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## POLAND ALMOST THERE



The Polish Junior team has come on strong in the last few days and another three wins yesterday, totalling 66 VPs , leaves them 19.5 VPs clear and needing only to avoid complete disaster in this morning's last round, where they face England, who are certainly in need of a very big win themselves. The silver medal almost certainly belongs to Italy, who are 18 VPs ahead of third, but the bronze could go to any one of Hungary, Norway, Israel and France, who are covered by just 6.5 VPs.
There are two rounds to go in the Schools Championship, with the title likely to be decided by the final round match-up of Israel and Latvia, though certainly Poland and Norway will also have something to say about that. Yesterday saw all the main contenders struggle, allowing Norway, who scored 60 on the day, to close right up to the leaders. Meanwhile, Sweden slipped a little but could still win a medal with a good last day.


## TODAY'S VUGRAPH

10.00 Israel v Norway
14.00 To be Arranged

Juniors
Schools

## IMPORTANT

Please note that the Closing Ceremony will be at 7.15 pm and not as in the official program. The ceremony will take place on the second floor of the tournament building.
After the ceremony, buses will take everyone to the venue for the Victory Banquet.
There will be no return buses after the banquet, however, it is only about 15 minutes walk away.

## CONTENTS

BELGIUM v FRANCE - ROUND 15 JUNIORS
.4

NORWAY v ITALY—ROUND 8 SCHOOLS
LATVIA $\vee$ NETHERLANDS - ROUND 9 SCHOOLS

## JUNIOR TEAMS RESULTS

## JUNIORS TEAMS PROGRAM

| ROUND I8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Home Team |  |  |  |  |  |  | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| I LITHUANIA | NETHERLANDS | $39-26$ | $18-12$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | SCOTLAND | HUNGARY | $22-95$ | $1-25$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | TURKEY | CZECH REP. | $71-40$ | $21-9$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | AUSTRIA | SPAIN | $42-71$ | $9-21$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | GREECE | NORWAY | $34-37$ | $14-16$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | ENGLAND | ISRAEL | $37-54$ | $11-19$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | PORTUGAL | CROATIA | $66-72$ | $14-16$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | POLAND | DENMARK | $63-25$ | $23-7$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | FRANCE | LATVIA | $54-37$ | $19-11$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| I0 ROMANIA | ITALY | $48-51$ | $11-16$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| II BELGIUM | SWEDEN | $48-17$ | $21-9$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| ROUND 19 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| 1 | NETHERLANDS | BELGIUM | 33-23 | 16.5-13 |
| 2 | SWEDEN | ROMANIA | 26-19 | 16-14 |
| 3 | ITALY | FRANCE | 48-42 | 16-14 |
| 4 | LATVIA | POLAND | 11-61 | 5-25 |
| 5 | DENMARK | PORTUGAL | 58-27 | 21-9 |
| 6 | CROATIA | ENGLAND | 29-64 | 8-22 |
| 7 | ISRAEL | GREECE | 112-30 | 25-0 |
| 8 | NORWAY | AUSTRIA | 12-36 | 10-20 |
| 9 | SPAIN | TURKEY | 25-39 | 12-18 |
| 10 | CZECH REP. | SCOTLAND | 51-42 | 17-13 |
|  | HUNGARY | LITHUANIA | 28-57 | 9-21 |


| ROUND 20 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |  |
| I NORWAY | NETHERLANDS | $25-13$ | $17-13$ |  |
| 2 SPAIN | ISRAEL | $16-87$ | $2-25$ |  |
| 3 CZECH REP. | CROATIA | $62-31$ | $21-9$ |  |
| 4 HUNGARY | DENMARK | $40-36$ | $16-14$ |  |
| 5 LITHUANIA | LATVIA | $34-26$ | $16-14$ |  |
| 6 SCOTLAND | ITALY | $12-81$ | $2-25$ |  |
| 7 TURKEY | SWEDEN | $31-44$ | $12-18$ |  |
| 8 AUSTRIA | BELGIUM | $14-105$ | $0-25$ |  |
| 9 GREECE | ROMANIA | $72-22$ | $25-5$ |  |
| I0 ENGLAND | FRANCE | $40-64$ | $10-20$ |  |
| II PORTUGAL | POLAND | $35-49$ | $12-18$ |  |

## SCHOOLSTEAMS

## RANKING AFTER SESSION II

| 1 ISRAEL | 206 |
| :--- | :---: |
| 2 LATVIA | 204 |
| 3 POLAND | 198 |
| 4 NORWAY | 194 |
| 5 SWEDEN | 184 |
| 6 FRANCE | 179 |
| 7 ITALY | 178 |
| 8 DENMARK | 172 |
| 9 NETHERLANDS | 168 |
| 10 GERMANY | 164 |
| 11 ENGLAND | 136 |
| 12 HUNGARY | 118 |
| 13 TURKEY | 104 |
| 4 AUSTRIA | 81 |

## JUNIORS TEAMS

## RANKING AFTER SESSION 20

| I POLAND |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2 ITALY | 398 |
| 3 HUNGARY | 360.5 |
| 4 NORWAY | 360 |
| 5 ISRAEL | 358 |
| 6 FRANCE | 354 |
| 7 ENGLAND | 345 |
| 8 NETHERLANDS | 318.5 |
| 9 DENMARK | 315.5 |
| IO BELGIUM | 312.5 |
| II SWEDEN | 308 |
| I2 TURKEY | 304 |
| I3 PORTUGAL | 283.5 |
| I4 GREECE | 269 |
| I5 AUSTRIA | 259 |
| I6 LATVIA | 255 |
| I7 ROMANIA | 237 |
| I8 SPAIN | 232 |
| I9 CZECH REPUBLIC | 228 |
| 20 LITHUANIA | 208 |
| 21 | 204 |
| 22 SCOTLAND | 198.5 |

