## 5th EUROPEAN OPEN BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS



Issue No.II

# The Closer You Get 



The record breaking start to the European Open Pairs

The nearer you get to the summit, the greater is the fear of failure and the disappointment that inevitably goes with it. That will certainly be true for the teams who are eliminated today at the semi final stage, but it applies in equal measure to the ones who were eliminated yesterday. While we rejoice for the winners and commiserate with the losers, we are reminded of the inscription on the wall of the Centre Court players' entrance at Wimbledon 'If you can meet with Triumph and Disaster and treat those two impostors just the same.'

## Teams Prize Giving

The Teams Prize Giving Ceremony will be held on Wednesday 29th June immediately after the end of the last match, in front of the playing area Cl

Today's - Schedule
10.00 Open Teams Round of 8 (RI)
10.00 O/W/S Pairs Qualification (R6)
10.30 Women/Senior Teams Round of 4 (RI)
12.00 O/W/S Pairs Qualification (R7)
12.30 Open Teams Round of 8 (R2)
14.00 Women/Senior Teams Round of 4 (R2)
15.00 O/W/S Pairs Qualification (R8)
15.30 Open Teams Round of 4 (RI)

I7.00 O/W/S Pairs Qualification (R9)
17.00 Women/Senior Teams Round of 4 (R3)
18.00 Open Teams Round of 4 (R2)
19.00 O/W/S Pairs Qualification (RIO)

## OPEN TEAMS

| ROUND OF 32 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Ist | 2nd | total |
|  | WRANG | 21 | 71 | 92 |
|  | ANAVA | 25 | 1 | 26 |
| 2 | ERICAS | 30 | 18 | 48 |
|  | ISRAEL | 37 | 31 | 68 |
| 3 | MONACO Z | 44 | 2 | 46 |
|  | TEXAN ACES | 10 | 38 | 48 |
| 4 | PATANE | 40 | 48 | 88 |
|  | RIEHM | 20 | 12 | 32 |
| 5 | MAHAFFEY | 28 | 68 | 96 |
|  | NETHERLANDS JUNIORS | 19 | 15 | 34 |
| 6 | SHANURIN | 19 | 57 | 76 |
|  | DENMARK OPEN | 51 | 32 | 83 |
| 7 | IRENS | 28 | 38 | 66 |
|  | VITO | 29 | 48 | 77 |
| 8 | LAVAZZA | 21 | 54 | 75 |
|  | KANIN | 16 | 38 | 54 |
| 9 | KOPECKY | 50 | 55 | 105 |
|  | HUNGARY STEVE | 10 | 48 | 58 |
| 10 | NETHERLANDS WHITE | 49 | 44 | 93 |
|  | OTVOSI | 15 | 35 | 50 |
| 11 | BESSIS | 37 | 33 | 70 |
|  | APTEKER | 25 | 43 | 68 |
| 12 | JOKER | 10 | 50 | 60 |
|  | ISRAEL MONGOS | 26 | 19 | 45 |
| 13 | MONACO A | 20 | 51 | 71 |
|  | HELLE | 27 | 33 | 60 |
| 14 | NETHERLANDS RED | 49 | 26 | 75 |
|  | KRAJEWSKI LOWICZ | 1 | 41 | 42 |
| 15 | ROSENTHAL | 26 | 23 | 49 |
|  | VAINIKONIS | 19 | 22 | 41 |
| 16 | KAMRAS | 23 | 50 | 73 |
|  | BEGIJNTJE | 16 | 44 | 60 |

## SENIOR TEAMS

| ROUND OF8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | Ist | 2nd | 3rd | total |
|  | KUTNER | 43 | 26 | 43 | 112 |
|  | WOJEWODA | 11 | 27 | 29 | 67 |
| 2 | PHARON | 43 | 11 | 36 | 90 |
|  | TEAM MARKO |  | 19 | 34 | 75 |
| 3 | GRENTHE | 35 | 46 | 30 | 111 |
|  | MIROGLIO | 26 | 29 | 30 | 85 |
| 4 | POL-CH | 49 | 19 | 30 | 98 |
|  | ENERGETYK | 3 | 26 | 13 | 42 |


| ROUND OF16 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Ist | 2nd | total |
|  | WRANG | 40 | 49 | 89 |
|  | ISRAEL | 12 | 23 | 35 |
| 2 | PATANE | 39 | 4 | 43 |
|  | TEXAN ACES | 30 | 29 | 59 |
| 3 | MAHAFFEY | 36 | 22 | 58 |
|  | DENMARK OPEN | 15 | 29 | 44 |
| 4 | LAVAZZA | 33 | 41 | 74 |
|  | VITO | 25 | 5 | 30 |
| 5 | KOPECKY | 22 | 12 | 34 |
|  | NETHERLANDS WHITE | 41 | 48 | 89 |
| 6 | JOKER | 5 | 10 | 15 |
|  | BESSIS | 32 | 34 | 66 |
| 7 | MONACO A | 52 | 11 | 63 |
|  | NETHERLANDS RED | 18 | 24 | 42 |
| 8 | KAMRAS | 14 | 8 | 22 |
|  | ROSENTHAL | 23 | 27 | 50 |

## WOMENTEAMS

| ROUND OF 8 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | Ist | 2nd | 3rd | total |
|  | CRONIER 45 | 49 | 34 | 128 |
|  | PENDER 24 | 37 | 8 | 69 |
| 2 | POLAND 37 | 20 | 27 | 84 |
|  | KAPADOKYA 50 | 3 | 32 | 85 |
| 3 | CBC MILANO 41 | 30 | 29 | 100 |
|  | JOEL 36 | 55 | 26 | 117 |
| 4 | NETHERLANDS WOMEN I 48 | 60 | 29 | 137 |
|  | ITALIA 25 | 2 | 28 | 55 |

## The King Sacrifice

by Patrick Jourdain (Wales)

In chess the Queen sacrifice is well known but a king sacrifice ends the game. Not so in bridge, witness this effort by Tim Verbeek of the Netherlands and Team Whitehouse. The deal comes from Round 6 of the Open Swiss Teams:

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

|  | - A 95 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 93 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 6432 |  |  |
|  | \& 95 |  |  |
| - 742 | N |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 1085$ |  | E $\bigcirc$ | QJ 64 |
| $\diamond$ K QJ 105 |  | E |  |
| - 84 | K1063 AQ32 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 72$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 98$ |  |  |
|  | KJ1076 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Krupowicz | Verbeek | Zawislak | Molenaar |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | 18 | D |
| Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Dы | 29 |
| 2 | All Pass |  |  |

In this partscore contest the double from Danny Molenaar showed four or more spades. The Is bid by Verbeek showed precisely three spades. The final contract was $2 \triangleleft$ by East, Slavomir Zawislak.

The defence began with $\diamond 9$ to the king and ace. Verbeek switched to the 99 and declarer's finesse lost to the king. A second club was taken by the ace.

Declarer's problem is that he cannot reach dummy. If he tries ruffing clubs North can over-ruff twice. There are five obvious losers. On lead with the ace of clubs Zawislak tried the effect of leading the trump queen. Verbeek let this hold. Next came the trump jack. This was more testing. Should the king offer his life in a noble cause?

Yes, indeed. If the king takes the second trump declarer has an entry with the ten to enjoy several diamond tricks. And so Verbeek played low again. The partscore was defeated.

Suppose North actually wins the first trump with the king and the defence cash ace and king of spades before South plays a third club. Declarer can ruff high and cash one diamond throwing his last club.

## Just the Facts

## Nevena Senior



Date of Birth: 2 1/09/1959
Place of Birth: Sofia, Bulgaria Place of Residence: Nottingham
What is your favourite colour?
Black to wear, green to look at
What kind of food makes you happy?
Thai
And what drink?
White wine and champagne
Who is your favourite author?
I have been reading mostly crime in the last ten years and my favourite authors vary. At the moment Jo Nesbo, a Norwegian described as the next Stieg Larsson
All time favourite movie?
Gone with the Wind
Do you have a favourite actor?
Al Pacino
Actress?
Michelle Pfeiffer
What kind of music do you like to listen to?
Classical, Bulgarian, Easy Listening
Do you have a favourite painter or artist? Da Vinci
What do you see as your best ever result?
Winning the Mind Sports Olympiad in Beijing and managing to stay with Brian for 20 years
Do you have a favourite hand?
Not really
Who is your favourite bridge player?
Catherine D'Ovidio in the women, Rumen Trendafilov in the men
Is there a bridge book that had a profound influence on you?
Polish Bridge Magazine in the second half of the 80s
What is the best bridge country in the world?
Poland \& USA
What are bridge players particularly good at (except for bridge)?
Having a good time in the bar after the bridge is over
What is it you dislike in a person?
Dishonesty
Do you have any superstitions concerning bridge?
I don't change pens if l'm winning
Who or what would you like to be if you weren't yourself? A Fox
Which three people would you invite to dinner?
Jason Hackett, David Gold and David Cameron
Is there something you'd love to learn?
Latin
What is the stupidest rule in bridge?
No strong feelings about it

## Same system - Different results

by Sviatlana Badrankova

Belarusian bridge owes a lot to Polish bridge and in many different aspects. First of all the Polish bidding system is so popular in Belarus that instances of systems like Precision or Better Minor are rare. So, when Belarus women met the Polish women in RR 7, the match promised to bring a lot of pushes. Nevertheless, 12 boards presented a harvest of 80 IMPs, 49-3I for our hostesses. I offer two boards from this match; one of them could be nominated as best played hand, the another one as a candidate for brilliant defense. The heroine is the same in both cases.

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

|  | - AQ952 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PK10832 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J |  |  |
|  | - KJ |  |  |
| - 63 | N |  | 107 |
| $\bigcirc 964$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ A Q J 7 |
| $\checkmark 10962$ |  | $E \quad \diamond A$ | $\checkmark$ A Q 53 |
| 4 A Q 32 |  | -6 |  |
|  | - J 84 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 5$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 874 |  |  |
|  | -109874 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sawicka | Shokhan | Harasimowicz | Beliankina |
|  | $1{ }^{1}$ | INT | Pass |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 21 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The different approach to the same system was revealed on the very first board. East led a small club (low from a doubleton) and declarer played the jack under West's ace. The spade return went to East's king and then the next trick was taken by dummy's 48 . Now Elena Shokhan cashed the K and sent the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ to the battlefield. East took her ace and played a trump back depriving declarer of a heart ruff. To this trick - attention! - West contributed a small heart.

