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## Bulletin 7

# IT'S A BLUE DAY 



Does this remind you of your partner?
Wednesday belonged to the Blues in the Junior Series. Italy, The Azzuri, strengthened their position at the top of the rankings with 60 VP on the day, despite losing 10-20 to Czech Republic in Round 14. Meanwhile France, Les Bleus, had a perfect day, 75 VPs out of 75 , to move up from tenth to sixth in the standings. Italy now leads with 295 VPs from Netherlands 285.5, Poland 270, Germany and Norway 268 and France 260.
In the Schools Championship, Poland scored 58 VPs from three matches against other teams in the top half of the field: 25-4 against Bulgaria, 16-14 against Germany, and I7-13 against England. The biggest total for the day, however, was achieved by Latvia, who took 25 against both Sweden and Wales plus 15 against Italy to score 65 and move up four places in the overall rankings. Poland leads with I47 VPs from England I32, Sweden I27, Bulgaria II8.5, Denmark II6 and Israel II4.
TEAM
PHOTOGRAPHS
Today it is the turn of the
following teams to have
their photographs taken
for the EBL database.
Would the captains
please ensure that all
present of the team plus the npc are
Palace as follows: front door of the


## VUGRAPH

 MATCHESNetherlands - France (Juniors)<br>10.00<br>Norway - Italy (Juniors) 14.00<br>Germany - Bulgaria (Schools)<br>17.30

Palazzo co Turismo
$\Psi$

FourSeasons


## JUNIOR TEAMS



## ROUND 13

|  |  | Match | IMP's | VP's |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| I | GREECE | AUSTRIA | $53-54$ | $15-15$ |
| 2 | SCOTLAND | NORWAY | $42-36$ | $16-14$ |
| 3 | LATVIA | FRANCE | $7-55$ | $5-25$ |
| 4 | TURKEY | NETHERLANDS | $47-62$ | $12-18$ |
| 5 | CROATIA | PORTUGAL | $40-53$ | $12-18$ |
| 6 | SLOVAKIA | ITALY | $17-78$ | $3-25$ |
| 7 | SWEDEN | GERMANY | $19-86$ | $2-25$ |
| 8 | ROMANIA | RUSSIA | $34-77$ | $6-24$ |
| 9 | CZECH REPUBLIC | DENMARK | $34-48$ | $12-18$ |
| IO BELGIUM | HUNGARY | $5 I-23$ | $2 I-9$ |  |
| II ENGLAND | POLAND | $34-33$ | $15-15$ |  |


| I | CZECH REPUBLIC | GREECE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | BELGIUM | ROMANIA |
| 3 | ENGLAND | SWEDEN |
| 4 | POLAND | SLOVAKIA |
| 5 | HUNGARY | CROATIA |
| 6 | DENMARK | TURKEY |
| 7 | RUSSIA | LATVIA |
| 8 | GERMANY | SCOTLAND |
| 9 | ITALY | AUSTRIA |
| IO | PORTUGAL | NORWAY |
| II | NETHERLANDS | FRANCE |

## ROUND 14

| Match |  |  |  | IMP's |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | ---: |
| VP's |  |  |  |  |
| I | HUNGARY | GREECE | $49-49$ | $15-15$ |
| 2 | DENMARK | POLAND | $44-42$ | $15-15$ |
| 3 | RUSSIA | ENGLAND | $35-38$ | $14-16$ |
| 4 | GERMANY | BELGIUM | $45-55$ | $13-17$ |
| 5 | ITALY | CZECH REPUBLIC | $24-50$ | $10-20$ |
| 6 | PORTUGAL | ROMANIA | $32-59$ | $9-21$ |
| 7 | NETHERLANDS | SWEDEN | $5 I-17$ | $22-8$ |
| 8 | FRANCE | SLOVAKIA | $78-15$ | $25-3$ |
| 9 | NORWAY | CROATIA | $4 I-30$ | $17-13$ |
| IO AUSTRIA | TURKEY | $17-65$ | $5-25$ |  |
| II SCOTLAND | LATVIA | $31-64$ | $8-22$ |  |


|  |  | ROUND |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I | GREECE | NETHERLANDS |
| 2 | FRANCE | PORTUGAL |
| 3 | NORWAY | ITALY |
| 4 | AUSTRIA | GERMANY |
| 5 | SCOTLAND | RUSSIA |
| 6 | LATVIA | DENMARK |
| 7 | TURKEY | HUNGARY |
| 8 | CROATIA | POLAND |
| 9 | SLOVAKIA | ENGLAND |
| IO | SWEDEN | BELGIUM |
| II | ROMANIA | CZECH REPUBLIC |


| ROUND 15 |  |  | ROUND 18 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Matc |  | IMP's VP's | 1 | DENMARK | GREECE |
| I GREECE | SCOTLAND | 56-36 19-11 | 2 | RUSSIA | HUNGARY |
| 2 LATVIA | AUSTRIA | 98-16 25-0 | 3 | GERMANY | POLAND |
| 3 TURKEY | NORWAY | 68-57-17-13 | 4 | ITALY | ENGLAND |
| 4 CROATIA | FRANCE | 35-84 5-25 | 5 | PORTUGAL | BELGIUM |
| 5 SLOVAKIA | NETHERLANDS | 23-113 $00-25$ | 6 | NETHERLANDS | CZECH REPUBLIC |
| 6 SWEDEN | PORTUGAL | 53-75 10-20 | 7 | FRANCE | ROMANIA |
| 7 ROMANIA | ITALY | 16-136 $0-25$ | 8 |  |  |
| 8 CZECH REPUBLIC | GERMANY | 43-92-5-25 | 8 | NORWAY | SLOVAKIA |
| 9 BELGIUM | RUSSIA | 83-63 19-11 | 9 | AUSTRIA | SLOVAKIA |
| 10 ENGLAND | DENMARK | 32-68 8-22 | 10 | SCOTLAND | CROATIA |
| 11 POLAND | HUNGARY | 80-14 25-2 | 11 | LATVIA | TURKEY |

## SCHOOLS TEAMS


RESULTS


| ROUND 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Match |  |  |  |  |  | IMP's | VP's |
| I | LATVIA | SWEDEN | $83-34$ | $25-5$ |  |  |  |
| 2 | DENMARK | HUNGARY | $26-38$ | $13-17$ |  |  |  |
| 3 | NETHERLANDS | CZECH REPUBLIC | $42-28$ | $18-12$ |  |  |  |
| 4 | TURKEY | FRANCE | $31-65$ | $8-22$ |  |  |  |
| 5 | ENGLAND | ISRAEL | $11-49$ | $7-23$ |  |  |  |
| 6 | ITALY | NORWAY | $34-73$ | $7-23$ |  |  |  |
| 7 | POLAND | BULGARIA | $82-27$ | $25-4$ |  |  |  |
| 8 | WALES | GERMANY | $7-100$ | $0-25$ |  |  |  |