## SCHOOLS TEAMS RESULTS

| ROUND 9 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| I | LATVIA | NETHERLANDS | $58-30$ | $21-9$ |
| 2 | HUNGARY | AUSTRIA | $68-31$ | $23-7$ |
| 3 | DENMARK | ISRAEL | $40-24$ | $18-12$ |
| 4 | ENGLAND | POLAND | $38-52$ | $12-18$ |
| 5 | SWEDEN | NORWAY | $18-80$ | $3-25$ |
| 6 | ITALY | GERMANY | $33-46$ | $12-18$ |
| 7 | FRANCE | TURKEY | $62-26$ | $22-8$ |


| ROUND 10 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| I | GERMANY | LATVIA | $58-42$ | $18-12$ |
| 2 | NORWAY | TURKEY | $86-16$ | $25-2$ |
| 3 | POLAND | FRANCE | $62-18$ | $24-6$ |
| 4 | ISRAEL | ITALY | $67-58$ | $17-13$ |
| 5 | AUSTRIA | SWEDEN | $12-60$ | $5-25$ |
| 6 | NETHERLANDS | ENGLAND | $32-59$ | $9-21$ |
| 7 | HUNGARY | DENMARK | $19-88$ | $2-25$ |

## ROUND II

|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I LATVIA | HUNGARY | $50-36$ | $18-12$ |  |
| 2 | DENMARK | NETHERLANDS | $25-54$ | $9-21$ |
| 3 ENGLAND | AUSTRIA | $61-43$ | $19-11$ |  |
| 4 | SWEDEN | ISRAEL | $43-44$ | $15-15$ |
| 5 | ITALY | POLAND | $69-41$ | $21-9$ |
| 6 | FRANCE | NORWAY | $40-17$ | $20-10$ |
| 7 | TURKEY | GERMANY | $36-56$ | $11-19$ |

# Belgium v France - Round I 5 Juniors 

## Beware of Derby Matches - By Jean-Francois Jourdain (Belgium)

For the first time since I became the captain of the Belgian Junior team (this means 1998), my boys managed to beat France, forcing me to go for the third time of the tournament to the grocer's, buying a bottle of Mumm Cordon Rouge (some in my team prefer Veuve Cliquot Ponsardin, but this is my business after all). Belgium had an excellent day on Wednesday, winning their three matches against Portugal (18-12), Romania (23-7) and finally France. The Frenchies, however, were the first to fire :

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.
Q -
$\bigcirc$ K 7
$\diamond$ A 9876432
\& AJ 7


| West <br> Hubert | North $T$ Bessis | East Guiot | South Gaviard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | T Bessis | Guiot | Gaviard |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| 39 | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |



Steven De Donder, Belgium

| West de Tessieres | North De Donder | East 0 Bessis | South De Roos |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | 29 | $2 \vee$ |
| 24 | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3s |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |

In the Closed Room, France had a fairly easy auction to reach $4 \checkmark$ when Gaviard seemed not to be too interested in his partner's long diamonds. This contract was made with an overtrick when West immediately covered the K\$, allowing declarer to take the ruffing finesse; France +450 .
In the Open Room, Olivier Bessis overcalled 2e and Godefroy de Tessieres prudently bid 24. Sitting behind the cards of Steve De Roos, if I had not known Godefroy for so many years, I should have thought he had simply psyched, but it appeared not to be the case at all. Intending to show his spade stopper (and what a stopper!), De Roos bid 34, which encouraged De Donder to leap to the thin diamond slam. This simply requires an even break in both red suits, and that was not the case. Olivier Bessis doubled happily but could not bring it more than one down. Anyway, II IMPS went to France.
France did not stay in the lead for very long. This is what happened on Board 6:

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \& J 1052 \\
& \otimes 3 \\
& \diamond 10986 \\
& \& J 542
\end{aligned}
$$

- K 96

81042
$\diamond$ K 42
\& A 1087

. Q 83
-AJ65
$\diamond$ Q 53
\& K 63

- A 74
- KQ987
$\diamond$ AJ7
\& Q 9

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hubert | T Bessis | Guiot | Gaviard |
|  |  | I | Pass |
| 2 $\otimes$ | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| De Tessieres | De Donder | O Bessis | De Roos |
|  |  | INT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

When I started to play bridge, it was stated in all French bridge books that the INT opening bid with a five-card major was a kind of heretic disorder, but nowadays they know better. Both tables avoided the inferior contract of $4 \checkmark$, which can still be made if you guess right in clubs, providing two discards for declarer's
two losers, one in diamonds and one in spades. In the Closed Room, Gaviard was told a heart lead was insane, and led the 2. This soon gave two early club tricks to declarer. After that he played on hearts and made his contract easily with three hearts and two tricks in each side-suit; Belgium +600 .
In the Open Room, De Roos knew nothing about declarer's heart holding, so he simply started his long suit. This ran to dummy's ten. Back came another heart to the king which was ducked by South (the key play), De Donder discarding the $\diamond 10$. A third heart was taken by the jack, De Donder pitching this time the $\$ 5$. De Roos switched to the $\$ \mathrm{Q}$ and Bessis ducked. He had to win the spade continuation in hand in order to clear the hearts. Back came a spade for dummy and now declarer had to guess the clubs right to make his contract. With only one entry left in his hand he could no longer take the double finesse in clubs, so he tried a club to the queen and was doomed to go down; 12 IMPS to Belgium.
A few seconds later, the Frenchies had a disaster:
Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

