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# Bleu is the Couleur 



We're on the ball
Last night football was allowed to steal a little of the European Bridge Team Championships limelight, as the EBL arranged for the vital match between France and Italy to be televised live in the VuGraph theatre, alongside the equally important game featuring Netherlands \& Romania.
Our deadline means we can't bring you those results, but we can say that in Group A, in stark contrast to the football, Italy enjoy a one VP advantage over Netherlands, with the chasing pack closing in whilst Germany continue to lead Group B, and with second placed Sweden they are way ahead of the rest of the field.

| Round 10 |  |  | Round 11 |  |  | Round 12 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | Netherlands - Croatia | RAMA | 19 | Russia - Germany | RAMA | I | Italy - Turkey | RAMA |
| 11 | Belarus - France | BBO I | 11 | France - Norway | BBO I | 11 | Sweden - France | BBO I |
| 3 | Italy - Greece | BBO 2 | 2 | Lithuania - Italy | BBO 2 | 8 | Iceland - Croatia | BBO 2 |
| 19 | Germany - Belgium | BBO 3 | 17 | Portugal - Poland | BBO 3 | 18 | Germany - Wales | BBO 3 |
| 1 | Monaco - Turkey | BBO 4 | 5 | Spain - Finland | BBO 4 | 16 | Poland - Belarus | BBO 4 |
| 8 | Czech Rep. - Denmark | BBO 5 | 8 | Croatia - Czech Rep. | BBO 5 | 6 | Netherlands - Monaco | BBO 5 |
| 13 | Sweden - Austria | SWAN | 9 | Denmark - Iceland | SWAN | 9 | Scotland - Denmark | SWAN |

## OPEN TEAMS PROGRAM

## GROUPA

| ROUND IO |  |  |  | 10.30 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |  |
| I | MONACO | TURKEY |  |  |
| 2 | ENGLAND | LITHUANIA |  |  |
| 3 | ITALY | GREECE |  |  |
| 4 | LATVIA | SERBIA |  |  |
| 5 | ISRAEL | SPAIN |  |  |
| 6 | LUXEMBOURG | SWITZERLAND |  |  |
| 7 | NETHERLANDS | CROATIA |  |  |
| 8 | CZECH REP. | DENMARK |  |  |
| 9 | ICELAND | SCOTLAND |  |  |
|  | FINLAND | BYE |  |  |

## GROUPB

| ROUND 10 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |
| II | BELARUS | FRANCE |  |
| 12 | NORWAY | SAN MARINO |  |
| 13 | SWEDEN | AUSTRIA |  |
| 14 | MALTA | ESTONIA |  |
| 15 | BULGARIA | HUNGARY |  |
| 16 | SLOVAKIA | PORTUGAL |  |
| 17 | WALES | POLAND |  |
| 18 | ROMANIA | RUSSIA |  |
| 19 | GERMANY | BELGIUM |  |
|  | IRELAND | BYE |  |


| ROUND II |  |  |  | I4.15 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |  |
| II | FRANCE | NORWAY |  |  |
| 12 | SAN MARINO | SWEDEN |  |  |
| 13 | AUSTRIA | MALTA |  |  |
| 14 | ESTONIA | BULGARIA |  |  |
| 15 | HUNGARY | IRELAND |  |  |
| 16 | BELARUS | SLOVAKIA |  |  |
| 17 | PORTUGAL | POLAND |  |  |
| 18 | WALES | ROMANIA |  |  |
| 19 | RUSSIA | GERMANY |  |  |
|  | BELGIUM | BYE |  |  |


| ROUND 12 |  |  |  | I7.35 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |  |
| I | ITALY | TURKEY |  |  |
| 2 | LATVIA | LITHUANIA |  |  |
| 3 | ISRAEL | GREECE |  |  |
| 4 | FINLAND | SERBIA |  |  |
| 5 | LUXEMBOURG | ENGLAND |  |  |
| 6 | NETHERLANDS | MONACO |  |  |
| 7 | CZECH REP. | SWITZERLAND |  |  |
| 8 | ICELAND | CROATIA |  |  |
| 9 | SCOTLAND | DENMARK |  |  |
|  | SPAIN | BYE |  |  |

## Today's Schedule

I0.00 Women Teams Registration
I 0.30 Open Teams, Round IO
I4.I5 Open Teams, Round II
I7.00 Women Teams Captains Meeting
17.35 Open Teams, Round I2

I 8.00 Women Teams Welcome Ceremony

| ROUND 12 |  |  |  | I7.35 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |  |
| II | SWEDEN | FRANCE |  |  |
| 12 | MALTA | SAN MARINO |  |  |
| 13 | BULGARIA | AUSTRIA |  |  |
| 14 | IRELAND | ESTONIA |  |  |
| 15 | SLOVAKIA | NORWAY |  |  |
| 16 | BELARUS | POLAND |  |  |
| 17 | ROMANIA | PORTUGAL |  |  |
| 18 | GERMANY | WALES |  |  |
| 19 | RUSSIA | BELGIUM |  |  |
|  | HUNGARY | BYE |  |  |



## Butler scores

From now on the butler scores will be updated every round and can be watched on the website and the intranet.

## OPEN TEAMS RESULTS

## GROUPA

ROUND 7 - subject to official confirmation

|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | ---: |
| I | TURKEY | DENMARK | $50-37$ | $18-12$ |
| 2 | LITHUANIA | CROATIA | $25-86$ | $3-25$ |
| 3 | GREECE | SWITZERLAND | $66-45$ | $19-11$ |
| 4 | SERBIA | MONACO | $30-84$ | $4-25$ |
| 5 | SPAIN | ENGLAND | $57-49$ | $16-14$ |
| 6 | FINLAND | ITALY | $46-36$ | $17-13$ |
| 7 | ISRAEL | LATVIA | $45-76$ | $9-21$ |
| 8 | SCOTLAND | LUXEMBOURG | $42-63$ | $11-19$ |
| 9 | ICELAND | NETHERLANDS $51-37$ | $18-12$ |  |
|  | CZECH REP. | BYE |  | $18-0$ |


| ROUND 8-subject to official confirmation |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| I | TURKEY | CROATIA | $32-11$ | $19-11$ |
| 2 | SWITZERLAND | LITHUANIA | $42-30$ | $17-13$ |
| 3 | MONACO | GREECE | $68-28$ | $23-7$ |
| 4 | ENGLAND | SERBIA | $39-30$ | $17-13$ |
| 5 | ITALY | SPAIN | $35-18$ | $19-11$ |
| 6 | LATVIA | FINLAND | $59-51$ | $16-14$ |
| 7 | LUXEMBOURG | DENMARK | $17-64$ | $6-24$ |
| 8 | NETHERLANDS | SCOTLAND | $99-15$ | $25-0$ |
| 9 | CZECH REP. | ICELAND | $33-35$ | $15-15$ |
|  | ISRAEL | BYE |  | $18-0$ |

## ROUND 9 - subject to official confirmation

|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | TURKEY | SWITZERLAND | $15-29$ | $12-18$ |
| 2 | LITHUANIA | MONACO | $47-38$ | $17-13$ |
| 3 | GREECE | ENGLAND | $38-56$ | $11-19$ |
| 4 | SERBIA | ITALY | $28-38$ | $13-17$ |
| 5 | SPAIN | LATVIA | $18-48$ | $9-21$ |
| 6 | FINLAND | ISRAEL | $23-30$ | $14-16$ |
| 7 | LUXEMBOURG | CROATIA | $48-33$ | $18-12$ |
| 8 | DENMARK | NETHERLANDS | $38-40$ | $15-15$ |
| 9 | SCOTLAND | CZECH REP. | $24-51$ | $9-21$ |
|  | ICELAND | BYE |  | $18-0$ |

## Delegates to the General Assembly



The delegates of every NBO are requested to confirm their attendance at the General Assembly which will take place on Sunday 22 June 2008.