Elena continued with the 10 , West played low, small heart from declarer, small diamond from East. As East's bid indicated 15-17, Elena placed East with all the remaining honours (except perhaps the jack of hearts). So she continued with a club ruffed in hand and the ten of hearts hoping for the best. As hoped for, the jack of hearts appeared from East. Now East faced a bitter choice: either exiting with a diamond (allowing declarer to score her club trick) or returning a heart, hoping for partner held the nine. East went for the latter - and found the very important 89 with partner. But West had
no more hearts and declarer generously allowed her to hold the trick. Now West had to play a diamond, presenting declarer with and entry plus a trick and her contract.. Small cards - the essence of bridge. Attention to the details - the essence of good declarer play. And +1IO for Belarus.

Next door, East doubled North's opening Is (INT would have been 4 cards in hearts and 5+ in a minor). South showed her weak fit with 24 and North applied full pressure with 3 . The defenders were happy to collect 5 tricks for +50 - no emotions. But 5 IMPs for Belarus.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/WVul.

- A 7
$\bigcirc 973$
$\diamond$ A 8742
-KJ2
- KJ86
© J 102
$\diamond$ K 65
\& 1063

- Q 1054
-AKQ65
$\diamond 10$
- Q 98
- 932
-84
$\diamond$ QJ 93
\& A 754


Elena Shokhan, Belarus

This time, the contract in both rooms was the same - as expected, actually.

| West <br> Sawicka | North <br> Shokhan | East <br> Harasimowicz | South <br> Beliankina |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \oslash$ | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | $3 \diamond$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | All Pass |

At the other table South bid (denying four cards in spades) as a transfer to INT. West bid 28 and South revealed a fit in partner's suit when she reopened with $3 \diamond$. East considered her hand worth one more bid and the same final contract was found.

This time, Elena Shokhan had to prove herself as a defender with a small issue that has surely been discussed, in every bridge book ever written. But let's see how it works on practice. The defence started with the $\triangleleft \mathrm{Q}$ and J, ruffed by declarer. A heart to the ten and one back to the 8 K followed. A small spade came next to dummy's if and North ducked smoothly. The experienced declarer had done her job well - if South held the A North must have the AK and declarer's next move was a club to the queen and South's ace. South exited with a club, North took the jack and forced declarer with the ace of diamonds. With one trump in each hand (and one remaining with the defenders) declarer continued spades. North took her ace and (as she confessed after the match, was so excited at the thought that the contract would go down) that she that she didn't cash her club winner before exiting with diamond, so the contract was only one down rather than two. Still, +100 for Belarus. Together with the +140 recorded next door that was 6 more IMPs for Belarus.

As admitted, Belarusian bridge owes a lot to Poland - Belarusian players can participate in the Polish Championship by correspondence (for free), our tournament directors are regularly invited to director's seminar (with free participation and accommodation). Belarusian teams can improve their skills and gain experience by participating in the Polish Nationals (Ist and 3rd divisions as well as macro-regionals). In spite of the modern open world, Belarusians still need Visas to enter the EU - and we know that a helping hand comes every time from Polish officials inviting us for competitions in Poland (there are a lot of tournaments, especially in summer). A lot of Belarusian players participating in competitions in Poland have learned Polish - just because it wouldn't be possible otherwise. All these facts are small pieces of a big picture of the long term and very cordial friendship between bridge players of our two countries. And that's why we, the Belarusian women, will be fans of the Polish team in the upcoming Venice Cup they have qualified for. Lot of success to you, girls! Powodzenia!

## Souvenir Cards

The cards that you have been playing with are now for sale at Jannersten's sales stand (next to the coffee bar).

## University Bridge 2nd FISU/WBF World <br> University Bridge teams (BBO)

Knock-out university teams championships organized on BBO only open for university bridge students
Started in January 201I, today reaching half finals Modalities
FISU
34 teams entered (highest participation ever at a university event!)
4 continents represented
Several teams participate from countries that never participated at previous events:
Venezuela, India, latvia, Australia, Hong kong,
All results on facebook account "Uni bridge"
Launch new 3rd event: start in Jan 2012?
Contact chairman TC FISU: geert.magerman@telenet.be Geert Magerman, Chairman Technical Commitee FISU

## University Bridge - Facebook account "UNI BRIDGE"

Aim: connect university bridge students all around the world Share continuously information with them
Let them communicate together
Launch new events
FISU Publish results
Created after FISU Championships Taiwan 2010 ( $8 / 2010$ )
Status: 259 students took themselves the initiatives to connect
Information:
Link to www.unibridge.org website with detailed info
Results \& matches online events
Launch of EUSA and FISU event
Replaces websites and e-mail
Strongly promoted by FISU
Contact chairman TC FISU:
geert.magerman@telenet.be
Geert Magerman, Chairman Technical Commitee EUSA

## Good Eidea

by Barry Rigal
Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

|  | - A Q J 87 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AQ 96 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ - |  |
|  | 2 Q 743 |  |
| ¢ K 6 | N | ¢ 1095 |
| $\bigcirc 1053$ |  | $\bigcirc$ J 72 |
| $\diamond$ Q 10542 |  | $\checkmark$ A J 83 |
| \& K 102 | S | \& $A 86$ |
|  | ¢ 432 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 84$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 976 |  |
|  | ¢ J 95 |  |

In the Swiss qualifying it was normal to reach four spades, and to receive the helpful trump lead - but few if any declarers played it correctly, and for the right reasons.
Let's say you capture the spade king with the ace at trick one. Normal play, whether after drawing trumps or not, was to play on clubs by leading to the nine. Now a diamond back and a further diamond after winning the club king would set you.
Instead, you should now draw a second trump and play the three top hearts. If the suit splits 4-2 you can ruff a heart later on and eventually lead a club to the nine for the contract.
When the hearts split 3-3 you draw the last trump...now what? If you play a club to the nine the same forcing defence as described above will prevail.
But in this ending, try the effect of leading a club to the jack - believe it or not this is a $100 \%$ guarantee of the contract!


When West wins his club honour he cannot usefully return a club or you can ensure making your game with the loss of just three clubs. If he plays a diamond you simply pitch a club and wait for East to win his $\diamond A$ and give you a club or diamond trick for your game.

## Championship Diary


(Our first three items appear thanks to Gabriel Chagas aided and abetted by Roy Welland)

From time to time it is useful to extend one's vocabulary. In a previous tournament we gave you interfrastically. Poznan's word is: Paraprosdokians I had to look up 'paraprosdokian'. Here is the definition: 'Figure of speech in which the latter part of a sentence or phrase is surprising or unexpected; frequently used in a humorous situation.'
For instance: 'Where there's a will, I want to be in it.'

Here's a thought for budding bridge writers:
To steal ideas from one person is plagiarism. To steal from many is research.

This is very popular:
A bus station is where a bus stops. A train station is where a train stops. On my desk, I have a work station.

Having made a brief visit to the Old Brewery shopping centre I was making my way to the office when I spotted our intrepid reporter Jos Jacobs making his way to the office. Later I asked him if he had enjoyed his long walk..... from the front door of the hotel to the back seat of the taxi.


The English Senior Team here in Poznan would like to thank their sponsors, Pharon Independent Financial Advisors for their generous support.

## Decide with Rodwell

by Jan van Cleeff

Open Swiss A, rnd 3 Mahaffey v.Vainikonis Eric Rodwell was sitting North with:

ゆQ $653 \bigcirc 8543 \diamond 1094 \Leftrightarrow 29$
The bidding started:
W/All

| West <br> Gawrys | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Kalita | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Dbl |
| Pass | $?$ |  |  |

Eric figured that it was too risky to pass, as might be a make. Which in fact turned out to be the case. So he tried 3NT and hoped to escape undoubled. However:

| West <br> Gawrys | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Kalita | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Dbl |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | $?$ |  |  |

Now what? Eric figured that West was likely to have long hearts so running away to $4 \circlearrowright$ was not an option. Therefore Eric passed and East led a diamond against 3NT doubled:

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
Q Q 653
-8543
$\checkmark 1094$

- Q 9
- 84

คKJIO 76
AJ 85

- 42


West won the $\triangleleft \mathrm{A}$ and switched to spades. East won the ten and when he cashed his ace and king as well, N/S ended up with a surprising +750 .
As described in yesterday's bulletin in another match Helness-Helgemo showed the proper defence against the same (doubled) contract: diamond to the ace, spade to the ten and diamond back. When declarer refrained from taking the losing heart finesse he escaped for minus two hundred 'only'.

## The Old Brewery



When you next walk out of the Main building of the Messe, look straight ahead. See the Novotel? Slightly to the left of that building is the "Stary Browar," the Old Brewery.

No, this is not yet another advertisement for Alcoholic Beverages, but a serious piece of advice about what to do when you have a couple of hours free from the bridge table.

The Old Brewery is a modern building, built on the site of a former brewery, preserving the original architecture and style. It was built in 2003 with a second part completed in 2007. The complex contains office space, exhibition galleries, but most importantly one of the largest shopping complexes in Europe, with 210 stores and restaurants.

The complex won the prize, in 2005, for the Best Shopping Center in the World from the International Council of Shopping Centers.

Gentlemen, take your wives and don't forget your wallets!

## Duplimate Discounts

The Duplimate dealing machines used at these championships will be sold at the end of the event with a 20\% discount.Visit the Jannersten Bookshop on the first floor.

## Low-level Disasters

by Jos Jacobs

Occasionally, a hand turns up on which you might almost automatically go for a number.
Yesterday's board 27, from Round 5 of the Open Team Swiss, was a suitable example.
In the Lavazza v. Kamras match, the Italians managed to play in the same suit at both tables - usually not a profitable thing to do, though the opponents may hold a different view on that:

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

|  | - AJ 94 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 103$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 53 |  |  |
|  | \% AKJ4 |  |  |
| , K Q 106 | N | +87 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ 76 | W | $\bigcirc 542$ |  |
| $\diamond-$ |  | $\diamond 19862$ |  |
| Q Q 10863 | 3 S | - 972 |  |
|  | ¢ 532 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 98 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK 1074 |  |  |
|  | ¢ 5 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Upmark | Baldursson | Cullin | Tokay |
|  |  |  | I $\diamond$ |
| Dbl | 19 | Pass | 2 - |
| Pass | $3{ }^{2}$ | Pass | 34 |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 49 | Pass | $5 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

After West's double, one wonders why NS let their opponents escape immediately, especially at this vulnerability. Why NS after doing so did not manage to land in 3NT themselves, is also an undisclosed secret. They had to pay heavily for it when they ran into a 5-0 trump break which meant the contract had to go down one. Kamras +50 .

In the Closed Room, things went much worse for the Italians:

| West <br> Duboin | North <br> Wikner | East <br> Sementa | South <br> Kamras |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Iß |
| Dbl | Redbl | Pass | Pass |
| I $\varangle$ | Pass | Pass | Dbl |
| Redbl | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \Leftrightarrow$ | Dbl | $2 \triangleleft$ | Dbl |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Two Clubs would probably have gone down three but it looked a reasonable spot. It is difficult to understand why East ran to $2 \diamond$. He had to pay heavily for it as the contract went down six for the unusual score of 1400 not vulnerable and 16 IMPs to Kamras.

