49th European Bridge Team Championships

Thursday, 26 June 2008

## Under Three Flags



What better way to espress yourself?
As we move ever nearer to the winning post each event sees a different country top the table.
The lead in the Open series changed hands several times during the day, but when the last result was posted it was Norway who had emerged on top, ahead of Germany, Russia and Italy.
Germany has increased its lead over Italy in the Women's series and these two are chased by France \& Spain.
Belgium has taken over from second placed Italy in the Seniors ahead of Turkey and Netherlands.

| Thursday 26th - 10.30 |  |  | Thursday 26th - 14.15 |  |  | Thursday 26th - 17.35 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | Iceland - Netherlands | RAMA | 8 | Italy - Russia | RAMA | 9 | Germany - Norway | RAMA |
| 1 | Portugal - France | BBO I | 1 | Sweden - France | BBO I | 1 | Bulgaria - France | BBO I |
| 5 | Czech Rep. - Italy | BBO 2 | 4 | Netherlands - Germany | BBO 2 | 3 | Italy - Netherlands | BBO 2 |
| 4 | Germany - Denmark | BBO 3 | 9 | Denmark - Poland | BBO 3 | 6 | Russia - Sweden | BBO 3 |
| 14 | England - Norway (W) | BBO 4 BBO 5 | 17 | Belgium - Norway (S) | BBO 4 | 30 | Italy - Germany (W) | BBO 4 |
| 14 | Poland - France (S) | BBO 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | Iceland - France (W) | BBO 6 | 30 | France - Scotland (W) | BBO 6 | 22 | Czech Rep. - France (W) | BBO 6 |
| 7 | Sweden - Bulgaria | SWAN | 9 | Denmark - Poland | SWAN | 4 | Denmark - Iceland | SWAN |

## WOMEN TEAMS PROGRAM

| ROUND 20 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |
| 21 | CZECH REP. | ISRAEL |  |
| 22 | SCOTLAND | DENMARK |  |
| 23 | FRANCE | ICELAND |  |
| 24 | RUSSIA | TURKEY |  |
| 25 | LEBANON | POLAND |  |
| 26 | PORTUGAL | SPAIN |  |
| 27 | WALES | AUSTRIA |  |
| 28 | GREECE | BYE |  |
| 29 | ITALY | CROATIA |  |
| 30 | FINLAND | GERMANY |  |
| 31 | ENGLAND | NORWAY |  |
| 32 | HUNGARY | SWEDEN |  |
| 33 | NETHERLANDS | IRELAND |  |


| ROUND 21 1 .15 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |
| 21 | AUSTRIA | ENGLAND |  |
| 22 | NORWAY | FINLAND |  |
| 23 | GERMANY | GREECE |  |
| 24 | CROATIA | NETHERLANDS |  |
| 25 | IRELAND | HUNGARY |  |
| 26 | SWEDEN | PORTUGAL |  |
| 27 | ISRAEL | WALES |  |
| 28 | ITALY | BYE |  |
| 29 | TURKEY | ICELAND |  |
| 30 | FRANCE | SCOTLAND |  |
| 31 | DENMARK | CZECH REP. |  |
| 32 | SPAIN | LEBANON |  |
| 33 | POLAND | RUSSIA |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| ROUND 22 |  |  |  | I7.35 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |  |
| 21 | ISRAEL | DENMARK |  |  |
| 22 | CZECH REP. | FRANCE |  |  |
| 23 | SCOTLAND | TURKEY |  |  |
| 24 | POLAND | ICELAND |  |  |
| 25 | RUSSIA | SPAIN |  |  |
| 26 | LEBANON | SWEDEN |  |  |
| 27 | PORTUGAL | IRELAND |  |  |
| 28 | NETHERLANDS | BYE |  |  |
| 29 | WALES | ENGLAND |  |  |
| 30 | ITALY | GERMANY |  |  |
| 31 | GREECE | NORWAY |  |  |
| 32 | FINLAND | AUSTRIA |  |  |
| 33 | HUNGARY | CROATIA |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## SENIOR TEAMS PROGRAM

| ROUND 14 | 10.30 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |
| 11 | AUSTRIA | WALES |  |
| 12 | SCOTLAND | SPAIN |  |
| 13 | FINLAND | SWITZERLAND |  |
| 14 | POLAND | FRANCE |  |
| 15 | DENMARK | GERMANY |  |
| 16 | TURKEY | ISRAEL |  |
| 17 | ENGLAND | BELGIUM |  |
| 18 | NORWAY | ESTONIA |  |
| 19 | SWEDEN | IRELAND |  |
| 20 | ITALY | NETHERLANDS |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ROUND | I5 |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |
| 11 | WALES | SCOTLAND |  |
| 12 | SPAIN | FINLAND |  |
| 13 | SWITZERLAND | FRANCE |  |
| 14 | AUSTRIA | DENMARK |  |
| 15 | GERMANY | TURKEY |  |
| 16 | ISRAEL | ENGLAND |  |
| 17 | BELGIUM | NORWAY |  |
| 18 | ESTONIA | SWEDEN |  |
| 19 | IRELAND | ITALY |  |
| 20 | NETHERLANDS | POLAND |  |


| ROUND 16 |  |  |  | I7.35 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |  |
| II | FINLAND | WALES |  |  |
| 12 | FRANCE | SPAIN |  |  |
| 13 | POLAND | SWITZERLAND |  |  |
| 14 | DENMARK | SCOTLAND |  |  |
| 15 | TURKEY | AUSTRIA |  |  |
| 16 | ENGLAND | GERMANY |  |  |
| 17 | NORWAY | ISRAEL |  |  |
| 18 | SWEDEN | BELGIUM |  |  |
| 19 | ITALY | ESTONIA |  |  |
| 20 | NETHERLANDS | IRELAND |  |  |

## Today's Schedule

I0.30 Open Teams F.R., Round II
Women Teams, Round 20 - Senior Teams, Round 14
I4.15 Open Teams F.R., Round I2
Women Teams, Round 21-Senior Teams, Round I5
I7.35 Open Teams F.R., Round I3
Women Teams, Round 22 - Senior Teams, Round 16

## WOMEN TEAMS RESULTS

## ROUND 17 - subject to official confirmation

Home Team Visiting Team IMPs VPs

| 21 | GERMANY | NORWAY | $44-33$ | $17-13$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 22 | CROATIA | ENGLAND | $54-51$ | $14-14$ |
| 23 | SCOTLAND | WALES | $64-33$ | $21-9$ |
| 24 | SWEDEN | GREECE | $75-6$ | $25-2$ |
| 25 | SPAIN | ITALY | $51-60$ | $13-17$ |
| 26 | POLAND | NETHERLANDS | $50-10$ | $23-7$ |
| 27 | TURKEY | HUNGARY | $74-36$ | $23-7$ |
| 28 | AUSTRIA | BYE | $0-0$ | $18-0$ |
| 29 | DENMARK | LEBANON | $72-34$ | $23-7$ |
| 30 | ISRAEL | RUSSIA | $30-57$ | $9-21$ |
| 31 | CZECH REP. | ICELAND | $39-34$ | $16-14$ |
| 32 | IRELAND | FINLAND | $34-80$ | $6-24$ |
| 33 | FRANCE | PORTUGAL | $46-12$ | $22-8$ |


| ROUND I8-subject to official confirmation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |  |
| 21 | SCOTLAND | CZECH REP. | $48-46$ | $15-15$ |  |
| 22 | ISRAEL | ICELAND | $46-33$ | $18-12$ |  |
| 23 | RUSSIA | DENMARK | $30-47$ | $11-19$ |  |
| 24 | LEBANON | FRANCE | $45-65$ | $11-19$ |  |
| 25 | WALES | NORWAY | $39-49$ | $13-17$ |  |
| 26 | HUNGARY | POLAND | $62-67$ | $14-16$ |  |
| 27 | NETHERLANDS | SPAIN | $35-69$ | $8-22$ |  |
| 28 | ENGLAND | BYE | $0-0$ | $18-0$ |  |
| 29 | GREECE | IRELAND | $24-25$ | $15-15$ |  |
| 30 | FINLAND | CROATIA | $20-70$ | $5-25$ |  |
| 31 | AUSTRIA | GERMANY | $24-83$ | $4-25$ |  |
| 32 | PORTUGAL | TURKEY | $20-55$ | $8-22$ |  |
| 33 | ITALY | SWEDEN | $45-57$ | $13-17$ |  |


| ROUND 19 - subject to official confirmation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |  |  |
| 21 | NORWAY | AUSTRIA | $72-24$ | $25-5$ |  |  |
| 22 | GERMANY | ENGLAND | $40-43$ | $14-16$ |  |  |
| 23 | CROATIA | GREECE | $49-67$ | $11-19$ |  |  |
| 24 | IRELAND | ITALY | $16-47$ | $9-21$ |  |  |
| 25 | CZECH REP. | WALES | $55-23$ | $22-8$ |  |  |
| 26 | SPAIN | HUNGARY | $70-16$ | $25-4$ |  |  |
| 27 | POLAND | PORTUGAL | $49-25$ | $20-10$ |  |  |
| 28 | FINLAND | BYE | $0-0$ | $18-0$ |  |  |
| 29 | FRANCE | RUSSIA | $37-36$ | $15-15$ |  |  |
| 30 | DENMARK | ICELAND | $43-32$ | $17-13$ |  |  |
| 31 | ISRAEL | SCOTLAND | $32-34$ | $15-15$ |  |  |
| 32 | SWEDEN | NETHERLANDS | $55-43$ | $17-13$ |  |  |
| 33 | TURKEY | LEBANON | $29-16$ | $18-12$ |  |  |

