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# FRANCE and ITALY FORGE AHEAD 



Italy v Austria - The battle of the sexes
France still lead and, along with Italy, have opened up a useful lead over the rest of the field. France scored 25,22 and 18 for a bye, a total of 65 on the day. Italy, with two 22s and a 23 did even better, totalling 67 VPs. Greece moved away from the bottom of the table, scoring 18 for a bye and beating Israel 16-14 and Scotland 19-II.
Of the favourites, Norway had a poor day, losing 12-18 to Israel and 10-20 against Poland, while managing a narrow win, I7-I3, over arch-rivals Sweden. Early leaders, England also fail to impress, losing I2-I8 to Estonia and I4-I6 to Sweden, while only scraping through 16-14 against Scotland.

## National Junior <br> Officials Congress

Thursday I Ith July 2002, IOam Churchill Room Grand Hotel (first floor)

All National Delegates are urged to attend this very important meeting. The EBL Youth Committee will report on the status of Junior Bridge in Europe and the National Delegates will be invited to report on the situation in their own countries. Delegates are advised that there will be a vote to reconfirm the EBL Youth Programme. If the NJO is not present, then the team captain or other official should attend the meeting in their place.

Panos Gerontopoulos
Chairman, EBL Youth Committee


## JUNIOR TEAMS



## ROUND ROBIN SESSION 7

|  |  | Match | IMP's |  |  | VP's |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| I | CROATIA | bye | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |  |
| 2 | bye | HUNGARY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  |
| 3 | CZECH REP. | BELGIUM | 43 | 50 | 14 | 16 |  |
| 4 | SWEDEN | NORWAY | 53 | 64 | 13 | 17 |  |
| 5 | POLAND | RUSSIA | 51 | 67 | 12 | 18 |  |
| 6 | SPAIN | DENMARK | 31 | 77 | 6 | 24 |  |
| 7 | TURKEY | ITALY | 56 | 96 | 7 | 23 |  |
| 8 | AUSTRIA | SCOTLAND | 84 | 18 | 25 | 2 |  |
| 9 | ENGLAND | ESTONIA | 28 | 42 | 12 | 18 |  |
| I NETHERLANDS | FRANCE | 46 | 79 | 8 | 22 |  |  |
| I I FINLAND | GERMANY | 53 | 52 | 15 | 15 |  |  |
| I2 ISRAEL | GREECE | 29 | 34 | 14 | 16 |  |  |

## ROUND ROBIN SESSION 8

|  |  | Match | IMP's |  |  | VP's |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| I | bye | CZECH REP. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  |
| 2 | BELGIUM | SWEDEN | 41 | 45 | 14 | 16 |  |
| 3 | HUNGARY | CROATIA | 28 | 68 | 7 | 23 |  |
| 4 | GREECE | bye | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |  |
| 5 | GERMANY | ISRAEL | 25 | 37 | 13 | 17 |  |
| 6 | FRANCE | FINLAND | 89 | 31 | 25 | 4 |  |
| 7 | ESTONIA | NETHERLANDS | 14 | 57 | 6 | 24 |  |
| 8 | SCOTLAND | ENGLAND | 47 | 53 | 14 | 16 |  |
| 9 | ITALY | AUSTRIA | 70 | 37 | 22 | 8 |  |
| I 0 DENMARK | TURKEY | 48 | 42 | 16 | 14 |  |  |
| I I RUSSIA | SPAIN | 34 | 24 | 17 | 13 |  |  |
| I2 NORWAY | POLAND | 26 | 50 | 10 | 20 |  |  |

## ROUND ROBIN SESSION 9

|  |  | Match |  | IMP's |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| VP's |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | FRANCE | bye | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| 2 | CROATIA | DENMARK | 16 | 39 | 10 | 20 |
| 3 | HUNGARY | ITALY | 15 | 50 | 8 | 22 |
| 4 | GREECE | SCOTLAND | 51 | 31 | 19 | 11 |
| 5 | GERMANY | ESTONIA | 36 | 20 | 18 | 12 |
| 6 | bye | RUSSIA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| 7 | TURKEY | SPAIN | 44 | 25 | 19 | 11 |
| 8 | AUSTRIA | POLAND | 7 | 63 | 4 | 25 |
| 9 | ENGLAND | SWEDEN | 30 | 37 | 14 | 16 |
| I 0 NETHERLANDS | CZECH REP. | 43 | 51 | 14 | 16 |  |
| I I FINLAND | BELGIUM | 31 | 37 | 14 | 16 |  |
| I2 ISRAEL | NORWAY | 43 | 30 | 18 | 12 |  |



## ROUND ROBIN SESSION IO

| I | BELGIUM | ISRAEL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | CZECH REP. | FINLAND |
| 3 | SWEDEN | NETHERLANDS |
| 4 | POLAND | ENGLAND |
| 5 | SPAIN | AUSTRIA |
| 6 | ESTONIA | FRANCE |
| 7 | SCOTLAND | GERMANY |
| 8 | ITALY | GREECE |
| 9 | DENMARK | HUNGARY |
| 10 | RUSSIA | CROATIA |
| II | NORWAY | bye |
| 12 | bye | TURKEY |