## ROUND 6

|  |  | Match | IMP's | VP's |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| I | WALES | LATVIA | $13-110$ | $0-25$ |
| 2 | GERMANY | POLAND | $46-51$ | $14-16$ |
| 3 | BULGARIA | ITALY | $60-26$ | $22-8$ |
| 4 | NORWAY | ENGLAND | $27-65$ | $7-23$ |
| 5 | ISRAEL | TURKEY | $53-17$ | $22-8$ |
| 6 | FRANCE | NETHERLANDS | $40-49$ | $13-17$ |
| 7 | CZECH REPUBLIC | DENMARK | $34-62$ | $8-21$ |
| 8 | HUNGARY | SWEDEN | $37-37$ | $15-15$ |


| ROUND 7 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | Match |  |  |  |
| I | LATVIA | ITALY | IMP's | VP's |
| 2 | POLAND | ENGLAND | $38-38$ | $15-13$ |
| 3 | WALES | TURKEY | $22-107$ | $17-13$ |
| 4 | GERMANY | NETHERLANDS | $70-65$ | $16-14$ |
| 5 | BULGARIA | DENMARK | $59-79$ | $11-19$ |
| 6 | NORWAY | SWEDEN | $42-63$ | $11-19$ |
| 7 | ISRAEL | HUNGARY | $34-65$ | $9-21$ |
| 8 | FRANCE | CZECH REPUBLIC | $57-49$ | $16-14$ |


|  | TODAY'S PROGRAM |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUND 8 |  |  |
| I | FRANCE | LATVIA |
| 2 | CZECH REPUBLIC | ISRAEL |
| 3 | HUNGARY | NORWAY |
| 4 | SWEDEN | BULGARIA |
| 5 | DENMARK | GERMANY |
| 6 | NETHERLANDS | WALES |
| 7 | TURKEY | POLAND |
|  | ENGLAND | ITALY |

## Today's Schedule

10.00 Schools Teams, Round 8
10.00 Junior Teams, Round 16
14.00 Schools Teams, Round 9
14.00 Junior Teams, Round 17
17.30 Schools Teams, Round 10
17.30 Junior Teams, Round I8

## ROUND 9

| I | LATVIA | HUNGARY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | SWEDEN | CZECH REPUBLIC |
| 3 | DENMARK | FRANCE |
| 4 | NETHERLANDS | ISRAEL |
| 5 | TURKEY | NORWAY |
| 6 | ENGLAND | BULGARIA |
| 7 | ITALY | GERMANY |
| 8 | POLAND | WALES |

## ROUND 10

| I | DENMARK | LATVIA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | NETHERLANDS | SWEDEN |
| 3 | TURKEY | HUNGARY |
| 4 | ENGLAND | CZECH REPUBLIC |
| 5 | ITALY | FRANCE |
| 6 | POLAND | ISRAEL |
| 7 | WALES | NORWAY |
| 8 | GERMANY | BULGARIA |


| SAVE WNATER! |
| :--- | :--- |
| A lot of half-full water bottles are left <br> lying around the playing area each day. |
| This is a terrible waste and our supplies <br> will run out if it continues. <br> Please, you are very welcome to take <br> water, but take it with you and finish it, <br> don't waste it. |
| and |

## JUNIOR TEAMS

## RANKING AFTER ROUND /5

| I ITALY | 295 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2 NETHERLANDS | 285,5 |
| 3 POLAND | 270 |
| 4 GERMANY | 268 |
| NORWAY | 268 |
| 6 FRANCE | 260 |
| 7 RUSSIA | 247 |
| 8 DENMARK | 232 |
| 9 LATVIA | 230 |
| 10 ENGLAND | 225,5 |
| II SWEDEN | 216,5 |
| 12 TURKEY | 213 |
| 13 BELGIUM | 211,5 |
| 14 CZECH REPUBLIC | 209 |
| 15 CROATIA | 200 |
| 16 HUNGARY | 196 |
| 17 GREECE | 189 |
| I8 SCOTLAND | 184 |
| 19 PORTUGAL | 170 |
| 20 ROMANIA | 144 |
| 21 SLOVAKIA | 139,5 |
| 22 AUSTRIA |  |

SCHOOLS TEAMS

## RANKINGAFTER ROUND 7

| 1 POLAND | 147 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2 ENGLAND | 132 |
| 3 SWEDEN | 127 |
| 4 BULGARIA | 1186 |
| 5 DENMARK | 114 |
| 6 ISRAEL | 113,5 |
| 7 GERMANY | 112 |
| 8 LATVIA | 105 |
| 9 FRANCE | 102 |
| IO NORWAY | 91 |
| 11 ITALY | 85,5 |
| 12 TURKEY | 85 |
| 13 CZECH REPUBLIC | 82 |
| 14 HUNGARY | 78 |
| 15 NETHERLANDS | 2 |
| 16 WALES |  |

## Insufficient Bid Laws

David Burn, many-time English international player and coach, sent this regarding the article in yesterday's bulletin about new ways to lose IMPs.
Just read an article in the bulletin from Jesolo, which you will find on page 17 of Bulletin 6.
This was part of the auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \diamond$ | $2 \bowtie$ | Dble | $2 N T$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | $4 \Phi$ | 4 |  |

The article says that, if South had not accepted this bid and 4s had been passed out, East would have led a diamond, won by West. Declarer could then have required West to lead a heart.
The Laws say this:

## 27B. Insufficient Bid Not Accepted

2. Conventional, or Corrected by Any Other Sufficient Bid or Pass.
If either the insufficient bid or the lowest sufficient bid in the same denomination may have been conventional or if the bid is corrected by any other sufficient bid or by a pass, (penalty) the offender's partner must pass whenever it is his turn to call (apply Law IOCI and see Law 23 when the pass damages the non-offending side; and the lead penalties of Law 26 may apply).

## 26A. Call Related to Specific Suit

If the withdrawn call related to a specified suit or suits and I. Suit Specified
if that suit was specified by the same player, there is no lead penalty, but see Law I6C.
2. Suit Not Specified
if that suit was not specified in the legal auction by the same player, then declarer may (penalty) either require the offender's partner to lead the specified suit (or one particular specified suit) at his first turn to lead, including the opening lead, or prohibit offender's partner from leading the specified suit (or one particular specified suit) at his first turn to lead, including the opening lead, such prohibition to continue for as long as offender's partner retains the lead.
"In what circumstances does East's double of 2 (a takeout double) 'specify' hearts? If it promises at least four of them? If he 'normally has at least four of them'? If West will always bid them with four?"

I am not an expert on the intent behind the law, however, my opinion is that even if the double promised four hearts it does not specify hearts in the sense that I would intend or understand by the meaning of the word specify. The disallowed $4 \checkmark$ bid showed a clear preference for hearts and gave a definite message about that suit, while the double was merely a general takeout call and gave little more information about hearts than would have, say, a INT opening bid (after which the lead penalties would certainly have applied). It did not specify a distinct preference for hearts so gave hugely different information about that suit to the $4 \checkmark$ bid, and so the full weight of the law on leadpenalties should apply.
What do you think? (Ed.)

## Another story

by GeO Tislevoll

This interesting board was shown on BBO, but a mistake that arose because of a lost connection for some seconds gave the impression that something else had happened than the real story. For once the commentators were a bit too quick when they praised South for his defence.

Round 9. Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

|  | ¢ 10653 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 5 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q 10 |  |
|  | \% J 1096 |  |
| ¢ K 987 | N | - A Q 4 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q J 103 |  | $\bigcirc$ K 9876 |
| $\diamond 3$ |  | $\diamond$ J 9 |
| 97542 | S | 2 K Q 8 |
|  | ¢ 12 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 42$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 876542 |  |
|  | \& A 3 |  |

Ivar Berg (East) and Tor Ove Reistad for Norway bid to Four Hearts without the opponents entering the bidding. A club lead would beat the game if North takes the first trump and gives South a club ruff. Also, a diamond lead to the ace and club switch will result in the Norwegians going down. But after a diamond lead to the ace, North continued diamonds, ruffed by West. A trump was led, and North took the ace and played a club, a little too late. On BBO we


Ivan Berg
could see East putting up the club king, and South played low! Now the comentators (one of them myself) became enthusiastic, because they could see North would be squeezed in the black suits if Sout took the king of clubs with the ace. Now declarer probably would go down, the commentators said, because he would play a club to the queen. So the defence was good, most of the commentators agreed, but that is not entirely true. After winning the trick with the club king declarer could play like this: three rounds of spades, and a fourth round of spades ruffed by East. Then the diamond jack is ruffed, leaving this position:


From here on, it doesn't matter if declarer plays a club to the queen or if he plays low from his hand. If he goes up with the queen South can take it with the ace, but then he has to play a card to give a ruff and discard, and East's last club disappears.
But the fact was that actually the operator had made one of her very rare mistakes because she lost connection, and South had actually taken the club king with the ace. What then happened was this: South played another club after the ace, taken by East's queen. Then he ruffed the last diamond and continued with the remaining trumps. Before the last one this was the position:


On the eight of hearts, North had to give up a spade, or throw his club jack, and declarer had his contract either way.