SENIOR TEAMS RESULTS

## ROUND II - subject to official confirmation

|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| II | WALES | BELGIUM | $11-42$ | $8-22$ |
| I2 | SPAIN | ISRAEL | $21-63$ | $5-25$ |
| I3 | SWITZERLAND | GERMANY | $34-56$ | $10-20$ |
| I4 | FRANCE | AUSTRIA | $26-46$ | $10-20$ |
| I5 | FINLAND | SCOTLAND | $13-54$ | $6-24$ |
| I6 | ESTONIA | DENMARK | $6-94$ | $0-25$ |
| I7 | IRELAND | TURKEY | $18-46$ | $8-22$ |
| I8 | NETHERLANDS | ENGLAND | $23-56$ | $7-23$ |
| I9 | ITALY | NORWAY | $38-21$ | $19-11$ |
| 20 | SWEDEN | POLAND | $42-33$ | $17-13$ |

## ROUND 12 - subject to official confirmation

|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| II | ISRAEL | WALES | $61-2$ | $25-2$ |
| I2 | GERMANY | SPAIN | $51-39$ | $18-12$ |
| I3 | AUSTRIA | SWITZERLAND | $81-11$ | $25-1$ |
| I4 | SCOTLAND | FRANCE | $9-8$ | $15-15$ |
| I5 | POLAND | FINLAND | $62-25$ | $24-6$ |
| I6 | DENMARK | BELGIUM | $24-66$ | $5-25$ |
| I7 | TURKEY | ESTONIA | $79-18$ | $25-2$ |
| I8 | ENGLAND | IRELAND | $44-29$ | $18-12$ |
| I9 | NORWAY | NETHERLANDS | $22-49$ | $9-21$ |
| 20 | SWEDEN | ITALY | $59-28$ | $22-8$ |

## ROUND 13-subject to official confirmation

|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| II | WALES | GERMANY | $33-16$ | $19-11$ |
| I2 | SPAIN | AUSTRIA | $33-7$ | $21-9$ |
| I3 | SWITZERLAND | SCOTLAND | $28-48$ | $10-20$ |
| I4 | FRANCE | FINLAND | $54-38$ | $19-11$ |
| I5 | ISRAEL | DENMARK | $10-53$ | $5-25$ |
| I6 | BELGIUM | TURKEY | $17-27$ | $13-17$ |
| I7 | ESTONIA | ENGLAND | $51-9$ | $25-5$ |
| I8 | IRELAND | NORWAY | $21-23$ | $15-15$ |
| I9 | NETHERLANDS | SWEDEN | $25-10$ | $18-12$ |
| 20 | ITALY | POLAND | $28-7$ | $20-10$ |

## Sitout exercise | |

With few high cards it is often easier to take more tricks if you have many trumps.
Today's question is:What is the minimum of high cards necessary to make a major game? As usual you are free to place all 52 cards.

## OPEN TEAMS PROGRAM

| ROUND II |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |  |
| 1 | PORTUGAL | FRANCE |  |
| 2 | ENGLAND | RUSSIA |  |
| 3 | NORWAY | POLAND |  |
| 4 | GERMANY | DENMARK |  |
| 5 | CZECH REP. | ITALY |  |
| 6 | TURKEY | LATVIA |  |
| 7 | SWEDEN | BULGARIA |  |
| 8 | ISRAEL | ESTONIA |  |
| 9 | ICELAND | NETHERLANDS |  |


| ROUND | 2 | 14.15 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |
| I | SWEDEN | FRANCE |
| 2 | ISRAEL | TURKEY |
| 3 | ICELAND | CZECH REP. |
| 4 | NETHERLANDS | GERMANY |
| 5 | ESTONIA | NORWAY |
| 6 | BULGARIA | ENGLAND |
| 7 | LATVIA | PORTUGAL |
| 8 | ITALY | RUSSIA |
| 9 | DENMARK | POLAND |


| ROUND 13 | 17.35 |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |
| 1 | BULGARIA | FRANCE |
| 2 | LATVIA | ESTONIA |
| 3 | ITALY | NETHERLANDS |
| 4 | DENMARK | ICELAND |
| 5 | ISRAEL | POLAND |
| 6 | RUSSIA | SWEDEN |
| 7 | PORTUGAL | TURKEY |
| 8 | ENGLAND | CZECH REP. |
| 9 | GERMANY | NORWAY |

## OPEN TEAMS RESULTS

| ROUND 8-subject to official confirmation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |  |
| I | FRANCE | TURKEY | $43-23$ | $19-11$ |  |
| 2 | CZECH REP. | SWEDEN | $67-64$ | $16-14$ |  |
| 3 | GERMANY | ISRAEL | $47-37$ | $17-13$ |  |
| 4 | NORWAY | ICELAND | $47-63$ | $12-18$ |  |
| 5 | ENGLAND | NETHERLANDS | $22-81$ | $4-25$ |  |
| 6 | PORTUGAL | ESTONIA | $76-33$ | $24-6$ |  |
| 7 | RUSSIA | BULGARIA | $39-31$ | $16-14$ |  |
| 8 | LATVIA | POLAND | $57-32$ | $20-10$ |  |
| 9 | DENMARK | ITALY | $32-51$ | $11-19$ |  |


| ROUND 9-subject to official confirmation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |  |
| I | FRANCE | ISRAEL | $46-14$ | $22-8$ |  |
| 2 | SWEDEN | ICELAND | $43-57$ | $12-18$ |  |
| 3 | TURKEY | NETHERLANDS | $55-53$ | $15-15$ |  |
| 4 | CZECH REP. | ESTONIA | $41-29$ | $17-13$ |  |
| 5 | GERMANY | BULGARIA | $41-35$ | $16-14$ |  |
| 6 | NORWAY | LATVIA | $60-21$ | $23-7$ |  |
| 7 | ENGLAND | ITALY | $38-55$ | $11-19$ |  |
| 8 | PORTUGAL | DENMARK | $8-64$ | $4-25$ |  |
| 9 | RUSSIA | POLAND | $41-31$ | $17-13$ |  |


| ROUND IO - subject to official confirmation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |  |
| I | CZECH REP. | FRANCE | $46-34$ | $17-13$ |  |
| 2 | TURKEY | GERMANY | $29-36$ | $14-16$ |  |
| 3 | SWEDEN | NORWAY | $46-62$ | $12-18$ |  |
| 4 | ISRAEL | ENGLAND | $52-44$ | $16-14$ |  |
| 5 | ICELAND | PORTUGAL | $37-33$ | $16-14$ |  |
| 6 | NETHERLANDS | RUSSIA | $24-56$ | $8-22$ |  |
| 7 | ESTONIA | POLAND | $49-57$ | $14-16$ |  |
| 8 | BULGARIA | DENMARK | $55-10$ | $24-6$ |  |
| 9 | LATVIA | ITALY | $33-36$ | $14-16$ |  |

## OPEN TEAMS RANKING <br> after 10 rounds

## subject to official confirmation

| I | NORWAY | 180.00 | 10 | CZECH REP. | 148.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | GERMANY | 178.00 | 11 | POLAND | 146.00 |
| 3 | RUSSIA | 170.00 | 12 | DENMARK | 145.00 |
| 4 | ITALY | 168.00 | 13 | TURKEY | 137.00 |
| 5 | SWEDEN | 165.00 | 14 | LATVIA | 136.00 |
| 6 | FRANCE | 163.00 | 15 | ENGLAND | 134.00 |
| 7 | ICELAND | 161.00 | 16 | ISRAEL | 115.00 |
| 8 | BULGARIA | 157.00 | 17 | ESTONIA | 114.00 |
| 9 | NETHERLANDS | 156.00 | 18 | PORTUGAL | I I I . 00 |