## GROUP B

## ROUND 7 - subject to official confirmation

|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| II | FRANCE | RUSSIA | $53-50$ | $16-14$ |
| I2 | SAN MARINO | WALES | $30-64$ | $8-22$ |
| I3 | AUSTRIA | PORTUGAL | $57-64$ | $14-16$ |
| I4 | ESTONIA | BELARUS | $39-41$ | $15-15$ |
| I5 | HUNGARY | NORWAY | $63-40$ | $20-10$ |
| I6 | IRELAND | SWEDEN | $32-58$ | $10-20$ |
| I7 | BULGARIA | MALTA | $104-59$ | $24-6$ |
| I8 | SLOVAKIA | BELGIUM | $69-34$ | $22-8$ |
| I9 | GERMANY | POLAND | $67-42$ | $20-10$ |
|  | ROMANIA | BYE |  | $18-0$ |


| ROUND 8-subject to official confirmation |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| II | WALES | FRANCE | $23-61$ | $7-23$ |
| I2 | PORTUGAL | SAN MARINO | $75-52$ | $20-10$ |
| I3 | BELARUS | AUSTRIA | $31-52$ | $11-19$ |
| I4 | NORWAY | ESTONIA | $89-29$ | $25-3$ |
| I5 | SWEDEN | HUNGARY | $79-17$ | $25-3$ |
| I6 | MALTA | IRELAND | $9-104$ | $0-25$ |
| I7 | SLOVAKIA | RUSSIA | $40-25$ | $18-12$ |
| I8 | POLAND | BELGIUM | $36-43$ | $14-16$ |
| I9 | ROMANIA | GERMANY | $17-85$ | $2-25$ |
|  | BULGARIA | BYE |  | $18-0$ |


| ROUND 9-subject to official confirmation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |  |
| II | FRANCE | PORTUGAL | $22-15$ | $16-14$ |  |
| I2 | SAN MARINO | BELARUS | $38-24$ | $18-12$ |  |
| I3 | AUSTRIA | NORWAY | $22-27$ | $14-16$ |  |
| I4 | ESTONIA | SWEDEN | $25-39$ | $12-18$ |  |
| I5 | HUNGARY | MALTA | $37-7$ | $21-9$ |  |
| I6 | IRELAND | BULGARIA | $34-21$ | $18-12$ |  |
| I7 | WALES | SLOVAKIA | $23-30$ | $14-16$ |  |
| I8 | RUSSIA | POLAND | $30-41$ | $13-17$ |  |
| I9 | ROMANIA | BELGIUM | $35-19$ | $18-12$ |  |
|  | GERMANY | BYE |  | $18-0$ |  |

## OPEN TEAMS RANKING GROUP A after 9 rounds subject to official confirmation

| I | ITALY | 164.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | NETHERLANDS | 163.00 |
| 3 | CZECH REP. | 161.00 |
| 4 | FINLAND | 157.00 |
| 5 | ICELAND | 156.00 |
| 6 | ISRAEL | 148.00 |
| 7 | MONACO | 144.00 |
| 8 | DENMARK | 143.00 |
| 9 | LATVIA | 139.00 |
| 10 | TURKEY | 138.00 |
| I | ENGLAND | 136.00 |
| 12 | CROATIA | 132.00 |
| 13 | GREECE | 128.00 |
| 1 | SPAIN | 125.00 |
| 15 | LUXEMBOURG | 113.00 |
| 16 | LITHUANIA | 109.00 |
|  | WITZERLAND | 109.00 |
| 18 | SERBIA | 106.00 |
| 1 | SCOTLAND | 100.00 |

## OPEN TEAMS RANKING GROUP B after 9 rounds <br> subject to official confirmation

| $\mathbf{I}$ | GERMANY | $\mathbf{1 8 6 . 0 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | SWEDEN | $\mathbf{1 8 0 . 0 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | RUSSIA | $\mathbf{1 5 4 . 0 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | NORWAY | $\mathbf{1 5 2 . 3 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | POLAND | $\mathbf{1 4 9 . 0 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | BULGARIA | $\mathbf{1 4 8 . 0 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | FRANCE | $\mathbf{1 4 6 . 0 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | PORTUGAL | $\mathbf{1 4 5 . 0 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | IRELAND | $\mathbf{1 4 3 . 7 0}$ |
| 10 | BELARUS | 139.00 |
| 11 | SLOVAKIA | 136.00 |
| 12 HUNGARY | 122.00 |  |
| 13 | BELGIUM | 119.00 |
| 14 | WALES | 118.00 |
| 15 | AUSTRIA | 117.00 |
| ESTONIA | 117.00 |  |
| 17 SAN MARINO | 113.00 |  |
| 18 | ROMANIA | 58.00 |
| 19 MALTA |  |  |

## Is this a record?

Chris Dixon came into the Bulletin office to ask a question of the team, so we will pass it on to you, in case you can help.
Chris told us that although he has captained many British and English teams, his sole appearance as a player came when he represented Great Britain on the Open Team in 1971.There has therefore been a gap of 37 years between his first and second appearances. He wanted to know if this was a record; so is there anyone out there who has a lacuna of more than 37 years between one international appearance and the next? I throw out Louis

Tarlo as a possibility.
Incidentally, while musing on that question, I raised an alternative question. How many people have played International Bridge as both Juniors and Seniors but did not play at the Open (or Women)?
And how about players competing in four events: Junior, Senior, Open and Women? Sex-change possibilities aside, one assumes that only women over 55 might qualify; I wonder whether Kirsten Steen-Moller would qualify? We know she has medals in three categories but l'm not sure what her major achievements at Open level are.

## OPEN TEAMS

## Round 5

## France v Germany Bulgaria v Norway

After the opening day, Germany were the proud leaders in Group B. When they had to face the hosts in Monday afternoon's round 5 , they still were leading the group. France were lying in 7th place, just ahead of the qualification mark. In the same round, Bulgaria and Norway, 4th and 5th at that point, also had to play each other, so it would probably make sense, I thought, to make one combined report about these two interesting matches.

Right on board I, the same problem occurred in both matches, not surprisingly. The players involved also found the same two solutions, one of them right and the other one wrong, so we saw exactly the same swing in both matches.


Entscho Wladow, Germany

France v. Germany:
Open Room

| West <br> Wladow | North <br> Bompis | East <br> Elinescu | South <br> Quantin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| 2 | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| 3 | All Pass |  |  |

Ten easy tricks, Germany +130 .
Closed Room

| West <br> Léry | North <br> Gromoeller | East <br> Mouïel | South <br> Kirmse |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 3\& | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Down two, Germany +100 and their first 6 IMPs.

Bulgaria v. Norway:
Open Room

| West <br> Brogeland | North <br> Isporski | East <br> Lindquist | South <br> Kovacher |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | I |
| Dble | Pass | $1 \$$ | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | $2 \$$ | Pass |
| 3 | All pass |  |  |

Ten easy tricks, Norway +130 .

Closed Room

| West <br> Stoyanov | North <br> Helgemo | East <br> Hristov | South <br> Lund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \downarrow$ | $3 \checkmark$ |
| Dble | Pass | $3 \$$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All pass |  |  |

Down two, Norway + 100 and their first 6 IMPs.
Judge for yourself who is most to blame in either auction...

On the next board, the German EW pair overbid to a slam off the AK, among other things, losing 12 IMPs in the process. Then came board 4:

Board: 4. Dealer West/All vul.