South led the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ which held and shifted to his singleton club. North won the jack and returned the PI IO . Dummy won the ace and tried the $\Phi \mathrm{K}$ but North took the ace and cashed two top clubs on which South shed his two remaining spades. All was set now for a defensive cross-ruff, declarer coming to just one more trick on the strength of his spot cards.

## French Defence (or Neve on a Sunday)

by Barry Rigal

Jerome Rombaut and Joanna Neve combined well here yesterday, to defeat a 3NT contract that had been made round the room.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- A 9653
$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond$ QJ 4
- QJ 64


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \diamond$ |  | 18 | Db/* |

Sitting South, Neve led a low spade. Declarer played low from dummy and Rombaut went up with the ace and returned a low club to the nine. Declarer ducked and Neve made no mistake, unblocking the club king to leave Rombaut able to cash out when he won the diamond. Would declarer have ducked the first diamond if Neve had not unblocked? We'll never know!

## Open Teams Round of 32, First Half

by Jos Jacobs

In this report, I will have a look at the first half of three of the 16 matches played in the Round of 32: Bessis v. Apteker, Monaco Z v. Texan Aces and Netherlands White v. Otvosi.

The set started with a board on which absolute par would be +50 to $N / S$ for beating $5 \vee$. Diamond lead to the ace, spade underlead and diamond ruff.As you can imagine, this defence was generally considered too difficult.

At some tables, however, they managed to beat par in all directions:

Bessis v.Apteker:

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

|  | - Q 7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 63$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 87542 |  |  |
|  | - 942 |  |  |
| - 6 | N |  | - 94 |
| PAK9854 | W E |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ KJ 93 |  |  |  |
| - A 10 | S |  | 863 |
|  | - AKJIO8532 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A |  |  |
|  | 2 K 75 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Delmonte | $T$ Bessis | Bach | M Bessis |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ |
| 28 | Pass | $4{ }^{\circ}$ | $4{ }^{4}$ |
| 58 | Pass | Pass | 5 |
| Dы | All Pass |  |  |

Michel Bessis took the obvious save against 5 $\$$. When he used his only entry to dummy to lead a club to his king and West's ace, he was two down. Apteker +300.

| West <br> Smirnov | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gower | Piekarek | Apteker |  |
| Dbl | Pass | Pass | 4ll Pass |

Apteker opened 4s and played there when Smirnov doubled. He too led a club from dummy to his king, this way going down just one for -I00 and the first 5 IMPs to his team.

| West <br> Sunderram | North <br> Multon | East <br> Sridharan | South <br> Zimmermann |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| $5 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| All Pass | Pass | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{2}$ |

As he was not doubled, Zimmermann could afford a small extra chance after ruffing the second heart and cashing his $\diamond A$. If the $\diamond K$ happened to be doubleton, there might be time to discard a losing club on the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$, should dummy has two entries. So he decided to lead a low spade from his hand to the seven in dummy. East surprisingly won the nine and returned a low club. When Zimmermann rose with the king, the defenders had three tricks in the suit to put the contract down three. Texan Aces +150 .

| West <br> Zmudzinski | North <br> Venkatesh | East <br> Balicki | South <br> Anklesaria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| $4 \boxtimes$ | Pass | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| Pass | Pass | 58 | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | All Pass |  |

$4 \diamond$ showed a good $4 \diamond$ hand and South's pass of $5 \triangleleft$ confirmed defensive values. When North (obviously) did not find the recommended defence to beat it, Monaco $Z$ scored +650 at this table to win II IMPs anyway. So it did not matter after all that they paid an extra undertrick at the other table.

A few boards later, some defenders missed the chance given to them by declarer.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- 6

A QJ943
$\diamond 3$
\& 19742
$\triangle A K 1072$
$>5$
$\diamond 10654$
\& K 63

| N |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| W | V |
| S |  |
|  | J 985 |
| $\bigcirc 107$ |  |
| $\diamond$ A Q 9 |  |
| - A 1085 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Delmonte | $T$ Bessis | Bach | M Bessis |
|  | $3 \Omega$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |

All Pass

In the Bessis v.Apteker match, East led the Q , which was won by dummy's ace.Thomas Bessis next ran the $\vee I 0$ from dummy, which was allowed to hold. Had East won, he could have reached partner with a spade to obtain his club ruff for one down but he was given no second chance after this. On the next trump, declarer put up the $\vee A$ when West showed out and then took a successful diamond finesse to dispose of his spade loser.After that, he could afford to give up a club and suffer a ruff in the suit, the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ being the 3rd and last defensive trick. Just made, Bessis +620 .

| West <br> Smirnov | North <br> Gower | East <br> Piekarek | South <br> Apteker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $3 \Omega$ | Pass | $4 \nabla$ |

## All Pass

At the other table, the first two tricks were the same as in the other room but when Gower again played low from hand at the second round of trumps, Piekarek was given a second chance which he gratefully took. One down, Bessis another +100 and 12 IMPs.

| West <br> Sunderram | North <br> Multon | East <br> Sridharan | South <br> Zimmermann |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 48 | All Pass |  |

In the Monaco Z v. Texan Aces match, Multon opened $4 \checkmark$ and made his contract along the same line as his French compatriot Bessis, when East did not take the 8 K at his first opportunity. Monaco $Z+620$.

| West <br> Zmudzinski | North <br> Venkatesh | East <br> Balicki | South <br> Anklesaria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | 10 |
| IS | 30 | 39 | 49 |
| Pass | 59 | All Pass |  |

At the other table, North did not open his hand but elected to show his two-suiter later on in the auction. This led to N/S ending up in the wrong denomination. Down two, +200 more to Monaco Z and I3 IMPs more to them.

| West <br> Nowosadzki | North <br> Paulissen | East <br> Tuszyñski | South <br> Jansma |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $3 \Omega$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |

## All Pass

In the Netherlands White v. Otvosi match, Paulissen adopted a different line after winning the 8 A at trick one. Realising a club ruff was imminent, he went for a scissors coup, playing $\diamond A$ and $\diamond Q$, shedding his spade when West did not cover. This play would have worked extremely well had trumps been 3-2.Against the actual 4-I break, the defenders now were able to tap declarer in diamonds every time they got the lead so the contract went down three. Otvosi +300 .

| West <br> Verhees | North <br> Puczynski | East <br> Van Prooijen | South <br> Chmurski |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $3 \varnothing$ | Pass | $4 /$ |
| 4 4n | Pass | Pass | Dbl |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

At the other table, Verhees took his life into his own hands by boldly overcalling 4 .
Declarer lost five tricks on a diamond ruff and thus was down two as well, another +300 for Otvosi and 12 IMPs to take the lead in the match.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/WVul.

- J 2
$\bigcirc 43$
$\diamond$ A 932
\& 109542


As you can see, the proper defence to beat 40 is to stay passive all the time. Once N/S touch diamonds, the game will be made if declarer guesses right.
$4 \checkmark$ was played all round the room but both Zmudzinski and Verhees were among the ones who were allowed to make it when their opponents prematurely opened up diamonds.


Mariusz Puczynski, Poland

This gave Monaco Z and Netherlands White 12 IMPs each. Piekarek also guessed right on a diamond return but his side did not gain on the board as there was a defensive accident at the other table which also allowed the game to make.

Please note that there is a little more to this board, as Australia's Tim Bourke quite rightly observed. You will find it in tomorrow's Bulletin, in Brent Manley's report of the Mahaffey v. Netherlands Juniors' match.

On board 9, the defenders needed to play clubs at the right moment but they did not always find the required defence.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- A 42

คA432
$\diamond$ A 6
\& A 742

- 18
$\bigcirc$ K 7
$\diamond$ KJ543
2 QJ 86

- K 953
$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond$ Q 109872
\& K 5

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Delmonte | $T$ Bessis | Bach | M Bessis |
|  | INT | 2 2 | Dbl |
| $2 \bigcirc$ | Dbl | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

In the Bessis v.Apteker match, Ashley Bach did not bother to lead the suit the cards wanted him to lead. He chose a low spade instead on which Delmonte quite rightly inserted the eight. Declarer won the ace and played $\diamond A$ and another to West's jack. West shifted to the 8 K which was won immediately by declarer, who by then had already seen two heart discards (the queen and a low one) from East. When West still had a heart left upon winning the $\diamond$ K, he could offer his partner three more tricks to cash in the suit. A surprise one down, Apteker +50 .

| West <br> Smirnov | North <br> Gower | East <br> Piekarek | South <br> Apteker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INT | Pass | $2 \%$ |
| Pass | $2 \Omega$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Piekarek led the $\vee Q$ which West overtook to continue the suit when declarer ducked. East won the second heart and, rather than continuing the suit, shifted to a low spade. The idea of a switch was correct but he chose the wrong suit, as a top club would have given his partner the chance to establish two tricks in the suit before declarer would have come to his nine. Apteker +400 and 10 IMPs back to them to retake the lead.

In the Netherlands White v. Otvosi match, Paulissen found the winning move.

| West <br> Nowosadzki | North <br> Paulissen | East <br> Tuszyñski | South <br> Jansma |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INT | $2 \triangleleft$ | Dbl |
| $2 \boxtimes$ | Pass | Pass | $3 \boxtimes$ |
| Dbl | 3NT | All Pass |  |

From East's $2 \triangleleft$ overcall, Paulissen knew the hearts would be 6-2 when East led the $\oslash$ Q. So he ducked the king when West overtook but rose with the ace on the continuation of the suit. Having thus avoided the lethal club shift, he was never in danger again. The moral of the story is that West effectively is the one who has to shift to clubs after overtaking as declarer cannot afford to win the first round of hearts. Just made for a useful +400 to Netherlands White.

| West <br> Verhees | North <br> Puczynski | East <br> Van Prooijen | South <br> Chmurski |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 』$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

As there had been no opponents' bidding at the other table, declarer was very much left to his own devices. West overtook the $\vee Q$ and continued the suit, but declarer ducked again as he had no clue. (editor: on this hand rather than in general.) When Van Prooijen correctly led the \$9 next, even 2NT could no longer be made as the defence will get two clubs and two diamonds with the two heart tricks they already got. One down, +50 and 10 more IMPs to Netherlands White who by now were clearly in the lead.