WOMEN TEAMS RANKING after 19 rounds
subject to official confirmation

SENIOR TEAMS RANKING after 13 rounds
subject to official confirmation

| I | GERMANY | 347.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | ITALY | 332.00 |
| 3 | FRANCE | 330.00 |
| 4 | SPAIN | 329.00 |
| 5 | SWEDEN | 320.00 |
| 6 | NORWAY | 319.00 |
| 7 | DENMARK | 313.00 |
|  | RUSSIA | 313.00 |
| 9 | ENGLAND | 308.00 |
| 10 | CROATIA | 304.00 |
|  | POLAND | 304.00 |
| 12 | CZECH REP. | 300.50 |
| 13 | ISRAEL | 297.00 |
|  | NETHERLANDS | 297.00 |
| 15 | TURKEY | 292.00 |
| 16 | FINLAND | 285.00 |
| 17 | ICELAND | 284.00 |
| 18 | SCOTLAND | 268.00 |
| 19 | HUNGARY | 267.00 |
| 20 | PORTUGAL | 242.00 |
| 21 | IRELAND | 229.50 |
| 22 | WALES | 229.00 |
| 23 | GREECE | 226.00 |
| 24 | AUSTRIA | 208.00 |
| 25 | LEBANON | 181.00 |


|  | BELGIUM | 242.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | ITALY | 235.00 |
| 3 | TURKEY | 233.00 |
| 4 | NETHERLANDS | 217.00 |
| 5 | ENGLAND | 215.00 |
|  | SWEDEN | 215.00 |
| 7 | AUSTRIA | 213.00 |
| 8 | DENMARK | 211.00 |
| 9 | ISRAEL | 209.00 |
| 10 | SCOTLAND | 207.00 |
| 11 | FRANCE | 202.00 |
| 12 | POLAND | 201.00 |
| 13 | GERMANY | 182.00 |
|  | NORWAY | 182.00 |
| 15 | IRELAND | 171.00 |
| 16 | FINLAND | 160.00 |
| 17 | ESTONIA | 151.00 |
| 18 | SPAIN | 145.00 |
| 19 | WALES | 142.00 |
| 20 | SWITZERLAND | 131.00 |

## INTERNATIONAL MIND SPORTS GAMES BEIJING VISAS

This year, due to the Olympic Games, the procedure to obtain the visas (even «Touristic » visas) are more complicated than for Shanghai last year.
To obtain the visa you will definitely need an invitation letter from the Chinese organisers and some countries even require it in Chinese.
Each NBO has then to fill a form listing all the players and accompanying people and send it to Lilian Sun sunchengmo82@yahoo.com.cn - before July 3Ist. She will then send you via mail the invitations to be produced to the local embassies to obtain the visas.

## OPEN TEAMS

## Round 7

# France v England Russia v Germany 

On Tuesday afternoon, both France and England had to fight for their chances to finish within the first six in a direct confrontation. Somewhere else in the Palais Beaumont, the leaders, Germany, were facing Russia, the latter fresh from a $24-6$ win in their morning match that had made them jump into the first six after an indifferent start. Here is a combined report on these two matches.

The opening board of the set immediately produced swings in both matches when more ambitious contracts than the expected spade partscore were reached:

Board: I. Dealer North/None vul.


## France v. England

Open Room

| West <br> Waterlow | North <br> Bompis | East <br> Hackett | South <br> Quantin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Pass | $\mathbf{2} \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \mathbb{}$ |

One could say that Quantin was the only of the four declarers involved who was playing a decent contract. When West led a low club, the defence had immediately established its 4th trick so Quantin and France had to be content with +140 .

## Closed Room

| West <br> Levy | North <br> Hackett | East <br> Mouiel | South <br> Hackett |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2 ゅ$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |

In the other room, East was on lead. When he too led a low club, Jason successfully ran this to his queen to make his contract. England +420 and 7 IMPs.

## Russia v. Germany

Open Room

| West <br> Elinescu | North <br> Gromov | East <br> Wladow | South <br> Dubinin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \Omega$ | Pass | $3 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | $4 \varrho$ | All Pass |  |

By leading the $\triangleleft I 0$, EW started off their defence along the right track. Had West overtaken and played a club through, all would have been well. However, when the $\Delta I O$ held the trick, East led a club himself...Russia +420 .

| Closed Room <br> West <br> Matushko | North <br> Piekarek | East <br> Khokhlov | South <br> Smirnov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 2 Pass | $2 \Omega$ |  |
| All Pass | 2 | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |

Here, East led the $\vee A$ and shifted to the $\diamond 10$ which held the trick. When he went back to hearts at trick three, declarer could not get rid of his club loser and thus had to go one down. Russia +50 and 10 IMPs, exactly the start they wanted.

A few boards later, the German doctors were in a slam:


Jean-Christophe Quantin, France

Board: 5. Dealer North/NS vul.

- J 10

○K 754
$\diamond 10954$
\& J 52

| - Q 853 | N | - AK976 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢J106 |  | $\bigcirc$ A 8 |
| $\checkmark$ KJ3 |  | $\checkmark$ A 7 |
| - 874 | S | ¢ K Q 96 |
|  | - 42 |  |
|  | ¢Q 932 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 862 |  |
|  | - A 103 |  |

Open Room

| West <br> Elinescu | North <br> Gromov | East <br> Wladow | South <br> Dubinin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | $1 \$$ | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass |
| $3 \$$ | Pass | $4 \%$ | Pass |
| $4\rangle$ | Pass | $6 \mathbf{2}$ | All Pass |

Well, the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ was with South so for the slam to succeed NS should have been kind enough to lead the \%A. When Dubinin led a trump, declarer was left to his own resources and thus quietly went one down. Russia +50 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Matushko | Piekarek | Khokhlov | Smirnov |
|  | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| $2 \Phi$ | Pass | 49 | All Pass |

No EW overbidding here. Russia another +420 and 10 IMPs more.

|  | Board: 6. Dealer East/EW vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 AJ 1082 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 109 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A |  |  |
|  | Q Q 62 |  |  |
| ¢ Q 543 |  | , K 76 |  |
| ๑K875 | W | Р J 43 |  |
| $\checkmark$ K J 3 |  | $\diamond 642$ |  |
| 9 53 |  | \& K 974 |  |
| 49 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 62$ |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ Q 109875 |  |  |  |
| * AJ 108 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Waterlow | Bompis | Hackett | Quantin |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass | $3 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Another decent contract for the French, making with two overtricks when both rounded kings behaved. France +150 .

## Closed Room

| West <br> Levy | North <br> Hackett | East <br> Mouiel | South <br> Hackett |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | 2 2 |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Opposite Justin's weak two, Jason took his fate in his own hands by bidding 3NT. He was richly rewarded with a suitable dummy and some friendly breaks, so nine tricks easily rolled home. England +400 and 6 IMPs to lead 16-0 now.

On the following board, all sorts of things were happening, as one might expect when a player is dealt 6-6 in the majors:

Board: 10. Dealer East/All vul.


## Russia v. Germany

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elinescu | Gromov | Wladow | Dubinin |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | $6 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $6 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |  |

Even a jump to the five-level could not stop East, though he had to make his cuebid at slam level now. Though West had some nice goodies in the majors, $6 \boxtimes$ was still one off...
Russia +200 .
Closed Room

| West <br> Matushko | North Piekarek | East Khokhlov | South <br> Smirnov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 19 | Pass |
| 2\% | $2 \diamond$ | 38 | $5 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |

Khokhlov elected to open the bidding in spite of his lack of hcp. This worked nicely when partner proved strong enough to force to game. In the end, Piekarek did well to take the save but Germany had lost another 500 at this table: Russia + 12 IMPs to lead 39-II now.

## France v. England

Open Room

| West <br> Waterlow | North <br> Bompis | East <br> Hackett | South <br> Quantin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| All Pass |  | $4 \diamond$ | 5 |

When Waterlow could not find a bid over $5 \diamond$, Paul Hackett was not tempted a second time, so France escaped for -I00.

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Levy | Hackett | Mouiel | Hackett |
|  |  | Pass | 12 |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \&$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ | 5 | All Pass |

Over just $2 \diamond$, Lévy easily found a bid so Mouïel could bid what looked like one for the road over $5 \diamond$, not having to show his full values. France +650 and II IMPs back.

Board II, discussed extensively elsewhere in the bulletin, produced swings in both our matches too.


Andrei Gromov, Russia

Both Khokhlov and Mouïel gained 10 IMPs for their respective teams by bringing home 4\$ with the recommended line of play: one round of trumps and four rounds of diamonds, endplaying North.

Big swings in both matches also on board I5:
Board: I5. Dealer South/NS vul.