## Milan is not an Italian City

## by Patrick Jourdain

Ine Gielkens, the former Dutch international player who is in Jesolo as npc of the Czech Republic Junior team, reported this deal from their Round 12 match against Russia.

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- 10983
$\bigcirc 1076$
$\diamond 432$
\& A 86
- 17542

Q -
$\diamond$ A 1087
\& K 743

© AK 6
คA842
$\diamond$ J 96

* Q 92
, Q
『 K Q J 953
$\diamond K$ Q 5
」 105

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Macura | Osipov | Kopecky | Dobrin |
|  |  | INT* | Dble |
| 24 | Pass | Pass | 38 |
| 4\% | $4 \bigcirc$ | 49 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |
| * \|1-14 |  |  |  |



Milan Macura

Michal Kopecky opened a weak no trump, doubled by South, and eventually Milan Macura found himself in Four Spades doubled.
North led a heart, taken by the ace as declarer threw a club. Next came the jack of diamonds covered by the queen and ace. Declarer returned to dummy with a trump to the king felling South's queen. Next came a diamond taken by South's king. A second heart was ruffed by declarer. Macura cashed the $\diamond I O$ all following, and then played a small club to the queen which held. This was followed by a third heart ruffed in hand. The last diamond was ruffed by North and over-ruffed in dummy. A spade to the jack was followed by the last trump, endplaying North into leading a club up to declarer's king. Plus 590 was worth 10 IMPs to the Czech Republic when at the other table Russia made nine tricks in a spade partscore.
A couple of boards earlier Macura and Kopecky had shown their bidding skills:

Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

|  | ¢ J 1076 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | คA 762 |  |
|  | $\checkmark-$ |  |
|  | 2) 7654 |  |
| ¢ Q | N | ¢ AK9853 |
| $\bigcirc 193$ |  | $\bigcirc$ - |
| $\diamond$ J109643 |  | $\diamond$ AKQ 8 |
| ¢ $A K Q$ | S | \& 1092 |
|  | ¢ 42 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ KQ 10854 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 752$ |  |
|  | 9 83 |  |

Open Room

| West <br> Macura | North | East <br> Kopecky | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT(i) | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ (ii) | Dble |
| Pass(iii) | $3 \triangleleft$ | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \curvearrowright$ |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| $7 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

(i) $\mathrm{II}-\mathrm{I} 4(\mathrm{I} \diamond$ is prepared in 'Chinese' Club!)
(ii) Transfer
(iii) Pass $=$ less than three spades

The Grand slam earned the Czech Republic 16 IMPs (against Six Hearts doubled down four), for a match win of 18-12 VPs.


## 2006 Bridge Awards in China

by Fu Tsiang
2006 Shen Hua Declarer Play Award
Parallel Winner I: Dong Yong Ling
From: Women Round Robin of National Championship,
27th March

Board 6. Dealer East. EW Vul.

- K 43
© K
$\Delta K 652$
\& AK 108

- Q 9865

ค9642
$\diamond$ A 4

- Q 5

| West | North | East | South <br> Dong Yong Ling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I $\diamond$ | INT | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 0}$ |
| Pass | 40 | All Pass | 20 |

How would you play Four Spades on the lead of the club seven? One heart loser can go on one of dummy's club honours. You can afford to lose two trump tricks. Do you choose to ruff a heart then draw trumps?
Dong Yong Ling, a long-time player on the Beijing Women's Team, won the club ace in dummy and played the heart king. West ducked this trick, although if she'd taken her ace at once and played another heart, declarer would have faced a difficult guess.
Dong continued with the heart queen, taking note of the appearance of the ten from East. West won the heart ace and exited with the eight. Dummy ruffed and East's jack dropped, establishing the nine in declarer's hand.
Dong decided to cross to hand with the ace of diamonds before leading trumps, to test whether West held a singleton ace.The spade king won the trick and East's jack forced Dong to think for a long time. She finally pulled the diamond king and ruffed a diamond back to hand, East following with the jack. If there had been no falsecard from East, West's red-suit holdings should be 4-4. Because West didn't continue with another club after winning the heart ace, it was probable she held a singleton there.
Dong now carefully played the heart nine, ruffing in dummy with the four of spades. She safely ruffed a diamond back to hand and threw out the club queen to wait for the tenth trick with the queen-nine of trumps.
This was the full deal:
, K 43
$\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ Q
$\diamond$ K 652
\& $A 108$
, A 1072
คA875
$\diamond$ Q 1087
ค 7
$\Phi$
© J 103
$\diamond$ J 93
-196432
, Q 9865
ค9642
$\diamond$ A 4
2 Q 5

Dong's play avoided the potential danger successfully. After six tricks this was the position:

|  | - 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc-$ |  |
|  | $\triangleleft$ K 65 |  |
|  | - K 108 |  |
| - A 107 | N | , - |
| $\bigcirc 7$ |  | $\bigcirc-$ |
| $\diamond$ Q 108 | W E | $\diamond 19$ |
| \% - | S | * 19643 |
|  | - Q 986 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 9$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 4$ |  |
|  | \& Q |  |

Deep Finesse pointed out that there was just one card that could lead the contract home at each of the next tricks. At the table, Dong Yong Ling selected the only correct card at each trick.

## Championship Souvenirs

There are a number of souvenirs of these championships on sale at the reception desk. What better way to remember a wonderful experience than to take one or more home with you?
The range includes good quality shirts in a range of colours, with the championship logo actually sewn in not just stuck on, two types of bag and also keyrings.


## Dutch Round-Up

The future of international junior bridge is under threat, with the WBF, amongst other options, discussing the possibility of switching to a four- instead of the current two-year cycle. An interesting point about the future of Youth Championships was made by Brian Senior, the bulletin editor. He stated that in fact the threat of organising not even one youth event in any year is really endangering the development of bridge for young people. Suppose you are 23 or 24 and succeed in qualifying in your own country for an international championship. That is something every junior is looking forward to. You feel good until the EBL and/or WBF decide that there will be no tournament that year. It was your last chance because in two years time you will exceed the age limit for juniors. Maybe half the players who only qualify to play in one junior championship would find that they missed out altogether if the frequency of events was halved. This will probably decrease the enthusiasm of young people. So the hard work of many years will disappear and young boys and girls will not be inclined to take up bridge as a competitive sport. As Brian stated, an international youth event every year is what we are looking forward to.
Also, Erik Rohrberg of Denmark expressed his anxiety about the diminishing interest in junior bridge. Krister Andersson of Sweden is convinced that we must do everything to keep the big junior championships. Hartmu Kondoch of Germany already suggested that he could arrange a venue for the junior pairs in 2008. Let us all do our best and put our heads together. Maybe the closing ceremony on Saturday will provide the opportunity to put one and one together.
At last the championship really got underway with rounds II and I2 on Tuesday. Wednesday, with three matches, was important for all the teams in contention for the title, the


Vincent de Pagter
medals and the qualifying places for the world teams (that is something every junior wants to reach).
Just some impressions from the rounds 7-II.
Juniors Round 7. Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.
¢ A 9832
$\triangleright$ J 7
$\diamond A 7$
29854

| $\begin{array}{r} 54 \\ \wp K 2 \end{array}$ | N |  | - KQJ 107 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\bigcirc 93$ |
| 勺J9532 |  |  | $\diamond$ Q 104 |
| * KJ 106 | S |  | \& A Q 3 |
|  | - 6 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A | 8654 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 8 |  |  |
|  | - 72 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |

Vincent de Pagter opened vulnerable in first seat with a pre-emptive 3 『. Jacco Hop raised to game, which was easy even with the trump king offside. The commentator in the vugraph thought this a lucky one. But a classic $3 \vee$ pre-empt promises seven tricks. So with two aces that makes nine and then the try for the vulnerable game looks all right.
Marion Michielsen and Meike Wortel did well against Italy to hold the Dutch loss to $10-20$ in Round 8 of the Junior Championship.

Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- 974
$\bigcirc$ Q J 10
$\diamond$ J 92
\& K J 83

Somehow, I feel for 4s by South (like the Dutch did) but North went for a penalty. The spade ace did not harm declarer who could ruff two spades and dispose of a club on the diamond king

Against Hungary in Round 9, Hop/de Pagter ran into an unlucky distribution after a surprise lead:

Board I3. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
© K 1062
$\vee$ Q J 5
$\diamond$ Q J
2 1932

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AJ5 } \\ & \vee 1072 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\pm 93$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ A 4 |
| $\checkmark$ A 1083 |  | E | $\diamond 954$ |
| \% 1084 |  |  | 2 AKQ 765 |
|  | , Q |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ | 63 |  |
|  | $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ |  |  |
|  | - - |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Pass | 1\% | 18 |
| Dble | 2\% | 3\% | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

With the expected lead in hearts, declarer finds out about the club distribution and uses the two aces in dummy to pick up the clubs in North, making six tricks in clubs via two finesses. Unfortunately for the Netherlands the Hungarian South chose a small spade to lead. Declarer, not being clairvoyant, now went down one.
In the match against Poland in Round IO, Bob Drijver had a tough problem where a lot of courage was needed.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.
Q -
© K 8
$\diamond$ QJIO 865 - AK 1073

- A 10964
Q Q 3
$\diamond 93$
\& 6542

| N | - 87532 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | $\bigcirc 10654$ |
| W E | $\diamond$ AK 42 |
| S | \& - |
| , KQJ |  |
| QAJ972 |  |
| $\checkmark 7$ |  |
| \& Q J 98 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 28 |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | $4{ }^{\circ}$ |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | $4{ }^{4}$ |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 52 |
| Pass | 6 | Dble | All Pa |

Not an easy one. Personally, I would probably have bid 3NT after $3 \%$, but $4 \%$ gave North the push to go to slam even when he found out about only one ace. Bob explained that South, with 4 Axx , probably would have bid 3s after 3e and
that 4e should be a really slam interested hand. Right he was.
After $\diamond \mathbf{A}$ and a spade, ruffed, declarer ruffed three diamonds in dummy for +1090 and a gain of 5 IMPs when Poland reached and made 6\% undoubled.
Against Germany in Round II it was what the player himself called an undisciplined action that created the I9-II win for the Netherlands.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/WVul.

- J 10
- A Q 10842
$\diamond 942$
- 106

$$
3
$$

$\diamond J 5$
$\diamond K J 765$
$\&$ QJ 753


м K 98754
$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond A 3$
\& A 984

- AQ62
- K 973
$\diamond$ Q 108
\& K 2

| West | North | East <br> N | South <br> Pass |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \varangle$ | Pass | $4 \varnothing$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Jacco Hop knows that you cannot punish partner if he balances. But somehow the North hand seemed an exception. East/West could take three minor-suit tricks (for a push because the Dutch East/West pair bid and made 24) but East selected a small spade which made ten tricks and +590 possible.


Jacco Hop

## JUNIORS TEAMS

 ROUND I2

Italy were the leaders in the Junior event when they met Sweden, also challenging for a qualifying spot, so a very important match. The action mostly came in the bidding.
We will draw a veil over Board 2, where Rimstedt/Sivelind bid as though they had never met before to reach a ridiculous slam and present II IMPs to Italy, and the next big swing also was in favour of our hosts.

## Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- AJ 76
$\checkmark$ A 10
$\diamond \mathrm{J} 82$

8) 10865

| Q K | N | ¢ Q 82 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ K Q 32 | W | จJ98754 |
| $\diamond$ A Q 103 | W E | $\diamond 97$ |
| \% KQ 43 | S | 9 72 |
|  | ¢ 109543 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 6$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 654 |  |
|  | 2 AJ9 |  |



Arrigo Franchi

## SWEDEN

| West <br> Sivelind | North <br> Sangiorgio | East <br> Rimstedt | South <br> Baroni |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 1\% | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 14 |
| Pass | 34 | All Pass |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Montanari | Thalen | Franchi | Asplund |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |  |

Sara Sivelind opened a strong club and Cecilia Rimstedt responded $\mathrm{I} \diamond$, negative. When Irene Baroni overcalled, Sivelind passed and now Alberto Sangiorgio's pre-emptive raise did its job. Sivelind could have guessed to double for take-out, and no doubt would have done so with the same shape and point-count without a wasted king, but there was no security at all at the four level facing a weak hand so she passed and the cold heart game was missed.
Sivelind led the king of hearts to dummy's ace and Baroni ruffed the $\vee I O$ and led a spade to the king and ace and a second spade. Rimstedt won the queen of spades and switched to a diamond. Three rounds of those gave her a ruff and there was still a club to come; down one for - 100 .
Matteo Montanari opened 2NT, one of my pet hates with a singleton, but it worked just fine this time as Arrigo Franchi transferred to hearts, Montanari broke the transfer, Franchi retransferred and Montanari duly played $4 \bigcirc$. There were three aces to lose but the king of diamonds was where it had to be so that was +620 and II IMPs to Italy, who led at this point by 34-I.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- 107652
$\checkmark$ A Q 108
$\diamond 8$
2 143


| West <br> Sivelind | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sangiorgio | Rimstedt |  |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Montanari | Thalen | Franchi | Asplund |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 10 | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 3 - | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Sivelind opened 2NT to show both minors, either weak or game-forcing - a slight stretch but we all love to use our pet bids whenever we can. Rimstedt gave preference to diamonds and Sivelind showed the game-force with short hearts, just in case. Switch East's majors around and slam is huge, but with the wasted heart values Rimstedt signed off in $5 \diamond$. There was nothing to the play after Baroni had cashed the top spades; +600 .

Montanari showed his six-five shape then admitted to a bit of something in spades. Unless there is something I don't know about there methods, he seems to have described his hand perfectly and it looks like a clear misjudgement on Franchi's part to not play in the nine-card diamond fit. Three rounds of spades were played. Montanari won the third round, cashed one diamond winner then led a club to the ten and jack. Bjorn Thalen cashed out for two down; -200 and I3 IMPs to Sweden.