ค AKQ 542 $\diamond$ Q J 1064

```
Q|65
\(\vee\) J 6
\(\diamond A\) Q 9632
\(\%\) -
```



```
¢ K 9732
\(\bigcirc 97\)
\(\diamond 1084\)
\& 872
- A 10
1083
K 75
AK 953
```

In the France v. Germany match, there was no swing as these were the auctions:

Open Room

| West <br> Wladow | North <br> Bompis | East <br> Elinescu | South <br> Quantin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $I \diamond$ | $1 \$$ | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Dble | $4 \%$ | Pass | 69 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room

| West <br> Lévy | North <br> Gromoeller | East <br> Mouïel | South <br> Kirmse |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I $\diamond$ | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 60 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Both declarers easily made all the tricks, needless to say.
In our other featured match they seemed to be playing a different board...

| West <br> Brogeland | North <br> Isporski | East <br> Lindqvist | South <br> Kovachev |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \boxtimes$ | Pass | INT |
| $2 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | $5 N T$ | Pass | 79 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

A very elegant way to reach the top spot for a well-deserved +2I40.

Closed Room

| West <br> Stoyanov | North <br> Helgemo | East <br> Hristov | South <br> Lund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \diamond$ | $4 \Omega$ | Pass | Pass |
| $4 \Phi$ | Pass | Pass | $5 \varangle$ |
| Pass | Pass | $5 \$$ | All Pass |

Helgemo mistimed his jump to $4 \checkmark$ here, as his partner
was holding the good hand. The Norwegians did not even double 54. We will never know if South's pass over 54 was forcing in this situation...

The contract went down two for +200 to Norway but 18 IMPs to Bulgaria.

Another two boards later, EW reached a thin game against which finding the winning defence needed careful timing:

Board: 6. Dealer East/EW vul.

|  | - J 9 $\begin{aligned} & \vee K 10653 \\ & \diamond 1873 \end{aligned}$ $87$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Q 752 | N | - 10864 |
| $\bigcirc$ A9 7 |  | Q QJ 4 |
| $\checkmark 6$ | W E | $\checkmark$ AKQ 95 |
| - A QJ5 4 | S | - 10 |
|  | - AK 3 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 82$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1042$ |  |
|  | \& K 9632 |  |

At all four tables $W$ was declarer in 4s but we saw four different defensive approaches.
In the France v. Germany match, both Bompis and Gromoeller led the 88 to dummy's ten. Quantin covered this with the King but Kirmse did not and thus created a big swing for his team. Lévy, declaring for France, led a trump from dummy and ducked this to North's nine but now, Gromoeller continued the good work by exiting in diamonds. Dummy won and another trump was led, Kirmse cashing the \$AK before playing a heart which left declarer with no chance, as the 9 K was wrong and the clubs were not yet established. Germany +100 .

Wladow, declaring for Germany, won the e K with the ace and crossed in diamonds to lead a trump, ducked to North. Bompis now made what looked like a gallant effort to defeat the contract after all by leading a heart away from his King. This extra trick was all declarer needed. Dummy won the Queen and in the end, there would be a trump left in both $E$ and $W$ to cater for the remaining losers. Germany +620 and 12 IMPs.

In the Bulgaria v. Norway match, Helgemo made a curious lead: the 9 . Lund won the King and led a heart, ducked to Helgemo's King. He exited with a heart to dummy's Queen and declarer's next move was a spade from dummy, ducked to Helgemo's Jack...One down.

Isporski found the unlucky lead of a low heart to dummy's Queen. Brogeland, too, next ducked a trump to North. On lead again, Isporski continued the 8 to the ten, King and Ace... End of the defence, Norway +620 and 12 IMPs.

We did not have to wait long for the next swing in either match: just another two boards.

Board: 8. Dealer West/None vul.
\& AQJIO 972
$\bigcirc 97$
$\diamond 864$
\& 3

$$
43
$$

$\diamond J 10832$
$\diamond K$
$\& K$ Q J 64
$W^{2} \quad$ E

## $\$$ - <br> Q Q 65 <br> $\diamond A$ Q 10732 <br> - A 1098

\& K 865
$\checkmark$ AK 4
$\diamond$ J 95
\% 752
In the France v. Germany match, Lévy-Mouïel did the right thing by not saving against 4s.

## Closed Room

| West <br> Lévy | North <br> Gromoeller | East <br> Mouïel | South <br> Kirmse |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |

One down, France +50 .
It did not help them very much, however, as Elinescu had other ideas:

Open Room

| West <br> Wladow | North <br> Bompis | East <br> Elinescu | South <br> Quantin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 \%}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $6 \%$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

2\% was Precision style, showing five clubs and any fourcard suit but Wladow admitted, after play was over, that he had missorted his hand...(a euphemism for downgrading the hearts?)

What should North lead, in view of the double? When Bompis selected the 4 A, Wladow quickly had 12 tricks. Germany +1090 and 14 IMPs more.

The score at this point: 39-18 to Germany.
In the Bulgaria v. Norway match, both EW pairs saved against 4 but the outcomes were completely different:

| West <br> Brogeland | North <br> Isporski | East <br> Lindqvist | South <br> Kovachev |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $3 \Phi$ | Dble | $4 \checkmark$ |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| 58 | Pass | $6 \mathbf{2}$ | All Pass |

With South on lead, finding the heart ruff was automatic: Bulgaria +100 . Note the fine lead-directing $4 \checkmark$ bid by Kovachev.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stoyanov | Helgemo |  |  |
| 2)* | 24 | 3 | 49 |
| Pass | Pass | 5\% | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Hristov went on bidding till the sure minor-suit fit was reached. With North on lead, a heart was far from automatic. The $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ lead made it a quick +550 and 12 IMPs to Bulgaria tolead 33-18 at this point.

The approach the Germans had shown on this board did not always pay off, as we were able to see two boards later:

Board: IO. Dealer East/All vul.

- A 873

QQ9653
$\diamond 75$

- Q 4
\& Q 2
© J 102
$\diamond$ K 3
\& K 97653

- K 10964
- K 4
$\checkmark$ A 986
- 108
- J5

ค A 87
$\diamond$ QJ 1042

* AJ2

Open Room

| West <br> Wladow | North <br> Bompis | East <br> Elinescu | South <br> Quantin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT | All Pass | IQ | Pass |

Lead: $\vee 5$.
Closed Room

| West <br> Lévy | North <br> Gromoeller | East <br> Mouïel | South <br> Kirmse |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | $2 \boxtimes$ | All Pass |  |

Lead: 10.
In the Open Room, Elinescu's rather light opening led to a poor result for his team whereas the decent enough contract, reached by his team-mates after a weak NT opening
from South，failed on the rocks of distribution．Down two， vulnerable，at both tables produced a much－needed swing of 400 or 9 IMPs to France．

Yet another two boards later，Helgemo pushed his oppo－ nents overboard almost single－handedly levelling the match：

Board：12．Dlr：West／NS vul．
－KJ843
$\triangle$ A 6
$\diamond$ KJ 52
\＆ 63

```
& Q 5
&K IO 9 8 7 3
\diamond
& AKQ 7
```



```
－A 1072
\(\bigcirc\) Q J
\(\triangleleft 86\)
」 10842
```


## Bulgaria v．Norway：



Alain Lévy，France

When Brogeland took the diamond finesse to get rid of his club loser，he was just one down：Bulgaria +50 ．

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stoyanov | Helgemo | Hristov | Lund |
| 18 | 14 | 3 － | 39 |
| 4\％ | 49 | Pass | Pass |
| 5 | Dble | All Pass |  |

After two rounds of spades and a diamond from North， declarer won the Ace in dummy and tried to ruff a club first before touching trumps．This way，Helemo scored an unex－ pected trick with his $\triangle 6$ for a juicy extra undertrick：down three，Norway +500 and 10 IMPs back to trail by just I IMP．

Big swings again on the next board，with the goddesses of fortune very much favouring the brave：

Board：13．Dealer North／All vul．
－ 43
$\checkmark 763$
$\diamond$ K 10
\＆AJ8653
－ 19
$\bigcirc K$ Q J
$\diamond$ QJ 982
\＆K Q 10

## Open Room

| West <br> Brogeland | North <br> Isporski | East <br> Lindqvist | South <br> Kovachev |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass | $3 \vee$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

The Bulgarian NS bid their hands to the limit，due to their strong Club system．When the clubs behaved very friendly， II tricks rolled in easily in spite of the diamond lead．Bul－ garia +660 ．

The German NS pair produced an even more remarkable auction：

## Closed Room

| West <br> Lévy | North <br> Gromoeller | East <br> Mouiel | South <br> Kirmse |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | I足 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $\mathbf{3} 』$ |
| Pass | $4 \square$ | All Pass |  |

With everything behaving well and hearts 3-3, there was no effective defence. Germany +620 .

