## 7th EUROPEAN OPEN BRIDGE CHAMPIQNSHIPS <br> $\bigcirc$ C Daily Bulletin <br> 27th June-11th July

Editor: Mark Horton Co-Editor: Jos Jacobs Lay-out Editor \& Photographer: Francesca Canali Journalists: Snorre Aalberg, David Bird, John Carruthers, Patrick Jourdain, Fernando Lema, Micke Melander, Barry Rigal, Ram Soffer, Ron Tacchi

## THE UNTOUCHABLE UNDUTCHABLES

THURSDAY, JULY 92015

Issue No. 12
CONTENTS сиск то navigate
Open Teams, runners up p. 2

A hat trick of contracts
p. 3

Fight night
Mark Horton, p. 4
A deal from the open pairs...
Barry Rigal, p. 9
As ye sow...
John Carruthers, p. 11
A spectacular play revisited Jos Jacobs, p. 13
Blund vs Noralia ( $1 \& 2$ )
Jos Jacobs, p. 14
Stanza four of the Semifinals
Barry Rigal, p. 20
Orange White vs Khyuppenen
Ram Soffer, p. 22
Blund vs Noralia
Jos Jacobs, p. 26
Orange White vs Blund
David Bird, p. 29
Don't bid the same hand thrice
Herman De Wael, p. 32
Take vs Sagg
Ron Tacchi, p. 33
Good bid in Open Pairs
Micke Melander, p. 36
O/W/S Pairs Results p. 38

## Bracket



## (O)PEN TEEAMIS WHINNSESS

Team Orange White - Anton Maas (cpt), Ton Bakkeren (coach) Bart Nab, Tim Verbeek, Danny Molenaar, Bob Drijver

They dominated the round robin, were comfortable in the Round of 16 ,the quarter final and the semi final and were always in control in the final as they became the new European Open Team Champions. Let's hear it for Orange White, Bob Drijver, Bart Nab, Danny Molenaar \& Tim Verbeek, with Anton Maas, npc and Ton Bakkeren, coach.
TODAY'S SCHEDULE
SEMIFINALS A \& B
WOMEN \& SENIOR PAIRS
FINALS
$10.00-11.30:$ Round 1
$14.35-13.15:$ Round 2

The PRIZE GIVING CEREMONY for the European Women \& Senior Championship will take place today at 20.00 in the dedicated area at the far end of the cafeteria.

Tromso kommune

(OPEN TTEANS 2ad!
Team Blund - Aksel Hornslien, Boerre Lund, Olav Arve Hoeyem, Jorgen Molberg, Ole Berset,


Teams Noralia \& Khyuppenen - Arild Rasmussen, Jon Sveindal, Kieran Dyke, Justin Howard, Alexei Sterkin, Bauke Muller, Georgi Matushko, Vadim Kholomeev, Yury Khyuppenen, Simon De Wijs


## The President of the EBL

will host a press conference on Friday 10th at 15.00 p.m. in the Press Room of the Championship's Venue.

Together with Yves Aubry, Jan Kamras, Patrick Jourdain, Jostein Sorvoll, Inger Hjellemarken will jointly chair the conference and answer questions from journalists.

A cocktail will be served.


FRIDAY JULY 10TH, 3.00 P.M. - PRESS CONFERENCE - PRESS ROOM
2

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllll}26 & 27 & 28 & 29 & 30 & 31 & 32 & 33 & 34 & 35 & 36 & 37 & 38 & 39 & 40 & 41 & 42 & 43 \\ \text { BRACKET }\end{array}$


Yues Aubry, President of European Bridge League, and Homonnay Géza, President of Hungarian Bridge Federation, sign the contract that will take us to Budapest next year for the European Team Championships.


We remind you that on Friday and Saturday will be played the

## Marit Sweaas Swiss Pairs

The entry is free for all the players who have participated in either Open, Women or Seniors Pairs.

The entry fee for all the other players is 70 Euros per player (140 per pair).
You can register online at www.eurobridge.org and pay (cash only) at the venue's registration desk.

The program is the following:
Friday: 10.30-14.00 24 boards 15.30-19.00 24 boards

Saturday:10.30-14.00 24 boards
You are kindly requested to register as soon as possible

[^0]
## Baker vs China Final set four

The image of bridge is far too sedate. Maybe what we need is to promote a more dramatic picture to the public.
'My Lords, ladies \& gentleman, we now come to the main event on the card, the final of the European Open Women's Team Championship, an eight hour contest of 56 deals over four two hour rounds.


Introducing on my right in the Blue corner the Transnational Titans from USA and Netherlands, the multiple medalists, team Baker.
On my left in the Red corner, all the way from Asia, the pride of Beijing, China Orange.
Let'sgetreadyto ruuuuummmmbbbbllleeee!'
When the bell sounded for the last round China Orange were way behind on the scorecard to the tune of 66.5 - it seemed that only a knockout could save them.
They came out swinging, trying to land a haymaker.

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wang | McCallum | Shan | Baker |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | Pass | $3 \varsigma$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | $6 \uparrow$ | $6 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $6 \uparrow$ | Dble | All Pass |

West led the queen of hearts and declarer ruffed and played the jack of spades to East's ace. Back came the three of hearts and declarer elected to throw her losing club. West's ruff was the setting trick, -100 .
Declarer might have ruffed the heart return high - if trumps had been 2-2 she would have been able to get rid of all dummy's clubs on the diamonds and then ruff a club in dummy.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Michielsen | Chen | Wortel | Zhao |
| Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | 1 NT | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

Declarer had no trouble taking eleven tricks, +450 and 11 IMPs to China Orange.
They followed up with a left/right combination that left Baker reeling.

[^1]

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.
ค 8

- AK 432
$\diamond$ KJ7543
\& 6


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wang | McCallum | Shan | Baker |
|  | $1 \Omega$ | $2 \Omega^{*}$ | $4 \Omega$ |
| $5 \uparrow$ | $6 \diamond$ | Pass | $6 \Omega$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

$2 \checkmark$ Michaels
The North hand is of a type that has appeared in bidding forums since time immemorial (in English law the date is set at 6 July 1189) with the 'expert' panels usually being divided down the middle as to the 'right' opening bid.
$4 \checkmark$ looks aggressive and caused North to take out insurance when West jumped to 5 .
The defenders had to score a diamond and a club, +100 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Michielsen | Chen | Wortel | Zhao |
|  | $1 \Omega$ | $2 \Omega^{*}$ | $4 \Omega$ |
| $5 \$$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

$2 \checkmark$ Michaels

North's disciplined pass left South with an easy decision.
The defenders collected two spades, a heart and a diamond for +300 and 9 IMPs.

Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
A 9
๑ 98742
$\diamond 42$
\& K 10984


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wang | McCallum | Shan | Baker <br> Bat |
|  |  | $1 \Phi^{*}$ | Pass |
| Dble | $1 \uparrow$ | $1 N T$ |  |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

## $1 \checkmark$ Transfer to spades

An immediate 1 NT overcall would have been 14-19, so it is not clear why South started with a double. In principle N/S play 'system on' but would $2 \diamond$ over the double be a transfer?
North's final pass was alerted by the BBO operator - it might have been asking South to redouble. (When I met Karen yesterday morning there was no time to investigate such minutiae.)
Anyhow, with eleven tricks pretty much on ice in hearts South had to tackle 1NT doubled.

West led the jack of spades and declarer ducked twice, discarding a heart and a diamond from dummy. With two spades in the bag East switched to the king of diamonds and when declarer ducked she continued with the queen. Declarer won and decided to play two top clubs from her hand. West's discard on the second round was a blow, but at least declarer now knew (or should have) that West was 5-3-4-1. Her only chance was to exit with the king of hearts, which would have seen her home, but she crossed to dummy with a club to play a heart and now the defenders had just enough tricks in the minors for one down, +200 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Michielsen | Chen | Wortel | Zhao |
|  |  | Pass | 1\% |
| 140 | Dble* | 2NT** | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| 2NT Good | raise in |  |  |

It was slightly surprising that $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ did not take the save in $4 \mathbf{4}$.
$4 \checkmark$ was a doddle, +650 and 13 IMPs to China Orange, right back in the contest.

Baker was on the ropes, but when China Orange took a breather Baker finally landed a blow.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

- Q 76
$\checkmark$ Q J
$\diamond$ Q 1072
\& K 964

| A K J 10 |  | ¢ A983 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 10753 | N | $\bigcirc 864$ |
| $\diamond 65$ | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ A 3 |
| \& A Q 2 |  | \& J 1053 |

- 542
$\checkmark$ K 92
$\diamond$ KJ 984
\& 87
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wang | McCallum | Shan | Baker |
| $1 \varnothing$ | Pass | $2 \Omega$ | All Pass |

North led the queen of hearts, and when West ducked, she continued with the jack. Declarer won and played the jack of spades, covered by the queen and ace. Declarer unblocked the spades, crossed to dummy with a diamond and pitched a diamond on the ace of spades, +170 .
As you will have realised North needs to switch to a diamond at trick two; by the same token declarer should win the opening lead and play on spades. Well done if you would have led a diamond at trick one.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Michielsen | Chen | Wortel | Zhao |
| 1NT | Pass | $3 \%^{*}$ | Pass |
| 30* | Pass | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |


| $3 \%$ | Puppet Stayman |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3 ヵ$ | Five hearts |

Baker immediately missed a chance to land a counterpunch:

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

- K J 98
$\checkmark$ J 82
$\diamond$ A Q 105
\& J 5


Open Room

| West <br> Wang | North <br> McCallum | East <br> Shan | South <br> Baker <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1\& | Dble | $1 \Omega$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

North led the eight of spades and declarer won the third round of the suit and played a diamond to the king. When that held she played three rounds of clubs and was disappointed when North pitched the ten of diamonds. The convention card says. 'Attitude $-\mathrm{O} / \mathrm{E}$ ' so if that was a discouraging ten North should have pitched a heart. (You may say that it's obvious that declarer has the ace of hearts from this line of play, but I'm a great believer in nursemaiding partner.)
On the next club North pitched the two of hearts and South won and returned a.....heart. The grateful declarer claimed, +600 .

## Closed Room

| West <br> Michielsen | North <br> Chen | East <br> Wortel | South <br> Zhao |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $100^{*}$ | Dble | $1 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| $1 \mathrm{PT}^{*}$ | Pass | 3 NT | All Pass |

1\% 11-21 HCP (could be weaker, depending on shape/position) Can be any bal hand without 5M
$1 \diamond \quad 4+\diamond$
1NT 18-19 balanced
Once again the defenders started with three rounds of spades and declarer won and played a diamond to the jack. When it held she came to
hand with a club and played another diamond. North took the ace and cashed a spade but declarer had the rest, +600 and a flat board.

On the following deal N/S held 4 KQ $\bigcirc$ QJ85 $\diamond$ K96 \&10632 opposite NA976 ऽAK42 $\diamond$ AQ32 \&A. East had a preempt in clubs, but despite a 4-1 trump break, with careful play you could make $7 \circlearrowleft$. Neither pair got close.

The bout was drawing to a close as China Orange mounted one last furious attack:
Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.
A 109875
$\checkmark$ A 843
$\diamond A 96$
\& 5


Open Room

| West | North | East <br> McCallum <br> Shan | South <br> Baker |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Pass | 106 |
| Pass | $1 ヵ$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

$3 \diamond \quad$ Transfer to hearts
West led the two of diamonds and declarer won with dummy's ace and drew three rounds of trumps with the $৩ K Q J$. She continued with the ace of spades, followed by the queen and jack, West keeping the defenders in the game by ducking twice.
With seven tricks in the bag declarer now needs to exit with a diamond. The defenders win and play another diamond and declarer discards a club. If the defenders play another diamond declarer can ruff in dummy and play a club.
Not seeing this declarer played the ten of clubs from hand and East won and played a diamond. Declarer ruffed and played the jack of clubs but East won and played another diamond. When declarer ruffed in dummy West's king of spades came into its own.