It is hardly obligatory to double with the West hand but the vulnerability is in favour of doing so and the Swedish E/W pair competed up to 3s, which is fair enough. Baroni got the defence spot on. She led the queen of clubs which held the trick, then switched to a low heart. Rimstedt won that in hand to play a spade up and Baroni took the ace to play ace and another heart. Sangiorgio ruffed the heart and played ace and another club for his partner to ruff; down two for -I00.
Montabari did not come in with the West cards but Franchi did so as East once his right-hand-opponent was unable to respond in a major. Everything was going quite normally up to the point where Karl Asplund tried 3NT, which looks a little optimistic, and now the doubling started. Thalen rescued the partnership into 4\%, and Asplund converted that to $4 \diamond$, which Montanari doubled.
It looks as though $4 \diamond$ doubled is doomed to fail by a trick but something went wrong in the defence. Rather than lead the partnership suit - remember that declarer had suggested playing in 3NT - Montanari tried the saferlooking lead of the queen of hearts, and that was all the help that Asplund required. He ducked and Montanari switched to the queen of diamonds. Franchi won the bare ace and switched to a spade but Asplund could win the ace, run the queen of clubs and play ace and ruff a heart to get to dummy. Asplund ruffed a club back to hand then led his fourth heart and Montanari was powerless; +510 and 9 IMPs to Sweden.

Board 19. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- 8643
\& 1054
$\diamond$ K 973
95


Everything was very straightforward at our first table, where Rimstedt made 4s for +620 . At the other table Montanari made a transfer overcall, Franchi cuebid, then


Karl Asplund
bid 3NT without ever showing his spades, and Asplund doubled. That proved to be an expensive misjudgement. Asplund led the king of clubs and, to guard the hearts, he came down to bare $\diamond A$ and Q Q as Franchi ran the spades. Not wishing to risk his contract, Franchi did not bother with the almost-marked heart finesse. Instead, he cashed the top hearts then exited with dummy's low diamond, and Asplund had to give a trick to dummy's $\nabla \mathrm{J}$ at the end; ten tricks for +950 and 8 IMPs to Italy.
The Italians won the match by 53-30 IMPs, 20-I0 VPs, and consolidated their position at the top of the rankings.

## Today in History



On July 19th 1799 the Rosetta Stone was found. During Napoleon Bonaparte's Egyptian campaign, a group of his soldiers discover a black basalt slab inscribed with ancient writing near the town of Rosetta. Ancient Greek script on the stone told archaeologists that it was inscribed in the second century B.C.The Rosetta Stone was studied for two decades before French Egyptologist Jean François Champollion made a startling discovery: The two Egyptian scripts on the stone--hieroglyphic and demotic--belonged to the same spoken language. The artifact thus held the key to solving the riddle of hieroglyphics, a written language that had been dead for nearly two millennia. With his knowledge of demotic, Champollion was able to decipher the hieroglyphics, and the language and culture of ancient Egypt was suddenly open to scientists as never before.

## JUNIORS TEAMS



## LATVIA <br> Marchons, Marchons Les Bleus!



by Peter Ventura

France, with Thomas Bessis, Open Teams gold medallist in Antalya, was trailing in the rankings after 12 rounds. From their tenth position they needed to get some air under their wings and start climbing in the rankings. In their way was Latvia, lying in eleventh position before this match.
After three boards we had the soccer score of I-0 to France. Then this came along:

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

- A 1052
- 108742
$\diamond 1075$
\& K
- 64
$\bigcirc$ K Q 5
$\diamond A 98642$
\& A 7


PJ96
$\diamond K$ Q
Q Q 82
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T. Bessis | Bethers | O. Bessis | Lorencs |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room

| West <br> Kuldkepp | North <br> Vinay | East <br> Balasovs | South <br> Seguineau |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | $2 \triangleleft$ | 30 | All Pass |

In the Closed Room, Adrien Vinay's thin 28 overcall put the brakes on the Lettish bidding, which reasonably enough stopped in $3 \%$. On the heart lead declarer ran three rounds of hearts and ditched a losing diamond from hand. The defence took two trump tricks and a trick in each major suit; N/S -IIO.
Despite the poor diamond suit, Thomas Bessis took a shot at game when his brother, Olivier, was able to bid over $2 \wedge$. South led a spade to the ace and back came another spade to declarer's king. Both the diamond and the spade suits split nicely for Olivier, thus he eventually could claim
nine tricks; N/S +600 and 10 IMPs to France.
Did you spot the killing lead? Yes, a low club to the king. From here on declarer cannot succeed so long as North switches to a spade.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- $J 63$

Q 98
$\triangleleft$ Q 1093
\& KJ62
. K Q 5
©AJ 1065
$\diamond$ K 5
\& 953

In the Closed Room Meelis Kuldkepp was declarer in $2 \bigcirc$. North led the ten of diamonds and declarer lost one spade and three minor-suit tricks; N/S -I 40.


Olivier Bessis

A little more was at stake at the other table, as Olivier Bessis pre-empted $3 \vee$ over his brother's five-card One Heart opening. North led a heart, won in dummy. Declarer played a spade up and the king held the trick. Now declarer crossed to dummy in trumps and played another spade up. Martins Lorencs hopped up with the ace and played a low diamond in tempo. All of a sudden Thomas had a losing option in the diamond suit, which would not have been the case if South had exited with either of the black suits. Bessis misguessed the situation and played low. Now North could win the queen and the defence had to have another diamond trick and their two club tricks for one down. Very nicely defended by Lorencs! That defence was worth 5 IMPs to Latvia. Unfortunately for them, these IMPs were their last (in this match).

Board 9. Dealer North. E/WVul.

- A 105

Р J 954
$\diamond$ J 83
Q Q 76

| - 8 | N | - KJ964 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 108763$ |  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 2 |
| $\checkmark$ K 965 | W E | $\checkmark$ A Q 2 |
| \& 82 | S | 2 110 |
|  | - Q 732 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ - |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1074$ |  |
|  | \& AK9543 |  |

Open Room

| West <br> T. Bessis | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | O. Bessis | Lorencs |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | Pass |
| $4 』$ | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room

| West <br> Kuldkepp | North <br> Vinay | East <br> Balasovs | South <br> Seguineau |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | $19 *$ | 29 |
| Pass | $3 \%$ | Pass | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |

Thomas Bessis saw the defence cash two club tricks then switch to a diamond. He won the trick in dummy and then played the trump ace. Now he was down due to the nasty trump split.
Declarer in the Closed Room didn't succeed either, so no swing here.
In the vugraph match, South's overcall showed four spades and any minor suit. Not even here declarer found the winning line. With this information from the auction, I think declarer should consider running the ten of hearts. It is not likely that he will find South with all the hearts, so the only position you need to protect against is North holding all four.
At half-time France was leading by 25-7 IMPs and with
three boards to go the French lead had increased to 43-7 IMPs. This was the last large swing in the match.

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

|  | ¢ A 65 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 105$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q 75 |  |
|  | 2 AJ 107 |  |
| Q - | N | ¢ KJ 83 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q J 743 |  | $\bigcirc$ A 62 |
| $\checkmark$ AJ 10963 |  | $\checkmark 842$ |
| ¢ 54 | S | \% Q 83 |
|  | ¢ Q 109742 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 98 |  |
|  | $\diamond-$ |  |
|  | 2 K 962 |  |


| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| T. Bessis | Bethers | O. Bessis | Lorencs |
|  |  | Pass | $2{ }^{*}$ |
| $4 \diamond *$ | 49 | Dble | All Pass |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kuldkepp | Vinay | Balasovs | Seguineau |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 20* | Pass | 38 | 34 |
| $4 \diamond$ | Dble | $4 \checkmark$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Over the multi, Thomas found a useful weapon: $4 \diamond$, showing the red suits. Janis Bethers believed his side could make game, but Olivier expressed a different opinion by doubling 44.
East led the heart ace and then continued with another heart, won by dummy's king. Declarer played a spade to the ace and a spade towards dummy. East hopped up with the king and switched to a diamond, which was ruffed in dummy. Then declarer played the trump queen and, since West held a void in spades, it would be sensible to play for the club length to be in his hand, Bethers thought this, so he finessed through West. East could win the queen and there was a trump trick to come - one down; N/S -200. Did declarer misplay the hand by finessing through West? You be the judge!
Kuldkepp's opening of $2 \boxtimes$ showed hearts and a minor suit. North led a trump and declarer had to lose a trump and four tricks in the minor suits, thus he was two down; N/S +300 , and that was worth II IMPs to France.
That gave us the final score of 55-7 IMPs converted to 25-5 VPs.
Perhaps this was the turning point France so badly needed. This match was definately a sign of improvement, so had 'Les Bleus' begun their race to the top? Yes, it seems that the top teams have to be beware - as the French followed up this victory by defating Slovakia by $25-3$ VPs and Croatia $25-5 \mathrm{VPs}$. 'Allons enfant de la patrie... marchons, marchons!'