Alon Apteker, South Africa

Three boards later, both Bessis and Netherlands White further increased their leads:

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
$\perp 10$
ค J 10874
$\diamond K 97654$
$\% 7$

- K Q 4
$\bigcirc$ K Q 2
$\diamond$ J 8
2K K 963

¢ AJ98753
$\bigcirc 96$
$\diamond$ A Q 10
\& 8
© 62
คA 53
$\triangleleft 32$
\& AJ 10542

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Delmonte | $T$ Bessis | Bach | $M$ Bessis |
| INT | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{~ A l l ~ P a s s ~}$ |  |  |  |

A simple and effective South African transfer. Eleven tricks, Apteker +650 .

| West <br> Smirnov | North <br> Gower | East <br> Piekarek | South <br> Apteker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT | Pass | 28 | 39 |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |

When Apteker mistimed his overcall, Smirnov had an easy double. The costs was II00 or a loss of IO IMPs.At halftime, Bessis thus led by 12.

In the Netherlands White v. Otvosi match, we saw yet another case of a slam missing two aces:

| West <br> Nowosadzki | North <br> Paulissen | East <br> Tuszyñski | South Jansma |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 64 | All Pass |

As we all know, bidding slams like this is not a good proposition. Netherlands White +50 .

No overbidding by the Dutch at the other table, who registered an easy +450 and got II IMPs for their efforts to lead by 34 at halftime.

The score in our third featured match. Monaco Z v. Texan Aces, was $44-10$ at halftime but the Texan Aces from India won the second half $38-2$ and thus went through to the last 16 by a margin of just 2 IMPs. The same team reached the semi-finals of the Open Teams two years ago in Sanremo, though not all players present now are the same as on that occasion.


## GRAND

PRIX OF WARSAW

201 I
Thurday, 18th August
I730-Opening tournament - Open Pairs (30 boards)
Friday, 19th August
IIO0-2nd Additional Tournament - Open Pairs Barometer (26-30 boards)
1730--3rd Additional Tournament - Open Pairs (30 boards)

## Grand Prix of Mazovia Province

## Saturday, 20th August

I 100 - Opening Ceremony
Ist Congress Tournament - Open Pairs (30 boards)
1730-2nd Congress Tournament - Mixed Pairs (30 boards)
1730-Side event - Open Pairs (26-30 boards)
Sunday, 21 st August
1000-3rd Congress Tournament - the 201I Budimex Polish Grand Prix
Open Pairs (50 boards)

## Monday, 22nd August

IIOO - 4th Additional Tournament - Open Pairs (26-30 boards)
1730-4th Congress Tournament - Open Pairs (30 boards) Tuesday, 23rd August
IIO0-5th Additional Tournament - Cavendish (26-30 boards)
1730-5th Congress Tournament - Open Pairs (30 boards) Wednesday, 24th August
1100-6th Additional Tournament - Open Pairs Barometer (26-30 boards)
1730-6th Congress Tournament - Cavendish (30 boards)
Thursday, 25th August
IIO0-7th Additional Tournament - Open Pairs (26-30 boards)
1730-7th Congress Tournament - Open Pairs (30 boards) Friday, 26th August
IIOO - 8th Congress Tournament - Individual (24-30 boards)
1730-9th Congress Tournament - Open Pair IMP (30 boards)
Saturday, 27th August
I 100-10th Congress Tournament - Teams open
I 100 - IIth Congress Tournament - TEAMS WK _ 4
Sunday, 28th August
1000-10th Congress Tournament - Teams (BAM) open final
1000-I Ith Congress Tournament -TEAMs (BAM) WK _ 4 (final)
I IO0-Closing Tournament - Open Pairs Barometer (26-30 boards)

Closing ceremony to be held during the Tournament
Entry fee of apr 20Euros for Congress Tournament and I I Euros for Additional Tournament.
Prizes for $10 \%$ of contenders in each tournament and additional prizes for best players in Congress. Total amount of prizes exceeding 30000Euros.

## Pedal to the metal

by Brent Manley

With two rounds to go in the Swiss portion of the Open Teams, the Jim Mahaffey squad was positioned well to get to the knockout round, but it never pays to relax, and the American squad was firing on all cylinders in the penultimate set, when the met the French-German team of Michel and Thomas Bessis and Josef Piekarek and Alexander Smirnov.

The third board of the set was a push, but it was an extremely interesting play problem that was solved at neither table.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

|  | - Q 75 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc{ }^{\circ} 2$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q 9 |  |  |
|  | AJ842 |  |  |
| -10843 | N | - AK 92 |  |
| ¢ A 9853 |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 7$ |  |
| $\diamond$ K 7 |  | $\checkmark 1086$ |  |
| \& 105 | S | ¢ K Q 76 |  |
|  | Q 16 |  |  |
|  | - Q 1064 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J5432 |  |  |
|  | \& 93 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lev | M. Bessis | Pszczola | T. Bessis |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 19 | INT | Pass |
| 20 | Dы | 2. | Pass |
| 41 | All Pass |  |  |

Obviously a diamond lead will sink the contract trivially, but when your partner doubles Stayman, you normally obey his strong suggestion. Thomas Bessis started with the 29, ducked in dummy by Michel Bessis. Jacek Pszczola took the K and played a low heart to dummys ace. The 10 was taken by North's ace, and the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ went to declarer's king. Now declarer played the 2 Q from hand, and South ruffed with the $\varphi$, declarer discarding a diamond from dummy. The $\ulcorner\mathbf{Q}$ was ruffed and a diamond went to the king and ace. The was ruffed in dummy, and declarer ruffed another heart. The heart suit was good, but declarer had to lose another trump trick. He lost two minor-suit aces and two trump tricks for one down.

| West <br> Smirnov | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Piekarek | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | INT | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \mathbf{2 0}^{*}$ | Dbl | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |

Smirnov's 2 showed the majors, and Piekarek bid what he thought he could make.
Meckstroth, too, led the e9, covered by dummy's 10 and Rodwell's ace (a slight in accuracy by North). The came back, declarer winning the queen. Piekarek played the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ and a heart to the ace followed by a heart ruff. He cashed the $\Phi \mathrm{A}$ and $\Phi \mathrm{K}$ and was headed for plus 620 before he slipped up by playing the 2 K , pitching a diamond from dummy. He was able to ruff his low club in dummy and establish the long heart with a second ruff, but when he played a diamond to dummy's king, Rodwell won, cashed the LQ and had a winning club to cash (he had discarded the $\diamond Q$ on the fourth round of hearts).
Had Piekarek ruffed his low club before playing the king, he could have ruffed the long heart good, and if Rodwell had discarded the $\diamond Q$ on the fourth round of hearts, declarer could then play low diamonds from both hands to establish the king. If Rodwell retained the $\diamond A \mathrm{Q}$, then Piekarek could ruff his good 2 K with dummy's $\boldsymbol{\$} 10$. Rodwell could ruff the heart at the end but would have to surrender a trick to dummy's $\forall K$ for the IOth trick.

The first big swing of the match came on the next board with Mahaffey aheadl-0. It was a deal custom-made for the Precision system played by Jeff Meckstroth and Eric Rodwell.

| Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \& K Q J 2 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A J |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ KJ 9642 |  |  |  |
| 9, A |  |  |  |
| ¢ 863 |  | $\pm 95$ |  |
| $\bigcirc$ K Q 876 |  | 89432 |  |
| $\checkmark 8$ |  | $\diamond 753$ |  |
| \% Q J 106 | S | \& K 543 |  |
| ¢ A 1074 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 105$ |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A Q 10 |  |  |  |
| \& 9872 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Lev | M. Bessis | Pszczola | T. Bessis |
| Pass | I $\diamond$ | Pass | 19 |
| Dbl | Redbl | 2\% | Dbl |
| Pass | 4\% | Pass | $6 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

There was no way to avoid losing a heart trick in the contract of $6 \diamond$. Meckstroth and Rodwell found the perfect spot.

| West <br> Smirnov | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Piekarek | South Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | 4\% | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | Pass | 69 |
| Pass | 79 | All Pass |  |

Here is the interpretation:
1\% = Precision
$2 \triangleleft=$ Balanced 8 - 10
2NT = Majors?
$3 \diamond=4$ spades but not 4 hearts
3s = Setting trumps
3NT = Serious 3NT, showing slam interest
4\% = Cuebid
$4 \diamond=$ Cuebid
4NT = Roman Key Card Blackwood
$5 \vee=$ Two key cards without the trump queen
$6 \diamond=$ Diamond holding?
69 = The queen but not the king
79 = We have arrived
East led the $\mathbf{~} 5$. Rodwell claimed after a second round of trumps showed the suit to be 3-2. Plus 2210 was good for 13 IMPs.

The score was 19-0 for Mahaffey after seven deals, and they picked up another 4 IMPs on this one.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- J 87

ค7654
$\checkmark$ K 1063
43

- Q 4
$\bigcirc \mathrm{KJ} 103$
$\diamond$ A Q 94
- 82

-K 96532
- Q 8
$\diamond$ J 5
- Q 95
- A 10

คA 92
$\diamond 872$
\& AK 1076

| West <br> Smirnov | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Piekarek | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \mathbf{~ P o ~}$ | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | INT |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \mathbf{2}$ | All Pass |

Meckstroth cashed his two high clubs and gave Rodwell a ruff. Rodwell exited with a trump to Meckstroth's ace, and he continued with the $\diamond$. Declarer had no choice but to
duck, so the defenders collected the $\triangleleft K$ and $\vee A$ to defeat the contract by a trick.

| West <br> Lev | North <br> M. Bessis | East <br> Pszczola | South <br> T. Bessis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \mathbf{Q}$ | Dbl |
| Pass | $2 \Omega$ | $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | All Pass |

Thomas Bessis also cashed the top clubs and gave his partner a ruff, and North also exited with a spade to South. Instead of switching to a diamond, however, Thomas underled his $\vee \mathbf{A}$, hoping his partner had the queen. It was East who held that card, so Jacek Pszczola was able to pick up trumps and knock out the $\triangle \mathrm{A}$ to avoid losing a diamond. Plus IIO was good for 5 IMPs and a 24-0 lead.
Board 9 put the cap on an outstanding set for Mahaffey.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- A 95

คK 93
$\diamond$ A 6432
95

- 742

ค 1085
$\diamond$ K Q J 105
\& 84


- QJ 8
$\vee$ A Q J 64
$\diamond 7$
\& A Q 32
\& K 1063
$\bigcirc 72$
$\triangleleft 98$
\& K J 1076


Josef Piekarek, Germany

| West <br> Smirnov | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Piekarek | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | 18 | Dbl |
| $2 \boxtimes$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \varnothing$ | All Pass |  |  |

Meckstroth led the $\diamond 9$ to the king and ace, and Rodwell switched to a low spade: queen, king, 2. A spade was returned to Rodwell's ace and a third round of the suit put declarer in his hand. Desperately trying to create an entry to dummy's good diamonds, Piekarek played the $\triangle \mathbf{Q}$ from hand, ducked by Rodwell. It would have been necessary for Rodwell to duck again had Piekarek tried the $\vee \mathrm{J}$, but he continued by playing the 2 Q . Meckstroth won, drove out the A with the jack. Piekarek tried to ruff a club in dummy, but Rodwell overruffed with the 9 and got out with the 9 K . That was two down and minus 200.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lev | M. Bessis | Pszczola | T. Bessis |
|  | $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ | $\mathrm{I} \vee$ | Dbl |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{Q}$ | Dbl | Pass |
| 28 | All Pass |  |  |

Thomas Bessis started with the $\forall 9$ to the king and ace, but when his father returned a low spade, he took the king and played the 87 : 8 , 9 , jack. A low club from East was won with the 10 , and a second heart was played to the 10 , king and ace. The A a was followed by a club ruff, and declarer discarded his other club loser on a good diamond. Pszczola ended with nine tricks for plus 140 and a 9-IMP gain.