| Q Q 10$\bigcirc 6$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 642 |  |  |  |
| ¢ QJ9 864 |  |  |  |
| - AKJ 93 | N |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A 7 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 103$ | S |  | Q 975 |
| \& AK 73 |  |  |  |
|  | - 54 |  |  |
|  | ¢ Q J 85432 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J |  |  |
|  | -1052 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hubert | $T$ Bessis | Guiot | Gaviard |
| 1. | 2e | 4. | 5\% |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | 5 |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Julien Gaviard took a very optimistic save in $5 \%$, hoping to find some heart values with partner. Alas, this was not the case. Alexandre Hubert had no difficulty in finding a double which could reward him. This would have been +1400 after the lead of two top spades and three rounds of trumps. Gaviard changed his mind and ran to hearts, so he escaped for 'only' five down. Belgium +1100 and that meant a first drink to pay for me.
However, this could have been a pretty good result for France if Olivier Bessis and Godefroy de Tessieres had bid $6 \diamond$ or even 6 NT in the other room, but they found absolutely no reason to escape from the nine-card spade fit, and so went one down in 64 when De Donder, who had pre-empted 3\%, found the lead of the $\diamond \mathbf{A}$ and gave his partner a ruff at the next trick. Anyway, after North's pre-empt it would have been quite difficult for declarer to find the 4 Q. Belgium scored a further +50 and 14 IMPS.
On Board 13 Belgium stopped in the Closed Room in 2NT for a simple make but, at the table, the French players suggested that the vulnerable $4 \bigcirc$ should be cold. Deep Finesse thinks, meanwhile, that it should go one down. The Frenchies were consistent in the other room when they indeed settled for $4 \Omega$, doubled and two down; -500 and a further 12 IMPS to Belgium.

The Belgian lead had increased to an interesting 20-10 VP potential, when France went seriously wrong again, this time in the Open Room:

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.

- Q 962
- 10985
$\diamond$ K 108
\& 64
- K 43
- Q 62
$\diamond$ A Q 5
\& KQ 32

| West <br> Hubert | North <br> $T$ Bessis | East <br> Guiot | South <br> Gaviard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \boxtimes$ |
| INT | $2 \diamond($ i | Pass | $2 \oslash$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | $3 \oslash$ |


| West de Tessieres | North De Donder | East <br> O Bessis | South De Roos |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | 18 |
| INT | $2 \bigcirc$ | 3\%(i) | 38 |
| Pass | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| 44(ii) | Dble | 4 NT | Pass |
| 54 | Dble | Pass | Pass |
| 6\% | Dble | All Pass |  |

When Alex Hubert overcalled INT, Thomas Bessis transferred to $2 \checkmark$. When that came back to him, Benoit Guiot tried the simple and efficient competitive bid of $3 \diamond$, which should have been lay down. Gaviard tried a third heart but it appeared to be one too many. He guessed the spades right after the bidding, but had nevertheless to go one down; Belgium +50.
In the Open Room, Olivier Bessis transferred immediately to diamonds, but then took the push to $4 \%$. Despite the fact that he was facing a passed hand, Godefroy de Tessieres could still imag-
 and started cuebidding. His partner desperately tried to stop him by bidding 4 NT but that only comforted de Tessieres in his opinion that was forcing, so he answered to RKCB, showing two

key cards and the 2 Q . When the smoke cleared, and De Donder ran out of doubles, he was four down for - 800; Belgium another 13 IMPS.
Finally, France limited the damage a little on the very last deal:
Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

- A 108

คA72
$\checkmark 432$

- A 753

```
- 976
© J 9
\(\diamond A K J 5\)
Q QJ 64
```



```
- KQ432
- KQ4
\(\diamond\) Q 6
\& K 92
- J5
ค108653
\(\diamond 10987\)
- 108
```

| West <br> Hubert | North <br> $T$ Bessis | East <br> Guiot | South Gaviard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 19 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| $4{ }^{1}$ | Dble | All Pass |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| de Tessieres | De Donder | O Bessis | De Roos |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 20 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

In the Closed Room, Alex Hubert proved to be the most conservative junior in the field when he did not consider his cards to be worth an opening (this is not very surprising as he will be too old next year to be a junior). So Thomas Bessis could enter the bidding by opening his best minor (if you could say so). Nevertheless, the Belgians rapidly bid the game, but it proved not to be the best spot. Hubert should have settled for the obvious 3NT when his partner showed a fair hand with diamond problems. Knowing he was trailing, Bessis needed points and his three aces encouraged him to double. Julien Gaviard took the lazy $\diamond 10$ in hand, but he had a sudden inspiration and changed his mind, considering his best chance with his poor hand was to get a club ruff. So it happened soon and France scored +200.
In the Open Room Godefroy de Tessieres judged his hand very well when his partner first transferred to $2 \diamond$, then offered a choice of games. De Donder led the 95 for the two, eight and queen. He played a spade to the king which held, then a heart to the jack. De Donder hopped up with the ace and fired back another club.As the cards lie (i.e. the ace of spades onside) the contract could anyway not be defeated, but de Tessieres, not aware of that, did well by putting up the king, pinning the ten, so he made an overtrick and scored the last 13 IMPS of this exciting match, enough to hold the French loss to $12-18 \mathrm{VPs}$.