## GLIITALIANI NON AMANO LE QUADRI

by Furio Meneghini


Che le siano defunte e le $\diamond$ godano di pessima salute è noto da un pezzo, ma gli italiani sembrano aver preso fin troppo alla lettera la notizia, e aver perso pratica e confidenza nel maneggiare i minori. Nel turno finale di martedì gli School hanno superato I7-13 I'Olanda, ma dei 44 IMP messi a referto dagli avversari ben 28 sono stati concessi in soli due boards dove il numero di prese richieste a $\diamond$ è risultato inadeguato e non di poco.

Board n. 10 - Dealer E - Vuln. All

```
MT7652
AQT 8
\diamond
&|43
```



|  | $\diamond 97653$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $\diamond 632$ |
|  | Sala chiusa: $\quad$ |


| $\mathbf{O}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | pass | pass |
| $\mathbf{I} \diamond$ | pass | $\mathbf{I} \upharpoonright$ | pass |
| $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | pass | $3 \diamond$ | fine |

II $3 \triangleleft$ di Est è stato immediatamente allertato dallo stesso come "stavo pensando ad altro": ovviamente il compagno protetto dal sipario gli ha "fatto" le stesse carte con il 2 di \& al posto dell'A di $\diamond$ ed è passato. Meno 15 , perchè dall'altra parte gli orange sono saliti fino al piccolo infischiandosene delle due perdenti immediate a e obbligando telepaticamente N ad attaccare $\vee \mathrm{A}$, unica carta che mette il contratto sul vassoio.

| Board n. 16 - Dealer W -Vuln. E/W |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - JT 76 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ - |  |  |
| 2) 7654 |  |  |
| Q Q | N | - AK9853 |
| Q193 |  | $\bigcirc-$ |
| $\diamond$ JT9643 |  | $\diamond$ AK Q 8 |
| \& AK Q | S | * T92 |
|  | - 42 |  |
|  | ¢KQJ953 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |
|  | ¢ 83 |  |

Sala chiusa:

| 0 | N | E | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \diamond$ | pass | 19 | pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | pass | 32 | pass |
| 3 | pass | 3s | pass |
| 41 | pass | $5 \diamond$ | fine |

Alla prova dei fatti sembrerebbe che l'assoluta inattività dei verticali (che a quasi tutti gli altri tavoli hanno imbastito feroci azioni di disturbo con le $\vee$ ) abbia finito per impedire ad Est di valutare a pieno la potenza del suo vuoto. Però il compagno ha aperto con al massimo 4 p.o. fra e $\diamond$ e non ha dichiarato 3NT quando ne ha avuto la possibilità, dunque non dovrebbero esserci dubbi sulla copertura a e né si può sperare che quello possa prendere iniziative mancante di A-K-Q in atout. "Solo" I3 in emorragia perchè il grande è stato mancato anche nell'altra sala.
Per completezza di cronaca va aggiunto che alla mano successiva si perde di guadagnare ancora sui minori, quando gli olandesi si fermano all'infattibile 3e nella 6-I, mentre di là:

Board n. 17 - Dealer N -Vuln. None

- 18
$\bigcirc 64$
$\diamond 964$
- AJT 432
\& KT 73
$\diamond$ QJ 2
$\diamond$ QJ 5
$\&$ K 98

| N |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 | E |
|  |  |

- Q 9654

PK975
$\diamond \mathrm{A}$

* 765
- A 2
-AT 83
$\diamond$ KT8732
Q
Sala aperta:

| $\mathbf{O}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3 \boldsymbol{3}$ | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| fine |  | pass | 5 |

Di Franco in N intende proporre un'alternativa contro il fit nobile avversario, ma Mistretta non ha torto ad attendersi qualcosa di più (si accetta tutto, prese di testa, un singolo nobile, $\diamond$ onorate) dal compagno passato di mano e chiama la manche che proprio non si può fare, anche evitando l'attacco a

Abbiamo sì o no una scuola, un italian way of bidding? Dunque ogni tanto bisogna dimostrarlo, e puntualmente i fratelli maggiori, pur vittoriosi $20-10$ sulla quotata Svezia, lasciano 22 IMP sui 30 concessi in due delle tre smazzate
sopracitate, e ne guadagnano 7 nella terza dopo aver rischiato di perderne 13 .

> Board n. 10 - Dealer E - Vuln. All
> (vedi diagramma sopra)

Sala chiusa:

| $\mathbf{O}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | pass | pass |
| $1 \$$ | pass | $\mathbf{I} \$$ | pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | pass | $2 \boldsymbol{s}$ | pass |
| $\mathbf{3} \diamond$ | pass | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | pass |
| $3 N T$ | fine |  |  |

È vero che negli accordi di coppia $3 \triangleleft$ non mostra obbligatoriamente la 6-5 (e qui c'è materia per rinfocolare la mai spenta discussione su come trattare le 6-5 ascendenti, ma si aprirebbe un capitolo senza poter prevederne la chiusura), e che successivamente diventava obbligatorio scambiarsi il mezzo fermo, ma forse $3 \triangleleft$ da Est al secondo giro avrebbe funzionato meglio. Fatto sta che 3NT-I in sicurezza (vale a dire senza tentare il perdente doppio sorpasso a $\&$ ) non compensa certo la manche a $\diamond$ richiesta senza troppe esitazioni nell'altra sala.

## Board n. 16 - Dealer W - Vuln. E/W

(vedi diagramma sopra)
Sala chiusa:

| 0 | N | E | s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \diamond$ | pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| pass | 48 | 4NT | pass |
| 5 | pass | 5 | pass |
| $6\rangle$ | fine |  |  |


| Sala aperta: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | N | E | S |
| Pass(!!!) | pass | 14 | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| 3 | 5 ¢ | 5NT | 68 |
| pass | pass | $7 \diamond$ | pass |
| pass | 78 | double | fine |

In chiusa il 4NT era del tipo "let's go on" e 5e mostrava valori, ma il $5 \triangleleft$ di Est non ha raccolto le simpatie dei commentatori di Rama: Montanari ha però valutato che il compagno non aveva subito chiuso a manche, e con una buona dose di coraggio ha rialzato, il che poteva apparire al momento solo una riduzione del danno nel caso in cui nell'altra sala avessero chiamato il grande. La dichiarazione in aperta è stata pirotecnica (o psichedelica?): W ha esordito con un Passo molto oscuro, e N-S hanno poi sbarrato fin troppo, comunicando agli avversari di non vedersi fra le mani prese difensive. Non abbiamo ricevuto conferme se il 5NT di E fosse una Blackwood ad esclusione, e di conseguenza quale fosse il significato del Passo di W; fatto sta che $E$ ha ritenuto di avere elementi per andare a 7, e Sangiorgio si è visto recapitare una decisione che spostava 20 IMP(!): il Passo valeva -I3, il 7 § prodotto dopo lunga sof-


Matteo Montanari
ferenza ("colpa nostra, ce li abbiamo portati noi, ma 68 era senza dubbio un'ottima difesa, pago 300 in più e sottoscrivo l'assicurazione" arguiamo sia stato il suo pensiero) ne ha prodotti 7 positivi.