Both the other NS pairs were much more quiet:

## Closed Room

| West <br> Stoyanov | North <br> Helgemo | East <br> Hristov | South <br> Lund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | IS |  |
| Dbl | $2 \mathbf{2 0}$ | All Pass |  |

Ten tricks but II IMPs to Bulgaria.
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wladow | Bompis | Elinescu | Quantin |
|  | Pass | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3\% | All Pass |  |

Ten tricks but 10 IMPs to Germany.
Another two boards later, a slam swing was on in both matches:

Board: I5. Dealer South/NS vul.
¢ K Q 1043
\& 109
$\diamond$ K 2
\& A 432

| ¢ 87 | N | ¢ 65 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 643 | W E | $\bigcirc$ AJ 72 |
| $\diamond$ Q J 1075 | W E | $\diamond 643$ |
| ¢ 86 | S | \% 10975 |
|  | ¢ AJ92 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 85 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 98 |  |
|  | \& K Q J |  |

France v. Germany:
Open Room

| West <br> Wladow | North Bompis | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Quantin |
| $1 \diamond$ | 2 | $3 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Pass | 4\% | Pass | 4. |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

$2 \checkmark$ showed either 8 - 10 hcp with six spades or a variety of strong GF hands. This way, the French had given themselves the chance of declaring the slam from the right side of the table, i.e. the side from which it's pretty cold. When Quantin elected not to show his heart control, Bompis could not
move any more. France +680 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lévy | Gromoeller | Mouïel | Kirmse |
|  |  |  | $1 \%$ |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 64 | All Pass |  |

$4 \%$ showed a strong balanced spade raise and $4 \diamond$ was exactly the cuebid Kirmse wanted to hear. Played by North, the slam was just under $50 \%$ but who cares when it makes? Germany a fine +1430 and I3 IMPs more to lead by 82-29.


Brogeland's Is overcall of the strong Club showed clubs or the red suits and 30 thus was play or correct, showing at least two fits. These noises were enough to keep the opponents out of the slightly odds-against slam. Bulgaria +680 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South <br> Lund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 19 |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 34 |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | 68 | All Pass |  |

In an unopposed auction, Helgemo once again took the bull by the horns once Lund showed a heart control. With the $\vee A$ well placed at this table too, the Norwegian slam had rolled home for a I3-IMP pick-up to them and take over the lead: 5I-45.

After all these excitements, both matches quietened down considerably on the closing boards, the final scores being:

France v. Germany: 91-30 or 25-3 V.P.
Bulgaria v. Norway: 5I-59 or 14-I6 V.P.


## OPEN TEAMS

## Round 7

After the first two days' play, Finland were lying second to Italy in Group A. Their position in the standings may have been a surprise to many an "expert" here but it also is a perfectly good reason, I feel, to have a closer look at their match v. Italy, on Tuesday morning.

The match started off very quietly but as the match progressed, many different sorts of exciting hands came along. Defensive problems, play problems, bidding problems, judgement problems, all of more than enough general interest to be included in this report, I think.

Take for example board 4:

Board: 4. Dealer West/All vul.

|  | - 9 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 109 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 108643 |  |  |
|  | \& Q 43 |  |  |
| - AJ7652 | N |  | 108 |
| $\bigcirc 53$ | W E |  |  |
| $\checkmark 72$ |  |  |  |
| \& K 108 | $S$ ¢ |  |  |
|  | - 43 |  |  |
|  | PK8642 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q |  |  |
|  | - AJ9 5 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sementa | Koistinen | Angelini | Nyberg |
| Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In the Open Room, Sementa did not open the West hand. Left to their own resources, the Finns did not reach their cold heart game but preferred to languish in a diamond partial instead. Mind you, game might even be be made in diamonds on a defensive error.

But there was no such thing from Angelini. He cashed the \$K and, upon seeing his partner's count signal, accurately switched to a club to restrict declarer to 10 tricks. Finland +130 .

## Closed Room

| West <br> Juuri-Oja | North <br> Lauria | East <br> Kiema | South <br> Versace |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\text { Pass }}$ | Pass | $3 \varsigma$ | Dble |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

## Finland v Italy

by Jos Jacobs

In the Closed Room, Juuri-Oja did open the West hand and thus pushed his opponents into game. 4s by EW would have been too expensive against $4 \checkmark$ but the Italians ended up in their alternative diamond game when Lauria himself bid 49. As we saw, this can be defeated by a club switch at trick two but when Kiema continued playing on spades after leading the $\Phi$ K, Lauria easily wrapped up II tricks. So +600 and 10 IMPs to Italy.

Two boards later, NS could make game in spades but never entered the auction at either table:

Board: 6. Dealer East/EW

- A 6542
$\checkmark$ Q
$\diamond$ A 1042
\& 95


Open Room

| West <br> Sementa | North <br> Koistinen | East <br> Angelini | South <br> Nyberg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $2 』$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3 | All Pass |

Apparently, for Angelini there was no way to show diamond shortness. Still, the EW bidding must have sounded impressive enough to keep NS out. Italy +170.

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Juuri-Oja | Lauria | Kiema | Versace |
|  |  | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| 2 NT | Pass | $3 \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |  |  |

The Finns did have a way to show shortness and when this turned out to be in diamonds, West could confidently bid the heart game. Here too, it never occurred to NS to produce any noises. So Finland scored a fine +620 and 10 IMPs to just edge in front by I IMP.

This lead was not to survive the next board, however:

Board: 7. Dealer South/All
\& A 7543
$\bigcirc$ AK 7
$\diamond 2$

* Q J 82

```
$982
8942
< J 9 843
% 5
```



- Q 10

QQJ 1065
$\diamond 5$
\& K 10763

| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sementa | Koistinen | Angelini | Nyberg |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| Pass | 14 | Dble | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | $2 \checkmark$ | 3 | 38 |
| $4 \diamond$ | $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |  |

EW judged reasonably well to pass this (they might have doubled for 500) and Sementa led his club. Angelini won the ace and first cashed his $\diamond A$ before giving his partner a club ruff. This way, one undertrick disappeared but the contract still had to go one down. Italy +100 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Juuri-Oja | Lauria | Kiema | Versace |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 1Q | $\mathbf{2} \diamond$ | Dble |
| $5 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |  |

The anticipated save proved to be of the phantom type, as NS had no game their way. Kiema played well to go just one down by exploiting a slight defensive mistake. He won the trump lead and led a heart. Lauria went up with the king, Versace contributing the queen. Now, if Lauria plays a low spade immediately, even if declarer rises with the King, the defenders keep their communication intact to cash their major suit winners and avoid being endplayed.

