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The Winner's Circle


In the Open a terrific match saw the team from the USA come back from a 58-IMP deficit, Mahaffey Jim Mahaffey, Jeff Meckstroth, Eric Rodwell, Sam Lev, Jacek Pszczola, Gary Cohler) finally prevailing I55-I33 over the France/Germany combination Bessis (Josef Piekarek, Alexander Smirnov, Michel Bessis,Thomas Bessis). The bronze goes to Monaco A (Jean Charles Allavena, Nathalie Frey, Henri Fissore, Marco Catellani, Marc Bompis, Jean-Christophe Quantin).
The Women's champions are Turkey's Kapadokya (Mine Babac, Dilek Yavas, Serap Kuranoglu, Lale Gumrukcuoglu) who led from start to finish against Netherlands Women I (Carla Arnolds, Bep Vriend, Jet Pasman, Anneke Simons, Laura Dekkers, Marion Michielsen). The bronze goes to Cronier (Bénédicte Cronier, Sylvie Willard, Catherine D'Ovidio, Veronique Bessis, Jovi Smederevac, Nikica Sver).
The Senior title goes to France, Grenthe (Patrick Grenthe, Philippe Vanhoutte, Philippe Poizat, Guy Lasserre, Patrice Piganeau, François Leenhardt) who were too strong for the England/Sweden combination Pharon (Paul D Hackett, Tony Waterlow, Gunnar Hallberg, Hans Gothe, David Price, Colin Simpson). The bronze goes to a Poland/Switzerland alliance, Kutner (Roger Kutner, Marek Borewicz, Jacek Stasica, Wlodzimierz Wala)


## OPEN TEAMS

| F/NAL |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | Ist | 2nd | 3rd | total |
|  | BESSIS | 68 | 52 | 13 | 133 |
|  | MAHAFFEY | 43 | 61 | 51 | 155 |

## WOMEN TEAMS

| FMNAL |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | Ist | 2nd | 3rd | total |
|  | KAPADOKYA | 48 | 10 | 31 | 89 |
|  | NETHERLANDSWOMEN I | 6 | 17 | 28 | 51 |

## SENIOR TEAMS

| F/NAL |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | Ist | 2nd | 3rd | total |
|  | GRENTHE | 44 | 36 | 31 | III |
|  | PHARON | 31 | 18 | 15 | 64 |

## OPEN TEAMS

| PLAMOFF |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 1 |  | Ist | 2nd | total |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TEXANACES | 31 | 44 | 75 |
|  | MONACO A | 46 | $\mathbf{4 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 8}$ |

## WOMEN TEAMS

| PLAMOFF |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | Ist | 2nd | total |
|  | CRONIER | 42 | 60 | 102 |
|  | JOEL | 25 | 25 | 50 |

## SENIOR TEAMS

| PLAYOFF |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ist | 2nd | total |
| I | KUTNER | 39 | 41 | 80 |
|  | POL - CH | 36 | 39 | 75 |



## 17 th SWEDISH BRIDGEFESTIVAL $\ddot{O} R E B R O$, July $29^{\text {th }}-$ August $7^{\text {th }} 2011$

- The Chairman's Cup • 6 National Championships
- 29 Bronze tournaments - 8 Silver tournaments
- / Gold tournament • / Grand Master tournament
- Seminars for beginners • PartyNight with dance • Vugraph
- Daily Bulletin • Master Points and Cash Prizes in all tournaments

 All information to be found at www.svenskbridge.se
- CONVENTUM amano handla ? 3 :se


## Pairs Prize-Giving and Closing Ceremony

The pairs Prize-Giving and Closing Ceremony will be held on Saturday 2nd July immediately after the end of the play, in front of the playing area CI
Snacks will follow

## Awards:

I. Medals and titles will be awarded to the 3 pairs best classified in Final A of each category
2. Plaques will be presented to the first 3 pairs classified in Final B of the three categories
3. Challenge Trophies will be assigned to the Presidents of the Federations to which the first European Pairs in each category belong. Replicas will be presented to the first, second and third classified pairs. This only applies to those European pairs where both players are from the same country.

## The Trophies are:

"Paul Magerman Trophy" for Senior category
"AnnaMaria Torlontano Cup" for Women category
"Giorgio Belladonna Trophy" for Open category

WBF WOMEN'S CLUB
Bridge ${ }^{2}$ BSB

## What is the WBF Women's Club?

It is the official World Bridge Federation Club for Women players.Members can enjoy the pleasures of a true WBF Club on BBO.WBF Online Masterpoints are assigned.World's most important bridge players support the Club. If you want to join the Club, just go to the Hospitality Desk and fill the form.(Name, Surname, E-mail, Country \& BBO nick)

## Contact details:

"WBF Women's Club": www.wbfwomensbridgeclub.org
"3 Tournaments every day" (probably suspended during July and August because of the summer holidays and maybe replaced by special tournaments) For information, schedule, programme and results, please visit www.womensbridgeclub.org
"Weekly Bulletins" will be available for the comments on the deals. Link: http://td.bboitalia.it/wbcl.htm

## Just the Facts

## Jan Jansma



Date of Birth: 09/08/62
Place of Birth: Haarlem
Place of Residence: Spykenisse
What is your favourite colour?
Orange of course!
What kind of food makes you happy?
Steak! Medium rare please
And what drink?
Cola
Who is your favourite author?
Unfortunately I hardly ever read
All time favourite movie?
I liked the Harry Potter movies (OK and the books as well)
Do you have a favourite actor?
Jack Nicholson
What kind of music do you like to listen to?
Oldies from the 80s and Dutch Rap
What do you see as your best ever result?
Winning the Open European Teams in Tenerife
Do you have a favourite hand?
Yes, a 3s contract I played many years ago still pleases me.
Who is your favourite bridge player?
Gert Jan Paulissen of course
Is there a bridge book that had a profound influence on you?
Yes, Yes, Yes, Adventures in Cardplay is simply the very best book ever!
What is the best bridge country in the world?
Italy (by far!)
What are bridge players particularly good at
(except for bridge)?
Thinking logically
What is it you dislike in a person?
Shouting at your bridge partner
Do you have any superstitions concerning bridge?
No, but I do tend to be at the table 5-10 minutes in advance
Who or what would you like to be if you weren't yourself?
Paulissen, so I can play bridge with myself. LOL
Which three people would you invite to dinner?
Ruud van Nistelrooy, Louis van Gaal and my Aida of course
Is there something you'd love to learn?
I would love to play golf
What is the stupidest rule in bridge?
That a 20 second hesitation with screens is no hesitation!

# You Win Some - You Lose Some - How Unfair! <br> by Patrick Jourdain (Wales) 

At the lunchtime break in the Womens quarterfinals your reporter could see Jill Meyers was unhappy. I can't say she was crying in her soup because she had a rice dish, but the story soon came out. "What is the chance of losing because the missing trumps are 4-0 offside?" she enquired. The answer is $4.78 \%$. Here was the deal:


Jill Meyers and Jill Levin for Team Joel had an unopposed auction:

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Meyers | Levin |
| $1{ }^{1}$ | 2\% |
| 34 | 4NT |
| 5\% | 5 |
| 64 | $7{ }^{1}$ |



Jill Meyers, USA

2\% was an artificial game force, 4NT was keycard for spades, the response showed 0 or 3 keys, the relay asked about the queen of trumps, the response showed the queen but no outside king.

When you look at all four hands you can see this excellent contract bit the dust. At the other table Team CBC Milano had stopped in $6 \diamond$ so the loss was 14 IMPs instead of a gain by that amount. It was galling to find $7 \diamond$ by EAST can make because diamonds are 3-2 and the spade void is on lead but that must be an inferior grand slam.

As I expressed my sympathy, Jill continued. "Fortunately, there was some justice on the next board:"

Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.

- KJ 108
$\bigcirc 632$
$\triangleleft 43$

9) 10864
$\Delta$ Q

- K 987
$\diamond A J 75$
\& AK 73

| N |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| W | E |
| S |  |

\& A9 3
$\checkmark$ A Q
$\diamond$ KQ9862
\& 9

- 76542

ค」1054
$\diamond 10$
$\%$ Q J 2

Again their auction was unopposed:

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| Meyers | Levin |
|  | I $\diamond$ |
| 18 | 2 |
| 34 | 4. |
| 5 | 54 |
| $7 \diamond$ | All Pass |

3s was a splinter agreeing diamonds. 41 was keycard for diamonds. The response showed two keycards with either the trump queen or extra length. The relay was a grand slam try which Meyers, with both side-suit kings, accepted at once.
This was a brave effort given the result of the previous deal. This time there were no problems in the play. Team CBC Milano had again stopped in $6 \diamond$ so Joel was 13 IMPs to the good.
Back to back excellent grand slams had been bid by our two Jills for a net loss of I IMP when the opponents stopped in six. You win some, and lose some, but, yes, how unfair is that! The half-time score was 4I-36 to Milano.

## Testing Times

by Mark Horton

As you may have noticed the weather here in Poznan has been very good, the rain that has fallen generally being while everyone is asleep, or while play has been taking place.
Sunshine in summer is good for sportsmen, especially the ones who play that typically English game, cricket.
In an effort to introduce a few more of you to its mysteries I have written this report on the first half of the semi-final between The Texan Aces and Mahaffey in the style of a cricket commentary (or at least tried to).

Play started in bright sunshine (most unusual in cricket).
Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

|  | ¢ 7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q J 854 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 9862$ |  |  |
|  | 2 K 9 |  |  |
| ¢ K 9864 |  | ¢ J 103 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ - |  | $\bigcirc 732$ |  |
| $\diamond$ KQ 743 |  | $\checkmark 10$ |  |
| ¢ 753 |  | \% AJIO 842 |  |
| 4 AQ 52 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ K 1096 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ A J 5 |  |  |  |
| 2 Q 6 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Mahaffey | Shah | Cohler | Banerji |
|  | $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 2NT* |
| 3** | 34 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West tried the effect of a googly by showing his two-suiter, but East was not interested.
East led the ten of diamonds and declarer put up dummy's ace, drew trumps and played a diamond, following that with a claim, +420 .

In cricket, a googly is a type of delivery bowled by a right-arm leg spin bowler. It is occasionally referred to as a Bosie (or Bosey), an eponym in honour of its inventor Bernard Bosanquet. While a normal leg break spins from the leg to the off side, away from a right-handed batsman, a googly spins the other way, from off to leg, into a right-handed batsman.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anklesaria |  | Venkatesh | Meckstroth |
|  | 18 | Pass | 2NT* |
| Dbl | 3\%* | 5\% | Db |
| $5 \diamond$ | Dbl | 54 | Dbl |

West's double kept clubs in the picture and rightly or wrongly East got into the action. It is not clear why West ran his partner out from 5\$; perhaps his original double promised a two suiter so he imagined there would be a better spot? $5 \%$ would probably have cost 300 but 5 was tougher to handle. Declarer ruffed the heart lead and played the king of diamonds. (When South has the ace of diamonds, declarer can save a trick by crossing to the ace of clubs and playing a diamond.) South took the ace and switched to ace of spades and a spade. Declarer won in dummy, cashed the ace of clubs and cross-ruffed until he was out of ammunition, down four, -800 and 9 IMPs to Mahaffey.
Run out - one of the eleven ways of being dismissed at cricket
Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
© K 53
『K 94
$\diamond$ K 8
5 J 10974

| ¢ A 109 | N |  | ¢ Q 42 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 82$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ A 10653 |
| $\diamond$ A 10763 | W E |  | $\checkmark 94$ |
| \% Q 52 | S |  | ¢ A 83 |
|  | ¢ J 876 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q J 7 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q J 52 |  |  |
|  | 2 K 6 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Mahaffey | Shah | Cohler | Banerji |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 3 - | All Pass |  |  |

West played another extravagant shot but he had mistimed the ball badly. North led the jack of clubs and declarer went up with dummy's ace and ran the nine of diamonds to North's king. South won the club return and switched to the queen of hearts. When it held he correctly abandoned the suit and played the two of spades. North won with the king and returned the four of clubs for South to ruff. The seven of hearts went to the king and ace and declarer played a diamond to the ace and a diamond. That was two down, -I00.
Extravagant - A way of describing a stroke played with a flourish of the bat.

| Closed Room <br> West | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Venkatesh | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| I $\diamond$ | Pass | I $~$ | Pass |
| INT | All Pass |  |  |

West preferred a more orthodox stroke, simply nudging the ball into play by opening One Diamond. North led the ten of clubs and South won with the king and returned the suit. Declarer won with the king and ducked a diamond. South won and switched to the jack of hearts, but declarer won in dummy and cleared the diamonds for an easy +90 and 5 IMPs.