## RANKING AFTER SESSION 9

| FRANCE | 182 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 ITALY | 181 |
| 3 RUSSIA | 160.5 |
| 4 POLAND | 159 |
| 5 CROATIA | 156 |
| 6 NORWAY | 155.5 |
| 7 DENMARK | 151 |
| 8 ESTONIA | 146 |
| 9 CZECH REP. | 145 |
| 10 ISRAEL | 144.5 |
| 11 ENGLAND | 144 |
| 12 NETHERLANDS | 142 |
| 13 HUNGARY | 131.5 |
| 14 SWEDEN | 129.5 |
| 15 BELGIUM | 126.5 |
| 16 GERMANY | 125 |
| 17 FINLAND | 123 |
| 18 AUSTRIA | 115 |
| 19 TURKEY | 109 |
| 20 SPAIN | 96 |
| 21 GREECE | 95 |
| 22 SCOTLAND | 72 |

## SCHOOLS TEAMS

## TODAY'S PROGRAM

## ROUND ROBIN SESSION I

| I | ITALY | SCOTLAND |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | AUSTRIA | ISRAEL |
| 3 | NETHERLANDS | FRANCE |
| 4 | SWEDEN | ENGLAND |
| 5 | GERMANY | POLAND |
| 6 | CZECH REP. | IRELAND |
| 7 | WALES | NORWAY |
| 8 | bye | DENMARK |



Anyone else want to play some bridge?

## Sport News

## Cycling

Igor Gonzalez de Galdeano took the yellow jersey as leader of the Tour de France after ONCEEroski dominated the team time trial from Epernay to Chateau-Thierry. ONCE took the 67.5 km fourth stage in a time of IhI 9.49 , averaging 48 kph and making De Galdeano the first Spaniard to wear yellow since 1995, when Miguel Indurain won the race. Erik Zabel relinquished the jersey he had gained in Tuesday's sprint finish after a disappointing showing from Telekom, who ended the stage I2th, 2'47" behind.


## Football

Chelsea have released Yugoslavian midfielder Slavisa Jokanovic. The 33 -year-old, who was signed from Deportivo La Coruna for $£ 1.7 \mathrm{~m}$ in October 2000, had reached the end of his contract. Ipswich goalkeeper Matteo Sereni has moved to Brescia on a season's loan. The Serie A side will have the option to buy the 27 -year-old at the end of next season.
The Scottish Premier League's 10 breakaway clubs have agreed to accept a compromise over the split in TV revenues with the Old Firm. They were also pleased at changes in the voting procedure for issues concerning the entire SPL.

## Photographs of Teams and Players

The EBL is building up a photo database of players to be used primarily on the Internet, but also for publicity purposes.

Our photographer, Marco Marin, is here to accomplish this.
Team photographs will be taken before the start of each match, in accordance with a schedule to be published daily. Team captains will be informed through the Daily Bulletin and with notices in the team's pigeonhole when their team's photos are to be taken. To avoid double work, all players and the npe must be present. The whole procedure will be short, not exceeding 10 minutes per team.

Your cooperation will be very much appreciated.
Stefan Back
Vice-Chairman, EBL Youth Committee

| TEAM PHOTOGRAPHS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |



There were three deals in Round 5 that saw some pairs trying a slam contract. The first was Board 4, which produced a number of swings.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

|  | - 9432 <br> 98 <br> $\diamond$ KJ 4 <br> - J 1054 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 85 | N | * A Q J 1076 |
| $\bigcirc$ AKJ 7 |  | $\bigcirc 10$ |
| $\checkmark$ Q 1073 | W E | $\diamond$ A 95 |
| - AK 2 | S | * 863 |
|  | - K |  |
|  | Q Q 65432 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 862$ |  |
|  | - $\mathrm{Q}^{9} 7$ |  |

Belgium v Netherlands

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W v Parijs | Kuyvenhoven | $J v$ Parijs | Brink |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 12 | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 20 | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | $4{ }^{1}$ | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Schollaardt | Cornelis | Drijver | Peeters |
| INT | Pass | 28 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 31 | Pass |
| 4* | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| $4{ }^{2}$ | Pass | $4{ }^{4}$ | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| $6{ }^{1}$ | All Pass |  |  |

Both Wests showed their strong no trump type. For Belgium, Jef van Parijs made a mild slam try by going through 28 on his way to 4@, but two low trumps hardly appealed to West. Just as well really as after a heart lead declarer won the ace and took a spade finesse, settling for just ten tricks; +620 .

Bas Drijver made a clear slam try by transferring then raising to 34 . When he later showed a diamond control, Maarten Schollaardt drove to slam via RKCB. Tom Cornelis decided to attack with a low diamond lead. Schollaardt had little option but to run that to his hand and must have been pleased when his ten scored. He took a losing trump finesse and won the club return. There are a number of successful line from here. Schollaardt drew trumps and played three rounds of hearts, ruffing. The last trump squeezed North in the minors and the $\diamond A$ then squeezed South in clubs and hearts; +1430 and I3 IMPs to The Netherlands.