But Lauria first cashed the $\odot$ A before leading a spade, so Kiema could win the King, eliminate hearts and clubs and play a spade to Versace to obtain a ruff and discard. Only one down, but still +200 to Italy and 7 IMPs to regain the lead by 6 .
(Mesbur as East, on lead to $4 \checkmark$, cashed $\diamond A$ and saw Fitzgibbon's $\diamond 3$, and worked out to shift to the NA and another club, to give his partner the ruff.)

The Italian lead had reached 14 when board 10 appeared:


Sementa must have felt rather unsure about his side's potential, as he decided not to have a go at 49. This would have made easily, so one down in $4 \diamond$ looked a favourable result for Finland.

## Closed Room

| West <br> Juuri-Oja | North <br> Lauria | East <br> Kiema | South <br> Versace |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I\& | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | I $\diamond$ |
| All Pass |  | $\mathbf{3} \diamond$ | $3 N T$ |



Geir Helgemo, Norway

Versace just bid 3NT as a two-way action: it might well make but it might also be a general save. The additional advantage of it was that it silenced everyone. West led a club to East's ace and carefully ducked his \$A when East switched to the $\$ 7$. Dummy was now $100 \%$ entryless so Versace could not avoid going down four when the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ misbehaved. Finland +7 IMPs to about halve the deficit.
The Finnish even managed to regain the lead on the next board:


Lead: 9. Angelini won the first spade (not that it mattered much) and led the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$, taken by North's ace. The spades were cleared and even double dummy, declarer could not come to nine tricks any more. Finland +100 when the contract went down two.
Kiema showed the way at the other table, with the help of some extra info from the auction:

## Closed Room

| West <br> Juuri-Oja | North <br> Lauria | East <br> Kiema | South <br> Versace |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 19 | INT | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 32 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

2e showed the rounded suits and 2NT was natural.
Here too, the 9 was led but this time, declarer ducked (not that it mattered much). Kiema won the next spade, crossed in clubs and led a diamond up, the King winning. With one diamond trick in the bag, he continued the suit but North won and cleared the spades. Next came a club to the ten and the A , followed by a heart from dummy. When North turned up with a singleton honour, the 8 J
was ready to become the game-going trick. Well played, Finland another +400 and II IMPs to lead by 6 (3I-25).
With the score at 32-28 two interesting boards settled the issue:

| Board: 16. Dealer West/EW |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ A 1042 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$-- |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ Q 98 |  |  |  |
| \& A 76532 |  |  |  |
| Q Q J 85 |  | 4 | 63 |
| $\bigcirc$ AK 1072 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| $\diamond$ AK 6 |  | , | 7543 |
| \& 10 |  | - |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q J 984 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 2$ |  |  |  |
| ¢ K Q J 984 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sementa | Koistinen | Angelini | Nyberg |
| 19 | 3\% | Pass | 5\% |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

Angelini would have been much better off to bid $5 \diamond$. This contract can go down two on a heart lead, red $v$. green, but on a club lead it might even make...
In conceding -650 for their stripe-tail ape double, Italy looked set for another loss but Versace had other ideas...

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Juuri-Oja | Lauria | Kiema | Versace |
| 18 | 2\% | 2 - | 38 |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | 49 | Pass | 5\% |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Redble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Juuri-Oja's double with the West cards looked quite justified butVersace was there just to prove the opposite. Here too, Kiema might have spoiled the Italian party by bidding $5 \diamond \ldots$
Anyway, the round number ( 1000 ) obtained by Italy here was ample compensation for the losses at the other table: 8 IMPs to regain the lead by 36-32.
Here we should pay tribute to the French who were precise with their slam bidding as this was their auction:

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Matushko | Bompis | Khokhlov | Quantin |
| $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | Pass | $5 \%$ |
| Dble | Pass | $5 〉$ | $6 \%(!)$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

France +1090 and 13 IMPs as they were allowed to play $4 \checkmark$ doubled, one off, in the Closed Room.

Nicely judged and a great overture for what was to come for them on board 19 (reported elsewhere in the Bulletin)

Back to our featured match, in which, once again, the new leaders enjoyed their lead only a short time as this was what happened next:

Board: 17. Dealer North/None

|  | \& A Q 52 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 4 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 9842 |  |  |
|  | ¢ 62 |  |  |
| ¢ K 108763 | ¢ J 9 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 1096$ |  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 75 |  |
| $\diamond 6$ |  | $\diamond$ A 5 |  |
| \% K Q 8 |  | 407543 |  |
| - 4 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 1832$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ KJ 1073 |  |  |  |
| \& AJ9 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sementa K | Koistinen | Angelini | Nyberg |
| 1\% |  | Pass | 18 |
| 18 | Pass | INT | 2 - |
| 21 | $5 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |

This time, Angelini was quite right to double but after that, it was up to Sementa to find the correct defence. His lead of the s K was quite OK but apparently, something went wrong in the signaling. Angelini played the 23 and now Sementa, instead of shifting to a heart, continued the Q $\mathrm{Q} .$. Curtains. Finland +550 .

## Closed Room

| West <br> Juuri-Oja | North <br> Lauria | East <br> Kiema | South <br> Versace |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I $\diamond$ | Pass | I 8 |
| IS | Pass | INT | $\mathbf{3} \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

This sound contract was worth only +130 to Italy (10 tricks) so Finland had gained 9 IMPs to again take over the lead: 4I-36.

Three more rather quiet boards made the final score 4636 to Finland, I7-I3 V.P. Italy had registered their first defeat. So the "Editor's Curse" had struck again: we should not have written in the Daily Bulletin that (after two days) Italy were the only undefeated team..

## Tough Test

by Mark Horton
In Round 3 of the Open Series this deal attracted a lot of attention:

Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
Q Q 97
คA753
$\triangleleft 53$
2 K Q 62


The question everyone was asking was can East/West make Four Hearts?
There are two obvious situations to consider. First let us suppose that West is declarer and North leads a spade to the king and ace.
West will win and it looks natural enough to run the jack of diamonds. South wins and will probably switch to a club.
Declarer wins with dummy's ace and plays diamonds, discarding a club. North ruffs and has two obvious defences.
If he plays ace of hearts and a heart declarer must win in hand with the queen and ruff spades, having just enough control to establish the jack and draw the last trump.
On the alternative line of a low heart declarer wins cheaply in hand and simply cross ruffs the black suits.
That appears reasonable enough, but a low trump lead by North is much more testing. Declarer will enjoy the rare experience of winning the first round of trumps with the four, but has a hard task from here.

- If he tries running the jack of diamonds South will win and switch to a club. Now when North ruffs the third round of diamonds he can simply play ace of hearts and a heart leaving declarer a trick short.
There is a winning line, but it is not clear that it can be found. Declarer must play another trump at trick two. If North goes in with the ace and plays a third trump declarer must win in dummy and play a diamond, putting in the eight if South plays low.
If North withholds the ace of hearts declarer wins in dummy and plays a diamond, but this time if South plays low it is good enough to play the jack. When that wins declarer can either cash the ace of spades and ruff a spade, or cross to the ace of clubs, cash the ace of diamonds and play a diamond.
The question is, why should declarer adopt this line, rather than take the 'normal' diamond finesse?
Well, you might argue that the known void in trumps make sit more likely that South will hold length in diamonds.
If there is enough time I will check the results at every
: table to see if anyone was able to find the winning line on a
: trump lead - if you did make sure you pay a visit to the Bul-
: letin room!


## Messages from the Appeals Committee

All the appeals are written up and will eventually be published (the appeals from Antalya have just appeared on the EBL web-site - follow the links "Departments" and "Appeals").

Some appeals may be published in the Daily Bulletin, subject to interest and space contraints. We present here the first appeal, because it is (mildly) influenced by the new Laws.