[^2]
## Closed Room

| West | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| Michielsen | Chen |

Pass
Pass
24*

| East | South |
| :--- | :--- |
| Wortel | Zhao |
| Pass | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 』$ |
| All Pass |  |

When started with the three of clubs declarer's task had been greatly simplified.
East took the ace and switched to the four of spades, but declarer went up with the ace, cashed the $৩ K Q J$ and played the queen of spades. West won and returned a spade and declarer claimed the rest, +650 and 13 IMPs.

China Orange had scored 57 IMPs so far, but they had also given up 18 , so it seemed they were likely to lose on points.

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.


Open Room

| West <br> Wang | North <br> McCallum | East <br> Shan | South <br> Baker <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \wedge^{*}$ | $3 \uparrow$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

North cashed two spades and switched to a diamond. The ace of clubs was the setting trick, -50 .

Closed Room

| West <br> Michielsen | North <br> Chen | East <br> Wortel | South <br> Zhao <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \diamond$ | 4ヵ |
| 4NT* | $5 \uparrow$ | Dble | All Pass |

East cashed the king of diamonds and switched to a trump. Declarer won in dummy, took a second round and played a club to the ace followed by a club to the eight and jack. If East had continued with the queen of hearts declarer would have been in 800 territory, but she played a second diamond and the ruff and discard allowed declarer to 'escape' for -500 , still an 11 IMP loss.
The Director should have stepped in to save China Orange from further punishment, but they had to go on, dropping another 9 IMPs on the final deal.

Baker had landed far too many blows in the early rounds and they were worthy winners.


The match was broadcast on YouTube

# A DEAL FROM THE OPEN PAIRS QUALIFIER <br> by Barry Rigal 

I don't know about you but I often find it hard to follow a deal with North declarer, (plus in the newspapers it is always South who plays the hands!) so if the editor will forgive me, I have rotated the deal 180 degrees.
This hand presented an extreme challenge both for declarer and defence. Which side would you back?

Board 28 Dealer East. NS Vul.
4. A 9
$\checkmark$ AJ7 2
$\diamond$ K 1073
\& $A Q 9$

| ¢ 1042 |  | ¢ K J 7653 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark 93$ | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E | $\checkmark$ Q 104 |
| $\diamond$ Q 96 | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ A 85 |
| \& J 10653 |  | - 8 |
| 4 | Q 8 |  |
| $\checkmark$ | K 865 |  |
| $\diamond$ | J 42 |  |
| 4 | K 742 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Van den Bos Volcker | V.Lankueld Bessis |  |  |
|  | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |  |
| 1NT | Dble | $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |

Thomas Bessis received a low spade lead from Van den Bos. He started well by winning A (though his pause at trick one perhaps suggested his dilemma to East) and cashing $\& \mathrm{~A}$, judging from the spotcards played that the suit was breaking 5-1. So he abandoned clubs and led a second spade, essentially determining to play East for a 6-3-3-1 pattern. East in turn guessed well to go up with $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{K}$, but was now endplayed. At double-dummy and maybe singledummy it is best to play a low diamond. If (a big 'if') West puts in the nine, the defenders can set $4 \checkmark$ by force. Declarer can play three rounds of trumps to force a ruff and discard from East, but he will be an entry short to establish diamonds.
After much deliberation East actually gave the ruff and discard with a third spade at four. Declarer correctly ruffed in dummy and now does best to play for the $\diamond$ Q onside by crossing to hand with a heart to lead a diamond to the ten. Instead he drew
two rounds of trumps with the ace and king and could no longer make the hand. If he ruffed his club loser in dummy he would be marooned in dummy to concede two diamond tricks, and if he took a diamond finesse East would win and cash $\triangle$ Q then play a spade, on which West unguards diamonds, leaving East in sole control of that suit with his precious $\diamond 8$.
After two rounds of trumps Bessis played on clubs, but when East correctly discarded, declarer was out of practical chances. He ruffed a club in dummy and led a low diamond, but East ducked this to West's $\diamond$ Q; down one.
So does that mean declarer cannot succeed? No, but it is far from obvious how to make the game. The secret is to play for clubs 5-1 at trick two, quite a view, and lead a club to the king, then exit with $\uparrow$ Q. East wins and can either give the ruff and discard as we saw, when declarer pitches a diamond from hand, crosses to the 9 K and leads a diamond to the ten. Even if East ducks, declarer can arrange to set up the $13^{\text {th }}$ diamond with club entries to dummy. Best defence after winning AK is to play a low diamond to the nine and ten. Declarer now plays three rounds of trumps, throwing East in, to produce this ending.


Since East cannot play a diamond now, he leads a spade. Declarer pitches a diamond from hand, ruffing in dummy, and leads a low diamond, which the defence must allow to run round to West. Since that player has no spades left, he returns a club, and because both high clubs are left in the dummy, declarer ruffs out the diamonds (leading the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ for the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ ) and goes back to dummy in clubs to score trick 13 with $\diamond 7$ !


Matchpoint pairs
Entry $£ 175$ per player
Entries close 30/11/2015
Lunch \& Refreshments included

Friday
Pre-Tournament Goulash Pairs

Saturday
Registration and Auction
1st Session play
2nd Session play
Sunday
3rd Session play followed by Prizegiving \& Party
Finish by 4.30pm
NEW venue
Danubius Hotel Regents Park
For further details visit
Lodge Rd, London tgrsbridge@btconnect.com
"The guy who lands the first punch wins most fights." That apposite aphorism is also true of military conflicts, romance... and bridge. The key word is "most". Board 15 from the quarter-finals of the Open Teams and the semi-finals of the Women's Teams didn't really prove or disprove the point, but it certainly did provide an indication that sometimes an antithetical aphorism can also be true: "It's better to let sleeping dogs lie."

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A Q } 76532 \\ & \diamond \text { AK } 5 \\ & \diamond \text { A } 4 \\ & \text { \& } 105 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { A } & 1094 \\ \diamond & 764 \\ \diamond \text { Q J } \\ \& \text { AK J } 63 \end{array}$ |  | - J 8 |
|  |  | $\bigcirc$ J 1082 |
|  | ${ }^{+}$ | $\diamond$ K 962 |
|  |  | \& Q 42 |
|  | A AK |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 93 |  |
|  | $\diamond 108753$ |  |
|  | \& 987 |  |

Four spades is a pretty good contract, needing little more than 3-2 spades. Yes, you might also go down if East had only two clubs and led the suit, or if either defender could ruff something. Nevertheless, you'd want to be there, especially vulnerable at IMPs. The problem is getting there - on a normal 1s-1NT-2 auction by North/ South, there's little chance of that happening.

There were four matches being broadcast on BBO (three open quarterfinals and a women's semifinal). Let's look at what happened in each of them on this deal.

TEAM ORANGE WHITE v. VITAS
Table 1

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fisher | B. Drijuer | Schwartz | Nab |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \%$ | 14 | Dble* | Rdbl |
| 20 | 24 | 2NT* | 34 |
| Pass | 44 | All Pass |  |

2NT Weaker competitive values than a three-level bid

Table 2

| West <br> Fisher | North <br> B Drijver | East <br> Schwartz | South <br> Nab |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass |  | 14 | Pass |

All Pass

## CHINA ORANGE v. NETHERLANDS

Table 3

| West <br> Simons | North <br> Chen | East <br> Pasman | South <br> Zhao <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 140 | 14 | Dble* | Rdbl |
| Pass | Pass <br> Pass | 1NT <br> 1N | All Pass |

## ROSENTHAL v. KHIUPPENEN

Table 5
West
De Wijs
1NT
North
Willenken
East
Muller
South
Bilde
Pass
All Pass
$2 \diamond$ One major
24 Pass or correct
Table 6
West North East South
Brink
1NT
Pass
All Pass
$2 \diamond$ One major
2NT Relay asking suit and strength
$3 \diamond$ Good hand with spades

## NORALIA v. VENTIN

Table 7

| West <br> Wrang | North <br> Rasmussen Ventin | East <br> South <br> Sueindal <br> Pass |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 24 | All Pass |  |

At three tables (2, 4, and 7), West passed at his/her first turn. Where West never entered the auction, North/South reached two spades; when West came in later, East pushed them to three spades. Decades ago, before opening bids had suffered from devaluation, South might have considered raising two spades to three. Might have... But with today's currency at an all-time low, no one would venture a raise.

At three tables (1, 3 and 8 ), West opened the bidding with one club in second seat. In all three cases, North overcalled one spade, twice finishing in two spades and once (Table 1) reaching game after vigorous competition (given his lack of either high cards or shape) by East and a one-more-for-the-
road game bid by North, Bob Drijver. To be fair, the competition allowed South, Bart Nab, to show, first a good hand, and then a competitive raise.

At the remaining two tables (5 and 6), both in the same match interestingly enough, West opened a mini-notrump (De Wijs' was 9-14 and Brink's 9-12). Both Norths had a one-major, two-diamond bid available, and used it. Bilde used pass-orcorrect to reach two spades, whereas Khomoleev made an excellent decision to risk the three-level to get a better description of his partner's hand. When Khiuppenen bid three diamonds to show a good hand with spades, Khomoleev took him to game. That was an impressive auction.

Summarizing, where West did not open the bidding, North/South could not reach game on their own steam (zero for three). Where West opened with one club, North South had a chance (one for three) and Where West opened one notrump, North/South had a slightly better chance (one out of two).

What can we learn from this? Just that it is not always profitable to get in the first shot. While it is undoubtedly more fun to get in a lead-director on no values or to bully the opponents with one notrump, occasionally there is a price to pay. And the price is not always in the form of a penalty.
"...so shall ye reap."

PLAY BRIDGE TONIGHT!

SOCIAL EVENING TOURNAMENT

## AT HOTEL THE EDGE

START 21:30
15 BOARDS // 150 NOK PER PAIR


## A SPECTACULAR PLAY REVISITED

by Jos Jacobs

In Saturday morning's Bulletin, I published the deal below but my comments were not a correct reproduction of what Sweden's Peter Fredin really had been thinking when playing the deal.

So here is a more appropriate description of what had been going on.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
A K 2

- A J 1082
$\diamond$ AK 94
of A 7


| West | North <br> Fredin | East <br> ZCampanileBlaagestad |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | South |
| Zass | 10 | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 60 | All Pass |  |

The par contract reached in really no time at all. East led a club to declarer's ace and next, with nothing to guide him, Fredin elected to cash the $\smile A$. West now had a trump trick but with the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ coming down doubleton, the contract still was in no danger if you are allowed to play double-dummy.

At the table, however, Peter Fredin also realised that East could not know for sure that her partner was looking at the master trump. So rather than to play for his legitimate chance of the $\diamond Q$ coming down singleton or doubleton, he chose a play that might well have taken East by surprise: he led a low diamond from hand. If East were indeed looking at the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$, would she believe that this queen was the only honour declarer was missing in the suit?

So when I suggested on Saturday that Fredin had had a blackout, I was quite wrong. I should rather have congratulated him on making an imaginative deception play that might easily have succeeded against a different layout.

## NEW VIDEOS AVAILABLE


"Pierre Zimmermann invites you to Monaco 2016"


Ladies \& Gentlemen
Pere Zimmen intes youto Monaco 2016

GO TO PAGE:

"Budapest 2016"

"Knowing Nevena Senior"

## BLUND vs NORALIA (1)

by Jos Jacobs

## Open Teams Semi-final, second segment

At the start of the second segment, Blund were leading Noralia 33-27. Looking at the boards of the second session, I soon found out that many of them were pretty flat. The segment score reflected this very well: there were nine pushes, an overtrick to each side on two more boards and three doublefigure swings, all in the same direction.