Thomas Bessis, France

Mahaffey picked up I IMP on the final board to finish off a 33-0 victory.

On the final round of the Swiss, the Americans faced the Swedish Kamras team. The match started off with a lively deal.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

> \& K 84
> ® A 74
> $\diamond$ A 986
> $\&$ K 108


| West <br> Cullin | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Upmark | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $3 \%$ |
| $4 \%$ | Dbl | $4 \triangleright$ | $5 \%$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | All Pass |

Per-Ola Cullin led the $\diamond 2$, taken by Meckstroth with the ace. He had to lose a spade and two diamonds for minus 100.

| West <br> Lev | North <br> Tornqvist | East <br> Pszczola | South <br> Wikner |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | $3 N T$ | $4 \varrho$ | All Pass |

A club to the ace was followed by a heart to the ace and a heart ruff. Declarer still had to lose to the $\diamond A$ and the trump king. That was minus 100 and 5 IMPs to Kamras.
Mahaffey got it back and a bit more on the next deal.

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
( K 63
คA 53
$\diamond$ Q 94
\& KJ 52

- J 109842
$\checkmark$ Q J
$\diamond$ KJ 65
\& 6


| West <br> Cullin | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Upmark | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2} \diamond{ }^{*}$ | Dbl | Redbl | $3 \%$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

A diamond lead would have sunk the contract before declarer could take a trick, but Johan Upmark, guessing his partner's suit ( $2 \triangleleft$ showed a weak two-bid in a major), started with the Q Q. Rodwell ran home with six clubs, two spades and a heart for plus 600 .

| West <br> Lev | North <br> Tornqvist | East <br> Pszczola | South <br> Wikner |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Dbl | $2 \&$ | $3 \&$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| $3 \&$ | All Pass |  |  |

Sam Lev was one down in 34, but it was an II-IMP pickup.

The Swedes went ahead on a slam swing three boards later.

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
Q Q 864
ค 18
$\diamond$ Q J
-98765

| - K | N | - AJ 1072 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 95 |  | PA 43 |
| $\checkmark$ A 765 | W E | $\diamond$ K 943 |
| \& AJ1042 | S | \& K |
|  | - 953 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 10762$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1082$ |  |
|  | - Q 3 |  |


| West Cullin | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Upmark | South Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| $2 \%$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Rodwell hit on the opening lead of the $\oslash$ J. Cullin won in dummy, cashed the K and played a spade to his king. He pitched a heart on the c A , and when the Q fell, he played a diamond to the king and a diamond to the ace before discarding dummy's other heart on the $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. .The defenders had a trump trick and that was all - plus 920.
At the other table, Lev and Pszczola settled in 3NT on the East-West cards for plus 430 and a IO-IMP loss.
Another 4 IMPs went to the Swedes on the next deal, and it could have been more.

Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- 654

Q Q 8
$\diamond$ A 87
\& Q 10753
© Q 2
Q 7543
$\diamond$ K J 102
\& K 94


AK 1098 $\checkmark$ -
$\diamond$ Q 9653
\& $A J 2$
s J 73
คAKJIO 962
$\diamond 4$
286

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lev | Tornqvist | Pszczola | Wikner |
| Pass | Pass | 19 | $2 \bigcirc$ |
| Dbl | Redbl | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | Db | Redbl | Pass |
| $6 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | 68 |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |

Meckstroth lost five tricks for minus 800, but if he had not bid $6 \bigcirc$ the loss would have been 12 IMPs because $6 \diamond$ is cold and Lev and Pszczola played 4¢ for plus 650 at the other table. That made the score 19-12 for the Swedes, and they tacked on 2 more IMPs the rest of the way to I for Mahaffey, to come out with a $21-13$ win.


Arvid Wikner, Sweden

## Open Teams Round of 32 , Second Half

by Jos Jacobs

At halftime, Lavazza were leading Kanin 21-16 whereas the Vito v. Irens match was even closer: 29-28. So we might well get a hard-fought second half in either of these matches. The prospects for this would look extremely bright if you would take the very first board as an indication:

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
A Q J 1087642

- K 72
$\checkmark 10$
- 

| Q - | N | - K 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QJ10965 |  | Q Q 43 |
| $\diamond$ K Q 632 | W E | $\checkmark$ AJ 74 |
| K106 | S | - A953 |
|  | - 53 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 8 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 985$ |  |
|  | * QJ8742 |  |


| West <br> Hoiland | North <br> Bocchi | East <br> Brekka | South <br> Madala |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | All Pass | Dbl | Pass |

Hoiland had no trouble in removing partner's double after opening the bidding on a hand without any defensive prospects.As you can see, only an unlikely heart lead would defeat this. Kanin +400 .

At the other table, Duboin could not open the bidding, so Kvangraven opened a bold 44:

| West <br> Duboin | North <br> Kvangraven | East <br> Sementa | South <br> Harding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |

Sementa, holding three defensive tricks, saw no reason to do anything but leave the double in. He was soon to regret this when his opening lead of the was ruffed. Declarer went on to cash the $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ and cross to the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ to present the Q . West covered and declarer ruffed, so after ruffing his last heart in dummy the diamond loser disappeared on the ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~J}$. Making six, +1I90 to Kanin and 17 IMPs back to take the lead by 12 straight away.

In the Vito v. Irens match, we saw basically the same swing:

| West <br> Karaivanov | North <br> Townsend | East <br> Rusev | South <br> Bakhshi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \boxtimes$ | $4 \varrho$ | $5 \boxtimes$ | Pass |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | All Pass |

On this auction, Rusev must have been even more disappointed to find out that he could not beat the contract. His only consolation may have been that they did not chalk up an overtrick...Irens +850 .

At the other table, Groetheim too could take advantage of his Ist seat opening bid:

| West <br> Groetheim | North <br> Popov | East <br> Tundal | South <br> Skorchev |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | $4 s$ | Dbl | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

Maybe, it's Norwegian style but Groetheim also chalked up an easy enough +400 when the heart lead was not found. That was 15 IMPs for Irens who thus took the lead by 14 .

On the next board,Vito hit back immediately;

| Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 A 854 |  |  |  |
| ¢ K 84 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ K 95 |  |  |  |
| \& Q J 6 |  |  |  |
| ¢ K 107 | N | ¢ 963 |  |
| Q J 1053 | W | $\checkmark$ A 2 |  |
| $\checkmark 107$ |  | $\diamond$ Q J 8632 |  |
| \% K 1092 | S | -43 |  |
| Q Q J 2 |  |  |  |
| QQ976 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 4 |  |  |  |
| 2 A 875 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Karaivanov | Townsend | Rusev | Bakhshi |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | I 8 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

East led a diamond and declarer ducked this. This seems a routine play but from here on, declarer would always have to lose two black tricks so he has to time his play very well.

Upon winning the $\diamond A$ he should play a low club to the queen and a low spade back to the queen. With the heart suit frozen for the defenders and the spades $3-3$, the $\$$ and $\bigcirc$ Q will serve as the necessary entries to repeat the low club play from dummy and to get back to dummy to cash the last club. If the defence play hearts at any time, declarer will lose only one tricks in the suit.

Once declarer ducked the first diamond, the defence still had their four other tricks coming when declarer first went after the hearts, so the contract was one down, Vito +50 .

| West <br> Groetheim | North <br> Popov | East <br> Tundal | South <br> Skorchev |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ | Pass | I $\vee$ |
| Pass | $1 乌$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

At the other table, the Bulgarians took full advantage of placing the contract in the South hand. When West, with nothing to guide him, led a club, declarer's problems were soon over. Another +400 and 10 IMPs back for Vito who thus closed the gap to just 4.

Two boards later, the Bulgarians actually captured the lead when a Norwegian slam on little more than an outside finesse failed, and two more boards later, we saw the start of an Italian rally in the Lavazza v. Kanin match:

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.
-AJ64
8 AJ 3
$\triangleleft$ A 65

- 195


| West <br> Hoiland | North <br> Bocchi | East <br> Brekka | South <br> Madala |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | $2 \Omega$ | Pass | $3 \mathbf{3}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

On this hand, it is in fact South who should be the declarer as East may find the killing lead of a club from his doubleton. After the club ruff declarer will still lose a diamond.

When Brekka led the $\diamond$ J instead, dummy's queen was put up successfully and Bocchi soon claimed II tricks. Lavazza +650 .

| West <br> Duboin | North <br> Kvangraven | East <br> Sementa | South <br> Harding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | INT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 \boxtimes$ | Pass | $3 \mathbf{3}$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

When North skipped the club cuebid, it was not so difficult any more for Sementa to try the effect of a club lead. One down. Lavazza another +100 and 12 IMPs back to take the lead by 6 .

The outcome of the next board also hinged on who was, going to be the declarer.

Board 2I. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- 72
- K J 9
$\diamond \mathrm{K} 2$
\& AK 9743


| West <br> Hoiland | North <br> Bocchi | East <br> Brekka | South <br> Madala |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $1 \Phi$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| $2 \triangleq$ | Pass | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | $3 \Omega$ | All Pass |

With the spade lead established, the best the Italians could do was to double 39. When they left it alone, they had to be content with 150 only, as three down was the outcome.

| West <br> Duboin | North <br> Kvangraven | East <br> Sementa | South <br> Harding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Pass | INT | Pass | 3NT |

The Norwegians at the other table made bidding a game look ridiculously easy and so it proved when East could not possibly find the spade lead. On a heart lead, declarer could
come to two overtricks when the spade shift was not found either. Kanin +660 and II IMPs back to them to regain the lead by 5 .

When the Italians bid an easy enough slam on the next board that proved too difficult for the Norwegian methods, the Lavazza rally continued and they once again took the lead, not to lose it again as this was the next board:


David Bakhshi, England

24 showed four-card support so one feels East might have taken the save, being able to see his partner's singleton heart. When he did not, Madala had to cope with the $\$$ K lead, overtaken by East who played back the $\$ 7$. Madala ducked, West won and returned the suit. Now, Madala won the ace, crossed to the $\vee \mathbf{A}$ and ran the $\vee \mathrm{J}$, thus ending up with an overtrick. Well done, Lavazza +650 .

| West <br> Duboin | North Kvangraven | East <br> Sementa | South <br> Harding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| Dbl | 2NT | 34 | Pass |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | 49 | Dbl |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In the other room, the Italians did take the save, so the Norwegians had to be content with +200 only to lose a further 10 IMPs. Lavazza clearly had put the match out of reach with only 5 boards to play.