## ROUND 5 SLAMS

## Hungary v Scotland

| West | North | East <br> MeCrossan | Mraz |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | South |
| :---: |
| INT |

Once again, both Wests described a strong no trump type. For Scotland, Bergson showed his spades then made a self-agreeing splinter bid. When that got doubled, McCrossan made a noncommittal pass, feeling that he had a lot of stuff in hearts but not such a bad hand for his opening. Bergson checked on key cards but then settled for 51 on finding that there was one missing. The lead was a club but McCrossan had no problems. He won and led a spade to the ace, dropping the bare king, and later took a heart finesse for twelve tricks; +680.

The Hungarians drove to slam and Coyle led a low heart. Hegedus ran the heart and Batemen played the nine. Was that the correct card in this partnership? Hegedus won the 810 and crossed to a top club to take the trump finesse. Coyle saw the possibility to give his partner a heart ruff and continued the suit. A second heart finesse gave Hegedus three discards for his minor-suit losers; +1430 and I3 IMPs to Hungary.

Italy v Croatia

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Uccello | Praljak | Guariglia | Kazalicki |
| INT | Pass | 28 | Dble |
| Rdbl | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | $4{ }^{4}$ | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 5 | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brguljan | Lo Presti | Zoric | Mazzadi |
| INT | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| $2{ }^{1}$ | Pass | $4{ }^{4}$ | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

Italy stopped in 54 and, as we have seen, twice that has meant losing 13 IMPs, however, slam is a long way from being secure, and this time it was the slam bidders who conceded the IMPs. The Croatian pair sailed into slam, 44 after transferring being a slam try. Lo Presti led a trump and Brguljan saw no reason not to take
the finesse. That lost, of course, and he ran the heart return to dummy's ten and drew trumps. But there were eleven tricks and no more; - 100 .

## Board I 2. Dealer West. North/South Vul.



Board 12 was not so much about getting to slam, though one pair of unfortunates had a misunderstanding and played in 4\% on the North/South cards, but of whether it was possible to get to seven.

Estonia v Greece

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rubins | Karapanagiotis | Matisons | Katsaris |
| 3\% | Dble | 38 | 4\% |
| Pass | $4{ }^{1}$ | 5* | 64 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| M Dialynas | Naber | A Dialynas | Tihane |
| 3\% | Dble | 5\% | 6\% |
| Pass | 68 | Pass | 78 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |



Oliver Burgess

It is not easy after an opposing pre-emptive barrage but that South hand looks enormous after partner has made a take-out double and surely Tihane's choice of cuebid followed by raise to seven is the practical shot. It earned Estonia 13 IMPs when Greece stopped in six - was Katsaris really fooled by Matisons' baby psyche?

Hungary v Scotland

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McCrossan | Mraz | Bergson | Szegedi |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 2NT |
| 3\% | Pass | 5\% | 68 |
| Pass | Pass | 7\% | Pass |
| Pass | $7 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Marjai | Bateman | Hegedus | Coyle |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 4\% |
| Dble | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 68 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In this match neither West saw an opening pre-empt in his cards. What is wrong with 30 at favourable vulnerability is beyond me, but I have no doubt that they had their reasons. McCrossan came in over Szegedi's forcing heart raise and Bergson was able to take some space away with a jump to $5 \%$. Szegedi's jump to $6 \bigcirc$ looks a little lazy now when he is surely worth a 68 cuebid on the way, and Mraz had no reason to raise to seven. Alas for Scotland, Bergson did not see the danger in taking what looked as though it would be a paying sacrifice. When Szegedi passed 7e round to him, Mraz did well to go on to $7 \mathbb{8}$; 13 IMPs to Hungary.

Croatia v Italy

North
Lo Presti
Pass
$6 \varnothing$
East
Zoric
6\%
All Pass

South
Mazzadi Dble
West
Uccello
39
Pass
North
Praljak
Pass
68
East
Guariglia
$5 \%$
$7 \%$

## South <br> Kazalicki $5 \diamond$ <br> Dble

In this match neither North came in over the pre-empt, making it much harder to reach seven. Zoric's leap to 6 really put it to his opponents and the best that Mazzadi could do was to double. He had no idea that the grand would be good so, of course, had to pass Lo Presti's $6 \triangleleft$ response.

Guariglia only raised to $5 \%$ and, if the bidding record is correct, Kazalicki made a very odd call of 5 when double looks to be routine. Five Hearts attracted a raise to six from Praljak and Guariglia took the save. Kazalicki did not leave the decision to his partner, doubling in front of him. The sacrifice went for 1100 but that was worth 8 IMPs to Italy.

Board I9. Dealer South. East/West Vul.

```
-1053
\veeAQ 1043
K 7 4 3
\vee
```

```
$4
\K92
\diamond A 8 5
&KJ10943
```



```
- AKQJ 82
ค J 765
\(\diamond 10\)
\& A 5
- 976
\(\checkmark 8\)
\(\checkmark\) QJ 962
Q Q 876
```

Any slam is pretty poor, but several pairs tried their luck at the six level.