The first board saw the first of these three swings:

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
A 83
$\checkmark$ KQ 87
$\diamond 8743$
\& A Q 10

A 96
$\checkmark$ J 1054
$\diamond$ J 6
\& J 9654


๑ Q 1072
$\checkmark$ A 963
$\diamond 102$
\& K 83

- AKJ54
$\checkmark 2$
$\diamond$ AKQ 95
\& 72
Open Room

| West <br> Sueindal | North <br> Lund | East <br> ARasmussenBerset <br> South |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  |  | $1 ヵ$ |

NS's old-fashioned approach made it possible to play the diamond slam from the right side of the table. With the clubs protected, South's second club will go on a top heart and the spades can be ruffed out easily once the trumps break 2-2. Not that the slam is particularly good so NS did well to stay out of it. Twelve tricks, Blund +620 .

Closed Room

| West <br> Hornslien | North <br> Dyke | East <br> Hoeyem | South <br> J.Howard <br> $1 \diamond$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 N T$ |
| Pass | $5 \mathbf{\&}^{*}$ | Pass | $6 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

[^3]The wide-range forcing 1NT placed the diamond contract in the South hand. As you can see, only a club lead defeats the slam as East's $\% \mathrm{~K}$ is established while his $\triangle \mathrm{A}$ is still there. Hornslien in fact led a club, giving declarer no option but to take the losing finesse. Blund +100 and 12 IMPs. This was a particularly fine shot given no double of $5 \%$ !


On board 16, both EW pairs had the chance to bid game and make it. The problem was West's rebid after an opening bid of 10 by West and a 14 response by partner.

You hold:
か 75 ソKJ $97432 \diamond \mathrm{~A}$ \& K J 10
The full hand:
Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- 106
$\checkmark$ A 5
$\diamond$ K Q 1083
\& 8762
- 75

๑KJ97432
$\diamond A$
of K J 10


- AQ 94
$\bigcirc 86$
$\diamond 7642$
of Q 95
A KJ832
$\checkmark$ Q 10
$\diamond$ J 95
\& A 43
Both Wests rebid just $2 \circlearrowleft$ and played there. The most likely way to get to game would be if NS enter the auction. Then, a non-jump $3 \triangle$ rebid would be automatic, as would partner's raise to game. Of course with the spade finesse losing, declarer must guess hearts to make game.


On board 20, Noralia might consider themselves just a little unlucky:

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

|  | - A 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 73$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 73 |  |
|  | \& A Q J 108 |  |
| * 109 |  | ¢ 8743 |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ982 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\checkmark$ Q 105 |
| $\diamond$ K 10982 | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $\diamond$ J 54 |
| -4 3 |  | \& K K 96 |
|  | - KQJ 65 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 64 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 6 |  |
|  | \& 754 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sueindal | Lund | ARasmussenBerset |  |
| Pass | $1 \propto$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

Rather than leading his singleton, Sveindal opted for the more aggressive lead of a diamond. Though declarer had the courage to run this to his queen, he was by no means home when the queen scored. With the heart suit open, he could not afford to draw trumps so he immediately took the club finesse. When East took his king, the lead of a heart honour followed by a club if it were allowed to hold the trick, or by a heart underlead by West if declarer covered with the king, the contract would still have gone one down. When East continued a diamond instead, declarer had no further problems. Apparently, East could not believe that partner's 3 really was a singleton... But if he wasn't going to play his partner for a singleton maybe he should have ducked the club?
Blund +620 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hornslien | Dyke | Hoeyem | J.Howard |
| 20 | $3 \mathbf{4}$ | Pass | 34 |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

Two Hearts showed the major-minor two-suiter but NS reached game easily enough.
The opening lead at this table in fact was the $\% 3$, which very much looked like a singleton. When declarer took the finesse anyway, knowing
that one immediate ruff could not possibly hurt him and that East was highly unlikely to hold the $\checkmark A$ as an entry for a second ruff, the defender nevertheless had the same chance to beat the contract as they had in the other room by playing a heart honour next.

East did actually continue the $\varsigma \mathrm{Q}$, covered by king and ace, but then we saw a variation on what I said above. West cashed his VJ and continued the suit and now, declarer, who could have realised that trumps were going to be 4-2, ruffed with dummy's ace, thus promoting a trump trick for the defence. One down, Blund another +10 and 12 more IMPs to their credit.


After five consecutive flat boards, no. 26 was a matter of technique:

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.


At both tables, East opened 1NT and became declarer in $4 \mathbf{~ a f t e r ~ a ~ c l a s s i c ~ S t a y m a n ~ a u c t i o n . ~}$
In the Open Room, Berset for Blund led a club to dummy's ace. Declarer then took an immediate finesse of the queen of diamonds. When South won his king and returned the $\diamond 9$, covered by the ten, jack and ace, East could no longer make the contract. Blund +100 .

At the other table, South led the $\circlearrowleft 7$. When East ran this round toward his jack, North won the ace and returned the suit. Declarer won the king in dummy, unblocked the $\& A$ South's king. South could do nothing better than return his other trump, so declarer won, played the $\% \mathrm{~K}$, ruffed his last club and led a diamond from dummy, inserting the seven when North played low. (The $\diamond 8$ would not have helped - declarer plays the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ and when South wins and returns the $\diamond 9$ the $\diamond 7$ becomes established. More beer for everyone!)
South could win his diamond nine but found himself on play. He returned the $\circlearrowleft 3$ but when dummy's $\triangle 6$ held the trick, the possible diamond loser went away and the contract was home. Blund +620 and another 12-IMP swing. They had outscored Noralia 38-1 over the second segment to lead by 43 at the halfway mark.

## EBL SOCIAL ACCOUNTS

## BLUND vs NORALIA (2)

## by Jos Jacobs

## Open Teams Semifinal, third segment

At halftime, Blund led 71-28 so Noralia would need some good boards quickly to have any chance of staying in the match.

Board 1 gave them the start they wanted:
Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.

- AK Q 109
$\bigcirc$ Q 43
$\diamond$ KJ 2
\& 62


ヘ 876542
$\bigcirc 8$
$\diamond$ A 54
\& 1043
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dyke | Lund | J.Howard Berset |  |
|  | $1 N T$ | Pass | $2 \Omega$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Dble | Pass |
| $4 \Omega$ | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

In the Open Room, the Australian EW bid up to $4 \bigcirc$ after South's transfer. But North, applying the Law, judged that 4 could not possibly go down very much. He was quite right: 4 4 was on a diamond finesse, but $4 \bigcirc$ would gave gone down one as well, although the diamond finesse was working for EW. Holding AK-A opposite partner's delayed take-out double, West doubled the final contract to score an extra 50 points. Noralia +100 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hoeyem | A.RasmussenHornslein | Sueindal |  |
|  | $1 N T$ | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 31 | All Pass |  |

At the other table, NS had a way to show both a minimum opening bid and good support, so
they were able to stop in 3 which was actually allowed to make with an overtrick. Noralia +170 and 7 IMPs back.

A bigger swing to Noralia came on board 4.
Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
ค 109762
$\bigcirc 1096$
$\diamond 4$
\& 10652


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dyke | Lund | J Howard Berset |  |
| $1 \&$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Dble | Pass |
| $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Howard's $1 \diamond$ showed hearts and the rest of the auction was natural. It was difficult to see for EW that 4 could not be made because the opponents' hearts were divided 3-3 between them - though arguably, if hearts had been 4-2 a diamond winner might have stood up. Their phantom sacrifice duly went one down but one would not be surprised at seeing a flat board. Blund +200 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hoeyem | A.RasmussenHornslein | Sueindal |  |
| 100 | Pass | $1 \Omega$ | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

Had Blund judged the defence as well as the auction, they would have registered a 9-IMP profit on the deal as $4 \uparrow$ should fail. At the table,
declarer found a neat solution after only a slight defensive inaccuracy.

West led the $\& \mathrm{~K}$ and continued the suit. East won the ace and continued the $৩ \mathrm{~K}$ - logical at first glance, maybe, but a low heart would have been much better. Declarer immediately seized his chance. He won the ace, drew two top trumps and went on to eliminate the minors before leading a low heart. West had to follow suit with the jack, giving East the unpleasant choice of leaving his partner on play to concede the contract or overtaking the jack to concede the contract himself.
Noralia +790 and 11 more IMPs to their credit.
On board 8, Noralia picked up a remarkable swing.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- A Q J 109
© Q 87
$\diamond-$
\& AJ 765


Open Room

| West | North | East South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dyke | Lund | J.Howard Berset |
| $1 \%$ | $1 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Over the nebulous club, Lund overcalled 19, feeling pretty certain that this was not going to be passed out. However unlikely that might have seemed to him, it is always dangerous to confuse the impossible with the merely unlikely. One overtrick, Blund +110 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Hoeyem | A.RasmussenHornslein Sveindal |  |  |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 ヵ$ | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

When West opened a more natural $1 \diamond$ and

North overcalled just 14, East's pre-emptive raise gave North room for one more call. After that, South had no trouble in calling the heart game, which proved an excellent choice. Sveindal only lost a spade in establishing the suit and, of course, the ace of trumps. Noralia +450 and 8 more IMPs. Their deficit had been reduced to 16 at this point, so we definitely had a match, or at least so it looked at this point.

On board 10, both teams missed a chance of a game swing:

Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.
A AKQ 862
$\checkmark$ K 107
$\diamond 9$
\& K 96


When East passed as dealer, both Souths opened a natural weak two in hearts. They thus became declarers in $4 \bigcirc$ and stood no chance of making their contracts after West led the $\& \mathrm{Q}$.

The queen held the trick but the next club went to East's ace perforce and now, the diamond underlead to West's king to get a club ruff was obvious, in view of dummy.

But what if South can open a Multi and North bids $4 \%$, the modern gadget asking partner to transfer the game to North by bidding the suit below his long suit? With North the declarer, there is no legitimate way to beat $4 \checkmark$.


Two boards later, there was another swing but this time, it went to Blund:

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
A K 94
$\checkmark$ AKQ J
$\diamond$ A 53
\& J J 107


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dyke | Lund | J.Howard Berset |  |
| Pass | $1 \propto$ | 14 | $2 \&$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 3NT |

All Pass
When West did not raise spades, NS were bound to settle for 3NT. North's rebid of 2NT was automatic, as was South raise to 3NT. Thanks to the useful spade intermediates, making nine tricks was easy enough. Blund +600 .

In the Closed Room, West raised spades:
Closed Room
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { West } & \text { North } & \text { East } & \text { South } \\ \begin{array}{llll}\text { Hoeyem } & \text { A.RasmussenHornslein } & \text { Sueindal } \\ \text { Pass } & 1 \& & 10 & 2 \& \\ \text { 2 } & \text { Dble } & \text { Pass } & 3 \%\end{array}\end{array} l$
All Pass
Suddenly, North had a problem as a 2NT rebid would suggest a better spade stopper. South might have tried 3a which would have worked to perfection but North's double did not suggest any useful additional spade values. On the friendly layout, ten tricks were made, but Blund had gained 10 IMPs to lead by 27 now.


On the next board, Noralia hit back:
Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dyke | Lund | J.Howard Berset |  |
|  | Pass | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | Pass |
| 2 $\mathbf{4}$ | All Pass |  |  |

When East showed his majors in the balancing position, EW ended up in an excellent contract. Nine tricks, Noralia +140 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hoeyem | A.RasmussenHornslein Sveindal |  |  |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 30 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Rasmussen's inspired transfer to clubs not only led to a very playable fit but had the additional advantage of shutting East out. Not that it mattered very much, as $3 \%$ should have gone down.

When West led his trump, however, declarer could win the jack and immediately lead a spade. West won the second round of the suit but with the third spade a parking place for North's losing heart, declarer had assured himself of making the contract. When West decided to return the $\diamond J$, Sveindal actually made an overtrick when he ran it to his king, intending to finesse the nine on the way back. This was not necessary, since West went up with his ace when declarer returned the suit. So Noralia scored another +130 for a useful gain of 7 IMPs.

With 14 boards to play, the score stood at 8262 to Blund.

