



3rd World University Bridge Championship

Bulletin No.6

October 26, 2006

Tianjin

P.R.China

Organizing Committee of 3rd WUBC

Letter to Welcome Mr. Damiani



When the 3rd World University Bridge Championship enters into pivotal stage, one of our familiar and amiable friends, Mr. Jose Damiani, venerable President of WBF, comes to enjoy the championship with us. Led by Mr. Damiani, the WBF zealously concerns and supports the development of University Bridge Project all the time. They not only pay attention to the continued development of bridge project, but acknowledge the further meaning this mental sport gives to human education and intellectual quality. At the same time, Mr. Damiani is concerned about the youth, attaching importance to communication and friendship brought by bridge.

In this sense, I extend warm welcome and heartfelt gratitude to WBF and Mr. Damiani on behalf of committee of the 3rd WUBC, as well as concerned officials, coaches and athletes! I wish more chances appear to make WUF and WBF work together to popularize and improve the project of University Bridge in the world.

Waltz on the forth day

Following the tangle time on the third day, elegant waltz came to performance. Every team played their best standards, which can be compared with the Bermuda Bowl, the World Cup of Bridge. You could sense not only the severe competition, but also graceful behave. Every match today was dialogues between strong teams. Although suffering two big defeats, China A still on the top, with 19.61VPs averagely. In the afternoon, the

team won Sweden, consolidating its 1st position. Poland B has jumped to 2nd position from yesterday's 3rd position, with 18.83VPs averagely. Following are USA and Sweden. Because of its lost in this afternoon's critical round, Sweden fell into 4th position with 18.35VPs averagely. There will be 3 rounds tomorrow, and we hope wonderful performances would be put on.

Ranking after Round 24

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Team</u>	<u>T. VP</u>	<u>Ave.</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Team</u>	<u>T. VP</u>	<u>Ave.</u>
1	China A	469	19.61	14	France A	361	14.91
2	Poland B	451	18.83	16	France B	358	14.78
3	USA	444	18.57	17	China B	351	14.48
4	Sweden	440	18.35	18	Belgium A	350	14.43
5	Norway	423	17.61	19	Serbia	332	13.65
6	Italy	414	17.25	20	Chinese Taipei B	331	13.61
7	Netherlands	413	17.17	21	Japan	321	13.17
8	Poland A	410	17.04	22	Turkey	313	13.04
9	Hong Kong	391	16.22	23	Indonesia	313	12.83
10	Denmark	388	16.09	24	Chinese Taipei A	298	12.17
11	Canada	372	15.39	25	Thailand	250	10.09
12	Czech Republic	370	15.30	26	Belgium B	216	9.00
13	Germany	365	15.09	27	Botswana	184	7.22
14	Great Britain	361	14.91				

Today's Vu-Graph Matches

Rd.	Time	Vu-Graph Table 1 (VG1) (Open Room ONLY)	Vu-Graph Table 2 (VG2) (Open Room ONLY)
25	09:30-10:35	Sweden vs. France A	Poland A vs. Germany
26	10:55-12:00	China A vs. Germany	Poland B vs. Denmark
27	12:20-13:25	Sweden vs. Italy	USA vs. Poland B

Match of the day: Norway vs USA

On day 4, the day before the last day of the tournament, many strong teams are playing each other. It was not easy to pick up a match to analyze, as all the teams showed us junior bridge can also be very tough. At a certain time, I thought I was live broadcasting a match of the Bermuda Bowl, and was sure that the quality of those boards were better than half of the field in the Bermuda Bowl. I think in the future, there will be more and more good players joining this event. At the end, we decided to choose the match Norway-USA. Both teams played extremely well, especially the Americans. Although their opponents didn't make many mistakes, they were even faultless. Let's have a look at some of the hands:

On hand one, the American EW in the open room managed to beat an overbid 2NT, but their teammates in the open room made 3NT for a 10 imps gain! Then, after 2 pushes and one extra down trick to the American side, came this hand:

Board 5	♠ KJT96	
NS / N	♥ K8765	
	♦ AJ8	
	♣ -----	
♠ 32	N	♠ AQ875
♥ J	E	♥ 43
♦ Q7432	W	♦ K65
♣ 97542	S	♣ AJ6
	♠ 4	
	♥ AQT92	
	♦ T9	
	♣ KQT83	

N	E	S	W
Lindqvist	Wooldridge	Lunna	Barth
1♠	P	2♥	P
2♠	P	3♣	P
3♥	P	4♥	P
4NT	P	5♦	P
6♥	X	All pass.	