## England v Czech Republic

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Macura | Probst | Vrkoc | Handley-Pritchard Pass |
| 120 | 18 | Dble | Pass |
| 2* | Pass | 28 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 4. | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Burgess | Pulkrab | Birdsall | Vozabal Pass |
| 12 | 18 | 14 | Pass |
| 2\% | Pass | 2 | Dble |
| 2NT | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | $4{ }^{4}$ | Pass |
| 5\% | Pass | 6\% | All Pass |

Czech Republic stopped safely in the spade game for +620 after the defence began with three rounds of hearts. England went overboard, perhaps because Burgess expected more than a doubleton club for his partner's $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ call, not appreciating that Birdsall was intent on a spade contract all along. After a spade lead, Burgess tried four rounds of the suit to get rid of all his hearts. North was able to ruff the fourth spade and the contract drifted a couple off for -200 and I3 IMPs to Czech Republic.

## Scotland v Hungary

| West | North | East <br> McCrossan | South <br> Mergson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Szegedi |  |  |  |

A fine example of a weak $2 \diamond$ opening from Szegedi created a problem for the Scottish East/West pair. Having seen his partner make a three-level overcall, can Bergson be blamed for taking the push to 5 over $5 \triangleleft$ ? I don't think so, looking at solid spades, short diamonds and a partial club fit. The heart lead meant a quick one down for +100 to Hungary.

Though North/South found the diamond fit at the other table, they did not do nearly enough bidding to put pressure on their opponents. While it would probably not have mattered, surely Coyle is worth more than $3 \triangleleft$ when his partner introduces the suit? Coyle led his singleton heart but Bateman won and tried a club switch. Had South held the \&A or A, that might have proved to be a very effective switch. As it was, it just allowed declarer to come to twelve tricks, winning the \&A, drawing trumps and taking the club finesse to establish the suit; +680 and 13 IMPs to Hungary.

Estonia v Greece

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M Dialynas | Naber | A Dialynas | Tihane 2NT |
| Dble | 3 | 4* | Pass |
| 4 | Dble | 4NT | Pass |
| 5\% | Pass | 54 | Pass |
| 6\% | Pass | 68 | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Rubins | Karapanagiotis | Matisons | Katsaris |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 20 | $2 \bigcirc$ | 34 | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | $4{ }^{4}$ | Pass |
| 5\% | Pass | 6\% | All Pass |

Tihane's 2NT opening claimed to be weak with at least fivefive in the minors. It caused his opponents terrible problems and they eventually subsided in the faintly ridiculous spot of $6 \triangleleft$. That inelegant contract drifted three off for 300 to Estonia.

It looked as though the Estonian gain might be a relatively modest one as Rubins/Matisons sailed up to the apparently hopeless club slam in the other room. However, the chosen lead was a trump, which I think deserves a sad fate. South withheld his queen, of course, and declarer won cheaply and cashed the A. He had no legitimate chance whatsoever from here, of course, but Rubins just started running spades through South. It seems that South was determined not to allow his trump queen to be couped but, when he kept on discarding, all of declarer's red losers went away and the Q was the defence's only trick; +1370 and 17 IMPs to Estonia.


## JUNIOR TEAMS

## SESSION 6

$\square$ HUNGARY

The team of four from Estonia were coming $2 n d$ after five rounds, and Hungary had just won their previous match $25-0$, so both teams were in good form. Gai Hegedus played in the Hungarian Open Team recently at Salsomaggiore, but the Estonian youths did not have the same opportunity as their country did not take part in Salsomaggiore. Estonia's only previous appearance at the European Junior Teams Championship was a last placing in 1992.

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.
$\stackrel{\varphi}{5}$
○J 6
$\diamond$ A Q J 87
4 A Q 1032

- 10843
$\triangleright 1073$
$\diamond 652$
- J 76

- 9652
- AK 98
$\diamond 3$
\& K 985

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tihane | Hegedus | Naber | Marjai |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 5\% |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

sA was led. Gai Hegedus ruffed the spade continuation, played $\vee \mathbf{A}$ and a spade ruff, eventually coming to II tricks on a safe cross-ruff.

| West | North <br> Rubins | East <br> Suranyi | South <br> Matisons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minarik | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | Rdble |
| Pass | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \&$ | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Presumably double of $I \triangleright$ by South would have been for takeout. $\uparrow$ A was cashed and $\uparrow K$ ruffed. Karlis Rubins played $\forall A$ then $\diamond$ Q, which Marcell Suranyi correctly ducked. Declarer cashed $\diamond$ A, $\vee \mathrm{K}$, ruffed a spade and led $\diamond 7$, eventually coming to II tricks.

In other matches, optimal bidding and play was not so common. On vugraph, 6e was made by Daniel Sivelind of Sweden, because $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ was covered, allowing declarer to ruff two diamond losers in dummy without the danger of an over-ruff. A duck of
$\checkmark$ Q means that by the time the fourth round of diamonds is being ruffed, West has no more diamonds, forcing declarer to ruff high and try to guess the trump position.

If the duck of $\diamond K$ seems to you to be a tough play to find at the table, there is a general principle to help find such plays, namely 'in general, try to have the major tenace'. This means that if LHO leads a king from KQ into dummy's AJx, it is usually best to duck, retaining the major tenace of the AJ over the Qx. This approach leads to your side having better control of the suit. Board $I$ is not the best example, but the same principle applies: by retaining $\diamond$ KIO over declarer's $\vee$ J 8 , you leave declarer not in control of the diamond suit.