## Correction

Stelio di Bello and Fabio Lo Presti were not allowed to use their regular convention card in this championship, since they're using different methods depending on the vulnerability. Therefore, it sometimes has been slightly difficult for us to follow their auctions. On this deal from Italy's victorious match against England, Stelio di Bello pointed out that $2 \checkmark$ over the no trump opening ( $9-1 \mathrm{I}$ ) was not a transfer, as we wrote in Thursday's bulletin. It in fact showed hearts and a weak hand.This time Fabio Lo Presti had psyched.This was the complete layout:

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

$$
\text { A } 62
$$

Q QJ 6
$\diamond 6$
\& AK Q 832

```
4.Q 54 3
\diamond
\diamond Q 8432
&96
```



| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | INT | Pass |
| 2『* | 3\% | All Pass |  |

N/S missed the cold game in hearts, and indeed a slam on a finesse, but the director changed the score to $4 \checkmark$ with an overtrick for N/S for an unusual push, due to the fact that there was only a special alert at one side of the screen.

## Teams and Players' Photos Schedule - Saturday July 23rd sCHOOLS

### 13.10 Italy <br> 13.15 Latvia

All the above teams (including the captain and the coach) are kindly requested to be present at the specific time outside of the building.
Please make sure that you wear your badge and national uniform.
Maria Plubi
EBL Photographer


## Norway v Italy - Round 8 Schools

## The Flat Boards Were the Most Enjoyable

Both these teams were stuck in mid-table and needed some big wins quickly if they were to get into a medal position. A nice result here would improve the chances for either team. In this match, we truly enjoyed the flat boards rather than the swings. We considered displaying only pushes from this match for a change, but as a matter of a fact only one swing will follow.



Erlend Skjetne, Norway

| West <br> Skjetne | North <br> Mistretta | East <br> Simonsen | South <br> Di Franco |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1 / 8$ | Dble |
| Pass | $1 Q$ | Pass | $3 \mathbf{3}$ |

## All Pass

Neither player in North's seat was tempted to pass I $\varnothing$, so there were not many other options than to bid I4. Now South, Massimiliano di Franco's 3s might be found in the school book of bridge, but on this very board his opponent in the other room, Lars Arthur Johansen was more successful when he went for game.
At both tables East led the ace of hearts then switched to a diamond. Two rounds of hearts might disturb declarer, but the play would be quite straightforward due to the lie of the cards. The Norwegian N/S pair scored +620 and the Italian +170 and that was 10 IMPs to Norway.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- 14
$\bigcirc 632$
$\diamond 742$
\&KJ632

$$
A 8
$$

$\vee K Q 7$
$\diamond K J 983$
$\& 1074$

\& KQ76532
©AJ9
$\diamond A$ Q 5
a-

- 109
-10854
$\triangleleft 106$
\& A Q 985

| West <br> De Marco | North Bogen | East <br> Montanari | South Johansen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 2\%* | Dble |
| 2 ${ }^{*}$ | 3\% | 4\% | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 79 | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Skjetne | Mistretta | Simonsen | Di Franco |


| $1 \diamond$ |  |  | Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $3 \triangleq$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 N T$ | Pass |
| $5 \%$ | Dble | $7 \boldsymbol{2}$ | All Pass |

De Marco/Montinari solved this board easily enough. 2e asked for the length in spades and $2 \checkmark$ denied three. By bidding $4 \%$ diamonds was agreed as trumps. Montinari knew his partner held a balanced hand with two spades, therefore he could tell that 44
was a cuebid for the ace. 4NT asked for the aces and $5 \triangleleft$ showed two aces out of five, still with diamonds as trumps. Now Montinari thought he had all necessary information, thus he jumped to 74. The grand was cold; $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+2210$.

Did you read Thursday's bulletin, where the Norwegian pair, Johansen/Bogen made 7s doubled when three aces were missing? Well, here it was the other Norwegian pair who landed on their feet. 24 was $15+$ with six spades or more; 3s showed trump support then two cuebids followed; 4NT asked for aces and $5 \%$ showed one or four out of five. When Mistretta doubled 5\% Fredrik Simonsen was quite confident that West held the ace of trumps rather than the ace of clubs, thus he bid $7 \boldsymbol{4}$. When no one doubled he was even surer.
"You are just too lucky; I just had the king of clubs", complained Eugenio Mistretta, when declarer claimed at trick one.
Simonsen could have used Exclusion Blackwood in this situation, as the Norwegian pair uses this convention, but Simonsen wasn't completely convinced if his partner would remember it.
No swing on this board, and halfway through the match the score had moved onto 20-II in favour of Norway.
What do you lead from this hand, if your right hand opponent opens 3NT (gambling) in first position and all pass?


It is obvious that East has gambled with a long diamond suit. Do you lead the ace of clubs, to see the dummy, or do you prefer something more exotic? Make your decision first, then read on.