## STANZA FOUR OF THE SEMIIFINALS

by Barry Rigal

The match between Orange White and Khiuppenen was the closest of our matches as we entered the final set. The Dutch (technically the team with more Dutch on, since Muller-De Wijs were playing for the Russian squad) led 95-79, having started extremely well but been gradually reined in.

Bob (note: not Bas - that metaphorical ship has sailed) Drijver earned a small swing for his side when as East he opened $1 \checkmark$ and allowed his opponents to play 4 4 undoubled. Muller opened $4 \checkmark$ and doubled 4ヵ when that got back to him. At least he knew there would be no overtricks... wrong!

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.


That made it 101-79, and the boards went quiet for four deals with overtricks moving us along to 103-80.


Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Verbeek | Muller | Molenaar |
|  | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | 3NT |
| Pass | $4 \diamond(\checkmark)$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Nab | KhiuppenenDrijuer | Kholomeen |  |
|  | $2 \Phi$ | $2 \uparrow$ | $4 \Omega$ |
| Dble | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | $5 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

That initial disciplined pass did not work well for Verbeek. The commentators sympathized, but of course EW did have the opportunity to score a goal. Had East passed $4 \bigcirc$ all would have been well for his side - but doubtless that was not the hand he expected for a double... and maybe Nab might have seen this result coming. The removal to $5 \%$ met an equally enthusiastic double. The defenders allowed declarer to take a spade ruff in dummy and play on trump. Eventually declarer needed 3-3 trumps to escape for 300 or go for 800. The defenders cashed two spades and shifted to diamonds, and when Molenaar finessed he ended up -200. 11 IMPs made it 103-91 for White.



After the previous deal, you would have no doubt as to which of the North players would act at favourable vulnerability over 1 -- would you?

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Verbeek | Muller | Molenaar |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 1ヵ | 2ゅ | $3 \diamond$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| 3 | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room


Both tables could have held the spade contract to nine tricks easily enough. In the Open Room
The club lead was more attractive, perhaps, but there again, against $3 \boldsymbol{d}$ it was more logical to play partner for values while against 4a hearts had not been bid.
Both defenders led clubs, letting declarer shake a heart loser on the diamonds and bring home ten tricks. But White had 10 IMPs and led 113-91, which became 114-91 after an overtrick IMP went the leader's way. Five deals to go.

Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul.
a KQ
$\bigcirc$ Q J 85
$\diamond$ K 96
\& 10632

$\begin{array}{ll}\wedge & J \\ \diamond & 6 \\ \diamond & 85\end{array}$
A A 976
$\checkmark$ AK 42
$\diamond$ A Q 32
of $A$
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Verbeek | Muller | Molenaar |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Dble |
| Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | 68 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Nab | KhiuppenenDrijver | Kholomeev |  |
| Pass | Pass | 4\& | Dble |
| Pass | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |

You can allocate blame for the Closed Room disaster as you see fit. Personally I give East credit - but I believe Muller did not have a 4\% opening available? In third or fourth chair Texas is something of a blunt instrument, whereas we all like to up the ante with a long minor, don't we? Verbeek did not struggle excessively to find a way to the 13 th trick, so White had 10 IMPs to lead 124-91. Four deals to go; all over? Yes pretty much so. De Wijs found a nice defence to $4 \mathbf{A}_{\mathrm{x}}$ to collect 800 against his 650, but the final deal of the match saw a final attempt at a swing land 800 in White's column for a further 12 IMP and a 136-95 victory.


## TEAM ORANGE WHITE vs KHYUPPENEN

by Ram Soffer

Team Orange White has been the most impressive by far in the first three days of competition, winning the Swiss qualifier by a handsome margin and then disposing of Lazer and Vitas in their first two knockout matches.
In the semifinal they had to meet their compatriots Simon De Wijs/Bauke Muller who play for the Russian team Khiuppenen.
Orange White started the second session with a lead of $42: 19$, but it was not enough for them. During the first four boards they were on fire.

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 83 \\ & \diamond \text { K Q } 87 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 8743$ |  |  |
|  | \& A Q 10 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \wedge & 96 \\ \diamond & J 1054 \end{array}$ | N ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | Q 1072 |
|  | ${ }^{\text {N }}$ | $\checkmark$ | A 963 |
| $\diamond$ J 6 | ${ }^{\text {W }}$ | $\diamond$ | 102 |
| \& J 9654 |  | \& | K 83 |
|  | A | A AKJ54 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 2$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AKQ 95 |  |  |
|  | \& 72 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Nab | De Wijs | Drijuer | Muller |
|  |  |  | 1\%** |
| Pass | $2 \diamond *$ | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

1\& 15+ any distribution
$2 \diamond 9-11$ balanced
After the first two bids showed a lot of strength, the natural part of the auction started with 2 . North didn't like the fact that all his points were in South's short suits and signed off in 3NT. N/S +660 .



Molenaar used an artificial $2 \%$ bid instead of a natural $3 \diamond$, and it proved to be extremely useful, as the final contract was played from the right side.
Learning of his partner's strong spade-diamond two suiter, Verbeek liked his four-card support and drove to $6 \diamond$ knowing that a club lead wouldn't endanger him since he was going to be the declarer!
The play was easy after trumps broke 2-2. Declarer ruffed out spades and claimed, losing only the $\checkmark \mathrm{A}$. $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}+1370$ and their lead increased to $54: 19$.

On the next board Nab/Drijver reached 4®, which was missed by Matushko/Sterkin at the other table. By the time the next board was played the lead was already 67:19.

[^4]Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
A Q 87
$\bigcirc 985$
$\diamond$ Q 83
\& AK 95


Once again Team Orange White bid and made a slam which was not reached at the other table, but this time it was rather a fluke.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | De Wijs | Drijver <br> Dass | Muller |
| 2NT |  |  |  |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

N/S +630 after a very simple auction. Even if North invited with 4NT, South would not have accepted with 20 HCP . There seemed to be no reason why this board would not be a push, but...

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Matushko | Verbeek | Sterkin | Molenaar |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \&$ |
| $2 \Omega$ | Dble | $3 \Omega$ | $4 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | $6 \%$ | All Pass |  |

According to his system Molenaar opened $1 \%$ and not 2NT (regarded by some players as the "slam killer"). Matushko essayed a typically aggressive $2 \circlearrowleft$, white against red. As a result the bidding reached the three-level before South had a chance to show his real strength.
So Molenaar bid $4 \checkmark$. How would you interpret this bid in the North seat with three small hearts? Haven't the opponents promised a 9-card fit? $6 \%$ looked ideal opposite a strong hand with a stiff heart, and that was Verbeek's next call.
The club slam in a 4-3 fit wasn't the greatest of contracts. A heart can be ruffed in South's hand, but he still needs both a favourable trump break and the diamond finesse.
The first condition was met in the actual deal, and the second one was provided by Matushko's decision to choose an active lead. His underlead of the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ was pretty unfortunate, the only one to give away the slam.

Molenaar organized a heart ruff, drew trumps and finally discarded a diamond from dummy on his spades. N/S +1370 and at this stage Team Orange White was running away with a 79:19 lead.

On Board 19 they tried another overbid, but this time they didn't get away with it, as Muller/De Wijs found the correct defence to defeat a 3NT contract which was based on two balanced hands with a total of 23 HCP , reducing the lead to 79:25.
There followed seven consecutive boards in which the contract was $4 \boldsymbol{d}$ in both tables. Some of these deals provided enough room for errors in card play and defense which created a few swings.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.
A A 2
$\checkmark 73$
$\diamond$ A 73
\& A Q J 1082


This board showed how tired the players have become in the fourth day of competition. Both players in the East seat would have liked to forget about it, for different reasons.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | De Wijs | Drijver | Muller |
| Matushko | Verbeek | Sterkin | Molenaar |
| $2 \Omega$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

West led his singleton club in both rooms (there is a "rule" that when a preemptor leads an unbid suit, it is a singleton).
At the closed room declarer finessed the $\& \mathrm{Q}$. At first Bob Drijver defended correctly. An immediate club ruff would have given away the contract, but Bob played the $\bigcirc 10$, covered by K and A . Nab continued with the $\checkmark \mathrm{J}$.
The simplest way to beat the contract was to overtake and give a club ruff, but Drijver let his partner win. Nab continued hearts, and fortunately for the defence, declarer could not benefit from ruffing small in dummy due to entry problems. Therefore Muller ruffed high and attempted to


## Team Orange White vs Khyuppenen

draw trumps in three rounds.
When the 2 was led from dummy it was an obvious case of "second hand low", but for some reason East inserted the $\boldsymbol{\$}$. A few tricks later he was trump-couped when declarer ran dummy's clubs
At the open room declarer went up with the of A in trick 1, drew trumps in four rounds and drove away the $\% \mathrm{~K}$.
Had the $\% \mathrm{~K}$ been at West, he would have been safe, but it was Sterkin (East) who won the trick.
Declarer already had six tricks, and he could see 4 more sure tricks on the table. Obviously the defence needed three immediate heart tricks. Despite these clues, Sterkin didn't lead $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ or $\bigcirc 10$ to defeat the contract, but rather the $\triangle 5$ which let it make. A strange push.

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.


| West <br> Nab | North <br> De Wijs | East <br> Drijver | South <br> Muller |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $1 \uparrow \mathbf{1}$ |

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
A 3
$\bigcirc 8432$
$\diamond A$ Q 9
\& A5432


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | De Wijs | Drijuer | Muller |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| Dble | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Muller led his stiff $\checkmark \mathrm{K}$, later getting a heart ruff. E/W-100.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Matushko | Verbeek | Sterkin | Molenaar |
|  | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 4ヵ | All Pass |  |  |

Here 4\$ was played by West after a typical multi $2 \diamond$ auction. What would you have chosen to lead with the North cards?
Since all textbooks condemn leading a suit headed by the ace without the king, as well as leading a singleton trump, the choice of a passive heart seems obvious.
Verbeek decided to be clever, picking the A. A heart switch would have been alright, but his next move was the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, from which the defence could no longer recover. $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+620$.

The end result of the session was a halftime lead of $82: 52$ to Team Orange White. They managed to preserve this lead throughout the remainder of the match, winning by 136:95 and advancing to the final vs Blund.


## BLUND vs NORALIA

## by Jos Jacobs

## Open Teams Semi-final, segment four

At the start of the final segment, Noralia would need a very good set of boards to have any chance of making it to the final.

Board 15, the opening board of the set, was a routine $4 \uparrow$ but on the next board, both teams had their chances:

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dyke | Hornslien | J.Howard Hoeyem |  |
| Pass | Pass | $4 \Omega$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |



To me, West might have considered bidding $5 \%$ after the double which confirmed the strong variety of the 3rd in hand $4 \checkmark$ opening bid. Of course partner doesn't always deliver such trump support. If the double was


Lightner for a club lead... Of course if North now "sacrificed" at 54, EW would have the same problem as going on to $6 \%$ at red v. green is probably asking too much. And the defenders do have two diamonds and a heart ruff.

Nevertheless, Noralia missed a fair chance here and conceded - 690 when 44 made with a doubled overtrick.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berset | A.RasmussenLund | Sueindal |  |
| Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | $2 \Omega$ | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In the Closed Room, North's opening bid must have taken Lund by surprise but it also had the effect of silencing him for most of the rest of the auction. In 44, Sveindal made the same 11 tricks but Blund had scored 6 more IMPs.

They added a lot more to that on the next board.


Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dyke | Hornslien | J.Howard Hoeyem |  |
|  | $1 \circlearrowleft$ | $1 ヵ$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $5 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Well, West held a lot of defensive strength but mainly in the wrong suit. How was he to know that EW, also had a double fit in the black suits? East had overcalled 14 only.
Blund +650 as there was no defence against 50 .

| Closed Room |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North East | South |
| Berset | A.RasmussenLund | Sueindal |
|  | 10 20 | $4 \checkmark$ |
| 40 | $5 \diamond$ Pass | $5 \bigcirc$ |
| 50 | Pass Pass | 60 |
| Dble | All Pass |  |

At the other table, Lund showed his black twosuiter, so West went on to 5 on general principles about the double fit. From this point, Noralia could only try to restrict the loss by doubling 54 and collecting +300 for a loss of 8 IMPs. Going on to $6 \bigcirc$, one down, made it a $13-\mathrm{IMPs}$ loss.