Wooldridge, USA

After the biddings shown above, the American E, Wooldridge, thought he had heard enough and could not resist to giving a double on the final contract. He should be right on most occasions, as not only did he have the first suit of dummy well controlled, but he had an extra A. Only after he saw the dummy, he knew how wrong he was: the one who asked for key cards had a void! That was rather unfortunate for him; we can see a ♦ lead would beat the contract. However, partner led a ♠ in respect to his “lead directing” X. After he won the ♠Q, he tried a

small one back, but the Norwegian declarer discarded his losing \diamond anyway. It looked like the end of the defense, however, the declarer managed to mess up the play. Actually, he had several ways home: ruffing down the \clubsuit A 3rd or cross-ruffing the rest after cashing one round of trumps. But, his started cross-ruffing without cashing one round trump. At certain stage, he was in danger of a possible trump promotion and he duly managed to lose a trick to the bare J of trumps! Down one and 17 imps out of nowhere for the USA team.

Board 6. \spadesuit QJ9654
EW / E \heartsuit KT5
 \diamond -----
 \clubsuit JT43

\spadesuit K32	N	\spadesuit A
\heartsuit AJ82	E W	\heartsuit Q7643
\diamond KQ76	S	\diamond A82
\clubsuit K7		\clubsuit AQ96

\spadesuit T87
 \heartsuit 9
 \diamond JT9543
 \clubsuit 852

N	E	S	W
Lindqvist	Wooldridge	Lunna	Barth
	1 \heartsuit	P	2NT
3 \spadesuit	3NT*	P	4 \clubsuit
P	4 \diamond	P	4 \heartsuit
P	4 \spadesuit	P	4NT
P	5 \diamond	P	6 \heartsuit

All pass.

I can understand that the junior players will never give opponents a free run whenever they have a chance. However, aggressiveness can backfire from time to time. This was one of the occasions. N decided to enter their

game going auction with 3 \spadesuit . Now the 3NT bid from Wooldridge was meant as “serious 3NT”, but it was un-discussed in their partnership. In fact, many experts treat this bid in this situation as either serious 3NT or a cue-bid (of \spadesuit) showing method. I can hardly say which way is better, however, you have to just discuss with your partner and decide on one of them. Anyway, they reached this 6 \heartsuit which can be beaten on a “normal” \diamond J lead. No! The poor S decided to respect his partners overcall and led \spadesuit 7. That was that, declarer soon claimed 12 tricks and 1430 in their column. In the closed room, the American N was more aggressive. Without knowing his \heartsuit K was in the right position, he still Xed the final contract in attempt to a \diamond lead- that is the so called the Lightner X. The good news was that his partner got the message; the bad news was that so did the opponents! They quickly ran to 6NT which was lay- down on any lead. There was even worse news: his partner had a natural \diamond lead! Anyway, the board was a push and we moved on to the next with the feeling that one might have missed something on this board.....

The next two boards were two cold games and the Americans won 26 imps on these 8 boards while they conceded only 1 imp to their opponents. Or it was 23:7 VPs for the USA. I was quite impressed by their standard of play and am seriously considering these guys as some tough opponents in the future.

Round up of the day

I was not worried about choosing some time technical hands for the day. As I mentioned earlier, there were a lot of hands that were played high quality of skill. However, I do not have time to go through all of them. The following 4 hands could be more interesting, and in some ways, more educational.

In round of 21, we saw two European teams facing each other in the viewgraph. My international experience tells me that the European teams are always tough to play against. After watching some of our juniors on play, I realized that the European juniors are not easier!

Board 3		♠ 932			
EW / S		♥ AKJ8654			
		♦ 4			
		♣ 75			
♠ AQT74	N	♠ KJ85			
♥ 9	E W	♥ T732			
♦ AJ2	S	♦ K8			
♣ KT42		♣ J83			
		♠ 6			
		♥ Q			
		♦ QT97653			
		♣ AQ96			

N	E	S	W
Cullin	Michielsen	Johansson	Wortel
		P	1♠
1NT!	2♠	3NT	P
4♥	All pass.		

The Swedish N, Cullin, made a rather imaginative 1NT overcall on W's 1♠ opening. That worked out like a dream. The Dutch W decided to trust him and only give a simple raise of 2♠. S, on the other hand, had no reason to realize the joke and made a normal raise to 3NT. N couldn't let this

happen and retreated to 4♥. When this was passed out un-doubled, the Swedish was going to win 11 imps on the board anyway. With the ♣Q onside, 4♠ by EW can make an overtrick and 4♥ should go down two. E led her 3rd best ♠8 and to the A and W found the correct trump switch. It seemed that nothing would go wrong as declarer had 5 inescapable 5 losers. N tried a small ♦ from dummy, trying to get back to his hand. W rose in with the A and....without much thought, tried to give her partner a ♦ ruff! The ruff fell in, declarer ruffing this, setting up the ♦ suit. Declarer could draw trumps, enter dummy with ♣A to cash all the♦ for +1! Rather fortunate for the Dutch, in the closed room they also had a disaster. The boys tried to double the opponents in 4♠ and that made no less than one overtrick! They both thought they won 8 or 14 imps on the board. But when this meets together, it was only 16 imps instead of the expected 22! Still it was a big board for the Swedish team.