Orthodox stroke - The application of sound technique while batting.
Duck - to be out without scoring.

| Board 3 Dealer South. E/W Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 A 876 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q J 3 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 984$ |  |  |  |
| ¢ K 52 |  |  |  |
| -103 |  | 4 | 52 |
| $\bigcirc$ K 4 | W E |  | 62 |
| $\diamond$ JI0 76 |  |  | Q 3 |
| \% Q J 1083 |  | \% 9 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 5$ |  |  |
| ¢ 764 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Mahaffey | Shah | Cohler | Banerji |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 18 | Dbl | 2\% |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | All Pass |

This deal served as a reminder that one does not always get away with a light opening bid. East led the ace of diamonds and switched to the nine of clubs. Declarer was already booked for three down, a nice hat trick for the defenders, -500 .

Hat trick - The term was first used in 1858 in cricket to describe HH Stephenson's feat of taking three wickets in three balls, and was used in print for the first time in 1878.

| Closed Room <br> West | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Venkatesh | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | I $\diamond^{*}$ | Dbl | Rdbl |
| INT | All Pass |  |  |

What a difference a bid makes!
North led the queen of hearts and declarer won with dummy's ace and played the nine of clubs to the jack and king. He won the heart return in hand and played the queen of clubs, matching it with dummy's queen of diamonds. He played the ten of clubs, this time parting with the king of diamonds. When South again withheld the ace of clubs he took
his diamond tricks for +120 , still a loss of 9 IMPs.
After a number of maiden overs, this deal came along:
A maiden over, one where no runs (IMPs) are scored.
Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.
Q Q J 5
QJ 93
$\diamond 972$
2 A Q 85
$\wedge A 108$
$\diamond A K 2$
$\diamond$ Q 83
$* K 642$

© 642
Q Q 64
$\diamond$ AJIO 64
\& 13
¢K 973
10875
K 5
\& 1097
Open Room

| West <br> Mahaffey | North <br> Shah | East <br> Cohler | South <br> Banerji |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| INT | Pass | $2 \mathbf{2}^{*}$ | Pass |
| $3 \mathbf{3 N}$ | Pass | 3 NT | All Pass |

With an awkward choice North went for the five of clubs, a false stroke indeed. Declarer put up dummy's jack, came to hand with a heart and played a diamond to the jack and king. South played the nine of clubs and when that was ducked he continued with the ten. That gave the defenders four tricks, but thereafter the defence were stumped. Declarer had the rest, +600 .

Stumped - another way to be dismissed

Closed Room

| West <br> Anklesaria | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> Venkatesh | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| INT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{e}^{*}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond *^{*}$ | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

When North led the queen of spades the potential boundary had been cut off. Declarer took the second spade and tried the diamond finesse. South won and cashed his spades, North discarding the nine of hearts. South switched to the ten of clubs, two down, -200 and I3 IMPs to Mahaffey.

Boundary - the edge of the playing field, or a scoring shot where the ball is hit to or beyond that point
With the score at 14-37 the Aces needed someone to score a century.

The first definite century (l00 runs) in a major cricket match was scored by John Small when he made 136 for Hampshire $v$ Surrey at Broadhalfpenny Down in July I 775.

| Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢K 542 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 6$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ KJ 1052 |  |  |  |
| ¢ AJ 4 |  |  |  |
| ¢ Q 87 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 843$ | W E |  | 7 |
| $\diamond 9643$ |  |  | 87 |
| \% K 86 | S |  |  |
| ( AJ 10 |  |  |  |
| ¢KJIO 952 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ - |  |  |  |
| 2 Q 1072 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Mahaffey | Shah | Cohler | Banerji |
|  | I $\diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 38 |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

On this layout the heart game is the easier of the two, but 3NT was playable.
East led the five of clubs and West put up the king, taken by declarer's ace. A heart went to the nine and declarer continued with the ten, discarding a diamond as East won


Keyzad Anklesaria, India
with the queen. A diamond went to the nine and ten and declarer went to dummy with the ace of spades and cleared the hearts. East cashed the ace of diamonds before the rats got at it, +630 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Anklesaria | Rodwell | Venkatesh | Meckstroth |
|  | I $\diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 11. | Pass | 28 |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 21 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

East led the nine of clubs and that ran to declarer's jack. When he played a heart East went up with the ace and switched to the seven of diamonds for the nine and jack, declarer discarding a club from dummy. When declarer played a spade to the ten West took the queen and returned a diamond for the king and ace, East exiting with a club. West did not cover the ten, so declarer tried the king of hearts. When the queen did not appear he had no way home, - 100 and 12 IMPs to the Aces.
This was a much tougher defence to cope with, but there was a difficult winning line. Declarer must reject the spade finesse, playing a spade to the ace. Then he clears the hearts, discarding a spade from hand. East can't safely exit in a black suit, so tries a low diamond. Declarer wins and simply exits with a diamond to endplay East.
As the players left the field for lunch, the Aces trailed 2637 at the half.

Lunch is the interval at the end of the morning session before play resumes in the afternoon.
In 1993, with lunch approaching, Shane Warne bowled Mike Gatting with what was later described as the ball of the century. The somewhat rotund Gatting was known to be fond of lunch and his dismissal prompted the former England Captain Graham Gooch, to comment: "He looked as though someone had just nicked his lunch. This was further alluded to by journalist Martin Johnson, who said "How anyone can spin a ball the width of Gatting boggles the mind" and again by Gooch who added "If it had been a cheese roll, it would never have got past him."

```
Today's - Schedule
10.00 Open Pairs Semi-final A&B (R6)
10.00 W/S Pairs Qualifying (RI4)
12.00 Open Pairs Semi-final A&B (R7)
I2.00 W/S Pairs Qualifying (RI5)
15.00 Open Pairs Semi-final A&B (R8)
15.00 W/S Pairs Qualifying (RI6)
17.00 Open Pairs Semi-final A&B (R9)
17.00 W/S Pairs Qualifying (RI7)
19.00 O/W/S Pairs Semi-final A&B (RIO)
19.00 W/S Pairs Qualifying (RI8)
```


# Is splendid company good enough? 

by Sviatlana Badrankova

Last night, returning to my hotel after a late supper, I discovered in the lobby two Russian athletes having a philosophical conversation about right decisions and winning decisions. As everyone can guess, this discussion was inspired by their match result - in the Round of 32, the Russian team Shanurin lost to Denmark Open 76-83. After 14 boards, Shanurin trailed 19 to 5 I and the gap seemed insurmoutable. However, in the second half the Russian team chalked up 3 two-digit swings and 4 boards before the end the score was 65 to 61 .
A vulnerable disaster for Khven-Rudakov who played $2 \triangleleft$ doubled on a 4-3 fit and a combined II HCP, which cost 1400. The next deal brought one overtrick and I IMP for the Russians. Then the penultimate board appeared on the table.

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

|  | - K 863 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PA873 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 6 |  |
|  | - K 42 |  |
| Q Q | N | - 1097 |
| $\bigcirc$ QJ 2 |  | $\bigcirc 1065$ |
| $\checkmark$ K 10742 |  | $\checkmark$ A 9853 |
| - A976 | S | 2 J 5 |
|  | - AJ5 52 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 94$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q |  |
|  | ¢ Q 1083 |  |

Alexander Dubinin opened Is and West announced himself with a take out double. N/S reached 41 and West led the queen of hearts. Declarer took with the $\odot \mathrm{K}$ and played a small trump. When the queen appeared, two more rounds of trumps followed. A hearts was ducked and an elimination of the red suits led to this position:


Declarer knows the defenders started with 17 points.

With ten cards in diamonds neither defender has bid the suit, so the 5-5 split is likely. West had a singleton spade and hearts are known to be 3-3. East has shown up with the ace of diamonds, but did not bid. It seems that West must be I-3-5-4.
Quite a lot of information for a master.
In this ending, Alexander Dubinin played a club to the $\& \mathrm{Q}$ and waited for the return. A diamond would provide him with a ruff and discard and a club with a hoped for additional trick in the suit. When West exited with a club, declarer played low from the table - and East's jack meant one off. The line of play chosen was statistically correct the decision was right. But, unfortunately, the right decision wasn't the winning one.
The Danes scored 8 IMPs, as next door the Russians E/W sacrificed in 5 for -300 . A winning decision in 49 would have meant 3 IMPs to Russia. Enough to change the result of the match.
Seeing all four hands, a newbie will ask loudly - how can one lose this game with the onside? That's the difference between a newbie and a master: a real master prefers to lose the contract via a squeeze or throw-in than to make it just because of successful finesse. Don't you believe me? A brief examination of the board records reveals three more unlucky declarers, Jeff Meckstroth, Jean Christophe Quantin and Simon de Wijs. Isn't that splendid company every ordinary bridge player would like to join?
It is indeed, but is it good enough?
Incidentally, an editor points out that ducking the first trick might have worked well!


Alexander Dubinin, Russia

## By Jove how tickled I am!

by Barry Rigal

As Ken Dodd might have said, you cannot hope to stop Jovanka Smedervac (known as Jovi), you can only hope to contain her.

Kenneth Arthur Dodd OBE is a British comedian and singer songwriter, famous for his frizzy hair or "fluff dom" and buck teeth or "denchers", his favorite cleaner, the feather duster (or "tickling stick") and his tattyfilarious greeting "How tickled I am!" He works mainly in the music hall tradition, although, in the past, has occasionally appeared in drama, including as Malvolio in Shakespeare's Twelfth Night on stage in Liverpool in 197I; on television in the cameo role of 'The Tollmaster' in the 1987 Doctor Who story Delta and the Bannermen; and as Yorick (in silent flashback) in Kenneth Branagh's film version of Shakespeare's Hamlet in 1996. In total he has sold more than 100 million records worldwide. In the 1960s his fame was such that he rivalled The Beatles as a household name.
In 1989 Dodd was charged with tax evasion. The subsequent trial led to several revelations. The Diddy Men, who had appeared in his stage act, were often played by local children from stage schools, and were revealed never to have been paid. Dodd was also revealed to have very little money in his bank account, having $£ 336,000$ in cash stashed in suitcases in his attic. When asked by the judge, "What does a hundred thousand pounds in a suitcase feel like?", Dodd made his now famous reply, "The notes are very light, M'Lord."
Dodd also joked that when he started working Income Tax was only sixpence in the pound and no one had told him it had changed.

Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

|  | ¢ Q 106 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 8$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 10932$ |  |  |
|  | \& AK 1093 |  |  |
| ¢ K | N |  | 83 |
| QK9763 | W E |  | Q J 4 |
| $\diamond$ Q J 4 |  |  |  |
| 9 8752 | S |  |  |
|  | - A 9542 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1052$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK 85 |  |  |
|  | ¢ J |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Sver |  | Smederevac |
|  | Pass | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | $3 \checkmark$ | Pass | 49 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

After Nikica Sver's artificial $3 \diamond$ - which showed a threecard raise in spades - Jovi was unwilling to run the chance of missing a vulnerable game. She bounced to game and East led the $\forall J$ - Rusinow. East contributed an encouraging seven, so declarer won in hand and led the 810 , won by East for a second diamond play. Back came the $\diamond 6$, and Smederevac guessed well to rise with the ace and ruff a heart then play three rounds of clubs, discarding a heart from hand ruffing low in hand as East produced the 2 Q . Now Jovi exited with a diamond as East pitched a heart, ruffed the heart continuation in hand as East followed with the $>\mathbf{A}$, and had reached this ending.