So Blund led by 39 with just 11 boards to play. It looked all over and so it turned out.

To end this report, though, here are two consecutive deals on which the North players from each team did very well. Here is the first:

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

- KJ 98
$\bigcirc$ J 82
$\diamond$ A Q 105
\& J 5


Open Room

| West <br> Dyke | North <br> Hornslien | East <br> J.Howard Hoeyem <br> Pass |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \diamond$ |  |  | South |
| $1 \checkmark$ | Pass | $1 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Hornslien made the excellent opening lead of the 9 which held the trick. Declarer won the third round of the suit and played off three top clubs, seeing the $4-2$ break. Double-dummy, he could have made the contract now by twice leading a diamond from his hand but when he conceded a club to South, he could no longer make the contract as North held the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and the 13 th spade. Blund +100 .

Closed Room

| West <br> Berset | North <br> A.RasmussenLund | South <br> Sueindal |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| 1\& | Dble | $1 \Omega$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

When North led the $\diamond A$ and another, declarer was home easily even after he put up dummy's king in trick two. He went on to establish a club for his ninth trick. Blund +600 and 12 IMPs to put the match out of reach for Noralia, since the Blund lead now had gone up to 57 .

On the next board, Noralia showed they were going down in a blaze of glory:

Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul.
A KQ

- Q J 85
$\diamond$ K 96
\& 10632


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dyke | Hornslien | J.Howard Hoeyem |  |
| Pass | $1 \&$ | $3 \&$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | $6 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Compared to the easy $6 \checkmark, 6 \mathrm{NT}$ is not a very good contract as it needs the diamonds 3-3 (or J 10 bare) with the extra chance of the J 10 to three. When the latter requirement materialised, Hornslein had his 12 tricks. Blund +990 .

One wonders why NS never got to their heart fit. What would double over $3 \%$ have shown?
South might even have tried 4\% to show his 4-4-4-1.
In the Closed Room, North could not conjure up an opening bid from anywhere so NS had to cope with East's $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$ opening. Of course, North knew he had something in reserve when he bid $4 \bigcirc$ but opposite a less strong partner, 10 or 11 tricks might very well be the maximum number.

However, when South made the strongest possible move next, Rasmussen showed the full extra values of his hand in the only way he could: he bid 5NT. Sveindal quite rightly took this as the old-fashioned Josephine and went straight for the bulls-eye.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Berset | A.RasmussenLund | Sueindal |  |
| Pass | Pass | $4 \&$ | Dble |
| Pass | $4 \odot$ | Pass | $5 \%$ |
| Pass | $5 N T$ | Pass | $7 \circlearrowleft$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Had there been no club pre-empt, the grand would have been quite easy to play: ruff two clubs low in South and there you are. On the known actual club layout, declarer had to find a more complicated solution however, consisting of ruffing spades and/or diamonds in North.

Rasmussen started his good work by cashing his ๑QJ, thus saving his low trumps for later ruffs. Seeing the 4-1 break, declarer next cashed his top spades, noting the fall of the 8 and $\mathbf{\$} 10$ in East (or maybe not, as we shall see). From here, his prospects were beginning to look bright. If spades were 5-2, diamonds had to be 3-3 as East would surely have opened $4 \%$ on a seven-card suit. If spades were $4-3$ after all, the small extra chance of East holding exactly $\mathbf{N} 10 \mathrm{x}$ might now materialise.

Rasmussen chose a line, however, in which it did not really matter. He crossed to dummy's ace and cashed $\boldsymbol{\$} \mathrm{A}$, which brought down the jack, so his troubles were over but apparently, Rasmussen did not realise this, because of tiredness after a long day's play. He went on to play the high $\$ 9$ but he ruffed it in dummy. Next, he cashed his two remaining top diamonds and ruffed the fourth diamond with dummy's last small trump, West having to follow suit all the time. As dummy's last two cards now were the ऽAK West could only underruff...

Well played indeed for a great +1510 and 11 fully deserved IMPs, however to no avail. Noralia had won the battle but lost the war, the final score in this semi-final being: Blund-Noralia 123-74.


ORANGE WHITE vs BLUND
by David Bird

## Open Teams Final, Segment one

The unfancied Blund team from Norway had done wonderfully well to qualify for the KO stage and then win three matches against formidable opposition. Would they extend their dream into the very last match, the final? Time would tell.

Board 2. Dealer East. N-S Vul.

- A 4
$\bigcirc$ J 9
$\diamond$ K J 96
\& AJ5 32


Open Room

| West <br> Berset | North <br> Verbeek | East <br> Lund | South <br> Molenaar |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \diamond$ | $5 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass |
| $5 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |  |

From East's point of view, West's pre-emptive 4^ might have put North to an awkward guess. It was therefore not automatic to bid 'five over five'. On this occasion it was the right thing to do, with partner's $৩ \mathrm{~K}-10-7$ fitting splendidly. South would surely have made $5 \diamond$ for 600 and the spade sacrifice was only 300 down.
Would East judge so accurately at the other table?

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Hoeyem | Drijver | Hornslien |
|  |  | 19 | Pass |

44 All Pass
South surprised us by not finding the diamond overcall and East was spared any decision at the five-level. That was 6 IMPs to Team Orange White.


Board 5. Dealer North. N-S Vul.


Lund made the pressure opening bid of 3as and Molenaar then had to choose between 3NT and Pass. 'Most players would bid 3NT' was the verdict of the BBO commentators. Molenaar may have reasoned that his partner was a passed hand and might anyway re-open with a double if he held a near opening bid with the expected spade shortage. $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ was passed out and went 150 down.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Hoeyem | Drijver | Hornslien |
|  | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Dble |
| $2 \Omega$ | $3 \%$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

It was easier for $N / \mathrm{S}$ in the Closed Room when Bob Drijver opened with a multi. West led the $\triangle 5$ against 3NT and Horslien scored three spades, three hearts and three diamonds for +600 . 10 IMPs to Blund.

Board 6. Dealer East. E-W Vul.
A KQ94
$\checkmark 85$
$\diamond 765$
\& 8742


A A653
$\checkmark 93$
$\diamond 10982$
\& J 109

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Berset | Verbeek | Lund | Molenaar |
|  |  | 2\%* | Pass |
| $3 \%$ | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| $4 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 48 | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | 5\%* | Pass |
| $5 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 5NT* | Pass |
| 60 | All Pass |  |  |

West held a promising hand opposite a $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ opener and was unwilling to bid just $4 \checkmark$ at his second turn. Perhaps his $4 \diamond$ was intended as a Last Train slam-try, in which case it would normally deny a spade control. East was minimum for his $2 \%$ opening, anyway, and signed off in 40 .
West still reckoned he was too strong to accept a mere game contract opposite a $2 \%$ opening. Had he cue-bid 5\% next, the notoriously fickle Gods of the Five-level would have been forgiving. He preferred to bid 4NT and they were soon in $6 \bigcirc$ with no spade control. As you see, there are 13 tricks to take unless a spade is led. Molenaar reached for his A A and was delighted to see a clear signal of the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ from partner. One down and you may think that justice was done.
At the other table, the auction was a straightforward $1 \circlearrowleft-2 \%-3 \bigcirc-4 \bigcirc$ and South had no reason to lead the A against a game contract. Thirteen tricks were made after the $\diamond 10$ lead and that was 13 IMPs to Team Orange White.

Board 7. Dealer South. Both Vul.
A 3
© A 9753
$\diamond$ J 9654
\& 43


| West | North <br> Berset | Verbeek | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lund | South <br> Molenaar <br> $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ |  |  |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | $3 \%$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

South's 2 showed spades and a minor and was (you guessed it) weak. When East passed the takeout double, South rescued himself into clubs. Was that right? Going one level higher would mean that he would have to score two extra tricks to show a profit. If North held something like $1=5=4=3$ shape, he could have initiated a rescue himself.
West started brightly with a low trump, East drawing two rounds. After a diamond to the queen and a heart to the king, Molenaar led the $\% \mathrm{~J}$ to the $\& A$. West scored the $\diamond A$ and exited with a trump to South. The 9 went to West's J and declarer ruffed a third round of diamonds. He led the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{Q}$ to East's A , leaving East with $\boldsymbol{\$ K - 8 - 6 ~}$ to declarer's 10-7-2. Sadly East now played the © K, allowing a finesse by declarer at Trick 12. The penalty shrank from an obese 1400 to an overweight 1100.

| West | North <br> Hoeyem | East <br> Drijuer | South <br> Horslien <br> $2 \uparrow *$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nable | All Pass |  |  |

Horslien looked favourably on the same opening bid and E-W collected 1100 for a flat board. The late defensive lapse at the other table had cost 7 IMPs.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berset | Verbeek | Lund | Molenaar |
|  |  | Pass | $2 \diamond *$ |
| Dble | $4 』 *$ | Dble | $4 \uparrow$ |

All Pass
South opened a multi and the next three calls were text-book. North's $4 \checkmark$ was pass-or-correct, to play in partner's suit, and East's double showed points. South corrected to 44 and now there was an apparent disagreement by E-W. If West's Pass was not forcing in their methods, he might perhaps have bid 4NT to show at least two places to play. When West and East both passed, South was left to play the spade game undoubled.
Berset led a top heart and could have ensured two down by playing ace and another diamond. (East was surely a big favourite to hold the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ after the bidding.) When West preferred a low club switch, Molenaar rose with the $\& \mathrm{~A}$ and ran the © Q successfully, West showing out. He continued with the loser-on-loser play of the $\checkmark \mathrm{Q}$, discarding a diamond. The defenders could score only two more minor-suit tricks and declarer escaped for one down. 100 away.

| West | North <br> Hoeyem | East <br> Drijuer | South <br> Horslien |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| $3 \diamond *$ | Pass | $3 \wedge^{*}$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond *$ | Pass | $4 \diamond *$ | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

South declined to open on his cards and the 10card spade fit lay undiscovered. Declarer managed to discard one of dummy's hearts on his club suit and recorded +620 for a swing of 11 IMPs to Team Orange White.

We will end with another deal where South had to decide whether to pre-empt in the second seat:

Board 14. Dealer East. Both Vul.
Q 1084
© AJ9863
$\diamond$ Q 3
\& 8


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berset | Verbeek | Lund | Molenaar <br> Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ |  | Dble | All Pass |

Molenaar did open, as he had on Board 10. West overcalled $3 \triangle$ and North doubled for penalties, even though E-W might have a bolt hole in clubs. There was no further bidding and declarer won the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ lead with the ace, continuing with the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ and K . After discarding a club on the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$, he ruffed a spade in his hand and led the $\mu \mathrm{Q}$ to the $\% \mathrm{~A}$. Molenaar continued with the $\% \mathrm{~K}$ (North discarding the N ) and $\% 10$, North ruffing declarer's $\%$. With only trumps remaining, North led the $\checkmark 8$ to the $\circlearrowleft 10$. When declarer exited with his last club, Verbeek ruffed low to leave him with hxA-J-9. He led the $\triangle 9$ to declarer's $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$, demonstrating the play that East had missed on Board 7, and claimed the last two tricks with his $\bigcirc$ A-J. Everyone had done their best in the play, it seems, and the result was +300 for $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nab | Hoeyem | Drijuer | Horslien |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 18 | Pass | 14 | $3 \diamond$ |
| Dble* | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | 3NT | Dble |
| 4\% | All Pass |  |  |

Once again Horslien chose to pass where his counterpart had opened. E-W wriggled from $3 \bigcirc$ doubled into 40 undoubled and lost just 50. That was 6 more IMPs to Team Orange White, who won the first session by 49 IMPs to 11 .