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

| - A 9 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢KJ32 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J 63 |  |  |  |
| - K 862 |  |  |  |
| - KQ832 | N |  | - 5 |
| $\bigcirc$ A 875 |  |  | 8104$\triangle A K Q 9542$ |
| $\checkmark 1087$ | W | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 9 Q |  |  | $\diamond$ AKQ 9542 d J 75 |
|  | J10764 |  |  |
|  | PQ96 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ - |  |  |
| - A 10943 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| De Marco | Bogen | Montanari | Johansen |
| Skjetne | Mistretta | Simonsen | Di Franco |
|  |  | 3NT | All Pass |

As you can see, the winning answer to our question above was to lead a low club. A spade might lead to the goal if North wins, then cashes the king of clubs and plays on clubs, while a heart lead or switch after the ace of clubs also defeats the contract. Did you find the killing lead?
Johansen led the jack of spades, to queen and ace at his table. North found the switch - but in hearts; 3NT just made for +400 . Di Franco tried the ace of clubs and continued in clubs when he got a positive signal from his partner. North could win the club ace but declarer now had his nine tricks; +400 and no swing. The result in the match was $49-27$ to Norway; 20-IO VPs.

## Disaster Corner

## By Jean-Francois Jourdain (Belgium)

Thursday, July the $21^{\text {st }}$, is the national day in Belgium, so many of you were not a bit surprised when our team arrived in the morning carrying the national flag. It seems as though the gods of the calendar gave us a wink, since on this single day we had to face the two bottom teams, Scotland and Lithuania. This last match was a success (and cost me a fourth bottle of champagne when we scored our only 25 of the tournament), but before that I had a very painful morning when Scotland won by a resounding 25-4. To put things clearly, we simply committed suicide on a string of deals, playing unmakeable games or refusing to bid them when they were ice cold. So after missing three games in a row, Pieter Vanparijs tried to force destiny and earned a well-deserved place in the Disaster Corner.

Round 16. Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

|  | ¢ 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AKQ 96 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 64 |  |
|  | \& K 974 |  |
| - A 852 | N | - K 1063 |
| $\bigcirc 10543$ |  | ¢J82 |
| $\checkmark 95$ | W E | $\checkmark$ AJ 83 |
| - 183 | S | - A 2 |
|  | - QJ 97 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 7$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 1072 |  |
|  | \& Q 1065 |  |

After Els Toutenel opened I $\varangle$ with the North hand, Pieter responded 14, then over $2 \%$ invited game with the ugly overbid of 2 NT. When Els accepted that and Phil Morrison for Scotland started with the 2 , he missed the chance to get things right, as double dummy you can make this very thin contract.
Frazer Morgan rose with the ace after some thought, and switched to the W. With only six tricks in the bag, Vanparijs needed something very lucky to happen and could have tried his luck with the $\$ 9$, developing a trick in this suit. After all, when you do not do so, you rely on the 3-3 diamond break and you need to finesse the $\diamond$ J as well, so a finesse in spades (or a defensive mistake by playing a second round of spades, for example) seems your best chance. But Pieter was afraid to go down immediately and put up the queen. Now he was doomed to down one, since the diamonds did not break. Simply to play a neutral club, or even a heart, should have been enough for the defence. But Morrison had some commiseration for declarer and decided to give him a last chance by putting the $\diamond 9$ on the table. Now Pieter Vanparijs had still a winning line by covering with the queen and taking the deep finesse in diamonds, crushing the $\diamond 5$ with the six and scoring his four! But he let it run to his ten, and since the hearts had the very bad idea not to be $\vee \mathrm{JlOx}$ in one hand, he finally went one down. Scotland scored 5 further IMPS, on the way to their first maximum score of the tournament.

## Latvia v Netherlands - Round 9 Schools

Latvia lay second, trailing leaders Israel by 9 VP , going into this match, while the Netherlands were in mid-table. Although they could not know this, of course, Israel were to lose to Denmark by 12-18 in this round, so Latvia needed 22 VPs to lead on their own, 21 to tie with Israel.
Our first exhibit is a well-played push.

| Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -10865 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 4$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J107542 |  |  |  |
| Q $\mathrm{Q}^{5}$ |  |  |  |
| - K 97 | N |  |  |
| QQ6532 | W E |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ Q 93 |  |  |  |
| -9 9 | $S$ |  | 08762 |
|  | - A Q 2 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AKJIO |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK 8 |  |  |
|  | ¢ KJ3 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Michielsen | P Bethers | De Pagter | Lorencs |
|  |  | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3n | Pass | 38 |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |
| West | North | $\underset{\text { East }}{\substack{\text { Eethers } \\ \\ \text { Pass }}}$ | South |
| Balasovs | Verbeek |  | Hop |
|  |  | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3\% | Dble | 3 - |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Both Souths opened with a strong artificial bid and eventually declared 3NT.
Marion Michielsen led a heart into declarer's suit because nothing else looked to be any more attractive. Martins Lorencs won the $\S \mathrm{J}$ and played three rounds of diamonds. Michielsen followed Vincent De Pagter's discards and switched to the nine of clubs for the queen and ace and back came a heart. Lorencs won the $\bigcirc$ A, cashed the club winners and played king then ten of hearts, leaving Michielsen to lead into the spade tenace to give the ninth trick; +600.
Jurijs Balasov led a club in response to Janis Bethers' double of the 32 enquiry. That was covered by the queen and ace and Bethers switched to a heart. Jacco Hop rose with the heart ace and cashed the top diamonds, then the club winners, before exiting with his third diamond. Balasov won the diamond and returned a heart to the jack. Two more rounds of hearts put him back on play and he too had to lead into the spade tenace; nine tricks for +600 and no swing.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- K 108742
-KQ752
$\diamond$ Q 9
- J 9
$\checkmark$ A 10
$\diamond 10853$
\& AK 1085