Board 2. Dealer East. North/South Vul.

- AJ 854
$\checkmark 97$
$\diamond$ K 105
\& A 106
$\pm$ Q
ه 8532
$\diamond A$ Q 6
298732
- K 32

AKJ 106
982
94


Aivar Tihane

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tihane | Hegedus | Naber | Marjai |
|  |  | Pass | INT |
| Pass | 2 - | Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 49 | All Pass |  |

$2 \triangleleft$ was Game-forcing Stayman. ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~K}$ was led, and ducked, which looks like the best play. Hegedus won the club continuation, ruffed a club, drew trumps and had a choice of lines, all of which succeed as the cards lie. At the other table against 4s, Marcell Suranyi switched to a diamond after ek was ducked. This does not defeat 44. Some declarers went down, mostly after they had won the first club. Bas Drijver from the Dutch team pointed out that in a youth bridge game where light opening bids are commonplace, a dealer who leads $\boldsymbol{2} \mathrm{K}$ having passed earlier is less likely to hold $\diamond A$ than his partner, and as this makes the threatening diamond switch more likely, perhaps one should win the first club. Any further analysis is best left to the deep thinkers out there.

Board 6. Dealer East. East/West Vul.


It seems that the splinter promised at least two aces. Hegedus promptly cashed $\diamond A$ and switched to 98 to dummy's king. After a spade to the king, Tihane didn't even bother with the play one does at club level of tempting a cover by playing $\mathbf{~ J}$, because Hegedus is such a classy card player that there was no point trying that. When he led $\$ 3$ and Hegedus played low, Tihane thought it through. It felt like the opening leader was cashing an ace and waiting for his trump trick. Also, the Hungarians are aggressive weak jump overcallers, so Hegedus's failure to try $3 \diamond$ over is made North more likely to have shorter diamonds than his partner and thus longer spades. Furthermore, Hegedus had risked picking up his partner's $\$ \mathrm{Q}$ with the club switch - did this make North more likely to have Q ? Tihane had the courage to back his judgement by taking the slightly anti-percentage play of finessing; 17 IMPs to Hungary because 6NT made at the other table.

6NT? Gabor Minarik checked for aces after the $4 \diamond$ splinter,
found $₫ \mathrm{Q}$ was missing and, realising that this made his partner almost certain to hold AQx , he had the presence of mind to select 6NT in case there were 12 winners without having to guess \&Q. North misjudged, thinking that perhaps the 6NT contract meant that spades were declarer's weakness, and chose 4 as his lead. A triumphant result for Minarik, except that he presumably would have taken the percentage play and made 6NT anyway.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

|  | ¢ K Q 6 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ ノ96432 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 63$ |  |  |
|  | \% J 2 |  |  |
| ¢ J 108742 | N |  | ¢ 3 |
| $\bigcirc 1087$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ Q |
| $\diamond$ K 4 |  |  | $\checkmark$ A 10982 |
| 9 83 | S |  | \& K Q 9754 |
|  | ¢ A 95 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 5 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 75 |  |  |
|  | \& A 106 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Tihane | Hegedus | Naber | Marjai |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2 | Dble |
| 24 | Pass | 3\% | Dble |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | 4NT | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | 5\% | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

South had to borrow his last Double Card from his screenmate. Perhaps East might have passed at one of his turns to call, but many good players have learnt from experience that an aggressive approach to bidding $6 / 5$ shapes yields dividends. The cost was only 2 IMPs, as $4 \bigcirc$ is cold and $5 \%$ doubled went for 500 . In order to prevent diamond ruffs, 26 was led on which North played the two, retaining ${ }^{\rho}$ to over-ruff a diamond, which he did shortly thereafter. On the double dummy lead of a low spade for a trump switch, declarer might run $\diamond 10$ to hold the loss to 500 , so the best defence happens to be a simple heart lead, allowing a trump switch after the diamond over-ruff. West's pass of 4NT, surely denying a singleton diamond, means that working all that out at the table is not totally impossible. Simpler folk would get it right by simply seeing an AK holding and leading it.

Playing against Norway's revolting contract of $5 \triangleleft$ doubled on Board 8, Bas Drijver for Netherlands led $\diamond 3$ to the $\triangleleft 8, \diamond Q$ and $\diamond$ K. Later he over-ruffed a club with his carefully preserved $\checkmark 6$, to score plus 1400. Now we know why it's recommended to lead low from a doubleton trump. How does one reach such contracts? West opened a Multi $2 \diamond$, East chose to pass (suggesting a diamond suit, one would think), South doubled, North found the pressure bid of $4 \checkmark$, East tried $5 \%$, and West naturally enough (if bidding diamonds twice with a doubleton can be called natural) converted to 5 . That's enough of the match between the two pre-tournament favourites, which Norway won narrowly.