Johansson, Sweden

However, the Dutch immediately struck back:

Board 5 ♠ KJT82
 NS / N ♥ 5
 ♦ 975
 ♣ KJ63

♠ AQ3	N	♠ 4
♥ AJT98	E	W
♦ Q6	S	♥ 732
♣ A92		♦ AT83

♣ QT754

♠ 9765
 ♥ KQ64
 ♦ KJ42
 ♣ 8

N	E	S	W
Cullin	Michielsen	Johansson	Wortel
P	P	P	1♥
1♠	2♥	2♠	4♥

All pass.

N led a rather unfortunate ♠J and went around to the Q. the young and pretty Dutch girl, Wortel, ruffed a ♠ in dummy. After a small ♥ to the 8 held, she cashed ♠A, which did not seem right to me. We were all predicting a possible down one in the viewgraph room, but she soon proved us wrong! She played a small ♣ from hand and we found out this was the winning play! The defenders had no answer to this. N had to win his K, ducking was useless to him. Now he had two ways of conceding the contract. If he gives partner a ♣ ruff, the losing ♦ would be discarded on the 4th ♣ of dummy, and if he plays a ♦ to set up their ♦ trick, the ♣ ruff was gone. In any case, she had her contract for 420. the Swedish W in the closed went down 2 and that was 11 back to the Netherlands. The match ended up a 6 imps loss for the Dutch and 13:17 in VPs. However, they had a reason to be realized since they were heading a big defeat after the first half and did get some thing back at the end.

The last match of the day we saw the battle between the 1st and 2nd placed teams, China A and Sweden playing each other. At the time, China A had just suffered a big defeat against the Belgiums and Sweden, USA all had just won their matches heavily to close the gap to 13 and 15 VPs. The match attracted most of the attention.

Board 1 ♠ A75
 None / N ♥ T932
 ♦ AQ932
 ♣ 2

♠ 9	N	♠ KQ63
♥ QJ87	E	W
♦ KT4	S	♥ AK4
♣ QJ986		♦ 875

♣ KT5

♠ JT842
 ♥ 65
 ♦ J6
 ♣ A743

N	E	S	W
Jin	Cullin	Liu	Johansson
P	1NT	P	2♣
P	2♠	P	2NT
P	3NT	All pass.	

After having opened a 15-17 NT and an invitational auction, the Swedish E decided that his 15 count looked like a “maximum” 15 and accepted the invite. It was all up to the Chinese girls to beat it. The Chinese S led ♠J, I don’t know if it was coded or not. But it seemed to me that N read the position well. If it was coded, it was much simpler. She realized that she needed S to have an entry in ♣ and 2 small ♦ to beat this. After some thought, she switched to a small ♦ to the J and the contract had to go two down. However, the Chinese boys sold out to 3♠ in the closed and allowed it to make. So her brilliant defense had cost her side 1 imp!

Board 2 ♠ K9854
 NS / E ♥ J4
 ♦ AJ2
 ♣ QJ4

♠ A63	N E W S	♠ J72
♥ A95		♥ QT832
♦ Q43		♦ 97
♣ 9532		♣ K87

♠ QT
 ♥ K76
 ♦ KT865
 ♣ AT6

N	E	S	W
Jin	Cullin	Liu	Johansson
	P	1♦	P
1♠	P	1NT	P
2♣	P	2♦	P
2♠	P	3NT	All pass.

On board two, the Chinese girls bid a sharp Vul. 3NT. It looked that, on ♥ lead, she needed to find ♦ Q to land her contract. Would she find it? No, she didn't need it at all! The W led a small ♦! Liu soon had 9 tricks. At the end, in a desperate situation, W tried to play ♥A and ♥9, but not only that set up ♥K for the declarer but also isolated the ♥ menace. Liu squeezed E for 11 tricks and a marvelous 660! The Swedish NS were only in 2♠, making 10 tricks and first big swing went to china. Before the end of the match, the Chinese boys in the closed also stole an impossible 3NT with 5 top losers for NS. However, they failed to cash them and it was another impossible 630. The open room EW stopped in 2♥ peacefully, made plus one for 10imps loss. With these two big boards, China A won 23:7 VPs, going away in a very comfortable position for the title.

University Bridge Community: "I need your help"

Dear friends, I hope you are all enjoying your championship! I'm sure you will never forget this experience and that makes me happy!

This championship is the result of a lot of years building up to make bridge more popular at universities. We started small several years ago, and we want to become more and more important within the bridge and the university environment.

That's why, to further develop bridge at universities in the future, I need your help!

Indeed, we need to create bridge clubs at the universities all over the World! You can hereby count on any support from the WBF and FISU to help you realise.

To do so, we create the University Bridge Community, and a lot of people joined yet this environment. The aim is to work together to develop bridge at universities and to create new university bridgeclubs.

I'm happy to announce that the following team of students (or former students) will start to make clubs at the universities in their country:

- France: Yannick;
- Serbia: Nicolas
- Belgium: Nina
- The Netherlands: Bob;
- Norway: Ivar
- Italy: Adrea (not at this Championships)
- Czech Rep.: Milan
- Poland: Bobo
- Germany: Felix

I will propose these students to their federation, and of course FISU and WBL are willing to support them as much as they can.