Now a spade toward dummy's queen left West on lead, unable to do anything helpful. She played a heart and let declarer take her three trumps separately.


## The Open Teams Swiss revisited

by Jos Jacobs

This is how I started my Round 3 report about the board below in last Monday's Bulletin.
"The next board was about lost suits, missed games and all that:"
Later, I gathered that I should have added the story below to this report as well, about a declarer who fell into a cunning defence:

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.


North, Dehaye for the Belgian team Cooremans, was declaring 3NT and Piekarek led a low club. Dummy threw a heart, Smirnov played the queen and declarer won the king to continue a low diamond. Piekarek went straight up with the king and suddenly, Dehaye had a problem. If the king were a true card, he has to duck this to keep communications intact. After some thought, declarer indeed decided to play low from dummy, thus enabling the defenders to cash four more club tricks. Well defended indeed. They were the only pair from the seven who were defending 3NT to actually beat this contract. The funny thing is that this false card is entirely obvious once you think of it.

## 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.

## Souvenir Cards

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

## Championship Diary



On Tuesday, BBO watchers following the match between Mahaffey and the Texan Aces could enjoy the comments of rafizain - for instance: 'Meckwell usually win the tournaments they play in unless I am their team mate.'
Any idea who it was? (See the end of this diary.)

Some people take their player number at these championships quite seriously. Janice Seamon-Molson is very happy to have been awarded number 2220. Patrick Grenthe is slightly less enthusiastic about his number 1440. Jason Hackett is rather insulted by his 1470. And Herman De Wael has also played the same deal, but he made only 9 tricks in INT.

## More from Gabriel Chagas:

Whenever I fill out an application, in the part that says, 'In case of emergency, notify:' I put 'DOCTOR.'
I used to be indecisive. Now I'm not so sure.
Hospitality is making your guests feel at home even when you wish they were.

Eric Koish writes from Toronto:
The real time info on the Poznan site is wonderful and you're doing a great job with the Bulletins. My only beef (and I don't see an easy solution) is that readers generally have no idea who is on any team unless they remembered to keep on hand the Bulletins listing the team members (which seem to have plenty of errors themselves re actual bodies participating). With the website's mouseover facility for team members everything is easy, but readers do not always have their computers handy.
I have an idea that we will implement next time!

The mystery man, appearing for the first time ever as a BBO commentator, and using his sons' names to make up his handle, Rafi \& Zain, was non other than Zia Mahmood.

## The Best Leads Against 3 NT (Part I) <br> by David Bird and Taf Anthias

The authors were a formidable partnership in the seventies before Taf Anthias went to work in the USA (he was a vice President of Cisco Systems). They are working on a project to evaluate opening leads. Taf is an expert programmer and they are using some programs that he has written to automate the process. Their conclusions against no trump contracts will be published in a Master Point Press book towards the end of the year.

Recent advances in bridge software allow the best opening leads to be investigated. For a given West hand, several thousand deals can be generated that match the chosen auction. These deals are then played at double-dummy, against the 13 possible opening leads, to see which lead works best. Our investigations suggest that the double-dummy advantages to both declarer and the defenders tend to cancel each other out, giving a sound basis for evaluating the leads.

The auction INT - 3NT, which you should assume throughout this article, gives you valuable information about the responder's hand. He does not hold a 5-card major or he would have made a transfer bid on the way to 3NT. He is also unlikely to hold a 4-card major, since he did not use Stayman.

What about the opener's hand? It is standard practice to open a strong INT on 5-3-3-2 hands with a 5-card major, otherwise you can run into rebid problems. The opener will hold a 5 -card major roughly $10 \%$ of the time. Nevertheless declarer and the dummy, between them, are likely to hold fewer cards in the majors than in the minors. There are the figures:

North (the dummy) holds an average of 2.44 cards in each major

South (declarer) holds an average of 3.38 cards in each major

Between them, they hold an average of 5.82 cards in each major, while the defenders hold 7.18. The flipside of this is that the defenders hold an average of 5.82 in each minor against North/South's 7.18. This has a very important implication: it is generally better to lead a major suit than a minor suit.
(Note that when the opponents are playing a 4-card major system, such as Acol, the bias in favour of major-suit leads is even stronger.)

## Should I lead a 4-card minor or a shorter major?

## Hand I

What would you lead from:

$$
\text { 」 J } 86 \vee 9 \text { K K } 72 \text { KJ } 72 ?
$$

First thoughts The guideline 'fourth-best from your longest and strongest' suggests a minor-suit lead. Leading from an honour combination often costs a trick, however, and the compensating rewards are not that high when the suit contains only four cards. Let's see the result of the 10,000-deal simulation for this West hand:

Beats contract (IMPs)
46
89
21.3\%
20.6\%

I3.2\%
14.1\%
15.7\%

Avg.Tricks (MPs)
$\diamond K$
$\diamond 2$
$\$ 2$
The major-suit leads are well ahead, both at IMPs and at matchpoints. So that we can judge the bias in favour of majorsuit leads, we will now swap the majors and the minors. What would you lead here:

|  | Beats contract (IMPs) | Avg. tricks (MPs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢K | 16.8\% | 3.19 |
| \$2 | 12.7\% | 2.83 |
| 82 | 12.0\% | 2.85 |
| $\checkmark 6$ | II.9\% | 2.90 |
| 9 | 12.3\% | 2.92 |

A lead from the KQ72 combination is now easily best, provided you lead the king rather than the 2 . An $8 \%$ deficit has been changed into a $5 \%$ advantage - a swing of $13 \%$ due to the switching of the major and minor suits!
The table contains some other points of interest. It is better to lead the $\Phi \mathrm{K}$ rather than the $\$ 2$. However, when the combination was in diamonds (a minor suit) it was marginally better to lead the " 2 . How can that be? One of the main benefits of leading the king is that you may be able to drop a doubleton jack from declarer or the dummy. This is more likely to happen in a major because the declaring side holds fewer major-suit cards than minor-suit cards.

Another important point to note is that leads from a 4-card suit headed by one or two honours are not particularly effective. You can see from the second table how closely the passive short-suit leads compete, despite being in the minor suits.

## Hand 2

What would you lead from:

```
A 8 &KQ 8 2 \KJ5 3 85 3?
```

First thoughts This time one of the 4-card suits is in a major, the other in a minor. What effect will the major-suit bias have?

|  | Beats contract (IMPs) | Avg.Tricks (MPs) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ¢A | $16.8 \%$ | 3.38 |
| $\odot \mathrm{~K}$ | $26.0 \%$ | 3.80 |
| $\nabla 2$ | $19.7 \%$ | 3.42 |
| $\diamond 3$ | $12.6 \%$ | 3.25 |
| $28 / 5 / 3$ | $18.3 \%$ | 3.47 |

The $\triangle \mathrm{K}$ lead towers over the table and a fourth-best diamond is worst of all. This is another clear indication that major-suit leads should be favoured.

Opposite this particular West hand, East will hold an average of 3.4 hearts and only 2.5 diamonds - almost a full card fewer in the minor suit. East will hold an average of only 2.33 high-card points, too, so the prospects of finding him with the $\diamond A$ or $\diamond Q$ are not good.

## Should I lead a 4-card major or a stronger 4-card

 minor?
## Hand 3

What would you lead from:
\& Q 965 ® $104 \diamond$ K 82 QJIO2?

First thoughts Is the 'major v minor' situation enough to close the gap between the sequence in clubs and the queenhigh spades? Will the major-suit doubleton fare well again? Here are the numbers:

|  | Beats contract (IMPs) |
| :--- | :---: |
| \multirow{2}5{} | $23.1 \%$ |
| $\diamond 10$ | $25.0 \%$ |
| $\diamond 2$ | $19.3 \%$ |
| \multirow{2}\mathrm{Q}{} | $23.2 \%$ |

Avg. Tricks (MPs)
3.32
3.31
3.15
3.41

It's a close race! The club sequence lead is a fraction ahead of the spade lead at matchpoints. The nondescript heart doubleton shows well at IMPs, confirming earlier results.

## Should I prefer a short major to a 5-card or 6-card minor?

## Hand 4

What would you lead from:
Q Q $6 \vee \mathrm{~K} 5 \diamond 10873$ 」 10432 ?
First thoughts Spurred on by the results from the previous hand, we will see how doubleton honour leads fare in the major suits. Not the type of lead that you see very often, but perhaps they work well.

|  | Beats contract (IMPs) | Avg.Tricks (MPs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢Q | 15.2\% | 2.92 |
| QK | 15.7\% | 2.76 |
| $\checkmark$ 3 | II.0\% | 2.88 |
| ¢ 3 | II.7\% | 2.85 |

Indeed they do! The major-suit doubletons share the prize money at IMPs. When you are playing matchpoints, the $\Phi$ Q lead is as good as anything.

## Hand 5

What would you lead from:
\& K 105 8A5 51086532 4?

First thoughts This time we set our short major-suit holdings against a 6-card minor suit, albeit a very weak one. Partner is unlikely to have enough help in diamonds to establish that suit. Indeed, he is quite likely to have a singleton diamond.

|  | Beats contract (IMPs) | Avg.Tricks (MPs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\& 5$ | $18.1 \%$ | 3.35 |
| 8 A | $28.7 \%$ | 3.58 |
| $\diamond 4$ | $19.6 \%$ | 3.44 |
| $\$ 8$ | $15.4 \%$ | 3.28 |

The $\oslash A$ is easily best at IMPs and very worthwhile at matchpoints. Let's see a typical deal from the simulation where a lead of the 8 A will beat $3 N T$ :


Ace and another heart removes one of declarer's stoppers in the suit. He sets up the club suit and your partner clears the hearts, declarer shaking his head as you discard! Declarer has eight tricks and cannot find a ninth before East enjoys the established cards in hearts for one down.

As you see, a diamond lead is too slow. East wins with the $\diamond A$ and declarer is safe whether East returns the $\diamond 8$ or the ८J.

## CONCLUSIONS

- Against the auction of INT - 3NT, it is usually right to lead a major suit. This is because the defenders hold an average of 7.18 cards in each major; declarer and the dummy, between them, hold only 5.82 cards.
- Be wary of leading from a four-card suit headed by one or two honours. Prefer to lead from three spot-cards.
- From a holding such as K-Q-7-2, it is usually better to lead the king (or queen) rather than a low card - just as you would against a suit contract.

[^0]
## Women's Teams Semifinal, segment 3 Cronier v. Netherlands Women

by Jos Jacobs

When the final segment of this match underway, the Dutch held a narrow lead: 55-47.

On board 2, however, the Dutch dealt their opponents a firm blow:

| Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Q 764 |  |  |  |
| ¢ 632 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ Q 932 |  |  |  |
| * 107 |  |  |  |
| - J10832 |  | $\pm 9$ |  |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 4$ |  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 75 |  |
| $\checkmark$ AK 86 |  | $\diamond 104$ |  |
| * J 3 | S | \& AKQ 986 |  |
| - AK5 |  |  |  |
| QJ1098 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J 75 |  |  |  |
| - 542 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Vriend | Cronier | Arnolds | W Willard |
|  |  | 19 | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 28 | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 4* | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 45 | Pass |
| 5\% | Pass | 6\% | All Pass |

A good natural auction to a very good contract. Even on the best defence of the A and a trump back, declarer stillmade the contact easily by ruffing her heart loser in dummy with the . Netherlands Women +920 .

| West <br> Bessis | North <br> Michielsen | East <br> D'Ovidio | South <br> Dekkers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass |
| $1 \mathbf{3}$ | Pass | $\mathbf{2} \varnothing$ | Pass |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Pass | $\mathbf{4 \infty}$ | Pass |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Pass | $\mathbf{4} \varnothing$ | Pass |
| $5 \boldsymbol{5 \%}$ | All Pass |  |  |

The same auction in the other room, except for the conclusion. Cronier +420 but II IMPs to the Dutch, who now led by 19 .