At another table, West restrained himself enough to pass as dealer, but that was the end of any restraint. North opened $2 \triangleleft$

Multi, East bid 3\%, South bounced to $4 \checkmark$ (a good pressure bid), West ventured 44, North doubled for penalty, East rescued to 4NT, South doubled, West called 5\&, passed to South who 'knew' that partner had spades for his double of 49. It may have seemed to him that West was fooling around with club support, as a 44 call by a passed hand didn't seem to make much sense. $5 \diamond$ (pick a major) would have been safer, but 54 was his actual call! This was passed to East, who doubled, forcing a retreat by North to 68 , which failed by only one trick. Passing out 5ould have scored well too.

Board 9. Dealer North. East/West Vul.
imised the danger of a club ruff, and declarer emerged with minus 100, not too bad, but losing 5 IMPs when 4 by East failed by a trick at the other table.

On vugraph, Turkey made $3 \triangleleft$ doubled. South bid $2 \triangleleft$ over the $1 s$ overcall, West raised to $2 s$ then doubled South's $3 \diamond$ rebid. At the other table, Turkey's East/West pair bid to 4 , over which South decided to save in $5 \diamond$, Turkey extracting the maximum penalty of 500 , contributing 14 IMPs to Turkey's $18-12$ win.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.


| West <br> Tihane | North <br> Hegedus | East <br> Naber | South <br> Marjai <br> Pass |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT | Pass | $2 \&$ | Pass <br> $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 \vee$ | All Pass |  |

Naber wrapped up II tricks very quickly. West's decision to downgrade his hand to open a $15-17$ NT with his $4-3-3-3$ shape and a dismal four-card suit seems sensible, and East's non-forcing $2 \triangle$ call is automatic, as a singleton king is a dubious asset. However, it seems that West should have re-evaluated his hand and raised to $3 \oslash$. His original assessment of his hand as poor has to be modified in the light of the bidding, his hand having become monstrously huge if partner has short diamonds which is not just possible but quite likely. Hungary survived in 3NT at the other table after a club lead and subsequent club continuation, to pick up 5 IMPs.

Board I4. Dealer East. None Vul.

|  | - 108 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q J |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 843 |  |
|  | \& J 10853 |  |
| ¢ AK 4 | N | Q Q J 953 |
| $\bigcirc$ AK 75 |  | $\bigcirc 1032$ |
| $\diamond$ J 2 | W E | $\diamond$ A 9 |
| \% A 942 | S | \% Q 76 |
|  | ¢ 762 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 9864$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 10765 |  |
|  | \& K |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tihane | Hegedus | Naber | Marjai |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 18 | $1 \varangle$ | Dble | $1 \underline{4}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | Pass |
| $2 \varangle$ | Pass | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |

Against the strong (17+) $1 \%, 18$ showed either spades or both minors. East/West appear not to have done their homework on how to defend against this defence, with some doubt surrounding the meaning of the double of I to the queen, king and ace, declarer thought for a long time about the best way to play this awkward contract. Eventually he cashed $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and $\odot \mathrm{K}$ and, much relieved to see the friendly lie, he simply played a heart to the ten and claimed ten tricks. At the other table, Hungary had a free run to 6ut even the friendly club and heart lies were not enough to allow that contract to make.

Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.


QQ was led to the ace, followed by $\$ \mathrm{~K}$. The abnormal (high, low) sequence of spade plays by East showed a doubleton. Thus, after a club to the ace, a third spade was played. Peter Marjai got it right, ruffing with the ace, cashing the queen and finessing the jack; plus 420.

The logic is that as West has more spades than East, East is likely to have more hearts then West. Tihane, who thought for a while before selecting $1 \boldsymbol{4}$, would have regretted his choice of bid.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minarik | Rubins | Suranyi | Matisons |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \varnothing$ |
| INT | $4 \stackrel{5}{2}$ | $5 \&$ | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Minarik's more traditional INT overcall to show $5 / 5$ in the other suits hit the jackpot. Playing INT as 15-18 in this position is becoming out of date. The lead of $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ went to the queen,
and $\diamond K$ was cashed. The best explanation for 9 being led next is that Estonia have only four players, a disadvantage as it introduces tiredness as a factor. It was the third long match of the day. Fortunately for the Estonians, there are not three matches every day, and the presence of two byes due to Romania's late withdrawal caused by visa problems, might help their chances. Actually, after $\triangle A$ at trick three, North might try a third diamond at trick four, as it would have promoted a trump trick if partner had had eKIO. 550 plus 420 was 14 IMPs to Hungary.

Board I8. Dealer East. North/South Vul.


At the vulnerability, North's double looks risky. If it was intended as take-out, then South would not have voluntarily bid hearts, so it appears that the Hungarian pair had not done their homework against a Multi $2 \triangleleft$. Peter Marjai played skilfully to hold the loss to 500 . At the other table, South bought the hand by opening 2 §, an animalistic bid at the vulnerability. He was defeated by two tricks but Hungary gained 7 IMPs. The two Hungarian players who opened the bidding on their respective five-card majors can take the credit.

Estonia certainly are much too good at bridge to have any chance of repeating their last placing at their only previous appearance in this event If they had six players, they might even be serious contenders for the title, as the extreme mental demands of world class bridge make it difficult for one pair to play every board, let alone two pairs. The match, full of the fast thoughtful card play that is typical of Eastern Europeans, ended with Hungary winning 17-13.