Do you want to join us? Please inform me, we make our future together!

Thank you in advance for your help!

Geert Magerman
Chairman TC FISU

Quiz of the tournament

Kess Tammens (NED)

What can you do when a tournament gets in the decisive stages and your team is out of contention? Of course we all enjoy our stay in Tianjin. Interesting worthwhile experiences and a lot of new. Friends. Frontiers in a for the most of us unknown country were opened. Bridge is our game and passion, not only a pastime but a competitive (top)sport and our main goal of our visit was to perform well in the University World Championship, winning the title or gaining a medal. The Dutch team, practically eliminated for a place in the top-three had only the game to play for in the fourth day of this tournament. They will have to await a future event to get a new chance for glory. So the eye was on developing more and better skills in this difficult sport of the mind.

Listening to the arguments of the juniors and discussing certain actions can help everyone to a better understanding of the bidding.

So a small quiz about fourth day boards.

1: First in hand. None vulnerable

Do you open ♠ KJ965 ♥ AQ62 ♦ 2 ♣ 876?

And if you do : 1♠ or some form of weak with both majors?

2: Suppose you open 1♠ on the first question; the bidding develops quickly.

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
	1 ♠	2 ♦	4♦(splinter)

5 ♦ ??

What do you do after 5♦?

3:WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
		pass	pass

2 ♣	pass	2 ♦	pass
-----	------	-----	------

2 NT	pass	??	
------	------	----	--

East-west are green, north-south are red. Partner shows 22-23 with a balanced hand: what is your reaction with ♠ J54 ♦ 8752 ♦ J108 ♣ J108?

4:WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
		pass	pass

2 ♣	pass	2 ♦	pass
-----	------	-----	------

2 NT	pass	3 ♣	pass
------	------	-----	------

3 ♦	pass	??	
-----	------	----	--

You decided to go to game with the three Jacks and launch Puppet Stayman to find a possible 5-4 fit in ♥ or 5-3 fit in ♠. 3♦ by west shows one or two fourcards in the majors. Which game you bid?

5: You pick up first in hand, green versus red, ♠ 6 ♥ Q ♦ Q1097653 ♦ AQ96.

What is your opening bid: 1♦, 2♦ (if weak) 3♦, 4♦ or pass?

6:WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
			pass

1 ♠	1 NT	2 ♠	3 NT
-----	------	-----	------

Pass	4 ♥	??	
------	-----	----	--

Dou you agree with 2♠ or do you have something else in mind. What is your bid after this awkward sequence?

7:WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
			1 ♥

pass	1 ♠	2 ♣	dbl(3-♠)
------	-----	-----	----------

3 ♣	3 NT	pass	??
-----	------	------	----

All vulnerable: do you pass 3NT or do you have any bid in mind with

♠ J64 ♥ KQ10987 ♦ AQ72 ♣ -?

8: Two constructive problems:

Usually bridge is a competitive game. Weak openings and/or preemptive interventions cause a lot of noise and create many decisions. Sometimes you get a free run and you can profit from goos systematic agreements.

a)

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
			pass
1NT	pass	??	

Do you have a system for bidding after 1NT-opening with strong two-suited hands like: ♠ AJ852 ♥ 7 ♦ 2 ♣ KQJ962.

Do you have any tools in this situation?

b)

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
	1 ♠	pass	2 ♥
pass	4 ♥	pass	??

Does 4♥ show a weak hand with at least 5♠+4♥ and some distributional values. Does south (♠ 4 ♥ AQ1092 ♦ 10 9 ♣ KQ1083) has enough to continue and if so with which bid?
ANSWERS ON TODAY'S BIDDING QUIZ(of course you may have a different opinion)

9:

WEST	NORTH	EAST	SOUTH
	Pass	1 ♣	1 ♥
3 ♣	pass	pass	??

Would you have overcalled 1♥ or do you double for take out after 1?

With nobody vulnerable: do you consider action against 3♣ which is explained as invitational?

South: ♠ AK8 ♥ K10972 ♦ K 1073 ♣ K

Board 1
none

♠ KJ985
♥ AQ62
♦ 2
♣ 876

♠32
♥9
♦Q109764
♣J1042



♠ 107
♥ K843
♦ AKJ85
♣ Q5

♠ AQ84
♥ J1075
♦ 3
♣ AK94

1: Not the values for a opening of 1♠. Too strong for a weak two-suited opening bid. Probably an initial pass is a good move to inhibit north-south from getting too high.

2: After you have opened 1♠ and partner has shown a GF hand with singleton ♦ you better hurry to double 5♦ so partner will not feel the urge to bid 5♠.The duplication in diamonds and the lack of honors in the north hand oblige you to double.

