make but not if slam is possible. On this hand North's aggressive action proved his undoing. Even with and spades breaking there is a strong likliehood that the heart finesse will fail giving the defence two sure tricks.
(The merits of $4 \diamond$ are unclear to me - and with best defence - a black suit lead instead of a trump - it can cost IIOO. Editor)

Congratulations to the Norwegian, Espen and Helen Erichsen, Boye and Tornye Brogeland and Tor and Gun Hellness on winning a very hard fought final.