# ATTENTION SCHOOLS CAPTAINS and PLAYERS 

## Schools Captains Meeting <br> 1700 <br> Schools Welcome Ceremony <br> 1900

Thursday I Ith July
The Carlton Suite at the Riviera Centre

## The Trump Guard Squeeze <br> by Michael Rosenblum

Round I Russia v Sweden
Board I5. Dealer South. North/South Vul.

- A 7

○K 83
$\diamond$ AK 8532

- J 4


| West | North | East <br> Malinovskij | Cullin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | Srasnosselskij |
| :---: | | South |
| :---: |
| Upmark |
| Pass |

${ }^{(1)}$ Both minors, weak
The opening lead was the jack of diamonds to the queen and king. North, Cullin, switched to ace and another spade and Mikhail Krasnosselski misguessed, finessing and losing to the queen.

If South does not lead a heart at this point, his partner will be squeezed in the red suits. Upmark was aware of the situation and duly found the heart switch, the ten. Cullin withheld his king and Krasnosselski won. Now he ran all but one of his trumps to come down to this ending:


North had to find one more discard and could not afford a red card so pitched the four of clubs. Now Krasnosselski played the $\& 10$ to dummy's queen, ruffed a diamond and, after cashing the $\vee A$, finessed the 9 for his contract.

Of course, Krasnosselski is top of the European Junior MP list, and perhaps a less experienced player would have missed this opportunity.

In the replay, the Swedish East bid 3\& over his partner's 2NT opening (again weak with both minors), and this went three down after Alexey Zaitsev led a trump.


We are all very good looking, smart, charming, full of humour and, above all, extremely modest.

In alphabetical order:
Karlo Brguljan (22): The best and most experienced player in our team. He has won numerous international tournaments and also this year's Croatian Cup.

Matija Katlicki (2I): Often chooses the best meal in a restaurant. If you want to know what he just had, examine the stains on his pants.

Sandra Kulovic (22): The Iron Lady of the team (we call her that because she is ironing our stuff). Although she denies it, she is jealous of every good looking girl around (looking the way she does, she has nothing to be jealous of. Editors).

Marjan Praljak (24): An unemployed mathematician who is studying probabilities, so he always manages to find a $100 \%$ line of play to lose an unbeatable contract, preferably doubled.

Tomislav Scepanovic (24): A lunatic! Feel free to double. The probable result? Down five redoubled.

Vedran Zoric (22): He almost didn't come here because his girlfriend wouldn't let him go. Now he has become the favourite prey for elderly drunken women in local Torquay pubs.

Dubo (age unknown): Often copied but never equalled.

# Calling All Soccer Players! 

The Hungarian Junior team is organising a soccer game this morning, Thursday. The
game is open to anyone who wants to join in.
We are meeting at II. 00 am in front of the Riviera Centre.