- 8
$\vee$ AKQJ43
$\diamond$ K Q J 109
\& Q



## Open Room

| West <br> Elinescu | North <br> Gromov | East <br> Wladow | South <br> Dubinin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| I $\diamond$ | $4 \oslash$ | $4 \varrho$ | Pass |
| Pass | $5 \oslash$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Wladow won the board for Germany when he judged to bid 49.This would have gone down just one but when Gromov bid again, the Germans even registered a plus score: 200.

Closed Room

| West <br> Matushko | North <br> Piekarek | East <br> Khokhlov | South <br> Smirnov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{I} \diamond$ | $4 \oslash$ | All Pass | Pass |

When Khokhlov was less inspired than Wladow, Germany were allowed to score +620 for a gain of 13 IMPs. The score now stood at 50-29 to Russia.

France v. England
Open Room

| West <br> Waterlow | North <br> Bompis | East <br> Hackett | South <br> Quantin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{I} \diamond$ | $4 \oslash$ | All Pass | Pass |

No action from Paul Hackett either. France +680 when West ducked both a spade to dummy's jack and the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$, led from dummy next.

Closed Room

| West <br> Levy | North <br> Hackett | East <br> Mouiel | South <br> Hackett |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $I \diamond$ | $4 \varnothing$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $4 \varrho$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

When Mouiel was as inspired as Wladow, the twins did well to double this but they too, had to be content with a modest score of +100 only. France thus gained II IMPs here to lead by 43-17 at this point.

In the Russia v. Germany match, not very much more happened from here, the final result being $56-36$ or 19-II V.P. to Russia. They had stayed on course for Sao Paulo but Germany had managed to stay in the lead.

In the France v. England match, the last major swing went to England:

Board: 18. Dealer East/NS vul.

|  | - J 1092 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 98$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ QJI0 8 |  |  |
|  | * J 65 |  |  |
| Q - | N | - KQ65 3 |  |
| QJ10653 |  | $\bigcirc 72$ |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 9652 |  | $\checkmark 74$ |  |
| - A 102 | S | \& K Q 93 |  |
|  | . A 874 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AKQ 4 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 3 |  |  |
|  | ¢ 874 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Waterlow | Bompis | Hackett | Quantin |
|  |  | 14 | Dble |
| Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Paul Hackett's very light opening not only caught South, but also effectively talked NS out of what was by far their best fit. They might well have made $2 \wedge$ but $2 \diamond$ was not a success and had to go down two: England +500 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Levy | Hackett | Mouiel | Hackett |
|  |  | Pass | INT |
| Dble | Pass | $2 』$ | All Pass |

When East passed, South opened INT after which an EW gadget saw them reach a shaky contract. Mouiel even made his 29 but still had lost 9 IMPs with this effort. The final score thus became $46-26$ or I9-I I V.P. to France.They were back in the first six, or at least almost.

## Sitout 9 - Solution

West plays Five Diamonds after North has bid hearts, raised by South. South overtakes the club king lead by North, and returns the spade three. You win the ace and play the diamond ace but North shows out.


North must have a 3-6-0-4 distribution. So what, I hear you ask. Where is my eleventh trick?

Try the following:
Unblock a high diamond in dummy on the first trump trick. Continue with king and queen of spades. Ruff the queen high. Then draw all the trumps via finessing with the seven.
In the four-card ending you exit with the spade two. What can North do?


The answer is: Surrender.

## Old Man's Perfect Play

by Erdal Sidor

Orhan Ekinci is one of the well known bridge players in Turkey. He has previously represented his country twice in the Open series.
In Round IO of the Seniors he played this hand against the Netherlands:


North led his singleton heart and declarer won in dummy and played a spade to the ace disclosing the $4-0$ split. Then he played four rounds of diamonds, discarding his remaining hearts. When North had to win the fourth diamond he was knocked-out.
A diamond would allow a ruff and discard, while either black suit would cost a trick.

This deal provoked a considerable amount of discussion, as many players went down, eschewing the possible loser on loser play and simply playing South for the queen of clubs.
I had various conversations with some of the very best declarer players, notably Sabine Auken, Jean Paul Meyer and Guido Ferraro, although as it happens none of them declared this deal.
Is there any particular reason why South should be 0634 as opposed to 0643? Well, with eight clubs missing and only seven diamonds there is something of a case, although it's very tiny.

The real question one should is ask is can the contract be made if South is the one with the four diamonds?

If that is the case and North still has the AQ then there
is nothing to be done as declarer will inevitably lose two clubs, a heart and a trump.

The interesting case is the one where South has four diamonds and the queen of clubs, as in this layout:

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

- J 953
$\bigcirc 3$
$\diamond 762$
\& A 7532


When South produces the jack of diamonds, declarer has a choice of plays.
He can discard his last heart, ruff South's heart exit high (an interesting side line is that ifWest ruffs low, North must find the brilliant defence of refusing to overruff, instead discarding a club. If he overruffs and plays a trump declarer simply plays two more rounds of trumps ending in dummy, and the last of these squeezes South. But refusing to overruff upsets this plan. Declarer can continue with three rounds of spades, but North wins and exits with a club and South calmly puts in the nine leaving declarer with two losing clubs) and play a low spade.
If North ducks the trump, declarer win in dummy and plays a club to the ten. If North goes in with the jack and exits with a spade then declarer must exercise a little care: he plays the eight from dummy, overtaking in hand and then crosses to the ten of spades, which squeezes South in hearts and clubs.

Alternatively declarer may elect, when South produces the diamond jack in the diagrammed position, to ruff high and then play a low trump (indeed, a heart also works). North can win with the jack and exit with a trump, but declarer has more than one way to get home. I like the one where declarer wins in dummy and plays a club to the ten and ace. He wins the trump exit in hand and exits with a heart to endplay South. I leave you to enjoy working out the other possibilities.

So, when South has the queen of clubs you can afford to play for the loser on loser, since you will never go down when the contract can be made by following this line. It also gives you a significant extra chance of making the contract when the queen of clubs is wrong.

## OPEN TEAMS

## Round 8

## Norway v Iceland

When play started on Wednesday morning, Iceland and France shared the interesting 6th spot, so it was clear that Iceland needed to win if they wanted to keep their aspirations alive. There was a small problem, however: they had to play Norway, who would welcome a big win to keep their chances of winning the European title intact.
The match started well for Iceland with a double partscore swing on the first board:


Helgemo's raise to $2 \checkmark$ changed the tempo of the bidding. Lund had to bid a competitive $3 \oslash$ after which Baldursson could show extra strength by doubling. East correctly signed off, downgrading his 8 K . When the clubs proved 32 the 4-I trump break did not hurt declarer, so nine tricks were duly made. Iceland +140 .

Closed Room

| West <br> $A a$ | North <br> Jorgensen | East <br> Molberg | South <br> Armansson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | 18 |
| 14 | Pass | 24 | Dble |
| Pass | $3 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |

In the Closed Room, Jorgensen did not raise to 29 . When Armansson decided to double 2^, Aa might have redoubled but eventually the Norwegians sold out to $3 \bigcirc$.

Spades were led and continued, declarer ruffing. A club came next but now, the defence played off three rounds of that suit instead of forcing declarer with spades all the time. When declarer eventually led the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ from dummy,

East did not cover, thus solving declarer's trump suit problem. Not that it mattered any more, as dummy lacked the entry for a repeated heart finesse anyway. Iceland another +140 and a useful 7 IMPs to open their account.
Norway restored order immediately with two big blows in succession:

Board: 2. Dealer East/NS vul.


When Jonsson, after his shaded opening bid, failed to speak again, Norway had escaped the axe. Iceland +300 .


Thorlakur Jonsson, Iceland

## Closed Room

| West <br> $A a$ | North <br> Jorgensen | East <br> Molberg | South <br> Armansson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \mathbf{2}$ | Dble | All Pass |

Molberg brought himself into a much better position by passing as dealer, as he now had an automatic balancing double of $2 \triangleleft$ available. Jorgensen ran but it did not really matter any more: Norway would have scored (at least) +800 in $2 \triangleleft$ too... II IMPs back to them.
On the next board, an unlucky lead by an Iceman led to an even bigger swing:

Board: 3. Dealer South/EW vul.

- 2
$\checkmark$ K Q 3
$\diamond J 632$
A A 7643


Open Room

| West <br> Baldursson | North <br> Helgemo | East <br> Jonsson | South <br> Lund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \boxtimes$ |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| 2NT | All Pass |  |  |

Helgemo won the heart lead in hand and ducked a club to West's queen. He won the next heart in hand as well to lead a diamond up, but this way he had lost the entry to fully enjoy his luck in clubs and eventually went two down. Iceland +I00.