In the Vito v. Irens match, we saw an even bigger swing:

| West <br> Karaivanov | North <br> Townsend | East <br> Rusev | South <br> Bakhshi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Dbl |
| $2 \&$ | $4\rangle$ | $4 \Omega$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | All Pass |  |

South led a heart to partner's ace and North returned a club to partner's ace. The defence needed to beat the contract is to cash the $\diamond K A$ now. If you don't but play a club instead, as happened at this table, declarer will ruff, draw trumps, ruff a club felling the queen and discard a diamond loser on the now master 9 . Just made...Vito +790 .

| West <br> Groetheim | North <br> Popov | East <br> Tundal | South <br> Skorchev |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | I 8 |
| Dbl | $2 N T$ | 49 | Pass |
| Pass | 58 | All Pass |  |

In the other room, it was South who found an opening bid in Ist seat, and now, Popov not only showed his good fourcard raise but even went on to $5 \triangleleft$ when 4s came round to him.

When West led the \$K overtaken by South who returned a club, the only thing Skorchev had to do was to guess the trumps. This proved an easy enough job so Vito added another +650 to gain 16 IMPs. Their lead had gone up to 23 by now.

Irens recouped 10 IMPs three boards later:

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.
\& K 9
®K9642
$\diamond$ K Q 85
\& K 8
$\& 108754$
$\diamond A Q$
$\diamond 10932$
$\& A 4$


- A 6

ค 85
$\diamond$ J 74

2 J 109732
© Q J 32
ค J 1073
$\diamond A 6$
\& Q 65

| West <br> Karaivanov | North <br> Townsend | East <br> Rusev | South <br> Bakhshi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | 48 | All Pass |  |

As South could show a constructive four-card raise with $2 \diamond$, Townsend simply made as good a shot as any at game. When the hearts only produced one loser, the contract came home easily enough. Irens +620 . Please note that West did not open.


Geir Brekka, Norway

The Norwegians made life more difficult for their opponents at the other table when West opened is in 3rd seat. One can understand why game was missed, though both North and South had something in reserve... Vito +140 only so 10 IMPs back to Irens, down by 13 with two boards to go.

Both Lavazza and Vito scored medium-size swings on the penultimate board to put their match out of reach for the opponents but Irens still managed to heavily reduce their deficit on the last board:

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.


When Hoiland opened 44, he was left to play there. Bocchi led a club and Madala took his tricks and returned the suit. For safety reasons, Hoiland ruffed this with the ace so all was well when North did not hold four trumps. Kanin + 420.

At the other table, a lively auction developed when Duboin opened only ls as dealer.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Duboin | Kvangraven | Sementa | Harding |
| 19 | Pass | 2\% | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3s | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 59 | All Pass |  |  |

When the Italians did not manage to put the brakes on in time, they had to pay dearly for it because both club honours were offside. Kanin another +50 and IO IMPs back to lose by 21 .

## Open Teams Round of 32, Second Half

by Barry Rigal

These days the commentators do not need to be experts in double-squeezes; a quick surreptitious review of Deep Finesse will enable us to pontificate confidently that 'Slam is cold on the double squeeze'. Sometimes even when we have the tools at our disposal we still can't crack the problem. So let's see if you are any better!

When this board was shown on vugraph between Angelini and Mossop - the last of the Round Robin matches - Mossop needed a big win. Bring home 6s here might have been enough - and playing slam from the North seat on a diamond lead gave them an outside chance to do so. Take over the reins with the sight of all four hands and consider what you would discard at trick one (yes, ruffing would be a poor idea) and how you intend to advance the play.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

|  | ¢ A 105 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 108$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q 83 |  |
|  | ¢K 82 |  |
| ¢ 42 | N | ¢ K 8 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 975 |  | $\bigcirc 162$ |
| $\diamond$ J 942 | W E | $\triangleleft$ K 10765 |
| \% Q J 6 | S | \& 743 |
|  | (QJ9763 |  |
|  | - A 43 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ - |  |
|  | 2 A 1095 |  |

If you are anything like me you will pitch a club (maybe the nine) from dummy and win cheaply in hand then ruff a diamond to dummy and take a spade finesse. Now a top diamond or a club from East will disrupt the timing (a diamond because it kills your diamond menace or forces dummy into a premature discard). I'm not sure that I understand why - but if DF tells you it is the case, you'd better believe it.

The winning line is to play ace and another spade at tricks two and three - why take a finesse if it is losing? Back comes a club, you win the ace and cash a few more trumps while West pitches diamonds and East lets go a club (If West pitches two hearts he exposes his partner to a finesse in hearts while if he pitches a heart and two diamonds East is caught in a red-suit squeeze) You reach this ending after cashing the club king and diamond ace:


Now the reason why you couldn't ruff a diamond at trick two becomes apparent; you need to be able to ruff a diamond to dummy now and still have a diamond menace in hand left over. Ruff a diamond, cash the last trump and pitch a club unless West has discarded the Q , and you have the matrix for a perfect double squeeze.

## Day of Remembrance, Poznan 28 June 2011



The Poznan 1956 protests, also known as Poznan 1956 uprising or Poznan June (Poznański Czerwiec), were the first of several massive protests of the Polish people against the communist government of the People's Republic of Poland. Demonstrations by workers demanding better conditions began on June 28, 1956, at Poznan's Cegielski Factories and were met with violent repression.
A crowd of approximately 100,000 gathered in the city center near the UB secret police building. 400 tanks and 10,000 soldiers of LudoweWojsko Polskie and the Internal Security Corps under Polish-Soviet general Stanislav Poplavsky were ordered to suppress the demonstration and during the pacification fired at the protesting civilians.
The death toll was placed between 57 and 78 people, including a I3-year-old boy, Romek Strzałkowski. Hundreds of people sustained injuries. Nonetheless the Poznan protests were an important milestone on the way to the installation of a less Soviet-controlled government in Poland in October.
Many historians consider the Poznan 1956 protests to be an important milestone in the modern history of Poland, and one of the events that precipitated the fall of communism in Poland.
On June 21, 2006, to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the events, the Polish Sejm declared June 28 to be a national holiday in Poland; the Day of Remembrance of the Poznan, June 1956.

## Dziecko + zapałki = pożar

by Wojtek Siwiec

Tytułowe ostrzeżenie przed kilkudziesięciu laty widniało na każdym sprzedawanym w Polsce pudełku zapałek. O brydżową analogię nietrudno - każda z konwencji, nawet tych najprostszych, winna być używana z rozwaga i wyłacznie w celu, do którego została stworzona. Inaczej nietrudno o pożar; przykładem niech będzie jedno z rozdań turnieju teamów, w którym w roli dziecka nierozważnie bawiącego się zapałkami wystąpił jeden z brydżystów polskich. Aby jednak, broń Boże!, nie naruszyć dóbr osobistych bohatera opisywanych wydarzeń, zachowuje jego anonimowość..



Geoff Hampson, USA

Pokój zamknięty:

| West <br> $a$ | North <br> Hampson | East | South <br> Greco |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pas | IBA' $^{\prime}$ | pas | pas |
| ktr.(??) | rktr.c(!) | pas | 2 pas $^{2}$ |
| pas |  |  | pas |

I w tych założeniach i pozycji licytacyjnej 15-I7 PC
2 transfer na piki
a dziecko
b zapałki
c pożar!
Teoretycznie kontra na transfer pikowy wskazuje kiery, także $w$ aspekcie wistowym, szczególnie w tym wypadku, gdy kontrujacy jest po pasie.W tym rozdaniu takie działanie zawodnika $W$ - jedynie z czwartym asem z damą i niskimi blotkami - było jednakże więcej niż igraniem z ogniem. Szczególnie że trafiło nie na byle kogo, tylko na znakomita pare amerykańską młodszego pokolenia - Erica Greco z Geoffem Hampsonem. Ten ostatni - z silnym pięciokartem w kierach - zrekontrował. Wprawdzie WE mieli jeszcze bezpieczną ucieczke na 3e (tylko bez jednej), ale żadnych prób w tym kierunku już nie podjęli. Także obrona przeciwko $2 \curlyvee(\mathrm{~S})$ z rekontrą niespecjalnie rozgrywajacego przetestowała, tyle że kosztowało to jedynie nadróbke, sam kontrakt był bowiem nie do położenia. W pierwszej lewie W pociagnał $\diamond$ A. Teraz, aby $S$ zrobił tylko swoje, trzeba było wyjść w blotke atu; potem, po dojściu na eD - E powtórzyłby kierem i broniący wzięliby karo, dwa kiery oraz dwa trefle (najpóźniej w drugiej rundzie tego ostatniego koloru rozgrywający musiałby jednak zadysponować ze stołu dziewiątkę).

W drugiej lewie W wyszedł jednak w trefla, a jego partner zabił dziadkowego waleta damą i-wciąż jeszcze wierząc w możliwość obłożenia kontraktu - próbował ściagnać A. Greco przebił więc w ręce, a następnie zagrał kiera do króla na stole i kontynuował stamtąd 8 W . Grał pewnie, wiedział bowiem, że kontrujacy ma tylko cztery kiery, z piatym asem $z$ damą $w$ tym kolorze oraz $\diamond A$ dałby bowiem na trzeciej ręce otwarcie $1 \rho$.

Ostatecznie Eric oddał tylko karo, trefla, oraz dwie wziątki atutowe, wygrał więc zrekontrowany kontrakt z nadróbka. I zapisał sobie niezwyczajne 840 punktów, dokładnie dwa razy więcej (co przełożyło się na 9 impów) niż gracze NS na drugim stole - za wylicytowaną i zrealizowaną dograną w piki.

## Balicki - Żmudziński nie tracą formy

by Wojtek Siwiec

Nasza najlepsza para - Cezary Balicki z Adamem Żmudzińskim - występuje w Poznaniu w superteamie Pierre’a Zimmermanna, wraz z Geirem Helgemo, Torem Helnessem, Franckiem Multonem oraz właśnie Zimmermannem. To ten sam skład, który niespełna dwa lata temu wygrał w Sao Paulo mistrzostwa świata teamów ponadnarodowych. Nie raz już pisałem, że - moim zdaniem - najsilniejszą stroną polskiej pary jest gra w obronie, szczególnie przeciwko kontraktom na niskich wysokościach.A że wiele z nich zostaje uprzednio skontrowanych - drżyjcie, przeciwnicy! Czas płynie, a pod tym względem nic się nie zmienia, Balicki ze Żmudzińskim nadal są prawdziwymi brydżowymi kilerami. Najlepiej potwierdzi to rozdanie z niedzielnego meczu MONACO Z (czyli Zimmermann) - ISRAEL MONGOS...