In the appeal we publish here one of the teams was unaware that an appeal had been lodged. Luckily they arrived sufficiently long enough before play started that the hearing could be held. In order for the Appeals Committee to be able to contact players, the organisers ask all captains to lodge, at the hospitality desk, a telephone number where they can be reached in case of an emergency. (Mobile phone or Hotel telephone).

## Appeal No. I <br> Hungary v Belarus

## Appeals Committee:

Jens Auken (Chairman, Denmark), Grattan Endicott (England), Guido Ferraro (Italy), Jean-Paul Meyer (France), Barry Rigal (England), PO Sundelin (Sweden)
Herman De Wael sat in on the meeting to act as Scribe
Open Teams Qualifying Round 6
Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- A 9864
$\bigcirc 7$
$\diamond$ J 2
KJ763
¢ KQ 53
$\checkmark$ QJIO 843
$\diamond 10$
\& $A Q$

- 110『 K 965
$\diamond A$ Q 9863
$\% 5$
© 72
- A 2
$\diamond$ K 754
\& 109842

| West <br> Timakhovich | North <br> Hégedüs | East <br> Zhukov | South <br> Honti |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | $2 \Omega$ | $4 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| 48 | All Pass |  |  |

Comments: 2 and a minor
4\% see below
Contract: Four Hearts, played by West
Lead: 4
Play: $\diamond I O$ to the Ace, $\diamond Q$ run
Result: 12 tricks, NS -680
The Facts:
4\% was explained by East to North as showing Heart support and Club shortness, while West explained it to South as Heart support and a club suit. South called the Director when dummy was spread and again at the end of the hand, stating that he would have bid 4NT if he had been told 4e showed a club singleton.

## The Director:

Checked the System Card of East/West and could not find anything regarding this sequence, so he decided to rule that South had been misinformed.
The Director considered that South had not bid $4 \diamond$ or $5 \diamond$, so he ruled that South would not have bid 4NT either.

Ruling: Result Stands
Relevant Laws: Law 40B4, I2BI

## North/South appealed.

Present: All players except West and both Captains
The Players:
North explained that bidding $4 \diamond$ or $5 \diamond$ was less indicated than 4NT would have been if the 4e-bid had been explained correctly to South. With the explanation received, South "knows" there is a diamond fit, but if it's explained as short, it's more probable that the fit is in clubs. When asked whether he did not consider that by bidding $4 \diamond$ he could be playing $4 \diamond$, North replied that East/West would certainly bid $4 \bigcirc$.
East/West mentioned that South might bid 4NT after $4 \diamond$ and $4 \oslash$, but North retorted that served no purpose, since they already knew the diamond fit. Bidding $5 \diamond$ is then once again up to South, so the problem is exactly the same.

The Committee:
Confirmed that South had been misinformed, and considered North/South had been damaged as a result.
Not bidding $4 \diamond$ was considered an error, but that is irrelevant, since even after bidding $4 \diamond$, North/South can never end up in 5 e.
If $4 \%$ is explained correctly to South, a bid of 4NT is clearcut, and North/South will reach 5\%. North/South should be compensated for that damage.
There was some discussion afterwards, if East/West would bid $5 \vee$. On this subject, the following considerations were made:

- East would continue to believe he had shown his hand, and he would double to show defensive values. The doubleton spade looks particularly bad in playing $5 \triangleleft$.
- West might continue to believe his partner held real clubs, so he would not remove 5 N .
- East/West, as offending side, should have no benefit of the doubt in this case.
For those reasons, the Committee felt there was no reason to include any weight for a contract of $5>$.
Five clubs is normally 2 off, losing a spade, two minor aces and a diamond ruff.

The Committee's decision:
Director's ruling adjusted:
Score adjusted to 5 EX by North, making 9 tricks, NS -300
Deposit: Returned

Note: Under the 2007 Laws, the Director is instructed to consider weighting the various possible outcomes of the hand, as set out in Law 12 Cl (c). Other zones, most notably Zone 2 (the ACBL) have exercised an option in the laws which replaces Law 12 CI (c) with Law 12 CI (e), which means the most favourable/unfavourable result is awarded.
The Committee, in exercising the powers of the Director, decided to rule that there was no substantial likelihood of a contract of $5 \gtrdot$, which explains why they too, despite ruling under Law I 2 Cl (c), arrived at a score adjustment with just one score.


## Championship Diary

A man purchased a case of rare, very expensive cigars and insured them against ...... fire. Within a month, having smoked his entire stockpile of fabulous cigars, and having yet to make a single premium payment on the policy, the man filed a claim against the insurance company. In
I his claim, the man stated that he had lost the cigars in 'a series of small fires.'
The insurance company refused to pay, citing the obvious reason that the man had consumed the cigars in a normal fashion. The man sued...and won. In delivering his ruling, the judge stated that since the man held a policy from the company in which it had warranted that the cigars were insurable, and also guaranteed that it would inI sure the cigars against fire, without defining what it conI sidered to be 'unacceptable' fire, it was obligated to compensate the insured for his loss. Rather than endure a I lengthy and costly appeal process, the insurance compaI ny accepted the judge's ruling and paid the man $\$ 15,000$ for the rare cigars he lost in 'the fires.'
However, after the man cashed his cheque, the insurance company had him arrested on 24 counts of arson. With his own insurance claim and testimony from the previous case being used as evidence against him, the man was convicted of intentionally burning the rare cigars and sentenced him to 24 consecutive one-year terms.

Richard Fleet is one of several people to contact us by email - you will readily understand why we publish his comments:

This is well up to the high standard that we've come to
expect - well done to all the team.A couple of comments on Bulletin 3:
I. I would have thought that a pair of children could have bid the grand on page $12 / 17$. What's system got to do with it? Even without the availablity of a forcing 38
 $29-2 \diamond-4 \diamond-5 \diamond-5 N T$... (depending upon whether East is allowed to bid $4 \diamond$ systemically). Without understanding all the complexities of their system, Lindquist's $4 \checkmark$ bid (no asterisk so presumably natural) seems a serious underbid.
2. I don't think that Bertheau's I opening on page I5 was worth 6 IMP. Rather, it was the actions of Lund and Helgemo in not bidding hearts that produced the swing. Even so, it seems amazingly conservative to pass 2 with the South cards (7 losers!).

All the best and keep up the good work.
As you might imagine football gets the odd mention I during the course of the day. Our resident vexillologist I Herman De Wael (the eleventh most famous Belgium) asked if we had heard of a well known Belgium football commentator who was world famous in Belgium.

The round 8 match between France and Wales was on BBO. When the controller pointed out the commentary was in French a Polish spectator said that was marginally better than having it in Welsh!

The bulletin editors were discussing the correct approach to the forthcoming press dinner. 'How about the possibility of finding four non-drinkers to share a table of six?' suggested one of them. ' I know' suggested the other;'how about ..............?'.
'No dice' said the first. 'We'd need at least three bottles a person just to drown him out!' 'Not at all' said the second; 'drink the first bottle, hit him over the head with it, and things will work out just fine'.
So if you are approached by either the Editor or Tacchi, remember to pack a strong hat, and some bandages.