## DON'T BID THE SAME HAND THRICE

by Herman De Wael

When acting as a director, you are sometimes witness to the strangest occurences. This one happened on Tuesday:

I am called to a table and when I arrive this is what I see:

cards of board 19. He passes again, West opens his $1 \%$ and everything proceeds normally.
However, the fun isn't over. South has made a call with the hand from board 20, and he's now going to play this board. He's in fourth seat now, and so West has the additional piece of knowledge that South does not hold opening values. I check with some colleagues and we all agree this is Authorized Information to West. I am not going to remind him of it, but I stay in the vicinity just to keep an eye on things. So they take the cards from board 20, South looks at the hand he's seen before, and he passes. (pause for laughter here)
I am not going to allow that and I take the pass away. There are no penalties for a pass out of turn, behind screens, but I remind West that, again, this is authorized
South has passed, and West has opened 10\%. information to him.

But wait - there are still 13 cards in the south pocket of the board and yet South is also holding 13 cards.
It turns out South has taken the cards out of board 20, while the others are playing 19 .
I check everything and give South the correct

West passes, the tray departs to the other side, and comes back with two more passes. So now South is in the extraordinary position of being able, for a third time, to bid the same hand in the same position. With a theatrical gesture, he passes, yet again.

## WOMEN \& SENIORS

Women and Seniors players who do not qualify for the Finals may play free of charge in one or both the NBF side events tomorrow Thursday.
Each event consists of 24 boards.
Starting Times: Morning Event - 10.00 // Afternoon Event - 14.30

## MISSING CASH?

Contact Jannerstens at the bridge stall in the bridge plaza if you are the one who mislaid cash in the play area.

## TAKE vs SAGG

by Ron Tacchi

## Seniors Teams Final, Segment 2

Take your marks....
After the first of the four fourteen board sessions the Swedish team of Take (Aldeborg, Karlsson, Trapp and Elmroth) had a healthy lead of 41-15 over the Norwegian team Sagg (Aronsen, Goldeheim, Tornberg and Gravrak). To get themselves back into the match Sagg would need to take advantage of a swingy set of boards.
Board 1 provided such an opportunity - would it be to Sagg's advantage?


Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
A 83
๑ K Q 87
$\diamond 8743$
\& A Q 10

| A 96 |  | - Q 1072 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ J 1054 | N | $\bigcirc$ A963 |
| $\diamond$ J 6 | $\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{S}} \mathbf{E}$ | $\diamond 102$ |
| \& J 9654 |  | \& K 83 |
|  | A AKJ54 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 2$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK Q 95 |  |
|  | \& 72 |  |

Open Room

| West <br> Goldenheim | North <br> Trapp | East <br> Aronsen | South <br> Elmroth |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \Omega^{*}$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow{ }^{*}$ |

## $4 \bigcirc$ Cue bid

After a strong club auction Take had no problem in reaching the diamond slam. After a heart lead to the ace and a spade switch declarer had no problem bringing home his contract when the trumps broke 2-2.

Closed Room

| West <br> Karlsson | North <br> Tornberg | East <br> Aldeborg | South <br> Gravrak <br> $1 ヵ$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ |  | Pass |
| Pass | $5 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $6 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Tornberg elected to reply $2 \diamond$ to the natural spade opening bid. He must have been a little nervous when three bids later he found himself in a diamond slam, but the sight of dummy must have calmed his nerves. This time declarer's task was even easier after the lead of the ace of hearts.
Both teams might have had slim hopes that this might be a positive swing.

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.

- 84
$\checkmark$ A 5
$\diamond$ A Q 82
\& AK J 102


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Goldenheim | Trapp | Aronsen | Elmroth |
|  | $1 \&^{*}$ | Pass | $1 \diamond^{*}$ |
| $1 \$$ | $2 \mathbf{N}^{*}$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |

All Pass

Elmroth received the lead of the king of spades which he ducked. West now switched to a diamond. Declarer eschewed the finesse and rose with the ace. He then cashed the ace and king of clubs discarding a diamond and a spade. Declarer now fell from grace, he led a small club from dummy and ruffed with a small trump. West gratefully overruffed with the eight and declarer was now down in a solid one. Why he did not just play ace and another trump I do not know.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Karlsson | Tornberg <br>  <br>  <br> Aldeborg Graurak |  |  |
| 1NT | Dble | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  | $4 \uparrow$ |

Bizarrely the play record in this room is very similar in that a high spade was led but West switched to a club, declarer took his ace and king, discarding two spades, and again ruffed a small club with a small trump and that was overruffed by the eight. West continued with a spade to the ace. Gravrak now played a trump to the ace and took a ruffing finesse in the club suit. Mow to my way of thinking and counting East/West had already taken two tricks and still had the king and queen of trumps to add to their tally but the record states that South claimed ten tricks and that the contract made. Either there is a mistake in the play record or it is a splendid claim. Either way it was ten IMPs to Take.
In general the boards were flat and unlikely to provide swings. Finally a chance for someone to create a score. Six spades is a playable contract, but would either team bid it? The answer was no. In the Open semi-finals and the Womens final half the teams bid the slam and all but one made it.


Olve Graurak

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
A A 1084
$\bigcirc$ K
$\diamond$ K J 109
\& AJ 83

| ¢ J 5 |  |  |  |  | 962 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | N |  | $\bigcirc$ J 6 |
| $\diamond$ A 62 |  |  | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathbf{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ | Q 8753 |
| \& K 62 |  |  |  | 9 | 1095 |
|  |  | 9 | K Q 73 |  |  |
|  |  | $\bigcirc$ | AQ 752 |  |  |
|  |  | $\diamond$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Q 74 |  |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Goldenheim | Trapp | Aronsen <br> Elmroth |  |
| Pass |  | $1 \mathbf{N}^{*}$ |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Karlsson | Tornberg | Aldeborg <br> Graurak |  |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \Omega$ |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{4}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $3 \mathbf{0}$ | Pass | $4 \mathbf{4}$ |

How would you play Six Spades if you were in it? If played by North a minor suit lead eased declarer's problems substantially. If we take the case of a heart lead then declarer will perforce win in dummy. As the cards lie, even though the hearts are 5-2 declarer should prevail. If declarer draws trumps West already has a minor difficulty on the third round, he cannot discard a club as declarer will then make four club tricks, if he discards a heart then declarer can ruff the fifth heart good and a diamond discard will show up the diamond position quickly. Notwithstanding West's discard South can play a diamond towards dummy, I would play the king because a world champion told me that if I had no idea as to the position of the ace and queen, then play the defender on lead to trick one for the ace if there is no other indication. A piece of advice that has served me well over the years. (However if West has discarded a diamond and declarer plays the jack he can still get home.) If the king wins then there are many routes to success such as playing for the clubs to be 3-3. If West rises with the ace then the simplest route is to take a ruffing finesse
against East's queen of diamonds and then take the club finesse, success was always predicated on that finesse working. There are also several lines where declarer can arrange to take two ruffs in one hand and come to twelve tricks - there are a legion ways of successfully playing the hand, the reader is urged to get a pack of cards and analyse the various lines, it will pass a pleasant half hour.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
a 3
$\bigcirc 8432$
$\diamond A$ Q 9

* A5432

A 1052
© AJ 976
$\diamond K$
of K J 109


A A Q J 986
$\checkmark$ Q 105
$\diamond$ J 73
\& 8
A K 74
$\checkmark$ K
$\diamond 1086542$
\& Q 76
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Goldenheim | Trapp | Aronsen | Elmroth |
|  | $1 \diamond^{*}$ | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \diamond^{*}$ |
| $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

East remembering a certain adage about a six-card major bid the game. South led his singleton king of hearts. Declarer made a valiant effort by playing ace and another trump but to no avail as South could not possibly lead the wrong suit as North held both missing aces and so he obtained his heart ruff to defeat the contract.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Karlsson | Tornberg | Aldeborg <br> Graurak |  |
| 2NT* | Pass | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| 4^ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| 4 | All Pass |  |  |

After East's multi $2 \diamond$ he soon found himself in the spade game. At this table South elected to lead a small trump, whilst on occasion this lead can gain, it was not to be so here. Declarer continued with a heart towards dummy and when the king appeared he played a trump to his ace and then played on hearts and claimed his contract. Twelve IMPs to Take.
Aside from the two game swings there were no other scores of note. Take won the session 25-4 and had increased their lead to 66-19 with two sessions to play.


Take team - Kent Karlsson, Kalle Aldeborg, Leif Trapp, Gunnar Elmroth

## GOOD BID IN OPEN PAIRS

by Micke Melander

We are closing in on the end at the European Open Championships in Tromsö but what remains to be played are the pairs in each category. Here come some hands from session six, Wednesday morning.

Board 21. Dealer North. NS Vul.
A K 1053
$\checkmark$ K J 5
$\diamond$ J 10
of K Q 109


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Efraimsson | Whittaker | Morath | Bertheau |
|  | $10 \%^{*}$ | Pass | $1 \Omega$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass | 3NT |

All Pass
$1 \% 2+0$
Naturally, Morath didn't find the lead of a diamond against the Three Notrump contract in, which at first glance it seemed like the only way of getting an extra trick for the defense would be if declarer would find to locate the queen of hearts. With really no appetizing opening lead to make Morath eventually lead the four of spades straight into declarer's tenace.

Whittaker won in hand with the ten, played a spade to the ace and a club to his king. When Morath ducked, declarer cashed the king of hearts and put the jack on the table. When no queen appeared he made no mistake when he went up with the ace to see the queen drop from West. Declarer then cashed his remaining hearts from dummy, on which Morath had to hang on two his two aces and jack-six of spades. The queen of spades followed which held the trick, Morath was next used as a stepping stone when he was thrown in on the ace of clubs. He could cash his ace of diamonds but had to give declarer the last
trick with the king of spades for eleven tricks.
Actually it didn't matter if Morath would have led a diamond to trick one. Declarer would still, provided that he found the queen of hearts, squeeze East to still make his 11 tricks, since that player has to hang on to his four spades and two aces.

Still the critical pairs move on the board in order to score well was to put the contract in no-trump instead of Four Hearts, since there were the same number of tricks in the two contracts. 3NT with eleven tricks gave 195 out of a possible 208 points.

Board 22. Dealer East. EW Vul.
A 62

- Q 1097
$\diamond$ A 976
\& J 102


A 54
$\checkmark$ AJ5 2
$\diamond$ QJ832
\& $A Q$

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Efraimsson | Whittaker Morath | Bertheau |  |
|  |  | 1 a | Dble |
| $29^{*}$ | Dble | 4 | All Pass |
| $2 毋$ | Art. raise in spades |  |  |

Efraimsson-Morath struck back on the next board. The only way to defeat Four Spades was to lead the ace of clubs and follow it up with the queen to establish a second trick in clubs before declarer could set up his king of hearts to dispose one of the losers in clubs.
Berthau led a trump, and declarer won in hand to immediately return a heart towards the king to set up his discard. The defense was then powerless, since declarer could discard a club and ruff the suit, good getting rid of his diamond losers.
145.76 points back, and a good $72 \%$ result, which almost levelled the round for E-W for the earlier loss.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Black | ReinholdtsenHallberg | Luostarinen |  |
|  | 1NT | Pass | 3NT |

All Pass
When Hallberg decided to lead the six of clubs it was all over for declarer, even though he tried his best by ducking two rounds of the suit before winning the third. West had no problems in leading back a spade since Hallberg had overtaken the second rounds of clubs and returned the seven of the suit, his highest spot-card, to tell the story about where he had his entry to collect the established clubs. One down.

Still, one down was 120.15 for E-W since at many of the other tables declarers had managed to go two or even three down in the same contract. With the queen of spades in West, Four Spades was a superior contract compared to Three Notrump, but not many managed to get there since the players sitting North tended to open with 1NT.