East
north-south

♠ KQ832
♥ A 6 4 3
♦ 7 6 4
♣ Q

♠ A 7 6
♥ K Q J 9
♦ A K Q
♣ K 9 2



♠ J 5 4
♥ 8 7 5 2
♦ J 10 8
♣ J 10 8

♠ 10 9
♥ 10
♦ 9 5 3 2
♣ A76543

3: three points opposite 22-23, together enough power for game. There however some buts. In the first place the jacks in east may not work(for instance opposite AKQ, not uncommon in such powerhouse hands. The second weak point of the east hand is the total lack of entries. The third argument you

may think of is that partner with a 23 count and a good fivecard suit often elects to open a 24-25 range NT. And after all you are not vulnerable and to score now and then +150 instead of +400 is not too harmful. With all this in mind the writer of this quiz would have passed 2NT.

4: If you decided to go on you find out that there is no 5card ♥ or ♠ in the west hand. What do you bid: 3♠ to show your fourcard hearts or 3NT with the terrible 4-3-3-3. The choice clearly is in favour of 3NT. The J108 in ♣ and ♦ are very useful as second stopper if west has A small doubleton in that suit. And nine tricks in NT must be easier than ten in hearts.

West		♠ KQ832			
none		♥ A 6 4 3			
		♦ 7 6 4			
		♣ Q			
♠ A 7 6			N		♠ J 5 4
♥ K Q J 9			W	E	♥ 8 7 5 2
♦ A K Q			S		♦ J 10 8
♣ K 9 2					♣ J 10 8
		♠ 10 9			
		♥ 10			
		♦ 9 5 3 2			
		♣ A76543			

Some reflections about the play:

In 3NT are after ♠K lead two tricks in spades, three in hearts and three in diamonds. The ninth trick depends on the winning decision in clubs after declarer gets to dummy with ♠J. A lucky ♣K wins the jackpot. I wonder if any of the students succeeded in bidding and making 3NT. Certainly a nominee for best played hand of the championship.

In 4♥ north leads ♣Q to the ace and gets a ruff. Now he does well to play ♠K to develop the setting trick, just in case west is 2♠-4♥-5♦-2♣

South		♠ 9 3 2			
east-west		♥ AKJ8654			
		♦ 4			
		♣ 7 5			
♠ AQ1074			N		♠ KJ85
♥ 9			W	E	♥ 1073 2
♦ A J 2			S		♦ K 8
♣ K 10 4 2					♣ J 8 3
		♠ 6			
		♥ Q			
		♦ Q1097653			
		♣ AQ96			

5: Not by far a 1♦ opening; with this vulnerability a preemptive action is recommended. After 3♦ west will probably overcall and east-west will reach 4♠. But a courageous 4♦ will likely be the beginning and end of the bidding.

6: The 2♠-bid is too little. 3♠ or an invitational 2NT would describe the hand better. After the unexpected 4♥ east may consider to double 4♥. But if this will induce a 4♠-bid by west in uncertain.

South		♠ A1052			
all		♥ A 2			
		♦ K 9 4			
		♣ Q 8 6 3			
♠ K Q 9 8			N		♠ 7 3
♥ 5			W	E	♥ J 6 4 3
♦ J 10 8 3			S		♦ 6 5
♣ 9 7 5 4					♣ AKJ102
		♠ J 6 4			
		♥ KQ10987			
		♦ AQ72			
		♣ --			

7: If you trust partner and pass 3NT north will have to finesse in hearts to make nine tricks. But a ♥-contract is much better. It could even be slam! So 4♥ or 4♣ to point out a void are recommended actions.

8a)

South	♠ 10 4 3		
east-west	♥ KQ1054		
	♦ K 8		
	♣ A 10 4		
♠ K Q 6	N	♠ AJ852	
♥ A 8 6 3	W	♥ 7	
♦ A Q J	E	♦ 2	
♣ 8 7 5	S	♣ KQJ962	
	♠ 9 7		
	♥ J 9 2		
	♦ 10 9 7 6 5 4 3		
	♣ 3		

A suggestion

WEST	EAST
1 NT	2♠*
3♣	3♠*
3 NT	4♦*
4♥*	4 NT
5♥	6♣*

2♠ = transfer to clubs

3♠ = 4+♠ in slam interested; with 6-5 and not slam interested transfer first to ♠

4♦ = cuebid guarantees 6♣+5♠-1-1,

4♥ shows 6-5-0-2 or 2-0;

with 6♣+4♠ bid 4♣

4♥ = cuebid

6♣ = west can correct to ♠ with two small ♣

North	♠ KJ1096		
north-south	♥ K8765		
h	♦ A J 8		
	♣ --		
♠ 3 2	N	♠ AQ875	
♥ J	W	♥ 4 3	
♦ Q7432	E	♦ K 6 5	
♣ 97542	S	♣ A J 8	
	♠ 4		
	♥ AQ1083		
	♦ 10 9		
	♣ KQ1083		

8b) North has to have almost a perfect hand for 6♥. ♠A, ♥K-fifth or ♥KQxx, diamond enough aces. I don't think north's 4♥ can contain all those features.