## OPEN TEAMS

## Round 6

Sweden versus Bulgaria in Round 6 was a match with two faces. After 12 boards Sweden was in the lead by 56-0! Just when everyone thought the Bulgarians would be crushed, on the last eight boards Bulgaria scored 36 and Sweden only 6 , leaving us the score 62-36 IMPs.
Sweden kicked off at a furious tempo. Nystrom/Bertheau had no problem bidding to Seven No Trumps with 15 top tricks on Board I, while Karakolev/Danailov stopped in six. That was worth II IMPs for Sweden and a good start for them. Bulgaria lost more IMPs on a poorly made slam decision here:

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
$\pm 94$
ค」 1043
$\diamond 104$
KJJIO 86


Open Room

| West <br> Kovachev A-S | North <br> Nystrom | East <br> Isporski | South <br> Bertheau |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 N T$ | Pass |
| 60 | Dble | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Two No Trumps showed 22-23 HCP's and Kovachev took a rather optimistic view when he made an effort for a slam spot with his poor nine-count. That move backfired as the Bulgarians ended up in a hopeless small slam, - 100 .
Five Diamonds is the best contract, so with a little bit of luck this board could have been a push since the bidding in the Closed Room was the following:
Closed Room

| West <br> Wrang | North <br> Karakolev | East <br> Nilsson | South <br> Danailov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2 0}^{*}$ | Pass |
| $\mathbf{1} \nabla^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \mathbf{2 0}^{*}$ | Pass |
| $\mathbf{2} \wedge^{*}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

After a strong club opening Wrang's One Heart showed a balanced hand, and when he found out his side had two balanced hands with no more than 3I-32 HCP's, slam was not an option. The Swedes judged their values in a better manner and stopped in time. However, if Danailov would have found the imaginative lead of the club ace, the contract would have been beaten. When he led a low spade, Nilsson made his game and that was I3 IMPs to Sweden.

## Sweden v Bulgaria

by Peter Ventura

| Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ K 10642 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 9$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ Q 5 |  |  |  |
| \& A 8632 |  |  |  |
| ¢ A Q 93 |  | ¢ |  |
| คA 542 | W E |  | 76 |
| $\diamond$ J 103 |  |  | 762 |
| \& 104 |  | \& Q J 5 |  |
|  | ¢ J 85 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q J 103 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 94 |  |  |
|  | ¢ K 97 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kovachev A-S | Nystrom | Isporski | Bertheau |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \diamond *$ | 14 | 24* | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

One Diamond was Precision style. Bertheau, with an acceptable trump holding, had an easy task to convert Nystrom's optional double to a penalty ditto. North led his singleton heart and when declarer let the nine hold Nystrom switched to a diamond. Declarer was soon down two, -500.


Fredrik Nystrom, Sweden

Karakolev's opening showed spades and a minor, 4-9 HCP's, and he was left to play there for +110.9 IMPs to Sweden.
At this point Bulgaria was trailing by 56 IMPs! Then the first swing for Bulgaria came along.


Two Clubs was Precision, and Kovachev bid the no-trump game without giving away any information. North now had an awkward lead. Nystrom knew West had something in clubs, so he tried the ace of diamonds. Declarer won the diamond continuation in hand with the ten, and then played a spade towards dummy. North won the ace and played more diamonds. Declarer cashed the king of spades and let the club ten run, won by North's king. North could take his diamond trick, but declarer had the rest, +600 .
A heart lead would have been the best choice, but even the club king would have worked this time.
Closed Room

| West <br> Wrang | North <br> Karakolev | East <br> Nilsson | South <br> Danailov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | Pass |
| INT | Pass | $2 \mathbf{2}^{*}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond{ }^{*}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | All Pass |

In the Closed Room the Swedes again bid less aggressively than the Bulgarians. Since the game was made in the Open Room, the board was already lost for the Swedes.
Here North led a low club, won by dummy's ten, and a diamond was played to the ten and queen. Declarer won the heart return and played hearts back to South's queen. A diamond to the king and ace followed, and when Karakolev produced another diamond Wrang misguessed the position as he hopped up with the jack. At this point it is crucial for declarer to strip North of his remaining heart, but Wrang instead played the king of spades. North won the spade ace, cashed a winning diamond and since he still had a heart to exit with, declarer was one trick short, -100 . That was the start of a Bulgarian recovery. However, after Sweden's impressive start they were out of reach; Sweden 20, Bulgaria $I 0$.

## Dutch Recovery

by Patrick Jourdain (Wales)

In the round 6 match between the Netherlands and Czech Republic, the Dutch reached the wrong game contract on this deal, but Sjoert Brink recovered the points by taking advantage of his opponent's slip in defence:

Board I4. Dealer East. None Vul.

- A Q 86

ค 10932
$\diamond 8$
\& 9872

| K 1097432 | N | - J5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 8 |  | QJ75 |
| $\checkmark 2$ | W E | $\checkmark 10764$ |
| 2 A 43 | S | \& QJ 65 |
|  | - - |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 64 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AKQJ953 |  |
|  | - K 10 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South Brink |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vozabal | Drijuer | Slemr | Brink |
|  |  | Pass | 20* |
| $3{ }^{1}$ | Pass | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 4** | Pass | $5 \%$ |
| Pass | 5 | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bakkeren | Kurka | Bertens | Mraz |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| 2. | Pass | Pass | 34* |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

In the Closed Room the Czech Republic reached Three Notrumps. On a spade lead Kurka scored a simple 460. At Brink's table both 3 NT and 48 were bypassed and Brink found himself in Five Diamonds where he faced the loss of a heart and two clubs. West found the safe lead of a trump. Brink drew trumps and then laid down the ace of hearts.Vozabal fatally followed with a small heart. Brink continued with a low heart and West found himself on play with the queen, endplayed to concede the game for a 2 IMP swing to the Czech Republic. If West has both heart honours there is no defence. But if the honours are split and West has 3 hearts declarer has to play ace, king and another heart. Had West unblocked the heart queen the defence have the upper hand. Declarer cannot set up a heart entry to dummy without allowing East into the lead for the killing club switch.The play still has interest, though.AfterWest unblocks declarer now goes back to cashing trumps. Both defenders must keep three clubs to prevent declarer being able to make the game by exiting in clubs. (If West comes down to two clubs, declarer exits with the ten. If East has the doubleton club then declarer can exit with the king.) Netherlands won the match 17-13.

## New Laws

In the first article (see Monday June 16 bulletin) the main changes that were mentioned related to activities and right procedures by the players.

In this article we will describe other important changes in the laws.

A major change relates to insufficient bids. From now on an insufficient bid may be replaced by a call which describes hands that were also described by the insufficient bid. Also we retain the possibility to replace a natural insufficient bid by a natural bid in the same suit on the lowest legal level.

We need a couple of examples to make clear what is meant.
1s-I I overcall If $I \triangleleft$ was meant to show 4+ hearts and $2 \triangleleft$ in the system shows hearts as well the auction continues normally. Though $X$ in most cases also shows hearts it normally doesn't promise 4 hearts by agreement and if $I \vee$ shows 5 or more cards in that suit even a guaranteed 4 card hearts with a double does not describe a hand included in the $1 \Omega$-bid.
le-Is-I $\rangle$ TheTD finds out that the $I \triangleleft$ was meant as a natural response to 18 without noticing the overcall of l4. If this pair uses a negative double showing a 4-card hearts suit that double allows the auction to be continued normally. The replacement by $2 \triangleleft$ is allowed if $2 \checkmark$ is natural. This even makes it possible to make a distinction between a 4-card suit or a longer one.

It is important to understand that not only the suits shown have to be considered but also the strength when using the first criterion. In the second example the double shows at least the strength of the insufficient $I \oslash$ answer.

Once in a while a bid doesn't show anything, which then means that if it is insufficient it may be replaced by any legal call.

> INT-pass-2』-3e

24
The TD finds out that the INT-opener did not see the $3 \boldsymbol{1 0}$ bid. If this pair has an automatic 24 answer to the $2 \checkmark$ transfer any legal call as a replacement is permitted. For example 34, though it does not comply with the other criterion, the call of 24 not being natural.

The law has become more severe towards a player who tries to solve the irregularity himself, by a replacement call. If his LHO does not accept the insufficient bid the substitution (if legal) stands and the TD has to decide whether this bars partner or not.