Closed Room

| West <br> Aa | North Jorgensen | East <br> Molberg | South Armansson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | INT |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 21 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

Here we had a quite reasonable Norwegian auction until North doubled. When South led a low diamond away from his king, the prospects of this contract suddenly were looking quite reasonable again. After giving up a heart and a
club, declarer cross-ruffed himself to an end position in which dummy held the blank $\$ \mathrm{Q}$ and declarer was left with sAJ7, South having had to follow suit every time and thus still to play from his \$KI083 when East led his last diamond. Contract made, Norway +790 and 12 more IMPs to lead 23-7.
With the score at 24-19 to Norway, this was board 8:
Board: 8. Dealer West/None vul.
4 A 5
คAK 872
$\diamond$ A 973
\% 98

```
& 9876
Q J1063
\diamondQ 5
& A 102
```


\& QJ 32
$\bigcirc 95$
$\triangleleft K 862$
\& Q 76

- K 104
$\bigcirc$ Q 4
$\diamond$ J 104
\& KJ543
Open Room

| West <br> Baldursson | North <br> Helgemo | East <br> Jonsson | South <br> Lund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | I $\otimes$ | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

For this contract to succeed, a 3-3 break in hearts and split diamond honours were required. Down two on a spade lead from West, Iceland +I00.


Geir Helgemo, Norway


Jon Baldursson, Iceland

## Closed Room

| West <br> Aa | North <br> Jorgensen | East <br> Molberg | South <br> Armansson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \vee$ | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \boxtimes$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The Icelandic NS were less ambitious, and rightly so at this vulnerability. Iceland another +170 and 7 IMPs back when ten tricks came in. They had regained the lead: 26-24.
But not for long...
Board: 9. Dealer North/EW vul.

- AK 2
$\bigcirc 43$
$\diamond$ AK 43
」 1976


Armansson correctly ducked the heart lead but when Molberg next led a spade the defence had to prevail after all. Well done by Norway for a score of +50 to them.

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Baldursson | Helgemo | Jonsson | Lund |
|  | INT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 Q}$ |
| Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

With North, Helgemo, at the helm, a defensive slip let the contract through. Helgemo won the $\triangleleft \mathbf{Q}$ and led a low club from dummy. If West goes up with the king (not so easy!) or if East ducks his ace, all will be well for the defence but when East won his ace in the Ist round of the suit, that was the end of the defence. Norway +400 and IO IMPs back to lead by eight now.
But not for long...
Board: 10. Dealer East/All vul.
上 J 865
$\triangle$ AK 864
$\diamond K 5$
2 Q 8

$$
1072
$$

$\diamond-$
$\diamond A Q 7643$
$\&$ AK 104


- A Q 93
$\bigcirc 1075$
$\Delta$ J 92
- 32
, K 4
®Q1932
$\diamond 108$
9765
Open Room

| West <br> Baldursson | North <br> Helgemo | East <br> Jonsson | South <br> Lund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | $3 \triangleleft$ |
| Dble | Pass | $3 \Omega$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |

As you can see, $5 \diamond$ is an excellent contract but with all the finesses wrong, declarer was a strong favourite to go down. Jon Baldursson had other ideas:
He ruffed the heart lead and played a spade to the queen and king. South returned the $\% 7$ but Jon put up the ace (noting the fall of the eight) and continued $\diamond A$ and another. West persisted with hearts, so Jon ruffed again and successfully ran the $\$ 10$. Two more spades were cashed, dummy's last heart was ruffed and dummy was reached again with the $\forall$ J, on which South discarded the 25 . When South next followed suit with the 20 on the from dummy, Baldursson put up the king and thus landed his contract. Iceland a well-deserved +600 .

Closed Room

| West <br> Aa | North <br> Jorgensen | East <br> Molberg | South <br> Armansson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I $\diamond$ | 18 | Pass | Pass |
| All Pass | $1 Q$ | 48 |  |

With all the finesses right for NS, this contract just went one off... +200 to Norway but 9 IMPs to Iceland to just regain the lead.

Board: II. Dealer South/None vul.
Q Q 1076
ค 64
$\triangleleft A K 876$
\& K 9

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& A } 83 \\ & 8 \mathrm{~K} 9 \end{aligned}$ | N |  | - K 95 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 532 |
| Q+104 | 2 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| - J 42 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A Q 10 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 54$ |  |  |  |
| Q Q 8532 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Baldursson | Helgemo | Jonsson | Lund |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 28 | Pass |
| Pass | 2. | All Pass |  |

Well balanced by Helgemo for just one off, Iceland +50 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North <br> Aa | East <br> Jorgensen | South <br> Molberg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Armansson |  |  |  |

A Norwegian misunderstanding led to a strange contract that had to go two down. Iceland another +300 and 8 unexpected IMPs to lead by 9 .
The Precision-style 2 opening showed its preemptive value on the board below:

Board: 14. Dealer East/None vul.

- 7652
-AQ764
$\checkmark$ K 9
- 85
- K IO 9843
$\bigcirc 10$
$\triangleleft$ Q 653
\& 14

| N | ¢ - |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 93$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 1042 |
| S | \& A Q 10763 |
| - A Q J |  |
| Q1852 |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 87 |  |
| -K92 |  |


| Open Room <br> West <br> Baldursson | North <br> Helgemo | East <br> Jonsson | South <br> Lund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 s}$ | 38 | All Pass | Dble |

In a sense, Helgemo was unlucky to find his partner with such solid spades. With North declarer, there was no realistic way to beat $4 \checkmark$. Norway +170 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North <br> Aa | East <br> Jorgensen | South <br> Molberg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Armansson |  |  |  |

Or do you think Molberg should have underled his AQ twice to get his spade ruff?
Iceland +420 and 6 more IMPs.
On the next board, West's choice of opening lead was the decisive factor:

Board: 15. Dealer South/NS

- KJ 108
- K 75
$\triangleleft 964$
- A 103
$\$ 9$
$\vee$ AJ 1084
$\diamond$ AJ 52
$\& 876$

| N |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| W | V E |
|  | S |
| - A 4 |  |
| Q9632 |  |
| $\checkmark$ K Q 10 |  |
|  | QJ 94 |

Q Q 76532
$\bigcirc$ Q
873
\& K 52

- A 4

『9632

- QJ 94

Open Room

| West <br> Baldursson | North <br> Helgemo | East <br> Jonsson | South <br> Lund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I $\varnothing$ | Dble | Pass | INT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

When West led the $\diamond 2$, Lund won the ten, took a losing club finesse and later ran the through East to land his contract with relative ease. Norway +600 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aa | Jorgensen | Molberg | Armansson |
|  |  |  | I $\diamond$ |
| I $\triangleright$ | Dble | Pass | INT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

For Norway, Aa led the $\vee$ J, ducked in dummy and overtaken (perforce) by East's queen. East led a diamond and West ducked declarer's queen so when Armansson next took a losing club finesse, he very soon found himself two down. Norway +200 and I3 IMPs back.

The score now was $53-47$ to Iceland. The remarkable thing was, though, that Norway had so far scored four dou-ble-figure swings and Iceland none.

Iceland sealed their victory on board 19 with yet another medium-sized swing:

Board: 19. Dealer South/EW
© Q J 103
$\bigcirc 1064$
$\diamond$ J 872
\& K 2


Open Room

| West <br> Baldursson | North <br> Helgemo | East <br> Jonsson | South <br> Lund |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IS | INT | Pass | IN |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

East led a heart to West's ace. Baldursson now went on to cash the $\diamond K$ first before continuing hearts, so he had sacrificed some undertricks but assured beating the contract.

Down only four, Iceland +200.
Closed Room

| West <br> Aa | North <br> Jorgensen | East <br> Molberg | South <br> Armansson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 0}$ | Pass | Pass | 30 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

This was the proper contract, Iceland +130 and 8 IMPs to win $63-47$ or $18-12$ V.P. They must have been disappointed in finding out they this useful win saw them go down from 6th to 8th in the table... with Sweden on the menu next!

Norway dropped to 3rd after this defeat, 7 VP behind Germany now and with Latvia as their next opponent.

## Sitout |O - Solution

How many spades can East-West make with maximum help from North-South?


Without revokes it is difficult to make all the tricks when opponents own the top trumps so let us settle for a modest small slam.
It requires some delicate carding by both sides.

## Trick

I- $\vee \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{Q}, 3$
$2->8,9,10, \diamond A$
$3-\diamond 3, \mathrm{~J}, \mathrm{Q}, 10$
$4-\diamond 4,7,9,8$
$5-\diamond 6,5,5, \diamond \mathrm{~J}$
Time for a trump
6-Q, LO, 2, 8
Now we give defenders a chance to ruff, which they eagerly grab

8-9, J, 7, 2
9-4, 5, 3, ゝK
10-4, 3, 4, K
II-I 3 West's $\triangleright 6,2$ and $\diamond 2$ are high. Note how a careful West could save his red deuces for the last tricks.
All declarer lost, and emphatically so, was trick 7.
Six Spades perhaps not bid, but made.