In the vugraph match south reached 6♥ which was doubled by east. Maybe not the best move because a minor suit lead would please east as well as the spade he asked for: ♠3, ♠J, ♠Q and ♠4. East returned a small spade so south could get rid of his diamond. Declarer now played ♦A and ruffed a diamond. Small club ruffed and en diamond ruff to get back to south. A second small club ruffed in dummy followed by ♠K. East ducked and south was at the crossroads. The commentators thought he could no longer make his contract which was besides the truth. In fact simple: south ruffs with ♥A, ruffs ♣10 small in dummy and sees ♣A come down. ♥K and ♥A to draw the trumps and ♣K and ♣Q as tricks eleven and twelve.

9:

North	♠ 9 7 6 2		
none	♥ J 3		
	♦ Q 9 8 5 2		
	♣ 5 4		
♠ Q 4 3	N	♠ J 10 5	
♥ Q 5	W	♥ A 8 6 4	
♦ A 6 4	E	♦ J	
♣ Q9632	S	♣ AJ1087	
	♠ A K 8		
	♥ K10972		
	♦ K 10 7 3		
	♣ K		

Teammates usually consist of matches of 16 or more boards. In the format of this championship the big number of participants plus the fact that all the teams would meet another was the cause that a match only was about eight boards. This had the effect that a small difference of 6 imps already was a 17-13 victory. It payed to be very aggressive, also on partscores. It was clear that east-west had between them 23 or more points. Any action by south is not without danger. If you pass 3♣ east-west score 110. If you double north bids 3♦ and it becomes 110 for yourself. Were you courageous or a little coward?



BRIDGE 2008

Lodz Poland
4th World University
Championship



On behalf of the Organizing Committee of the 4th World University Bridge Championship, I am honored to send our sincere congratulations to the organizing committee of Tianjin Championship.

Thank you for everything, you did an excellent job! We are taking over the FISU flag, and know we will have to work hard to meet the high standards you have set.

We are pleased to invite all sports enthusiasts to the 4th World University Bridge Championship which will take place in Lodz, Poland, in September 2008. Because of the event's excellent atmosphere, we expect it to provide unforgettable experience for both competitors and spectators. We wish all the competitors of this year's Championship good luck and we hope to see you in our city in two years time.

Meet your friends at the 'University Bridge Room'!!!

At this Championships, during the accreditation, you all registered on Bridgebase Online.

Indeed, we want it to make possible for you to meet your friends of this Championships after the tournament and play bridge together at a special public internet club reserved for you!!

To be able to recognize easily how many students that are on-line, it is recommended and please use your 'uni_name' account, so you will make it very easy for your friends to find you!

We will start to play at fixed hours, every Wednesday 20.00h (Paris time) and every Sunday at 15.00h (Paris time).

I'm happy to announce that some top players have joined the club yet, as for example the World

Champion of Verona Jack Zhao. I'm sure I will be able to convince Zia Mamhood and other stars to play with you in the university club.

After the start, we will although try to organize special tournaments. What do you think about the 'Beat Jack Zhao' tournament, or the 'Beat Zia Mamhood' tournament? Please inform me about all your suggestions!!

You will find all information and these tournaments on the university bridge platform: www.unibridge.org.

You find the list of all usernames of this Championships on last two pages.