The French had reduced their deficit to II when an aggressive intervention by Willard paid off:

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- A 1098
- J 86
$\diamond 9543$
-8 7

| West <br> Vriend | North <br> Cronier | East <br> Arnolds | South <br> Willard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \nabla$ | Pass | INT | $2 \boxtimes$ |
| $4 \vee$ | $4 Q$ | All Pass |  |

Declarer lost the obvious five tricks, but as nobody had found a double, this cost them only -100.

When Dekkers kept silent at her first turn, the Dutch had to be content with defending 4 ).


Catherine D' Ovidio, France

| West <br> Bessis | North <br> Michielsen | East <br> D'Ovidio | South <br> Dekkers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | Pass | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | Pass |
| $2 \varnothing$ | Pass | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | Pass |
| $\mathbf{4} \varnothing$ | All Pass |  |  |

As there was simply no defence to beat this, France scored +420 here and thus got another 8 IMPs to bring the score to 74-7I to the Dutch with just 6 boards to play.Was a tense closing stage coming up?

When the French easily reached the very good slam on board 13 , not bid by their opponents, many kibitzers thought this was it:

Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.

- 10865

คA 82
$\triangleleft A K 6$

- Q 109
- AKJ 3
©K963
$\checkmark 85$
* 752
$\& Q 9742$
$\odot 1075$
$>432$
$>84$

The French were leading by 14 after this board and board 14 was a push. On the next board, D'Ovidio and Bessis had taken a non-vulnerable save which might cost them 4 IMPs, on the surface of it:

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- Q 52
$\checkmark$ A Q 42
$\diamond 105$
- AK 75
- J 1093
\& K 1095
$\diamond 876$
- 82

- 8

873
$\diamond$ A QJ9432
Q Q

- AK 764

P J 6
$\diamond K$
109643

| West <br> Bessis | North <br> Michielsen | East <br> D'Ovidio | South <br> Dekkers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{s}$ | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | All Pass |  |

Sticking your neck out can sometimes be dangerous, as was proved here. Down four but no real harm done as N/S were cold for 44 and 5 . Netherlands Women +800 .

In the Open Room, however, the French reached another


Laura Dekkers, Netherlands
slam, and a reasonable one too:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vriend | Cronier | Arnolds | Willard |
|  |  |  | 19 |
| Pass | 2\% | $3 \checkmark$ | 4\% |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 6\% | All Pass |  |

Just like it did on board 19 of the Open Teams semifinal, the Law of Restricted Choice caused declarer's undoing in this slam. Arnolds cashed the $\triangleleft \mathrm{A}$ and exited with a heart, which declarer won with the queen. She then played the A and, seeing the fall of the jack, crossed to dummy in spades to take the a priori 2 -I on finesse in trumps. One down, Netherlands Women +100 and 14 IMPs back.

The match suddenly was tied with only the last board to play. Here is that last board:

Board 16. Dealer West. E/WVul.

- 185
© A 3
$\diamond$ A 1097653
$\rightarrow 2$


| West Bessis | North Michielsen | East D'Ovidio | South Dekkers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 19 | 29 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | $3 \checkmark$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 5 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Laura Dekkers rightly evaluated her aces and kings as useful cards opposite partner's long diamonds so the Dutch reached game easily enough. This also proved nearly beyond the limit of the hand as it now needed the KJ to come down in three rounds, apart from the squeeze possibilities, when trumps split 3-I. Michielsen won the SK lead, cashed the trump ace and took a club finesse to get rid of her losing heart on the once the finesse held. She come back to hand with a club ruff and when the jack appeared, simply conceded two more trumps for her contract. Netherlands Women +400 . Please note (again) the positive effect of opening the bidding.

The French still might have survived the last board as this had been the auction:

| West <br> Vriend | North <br> Cronier | East <br> Arnolds | South <br> Willard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \varnothing$ | Pass |
| $2 \oslash$ | $3 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Once North did not open the bidding, and understandably so, N/S never reached a position from which they could accurately assess what was going on. That's probably why the French missed the chance to axe the final contract and collect +800 and a berth in the final.

Playing in 3 undoubled, the only thing Carla Arnolds had to do was to collect six tricks. As she had no more than seven losers, she managed this alright. Cronier +300 but 3 IMPs to the Netherlands Women who thus managed to secure their place in the final right at the wire.

## The IBPA Outing



Members of the International Bridge Press Association enjoyed an outing to Kornik Castle, a 40-minute bus ride from Poznan, with an excellent guide to assist us.
The Castle was built in the 14th century and donated to the Polish people in 1923. We saw impressive evidence of Poland's history, particularly significant on the day, 28th June, commemorating the sacrifices made in Poznan in 1956 to initiate the Poland we know today.
We strolled in the beautiful grounds, and were treated to an excellent lunch as guests of the Polish Bridge Union.We thank the PBU and its President, Radek Kielbasinski, for their hospitality.
IBPA has some 300 members worldwide. It has a monthly Bulletin edited by John Carruthers. Members enjoy the facilities of the Press Room at major championships such as this. You can apply for membership in the Press Room on Floor C in the office area. Ask for the Press Room Manager, Jan Swaan. Membership costs US $\$ 42$ per annum. New members here pay 1.5 years i.e. US $\$ 63$ through to 31 st December 2012 .

Patrick Jourdain, IBPA President

## Women's Teams Semifinals, segment 3

by Jos Jacobs

At the beginning of the last segment in the semifinal match between Kapadokya and Joel, the former were up by 76-60. They immediately expanded their lead on the first board of the set:

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

|  | ¢ A Q 42 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 95$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 975 |  |
|  | \& Q 42 |  |
| ¢ 7 | N | ¢ K 10 |
| ๑K 763 | W E | $\checkmark$ AJ 102 |
| $\diamond$ AKJ | W E | $\checkmark 10643$ |
| \& K 10976 | S | \& A 85 |
|  | ¢ J98653 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 84 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ 82 |  |
|  | \% J 3 |  |



Sabine Auken, Germany

As it happened, 5 would have been the last playable spot for EW. If you manage to guess the $\vee \mathbf{Q}$, you may be able to survive and get to your required II tricks. Any bad break in the minors might wreck your contract after all. Of course, $6 \%$ stood no chance. Kapadokya +100 .

| West <br> Yavas | North <br> Levin | East <br> Kuranoglu | South <br> Meyers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 0}$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | $4 \oslash$ | All Pass |

The Turkish EW reached their proper contract in natural fashion and easily emerged with II tricks. Kapadokya +450 and II IMPs.

A few boards later, the mainly American Joel team recouped some IMPs:

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Auken | Gumrukcuoglu | Seamon-Molson | Babac |
|  | Pass | 19 | 19 |
| 2 | $3 \checkmark$ | Dbl | 34 |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | Pass |
| 4\% | All Pass |  |  |

Perhaps, the German/American pair felt they had missed a game here as Janice Seamon-Molson found an elegant way to II tricks. South led her singleton diamond which ran to declarer's jack. Next, the A was unblocked and a heart ruffed. The $\diamond Q$ disappeared on the $\$ K$ and declarer next tried the $\diamond A$ which was ruffed by South in front of dummy with the 2 J . South returned a trump to the queen and ace but declarer next crossruffed her way to II tricks, losing the last trick to both North's $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ and South's remaining trump.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yavas | Levin | Kuranoglu | Meyers |
|  | Pass | 12 | 19 |
| Dbl | Redbl | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 5\% | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | All Pass |  |

In the other room, the bidding had been far less revealing. The redouble was negative but declarer had no indication yet about the actual 6-I diamond break.
South led a spade, won in dummy perforce and declarer lead the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$, covered by king and ace. Next came the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ on which declarer threw a heart from dummy rather than a diamond. When she next tried to cash the $\diamond$ J, South could ruff low and return a spade for North to overruff the dummy with her singleton 2 Q . North returned a low heart, declarer ruffing and cashing the eA next. When South discarded her $\vee A$ on a diamond ruff in dummy, she was bound to score her en passant, leaving declarer with a diamond loser as well. Down two, Joel +300 and IO IMPs.
More IMPs for Joel when the Turkish could not cash their winners here either:

## Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.



In the Open Room, Auken showed diamonds by bidding $2 \%$.When she gave "preference" for spades, not knowing of course that partner was 5-5, EW ended up in a peculiar contract which was actually made on a trump lead. The hearts being 3-3 with the king onside really made declarer happy here. Joel + I IO.

| West <br> Yavas | North Levin | East | South <br> Meyers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | 19 |
| $1 \diamond$ | 1s | $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dbl | Pass | 3\% |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | Pass | Dbl | All Pass |

3NT on two combined II-counts often is no guarantee for success and this board was no exception. West led a spade to the king and ace and East duly retuned a low heart to West's Queen. At this points, the defence can sit back and wait for their three more tricks to come in. However, when West returned a heart and West ducked this, suddenly the EW communication to cash their three tricks had gone. In dummy with the 810 , declarer simply finessed the e K first and later lost another trick to the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ but neither major suit ever entered the play any more...Joel a surprise +550 but 12 much-needed IMPs to close the gap to within 5 IMP now.
Three boards later, the match was effectively over when Auken and Seamon-Molson significantly overbid:

Board 9. Dealer North. E/WVul.

|  | ¢ KJ 92 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 1075$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 732$ |  |  |
|  | 9985 |  |  |
| ¢ A Q 64 | $N \quad \pm 5$ |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 32 | W | $\bigcirc$ A J 984 |  |
| $\diamond$ J 5 |  |  | $\diamond$ A Q 1096 |
| \% K Q J 7 | S | 932 |  |
| ¢ 10873 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ K 6 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ K 84 |  |  |  |
| 2 A 1064 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Auken | Gumrukcuoglu Seamon-Molson |  | Babac |
|  | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 2\% | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 54 | Pass |
| 6NT | Pass | Pass | Dbl |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

To me, it looks as if Auken's $4 \oslash$ was fast arrival but this message may well not have come across since it had not seen bid over $2 \diamond$. Holding the two vital red kings and an ace as well, South had an easy double that netted +800 .

| West <br> Yavas | North <br> Levin | East <br> Kuranoglu | South <br> Meyers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| $\mathbf{2 8}$ | Pass | $\mathbf{2} \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| $\mathbf{2} 8$ | Pass | $\mathbf{4} \vee$ | All Pass |

No experiments or frivolities in the other room where they quickly reached $4 \checkmark$ and no more than that: Kapadokya +620 and 16 IMPs.

Very little happened in this segment after this board, the final score being II0-89 to Kapadokya.

## Making up for lost IMPs

by Brent Manley

When the Mahaffey and Bessis teams met in the Swiss segment of the Open Teams, the Americans won in a rout, 33-0.
With both teams making it to the final, the French-German squad was looking for revenge - and they achieved it, at least in the first of the three sets in the championship round.

It was an action-packed 16 boards, and Mahaffey got off to a fast start, thanks mostly to overbidding by Michel Bessis on the first deal. In fact, East might be forgiven for thinking during the auction, "Bessis and desist."

## Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

|  | - KQ 98 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 43$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 9853$ |  |  |
|  | ¢ ${ }^{\text {J }} 3$ |  |  |
| - 54 | N | Q 102 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AKJ9 |  | QQ 10876 |  |
| $\checkmark$ AKQ 4 |  | $\checkmark$ J 62 |  |
| - K 102 | S | \& Q 7 |  |
|  | - A 763 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 52$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 107$ |  |  |
|  | \& A 985 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| M. Bessis | Rodwell | T. Bessis | Meckstroth |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| 4* | Pass | $4{ }^{\circ}$ | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 59 | All Pass |

Thomas Bessis did his best to sign off, but Michel felt his hand was worth one more bid, putting him one level too high. Eric Rodwell led the $\Phi \mathrm{K}$ and continued with a spade to Jeff Meckstroth's ace. The A was next and Bessis was one down.

| West <br> Mahaffey | North <br> Piekarek | East <br> Cohler | South <br> Smirnov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | I $\triangleleft$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

Game was high enough for Gary Cohler, so plus 420 produced a IO-IMP gain for the Jim Mahaffey team.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- A8653
$\bigcirc$ -
$\diamond$ AK 1054
\& Q 32

```
@ 74
©AJIO984
\(\diamond\) Q 92
-96
```

| West <br> M. Bessis | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> T. Bessis | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | IS | Pass |
| INT | $2 \diamond$ | Dbl | $3 \diamond$ |
| $4 \oslash$ | All Pass |  |  |

Rodwell cashed his two high diamonds and switched to a low club. Bessis put in the jack, and Meckstroth took the king. He could have played his spade to Rodwell's ace for a ruff, but he continued with a low club. Bessis still had to lose a spade, so he conceded one down.


Jim Mahaffey, USA

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mahaffey | Piekarek | Cohler | Smirnov |
|  |  | INT | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Dbl | Pass | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Dbl | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Josef Piekarek ruffed the opening heart lead and played the ${ }_{5}^{2}$ from hand. Had Cohler ducked, Piekarek would have gone down, but Cohler took the cA and played another club at trick three. Piekarek inserted dummy's \& 10 , which held. Declarer then played a spade to his ace, ruffed a spade, ruffed a heart and ruffed a spade. Mahaffey could overruff, but that was the end of the tricks for his side. He could force declarer again in hearts, but Piekarek was able to pick up trumps with the $\diamond A$ and $\diamond K$ and enjoy the clubs. That was II tricks and II IMPs to Bessis. If Mahaffey had not overruffed would he have beaten the game, do you think?
Bessis doubled their IMPs on the next board.
Board 3. Dealer South. E/WVul.


Meckstroth and Rodwell had a long auction that ended at 5\% by Meckstroth, who had started with a Precision le.
At the other table, Alexander Smirnov started with 18 from the South position. Mahaffey put in a 2 overcall, but Smirnov-Piekarek shrugged it off and were soon in 6\% for another II IMPs on the scoreboard.
On board 4, the slam swing was generated by Mahaffey.
Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

## $\perp 9$

® A 75
$\diamond J 10854$
K K 942
$\& J 108763$
$\diamond 3$
$\diamond A Q 7$
$\& 876$


- AK 2

๑K Q J 1096
$\diamond K$
\& AJ 10

| West <br> M. Bessis | North Rodwell | East <br> T. Bessis | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 19** |
| 19 | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 2NT* | Pass | 49** |
| Pass | 5\% | Pass | 68 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Meckstroth's le was Precision, 2NT by Rodwell showed three-card heart support, 4§ was Roman Key Card Blackwood, and when Rodwell showed one key card, Meckstroth placed the contract. It was an easy 12 tricks for plus 1430.

At the other table, the Germans had to cope with a Multi $2 \triangleleft$ from Mahaffey.

| West <br> Mahaffey | North <br> Piekarek | East <br> Cohler | South <br> Smirnov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $2 \boxtimes$ | Dbl |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | $3 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $4 \oslash$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Smirnov took 13 tricks when Mahaffey started with a club (the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ went away on the long club from dummy), but it was still a I2-IMP loss. The match was tied at 22.
Board 5 produced one of only two pushes in the set, then Mahaffey went ahead when Rodwell showed his skill as declarer.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- KQ4 2
$\bullet A J 9$
$\diamond$ AJ
- K 732
$\pm 9$
Q Q 1083
$\diamond$ Q 4
- QJ9 85

- AJ 108
© 764
$\diamond 108763$
\& A
. 765
K 52
$\diamond$ K 952
\& 1064

| West <br> M. Bessis | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> T. Bessis | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{s}$ | Pass | I $\diamond$ |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 2NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Thomas Bessis started with a diamond, and Rodwell took the queen with the ace. He cashed the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ and played a low club from hand. Bessis won perforce with the ace and switched to a heart, which went to West's queen and Rod-
well's ace. Now the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ from Rodwell was ducked by East, after which Rodwell played a low spade. Bessis won with the $\$ 10$ and played another heart. Rodwell was tuned in at that point, so he won the heart trick in hand, cashed the ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~K}$, then played a heart to dummy.A spade to his queen allowed Bessis to take two spade tricks, but in the end he had to play a diamond from the 10 to dummy's K 9 , and Rodwell did not err in the play for plus 150.
At the other table, Piekarek played 3NT from the North seat on a low diamond lead. He took the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ with his ace and cashed the $\diamond$ J, but instead of playing a low club from hand as Rodwell had done, he played the $\stackrel{Q}{ } \mathrm{Q}$. Cohler won the $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ and played the $\uparrow$, ducked. Cohler continued with the 10 to Piekarek's king. Now a low club from North put Cohler in, but he was able to cash his winning spade and exit with a heart. With no chance of an endplay, Piekarek could do no better than eight tricks for minus 50 and 5 IMPs to Mahaffey, now leading 27-22.
Mahaffey picked up an overtrick IMP on the next deal, but another slam swing went to Bessis on board 8.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

|  | - A Q 6 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 1098 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 108$ |  |  |
|  | $\cdots$ A Q J |  |  |
| +932 |  | - |  |
| ¢ J 63 |  | E $\quad$ - |  |
| $\checkmark$ K Q 3 |  | E $\diamond$ | 9654 |
| 2 K 1098 |  |  | 432 |
|  | ¢ K 8754 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 72 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 72 |  |  |
|  | 265 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| M. Bessis | Rodwell | T. Bessis | Meckstroth |
|  | 2NT | Pass | $3 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | 49 | All Pass |  |

Rodwell ducked the opening diamond lead, won the club shift with the queen and soon was claiming plus 480.

| West <br> Mahaffey | North Piekarek | East <br> Cohler | South <br> Smirnov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 19 | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 38 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | 69 | All Pass |  |

On a spade lead from Mahaffey, Smirnov took all the tricks for plus 1010. Bessis was ahead 33-28.
Mahaffey pushed back in front on the next deal.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
4 K Q 3
$\vee$ J 43
$\triangleleft 8532$
\& AJ5


| West <br> M. Bessis | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> T. Bessis | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \diamond{ }^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 \vee$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| All Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |

Thomas Bessis led the $\$ 10$ to dummy's jack. A club went to Rodwell's jack, which held, and he continued with the QK. Rodwell finished with II tricks for plus 460.

| West <br> Mahaffey | North <br> Piekarek | East <br> Cohler | South <br> Smirnov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | INT |
| $2 \mathbf{2 0}$ | Dbl | Redbl | Pass |
| 28 | Dbl | All Pass |  |

The opening heart lead went to Smirnov's ace. Mahaffey won the heart continuation with the queen and picked up the other trump with the king. He then ducked a couple of spades and eventually emerged with seven tricks for minus 200 and a 6-IMP gain.
The other push of the match occurred on the next deal when 3NT went down at both tables, then Mahaffey tacked on another 5 IMPs on a partscore deal.
The tide turned against Mahaffey thereafter, as Bessis outscored the Americans 35-4 over the final five deals.
This one cost II IMPs.
Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- Q 543

8864
$\diamond$ K 1093

* 17

- AJ 10982
$\bigcirc$ A
$\checkmark 6$
\& K Q 432
, K 76
-KJ972
- Q 84
\& 86

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M. Bessis | Rodwell | T. Bessis | Meckstroth |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 23 | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | 7\% | Pass |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

With trumps 2-2 and the spades 4-3, there was no real problem, although, as one might expect, the play went slowly in the beginning. The Mahaffey-Cohler auction lasted a round longer but did not produce the optimum result.

| West | North Piekarek | East Cohler | South <br> Smirnor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I $\diamond$ | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| 2\% | Pass | 2)* | Dbl |
| Pass | Pass | 39 | Pass |
| $3 \checkmark$ | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| 5\% | Pass | $6 \%$ | All Pass |

Plus 940 was an II-IMP loss as Bessis pulled ahead 44-39. Another 7 IMPs went away on the next deal.

Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.

$\checkmark$ K 8
$\diamond 1098765$

* 652

| ¢ Q J 96 | N | ¢ 10842 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 10$ |  | $\bigcirc 652$ |
| $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ Q | W E | $\diamond$ A J 2 |
| ¢ K 109874 | S | \& $A$ Q J |
|  | ¢ AK 5 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q J 9743 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 43$ |  |
|  | 2 3 |  |


| West <br> M. Bessis | North <br> Rodwell | East <br> T. Bessis | South <br> Meckstroth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | $1 \%$ | 48 |
| $5 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | Pass | Dbl |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Meckstroth cashed his top spades, then the $\vee \mathbf{A}$, followed by a spade ruff by Rodwell. Considering that East-West can make 44, this should have produced some IMPs for Mahaffey. It didn't.

| West <br> Mahaffey | North <br> Piekarek | East <br> Cohler | South <br> Smirnov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | $4 \Omega$ |
| Dbl | All Pass |  |  |

There was no defense to $4 \oslash$, so minus 790 cost 7 IMPs.

Mahaffey gained 4 IMPs on a partscore swing, but lost 6 on a partscore swing for the other side on the penultimate board. The final deal put an exclamation point on the set for Bessis.

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
, 7
$\bigcirc$ KQ632
$\triangleleft$ Q 1065

- J 107


Michel Bessis lost a spade, two hearts and a diamond for plus 140. It was a very different story at the other table.

| West <br> Mahaffey | North <br> Piekarek | East <br> Cohler | South <br> Smirnov |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT | $2 \Omega$ | $2 \Omega$ | $4 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Piekarek had to lose a diamond and two clubs, but had no real difficulty coming to 10 tricks for plus 420 and an IIIMP swing for his team.
The first of three sets ended with Bessis in front 68-43.


Jeff Meckstroth, USA

## Jak nie obłożyłem pięciu kierów...

by Wojtek Siwiec

... czyli samokrytyczne wyznanie Piotra Gawrysia - tak powinien brzmieć podtytuł tego artykułu. Jego team VAINIKONIS - z aktualną (Piotr Gawryś - Jacek Kalita) i byłą (Bogusław Gierulski - Jerzy Skrzypczak) parą reprezentacji Polski w składzie - odpadł już w I/32 finału mistrzowskiego turnieju teamów open, przegrywając z drużyną ROSENTHAL ośmioma impami. Wśród kilku rozdań decydujących o takim właśnie rozstrzygnięciu znalazło się zatem i następujące...

Rozd. 23/II; rozdawał S, obie po partii

|  | -10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AW 96 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 7652 |  |
|  | ¢ D 105 |  |
| ¢ K D 94 | N | 4 A 87652 |
| $\bigcirc 7$ |  | $\bigcirc$ D 84 |
| $\diamond$ DW 108 |  | $\diamond 94$ |
| 9K963 | S | \% W 7 |
|  | ¢ W 3 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 10532 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 3 |  |
|  | \& A 842 |  |

Pokój otwarty:

| West <br> Kalita | North <br> Fredin | East <br> Gawryś | South <br> Fallenius |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | pas |
| pas | $1 \diamond$ | $1 乌$ | $2 \vee$ |
| $4 \varsigma$ | $5 \vee$ | pas | pas |

Przeciwko rozgrywanemu ostatecznie przez Björna Falleniusa kontraktowi 5 『 Jacek Kalita zawistował $\mathbf{~ K}$. Posłuchajmy teraz Piotra Gawrysia:

- Natychmiast zorientowałem się, że na swoją licytację partner musi mieć kartę trójkolorową z krótkością w kierach. Mieliśmy zatem do wzięcia pika i prawie na pewno lewę treflową, aby zatem grę położyć, musieliśmy też zdobyć wziątkę atutową. Moim podstawowym zadaniem powinna więc być ochrona $\vee$ D przed ewentualnym wyimpasowaniem. Stąd pierwsza myśl, zwykle najlepsza: do partnerowego $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$ należy dołożyć $\$ 2$ - jednoznacznego, czytelnego lawintala na trefle (!) - po to, aby w drugiej lewie wyszedł on w ten kolor. Jacek zagrałby wówczas blotką treflową, a rozgrywający na pewno nie wstawiłby ze stołu damy, tylko dziesiątkę (albo puściłby tę lewę do asa z dziewiątką w ręce, jeśliby miał tam taką właśnie konfigurację kart). Ja wstawiłbym wówczas $\%$, a S zabiłby w ręce
dwóch lew przeciwnik najprawdopodobniej założyłby, że mam trzy- albo nawet czterokartowy fragment treflowy, na przykład sKW x x.A że odlicytowałem też długie piki, to ewentualnej krótkości kierowej spodziewałby się wyłącznie w mojej ręce.Albo zatem zagrałby atuty z góry, albo - gdy racjonalnie przyjałłby, że na licytację do 4¢ jeden $z$ nas musi mieć $w$ kierach singla - ściągnąłby najpierw $\vee K$, aby poszukać ewentualnej $\vee D \times \times$ w ręce mojego partnera. W obu wypadkach przegrałby swój kontrakt bez jednej.
Niestety, nie posłuchałem swojej - wspartej błyskawiczną analizą - intuicji i nie zdecydowałem się na przeprowadzenie tak efektownej obrony. Zamiast tak zagrać, pobiłem partnerowego \$K asem (aby czasem nie przyszło mu do głowy wyjść w drugiej lewie w atu) i odszedłem e7. Fallenius zabił w ręce eA i zagrał kiera do dziadkowego asa, a w następnej lewie zaimpasował mi $\vee$ D. Pozbawiony innych przesłanek racjonalnie bowiem założył, że to właśnie $W$ na swój skok na 4s - jest w kierach krótki. Potem zagrał jeszcze trefla do damy i już miał swoje, warte 650 punktów. Do dziś pluję sobie w brode, że nie zagrałem tak, jak myślałem, tym bardziej że było dla mnie w zasadzie jasne, iż tak właśnie zagrać powinienem.

W rozdaniu tym VAINIKONIS stracił 13 impów, na drugim stole bieg wydarzeń był bowiem następujący:

Pokój zamknięty:

| West <br> Silverstein | North <br> Gierulski | East <br> Grue | South <br> Skrzypczak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ktr. (!) | $3 \Phi^{\prime}$ | $4 \varrho$ | I $\downarrow$ |
| pas | pas | pas | $5 \vee$ |

## I splinter z fitem kierowym

Obrona przebiegała tak samo jak w pokoju otwartym: بૂK do asa i odwrót w blotkę treflową, która została zabita przez rozgrywającego asem w ręce. Tu jednak Jerzy Skrzypczak zagrał kiery z góry i wpadł bez jednej, za 100. I on miał szansę na zwycięskie rozwiązanie koloru atutowego, wskazania w tym kierunku były jednak nieco słabsze niż przy drugim stole. Gdyby jednak przyjął, że na swoją licytację do szczebla 4e - po partii, na zaledwie 18 PC - któryś z przeciwników powinien mieć krótkie kiery, to krótkości tej należało poszukać w ręce kontrującego (W), ten bowiem swoją zapowiedzią wskazał fity w trzech pozostałych kolorach. Ponadto jego ręka w zasadzie na pewno nie zawierała sakramentalnych ongiś 13 PC, musiała być zatem oparta na dobrym, typowym dla wywoławczej kontry, układzie - z singletonem w kierach właśnie.

## Polish style

by Wojtek Siwiec

W eliminacjach mistrzowskiego turnieju par open z polskich duetów najlepiej spisali się Marek Barylewski z Cezarym Krzemińskim oraz Andrzej Jeleniewski z Jarosławem Wachnowskim, którzy zajęli w nich odpowiednio piąte i szóste miejsce. Jak opowiadał mi Jeleniewski, za czołową pozycja jego duetu stoi typowo polski styl gry, a więc ostra, agresywna licytacja, wsparta dobrą techniką gry. A to razem wzięte często stawia przeciwników przed trudnymi problemami, których przynajmniej od czasu do czasu nie rozwiązują oni właściwie. Jako przykład Andrzej przedstawił rozdanie z pierwszego dnia turnieju, które on z partnerem rozgrywali przeciwko innej czołowej polskiej parze...

## Rozd. I3/V; rozdawał N, obie po partii



## I I5-I7 PC

2 brak starszych czwórek
3 konwencja Smolenia: wskazanie układu 4@-5

Po wskazaniu przez Jarosława Wachnowskiego przy pomocy niezbyt w Polsce popularnej konwencji Smolenia układu 5 8 -4® Andrzej Jeleniewski wybrał końcówkę w pierwszy z tych kolorów. Była ona grana na siedmiu atutach, tyle że przeciwnicy o tym nie wiedzieli, co w istotny sposób odbiło się na przebiegu obrony. Przeciwko $4 \checkmark(S)$ Bogusław Pazur zaatakował $\diamond 6$, a jego partner - Marek Wójcicki - zabił pierwszą lewę $\diamond A$ i powtórzył karem. Jeleniewski utrzymał się więc w ręce $\diamond$ K, a następnie dostał się
do dziadka singlowym ekK (z ręki wyszedł jednak 26 - aby utrudnić obrońcom rozczytanie ilościowego rozkładu tego
 tatniego kara. To pozwoliło broniącym na skompletowanie ilościówek treflowych, kiedy zatem Andrzej wyszedł następnie z ręki $\vee 3$, gra znalazła się w poważnym niebezpieczeństwie. Otóż gdyby Pazur wskoczył wówczas królem atu i zagrał w blotkę treflową,Wójcickiemu wypromowałaby się wziątka na $\oslash \mathrm{W}$. A że ponadto broniący musieliby jeszcze dostać lewę na ¢K, kontrakt zostałby położony bez jednej.

Tyle tylko, że Pazur był przekonany, że przeciwnicy graja normalny kontrakt na ośmiu kierach, partner ma zatem w tym kolorze jedynie dubletona. Nie wskoczył więc $\vee K$, aby nie rozwiązywać przeciwnikowi ewentualnej palcówki w tym kolorze (gdy E posiada $\vee W$ x). Jeleniewski nie zmarnował szansy - prawidłowo zadysponował ze stołu 9 D i połączył po raz trzeci atuty. Po lewie na $\vee K ~-~ W ~ z a g r a ł ~ w ~ k a r o, ~ a l e ~ r o z g r y w a j a c y ~ p r z e-~$ bił w dziadku, a następnie zagrał $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ i pika z ręki. A po wzięciu tej lewy $\mathbf{~ D ~ w ~ d z i a d k u ~ p o w t o ́ r z y ł ~ p i k i e m . ~ K o n - ~}$ trakt zostałby zrealizowany także wówczas, gdyby W miał drugiego $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$.

Dokonanie Andrzeja Jeleniewskiego w tym rozdaniu (620 dla NS) wyceniono na 89,93\% maksa. Takich właśnie not wszystkim polskim parom w następnych sesjach mistrzostw, z finałem włącznie, serdecznie życzę.


Boguslaw Pazur, Poland

## OPEN PAIRS - SEMI FINAL A

( standings after 5 sessions - subject to confirmation)

| Rank | Names P | Percentage | 56 | S ASSAEL - Y KAHYAOGLU | 51.09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | R ROHOWSKY - E SANSOUR | 62.16 | 57 | G MIHAI - R MIHAI | 51.08 |
| 2 | I RADJUKEVICH - A TIMAKHOVICH | 59.77 | 58 | F BAKKEREN - T BAKKEREN | 50.93 |
| 3 | K DOXIADIS - P KANNAVOS | 59.76 | 59 | P KARLYKOV - B SHUKHMEYSTER | 50.84 |
| 4 | K SIKORSKI - W WEjKNIS | 59.48 | 60 | S GARCIA - Q ROBERT | 50.81 |
| 5 | R v PROOIJEN - LVERHEES JR | 59.42 | 61 | O BESTRZYNSKI - R NOWICKI | 50.68 |
| 6 | P CRONIER - G D TESSIERES | 59.07 | 62 | I HAYES - H MATTSON | 50.34 |
| 7 | R JAGNIEWSKI - M KWIECIEN | 59.06 | 63 | H BERTENS - B WESTRA | 50.29 |
| 8 | R NIEDZIELSKI - J PRZYGRODZKI | 58.54 | 64 | W GAWEL - PWIANKOWSKI | 50.24 |
| 9 | L K NIELSEN - M SCHALTZ | 58.43 | 65 | A JASZCZAK - M LESNIEWSKI | 50.09 |
| 10 | M NOWOSADZKI - PTUSZYNSKI | 58.35 | 66 | U KIELICHOWSKI - A KOZIKOWSKI | 50.04 |
| 11 | J ROMBAUT - P SCHMIDT | 57.76 | 67 | A JELENIEWSKI - JWACHNOWSKI | 50.00 |
| 12 | V ARONOV - A ZOBU | 57.68 | 68 | G BREKKA - T HOILAND | 49.99 |
| 13 | P BUSSE - A SYREK | 57.58 | 69 | S ORLOV - D PROKHOROV | 49.81 |
| 14 | T HELNESS - J MOLBERG | 55.97 | 70 | M BAREL - Y ZACK | 49.74 |
| 15 | W SZELKA - C WOLCZAK | 55.54 | 71 | A KASPRZAK - M SZALINSKI | 49.73 |
| 16 | L SEBBANE - L THUILLEZ | 55.53 | 72 | S COPE - S SHAH | 49.72 |
| 17 | S GUPTA - K R VENKATARAMAN | 55.43 | 73 | TWINCIOREK - M WRECZYCKI | 49.61 |
| 18 | S MLYNARCZUK - W TOMASZEK | 55.21 | 74 | M ROMANOVSKA - K RUBINS | 49.54 |
| 19 | A BACH - I DELMONTE | 54.99 | 75 | D NIKOLAYENKO - G RYBNIKOV | 49.52 |
| 20 | K JASSEM - K MARTENS | 54.95 | 76 | A MALINOWSKI - J P SVENDSEN | 49.45 |
| 21 | G KARAKOLEV - Z ZAHARIEV | 54.58 | 77 | J H HERLAND - D UELAND | 49.43 |
| 22 | J CIECHOMSKI - W SKORA | 54.37 | 78 | A DELLA MONTA - B HACKETT | 49.26 |
| 23 | J FJAELBERG - J E OLSEN | 54.33 | 79 | P B NEHMERT - MYUEN | 49.21 |
| 24 | M C TOKAY - A VERSACE | 54.19 | 80 | B EFRAIMSSON - A MORATH | 49.15 |
| 25 | M EIDI -VVROUSTIS | 54.08 | 81 | K BURAS - G NARKIEWICZ | 49.09 |
| 26 | E MISZEWSKA - S ZAKRZEWSKI | 53.92 | 82 | N KUBAC - N ZORLU | 49.07 |
| 27 | J JANSMA - G J PAULISSEN | 53.91 | 83 | P ILCZUK - M JELENIEWSKI | 49.04 |
| 28 | S HENCLIK - K OMERNIK | 53.87 | 84 | R GARDZIELEWSKI - P KOLWICZ | 49.02 |
| 29 | E GINOSSAR - R PACHTMAN | 53.66 | 85 | L BREDE - K KOTOROWICZ | 48.96 |
| 30 | P CULLIN - J UPMARK | 53.56 | 86 | T BAKKE - J HOYLAND | 48.82 |
| 31 | R RITMEIJER - M TICHA | 53.18 | 87 | F FLORIN - M IONITA | 48.77 |
| 32 | P ZATORSKI - S GOLEBIOWSKI | 53.01 | 88 | I BAREKET - A LENGY | 48.71 |
| 33 | B FALLENIUS - P FREDIN | 52.98 | 89 | D BOGUCKI - I DZIKOWSKI | 48.56 |
| 34 | R BOWDERY - J HACKETT | 52.88 | 90 | N BUCHLEV - J LESNICZAK | 48.50 |
| 35 | B POPOV - S SKORCHEV | 52.87 | 91 | M EIDE - S O HOYLAND | 48.38 |
| 36 | M KLUKOWSKI - T KLUKOWSKI | 52.79 | 92 | G BILAL - B BROGELAND | 48.35 |
| 37 | F MULTON - P ZIMMERMANN | 52.50 | 93 | I COLDEA - B MARINA | 48.31 |
| 38 | D DANAILOV - J STAMATOV | 52.41 | 94 | D MOLENAAR - TVERBEEK | 48.24 |
| 39 | A APTEKER - C GOWER | 52.38 | 95 | D BILDE - E JEPSEN | 48.23 |
| 40 | S PETERKIN - S PUNCH | 52.36 | 96 | T OSINSKI - R SZCZEPANSKI | 48.22 |
| 41 | A GULA - M TACZEWSKI | 52.35 | 97 | J CIESLAK - D FILIPOWICZ | 48.21 |
| 42 | S JOHNSEN - A STOKKELAND | 52.30 | 98 | J CVENTIN - FWRANG | 48.18 |
| 43 | D BAKHSHI - T TOWNSEND | 52.25 | 99 | V GIUBILO - R ZALESKI | 48.12 |
| 44 | I KANDEMIR - S KOLATA | 52.22 | 100 | M KRUPOWICZ - S ZAWISLAK | 48.09 |
| 45 | J KOTOROWICZ - P MIECHOWICZ | 52.20 | 101 | J ALFEJEVA - M MATISONS | 48.08 |
| 46 | M CHERNY - L GREENBAUM | 52.16 | 102 | E HOMME - K O KOPSTAD | 48.00 |
| 47 | T DE MENDEZ - X MICHAUD-LARIVIERE | E 51.99 | 103 | M KANE - P SHIELDS | 47.96 |
| 48 | G REKSTAD - P TONDEL | 51.96 | 104 | I KHAZANOV - M LEBEDEVA | 47.78 |
| 49 | O GHIGHECI - I ROTARU | 51.92 | 105 | A PETRUNIN - A STERKIN | 47.50 |
| 50 | F BJORNLUND - N SANDQVIST | 51.81 | 106 | K NADAR - B SATYANARAYANA | 47.49 |
| 51 | P JASSEM - P TUCZYNSKI | 51.52 | 107 | S JANIK - J NOWAK | 47.36 |
| 52 | A MALINOWSKI - A RASMUSSEN | 51.49 | 108 | G PROBOLA - J ROGOWSKI | 47.14 |
| 53 | J GRANSTROM - K PATANA | 51.26 | 109 | J AUKEN - S CHRISTIANSEN | 46.96 |
| 54 | M DUGUET - F RIEHM | 51.12 | 110 | M MALYSA - D RYAN | 46.92 |
| 55 | D ISRAELI - D PADON | 51.11 | 111 | P GUILLAUMIN - F STRETZ | 46.85 |