Rozd. 27/SV; rozdawał S, obie przed partią

- AW 94
$\checkmark 103$
$\diamond$ D 53
\& AKW 4

| ¢ K D 106 | N | ¢ 87 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AW 76 |  | $\bigcirc 542$ |
| $\diamond-$ | W E | $\diamond$ W9862 |
| 2 D 10863 | S | ¢ 972 |
|  | ¢ 532 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K D 98 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK 1074 |  |
|  | 95 |  |



Dan Israeli, Israel

Pokój otwarty:

| West <br> Zimmerman | North <br> Padon | East <br> Multon | South <br> Israeli |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | I $\downarrow$ |
| ktr. | rktr.' | pas | pas |
| $2 \mathbf{2 0}$ | ktr. | pas | pas |
| pas |  |  |  |

I siłowa

Po dosyć oczywistej wywoławczej kontrze W para WE znalazła się w kłopotach, tym bardziej że jej 2e łatwo było skontrować. Po ataku $\diamond 3$ rozgrywający wpadł bez trzech, za 500. Nie była to tragedia, na NS wychodziło bowiem 3BA (z nadróbkami), na zysk w tym rozdaniu Multon - Zimmermann też chyba jednak nie liczyli. Tymczasem jednak...

Pokój zamknięty:

| West <br> Bakeret | North <br> Balicki | East <br> Lengy | South <br> Żmudziński |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | I $\downarrow$ |
| ktr. | rktr.' | pas | pas |
| I $\vee$ | pas(!) | pas | ${\text { ktr. }{ }^{2}(!)}_{\text {pas }}^{\text {pas }}$ |
|  | pas |  | pas |

I siłowa
2 karna, a przynajmniej bardzo mocno propozycyjna
GraczeWE odeszli tu na $\ \vee$, ale nasi reprezentanci zdołali karnie skontrować nawet tak niski kontrakt (dużo łatwiej kontruje się przecież grę na szczeblu dwóch). Także obrona była bezlitosna. Balicki zaatakował \&A, a w drugiej lewie wyszedł w atu - trójką. Żmudziński wstawił na trzeciej ręce १D, a rozgrywający zabił ja asem i zagrał eD. Cezary pobił
 wyszedł teraz blotką karo - do ósemki ze stołu i króla e-S-a; figura ta została przebita przez rozgrywającego w ręce. W zagrał następnie $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ - Cezary pobił go $\$ \mathrm{~A}$, zgrał \$2 na którego Adam pozbył się swojego ostatniego pika - po czym powtórzył kierem. A Żmudziński pobił tę lewę $\triangleleft$ K i po raz trzeci połączył atuty. Rozgrywający próbował teraz ściągnąć 5 D , co kosztowało go dodatkową (czwartą) lewę wpadkową (powinien był zagrać trefla i wyrzucić ze stołu pika - dostałby wówczas jeszcze wziątkę na $\diamond$ W). Żmudziński przebił ja bowiem ostatnim w rozdaniu atutem i wyszedł blotką karo - do damy w ręce partnera. A Cezary ściągnął wyrobionego mu $\$ \mathrm{~W}$ i powtórzył karem - Adam zdobył zatem ostatnie dwie wziątki na $\diamond$ A 10 , położone za $\diamond$ W 9 dziadka.

Skontrowany I $\triangleleft$ został zatem położony aż bez czterech, za 800 , więc ZIMMERMANN nie tylko nic w tym rozdaniu nie stracił, ale jeszcze wygrał 7 punktów meczowych.

## OPEN PAIRS - QUALIFYING <br> (final standings after 5 sessions - subject to confirmation)

| Rank | Names P | Percentage | 49 | R ROHOWSKY - E SANSOUR | 54.84 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | D BILDE - E JEPSEN | 63.19 | 50 | D KOZLOWSKI - H LAKOMSKI | 54.69 |
| 2 | N KUBAC - N ZORLU | 60.30 | 51 | E CZUBAK - S ROKICKI | 54.47 |
| 3 | P CRONIER - G D TESSIERES | 60.18 | 52 | VVROUSTIS - M EIDI | 54.41 |
| 4 | M BARYLEWSKI - C KRZEMINSKI | 59.09 | 53 | A MORATH - B EFRAIMSSON | 54.33 |
| 5 | T BAKKE - J HOYLAND | 58.56 | 54 | J MAKARUK - P NIEDZIELSKI | 54.26 |
| 6 | P JASSEM - P TUCZYNSKI | 58.40 | 55 | M ROMANOVSKA - K RUBINS | 54.21 |
| 7 | P GUILLAUMIN - F STRETZ | 58.33 | 56 | M JAWORSKI - T PILCH | 53.91 |
| 8 | K NADAR - B SATYANARAYANA | 58.32 | 57 | O RODZIEWICZ-BIELEWICZ - W TALAR | 53.90 |
| 9 | S GARCIA - Q ROBERT | 58.29 | 58 | A HERMANSDORFER - J UJMA | 53.88 |
| 10 | J GRANSTROM - K PATANA | 58.28 | 59 | M MATISONS - J ALFEJEVA | 53.87 |
| 11 | A JELENIEWSKI - JWACHNOWSKI | 58.28 | 60 | P BUTRYN - N SAKOWSKA | 53.87 |
| 12 | N BUCHLEV - J LESNICZAK | 58.23 | 61 | F BJORNLUND - N SANDQVIST | 53.84 |
| 13 | J CIECHOMSKI - W SKORA | 57.97 | 62 | J SCHINZE - J CAPPELLER | 53.81 |
| 14 | L K NIELSEN - M SCHALTZ | 57.94 | 63 | A GULA - M TACZEWSKI | 53.79 |
| 15 | R JAGNIEWSKI - M KWIECIEN | 57.92 | 64 | H BERTENS - B WESTRA | 53.79 |
| 16 | P ZATORSKI - S GOLEBIOWSKI | 57.35 | 65 | D IORDACHE - D B COTESCU | 53.69 |
| 17 | P KARLYKOV - B SHUKHMEYSTER | 57.33 | 66 | A JASZCZAK - M LESNIEWSKI | 53.58 |
| 18 | W SZELKA - CWOLCZAK | 57.28 | 67 | A LEVY - FVOLCKER | 53.57 |
| 19 | M DEMBINSKI - M PEDZINSKI | 56.87 | 68 | M KRASNICKI - P TELESZYNSKI | 53.51 |
| 20 | R BOWDERY - J HACKETT | 56.75 | 69 | T BIRKELUND - LW KUARSVIK | 53.51 |
| 21 | S ASSAEL - Y KAHYAOGLU | 56.66 | 70 | W JABLONSKI - A JAKIMIEC | 53.47 |
| 22 | L BREDE - K KOTOROWICZ | 56.59 | 71 | G KARAKOLEV - Z ZAHARIEV | 53.44 |
| 23 | M CHERNY - L GREENBAUM | 56.40 | 72 | O GUR - MYILMAZ | 53.39 |
| 24 | TWINCIOREK - MWRECZYCKI | 56.25 | 73 | M BARTOSZEWSKI - T SINKIEWICZ | 53.36 |
| 25 | R GARDZIELEWSKI - P KOLWICZ | 56.19 | 74 | S NYSHCHYI -V ZUBAN | 53.36 |
| 26 | A HINTERTAN - R URBANSKI | 56.14 | 75 | T FORRESTER - D GOLD | 53.29 |
| 27 | I KANDEMIR - S KOLATA | 55.99 | 76 | E MISZEWSKA - S ZAKRZEWSKI | 53.24 |
| 28 | D WARWAS - M TYRAN | 55.93 | 77 | S O HOYLAND - M EIDE | 53.18 |
| 29 | S DISSARD - S DE DONDER | 55.86 | 78 | S PETERKIN - S PUNCH | 53.10 |
| 30 | T GOTARD - T GOTARD | 55.81 | 79 | A ALLFREY - A ROBSON | 53.07 |
| 31 | K LATAWIEC - P STOPA | 55.62 | 80 | S SIMANAITIENE - A TYLA | 52.99 |
| 32 | R LACHOWICZ - P SALINSKI | 55.61 | 81 | K CHLOBOWSKI - T BIERNAT | 52.98 |
| 33 | E KACZMAREK - W SROCZYNSKI | 55.50 | 82 | I COLDEA - B MARINA | 52.76 |
| 34 | G BAJEK - W SIUDA | 55.45 | 83 | M YERGIN -V DENIZCI | 52.73 |
| 35 | S GUPTA - K R VENKATARAMAN | 55.32 | 84 | T SIELICKI - M KWIECINSKI | 52.72 |
| 36 | M GIZA - T LATOS | 55.29 | 85 | H MATTSON - I HAYES | 52.71 |
| 37 | X MICHAUD-LARIVIERE - T DE MENDEZ | 55.26 | 86 | FAYDOGDU - N AYDOGDU | 52.70 |
| 38 | B AMBROZ - M SENK | 55.22 | 87 | P GRUSZCZYNSKI - M NOWACZYK | 52.68 |
| 39 | G MIHAI - R MIHAI | 55.20 | 88 | K SIKORSKI - W WEJKNIS | 52.66 |
| 40 | S OLECH - J POLETYLO | 55.20 | 89 | M MALYSA - D RYAN | 52.56 |
| 41 | O GHIGHECI - I ROTARU | 55.14 | 90 | J FJAELBERG - J E OLSEN | 52.55 |
| 42 | V GIUBILO - R ZALESKI | 55.09 | 91 | $\checkmark$ KHANUKOV - M FELMY | 52.54 |
| 43 | G ZIVKOVIC - D MOSSOP | 55.05 | 92 | S NIAJKO - A POMARANSKI | 52.47 |
| 44 | E BEDNARCZYK - B OSTROWSKI | 55.03 | 93 | J ROMBAUT - P SCHMIDT | 52.41 |
| 45 | A DELLA MONTA - B HACKETT | 55.01 | 94 | M LOEFGREN - N BAUSBACK | 52.40 |
| 46 | S MLYNARCZUK - W TOMASZEK | 55.00 | 95 | A MALINOWSKI - A RASMUSSEN | 52.37 |
| 47 | M DOBRZYNSKI - W ARCZEWSKI | 54.99 | 96 | M KITA - R WOLINSKI | 52.34 |
| 48 | S JOHNSEN - A STOKKELAND | 54.87 | 97 | T KLUZ - K KLEINROK | 52.28 |