## NOTE

Israel received a preliminary I8VP for the match against Lebanon in the Women's series, which was not played.
According to the regulations the final result will be based on the average results against Lebanon of the four teams just above and the four teams just below lsrael in the ranking at the end of the round-robin but without the results obtained against Lebanon. Lebanon then receives the complimentary score.
It is estimated Israel will get 3 to 4 VP 's extra.

## The Reporter's Lot is not a Happy One

by Mark Horton

Choosing a match to watch is a somewhat haphazard affair, and if the computer is having an off day and fails to deliver an interesting set of deals or the players make things look too easy you can find yourself short of material. A bit like the people who had to report on the Euro 2008 quarter final between Italy \& Spain.
Yesterday morning I decided to follow a table from the Women's series, but after half a dozen boards the scoreboard had scarcely moved so I decided on an alternative strategy of taking advantage of the electronic data that is available to review the action on some of the more interesting deals at several tables.

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.


Victoria Gromova, Russia

On this deal several pairs attempted the hopeless Four Spades. 3NT has excellent practical chances in so far as South will surely lead a heart. It made easily enough at the two tables where it was attempted, by the English pair leading the Butler, Catherine Draper \& Anne Rosen, playing against Croatia, and as you might have guessed by a well know Russian outfit:

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ponamereva | Lazar | Gromova | Arami |
|  | Pass | Pass | I 8 |
| $1 Q$ | Pass | $2 \Omega$ | Dble |
| Redble | $3 \Omega$ | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

South led a heart and some indifferent discarding saw declarer emerge with II tricks.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
Q Q 1092
ค J 43
$\diamond 5$
\& K Q 1092

- J 64
$\checkmark$ AK
$\diamond$ K J 1087
8 743


A few pairs got caught on this deal when South discovered it was not safe to enter the auction:

Open Room

| West | North | East <br> Ahonen | South <br> Nurmi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kence |  |  |  |

## * Forcing 4 or less spades

After two rounds of hearts, a club to the ace and the queen of hearts East/West collected +800 and that gave Finland 9 IMPs against Ireland.

Since the disappearance of Great Britain, England, Scotland \& Wales are separately represented and matches between the three take on special significance.


Liz McGowan, Scotland
Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- AJ 6
- AQ952
$\diamond$ K Q 7
\& Q 7

| ¢ Q 9 | N | ¢ 7543 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ K J 876 |  | $\bigcirc 103$ |  |
| $\diamond$ AJ 62 |  | $\diamond 93$ |  |
| 9 42 | S | \% K 10985 |  |
| ¢ K 1082 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 4$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 10854$ |  |  |  |
| \% AJ63 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Woodruff | Benson | Clench | Alexander |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

On the lead of the ten of clubs declarer made nine tricks, as did virtually everyone else, so not much chance of a swing?

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McQuaker | Commins | McGowan | Shea |
|  |  |  | Pass |

$18 \quad$ All Pass

The same opening bid, but from West, and South's failure to balance cost her side dearly. Declarer scrambled five tricks, -200 and Scotland stole 9 IMPs from Wales.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- A 5

จAK 872
$\triangleleft A 973$
298

$$
9876
$$

$\diamond J 1063$
$\diamond$ Q 5
$\& A 102$


- Q J 32
$\bigcirc 95$
$\diamond$ K 862
\& Q 76
¢ K 104
$\checkmark$ Q 4
$\diamond J 104$
\& KJ543
3NT was the popular spot, but it generally failed. Let's drop in on the leaders, Germany, to see how they fared against Norway:

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thoresen | Auken | Vist | Von Arnim |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{Q}^{*}$ | Pass | $22^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 \$^{*}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

East led the queen of spades and declarer won with the ace and ran the nine of clubs, which was allowed to hold! That cost a trick, but not the contract. A second club went to West's ten and back came a spade to dummy's ten. The jack of diamonds was covered by the queen and ace and another diamond went to dummy's ten. Now declarer ducked a club and was +660 .

## Closed Room

| West <br> Alberti | North <br> Harding | East <br> Schraverus-Meuer | Fouglestad |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \S$ | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Played by South 3NT is very tough.
West led the eight of spades and declarer allowed East's jack to hold. She won the next spade with dummy's ace and can only get home by playing on clubs - low to the jack being theplayed a heart to the queen, followed by the jack of diamonds for the queen and ace. A diamond to the ten was followed by the top hearts, East discarding the six of clubs and declarer the three. A club went to the jack and West's ace and declarer won the spade return pitching a heart from dummy. A club to the king was followed by another club and West won and cashed out for one down and II IMPs.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- AK 2

ค. 43
$\diamond$ AK 43

- 976
- 1873
$\bigcirc 75$
$\diamond$ J9876
\& K 8

| N | - Q 965 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | QQJ 1092 |
|  | $\checkmark 10$ |
| S | - A 52 |
| -104 |  |
| PAK 86 |  |
| $\checkmark$ Q 52 |  |
| 2 Q 1043 |  |

3NT was a popular contract and you would expect it to go down on a heart lead that was generally found. But it made no less than nine times, usually because East didn't switch to spades and/or won the first club.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- J 865

PAK864
$\triangleleft K 5$


Five Diamonds was the popular contract, but no-one managed to make it - not really surprising. Only one E/W pair made a game and for that we have to visit the Greece $v$ Sweden encounter:

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bertheau | Mitsi | Midskog | Velaitou |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| I $\diamond$ | 18 | 19 | 38 |
| Dble | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |

4. All Pass

South led the queen of hearts and declarer ruffed and ran the ten of spades to South's king. She took the club switch with dummy's ace and played a low diamond to North's king. North switched to a spade so declarer drew trumps and claimed the rest.
Another heart after winning the king of diamonds would have forced dummy to ruff and cooked declarer's goose.
One North/South pair made game, Denmark's Nadia Bekkouche and Trine Binderkrantz, who were doubled in Three Hearts by Lebanon.

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
, 172
$\checkmark$ K 6
KQJ943
\& Q 10

| ¢ K 86 | N | ¢ A 10943 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q J 9 5 43 | W E | $\bigcirc 8$ |
| $\diamond 107$ | W E | $\checkmark$ A 86 |
| * A 7 | S | \& K 643 |
|  | , Q 5 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 1072 |  |
|  | $\diamond 52$ |  |
|  | 219852 |  |

Italy has been doing well - they achieved a spectacular result on this deal against Spain:

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bordallo Cortina | Manara | Matut | Ferlazzo |
| $2 \otimes$ | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West led the five of hearts and declarer won with the ten and played on diamonds. The play record goes no further, but somehow declarer recorded nine tricks!!

Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.

- Q 94

๑KQ10965
$\diamond$ J
2 1063

- K J 6

ค 82
$\diamond$ A 10842
\& Q 72


In theory you can defeat Four Hearts, but it was made several times as East is likely to lead a low diamond. 3NT is a very decent proposition as it takes a club lead followed by a switch to the queen of diamonds to beat it. Only one pair attempted it:

| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ponomareva | Lazar | Gromova | Arami |
|  | $\mathbf{2} \nabla^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $\mathbf{3} \mathrm{D}^{*}$ | Pass | 3 NT |

You can't blame West for leading a diamond, but that was declarer's ninth trick which gave Israel 10 IMPs.
Revenge for Board I and a good place to stop, especially as the layout Editor is begging for some copy.

## OPEN TEAMS

## Round 8

## Denmark v Italy

by Peter Ventura

Italy has more or less been ranked first from start to finish in the seven previous European Championships. However, here in Pau the Italian squad need put on a to spurt if they want to keep the trophy. Would Denmark, lying twelfth after seven rounds, in Wednesday's morning match be the first dish of the day for the Italians?

Italy kicked off fastest, and they were gaining IMPs which took them to an early lead by 17-0 after three boards. 8 IMPs came here:

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.


## TRANSPORTTO PAU AIRPORT ON SUNDAY, JUNE 29

There will be bus transfers to the airport on Sunday, June 29, only.

Team Captains are kindly requested to register at the Hospitality Desk, mentioning the number of persons, the hotel from which each person is leaving and the departure time of each person's flight.

Staff members may also register individually.
Registration will be closed on Thursday, June 26, at the end of the day's play.

Departure times of the buses will be published on Friday afternoon, June 27.