- Q 6
© J 4
$\diamond$ AKJ 7
\& J 6432
- A 53

ค9863
642
Q 97

| West <br> Michielsen | North P Bethers | East De Pagter | South Lorencs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \%$ | $1 \diamond$ | 24. | Pass |
| 3\% | 3 | Dble | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Balasovs | Verbeek | J Bethers | Hop |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ | 2NT | 3 |
| Pass | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |



Janis Bethers, Latvia

Both Norths showed the major two-suiter with their initial calls. Peteris Bethers then competed at the three level on his own and that convinced his partner to go on to 4 万 over 3NT a big winning decision, as it turned out, with 3 NT cold unless a spade is led, plus, $4 \checkmark$ doubled proved to be a very nice contract indeed. De Pagter cashed a top diamond then switched to a club, ruffed. Short of dummy entries, Bethers led a heart honour from hand, lost a diamond, then ruffed the next lead, laid down the remaining heart honour, and tested the spades. When they too divided evenly, he had ten tricks for a rather nice +590 .
At the other table, Hop competed with 3 but North, Tim Verbeek did not go on to 4 §. Four Diamonds should have been made after the lead of the king of hearts. Balasovs won the heart and played a diamond to the ace. Now he tried a club and when that was ruffed there were four tricks for the defence; down one for-100. When North shows a major two-suiter, there is no reason to try to cross to hand to try a diamond finesse, so declarer should just play diamonds from the top and hope for the best; still IO IMPs to Latvia.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- K 42
-A 53
$\diamond$ KJ 8
* A Q J 6
- 9765
- Q 86
$\diamond$ A 73
-K 84


Tim Verbeek, The Netherlands

| West <br> Michielsen | North P Bethers | East <br> De Pagter | South <br> Lorencs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 19 | $3 \diamond$ | 34 |
| $4 \diamond$ | 4NT | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | 5NT |
| Pass | 64 | All Pass |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Balasovs | Verbeek | J Bethers | Hop |
| Pass | 19 | 3 - | 34 |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 44 | All Pass |  |

The Dutch E/W pair made life as difficult as they could for their opponents by competing to the five level, but Lorencs was prepared to believe that his opponents must have most of the diamond honours and so was willing to drive to slam when facing a partner who could ask for key cards. Six Spades was easy after the ace of diamonds lead. Lorencs ruffed and drew all the trumps then took a successful club finesse. He continued with ace of hearts and a heart to the jack and queen. Back came a diamond but Lorencs could win the king and cash out, via a second club finesse; +980.
The Latvian E/W pair allowed their opponents more room in which to explore the hand and, after one cuebid each, the Dutch settled for game; +480 but II IMPs to Latvia.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

```
                                    @ K
คA10864
\(\diamond A\) Q 1098
\& 32
```



| West <br> Michielsen | North P Bethers | East <br> De Pagter | South Lorencs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 19 | 24 | Dble | 3\% |
| Dble | 3 | Pass | $3 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Balasovs | Verbeek | J Bethers | Hop |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 19 | 2 | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Dble | All Pass |

Bethers showed a two-suiter and for a second time his side declared a doubled contract, again with great success. Lorencs ducked the trump lead to De Pagter's jack and back came a spade. Lorencs rose with the ace, crashing dummy's king, then
threw a club on the spade queen. Next he took the diamond finesse and, when that worked so well, continued with four more rounds of diamonds, throwing spades from hand. Now he exited with a club, ruffed the club return and exited with a low trump to endplay East, who had to lead into the ace-ten of hearts at trick twelve to concede the overtrick; nicely played for +930 .
Verbeek made a simple overcall then raised himself to game on getting support from Hop. He too was doubled and received a spade lead.Verbeek won the spade ace and threw a club on the queen of spades. Next he played a diamond to the king and ace before exiting with a low club to the king.Verbeek ruffed the club continuation and cashed the queen of diamonds. He must have liked what he saw and just cashed the ace of trumps, after which he played on diamonds for one down;-200 and 15 IMPs to Latvia.
Had Verbeek tried ducking a heart instead of cashing the ace, Janis Bethers could have won and exited with a diamond. Declarer can play out the diamonds but East ruffs the fifth round and still has a third club with which to get off play so comes to a third trump trick in the ending for down one.

|  | 11. Dealer So | None Vul. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - 987 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AJ952 |  |
|  | 2 Q 843 |  |
| - 2 | N | - AKQJ 6 |
| $\bigcirc 1075$ |  | - KQ983 |
| $\diamond$ K Q 64 | W E | $\diamond-$ |
| \& KJ1095 | S | - 762 |
|  | -10543 |  |
|  | Q AJ 62 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 10873$ |  |
|  | 4 A |  |


| West <br> Michielsen | North P Bethers | East De Pagter | South Lorencs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Balasovs | Verbeek | J Bethers | Hop |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 2\%(i) | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Dble |

## All Pass

(i) Strong and artificial or weak with diamonds.

Both Easts declared the heart game. Lorencs cashed his ace of clubs then switched to a diamond for the king, ace and ruff. De Pagter played the $\vee \mathrm{K}$, ducked, then the $\vee \mathbf{Q}$ to the ace. Lorencs led a diamond to dummy's queen and declarer started on the spades. De Pagter cashed all five spades, Lorencs correctly not ruffing the fifth round. Now, had he pitched all four clubs from the dummy, he would have been in a position to ruff the club loser and there would have been nothing South could have done to beat the contract. Alas, De Pagter threw one diamond away
before spotting what he needed to be doing, and now there was no way to shut South's little heart out of the game; down one for - 50 .
Hop led a diamond at trick one, the ace being once again ruffed out. Bethers led the $\vee Q$ to the ace and threw a club on the queen of diamonds continuation then played five rounds of spades, being sure that the trumps had to be four-one for the double. Hop did not ruff the fifth spade, throwing a diamond. Now a club to his ace left him powerless to take more than one more trump trick; +590 and I2 IMPs to Latvia.
At this stage Latvia looked to be on course for a maximum win but, to their credit, the Dutch team came back well in the last few boards, aided by an unnecessary - 1400 by the Latvian N/S pair who, having made +590 and +930 already in the set probably thought they could walk on water - they were mistaken.

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


Bethers simply raised to game and the spade lead, ducked, and spade continuation, swiftly put paid to that contract; down two for - 200.
Verbeek bid 2 to invite game and, when Hop doubled, takeout in context of having already shown a balanced hand with a spade stopper, tried $4 \AA$, converted by Hop to show the red suits. Four Diamonds was a nice contract. Hop won the spade lead and played three rounds of clubs, throwing his spade loser as East ruffed with the bare ace. Hop ruffed the spade return and played king and another diamond. Balasovs won the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ and exited with his last diamond. Hop won in dummy, cashed the club winner and had just one heart to lose; +130 and 8 IMPs to Netherlands.
Latvia ran out winners by $58-30 \mathrm{IMPs}$, converting to $21-9 \mathrm{VPs}$, to move into a tie for the lead with Israel.

## IIth Red Sea International Bridge Festival

## Eilat - Israel

13-20 November 2005

## Program :

Sunday November 13th :
Monday November 14th :
Tuesday November 15h :
Wednesday November 16th :
Thursday November 17th :
Friday November 18th :
Saturday November 19th :

National Simultaneous Pairs
IMP Pairs Session I
IMP Pairs Session 2
Get Together Cocktail, Official Opening Ceremony
Open Pairs Session I
Open Pairs Session 2
Invitational Tournament
Open Pairs Session 3
Distribution of prizes
Teams Session I
Teams Session 2
Cocktail \& Distribution of Prizes

There will also be extra bridge events every morning, and social gatherings with snacks and cocktails every day. David Birman and the organizing committee are glad to invite the winners of the 2005 European Junior Bridge Championship to this festival. These players will receive free accommodation and entries.

## Contact Information :

David Birman, 50 Pinkas St. Tel Aviv, Israel.
Tel : 972-3-6058355 Fax : 972-3-5465582 Email : Birmand@inter.net.il
The Israeli teams are available here for more information.