Another major change concerns the penalty for a revoke. It becomes one trick unless the player won the trick in which he revoked (ruffed it when able to follow suit) on
which case the penalty remains 2 tricks (of course under the assumption that the revoking side won at least 2 tricks from the revoking trick onwards). This means that the TD more often than in the past has to adjust the score if a I trick penalty does not offer sufficient compensation for the damage created by the revoke.

NBO's get a wider opportunity to restrict the use of partnership understandings. They may create special understandings on the basis of opponents not being familiar with those and then forbid their use. They also may restrict the use of artificial psychic calls.

There is a normal protest time regarding TD's dealing with irregularities. But in case of a scoring error a regulation may allow the TD in cooperation with the tournament organizer to correct it even later.

From now on players should shuffle their hand before putting it back in the board. In a tournament like this there is no need to do so, since each physical board is only played once, but in other cases not shuffling creates useful information about the order in which the cards were played.

We have introduced a clarification period, the time between the final pass in the auction and the first lead being faced up. That is the time for the projected declarer and dummy to inform their opponents about wrong explanations given and both are allowed to consult their system card for it.

Once in a while it happens that a board can't be played through a fault by a player. When in a teams event the innocent side at the other table has already obtained a good score the TD may take that into account when deciding the adjusted score.

Appeal procedures may be varied in any way, which means that they may even be abandoned.

Ton Kooijman

## Recording

We have noticed that some countries do not record their matches in accordance with the conditions of contest (B3.3.9). As you all know the home team is required to record bidding and play in the open room while the visiting team does so in the closed room. The recording is done by the captain or an appointed designee. If a team has a captain playing we allow a player of the team sitting out to do the job.
Teams not complying with this regulation will be fined 2VP's and repeated violation will result in exclusion.

## DANS LA LUZERNE

La luzerne (ou plutôt le Trèfle) a été favorable aux Français lors de la séance d'hier matin au cours de leur méritoire victoire en face des Russes.
Seuls, dans les deux poules, ils ont appelé - gagné - 6 Trèfles (contrés qui plus est) sur la donne 16 puis 7 trèfles sur la 19. Le mérite en revient à Marc Bompis et Jean Christophe Quantin.


Donne 19. Dealer Sud. E/O Vul.

|  | ¢ 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AD 753 |  |
|  | $\diamond 1073$ |  |
|  | \% R DV 3 |  |
| 4 D 832 | N | Q RV9 |
| $\bigcirc 98642$ |  | $\bigcirc$ RV |
| $\checkmark$ V 94 | W E | $\checkmark$ D 8652 |
| 2 6 | S | \& 1084 |
|  | - A 10754 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark A R$ |  |
|  | 9 A 9752 |  |

Le Trèfle a failli autant leur sourire sur la donne 13 qui a vu leurs adversaires déclarer 3 SA en Nord Sud avec une teneur à Trèfle peut-être légèrement insuffisante, à savoir DIO en main en face d'un singleton au mort. Alain Lévy, en grand spécialiste, a produit l'entame du Valet de Trèfle dans As Valet 3.Sept levées de Trèfle étaient à prendre à l'entame, mais l'excellent Hervé Mouiel - et comme on le comprend - a pensé que l'entame provenait d'un doubleton et fourni petit pour ne pas livrer 3 levées (As Dame 10) au

déclarant dans la couleur. Pour la petite histoire, leurs équipiers gagnaient 4 piques sans coup férir dans l'autre salle.

Donne I3. Dealer Nord. Tous Vul.

- DV 52

『 V 875
$\diamond A \vee 97$
\& 5

| - 743 | N | - R 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ R 109643 |  | $\bigcirc 2$ |
| $\checkmark 5$ | W E | $\checkmark 643$ |
| - AV3 | S | ¢ R 987642 |
|  | - A986 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AD |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ RD 1082 |  |
|  | - D 10 |  |

## MAUVAISE DECISION

La mauvaise décision est un très doux euphémisme pour qualifier une erreur grossière commise par un champion.

## COURSE D'ATTENTE

La formation maltaise, qui, soit dit en passant respecte parfaitement la parité, puisque comprenant trois joueuses pour trois joueurs, a choisi comme tactique la course d'attente prolongée. A dire vrai, peut-être ne s'agit-il pas d'une tactique. L'autre hypothèse tient à la contrariété due à la perte d'une valise qui aurait contenu leur système d'enchères.

## OU L'ON REPARLE DUTREFLE

Sur les donnes 5 et 12 du 7 ème tour, on pouvait être tenté, et certains ont succombé à cette tentation, d'appeler un chelem à Trèfle qui, à chaque fois, chutait sur une répartition perfide des atouts. Ce qui a permis à Philippe Cronier de déclarer malicieusement, lors de son commentaire au rama, que l'horoscope que chacun pouvait lire dans le journal du matin interdisait de nommer les chelems à Trèfle. Ce fut en tout cas vérifié jusqu'à la donne 12.

## PORTRAIT D'UN SPORTIF

Peut-on parler de hasard à propos de la carrière bridgesque du sympathique Patrick Bocken. II se peut. D'une famille sportive, Patrick, par ailleurs très bon spécialiste du hockey et classé C $15 / 2$ en tennis a commencé de jouer au bridge à l'âge de 24 ans (il en a 32 aujourd'hui). Il apprit un jour qu'en son club, le Léopold, un tournoi de débutants allait être organisé. Suivi de commentaires.
Jusque là, Patrick pratiquait le whist occasionnellement avec son père. Il s'inscrivit au tournoi qui, faute de combattants, n'eut jamais lieu. En revanche, il eut droit aux explications gratuites dispensées par Alain de Duve, le fils du


Prix Nobel de biologie.
Conquis, il dévora en 18 heures de rang un ouvrage consacré à la majeure cinquième, avant d'apprendre - tout à fait par hasard également, et ce, trois jours avant l'épreuve -, l'existence d'un championnat de Belgique juniors. Patrick a alors
remporté ce tournoi en face de Guillaume Smits.
Deux fois finaliste par la suite de la Division I, ce qui justifie sa présence à Pau, cet ingénieur électromécanicien, amateur de musique classique (il classe Beethoven un peu devant Mozart) est, précisons-le à l'intention des charmantes joueuses qui vont arriver dès aujourd'hui et que ce court portrait pourrait intéresser... célibataire.

## HOMONYMIE OU PRESQUE

Nos amis anglais comptent sur Tony Waterlow pour les mener à la qualification. Il est vrai que, ce que beaucoup de Français ignorent, son patronyme, à une lettre près; constitue un nom de... victoire.

## Sit-out exercise 2 - solution

Minimum strength for 3NT?
East-West can't be kept from nine tricks with the following layout:

- AKJIO 987543
$\bigcirc A$
$\diamond A$
\& K
1 -
$\bigcirc 2$
$\diamond 32$
- AJ 109876543

- Q 32

876543
$\diamond 7654$
\& 2
, -
© K Q J 1098
$\diamond K$ QJ 1098
$\%$ Q
North can take spade A, K and his red aces, but the rest belongs to East-West.
7 points! Did you find a solution with less?

## Sit-out exercise 3

Five Diamonds - time for a problem where no creative skill is needed.
West opens with Three Spades and leads the king of his suit against West's Five Diamonds. South follows with the jack. West wins the trick, and plays a trump to the ace. South discards a club.

| - A 5 | N | - 76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ AK 83 |  | $\bigcirc 762$ |
| $\diamond 9876543$ | w | $\checkmark$ AK 2 |
| 2- | S | \% KQJ8 |

Best play? What are the chances to make?

## Humble Pie Corner

## P-O- Sundelin

Yesterday we ran the 'impossible 3NT' solution with a 53-card diagram, which is of course standard in Sweden. However, purists may prefer to delete the superfluous spade four from the South hand!
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