Board n. 17 - Dealer N - Vuln. None
(vedi diagramma sopra)
Sala chiusa:

| O | N | E | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | pass | pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| pass | INT | double | $2 \diamond$ |
| 24 | $3 \checkmark$ | 3s | 3NT |
| double | 4\% | pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| double | fine |  |  |

La licita è stata sanguigna, eW ha avuto problemi a gestire l'adrenalina. Poi non ha trovato l'attacco e 510 punti dopo si è trovato solo con gli spettri ululanti "i parziali non si contrano mai...quando hai fatto scappare gli avversari da 3NT hai già fatto il tuo...".


## A CINQUE BOARD DALLA FINE

by Furio Meneghini

Dopo il board I5 del turno mattutino gli "anziani" conducevano 40-I7 e i "piccoletti" erano avanti 33-30, ma da quel momento in poi le loro strade si sono drammaticamente separate.

|  | Board $16-W-E / W$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - Q 643 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 842$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ QT 62 |  |
|  | - A 2 |  |
| - AK 752 | N | - 9 |
| PAK 76 |  | ¢ JT 53 |
| $\checkmark 7543$ |  | $\checkmark$ A 8 |
| - - | S | *KQJ763 |
|  | - JT 8 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 9 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ KJ9 |  |
|  | ¢ T9854 |  |

Botta-DelleCave fanno un velleitario tentativo di slam, si arrestano a 5 , ma sull'attacco $\diamond W$ prende, gioca A-K di e taglia una $\diamond$, poi fa girare K ; N gioca \& ancora tagliata e Q-J di per lo scarto di due $\diamond, \mathrm{N}$ taglia e giocando l'ultima promuove al surtaglio la Q del compagno. Linea di gioco poco ispirata, ma l'errore che costa 12 IMP è soprattutto quello dichiarativo.

In questo board gli junior marcano 2 per aver scelto manche a colore invece che a Senza.

|  | Board 17 - N - None |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - AKJT 3 |  |
|  | Q J 73 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 6 |  |
|  | - Q 62 |  |
| - 854 | N | Q Q 972 |
| $\bigcirc 86$ |  | $\bigcirc 952$ |
| $\diamond$ KT 43 | 0 E | $\diamond 182$ |
| * AT9 4 | S | + 753 |
|  | - 6 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AKQT 4 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 975 |  |
|  | - KJ 8 |  |

Lo slam non è dei peggiori, però si realizza solo ricavando quattro prese dalle . Il norvegese fa girare il J (linea superiore) e vince, lo slovacco gioca Q in caduta e perde: poichè quando tocca a noi ci fermiamo a manche, gli junior guadagnano II, e gli school ne perdono altrettanti.

$\stackrel{\Delta}{\wedge}-$
$\diamond$ QJ 743
$\diamond$ AJT 963
$\& 54$

Gli school giocano entrambi la manche a in NS, sdovinano a e vanno down, ma i nordici guadagnano 3 via Contro. Gli junior giocano a 8 in EO, ma i nostri ne giocano 4 lisce e fanno 8 prese, gli altri 5 contrate e perdono anche una presa in più, vale a dire 700 (12 IMP) di differenza.
Dopo un board pari (ma in realtà è l'unico in cui Italia$S$ riesce a sbiancare lo score con un punticino di surlevee) si chiude con un altro slam.

Board $20-W$ - All

- K 972


61 sembra contratto di routine, ma gli slovacchi si fermano -non ho capito perchè- a cinque, e consentono ai nostri di chiudere con altri I3 incamerati, per un parziale di $38-0$ in 5 board che porta all'en plein nel risultato finale. Invece DiFranco-Mistretta pongono la ciliegina sulla torta...degli avversari facendo un uso discutibile della Turbo e approdando al grande poco sportivamente contrato da Est: 17 sanguinosissimi IMP che portano il parziale a 43-I confezionando uno scoraggiante 23-7 in VP.
$E$ io che me ne ero andato lasciando due incontri incerti...

## JUNIOR TEAMS BUTLER

|  | Name |  | Butl | Brd | Country | 34 DAMASO Nuno | PRATAS Pedro | -0,03 | 200 | Portugal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EIDE Petter | LIVGARD Allan | 1,41 | 199 | Norway | 35 SOFIOS Michalis | DARKADAKISA. | -0,03 | 120 | Greece |
| 2 | BOLDRINI Andrea | MANNO Andrea | I, II | 200 | Italy | 36 DONDIVIC Luka | GRACIN Tomislav | -0,05 | 180 | Croatia |
|  | PAGTER Vincent de | HOP Jacco | 0,88 | 200 | Netherlands | 37 MARTINOVIC Slavica | STANICIC Ognjen | -0,06 | 180 | Croatia |
|  | NOWOSADZKI M. | WIANKOWSKI Piotr | 0,87 | 260 | Poland | 38 BALASOVS Jurijs | LOPER Oliver | -0,09 | 100 | Latvia |
|  | SANGIORGIOA. | BARONI Irene | 0,85 | 220 | Italy | 39 NISTOR Radu | STAFIE Diana Mihaela | -0,12 | 280 | Romania |
| 6 | WORTEL Meike | MICHIELSEN Marion | 0,74 | 200 | Netherlands | 40 NEKRASOVA Ksenia | VOLOZHENIN Ivan | -0,13 | 160 | Russia |
|  | KATERBAU Janko | REHDER Martin | 0,69 | 219 | Germany | 4I MORGAN Frazer | MORRISON Philip | -0,13 | 180 | Scotland |
| 8 | OSIPOV Anton | VOLOZHENIN Ivan | 0,64 | 140 | Russia | 42 CHAUVELOT Nicolas | ROBERT Quentin | -0,13 | 160 | France |
|  | BESSIS Olivier | BESSIS Thomas | 0,60 | 240 | France | 43 GULA Artur | TACZEWSKI Mikolaj | -0,15 | 119 | Poland |
| 0 | HAPPER Duncan | GREEN Ben | 0,56 | 260 | England | 44 KULDKEPP Meelis | BALASOVS Jurijs | -0,19 | 180 | Latvia |
| 11 | VINAY Adrien | SEGUINEAU Paul | 0,54 | 200 | France | 45 VANPARIJS Jef | GUIOT Benoit | -0,21 | 180 | Belgium |
| 12 | NIELSEN Lars K. | HOUMOLLER Jonas | 0,44 | 240 | Denmark | 46 SAKIRLER M. | AKAY Veysi | -0,25 | 240 | Turkey |
| 13 | MACURA Milan | KOPECKY Michal | 0,41 | 280 | Czech Rep. | 47 SINCLAIR Andrew | WILKINSON A. | -0,26 | 220 | Scotland |
|  | MONTANARI Matteo | FRANCHI Arrigo | 0,39 | 179 | Italy | 48 IVANCIC Matej | ZEPIC Vjekoslav | -0,32 | 240 | Croatia |
| 16 | THALEN Bjorn | ASPLUND Karl GROENENBOOM M | 0,38 | 240 | Sweden | 49 TOMCANI Jan | LUKOTKA Robert | -0,34 | 299 | Slovakia |
| 16 | DRIJVER Bob | GROENENBOOM M. BERG Erik | 0,38 0,30 | 199 199 | Netherlands Norway | 50 DOBBELS Tine | DE HERTOG Dirk | -0,37 | 180 | Belgium |
| 18 | KEPEKCI Mehmet F . | CEREK Muharrem | 0,30 | 220 | Turkey | 51 KISS Gabor | TORMA Robert | -0,40 | 180 | Hungary |
| 19 | SIKORA Jan | NAWROCKI Piotr | 0,27 | 219 | Poland | 52 VLACHOVA Karolina | BERAN Vladimir | -0,40 | 160 | Czech Rep. |
| 20 | WUERMSEER Maria | GOTTANKA Daniel | 0,26 | 160 | Germany | BARBOSA Joao | PALMA Antonio | -0,48 | 240 | Portugal |
| 21 | BETHERS Janis | LORENCS Martins | 0,22 | 300 | Latvia | 54 DARKADAKIS A. | LATOUSAKIS Michalis | -0,53 | 120 | Greece |
| 22 | DOBRIN Denis | OSIPOV Anton | 0,18 | 80 | Russia | 55 ELLISON Myles | ELLISON Gyles | -0,56 | 200 | Scotland |
| 23 | SIVELIND Sara | RIMSTEDT Cecilia | 0,15 | 220 | Sweden | 56 BRAGA Rafael | BRAGA Ricardo | -0,56 | 160 | Portugal |
| 24 | VAN MECHELEN R. | DEVISSCHERE Willem | 0,13 | 240 | Belgium | 57 MARJAI Gabor | RETTEGHY Orsolya | -0,58 | 180 | Hungary |
| 25 | DOXIADIS K. | KONTOMITROS K. | 0,12 | 300 | Greece | 58 HODEROVA Pavla | JANKOVA Jana | -0,66 | 160 | Czech Rep. |
| 26 | MOLLER PEDERSEN | SORENSEN Lars M. | 0,11 | 160 | Denmark | 59 HARING Stuart | COPE Simon | -0,66 | 200 | England |
| 27 | SMIRNOV Alexander | GOTARD Thomas | 0,10 | 220 | Germany | 60 SCHULZ Dieter | BINA Richard | -0,66 | 180 | Austria |
| 28 | MINARIK Gabor | HONYEK Andras | 0,09 | 240 | Hungary | 61 ARVIDSSON Eric | BECH Simon | -0,76 | 140 | Sweden |
| 29 | IMAMOGLU Levent | GUNDOGDU M. | 0,06 | 140 | Turkey | 62 EGLSEER Werner | GOGOMAN Adele | -0,83 | 240 | Austria |
| 30 | STOCKDALE Susan | CROPPER David | 0,05 | 140 | England | 63 ISLAM Jefri | STIGLEITNER Philipp | -0,87 | 180 | Austria |
| 31 | MOCHALOVA Julia | DOBRIN Denis | 0,05 | 220 | Russia | 64 KIANICA Lubos | SIDOR Lukas | -1,09 | 300 | Slovakia |
| 32 | berg Ivar | REISTAD Tor Ove | -0,01 | 200 | Norway | 65 AGICA Marius | DOBRESCU Raluca | $-1,26$ | 240 | Romania |
| 33 | SCHALTZ Martin | BROENDUM Kristian | -0,02 | 200 | Denmark | 66 SOFIOS Michalis | VATSOLAKI Eleni | $-2,13$ | 60 | Greece |