$\left.\begin{array}{lllll}98 & \text { F FLORIN - M IONITA } & 52.25 & 151 & \text { A MALINOWSKI - J P SVENDSEN } \\ 99 & \text { P BETHERS - A IMSA } & 52.25 & 152 & \text { G PROBOLA - J ROGOWSKI }\end{array}\right] 50.53$

E ELIASSEN - T SOILAND
205 A NOWAKOWSKI - A WITKOWSKI
206 A HYCNAR - R WAJDOWICZ
207 R DANCEWICZ - W BIEGAJLO
208 Z KOWALEWSKI - A RUTKOWSKI
209 W KOZUCHOWSKI - R JUNIK
210 M CHEBELEU - L OJOGA
211 M D MORTENSEN - M ROHRBERG
212 M HUTYRA - R WOLANSKI
213 K WARZOCHA - A KOKORYKA
214 G SZOTS - C CZIMER
215 M KEMENOVA -JTOMCANI
216 P ILCZUK - M JELENIEWSKI
217 R JASKIEWICZ - S JASKIEWICZ
218 J HOLMBAKKEN - F JOHNSTUEN
219 JT BERG - O SVENDSEN
220 J COUNIL-JP DESMOULINS
221 J ROMANOWSKI - W ROZWADOWSKI
222 G OIKONOMOPOULOS - PANGELOPOULOS
223 B PAZUR - M WOJCICKI
224 J KOSCIELNY - P MACHOWCZYK
225 D STOKKVIK - J OVESEN
226 R BENNETT - H SMITH
227 A HUSSEIN - T SADEK
228 E AKSUYEK - A GURSEL
229 I POPOV - M LEWIS
230 J GREWLING - P SOLECKI
23I J GRZELCZAK - T KRYSZTOFIAK
232 MYUEN - P B NEHMERT
233 M STAVRACHE - B BONTAS
234 R KUJAWSKI - G MALAZDREWICZ
235 K OMERNIK - S HENCLIK
236 M BARTKOWSKI - B SZULEJEWSKI
237 Z KULESZA - Z SABALA
238 M SINKIEWICZ - JTRETOWSKI
239 E SAELENSMINDE - F SVINDAHL
240 L GLAERUM - T UNDEM
24I T JARMOLINSKI - TWASILEWSKI
242 K BEDNAREK - Z SZYSZKOWSKI
243 A CZECH - M PIECZKA
244 I FERANCHUK - I GODUN
245 A DUDZIK - A KUSION
246 J DOMBROWE -W NAQVI
247 JFALLIX - W LIBBRECHT
248 A BOWLES - S MOHANDES
249 Y CHUMAK - O ROVYSHYN
250 M PACHNIEWSKI -W SOLTYSIAK
251 P BANG - J MURI
252 L CHERNYAK - D DOBRIN
253 A BENOIT - O GIARD
254 J KACZOROWSKI - G KULAK
255 K BUZALA - M NIEMIR
256 G GAWRON - J KOWAL
48.67
48.67
48.58
48.57
48.54
48.54
48.54
48.5I
48.44
48.43
48.4I
48.4I
48.34
48.29
48.25
48.18
48.16
48.08
48.00
47.96
47.89
47.88
47.84
47.84
47.80
47.76
47.74
47.70
47.70
47.65
47.64
47.58
47.52
47.50
47.49
47.36
47.34
47.30
47.25
47.21
47.16
47.08
47.01
46.93
46.87
46.75
46.65
46.63
46.47
46.37
46.35
46.35
46.31

257 J OCHIIEWICZ - C PRZASNEK
258 M MLYNARCZYK - P SIWINSKI
M MLYNARCZYK - P
J RODZIEWICZ - M RODZIEWICZ
261 A GORZEWSKI - P SUCHODOLSKI
262 R CYLWIK - J BATOG
263 A CSATLOS - L HITTMANN
264 K CZUL - JWESOLOWSKI
P JOKISCH - U KASIMIR
J MACHOTKA - N MERCAN
F MAGRI - P BARTOLOTTI
B RASULA - J SADAR
P KACPRZAK - P LECKI
M HENC - EVELECKY
JA PAULSEN - R SMISETFOSS
272 M HUBERSCHWILLER - Q LEVOY
273 J RADECKI - T PALUCHOWSKI
274 T MacCORMAC - R McMAUGH
275 W RAFALSKI - D BORYSOW
276 T KUS - P RESZCZYNSKI
277 A SKOP - A WUJKOW
278 K KRAJEWSKI - S GAWRYSZCZAK
279 R KAZMIERCZAK - M PILECKI
T BRAUN -V LENZ
I GLOWACKI - J IWANSKI
D PILON - G IZISEL
J KLIMCZAK - D KRUPNIK
284 MWHELAN - M BALDYSZ
285 W MARYNIOWSKI - T NIEDZWIADEK
286 J BOROWINSKI - L MIELCZAREK
287 M HJELTE - J SAFSTEN
T BARANOWSKI - J MAZURKIEWICZ
J KURDEJ - E SEICHTER
D MORAWSKI - I SALONEN
MVAN HOOIJDONK - MWINKEL
B WYSOCKI - M DOBROWOLSKI
A WLAD - R KIELCZEWSKI
J MAJKUT - L MOKRZYCKI
M BLACH - W SOLTYSIK
R KARP - J KOWALOWKA
K BEYER - R KLUK
S PIEPIORA - PTOMCZAK
299 H K PETERSEN - K HANSEN
300 T STRYSZAWSKI - M RODZAJ
301 R SZCZEPANOWSKI - P DYBOWSKI

309 J BALASOVS - U BETHERS
46.27
46.24
46.17
46.17
46.11
46.00
45.88
45.85
45.81
45.76
45.71
45.70
45.68
45.65
45.63
45.60
45.58
45.58
45.48
45.44
45.39
45.23
45.19
45.17
45.03
44.96
44.91
44.77
44.75
44.67
44.59
44.42
44.42
44.36
44.28
44.05
44.02
43.81
43.77
43.71
43.65
43.62
43.58
43.10
43.09
42.98
42.96
42.91
42.64
42.44
42.22
42.14
42.05

310 T BISPING - W STRZEMECKI
3II M SOROKA - Z STACHOWIAK
312 W RADZIAK - W ANDRUK
313 M MAKATREWICZ - J JANIAK
314 L GOLDER - A PELSZYNSKA
315 R KLEJNY - J HLIWA
316 M CZEREPAK - G JARZABEK
41.90
41.73
41. 69
41.63
41.58
40.60
40.51

317 W DZIACHAN - T URBANSKI
40.13

318 C C UNGUREANU - D UNGUREANU 39.76
319 M BIELAWSKI - I CHALUPEC 39.69
320 S SAMOL - M KRZYWINA 37.99
321 J BOJKO - B JAKUBOWSKA 37.87
322 B BASARAN - H CIVGINER 36.37
323 FVLAANDEREN - F VLAANDEREN

## WOMEN PAIRS - QUALIFYING

## (final standings after 5 sessions - subject to confirmation)

| Rank Names | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| I | R MIRCHEVA - A LEKOVA-KOVACHEVA | 59.98 |
| 2 | K BERTHEAU - J LARSSON | 58.88 |
| 3 | J NEVE - M ROSSARD | 58.41 |
| 4 | R BARENDREGT - MVERBEEK | 57.52 |
| 5 | G HELNESS - S THORESEN | 56.74 |
| 6 | JTACZEWSKA - M HOLEKSA | 55.54 |
| 7 | L BRIKMANE - NVEKSA | 54.93 |
| 8 | C HALLKVIST - C SJOBLOM | 54.68 |
| 9 | CVECHIATTO - E WEBER | 53.20 |
| I0 | JYARDIMCI - B ATALAY | 52.70 |
| II | K McCALLUM - L BAKER | 52.52 |
| I2 | B PANCHEVA - VYANEVA | 52.48 |
| I3 | C SEALE - C JAGGER | 52.32 |
| I4 | P v MALCHUS - G SMYKALLA | 51.96 |
| I5 | E SHOKHAN - Z BELIANKINA | 51.89 |
| I6 | N SENIOR - R WOLFARTH | 50.5 I |
| I7 | J COOPER - M McGREGOR | 50.27 |

## SENIOR PAIRS - QUALIFYING

(final standings after 5 sessions - subject to confirmation)

| Rank | Names |
| :--- | :--- |
| I | C MARI - S WALTER |
| 2 | G VIOLINI - G GIGLI |
| 3 | F FALAY - O EKINCI |
| 4 | S KOSIKOWSKI - W HOEGER |
| 5 | Z KUNC - L LANIEWSKI |
| 6 | N DOREMANS - JTROUWBORST |
| 7 | R TOLUN - E BANKOGLU |
| 8 | J CHODOROWSKI - I CHODOROWSKA |
| 9 | K ANTAS - T KACZANOWSKI |
| 10 | A KONDEJA - W BURAKOWSKI |
| II | G YALMAN - A YALMAN |
| I2 | W BUZE - J POLEC |
| I3 | B BUDZYN - L BUDZYN |
| I4 | AVERMUND - B O SORENSEN |
| I5 | PWEYMANN - W KWIATKOWSKI |
| I6 | M E COPUR - C S GEBECELI |
| I7 | B STRATER - U KRATZ |
| I8 | S OWCZAREK - Z RADWANSKI |

Percentage
59.63
58.91
57.02
55.29
55.22
55.10
55.06
54.61
54.00
53.84
53.60
53.44
52.83
52.77
51.96
51.72
51.50
51.48

| 19 | M DRUKIER - U HUSTEN | 50.98 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | P ERICH - C NIEMEIJER | 50.90 |
| 21 | K DRIVER - G DRIVER | 49.65 |
| 22 | K PUCZYNSKI - WWYRZYKOWSKI | 49.59 |
| 23 | D LIGGAT - E ( McGOWAN | 48.78 |
| 24 | A NIMHAUSER - D HIRTZ | 48.57 |
| 25 | G RANGEVALL - B LILJEKVIST | 48.32 |
| 26 | J STANCZYK - W KOZICKI | 48.15 |
| 27 | J POCHRON - S SZENBERG | 47.69 |
| 28 | K O SHEA - E COUNIHAN | 47.21 |
| 29 | M SZMAKFEFER - A PIESIEWICZ | 47.08 |
| 30 | LWARWOCKI - K POKORSKI | 46.96 |
| 31 | D JEDRZEJEWSKI - M LUKASIAK | 46.33 |
| 32 | A FRONCZAK - J SUKOW | 46.05 |
| 33 | L SADOS - R BUDZIK | 43.41 |
| 34 | W KANIEWSKI - J KOPRAS | 41.82 |
| 35 | Z KOVACS (2) - A BUZA | 41.27 |
| 36 | M NOWACKI - A ALEKSANDRZAK | 41.20 |
| 37 | R LEVKOFF - R SEAMON | 36.45 |