Geert Magerman
Chairman Technical Committee Bridge FISU

		T. VP	Ave.	Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	28	bye	Pen.	
1	GER	365	15.09	13		25	16	5	7	25	14	25	13	8	22	7	21	25	3	7	11	17	15		8		11		25	14	23	18		
2	BEL A	350	14.43	18	4		16	4	17	25	5	8	14	16	25	16	5	15	23	22	14	1		12		25		11	19	12	23	18		
3	JPN	321	13.17	21	14	14		11	20	14	9	5	9	16	16	14	12	16	0	16	14		4		8		14	2	25	25	25	18		
4	SWE	440	18.35	4	25	25	19		25	25	15	17	17	22	16	24	20	17	7	16		17		14		16	18	9	25	17	16	18		
5	TPE A	298	12.17	24	23	13	10	4		25	2	11	5	17	20	8	18	12	2		11		10		9	18	20	7	17	3	15	18		
6	BOT	184	7.22	27	0	1	16	5	5		9	14	0	14	20	7	1	7		7		3		0	8	9	6	0	18	8	8	18		
7	POL B	451	18.83	2	16	25	21	15	25	21		15	9	16	25	25	16		22		23		12	6	17	24	20	14	23	18	25	18		
8	GBR	361	14.91	14	5	22	25	13	19	16	15		3	7	13	14		17		20		9	19	20	11	11	14	13	16	21	20	18		
9	NED	413	17.17	7	17	16	21	13	25	25	21	25		21	25		15		9		19	18	8	20	18	19	12	10	17	14	7	18		
10	FRA B	358	14.78	16	22	14	14	8	13	16	14	23	9			17		19		16	10	13	9	5	11	19	25	20	25	5	13	18		
11	THA	250	10.09	25	8	5	14	14	10	10	0	17	0				6		14	9	16	7	12	15	4	8	8	7	22	11	15	18		
12	CHN B	351	14.48	17	23	14	16	6	22	23	2	16		13				18	11	17	8	10	11	16	16	16	16	16	14	4	25	18		
13	CAN	372	15.39	11	9	25	18	10	12	25	14		15		24			21	13	12	13	7	14	7	16	19	15	11	23	24	7	18		
14	INA	313	12.83	23	5	15	14	13	18	23		13		11		12	9		0	25	12	16	21	14	9	10	20	4	14	9	8	18		
15	CHN A	469	19.61	1	25	7	25	23	25		8		21		16	19	17	25		16	24	25	25	17	9	21	17	20	25	16	25	18		
16	DEN	388	16.09	10	23	8	14	14		23		10		14	21	13	18	5	14		10	21	20	6	24	18	21	23	16	16	18	18		
17	FRA A	361	14.91	14	19	16	16		19		7		11	20	14	22	17	18	6	20		7	4	17	18	15	12	12	24	20	9	18		
18	USA	444	18.57	3	13	25		13		25		21	12	17	23	20	23	14	5	9	23		20	16	19	24	17	23	25	25	15	18	-1	
19	CZE	370	15.30	12	15		25		20		18	11	22	21	18	19	16	9	1	10	25	10		11	5	21	22	21	18	7	7	18		
20	POL A	410	17.04	8		18		16		25	24	10	10	25	15	14	23	16	13	24	13	14	19		20	13	15	14	20	7	24	18		
21	ITA	414	17.25	6	22		22		21	22	13	19	12	19	25	14	14	21	21	6	12	11	25	10		19	17	19	20	15	15			
22	TPE B	331	13.61	20		5		14	12	21	6	19	11	11	22	14	11	20	9	12	15	6	9	17	11		23	7	25		13	18		
23	TUR	313	13.04	22	19		16	12	10	24	10	16	18	5	22	14	15	10	13	9	18	13	8	15	13	7		1		8	17			
24	NOR	423	17.61	5		19	25	21	23	25	16	17	20	10	23	14	19	25	10	7	18	7	9	16	11	23	25		22			18		
25	BEL B	216	9.00	26	2	11	4	5	13	12	7	14	13	3	8	16	7	16	5	14	6	3	12	10	10	5		7		13				
26	HKG	391	16.22	9	16	18	5	13	25	22	12	9	16	25	19	25	6	21	14	14	10	3	23	23	15		22		17			18		
28	SRB	332	13.65	19	7	7	5	14	15	22	3	10	23	17	15	5	23	22	4	12	21	15	23	6	15	17	13						18	

Country / Region	GivenName	Surname	BBO Username
BEL	Kristof	De Cnodder	uni_kristo
BEL	Dirk	De Hertog	uni_dirk
BEL	Nina	De Kegel	uni_nina
BEL	Tine	Dobbels	uni_tine
BEL	Johan	Fastenakels	uni_johan
BEL	Rutger	Van Mechelen	uni_rutger
BEL	Elke	Ydens	uni_elke
BEL	Ine	Ydens	uni_ine
BOT	Rodric Jackson	Kemane	uni_Rodric
BOT	Meshack	Kgosidialwa	uni_meshac
BOT	Stix	Mafa	uni_Stix
BOT	Dimpho	Moalosi	uni_dimpho
BOT	priscilla	sadimbo	uni_prissy
CAN	Anton	Blagov	uni_Blagov
CAN	Charles	Halasi	uni_Halasi
CAN	Brian	Hardy	uni_brian
CAN	Daniel	Korbel	uni_dan
CAN	Susan	Korbel	uni_susie
CAN	David	Sabourin	uni_sabou
CHN	Wei	Chao	uni_cw82
CHN	Jing	Jin	uni_jj
CHN	Xin	Li	uni_lix
CHN	Zhenpeng	Li	uni_awd
CHN	Jing	Liu	uni_liujin
CHN	Shu	Liu	uni_ls
CHN	Yan	Liu	uni_lyly
CHN	Feng	Qin	uni_tedy
CHN	Chang	Wang	uni_cstar
CHN	Yan	Wang	uni_wangy
CHN	Zhenguo	Wu	uni_wzg
CHN	Di	Zhuo	uni_kingd
CZE	Pavla	Hoderova	uni_pavla
CZE	Jana	Jankcova	uni_jacek
CZE	Michial	Kopecky	uni_misak
CZE	Milan	Macura	uni_cicam