Three No Trumps will be defeated only on a diamond lead, so when South led his longest suit declarer, had nine tricks secured. As a matter of fact, Lauria made two overtricks since South pitched two clubs on the spades. Italy +460 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bjarnarson | Bocchi | Askgaard | Duboin |
|  | Pass | Pass | 18 |
| 14 | $2 \bigcirc$ | 24 | All Pass |

Here declarer painlessly claimed nine tricks upon a heart lead: Denmark +140 but that was 8 IMPs to Italy.
How would you defend with the East hand below?


Two No Trumps was invitational. Your partner leads the seven of hearts, dummy plays the three and your nine allows to take the first trick. How do you want to proceed?
Lorenzo Lauria realized that his heart suit most probably would not be established, since it was likely for West to hold only two hearts. Therefore he abandoned the hearts and instead switched to a spade. Not surprisingly, signore Lauria had found the killing defence. This was the whole layout:

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
, AK2
$\bigcirc 43$
$\diamond A K 43$

- J 976
- 1873
$\bigcirc 75$
$\diamond 19876$
\& K 8


Q Q 965
Q Q J 1092
$\checkmark 10$
\& A 52
, 104
คAK 86
$\diamond$ Q 52
\& Q 1043

| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Versace | Bilde | Lauria | Hansen |
|  | I $\diamond$ | 18 | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bjarnarson | Bocchi | Askgaard | Duboin |
|  | INT | Pass | 2\% |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 38 | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The spade switch created two spade tricks for the defence, and along with the first heart trick and two club tricks declarer had only eight tricks. Bravo, Lauria!
Declarer can not succeed by refraining from ducking the first heart trick, since West in that case could win an early club trick and return a heart. Thus East would still have a club entry to his established hearts. This was indeed what happened in the Closed Room, where Bocchi grabbed the heart lead by East immediately, so no swing.

Halfway through the match Italy were leading by 30 to 8.
Board I3. Dealer North.All Vul.


Closed Room

| West <br> Bjarnarson | North <br> Bocchi | East <br> Askgaard | South <br> Duboin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2} \oslash$ | Pass | 4 |

All Pass

How strong can a weak two be? Well, here North's hand would not contain more than 10 points and not likely an ace aside of K-Q-J-x-x-x in hearts. But it likely could be a hand like this:

```
x X
    & KQ IO 9 x x
Q J x
& x x
```

To bid game or not to bid game, that is a matter of style, but it is easy to sympathize with Duboin's choice.
Bilde got a spade lead and could pitch a losing club on the fourth spade for two overtricks, while Bocchi faced a club lead which led held him to nine tricks; Denmark +I70 and +100 respectively gave them 7 IMPs.
In Norway's match against Iceland Geir Helgemo was declaring Four Hearts. He got a low diamond as his lead, so he played low from dummy and West's ace won the trick. West switched to a club and from here on Helgemo misplayed the hand, as the cards lie, when he took the club ace and eventually played for his $75 \%$ chance by taking the double finesse in spades. A better line in the long run might be to duck the club switch, win the club ace on the second turn, draw the trumps, discard a club on the diamond king, and then ruff a club. When the club suit is divided 3-3 you can pitch a spade and you will have ten tricks. If the club suit is divided $4-2$ you will still have the chance of guessing the spade suit successfully.

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
-KJ 108

- K 75
$\diamond 964$
- A 103

49
©AJ 1084
$\diamond$ AJ5 2

- 876


Open Room

| West | North | East | South <br> Hersace |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bilde | Lauria | Hansen |  |
| $2 \boxtimes$ | $2 N T$ |  | INT* |
| Pass | $3 \varnothing$ | Dble | $3 N^{*}$ |
| All Pass |  |  | $3 N T$ |

*12-14
Closed Room

| West <br> Bjarnarson | North <br> Bocchi | East <br> Askgaard | South <br> Duboin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1 IN |
| I $\varangle$ | Dble | Pass | INT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Both tables reached the poor contract of Three No Trumps and both declarers faced the lead of the heart jack. Hansen covered with the king, which held the trick. At trick two he finessed the spades successfully, and played a spade to the ace. On the losing club finesse East returned a diamond. Declarer put up the king and now Versace erred by playing the ace. By playing low declarer would have been doomed, as West can discard on black cards after South. However, when with on the diamond ace,Versace cashed the heart ace and exited with a club to dummy's ace.At this point this was the position:

|  | - K 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 7$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 96$ |  |
|  | - 10 |  |
| - None | N | - Q 62 |
| $\bigcirc 1084$ |  | $\bigcirc$ None |
| $\checkmark \mathrm{J} 2$ | W E | $\diamond 83$ |
| -8 | S | - 5 |
|  | - None |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 96$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 10 |  |
|  | - 19 |  |

When declarer cashed the king of spades, with a heart discard in hand, and then two club tricks, West has to come down to three red cards. If he keeps two diamonds a heart will throw him in and then give declarer two diamond tricks. In practice Versace kept two hearts and bared his diamond jack, in case partner held the diamond ten, but now declarer played the queen of diamonds - and dropped the jack. Well done by Bilde! Denmark +600 and that was 12 IMPs when Duboin did not duplicate the Danish play at the other table.

Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.

| - J 4 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 876 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 95$ |  |  |  |
| KJ832 |  |  |  |
| - AKQ 1093 | 3 N |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 54$ | W E |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \diamond 84 \\ & \bullet 976 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 10763 |
|  | S |  |  |
|  | + 52 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AJ 1093 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q 2 |  |  |
|  | \& A 105 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Versace | Bilde | Lauria | Hansen |
|  | Pass | Pass | 18 |
| 2. | 38 | All Pass |  |

This was a reasonable auction to a reasonable contract. Declarer lost two spades and a club trick, so Denmark +170 .

## Closed Room

| West <br> Bjarnarson | North <br> Bocchi | East <br> Askgaard | South <br> Duboin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | Pass | Pass | I 8 |
| $3 \mathbf{4 Q}$ | All Pass |  |  |

The heart opening showed five cards. Bjarnarson's preempt forced Bocchi to participate on the four-level, so he did bid Four Hearts with that rubbish. However, this time it turned out very well for the Italians, as it was almost impossible not to make the game.
The defence started with two rounds of spades, and then played a diamond into declarer's tenace. When declarer took the trump finesse and played the clubs from the top he emerged with eleven tricks. Italy +450 and that was 7 IMPs for them.

Three more rather quiet boards made the final score 5I32 to Italy, I9-I I VPs. Were the Azzurri on their way to the position where they left off in Warsaw?

## VICTORY BANQUET



The Victory Banquet will take place on Saturday, June 28 at 19.00 hrs. in the Jaï Alaï, about I2 kms away from the Palais Beaumont.

Invitation cards can be picked up at the Hospitality Desk. Team Captains are requested to pick up the invitations for all their players as well. Staff members should obtain their invitations through their respective department chiefs.

All invitations should be picked up not later than Friday, June 27 at noon.

Other guests who want to attend the banquet can buy their invitation cards at the Hospitality Desk at a cost of 25 euros.

When picking up invitation card(s), you are requested to register all persons involved for the transfer to the banquet venue. Buses will leave at 18.00 hrs . and at 18.40 hrs from the Palais Beaumont. Please note that you cannot change your bus transfer time once you registered.

IMPORTANT NOTE: you are requested to present your invitation card to get access to the bus and also to get access to the Jaï Alaï.

# World University Bridge Championships 2nd till 9th September 2008, Lodz (Poland) 

The 4th World University Bridge Championship organised by FISU (International University Sports Federation) will be held in Lodz, Poland from 2nd till the 9th of September 2008. After a wonderful championship in 2006 in Tianjin with 27 University teams, this event must be a bigger success. 2 University or High School teams per country are allowed. Official entries pass via the National University Sport Federation of the country. The costs are limited to less then 1000 Euro per team of 4 players full board. Please contact the National University Sports Federation of the country or the University of the students to see if there can be support from there side to cover some costs. Flying to Lodz is cheap via Ryan Air and Wizz Air.

The championships will be played at the University Campus at Lodz. The highest technical bridge standards will be applied and the matches will be broadcast on the internet at www.unibridge.org. The local organization committee will organise every evening special student activities like sports competitions at the campus and a visit to the music festival in town during that period.

Till now, about 20 teams have entered for this championship with a lot of Asian teams, USA and Canada, but still a lot of European countries are missing. It is not too late to enter teams for this event with a big university spirit!!!

All information about this championship regarding entry conditions, costs, schedule, visa, can be found on this website www.unibridge.org or www.bridge2008.net. For any other information about this Championships, please contact geert.magerman@pandora.be or Radek Kielbasinski President of the Polish Bridge Union or Slawek Latala (TD in Pau).

See you in Lodz!!

[^0]
# First 'European University Bridge Championships' organized by EUSA in Opatija (Croatia), 4th till IOth October 2009 

 onships will be organised in Opatija, Croatia. Bridge has been recognized as a sport in 2007 by EUSA, European University Sports Association. It is a competition between universities and any country and university can send any number of teams. At the last European University Bridge Championships in Brugge, 32 university teams have participated. In Croatia, we would like to do better with at least 35 university teams.More information about this event will be published as soon as it is available on www.unibridge.org.

Geert Magerman
Chairman Technical Committee FISU and EUSA
geert.magerman@pandora.be

## 'University Bridge Pairs' on BBO

After the European University Bridge Championships in Brugge, we organised till now 5 times the 'University Bridge Pairs' competition, allowing the students to meet each other after the event and play bridge.

This competition on the internet was a big success, and was contested by 70 to 220 pairs. Twice this was won by students who were in Brugge. We will continue this tradition in September, every first Sunday of the month on BBO, starting at 7 PM (Paris time) playing 20 boards.

More information will be published on www.unibridge.org.

Please inform all the students of your federation about this possibility!!

[^1]
## UNDER 18 INTERNATIONAL TEAMS OPEN TOURNAMENT - Pau, 24/26 june 2008

| nr | teams | I | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | pen | vp | rank |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | France I | xx | 22 | 25 | 25 | 22 |  |  | 23 | $\mathrm{II7}$ | $\mathrm{I}, 5$ |  |
| 2 | France 2 | 8 | xx | 25 | 19 | 25 | 23 |  |  | 100 | 3 |  |
| 3 | France 3 | 0 | 2 | xx | 16 |  | 23 | I |  | 42 | 7 |  |
| 4 | France 4 | 3 | II | I 4 | xx |  |  | 2 | 14 | 44 | 6 |  |
| 5 | Italy Boys | 8 | 3 |  |  | xx | 25 | 5 | 13 | 54 | 5 |  |
| 6 | Italy Girls |  | 7 | 7 |  | I | xx | 0 | 0 | 15 | 8 |  |
| 7 | Sweden |  |  | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | xx | 17 | 117 | $\mathrm{I}, 5$ |  |
| 8 | Germany | 7 |  |  | 16 | 17 | 25 | 13 | xx | 78 | 4 |  |

## ROUND I - subject to official confirmation

|  | Home Team | Visiting Team | IMPs | VPs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | FRANCE I | FRANCE 4 | $76-19$ | $25-3$ |
| 2 | FRANCE 2 | FRANCE 3 | $89-28$ | $25-2$ |
| 3 | ITALY BOYS | ITALY GIRLS | $87-22$ | $25-1$ |
| 4 | SWEDEN | GERMANY | $37-29$ | $17-13$ |

## ROUND 4 - subject to official confirmation

Table Home Team Visiting Team

| I | ITALY BOYS | FRANCE I | $12-41$ | $8-22$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | FRANCE 2 | ITALY GIRLS | $53-18$ | $23-7$ |
| 3 | FRANCE 3 | SWEDEN | $24-89$ | $1-25$ |
| 4 | FRANCE 4 | GERMANY | $33-39$ | $14-16$ |


| ROUND 5-subject to official confirmation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Table Home Team |  |  | Visiting Team |  |  |
| I | FRANCE I | GERMANY | $59-25$ | $23-7$ |  |
| 2 | FRANCE 2 | ITALY BOYS | $72-22$ | $25-3$ |  |
| 3 | ITALY GIRLS | FRANCE 3 | $33-67$ | $7-23$ |  |
| 4 | SWEDEN | FRANCE 4 | $65-4$ | $25-2$ |  |


| ROUND 6 - subject to official confirmation |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |
| I | SWEDEN | FRANCE I |
| 2 | GERMANY | FRANCE 2 |
| 3 | FRANCE 3 | ITALY BOYS |
| 4 | FRANCE 4 | ITALY GIRLS |


| ROUND 7 - subject to official confirmation |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Home Team | Visiting Team |
| I | ITALY GIRLS | FRANCE I |
| 2 | SWEDEN | FRANCE 2 |
| 3 | GERMANY | FRANCE 3 |
| 4 | FRANCE 4 | ITALY BOYS |

[^2]
## MAIN DE VELOURS

Si l'arbitrage se passe aussi bien, il le doit d'abord à la cohésion de l'équipe. Une équipe, dont toutes les décisions sont d'autant meilleures qu'elles sont prises collégialement par trois arbitres au moins et entérinées par Antonio Riccardi, qui connaît quasiment tous les joueurs. Certains d'entre eux depuis l'âge des juniors. Il bénéficie donc d'un atout majeur : leur confiance. Il ne lui reste plus qu'à appliquer sa manière que nous définirions en inversant de célèbres propos: «Une main de velours dans un gant de fer ».


## DE LA DIFFICULTE DU CAPITANAT

Jiri Stulc, l'enjoué responsable de l'équipe tchèque, a dirigé durant 35 ans des équipes de volley-ball. ne expérience qui ne lui est pas inutile dans son capitanat, tant il est vrai que certains de ses protégés n'aiment pas jouer le matin ou que d'autres ne souhaitent pas en découdre sous l'œil des caméras. II doit aussi composer avec ceux qui ne veulent pas rencontrer certains pays... ou tiennent à l'avoir comme scoreur.

## UNE FAMILLE QUI PROMET

Ce sont quatre représentants que compte la famille Rimstedt à Pau. Outre Sandra, 21 ans et Cecilia, 19 ans, brillantes dans l'épreuve réservée aux dames, leurs frère et sœur, jumeaux, collectionnent les scores de 25 dans le tournoi cadets. Un nom à retenir d'autant plus qu'Ola et Mikael viennent d'avoir 13 ans.

## QUE PENSER DU CHIFFRE I3?

La donne 13 d'hier matin a provoqué bien des différences dans le camp français ( 10 points en faveur des filles, par ex-
emple), ce, dans les deux sens, tant il est vrai que l'entame était décisive. Le fait de nommer les Cœurs de la main de Nord laissait la chance de gagner la manche sur l'entame d'un petit Pique alors qu'un maniement normal des Piques, en partant de la main de Nord était voué à l'échec.

|  | - D9 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QRD 10965 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ V |  |
|  | 2 1063 |  |
| - RV6 | N | - 752 |
| $\bigcirc 82$ |  | QV43 |
| $\checkmark$ A 10842 |  | $\checkmark$ D973 |
| - D 72 | S | \& R V 8 |
|  | - A 1083 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 7 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ R 65 |  |
|  | - A 954 |  |

Dans le cas présent, il n'était pas déconseillé, n'en déplaise à certains puristes, d'ouvrir de 2 Cœurs en Nord, malgré l'existence d'un honneur 3ème à Pique

## I 3 TOUJOURS

Les champions qui, comme chacun sait, savent au moins compter jusqu'à 13 , connaissent certainement le parfait anagramme suivant : Eleven + Two = Twelve + One.

## NUANCE

Nous avons fait allusion, hier, aux avantages comparés d'une deuxième entame au bridge et d'un deuxième service au tennis. Jean-Paul Meyer a découvert une différence essentielle entre les deux sports : «La deuxième entame aurait des chances d'être meilleure que la première.»

## FORTS DE CAFE

Les comptoirs Lavazza ont leurs habitués. Ce qui fait dire à Katy Darrigade (parente du célèbre routier sprinter gascon du passé) que, parmi ses consommateurs de café, elle connaît désormais les amateurs de long, de normal, de large, de ristretto ou d'americano (on en oublie).



[^0]:    Geert Magerman
    Chairman Technical Committee FISU and EUSA geert.magerman@pandora.be

[^1]:    Geert Magerman
    Chairman Technical Committee FISU and EUSA
    geert.magerman@pandora.be

[^2]:    Francel Charignon Fabrice, Lafont Gregoire; du Corai Edouard, Cotreau Pierre
    France2 Loislard François., Boekhorst Maxime;Thibault Wiplier, Dieuleveut Anouk
    France3 Collard Adrien, Darrius Alexis, Benoit Lévy; Landeau Alexandre,Berard Raphael
    France4 Bernard Julien, Beugin François; Leleu Anais, Beron Kevin
    Italy Boys Palermo Francesco, Maruzzella Gianluca; Sau Roberto, Calmanovici Alessandro; Balestra Simon,Zanasi Gabriele
    Italy Girls Colombo Lara, Loreto Martina; Francese Corinne, Baldini Cecilia, Lanzuisi Flavia
    Sweden Grankvist Mikael, Rimstredt Mikael; Rimstedt Ola, Grankvist Ida
    Germany Ertel Niko, Kaeppel Katharina; Heim Anne, Eggeling Marie, Rudoplh Alona, Kaeppel Dominique