Worth noticing are; if you managed to get Three Notrump declared from South you would actually have a better stopper in clubs coming from your A84 vs J 9 and you could make 3NT played from that hand (even though its pairs and Four Spades still scored better).

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.

- A9532
© 975
$\diamond$ K Q 1076
$\&$ -

$\bigcirc$ Q 10
$\diamond$ J 932
\& A 108742

| West <br> Black | North <br> Reinholdtsen Hallberg | East <br> Suostarinen |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \&$ | $1 \triangleleft$ | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ | Dbl | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ |  |  |

All Pass
Here Gunnar Hallberg showed proof of why he is rated so highly as player. After leading the ace of hearts he immediately shifted to a trump. That eliminated declarer's chances of making his contract. West won with the ace of diamonds and returned a heart to Hallbergs king. Declarer simply didn't have enough trumps any longer to be able to set up his spades in hand and was down. Any switch to either black suit by Hallberg would have given the contract away - in theory he could have cashed the king of hearts and then returned a diamond as well which would have worked equally well.

One might think the contract might even go two down if the defence plays a second round of trumps. That wasn't the case since declarer just ruff two spades and gives away a third round still getting home with nine tricks.

At many tables N-S let their opponents play either game or a partscore in hearts and let the contract through when they led diamonds. 126.43 was the reward for defeating Four Diamonds, almost an average in other words.

## OPEN PAIRS

RANKING AFTER ROUND 10

|  | PAIR | MP | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NANEV I. - GUNEV R. | 12,607.18 | 60.61 |
| 2 | KWIECIEN M. - JANISZEWSKI P. | 12,169.12 | 58.51 |
| 3 | SKJETNE E. - LUNNA K. | 12,138.50 | 58.36 |
| 4 | KOPSTAD O. - GRUDE T. | 12,090.50 | 58.13 |
| 5 | KOLATA S. - KANDEMIR I. | 12,062.41 | 57.99 |
| 6 | SMITH V. - EVJEN S. | 12,041.03 | 57.89 |
| 7 | YADLIN D. - YADLIN I. | 12,029.54 | 57.83 |
| 8 | GAWRYS P. - KLUKOWSKI M. | 12,016.05 | 57.77 |
| 9 | HANTVEIT T. - HOYLAND S. | 11,999.24 | 57.69 |
| 10 | ROMANSKI J. - GRZELAK R. | 11,932.02 | 57.37 |
| 11 | CORNELL M. - BACH A. | 11,857.09 | 57.01 |
| 12 | SIMONSEN S. - BERG E. | 11,769.52 | 56.58 |
| 13 | MORATH A. - EFRAIMSSON B. | 11,709.57 | 56.30 |
| 14 | SVINDAHL F. - HANSEN J. | 11,705.63 | 56.28 |
| 15 | SMIRNOV A. - PIEKAREK J. | 11,631.87 | 55.92 |
| 16 | BESSIS T. - VOLCKER F. | 11,503.49 | 55.31 |
| 17 | OZDIL M. - OZBALCI E. | 11,461.72 | 55.10 |
| 18 | YILMAZ M. - GUR O. | 11,431.90 | 54.96 |
| 19 | HOYLAND J. - HOYLAND S. | 11,423.93 | 54.92 |
| 20 | ROMANOVSKA M. - GOLDBERG C. | 11,418.38 | 54.90 |
| 21 | TOWNSEND T. - SANDQVIST -. | 11,398.94 | 54.80 |
| 22 | FJAELBERG J. - OLSEN J. | 11,385.99 | 54.74 |
| 23 | ERBIL E. - ZOBU A. | 11,375.95 | 54.69 |
| 24 | LINDQVIST E. - BROGELAND B. | 11,339.14 | 54.52 |
| 25 | LYNGEN I. - LARSEN H. | 11,324.15 | 54.44 |
| 26 | HOMONNAY G. - WINKLER G. | 11,317.78 | 54.41 |
| 27 | HELMICH A. - HOP G. | 11,306.95 | 54.36 |
| 28 | LANZAROTTI M. - MANNO A. | 11,305.87 | 54.36 |
| 29 | STABELL L. - STABELL T. | 11,289.62 | 54.28 |
| 30 | ISPORSKI V. - KOVACHEV V. | 11,289.41 | 54.28 |
| 31 | QUANTIN J. - LORENZINI C. | 11,260.69 | 54.14 |
| 32 | AYDIN A. - SUZER U. | 11,260.47 | 54.14 |
| 33 | BERTHEAU P. - WHITTAKER W. | 11,250.28 | 54.09 |
| 34 | KOLESNIK A. - ROEDER R. | 11,250.05 | 54.09 |
| 35 | VOLL R. - KINDSBEKKEN A. | 11,212.75 | 53.91 |
| 36 | GIARD O. - BENOIT A. | 11,176.60 | 53.73 |
| 37 | LEVIN R. - BLANCHARD S. | 11,119.84 | 53.46 |
| 38 | RUBINS K. - LORENCS M. | 11,116.34 | 53.44 |
| 39 | VAINIKONIS V. - OLANSKI W. | 11,067.37 | 53.21 |
| 40 | COLDEA I. - ROTARU I. | 11,060.26 | 53.17 |
| 41 | SKIMMELAND T. - LARSEN G. | 11,053.41 | 53.14 |
| 42 | RITMEIJER R. - TICHA M. | 11,047.48 | 53.11 |
| 43 | LINDER P. - SWENSSON P. | 11,040.18 | 53.08 |
| 44 | VAN LANKVELD J. - BOS B. | 11,039.70 | 53.08 |
| 45 | RAJADHYAKSHA P. - GORDON M. | 11,023.71 | 53.00 |
| 46 | GINOSSAR E. - RESHEF O. | 11,017.83 | 52.97 |
| 47 | SEN T. - KAYA E. 11,002.62 | 52.90 |  |
| 48 | MARTENS K. - FILIPOWICZ D. | 10,981.59 | 52.80 |
| 49 | O'CONNOR S. - BELL M. | 10,977.97 | 52.78 |
| 50 | SAETHER J. - SCHEIE M. | 10,966.58 | 52.72 |
| 51 | AYAZ I. - PEYRET H. 10,951.05 | 52.65 |  |
| 52 | JOHNSEN S. - STOKKELAND L. | 10,947.03 | 52.63 |
| 53 | BOMPIS M. - VINCIGUERRA H. | 10,923.85 | 52.52 |


| [***v | 7th EUROPEAN OPEN BRIDGE CHAN | IPS |  | Tromsø, Norway |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PAIR | MP | \% |  |
| 54 | KVANGRAVEN N. - LIE T. | 10,902.99 | 52.42 |  |
| 55 | OHREN J. - BRENTEBRAATEN F. | 10,898.97 | 52.40 |  |
| 56 | AA T. - LIVGARD A. | 10,887.96 | 52.35 |  |
| 57 | GIERULSKI B. - SKRZYPCZAK J. | 10,868.70 | 52.25 |  |
| 58 | HERLAND J. - FROEYLAND S. | 10,866.96 | 52.25 |  |
| 59 | JACOB T. - MACE B. | 10,861.45 | 52.22 |  |
| 60 | JOHANSEN L. - REKSTAD G. | 10,628.10 | 52.14 |  |
| 61 | KING P. - McINTOSH A. | 10,840.64 | 52.12 |  |
| 62 | KREUNING H. - OUDA S. | 10,828.00 | 52.06 |  |
| 63 | WINKEL M. - VAN HOOIJDONK M. | 10,823.01 | 52.03 |  |
| 64 | GUMBY P. - LAZER W. | 10,820.62 | 52.02 |  |
| 65 | HELGEMO G. - HOFTANISKA T. | 10,820.46 | 52.02 |  |
| 66 | HELNESS T. - HELNESS F. | 10,810.46 | 51.97 |  |
| 67 | WILLENKEN C. - BILDE D. | 10,802.34 | 51.93 |  |
| 68 | FODSTAD A. - AAREBROT A. | 10,582.51 | 51.92 |  |
| 69 | HANLON T. - CARROLL J. | 10,576.79 | 51.89 |  |
| 70 | EBER N. - BOSENBERG C. | 10,777.82 | 51.82 |  |
| 71 | BAUMANN K. - EILERAAS S. | 10,544.46 | 51.73 |  |
| 72 | BIGDELI F. - POLET G. | 10,751.59 | 51.69 |  |
| 73 | AUSTBERG P. - BERG J. | 10,746.16 | 51.66 |  |
| 74 | JOERSTAD K. - JOERSTAD R. | 10,745.05 | 51.66 |  |
| 75 | ENGEBRETSEN G. - LOEN L. | 10,744.53 | 51.66 |  |
| 76 | MICHAUD-LARIVIERE X. - DE MENDEZ T. | 10,715.61 | 51.52 |  |
| 77 | NITTER T. - LUTRO J. | 10,706.03 | 51.47 |  |
| 78 | HOFF G. - HJELMELAND G. | 10,705.79 | 51.47 |  |
| 79 | OTVOSI E. - CHRISTIANSEN K. | 10,692.29 | 51.41 |  |
| 80 | WEINSTEIN S. - HUMPHREYS G. | 10,685.72 | 51.37 |  |
| 81 | TATLICIOGLU S. - KAYTAZ B. | 10,655.55 | 51.23 |  |
| 82 | BAREKET I. - LENGY A. | 10,651.91 | 51.21 |  |
| 83 | SANBORN K. - SANBORN S. | 10,650.90 | 51.21 |  |
| 84 | SMILGAJS A. - BENDIKS J. | 10,650.08 | 51.20 |  |
| 85 | REINHOLDTSEN J. - LUOSTARINEN J. | 10,646.25 | 51.18 |  |
| 86 | DAVIDSEN R. - SAUR J. | 10,640.55 | 51.16 |  |
| 87 | EIDE L. - ELLINGSEN K. | 10,631.44 | 51.11 |  |
| 88 | MIHAI G. - MIHAI R. | 10,630.60 | 51.11 |  |
| 89 | HALLBERG G. - BLACK A. | 10,616.35 | 51.04 |  |
| 90 | CHUMAK Y. - ROVYSHYN O. | 10,614.52 | 51.03 |  |
| 91 | LARSEN E. - EVENSTAD S. | 10,614.10 | 51.03 |  |
| 92 | HOILAND T. - OVESEN J. | 10,601.50 | 50.97 |  |
| 93 | RIMSTEDT P. - JONSSON S. | 10,599.31 | 50.96 |  |
| 94 | EIDE H. - BAKKE C. | 10,597.58 | 50.95 |  |
| 95 | SAELENSMINDE E. - HAUGE R. | 10,594.64 | 50.94 |  |
| 96 | MALINOWSKI A. - PADON D. | 10,381.67 | 50.93 |  |
| 97 | HORNISCHER G. - WEINBERGER S. | 10,582.85 | 50.88 |  |
| 98 | MAGRI F. - BARTOLOTTI P. | 10,574.16 | 50.84 |  |
| 99 | SERPOI G. - TEODORESCU C. | 10,567.45 | 50.81 |  |
| 100 | ROLL Y. - LEVIN A. | 10,543.98 | 50.69 |  |
| 101 | HELGESEN L. - GJOES T. | 10,523.06 | 50.59 |  |
| 102 | TISLEVOLL G. - BREKKE V. | 10,519.67 | 50.58 |  |
| 103 | JASSEM K. - MAZURKIEWICZ M. | 10,515.56 | 50.56 |  |
| 104 | GARSEG T. - STATLE S. | 10,495.63 | 50.46 |  |
| 105 | GROSSACK A. - GROSSACK Z. | 10,495.22 | 50.46 |  |
| 106 | ROMANOWSKI J. - ROZWADOWSKI W. | 10,490.64 | 50.44 |  |
| 107 | ARONOV V. - DAMIANOVA D. | 10,467.02 | 50.32 |  |
| 108 | HAGA O. - BAARDSEN T. | 10,464.67 | 50.31 |  |
| 109 | SILVERSTEIN A. - ROSENTHAL A. | 10,459.28 | 50.29 |  |
| 110 | MARSTRANDER P. - ANDERSSEN R. | 10,458.41 | 50.28 |  |
| 111 | DINKIN S. - TUNCOK C. | 10,451.37 | 50.25 |  |
| 112 | ERNSTSEN S. - HAETTA L. | 10,443.61 | 50.21 |  |
| 113 | LINDESTEG O. - UELAND D. | 10,436.89 | 50.18 |  |