## SCHOOLS TEAMS BUTLER

|  | Name |  | Butl | Brd | Country | 24 ERCAN Sehmus | ILGIN Irfan | 0,00 | 40 | Turkey |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | KRAWCZYK Joanna | TUCZYNSKI Piotr | 2,25 | 59 | Poland | 25 DELLE CAVE G. | CATTABIANI A. | -0,03 | 60 | Italy |
| 2 | FRANCESCHETTI P. | KILANI Alexandre | 1,29 | 80 | France | 26 ROHRBERG Matias | TOFTE Lars | -0,13 | 100 | Denmark |
| 3 | JONES Edward | MYERS Robert | 1,17 | 140 | England | 27 GRUDE Tor Eivind | HEGGE Kristoffer | -0,19 | 80 | Norway |
|  | JASSEM Pawel | ZATORSKI Piotr | 1,17 | 100 | Poland | 28 LORENZINI Cedric | CANONNE Marion | -0,21 | 100 | Franc |
| 5 | MORTENSEN M. | EGE Niclas Raulund | I, II | 80 | Denmark | 29 YILMAZ Ovunc | ERCAN Sehmus | -0,28 | 60 | Turkey |
| 6 | RIMSTEDT Sandra | GRONKVIST Ida | 1,01 | 140 | Sweden | 30 CIMINS Janis | OLTE Karlis | -0,33 | 60 | Latvia |
| 7 | BOZZAI Bence | LAZAR Kornel | 0,98 | 40 | Hungary | 31 EIDE Harald | SKJETNE Erlend | -0,38 | 100 | Norway |
| 8 | LAZAR Alon | MEYUCHAS Moshe | 0,96 | 120 | Israel | 32 LHUISSIER Nicolas | LEBATTEUX Aymeric | -0,45 | 100 | Fran |
| 10 | ORMAY Krisztina | LAZAR Kornel | 0,77 | 60 | Hungary | 33 PASKEThomas | PASKE Benjamin | -0,45 | 120 | England |
| 10 | EGGELING Marie | ZIMMERMANN Felix | 0,77 0,68 | 60 100 | Germany | 34 BARNET Lukas | DUDKOVA Marketa | -0,49 | 100 | Czech Rep. |
| 12 | BILDE Dennis | JEPSEN Emil GIAMPIETRO Cristina | 0,68 0,67 | 100 60 | Denmark | 35 GOKSU Cihan | ILGIN Irfan | -0,56 | 80 | Turkey |
| 13 | BETHERS Peteris | IMSA Adrians | 0,64 | 140 | Latvia | 36 WACKWITZ JR E. | VERBEEK Erik | -0,72 | 100 | Netherlands |
| 14 | IGLA Bartlomiej | MACHNO Artur | 0,63 | 120 | Poland | 37 HELMICH Aarnout | HOP Gerbrand | -0,74 | 120 | Netherland |
| 15 | SIDEROV Zhivko | SYUSYUKIN Ivan | 0,56 | 140 | Bulgaria | 38 SPANGENBERGJ. | SPANGENBERG S. | -0,78 | 40 | Netherlands |
| 16 | BOGEN Haakon | JOHANSEN Lars A. | 0,55 | 100 | Norway | 39 RATNIEKS Janis | OLTE Karlis | -0,92 | 60 | Latvia |
| 17 | SKORCHEV Stefan | SPASOV Dean | 0,49 | 139 | Bulgaria | 40 BOTTA Giorgia | DELLE CAVE G. | -0,98 | 60 | kaly |
| 18 | ZYLKA Kamil | TEICHMANN Lukas | 0,33 | 100 | Czech Rep. | 4I PETRASEK Matej | FRANK Vaclav | -1,14 | 80 | Czech Rep. |
| 19 | DAMTY Oshri | EREZ Eyal | 0,31 | 100 | Israel | 42 SINKOVICZ Peter | HOFFMANN Tamas | -1,24 | 140 | Hungary |
| 20 | MISTRETTA Eugenio | DI FRANCO M. | 0,31 | 140 | Italy | 43 GERSTNER Gal | SCHWARTZ Ziv | -1,45 | 60 | srae |
| 21 | FRYKLUND Erik | GRONKVIST Mikael | 0,29 | 140 | Sweden | 44 HARRIS James | RICHARDS Jonathan | -1,54 | 100 | Wale |
| 22 | ORTH Paul | GUBA Gerrit | 0,16 | 140 | Germany | 45 BOZZAI Bence | ORMAY Krisztina | $-1,55$ | 40 | Hungary |
| 23 | UCAR Ali | GULCU Koray | 0,02 | 100 | Turkey | 46 EVANS Claire | WATKINS Rebecca | -3,28 | 120 | Wales |