| $I I 2$ | J JANOWSKI - S PAJAK | 46.82 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| II3 | J F ALLIX - W LIBBRECHT | 46.80 |
| II4 | F BIGDELI - P BOCKEN | 46.75 |
| II5 | S DE DONDER - S DISSARD | 46.74 |
| 116 | E KACZMAREK - W SROCZYNSKI | 46.58 |
| 117 | J MAKARUK - P NIEDZIELSKI | 46.50 |
| II8 | T BARDSEN - K C BAUMANN | 46.39 |
| II9 | A GOLYGOWSKI - R PALASZ | 46.14 |
| I20 | A ARLOVICH - EVAINIKONIS | 46.05 |
| I2I | W NICINSKI - A PAWLOWSKI | 45.88 |
| I22 | J MSCISZ - JWOJCIESZEK | 45.81 |
| I23 | B KRUCZEK - B LESIECKI | 45.63 |
| I24 | W FRUKACZ - J ZADROGA | 45.60 |
| I25 | FAYDOGDU - N AYDOGDU | 45.45 |
| I26 | P BUTRYN - N SAKOWSKA | 45.39 |
| I27 | M BARYLEWSKI - C KRZEMINSKI | 45.29 |
| I28 | M ASKGAARD - G BJARNARSON | 45.16 |
| I29 | B AMBROZ - M SENK | 45.07 |


| I30 | G SERPOI - C STIRBU | 44.86 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I3I | J ROMANOWSKI - W ROZWADOWSKI | 44.84 |
| I32 | T GOTARD - T GOTARD | 44.84 |
| I33 | J KAMRAS - A WIKNER | 44.62 |
| I34 | V DENIZCI - MYERGIN | 44.60 |
| I35 | M DEMBINSKI - M PEDZINSKI | 44.59 |
| I36 | T BRAUN - V LENZ | 44.0 I |
| I37 | E CZUBAK - S ROKICKI | 43.95 |
| I38 | M KOPECKY - J KURKA | 43.06 |
| I39 | W DOLNY - J MICHALOWSKI | 42.95 |
| I40 | B I HANSSEN - I LYNGEN | 42.68 |
| I4I | FVOLCKER - A LEVY | 42.6 I |
| I42 | W BROWN - S DYBDAHL | 41.90 |
| I43 | M TYRAN - D WARWAS | 40.8 I |
| I44 | E BEDNARCZYK - B OSTROWSKI | 40.76 |
| I45 | O BERSET - B O EKREN | 39.55 |
| I46 | R BOEDDEKER - F ZARKESCH | 39.28 |

## OPEN PAIRS - SEMI FINAL B

( standings after 5 sessions - subject to confirmation)

| Rank |  | Names |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| I | M LANZAROTTI - A MANNO | 62.83 |
| 2 | R OPALINSKI - P ZAWADA | 61.58 |
| 3 | S CAITI - M PATTACINI | 61.03 |
| 4 | A IVANOV - S IVANOVA | 60.13 |
| 5 | R FRANZEL - G KRIFTNER | 59.90 |
| 6 | M KHVEN - E RUDAKOV | 59.16 |
| 7 | Y CHUMAK - O ROVYSHYN | 59.03 |
| 8 | A BENOIT - O GIARD | 58.68 |
| 9 | A HUSSEIN - T SADEK | 58.61 |
| I0 | P GAWRYS - J KALITA | 58.36 |
| II | A ALLFREY - A ROBSON | 58.23 |
| I2 | A DUDZIK - A KUSION | 58.03 |
| I3 | K CZUL - JWESOLOWSKI | 57.45 |
| I4 | T KUS - P RESZCZYNSKI | 57.06 |
| I5 | J CAPPELLER - J SCHINZE | 56.89 |
| I6 | P BETHERS - A IMSA | 56.85 |
| I7 | K LATAWIEC - P STOPA | 56.78 |
| I8 | J OSTROWSKI - PWITTENBECK | 56.65 |
| I9 | T SPODENKIEWICZ - W TURANT | 55.84 |
| 20 | U JANSONS - A SMILGAJS | 55.58 |
| 21 | E ELIASSEN - T SOILAND | 55.42 |
| 22 | T FORRESTER - D GOLD | 55.36 |
| 23 | M ARUTIUNIANC - J GACKOWSKI | 55.32 |
| 24 | L KOSTEK - R ZWOLAK | 55.21 |
| 25 | P CHINDELEWICZ - B PAWSZAK | 55.19 |
| 26 | D KOZLOWSKI - H LAKOMSKI | 55.12 |
| 27 | J ZNAMIROWSKI - M PIETRASZEK | 55.05 |
| 28 | K KARAIVANOV - T RUSEV | 55.05 |
| 29 | B PAZUR - M WOJCICKI | 55.04 |
| 30 | R JUNIK - W KOZUCHOWSKI | 54.95 |
| 31 | JVOLDOIRE - P SAPORTA | 54.78 |
| 32 | D FORGE - VVENTOS | 54.72 |
| 33 | J BOROWINSKI - L MIELCZAREK | 54.72 |
| 34 | A DEBOWSKI - R SZLACHETKA | 54.58 |
| 35 | G GAWRON - J KOWAL | 54.49 |
| 36 | J HOLMBAKKEN - F JOHNSTUEN | 54.24 |
|  |  |  |


| 37 | M JAWORSKI - T PILCH | 54.06 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 38 | P LYCZKOWSKI - A SERWACH | 53.98 |
| 39 | E AKSUYEK - A GURSEL | 53.97 |
| 40 | J CARROLL - T GARVEY | 53.77 |
| 41 | M CZEREPAK - G JARZABEK | 53.69 |
| 42 | A PESZKE - JWROBEL | 53.68 |
| 43 | J MACHOTKA - N MERCAN | 53.63 |
| 44 | K KRAJEWSKI - S GAWRYSZCZAK | 53.58 |
| 45 | T SEN - H PEYRET | 53.55 |
| 46 | T CHARLSEN - T E HOFTANISKA | 53.27 |
| 47 | W RADZIAK - W ANDRUK | 53.23 |
| 48 | M KEMENOVA - J TOMCANI | 53.21 |
| 49 | A GROMOV - W STARKOWSKI | 53.09 |
| 50 | A CHONIAWKO - Z PLESKOT | 53.07 |
| 51 | M KUPNICKI - L MAJDANSKI | 53.02 |
| 52 | O GUR - MYILMAZ | 52.99 |
| 53 | M R SAKIRLER - M O SEN | 52.85 |
| 54 | J BETHERS - M LORENCS | 52.83 |
| 55 | M WHELAN - M BALDYSZ | 52.79 |
| 56 | S KOWALCZYK - M PAWLIK | 52.73 |
| 57 | R DANCEWICZ - W BIEGAJLO | 52.73 |
| 58 | M CICHOCKI - P ZURAKOWSKI | 52.69 |
| 59 | M LEWIS - I POPOV | 52.64 |
| 60 | T PALUCHOWSKI - J RADECKI | 52.54 |
| 61 | B BASARAN - H CIVGINER | 52.50 |
| 62 | D B COTESCU - D IORDACHE | 52.41 |
| 63 | Z BELING - G LEWACIAK | 52.25 |
| 64 | M JANECZKO - J SZCZERBOWSKI | 52.21 |
| 65 | P BLASZCZYK - M SAMUJLLO | 52.18 |
| 66 | J BATOG - R CYLWIK | 52.16 |
| 67 | D LIPUZIC - M NOVAK | 52.13 |
| 68 | D MOSSOP - G ZIVKOVIC | 52.11 |
| 69 | K GOLAS - J ZABROCKI | 52.08 |
| 70 | S SIMANAITIENE - A TYLA | 51.94 |
| 71 | A CSATLOS - L HITTMANN | 51.85 |
| 72 | M BARTKOWSKI - B SZULEJEWSKI | 51.81 |
| 73 | B O AASAN - J HANSEN | 51.80 |
|  |  |  |