Country / Region	GivenName	Surname	BBO Username
DEN	Kristian	Broendum	uni_kris
DEN	Kxre	Gjaldbxk	uni_hardk
DEN	Christina	Mortensen	uni_chris
DEN	Lars Kirkegaard	Nielsen	uni_Lars
FRA	David	ANCELIN	uni_dais
FRA	Landry	Andsea	uni_looloo
FRA	Masion	Camme	uni_masion
FRA	France	Fiastre	uni_france
FRA	quentin	LEVOY	uni_kent1
FRA	Nicolas	Lhuissier	uni_nicola
FRA	simon	poulat	uni_saumon
FRA	Yannick	VALO	uni_yannou
FRA	Vincent	Vidalat	uni_vince
GBR	Tom	Dessain	uni_tomd
GBR	Geraint	Harker	uni_harker
GBR	Nicola	Macdougall	uni_nicola
GBR	Robin	Zigmond	uni_robin
GER	Jan-Heudrih	dewiljes	uni_jan
GER	Matthias	Felmy	uni_pancho
GER	Thomas	Gotard	uni_thomas
GER	Daniel	Gottanka	uni_daniel
GER	Oliver	Hevemeier	uni_oliver
GER	Maria	Wuermseer	uni_Maria
HKG	Abby	Chiu	uni_Abby
HKG	Bubble	Ho	uni_Bubble
HKG	Arthur	Lau	uni_Arthur
HKG	Chun Ting Arthur	Lau	uni_lcta
HKG	Chung-man	Leung	uni_LCM
HKG	Kinman	Leung	uni_Kinman
HKG	Wai-sing	Yiu	uni_Sing
INA	Suci	Amita Dewi	uni_chips
INA	Steward	bujung	uni_stebu
INA	mario	mambu	uni_mario
INA	ari	maramis	uni_ari
INA	Clif	Tangkuman	uni_cako
INA	Kristina	Wahyu	uni_nana

Country / Region	GivenName	Surname	BBO Username
ITA	Andrea	Boldrini	uni_mattop
ITA	francesco	Ferrari	uni_franci
ITA	Fabio	Lo Presti	uni_spenny
ITA	alberto	sangiorgio	uni_lake
JPN	Yuichi	IKEMOTO	uni_sacura
JPN	Satoshi	IMAI	uni_kakasi
JPN	Kenichi	ITO	uni_itoken
JPN	Hiroaki	MIURA	uni_hirmi
JPN	Motoaki	Shiga	uni_Gauss3
JPN	hiroki	YOKOI	uni_hrkyk
NED	Jeroen	Bruggeman	uni_jeroen
NED	Bob	Drijver	uni_bobdr
NED	Marion	Michielsen	uni_marion
NED	Dennis	Stuurman	uni_dennis
NED	Ralf	Walgemoet	uni_ralf
NED	Meike	Wortel	uni_meike
NOR	Ivar	Berg	uni_ivar
NOR	Espen	Lindqvist	uni_esp
NOR	Karl Morten	Lunna	uni_knall
NOR	Tor-Ove	Reistad	uni_tor
POL	Konrad	Araszkiwicz	uni_konrad
POL	Krzysztof	Buras	uni_burago
POL	Przemyslaw	Janiszewski	uni_janis
POL	Jacek	Kalita	uni_jacek
POL	Jakub	Kasprzak	uni_kubuku
POL	Krzysztof	Kotorowicz	uni_kotor
POL	Piotr	Madry	uni_klaver
POL	Piotr	Nawrocki	uni_piotrm
POL	Michael	Nowosadzki	uni_mlody
POL	Przemyslaw	Piotrowski	uni_rzemek
POL	Jan	Sikora	uni_sikora
POL	Piotr	Wiankowski	uni_piotrw
SRB	Marko	Gligorijevic	uni_Marko
SRB	Marko	Jurasic	uni_serb
SRB	Nikola	Maksimovic	uni_Nikola
SRB	Zdravko	Popovic	uni_zdravc

Country / Region	GivenName	Surname	BBO Username
SWE	Per-Ola	Cullin	uni_pocken
SWE	Hakan	Johansson	uni_k
SWE	Patrik	Johansson	uni_patrik
SWE	Per-Erik	Malmstrom	uni_pekk
THA	Kasamon	Panichkrajang	uni_Earl
THA	rawit	Sookkasem	uni_view
THA	Chirawut	Thotongkam	uni_korn
THA	Nattakul	Tunyaset	uni_aui
THA	Tanaporn	Tunyaset	uni_yui
TPE	LoMei	Chang	uni_phoebe
TPE	Hsiangwen	Cheng	uni_Hsiang
TPE	TingChun	Huang	uni_LH
TPE	JongChuan	Lee	uni_leeaa
TPE	Chun-Ping	Liao	uni_lcping
TPE	Chih-Hung	Lin	uni_mec
TPE	Howard	Ling	uni_howard
TPE	Roth	Peng	uni_roth
TPE	Kun-Hung	Tsai	uni_khtsai
TPE	Po-Han	Wang	uni_wangph
TPE	Ching-Chun	Yang	uni_goleb
TPE	Yu-Jen	Yang	uni_Yang
TUR	Arda	Cicek	uni_arda
TUR	Ercis	Ercan	uni_ercis
TUR	Mustafa	Karakus	uni_musti
TUR	Erdem	Ozturk	uni_erdem
USA	John	Barth	uni_barth
USA	Jason	Feldman	uni_jfeld
USA	Ari	Greenberg	uni_arigrn
USA	Ronald	Smith	uni_zron
USA	Joel	Wooldridge	uni_buffst