## SCHOOLS BUTLER AFTER II ROUNDS



## JUNIORS BUTLER AFTER 20 ROUNDS

| 1 | Ferrari Fr | ITA | 1.43 | 160 | 65 | Damaso Nu | POR | 0.01 | 280 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | Sangiorgio A | ITA | 1.43 | 160 | - | Pratas Pe | POR | 0.01 | 280 |
| 3 | Jerolistch S | AUT | 1.01 | 180 | 67 | Serea Ga | ROM | 0.00 | 280 |
| 4 | Kalita Ja | POL | 0.92 | 320 | 68 | Drijer Bo | NET | -0.03 | 259 |
| 5 | Marjai Pe | HUN | 0.88 | 320 | - | Tammens Ba | NET | -0.03 | 259 |
|  | Minarik Ga | HUN | 0.88 | 320 | 70 | Beran VI | CZE | -0.04 | 280 |
| 7 | DiBello St | ITA | 0.83 | 400 | 71 | Johansson Pa | SWE | -0.05 | 300 |
|  | LoPresti Fa | ITA | 0.83 | 400 |  | Morin He | SWE | -0.05 | 300 |
| 9 | Ringseth JA | NOR | 0.82 | 260 | 73 | Schaltz Ma | DEN | -0.07 | 380 |
| 10 | Kotorowicz K | POL | 0.81 | 340 |  | Doxiadis Ko | GRE | -0.07 | 380 |
| 11 | Bessis Th | FRA | 0.80 | 340 |  | Karamanlis M | GRE | -0.07 | 380 |
|  | Gaviard Ju | FRA | 0.80 | 340 | 76 | Seker BD | TUR | -0.09 | 300 |
| 13 | Araszkiewicz | POL | 0.79 | 399 |  | Ucan OI | TUR | -0.09 | 300 |
|  | Buras Kr | POL | 0.79 | 399 |  | Gjaldbaek Ka | DEN | -0.09 | 380 |
| 15 | Ginossar El | ISR | 0.73 | 379 | 79 | Eglseer We | AUT | -0.10 | 400 |
|  | Reshef Op | ISR | 0.73 | 379 | 80 | Malmstrom Pe | SWE | -0.13 | 280 |
| 17 | Eide EA | NOR | 0.72 | 260 |  | Salomonsson | SWE | -0.13 | 280 |
| 18 | Lindquist Es | NOR | 0.71 | 280 | 82 | Kontomitros | GRE | -0.16 | 379 |
| 19 | Berg Er | NOR | 0.63 | 280 | 8 | Vroustis Va | GRE | -0.16 | 379 |
| 20 | Soderlund Ro | SWE | 0.61 | 220 | 84 | Anter SM | TUR | -0.22 | 180 |
|  | Thalen Bj | SWE | 0.61 | 220 |  | Bakan HG | TUR | -0.22 | 180 |
| 22 | Azizi Ad | ISR | 0.59 | 240 | 86 | Balint Mi | ROM | -0.29 | 260 |
|  | Byrne Mi | ENG | 0.59 | 300 |  | Lazar CL | ROM | -0.29 | 260 |
|  | Morris AI | ENG | 0.59 | 300 | 88 | Owczarek Pi | AUT | -0.35 | 400 |
| 25 | DeDonder St | BEL | 0.51 | 400 |  | Schulz Di | AUT | -0.35 | 400 |
|  | DeRoos St | BEL | 0.51 | 400 |  | Kopecky Mi | CZE | -0.35 | 260 |
| 27 | BarYossef Yo | ISR | 0.50 | 220 | 91 | Barzda Sa | LIT | -0.40 | 260 |
| 28 | Groenenboom | NET | 0.47 | 260 | 92 | Morgan Fr | SCO | -0.42 | 300 |
|  | Molenaar Da | NET | 0.47 | 260 |  | Morrison Ph | SCO | -0.42 | 300 |
| 30 | Houlberg AS Houlberg Si | DEN | 0.46 0.46 | 160 160 | 94 | KulovicProbs | CRO | -0.43 | 280 |
| 32 | Houlberg Si Eide Pe | DEN | 0.46 0.40 | 160 260 |  | Martinovic S | CRO | -0.43 | 280 |
|  | Munnen An | NET | 0.40 | 280 | 96 | Macura Mi | CZE | -0.44 | 320 |
|  | Ritmeijer Ri | NET | 0.40 | 280 | 97 | Barbosa Ja | POR | -0.46 | 260 |
| 35 | Woodcock An | ENG | 0.37 | 219 |  | ${ }_{\text {Palma }}$ An | POR | -0.46 -0.48 | 260 |
|  | Burgess OI | ENG | 0.37 | 219 | 99 100 | Blazevicius Bielskis An | LIT | -0.48 -0.51 | 300 |
| 37 | Nyaradi ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | HUN | 0.26 | 240 | 101 | Bielskis An |  |  | 300 |
|  | Nyaradi Zs | HUN | 0.26 | 240 | 101 102 | Korkevicius Brikmane Li | LIT | -0.54 -0.55 | 300 |
| 39 | Braga Ra | POR | 0.25 | 260 | 102 | Vrikmane ${ }^{\text {Vi }}$ | LAT | -0.55 | 220 |
|  | Braga Ri | POR | 0.25 | 260 |  | Veksa Na GomezHierro | SPA | -0.55 | 220 |
| 41 | Birman AI | ISR | 0.24 | 200 | 104 | SunolTorres | SPA | -0.58 -0.58 | 260 |
|  | ${ }^{\text {Bessis Ol }}$ | FRA FRA | 0.24 0.24 | 240 240 | 106 | Pojman Mi | CZE | -0.61 | 239 |
| 44 | Dalkilic Ba | TUR | 0.21 | 319 | 107 | Toutenel El | BEL | -0.66 | 180 |
| - | Eskizara Om | TUR | 0.21 | 319 |  | Vanparijs Pi | BEL | -0.66 | 180 |
|  | Houmoller Jo | DEN | 0.21 | 260 | 109 | Pisa Zb | CZE | -0.70 | 319 |
| 47 | Livgard AI | NOR | 0.20 | 260 | 110 | Brguljan Ka | CRO | -0.77 | 300 |
| 48 | Nielsen La | DEN | 0.17 | 260 |  | Kazalicki Ma | CRO | -0.77 | 280 |
| 49 | Neimanis Ja | LAT | 0.14 | 379 | 112 | Ellison My | SCO | -0.83 | 300 |
|  | Rubins Ka | LAT | 0.14 | 379 |  | Wilkinson AI | SCO | -0.83 | 320 |
| 51 | Chauvelot Ni | FRA | 0.12 | 220 | 114 | Baronaite Mo | LIT | -0.91 | 220 |
|  | Thibault Ma | FRA | 0.12 | 220 | 115 | Mandruta Co | ROM | -0.94 | 280 |
| 53 | Honyek An | HUN | 0.10 | 239 | 116 | EscaleraGuer | SPA | -0.95 | 259 |
|  | Szabo Cs | HUN | 0.10 | 239 |  | LedesmaPique | SPA | -0.95 | 259 |
| 55 | Argelazi El | ISR | 0.09 | 180 | 118 | Vulcan Bo | ROM | -0.96 | 260 |
| 56 | GodedMerino | SPA | 0.05 | 280 | 119 | Jogun Ni | CRO | -0.98 | 240 |
| - | Goncalves Pe | SPA | 0.05 | 280 | 120 | Vukic Go | CRO | -1.00 | 220 |
|  | Guiot Be | BEL | 0.05 | 220 | 121 | Gruber Ch | AUT | -1.01 | 220 |
|  | Hubert Al | BEL | 0.05 | 220 | 122 | Laukus La | LAT | -1.16 | 200 |
|  | Green Be | ENG | 0.05 | 280 | - | Movsovics Le | LAT | -1.16 | 200 |
|  | Happer Du | ENG | 0.05 | 280 | 124 | Vainikonis E | LIT | -1.20 | 220 |
| 62 | Moraru Co | ROM | 0.04 | 260 | 125 | Pearson Go | SCO | -1.29 | 200 |
| 63 | Boldrini An | ITA | 0.03 | 240 | 126 | Ellison Gy | SCO | -1.33 | 180 |
| - | Sbarigia Ma | ITA | 0.03 | 240 | 127 | Sigmund Ma | CZE | -1.42 | 180 |