| 74 | J A PAULSEN - R SMISETFOSS | 51.69 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 75 | A BOWLES - S MOHANDES | 51.68 |
| 76 | J JELEN - A WILKOSZ | 51.67 |
| 77 | E SHANURIN -V TATARKIN | 51.63 |
| 78 | J BLAJDA - G SUPERSON | 51.62 |
| 79 | P GOMEROV - E ZAPADINSKIY | 51.51 |
| 80 | R BOYD - M RUDZINSKI | 51.51 |
| 81 | B RASULA - J SADAR | 51.50 |
| 82 | T BARANOWSKI - J MAZURKIEWICZ | 51.48 |
| 83 | L GOLDER - A PELSZYNSKA | 51.38 |
| 84 | R BENNETT - H SMITH | 51.31 |
| 85 | M HENC - EVELECKY | 51.28 |
| 86 | J HLIWA - R KLEJNY | 51.27 |
| 87 | A CZECH - M PIECZKA | 51.26 |
| 88 | T KOUKOUSELIS - Y PAPAKYRIAKOPOULOS | 51.26 |
| 89 | C CURTIS - P FEGARTY | 51.22 |
| 90 | A SUWIK - TWISNIEWSKI | 51.16 |
| 91 | W MARYNIOWSKI - T NIEDZWIADEK | 51.12 |
| 92 | A HYCNAR - R WAJDOWICZ | 51.05 |
| 93 | P JOKISCH - U KASIMIR | 51.03 |
| 94 | J JAGODZINSKI - R KOWALEWSKI | 51.01 |
| 95 | E DEBUS - R VAN MECHELEN | 50.83 |
| 96 | S PIEPIORA - P TOMCZAK | 50.75 |
| 97 | W STACHNIK - M URBANSKI | 50.71 |
| 98 | J KOSCIELNY - P MACHOWCZYK | 50.67 |
| 99 | R CHMIELAK - M WALCZAK | 50.61 |
| 100 | TWASILEWSKI - T JARMOLINSKI | 50.61 |
| 101 | P ZAK - J ZAREMBA | 50.54 |
| 102 | J GRZELCZAK - T KRYSZTOFIAK | 50.44 |
| 103 | R KIELCZEWSKI - A WLAD | 50.43 |
| 104 | K BEDNAREK - Z SZYSZKOWSKI | 50.32 |
| 105 | N BAUSBACK - M LOEFGREN | 50.30 |
| 106 | D BORYSOW -W RAFALSKI | 50.27 |
| 107 | G SZOTS - C CZIMER | 50.21 |
| 108 | Z KULESZA - Z SABALA | 50.04 |
| 109 | R LACHOWICZ - A WITKOWSKI | 49.89 |
| 110 | T BIRKELUND - LW KVARSVIK | 49.84 |
| 111 | M MLYNARCZYK - P SIWINSKI | 49.84 |
| 112 | A SKOP - A WUJKOW | 49.70 |
| 113 | M FECHNER - M ROBAK | 49.47 |
| 114 | J KLIMCZAK - D KRUPNIK | 49.46 |
| 115 | M KITA - R WOLINSKI | 49.44 |
| 116 | A HERMANSDORFER - J UJMA | 49.40 |
| 117 | M MAKATREWICZ - J JANIAK | 49.32 |
| 118 | M MACIAZEK - J ROMOT | 49.28 |
| 119 | E KLIDZEJA - O NYEMTSEV | 49.28 |
| 120 | D KOPRON - T PAWLUK | 49.17 |
| 121 | JT BERG - O SVENDSEN | 49.14 |
| 122 | S NYSHCHYI -V ZUBAN | 49.12 |
| 123 | J OVESEN - D STOKKVIK | 49.01 |
| 124 | M BARTOSZEWSKI - T SINKIEWICZ | 48.98 |
| 125 | D STUURMAN - EWACKWITZ | 48.96 |
| 126 | M KRZYWINA - S SAMOL | 48.88 |
| 127 | H K PETERSEN - K HANSEN | 48.42 |
| 128 | M GIZA - T LATOS | 48.38 |
| 129 | V PLATONENKO - K TRETYACHENKO | 48.38 |
| 130 | J BENDIKS - J BENDIKS | 48.35 |
| 131 | S MARTINUSSEN - D H PAULSEN | 47.94 |
| 132 | M HUBERSCHWILLER - Q LEVOY | 47.93 |
| 133 | H KOPERNOK - T SZYMCZYK | 47.92 |


| I94 | M SZALEWICZ - P ZUBIEL | 41.69 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I95 | R KARP - J KOWALOWKA | 41.64 |
| I96 | P KAZUB - A KONCZAK | 41.54 |
| I97 | K BUZALA - M NIEMIR | 41.52 |
| I98 | J RODZIEWICZ - M RODZIEWICZ | 40.99 |
| I99 | M BIELAWSKI - I CHALUPEC | 40.67 |
| 200 | S CIESLAK - M PATER | 39.28 |


| 201 | L CHERNYAK - D DOBRIN | 38.72 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 202 | J LOSIAK - J STANCZAK | 37.74 |
| 203 | M SOROKA - Z STACHOWIAK | 37.42 |
| 204 | K KUJAWA - T UKRAINSKI | 34.09 |
| 205 | S OLECH - J POLETYLO | 28.5 I |
| 206 | M KRASNICKI - PTELESZYNSKI | 23.61 |

## WOMEN PAIRS - QUALIFYING

(standings after I3 sessions - subject to confirmation)

| Rank Names | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| I | K BERTHEAU - J LARSSON | 59.12 |
| 2 | G HELNESS - S THORESEN | 56.18 |
| 3 | E WEBER - CVECHIATTO | 55.14 |
| 4 | M ROSSARD - J NEVE | 54.96 |
| 5 | R MIRCHEVA - A LEKOVA-KOVACHEVA | 54.83 |
| 6 | JTACZEWSKA - M HOLEKSA | 54.10 |
| 7 | B PANCHEVA - VYANEVA | 53.11 |
| 8 | C SEALE - C JAGGER | 52.89 |
| 9 | E SHOKHAN - Z BELIANKINA | 52.68 |
| I0 | G BREWIAK - D KAZMUCHA | 52.62 |
| II | J SPANGENBERG - S SPANGENBERG | 52.52 |
| I2 | A DE BIASIO - D GIGLIOTTI | 52.22 |
| I3 | JYARDIMCI - B ATALAY | 52.14 |
| I4 | J KENNY - E JOYCE | 51.96 |
| I5 | U HAPONAVA - S BADRANKOVA | 51.68 |
| I6 | M STEGAROIU - M BALINT | 51.19 |
| I7 | R BARENDREGT - MVERBEEK | 51.10 |
| I8 | L BRIKMANE - NVEKSA | 50.63 |
| I9 | C SJOBLOM - C HALLKVIST | 50.49 |
| 20 | N SENIOR - R WOLFARTH | 50.38 |
| 21 | L GODFREY - L LHERE | 50.37 |

22
M AGHEMO - A UGLIETTI 50.36

23 C BALDYSZ - J KROGULSKA 50.13
24 E HARASIMOWICZ - M SAWICKA 49.89
25 A BLEWITT - D GEORGEVIC 49.70
26 K McCALLUM - L BAKER 49.47
27 G SMYKALLA - P v MALCHUS 49.29
28 H DOWLING-LONG - G PENDER 49.27
29 M HOMME - JFENESS 48.61
30 S PAOLUZI - C GOLIN 47.94
31 F BRACCO - G MURANTE 47.79
32 D GRIGOROVA - M NIKOLOVA 47.47
33 M McGREGOR - J COOPER 47.30
34 C TORSTENSSON - A NORDBJORK 47.14
35 I CZAJKA - P KLIMENTOWSKA 46.80
36 P O NEILL - P MEEHAN 45.67
37 A SORESINI - M SEVERGNINI 45.64
38 C HOLCZER - A LEVANON 45.12
39 M MODLIN - M NIEHAUS 44.7I
40 E MIELCARZEWICZ - J ZIETARA 44.64
41 A DOSSENA - L GENTILI 44.19
42 R CLOW - H CORNFIELD 40.67

## SENIOR PAIRS - QUALIFYING

(standings after 13 sessions - subject to confirmation)

| Rank Names | Percentage |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| I | C MARI - S WALTER | 56.53 |
| 2 | F FALAY - O EKINCI | 55.60 |
| 3 | A JEZIORO - J RUSSYAN | 54.73 |
| 4 | Z KUNC - L LANIEWSKI | 54.54 |
| 5 | V MELMAN - S ZELIGMAN | 54.29 |
| 6 | G GIGLI - G VIOLINI | 53.83 |
| 7 | J KLUKOWSKI - V MARKOWICZ | 53.65 |
| 8 | J CHODOROWSKI - I CHODOROWSKA | 53.61 |
| 9 | B O SORENSEN - A VERMUND | 53.29 |
| I0 | M ROESER - E WOJEWODA | 53.26 |
| II | PWEYMANN - W KWIATKOWSKI | $53.1 I$ |
| I2 | A BURATTI - A COMELLA | 52.64 |
| I3 | S OWCZAREK - Z RADWANSKI | 52.60 |
| I4 | P ADAD - G SALLIERE | 52.21 |
| I5 | T KACZANOWSKI - K ANTAS | 52.15 |
| I6 | N DOREMANS - JTROUWBORST | 52.08 |
| I7 | A KOWALSKI - G BONGIOVANNI | 52.03 |
| I8 | A KONDEJA - W BURAKOWSKI | 51.82 |
| I9 | P ERICH - C NIEMEIJER | 51.33 |
| 20 | L NIEMIEC - I KOWALCZYK | 51.33 |
| 21 | B STRATER - U KRATZ | 50.85 |
| 22 | M E COPUR - C S GEBECELI | 50.84 |
| 23 | S KOWALCZYK - J SUCHARKIEWICZ | 50.73 |


| 24 | W HOEGER - S KOSIKOWSKI | 50.69 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25 | J POCHRON - W TOMASIAK | 50.27 |
| 26 | B BUDZYN - L BUDZYN | 49.98 |
| 27 | L WARWOCKI - K POKORSKI | 49.94 |
| 28 | D LIGGAT - E ( McGOWAN | 49.89 |
| 29 | U HUSTEN - M DRUKIER | $49.8 I$ |
| 30 | A PIESIEWICZ - M SZMAKFEFER | 49.79 |
| 31 | W BUZE - J POLEC | 49.30 |
| 32 | K PUCZYNSKI - W WYRZYKOWSKI | 49.10 |
| 33 | J STANCZYK - W KOZICKI | 49.05 |
| 34 | K DRIVER - G DRIVER | 48.80 |
| 35 | A ALEKSANDRZAK - M NOWACKI | 48.70 |
| 36 | G RANGEVALL - B LILJEKVIST | 48.14 |
| 37 | A FRONCZAK - J SUKOW | 46.69 |
| 38 | Z KOVACS (2) - A BUZA | 46.25 |
| 39 | M LUKASIAK - D JEDRZEJEWSKI | 44.33 |
| 40 | D HIRTZ - A NIMHAUSER | 43.95 |
| 41 | L SADOS - R BUDZIK | 43.62 |
| 42 | K O SHEA - E COUNIHAN | 40.84 |
| 43 | J KOPRAS - W KANIEWSKI | 40.42 |
| 44 | E BANKOGLU - R TOLUN | 39.29 |
| 45 | G YALMAN - A YALMAN | 36.89 |
| 46 | R LEVKOFF - R SEAMON | 36.54 |



# 3rd-4th September 2011 <br> <br> Marble Arch <br> <br> Marble Arch <br> London <br> England 

## Format

The format is based on a total entry of 36 teams.

## Day 1 Saturday 3rd September 2011

The event will begin with team registration and a bagel brunch (teams wishing to do so can register on Friday evening).

The auction will be followed by the first session of play in the qualifying round robin.
Then, TGRs invites you to a British Barbecue Dinner, followed by the final matches in the qualifying stage.

## Day 2 Sunday 4th September 2011

There will be two matches before lunch in the Main Final, and three in the Swiss Teams.
Immediately following the end of play, the prizes will be awarded and we will say farewell.

For more information, visit our website www.tgrsbridge.com

- Duplicated boards
- Bridgemate scoring
- Vu-graph presentation of selected matches


[^0]:    - Even a doubleton in a major suit may be a better lead than a 4-card or 5-card minor headed by an honour or two.