## JUNIOR TEAMS

BUTLER AFTER SESSION 8

| I | FRA | O. Bessis - de Tessieres | 80 | 1.86 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | ITA | Mazzadi - lo Presti | 120 | 1.35 |
| 3 | NOR | Harr - Sundklakk | 120 | 1.27 |
| 4 | RUS | Rudakov - Zaitsev | 120 | 1.15 |
| 5 | CRO | Brguljan - Zoric | 120 | 1.05 |
| 6 | ENG | Gold - Hydes | 120 | 1.04 |
| 7 | HUN | Mraz - Szegedi | 60 | 0.93 |
| 8 | FRA | T. Bessis - Gaviard | 100 | 0.91 |
| 9 | NOR | Hakkebo - Harr | 20 | 0.90 |
| 10 | RUS | Andreev - Romanovitch | 100 | 0.82 |
| 11 | DEN | Gjaldbaek - Henriksen | 80 | 0.79 |
| 12 | EST | Matisons - Rubins | 160 | 0.77 |
| 13 | ITA | Guariglia - Uccello | 60 | 0.77 |
| 14 | AUS | Grumm - Kummel | 100 | 0.76 |
| 15 | POL | Araskiewicz - Wittenbeck | 80 | 0.75 |
| 16 | ISR | Hoffman - Lellouche | 120 | 0.65 |
| 17 | CZE | Pulkrab - Vozabal | 120 | 0.63 |
| 18 | CRO | Kulovic - Scepanovic | 60 | 0.52 |
| 19 | NED | Bruggeman - De Groot | 120 | 0.43 |
| 20 | NOR | Ellestad - Joerstad | 140 | 0.35 |
| 21 | FRA | Grenthe - Grenthe | 100 | 0.35 |
| 22 | POL | Kotorowicz - Kotorowicz | 160 | 0.24 |
| 23 | ISR | Ginossar - Reshef | 140 | 0.24 |
| 24 | DEN | Marquardsen - Schalz | 100 | 0.23 |
| 25 | NED | Drijver - Schollaardt | 120 | 0.14 |
| 26 | HUN | Hegedus - Marjai | 120 | 0.14 |
| 27 | SWE | Cullin - Upmark | 120 | 0.10 |
| 28 | GER | Sauter - Schueller | 80 | 0.03 |
| 29 | FIN | Airaksinen - Heikkinen | 160 | -0.01 |
| 30 | CZE | Jellinek - Martinek | 120 | -0.07 |
| 31 | CZE | Macura - Vrkoc | 40 | -0.08 |
| 32 | BEL | P.Van Parijs - Vandevelde | 100 | -0.13 |
| 33 | TUR | Sakrak - Suicmez | 160 | -0.14 |
| 34 | EST | Naber - Tihane | 160 | -0.18 |
| 35 | CRO | Kazalicki - Praljak | 60 | -0.18 |
| 36 | ENG | Birdsall - Burgess | 120 | -0.21 |
| 37 | HUN | Minarik - Suranyi | 60 | -0.22 |
| 38 | POL | Baranowski - Skalski | 80 | -0.25 |
| 39 | BEL | Cornelis - Peeters | 100 | -0.26 |
| 40 | SWE | Eriksson - Sivelind | 120 | -0.28 |
| 41 | GER | Ewald - Stoszek | 80 | -0.28 |
| 42 | ITA | di Bello - di Bello | 100 | -0.31 |
| 43 | BEL | J.Van Parijs - W.Van Parijs | 80 | -0.34 |
| 44 | ESP | Goded Merino - Masia | 100 | -0.44 |
| 45 | NOR | Hakkebo - Joerstad | 20 | -0.45 |
| 46 | NED | Brink - Kuivenhoven | 80 | -0.46 |
| 47 | ISR | Tal - Tal | 60 | -0.48 |
| 48 | RUS | Krasnosselski - Malinovski | 100 | -0.49 |
| 49 | AUS | Steiner - Winkler | 100 | -0.49 |
| 50 | ENG | Handley-Prichard - Probst | 80 | -0.51 |
| 51 | DEN | Houmoller - Houmoller | 100 | -0.52 |
| 52 | AUS | Gogoman - Gogoman | 120 | -0.53 |
| 53 | SCO | Bergson - McCrossan | 120 | -0.55 |
| 54 | FIN | Ahonen - Nurmi | 160 | -0.56 |
| 55 | GRE | Labrou - Mylona | 100 | -0.58 |
| 56 | SCO | Gaffin - Sinclair | 100 | -0.87 |
| 57 | GRE | Dialynas - Dialynas | 100 | -0.89 |
| 58 | ESP | Mansilla - Perez Calisteo | 120 | -0.89 |
| 59 | GER | Bokholt - Kornek | 80 | -0.96 |
| 60 | ESP | Goded Merino - Perez Calisteo | 20 | -1.15 |
| 61 | TUR | Basaran - Kesikbas | 160 | -1.18 |
| 62 | ESP | Malagrida - Masia | 40 | -1. 23 |
| 63 | NOR | Hakkebo - Kvangraven | 20 | -1.50 |
| 64 | GRE | Karapangiotis - Katsaris | 80 | -1.54 |
| 65 | SWE | Larsson - Linerudt | 40 | -1.80 |
| 66 | SCO | Bateman - Coyle | 100 | -2.13 |

## Has It To Do <br> With Age?

by Christer Andersson

During the first couple of days we have heard on more than one occasion that juniors are uninhibited bidders. There may be some truth in that statement. We also recognise that many of the juniors participating in these Junior Championships later turn up in the corresponding Open and Women's European Team Championships. By then, they have often become more cautious bidders, but not always. Take a look at this example from the match between Ukraine and Russia in the recent Open Championship in Salsomaggiore.

## Dealer West. East/West Vul.

```
Q Q
8 K Q 107
* A| }8
&8
```



```
- AK IO
\(\triangleright 2\)
\(\diamond\) K 763
- AKQ9 3
- 9762
898653
\(\diamond 10\)
\& 1052
```

In the Closed Room, Russia were sitting North/South. When North, Maxim Khven opened in second seat with a Precisionstyle $1 \diamond$, South, Georgi Matushko felt that he had to talk his opponents out of a likely game. Although East, Gennadiy Rybnikov had entered the bidding with a take-out double, Matushko calmly introduced his heart suit at the one level. And when West, Dmytro Nikolayenko made a responsive double and North was able to raise to $2 \vee$, Matushko competed to $3 \vee$ over East's $3 \boldsymbol{e}$. When this did not prevent West from bidding 3NT, Matushko had to sacrifice in $4 \checkmark$ to prevent his opponents scoring their vulnerable game.

This was the full auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rybnikov | Khven | Nikolayenko | Matushko |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | 18 |
| Dble | $2 \vee$ | 38 | 38 |
| 3NT | Pass | Pass | $4 \vee$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

West led his lowest club to partner's queen. The trump switch was won by West's ace and a trump continuation by the king on table. A diamond to the ten and queen gave the defence an opportunity to play the third round of trumps. Matushko won the trump on table and played $\diamond A$ then took a ruffing finesse against East's king. Two down resulted in an 8 IMP pick-up as 3NT was made at the other table. Even on a forcing defence, playing the black suits instead of drawing trumps, the best the defence can manage is down three, which would still be a 3 IMP gain to Russia.