[^5]| **** | EUROPEAN OPEN BRIDGE CHAMP | HIPS | Tromsø, Norway |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PAIR | MP | \% |  |
| 114 | OVESEN V. - HATTEN O. | 10,436.26 | 50.17 |  |
| 115 | DOBROWOLSKI M. - MADUZIA A. | 10,407.24 | 50.03 |  |
| 116 | ZUR-CAMPANILE M. - MCALLISTER J. | 10,406.63 | 50.03 |  |
| 117 | BILDE M. - FARHOLT S. | 10,394.36 | 49.97 |  |
| 118 | LAKATOS P. - DOMBI G. | 10,387.43 | 49.94 |  |
| 119 | GUSTAVSSON T. - CLARIN P. | 10,171.39 | 49.90 |  |
| 120 | ELIASSEN R. - ELIASSEN S. | 10,371.56 | 49.86 |  |
| 121 | COUNIL J. - ROUSSEL N. | 10,369.42 | 49.85 |  |
| 122 | KOLUDA P. - DARKIEWICZ-MONIUSZKO G. | 10,367.38 | 49.84 |  |
| 123 | JOHANSEN J. - JOHANSEN A. | 10,363.60 | 49.82 |  |
| 124 | GOWER C. - APTEKER A. | 10,335.92 | 49.69 |  |
| 125 | EIDE L. - ANDREASEN A. | 10,334.67 | 49.69 |  |
| 126 | SHI B. - TIAN W. | 10,334.39 | 49.68 |  |
| 127 | DALECKI M. - MODRZEJEWSKI M. | 10,115.26 | 49.62 |  |
| 128 | JENSAAS J. - INGEBRIGTSEN T. | 10,307.24 | 49.55 |  |
| 129 | HELGESEN K. - ANFINSEN E. | 10,263.67 | 49.34 |  |
| 130 | VAN DER TOORN C. - KAPTEIN M. | 10,044.89 | 49.28 |  |
| 131 | FREDIN P. - SHERMAN G. | 10,236.81 | 49.22 |  |
| 132 | KOWALSKI D. - BLACH M. | 10,198.57 | 49.03 |  |
| 133 | BJERKSET S. - LANGEN A. | 10,183.85 | 48.96 |  |
| 134 | FAILLA G. - DE MICHELIS L. | 10,182.62 | 48.95 |  |
| 135 | THOMASSEN K. - HINGE S. | 10,175.05 | 48.92 |  |
| 136 | MARTINUSSEN S. - PAULSEN D. | 10,167.02 | 48.88 |  |
| 137 | FRANCHI A. - ZALESKI R. | 10,159.48 | 48.84 |  |
| 138 | GOLD D. - CASTNER K. | 10,155.12 | 48.82 |  |
| 139 | BOGACH A. - RAPOPORT V. | 10,149.05 | 48.79 |  |
| 140 | THOMASSEN P. - ANDERSEN S. | 10,143.89 | 48.77 |  |
| 141 | GOLEBIOWSKI S. - JASZCZAK A. | 10,135.16 | 48.73 |  |
| 142 | SIVERTSEN A. - KARLSEN S. | 10,131.12 | 48.71 |  |
| 143 | CARCASSONNE-LABAERE V. - LABAERE A. | 10,130.61 | 48.70 |  |
| 144 | BULL S. - BULL I. | 10,117.65 | 48.64 |  |
| 145 | POLAK T. - VAN OVERBEEKE T. | 10,117.17 | 48.64 |  |
| 146 | TER LAARE M. - MOLLE L. | 10,114.01 | 48.63 |  |
| 147 | SAETRE J. - OVESEN S. | 10,105.74 | 48.59 |  |
| 148 | JENSEN B. - JOHANSEN R. | 10,103.66 | 48.58 |  |
| 149 | SCHIPPERS-BOSKLOPPER E. - STIENEN R. | 10,023.47 | 48.19 |  |
| 150 | SIELICKI T. - TUCZYNSKI P. | 10,020.60 | 48.18 |  |
| 151 | ZACK Y. - COHEN I. | 10,008.09 | 48.12 |  |
| 152 | DESSAIN T, - KABAN T. | 9,993.82 | 48.05 |  |
| 153 | BEYER M. - BAARDSEN T. | 9,746.01 | 47.81 |  |
| 154 | GIUBILO V. - MEDUGNO G. | 9,913.34 | 47.66 |  |
| 155 | SANDSMARK T. - ROGNSAA B. | 9,910.03 | 47.64 |  |
| 156 | HOFSETH J. - KRISTENSEN A. | 9,906.96 | 47.63 |  |
| 157 | STRAND K. - HELMERSEN K. | 9,903.86 | 47.61 |  |
| 158 | VARDAR R. - KAYA M. | 9,852.03 | 47.37 |  |
| 159 | SAUR O. - AABYE J. | 9,840.46 | 47.31 |  |
| 160 | NYMOEN A. - DALING T. | 9,816.67 | 47.20 |  |
| 161 | RYDLAND B. - BOGEN J. | 9,806.96 | 47.15 |  |
| 162 | NORDVIK V. - IVERSEN T. | 9,800.53 | 47.12 |  |
| 163 | OLSEN R. - OLSEN S. | 9,778.34 | 47.01 |  |
| 164 | CHMURSKI B. - CHALUPEC I. | 9,722.73 | 46.74 |  |
| 165 | RYNNING E. - BREKKA G. | 9,720.99 | 46.74 |  |
| 166 | COPE S. - PASKE T. | 9,715.03 | 46.71 |  |
| 167 | SKALMERAAS T. - SKALMERAS P. | 9,690.03 | 46.59 |  |
| 168 | AUKEN S. - WELLAND R. | 9,620.16 | 46.25 |  |
| 169 | KALTENBORN J. - BRUUSGAARD R. | 9,594.55 | 46.13 |  |
| 170 | OLSEN R. - BJORKAN I. | 9,568.21 | 46.00 |  |
| 171 | HAUGE B. - HAUGE T. | 9,535.02 | 45.84 |  |
| 172 | KRISTIANSEN T. - FAGERDAL R. | 9,525.00 | 45.79 |  |
| 173 | SVARE A. - DYRKORN O. | 9,507.27 | 45.71 |  |


|  | PAIR | MP | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 174 | JANSONS U. - GERMANIS A. | 9,486.17 | 45.61 |
| 175 | OLSEN M. - OEDEGAARDEN H. | 9,255.16 | 45.40 |
| 176 | LEHN R. - ELDE T. | 9,427.88 | 45.33 |
| 177 | PARVULESCU M. - BUJENITA D. | 9,417.00 | 45.27 |
| 178 | SAYILKAN T. - KIZILOK O. | 9,403.95 | 45.21 |
| 179 | MORTENSEN M. - VAAGE J. | 9,395.61 | 45.17 |
| 180 | JENSEN P. - STRAUMSNES T. | 9,363.06 | 45.01 |
| 181 | McLEISH P. - McLEISH D. | 9,362.65 | 45.01 |
| 182 | KVAMSDAL L. - HOFF A. | 9,345.87 | 44.93 |
| 183 | BUIJS P. - DE HULLU H. | 9,337.29 | 44.89 |
| 184 | EIDE M. - LOMSDALEN O. | 9,316.70 | 44.79 |
| 185 | VESTERLUND A. - BRAENDVANG M. | 9,308.19 | 44.75 |
| 186 | KARLSEN L. - JAKOBSEN G. | 9,303.33 | 44.73 |
| 187 | DAHL S. - FUGLEM G. | 9,297.62 | 44.70 |
| 188 | ELIASSEN E. - SOOILAND T. | 9,278.55 | 44.61 |
| 189 | EIDE E. - ROREN T. | 9,268.41 | 44.56 |
| 190 | STERN L. - URMAN L. | 9,243.31 | 44.44 |
| 191 | VALLESTAD A. - PEDERSEN B. | 7,349.54 | 44.17 |
| 192 | OLSEN M. - LYNGBOE T. | 9,181.21 | 44.14 |
| 193 | GILL P. - DAWSON J. | 9,119.85 | 43.85 |
| 194 | MARRO C. - MARRO V. | 9,106.32 | 43.78 |
| 195 | LARSEN H. - JOHANSSON S. | 9,105.06 | 43.77 |
| 196 | MIDJO R. - UKKELBERG O. | 9,077.73 | 43.64 |
| 197 | JENSEN R. - ALMLI S. | 9,069.64 | 43.60 |
| 198 | ELIASSEN N. - CHRISTENSEN P. | 9,016.99 | 43.35 |
| 199 | ARNTSEN R. - SOTTAR R. | 8,980.44 | 43.18 |
| 200 | LASSERRE D. - BRUNET K. | 8,976.10 | 43.15 |
| 201 | MUSAOGLU A. - MINASYAN A. | 8,862.61 | 42.61 |
| 202 | ZUBOV V. - FILIPPOV V. | 8,859.81 | 42.60 |
| 203 | NOKLEBY J. - HEGBOM E. | 8,800.73 | 42.31 |
| 204 | SANDVIK C. - BREMNES H. | 8,750.21 | 42.07 |
| 205 | NORUM J. - SIVERTSEN S. | 8,737.76 | 42.01 |
| 206 | MALUISH A. - MILL A. | 8,628.13 | 41.48 |
| 207 | KIRCHHOFF L. - SECHRIEST S. | 8,460.70 | 40.68 |
| 208 | WEIE D. - OLSEN S. | 8,265.73 | 39.74 |
| 209 | SVENDSEN O. - GILLIS S. | 8,233.42 | 39.58 |
| 210 | KRISTOFFERSEN L. - STENBRO E. | 7,744.46 | 37.23 |

## DUPLIMATE

The Duplimates used to duplicate the championship boards in Tromso are sold out but you can pre-order a Duplimate to be used at the World Championships later on this year on the same terms, i.e. EUR 1999. Contact Jannerstens at the bridge stall in the bridge plaza, or drop a line to per@jannersten.com.




Women and Seniors players who do not qualify for the Finals may play free of charge in one or both the NBF side events tomorrow Thursday. Each event consists of 24 boards.
Starting Times: Morning Event-10.00 // Afternoon Event-14.30

## OPEN TEAMS KNOCKOUT




[^0]:    GO TO PAGE:
    $\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllll}1 & 2 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 15 & 16 & 17 & 18 & 19 \\ 20 & 21 & 22 & 24 & 25\end{array}$
    $\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllllll}26 & 27 & 28 & 29 & 30 & 31 & 32 & 33 & 34 & 35 & 36 & 37 & 38 & 39 & 40 & 41 & 42 & 43 & \text { BRACKET }\end{array}$

[^1]:    
    $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllll}26 & 27 & 28 & 29 & 30 & 31 & 32 & 33 & 34 & 35 & 36 & 37 & 38 & 39 & 40 & 41 & 42 & 43 \\ \text { BRACKET }\end{array}$

[^2]:    GO TO PAGE:

[^3]:    * 1 or 4 Key Cards

[^4]:    go to page: $\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 15 & 16 & 17 & 18 & 19 & 20 & 21 & 22 & 23 & 24 & 25\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllllll}26 & 27 & 28 & 29 & 30 & 31 & 32 & 33 & 34 & 35 & 36 & 37 & 38 & 39 & 40 & 41 & 42 & 43 & \text { BRACKET }\end{array}$

[^5]:    GO TO PAGE:

